UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 94—PART 11

MAY 11, 1948, TO JUNE 19, 1948

(PAGES A2881 TO A4174)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1948

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

FEB 3 '49

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Appendix

The Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 11 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address relative to the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, delivered by me on May 4, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Greetings, everybody. I have received large numbers of telegrams and letters about the housing legislation recently passed by the Senate. This measure is known as the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

What were the problems facing the Senate that it is hoped this measure will help solve?

The acute housing shortage, which it is conceded exists in many sections of our country, can be roughly divided in two phases:

First. Emergency housing to take care of immediate needs, and

Second. Long-range housing principally for low-income groups.

The problem varies from State to State and ofttimes it is different from one community to another within the State. A few States are taking care of housing of their people very well with little outside help. Utah, it is said, is one of these. Most of the States having large cities are not doing so well. In this class, conditions range from bad to critical.

Let's go into the question of emergency housing first. World War II veterans are most affected by the shortage. While they were away, available homes were all occupied. Building of new homes practically stopped except for temporary war housing constructed in war-industry centers. Meanwhile, the population of the country increased some 12,000,000 since 1939. Also our housing plant was gradually wearing out. Veterans couldn't compete with war workers who received big pay during the war. People with war savings bought the houses. The veterans were left literally out in the cold.

We are spending more than $6,000,000,000 per year for veterans' benefits in other fields, but in housing we have failed miserably. I say this, notwithstanding the fact that our builders—and they deserve praise for what they have done—constructed more houses last year than had been constructed in any one year previously for the past 20 years.

But this record, as good as it was, did not meet more than half the accumulated demand for houses.

Houses are becoming more plentiful, but the cost of new homes is so high they are beyond the means of most veterans and low-income groups. They are completely out of their reach unless they go in debt the rest of their lives to pay for them.

Another factor which has aggravated the situation is the fact that most of the new houses are built for sale, not for rent. The demand, however, is for rentals rather than for purchase. Under normal conditions, more than half of our houses built in the past were built for rent, but now, because of the high cost of homes, the situation is drastically reversed. People who are earning $1,200 a year, or even twice that sum, cannot buy homes They have no alternative but to rent.

The need for housing for the low-income groups naturally ties in very closely with the next phase of the problem which I shall discuss, that of long-range housing. This phase of the housing problem has been before the public for many years. More than a decade ago a late President of the United States said that one-third of the Nation was ill-housed. Since then we have spent many millions of dollars and have created many new housing agencies, but we have only begun to solve this long-range program.

This phase of the problem as it appeared to the Senate was something like this:

There are literally millions of families in the United States earning less than $200 per month. Many of them are in the $100 per month pay schedule. They were unable to buy homes when prices were low, and certainly they are not in a position to buy them now that prices are so high, because all other living costs have increased much more even than rent. They are likely to be more or less perpetually in the rental group. The homes they now live in are what is known as second-hand, third-hand, fourth-hand, and even fifth-hand homes. By that is meant homes that have become old, obsolete, homes that were built many years ago before modern sanitary facilities were used extensively. The rentals are low, because these homes and the sections where they were built have deteriorated in value.

It was such conditions as prevail in these low-rental homes that prompted the first long-range housing bill. That was during the heyday of the New Deal.

Since then much study has been made of the problem, and today in the Senate bill, an affirmative approach is made to this problem which it is hoped eventually will solve it, at least in part.

Because of the nature of the bill, it will take at least a year, even if the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill becomes law, to get this program in operation. The provisions of the bill which attempt to solve this problem are the ones which are the most controversial. The Senate approach for the solution of the problems as I have outlined them, was, first, to give private enterprise every opportunity to build the homes for America. That is the cornerstone, the chief reliance of those who framed this bill.

Under the old National Housing Act, the Government insured housing loans up to a certain percent of the loan made. This was to take the risk out of housing built so that banks, building-and-loan agencies, and others could safely risk their capital. Great progress was made under this provision. It was known as title 6 under the old act. The new bill extends this feature for another year.

The bill increases the amount available for loans and improves home-financing arrangements.

It provides a way to unlock and make available vast resources of capital now held by life-insurance companies. The money held by these companies, running into the billions of dollars, belongs to the beneficiaries of life-insurance policies. It cannot be gambled with by the companies as it is held in trust. However, it should be put to work. This bill provides insurance and a guaranteed return on investments made by insurance companies in the low-rental housing.

This should greatly encourage building in this field. It should take care of most of the demand, not only for ordinary low-income groups but for many veterans and their families.

Particular attention is given to the problem of veterans. For example, the bill provides that when groups of five or more veterans get together to build homes they may receive loans up to 95 percent of the cost. It may also provide for technical assistance. They are given priorities for available housing. This is an extension of the old law. GI loans are made more attractive to finance institutions. Other priorities are extended to families of veterans who were killed or died during the period of their services.

The bill provides for secondary purchasing agencies to buy mortgages from banks which have been making loans to veterans. The bill also amends the Banking Act to allow national banks to underwrite housing obligations.

The bill also establishes a single housing agency in which all Government effort will be concentrated. It also provides for intensive investigation and study of housing costs and methods of construction and financing which will help to lower the costs.

The plight of the small farmer is not overlooked. Those who are not able to get credit elsewhere are given facilities for borrowing money to put in sanitary and other necessary features in their homes. They will also be able to get credit for the building of homes where they can show they cannot borrow elsewhere and in certain instances they are given small grants in aid to help in building homes to raise their standard of living.

All of these provisions I have mentioned and others—about 90 percent of the provisions of the entire bill—are all planned to aid private enterprise in solving the enor-

mous problem of housing the American people. So far as I have been able to learn, there is very little objection to any of them.

Titles 5 and 6 of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill provide an affirmative approach to the solution of the long-range housing problem for those with very low incomes. These provisions, in brief, provide for slum clearance and for the extension of the public low-rent program to serve those families whose incomes are so low that private enterprise, even with the improved aids provided in this bill, cannot hope to service them. Federal contribution to help reduce rentals so that they will be within the means of low-income families are authorized and annual contributions to be contracted for at the rate of $32,000,000 a year for each of the 5 years following the enactment of the bill.

There was also a limitation placed in that not more than 500,000 units of public low-rent housing may be undertaken over the 5-year period. It gives low-income veterans first preference in occupancy.

In order for any State or community to take advantage of these provisions of the bill, they must first establish that private enterprise can't and won't undertake the work and that it is absolutely necessary to have the provisions of this bill applied to these States and communities. However, before they can get this help, they must first enact legislation which will permit the organization of the public-housing agencies. Finally, the occupants of this type of housing would be limited strictly to families whose incomes are at least 20 percent below the minimum income required to purchase or rent standard private housing, new or old, in the locality involved. They will be required to pay rent up to the limit of their ability.

In writing these provisions into law, the Senate had ample precedents. It had, for instance, the history of the helps government has given to private industry. May I mention a few:

A protective tariff prevailed for many years to aid infant industry in this country to get on its feet. This tariff in effect was a subsidy paid by all the people who bought the products of these industries. It is still in effect on many products.

Land grants to railroads to encourage private industry to build these means of transportation.

Mail subsidies to steamship companies and to air lines to encourage these industries to become firmly established.

Flood control, which aids private owners in reclaiming millions of acres of land along streams.

Home Owners' Loan Corporation which put the Government in the business of lending money to save homes from foreclosure.

Government insurance for deposits in banks. The United States went into the insurance business to help keep the banks solvent.

Establishment of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the days of Herbert Hoover. This was done to provide loans for businesses during the depression which could not borrow money elsewhere.

Support prices for metals, farm crops, and wool.

Probably the best known example of what I am talking about is the United States irrigation and reclamation program for aiding Western States to reclaim their arid lands. Westerners had done their best with their own means and capital to reclaim these lands. They did reclaim all those under easy, low-cost projects.

The central Utah reclamation project is now waiting congressional approval. It is estimated to cost between four hundred and eight hundred million dollars. Utah is asking Congress to back this bill. Southern, Eastern, and Midwestern States do not need reclamation, but many of them urgently need housing. Utah is apparently not interested in slum clearance and public housing. How can the Utah congressional delegation deny other States help in solving the gigantic housing problem facing them when it asks their help to solve its reclamation programs? Both programs call for help from Uncle Sam.

It is claimed that the TEW housing bill and public housing cost is exorbitant. As a matter of fact, the cost is comparatively small in relation to other items on the budget. We must measure costs by over-all results. The subsidy commitments for those in the lowest-income groups are the only direct costs to taxpayers, beside those of administration, of any consequence. These subsidies will amount to $32,000,000 the first year and increase to an average of $130,000,000 per year. The total cost of this program for a 10-year period will be approximately $1,300,000,000, or, in 10 years, less than one-tenth of what the Armed Services cost the people in one year.

This does not take into consideration the community gains through property improvement. That is a sound investment of Government funds to which our people would not object. It resolves itself to this: these low-income people cannot supply all their own needs, therefore the money must come from other sources. Private enterprise, while best equipped to handle the ordinary situation, has so far failed in this particular field. It cannot be expected to build housing quarters for people who cannot pay rent high enough to make a profit on the investment. Investors should not be expected to do this job. Only the Government can do it.

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is not a perfect measure. But I sincerely believe that it is sound enough and has enough merit to justify its trial in the solution of one of our most difficult problems.

I close this broadcast with a quotation from a man whom Senator TOBEY said was a great radical.

I quote: "We aim to set up in this country a human society, not an economic system. We aim for increased production and greater efficiency, but to the end that we may have happier home life in America."

That radical was Herbert Hoover.

Oberlin College Mock Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 11 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on the evening of last Friday, May 7, there was delivered before the Oberlin College mock convention a keynote address by our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. It is well worthy of the consideration, I might say, of both the Democratic and Republican Members of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. In this connection, I should like to point out that in the result of the Oberlin College mock convention the Senate of the United States did very well.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the convention, the privilege of addressing you here today is a very special honor because you of Oberlin College are foremost in representing the youth of America in a fine tradition of culture, citizenship, and a profound concern with the conduct of our National Government.

You are pioneers in molding opinion of the youth of our country into the shape of political things to come. You can recall with enviable pride the Oberlin convention in 1860 which nominated Abraham Lincoln, and since that time your voice has been prophetic, in each convention year, of the sincerest thinking among students of public affairs.

An invitation to deliver the keynote address before so distinguished a gathering is, therefore, both a rare opportunity and a grave responsibility.

It would not be appropriate for me, as keynote speaker, to anticipate or even to influence your platform—let alone indicate preferences for candidates. But I will say that whatever your choice may be, the Republican Party today offers you the wealth of leadership, the strength, and the unity necessary to make that choice become an ultimate reality.

I take it that my opportunity and my responsibility today is one of interpreting to you what the over-all spirit of this convention should be. The spirit of this convention is to select a candidate and a platform which will effectively resolve the grave problems which face us and carry this Nation forward toward the objectives of world peace and stability.

NATIONAL UNITY

First, then, we must take stock of our own situation. It is not necessary to offer detailed evidence of the fact that certain basic conflicts exist in our country today. We see differences, for example, between agriculture and industry, between management and labor, and between pressure groups of one kind and another who pursue their own selfish ends. Basically, such disagreements are part and parcel of the democratic process. As long as they are kept within the bounds of discussion and compromise—as long as both sides keep their perspective and are always mindful of the greater national aims common to us all, we need have no fear of becoming a Nation divided. But if we allow these differences to become real conflicts, then we expose ourselves to real danger from subversive forces which are ever on the alert to exploit cleavages as they have worked to spread chaos and confusion among the peoples of Europe and Asia. We must think in terms of national teamwork if America is to achieve her position of legitimate leadership in a chaotic world. I am not thinking alone in terms of America's material greatness, but also in terms of her spiritual leadership. Throughout America's history, she has been given an insight into the real fruits of freedom. She has a mission to pass that insight on to others.

While talking on this subject of disunity, let me honestly criticize what seems to me to be divisive tendencies in our political parties. In the popular mind, the Republican Party is the party of efficiency, of fiscal soundness, and of industrial prosperity. At times in our history we may have lacked human warmth and understanding, and in our eagerness to be efficient we have condoned abuses brought about by an understandable but regrettable human selfishness. We have permitted, at times, the enormous growth of our business enterprises to lead us too far along toward economic monopoly. These trends, which we must recognize and control, have contributed to division instead of an all-around cooperation, and it may have been these unfortunate trends, coupled with the devastating world depression, which led to the taking over of the Government by the Democrats and the inauguration of the so-called New Deal reforms in 1932.

When the Democrats came into power, their reforms, with the emphasis on the human side of our national problems unfortunately led to exaggerations, on their part, which have also been distinctly divisive. We have seen the destructive formulas, such as "soak the rich," "tax, spend and elect," along with Government hand-outs and paternalism for votes leading inch by inch to excessive Government control. Here again are trends which must be eradicated.

Thus we have moved, in the course of a relatively few years from economic control of our national life by big business to political control of our every-day activities by big government. Now we face the task of finding the road back to a better balanced expression of our free-enterprise system.

THE KEYNOTE

In examining these problems, I feel that there is need to review those traditions which have made America the greatest Nation in the world. In a crisis such as is now upon us, we should seek again those divine inspirations of Almighty God that led our forefathers to this country and guided them in the formative years of this great Nation. And beyond these spiritual forces, which must always be the foundation of everything we do, I feel that we are called upon again to do all in our power to release the creative energy of our people. This same need for the release of creative energy exists throughout the entire world. The world today is in a state of chaos, confusion and despair, and is suffering from all the aftermath of a cruel, devastating war. It is endangered by the sinister forces of communism—forces that feed on divisiveness, human hatreds and the destruction of the creative powers of man.

These conditions impose a particular burden on the American Government in power, on its leadership and on the effectiveness with which it executes its mandate. Consequently, there is a particular interest in the differences between the Democratic and the Republican conception of the proper function of government.

During 16 years of New Deal control, the leaders of Government have moved more and more to the idea that they can blueprint the millennium for our people, and then by mere passage of laws can bring that millennium about. The Democratic New Deal has magnified the so-called brain trust conception of planning and handing out to a Nation of 140 million independent, free-thinking people a program developed by a few bright young men who think they know what is best for the rest of us. This doctrine of blueprinting our lives, which temporarily seemed necessary during the thirties because of the depression through which the world was passing, has now tended to become crystallized as a substitute for our original American system. Its effect is to separate rather than unite the Nation. It suggests that individual initiative is inherently selfish and opposed to the public interest, and that better standards of living can be bestowed by a Government bountiful rather than by the efforts of the people themselves. This trend is profoundly dangerous. In time it produces the kind of paternalism which leads imperceptibly but inevitably to regimentation. World War II, with its inevitable need of certain controls in the interest of the war effort, has tended to accelerate the political philosophy of centralized control. We have witnessed vicious examples of the extremes of such centralized control in Hitler's Germany, Mussolini's Italy, and presently Communist Russia. Under this system, the people become the servants and ultimately the slaves of the government.

How sharp is the contrast between the New Deal planned economy concept and the fundamental American approach, which I maintain has been our traditional Republican approach? The Republican point of view places the chief reliance upon the individual, creative, productive faculties of all of our people. It encourages the vision and courageous spirit of enterprise which has made America great. This is what I mean by the release of creative energy. This is what I understand to be true liberalism. The emphasis is not on a paternalistically protected society, which is a static conception and which ultimately would lead to deterioration, but rather on an inspired spirit of adventure—a dynamic, positive, aggressive approach to national and world problems.

This doctrine teaches us that progress in the future, as in the past, can best be achieved by the personal and individual enterprise of a Nation of free men and women, jealously safeguarding their civil and religious liberties. Its faith is founded on the principles of truly representative government so wisely provided by the founders of our Nation. It opposes monopolies by big business and restrictive controls by big government.

It holds that high standards of living are dependent on the full utilization of the vast resources of our country; upon competitive prices in the domestic market, and a prosperity based on production in abundance rather than scarcity. Only as we create wealth can we distribute it.

The basic principles are entirely consistent with a sound social-security program recognizing the necessity of caring for those who are dependent—whether their need be due to age or other causes beyond their control. This is fundamentally the American system; the Government serves the people. This is the system to which we can look for the release of the creative energy of our people. This approach demands that every attention of government should be focused on aiding the individual citizen to take care of himself and his dependents. It is not the primary function of government to give everybody a job, but rather to create and maintain an economy in which everyone can find his own job. The paternal care by the Government of its citizens, the "cradle to the grave" philosophy of the Democratic administration is contrary to our Republican conception of the proper function of the state.

CREATIVE ENERGY IN THE FIELD OF FOREIGN RELATIONS

The application of these principles in matters of foreign policy demands that we as Americans present a completely united front in dealing with the other nations of the world. It would be disastrous were we to have a conflict between a Republican foreign policy and a Democratic foreign policy. In our foreign relations we must leave politics at the water's edge.

The swiftly moving events in Europe, and, in fact, throughout the world since the close of the shooting war, have alined the United States definitely on the side of rehabilitation and reconstruction of the free nations of the world so that they can once again take care of themselves in the family of nations.

As against this positive objective, we see the Communists' negative and destructive tactics in operation. They seek to spread confusion and chaos in the other countries of the world, and then capitalize on their weakness and absorb them. Thus, whether we wish it or not, we are confronted with a very definite war of ideas which is being fought on a battlefield that is world-wide. The positive Christian concept of freedom through reconstruction and cooperative self-help—as, for example, in a united Europe—opposes the atheistic conception of Marxism with its attendant dominance of the dictator and the ruthless police state.

The approval on April 3 by both Houses of the Congress of the legislation that puts into practical effect the operations of the so-called Marshall plan is an achievement of vast historical importance and is directly in line with the over-all purpose of reconstructing and releasing creative energy in the post-war world. But beyond that, the Marshall plan, pointing the way for the participating nations to unite their resources for economic recovery, may well bring about a peaceful federation of all Europe, and even ultimately a United States of Europe, that neither Napoleon nor Bismarck, nor Kaiser Wilhelm, nor Hitler were able to bring about by military conquest. This achievement is a bipartisan product developed by the leadership of both parties in the Congress. It is an inspiring tribute to the fundamental soundness of the American patriotic conception of our national destiny. We are called upon, as a people, to take a position of positive, aggressive, friendly leadership, with the ultimate goal of a "one world" united to preserve the peace. On the road to that goal we are confronted with the present conflict of ideologies which we must face courageously, with adequate provision for military security. But beyond military security, our vision and our over-all purpose must be to unite the world and not divide it. We must hope that in the course of time, by friendly firmness, we will bring the great mass of the Russian people to see that the way of freedom is the way of peace, and that coercion leads only to conflict.

America can no longer think in terms of isolation. We are a part of the world, and with the destiny that has been pointed out to us by Almighty God, we must accept the responsibility of inspiring, dynamic leadership.

CREATIVE ENERGY IN THE FIELD OF DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

As a nation, we cannot hope to cope with the world situation until we put our own house in order. Therefore, our most important immediate objective must be that of directing all of our governmental function to the release of the creative energy of our people here at home.

The quality which has made America great has been the stimulation of individual initiative, inventiveness, and imagination. The great productive powers of our country rest upon this foundation which has given us the highest standard of living of any nation in world history. The basis for this great productive genius is freedom of action and expression—the right of the individual to decide whether he wants to run a filling station or a bank, and the spirit which insists on the inalienable right to criticize the way in which his government functions. This is the basic creed of the Republican Party.

Here is where the contrast comes between the planned New Deal economy of paternalistic control and the Republican philosophy of the release of the creative energy of the individual. In saying this, I am not unaware of the abuses that can creep into a free system. I am not unmindful of the dangers of monopoly. These evil tendencies must be controlled. However, I wish to emphasize the essential and striking contrast between a regimented society and the release of the imagination and creative energy of a people.

There can be no excuse for Government controls over our economy except in time of war emergency. Of course we must be prepared, when emergencies arise, temporarily to ration scarcities, and even to control prices. But let us be sure that we regard these expedients as temporary—to be abandoned when times return to normal. Let us face the dangers of inflation fairly and squarely. Let us meet the economic crisis, not by controls and restraints, but by encouragement of maximum production through the release of individual energies and initiative. There is no other way to achieve our productive potential and to effect the price reductions which will spread the benefits of efficient production to all our people.

It is thus the function of government to aid in creating a condition in which people can help themselves by working out their own destinies, and to avoid imposing stultify-

ing limitations, restraints, and controls. The government must be positive. It should properly be looked upon as the umpire of the great game of our everyday life. It makes the rules of the game and enforces them. It must not attempt to do for people what they can do for themselves. It must ever direct its efforts toward releasing the creative energy of the people to the end that their will to work may be stimulated and inspired.

This philosophy of government places the Republicans in opposition to government by bureaucracy. We are the ardent champions of the decentralization of government, and of guaranteeing to States their original rights of home rule. We recognize our Federal system as a union of independent States; that it was created by those States and is, or should be, their servant. We hold that we as a Nation are ruled most successfully when we decentralize power, and place a maximum of responsibility in the hands of local governments.

However, before the States can discharge their full responsibilities, they must be financially able to carry them. For many years, the Federal Government has steadily encroached on what are properly State sources of tax moneys. The end-product has been that the States have only left to themselves tax fields that are completely inadequate to produce the revenues needed to assume their responsibilities. Consequently, many of the States have been and are compelled to rely on aid from the Federal Government. The Congress must devise a more equitable division of tax fields whereby the States will be allocated tax sources capable of producing sufficient revenues to meet the costs of those functions of government which are the responsibility of the States. Until such a revision is made, the possibilities of the decentralization of government will be sharply limited.

IMPORTANT PENDING ISSUES

The principle which I have called the release of creative energy and the encouragement of individual initiative has a specific application to every important issue which the country faces today. Let me give some outstanding examples.

1. Fiscal policy: One of the most pressing problems at the moment is that of fiscal policy. In times of peace there is no excuse for government deficits. Yet today we are in a very unsound position, and the only cure which the present administration has been able to apply is excessive taxation. The result is to discourage individual incentive and investment of risk capital which curbs the experimental enterprises which have led to our Nation's phenomenal success in production. We must consider a complete overhaul of our tax system, with a view to eliminating inequities and reducing the present penalties which are imposed on personal incentive and which very definitely retard the release of creative energy.

2. Management-labor relations: Just as we oppose the control of our national economy by big business, and the political control of our daily living by big government, so we also oppose the monopolistic control of working groups by big labor leaders. The Republican Party has made a commendable beginning toward the solution of this problem in the Taft-Hartley Act. This act seeks, first, to balance the bargaining powers of labor and management, and second, to emancipate the working man from the dictatorship of union leaders. Here again, if we can think in terms of releasing the creative energy of the worker and inspire him with interest in his particular industry, we can begin to catch the right spirit of labor-management relations. I am more interested in the cooperative, productive spirit of a given industry, where management and labor work together in producing a product, than in antagonistic bargaining which may well sow the seeds of discord and devisiveness. In management-labor cooperation, there can be given incentives to the workers to develop their creative instincts and produce more and improve the quality of their product.

Under this approach the workers would be entitled, as vitally important participants in industry, to look forward to annual employment at an annual wage, to reasonable security through properly administered welfare funds, and adequate provision for old age. If we can keep in mind that our basic objective is the release of the creative energy of all—management and workers alike—we can develop the right perspective in these relationships.

The Republican Congress, mindful that the Taft-Hartley Act might require amendments to eliminate inequities—which could develop out of changing conditions—established the Joint Congressional Committee on Labor Management Relations to keep alert for needed changes in the act and guide the Congress by their recommendations.

3. Civil-rights program: We must at all costs in this country maintain those guaranties of personal freedom which are contained in the Bill of Rights of our Federal and State Constitutions. All other personal rights are dependent upon the assurance of religious liberty, a free press, free assembly, the right of petition, and protection against the taking of life, liberty, and property save by due process of law.

Only through an independent judiciary can individuals and minorities be protected in these rights. It is vitally important, therefore, that we resist any efforts to subordinate the courts to the legislative or executive branches of the Government. The integrity and absolute independence of our courts must be preserved.

In support of human freedom we should not limit ourselves to mere observance of the letter of the Constitution but we must actively employ in government the principles of truth, justice, and tolerance toward all men. There is no room in this Republic for discrimination against citizens because of race, creed, or color. All Americans must enjoy not merely political equality but also equality of opportunity, both educational and economic.

4. National housing program: Every effort of both governmental and private agencies must be bent toward providing adequate housing for the Nation. The role of government should be confined, as far as possible, to assist private enterprise in doing the job. However, where conditions make it unprofitable for private industry to function, as is the case in slum clearance, the Government must take active part. I feel that the Taft-Ellender-Wagner Housing Act recently passed by the Senate is an important step forward toward better housing for veterans and nonveterans as well.

5. National health program: In the important field of public health, the Republican Party is committed to the development of a national health program which will encourage the several States and local communities to develop their own health program and health facilities. While Federal funds would be appropriated for this purpose, the programs themselves would be predicated upon the sound principles of State administration and local responsibility.

The Republican Party will not and cannot subscribe to any plan that calls for a Federal bureaucracy and the socialization of medicine. Socialization can only result in the complete regimentation of the medical profession and the peoples of America, and in the ultimate disintegration of the present enviable and unparalleled standards which this Nation has achieved in the field of public health.

6. Federal air to education: Here again is a vital State and national problem. We do not now have a decent minimum educational standard in America. The bill on Federal aid to education which was recently passed by the Senate aims at raising our Nationwide educational standards. One of the basic guarantees of our constitution is that of equality of opportunity. It is up to us, as a Nation, to assure boys and girls—regardless of the section of the country they live in—that they shall have an equal opportunity for an adequate education.

7. National Science Foundation: The Senate this week passed a bill sponsored by myself and other colleagues establishing a National Science Foundation. The evidence presented at the hearings on this legislation overwhelmingly demonstrated the immediate need for effective national action in the all-important field of science. The advances which have been made in all fields of science in recent years have had a profound effect on all phases of our life and there are indications that our new knowledge brings us to the threshold of new discoveries whose impact on our lives may exceed anything in our whole history.

8. Reciprocal trade agreements: Our foreign trade policy must be completely consistent with our foreign political policy. We have adopted an international political policy of cooperation with other nations of the world—we therefore cannot adopt a trade policy of economic isolationism, without seriously jeopardizing the chance for world peace. Trade reciprocity is an effective form of economic cooperation. We have been farsighted in our foreign political policy. We should now be prepared to be equally farsighted in our foreign economic policy.

CONCLUSION

To sum up:

I see a definite challenge for the Republican Party to provide the positive aggressive leadership necessary to bring unity and cooperation out of chaos and confusion both at home and abroad.

If we are to inspire our people to the maximum development of their creative energy, we need a new vision of America in the spirit of Lincoln: "With charity to all; with malice toward none," and a courageous acceptance of the challenge to banish fear and move forward unitedly.

Class, regional, and national antagonisms are the relentless enemies of a creative national spirit, but it is only with such a spirit that our people can cope successfully with their political, social, and economic problems.

To reunite America and give us real security, we need the reestablishment of those moral and spiritual controls of human conduct, which throughout history have been inspired by faith in God.

It is in this spirit and against this background that the Republican Party will offer its candidates and its platform to the American people in 1948.

The Taft-Hartley Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 11 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the Taft-Hartley labor law, delivered by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], before the annual convention of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, in Pittsburgh, on Monday, May 3, 1948. Following the address I

ask to have printed several editorials from Pennsylvania newspapers regarding it.

There being no objection, the address and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA

I deeply appreciate the honor of being invited again to address this important State convention.

It has been my privilege to meet with you on a number of similar occasions, and to discuss with you the problems of the day as they affect the welfare and progress of American labor.

I feel I may safely assume that you have asked me here because you regard my views and suggestions as having some value. I can assure you that these meetings have been valuable to me.

They have helped to clarify my thinking on labor problems. Out of these deliberations I have gained guidance in arriving at decisions that I have been called upon to make as a public official—elected by the people and responsible to all the people.

At all times our conferences and discussions were carried out in an atmosphere of helpful cooperation. Even when we disagreed, each admitted that the other was acting in accordance with his honest judgment. That is the American way.

There has always been the spirit of fair play and friendliness in our dealings, for which much of the credit must go to your distinguished and able President, Jim McDevitt. There was likewise considerable frank give and take. We laid our cards on the table in our dealings with each other. That, I repeat, is the American way.

I propose today to continue that same frankness and plain talk which has characterized all of our dealings in the past.

One of the reasons I am glad to talk to you today grows out of the fact that when I picked up my copy of the January issue of the Pennsylvania Federationist, and subsequent issues, I discovered that in the opinions of the editors I am "against labor."

Not only was I listed as "against labor," but I was placed at the head of the list of those who were labeled "against labor."

The others on that list were the entire Pennsylvania Republican delegation in Congress. There are men in that delegation who have fought the good fight for labor on many occasions—and you know it. There are many men in that delegation who have worked with their hands. They all understand the problems of men and women who work. I would say that the large majority of them have seen eye-to-eye with you—and have voted accordingly—on many occasions.

I am proud to state that many times, as a private citizen and in my official capacity, I have helped to advance the cause of labor. One of the finest associations of my life goes back to the days when, as a lawyer, I represented the United Mine Workers in Greene County, Pa.

But, nevertheless, the Republican Members of the Pennsylvania congressional delegation—and I—were listed as "against labor", because we had voted for the Taft-Hartley Act.

No matter what the Federationist said and what some labor people have stated on a number of occasions, I refuse to regard my vote for that legislation as the end of a sincerely appreciated friendship.

In my long years of public service, I believe I have worked and voted consistently in the best interest of American labor.

No matter what anyone may choose to say, I shall continue to work and vote for the American workingman—to safeguard his rights and privileges—to protect his job and his security—and to maintain his standard of living at the highest possible level.

Many elements have entered into the establishment of the American standard of living. There was the superior ability and skill of the American workman and the initiative, resourcefulness and the know-how of American management.

And there was the protection given American jobs and industry against unfair competition which would flood our country with goods produced by cheap, underpaid or slave labor.

Unfortunately there are men in this country who would destroy the plan under which America became the greatest industrial producer in the world.

In line with our tradition of speaking frankly to each other, I want to talk to you here today on the subject of the Taft-Hartley law because that seems to be the only difference that has come up between us.

Last year, when this law was under consideration before Congress, I declared my opinion that it had merit to correct certain abuses which had grown up in recent years under the Wagner Labor Relations Act. I said if the Taft-Hartley Act should prove unfair or unworkable in any of its provisions, I should be the first to move to strike down or amend those sections. I said I should be glad to receive any information disclosing flaws in the act.

From that day to this—and that is nearly a year ago—I have not received one personal visit, one telephone call, one letter, or one postcard, detailing a specific event or happening supporting the charge that it is a "slave labor" law. I have received no such information from the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, or from any of the member unions, or from individual, card-carrying members.

But I will tell you what I have heard from labor. I have heard demands that the Taft-Hartley Act must be repealed in its entirety—that it must be torn out by the roots. I have heard it labeled a "slave labor" law by the President of the United States, the same President—Harry Truman—who wanted to break a strike of railroad workers by drafting the men into the armed forces.

You will remember that this type of "slave labor," recommended by the President, was blocked by many of the same Republicans in Congress who are today listed as against labor.

It is difficult to understand how the calm logic and good sense of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor gave way, in this instance, to hysteria and misunderstanding.

This is the first time—and I regret to have to say this—that I have known the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor to denounce its friends over a nonexistent ghost in the cellar.

My friends, and I mean my friends, let us be as blunt as we have always been with each other. Let us take a look at this law. Congress passed it for two reasons. It was passed because some segments of labor refused to clean up the abuses in its own house, and also because certain parts of the house of labor had become worm-eaten with communism.

It is still too soon to know how all phases of this act will operate, and too soon for the courts to make final determination of the validity of all its provisions. But let me point out how this law has operated up to now.

Through its requirement for filing noncommunistic oaths, the Taft-Hartley law has become the comb by which the CIO is ridding itself of the communistic vermin in its hair. Great progress has been made in this direction. Honest, American CIO leaders have rejoiced that the law has enabled them to take their unions out of hock to Moscow.

Your federation, thank God, has not had this problem. But in my opinion, the law has earned its way by that provision alone. Communism, wherever it exists, destroys the labor union. Elimination of the poisonous Communist infiltration from one branch of labor, benefits all labor.

As I have told you on previous occasions I do not believe in jurisdictional strikes nor in secondary boycotts. In this field, the law has been highly effective, according to reports from various parts of the country. It is no secret that the A. F. of L., itself, felt something must be done to curb jurisdictional strikes. For example, the A. F. of L. found itself powerless to settle the Hollywood jurisdictional strikes which were giving the whole labor movement a black eye.

The injunctive provisions of the law have come into play most sparingly. I think they will always be used sparingly. I know that this feature is most strongly opposed by labor. If abuses of this provision occur, believe me, I shall fight for changes in the law to rectify that situation.

You know and I know that there are some labor leaders with whom it seems to be impossible to reason or bargain.

Recently one of the top-ranking labor leaders walked out on your organization and your great leader, William Green, with the words "We disaffiliate."

More recently he attempted to walk out on millions of Americans whose welfare—actually their life's blood—depended upon the great coal-mining industry.

Without the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law many of you assembled here today and those you represent would not be working at the job of your choice.

You would be seriously and harmfully affected in your rights as citizens—the right to work and earn and to provide for your families—through no fault of your own.

Can it honestly be said that there should be no provision in the law to meet a crisis such as we were confronted with so recently. I think you will agree that when such a situation creates a national emergency—threatening the economy of the Nation—the health and safety of its people—the power of the Government must be invoked—promptly, vigorously, fairly, and fearlessly.

Some provisions of the act are in litigation, awaiting final determination by the Supreme Court. If the courts do not clarify them, it will be the duty of Congress to do so. You can be assured Congress is willing to make changes at any time so that the Taft-Hartley law will operate with the least friction and with fairness to the worker, the employer, and the American people.

Your basic rights all remain unchanged. You are protected in:

Your right to work at the job of your choice.

Your right to organize.

Your right to bargain collectively.

Your right to strike, unless the greater right—the health and safety of all the people—is endangered.

Let me remind you once again of something I said on two prior occasions when I addressed State federation conventions. I pointed out that it was unwise for labor laws to regulate employer-employee relationships. In that I quoted the authority of your first president—the great labor statesman—Samuel Gompers, who warned labor to keep away from laws.

Several years ago, the first time I discussed this subject, I explained that the trouble with laws is that they are subject to change, and that some of the changes might seem adverse to you.

You men are leaders of organized labor in our State. Let me make a prediction. A few years hence, you will agree that the National Labor Relations Act of 1947, with the necessary changes disclosed by time and experience, has been a good law for labor and the American people.

As I look over my own career as a public official I am pleased to find numerous instances when my support was acknowledged and praised by your own leaders as serving the best interests of the workingman.

Let me give you one example:

In August 1947, the leading article in the Pennsylvania Federationist told about the conclusion of a new agreement on heavy and highway construction in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. This was described as a history-making agreement. It provided for the establishment of prevailing wage rates, submitted by your federation, and approved by the building-trade unions, in every county of the State.

Let me quote from that article:

"It is indeed a glorious triumph for our movement to have been able to achieve this agreement, after 20 years of effort, that makes possible the payment of union wage rates on all State-construction operations. We are indeed grateful to Gov. Edward Martin; his secretary, George Bloom; Secretary of Highways Ray F. Smock, Chief Engineer Thomas C. Frame, and Deputy Engineer Charles H. Buckius for their cooperation in making possible this understanding whereby the working conditions have been standardized throughout the State on all heavy and highway construction work."

Let us go back to 1930, when I was chairman of the Republican State committee. I arranged the conferences which resulted in amending the State code to provide minimum-wage rates in specifications for State building contracts. Those rates were first set in 1931 and set a pattern which was copied by the Federal Government in 1935.

In 1933, as State chairman, I helped to launch the investigation of sweatshops in Pennsylvania. A resolution for the probe had passed the House and had been pickled in the Senate. I got it out on the floor and to a successful Senate vote.

During my administration as governor there were enacted into law liberalized unemployment compensation benefits, unemployment compensation benefits for veterans following the exhaustion of their GI rights, increased benefits under workman's compensation, creation of the second injury reserve fund, a vastly liberalized occupational disease law, allocations of funds for the training and retraining of the physically handicapped, improved safety laws and much other legislation of benefit to the workers of the State.

I have no quarrel with those who have listed me as against labor. I do not question their right to their opinion. Under the sacred American principles of free speech and a free press they have every right to express and publish the result of their judgment, whether it be friendly or critical.

But I do question the fairness of passing judgment upon a Member of Congress or other legislative body because he is not 100 percent in agreement with those who sit as the judge and jury.

In my opinion it is proper to examine the whole record before reaching a decision.

In order that my own position may be clearly understood I want to tell you now, with all the emphasis at my command, that I will support labor's legislative proposals when I am convinced they have right and justice on their side.

I will oppose all requests or demands that are unfair or whenever I feel that they are put forward without considering the welfare of all the people, whom it is my duty to represent.

The same principles will guide me in matters concerning business, whether it be big business or small business, agriculture, mining, education, social welfare, or any other special groups.

I refuse to be a yes man for any organization or any pressure group. I will not be diverted from the course I believe to be right by threats of political reprisal no matter where they originate. I know that you, as good Americans, would want me to take that stand.

Above everything else the Federation of Labor member is a good American and a patriotic citizen. He believes in the dignity of labor and will fight against anything that impairs its prestige.

He is a self-respecting, law-abiding, God-fearing man of tolerance and good will. He stands firmly on the best American tradition in politics, education, and in his church.

He has taken leadership in the fight to retain and strengthen the American way of life. He hates communism with all his heart and soul.

With these admirable qualities there is interwoven great and proper pride in his skill and craftsmanship—the highest in all the world.

That is the type of American who built America and made it the greatest Nation of the earth. That is the type of American that makes up the membership of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor.

If labor and management live by the Golden Rule—if both practice fair play, equal justice and equal opportunity—the day will come when there will be no need for Government to have any part in labor-management relations.

However, until that happy day dawns, it is the obligation of Government to protect the great third party to every labor dispute—the American people.

To that purpose I shall exert all my effort, giving impartial recognition to the constitutional rights of all concerned, and keeping in mind always that the rights of the people as a whole are paramount to those of any group or section.

All of us—the worker, the investor, the employer, the manager, and the public official—all want to make America better and stronger. All of us want industrial peace and harmony. We want an ever-rising standard of living and increasing educational opportunities for our children.

All of these splendid things are within reach in this great land of ours.

Organizations like the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor can point the way to achieve them.

[From the Pittsburgh Press of May 5, 1948]

MARTIN AND THE A. F. OF L.

There seems to have been a marked difference of opinion at the A. F. of L. State convention here this week.

On one side were A. F. of L. officials and United States Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, Philadelphia Democrat. On the other, United States Senator EDWARD MARTIN, Washington, Pa., Republican.

Senator MYERS, not unexpectedly, flayed the Taft-Hartley labor law. He had voted against it and it was natural, in view of the A. F. of L. cry of "slave labor" law, that he develop this point of view at the convention.

But Senator MARTIN was up against a tougher situation. He voted in favor of the Taft-Hartley law. And the A. F. of L. magazine, the Pennsylvania Federationist, called him antilabor as a result.

Senator MARTIN met this challenge head-on.

The Senator denied that his vote on the Taft-Hartley law was evidence that he was unfriendly to the A. F. of L. or any organized labor.

"It is difficult to understand," he said, "how the calm logic and good sense of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor gave way in this instance to hysteria and misunderstanding.

"This is the first time that I have known the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor to denounce its friends over a nonexistent ghost in the cellar."

Which is exactly what happened. Professional labor leaders continue to scream about the Taft-Hartley law. But the record, to date, indicates no evidence whatsoever of a single case in which the rights of labor have been hamstrung.

The law has added responsibility to organized labor. But it has done nothing to enslave it. In fact, it has given union members a greater degree of self-reliance.

As Senator MARTIN pointed out, "You are protected in your right to work at a job of your choice, your right to organize, your right to bargain collectively, your right to strike—unless the greater right, the health and safety of all the people, is endangered."

Even Senator MYERS, while joining the professional outcry against the Taft-Hartley law, admitted the need for it when he said: "Labor can do a great deal within its own family * * * to clean up the aggravating, annoying, unnecessary, foolish, little dumb things which some union leaders pull."

That, Senator MARTIN said, was one of the reasons for passing the law—"because some segments of labor refused to clean up the abuses in its own house."

Senator MARTIN did himself, his constituents, and the A. F. of L. a good service in standing his ground on this issue—in refusing to alibi or explain his vote on the Taft-Hartley law.

Chances are a majority of the union members for whom the convention presumes to speak will agree with him.

[From the Oil City Derrick of May 4, 1948]

MARTIN ADDRESSES LABOR

Senator EDWARD MARTIN, of Pennsylvania, addressed the annual convention of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor in Pittsburgh yesterday afternoon. He has met with this body before and discussed with its members the problems of the day.

The January issue of the Pennsylvania Federationist said Senator MARTIN was against labor. In fact he was set at the head of a list that included the entire Pennsylvania Republican delegation in Congress. This was because they supported the Taft-Hartley bill. And this was the subject which the Senator discussed. MARTIN is a public character who never retires from any fight. His record in the Army of the United States proves this.

MARTIN told the federation there many members of the Republican delegation in Congress who fought the good fight for labor on many occasions—"and you know it." When MARTIN practiced law he was attorney for the United Mine Workers in Greene County.

He dissected the Taft-Hartley act and said that he would be glad to receive any information disclosing flaws in the act. Said he: "From that day to this, and that is nearly a year ago, I have not received one personal visit, one telephone call, one letter, or one postcard detailing a specific event or happening supporting the charge that it is a 'slave labor' law. I have received no such information from the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, or from any of the member unions or from individual, card-carrying members."

Continuing, Senator MARTIN said: "Through the law's requirement for filing noncommunistic oaths the Taft-Hartley law has become the comb by which the CIO is ridding itself of the communistic vermin in its hair. * * * Elimination of the poisonous Communist infiltration from one branch of labor benefits all labor." The Senator does not believe in jurisdictional strikes nor in secondary boycotts. He pointed out that the AFL found itself powerless to settle the Hollywood jurisdictional strikes which were giving the whole labor movement a black eye.

"Recently one of your top-ranking labor leaders walked out on your organization and your great leader, William Green, with the words 'We disaffiliate.'" This was John L. Lewis. * * * "Can it honestly be said that there should be no provision in the law to meet a crisis such as we were confronted with recently? I think you will agree that when such a situation creates a national emergency—threatening the economy of the Nation—the health and safety of its people—the power of the Government must be in-

voked promptly, vigorously, fairly, and fearlessly. * * * Your basic rights remain unchanged. You are protected in your right to work at the job of your choice, your right to organize, your right to bargain collectively, your right to strike—unless the greater right, the health and safety of all the people, is endangered."

In August 1947, the leading article in the Pennsylvania Federation told about the conclusion of a new agreement on highway construction in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The Senator read the following quotation from that article: "It is indeed a glorious triumph for our movement to have been able to achieve this agreement, after 20 years of effort, that makes possible the payment of union wage rates on all State construction operations. We are indeed grateful to Gov. Edward Martin, his secretary, George Bloom; Secretary of Highways Ray F. Smock, Chief Engineer Thomas C. Frame, and Deputy Engineer Charles H. Buckius for their cooperation in making possible this understanding whereby the working conditions have been standardized throughout the State on all heavy and highway construction work."

"I have no quarrel with those who have listed me as 'against labor.' But I do question the fairness of passing judgment upon a Member of Congress or other legislative body because he is not 100 percent in agreement with those who sit as judge and jury. * * * However it is the obligation of the Government to protect the great third party in every labor dispute—the American people."

[From the Erie Times of May 4, 1948]

SENATOR TELLS OFF LABOR

When it comes to straight talking, Pennsylvania's Senator ED MARTIN takes a back seat for no one.

Yesterday in Pittsburgh he addressed the annual convention of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor.

A few hours earlier the organization's executive committee had endorsed President Truman for reelection while its publication editorially labeled Senator MARTIN and the entire Pennsylvania congressional delegation as antilabor.

After detailing his own public record in behalf of labor, Senator MARTIN said:

"I * * * question the fairness of passing judgment upon a Member of Congress or other legislative body because he is not 100 percent in agreement with those who sit as the judge and jury. In my opinion it is proper to examine the whole record before reaching a decision.

"In order that my own position may be clearly understood I want to tell you now, with all the emphasis at my command, that I will support labor's legislative proposals when I am convinced they have right and justice on their side.

"I will oppose all requests or demands that are unfair or whenever I feel that they are put forward without considering the welfare of all the people, whom it is my duty to represent.

"I refuse to be a 'yes man' for any organization or any pressure group. I will not be diverted from the course I believe to be right by threats of political reprisal no matter where they originate. * * *"

That's very straight talk from a man being mentioned for President.

He was equally blunt in his defense of the Taft-Hartley labor law and demands of labor that it be repealed.

"I have heard demands that the Taft-Hartley Act must be repealed in its entirety—that it must be torn out by the roots. I have heard it labeled a 'slave labor' law by the President of the United States, the same President—Harry Truman—who wanted to break a strike of railroad workers by drafting the men into the armed forces.

"You will remember," continued MARTIN, "that this type of slave labor, recommended by the President, was blocked by many of the same Republicans in Congress who are today listed as 'against labor.'

"It is difficult to understand how the calm logic and good sense of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor gave way, in this instance, to hysteria and misunderstanding. This is the first time, and I regret to have to say this, that I have known the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor to denounce its friends over a nonexistent ghost in the cellar."

Labor won't like that speech. But it must admire the Senator for the nerve it took to deliver it.

Address by Hon. Irving M. Ives, of New York, Before the 1948 Oberlin Mock Convention

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 11 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, it was my privilege last Friday and Saturday to be at Oberlin College in the State of Ohio to attend and participate in the mock Republican convention which was held there, and which was to those engaged in it a very interesting and educational event.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine address delivered by our distinguished colleague the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. He was the permanent chairman of the convention. I can assure my colleagues that he presided over it with great dignity and skill, and preserved order throughout the proceedings with great ability. From a professional standpoint it may also be interesting to our colleagues to know that many Members of the United States Senate were considered by the young people of Oberlin College as being highly desirable Presidential timber. Seven of our colleagues were nominated and voted for.

The convention, which has been a tradition at Oberlin since 1860 when Abraham Lincoln was nominated, was a great success. Its educational value to the students particularly cannot be overstated.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The honor accorded me by your invitation to appear on the program of the 1948 Oberlin (Republican) mock convention is greatly appreciated. Recognizing the historical significance and importance of Oberlin mock conventions, I am especially pleased to participate on this occasion. As faithfully and conscientiously as I can, I shall discharge the duties which may be assigned me.

The permanent chairman of a convention, as you probably know, is expected ordinarily to review the party record and accomplishments. In my remarks tonight, however, I shall depart to some extent from the established role of a permanent chairman and speak of the future as well as of the past. In doing so, I hope not to be repetitious or to conflict with the theme of the splendid address of your last night's keynoter, my very good friend and distinguished colleague, Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey.

In the record of the Eightieth Congress the ground work has been and is being laid for the distant future of our country. The years 1947 and 1948 are decisive years in the history of the United States. In these years we have been charting our course, weighing anchor, and beginning our voyage on the unknown and unpredictable seas of the future.

Because of postwar world conditions, foreign policy has dominated our consideration. We are aware, however, that in its effect upon the ultimate fate of the Nation's domestic policy is just as important. The two are interrelated and interdependent, and, whether we will or not, action in the one field has immediate consequences in the other field.

It is not my purpose tonight to dwell upon the menace to world peace which arises from the ideology and purpose and program of Soviet Russia. As long as any great tyrannical power, bent on world conquest, exists in the world—be it Russia or any other great state or combination of states, there would seem to be only one safe course for the United States to follow. History itself would seem to dictate this course.

Experience has shown that no war of importance can occur again without our becoming involved in it. Our primary job, therefore, is so to prepare ourselves that there will be no world war III.

This purpose is fundamental in the European recovery program and in our programs of aid to Greece and Turkey and China. It is equally fundamental in the program for strengthening our armed services which is now under consideration in the Congress. It is no less important in the effort we should exert to help make the United Nations function effectively and to help strengthen the United Nations wherever possible under existing conditions. In these various activities we have been and are creating an integrated program of adequate national preparedness.

But these activities are a drain upon our national wealth and a threat to our national economy. Our task is no easy one. We have endeavored to meet the exigencies with which we are faced abroad and at the same time to provide the necessary protection for our economy at home. Thanks to Republican insistence, we have thus far succeeded in doing so.

Unfortunately, our bipartisan foreign policy has too often been bipartisan in name only. Too many times the Truman administration has made commitments abroad without the knowledge or approval of Republicans. Too often this tendency of the Truman administration to go it alone has caused embarrassment and difficulty for all concerned. Moreover, indecision and a lack of candor have frequently given to the United States the appearance of having no foreign policy at all.

I personally believe strongly in a bipartisan foreign policy. To be bipartisan, however, such a policy requires the cooperation and participation of both major parties. To achieve this objective there must be definite agreement on aims and forthrightness and consistency in the expression of these aims. There must be mutual confidence among those representing the two major parties and determination to act for the benefit of the whole country, regardless of political or personal gain.

This is the only kind of bipartisan foreign policy which can be truly effective. It is the kind of policy which the Truman administration has too often denied to Republicans.

The world's greatest need today is for a revival of the moral leadership of the United States. This requires an American foreign policy which is strong, definite, and reliable. It should reflect the great moral and spiritual values which are the real foundation of America's greatness and are still dominant

in American character. True to the traditional spirit of the American people, it should aid the persecuted and the oppressed, wherever possible, defending the rights of the weak and the small and cherishing, above all, the sanctity and honor of our given word. This kind of foreign policy will require strength to defend it, clarity so that it may have appeal and be understood, and unquestioned stability in order that all mankind may have confidence in it.

I stated that foreign policy and domestic policy are interrelated and interdependent, and I indicated that in the formation of a national preparedness program we Republicans have recognized this condition. The impact of an inordinately heavy demand for American goods abroad in a period of serious shortages at home is inescapable. I need not remind you of its inevitable consequence when carried to excess. The effects of domestic shortages have long been obvious. Ever since VJ-day we have been experiencing a creeping inflation.

It is regrettable that the Truman administration fails to understand the basic causes of inflation. As you know, the President's only answer has been his 10-point program of controls.

To a limited extent, controls are necessary. Rent controls, export controls, credit controls, allocations of scarce and vital materials—this type of controls is needed for the time being, and to a considerable extent has been imposed already by Republican congressional action. But, more than this, subject to proper restrictions, we have provided the means of cooperation in industry itself, which can prove most helpful in enabling business voluntarily to remove bottlenecks and log jams in an all-out effort to produce more goods and to assure their proper distribution.

But rationing and wage controls and price controls in a peacetime economy can only defeat their own purpose. High prices are due to scarcities and scarcities are due to insufficient production and there can only be full production in a free economy when a reasonable profit is assured to private industry. Price controls without wage controls jeopardize profits and often turn profits into losses. Without profits or with uncertain profits, production is retarded and with reduced production scarcities increase. Only in a wartime economy, when the profit motive must be disregarded in the face of national emergency, can these controls over distribution and wages and prices be effectively imposed. Only in a war emergency will the American people tolerate such regimentation.

We Republicans have been endeavoring to encourage production and thereby to make available more goods. By reducing taxes we have sought to release venture capital to enable industry to expand and new industry to be created—all for the production of more goods and in order to accelerate needed expansion in our economy. Only by this process can America prosper and the American people remain free.

Vital as is the economic aspect of the grave problems which confront us, there is another and even broader and just as important phase of our American life. After all, defense from aggression abroad and a sound economy at home will not alone produce the kind of America which we want. These things alone will not bring happiness to the American people. Only as we can realize steady improvement in our standard of living and in our day-to-day relationships with one another, can we have the country of our dreams.

The ordinary man desires at least a respectable place in which to live, a proper diet for himself and his family, the assurance of an equal opportunity for his children, and a chance to enjoy his share of the good things in life. His yearning for all these things is natural and justified. In order to meet his demands we must raise the standard of education in our country. We must abolish slums, whether in our great cities or in our rural areas, and substitute dwelling places where men can live decently. We must give to all our people the assurance that they will receive proper medical care and attention; and we must provide adequate pension protection for the aged and the infirm.

Some may say that these ideas are socialistic. I deny it. What I propose is part and parcel of the Republican program now in the process of formulation or passage by the Congress. Far from being socialistic, it offers the only antidote for socialism of which I am aware.

To be sure, these programs will cost money—much money. They cannot be undertaken simultaneously and on a full-scale basis at the present time. Our national wealth and income will not permit. But they can be begun and they can be the objectives toward which we as a people are directing our course. And they should be the things for which enlightened Republicanism stands.

Above and beyond these material things of which I speak, however, are the human relationships in our everyday lives. One of the broad areas where these relationships are vital is the field of labor relations. In this area, as you know, the present Congress has enacted the Taft-Hartley Act, whose purpose has been to bring into proper adjustment and balance the relationship between labor and management and to protect the individual worker against coercion or exploitation by anyone. To be sure, this new law has defects, but the good in it far outweighs whatever of evil it may contain. Moreover, through experience its defects can and will be corrected and a happier worker-employer condition should finally emerge.

Most important of all in the sphere of human relations is that area pertaining to civil rights. Probably the most glaring inconsistency in American life and one of the most serious handicaps which we as a Nation encounter in the exercise of our influence abroad is our failure as Americans to live up to our so-called American creed. We profess much, but too often we seem to lack the courage of conviction.

Most happily, marked progress has been made in recent years in this sphere of human relations. Great strides have been taken in some of the States of the Union in combating prejudice and in providing equal economic opportunity for all. Although the campaign against discrimination in employment because of race or religion or national origin has been and should always be nonpartisan, we Republicans can take just pride that in the attainment of these results Republican initiative and Republican determination have contributed mightily.

Today what we need in our country above all else is unity. The program I have outlined will contribute substantially to national unity. As I have implied, however, this goal cannot be reached by the snapping of a finger or the passage of a few bills.

Its achievement demands courage and vision. It will require sacrifice. Its realization will need patience and determination. It calls for idealism.

Not long ago we were engaged in the most tragic struggle ever inflicted upon mankind. During that struggle we attained a loftiness of purpose which sometimes only suffering and dire extremity can produce. In that purpose we had visions of a better world and a better America.

Most of the young men and young women who fought the fight against Nazi and Fascist tyranny, of whom more than 300,000 paid the supreme sacrifice and other hundreds of thousands were maimed for life, believed in the great cause for which they were fighting and had faith that out of their sacrifice would emerge a better world and a better America. Their sacrifice and their faith impose upon us a sacred obligation. We must not fail them.

Their hopes, their ambitions, their dreams can be made realities. This is the challenge with which we as Republicans and Americans are faced. It is the challenge which we Republicans must accept. With faith in ourselves and in one another and in Almighty God and with the courage which this faith inspires, we can succeed, we must succeed in this great undertaking.

Racial Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 11 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on the evening of last Sunday, May 9, there was delivered before the Long Beach Forum, Long Beach, N. Y., an address on racial discrimination by the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] which I think is well worthy of consideration by the Congress. The address was entitled "Wake Up, America!" I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAKE UP, AMERICA!

The topic for discussion this evening is racial discrimination. However, before taking up the subject, allow me to express appreciation to my good friend, Councilman Joe Ross, who has so cordially invited me to be here this evening and to speak on a subject which I deem to be of transcendental importance to all of us.

As I look over the audience I am reminded of the Chicago newspaper which spoke of New York editorial writers who refer to the United States as "we Anglo-Saxons" and suggested that they should see some of the Anglo-Saxons at Forty-seventh and South Parkway.

Needless to say, I am happy to be here. I feel at home in New York and its environs although I come from a sparsely populated State and one utterly unlike yours from the standpoint of population, industry, commerce, and geography. I enjoy the fast tempo of your life. I like to see the vast crowds, the thousands of eager faces showing strains of many races—all living, working, and playing, and together making the greatest city in the world.

I am particularly glad to be in your lovely little city of Long Beach. The interest in national and world affairs expressed through this forum gives testimony to the progressive attitude and civic pride of your citizens and you are to be congratulated.

Most speakers try to be as circumspect as possible when handling a subject as delicate as racial discrimination. But the world situation today is so critical, the fate of western civilization is so precarious, and the future of our Nation as a great power is so imperiled that we find circumspection out of order; it is time to speak out boldly—let the chips fall where they may. Discrimination endangers our country, and a threat to our national safety is a matter which vitally concerns us all, and it behooves us as good citizens to study and understand the problem. And if we find that racial discrimination presents such a threat to our safety,

then we should immediately, with every ounce of resolution and determination at our command, seek to eradicate it from our way of life.

I can approach the problem with first-hand knowledge. I am a Catholic of Spanish descent and a representative of one of the larger racial minority groups. It is a racial minority which has been especially discriminated against in a country which we all know is predominantly Anglo-Saxon and Protestant. Still I feel I can approach the problem impartially because I view national problems not as a Catholic, not as a descendant of the Spanish Conquistadores, but solely and exclusively as an American. Furthermore, though belonging to a minority group, I occupy, thanks to the electorate of my State and our democratic institutions, one of the highest offices our Nation has to offer.

I feel deeply on the subject—there is already too much division in our country. Two weeks ago I led the fight against the granting of a Federal charter to the Catholic War Veterans because I felt that our boys fought, bled, and died together in the last war as Americans—not as Catholics, not as Jews, not as Presbyterians—and in peace, veterans should be encouraged always to face the future as Americans. I am opposed to dividing them in times of peace into racial religious groupings, as I am opposed to so dividing them in times of war.

Before discussing discrimination let us examine the credit side of the ledger. Our heritage of civil liberties is something we should be very proud of—our national record is a worthy one. The dignity of the individual is the core of this heritage and the welfare of the individual is the purpose and final goal and objective of our laws and institutions. We have a record three centuries long of constant striving to equalize opportunity for all men, and certainly no nation in history has ever offered better opportunity of achieving the ultimate goal of complete freedom and equality. It is true that we have fallen short of reaching the goal, but we all know the objective and we want to get there. For what we have accomplished we can take pride. Our heritage has permitted the election of a Smith, a Roosevelt, a Lehman, and a Dewey as the executive of this great State. In New Mexico at least half of the elected officials are of Spanish ancestry.

Unfortunately this is far from the case in the neighboring States of Texas, Arizona, and Colorado. There the record is not good. Perhaps the reason for this is because our laws and Constitution provide equal rights and equal opportunity under Federal authority but no attention is given to the abuse of civil rights by individuals or by the States.

Discrimination is too widespread to need prove its existence—inequality of opportunity, segregation of individuals, abuse and mistreatment because of race and color is familiar to us all. The implications of discrimination, however, are not always so well known or understood. That an American citizen of Mexican descent in Arizona or Colorado may not occupy public office is a national disgrace. But what is more important at the moment is that such discrimination imperils relations with our sister republics of the Western Hemisphere at a time when pan-American solidarity is the cornerstone of national security.

Therefore, when Southern spokesmen tell us to mind our own business and let the South solve its own problems we can hurl back the answer with a vengeance—Bilboism in Mississippi concerns each and every American. First because Bilboism is intrinsically wrong; second, because it is un-American; and, third, because it jeopardizes our national security.

But let us retrace our steps for one moment—why do we have racial and religious bigotry in this country? The answer is simple. The population of the United States is composed of immigrants, or descendants of immigrants, who came to this country from all parts of the world. Every race, clime, and language is represented here. Basically the older population came from northern Europe and is predominantly Anglo-Saxon, white and Protestant. However, even in early Colonial days the French, the Germans, the Irish, and the Jews were represented and, of course, helpless shackled blacks from Africa soon joined them. Slavery was introduced in Virginia 10 years before the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth, though strangely enough, these blacks were held like the indentured whites and could gain their freedom after the period of indenture. Following the Civil War and with the coming of the industrial revolution and the march of civilization westward a new flood of immigrants came to our country. They introduced the language, the customs, the religion, and even the dress of the countries of their origin.

Today, people representing every race known to man live in New York City. In Massachusetts we have Poles, French, Portuguese. There are Germans in Pennsylvania, Swedes, Norwegians, and Danes in the Lake Region and Italians and Greeks are scattered from one end of the country to the other. This conglomeration of races, languages, customs, and religions gave rise to countless differences and conflicts, most of which remain unsettled to this day. Until the problems created by the presence of minority groups are solved, the United States will to that extent be divided.

Negroes form our largest minority, closely followed by the Jews. Another great minority is represented by people who came to this country from our neighbor to the south—Mexico.

Wherever these newcomers have settled their poverty, ignorance, and low standard of living permitted exploitation by the older populations with whom they came in contact, and the latter were not reluctant to take advantage of the fact.

In time, with education, leaders arose among the exploited and pushed by universal yearning for advancement of the masses they sought to elevate themselves and their fellows and collided head-on with the entrenched interests of the older populations. Fanned by ignorance and greed the conflict inevitably becomes more acute in ratio to the extent of the profit obtained by the exploiting group.

The pattern was true when the Irish, the Poles, and the Italians, etc., were foreigners and so long as the so-called 100-percent American could keep them in the lower-wage-scale jobs. The pattern is true today in the case of the Negroes and Mexican-Americans.

Let us see how this works out in relation to the whole economic and social picture—let us examine the problem and see if we are interlopers in pressing for fair employment practices, as the Bilbos and Talmadges charge.

In World War II we were fighting to preserve our way of life and to defend western civilization. Hitler had loosed the demon hordes of pagan nihilism on civilization, and to our everlasting honor it became our glorious role in history to crush these hordes and destroy their master and his maniacal system. To do this we had to wage total war. Every sinew, every muscle, every last bit of energy and determination had to be expended in order to win the victory.

We all had a stake in that war. New Mexico had its entire National Guard fighting with its back to the wall at Bataan and Corregidor. Our men weren't asking for relief or rescue; they begged only for arms, medicine, and provisions. I wish that the congressional opponents of FEPC could ask the helpless hulks of men in New Mexico, the prisoners who survived the death march and the salt mines of Japan, if it was wise—not right, mind you—to keep the manpower represented by 13,000,000 Negroes and some 2,000,000 Mexican-Americans out of the defense plants because of color or race.

This is not idle talk. Let me tell you what happened. Early in the war, when the reserves of our manpower were reaching the point of exhaustion, a vast source of manpower remained untapped. The Negroes and the Mexican-Americans in our war plants were deprived undemocratically, unrealistically, and foolhardily of the opportunity to help win the war by contributing their labor and skill in defense-plant work. They could fight, but they couldn't work. The situation grew critical, production was lagging; finally, after considerable study, President Roosevelt by Executive order established the Fair Employment Practices Commission, and at long last we began to utilize this important source of manpower.

In the last war the percentage of volunteers from New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, and Texas was very high. A vast number were boys of Spanish or Mexican ancestry; they could bear arms, but their fathers, brothers, and sisters, under the system existing at the time, could not get jobs in war plants, or, if allowed to work, they could do only the most menial of tasks and at a discriminatory wage rate.

Discrimination is un-American and cannot be a part of the American way of life. It is contrary to our spirit of fair play.

Imagine the feelings of the Japanese-American, who fought so valiantly in Italy—we had no better troops, not excepting the marines—fighting for democracy and all the while his country was gathering up his father, mother, and sisters and herding them like cattle into concentration camps.

Macario Garcia, of Texas, won the Congressional Medal of Honor. President Truman bestowed the decoration, and he told the young hero that he would rather have earned that medal than be President of the United States. Back home in Texas a week later, on his way to a Rotary Club luncheon to which he had been invited, this young man stopped at a drug store in Sugar Land to get a coca-cola—in the uniform of the country he loved and wearing its highest decoration—he was referred to a sign, "We don't serve Mexicans." When he protested the insult he was hit over the head with a baseball bat and was hurt so badly he could not proceed with his journey. Texas should be ashamed.

And the Negro who lay dying of wounds in New Guinea and asked that a grave marker be placed over him reading: "Here lies a black man who died fighting yellow men that white men might be free." Perhaps he could foresee the shocking massacre at Monroe, Ga., when two helpless Negro couples were forcibly removed from a car by a lynch mob and shot down like dogs as they pleaded for their lives.

At Pando, Colo., construction of a camp to train winter troops was started. Hundreds of employees were needed by the contractor. Workmen were recruited from all the surrounding areas, including New Mexico. About 500 of these employees were Americans of Spanish extraction from New Mexico, Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, and Arizona. Most of them had sons in the service of the country. Many had sons who were prisoners of the Japanese in the Philippines. Someone complained that there were "too many Mexicans" working in the camp. Suddenly came an order dismissing everyone who bore a Spanish name. Better than 500 persons were dismissed in one day. Juan P. Romero, of Rodarte, N. Mex., formerly a State representative from Taos County, and a Republican, telephoned me about the situation. Senator ED JOHNSON of Colorado was as horrified as I when he learned of the situation. Together we protested to the general staff and in 3 days every man went back to work and the matter was settled, except perhaps in

in American character. True to the traditional spirit of the American people, it should aid the persecuted and the oppressed, wherever possible, defending the rights of the weak and the small and cherishing, above all, the sanctity and honor of our given word. This kind of foreign policy will require strength to defend it, clarity so that it may have appeal and be understood, and unquestioned stability in order that all mankind may have confidence in it.

I stated that foreign policy and domestic policy are interrelated and interdependent, and I indicated that in the formation of a national preparedness program we Republicans have recognized this condition. The impact of an inordinately heavy demand for American goods abroad in a period of serious shortages at home is inescapable. I need not remind you of its inevitable consequence when carried to excess. The effects of domestic shortages have long been obvious. Ever since VJ-day we have been experiencing a creeping inflation.

It is regrettable that the Truman administration fails to understand the basic causes of inflation. As you know, the President's only answer has been his 10-point program of controls.

To a limited extent, controls are necessary. Rent controls, export controls, credit controls, allocations of scarce and vital materials—this type of controls is needed for the time being, and to a considerable extent has been imposed already by Republican congressional action. But, more than this, subject to proper restrictions, we have provided the means of cooperation in industry itself, which can prove most helpful in enabling business voluntarily to remove bottlenecks and log jams in an all-out effort to produce more goods and to assure their proper distribution.

But rationing and wage controls and price controls in a peacetime economy can only defeat their own purpose. High prices are due to scarcities and scarcities are due to insufficient production and there can only be full production in a free economy when a reasonable profit is assured to private industry. Price controls without wage controls jeopardize profits and often turn profits into losses. Without profits or with uncertain profits, production is retarded and with reduced production scarcities increase. Only in a wartime economy, when the profit motive must be disregarded in the face of national emergency, can these controls over distribution and wages and prices be effectively imposed. Only in a war emergency will the American people tolerate such regimentation.

We Republicans have been endeavoring to encourage production and thereby to make available more goods. By reducing taxes we have sought to release venture capital to enable industry to expand and new industry to be created—all for the production of more goods and in order to accelerate needed expansion in our economy. Only by this process can America prosper and the American people remain free.

Vital as is the economic aspect of the grave problems which confront us, there is another and even broader and just as important phase of our American life. After all, defense from aggression abroad and a sound economy at home will not alone produce the kind of America which we want. These things alone will not bring happiness to the American people. Only as we can realize steady improvement in our standard of living and in our day-to-day relationships with one another, can we have the country of our dreams.

The ordinary man desires at least a respectable place in which to live, a proper diet for himself and his family, the assurance of an equal opportunity for his children, and a chance to enjoy his share of the good things in life. His yearning for all these things is natural and justified. In order to meet his demands we must raise the standard of education in our country. We must abolish slums, whether in our great cities or in our rural areas, and substitute dwelling places where men can live decently. We must give to all our people the assurance that they will receive proper medical care and attention; and we must provide adequate pension protection for the aged and the infirm.

Some may say that these ideas are socialistic. I deny it. What I propose is part and parcel of the Republican program now in the process of formulation or passage by the Congress. Far from being socialistic, it offers the only antidote for socialism of which I am aware.

To be sure, these programs will cost money—much money. They cannot be undertaken simultaneously and on a full-scale basis at the present time. Our national wealth and income will not permit. But they can be begun and they can be the objectives toward which we as a people are directing our course. And they should be the things for which enlightened Republicanism stands.

Above and beyond these material things of which I speak, however, are the human relationships in our everyday lives. One of the broad areas where these relationships are vital is the field of labor relations. In this area, as you know, the present Congress has enacted the Taft-Hartley Act, whose purpose has been to bring into proper adjustment and balance the relationship between labor and management and to protect the individual worker against coercion or exploitation by anyone. To be sure, this new law has defects, but the good in it far outweighs whatever of evil it may contain. Moreover, through experience its defects can and will be corrected and a happier worker-employer condition should finally emerge.

Most important of all in the sphere of human relations is that area pertaining to civil rights. Probably the most glaring inconsistency in American life and one of the most serious handicaps which we as a Nation encounter in the exercise of our influence abroad is our failure as Americans to live up to our so-called American creed. We profess much, but too often we seem to lack the courage of conviction.

Most happily, marked progress has been made in recent years in this sphere of human relations. Great strides have been taken in some of the States of the Union in combating prejudice and in providing equal economic opportunity for all. Although the campaign against discrimination in employment because of race or religion or national origin has been and should always be nonpartisan, we Republicans can take just pride that in the attainment of these results Republican initiative and Republican determination have contributed mightily.

Today what we need in our country above all else is unity. The program I have outlined will contribute substantially to national unity. As I have implied, however, this goal cannot be reached by the snapping of a finger or the passage of a few bills.

Its achievement demands courage and vision. It will require sacrifice. Its realization will need patience and determination. It calls for idealism.

Not long ago we were engaged in the most tragic struggle ever inflicted upon mankind. During that struggle we attained a loftiness of purpose which sometimes only suffering and dire extremity can produce. In that purpose we had visions of a better world and a better America.

Most of the young men and young women who fought the fight against Nazi and Fascist tyranny, of whom more than 300,000 paid the supreme sacrifice and other hundreds of thousands were maimed for life, believed in the great cause for which they were fighting and had faith that out of their sacrifice would emerge a better world and a better America. Their sacrifice and their faith impose upon us a sacred obligation. We must not fail them.

Their hopes, their ambitions, their dreams can be made realities. This is the challenge with which we as Republicans and Americans are faced. It is the challenge which we Republicans must accept. With faith in ourselves and in one another and in Almighty God and with the courage which this faith inspires, we can succeed, we must succeed in this great undertaking.

Racial Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 11 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on the evening of last Sunday, May 9, there was delivered before the Long Beach Forum, Long Beach, N. Y., an address on racial discrimination by the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] which I think is well worthy of consideration by the Congress. The address was entitled "Wake Up, America!" I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAKE UP, AMERICA!

The topic for discussion this evening is racial discrimination. However, before taking up the subject, allow me to express appreciation to my good friend, Councilman Joe Ross, who has so cordially invited me to be here this evening and to speak on a subject which I deem to be of transcendental importance to all of us.

As I look over the audience I am reminded of the Chicago newspaper which spoke of New York editorial writers who refer to the United States as "we Anglo-Saxons" and suggested that they should see some of the Anglo-Saxons at Forty-seventh and South Parkway.

Needless to say, I am happy to be here. I feel at home in New York and its environs although I come from a sparsely populated State and one utterly unlike yours from the standpoint of population, industry, commerce, and geography. I enjoy the fast tempo of your life. I like to see the vast crowds, the thousands of eager faces showing strains of many races—all living, working, and playing, and together making the greatest city in the world.

I am particularly glad to be in your lovely little city of Long Beach. The interest in national and world affairs expressed through this forum gives testimony to the progressive attitude and civic pride of your citizens and you are to be congratulated.

Most speakers try to be as circumspect as possible when handling a subject as delicate as racial discrimination. But the world situation today is so critical, the fate of western civilization is so precarious, and the future of our Nation as a great power is so imperiled that we find circumspection out of order; it is time to speak out boldly—let the chips fall where they may. Discrimination endangers our country, and a threat to our national safety is a matter which vitally concerns us all, and it behooves us as good citizens to study and understand the problem. And if we find that racial discrimination presents such a threat to our safety,

then we should immediately, with every ounce of resolution and determination at our command, seek to eradicate it from our way of life.

I can approach the problem with first-hand knowledge. I am a Catholic of Spanish descent and a representative of one of the larger racial minority groups. It is a racial minority which has been especially discriminated against in a country which we all know is predominantly Anglo-Saxon and Protestant. Still I feel I can approach the problem impartially because I view national problems not as a Catholic, not as a descendant of the Spanish Conquistadores, but solely and exclusively as an American. Furthermore, though belonging to a minority group, I occupy, thanks to the electorate of my State and our domocratic institutions, one of the highest offices our Nation has to offer.

I feel deeply on the subject—there is already too much division in our country. Two weeks ago I led the fight against the granting of a Federal charter to the Catholic War Veterans because I felt that our boys fought, bled, and died together in the last war as Americans—not as Catholics, not as Jews, not as Presbyterians—and in peace, veterans should be encouraged always to face the future as Americans. I am opposed to dividing them in times of peace into racial or religious groupings, as I am opposed to so dividing them in times of war.

Before discussing discrimination let us examine the credit side of the ledger. Our heritage of civil liberties is something we should be very proud of—our national record is a worthy one. The dignity of the individual is the core of this heritage and the welfare of the individual is the purpose and final goal and objective of our laws and institutions. We have a record three centuries long of constant striving to equalize opportunity for all men, and certainly no nation in history has ever offered better opportunity of achieving the ultimate goal of complete freedom and equality. It is true that we have fallen short of reaching the goal, but we all know the objective and we want to get there. For what we have accomplished we can take pride. Our heritage has permitted the election of a Smith, a Roosevelt, a Lehman, and a Dewey as the executive of this great State. In New Mexico at least half of the elected officials are of Spanish ancestry.

Unfortunately this is far from the case in the neighboring States of Texas, Arizona, and Colorado. There the record is not good. Perhaps the reason for this is because our laws and Constitution provide equal rights and equal opportunity under Federal authority but no attention is given to the abuse of civil rights by individuals or by the States.

Discrimination is too widespread to need prove its existence—inequality of opportunity, segregation of individuals, abuse and mistreatment because of race and color is familiar to us all. The implications of discrimination, however, are not always so well known or understood. That an American citizen of Mexican descent in Arizona or Colorado may not occupy public office is a national disgrace. But what is more important at the moment is that such discrimination imperils relations with our sister republics of the Western Hemisphere at a time when pan-American solidarity is the cornerstone of national security.

Therefore, when Southern spokesmen tell us to mind our own business and let the South solve its own problems we can hurl back the answer with a vengeance—Bilboism in Mississippi concerns each and every American. First because Bilboism is intrinsically wrong; second, because it is un-American; and, third, because it jeopardizes our national security.

But let us retrace our steps for one moment—why do we have racial and religious bigotry in this country? The answer is simple. The population of the United States is composed of immigrants, or descendants of immigrants, who came to this country from all parts of the world. Every race, clime, and language is represented here. Basically the older population came from northern Europe and is predominantly Anglo Saxon, white and Protestant. However, even in early Colonial days the French, the Germans, the Irish, and the Jews were represented and, of course, helpless shackled blacks from Africa soon joined them. Slavery was introduced in Virginia 10 years before the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth, though strangely enough, these blacks were held like the indentured whites and could gain their freedom after the period of indenture. Following the Civil War and with the coming of the industrial revolution and the march of civilization westward a new flood of immigrants came to our country. They introduced the language, the customs, the religion, and even the dress of the countries of their origin.

Today, people representing every race known to man live in New York City. In Massachusetts we have Poles, French, Portuguese. There are Germans in Pennsylvania, Swedes, Norwegians, and Danes in the Lake Region and Italians and Greeks are scattered from one end of the country to the other. This conglomeration of races, languages, customs, and religions gave rise to countless differences and conflicts, most of which remain unsettled to this day. Until the problems created by the presence of minority groups are solved, the United States will to that extent be divided.

Negroes form our largest minority, closely followed by the Jews. Another great minority is represented by people who came to this country from our neighbor to the south—Mexico.

Wherever these newcomers have settled their poverty, ignorance, and low standard of living permitted exploitation by the older populations with whom they came in contact, and the latter were not reluctant to take advantage of the fact.

In time, with education, leaders arose among the exploited and pushed by universal yearning for advancement of the masses they sought to elevate themselves and their fellows and collided head-on with the entrenched interests of the older populations. Fanned by ignorance and greed the conflict inevitably becomes more acute in ratio to the extent of the profit obtained by the exploiting group.

The pattern was true when the Irish, the Poles, and the Italians, etc., were foreigners and so long as the so-called 100-percent American could keep them in the lower-wage-scale jobs. The pattern is true today in the case of the Negroes and Mexican-Americans.

Let us see how this works out in relation to the whole economic and social picture—let us examine the problem and see if we are interlopers in pressing for fair employment practices, as the Bilbos and Talmadges charge.

In World War II we were fighting to preserve our way of life and to defend western civilization. Hitler had loosed the demon hordes of pagan nihilism on civilization, and to our everlasting honor it became our glorious role in history to crush these hordes and destroy their master and his maniacal system. To do this we had to wage total war. Every sinew, every muscle, every last bit of energy and determination had to be expended in order to win the victory.

We all had a stake in that war. New Mexico had its entire National Guard fighting with its back to the wall at Bataan and Corregidor. Our men weren't asking for relief or rescue; they begged only for arms, medicine, and provisions. I wish that the congressional opponents of FEPC could ask the helpless hulks of men in New Mexico, the prisoners who survived the death march and the salt mines of Japan, if it was wise—not right, mind you—to keep the manpower represented by 13,000,000 Negroes and some 2,000,000 Mexican-Americans out of the defense plants because of color or race.

This is not idle talk. Let me tell you what happened. Early in the war, when the reserves of our manpower were reaching the point of exhaustion, a vast source of manpower remained untapped. The Negroes and the Mexican-Americans in our war plants were deprived undemocratically, unrealistically, and foolhardily of the opportunity to help win the war by contributing their labor and skill in defense-plant work. They could fight, but they couldn't work. The situation grew critical, production was lagging; finally, after considerable study, President Roosevelt by Executive order established the Fair Employment Practices Commission, and at long last we began to utilize this important source of manpower.

In the last war the percentage of volunteers from New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, and Texas was very high. A vast number were boys of Spanish or Mexican ancestry; they could bear arms, but their fathers, brothers, and sisters, under the system existing at the time, could not get jobs in war plants, or, if allowed to work, they could do only the most menial of tasks and at a discriminatory wage rate.

Discrimination is un-American and cannot be a part of the American way of life. It is contrary to our spirit of fair play.

Imagine the feelings of the Japanese-American, who fought so valiantly in Italy—we had no better troops, not excepting the marines—fighting for democracy and all the while his country was gathering up his father, mother, and sisters and herding them like cattle into concentration camps.

Macario Garcia, of Texas, won the Congressional Medal of Honor. President Truman bestowed the decoration, and he told the young hero that he would rather have earned that medal than be President of the United States. Back home in Texas a week later, on his way to a Rotary Club luncheon to which he had been invited, this young man stopped at a drug store in Sugar Land to get a coca-cola—in the uniform of the country he loved and wearing its highest decoration—he was referred to a sign, "We don't serve Mexicans." When he protested the insult he was hit over the head with a baseball bat and was hurt so badly he could not proceed with his journey. Texas should be ashamed.

And the Negro who lay dying of wounds in New Guinea and asked that a grave marker be placed over him reading: "Here lies a black man who died fighting yellow men that white men might be free." Perhaps he could foresee the shocking massacre at Monroe, Ga., when two helpless Negro couples were forcibly removed from a car by a lynch mob and shot down like dogs as they pleaded for their lives.

At Pando, Colo., construction of a camp to train winter troops was started. Hundreds of employees were needed by the contractor. Workmen were recruited from all the surrounding areas, including New Mexico. About 500 of these employees were Americans of Spanish extraction from New Mexico, Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, and Arizona. Most of them had sons in the service of the country. Many had sons who were prisoners of the Japanese in the Philippines. Someone complained that there were "too many Mexicans" working in the camp. Suddenly came an order dismissing everyone who bore a Spanish name. Better than 500 persons were dismissed in one day. Juan F. Romero, of Rodarte, N. Mex., formerly a State representative from Taos County, and a Republican, telephoned me about the situation. Senator ED JOHNSON of Colorado was as horrified as I when he learned of the situation. Together we protested to the general staff and in 3 days every man went back to work and the matter was settled, except perhaps in

the hearts of the men who had ordered the discriminatory firing in the first place. Unquestionably malice, prejudice, and ignorance still remained embedded in their hearts.

These things are wrong. I know that there are many among us who refer to the Italians as "Wops," to the Mexicans as "Greasers," to the Jews as "Yids," and the Irish as "Harps," but if we stop to consider how important it is that we be united now, we would forget our differences, forget that we are of Irish, Spanish, English, or Italian extraction and concentrate on being Americans.

Anyone who has observed the progress of Communist aggression since World War II will realize that the greatest aid to its progress has been disunity and political disorganization. Every nation engulfed by communism has previously been torn asunder by factionalism, confusion, and bitter internal controversy. We cannot afford racial differences in America.

We now realize the folly of having disarmed so soon after the end of World War II. We plan to build a great air force, to strengthen our ground forces, and to increase the striking power of our Navy. We are waging a cold war against communism throughout the world. We are sending billions to Europe in an effort to rehabilitate those war-torn countries, to stabilize their economies and their governments, and if possible to weld them together into a political unit which will stand strong and steadfast against the onslaught from the east.

All this, however, will be useless if we try to fight communism with arms and dollars alone. Our best answer to communism is the living, working proof of democracy furnished by our divinely inspired institutions and system of government. As long as America offers the world a haven of hope for the oppressed and the weak, we will triumph over communism. To accomplish this we must have a deep-rooted conviction of the superiority of our institutions. Contrariwise, if under our system of government there is misery, suffering, want, oppression, and discrimination, the weapons of communism are strengthened and sharpened.

Every slum, every lynching, every example of Jim Crowism is taken up by the Communist and used as an argument to advance his cause. Let us quit kidding ourselves. The Negro, the oriental, and the Mexican have cousins by the millions throughout the world. Their numbers may be few in this country by comparison with other racial groups, but every time a barber in Arizona refuses to serve a visiting Latin American from Mexico or Venezuela you can be sure that they hear about it in South America, and you can bet your bottom dollar that the Communist agents will make use of it as propaganda.

The Communist agents in China, in Korea, in Formosa, Indochina, the East Indies, and Japan are doubtless now exploiting the knowledge that under California laws the last wish of the dying Nisei hero is denied him—his parents cannot hold land willed them by their son; it escheats to the State.

And what about Latin America? We can't expect the nations of this hemisphere to break their necks to help us in the event of another war if we continue to mistreat their cousins in our own country.

Doubtless there are many who would say, "To hell with South America." But it is not as simple as that. Had it not been for the endless supply of raw materials which came from South America to feed our war industries, the end of World War II might well have been prolonged, or perhaps even different.

We are on the brink of war today. No thinking person wants war, but if we have war we cannot afford to be isolated from the rest of the world. If we face facts we must admit that the population of the world is not predominantly white. As a matter of fact, the yellow, brown, and black races far outnumber the white. These races are restless. The downtrodden millions in Indo-China, the East Indies, and Africa are striving even now to throw off the yoke of imperialism. We will need vital raw materials which these countries possess and without which it is impossible to wage modern war. We can't expect these races to be friendly and to assist us in war if at the same time we discriminate against groups of our own citizens because of race or color.

From a moral, ethical, and ethnological standpoint, there is absolutely no basis for discrimination. Given equal background, equal opportunity, equal schooling, most people in a given environment, though of different race or color, will tend in the long run to progress equally.

The Mexican-American Joe Martinez from Colorado, who won the Congressional Medal of Honor and a hero's grave on Attu loved his country just as much as Colin Kelly or John Bassilone.

I am quite sure we all agree that in the eyes of God all men are equal, and it matters not to God if a man be black, brown, yellow, or white.

In the dedication of the Fifth Marine Division Graveyard at Iwo Jima, the division's Jewish chaplain, Rabbi Roland B. Gittlesohn, the Cleveland-born son of a Lithuanian immigrant, had this to say:

"Here lie officers and men, Negroes and whites, rich men and poor * * *. Here are Protestants, Catholics, and Jews * * *. Here no man prefers another because of his color. Here there are no quotas of how many from each group are admitted or allowed. Theirs is the highest and purest democracy.

"Any man among us the living who * * * lifts his hand in hate against a brother, or thinks himself superior to those who happen to be in the minority, makes of this ceremony and of the bloody sacrifices it commemorates, an empty mockery. * * *"

I am not speaking academically. We are facing stern reality. This forum is composed of public-spirited citizens. You are interested in the outcome of the next Presidential election. You are interested in the international situation. Being well-read persons, you know that President Truman by Executive order created over a year ago a Commission which had for its purpose the study of civil rights in the United States. In a report entitled "To Secure These Rights," the President's committee outlined the minority problem in the United States, analyzed the civil rights which are most abused and which require the protection of the Federal Government. The committee recommended to the President the enactment of legislation enabling administrative institutions to protect these rights. In a vigorous message to Congress President Truman stood four-square on the recommendations of his committee. Immediately a hue and cry arose from the South. Threats of bolting and of withholding electoral votes filled the air. Leaving political implications aside, the President is right and the southerners are wrong on this issue.

From a practical standpoint it seems foolhardy that 10 percent of our people should be permanently held down and prevented from using their energies in critical times. We are in a cold war up to our necks. A shooting war may be just around the corner, and whether we like it or not, we cannot afford to turn down the help of 15,000,000 people. The opponents of a civil-rights program are imperiling the security of our Nation by persisting in their bigoted approach to this problem. The civilization which they love so much can well be endangered by their shortsightedness.

The State of New York is to be congratulated for its enlightened attitude toward minority problems. It is not easy, I know, to live with neighbors who are different from ourselves. As a matter of fact, where is the family that has no spats? I know in my own case that the Spanish-speaking people of New Mexico, from whom I spring, have had a tremendous struggle to adapt themselves to American ways of life, but they are winning the fight. Every day lawyers, doctors, dentists, nurses, and scientists of Spanish descent are taking their place as useful American citizens. They are proud of their heritage; they are proud that their ancestors came to New Mexico before the Anglo-Saxons; they are proud of their language; but above all, they are proud of being Americans.

Their pride in America must not be transformed into bitterness and disillusionment by discrimination and segregation. False doctrines of racial superiority properly belong in a Nazi state—not in America. Join then in a fight which concerns us all. Fight to provide the equality of freedom and opportunity that alone will make worth while the death of Joe Martinez, Colin Kelly, and John Bassilone.

I thank you.

California's Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 11 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, many veterans are not in possession of full information regarding their legal rights to various benefits, privileges, preferences, and exemptions which have been granted to them by legislation enacted by the State of California. It is, therefore, a pleasure for me to present, for their information, an outline of part of such laws, as compiled by Mr. Irwin J. Landis, director of rehabilitation of the Disabled American Veterans, 1816 South Figueroa Street, Los Angeles 15, Calif. I ask unanimous consent to have the résumé printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. At a later date I shall submit the remainder of the information.

There being no objection, the résumé was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CALIFORNIA VETERAN LAWS

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

County allowances are provided for burial or cremation of indigent veterans or their widows. Burial may not be in potter's field.

Maintenance of soldiers' graves is a county charge.

The county clerk is required to apply to the United States for a suitable headstone. An allowance is made for setting the stone in place. Veterans' graves are to be kept properly marked and identified.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Acknowledgment has been made of legal instruments and the administration of oaths.

Evidence may be admitted of presumed death or absence of a member of the armed forces.

Appearance in adoption proceedings is waived during military service.

Disabled veterans may vote an absentee ballot.

A fiduciaries Wartime Substitution Act has been enacted.

Protection is afforded persons acting under power of attorney.

The State Veterans' Farm and Home Purchase Act of 1943 provides for removal of disability of minority for qualified veterans.

Sale of real property to enforce the collection of taxes is postponed as a protection to members of the armed forces and their dependents.

Statutes of limitation are suspended during time of war.

The board of directors of the Veterans' Home of California shall hold in trust funds left by veterans and dispose of such funds to the proper heirs.

When a member of the armed forces dies leaving no real property and an estate not exceeding $1,000 the spouse, children, parent, brother or sister, or guardian may dispense with letters of administration or the awaiting of the probate of the will, if any.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Absentee registration and voting has been granted.

Convicts may be restored to the rights of citizenship to become eligible upon being honorably discharged.

CLAIMS, ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS, SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

County clerks are empowered to certify affidavits for United States pension claimants without fees. They may not charge any fees or receive other compensation for such certification.

No fees are allowed notaries public for services rendered in the matter of a pension claim or any claim to be presented to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

County recorders may not charge fees for issuing certified copies of discharge papers.

Free copies of public records are issued to applicants for benefits through the Veterans' Administration under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

Public officials may not take fees for issuing verified copies of discharge papers or other public records to be used in a pension claim or a claim for allotment, allowance or insurance under any act of Congress.

County recorders may not charge fees for recording and indexing discharge papers.

Public officers may not take fees for recording or indexing discharge papers.

Appointment of country service officers have been authorized.

Powers and duties of the veterans' welfare board have been outlined with annual appropriations.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS, QUALIFICATION FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

Persons who have served in active military service during war with any foreign power may be admitted to junior colleges.

Any medical director, medical inspector, past assistant surgeon and assistant surgeon of the United States Navy and any surgeon of the United States Army honorably discharged or any Surgeon General, Assistant Surgeon General, senior surgeon, past assistant surgeon and assistant surgeon of the United States Public Health Service on active duty or detached shall be eligible for a physician's and surgeon's certificate.

Educational aid has been extended to certain veterans, including World War II veterans, with an appropriation of $500,000.

Custody and expenditure of State and Federal funds have been authorized for education of veterans in the public schools.

An apprentice embalmer may be granted an extension of leave of absence while serving in the armed forces.

Graduates of law schools operating on a full-time basis for 24 months or part-time basis for 36 months satisfy the requirements for taking the bar examination; otherwise veterans returning to civilian life may be delayed an additional year in taking such examination.

Periods of service in the armed forces, whether of that of an artisan or of the same general nature, shall be counted by the State personnel board as journeymen experience under the State Civil Service Act and also under the Government Code.

Subject requirements have been relaxed for persons whose induction into the armed forces prevented their taking the examination to practice optometry.

Teaching credentials and certificates are continued in force during military service and until 6 months after discharge.

The period spent in service in the armed forces shall be excluded in computing the time an attorney from a sister State has practiced in order to practice in California, the requirement being 4 years out of the next 6 years immediately preceding application.

Vocational education is provided for members of the Veterans' Home of California.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Aid is extended for children of veterans who served in the Army Navy or Marine Corps of the United States during World War I or II and who were killed in action or died as a result of war service. Amount: $250 for any 1 year for students of collegiate, junior college, business and trade school rank; $135 for any 1 year for students of high school rank. Persons who made application or received aid while under 21 may continue until they reach the age of 27 if necessary.

Children of certain disabled veterans are exempt from tuition and incidental fees in State-owned colleges and universities.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Affidavits must be filed with the veterans' welfare board on forms prescribed by the State personnel board for preference in examinations under the State Civil Service Act or the Government code.

Any person whose name appears on any employment list under the State Civil Service Act or Government code who enters the armed forces before such list is abolished shall retain his place thereon until 3 years following a discharge.

Being a veteran of World War II or of some other war is a prerequisite to membership on the veterans' welfare board.

Benefit rights under the Unemployment Insurance Act are preserved for trainees in the armed forces.

Civil-service status of employees of the Attorney General is protected during military service.

Contributions have been provided to teacher retirement funds during active military service.

Employees in the department of corrections are included under the State civil service and shall have a right to return to a position after service in the armed forces.

In computing benefits under the county retirement system, the continuity of service is not considered broken if an employee is reinstated within 90 days after the termination of military service. Payment of contributions is optional.

Leaves of absence are granted to county, city or district employees or officers for military service.

Leaves of absence are granted to noncivil-service employees of State colleges with the right to return to positions within 90 days after termination of military service.

Leaves of absence are granted to school employees requiring certification with right to return to positions within 90 days after termination of military service.

Military-service credit is extended to county foresters, fire wardens, and firemen under the retirement system.

Military-service credit is extended for the purpose of qualifying for retirement and death benefits under the State Employees' Retirement Act.

Military-service credit is considered in the computation of service for retirement of teachers.

Officers or employees of municipal utility districts shall be restored to a position in the district's civil-service system following termination of service in the armed forces. Employees of public utilities acquired by districts shall also be restored to former positions.

Preference is extended to veterans and widows of veterans in the State civil service, including veterans of World Wars I and II (includes period September 16, 1940, to December 7, 1941), the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, the Boxer Rebellion, the Indian War, and the Civil War. Service in any such war in the American Red Cross Nursing Corps is included.

Five- and 10-point preference is extended to veterans on entrance examinations held under the State act.

Preference is extended to veterans in administrative and other work under veterans' aid and welfare laws.

Preference is extended to veterans in classification on eligible lists for policemen and watchmen under the State Civil Service Act.

Preference is extended to veterans under the merit system applied to noncertificated employees in certain school districts.

Preservation of benefits are provided under the County Employees' Retirement Act of 1937 while in the armed forces during World War II.

Reentry is required into public office or employment within 6 months after termination of military service.

"Rehabilitation" under Civil Service Act and the Government code means a restoration of veterans declared to be 10 percent or more disabled, either physically or mentally.

A city officer may be reinstated upon discharge or release from military service prior to expiration of his term of office.

Reinstatement is provided for county and township officers and employees within 6 months after termination of military service.

Reinstatement of noncertified school employees may be made within 90 days after termination of military service, or within 1 year from date terminating present hostilities.

Reinstatement is provided for public officers and employees after discharge from military service.

Renewal of credentials or certificates of teachers is provided, both probationary and permanent, by the commission of credentials upon application within 6 months after the end of World War II.

Retention of civil-service status is provided; restoration of positions with seniority after military service under the State Civil Service Act and the Government code includes those persons serving with the American Red Cross.

Classified and unclassified school employees may be returned to school service.

Return is provided to public officers, deputies, assistants, and employees to public service within 6 months after termination of military service.

Rights are preserved of certified permanent school employees following termination of military service.

The California Employment Commission is required to operate and maintain a veterans' placement service.

The employer shall contribute for each member of the State employees' retirement system who is absent in military service and who returns to State service within 6 months after his discharge.

The State board of personnel may, in an examination under the State Civil Service

Act or under the Government code, allow discretionary general or individual preference in ratings to permanently disabled veterans with service-connected disability.

Time spent in the military service during World War II shall not be considered in computing the 3-year period during which a request for reinstatement after resignation may be made under the State Civil Service Act or Government code.

Veterans may take State civil-service probational examinations missed while in the armed forces.

EXEMPTION FROM EXECUTION, GARNISHMENT, ETC.

Money received as pension or other benefit from the United States or from the State is exempt from execution or attachment.

Our Great American Heritage—Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 11 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the American Legion Auxiliary of Missouri each year awards a prize to the student submitting the best essay on Americanism. This year the essay of Charles Davis Matthews IV, 13-year old Sikeston, Mo., High School student, was awarded first place.

I ask unanimous consent to have this essay entitled "Our Great American Heritage—Liberty," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR GREAT AMERICAN HERITAGE—LIBERTY

(Winning State essay on Americanism by Charles D. Matthews IV)

The test of any nation's government is determined by the happiness of those who live under its influence. I can think of no better way to describe my American heritage than to tell you of my day, which would be that of a typical American boy.

I wake up in the morning in a comfortable bed after a night of pleasant dreams without fear. I eat a hearty breakfast and walk to public school.

Attending citizenship class fills my first hour. This class studies every form of government used by the countries of the world. I am encouraged to compare these governments with my own. The Junior Review, a weekly paper which our class enjoys, tells me truthfully the news of the world.

The second period is for study. This hour is spent reading magazines, newspapers, and books. The more I read and study, the more I believe in a formula for freedom.

My third period is Latin. This course is a study of the ancient Roman customs. I find even then the people wished for peaceful ways of living.

In my fourth hour class, English, I try to improve my speech, my writing, and my knowledge of the literature of all nations. The teacher chooses, without prejudice, the best masterpieces of ancient and present-day authors.

Having enjoyed a body-building lunch, obtainable in America, I return to school for algebra class. I study the contributions the great mathematicians have made, not to one country, but to all the world.

Band practice comes next. I learn to express myself through music. The lives of all people through the ages are pictured in music, and I find another way of appreciating my heritage.

I have a variety of things to do in the afternoon. The neighborhood games are wonderful, and it never occurs to my friends or me that because we may have different religious beliefs or political views we cannot have fun together.

After dinner I may see a movie, uncensored as to the news of the world, listen to my choice of radio programs, or read. At bedtime I may pray as I wish, for I have the right to worship as I believe.

I thank God that I live in a country that has gained its independence, a nation once unheard-of, which started as a weak group of Colonies and became our present Nation with its freedom of religion, speech, assembly, and press. Brave men such as Washington, Madison, Franklin, and many others, risked their lives that we might have what they worked to attain. Are we going to let this great heritage slip from us? Most of us do appreciate our blessings, for we have had liberty all our lives. Do we have to have liberty taken away from us before we can realize its importance? God be merciful if we do.

Conditions in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 11 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Sumner Welles entitled "Partition Is a Fact," from the Washington Post of this morning.

I also ask that there be printed an open letter to the President of the United States, signed by a distinguished group of Americans, from the Washington Post of this morning, dealing with the Palestine problem.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW PALESTINE STALL—PARTITION IS A FACT

(By Sumner Welles)

The extent of the administration's ineptitude in dealing with Palestine seems to be unlimited.

The trusteeship plan proposed by the United States has fortunately been shelved by the Assembly. It would have ended all Jewish hopes for independence. It would have prevented the resettlement in the Holy Land of all but a handful of Europe's Jewish refugees. It would have represented an abject acquiescence by the United Nations in Arab aggression. It would have created precisely that situation in the Near East most likely to increase tension between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Now the administration is backing a set of British proposals which are open to every one of these objections.

Britain's most recent maneuvers at Lake Success require close scrutiny.

Mr. Creech-Jones' recommendation that "some neutral authority" be established to act for the United Nations and to take over from the mandatory power on May 15 until such time as "the communities can resolve their conflict or the form of future government be finally determined" is merely further evidence of Britain's intention to sacrifice Jewish rights in return for Arab support. The proposal has already included the Assembly's political committee to recommend "a provisional regime for Palestine."

But plausible as the proposal may superficially seem to be, the dangers inherent in it would be fatal to the hope for a lasting Palestine settlement.

The British initiative is intended to prevent the partition plan from becoming effective by default when the mandate expires. If the maneuver proves successful its sponsors can claim, when the Jews on May 16 announce the formal establishment of the independent republic promised them by the partition plan, that they are acting in defiance of the United Nations.

The Soviet Union has made it clear that it will recognize the new Jewish state. Presumably other propartition countries will take similar action. Will the ensuing deadlock enhance the United Nations authority? If this plan is adopted, and no brief period is fixed for its duration, we will see an attempt to transform this "provisional regime" into the same Anglo-American condominium as that contemplated in the trusteeship plan of the United States. Mr. Creech-Jones urges that this "provisional regime" should continue until the Arabs and Jews come to an agreement. Under that restriction what chance would there be for the Jewish state promised by the Assembly last November?

In all of the sterile debates that have been going on in the Security Council, in the Assembly's Political Committee and in the Trusteeship Council only one courageous and realistic course has been recommended. Australia and New Zealand, supported by such other governments as Uruguay and Guatemala, insist that the Assembly should relentlessly cut its way out of the disgraceful dilemma into which it has been forced by American folly and revert to its original plan for the economic union and partition of Palestine.

The most urgent essential is that Jerusalem and the other holy places be safeguarded by United Nations authority. Had the United States not obliged the Trusteeship Council 2 months ago to postpone the completion of the arrangements for a trusteeship over Jerusalem with which it had been charged by the partition resolution, that program would now be available to go into effect on May 15.

If a neutral authority in Palestine is required as an unavoidable stopgap, what more logical authority could there be than the Palestine Commission, set up by the Assembly to carry out the partition plan and which, despite every form of obstacle, has discharged its obligations ably and with marked devotion to the highest interests of the Untied Nations?

If a provisional regime is to be set up it must have force to back it. If force is available for this purpose, why should it not be equally available to implement the partition plan? In the latter case a United Nations force could obviously count upon the support of the Jewish Army.

The Jewish state already exists. Partition has taken place. The provisional government of the Jewish republic is already functioning. All of these steps have been taken under the provisions of the Assembly's resolution of last November, and in reliance upon the authority of the United Nations.

Yet our own Government, in total disregard of the catastrophic harm done to the United Nations, of the effect upon the confidence of other nations in this Government's faith, of the increasing strain placed upon Soviet-American relations, and of the vital interests of the Jews, persists in a series of grotesque gyrations which we are told by

President Truman represents an attempt to help the United Nations to find a peaceful settlement.

The conclusion is now inescapable that if the Jewish commonwealth survives the approaching crisis, and if the Jewish refugees eventually find a home in Palestine, it will be solely because of the strength and devotion of the Jewish people, and in spite of American policy.

IS BRITISH SABOTAGE TO BE BASIS OF UNITED STATES POLICY ON PALESTINE?—AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

MR. PRESIDENT: On November 29, 1947, your leadership defeated the delaying tactics of the middle eastern section of the State Department and brought about the decisive vote of the United Nations in favor of partition with economic union in Palestine.

On the day following that vote, however, the State Department resumed its active collaboration with the British Foreign Office to prevent the implementation of that resolution. This was reflected in the embargo on arms shipments to Palestine by the United States on December 6; the failure of the State Department to let the Arab states know we would not tolerate their revolt; active propaganda by the Defense Department to prove the necessity of middle eastern oil for war purposes and the danger that the Arabs would cancel oil leases; and in the charge of lack of patriotism against those who favor partition.

Secretary of Defense Forrestal has justified the new American appeasement policy as essential to preventing the cancellation of oil concessions by the Arab states. But the facts are that no Arab rulers have threatened to cancel oil leases; American military experts concede that middle eastern oil installations could be destroyed almost overnight in the event of war; and there are ample undeveloped oil reserves in the United States, Mexico, Venezuela, Peru, Colombia, Brazil, and Argentina, apart from the enormous potential of synthetic oil.

Actually, except for the determined sabotage of the partition resolution by the British and our own State Department, there is nothing in the present Palestine situation which was not anticipated last fall when you directed the American delegation to support partition.

On October 31 your representative, Herschel Johnson, told correspondents at the United Nations that if the Arabs resisted partition there was no reason why the Jewish state could not be set up and the Arab area turned over to the trusteeship council. On November 22 he told the Ad Hoc Committee on Palestine of the United Nations, "We do not say we anticipate no trouble." On November 25 he voted for the inclusion, in the preamble of the resolution, a specification that "the Security Council should determine as a threat to peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression, in accordance with article 39 of the Charter, any attempt to alter by force the settlement envisaged by this resolution." On November 29 he told the final session of the General Assembly, "If we are to effect through the United Nations a solution of this problem, it cannot be done without the use of the knife."

BRITAIN IS BEHIND ACTS OF ARAB LEAGUE

The military and political developments in the Arab world are controlled by the Arab League composed of the Governments of Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Transjordan, and Yemen. Representatives of the British Government were present at the meetings of the Arab League where the revolt was planned, and are in continuous connection with it.

Within a month after the November 29 resolution the Arabs were encouraged by Foreign Minister Bevin, of Great Britain, to believe that partition would be supplanted by a federal state. Armed shipments have been continued by Britain to the Arab states despite their known use for Palestine warfare.

The Arab world is incapable of a sustained revolt without the active support of the western nations, including moral encouragement, military supplies, and training of troops. That the present revolt has taken place is due to the direct encouragement of the British Government, which is in active alliance with the Arab League.

Since 1945 the British Government, under the direction of Foreign Minister Bevin, has resisted every American proposal for a decent settlement of the Palestine question. This was true in 1946 when he refused to accept the proposal of the Anglo-American Committee, and your own, for the admission into Palestine of 100,000 Jews. It was true again in 1947 when he refused to accept the UNSCOP report in favor of partition.

BRITISH DELIBERATELY CREATE CHAOS

In 1948 the British Government has deliberately created chaos in Palestine under the pressure of which it is trying to force the United States Government to discard partition, to appease the Arabs, and to secure its own continuing control in the Middle East. For the British Government, by arrangement with the Arab League, is to receive base rights in Haifa, the Negev, and the Galilee, if partition is shelved through one of several schemes to assure Arab dominance in the whole of Palestine.

BRITISH PLOT AGAINST THE UNITED NATIONS AND PARTITION

The British plot against the United Nations decision on Palestine is revealed in the secret documents of British Military Intelligence in Palestine and the Middle East. These have been incorporated in a memorandum submitted to the United Nations and to you on April 30 by the nation associates. This memorandum proves that:

1. Representatives of the British Government attended the meeting of the Arab League where the Arab revolt was first planned, and that the British representative in Egypt, Brig. P. A. Clayton, regularly attends the meetings of the Arab League.

2. The British first suggested the use of "volunteers" in the Arab invasion of Palestine, instead of the official armies of the Arab states, as a direct means of avoiding United Nations action to curb them.

3. British Intelligence is aware of every move of the invading forces in Palestine, but the British representatives have not informed the United Nations.

4. The British in Palestine have sent messages to Arab leaders requesting them to ask the invaders to be as unobtrusive as possible.

5. In the opinion of British Military Intelligence the Arab invaders have served as a pacifying and stabilizing force.

6. The Arabs have instructions not to attack the British.

7. The British, in allowing 10,000 foreign invaders to enter Palestine, have condoned aggression.

8. Units of the Arab Legion have been deliberately retained in Palestine in order to coerce the Jews.

9. As far back as February 13, the British knew of the plan of King Abdullah of Transjordan to march into Palestine; and that, under past and current treaties, Abdullah's Arab Legion, trained, armed, and financed by the British, could not move without British knowledge and consent.

10. The British have admitted into Palestine Arabs of known Nazi allegiance and training and Nazi prisoners of war in command of attacking units.

BRITISH DELIBERATELY DESTROY ASSETS OF PALESTINE

Further, the Nation Associates Memorandum reveals that:

The Palestine administration of the British Government is involved in an organized dissipation of the assets of the country in the determination that there should be a vacuum and chaos at the end of the mandate.

An artificial deficit has been created.

The Jews have been landlocked by the turning over of two railroads connecting with the outside world to Egypt and Transjordan.

A deliberate break-down of central authority has been undertaken as part of the British move to create chaos.

BRITISH MILITARY RIGHTS IN PALESTINE

Laws have been drafted which would guarantee British rights in perpetuity to military bases and control of land, rail, and sea connections to the Middle East.

PARTITION IS A FACT

Despite British sabotage, the Arab revolt, and Jewish reprisals, partition is a fact.

Dr. Pablo Azcarate, head of the advance party of the United Nations Palestine Commission, on his return from Jerusalem a fortnight ago, reported that partition was in effect and could not be overthrown.

The truce commission of the United Nations has reported that the Jewish Agency has taken over suspended governmental activities as the British withdraw and is functioning effectively in spite of constant warfare.

Resisting with remarkable courage the war of nerves being waged against them, and Arab assault, the Haganah has occupied the key points in almost the whole area awarded the Jewish state by the United Nations. Jewish authorities have taken over most of the services. More impressive still, they have set up an agency to safeguard the properties of Arabs fleeing from towns and villages taken over by the Jews. Arab businesses are managed wherever possible, vineyards and farms are being attended, and produce used, but the assets are conserved for the legal Arab owners. Not the United Nations, but the Jews, themselves, have implemented the United Nations decision.

A MINIMAL PROGRAM FOR PALESTINE

Is British sabotage, Mr. President, to be permitted to serve as the basis of United States policy on Palestine?

The press of the United States and leading American spokesmen for the democratic way of life are unanimous in declaring the present reversal of our policy is without justification, an attack on the prestige of the United States, a threat to the authority of the United Nations, and a peril to peace and security in the Middle East and in the world at large.

You, Mr. President, have continued to endorse partition. The resolution of November 29 still stands. Justice, honor, practicality, all demand a new directive by you to insure its implementation.

A minimal program should be:

United States recognition of the Jewish state on May 15 at the mandate's end.

A loan to that state.

Trusteeship for the Arab areas of Palestine pending the creation of an Arab government.

A general embargo on the shipment of arms to the states comprising the Arab league.

A recommendation to the Security Council to recognize that aggression of the Arab states is a threat to peace.

Recognition of Haganah and supplying of arms to it.

The will to carry through partition thus demonstrated by the United States can put an end to Arab gangsterism, British sabotage. It will also safeguard the authority of the United Nations and lay the foundations for a more lasting peace. To do less, to yield to Arab blackmail, is to destroy the moral foundations on which our country is built.

HENRY A. ATKINSON.
BARTLEY C. CRUM.
LEON HENDERSON.
FREDA KIRCHWEY.
PHILIP MURRAY.
JAMES G. PATTON.
T. O. THACKREY.

Henry A. Atkinson is secretary of the Church Peace Union; Bartley C. Crum, a member of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, is publisher of PM; Leon Henderson, former Director of the OPA, is national chairman of Americans for Democratic Action; Freda Kirchwey, editor of the Nation, is president of the Nation Associates; Philip Murray is president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations; James G. Patton is president of the Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union; T. O. Thackrey is editor and publisher of the New York Post and Home News.

The Place of Small Business in Representative Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, the National Federation of Small Business, Inc., has just issued, through its Washington office, a statement that should have the attention of every Member of the Congress. I have received a copy through the courtesy of Mr. George J. Burger, director of the Washington office, and I am glad to have it, and under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I shall offer the statement in full, to include the text of a message from the president of the federation, Mr. C. Wilson Harder.

I do not need to tell you, Mr. Speaker, what the Federation of Small Business has done, and is still doing, to protect small businesses in the United States. It is a very necessary job. I have reason for saying that. In the year 1942, the year before I came to the Congress, I was a member of the State senate in California.

That year, the senate appointed an interim committee of two members. I was the Republican member; Senator Robert W. Kenny, later attorney general of California, was the Democratic member. We were told to find out what should be done to gear California into the war program, then starting. We had no idea that this investigation would take us into nearly every county in California, nor that it would keep us busy all year. Certainly we had no idea it would bring us a medal for services on the home front. The medal is not important now. It is important that the reason we got it was because of the committee's work to encourage the grouping of small businesses, so that they could contract, as a group, with the Government for war production. To me, the importance of the effort, Mr. Speaker, went beyond the benefits to the small-business men and women who were involved. I had been in Germany in 1935 and in 1937, the latter year as a member of a United States delegation, and I was convinced then, as I am now, that one of the methods used by the amiable artisan from Austria, Herr Schickelgruber, to sieze control of Germany, was to encourage big industries, and to eliminate by a process of attrition, small, independent businesses, the little workshops of Germany, just as centralized government in the United States is evidently trying to build up big industry, at the expense of small business.

Mr. Speaker, you do not need to ask why such a policy should exist. It is evident on its face. If business can be enlarged, and great industries and great combinations fostered, then little business must join big business or die. When there is no longer a free, independent, and prosperous small business it is only a matter of time before centralized government—under any name, fascism, communism, socialism, or the New Deal—which was old in the days of Rome and Greece, there was nothing new about it—can take control of a nation.

The evidence is in the release of the Federation of Small Business. Small business represented 97.8 percent of the business of America in 1946. I mean little businesses, which have 500 or fewer employees. In 1943 this group received 22 percent of the Government's business; the Government being at that time the largest contractor. In spite of that low figure, Mr. Speaker, the committee, headed by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]—the House Small Business Committee—has just reported that in the first 2 months of 1948 this same group, the small business group, the backbone of American independence and security, had only 7 percent of the business from the Federal Government.

Mr. Harder, in the statement sent me by Mr. Burger, says:

> Government is ill serving the national interests by slighting the small-business man.

I go a little further. I say that government, intentionally or unintentionally, is helping destroy this Nation; is helping destroy representative government under the Republic, by slighting the small-business man. I am indebted to Mr. Burger and Mr. Harder for the release which now follows:

C. W. Harder, president of the National Federation of Small Business, today, May 6, 1948, called on President Truman and congressional leaders of both major political parties—Senators VANDENBERG and BARKLEY, Speaker MARTIN, and Congressman RAYBURN—for fuller use of small independent business productive facilities in Government procurement for foreign aid and national defense. Mr. Harder's request was occasioned by a staff report of Representative WALTER C. PLOESER's House Small Business Committee, which disclosed that, during the first 2 months of 1948, but 7 percent (by dollar volume) of all Army supply contracts awarded were given to smaller firms, firms employing under 500 wage earners.

Mr. Harder called attention to a report by the Smaller War Plants Corporation (Economic Concentration and World War II), made in 1946 for the Senate Small Business Committee, which showed that smaller firms accounted for 97.8 percent of all United States manufacturers; that in 1943 these firms received about 22 percent of Government defense procurement. He said that the difference between the wartime 22 percent and the present 7 percent may indicate a preference in certain quarters of Government for giant enterprise. He warned that continuation of present procurement practice will further strengthen concentrated businesses. In support of this statement, he referred to a declaration in the Smaller War Plants Corporation study that the increases in concentration which took place during the war were due largely to the distribution of the great bulk of the war contracts to a small number of great firms.

He pointed to the increasing importance of Government procurement to the business community. In 1939, he said, Government expenditures for the Army and Navy (there was no item of foreign relief in the budget) amounted to about 1 percent of the national income, while in 1949 they are likely to approach fully 10 percent of a national income about 2½ times greater than the Nation produced 10 years ago. The small business share of these expenditures, he declared, is negligible.

From a national defense standpoint, Mr. Harder said, Government is ill serving the national interest by slighting the small-business man. He asserted and in support of his assertion referred to recent statements of Generals Eisenhower and Bradley, that the present "cold war" may erupt into a "hot war." He said that such an eventuality would find the Nation in need of all its productive facilities, but "if present procurement policies are followed it seems apparent that we will enter any fray lacking a good part of our present productive potential." He recalled that, in early 1941, Republican and Democratic Congressmen were agreed that total national defense could be achieved only after Congress and the administration had done everything in their power "to bring into being the skill, the efficiency, and the administrative and executive ability of the small-business men of our whole country."

Mr. Harder charged the Government with involving itself in a seeming contradiction in appropriating large sums of money to protect small business interests, yet at the same time permitting the award of supply contracts in such manner as to strengthen and promote concentration in business.

"We do not charge, in the absence of detailed proof, that Government agencies are not employing all possible measures to assure equitable placement of supply contracts with smaller enterprise," Mr. Harder said. "But we do say, emphatically, that need for immediate investigation of supply contract placement is definitely indicated. And we do say that if it is determined that smaller firms are receiving inequitable treatment, all possible steps must be taken to correct the situation. It is obvious that Government can accomplish now (in the direction of utilizing small busines facilities) at least as much as was accomplished, according to the Smaller War Plants Corporation study, during the war. It is equally obvious that with the lessons of the last war so readily available, and with the methods of integrating small business into the effort so clearly indicated, that even more can be accomplished now than was accomplished then."

Following is the text of Mr. Harder's message:

"The small, independent business members of the National Federation of Small Business are deeply concerned over a recent staff report of Representative WALTER C. PLOESER'S House Small Business Committee that during the first 2 months of 1948 but 7 percent (by dollar volume) of Army supply contracts awarded to business firms were awarded to smaller firms, firms employing under 500 wage earners.

"In this connection, attention is called to the fact that a Smaller War Plants Corporation Study (Economic Concentration and World War II), prepared in 1946 for the Senate Small Business Committee, showed that smaller firms represented 97.8 percent of all manufacturing concerns in the United States; that these firms received (in 1943) about 22 percent of all Government supply contracts (exclusive of subcontracts awarded them by big business prime contractors).

"We believe the difference between the wartime 22 percent small business share and the present 7 percent peacetime small business share may be tremendously significant—that it may indicate the presence in certain quarters of Government of a tendency to cater to giant enterprise. Here we call your attention to a recent statement of one of our prominent small manufacture members—a gentleman who has had long and intimate experience with big business and with Government in its relations with the business fraternity, who said: 'The method of procurement which the "bigs" in Army and Navy prefer to use is to make out, for instance, one set of blueprints for one or two large concerns, rather than to make out 100 or even 1,000 blueprints for smaller manufacturers.'

"The great danger in the current situation was ably described by the Smaller War Plants Corporation when, in the same study, it stated: 'The increases in concentration which took place during the war were due largely to the distribution of the great bulk of the war contracts to a small number of great firms. It was the distribution of nearly $200,000,000,000 of prime supply contracts which was the key to the control of productive resources during the war. * * * Companies obtaining prime contracts secured thereby the instruments of economic power. They received money in the form of substantial profits for the production of goods, they were granted priorities and allotments for needed materials, parts, components, and so forth. And, further than this, they were granted the power of determining how much of these priorities and allotments should be passed down to subcontractors, who and how many the subcontractors should be, and how much of the allocations each should receive.'

"Admitted is the fact that this Nation is not now in the middle of a war, that its economy is not now as dependent on Government supply contracts as it was during the war. Still expenditures for foreign relief and rehabilitation and for national defense—which may extend over a greater number of years than is now expected—are relatively greater than in any other nonwar period in our history. Consider that in 1939, a prewar peacetime year, Government expenditures for the Army and the Navy amounted to about $864,411,473 out of a total national income of about $72,532,000,000 and a Government budget of about $5,164,824,000. In 1949, Government expenses for national defense will approximate $14,000,000,000, and for foreign relief and rehabilitation will approximate $5,000,000,000, out of a total national income of about $200,000,000,000 and a Government budget of about $40,000,000,000. Thus, in 1939 about 1 percent of the national income went for maintenance of the defense establishment; today about 10 percent of a national income that is about two and one-half times greater is going for foreign aid and for national defense. In 1939, about 17 percent of the Government budget was allocated to national defense; today about 50 percent of a Government budget that is almost eight times greater is going for foreign aid and national defense. This does not take into account the possibility of reestablishment of peacetime "lend leasing" of armaments now reported under consideration.

"Our point here is that business today is more dependent on governmental supply contracts than at any other period in our peacetime history, that indications are that small enterprise is receiving a relatively very small share of these contracts. To illustrate the importance of this vast peacetime Government purchasing program we call your attention to two recent reports. The first refers to a division of one of the major automakers who (so it is said) has cut deliveries of new cars to its dealers because it has turned over one of its plants to production for Government procurement. The second refers to a major rubber manufacturer who (so it is said) has turned an entire tire plant over to the manufacture of tires and tubes for Government purchase.

"In face of these conditions, the smaller-business man capable of contributing to the relief and defense preparedness program is finding it increasingly difficult to come by raw materials for manufacture. His market is cut. He is caught in the vise of rising costs (or costs that are not lowering). When he turns to Government as a potential market, he finds that 2.2 percent of the manufacturing firms, the giant concerns employing over 500 wage earners each, are receiving 93 percent (by dollar volume) of all Army defense supply contracts.

"As this Nation enters further into the current 'cold war,' which General Eisenhower stated recently might at any time become a 'hot war' (a viewpoint which General Bradley apparently shares), this situation may well become worse. If a 'hot war' should ensue, this Nation will need the total facilities of all business to see it through to success—but if present procurement policies are followed it seems apparent that we will enter the fray lacking a good part of our present production potential. In this connection, we are struck by the similarity of conditions in the field of Government procurement today with those that existed just before the last war. Small enterprise then was all but frozen out of Government supply contracts, and it wasn't until after the administration and the Congress recognized the problem and took positive steps to remedy it that smaller firms were allowed to contribute their share to the defense effort.

"In this connection we are struck also by a seeming contradiction in Government effort. On the one hand, Government states as policy that small business—which is recognized as the bedrock of our democratic way of life and which, by testimony of both business and Government officials, contributed much of the success of our past war effort—is to be assured equal opportunity to succeed. To this end there have been established in the Congress small business committees; to this end there has been recommended by the President and approved by the Congress the largest appropriations ever for a vigorous antitrust and antimonopoly program. On the other hand, Government awarding of procurement supply contracts contributes to the further up-building and strengthening of monopolistic business concentration.

"We do not charge, in the absence of detailed proof, that Government agencies are not employing all possible measures to assure equitable placement of supply contracts with smaller enterprise. But we do say, emphatically, that need for immediate investigation of supply contract placement is definitely indicated, and we do say that if it is determined that smaller firms are receiving inequitable treatment, all possible steps must be taken to correct the situation.

"It is obvious that Government can accomplish now—in the direction of utilizing small-business facilities—at least as much as was accomplished, according to the Smaller War Plants Corporation study, during the war. It is equally obvious that with the lessons of the last war so readily available, and with the methods of integrating small business into the effort so clearly indicated, that even more can be accomplished now than was accomplished then.

"In conclusion, we call your attention to the fact that as far back as early 1941, on the eve of the last war, many Republican and Democratic Congressmen were agreed that total national defense could be achieved only after Congress and the administration had done everything in their power to bring into being the skill, the efficiency, and the administrative and executive ability of the small-business men of the whole country. This they did after much travail. This apparently is not being done today."

House Bars Public From Hearings on Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor of May 3, 1948:

HOUSE BARS PUBLIC FROM HEARINGS ON TRADE AGREEMENTS

(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—Hearings on extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act opened today.

With the public barred.

The press barred.

Advocates of the measure grudgingly admitted.

House Ways and Means Committee hearings limited to 6 days.

Explaining this unusual procedure, Representative BERTRAND W. GEARHART (Republican), of California, chairman of the subcommittee holding the hearings, said:

"I cannot see that any useful purpose would be served by listening to spokesmen for a bunch of ladies' sewing societies reading statements on the legislation by the State Department."

ADVOCATES BARRED

However, it is not only ladies' sewing societies that Mr. GEARHART has worked to keep from testifying at these secret streamlined proceedings. For example, the well-known National Foreign Trade Council was denied time to defend the program, but received a last-minute reprieve due to the intercession of Representative ROBERT L. DOUGHTON (Democrat), of North Carolina. From a list of those scheduled to testify, it appears that only critics of the program are willingly being allowed to take the stand.

The following discloses the rejection form that Mr. GEARHART is sending to those asking time to testify who are known advocates of the program.

"If you will but glance at your calendar and note the expiration date of June 12, you will appreciate how utterly impossible it is for the subcommittee to hold extensive full-dress hearings on the proposal to extend the Trade Agreements Act. The Senate is entitled to have as much time as we consume in the House in which to determine its course.

"If the State Department witnesses had returned to the United States prior to March 1 after their long absence in Geneva and Havana, a different situation would have confronted us, but at this moment the Congress is up against the guns. For this reason, only acknowledged experts in foreign trade can be heard. If any legislation is to be enacted, it must be in the Senate by May 15."

FOR THE RECORD

"As chairman of the subcommittee I would be very glad indeed to present to the subcommittee and have incorporated in the record any statement that you might care to present. Your interest is appreciated."

Boiled down, what Mr. GEARHART has been telling various supporters of the act who wished to testify:

1. It is the State Department's fault that hearings have to be limited to 6 days. If the Department's experts had not been in Geneva and Havana negotiating a world trade charter and tariff agreements, hearings could have been started earlier.

2. With little time, only acknowledged experts can be heard. I do not consider you an acknowledged expert. However, feel free to write your views and we will get them in the record.

As for point one, it is learned here that the State Department witnesses on whom Mr. GEARHART puts the blame for delay in hearings have been back in the United States since early March. They have been available as witnesses for approximately 2 months. It is hard, therefore, to understand how their activities up until March can explain committee delay these past 2 months.

EXPERTS LISTED

On point two, a list of those whom Mr. GEARHART had readily agreed to hear, sheds considerable light on his concept of experts on foreign trade. Scheduled to appear were:

Claudius T. Murchison, of the cotton Textile Institute; Matthew Woll, of the American Wage Earners Protective Association; Wycliffe Rose, of the American Tariff League.

May 4 witnesses are understood to be: Prof. Donald Adams, of the University of California; Arthur Besse, of the National Wool Manufacturers Association; Albert S. Goss, of the National Grange.

All of these men or the organizations they represent are understood here to be critics of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. If not opposing the program outright, they are expected to advocate amendments. Mr. GEARHART is said to be interested in hearing only those who can suggest "improvements" in the act. Most of those who wish to continue it as is are getting the polite brush off quoted above.

EDITORIAL CRITICISM

The American Tariff League, in the eyes of Mr. GEARHART, is an expert of foreign trade. The National Foreign Trade Council is not. The fact that the former is critical of the present program and the latter a supporter of it may or may not explain the different treatment they received at his hands. Only last-minute action by Mr. DOUGHTON got the Foreign Trade Council time at the closed hearings.

This unusual procedure being followed by the House Ways and Means Committee on a major matter of foreign policy, it needs to be stated, is running into mounting criticism. Example is the editorial that appeared in a Washington newspaper this week end that declared: "Not in a long time has a congressional body shown less regard for public opinion or for the traditional American procedures followed in important matters of this sort. * * * The House Ways and Means Committee ought to get down off its high horse and remember that this is America."

Reciprocal Trade Agreements and the Watch Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on April 27, 1948, the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the States of Illinois and Nebraska assembled at the Mayflower Hotel in the Capital City for the purpose of discussing with the officials of the Elgin National Watch Co., which has extensive plans in both of these States, a serious problem which confronts the jeweled watch industry of the United States. At that time we were privileged to hear an address by Mr. T. Albert Potter, chairman of the board of directors of the Elgin National Watch Co., which address clearly and succinctly revealed a condition that handicaps this American industry to the advantage of its foreign competitors. Here is an American industry, employing American labor, paying American wages, aiming to sell an American product to the American people. It desires no special favors, it requests no stifling of competition, it seeks no monopoly in business. The American Congress, in the legislation soon to be considered for the extension of reciprocal trade agreements, can accord to this industry the fair treatment it deserves. Believing that all Members of Congress will be interested in the facts as revealed by Mr. Potter in his address on April 27, I include it herewith in my remarks:

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS AND THE WATCH INDUSTRY

It is not my purpose at this meeting to give you an harangue on the subject of the reciprocal trade-agreements program. But the act is about to be reconsidered and it seemed an appropriate time to pass our views on to you, who, I know take pride in this essential industry, and its 8,300 employees in your States.

First, I want to make one thing perfectly clear: That the American watch manufacturing industry is efficient in its manufacturing operations and techniques. I know, from personal observations of the Swiss factories which, until the war interfered, I made a practice of visiting about once a year. Our per capita production is, to our belief, for comparable merchandise, greater per man-hour. We use, in connection with our own research department, Mellon Institute, Battelle Memorial Institute and the Illinois Institute of Technology to constantly improve our methods and production. I stress this to establish the fact that the American industry has done everything it can to meet the difference in cost of manufacturing watch movements here and abroad, and is not trying to hide behind a tariff wall.

The 1930 Tariff Act provided this industry with a schedule of specific dollar-and-cents duties which fairly well reflected, at that time, the difference in the cost of production of watch movements here and abroad. Even if those rates were still in effect, they would not be as adequate today as they were then because of their being specific, and because the cost of production has risen in both countries, here somewhat more dollar-wise than in Switzerland. However, the trade agreement of 1936 with Switzerland reduced the rates of the 1930 Tariff Act by about 34 percent on the average. In many classifications, it even carried them below the rates of the 1922 tariff. The result was that the American industry's share in the American jeweled-watch market dropped from considerably more than half, where it stood during 1930–36, to considerably less than half during the years 1936–41. This loss in position is a very significant thing and reflected itself during the war years in the fact that the American industry was not then large enough to meet, as quickly as was desired, the demands of our armed services. What had happened was that, during 1936–41, as we began to come out of the depression, the reduced rates of the trade agreement with Switzerland prevented the American industry from expanding by decreasing the percentage of the market it could obtain.

During the war years, of course, our facilities were devoted to the war effort. After the fall of France, Switzerland was entirely surrounded by the Axis Powers, and we became the sole remaining source of precision timing instruments for the Allies. But the Swiss exports of watches of a nonmilitary character were not cut off, and imports of jeweled watches into the commercial channels of this country soared from slightly over 4,000,000 units in 1941 to a high of over 9,000,000 units in 1946, at a time when we were out of the market.

The industry has already been hurt in the prewar years by the Swiss trade agreement, not only to its own detriment, but also to that of the national defense. We witnessed a flood of importations into this country which was selling our customers and so thoroughly saturating the demand for watches that we could anticipate no backlog of demand after the war with which to rebuild the industry. Because of these threats, we began thinking, in the fall of 1943, of attempting to obtain relief from the reduced rates of the trade agreement.

What avenues for adjusting the trade-agreement rates were open to us? Not the courts. Not even an allegedly impartial administrative agency. Only the same people who had reduced the rates in the first place. Furthermore, these people were openly committed to a policy of freer trade. It didn't look like too promising a prospect. However, we determined to go ahead. It is not necessary to go into the details of our experiences in protesting the Swiss trade agreement to make clear to you the need for modification of the reciprocal trade-agreements program. A few brief statements of fact will be sufficient.

Elgin filed a brief with the Committee for Reciprocity Information on March 4, 1944. We were not even accorded a hearing thereon until January 29, 1945, almost 11 months later. In the interim, the industry as a whole had filed a supporting brief.

The Committee for Reciprocity Information is without authority to act. It simply passes the information submitted to it—both oral and written—back to a trade-agreements committee. We were not permitted to meet with this group.

Finally, late in March of 1946—over 2 years from the original filing of the Elgin complaint—the State Department called representatives of the industry to Washington and suggested a course of action. Note that the matter was now in the hands of the State Department.

The course of action suggested is also significant. The State Department proposed that the Swiss be asked to impose an export quota on the direct shipment of watches to this country from January 1, 1946, to March 31, 1947. This export quota for the year 1946 was to be based on the direct exports to the United States by Switzerland during 1945, the biggest year, up to that time, in the history of Swiss watch exports to the United States. The Swiss were also to do what they could to curtail indirect shipments so as to prevent the quota being exceeded by importers obtaining watches by way of third countries. They were also to expedite the delivery of watchmaking machinery which the American industry, principally Waltham, then had on order with Swiss machine builders to replace that which we were unable to make during the war. Although we protested the obvious ineffectualness of this proposal, the State Department went ahead with it in an exchange of notes under date of April 22, 1946.

The figure agreed to with the Swiss provided no protection for the American companies. The significant thing about all of this maneuvering, however, is that there was a recognition by the trade-agreements organization that the American industry had a good case. The State Department, after 2 years of delay, felt that something had to be done to dispose of the matter, but were unwilling to take direct, effectual action.

As for Swiss compliance with the agreement of the exchange of notes, suffice it to say

that 1946 imports exceeded 1945 by over 300,000-jeweled units, although the Tariff Commission, has, by making certain deductions and the use of Swiss classifications, decided that there was compliance with the spirit, if not the letter of the agreement. No one has been able to even technically justify the refusal by the Swiss to deliver the machinery, which has not been done to this day. Instead of expediting delivery, as agreed, the ink was no sooner dry on the notes which were exchanged than the Swiss created a machinery trust known as Machor, to lease the machinery, on terms wholly unacceptable to the American industry, and probably violating our antitrust laws, and flatly refused to deliver even that long on order.

The conclusions we have reached from this experience are these:

1. The fact that relief must be sought from the same agencies that exercise the authority to reduce the tariffs in the first instance is definitely wrong, and in itself practically eliminates the possibility of an American industry obtaining relief from the injurious effects of the reciprocal trade agreements program. The King does no wrong.

2. There are no time limits within which action must be taken on an application for relief, and no means available by which to compel action. The trade-agreements organization can stall a complainant off until an industry is rendered impotent. Likewise, there are no standards as to what constitutes damage to an American industry. The decision on this question is entirely within the discretion of the trade-agreements organization which, as noted above, means largely the State Department. There is absolutely no appeal to the courts nor even to an impartial administrative agency.

3. Neither in the negotiation or amendment of a trade agreement are representatives of the American industry permitted to sit in so as to be available for counsel and advice on specific proposals under consideration. This method of procedure is the direct opposite of what we understand to be used by foreign countries whose negotiators either are, or include, representatives of affected industries. At one time during our discussions with Mr. Clayton prior to the negotiation of the exchange of notes he indicated that he would use members of the industry as consultants. But that was the last we heard of it.

4. No distinction is required to be made between those countries whose economic philosophy differs from our own. The Swiss watch industry is a highly organized and Government-supported cartel. If it should obtain complete control of this market the importers' prices would be determined by the Swiss watch trust, as it is now.

5. As the matter now stands, the administration of the program is dominated by the State Department, which is using it as an instrument of international diplomatic policy, with regard for the consequences to our national economy and defense as secondary considerations. In December of 1946, by which time it had become apparent that the export quota established by the Swiss pursuant to the exchange of notes had afforded no protection to the American industry, we asked the State Department to consider extending the agreement from March 31, 1947, to the end of the year, but on a more realistic basis as to quota. This they flatly refused to do. We then asked the State Department to consider canceling the trade agreement so as to restore the 1930 tariff rates. This they also flatly refused to do. Their refusal to do anything more was based on a concept which is fraught with danger for all American industry touched by the reciprocal trade agreements program. Mr. Thorpe, Assistant Secretary of State in charge of Economic Affairs, says this, in his letter of April 10, 1947, declaring the industry's request for cancellation of the trade agreement:

"Since the statistics compiled by the United States Tariff Commission show that by 1941 American producers of both jeweled and nonjeweled watches were selling more watches in this country than ever before, and since the domestic industry, having virtually completed its reconversion to civilian production, is now producing watches at an annual rate which compares favorably with that of 1941, it was not felt that the American watch-manufacturing industry was able to demonstrate that it had suffered any serious damage as a result of the trade agreement of 1936 with Switzerland. The fact that imports of Swiss watches have substantially increased simply indicates that total effective demand in this country has likewise increased."

Analyze that statement for a moment. It is over the signature of a policy-determining officer of the State Department. His statements about our production are not entirely correct.

However, the relative accuracy of his figures is not the important thing. What I want to direct to your attention is the economic philosophy evidenced by that statement. So long as we can make and sell as many units as before the war and the trade agreement, we are not injured no matter how much the market has expanded in the meantime. In other words, American industry is not entitled to grow under the reciprocal-trade-agreements program. In an expanding market and rising costs, that means that American industry is faced with stagnation. Today, in order to even survive, you must have larger volume at lower unit profits. What the State Department is doing under the reciprocal-trade-agreements program is to treat American industry as a static force in a dynamic economy, and, unless you gentlemen reverse this kind of thinking in the administration of the reciprocal-trade-agreements program, you are going to see an important part of American industry sustain irreparable damage.

What we in the American watch manufacturing industry need is an equality of opportunity in our own market. We are not seeking an advantage, only a balancing of factors over which we have no control, so that we can experience a natural growth absolutely essential if this industry is to be adequate to the defense of the Nation in times of war, and a preventive to monopoly control during times of peace.

The war materially strengthened the financial position of the importers of Swiss watches. They enjoyed volumes and profits unprecedented in the business. Their profits were not subject to renegotiation. They introduced, and extensively advertised under American addresses, brand names hitherto unknown to the American public. They got Swiss watches into stores which formerly were exclusive dealers in American-made watches. All of which, of course, inured to the benefit of the Swiss industry. As I have said many times before to the trade-agreements organization and to the congressional committees, we cannot expect the Swiss or the importers to relinquish this advantage without a struggle. And the proof of this statement is at hand. Since the middle of last year, the Swiss have been accumulating a fund which by the end of 1948 is expected to total $5,000,000, and to replenish itself at about the rate of $3,000,000 annually. An American advertising agency has been working on a promotional plan of international propaganda of gigantic extent, and which embraces all kinds of advertising, movies, contests, publicity, etc. About one-third of this money, but more if necessary to accomplish their objective, is to be spent in the United States. Publicity, which is obviously a part of the program, has already begun to appear in our newspapers and theaters. The advertising copy has begun to run in the international editions of Time and Life magazines. We understand it will break in the United States next month. The importers' part in it is to increase the pressure on you Congressmen for even more favorable treatment than the Swiss already enjoy. You will be interested in the following excerpt from an official organ of the Swiss Watch Chamber, March 18, 1948, page 259:

"Swiss horology thus will utilize the advertising means so effective in the United States, the press, radio, movies, photography, and television. These mediums exercise an influence which extends even to politics; and one can be sure that it will reach right up to Members of Congress."

We shall do our best to meet this new threat to the industry, but, frankly, Elgin, Hamilton, and Watham, as the only exclusively American manufacturers of fine jeweled watches, do not have the money with which to match this campaign.

The answer, as I see it, now lies with the Congress. We have exhausted our administrative remedies. Unless the Congress is willing to insist on a realistic approach to the reciprocal trade agreements program, so that exceptions are made to the over-all objectives where exceptions are warranted, we cannot hope to build this or any other industry to the extent consistent with national well-being both in times of war and peace.

Basically, three things must be done. One, standards must be established in the law itself against which to measure when an industry has been damaged by a trade agreement, so as to limit the complete discretion which now rests in the administrative agencies. Two, to this must be added review by an impartial agency with appeal to the courts to protect against the arbitrary exercise of power. Three, limitations must be placed on dealings with countries which control their industries through cartels, price-fixing and quotas, to the disadvantage of American industry. We have placed before the special subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee, which is to consider the bill for extension of the trade-agreements program, amendments which we feel would make the corrections I have suggested. I hope you will give them, and the problems of this industry, your earnest and sincere consideration.

Summary of Address by Oris V. Wells, Chief, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Before the Delta Council, Cleveland, Miss., May 5, 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following summary of the address delivered by Oris V. Wells, Chief, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, at the annual meeting of the Delta Council, Cleveland, Miss., Wednesday, May 5, 1948, to wit:

It is conventional on occasions such as this for the speaker to say how glad he is to meet with the people before him, but my problem today is how to say it in such a way as to convince you that I really mean it—that it does actually mean a great deal indeed to be asked to speak at the Delta Council. Fortunately your own accomplishments help me here. Not only is the Delta one of the world's richest and most fabulous farming areas, but you have also created in the Delta Council a farmers' association that can be as

tyrannical as it desires in the matter of speakers. An invitation cannot be refused.

I

I am an economist. I do on occasion talk about economic trends and I have learned by sad experience that people do sometimes tend to read what they want to hear into what the speaker may consider a most carefully hedged and balanced statement. And since this is in many ways a new farm country, bold, confident and surprisingly successful, I suspect you would not be averse to some optimistic comments. So perhaps I had better start with my leading hedge, with the one word of caution which I feel should not be overlooked.

I am not going to forecast prices of specific farm products, but I do want to call your attention to the present level of farm prices generally and to some characteristics of their behavior over the last century and a half. The prices of farm products are today at a relatively high level, averaging over two and a half times prewar or, measured on an index number basis, about 290 percent of prices during the commonly used base period, 1910–14.

Now here is the sobering fact. Farm prices in this country have reached similar peaks three times in the past—first, following the War of 1812; second, immediately following the end of the War Between the States in 1865; and, third, shortly following World War I. Each time the war-induced peak was followed by a more or less drastic decline, culminating in the abrupt drop of slightly over 50 percent in farm prices within the 12 months from May 1920 to May 1921. Farmers too far in debt found themselves wrecked in each case, while farmers generally have found that as compared with their costs the prices at which they sold their products fell first and farthest.

I can see no good reason why farm prices and farm incomes should ever again be so sharply, cruelly, and disastrously squeezed as was done in 1920–21 or again following 1929. But such a possibility must not be overlooked. And at the same time we should certainly realize that a number of adjustments are likely ahead under any conditions—that some moderate decline in farm incomes, foreign trade, and general business activity can be expected if and when the world food crisis subsides and American business catches up with the war-deferred demand for durable goods here at home. Such adjustments could come as a series of steps without widespread recession. However, prices paid by farmers for goods and services have doubled since 1935–39. These prices or costs are relatively "sticky", and in case of even a moderate readjustment in farm prices many farmers are going to find themselves squeezed.

But so much for all that. Farmers are in a relatively good position to work out such changes or adjustments as are likely to be called for in the immediate future, and with your permission I now want to turn to the longer-run outlook, giving some attention to competition, mechanization, and industrialization as they relate to the South.

II

I believe that the longer-run outlook for Southern agriculture and for Southern farm people is relatively good, especially as compared with conditions which existed during the interwar years, 1919–39.

In arriving at such a conclusion it is necessary that I make one or two flat assumptions, and equally it is necessary that I call your attention to some qualifications or, more specifically, to difficulties which may have to be overcome if such an outlook is actually to be realized.

I do assume that we shall somehow or other work out a relatively stable and enduring peace over the years ahead. It seems to me that this is the only tenable assumption, and in any event I certainly am not prepared nor do I think it would be proper for me to discuss any alternative in this field.

I further assume that we all agree that Delta farmers, at least, are starting from a relatively good base and that your chief crop, cotton, is in a stronger statistical position than at any time since the early 1920's. Stocks of American cotton at the beginning of this season were the lowest since 1929, supplies were the lowest since 1924, and domestic consumption this season is running only moderately less than during the war and will probably reach 9,000,000 bales, or 175 percent of the average for the prewar decade, 1930–39. Per capita consumption of cotton is well above the long-run average of 26 pounds, and, despite the increasing use of synthetic fibers, it is not expected to be much reduced so long as we maintain high-level employment.

True, exports are down. But this is not such a catastrophe as might be considered at first glance. To a considerable extent it means that we are now producing cotton for domestic consumption rather than for foreign markets, that we are now consuming some 9,000,000 bales of cotton within the United States as compared to about 6,000,000 bales during the interwar years, 1919–39. Meanwhile, cotton is again going into German and Japanese mills, and American cotton is one of the items which will certainly move in volume under the European recovery program.

The current situation with respect to the other commodities which you ordinarily sell, especially oilseeds and livestock, is also relatively good.

As we look further ahead, there are several underlying trends which seem to offer farmers an excellent chance for an increasing domestic market. The American economy is still expanding and even so severe a depression as the one during the decade of the 1930's was not sufficient to altogether offset the growth factors. Population is likely to increase by perhaps as much as 20 percent over the next 25 years. An increase of 20 percent in the number of people within the continental United States itself should mean an increase of at least 20 percent in the need for foods and fibers, assuming average per capita consumptions remain at about their current level.

Assuming per capita consumptions will continue at about the current level in this country would seem to be setting a rather moderate goal. All indications are that farmers could produce the necessary products. As usual, however, there are two sides to this guess. Current per capita consumptions of cotton and tobacco are above average, while average per capita consumption of all food is now running some 13 to 25 percent above the prewar level. With severe depression some reductions in average per-capita consumption could be expected, but, on the other hand, if employment can be maintained, some further increases could be expected.

This brings us square up against the question of the great depression. Your attention has already been called to the expected increase in population over the next 25 years. The actual labor force, or the number of people who will be able and willing to work, will also increase. At the same time, the average efficiency or productivity of the American worker has been steadily increasing for years, and it seems only reasonable to assume that this trend will also continue. We have the people, we have the workers, and we have the technological skill to keep going, but will we?

I believe that the next 25 years are more likely to be characterized by relatively high-level employment with only an occasional recession or slackening in business, rather than the reverse. I must say, however, that there are a great many other people who are far less optimistic and that we all realize that the conditions which might develop under less favorable circumstances must also be considered.

But some of the special problems of the cotton South also need to be considered. Even granting economic conditions generally within the United States which lean toward the prosperous side, can southern farmers—or better, how can southern farmers best meet the competition which lies ahead?

For example, there is the question of cotton versus synthetic fibers. All I want to do here is to call your attention to the fact that even though our average per capita consumption of cotton tends to remain constant, cotton is not sharing in the growing American market to the extent which it might. Synthetic fibers have shown a steady increase, accounting for about 5 percent of all fibers consumed in this country in 1925, about 10 percent in 1935, and about 20 percent in 1945. That is, cotton is still by all odds our most important clothing and household fiber, but it is also evident that there is need for finding ways in which cotton can be made both more attractive and more useful.

In this connection, I am going to take a few minutes to call your attention to a recent study which the Bureau of Agricultural Economics made of women's preferences among selected textile products. This study or survey was based on about 1,800 personal interviews, so selected as to give a scientific cross-section of all United States women, both farm and nonfarm. The questionnaire dealt with women's garments and certain household textile products. The main objectives of the survey were:

1. To determine the proportion of women who buy selected garments and household textiles in ready-made form.

2. To determine the fiber preferences of women in each of the selected articles and the reasons for these preferences or nonpreferences.

3. To determine what characteristics of the articles are considered most important by women.

You will be interested in knowing that a majority—that is, from 51 to 86 percent of the women purchasing ready-made items said they preferred cotton for house dresses, aprons, pajamas, anklets, nightgowns, bedspreads, tablecloths, light-weight curtains, and as the mixing fiber in part-wool blankets. Rayon was favored in summer slips and short-sleeved blouses. Wool was the preferred fiber in one-piece winter street dresses, although rayon and mixtures of wool with other fibers were favored by substantial percentages of women. Nylon was far and away the preferred fiber in full-length stockings. Linen and cotton dish towels ran about equal.

The main reasons women gave for preferring cotton garments and textiles were that cotton is durable, that it looks well after laundering and that it is easy to wash. The most frequently mentioned reasons for disliking cotton were that it tends to wrinkle and that it is not dressy looking. Quite a few women were of the opinion that cotton is less colorfast than other fibers. Perhaps I should add that the chief faults women said they found with rayon was its tendency to fray and pull at the seams of garments, a tendency to wrinkle, and lack of durability. In terms of what they wanted in a fabric women generally indicated that good laundering (or dry-cleaning) qualities, durability, and good appearance were most important.

This consumer study has been well received by the textile industry not only as an aid in determining more intelligent sales policies but also as a basis for further research. A companion survey is now starting which will deal with men's garments, covering wool as well as cotton and competing synthetics. We hope the results of this second study will be available this fall.

The suggestion that we need increased research relating to cotton and cotton utilization leads to another observation. Specifically, as individuals, farmers are not able to carry on technical laboratory research, nor are they able to do a great many other things which are necessary to maintain equal competitive strength with other groups. American farmers are faced with the question as to whether they can find ways of working together sufficiently well to maintain equal competitive strength with other economic groups within the American and world economy, especially in the price or income field.

There are a wide range of administered or semiadministered prices in the business field due to a number of factors—the economics of large-scale production, the structure of our business system, buttressed as it is by such devices as tariffs, patent rights, and the corporate form of organization. Again the American labor movement is here to stay, and many American wage rates, per hour or per week, are administered rates. Stable wage rates reinforce the business tendencies already referred to.

Now, these facts create a setting for the farm-price problem, which is difficult enough, but we must also look at the foreign market. Here again the American farmer will find that the free play of economic forces is hardly the current rule. On the one hand, if we are to have a relatively stable agriculture over the next decade or so, it appears that a considerable portion of several of our products, including cotton, will have to be sold abroad. On the other hand, we find ourselves today faced with almost every possible form of semiadministered, regulated, or on occasion, straight state trading in the foreign market.

Farmers have no choice but to face these problems direct. Perhaps they can work out ways of forcing more flexibility into our economic system. Perhaps not. But the thing I want to emphasize here is that the central issue in the farm-price field is not whether farmers have support prices, or Government payments, or what not; rather, it is whether or not farmers can find ways of working together which will allow them to exercise equal bargaining strength with the other segments of our extremely complex and complicated economic world. It was an endeavor to find an answer to this issue which led farmers into their farm supply and marketing cooperatives, into farm organizations, and into farm programs such as those provided for in the Soil Conservation Act of 1937 and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

It is my understanding that the Delta area is fast moving toward mechanized farming. Again it seems to me this is a field which has some extremely interesting economic facets. In the first place, efficient mechanized farming requires good-sized farms and in many areas farm size is a limiting factor. A second observation is to the effect that mechanized farming requires a very considerable capital investment. I am told that on the basis of current tractor, truck, and machinery prices it would require $60 or more per acre of cropland (perhaps as much as $90 per cotton acre) to completely mechanize a 320-acre Delta cotton farm, assuming 200 acres of cotton and 120 acres of such other crops as oats, soybeans, and lespedeza. That is, a 320-acre farm would require a machinery investment alone of about $20,000.

Actually, farm mechanization is the substitution of capital in the form of machines for labor. Many of the machines and mechanized techniques now being used in the cotton area are still in the semiexperimental stage. Some of them will almost certainly be discarded which means obsolescence charges could run high. But all this is part of the cost of progress, and the rapidity with which mechanization moves will depend upon many things—upon the availability of labor as well as wage rates, upon the speed with which well-adapted machines are developed, and upon the extent to which farm incomes hold at a high level.

I also want to call your attention to the fact that mechanized farming does mean precision farming. It does call for both skilled labor and skilled management. It makes farmers increasingly dependent upon the way in which the price system behaves. Mechanization also changes tenure patterns and if widely adopted it eventually means that many less laborers will be needed in cotton production and will be available for employment in industry and service trades either outside or inside the South.

We must then talk about mechanization in a double sense. What is needed is farm mechanization along with increasing industrialization in the towns and cities of the South. I do not want to quote statistics at length but any of you who are interested will find a great deal of most interesting material in the recent belt-wide studies of the economic problems of the Cotton Belt. One of these studies indicates that the successful mechanization of southern farming could well result in the displacement of about 100,000 farm workers annually over each of the next 20 years, reaching a peak of around 150,000 workers per year by about 1960. But if farm workers are going to be displaced they must find employment some place else. This brings us back to the problem of prosperity versus depression in the United States, and also raises the question as to whether the industrial and urban growth necessary to absorb such a shift of workers is likely to take place within or outside the South.

The same study group which estimated the rate of possible displacement also made a number of interesting calculations with respect to the investment required in manufacturing, assuming the displaced farm workers were absorbed by industrial and other urban employment within the South itself. They first of all discovered that sales, service, and other nonmanufacturing employment ordinarily runs about double the actual number of people employed in manufacturing industries within the average city or town. This means that only about one out of every three displaced workers would actually have to be absorbed within the manufacturing industries. They also endeavored to estimate the total amount of new investment which would be required within the South to absorb the indicated number of industrial workers over the next 20 years. The answer was about $500,000,000 annually, or a 20-year total of $10,000,000,000. Now I know that $10,000,000,000 sounds like a great deal of money to a group of thrifty farmers. It is, but it is also only about one-half of the new capital investment which American business is actually making this year. Stretched out on an annual basis, it would be a very moderate sum indeed in relation to the amounts which are certainly going to be invested in industrial development in this country over the next two decades if we assume our economy is going ahead. But I again find myself talking about something with which you are probably better acquainted than I, since my acquaintance is limited very largely to a few statistical facts—statistics which do indicate, however, that many new industries are moving into the South.

Public Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, in cooperation with the newspapers of my district, I have just completed a month-long poll of public opinion among northeastern Indiana voters on six major issues confronting the Eightieth Congress. In the belief that my colleagues will wish to study and analyze the returns from this survey of a typical cross-section of the Middle West, I have asked permission to extend my remarks and report the outcome in some detail.

At the outset I would like to tell you a little something about my district and about the manner in which the poll was conducted.

The Fourth Indiana District comprises eight counties in the northeast corner of Indiana—bordering Michigan on the north and Ohio on the east. Its population of approximately 300,000 is a fairly representative segment of America—about half urban and half rural.

Fort Wayne, its principal city, is a growing, progressive, industrial and commercial center. Its rural areas contain many small but productive farms. A high percentage of Fourth District citizens own their own homes and farms.

All labor and farm organizations are represented, as well as large industries and small business. The major political parties are evenly divided. The district supported Roosevelt in 1932 and 1936, Willkie and Dewey in 1940 and 1944.

The Fourth District is close to the population center of the Nation. Its southern border is just a few miles from Muncie, Ind., the Middletown of America.

BALLOTS SENT TO 60,000

Late in March I sent out 30,000 straw ballots to rural constituents on the back of a list of free Government farm bulletins. To insure a true cross-section of opinion, an additional 30,000 ballots were mailed to urban areas—to churches, labor unions, schools, lodges, civic clubs, and veterans' organizations in Fort Wayne and the smaller cities of the district.

Splendid cooperation in the poll was given by my largest newspaper—the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel, which printed ballots daily in its news columns and promoted interest in the poll as a public service. Several other newspapers in the district, including many weeklies, also cooperated by printing the ballots and inviting reader participation.

More than 5,500 ballots were returned between April 1 and May 1. This relatively high return, above the usual response to such inquiries, may be accounted for by the fact that people like to express their views to their Congressman, and the issues involved were of genuine public interest.

The poll did not attempt to cover all questions of current public and congressional concern, but it did make reference to six of the most important and controversial.

Following are the questions and answers, based on a final tabulation just completed:

ISSUE POLL RETURNS

1. Do you believe the Taft-Hartley labor law of 1947 should be left alone? Yes, 18.4 percent; repealed, 12.6 percent; strengthened, 55.1 percent; no opinion, 13.9 percent.

2. Do you favor a reduction now from the wartime burden of taxation? Yes, 71.7 percent; no, 21.4 percent; no opinion, 6.9 percent.

3. Do you favor compulsory peacetime military training? Yes, 37.8 percent; no, 59.8 percent; no opinion, 3.4 percent.

4. Do you favor the so-called Truman-Marshall plan? Yes, 18.5 percent; no, 71.7 percent; no opinion, 9.8 percent.

5. Do you favor the return of price controls? Yes, 11.6 percent; no, 80.7 percent; no opinion, 7.7 percent.

6. Do you think the administration is following the right course to avoid war with Russia? Yes, 16.8 percent; no, 64.1 percent; no opinion, 19.1.

PRESIDENTIAL POLL RETURNS

Voters in the issue poll also were invited to indicate their choice for President in 1948 in a seventh question, response to which was made optional. No candidates were mentioned on the ballot. Voters, instead, were asked to write in the name of their Presidential favorite. Approximately 3,500 voters did so with the following results:

1. Taft	814
2. Dewey	595
3. Stassen	444
4. MacArthur	289
5. Truman	260
6. Vandenberg	244
7. Eisenhower	192
8. Bricker	132
9. Warren	123
10. Wallace	102
Others	146

Ballots were received throughout the month of April and about half of them were cast following the Nebraska primary April 13 which was won by Harold E. Stassen. Stassen's popularity with Fourth District voters increased noticeably during the last 2 weeks of the poll, but he was unable to overcome the heavy lead piled up by Senator TAFT in the early stages of the voting.

A large complimentary vote was received by the Speaker of the House, Mr. MARTIN, and the majority leader, Mr. HALLECK, whose district borders mine.

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF REPLIES TO QUESTIONNAIRE

In order to make possible a break-down of returns by population groups, marked ballots were sent to farmers, church groups, schools, and labor unions, and separate tabulations were maintained in these four categories. Following is a percentage distribution of replies to the questions, according to these classifications:

Question 1. Do you believe the Taft-Hartley labor law of 1947 should be left alone?

	Yes	Repeal	Strengthen	No opinion
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
All voters	18.4	12.6	55.1	13.9
Rural	20.9	12.1	47.1	19.9
Churches	22.3	6.1	50.0	21.6
Schools	18.5	14.4	51.1	17.0
Labor	9.7	81.2	6.1	3.0

Question 2. Do you favor a reduction now from the wartime burden of taxation?

	Yes	No	No opinion
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
All voters	71.7	21.4	6.9
Rural	66.6	21.3	12.1
Churches	71.5	20.6	7.9
Schools	46.2	50.0	3.8
Labor	75.0	13.2	12.3

Question 3. Do you favor compulsory peacetime military training?

	Yes	No	No opinion
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
All voters	37.8	59.8	3.4
Rural	36.9	47.8	15.3
Churches	20.0	69.2	10.8
Schools	49.2	44.8	7.0
Labor	40.1	51.2	8.7

Question 4. Do you favor the so-called Truman-Marshall plan?

	Yes	No	No opinion
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
All voters	18.5	71.7	9.8
Rural	18.4	66.1	15.5
Churches	26.9	51.5	21.6
Schools	33.7	57.7	8.6
Labor	20.1	63.2	16.6

Question 5. Do you favor the return of price controls?

	Yes	No	No opinion
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
All voters	11.6	80.7	7.7
Rural	10.8	81.2	8.0
Churches	9.2	80.7	10.1
Schools	23.3	69.2	7.5
Labor	35.5	52.3	12.2

Question 6. Do you think the administration is following the right course to avoid war with Russia?

	Yes	No	No opinion
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
All voters	16.8	64.1	19.1
Rural	17.5	54.1	18.4
Churches	20.1	57.6	22.3
Schools	29.6	55.9	14.5
Labor	22.5	48.2	29.3

In conclusion, I wish to thank the many thousands of Fourth District citizens who cooperated in this project and who so often wrote me in considerable detail their views on these and other important national questions—for the most part in an intelligent and informed vein.

Typical of these letters was one received from Mrs. Paul Drerup, of St. Joe, Ind., the mother of four children, who wrote as follows:

ST. JOE, IND., *April 1, 1948.*

GENTLEMEN: I am glad of this opportunity to express my opinions on important questions of the day. My thanks to the News-Sentinel and Congressman GILLIE, and I hope it will enable him to use his vote and influence in Congress to carry through the will of his constituents and the American people as a whole.

1. From all I know about the Taft-Hartley law, I am in favor of most of its provisions and think it should be left alone for a while. Time and changing circumstances will suggest to the lawmakers how it can be amended to be more just and equitable. Give it a trial. By no means repeal it.

2. First of all, the reduction should be in Government spending; reduction in taxation should follow as a matter of course. We must reduce the national debt and pare down current expenses if we are to remain solvent. Plain common sense, the instinct of self-preservation, ought to dictate our national economy. Sometimes I feel sure that the bureaucrats in Washington are so dazed by the thought of endless millions and billions that they forget all about dollars and sense. Surely it is not possible for the Nation to do what an individual or a corporation cannot do, financially, and survive. The laws of arithmetic do not change.

3. Compulsory peacetime military training has never prevented a war in the past. In this atomic age it is a futile gesture toward preventing a future war, and who honestly believes it would win a war just to have a mammoth standing army mobilized? The weapons of warfare are vastly different than a generation ago. The concept of universal military training is outmoded.

4. No; I don't favor the Marshall plan. Can't we keep out of Europe? Billions sent to Europe will not change the course of the history of those nations but will certainly impoverish us. I agree with Henry Hazlitt in his appraisal of the "martial" plan. Read his book, Will Dollars Save the World?

5. Price fixing and rationing. Didn't we have enough of that? Evidently Truman thinks it ought to be a permanent fixture. No; 1,000 times no.

6. We should avoid war at all costs. There will be no victory in the next war—only degrees of losing it. Can't say we win the war and lose the peace—that means we didn't win at all. I don't want war with Russia ever. We can't kill communism that way and we surely don't want to kill off millions of Russian people, though there are a few whose demise would be good news. Let's stay out of Europe and see what happens. If communism engulfs the whole world except our North America, would that be any worse than a devastating world war III and the condition of all the combatant countries afterward?

We ought not to attempt saving the world and drown ourselves in the effort. The evils of communism will not corrupt human nature. It is a black tide on the sands of time, but it will recede. The United States perhaps has a destiny to save mankind, but the method will have to be that of missionaries. Start from the bottom and work up, by preaching and teaching the doctrines of Christianity and the fundamentals of democracy, in the villages, schools, hospitals, and organizations of other lands. It is certain to take a long time. Let us be the seedbed of Christianity rather than the arsenal of democracy.

I think there are a number of capable men with whom we might trust the highest office of the land—one of whom is not the present incumbent. We couldn't go far wrong with Senator ROBERT TAFT. I hope both parties nominate the best man they can find. I have always voted Republican, but I can and would change, if I thought the Democrats had a better candidate.

So much for my opinions, which are also those of my husband. We are 30 years of age and have 4 children.

MRS. PAUL DRERUP.

Republican Hostility Toward Farm Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the attitude of the Republican Congress toward farmer cooperatives is probably most openly expressed in the unretracted statement appearing at page 16 of the

report of the Committee on Ways and Means on H. R. 4790, the Knutson tax bill:

Although it is conceded that small businesses are the keystone in the free-enterprise system, their destruction continues unabated. It is a 3-way squeeze. They are being bankrupted by competition of tax-free cooperatives, exorbitant Federal taxes, and the strait-jacket Government regulations, like the wage-and-hour law.

Providing Congress fails to recognize the urgency, and neglects to take prompt action to eliminate the cause for this crushing misfortune, commercial failures will not decrease but increase, and small manufacturers will in all likelihood be destroyed or obliterated.

Although the suggested elimination of cooperatives probably will not be brought up in this session of Congress, this committee report is suggestive of the type of legislation that a Republican Congress might be expected to enact if it were not at least partially subdued by the threat of a veto by a Democratic President. That this policy of hostility to cooperatives does not have strong grass-roots support is readily apparent from the following article from the Washington Daily News of August 29, 1947, by Thomas L. Stokes, entitled "War in GOP on Co-ops":

WAR IN GOP ON CO-OPS

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

War has opened within the Republican Party, most noisily in the Middle West, against the new investigation into cooperatives started by the House Small Business Committee.

A Missouri Republican, Representative WALTER C. PLOESER, is directing the investigation.

Farm cooperatives are heavily concentrated in the Middle West. That is strongest GOP territory. Farm leaders, judging from their critical reaction, regard this investigation promoted by Republicans in Congress as hostile to their cooperatives, particularly because of the emphasis on the tax exemption that is available to farm cooperatives. This was cited at the outset as the chief point of inquiry.

The outbreak from the farmers has posed a delicate political problem. It is learned also that prominent Mid-West Republicans privately have questioned the political wisdom of this investigation. That probably explains Representative PLOESER's decision to soft-pedal the tax-exemption phase henceforth in the public hearings scheduled all over the country. Instead, inquiries into this matter will be left to his staff, who will compile data on it.

It will be interesting to see whether the investigation hereafter will bear most heavily on consumer cooperatives. It was known from the beginning they would be a principal point of attack. Strict consumer cooperatives are not tax exempt. But this also has its political pitfalls. For the biggest and most successful consumer cooperatives—and some of them are really big—are among farmers. Consumer cooperatives are growing steadily in cities, too. The shift in city votes was responsible for the gains by Republicans in the last election that gave them control of Congress.

It begins to appear somebody in the GOP Congress got off on the wrong foot in this new investigation which comes so soon after an exhaustive inquiry into cooperatives by the same committee last year that gave them a clean bill of health.

Most outspoken in the clamor from the grass roots has been F. V. Heinkel, president of the Missouri Farmers Association in Representative PLOESER's home State, the second largest farm cooperative in the country. He told his association's annual convention this week:

"Farmers throughout the Nation have been shocked and disheartened by attacks made against agriculture and farm cooperatives by a Republican-controlled Congress. This is especially true since farmers were the first to turn away from the New Deal and vote the Republicans into power, particularly in view of the Republican Party's platform pledge to support cooperatives.

"What farmers out here in Missouri want to know is: Does this inquisition by Republican-controlled committees have the blessing of the national Republican leadership? Or does the national leadership stand behind the thinking of such great friends of agriculture as Representative CLIFFORD, Republican, of Kansas, and the venerable Senator ARTHUR CAPPER, Republican, of Kansas.

"The time has come when farmers on election day must be farmers first and partisans second. Out of sheer self-defense we must hereafter remember our friends as well as our enemies in both political parties."

On the same day, Ralph Snyder, president of the Wichita (Kans.) Bank for Cooperation, told the American Institute of Cooperation at Fort Collins, Colo., that big monopolies and the combinations of big business were behind the investigation and were spending millions in an effort to discredit cooperatives.

Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the value of a well-balanced soil conservation program is nowhere more clearly illustrated than by a fine article which appeared May 5 in the West Memphis News and was concerned with the activities and views of Mr. Alex Stirewalt, chairman of the Crittenden County Triple-A Committee.

The top soil of thousands of fine acres of farm land is constantly being washed down the Mississippi River to the Gulf of Mexico. Other streams in the Nation are also filled with the finest top soil of our farms.

Mr. Stirewalt, whose common-sense views are contained in the article to which I refer, has served as chairman of the Production and Marketing Committee of Crittenden County for many years. He has been in a position to study at first hand the all-important program of preserving our soil and preventing soil erosion. His informed opinions are worthy of the consideration of this Congress.

I set forth below the article on this able farm authority.

ALEX STIREWALT DISCUSSES SERIOUS RESULT OF QUANTITY SOIL EROSION

Many years ago a wise Midwest farmer recognized what was happening to good farming land in America when he said, "the best part of my farm is down below New Orleans." And this week, Alex Stirewalt, chairman of the Crittenden County Triple-A Committee, wonders if anyone has thought to count the number of farms which go under the bridge during a single flood season.

He bases his figures on the fact that the deep accumulations of silt in the deltas of great rivers of this country is primarily the topsoil of farms carried by unchecked water. Tests show, says the chairman, that around 400 million tons of topsoil roll down the Mississippi River each year. An inch of topsoil from an acre of land weighs between 140 and 150 tons. At 150 tons of topsoil per acre, this loss would mean the equivalent of an inch of topsoil from two and two-third million acres.

The Columbia, Rio Grande, and many other rivers are rolling soil out to sea, too, the chairman points out, but the Mississippi alone carries the equivalent of an inch of topsoil from the surface of nearly 17,000 farms of 160 acres each. And even more serious, says the chairman, the topsoil comes from the best land on the farm—the land that is in row crops or which is being worked most to produce the Nation's crops.

Says the chairman, "like the sand in the hour-glass, the soil at the top is going down. But unlike the hour-glass the process cannot be reversed. The topsoil does not run back. "From that limited amount of topsoil, which is getting less each year, must come the 435 million meals a day for the 145 million people in this country. In addition, tons and tons of food are needed to keep Europe from going under.

"And every farm that goes under the bridge means just that much less land from which to grow the food we need—that much more of a burden on the land that is left." Mr. Stirewalt said that the primary objective of the triple-A conservation program is to reduce this loss. "Through this program," he points out, "the Nation cooperates with its farmers in carrying out conservation practices which keep the soil and water on the farm."

Taxpayers of United States Under ERP Pay for Newsprint for Foreign Newspapers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George E. Sokolsky which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald under date of May 11, 1948:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Lord Rothermere recently raised the question of more newsprint for Great Britain. Certainly one of the most serious shortages in all the world is that of paper.

If the truth is to be known to the people, there should be a great many newspapers, magazines, and all sorts of vehicles of expression.

The shortage of newsprint gives a tremendous advantage to those who are plentifully supplied, particularly governments, and handicaps those in the opposition.

Lord Rothermere raised sharply the issue that if we wish to agitate for our theories of a free society in Europe, then the European newspapers, particularly the British, must have more newsprint.

Unfortunately, most of the newsprint today comes from Canada—one country.

Newsprint from Finland and Scandinavia is scarce and the price is foul. Even the Canadian price is out of line and in the United States some newspapers are forced to buy in the black market at impossible prices to keep going at all.

Some of the British newspapers own mills in Canada but they have no dollars to pay for what they get there.

They criticize the American newspapers for using too much, but it seems that that is immaterial, for their complaint thus far has only been that they lack the dollars to buy in Canada.

Now they expect to get the dollars from Paul Hoffman, head of ECA, alias ERP.

In a period of shortage, therefore, it will be the American dollars, taken from our taxes, that will produce an increased newsprint scarcity for the American newspaper.

The increase for Great Britain from Canada and Newfoundland will be 33,000 tons per year, paid for out of ERP dollar balances, and while it is likely that American newspapers may not complain too much about that, there is a fear that this is only a beginning, with other ERP countries making similar demands.

Americans would like to know precisely how these dollar balances, which we are handing to Europe as a gift, will be used.

In an official statement, Paul Hoffman "disclosed that figures obtained from official Canadian sources indicate newsprint production in Canada and Newfoundland during 1948 will be approximately 4,875,000 tons, of which 285,000 tons will be consumed in Canada. Shipments to the United States are expected to be 3,960,000 tons. The proposed shipments to the United Kingdom from Canada and Newfoundland will be about 3 percent of the Dominion's output for the next fiscal year."

It seems that much of this problem could be solved if the trade between Great Britain and Scandinavia could be stimulated by an exchange of British coal for Scandinavian pulpwood. England has a machine capacity to produce between 900,000 and 1,000,000 tons of newsprint annually.

Of this capacity, about 700,000 tons is lying idle, because the British are unable to purchase pulpwood, which used to come mostly from Russia, Poland, and Scandinavia.

Before the war, Great Britain used 1,325,000 tons, of which they imported 375,000 from Canada and Newfoundland. If they put their present idle machinery to work, they could easily fill that amount.

Today the British only consume 325,000 tons of newsprint and the impression is general that that reduction in consumption, while the machinery is idle, is not unrelated to Socialist politics.

They could obtain the pulpwood from Canada and Newfoundland for their newsprint mills at a cheaper cost than newsprint from the same countries. Thus far, the British Government has not encouraged the import of pulpwood. In fact, Sir Eric Bowater, largest manufacturer of newsprint paper in the world, so admitted on March 11, 1948, in the annual report to his company.

It will be a serious mistake for Great Britain or any ERP country to use American money to compete with American newspapers for the supply of this essential but scarce commodity. It will create suspicion over all ERP arrangements. It is starting off with the wrong foot. Much sounder would be the import of pulpwood to put the idle British mills to work.

Why should any mills be idle when there is such a shortage in this commodity and when pulpwood is available?

Now that dollars can be used—our dollars—they ought to buy the wood and let their own machines produce the paper they truly require.

World Health Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, over a year ago the Senate approved a bill proposing that the United States join the World Health Organization. The House Foreign Affairs Committee unanimously approved the bill after hearing the report of the Bolton subcommittee. However, on March 12, 1948, the House Rules Committee voted to table the measure. This leaves the United States in the difficult position of boycotting an organization that it helped to create.

The first meeting of the World Health Organization will be held in Geneva, Switzerland, in June 1948, and to every medical man and to those in this country interested in public health, our participation in this meeting is very essential.

The World Health Organization has the endorsement and support of the American Medical Association, the American Red Cross, the American Social Hygiene Association, the American Public Health Association, the American Dental Association, the National Nursing Council, the American Academy of Tropical Medicine, the American Association of University Women, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, and many others.

In testifying before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on May 5, 1948, the Honorable Warren R. Austin, United States Repreesntative at the seat of the United Nations, stated that one method of strengthening the United Nations is by joining the World Health Organization.

Mr. Speaker, as typical of the importance and to the need of support of House Joint Resolution 161, I call attention to the following editorials from the Journal of the American Medical Association of April 3, 1948, and of the Washington Post of March 31, 1948:

JOURNAL HITS FAILURE OF UNITED STATES TO SUPPORT WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

The House of Representatives, in shelving a bill which would make the United States a member of the World Health Organization, owes some explanation for its action to all those interested in public health, the journal of the American Medical Association states editorially in its April 3 issue.

The editorial says in full:

"Recently the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives tabled a bill to ratify the constitution of the World Health Organization and make the United States a member of that body.

"Already 23 other nations have signed the constitution of WHO, and the 3 additional ratifications necessary to complete organization will unquestionably become effective within the next few weeks.

"The first meeting of the new World Health Organization has been called in Geneva, Switzerland, in June 1948. This means, no doubt, that the United States will not be present as a member.

"Unfortunately a statement has not appeared as to why the Rules Committee took the action mentioned. Unless there are reasons which are secret and not available, the failure of the Rules Committee to recommend positive action is an embarrassment to American leaders in the field of health.

"The American Medical Association has thus far participated in the development of the World Health Organization and has also played a leading role in the organization of the World Medical Association.

"There has seemed to be every reason why these two bodies could cooperate for the advancement of world health. Some of the projects which the Interim Commission of the World Health Organization has been studying include international agreements for the control of quarantine and isolation and for the prevention and spread of infectious diseases; the establishment of international standards for biologic and similar agents; and the development and circulation of scientifically collected vital statistics.

"The Rules Committee which has rejected participation by the United States in this activity would do well to explain the action taken to the American agencies interested in public health which have thus far strongly supported participation by our Government in the World Health Organization."

HEALTH ORGANIZATION

The tyranny to which the House of Representatives submits on the part of its Rules Committee could scarcely be better illustrated than in the case of the bill authorizing American membership in the World Health Organization. This measure was passed unanimously by the Senate and received the indorsement of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Yet on March 12 the Rules Committee, for reasons it has made no attempt to explain, tabled the bill, forbidding the House even to vote on it. Unless the committee can be persuaded to change its mind, the Eightieth Congress will expire without providing for American participation in an international effort in which this country has been a pioneer.

The prevention and control of epidemics is one of those international undertakings which have remained free from East-West rivalry. For 40 years the United States has worked harmoniously with other countries toward this nonpolitical objective. This country was represented in 1946 at a preliminary health conference in Paris and later at the International Health Conference in New York out of which plans for the World Health Organization as a United Nations adjunct emerged. The WHO will officially come into being as soon as 26 nations have signified approval of it. Some 24 nations have already joined, the latest among them being the Soviet Union. Thus the effect of the Rules Committee's intransigence is to have American medicine lagging behind Russian in a strictly humanitarian field.

The promotion of health is an obvious concomitant of the Marshall Plan. This country can scarcely be indifferent to the spread of disease among peoples it is assisting economically. The World Health Organization is expected to have its first regular meeting in June. It would be a great misfortune if the United States should not be represented at it. We hope, therefore, that the House majority leader will assert a little leadership in respect to the autocratic Rules Committee.

Price Policies of Heavy Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. H. LICHTENWALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. LICHTENWALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I am submitting the following editorial which appeared in the Allentown (Pa.) Evening Chronicle on Monday, May 3, 1948:

IN THE WAKE OF THE NEWS—A LOCAL PROBLEM

A week ago today the Supreme Court upheld the Federal Trade Commission's stand on the basing point system, which if enforced to the full extent of all implications involved, will upset the price policies of several hundred heavy industries in this country.

The case is of particular importance in this area because of several industries, including steel and cement, which directly will feel the effect of the decision.

For years cement has been sold in all markets on the multiple basing point plan which permitted manufacturers to quote the same prices in any given market. It was not a price-fixing plan in the sense that any agreement had been written between various companies, merely the creation of a price by the mill quoting the lowest figure in any particular area. The policy permitted mills to compete in markets well beyond the immediate confines of a particular producing plant. The policy has been accepted generally, and no improvement is offered by merely tossing the policy aside. In fact, according to some executives, the abolition of the multiple basing point plan may open the fiercest type of price war between various mills, with the companies operating widely scattered plants in strategic market area holding the advantage.

It is inconceivable, for example, that all the cement produced in the Lehigh Valley can be consumed in this immediate area. A mill will be able to compete, if the FTC rule remains unchanged, only so far as freight rates permit the product to be hauled before running headlong into the price of a more strategically located competitor or a more economically operated plant.

If this condition persists, irreparable harm may come to some mills in this territory. Men will be thrown out of work as the product becomes unsalable in distant markets.

One executive visualizes generally higher rather than lower prices for heavy products, a situation, if true, calling for greater clarification of the decision. If no further appeal is possible under the law as it is written, it becomes a question for debate on the floor of Congress.

One unfortunate phase of the whole picture lies in the fact that only within the month the large steel companies have announced price reductions as steps toward curbing further inflation of costs in this basic product. It now becomes necessary to revise thinking and planning along this line in light of the decision of the high court and a thorough airing in Congress of the problem during the remaining weeks of its session might be in order.

H. R. 6054

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony regarding H. R. 6054, before the House Committee on Agriculture by Waters S. Davis, Jr., president-manager, Association of Texas Soil Conservation District Supervisors:

There are several reasons why what I have to say may be of value to this committee.

In the first place, I am an owner-operator of farms and ranches in three different parts of Texas. All of them are now being run in accord with the farm plans created for them by the local Soil Conservation Districts.

Equally important is my nearly 4 years' experience as a Supervisor of the Brazoria-Galveston Soil Conservation District on the Gulf Coast. My home ranch is located there, in Galveston County.

My recent election as president manager of the Association of Texas Soil Conservation District Supervisors keeps me in touch with the now 148 districts in our State.

At the Galveston County ranch, where I live, there is a humid climate and an average annual rainfall of 46 inches. The land is flat, drainage is a problem and over-all production low.

Back in 1944 when the AAA would pay for all the ditches a farmer would put in, I ran 6 miles of them to drain about 60 acres. Some of the land I plowed, and on some I ran the ditches 100 feet apart with a maintainer spreading the dirt between them. Then we put on 400 pounds of fertilizer to the acre and seeded with White Dutch clover and Dallis grass. I was personally out around $20 an acre for seed, fertilizer, labor, etc. The taxpayers footed the ditching bill of something like $1,050 or $17.50 an acre.

That money—the Government's and my own—was wasted. The ditches didn't drain. The land was just as water-logged as before. And my seed didn't grow. Worse than that, some day I must fill up those nonengineered ditches at my own expense. My eyesight and bifocals proved poor substitutes for trained drainage engineers.

The next spring a soil conservationist with the Soil Conservation Service asked me if I were game to try again at making a good pasture out of the bog holes. He told me that engineers would first make a contour map of the field and then a soil scientist would take samples to determine the right fertilizer applications.

Skipping the details, I put in 146 acres that year the Soil Conservation Service way. I followed their plan to the letter. And I made White Dutch clover and Dallis grass grow within a stone's throw of where I failed on my own the year before. Beef production on my good pastures is five times that on the swampy land and the only additional feed I need is a little hay in cold weather. Cattle on the unimproved pastures must be fed high-priced cottonseed cake in the winter or they will die.

I know that the money spent by AAA means that many farmers and ranchers, who otherwise would be indifferent to the soil conservation program, will try soil conservation and improvement practices on their land. But I insist—and it is hard for me to put this point in as strong language as I think it ought to be—that this type of expenditure, without the kind of trained help that is given by SCS, is an unforgivable misuse of public funds. The payment of cash to landowners for land treatment and improvement practices has been going on for years with only haphazard provisions for any coordination with the work of the Soil Conservation Service. This lack of coordination between Government agencies ought to be corrected, if only for the reason that the public will get some benefit for the spending of its money. These cash payments ought to be effective in helping along the program of soil conservation. I believe the Hope bill will make them effective.

Another experience I have had, which I think is worth relating here, was on my ranch just east of Waco. There I have hilly land. Some years ago we put in some terraces with the help of the only agricultural adviser then available—the county agent. The catch to those terraces is that no adequate provision was made for the run-off water at the outfalls. The result is a terrific gully scarring the hillside.

It is interesting to note here that from 1932 to 1945 the calf crop at the Waco ranch gradually declined from over 90 percent to under 70 percent. Since then we have stocked the pastures as recommended by the Soil Conservation Service work unit and our 1948 calf crop now on the group is 92 percent.

These experiences I offer as examples of the differences in the approach methods of the various agencies. The old AAA, now the PMA, is charged with giving away money. The more they can spend, the better the work of that committee. I am not a member of the ACA county committee, but I have met with them a number of times, and I have observed enough of their operations to contend that entirely too little effort is made to see that the money spent gets results. Of course, as now set up, that is really about all they can do.

My experience with the Extension Service terraces has taught me again the old adage that "A little knowledge is a dangerous thing." That county agent had a booklet on terracing. And he probably had had a short course on the subject. But agricultural engineers aren't graduated from colleges after reading a pamphlet and spending a few days on the subject.

Recently I drove through the farming area around Brenham, Tex. That section offers some of the most glaring examples of the perils of incompetent terrace engineering in Texas. A county agent there laid out miles of terraces. Today those fields are full of breaks and washes. The terraces that were built there have actually ruined some of the land forever. I repeat: "A little knowledge is a dangerous thing."

Please don't consider these remarks a blanket condemnation of the Extension Service. When they stick to what they are trained for, educational work, they do well. There is a vast field in teaching farmers to be good farmers and not soil rapists.

I greatly favor the Hope bill's proposed appropriation of $3,000,000 for increasing the educational work of the Extension Service in behalf of soil conservation. There is need for this kind of help.

The several agencies having a part in the soil conservation program all are doing important work, but their work, to be most effective, must be coordinated. The Hope bill, I think, will have this effect. The PMA will pay money for good land practices, the soil-conservation districts will see that it is properly spent, and the Extension Service will carry on the educational phase of the job, all under the direction of the local land-owning farmers and ranchers in soil-conservation districts.

So much for my own experiences.

Let's look at the El Paso-Hudspeth soil-conservation district at the western tip of Texas. When that district was organized several years ago, the Bureau of Reclamation had been at work in the area for a long time. About 85,000 acres of cropland was thought to be nearly all the land that could be irrigated. Lack of water prevented putting more land under irrigation.

In the 5 years of its existence, the El Paso-Hudspeth soil-conservation district has put land-leveling or other land-development operations on 14,000 acres for irrigation, and improved methods of water application on 15,000 acres more. The 246 water systems that have been constructed or improved represent a more efficient use of both water and land.

On 1,300 acres of irrigated land in this district, improved irrigation systems and other soil- and water-conservation measures resulted in an increase of 250 bales of cotton, 600 tons of alfalfa, and 250 tons of oat hay in 1 year. Labor requirements for irrigation have been reduced an average of 50

percent and the actual water used as much as 40 percent. These practices, applied to the whole area, will doubtless increase the irrigable acreage over the 85,000 original estimate.

One owner—Earl Eads, 4 miles west of Acala—has a 15-acre field that for 20 years has been irrigated from every direction except the right one. The Soil Conservation Service's topographic map showed the correct way and now the field waters perfectly. And very little leveling was needed for this result.

There are 595 water systems planned and waiting to be installed in this district. These plans include farm irrigation and land preparation on 34,000 acres and improved methods of water application on 36,000 acres.

Wasteful use of water has damaged some of the irrigated valley land, causing undesirable salts to come to the surface and cause alkali spots. Information gathered by the soils men of the Soil Conservation Service, plus proper designing of irrigation ditches, helps to prevent the overuse of water and the harm that it does. Through proper treatment, the technicians of the Soil Conservation Service have been able to help operators leach out these spots and restore the soil to productivity.

Improved methods of water application have been developed for nearly 600,000 acres in Texas districts with the assistance of the Soil Conservation Service. This acreage is served by 3,707 water systems that have been installed. The number planned is 5,439.

From this you can see that soil conservation districts in Texas are carrying a heavy load in irrigation development. And they now have the experience to carry on this work at a faster rate.

In connection with irrigation, the Bureau of Reclamation has been of great service in development of water resources and in making this water available for irrigation. But here is another example of lack of coordination in money and efforts spent in behalf of agriculture. The program of irrigation development in the El Paso-Hudspeth soil conservation district could have been carried on more effectively had the operations of the Reclamation Bureau and the Soil Conservation Service been coordinated from the beginning. Until the Soil Conservation Service began to give assistance through the district to the farmers of the area, the farmers had no guidance of a worth-while kind. Of course, the farmers there have this assistance now, but wherever public money pays for carrying water to the piece of farmland there should be assurance that the water delivered will do the most good.

It is my understanding that the Bureau of Reclamation is planning to give engineering and agricultural guidance to farmers in projects now under consideration. This definitely would mean overlapping and duplication of service. Only legislation such as the Hope bill would provide would eliminate the possibility of this kind of duplication.

Of course, the help that the Soil Conservation Service has been able to give soil conservation districts has been limited by the lack of funds to employ enough of these trained technicians. We need more help of the kind these men are able to give us.

More of this assistance in Texas would mean more trained men to help solve our grassland problem. There are 20,000,000 acres of grassland which need to be seeded to bluestems, gramas, lovegrasses, Indiangrass, switchgrass and clovers. Since 1940 about 500,000 acres in Texas districts have been seeded. Most of this was abandoned farmland, so eroded and abused that it no longer was producing anything. The 500,000 acres that have been seeded since 1940 are carrying between 40,000 and 50,000 head of livestock.

There are at least 20,000,000 acres more of rangeland which have lost so much of their original grass cover that they should be seeded again to become productive. Through good management alone, the productivity of about 95,000,000 acres of Texas grassland could be doubled, much of it trebled, although this will require from 10 to 20 years. No man in the livestock business is going to turn down a proposition like that. But he can't achieve that kind of grass production without help.

The Soil Conservation Service is the only agency in the history of American agriculture that has provided the rancher on privately owned lands with technical help in the development and management of grasslands. In the past we have had considerable help in the improvement of livestock breeds and their management but none up until the Soil Conservation Service came along on soil protection and improvement of forage. There is a lot of talk about artificial insemination and what it will do for a dairy herd; but you can spend a fortune on breeding work and still not get good animals unless you give them good pastures at the same time. These Soil Conservation Service men know soils, they know grasses and what is most important, they obtain their information first-hand on the ranch with the operator and help him, not tell him, to work out a conservation plan.

I would like to add an example or two from the experience of other men who have tried this program as I have. It will help to get across the idea I have in mind when I say that the right kind of grassland management pays dividends for others as it has for me. H. C. Thane, of McCoy, Tex., has been a cooperator with his soil conservation district since 1940. He was running too many cows on his 1,270 acres. He had kept records and they showed that for the three years before 1940 his calf crop averaged 63 percent with his market calves weighing around 250 pounds. The total weights of beef marketed was about 27,500 pounds a year.

Mind you, Mr. Thane reduced his herd from 175 to 85 cows, but in spite of this reduction he marketed 29,640 pounds of beef in 1942. That was an increase of 2,140 pounds. His calf crop had increased to 90 percent and the weight of his market calves was about 300 pounds.

Out at Marfa, in the Highland Soil Conservation District, another rancher, H. B. Holmes, a district supervisor, will tell you also that good range conservation pays. About 1941, at the recommendation of the Soil Conservation Service technicians he reduced his herd from 230 to 180 head. He doubted though that there would be an increase in the weight of his calves, which already were averaging 420 pounds. However, his next calf crop averaged 480 pounds and the one after that averaged 520 pounds. And he did not "creep feed" any at all, a practice he had followed to get the increased weights.

Too many ranchers still have the notion that they count their wealth in the number of cows they have. They don't realize yet that it's the weight of their beef that counts.

One of the most stubborn problems in Texas is that of brush eradication, a problem that was born of rangeland abuse. There are 55,000,000 acres of range and farm land infested by mesquite. More millions of acres are covered by cedar, second growth post oaks, and other types of brush. Where brush thrives, you don't find good grass. But getting rid of this mesquite, cedar, shinnery, and the other brush types is very expensive.

Some time ago I bought 440 acres of post-oak-covered land near Waco. I bought it because I could get it at $25 an acre, which seemed to be cheap. Cleared land was selling for $40 an acre. Well, I have spent $25 an acre getting the post oak off that land, and I still have the brush and trees in windrows only.

Cheap eradication of brush is one of the problems that research and experimentation must solve. These millions of acres must be put back into good grass cover and then they must be kept that way, protected from overuse by livestock, and from wind and water erosion. These are jobs for soil conservation districts. The Hope bill provides that 5 percent of the appropriation for soil conservation will be earmarked for research. We need it.

There may be a justifiable reason when a program is young to have several different organizations working on it. But when the program becomes well defined and the work is laid out with a good understanding of the problems by those who are going to do the job, there is no excuse for further duplication of effort and expense. In any consolidation movement, however, care should be taken to avoid the destruction of organizations and principles which have been found to be effective in doing the work that must be done.

I was in favor of the Jensen bill, because it recognized the size of the soil conservation job and sought to give the Soil Conservation Service the personnel and tools needed to do the job in time. I considered it far superior to anything that at that time had been proposed.

However, I am now of the opinion that in the bill offered by Congressman HOPE we have something that we scarcely hoped to get for years. In it the principles of the Jensen bill are combined with an understanding of the need for conservation of all our agricultural resources and with a more effective structure for carrying on this job efficiently. I believe it contains all the best features of the Jensen proposal with some others that are highly important.

The broad aims of the Hope bill, I believe, are these:

(1) It recognizes the size of the soil-conservation job, and provides for needed surveys, research, and operating methods for doing it with the principle of sound land treatment and use as a foundation.

(2) It eliminates as far as is now practicable the duplication of effort among Government agencies, a step we have been slow in taking; and it recognizes the interrelationship of all our land and water resources, including our forests, wildlife, rangelands, and croplands.

(3) It recognizes the place of the soil conservation districts in accomplishing this job. These districts have proved their worth already and they represent as nearly a completely democratic way of doing this job as could be possible.

There are other important features of the bill, but these, as I have stated, I believe to be basic ones. All told, the bill represents a degree of near perfection that is possible only when the results of experience can be weighed by men who appreciate and understand the problem. I have talked with many supervisors of soil conservation districts about this legislation, and I find that they agree that the Hope bill is the kind of soil conservation legislation that we in Texas need and want.

I wish to make only one recommendation, that the designation "Agricultural Land Service" be changed back to "Soil Conservation Service." I recommend this for the reason that the functions of the Agricultural Land Service are more nearly those of the Soil Conservation Service than any other agency and that the designation "Soil Conservation Service" is known and respected around the world. The title "Soil Conservation Service" is worth millions as an established and accepted trademark; I think we ought not to throw it away.

The Soil Conservation Service has proved most practical and efficient in showing the right treatment and use of agricultural land. The Reclamation Service is experienced in the building of dams. The PMA now has the

experience of years in providing cash payments for applying good land practices. The Extension Service and experiment stations have years of valuable experience in their respective fields. Each of these services is important. Let each of them take its own part of the whole job so that the agriculture of our Nation can remain intact and feed our children and their children. The functions of each of these agencies should be carefully defined by law to make them work.

I think the law to accomplish this unity of effort and purpose is the Hope bill.

Outlaw the Communist Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GREGORY McMAHON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. Speaker, mankind, in his quest for a better life, for his furtherance of liberty, and the pursuit of intelluctual, moral, economic, and religious freedom, has, through the ages, looked for companionship and help from his fellowman; guidance and hope from his Creator.

This search reached a zenith during the Renaissance period, when man threw off the yoke of feudalism, plunged Europe into revolution after revolution in the 1800's, class privileges, and the domination of the nobility were destroyed, and the power of government passed into the hands of the masses. The freedom-loving people of Europe migrated to the New World in continuance of this search. But in the past few decades the development of this liberalism has swung far to the left. Strong groups of men, using this inate quest within each man's breast have with modern weapons attempted to saddle the world with their peculiar philosophies—fascism, nazism, and now communism.

Communism is not new. Over 100 years ago, in 1848, Ebenezer Elliott had this to say of a Communist:

What is a Communist? One who has yearnings
For equal division of unequal earnings,
Who in proof of his principles always is willing
To fork out a penny and pocket your shilling.

Webster's dictionary defines communism as "a system of social organization in which goods are held in common—common ownership of the agents of production and equal distribution of their products."

Today the heart of communism is in the Kremlin; the moving force, Joseph Stalin; the objection, destruction of capitalism, the core of which is the United States.

To accomplish this means the Communists formed the Comintern, spread its tertacles into every capital of the world, embarked on a philosophical war based on dialectical materialism.

During the late 1930's and early 1940's, it flip-flopped once or twice keeping tune with Stalin here in our own country, but never deviating from its main objective of grasping all material wealth for the benefit of the proletariat.

Looking at the record, we find that with the destruction of fascism, nazism, and other kindred man-made monsters of our era, Russia, with its Joe Stalin brand of communism, has subjugated upwards of 300,000,000 people, committed all sorts of crimes against humanity; murder, rape, plunder, has broken down the orderly procedure of the combination of the world's nations for their peace and security, the United Nations, has out-vetoed the world's desperate hope for peace, has sent to that body Molotov, to be their spokesman, and Vishinsky to use it as a platform for their sinister preachings.

This world attack has now centered upon the United States and calls for forthright, strong, united action by our people. What must we best do to protect ourselves in this crisis?

I maintain that we must outlaw the Communist Party. Make no mistake about it, the Communist Party is not political. It is not an economic philosophy which is advanced for the benefit of all mankind. It is a vicious, moving, driving force, atheistic in its conception, recognizing no race or color, and dedicated to the union, throughout the world, of a mass of automatons, who owe their allegiance only to those in control of the present trend of communistic thinking—Joseph Stalin and the Politburo.

MAIN OBJECTIONS FOR OUTLAWING THE COMMUNIST PARTY

It is an American political party.

We would drive them underground.

We show a weakness in our democratic Republic in resorting to laws and force to curb liberal, progressive thinking.

We would preclude the further gathering of information by our Federal Bureau of Investigation and Secret Service by putting the Communists on guard and thus making it more difficult to infiltrate the meetings and bring back valuable information.

To all of this there must be placed on the other side of the scale the safety of the American Constitution, the American people, and the untold generations yet to come.

Drive them underground? Who would not pass a law against a murderer or rapist for fear of driving him underground? Who would not say it is incumbent upon our police officers and those charged with the protection of our citizens that their job is to rout out the criminal by whatever means at their command? Who would not say that a criminal be so judged and so labeled and prosecuted to the full extent of the laws of this land? A Communist is a criminal, and yet we have no law in this country against the Communist.

WE NEED TO OUTLAW THE COMMUNIST AND HIS PARTY

Ten years of exhaustive study by the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Federal Bureau of Investigation have proven that—

The American Communist Party is not political in its nature and is controlled by a foreign power.

Its ultimate objective with respect to the United States is to overthrow our free American institutions in favor of a Communist totalitarian dictatorship to be controlled from abroad.

Its activities are carried on by secret and conspiratorial methods.

Its activities, both because of the alarming march of Communist forces abroad and because of the scope and nature of Communist activities here in the United States, constitute an immediate and powerful threat to the security of the United States and to the American way of life.

It would be penny-wise and dollar-foolish to resist communism abroad and not recognize it at home for the conspiracy that it is.

New Support Mobilized To Extend Trade Pacts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor of May 6, 1948:

NEW SUPPORT MOBILIZED TO EXTEND TRADE PACTS

(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—The forces that would extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for another 3-year period are mobilizing.

Secret House hearings, which for the first 2 days were confined to critics and "yes-but" witnesses, now are getting the views of some of the act's stanchest supporters.

Secretary of State George C. Marshall, today's star witness, reaffirmed the administration's position that the trade program is an essential part of American foreign policy. He repeated administration views that any limiting or crippling amendments would upset the beginnings of world economic recovery and would disastrously undermine faith in American leadership.

He followed an impressive panel of witnesses for extension, including Secretary of Defense James Forrestal; ERP's roving ambassador, W. Averell Harriman; Under Secretary of Commerce William C. Foster; and spokesmen for the United States and International Chambers of Commerce.

PEOPLE'S HEARING CALLED

At the same time a protrade group of citizens headed by former Secretary of State Cordell Hull (father of the reciprocal trade pact program) has called a people's hearing for May 14 at the Mayflower Hotel here. The rally is being held to propagandize extension of the trade pacts, since the House Ways and Means Committee hearings are executive—a euphonious word for secret; and testimony is being limited to 1 week, with many spokesmen for national groups which favor extension of the act being refused time to appear.

The hearings to date have not been the secret affairs they presumably were intended to be.

The first 2 days' testimony by opponents of the act leaked freely from behind closed doors as mimeograph machines belonging to the high-tariff lobby ground off copies for

the press of what opponent witnesses were saying. Similarly, testimony of the administration spokesmen mysteriously turned up in the hands of the press. As a result, the so-called executive hearings have become the best-known secret in Washington.

WIRES TO CONGRESS URGED

The Citizens Committee for Reciprocal Trade Agreements is appealing to the American people to write, wire, or contact their Congressmen to urge them to grant the 3-year extension the administration is asking. The dangers to the reciprocal trade agreements program, according to its supporters, stem from three causes:

1. This is an election year, and Congress appears to be convincing itself it should put off for a year certain decisions.

2. Any extension of less than 3 years and any crippling amendments would be interpreted abroad as American default of its world leadership.

3. The Marshall plan's success and even America's sincerity are involved, for, under aid legislation, the United States requires the 16 European nations to "cooperate to reduce barriers to trade among themselves and with other countries." By repudiating or crippling the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act the United States would be asking others to do what it was not prepared to do itself.

NFTC WINS HEARING

Among yesterday's witnesses was a spokesman for the National Foreign Trade Council—for the trade pacts—to which Chairman BERTRAND W. GEARHART, Republican, of California had at first denied time, declaring "only acknowledged experts in foreign trade can be heard." However, when this was called to the attention of other committee members and the list of witnesses indicated that the "antis" were being given a field day, the NFTC was allotted time.

The list of organizations which have protested the quickie closed hearings and resent Mr. GEARHART's insinuation they are "ladies' sewing societies" whose testimony would "serve no useful purpose" include dozens of farm, labor, business, professional, and citizens' organizations.

To those who argue that low tariffs threatens America's economy and its industry, officials here point to the sizable profits made by those industries that are particularly outspoken in criticizing the trade pacts. According to National City Bank of New York figures, the industries that claim the trade program is hurting them have never been so prosperous. Chemical products concerns, for example, earned 17 percent on their net worth last year; the return for cotton goods companies was 36 percent; for woolen goods companies 21 percent; and for glass products companies 17 percent.

Threat to Our National Security—Statement of Harry Slattery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include a few excerpts from the speech of Mr. Harry Slattery, delivered before the annual REA birthday dinner in Washington, May 11, 1948. Mr. Slattery is former Under Secretary of the Interior and former Administrator of the REA. He is now a prominent Washington attorney. Mr. Slattery knows whereof he speaks because he has long been a vital key in the public power and conservation movement. He has been associated with all principal aspects of conservation and public power since 1908. He helped draft the original Federal Water Power Act. His statement is as follows:

Never before in my more than 40 years in Washington have I seen a graver threat to our national security, to the protection of our conservation policies and to the safeguarding of our natural resources, than today. The situation is a reminder of the one that gave rise to the stinging veto of Theodore Roosevelt of the Rainey River Dam bill, when he denounced the plunders of that day of our natural resources. This situation is also a reminder of the infamous Tea Pot Dome scandal in the Harding Administration which aroused the Nation.

It was my privilege to be a small participant in those historic conservation fights. And I want to raise a protest against the events that are transpiring in Washington today—such as the efforts to cripple TVA—the so-called Rizley gas bill, and the tidelands oil steal which is indefensible—and also to the cavalier manner in which the protection of our strategic resources are being handled. These resources all are part of our national security program. Forty years of constructive conservation effort is lost if these present grab bills go through.

Out of this great conservation movement, it was my privilege, as Administrator of REA, to help administer and cement REA as part of our national security and prosperity program. If our conservation movement is destroyed, REA inevitably goes with it. It is my hope that all good patriotic Americans will realize the danger and make themselves heard. It is high time that this unholy alliance of the anticonservation lobby, made up of the utility lobby, the brazen oil and gas lobby, and the lobby which aims at the destruction of our strategic resources, should be driven out of Washington, as Woodrow Wilson once did the lobbyists in his day.

Carrier Fliers Groom for Pin-Point Role in Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, in the current discussion as to whether or not we should have a 70-group or a 66-group air force, I believe that too little attention has been paid to the role which naval aviation played in achieving our victory in World War II, and to the role which naval aviation would play in a future war. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an article by John J. Norris which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, May 9:

CARRIER FLIERS GROOM FOR PIN-POINT ROLE IN FUTURE

(By John G. Norris)

Some previously unpublished data on the Pacific war, released yesterday by the Navy Department, throws considerable light on a moot problem of the moment—the future of naval aviation.

The heated controversy over the size of the Air Force has obscured this other air power question mark. But within the armed services—particularly the naval air arm itself—the issue is serious and important.

Yesterday, on the occasion of the thirty-seventh birthday of naval aviation, some apparently dry and uninteresting statistics were made public. Admiral Louis E. Denfeld, Chief of Naval Operations, called attention to them in a separate statement commending the naval air record.

Analyzed, they yield these findings:

1. American Navy and Marine Corps planes destroyed 15,401 Japanese planes during the war. Sixty percent of them were shot down in aerial combat while the rest were parked planes blasted by bombing, strafing, or rocket attack.

2. United States carrier planes knocked out 80 percent of these Jap planes, land-based craft the rest. The mobility of the carrier contributed to this disparity, enabling its planes to reach major enemy air concentrations outside the range of our land-based fighter craft. Also, the flat-top's mobility made it possible to concentrate overwhelming forces of fighters in surprise attacks.

3. For these reasons, 48 percent of the planes bagged by our carriers were caught on the ground and destroyed before they could be flown in their own defense. On the other hand, Navy and Marine land-based planes were able to knock out only 10 percent of their total on the ground.

4. The above makes evident the ability of a strong carrier task force to gain local control of the air—an essential element of any military operation today. It is vital not only in amphibious operations but would make the job of our strategic bombers easier.

A FEW SPECIAL PLANES

Translating this in terms of the possible future employment of aircraft carriers—particularly in view of the Navy's present emphasis on its Pacific scoring record—other conclusions are drawn:

1. The Navy feels that the future major role of its aviation is gaining local air supremacy over a particular overseas area by concentrating its flat-tops there, rather than by following the so-called "Gallery theory" of strategic bombing from carriers.

2. This means loading the vessels with fighter planes rather than a balanced force of dive-bombers, torpedocraft, and, fighters, as during the war. Naval airmen estimate that the carrier of the future will have some 90 percent fighters. The remainder would be attack planes, packing a terrific wallop for special missions. This wallop might include an A-bomb.

3. Such a force, capable of taking instant local control of almost any desired point along one of the world's shorelines at the outbreak of war, would prevent any future Bataans.

American forces in the Philippines, as well as on Wake Island, were lost because we could not reinforce or evacuate them. Today, with the United States Navy dominant on the surface of the world's oceans and maintaining carrier forces to keep air supremacy overhead, the 200,000 or more American troops overseas would not suffer that fate, Navy chiefs say.

4. The same naval air power would enable American troops to seize overseas bases in the event of war and let our Air Force have halfway stations for bombing the enemy instead of letting him take such points to attack us. The Azores and Iceland are examples.

PROVED AT MIDWAY

To many older naval airmen, the present controversy over the future of naval aviation seems a paradox. One of the Nation's

newest fighting forces, it was born just before World War I and forged into a tough, precise instrument of war in the next two decades.

During World War II this new weapon proved its worth beyond all question. Carrier aviation—the major part of naval air today—won its spurs at Midway, and went on to spearhead the American drive across the Pacific.

It made possible the conquest of the Marianas, Leyte, Iwo Jima, Okinawa, and the final surrender of Japan. Veteran Navy fliers, therefore, are puzzled over the fickleness of many Americans.

Why is the "champ of '45" looked upon as a possible has-been in 1948, they demand? It couldn't be the atomic bomb, for the Bikini tests proved that warships are an unprofitable atomic target. Nor have we developed long-range, high-speed bombers which would make strategic bombing from the American continent profitable against targets halfway across the world.

On the contrary, recent statements by Air Force chiefs concede that they require overseas bases to carry on heavy, sustained, and effective air bombardment on an enemy whose vital centers are in the Eurasian heartland.

Yet, little public attention is given to the development of naval aviation, while Congress falls all over itself voting an all-powerful (land-based) Air Force.

MORALE NEEDS REPAIRS

What worries Navy air chiefs even more, however, is that the situation has affected morale. Young fliers, veterans of the Pacific air battles, seeing all this happen hard on the heels of the absorption of NATS into a new military air transport service under the Air Force, wonder about their future.

To offset it, the Navy plans to bring in squadron and air group commanders for special seminars at the Navy Department. There they will be told the facts of the present and prospective security situation—the broad viewpoint which junior and middle ranking officials rarely get.

Navy air chiefs believe firmly that the carrier and naval aviation will play a prominent role in warfare as long as piloted airplanes are effective. Whenever ground-to-air, target-seeking, guided missiles are perfected—one phase of push-button war—then both carrier and land planes will be on the way out, they concede.

But the Navy airmen insist that top speed and long range (with bomb-carrying capacity) cannot be combined at present. You can build a faster plane around a small gas tank than you can around a large one, they say. Therefore, defensive jet fighters at the target have an advantage over bombers coming halfway across the globe.

The 11 fast carriers the Navy has in commission now have planes quite similar to those in use during the war. Several good Navy jet fighter planes are ready or nearly ready, but problems of jet operations at sea had to be licked. The jets land fast, require long take-offs and have a dangerous backblast.

Regular operating jet fighter squadrons are now aboard at least two carriers, however, and more will follow.

JET BOMBER NEBULOUS

Navy chiefs will not discuss the development of jet carrier-based bombers, but hint they are on the way. Whether such craft are possible with present flat tops, or whether they must await the new 80,000-ton flush-deck (no "island" superstructure) vessel to be laid down next year, is not yet clear.

The so-called "Gallery proposal," put forward individually by Rear Adm. Daniel Gallery, one of the Navy's outstanding younger air admirals, does not depend on such a plane. It contemplates one-way A-bomb missions like the Doolittle raid on Tokyo, with long-range jet bombers taking off from carriers in the Arctic or Mediterranean.

Gallery's idea never has been adopted by the Navy high command. This is not because of the Air Force feeling—or at least not just because of it. Many ranking Navy men consider it a one-shot possibility, like the Doolittle raid, and not a real basis for planning a fleet.

It is in antisubmarine warfare, in fact, that naval aviation has its main future challenge and opportunity.

Actually, Russia has a sizable navy, only it is a different kind from what Japan had. The Soviet has some 300 submarines, and if U. S. S. R. plants are able to build any considerable number of the new type developed by the Germans, with long underwater endurance and speed, before we have a defense against it, the Red navy will be tough.

The U-boat—in German hands—twice came dangerously close to winning control of the Atlantic. To prevent another such close call, the Navy is trying to develop "hunter killer" forces of highspeed carriers, planes and destroyers.

A-BOMB ASSIGNMENT

But carrier aviation may have an even more vital and dangerous role against enemy subs in another war. The submersibles will need bases on or near the Atlantic to be effective, and bases can be bombed.

Therefore, a major role of the big carrier forces might be to knock out such bases.

Destruction of such enemy bases may be the vital factor in determining whether such a future war is fought largely overseas or in this country. For the possession of mid-Atlantic bases would be at stake.

The above, we suspect, may be what Navy officials will tell the squadron and group commanders about the outlook for naval aviation. This outline of the future may not be complete and official; at least it is what many top officers feel is ahead.

They believe that carrier aviation—the tool wrought by Towers, Bellinger, Reeves, Halsey, McCain, Radford, and hosts of others—has as brilliant a future as it has a past.

H. R. 5004

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune for April 29. The legislation mentioned in this incisive editorial is H. R. 5004, which, after public hearings, is now before the House Judiciary Committee:

FOR JUST DEALING

Practical considerations alone suggest that Congress act in this time of international stress to clear away all unnecessary obstacles to harmonious relations with other countries. When these obstacles reflect upon the Nation's reputation for just dealing, the need to act is doubly clear. An obstacle particularly galling to the Asiatic peoples has been this country's discriminatory immigration and naturalization policy. It is difficult to gauge the extent to which the policy destroyed our influence in China and Japan in the era when they were developing their contacts with the West. But the history is clear enough to dictate the removal of the discriminations now.

During and since the war Congress has acted to permit quota immigration to the Chinese, the Filipinos, and the natives of India. The ban still exists, however, against the Koreans, the Japanese, and a few other Asiatic peoples. Legislation introduced by Congressman WALTER H. JUDD would "make immigration quotas available to Asiatic and Pacific peoples" and "provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence." The bill would afford equal treatment to all, and it would correct specific injustices to individuals of oriental origin already in the country. Existing laws, for example, may deny citizenship to parents of the Japanese-Americans who fought so brilliantly in Italy. Gen. Mark W. Clark put the issue simply when he urged Congress to grant them the privileges of the democracy their sons helped to preserve.

Another matter reflecting upon the Nation's honor is delay in providing compensation to Japanese-Americans evacuated from their west-coast homes during the war. A House bill would afford compensation of up to $2,500 for property losses. That sum would not recompense those who lost their businesses or their professional livelihoods, but it would be a concrete token on the side of justice to individuals innocent of disloyalty.

We urge passage of these bills for reasons of humanity and of American fair dealing with men and with nations.

Communist Plotting in the Packing House Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, on April 26, 1948, the Daily Worker, the official Communist paper, printed a very important statement by John Williamson, national labor secretary of the Communist Party, United States of America. This individual is now under charges by the Department of Immigration and Naturalization for deportation as an alien Communist. Nevertheless, he is completely free to issue a directive which vitally affects thousands of workers in the packing-house industry and the consumers of the entire Nation.

Mr. Williamson calls the present packing-house strike "the most decisive front of labor's battle today." He says, "the packing-house workers' strike has great significance." He further declares that "the Communist Party, now as always, will give unstintingly of its time, energy, forces, and leadership to help guarantee the victory," in this fight.

Mr. Williamson is a member of the leading inner secretariat of the Communist Party of the United States of America. While the present packing-house strike may be sold to the workers and the people of the United States as a simple effort to improve wages and working conditions, Mr. Williamson and the Communist Party for which he speaks have other aims in giving their unstinted support to this strike.

It has long been Communist strategy to encourage continuous and exorbitant wage demands in order to upset our economy. Mr. Williamson goes even further. He thinks that the packing-house workers' strike "will establish the main outline of the pattern for all other workers in wage negotiations." In other words, he wants to stimulate a strike movement in all industry throughout the country. Why? Every action of the Soviet Union demonstrates that that country is preparing feverishly for war against the United States. Communist strategy calls for the crippling of the vital parts of the war machine of this country. Communist support of the packing-house strike and other strikes very evidently had this in mind.

Let me cite other sections of Mr. Williamson's statement to show that he has other designs than the welfare of the packing-house workers.

The Communist Party has long tried to get a foothold among the Negro workers, seeking to promote racial strife for its own subversive purposes. This is one of the aims of Communist plotting in the packing-house strike involving many Negro workers.

He further indicates that the Communist Party wants to maneuver the packing-house workers' union into becoming "a powerful force within the new party of Wallace," the only pro-Soviet Presidential candidate in the field in 1948. In other words, he wants to use the packing-house workers as Communist political cannon fodder.

He wants to turn the packing-house workers against their employers and against the Government of the United States. That is why he refers to the "arrogance of the employers and Government." He wants to use the strike as a vehicle against American foreign policy and so his statement on the strike is linked up with his condemnation of the "Marshall plan, interference in affairs of other nations, war program and big war appropriations." It should be remembered in this connection that the packing-house industry plays a vital part in our defense program.

Thus, every loyal American packing-house worker should consider seriously the fact that he is being exploited by Communist conspirators working within and outside his union. He should recognize that men like Herbert Marsh speak not in behalf of the workers in the industry but in behalf of his boss, John Williamson and the Communist Party. He should make every effort to clean house so that he may have a union that is of, by, and for the packing-house workers established on the basis of the mutual responsibility and benefits that will result to both labor and management from peace and stability in the industry.

Notwithstanding the fact that a majority of the rank and file of labor, as well as many of the officers of labor unions, are very appreciative of our efforts to cooperate with them in eliminating Communist officers from their unions, the Communists will endeavor to make union members believe we are anti-labor. The truth of the matter is that we are working with and for the benefit of unions, and their officers know it.

I defy a single American whose patriotism cannot be questioned to say that John Williamson, alien-Communist, is not trying to make slaves out of all workers in the United States for a Soviet dictatorship. Williamson is not interested in the workers of our country. He is only interested in establishing a Communist dictatorship in the United States.

The irony of this situation can more fully be recognized when you realize here is an alien-Communist that should be deported shortly, out on bail, directing the Communist strategy of the present strike of the CIO Packinghouse Workers Union.

Findings of National Health Assembly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESCTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the National Health Assembly which recently concluded its sessions in Washington was composed of representatives of practically all major groups in our population, including the medical profession, labor and other consumer groups, as well as Government representatives. Most of those of those who attended felt that it was the most successful meeting that has been held on the problem of getting better distribution of good medical care. Perhaps its general success was due in part to the fact that the delegates concentrated more on the points on which there was agreement, rather than on those on which there was, for the present at least, apparently irreconcilable disagreement.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report on that conference from the Washington Post of May 4, which includes the statement on the seven points in agreement:

The embattled medical-care section of the National Health Assembly last night finally resolved many of its differences, but left unsettled the question of compulsory national health insurance.

The planning committee, composed of representatives of the medical profession, the CIO and AFL, the Physicians' Forum, which supports national health insurance, and cooperative health associations, last night issued a seven-point preliminary report of conclusions.

All were agreed on the seven points. On the eighth point, whether or not the panel should recommend a plan of national health insurance, the statement said:

"There are areas on which the planning committee is not yet prepared to report. In the meetings of the medical-care section differing views were expressed as to the method of effectuating the principle of prepayment or insurance.

TWO OPPOSING VIEWS

"Some believe it can be achieved through voluntary plans. Others believe that a national health-insurance plan is necessary."

The seven points adopted were:

1. Adequate medical service for prevention of illness, care, and relief of sickness and promotion of a high level of physical, mental, and social health should be available to all without regard to race, color, creed, residence, or economic status.

2. The principle of contributory health insurance should be the basic method of financing medical care for the large majority of the American people, in order to remove the burden of unpredictable sickness costs, abolish the economic barrier to adequate medical services and avoid the indignities of a means test.

3. Health insurance should be accompanied by such use of tax resources as may be necessary to provide additional—

(a) Services to persons or groups for whom special public responsibility is acknowledged and

(b) Services not available under prepayment or insurance.

4. Voluntary prepayment group health plans, embodying group practice and providing comprehensive service, offer to their members the best of modern medical care. Such plans, furthermore, are the best available means at this time of bringing about improved distribution of medical care, particularly in rural areas.

5. The people have the right to establish voluntary insurance plans on a cooperative basis and legal restrictions upon such right (other than those necessary to assure proper standards and qualifications), now existing in a number of States, should be removed.

6. High standards of service, efficient administration and reasonable costs require:

(a) Coordination of the services of physicians, hospitals, and other health agencies in all phases of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment;

(b) Effective cooperation between the providers and the consumers of such services.

7. A medical-care program itself will not solve the health problems of the Nation. It must be coordinated with all efforts directed toward providing the people with adequate housing, a living wage, continuous productive and creative employment under safe working conditions, satisfying recreation and such other measures as will correct conditions that adversely affect the physical, mental, and social health of the people.

Leroy Johnson Well Liked by His Constituents as Well as His Colleagues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, it is always interesting to know what the constituents think of their Representative in the House. Recently LEROY JOHNSON showed me an editorial from the Stockton Record, his home-town paper.

I was pleased to learn that my own opinion of Mr. JOHNSON was confirmed by this paper. Also, it is in accord with all the colleagues of Mr. JOHNSON, whom I have talked to, on both sides of the aisle. The House of Representatives is an austerely accurate judge of the character and ability of its Members.

I would not presume to tell the people of California who to select as their Congressmen. But I can say with confidence that if they should return LEROY JOHNSON to us it would meet the unanimous approval of those in the House who know him.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial after receiving Mr. JOHNSON's permission to do so.

LEROY JOHNSON'S SOURCES OF STRENGTH

Of the 435 congressional districts in the United States, probably none is as difficult to represent as the third in California, of which San Joaquin County is a part. It is among the largest, both in area and in population. The diversity of economic interests, the interplay of competition between localities, the problems ranging from water conservation to building submarines—all these are possible pitfalls for an unwary Representative on Capitol Hill.

Under the circumstances, it would not be surprising for the Congressman from the Third District of California to execute at times some fancy footwork, like a ballet dancer running a gantlet of stale eggs. Not so in the case of LEROY JOHNSON, who aspires this year to be selected by the voters for his fourth consecutive term.

Stockton's former city attorney scorns the spectacular in his representation. His record is one of steadiness and consistency, not a consistency to be measured in terms of party policy, but rather by independent personal conviction attained after close study of the merits of all issues.

It is reasonable for San Joaquin County, out of loyalty to a resident of his own soil, to accord Congressman JOHNSON strong support. His real local strength, however, stems from deeper sources. They consist of his fine record in the House, his sincere attention to the individual requests and needs of his constituents, and his fairness in representing all of the interests and all of the people of his widespread and diversified district.

Reserve Officers Association Honors Hon. Walter Norblad, of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the Reserve Officers Association of the United States in the April issue of their magazine, the Reserve Officer, have paid a just and deserving tribute to our colleague and friend, Congressman WALTER NORBLAD, of Oregon. The people of Oregon are fortunate in having such able and distinguished representation in the Congress.

The tribute follows:

FRIENDS OF THE ROA

(That the issue of national security transcends partisanship, sectionalism, and prejudices which weigh heavily in some matters has been demonstrated time and again by those who have exhibited in Congress a spirited patriotism such as is the aim of ROA. Not because they serve only the interests of ROA, but because they serve their country, and seek the security of her freedoms, the Reserve Officer periodically singles out the friends of the ROA. For in the cause of national security we believe the ROA also serves and that a friend of the ROA is a friend of the Nation.—THE EDITORS.)

Representative WALTER NORBLAD'S friends recall many significant events and developments in his career, but to the Reservists he achieved fame last year for observing to Gen. Joe Collins, Deputy Chief of Staff, "I think that the United States Army treats the Reserves and National Guard like stepchildren."

To those who served with him in the Eighth Air Force, he is known as the intrepid, nonflying, briefing officer (combat intelligence) who volunteered for a number of combat missions, for which he won the Air Medal, and on one of which he unexpectedly appeared over the Normandy beaches on D-day some minutes before landings started.

To Oregon politicians he is remembered as the legislator who was elected at such a tender age that the Governor officially mistook him for a page boy.

To his former neighbors back in Escanaba, Mich., he is remembered as the morning paper boy who was out tossing the daily sheet at 4:30 a. m.; alumni of New Mexico Military Academy remember him as the cavalryman who took particular delight in riding the now obsolete saber course; and in various college-day circles he is recalled as a Portland newspaper reporter, a river deckhand, a bridge painter, and a river dredge shoreman.

Out in the Pacific Northwest today he is valued as the only House Armed Services Committee man from that section who is particularly concerned with the state of national security.

In current times Mr. NORBLAD is especially fitted for his present House committee assignment. He has a broad background in politics. After his initial youthful success in Oregon, he suffered a major set-back in his first step toward Congress. Defeated 4½ to 1, Mr. NORBLAD detected defections throughout the ranks of his political supporters. He explains that only his relatives voted for him, "and I'm not sure of some of them."

After playing a prominent part in the 1940 Republican convention landslide for Wendell Willkie, Mr. NORBLAD was making a comeback when the war came, and he went into the Air Force. He came out in 1945 as a captain, to win a special election, and then in 1946 was reelected by a 3-to-1 majority. Although ranking near the bottom for committee seniority, he has drawn some important assignments, and last fall went around the world on an inspection of Army, Air Force, and Navy bases.

It was not his first governmental exploratory trip. After graduating with BS and DJ degrees from Oregon in 1932, he visited South and Central America, took a year's graduate work at Harvard, then spent the next 7 months traveling in Europe and Asia Minor, visiting 35 countries.

He is a member of the law firm of Norblad & Norblad in Astoria, Oreg., the firm's senior member being the Congressman's father.

Politics in Appointments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the following letter to the editor and the editorial entitled "South Pacific Commission," both appeared in recent issues of the New York Times.

They relate an incident which is a sad commentary on some of the appointments made by this administration.

The editorial and the letter are as follows:

SOUTH PACIFIC COMMISSION

Appointment of the United States members of the South Pacific Commission that meets in Sydney, Australia, on May 11 to frame recommendations for the social and economic betterment of the dependent peoples of that almost forgotten part of the world reaffirms American interest in Pacific affairs. The Commission, which was patterned after the model Caribbean Commission that has worked well, is only a consultative and advisory body. But it could do much to reconcile conflicting interests and by the very fact of its existence call attention to several thousands of peoples who have no articulate spokesmen.

It is unfortunate, however, that President Truman could not have given more thought to the appointments. He discarded those suggested to him, after considerable study by an interdepartmental committee, of Paul Smith, editor of the San Francisco Chronicle, and Richard H. Wels, New York lawyer, both of whom have a long record of active interest in Pacific affairs. Then he made an offhand, last-minute selection of Prof. Felix Keesing, of Stanford University, and Milton Shalleck, a young New York lawyer, neither of whom had been even named by the interdepartmental committee. Both undoubtedly are sincere men. They will probably do a good job. Professor Keesing is an anthropologist of note who has long been a student of South Pacific peoples. But the South Pacific commissionerships, it seems to us, were too important to be handed out in such an offhand manner as apparently was the case. The method does not do credit to the job or to the importance of the Pacific in this country's future.

POLITICS IN APPOINTMENTS—FIRST APPOINTMENTS TO SOUTH PACIFIC COMMISSION ARE CRITICIZED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your editorial South Pacific Commission, which appeared in the Times on May 2, is a remarkable example of restraint in commenting on an odorous example of "palace politics" in the matter of appointments.

Paul Smith, of San Francisco, and Richard H. Wels, of New York, were nominated by the Department of State for appointment as Commissioners to represent the United States on the Six-Power South Pacific Commission. Their names had been recommended to the Secretary of State after many weeks of debate and discussion by an interdepartmental committee consisting of representatives of the Departments of State, Navy, War, Interior, Agriculture, and Labor, and the Federal Security Agency. Their selection by the interdepartmental committee was completely objective and, so we thought, completely in balance from the standpoint of age, ability, experience, residence, knowledge of the Pacific, and proven interest in the problems of native peoples. Partisan politics had absolutely no part in the discussions even though it so happened that Mr. Smith is a Republican and Mr. Wels is a Democrat.

Dr. Felix Keesing, who now has been appointed in lieu of Mr. Smith, was among those considered and rejected by the committee. Most of us had no doubt as to Dr. Keesing's competence as an anthropologist, but we did not regard the problems of the native peoples of the South Pacific as subjects of anthropological theorism. We viewed them rather as practical day-to-day economic and political problems with some relation to education, health, and welfare. We felt, too, that the post of commissioner called for an executive-administrator-diplomat rather than a student-scientist-author. In the face of Ed Pauley's timely intervention all these considerations went out the window and Dr. Keesing was appointed in lieu of Mr. Smith.

The name of Milton Shalleck, who has been appointed in lieu of Richard Wels, never came before the committee. To my knowledge his name has not heretofore appeared in connection with Pacific affairs. Mr. Wels, on the other hand, served long and well in the Pacific during the war. He has been a leader in the postwar drive for political justice for our dependent peoples in the Pacific. Those who know him as a lawyer and as a naval officer have the highest regard for his ability and competence. It is a shame that he should have been rejected in favor of one who is an unknown insofar as the Pacific is concerned but who appears to be a known in the inner circle at the White House.

As one of those who helped draft the six-power agreement for the establishment of the South Pacific Commission, I have hope that it will do much to open the way for international cooperation in the advancement of the native peoples of the South Pacific. I find little comfort in the fact that the first appointments to the South Pacific Commission by the United States have resulted from the personal machinations of the political pap and patronage boys. I had hoped that appointments would be made in a more wholesome and politics-free manner.

ROY E. JAMES,
Former Chief, Pacific Affairs Division, Department of the Interior.
PALMERTON, PA., *May 4, 1948.*

Save the Soil and Save Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the campaign launched 3 years ago in Texas to save the soil and save Texas has created a great interest among the farmers to practice soil-conservation methods. We are proud of the accomplishments of our Texas farmers for helping to save this topsoil which is such a valuable resource and hope that other States will have similar program to help the county agents and Soil Conservation Service people expand their conservation projects.

It takes a cooperative plan to effectively and efficiently carry out soil-conservation methods and the farmers will continue to make progress along these lines when given the know-how by our conservationists. Control of the programs should rest with the farmers and the groups of farmers.

The farmers of the Steeles Store area in Brazos County, Tex., have been recognized as the best soil-conservation group in Texas for the year. May their work inspire others to maintain the productivity of the land by conserving the topsoil and surface water.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Bryan Daily Eagle, Bryan, Tex., on May 3, 1948, entitled "Steeles Store Scores":

STEELES STORE SCORES

When 10 landowners and farmers of the Steeles Store area in Brazos County were recognized as the best soil-conservation group in Texas in the Save the Soil and Save Texas campaign launched 3 years ago by Walter Humphrey, editor of the Fort Worth Press, and now supported by the Houston Press and the El Paso Herald-Post, they brought not only $1,000 into their treasury, but a high and an unusual honor to themselves, their community, and Brazos County.

These 10 men, Marion Fazzino, Frank S. Seale, Lee J. Court, D. D. Catalena, J. M. Perrone, Jr., Mike Fazzino, John M. Perrone, Frank Salvato, Nick Salvato, and Fritz Severa, have operated approximately 1 year and by improving the drainage on their joint holdings have added to their productive acres—land will be in cotton this year that never had been in cultivation—and have acted to prevent soil loss through erosion by a better drainage system.

The mutual problem of improved drainage had been talked by these men and finally County Agent Wallace Kimbrough called a meeting, held on the big porch of the Perrone store at Steeles Store. Experts from the Soil Conservation Service were called in and a drainage association was formed within the group. Soil Conservationist C. C. Carlton and SCS Engineer Cecil Bryan aiding and advising.

As a result the big problem, a main drainage ditch which would serve the joint acreage, was solved. A ditch 12,888 feet in length, draining 1,115 acres, was constructed at a cost of $5.84 per acre.

These farmers, like others in this section, have learned the value of soil conservation. They realize the importance of proper drainage and that contour farming and terracing prevent erosion, and at the same time conserve surface water. The use of cover crops, such as the legumes that are being used here to hold and improve soil fertility by being ploughed under, is increasing and the value of this practice is being more generally recognized almost from day to day. In many cases, too, there is a byproduct in the grazing or forage value of these cover crops.

It is fundamentally important that every possible step be taken to conserve and improve the soil, the Nation's most valuable natural resource. As the population of this and other countries increases the demands upon the soil for food production will be intensified. The waste that has cost millions of productive acres in the past must be halted and so-called marginal lands must be recovered for productive purposes wherever possible. The erosion that in the past has resulted in the deposit in the Gulf of millions of tons of topsoil also must be halted.

But with soil conservation and prevention of erosion and the increase of productive acres by proper drainage, there also should be well planned efforts for the conservation of surface water. Today the water problem is one of the most serious confronting the economy of Texas. The underground supply is slowly but steadily diminishing. This is due, in part, to the clearing of the land. As this progresses rainfall drains off into creeks and rivers much more rapidly than in earlier years and less of the fall seeps into the ground, keeping it in better shape for agricultural use and adding in some measure to the underground water supply. Drainage that will take the water from an acreage in 2 or 3 days that formerly would have been inundated in some measure for weeks, serves one purpose, but another is not served when this water speedily finds its way into some creek or river.

The soil conservation work that is being done should be expanded and intensified and the example set by the Steeles Store group should be emulated in many communities. But with this work provision also should be made for the greatest possible conservation of water.

Ohio Primary Results Improve Taft's Chances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with permission granted me earlier today, I respectfully submit the following editorial by John S. Knight, of the Akron Beacon Journal for insertion in the RECORD:

OHIO PRIMARY RESULTS IMPROVE TAFT'S CHANCE

The Stassen bandwagon that came rolling out of Wisconsin and Nebraska found the going much rougher on Ohio's political highways last Tuesday.

Although Stassen won nine delegates from Senator TAFT in the Presidential primary, these pertinent facts cannot be ignored:

1. Stassen's delegate at large, Carrington T. Marshall, ran a poor last even though he had the advantage of being the only Stassen candidate in a contest for nine positions.

Prior to Tuesday's primary, Stassen had described the measure of his test in Ohio as the ability to win a majority of district delegates and a vote for his State-wide candidate higher than the average of all other delegates in the State field. In this test, Stassen failed on both counts. Put another way, it means that in a State-wide popularity contest among Ohio Republicans, Stassen has been decisively defeated by Senator TAFT.

2. The 11 contested districts were carefully hand picked by the Stassen managers. These were the districts in which TAFT was thought to be most vulnerable because of labor's opposition to the Taft-Hartley Act.

Yet Stassen not only failed to win a majority of these district delegates but four of the winning Stassen men scraped through with uncomfortably close margins.

In the Cleveland area, Stassen succeeded in only one contest out of six. Two Stassen delegates were elected from the Toledo district but the results were close.

In this, the fourteenth district, Mayor Charles E. Slusser, of Akron, TAFT supporter, trailed Roy V. Sherman, the best known Stassen delegate, by only 192 votes.

Since local political observers estimate that at least 5,000 Summit County Democrats crossed over and voted against TAFT in the Republican primary, the Stassen victory in this district is not particularly impressive even though his other delegate won handily over a TAFT candidate with a tongue-twisting name.

3. Ohio, because of its peculiar admixture of rural communities and industrial cities, is traditionally a happy-hunting ground for political rebels. In 1936, the late Senator William E. Borah won five Presidential delegates from BOB TAFT with only a week's campaigning and practically no organization effort.

The fact is that Akron, Toledo, and Youngstown voters rarely follow the political preferences of the rest of the State.

With both TAFT and Stassen rationalizing the outcome of last Tuesday's vote, the weight of the evidence seems to be on TAFT's side.

Stassen, we think, is whistling in the dark when he proclaims that "the Republicans of Ohio have advanced us another step toward nomination at Philadelphia."

On the contrary, it would seem that although Stassen has added nine delegates to an impressively growing list, his Ohio invasion may cost him dearly at Philadelphia.

The regulars resent his flouting of the established favorite-son tradition and call it poor sportsmanship.

Congressional leaders who will play a potent role at the Republican national convention take a dim view of Stassen's attempt to capitalize on opposition to the Taft-Hartley Act while admitting that on the whole it is a useful piece of legislation.

The fact that Stassen failed to gain a Statewide popular verdict in Ohio will solidify the opposition to him at Philadelphia.

TAFT, on the other hand, has buried the bugbear that has been plaguing him ever since he first announced his candidacy. Months ago TAFT admitted privately that the greatest obstacle to his nomination was the belief of many party leaders that he could not be elected.

The vote in Ohio should dispel their fears. His showing in the industrial cities was most remarkable in view of all the tumult and opposition that has been whipped up against the Taft-Hartley Act.

Taft has been charged with lacking color. He was portrayed by his enemies as a dry, humorless reactionary in contrast to Stassen's youthful, warm liberalism.

But TAFT demonstrated that he is no mean campaigner. He talked issues without evasion and slugged it out in a manner reminiscent of the famous Taft-Bulkley debates of 1938.

The Ohio Senator is one of those rarities in public life whose mental development has not been arrested by age.

Why did Stassen enter the Ohio fight? It was a carefully calculated risk and the decision to take it had to be made before the Wisconsin and Nebraska primaries. Stassen figured that if he could make an impressive showing against TAFT in Ohio, he would both deflate the Senator's campaign and improve his own position.

As events have turned out, he would have fared better by shunning the Buckeye State.

But when Stassen's decision was made he had no way of knowing that he would sweep Wisconsin and Nebraska so impressively.

While the Ohio primary offered a creditable demonstration of his strength, it also marked the end of the Stassen blitz.

Contrary to the popular impression, these Presidential primaries actually determine very little except to weed out the candidates who have little potential strength.

Wisconsin and Nebraska effectively disposed of General MacArthur's Presidential ambitions. A Stassen victory in the forthcoming Oregon primary could lay Dewey's hopes to rest.

With the probability that next June will find a deadlocked Republican convention at Philadelphia, anything can happen. It is my own view that TAFT'S chances have been materially improved by the Ohio election.

You can mark it down in your political future book that in the event of a stalemate, neither TAFT nor Dewey will ever agree to Stassen so long as their delegates can be kept under control.

There is much talk among political writers about Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG as the logical compromise candidate, possibly with Stassen as his running mate.

The infirmity of such talk is that it is too logical. The Republicans now sense that they can win with anybody. It would be tragic, indeed, if out of the back-room horse trading, a candidate of the Harding type should be selected.

If the Republicans are really sincere in their expressed desire to run on the record of the party, Senator TAFT is their man.

As leader of the Senate, he has carried the responsibility for all legislation enacted by the majority party.

Unlike many of the other candidates, TAFT'S position is known on every public issue.

The logic of TAFT as the Republican candidate appeals also to President Truman. At a recent Gridiron dinner, the President jocularly said in TAFT'S presence that "BOB was his favorite candidate for the Republican nomination."

That is because Truman thinks TAFT would be the easiest man to beat.

Since TAFT has decided views to the contrary, a Truman-Taft campaign would give the country something to remember.

At least, it would be the first time in 8 years when both candidates weren't sugaring the voters by out-promising each other.

Dorothy Thompson says the times call for sobriety.

By June, the Republican delegates at Philadelphia may have come to the same conclusion.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Radio Address to Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered over Station WNBE on May 8, 1948:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, whoever is fanning the flames of opposition to the Endicott-Vestal flood-wall proposal is doing western Broome County a disservice.

You folks in Endicott, and on the Vestal side, too, called on me to get some action. Things were pretty well started when all of a sudden a few people down the Susquehanna threw a monkey wrench in the whole works.

The question before the house now is, Are we going to let the tail wag the dog? Are the people of Endicott, Vestal, and Johnson City going to be brow-beaten in their demands for proper security against floods because somebody had a brainstorm farther down the line and imagines flood walls in our area are going to hurt them?

Such an idea is preposterous, but I suspect this fight is being stirred up by a handful right here in Broome County who look with a "sour grapes" attitude upon any idea which isn't theirs, no matter how much merit it might have or how great the need for it may be.

The No. 1 argument for the flood walls now is that immediate relief is needed; adequate protection for greater Endicott and Vestal is paramount, and the dams up the Susquehanna may take 25 or 30 years to complete.

From the circle of the select come the hue and cry, sounding louder and louder as the days go past, now approaching a shrill, frantic crescendo, the words, "Get HALL this time, and get him right."

Smear him, belittle his intentions, ridicule his efforts, undermine his friends.

We'll encourage labor agitators to take potshots at him. We'll shake the confidence of the old folks in him. We'll turn the farmers against him.

Yes; they haven't lost an opportunity this trip. They've put full-time in on the job of sabotaging your Congressman.

Their latest upheaval was among the dairy farmers of my district, who have always been among my staunchest friends. They knew if they could stab me in the back in the rural districts they might be able to make some hay.

Therefore, when I voted to take the tax off oleo, which practically all low-income families have to eat, they yelled to high heaven and told the farmers I had betrayed them.

You know and I know that a tax on food is morally wrong. When thousands of workers in the Triple Cities are forced to pay a tax on any basic item, that is un-American.

They are trying to tell the dairymen of Broome, Chenango, and Madison Counties, who have always had faith and confidence in me, that my vote against this tax will hurt their milk price and ruin production on our farms.

In the first place, I do not believe it will have any effect on the dairy business whatsoever. Milk and butter are absolutely indispensable. We can't get along without them, and they will always be in great demand and of prime necessity in a balanced diet.

But even if yellow-colored oleo did bring the price of butter down, which I can't imagine happening, this would have no effect on our dairy farmers, anyway, because yellow-colored oleomargarine just can't be sold in New York State.

So the boys who are raising this rumpus and calling me an enemy of the dairy farmers I have represented so many years are all wet. They are trying to create an issue which isn't there.

They are attempting to stir up my good friends, the dairymen, with the same kind of false premise as the labor agitators are trying to use against me with the Taft-Hartley bill.

Nobody has been hurt by the Taft-Hartley Act, but the so-called leaders are telling their union members I voted wrong.

By the same token, my dairy farmers can't be hurt by the tax being taken off oleo, because New York State prohibits yellow-colored oleo from being sold.

So the poison peddlers ought to get a new brand of poison. I am going to resist their efforts to smear me with our farm voters, just as I have fought them in the labor camp.

Nobody is going to be sore about something that doesn't hurt him. The oleo-tax repeal can't hurt our New York State farmers any more than the Taft-Hartley Act has thus far hurt American labor.

World Premiere of Four Faces West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, on May 15, in Santa Fe, His Excellency Gov. Thomas J. Mabry will be host to the world premiere of the Enterprise Studios' motion picture, Four Faces West. This picture, which stars Joel McCrea, Frances Dee, Charles Bickford, and Joseph Calleia, is based on the story Paso por Aqui, by Eugene Manlove Rhodes, and centers around the inspiring Inscription Rock, El Morro, now established as a national monument in New Mexico. The title of the story, taken from Inscription Rock, and chiseled there centuries ago by Spanish explorers, means, when free translated, "They passed this way."

The author, familiarly known throughout New Mexico as Gene Rhodes, is buried on the summit of San Andres Mountains. His grave is in a shady glen,

surrounded by trees and scrub oaks, in the heart of a country that Gene Rhodes loved, and, to quote him, "filled with the mystery and the magic of distance, the mountains, and the long leagues of the sun." As in the case of Robert Louis Stevenson, whose writings Gene Rhodes admired, his last resting place and the epitaph above it are in harmony with the life he led and the philosophy which lives in his tales of the West. By his own request the epitaph on his tomb contains the simple words from Inscription Rock, Paso por Aqui—(He) passed this way.

In this and in other stories, Gene Rhodes recorded the grandeur and glory of the vast expanses of mountains, plains, and skies of New Mexico. Through the characters he picked from the life which surrounded him, he recorded his philosophy of rigorous, yet simple conduct in harmony with the times and the challenging wilderness.

In behalf of the citizens of New Mexico I congratulate Enterprise Studios for its magnificent picturization of Gene Rhodes' tale and of one of the best-known historical incidents of New Mexico. Not only did Enterprise Studios portray this story realistically, and with great impact, but also filmed the picture in some of the most scenic areas of the world, which are located in New Mexico. I am referring to the vicinity of El Morro, the White Sands, and the region near Alamogordo.

Millions of Americans, through Four Faces West, will enjoy these scenic wonders as well as the exciting plot and true-to-life characterizations portrayed by the actors and actresses in the film. More than that, Four Faces West will bring to millions of Americans a story of the pioneers who made this country great.

New Mexico and Santa Fe are honored to be host for the world premiere of Four Faces West.

Labor Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a letter appearing in today's New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, there is more truth than poetry in the thoughts conveyed in Dr. Dennett's letter. This country has become the leading nation in the world because of our ability to produce. The one thing we need today to lick inflation and many other ills that lead to dissatisfaction and unrest is an increase in production. This cannot be accomplished with strikes and other labor interruptions. The Communists in our country are delighted whenever confusion interrupts our progress. Both labor and management should realize this and bend every effort to keep our industries functioning at high speed. The letter follows:

KILLING THE GOOSE—LABOR'S POLICY, SAYS READER, IS A SHORT-SIGHTED ONE

The wages of organized labor in this country today are liberal and fair and should not be increased. The fact that some industries have made large profits does not justify labor's demand for increased wages. It is not in the interest of labor that it should. It now receives the largest share of every dollar industry earns, and to demand and take more at this time simply means that the earned net profits will not be available to carry on the expensive research and experimentation by trained scientists who patiently search for discoveries that will create new industries and improve old ones. From the open hands of these scientists labor is indebted for its present bounty. But for them, toilers would be working 6 days a week, 10 hours a day for $3 a day, as they are doing in Russia. Corporations have set aside millions of dollars of their excess profits for research in chemistry, manufacture and economics that will result in better living for all people. It is unwise for a selfish, organized minority to hamper them. Shorter hours and higher wages in industry will not solve our economic problems.

In the event of hard times following further inflation, labor would suffer most of all for its folly. It has been truthfully said you cannot lift the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer nor help the poor by destroying the rich. The more industry is paralyzed and production diminished in key industries by strikes artfully promoted by labor leaders, the more Communists rejoice because confusion and anarchy are weapons used to further their cause.

This country is wasting its substance; Russia is conserving her own. We are talking about building airplanes; Russia is building them now, working 10 hours a day, 6 days a week. Labor in this country is conducting itself just as the French did before the war, when they were working short hours daily in a short day week, making one airplane while the Germans, working like beavers, were making a dozen. Russia believes and keeps saying the same thing can happen here if we keep on a little longer the way we have been going for the last 10 years. She may be right. There are wise, thoughtful men in this country who say we are on the wrong trail. Free enterprise in a capitalist country does more for the poor than socialism in totalitarian countries has ever done anywhere on earth. Our labor leaders by their present tactics will kill the goose that lays the golden egg.

DANIEL C. DENNETT, M. D.
WINCHESTER, MASS., May 6, 1948.

The Proposed Paradise and Glacier View Dams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the newspaper publicity given to the activities of the United States Corps of Engineers in carrying out investigations in western Montana, I have received many communications from Montanans, covering the proposals for dams at Paradise and Glacier View. I have written to Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers, for information on these two proposed projects and I am including with my remarks his reply.

The following points, in connection with the Paradise and Glacier View proposals, are pertinent and should be kept in mind.

First. The United States Corps of Engineers has neither the authority nor the funds for the construction of these two projects.

Second. Under specific authority, granted by Congress in 1938, the United States Corps of Engineers has been given the authority to make detailed investigations in the entire Columbia River Basin.

Third. The Paradise and Glacier View projects are not being proposed for construction at this time.

Fourth. Public hearings will be held to consider the views of the people of Montana on these two proposed projects.

Fifth. A complete report covering the Paradise and Glacier View projects must be made to Congress.

Sixth. After the report has been made to Congress—and only then—will authorizations for these and similar projects be considered.

Mr. Speaker, the reply of General Wheeler to my letter of April 21, 1948, follows:

MAY 6, 1948.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: Reference is made to your letter of April 21, 1948, enclosing correspondence from Mr. L. A. Colby, executive secretary of the Upper Columbia Development Association, Missoula, Mont., relative to the Paradise and Glacier View Dam projects on the Clark Fork of the Columbia River and the North Fork of the Flathead River, respectively. The enclosures with your letter express opposition to the construction of projects such as these until such time as the Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation present a consolidated program covering the upper Columbia River Basin. You ask for information on this subject.

As you undoubtedly are aware, at this time we do not have the necessary authority from Congress nor funds for the construction of the Paradise or Glacier View projects. Pursuant to specific authority from Congress, however, we now have under way a detailed investigation of the entire Columbia River Basin. The necessary field studies and the preparation of a report on that investigation are being accomplished under the supervision of Col. Theron D. Weaver, our division engineer of the North Pacific Division, with the study of that portion of the Columbia River Basin lying within Montana being carried out under the immediate direction of Col. Leland H. Hewitt, the district engineer at Seattle, Wash. Information is available to this office to the effect that the Paradise and Glacier View projects are included among a large number of prospective improvements for the development of the water resources of the Columbia River Basin that are being studied in connection with the current investigation of that river basin. The two projects are, therefore, not being proposed for construction at this time. They are rather being proposed for discussion at hearings to be held in the areas concerned in order that the views of interested persons and organizations may be obtained and considered in formulating plans for the development of the Columbia River and its tributaries.

With reference to the desire of the local interests that the Corps of Engineers and

the Bureau of Reclamation present a consolidated working program covering the headwaters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, I can assure you that our studies of the Columbia River Basin are being carried on with that express purpose in mind. The activities of the Corps of Engineers and those of the Bureau of Reclamation as well as other Federal agencies and State representatives concerned with the development of the water resources of the Columbia River Basin are being coordinated at field level through the Columbia Basin Inter-Agency Committee, a group similar to the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee with which the people of Montana are already familiar. Through the activities of the Columbia Basin Inter-Agency Committee and other normal procedures for coordinating our work and that of the Bureau of Reclamation, the plans for development of the Columbia River Basin under consideration in connection with our current investigation of that river basin are being discussed from time to time with representatives of the Bureau, as well as with other cooperating agencies and the local people concerned. The report of the division and district engineers will not only reflect the results of this coordination with the Bureau but will also contain a statement of the views of the Bureau and other cooperating agencies and of the desires of local interests concerning the plans proposed in the report.

The division and district engineers' report on the Columbia River Basin investigation is expected to be completed and submitted to this office in the fall of this year, at which time you will be notified. When that report is received, it will be referred to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors for review as required by law. Upon completion of the Board's action on that report, my proposed report thereon will be furnished to the Governors of the affected States and to interested Federal agencies at the Washington level, including the Bureau of Reclamation, for further comment, if desired, and the written comments of the governors and interested Federal agencies will accompany the complete report to Congress with the recommendations of the chief of engineers regarding improvements considered feasible and economically justified at that time. After the report has been transmitted to Congress, further action toward the construction of any projects that may be recommended therein will depend upon the authorization of those projects by Congress and the appropriation of the necessary funds for the work proposed.

I wish to again assure you that the status of the Paradise and Glacier View projects is not one of being proposed for construction at this time but rather of being proposed for consideration by all concerned. The views of local interested persons and organizations as expressed at public hearings and by other means will, of course, be carefully considered by the reporting officers and will exert a considerable influence in the formulation of the conclusions and recommendations of the division and district engineers when their report is submitted to this office. In this connection I may mention that since the date of your communication Colonel Hewitt has issued notices of a public hearing on the Glacier View prospect, to be held at the country club at Kalispell, Mont., at 10 a. m. on May 25, 1948, and of a public hearing on the Paradise project to be held in the high-school gymnasium at Hot Springs, Mont., at 10 a. m. on May 26, 1948. Accordingly, I have requested Colonel Hewitt, if he has not already done so, to furnish copies of those notices to you and to the Upper Columbia Development Association.

In order that Colonel Weaver and Colonel Hewitt may know of your interest in this matter and may have the views expressed in the enclosures with your letter for consideration in connection with the current studies of the Columbia River Basin, I have today referred your letter and copies of its enclosures to them. In the event the local interests should desire further information on those studies, or if they should have any additional data which they wish to submit for consideration in connection with the studies, it is suggested that they may wish to communicate directly with Colonel Hewitt for that purpose. His address is: The district engineer, Seattle district, Corps of Engineers, 4735 East Marginal Way, Seattle 4, Washington.

The enclosures with your letter are returned as requested.

Sincerely yours,

R. A. WHEELER,
Lieutenant General,
Chief of Engineers.

Proposed California Aged and Blind Aid Constitutional Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I feel impelled, before the adjournment of the Eightieth Congress, to call to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that 330,000 citizens of California have signed petitions for an initiative State constitutional amendment, which would increase old-age assistance from $60 to $75 per month and blind pensions from $75 to $85 per month. This measure, which has been officially titled the "Aged and Blind Aid Constitutional Amendment," has qualified for the November ballot and will be voted on by the people of California at that time.

This social-welfare initiative is sponsored by Mr. George H. McLain, who is chairman of the Citizens' Committee for Old Age Pensions, an organization composed of elderly and blind Californians who have banded together to provide more adequate sustenance and protection for themselves.

Mr. McLain founded the citizens' committee more than 7 years ago, at the request of the elderly and blind. Since then, he has devoted all his time and efforts toward obtaining the adoption of adequate security measures for these deserving members of our society and to seeing to it that existing welfare laws are administered in an honest, fair, and humanitarian manner. On several occasions, he has journeyed here to Washington to testify in behalf of amending and broadening the National Social Security Act, and has on many occasions stated the fallacy of each of the several States fighting against odds to gain a living pension program, declaring that it is solely the practical and sensible duty of the Congress to establish a Nationwide, adequate old-age pension system. Many of the Members of this House, including myself, have expended much effort toward this end.

Besides increasing California old-age assistance to $75 per month, and blind pensions to $85 per month, this measure provides that the eligibility age for aged assistance would be lowered from 65 to 63 in cases where the applicant has been a resident of the State for 10 out of the past 15 years. It also would eliminate the so-called responsible relatives clause from the present State law; and, as you know, this action is in agreement with the recommendations of the Federal Social Security Administration. The amendment also would provide for the election of the State welfare director by the people, so that this important position no longer could be used as a political patronage appointment. And it would save the home owners of the State an estimated $15,000,000 in taxes annually by taking administration of the assistance program away from the 58 county welfare authorities and centralizing it in the State welfare department.

The recent costly strike by the United Mine Workers Union for a pension program indicates that there is a definite demand to solve this problem on a national basis. It is obvious that, in cases where pension programs are financed through private profits, the cost of the programs will merely be passed on to the general public through increased prices for consumer goods.

The failure of Congress to provide a proper and adequate Federal social security during the more than 11 years that the act has been in operation represents a regrettable lack of vision toward the needs and the well-being of so many hundreds of thousands of aged and blind persons throughout our country.

Many worth-while organizations are trying to provide security for the aged and blind, and I am wholeheartedly in favor of the adoption of an adequate social-security program for the aged and blind by the Congress on a national basis. Until such action is taken, however, it is only natural for groups in the various States to take such action as seems wise and necessary within their own jurisdiction, to make adequate provisions for their own aged and blind citizens. Such action is being taken, or will soon be taken, in many other States besides California. This disturbing cycle has been going on for many years past, first one State then another; however, the enemies of social security and humanitarian progress are usually well enough entrenched and organized to defeat the efforts State by State. In many States it has been more simple to defeat the meritorious efforts of persons dedicated to this cause than it will be in California. It is surely obvious to those of us here representing the people at large in the United States, that this State-by-State method is not the proper way to meet this problem. Many States are not sufficiently solvent fiscally to award their citizens adequate pensions. Other States are dominated by a reactionary element to the extent that successful passage of adequate social-security amendments are most improbable, if not impossible. Some States have enacted meritorious provision for their aged and blind, and in some instances have weakened their

financial structure, due to the fact that harassed and aged citizens will migrate to such States to live until such time as they are eligible to benefit by the more liberal provisions of these States, often breaking the home ties of years, and, in some instances, of generations, reacting to a perfectly natural and instinctive urge to protect themselves from the dread of poverty and indigency in their declining years.

The success of the people in a great many of our States to insure decent and adequate pensions for their aged and blind should be more than ample notice to the Congress of the United States that a Nation-wide, uniform, and adequate pension is long overdue for the aged and blind citizens of our country.

Americanism Should Be Cherished, Nourished, and Stimulated—It Is Our Birthright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting herewith a question and answer review on Americanism prepared by Agnes Morley Cleaveland, titled "American Primer," which should be read by every Member of the Congress and which I am sure will be received with appreciation by all those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is clear, readily understandable, and to the point. It is timely because of the attempts on the part of many elements, some guided and directed, many beguiled and misdirected, that are trying to make it appear that Americanism is old-fashioned, outmoded, and having served its purpose should be discarded for some other type of government or way of life in the United States.

No American citizen can read the American Primer and not be impressed with the fallacy of such beliefs. No American citizen can read this review on Americanism and not be more proud of his heritage that he is part of this great Nation, the last bulwark of liberty and equality for the individual left in the world and the future hope of mankind for freedom in a self-governed orderly society.

I recommend the American Primer to all Members of Congress.

AMERICAN PRIMER

(By Agnes Morley Cleaveland)

Question. What is America?

Answer. America is an ideal of human liberty. Whoever understands and accepts this ideal is a potential American. We comprise many racial stocks bound together by one ideal.

Question. What is this ideal?

Answer. Equality of opportunity. The opportunity to strive for the legitimate attainment of what one values supremely.

Question. Does America provide this opportunity?

Answer. Yes. Our basic law establishes it. Dishonest and selfish men often attempt to interfere with the working of the law, but that is a violation of our theory of Government and not a result of it.

Question. What is government?

Answer. Government is a scheme whereby human beings may get along together in peace.

Question. What distinguishes the human being from the rest of the animal kingdom?

Answer. He is the highest animal in the biological realm plus something more; something men call a soul; something that gives him the right to an opinion and the right to protection in expressing that opinion. In this way man, through the exercise of imagination, modifies his environment in his own interest rather than wait for the slow process of evolution to adapt him to it.

Question. Do slaves enjoy this right?

Answer. No. That is why slavery is the greatest evil in the world.

Question. Is slavery a greater evil than war?

Answer. Yes, because slavery can, and ultimately does, produce all the physical horrors of war, and in addition is longer drawn out and more hopeless and spiritually debasing.

Question. Why is war often called the greatest evil?

Answer. Because war is more dramatic and attention is more easily focused upon it than upon slavery.

Question. What is war?

Answer. A method of settling an argument.

Question. Is there such a thing as a righteous war?

Answer. Yes, if the argument is in behalf of a righteous cause and the opponent will listen to no other argument. The use of violence to settle an argument is a blot upon civilization, but there are "horrors of peace" whose removal will automatically do away with war.

Question. What can stop war?

Answer. A common ideal. The American Constitution is the ideal which has stopped war between the various States in this country.

Question. What about the Civil War in 1860?

Answer. The issue there was the Constitution itself. It was America's second test of the principle of human rights as paramount to all other issues.

Question. What is a constitution?

Answer. A constitution is a covenant which people enter into between themselves to respect one another's rights.

Question. What rights?

Answer. Rights which belong to human beings because they are something beyond animals, the right of honest religious practice, the right of free speech and free assemblage, the right to bear arms on lawful occasions, the right to legal redress, etc.

Question. Where do these conditions appear in the American Constitution?

Answer. They are implied throughout the entire instrument but are categorically listed in the first 10 amendments known as the American Bill of Rights. These amendments were demanded before all of the Original Thirteen Colonies would ratify the Constitution.

Question. Why is it called American Bill of Rights?

Answer. Because the original Bill of Rights was promulgated in England in 1689, about four centuries after the Magna Carta, which was the first and greatest political declaration in which human rights were conceded. The Magna Carta was secured by the common people to prevent the tyranny of their rulers. It established the principle that there is such a thing as inalienable rights in human relationships, rights which are not man given and which, therefore, cannot be taken away by man.

Question. Do inalienable rights conflict with property rights?

Answer. They are inseparable. It is only when property is acquired by violating the law that we call it supplanting human rights with property rights. Men living together peaceably must recognize the sanctity of property rights as well as other rights.

Question. What is the state?

Answer. A voluntary organization of individual human beings who unite for mutual protection and benefit.

Question. Does such cooperative effort abrogate any basic human rights?

Answer. No; the individual's welfare is the goal of the state. It could have no other reason for existing.

Question. When there is a conflict of individual interests must there not be a superauthority to decide between them?

Answer. There can be no conflict of basic interests under a constitutional form of government. The one all-inclusive interest in such a form of government is that one's status as a human being shall be recognized and respected. If the conflict is between human desires for material advantages, some sort of give-and-take compromise must be worked out.

Question. Has America such a give-and-take system?

Answer. Yes. It is called "the checks and balances" theory of government.

Question. What is meant by that?

Answer. Fundamentally, it means that human impulses, human enthusiasms, human whims, must be checked and balanced against one another until time shall permit the emergence of that which is socially adaptable and which expresses the average understanding of all the people. Our system releases human energy for constructive ends and checks it against destructive ones.

Question. How is that accomplished in America?

Answer. By checking majority tyranny as well as the possible tyranny of an autocrat, a bureaucracy or any other minority group.

Question. How is the majority checked?

Answer. By the calendar. At stated intervals the majority must submit to a recount of the votes of the whole people in order to redetermine the majority will. At each recount (election) there is a realignment of individuals. A different set of people may come into temporary power.

Question. Is the "calendar limit" the safest of all checks upon possible mob-hysteria?

Answer. Yes; because it is absolutely impersonal. It is not the will of man, but the impersonal working of time itself.

Question. Does this make government less responsive to the will of the people?

Answer. No; it makes it impartially responsive to the will of the whole people and not to any group within the whole, whether a minority or a majority group.

Question. Are there any other checks upon possibly misguided human passion in the American scheme of life?

Answer. Yes. The separation of governmental functions into administrative, legislative, and judicial. Also the division of political authority into Federal, State, and municipal.

Question. Are these devices all for the same purpose?

Answer. Yes. They are to insure the individual against usurpation of any of his inalienable rights; to secure orderly progress and to give all of the people a voice in their own government.

Question. Does any other nation have these safeguards?

Answer. Not to the extent we enjoy. Even democratic England is more at the mercy of temporary outbursts of majority enthusiasm which may ultimately prove to be what the people did not want after all. In England a majority expression of disapproval can throw an existing government

out of office without waiting for a predetermined lapse of time. This makes for majority domination rather than for the impartial effort to secure what all the people really want.

Question. What do all the people really want?

Answer. They really want progress. Only the blindly egotistical are sure they know what form progress should take. The blindly egotistical, entrenched in authority, would impede progress.

Question. Can progress be actually stopped?

Answer. No; but it can be hampered so that it goes forward only by violence. The aim of democracy is to provide a method whereby progress may go forward without violence. This is accomplished through the votes of the people.

Question. Has America enjoyed steady and orderly progress?

Answer. Yes. From the arrival of the Pilgrims in 1620 until the present day, America has shown along all lines the most rapid progress that the world has ever witnessed, as well as having had the most enduring peace.

Question. Along what lines must a nation show progress in order to justify itself?

Answer. Political, social, economic, and spiritual.

Question. How has America justified herself politically?

Answer. America is the world's model for a successful League of Nations, 48 political units, held together by a common ideal of human rights, and cemented by the mutual acceptance of the Constitution, have demonstrated that it is possible for communities of different interests, different racial origins, and different training to live in harmony without artificial barriers, either military or economic, being raised against one another.

Question. How has America justified herself on the social side?

Answer. America is free from the greatest blight that can crush the spirit of a people—class distinction on the basis of birth.

Question. Have we no class distinction in America?

Answer. Nobody in America is compelled either by law or by tradition to remain in any particular so-called class. Of course, we have temporary groupings, such as the employed and the unemployed, the sick and the well, but the individuals who temporarily compose these groups are not fixtures in them and they are always free to get out through their own efforts.

Question. Has America justified herself on the economic side?

Answer. Yes. We have the highest average standard of living of any nation on earth and the widest diffusion of national wealth. Although we comprise but 7 percent of the world's population, we do about one-half of the world's business. Our national income is allocated approximately as follows: Over two-thirds to salaries and wages and the rest to business, large and small. So-called big business clears less than 4 percent net profit from 10 percent of the national income. If profits from all large and small businesses were thrown into the total income and it was reallocated equally to all the people, the average raise to the wage earners would be very slight. This proves that, notwithstanding all manifest inequalities in distribution, it is not the very rich who hold the national wealth in their own hands and away from the masses. To redistribute the total wealth with any degree of equality would be to levy upon the higher wage earners for the benefit of the lower wage earners. The relative amount contributed by the so-called very wealthy would raise the total average almost imperceptibly.

Question. What are the social benefits from private profit?

Answer. Great foundations for scientific research and social betterment, libraries, privately endowed hospitals, schools, churches, welfare associations of all sorts are supported by private capital. If all wealth were redistributed, the support of these institutions would have to come out of direct taxation of all the people and many of them would be abandoned. All would be subject to political exploitation to their great detriment. The money which flows through the hands of capitalists goes back largely into general circulation for public use and benefit.

Question. What can America claim on the spiritual side?

Answer. Aside from the fact that recognition of man's spiritual status is the cornerstone of our national life, there is a public sentiment in this country which has always been concerned with human welfare. Since 1910 America has had a falling death rate in spite of the millions of unemployed. There have been few, if any, deaths from actual starvation. We have as a Nation taken care of our unfortunates. The American conscience is today concerned above all else with the problem of what constitutes social justice.

Question. What is social justice?

Answer. America recognizes three things as underlying true social justice: (1) Universal franchise; (2) elementary education at the expense of all the people; (3) equality of protection by the forces of law and order. When men have these three boons they are equipped to decide upon their own manner of life as freemen enjoying the blessings of democracy. Liberty of thought coupled with obedience to the will of a temporary majority is the basis for social justice.

Question. What is the aim of democracy?

Answer. The building of national character to the end that increasingly fewer arbitrary laws may be necessary. Neither efficiency nor any immediate interpretation of what constitutes social justice is the supreme aim of democracy. Rather is it character building for the individual citizen.

Question. Is there a distinction between a democracy and a republic?

Answer. Technically, yes; but not in the broader sense in which the word democracy has come to be used. A republic is a form of delegated authority vested in representatives elected by the people. Strictly speaking, America is a Republic, because it is not the uninformed undirected will of the people which operates. A republic seeks to keep an open road for guidance so that the will of the people may prove more nearly approximate ultimate wisdom. All mass movements of pressure upon these elected representatives violate the basic principle of a republican form of government and tend toward mob rule and curtailment of individual liberty.

Question. Is not equality as important as liberty?

Answer. Equality cannot be specifically defined. There is no such thing in the realm of the physical universe. In the mental realm as well there is no literal equality. No two people have identical tastes, desires, hopes, aspirations, or motives. Equality of happiness and satisfaction can never be achieved by arbitrary forcible distribution of material things. Equality of opportunity is based upon liberty to seek one's own idea of satisfaction. The effort to substitute an enforced equality of things for basic liberty is the effort to substitute privileges for rights, with the result that neither is obtained, and a lower average standard of living is brought about.

Question. What are the arguments being used today for abandoning the American theory of government?

Answer. There are five principal arguments:

1. That we have no more geographical frontier.

2. That the machine age has completely changed the nature of our society.

3. That individualism belongs to a simple type of society and collectivism to a complex one.

4. That laissez faire has been the basis of American business and has been its undoing.

5. That the profit motive is socially unethical and should be replaced by the service motive.

Question. What is the answer to the "no more frontier" argument?

Answer. The answer is that we reached our last geographical frontier when the Lewis and Clark expedition arrived in Oregon in the year 1805. Since then it has been intensive development. We have hardly scratched the surface of intensive development in this country. Furthermore, the frontier of new mechanical inventions and new industrial processes offers as wide opportunities for individual enterprise as ever did a geographical wilderness.

Question. What is the answer to "the machine age" as a reason for abandoning the theory of human relationships which we call our form of government?

Answer. The answer is that the machine is man's own creation and subject to his will. It is not a Frankenstein monster which has wrested dominion from man and made of him a helpless victim. The inanimate cannot dictate terms to the animate. There is no logic whatever in the argument that "the state" becomes a superentity and individuals mere "units of social efficiency" because man has invented machines to relieve himself of drudgery. The machine merely increases man's physical powers but does not affect the principles of his relationship to other men. Moreover, through the use of machines, employment has increased at a faster rate than the increase of population. Every new invention opens opportunities for human effort and human enjoyment.

Question. But does man not have to make social adjustments because of this multiplied mechanical power?

Answer. Yes. But since mentality resides in the man and not in the machine, man always has made all adjustments necessary. When he has a basic principle to guide him, his adjustments are socially equitable.

Question. What is the answer to the argument that "individualism" belongs only to a young or primitive nation and is unsuited to an older and more developed one?

Answer. The answer is that thinking is a strictly individual enterprise. There is no such thing as mass thinking. Ideas originate with one person's mental effort and are passed on to others. When large numbers accept an idea we call it the "public mind." The origin of the idea may be obscure, but it had a definite source in some one human being's mental processes and became common property by acceptance. Therefore, individualism is the source for ideas. A hypothetical entity, called "the group," or "the state," cannot think.

Question. What does "the state," when used in this sense, mean?

Answer. It means a few extreme individualists who presume to do all the thinking for the masses. Actually it means imposing their own will.

Question. Why has the word "rugged individualism" become a term of opprobrium?

Answer. Because the word "rugged" can be misused to suggest "ruthless." It would be difficult to create distaste for the word "individualism" unless some distasteful qualifying adjective were added. Hence those who wish to tear down the American theory of controlled individual liberty, seized upon the word "rugged" and distorted it into meaning "ruthless." American individualism is rugged, in the correct use of the word, because it is independent, staunch, and self-respecting. Defamation of terms is just as immoral

and frequently more disastrous than defamation of personal character.

Question. What is the answer to the argument that laissez faire has brought economic ruin to this country?

Answer. In the first place this country is not economically ruined, and in the second place we have never been afflicted with laissez faire. The phrase is a French one meaning, in substance, "leaving it alone." American business is and always has been highly regulated. From tariffs through the whole gamut of rate-fixing commissions, banking laws, workmen's compensation, income tax, etc., etc., the laissez faire principle is discarded and has been almost from our beginnings as a nation.

Question. Why is the profit motive called wicked?

Answer. For the same reason that other phrases are used to obscure the true purposes of those who misuse the term to undermine confidence in American institutions. No two people define "profit" alike. There is every kind of profit; mental, moral, and spiritual, as well as financial, and there is no clearly defined line btween them. Every act of our lives—if we are free men and not slaves—is performed with the idea of its being profitable in one form or another.

Question. It the profit motive synonymous with capitalism?

Answer. Yes.

Question. What is capitalism?

Answer. Capitalism is the science of the use of capital.

Question. What is capital?

Answer. Capital is the product resulting from the exercise of four spiritual qualities: initiative, industry, honesty, and self-restraint. In other words, a person thinks of something and decides to do it; that is initiative. He does it; that is industry. He does it properly; that is honesty. He does not consume all that he has produced; that is self-restraint.

Question. To whom does this product belong?

Answer. Morally, it belongs to the person who exercised these spiritual qualities.

Question. What are the incentives for creating capital?

Answer. Necessity and hope of exceptional reward.

Question. Which has operated in this country?

Answer. Both.

Question. Would these incentives exist in a society under a dictatorship?

Answer. The necessity motive would produce a minimum result. Under a dictatorship, false hopes must be held out to take the place of realizable hopes. An artificial enthusiasm for the thing called "the state" must be induced by skillful propaganda. Dictators take the capital away from those who have created it, on the false promise of producing a better society in the future.

Question. Who are the masters under a dictatorship?

Answer. The small group surrounding the dictator.

Question. What is the principal argument made by a would-be dictator in order to get himself elevated to power?

Answer. That wealth is unjustly concentrated in the hands of the few and that he, the dictator, will redistribute it.

Question. Does this deceive people?

Answer. It appeals to unfortunate of bitter people who feel but do not think.

Question. If they thought, what would they realize?

Answer. They would realize that dictatorial political power concentrated in the hands of a few operates against any creation of wealth because it deadens initiative.

Question. Is wealth dangerously concentrated in the hands of a few in America?

Answer. Wealth, meaning capital, must be, in large measure, under control of the competent and the experienced, or there can be no production. But the management of capital is only one aspect of it. The benefits of capital is the other aspect. In America the benefits are more widely diffused than in any nation on earth.

Question. Is it as justly distributed as it should be?

Answer. No. But it is more justly distributed than at any time in the past history of mankind. It is a further tribute to our national conscience that we compare our condition with an ideal State rather than with the conditions out of which mankind has grown. The galley slaves, or the workmen who built the pyramids, would undoubtedly consider the status of even an unemployed American worker one of bliss.

Question. What is there to lend hope that the condition of the workers in America will continue to improve?

Answer. The general trend of economic thought and practice in America and the psychology of the American businessman assures it. In what is called the "old" economics, labor was considered wholly a part of production cost, and therefore to be kept at the lowest possible point. But gradually there grew up in America the understanding that wages is buying power, hence a great home market which had been neglected in the scramble for foreign markets. Therefore, far-sighted employers began to raise wages and cut production costs by skillful management and mass output. Henry Ford led in this new theory of wages as a market to be stimulated.

Question. What are the psychological factors characteristic of American businessmen?

Answer. American businessmen, as a class, are primarily interested in expanding their businesses. They care little about putting capital into nonproductive personal things such as vast quantities of jewels, etc., as do East Indian potentates. American businessmen put the larger part of their surplus back into industrial enterprises which furnish jobs and produce benefits for large numbers of people. Furthermore, great family fortunes are comparatively few in America. The American expression is "From shirt sleeves to shirt sleeves in three generations."

Question. Are there no great family fortunes in America, controlled by a few men?

Answer. Yes, but until all the facts can be ascertained, it is impossible to say how socially detrimental these are. For example: If Henry Ford were to exercise his legal right and close down all of his enterprises overnight, it would be a social catastrophe of the first magnitude. The same is true of most of the large public corporations and industries.

Question. Who owns most of the large industries in America?

Answer. Millions of American citizens. Stockholders outnumber wage earners by a considerable margin.

Question. What does this indicate?

Answer. It indicates that every man a capitalist is the American trend.

Question. Is this trend toward general prosperity and a steadily rising standard of living likely to continue?

Answer. Yes, unless arbitrarily interfered with by politicians.

Question. Why do politicians interfere?

Answer. Because they want power, and to secure power, they must have the votes of people who think the politicians can give them privileges. Hence they appeal to the poor.

Question. Are there more so-called poor than so-called rich?

Answer. Yes. Because most people prefer to be told what to do rather than to take the responsibility and risk of carrying the burden of decision. To become rich honestly, one must exercise not only the qualities of initiative, industry, honesty, and self-restraint, but one must also assume risks which are often extremely burdensome. The rich by inheritance are a small and unstable minority. The "profit system" is really the profit and loss system. More newly launched businesses fail than succeed.

Question. Are most businessmen honest?

Answer. Yes. If they were not, they could not long endure. Dishonesty winds itself up very quickly.

Question. Is business, in general, as honest as it should be?

Answer. No. Probably nobody is as honest as he should be, but business as a whole is as honest as politics as a whole, and to transfer power from business to politics would be to jump from the frying pan into the the fire. There is no such a thing as a foolproof or knave-proof social system.

Question. Is the country as safe under business domination as it would be under more extensive political domination?

Answer. Yes. Probably safer, because politicians too often get into power by the easy route of promises, whereas a business executive arrives at a place of power only through performance. Furthermore, the businessman is staking his own money as well as the investor's money on his judgment.

Question. Do politicians face a profit and loss test?

Answer. It is mostly profit and no loss to the politician while he is in office. He has, too often, risked only the promises he has made. But once in power, he may become despotic if unchecked.

Question. What can break any business depression?

Answer. Restored confidence.

Question. Is that all that is necessary?

Answer. Yes. Humanity has every ingredient but that one for permanent prosperity. We have supply, demand, raw material, technical ability, money for financing—everything that goes into the making of prosperity.

Question. Why do not we (in America) launch it, and prove to the world its immediate feasibility?

Answer. Because the obsession for "reform" has settled over us like a pall and nobody knows what kind of reform will be or should be tried.

Question. Is this desire for reform sincere?

Answer. Some of it is, but a great deal of it is a blind for efforts to destroy the American ideal of human liberty and replace it with the old, autocratic idea. The human lust for power is insatiable. Great concentration of power is possible only under the autocratic theory of government where the rank and file of human beings are treated as unprotesting "social units" without the right to experiment in their own way of life.

Question. Is not a great deal of reform needed?

Answer. Assuredly. But it must begin with the strengthening of individual character. The blanket reforms so unthinkingly proposed neglect that factor. They usually propose to shower benefits upon all alike—upon the undeserving as well as the deserving.

Question. Are most people suffering privation through no fault of their own?

Answer. Nobody can answer that question accurately. Just how much, or how little, anybody is responsible for the condition in which he finds himself omniscience alone knows. It is decidedly dangerous to build up a popular sentiment that every person in distress is an innocent victim of a vicious system, and that the world owes him a living.

Question. Is there a danger of overworking the sentiment, "The system is to blame"?

Answer. Great danger. We weaken the whole national fiber when we lay too many social ills at the door of the system, and absolve the individual from all moral responsibility.

Question. What is the remedy?

Answer. A reawakened public and private conscience and sense of personal responsibility.

Question. Are there signs of this taking place?

Answer. Yes. People are beginning to think. A depression is always, by its nature, a great stimulus in that respect. Those who offer communism or fascism as a solution find it increasingly difficult to make out a case for themselves in view of the examples of how these dictatorships work in practice. Other than dictatorship, there is only constitutionalism. Americans are turning to the study of that with renewed interest.

Question. Is there no middle ground, Christian socialism, for instance?

Answer. No. Christian socialism is diluted communism, having the same ultimate objective—the abolition of private capital and the substitution of control over industry by a small, all-powerful clique.

Question. Why is this dangerous?

Answer. Because the management of human beings is vastly more difficult than the management of inanimate matter. If human beings are reduced to units of social efficiency, which is to say, to animate cogs working alongside the inanimate cogs in the social machine, then uncontested power and authority must be concentrated in the management of them, even the power of life and death.

Question. Can there be such a thing as collectivism as demanded by so-called Christian socialism?

Answer. No. Christianity is based upon individual responsibility and individual accountability, hence individual status is the social unit.

Question. How does the doctrine of "my brother's keeper" apply?

Answer. It applies in recognizing one's fellow creatures as sons of God and according them that status.

Question. How is this recognition given?

Answer. By acknowledging that there are inalienable rights and allowing freedom in exercising them.

Question. Is it in this that men are born free and equal?

Answer. Yes. We are born human beings with the capacity to think. To surrender this right to a dictator or to a so-called system is to surrender one's birthright.

Question. Is America in danger of losing her freedom?

Answer. No. America is waking up to the threats against it, which is all that is necessary. People who have once known freedom do not surrender it.

Question. How should we treat the enemies of our theory of government?

Answer. Americans will show such a united front of loyalty to their form of government that traitors to it will look as foolish as they really are.

Question. Should the subversive elements be put down with violence?

Answer. Not unless they incite violence first. If they do, it is the duty of our forces of law and order to quell them.

Question. What should be the limits to tolerance?

Answer. When facts warrant the conviction that a demand for tolerance is not made in good faith, but is a cloak behind which to hide a purpose to destroy our system—a system which is tolerance itself—in favor of an autocratic system which knows no tolerance, then there is no virtue in allowing one's self to be deceived. Tolerance is no virtue where human liberty is at stake.

Question. When humanity has rid itself of the menace of human dictatorship what may we expect as the next step?

Answer. A greatly accelerated prosperity and enhanced social justice. Poverty is unnecessary and will be abolished, but not by any short cut or concentrated power in the hands of a few despots.

Question. Is abolishing poverty the supreme object of society?

Answer. No. That is but one step. After it has been accomplished the most serious problem remains to be faced.

Question. What is that?

Answer. The establishing of man's true relationship to his Creator; in other words, the understanding of what is ultimately true and right, which alone can bring satisfaction.

Question. Will America succeed?

Answer. It must, because America was founded upon the motto, In God We Trust.

Mother's Day, 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to address the twenty-fourth annual Mother's Day ceremonies sponsored by the American War Mothers at Arlington National Cemetery, Sunday, May 9. My address is as follows:

Madam Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great honor to participate in the 24th annual Mothers Day ceremonies sponsored by such a fine organization as the American War Mothers, which symbolizes the true spirit of American motherhood.

As we assemble here in the ampitheatre of this beautiful city of the dead, and in the shadows of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, the surroundings create a spirit of reverence, in keeping with the solemnity of this occasion. Yes, it is a fitting place, to pay tribute to the mothers of America, many of whom have given their own flesh and blood on the altar of patriotism, so that American ideals may endure from generation to generation.

The word "mother" is one of the most beautiful and inspiring words in the languages of mankind. It is a word that stirs tender emotions among those of us who are blessed with having our mothers still with us; while to those who mourn her passing the name "mother" floods the soul with sweet memories.

We cannot utter the cherished word of "mother" without recalling the joys and sorrows of life from the time we lisped the tender prayers of childhood until we had reached manhood or womanhood. If along life's highway we were blessed with our mother's counsel and guidance, we realize the great loss sustained by those who were deprived of their mother early in life, and who were forced to face the trials and tribulations of this vale of tears without the wholesome influence of a mother's love.

For centuries the mothers of the world have been immortalized in poetry and song. But until 34 years ago a national holiday was not observed. It was during the Administration of President Woodrow Wilson that the Congress of the United States proclaimed that the second Sunday in May shall be the occasion for an annual tribute to mothers.

So today on May 9 we pause in the hectic struggle of world and personal affairs to eulogize a mother's love—an influence far stronger for right living than all the world's philosophies, diplomacy and wars.

In 1914, when President Wilson affixed his signature to the joint resolution establishing Mother's Day, he did so as war clouds hovered over Europe. Since that time our country has been involved in two great world wars. Millions lost their lives, including thousands of the flower of American manhood. The resources of our country were tapped. New ideologies were born and have challenged the cherished possessions of all Americans.

As we look around us today, no one will deny that, as we observe the thirty-fourth anniversary of Mother's Day, we are living in a confused world. On the horizon one may see a gathering of war clouds that may lead America and the world into another global conflict too destructive to contemplate.

Today the world is divided into two spheres of influence with different concepts of freedom. One sphere of influence, dominated by Soviet Russia, decrees that the State is supreme and that man must be a tool of the Government. On the other hand, the United States represents the other sphere of influence, which upholds the rights of the individual and insists upon the preservation of the human dignity of mankind.

Such opposing philosophies were bound to clash and the conflict between them has been aided by the statement of Premier Stalin that capitalism and communism cannot live in the same world. Is this not a direct challenge to the American way of life and to all its cherished ideals? To those who would criticize America for not compromising or appeasing Russia, I ask, how can you make peace with a nation whose ambition is to communize the world?

Are we to turn our backs on Stalin's fifth column that has invaded the nations of the world, including our own? Are we to sit idly by and watch the iron curtain imprison all of Europe? Are we going to watch the Soviet Union devour much of the Asiatic Continent and extend its influence with devastating effect on friendly neighbors in the Western Hemisphere?

Are we going to permit Russia to expand her military might, to strengthen her fifth column, and to poison the minds of the peoples of the world against us with propaganda that threatens universal peace.

If I know the American people and the mothers of this Nation, the answer is emphatically, "No."

We Americans have proved ourselves advocates of peace by our participation in two costly world wars. If we have been misunderstood in our dealings with Moscow, let Premier Stalin accept the invitation of President Truman when he said, "The door is always open." America's chair has always been occupied at the peace table. I wish it were possible to say the same thing about the Soviet Union.

In meeting this challenge of communism, Americans everywhere reaffirm their undying love for their country. We rededicate ourselves to the American way of life and its manifold blessings which comprise life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

America has been great in the past, we are great today and, with the help of Almighty God, we shall be greater tomorrow. This greatness has brought with it a corresponding degree of responsibility as individuals and as a Nation.

The moral strength of a nation depends upon the caliber of its citizens. In this connection, home influence plays a conspicuous part in molding future citizens. Here is where American motherhood plays a stellar role.

From the founding of this Nation America's mothers have been the stabilizing influence that has guided the leaders of our country. The greater the personage the more eager he has been in acknowledging the debt he owned to his mother. We all recall President Lincoln's noble sentiments—"All that I am or hope to be I owe to my angel mother."

Yes, the great American home has produced numerous other Lincolns, whose characters were molded by saintly mothers through a spirit of self-sacrifice that is an inspiration and a blessing.

We shall need more Lincolns to lead America in the days to come and it is refreshing to know that American mothers will be found equal to the task of promoting sound American homes.

It is true that there is some evidence of carelessness, indifference, and apathy in American home life. We also have our problems with juvenile delinquency. But these conditions are the result of a failure to heed the cardinal principles instilled in home training—faith, loyalty, and obedience to the laws of God and society.

In recognizing the flaws in family life, we cannot escape the fact that, by their existence, family unity is weakened and the opportunity is offered to our enemies to attack the very pillars of our Government—the American home.

As we pay tribute today to the mothers of America, let us all unite in a determination to safeguard the American home that it may continue its influence in the building of a greater America. Let us convey to the nations of the world that we are a united people, who love our form of government and who seek nothing else than a burning desire to dwell in peace with all nations.

In conclusion, I can think of no better tribute to the mothers of America than to commend them to Almighty God in the beautiful prayer of John Frederick Fedders:

"May the Lord bless and keep our mothers—the sculptors who chisel the characters of the children. May His face shine upon the artists of the race whose ministries color the character of every community. May the Grace of the Lord and His abiding peace be with our mothers, whose music in lullaby and litany reveals to all—the hidden soul of harmony."

United States of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial and articles from the Washington Post and the Washington Evening Star:

[From the Washington Post of May 11, 1948]

THE NEW CHURCHILL

Metternich felt that peace could be insured only by the recognition across frontiers of a unifying idea. His idea was legitimacy. If peoples, he said, agreed on the return of legitimate governments, then the panic left by the Napoleonic wars would disappear. Mr. Churchill is actuated by the same approach in the present peace making. Different occasions, different ideas; Mr. Churchill's unifying idea is—unity itself. His is now the voice that is making federation the stuff of European politics. To be sure, a wide gulf is fixed between idea and realization, but this idea is equipped with hands and feet because of the circumstances of its birth.

The first augury of success of the movement to federate Europe is the intrinsic merit of the idea. Neighborhood is the word of the twentieth century. It is forced upon the people of this earth by the physical facts of their new environment. It is now possible to dispatch a message around the earth in a few seconds and to travel around it in less than 4 days. In this new environment flat maps have become archaic, national sovereignty an anachronism, and the strategy of American security a global business. Related to the merit inherent in the idea of a federated Europe is its timeliness. Lecky says that no matter how merit worthy an idea may be, there must be a predisposition in society to receive it. The common man is ready—of that we are convinced. To their slowpoke governments the peoples of Europe long ago gave a mandate not to talk about the difficulties of federating Europe but to resolve them.

The final augury of success for a federated Europe is the leadership that is now forthcoming. Mr. Churchill has become our No. 1 world citizen. He will not live long enough, perhaps, to be the statesman of federated Europe. His role is rather that of prophet. None could better fill it. Mr. Churchill inspires the boldness and imagination without which men would remain chained to their own pedestrianism. He furnishes exhilaration to the common life of free men everywhere. Yet he knows the difficulties of working out his conception: I am a European. How to conquer them? Surely in his way, which is to think in terms of the European civilization. He appreciates the talonlike grip of national sovereignty. The way to undo the attachment, he says, is to talk not of relinquishment but to enlarge the grip—to think of that larger sovereignty which can alone protect the nations' diverse and distinctive customs and characteristics and their national traditions.

Men move toward their destiny under the impetus of danger. The danger that is spurring unity in Europe is, of course, the threat of communism. The way to react to it is the Churchill way. For if danger excites fear, the danger will triumph. If, however, it promotes challenge, the danger is doomed. There is a dynamic about communism that can be overcome only by a greater dynamic. A bad idea can be conquered only by a better one. As we know in Presidential campaigns, antis do not win victories. That is why the new movement in Europe is so much to be welcomed and encouraged. For the weakness of Europe, no less than the aggression of Moscow is driving this country inexorably into a military state.

[From the Washington Post of May 11, 1948]

THE UNITY OF EUROPE

(By Walter Lippmann)

"But our aim here," said Mr. Churchill to the Congress of Europe, "is not confined to western Europe. We seek nothing less than all Europe."

Is this a dream? Or is it an aim which responsible governments in Europe can take seriously, and which this country can support?

If we think of the unification of Europe in terms of a federal union comparable with our own in its integration and centralization of authority, we cannot, I think, in any near future expect to see it achieved. Even the Benelux nations have not yet in fact resolved the disparities of their currencies and their prices and terms of trade. The British dilemma, as between their role in Europe and their interests in the Commonwealth and Empire, is not in sight of being resolved. The sense of a common European destiny is indeed thin and abstract as between the progressive countries of northern Europe, the Scandinavians, the Dutch and the Belgians on the one hand and on the other the countries of the Balkan and Iberian peninsulas.

Nevertheless, once every allowance has been made for the divisions, there is almost certainly a deep and growing feeling all over the continent that somehow all of Europe has a common interest in becoming an independent great power in the world. It is to this feeling that Mr. Churchill, with his genius for discerning the reality of things, addressed himself. It is the feeling, of course, that the domination of Europe, or of any large part of it, by Russia is in the end intolerable; that it would be intolerable even if Russia were not Communist, even if Russia were not a police state.

Though it is impossible to prove it, I think it is true that in eastern Europe—I am thinking particularly of Poland and Czechoslovakia—the greatest and strongest and most genuine sentiment is not pro-communism or anti-communism but nationalism, rooted in religion and in history, which causes almost all Poles and Czechs to identify their patriotism with membership in the community of Europe. The issue is deeper than whether industries shall be nationalized or the land redistributed, far deeper than whether they shall remain within the Russian diplomatic orbit. It is whether the regime of their lives shall conform with what they are and have been throughout their history—nations belonging to European civilization and not to an alien civilization which has had its center in Byzantium, St. Petersburg, and Moscow.

But it is not only this feeling that Russia is an intruder in Europe which possesses the nations of Europe. In a different way they feel also that their dependence upon America for sustenance, rehabilitation, and protection is, however necessary today, in the long run intolerable. If they cannot be slaves to Russian despotism neither can they be the clients of the American Republic. We must welcome that feeling, which is general in Europe, and most emphatic among those Europeans with whom we are most closely associated. If this feeling did not exist, the best hope of the European recovery program would be doomed to frustration.

The unifying sentiment of the Europeans is not socialism or anticommunism but the will to be masters in their own continent, to be independent again, and to be not the stakes of Soviet-American diplomacy—but to be a power in their own right in order to decide the fate of Europe and the destiny of the world. This sentiment, which springs from their dignity and the remembrance of their historic greatness, is fortified today by the fear that if they do not intervene in the diplomatic struggle, their continent will become a battlefield on which non-European powers fight a ruinous war.

If this is indeed the sentiment in Europe what is the chief difficulty about arousing it to action? It is the memory of Hitler's intent to unify Europe under Nazi domination. The great task of the Congress of Europe, and of its leaders like Mr. Churchill, is to prove that Germany can be taken into the European community. They have to prove that to the Poles and the Czechs and also to the west Europeans.

"United Europe," said Mr. Churchill, "provides the only solution" of the German question—how to restore the life of Germany safely for the rest of Europe. Mr. Churchill did not on this occasion specify how this was to be done. But on other occasions he has. The solution of the German question is the admission of the German states, loosely confederated but not under a unified central government, into the larger federation of Europe.

If this view is not accepted by the British Government and the American, if they persist in their present course which is taking them toward a unified and centralized Germany, this European movement for unity will founder on the cardinal error of Anglo-American policy in Germany. No peaceable settlement of the German and, therefore, of the European problem is conceivable if Anglo-American policy in Germany connives at the revival of a nationalist German state.

So if we are really in earnest in our support of the United States of Europe, we shall

have to take concrete measures to reorient the Pentagon and the Foreign Office and many of the bureaus of the State Department on their policy toward Germany.

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 10, 1948]

EUROPEAN CONGRESS UNANIMOUSLY VOTES TO FORM FEDERATION

THE HAGUE, THE NETHERLANDS, May 10.—Delegates to the unofficial Congress of Europe unanimously adopted today a resolution looking toward a federation of nations on the Continent.

The time has come when the European national must transfer and merge some portion of their sovereign rights to permit formation of a European federation, the resolution said.

Winston Churchill, a leader of the congress, declared in an address in Amsterdam last night a united Europe would revive the old glory of the Continent. Walter N. Maguire, a Stamford (Conn.) lawyer attending as an observer, told the congress the United States wants a strong and united Europe as our powerful and resourceful partner.

Some 28 nations were represented in the vote of the congress, which is being held without governmental sponsorship. These included the 16 Marshall plan countries, western Germany and exiled leaders from Spain, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria.

The delegates said the union should be open to all European nations democratically governed and which undertake to respect a charter of human rights.

The congress is to finish preliminary organization tonight. Some 600 delegates from 22 countries have been meeting since Friday.

Yesterday the congress unanimously approved a cultural committee resolution to set up a permanent European cultural organization.

The Political Committee voted down a proposal of former French Premier Paul Reynaud to call western European elections of a consultative continental assembly by the year's end.

Two other Frenchmen had praised the plan as something positive, but R. W. G. Mackay, of Britain, had contended the various parliaments could not authorize elections within 6 months, and held the parliaments themselves should appoint assembly delegates.

Mr. Mackay, urging caution, said Mr. Reynaud was "trying to make a fool of the congress," and called his plan rubbish.

Mr. Churchill called for a transformation of the Western World and a united Europe "in which men will be proud to say, 'I am a European,' where men of every country will think as much of being a European as of being a citizen of their own country."

URGES END OF RIVALRIES

He urged cessation of national rivalries, praised the United States' great services to mankind, and called for a stand against any kind of totalitarian tyranny.

Dr. Henk Brugmans, head of the Dutch Federalist Movement, told the crowd, "what we need is a federation like Switzerland and the United States."

In Toulouse, France, the French Popular Republican Movement, party of Premier Robert Schuman, ended its national congress by passing a resolution in favor of progressive building of a federated Europe. It sent salutations to the Hague Congress.

The party said the federation should not be based on antisovietism, because that would endanger peace, but declared also that continental reconstruction should be speeded to "prevent domination by the Cominform." It said Germany could be reestablished only as a member of a federation.

Foreign Trade Zones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER R. JONES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include portions of a statement made by me before the House Ways and Means Committee with reference to an amendment of the Foreign Trade Zones Act H. R. 6160, under consideration by that committee, and a statement on the same subject made by a representative of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce:

STATEMENT OF HON. HOMER R. JONES, OF WASHINGTON, ON H. R. 6159 AND H. R. 6160, BILLS SEEKING TO AMEND THE FOREIGN-TRADE ZONES ACT

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am happy to appear in support of this legislation, particularly in view of the fact that the city of Seattle which I represent in the Congress, as well as the State of Washington is tremendously interested in the establishing of a foreign trade zone on Puget Sound, and in these measures because of their favorable effect on the future of such zones throughout the United States. We believe enactment of these bills will serve the best interests of the Nation, and enhance international good will and trade while at the same time promoting the economy of our own country. Puget Sound traders and business have been actively and vitally interested in a foreign trade zone for Puget Sound for several years. I should like to include at this point as part of my statement portions of an article which indicates the interest of our area in foreign trade zones, appearing in the January 1948 issue of Pacific Northwest Industry, a monthly journal of progress in business, economics, and industry published by the University of Washington, entitled "A Foreign Trade Zone for Puget Sound."

"A FOREIGN-TRADE ZONE FOR PUGET SOUND

"What are foreign-trade zones? Foreign-trade zones are customs-guarded areas into which any goods which may legally enter the United States—whether foreign or domestic, free or dutiable—may without customs or other Government agency intervention, bond, or expense be stored indefinitely, cleaned, graded, repacked, reconditioned, or otherwise manipulated, and sold, but may not be manufactured or exhibited. Zones and their European free port counterpart thrive in high-tariff nations; there they provide relief to importers and merchandise from certain customs, Pure Food and Drug, Internal Revenue, and other governmental agency controls without reducing in the slightest degree the public protection provided by those agencies. Goods in a zone may be reexported usually without customs formalities or entered into the United States on compliance with existing Federal laws and regulations. Zones are public utilities operating by permission of and under the jurisdiction of the Federal Foreign-Trade Zones Board, zone rates and charges are subject to the approval of the Board. Two zones have been opened in the United States; one at Mobile, Ala., closed after about 6 months, and one at New York, which has been in operation for 9 years. Free ports in Europe have operated for about 70 years. Manufacturing in them is unimportant (Copenhagen and Hamburg are exceptions), and their effect on the transshipment and consignment trade, merchant marine and shipping, and foreign trade apparently is not outstanding except in certain instances.

"Attitude of trade organizations toward zones: The following important associations in the international trade and allied fields have expressed approval of zones: American Association of Port Authorities, National Council of American Importers, National Foreign Trade Council, Inc., United States Department of Commerce, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Commerce and Industry Association of New York, International Business Conference, New York Foreign-Trade Zone Operators, Inc., Pacific Northwest Trade Association, and the Seattle Chamber of Commerce. Only the American Warehousemen's Association and some of its State members, including the Washington State Warehousemen's Association, are known to be opposed to zones; they favor extension of zone advantages to customs-bonded warehouses.

"Advantages of zones over customs-bonded public warehouses: Zones have advantages over customs-bonded public warehouses in the storing and manipulating of imported dutiable goods, but customs-bonded warehouses have no advantages over zones. Zones may store both free and dutiable goods, bonded warehouses may not store free goods; no bond is required for goods stored in a zone, but a bond equal to double the amount of duty is required of goods in a bonded warehouse. Goods entering the customs area from the zone pay duty on their amount, condition, and classification at that time; goods entering a bonded warehouse pay duty on their amount, condition, and classification at that time rather than at the time of entry into the customs area. Goods may enter and be re-exported from zones without customs interference; customs officials control the entry into and the removal of goods from customs-bonded warehouses. Manipulation of goods in a zone involves no customs expense; in a warehouse the owner of goods undergoing manipulation must pay for the customs supervision. Goods may be stored in a zone indefinitely, but in a warehouse only 3 years. Domestic and foreign merchandise may be combined in a zone, but not in a bonded warehouse; only entire original packages may be taken into customs area from a warehouse, but original packages may be broken into smaller lots and entered from a zone. Goods while in a zone are free from food and drug, customs, excise, agricultural, and other governmental agency regulations; goods in a bonded warehouse are subject to all such restrictions. Those are some but not all of the advantages of a zone over a customs-bonded warehouse.

"Each point listed above in favor of the zone constitutes an advantage to importers. Exporters are benefited by being free to combine domestic and foreign dutiable goods in a zone for export with no customs interference or expense. Foreign exporters will find the zone a haven in a high-tariff nation where they may stock pile dutiable goods without customs interference and with no expense other than normal storage and insurance costs; to them the zone provides maximum flexibility with minimum restrictions and costs. Shipping will be benefited inasmuch as loading and unloading may be done at any time. Finally, other advantages may accrue from a zone; favorable publicity, competitive zones would not siphon off the area's trade, attract shipping, and benefit business. Some businessmen in the Puget Sound area contend that these other advantages alone constitute sufficient justification for the establishment of a zone there.

"Zone experience in the United States: Zone experience in the United States is limited to the New York and the Mobile operations. The Mobile zone can hardly be considered an operation; it was open about 6 months but always under a political cloud.

"Attitude of Puget Sound businessmen: Most businessmen agreed that a zone on Puget Sound would be a desirable facility. Only the warehousemen are strongly opposed to the creation of a zone in this area; a few other businessmen believe that a zone would do little good (unless another coast city establishes a zone) but no harm; and a few proponents insist that the area should have a zone whether or not it can be self-supporting.

"It was generally agreed that the State would benefit from a zone, therefore the State should underwrite it during its formative period. General agreement also prevailed on these points: That if a zone is established by another coast city, Puget Sound must have one to protect its trade against diversion; that the port of Seattle should be the sponsoring organization if a zone is established on Puget Sound; that a zone in the area would provide substantial benefits, and that neither the tonnage a zone would get, all of the uses it would be put to, nor all of its value could be foretold.

"Zone location on Puget Sound: Seattle is the only Washington port which receives an appreciable volume of general merchandise of the type which might use a zone. Except for Tacoma, with a nominal amount, other Washington ports received almost no such goods. In 1935 and in 1936 Seattle received about 350,000 tons of goods, of which 60,000 to 90,000 tons were estimated to be dutiable. Total dutiable goods entered in or passing through Seattle in bond are estimated at 150,000 tons annually. It is from that type of tonnage that a zone on Puget Sound might logically expect most of its business. Total imports into Seattle—and Puget Sound—should increase as the foreign trade of the United States increases; a 30-percent increase for both would seem nominal. Reexports have been insignificant from the Washington customs district, and while a zone may stimulate them somewhat, it cannot expect to sustain itself chiefly from such business.

"Attitude of three Washington organizations: The Seattle Chamber of Commerce, three transcontinental railroads acting together, and the Washington State Warehousemen's Association openly opposed the creation of a zone in Seattle a decade ago. Today the Seattle Chamber of Commerce favors a zone, provided that research indicates its economic feasibility; the railroads are open-minded and willing to consider any definite proposal which may be forthcoming; and the Warehousemen's Association remains stanchly opposed to a zone in Seattle.

"Significant pending Federal legislation: The Celler amendment to the Celler Act would permit manufacturing and exhibiting, both now prohibited in zones. Passage of the amendment probably would not result in much manufacturing in zones because it could be engaged in profitably only if most materials used in the process come from, and the completed product is sent to, foreign nations. It would abolish the present need for distinguishing between manipulation (legal) and manufacturing (illegal), and it would encourage zones to become permanent showrooms for the world's goods."

The Seattle Chamber of Commerce, in a statement to this committee, will further indicate our specific interest in the proposed amendments to the Zone Act, and urge passage for several reasons, all of which I want to assure the committee is the best judgment of the traders and businessmen of my district on this important legislation. The Seattle chamber's statement deals specifically with our attitudes with regard to manufacturing and exhibition as provided in the Celler and Buck amendments. Enactment of either amendment would, in our opinion, increase the value of the foreign trade zone as a trading institution and permit full utilization of those specific, permissible functions which constitute the basis for the expectation that zones will expedite and encourage foreign commerce, stimulate our country's imports and exports, which, in turn, would stimulate our domestic business and benefit our entire economy.

STATEMENT BY THE FOREIGN-TRADE ZONE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE WORLD TRADE COMMITTEE, SEATTLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Puget Sound traders and allied businessmen have been actively and vitally interested in a foreign-trade zone for Puget Sound for the past 4 years. It is expected that their interest, activity, and effort will be rewarded shortly by a formal application to the Foreign-Trade Zones Board for a charter for a zone on Puget Sound. Therefore, the business elements of this area will be affected by—and are deeply concerned with—any legislation which seeks to modify the present Foreign-Trade Zones Act as passed on June 18, 1934. They are, moreover, appreciative of the opportunity to express their views on H. R. 6159 and H. R. 6160, which, in effect, seek to permit manufacturing and exhibition in foreign-trade zones.

URGE ADOPTION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

For reasons which are concisely set forth below, it is believed that the best interests of our Nation will be served by the passage of either of these amendments. Therefore, we strongly urge the Congress of the United States to make one of the amendments the law of the land. Such action will, in our judgment, promote the economy of the Nation and enhance international good will and trade.

It is emphasized that this action by Puget Sound businessmen in endorsing the proposed amendments to the Zone Act is neither new nor hastily conceived. The minutes of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce will verify the fact that manufacturing and exhibition were considered so essential to the successful operation of a zone on Puget Sound that the Seattle Chamber of Commerce conditioned its initial endorsement of a zone for this area on the passage of the then pending Celler amendment. That action was taken on September 4, 1945. Because of the conviction that such an amendment would soon be passed, the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, on November 4, 1947, endorsed a zone for this area without qualification.

AMENDMENTS WILL BE BENEFICIAL

Adoption of the amendments under consideration is urged because the full benefits of the Foreign Trade Zones Act of 1934 can be realized only with the removal of the present legislative prohibitions against manufacturing and exhibition in zones. In our studied opinion, passage of the proposed amendments would result in harm to no group or institution; only benefits would accrue.

Legalizing manufacturing and exhibition in foreign-trade zones will make zones more useful to more products and to more businessmen. It will result in an increase in American imports which, by providing more dollars to foreign nations, will increase American exports. Increased exports will result in increased production at home, or firmer prices, or both. More production and firmer prices will result in benefits to many elements in our economy. Thus passage of either of the proposed amendments will initiate a chain of desirable economic events which will enhance the prosperity of practically every segment of our economic life.

THE CASE FOR MANUFACTURING

Experience has indicated that clear-cut distinction never can be established between manufacturing and manipulation; yet distinctions are required under the present law. It follows that such distinctions will always be wanting. Recent instances in which the Foreign Trade Zones Board has reversed the Commissioner of Customs in the latter's interpretation of what processes constitute manufacturing emphasize the problem. Nor is the present system satisfactory by reason of the fact that it reserves the right of appeal from customs decisions; such negative procedure breeds delay and expense and discourages entry of goods into zones. To determine whether or not a particular process is manufacturing or manipulation requires that goods be taken into a zone, that permission to manipulate then be requested and, if the request is rejected by the Commissioner of Customs, that such rejection be appealed to the Foreign Trade Zones Board. That is, indeed, a tortuous process. Passage of either of the proposed amendments would eliminate that expensive, tedious, uncertain procedure and would thereby encourage more generous utilization of the zone's facilities to the advantage of all parties concerned and to the detriment of none.

The preamble of the Foreign Trade Zones Act says the act is "to expedite and encourage foreign commerce * * *" It is apparent from the act which enumerates nine specific permissible functions in zones that it was the intention of Congress to stimulate foreign commerce by permitting and encouraging the performance of those functions in an area entirely free of customs and other Federal regulatory bodies' control or interference. It is equally obvious that the extent to which merchandise in zones will be broken up, repacked, assembled, distributed, sorted, graded, cleaned, mixed with foreign or domestic merchandise depends substantially upon the freedom given to owners of merchandise to utilize to the fullest those permissible functions. Maximum utilization is possible only by removal of the present restriction against manufacturing. The history of the Commissioner of Customs' narrow interpretation of "manipulation" is ample evidence that this restrictive process alone has effectively negated the basic, broad purpose of the Foreign Trade Zones Act by placing severe limitations on the very functions which were intended to be a major constructive feature of foreign-trade zones. Enactment into law of H. R. 6159 or H. R. 6160 would provide opportunity for maximum utilization of those permissible functions specifically enumerated in the basic act. This liberalizing influence would be wholly beneficial.

It is believed that full-fledged manufacturing probably will not assume major proportions in zones in the United States. In most instances, major manufacturing—as contrasted with manipulation—in zones would be profitable only if dutiable raw materials were entered into a zone, manufactured, and then reshipped to foreign nations. Generally the rates of customs duty on manufactured products are considerably higher than the rates of the raw materials from which such goods are processed. For such finished items—even if the raw materials should be stored in a zone—it would be more economical to manufacture them in customs territory rather than in a zone.

Confirmation of this point of view is had from the experiences of free ports of Europe prior to 1929. In those ports in which manufacturing was permitted, very little manufacturing was done.

THE CASE FOR EXHIBITION

Because foreign trade zones are outside of the tariff limits of the United States, it appears to be wholly inconsistent to prohibit exhibitions therein. On the other hand, zones are ideal institutions for exhibits of foreign goods by reason of their special characteristics: No duty, bond, or internal revenue tax may be put on such goods; no time limit and no quota, pure food or drug, or marking restrictions apply to such goods.

Exhibition of merchandise in zones offers important benefits with no known disad-

vantages. Merchandise marts and trade exhibits are recognized as effective media for stimulating sales of domestic goods; they can be equally effective promotional methods for foreign goods. The provisions of the two amendments here under consideration will make possible permanent international exhibits of foreign goods in foreign-trade zones. Such exhibits logically would increase imports—and therefore exports—and could save buying trips abroad by domestic buyers. Exhibited goods could be sampled, purchased, stored, and manipulated or manufactured in the zone. Businessmen frequently would go to a zone to see comprehensive exhibitions of foreign goods when they would not go abroad to see the same items. Likewise they will buy more readily goods which they have examined in a zone rather than those which they must buy by description.

CONCLUSIONS

Passage of either H. R. 6159 or H. R. 6160 would increase the value of the foreign-trade zone as a trading institution; it would permit full utilization of those specific, enumerated permissible functions, which constitute the basis for the expectation that zones will "expedite and encourage foreign commerce." Enactment of either amendment into law should stimulate our imports and our exports which in turn should stimulate domestic business. The entire economy should benefit therefrom. It is believed that no disadvantages will accrue from passage of such legislation and that no interests will be injured.

Therefore the Congress of the United States is respectfully urged to take prompt and affirmative action on either H. R. 6159 or H. R. 6160.

The recommendation approved by the board of trustees of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce on November 4, 1947, follows: "That the Seattle Chamber of Commerce give its unqualified endorsement to the earliest possible establishment of a foreign-trade zone on Puget Sound and that the chamber call on all public-spirited citizens and organizations throughout the State of Washington to give their wholehearted support to this project."

SUPPORTING ARGUMENT

1. At its September 4, 1945, meeting, the board of trustees adopted a resolution endorsing the establishment of a foreign-trade zone at the port of Seattle, conditioned on a careful study of its feasibility and the passage of the Celler bill (H. R. 3382) which was designed to permit manufacturing, exhibition, and sampling of dutiable imported foreign merchandise within a zone area.

2. Such a survey was made by Prof. Charles J. Miller, and was published jointly by the Washington State Department of Conservation and Development and the port of Seattle. While it is strictly a factual study and makes no recommendations, the facts set forth therein demonstrate the advantages to be gained from the establishment of a foreign-trade zone on Puget Sound.

Funds for Holston and Watauga Dams Approved—Assures Progress in Upper East Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, while it is regrettable that the Appropriations Committee of the House did not include funds for the steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., we are thankful that money was included in the appropriation for continued construction of Holston and Watauga Dams in upper East Tennessee. Wautauga Dam is well under way and the South Holston Dam site has been prepared and construction is ready to begin. Recently, I had the opportunity of visiting both of the projects. Building of these dams will add considerable electrical energy to the system, will be very beneficial in the flood-control program and will add much to the progress of this splendid section of Tennessee. The recreational advantages of this section will be given a great impetus after the construction of these dams. I am glad that Congress has determined that their construction shall continue as rapidly as possible.

The Trade Agreements Program and the National Grange—Statement of Albert S. Goss, National Master

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that the National Grange, a fraternal organization of American citizens who are engaged in agricultural pursuits, favors the extension of the Trade Agreements Act, but only for a 1-year period and with a proviso requiring congressional approval of any trade agreements that may be negotiated under its terms.

In order that the membership of this body may be informed in respect to the precise recommendations of the National Grange, I offer, for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a statement which was recently delivered before a subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee by its national master, Mr. Albert S. Goss, of Washington, D. C.

The Albert S. Goss statement to which I have just referred, Mr. Speaker, is the following:

TESTIMONY OF ALBERT S. GOSS, MASTER, THE NATIONAL GRANGE, ON RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS, MAY 4, 1948

1. America needs a tariff policy. It should be based on sound economic principles and its administration should be such that changing economic conditions would automatically be reflected in changed rates, with due regard for the necessity of sufficient assurance of continuity to permit the consummation of transactions covering a reasonable term of performance.

2. It cannot be said that we have a tariff policy. The nearest we come to it is a provision in the Trade Agreements Act of June 12, 1934, that the President may modify tariff rates whenever he finds "that any existing duties or other import restrictions * * * are unduly burdening or restricting the foreign trade of the United States." In practice this results in promoting foreign trade without regard to its effect on our domestic economy. There seems to be a widespread feeling that trade invariably creates wealth and promotes prosperity. Trade of itself does not create new wealth although prosperity can be promoted provided we trade the items we can produce to the best advantage for products which can be produced to best avantage elsewhere. Similarly prosperity can be retarded if we trade for things we do not need or so trade that we retard the production of wealth, or injure our producers. In such circumstances no one benefits but the middleman who profits at the expense of our total economy. There is nothing gained by trade unless it accomplishes some definite beneficial purpose other than enriching the middleman. We need a tariff policy defining such purpose.

3. Our latest tariff act, known as the Smoot-Hawley Act, was passed in 1930. Like its predecessors it was hammered out in committees and on the floor of the Congress after long study of differences in production costs between home and abroad, modified to a greater or less degree by pressures from special interests, by trades, by bargaining, and by political pressures. When enacted it was not a policy, but a schedule of rates. No committee, with all the burdens the members have to carry, can make the detailed studies necessary to apply sound tariff principles to the thousands upon thousands of individual items which make up our tariff structure. Tariff making has proved to be such a long difficult process that tariff legislation is the dread of both majority and minority parties, and needed tariff changes have often been long deferred for fear of opening the whole question up for changes of such a far-reaching nature that a wholesale revision might result.

4. It is true that legislation has been enacted permitting a 50-percent modification in tariff rates, up or down, plus another 50 percent in some cases, but since no guiding principles have been established by the Congress, it is not surprising that an administrator who happened to favor free trade should manage to make all the changes on the down side, just as an administrator who happened to favor high tariff rates would likely put the rates all up again. That is not a tariff policy.

5. Under our Constitution the responsibility for determining our tariff policies rests with the Congress, but under the practice which has developed, the Congress has practically abdicated, and reciprocal trade treaties are consummated on terms differing widely from those established or intended by the Congress with little or no regard for rising production costs or changing economic conditions. When the decisions on tariff adjustments are determined by a department whose principal functions are primarily to promote foreign relations, it is inevitable that domestic problems will not get the same consideration as would be given either by the Congress or a commission charged with carrying out a definite tariff policy.

6. Now the Congress is asked to continue the present "policyless" program for another 3 years. We are opposed to the proposal. We believe the time has come to adopt a sound tariff policy and to take adequate steps to see that it is administered as the Congress intends. We believe the Congress can adopt such a sound proposal now as well as a year or 3 years from now. If, however, this should prove impossible in the short time remaining, we would oppose renewing the present law in its present form for even 1 year. In such circumstances we would recommend:

7. (A) A provision that no reciprocal trade agreement should become effective until it either had the approval of the Congress or had lain before the Congress for 30 or 60 days when the Congress was in session, and had not been disapproved in whole or in part by majority vote.

8. (B) The renewal of the act, amended as suggested above, for not more than 1 year, to give time to develop a sound tariff policy.

9. We would prefer to see the act expire than to to see it renewed in its present form.

In its present form it has worked to the disadvantage of the farmer, possibly because so many countries have little or nothing to export to us except agricultural products. If we apply the 1945 reduced rates to the 1939 dutiable imports, our last prewar years, 65 percent of all the cuts figured on value, were on farm products. The average reduction was about 45 percent—almost as much as the permissible limit. The Geneva conference has extended these still further. We do not believe that Congress intended that the farmer should bear such an undue share of the burden.

10. What we would really like to see would be the enactment of legislation providing:

11. A clean-cut tariff policy to serve as a guide (1) in modifying general tariff rates from time to time, and (2) in consummating reciprocal trade agreements.

12. A tariff commission clothed with the authority and duty to:

(1) Maintain a constant study of domestic and foreign production costs and production conditions.

(2) Make recommendations to the President and the Congress for modifying existing tariff rates, such modification to conform to the tariff policy established by the Congress, with due regard for ample notice of change. If constitutional we would even prefer that the Commission itself establish the tariff rates subject to the approval of the Congress after 30 or 60 days' opportunity for scrutiny as provided in paragraph 13 below.

(3) Make recommendations to the Congress for approval or disapproval of every reciprocal trade agreement proposal, as provided in paragraph 13 below, accompanying such recommendation with an analysis of its terms and of its conformity to the policy established by the Congress.

(4) Make recommendations to the Congress from time to time for the exclusion of existing items, or the addition of new items with proposed rates thereon.

13. That all tariff rates promulgated by the President or by the Federal Tariff Commission, and all proposed reciprocal trade agreements should be referred to the Congress before which the proposal should lie for 30 or 60 days unless sooner approved or rejected in whole or in part, and if no action is taken by majority vote, at the expiration of such period the proposed change would become part of our national tariff schedule.

14. That the action of the Commission with regard to establishing tariff rates should be confined to items covered in present law, or items specifically approved by the Congress, except that the Tariff Commission would be expected to make recommendations as outlined above.

15. Granting the President power for a 2-year term to enter into trade agreements with other nations, of not longer than 3 years duration, with the 6 months' notice clause as now provided, when the terms of such agreements have been approved by the Tariff Commission as conforming to the tariff policy established by the Congress, and when such trade agreement has either been approved by the Congress or has lain before it for the statutory 30- or 60-day period; providing that in cases where negotiations for such an agreement have been started before the expiration of such 2-year term, an additional 12 months should be allowed for the consummation of such agreement. Until experience has demonstrated the wisdom of such reciprocal trade agreement provision, a grant of authority limited to 2 years would seem best so as to permit each new Congress to look it over.

16. Granting the President power to modify tariff rates on recommendation of the Tariff Commission provided that such proposed changes have either been approved by the Congress or have lain before it for the statutory 30- or 60-day period.

17. That with the exception of the trade agreement clause discussed in paragraph 15, the authority of the President to modify tariff rates upon recommendation of the Tariff Commission, and with the approval of the Congress, should remain on the statute books until changed by the Congress.

18. With reference to a tariff policy, we recommend:

19. That tariffs be confined to those items which are substantially competitive with American production.

20. That the basis of rate making should be (1) the difference in cost of production between home and abroad, confined to items which can be produced on an economically sound basis, (2) the need to encourage production of strategic items, and (3) the need to maintain production of specific items in the interest of the general welfare and the maintenance of a balanced economy.

21. That in determining the tariff rates and the items on which they would apply the Tariff Commission should take into consideration, among other factors—

(1) Natural advantages. It being the purpose not to exclude items which can be produced abroad at much lower cost by reason of advantageous soil conditions, climatic conditions, transportation conditions, cheaper sources of raw materials, or other natural advantages.

(2) Standards of living: It being the purpose to protect our producers from competition of products produced by workers engaged in any phase of production or marketing, whose low standards of living have contributed to the low cost of the imported product, giving due consideration to the effect of such living standards upon the increase or decrease in output.

(3) Diverse uses: It being the purpose to protect producers from low-cost products made possible by an abnormally high market for a portion of the product. (The sheep industry might be cited as an example of diverse uses. If the producers of Australia enjoyed an abnormally high market for lamb or mutton, their cost of producing wool would be lower, and the excess supply might drive selling prices to levels ruinous to foreign producers. Unless protected against such abnormally low wool prices, which might be artificial or might be merely temporary, American sheep production would fall off materially and the American people would pay higher prices for meat.)

(4) Temporary conditions: It being the purpose to protect producers from the effects of dumping surplus products on our markets at figures made possible by abnormal or unusual circumstances.

(5) Continuity of supply: It being the purpose, except in cases of abnormally low supply, to protect our producers against competition of products, the supply of which may not be constant. (Tree crops might be cited as an example. Foreign producers might be able to invade our markets for a few years at prices ruinous to our average producers, but unless there were reasonable likelihood of continuity of supply, American consumers might face scarcities and exorbitant prices if our orchards had been destroyed and it took years to replace them.)

(6) Sudden injury to well-established industry: It being the purpose to prevent some change in imports to effect the sudden serious injury of some industry without adequate opportunity for the owners and employees to make adjustments to protect themselves.

(7) Subsidized competition: It being the purpose to protect American producers from competition made possible by such artificial advantages except, of course, in the case of such commodities as we cannot produce in sufficient volume for our needs at reasonable costs.

(8) Domestic programs of price support for agricultural products: It being the purpose to avoid undermining any price-support programs which the Congress sees fit to provide.

21. That the Congress empower the President to designate strategic items deemed necessary for self continence; it being the purpose to encourage the production of such strategic items as the Congress or the President may from time to time determine, even at higher costs than we would have to pay for imports, in order that we might not find ourselves disastrously dependent on foreign supplies in time of war when such supplies might be cut off. Stock piling of strategic materials should be encouraged and power given to the President to suspend tariffs for the purpose.

22. That a policy of protecting the producers of products entering into world competition be perfected, designed to give them at least the advantage of freight differentials if needed to maintain production on a sound basis. For example, rice growers may soon have to face the competition of world markets and, unless we reduce production to domestic requirements, our domestic prices if not protected, would be Liverpool prices, less freight. If we reduced production to something lower than domestic requirements, our prices would be Liverpool prices plus freight. It would not be in the public interest to reduce the production of this great source of wealth in order to attain a remunerative price level. In such circumstances America, and the world at large, would be better off to maintain a two-price system, supported by a tariff, giving protection to the extent of the sum the public would have to pay in freight under reduced production. Congress may well consider policies which will continue the stable production of our basic crops, protected by a two-price system which will assure the continuation of production rather than a curtailment with resulting loss of both national income and jobs.

23. We do not submit these suggestions as constituting a complete or perfect tariff policy. In our judgment, however, if adopted, they would provide us with a start or foundation for a tariff policy which would serve as a badly needed guide, both to the Tariff Commission and to the administrators of our laws involving tariff adjustments or reciprocal trade agreements. The policy could well be modified by the Congress from time to time as economic conditions changed or as experience demonstrated that modification might be advisable, but we would strongly urge that the Congress (a) confine its tariff legislation to establishing basic policies; (b) that it place the responsibility for rate making on the Tariff Commission or some agency adequately equipped to conduct the research necessary to determine how the policies should be applied to individual items; (c) that such agency be amply financed to do a good job and do it promptly; and (d) that any changes in tariff rates, in reciprocal agreements or otherwise, be laid before the Congress with full reports thereon, before becoming effective, in order that the Congress may always be the judge as to whether its policies are being carried out within its full intent and purpose.

24. What we need most is a tariff policy that business, labor, and agriculture can rely on—a policy based on sound principles rather than political considerations—and we need it now.

The Cloth Should Fit the Body

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker,, an article appearing in the Tuesday, May 11, issue

of the Evening Star has attracted my attention. It is a clear exposition of the revenue problem as it affects Congress and the District.

The taxing problems of the District are particularly different from any other designated area in the United States. They are not well suited to either the property tax or the income tax as a solution. The sales tax, however, is well suited to solve the District's revenue trouble.

The article follows:

FOR LOCAL NEEDS ONLY—SALES TAX PROPONENTS WILL ARGUE THAT ITS ADOPTION HERE WOULD EXERCISE NO INFLUENCE OUTSIDE

(By Don S. Warren)

If Congress is to pass the proposed sales tax for the District it will have to surmount the old argument that it would be setting a policy to be followed by the States.

Legal experts and practical-minded students of city finance here say it has no bearing on the case since Congress sits as a "city council" for the National Capital. Yet, the hurdle will have to be crossed. The old argument is being raised in advance of joint congressional hearings this week on new District taxes.

There are reasons for disliking sales taxes that are accepted even by sponsors of the proposed retail sales levy but this is not one of them. Sponsors say this one is so out of date and so far from fundamental considerations it should be quickly discarded.

It is contended by district officials and numerous other advocates of the sales tax plan that there is no other adequate and practical means of raising an extra $6,000,000 to $13,000,000 needed for next year. None, that is, that would not cause grave hardships on some classes of taxpayers. The exact amount needed turns on whether a Government pay raise is to be added to the pending record 1949 budget.

MANY STATES HAVE IT NOW

Twenty-seven, more than half, of the States, including Maryland and West Virginia and other nearby States, already are using sales taxes. Such laws, in fact, affect a very considerable portion of the United States area.

Therefore, advocates of this means of solving the District's financial headache contend, it is unreasonable to talk about a District act of Congress influencing the States.

Also, they ask whether any District laws in recent times, at least, have been taken as State models. In most instances, they insist, the District has been behind the States in adopting new State or municipal administrative policies.

The case is put on a more fundamental basis by Corporation Counsel Vernon E. West and some members of the District committees in Congress. They maintain that when Congress legislates for the National Capital it does so not as the National Legislature but as a State legislature or as a city council for this particular metropolitan area and to meet its own peculiar problems.

"I never could see the argument," said Mr. West, "that a law enacted for the District should be considered as a pattern for the States. The courts have held that Congress, in action on District measures, was sitting as a State legislature."

NEVER VERY FAR OUT FRONT

The record indicates that while Members of Congress at times have sought to try out governmental philosophies on the District, most frequently new policies proposed for the District have been stalled until accepted elsewhere.

For instance, a fight was made by the District some years ago for a merit-rating system as to employers' taxes under the unemployment-compensation system, because pay rolls here were relatively stable and the District was piling up a large jobless insurance fund. The plan was defeated because it was counter to the then prevailing Federal policy—but later was accepted when there was a change of thinking in the Federal administration.

In the current Congress there are two notable examples on the model-law thinking.

First, there was daylight-saving time. The District wanted it. Most cities and large State areas along the eastern seaboard had it, but Congress knew of opposition from farm-State spokesmen, who feared congressional action, even for the District, might have an effect on their States.

They got around that by granting authority to the District Commissioners to order the change. The philosophy was that if the Commissioners did it, Congress still would not be setting the policy. It satisfied Washington temporarily, but it was a dodge that all here understood.

FOR LOCAL CONDITIONS ONLY

There was another case, however, where Congress met its responsibilities forthrightly, and without causing any rebellion in the States.

The Supreme Court had laid down the rule that insurance was subject to the antitrust laws, meaning that unless State and District regulatory laws were adopted for uncovered fields, Federal laws would apply. Casualty insurance here was not yet under regulation.

The old sophistry that a congressional act for the District would set a State pattern thereupon brought insurance spokesmen here from many States seeking to get "model" provisions in this city's act. But at the outset, Representative SIMPSON, Republican, of Illinois, head of the House District Subcommittee in charge of the problem, announced he would sponsor no model law, but only one deemed to meet the District's own special problems.

After numerous hearings, such a bill was reported and finally passed. And in the House report, the Simpson subcommittee succinctly observed that the measure "is not intended for use as a model in any of the States."

It was convincing. It worked.

If the sales tax is needed for Washington, because of special and peculiar circumstances of city budget and revenue, there is no reason why Congress in enacting it should be accused of trying to influence the policies of any State.

The Trade Agreements Program and George Rothwell Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, because of the hue and cry that the proponents of sweetness and light, that is, the proponents of extension of the Trade Agreements Act without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t," have raised over what they choose to call star-chamber proceedings of the House of Representatives Committee on Ways and Means, it would be interesting to read the comments upon the legislative procedure which has been followed in the light of State Department secrecy of one of America's greatest columnists, George Rothwell Brown, which recently appeared in the Los Angeles (Calif.) Examiner and some 60 other metropolitan dailies under his widely known caption of The Political Parade.

The George Rothwell Brown commentary to which I have just referred, Mr. Speaker, is the following:

(By George Rothwell Brown)

WASHINGTON, May 3.—The State Department, impudently trying to stampede Congress into a hasty 3-year extension of the Roosevelt-Hull free-trade Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, is meeting with commendable resistance on Capitol Hill.

Verily, it makes a lot of difference whose male bovine animal is gored.

Loud protests are raised over the decision of Ways and Means Committee Republicans to confine new hearings on the 1-year extension bill to qualified experts, and not to open them to floods of propaganda by pressure groups.

This program of closed-session hearings has been denounced as involving star chamber proceedings, and this by supporters of a policy that was born and reared in secrecy.

The reciprocal trade agreements were drafted at the State Department behind closed doors.

Access by American industry to information while the specific agreements were being drawn became a joke.

Industry was permitted to know nothing of what was going on until the tariff reductions had been agreed upon.

No industry could ascertain how badly it had been hit until after the deadly blow had fallen.

Charges of star chamber proceedings come with considerable humor from the New Deal totalitarian dictatorship.

The Geneva ITO Conference last year was conducted in an atmosphere of wartime censorship. The American officials at the League of Nations were virtually inaccessible, protected behind a wall of secrecy by uniformed guards.

So disgusted were many foreign correspondents with the denial of access to news of the conference that many of them left Geneva.

Not until a group of correspondents, among them this writer, made formal demand for the removal of the gag did Mr. Will L. Clayton agree to have spokesmen meet the press twice a week to report such progress as they might be willing to have published.

All details were shrouded in secrecy until the end of the conference.

It takes a good deal of nerve for the State Department and its stooges to protest against the closed hearings of the Ways and Means Committee, in view of the Department's own preference for secrecy in putting its low tariff agreements into effect in complete silence and darkness.

As a matter of fact there is no need for more public hearings on the extension of the Trade Agreements Act, which is to expire on June 12 unless Congress continues the law.

Last summer the committee took 1,800 pages of testimony. Mr. Clayton knew that the time was growing short, but he spent months in Geneva and Paris. The State Department also spent weeks at the Habana Conference to underwrite the Geneva agreements.

Its officials did not return to Washington until March 15. Now they want a 3-year extension, with Congress meekly signing on the dotted line.

There is now no time for extended public hearings. The committee has all the facts it

could possibly need. It could obtain nothing new.

It is expected at the Capitol that the House bill, extending the tariff agreements Act for 1 year, instead of 3, and with amendments enabling Congress to regain in part its lost constitutional powers in the making of revenue laws, can be passed in time to send it to the Senate by May 15.

A 1-year extension is sufficient. A new Congress, next year, can deal with the subject in the light of a rapidly changing world economic picture, whether that Congress be Republican or Democratic.

Rio Grande Death Watch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the third part of the article written by Arthur W. Hamilton with respect to the Rio Grande flood-control problem in New Mexico, and which reads as follows:

RIO GRANDE DEATH WATCH—THE STORY OF A DYING RIVER

(By Arthur W. Hamilton)

III

The matter has been brought to a head through the introduction of a bill in the United States Senate by Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, of New Mexico, to "authorize comprehensive reclamation of land in the Rio Grande Valley in New Mexico," and by the recent submission to Congress of reports from the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation in which construction of major dams is recommended.

The arguments of the northerners are, briefly, somewhat, as follows:

The continuing rise of the river bed, by causing more lands to become waterlogged each year, will eventually bring agriculture in the valley to a halt. Disinherited farmers will be forced to migrate to other areas, and business activity in the valley will cease when agricultural production is stopped and towns are flooded.

Middle-valley rehabilitation must be accomplished within the limits of the terms laid down in the Rio Grande compact, an interstate treaty which guarantees delivery of specified amounts from the flow of the Rio Grande to participants in the treaty. The proposed rehabilitation would be carried out by Federal agencies—the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and, possibly, the Soil Conservation Service. Federal officers in these agencies could not support a project which would violate the compact, nor could they propose abrogation of lower-valley water rights, which have been established firmly for years by a decision of the New Mexico Supreme Court.

Furthermore, a dam site, such as Elephant Butte, is an irreplaceable natural resource, which, properly cared for, will continue to serve the people below it indefinitely. Once filled with sediment it is useless, or worse than useless, since it then becomes an obstacle in the way of further development. In the Rio Grande Valley dam sites are few; they must be treated in a manner that will preserve them for the future and not as though they were private properties to be exploited until reckless disregard for preservation of the watershed forces abandonment.

Comparative evaporation figures indicate that upstate water storage is economical. The surface evaporation in cool northern New Mexico, where much water would be stored if the reclamation program is completed, is so much lower than that of hot southern New Mexico (3.7 feet against 6 feet) that considerable water would be saved through this differential alone. An additional saving would be effected in transit downriver through controlled release of large amounts of water from upstream reservoirs, since large volumes intermittently moving swiftly downstream lose much less by evaporation than the present trickle swelled only occasionally by floods.

Finally, the northerners point out that the wild cedar and cottonwoods which cover miles of sediment plains at the upper end of Elephant Butte Reservoir use as much water every year as is now being released annually to 40,000 acres of farmland below the dam. They maintain that this wild growth could be checked if water-flow and sedimentation were controlled by dams and soil-conservation measures upstream.

Southern New Mexicans and Texans react to these arguments rather coldly. They state categorically that any attempt at land conservation or water storage in northern New Mexico will impoverish them immediately, and, furthermore, that to spend good money merely to prevent mud from taking a little trip down a river is damned nonsense, anyway.

The preponderant opinion below the dam is that the entire project is the result of the manipulations of northern New Mexico politicians who want to entrench themselves by pandering to comparatively heavily populated northern counties at the expense of southern water users.

Southerners maintain that if the dams are built Elephant Butte Reservoir will be a dry lake most of the time, Rio Grande compact and vested water rights notwithstanding, and that salinity and alkalinity in the reservoir will increase as a result of upstream control and water use to the point where water from the reservoir will be useless for irrigation. Land values south of the dam will decrease sharply, it is said.

The flood threat to Albuquerque can, opponents of the dam program say, be averted through dredging and straightening the river channel, and at a much smaller cost than the $90,000,000 estimated for the project proposed by the Chavez bill.

The low water level in Elephant Butte Reservoir at present is pointed out as a prime reason for opposition to upstream dams. Quoting a Dona Ana County official, a southern New Mexico newspaper says: "With the storage of all floodwaters behind Elephant Butte Dam since it was completed in the year 1915, we face the water shortage for the coming year to such an extent that at the present time the allotment to each farm in Mesilla Valley is only 1 acre-foot for 1948." (Allotments ordinarily range from 2 to 4 acre-feet.) It is expected, however, that late spring floods will ease this situation.

Even before the Chavez bill to authorize Middle Valley Dam construction and land reclamation was referred to Congress, a Texas editor, who absently expressed his belief that there might be some merit in the proposed corrective program in the Middle Valley, was swamped with very bitter letters from his below-the-dam readers. He was called a traitor and an idiot, and there were indications that he might be run out of the country. He quickly shaped his opinions on the subject to those of his readers, and now roundly denounces in his editorials anyone even slightly favorable to the reclamation of the hated north country.

Behind their barricades the opposing factions are forming their skirmish lines. Pressure groups are being organized—the Middle Rio Grande Flood Control Association to the north, and, below the dam, the Elephant Butte Water Rights Association, along with a similar organization in El Paso and Hudspeth Counties in Texas. Each has announced that its is the cause of right and justice.

Aboriginal Indian Rights in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER R. JONES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include three editorials from the Seattle Times of April 26, May 5, and May 9, 1948, having to do with hoped for early and favorable action by the Congress on Senate Joint Resolution 162, a measure to repeal the arbitrary power of the Interior Department to create Indian reservations in Alaska:

[From the Seattle Times of April 26, 1948]

ONE OF ALASKA'S TROUBLES NEARER TO SETTLEMENT

Promise that the uncertainties that long have bedeviled the Alaska salmon fishing and packing industry may be resolved by adoption of a reasonable Government policy and appropriate legislation on the question of fish traps is given by a preliminary report virtually unanimously adopted by a joint committee of the United States Senate and House of Representatives.

The significant features of the report are that it accepts the principle that fish traps are not detrimental to conservation of the salmon resource, and that the present operators of the Alaska-salmon industry have rights to their established fish-trap sites which should not be altogether abrogated.

The joint committee had before it three measures dealing with this controversial issue. One, introduced by Alaska's Congressional Delegate BARTLETT, would prohibit the use of fish traps in Alaska waters outright. Another, also sponsored by BARTLETT, would empower the Territorial government to regulate types and use of fishing gear. A third bill, prepared by the Department of the Interior, would permit the leasing of fish-trap sites, with certain limitations, to present operators for a 15-year period, at the expiration of which the present operators would be entirely excluded from further use of their trap sites.

Another factor in the controversy of which the committee took cognizance involves the claims of Alaska Indians to aboriginal rights to important trap-fishing areas, claims which await settlement by congressional action along with the whole problem of Indian rights in the Territory.

The joint committee's report concluded that interim legislation must be enacted by Congress governing the leasing of fish traps and that the salmon industry shou'd not be hampered by present well-grounded fears that their use of essential sites may be summarily terminated.

Two of this State's Representatives in Congress, Senator WARREN MAGNUSON, Democrat, and Congressman THOR TOLLEFSON, Republican, took leading roles in this inquiry. The report was signed by them and by all the nine other House Members of the joint committee. Their careful efforts toward solution of this difficult problem deserve the appreciation of both the salmon industry

and the labor organizations affiliated with it. As the committee's report concludes, "Stability is as essential to the economy of Alaska and those dependent on it as to the industry itself."

[From the Seattle Times of May 5, 1948]

SOONER OR LATER, CONGRESSMEN ARE BOUND TO HEAR

Support spreads for the measure now before Congress to repeal the bureaucratic power of the Interior Department to create Indian reservations and pass out aboriginal property rights as it takes the notion in Alaska. The resolution, introduced first by Senator BUTLER, Republican, of Nebraska, now has the endorsement of the Pacific Northwest Trade Association. Following its approval by the Western States Council, it also was endorsed by chambers of commerce of Los Angeles, San Francisco, Salt Lake City, and Ogden, Utah. The Seattle Chamber of Commerce also has actively advocated this legislation. Meanwhile, however, it continues to repose in committee, without much evidence of progress toward enactment.

The authority now vested in the Interior Department to establish aboriginal Indian rights in Alaska has effectually prevented development of a large pulp industry in the Territory. One major pulp company was at the point of investing large sums there, and others were considering it. But these projects were effectively discouraged by the uncertainty of property rights in Alaska forest lands. The policy of the Interior Department toward private capital invested in the Alaska salmon industry was sufficient warning of what might happen to any large pulp-manufacturing enterprise undertaking to utilize Alaska timber.

The remedial legislation has been pending for some time in committees of both Houses of Congress. Members of our State delegation in Washington, D. C., have been fully advised of the importance of this measure to Alaska and the Pacific Northwest. They should exert renewed efforts to jar it loose from the pigeonholes where it seems to be temporarily sidetracked.

[From the Seattle Times of May 9, 1948]

FOR THE SAKE OF ALASKA

Early and favorable action by Congress on Senate Joint Resolution 162, sponsored by Senator BUTLER (Republican), of Nebraska, and Senator WATKINS (Republican), of Utah, was urged by the Times last Wednesday. This is the measure to repeal the arbitrary power of the Interior Department to create Indian reservations in Alaska. The Times urged this State's congressional delegation to exert every effort in behalf of this resolution.

Since then, word from Washington, D. C., indicates that action on the measure at last is imminent. The Times reiterates its appeal to the Washington Senators and Representatives to back the resolution to the limit and obtain a favorable vote for it in both Chambers of Congress.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein the attached article entitled "A Natural Approach to the St. Lawrence Waterway Problem" by William Jaspersen, AAE, Toledo, Ohio:

A NATURAL APPROACH TO THE ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY PROBLEM

(By William Jaspersen, A. A. E., Toledo, Ohio)

Since this interesting proposition will no doubt come up again before Congress for final action, and, we hope, when our representatives will be able to give some sane and serious thought to the subject instead of making it a political issue, it appears timely to call attention to a very important aspect of this subject which has apparently been overlooked, and that is the full value and extent of this vast natural resource. Water, deep, navigable, for thousands of miles inland to the heart of our natural resources and industrial and agricultural empire, and, at an elevation of over 1,500 feet above sea level, a storage reservoir capable of producing millions of horsepower in electric energy which is vitally needed in prosperous peacetime and particularly in wartime.

Let us analyze this asset. The present water and drainage area covers approximately 94,710 square miles of water area and 281,670 square miles of drainage area, of which 60,710 square miles of water area and 173,740 square miles drainage area exists on the United States side of the United States-Canadian boundary, and 34,000 square miles water area and 117,930 square miles drainage area on the Canadian side. This gives the United States considerable majority in this asset; therefore, if this plan were followed through it would put the Canadian Government on a comparative 50–50 basis which she should be. By diverting the waters of a vast area north and west of Lake Superior which has a large drainage area, this diversion suggests an important and sound possibility, proven by the Ogoki diversion above Lake Nipigon, which was completed in June 1943, several years after I proposed the same type of diversion on the Upper Mississagi and Wenebegon Rivers to augment the water supply at Aubrey Falls, a beautiful falls with wonderful power possibilities.

Through the Ogoki diversion, according to the chairman's annual statement to the Ontario Hydroelectric Power Commission in 1943, these statements appear:

"The commission now owns and operates 47 hydroelectric plants, and purchases for resale, a total capacity of 2,540,000 horsepower of hydroelectric energy. The diversion of the Ogoki and the construction of the remedial weir on the Niagara River had an appreciable effect on higher levels in Lake Erie, thereby increasing the output of all the generating plants at Niagara, including the addition of the De Cew Falls plant and new plants on the Nipigon which made possible the production of 90,000 horsepower at the latter and 360,000 horsepower at the lower lake plants. This diversion of additional water to renew plants provided an important factor in meeting its tremendous demand for war material and ammunition."

The average seasonal variation between high- and low-water levels in the several lakes amounts to 4.99, approximately 5 feet and an average annual rainfall of 31.4 inches. This seasonal variation is and has been a serious handicap to our shipping interests, especially our ore-handling ships, who are not able to carry their full capacity on account of the lowered clearance at the locks, the river channels, and various harbors.

Now, my proposal is to make an agreement with Canada and permit the diversion of enough water which now flows north through the Ogoki, Albany, Moose, and Nelson Rivers into Hudson Bay, into Superior, in sufficient and controlled amount to maintain the entire lake system at present normal mean level or, if desirable, slightly above. Our shipping can be at all times assured of a full 27.5-foot clearance depth throughout the entire system, in addition to the necessary water required to generate the vast amount of hydroelectric power. The additional drainage area this diversion would provide could be credited to Canada to bring her share of the water and drainage area nearer an even amount now on the United States side, and Canada could in addition enjoy the hydro power developed at this diversion unit, since the many lakes and their respective drainage areas vary in elevation up to as high as 1,568 feet (Superior 602.18 feet mean), and the larger lakes such as the Rainy River group, Lake of the Woods, and even Lake Winnipeg, together with hundreds of others varying in elevation from 700 feet, 1,100 feet, 1,400 feet, and above.

The approximate drainage area involved in this region, including Nipigon and east and west thereof would amount to approximately 75,000 square miles. This additional water with the present discharge outflow of the several lakes—Superior, 70,900; Michigan, 50,800; Huron, 81,300; Erie, 23,000; Ontario, 15,000, and by general diversion 76,200—makes a grand total of approximately 315,000 cubic feet per second, with a potential capacity of approximately 12,700,000 horsepower through the several natural head stages.

With this additional water supply and proper control thereof, a full mean level could be maintained, regardless of how much water is withdrawn for power purposes, lock operations, and Chicago drainage requirements. The hydroelectric power produced would be adequate to supply the entire East and the Midwest industrial area, operating utilities basic power supply, as well as the railroads for trunk-line power, and the increased power demand which now exists, at a cost far below the present basic power costs.

The power plants, as well as necessary dams and works for maintaining and controlling the water supply and lake levels, as well as the completion of the lower St. Lawrence channels, should be built, owned, and operated by a joint commission of United States and Canadian experts on a 50–50 basis, and financed by a suitable size and type of bond issue guaranteed by both Governments, and sold to any investors, including governments, States, banks, utilities, etc. The power operations would provide sufficient profit to retire the bonds, take care of the maintenance and operations of the entire project, including locks, which should all (the Soo and Welland) be included in the assets, with all American and Canadian vessels enjoying free passage, and ships of foreign register paying a nominal entry fee.

Unless this additional water supply can be assured it is perhaps doubtful whether the full capacity of the system, including shipping and power, can be maintained, and which is necessary to justify the project. On the other hand, if so installed it will be one of the greatest national assets in the world today.

Tidelands Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENDERSON LANHAM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting also with my wholehearted approval an editorial which appeared in the Atlanta Journal for May 5, 1948, relative to the transfer to the

States of oil and other natural resources in the tidelands of the United States:

SHALL THE UNITED STATES RENOUNCE A GREAT RESERVE OF OIL?

Despite the fact that the Georgia delegation—with the single exception of Representative HENDERSON LANHAM—voted the other day for the bill giving States sovereign ownership of their tidelands, this newspaper seriously doubts the wisdom of the legislation.

Briefly stated, this is the situation: There is oil under the coastal floor off several States. It is believed there may be very much more than already has been proved. Some of the States—notably California, Louisiana, and Texas—have sold or want to sell the rights to produce this oil.

The Federal Government, as represented by the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, claimed the oil as belonging to the Nation and wanted to preserve it from present commercial exploitation as a potential reserve against the time when it might be vitally needed by us all.

So the question of sovereignty was thrown into the Supreme Court which decided that the Federal Government has "a paramount rights and power" over the lands, minerals, and other things lying seaward three nautical miles.

The lobby of States' attorneys general, led by the California official, then renewed its efforts to have Congress pass a law quitting claim to all such land and giving the States liberty to do as they please.

This lobby had actually succeeded in getting Congress to pass such legislation in 1946 while the case was pending in the Supreme Court, but President Truman vetoed it in a sharp message and the effort was dropped until the present session. Last week the House voted 257 to 29 in favor of renouncing Federal claim.

The big argument for the bill, of course, was the old standby, "State's rights." However, it seems to us there is in the question an element vastly more important than legalistic quibbling.

That matter is the conservation of a natural asset, the dissipation of which through private exploitation might imperil the security of the Nation. Oil now is at the bottom of a great part of the international unrest, diplomatic chessplay and military dispositions. It is the most precious commodity in the world, because lack of it could mean industrial collapse and military failure.

Why should the oil which nature placed beneath the waters of the American littoral be given by Congress to those States facing the Atlantic, the Pacific, and the Mexican Gulf, perhaps to be frittered away, when there is strong legal ground for saying the lands belong to the Republic?

We hope the Senate will refuse to follow the House's lead, and if it does follow we hope the President again will veto the quittal of claim. Keeping title to the tidelands in the Federal Government is one simple way of protecting the oil reserves for the good of the people of 48 States.

TVA Audit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following letter from E. L. Kohler, CPA, formerly executive officer of the Petroleum Administration for War—widely known authority of national repute, on accounting:

[From the Journal of Accountancy for April 1948]

In endeavoring to correct the editorial comment accompanying an excerpt from a report of the General Accounting Office on the TVA in its June 1947, issue the Journal has again drawn misleading inferences from the same report. In a March 1948 editorial the Journal says that the highly controversial question is not whether the Authority's accounts are honest and accurate, but whether they provide a valid basis of comparing the cost of TVA power operations with those of privately owned utilities. Perhaps the Journal is not to be blamed for this interpretation; the report on which it is based is itself sadly lacking in the clear and incisive subject matter so necessary for valid inferences.

The March editorial also states that "from all that we can learn it appears that TVA has maintained complete and accurate accounts of receipts, costs, and expenses. It has published full and informative financial statements." What, then, is the controversy? Are the accounts at fault solely because they have been alleged to lack comparability with those of private industry?

My guess is that no one has really tried to compare TVA's power costs with those of private industry. John T. Flynn, in the December 1947 Reader's Digest, appears to do so. Proceeding on the wholly unscientific ground that a cost to the power industry is a cost to the TVA, he conjures up a dozen "hidden" subsidies he thinks inherent in the Government's power operation, and thereby turns a profit into a loss. He notes wide margins between the expenses of a public agency and those of a privately owned corporation, but he evidences little or no interest in the causes. The impression gained by the average reader of his article is that the TVA, with malice aforethought, has omitted actual costs from its accounts.

Comparisons of income statements are by no means impossible simply because the organizations compared incur different types or rates of expenditure. It is the very purpose of comparison to bring such differences into the open and explain their origins.

Thus the combined administrative expenses of the TVA power organization and its distributors, in terms of a unit cost per kilowatt-hour, are low in comparison with the equivalent average unit cost of the country's private utilities, partly because the TVA operates a multipurpose project and the administrative expenses are shared with operations other than power; partly because administrative salaries paid in governmental organizations are substantially lower than in private business. Distribution expenses of the retailers of TVA power are less because of a simple, inexpensive organizational structure. From these and other comparisons one may identify both the advantages and often the disadvantages of public ownership of power facilities

For 15 years TVA's power-accounting policies have conformed strictly with (a) the accounting regulations laid down by the Federal Power Commission for private utilities, (b) policies prescribed by the TVA Act of 1933 and successive congressional appropriation acts since that date, (c) the pronouncements on accounting procedure to be found in the American Institute of Accountants bulletins, and (d) standards of corporate accounting recommended by the American Accounting Association. What shocked the authors of the GAO report and the Reader's Digest article was that by such close adherence to these regulations, policies, and standards the TVA was still able to show a net profit of 48 percent of gross as against an average for the industry of but 17 percent. They want TVA costs increased pronto by expenses the TVA itself has not incurred, perhaps because, unconsciously or otherwise, and notwithstanding an asserted yen for true costs, they entertain fears of the consequences that might follow the continued showing of a 48 percent net profit by a publicly owned power property.

Now that the GAO and John T. Flynn have had their say, the proposal to load extraneous costs against the TVA is an important matter of public policy deserving careful analysis by students of good government.

Federal Communications Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, last week I addressed the House on the subject of the Federal Communications Commission and its granting of five permits to one Edward Lamb over a period of 2 weeks.

Since I made that address I have had innumerable calls from various individuals calling to my attention many matters which bear scrutiny in connection with the awarding of radio permits.

So serious have been these matters that I believe the entire subject should be surveyed and ventilated.

In this connection I addressed two letters to two standing committees of this House. One is addressed to the Hon. CHARLES WOLVERTON, chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the other to the Hon. J. PARNELL THOMAS, chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The letters speak for themselves and I bring them to the attention of the House:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 6, 1948.

Hon. CHARLES WOLVERTON,
Chairman, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WOLVERTON: On yesterday I made a speech on the floor of the House relating to the rather peculiar activities of the Federal Communications Commission in awarding five radio permits to a man named Edward Lamb, of Toledo, Ohio, within a period of 2 weeks. For your ready reference the speech I made is recorded on page 5326 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, May 5.

I direct your attention to the long record of Mr. Lamb with Communist organizations, and Communist-front organizations. Since making this speech I have been contacted by many parties who have volunteered information in connection with other peculiar activities of the Federal Communications Commission, one which is said to involve the granting of permits to two aliens, in direct violation of the law.

It is also my understanding that a file has previously been submitted to your committee on the unusual diligence of the Federal Communications Commission in favoring particularly those applicants who walk arm in arm with fellow-travelers of the Communist Party. Since your committee is the

cognizant committee, I am respectfully directing this matter to your attention, asking that an investigation be conducted of the Federal Communications Commission, as to the method employed by them, and the yardstick applied in granting permits for radio broadcasting stations. I believe our radio communications system is a vital and integral part of this country's defense, and should be above suspicion in any instance. I believe that the people of this Nation should know what influences have or have not been used on the Federal Communications Commission, and whether or not a sinister Red network is being established through their assistance and cooperation, even if unwittingly given.

There can be no doubt that with the revelations in the Lamb case a cloud has been cast over the Federal Communications Commission, which cannot be removed except by a complete and thorough investigation of the facts in the case. I, therefore, respectfully request that you place this matter before your committee for action.

Sincerely yours,

F. EDW. HÉBERT.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 6, 1948.

Hon. J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman, Un-American Activities Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. THOMAS: On yesterday I made a speech on the floor of the House (p. 5326, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, May 5, 1948) with reference to the granting by the Federal Communications Commission of five radio permits within a space of 2 weeks, to Edward Lamb, of Toledo, Ohio.

I know that you are familiar with Mr. Lamb's communistic activities in this country, as I recall that you made a speech about him last January on the floor of the House. While I readily recognize the fact that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is the cognizant committee over the Federal Communications Commission, I do believe that the Committee on Un-American Activities has a duty and a responsibility to perform to determine just how deep communistic influences reach into the Federal Communications Commission, in granting of radio permits.

I have formally asked Chairman CHARLES WOLVERTON of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, to make an investigation of the manner and method in which radio permits are granted to applicants. In addition, however, I believe that the Committee on Un-American Activities should conduct its own investigation of the FCC in order to determine just how many more people of the stripe of this man Lamb, have been so favored by the Commission in the granting of permits. I think we should find out whether or not this is part of a "Red" network which is being set up in this country in keeping with the instructions of the Communist Party from Moscow, to gain key positions in transportation, communications, and public safety divisions of the Government, preparatory to any coup which may develop.

I have been informed that at least two aliens have been given radio permits by this Federal Communications Commission. Since I made my speech on the floor yesterday I have heard numerous complaints about how other people, real Americans, whose Americanism has never been challenged, are kept cooling their heels in the halls of the Commission, while fellow travelers get all the courtesies and results.

As one individual expressed it to me: "You can't get a permit unless you are a commissar."

I respectfully ask that you place this matter on the agenda of the committee on its next meeting for a full and complete discussion, preliminary to a thorough investigation of the whole set-up, which has a very bad smell, to say the least.

Sincerely yours,

F. EDW. HÉBERT.

House Concurrent Resolution 190

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein House Concurrent Resolution 190 expressing the sense of the Congress that there should be a bipartisan platform on foreign policy. This resolution, which I introduced on April 27, 1948, is as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that there should be a bipartisan platform on foreign policy, including the following principles:

(1) Because this Republic was brought into being for the prime purpose of laying the foundations for a just and permanent peace, and because every true American is devoted to the achievement of this objective, the United States should firmly dedicate itself and all of its resources to the maintenance of its destiny-given position of leadership for world peace.

(2) Because it is desirable to give the Members of Congress a more potent voice in the development and in the implementation of foreign policy, there should be appointed immediately a select committee to conduct a thorough study of international relations and to carry out a searching investigation of the Department of State and the Foreign Service.

(3) Because the United States must continue to exercise leadership in the establishment of a real, workable, and effective world organization it should, if the defects of the United Nations (chief of which is the veto) cannot be removed and if the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics continues in its refusal to cooperate, abandon the United Nations and form at once a new international organization of liberty-loving democratic nations without the presence of the impeding Soviet Union.

(4) Because diplomatic appeasement, which has failed in the past, leads only to conflict, such appeasement of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics should cease.

(5) As long as aid to free nations is effective in checking the advance of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and preventing the spread of communism, economic assistance to rehabilitate the economies of nations resisting Russian aggression and the spread of communism should be continued by the United States.

(6) If a democratic nation, threatened by a Communist minority which is either directly or indirectly aided, abetted, and controlled by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, asks aid of the United States, assistance should be extended, be it economic or military.

(7) The United States should (a) inform the world, and particularly the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, that it intends to use its force to stop aggression directed at strategic points such as the approaches to the Atlantic, Gibraltar, the nations of western Europe, the Dardanelles, Greece, Turkey, Iran, the Near East, the Persian Gulf area, China, and the islands of the Pacific; (b) state clearly that whenever there is an encroachment on these areas, or any other strategic positions, the integrity of which the United States deems essential to its security and survival, the nation making such encroachment will meet the immediate, sustained, and unrelenting resistance of the United States; and (c) for the self-interest of the United States and the peace of the world, establish a line beyond which an aggressor may not move without encountering the full force and power of the United States.

(8) Because the achievement and the maintenance of adequate preparedness on the sea, on the land, and more especially in the air, and because atomic supremacy and air supremacy by the United States must be realized at all costs, the funds required to keep it the strongest military nation should be appropriated, provision for full and adequate manpower for the armed services should be made, and the armed services should move efficiently and effectively to an early and full realization of this determined objective.

Political Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 12 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on political conditions in America today, delivered in New Haven, Conn., on May 11, 1948, by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], chairman of the Democratic National Committee, at a dinner sponsored by the Democratic Committee. I appreciate very much the generous references to the senior Senator from Connecticut made in the speech by the Senator from Rhode Island.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is a political year, 1948, the quadrennial when we, the American people, elect our President. Today as this political year hurtles on through history at a dizzying pace all of you are wondering about this candidate or that one. But remember this:

The atomic bomb knows no politics.

There is no democratic atom bomb; no reactionary atom bomb—Republican style.

The fact is that the atom bomb will not be a candidate for President.

Republicans do not seem to realize this. The attitude of the Senate Republican leaders toward the reappointment of the five-man Atomic Energy Commission defies understanding.

They would apply spoils politics to the most deadly force the world has ever known, and slow down our most vital program at a time when continued progress is most necessary. Already many scientists who have been working on the atomic energy projects have been upset and confused by the political attacks made on the Commission. Their work has been slowed.

What are the facts?

In accordance with the McMahon Atomic Energy Act, the terms of these five members all expire on August 1, 1948. Appointments or reappointments from then on are to be for staggered terms. Recently President Truman renominated all five of the present members, for terms varying from 1 to 5 years. He submitted the nominations

months in advance, in order that the Senate might have ample time to consider their reappointment and thus assure continuity in the functioning of the Commission.

But regarding these renominations, Republican leadership in the Senate will not say yes and it will not say no. What it wants to do by one means or another is to postpone consideration of the question until after the election.

President Truman has every sound argument on his side in asking prompt consideration of these nominations.

The five members were exhaustively investigated before this present Senate confirmed their appointment.

Subsequently, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has been able to follow their work in detail.

There is ample time for any necessary further investigation.

Above all, as President Truman said:

"It is imperative that our program in this field continue to advance and that there be no uncertainty in the continuity of the experienced leadership essential for the Nation's preeminence in the field of atomic energy."

Why is it imperative? It is imperative because, in this divided world, our preeminence in this field is the ultimate form of preparedness. The first great break with Russia came on the issue of atomic energy. Russia torpedoed a workable system of atomic-energy control and brought into being the grimmest competition that mankind has ever seen: an atomic armaments race. The steady deterioration of relations between Russia and the West has been coexistent with that atomic armaments race—a race made all the grimmer by the fact that its progress is shrouded in the blackest secrecy by both contenders.

Congress is considerably exercised these days about preparedness. Comments of many Congressmen on the current state of affairs in the world, and on the need for preparedness, verge on the hysterical. One might suppose that the Senate, for the sake of preparedness alone, would confirm the reappointment of the Atomic Energy Commission, and hence assure the continuity of our atomic-energy program, swiftly and with hardly a dissenting voice.

Yet instead of that, for reasons of politics, Senators pause in their declamations on the subject of preparedness to shake their heads, raise their eyebrows, and push aside this little matter of an atomic-energy program until after November's election.

This attitude defies understanding.

Your own Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, who as chairman of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee drew up the legislation under which the Atomic Energy Commission functions, has expressed himself forcefully. He declared: "Atomic energy is no subject for politicians."

Incidently, Senator MCMAHON's statesmanlike stand, which has won him universal acclaim, is typical of the high quality of service he renders the Nation in the Upper Chamber.

I join with Senator MCMAHON in a plea to Republicans to leave atomic energy to the scientists and not apply politics to the most terrible force that now exists.

We know that we now stand at the peak of prosperity; that our standard of living is at an all-time high. Yet we cannot hope to remain at that high level if the atomic bomb becomes the subject of political maneuverings.

Outside the field of atomic energy and of foreign relations there is ample cleavage between the parties. In this year of 1948 our working democracy reviews the political record. The facts are studied. Then we march to the polls and make our decisions in secret behind the voting booth curtain.

This is working democracy. This is the kind of working democracy that is now face to face with the concept of the totalitarian state. And it is this same totalitarian state which is now competing against us in the field of atomic science.

In our working democracy the state is the servant of the individual. This is the wise course. This is the course of freedom. And we must not imperil that course of freedom, for it is our own lives we imperil when we do so.

What do the people of this working democracy find as they examine the record in this year of decision?

They find the United States the greatest and most powerful nation on earth. They find us the world's leader. They find us too under challenge from the forces behind the "iron curtain."

We are in the midst of the greatest era of prosperity the world has ever seen. The Truman years are the outstanding years of our prosperity. American business is more prosperous today than at any time in history. Last year corporate profits were seventeen billion after taxes. Profits are at an even higher rate this year The average annual gross national production during the years of the Truman administration has been over $212,000,000,000. This compares with an average of $93,800,000,000 during the Coolidge boom years of 1925–28. And compares with an average of $82,000,000,000 during the Hoover years 1929–32.

Civilian employment has averaged 55,400,000 during the Truman administration. It has reached the total of 60,000,000 at work. Forty-two million three hundred thousand at work was the Hoover average.

The average real disposable income per each individual in the United States today is $1,249, as compared with only $744 during the Hoover years. America has the highest standard of living in the world.

We have accomplished the bulk of the job of reconversion after the war with less social and economic friction than this has caused in other nations. We have emerged from a terrible war, strong and capable of growing stronger, instead of exhausted and helpless. Here we are on the top and still climbing.

Since 1932 the Democratic Party has given all of the country a New Deal—industry, business, the farmer, the workingman. All get a break. All were in bad shape in 1932. All recovered together—not just one class or group.

None of us want to return to the bread lines, apple peddlers, and folding banks of 1932. We don't have to. We have something now that we didn't have in 1932. Thanks to Democratic administration. That is a Government policy of seeking to avoid the old cycle of boom and bust.

The President is advised on economic conditions by a council of economists. We have the information and the know-how so that your Government can plan actions to maintain our present high level economy and avoid a return to the old cycle of boom and bust.

Whether we actually do act to avoid an economic crash depends immediately upon the Congress and finally upon the people who elect the Congress.

For there are also danger signals to our economy.

Here are some of them:

The consumers' price index has dropped only very slightly from the peak in January 1948 and is still much higher than the average of 1947. Food has gone down a trifle, but rent and clothing continue to rise.

Food and farm products are rising again on the wholesale market.

Wholesale prices on industrial products are higher than at any time during the record peak year of 1947.

Personal income, adjusted to the price level, has moved downward in the first quarter of 1947. Preliminary figures show they are even lower in the first quarter of 1948.

Thus we face a dangerous inflationary trend—price levels at or near the inflationary peak, decline in actual value of income, and rising profits. And inflation can apply the rending force of economic chain reaction to our civilization.

That's the economic chain reaction President Truman asked Congress to help him prevent months and months ago—last November, to be exact. But nothing has been done. That's a part of the Republican record.

The Democratic Party is proud to be running on its record in this crucial year of decision. We are proud of the record of the Democratic Congresses which have served with President Roosevelt and President Truman. We are proud of the records of Roosevelt and Truman. We are proud that the Democratic Party has been the caretaker of the country in years of war and reconversion from war and has brought the nation through these crises stronger than it ever was before. Yes, we Democrats are proud of our records.

But what of the Republicans? They want to run on promises. They ran on promises in 1946. They did a good job of promising—such a good job that they won the 1946 congressional elections. It is easy to make promises—but it is performance that counts.

The people know that now. They have seen the performance of the Republican Congress. It's a sorry contrast with the Republican promises. So this time the Republicans will have to run on performance, not promises. This is no year to play with promises and rosy dreams. Abroad we find world peace in serious peril. At home we find serious dislocations in the economy.

These dislocations, incidentally, are the result of Republican promises come home to roost. The Republicans promised a plentiful supply of everything we needed at low prices if we followed their economic recipe for ending price controls and letting things rip.

Well, things ripped all right. In fact, you could call the results of electing a Republican Congress not only a rip but an extended economic tear.

I think that economic tear will end on January 1, 1949, when a Democratic Congress takes over, and I pray that the hangover will not be too serious.

I cite the Republican promise and the Republican performance on high prices only as an example of the reasons why the Republicans will have to run on their record this year no matter whom they nominate in an effort to dress up Hardingism with a new look.

The early days of the Republican Congress were glorious ones for them. They were long, lazy, languid days while the new lawmakers basked comfortably in their own esteem.

Those were the days of glorious unity for the Republicans!

But look at them now;

There are Taft Republicans, Dewey Republicans, Stassen Republicans, Vandenberg Republicans, Warren Republicans, Bricker Republicans, Joe Martin Republicans, MacArthur Republicans, high-tariff Republicans, isolationist Republicans, antidraft Republicans, probonus Republicans, John L. Lewis Republicans, Colonel McCormick Republicans, Governor Green Republicans, butter Republicans, oleomargarine Republicans and Senators MORSE, AIKEN, and TOBEY who often look in Republican surroundings as if they had made a mistake in the address and showed up at the wrong party.

But there is one thing which binds this odd assemblage together. That is the record of the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress.

And, marching steadfastly to the rear behind a banner with this strange device, "Hell Bent for Backwards," the Republicans have rolled up quite a record on domestic issues.

For example: Labor.

The Republicans promised to solve the problem of labor-management relations.

After great labor they came up with a Rube Goldbergian piece of legislation known as the Taft-Hartley Act.

This, they solemnly assured the Nation, would end industrial disputes for all time. No more industrial disputes, no more work stoppages.

And furthermore, they added, union members didn't know what was good for them.

Once they really got used to the law, the Republicans said, unions would love it as much as the National Association of Manufacturers.

The Republicans launched a terrific sales campaign to sell the Taft-Hartley Act. They did everything but go on the radio with the slogan THMFLR—Taft-Hartley means finer labor relations.

Yet in the only labor dispute in which it appeared that the Taft-Hartley Act was going to have some effect the Republicans sought to finesse their own law. I refer, of course, to the strange case of Joe Martin, John L. Lewis and the 13 minutes that shook the world.

Mr. Lewis, it seems, is a Republican and the Taft-Hartley Act wasn't meant to apply to him.

The plain fact is that the Taft-Hartley Act has not done what it was supposed to do. It has increased the number of labor disputes that are coming before the NLRB, it is increasing government red tape, and it is more expensive than the old system.

Let's look at another Republican promise. They were going to save money.

They assailed the President's budget vigorously.

It was too big, the Republicans said, and they were just the fellows to whittle it down to size.

The result. The Republicans wound up by appropriating more money than the President had asked for in his budget.

The Republicans are still making those same old promises about the President's budget for the current fiscal year.

But once again the performance is not there.

Why? Well, here are the cold, hard facts about the President's budget:

The President's budget was so carefully prepared that in order to reduce it the Republican Congress must do one of these things: Weaken our national defense; reduce our foreign-aid program to ineffectiveness; break the promises we have made to assist able-bodied veterans to civilian readjustment and to care for those who were disabled in the service of their country; welsh on the interest on our national debt or fail to pay legally owed tax refunds; turn backward the program to raise our level of health, education, and housing; fail to reduce our national debt; reduce established Federal programs in the field of business, labor, and the development of natural resources to a dangerous level.

Do we want to do those things? We do not.

With the peculiar cart-before-the-horse economic philosophy which Republicans follow, they decided that if they could not reduce the budget, they would reduce Government revenue anyhow.

So they passed a $5,000,000,000 tax cut at a time when they were increasing appropriations for defense and voting the European recovery program.

The President made the sound business proposal that we reduce our national debt now instead of giving lavish tax cuts to upper bracket taxpayers.

But it turned out that Republican campaign contributors preferred the tax cuts. They got them, thus adding to the danger of inflation.

Now let us look at some more problems and see how the Republicans have measured up to them. Housing, for one. We need decent homes for our veterans. The Republicans passed a housing bill in the Senate to give the homeless millions lip service in this election year. Then, while Senator TAFT, one of the authors of the bill was fighting for his political life before an ungrateful electorate, another Republican sought to slide through a housing bill joker that would have doomed the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill in the House.

And if the words of Republican leaders in the House mean anything, that bill will never pass the House .

Net Republican performance on housing—zero.

Health program. The war revealed a shocking health situation in this Nation, with hundreds of thousands of young men unable to serve their Nation in time of peril because of ill health.

The score on this problem. Talk and promises. Performance—zero.

Aid to small business. Day after day big businesses continue to swallow up their smaller competitors.

Republicans pay lip service to the Democratic Party's belief that small business is the backbone of our free enterprise economy. What is the performance? The Republicans cut out all appropriations for the Office of Small Business in the Department of Commerce. They have failed to pass legislation designed to plug loopholes in present antimonopoly legislation. Meantime, big business gets bigger and small business gets smaller. And I cannot believe that the Republicans are really concerned.

But it should concern all of us in New England where small business is of paramount importance.

On dozens of other issues the Republican Congress is virtually on a sit-down strike. Admission of displaced persons seems to me to call for the most urgent action. But the Republicans are in no hurry.

And so it goes—inaction and reaction in the Congress, with the Nation's welfare sidetracked while Republican leaders jockey for position in the Presidential race.

It is not a pretty story.

For when a political party is given control of the Congress or of the administration that party is given a trust.

Now in business life, if a trustee of an estate acts unwisely or dishonestly, there can still be some recovery made of the assets of the estate. But when a trustee entrusted with the country's welfare acts unwisely on such issues as atomic energy, military defense, or the inflationary spiral, the story is not the same.

If our economy is pushed over a cliff or if we fumble the peace, there could well be no recovery.

The trust which a political party holds when its members are in power does not stop at the top.

We can all be proud of the way our President has risen above politics to serve the common welfare of all of us.

We can be proud of the way he is fulfilling the highest trust that America places in an individual.

We can be proud of how his actions contrast with the sordid partisanship of the Republican majority in the Congress on domestic issues.

But the trust does not end with the President.

His responsibility is shared by every Democrat, all the way down to the precinct.

As party leaders you share that trust.

In one sense the precinct worker is the key figure in elections.

One vote lost in a precinct can lose a congressional district. One vote lost in Congress can be the deciding margin on a critical piece of legislation.

The national leadership of the party is dependent upon local leadership.

And that is the responsibility of every Democrat.

The 1946 elections were a minority election.

More than 90 percent of the electorate went to the polls in the recent election in Italy.

In our 1946 congressional elections, less than 40 percent of the electorate went to the polls.

The Republicans won control of the Congress in 1946 but the total Republican vote was only two-ninths of the electorate.

That is minority rule.

Let's have majority rule this election.

The issues are too big to let a minority decide them.

It is fortunate that we have a bipartisan foreign policy.

But that policy cannot survive unless it is based on the solid rock of a sound American economy.

We must end the present failure to meet the problem of inflation.

High prices will institute a chain reaction in our economy unless we act to stop the inflationary spiral.

If our economy crashes from its present record level it will pull down with it the hopes of all the free nations of the world.

And I fear that out of the wreckage will not arise the democratic government and the free-enterprise economy that we enjoy today.

I believe that the vote in November will decide whether we obtain national economic security or revert to the boom and-bust economy of republicanism.

I believe the November vote will decide in favor of continued prosperity, continued progress toward peace by a victory for Harry S. Truman and the Democratic Party.

I say that because I believe in President Truman and because I share his deep-seated faith in you, the people of the United States.

Centennial Celebration of the Woman's Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 12 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, recently in the Denver Post there was published a guest editorial by Eudochia Bell Smith, director of the Federal land office in Denver, and former Colorado State senator, on the centennial celebration to be held this summer commemorating the beginning of the woman's movement, which has led to the enfranchisement of women in the United States. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD this spendid editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOMAN'S MOVEMENT BEGAN CENTURY AGO—COLORADANS TO CELEBRATE CENTENNIAL WITH PRIDE

(By Eudochia Bell Smith, former Colorado State senator)

"We women won what we want!" is the centennial cry of the woman's movement in America, which will be heard with crescendo salutations as mid-July approaches.

One hundred years ago, while attending the annual meeting of the Friends Society of New York, four women held a conference at Seneca Falls as the first woman's right

movement. Later, these same crusaders shifted the scene westward, and helped open up Colorado, always backward in women's movements, to round out their original resolution. That resolution read: "That woman is man's equal, was intended to be so by the Creator, and the highest good of the race demands that she be recognized as such * * * that women ought to be enlightened in regard to the laws under which they live * * * that it is the duty of the women of this country to secure to themselves their sacred right to the elective franchise."

Thus we inherited the nucleus of the woman-suffrange movement which resulted years later in the adoption of the nineteenth amendment. The four women who led were Lucretia Mott, Martha Wright, Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Mary Ann McClintock, who so impressed the editor of the Seneca Falls Courier that he printed the call free July 18 and 19, 1848.

Today in Washington, there is a marble shrine dedicated to the Woman Movement of the World. It is the first monument of women to women presented and executed by women.

In the words of the sculptor, Adelaide Johnson, "This monument is an immortal record of the mightiest thing in the evolution of mankind."

Presented to the women of America by the National Women's Party, it was accepted by Speaker Gillette in the name of women of the Nation and unveiled in the capitol rotunda on the birthday of Susan B. Anthony, February 21, 1921.

Already this year, there has been one convention marking the woman's centennial, that of the women's bureau conference, participated in by representatives from 26 States of the United States and Puerto Rico, representing more than 155 different women's organizations.

The speaker was one of the outstanding exponents of woman's rights in the world today: Dr. C. Mildred Thompson, dean of Vassar College, educator, writer, lecturer and the only member of the United States delegation to the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education in London in 1944.

The fight for suffrage in Colorado came 21 years after the Seneca Falls meeting, with the arrival here of Elizabeth Stanton and Susan B. Anthony. Under leadership of the wife of the Territorial Governor, Edward M. McCook, the Colorado Suffrage Association was formed, but the general assembly of 1879 voted suffrage down.

A committee headed by Judge Amos Steck, however, entered a favorable report strongly endorsing the move, pointing out "by putting women on an equality with men before the law, stimulating them to inquire into everyday affairs of life, they will gradually but surely remove the prejudice now existing against the employment as clerks, bookkeepers, saleswomen and in all the lighter but necessary labor now exclusively performed by the males. That enfranchisement will degrade women to the lower general level of the mass of men, we see no reason whatever to believe."

To illustrate what Judge Steck meant, Denver had a population of 7,000 in 1871, and only 27 women were engaged in business and not one in the professions outside of teaching. Here was woman's directory: 15 dressmakers, 3 hotelkeepers, 4 boarding-house keepers, art-school proprietor, laundry owner, tobacco-store owner, and 2 owners of hairdressing establishments; in Colorado, women were limited to 15 classifications in which they could be properly employed. Teaching came first.

Dr. Alida Cornelia Avery, first woman doctor, arrived in Denver in 1874, with degrees from Philadelphia Woman's College, New England Female Medical College and 9 years service as professor of physiology and hygiene at Vassar College. Because she found she could not practice medicine in Colorado, she threw herself in the struggle to obtain rights, and as president of the Territorial Woman's Suffrage Society, enlisted the aid of such notables as Willard Teller of Central City.

In 1881, Dr. Avery got a bill through authorizing the registration of women practitioners. Thus after 7 years fighting, Dr. Avery was admitted to practice, and grudgingly extended membership in the Arapahoe County Medical Society. State Medical Society kept up the bars until Dr. Madeline Marquette Baker was graduated from Gross Medical in Denver and thus admitted to membership in the State association.

Women of Colorado won their 24-year fight for equal rights in the election of 1893 with a majority of 6,337 votes. Three years ago Colorado in perhaps her hardest fought battle, put through the amendment to remove the last fetter on her sex. Now all courts including the Federal, call them on all venires; jury service for women. Yes, Colorado will proudly take her place in the centennial celebration of woman's movement.

The Displaced-Persons Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 12 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, so much misinformation and conjecture have been spread by those who, for one reason or another, are averse to action by this country to receive displaced persons from Europe, it would seem most desirable to get for our people actual facts about these unfortunate persons, presented objectively by someone who has been on the ground and had an opportunity to see and judge the types of persons who are asking for admission to this country. In an article in the Saturday Evening Post by Martin Sommers, foreign editor of the Post, an unbiased and authoritative picture is given of the types of persons in displaced-persons camps visited. Mr. Sommers went as a member of a group of editors and publishers and, we must presume, had a real opportunity to see and observe all angles of this displaced-persons problem.

The conclusion reached by Mr. Sommers, presented convincingly in his article, is that the DP's would pay America a dividend, besides reflecting once again to the world America's willingness to help unfortunates no matter where disaster strikes throughout the world.

Because, like Mr. Sommers, I am convinced that the Congress should take action on this important matter during the present session, I am calling Mr. Sommers' article to the attention of my colleagues and I have selected a large portion of the article as deserving of the attention not only of Members of Congress but our citizenry generally, and I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NUREMBERG, GERMANY.—A few miles outside of this jewel city where nazism finally was buried beneath the most forbidding heap of bones and rubble in Germany you find Camp Valka. And Camp Valka will give you something of a shock. For Hitler, the great spoiler, spoiled the meaning of the word "camp" to an extent, too—over here, when a camp is mentioned your subconscious mind makes you think of Dachau and Buchenwald and the others. So when you find that Valka is a pleasant place, where old men and women—not only children—smile, where eyes are bright and friendly, where hope still lives, you're astonished.

Your astonishment grows with everything you see at Valka. Nothing you have read about displaced persons would lead you to expect what you find here. There is a homemade fountain at the entrance to the camp. The neatly raked dirt walks are bordered by chips of bright stone, with a few plants. The bleak barracks—this was once a German troop kaserne—have been converted into apartments which, though crowded, manage to be attractive inside because of the resourcefulness of the occupants.

You find flowers on the window sills. There are hand-stitched curtains in the windows, and the carefully made beds have a few embroidered pillows scattered on them. The few pots and pans hanging over the stove in the kitchen-living room—10 by 12—are burnished. Seven people in three small rooms is about par for an apartment, but this morning only grandma is at home doing the housework. Father is at work in the camp's carpenter shop, mother is doing her share of the work in the community laundry before going to the commissary to line up for rations, the eldest son is salvaging metal for camp construction from a nearby dump, and the other children are at school.

School? Yes; we find there is a school for all children up to the eighth grade, with tutors having university degrees available for advanced students as well as heads of families reaching out for adult education. A former Riga headmaster is principal of the elementary school. He is toothless, his hair is thin, his lean frame is bent with age and ancient wrongs, and his voice quavers. But he has not lost the quiet smile and gentle, civilized air that is the trade-mark of the intellectual the world over.

Valka also has a clinic, a library, a shoe repair shop, a hothouse with potted flowers, a tiny forge, and a sort of city hall. But Valka prides itself most on its churches—a chapel of rare charm, built stick by stick by the menfolk, for the Greek Orthodox Catholics, and still another place of free worship for the Lutherans, who are in the minority here. The work that has gone into the carving of the altars, the painting of the murals, and the embroidering of the immaculate altar cloths attests that, homeless and destitute of material things as they are, the people of Valka are rich in spiritual assets.

These people of Valka are Balts—around 2,000 from Latvia and 1,200 more from Lithuania and Estonia. The majority of them are what would constitute a cross section of the middle class in our own country—in their Baltic homelands they were doctors and teachers, insurance salesmen and small-business men, artisans and farmers, nurses and engineers. They are maintained here at a cost of $13 a month each as the wards of the United States Army and the International Refugee Organization, which is taking over the trusteeship.

When Russia swallowed their little countries as effortlessly as any whale ever swal-

lowed a school of herring, these Balts decided they could not endure political and spiritual enslavement, so they took off for destinations unknown. Because of this, they hate communism as fervently as they cherish the ideal of liberty, an ideal for which they all risked their lives when they walked or hitchhiked their way here with nothing more than they could carry on their backs or in their hands.

When you talk to these people about communism, what you hear would make a discussion of the same subject at the union league sound very insipid indeed by comparison. Lt. Col. Jerry M. Sage, of Spokane, who has worked for 3 years with the DP's after making a splendid shooting-war record in the Army, put it this way, "If I were asked to point out the community which I considered the least susceptible to nazism, fascism, and communism, I would not take you to the isolated 100 percent American small town in the Middle West, but to a DP center in our zone in Germany."

It is true that Valka is an exceptionally efficient example of a DP camp, but our visiting group of editors and publishers inspected a number of others. In one we looked over the camp police station's blotter, and made other attempts to find concrete evidence of reports we had heard—that Germans naturally magnify and circulate these widely—about the lawlessness of DP's, particularly in some of the Polish camps. On the police blotters we found reports of this one and that one being AWOL for a few days, reports of a few fights, and some charges of petty thefts.

It is true that some displaced persons are active in the black market and that in one camp the bid-and-asked prices for the black market are set daily, in a sort of stock-exchange operation. But when you consider the desperate destitution of many of these people and the succession of spiritual earthquakes they have endured for years on end, you are surprised to discover that there is not a great deal more lawlessness. You reflect on the crime that environment has brewed in some of our big city slums at home. Over-all, few American industrial towns can point to a better record for law and order than the displaced person camps in Germany. And the people in the worst of our homeside slums are warmer in winter, and better fed, and better clothed than the DP's of Germany and Austria.

You cannot escape the conclusion that to an extraordinary degree the character and general make-up of the displaced persons in the American and British zones in Germany and Austria have been distorted and misrepresented. In America I heard everywhere that "the trouble with them is they just won't work," they've lost the habit of work, and they prefer to sit around aimlessly until we—or somebody—do something for them. This may be true in some places, but in the camps we were able to inspect nothing could be further from the truth. To an extent that amazes the visitor, these people have learned how to improvise with what they have—the art of making something out of nothing. The fact is, about all they have is their will to work, and most of them properly evaluate that asset—they want to show the world just how hard they can work, because that is the only way they have of winning their way to a normal life somewhere.

The majority of the refugees in the camps today represent the "hard core"—displaced persons who cannot or will not go back to their homes—but hundreds of thousands have been repatriated. Those in American zone camps include 112,697 Jews, 109,522 Poles, 79,943 Balts, around 5,000 Yugoslavs, some 2,400 Russian exiles, and others.

The great majority want to emigrate to the United States, Canada, Australia, or Latin America. But this is not true of most of the Jews, who are largely strongly Zionist, zealously bent on getting to Palestine, which they consider their homeland.

Army officers who handle the displaced persons under Brig. Gen. Thomas L. Harrold, Chief of the Civil Affairs Division, European Command, have almost unanimously reached the same conclusion on a solution for the problem. Their argument is convincing. While we have been doing nothing whatever about displaced persons except to keep them in a sort of outdoor almshouse, other countries have been busy with a more practical program. They have taken their pick—they've told the authorities what their requirements are and what age groups are desirable. They have accepted displaced persons carefully screened to fit these specifications. Great Britain has taken 25,000 workers, including many miners. France and Belgium have taken miners, too. Norway and Australia invited some with special skills, as well as farmers. Holland got in an early bid for specialists and took 8,000 artisans and nurses. A good many of our Army officers, having been with the problem of the DP's a long time, take a practical view of it. They say that if we don't act, if things continue in the present course, it is obvious that all the useful and skilled people in these camps will be taken elsewhere, and we shall get what is left, or, to put it bluntly, the least desirable of the DP population. If we don't act this spring, their view is that a development is a certainty. The best informed of these officers are also convinced that other countries have made a mistake in accepting only single workers. The families, the men and women with growing children, would give us the most desirable kind of new Americans, they insist. They point out that traditionally those who brought their young with them to the land of promise made the greatest contribution to our country.

Nobody who has seen these people can doubt that we could use some of them. Many impress you as the kind of people who emigrated from Europe to our shores because of religious persecution, the people who made our country what it is today. An investment in displaced persons as American citizens of the future would pay us dividends; those with families of bright young children particularly would be suited to life in the United States. There are others. For example, although Holland took some nurses, there are still trained nurses in the camps, and American hospitals are in desperate need of nurses, and trainees in the field.

At Valka I talked to one bright young woman in her twenties, a doctor of philosophy from the Lithuanian university at Vilnius and profficient in English. The next week she was scheduled to leave for Canada to become a domestic servant in a household there.

We could set up a scale of standards, and screen applicants for immigration in a wise and humane fashion. That is what the Army recommends, unofficially—the Army's job is to do, not to tell the Government what to do, of course. But the Army does regard the problem as extremely acute. One reason is the hatred of the German population toward the Fluchtlings, a smoldering fire which could flame into violence at any time, and result in riots. There could be shooting in which American soldiers would be killed.

Whether we act to do ourselves a service by bringing worth-while displaced persons to the United States or sit back and finally saddle ourselves with a great horde of unemployables is up to Congress. There are obvious humanitarian reasons, in the American tradition, for acting now in behalf of these suffering people, before hope dies within them. But putting all humanitarian consideration to one side, enlightened self-interest ought to prevail on Congress to act.

Freedom Rally Address by Hon. Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, almost a month ago today I had the honor to address the freedom rally at the invitation of the Coordinating Committee of American-Polish Associations. I request unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my address at this freedom rally, April 11, 1948, New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Just about 3 years ago, in the spring of 1945, I had the honor to be the guest of this same Coordinating Committee of American-Polish Associations which is again the moving spirit of this freedom rally. It was just 2 months after the signing of the Yalta agreement and 1 month before the San Francisco Conference. We were then energetically engaged in warning the makers of American foreign policy that Yalta held the seeds of a great tragedy for the world. Our warnings were not heeded.

The world has already paid a heavy price for the mistakes of some of our leaders. The cost is still rising. Today, in spite of all the blood and treasure sacrificed on the world's battlefields, there is no peace.

It is almost 3 years since the war ended. Sometimes peace seems farther away than it did at the darkest moments of the war. Much of Europe is still in a state of devastation. Economic life has not recovered. Fighting continues to rage in the Holy Land, China, Greece, and India.

From the border nations of western Europe the Communists now control much of the earth eastward to our own Territory of Alaska. Whole nations, almost whole continents, have become engulfed by a Red tide of tyranny which holds in subjection the greatest number of people ever brought under single control in all recorded history. Two fundamental ideas of life, one geared to human freedom and the other to state despotism, face each other throughout the world. Everywhere there is dissension and threats of hostility. Everywhere there is fear in the hearts of men.

How has the world been reduced to this tragic state of affairs? In the late war many nations banded together to crush the march of tyranny begun by Hitler and his Nazi hordes. What was the spirit which lifted our hearts and made us stout enough to face that titanic struggle without flinching? We know it was the spirit embodied in the four freedoms, in the Atlantic Charter, and in the hope that when the smoke of battle cleared nations could unite in a world organization capable of assuring peace, justice, and prosperity.

Chief among the sentiments which inspired us was freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom from fear and want. We sought no selfish gains, territorial or other, out of the war. We rejected the idea of territorial changes without the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned. We promised to respect the right of all peoples to freely choose their own form of government. Sovereign rights and self-government were to be restored to those who had been forcibly deprived of them. We agreed to work toward free access to trade and raw

materials which is necessary to world prosperity. We looked toward the organization of a peace in which nations would abandon the use of force and which would afford to all the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries.

It was for these goals that America entered upon the gigantic program of lend-lease without which the war might not have been won. It was in support of these goals that America finally dedicated her manpower and all her resources to the gage of battle. Russia did not join in many of these hopes and promises, to be sure, but she welcomed the powerful aid the free world gave her on these grounds.

Then, in the early dawn of victory and when the guns finally fell silent on a shattered world, came that series of tragic conferences and events which turned the victory of a hard-won war into a peace filled with disaster. The great sacrifices on the battlefields for the ideals we had proclaimed were bartered away over the conference tables of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. We had rejected the German surrender until it could be made to all the chief allies together. We stayed the victorious march of General Patton's and General Bradley's armies to permit the Red army to be the first to enter Berlin and Prague.

At Tehran, against the wishes of our British ally, we made fatal concessions to the Soviet Union. Before the war was over we had sacrificed two of our allies, Poland and Yugoslavia. The legitimate government of Poland was not represented at the San Francisco Conference, although 20 divisions of her brave army fought on our side throughout the war. Even while the San Francisco Conference debated, the Soviets captured 16 leaders of the gallant Polish underground army which had fought the Nazis for 5 years and had assisted the Red army in the final rout of the Nazis. We saw war-exhausted men of Poland marched off to Soviet concentration camps.

In Yugoslavia, the hero and warrior, Gen. Draja Mihailovich, was also sacrificed by his western allies. His government and his people were turned over to the Communist agent Tito who is today actively conspiring against the freedom and peace of his neighbors.

So intent were our leaders on the war and so eager were they to promote Soviet good will that they closed their eyes to the rape of the smaller Baltic Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

At Yalta we not only confirmed the Tehran betrayals but assigned half of Europe and the industrial heart of China—Manchuria—to the tender mercies of a government which knows no tenderness and mocks at mercy. The strategic Kuriles Islands were consigned to Russia, and China and Korea were opened to Soviet domination and exploitation.

Agreed upon at Yalta and written into the Charter at San Francisco was the veto power which has since been used by the Soviets to block attempts to bring peace to a war-torn world. I said at the time that the veto power would make the United Nations unable to fulfill its great mission to organize peace, and this has now come to pass.

Then, in hammering out the peace compacts with minor enemy nations, we surrendered to Moscow total dominion over Bulgaria, Rumania, and Hungary. America agreed to a reparations scheme for Italy which siphons off economic aid to that unfortunate people as fast as we can pump it in. We created a focus of war infection in Trieste. We left Italy exposed to the depredations of a Communist fifth column supported by the armed forces of her agressive neighbor, the Tito dictatorship. At this very moment the Communist fifth column seeks to grind Italian freedom under the heel of a Togliatti dictatorship.

At Potsdam we agreed to a system of reparations and to a future economic life for Germany which retards German recovery and the recovery of all of western Europe. As a result, the United States is today subsidizing the Germans on the barest living standard in order to prevent them from supporting themselves. The whole outlook for European recovery is being sacrificed to this nonsensical policy.

It seems incredible that nations which made such sacrifices to crush Nazi tyranny could be so blind as to permit another tyranny to rise out of the ashes of Nazi defeat.

I am sure it was not planned that way. You and I know that the American people despise oppression. We know that Americans historically are the champions of freedom and justice. But by unwise and secret diplomacy, we have found our high ideals being traded away.

Looking back on these developments it is possible to see in part at least how we blundered down this tragic road. We allowed the Soviet Armies to take the military honors at Berlin and Prague for perfectly good reasons. We wanted to recognize the measure of Russian sacrifices and suffering in the war. We wanted to continue the solidarity of the United Nations in the finishing of the war and in building the peace. We entered upon the fateful conferences at Tehran and Yalta for these ends and in a sincere effort to understand Russian fears for her postwar security. Our leaders sought her good will, but in our eagerness to win her trust they paid her a price which left almost totally bankrupt the ideals for which we fought the war. When we finally rubbed the secrecy of those conferences from our eyes, the brutal fact confronted us that we had bribed the masters of the Kremlin by conceding them chunks of territory and the freedoms of innocent populations.

How did the Soviets respond to the trust we placed in her? How did she deal with the concessions we made?

She used her entry into Berlin and Prague as a political device to impress the smaller nations with her power. She looked upon war-torn Europe as a fertile field for Communist expansion. She determined to make herself strong by sapping the strength of Europe and enslaving the free manhood of the west. She used Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam not alone for her own peace and security, but to dominate her smaller and weaker neighbors. She turned trust into license and concession into grab. She used every postwar problem and conference to undermine her neighbors, and to spread confusion and strife as weapons to force totalitarian communism on the free areas of the world. The pattern has now become familiar. It seeks to overthrow every free nation by infiltration of Communist fifth columns, by vicious propaganda, terrorism, domination, and then purges.

We must recognize communism for what it is—a vast international conspiracy with tentacles in every country in the world, our own included. Whatever it may be in theory, it is in practice a great engine of power, operated by desperate, ruthless, unscrupulous men, who have no respect for human liberties or for human life. They are men who will not hesitate to plunge mankind into another blood bath if we leave them any chance of winning world dominion.

The grave error of our wartime leaders was their surrender of principle to expediency. They sometimes laid aside the principles of peace they proclaimed when they called the country to the colors. They failed to realize that the weight of American technology and production was in itself enough to tip the scales to victory without further offerings to Russia. Also, our leaders failed to trust us. Their deals were in secret. I believe that if the American people had been taken into confidence by their leaders, 140,000,000 people in eastern Europe and millions more in northern China would never have been delivered into Soviet enslavement.

On May 23, 1944, when it became apparent that our valorous allies, Poland and Yugoslavia, were being abandoned to a totalitarian fate, I addressed the Senate and said:

"Certainly the American people have not gone into this struggle for the purpose of turning over Europe to the control of any nation or group of nations, much less to substitute the terrors of one dictatorship for another. * * * We have no desire to be a party to the establishment of any postwar organization which is to be dominated by one, two, three, or four nations."

Our wartime leaders undoubtedly meant well. Yet our late President and three Secretaries of State—Hull, Stettinius, and Byrnes—failed to understand that the Soviet Union was busy not only waging a military war against Germany but also a diplomatic war against their allies. But our leaders refused to heed those who did understand this crucial key to the course of events.

A full cycle has been taking place from that fateful day in December 1939, when Russia moved on Finland over American protest to the present moment when the immensely stronger weight of the Soviets is again pressing upon Finland, as it is everywhere else in Europe.

American public opinion is at last awake to the fateful commitments to Soviet Russia and to their harsh consequences. And we are acting characteristically to the ominous turn of events. Let me give you a brief summary of changing public opinion as I see it.

During the war years we had placed our trust in the Soviets as an ally. We opened lend-lease to them and supplied them liberally with our war production and all other materials necessary to sustain them. We shared our technical skill and secrets with them. We cooperated wholeheartedly with them in devising the military strategy against the Nazis.

When the war ended we joined with them in UNRRA for the relief of the destitute. They received far more out of UNRRA than they ever put in and America paid some seventy-five percent of the cost. We included them in all international plans for postwar relief and reconstruction. Although we were disappointed when they remained cold to plans for peace and recovery, we still believed they would think the better of it and eventually would participate.

But as Russia became more demanding, more aggressive toward her neighboring small countries; as she turned concessions and events to her self-interest alone, and as she blocked so many sincere efforts to peace and recovery, American opinion became somewhat bewildered and confused. We remained patient, however, and redoubled our efforts to understand Soviet ways.

As the Soviets continued and as case after case revealed her aggressive conduct, American opinion turned to irritation and protest. We made strong representations, I remember, in the Petkov and similar cases. And when diplomatic notes failed to move the masters of the Kremlin, America began to face the tragic reality, that in spite of our protests, the freedom of over 140,000,000 Europeans was ruthlessly being crushed by Moscow and her dominated satellite governments. But even then we could hardly believe that the Soviet leaders were so foolhardy to continue their aggressive conduct. We simply could not believe the Soviets would follow in Nazi footsteps after the terrible lesson of what Nazi oppression had cost the Germans and Europe.

It took the reestablishment of the Cominform, the threats to Greece and Turkey, and above all the seizure of Czechoslovakia and the death of the Czech patriot, Jan Masaryk, to convince some American leaders of the real meaning of Soviet behavior.

Thereupon, American opinion shifted another notch. We continued our simple economic aid to Greece, Turkey, China, and the 16 nations who met at Paris. But we took the further step of encouraging the free nations to work together for their safety and security. We began to show a firm determination to help them remain free. We took a firmer stand in direct resistance to Soviet actions in the United Nations and other international councils. And finally, we turned once again to our own rearmament with a program that should give notice to the world that America is at last aroused.

What is it we seek? Certainly, we wish to recapture the moral leadership which was bartered away by secret commitments and unprincipled appeasement. Here we are returning to the firm, positive ground which made America a haven for the oppressed and a champion of freedom throughout our history. We want the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter to be the beacon lights on the road we seek to travel. We demand an end to secrecy. We insist upon faith and integrity instead of half-truths and broken pledges

We must insist with all our force that a free world be allowed to heal its wounds in peace; and that the people of every country be permitted to order their own lives freely and in peace. We have already moved to permit Germany to support herself and contribute her share to the economic recovery of Europe. We propose to stay in Germany as long as needed for this purpose. We ask that Trieste be returned to Italy, rather than leave it as a no-man's land of constant friction. We have quickly passed the foreign aid bills to strengthen free peoples and hasten their recovery.

This is but the beginning of what we hope will become a general resettlement of postwar problems looking toward peace, equity, justice, and security for all nations. We hope the Soviets will join in this healing operation. The world needs the great contributions the Russian people can make to world peace and progress. We shall deeply regret any disposition the Soviet leaders may have to turn the clock back further to renewed strife and misery.

In my address to the Senate about 2 weeks ago, I outlined some 17 steps which our country should take to safeguard its future and to enable it to contribute toward world peace and stability. This program implements the following first principles:

America must be financially sound and economically strong.

Our Army, Navy, and Air Force must be reinvigorated with manpower and matériel to meet any eventuality.

Our industrial potential must be geared to the defense needs of the Nation.

Our scientific secrets must be safeguarded and scientific progress pushed vigorously.

Our military leaders should at once coordinate their efforts and draw up a strategic plan to meet any contingency.

Those who would confuse our counsels and subvert our efforts must be removed from Government positions.

We should deal with all countries, particularly with the Soviets, on a reciprocity basis so that good relations with all become a two-way street.

We must encourage and support those who resist aggression. We must not strengthen those who strive to undermine the United States and other free countries.

We should support and strengthen the United Nations until it is capable of dealing justly and effectively with aggression.

Finally we must have a government in Washington which is aware of the real nature of the trials we have to face and which will deal with them firmly, courageously, and intelligently.

In this hall this afternoon there are Americans whose ancestral roots are in Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, China, Czechoslovakia, Holland, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, Italy, Ireland, Korea, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, and Spain. This is in the true spirit of America for we have welcomed to our shores men and women who sought an opportunity to work out their own destinies in peace.

Think of it—in this hall there are people of almost a score of nationalities free to worship as they please, to speak and write as they wish, and free to move about this great country as they will in the full knowledge that our Government and our Constitution will protect their liberties, freedom, and security.

Our spirit stems from the very foundations on which the United States began. The spirit of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln in our memories is greatly enriched by the kindred spirits of Kosciusko, Pulaski, Garibaldi, Mazzini, Kossuth, Sun Yat-sen, and many others of the old world—east and west—who joined in common search and struggle for liberty, freedom, and truth.

All of the people in this hall know of the great statue which can be seen from Battery Park in lower Manhattan. It is the Statue of Liberty, the gift of France to America, holding high the torch of freedom. It symbolizes what America means to all of us. The same lamp of liberty burned in the spirit and hearts of our forebears, yours and mine. Let us unite in the determination to spread its shining light throughout the world.

The Civil-Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 12 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Threat of Tyranny," published in the May issue of the Southern Agriculturist.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE THREAT OF TYRANNY

President Truman's civil rights recommendations, if they were to be enacted into law by Congress, would be the most flagrant violation of constitutional rights in the history of this Republic.

If the proposed Federal Employment Practices Commission were to be approved by Congress, set up by the administration, and enforced by the FBI, there would be an avalanche of injustice falling upon the Nation, and far more human rights would be assaulted than there would be civil rights upheld. A man must be able to hire whom he pleases. Any interference with such a right not only violates the Constitution and jeopardizes the personal and economic s curity of the American people, but also affronts what the great philosopher Kant called "the inherent dignity of the individual."

The proposed Federal antilynching law is an insulting exaggeration of the local situation—and brushes aside the sincere and, all things considered, successful efforts of the States to put an end to a crime deplored by everyone but the most unscrupulous demagogue.

Demagoguery, indeed, has not been confined to the few whose philosophy of inferior races smacks of Hitler and the bombed-out buildings of Berlin. When one looks for the motive behind the antisegregation bill, for example, one can almost smell the bait for votes. Like the other sections of the civil-rights proposals, it is nothing more or less than a short-circuiting of the Constitution and of a free people's rights.

There are those, of course, who shrug their shoulders and remark, "Naturally, nothing will be done about it. It's all just politics."

If this be true, it is no less reprehensible. The slow but steady progress made by southerners of both races to bring about better relations can be badly damaged and even destroyed by turning the problem into a political football to be kicked about as a between-the-halves feature by the two parties.

As for the Federal fair employment practices proposal, it is an astonishing piece of business for a free people even to consider. To enforce it by sending agents into the day-by-day transactions of a private business, to oversee its acts, both of omission and commission, to instruct it, finally, on whom it must hire, fire, and even promote—all this is profoundly shocking.

One does not have to look across the seas today to be made aware of the vigilance a people must keep in order to retain its dignity and rights. What manner of men are we who can readily comprehend tyranny in Prague, but fail to see its threat in Washington?

Palestine and Middle East Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 12 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I recently delivered at the Hotel Statler before the Palestine and Middle East Conference.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On behalf of my colleagues Senator TOBEY and Senator CHAVEZ, and myself, I welcome you. We are mindful of the graciousness and courtesy which you have shown by coming here in answer to our invitation.

We have no particular point of view on Palestine to advance or defend. As three Senators, we accepted an invitation to help sponsor a conference for a discussion of Palestine problems. We seek only to better our understanding and the understanding of the public of America's problems in the Middle East. We are sponsors or advocates of no single school of thought on Palestine. As three Senators we have had nothing to do with the details of the arrangements of this conference and we have no intention of directing in any way its course.

We have called upon you to assist and guide us in determining the answers to problems which have vexed and troubled many minds and which have today brought misfortune to millions and pushed the world further from peace and nearer to the brink of disaster.

The problems with which we are concerned did not begin with Adolf Hitler. They did not begin with imperial aggrandizement nor did they have their origin in the holy crusades of the Roman Empire. Essentially, the problems which must concern us here antedate any specific historic event. We are faced with challenges in the field of international relations which are eternally old

and at the same time recurrently new. Our chief problem is essentially the question of whether men can reason together and in the name of truth and justice come to a conclusion which is ultimately transferred into a course of action. We are trying to discover a solution to human and social problems, not in terms of might, not in terms of convenience, but entirely in terms of what we believe to be our highest moral values.

The calling of this conference has met with the most heartening response. It is gratifying that statesmen, jurists, scholars, soldiers, captains of industry, leaders of labor, clergy and laity answered our call in such numbers that we were somewhat overwhelmed by the astonishing response.

In fact, it became clear to those who arranged the details of this conference that what they had hoped would be a compact working group was growing quite unwieldly and they therefore suggested to all who had been originally invited that they state their views in writing and allow a working group to digest and synthesize these ideas for resubmission to all those who indicated their desire to sponsor or participate. In this way, the impracticality involved in hearing and appraising several hundred oral statements could be avoided with a minimum of loss of the thinking and insight of this distinguished group of minds.

However, not all who heard about the conference were entirely pleased with our endeavor. The proposition, that a group of distinguished minds should meet to formulate a program worthy of the United States—in which we would make an appraisal based purely on America's spiritual and material interests—this quest was criticized and attacked from certain quarters. My office, the offices of my colleagues, have received letters and calls from several sources in the past few days, scolding and criticizing us for having summoned you people together to think with us about our problem. I must say that it is exceedingly gratifying to note that we have not been attacked from one side, but from both sides—I should like to amend that to say from all sides—since the special interests who feared your dispassionate search number many more than two. We have been charged with being advocates of the American League To Free Palestine. We are not. We are neither advocates nor opponents of the American League To Free Palestine. We only are searchers after facts, and we think this conference should develop some helpful views which will aid public thinking on Palestine.

Particularly I must note that there were some well-meaning critics who said that our motives were commendable but that a conference of this sort would only confuse already existing proposals now pending before the United States Government or the United Nations. They asked us not to rock the boat, not to upset the apple cart and, in some cases, not to spill the oil can.

I, for one, do not know of any comprehensive program of the United States which our Government has initiated regarding the Middle East, nor do I believe that the average American citizen could explain or even describe in the vaguest terms what our long-range policy is. I do not know what our objective is in the Middle East unless it be confusion as a technique. As to the short-term operations which we are pursuing, I do not think that these have met such gala success that we need feel either shy or ill advised in undertaking our own quest. This is an objective inquiry. However, we must make it clear that an objective inquiry does not mean that it has no object. During this conference, our curiosity about the facts is not that of the curator or librarian but that of men who must, in a short space of time, deal with and project a formula which we would like to see adopted as the foreign policy of our country at once. It has been said too frequently that there is no solution to problems of the Middle East and particularly to the bitter and tragic situation in Palestine. I cannot accept this philosophy of pessimism, since all historic experience proves that human problems can be resolved if one applies the new ingredient of the imagination to the particular situation. In our call letter inviting you gentlemen, there appeared the sentence "We must avoid fruitless polemic about the Arab case, Zionist case, British case, etc., and get down to a practical American policy which is not based on makeshifts but on a creative solution." It is interesting that, amongst the numerous warm letters which my colleagues and I received, these last two words, "creative solution", were most frequently chosen and quoted by the responders from whom we heard. Obviously, there can be no solution to a deadlock in the terms of a deadlock. And only if a new element, or a new concept, is introduced, can an impasse be passed.

It is in the inquiry into what this new element may be that you and I are engaged.

It is not for me to outline or suggest what you gentlemen are to decide. Nor is it my duty to propose the solutions which might logically evolve from the facts. I just don't know at the present moment what a proper solution to the Palestine issue is. That is one reason why I agreed to help call this conference.

I would pose those basic questions which this conference must answer if we are to create a solution. The substance and the solution must come from you.

We would be naive indeed to pretend that the conflict raging throughout the Middle East is purely of local origin and limited concern. In the Middle East today we can see the collision of the irresistible force meeting the immovable mass. The collision has brought anguish and disaster to vast populations who are caught between the anvil of medieval feudalism and the hammer of western economic and political change. I believe we are all in full agreement as to the nature of the basic clash in the Middle East; that we are witnessing the march of free, enlightened and democratic forces colliding with the inertia, the status quo of an established old regime, which has held the Middle East enthralled for over 1,000 years. The fixed and final arrangements of the feudal pattern of lives are being shaken by the ferment of change and revolution.

In the work of our conference we must not presuppose a liking for any particular group or any particular community since no group and no community in the Middle East nor anywhere else in the world has exclusive monopoly on the forces of progress or oppression. We are not gathered here to determine if we like the Mohammedan or if we pick the Jew. We are not gathered here to blueprint new intrigues whereby the United States can ally itself to a particular monarch or a republican regime in the Middle East.

Essentially, the struggle in the Middle East today is between the old order and the new order. And the task which remains before us is to determine what are the implications to America in this struggle and what role should we play?

Today, in the mighty conflict which is raging both on the barricades in Palestine and in a less sanguinary manner, behind the scenes in the universities and the bazaars of the Middle East, two ways of life are locked in death struggle. America's current whirling dervish policy in the Middle East must go. We can no longer take a pro-Zionist line regarding Palestine on Monday, a pro-British line on Tuesday, and a pro-Arab line on Wednesday. We must develop and project the American line.

In every situation arising in that area the United States is invited—nay, compelled to make a choice. It is the highest purpose of this gathering to determine the consistent rule by which we can make these choices so that we are no longer guilty of a patchwork policy. The embarrassment of our great Nation standing before the United Nations and oscillating from day to day, can no longer be tolerated. The confusion whereby we twist and turn from one makeshift to another has led to the serious deterioration of American prestige and has had dire, if not fatal complications for the United Nations. All of this vacillation and confusion comes from the fact that we have not cleared up our own psychological confusion regarding the forces of the Middle East and therefore we are unable to move along a logical course.

It is not for me to determine which force in the Middle East we are to choose. That is for you gentlemen. But I do know the test which must be applied. This conference is charged with determining, for instance, if America's current actions in the Middle East are sage and sober from the point of view of protecting our strategic, military, and economic interests.

America is deeply worried about communism. Do our actions in the Middle East tend to effectively counter the Communist threat or are we following a course which is ineffective and possibly even favorable to the development of communism? Does the State Department and its actions truly represent the interests and the security of the United States in the Middle East or has it been remiss and shortsighted? Have we, the United States, subordinated our interests in the Middle East to those of the British Empire or any other special interest? Are we assisting or frustrating the forces which are dangerous to the United States?

In conclusion, I might summarize my charge to you gentlemen by stating our proposition in its most elementary form:

At the present time the force of western enlightened free enterprise and democracy is locked in a struggle, is under a continuous and relentless attack by forces of colonialism, imperialism, and feudalism in the Middle East. We must answer these questions:

What does the United States stand to gain or lose if the forces of progress are destroyed in the Middle East?

What does the United States stand to gain or lose if the forces of progress succeed in the Middle East?

You gentlemen must strike a balance and determine what America stands to gain or lose in these choices and what risks we must take.

We can no longer live in two worlds. We can no longer abide in the twentieth century and the thirteenth century. We can no longer talk eloquently of one type of society and work desperately for another.

Alaskan Election Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 12 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, it has been an old saying politically in this country for many years that "as Maine goes, so goes the Nation." It has not held true in the past few elections, but there has been a section of this country that has held elections, and ever since they have had elections the adage could apply to that Territory. Every single

election held in the Territory of Alaska, Mr. President, has been a forerunner of what has happened in the Nation.

The Territory had an election last Tuesday, and the returns, although not uniformly complete, since there are certain sections of Alaska which have to send in the ballots by dog team, which takes a little while, are sufficiently complete to give the trend. It is with great pleasure that I announce, even from this side of the aisle, or from the other side of the aisle, that the Alaskan election has in my opinion carried out this old political maxim. The Democrats were elected by a majority of 2 to 1.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to ask him whether he knew and could tell us whether the new party, led by Henry Wallace, was on the ballot in any way, shape, or form in that election?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not think it was on the ballot in Alaska. I am not sure.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then I contend it is not a fair sample.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I assure the Senator that the election was conducted in accordance with the laws of Alaska. The new party candidates probably would have appeared on the ballot, but they apparently came too late.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Alaska Sunday Press, of Juneau, Alaska, and also to say, with a great deal of pleasure, I note that the very distinguished Delegate from Alaska, whom many of us know in this Congress, Mr. E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, was reelected by an overwhelming majority. I ask unanimous consent to place the Alaskan returns in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TERRITORY STILL DEMOCRATIC

With returns from last Tuesday's primary election (the new blanket primary) still incomplete as this is written, it is clearly apparent that Alaska is still at the top of the Democratic Party's column. If the 30-year-old political axiom holds true this year—as Alaska goes so goes the Nation—then those political wiseacres who are filling myriad newspaper and magazine columns with predictions of a GOP landslide next November will have some tall explaining to do when the ballots are tabulated.

On the face of the early returns—the First and Third are almost complete—Delegate BOB BARTLETT will carry the primary over his GOP opponent by 5 to 1 or better. And under the blanket primary law it is possible he will be named the GOP candidate also. If enough Republicans marked his ballot, that seems to be inevitable. The results of the delegate primary seems to be the best criterion as to whether or not Alaska remains Democratic.

In the other Territorial races, J. Gerald Williams, Democrat, was polling more than 2 to 1 votes of that cast for the GOP candidate, Almer J. Peterson. Frank A. Boyle, who is in winner's post over Harry E. DeLand for the Democratic nomination for auditor, had almost 6 to 1 over Albert E. Goetz, Republican. Donald MacDonald and Frank Metcalf, Democratic contestants for highway engineer, polled about 7 to 1 over Ira P. Farnsworth, GOP candidate.

Low-Cost Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 12, 1948

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, there is included herewith a broadcast I made on April 30 over radio stations WBAB, in Atlantic City, and WSNJ, in Bridgeton, entitled "Low-Cost Housing":

Last week I said that we must not permit our preoccupation with the international situation to serve as an excuse for neglecting domestic projects of the utmost importance to our people at home. I mentioned particularly housing. Since that time there has been an encouraging development. At the end of the week the Senate passed the General Housing Act, and thus the responsibility for housing legislation now squarely confronts the House.

It seems to me there can be but little objection to the policy of this housing proposal. It properly recognizes that the welfare and security of the Nation, and the health and living standards of the people, require production of residential dwellings and community development sufficient to remedy the admittedly serious housing shortage. It further proposes the beginning of a program to eliminate slum areas and sets forth these basic principles:

1. Private enterprise shall be encouraged to serve as large a total need as it can.

2. Government assistance shall be utilized where feasible to help private enterprise serve that need.

3. Government aid shall be established to clear slums and provide adequate housing for families with incomes so low that they cannot otherwise be decently housed; and that Government aid is limited to those communities which can demonstrate that those needs cannot fully be met through reliance solely upon private enterprise or upon local and State revenues.

Now, it seems to me that those basic principles are sound. I think there are very few of us who will not insist that whenever private enterprise can supply the need for housing, it shall exclusively do so. There are some who perhaps feel that the Federal Government should not function at all in this problem, but I am satisfied that there is a need for the clearance of slum areas, and a need for the construction of low-cost housing which is not attractive to private capital. In that field community, State, and Government efforts are required and justified.

It is self-evident that to construct a new home today, even one of very modest size and appointments, requires an investment of between $7,500 and $12,000. If private capital builds such a modest home for investment, the minimum rental is likely to be at least $75 per month, and in most cases higher. There is a great field for such construction, and it is proceeding rapidly. The level of prosperity and employment and wage scales is high, and there are plenty of customers for that high-cost housing. But it is also evident that throughout the Nation and throughout our district in south Jersey, there is a high proportion of families who are willing to work and are satisfactorily employed, who nonetheless are wholly unable either to buy or rent decent homes at the present price structure. It is a matter for national concern that such people be decently housed, and that is the field where Government aid can operate.

And, of course, the further field is that of slum clearance. The gradual elimination of slum areas and their replacement with decent housing units is of a social value which cannot be exaggerated.

It seems to me, therefore, that the principle of this legislation is sound. We must continue to emphasize the language of the bill which provides that Government aid can in no circumstances be extended where private enterprise or local or State assistance will do the job. Within this sound principle, the Housing Act effectively and sensibly administered will be of enormous social benefit.

I have said before that our district suffers less than more congested and metropolitan areas. Nonetheless, in Atlantic City, particularly, and in the three Cumberland cities of Bridgeton, Millville, and Vineland-Landis, as well as in Cape May County, there is need for housing, and there is need for slum clearance. The local authorities in these communities are aware of that need, and with some degree of assistance I am satisfied that they can and will do a job.

The present bill contains broad provisions for home loans and insured mortgages particularly for veterans, for housing research to study means of reducing cost, for rental housing aids, and for the insurance of housing investments, for slum clearance and urban redevelopment, and for the construction of low-rent housing with veterans' preference. It is not incumbent upon the House to accept every sentence of the Senate bill, but it is incumbent upon us to join with the Senate and move quickly toward the solution of the housing problem.

River Valley Chambers Should Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 12, 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shreveport Times of May 9, 1948:

RIVER VALLEY CHAMBERS SHOULD ACT

The United States Chamber of Commerce in a carefully timed statement to all Members of the Senate, Monday morning urged that the $708,000,000 waterway development bill reported by the Senate Finance Committee be cut to $400,000,000. The statement came as the Senate began consideration of the measure.

We do not think the United States Chamber's action is going to be welcomed by chambers of commerce in the various river valleys and waterway areas of the Nation, whether they be Red River, Mississippi, Ohio, or any other. Chambers of commerce up and down these valleys for years have been working their hardest to get waterway development, often making it their major project. Because such development is essential to the safety and protection of their land and people, development of their industry and transportation, and needed to promote agriculture, the United States Chamber always has in the past, we believe, given its full support to its affiliates. Now, papa has deserted the whole family and left the children orphaned on someone's doorstep.

The Overton Red River lateral canal from Shreveport to the Mississippi, is only one project included in the Senate committee's bill. Safety, protection, and development up and down the Red, on our bayous, in the

whole Mississippi-Missouri-Ohio Valley are affected. The Times believes that every chamber of commerce in every valley area should get busy and let the United States Senate know right now that the United State organization is not speaking for them. And it must be done right now if it is to have any effect, for the bill already is nearing a vote.

Is Russia Sparring for Time?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1948

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, it appears that Russia is seeking time to reappraise her position in world affairs. Events of recent months seem to have made an impression upon her. The Italian election did not go the way she wanted it to. The recent move to consolidate the position of western Europe into a federation of states. The evident attitude of the United States that we will not stand for any more foreign subversive activities here indicate a need for Russia to take stock in her future position.

It is singular to note that the countries she has annexed are all of Slavic origin. She has failed in Italy and Greece.

Here is a recent article from the United States News which sums up Russia's present position very well:

THREE IN KREMLIN WHO ARE SHAPING A MORE CONCILIATORY POLICY TOWARD THE UNITED STATES: TASK OF MESSRS. STALIN, MOLOTOV, AND ZHDANOV

A small group of men, behind the Kremlin walls, is shifting the course of history by an abrupt change in Russian policy toward America. These men have been stopped cold in their westward advance. They have been forced to reconsider. The men, busy developing a new phase in the cold war, are:

Joseph Stalin, aging dictator, who gives more and more of his work to others, but still has the last emphatic word.

Vyacheslav M. Molotov, the coming man of Russia, who largely has been making Soviet foreign policy for months.

Andrei A. Zhdanov, fire-eating nationalist and expert on foreign affairs, who sometimes disagrees with Mr. Molotov and often competes with him for Premier Stalin's favor.

In recent weeks, this powerful trio has had the world talking fearfully in terms of war. The inner story of what the three have done is revealing. And what they are doing now, their personalities and ideas are basic to the future.

PEACE?

Informed Washington circles now expect definite peace feelers from Russia. In the face of the Italian elections, the European recovery program and American determination to rearm, it is believed the men of the Kremlin may finally have been brought to a realization that they can go no further without courting a war for which they are unprepared and from which they can gain little.

American officials will be willing, of course, to talk it over with the Russians. How much might be accomplished, however, remains a puzzle. The talks would be overlaid with a spirit of distrust on both sides. Any accord that might be reached would be subject to later interpretation or repudiation as Mr. Stalin and his colleagues see fit. The war of nerves would continue. In any event, President Truman has reiterated that there will be no meeting between him and Mr. Stalin unless the latter comes to Washington. Such a trip is highly unlikely.

GAINS AND LOSSES

The advantages of an agreement seem to lie mostly with Russia. The Soviets critically need materials and manufactured goods that could be purchased in the United States, under a commercial accord.

Peace talk, too, would take much of the steam out of the present rearmament drive. Taxpayers might rebel at continued huge military spending. The threat to Moscow of American rearmament would be eased. After lulling America into a false sense of security, the Moscow group could resume its bellicose attitude later, whipping up and quieting war scares at will.

As to the coming peace feelers, some officials say they grow very alert and suspicious when Russia "begins to purr."

WAR AND THE ATOM

Top American circles are convinced, too, that Mr. Stalin and his colleagues hardly want war with the United States. They are not equipped to undertake such a prolonged struggle as would be involved.

High Washington officials believe that the Russians may have given up efforts to develop an atomic bomb of their own. The necessary quantities of materials, water power, and transportation are so vast that it is felt the Soviet Union could not divert them from other uses. In Russia, too, uranium deposits are believed to be scarce and of a poor grade.

So, in view of all these things, the Russian leaders have been hauled up short and forced to reconsider. A definite indication of this is seen in the fact that anti-American propaganda by way of speeches, newspaper articles, and the radio has almost ceased in Russia and its satellite countries. Such a development almost always precedes a switch in the Russian line. It closes a phase of the cold war of which Mr. Molotov, more than any other, was the author.

PREELECTION DRIVE

Nearly a year ago, it is reliably reported, Mr. Molotov drew up a program of immediate Russian expansion. It was based on his expectation that American resistance would be slight, that in fact the United States would be able to do little or nothing until after the Presidential election of next November. Mr. Molotov was setting out to take advantage of the slowness with which democracies sometimes must move.

In this, he made a serious error, as events proved. Russia was able only to tighten the drawstring on Czechoslovakia, which already was in the bag, and work out an arrangement with Finland. Mr. Molotov had to report to Premier Stalin that his policy was mostly a failure.

THE DICTATOR

It is thought unlikely, however, that he has injured his popularity with Mr. Stalin. They have been to closely associated for many years. There have been other failures in the past, and these have not hurt him with the boss. The sphinxlike dictator is patience itself in achieving his long-range objectives.

At 68, Mr. Stalin, completely gray, looks old but in good physical condition. His step is firm, and his mind is said to be as keen as ever. Nevertheless, he must take it easy. His 15 to 20-hour working days are a thing of the past. His vacations on the shore of the Black Sea grow longer. Last year it was 5 months; the year before, three. Reports persist that he has a heart condition that must be kept constantly in mind.

Necessarily, he has had to delegate some of his jobs and many of his powers to others. Mr. Molotov and Mr. Zhdanov have been the chief recipients, but other members of the Politburo, the top council of Russian leaders, have been included. Mr. Stalin's essential power remains unweakened, however. The men about him are completely loyal. When he wants his powers back he gets them.

Mr. Stalin is said to be writing a book, his legacy to communism. The volume elaborates the Leninist interpretation of Marxism, and applies it to situations arising since Nicolai Lenin's death. Its central tenet is that the last stage of capitalism is imperialism. He believes that American policy is imperialistic and that consequently the downfall of the United States is only a matter of time.

ACTING PREMIER

Many of the central administrative powers usually wielded by Mr. Stalin have been turned over to Mr. Molotov. The latter not only has been making foreign policy, but he has been running domestic affairs as well, subject only to Mr. Stalin's veto. When given power, he exercises it with an iron hand. As an administrator, Mr. Molotov is the height of efficiency. Long hours of concentrated work are his habit.

When Mr. Stalin is in Moscow, he and Mr. Molotov occupy adjoining apartments in the Kremlin. When the dictator is away, Mr. Molotov visits him frequently and keeps in communication.

They have been working together since 1912, when they helped Lenin publish his newspaper Provda in St. Petersburg (now Leningrad). By chance, Mr. Molotov was one of the few key bolsheviks in St. Petersburg when the revolution came. Mr. Stalin at that time was in exile in Siberia. Mr. Molotov and others kept the revolution going until the exiles could return. Later, he sided effectively with Mr. Stalin, after Lenin's death, to make him the top man.

If a United States-Russian conference should develop for the present situation, American officials know what to expect. Mr. Molotov's conferences by now have fallen into a definite pattern: early cordiality, heavy demands, protracted discussion and deadlock, followed by either postponement or a futile compromise, usually closer to Mr. Molotov's desires than those of the democracies.

MR. ZHDANOV

Less known outside Russia than Mr. Stalin or Mr. Molotov, he is a constant force for Russian nationalism. Huge, plump, black-haired and smiling, the 52-year-old Mr. Zhdanov is considered one of the most intelligent and best educated of Russian leaders.

He was born in the Ukraine, aligned himself with the bolsheviks at an early age, and had a minor part in the revolution. Thereafter his rise was rapid. In 1934 he became a member of the Politburo, and a close association with Mr. Stalin began. Mr. Stalin likes his salty humor. He also liked a book written some years back by Mr. Zhdanov defending him against the attacks of Trotskyite defamers.

It is Mr. Zhdanov who foments antiforeign sentiment in Russia. He usually favors going ahead with expansionist plans where the more cautious Mr. Molotov is likely to hold back. Mr. Zhdanov is credited with having prodded Mr. Stalin into the war against Finland that began in 1939. Thus, he and Mr. Molotov furnish a balance that Mr. Stalin finds useful.

Mr. Zhdanov is an effective propagandist with the Russian people. He mobilizes Soviet writers and sees that they stick strictly to the party line. It is he who has been upbraiding Russian composers for writing music that he thinks is a non-Russian aping of western composers.

As a general in the Red Army, Mr. Zhdanov was the "hero of Leningrad." He

saved the city from the Nazis, although at a terrific cost in casualties. This has given him an important influence with the upper echelons of the army.

SUCCESSION

There is no doubt that Mr. Stalin has tapped Mr. Molotov as his successor. Whether that decision can be made to stick after Mr. Stalin's death, however, is a matter of dispute. So much power is involved that a struggle for the dictatorship could easily develop.

In such a contest, two other men would be important. Lavrenti P. Beria controls the army of secret police. No government could last without his support, it is said. Mr. Beria, implacably ambitious, might want the job for himself. Georgi M. Malenkov, formerly Mr. Stalin's private secretary and the chief dispenser of jobs in the Soviet bureaucracy, has powerful support in the Communist Party. Mr. Zhdanov could call on the army for aid.

A row over the succession is considered a distinct possibility, one that has been included in the future considerations of American foreign policy.

COLD WAR

But meanwhile, with Mr. Stalin still alive, the outlook for the months ahead is plain. The Russian line is changing to a more friendly approach to America. There is to be less emphasis on elections in western Europe and more on sabotage, strikes, terrorism. The cold war will continue, but the trend is away from steps that would lead to a "hot," or shooting war.

McGregor Will Hold Conferences in District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1948

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, it has always been my policy to keep in constant contact with the people of the Seventeenth Ohio District, whom I represent in Congress. I am anxious to learn what the folks back home are thinking about. In order to follow this policy, I have attempted to make myself available to my constituents so they might discuss with me their views relative to national issues and also to give me the opportunity to be of service to them as their Congressman.

In accordance with my annual procedure, during the period of our official congressional recess I plan to visit the six counties of the district. I have made arrangements to be at the courtroom of the county courthouses from 9 a. m. to 5 p. m. and have set forth the following schedule:

Monday and Tuesday, August 9 and 10, Ashland, Ashland County.

Wednesday and Thursday, August 11 and 12, Mansfield, Richland County.

Friday and Saturday, August 13 and 14, Mount Vernon, Knox County.

Monday and Tuesday, August 16 and 17, Delaware, Delaware County.

Wednesday and Thursday, August 18 and 19, Newark, Licking County.

Friday and Saturday, August 20 and 21, Coshocton, Coshocton County.

I have been most gratified with the results obtained in the past and interest shown by the number of constituents who have availed themselves of our conference plan.

No appointments are necessary, and I look forward to meeting a greater number this year, as I am certain we all have problems of personal and national interest to discuss, which will be of mutual benefit. I urge my constituents to confer with me on the date most convenient to them so that I may have their views, which will aid me in representing them in Congress.

Prune Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1948

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following copy of a communication addressed to one of my colleagues by John B. Schneider, manager of the California prune-marketing program:

MAY 5, 1948.

Congresswoman HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN DOUGLAS: In the April 29 issue of the San Francisco News there appeared a long article with appropriate banner headlines and a large picture of our California Congresswoman explaining the increased price of food. You are quoted as saying prices are 25 percent higher than when price controls were lifted. In this article appears the following:

"Dried prunes—a lovely dish. Thirty-two under OPA; 54 cents last year. And about the same today. Some reason for a sigh."

I must assume, for the sake of some reasonableness, at least, that these prices represent prices for 2 pounds of prunes. As you no doubt know, the California prune industry is a very large and important segment of the fruit-growing industry of California. The economic position of the growers has been so disastrous this last year that the problem is serious. The prices to the growers, instead of being higher than during OPA days, is considerably lower. Likewise, the prices to the consumers, instead of being 25 percent higher, are considerably lower than those in effect during OPA days. For this reason, this type of publicity (such as that to which I refer) causes undue harm to the efforts of the industry in attempting to assist itself. As a matter of record, the following are the figures which actually did prevail during the OPA period:

The average price for the month of October 1942, as reported by the United States Department of Agriculture, was 16.2 cents per pound. This is at the rate of 32.4 cents for 2 pounds. There was at that time in effect a Government subsidy of 3 cents per pound which the consumer was paying, not directly, but through his Government. This, for the 2 pounds, would amount to a total of 6 cents, which, added to the 32.4 cents, would be 38.4 cents for a 2-pound carton.

In July 1946, still under OPA, the price advanced, including the same 6-cent subsidy for 2 pounds, to a total of 42.2 cents for 2 pounds. Hence, your reference that the price of prunes during OPA days was 32 cents is inaccurate. Actually, the price, when controls went off, was 42.2 cents for 2 pounds.

I wonder where you found it necessary to pay 54 cents for a 2-pound package of prunes at this time. I have just returned from a long trip through the eastern markets, including the city of Washington, and went to a number of retail establishments. The price which I found as a prevailing price was about 35 cents per 2-pound package, with some small retail establishments that were charging 40 cents for 2 pounds. The price since my return has dropped still further.

You may also be interested in a record of the farm price of prunes. The following brief table will show you the trend from 1941 through 1947:

Farm price:	*Cents*
1941	3.75
1942	7.30
1943	9.60
1944	10.90
1945	10.50
1946	12.80
1947	8.00

The above figures are average annual prices as reported by the United States Department of Agriculture. The price indicated for 1947 prunes, which crop is now being sold is preliminary. The final figure will probably be lower than the preliminary figure. As a matter of fact, the price to the grower since the harvest of last year has dropped from about 8 cents per pound to the present prevailing price ranging from 5 cents to 5½ cents per pound. These prices are considerably below the cost of producing the crop.

I call the above information to your attention, not in any sense of criticism or objection to your endeavors to bring costs of living down to a reasonable level, but only because prunes, and I believe you will agree, are a very unfortunate choice. This is one product which is available to the consumer at a price considerably lower than that which prevailed during the war period. This situation is due to a number of causes. One important cause, with which you as a Representative of California might wish to be familiar with, is that California produces more than 75 percent of all the prunes grown in the entire world. California is an important source of prunes, not only for the American consumer but for consumers in many other parts of the world. Before the war, approximately 40 percent of California's production was exported. Of these exports about 80 percent were sold in Europe. During the war, our Government purchased these prunes, which previously had been sold abroad, and made them available either to our armed forces, to the armed forces of our allies, or to the civilian populations of our allies. This year, that outlet was not available and it was only through the effective cooperative efforts of all agencies of the Government including Congress, that a sizable quantity of prunes has been made available through the Commodity Credit Corporation to some of our friends abroad. Many of them, however, have not had the good fortune of enjoying our prunes this year. Let me cite just two examples:

France, before the war, imported an average of 18,000 tons of California prunes per year. This year it received none, except for small packages which friends of the French have sent to that country.

England is another example. England, last year, with the extension of a sizable American loan, purchased 33,000 tons of prunes. This year, that country has purchased none.

All this terrific supply of prunes has been available for consumption in this country. The simple economics consequent of this situation, which anyone can readily see, is to

reduce the price, and that has in fact occurred.

Your fellow Congressmen, such as Congressman JACK ANDERSON, the Congressman from the heart of the prune producing area; Congressman CLARENCE F. LEA, who comes from another important prune producing area; Congressman CLAIR ENGLE, also from an important prune producing area, and nearly all the other Congressmen from California are familiar with the problems of the prune producing industry.

May I suggest that a possible healthful positive approach to the consumer of the United States is to call to his attention those products which are lower in price and economical items. This positive approach would be most helpful both to the consumer and to the producer, the welfare of both being matters I am sure, of concern to you.

Cordially yours,

JOHN B. SCHNEIDER, *Manager*.

What Americans Expect in Return for Their ERP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER E. BREHM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 12, 1948

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George E. Sokolsky, appearing in the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch, entitled "What Americans Expect in Return for Their ERP":

WHAT AMERICANS EXPECT IN RETURN FOR THEIR ERP

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The Economist, undoubtedly one of the most important weeklies in England, if not in all the world, has this to say of ERP:

"In time of peace, in order to aid nations geographically remote and politically separate from the Americas, at a time of great internal shortages, the United States is ready to give away over $5,000,000,000 worth of commodities as the first installment of a wider program, to give them for peaceful economic reconstruction, and, save for minor exceptions, to give them without political conditions of any sort. A year ago the project would have been inconceivable—Congress was then making desperately heavy weather over only $400,000,000 for aid to Greece and Turkey. Ten years ago such an initiative would have driven the Nation en masse into the arms of the America Firsters. And search back as one may through the annals of the United States, or of any other power, there is no record of a comparable act of inspired and generous diplomacy."

It adds:

"It will be difficult, after this demonstration of international solidarity, to go on repeating the old gibes about American isolationism, the old complacent references to American political immaturity. In recent months the American public, in its eagerness for information, its sustained interest in foreign affairs, and in its acceptance of positive and onerous international responsibility, is rapidly qualifying for the title of the least isolationist and self-absorbed of peoples."

But I fear that the Economist does not altogether grasp the reason for the change in American attitude. The editors of this magazine attribute much of the success of ERP to Messrs. Marshall, Acheson, Vandenberg, and Douglas. They might have added Bernard Baruch, Herbert Hoover, Christian Herter, and dozens of others.

And there is danger in any misunderstanding about ERP. The American people do not want it to be another costly flop like the British loan. They do not expect ERP to be dissipated and wasted. As a matter of fact, they could not afford to have it dissipated and wasted.

The American people do not want a war with Soviet Russia or any other country. They do not believe that such a war will benefit the victor any more than the vanquished. They know that the last war cost more than $300,000,000,000 and left the country with a debt of $252,000,000,000, a Government budget of roughly $40,000,000,000. They are convinced that the next war will alter their economic system and devastate their social and political life.

Ergo, they are willing to take out a time-insurance policy and pay a high rate. If Soviet Russia is contained east of the Elbe, north of the Italian-Greek-Turkish line in the Mediterranean, out of the Near East altogether, out of China, peace may for a considerable period be possible.

This formula involves the revival of the economies of 17 or more nations. It requires an American underwriting of their powers of economic and political survival. It forces upon the United States the responsibility of sustaining a standard of living among these peoples, high enough to discourage revolution, high enough to create a climate antagonistic to communistic blandishments among the proletariat and the intellectuals—the latter being particularly prone to travel in alien and distant green pastures.

The formula is risky and contains within itself many germs of its own destruction. But so does any other formula that anyone can conceive. If the Russians really want a war, they can have one tomorrow morning, as the atmosphere is full of causes for war. The same is true of the United States. The marvel of it is that incident after incident has occurred, and both sides have indicated a vast capacity for forbearance. But that does not mean that war may not come before ERP accomplishes its purposes.

There in a nutshell is the situation If the statesmen of Europe and China and our ECA administrators use our credit carefully, constructively, vigilantly, it may accomplish its ends. If the billions of American credit provide a wild holiday of spending for spending's sake, it will do infinite harm and may ruin the United States as well as western Europe.

A Republican Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 12, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial that appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on May 12, 1948:

A REPUBLICAN RESPONSIBILITY

The many Americans who want to see the Fellows bill for resettlement here of 200,000 displaced persons go through the House of Representatives with flying colors are naturally impatient of delay. Speaker MARTIN, who favors its passage, looks for Rules Committee action next week. But he also announces a steering committee decision to poll the majority membership before the measure is brought to the floor. Action in behalf of the displaced persons thus becomes primarily a Republican responsibility. We urge, with all the force at our command, that the Republican Members make the statesmanlike decision by registering overwhelmingly their willingness to put the Fellows measure to a vote. That decision will insure House leadership on this, the most important humanitarian issue of the peace.

For though the Fellows bill is not all those closest to the displaced persons problem ask, it is far superior to the pending Senate measure. The number to be admitted—200,000 in 2 years—is twice the number specified in the Senate bill. The clause charging those admitted against future quotas from their countries of origin is a hard proviso, but it does not defeat the central purpose as do certain restrictive provisions of the Senate bill. The best hope for a real solution of the displaced persons issue is that the House will give the Fellows bill such decisive precedence as to insure its acceptance by the Senate as well.

Educational Assistance Available to War Orphans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 12, 1948

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following survey made by the Gold Star Society of American War Widows and Orphans showing the educational advantages available to war orphans through State, institutional, and private scholarships:

A total of 43 States have made some provisions for the advanced education of their war orphans. Scholarships are provided by 29 of these. An additional 14 have made provisions in the form of certain exemptions or other privileges. Scholarships and assistance allowances have also been established by private persons and organizations desiring to help the war orphans.

In direct contradiction to the many facilities provided for the orphan in advanced years, we find a deep lack of consideration for the provision of the necessities during childhood and adolescence. The obvious, and unfortunate, conclusion must be that while this lack of adequate precollege provision continues to exist there will be many orphans who will be forced to work at an early age in order to augment family income, and many more who will not be able to complete even education of high-school grade.

A detailed summation follows:

STATE AID

The following States, including the District of Columbia, provide aid in the education of war orphans: California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming, and District of Columbia.

Scholarships of $150 a year: The Nevada and New Jersey acts provide $150 a year for each child. The Nevada act limits the bene-

ficiaries to those under the age of 19 attending high school. No other State limits the scholarships to high-school students.

Scholarships of $200 and $250 a year: The Connecticut, Delaware, Minnesota, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and District of Columbia acts give each child $200 a year. The Minnesota act also exempts students from the payment of tuition at State institutions of secondary and college grade. The Massachusetts act gives each child $250 a year.

Scholarships of more than $250 a year: The Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, and West Virginia acts provide $300 a year for 4 years and free tuition at State educational and training institutions of secondary and college grades. The North Carolina act grants free tuition, and to those needing financial assistance, board and room rent, as well, at any of the State educational institutions.

Under the California act, as amended July 17, 1945, students of collegiate, junior college, business and trade-school rank receive $400 a year if they pursue the regular course, or $480 if they pursue the full year, including summer course. Students of high-school grade receive $200 for the regular school course, or $240 for the full-year course. Dependent widows, as well as orhpans, of veterans are eligible for these scholarships. California, so far as known, is the only State that provides aid in the education of widows of veterans.

The Indiana, Michigan, Texas, and Wyoming acts simply exempt war and postwar orhpans from payment of tuition, matriculation fees, and other fees. The amount to be paid for each child in Oklahoma is determined by the Soldiers' Relief Commission, and in Nebraska by Nebraska Veterans Aid Fund Committee.

The Oregon State Board of Higher Education on May 8, 1945, approved a report of its finance committee recommending that in awarding the state scholarships now authorized by law, special consideration and priority be given to orphans of veterans of World Wars I and II. The State scholarships exempt students from payment of tuition and fees.

EDUCATION OF WAR ORPHANS

In addition to State-endowed scholarships the following States have available special privileges as follows:

Connecticut: The following institutions cooperate with the American Legion and Auxiliary in assisting orphans of veterans in attaining higher education through scholarships, reduced rates, vocational guidance, student employment, etc.: Booth Preparatory School, Junior College of Connecticut, New Haven Preparatory School, Roxbury School, Tafts School, Waterbury Catholic High School, Yale, Wesleyan, Trinity, Albertus Magnus College, Connecticut College for Women, Arnold College of Physical Education.

District of Columbia: The following institutions each grant one scholarship to war orphans: Southeastern University, Columbus University, National University, Strayers Business College, Washington College of Music.

Florida: Under the Scholarship Act, war orphans are exempt from the payment of tuition at State institutions. The University of Florida and State College for Women also exempt them from payment of all matriculation and other fees.

Georgia: Under the Scholarship Act, war orphans are exempt from payment of tuition at State institutions.

Illinois: Under the Scholarship Act, war orphans are exempt from payment of tuition at State institutions. The Onargo Military Academy grants special scholarships to all war orphans.

Indiana: Under the Scholarship Act war orphans are exempt from the payment of tuition and matriculation and other fees at Purdue University, Indiana University, and Ball and Indiana State Teachers Colleges. Franklin College offers one special scholarship to a war orphan.

Maine: Under the Scholarship Act, war orphans are exempt from payment of tuition at State institutions. Free tuition is also granted war orphans at Bates College and, by special arrangement, at Bowdoin and Colby Colleges.

Massachusetts: A 10-year scholarship has been granted war orphans by the Bay Path Institute, and authorities of 22 other colleges have expressed their willingness to grant preference to war orphans.

Michigan: Under the Scholarship Act, war orphans are exempt from payment of tuition and matriculation and other fees at State institutions.

Minnesota: Under the Scholarship Act, war orphans are exempt from payment of tuition at State institutions, except the University of Minnesota.

Nebraska: Each State normal school grants an honor scholarship, valued at $150, to a war orphan. Luther College grants one scholarship to a war orphan, amounting to one-half the tuition for a 2-year course. The University of Omaha will help through the student aid any veteran's child recommended by the American Legion Auxiliary. Creighton University will consider the case of each war orphan separately in granting some form of scholarship. The American School of Commerce in Omaha will reduce tuition to children of veterans by 50 percent and will assist them in other ways.

New Hampshire: Under the Scholarship Act, war orphans are exempt from the payment of tuition at State institutions.

New Jersey: The following institutions grant special concessions to war orphans. Exemption from payment of tuition, Princeton University, Seton Hall College, Rider College, St. Joseph's College, Bloomfield Theological Seminary, New Jersey Law School, Mercer Beasley Law School, College of St. Elizabeth, John Marshall College of Law. Exemption from payment of tuition and fees, New Brunswick Theological Seminary (also provides room rent), Panzer College of Physical Education. Scholarships: Rutgers University, Stevens Institute of Technology, Newark College of Engineering, LeMaster Institute. Special consideration: Princeton Theological Seminary, New Jersey College for Women.

North Carolina: Under the Scholarship Act, war orphans are granted free tuition, board and room, as well as exemption from payment of fees, at all State institutions.

Oklahoma: All colleges in Oklahoma assist war-orphan students in obtaining employment. The Oklahoma College for Women exempts war orphans from payment of fees.

South Carolina: Under the Scholarship Act, war orphans are exempt from payment of tuition at State institutions.

Texas: Special concessions are granted to war orphans at the following institutions: Southern Methodist University, Mary Hardin-Baylor College, Howard Payne College, and Texas Technological College.

Vermont: Under the Scholarship Act, war orphans are exempt from payment of tuition at State institutions.

Virginia: Under the Scholarship Act, war orphans are exempt from payment of tuition at State institutions.

West Virginia: Under the Scholarship Act, war orphans are exempt from payment of tuition at State institutions.

Wyoming: Free tuition and exemption from payment of fees are granted to war orphans at the University of Wyoming.

Although no funded scholarships are provided special considerations have been granted by the following States:

Alabama: Under the Scholarship Act, war orphans are exempt from payment of tuition at State institutions.

Arizona: In Arizona college authorities cooperate with the American Legion in giving special consideration to individual needs of war-orphan students but give no financial assistance.

Arkansas: Under the Scholarship Act, war orphans are exempt from payment of tuition at State institutions.

Colorado: The following institutions each grant two war orphans exemptions from payment of tuition and fees: University of Colorado, University of Denver, Colorado State Teachers College, Colorado Agricultural College, Colorado School of Mines, Adams State Teachers College.

Iowa: The following Iowa institutions grant special concessions to war orphans: Exemption from payment of tuition—Buena Vista College, Upper Iowa University, University of Dubuque. Exemption from payment of 50 percent of tuition—Iowa State University, Iowa State College, Iowa State Teachers College, Drake University. Scholarships—Coe College, Cornell College, Luther College, Clark College, Dubuque College. Special consideration—Central College, Columbia College, St. Ambrose College, John Fletcher College, Graceland College, Grinnell College, Penn College, Western Union College. Tabor College has a definite program to help children of all classes of veterans.

Kentucky: Under the Scholarship Act, war orphans are exempt from payment of tuition at State institutions.

Maryland: University of Maryland will cooperate with auxiliary in obtaining scholarships in individual cases.

Missouri: Free tuition is granted war orphans at State Teachers College and $100 exemption from payment of tuition is granted by William Woods College. Scholarships have been offered war orphans at Washington University, Wentworth Military Academy, and Hannibal-LaGrange, which also assists war orphans in obtaining employment. Lindenwood College and Missouri Valley College assist war orphans as much as possible.

New Mexico: Under the scholarship act, war orphans are exempt from the payment of tuition at State institutions.

North Dakota: War orphans who resided in the State at the time of the passage of the scholarship act are exempt from the payment of tuition and fees at State institutions. These schools also assist war orphans in finding employment.

Ohio: Many institutions of higher learning in Ohio offer scholarships or make special concessions to war orphans.

Tennessee: Under the scholarship act, war orphans are exempt from payment of tuition at State institutions.

Washington: Under the scholarship act, war orphans are exempt from payment of tuition at State institutions.

Wisconsin: On favorable decisions on specific application, free tuition, exemption from payment of fees, and sometimes scholarships are granted war orphans at the following institutions: University of Wisconsin, Marquette University, Stout Institute, Ripon College, Lawrence College, Carroll College.

There are available to war orphans the La Verne Noyes Scholarships established under the will of the late La Verne Noyes, of Chicago, Ill. The American Legion makes available scholarships and scholarship loans funds through 32 departments of the American Legion Auxiliary. These fall into the main category of National President Scholarships, National Commander Scholarships, and Eight and Forty Scholarships. An organization known as "War Orphans Scholarships, Inc." with headquarters in New York City has been established to provide scholarships amounting to $500 yearly for the orphan of any man killed in service. The exception in the extension of these scholarships is that they are not available to Negro children. Appointments to Federal

military institutions are also available as provided by the act of June 8, 1926, amended by act of November 24, 1945, to include sons of deceased veterans of World War II.

It should be noted that all deceased veterans' children receiving pension compensation may have such compensation continued after their eighteenth birthday, provided they are pursuing course of instruction in approved schools or colleges. Compensation continues until the completion of the course of instruction or marriage of the child, but not beyond the day preceding the child's twenty-first birthday.

California in Review After a Century of American Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a lecture by Rockwell Dennis Hunt, Ph. D.:

BUILDING THE EMPIRE STATE OF THE PACIFIC

(Fifth in a series of eight public centennial lectures, by Rockwell Dennis Hunt, Ph. D.)

Dr. HUNT. When the good ship *Oregon* came in through the Golden Gate on the 18th of October 1850, she brought good news, glad tidings for all the people. Flags were flying. And instantly the people understood news and the import of that important message, namely, the *Oregon* had brought word California had been admitted into the Union by the signature of President Fillmore to the California bill. There was an instant outpouring of the people; exultant feeling everywhere when they learned about it.

They had a spontaneous celebration on Portsmouth Square that very day; but they planned to have a more formal celebration a little later; so on the 29th of that month, October 1850, they had a more formal celebration in commemoration of the fact that California had at last been admitted as the thirty-first State into the Union. It was on that occasion that Nathaniel Bennett was the orator of the day. In the course of his remarks he had these graceful words to say, after describing anomalous conditions preceding:

"It was at such a time that the tidings of the event which we celebrate reached us, and the rebound of our feelings today is in proportion to the depth of our past depressions. If, when the tempest has gathered over the troubled waters, and the angry billows, lashed into fury, rave around the devoted bark, the winds are suddenly lulled, the waves hushed, and the warm sunshine again sleeps on the bosom of the tranquil sea, the thrill of delight which the hardy mariner feels is enhanced by the recollection of the imminent dangers from which he has just escaped."

There was great mutual felicitation and congratulation; and as suggested by these words, it is necessary to go back to present the background and the antecedents to that glad day. California had become American officially by virtue of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, signed on the 2d of February 1848. No longer was Mexico in control of the province. There was a sudden shift so far as the legality was concerned from the Mexican to the American authority, although preparation had been going forward for a few years toward that end.

While the treaty was being signed, almost at that moment but before the American settlers heard about the treaty, the gold discovery by Marshall brought a great new force and impulse into California history and into the national history of the United States. But when California was finally conquered, finally acquired, the Mexican War was still not concluded—at least word of the end of the war had not reached the Californians. Therefore, the rule in California would necessarily have to be of a military sort—a de facto government by military ruling. You will remember that following Sloat was Stockton; following Stockton was Kearny; and then we come to Colonel Mason, passing over a short period of active governship by Fremont and the controversy, all of which we have to omit tonight. Colonel Mason became the active military governor for California, exercising civil power but being a military officer.

Now as the people began to come in by thousands at the time of the gold rush, the problem was greatly accentuated and the situation made far more difficult because, as you know, this great throng of gold hunters brought in all classes of people, some very vicious, wild, criminal characters; some not only from the United States, but from other nations, other peoples, other lands, greatly emphasizing and multiplying the difficulties of keeping any sort of order. You recognize also that for the most part the government at the mines was self-constituted by the miners themselves, and while there was a certain degree of uniformity at the different mines, there was by no means complete uniformity, and there was a great deal of what might be called decentralization.

Now in the meantime when one nation acquires territory from another, according to international law, the laws and practices of the old nation that relinquishes power will continue to obtain in that conquered territory until supplanted by a government by the controlling power, insofar as it is not out of harmony with the constitution and the laws of the conquering power. This meant that the Mexican law should still continue in force until a substitution should be presented by the Congress of the United States for California. People began to inquire, especially the American miners and settlers, "What is the Mexican law? Where is it? We do not find any Mexican law, practically speaking."

Now, as a matter of fact, there has been very little law that was understood even by the Mexicans themselves outside of a very few general propositions, especially that of the alcalde, a kind of a vaguely powered magistrate for the different towns, but how could the Americans be expected to understand what laws were obtaining there? And some of them were sticklers for law. They didn't know the Spanish language, and so if a law was presented to them in Spanish, they would not recognize it; they would not pay much attention to it. Moreover, the laws that were enforced were, you might say, those belonging to the Latin races and not the Anglo-Saxon race, foreign to those Americans who had come into California and those Americans who were continually coming into California, especially those who were law-abiding and who desired law and government—a good government. They brought in their own ideals of government. They were accustomed to trial by jury and they were accustomed to different practices in the American courts; they did not care anything about the old, effete laws they could not even discover that were handed down from Mexico.

I think it is one of the most natural things in the world that these American settlers, when they saw the need pressing more and more all the time for law and order, should think in terms of their own experience, and their own knowledge, and their own ideals and principles regarding law. And if you carry that one step further, it would almost mean that wherever a higher power fails to present law to them and give them a government, they, as good democratic people, have the right to govern themselves. This is more or less laying a foundation for that which is to follow. Think for a moment of that day, that period, which we call '49. Mr. Bancroft has this to say, "The California year of 1849, what was it? An exclamation point in the history of civilization, a dash in the annals of time. This 12 months was not so much a year as an age; not so much an episode as an era—never to be repeated."

Mason was the de facto governor, a military officer, and after the treaty was signed, technically speaking, there was peace between the United States and Mexico, and thereafter we have the anomalous situation of a military officer ruling in a time of peace, and there was beginning to be heard a good deal of grumbling along that line, and a good deal of clamoring for a government of some kind. Some began to think, "We have no laws in California." They could not find any. Colonel Mason asked them to be patient, saying, "It is the duty of Congress to present you with a government." Some were patient, but impatience was gaining great headway there more and more, and also the clamoring became more and more loud, with vigorous protests, and they said, "Nothing is more natural, nothing is more right than this: If Congress fails to give us a government, it is our privilege to provide our own government."

Thereafter one of the things some of the settlers resorted to is what were called "provisional government meetings." One was held in San Jose, where the different settlers came together, adopted resolutions in favor of government by themselves, and suggested a time when they should have delegates and hold a general convention to provide some kind of territorial government. The same kind of thing happened in San Francisco, in Sacramento, and one or two other points. These are known as provisional government meetings. Now at the time Colonel Mason did not actively object to those.

Another thing that was done was that in San Francisco, which of course had become the metropolitan center, there was organized the legislative assembly consisting of 15 leading pioneers in San Francisco. They undertook to lay down the regulations, rules and laws for themselves in that city. That, of course, was from a technical, legal standpoint out of order; it could not stand the test of strict legality. On the other hand, Congress had failed. Congress adjourned a second time without providing a government for California.

About the time they were looking forward to some further change, there came Bennett Riley, who superseded Mason in the spring of 1849. General Riley was a good man, a faithful soldier, patriotic and loyal, but even more conservative than Colonel Mason had been. So when he looked about and took in the situation, he was very careful to obey orders from Washington. Therefore he would not give countenance to this legislative assembly of fifteen in San Francisco. He pronounced it illegal, unauthorized, and advised the people to have nothing to do with it and pay no attention to its mandates. He did not approve the provisional government meetings that were being held and had been held; but he was patriotic and he saw the seriousness of the situation quite definitely. He finally advised, "Let us wait until the good ship comes in, giving us the report from Congress once more."

The news came! Congress for the third time had adjourned without providing a government for California. Now in a moment we may inquire, "Why all this dillydallying, this delaying on the part of Congress?" It

is quite plain to see—and we shall approach that in a moment. The slavery and slavery extension question was the chief question of controversy in all that time.

Now when General Riley was confronted with this fact that, here are these people clamoring for a government, desiring it, it is needed, basically needed, and there is no return from Congress, then he said, after that third failure of Congress reached him, "I will call for an election of delegates to a convention myself as de facto governor." He did that. He issued a proclamation in the late spring of 1849 and set August 1 as the date for selecting the delegates to a convention which would meet in Monterey on the 1st of September, and proceed to form a fundamental law for either the territory of California or the State of California.

But in the meantime came up this great controversy between the settlers and the administration. That brought a question up that was quite technical in character, and I must dwell upon it very briefly tonight. The question was the settler's theory versus the administration's theory of the status of California during that period called the no-government period in California history.

The settlers believed they had the right to organize, call a meeting, have a convention, and establish their own fundamental law. On the other hand, General Riley had pronounced this legislative assembly illegal, and he had refused to recognize the validity of any of those provisional government meetings. Now he had named a date for the election of delegates to a general convention. They were head-on in regard to that situation, that theory. Both claimed they were right. The administration theory was sometimes called the Buchanan theory, and the settlers' theory was sometimes called the Benton theory, because Senator Benton at Washington was the chief backer, from the standpoint of national circles, of the settlers' theory. It was a direct conflict as to what was to happen. I would like to be a little more accurate in stating one or two things about that, and so from what I have previously prepared I quote very briefly:

"Stripping the argument of all passion, the settlers' theory may be briefly stated as follows: The moment the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo took effect, the Constitution of the United States and American principles were extended over the acquired territory of California. Although no territorial system of American civil law has been regularly extended over or established in California, the Mexican civil law has been in fact superseded. Congress, whose primary power to legislate is admitted, failing to provide a Territorial government, it is no usurpation in the people to legislate temporarily for themselves in self-defense. As matter of fact, the government established during the war was at its conclusion continued as de facto government, but whereas it had before derived its authority from the rights of war, it now has no such source of power, but derives its authority from the 'presumed consent of the people.' A subordinate military officer can no longer legally fill the office of governor except by the sufferance of the people. While their presumed consent was 'irresistibly inferred' by Secretary Buchanan in a priori manner, it was historically entirely unreal; instead of consent there was express dissent and repeated protest 'against the de facto government.' Again, since the President, through his secretary, 'urgently advises the people of California to live peaceably and quietly under the existing government,' he evidently believes that the people had the right to change it."

That is a brief statement, in part, of the settlers' theory. Now let me similarly present a brief and objective statement of the administration theory of the status of California during that time:

"This theory may be briefly summarized: Under a general principle of the law of nations, the laws of California, which were proclaimed to be in force after the American conquest, must, at the conclusion of peace with Mexico, continue in full force until changed by competent authority. That authority is vested solely in Congress. Hence, Congress failing to make other provision for the territory, the system of laws, defective as it is, which obtained under military rule, must insofar as they are not inconsistent with the laws, constitutions, and treaties of the United States, continue in force under the civil government de facto; the commanding military officer, by virtue of a vacancy in the office of governor, is ex officio civil governor. The Legislative Assembly of San Francisco, or any similar body, therefore, purporting to represent the people and presuming to legislate for them, is an illegal and unauthorized body, having usurped powers vested solely in the United States Congress."

There you have the head-on collision between the administration theory and the settlers' theory. And in the meantime General Riley had named a date for the election of delegates to a convention. What happened? Those old pioneers—not old in those days, but virile-thinking, earnest, patriotic men—believed intensely in having a government. The object they had in view was more important to them than the particular manner in which they achieved that object. Therefore some of them began very promptly to say, "While the governor has no right, being not really governor, to name this in an authoritative manner, nevertheless it may be that we can achieve the result that we desire by alining ourselves with his plan, and while we reserve to ourselves the technical right of maintaining the justice of our cause, yet practically as a means of expediency we may well fall in and agree to have delegates elected and meet at the convention together at the time designated by Bennett Riley." Others began to take that view of it, and it was not very long until the Legislative Assembly of San Francisco quietly passed out of existence. Other movements of the kind became quiescent, died down, and in the course of just a few weeks there was practically full unanimity in accepting the plan set forth by Bennett Riley for this convention, to prepare a constitution for a State or Territory. And that was an interesting exhibition, instructive exhibition, of a type of patriotism represented by some of those pioneers, though they remained sticklers for the law and to the very last they claimed Bennett Riley did not have the right to call the convention, but as a matter of expediency they felt they could get the thing done that way. I think that was an interesting experience in our California history at that critical time. Had the claims of the settlers' theory been pressed to the limit there, then the whole situation would have been changed and we do not know what the consequence might have been; but they did not press them because they considered the matter one of expediency, and not of fundamental principle.

Thereafter they united with good spirit in the plan to elect their delegates. It was an interesting thing to see those miners—for nearly 75 percent of the population of California at that time was engaged directly or indirectly in hunting for gold—turn aside from their gold hunting to select the different delegates to a convention to meet in Monterey. That in itself is an exhibition of citizenship that we could well take to heart today. They were not too deeply engrossed in their daily toil and their search for gold to do that civic thing; so they had their election for the different delegates from the different districts of the province of California and there they met the 1st of September at Monterey.

On that particular day a quorum was not present, so they adjourned until the following Monday, when, on the 3d of September, they organized the convention in the old capital of Monterey.

Now, let us proceed to study that convention a little while. First, about the delegates themselves. In all there were 48 delegates that were accredited as being authorized, although there was some little degree of irregularity, which did not nullify the situation. And this body represented a goodly number of different professions: some lawyers, some agriculturists, some miners; and it is refreshing to note that one man by the name of Moore put down as his profession, in the days of 1849, "elegant leisure"—perhaps the most refreshing thing about the convention that I know. Then they proceeded to organize in Colton Hall. Colton Hall, which many of you have seen, is one of the finest and most significant landmarks in the State of California today. I was delighted when I was there in 1946 at the big Sloat Centennial Celebration to see how well it is maintained now. Walter Colton, as you know, was the alcalde at Monterey; highly respected and honored because of his integrity and his ability. His books are of great value to us now. This building, a two-story one, had been erected of building stone, found nearby, and in the upper story of the building called Colton Hall the convention was held. It is a historic spot.

Now another point about the delegates is very interesting to me. It was a convention of young men, comparatively speaking. Very few of the men were past the meridian, or the age of 50. The average age was in the thirties, and one or two were as young as 25 years of age in that convention; so it was not a convention of old men at all. There were seven native Californians in the group of delegates, including Gen. M. G. Vallejo, who was regarded as a leading Californian of the whole territory at that time. It is interesting to go into detail further, but picture to yourselves the class of delegates there. So far as my knowledge goes, when a group of delegates has been assembled for a purpose as serious as this purpose was, seldom has there been so little sinister, indirect, banal politics involved in the selection of delegates or the performance by the delegates of their duties. Rather remarkable, I would say. They had a clear view of what they were there for, and they had a patriotic point of view. The objective was noble and true and good. I may not be permitted to make that fully 100 percent, but I say it ranks high as compared to similar organizations and similar conventions anywhere in American history.

Finally, after getting organized, Dr. Robert Semple, a tall pioneer, was chosen as president. When he made his initial speech as president-elect, he said:

"We are now, fellow citizens, occupying a position to which all eyes are turned. It is to be hoped that every feeling of harmony will be cherished to the utmost in this convention. By this course, fellow citizens, I am satisfied that we can prove to the world that California has not been settled entirely by unintelligent and unlettered men. Let us, then, go onward and upward, and let our motto be, 'Justice, Industry, and Economy.'"

J. Ross Browne was selected to be reporter for the convention, perhaps the only man there who could take down the discussions by shorthand; two chaplains were chosen; Dr. Samuel Willey, representing the Protestant faith, and Father Ramirez representing the Catholic faith, officiating on alternate days, and thus, with a few other officers chosen, they set to work on the main project that had brought them together.

They selected a Bill of Rights, a good Bill of Rights, not very original, but, nevertheless, based on the correct principles as handed down from old English history in our colonial times until then. One of the first questions that confronted the Convention was, shall we organize as a territory of the United States or shall we proceed

at once to organize as a State? A very fundamental question. It was far reaching in its consequences. And almost immediately, but not unanimously, the Convention decided to organize as a State and not as a territory. That was in opposition to most of the delegates from the southern part of the territory, to be sure, but they were in a very slight minority as far as numbers were concerned. Of course, the reason is apparent why these strong pioneers wanted a State, and not a territory. The population had become large and by this time, the late 1849, there must have been close to 100,000 white people in California. It was quite sure before the end of the year the total had reached fully 100,000, even though the census for 1850 showed a smaller number, for everybody knows the census was very incomplete. So they proceeded to organize as a State and that, of course, is the basis for looking upon California as the Minerva State—Minerva, full grown from the brain of Jupiter, not passing through any subordinate or intermediate stage whatsoever, but coming forth as a full-grown, full-fledged State clamoring to be admitted a little later as a State in the sisterhood of States of this Union.

So we come to the work of that Convention with its different problems, its different discussions. I mention two or three of the discussions that took place, and then I will go somewhat more fully into one or two.

The feeling of the delegates was rather strongly against big corporations, and the delegates mostly were rather suspicious of the banks in general. That attitude was displayed on more than one occasion. Provision was made for the organization of a State university, although the university was not actually organized until a good many years later. And another thing that was done, believed to be the first of its kind among the States of the Union: after much discussion it was decided that married women could hold property in their own names instead of in their husbands' names. That was a rather novel innovation, according to the practice up to that time.

There were two other questions which I wish to enlarge upon a bit. First, about the boundary of California. The discussion about the boundary proved to be the longest, most exciting, and most animating of all the discussions of the Convention. The northern boundary, of course, was fixed by the line of Oregon; the western boundary, of course, was fixed by the Pacific Ocean; the southern limit was fixed by the Mexican boundary; so it was simply the eastern boundary that gave rise to the question. Now the California that had been annexed by the war with Mexico included something like 450,000 square miles, probably more than that, although the eastern boundary of that was rather vague, around the Rocky Mountains. That naturally would include what we call Arizona, Nevada, and extending on into Utah. There were some who were advocating that the whole of the acquisition from Mexico should be in the State of California because that was acquired from Mexico. On the other hand, this far-eastern territory had no representatives, no delegates, at the Convention whatsoever. A few wished admission after the whole performance was over, so to speak, but no delegates at all from that eastern part of this vast territory were there.

The discussion brought a number of recommendations and suggestions. "Where should the eastern boundary be—the 116th parallel, or further east, or at the crest of the Sierra Nevada Mountains?" There was great excitement on the subject. I will not go into the controverted question as to how much of sinister import there might have been in some of that discussion, but at least there were some who believed if they should adopt a constitution for the whole of that big territory that would undoubtedly be too large for one State, which probably would necessitate a dividing line east and west, and maybe the southern State thus formed later on would be a slave State, because they knew the northern one would be a free State. I do not enter into the merits of that discussion tonight, but it is an interesting subject to try and get some inkling as to the slavery question being involved in the discussion for the eastern boundary for California. The Convention was nearly wrecked at one time near the end because of the sudden passing of a motion when one delegate arose shouting, "Your constitution is gone; your constitution is gone"; and one said, "Let's adjourn sine die," which almost wrecked the work of the Convention. But happily there was time to think it over for a second consideration, and next morning a motion was made that placed the boundary where it is today and that prevailed by a strong majority, thus establishing the present boundary of California.

The other question that did not bring out very much discussion at the time, but was even more far reaching, was that in the course of the convention delegate Shannon, a native of Ireland, presented a resolution, as he had promised before going to Monterey to do, which said, "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, unless for punishment for crimes, shall ever be tolerated in this State." That was indeed a stirring proposition; but little did they suspect the far-reaching significance of it at that time. Almost without debate that -was adopted, and adopted unanimously, though I do not doubt but some afterwards would have been glad to change their vote because of the development that occurred. I can heartily agree with Dr. Willey, chaplain of the convention, when he wrote afterwards, "Right there was the pivot point of the slavery discussion in the United States." When that resolution was adopted and that section became a part of the constitution of California, that meant that California, if and when she came into the Union, would be a free State.

Now that does not have any particular bearing on the fact as to whether or not any slaves ever were in California, or whether there would be any possibility of an owner from the east or south bringing a slave with him—which itself is an interesting question. There were slaves in California; there were Indian slaves; and there were the Negro slaves, not many but some, and there is a history of that, too—but that is aside from the main question now.

The constitution that was formed had this antislavery clause in it and that, as Dr. Willey has said, was the culminating point of the slavery question in America, for from that moment human slavery was doomed in California, and not only that but doomed in the United States of America.

The constitutional convention finally came to an end. The delegates had their work completed, and about the 13th of October after practically 6 weeks' labor, the constitution was completed. That was a very interesting time indeed and perhaps more excitement prevailed and more good will was expressed during the last day or two than during all the rest of the convention combined. All the differences seemed to have been forgotten. General Riley, who was military de facto governor during this time, heartily acquiesced. He had called the convention himself, and when the convention proceeded to give us a constitution, and the next month that constitution was voted on by the people of California and adopted by an overwhelming majority, Bennett Riley did not stand for one moment in the way but relinquished his power gracefully and congratulated the people in a beautifully gracious speech when they ended the convention. And there in the harbor of Monterey 31 guns were fired—the thirty-first gun for the new State of California. The convention adjourned and the delegates went home.

Now the scene shifts. The subsequent activity is in the city of Washington, D. C. The constitutional government being established in California in late December, in January the legislature assembled in San Jose. Gov. Peter Burnett took office as Governor; two men were elected to Congress by the people, and when the legislature assembled they elected two men for Senators, Gwin and Fremont, to be the first United States Senators from California. They, of course, made their way back to Washington, with their memorials, beseeching Congress to admit California, and clamoring and knocking loudly at the door of the Nation for admission into the Union. While Congress had assembled in the latter part of 1849, that Congress did not adjourn until the last of September, the following year.

Why should Congress continue such a long, arduous session as that? California is to blame for it to a large extent. This whole situation brought on the most memorable debate in the history of Congress, or in the history of the United States Senate. You will remember there was the triumvirate—the three great men of the triumvirate; Webster, Clay, and Calhoun, and the ripe fruits of their lifetimes were poured into that controversy and that debate in the United States Senate. Everybody in the Senate, and many in the House of Representatives, took a part in that memorable debate. Extracts from their speeches are extremely instructive and interesting, not only from the standpoint of California history but American history and American ideals. How could Calhoun ever consent to having California come into the Union as a free State when he knew that there were then 15 slave States and 15 free States, and California's admission would mean the sixteenth of the free States, a powerful, dynamic, young giant, with no other State from the South or slave State to counterbalance! He seemed to sense the whole situation, that it meant the destruction of the South. It was an extremely important debate. Clay presented his omnibus bill with four or five different propositions—the fugitive law, and other propositions of the omnibus bill, and he was the brains among the appeasement people, loyal and true, sincere and devoted. Webster said, "I come here not to speak as a Massachusetts man, or a North man, but as an American," and so he gave his great seventh of March speech. The debate went on, until something had to happen. What did happen? The Senate finally passed the California bill. The omnibus bill itself was unscrambled so they took one item up at a time, and most of the bills embodied in the omnibus bill of Henry Clay were finally put through, and then on the seventh day of September, 1850, the House passed the California bill. Two days later, on the ninth, President Fillmore affixed his signature to the California bill, and thus California was admitted by that act into the sisterhood of States, the thirty-first star of the great galaxy. Parenthetically, I think I ought to say that the chief credit for that does not go to President Fillmore, but should go to President Taylor, because President Taylor, who died in office just a little before this time, is the man who recommended the passage of the California bill for the admission of California as a free State, and President Fillmore had not done anything comparable in that direction to the work done by his predecessor, who died in office.

Thus California was admitted into the Union, and the national significance of the admission of California is almost too large a subject to enter upon now. But what we said is itself a hint as to the national significance of the admission of California into the Union. You can project the thought a little further and then you will remember that California, being in the Union, served a noble purpose at the time of the Civil War, which was brought on very largely by these

struggles of 1850, so 1850 was a year of destiny; and during the Civil War it was the gold from California that steadied the credit and served the financial backing for the cause of the North; and the Golden State stood true, especially under the administration of Leland Stanford, to the cause of the Union.

Other reasons that need not be explored tonight indicate that the admission of California was significant, not simply from a local standpoint, but from a national standpoint, and likewise even from a world standpoint.

Now I think I am justified in making a remark of my own at this point, and that is that while we are interested in the days of gold, and in the exciting times of the miners' days, the exuberance and the wild life and all this, connected with the mines, the glamor and fascination and the romance, we owe it to ourselves to take serious thought as to what was actually accomplished there in those days of struggling for free government, law, and order. Woodrow Wilson in one of his State papers said, "What we seek is the reign of law based upon the consent of the governed and sustained by the organized opinion of mankind."

California was giving an excellent exhibition of self-control in spite of the excesses of the men, and the vigilance committees, etc. We ought to take note and remember, as one good writer said, that history serves us little purpose unless there is in it some sermon of moral value. California was not all adventures in the field of gold, not all given to gambling and drinking; but here is the lofty sentiment that should also be placed before us, taken from the lines of some anonymous writer whose lines appear on the title page of Mr. Turrill's little book called California Notes.

"O California, prodigal of gold,
Rich in the treasures of a wealth untold,
Not in thy bosom's secret store alone
Is all the wonder of thy greatness shown.
Within thy confines, happily combined,
The wealth of nature and the might of mind,
A wisdom eminent, a virtue sage,
Give loftier spirit to a sordid age."

Mundt Bill Is Unconstitutional

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, although few of the Members have had an opportunity to really study the Mundt bill—the Subversive Activities Control Act, so-called—debate probably will be opened on the bill tomorrow.

Fortunately, many public-spirited organizations and lawyers have volunteered to supply us with analyses of the bill. It is noteworthy that I have not received one single communication to date in support of this measure, but scores in opposition.

I have, however, received two communications in opposition so effective, so concise, and so useful that I am inserting both in the RECORD, under leave, in the hope that Members can study them.

The first is the completely objective but strongly condemnatory memorandum of the American Civil Liberties Union prepared by the distinguished libertarian attorney Osmond Fraenkel, which follows:

MEMORANDUM WITH REGARD TO H. R. 5852 AS REPORTED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

In its revised form, H. R. 5852 differs materially from its original version. The report of the House Committee (No. 1844) indicates that many of the revisions were made to avoid constitutional attacks. In our view, the bill remains obnoxious and, in important respects, unconstitutional.

The bill has two major objectives. It imposes criminal sanctions for a large number of activities; it seeks to compel the registration of certain kinds of Communist organizations. Before considering the provisions of the bill in detail, we wish to point to two underlying aspects which in our opinion render most of its provisions unconstitutional: (1) the definition of the bill, and (2) the fact that determination of the basic issue in regard to the character of the organization is left to the Attorney General rather than to the courts.

TERMS NOT DEFINED

1. There are two basic terms in the bill—"Communist political organization" (section 3–3) and "Communist-front organization" (section 3–4). Neither is defined with sufficient precision. It should be observed, in the first place, that an organization comes within either category if "it is reasonable to conclude" that it has certain characteristics on the basis of "some or all" of certain indicated considerations. Thus, there is no requirement that the weight of the evidence establishes that a suspected organization is of the specified character. It would appear also that a finding could be based on any one of criteria set forth.

In the case of "political" organizations, the criterion is either control by a foreign government or political organization, or a finding that the organization is a "principal" instrumentality used by the "world Communist movement." Either criteria can be determined on the basis of a series of considerations, many of them wholly unrelated and entirely lawful. Among those mentioned are support of the principles of Marx and Lenin and the extent to which the organization resists the efforts to obtain information with regard to its membership. Included are also matters more directly connected with control by a foreign government.

In the case of "front" organizations, the criterion is either control by a political organization or a finding that the operations of the suspected front organization assist a political organization or a foreign government or the world Communist movement. Either of these criteria can be established on the basis of the identity of persons active in management, the source or use of funds and the positions taken by the organization on matters of policy.

We submit that such catch-all definitions transgress the requirements of certainty imposed by the due-process clause and operate as a serious impairment of freedom of speech and association. See *Winters* v. *New York* (68 Sup. Ct. 665).

JUDICIAL FUNCTIONS ELIMINATED

2. The foregoing is rendered even more objectionable by the fact that the Government may be able to avoid offering proof before a judge and jury that the suspected organization comes within the category of the law. For the bill in its registration provisions (sec. 8) compels action by an organization designated as coming within the scope of the law by the Attorney General under the administrative provisions of section 13. Moreover, failure to register is a crime (sec. 15). Membership in an organization that has not registered is a crime (sec. 10). Use of the mails or instrumentalities of interstate commerce or of the radio is a crime unless accompanied by a statement that a Communist organization is responsible for the utterance (secs. 11 and 15 (c)).

Since it is contemplated that the Attorney General will determine which organizations are within the scope of the law, the Government may contend in a prosecution under the law that it need only show failure to register, failure to label speeches or printed matter or continuance of membership, and that the order of the Attorney General if upheld on appeal is conclusive. That we submit is in violation of the provisions of the sixth amendment which guarantees trial by jury and a right of confrontation of witnesses. *Kirby* v. *United States* (174 U. S. 47).

CRIMINAL LIABILITY VERY BROAD

3. Section 4 creates criminal penalties wholly independent of the two types of organizations we have been discussing. Any activity aiming at the organization of a "totalitarian dictatorship" is punished by a possible fine of $10,000 or imprisonment for 10 years provided the dictatorship is under the control of a foreign government or individual. Domestic efforts to produce totalitarianism are left untouched. The bill quite plainly is aimed at every effort in this direction and is not limited to acts of violence and to overt acts at all. For it expressly punishes participation in any movement "to facilitate or aid" the establishment of such a dictatorship. The last clause of this section contains the unusual provision that a prosecution under it shall never be barred by limitations. Section 5 states that anyone convicted of this offense shall lose his citizenship.

Section 4 (a) (1) makes it unlawful "to attempt in many manner" to establish a "totalitarian dictatorship" in the United States under control of a foreign government. There is, of course, no definition as such of what constitutes a "totalitarian dictatorship." But beyond that, it is quite clear that this provision on its face is not applicable to acts alone, but to speech and publication as well. It is hard to imagine a phrase broader than "in any manner" as a method of criminal liability. In *Winters* v. *New York*, the Court said, "a statute so vague and indefinite, in form and as interpreted as to permit within the scope of its language the punishment of incidents fairly within the protection of the guaranty of free speech is void on its face."

As to the rest of section 4, it is so vague that one would not know with any certainty what actions would subject one to criminal liability. What exactly is prohibited in the injunction against performing or attempting to "perform any act with intent to facilitate or aid in bringing about the establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship"? What is covered by participation in the "supervision" of such a movement or the facilitation or assistance in bringing about such a system of government? As stated in the Winters case, supra, "where a statute is so vague as to make criminal an innocent act, a conviction under it cannot be sustained. *Herndon* v. *Lowery* (301 U. S. 242, 259)." See also *Stromberg* v. *California* (283 U. S. 359, 369).

Finally, this section would even outlaw a proposal to amend the Constitution to establish a "totalitarian dictatorship."

BLANKET PROSCRIPTION

4. Section 6 prohibits employment in the service of the United States, excepting only for elective offices, of any person who is a member of a Communist "political" organization. An individual can be punished for applying for such a position if he has reasonable grounds for believing that the organization is of such a character. It is not clear whether in a prosecution under this section a finding by the Attorney General in regard to the character of the organization would be binding.

We have consistently opposed the blanket proscription of persons from Government service merely because of their affiliations. We find no justice in the broad scope of this bill whatever may be the question of its constitutionality.

5. Section 7 forbids the issuance of passports to members of such a "political" organization. This provision is justified by the committee in its report on the ground that it would cut the thread of the international Communist conspiracy. We have always been of the opinion that there should be as few restrictions as possible on travel both into and out of the United States. We see no justification for the restrictions here imposed.

6. The registration requirements of section 8 require the annual listing of officers and an accounting of receipts and activities with a statement of the sources of funds. The Attorney General is authorized to specify the details. These are required of both types of organizations. "Political" but not the "front" organizations must also list annually the names and addresses of members. The Attorney General is required to notify any individual listed as a member. The bill, however, requires the "front" organizations to keep records of members.

FREEDOMS SERIOUSLY IMPAIRED

Section 9 provides that the registration data is available for public inspection and that the Attorney General should annually submit to Congress a list of organizations and of the data given, including names of members.

We are of the opinion that these registration provisions, as well as the provision of section 11, which require the labeling of all material circulated by either of these organizations, are serious impairments of speech and association, and that they fall within the ban of the principles laid down in a host of Supreme Court decisions. We wish only to call specific attention to Judge Rutledge's statement in *Thomas* v. *Collins*, 323 U. S. 516, where he said:

"As a matter of principle, a requirement of registration in order to make a public speech would seem generally incompatible with the exercise of free speech and free assembly."

7. The administrative provisions call for little comment.

Section 13 requires full hearing before any determination by the Attorney General with provision for subpenas. The Attorney General must make written findings. An organization which has registered may apply for a determination that it does not come within the law and that its registration be canceled.

Section 14 allows judicial review by the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia with final review by the United States Supreme Court. The findings of the Attorney General are to be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. We have no criticisms of these provisions, except as indicated above. We oppose the possibility of a finding by the Attorney General which may be conclusive in a criminal prosecution against an individual.

CONCEPTS UNCONSTITUTIONAL

8. Permeating the bill are two concepts, the unconstitutionality of which cannot be doubted.

1. The proposed bill imposes disabilities merely on the basis of organizational affiliation and not on the basis of personal illegal acts.

In recent years, no doctrine has been more bitterly attacked than the several legislative and executive attempts to impose guilt by association. Prof. Zechariah Chafee, Jr., in his Free Speech in the United States (1941) poignantly illustrates the dangers and absurdities of the doctrine. Pages 470–484.

Under section 10, a member of a "Communist political organization" may go to jail for 2 years merely for belonging to such a group if it has not registered. The default of the organization in failing to comply with the law is imputed to each member, thereby resulting in the commission of a separate crime by each member for further adherence to the organization. As Mr. Justice Jackson stated, "if any fundamental assumption underlies our system, it is that guilt is personal." *Korematsu* v. *U. S.* (323 U. S. 214). Section 10 is therefore unconstitutional. See Mr. Justice Murphy in *Bridge* v. *Wilson* (326 U. S. 135).

BILL OF ATTAINDER UNCONSTITUTIONAL

2. The proposed legislation imposes disabilities by legislative proscription rather than by judicial trial and hence is unconstitutional as a bill of attainder.

A bill of attainder is defined as a legislative act which inflicts punishment without a judicial trial. *Cummings* v. *Mo.* (4 Wall. 277). The present bill constitutes a congressional determination that in effect all members of a Communist political organization are automatically subjected to certain penalties merely by the fact of membership. The bill by the registration provisions removes the right of privacy from them. They may not obtain or seek privileges, such as passports or Federal jobs, to which other persons are eligible. It is hard to see a distinction between a statute prescribing certain oaths as a condition to practice law in the Federal courts and a statute such as the one under consideration. If the Supreme Court has ruled the former unconstitutional because of some presumption of guilt which would be the basis for the denial of the privilege, then the latter must also fall. *Cummings* v. *Mo, supra; Ex Parte Garland* (4 Wall. 333), and see as particularly in point *United States* v. *Lovett* (328 U. S. 303, 315, 317).

We do not doubt, furthermore, that while Congress may define conspiracy, it is the responsibility of the courts alone to decide what groups fall within the definition. The definition of a "Communist political organization" is an ill-disguised method to define the Communist Party as an international conspiracy. The use of the term "Communist" brings the statute within the Lovett case's dictum that "legislative acts, no matter what their form, that apply to named individuals or to easily ascertainable members of a group * * * are bills of attainder." *United States* v. *Lovett, supra*, 315.

RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS

The second insertion is a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the American Jewish Congress which is equally trenchant and objective.

RESOLUTION ON THE MUNDT BILL ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, MAY 6, 1948

The American Jewish Congress is uncompromisingly opposed to totalitarianism in all its forms. We, therefore, oppose the Mundt bill (H. R. 5852) which proposes a "Subversive Activities Control Act, 1948" because it would promote one form of totalitarianism without in any way meeting the threat of subversive activity with which it purports to deal.

In its attempt to protect American democracy, the proposed bill violates most of the fundamental principles on which our democracy rests. It disregards the basic principle that guilt is personal. It deprives American citizens of equal rights solely because of their opinions. The vagueness of the bill's provisions would make it impossible for any citizen to know whether or not he is violating the law. Penalties are imposed without any showing that those punished have knowingly engaged in illegal conduct. A single administrative official is given the power of life or death over all organizations by being authorized to declare which views may safely be expressed. The bill ignores the wise warning of the President's Committee on Civil Rights against "any attempt to impose special limitations on the rights of (any particular group) to speak and assemble."

Our government is clearly entitled to and should protect itself against subversive activity through legislation which punishes those whom a fair trial finds guilty. Such legislation already exists. It is a crime to advocate the overthrow of the government by force and violence. Agents of foreign governments and principals are required to register. These laws represent the democratic and constitutional method of dealing with threats to our system of government. The Mundt bill would circumvent traditional principles by eliminating fair trial and by punishing not only subversive activity but many forms of political expression which are clearly entitled to constitutional protection.

The bill is frankly aimed at curbing the activities of organizations loosely described as "Communist-front organizations." The experience of recent years shows clearly that powerful elements in our country are only too ready to apply that term to all organizations which believe in and work for the extension of democracy in this country by eliminating discrimination, protecting civil rights, and promoting equality of opportunity. The Mundt bill is drafted in such a way as to facilitate its application to such groups. A single official, the Attorney General, would be given broad power to bring any organization within the terms of the bill by finding that it advocates causes which parallel those of Communist political organizations or of a Communist foreign government. Thus the mere fact that the Communist Party of America advocates price control and the extension of the antitrust laws, social-security and minimum wage legislation, as well as legislation curbing the evils of racial and religious discrimination, would make it highly dangerous for any other group to support such causes. Legislation which curbs to any substantial extent the advocacy of progressive causes is not only unconstitutional but politically unwise.

We urge the Congress of the United States to turn its attention to those bills which would defeat communism by extending democracy. Legislation to protect and extend the right to vote, to combat racial and religious discrimination in employment and in governmental activities, to end lynch terror, and to provide decent housing and education for all Americans would preserve and further the American ideal. The Mundt bill would destroy that ideal.

For these reasons we urge defeat of the Mundt bill. We urge, furthermore, that Congress resist any attempts to rush this bill through on a wave of hysteria and that it hold hearings in which its highly controversial provisions can be given adequate scrutiny and consideration.

GRAFTON'S COLUMN FROM NEW YORK POST

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am inserting the column written by Sam Grafton and printed in the New York Post of May 11, in which he discusses the far-reaching implications of the Mundt bill.

To my mind, this is a bill which should arouse every American. It is incredible to me that the committee should have seriously proposed a measure so fraught with dangers. Every reading of the bill opens up new avenues of potential repression, not of the Communist Party but of everyone.

I have said before, and will say again, that this bill does far more to subvert the American way of life than any of the ills it proposes to remedy.

I'd Rather Be Right

(By Samuel Grafton)

There are already Federal laws against attempting to overthrow the Government by force and violence. In fact, this type of activity is disapproved throughout the world. There are very few countries which tolerate or encourage it, and revolution is illegal almost everywhere.

What, then, is new about the Mundt bill, brain child of the House Un-American Activities Committee? What is new about it is precisely what ought to make Americans recoil from it in horror. It is the doctrine that the Government should be allowed to punish men for attempting to overthrow it without having to prove it on them.

THE BROWN HAT TEST

The bill contains a clause which forbids, under penalty of high fines, long imprisonment, and loss of citizenship, "any attempt in any manner" to set up a totalitarian dictatorship in this country under foreign orders. And, of course, anybody who actually tried to set up a totalitarian dictatorship here under foreign orders, or even without them, might properly be considered a low type who should be discouraged.

But this bill does a remarkable thing. In its preamble and in its supporting verbiage it sets up the doctrine that anybody who joins the Communist Party, or who works with it or some of its members in any organization, or even who looks as if he does, is, in effect, helping to set up a totalitarian dictatorship under foreign orders.

And here, the bill ceases to be one aimed against actions of a certain kind, and becomes a bill aimed against people of a certain kind. It sets up a punishment clause barring certain activity and then, by a sweeping legislative declaration, seeks to establish that all people of a certain kind are engaged in the prohibited activity; and that is what one means when one says that this bill allows the Government to punish without having to supply proof. It is like setting up a penalty for burglary and adding a postscript to the effect that all men who wear brown hats are burglars, in which case the district attorney, presumably, need only prove that the prisoner was wearing a brown hat.

THE SPREADING SHADOW

And the shadow of illegality thus suddenly cast over activities previously legal spreads very far. For under the bill any organization whose activities make it "reasonable to conclude that it is under the control of a Communist political organization" could be legally labeled as a Communist front. And there are those in this country who recenty felt that it was quite "reasonable to conclude" that Franklin D. Roosevelt was under Communist control.

The actual registration burdens placed on Communist front organizations are slight, perhaps to keep liberal opinion from becoming too alarmed. But the chain of guilt by association is there, formally set up on the loosest ground, so that in the end a housewife who belonged to an organization which demanded more day nurseries, and in which there was one Communist or maybe even none, might find herself connected right back up to the Kremlin, and thus brought within reach of the penalty clause. That clause, with its grim and sweeping prohibitions against "any attempt in any manner" to set up communism, might easily cover such actions as attending a meeting, or buying a book.

BUCKSHOT METHOD

This bill would substitute fear for knowledge as the active principle in our American behavior, for it seeks to meet Communist persuasions with legalistic clubs instead of with counterarguments and counterpersuasions. It would change the very texture of our life, introducing something like a doctrine of lèse majesté, which can make treason of a sneeze.

We must, like all countries, protect ourselves against treachery, but that is an administrative job; it is like the job we did against sabotage during the war. This bill is a legislative effort to take over this administrative function, and it seeks to do it by the buckshot method, by proceeding against people in the mass instead of against actions in the particular. It must not become law.

Republican Party Candidates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial taken from a recent issue of the Oregon Statesman and written by Charles A. Sprague, editor and former governor of our State. I commend to your reading the viewpoints expressed herein:

IT SEEMS TO ME

(By Charles A. Sprague)

This is the day Governor Dewey comes to town. We are hospitable folk here, and I trust the elements will not give him a washday greeting like yesterday morning's.

The campaign for the Republican nomination for President is entering its final public stage. The Oregon primary is the last before the June convention which carries any significance. This one has plenty. Offstage, however, there is a spate of long-distance telephoning, luncheon conferences, lobby buttonholing as party architects seek to design a winning ticket.

Already we hear much about leading candidates killing each other off. At first Dewey and Taft were to deadlock which would throw the palm to a third. Now Stassen is admitted to the charmed circle and there are three who will kill each other off. Many prophets forecast that Vandenberg will be the residuary legatee of this triple tie.

But why, I ask, should the convention kill off its leaders to go for a dark horse? Vandenberg stands in high favor, but he may have been correct in saying that he felt he could do his country more good by staying in the Senate. If Dewey and Stassen and Taft are the party's strong men why settle on someone weaker? The party did that in 1920 when Hiram Johnson and Leonard Wood battled to a draw—and look what we got. Democrats did that in a way in 1944 over the Vice Presidency—and look what they got.

No, let's have done with this talk, about a deadlock of the principals and let the convention pick one of the three as the party nominee. Why not, as in bridge, lead from strength rather than weakness?

Women in the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1948

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of May 12, 1948:

MAKE THEM REGULARS

A year ago the Senate voted almost unanimously to make the Wacs, Waves, and Women Marines component parts of the Regular armed services. The legislation has been specifically requested by the top officials of both Army and Navy. In February of this year Secretary of Defense James Forrestal joined with Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower in again urging it upon the House Armed Services Committee.

Nevertheless that committee reported out a substitute for the Senate measure authorizing enlistment of women only in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps Reserves. On April 21 the House passed it by a voice vote. The House bill, offering neither prestige nor security to prospective recruits, will make it almost impossible to get volunteers. It will defeat the purpose stressed by Fleet Admiral Nimitz and General Eisenhower—to maintain in the three military establishments a well-organized nucleus which can be quickly expanded in case of war and which can explore new fields in which women may release men for combat duty.

The Senate and House conferees will meet this week to reach agreement on a bill. We urge that the House conferees recede from a position that goes contrary to the Nation's defense plans. We urge that they accept the Senate bill giving to the several women's corps the permanent and Regular status which they rightly earned in World War II.

Civil Aeronautics Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1948

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article by Tom Stokes, calling attention to the desperate plights of the veterans in the air-cargo business:

SHAMEFUL CAB

It's a constant revelation to watch how small businesses trying to operate in the best traditions of our so-called "free, competitive enterprise system" are bumping their heads against big established corporate interests which use their power in a monopolistic, freeze-out manner. And all the time the big outfits are getting bigger, and of late they seem very well entrenched in Government.

Take, for example, the case of a bunch of young fellows in the air service who came back from the war, bought themselves some surplus cargo planes and organized a number of companies to carry air freight. They got off to a fine start and did a nice business for quite a while. But obstacles began to be raised in their way, and some have lost out.

For one thing, not one of these air-freight lines has been granted a certificate by the Civil Aeronautics Board, so they have to operate under restrictions, including the difficulty of borrowing to finance themselves. Five of the six more important of these veterans' companies have been recommended for certification after 2½ years by a CAB examiner's report, which still, however, must be approved by the CAB.

This dilatory CAB certifying procedure was described as "shamefully slow" by one of the air-freight lines' champions in Congress, Representative John F. Kennedy, Democrat, of Massachusetts, himself a war veteran.

But there have been other difficulties, in which both the CAB and the major air lines have had a part. One is the freeze-out, a rate-cutting process.

Last fall the certified air lines proposed, and got from CAB, a reduction in the rate for air freight as low as 13 cents a ton-mile, and after that a second cut. The veterans' air-freight companies protested, and the CAB ordered an investigation into air-freight charges still not completed. The major companies certified to operate air freight have only 60 freight planes, while the veterans' companies have 125.

The veterans charged that the new rates were far below cost and that their sole purpose was to undercut them and drive them out of business. The big companies can stand to take a loss on such business, since they have little of it, and since they are receiving very handsome subsidies for carrying the mail, and recently have raised their passenger rates.

Only a few days ago CAB granted another handsome increase in air-mail subsidies which Representative KENNEDY said "amounts to the Government using the taxpayers' money to finance those who are trying to crush the veterans' air-freight lines." The new rates, which strangely are called service rates, are five times the rates approved for air cargo, he said.

And now comes another wrinkle, a bill purportedly promoted by the certified air lines that would classify all parcel post as mail and give it a rate averaging 50 cents a ton-mile, which as set up would tend to divert more business, and at a high rate, to the big air lines and further discriminate against the air-freight business.

The Air Freight Association, composed of the veterans' air lines, did not find out about this measure until it was on the Senate calendar. They don't have the high-priced, eagle-eyed lobbyists of the big companies. They got hold of Senator LANGER, Republican, of North Dakota, chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and he gave them a hearing. They said they don't want any subsidy. They argued parcel post should be treated as freight, and say they can carry it for 25 cents a ton-mile over-all.

Whole Truth of Soviet Bid for Understanding Unknown to People—Denials of White House Through Tydings Do Not Disclose All the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 12, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by David Lawrence that appeared in the Washington Evening Star of May 11, 1948:

WHOLE TRUTH OF SOVIET BID FOR UNDERSTANDING UNKNOWN TO PEOPLE—DENIALS OF WHITE HOUSE THROUGH TYDINGS DO NOT DISCLOSE ALL THE FACTS

(By David Lawrence)

The American people are entitled to know all of the truth about the efforts of Russia to reach an understanding with the United States. The denials from the White House issued through Senator TYDINGS over the week end do not present all of the truth. There was such an effort on the initiative of a high Russian official and the facts are well known in the State Department and among certain committees on Capitol Hill.

The Maryland Senator made a radio speech over the week end saying he had asked President Truman about reports that Russia suggested a conference between Stalin and the President just prior to the Czechoslovak crisis and that the President answered with a categorical "No." Mr. TYDINGS continued:

"The President said there was absolutely not one iota of truth in the report. He said that neither Mr. Stalin nor anyone else representing Russia had made any suggestion to him or to the American Government."

AMBIGUOUS ANSWER

Technically speaking, the President gave Senator TYDINGS an accurate though ambiguous answer. It is true the approach wasn't made to Mr. Truman and because it was unofficial and informal it might also be argued that according to diplomatic forms the approach was not made "to the American Government."

Mr. TYDINGS went on to say in his speech that "many of us have heard this manufactured rumor about Russia wanting to meet with the President to work out a solution of European and world problems. We have heard it said that Mr. Truman would not confer with Russia. This is a sample of the propaganda that unfortunately confuses our well-meaning people."

But what are the facts?

Late in January of this year Robert Murphy, who occupies the high post of political adviser to General Clay, commander in chief of American forces in Germany, received at his home in Berlin a Russian official who serves in the opposite post as the top political adviser to the Russian commander in chief in Berlin.

The Russian official arrived between 8 and 9 o'clock and stayed until 2 in the morning. The initiative was entirely that of the Russian official. All manner of subjects relating to outstanding issues between the two countries were canvassed. During the evening, the Russian official suggested that President Truman and Marshal Stalin meet in Moscow. Mr. Murphy replied that Mr. Truman had expressed himself often as opposed to a trip to Moscow and would gladly meet Stalin in Washington, whereupon, the Russian official stated that this could not be arranged but suggested a third meeting place, namely Stockholm.

HINTED "CERTAIN STEPS"

At the time of the conference, the Russian official hinted at certain steps that would be forthcoming unless an understanding could be reached. It is believed he was referring to steps subsequently taken in Czechoslovakia and Finland. It was hinted that further exploration of the issues might make unnecessary such steps as were being contemplated but which were not mentioned.

At the time of the meeting at Mr. Murphy's house, the Marshall plan was very much in the public eye. It is conceivable that the President and Secretary Marshall felt that to engage in a conference might be misunderstood as a weakening of American policy or as a willingness to make concessions that could not be made. Whatever the reasons for American rejection of Russia's initiative, the fact is that the incident happened and was not just manufactured by well-meaning persons.

Mr. Murphy is an experienced diplomat of the American Foreign Service and he made a complete report on the affair and supplemented it with oral conversations at the State Department shortly afterward when he came to Washington. It is believed that Mr. Murphy's report was not relished and there is a rumor that he was punished for his fervor in recommending that the matter be pursued. He was not permitted subsequently to take the top-level role that he deserved at a London conference on the economic planning for Germany's three zones.

At a time when the American people are being asked to submit to another draft law, it falls with ill grace for the administration to supress the facts about what seems to have been a Russian effort to reach an understanding with the United States. Certainly, the Tydings-Truman conversation constitutes a technical denial. The whole truth should be revealed even if the administration for good reasons of its own decided not to accept the Russian offer or chose for the sake of expediency to regard it as without significance, or as likely to prove futile anyway. Evasion begets distrust. Candor begets confidence.

Feeding Europe Pays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor:

FEEDING EUROPE PAYS

American agriculture will be exceptionally benefited by the European recovery program with its huge exports of foodstuffs abroad. These shipments promise to postpone the downward readjustment of farm prices which some day seems inevitable, maintain farm prices at a high level, and continue the unexampled prosperity of farming.

How essential it is that American farmers have a good outlet, especially in Europe, for their surplus production is indicated by the period from 1920 to 1940. Some 60 to 75 percent of all American agricultural exports then went to the western European countries covered in the Marshall plan, as O. V. Wells, Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture, recently pointed out.

Before the war, western Europe produced only about two-thirds of its total food. The war caused a sharp drop, and population has increased about 8 percent. The food schedules under the ERP program do not actually restore average per capita food consumption in Europe to its prewar level.

The American farmer has had an unusual role thrust upon him by Soviet Russia. The food he grows furnishes the most important contribution of the American Government for the next year or two toward fending off communism and safeguarding democracy. By helping to preserve the economy of western Europe, the American farmer assures himself the maintenance of a sizable and invaluable outlet for his production. When he produces for western Europe, he also handsomely provides for himself.

Civil Disobedience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 12 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain correspondence which

I have received in connection with civil disobedience.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 11, 1948.

Mr. A. A. HEIST,
Southern California Branch,
American Civil Liberties Union,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. HEIST: As mentioned in your letter of May 5, I shall be glad to place your letter of April 22 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as well as my reply to it of May 5 and your letter of May 5 to me. Mr. Walter White's letter to which you refer was placed in the RECORD at the same time I put yours in the RECORD.

Concerning that part of your letter of May 5 which reads as follows: "Unless you print my second letter, I shall continue to question your motives in using my first," may I say that whenever anyone uses such language in communicating with me I am not at all impressed.

Sincerely yours.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA BRANCH,
Los Angeles, Calif., May 5, 1948.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: It has just been brought to my attention that you read my letter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I hope that you will not fail to give the same publicity to the letter from Walter White, and unless you print my second letter, I shall continue to question your motives in using my first.

Sincerely yours,

A. A. HEIST,
Private Correspondence.

MAY 5, 1948.

Mr. A. A. HEIST,
Director, Private Correspondence,
American Civil Liberties Union,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. HEIST: Thank you very much for your letter of April 22. I am very glad to have it because it gives me a better understanding of the motives I know to be sincere which cause you to take the position you do on civil disobedience. I am sorry that I cannot agree with the advisability of the course of action which you suggest.

You will find enclosed a copy of a letter which I have written another person who disagrees with my position on this issue. His letter to me was very personal and critical of my motives and that is why you will find in my reply to him some personal remarks which are not applicable to your letter.

As to the position of the conscientious objectors, you are, I think, overlooking the fact that their rights rest entirely upon our conception of freedom of religion. However, Randolph's program of civil disobedience is not based on that constitutional premise at all. It is rather based on exactly what he intends to be based on, namely, civil disobedience. Such a principle cannot be reconciled by a government of law under a written constitution. The United States is not India. The liberties of our form of government are encompassed in the Constitution and any course of action in relation to civil rights under our Government which cannot be reconciled with the rights set forth in the Constitution cannot be supported by a Member of the Senate.

I know that many of my liberal friends consider that to be a very legalistic approach to this problem. However, we can't have our constitutional rights and eat them too. We can't justify demanding civil rights under our Constitution and then throw it aside when we don't like its application to some course of action which is proposed out of a sincere motive to secure the civil rights provided for in the Constitution. I think the supporters of Randolph's civil disobedience program find themselves on one of the horns of that dilemma.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely yours.

MAY 3, 1948.

Thank you very much for your letter of April 28. I am sorry that you and I completely disagree on the legal questions involved in Mr. Randolph's proposal for civil disobedience.

You completely beg the question, as did Mr. Randolph, when you argue that the Government now has time to change its policy on segregation and discrimination. Of course, the Government still has time to change its policy. However, if you sat in my seat in the Senate and fought as hard as I am fighting to try to convince the Congress that it should change its policy and then have someone come along with a proposal of civil disobedience if the Government doesn't change its policy on civil rights bills to his liking, you would have a better understanding of how unwise and ill-advised Randolph's proposal was. It gave every politician in the Congress who wants to avoid voting on our program of civil rights legislation an excuse for postponing indefinitely that program giving the reason that the Congress was being threatened. To me such excuses are pure rationalization but that does not change the political complexion of things here in Congress.

You and Randolph and all the rest who are trying to make a case for the civil disobedience program have simply developed a blind spot apparently when it comes to seeing the great harm you have done to our civil-rights program. Your argument to the effect that the law of treason would not apply in time of war because of your claim that you would be serving a higher law than the American Constitution is just plain nonsense. Randolph and his followers will never be able to escape the application of the law of treason in time of war on any grounds of conscientious objections because the law is perfectly clear that the exemption from military service on the ground of conscientious objections is based upon the Constitution's guarantee of freedom of religion. It is perfectly clear that the proposed program of civil disobedience is based upon a foundation of political action.

I am very much amused at the last paragraph of your letter because for you to advise me, in light of my record in the Senate, that I should be concerned with the abolishment of Jim Crowism in the armed services, as though that has not been my concern, is really funny. However, your proposal in the last part of that sentence that Negroes and sympathetic whites should engage in civil disobedience in the name of the spirit of the founders of this Nation is nothing short of libel against those founders. I think you and the others who are following your line of civil disobedience should reexamine your position on this issue because I am satisfied you are doing great injury to the cause of civil rights in America.

Sincerely yours.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA BRANCH,
Los Angeles, Calif., April 27, 1948.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am very grateful to you for all the material that you sent me re: the Randolph episode. It is the more appreciated when one as busy as you takes time to set forth his position to one outside of his voting constituency. I wish I could get as clear-cut statements from some of my own Representatives.

I have read all the material with very great care, but think its main value is in the study of a pricked conscience. There certainly is nothing to convince me that Randolph's proposal was ill advised or a great disservice. After reading it all I agree the more heartily with the judgment of the Christian Century that Mr. Randolph's position is one which is legally and morally sound. Nonviolent resistance to taboos which are themselves a violation of our basic law is not only not treason; it is a democratic duty and an essential form of Christian witness.

Will you permit me to point out what seems to a preacher to be evidence that you have tried, probably unconsciously, to satisfy your conscience rather than to follow it? You protest again and again that you are a friend of, and worker for, civil liberties, and no one will deny it. But, while I am not a close reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I dare say that you have never written into the RECORD as much on the evils which Randolph and White point out as you have in criticizing Randolph for the position which he takes. Of course, in this particular you are not a sinner above all others. It is a common fault of us liberals to agree in principle and then find fault with the other fellow's method.

The fundamental difficulty at issue between you and Randolph would seem to me to be that you are holding to a philosophy of gradualism that was common and, maybe, tenable before World War I, but can scarcely be expected to apply in the present revolutionary period. I have long been a critic of the Negroes for so continuously extending the period of grace for us whites. I honor Mr. Randolph for now calling a halt, even though it may seem to shake the Government itself. Your insistence that this is a matter which must be settled by the people, instead of being embodied in law, is, of course, a part of this philosophy and one of the great obstacles to progress. I have consistently worked against the idea of putting everything up to Congress, but there come times when it is the obligation of lawmakers to recognize the highest social mores and compel their recognition by the minorities who profit by their nonrecognition. You can't wait until everybody is ready to do away with segregation before making segregation illegal, and Government services and institutions ought to lead the way.

The country was no more ready for FEPC when F. D. R. put it over by Executive fiat than it is now for an unsegregated Army. But FEPC worked unbelievably well, and the fact that it was the law of the land was one of the factors in a very perceptible improvement in race relations. Antidiscrimination codes, such as the one we have here in California, could not wait until most of the people would accept Negroes in their restaurants, but it has only required a few cases to bring about a situation in which the right of colored people here in Los Angeles to sit anywhere they please in a theater or to go even to some of the "swell" restaurants is simply taken for granted. Likewise, within the last 2 years we have practically abolished segregated schools in California, not because the particular communities were "ready for it," but because segregated schools, like all other segregation, is morally indefensible in a democracy.

When it comes to the situation in the armed services, it would seem to me that there was enough experimentation in the last war, and with favorable enough results, so that officers and men in uniform who do not personally know and respect the implications of democracy should be reminded of them by law without compromise.

I was, of course, interested in the "hypothetical" which you put up to Mr. Randolph. That also seemed to me to be rather cover-

ing up the issue by distracting attention to something against which there would naturally be a considerable public feeling. After all, we are being told that the new Army is to be raised "to prevent war," not to fight a war. And I don't think that you would even frame a "hypothetical" that would suggest that what Mr. Randolph said with regard to segregation could be construed as treason in peacetime. But, in any event, let me remind you that the same sort of argument that you use was once used against conscientious objectors whom you now take for granted. My only regret is that a layman like Mr. Randolph did not put his argument on a religious basis. In the light of the teachings of the prophets and of Jesus, the test of real religion is justice and a resulting brotherhood. Therefore, any nonviolent measure which is taken to fight segregation is profoundly religious, and all objection to segregation may well be on the highest plain of conscientious objection. Our organization has consistently fought for the principle that we should have had a broad interpretation of the phrase "by religious training" in the Selective Service Act of the last war. I know personally a number of men who had no church connections whose objections to war are more profoundly religious than those of many of the CO boys who "got that way" through church training.

This leads me to say to you as a member of the Committee on Armed Services that I greatly hope that if the Senate bill coupling UMT with selective service is enacted into law that many church bodies will follow the example of Mr. Randolph and counsel nonviolent civil disobedience. When the Dillon and Read Government crowd, supporting American militarists, use one scare after another while restoring to power the cartel leaders of Germany, and when a committee treats witnesses as your committee is reported to have treated opponents of UMT and selective service as compared with the reception given proponents, then it is time that churchmen took seriously their allegiance to a higher power. If, after two world wars, we are still to remain the helpless pawns of interests behind present policies, then I agree again with the Christian Century that nonviolent resistance "is a democratic duty and an essential form of Christian witness."

I hope you will pardon a Methodist preacher of 40 years of service for writing at such length. To have done so is my tribute of regard for your mind and patriotism. I can only hope that you will now read into the RECORD Mr. White's letter of April 14, and that you will propose and support a section of law which will wipe out segregation in the armed services of our country.

Sincerely yours,

A. A. HEIST,
Director, Private Correspondence.

APRIL 22, 1948.

Mr. A. A. HEIST,
Director, Private Correspondence,
American Civil Liberties Union,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. HEIST: In response to your letter of April 14, I am sending you copies of the correspondence I have had with Walter White. Also enclosed are tear sheets from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 12 containing a speech I gave in the Senate on the civil disobedience proposal of Messrs. Randolph and Reynolds.

I am at a complete loss to understand your failure to recognize how ill-advised Randolph's proposal is, or to see how great a disservice a program of civil disobedience would be to attaining the goal of a sound civil-rights legislative program.

Very truly yours.

Housing Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 12, 1948

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that while the real-estate-lobby opponents of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner long-range housing bill are objecting bitterly to the Senate-approved bill, and are saying that they are solving the housing shortage, in reality the housing situation in this country continues to become more deplorable.

As witness of this, I wish to include in the RECORD an article from the Boston Herald of Saturday, May 1, 1948, concerning the plight of two families from my district, which mirrors the many thousands of similar cases where American families are being buffeted, shamed, and broken because of the lack of suitable housing:

TWO SOMERVILLE FAMILIES SETTLE DOWN IN SCHOOLS

Two Somerville families, each with six children, who were moved Thursday to unoccupied classrooms of two of the city's elementary schools, settled down last night to spend at least the week end in those quarters.

They were Mr. and Mrs. William Campbell and their children, whose temporary address was the Bennett School, and Mr. and Mrs. John Brooks and their children, living in the Cholerton School. The Campbells were evicted from a house which was sold, and the Brooks were forced from an overcrowded five-room apartment also occupied by two other families.

Charles J. Willwerth, general agent of the board of public welfare, provided electric plates on which the families did some cooking yesterday. Quartered in rooms not being used for school purposes, the children did not interfere with the regular pupils yesterday.

Somerville officials continued to try to find homes for the two families.

California in Review After a Century of American Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include herewith a lecture by Rockwell Dennis Hunt, Ph. D.:

CALIFORNIA IN REVIEW AFTER A CENTURY OF AMERICAN CONTROL

STRUGGLE FOR SOCIAL ORDER

(Sixth in a series of eight public centennial lectures by Rockwell Dennis Hunt, Ph. D.)

Dr. GREENE. For tonight, the "Struggle for Social Order" is the title of the lecture. Dr. Hunt. [Applause.]

Dr. HUNT. We have had something to say about gold, and about the formation of the State government under its new constitution. That does not tell the whole story of the early history of California during those years, 1849 and immediately following. There were many vicissitudes. California was tried as almost no other State, perhaps, in the entire Union has been tried in the matter of securing and establishing social order.

This is not so surprising when one stops to reflect upon the character of the people coming in, and of the events of those days. There was a great mass of people, a heterogeneous mass, representing different classes, different ages, different nationalities, different patterns of thought, all coming rather suddenly, and it was the suddenness with which things were happening then which caused Mr. Bancroft to speak of a day as being an age or an epoch rather than a 24-hour period. Things were happening overnight. Another thought to bring to bear is that it is rather traditional that the frontier of any land is a laboratory of democracy. The frontier which was so earnestly and faithfully studied by Professor Turner was the characteristic in any American history.

The westward movement. As we know, the culmination of this movement was in California. In another sense, the culmination occurred in those days of '49 and '50, still later, however, being pierced and obliterated by the bringing to this State of the transcontinental railroad.

Now, when we consider the character of the people, the rapidity of the tempo of changes taking place, the excitement, and the spirit of mania for gold hunting, with its concomitant practices of gambling and speculation, it is not to be wondered at that there must have been a great and protracted struggle for social order—social order in the broad sense, including the political activities, and the legal aspects of life, as well as other phases of what we know as social life. There we were. I call your attention to one or two very important distinctions; first, a distinction between abstract theory and concrete theory.

Abstract theory of the law, for example, is one thing. The actual practice of the people in their local lives is quite another thing many times. We are aware of that now in more instances than one, and if that is true, it is still more emphatically true at the time of which we speak tonight. There was a kind of legal code, but it was vague; it was ill-understood; it was supposed to be a perpetuation of the laws of Mexico that were not out of harmony with the United States' Constitution and statutes; but, as we already learned, the people were restive under that; they did not understand it; they could not find the law; they really did not know what it was, and even after they had the constitution of California that would take time to be circulated into the outer parts of the mining districts and elsewhere. So there was no well-established legal system in California at the first period.

However, my point just here is to draw further attention to the difference between what may be called a legalistic view and a practical, concrete view of living. For one of the complaints that brought on one of the largest vigilance committees was that law itself was made to be a cloak behind which might be found vice and corruption, mismanagement—basking, so to speak, in the sunlight of the law. I would like at this time to give you one or two very pertinent quotations that will call your attention to the difference that I have in mind. "Infinitely wider than the field of law is the domain of morality." The old Latin expression from Cicero was "Quid leges sine moribus?" meaning, What is the use of laws unless you have moral customs, was a question that was very pertinent in reference to

early California. "A man may be a bad husband, a bad father, a bad guardian," wrote Sheldon Amos, "without coming into conflict with the rules of a single law. He may be an extortionate landlord, a wasteful tenant, a hard dealer, an unreliable tradesman, and yet the legal machinery of the country may be quite powerless to chastise him. He may be, furthermore, a self-seeking politician, an unscrupulous demagogue, or an indolent aristocrat, and yet satisfy to the utmost the claims of the law upon him. Nevertheless it is just in the conduct of these several relationships that the bulk of human life consists, and national prosperity and honor depend."

No law is perfect nor perfectly executed, practiced, unless there is a widely diffused moral sentiment sustaining and upholding that law. Again, while we are enjoined in general to obey the law of the land, and good citizens will obey the law, yet mere literal obedience to the law is only a mark of passive or negative virtue as a citizen, and not the mark of positive good citizenship itself. It may be apathetic; it may be passive; it may be negative; but good citizenship calls for something positive, something creative, a manly virtue that goes beyond mere adherence to the legalistic form of the regulations.

Now it often happens that the normal growth of law is interfered with, both the spirit of the law and the form of it, as in the case of the superimposition of the complete system upon an unprepared people; and the people of California were not fully prepared for a system of law at the time it was imposed in 1850. Then there were other reasons which made it imperative that the true spirit of the law must be magnified and extolled above anything of legalistic morality, for I go so far as to say under certain circumstances legalistic morality may become actually immoral. Some of the most dangerous citizens of our communities are those who claim to be obeying the law to the letter and yet in heart are some of its worst citizens. Now such a remark applies particularly to some of the people and some of the events of which we speak in connection with the struggle for order in early California.

Getting along more rapidly into the subject, popular tribunals of some sort have been found in the frontiers quite generally, whether they be called vigilance committees, regulators, or, in a very bad example, lynch law; so California does not stand alone in having vigilance committees, but it stands very conspicuous in that regard, as we all know. Statutory law was itself lacking in part. The tribunals we had set up in California were very imperfect, and imperfectly adjudicated. There was a great disregard for some of the perfectly sound practices, and then on the part of a good many there was indifference, apathy; and the indifferent person, the careless person, is often a bad citizen, even though they may say he is a good man.

I would make this great distinction between lynch law and the typical vigilance committee. Lynch law practically is another word for mobocracy. It is the rule of the mob. It is not intelligent. It is passionate, not based upon reason, but based upon passion. Now most of the people in California at this time—not all—were rather high-grade persons. On that I have these rather studied, careful words from Mr. Theodore Hittell: "The greater part, though rough in dress and not overnice in language, were sober and industrious, well-fitted to preserve public order and admirably calculated to found a great State. Thrown upon their own resources in an untried field, they had to pursue a new career. Having no precedent, they had to make precedents. Taken in general, there certainly never was before, and it may be doubtful whether there will ever be again, thrown together under such peculiar circumstances such a body of choice and picked spirits."

Now even before the State machinery was put into actual motion in the last of 1849 and beginning of 1850, there had developed a good deal of disorder, especially in San Francisco. There was a motley population. There were those who were called "bad whites," "loose fish"; among the others there were those who had come to reap where they had not sown and to capitalize on the labor and the prosperity of others, and people were absorbed in their search for gold and profit rather, on a whole, than paying attention to the government. It was a social besetting sin to let things go and as we might say on the part of many, to let the devil take the hindmost. That was the situation. It is easily understandable, especially in San Francisco in those boisterous days.

The vigilance committee is a different thing from the lynch law. The vigilance committee is not a mob, not a tumultuous rabble. Indeed, prominent among its other functions is that of holding brute force and vulgar sentiment in wholesome fear. The vigilance committee is an exponent of the law in spirit and in truth, and its doctrine is that in case the officials of the law are corrupt and fail to represent the spirit of the law, then it becomes the duty of the good citizens, law abiding in spirit, to take the law into their own hands. An unhappy situation, undesirable in any normal society; but there were the unique conditions we have to confront. It respects the majesty of the law and is in effect the champion of the law itself. There was that disturbance brought on by the so-called hounds, or the regulators, in San Francisco in 1849. This band, self-constituted, undertook to take the law into its hands, or to represent the law, but was unfair; in fact became cruel and vicious toward some of the population, especially some of the people from Chile, and that became unbearable on the part of the public-minded citizens who saw what was going on, and thus the affair of the hounds, or the regulators, was brought to an end very quickly when the loyal citizens organized and put them to rout. In the meantime there had been some kind of a vigilance committee, which need not be here described, much earlier even than that in Los Angeles—1836—said to be the first vigilance committee in California, but not particularly significant to our discussion. Now there was a salutary clean-up by putting these hounds to rout in 1849, in the month of July, but that was not yet the first of the great vigilance committees that must claim our attention. This clean-up did not last very long.

In the meantime San Francisco was called upon to suffer the ordeal of fire, six conflagrations in a period of 2 or 3 years. Some of them undoubtedly were set on purpose; some were accidental. But all were quite disastrous. Of course, San Francisco was very flimsily built with tents, and often the tents were supplanted by wood that was very combustible, and each time San Francisco, true to her own tradition and ideal, rose a little stronger, a little better after the conflagration. Parenthetically, the most splendid example of that San Francisco ever showed to the world came after the great earthquake and fire of 1906, when, within 3 short years, the majesty and the glory of the city was displayed in a rather attractive city of buildings in a way that almost nobody expected could have been possible—the phoenix rising out of the ashes—the symbol for the city of San Francisco.

Now, social insanity returned soon after the clean-up of the regulators. Social insanity is hardly too strong a word. Things were going at a very lively pace. Speculation; high prices; gambling. I have read of one instance, speaking of prices, where a person died insolvent, being in debt to the extent of $41,000. Before that estate was settled—and it did not take very long—the property of that estate had increased in value to such an extent that it was not only out of debt but had come to yield an annual income of $40,000. Rates of interest were anywhere from 2 to 10 or 12 percent a month, compound. Other things were corresponding. So it is not very difficult to understand that there was a good deal of what we may truly call social insanity in those days and in that particular place.

That went on until conditions became intolerable. Crime was abroad, and crime became very open, overt, and apparently there was little attempt to conceal it. Then we come to the conditions that brought on the great committee of 1851. The objects of the great committee of 1851 were "to watch, pursue, and bring to justice the outlaws infesting the city, through the regularly constituted courts, if possible, through more summary course, if necessary." That is the clause, this latter clause, that explains going beyond mere adherence to the technical law. It is not my purpose to give a recital of the details of these vigilance committees. That may be read in the books and in the splendid accounts that we have. I will take this occasion to mention the best history of the great vigilance committee of 1851, with remarks on the general subject of the vigilance committee, and that is this splendid monograph by Dr. Mary Williams, published by the University of California Press in 1921, entitled "History of the San Francisco Committee of Vigilance of 1851." In another volume of similar size she brought together the documents of that great vigilance committee. That is quite surely the most scientific and authoritative history of that great committee. And I may mention one or two other references while speaking of that. Two complete volumes of the Bancroft history are on Popular Tribunals, dealing with this whole subject, in addition to references to the subject in his history on California; and a great many pages are devoted to the subject of the vigilance committees, particularly the committee of 1856, in the four-volume history by Theodore Hittell—History of California. Other references are numerous.

In the committee of 1851 the principal leadership, at least for a while, came to Sam Brannan. Sam Brannan is the same person who is seen so active in different connections in those days; the man who was the booster for the gold discovery, and who in a proper sense started the real gold fever by striding down the streets of San Francisco showing his bottle of dust and shouting, "Gold! Gold from the American River!" This committee of 1851 came to the point of exercising its power, after enlisting several hundred of the best-known citizens of San Francisco, even to the extent of execution by hanging. The Jenkins' burglary, the trial, the execution, and the presence of the law-and-order party all came in in connection with that great committee. The results of the committee were very marked. Dr. Mary Williams in her history says that—

"Probably every reader of these pages already knows that the men who organized them were respectable and influential members of the body politic; that for brief periods they assumed unlawful control over criminal matters in their city; that they arrested and confined prisoners at their own discretion, hanged whom they would, and banished from the State citizens and aliens whose presence they deemed a menace to public order, while the community not only tolerated their usurpation of power but supported them in the infliction of condign punishments. But it is not so generally known that these societies which defied the law regulated their conduct by the ordinary practices of parliamentary procedure, and kept careful records of their daily actions."

That, you will readily see, differentiates them very clearly from anything like lynch law or mobocracy.

Now it is not only in San Francisco that there was this struggle going on, but in various parts of the State, and not only in

California but the same movement of vigilance committees and vigilantism extended further East, even to Utah and the Rocky Mountains. One can find large numbers of instances of vigilance committees in interior towns. I might mention just two or three. Not always did they maintain the high order of the vigilance committee in San Francisco, but in a good many instances, too many, we must sadly confess, they descended to mobocracy or lynch law, in some of the mining centers. From the Alta California of February 26, 1851, I read:

"By a gentleman who arrived from Stockton yesterday, we learn that a lynching operation came off on Sunday at Stockton. A man had been caught stealing some clothing and having given it up was allowed to go free. Soon afterward, on the same day, he was caught in the actual act of stealing a mule, when he was taken by the populace, a rope placed around his neck and he was dragged across the slough with a determination to hang him, which would undoubtedly have been done had not the sheriff interposed and the man was given up to justice."

The Stockton Times of July 6, 1850, was filled with accounts of murders and robberies in the mines, showing a most disturbed and dangerous state of things. The Times contends that the foreign miners' tax law has contributed to and brought about this unhappy result. There are certain extracts, for example: "Robberies. Numerous robberies have been committed at Jamestown, Wood's, Sullivan's, Columbia, and so so forth, within the last few days. The miners are greatly excited on the subject, and it is believed that terrible reprisals will be made if the offenders be caught."

There were cases in Sacramento. In almost any important center you could mention you would find there were some acts of the vigilance committee, or in some cases practices that descended to lynch law; so the activities were not at all confined to San Francisco alone.

Great, good results flowed from the activities of the committee of 1851. The Alta California, undoubtedly the leading newspaper of that time, said, 5 days after the hanging of Jenkins:

"It is certainly a fact that since the excitement which resulted in the execution, crimes of the more heinous nature have visibly decreased. Whereas previously scarce a night occurred that we had not occasion to note down a knocking down, drugging, robbery, or burglary, since that night there has been but one case of robbery of which we have heard."

The salutary effect cannot be well questioned. But, unfortunately, it did not last very long. That was partly for the reason that new people were coming in all the time, men were moving out of San Francisco and going hither and thither into the mines and some returning to the East, so that the population was changing, and there was not that stability of population that you and I are accusomed to. Then there grew a sense of indifference and carelessness, and that same besetting sin of being engaged in one's own business and in the making of one's own profits to such an extent that crime began to stalk abroad again. But before we come to the committee of 1856 we recognize a different type of irregularity—of vice. There was more cleverness and less of the crude type of crime being committed. It took the shape of stuffing the ballot boxes, withholding the privilege of voting, and of doing things behind the cloak of the law, instead of in direct violation of the law. There was craftiness. But this was a dangerous thing. As I said a few moments ago, where they tried to adhere to the strict letter of the law they could still be criminal at heart and do infinite mischief in the community. There was that sort of thing, not outright crime in overt acts such as actual robberies, burglaries, and murders—although those were not by any means absent—that proved to be the most threatening aspect of the society in San Francisco in those years, just preceding 1856. Criminal records shows that in California 538 persons met their death by violence. Of these 370 were white; 138 were Indians; 32 were Chinese, and 3 were Negroes. During this same year (1855) 47 persons were said to have been executed by mobs, 9 by legal tribunals, 10 were killed by sheriffs or police officials, and 6 by collectors of the foreign miners' tax; 12 perished in fights about mining claims, and 8 over the gaming table. Prior to 1855 homicides were at least as frequent. The district attorney of San Francisco asserts that during the years 1850 to 1853, inclusive, there were 1,200 murders and only one legal criminal conviction. Now, perhaps, that is enough to give an idea of the conditions that were prevalent up to 1854 and 1855, especially in San Francisco, and, in general, in many of the mining centers; for some of the mining towns of 1855 had populations of anywhere from five, ten, fifteen, or twenty-five thousand persons each, some that we now know as ghost towns.

Then there came the cause—and here we cannot go into all the detail—of the great committee of 1856. There came the immediate cause for the formation of the committee. James King of William, a pioneer, had become editor of the Evening Bulletin in San Francisco, and wisely or unwisely he began to criticize most caustically and unmercifully some of the public officials and others, and he mentioned names and places. He did not deal in any circumlocution at all. One of the victims of that attack was James Casey, and the thing that he particularly resented was the announcement that the editor had said in the paper that he had been a jailbird back in the East—that he had had a criminal experience. Casey challenged James King of William to a duel. The duel was declined. Then he threatened to do him violence.

You are acquainted with the leading facts. When James King of William left his office one day he was accosted on the street, on the sidewalk, by Casey, and before he had time to defend himself, as he evidently intended to do, he was shot by Casey; and in the course of a few days the wound proved to be fatal—James King of William died. That event produced a most profound sensation in San Francisco. Immediately there was a call for the organization of the vigilance committee. And thus we have the beginning of the great committee—the greatest in our history and one of the greatest, perhaps the greatest, of all in the history of the United States, the Committee of 1856. William T. Coleman was called to be head of that committee.

I wish that we all might become better acquainted with the life and the character of that man, "The Lion of the Vigilantes," as one of his biographers has called him, "Old Vigilante," as he came to be known. William T. Coleman, honored, respected citizen! Citizens went into that committee with the most serious purposes, and some of them testified, and we have it on record, that they never went into any enterprise more seriously or with a higher purpose in their lives than they went into that committee; and they organized it and made it strong, thousands of men ultimately becoming loyal members. They organized and in military fashion; many of them were armed, and they established what is called Fort Gunnybags. That is the place where they fortified the building with sacks of sand. They solemnly tapped that great bell when the committee was to be assembled—and they meant business.

It did not take very long, especially after the death of James King of William, for them to bring Casey to justice; an hour or so for the trial; another hour or so and he was hung; and that was the first stern act of that kind in connection with the work of the great vigilance committee of 1856. He was not the only one by any means that suffered at the hands of the committee. It was a stern business. These men knew that they were taking the law into their own hands.

What were the legal authorities doing? The governor was J. Neely Johnson, and I am sorry to have to say that I think he pursued a very vacillating and pusillanimous course—not an admirable course, not clear-cut, not good statesmanship, although he in his way, perhaps, generally meant well. And the course taken by William T. Sherman, who afterwards became a great general of the Civil War, was not altogether to be praised at that time. You can read the accounts of Farwell and Coleman and others in the articles that were written and published long ago. The governor represented what was called the Law and Order Society—law and order movement. "Stand by the law!" Ordinarily, of course, you would think this desirable. Under those circumstances you have to remember that several thousand of the best, most respected men of the entire community of San Francisco had given their pledge as active members of that great vigilance committee, and they were there for a definite end and high purpose. They carried on. They did not hesitate. And they were the most happy of all of the populace when the time came that they could adjourn sine die. They did not like the business they were in. There was no gloating, no boasting, but there was dignity, respect, and majesty of activity on the part of those members and officers of the great committee.

I realize that there may be some now in these days who would look upon all vigilance committees, including this, with disfavor. I would beg of such to go back and review the situation carefully, review the motives that animated these men, and appraise the results that were achieved by these committees, and high as our respect for law and order is under constituted authorities, it seems to me if they do that they will not fail to agree that on the whole, by and large, the vigilance committees of 1851, and of 1856, did a salutary work, and in the end it proved to be lasting; there was no similar disturbance of similar magnitude for many years to come in San Francisco. It was a pity that such means had to be resorted to, and when speaking words of commendation for some of these men, I would single out William T. Coleman and declare he was the greatest of them all, and what he did was truly noble and praiseworthy. Mr. Stevenson, who wrote the book entitled "The Wrecker," had this to say about Coleman:

"THE LION OF THE VIGILANTES

"That lion of the vigilantes had but to rouse himself and shake his ears, and the whole brawling mob was silenced. I could not but reflect what a strange manner of man this was, to be living unremarked there as a private merchant, and to be so feared by a whole city."

It shows something of the quiet power of this man who was a recognized leader of the great vigilance committee of 1856.

The plan of adjournment was laid before the delegates at a meeting of that board held on the 13th, and it was fully approved; the 18th of August instead of the 21st being finally fixed as the day of demonstration. The gunny-bag barricade was taken down the 14th. At the Saturday afternoon meeting of August 16 the rooms of the building were ordered thrown open to the members of the committee, their friends, and their families the next Thursday and Friday, the 21st and 22d, from 10 a. m. until 5 p. m. of each day, notice of the same to be posted in the building and published in the papers. A committee of five was placed in charge of the reception. The predictions of the law and order party concerning the evil effects

fell to the ground. There was no reaction, no domineering mobocracy, no attempt to seize the reigns of government, no intoxication incident took possession of supreme power. They adjourned sine die, but did not wholly disorganize, because they held themselves in a sense in readiness for any subsequent call—subject to the call of the executive committee headed by Mr. Coleman.

The final demonstration was a very imposing one, a wise and proper movement, so pronounced by Mr. Hittell, by Mr. Bancroft, and so far as I know and believe, by other best authorities. It was a grand review and military parade on the 18th with 4 regiments of infantry, 2 squadrons of cavalry, 1 battalion of artillery, 1 battalion of riflemen, I battalion of pistolmen, and 1 police battalion—in all were over 6,000 armed men in that final demonstration. Is it not beautiful to think that when they gave that demonstration they repaired to their homes and respective businesses and were glad to be relieved of the situation? But even then they had the difficulty of meeting a situation when Judge David S. Terry stabbed Hopkins, and he a judge of the Federal court. It is difficult to know, or to imagine what would have happened, if Hopkins had died as a result of the incident; but perhaps, fortunately, he did not die and the matter had proceeded so far that the case was not carried to the limit—the vigilance committee was at an end.

All I have to add is simply this: The circumstances were such as to justify these extraordinary and technically illegal measures and means. But we all may well pray to heaven that situations may never recur in our Golden State when we shall have to resort again to a vigilance committee. This calls upon us, I think, to be not simply passive citizens and give passive obedience to the laws but to have the active virtue of participation and intelligence regarding law and citizenship. And if we do that in large numbers, in predominant numbers, there will be no occasion for any vigilance committees. We, ourselves, in the United States, are the result of a revolution—we must never forget that. Nor must we forget that there are circumstances when extraordinary means may be taken; but let us hope and pray that it will never be necessary to resort to vigilance committees. Then we can more nearly live up to the maxim of President Woodrow Wilson when he said: "What we seek is the reign of law, based upon the consent of the governed, and sustained by the organized opinion of mankind."

Father Tiso Rejected Soviet Offer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1948

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article from the Messenger, official publication of the Catholic diocese of Belleville, Ill.

FATHER TISO REJECTED SOVIET OFFER—MIGHT HAVE SAVED HIS LIFE BY AGREEING WITH COMMUNISTS

BUENOS AIRES.—The late Reverend Josef Tiso, wartime President of the Slovak State who was executed a year ago in Bratislava, might have saved his life if he had been willing to agree to Communist proposals, according to a report circulated here.

The first anniversary of Father Tiso's death was marked by the Slovak community here with a memorial mass and patriotic exercises during which the Slovak leader was eulogized as a martyr for the cause of Slovak national independence and the fight against communism.

According to the reports a Red Army colonel, named Tegero, approached on Good Friday, 1945, the then Slovak Minister of Foreign Affairs, Ferdinand Durcansky, and told him that everything would be "all right" with the Slovak State and Father Tiso, provided he agreed to remain in Slovakia and declare it a republic under Soviet Russian protectorate. Father Tiso immediately turned down the offer, refusing to do business with Stalin.

Mr. Durcansky was tried in absentia together with Father Tiso and also sentenced to death.

The Christian Religion Is Worth While

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. M. (DON) WHEELER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1948

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I am including an address made by Henry Whitefield Samson recently which I think is very timely:

THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION IS WORTH WHILE

(By Henry Whitefield Samson, Washington, D. C.)

The foundation of the Christian religion is belief in God and in His only begotten son, Jesus Christ, and in the Bible, the wonderful Book which has successfully withstood the assaults of generations. The Bible has maintained itself against numerous foes who have arisen to oppose it. Atheists have aimed to cast it out, and ungodly men despised it for its purity, simplicity, high ideals, and beauty of expression. Where the influence of the Bible is, you will find the best civilization, government, law, and respect for authority. No people can exist unless governed and restrained by law. However, law must have the morality taught by the Christian religion back of it, as morality cannot be preserved by law alone.

Christ said: "Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's," and thereby recognized respect for and obedience to civil law.

To understand and appreciate this Book of Books we must possess an open and receptive mind. As the student comes to the teacher for information, guidance, and assistance, so we must come to the Holy Word for spiritual help, to drink in its precepts, to search its spiritual depths, and to know and appreciate its beauty, unity, and attractiveness, so we may absorb through its teaching, and in our daily lives show forth its precepts to the men and women with whom we are brought in contact.

But, the reader may ask, "How am I to obtain this receptive attitude in my study of the Bible?" By prayerful, simple trustfulness. As the wee babe places perfect faith in its mother, so we must through the exercise of faith approach the beloved Book.

What simpler and more impressive statement from the Bible could we have than the following: "Now, faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." This lights the dark places. The rough places become smooth. Our eyes are opened, and we behold unfolding truth, which will enable us to appropriate the blessing so freely given us. But says the materialist, "How am I to know? What evidence of this do we have?" Who doubts that Caesar, Napoleon, or George Washington lived? The record of their lives has been given us by historians, who present historical facts, which we accept.

Naturally, we should have no difficulty in accepting belief in God, Christ, the Twelve Apostles, Moses, Abraham, and many others in Holy Scriptures.

We exercise faith in each instance above mentioned, and by applying the same reasoning and logic, the conclusion is identical. We believe in the law of gravitation although we do not see it. Archaeology, history, and science confirm our evidence of God, and the validity of the Word of God.

The writer, in conversation with a young woman who attended a university, was informed that she was a "materialist." The question was asked her, How do you know you are your mother's own daughter?" She replied, "By biological test." Then she was asked, "Who makes this test; are you a biologist?" "No," she answered, "the biologist must make the test, and I accept his report." To this she received the reply, "Then your materialism fails, and you are where you began, as you must, through faith, accept the report of the biologist."

Everything about us represents order, unity, utility, and beauty. In order to sustain life we must have air, food, water, clothing, and shelter, all of which are provided by Almighty God for our world. The fields and farms provide foodstuffs for man and beast. The moisture is carried up by the influence of the sun from the rivers and sea, condensed as rain, supplying the springs and rivers, from whence we receive water. The water from these turn wheels which generate electricity that has a thousand uses.

The sun warms the earth, causes the grass, vegetables, fruit, and grain to grow, which sustain man and beast.

Beautiful gardens radiate every color of the rainbow, exhaling their perfume, while the busy bee quaffs nectar from the open flowers. In everything and on every hand, we are faced by evidence of Divine overruling thoughtfulness, and the guiding hand of God, the Creator. Where there is a design, there must be a designer. Where there is a building there must be a builder. Where there is an effect there must be a cause. There is a Creator, and He is God.

Each day we are reminded of the shortness of human life. Each tick of the clock is a step nearer eternity.

We know that every watch and clock in our country is timed from pendulum and quartz crystal-type oscillating clocks at the United States Naval Observatory in Washington, D. C. These clocks are checked on clear nights by observations of the stars. No time without the stars. No stars without the Deity.

The latest astronomical reports disclose that through the medium of the telescopes our vision of space is becoming more and more extended, as galaxy and illimitable space are being discovered and studied. The universe is governed by law and order, because God is on His throne. The psalmist said: "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth His handiwork."

Job was a learned man and a scientist. He announced: "He stretcheth out the north over the empty place, and hangeth the earth upon nothing." Sir William Herschel, in searching the heavens with his telescope found the barren part, the empty places in the north, precisely where Job told Bildad the Shuhite the empty place was stretched out. Solomon in a single verse describes the atmosphere, evaporation, condensation, and rainfall, as actual observations show it today.

That it has laws and is obedient to order as the heavenly host in their movement, we infer from the fact announced by him in this passage: "All the rivers run into the sea, yet the sea is not full; unto the place from whence the rivers come, thither they return again."

We come to the Bible as truth-loving, knowledge-seeking explorers. By faith we knock at the door, which swings open, revealing the marvelous wonders of the Infinite.

The influence of the Christian religion on our daily life, and incorporating its precepts into our life are of paramount importance. "The tree is known by its fruit." If we have the appearance of being Christian and fail to live these principles each day, we are like the scribes of whom Jesus said: "Woe unto you, scribes, Pharisees, hypocrites; for ye are like unto whited sepulchers, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones and of all uncleanness." (Matthew 23:27).

Our Christian religion must be real, practical, and vitalizing, otherwise it is valueless. It is a fight against evil, right against wrong, light against darkness, honesty against dishonesty.

The Christian religion will change, uplift, and adorn our lives. It will be felt in our daily contacts with others. This unseen power will touch their lives, exerting its uplifting influence for good on them. Only by living the Gospel of Christ daily, can we come into proper relation with God, have a complete realization of its beauties, and be enabled to give to others its helpful, uplifting, saving power.

Today, noise, confusion, greed, jealousy, suspicion, and atheism are abroad in our land. Murder, crime, divorce, immorality are increasing. Communism, socialism, fascism, nazism, and other "cure it all" isms and cults offer quack nostrums. All these are false and futile. Only a return to belief in God, Christ, and the Bible can and will redeem this weary, exhausted, war-torn, sin-sick world that is sinking in sin and dissipation.

We, like the prodigal son, must return to our Father. He will receive us with open arms, and with unfathomable love will welcome us home. May God open our eyes that we may see, our ears that we may hear, our hearts that we may receive, and our wills that we may obey.

The Full Use of Existing Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1948

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD a statement made by Mr. L. C. Allman, vice president of the Fruehauf Trailer Co., of Detroit, Mich. His statement in regard to the use of modern highways contains some challenging suggestions. I trust every Member of the House will read it.

THE FULL USE OF EXISTING HIGHWAYS

(By L. C. Allman, vice pesident, Fruehauf Trailer Co.)

What's par in S. W. R.?

And by S. W. R. we mean sizes, weights, and regulations.

A modern highway in one State is very similar to a modern highway in every other State. A few States give at least reasonable recognition to the carrying capacity of their highways—and permit greater use, although not the full use, of this capacity. In other States, and in some cases they may be adjoining States, the carrying capacities of the highways may be practically identical, but the permitted loads do not begin to approach a uniform figure.

Isn't there any par on this public course—these roads and streets that have been built and are maintained with the tax money which comes, directly or indirectly, from American industry?

WHY SO MUCH DIFFERENCE?

Why are the people denied the benefits that would come from the full use of the carrying capacity of our modern roads and streets? Why is there so much difference in the size and weight standards of the various States? Can highway engineers be held responsible for this impractical mess of laws? The answer is "No." However, there may have been some cases in which these engineers have been too hesitant to come to the support of the public interest—and have failed to acquaint political leaders with the true capacity of the roads. It may well be said, too, that highway authorities have failed to take leadership in obtaining efficient operation of a public property—roads and streets—about which they are better informed than anybody else.

POLITICAL EXPEDIENCY

It is quite probable that many of these size-and-weight laws in the various States have been too largely influenced by political considerations. Selfish interests, not always outside the industry itself, have had too much to do with the enactment of these laws—or the failure to bring about much better legislation. Ignorance has been responsible for some of the restrictions placed upon such useful business tools as commercial highway vehicles. But time after time and in State after State, new size-and-weight laws have been put through on the sole basis of give-and-take political expediency.

TIME FOR SCIENTIFIC APPROACH

Isn't it time, in all States, to make a scientific rather than political approach to the subject of size-and-weight allowances for commercial vehicles?

Highway engineers know that our modern roads will carry heavier gross loads, if properly distributed, than are now permitted. Think of our great Nation-wide transportation plant—costing $32,000,000,000—operating at an efficiency of probably not more than 50 percent.

PAR CAN BE ESTABLISHED

We believe it is possible to arrive at a reasonable par—and we have a proposal to make which has developed from consultations with transportation authorities, vehicle designers, and operators of commercial vehicles. We offer these size-and-weight specifications as minimums which can reasonably be applied to many of our roads and streets, if not all.

If there are some few roads to which these specifications cannot be applied, they can be posted accordingly. But, by all means, when it comes to replacing or rebuilding these roads, they should be made to conform. Certainly these specifications should be the minimum guide for all new road construction.

PROPOSED SPECIFICATIONS

Over-all length of single unit, 40 feet.

Over-all length of tractor-semitrailer, or other combination, 60 feet.

Over-all height, 13 feet 6 inches.

Over-all width, 102 inches (on prescribed highways).

Weight per axle, 18,000 pounds. Minimum axle spacing, 42 inches. Not more than 4 axles of 18,000 pounds each within any 24 feet.

On the basis of all information now available it is believed that the size-and-weight limitations herein proposed will be adequate to provide full use of our highways for many years to come.

To those who question the capacity of some of our bridges, we would reply that we are not so sure that there are very many weak bridges, but, to find out for certain just what their number may be, we would suggest that a scientific study of the practical capacity of all the bridges on all State trunk lines be made at the earliest opportunity.

We have reason to believe that a good many heretofore considered unsafe for heavier loads would be found to be more than capable of safely withstanding substantial increases in the gross weight of commercial vehicles.

Those few found to be inadequate should, of course, be rebuilt or strengthened sufficiently to bring them into line with the others, and this could be done at reasonable expense. These bridges should be properly posted until necessary repairs are made.

SEVENTY-FIVE YEARS—A LONG TIME

Competent engineers advise us that when a modern highway bridge is built today, it's going to stay right there for probably the next 75 to 100 years. Well, what's par in the strength of these bridges?

Are we ready now to put a ceiling on the sizes and weights of commercial vehicles—a ceiling that will prevent us from making these vehicles so they can carry more tonnage at any time during the next 75 years—simply because somebody insists upon building weak bridges?

A COMPROMISE AT BEST

In recent years, some progress has been made by highway authorities in attempting to arrive at a reasonable conclusion on this size-and-weight problem. At best, the figures finally agreed upon represented a compromise between parties whose views on the subject were in great disagreement—and there still seems to be doubt as to whether the compromise figures are to be regarded as a floor or ceiling.

When it is proposed that full use be made of the capacity built into our great national transportation plant—our roads and streets—why must we tolerate a compromise solution?

TURN TO THE ENGINEERS

It's time to turn to the transportation engineers—the highway and vehicle engineers—and permit them to apply engineering principles to the problem of the full use of existing highways. We need a study of our transportation plant and the vehicles operating over it—based on current roads and business, and a reasonable regard for the future.

This is the time for all of us—highway engineers, vehicle engineers, highway users, and maybe the leaders of our armed forces—all to sit down together in great humility and with one supreme purpose—to figure out ways and means for permitting the full usage of our roads and streets in the interest of all our citizens.

The people come first. They are entitled to every good thing that engineering genius can give them. We've had too much heat in highway matters. Let's let the light in. Let's really arrive at a sound enginering answer to the very logical question—What's par in S. W. R.?

IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Those whose business it is to know something about the next war—if it should come—are not pulling any punches in telling just what will be expected of industry. They emphasize over and over that we must be industrially strong, that we must make proper preparations now, that we must have mobilization plans, that transportation is all important—that all productive capacity will have to be utilized to its maximum potential.

If, in some future emergency which may develop almost overnight, we are going to be asked by our military leaders to perform highway-transport miracles—where is the wisdom of bottlenecking our present or future highway system by considering any specifications lower than those we are now proposing?

Think what it would mean to all our people if our splendid highway system should be unshackled—should be used to its full capacity. The simple truth is that the taxpayers are not getting full value for the money they have paid out for their highways. It is in the public interest that the use of existing highway facilities be extended to the point where their maximum potential capacity to serve the citizens be utilized.

Americanization Day Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 12, 1948

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, once again for the seventeenth consecutive year, Americanization Day was celebrated in Jersey City under the auspices and sponsorship of Captain C. E. Fisk Post, No. 132, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. The celebration this year was probably the biggest which has ever taken place on this now historic occasion. For more than 3 hours those participating in the parade passed before many thousands of persons who lined the parade route, and before additional thousands who had gathered in the stands at Pershing Field where the parade terminated. In the line of march were contingents from the Regular Army, from the Navy, and the Marine Corps. Practically all veterans' organizations and their ladies' auxiliaries were represented in the line of march. At Pershing Field the parade was reviewed by high officers of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion and by representatives of the Spanish-American War Veterans as well. The mayor and the city commissioners of Jersey City were also among the reviewing officials.

The grand marshal of the parade was Lt. Stephen R. Gregg, winner of the Congressional Medal of Honor. Mr. Daniel D. Kemp, Sr., veteran of World War I, was chief of staff. Also in line were Capt. F. X. Burke, Messrs. John W. Meagher and Nicholas Oresko, all of whom likewise are holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor, and Messrs. Patrick Newman and Raymond A. Brown, Jr., winners of the Distinguished Flying Cross. All of them served as aides to the grand marshal.

The general chairman of the celebration, who through all the years has served to make the affair a constantly growing success was Mr. George A. Thornton, Sr., veteran of World War I.

Again the city of Jersey City was honored by the presence on this occasion of the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Prior to the arrival of the parade at Pershing Field, the throngs there present were addressed by Hon. Frank H. Eggers, mayor of Jersey City; Mr. William G. McKinley, national executive committeeman of the American Legion; Mr. Ray H. Brannaman, national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; Mr. Sheldon De Baum, commander, department of New Jersey, Veterans of Foreign Wars; Mr. William F. Morley, Seton Hall College student; and myself. The invocation was offered by Rev. Leonard A. Sibley, and the benediction by Father Michael Hornak. At the conclusion of the parade there was the usual massing of the colors which thrilled the thousands of spectators.

Jersey City has come to be especially proud of this celebration, which for enthusiasm and numbers, is not paralleled anywhere in the country. It drew especial praise from the national commander in chief. The preparatory work required by this demonstration is all performed by Capt. C. E. Fisk Post, No. 132, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, whose members to a man give to it all the necessary attention and energy. From small beginnings the celebration has attained immense proportions and is participated in now not only by citizens of Jersey City but by multitudes from the entire New York Metropolitan district. I am personally proud of the fact that I have been invited by those in charge of the celebration to address the assembled audience at every one of these demonstrations.

Will the Republican Pledge to the People Join the Atlantic Charter in the Ashcan?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, on December 5, 1945, the Republicans of the Senate and House issued a Statement of Principles, Policies, and Objectives of Republican Members of Congress.

Presumably that statement constituted the commitment which induced the American people to elect a Republican majority to the Senate and House in 1946.

It opened with this sentence:

> Today's major domestic issue is between radicalism, regimentation, all-powerful bureaucracy, class exploitation, deficit spending, and machine politics, as against our belief in American freedom for the individual under just laws fairly administered for all, preservation of local home rule, efficiency and pay-as-you-go economy in government, and the protection of the American way of life against either Fascist or Communist trends.

On this major issue of regimentation this covenant was made more binding and clear-cut by these words:

> Neither the war nor any other excuse shall be justification for fastening regimentation permanently upon the American people.

Mr. Speaker, the American people expect the Republican Party to keep faith with them. That is why they elected us. If our solemn pledges, like those made by the Democratic Party, should turn out to be worthless, the American people will be sorely betrayed.

It is inconceivable that a Republican Congress, elected on a specific pledge of ending regimentation, should fasten on America the cruel shackles of a peacetime draft and conscription.

Such militarism and regimentation on the alibi of communism would take us in Hitler's footsteps.

Will the Republican Party collaborate in repeating here the Nazi course of militarism and regimentation?

Was Hitler right?

High Lights of Navy's Pacific War Record

REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, recently the Navy Department released a statistical résumé of the naval air operations in the Pacific war, which has been analyzed and interpreted in a very commendable article appearing in the Buffalo Evening News on May 10, 1948, which I urge receive the attention of every Member of Congress and citizen interested in our national defense and national security.

Prior to the National Security Act of 1947, which provided for the unification of our armed forces, a very powerful campaign was waged to have all elements of air operations placed under the control of the new Department of the Air Force. Fortunately, the Congress at that time realized that our Navy could not be effective without its own integrated air arm and wrote in the law specific provision preserving for the Navy the right of retaining its own essential air arm for naval operations. It is regrettable that this question of naval aviation has not been settled with any finality even though this provision is in the statute. The campaign still goes on in certain quarters for the control of all aviation to be placed under the new, single Department of Air. Only an interested, active, enlightened public can prevent this from happening.

Unquestionably, the use of air power is the most effective medium of military operations. For years, the policy and procedures of the Navy Department have been to integrate air operations into the entire area of naval operations. Having started years ago to train naval officers in aviation, the time is now at hand when the commanders of most fleets and task forces will be men who have had not only naval training but aviation, as well. Naval aviation is not an independent unit of the naval establishment but rather an integral part of it, fully as much as is submarine and amphibious operations. To take from the Navy its air arm would be as illogical and disastrous as to deprive the Navy of its submarine and fleet marine forces.

I have always felt that it was a serious mistake to have created an independent air force, which of necessity must be dependent on the use of land or water for its logistic or material support. I predict that the time may well come when the country will realize how impotent it has made its army through the denial to it of the use of air power in all its operations. It is highly important to our national security that we do not make this same mistake with regard to our naval forces.

I repeat that this can only be prevented by an alert, interested, and informed public. The articles which I include should be read by everyone. They follow:

[From the Buffalo Evening News]

HIGH LIGHTS OF NAVY'S PACIFIC WAR RECORD

According to the official statistics of United States naval aviation in the Pacific war:

Navy and Marine Corps aircraft destroyed 15,401 Japanese planes, 9,249 in air combat and 6,152 on the ground, or on carrier decks.

Of these, Navy carrier planes destroyed 12,268, including 6,444 in air combat and 5,824 on the ground or on carrier decks.

Of the 12,268 Jap planes destroyed by United States carrier aircraft 93 percent were land-based planes.

United States carrier aircraft destroyed 4,571 Japanese planes in the 5 months of the Philippines campaign, and 4,387 more in the final campaigns against Okinawa and Japan.

In the Philippines, Okinawa, and Japan campaigns, United States carrier aircraft shot down 20 Japanese planes for each of their own planes lost to the guns of Jap pilots.

For the war as a whole, United States carrier fighters shot down over 18 Jap planes for each fighter shot down by Japanese aircraft.

During 1944 and 1945 Japanese planes shot down only 38 Navy and Marine Corps dive and torpedo bombers, out of over 100,000 bombing sorties.

During the one month of October 1944, United States carrier aircraft destroyed 1,851 Japanese planes in the Philippines, Formosa, and the Ryukyus.

NAVAL AIR SUPERIORITY TO LAND-BASED POWER CONCEALED BY USAF—PACIFIC WAR PROVED CARRIER PLANES THE BEST WEAPON BUT NAVY IS MUZZLED AND AIR FORCE PROPAGANDA CAMPAIGN DECEIVES CONGRESS

(By Richard Essex)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—In the absence of an interpretation of the bare statistics of the wartime record of naval aviation released in Washington Saturday, the full importance to America of naval aviation is not revealed. Rather, it seems to the News, the absence of an explanation tends to minimize the significance of these statistics so far as the average reader is concerned.

(Naval public-relations officers say that since the document is a clear statistical presentation of how valuable floating bases are in reaching the enemy, and how effective we have been in destroying his ship- and shore-based aircraft, we, therefore, did not give the figures any official interpretation.

(Those conversant with the situation in the Department of Defense suggest that perhaps Air Force pressure made the Navy reluctant to talk. This is important in view of the action of the Congress in expressly providing that the Navy should retain control of naval aviation. In view of the gravity of a sound naval defense policy, the News requested a qualified former Naval Reserve officer, with extensive air experience, to study the release and prepare this article).

United States naval aviation is air power—as fully as is the United States Air Force—but the Navy can't say so. United States carrier aviation in the Pacific war had a far better record against the Japanese Air Forces than did our land-based aviation—but the Navy can't say so, nor explain why carrier air power was superior.

Such are the clear implications of the Navy's release last week, for the first time, of the full wartime statistical record of naval aircraft against Jap aircraft. No comment, comparison, or explanation accompanied the bare figures released. Why? Let us look at some of the comparisons the Navy omitted.

United States Navy and Marine Corps aircraft destroyed a total of 15,401 Japanese planes. Although the Navy did not say so, this is 49 percent more than the 10,343 Japanese planes destroyed by the United States Army Air Forces.

CARRIER PLANES GOT 80 PERCENT

Of the Navy's total, 80 percent, or 12,268 Japanese planes, were destroyed by United States carrier-based aircraft. This alone is 19 percent more Japanese planes than were destroyed by the Fifth, Seventh, Tenth, Eleventh, Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Twentieth Air Forces from their hundreds of bases in the Central, South, and Southwest Pacific, and in China, Burma, India, and Alaska. It is significant that 93 percent of the 12,268 planes destroyed by United States carrier aircraft were Japanese land-based planes.

United States carrier planes, furthermore, accomplished their results with less losses in air combat. They shot down 6,444 Japanese planes but lost only 451 of their own aircraft at the hands of Japanese pilots. This was a 14-to-1 superiority over Japanese planes in aerial combat.

Land-based Navy and Marine aircraft, in contrast, shot down 2,805 Japanese planes but lost 446 in the process, a superiority of less than 7 to 1. Land-based Army Air Forces planes shot down 7,362 Japs, but lost over 1,500 to the guns of Nipponese pilots, a superiority of less than 5 to 1.

GOT THEM ON GROUND, TOO

Nor was the superiority of carrier planes limited to aerial combat. United States carrier aircraft destroyed 5,649 Japanese planes on the ground at the enemy's own airfields. This was nearly twice as many as the 2,981 Japanese planes destroyed on the ground by all the bombers and fighters of the seven Army Air Forces in the Pacific.

These figures show an overwhelming superiority for carrier-based planes as an instrument for the destruction of enemy air forces. Why has not the Navy told this to the public, and to a Congress whose eagerness to expand American air power has been directed almost exclusively to expanding the land-based Air Force? And why has there been no explanation of the reason for carrier supremacy in the air war?

The answer is simple. The Navy is muzzled. The muzzle is applied by the Air Force, which cannot bring itself to admit, or let the public and Congress be informed, that sea-based aviation is a form of air power more effective and economical in many ways than is land-based aviation.

AIR FORCE PROPAGANDA

The Air Force has for 3 years conducted a vigorous propaganda campaign to identify itself as the exclusive proprietor of American air power. In this way the Air Force planned that it alone would cash in on the popularity of air power. Any contrary views were "controversial" and were suppressed within the Military Establishment. The current votes in Congress show how effective was the Air Force campaign. But national security demands that the public know all the facts and opinions, so that we may build the right air weapons for our air defense, whether they are Air Force weapons or not.

How would the Navy explain the superiority of carrier air power, and its significance for the future, if it were free to talk about its own weapons? The figures themselves, and a glimpse at history provide some clues.

Air power, I think the Navy would say (and I think the Air Force and the RAF would both agree) is primarily the ability to gain superiority in the air against enemy air weapons, at whatever places and for whatever purposes that superiority is needed.

PURPOSE OF AIR POWER

Air power, as both we and the British found (and the Germans and Japanese to their sorrow) is the ability to push the enemy air force back on its own homeland, with its back to the wall, unable to attack, fighting a losing battle in defense of its own last bases and supporting industries.

Air power is not measured in tons of explosive or in atom bombs. The primary target of air power is not enemy cities, but the enemy air force. Air power is the ability to make the enemy air force fight where we want it to, on our own terms, and to destroy it. Then we may bomb at will—and be free from enemy bombing.

This description of air power squares with the major official analyses of the European air war. It also precisely describes the carrier air campaign in the Pacific. Our carrier air force established air supremacy wherever it went. It carried the air offensive against the Japanese air forces, made them its primary target, rendered them incapable of effective sustained attack, forced them back to a frantic and fruitless defense of own homeland, and destroyed them.

GREAT TACTICAL ADVANTAGE

Carrier air power established air superiority more quickly and at far less cost than did our land-based air forces. Carrier air power carried our air offensive forward more rapidly than did our land-based air forces.

Carrier aircraft established air superority in areas out of range of our land-based air forces. Carriers struck behind the Japanese forward air bases, weakened the structure of enemy air power, and bombed its remains to extinction on the ground.

The record verifies these statements. The carrier forces virtually eradicated all enemy air strength in the many Central Pacific island groups, before our land-based air forces could be brought within range.

But the carriers' abilities were not limited to overcoming air forces based on isolated islands. A total of 8,812, or 72 percent, of the Japanese planes destroyed by carrier aircraft were destroyed in the Japanese inner zone—Japan, the Ryukyus, Formosa, and the Philippines, substantial land masses defended by thousands of planes at hundreds of airfields. Half of these planes were destroyed on the ground; in shooting down the remaining half the carrier planes achieved a combat superiority of 20 to 1. In the Philippines, Formosa, and Ryukyus alone carrier aircraft destroyed more than 3,500 Jap planes before our Army Air Forces' planes had more than nibbled at these areas.

AAF PROGRESSED SLOWLY

The contrast in speed and cost of advance is striking. In 2 years the Fifth Air Force advanced only 700 miles, from Port Moresby to Hollandia, sustaining heavy losses. It took the land-based South Pacific Air Forces 16 months from the landing on Guadalcanal to establish air superiority over Rabaul, 700 miles distant. Vast ground armies, amphibious forces and supply fleets were needed to take and build the new jungle airfields required for these slow advances.

But the new war-built carrier air force, only 10 months after it opened its westward advance against Tarawa, had gained air superiority over the heart of the Philippines, 3,600 miles to the west. Five months later it was sweeping the skies over Tokyo. In these 15 months it destroyed over 8,000 Japanese planes. Its losses were one light carrier, plus five thin-skinned, emergency-built escort carriers, only two of which were

lost to air attack. These may be compared with the dozens of slowly built, expensive airfields left to rot by our land-based air forces as they moved up to occupy the new areas opened for them by carrier air superiority.

HEAVY BOMBERS NEED HELP

The reasons for the superiority of carrier air power are simple. Air superiority cannot be gained by long-range bombers alone. In the European war heavy bombers could not in daylight attack beyond escort fighter range without suffering unacceptable losses. In no theater of war did heavy bombers alone effectively reduce enemy air strength. In no area was it possible to establish and maintain air superiority, sufficient to destroy the enemy air force, beyond the limited range to which fighter planes could fly.

Air power is not fighter planes alone. But fighters are required to destroy the enemy air force and create the conditions under which unlimited bombing attack as well as land and sea operations are possible. And until fighter strength as well as bomber strength is brought to bear on the bases and centers of enemy air power, the initiative remains with the enemy, his air strength increases, and he is free to retaliate at will. The task is to reach those centers, quickly and in overwhelming force, with fighters as well as bombers.

PROFITS BY MOBILITY

The United States Navy's carrier air force is a balanced blend of bombers sufficiently powerful and precise to force the enemy to the defensive, and of fighters capable of driving the enemy from the skies.

This carrier force has an ability not possessed by any land-based air force: mobility. Its bases can readily be moved. Mobility gives it range. The land-based force can establish air superiority only within fighter range of its fixed base; it can extend that range only after ground or naval forces capture and build new bases. The carrier force from its movable bases can capture air superiority at any point within fighter range of any ocean without delay.

Mobility not only extends offensive range, but also permits surprise, a powerful asset in winning air superiority. The enemy can always concentrate his air defense and attack against our fixed land bases at known locations. He does not know from what direction a carrier attack may come.

SAVES EXPENSIVE BASES

Mobility further permits concentration, without waste. Concentration of fighter and bomber strength assures overwhelming air superiority at minimum cost at whatever point it is applied. At each point wherever concentration of land-based air strength is desired it is necessary to build a chain of expensive bases. To concentrate carrier air strength it is necessary only to assemble into one group as many ready-built ships as are desired. This group can then be moved about to provide concentrations at many points.

The mobility of the carrier air force can be no better illustrated than by its record for the months of January and February 1945. In less than 60 days the same fast carrier force of over 900 fighters and bombers attacked points over a 3,000-mile arc from Tokyo through Iwo Jima, Okinawa, Formosa and Luzon to Hong Kong and Indo-China.

HAD SURPRISE EACH TIME

At each of these points the carrier force gained surprise, overwhelmed the local defenses, secured air superiority, and made effective bombing attacks. It destroyed 1,387 Japanese aircraft, considerably more than its own strength. To have matched its strength the Japanese would have had to maintain a thousand planes at a dozen airfields at each of the seven widely separated areas attacked—7,000 planes at 80 or more airfields in all.

Carrier air power reflects the Navy's understanding that air superiority over enemy territory, and not bomb tonnage, is the first requisite of air power. The Navy understands that mobility, concentration, and surprise, for centuries the greatest military assets on sea or land, are even more vital to air power. Carrier air power is the fast-moving panzer force that pierces or outflanks the Maginot Line of fixed-base air power, cuts its communications, and entangles it in its own sprawling and complex supply problems.

In carrier air power the Navy has a weapon of quality and precision, as well as of mobility. Navy emphasis is on quality, not quantity, whether in planes, in pilots, or in bombing. Mobility and quality spell economy—maximum results from a minimum expense.

ECONOMICAL IN WARTIME

The carrier air force, if built up in peacetime, is economical in wartime when economy of men and materials counts. Its bases are built, ready to be steamed to any theater. It does not need to wait for the mobilization and assembly of amphibious forces and construction troops. By striking immediately at centers of enemy air strength it can seize the initiative in the air, reduce our initial losses, turn the enemy more quickly to defense, more rapidly begin the destruction of his air force, and shorten the air war.

It can only be estimated how much our possession of 16 large carriers in December 1941 might have shortened the war. Certainly the expensive Solomons and New Guinea land campaigns need not have been fought. It is possible the Japs would not have dared attack at all, for 1,000 planes could have been put over Tokyo in a week. No American land-based planes had the range to reach Japan.

Carrier air forces, plane for plane, destroy enemy air power most quickly. Dollar for dollar and man for man they are the most economical way to carry the initial air offensive against the enemy overseas—and by so doing to turn the air war from our own cities. No nation has a comparable weapon to use against us.

In deciding what air weapons the United States requires—and can afford—let the American people and their Congress not be deceived by declarations that all air power is in the Air Force. The record of naval air power proves otherwise. May we hope that Congress will inquire why this record has been withheld, and insure that all may learn our true air defense needs while there is still time.

[From the Buffalo Evening News of May 10, 1948]

THE STORY NAVY COULDN'T TELL

A shocking story of the muzzling of one of our armed services for the glorification of another is told today on page 1 of the News. It is a story with tremendous implications for the future development of our national security establishment, one with which every American, and especially every Member of Congress should be familiar. And yet it is a story that the service most concerned could not tell. The implication is clear: The Navy had been muzzled by the Air Force, apparently with the backing of the Army and the administration high command.

The story had to be pieced together from fragmentary factual disclosures. It is a proud story, basically, of the brilliant achievements of naval aviation in the recent war. But the Navy couldn't tell it proudly. It had to whisper the bare facts. It put them out deadpan, in a press release headed simply: "Naval aviation's air combat record detailed on occasion of its thirty-seventh anniversary." It offered no interpretations, no comparisons, no comments, or hints that this record may have pregnant meaning in the controversy now raging over the composition of our future defense forces.

This is the story, as Congress should have had it long ago—and as pieced together only now for the News by a former Naval Reserve officer who cannot be identified except by the pen name, Richard Essex:

1. Naval aviation (Navy and Marine Corps) destroyed a total of 15,401 Japanese planes during the Pacific war—49 percent more than the 10,343 destroyed by the Army Air Forces.

2. Eighty percent of the Navy's total (12,268 Jap planes) were destroyed by United States carrier-based aircraft—and of these, 93 percent were Japanese land-based planes. Thus, United States carrier planes alone destroyed 19 percent more enemy aircraft than did all the Army Air Forces.

3. For every United States carrier plane lost in air combat, 14 enemy planes were shot down. This 14 to 1 ratio of air combat superiority for United States carrier planes compares with a ratio of about 7 to 1 for land-based Navy and Marine planes—and 5 to 1 for the Army Air Forces.

4. United States carrier planes also destroyed 5,649 of the enemy's planes on the ground—nearly twice as many as the 2,981 destroyed on the ground by all the Army Air Forces.

What bearing do these comparisons have on our future security? At the very minimum they mean this: Naval aviation, and especially carrier-based aircraft, played the major role in the winning of American air supremacy in the Pacific war—and thereby demonstrated the vital importance of naval air power in any future war strategy.

For 3 years now, as "Richard Essex" points out, the Air Force has subjected the American public to an incessant propaganda campaign to identify itself as the exclusive proprietor of American air power. It is almost as if the former Army fliers had taken out a copyright on this popular concept. Air power has been served up to the public in terms of great fleets of land-based planes equipped to wreak havoc anywhere in the world.

And the Navy has said nothing about air power. The Air Force apparently will not admit—and the Navy cannot officially claim—that sea-based aviation is also a form of air power more effective and economical in many ways than land-based aviation.

The bare record of naval aviation speaks for itself—and it is shocking to find that not even its most obvious conclusions have been drawn for the benefit of a Congress that is being literally stampeded by the propaganda of the Air Force.

But if this is a Navy-Air Force feud, why has not the Navy been able to hold its own? The answer seems simple: In the name of unification the three services are expected to compose their differences and present Congress with an over-all defense program. But the Army as well as the Air Force has a stake in land-based air power. Its job is to win, hold, and supply the bases. Under the air-power concept, this is its main job. Sea-based aviation, on the other hand, is a Navy show requiring no Army support. The answer thus appears to be a simple case of majority rule, 2 to 1—Army and Air Force against Navy.

The Navy, in consequence, is muzzled. The claims it would make for naval aviation if it could do so are detailed in the account by Richard Essex. It merits the study of every American who has a part in determining the composition of our future Military Establishment. Air power is not just strategic bombing by huge fleets of B-29's. It also involves, first and most decisively, the winning of air supremacy over any hostile air force at any point of conflict. If Congress doesn't know what naval aviation has done and can do in that realm, it's time it found out. And it also had better be inquiring who tied a gag on the Navy—in flagrant violation of the spirit of the unification program.

Our Greatest Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1948

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, an article by E. T. Leech, which appeared in yesterday's Washington News, is worthy of the attention of everyone.

Each of us must accept the individual responsibility of making our democracy work. As the author of this article so well states:

The price of ignorance can be enormous. Until more Americans are qualified for the responsibilities of freedom, it will always be a danger.

The article follows:

OUR GREATEST DANGER

(By E. T. Leech)

"Why didn't you print it on page 1, where everybody would read it?"

This is one of the questions most frequently asked of a newspaperman. Especially when it involves some matter with which the questioner happens to be in full agreement.

The public seems to believe that whatever is printed on the first page gets read. Newspapermen know differently. Much important news which rates page 1 in the newspapers and unusual time on the radio is neither read nor listened to. How to get it read is one of the unsolved problems of editing.

Various opinion polls have supplied some disturbing data. They reveal that a large number of Americans apparently pay no attention to important news involving their personal welfare

Dr. Gallup took a poll recently on President Truman's civil-rights program. This program has been page 1 news in almost every paper. It has involved the revolt of Southern Democrats and many other developments.

Yet even in the South—where interest in the matter is most intense—32 percent of those questioned had never read or heard anything about it. Outside the South, 45 percent never heard of it.

When the Taft-Hartley Act was a burning issue in Congress, and unions were rallying their members to oppose it, a Gallup poll revealed that 39 percent of those questioned had neither read nor heard anything about it.

After stories about the Marshall plan had been appearing on the front pages for weeks, and radio debates about it were numerous, a poll showed that 51 percent of the American people had neither read nor heard of it.

Not long ago Dr. Gallup conducted a couple of novel polls to test the extent of public information.

In the first, pictures of some of America's best-known faces which had appeared over and over again in newspapers, magazines, and newsreels, were shown to a national cross section of citizens. Seven percent did not recognize President Truman. General Eisenhower's face was unknown to 17 percent, General MacArthur's to 24 percent, Henry Wallace's to 38 percent, Jim Farley's to 69 percent. And 89 percent could not identify Speaker JOE MARTIN, the man who would be President tomorrow if Mr. Truman were to pass away tonight.

In a second test, those questioned were shown an outline map of Europe. Only one-third of them could locate Greece, which has been in the news for months because it is getting millions of our tax dollars. Nearly one-half could not identify Spain; one-third could not place France; and 28 percent could not point out England.

All of the issues, men, and countries involved in these polls are closely related to questions and events that touch the lives and welfare of all Americans.

This is a pretty serious situation in a democracy. It would make little, if any, difference in Russia or Yugoslavia or some other country where the state does all the thinking and acting for its citizens. But in a democracy the people make their own decisions and the price of ignorance can be enormous.

For democracy is the most difficult kind of government. It can function properly only if the people are well enough informed to make intelligent decisions on public questions.

We have more schools, colleges, newspapers, magazines, radios, motion pictures, libraries, museums—more of every source of education and information—than any other country. But apparently these things don't touch a considerable part of our voting population.

This is the greatest single source of danger to our democracy. Greater than Russian aggression and Communist intrigue, for example—neither of which has any chance in an enlightened land.

Until more Americans are qualified for the responsibilities of freedom, it will always be in danger.

Why Torment the American People With the Threat of More Controls?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, just because Great Britain has 25,000 controls on almost every phase of the acts of its citizens under the socialistic government, must the New Deal follow suit?

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the following short editorial which appears in the Wall Street Journal of May 12, 1948:

WE CAN USE NONE

Mr. Charles Sawyer, the new Secretary of Commerce, says that he believes in as little Government control as the United States can get along with.

We think that the United States can get along without any and we wish that Mr. Sawyer could have found it expedient to say so. But his statement must be interpreted in the light of what is going on in Washington and as such it is welcome.

There still exists in Washington the idea that somehow something has happened that is beyond the capacity of private industry, that something can be gained by the Government stepping in and telling people what they should do.

The current thought among the advocates of control is that some system should b set up on a stand-by basis, not to be used except in case of emergency.

In the first place if such a system were organized, the emergency that would justify its use would be found in a matter of days. Washington is full of people who can see an emergency easier than a delirium tremens victim can see a pink snake.

In the second place the mere threat of controls creates the disruption that is such a persuasive argument for the institution of controls. Thinking that they may be used, people begin to make preparations to avoid controls and in doing that they dislocate the movement of supplies and services through the usual channels.

The fact is that since last November people in Washington have been predicting situations which would call for controls. So far none of the situations have developed and if the Government will let people use their own good sense, the situations almost surely will not develop.

Why Destroy Private Enterprise?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1948

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I offer an editorial from the Baker Democrat-Herald, Baker, Oreg., of May 6, 1948, entitled "Will Government Be Allowed To Kill Private Industry?"

This editorial sets forth accurately the threat to private enterprise and private industry. It is a clear picture of the effect of a policy of government ownership and state socialism against the long-established system which has made America so great and powerful.

The editorial follows:

WILL GOVERNMENT BE ALLOWED TO KILL PRIVATE INDUSTRY?

Unless an enlightened Congress maintains proper vigilance over the economic principles of democracy, the proposal of the Tennessee Valley Authority to construct a $54,000,000 steam power plant at New Jacksonville, Tenn., will form a new precedent for Government competition with private industry.

TVA has been held out to the American people as a vast project to control navigation and floods, with surplus hydroelectric power considered as a byproduct. TVA's request for funds to construct the steam plant strips away the pretext, leaving a clear picture of the Government's desire to drive a further wedge into private industry.

The American people have invested almost $900,000,000 in TVA. These funds have come from Government creditors, citizens who have loaned the Treasury money at rates of interest upward to the 2.9 percent paid on series E war bonds securities. In return the mammoth TVA investment returns so little interest to the Treasury it barely merits mention. The 1947 TVA annual report acknowledges interest paid at the rate of 1 percent on just $56,500,000, or an actual return of .00063 percent on the entire outlay. The weird financial Goliath is possible only because under other existing legislation TVA is not subject to any regulations other than those set by itself.

Once TVA's position as an outright producer is ratified, there is scarcely any activity in which the Federal Government could not engage. The precedent would be established whereby the Government could embark in peacetime on any business in competition with its taxpaying citizens. As an example, Gordon Clapp told a Senate committee last month that his lawyers had ad-

vised him that TVA has a legal right to build a phosphate plant in Florida.

Private enterprise has real reason to be concerned with the left-wing philosophies of socialized industry. France and Great Britain socialized their power industries. In France the ultimate result was a power rate eight times higher (at normal rate of exchange), although consumption is up 50 percent. In spite of steady rate increases, Nationalized Electric Corp. of France operated at a 5,000,000,000-franc deficit last year.

Prior to taking over the power industry in Great Britain, government officials predicted that after nationalization rates would be lower. On April 1 (Vesting Day), the power industry became a government monopoly, known as the British Electrical Authority, at a cost of $1,420,000,000 to British taxpayers. Immediately, B. E. A. officials announced a development program to cost taxpayers an additional $2,800,000,000 and facing the embarrassing situation of having to raise rates.

Government-controlled industry has never been able to compete with the enthusiasm of private enterprise. The TVA move directly into competition with taxpaying industries will create another burden on American taxpayers. The trend toward socialization must be halted before we face the plight of England and France.

Thomas A. Edison really summed it up when he said, "There is far more danger from a public monopoly than there is in a private monopoly, for when the Government goes into business it can always shift its losses to the taxpayers. The Government never really goes into business, for it never makes ends meet, and that is the first requisite of business. It just mixes a little business with a lot of politics and no one ever gets a chance to find out what is actually going on."

Congress Should Pass the Russell Bill Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1948

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to draw the attention of the House to a pending bill, H. R. 2455, entitled "A bill to establish within the Department of the Interior a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes."

To my mind, this bill is one of the most important with which we have to deal during this session, as it involves creating, as far as possible, a domestic mineral and metal sufficiency for the national defense and security.

I should like to read to the Members the statement of policy in the first part of H. R. 2455 and ask frankly if anyone can disagree with these avowed purposes:

It is the policy of the Congress that every effort be made to stimulate the exploration, development, mining, and production of strategic and critical metals and minerals by private enterprise to supply the industrial, military, and naval needs of the United States by providing for the development and conservation of these materials in order to decrease and prevent, wherever possible, a dangerous and costly dependence of the United States upon foreign nations for supplies of such materials. To this end it is the further policy of the Congress that every effort be made to stimulate, stabilize, and maintain a sound and active mining industry within the United States and to coordinate the programs now provided for or to be provided for by law for making scientific, technologic, and economic investigations concerning the extent and mode of occurrence; the development, mining preparation, treatment, and utilization of ores and other mineral substances found in the United States or its Territories or insular possessions which are essential to the common defense or the industrial needs of the United States; and to stimulate the commercial extraction and production of the same.

At this time I shall not attempt to go into the details of the bill. I expect to discuss them on the floor at some later date. I do ask every Member who is interested in helping to make the United States independent of foreign sources of strategic and critical minerals to study H. R. 2455 carefully and give it sympathetic consideration when it comes before you.

Communist Party of the United States as an Advocate of Overthrow of Government by Force and Violence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1948

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a report of the Committee on Un-American Activities on the "Communist Party of the United States as an Advocate of Overthrow of Government by Force and Violence."

I am doing this in order that every Member of the House and Senate may have the contents of this report at his finger tips, and to make it available to every reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD throughout the entire country.

We are now in a deadly conflict between atheistic communism and Christian civilization, throughout the world.

If communism wins, Christianity will perish, liberty will die, and freedom will disappear from the face of the earth.

Let me say, by way of introduction, that the head of the Communist Party in the United States is William Z. Foster. In 1930, while testifying before the temporary Committee on Un-American Activities, this same William Z. Foster, who was also head of the Communist Party at that time, made this statement:

No Communist, no matter how many votes he should secure in a national election, could, even if he would, become President of the present Government. When a Communist heads the Government of the United States—and that day will come just as surely as the sun rises—the government will not be a capitalist government but a Soviet government, and behind this government will stand the Red army to enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat.

You will find that the Communists have never deviated from this vicious policy.

The report of the committee referred to follows:

REPORT ON THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES AS AN ADVOCATE OF OVERTHROW OF GOVERNMENT BY FORCE AND VIOLENCE

INTRODUCTION

The Communist Party of the United States of America advocates the overthrow of our Government by force and violence. As documentary proof of this, the Committee on Un-American Activities submits the following report.

The committee hopes that this report will dispel any confusion on the question that may presently exist in the mind of the American public, demonstrate the urgent need for enforcing existing legislation dealing with the Communist Party, and illustrate the voluminous evidence available for such enforcement.

This report will show that—

1. The teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin constitute the credo of the Communist Party, U. S. A.—in fact of the Communist movement throughout the world. The doctrine of forceful and violent overthrow of anti-Communist governments is a basic premise of these teachings.

2. The model party of the American Communist is the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, whose history forms a basic "guide" or textbook for American Communists on the practice of force and violence.

3. The American Party is now and always has been under the direction of an international Communist organization dominated by the leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.[1] This was true under the Communist International and now under the Communist Information Bureau. This world movement has consistently advocated forceful and violent measures against anti-Communist governments. It is no mere coincidence that in every one of the countries recently overthrown by such Communist violence, leaders of the Communist International have seized positions of power.

4. The Communist Party, U. S. A., and its leaders, both present and past, are on public record as advocates of the forceful and violent overthrow of the American Government, despite their recent disavowals. Many of these leaders have received training in Moscow on the practical application of such methods.

5. The Communist Party, U. S. A., has encouraged, supported, and defended, without a single deviation, the ruthless measures of foreign Communist parties to overthrow their legally constituted governments by force and violence. In other words, what the Chinese or Greek Communists are doing today is what the American Communists plan to do tomorrow under similar circumstances.

6. While the United States Supreme Court has not yet made a judicial determination on the question, numerous lower Federal courts have, with unusual consistency, handed down decisions which characterize the Communist Party, U. S. A., as an advocate of overthrowing our Government by force and violence.

The threat offered to our national security by the continued, almost unrestricted operation of such a movement within our own borders should be obvious to everyone.

Communism today, far from being the weak, isolated movement it once was, is a

[1] Evidence that the American Communists are mere cogs in the international Communist machine is presented in greatly abbreviated form in this report. Documented proof of this particular aspect of the Communist Party may be found in the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities, published as H. Rept. No. 209, April 1, 1947, titled "The Communist Party of the United States as an Agent of a Foreign Power."

powerful force for evil whose influence is being exercised in virtually every country in the world. Under the leadership, support, and inspiration of the Soviet Union, a communistic dictatorship has been forced upon one nation after another in Europe by the ruthless use of force and violence. These outbursts of Communist violence—all obviously aimed at paving the way for eventual subversion of the entire world to Moscow dictation—have also occurred in Asia and in our own hemisphere. Each of these subjugated countries constitutes a bridgehead from which forcible and violent attacks can be launched against the United States either directly or in cooperation with the American Communists.

Communist violence manifested on April 9, 1948, in Colombia should give us all cause for thought. If a handful of Communists could achieve such effectiveness in a neighboring country, far removed from the Soviet Union, we cannot continue to blind ourselves to the menace of our own Communists who form a greater proportion of our population than the Colombian Communists in the Colombian population.

The administration, in its request for a stronger air power, large Army, and other national-defense measures, has recognized the march of Communist aggression as a threat to our national security. It has failed, however, to appreciate and understand the potentialities of Communist agents within our Nation. The harm that can be done by the internal Communist movement in the event of a national emergency must not be minimized. The potentialities for injury at the hands of some 75,000 Communist Party members and their hundreds of thousands of supporters in the United States is not to be judged in terms of their numerical strength. Modern society has become so intricate that it is conceivably possible for a comparatively small, closely knit, and determined group, located in strategic and sensitive points and dedicated to the use of force and violence, to create serious confusion, to dislocate and perhaps even paralyze the machinery of our economic and social life. It has been established that the American Communists have for years concentrated on infiltrating strategic areas of our economy, especially at the vital parts of the American military machine. The advances of modern science have made available to each individual Communist forces of destruction which would have been inconceivable years ago. Moreover, the advantage which the Communists hold in being able to work in secrecy makes us twice as vulnerable to a sudden Communist strike or coup which will find us utterly unprepared. Communists reaped the full benefit of such surprise tactics in Bogota.

The problem of our Communist minority is doubly serious in view of its basic belief that sabotage, terrorism, armed insurrection, civil war, and any other measures of force and violence are justified in promoting the cause of the Soviet Union. As this report will show, such tactics have been hammered into the American Communists by their international leaders ever since the movement in America was started in 1919. A virtual blueprint for revolutionary action under such slogans as: Learn how to use arms! Acquire arms! Break up the armies! Seize the factories! Use terror! Kill the leaders! Smash the state machine! is provided in the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin. These works are gospel to the American Communist movement and to the movement in every other part of the world. To those who would dismiss this as mere theory, we say that the Communists mean business, here as well as everywhere else in the world. And we are receiving daily examples from numerous foreign Communist Parties who are applying these tactics in amazing conformity with the blueprint laid down by the Communist theoreticians previously referred to.

It should be noted carefully that the teachings of the international Communist leaders constantly reiterate the instruction that all Communist Parties must "defend the U. S. S. R. * * * by every possible means" in the event of a war against the Soviet Union. The principal means recommended by these leaders for such defense of the Soviet Union is the same means they recommend for the achievement of the overthrow of the American Government—civil war. This civil war, in their own words, "is unthinkable without the worst kind of destruction, without terror and limitations of formal democracy." The chairman of the American Communist Party, William Z. Foster, is on public record as endorsing such revolutionary tactics despite his recent disavowals.

The committee is aware that the Communists have deliberately promoted confusion regarding their belief in violent overthrow of the American Government in order to lull the American people into a false sense of security and to avoid prosecution under the law. The committee hopes that this report will remove any doubts that may have been created on this point in the mind of the American public.

The committee also hopes that this report will demonstrate the urgent need for enforcement of existing laws against the Communists and indicate the wealth of documentary evidence that is available to enforcement authorities as a basis for prosecutive action.

Among the existing laws under which Communists can be called to answer in courts of justice are:

The Smith Act (printed in full at end of this report), which provides penalties up to 10 years in jail and a $10,000 fine for persons who "knowingly or willfully advocate, abet, advise, or teach the duty, necessity, desirability, or propriety of overthrowing or destroying any government in the United States by force or violence * * *"

The Voorhis Act, which requires organizations to register with the Attorney General if the organizations are subject to foreign control or if "one of the purposes or aims of which is the establishment, control, conduct, seizure, or overthrow of a government or subdivision thereof by the use of force, violence, military measures, or threats of any one or more of the foregoing."

A vigorous enforcement of both laws, based on the true character of the Communist Party, should be instituted by the executive branch of the Government without further delay. To hesitate any longer will be to sacrifice our national security.

DEVOTION TO PRINCIPLES OF MARX, ENGELS, LENIN, AND STALIN

It is difficult to find a comprehensive document published by the Communist Party, U. S. A., which does not express the party's devotion to the teachings of one or all of its leading theoreticians, Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin. Despite every fluctuation of the party line and despite changes in the personnel of its leadership, these principles remain as the avowed and fundamental theoretical basis of the organization. We will later show that their teachings advocate overthrow of government by force and violence.

The constitution of the Communist Party, U. S. A., adopted on July 28, 1945, and presently in force, declares in its preamble: "The Communist Party of the United States is the political party of the American working class, basing itself upon the principles of scientific socialism, Marxism-Leninism." [2]

[2] Constitution of the Communist Party of the United States of America, published by the Communist Party, U. S. A., national office, 35 East Twelfth Street, New York 3, N. Y., September 1945. Inserted into the hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities on February 20, 1948, by Benjamin J. Davis in behalf of the Communist Party, U. S. A.

Political Affairs, formerly known as The Communist, "a magazine of the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism published monthly by the Communist Party of the United States of America," now calls itself "a magazine devoted to the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism." Its chief editor is Eugene Dennis, executive secretary of the party; and its editorial board consists of Mr. Dennis and V. J. Jerome, Alexander Bittleman, Max Weiss, and Henry Winston, all members of the national board of the party.

In its February 1948 issue, on pages 110 to 118, in an article entitled "The Communist Manifesto Lives!" Political Affairs not only emphasizes the present validity and authority of the Communist Manifesto but also stresses its common inspirational character with Communist Parties throughout the world. The article shows that Lenin and Stalin were primarily inspired by the Communist Manifesto and states that "the Manifesto has become, to 'Lenin, a handbook for every class-conscious worker.' Today, sixty years since these words were written, wherever the fight for freedom is on the agenda, the Manifesto is a manual of procedure * * *

"In France and Italy, millions of workers, farmers, and professional people struggle under the banner of Marxism, held aloft by the giant Communist Parties.

"In China, millions, fighting for a free, independent, democratic life, are inspired by the teachings of scientific communism. In the people's republics of Viet Nam and Indonesia; in Korea, in Africa, in the Western Hemisphere, the principles of the Manifesto are being studied in the heat of struggle. The Greek people, resisting American imperialist oppression, are fortified by the indestructible ideas of the Manifesto * * *

"The greatest verification of the predictive power of the Manifesto is the Union of Socialist Republics * * *

"It was in line with this struggle that Lenin and Stalin built the working class party of a new type, the Bolshevik party. It was by fully mastering essence and the method of Marxism that Lenin and Stalin, by applying its teachings to the specific world conditions and the conditions of Russia in 1917, led the masses to the successful overthrow of Czarism and the abolition of capitalism. It was under the banner of Marxism-Leninism that the toilers of Russia, having established the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, achieved the highest form of democracy, Socialist democracy."

As late as September 1947, on the occasion of the one hundredth anniversary of the writing of the Communist Manifesto, William Z. Foster, present chairman of the Communist Party, U. S. A., reaffirmed his fealty to the founders of Communist doctrine, indicating at the same time that the Communist Parties of other countries were fundamentally the same in their loyalty. He declared:

"As the Marxists-Leninists of the world celebrate during this year the 100th anniversary of the writing of the Communist Manifesto by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, the great principles of social development laid down in that immortal document are being dramatically confirmed by the course of history and by the present state of the world."

Mr. Foster hails "the big growth of Communist Parties in various countries, and the rapid development of Marxist-Leninist ideology among the workers of the world." He advises the leaders of labor unions and of the progressive movement "to study carefully the scientific principles laid down by Marx and Engels a century ago in the famous Communist Manifesto." [3]

In preparation for Lenin memorial meetings arranged by the Communist Party,

[3] Marxism and American "Exceptionalism," by William Z. Foster, in Political Affairs, September 1947, p. 794.

U. S. A., throughout the country, the Worker of January 18, 1948, page 5 (magazine section), official organ of the party, carried a feature article entitled "Lenin's Legacy Honored," from which we quote:

"Peoples of many lands during the past and coming weeks are honoring the name and achievements of Vladimir Ilyitch Ulyanov (1870–1924), the great Marxist and revolutionary statesman who under the popular and widely-known name of Lenin, led the forces which established Soviet power in the old Russian Empire and founded the U. S. S. R.

"Accordingly memorial meetings are occurring during this period in the principal cities of America."

In the November 1947 issue of Political Affairs, pages 1040–1046, William W. Weinstone, New York State educational director of the Communist Party, U. S. A., laid down a list of recommended readings for party members on the occasion of the one hundredth anniversary of Marxism, which establishes still further the current adherence of the party to the teachings and principles of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin. Among other works he urges the reading of the following: Marx and Engels' Communist Manifesto; Engels' Socialism: Utopian and Scientific; Lenin's State and the Revolution; Lenin's Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism; Marx' The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte; Marx' Civil War in France; Stalin's Foundations of Leninism; Lenin's The Three Sources and Component Parts of Marxism; Lenin's Karl Marx; Kherzentsev's Life of Lenin; Kherzentsev's Life of Stalin; Engels' Anti-Duhring; Engels' Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State; Engels' Peasant War in Germany; Lenin's What Is To Be Done; Lenin's Collapse of the Second International; Lenin's Left-Wing Communism; Stalin's Leninism; Stalin's Marxism and the National Question; Engels' Ludwig Feuerbach; Karl Marx' Selected Works; Marx' Wage-Labor and Capital, also Value, Price, and Profit, and also volume I of Capital; N. Krupskaya's Memories of Lenin; Plekhanov's Fundamentals of Marxism; Mehring's Karl Marx.

New Century Publishers is an official Communist Party publishing house, which has published the works of William Z. Foster and Eugene Dennis, Communist Party chairman and executive secretary, respectively, as well as the theoretical magazine of the party known as Political Affairs and the Constitution of the Communist Party, U. S. A. In its latest catalog of 1946, the following works by or about Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin are offered for sale:

Marx and the Trade Unions, by S. A. Losovsky.
History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, by Joseph Stalin and others.
History of the Russian Revolution, by Stalin and others.
The Russian Revolution, by Vladimir Lenin and Joseph Stalin.
The Road to Power, by Joseph Stalin.
Fundamental Problems of Marxism, by George Plekhanov.
Handbook of Marxism, by Emile Burns, major selections from Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin.
What Is Leninism?
Theory of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, by Lenin.
Theory of the Proletarian Revolution, by Lenin.
Strategy and Tactics of the Proletarian Revolution, by Lenin.
Marxism-Leninism Versus Revisionism, by William Z. Foster.
History of the Communist Manifesto, by V. Adoratsky.
Marx, Engels, and Lenin on Ireland, by Ralph Fox.
Marxism and Modern Art, by F. M. Klingender.
Marxism and Modern Idealism, by John Lewis.
Mastering Bolshevism, by Joseph Stalin.
Marxism Versus Liberalism, by Joseph Stalin.
Lenin on the Agrarian Question, by Anna Rochester.
Marxism Economic Handbook and Glossary, by W. H. Emmett.
New Data for Lenin's Imperialism, by E. Varga and L. Mendelsohn.
Marx as an Economist, by Maurice Dobb.
Value, Price, and Profit, by Karl Marx.
Wage-Labor and Capital, by Karl Marx.
Capital, volume I, by Karl Marx.
The Civil War in France, by Karl Marx.
Class Struggles in France, by Karl Marx.
Critique of the Gotha Programme, by Karl Marx.
The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte, by Karl Marx.
Founding of the First International, documents of Marx and others.
Letters to Kugelmann, by Karl Marx.
The Poverty of Philosophy, by Karl Marx.
Selected Works of Karl Marx.
Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State, by Friedrich Engels.
Anti-Duhring, by Friedrich Engels.
Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844, by Friedrich Engels.
Dialectics of Nature, by Friedrich Engels.
Engels on Capital.
The Housing Question, by Friedrich Engels.
Ludwig Feuerbach, by Friedrich Engels.
The Peasant War in Germany, by Friedrich Engels.
Socialism: Utopian and Scientific, by Friedrich Engels.
The Civil War in the United States, by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels.
Correspondence of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels.
The German Ideology, by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels.
The Manifesto of the Communist Party, by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels.
Marx and Engels on Reactionary Prussianism.
Revolution in Spain, by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels.

Works of Vladimir Lenin

The Prerequisites of the First Russian Revolution (1894–99).
The Struggle for the Bolshevik Party (1900–1904).
The Revolution of 1905–7.
The Years of Reaction and the New Revival (1908–14).
Imperialism and the Imperialist War (1914–17).
From the Bourgeois to the Proletarian Revolution (1917).
After the Seizure of Power (1917–18).
The Period of War Communism (1918–20).
The New Economic Policy: Socialist Construction (1921–23).
The Communist International (please note that this work is sold 3 years or more after the alleged dissolution of the Communist International).
The Theoretical Principles of Marxism.
Theory of the Agrarian Question.
The Iskra Period.
Materialism and Empirio-Criticism.
The Imperialist War.
The Revolution of 1917.
Toward the Seizure of Power.
From 1916 to March 1917.
From Spring 1918 to Spring 1919.
Imperialism—the Highest Stage of Capitalism.
"Left-Wing" Communism: An Infantile Disorder.
Marx-Engels Marxism.
The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky.
The State and the Revolution.
Two Tactics of Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution.
What Is To Be Done?
Lenin on Engels.
Lenin on the State.
Lenin on the Woman Question, by Clara Zetkin.
A Letter to American Workers.
The Teachings of Karl Marx.
The War and the Second International.
Paris Commune.
Religion.
Letters From Afar.
Tasks of the Proletariat in Our Revolution.
April Conference.
The Threatening Catastrophe and How To Fight It.
Will the Bolsheviks Retain State Power?
On the Eve of October.
Lenin—Three Speeches by Joseph Stalin.
Foundations of Leninism, by Joseph Stalin.
Problems of Leninism, by Joseph Stalin.
Woman and Society.
War and the Workers.
The Young Generation.
Marxism and Revisionism, by V. I. Lenin and Joseph Stalin.

Works of Joseph Stalin

Dialectical and Historical Materialism.
Marxism and the National and Colonial Question.
Marxism and the National Question.
The October Revolution.
Selected Writings.
Stalin's Early Writings and Activities, by L. Beria.
The War of National Liberation.
In Praise of Learning, by Joseph Stalin and V. M. Molotov.
Interview With Foreign Workers' Delegations.
From Socialism to Communism in the Soviet Union.
The Lenin Heritage.
The Soviets and the Individual.
The Stalin-Howard Interview.
Stalin on the New Constitution.
To the Collective Farm Shock-Brigade Workers.
Life and Teachings of V. I. Lenin, by R. Palme Dutt.
Life of Lenin, by P. Kerzhentzev.
Our Lenin, by Ruth Shaw and H. A. Potamkin.
Reminiscences of Lenin, by Clara Zetkin.
Stalin, by V. M. Molotov, K. Voroshilov, and others.
Vladimir Lenin, a Political Biography.
Karl Marx, His Life and Work, by Paul Lafargue and Wilhelm Liebknecht.
Lenin and Krupskaya, by C. Bobrovskaya.

That this devotion to the precepts of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin is no accident, nor the whim of some leader or faction of the Communist Party, U. S. A., but rather part of an international policy emanating from Moscow, is demonstrated by the following description of the training of Communist Party and Soviet personnel, from an official report of G. Malenkov representing the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union before the Conference of Communist Parties held in September 1947 in Poland:

"The training and perfection of party and Soviet personnel is one of the vital problems on the solution of which the party is now working. This training is aimed at helping millions of party and administrative workers to master Marxist-Leninist science.

"In addition over 90 million copies of Marxist-Leninist classical works have been published since the end of the war." [1]

[1] The Activities of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), in the publication known as For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy, December 1, 1947, p. 2, Organ of the Information Bureau of the Communist Parties in Belgrade.

That the doctrines expounded in the Communist Manifesto are held in highest regard by the Communist Parties of the world is indicated by a statement appearing in the official organ of the Cominform, successor to the Communist International, as follows:

"The working class and the Communist Parties of the world are celebrating a notable date—the centenary of the 'Communist Manifesto' of Marx and Engels. * * * The Communist Manifesto is one of the great landmarks of the working class struggle for liberation from the yoke of capitalism. * * * Lenin and Stalin are the direct successors and inheritors of the ideological treasure of Marx and Engels. Thus, the practical experience of a number of countries has also vindicated the vitality of the Manifesto and the brilliant genius of Marx and Engels who founded the theory of scientific communism, and who equipped the working class of the world with a mighty and invincible doctrine."[5]

Thus the doctrines of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin have constituted the very basis upon which the Communist movement was founded throughout the world, the very basis upon which it operates at the present time. We shall show that advocacy of overthrow of government by force and violence is an organic and inescapable part of these doctrines.

Basic Communist Documents Advocating Force and Violence

In presenting the programmatic directives of the leading oracles of the Communist movement such as Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, Vladimir I. Lenin, and Joseph Stalin, of the Communist International and its successor, the Cominform, and of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of the United States, we shall by no means exhaust all their utterances dealing with force and violence which are scattered through a large number of voluminous works. We have sought merely to present typical views on the necessity of resort to force and violence, at the same time showing their validity and authority over a period of years down to the present time.

For purposes of precision and proper interpretation of these views, it might be well to note that Alexander Burrill in his Law Dictionary and Glossary defines force as "unlawful violence offered to persons and things." Bouvier's Unabridged Law Dictionary defines violence as "force which is employed against common right, against the laws, and against public liberty." We hold that advocacy of civil war, armed uprising, and insurrection may properly be included under these heads.

In presenting citations showing advocacy of overthrow of government by force and violence, the committee has withheld references which do not openly so advocate but which might be interpreted as carrying such advocacy by implication. We have therefore omitted references limited merely to advocacy of "revolution," "revolutionary overthrow," "conquest of power," "expropriation of property," "class struggle," and similar expressions, without necessarily implying that such aims do not entail the use of forcible and violent means.

Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels

Karl Marx was a German philosopher who formulated the principles which constitute the basis of the world Communist movement at the present time. His best known works are The Communist Manifesto and Capital. The Manifesto was written in 1847 in behalf of the League of the Communists. Together with Friedrich Engels, his close collaborator in writing these works, Marx was the founder of the International Working Men's Association, otherwise known as the First International. The association was founded in London in 1864 and was dissolved in 1876. The Second International was known as the Socialist International, from which the Communists split to form the Third or Communist International. The Marx-Engels Institute in Moscow has published an exhaustive bibliography of Marx' and Engels' writings and has begun the issue of a collected edition of their writings in 42 volumes.

1. The following passage is taken from the Communist Manifesto:

"In depicting the most general phases of the development of the proletariat, we traced the more or less veiled civil war raging within existing society, up to the point where that war breaks out into open revolution, and where the violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie lays the foundation for the sway of the proletariat * * *.

"If the proletariat during its contest with the bourgeoisie is compelled, by the force of circumstances, to organize itself as a class; if, by means of a revolution it makes itself the ruling class, and, as such sweeps away by force the old conditions of production, then it will, along with these conditions, have swept away the conditions for the existence of class antagonisms, and of classes generally, and will thereby have abolished its own supremacy as a class * * *.

"The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win * * *."[6]

2. "Brutal conflict" and "bloody struggle" are confidently predicted by Marx in the following passage from his Poverty of Philosophy:

"In the meantime, the antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is a struggle between class and class, a struggle which, carried to its highest expression, is a complete revolution. Would it, moreover, be matter for astonishment if a society, based upon the antagonism of classes, should lead ultimately to a brutal conflict, to a hand-to-hand struggle as its final denouement? * * *

"It is only in an order of things in which there will be no longer classes or class antagonism that social revolutions will cease to be political revolutions. Until then, on the eve of each general reconstruction of society, the last word of social science will ever be:

" 'Le combat ou la mort; la lutte sanguinaire ou le néant. C'est ainsi que la question est invinciblement posée.'—George Sand.

" 'Combat or death; bloody struggle or extinction. It is thus that the question is irresistibly put.' "[7]

3. To offset any possible illusions as to the possibility of resort to constitutional means, Marx and Engels declare:

"The working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery and wield it for its own purposes."[8]

4. In his letter to Dr. Ludwig Kugelmann on April 12, 1871, Marx indicated that to attain power the proletarian revolution must "be no longer, as before, to transfer the bureaucratic-military machine from one hand to another but to smash it, and that is essential for every real people's revolution on the Continent."[9]

Vladimir I. Lenin

Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov Lenin was an avowed disciple of Karl Marx. He headed the Bolshevik or majority wing of the Social Democratic Party of Russia under the Czarist regime. In November 1917 he led an armed insurrection which overthrew the democratic government established by Alexander Kerensky. Lenin was the outstanding theoretician and founder of the Communist International. He was the first Premier of the Soviet Government. Lenin's pamphlets and collected works have been published and republished both in the United States and in Moscow. They are accepted as unreservedly authoritative by Communist Parties throughout the world.

Much of this material was written during the period prior to 1917 when Lenin was a leader of the Communist (Bolshevik) faction of the Russian Social Democratic Party, or Socialist Party, prior to the foundation of the Russian Communist Party.

5. We cite first from the classic work by Lenin, The State and the Revolution, on the role of force and violent revolution:

"Fifthly, in the same work of Engels, from which every one remembers his argument on the 'withering away' of the state, there is also a disquisition on the significance of a violent revolution. The historical analysis of its role becomes, with Engels, a veritable panegyric on violent revolution.

"Here is Engels' argument:

" '* * * That force, however, plays another role (other than that of a diabolical power) in history, a revolutionary role; that, in the words of Marx, it is the midwife of every old society which is pregnant with the new; that it is the instrument with whose aid social movement forces its way through and shatters the dead, fossilised political forms—of this there is not a word in Herr Duehring. It is only with sighs and groans that he admits the possibility that force will perhaps be necessary for the overthrow of the economic system of exploitation—unfortunately! because, all use of force, forsooth, demoralises the person who uses it. And this in spite of the immense moral and spiritual impetus which has resulted from every victorious revolution!

" 'We have already said above and shall show more fully later that the teaching of Marx and Engels regarding the inevitability of a violent revolution refers to the bourgeois state. It cannot be replaced by the proletarian state (the dictatorship of the proletariat) through "withering away" but, as a general rule, only through a violent revolution. The panegyric sung in its honour by Engels and fully corresponding to the repeated declarations of Marx (remember the concluding passages of the Poverty of Philosophy and the Communist Manifesto, with its proud and open declaration of the inevitability of a violent revolution).

" 'The necessity of systematically fostering among the masses this and just this point of view about violent revolution lies at the root of the whole of Marx's and Engels' teaching.

" 'The replacement of the bourgeois by the proletarian state is impossible without a violent revolution. * * *

" 'Overthrow the capitalists, crush with the iron hand of the armed workers the resistance of these exploiters, break the bureaucratic machine of the modern state. * * *

" 'But the dictatorship of the proletariat—i. e., the organization of the vanguard of the

---

[5] Centenary of the Communist Manifesto, by P. Yudin in For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy, February 15, 1948, p. 2, Organ of the Information Bureau of the Communist Parties, published in Belgrade.

[6] Manifesto of the Communist Party, by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels (published by International Publishers, New York, 1932, and originally published in 1848), pp. 20, 21, 31, 44.

[7] The Poverty of Philosophy, by Karl Marx, a translation of Misere de la Philosophie, by Karl Marx with a preface by Friedrich Engels (Charles H. Kerr & Co., Chicago, 1920), pp. 190 and 191, originally published in 1847.

[8] Civil War in France, by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels (International Publishers, New York, 1940), p. 54, which first appeared as a series of articles in 1848.

[9] Letters to Dr. Kugelmann (International Publishers, New York, 1934), p. 123.

oppressed as the ruling class for the purpose of crushing the oppressors—cannot produce merely an expansion of democracy. * * *

"'We must crush them [the exploiters] in order to free humanity from wage-slavery; their resistance must be broken by force. * * *.'" [10]

6. Lenin preached the necessity of civil war when he was still a member of the Russian Socialist Party. His preachment was presented as a guide to the Communist Party, U. S. A. in its official literature.

"The opportunists had long been preparing the collapse of the Second International by renouncing the Socialist revolution and substituting for it bourgeois reformism; by rejecting the class struggle, which at certain moments necessarily turns into civil war, and preaching instead the collaboration of classes, by preaching bourgeois chauvinism and defense of the fatherland, under the cloak of patriotism, and rejecting the elementary truth of socialism expressed long ago in The Communist Manifesto, that the workers have no fatherland; by confining themselves in the struggle against militarism to a sentimental philistine point of view instead of recognizing the necessity of a revolutionary war of the proletarians of all countries against the bourgeois of all countries; by making a fetish of the necessity of utilizing bourgeois parliamentarian and bourgeois legality, forgetting that in time of crisis illegal forms of organization and propaganda are imperative."

"The slogans of Social-Democracy must now be: First an all-embracing propaganda of the Socialist revolution, to be extended also to the army and the area of military activities; emphasis to be placed on the necessity of turning the weapons, not against the brother wage-slaves of other countries, but against the reaction of the bourgeois governments and parties in each country; recognition of the urgent necessity of organizing illegal nuclei and groups in the armies of all nations to conduct such propaganda in all languages; a merciless struggle against the chauvinism and patriotism of the philistines and bourgeoisie of all countries without exception." [11]

7. Lenin insisted on the inevitable connection between the class struggle and civil war and branded as opportunists those who denied this view.

"Civil wars are also wars. Those who accept the class struggle must accept civil wars, which, under certain circumstances, are a natural and inevitable continuance, development, and accentuation of the class struggle in every society based on class division. * * * To deny or overlook civil wars would mean becoming a victim of the most hopeless opportunism and abandoning the social revolution." [12]

8. Again and again in his writings he stressed the need of turning a so-called "imperialist war" into civil war.

"But if in 1914 failure to understand that the imperialist war must inevitably be turned into a civil war was merely philistine stupidity, now, in 1919, it is already something worse. It is treachery to the working class. For civil war both in Russia, and in Finland, and in Latvia, and in Germany, and in Hungary is a fact." [13]

9. Lenin emphasized and developed Marx' theory about the necessity of smashing the democratic state machine by force.

"'In his notes on Marx' Critique of the Gotha Programme, Lenin refers to the 'smashing' of the bureaucratic-military machine and to the necessity of 'crushing of the resistance of the rich by force.'" [14]

10. One of the heroes of the international Communist movement, eulogized by Lenin, was Karl Liebknecht, the German Socialist who urged the German workers to turn their guns against their own government during the First World War.

"Karl Liebknecht called upon the workers and soldiers of Germany to turn their guns against their own government. Karl Liebknecht did that openly from the parliamentary tribune (the Reichstag) * * *.

"Those who confine themselves to 'demanding' that the bourgeois governments should conclude peace or 'ascertain the will of the peoples for peace,' etc., are actually slipping into reforms. For, objectively, the problem of war can be solved only in a revolutionary way." [15]

11. Lenin showed that the possibilities of civil war were not limited to Russia but could be extended to include the most developed capitalist countries.

"Civil war has become a fact, not only in Russia, but also in the most developed capitalist countries of Europe, for example Germany." [16]

12. Similarly the thesis turning "imperialist war" into civil war could be extended to nations outside of Russia.

"Now, the transformation of imperialist war into civil war has become a fact in a number of countries, not only in Russia, but also in Finland, in Hungary, in Germany, and even in neutral Switzerland, and the growth of civil war is observed, is felt, is palpable in all advanced countries without exception." [17]

13. Lenin time and again pilloried those who opposed propaganda calling for the defeat of the capitalists through civil war.

"The lackey souls of the Berne International never think of *imbuing* the masses with the consciousness of the inevitability and necessity of *defeating* the bourgeoisie in civil war * * *." [18]

14. He leveled his sharpest criticism against those who counseled reliance upon constitutional means instead of civil war.

"Comical pedants! They failed to understand that voting within the limits, the institutions, the customs of bourgeois parliamentarian is *part* of the bourgeois state apparatus which must be broken and smashed from top *to bottom* in order to effect the dictatorship of the proletariat, in order to pass from bourgeois democracy to proletarian democracy.

"They failed to understand that, generally speaking, it is not voting but civil war that decides all serious questions of politics when history places the dictatorship of the proletariat on the order of the day." [19]

15. The task of accomplishing the violent overthrow of the state was pointed out by Lenin in outlining the fundamental tasks of the Communist International.

"Only the violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the confiscation of its property, the destruction of the whole of the bourgeois state apparatus from top to bottom—parliamentary, judicial, military, bureaucratic, administrative, municipal, etc., right up to the very wholesale deportation or internment of the most dangerous and stubborn exploiters * * * only such measures can ensure the real subordination of the whole class of exploiters." [20]

16. Lenin openly scoffed at legality and as early as 1920 held that America was entering the stage of civil war.

"In nearly all countries in Europe and America the class struggle is entering the stage of civil war. Under the circumstances, the Communists can have no confidence in bourgeois legality." [21]

17. Prior to World War I, Lenin urged the necessity of turning the weapons of the army against the government itself as essential for the social revolution.

"The slogans of Social-Democracy must now be: First, an all-embracing propaganda of the Socialist revolution, to be extended also to the army and the area of military activities: emphasis to be placed on the necessity of turning the weapons, not against the brother wage-slaves of other countries, but against the reaction of the bourgeois governments and parts in each country. * * *" [22]

18. He proposed the slogan of civil war instead of peace.

"The slogan of 'peace' is incorrect, as the slogan must be: changing the national war into civil war. (This change may take a long time, it may and will demand a number of preliminary conditions, but the work must be conducted along the line of such a change, in this spirit and in this direction.)" [23]

19. He advocated systematic preparation of the armed forces for civil war.

"As to ourselves, we must prepare a mass (at least a collective) action in the army, not of one nation alone, and conduct all the work of propaganda and agitation in this direction. To direct the work (stubborn, systematic work that may require a long time) in the spirit of transforming the national war into civil war—this is the whole issue." [24]

20. Lenin was a ruthless opponent of those who advocated reform instead of civil war.

"The opportunists had long been preparing this collapse by rejecting the Socialist revolution and substituting for it bourgeois reformism; by repudiating the class struggle with its inevitable transformation into civil war at certain moments * * *." [25]

21. According to Lenin the policy of transforming an imperialist war into civil war, which he advocated, was founded upon principles established by the Paris Commune.

"The proletariat exposes this swindle (of national war) in that it raises the slogan of

[10] State and Revolution, by V. I. Lenin (International Publishers, New York, 1935), pp. 18, 19, 20, 43, 73.

[11] Excerpts from The Communist, a magazine of the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism, published monthly by the Communist Party of the United States of America, August 1934, vol. XIII, No. 7, pp. 751–754. From an article entitled "The Tasks of Revolutionary Social-Democracy in the European War," by V. I. Lenin.

[12] Excerpt from an article entitled "Socialism and War," by V. I. Lenin, published in the Daily Worker, April 8, 1933, p. 5.

[13] Lenin on the Historic Significance of the Third International (Martin Lawrence, London, 1934), p. 22.

[14] Lenin on the Critique of the Gotha Programme, from his notebook, Marxism on the State (January-February 1917), published in Critique of the Gotha Programme, by Karl Marx (International Publishers, New York, 1938), pp. 50 and 56.

[15] The Tasks of the Proletariat in Our Revolution, Draft of a Platform for the Proletarian Party, from a speech delivered by V. I. Lenin on April 23 (10), 1917, and published in the Communist International, by V. I. Lenin (International Publishers, New York, 1938), pp. 7 and 9.

[16] Ibid., Speech at the Opening of the First Congress of the Communist International, March 2, 1919, p. 26.

[17] Ibid., The Tasks of the Third International, p. 48.

[18] Ibid., p. 49.

[19] Ibid., p. 51.

[20] Theses on the Fundamental Tasks of the Second Congress of the Communist International, delivered July 4, 1920, ibid., p. 164.

[21] The Conditions of Affiliation to the Communist International, ibid., p. 202.

[22] The Tasks of Revolutionary Social Democracy in the European War, Collected Works of V. I. Lenin, vol. XVIII, The Imperialist War (International Publishers, New York, 1930), p. 63.

[23] Ibid., p. 74.

[24] Ibid., p. 75.

[25] Ibid., p. 80.

transforming the imperialist war into civil war. This very slogan was suggested by the Stuttgart and Basle resolutions, which had in mind not war in general but precisely the present war, and which spoke not of the 'defense of the fatherland' but of 'hastening the collapse of capitalism,' of utilizing for this aim the crisis created by the war, and of the example of the Commune. The Commune was a transformation of war between peoples into civil war." [26]

22. He specifically laid down, as the task of the Communist International, civil war against the capitalist class of all countries.

"Work directed toward transforming the war of the peoples into a civil war is the only Socialist work in the epoch of an imperialist armed conflict of the bourgeoisie of all nations. Down with the sentimental and foolish preacher's yearnings for a 'peace at any price!' Let us raise the banner of civil war! * * * If not today, then certainly tomorrow; if not during the present war, then after it; if not in this war, then in the following one, the proletarian banner of civil war will rally not only hundreds of thousands of enlightened workers, but also millions of semiproletarians and petty bourgeois * * *. The Third International is confronted with the task of organizing the forces of the proletariat for a revolutionary onslaught on the capitalist governments, for civil war against the bourgeoisie of all countries * * *." [27]

23. Quoting Engels, Lenin pointed out cunningly how to place the blame for violence and civil war upon what he called the ruling class.

"Engels wrote in 1891, advocating, most correctly, the use of bourgeois legality by us revolutionists in the period of so-called peaceful development. Engels' idea was perfectly clear; we class-conscious workers, he said, would be the next to shoot; it is more favourable for us to choose the moment for changing the ballots into bullets (to pass to civil war) when the bourgeoisie itself has broken the legal basis created by it." [28]

24. Lenin had no use for those who advocated civil peace, indicating clearly his preference for civil strife with arms in hand.

"To turn the present imperialist war into civil war is the only correct proletarian slogan following from the experience of the Commune, indicated by the Basle (1912) resolution and dictated by all the conditions of an imperialist war between highly developed bourgeois countries.

"Civil war to which revolutionary Social-Democracy calls at the present period is a struggle of the proletariat, with arms in hand, against the bourgeoisie for the purpose of expropriating the capitalist class in the advanced capitalist countries * * *.

"As the first steps toward changing the present imperialist war into civil war, we may indicate * * *. Complete break with the policy of 'civil peace' * * *. Support to every kind of revolutionary mass action of the proletariat in general." [29]

25. As a preparation for civil war, Lenin proposed every possible measure for weakening the government, including the army.

"The struggle against the government that conducts the imperialist war must not halt in any country before the possibility of that country's defeat in consequence of revolutionary propaganda. The defeat of the governmental army weakens the government, aids the liberation of the nationalities oppressed by it, and makes civil war against the ruling classes easier." [30]

26. Lenin called attention to the importance of military reverses as a means of facilitating civil war.

"Revolution in wartime is civil war. Transformation of war between governments into civil war is, on the one hand, facilitated by military reverses (defeats) of the government; on the other hand, it is impossible to strive in practice towards such a transformation without at the same time working towards military defeat." [31]

27. He urged that advantage be taken of the difficulties of the government in order to break civil peace.

"The only policy of a real, not verbal, breaking of 'civil peace,' of accepting the class struggle, is for the proletariat to take advantage of the difficulties of the government and its bourgeoisie with the aim of overthrowing them." [32]

28. He further stressed civil war and mass action as the only possible road to socialism.

"Do not trust any high-sounding programmes, we say to the masses; rely on your own mass revolutionary actions against your government and your bourgeoisie, try to develop such actions; there is no escape from barbarism, there is no possibility for progress in Europe outside of civil war for socialism." [33]

29. Lenin proposed that civil war be incorporated into the party program.

"In our opinion the Left must come forth with a general declaration of ideas which would * * * offer a program of revolutionary actions (whether to say civil war or revolutionary mass action is not so important after all) * * *." [34]

30. It was Lenin's opinion that all consistent class struggle in time of war leads inevitably to civil war.

"Our duty is to help make these (revolutionary) sentiments conscious, to deepen them and give them form. The only correct expression of this task is the slogan 'Turn the imperialist war into civil war.' All consistent class struggle in time of war, all 'mass actions' earnestly conducted must inevitably lead to this." [35]

31. Lenin's support for the policy of ushering in civil war during a so-called imperialist war dates back to his agitation within the Russian Socialist Party.

"It is the chief task of the Social-Democratic opposition at the present moment to raise the banner of revolutionary Marxism, to tell the workers firmly and definitely how to look upon imperialist wars, to put forth the slogan of mass revolutionary action, i. e., to turn the period of imperialist war into the beginning of a period of civil wars." [36]

32. Lenin envisaged the use of armed force against other non-Communist states by the country in which the revolution had been successful.

"The victorious proletariat of that country, having expropriated the capitalists and organized Socialist production at home, would rise against the rest of the capitalist world, attracting the oppressed classes of other countries, raising among them revolts against the capitalists, launching, in case of necessity, armed forces against the exploiting classes and their states." [37]

33. In the plainest terms Lenin advised members of the armed forces to use their weapons against their own government.

"Tomorrow you are deprived of the election ballot, you are given a rifle and a splendid machine gun equipped according to the last word of machine technique—take this weapon of death and destruction, do not listen to the sentimental whiners who are afraid of war. Much has been left to the world that must be destroyed by fire and iron for the liberation of the working class. And if bitterness and despair grow in the masses, if a revolutionary situation is at hand, prepare to organize new organizations and utilize these so useful weapons of death and destruction against your own government and your bourgeoisie." [38]

34. The continuity and modern validity of Marx's and Engels' advocacy of force and violence is shown by Lenin in the following passage:

"Marx and Engels, in 1847, while living abroad * * * appealed for revolution; they openly and directly spoke of applying force. * * * Either we are really and firmly convinced that the war is creating a revolutionary situation in Europe, that all the economic and social-political circumstances of the imperialist epoch lead up to a revolution of the proletariat—then it is our bounden duty to explain to the masses the necessity of a revolution, to appeal for it, to create befitting organizations, to speak fearlessly and in the most concrete manner of the various methods of forceful struggle and of its 'technique * * *.'" [39]

35. Lenin has explained clearly the functions of the Soviets as organs of insurrection.

"Soviets of Workers' Deputies, etc., must be looked upon as organs of insurrection, as organs of revolutionary power." [40]

36. He categorically rejected the possibility of a peaceful seizure of power.

"This essence of the matter is that at present power can no longer be seized peacefully." [41]

37. Lenin outlined historically the role of an armed and organized minority in imposing its will upon the unorganized majority.

"A revolution, furthermore, is distinguished from the 'normal situation' in a state in that the controversial state questions are decided directly by the struggle of classes and masses, including the armed uprising. It cannot be otherwise, once the masses are free and armed * * *. Beginning with the Peasant War in the Middle Ages in Germany, through all the large-scale revolutionary movements and epochs up to 1848 and 1871, and further up to 1905, we see innumerable examples of how the more organized, more class-conscious, better armed minority forces its will upon the majority and is victorious over it.

"Friedrich Engels particularly emphasized the lesson of the experiences which to some degree make the peasant uprising of the sixteenth century identical to the 1848 Revolution in Germany, namely the desultory character of the actions, the absence of centralization among the oppressed masses, which is due to their petty-bourgeois status in life. Approaching the matter from this angle we arrived at the same conclusion. A plain majority of the petty-bourgeois masses decides nothing, and can decide nothing. * * *

"It is well known that in the long run the problems of social life are decided by the class struggle in its bitterest, sharpest form, namely, in the form of civil war." [42]

38. Mentioning the reference of Karl Marx to uprising as an art, Lenin recalled the need of popularizing armed uprising.

---

[26] Ibid., p. 87.
[27] Ibid., pp. 88 and 89. It should be noted that the Russian Communists (Bolsheviks) were in 1914, when this article was written, members of the Social Democratic Labor Party of Russia.
[28] Ibid., p. 95.
[29] Ibid., p. 147.
[30] Ibid., p. 149.
[31] Ibid., p. 198.
[32] Ibid., p. 200.
[33] Ibid., p. 207.
[34] Ibid., p. 208.
[35] Ibid., p. 232.
[36] Ibid., p. 248.
[37] Ibid., p. 272.
[38] Ibid., p. 316.
[39] Ibid., pp. 346, 347.
[40] Ibid., p. 357.
[41] Collected Works of V. I. Lenin, vol. XXI, book I, Toward the Seizure of Power (International Publishers, New York, 1932), p. 45. Translated by Moissaye J. Olgin.
[42] Ibid., pp. 68 and 69.

"What we are concerned with is not the 'day' of the uprising, not the 'moment' of the uprising in the narrow sense of the word. This will be decided by the common voice of those who are in contact with the workers and soldiers, with the masses. * * *

"What matters is that we must make the task clear to the party, place on the order of the day the armed uprising in Petrograd and Moscow (including their regions), the conquest of power, the overthrow of the government. We must think of how to make propaganda in favor of this without committing ourselves in the press.

"We must recall and ponder the words of Marx on uprising: 'Uprising is an art,' etc." [42]

39. He adds the following from a letter to the Central Committee of the Social-Democratic Labor Party of Russia, of which he was a member:

MARXISM AND UPRISING

(Letter to the Central Committee of the Social-Democratic Labor Party)

"Among the most vicious and perhaps most widespread distortions of Marxism practiced by the prevailing 'Socialist' parties, is to be found the opportunist lie which says that preparations for an uprising, and generally the treatment of an uprising as an art is 'Blanquism.' * * *

"To accuse Marxists of Blanquism for treating uprising as an art! Can there be a more flagrant distortion of the truth, when there is not a single Marxist who denies that it was Marx who expressed himself in the most definite, precise, and categorical manner on this score; that it was Marx who called uprising nothing but an art, who said that uprising must be treated as an art, that one must gain the first success and then proceed from success to success without stopping the offensive against the enemy and making use of his confusion, etc., etc."

"To refuse to treat the uprising as an art means to betray Marxism and the revolution. * * *

"Having recognized the absolute necessity of an uprising of the workers of Petrograd and Moscow for the sake of saving the revolution and of saving Russia from being 'separately' divided among the imperialists of both coalitions, we must first adapt our political tactics at the conference to the conditions of the maturing uprising; secondly, we must prove that we accept, and not only in words, the idea of Marx about the necessity of treating uprising as an art. * * *

"And in order to treat uprising in a Marxist way, i. e., as an art, we must at the same time, without losing a single moment, organize the staff of the insurrectionary detachments; designate the forces; move the loyal regiments to the most important points; surround the Alexander Theater; occupy Peter and Paul Fortress; arrest the general staff and the government; move against the military cadets, the Wild Division, etc., such detachments as will die rather than allow the enemy to move to the center of the city; we must mobilize the armed workers, call them to a last desperate battle, occupy at once the telegraph and telephone stations, place our staff of the uprising at the central telephone station, connect it by wire with all the factories, the regiments, the points of armed fighting, etc.

"Of course, this is all by way of example, to illustrate the idea that at the present moment it is impossible to remain loyal to the revolution without treating uprising as an art.—N. Lenin." [43]

40. He analyzed the nature of civil war from the eighteenth century on, urging the futility of reliance upon parliamentary means, as shown by this analysis.

"This experience, in full accord with the experience of all the European revolutions, from the end of the eighteenth century on, shows us that civil war is the sharpest form of the class struggle, it is that point in the class struggle when clashes and battles, economic and political, repeating themselves, growing, broadening, becoming acute, turn into an armed struggle of one class against another class. Most often—one may say almost always—there is to be observed in all more or less free and advanced countries a civil war between those classes whose contradictory positions towards each other is created and deepened by the entire economic development of capitalism, by the entire history of modern society the world over, namely, between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. * * *

"Such are the facts. Such is the history of our own revolution. We must learn most of all from this history, we must ponder most of all on its course and its class meaning. * * *

"A comparison of the data concerning 'parliamentary' elections with the data concerning the above-named mass movements, fully corroborates, as far as Russia is concerned, an observation often made in the West, namely, that the strength of the revolutionary proletariat, from the point of view of influencing the masses and drawing them into the struggle, is incomparably larger in the extraparliamentary than in the parliamentary struggle. This is a very important observation as regards civil war." [46]

41. The following exhibit presented as a model and guide, shows the precision with which Lenin prepared for armed uprising.

(Letter to I. T. Smilga, chairman of the Regional Committee of the Army, Navy and Workers of Finland (in Helsingfors) by Lenin, October 10, 1917:)

"I think you must utilize your high position, shift to the assistants and secretaries all the petty routine work without wasting time on 'resolutions,' but giving all your attention to the military preparation of the troops in Finland plus the fleet for the impending overthrow of Kerensky. You must create a secret committee of trusworthy military men, together with them discuss matters thoroughly, collect (and personally verify) the most accurate data concerning the composition and location of troops near and in Petrograd, the transfer of troops in Finland to Petrogram, the movement of the navy, etc." [47]

42. Lenin advised a sudden attack from several strategic points and the armed seizure of certain key buildings.

"The victory of the uprising is now secure for the Bolsheviks; (1) we can * * * (if we do not 'await' the Soviet Congress) launch a sudden attack from three points, from Petrograd, from Moscow, from the Baltic fleet; (2) we have slogans whose support is guaranteed; down with the government that suppresses the uprising of the peasants against the landowners; (3) we have a majority in the country; (4) complete disorganization of the Mensheviks and S. R.'s; (5) we are technically in a position to seize power in Moscow (which might even be the one to start, so as to deal the enemy a surprise blow); (6) we have thousands of armed workers and soldiers in Petrograd who can seize at once the Winter Palace, the General Staff Building, the telephone exchange and all the largest printing establishments. * * *

"If we were to attack at once, suddenly from three points, in Petrograd, Moscow, and the Baltic fleet, there are ninety-nine out of a hundred chances that we would gain a victory. * * * If with chances like the present, we do not seize power, then all talk of Soviet rule becomes a lie." [48]

43. Again Lenin repeats his emphasis on the nature of the Soviets as organs of insurrection.

"The question, then, is: What is to be the work of the Soviets of Workers' Deputies? We repeat what we once said on No. 47 of the Geneva Social-Democrat (October 13, 1915): 'They must be regarded as organs of insurrection, as organs of revolutionary power.'" [49]

44. Here Lenin shows how Marx' advice to smash the ready-made state machinery was actually carried out.

"The proletariat, however, if it wants to preserve the gains of the present revolution and to proceed further to win peace, bread, and freedom, must 'destroy,' to use Marx' word, this 'ready-made' state machinery. * * *

"I have said that the workers have smashed the old state machinery. To be more precise: They have begun to smash it. * * * The police of Petrograd and many other places have been partly killed off, and partly removed." [50]

45. Lenin specifies that in the course of shattering the government apparatus, the army, the police, and the bureaucracy be destroyed.

"In the foregoing letters the tasks of the revolutionary proletariat of Russia have been outlined as follows * * * (4) it must shatter and completely eliminate the old government apparatus prevailing in all the bourgeois countries, the army, the police, the bureaucracy, putting in its place (5) not only a mass organization but an organization of a universally armed * * *." [51]

46. During World War I, Lenin showed that the Soviet Government must be the initiator of civil war in other countries.

"THE REVOLUTION IN RUSSIA AND THE TASK OF THE WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES

"Comrade-Workers:

"* * * The imperialist war, i. e., the war for the division of spoils among the capitalists, for the crushing of weak peoples, has begun to change into civil war, i. e., a war of the workers against the capitalists. * * *

"The honor and the good fortune of being the initiators of the revolution, i. e., of the great, the only legitimate and just war, the war of the oppressed against the oppressors, has fallen to the lot of the Russian workers." [52]

47. Lenin counseled the overthrow not only of kings but also of democratic governments which he called bourgeois.

"We must tell the workers and soldiers in a simple, popular language, free of learned words, that it is their duty to overthrow not only Wilhelm, but the English and the Italian kings as well. That is the first thing. Secondly and chiefly, it is their duty to overthrow the bourgeois governments * * *." [53]

48. Again and again he tried to drive home Marx's dictum regarding the necessity of smashing the state machinery.

"Marx teaches us, on the basis of the experience of the Commune of 1871, that 'the

---

[42] Ibid., p. 222.

[43] The definition of uprising as an art is given in Revolution and Counterrevolution in Germany; the book was written not by Marx, as was thought for a long time to be the case, but by Engels (footnote No. 83), ibid., p. 300.

[45] Ibid., pp. 224, 227, 228, and 229.

[46] Ibid., pp. 231 and 234.

[47] Ibid., pp. 265 and 266. Lenin advised Smilga to burn this letter. Smilga kept the letter, only tearing from it the name of the sender, out of consideration of conspiracy (footnote), ibid., p. 303.

[48] Ibid., pp. 277 and 278.

[49] Collected Works of V. I. Lenin, vol XX, book I, The Revolution of 1917 (International Publishers, New York, 1929), translated by Joshua Kunitz and Moissaye J. Olgin, p. 49.

[50] Ibid., p. 50.

[51] Ibid., p. 63.

[52] Ibid., p. 64.

[53] Ibid., p. 72.

working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state-machine and make it serve its own purposes.'[54]

"The proletariat must smash this machine (the army, the police, the bureaucracy). It is this that the opportunists are denying and minimizing. This is the most important practical lesson to be learned from the Paris Commune and the Russian Revolution of 1905 * * *.

"But we differ from the opportunists and the Kautskians in that we insist that we do not need a 'ready-made' state-machine as it exists in democratic bourgeois republics, but actual power in the hands of the armed and organized workers. This is the state that we need. In their essence the Commune of 1871 and the Soviets of Workers' Deputies in Russia in 1905 and 1917 were just such a state. * * * It (the Soviet of Workers' Deputies) declares that it has no confidence in all the bourgeois governments. It calls upon the workers of the world to overthrow their governments."[55]

49. Lenin presents here a clear definition of a Soviet Government as distinguished from other governments to show that it is not based upon law but outright seizure of power.

"What is the class composition of that other government (the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies)? * * * It is a revolutionary dictatorship, i. e., it is a power based not on laws made by a centralized state power, but on outright revolutionary seizure. * * * It is a power quite different from that of the ordinary type of parliamentary bourgeois-democratic republic that is still prevalent in the advanced countries of Europe and America. * * * The fundamental characteristics of this kind of power are: (1) Its origin is not in a law previously considered and passed by Parliament, but in the direct initiative of the masses from below, everywhere; in outright 'seizure,' to use a popular expression. * * *"[56]

50. Lenin repeatedly held out Karl Liebknecht as a model to revolutionists throughout the world because the latter had urged German soldiers to turn their guns against their own government.

"Karl Liebknecht called upon the workers and soldiers of Germany to turn their guns upon their own government. * * *

"Liebknecht alone represents socialism, the proletarian cause, the proletarian revolution."[57]

51. In a manner similar to the American Communist Party of today, Lenin pointed out that under certain conditions the civil war slogan may be set aside, but only temporarily.

"One must know how to look from the Marxist standpoint which says that the imperialist war will turn into civil war as a result of objective conditions and not as a result of subjective desires. For the time being we lay aside this slogan, but only for the time being."[58]

52. Designating the Soviets as agencies based upon direct and open force rather than law, Lenin called them the central force of the revolution. Today we find similar bodies being set up in various countries on the eve of revolutionary coups and known as "action committees."

"The Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, spreading the network of their organization over all of Russia are at this moment the central force of the revolution. * * * Such power is a dictatorship, i. e., it rests not on the law, not on the formal will of the majority, but on direct and open force. Force is the instrument of power."[59]

[54] Karl Marx, The Civil War in France, p. 60, noted ibid., p. 356.
[55] Ibid., pp. 80 and 81.
[56] Ibid., p. 115.
[57] Ibid., p. 148.
[58] Ibid., p. 279.
[59] Ibid., p. 281.

53. While Lenin did not completely disapprove of the policy of the Paris Commune of 1793 in guillotining the rulers of France, he thought that mass arrests would be sufficient in the twentieth century. His present-day exponents have not hesitated, however, to resort to methods similar to those of the Paris Commune.

"The Jacobins of 1793 were the representatives of the most revolutionary class of the eighteenth century, the city and country poor. Against this class that had actually (not merely in words) done away with their monarch, with their landowners, with their moderate bourgeoisie by means of the most revolutionary measures, including the guillotine, against this truly revolutionary class of the eighteenth century the combined monarchs of Europe were waging war. * * * This example of the Jacobins is instructive. It has not yet become obsolete, except that it should be applied to the revolutionary class of the twentieth century, to the proletarians and semi-proletarians. For to this class, in the present twentieth century the enemies of the people are not the monarchs, but the landowners and the capitalists as a class. * * *

"The 'Jacobins' of the twentieth century would not guillotine the capitalist; following a good example does not necessarily require imitating it. It would be sufficient to arrest from fifty to one hundred magnates and bank leaders * * *."[60]

54. Communist philosophy and theory calls for the establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin defines such a dictatorship as based upon force and unrestricted by law. He specifically shows that this approach applies to America.

"Dictatorship is rule based directly upon force and unrestricted by any laws.

"The revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat is rule won and maintained by the use of violence by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, rule that is unrestricted by any law. * * *

"The proletarian revolution is impossible without the forcible destruction of the bourgeois state machine. * * *

"And, the question having been put, there can be no doubt as to the reply: the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat is violence against the bourgeoisie; and the necessity for such violence is particularly created, as Marx and Engels have repeatedly explained in detail (especially in The Civil War in France and in the preface to it), by the existence of a military and a bureaucracy. But it is precisely these institutions that were nonexistent in England and America in the 1870's when Marx made his observations (they do exist in England and in America now)."[61]

55. Lenin's teachings were used as a guide in teaching the need of insurrection to American workers. By way of example we cite the following from a pamphlet published by the Trade Union Educational League, then headed by William Z. Foster, who is now chairman of the Communist Party, U. S. A. The author of the pamphlet is A. Losovsky, now director of the information bureau attached to the Soviet Council of Ministers, who was then head of the Red International of Trade-Unions:

"Lenin conceived of the revolution as of something that was moving right upon us, and not as something lying in a far-off distance. Because of this he never tired of insisting that we must prepare ourselves daily for the revolution, even politically and technically. The political preparation consisted in training the masses for action thru everyday struggle. Lenin used to say: 'The most important thing is to bring the masses in motion, thereby enabling them to accumulate experiences within a short period of time.' The revolution confronts us directly with the problem of armed insurrection. And to speak of this without proper technical preparations, is merely to mouth empty phrases. He who wants the revolution must systematically prepare for it the broad masses, who will, in the process of preparation, create the necessary organs of the struggle. * * *

"The Mensheviks were fond of ridiculing the idea of technical preparations for an armed insurrection. According to their conception the center of gravity would lie in the sphere of propaganda, of arming the minds of the workers. To this Lenin's reply was: 'He who refuses technically to prepare for the insurrection ultimately rejects the insurrection itself, and transforms the program of the revolution into an empty phrase.' "[62]

56. Lenin was no mere theorist in his advocacy of force and violence. He insisted upon his followers learning the use of arms and actually using them.

"An oppressed class which does not strive to learn how to use arms, to acquire arms, deserves to be treated like slaves. We cannot forget, unless we become bourgeois pacifists or opportunists, that we are living in a class society, that there is no way out, and there can be no way out, but the class struggle. * * *

"Our slogan must be arming of the proletariat in order to vanquish, to expropriate and to disarm the bourgeoisie. These are the only possible tactics a revolutionary class can adopt; these tactics follow logically from the whole objective development of capitalist militarism, and are dictated by that development."[63]

57. Lenin envisaged the necessity of forcefully suppressing those opposed to the Communist dictatorship.

"History teaches that no oppressed class has ever come to power or could have come to power, without going through a period of dictatorship, that is the conquest of the political power and the forceful suppression of the desperate, savage resistance which is always offered by the exploiters and which stops at nothing—not even the greatest crimes."[64]

58. Lenin outlined the course of revolutionary development from strikes to armed uprising and civil war.

"In the matter of tactical leadership of the revolutionary struggle, the proletariat must be guided by two basic theses. In the first place, Leninism does not limit the movement to any one particular form of struggle but rather strives to master all forms. Various forms of proletarian struggle are the strike movement, demonstrations, parliamentary struggle, revolutionary utilization of parliament when the situation demands it and also the higher forms of struggle; armed uprising, civil war, dictatorship of the proletariat. In the second place, Leninism approaches the problem as to what particular form of struggle is to be utilized, historically, in connection with and taking into consideration the entire concrete situation. In the choice of means it is necessary to show the greatest flexibility."[65]

59. In the following passage Lenin showed the continuity of the doctrine of the use

[60] Collected Works of V. I. Lenin, vol. XX, book II, The Revolution of 1917 (International Publishers, New York, 1929), p. 226.
[61] V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. XXIII, 1918–19 (International Publishers, New York, 1945), pp. 354, 355, and 356.
[62] Lenin, The Great Strategist of the Class War, by A. Losovsky (Trade Union Educational League, 1113 West Washington St., Chicago, Ill.; September 1924), p. 17.
[63] Lenin, The Military Program of the Proletarian Revolution, reprinted in The Communist, vol. XIV, January 1935, p. 26.
[64] Lenin on Bourgeois Democracy and Proletarian Dictatorship, op. cit., The Communist, vol. X, No. 4, April 1931, p. 360.
[65] V. Adoratsky on the Theoretical Foundations of Marxism-Leninism, the Communist., vol. XI, No. 5, May 1932, p. 469.

of force and violence from 1848 to 1915. The volume cited herewith, it should be noted, was published by International Publishers, American Communist publishing house, in 1943, long after the adoption in 1938 of the constitution of the Communist Party, U. S. A., which sought to imply denial of the use of force and violence.

"* * * the famous Manifesto of the Communist Party called for revolution; they openly and directly spoke of using force; and they declared the attempt to hide revolutionary aims, tasks, and methods of struggle to be contemptible. The revolution in 1848 proved that Marx and Engels alone had approached the events with correct tactics. Several years before the 1905 revolution in Russia, Plekhanov, then still a Marxist, wrote an unsigned article in the old Iskra of 1901, expressing the views of all the editors on the coming insurrection, on ways of preparing for it, such as street demonstrations, and even on technical devices, such as using wire in the fight against the cavalry. The revolution in Russia proved that only the old Iskraists had approached the events with correct tactics. Now we are faced with this alternative; either we are really and firmly convinced that the war is creating a revolutionary situation in Europe, that all the economic and social-political circumstances of the imperialist epoch are leading to a revolution of the proletariat—in that case we are in duty bound to explain to the masses the need for a revolution, to call for it, to create the necessary organizations, to speak fearlessly and in the most concrete manner of the various methods of violent struggle and of its 'technique.'

"In Russia, nobody places the beginning of the 1905 revolution before January 22 (9), 1905, whereas revolutionary propaganda, in the very narrow sense of the word, the propaganda and the preparation of mass action, demonstrations, strikes, barricades, had been conducted for years before that." [66]

60. Citing Marx and Engels as his authority, Lenin made a central point of the need for smashing the army.

"Engels wrote that in France, after each revolution the workers were armed. The armed workers were the embryo of a new army, the nucleus of the organization of a new social order. The first commandment of every victorious revolution, as Marx and Engels repeatedly emphasized, was: smash the old army, dissolve it, and replace it by a new one. In rising to power, the new social class never could, and cannot now, attain power or consolidate it except by absolutely disintegrating the old army." [67]

61. Lenin excoriated his fellow Socialists prior to 1917 for failing to appreciate the merits of revolutionary violence. His words are reprinted by the Communists today as the acme of wisdom.

"Hence, to talk about 'violence' in general, without examining the conditions which distinguish reactionary from revolutionary violence means being a petty bourgeois who renounces revolution, or else it means simply deceiving oneself and others by sophistry. The same holds good about violence against nations. Every war is the exercise of violence against nations but that does not prevent Socialists from being in favor of a revolutionary war." [68]

62. Explicit rules and instructions dealing with what he termed the art of insurrection were laid down by Lenin.

"Now, insurrection is an art quite as much as war or any other and subject to certain rules of proceeding, which, when neglected, will produce the ruin of the party neglecting them. Those rules, logical deductions from the nature of the parties and the circumstances one has to deal with in such a case, are so plain and simple that the short experience of 1848 had made the Germans pretty well acquainted with them. Firstly, never play with insurrection unless you are fully prepared to face the consequences of your play. Insurrection is a calculus with very indefinite magnitudes the value of which may change every day; the forces opposed to you have all the advantage of organization, discipline, and habitual authority; unless you bring strong odds against them you are defeated and ruined. Secondly, the insurrectionary career once entered upon, act with the greatest determination, and on the offensive. The defensive is the death of every armed rising; it is lost before it measures itself with its enemies. Surprise your antagonists while their forces are scattering, prepare new successes, however small, but daily; keep up the moral ascendancy which the first successful rising has given to you; rally those vacillating elements to your side which always follow the strongest impulse, and which always look out for the safer side; force your enemies to a retreat before they can collect their strength against you; in the words of Danton, the greatest master of revolutionary policy yet known, 'de L'audace, de L'audace, encore de L'audace!' (Germany: Revolution and Counter-Revolution)." [69]

63. On August 20, 1918, Lenin sent a letter addressed to "American workers" which was widely distributed by the Communists in the United States and has since been reprinted a number of times. We quote from this letter:

"For the class struggle in revolutionary times has always inevitably and in every country taken on the form of a civil war, and civil war is unthinkable without the worst kind of destruction, without terror and limitations of formal democracy in the interests of the war.

"The American people has a revolutionary tradition adopted by the best representatives of the American proletariat, who gave repeated expression to their full solidarity with us, the Bolsheviks.

"But now, when we are confronted with the vastly greater task of the overthrow of capitalist wage slavery, the overthrow of the rule of the bourgeoisie—now the representatives and defenders of the bourgeoisie, as well as the social-reformists, frightened by the bourgeoisie and shunning the revolution, cannot understand and do not want to understand the necessity and the legality of civil war."

"The American workers will not follow the bourgeoisie. They will be with us for civil war against the bourgeoisie." [70]

64. The well-known reporter of the New York Times, Cyrus L. Sulzberger, has shown the continuity of the Leninist line on force and violence as applied at the present time.

"At a party congress in 1919, Lenin proclaimed: 'We are living not merely in a state but in a system of states, and the existence of the Soviet republic side by side with imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable.

"'One or the other must triumph in the end. And before that end supervenes, a series of frightful collisions between the Soviet republic and the bourgeois states will be inevitable.'

"In 1920, Lenin addressing the Moscow Communist Party nucleus said: '* * * As soon as we are strong enough to defeat capitalism as a whole, we shall take it by the scruff of the neck.'" [71]

JOSEPH STALIN

As Prime Minister of the Soviet Government and as the secretary-general of the leading Communist Party of the world, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Joseph Stalin occupies a post of undisputed authority in the international Communist movement. The attitude of the Communist Party, U. S. A., toward him is one of complete idolatry, as indicated by the following statements of its leaders:

"In the whole past period, Joseph Stalin has made the most invaluable contributions toward helping the American Communists become the best representatives of the interests of the American proletariat. It was Stalin's profound contribution to the discussion of the problems of the American working class which armed our Party in the struggle against the treacherous and splitting intrigue of the Lovestone clique. * * * This prepared our Party politically to take the lead in gathering the forces of the working class for effective organization and struggle. * * *

"In the course of doing this, Stalin enriched our Party's understanding of the fact that proletarian internationalism is based on the common international features of capitalism and the struggle against it. * * *

"As against the reactionary efforts of Social-Democracy to chain the working class to support of the imperialist war, the policy of the Soviet Union, led by Joseph Stalin, teaches the workers in the capitalist countries to struggle against the imperialist war, to develop their own independent class policy, to strengthen their organizations and positions, and to develop the struggle against imperialism, and for socialism." [72]

In June 1936 and in May 1938, Joseph Stalin was elected to the honorary presidium of the Communist Party, U. S. A. The March 1943 issue of the Communist carries greetings to Joseph Stalin as "Supreme Commander in Chief" of the Red Army and as "Lenin's best collaborator, his continuator and successor," and as "the greatest of war captains of our time." The greeting is signed by Earl Browder, then general secretary of the American party.

The leading article in the January 1940 issue of The Communist on Sixteen Years With Lenin, refers to Joseph Stalin as "Lenin's greatest disciple and closest collaborator," who vowed to "build and strengthen the Communist International," a vow which "sounded like a clarion call" to which the "struggling masses in all countries responded."

65. The following citations on force and violence are quoted from the standard works of Joseph Stalin. In large measure they reiterate the utterances of Marx, Engels, and Lenin.

"I quote Lenin once more:

"'The dictatorship of the proletariat is a peculiar form of class alliance between the proletariat (the vanguard of all those who labour) and the various strata of the non-proletarian labouring masses (the petty bourgeoisie, independent artisans, peasants, members of the intelligentsia, etc.) or with the majority of these; it is an alliance against capital; an alliance aiming at the complete overthrow of capital, at the crushing of bourgeois resistance and the frustrating of any attempt at a bourgeois restoration; an

[66] Selected Works, V. I. Lenin, vol. V (International Publishers, New York, 1943). Revolutionary Marxists at the International Socialist Conference, September 5–8, 1915, pp. 228 and 230.

[67] Ibid., What Is Internationalism, p. 174.

[68] Ibid., p. 175.

[69] Ibid., Can the Bolsheviks Retain State Power, pp. 291 and 292.

[70] A pamphlet published by the International Publishers, New York, Second printing, 1935, in an edition of 100,000: A Letter to American Workers, V. L. Lenin, pp. 16 and 17.

[71] New York Times of October 16, 1947, p. 8, from an article by C. L. Sulzberger, entitled "World Reds Show Continuity of Adherence to Leninism."

[72] Lenin and Proletarian Internationalism, by Max Weiss, member, National Committee, Communist Party, U. S. A., in The Communist, January 1941, pp. 31 and 34.

alliance designed for the establishment and the definitive consolidation of socialism. This peculiar form of alliance is entered into under special circumstances at a time when civil war is raging; it is an alliance between the convinced supporters of socialism and its wavering allies. (Some of the allies may be "neutrals," and then an agreement to fight may be replaced by an agreement to maintain neutrality). It is an alliance between classes which differ economically, politically, socially, and ideologically' (Works, Russian edition, vol xvi, p. 241).

"With reference to the crushing of the exploiters, as one of the chief aims of the dictatorship, Lenin writes:

" 'Scientifically defined, a dictatorship is an authority based directly on force, an authority which is absolutely unrestricted by any laws or regulations. * * * The dictatorship means (let the cadets grasp the fact once for all!) power, unlimited power, based on force and not on law. When civil war is raging, the authority of the victors cannot be anything but a dictatorship. * * *' (Works, Russian edition, vol. xvii, pp. 355 and 361).

" 'Of course, the dictatorship of the proletariat does not mean force and nothing else, although a dictatorship cannot be maintained except by force. To quote Lenin:

" ' "The dictatorship does not mean force alone, though it is impossible without force. It likewise betokens a higher organization of labour than has previously existed" (Works, Russian edition, vol. xvi, p. 222).

" 'The dictatorship of the proletariat * * * is not merely the exercise of force against the exploiters, and indeed does not chiefly consist in the use of force. The economic basis of this revolutionary force, the guarantee of its vitality and success is that the proletariat represents and realizes a type of social organization of labour higher than that represented and realized by the capitalist system. That is the main point. Herein lies the source of the strength of communism; wherein we find assurance of its inevitable victory * * *' Works, Russian edition, vol xvi, pp. 247-248).

"Let us turn to Lenin. In August 1915, more than two years before the October revolution, he said:

" 'Irregularity in economic and political development is an invariable law of capitalism. It is, therefore, possible for socialism to triumph at the outset in a small number of capitalist countries, nay, even in one alone. The victorious proletariat in such a land, having expropriated the capitalists and having organized socialist production, would rise against the remainder of the capitalist world, winning over to its cause the oppressed classes in other lands, inciting them to revolt against the capitalists, and even, when needs must, having recourse to armed intervention against the exploiting classes and their States (Works, Russian edition, vol. xiii, p. 133).' " [73]

66. Again, Stalin, the present undisputed dictator of the world Communist movement, validated the dicta of Marx, Engels, and Lenin on the necessity of force and violence to accomplish the Communist revolution. The United States is specifically mentioned as no exception to this formula.

"The dictatorship of the proletariat cannot arise as the outcome of the peaceful development of bourgeois society and bourgeois democracy. It can only arise as the outcome of the destruction of the bourgeois State machine, the bourgeois army, the bourgeois bureaucracy, and the bourgeois police force.

"Marx and Engels, guided by the experience of the Paris Commune, wrote:

" 'The working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made State machinery and wield it for its own purposes' (The Civil War in France, Truelove, London, 1871, p. 15).

"Again writing to Kugelmann in 1871, Marx said:

" 'The aim of the proletarian revolution is no longer (as used to be thought) to transfer the bureaucratic and military machine from one set of hands to another, but to smash that machine. This is the indispensable prerequisite for any genuine folk-revolution on the continent.

" 'Marx's reservation "on the Continent" has given the opportunists and Mensheviks of all lands the chance of shouting in chorus that at any rate as regards certain countries that were not on the continent of Europe (Britain and the United States) he conceded the possibility of the peaceful development of bourgeois democracy into proletarian democracy. Marx did, in actual fact, admit this possibility and he had good reason for doing so in regard to the Britain and the United States of the early seventies, before the days of monopolist capitalism and imperialism, and at a time when in those countries (owing to the peculiar conditions of their development) militarism and bureaucracy were but little in evidence. That was at an epoch when imperialism was in its infancy. But several decades later, changed, when imperialism had grown to its full stature and was dominant in all capitalist countries without exception, when militarism and bureaucracy had become established in Britain and the United States as well as on the continent of Europe, and when the exceptional conditions favourable to a peaceful development in the English-speaking world has passed away—then Marx's reservation "on the Continent" had become obsolete, and what he said of continental Europe applied with equal force to Britain and the United States.'

"In 1917, Lenin wrote:

" 'Nowadays, in the epoch of the first great imperialist war, Marx' reservation lapses. Britain and the United States, which have been up till now (thanks to their exemption from militarism and bureaucracy) the last and greatest embodiments of Anglo-Saxon "freedom" have at length come, like the other nations, to wallow in the foul and bloody mire of bureaucratic and militarist institutions, which establish a universal tryanny. Today in Britain and the United States, no less than elsewhere, the smashing, the destruction of the "ready-made State machinery" (which in those lands has during the years 1914-17 achieved the same imperialist perfection as on the continent of Europe) "is the indispensable prerequisite of any genuine folk-revolution.' (Works, Russian edition, vol. xiv, pt. II, p. 327.)

"In other words, as far as the imperialist countries are concerned, we must regard it as a universally applicable law of the revolutionary movement that the proletarian revolution will be effected by force, that the bourgeois State machine will have to be smashed, as an indispensable preliminary to the revolution.

"No doubt in the distant future, if the proletariat has triumphed in the chief countries that are now capitalist, and if the present capitalist encirclement has given place to a socialist encirclement, it will be possible for a 'peaceful' transition to be effected in certain capitalist countries where the capitalists, in view of the 'unfavorable' international situation will deem it advisable 'of their own accord' to make extensive concessions to the proletariat. But this is to look far ahead, and to contemplate extremely hypothetical possibilities. As concerns the near future, there is no warrant for any such expectations.

"That is why Lenin is perfectly right when he says:

" 'The proletarian revolution cannot take place without the forcible destruction of the bourgeois State machine and its replacement by a new machine.' (Works, Russian edition, vol. xv., p. 453.) [74]

" 'The question of power is the fundamental question of the revolution' (Lenin). Does this mean that the only thing required is to seize power? No, it does not. The seizure of power is only the beginning. For a number of reasons the bourgeoisie overthrown in one country remains for a considerable time stronger than the proletariat which has overthrown it. Therefore, the important thing is to retain power, to consolidate it and make it invincible. What is required to attain this end? At least three main tasks confronting the proletariat 'on the morrow' of victory must be fulfilled. They are:

" '(a) To break the resistance of the landed proprietors and capitalists now overthrown and expropriated by the revolution, and to liquidate every attempt they make to restore the power of capital;

" '(b) To organize construction in such a way as will rally all toilers around the proletariat and prepare the way for the liquidation, the extinction of classes;

" '(c) To arm the revolution and to organize the army of the revolution for the struggle against the external enemy and for the struggle against imperialism.' " [75]

67. Stalin considered the overthrow of our system as inevitably the result of resort to violence. For strategic and propagandistic reasons he places the responsibility for such measures upon those who oppose the Communist revolution.

"Capitalism is decaying but it must not be compared simply with a tree which has decayed to such an extent that it must fall to the ground of its own accord. No, revolution, the substitution of one social system for another, has always been a struggle, a painful and a cruel struggle, a life and death struggle. And every time the people of the New World came into power they had to defend themselves against the attempts of the Old World to restore the old order by force; these people of the New World always had to be on the alert, always had to be ready to repel the attacks of the Old World upon the new system. That is why the Communists say to the working class: Answer violence with violence; do all you can to prevent the old dying order from crushing you; do not permit it to put manacles on your hands, on the hands with which you will overthrow the old system. As you see, the Communists regard the substitution of one social system for another, not simply as a spontaneous and peaceful process but as a complicated, long and violent process. Communists cannot ignore facts." [76]

68. He endorsed Lenin's prediction as to the sanguinary, violent, and military phases of the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"That is why Lenin declares: 'The dictatorship of the proletariat is the fiercest, sharpest and most merciless war of the new class against its more powerful enemy, the bourgeoisie, whose resistance is increased tenfold by its overthrow. * * * The dictatorship of the proletariat is a stubborn struggle—sanguinary and bloodless, violent and peaceful, military and economic, educational and administrative—against the forces and traditions of the old society.' ('Left'—Communism.) * * *

" 'We must, therefore, regard the dictatorship of the proletariat, the transition from capitalism to communism, not as a fleeting period replete with "super-revolutionary"

[73] Leninism, by Joseph Stalin (International Publisher, New York, 1928), pp. 25, 26, 27, 58, and 59.

[74] Ibid., pp. 116, 117, 118.

[75] Ch. IV from Foundations of Leninism, by Joseph Stalin, published by the International Publishers, New York, 1932, pp. 44, 45.

[76] Marxism versus Liberalism—An interview of Joseph Stalin, by H. G. Wells (International Publishers, New York, 1935), pp. 16, 17.

deeds and decrees, but as an entire historical epoch full of civil wars and external conflicts, of persistent organizational work and economic construction, of attacks and retreats, of victories and defeats.'" [77]

69. Stalin gave his full endorsement to Marx' prediction regarding the necessity for many years of civil war.

"Marx said to the workers: 'You will have to go through fifteen, twenty, fifty years of civil wars and conflicts of peoples, not only to change the conditions, but in order to change yourselves and to make yourselves capable of wielding political power.'" [78]

70. Stalin reiterated that the dictatorship of the proletariat can only come about through violent revolution. He completely discounted the possibility of peaceful change in this direction. He called for the smashing of the state machine in all its parts.

The dictatorship of the proletariat does not arise on the basis of the bourgeois order; it arises while this order is being torn down, after the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, in the process of the expropriation of the landlords and capitalists, during the process of socialisation of the principal instruments and means of production, in the process of violent proletarian revolution. The dictatorship of the proletariat is a revolutionary power based on violence against the bourgeoisie.

To put it briefly: the dictatorship of the proletariat is the domination of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie untrammeled by law and based on violence and enjoying the sympathy and support of the toiling and exploited masses (Cf. Lenin State and Revolution).

Second deduction: the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot come about as a result of the peaceful development of bourgeois society and of bourgeois democracy; it can come only as the result of the destruction of the bourgeois state machine, of the bourgeois army, of the bourgeois civil administration, and of the bourgeois police.[79]

71. He repeated that the necessity for smashing the government military machine applies in the United States. He considered the law of violent revolution as an inevitable part of the law of revolution in such countries as the United States.

"In his letter to Kugelmann (April 12, 1871) Marx wrote that the task of the proletarian revolution must 'be no longer, as before, to transfer the bureaucratic-military machine from one hand to another, but to smash it, and that is essential for every real people's revolution on the Continent' (Letters to Dr. Kugelmann International Publishers, p. 123).

"Marx did in fact concede that possibility, and he had good grounds for doing so in regard to the England and the United States of the seventies of the last century when monopoly capitalism and imperialism did not yet exist and when these countries, owing to the special conditions of their development, had, as yet no developed militarism or bureaucracy. That is how matters stood before developed imperialism made its appearance. But later, after a lapse of thirty to forty years, when a state of affairs in these countries had undergone a radical change, when imperialism was developing and was embracing all capitalist countries without exception, when militarism and bureaucracy appeared in England and the United States also, when the special conditions of peaceful development in England and the United States had disappeared—then the qualification in regard to these countries could no longer apply.

"Lenin said 'Today, in 1917, in the epoch of the first great imperialist war, this exception made by Marx is no longer valid. Both England and America, the greatest and last representatives of Anglo-Saxon "liberty" in the whole world in the sense of the absence of militarism and bureaucracy, have today plunged headlong into the all-European dirty, bloody, morass of military bureaucratic institutions to which everything is subordinated and which trample everything underfoot. Today, both in England and in America, "essential for every real people's revolution" is the break-up, the shattering of the "ready-made" state machinery (brought in those countries, between 1914 and 1917, to general "European" imperialist perfection)'" (State and Revolution, Little Lenin Library, p. 34; Collected Works, vol. XXI, book II, p. 180).

"In other words, the law of violent proletarian revolution, the law of destruction of the machinery of the bourgeois state as a condition precedent for such revolution, is an inevitable law of the revolutionary movement in the imperialist countries of the world. * * *

"Lenin is therefore right in saying: 'The proletarian revolution is impossible without the violent destruction of the bourgeois state machine and its replacement by a new one'" (The Proletarian Revolution and Renegade Kautsky).

"The Soviet Power is the State Form of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. The victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat signified the suppression of the bourgeoisie, the break-up of the bourgeois state machine and the displacement of bourgeois democracy by proletarian democracy. That is clear." [80]

History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

Communist literature is replete with references to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as a model party, as "an example for the Communist Parties of all countries." [81] William Z. Foster, present chairman of the Communist Party, U. S. A., has extolled the CPSU as the "leading party" of the Communist International, "by virtue of its great revolutionary experience." [82] It is therefore highly significant that the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which explains in great detail how that party seized power by resort to force and violence, is a subject of required reading and study for Communist Party members, for Communist schools, and is presently on sale at Communist bookshops throughout the United States.

The Communist Information Bureau, modern version of the Communist International, has given the following clear directive to all Communist Parties:

"The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Party of Lenin-Stalin, which has a membership of many millions, serves as a great example to the Communist Parties of other countries who see in the CPSU (B) the foremost champion for peace, freedom and the independence of peoples." [83]

New Century Publishers, official American Communist publishing house, in its most recent catalog dated 1946 has listed the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as "A classic work of historical and dialectical materialism."

The Jefferson School of Social Science, cited by Attorney General Tom C. Clark as an "adjunct of the Communist Party," announced in its spring 1947 catalog, a course entitled "History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union," in which the book "History of the CPSU" was to serve as "the basic text."

On March 1, 1939, when 100,000 copies of the English edition of this work were released for publication as the "greatest story of this generation," Earl Browder, then general secretary of the Communist Party, U. S. A., said:

"This is no ordinary book to be skimmed through and then laid aside on a bookshelf. It is a scientific textbook to be studied and mastered, not a collection of dogmas to be memorized, not for mechanical quotation of extracts, but to understand the essence of the theory of Marxism-Leninism so that it can be applied to the most varied and different problems and situations, so that this theory can be enriched with new experiences of the revolutionary working class movement also of our country." [84]

The December 1938 Plenum of the Communist Party, U. S. A., stressed the importance of this volume even more emphatically and declared:

"Our great brother Party, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which gave to the world the supreme example of the Communist program translated into life, has also now provided us with a great instrument for our ideological rearmament. It is the new book, A Short Course in the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, prepared under the direction of its Central Committee, with the personal participation and leadership of Comrade Stalin. * * *"

In this connection the following steps for popularizing the publication were announced by the Central Committee of the CPUSA:

"A campaign has been launched to get the book into the hands of every member of the Communist Party and through them, to their friends. * * *

"Each district is called upon to organize at least one mass meeting at which a leader of the Party should lecture on the book. * * *

"The national educational department of the Communist Party is preparing an outline to aid in the study of the book.

"The Communist press will run a series of articles by Communist leaders on various phases of the book." [85]

As recently as November 1947, in the magazine Political Affairs, William W. Weinstone, New York State educational director of the Communist Party, recommended the History of the CPSU for both intermediate and advanced stages of study of Marxism-Leninism.

In the March 1948 issue of Political Affairs, official Communist Party monthly theoretical organ, Eugene Dennis, general secretary of the party, insisted that the party—"must acquire a new and more profound grasp of the theory and lessons to be learned from such Marxist classics as * * * the History of the CPSU as well as from such authoritative Marxist political journals as the new publication of the Communist Information Bureau, For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy."

The following citations on force and violence are taken from the History of the CPSU serving as a clear instruction and guide to all members of the Communist Party, U. S. A.:

72. This basic guide for American Communists reiterates the principles of Marx and Engels regarding the impossibility of accomplishing the Socialist revolution by other than violent means.

"Marx and Engels taught that it was impossible to get rid of the power of capital and to convert capitalist property into public property by peaceful means, and that

[77] Ch. IV from Foundations of Leninism by Joseph Stalin, published by the International Publishers New York, 1932, p. 47.

[78] Ibid., published by International Publishers, New York, 1934, in an edition of 100,000, p. 49.

[79] Ibid., pp. 50, 51, 52.

[80] Ibid., pp. 53, 54, 55.

[81] Daily Worker, March 5, 1939, reprint of cabled editorial from Moscow Pravda.

[82] Toward Soviet America, by William Z. Foster (Coward-McCann, Inc., New York, 1932), p. 259.

[83] For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy, Organ of the Information Bureau of the Communist Parties, published in Belgrade, February 15, 1948, p. 1.

[84] Daily Worker, March 1, 1939, p. 3.

[85] Daily Worker February 13, 1939, p. 6.

the working class could achieve this only by revolutionary violence against the bourgeoisie, by a proletarian revolution, by establishing its own political rule—the dictatorship of the proletariat—which must crush the resistance of the exploiters and create a new, classless, Communist society.[86]

73. As a type study the History of the CPSU calls attention to the armed revolt on the Russian battleship *Potemkin*, the first revolutionary action in the Russian armed forces.

"In June 1905 a revolt broke out on the *Potemkin*, a battleship of the Black Sea Fleet. The battleship was at that time stationed near Odessa, where a general strike of the workers was in progress. The insurgent sailors wreaked vengeance on their detested officers and brought the vessel to Odessa. The battleship *Potemkin* had gone over to the side of the revolution. * * *

"Lenin attributed immense importance to this revolt. He considered it necessary for the Bolsheviks to assume the leadership of this movement and to link it up with the movement of the workers, peasants, and local garrisons. * * *

"The *Potemkin* revolt was the first instance of mass revolutionary action in the army and navy, the first occasion on which a large unit of the armed forces of the tsar sided with the revolution. * * *

"The workers' recourse to mass political strikes and demonstrations, the growth of the peasant movement, the armed clashes between the people and the police and troops, and, finally, the revolt in the Black Sea Fleet, all went to show that conditions were ripening for an armed uprising of the people." [87]

74. Time and again it stressed the importance of armed uprising.

"Lenin considered that the most effective means of overthrowing tsardom and achieving a democratic republic was a victorious armed uprising of the people. Contrary to the Mensheviks, Lenin held that 'the general democratic revolutionary movement has already brought about the necessity for an armed uprising,' that 'the organization of the proletariat for uprising' had already 'been placed on the order of the day as one of the essential, principal and indispensable tasks of the Party,' and that it was necessary 'to adopt the most energetic measures to arm the proletariat and to ensure the possibility of directly leading the uprising.'

"To guide the masses to an uprising and to turn it into an uprising of the whole people, Lenin deemed it necessary to issue such slogans, such appeals to the masses as would set free their revolutionary initiative, organize them for insurrection, and disorganize the machinery of power of tsardom. He considered that these slogans were furnished by the tactical decisions of the Third Party Congress, to the defense of which his book Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution was devoted." [88]

75. The book reiterates the necessity of armed force to accomplish a successful revolution.

"A decisive victory of the revolution over tsardom is the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, Lenin said: '* * * Such a victory will be precisely a dictatorship, i. e., it must inevitably rely on military force, on the arming of the masses, on an uprising, and not on institutions of one kind or another, established in a "lawful" or "peaceful" way.'"

"The Bolsheviks called the workers to arms, to prepare for armed uprising." [89]

76. The History of the CPSU then describes in detail Lenin's preparatory steps for the armed uprising.

"The bulk of the sailors and soldiers in revolt did not yet clearly realize the necessity for the overthrow of the tsarist government, for the energetic prosecution of the armed struggle. They were still too peaceful and complacent; they frequently made the mistake of releasing officers who had been arrested at the outbreak of the revolt, and would allow themselves to be placated by the promises and coaxing of their superiors. * * *

"The revolutionary movement had approached the verge of armed insurrection. The Bolsheviks called upon the masses to rise in arms against the tsar and the landlords, and explained to them that this was inevitable. The Bolsheviks worked indefatigably in preparing for armed uprising. Revolutionary work was carried on among the soldiers and sailors, and military organizations of the Party were set up in the armed forces. Workers' fighting squads were formed in a number of cities, and their members taught the use of arms. The purchase of arms from abroad and the smuggling of them into Russia was organized, prominent members of the Party taking part in arranging for their transportation.

"In November 1905 Lenin returned to Russia. He took a direct part in the preparations for armed uprising, while keeping out of the way of the tsar's gendarmes and spies. His articles in the Bolshevik newspaper, Novaya Zhizn (New Life), served to guide the Party in its day-to-day work.

"At this period Comrade Stalin was carrying on tremendous revolutionary work in Transcaucasia. He exposed and lashed the Mensheviks as foes of the revolution and of the armed uprising. Speaking at a meeting of workers in Tiflis on the day the tsar's Manifesto was announced, Comrade Stalin said: 'What do we need in order to really win? We need three things: first—arms, second—arms, third—arms and arms again!' " [90]

77. The volume describes the participation and the leadership of the Russian Communists in the armed revolt.

"As by that time the armed uprising had already begun in Moscow, the conference, on Lenin's advice hastily completed its work and dispersed to enable the delegates to participate personally in the uprising. * * *

"In reply to this, the Moscow Bolsheviks and the Moscow Soviet of Workers' Deputies which they led and which was connected with the broad masses of the workers, decided to make immediate preparations for armed uprising. On December 5 (18) the Moscow Bolshevik Committee resolved to call upon the Soviet to declare a general political strike with the object of turning it into an uprising in the course of the struggle. This decision was supported at mass meetings of the workers. * * *

"When the Moscow proletariat began the revolt, it had a fighting organization of about one thousand combatants, more than half of whom were Bolsheviks. In addition there were fighting squads in several of the Moscow factories. In all, the insurrectionaries had a force of about two thousand combatants. The workers expected to neutralize the garrison and to win over a part of it to their side. * * *

"The uprising assumed a particularly stubborn and bitter character in the Krasnaya Presnya district of Moscow. This was the main stronghold and centre of the uprising. Here the best of the fighting squads, led by Bolsheviks, were concentrated. * * *

"The uprising was not confined to Moscow. Revolutionary uprisings broke out in a number of other cities and districts. There were armed uprisings in Krasnoyarsk, Motovilikha (Perm), Novorossisk, Sormovo, Sevastapol and Kronstadt. * * *

"The oppressed nationalities of Russia also rose in armed struggle. Nearly the whole of Georgia was up in arms. A big uprising took place in the Ukraine, in the cities of Gorlovka, Alexandrovsk and Lugansk (now Voroshilovgrad) in the Donetz Basin. A stubborn struggle was waged at Latvia. In Finland the workers formed their Red Guard and rose in revolt. * * *

" 'On the contrary,' Lenin said, 'we should have taken to arms more resolutely, energetically and aggressively; we should have explained to the masses that it was impossible to confine ourselves to a peaceful strike and that a fearless and relentless armed fight was indispensable.' " [91]

78. This revolutionary textbook then recalls Marx' definition of force.

" 'Force,' said Karl Marx, 'is the midwife of every old society pregnant with a new one.' " [92]

79. In full support of the line laid down by Lenin this authoritative work rejects the moderates' plea for civil peace and urges civil war in preference.

"In opposition to the Menshevik and Socialist-Revolutionary renunciation of revolution and their treacherous slogan of preserving 'civil peace' in time of war, the Bolsheviks advanced the slogan of 'converting the imperialist war into a civil war.' This slogan meant that the labouring people, including the armed workers and peasants clad in soldiers' uniform, were to turn their weapons against their own bourgeoisie and overthrow its rule if they wanted to put an end to the war and achieve a just peace. * * *

"In opposition to the Menshevik and Socialist-Revolutionary policy of defending the bourgeois fatherland, the Bolsheviks advanced the policy of 'the defeat of one's own government in the imperialist war.' This meant voting against war credits, forming illegal revolutionary organizations in the armed forces, supporting fraternization among the soldiers at the front, organizing revolutionary actions of the workers and peasants against the war, and turning these actions into an uprising against one's own imperialist government. * * *

"Lenin held that the policy of working for the defeat of one's own imperialist government must be pursued not only by the Russian revolutionaries, but by the revolutionary parties of the working class in all the belligerent countries." [93]

80. The conversion of "imperialist war" into civil war is practically the theme song of this work.

"At the front, the Party agitated for fraternization between the soldiers of the warring armies, emphasizing the fact that the world bourgeoisie was the enemy, and that the war could be ended only by converting the imperialist war into a civil war and turning one's weapons against one's own bourgeoisie and its government. Cases of refusal of army units to take the offensive became more and more frequent. There were already such instances in 1915, and even more in 1916." [94]

81. The volume describes how the police and armed forces were either disarmed or disintegrated.

"On the morning of February 26 (March 11) the political strike and demonstration began to assume the character of an uprising. The workers disarmed police and gen-

[86] History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks). Short course. Edited by a commission of the Central Committee of the CPSU (B). Authorized by the Central Committee of the CPSU (B). International Publishers, New York, copyright, 1939, p. 9.

[87] Ibid., pp. 60, 61.

[88] Ibid., p. 70.

[89] Ibid., pp. 70 and 78.

[90] Ibid., p. 81.

[91] Ibid., pp. 82, 83, 84.

[92] Ibid., p. 130.

[93] Ibid., p. 167.

[94] Ibid., p. 172.

darmes and armed themselves. Nevertheless, the clashes with the police ended with the shooting down of a demonstration on Znamenskaya Square. * * *"

"On February 26 (March 11) the 4th Company of the Reserve Battalion of the Pavlovsky Regiment opened fire, not on the workers, however, but on squads of mounted police who were engaged in a skirmish with the workers. A most energetic and persistent drive was made to win over the troops especially by the working women, who addressed themselves directly to the soldiers, fraternized with them and called upon them to help the people to overthrow the hated tsarist autocracy." [95]

82. The arrest of ministers at the direction of the leaders of the Central Committee in the Communist Party is described together with the steps toward mutiny in the armed forces.

"On February 26 (March 11) the Bureau of the Central Committee issued a manifesto calling for the continuation of the armed struggle against tsardom and the formation of a Provisional Revolutionary Government. * * *

"The workers and soldiers who had risen in revolt began to arrest tsarist ministers and generals and to free revolutionaries from jail. The released political prisoners joined the revolutionary struggle. * * *

"In the streets, shots were still being exchanged with police and gendarmes posted with machine guns in the attics of houses. But the troops rapidly went over to the side of the workers, and this decided the fate of the tsarist autocracy. * * *" [96]

83. Lenin's precept that the Soviets (now known as action committees in certain countries) are the actual organs of armed uprising, is given added emphasis.

"The Revolution of 1905 had shown that the Soviets were organs of armed uprising and at the same time the embryo of a new, revolutionary power." [97]

84. The volume then describes the detailed instruction for the armed uprising given by Lenin to the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party.

"The Bolsheviks began intensive preparations for the uprising. Lenin declared that, having secured a majority in the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies in both the capitals—Moscow and Petrograd—the Bolsheviks could and should take the state power into their own hands. Reviewing the path that had been traversed, Lenin stressed the fact that 'the majority of the people are for us.' In his articles and letters to the Central Committee and the Bolshevik organizations, Lenin outlined a detailed plan for the uprising showing how the army units, the navy and the Red Guards should be used, what key positions in Petrograd should be seized in order to ensure the success of the uprising, and so forth. * * *

"On October 10, 1917, the historic meeting of the Central Committee of the Party took place at which it was decided to launch the armed uprising within the next few days. The historic resolution of the Central Committee of the Party, drawn up by Lenin, stated:

" 'The Central Committee recognizes that the international position of the Russian revolution (the revolt in the German Navy which is an extreme manifestation of the growth throughout Europe of the world Socialist revolution; the threat of conclusion of peace by the imperialists with the object of strangling the revolution in Russia) as well as its military position (the indubitable decision of the Russian bourgeoisie and Kerensky & Co. to surrender Petrograd to the Germans), and the fact that the proletarian party has gained a majority of the Soviets—all this, taken in conjunction with the peasant revolt and the swing of popular confidence toward our party (the elections in Moscow), and, finally, the obvious preparations being made for a second Kornilov affair (the withdrawal of troops from Petrograd, the dispatch of Cossacks to Petrograd, the surrounding of Minsk by Cossacks, etc.)—all this places the armed uprising on the order of the day.

" 'Considering therefore that an armed uprising is inevitable, and that the time for it is fully ripe, the Central Committee instructs all Party organizations to be guided accordingly, and to discuss and decide all practical questions (the Congress of Soviets of the Northern Region, the withdrawal of troops from Petrograd, the action of our people in Moscow and Minsk, etc.) from this point of view.' " [98]

85. A clear description is given of how the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party directed the armed revolt in both the Army and the Navy.

"The Pre-Parliament was dissolved. The Smolny, the headquarters of the Petrograd Soviet and of the Bolshevik Central Committee, became the headquarters of the revolution, from which all fighting orders emanated.

"The Petrograd workers in those days showed what a splendid schooling they had received under the guidance of the Bolshevik Party. The revolutionary units of the army, prepared for the uprising by the work of the Bolsheviks, carried out fighting orders with precision and fought side by side with the Red Guard. The navy did not lag behind the army. Kronstadt was a stronghold of the Bolshevik Party, and had long since refused to recognize the authority of the Provisional Government. The cruiser *Aurora* trained its guns on the Winter Palace, and on October 25 their thunder ushered in a new era, the era of the Great Socialist Revolution.

"On the night of October 25 the revolutionary workers, soldiers, and sailors took the Winter Palace by storm and arrested the Provisional Government." [99]

86. Joseph Stalin here describes the Communist (Bolshevik) Party as a party of a new type particularly suited to the struggle for power in a period of sharp collisions.

"The history of the Party teaches us that only a party of the new type, a Marxist-Leninist party, a party of social revolution, a party capable of preparing the proletariat for decisive battles against the bourgeoisie and of organizing the victory of the proletarian revolution, can be such a party. * * *

"The Bolshevik Party in the U. S. S. R. is such a party.

" 'In the prerevolutionary period,' Comrade Stalin says, 'in the period of more or less peaceful development, when the parties of the Second International were the predominant force in the working class movement and parliamentary forms of struggle were regarded as the principal forms, the party neither had nor could have had that great and decisive importance which it acquired afterwards, under conditions of open revolutionary battle.'

" 'But matters have changed radically with the dawn of the new period. The new period is one of open class collisions, of revolutionary action by the proletariat of proletarian revolution, a period when forces are being directly mustered for the overthrow of imperialism and the seizure of power by the proletariat. In this period the proletariat is confronted with new tasks, the tasks of reorganizing all party work on new, revolutionary lines; of educating the workers in the spirit of revolutionary struggle for power; of preparing and moving up reserves; of establishing an alliance with the proletarians of neighboring countries; of establishing firm ties with the liberation movement in the colonies and dependent countries, etc., etc.' " [100]

COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

The Communist or Third International was founded in Moscow on March 2, 1919, under the leadership of Vladimir I. Lenin. The Communist Party of America, predecessor of the Communist Party, U. S. A., held its first convention in Chicago from September 1 to 7, 1919, in response to the "clarion call of the Third International." The American Communist Party in all its stages, has been openly and avowedly affiliated with and has accepted the guidance and discipline of the Communist International until November 16, 1940, when it formally decided to—"cancel and dissolve its organization affiliation to the Communist International * * * for the specific purpose of removing itself from the terms of the so-called Voorhis Act."

This act requires such organizations to register.

On May 30, 1943, the Communist International (Comintern) was formally dissolved, to be succeeded by the Information Bureau of the Communist Parties (Cominform) established in September 1947 with headquarters in Belgrade.

There is every reason to believe that the Communist International was never actually dissolved and that the Communist Party, U. S. A., is as completely subordinated to the discipline of this Moscow-dominated world party, as it ever was. This belief is based upon the following characteristics of the American party prevailing during its affiliation with the Comintern and today:

1. Rigid adherence to policies paralleling in every respect the line of Moscow.

2. Interlocking affiliations and support of other Communist Parties throughout the world.

3. Devotion to the teachings and principles of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin.

4. Acceptance of press, radio, and other services from Moscow and Communist-dominated puppet states.

5. Sending of leaders to Moscow for guidance and instruction.

6. Glorification of Joseph Stalin.

7. Collaboration of representatives of the Soviet Government and its subsidiary puppet states with American Communist organizations.

8. Enforcement of Comintern statutes, discipline, and general procedure.

9. Authority of Moscow-designated representatives.

The authority of the Communist International, presently known as the Information Bureau of the Communist Parties, is both unchallenged and continuing, as the following statements of outstanding Communists will show:

(*a*) Joseph Stalin at the Second Congress of Soviets of U. S. S. R. (1924):

"Departing from us, Comrade Lenin adjured us to remain faithful to the principles of the Communist International. We vow to you, Comrade Lenin, that we will not spare our lives to strengthen and extend the union of the toilers of the whole world—the Communist International!" [101]

(*b*) William Z. Foster, present chairman, Communist Party, U. S. A., in 1932:

"The Communist Party of the United States * * * is the American section of the Communist International * * *. The Communist International is a disciplined world party * * *." [102]

[95] Ibid., p. 175.
[96] Ibid., p. 176.
[97] Ibid., p. 177.
[98] Ibid., pp. 204 and 205.
[99] Ibid., p. 208.
[100] Ibid., pp. 353, 354.
[101] History of the CPSU, p. 269, quoting The Lenin Heritage, by Joseph Stalin (International Publishers, New York, 1939).
[102] Toward Soviet America, by William Z. Foster (Coward-McCann, Inc., New York, 1932).

(c) The Communist Party—A Manual on Organization, in 1935:

"We do not question the political correctness of the decisions, resolutions, etc., of the Executive Committee of the C. I. (Communist International)." [102]

(d) Walter G. Krivitsky, former Chief of the Soviet Military Intelligence for Western Europe, in 1939:

"The Communist International is not an organization of autonomous parties. The Communist Parties are nothing more than branch offices of the Russian Communist Party. The Communist International that operates in Moscow is nothing more than an administrative body which transmits the decrees reached by the political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Russia." [104]

(e) Testifying on September 29, 1939, before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, William Z. Foster admitted that he was at that time a member of the executive committee of the Communist International and of its Presidium. Mr. Foster could not recollect a single instance in which the Community Party, U. S. A., had violated any of the statutes of the Comintern. He admitted that he considered the program of the Communist International as "a guide to general policy," which he accepted.

(f) Louis Francis Budenz, former managing editor of the Daily Worker, official Communist Party U. S. A., organ, former member of the National Committee of the Communist Party, U. S. A., in 1946:

"Now, I want to get here to the dissolution of the Communist International. * * * And it was agreed (by the National Committee) that Mr. Berger (Gerhart Eisler) should write this piece which he did write, in order to show to our comrades that internationalism still lives—'internationalism still lives' was the phrase used—even with the dissolution of the Communist International. And in order to drive that home, it was decided to put in (The Communist) a prominent article by Dmitri Manuilsky * * * because every trained Communist knows that Dmitri Manuilsky represents leadership of the Communist International even to this day. That was the understanding which prompted his open threat to the United Nations recently of the power of the Communist Parties throughout the world. That is the speech that is putting every party on its toes and was the signal from the Communist International." [105]

For more than 15 years prior to the adoption of the so-called Trojan Horse policy, the Daily Worker proclaimed itself on its masthead as the "Official organ of the Communist Party, U. S. A., section of the Communist International." The following citations are taken from official documents of the Communist International indicating that resort to force and violence is an integral part of its programmatic directives to the Communist Parties of the World including the Communist Party, U. S. A.:

87. The Communist International from its foundation has pointed out the futility of resort to legal channels for its revolutionary purposes and the need of destroying the state machinery.

"The bourgeois parliaments, which constitute one of the most important instruments of the state machinery of the bourgeoisie, cannot be won over by the proletariat any more than can the bourgeois order in general. The task of the proletariat consists in blowing up the whole machinery of the bourgeoisie in destroying it, and all the parliamentary institutions with it, whether they be republican or constitutional monarchial.

"The same relates to the local government institutions of the bourgeoisie, which theoretically it is not correct to differentiate from state organizations. In reality they are part of the same apparatus of the State machinery of the bourgeoisie which must be destroyed by the revolutionary proletariat and replaced by local Soviets of Workers' Deputies." [106]

88. A fundamental tenet of the Comintern policy has been the need of resort to armed uprising.

"The working class cannot triumph completely over the bourgeoisie through the use of only the general strike and the tactics of 'crossed arms.' The proletariat must have resort to armed uprising. Those who understand this must also understand that out of this inevitably flows the necessity of an organized political party, and that the formless labor associations are insufficient for this purpose." [107]

89. An armed struggle for the overthrow of democratic governments and for the establishment of an international Soviet Republic is the aim set down by the Third (Communist) International in 1920.

"The Communist International makes its aim to put up an armed struggle for the overthrow of the international bourgeoisie and to create an International Soviet Republic as a transition stage to the complete abolition of the state." [108]

90. This gathering also called for the violent defeat of the middle classes including business and professional men and the annihilation of the governmental apparatus of democracy.

"Only a violent defeat of the bourgeoisie, the confiscation of its property, the annihilation of the entire bourgeois governmental apparatus, parliamentary, judicial, military, bureaucratic, administrative, municipal, etc., even the individual exile or internment of the most stubborn and dangerous exploiters, the establishment of a strict control over them for the repression of all inevitable attempts at resistance and restoration of capitalist slavery—only such measures will be able to guarantee the complete submission of the whole class of exploiters." [109]

91. The assembly stressed that questions at issue must be settled by force of arms.

"That which before the victory of the proletariat seems but a theoretical difference of opinion on the question of 'democracy' becomes inevitably on the morrow of the victory a question which can only be decided by force of arms." [110]

92. The Communist International called the present an epoch of civil war.

"The world proletariat is confronted with decisive battles. We are living in an epoch of civil war. The critical hour has struck. In almost all countries where there is a labor movement of any importance the working class, arms in hand, stands in the midst of fierce and decisive battles. Now more than ever is the working class in need of a strong organization. Without losing an hour of invaluable time, the working class must keep on indefatigably preparing for the impending decisive struggle." [111]

93. It repudiated the notion that reforms can be achieved through parliamentary or legal means and stated that parliamentary institutions must be destroyed.

"Parliament at present can in no way serve as the arena of a struggle for reform for improving the lot of the working people, as it has at certain periods of the preceding epoch. It is the immediate historical task of the working class to tear this apparatus out of the hands of the ruling classes, to break and destroy it and to create in its place a new proletarian apparatus. * * *

"Consequently, Communism repudiates parliamentarianism as the form of the future; it renounces the same as a form of the class dictatorship of the proletariat; it repudiates the possibility of winning over the parliaments; its aim is to destroy parliamentarianism. Therefore, it is only possible to speak of utilizing the bourgeois State organizations with the object of destroying them. The question can be discussed only and exclusively on such a plane." [112]

94. According to the Comintern Congress, the Communist Party is to constitute the general staff of the civil war.

"The elementary means of the struggle of the proletariat against the rule of the bourgeoisie is, first of all, the method of mass demonstrations. Such mass demonstrations are prepared and carried out by the organized masses of the proletariat, under the direction of a united, disciplined, centralized Communist Party. Civil war is war. In this war the proletariat must have its efficient political officers, its good political general staff, to conduct operations during all stages of that fight. * * *

"The mass struggle means a whole system of developing demonstrations growing ever more acute in form, and logically leading to an uprising against the capitalist order of government. In this warfare of the masses developing into a civil war, the guiding party of the proletariat must, as a general rule, secure every and all lawful positions, making them its auxiliaries in the revolutionary work, and subordinating such positions to the plans of the general campaign, that of the mass struggle." [113]

95. Communists are instructed to enter parliamentary institutions, blow them up, and destroy them.

"One such auxiliary support is the rostrum of the bourgeois parliament. Against participation in a political campaign one should not use the argument that parliament is a bourgeois government institution. The Communist Party enters such institutions not for the purpose of organization work, but in order to blow up the whole bourgeois machinery and the parliament itself from within." [114]

96. The Communist International declared that civil war is on the order of the day in all countries.

"All over the world civil war is on the order of the day. Its watchword is—All Power to the Soviets!" [115]

97. The Manifesto of the Second Congress of the Communist International in 1920 specifically called for and encouraged barricade battles.

---

[102] The Communist Party—A Manual on Organization, by J. Peters, with an introduction by Jack Stachel (Workers Library Publishers, New York, July 1935, p. 27).

[104] Testimony before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, October 11, 1939, hearings, p. 5722.

[105] Testimony before the Committee on Un-American Activities on November 22, 1946, p. 23.

[106] Thesis, Communist International Second Congress, 1920, republished in The Communist, vol. XI, No. 2, February 1932, pp. 186, 187.

[107] The Second Congress of the Communist International, Published Papers, U. S. State Department, 1920, p. 90.

[108] Theses and Statutes of the Third (Communist) International, published by the Publishing Office of the Communist International, Moscow, 1920, and reprinted by the United Communist Party of America, p. 4.

[109] Ibid., p. 11.

[110] Ibid., p. 15.

[111] Ibid., p. 33.

[112] Ibid., pp. 44 and 46.

[113] Ibid., p. 47.

[114] Ibid., p. 47.

[115] The Capitalist World and the Communist International, manifesto of the Second Congress of the Third Communist International, published by the Publishing Office of the Third Communist International, Moscow, 1920, American edition, published by the United Communist Party of America, p. 23.

"The pariahs have arisen: Their aroused sentiments extend eagerly towards Soviet Russia, to the barricade battles in the streets of German cities, to the growing strike wave in Great Britain, to the Communist International." [116]

98. The Comintern attacked those Socialists who refused to support the policy of armed uprising.

"The Socialist who aids directly or indirectly in maintaining the privileges of one nation at the expense of another, he who acquiesces in colonial slavery, he who draws a line of distinction between races and colors in the matter of human rights; he who helps the bourgeoisie of the metropolis to perpetuate its domination in the colonies instead of promoting the armed uprising, the British Socialist who fails to support by all possible means the uprisings in Ireland, Egypt and India against the London plutocracy—such a Socialist should not only not get a mandate of confidence from the workers but should be shot or any rate branded with shame." [117]

99. The Comintern accused the moderate Socialists of flinching from civil war and terrorism.

"The number of victims required in this struggle is great, inasmuch as the conservative Social Democrats still retain their influence in the Independent Social Democracy, constantly reverting to the Social Democracy of the times of Bebel, failing to understand the nature of the present revolutionary epoch, flinching from civil war and revolutionary terrorism, and lingering in the train of events in the expectation of a miracle which is to come to the assistance of their inefficiency." [118]

100. The following citations from the pen of N. Bucharin are significant because he was for years the leading theoretician of the Communist International next to Lenin. He drafted the program of the Communist International adopted by its Sixth Congress in the summer of 1928. He explained the official Communist attitude on force as follows:

"And so you, Communists, are for force, we may be asked. Certainly, we shall reply. But we are for revolutionary force. First of all we think that by mere gentle persuasion the working class will never attain anything at all. The road of compromise, as preached by the mensheviks and the socialist revolutionaries will lead nowhere. The working class will achieve liberty in no other way except through a revolution, that is to say, through the overthrow of the power of capitalism, through the destruction of the bourgeois state. But every revolution is a form of violence against former rulers. The March revolution in Russia was force against the oppressors, landlords and the Czar. The October revolution was force, of the workers, peasants and soldiers, against the bourgeoisie. And such force against those who have oppressed millions of the toiling masses is not wrong—it is sacred. * * *

"But the working class is compelled to use force against the bourgeoisie even after the bourgeoisie has been overthrown in an open revolutionary fight.

"The proletarian state, similar to other states, is an organization of the dominant class (the dominating class is here the working class) and an organization of force over the bourgeoisie, as a means of putting an end to the bourgeoisie and getting rid of it. * * *

"He who is afraid of this kind of force is not a revolutionist. The question of force should not be regarded from the point of view that every kind of force is pernicious." [119]

101. Bucharin considered the best guarantee of security a bayonet in the hands of the worker. He echoed the words of Frederick Engels.

"The best guarantee, the best security for freedom, is a bayonet in the hands of the workers. These were the words of one of the creators of scientific communism, Frederick Engels." [120]

102. Bucharin, acting for the Communist International, called for revolts and insurrection in so-called imperialist countries, a term applied by communists to non-Soviet countries, like the United States.

"We must pursue the tactics of universal support of the international revolution by means of revolutionary propaganda, strikes, and revolts in imperialist countries and by propagating revolts and insurrections in the colonies of these countries. * * *

"The overthrow of imperialist governments by means of armed insurrection and the organization of the International Soviet Republic, such is the way to an international dictatorship of the working class." [121]

103. He insisted that the Socialist revolution could be accomplished only by force of arms.

"The most efficient means of supporting the international revolution is the organization of armed forces of the revolution. * * *

"The better we are organized, the better we arm the battalions of workers and peasants, the stronger will be the proletarian dictatorship in Russia, and the quicker will the cause of international revolution advance. * * *

"In Russia, where the revolutionary struggle and the development of the revolution in October caused the question of Socialism and the overthrow of the bourgeois government to be settled; immediately the dispute between the traitors to Socialism and the adherents of true Socialism was decided by force of arms." [122]

104. Bucharin scoffed at the possibility of revolution without civil war even in advanced countries.

"But there can be no revolution without a civil war. Or do they perhaps imagine that in other more advanced countries Socialist revolutions will take place without civil war? The example of Finland has proved the best evidence of civil war in advanced capitalist countries being even more fierce, more bloody, more cruel and frenzied than ours proved to be. Now we can foresee that in Germany, for instance, the war between the classes will be extremely acute. The German officers are already shooting their soldiers and sailors by hundreds for the slightest attempt at rebellion. It is only through civil war and the iron dictatorship of the workers that socialism can be attained. Such is the programme of the Communists." [123]

105. In its thesis on tactics the Third Congress of the Communist International in 1921 envisaged a long series of civil wars.

"Thesis on Tactics. The Communists were therefore right in declaring, while the war was still raging, that the period of imperialism was developing into the epoch of social revolution, i. e., of a long series of civil wars in a number of capitalist countries and of wars between the capitalist states on one side and proletarian states and exploited colonial peoples on the other side." [124]

106. It further insisted that strikes and political conflicts may develop into civil wars.

"The Communist Party must in this manner convince the widest circles of the proletariat by word and deed, that every economic or political conflict, given the necessary combination of circumstances, may develop into civil war, in the course of which it will become the task of the proletariat to conquer the power of the state.

"The bourgeoisie, though apparently conscious of its power and actually bragging about its stability, knows through its leading governments quite well, that it has merely obtained a breathing spell and that under the present circumstances every big strike has the tendency to develop into civil war and the immediate struggle for possession of power." [125]

107. The Third Comintern Congress urged its followers to secure military training in preparation for revolutionary battles to come.

"The proletariat rejects on principle and combats with the utmost energy, every kind of military institution of the bourgeois State, and of the bourgeois class in general. Nevertheless, it utilizes these institutions (army, rifle clubs, citizen guard organizations, etc.) for the purpose of giving the workers military training for the revolutionary battles to come. Intensive agitation must therefore be directed not against the military training of the youth and workers, but against the militaristic regime, and the domination of the officers. Every possibility of providing the workers with weapons should most eagerly be taken advantage of." [126]

108. This gathering also urged the seizure of the factories.

"At a time when the struggle against misery and poverty is the order of the day for millions of workers, when the requisitioning of bourgeois houses is imperative for the solution of the housing problem of the proletariat, when the practical experiences of life force the workers to interest themselves in the question of the arming of the working class, when the seizure of factories by the workers is taking place in various countries, can it be asserted that in such a period the trade-unions must not take part in such a struggle and must remain neutral which really means that they must serve the bourgeoisie?" [127]

109. The Communist International carefully graded all forms of direct action all the way from strikes and street demonstrations to armed uprising.

"The basis of the tactics of the trade-unions is the direct action of revolutionary masses and their organizations against capitalism. The gains of the workers are in proportion to the degree of direct action and revolutionary activity of the masses. Under 'direct action' we mean all forms of direct pressure of the workers upon the employers and the state: boycott, strike, street demonstrations, seizure of the factories, armed uprisings and other revolutionary activity which tend to unite the working class in the fight for Socialism. The aim of the revolutionary trade unions is, therefore, to turn direct action into a weapon of education and fighting ability of the working masses for the social revolution and institution of the dictatorship of the proletariat." [128]

110. In its call to the workers of all countries in 1921 the Communist International urged them to arm themselves.

"A CALL TO NEW WORK AND NEW STRUGGLES ADDRESSED TO THE PROLETARIAT OF ALL COUNTRIES BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

"* * * Forward to meet new great battles! Arm yourselves for new struggles. Straighten out the general battlefront of the proletariat!" [129]

---

[116] Ibid., p. 25.
[117] Ibid., p. 25.
[118] Ibid., p. 28.
[119] Programme of the World Revolution, by N. Bucharin, published by the Contemporary Publishing Association, New York, 1920, pp. 18, 19, and 20.
[120] Ibid., p. 81.
[121] Ibid., pp. 90 and 91.
[122] Ibid., pp. 91, 92, and 94.
[123] Ibid., p. 95.
[124] Theses and Resolutions, adopted at the Third World Congress of the Communist International (June 22–July 12, 1921), published by the Contemporary Publishing Association, New York City, 1921, p. 35.
[125] Ibid., pp. 60, 61.
[126] Ibid., pp. 91, 92.
[127] Ibid., pp. 133, 134.
[128] Ibid., p. 143.
[129] Ibid., p. 192.

111. Denouncing the futility of pacifism, the Comintern urged the efficacy of force of arms.

"For it would be very detrimental to the proletarian struggle for liberation if the working class were to disarm under the influence of such propaganda instead of arming and fighting on with increasing energy.

"Nebulous pacifist and sentimental hopes should not displace the clear realization that the bourgeoisie is able to rule and exploit, thanks to the control of the creative and destructive means of production.

"The proletariat must acquire the control of both of these if it is to free itself from exploitation and serfdom.

"But since its freedom is denied it by force of arms, it must acquire and defend it by force of arms. It must deprive the property-owning class of the military as well as of the political machines, and reconstruct them to serve its own demands and historical task." [130]

PROGRAM OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

The Program of the Communist International was adopted at its Sixth Congress held in the summer of 1928 in Moscow. It is the most authoritative programmatic document ever issued by that organization as a guide to Communist Parties throughout the world. It has been published and republished in many languages many times and it has never been superseded or repudiated despite the alleged dissolution of the Comintern.

Testifying on September 29, 1939, William Z. Foster, now chairman of the Communist Party, U. S. A., admitted that he accepts the program of the Communist International and that he quoted extensively from this source in his book, Toward Soviet America.[131] Mr. Foster was a member of the presidium of the Communist International. We cite from the Comintern program:

"The transition from the world dictatorship of imperialism to the world dictatorship of the proletariat extends over a long period of proletarian struggles with defeats as well as victories; a period of continuous general crisis in capitalist relationships and the maturing of socialist revolutions, i. e., of proletarian civil wars against the bourgeoisie; a period of national wars and colonial rebellions which, although not in themselves revolutionary proletarian socialist movements are nevertheless, objectively, insofar as they undermine the domination of imperialism, constituent parts of the world proletarian revolution; a period in which capitalist and socialist economic and social systems exist side by side in (peaceful) relationship as well as in armed conflict." [132]

112. This document called for forcible invasion of property relationships by the workers.

"Proletarian revolution, however, signifies the forcible invasion of the proletariat into the domain of property relationships of bourgeoise society, the expropriation of the expropriating classes, and the transference of power to a class that aims at the radical reconstruction of the economic foundations of society and the abolition of all exploitation of man by man." [133]

113. The Comintern flatly discounted the possibility of capturing power by peaceful means.

"The conquest of power by the proletariat does not mean peacefully 'capturing' the ready-made bourgeois state machinery by means of a parliamentary majority. The bourgeoisie resorts to every means of violence and terror to safeguard and strengthen its predatory property and its political domination. Like the feudal nobility of the past, the bourgeoisie cannot abandon its historical position to the new class without a desperate and frantic struggle. Hence the violence of the bourgeoisie can be suppressed only by the stern violence of the proletariat. The conquest of power by the proletariat is the violent overthrow of bourgeois power, the destruction of the capitalist state apparatus (bourgeois armies, police, bureaucratic hierarchy, the judiciary, parliaments, etc.) and substituting in its place new organs of proletarian power, to serve primarily as instruments for the suppression of the exploiters." [134]

114. The program of the Comintern pointed out that the Soviet state for the establishment of which all Communist Parties strive, is an armed proletarian state. In Communist literature Communist goon squads are usually referred to as the armed proletariat.

"The Soviet state completely disarms the bourgeoisie and concentrates all arms in the hands of the proletariat; it is the armed proletarian state. The armed forces under the Soviet state are organized on a class basis, which corresponds to the general structure of the proletarian dictatorship, and guarantees the role of leadership to the industrial proletariat." [135]

115. The Comintern called for confiscation of all property without compensation. In Communist-controlled countries forceful means have been used for this purpose.

"In this sphere the Communist International advances the following fundamental tasks of the proletarian dictatorship:

" 'A. Industry, Transport and Communication Services:

" 'a. The confiscation and proletarian nationalization of all private capitalist undertakings (factories, plants, mines, electric power stations) and the transference of all state and municipal enterprises to the Soviet.

" 'b. The confiscation and proletarian nationalization of private capitalist railway, waterway, automobile, and air transport services (commercial and passenger air fleet) and the transference of all state and municipal transport services to the Soviets.

" 'c. The confiscation and proletarian nationalization of private capitalist communication services (telegraphs, telephones and wireless) and the transference of state and municipal communication services to the Soviets.

" 'B. Agriculture:

" 'a. The confiscation and proletarian nationalization of all large landed estates in town and country (private church, monastery and other lands) and the transference of State and Municipal landed property including forests, minerals, lakes, rivers, etc., to the Soviets with subsequent nationalization of the whole of the land.

" 'b. The confiscation of all property utilized in production belonging to large landed estates, such as buildings, machinery and other investory, cattle, enterprises for the manufacture of agricultural products (large flour mills, cheese plants, dairy farms, fruit and vegetable drying plants, etc.).' " [136]

116. The Comintern reiterated the definition of the dictatorship of the proletariat and called attention to its bloody, violent, and military phases.

"The dictatorship of the proletariat is a continuation of the class struggle under new conditions. The dictatorship of the proletariat is a stubborn fight—bloody and bloodless, violent and peaceful, military and economic, pedagogical and administrative—against the forces and traditions of the old society against external capitalist enemies, against the remnants of the exploiting classes within the country, against the upshoots of the new bourgeoisie that spring up on the basis of still existing commodity production." [137]

117. Armed demonstrations and armed insurrection conducted under the rules of military science constitute the climax of the various forms of direct action proposed by the Comintern.

"In the event of a revolutionary upsurge, if the ruling classes are disorganized, the masses are in a state of revolutionary ferment and the intermediary strata are inclining towards the proletariat, if the masses are ready for action and for sacrifice, the Party of the proletariat is confronted with the task of leading the masses to a direct attack upon the bourgeois state. This it does by carrying on propaganda in favor of increasingly radical transitional slogans (for Soviets, workers' control of industry, for peasant committees for the seizure of the big landed properties, for disarming the bourgeoisie and arming the proletariat, etc.) and by organizing mass action, upon which all branches of the Party agitation and propaganda, including parliamentary activity, must be concentrated. This mass action includes: a combination of strikes and demonstrations; a combination of strikes and armed demonstrations and finally, the general strike co-jointly with armed insurrection against the state power of the bourgeoisie. The latter form of struggle, which is the supreme form, must be conducted according to rules of military science; it presupposes a plan of campaign, offensive fighting operations and unbounded devotion and heroism on the part of the proletariat." [138]

118. The Communist International has designated the demand "convert imperialist war into civil war" as one of its fundamental slogans.

"The fundamental slogans of the Communist International in this connection must be the following: Convert imperialist war into civil war; defeat 'your own' imperialist government; defend the U. S. S. R. and the colonies by every possible means in the event of imperialist war against them." [139]

119. Bringing Marx up to date the Comintern called for the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions.

"The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their aims can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all the existing social conditions." [140]

The sixth congress of the Communist International adopted in addition to its program, a resolution on The Struggle Against Imperialist War and the Tasks of the Communists, based upon a report by Palmiro Tagliotti, then known as Ercoli, who was a member of the Presidium of the Comintern, and who is now the active head of the Communist Party of Italy. This resolution is singularly relevant at the present moment during which the international Communist organization is seeking to label every effort to stem the tide of Soviet expansionism as a step toward imperialist war. It is a standard guide for Communist conduct in the present period, as the following exhibits will show:

"120. But the overthrow of capitalism is impossible without force, without armed uprising and proletarian wars against the bourgeoisie. In the present epoch of imperialist wars and world revolution, as Lenin has stated, proletarian civil wars against the

[130] The Worker, New York, Saturday, June 17, 1922, p. 4. Excerpt from the Theses of the Enlarged Committee of the Communist International, incorporated in an article entitled "Against the Next War the World Revolution."

[131] Hearings of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, p. 5356.

[132] Program of the Communist International Together With Its Constitution, published by Workers Library Publishers, New York, 1936, p. 34.

[133] Ibid., p. 35.

[134] Ibid., p. 36.

[135] Ibid., p. 39.

[136] Ibid., pp. 40 and 41.

[137] Ibid., pp. 48 and 49.

[138] Ibid., pp. 80 and 81.

[139] Ibid., p. 84.

[140] Ibid., p. 85.

bourgeoisie, wars of the proletarian dictatorship against bourgeois states and against world capitalism, and national revolutionary wars of the oppressed peoples against imperialism, are inevitable and revolutionary." [141]

121. The Comintern resolution stated that the Communists strive to transform the so-called imperialist war into civil war.

"Although convinced that war is inevitable under the rule of the bourgeoisie, the Communists, in the interests of the masses of the workers and of all the toilers who bear the brunt of the sacrifice entailed by war, wage a persistent fight against imperialist war and strive to prevent imperialist war by proletarian revolution. They strive to rally the masses around their standard in this struggle, and if unable to prevent the outbreak of war, they strive to transform it into civil war for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie." [142]

122. Where strikes and demonstrations do not suffice, the Comintern recommended sharper methods of struggle.

"All the important questions of foreign policy, of armaments, of the introduction of new weapons of war, etc., must be brought before the masses of the workers and utilized for the organization of revolutionary mass action. In this struggle the Communist Party, giving due and sober consideration to its strength, must march boldly and determinedly at the head of the masses. It must organize demonstrations and strikes against the war policy of the imperialist bourgeoisie and, at the proper moment, put to the masses the question of the general strike and of still sharper methods of struggle." [143]

123. The exigencies of civil war proposed by the Communist International require revolutionary mass action in the rear of the army and fraternization at the front.

"To transfer the war between the imperiolist states into proletarian civil war against the bourgeoisie, for the purpose of establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism—this transformation to be achieved by means of revolutionary mass action in the rear, and fraternization at the front." [144]

124. The Comintern cautioned against pacifism as a possible obstacle to civil war.

"It is the bounden duty of Communists strongly to combat all peace phrase-mongering; for at a certain moment, in the war, this can be utilized by the bourgeoisie as an extremely important ideological weapon to prevent the imperialist war from being transformed into civil war." [145]

125. Communists are called upon to show the relationship between revolutionary mass action and the final act of armed overthrow of the government.

"The Communist must tell the workers that the struggle against war is not a single and simultaneous act, and that revolutionary mass action on the part of the workers and poor peasants, in the rear and at the front, for the armed overthrow of the bourgeoisie, is the only proper means of combating war, to which all other means must be directed." [146]

126. The Comintern considered the general strike as a transition form of activity to the armed uprising.

"Side by side with other revolutionary mass actions (demonstrations, strikes in munition works, transport strikes, etc.), the general strike—as the supreme form of the mass strike movement—is an extremely important weapon, and as a transition to the armed uprising it constitutes a stage in the transformation of imperialist war into civil war." [147]

127. It advised steering the general strike toward the goal of armed rebellion.

"The general strike must not be an abstract watchword. It must be the aim and the outcome of our general practical activity. That being the case, the revolutionary proletariat must be ready, in the event of general strike, firmly to steer a course towards transforming the strike into an armed rebellion, if conditions are propitious for that." [148]

128. The Comintern opposed boycotting the army and preferred the policy of penetrating it in preparation for civil war.

"It means that the Communists, while strongly combating the harmful and illusory boycott slogan, must agitate for revolutionary work and organization in the bourgeois army, for the arming of the proletariat and for the transforming of imperialist war into civil war." [149]

129. The formation of guerilla forces was recommended as a preparation for civil war. This policy is now being carried out by the Communists in Greece and China.

"If the general situation is favorable for it, Communists must utilize such mass movements for the formation of guerilla forces, and for the immediate development of civil war. This applies especially to countries where strong national-revolutionary movements exist. In such countries the Communists, on the declaration of war—especially war against the Soviet Union—or in the course of the war, if the situation is favorable, must issue the slogan of national-revolutionary rebellion against the imperialists and for the immediate formation of national-revolutionary guerilla forces." [150]

130. Significantly the Comintern pointed out that civil war may break out in normal or peaceful periods. The necessary conditions for such rebellion were clearly outlined.

"The civil wars in Germany in 1920 and 1923, in Bulgaria in 1923, in Esthonia in 1924, and in Vienna in July 1927, prove that proletarian civil war may not only break out in times of bourgeois imperialist wars, but also in the present "normal conditions" of capitalism; for present day capitalism intensified the class struggle to an acute degree and at any moment may create an immediate revolutionary situation. The proletarian uprisings in Shanghai in March 1927, and in Canton in December 1927, contained important lessons for the proletariat, especially in the nationally oppressed colonial and semi-colonial countries. Events in Shanghai particularly show how proletarian uprisings can be utilized as a weapon in a national war against imperialism and its lackeys.

"All this makes it incumbent upon the Communists, primarily in connection with struggle against imperialist and counter-revolutionary wars, to put the question of proletarian civil war openly to the masses and to study the lessons of the above-mentioned uprisings.

"These lessons are:

"(a) In regard to the necessary conditions precedent for rebellion. A revolutionary situation must prevail, i. e., the ruling class must be in a state of crisis, for example, as the result of military defeat. The misery and oppression of the masses must be intensified to an extraordinary degree and the masses must be active and ready to overthrow the government by revolutionary mass action. A tried and tested Communist Party, having influence over the decisive masses of the proletariat, must exist.

"(b) In regard to the preparations for rebellion. The rebellion cannot be based solely on the Party; it must be based upon the broad masses of the working class. Of decisive importance is the preparatory work in the proletarian mass organizations particularly in the trade-unions; to secure their active participation in the work of preparing for the rebellion, and the creation of special organizations for rebellion, which shall unite all the masses. The question of rebellion must be put openly to the masses.

"Persistent and intensified work must be conducted for the purpose of disintegrating the bourgeois armies, which work at the moment of the uprising will assume the character of a struggle for the army.

"Activities for organizing rebellion and military preparation must both occupy a prominent place in the work among the proletarian masses and among the toilers in the colonies and semicolonies.

"The time for launching the rebellion will be determined by the state of maturity of the objective and subjective prerequisites for it. The time can be fixed definitely only if the closest contact exists between the Party and the masses of the revolutionary proletariat.

"(c) In regard to carrying out the rebellion. The rule must be: no playing with rebellion. The rebellion once launched must be vigorously prosecuted until the enemy is utterly crushed. Hesitation and lack of determination will cause the utter defeat of the revolutionary armed uprising. The main forces must be thrown against the main forces of the enemy. Efforts must be made to secure the superiority of the proletarian forces at the decisive moment at the decisive place, and without delay the rebellion must be carried over the widest possible territory. There is an art in rebellion; but rebellion is not purely a military problem, it is primarily a political problem. Only a revolutionary Party can lead a rebellion. On the outbreak of the rebellion the Party must subordinate the whole of its activity to the requirements of the armed struggle." [151]

131. The Communist International underscored Lenin's prediction that wars for national independence might serve its purposes at times.

"The tendency for national wars and rebellions to become transformed into proletarian wars and rebellions led by the proletariat—a tendency which Lenin predicted already in 1916—has notably increased." [152]

132. The Communist International agitated for the breaking up of the army by the proletariat.

"In imperialist States the attitude of the proletariat towards armies is determined by the following:

"No matter what their form of organization may be, armies are a constituent part of the bourgeois State apparatus, which the proletariat, in the course of its revolution, must not democratize, but break up." [153]

133. This supreme body of the world Communist movement recommended the formation of a Red Guard and Red guerrilla detachments in the period prior to the formation of a Red Army.

"The Military Question During the Proletarian Revolution. The main slogans upon which the democratic partial demands are based are: disarm the bourgeoisie; arm the proletariat.

"The arming of the proletariat assumes various forms at various stages of the revolution. In the period prior to the seizure of power, and in the first period after the seizure of power, it takes the form of a proletarian militia—a militia of the toilers, the Red Guard, and also Red Guerrilla detachments. The Red Army is the form of military organization of the Soviet Government, i. e., it is the army of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

---

[141] The Struggle Against Imperialist War and the Tasks of the Communists, published by Workers Library Publishers, New York, second edition, p. 10.
[142] Ibid., p. 13.
[143] Ibid., p. 20.
[144] Ibid., p. 21.
[145] Ibid., p. 21.
[146] Ibid., p. 22.
[147] Ibid., p. 23.
[148] Ibid., pp. 23, 24.
[149] Ibid., p. 24.
[150] Ibid., p. 25.
[151] Ibid., pp. 27, 28.
[152] Ibid., pp. 35, 36.
[153] Ibid., pp. 40, 41.

"The demand for a proletarian militia (a militia consisting of toilers, a workers' and peasants' militia) in an imperialist country is merely another way of formulating the demand for arming the proletariat and can be put forward only in the inevitable transitional stage in the military policy of the proletarian revolution, in the period prior to the organization of the Red Army." [154]

134. The function of the Red Guard, or Red goon squads, is to be the establishment of the so-called dictatorship of the proletariat or Communist dictatorship.

"The Red Guard is an organ of the rebellion. It is the duty of the Communists to agitate for the establishment of such a Red Guard and to organize it when an immediate revolutionary situation arises. * * *

"The proletarian militia is the armed organization of the proletariat fighting for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat or, an organ of the proletarian dictatorship for the purpose of suppressing the exploiters." [155]

135. Officer units of the army are to be liquidated under the Communist program.

"With regard to the national armies, the military program of Marx and Engels of 1848–70, i. e., the democratization of these armies for the purpose of converting them into revolutionary armies, must be applied with certain modifications. In regard to the imperialist armies, we can apply only the defeatist program, i. e. disintegration from within. In the event of special officer units or bourgeois class military organizations existing, efforts must be made to isolate and liquidate them." [156]

136. With characteristic perfidy the Comintern called its goon squads a proletarian militia. These were to be formed to accomplish the actual seizure of power.

"In countries passing through the stage of democratic revolution, the slogan for militia will prove inadequate and must therefore be expanded into the slogan: Organize a revolutionary army. This, of course, does not prevent the militia slogan from being advanced at the same time, particularly in preparing for rebellion. It must be noted that arming the proletariat does not contradict the demand for the armed nation; in fact, the armed proletariat is a fundamental part of the armed nation. While participating in the general organizations of the armed nation, it is absolutely essential to set up special, proletarian, armed units commanded by officers elected by these units. * * *

"The slogan proletarian militia (a militia of the toilers, a workers' and peasants' militia) takes the place of the demand for a democratic militia. When, in the process of the revolution in the colonies, the question of armed seizure of power arises, the question of organizing a Red Army must be brought up simultaneously with the organization of Soviets. The old, revolutionary, democratic forms of army organization must be substituted by class forms, dictated by the proletarian revolution." [157]

137. The Comintern believed in advancing the need of civil war prior to the actual outbreak of war.

"Work must be immediately commenced to explain to the workers why they must stand for the defeat of their imperialist country in the coming war. The slogan 'Transform imperialist war into civil war,' must already become the leading idea in our propaganda, before imperialist war breaks out." [158]

138. The chief target of Communist tactics in conducting a civil war is to be what they call the vital parts of the war machine, such as strategic industrial plants, communications, arsenals, etc.

"In fighting against war, the Communists must prepare even now for the transformation of the imperialist war into civil war, concentrate their forces in each country, at the vital parts of the war machine of imperialism." [159]

139. The Communist Party, U. S. A., reprinted the Comintern's demand for the confiscation without compensation of all property.

"The Communist Parties must, with all resoluteness, raise before the masses the task of the revolutionary way out of the crisis of capitalism.

"Against the quack recipes of the Fascists and the Social-Fascists for saving decayed capitalism, the Communists must prove to the masses that the ills of capitalism are incurable. Therefore, the Communists, while defending in every way the demands of the toilers, must untiringly disclose to the masses who are suffering from starvation and exploitation the whole truth, viz, that their catastrophic conditions will grow worse and worse under the blows of the continuous offensive of capitalism, until the toilers succeed in uniting their forces for a counterblow and the crushing of bourgeois rule.

"There is no way out of the general crisis of capitalism other than the one shown by the October Revolution, via the overthrow of the exploiting classes by the proletariat, the confiscation of the banks, of the factories, the mines, transport, houses, the stocks of goods of the capitalist, the lands of the landlords, the church, and the crown." [160]

140. The Workers Library Publishers, New York official Communist Party, U. S. A. publishing house, has reprinted the Comintern's call for civil war aimed at the vital parts of the country's defenses.

"In fighting against war, the Communists must prepare even now for the transformation of the imperialist war into civil war, concentrate their forces in each country, at the vital parts of the war machine of imperialism." [161]

141. The call for transformation of so-called imperialist war into civil war was reiterated by the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International in 1935 and reprinted by Workers Library Publishers.

"From the Struggle for Peace to the Struggle for Revolution. Should a new imperialist world war break out, despite all efforts of the working class to prevent it, the Communists will strive to lead the opponents of war, organized in the struggle for peace, to the struggle for the transformation of the imperialist war into civil war against the Fascist instigators of war, against the bourgeoisie, for the overthrow of capitalism." [162]

142. The same document calls for the victory of the Red Army over our own in the event of a conflict.

"If the commencement of a counterrevolutionary war forces the Soviet Union to set the Workers' and Peasants' Red Army in motion for the defense of socialism, the Communists will call upon all toilers to work with all means at their disposal and at any price, for the victory of the Red Army over the armies of the imperialists." [163]

143. Georgi Dimitroff, present head of the Communist government of Bulgaria and former general secretary of the Comintern, in his speech to that body in 1935, revived Lenin's teachings on the characteristics and lessons of civil war.

"'The school of civil war,' Lenin says, 'does not leave the people unaffected. It is a harsh school, and its complete curriculum inevitably includes the victories of the counter-revolution, the debaucheries of enraged reactionaries, savage punishments meted out by the old governments to the rebels, etc. But only downright pedants and mentally decrepit mummies can grieve over the fact that nations are entering this painful school; this school teaches the oppressed classes how to conduct civil war; it teaches how to bring about a victorious revolution; it concentrates in the masses of present-day slaves that hatred which is always harbored by the downtrodden, dull, ignorant slaves, and which leads those slaves who have become conscious of the shame of their slavery to the greatest historic exploits.' Lenin, Inflammable Material in World Politics, Selected Works, volume IV, page 298. International Publishers, New York." [164]

144. He further stressed the lessons to be learned from the October Revolution of 1917 led by Lenin as to the necessity for arming the revolution.

"The experience of the October Revolution has demonstrated patently that the basic content of the proletarian revolution is the question of the proletarian dictatorship, which is called to crush the resistance of the overthrown exploiters, to arm the revolution for the struggle against imperialism and to lead the revolution to the complete victory of socialism." [165]

145. In a history of the Communist International published by the Workers Library Publishers the decisive part played by the civil war in Russia is explained.

"On the same day was issued the manifesto of the Central Committee of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party (Bolshevik) on the imperialist war. * * *

"The manifesto divulges the treachery of the leaders of the Social-Democratic Parties and calls upon all consistent internationalists to explain to the masses the real character of the war, to expose the treachery of these leaders, to break off all relations with them, to carry on work among the masses under the slogan "Down with the imperialist war, transform it into civil war directed against your own governments. Long live proletarian revolution and socialism.'

"A breach was made in the imperialist front, in its weakest spot, in Russia the imperialist war was transformed into civil war, and in the conflagration of the civil war the proletarian revolution was victorious." [166]

146. In the same volume is revealed the fact that the Communist International formulated one international program for all Communist Parties in their effort to conduct

---

[154] Ibid., pp. 47, 48.
[155] Ibid., p. 48.
[156] Ibid., p. 50.
[157] Ibid., pp. 52, 53.
[158] Ibid., p. 66.

[159] The Communist, a magazine of the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism, published monthly by the Communist Party of the United States of America, February 1934, vol. XIII, No. 2. Fascism, the Danger of War and Tasks of the Communist Parties, thesis of the Thirteenth Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, p. 140.

[160] Ibid., p. 143.

[161] Theses and Decisions of the Thirteenth Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International—December 1933, published by Workers Library Publishers, New York, March 1934, p. 13.

[162] A pamphlet published by Workers Library Publishers, New York, November 1935. Seventh World Congress of the Communist International held in Moscow from July 25 to August 20, 1935, p. 47.

[163] Ibid., p. 48.

[164] Georgi Dimitroff, general secretary of the Communist International, in the Hall of Columns, Moscow, at the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International on August 2, 1935. Published by Workers Library Publishers, New York; second edition, September 1935; also by International Publishers in 1938 as ch. I in Dimitroff's book, the United Front. Dimitroff—Working Class Unity—Bulwark Against Fascism, pp. 19, 20.

[165] Ibid., p. 66.

[166] A booklet published by Workers Library Publishers, 35 East 125th St., New York (1929), Ten Years of the Communist International, by I. Komar, pp. 5 and 11.

a civil war against the business and professional classes of all countries.

"The Third Communist International had to be in order to give to the revolutionary proletariat of all countries one revolutionary character of this programme was defined by Lenin in 1914 when he confirmed the final collapse of the Second International: 'The Third International has before it the task of organizing the forces of the proletariat for revolutionary pressure on the capitalist governments, for civil war against the bourgeoisie of all countries, for political power, the victory of socialism.' " [167]

LENIN SCHOOL

The Lenin School in Moscow is used by the Communist International to train its operatives for activity throughout the world. Among those who studied in this school were a number of the outstanding leaders of the American Communist Party. Our committee has fortunately been able to obtain a copy of one of the textbooks used for this purpose, entitled "The Road to Victory" by Alfred Lange, from which we quote:

"The armed uprising in the Marxian sense is the rising of the masses of the people against the reactionary regime, the beginning of the armed collision between the revolutionary and counter-revolutionary classes, the direct fight for the capture of the political power through a revolutionary class.

" The concept of 'civil war' on the other hand, includes not only the fight for the capture of political power, but also the fight between the revolutionary and counter-revolutionary parties for power in general, that is to say, for the retention and the defense of the power once it has been captured. The armed uprising, therefore, is only the initial stage, the first phase of the civil war." [168]

147. In this work Lenin's conditions for a successful armed uprising are described.

"Lenin, the greatest theorist and practitioner of the armed uprising. * * * The third most important prerequiqite for victory is, according to Lenin, the presence of a weakening and disunity in the camp of the opponent. The uprising will have little chance of success if the ruling class stands united and strong and armed with all the means of power of the state opposite the revolutionary class." [169]

148. It pointed out that no dependence can be placed upon purely spontaneous uprising and that success can be expected only through a planned effort by the Communist Party.

"Experience has taught that a purely spontaneous uprising can never start simultaneously everywhere, that the peak of the revolutionary movement is reached at different times in different areas. A fair chance of success of the revolt however demands a simultaneous outbreak. This can be achieved only through the leadership of a strong party, which understands how to choose the right moment for the uprising in the over-all situation, how to speed up the course of development in backward areas, and to keep the more advanced revolutionary forces in check.

"One of the important, often the most important point, is always the capital of the country, because of its role as center of the enemy's state machinery. For this reason, it will always be correct to pay particular attention to concentration of gigantic preponderance at this point. The significance of the administrative centers of the provinces is equally important. The only general statement which can be made is that the crucial point should always be the one where the enemy is the weakest and where the crippling blow is to be struck." [170]

149. All efforts of the Communist Party should be concentrated upon the armed uprising, according to this thesis.

"The principle of the concentration of forces at the crucial moment and the crucial time means that the revolutionary party must direct all its energies and its structure toward the armed uprising. This does not mean literally that every party member should physically storm barricades with a gun in his hand, although he should be prepared to do so. There are other tasks also to be performed at the moment of the uprising, above all the agitation, and the questions of food supplies under those circumstances. However, all the activities of the party should be directed solely and exclusively in the interest of the armed uprising. It is a mistake to allow oneself to be diverted in such moments by questions of the organization of the economy or the proletarian state machinery and to devote more attention and strength to such problems during the uprising than is absolutely necessary." [171]

150. This volume derided those who believe that the class enemy can be won over by humanitarian methods. It called for the employment of terrorist methods.

"These, as well as other experiences of uprising in world history, leave no doubt that the rule is right, that determination and enterprise are of primary importance in the success of an uprising. Victory can be counted upon only when the revolutionist manages to seize the initiative. This initiative, determination, and enterprise can only be expressed by a daring, desperate, reckless attack.

"The part of the leadership of the masses and the role of the party and its leaders in the uprising is becoming clearer. Only a firm and determined leadership, which knows how to gamble everything on the revolution and how to act accordingly, can organize for victory.

"A great lesson of all the previous experiences with revolution has been that the enemy can never be influenced or defeated through humanitarianism. Only brute strength and power can convince him. He knows no chivalry, and if you show him chivalry he will only use it to surprise you at an opportune moment.

"The avowed enemy of the uprising should be shown only the strictest revolutionary discipline, yes, even terror. How much terror should be used must be determined on the basis of each individual situation.

"To beat the opponent one must strike on his weak and vulnerable side. The enemy certainly is not going to show and offer us his weak points. We have to search for these points. This means that an active attack and the ultimate liquidation of the enemy can only be successful if we can liquidate the camps of the opposition. And this can be done only by a direct attack on those camps.

"There is only one theoretically possible situation in which stalling, after the uprising has once begun, could be beneficial to the revolutionists and change the power relationships to their advantage namely; the possibility of military support from a foreign country, in which the revolutionary class has already seized power. In the midst of the conflict help will be welcomed by the fighters no matter where it comes from." [172]

151. This treatise described in detail the methods of defeating the forces of the government even to the point of killing its leaders.

"Lenin expressed the same principle in the following words: 'You should strive to surprise the enemy and to use advantageously the period during which his troops are still scattered.'

"The art of uprising consists in a large measure in a prevention of the concentration of the enemy's forces. That means the first moment of the uprising must be used at all costs to surround the individual greater or lesser portions of the enemy's forces, to decompose them with all available means, be it through speeches, through physical contact ('Kill the leaders', etc.) or through direct attack on these groups. The important thing is to cut off the enemy's retreat and communications with the outside world under all circumstances and to prevent his contact with other counterrevolutionary forces.

"It is always correct to concentrate enough forces on an enemy pocket that he is kept busy fighting off partisan attacks, even if he cannot be kept in one place. Such partisan activities, even from very small groups, are useful in confusing the enemy and slowing up the speed of his movements and preventing his prompt contact with other enemy forces.

"The goal of the uprising should be to defeat the enemy before he has a chance to form a front line. If it should get as far as the formation of a front line (when, for example, a fertile ground for the counterrevolution has been created through the neglect of political agitation in one or more rural areas) the least that should be striven for is to force the enemy to form the line in the most unfavorable spot, a spot where he will have as little room as possible and as few resources, human or otherwise, as possible, with which to rebuild his army, and to see to it that his hinterland does not stay 'calm' but is agitated and torn apart by partisan forces behind the front lines, etc." [173]

152. The author pointed to the need of developing the armed uprising from within the army and the police force.

"The unity of the revolutionary party must be a precondition of success of the final conflict. Hence, the great revolutionary significance of the battle within the revolutionary workers' party for unity, the significance of discipline and the principles of the democratic centralism which means the subjection of the individual to the whole, of the minority to the majority.

"The social democratic parties can afford the luxury of allowing factions and groups within their ranks because they are not revolutionary parties, because they want to organize the worker not for war but for the renunciation of war.

"A revolutionary workers' party, however, which wishes to organize the workers for the actual final end of the armed conflict, must be vitally interested in building up the foundations of its organization in the factories.

"An effective fight for the destruction of the armed forces of the enemy demands that it be waged not just from the outside but also from the inside. This is also the purpose of the 'peaceful' propaganda in the stronghold of the enemy's forces, the army, and police. It is not hard to see that this task is the best preparation for the armed uprising. At the moment of the final conflict 'peaceful' propaganda work is not enough. Needed is an armed fight against the police and the military and a physical battle for the military, that is to say, an active desperate fight with the counterrevolutionary elements for the winning over of the mass of soldiers. 'Peaceful' work means only work in anticipation of such a battle." [174]

[167] Ibid., p. 45.

[168] The Road to Victory, a theoretical discussion of Marxism and revolution, by Alfred Lange. English translation. Chapter I, The Particular Art of the Uprising.

[169] Ibid. Chapter II, The Choice of the Right Moment.

[170] Ibid., Chapter III, The Concentration of Forces.

[171] Ibid., ch. III.

[172] Ibid. Chapter IV, Attack at Any Price.

[173] Ibid. Chapter V, Prevention of the Concentration of the Enemy.

[174] Ibid. Chapter VI, A Few Conclusions.

COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Communist Party of the United States, known also at various times as the Communist Party of America, the Communist Labor Party of America, the United Communist Party of America, the Workers Party of America, the Workers (Communist) Party of America, and the Communist Political Association, has clearly espoused resort to force and violence, in its official publications or through official spokesmen. The fact that there are no recent direct statements along this line from official American Communist sources is due to its present policy of evading domestic laws which prohibit such advocacy. The party has therefore, limited itself to advocacy and training within its own nearest circles through official literature and schools. Since the Communist movement relies upon coup d'état methods effected by a trained minority, as has been demonstrated recently in various countries, such limited espousal suits its purposes much more effectively than any direct and public avowal of its violent aims. Ample evidence exists to show that the American Communist Party is basically attached to the advocacy of overthrow of government by force and violence, from its own document cited herein. The constitution and program of the Communist Party of America stated in 1921:

"The World War marks an epoch—the epoch of the collapse of capitalism and the beginning of the proletarian revolution. With the disintegration of imperialism come uprisings among the exploited masses in the colonies and in the small independent nations. The imperialist armies disintegrate. The ruling classes are unmasked and their incapacity to further direct the destiny of the world's working masses is exposed. Armed insurrection of the proletariat, resulting in victorious revolution, as in Russia, and a series of open armed conflicts with the state power of the bourgeoisie, as in Germany. This is typical of the conditions throughout the world." [175]

153. The original Communist Party of America, acknowledged predecessor of the Communist Party of the United States of America, openly advocated armed insurrection, civil war, and violent revolution.

"The revolutionary epoch upon which the world has now entered forces the proletariat to resort to militant methods—mass action, leading to direct collision with the bourgeois state. Mass action culminates in armed insurrection and civil war. The centralized power of the capitalist class manifests itself through control of the state machinery—the army, the navy, police, courts, bureaucracy, etc. It is through such means that the capitalist class imposes its will upon the workers. Mass action is the proletarian revolt against the oppression of the capitalist class. It develops from spontaneous activities of the workers massed in large industries. Among its initial manifestations are mass strikes and mass demonstrations. * * *

"The Communist Party will educate and organize the working masses for such direct political action, i. e., mass strikes and mass demonstrations, and will lead them in these struggles. These struggles form the major campaign of the Communist Party. It is through such struggles that the working masses are prepared for the final conflict for power. This can be nothing else but a direct struggle between the armed forces of the capitalist state on the one hand and the armed forces of the proletarian revolution on the other. In these mass strikes and demonstrations large masses of workers are united. New tactics and a new ideology are developed. As these strikes grow in number and intensity, they acquire political character through unavoidable collision and open combat with the capitalist state which openly employs all its machinery to break their strikes and crush the workers' organizations. This finally results in armed insurrection aimed directly at the destruction of the capitalist state and the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship. This objective cannot be attained unless the entire movement is under the control and guidance of the Communist Party.

"The Communist Party will keep in the foreground the idea of the necessity of violent revolution for the destruction of the capitalist state and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat based on Soviet power." [176]

154. It derided the efficacy of parliamentary or legal means and declared that the American state machinery should be destroyed.

"The bourgeois parliament, one of the most important instruments of the bourgeois state machinery, can no more be won by the proletariat than the bourgeois order in general. It is the task of the proletariat to destroy the entire machinery of the bourgeois state, not excluding its parliamentary institutions." [177]

155. It supported the Communist International in its advocacy of the use of force to create an International Soviet Republic.

"The Communist International. In order to overthrow the international bourgeoisie and to create an International Soviet Republic as a transition stage to the Communist Society, the Communist International will use all means at its disposal, including force of arms." [178]

156. The Communist Party of America declared openly that our system can be destroyed only by force.

"We know very well that capitalism cannot be abolished without the use of force.

"The capitalist magnates will hand over power to the workers only as willingly and as peacefully as the British Crown and feudal forces handed it over to the American bourgeoisie in 1776, and as peacefully and as willingly as the Southern slaveowners freed their Negro slaves in the Civil War.

"Indeed we openly proclaim that the industrial and agricultural workers, who, being the vast majority of the population of this country, have a right to establish their own rule, with force if need be, against the rule of the small group of trust magnates and capitalists generally." [179]

157. The Communist Party of America reprinted the official position of the Third Congress of the Comintern as its own.

"The official position of the Communist International as adopted at its Third Congress, held June 22-July 12, 1921, is as follows:

"With regard to acts of White Terror and the fury of bourgeois justice, the Communist Party must warn the workers not be deceived, during crises, by an enemy appeal to their leniency, but to demonstrate proletarian morality by acts of proletarian justice, in settling with the oppressors of the workers.

"But in times when the workers are only preparing themselves, when they have to be mobilized by agitation, political campaigns and strikes, armed force may be used solely to defend the masses from bourgeois outrages.

"Individual acts of terrorism, however they may demonstrate the revolutionary rancor of the masses, however justified they may be as acts of retribution against the lynch law of the bourgeoisie and its social democratic flunkeys, are in no way apt to raise the workers to a higher level of organization, or make them better prepared to face the struggle.

"We publish this statement for the benefit of our readers. The capitalist press will not publish it the next time they launch an attack on the Communist movement. We do not expect the hell hounds of the system, commonly known as secret-service operatives, to have brains enough to understand it. But the workers will learn and act accordingly." [180]

158. In the Michigan cases in 1923 in which the leaders of the American Communist Party were on trial, they defended the use of force.

"The Defense does not contend that the Communists say that the workers can achieve power and dominate the government as the dictatorship of the proletariat, without the use of force, either in achieving power or in protecting their rule after it is established. The Communist viewpoint that great historical changes have never come without a resort to force is boldly avowed, but is declared that this use of force must resolve out of the social and economic conditions, that Communists are not bomb throwers nor do they incite the workers to isolated acts of violence." [181]

159. The American Communist Party has even asserted its right to openly advocate the use of force and violence.

"The evidence brought before the jury in the form of the official documents of the Communist Party frankly stated in Communist viewpoint that the class struggle inevitably develops into an open struggle between contending classes and that the ultimate phase of the struggle between workers and capitalists would involve a resort to force. * * *

"What the Communists have done, and what they insist is their right, is to express their view, based upon historical precedents, that no privileged class has ever given up its power without a resort to force and that the class struggle between workers and capitalists will follow this historic precedent." [182]

160. The Daily Worker, official Communist organ in the United States has unreservedly espoused civil war between classes of society.

"But this social peace means above all, to deliver the working class helpless into imperialist war. Nothing can stop the slaughter of the wars of capitalism except the class war of the workers for the overthrow of capitalist government and the establishment of the workers' government. The cry of the imperialist for war between nations can only be answered by the cry of the workers for the war between the classes. The imperialist war must be turned into the civil war through which the power of the exploiting class shall be broken." [183]

161. The Workers Monthly, official Communist monthly organ, acknowledged the fact that the American party was formed in recognition of the historical example set by the Russian Communist Party in conducting an armed uprising.

"The Communist Party came into existence in the United States, as elsewhere in response

[175] Constitution and Program of the Communist Party of America. Adopted by the Joint Unity Convention of the Communist Party and the United Communist Party of America. Published by the Communist Party of America, 1921, pp. 6, 7.

[176] Ibid., pp. 18, 19, and 20.

[177] Ibid., p. 21.

[178] Ibid., p. 39.

[179] The Worker, Saturday, September 16, 1922, p. 4. Excerpt from Manifesto of the Communist Party of America.

[180] The Worker, New York, March 18, 1922, p. 6. From an editorial entitled "Individual Acts of Terrorism."

[181] The Worker, New York, Saturday, April 7, 1923, p. 2. From an article entitled "Communist Principles on Trial In Person of Foster in Michigan."

[182] The Worker, New York, Saturday, April 21, 1923, p. 1. From an article entitled "Foster Verdict Triumph for Communism in United States," by C. E. Ruthenberg.

[183] Daily Worker, Chicago, July 5, 1924, p. 5; J. Louis Engdahl and William F. Dunne, editors. Excerpt from an editorial entitled "Against Imperialist War."

to the ferment caused in the socialist parties by the Russian Revolution. It was the historical example, that is, the establishment of a proletarian state through an armed uprising of the working masses, the sweeping away of the old parliamentary form of government, the establishing of the new workers' government upon the foundation of the soviets, that drove into the Socialist parties the wedge which split them into two sharply defined groups; those who pretended they could achieve a Socialist society through forms wrung from the capitalist state and those who saw the only road to socialism, the overthrow of the capitalist state and the establishment of the proletarian state, the dictatorship of the proletariat. * * *

"The party was attacked because it taught the workers that they could emancipate themselves from capitalism only through an armed uprising which would overthrow the capitalist state and establish a soviet government. After it was driven underground the party considered it all the more its duty to continue this propaganda." [184]

162. Questioned by New York Aldermanic President McKee, William Z. Foster, present chairman of the Communist Party, U. S. A., frankly admitted that his organization teaches the workers that only by force and violence can the revolution be achieved.

"You cannot cure unemployment except by the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of a soviet government in the United States. We explain to the workers and we teach all the workers that only by violence finally can a revolution be accomplished. All revolutions have been accomplished by force and violence." [185]

163. Robert Minor, for many years a member of the executive committee of the Communist Party, U. S. A., and a delegate to the Communist International, made a similar public admission.

"* * * the Communist Party is the party of the working class, leading the workers in the class struggle and recognizing that all of history is made up of this struggle which has never been solved and never can be solved without violence. It is not a question of violence or no violence. It is a question of which class." [186]

164. The seventh national convention of the Communist Party, U. S. A., in 1930, endorsed Lenin's demand to turn imperialist war into civil war.

"In view of this growing danger of war, the Communist Party must carry through an intensive and continuous campaign for the popularization of Lenin's teachings on the struggle against war, propagating the slogan of the transformation of imperialist war into civil war, the defeat of 'our own' capitalist government, for the overthrow of 'our own' bourgeoisie." [187]

165. Before the House Special Committee To Investigate Communist Activities in the United States on December 5, 1930, William Z. Foster, declared under oath that armed struggle was necessary for the Socialist revolution.

"Only an armed struggle succeeded in eliminating the institution of chattel slavery. The same law of history will operate in the transition from capitalism to socialism." [188]

166. William F. Dunne, former member of the executive committee of the Communist Party, U. S. A., delegate to the Comintern and former editor of the Daily Worker denounced those who believe in the possibility of an orderly revolution.

"No 'Orderly Revolution.' There never has been and there never can be an orderly revolution. 'Orderly Revolution' means no revolution. The whole international experience of the working class, immeasurably enriched by the Russian Revolution, proves this beyond question." [189]

167. The following statements advocating the use of force and violence for the revolutionary overthrow of American capitalism are particularly significant because of the official position now held by the author. William Z. Foster, as chairman of the Communist Party, U. S. A. They are excerpts from his book, Toward Soviet America.

"The revolutionary danger to the capitalist system from the developing war situation is acute and menacing. If and when the imperialist powers launch a great war among themselves we may be sure that in many countries the workers and peasants, following the famous strategy of Lenin and under the leadership of the Communist International, will transform the imperialist war into a civil war against the capitalist system. * * *

"The road to this social development can only be opened by revolution. This is because the question of power is involved. The capitalist class like an insatiable bloodsucker, hangs to the body of the toiling masses and can be dislodged only by force.

"By the term 'abolition' of capitalsim we mean its overthrow in open struggle by the toiling masses, led by the proletariat. Although the world capitalistic system constantly plunges deeper into crisis we cannot therefore conclude that it will collapse of its own weight. On the contrary, as Lenin has stated, no matter how difficult the capitalist crisis becomes, 'there is no complete absence of a way out' for the bourgeoisie until it faces the revolutionary proletariat in arms. * * *

"Nevertheless, the working class cannot itself come into power without civil war. This is not due to the choice of the toilers; it is because the ruling class will never permit itself to be ousted without such a fight. 'Force,' says Marx, 'is the midwife of every old society when it is pregnant with the new one; force is the instrument and the means by which social movements hack their way through and break up the fossilized political forms * * *.'

"When the American working class actively enters the revolutionary path of abolishing capitalism it will orientate upon the building of soviets, not upon the adaptation of the existing capitalist government. The building of soviets is begun not after the revolution but before. The decisions of the soviets are enforced by the armed Red Guard of the workers and peasants and by the direct seizure of the industry through factory committees. * * *

"In order to defeat the class enemies of the revolution the counterrevolutionary intrigues within the United States and the attacks of foreign capitalist countries from without, the proletarian dictatorship must be supported by the organized armed might of the workers, soldiers, local militia, etc. In the early stages of the revolution even before the seizure of power, the workers will organize the Red Guard. Later on this loosely constructed body becomes developed into a firmly knit well-disciplined Red Army." [190]

168. In 1934 the Communist Party, U. S. A., was still making no bones about its advocacy of the need of an armed uprising and civil war.

"But along with the growth of revolutionary mass actions, such as demonstrations, strikes in basic industries, munitions works, waterside, rail transport, etc., the general strike—as the supreme form of the mass strike movement—can be a mighty weapon, and 'as a transition to the armed uprising it constitutes a stage in the transformation of the imperialist war into civil war.'" [191]

169. Many American Communist leaders were given special training in Moscow to prepare them for the practical application of these theories of force and violence. William Odell Nowell, a former Communist Party leader in Detroit, who studied at the International Lenin University in Moscow under this training program for more than a year in 1931–1932, described the procedure for the Special Committee on Un-American Activities. He said that the Communist Party of the United States and the Soviet Government paid his expenses as a student in this training program, which he stated was aimed at the production of "professional revolutionaries." His account of the training follows:

"We studied how to dismantle the weapons of the leading countries, that is, their main weapons, such as rifles or machine guns and so on. I also studied secret-service codes * * * we studied the details of how to develop street fights. I mean, how to do barricade fighting, how to seize control of a city, the most strategic, economically and technically strategic points, and so on. * * *

"* * * the science of civil warfare was developed down to its fine points. And a number of people were sent to the Red Army to secure further training in this respect. * * * I spent some time in the Red Army myself. * * *

"We were given regular military training. That is, we studied military science, strategy, such as is general in almost all countries. The strategy is pretty much the same, except in countries of different geographical situations, and so on. We had target practice and all that. Then we were taught what is called partisan warfare, the science of civil warfare, revolutionary uprising. It is not done legitimately and openly. You don't march in brigades and fight like armies that are meeting each other.

"The conspiratory type of warfare. It is related to the boring-in process, street fighting, and how to mobile (sic) in blocks, the blocks in a city, the workers in a plant; how to develop a general strike out of a local strike; how to develop a general strike into a city uprising, a city uprising into a national uprising, coordinating all these different uprisings. Then how to lead this thing, once it is raised, once these men are on the warpath, how to direct them. Then we come to something like open warfare. We break these people down into groups; we make armies on the basis of the immediate emergency of the moment, or whatever the situation may be. We were given

---

[184] The Workers Monthly, Chicago, October 1925, vol. IV, No. 12, p. 531.

[185] Statement by William Z. Foster, present chairman of the Communist Party of the United States, before Aldermanic President McKee. Daily Worker, New York, March 15, 1930, p. 5.

[186] Speech by Robert Minor before Mayor James J. Walker, New York, N. Y., Daily Worker, New York, March 15, 1930, p. 5.

[187] Thesis and Resolutions for the Seventh National Convention of the Communist Party of U. S. A., by Central Committee Plenum, March 21–April 4, 1930.

[188] Statement drafted by Communist Party of the United States and presented to Fish committee by William Z. Foster, present chairman, Communist Party, U. S. A., December 5, 1930. Workers Library Publishers, New York, p. 31.

[189] Daily Worker, November 7, 1932, p. 6; excerpt from an article entitled "Why Thomas Is Being Boosted by Republican, Democrat Press," by Bill Dunne.

[190] Toward Soviet America, by William Z. Foster (Coward-McCann, New York, 1932), pp. 64, 130, 212, 214, 271, and 275.

[191] The Communist, a magazine of the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism, published monthly by the Communist Party of the United States of America; August 1934, vol. XIII, No. 8, p. 799. An excerpt from an article entitled "The Leninist Party as Leader of the Struggle Against Imperialist War," by H. M. Wicks.

to know that in a revolutionary situation you cannot follow out mechanically any particular plan, only your objective. It is a tense situation. Therefore a party having an organization, with its fingers on everything—every portion of the city and its population, that it can depend on—is prepared to direct all its forces in the way they should be.

"[We were taught to concentrate on] the food supply, the warehouses, the utilities, that is water and lights, gas, and all those things; the communications, that is the railways entering the city, the streetcar service, telephone service, and telegraph; and all those things.

"[We were instructed in] sabotage; how to wreck trains, at this point closing down factories, facilitating discontent to raise the mob spirit in order to get the men on the go, and various other acts of sabotage, which of course could be attempted on a moment's notice. Also the general methods of derailing a train and destroying its cargo. I mean, if it is going to be available for the enemy, just put it full speed ahead when you know there is another train coming head-on, and just step aside." [192]

MOISSAYE J. OLGIN

Published by the Workers Library Publishers, official Communist Party, U. S. A., publishing house in 1935, Why Communism? is an outstanding Communist classic by Moissaye J. Olgin, who was, until his death in 1939, editor in chief of the Morning Freiheit, official Communist Party daily in the Jewish language. This book received featured notice in the Communist International (magazine) of July 20, 1935. Besides being a member of Central Committee of the Communist Party, U. S. A., Olgin was its candidate for public office on a number of occasions, including United States Senate in 1924, New York State Assembly in 1933 and 1936.

On the occasion of Olgin's death on November 22, 1939, William Z. Foster, present chairman of the Communist Party, U. S. A., and Earl Browder, then general secretary, jointly declared:

"The national committee of the CPUSA records with the deepest sorrow the death of Moissaye J. Olgin * * * whose influence extended far beyond the borders of America, as well as (being) a leading member of the Communist Party since 1922." [193] As late as May 24, 1947, the Daily Worker referred to him as "a great American, and champion of labor." We cite the following passages from the work Why Communism? showing advocacy of overthrow of the American Government by force and violence:

"We Communists say that there is one way to abolish the capitalist state, and that is to smash it by force. To make communism possible the workers must take hold of the state machinery of capitalism and destroy it." [194]

170. Olgin stressed the inevitability of resorting to force and civil war in America and preparation for this eventuality.

"If the workers rise in this way against war, the capitalists with their armed forces will try to break the deadlock. There will be attacks on strikers. The workers will have to offer resistance. We Communists do not close our eyes to the fact that this means civil war. But when the masses are organized and fight in great numbers under revolutionary leadership the victory is assured. Part of the army is certain to waver and to join the people. There may be victims, but their number cannot be compared to the losses in life and limb that the workers would suffer in the imperialist war.

"Victory in the civil war spells the doom of the capitalist state. We Communists do not say to the workers that they have to begin the civil war today or tomorrow. We say that the civil war is the inevitable outcome of long and arduous struggles against the capitalists and their state and that these struggles must be made the everyday practice of the working class." [195]

171. He described in detail the steps toward the armed uprising which display a remarkable similarity to Communist tactics in certain countries at the present time.

"A time comes when there is demoralization above, a growing revolt below; the morale of the army is also undermined. The old structure of society is tottering. There are actual insurrections; the army wavers. Panic seizes the rulers. A general uprising begins.

"Workers stop work, many of them seize arms by attacking arsenals. Many had armed themselves before as the struggles sharpened. Street fights become frequent. Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the workers organize revolutionary committees to be in command of the uprising. There are battles in the principal cities. Barricades are built and defended. The workers' fighting has a decisive influence with the soldiers. Army units begin to join the revolutionary fighters; there is fraternization between the workers and the soldiers, the workers and the marines. The movement among the soldiers and marines spreads. Capitalism is losing its strongest weapon, the army. The police as a rule continue fighting, but they are soon silenced and made to flee by the united revolutionary forces of workers and soldiers. The revolution is victorious. Can it be done? It has been done more than once." [196]

172. Olgin predicted that the revolutionists would avail themselves not only of rifles but of battleships, poison gas, and planes to be turned against the old system.

"What is true is that a revolution cannot win unless the armed forces, or at least part of them, join the workers. But once they join, the workers have not only rifles and cannon but also airships and poison gas and battleships to fight the bosses. Poison gases are destructive, to be sure, but their destructive power can be turned also against the old system. There is no reason why the workers should not use them against the enemy when the final conflict has arrived." [197]

173. Olgin did not mince any words on his advocacy of force and violence.

" 'But this is force and violence,' somebody will contend. 'Don't you Communists know that the use of force and violence is wrong?' We reply to this first, that if being a 'red-blooded American' means anything, it means that you must not take punishment lying down, that you must offer resistance." [198]

174. He held out the prospect that armed workers would crush American democracy.

"Having crushed the capitalist state, the social revolution, acting through armed workers and soldiers, will establish the Soviet state as the instrument of the workers' and poor farmers' power." [199]

175. Expropriation of property by force was Olgin's formula for the social revolution.

"It is the task of the soviets to abolish private property in the means of production and to establish Socialist production and distribution.

"This cannot be accomplished peacefully. The exploiters won't give up their loot even after their state power is crushed. They will have to be routed. The Soviet government will have to expropriate the expropriators by force. The latter will conspire and plot against the new system; they will organize counterrevolutionary uprisings. The Soviet state will have to crush these with an iron hand. The former exploiters will be given no quarter. The old system of robbery with all its rubbish will have to be cleared away. This means that the Soviet state must be ruthless; it must destroy the counter-revolutionary forces—the quicker the better for the workers and for the future of mankind." [200]

176. Olgin declared that the Communist Party engages in various forms of struggle including open mass combat with the police in the streets.

"The Communist Party leads political as well as economic struggles. These fights are conducted through literature, through mass meetings, through demonstrations and, when occasion demands, through open mass combat with the police in the streets." [201]

177. He ridiculed resort to legal or parliamentary means.

"We go to the lawmaking institutions, not to tinker them up for the benefit of the capitalists, but to be a monkey wrench in their machinery, preventing it from working smoothly on behalf of the masters." [202]

178. Published in 1936, the pamphlet What Is Communism? by the then general secretary of the Communist Party, U. S. A., Earl Browder, had the following to say regarding force and violence:

"History does not show a single example in which state power was transferred from one class to another by peaceful means, whether in the form of voting or some other method of formal democracy." [203]

179. As recently as March 31, 1948, Milton Howard, feature writer, declared on page 9 of the Daily Worker his lack of faith in democratic processes, as follows:

"There is no case in history where the propertied class has democratically permitted the Nation to vote establishment of new property relations which turned the Nation's industries over to the Nation as a whole, taking them out of the hands of the private owners."

180. The belief in forceful repression of those who do not fall in with the Communist viewpoint was also demonstrated in April 1948, when Dr. Howard Selsam, an avowed Marxist and director of the Jefferson School of Social Science, a Communist school in New York cited as subversive by Attorney General Tom Clark, told a newspaper reporter what would happen when Marxist socialism achieved its inevitable triumph in the United States. Selsam, who was identified as a Communist with the party alias of "Hill" by three former Communist professors in testimony before the Rapp-Coudert committee investigating subversive activities in the New York public schools, said: [204]

"When labor, the middle classes, and farmers have achieved a majority in the interest of carrying out an extremely democratic control of all peoples, it may be necessary to exercise repression against elements who would turn back the clock."

If an American newspaper opposed Marxism at such a time, Selsam said:

"That's a luxury that cannot be allowed. Measures would be taken to see that the press supported the general trend toward socialism. Noncomplying newspapers would have to suspend operation. That's where Marxism is rough about this." [205]

---

[192] Hearings before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, vol. XI, November 20, 1939, pp. 6984–7025.

[193] Daily Worker, November 23, 1939, p. 1.

[194] Why Communism? by M. J. Olgin (Workers Library Publishers, New York, 1935), p. 32.

[195] Ibid., p. 43.

[196] Ibid., pp. 59 and 60.

[197] Ibid., pp. 60. 61.

[198] Ibid., p. 61.

[199] Ibid., p. 62.

[200] Ibid., p. 63.

[201] Ibid., p. 65.

[202] Ibid., p. 66.

[203] What Is Communism? by Earl Browder, published by Workers Library Publishers, New York; second edition, 1936, Chapter XIV, Force and Violence, p. 127.

[204] Report of the Subcommittee of the Joint Legislative Committee To Investigate Procedures and Methods of Allocating State Moneys for Public School Purposes and Subversive Activities, February 11, 1942.

[205] Washington Evening Star, April 15, 1948, p. B8.

DENIALS AND MISCONCEPTIONS

In recent years official spokesmen for the Communist Party, U. S. A., have gone to considerable pains formally to deny the party's advocacy of overthrow of government by force and violence. The duplicity of such assurances is made manifest by the fact that the party simultaneously proclaims its continued devotion to the principles of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, of which the doctrine of overthrow of government by force and violence is an organic and inseparable part. The assumption is inescapable that such assurances are promulgated to throw dust in the eyes of the American people and for purposes of evading the law. It is clear that the American Party is being guided by Lenin's advice to make propaganda for armed uprising "without committing ourselves in the press."

In this connection it is well to bear in mind such examples of conscious evasion as the resolution of the National Committee of the Communist Party, U. S. A., adopted on November 16, 1940 to—

"cancel and dissolve its organizational affiliation to the Communist International as well as any and all other bodies of any kind outside the boundaries of the United States of America, for the specific purpose of removing itself from the terms of the so-called Voorhis Act." [206]

We have previously shown above and in our Report on the Communist Party of the United States as an Agent of a Foreign Power that there was no actual severance. Similarly the Communist International was "dissolved" on May 30, 1943, as a result of a pronouncement from Moscow while Russia was our ally, although the subsequent continued synchronization of the Communist movement throughout the world is proof of the falsity of the alleged dissolution of the international organization.

The policy of deceit is so inherently a part of the Communist movement that it is reflected in every section and phase thereof, in the conduct of its members who conceal party membership, in its numerous front organizations operating under false labels, in the campaign of falsehood against the United States now in effect throughout the world through Communist channels and in the flagrant violation of international agreements by the Communist-dominated government of the Soviet Union. No better case in point could be cited than the evidence contained in the documents on Nazi-Soviet relations, 1939–41, published by the State Department. In other words duplicity is innate in the Communist movement which was advised by Lenin to "resort to all sorts of devices, maneuvers, and illegal methods, to evasion and subterfuge," [207] in order to accomplish its purpose. It is in this light that the following Communist denials regarding the use of force and violence must be considered:

(Statement of William Z. Foster, chairman of the Communist Party, U. S. A.:)

"Question. Does the Communist Party advocate the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence or by any other unconstitutional means?

"Answer. We'll let the Supreme Court of the United States answer this question for us. In its decision in the Schneiderman case, June 1943, after examining exhaustively, on the one hand, the charges that the Communist Party advocates a violent seizure of power and on the other hand, the practices and doctrines of the party, including the writings of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin, the Court said:

"'A tenable conclusion from the foregoing is that the party in 1927 desired to achieve its purpose by peaceful and democratic means, and as a theoretical matter justified the use of force and violence only as a method of preventing an attempted forcible counteroverthrow once the party had obtained control in a peaceful manner, or as a method of last resort to enforce the majority will if at some indefinite time in the future because of peculiar circumstances constitutional or peaceful channels were no longer open.'

"We Communists accept this formulation as a fair statement of our attitude toward the question of political violence. American Communists have always recognized the historical fact that parties with advanced social programs cannot secure governmental power by conspiratorial methods or by minority coup d'état. * * * The danger of violence in such situations always comes from the reactionary elements, who refuse to bow to the democratic majority will." [208]

Mr. Foster did not state that the majority opinion in the Schneiderman case also declared that "This Court has never passed upon the question of whether the Party does so advocate, and it is unnecessary for us to do so now." [209] It is generally conceded by legal authorities at the present time that the fact that Russia was an ally at the time of the decision and the pressing need of national and international unity for the task of defeating the Axis Powers, created an atmosphere conducive to a favorable decision in this precedent-making case, of which the Court could not have been unmindful. It is also generally conceded that the "cold war" now being waged by the Soviet Union and its Communist satellites against the United States and the attitude of this group toward its treaty pledges and the democratic rights of national groups has dissipated this favorable atmosphere and has disillusioned those who may have cherished some hope of Communist adoption of democratic and peaceful methods. There is good ground for the belief that a future test case before the United States Supreme Court will result in a decisive opinion regarding the party's advocacy of overthrow of government by force and violence. In publishing this report, our committee seeks to aid in clarifying this issue.

In his pamphlet entitled "Is Communism Un-American?" Eugene Dennis, general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States, has voiced a similar denial of advocacy of force and violence:

"Question. The party's aim is the violent overthrow of the American system.

"Answer. The position of the Communist Party on this question is definitely embodied in the constitution of the Communist Party which states:

"'Adherence to or participation in the activities of any clique, group or circle, faction or party, which conspires or acts to subvert, undermine, weaken or overthrow any or all institutions of American democracy, whereby the majority of the American people can maintain their right to determine their destinies in any degree, shall be punished by immediate expulsion * * *.'

"Force and violence—resistance to the process of basic social change—have always been initiated and exercised by reactionary classes bent on maintaining their power and privileges against the will of the overwhelming majority." [210]

There are a number of cleverly concocted loopholes in these formulations. Whether it be in a strike against an employer or in an attempted invasion of a weaker nation, the forces of international communism have adhered to Hitler's technique of blaming any resultant violence upon the victim of the attack. On May 30, 1937, the Communists organized and led a riot against the Republic Steel plant in Chicago in which a number of persons were injured and 10 were killed. A coroner's jury investigation disclosed that the riot had been carefully prepared by the Communists even to the extent of provision for Red Cross supplies and motion-picture cameras. The entire Communist press then proceeded to place the blame upon the Republic Steel Corp. and the Chicago police force.[211]

Speaking on November 29, 1939, and in defense of the unjustified Soviet invasion of little Finland, V. M. Molotov, Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs, brazenly declared:

"Men and women, citizens of the Soviet Union, the hostile policy pursued by the present Government of Finland toward our country compels us to take immediate measures to insure the external security of our state. * * * In recent days abominable provocations have been initiated by the Finnish militarists on the frontier between the Soviet Union and Finland * * *." [212]

This policy of blaming the victim of Communist attack for any ensuing violence, drew forth the following sarcastic comment from Chief Justice Harlan Stone in the Schneiderman case:

"We need not stop to consider the much-discussed question whether this means that that force was to be used if established governments should be so misguided as to refuse to make themselves over into proletarian dictatorships by amendment of their governmental structures, or should have the effrontery to defend themselves from lawless or subversive attacks. For in any case the end contemplated was the overthrow of government, and the measures advocated were force and violence." [213]

As another loophole it should be noted that the Communist constitution prohibits action against "any and all institutions of American democracy, whereby the majority of the American people can maintain their right to determine their destinies in any degree." Subversion is not prohibited against existing institutions of the American Government. Thus the Communists have only to decide for themselves that such institutions are not of a nature "whereby the majority of the American people can maintain their right to determine their destinies," or decide that a majority is motivated toward force and violence toward the institutions of American democracy, and the prohibition immediately loses its validity. Those who remember the facility with which the Communists transformed their conception of the United States as a peace-loving democracy into one of warmongering imperialism immediately after the signing of the Stalin-Hitler pact in August 1939, will therefore place little reliance upon this obvious, face-saving, legalistic formula.

The sincerity and reliability of Mr. Foster's denial of his party's advocacy of overthrow of our Government by force and violence are seriously impugned by his avowed hostility toward this Government as expressed as recently as March 1948 in the party's official monthly organ, Political Affairs. Here he refers to the United States as being one of two "hostile camps," that of "imperialism,

[206] The Way Out, by Earl Browder (International Publishers, New York, 1941), p. 191.

[207] "Left-wing" Communism, An Infantile Disorder, by V. I. Lenin (International Publishers, New York, 1934), p. 38.

[208] New York Herald Tribune, January 11, 1948, p. 38.

[209] *Schneiderman* v. *United States*, 320 U. S. 118, at p. 148.

[210] Is Communism Un-American? by Eugene Dennis (New Century Publishers, New York, March 1947), p. 7.

[211] Chicago Sunday Tribune, July 25, 1937; Chicago Daily News, July 21, 1937; Chicago Daily Tribune, July 22, 1937; Chicago Daily Times, July 22, 1937; Chicago Evening American, July 22, 1937.

[212] U. S. S. R. Foreign Policy by Victor A. Yakhontoff (Coward-McCann, Inc., New York, 1945), p. 225.

[213] *Schneiderman* v. *United States*, 320 U. S. 118, at p. 190.

fascism, and war," against which he juxtaposes the U. S. S. R. standing for "democracy and peace." He charges the United States with "ruthless determination to rule the world," and "a domestic program of general political reaction, wild profiteering, and warmongering." He demands that "The Anglo-American imperialists must be stopped cold by superior democratic mass pressure for peace." Current Communist literature is replete with such expressions of antagonism toward the American Government.

Similarly Mr. Foster's repudiation of minority coups d'état and his alleged reliance upon majority rule, must be weighed in the light of the historical fact that wherever the Communists have taken over power both in Russia and in the so-called puppet states, it has been through the coup d'état technique everywhere with Mr. Foster's approval and that of his organization. The Supreme Court's acceptance of these assurances of peaceful intent in the Schneiderman case can well be understood at the time, since the subsequent minority, terrorist coups d'état in Yugoslavia, Hungary, Albania, Bulgaria, Poland, Rumania, Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia had not yet occurred.

Communists, the world over, have displayed a remarkable facility in applying their doctrine of two truths. The disclaimer regarding advocacy of overthrow of government by force and violence is a truth intended to disarm and confuse those outside of the Communist movement. For the Communist insiders the opposite is the truth. In the September 1945 edition of the constitution of the Communist Party of the United States of America, in which acts to subvert, undermine, weaken, or overthrow any or all institutions of American democracy are abjured, we find the preamble declaring:

"The Communist Party of the United States is the political party of the American working class, basing itself upon the principles of scientific socialism, Marxism-Leninism."

Thus the party initiate is advised that the basic Marxist-Leninist doctrines calling for support of overthrow of government by force and violence, are still in force.

COMMUNIST DISCIPLINE

Although the majority opinion of the Supreme Court in the Schneiderman case held that "under our traditions beliefs are personal and not a matter of mere associations, and * * * men in adhering to a political party or other organizations do not subscribed unqualifiedly to all of its platforms or asserted principles." [214]

It is highly significant that William Z. Foster did not repeat this statement in his answers to questions in the New York Herald Tribune of January 11, 1948. To have done so would have been to repudiate the principle of iron discipline which is basic with the Communist Party. As late as 1948, No. 31 of the Little Lenin Library, published by International Publishers, official American Communist Party publishing house, published the statement of Joseph Stalin calling attention to the need of iron discipline in the party. [215]

The official program of the Communist International, never repudiated or repealed, defines the Communist Party as a revolutionary organization, bound by iron discipline.

In July 1935, the Workers Library Publishers, official Communist Party, U. S. A., publishing house, issued a pamphlet by J. Peters, entitled "The Communist Party, a Manual on Organization." To establish the authority of this publication, it included an introduction by Jack Stachel, who is now a leading member of the National Board of the Communist Party, U. S. A., chairman of its educational commission, and a member of the editorial board of the party's theoretical organ, Political Affairs, who declared:

"The manual embodies, therefore, the best that is available in the theory and practice of organization in our own party and the Communist International."

This authoritative pamphlet clearly sets down the nature of Communist Party discipline and the responsibility which each individual member owes to the principles and decisions of that organization, as follows:

"It is clear, however, that basic principles and decisions, such as, for example, the program of the Communist International, cannot be questioned in the party. * * * We do not question the theory of the necessity for the forceful overthrow of capitalism. We do not question the correctness of the revolutionary theory of the class struggle laid down by Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin. * * * We do not question the political correctness of the decisions, resolutions, etc., of the executive committee of the CI, of the convention of the party, or of the Central Committee after they are ratified. * * *

"This discipline is based upon the acceptance of the CI and the party program. * * * There can be no discipline in the party if there is no conscious and voluntary submission on the basis of a thorough understanding of the decisions of the party. 'Only conscious discipline can be truly iron discipline' (Stalin).

"WHY DO COMMUNISTS ATTACH SO MUCH IMPORTANCE TO DISCIPLINE?

"Because without discipline there is no unity of will, no unity of action * * *. The class war is bitter. The enemy is powerful; it has all the means of deceit and suppression (armed forces, militia, police, courts, movies, radio, press, schools, churches, etc.). In order to combat and defeat this powerful enemy, the army of the proletariat must have a highly skilled, trained general staff (the Communist Party), which is united in action and has one will. How can any army fight against the army of the enemy if every soldier in the army is allowed to question and even disobey orders of his superior officers?

"Our party cannot lead the masses if there is not unity in action. Unity of will and action can be achieved only if all the members of the party act as one—are disciplined." [216]

Article III, section 2, of the 1945 constitution of the Communist Party of the United States of America, declares:

"Any person eligible for membership according to section 1, who accepts the aims, principles, and program of the party as determined by its constitution and conventions, who holds membership in and attends club meetings, who is active on behalf of the party, who reads the party press and literature and pays dues regularly, shall be considered a member."

If it were not clear from the foregoing that we are dealing here with a party of "a new type," in which neither differences of opinion nor disagreement with basic principles is tolerated, then the long list of expulsions and liquidations of the most prominent Communists in Russia and in the United States for alleged deviations from the line of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin would certainly clinch the point. This is a phenomenon entirely absent from our traditional political parties, which tolerate almost limitless divergence of opinion. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, for example, has eliminated the following members of its controlling committee: Bukharin, Kamenev, Lominadse, Radek, Rykov, Tomsky, Trotsky, Zinoviev, and many others. Most recently the eminent Soviet economist Eugene Varga was excoriated. Bukharin, the leading Soviet theoretician after Lenin, was charged by Stalin with "departure from the Marxist-Leninist theory of the class struggle." Trotsky was castigated for his "negation of Lenin's theory of the proletarian revolution." [217] In 1929 Jay Lovestone was expelled from his post as executive secretary of the Communist Party of the United States and from membership in the party as a result of charges made by Joseph Stalin before the Presidium of the Communist International that Lovestone was opposed to "the line of the Comintern within the ranks of the American party, the idea of bolshevization of the American party, the idea of struggle against deviations from the Marxian position, and especially the Right deviation, the idea of Leninist unity in the party. * * *" [218]

In 1945, Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist Political Association, as the Communist Party of the United States was then known, was summarily expelled following a criticism from Jacques Duclos, French Communist leader and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International. Speaking before the special convention of the Communist Political Association on July 26–28, 1945, William Z. Foster, present chairman of the Communist Party, U. S. A., castigated Browder for his crimes as follows:

"Browder's line is a rejection of the Marxian economic doctrines * * * he rejects Marx's theory of surplus value and of the exploitation of the workers. * * * Browder's line is a rejection of the Marxian principles of the class struggle. * * * Browder's line is a rejection of the Marxian concept of the progressive and revolutionary initiative of the working class. * * * Browder's line is a rejection of the Leninist theory of imperialism as the final stage of capitalism. * * * Browder's line is a rejection of the Marxian-Leninist perspective of socialism. * * * From all of this, it should be clear that Browder is preaching anti-Marxism, in fact 'a notorious revision of Marxism,' as Duclos said." [219]

Under these circumstances it is difficult at this time to defend the view of the majority of the United States Supreme Court as far as it applies to members of the Communist Party, U. S. A., that "under our traditions beliefs are personal and not a matter of mere association, and * * * men in adhering to a political party or other organization notoriously do not subscribe unqualifiedly to all of its platforms or asserted principles." [220]

It is clearly shown that the Communist Party, U. S. A., is in no sense a political party according to our traditions, that contrary to the practice in other American political parties, membership in the Communist Party does imply complete and unqualified compliance with all its platforms and asserted principles, and that failure to so comply, even in the cases of top-flight Communist leaders, has been punished by expulsion and even physical liquidation.

A much more tenable position was taken in the case of *United States* v. *Wallis*, [221] where it was held that disavowal of any personal belief in or intention to use force and violence, coupled with a denial that it was a Communist principle of action, was no defense where evidence was educed to prove that it was part of the program of the Communist Party. Current developments should persuade the Supreme Court to adopt this

---

[214] *Schneiderman* v. *United States*, 320 U. S. 118, at p. 136.

[215] On the Theory of Marxism by Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, V. I. Lenin, Joseph Stalin, p. 31.

[216] The Communist Party—A Manual on Organization, by J. Peters (Workers Library Publishers, New York, 1935), pp. 8, 26, 27, 28.

[217] Leninism, Selected Writings by Joseph Stalin (International Publishers, New York), pp. 23 and 98.

[218] Speech before Presidium of the Communist International on May 14, 1929, by Joseph Stalin, submitted in testimony of Jay Lovestone, Hearings, Special Committee on Un-American Activities, vol. 11, p. 7114.

[219] The Struggle Against Revisionism, by William Z. Foster in Political Affairs, September 1945, pp. 782–799.

[220] *Schneiderman* v. *United States* (320 U. S. 118) at p. 136.

[221] 268 Fed. 413 (S. D. N. Y., 1920).

more realistic and accurate position in the forthcoming cases.

Finally it should be noted that in 1947, long after the adoption of the constitution of the Communist Party, U. S. A., and its avowed eschewment of force and violence, we find William Z. Foster, present chairman of the organization, referring to the revolutions in Yugoslavia, Poland, and other countries in central and eastern Europe, as follows from his recent book, The New Europe (p. 18):

"The essence of this revolution is that the peoples in these countries, during the war, with the potent help of the Red Army, drove out the Fascist invaders and also smashed their own big capitalists and landlords who almost unanimously joined the Fascists. In these struggles the old states' machinery was destroyed. * * *"

It must be remembered that Communists label opponents indiscriminately as "Fascists," "capitalists," or "landlords." What we have here therefore is a modern formulation of Marx' advice to "smash" the "bureaucratic-military machine."

THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

The Communist Party of the United States is part of a world-wide Communist organization. The American Communist Party, together with the Communist Parties in other countries, might well be likened to spokes in a wheel, the hub of which is the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. All of the parties are working together under the central control and guidance of the Soviet Communists toward a single aim—the subversion of the world to a Soviet dictatorship.

The Communist Party in this country has functioned as a section of the world Communist organization since the day of the party's organization here in 1919.

A more detailed proof of the American Communists' basic and continuous role as a link in world-wide Communist conspiracy directed by Moscow will be found in a 56-page report based on documentary evidence which was issued by the Committee on Un-American Activities of April 1, 1947. The report is entitled "The Communist Party of the United States as an Agent of a Foreign Power."

It is necessary to amplify certain features regarding the Communist International, however. The continued existence of the Communist International after its supposed dissolution was evidenced by the assumption by former Communist International leaders of controlling positions in European countries which have been subverted to Soviet puppet states, during and since the Second World War. In every instance, the legally constituted governments of these countries were overthrown by Communist resort to force and violence. Among the Comintern leaders who thus assumed positions of power are: Georgi Dimitrov, former general secretary of the Communist International and now Prime Minister of Bulgaria; Clement Gottwald, former member of the Comintern Executive Committee and now Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia; Anna Pauker, former member of the Comintern Executive Committee and now Foreign Minister of Rumania; Boleslaw Bierut, a leading Polish Comintern agent and now that country's President; Matyas Rakosi, former member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International and now Deputy Prime Minister of Hungary.

Open, above-ground activity by the Communist International was resumed in September 1947 as a result of a meeting of European Communist leaders in Poland. It comes as no surprise that this new version of the Comintern, which is called the Communist Information Bureau or Cominform, has openly enrolled the Communist Parties of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Poland, and Hungary where the old Comintern officials are in command. Also avowed members of the Cominform are the Communist Parties of the Soviet satellite, Yugoslavia, and of France and Italy. Master of the international alliance, however, is the Soviet Union, which sent two of Stalin's most trusted lieutenants to help organize the new information bureau, and to serve as permanent representatives of the Russian Communist Party. These are A. Zhdanov and G. Malenkov, both of whom serve on the powerful Politburo of the Soviet Government and on the secretariat of the Russian Communist Party. They presented the leading reports at this conference.

Undoubtedly reasons of expediency have prevented Communist Parties in other nations from declaring open affiliation with the Cominform. This is admitted by the Communists of the United States, who support the Cominform enthusiastically but explain that they cannot affiliate officially because unfavorable reaction to the party will increase among citizens of the United States. Here is how the National Board of the Communist Party, U. S. A., put it:

"The establishment of an information bureau by nine Communist Parties of Europe is of great significance. * * *

"These Communist Parties are the leaders of the working class and peoples of their countries. They are the champions of national freedom, social progress, economic reconstruction, democratic advance, and world peace. * * *

"It is already clear that their joint declaration of views and their formation of an information bureau has everywhere strengthened patriots defending national freedom and the cause of peace, making more effective their resistance to the program of imperialist expansion, intervention, and war, of which Wall Street is the chief instigator.

"Considering the question of whether or not to seek affiliation to the new information bureau, the national board of the Communist Party has concluded that the present political situation in the United States is such that the Communist Party should not affiliate. The reactionary and pro-Fascist forces now whipping up anti-Communist hysteria and war incitement in our country would undoubtedly seize upon such action by the American Communist Party as a pretext for new provocations and repressions against the Communists and all other sections of the American labor and progressive movement. * * *"[222]

The Cominform's official publication, entitled, in accordance with typical Communist double talk, "For a Lasting Peace; For a People's Democracy," is a new vehicle for directives from the Soviet Union to the other Communist Parties of the world. Words from Soviet Communist leaders are given the greatest prominence in this publication, which is printed at the Cominform headquarters in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, and translated into many languages.

A front-page editorial in the initial issue of the Cominform organ, dated November 10, 1947, lays down the rule that:

"Communist Parties everywhere must become a leader or organizer of the popular masses in the struggle for peace and a people's democracy."

The same editorial explains that the leader of the struggle for peace" is the Soviet Union, which has sworn to resist the attempts of the United States to plunge the world into another war. A people's democracy is interpreted as the form of government found in the Soviet Union and its satellite states, in contrast to the "fascist-like" United States, where monopoly capital allegedly rules.

The initial issue of the Cominform organ also prints the following unmistakable command:

"The plan for the economic and political enslavement of Europe by American imperialism is being supplemented by plans for the economic and political enslavement of China, Indonesia, the South American countries. * * *

"Under these circumstances it is necessary that the anti-imperialist, democratic camp should close its ranks, draw up an agreed program of actions, and work out its own tactics against the main forces of the imperialist camp, against American imperialism and its British and French allies, against the right-wing Socialists, primarily in Britain and France. * * *

"The Communist Parties * * * must take into their hands the banner of defense of the national independence and sovereignty of their countries. If the Communist Parties stick firmly to their positions, if they do not let themselves be intimidated and blackmailed, if they courageously safeguard democracy and the national sovereignty, liberty, and independence of their countries, if in their struggle against attempts to enslave their countries economically and politically they be able to take the lead of all the forces that are ready to fight for honor and national independence, no plans for the enslavement of the countries of Europe and Asia can be carried into effect.

"This is now one of the principal tasks of the Communist Parties."

RESORT TO FORCE AND VIOLENCE BY FOREIGN COMMUNIST PARTIES

We have shown above how slavishly the American Communist Party has devoted itself to the revolutionary strategy, tactics, and principles of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, involving advocacy of and resort to force and violence. Considering the fact that the Communist Parties in other countries are part of a world party, controlled by Moscow, considering also that the Communist Party, U. S. A., is a disciplined part of this world organization, it is relevant to examine the present tactics of some of these Communist Parties to determine to what extent they have actually put into practice a policy of resorting to overthrow of constitutional government by force and violence. If the pattern of the world Communist Party is viewed in its proper perspective, it must be realized that foreign Communist parties engaged in open, civil conflict, are replicas of the American party, merely in a more advanced stage of revolutionary development. What the Communists in China or Greece are doing today is what the American Communists would do under similar circumstances.

Demonstrating that the Communist resort to force and violence in other countries is merely an extension of the same fundamental Communist principles to which the American party is similarly devoted, is the fact that the domestic Communist Party, its press and spokesmen have given unreserved support to these foreign movements. There has never been any repudiation or criticism of their resort to forcible and violent methods by the Communist Party, U. S. A., despite its claimed repugnance for such tactics.

STATE DEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENCE

In order to secure the completest possible information on this question, our committee addressed the following letter to Secretary of State George C. Marshall on January 12, 1948:

Hon. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Our committee is considering legislation dealing with the Communist Party of the United States. As you well know, this organization is an integral part of a highly disciplined national movement together with the Communist parties of nations throughout the world.

We should like to have, therefore, if it is available, a study showing examples of resort to force and violence by Communist parties in various countries.

This memorandum will be very useful in our efforts to establish the fact that the Communist Party of the United States of America,

[222] Political Affairs, December 1947, p. 1141.

from the time of its inception to the present time, is an organization that writes, circulates, distributes, prints, publishes, and displays printed matter advising, advocating, or teaching the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States.

Very sincerely,

J. PARNELL THOMAS, *Chairman.*

On February 2, 1948, we received the following reply from Mr. Charles E. Bohlen, counselor of the Department of State:

The Honorable J. PARNELL THOMAS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. THOMAS: In your letter of January 12 you ask for any studies that might be available in the Department which would show examples of resort to force and violence by Communist parties in various countries.

The information you seek is not susceptible to documentary proof. As you will realize, any such activities are conspiratorial in nature and are covered up to the fullest possible extent. The information which we have consists of expressions of opinion or analyses of internal situations in various foreign countries which come to us from confidential sources. The nature of the sources of this information and the fact that it deals with the internal affairs of other countries make it unsuitable for public discussion.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. BOHLEN, *Counselor*
(For the Secretary of State).

In the absence of data from the State Department, our committee consulted reliable reports appearing in the American press and elsewhere. The result of these findings we now present.

CHINA

The revolutionary plans of Soviet leaders regarding China are virtually a matter of public record. Joseph Stalin himself declared before the enlarged executive committee of the Communist International on November 30, 1926:

"One thing is clear, that it is the chief duty of the Chinese Communists to fight to prepare the way for the development of the Chinese revolution." [223]

The Soviet-directed Communist International issued the following declaration on the subject during its world congress in Moscow in 1928:

"In China the revolution will place before the party the preparation for and carrying through of armed insurrection as the sole path to the completion of the bourgeoise democratic revolution * * * the overthrow from power of the Kuomintang * * * and the creation of the rule of the Soviets." [224]

Like an echo are the words of the leader of the Chinese Communists, Mao Tse-tung, in 1938:

"Armed struggle is the salient form of China's revolution. We Communists never conceal or disguise our political aims. Our future or ultimate program is to advance China into the realm of doubted." [225]

There are few tactics of violence that the Chinese Communists have not used in pursuing their revolutionary objective. Open, armed assaults by Communist armies in China are the subject of almost daily reports in the press, the following of which is typical:

"The attack of the Communist armies against Mukden has gained in intensity in the last few days.

"The government troops are fighting desperately against heavy odds." [226]

Guerrilla raiding aimed at wrecking the Government through economic chaos is another of the Chinese Communist tactics, which has been forcefully described by William C. Bullitt:

"The Communists use guerrilla tactics moving swiftly and attacking at night, hiding in villages and resting in the daytime.

"They are attempting to bring down the Government not by destroying its armed forces but by wrecking the economic life of the country. Hence they do not hesitate to burn towns and villages, destroy railroads and blow up industrial installations, such as power plants which they cannot carry away." [227]

Secretary of State George C. Marshall supported this view when he said that the Chinese Communists—

" * * * do not hesitate at the most drastic measures to gain their end as, for instance, the destruction of communications in order to wreck the economy of China and produce a situation that would facilitate the overthrow or collapse of the Government, without any regard to the immediate suffering of the people involved." [228]

Regarding the primary object of the Chinese Communist activities, former ambassador Bullitt has the following to say:

"Soviet imperialism, following in the footsteps of Czarist imperialism, and using the Chinese Communists as instruments of Soviet power politics, is striving to reduce China to the status of a satellite of the Soviet Union." [229]

Terrorism, brutality, and a wanton disregard for human life are also essential elements of the Communist revolution in China. Geraldine Fitch, a China resident since 1919 who has made a special study of communism, states:

"Chinese communism, like Russian communism, advances not by the support of the people and popularity with them, but by the use of terrorism and intimidation, oftimes by ruthless purging of opposition.

"In 1927 the young Red leader at Pheng Phi near Swatow had a large sign written in blood over his cave headquarters, announcing that the Russian advisers had instructed the Chinese Reds to kill eight groups of villagers, including religious people of any sect and those who favored a capitalist America. And kill them they did, by the score." [230]

H. E. Paul Yu-Pin, D. D., archbishop of Nanking, China, related in his Report on China to Institute of Chinese Culture and reprinted in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 13, page A4599, that:

"Some months ago, in Inner Mongolia, in the Province of Charhar, in the city of Chungli, the Communist troops overran this little Christian village of 3,000 people and slaughtered half of the population. Church buildings were destroyed.

"Sungshu Twei Tsi is a town of the Province of Jehol in Inner Mongolia. This is a Christian community of 2,000 people. Communist troops invaded the town. They murdered hundreds of Christian inhabitants.

"Recently the famous Trappist monastery in Young Kai Ping, Charhar Province, Inner Mongolia, was overrun by the Communist troops, 80 Chinese Trappist monks—noble men who never harmed their fellow men—were captured and taken away as prisoners. The monastery was burned to the ground. What happened to the monks?

"A Polish bishop in North China, together with 12 priests and sisters, were beaten by the Communists."

The Reverend Calvert Alexander, editor of the Jesuit Missions magazine, in releasing the first documented charges against Chinese Communists in connection with the campaign against the church in Communist-occupied areas, declared in February 1948 that Chinese Communists were killing all American missionaries captured in northern China, both Catholic and Protestants. The documented report maintained that:

"1. Forty-nine Catholic priests and lay brothers had been 'executed, murdered, or tortured to death' by Chinese Communists in the last 2 years.

"2. All church property was being seized for Communist use.

"3. Church leaders are being arrested, fined, expelled, imprisoned, or executed." [231]

Freda Utley, a former Communist who first saw China in 1928 when she delivered instructions from the Comintern in Moscow to Chinese Communist leaders, and who has frequently revisited China since then, has stated:

"* * * Not only is there abundant evidence that the Chinese Communist Party leaders have wholeheartedly adopted the same philosophy as the rulers of Soviet Russia; not only do they believe that the end justifies the means and that lying, cheating, political chicanery, cruelty, even murder are the means which must be adopted to win and retain power for the Communist Party, they have already advanced some distance along the same road to tyranny as the Russian Communist Party trod long ago * * *." [232]

Mrs. Utley also found that "like the Bolsheviks before them," the Chinese Communists "have already started to solve the agrarian problem by the mass murder of 'kulaks.'" She further pointed out that not even Japanese onslaught on China in World War II called a halt to Chinese Communists' brutal aggression against fellow Chinese. In her recent book, Last Chance in China, she stated:

"Lin Yutang, who was sympathetic to the Communists in the early years of the war, has written: 'For every Japanese they claim to have killed, the Communists have killed at least five Chinese. For every town they have captured from the Japanese they have captured 50 towns from other Chinese. Of the hundreds of "clashes" per year they claim to their credit, a fair percentage must include those with the Chinese "enemy"—half of their weapons have been robbed from other Chinese guerrillas and regular units * * *.'" [233]

Coupled with reports of the brutal and wholesale destruction of life and property in the Chinese civil war are numerous accounts of direct military support to the Chinese revolutionaries from the Soviet Union.

Dr. William M. McGovern, Northwestern University professor who recently made a survey of the Far East in the capacity of special investigator for the House Foreign Affairs Committee, reported to his committee in March 1948 that Russia has been supplying arms and ammunition to the Chinese Communists for 2 years, using both captured Japanese stocks and new weapons and material produced with equipment taken from captured Japanese munition plants.[234]

Evidence that Russia's military intervention extends back to the earliest days of the Chinese civil war, however, has been offered

---

[223] Speech by D. Z. Manuilsky, published in pamphlets, China in Revolt, literary department, Daily Worker, 1927, p. 11.

[224] Thesis of the Revolutionary Movement in the Colonies and Semi-Colonies, adopted by the Communist International in 1928 (Workers Library Publishers, New York), p. 49.

[225] The Fight for a New China, by Mao Tse-tung (New Century Publishers, New York, December 1945), p. 37.

[226] Washington Evening Star, January 2, 1948, p. A-9.

[227] William C. Bullitt, A Report to the American People on China, Life Magazine, October 13, 1947, p. 140.

[228] Freda Utley, Last Chance in China (Bobbs-Merrill Co., New York, 1947), p. 175.

[229] William C. Bullitt, A Report to the American People on China, op. cit., p. 35.

[230] Blunder Out of China, article by Geraldine Fitch extended into the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, pt. 13, p. A3962.

[231] Washington Times-Herald, February 7, 1948, p. 6.

[232] Freda Utley, Last Chance in China (Bobbs-Merrill Co., New York, 1947), p. 161.

[233] Ibid., pp. 163 and 203.

[234] Washington Daily News, March 7, 1948, p. 5.

by George E. Sokolsky, author and columnist who served as American correspondent in China from 1920 to 1930 among other varied duties in that country. Mr. Sokolsky stated in his newspaper column of November 28, 1947:

"I can testify, from personal knowledge and experience, that this Chinese Communist group was organized by Michael Borodin, who, with Marshal Blucher, then called General Galens, and about 100 Russian civilian and military advisers, came to China in 1924 and remained until 1927, when they were dismissed by Chiang. * * *

"The top command of the present Chinese Communists' group consists of men who were then in the Third International, some of whom studied in Red Army schools, attended conferences at Baku and Moscow, and whose relationship to the Third International was recorded in the official minutes of this body as released in several languages in its official organ called the International Press Correspondence." [235]

In another column, Mr. Sokolsky described the results of a raid conducted on a compound lying west of the Soviet Embassy on April 6, 1927, by Chinese police and troops, armed with a warrant countersigned by the dean of the diplomatic corps in Peking:

"The raid resulted in the arrest of important members of the revolutionary party and the discovery of banners to be used by the revolutionaries in an uprising, seals, rosters, and other incriminating evidence and documents.

"Besides there was discovered large quantities of arms and munitions such as machine guns, rifles, and cartridges and documentary evidence of communications between the Soviet Government and the revolutionary party.

"All these were found either in premises directly under control of the Soviet Embassy or in offices intimately connected with the Embassy."

Among the documents discovered in the raid, Mr. Sokolsky states, was a certified copy of an obligation to compensate the U. S. S. R. for "military and other supplies received," together with a receipt for supplies valued in the amount of 6,395,642 rubles. The obligation and receipt, dated August 1926, Moscow, was signed by Feng Yu-Hsiang, who Sokolsky points out "is now in the United States attacking his own Government and strengthening public support for the Chinese Communists." [236]

William R. Johnson, a resident of China for 39 years, who was active in international relief projects in that country, corroborates the position taken by Mr. Sokolsky by stating in the December 1947 issue of the China Monthly (p. 5):

"Russian preparations for such a conquest of China have been continuous since, by arrangements with Dr. Sun Yat-sen, Russian agents began the training of thousands of Chinese in all the techniques of Bolshevist revolutionary activity in South China in 1924 * * *."

It is worth noting at this point that the Moscow-directed Communist International in an obvious attempt to hasten the overthrow of the Chinese Government, demanded and obtained the dismissal of the entire central committee of the Chinese Communist Party in 1927. The change in leadership was necessary, the Comintern asserted, because the central committee had "ignored" the Comintern's instructions for—

"A rapid and most determined development of the peasant revolution. * * *

"The organization of armed mass resistance to the external (Chiang Kai-shek) and internal (Sai Do-in, Sen Ki-chiang, etc.) counterrevolution by arming the workers and by an influx of workers and Communists into the army." [237]

Reports of direct Soviet aid to its warring Chinese agents since the end of World War II are numerous. It has been emphasized that temporary Soviet occupation of Manchuria after the war vastly facilitated such aid. Describing an announcement from the Chinese National Government, Clyde Farnsworth said in the Washington Daily News of December 1, 1947 (p. 12):

"Discreetly but nonetheless plainly this Nanking statement implies that Russian occupation of Manchuria in its belated war with Japan helped set the stage for China's civil war.

" 'The infiltration of Chinese Communists into Manchuria during and following Soviet occupation constituted a new factor in the Communist impassee after VJ-day,' said the long note * * *

"The Nanking response recited first that, on VJ-day, the Government faced Communist troops numbering 310,000 in addition to a larger number of so-called Red militia and that the situation in Manchuria offered the Reds 'more and better equipment.' "

On the same point, H. E. Paul Yu-Pin, D. D., archbishop of Nanking, China, has said:

"The Chinese Communist armies, sheltered, equipped, and in part officered by the Russian Army, attempted to establish independent sovereignty in Manchuria. These armies met in battle with the armies of the Chinese Government.

"The Soviet plan was to use the time gained by the armistice to transfer as many Communist troops as possible from north China to Manchuria and there to arm them with the abundant Japanese supplies and equipment which the Russian Army surrendered.

"In the war in China the Communist forces have fighting for them, not only Chinese Communist troops, but also Korean troops, Mongolian soldiers, Japanese troops, and Russian officers. These international brigades comprise one-third of the Communist force in Manchuria. Some officers of the Russian Army direct military operations. Russia supplies much of the war materials used by the Chinese Communists, most of the guns, ammunitions, and artillery used were surrendered to Russia by Japan; some of the supplies are part of American and British lend-lease to Russia * * *." [238]

On June 25, 1947, the American press carried the following announcement:

"Chiang Kai-shek's chief of staff conceded today his armies in Manchuria were in a perilous position and accused Russia of giving the Communists 'substantial' help in the civil war." [239]

This followed by only a few days a charge by Dr. Sun Fo, Vice President of China, that Korean troops from Russian-controlled north Korea were fighting with the Chinese Communists; that the Government had information, not definitely confirmed, that Chinese Communists were being trained by Russians in a school in eastern Siberia and that the port of Dairen has been maintained by the Russians to serve as a supply base for the Chinese Communists. [240]

The Washington Daily News of December 16, 1947 (p. 18), carried news from Shanghai that—

"The usually reliable Chinese newspaper Wahkiu Yatpao reported today Russia has agreed to train and equip 11 Chinese Communist divisions for the north China war.

"The paper said the training program was part of a six-point military pact between the Chinese Communists and Russia reached during three conferences in Moscow last month."

Constantine Brown, columnist and foreign-affairs expert for the Washington Evening Star, observed in his column of June 12, 1947 (p. A-13), that:

"The unexpected appearance of a small Soviet air force in China is causing new headaches for diplomatic and military officials. Troops of the Mongolian People's Republic—a state which, while not formally a member of the Soviet Union, is entirely controlled by the U. S. S. R.—have invaded the western Chinese Province of Sinkiang to a depth of as much as 200 miles.

"A Soviet bombardment group of four planes is reported to have strafed the Chinese forces and killed some civilians as well."

Hanson W. Baldwin, writing for the New York Times, of October 12, 1947 (p. 17), asserted that:

"The Communist armies unquestionably have been helped somewhat with material, largely ammunition, but particularly with leadership and direction by Russia."

Another New York Times article, appearing on October 19, 1947 (p. 54), observed that Michael Keon, an Australian journalist who had just spent 6 months "in almost every part of the Communist-controlled areas in Shantung," found that Chinese Communists in Shantung had been receiving a limited amount of Russian material aid through Chefoo before that port was captured by the Nationalist troops. Keon was also reported to have seen a Soviet merchant vessel making three trips into Chefoo and to have learned there was a steady traffic by small Chinese ships between Chefoo and Dairen and other Manchurian ports. Keon further reached the conclusion that Chinese Communists in Manchuria cooperated closely with the Russians.

Clyde Farnsworth, reporting in the Washington Daily News of December 19, 1947, stated that:

"Informed Chinese said the Russians had rearmed China's Reds with 1,500,000 rifles, 500,000 machine guns, 20,000 mortars and other artillery pieces."

On November 30, 1947, within 2 months after the revamped Communist International, known as the Cominform, was proclaimed to the world, the following dispatch from Nanking was carried by the New York Times (p. 47):

"A far eastern 'Cominform' was set up in the Communist-controlled Manchurian city of Harbin on November 20, according to usually reliable Chinese press reports received from Changchun today. The conference was attended by delegates from the Soviet Union, Outer Mongolia, Korea, and China."

It is interesting to note, in this connection, that C. L. Sulzberger, writing in the New York Times on December 25, 1947 (p. E-3), reported one of the objectives of the entire Cominform apparatus to be "to keep supplies and promises flowing to Communist guerrillas fighting civil wars in Greece and China."

That the Communist revolution in China is a do-or-die enterprise is all too evident. President Chiang Kai-shek said on April 18, 1947:

"If the Chinese Communist Party abandons its policy of seizing power by force and cooperates to achieve the unity of the nation, it still has an opportunity to join the Government and to participate in the work of national reconstruction." [241]

---

[235] These Days, by George E. Sokolsky, Washington Times-Herald, November 28, 1947, p. 15.

[236] These Days, by George E. Sokolsky, Washington Times-Herald, January 9, 1948, p. 11.

[237] The Communist International (a "report on the activity of the Communist International during the period which elapsed between the Fifth and the Sixth International Congress." 1924-28), published July 1928 (Dorrit Press, Ltd., London), p. 449.

[238] H. E. Paul Yu-Pin, D. D., Report on China to Institute of Chinese Culture, reprinted in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, pt. 13, p. A4599.

[239] Washington Post, June 25, 1947, p. 9.

[240] New York Times, June 21, 1947, p. 9.

[241] Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, pt. 12, p. A3258.

However, on June 21, 1947, the American press reported the following gloomy conclusion of Dr. Sun Fo, Vice President of China:

"The Communists never will be content with the minority role in any government of China to which their numbers would entitle them. They believe in the policy of rule or ruin." [242]

Now, what has been the attitude of the Communist Party of the United States toward the Communist forcible methods in China? Has it, as the professed opponent of overthrowing the Government by force and violence, condemned its fellow Communists for the inestimable bloodshed and suffering inflicted on the Chinese people? To the contrary, the Communist Party of the United States has joined the Chinese Communists in calling for the overthrow of China's legally constituted government.

As a practical method of aiding the Chinese Communists, the American party has concentrated its efforts on an all-out campaign to prevent any American assistance which might help the Chinese National Government repel its Communist attackers. To this end, the American Communists are unleashing barrage after barrage of propaganda attempting to show that the Chinese Communists are heroically struggling to save democracy from a Fascist dictatorship imposed by the legally constituted government. This propaganda even goes so far as to maintain that the United States itself is responsible for the Chinese civil war. For example, the Daily Worker, official organ of the Communist Party of the United States, asserted on October 26, 1947 (p. 4):

"Further American aid can only postpone but cannot prevent Chiang's inevitable defeat. The Chinese Communist Party has now declared, after years of working for conciliation, that there is no place for Chiang Kai-shek in the democratic coalition government that will be formed as soon as the Koumintang dictatorship has been overthrown.

"The people of the Kuomintang areas are rallying increasingly to support the democratic front, led by the Communist Party, which is now the main leader of the national struggle for independence and democracy."

Political Affairs, an official monthly magazine of the American Communist Party, stated in the July 1947 issue (pp. 597 and 600):

"* * * United States imperialist intervention in China is directly responsible for the civil war * * *. In scope, magnitude, and strategic significance, the United States-sponsored war directed at preventing China from becoming united, democratic and free, is the decisive postwar military operation of the imperialist forces * * *."

Mass meetings and petitions are favored tactics in the American Communists' propaganda campaign which proceeds not only under the open auspices of the Communist Party itself but also through Communist-supported organizations, such as the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy. William Z. Foster, chairman of the American party, emphasized the importance of such meetings in the Daily Worker of December 2, 1945:

"On the international scale, the key task * * * is to stop American intervention in China * * *. The war in China is the key of all problems on the international front and it is here, above all else, where we have to deal the hardest blow to reaction.

"On the question of China, which is our key concentration * * * we want to hold 500 meetings all over the country to mobilize all the forces of the people that we can reach to put a stop to the intervention in China. Our party must use every ounce of its strength and skill and organizational ability to make these 500 meetings a success."

[242] Washington Post, June 21, 1947, p. 16.

Entirely in line with the task outlined above was the conference on China and the Far East held in San Francisco October 18–20, 1946, under the auspices of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy. Among the Communist-line ballyhoo produced by this front group were the proclamation of a Get Out of China Week and a resolution asking for congressional action.

The Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy repeated this performance in January 1948 by holding a National Conference on American Policy in China and the Far East in New York City, at which protests against any aid to the National Government of China were again made and another "China Week" planned. The conference won high praise from Chairman William Z. Foster of the American Communist Party.[243] Speakers at this conference significantly included Anna Louise Strong, former editor of the Moscow Daily News and now a writer for official American Communist publications; and Frederick V. Field, also a writer for official Communist publications. Sponsors included such figures as Ferdinand C. Smith, under deportation proceedings as an alien Communist; Ben Gold, avowed Communist union leader; Harry Bridges, identified as a Communist by the Daily Worker itself; Albert Maltz, Hollywood screen writer whose Communist Party affiliation was exposed by the Committee on Un-American Activities; and Ella Winter, Daily Worker writer.

Thus we find complete support by the American Communist organization of force and violence as practiced by the Chinese Communists.

GREECE

While China is locked in a bloody life-and-death struggle with Communist revolutionaries, on a neighboring continent the nation of Greece is desperately trying to cope with a civil war of the same brutal pattern.

Greek Communists scarcely waited for World War II to end before launching their plans for the violent overthrow of the lawful Greek Government. Today those plans have progressed so far that the Communists have set up within Greece their own independent state under whose banner Communist armies daily do open battle with troops of the Government. Encouragement or aid to the Greek rebel state from the Soviet Union and Soviet satellite states bordering Greece have added serious complications to the civil war.

While the United States Government has just begun to consider countering the Soviet efforts in China, it is noteworthy that the Greek situation has been found to be so urgent that millions of dollars worth of military and economic aid have already been rushed to the legal Government of that country from the United States. Government leaders, from the President on down, have been outspoken in their denunciation of the activities of the Greek Communists. In a report to Congress on aid sent to Greece, President Truman said on February 16, 1948:

"* * * Greece has been subjected to ever-increasing pressure by the Communist minority, which, subservient to the foreign influences from which it draws support, would impose its will on the Greek people by force of arms. * * *

"It is significant that the guerrilla warfare is directed not against the Greek Army but against the people of Greece. The deliberate and wanton destruction of Greek villages does not result from military engagements. It is determined and ruthless destruction intended to render people homeless and drive them from the soil; to force them into overcrowded urban centers where they become charges of an already overburdened state, and to create for them conditions of misery and hardship in the hope that this will make them susceptible to political agitation. * * *

"These bands which traffic in human misery and chaos are small, too small to claim any truly representative character. They total about 20,000 of which a large portion are known to have been unwillingly impressed into the guerrilla ranks under threat of death to themselves and their families." [244]

On February 18, 1948, Loy W. Henderson, Secretary of State George C. Marshall's chief adviser on Greek affairs, bluntly stated that the present "conspiracy against Greece" is only a part of a plan formulated by the Communists years ago for world revolution.

"Even the international Communists must realize the immediate dangers to world peace which might be involved—"

he said—

"if they resort to more overt forms of aggression, such as the despatch from the puppet states of heavy reinforcements for the guerrillas in Greece or of heavy shipments of arms."

Henderson also noted that the Communist campaign against Greece was nurtured during the war years and began to mature with the connivance of the governments of Greece's northern neighbors when Greece was liberated by the British in 1944.[245]

"The Greek Communist guerrillas," he added, "are committing atrocities of the most violent and even obscene nature daily." The Greek guerrillas are using a weapon "civilized peoples and governments cannot employ. I refer to the weapon of terror." [246]

Mark Ethridge, American member of the United Nations Balkan Inquiry Commission which spent 3 months in Greece, Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia, has noted that "the Communists saw their chance to take over Greece" when the fight against the Germans ended, that tensions developed by this struggle for power flared into the revolution of December 1944–January 1945, that the British finally turned the battle against the Communists, but not before "blood ran all over Greece." Although all bands were required to lay down their arms when amnesty was declared after this first revolutionary flare-up, Mr. Ethridge reported:

"The Greek Government charged * * * and the inquiry commission heard a good deal of evidence to prove it, that the KKE, the Greek Communist Party, sent agents all through northern Greece * * * to urge members of the ELAS fighting force and other Communists to surrender no more than a token number of arms, and to flee into Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia to wait for the next round.

"ELAS surrendered about 41,000 rifles, whereas the number it possessed has been estimated at four times that many. Great numbers of ELAS fighters, Communist politicos, and Slavo-Macedonians did take refuge in the northern countries. * * *"

Of the Communists who fled Greece after their first defeat Ethridge said:

"Those who went to Albania were concentrated at the village of Rubig, near Tirana, where those above military age were assigned work jobs and those of military age were given training. A military manual written by a group of ELAS fighters was used as the base of military instruction. Arms for training were furnished, according to witnesses, by the Albanian Government.

"About 4,000 of the refugees who went into Yugoslavia were concentrated at Bulkes, some 80 miles north of Belgrade, where they were also given military training, particularly in guerrilla warfare. The Bulkes manual was also introduced in evidence before the Commission * * *.

"The refugees waited in the Russian satellite countries for word of the next move, while recruiting in Greece continued * * *."

[243] Political Affairs, March 1948, p. 265.

[244] New York Times, February 17, 1948, p. 16.
[245] Washington Post, February 19, 1948, p. 1.
[246] Washington Times-Herald, February 19, 1948, p. 1.

Mr. Ethridge said it became "obvious" to the majority of the Balkan Inquiry Commission members that the Communists had not for an instant given up the idea of overthrowing the Greek Government.

The second round in the effort to take Greece, he stated, finally came in March 1946, and the guerrilla activity against the Greek Government during 1946 and 1947 took a "well-planned, well-directed military course." Indeed, Mr. Ethridge reported—"the Greeks charged that General Dapsevic, one of Tito's leading military men, directed the training and arming and even the campaign itself from the outside."

There is evidence, however, he said, that in the fighting around Yanina and Konits and in Greece, battalions of Greek guerrillas were assembled in Yugoslavia, marched across western Macedonia into Albania, and there staged for the attack upon Greece.

Mr. Ethridge, who made this report in August 1947, said that the Communist guerrillas, an estimated 16,000 strong, are like "will-o'-the-wisps who can strike and then run across a border to be freshly supplied and freshly armed and reorganized." Russia can stop the war on Greece, he concluded, simply by ordering her satellites to stop aiding the Greek Communist guerrillas.[247]

It should be noted that the Balkan Inquiry Commission, on which Mr. Ethridge served, formally denounced Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria for furthering the Greek Communist war.

A picture of the Communist terror which today stalks Greece is also gained from daily news reports in the American press. William H. Newton, Scripps-Howard correspondent, wrote on November 4, 1947, while with the Greek Army at the Yugoslav border:

"Armed guerrillas roam the countryside at night. They get guns and ammunition from Marshal Tito in Yugoslavia. They retreat across the Yugoslav or Bulgarian border when pressed by Greek Army patrols. They are led by Communists and their objective is to bring about the collapse of Greece. * * *

"The guerrillas move in at night and mine the railways and roads. Trains move only by day. Villages along the railway are surrounded by barbed wire and soldiers with mortars and machine guns are on guard. * * *

"American sources estimate there are about 15,000 guerrillas operating in northern Greece. Of these about 4,000 are 'hard-core Communists,' United States observers believe, and the rest are either ordinary bandits or have been forcibly impressed into service of the guerrillas. * * * By terrorizing undefended villages night after night they force farmers to flee just at the planting season. By mining railways and roads they prevent the movement of crops to market. In a country where there is less than an acre of arable land per person any reduction in crop acreage becomes a matter of life and death. * * *"[248]

Leigh White, foreign correspondent for the Washington Evening Star and Chicago Daily News, reported from Komotine, Thrace, on November 28, 1947, after a "band of 1,800 guerrillas, newly strengthened with men and equipment from Bulgaria," were temporarily prevented from encircling that provincial capital:

"* * * The whole area between Komotine and the Bulgarian frontier in the Rhodope Mountains, 10 miles north of here, is subject to continual guerrilla raids. "The guerrillas are Greek nationals, but their supplies and inspiration are largely Bulgarian * * *.

"The battalions are led by hardened Communist veterans who shoot their seriously wounded to prevent their talking when left behind, and who threaten to murder the families of any of their peasant troops who surrender * * *."[249]

A. C. Sedgwick, reporting to the New York Times from Athens on December 16, 1947, noted that:

"While the guerrilla forces have been able successfully to impede recovery, to spread terror, and to destroy crops, installations, and communications pretty much at will, they have not thus far succeeded in setting up a permanent headquarters * * *.

"At other points of unexpended attack, where there were no army units, the rebels were able to carry out their usual practices—burn down villages, carry off women, and forcibly recruit young men * * *."[250]

On Christmas eve of 1947 came the proclamation by the Greek revolutionaries of a separate rebel government under "General" Markos Vafiades. Eight Communist "cabinet" members in the new government, which was named the First Provisional Democratic Government of Free Greece, in utter mockery of the accepted meaning of the terms, included the leader of the Communist revolution in Athens in 1944 and one of the leaders of the Greek Army and Navy mutiny in the Middle East during the war, now under a death sentence imposed by a Greek naval court.[251]

Admitted aims of the rebel government included organization of an army, fleet, and air force and development of "especially friendly relations with the Soviet Union, the Balkan democracies, and other democratic states."[252]

The New York Times editorially blasted at the rebel government:

"After 6 months of preparation, the Communist command of the guerrillas in northern Greece has now made its long-expected move and proclaimed a rival 'government' in opposition to the established Greek Government, which is recognized by all nations, including Soviet Russia * * *. It is merely another, and a particularly hollow puppet of the Communist International, which is itself merely one of Russia's foreign legions * * *. Its purpose is merely to deliver Greece into Russian hands * * *. Behind "General" Markos Vafiades, the head of the self-styled 'government,' stand Russia and her Balkan satellites, whose aid alone has enabled Vafiades to elude the Greek Army. * * *"[253]

Western observers predicted and the French Communist organ, L'Humanite, flatly asserted that the Soviet satellite nations would officially recognize the rebel Greek government, thus gaining an argument for openly supplying military aid to the Greek guerrillas.[254] That such recognition by Russia and her satellites has not yet been forthcoming is attributed in large measure to a stern warning from the United State Government that such recognition would constitute open disregard of United Nations decisions and have "serious implications."[255]

Following the establishment of the rebel government, Greek Communists intensified their brutal war against the lawful Greek Government and the Greek people. In his most ambitious campaign so far, General Markos concentrated the greatest force of rebels ever assembled on one spot in an attempt to take the Greek mountain town of Konitsa as a headquarters for the new government. The rebels were forced finally to retreat, however.[256]

Other signs of redoubled Communist activities in Greece included the announcement by Greek police on Christmas Day 1947 that 450 persons had been arrested in connection with a Communist-inspired plot to assassinate a number of prominent Greek politicians, including former Premier Stylianos Gonatas.[257]

The Washington Times-Herald on January 18, 1948 (p. 2), reported:

"Guerrillas blew up a train on the Thessalian railroad in eastern Greece today derailing 20 cars. * * *

"Reliable sources said that in addition to blasting the Larissa-Volos train, guerrillas also destroyed two bridges on the Thessalian line. * * *

"Earlier, the Ministry of War announced a strong guerrilla band had attacked the town of Platanos in the Arahova region of southern Greece. * * *"

A New York Times correspondent reported in that newspaper on February 7, 1948 (p. 1), that:

"A Greek military spokesman tonight confirmed reports of guerrilla activity in the Athens area. He said that not since the left-wing ELAS attempt to seize power in December 1944 and January 1945 had armed subversive elements struck so near the capital. * * *

"Archbishop Damaskinos, head of the Greek Church and former regent, last night cabled a protest to the United Nations appealing for intervention specifically on the ground of atrocities attributed to the guerrillas, including crimes against women."

A few days previous, the Greek Government had announced the arrest of 133 persons in Lamia in connection with a plot to seize that town.[258]

An Associated Press dispatch from Athens on March 1, 1948, disclosed that more than 60 officers and sailors were arrested on charges of trying to sabotage the Royal Greek Navy. Those arrested were members of a Communist organization composed mainly of sailors dismissed after a Middle East mutiny in 1943 and confessed to present plans to damage Greek warships and naval installations in general, the dispatch said.[259]

That Communist aggression is not only limited to the Greek people was demonstrated by a United Press report appearing in the Washington Times-Herald of January 15, 1948 (p. 1):

"Guerrillas slit the throats of three Greek workers on an American-aid project and warned that the same fate awaited any Greek working for the Americans, United States engineers reported today.

"One American construction supervisor received a guerrilla note demanding he leave the area or have his throat cut. He replied he would be happy to meet the guerrillas one at a time, and he heard no more from them."

It is interesting to note that a New York Times correspondent on December 25, 1947, reported the guerrillas had recently acquired artillery, including pack howitzers, heavy mortars, and 105-mm. guns, and, as proven by an examination of duds and exploded fragments, were using Russian shells.[260]

The Soviet Union, both directly and through the Communist Information Bu-

---

[247] Mark Ethridge, Macedonia Wouldn't Satisfy Red Appetite Now, Washington Post, August 10, 1947, sec. II, p. 1.

[248] Washington Daily News, November 4, 1947, p. 26

[249] Washington Evening Star, November 28, 1947, p. B–13.

[250] New York Times, December 17, 1947, p. 14.

[251] Washington Evening Star, December 24, 1947, p. 1.

[252] New York Times, December 25, 1947, p. 1.

[253] New York Times, December 26, 1947, p. 14C.

[254] Washington Evening Star, December 25, 1947, p. 1.

[255] New York Times, January 1, 1948, p. 22.

[256] Ibid.

[257] Washington Times-Herald, December 26, 1947, p. 1.

[258] Washington Evening Star, February 3, 1948, p. 2.

[259] Washington Evening Star, March 1, 1948, p. A–2.

[260] New York Times, December 25, 1947, p. 24.

reau, which she controls, has been outspoken in her support of the Greek rebels.

The Greek Ambassador to the United States, Vassili C. Dendramis, has expressed the conviction that the Communist Information Bureau was instrumental in setting up the rebel government in Greece.[261] On the same point, New York Times Correspondent C. L. Sulzberger has expressed the opinion that one of the objectives of the Cominform is to keep supplies and promises flowing to Communist guerrillas in Greece. "The official Cominform is organizing wide Balkan support for Gen. Markos Vafiades' guerrillas in Greece," according to Sulzberger. "This is now open and supplies are being not only sent but advertised." [262]

It should be noted that the official organ of the Cominform For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy, printed this encouragement of the Greek revolutionaries on the front page of its December 1, 1947, issue:

"The valiant troops of the Greek democratic army who are setting heroic examples in the struggle for freedom and independence are frustrating the intentions of the Anglo-American warmongers to enslave the Greek people and to convert Greece into a springboard for a new war."

The Cominform organ also does not hesitate to make a direct appeal for aid to the Greek Communists:

"The working people of the world, the democrats of all countries have every right—and it is their sacred duty—to render assistance to the much-suffering Greek people. This assistance should take the form of a world-wide demand that the Anglo-American troops be withdrawn from Greece and that American intervention cease; it should take the form of moral and material support for the Greek people who are fighting for their freedom and independence."

The same appeal for aid includes the announcement that:

"At their recent conference in Belgrade the representatives of the trade unions of Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Albania discussed the political situatiton in the Balkans and asked the World Federation of Trade Unions to appeal to the working people of all countries to render moral political assistance to the fighting Greek people, to collect funds, and give other material assistance to the victims of Fascist terror in the country." [263]

It should be noted that the "Greek people" referred to by the Cominform organ are the Communist guerrillas, and that the "Fascist terror" is the legally constituted Government of Greece.

Similarly in support of the Greek Communist rebels are statements from the Moscow radio and press, which carry only those views favored by the Soviet Government. The Moscow radio has said:

" We find more and more reasonable people who recognize that the Sophoulis and Tsaldaris Government [the legally constituted Government now beseiged by the Communists] is really illegitimate * * *."[264]

The Moscow New Times has said:

"Today only one country in this part of Europe is still a hotbed of trouble and conflict. That country is Greece, where the roots of trouble have been preserved through the efforts of the British and American monopolies." [265]

The stand taken by Soviet leaders before the United Nations organization has also been steadfastly on the side of the Greek Communist rebels and their Soviet satellite collaborators. Arbitrarily rejecting the majority report of the UN Balkan Inquiry Commission which found that Greece's puppet neighbors were promoting the civil war, Soviet representatives wielded the veto power to block any action by the UN Security Council toward solving the Greek crisis. In one bitter harangue after another Soviet spokesmen such as Andrei Gromyko and Andrei Vishinsky tried to blame the civil war on the legal Greek Government and the United States and to represent the accused satellites as peace-loving nations minding their own business. When, despite the Soviet Union's strenuous resistance, the UN General Assembly created a special committee to implement a UN resolution warning Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria not to assist the Greek rebels, the Soviet Union refused to have anything to do with the committee. This attitude of the Soviet Union led to the following terse observation by the minister of external affairs of Australia and UN delegate, Dr. Herbert Evatt:

"The well-coordinated verbal counteroffensive hurled against Greece indicated very close cooperation between the Balkan countries and the Soviet Union, a fact that constituted the most serious aspect of the Greek question since it revealed a common aim—the overthrow of the present Greek Government by force." [266]

In lock step with the U. S. S. R. and her satellites in the plot to overthrow the legal Greek Government is the Communist Party of the United States. In a furious propaganda campaign the American Communists are repeating and amplifying Soviet vituperation against the legal Greek Government in an attempt to convince the American public that the Communist revolution in Greece is justified. And despite the fact that the United States is spending millions of dollars to help Greece ward off its Communist attackers, the Communists within the United States are following the line of the Communist International or Cominform and promoting moral and material aid for the other side.

Eugene Dennis, general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States, in outlining some of the party tasks at a meeting of the party's national committee in February 1948, said:

"* * * We must now help organize the widest support and Nation-wide demonstrative activity to * * * render the most complete political, moral, and economic aid to the people's democratic movement in * * * Greece." [267]

Dennis made it clear that by "people's democratic movement" he meant the Greek Communist rebels, not the lawful Government supported by the United States. All of the Communist propaganda relies heavily on such misleading phrases in an attempt to confuse the issues and to curry popular support for what is fundamentally unpopular with truly democratic peoples.

Typical of the Communist propaganda in behalf of the Greek revolutionists is the following statement in the Daily Worker, official organ of the American Communist Party, which, it should be noted, has adroitly transformed proven charges against Greek Communist guerrillas into charges against the Greek Government:

"Today, the Greek people are still fighting for their freedom. This time they are fighting a minority of monarchists and Fascist quislings who stay in power only because Washington is sending them money and ammunition.

"The establishment of a genuinely democratic Greek Government in northern Greece, under the leadership of General Markos, puts the Athens clique even more nakedly on the spot as a government of usurpers backed by a foreign power.

"Wherever the people of a nation defend their democratic liberties and national independence, the reactionaries see the hand of 'Soviet invasion.' This is a compliment to the Soviet Union's stand for freedom, however false it may be in fact. But it is an alibi for our interference with the governments of every nation in the world." [268]

On another occasion, the Daily Worker was even more violent:

"* * * Greece is a hell house of fear, persecution, and murder, where the collaborators of the Nazis are sitting in the seats of power thanks to the intervention of Churchill in 1944 and Truman's intervention since then." [269]

The same Communist organ devoted an entire page of its November 19, 1947, issue (p. 8) to an optimistic summary of the Greek rebels' progress in "liberating" Greece. It said in part:

"The shaded areas on the map of Greece opposite, represent the territory liberated and governed by the democratic army under Gen. Vafthiades Markos. * * * Self-governing bodies, people's councils, courts, schools, banks, and trade exchanges are functioning in many localities. * * *

"The guerrillas' job is to protect the freed heart of their land, and fight for the independence and liberty of all Greece. * * * The threat of American troops coming to carry out the mission which President Truman calls restoring order makes their struggle more urgent, their resistance more determined. They've fought in their mountains for 7 years now—and their answer to American threats is their record: 'The Greek people will never give up, they will never be beaten'."

Confidence in the eventual success of the Greek Communist revolution was also expressed by William Z. Foster, chairman of the Communist Party, U. S. A., in the official Communist magazine, Political Affairs, for June 1947 (p. 497). "In Greece," Foster said—

"* * * Anglo-American imperialism is in control and it is making every effort to keep the old reactionary cliques in existence." Nevertheless, he said, it was safe to say that Greece—

"will not be able to withstand very long the new spirit of democracy and international cooperation that is sweeping through the peoples of central Europe and the Balkans * * *."

Functioning again as a cheering section for the Greek guerrillas, the American Communist Party through its Daily Worker on January 18, 1948, related the evils flourishing in Greece as a result of American intervention and concluded:

"Both the Athens puppets and the American officials engineering them are reaching the point where it is difficult to decide what to lie about next. A lie good for the United States Congress does not go over with the Greek people. More and more Greeks are recognizing the free Greek Government as their only hope for peace, and are going to the mountains to take up arms to defend it." [270]

Mass meetings, picket lines, and petitions play an integral part in the American Communists' campaign for their Greek colleagues. For example, the New York State committee of the Communist Party sponsored a lunch-hour demonstration on a New York City street corner on December 10, 1947, to rally support for the Greek Communists as well

[261] Washington Post, December 27, 1947, p. 2.
[262] New York Times, December 25, 1947, p. E-3.
[263] For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy, December 1, 1947, p. 7.
[264] New York Times, December 17, 1947, p. 14.
[265] New York Times, December 25, 1947, p. 24.
[266] The General Assembly and the Problem of Greece, Department of State Bulletin Supplement, vol. XVII, No. 440-A, December 7, 1947.
[267] Eugene Dennis, report to national committee, Communist Party, U. S. A., February 3-5, 1948, reprinted in Political Affairs, March 1948, p. 211.
[268] Daily Worker, December 29, 1947, p. 9.
[269] Daily Worker, December 9, 1947, p. 4.
[270] Daily Worker, January 18, 1948, p. 11.

as Communists uprising in other foreign countries. To encourage American unionists' support, for which this particular rally was intended, the Daily Worker in announcing the rally spoke glowingly of the need for American support of Greek labor. After speeches by such leaders as John Gates, Daily Worker editor; Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, head of the women's commission of the Communist Party; Robert Thompson, New York party chairman; and Ben Davis, Communist Party representative on the New York City Council, it was startlingly clear that support for Greek labor was synonymous with support for Greek Communists. The Marshall plan, Mr. Davis told the noon-hour audience, was nothing more than an attempt to foist fascism on the people of the world. And, he warned, instead of permitting that to happen, "Italian, French, Greek, and Chinese workers will fight for their freedom just as Americans fought in 1776." [271]

The anxiety of American Communists to ensnare unions into supporting Greek Communists had been evident, also, from Daily Worker articles appealing to A. F. of L. and CIO unions to protest American policy in Greece. With national leaders of both the A. F. of L. and CIO on record as fully behind the Marshall plan and other American efforts to halt the revolutionary spread of communism in Greece and other foreign countries, however, Communist success has been limited to those individual unions within the CIO and A. F. of L. where the Communist membership is in control.

Another type of mass organization through which the campaign of the Communists has been promoted is the American Council for a Democratic Greece, which picketed the Greek consulate in New York City on February 18, 1948. The Daily Worker prominently heralded the event as follows:

"A demonstration to protest American military intervention on the side of Greek fascism has been called for tomorrow [Wednesday] afternoon, 4 to 6 p. m., in front of the Greek consulate, Sixth Avenue and Forty-ninth Street, the American Council for a Democratic Greece announced today.

"Robert Thompson, State chairman of the Communist Party, called on the citizens of New York to "raise an outcry to stay the hand of the Greek monarchist-Fascist executioners."

"'The Truman administration is in the first place responsible for this terror,' Thompson said. 'American officers, sent by Truman, are inciting an unwilling Greek citizenry and even an unwilling Royalist-Fascist-led Army to make a war of brother against brother.'

"Many prominent citizens and trade-union leaders have announced their support for the demonstration. * * *" [272]

On the day after the event, the Daily Worker joyfully reported that more than 200 persons had taken part in the picketing of the consulate, during the course of which a memorandum was submitted to the consulate listing the "Athens Government's atrocities and persecutions of the Greek people" and asking withdrawal of American military support from Greece.[273]

It should be noted that among the Communists in strategic positions in the American Council for a Democratic Greece are Peter Harisiades and D. Christophorides, on the national board; Oreste Stephano, executive vice president; and Stephen Leondopoulos, treasurer. The Justice Department is now seeking to deport Harisiades as an alien Communist seeking to overthrow the United States Government by force and violence. It should be noted further that among the signers of the memorandum presented to the Greek consulate during the February demonstration were: Ben Davis, Communist city councilman in New York; Max Perlow, whom the Daily Worker identified as a Communist Party member on July 18, 1933; Walter Garland, former Communist Party candidate for the New York State Assembly; and Ella Winter, Daily Worker writer.

Other Balkan States

In the five other countries that complete the Balkan group—namely, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Yugoslavia—Communist minorities staged one successful revolution after another against the legally constituted Balkan governments. In each case, the revolution was speeded by the threat or actual presence of armed troops of the Soviet Union, in whose shadow the Balkans lie.

Czechoslovakia

Most recent Balkan state to be brought under a reign of terror is the historically democratic nation of Czechoslovakia. Although the Government of the Czech Republic had been cooperating with the Communists and supporting Soviet foreign policy for years, it was not until February 1948 that the Communists made their successful bid for total power.

That the Communists had long made careful preparations for the final February coup is all too evident. Even while they ostensibly cooperated with non-Communist parties in a Czech "national front" government following World War II, the Communists were quietly worming their way into control of the police forces, trade-unions, and radio and press of Czechoslovakia.

It was the non-Communists' sudden realization of the Communist inroads on the country's police forces that touched off the crisis leading to the country's downfall, in fact. Learning that the Communist Minister of Interior had just replaced eight powerful police officials in and around Prague with Communists, an alarmed majority of the Czech Cabinet on February 13, 1918, ordered the appointments suspended. The Minister of Interior refused to obey, and 12 non-Communist cabinet members resigned in protest on February 20, 1948.

With the conspiracy against Czechoslovakia thus exposed and challenged, the Communists abandoned all pretenses and made a swift, violent strike for total power. Klement Gottwald, Communist Prime Minister and former member of the Communist International's central executive committee, replaced the protesting cabinet members with pro-Communists; ordered the organization of action committees or revolutionary soviets; and forcefully suppressed opposition with the aid of the Communist-controlled police.[274] The success of the Communist revolution in Czechoslovakia was announced to a horrified world on February 24, 1948.

The ruthless violence of the Czech Communists in their coup was the subject of one bulletin after another in the American press. The United Press reported from Prague on February 23 that:

"Communist-led police seized the headquarters of the left-wing National Socialist Party and arrested seven moderate political leaders today in a series of armed raids which began before dawn.

"The raids, and a statement by the Communist-controlled Interior Ministry that the National Socialists were plotting a revolution, climaxed a political crisis in which the Communists appeared to be seeking total power.

"As their police, newly armed with carbines and tommy guns swept through the capital, Communist officials forbade all foreign travel by Czechs except by permission of the Interior Ministry. * * *

"The 'discovery' of the plot climaxed a day-long series of raids and decrees apparently aimed at frightening Benes and minor party leaders into agreement with the Communist demand for full power in the Government.

"Armed police stood guard at public buildings and downtown street corners throughout the day. Interior Ministry trucks loaded with uniformed constables prowled the streets. Three-man army patrols wearing red arm bands reinforced the police detachments. * * *" [275]

But it was all over by February 24, when the United Press again reporting from Prague said:

"The Communist Party seized control of Czechoslovakia today, using its power over police and labor unions to take over almost every phase of national life. * * *

"Red 'action committees' were given full power over national and local political life, and Communist-led unionists were ordered to take over all large factories. * * *

"Vaclav Nosek, Communist Interior Minister, who is in charge of police, clamped tight police controls on the entire country, and reinforced border guards to prevent fugitives from slipping across the frontier.

"Nearly 200 non-Communist leaders were arrested in country-wide raids by uniformed police and soldiers. The police were reinforced by plain-clothes men wearing red arm bands and lapel badges. * * *

"Opposition magazines and newspapers were silenced by outright seizure, confiscation of editions, or the refusal of Communist labor unionists to print them. Paper mills refused shipments to non-Communist organs and the post office refused to distribute leading opposition journals. * * *" [276]

The ruthlessness of the Communist conquerors was further demonstrated in a report from a New York Times correspondent on February 25, 1948, concerning the Communist handling of a Czech student demonstration:

"* * * At least one person was killed and several were wounded when the police fired on a procession of 1,500 students marching to ask President Benes not to install the new government. The police beat the students with rifle butts and blocked off every route to the Hradcany castle toward which they were marching. * * * About 50 students are understood to be under arrest for disturbing the peace after their demonstration.

"Their leaders had hoped to get peacefully to the castle by marching. The police considered their shouting of slogans such as 'Remember the 17th of November,' which is the date of the student martyrs of the occupation, as a provocation and apparently resented constant appeals to save the Masaryk republic. * * *"

In the same report, the Times correspondent stated regarding the general situation in Prague:

"The city was thick with four- and eight-men police patrols armed with automatic rifles, marching single file as if going into battle. The armed militia of the nationalized factories was readied. * * * Seven high functionaries were arrested in the Ministry of Justice. * * *" [277]

Communist discovery of a "plot" against the Czech Government by the Czech National Socialist Party—significantly the largest opposition party in the country—is familiar Communistic tactic. In the summer of 1947, the Communists had unearthed an alleged plot against the Slovak Democratic Party, in an obvious attempt to discredit the majority party of Slovakia. Evidence that the Communists themselves were the real plotters of conspiracy has now been brought to the eyes of the whole world.

The Czechoslovak Minister of Justice warned of Communist plans to bring conspiracy charges against the National Socialist Party to which he belonged as early as

[271] Daily Worker, December 9, 1947, p. 3, and December 11, 1947, p. 2.
[272] Daily Worker, February 17, 1948, p. 2.
[273] Daily Worker, February 19, 1948, p. 16.
[274] New York Times, February 29, 1948, p. E 3.
[275] Washington Post, February 24, 1948, p. 1.
[276] Washington Post, February 25, 1948, p. 1.
[277] New York Times, February 26, 1948, p. 1.

January 23, 1948.[278] A few days earlier this Minister had the courage to declare that the Communists themselves were instigators of a plot to assassinate three Czech Ministers. He cited the discovery of two hiding places in which large quantities of weapons such as heavy machine guns, and automatics ready for immediate use, were stored.[279]

The similarity of the techniques of the Communist revolutionaries in Czechoslovakia and the Communists who overthrew the Russian Government in 1917 have been pointed out by the newspaper PM:

"The Czechoslovak action committees are similar to the soviets or councils through which the Bolsheviks won and consolidated power in Russia in the 1917 revolution. Originally the soviets were simply factory strike committees. Between March and November 1917—during the time of weak provisional governments—the Bolsheviks spread the system to the army, where each battalion chose a soviet, and to the villages. The soviets were then linked up in congresses, representing revolutionary workers and peasants.

"In Czechoslovakia today, as in Russia in 1917, the Communists do not have a working majority in Parliament, but they do control the action committees." [280]

The hand of the Soviet Union in the Czech revolution was poorly concealed. The United Press reported from Frankfurt, Germany, on March 21, 1948, that:

"Czechoslovak refugees formerly in high positions asserted today that President Benes gave in to the Communist coup because of the presence of large formations of Russian troops near the frontier.

"The refugees, who include former ministers and other members of the Czechoslovak Parliament, said that if Benes had been able to get the Czech Army to put down the Communist putsch, Soviet retaliation might have been expected.

"The Russian troops, they said, were officially on maneuvers but were based near the frontier. * * *

"The refugees said that in their opinion Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Zorin, a former Russian Ambassador to Prague, gave the Czechoslovak Communists the Kremlin's O. K. for the coup.

"Zorin arrived in Prague by plane February 19, officially to supervise Russian grain deliveries, and returned to Moscow just after Benes approved the new Communist government, the refugees said. * * *" [281]

The role of Zorin as a supervisor of the Czech revolution was also testified to by Pavel Tigrid, a leader of the Czech Catholic People's Party who escaped from Czechoslovakia. He said:

"* * * Soviet officials fully approved the events in Czechoslovakia in advance. The Czech crisis developed very quickly following the arrival on February 19 at the Prague airfield of Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister V. A. Zorin, who formerly was the Russian Ambassador to Czechoslovakia.

"It has been established that Zorin brought from Moscow orders for the Czech Communists to go ahead with their putsch. Zorin talked personally with several non-Communist ministers of the Czech Government in an attempt to win their approval of the new government.

"Zorin reportedly said that the "revolutionary changes" in Czechoslovakia were made with the Kremlin's full consent. * * *

"The President (Eduard Benes) now is virtual prisoner at his country home. * * *" [282]

It should also be noted that the Russian General, A. S. Gundorov, arrived in Czechoslovakia just as the Czech political crisis was reaching its climax. The Soviet officer's ostensible purpose was to serve as a delegate to a Pan-Slav Congress in that country.[283]

To the columnists, Joseph and Stewart Alsop, there is no doubt that "the ruthless Communist power play" in Czechoslovakia "was actually prepared in broad outline in Moscow during the war, nearly 5 years ago," and that the Czech Communists "began to use their power when the command was transmitted from the Kremlin * * * by the Soviet Under Secretary of State Zorin." [284]

The Moscow-directed Communist Information Bureau has been unusually blunt on the subject of the Czech revolution. A New York Times correspondent reporting from the Cominform headquarters in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, on March 15, 1948, said:

"The bulletin of the Communist Information Bureau (Cominform) charged today that reactionary forces, recently defeated in Czechoslovakia, 'have merely gone underground' and called for a thorough 'purge' in that country.

"The unusually frank report on the situation in Czechoslovakia, signed by R. Slanski, acknowledged that the Communists were a minority force, but asserted their determination to stay in power through such mechanisms as 'action committees,' which played a major role in assuring a victory in the latest crisis. * * *

"Discussing recent events, the Cominform paper said the crisis was provoked because anti-Communist members in the previous Government had a majority and were able to vote down Communist proposals. * * *" [285]

It is interesting to note that on the same day in Prague, Czechoslovakia, the Cominform words were virtually echoed by Foreign Trade Minister Antonin Gregor, one of the new Communist members of the Czech Government, who warned in an address that the new regime would exterminate the opposition. "With full responsibility," he said, "I can announce that against those who now undermine or sought to undermine the regime, or which in future will endanger its development, we will proceed ruthlessly until their full extermination." [286]

The Communist outrage against the Czech Government has been bitterly condemned by a number of the high-ranking Czech diplomats. Juraj Slavik, Czech Ambassador to the United States, and Frantisek Nemec, Czech Minister to Canada, resigned on March 3, 1948, declaring they would carry on in exile a fight against the seizure of Czechoslovakia. Slavik charged that Communist domination had made his country a "totalitarian police state" and said, "I cannot accept as legal the government headed by President Benes under duress and terror." [287]

Dr. Jan Papanek, permanent Czechoslovak delegate to the United Nations, demanded a United Nations investigation of the Czech situation, in a blistering statement issued on March 10, 1948. Dr. Papanek's statement said in part:

"* * * Today I feel that I can no longer postpone action without failing to do my duty to my country and to my terrorized, silenced, and enslaved people. And I take recourse to the provision of the Charter of the United Nations in a specific situation, a situation in which one member of the United Nations has violated the independence of another.

"The Government of the Czechoslovak Republic, legally constituted by the general parliamentary elections of May 1946, had been undermined and openly placed in jeopardy on February 22, 1948, through force by a Communist minority. This Communist minority was encouraged and given promise of help, if necessary, by the representatives of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics who came to Prague for that purpose, led by V A. Zorin, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs.

"The political independence of Czechoslovakia, a member of the United Nations, has thus been violated by threat of use of force of another member of the United Nations, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in direct infringement of paragraph 4, article 2, of the United Nations Charter. * * *

"It is very clear that the coup by the Communist minority by force was effectuated successfully only because of official participation of representatives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and because of the threat of the use of military force of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in readiness on the northwest boundaries of Czechoslovakia. Official and military representatives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics participated in closed and public meetings of the Communist Party and stayed long enough to see organized terror take hold of the free democratic Czechoslovak people.

"Pictures taken in the streets of Prague, published in the world press, show officers of the Soviet Union with armed police, clad in new Czechoslovak uniforms, participating in the meetings and demonstrations. * * *

"The Communist usurpers spread terror and break every law which establishes and protects the freedom of men and democratically established institutions, even while they say they are carrying out the will of the people. * * *

"The President is prevented from executing his constitutional powers. Political parties have been forced to change their leaders. Many regularly elected members of Parliament have not only been removed from office, but deprived of their parliamentary immunity. Many have been brutally beaten and jailed. * * *

"The official lists of names of individuals faithful to their democratic principles who have been arrested without legal grounds are increasing daily. * * *" [288]

To many, a silent but no less eloquent protest against the Communist betrayal of Czechoslovakia occurred in the death of Czech Foreign Minister Jan Masaryk, whose body was found lying in a courtyard below his window on March 10, 1948, 2 weeks after the new regime came into power. It was felt in Washington that the famed son of the founder of the Czech Republic jumped out of his apartment window because he was hopeless of defying successfully or even moderating the course of the Communist minority terrorism.[289]

The Czechoslovak outrage has also had violent world repercussions in America. "The tragic death of the Republic of Czechoslovakia has sent a shock throughout the civilized world," President Truman told Congress. At the same time the President condemned the Soviet Union for its aggression in the rest of the Balkans and Europe.

"Since the close of hostilities, the Soviet Union and its agents have destroyed the independence and democratic character of a whole series of nations in eastern and central Europe.

---

[278] New York Times, February 29, 1948, p. E-3.
[279] New York Times, January 22, 1948, p. 24.
[280] PM, February 25, 1948, p. 3.
[281] Washington Times-Herald, March 22, 1948, p. 2.
[282] PM, March 10, 1948, p. 11.
[283] PM, March 11, 1948, p. 12.
[284] Washington Post, March 3, 1948, p. 15.
[285] New York Times, March 16, 1948, p. 14.
[286] Ibid.
[287] Washington Times-Herald, March 4, 1948, p. 4.
[288] New York Times, March 11, 1948, p. 2.
[289] New York Times, March 12, 1948, p. 12.

"It is this ruthless course of action, and the clear design to extend it to the remaining free nations of Europe, that have brought about the critical situation in Europe today * * *." [200]

Secretary of State George C. Marshall bluntly described the present state of affairs in Czechoslovakia as a "reign of terror." [201]

Mr. Matthew Woll, vice president of the American Federation of Labor, saw the events in Czechoslovakia as a warning that "the Kremlin is frantically and fanatically preparing a military attack against the democratic peoples of the west—moving as the Nazis did in 1939 to plunge a peaceful world into a catastrophic war." [202]

The continuing nature of the Soviet Union's international conspiracy after the fall of Czechoslovakia was also foreseen in a New York Times editorial:

"As the result of a Communist revolution which has forced President Benes to acquiesce in something that was 'not in complete accordance with his wishes,' Czechoslovakia has today become a totalitarian police state under a Communist dictatorship and the last flickering lights of freedom that shimmered through the iron curtain are going out * * *.

"Moscow has disdained to disguise its own intentions. There is no reason to expect that Czechoslovakia will be the last target of Russo-Communist expansion." [203]

In the midst of American indignation at the Czech disaster, there remained one discordant note. This was sounded by America's Communists who raucously defended the Czech Communist terrorists all along the line.

William Z. Foster, the head of the American Communist Party, unblushingly made the following statement after Czechoslovakia bowed to the Communists:

"The basic significance of the stirring events of the past week in Czechoslovakia is that American imperialism has been balked in its attempt to set up its control over Czechslovakia under the Marshall plan. * * * Its plans for provoking a crisis, and very probably a civil war in that country, have failed competely.

"Wall Street has been defeated by the class solidarity of the workers and the national independent spirit of the Czechslovak people. * * *

"The massed workers, full of revolutionary spirit, went into a counteroffensive of their own. They compelled Benes to accept the resignations of the 12 reactionary Cabinet ministers and also to recognize the new democratic cabinet headed by Gottwald. Their prompt and resolute action, under determined Communist leadership, saved Czechslovakia from the disastrous civil war that the reactionaries were counting on. * * *

"The American warmongering press is now shouting that the governmental change in Prague is the result of a Moscow plot. This is a stupid, Red-baiting lie. It is the yelp of a wounded, frustrated reaction, one of whose most dearly cherished imperialist projects has been shattered on the rocks of the people's democracy. * * *

"The democratic victory won in Czechoslovakia forecasts the eventual victory of all of the people of western Europe. * * *

"The peoples of Europe, who fought so hard to free themselves from the tryanny of Hitler, are not going to submit to the tyranny of Wall Street. The events in Czechoslovakia are a great victory for democracy. All of Europe, sooner or later, must and will go truly democratic and start to build the socialism that the great masses of the people desire." [204]

The following statement by another leading American Communist not only illustrates the American party's support of the Czech Communist revolutionaries and their open violence but also offers an unusually crass example of their readiness to deny their use of violence in the face of clear evidence. It is made by Joseph Starobin, foreign affairs "expert" for the official organ of the American Communist Party, the Daily Worker:

"* * * there isn't the slightest shred of evidence that Czechoslovakia is any less an independent country than before the government crisis, not a fragment of evidence that the Soviet Union had anything to do with the country's political upheaval. * * *

"Czech Communists have stopped another Munich, far from having perpetuated one, as our papers (which see everything upside-down in their Alice-in-Wonderland mirrors) would have us believe.

"They [Communists] have exercised the defensive powers of the state to protect the state—and there is every evidence that the crisis will be settled within constitutional limits. Even if it were settled beyond those limits, there are certainly crises which demand that." [205]

The Stalinist line maintained by the American Communists on the Czechoslovakian situation has been described by the newspaper PM, in an interesting survey of the treatment of the Czech crisis by the Daily Worker. The survey showed that when the Czech storm broke with the resignation of 12 non-Communist Czech Cabinet members over the stacking of the police with Communists, the Daily Worker story of February 22 left out the reason for the Cabinet resignations. The following day's story in the Daily Worker stated as a fact rather than as a Czech Communist allegation that the crisis had been brought on by "capitalist exploitation" and "plots against the Republic." The Daily Worker of February 24 was the only New York paper to say that documents proving a plot against the Communists had been discovered; no description of the documents were offered. The February 25 Daily Worker heralded the decision of the Czech Social Democratic Party to reverse its position and work with the Czech Communists but did not mention the fact that the party vote reversing its stand followed a police raid on the party's headquarters or that the vote was taken while a police guard of 125 men with rifles stood outside the building.

The Daily Worker on February 26, instead of reporting an attack on protesting Prague students by the Communist-controlled police as other newspapers did, printed a so-called exclusive story which told how Czech security police had arrested 15 spies working for a secret service organized in the United States zone of Germany. The Daily Worker said the conspiracy had support from "as far away as Connecticut." A Daily Worker editorial in the same issue hailed the Communist-controlled Czechoslovakia as "free today, gloriously rid of all big-money intrigues and conspiracies."

On February 27, the Daily Worker ran glowing accounts of how all of the Czech people were celebrating and rejoicing in their new Communist government, as well as other articles eulogizing the new government. [206]

HUNGARY

Like Czechoslovakia, the Soviet satellite state of Hungary has a tragic history of Communist resort to force and violence, promoted by the Soviet Union and supported by the Communist Party of the United States.

In the case of Hungary, however, the Communist revolution was carried on in the actual presence of Soviet troops who remained on Hungarian soil after separating the Balkan nation from Axis domination. Direct Russian intervention in Hungarian affairs was so obvious that official protests were addressed to the Soviet Union from the American Government.

The revolution that catapulted Hungary into the role of a Soviet puppet state was completed on May 31, 1947. Although a non-Communist Small-Holders Party had held majority control in the Hungarian Government as a result of free elections since 1945, Hungarian Communists just like the Czech Communist had maneuvered themselves into key positions in the Government, including the department of military police. By the beginning of 1947 the Communists were ready to seize power, which they did by forcefully ousting the opposition leaders on trumped-up charges of conspiracy. As columnist Constantine Brown described it:

"* * * the coup began in January (1947). First event was the rounding up of a large number of politicians, army officers, and other officials on the charge that they were involved in a plot to restore the regime of Admiral Horthy, Hungary's Nazi-serving prewar regent, when Russian troops left the country in accordance with the Hungarian peace treaty. Although the fictitious character of this plot was readily apparent, 13 persons were tried on the charge and several were sentenced to death. * * *" [207]

Arrests subsequent to the Communists' discovery of a "plot" in January 1947 were reported to total 3,000, according to an Associated Press dispatch of May 29, 1947. One of the most flagrant arrests, which drew the official protests of the United States Government, was that of Bela Kovacs, secretary-general of the majority, non-Communist Small Landholders Party on February 26, 1947. Kovacs was arrested by the Russians for conspiracy in the plot after Hungarian Communists failed in their attempt to get a waiver of Kovacs' parliamentary immunity. On the basis of an alleged confession by Kovacs, whom the Russians continued to hold, the Russian military governor in May 1947 brought conspiracy charges against the Hungarian Premier, Ferenc Nagy, the Foreign Minister, and the Speaker of the House, all members of the Small Landholders Party, as well as most of the prominent bankers, businessmen, and industrialists, in fact, virtually all of the leading capitalists of Hungary. Premier Nagy's secretary was arrested on May 30, and Nagy, who was visiting in Switzerland, refused to return to Hungary and certain arrest by the Russians. [208] The government that emerged from this violent crisis on May 31, 1947, was completely controlled by the Communists.

Nagy condemned the "Russian-Communist conspiracy" against his Government in a statement issued on June 17, 1947, in which he said:

"As a result of the direct intervention of the Soviet Union * * * I was ousted from my office, and a new government was imposed upon the Hungarian people. * * *"

"I protest again the aggression to which my country has fallen victim. * * *" [209]

After the Communist seizure of control of Hungary, which was denounced in official United States notes as a minority nullification of the will of the majority, the Communists proceeded on a campaign to destroy

[200] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 17, 1948, p. 2997.
[201] New York Times, March 12, 1948, p. 12.
[202] New York Times, March 16, 1948, p. 12.
[203] New York Times, February 26, 1948, p. 22.
[204] Daily Worker, February 27, 1948, p. 3.
[205] Daily Worker, February 29, 1948, p. 3.
[206] PM, February 29, 1948, p. 17.
[207] Washington Evening Star, June 4, 1947, p. A-11.
[208] New York Times, May 31, 1947, p. 1.
[209] New York Times, June 18, 1947, p. 8.

minor opposition within Hungary. In illustration is the following account of the treatment of Zoltan Pfeiffer, leader of the Hungarian Independence Party, chief opposition party of the moment, on August 25, 1947:

"Budapest, August 26.—Zoltan Pfeiffer, leader of the Hungarian Independence Party, lies in bed tonight at his home in Budapest suffering from concussion of the brain and other severe injuries sustained at the hands of Communists, who broke up a meeting that his party had planned to hold yesterday at Csongrad. * * *

Mr. Pfeiffer was beaten with bicycle pumps and sticks by a crowd of two to three hundred Communists. Tamas Keresztes, former parliamentary deputy (and Independence Party member) was struck with shovels, knocked to the ground, and left in a pool of his own blood. Mr. Keresztes was taken to the hospital in an ambulance and is said to be suffering from serious head injury. * * *"[299]

Pfeiffer escaped from Hungary and came to America on November 12, 1947, at which time he told Americans:

"I stayed right up to the shadow of the noose. For 3 months my party was the only real opposition, but it was like playing cards against a man with a pistol that shoots dumdum bullets. * * *"

"They [the Communists] have dropped their masks now. I have now been graduated from a school on how to turn democracy into terrorism. * * *"[301]

As of March 1948, only one opposition party was left in Hungary and that was being threatened with extinction by the Communists. A New York Times correspondent reported on February 21 that:

"The Hungarian Socialist Party having been virtually absorbed by the Communists through the forced resignation of 20 of its conservative leaders, the expulsion of 5 others, and the arrest of 1 of its cabinet ministers, Istvan Barankovics' People's Democratic Party is reliably reported here to be next on the list to walk the plank. It is the only opposition party left in Hungary.

"* * * already several officials of his (Barankovics') party have been arrested or attacked on one charge or another and this week the party as a whole was threatened by the Minister of the Interior. * * *"[302]

Americans have not been exempted from the high-handed tactics of native and Russian Communists in Hungary. Two American colonels, both connected with the United States Legation and both carrying passes from the Hungarian Foreign Office authorizing free travel anywhere in the country, were arrested by a Soviet army colonel on January 14, 1948, held incommunicado and sent to Vienna under an armed guard without justification and without explanation.[303] On August 1, 1947, an American citizen, Stephen T. Thuransky, was arrested by Hungarian police for allegedly uttering unfavorable comments regarding the Communist leaders of Hungary; when Thuransky was being transferred from one jail to another the next day, he escaped. He had been beaten by the Hungarian police and threatened with shooting.[304]

The force and violence of the Communists in seizing control of Hungary has been vividly described by Ferenc Nagy, the Hungarian Premier ousted by the Communists. Testifying before the Committee on Un-American Activities on February 6, 1948, Nagy related the following Communist tactics which he said were duplicated in the seizure of Bulgaria, Rumania, and Yugoslavia:

"* * * Communism acquired an entering wedge * * * with the assistance of the Soviet occupation forces. This process generally begins with large-scale looting by the Soviet armies, with the mass violation of women, and with other manifestations of brutality. The public becomes terrorized; it becomes incapable of self-defense; political resistance comes to a halt. * * *

"The Soviet military commanders put those designated by the Communists into the key jobs in the cities, in government offices, and in the business enterprises. * * *

"The political police is organized on Soviet instruction. The majority of the old police personnel is dismissed. Those police who in the past had the misfortune of encountering Communists in the performance of their official duties are put behind bars and most often executed. The new police is made up of jailbirds, of men with police records, and of Communists who survived illegally under past regimes. They begin their new assignment with looting, and with persecuting and killing innocent people. They develop the persecution of innocent people to a high art. They create concentration camps where they collect those who might resist Communist expansion. They employ newly developed inquisition techniques against those who do not confess to the crimes with which they are charged and against those unwilling to incriminate unjustly others still at liberty.

"The political police is a special branch of the police vested with extraordinary authority and very quickly develops into the terror of the country. * * *

"They teach the workers to exercise mass power; they teach them to demonstrate. Those of you living in a free and orderly country cannot conceive the effect of some tens of thousands of workers marching the streets in disorder and threatening some cabinet minister, judge, or public official with removal if he denies their demands. The government is helpless against such mass demonstrators because force cannot be used against them, since the police and the army are in the hands of the very same group which incites the workers to violence. If there should chance to be a man in the government who resists their demands, they respond with an outbreak of strikes and with production stoppages leading to economic disintegration. * * *

"(After a rigged election) the communistic screw is given a couple more turns. They remove from the government those men whom the public has hitherto trusted and replace them with their own men. If perchance some member of the government is so popular that he cannot be removed summarily means are found to implicate him in a conspiracy. The political police discover that a group of men is involved in a conspiracy against the new order. They arrest a number of them. With the aid of modern inquisition techniques, they secure confessions which incriminate not only those arrested but a number of public officials, high-ranking military men, or some political leaders as well. These are then arrested by the political police. Some are usually charged with espionage, which provides a pretext for their being carried off by the Soviets. * * *

"Communism achieved its results in eastern Europe with the assistance of Soviet arms. * * *"[305]

The former Hungarian leader has also been outspoken in his conviction that there is a Moscow-directed international conspiracy for Communist world domination. As he told the Committee on Un-American Activities:

"There can no longer be any doubt that under Soviet leadership the purpose of communism is world domination. What we are confronted with here is not Soviet assistance in the domestic programs of the Communist Parties in various countries; rather, we are confronted with Soviet directives, motivated by foreign policy objectives, to Communist Parties in individual countries for the purpose of disrupting the established order. * * *

"It is necessary to keep clearly in mind that every Communist Party in the world is under Soviet direction. * * *"[306]

Arthur Schoenfeld, who served as United States representative to Hungary from January 1945 until April 1947, has stated that Soviet conquest of Hungary was planned so well and so early that the Soviet Army liberating Hungary from Nazi rule brought with it special "Hungarian experts" to help force communism on that country. According to Schoenfeld:

"These men were Hungarians, trained in the school of imprisonment, escape, exile, and conspiracy. Some of them were graduates of the Comintern at Moscow with practical experience in subversion and revolution in countries besides their native Hungary. As soon as the fighting stopped, these experts set to work promptly to build up the Communist Party organization, rearranging and infiltrating the wrecked machinery of government."[307]

An official United States note, delivered to the Soviet Chairman of the Allied Control Commission for Hungary and to the Hungarian, Soviet, and British Governments, protested the Russian and Hungarian Communist tactics months before the final coup in May 1947. The note said in part:

"The Government of the United States * * * is impelled at this time to express its feeling of concern at the political crisis which has now been precipitated in Hungary. * * * Unable to achieve their political ends through normal constitutional processes, the Hungarian Communists, together with other members of the leftist bloc, have endeavored to implicate a number of representatives of the majority Smallholders Party in a recently revealed plot against the Republic. * * * Simultaneously, police and administrative authorities responsive to the dictates of these minority elements have utilized their powers of investigation of the conspiracy not toward the expeditious judicial resolution of a threat against the state but to conduct a general campaign against their political opponents.

"The Soviet High Command in Hungary has now, by direct intervention, brought the situation to a crisis. * * *

"These developments, in the opinion of the United States Government, constitute an unjustified interference in Hungarian internal affairs, the effect of which will be to support the efforts of a small group in Hungary to substitute a minority dictatorship for a responsible administration representative of the will of the Hungarian people as expressed in free and untrammeled elections. * * *"[308]

To the American Communists, however, the Russian and Hungarian Communists could do no wrong. The non-Communist Hungarian leaders were Fascist conspirators and the Hungarian Communists were saviors of democracy, according to propaganda issued by the American puppet party. It described Ferenc Nagy, the former Hungarian premier, as a Fascist with a long history of scheming against the Hungarian people, and recommended that he should be deported back to Hungary where a people's court will mete out justice to these pogrom makers and traitors.[309]

---

[299] New York Times, August 27, 1947, p. 1.

[300] Washington Times-Herald, November 13, 1947, p. 5.

[301] New York Times, February 22, 1948, p. 2.

[302] New York Times, January 17, 1948, p. 6.

[303] New York Times, August 5, 1947, p. 1.

[304] Hearings before the Subcommittee on Legislation of the Committee on Un-American Activities, February 5, 1948, pp. 88–92.

[305] Ibid., pp. 87 and 92.

[306] New York Times, July 21, 1947, p. 7.

[307] Report on the Strategy and Tactics of World Communism, Supplement 2, issued by Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, 1948, pp. 23 and 24.

[308] Daily Worker, October 4, 1947, p. 6.

After the final coup which gave Communists a strangle hold on Hungary, the American Communists' official organ, the Daily Worker, published a story called What's Behind the Hungary Crisis, which said that the Hungarian coup was manufactured out of the whole cloth by the State Department and the press in order to help railroad through antilabor and anti-rent-control legislation in the United States.[310]

"There is clear evidence of unconstitutional activities by the deposed Hungarian officials," the Daily Worker stated flatly on June 7, 1947 (p. 2); this was elaborated upon on the same day by another Daily Worker story entitled "Inside Story of the Fascist Plot in Hungary," which said in part:

"Ferenc Nagy resigned the premiership of Hungary last week, after 2 years of pretending he didn't know his pals were plotting the country's return to dictatorship.

"Nagy resigned only when things became too hot for him, only when he could no longer hide his connections with the conspirators behind his position in the majority Smallholders Party.

"These facts, based on statements made by the arrested conspirators and on investigations by the Hungarian democratic parties, were brought to the Daily Worker's attention yesterday. * * *

"The executive committees of the Hungarian democratic parties issued a statement after Nagy's resignation, explaining that the Fascist conspirators had deliberately chosen to work their plot from within the Smallholders Party * * *.

"It was over 15 months ago that the Socialist and Communist coalition called on the Smallholders Party to cleanse itself of saboteurs and cooperate with the over-all government policy. Thus Nagy's removal and the exposure of the plot in high government circles means no change in the government's policy. It only means that that policy will be carried out from now on." [311]

Indicative of the close ties between the Communist government of Hungary and the Communist Party, United States of America, is the recent visit as an honored guest of Louis Weinstock, member of the national committee of the American party. Although visitors from western countries are not generally welcomed, Weinstock was permitted to stay 3 months. In a series of ecstatic articles in the Daily Worker in March 1948 he hailed the new freedom for ordinary Hungarians. He described the cordial reception he received from Dr. John Gyetvay, governor of the state of Berenya and former editor of the New York Communist daily, Magyar Joco, and Louis Bebritz, under secretary of the Hungarian Ministry of Railroads and Communications, formerly on the staff of the New York Communist daily, Uj Elore.[312]

RUMANIA

Another victim of Communist terror tactics supported by a Red Army of occupation is Rumania. Although they represent only between 5 and 10 percent of the Rumanian population, the Communists, acting as Moscow's pawns, today have a strangling control over this Balkan State. These Communists also have the constant moral support of Russian troops, estimated in November 1947 as being between 100,000 and 150,000 strong.[313]

This Communist control was achieved by outrages against the Rumanian people that began as soon as the country was liberated from the Axis by the Russians. The outrages proceeded despite note after note of protest from the American Government. The most recent United States note, released on February 4, 1948, offers a good summary of the Communist methods:

"By its actions over a period of almost 3 years since March 1945, the Rumanian Government placed the legitimate and patriotic opposition elements in Rumania in a position of seeming to constitute a clandestine, subversive movement. * * *

"* * * notwithstanding the categorical nature of * * * international commitments, the Rumanian Government undertook virtually at once to subvert them. * * * All manner of chicanery and extreme physical violence was employed by or with the consent of the Rumanian Government to reduce the legitimate political activity of any elements not subservient to the controlling minority. Every one of the assurances given was either ignored or sabotaged. * * *

"* * * In the spring and summer following its signature of this treaty (peace treaty with the Allied Powers signed February 1947) the Rumanian Government through its police authorities, intensified its systematic and brutal campaign to eliminate all political opposition. Nation-wide man hunts were conducted on a mass scale resulting in the arbitrary arrest and incarceration of thousands of opposition and nonparty persons. * * *

"* * * Reports reaching the United States Government over a period of several months demonstrated convincingly that the political prisoners apprehended as a result of the mass arrests in Rumania were being subjected by the Rumanian authorities not only to physical conditions to starvation and disease, but in some instances to methods designed to extract confessions in anticipation of forthcoming trials. * * *

"* * * in October and November 1947, the Rumanian authorities tried, convicted, and sentenced for treason Mr. Juliu Maniu, former Rumanian Premier and other members of the National Peasant Party of Rumania. The transparent political motivation of this judicial process was manifest. * * *" [314]

The direct role that the Soviet Union played in establishing the Rumanian dictatorship was illustrated by the demand from Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Andrei Vishinsky that King Michael of Rumania dismiss the Radescu government and install the Communist puppet Petru Groza as premier. The King followed Vishinsky's orders on March 2, 1945, when he was told that failure to do so would be considered a hostile act by his government.[315]

The abdication of the King himself was forced by the Communists on December 30, 1947. New York Times Correspondent W. H. Lawrence, reporting from Bucharest, Rumania, on the following day, stated:

"* * * What had been announced as the voluntary abdication of young King Michael was in fact a cold-blooded Communist-dictated coup d'état against the monarchy * * *." [316]

King Michael himself, abandoning a long silence on the subject, explained the circumstances of his abdication in a statement issued in London on March 4, 1948:

"* * * In the morning of December 30, 1947, Mr. Petru Groza and Mr. Gheorghiu-Dej, members of the Rumanian Cabinet, presented to me the text of acts of abdication, urging me to sign it at once.

"Both came to the royal palace after it had been surrounded by armed detachments, informing me they would hold me responsible for the bloodshed which would follow as a consequence of instructions already issued by them in case I should not sign within the time limit.

"This act was imposed by force by a government installed and maintained in power by a foreign country—a government utterly unrepresentative of the will of the Rumanian people.

"This government has broken the pledge binding them to respect the political freedom of the Rumanian people, falsified the election, and annihilated the democratic political leaders who enjoyed the confidence of the country.

"The removal of the monarchy constitutes a new act of violence in a policy for the enslavement of Rumania * * *." [317]

Reports of police intimidation and arrest of non-Communists for purely political reasons were as numerous from Rumania as from the other Balkan satellites already discussed. A Chicago Tribune correspondent who toured Rumania for 8 days in April 1947 noted that—

"* * * On the political front we found an elaborate spy system of the Russian type, intimidating people who have been under different despotism through almost all of their history. Rumanians were being jailed for not much more than a whisper of dissension. * * * We talked with Rumanians deported to slave-labor camps in Russia and released only after physically broken down by the deprivations * * *." [318]

After a tour of the Balkan country, Maj. Tufton Beamish, member of the British Parliament, reported on November 24, 1947, that—

"* * * New waves of arrests were sweeping the country while I was there. Thousands of political prisoners are known to be held, without trial, in prisons and camps in inhuman, half-starved conditions * * *." [319]

American officials in Rumania have not been free from this Communist police terror. Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California, reported after a visit to Europe that a secretary of the American Legation had been searched at gun point by police on November 4, 1947; that the chauffeur of a United States Army sergeant was assaulted by two men in civilian clothes on June 28, 1947; and that the homes of three officers on the United States military staff had been searched by secret police.[320]

The close interlocking of the Rumanian dictatorship with the Soviet Union is indicated by a speech delivered in Bucharest on December 19, 1947, by Yugoslavia's Marshal Tito, who declared that the Danubian Federation, including Poland and Albania as well as the states bordering on the Danube, was led by Premier Stalin. The speeches of Marshal Tito and Rumanian Premier Petru Groza were concluded with the cry, "Long live Generalissimo Stalin" which the crowd repeated.[321]

Serving today as Rumania's Foreign Minister is Anna Pauker, former member of the executive committee of the Communist International.

The devotion of the ruling Workers' Party of Rumania to the principles of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin and to the Communist Party in the Soviet Union is shown by the following statement of G. Georgiu-Dej, member of the Rumanian Cabinet, speaking before the Workers' Party of Rumania on February 21, 1948:

"* * * Comrades! The ideas of Marx and Engels, further developed and enriched

[310] Daily Worker, June 4, 1947, p. 1.
[311] Daily Worker, June 7, 1947, p. 1.
[312] Daily Worker, March 24, 1948, p. 7.
[313] New York Times, November 9, 1947, p. E-3.
[314] New York Times, February 5, 1948, p. 8.
[315] I Saw Poland Betrayed, Arthur Bliss Lane, Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1948.
[316] New York Times, January 1, 1948, p. 1.
[317] Washington Times-Herald, March 5, 1948, p. 5.
[318] Washington Times-Herald, April 24, 1947, p. 4.
[319] London Daily Telegraph and Morning Post, November 24, 1947.
[320] Washington Evening Star, December 9, 1947.
[321] New York Times, December 20, 1947, p. 2.

by Lenin and Stalin, have found practical application in the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics, the first socialist state in the world. These ideas are an inspiration to the people of the new democracies in their struggle for socialism. The idea of replacing capitalism by a new, higher social system—by a socialist system—has taken deep root among millions of people all over the world. We are living in an age that marks a new epoch in the history of mankind. To us has been granted the good fortune to observe the magnificent spectacle of the unfolding of man's creative forces in the country where socialism has triumphed, and where the gradual transition toward Communist society is under way; that is, in the Soviet Union. It is our good fortune to be able to utilize the rich experience and wisdom of the glorious party which is leading the Soviet people from success to success, the experience and wisdom of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union [Bolsheviks], headed by the brilliant teacher of the working people of all lands, the disciple of the immortal cause of Marx, Engels, Lenin, J. V. Stalin. [Stormy applause and ovation in honor of Stalin.]

"The teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin are as a beacon light illuminating the path of the Workers' Party of Rumania, the path to further successes by the peoples' democracy—the path to a socialist Rumania." [322]

The extent to which the Workers' Party of Rumania is allied with the Communist Parties of other countries is shown by the fact that greetings were brought to its congress held on February 21–23, 1948, by representatives of the Communist Parties of Great Britain, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Albania, Austria, Belgium, Greece, France, Holland, Italy, Spain, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and Palestine.[323]

As a former member of the executive committee of the Communist International it is fully understandable that William Z. Foster, present chairman of the Communist Party, United States of America, should express enthusiastic endorsement of the Communist regime in Rumania and hail its "splendid democratic achievements." [324]

BULGARIA

The government of Bulgaria is headed by George Dimitrov, former general secretary of the Communist International. Communist-rigged elections to the Bulgarian National Assembly held on October 27, 1946, showed the Communists as receiving 2,262,321 votes out of a total of 4,188,276. Vassil Kolarov, former member of the executive committee of the Communist International, acted as speaker of the Parliament and acted as Provisional President following the plebiscite of September 8, 1946, which ousted the King and established a so-called republic.

The terroristic character of the present Bulgarian government is most clearly displayed by the warning of Premier Dimitrov to his parliamentary opposition, following the hanging of Nikola Petkov, opposition Agrarian leader, on September 23, 1947. Attacking the Social Democrats for criticizing the budget, Mr. Dimitrov threatened them with the fate of Petkov and the Agrarian Party as follows:

"They broke their heads, and their leader is under the ground. Think this over and do not follow in the footsteps of your allies, foreign agents, and Bulgarian enemies. If you are not wiser, you will get from the nation such a lesson as you will remember as far as St. Peter." [325]

Referring to the trial of Petkov, the United States Department of State declared that it "constituted but one of a series of measures undertaken by the Communist-dominated fatherland-front government to remove from the Bulgarian scene all save a purely nominal opposition and to consolidate, despite its professions to the contrary, a totalitarian form of government."

Mr. Petkov had charged that the fatherland-front government was subjecting the opposition to beatings and killings. The State Department charged that two defense attorneys were seized by the militia.[326]

In an article appearing in the Washington Evening Star for September 22, 1947, page A–7, Constantine Brown disclosed the role played by Soviet military forces in Bulgaria. He estimated that the Soviet army of occupation which had been reduced to 100,000 had been increased in the last 2 months "to a high of 185,000 men provided with the latest equipment."

Testifying before the House Committee on Un-American Activities on February 19, 1948, Mr. George M. Dimitrov, former general secretary of the Bulgarian Agrarian Party, who, although having the same name, is in no way related to the Communist premier, described the orgy of violence which has swept his unhappy country under the Communists.

With the active cooperation of the Soviets and their army, the Communists in Bulgaria grabbed on that date the police and the dispensation of justice in their hands, and, through their political commissars, established their control over the army. A little later and in the same manner, they took over the nation's education, finances, et cetera, and today they are putting the finishing touches to the complete sovietization of the country and the entrenchment of the dictatorship of the Communist Party. * * *

"Without the knowledge of the non-Communist organizations within the government and even without the knowledge of the non-Communist members in the cabinet, the Communists arrested and killed off without trial over 50,000 Bulgarian citizens. Arrests have been more than two or three hundred thousand. By means of the so-called people's courts, they brought to trial another eight to ten thousand persons, of whom over two thousand were sentenced to death and executed within 24 hours, while the bulk of the others have since been rotting and dying in prison cells, concentration camps, and the so-called labor-educational communities, which are actually designed for slaves in the Soviet manner. * * *

"The dissolution and the final liquidation of all non-Communist political organizations started by threats, arrests, and beatings of their more active members. Having once shaken them sufficiently, they were officially dissolved, their leaders and more prominent members thrown in jail, others were tried on fabricated charges, while many thousands of smaller men were deprived of their freedom even without the formality of going through a trial. * * *

"The lives, the liberties, and the property of all Bulgarian citizens today are in the hands and at the mercy of an irresponsible minority, which tries to play with them in the Soviet manner, known for its diverse methods of inquisition, concentration, and slave-labor camps. And today, when I speak to you here in this hall before this committee, whose activities are under the control of the free citizens of your country, far away there in my little but beautiful land, thousands upon thousands of hard-working, freedom-loving, and proud people are slowly rotting in their prison cells and concentration camps, many of them dying daily as a result of torture or outright execution. * * *

"The most influential body in the provinces is the militia. It is largely self-directed and is often above the government and laws. It dictates to many government officials, makes its own rules, and often tells courts what sentences to pronounce. There is no state institution or government department, not even the army, that can control the militia in some parts of the country. In many of the provinces it is master, taking what it pleases, dispossessing whom it pleases, physically eliminating Bulgarian citizens according to its will. It and the people's courts have killed no fewer than 12,000 Bulgarians, mostly ordinary, independent, solid community leaders, along with a few war criminals and Fascists. The militiamen are heavily armed, most of the leaders had long been subversive, working as rebels against previous governments, and some are ordinary bandits. Brigands can with impunity rob Bulgarians in the name of the new order and 'for the good of the common people * * *'"

Despite the fact that world opinion generally condemned the Communist regime in Bulgaria, the Communist Party, United States of America, was unhesitatingly enthusiastic in its acclaim. William Z. Foster, chairman of the CPUSA, paid tribute to the "splendid democratic achievements" of Bulgaria and lauded Georgi Dimitrov (not to be confused with the Agrarian Party leader) as one member of the "most brilliant and effective body of statesmen in continental Europe today." [327]

The official Communist press in the United States has been quick to resent any criticism of what is going on in Bulgaria. The Daily Worker of June 6, 1947, page 6, printed an article by its Washington correspondent, Rob F. Hall, which denounced an article in Life magazine for May 12 because "The struggle of the Balkan peoples to establish a new democratic life after centuries of oppression is misrepresented as "spreading Soviet control" behind the so-called iron curtain. * * * But so highly developed is the art of deceit among Mr. Luce's writers that from such inspiring material they contrived a sordid story of dictatorship, repression, and unrest."

Rob Hall then recounts his interview with Nissim Mevorah, representative of the Bulgarian Government in the United Nations investigation of the Greek-Bulgarian-Yugoslav border dispute, which puts Bulgarian life in a highly favorable light. Hall quotes Mevorah as saying:

"We find it hard to understand, therefore, why the United States Government should now show hostility to us in our efforts to apply in our own country the American principles of freedom and democracy."

POLAND

The Red Army attacked Poland on September 17, 1939. A provisional government was formed on June 23, 1945, including members of the non-Communist government-in-exile and the so-called Lublin or Communist-dominated government. On January 19, 1947, a Communist-Socialist bloc elected 394 members of the Sejm (Parliament) out of a total of 444 seats in a rigged election. Boleslaw Bierut, former official of the Communist International and a leading member of the Polish Communist Party, was elected President. Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Polish Prime Minister and Peasant Party leader, was recalled to Warsaw in June 1945 to assume the post of Vice Premier. After the elections

[322] For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy, March 1, 1948, p. 3, Organ of the Information Bureau of the Communist Parties in Belgrade.

[323] Ibid.

[324] The New Europe by William Z. Foster (International Publishers, New York, 1947), p. 27.

[325] New York Times, January 14, 1948, p. 1.

[326] Washington Star, September 23, 1947, pp. A–1 and A–5.

[327] The New Europe, by William Z. Foster (International Publishers, New York, 1947), pp. 27 and 38.

of May 1947, the Polish Government initiated a series of purges of all anti-Communists elements and today the Communist Party exercises complete control of that unhappy country. We cite herewith excerpts from a series of articles by Mr. Mikolajczyk describing from first-hand knowledge the terrorist methods of the Russians in Poland in the Polish Communist-dominated government itself.

"It would have been comparatively simple for me to die in Poland. It would have climaxed the murders of 104 Peasant Party leaders and the cynical confiscation and destruction of the party's various headquarters. * * * [328]

"Inside Poland, the Russians were arresting, shooting, and deporting thousands of members of the home army and the underground—with the servile agreement of the Communist Lublin government (1945). * * *

"Russia was dismantling and shipping to the U. S. S. R. a great number of Polish factories. It was also looting, burning villages whose people were reluctant to collaborate, and removing our livestock and other effects. * * * [329]

"Let me summarize in the briefest possible manner the subsequent Communist campaign against the Polish Peasant Party:

"The security police killed our general secretary, Bolesław Scibiorek. Then a year later and on the eve of the fixed election, they started a 'trial' in which they attempted to prove that we ourselves had ordered the illegal Polish underground to murder Scibiorek. * * *

"At least seven whole Polish villages were burned to the ground because their people refused to become Communists. No one can estimate the number of houses burned in other cities and villages and the value of the properties confiscated. * * *

"Security police stations became torture houses for hundreds of thousands of Poles arrested for believing in the lofty precepts laid down by the Americans and British and agreed to by Stalin. Untold thousands were murdered in these horror chambers and hundreds of their bodies have been discovered in the grounds around such police stations as those in Kepno, in the province of Poznan, and Bochnia, in Krakow Province. * * *

"When Madame Chorazyna, our MP, rose in parliament to speak of the freedom of the press which had been guaranteed us, her speech was censored and 2 hours later she barely escaped death, along with her son, when a barrage of bullets crashed through the windows of her home. * * *

"When the reign of terror in Poland became known to the outside world, President Truman and Foreign Minister Bevin were among those who frankly called Poland a police state.[330]

"I cannot deal here and now with the tortures our people underwent during efforts to make them renounce the party. Many of these tortures are too vile to display even in the free press. Suffice it to say that the sadism of Nazi executioners were equaled and often surpassed by security police trained by the NKVD.[331]

"In the weeks before the election more than 100,000 Poles were arrested by the security police. They were kept, half clothed or naked, for days in frigid open fields for refusing to withdraw their names from lists proposing Polish Peasant Party candidates for office. * * *

"One hundred and forty-two of our candidates were kept in prison throughout the normal campaign period before the election. One of these, Mr. Szygula, a farmer in Silesia, was tortured to death in prison. * * *

"Security police officially killed 126 members of our party during this reign of terror before the election. Military units were created and sent to the villages to lend armed force to the Communists. These units were commanded and their terroristic program outlined by General Korczyc, a Russian general who is now chief of staff of the Polish Army. * * *

"At the closing of the polls the commissioners—acting on orders enforced by the presence of the security police—systematically burned all those Polish Peasant Party ballots in excess of 10 percent.[332]

"A spy was placed in nearly every house to report conversations, and as a result of this tactic many innocent Poles have been sentenced to 5 years in jail for spreading false rumors. * * *

"The Polish Army numbers 150,000 men. At first, 10,000 of its officers were Red Army men. This has been reduced to 3,000. All important positions from chief of staff down through the echelons are held by Russian officers who have been ordered to become Polish citizens. Few Poles are permitted in the Polish air force. It is completely controlled by Russians. * * *

"The great scourge of the Polish people, the security police, numbers 230,000 men officially. Communist gangs are armed on the pretext that they are 'voluntary help police,' (the ORMO). * * *

"NKVD men are stationed in every security police office as 'advisers'. They are of course, part of the organization which also polices Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and the Soviet occupation zone of Germany. In this way eastern Europe has become one vast police state under a single control. Poland's independent political parties have been exterminated. Its economic and social life has been sovietized. Its champions of independence have been liquidated or silenced by torture.[333]

"A Russian colonel told me: 'Our men prepare the way for us in France and Italy, and they hope to bring about changes in the government there so that the Red Army will not be forced to march in. But even if they fail, there are plans for the army to move into those lands.' " [334]

Arthur Bliss Lane has been a distinguished member of the United States diplomatic corps since 1916. He has served in Italy, Poland, England, Switzerland, Mexico, Nicaragua, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Colombia, and Costa Rica. He was Ambassador to the Polish Government from 1945 to 1947. He described the situation in Poland in his recent book entitled "I Saw Poland Betrayed" (Bobbs-Merrill Co., Indianapolis, 1948). His analysis fully corroborates the account of Mr. Mikolajczyk and gives the lie to any Communist claims about relinquishment of methods of force and violence. We quote his work in part:

"A basic tenet of Soviet policy is the eradication of all truly nationalistic elements in areas under Soviet control. This explains the forcible deportation to Siberia of hundreds of thousands of Poles after the occupation of eastern Poland in September 1939. The same policy has been responsible for the liquidation—physical or political—of nationalist elements in Hungary, Bulgaria, Austria, and Yugoslavia (p. 38).

"But there was one group in Poland about which nothing was officially said. It was generally known, however, that this group, which corresponded to the Politburo in the Soviet Union, acted under the direction of the Kremlin and was the controlling force in Poland (p. 113).

"But on June 19, 4 days after their arrival, the trial of the 16 arrested Polish leaders was begun in Moscow. I was to learn that the 16 had been taken to Moscow by airplane, thinking they were proceeding to London; that the plane had landed in the snow in a field many miles from Moscow, in the wintry weather at the end of March; that they had been taken to the Lubianka Prison, in Moscow, where each had been placed in solitary confinement. During their imprisonment they had been subjected to continual exposure, night and day, to glaring electric light, preventing rest and sleep. Questioned and requestioned under this mental torture for weeks, they finally admitted to the charges and readily confessed them when interrogated publicly by the prosecutor. It was a repetition of the technique employed in the Moscow trials of 1937—a technique now in use in all Soviet-dominated nations (pp. 116 and 117).

"During our early days in Warsaw even the word of our Polish friends was not needed to convince us of the terrorist methods employed by the Soviet Army and secret police (p. 161).

"In addition to the terror created in Poland by the returning Red Army, the newly formed Polish Security Police—Urzad Bezpieczenstwa, colloquially known as UB—was making itself unpleasantly known. Like the NKVD, the Russian counterpart, the members of the UB were distinguished by blue collar tabs and hat bands. Many an arrest by these uniformed agents was witnessed by members of the American Embassy on the streets of Warsaw during those early days. Later, more subtle and terrifying methods were employed, such as arrests in the middle of the night; and the person arrested generally was not permitted to communicate with the outside world—perhaps for months, perhaps for all time (p. 162).

"Mr. Stanislaw Radkiewicz, Minister of Public Security, frankly admitted that the Russians had lent him 200 NKVD instructors, who would organize the Polish Security Police along Soviet lines (p. 166).

"All gave me information confirming the opinion which we had already formed from our 2 months in Poland: Poland was a police state governed by the Kremlin. I was everywhere assured that not more than 5 percent of the people supported the provisional government. The Peasant Party and the Christian Labor Party together represented over 80 percent of the electorate. Anyone not supporting the Government was in danger of arrest, I was told. Former members of the underground were particularly vulnerable (p. 184).

"But the pressure which was being exerted on Mikolajczyk was not merely verbal. Two members of his party had suffered violence at the hands of the security police; one Kojder had mysteriously disappeared, despite the efforts of the Ministry of Public Administration to ascertain his fate; Scibiorek, another leader, had been killed in Lodz because he had insisted on remaining loyal to Mikolajczyk. Later, the Government was to charge that Scibiorek was killed by his own party. The United States Government was so provoked by these political murders, flouting the spirit of the Yalta decision, that Secretary Byrnes gave the press a statement bitterly denouncing the outrages (p. 191).

"From our earliest days in Poland information kept pouring in to us, not only to me personally and to the rest of our staff, but to American newspaper correspondents as well, that a reign of terror was being imposed on the Polish people by the security police. Even if we had been so incredulous as to brush aside these reports we could not

[328] Washington Times-Herald, January 12, 1948, p. 1.
[329] Washington Times-Herald, January 24, 1948, p. 2.
[330] Washington Times-Herald, January 27, 1948, p. 2.
[331] Washington Times-Herald, January 28, 1948, p. 2.
[332] Washington Times-Herald, January 29, 1948, p. 2.
[333] Washington Times-Herald of January 30, 1948, p. 2.
[334] Washington Times-Herald, January 31, 1948, p. 2.

conscientiously have dismissed the information coming from relatives of American citizens who were then in prison. By February 1946, 84 claimants to American citizenship were in jail, almost all—so their relatives apprised us—for the 'crime' of having once been members of the underground army clandestinely fighting the Nazis (p. 197).

"We estimated, however, in 1946, that over 100,000 Poles were being forcibly detained either by Polish or Soviet police officials. This estimate was based on our knowledge that large concentration camps constructed by the Nazis were still being used in Oswiecim, in Rembertow (near Warsaw), and in Wolow (Wohlau), about 30 miles from Wroclaw, in the zone under the Red Army control. In addition, the prisons in Krakow, Lublin, and Poznan were filled to capacity with political prisoners (p. 209).

"During the Christmas holidays petitions were circulated by hand throughout Poland by security police officials. These UB members went from house to house in the cities and villages endeavoring to obtain the signatures of as many voters as possible indicating their support for the candidates on the Government list. * * *

"We received reports from the larger cities—Krakow, Poznan, Gdansk, Katowice, and Lublin—that those persons who refused to sign the manifesto were told they would probably lose their living quarters and their jobs unless they reconsidered their attitude. * * *

"The UB went further than merely threatening. Many cases of physical torture were reported to the Embassy. The UB were not far behind the Gestapo in inventing refined brutalities. We learned of persons forced to remain during that unusually cold winter in icy water up to their knees for 2 or 3 whole days in attempts to drive them to sign the manifesto. An unfortunate man stood this torture for 72 hours rather than agree to support the Government ticket. Gangrene set in. Both his feet were amputated (pp. 279 and 280).

"I could see no difference between Hitler's and Stalin's aims. Both were after world domination. I could not see the difference, which so-called liberals in the United States often claim to see, between the methods of the two tyrants. They were exactly the same—suppression of personal liberty; terrorism by the police; sickening propaganda that the totalitarian state is democratic (p. 288).

"Surely the Soviet Government must be called on to assume responsibility for having deported hundreds of thousands of Poles to Siberia during the Soviet occupation of the territory east of the Molotov-Ribbentrop line, from 1939 until after the German attack upon the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941. This was action calculated to remove Polish nationalistic and non-Communistic elements and to extinguish the flower of the Polish Army. Even though the Soviet Government has tried to avoid responsibility for the Katyn incident, with violent protestations of innocence, the accusing finger of public opinion in Poland is still pointed at the Kremlin; for that liquidation of 10,000 Polish officers would be consistent with the Soviet policy of systematically destroying all elements representative of Polish nationalism. Not only were the Nazis and the Soviets in agreement on the annihilation of the Polish state, but they employed similar police state measures to snuff out the spirit of Polish independence (pp. 303 and 304).

"Although it was agreed that democratic leaders from within Poland and from abroad should constitute the new provisional government of national unity, the Communist embryo of that Government-to-be was already functioning in Poland, backed by the Red Army and by the Russian NKVD. In those circumstances the really democratic forces never had a chance to express themselves freely or to form a government clearly representative of the Polish people (pp. 304 and 305).

"The arrest of the 16 Polish leaders and their trial at Moscow in the spring of 1945 was another instance, carried out in defiance of Western public opinion, of the Soviet Government's determination to put an end politically to all Polish leaders who might furnish an element of nationalistic opposition to the Communist-dominated government. Next, with an efficiency and concentration on detail recalling the methods of the Gestapo, the NKVD and its Polish counterpart organized the police state so that all effective opposition would be quenched. Arrests, tortures, and assassinations were as effective under the Soviet-directed police state as under the Nazi variety (p. 305).

"But with the present group in control, supported as they are by Moscow and by Soviet-dominated armed forces, the populace has no chance to establish a government of its own choice (p. 307)."

We have chosen two outstanding and internationally known observers and have cited their accounts of the Communist regime in Poland, which could be amplified at length from newspaper reports which have appeared elsewhere. We have shown the intimate interrelation of the Soviet Government in the Polish picture. What has been the reaction of the Communist Party, U. S. A., to this brazen display of force and violence?

Political Affairs for April 1947, official theoretical monthly organ of the Communist Party, U. S. A., has featured articles by Wladyslaw Gomulka, Vice Premier of Poland and general secretary of the Polish Workers' Party, which is the Communist Party of Poland, and Hilary Minc, Polish (Communist) Minister of Industry and Commerce. In view of the highly controlled nature of Communist publications, this indicates their close fraternal relations with the American Communist Party.

As late as February 27, 1948, in the Daily Worker, William Z. Foster, chairman of the Communist Party, U. S. A., referred to Poland as "one of the most advanced of all the democracies in eastern Europe" and hailed its liberation by the Red Army.

Numerous Communist-front organizations are supplementing this support, including the American Polish Labor Council, the Polish American Trade-Union Council, the American Slav Congress, the Polonia Society, and such Polish Communist papers as Glos Ludowy.

The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, another front organization, published a pamphlet entitled "Inside Liberated Poland," by Anna Louise Strong, one-time editor of the Moscow News. The same organization has published another brochure called We Will Join Hands With Russia on Polish-Soviet relations.

John Stuart, an editor of the Communist weekly, New Masses, speaks of the Communist regime in Poland as follows in its issue of January 13, 1948:

"The Workers Party of Poland is a brilliant phenomenon. The traveler feels its prestige and influence everywhere. Born out of the war, it is a new Communist Party. * * * It is in this sense of people and their needs, this immersion in masses of people, that gives the PPR its dash and imagination and makes it the first party of Poland."

YUGOSLAVIA

Communist leader Marshal Joseph Broz (Tito) was made Premier of Yugloslavia on March 2, 1945. Its constitution, adopted January 31, 1946, closely resembles the Russian pattern. At the September 1947 conference of Communist parties held in Poland, M. Djilas, a former Comintern operative, vice president of the Yugoslav Presidium and head of the dreaded OZNA, or secret police, clearly described how the Yugoslav Communist Party accomplished its successful armed uprising:

"The Communist Party of Yugoslavia developed in a difficult illegal struggle in an armed uprising and intensive work to build and rehabilitate our devastated country. * * *

"As in every revolution, so, too, in the Yugoslav revolution, definite historical circumstances were necessary. I shall not dwell on them, but I should like to emphasize that, however favorable, such circumstances alone, as is generally known, are not sufficient to insure the victory of the working people unless there is a revolutionary, well-organized party, capable of leading the people into the struggle. Such a part existed in Yugoslavia. * * *

"The Communist Party of Yugoslavia organized an armed uprising immediately after the occupation of the country as the only effective form of struggle in conditions of war. * * *

"The Communist Party of Yugoslavia entered the war after 20 years of illegality. * * *

"The nucleus of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia is made up of cadres which passed through the stern school of the uprising and the 4 years of war."[335]

The regime in Yugoslavia has been accurately described by Reuben H. Markham, long a correspondent in the Balkans for the Christian Science Monitor. We quote in part from his recent work, Tito's Imperial Communism.

"Yugoslav Communists did seize towns and villages. Red flags proudly snapped over some town halls. The 'cells' appeared in the open, as little soviets. Communist secret police instantly went into action and summarily disposed of the main local opponents of communism. Active bourgeois leadership in the 'freed' areas was eliminated. All necessary goods were requisitioned, youth was mobilized for the new Communist army, and the new order was inaugurated * * *.

"From the end of the summer of 1941, civil war raged in Yugoslavia, along with the war between Yugoslavs and Germans. The main struggle in Yugoslavia, after Tito's fateful invasion of Serbia, was the civil struggle between the Communists and anti-Communists * * *.

"When Yugoslav men and women were massacred because of Partisan raids, that was part of Tito's revolutionary Armageddon. When shrieks of Yugoslav mothers and children filled the dark and bloody nights, that was as the thunderous chorus of the morning stars of revolution, and when valleys and plains were laid waste, that was the destruction of the old in preparation for the new—for the world Soviet and Communist domination * * *.

"We know that Partisans carried guns and freely used them; we know they lived amid carnage, that they were flaming with hatred, that they called all non-Partisans 'Fascist' and treated them as mortal enemies. Everyone who has had any contact with Partisans knows they inordinately boast of their killings; yet amid such scenes, with such passions, we are led to believe that they held free elections. They themselves have described such elections. Nine-tenths of the voting was open and public. In a room or in a public square, people raised their hands as men with tommy guns counted them * * *.

"To most Serbs of Serbia, including Mihailovich, Tito's civil war seemed execrable. They know that Tito was using the World War to further a political revolution and impose a Communist government upon an unwilling nation. * * *

---

[335] For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy, December 1, 1947, p. 6, Organ of the Information Bureau of the Communist Parties in Belgrade.

"On the first day of the struggle Tito had opened the civil war; to the last day he pursued it. It was he who took the initiative in destroying Yugoslav unity, in setting Yugoslavs against Yugoslavs, and in pulverizing Yugoslav's resistance to Germany * * *.

"This insistent, public refusal of asylum and this justification of slave labor illustrates the attitude of the People's Republic toward violence and terror. Tito has deprived Yugoslavs of any inalienable right to life. I have seen a carefully tabulated list, covering 500 large typed pages, of the names of Serbs whom the Partisans were accused of having killed. Each case was described in detail. The victims were from many Yugoslav towns and villages. Some were peasants, a number were workers, most were members of the bourgeoisie. Many were teachers, small merchants, lawyers, priests, reserve officers, judges. They were champions of the established order—as are most Americans. * * *

"Likewise, in notes to the United States Government, Tito admitted that more than 100,000 persons were kept at forced labor in Yugoslav labor camps 2 years after the end of the fighting. Tito called them Nazis and Fascists, which is his name for every opponent. * * *

"But it is certain that the Partisans marked their triumph by killing their fellow citizens on a large scale. The impressions of that carnage upon many Yugoslavs seem to have dwarfed the other horrors. Weeping was heard in thousands of homes. Fear swept as a storm through the land. Tito's triumph was identified in the minds of many Yugoslavs with blood. The red star on the Yugoslav flag, on the Serbian flag, on the Croatian flag came to symbolize fratricide. * * *

"Tito and his People's Republics have maintained the largest army in Yugoslav peacetime history. Its official and real head is Marshal Tito. It is led by Communist generals and colonels and has been under close Soviet direction. * * *" [336]

To amplify this picture of violence and terror, we cite the defense statement of Aloysius Stepinac, archbishop of Zagreb and Catholic primate of Yugoslavia, on the occasion of his trial on September 30, 1946, before the so-called people's court of that country. This trial was characterized by the New York Times of October 13, 1946, as "clearly political with the conviction foreordained."

"Between 260 and 270 priests have been killed by the National Liberation Front. There exists no civilized country in the world where so many priests would have been put to death for such 'crimes' as you have brought up against them. * * *

"You have looted the seminary of all its furnishings, of all its property. * * *

"All our Catholic printing plants have been taken away from us. * * *

"Building of some of the religious in the Bachka have been confiscated. * * *" [337]

On March 27, 1946, Harold Shantz, American Chargé d'Affaires at Belgrade, delivered a note to the Yugoslav Foreign Office, protesting against Soviet obstruction to the Allied military government in Venezia Giulia. Venezia Giulia is a northeastern Province of Italy, half of which, including Trieste, is under joint American and British occupation, and half under Yugoslav control. The note indicates typical Communist methods.

"Incitement to unrest: Yugoslav authorities have brought into zone A (American-British zone) armed pro-Slav groups from zone B (Yugoslav zone) for pro-Slav demonstrations, such as those at Gorizia on March 2 and 27, 1946, and at Trieste on March 26, 1946. A resident of zone B who was arrested in Trieste on March 26 for carrying firearms made a voluntary signed statement that he and two others had been given arms by zone B authorities and sent across the Morgan line to demonstrate. Other residents of zone B arrested in Trieste have stated that they were warned to participate in demonstrations and were furnished motor transport as far as the Morgan line. Six shiploads of demonstrators from zone B were brought to Trieste on April 2, 1946, despite specific assurance that no persons from zone B would participate.

"Intimidation of local population: On March 10, 1946, a known extremist action squad leader, with 10 men, left PNOO headquarters in Trieste and went to Servola where he directed a demonstration. During the general strike in Trieste on March 11, 1946, action squads wearing a red star compelled shopkeepers to close their shops. On numerous occasions action squads from Communist cultural clubs have beaten up pro-Italians; one such club was raided on March 30, 1946, and arms were found, leading to the arrest of 25 persons.

"Intimidation of local officials: Nine specific cases have been reported in which members of civil police have received threats to themselves or their families in zone B in an attempt to induce them to leave the force or act as pro-Slav agents. On March 14, 1946, a delegation representing 42 Slovene teachers requested Allied military government protection as they were constantly being threatened by pro-Yugoslav elements and feared abduction, and felt that they must resign from their schools unless assured of Allied military government protection.

"Criminal and terrorist activities: Members of the Yugoslav Army and para-military organizations such as KNOJ and OZNA have been arrested while abducting civilians and engaged in other criminal acts. Four of these have volunteered signed statements that they were sent on their missions by their superiors in Yugoslavia and zone B.

"As will be evident from the above instances, the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom have been forced to conclude that the provocative activities of the PNOO and other pro-Yugoslav organizations have been encouraged and directed by Yugoslav officials from within Yugoslavia." [338]

The Daily Worker, official organ of the Communist Party, U. S. A., has been most articulate in support of the policy of Communist Marshal Tito. Ella Winters, one of its feature writers, was granted permission to visit that country, although such permission is not readily granted to American writers. She was even granted a personal interview by Tito, himself, whom she praised effusively. In this interview he declared with Marxist clarity: "We have gotten rid of the whole old-state apparatus." He justified "strong measures" against all opposition.[339]

Equally laudatory of the Communist regime in Yugoslavia is William Z. Foster, present chairman of the Communist Party, U. S. A. The following comments were made after his European trip in 1947:

"The new democracies in Yugoslavia, Poland, and other countries in central and eastern Europe are the result of national democratic revolutions. The essence of this revolution is that the peoples in these countries, during the war, with the potent help of the Red Army, drove out the Fascist invaders and also smashed their own big capitalists and landlords who almost unanimously joined the Fascists. In these struggles the old states' machinery was destroyed, and the peoples built new peoples' governments in their place, as well as nationalizing the basic sectors of the industrial system. * * *

"Let the major achievements of the progressive new Yugoslav Government illustrate the general trend in the new democracies. The properties of the traitor capitalists have been confiscated, without compensation. An end has been put to privately owned monopolies, cartels, and to so-called free enterprise in the basic economy of the country. The great landed estates, including the lands of the churches, have been divided up among the peasants. The landowners have received no compensation for their lands. * * *

"In the more progressive democracies on the Continent, however, the general policy (not yet fully applied) regarding compensation goes about like this: The many important industries owned by the Germans are confiscated outright, without compensation, and so also are the plants of native capitalists who collaborated with the Germans. As for the big landed estates, the general rule has been no compensation, although in some instances the church may be paid for the lands divided among the peasants." [340]

Again in the Worker for May 18, 1947, page 2, he continues his panegyric, as follows:

"Yugoslavia is now, next to the Soviet Union, the most democratic country in the world. It has become one of strong fortresses of international democracy. * * *

"The epic struggle was led by the National Liberation Front, the heart and backbone of which was the Communist Party. At the head of the whole war movement and of the new Yugoslavia stands Marshal Tito, a brilliant Marxist. * * *

"Answering further the general charges of Yugoslavian dictatorship, the marshal * * * defends the Soviet dictatorship of the proletariat, as having been 'necessary in the great October revolution, so that the ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin might be put fully into effect. * * *'"

Communist-front organizations in the United States are actively promoting the cause of Communist Yugoslavia, among them being the American Slav Congress, the Croatian Fraternal Union, the United Committee of South Slavic Americans, the International Workers Order, the American Committee for Yugoslav Relief, and the American Committee for a Free Yugoslavia. These efforts are supplemented by Slobodna Rech, a Communist Serbian newspaper, as well as the Croatian newspaper Zajednicar.

ITALY

The Communist Party of Italy has not yet realized its ambition of taking over power in that country. Its leader, Palmireo Togliatti, alias Ercoli, former member of the executive committee of the Communist International, has time and again threatened resort to force and violence, in the event that his group is not victorious through parliamentary means. Speaking at the sixth congress of the Communist Party of Italy in January 1948, he declared:

"We have after all experience which is much greater than that which we had in 1920 and 1923. We have behind us the experience of the partisan war and not only do we have this experience, but tens of thousands of youths and adults who have

---

[336] Tito's Imperial Communism, by R. H. Markham (University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1947), pp. 73, 74, 79, 114, 122, 144, 145, 216, 264, 265.

[337] My Conscience Is Clear, by Aloysius Stepinac, pamphlet No. 9 (Catholic Information Society, New York, 1947), pp. 9, 10, and 12.

[338] National and International Movements, Report on the Strategy and Tactics of World Communism, Supplement 2, printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs by Subcommittee No. 5 (U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1948), pp. 100, 101, and 102.

[339] Daily Worker, October 2, 1947, pp. 6 and 9.

[340] The New Europe, by William Z. Foster (International Publishers, New York, 1947), pp. 18, 25, 26, 28, and 29.

learned to use arms for the defense of liberty and the independence of the country and who, if the situation should arise in which as happens many times in the course of democratic revolutions, liberty must be also defended and reacquired with arms, they would do everything in their duty toward democracy and toward their fatherland." [341]

The phrases about "liberty," "democracy," and "independence" are, of course, simply Communist double talk for a Communist dictatorship. Reporting from Italy for the New York Times of November 17, 1947, page 1, Arnaldo Cortesi states:

"Fear that the Communists are about to pass from riots and strikes to some more positive form of direct action spread in Italy today.

"Palmiro Togliatti, No. 1 Communist, speaking in Milan today, urged his followers to 'descend into the streets again, if necessary, and defend democracy in a much more determined form.'

"The Communist central committee also heard speeches by Luigi Longo and Mauro Scoccimarro, lesser leaders, who voiced their belief that legal methods of seizing power should be abandoned."

In the same vein Mauro Scoccimarro, former Minister of Finance, addressing the provincial congress of the Communist Party in Turin, declared last year:

"In this new phase we can even be pushed to a position wherein the last word will be arms." [342]

The confidence of these two Communist leaders in the outcome of a violent assault upon the constituted Government of Italy is based upon the fact that the Communist Party is known to have made elaborate armed preparation for an uprising, according to reliable reporters. We cite for example the New York Times of November 11, 1947, page 18:

"Authorities estimate the strength of the Communist partisans in the four northern regions of Liguria, Piedmont, Lombardy, and Emila at more than 80,000. These men, they said, are fully armed and live mostly outside the large cities. In addition, it was added, the parliamentary organization of the Communists in the cities can count on action squads divided into cells of 5 to 10 men. * * *

"These groups are the 'shock troops' that in case of armed demonstration or downright insurrection would have the task of quickly seizing key points in the cities as the first step toward control."

Again this picture is amplified by the report of the unusually well informed columnist, Constantine Brown:

"A well-disciplined force of 20,000 to 25,000 men, accompanied by bugles and drums, paraded Sunday in Rome under the pretext of honoring the unknown soldier of World War II. * * *

"The paraders were unarmed, but the Italian Government knows that there are caches of arms in Rome itself, ready for distribution to Longo's partisans at a given signal.

"The number of Italian Communist partisans, which were estimated last spring at about 70,000, is said to have increased in the last few months to more than 200,000, thus almost equaling the combined total of the regular Italian Army and police force. * * *

"The parade Sunday in Rome was only an appetizer, a warning to the Italian Government that the Italian Communists are ready for a show-down which could plunge the country into civil war." [343]

Citing a secret United States Army report which has never been denied, Drew Pearson states in the Washington Post for September 8, 1947, page 12:

"The United States Army has discovered hidden stores of Communist arms, and an underground Italian-Slav army ready to seize northern Italy as soon as the American Army evacuates.

" 'The chief aim of insurrectional action,' says the secret War Department report, 'is to build a bridgehead for the Slav elements of the Emilia-Romagna region.'

"To further the Italian insurrection aims, the occupation wedge would, by acts of sabotage on highways and railways, ambush, and other guerrilla tactics, cut off the movements of the Allies in support of the Government troops sent to crush the insurrection.

"Having started in the heart of Emilia, the movement would immediately extend into the Veneto and the Liguria and gradually embrace the surrounding regions (like an oil spot) either through disorganizing and flanking operations of the militarily less organized Red elements of those districts, or by armed action aiming at a new march on Rome whose duce would be Longo.

"The action is based particularly on surprise and ferocity in the early hours so as to gain a few days of insurrectional autonomy in order to mobilize.

"Citing direct Soviet aid given to the Italian Communists, the report states: 'The Russian officers residing at the Soviet repatriation office of Salsomaggiere are the technical advisers of the regional command.' "

These efforts have, however, gone far beyond the stage of mere verbal threats and military preparation. They have reached the stage of actual and open resort to violent methods. We shall rely in this connection upon the reports of Arnaldo Cortesi, well-known reporter for the New York Times:

"Communist shock troops attacked policemen who had ventured ahead of the main force. Two policemen were hit with clubs and seriously injured. A second lieutenant was taken prisoner and held as a hostage.

"At this point the police fired over the rioters' heads. In reply the Communists threw five hand grenades against the police jeeps. [344]

"The most serious happened in Ferrar, where the Communists were aroused over the arrest of one Elio Benati, who was suspected of organizing previous riots. A large crowd of demonstrators after listening to an inflammatory speech by Communist Deputy Ruggiero Grieco, attacked the central police station. The mob was repulsed twice but on its third try overwhelmed the police and released the prisoner, who was carried in triumph through the streets. [345]

"Near Agro di Vernola Communists cut down telephone posts. The police arrested some of the persons responsible, including the Communist secretary of the local chamber of labor. * * *

"When a group of Communist 'activists' tried to force their way into the meeting hall they clashed with the police, who arrested one * * *.

"A general strike was ordered in Chiusi yesterday to force the release of five former Communist partisans accused of murder. They were held for trial on a charge of killing a police sergeant and four carabinieri.

"The extreme left-wing press is making every effort to fan the fire into a blaze. L'Unita, Communist Party newspaper, published a report of yesterday's riots in Palermo, Sicily, under the headline, The People of Palermo Destroy the Lairs of the Enemies of Democracy. [346]

"Communist 'activists' (specialists in direct action, organized into efficient squads, poured into the city [Naples] by the hundreds aboard trucks and spread confusion and terror far and wide.

"The Communists wrecked and burned the offices of right-wing organizations and parties, hunted down and attacked citizens suspected of anti-Communist sympathies, engaged in numerous encounters with the police, and attempted to storm the police headquarters and city hall * * *.

"While the rioting in Naples still was in progress, Communist deputies were threatening further violence. * * *

"When the available supply of newspapers had been exhausted, the Communists organized numerous man hunts and attacked citizens who they thought were members of right-wing parties. Many of the intended victims defended themselves strenuously, and gunfire soon was heard all over the city. The Communists resisted all attempt at interference by the police, who were handicapped by strict orders from Rome not to shoot unless it was necessary * * *.

"Later the Communists demolished the headquarters of the right-wing parties, those of the Common Man Front and of the Nationalist movement being the favorite targets. Typewriters, telephones, furniture, files, and books were thrown into the streets and set afire * * *.

"The fighting assumed an extremely grave turn when the police, after a hand-to-hand clash, arrested half a dozen criminals who were recognized among the most turbulent elements in the Communist crowd and took them to headquarters, which soon was surrounded by an enraged mob. [347]

"Lawlessness and violence on a considerable scale broke out yesterday and today in Genoa, Milan, and some minor centers in northern Italy. The rioting followed a speech delivered by Palmiro Togliatti, the Communist leader, to the central committee of the Communist Party, in which he announced an intensification of agitation against the Government, both inside and outside the constituent assembly.

"In Genoa yesterday some hundreds of Communist 'activists' (specialists in direct action) were transported to the center of the city in trucks belonging to the local chamber of labor and indulged in numerous acts of violence. They demolished the headquarters of the Nationalist Party, robbing and seriously injuring the 74-year-old janitor. The Communists then sacked and set fire to the offices of the extreme right-wing Italian Social Movement. They seized its leader, Prof. Emanuel Gherzi, with the intention of submitting him to the judgment of a people's tribunal.

"The disturbances lasted almost all day, and many citizens who expressed their disapproval of the Communists' actions were beaten * * *.

"Soon afterward a crowd of Communists wrecked the headquarters of the independent partisan movement, which is believed to be anti-Communist, then set fire to the headquarters of the Common Man Front. (It also demolished the plant of the Monarchist newspaper, Mattio d'Italia, the United Press said.)

"According to the best available information, however, it appears that several hundred Communist workers went to San Giuliano last night to carry out a punitive expedition against some local residents said to be responsible for a shooting that had occurred in the village. After severely beating one man, they went to a farm owned by two brothers, who were absent. They found a young nephew of the owner, Giorgio Magenes, whom the left-wing press described

---

[341] L'Unita, January 6, 1948.

[342] Washington Post, December 9, 1947, p. 3.

[343] Washington Evening Star of December 9, 1947, p. A–11.

[344] New York Times, December 6, 1947, p. 2.

[345] New York Times, November 19, 1947, p. 12.

[346] New York Times, November 16, 1947, pp. 1 and 28.

[347] New York Times, November 14, 1947, p. 4–C.

as a Fascist and whom the right-wing press called a member of the Common Man Front.

"Signor Magenes, seeing the crowd advance, climbed to the roof and with a revolver killed one of the attackers and wounded another who later died. The attackers finally induced Signor Magenes to come down by promising to spare his life, but as soon as he was in their hands they beat him to death. Among the attackers was the Communist mayor of San Giuliano." [348]

These are not the irresponsible utterances or acts of an individual Communist Party acting on its own, but they are rather a part of the international pattern originally established by the Communist International, to which all sections of this movement conform in accordance with the particular stage of development of the movement. Reporting to the Sixth Congress of the Communist Party of Italy, held on January 4–10, 1948, which was attended by fraternal delegates of Communist Parties of other countries, Palmiro Togliatti emphasized this fact, in the following words:

"Comrades, representatives of the fraternal parties, we have known each other for a long time; we are veterans of many struggles. There is nothing in the recollection of our common past, of our common work and struggle, when we were united in the great proletarian organization—in the Communist International—of which we need feel ashamed. On the contrary, we are proud of our past." [349]

Finally Togliatti acknowledged that the principles and tactics of the Communist Party of Italy are based upon the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin and the example of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

"Marxism-Leninism contain the principles which enable one to understand history of human development, why the problems of building a new society are raised in one form and not another. In the Communist Manifesto we find the sources of the greatest streams of thought and action in modern history, the culminating point of which is the great October Socialist revolution, carried out by the Communist Party of the Bolsheviks, the party which was educated by Lenin and Stalin in the spirit of the teachings of Marx and Engels, in the spirit of the Communist Manifesto. This great party was able, for the first time in history, to lead the working class to the conquest of power, to transform it into a leading class, to lay the foundations of the new Socialist society.

"I can think of no better way of concluding this session of our Congress than by addressing ourselves with respect and gratitude to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its leaders who were able to make a decisive contribution to the historical development of mankind because they remained faithful to the principles of Marxism. Our party, too, must be loyal to those principles if it wishes to go forward and develop as a great democratic revolutionary force." [350]

The Worker of March 30, 1947, page 9, official organ of the Communist Party, United States of America, displayed considerable pride in the achievements of the Communist Party of Italy and praised Palmiro Togliatti, its secretary, whom William Z. Foster has called one of the "most brilliant and effective" statesmen in continental Europe today. During Foster's visit to Rome, as described in the same issue of the Worker, he was escorted about by Ambrogio Donnini, for years an active member of the Communist Party, United States of America, and now a prominent leader of Italian Communists. Foster reported he felt that "Communists really count in democratic Italy."

MISCELLANEOUS COUNTRIES

We could go on and on in amplification of the pattern we have outlined above as shown in Brazil, Burma, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Egypt, France, Germany, India, Indochina, Indonesia, Japan, and other countries. Everywhere it is the same with minor differences in accord with the local situation—unreserved adherence to the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin; the carrying out of these theories in the form of resort to force and violence; slavish loyalty to the Soviet Union. In every case the use of force and violence by other Communist parties is supported by the Communist Party, United States of America, its spokesmen, its official organs, and its front organizations, as well as by the Soviet Union.

LEGAL DETERMINATIONS AS TO THE COMMUNIST PARTY AND ITS ADVOCACY OF OVERTHROW OF GOVERNMENT BY FORCE AND VIOLENCE

SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

The Schneiderman case: The Communist Party and its spokesmen have, ever since the opinion in the Schneiderman case [351] was handed down by the Supreme Court in the summer of 1943, claimed that this decision established the fact that the Communist Party does not advocate the overthrow of the Government by force and violence, whereas in reality the holding in the case was on the narrow issue as to whether the Government, in a denaturalization proceeding, had sustained the burden of proof by clear, unequivocal, and convincing evidence that Schneiderman was not in fact attached to the principles of the Constitution. The Court determined the Government had not sustained the necessary burden of proof.

Moreover, the Court expressly stated:

"For some time the question whether advocacy of governmental overthrow by force and violence is a principle of the Communist Party of the United States has perplexed courts, administrators, legislators, and students. * * * This Court has never passed upon the question whether the party does so advocate and it is unnecessary for us to do so now."

The Bridges case: Another case often referred to by the Communist Party in an endeavor to prove that one may advocate overthrow of the Government by force and violence and still not be subject to deportation under the pertinent statute is that of *Bridges v. Wixon*.[352] The Court in this case merely held (1) that the Government had not proved that Bridges was so associated with the Communist Party as to necessarily advocate the overthrow of the Government by force and violence, but that he was in reality cooperating with the Communist Party only in wholly legitimate measures and, therefore, was not so affiliated therewith, in the sense intended by the statute, as to warrant his deportation; and (2) that evidence of affiliation employed to find that Bridges was a member of the Communist Party was improperly admitted. Nowhere did the Court suggest that the Communist Party did not advocate the overthrow of the Government by force and violence, since that question was not in issue.

FEDERAL COURT DECISIONS

Opposed to this refusal on the part of the Supreme Court of the United States to make a judicial determination as to whether the Communist Party advocates the overthrow of the Government by force and violence we have the decision of many lower Federal courts that the party does so advocate.[353] These courts have uniformly sustained, when based on comparable records, administrative findings to the effect that the Communist Party from its inception in 1919 has believed in, advised, advocated, and taught the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States. Other courts have gone to the extent of holding that the Communist Party, as a matter of law, will be presumed to advocate force and violence even in the absence of specific evidence.[354] The following are excerpts from opinions of still other Federal courts on the advocacy by the Communist Party of the overthrow of the Government by force and violence:

Antolish v. *Paul et al.* (283 F. 957 at p. 959):

"(3) When, therefore, purposes and methods are announced which indicate an overthrow of society and government as now organized, constituted, or claimed to be dominated in language such as 'by direct action,' by 'mass action,' by 'revolutionary mass action,' suggesting 'the army of the proletariat,' the 'revolutionary soldiers,' the 'red guard,' the use of all means of 'battle,' direct conflict with governmental machinery in open combat, and the like, the query at once arises whether such language is fairly susceptible of a meaning which necessarily excludes all but peaceable or persuasive means and necessarily suggests repugnance to force or violence, or that it excludes any idea except a change so peaceable, yet so certain, that the transition from the old to the new era will come about with a sort of gradual spontaneity, the old quite willingly receding before the new. It suffices to accept the concession, made by counsel upon argument, that it is hardly fair to ascribe to such language a meaning so exceedingly mild. In other words, the concession was made that, of necessity, the means to be used, if success

[348] New York Times, November 3, 1947, p. 1.

[349] For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy, January 15, 1948, p. 2, organ of the information bureau of the Communist Parties, Belgrade.

[350] Ibid., p. 4.

[351] 320 U. S. 118 (1943).

[352] 326 U. S. 135 (1945).

[353] *Kenmotsu* v. *Nagle* (44 F. 2d 953, 954–955 (C. C. A. 9)); certiorari denied (283 U. S. 832); *Saksagansky* v. *Weedin* (53 F. 2d 13, 16 (C. C. A. 9)); *Wolck* v. *Weedin* (58 F. 2d 928, 929 (C. C. A. 9); *Sormunen* v. *Nagle* (59 F. 2d 398, 399 (C. C. A. 9)); *Branch* v. *Cahill* (88 F. 2d 545, 546 (C. C. A. 9)); *Berkman* v. *Tillinghast* (58 F. 2d 621; 622–623 (C. C. A. 1)); *In re Saderquist* (11 F. Supp. 525, 526–527 (D. Me.)); affirmed sub nom., *Sorquist* v. *Ward* (83 F. 2d 890 (C. C. A. 1)); *United States* v. *Curran* (11 F. 2d 683, 685 (C. C. A. 2)); certiorari denied sub nom., *Vojnovic* v. *Curran* (271 U. S. 683); *United States* v. *Smith* (2 F. 2d 90, 91 (W. D. N. Y.)); *Re Worozcyt et al.* (58 Can. Cr. Cas. 161 (Sup. Ct. Nova Scotia, 1932)). Of the three cases mentioned in the opinion of *Schneiderman* v. *United States* (320 U. S. 118, at 148, fn. 30) as holding to the contrary, one—*Colyer* v. *Skeffington* (265 Fed. 17 (D. Mass.))—was, as there noted, reversed on appeal (sub nom. *Skeffington* v. *Katzeff*, 277 Fed. 129 (C. C. A. 1)); and one—*Strecker* v. *Kessler* (90 F. 2d 976 (C. C. A. 5))—was affirmed by this Court, with modification, on other grounds, and without consideration of this point (307 U. S. 22). In the third, *Ex parte Fierstein* (41 F. 2d 53 (C. C. A. 9)), the only evidence adduced in support of the finding was the bare statement of the arresting detective that the party did so advocate.

[354] *Murdock* v. *Clark* (53 F. 2d 155, 157 (C. C. A. 1)); *United States ex rel. Yokinen* v. *Commissioner* (57 F. 2d 707 (C. C. A. 2)); certiorari denied (287 U. S. 607); *United States ex rel. Fernandas* v. *Commissioner of Immigration* (65 F. 2d 593 (C. C. A. 2)); *United States* v. *Perkins* (79 F. 2d 533 (C. C. A. 2)); *United States* v. *Reimer* (79 F. 2d 315, 316 (C. C. A. 2)); *United States ex rel. Fortmueller* v. *Commissioner of Immigration* (14 F. Supp. 484, 487 (S. D. N. Y.)); *Ungar* v. *Seaman* (4 F. 2d 80, 81 (C. C. A. 8)); *Ex parte Jurgans* (17 F. 2d 507, 511 (D. Minn.), affirmed, 25 F. 2d 35 (C. C. A. 8)).

is to be achieved, involved the use of force if and whenever other means prove unavailing."

Skeffington v. *Katzeff* (277 F. 129, at pp. 132–133):

"We have carefully examined these exhibits for the purpose of ascertaining whether they contain statements which, giving to language its ordinary meaning, would warrant any reasonable mind in reaching the conclusion that the Communist Party teaches or advocates the overthrow by force and violence of this Government as now constituted.

"Following are some of the declarations of purpose and program which, whether found in the manifesto of the Communist International or in the manifesto and constitution of the Communist Party of America, are binding upon a member of the latter, for in the application for membership the applicant declares 'his adherence to the principles and tactics of the party and the Communist International':

" 'Communism does not propose to "capture" the bourgeoise parliamentary state but to conquer and destroy it. As long as the bourgeoise state prevails the capitalist class can baffle the will of the proletariat. * * *

" 'The state is an organ of coercion. * * *

" 'Therefore it is necessary that the proletariat organize its own state for the coercion and suppression of the bourgeoisie. Proletarian dictatorship is a recognition of that fact; it is equally a recognition of the fact that in the Communist reconstruction of society the proletariat alone counts as a class. * * *

" 'The proletarian class struggle is essentially a political struggle. It is a political struggle in the sense that its objective is political—overthrow of the political organizations upon which capitalist exploitation depends, and the introduction of a proletarian state power. The object is the conquest by the proletariat of the power of the state. * * *

" 'The organized power of the bourgeoise is in the civil state, with its capitalistic army under control of bourgeoise-junker officers, its police and gendarmes, jailers and judges, its priests, government officials, etc. Conquest of the political power means not merely a change in the personnel of ministries, but annihilation of the enemy's apparatus of government; disarmament of the bourgeoise, of the counterrevolutionary officers, of the white guard; arming of the proletariat, the revolutionary soldiers, the red guard of workingmen. * * *

" 'The revolutionary era compels the proletariat to make use of the means of battle which will concentrate its entire energies; namely, mass action, with its logical resultant, direct conflict with the governmental machinery in open combat. All other methods, such as revolutionary use of bourgeoise parliamentarism, will be of only secondary significance. * * *

" 'Civil war is forced upon the laboring classes by their archenemies. The working class must answer blow for blow if it will not renounce its own object and its own future, which is at the same time the future of all humanity.

" 'The Communist Parties, far from conjuring up civil war artificially, rather strive to shorten its duration as much as possible—in case it has become an iron necessity—to minimize the number of its victims, and above all to secure victory for the proletariat. This makes necessary the disarming of the bourgeoise at the proper time, the arming of the laborer, and the formation of a Communist army as the protector of the rule of the proletariat and the inviolability of the social structure. Such is the Red Army of Soviet Russia, which arose to protect the achievements of the working class against every assault from within or without. The Soviet Army is inseparable from the Soviet state.'

"We think it would be going far afield to say that, from such statements of purpose, no reasonable man could reach the conclusion that force and violence are the necessary instrumentalities for its accomplishment and are contemplated, and that, if consummated, it would overthrow government as now instituted. On the contrary, it seems to us that a program which advocates the disarmament of the armed forces of the existing state, the arming of the laborers and the formation of a Communist army to protect the rule of the proletariat, affords substantial evidence that the Communist Party, of which the relators are confessed and avowed members, teaches and advocates the overthrow of government by force and violence."

United States ex rel. Abern v. *Wallis, Commissioner of Immigration* (286 F. 413):

"* * * the manifesto and program of the Communist Party, together with other exhibits in the case, are of such character as to easily lead a reasonable man to conclude that the purpose of the Communist Party is to accomplish its end—namely, the capture and destruction of the state, as now constituted—by force and violence. Since the party has seen fit to use words of general application, which in their popular and ordinary sense may fairly import, and which are appropriate to the use of, force and violence, and which have been found to have that meaning, there is no obligation upon the court to refine and construe the language so as to reach a different result. If force and violence be not within the contemplation of the party, it would be a simple matter to have the absence of such thought clearly appear. As it is, the language used would seem designed to mean all things to all men, and to be fairly susceptible of meaning, even though it does not unequivocably declare in favor of, force and violence."

* * * * *

"It may, of course, be suggested that some regard should be had for the imminence of such a possibility, and I am free to say that from the party's organization, as appears in the record, such possibility is not of the immediate future. The act of Congress, however, under which this proceeding was instituted provides for the deportation of aliens who are members of or affiliated with any organization that entertains a belief in, teaches, or advocates the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States. It will thus be observed that the question here is not one of degrees of imminence of overthrow by force and violence, but rather whether that is the ultimate purpose of the organization."

Dunne et al. v. *United States* (138 F. (2d) 137):

This case involves members of the Socialist Workers Party, a dissident Communist group not affiliated with the Communist International nor officially recognized by either the Communist hierarchy in Moscow or the Communist Party, U. S. A. Essentially, however, both the official and unofficial groups base themselves upon the teachings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin. The Socialist Workers Party are followers of Leon Trotsky, who was expelled from the Russian Communist Party. The official Communists are followers of Joseph Stalin. The legal questions involved are, however, fully relevant to this discussion.

At pages 148 and 149 in its decision, the court said: The declaration sets forth the program of action to effectuate this overthrow of the existing capitalistic society and the government which supports it. The first step is to build up the strength of the party so that it can have a majority of the exploited classes back of its leadership. The final step is to overthrow the existing government by force. The statements now to be quoted from the declaration leave no doubt that the final means are to be force and not orderly change:

"The belief that in such a country as the United States we live in a free, democratic society in which fundamental economic change can be effected by persuasion, by education, by legal and purely parliamentary methods is an illusion (R. 1182).

"The fundamental instruments of the workers' struggle for power cannot be the existing institutions of the governmental apparatus, since these represent basically the interests only of the capitalistic minority (R. 1183).

"Whenever the revolutionists find themselves in a Labor Party they will stand at each stage for those concrete policies and actions which sum up a progressive and class perspective; for complete breaks with the capitalist parties and no support of candidates on capitalist tickets; for direct mass actions and avoidance of limitation to parliamentary activities; for full internal democracy; for support and defense of concrete working-class rights against their invasion from any source, including invasions from candidates of the Labor Party itself; etc. (R. 119).

"While relying primarily on mass actions, propaganda, and agitation as the means for furthering its revolutionary aim, the party will also participate in electoral campaigns, though at all times contending against the fatal illusion that the masses can accomplish their emancipation through the ballot box.

"That the final use of force to overthrow the Government was the method of the party is further shown by expressions in the official publications of the party, by its leaders, officers, organizers, speakers, lecturers, and writers, and by the privately expressed statements of such. The party opposed Stalin (R. 932–934, 1196, 1266, 1272), supported Trotsky, and adopted and supported the Trotsky program from the beginning of the party (R. 944–945). After Trotsky arrived in Mexico (January 1937) various leaders of the party conferred with him there as to policies and actions. In the spring of 1938 and thereafter the matter of the use of defense guards was discussed with him (R. 288, 946–947). He either originated or endorsed the idea of such bodies (R. 286–287, 546, 569, 606, 686, 742–743, 949–950). The guards were to be organizations which party members would foster within labor unions to use force in protection of the unions. They were to grow into a militia and finally into the Red Army (R. 286–289, 415, 491, 540, 606, 716, 968–969, 1085–1086). Such a defense guard was organized in the Teamsters' Local No. 544 at Minneapolis in July or August 1938 (R. 1044) or in the fall of 1938 (R. 1014, 1102). This record leaves no doubt that force was the ultimate means to be used by the party in the overthrow of the Government by the 'proletariat.' Also, the record is substantial that a plan of organizing this force through the development of defense guards was employed."

United States ex rel. Georgian v. *Uhl* (271 Fed. 676 (C. C. A. 2d)):

The question whether the advocacy or belief contemplated by the statute (sec. I and II of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by the act of June 5, 1920) must relate to "immediate overthrow" has been considered by several courts.

In this case, the Court said:

"We express no opinion as to the result upon our minds of the evidence adduced at the deportation hearing, beyond this, viz, there was evidence, indeed it was admitted that though he did not and does not believe in the immediate overthrow of the Government of the United States that position is not the result of any affection for the same or approval of this Republic, nor of any objection to force and violence per se, but only results from an opinion that the time is not ripe. Ripeness is to be attained by teaching

and by the dissemination of the style of literature which it is his business to circulate; when the time is ripe, it is to be hoped that force and violence will not be necessary, but they will be appropriate as soon as they are likely to prevail.

"However fantastic the above-outlined social program may seem, it is impossible to say that a professed and avowed effort to hasten its consummation is not evidence of that which the statute forbids."

Turner v. *Williams* (194 U. S. 279):

This is another case illustrative of the point that advocacy or belief in the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence need not relate to "immediate overthrow" to be within the meaning of the pertinent immigration law.

In this case, the Court said:

"In that case there was involved the constitutionality of a provision contained in the Immigration Act of 1903 for the deportation of aliens who, at the time of entry, were 'anarchists.' The argument was made that 'conceding that Congress has the power to shut out any alien, the power nevertheless does not extend to some aliens, and that if the act includes all alien anarchists, it is unconstitutional, because some anarchists are merely political philosophers, whose teachings are beneficial rather than otherwise' (p. 292). After pointing out through a dictionary definition that the term 'anarchist' is used in the popular sense as 'one who seeks to overturn by violence all constituted forms and institutions of society and government, all law and order, and all rights of property, with no purpose of establishing any other system of order in the place of that destroyed' the Court said (p. 293): 'The language of the act is "anarchists, or persons who believe in or advocate the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States or of all government or of all forms of law, or the assassination of public officials." If this should be construed as defining the word "anarchists" by the words which follow, or as used in the popular sense above given it would seem that when an alien arrives in this country, who avows himself to be anarchist, without more, he accepts the definition. And we suppose counsel does not deny that this Government has the power to exclude an alien who believes in or advocates the overthrow of the Government or of all governments by force or the assassination of officials. To put that question is to answer it.'

"The Court then reviewed the evidence with reference to the alien involved and came to the conclusion (p. 294) that 'we cannot say that the inference was unjustifiable either that he contemplated the ultimate realization of his ideal by the use of force, or that his speeches were incitements to that end.'

"There is nothing in the legislative history of the phrase 'the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States' as used either in the 1920 or 1918 acts or in the prior statutes of 1917, 1907, and 1903, which indicates that Congress intended the phrase to be given such a narrow construction as would include only those aliens or organizations that believe in, teach, or advocate the immediate overthrow of this Government. Congressman Shattuc, the chairman of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, in presenting to the House the bill which became the 1903 act, and in pointing to some of the evils which it sought to meet, indicated a purpose in the bill as a whole broader than the protection of our Government against a danger of present overthrow:

"'* * * it has developed, new elements have been purposely injected into the stream (of immgrants) which, unless checked, threatened not only to seriously pollute it, but also to thrust upon our Nation and the States burdens they should not be called upon to bear.

"'By reason of this change the feeling of welcome which had hailed the incoming immigrant from 1821 to 1875 changed to one of alarm lest "the unguarded gate" might allow entrance too freely to elements discordant and not easily assimilated, as well as burdensome and harmful to the best interests of the country.

"'Hence there has arisen the demand, growing more and more insistent, that restrictive measures should be enacted to regulate the influx and sift the quality of the incoming aliens. * * *' (35 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 5757.)" [855]

Portions of the foregoing are excerpts from the brief of the United States Government in the case of *Kessler* v. *Strecker* (307 U. S. 22 (1939)).

FINDINGS OF FACT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL BIDDLE IN THE HARRY BRIDGES CASE

On May 28, 1942, Attorney General Biddle in his opinion in the case of Harry Bridges, on pages 31 and 32, made the following findings of fact relative to the Communist Party of the United States:

"That the Communist Party of the United States of America, from the time of its inception in 1919 to the present time, is an organization that believes in, advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States.

"That the Communist Party of the United States of America, from the time of its inception to the present time, is an organization that writes, circulates, distributes, prints, publishes, and displays printed matter advising, advocating, or teaching the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States.

"That the Communist Party of the United States of America, from the time of its inception to the present time, is an organization that causes to be written, circulated, distributed, printed, published, and displayed printed matter advising, advocating, and teaching the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States.

"That the Communist Party of the United States of America, from the time of its inception to the present time, is an organization that has in its possession for the purpose of circulation, distribution, publication, issue, and display, printed matter advising, advocating, and teaching the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States."

On pages 7, 8, and 9 of his report the Attorney General stated the following relative to the history of the Communist Party, its aims and purposes:

"'The Communist Party of the United States, a section of the so-called Third International, was founded in 1919, and, after its name was changed several times, finally became the Communist Party of the United States of America in 1929. The Third International advocated the class struggle, which was described as entering the phase of civil war in America. Illegal methods were also advocated, where necessary, to carry on its work; systematic agitation in the Army, the renouncing of patriotism, and the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism.

"The American 'section' adopted a program declaring: 'The Communist Party will systematically and persistently propagate the idea of the inevitability of and necessity for violent revolution and will prepare the workers for armed insurrection as the only means of overthrowing the capitalist state.'

"The Communist Party teaches the violent overthrow of existing governments, including the United States. This concept reaches back to the famous manifesto of Marx and Engels of 1848, which declares: 'The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions.'

"In The Thesis and Statutes of the Third International (1920) this doctrine is expanded:

"'The mass struggle means a whole system of developing demonstrations growing ever more acute in form and logically leading to an uprising against the capitalistic order of government.' Lenin speaks of the necessity of violent revolution.

"This and much other documentary evidence introduced by the Government, and the oral evidence of a number of witnesses to the same effect, who testified that the Communist Party of the United States had indoctrinated its members with these purposes, establishes, as Judge Sears concludes, that it is an organization that advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States.

"The evidence also sustained the Government's contention that the party writes, circulates, distributes, prints, publishes, and displays printed matter advising such overthrow, so that the party comes within the purview of the statute. This also Judge Sears found.

HISTORICAL PRECEDENTS AS TO THE COMMUNIST PARTY'S ADVOCACY OF THE OVERTHROW OF THE GOVERNMENT BY FORCE AND VIOLENCE

In a printed document, Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, entitled "Recognition of Russia," at page 530, the following statement of Robert F. Kelley, Division of Eastern European Affairs, Department of State, appears:

"It is believed that the evidence presented by the Department of State at this hearing has conclusively established three facts:

"First, the essential unity of the Bolshevik organization known as the Communist Party, so-called Soviet Government, and the Communist International, all of which are controlled by a small group of individuals, technically known as the political bureau of the Russian Communist Party.

"Second, the spiritual and organic connection between this Moscow group and its agent in this country—the American Communist Party and its legal counterpart, the Workers' Party. Not only are those organizations the creation of Moscow, but the latter has also elaborated their program and controlled and supervised their activities. While there may have existed in the United States individuals, and even groups, imbued with Marxist doctrines prior to the advent of the Communist International, the existence of a disciplined party equipped with a program aiming at the overthrow of the institutions of this country by force and violence is due to the intervention of the Bolshevik organizations into the domestic political life of the United States. The essential fact is the existence of an organization in the United States created by and completely subservient to a foreign organization striving to overthrow the existing social and political order of this country.

"Third, the subversive and pernicious activities of the American Communist Party and the Workers' Party and their subordinate

---

[855] The report of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, accompanying this bill, with respect to the instant provision, stated: "The second class [the class herein involved] was introduced to enable this country to deal effectively with an evil of a most insidious character, by rejecting those aliens whose purpose in seeking the protection and freedom furnished by American institutions is to propagate the doctrine of forcible resistance, by bloodshedding if necessary, to organized law and order, upon the theory that an effective treatment of the evil can be best secured by refusing admission to the teachers and disciples of a system not indigenous to the soil of this country" (H. Rept. No. 982, 57th Cong., 1st sess., p. 3).

and allied organs in the United States are activities resulting from and flowing out of the program elaborated for them by the Moscow group."

EXCERPTS FROM BRIEF OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT IN THE SCHNEIDERMAN CASE

Also following are excerpts from the brief of the United States Government in the Schneiderman case, hereinabove referred to, which throw great light upon the Communist Party aims and principles:

"The program of the Communist International and the resolutions of the United States section were to the effect that in the event of hostilities with Soviet Russia the first allegiance of party members was to be toward the U. S. S. R. (p. 8).[356]

"The court found that petitioner's oath of allegiance to the United States, required by title 8, United States Code, section 381, was false in that petitioner maintained allegiance and fidelity to the U. S. S. R. and to the Third International. The court also found that at the time of his naturalization and during the 5 years prior thereto, petitioner was a member of the Communist Party, the principles of which were opposed to the Constitution, and advised, advocated, and taught the violent overthrow of the Government, Constitution, and laws of the United States and disbelief in and opposition to organized government; that petitioner believed in, advocated, and supported the principles of the party; that petitioner was 'a disbeliever in' and 'opposed to organized government' and that he was a member of an organization' teaching disbelief in or opposed to organized government' (p. 9).

"The evidence shows that petitioner's primary political loyalty was a definitive political organization known as the Communist Party and the Third Communist International, and that he did not bear true faith and allegiance to the United States. In case of hostilities between Soviet Russia and the United States, the party's and petitioner's first allegiance would have been to Soviet Russia.

"The structure of the Communist organizations, their interrelationships, and their relations with their individual members resulted, ex necessitate, in petitioner's owing allegiance to powers other than the United States (p. 10).

"Conversely, the evidence establishes petitioner's lack of true faith and allegiance to the United States. It was a fundamental Communist tenet that members of the party had no country and owed no 'social patriotism' to their 'own' government; accordingly, in the case of war Communists were to precipitate civil war and the army was to be induced to revolt (p. 11).

"The official and officially distributed Communist literature introduced in evidence affords a firm basis for the district court's conclusion that the party espoused force and violence to accomplish its objectives. It was early stated by Marx that communism could be achieved 'only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions.' The principle of force and violence was thereafter reiterated and emphasized, particularly during the petitioner's probationary period. So fundamental with the party was force and violence at that time other groups or individuals who advocated ends not substantially different from those of the party, or who even taught force and violence but without enthusiasm, were severely condemned by the party and if members, were expelled (p. 12).

"Petitioner's principles relating to force and violence were not simply passive; force and violence were not regarded as a matter of historical inevitability. Rather the Communists themselves were to follow a prescribed program in order to create the situation in which force and violence were to occur. Since the interpretation for which petitioner contends embodied active precipitation of civil war and the overthrow of the Government by force and violence, it is not substantially different from the interpretation for which the Government contended in the courts below.

"It was the view of the organization to which he belonged that American democracy is a 'fraud,' that the present state must be 'annihilated' and an entirely new system substituted (p. 15).

"The evidence unequivocally shows that there is and can be no more than one interpretation of the literature concerning Communist objectives, aims, and tactics, with the possible exception of the narrow issue of force and violence, and even as to this issue it will be fully shown, infra, that the alleged distinction between prediction and advocacy is more apparent than real (p. 27).

"The district court found that petitioner at the time of his naturalization did not intend to bear true faith and allegiance to the United States but instead intended to maintain true faith and allegiance to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and to the Third International (p. 28).

"The record discloses that during the period in question national loyalties to a capitalistic state were regarded as incompatible with the obligations of party members, who were to have no 'fatherland' and no 'country.' They were, accordingly, to renounce 'social patriotism' and their 'own' government and country. It was the duty of the proletariat to 'destroy the bourgeois fatherland and not defend it or help extend it' (p. 46).

" 'We, members of the international proletariat, members of the exploited masses of the world, of the Communist Party and the Communist International declare * * * we will defend the Soviet Union, which is our country—the country of the working class of the world. We will do everything in our power to rout the imperialist enemies and bring about the victory of the Red Army' (acceptance speeches) (p. 47).

* * * * *

"Petitioner testified that he agreed with the general program and principles of the party at the time these speeches were made by the Communist candidates in the 1928 Presidential campaign. Although the speeches were made in 1928, we believe that they were sufficiently contemporaneous with petitioner's naturalization in June 1927 to reflect the principles of the party during the relevant period."

* * * * *

"Consistent with this purpose was the earlier pronouncement that—

" 'The Communist Parties should carry on precise and definite propaganda to induce the workers to refuse to transport any kind of military equipment intended for fighting against the Soviet Republics, and should also by legal or illegal means carry on propaganda amongst the troops sent against the workers' republics, etc.' (Statutes, Theses, and Conditions of Admission).

"To this end, in the course of such a war, the Communists were to 'propagate revolutionary defeatism' and 'agitate for the fraternalization of the soldiers of the imperialist armies which are arrayed against each other.'

* * * * *

"A 'foremost' task of the program of the Young Communist League and the Communist Party was 'revolutionary work in the bourgeois army through the organization of nuclei, revolutionary circles and groups. * * *'"

* * * * *

"To continue this thesis, as stated in another document:'

" 'Workers in ammunition plants, go on strike. Shut down your plants. Prevent governmental strikebreakers from resuming work. Keep guards over your railroad yards and depots lest transportation facilities be used by governmental agents. Marine workers, do not load either men or ammunition. Truck drivers, refuse to assist in war work. Workers of other industries, help the strikers. Farmers, refuse to give your foodstuffs and raw materials to be used for the slaughter.' (Why Communism?) (pp. 48 and 49.)

"The difficulty does not, in general, stem from an actual conflict of factual evidence; the basic evidence on this issue is chiefly documentary. Rather, the conflict centers upon the proper and sensible interpretation of the Communist principles as expressed in these documents (p. 60).

"In the fountainhead of Communist principles and doctrines, The Manifesto of the Communist Party, in whose general principles petitioner testified he believed, it was stated:

" 'The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions' (p. 62).

"The view that the Communists were to use force and violence to achieve their objectives was thereafter repeatedly advanced in their literature:

" 'We Communists say that there is one way to abolish the capitalist state, and that is to smash it by force. To make communism possible the workers must take hold of the state machinery of capitalism and destroy it' (Why Communism?).

" 'The dictatorship of the proletariat is born not of the bourgeois state of things but of * * * the development of the proletarian revolution through violence' (The Theory and Practice of Leninism, 1924–29) (p. 62).

" 'That which before the victory of the proletariat seems but a theoretical difference of opinion on the question of "democracy" becomes inevitably on the morrow of the victory a question which can only be decided by force of arms' (Statutes, Theses, and Conditions of Admission to the Communist International, 1923).

" 'The working class cannot achieve the victory over the bourgeoisie by means of the general strike alone and by the policy of folded arms. The proletariat must resort to an armed uprising.

" 'The elementary means of the struggle of the proletariat against the rule of the bourgeoisie is, first of all, the method of mass demonstrations. Such mass demonstrations are prepared and carried out by the organized masses of the proletariat under the direction of a united, disciplined, centralized Communist Party. Civil war is war. In this war the proletariat must have its efficient political officers, its good political general staff, to conduct operations during all the stages of that fight.

" 'The mass struggle means a whole system of developing demonstrations growing ever more acute in form logically leading to an uprising against the capitalist order of the government. In this warfare of the masses developing into a civil war, the guided party of the proletariat must, as a general rule, secure every and all lawful positions making them its auxiliaries in the revolutionary work, and subordinating such positions to the plans of the general campaign, that of the mass struggle (p. 63).

" 'An oppressed class which does not endeavor to possess and learn to handle arms would deserve to be treated as slaves. We would become bourgeois pacifists or opportunists if we forget that we are living in a class society, and that the only way out is through class struggle and the overthrow of the power of the ruling class. Our slogan must be: "Arming of the proletariat to con-

[356] Pages mentioned in this section refer to the pages of the Government brief.

quer, expropriate, and disarm the bourgeoisie." Only after the proletariat has disarmed the bourgeoisie will it be able, without betraying its historic task, to throw all arms on the scrap heap. This the proletariat will undoubtedly do. But only then, and on no account sooner'" (Program of the Young Communist International).

"The tenet that the Communists must achieve their objectives only by force and violence and not by peaceful means was declared applicable to the United States as well as elsewhere (p. 64):

"'Marx's limitation with regard to the "continent" has furnished the opportunists and mensheviks of every country with a pretext for asserting that Marx admitted the possibility of a peaceful transformation of bourgeois democracy into proletarian democracy, at least [in] some countries [England and America]. Marx did in fact recognize the possibility of this in the England and America of 1860, where monopolist capitalism and imperialism did not exist and where militarism and bureaucracy were as yet little developed. But now the situation in these countries is radically different; imperialism has reached its apogee there, and there militarism and bureaucracy are sovereign. In consequence Marx's restriction no longer applies' (The Theory and Practice of Leninism—The State and Revolution).

"So integral was the principle of the utilization of force and violence that the Communists sharply distinguished themselves from, and strongly denounced, other groups whose objectives might, in general, coincide with those of the Communists, but who subscribed to the belief that the means are to be peaceful (p. 65).

"'Fifth, in the same work of Engels * * * there is also a disquisition on the nature of a violent revolution; and the historical appreciation of its role becomes, with Engels, a veritable panegyric of a revolution by force. This, of course, no one remembers. To talk or even to think of the importance of this idea is not considered respectable by our modern Socialist parties, and in the daily propaganda and agitation among the masses it plays no part whatever. Yet it is indissolubly bound up with the "withering away" of the state in one harmonious whole. Here is Engels' argument:

"'"That force also plays another part in history (other than that of a perpetuation of evil), namely, a revolutionary part; that as Marx says, it is the midwife of every old society when it is pregnant with a new one; that force is the instrument and the means by which social movements hack their way through and break up the dead and fossilized political forms—of all this not a word by Herr Duehring. Duly, with sighs and groans, does he admit the possibility that for the overthrow of the system of exploitation force may, perhaps, be necessary but most unfortunate if you please, because all use of force, forsooth, demoralizes its user. And this is said in face of the great moral and intellectual advance which has been the result of every victorious revolution. * * * and this turbid, flabby, impotent, parson's mode of thinking dares offer itself for acceptance to the most revolutionary party history has ever known"' (The State and Revolution) (p. 66).

"'The necessity of systematically fostering among the masses this and only this point of view about violent revolution lies at the root of the whole of Marx's and Engels' teachings, and it is just the neglect of such propaganda and agitation both by the present predominant social chauvinists and the Kautskian schools that brings their betrayal of it into prominent relief'" (The State and Revolution.)

Nor were force and violence advocated simply as a necessary means; they were also urged for their purgative effect (p. 67).

"'Hence, revolution is not only necessary because there is no other way of overthrowing the ruling class, but also because, only in the process of revolution is the overthrowing class able to purge itself of the dross of the old society and become capable of creating a new society (Program of the Communist International) (p. 67). For reform was said to be only an accessory of the revolution, which was the primary objective (p. 68).

"Petitioner testified that the Communists hoped to attain their ends peacefully, but that although 'amending the constitution may provide for that * * * that is, as I see it, a purely academic question because the 'governing group in power today' will not permit the institution of a 'socialistic system' in the United States (p. 69).

"Petitioner's skepticism concerning the possibility of achieving communism by peaceful means in the United States coincides with the doubts expressed by other spokesmen.

"Petitioner suggests, however, that the right to resort to revolution is entirely consistent with accepted America principles, and that it is a right embodied in the Declaration of Independence and emphasized by Jefferson and Lincoln. But the revolution which petitioner contemplates bears no relation to the revolution approved by the Declaration, Jefferson, and Lincoln. The Declaration of Independence enunciates the right or revolution of the people 'whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends' and 'these ends of government' which the Declaration describes are to secure 'certain unalienable rights' which 'are endowed by' the Creator. Revolution is, therefore, justified in these circumstances. But the record in this case is barren of any suggestion that petitioner so circumscribed the right of revolution; rather, he believed in the right of a minority to overthrow any government which rejected the materialistic determinism advocated by Marx. Indeed, the very government which petitioner sought to create by revolution would be 'destructive of these ends': The traditional freedoms embodied in the Bill of Rights were to be denied 'the bourgeoisie'; 'class enemies' were to be deprived of their 'political rights'; and minorities were to lose their rights of representation. For the purposes of the Communist Party and its members were stated to be 'purposes utterly antagonistic to the purposes for which American democracy, so-called, was formed'" (p. 70).

"In the main, however, petitioner's evidence was directed toward establishing that the Communist philosophy is properly to be interpreted not as advocating—i. e., desiring—force and violence as an initial means to achieve its realization, but only as a prediction that force and violence would be necessary to defend the workers against capitalists' refusal to accept communism. Petitioner testified that such was his view of the Communist philosophy. Other evidence, embodied in the testimony of expert witnesses and in recent statements of Communists, similarly supported the view that the Communist attitude toward force and violence is not one of advocacy, in the sense that they desire it, but simply one of preparedness for the necessarily inevitable use of such means (p. 71).

"Broadly stated, the interpretation concerning force and violence for which petitioner contends is as follows: While it may be preferable and desirable to attain the ends of the Communist Party by peaceful means, attainment by such means is impossible. The impossibility derives from the fact that the 'ruling class' will not permit the achievement of the Communist ends. Instead, they will use every means of force and violence to resist the Communists. Accordingly, the Communists must, in turn meet the force and violence of the 'exploiters' or the 'ruling class' by their own force and violence. But the 'first user' of violence is the 'capitalistic government.' This sequence of events the Communists do not advocate; it is simply their prediction based on historical experience.

"A corollary to the distinction between advocacy and prediction is that the very existence of the state presupposes a present oppression of the dominated class by force and violence. Democracy itself is 'an organization for the systematic use of violence by one class against the other.' Therefore, even the present enforcement of a government's laws, coupled with the force and violence which the government is in position to use through its armed forces and police, constitute a present use of force and violence by capitalism, and, accordingly, force and violence have already been initiated by the state, and 'counterforce' is 'justified' (p. 73).

"'But this is force and violence,' somebody will contend. 'Don't you Communists know that the use of force and violence is wrong?' We reply to this, first, that if being a 'red-blooded American' means anything, it means that you must not take punishment lying down, that you must offer resistance; secondly, that it is not the workers but the capitalists and their state that start the use of force and violence. When you wish to stay on in your place of work and the employer who wants you fired sends for the watchman and has you thrown out, it is he that uses force. When you wish to stay on in the apartment of a house you and the like of you have built and the landlord calls the sheriff to evict you, it is he that uses force. When you go out on a demonstration in the open in front of a governmental office and the government sends the police and armed thugs to beat you up and disperse you, it is the government that is using force. When you are thrown in jail for refusing to transport ammunition in time of war, it is the government that is using violence against you. Force and violence are the daily bread of the exploiters and their government in dealing with the exploited. Force and violence are the very essence of the state. When the warehouses are bulging with foodstuffs you and the like of you have produced while you, the hungry, are kept from them by the armed force of watchmen and police, force and violence are used against you. How can you live and breathe if you do not resist? How can you defend your fundamental interests if you do not defy boss restrictions? To defy boss restrictions, to resist the attacks of the enemy class, is just as natural for the working class as it is for the red-blooded human being not to take punishment lying down (Why Communism?) (p. 73).

"Article X, section 5, of the 1938 constitution of the Communist Party provides for the expulsion of members 'found to be * * * advocates of terrorism and violence as a method of party procedure * * *.' Petitioner testified that this constitution is the only official expression of the principles of the party, and all other literature or documents inconsistent with it are, therefore, not binding on the party. But, as we have noted, the constitution also incorporates, by reference, the principles of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, 'embodied in the Communist International'; these principles, as we have seen, themselves included the advocacy of force and violence. But, in any event, we submit that petitioner's statement that all literature inconsistent with the 1938 constitution is not binding on the party does not foreclose the issue (p. 75).

"The constitution was adopted in 1938—11 years after petitioner was naturalized. It is, therefore, at most only slight evidence of the principles of the Communist Party and its predecessors in 1927 and the relevant prior

years, and it is not persuasive. The documents upon which the government relies in respect of the issue of force and violence are contemporaneous with petitioner's probationary period and naturalization. They are, in addition, on their face, official programs and expression, or where officially circulated and utilized as textbooks by the Communist Party and related Communist organizations. Further, the force of the 1938 constitution is doubtful in the light of the party's previously expressed principle to engage in opportunistic deviations in position, and to dilute its slogans and programs, where circumstances demand it.

"'The bolshevisation of our party must accomplish four general purposes:

* * * * *

"'(b) It must develop within the party and its membership an ability for maneuvering and campaigning in accord with the momentary needs and the possibilities of the class struggle.

"'A Communist Party must be able to maneuver and to adapt its tactics at all times to changing conditions. Changing conditions in the proletarian struggle for emancipation must not bring confusion into the ranks of the party but must be met by a Leninist appraisal of the new facts and if necessary by a speedy change of the methods of struggle (the Fourth National Convention, Workers (Communist) Party of America)' (p. 76).

"It cannot be gainsaid that language used in some Communist literature in respect of force and violence is susceptible of an interpretation more rhetorical than literal. But since the party saw fit to use explosive words of general application which in their ordinary sense fairly import that the party believed in, advocated, and taught the overthrow of this Government by force and violence when appropriate opportunity presented, there is no occasion, at least where the issue is the principles of the party itself, for a court to refine and construe the language so as to reach a different result (p. 78).

SUMMARY

The New York Times of March 23, 1948, quotes Hon. William O. Douglas, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, as stating that communism places state power in the hands of one small clique, enforces that power by secret police with the weapons of murder and terror, and sees to it that the people are deprived of the means of replacement and change. While this statement is not an official judicial decision, it is worthy of note as coming from a member of the United States Supreme Court.

From all of the above-quoted legal authorities, it is indisputably clear that, as presently constituted, the Communist Party of the United States advocates the overthrow by force and violence of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, your Committee on Un-American Activities has done its best to expose these subversive elements that threaten the destruction of our form of government, our religious institutions, and our American way of life.

We have been maligned, abused, and misrepresented by these subversive elements and their stooges in every possible way, in the press, over the radio, and through the moving-picture shows. But they have not deterred us, or our investigators, from getting the facts and exposing their un-American activities as the foregoing report shows.

I hope that every Member of Congress will join us in passing legislation that will forever put a stop to these subversive activities, and help us to save America for Americans.

Sabbath Observance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO ISACSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 13, 1948

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Speaker, Rabbi Dr. Jacob Hochman is the chairman of the West Bronx region of the Greater New York Council for Sabbath Observance. He delivered this talk on Sabbath observance at a mass meeting held at Congregation Ahavath Israel Anshei Sfard, 1744 Eastburn Avenue, Bronx, N. Y., on Sunday evening, January 30, 1948, at 7:30 p. m. This talk was also delivered over Station WEVD on the same day. It follows:

SABBATH OBSERVANCE

(By Rabbi Dr. Jacob Hochman, Bronx, N. Y.)

Friends, tonight I have the pleasure of speaking to you in behalf of Sabbath observance. The Sabbath is the chief bond which unites the Jews into a religious brotherhood. "Remember the Sabbath Day." Bear it in mind and prepare for its advent; think of it day by day, and speak of its holiness and its satisfying influence. By keeping the Sabbath we testify to our belief in God as the creator of the Universe, in a God who is not identical with Nature, but is a free personality, the Creator and ruler of the Nature. Man is made in the image of God and is endowed by Him with the power of creating. But in his little universe, too, matter is constantly getting out of hand, threatening to overwhelm and crush the soul. But the Sabbath, the Memorial of Creation endows us with the divine powers of saying "enough" to all rebellious claims of our environment and are reminded of our potential victory over all the material influences and forces that would drag us down. It has always been a blessing to those who observed it. The Sabbath is something that never existed in any nation or in any religion. It proved a standing reminder that man can emancipate himself from the slavery of worldly cares; that man was made for spiritual peace and joy. The Sabbath is one of the glories of our humanity.

Remember for if it to labor is noble, of our own free will to pause in that labor, which may lead to success, to money, to fame is nobler still. To dedicate one day a week to rest and to God, this is the prerogative and the privilege of man alone.

I come to you this evening as the chairman of the West Bronx region of the Greater New York Council for Sabbath Observance. It is indeed a high privilege for me to be able to present to my coreligionists of this community a life-insurance policy for perpetuity, gratis. That policy is the Sabbath.

All of us know that the Sabbath is the foundation of our faith. It is a sign between God and the children of Israel. "Remember the Sabbath Day to keep it holy." The Hebrew word Sabbath means desisting from work. Bear it in mind and prepare for its advent; think of it day by day and speak of its holiness and sanctifying influence.

The Sabbath, besides being a day of rest, is a holiday, set apart for the building up of the spiritual element in man. Religious worship and religious instruction—the renewal of man's spiritual life in God form an esential part of Sabbath observance. The Sabbath has thus proved to be the great educator of Israel in the highest education of all; namely, the laws governing human conduct. Sabbath worship unites Jews into a religious brotherhood. Neglect of such worship injures the spiritual life of both the individual and the community.

Work during the 6 days of the week is as essential to man's welfare as is rest on the seventh The proportion of 1 day's rest in 7 has been justified by the experience of the last 3,000 years. Physical health suffers without such relief.

All manner of work is forbidden on the Sabbath. Any other work which may lead to a breach of the Sabbath laws are also forbidden. Not only the children but also the servants, whether Israelites or heathen, nay, even the beasts of burden and the strangers are to share in the rest of the Sabbath day. The Sabbath is a boundless boon for mankind and the greatest wonder of religion.

Man made in the image of God has been endowed by Him with the power of creating. But in his little universe, too, matter is constantly getting out of hand, threatening to overwhelm and crush our souls.

"A memorial of creation." We are endowed with the divine power of saying "enough," to all rebellious claims of our environment, and are reminded of our potential victory over all national forces that would drag us down. The Sabbath is one of the glories of our humanity. It is an outstanding reminder that man can emancipate himself from the slavery of his cares, that man was made for spiritual reasons such as freedom, peace, and joy. For if to labor is noble, of our own free will to pause in that labor which may lead to success, to money, to fame is nobler still. Remember G. C. Montefiore said: "To dedicate one day a week to rest and to God is the prerogative and the privilege of man alone."

Let us take out this life insurance policy gratis now not only for ourselves but for our posterity as well. Remember and guard the foundation of our faith—the Sabbath for yourselves and your posterity.

Democracy at Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 13, 1948

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, a following editorial from the Gary Post-Tribune, Gary, Ind., calls our attention to the great humanitarian service that our European relief program accomplishes. When we provide the necessary finances and materials to reestablish these war-stricken countries, the millions of children which will be fed, clothed, and educated will prove a bulwark of good will for the United States which future generations will never forget. The editorial follows:

DEMOCRACY AT WORK

Democracy grows and expands as it acts. The foundations of the American Republic, forged in fires burning in minds of men determined to be free, have strengthened through the years as the principles of democracy have been put to work.

An important manifestation of democracy is at work for us today abroad—as people of America share their food with the world's hungry children. The crusade for children now being conducted by American Overseas Aid-United Nations appeal for children, is an avenue for the forward march of the democratic idea.

It is tragically ironic that the children of the world, who were least responsible for

World War II, should be its heaviest sufferers. Their weakened bodies, wracked by tuberculosis and rickets, shelter young minds which should be storing up the rich and gentle memories of childhood, but which instead are filling up with haunting hurt of hunger and despair.

There are 230,000,000 children who do not get enough to eat today.

Many will die, but millions can be saved. A generous contribution to the crusade for children will help carry democracy's message of humanitarian concern to those whose minds and bodies need nourishment.

Part II of Address by Henry Wallace at Pennsylvania People's Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 13 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD part II of an address delivered by Henry Wallace at the Pennsylvania Peoples' Convention, Pennsylvania Wallace Committee, on Sunday, March 7, 1948, at William Penn High School, York, Pa. On last Friday I submitted the first part of the speech.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HENRY A. WALLACE AT PENNSYLVANIA PEOPLE'S CONVENTION, PENNSYLVANIA WALLACE COMMITTEE, SUNDAY, MARCH 7, 1948, AT WILLIAM PENN HIGH SCHOOL, YORK, PA.

PART II

Men and women from all parts of the world joined to build America—and the new party is being built by those men and their children. Last week I was in Minnesota, whose great wheat farms were built largely by people from Scandinavia; whose great iron range is mined by men of Slavic background. The week before I was in the South, whose agriculture and industry was created largely by the toil of people from Africa and their descendants. I visited with cigar workers in Tampa, whose families originated in Puerto Rico.

Here in Pennsylvania we find the world's mightiest steel industry, built largely by people from eastern Europe and their descendants—people from the Ukraine, from Poland, from Czechoslovakia, from Yugoslavia. America has been built by people from every corner of the world, and we retain a kinship with peoples everywhere.

In the countries of eastern Europe, from which so many of our steel workers originated, those who fought against and survived the terror of the Nazis are rebuilding their farms and their industries. They are striving for a better life than they had known before. They are working to free their lands of the conditions which sent so many of their people to seek freedom in America. The institutions of these Slav countries differ from our own, but the aspirations of these people, who suffered most grievously from fascism and always fought back, are exactly the same—they want freedom and security. They deserve our help and our friendship, but they aren't getting it.

Today a campaign against these countries is being conducted in the United States. Men who insist that the people in the South are not educated enough for free elections make free elections the condition for aid to eastern European countries which were bound until recently by ancient feudalism.

The propaganda campaign against these nations obscures the stories of their hardships. We are not told of their inspiring efforts and truly impressive records in reconstruction, in building their industries, modernizing their agriculture, and in extending education and health care, where ignorance and in infant mortality so long prevailed.

The Wall Street men who use our resources to support Fascists around the world from Greece to China oppose aid for eastern Europe. They send notes and lectures in democracy to these people. They are assisted in their campaign by two native sons of Pennsylvania in whom you can take no pride—Bill Bullitt and George Earle.

These men are engaged in building up the bogey of a Slav menace," but if they know anything of the character of their fellow Pennsylvanians of eastern European origin, they should know that the threat of atom bombs will not intimidate the peoples of Moscow, Belgrade, Warsaw, and Prague.

Without the aid of the Truman doctrine and the ERP, the peoples of eastern Europe have made impressive records in recovery and reconstruction. The records of the eastern European countries are more impressive than those of western Europe. In October of 1947 steel production in comparison with 1937 was as follows: Belgium, minus 35 percent; France, minus 14 percent; Italy, minus 12 percent; while Czechoslovakia was plus 10 percent, Hungary plus 1 percent, and Poland, including Silesia, plus 19 percent.

Nor can it be said that the present political situation in Czechoslovakia is less democratic than the situation in France. The Communists and Social Democrats who control the Czechoslovakian cabinet, polled 52 percent of the votes in the last elections; while the main parties in the cabinet of France polled only 25 percent of the votes in the last election. We can presume that the Russians did exert direct or indirect pressure in Czechoslovakia, but we don't have to presume—we know—that our own Government was responsible for eliminating important political parties from the Government of France. At a very minimum, we share responsibility for any restrictions on political liberty in eastern Europe.

We must restore direct trade with eastern Europe. We must make a peace to end the cold war. We cannot afford the mad arms race we have started.

There isn't a single legitimate reason for talk of war. There isn't a single legitimate reason to spend 79 cents out of every tax dollar for war and preparation for war.

The ore of the Mesabi Range in Minnesota converted into steel in the great plants of Pennsylvania must be used for plows, not guns; for homes, not battleships; for nails, not bullets.

Steel is the key product of our entire economy. It is a monopoly of a handful of large firms controlling not only the ore, steel mills, but also the supplies of coke, limestone, and many of the crucial transport routes for moving these materials. This monopoly not only decides how much steel we should produce, how many houses can be built, how many automobiles can be made, and how many machines can be installed in factories here at home; it also determines much of our foreign policy and the future welfare of peoples the world over.

We can't afford to let the Steel Trust control the people. We must control the Steel Trust.

The big steel monopoly is in the forefront of the current attempt of big business to hamstring world recovery in order to increase already fantastic profits.

The world is hungry for steel and products made of steel. In Europe, in Latin America, and in Asia, in countries everywhere there is a desire to increase their own production of steel to make possible reconstruction and higher standards of living.

The American steel companies, which have taken over the world markets of the prewar European steel cartel, are not using this new position to supply more steel to the world. Actually, the percentage of steel exported from the United States is smaller than in many prewar years. Nonetheless the steel monopoly, with the help of the big-business men in the administration and Congress, is thwarting attempts to increase steel production abroad. Requests for loans to help develop steel and metal industries in foreign countries have been turned down or inadequately met, either through direct refusals—as in the case of Export-Import Bank loans; or through the veto power of Wall Street in the World Bank.

The steel companies refuse to ship semifinished steel to European producers, just as they refuse to ship semifinished steel to independent American producers. This refusal is sanctified in the details of the European recovery program. The steel monopolists will ship abroad only relatively small quantities of finished steel, at enormous prices, typically two or three times the domestic price. American workers and farmers, paying a large portion of the costs for European aid, will find that they are giving aid only to bankers and monopolists who are profiteering in European misery.

I don't think the American people want to give aid to Wall Street. We treated the bankers and industrialists royally during the war. They don't need this new help. It is the people of Europe who need help, and deserve help.

The foreign-trade policy of the Steel Trust hurts our steel workers here at home. It will lead to world depression and the collapse of world markets, just as the present domestic policies of the steel companies can lead to depression at home. By opposing real industrial development in western Europe and by tightening the embargo on exports to eastern Europe, the administration is cutting out future jobs for steel workers.

During the war it was clear that the postwar requirements for steel would be far above the existing capacity. But the Steel Trust, then as now, was more interested in profiteering on shortages than in supplying the needs of the country.

The steel companies have shut down facilities used during the war, and steel production in 1947 was 5,000,000 tons below the wartime peak.

The policies of Big Steel are a direct threat to all independent businessmen, as well as to labor. In every industry using steel and iron, independent enterprise is subject to a growing squeeze. The independent manufacturer, builder, and foundry man must purchase his supplies—when he can get them—at the gray-market price of two to three times the high official price of steel.

Today only the largest manufacturing firms, with close financial tie-ups to the steel monopolies, are assured a steady supply of raw material at regular prices. It isn't the teachings of Karl Marx, but the actions of the monopolists which threaten independent enterprise.

The administration and some congressional committees have shaken fingers at the Steel Trust, but when it comes to action they have consistently strengthened the steel monopoly. They know how to get tough with Russia. They know how to get tough with trade unions. They know how to get tough with liberals. And they know how—but they won't—get tough with the Steel Trust.

Those steel plants—in large measure—belong to the American people. It wasn't free

enterprise or the pioneering or patriotic spirit of the steel barons which developed the most modern facilities in the industry. During the war, the powerful steel firms refused to build plants needed for wartime steel production, so that the Government—you and I—had to spend over $1,000,000,000 to build additional capacity.

During the war years the steel workers alone purchased over a quarter of a billion dollars worth of war bonds, paid over half of a billion dollars in wartime income taxes, and a like sum in excise and other taxes. These payments, by the steel workers alone, were enough to finance the construction of the steel plants. The $3,300,000,000 in bonds purchased by the people of Pennsylvania not only covered the costs of the plants, but the profits of their operators.

I say the steel workers and the American people as a whole have a right to demand the fullest use of these facilities. I say that the people through their government must control the distribution of steel to the end that independent business enterprise in America shall not perish.

The scandals which make headlines—the story of Ed Pauley's speculation in grain and General Meyers' war contracts—these scandals fade into insignificance when they are compared with the swindle of the people by the Steel Trust.

The plants constructed from the savings of American workers during the war were operated by the steel companies at tremendous profit. After the war the plants were sold to the same steel monopolists for a fraction of their value.

The giant Geneva steel plant, built with the hard-earned savings of the workers at a cost of $202,000,000, was sold to the United States Steel Corp. for $40,000,000. The South Chicago plant, built by the Government at a cost of $91,000,000, was sold to Republic Steel for $35,000,000—to be paid over 20 years without interest. This means that Republic pays the equivalent of a very low rental for 20 years, and then gets the plant for nothing.

This is robbery and the American people have a right to know the facts. It isn't a few American Communists who have stolen our savings and public investment. It is those who cry "Communist" when we say with Lincoln that "this country with its institutions belongs to the people who inhabit it."

The recent $5-a-ton increase in the price of semifinished steel was only one of a series of quiet price boosts the steel trust has put over during the past 5 months. These increases amount to almost $300,000,000 a year.

This reckless drive for higher profits had its origin 2 years ago when John Snyder, now Secretary of the Treasury, and Ben Fairless, of United States Steel, met in Mr. Fairless' suite in the Carlton Hotel in Washington and set the inflationary pattern which has already hurt—and will hurt even more—every American worker and farmer. At that time John Snyder, Mr. Truman's pal from Missouri, arranged to give Ben Fairless a $5-a-ton price increase to cover steel workers' demands to maintain their take-home pay. For every $3 in wage increases, John Snyder gave United States Steel a $2 bonus.

Today the profits of Republic Steel Corp., thanks to John Snyder and the bipartisans, are more than six times their average for the five prewar years, and almost double their incredibly high wartime average. The profits of United States Steel and Bethlehem Steel are more than three times their prewar average, while Jones and Laughlin's 1947 profits were more than seven times their prewar average.

But the steel workers, handling some of the toughest jobs in the country, are not enjoying any increase in real wages over 1939 (if the official consumer price index is adjusted for the increased taxes they are paying).

Let's get a good look at this picture:

If wages for the steel industry as a whole were increased by reducing profits to double their prewar average, there would be an extra $600 per wage earner per year or about 30 cents per hour.

I repeat. If wages were paid out of industry profits as a whole to a point where the profits were still double the prewar average, there would be an additional $600 per year for each steel worker.

Looking at it another way: If only half of the added income resulting from recent steel price increases were distributed among the workers, this would permit a wage increase of 15 cents per hour; and if the workers received their fair share of the past year's increase in productivity this would permit a further increase of 15 cents per hour or a total of 30 cents per hour.

The wages of workers in the steel industry can be substantially increased to meet the effects of inflation; the prices of steel can be rolled back, and the gray market can be eliminated and still leave the steel barons with a more than comfortable existence.

We must take strong action now to break the grip of the steel monopoly on the American economy.

I urge:

First, establishment of a strict system of controls for the allocation of steel to the most essential users. We must guarantee a fair share of steel production to independent founders, fabricators, and manufacturers. The system of allocations must extend from iron ore to finished steel and would include instructions as to the proportions of the various types of steel to be manufactured.

Second, the prices of steel, iron, and key raw materials must be rolled back. The basing-point system should be eliminated. All prices should be put on a basis of the price at the mill plus actual cost of transportation.

Third, to break the current steel shortage, I propose Government operation of idle steel plants without profits to those who are now holding them idle when the country and the world are crying out for steel.

The system of allocation must be sufficiently strict to assure the supplies of iron ore, coke, and other materials needed by the Government-operated plants.

Fourth, I urge immediate planning to increase our national steel capacity. I urge Government planning to change the prince-and-pauper character of the steel industry. In the past this has meant the owners live like princes while the workers are thrown out of employment and pauperized when a depression strikes. There must be no depression in the steel industry from this time forward. In a world of insatiable needs there can be no excuse for idle or inadequate steel capacity.

It is time to end this postwar economic system designed by the monopolists and their political hirelings in Washington.

The big financiers and industrialists have taken every trick of the "confidence" men and polished them to new brilliance.

They talk about helping suffering peoples and then draft plans to make the rich richer and the poor poorer.

They talk about saving democracy in every corner of the globe and then ship arms to a Chinese dictator, Greek royalists, and reactionaries everywhere.

They talk about maintaining peace by threatening the people of the world with atom bombs.

They talk about "training in democracy" and propose to put a million boys a year under the authoritarian control of the Army.

But the double talk is becoming clear. You can fool some of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time.

There are dangers in the exposure of this double talk. Desperate men, exposed and cornered, may increase their use of even more hateful weapons to subdue the people into silence. We can expect ever greater attacks from un-American committees and those who would intimidate the people, but we can have confidence that a people's victory will result, if we remain loyal to our principles.

At the outset I mentioned briefly the attack of the House committee on Dr. Edward Condon of the Bureau of Standards. I said that they were not worried about Dr. Condon or the secrets of the atom bomb. The real worry of these men is the growing demand of all scientists that the fruits of their labor be put to use for the benefit of all mankind.

The objective of the new party, as I see it is to use the democratic machinery of the United States that all men may enjoy the benefits made possible by modern science.

As you go to the job of building a new party which will express the hopes and aspirations of the American people, I urge you to remember our great heritage of freedom. You might remember that it was here in the town of York that the Continental Congress found refuge more than a century and a half ago, and that the tasks you undertake here today can be every bit as significant in our national history as those of our forefathers.

I have confidence that we shall not fail.

Comments on Exchange of Diplomatic Notes With Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 13 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, recent editorials discussed the situation which recently developed over the exchange of diplomatic notes between our representatives and representatives of the Russians. Yesterday I placed in the RECORD an excellent editorial from the Washington News. Last evening I picked up the Washington Evening Star, which contains another editorial upon the same subject. In the same issue of the Star appears an article by Mr. Constantine Brown under the heading "This changing world," dealing with the same matter. The New York Times of this morning has an editorial entitled "Deeds, Not Words"; and a letter appearing in the same newspaper, addressed to the editor of the Times and signed by Mr. Louis Fischer, ably discusses the entire question. I ask unanimous consent that these editorials and articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 13, 1948]

NEGOTIATING WITH RUSSIA—STALIN VIEWED AS DESIRING NEITHER WAR NOR REAL PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Arthur Krock is, I believe, correct in saying in a recent column that "the basic difficulty between the United States and Soviet

Russia has not arisen because of a failure to confer." The trouble is, according to Mr. Krock, that the Soviet Government has not kept the agreements reached when we did confer and, moreover, that the actions of world communism—which are a chief contributing cause to the present Soviet-American tension—are not subject to negotiations between the United States and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Governments because the Kremlin denies responsibility.

I would like to take the matter a step further. If we examine the records of the numerous four-power and three-power conferences since 1942 we find that agreement resulted when the western powers granted all or part of Russia's demands for territory and extended influence; that disagreement resulted when the western powers rejected Russia's demands; but that no agreement at any international conference or, for that matter, at any United Nations session was ever the result of Moscow's readiness to diminish or withdraw its power abroad.

Moscow apparently expects its international relations to yield either expansion at the expense of the non-Soviet world or hostility. Expansion feeds the new Russian nationalism. The hostility of foreign nations can be used to justify the Soviet terror.

As a substitute for nonexistent liberties and deficient groceries the Soviet Government has since 1935 been administering to its sorely tried population bigger and bigger doses of jingoistic nationalism. Those of us who read Soviet newspapers and magazines cannot help noting that the spirit of the Soviet Union today is Russia "Ueber Alles." At home, Russian nationalism has produced unprecedented friction between the Russians and the national minorities. Abroad, Russian nationalism produces pan-slavism, Communist imperialism, and expansion.

The food of nationalism is foreign territory and aggrandized foreign influence. Whenever relations with the rest of the world do not yield these, Stalin prefers antagonism to compromise.

Democracy is relaxation. A dictatorship lives on tension and fear. To keep the tension and fear alive totalitarianism needs enemies.

Soviet publications are heavy with anti-American and antiwestern propaganda. Moscow is preaching self-sufficiency in economics, politics, culture, and inventions. Contacts with the west are regarded as dangerous. The Soviet people might discover that they had friends outside, that the enemy was not an enemy.

This is why Moscow rejects the Marshall plan. The plan will strengthen European countries so they can withstand Soviet expansion. If the Russians participated in it—either as it is now organized or if it were under the UN—Russia would have to collaborate in friendly fashion with the west. Russian adherence to the Marshall plan would thus have defeated both purposes of Soviet foreign policy; expansion and in the absence of expansion, the possibility of stressing foreign hostility. One or the other is necessary to the perpetuation of the Soviet dictatorship.

Stalin does not want war because Russia cannot afford it. Neither does he want real peace or friendship because his dictatorship cannot afford that either. This is the basic reason why we cannot sit down and settle it.

To satisfy some decent people and help them dispel their lingering illusions it would not hurt to invite Stalin to Washington and again offer Russia the friendship of America. It will only be accepted if America is prepared to join Russia in dividing the world into two spheres of influence wherein the lesser countries are dominated by the two colossi.

I do not believe the United States should or would enter into such a deal to enlarge the Russian empire and involve ourselves in a million headaches with foreign peoples. America should take another road. We should avoid war. We should not shun negotiations, but not await any important results from them. Our policy should be to so strengthen and solidify the non-Soviet world that Russia and the Communists cannot expand into it. A decade, say, of prosperity and peace during which there would be no evidence of democratic hostility to Russia would seriously endanger the Soviet empire and the Soviet dictatorship.

One instrument for the strengthening of the non-Soviet world is already available: the Marshall plan. Another, which is more vital, still has to be forged. In addition to the economic internationalism of the Marshall plan we need political internationalism. Our world is so badly sewed together that it is bursting at its national seams. Recent events clearly show that not even the smallest problem—Palestine, Greece, Korea—can be solved without first solving the biggest problem, the problem of international government.

The central problem of American foreign relations is really Russian domestic conditions, and we cannot sit down and settle those in conferences with the Soviet dictators. That will take time and peace.

LOUIS FISCHER.

NEW YORK, *April 30, 1948.*

[From the New York Times of May 13, 1948]

DEEDS, NOT WORDS

The confusion created by Soviet Russia's deliberate misrepresentation of the exchange of notes with the United States, which led both to false hopes and to false alarms, has now been clarified beyond the possibility of further misunderstanding by the statements of President Truman, Foreign Secretary Bevin, and especially Secretary Marshall, whose language is particularly to the point. These statements, which must be read in context with the American note and the whole American and British foreign policy, make it clear that the western powers continue, as they always have, to favor peace and cooperation with all nations, including Soviet Russia. But peace and cooperation are jeopardized by Soviet expansion and subjugation of other nations in the interest of Communist world domination, coupled with a policy of bad faith which is without precedent in modern diplomatic annuals, and in which the Russian misuse of the American note serves as the latest warning. All this raises the double question: First, how peace and cooperation can be had under such discouraging circumstances, and, second, what kind of peace and cooperation do we want or can we accept?

Both Mr. Marshall and Mr. Bevin agree that we neither asked for nor desire any general discussion or negotiations with Russia, since we have learned from long and bitter experience how futile such discussions are, and especially since a new failure in this field, or new disputes over paper agreements which Russia never honors, could only aggravate the tension and do the world great harm. Furthermore, as Mr. Marshall emphasizes, we are not going to enter into bilateral negotiations with Russia on matters of vital interest to other nations, a statement which should nullify the unmistakable Russian effort to drive a wedge between the United States and its political allies, and especially reassure the French, who have already made representations on that point. But if Soviet Russia really wishes to contribute something toward peace and cooperation, as it say it does, it can do so by action where action is possible and urgently necessary.

Such action is possible and necessary, Mr. Marshall points out, in matters now before the Security Council and other United Nations agencies which Russia has either stymied or boycotted, including the Atomic Energy, the Korean and the Balkan Commissions. It is likewise possible and necessary in those agencies in which negotiations with the Russians are still continuing, such as the Allied Control Council in Berlin and the Austrian treaty conference. But, beyond the points that Mr. Marshall indicates, such action is also necessary in order to carry out agreements Russia has actually signed. For unless Russia is willing to honor agreements already made there is no use of either new negotiations or new agreements, or much chance for real peace.

What this action should be is laid down in the agreements themselves:

1. Under the Atlantic Charter Russia pledged itself to eschew all aggrandizement, territorial or other; this requires that Russia halt its policy of expansion and release from bondage the 10 east European nations it has subjugated.

2. Under the agreements of Moscow, Tehran, and Yalta Russia pledged itself to act in cooperation with the western powers to restore democracy and popular sovereignty in liberated Europe through free and unfettered elections; this requires that Russia stop imposing Communist puppet regimes on other nations and permit the people to choose the form of government under which they will live.

3. Under the Potsdam agreement Russia pledged itself to treat Germany as a single economic unit, to leave Germany sufficient resources to enable it to live without foreign assistance, and to leave the final disposition of all territorial questions to the peace settlement; this requires that Russia nullify its unilateral annexations of German territory, stop its sovietization and exploitation of its occupation zone, and pool all German resources to feed the Germans, thereby helping to lift that burden from American backs.

4. Finally, under the United Nations Charter Russia pledged itself to refrain from the use or threat of force and to carry out United Nations decisions; this requires that Russia stop fomenting civil war in Greece and China, and at the very least refrain from obstructing United Nations bodies from carrying on their work.

These agreements, which Russia is constantly violating, were reached only at the price of great concessions on the part of the western powers affecting their principles, their honor, and their interests. For that very reason they also contain the minimum peace terms which the western powers can accept without courting disaster to themselves. It remains to be seen whether Russia is now willing to carry out these agreements, or whether the process of building up western power must continue for the defense of the West against the danger of new aggression.

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 12, 1948]

THIS CHANGING WORLD—NOTE TO MOLOTOV PUT UNITED STATES ON RECORD WITH DENIAL OF ERP AGGRESSION MOVES

(By Constantine Brown)

The purpose of Ambassador W. Bedell Smith's statement to Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov on May 4, according to responsible high officials in Washington, was to place the United States Government on record with a denial of any aggressive intentions in the European recovery program, the 70-group air force bill, and the limited draft bill.

Also, contrary to some interpretations, the United States Government has not suggested to the Soviet Government that a conference be held to iron out existing differences. This Government has always maintained a policy of leaving the door open to the U. S. S. R. to participate in our efforts to heal the deep wounds of the last war, and that policy has not been changed now. Today, as in the past, the American Govern-

ment welcomes the collaboration of all governments, regardless of their domestic policies, in a common endeavor to reestablish peace in the world.

That was the meaning of the statement to Moscow. It is also pointed out that an approach to Moscow could not be made until after Congress had approved the ERP and the increase in the Air Force, lest we give Moscow the impression that we are afraid.

VARIETY OF REACTIONS

The Soviet reply to the American note has produced a variety of reactions and interpretations, ranging from a feeling of limited optimism to one of guarded pessimism.

The only encouraging fact is that instead of ignoring our diplomatic demarche, the Kremlin answered in a fairly courteous manner. But it is also pointed out that the Soviet Government has not receded one inch from its position in international affairs and has taken advantage of the opportunity offered by the American note to reiterate publicly its old stand regarding encroachments on other countries throughout the world.

As usual Mr. Molotov assumed the offensive and stated in his reply that "the U. S. S. R. Government considers it necessary to state that the present unsatisfactory relations between the U. S. S. R. and the United States and the tense character of the international situation is a result of the policy of the American Government."

The customary fallacious arguments were used by the Soviet Foreign Minister when he compared the so-called "close cooperation" of Poland, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia, where "Communists were placed in power because the people of those countries know that they will fight against an eventual aggression of Germany or her allies," with United States relations with Canada, Mexico, and other Latin American republics.

OLD ARGUMENTS DUSTED OFF

Mr. Molotov also white-washed Russia's encroachments on her neighbors by accusing the United States of interfering in the domestic affairs of other sovereign nations such as Greece. He also dusted off the old argument, which the Germans and Japanese used before World War II, that "military threats against the U. S. S. R. * * * emanate from definite circles closely connected with the Government of the United States."

In view of the fact that it has been definitely proved that every one of the satellite armies is directed by Red Army officers and that satellite war industries are controlled by the U. S. S. R., Mr. Molotov's assertion that "the Soviet Government is creating no military bases in other countries and is not permitting herself to make any threats against any one at all" was received with skepticism by responsible American authorities.

The tenor of the Soviet reply to the American approach is not conducive to more than a "limited optimism," since the Russian Foreign Minister took advantage of our note to restate Russia's position as it has always been.

Military observers, who base their evaluations not on diplomatic moves but on what is actually going on in the areas dominated by the U. S. S. R. and in the Soviet Union itself, are suspicious of the Russian statement. They reluctantly recall that under similar strained conditions in 1941 the Japanese Government agreed to start diplomatic conversations with the aim of improving relations with the United States 3 months before Pearl Harbor. These were used as a cover and prelude for Pearl Harbor.

American military men maintain that until the U. S. S. R. gives some tangible proofs of good will in areas such as Germany, Austria, and Korea, it would be folly to relax our present limited preparations.

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 12, 1948]

UP TO RUSSIA

In view of the too-wishful first reactions to it, President Truman was forced to clarify the meaning of the latest diplomatic exchange between the United States and the Soviet Union. The event does not represent a new departure in our foreign policy. The only thing that has happened is that we have reaffirmed — through Ambassador Smith—our firm adherence to that policy and our determination to prosecute it vigorously. In short, there has been no discernible development warranting the belief that we may look forward now to an early settlement of our grave differences with the Russians. This point is amply supported by the texts of Ambassador Smith's statement to Foreign Minister Molotov and Mr. Molotov's response to it. For our own part, we have flatly blamed the Kremlin for the great seriousness of the present situation, and we have served notice that we intend to work as closely as possible with other free lands in mutual self-defense against direct and indirect Soviet aggression. At the same time, we have urged the Russians to get it clearly in their heads that we mean what we say, that our policy has overwhelming bipartisan public support, that election-year politics will not divert us from our course, and that it is foolish to count on our being weakened by an economic crisis. Finally, we have solemnly reassured them that we harbor no hostile or aggressive designs against them and that our door will always be wide open for a full discussion and settlement of the issues dividing us.

In other words, as President Truman has declared, the United States has simply reiterated its position because of a belief that reiteration might be helpful at this juncture in preventing any "unfortunate misunderstanding" in the Moscow government. In reply, speaking through Mr. Molotov, the Kremlin has absolved itself of any blame. Instead, it has accused us of being responsible for the bad state of American-Russian relations, and it has expressed its intention to keep on cultivating "friendly relations" in eastern Europe and elsewhere—a point implying total rejection of our charge that "friendly relations" in the Soviet lexicon means Communist subversion, terror, and the death of independence, as in Czechoslovakia. Nevertheless, declaring itself in favor of a "radical relaxation in international tension," the Kremlin has said that it stands outside our wide-open door ready to proceed to the "discussion and settlement of differences existing between us."

But what does all this add up to if the Russians are not prepared to effect a fundamental change in their over-all policy? There is everything to be said, of course, for our keeping the door wide open. For this is true: As long as our two countries remain on speaking terms, as long as they do not close the avenues of negotiation between them, we can hope for a peaceful understanding at some time in the future. Meanwhile, as of now, what issue of consequence can be discussed and settled between us unless the Soviet Union is really in a mood to cooperate? Korea? Greece? Germany? Austria? The violent propaganda war? Disarmament? Control of the atom? What?

The questions answer themselves. An elaborate two-power conference can accomplish exactly nothing without a prior decision by the Russians to reverse themselves, end their obstructionism and join sincerely with us and the rest of the United Nations in building a decent peace. Unfortunately, the indications are that this is not the case. The Russians apparently have merely jumped at the opportunity—which our Government unwittingly gave them—to reap a propaganda harvest for themselves.

The Prayer Call

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1948

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

THE LAYMEN'S MOVEMENT
FOR A CHRISTIAN WORLD, INC.,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIGNERS OF THE PRAYER CALL: Prayer for the United Nations is more important than ever before. But we are asking you to add to your prayers for the delegates petitions for another critical matter.

Whether or not we believe that military strength is necessary and important, in order to see that justice is done in the world, such armed might seems to be in process of being created. History shows that more often than not armed might slips from strength for humanity's sake to power for power's sake.

This danger places upon all who believe in prayer, an awe-inspiring responsibility to pray for spiritual power so that our military strength may be maintained purely as a background of determination and high moral courage, against which constructive action can be taken.

Won't you pray regularly and get as many others as possible to pray—"God give to our leaders and to all of us—the people of the United States—wisdom, understanding, and courage to use our military might solely for constructive purposes, in line with human progress?"

If we in America are to be really strong, you and I, and others like us—through prayer—must stand steadfastly for the right, as God gives us to see the right.

Very sincerely yours,

WALLACE C. SPEERS,
Chairman of the Laymen's Movement.

WHAT TO DO

1. Pray daily that our spiritual growth may exceed our military might.

2. Send a letter to the editor of your local newspaper.

3. Write President Harry S. Truman of your convictions.

4. Ask your minister to read Mr. Speers' letter in your church.

A PERSONAL WORD

You will forgive us for sending you another urgent request so soon after our letter of March 25. From the beginning we have envisioned those who sign the prayer card as a "praying army," to use Dr. Laubach's words, who could be called upon for any emergency.

Nearly 1,000 of the 25,000 to whom letters were sent have already replied. Some of you report interesting results in your church and prayer groups, have sent us copies of letters written to the delegate assigned you, and requested more prayer cards for local use. Others are sending the names and addresses of their librarians and hospital superintendents who will distribute prayer cards. Many of you are sending contributions.

All of this—with your growing prayer life—is tremendously encouraging. Our need for your prayers and help in every way is still very great.

Faithfully yours,

FRANCES E. ESHELMAN,
Secretary of the Prayer Call.

The visit to laymen of Europe by Weyman C. Huckabee, secretary of the Laymen's Movement, is now planned for July. Please add this friend to your prayer list.

Missouri Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT L. REEVES, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1948

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, recently there came to my attention an outline of Missouri's laws affecting veterans, their wives, their widows, their children, their orphans, and their organizations, as compiled by William E. Leach, national service officer for the Disabled American Veterans, who has his offices with the Veterans' Administration Regional Office, 415 Pine Street, St. Louis, Mo.

Most of the potential beneficiaries under these State laws are not aware of the valuable rights, privileges, exemptions, and benefits available to them, under certain circumstances, and therefore I am hopeful that this résumé of Missouri's veteran laws will come to their attention.

The outline is as follows:

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments executed by members of the armed forces.

Disability of minority is removed as to veterans and spouses.

Soldiers or mariners may dispose of wages or other personal property as by common law, or by reducing the same to writing.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND DUTIES

Absentee registration and voting is provided.

Voting rights have been established for inmates of soldiers' homes and hospitals.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

The State service officer is authorized to administer oaths in connection with claims against the United States or any State.

Custodians of records are required to furnish, free of charge, to a veteran or his dependent, copies of any public record for use in connection with claims against the United States.

Discharges are recorded free of charge.

It is the duty of the State service officer to disseminate among veterans of all wars information concerning their rights under the laws of the United States and rules and regulations of the Veterans' Administration, to aid veterans and their dependents in prosecuting claims for benefits against the United States or any State.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Preference is given to veterans in the State highway department service.

Benefit rights are preserved under the Unemployment Compensation Act, State eleemosynary and penal institutions.

The State service officer must be a veteran.

Leaves of absence are extended under the teachers' retirement system to those who serve in the armed forces.

GUARDIANSHIP

A limitation has been placed on compensation to guardians of persons entitled to monetary benefits from the Veterans' Administration.

The Veterans' Administration is entitled to notice of proceedings in cases where a guardian has been appointed or may be appointed for a person entitled to monetary benefits from said administration.

HOMES

Confederate veterans, their wives, widows, and orphans may be admitted to the Confederate soldiers' home at Higginsville.

Veterans of the Mexican and Civil Wars and their wives may be admitted to the Federal soldiers' home at St. James; also indigent veterans of the later wars.

HOLIDAYS

Armistice Day (November 11) is established as a public holiday.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital.

MEDALS

Medals have been awarded for service in the Spanish-American, Mexican Border, and World Wars.

MEMORIAL BUILDING PRIVILEGES, MEETING PLACES, ETC.

A memorial to Confederate veterans has been designated by the board of managers of the State eleemosynary institutions.

NATIONAL GUARD SERVICE

Credit is given for some time spent in the service of the United States with reference to service medals.

RECORDS, RELICS, ETC.

Provision has been made for the soldiers' and sailors' memorial hall in the capitol and the deposit of records for safekeeping.

TAX EXEMPTIONS; EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Time for filing return and deferment of payment of State income taxes is extended for members of the armed forces.

Veterans who applied for examination for certified accountants before military service retain their status 6 months after discharge.

Registration is provided for architects and engineers in the armed forces after termination of World War II.

Pharmacists' licenses are renewed without payment of lapsed renewal or registration fees within 1 year after termination of service in the armed forces.

All persons in the armed forces are exempt from taxation on real and personal property.

Members of the armed forces are exempt from jury duty and payment of a poll tax.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

The unauthorized wearing or use of insignia, badges, etc. of any military or ex-military organization is declared a misdemeanor.

Armory privileges are extended to veterans' organizations.

Most of the above legislation has been enacted by the Missouri Legislature through the sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veteran organizations.

At the present time the DAV has some 16 chapters throughout the State, most of which maintain volunteer or part-time service and employment officers to assist veterans with their problems in their own communities.

In addition to this service on a local level, the DAV maintains five full-time national service officers, under the direction of Comrade Leach, at the Veterans' Administration regional office in St. Louis, and three more, under the direction of Arch M. Hale, at the Veterans' Administration regional office, 212 West Fourteenth Street, Kansas City 6, Mo.

These DAV experts extend all types of service to veterans and their dependents, free of charge, more particularly in the technical preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their justifiable claims for various types of governmental benefits to which they may be lawfully entitled.

DAV MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official voice of America's disabled veterans.

According to its congressional charter of incorporation—Public Law 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law 668, approved July 15, 1942—active membership in the DAV is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities incurred during, or by reason of, active service during time of war in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it.

More and more wounded and disabled veterans of World War II are becoming active members of the DAV.

Eligibles may become life members of the DAV upon payment of a fee of $100 ($50 if born before January 1, 1902) in cash, or by a down payment of $5, or more, plus such installments as will complete payment of the full fee by the end of the second succeeding fiscal year (ending on June 30) after which, if not fully paid, a carrying charge of $5 per year would accrue. A growing percentage are becoming DAV life members. Annual membership is available at $5.

DAV NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Located at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati 6, Ohio, the national headquarters of the DAV takes care of all administrative matters and records, and publishes the DAV semimonthly newspaper, containing accurate, up-to-date information of interest and of value to disabled veterans and their dependents.

The present national commander of the DAV is John L. Golob, of Hibbing, Minn., a severely wounded World War I veteran, who has had a broad background of experience in various local, State, and national DAV activities which qualify him to lead an organization composed exclusively of America's disabled defenders.

Its national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-treasurer (business manager) of the organization, and editor of its newspaper, since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his able assistant.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The National Service Headquarters of the DAV is now located in a beautiful building at 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C., which was acquired by the organization in 1945.

In this Washington office are located the department for claims, headed by William E. Tate; the department on legislation, headed by Francis Sullivan; and the department of public relations and employment, headed by Millard W. Rice. In addition to these service departments it has as its office manager John E. Feighner, assistant national adjutant. All of these various departments are staffed by trained experts, all of whom are themselves war wounded or disabled veterans.

These DAV national officers know all about the technical complications that disabled veterans must overcome factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration, under the limitations and restrictions of existing law, as legalistically interpreted and as administratively applied.

Understanding such vexatious problems by personal experience, DAV national service officers are naturally more sympathetic than are nondisabled veterans or civilians and are, therefore, generally more effective in helping disabled claimants to comply with technical requirements to prove legal entitlement to benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The DAV has adopted, on a Nation-wide basis, a man-job-matching-method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,200,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally unemployable. The remaining 93 percent are less than totally disabled and must, therefore, supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment.

This scientific approach to a most distressing problem has produced some worth-while results thus far. The handicapped veteran's remaining abilities have been matched with the requirements of the job, rather than stressing his disabilities. It has been demonstrated by the employment record of such disabled veterans that they have a low absentee record, a low turn-over record, a low accident record, and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been proven that to hire disabled veterans is just plain, good business, bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers, and taxpayers generally.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation—its military and naval services during time of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as with those who are, or have been, dependent upon these heroes, so that other young men who, in the future, may be called upon to make similar sacrifices, will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that if they, too, should be so unfortunate they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported, as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth, and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

As a veteran myself, it is a pleasure for me to commend the service program of the DAV and I am sure it merits the consideration and support of the entire country.

Visiting Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. OWENS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1948

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, during the past week we have had the pleasure of seeing students from all over the country who have taken advantage of their spring vacations to visit the Nation's Capital, the most beautiful city in the world. Many of these students have come from a great State, Illinois. Among those present today were students of the St. Scholastica School for Girls, located in the northeast portion of Chicago, within the confines of the newly created Twelfth Congressional District of Illinois. The students are being chaperoned by several of the good sisters of that most excellent high school.

When we meet and speak with these representatives of what might aptly be called young America it makes us feel that we do not have to worry too much about what they may do in the future. All that we need to do is properly handle the affairs of today so that their paths may be made more easily traversible. May divine providence continue to guide our actions in this respect.

Scrap Iron Again!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the major bottlenecks in European recovery has been the lack of scrap iron. Such a great shortage has developed that we are even finding it necessary to ship some of our badly needed scrap abroad. It would seem to be a wise policy to use what we have under our control in Germany to assist our friends, particularly those countries participating in our European recovery plan.

According to the Wall Street Journal, the American zone in Germany is shipping 50,000 tons of steel scrap to Czechoslovakia behind the iron curtain. This may not sound like much but it is certainly a big gift to those behind the iron curtain. What reason have we to believe that it will not be sent back to us some day in the shape of bombs, atomic or otherwise, or possibly in the form of jet planes? I cannot for the life of me understand why we continue such shipments.

The article from the Wall Street Journal follows:

SCRAP FOR COMMUNISM—UNITED STATES STILL FEEDING RED-CONTROLLED CZECH ARMS PLANTS DESPITE OVER-ALL POLICY OF COMMUNIST CONTAINMENT

(By Joseph E. Evans)

FRANKFURT.—If the makers of our foreign policy are seriously concerned with combating communism, it is about time they showed some visible evidence of it here. Evidence rather to the contrary is what one finds in the American zone of Germany.

The United States zone is shipping 50,000 tons of steel scrap to Czechoslovakia while the political refugees pouring in from that country are treated not like allies but like Germans. There are extenuating circumstances connected with both these matters, but they aren't extenuating enough to explain the lack of a clear-cut policy.

The steel scrap deal was negotiated a long time ago—in October 1946—when very few people were thinking about the danger of feeding Russia's armament production. To date only about 7,000 tons have been shipped, not because of American reluctance but because of the physical difficulty of collecting and transporting it. There was also a delay caused by a misunderstanding as to the ferrous content of the scrap, but that was eventually straightened out.

When the Communists seized power in Czechoslovakia, a number of Americans apparently decided it was time to halt shipments of the scrap, and STEG, the organization responsible for collecting it, did actually call a halt. The Joint Export-Import Agency (JEIA), which controls all foreign trade for Bizonia, professes ignorance of any such action and plans to fulfill the contract. STEG, meantime, says its freeze order was countermanded by authority higher than either STEG or JEIA.

GOOD REASONS FOR MAKING SHIPMENTS

Putting aside for a moment the political implications, there are some reasons for fulfilling the contract. Trade between Bizonia and Czechoslovakia is fairly active. The ceramics industry in Bavaria is pretty much geared to a certain type of Czech coal, and it is dependent on Czech kaolin. There is also an important railway car-repair program under which bizonal cars are repaired in Czechoslovakia, and the Czechs pay Bizonia an appreciable amount every month for in-transit freight charges, since most of Czechoslovakia's imports from the West have to come through Germany.

The fear, therefore, is that if we broke the scrap contract the Czechs might retaliate by cutting off Bizonia's coal and kaolin supplies, refusing to repair its cars, depriving it of the in-transit freight revenue, and generally breaking off trade relations. It is highly doubtful that they would take such extreme measures, scrap or no scrap, simply because they need bizonal trade at least as much as Bizonia needs theirs. They have very likely been so cooperative about supplying coal and kaolin and other things because they needed the dollars to pay, among other things, the in-transit freight charges. That obligation would continue, for it is not easy to see how Czechoslovakia could reroute her imports from the west to avoid Germany.

TRADE COULD BE READJUSTED

But even if trade were virtually cut off, it would not be disastrous for Bizonia. Coal and kaolin could be gotten elsewhere, though not without readjusting the ceramics industry and perhaps affecting the quality of the products. The railway cars could be repaired elsewhere—in Belgium, for example.

In other words, it would not be pleasant for Bizonia to get along without Czechoslovakia, but it could be done. If that is, in fact, the risk involved in canceling the scrap contract, there are still impelling reasons why it should be taken.

The most obvious reason is the high war potential of scrap and the fair degree of certainty as to the uses to which it would be put. It is primarily the mammoth Skoda works which needs it, and they don't make toys there.

More than that, withholding the scrap would be a masterful stroke in any economic warfare against communism.

Fifty thousand tons of scrap may not sound like very much, but it is a lot to the Czechs and they are desperately anxious to get it. Big brother Soviet Russia promised them the same amount out of the Soviet zone of Germany and then backed down, and the Czech politicians in Berlin are running to Soviet headquarters in Karlshorst with tears in their eyes, trying to make the Russians change their minds. If they don't succeed, the matter will be argued on the Prague-Moscow level—it is important enough for that.

WOULD MESS SOVIET PLANS

So, if we refuse to ship the scrap from our zone, we will either force the Russians to give the Czechs the scrap out of their zone, thereby messing up Soviet plans, or, if that doesn't happen, the Czech Communists will simply be left in a very large hole. In either case it would mean trouble behind the iron curtain, and that, presumably, is what we want.

So much for economic warfare. Our attitude toward the Czech refugees is psychological warfare—in reverse. The Prague newspapers are having a fine time running pictures of refugees jammed into German camps with captions pointing out how America treats her friends, or words to that effect.

In Dieburg camp, not far from here, Czechs are crowded 20 and 25 to a room with no segregation of the sexes. They are getting half the German ration, or 600 calories a day. As a crowning insult, the camp is run by Germans.

Dieburg is admittedly exceptionally bad. In most other camps the refugees are getting

at least the full German ration and the administration is entirely Czech. But that still only means the Czechs are regarded as the equals of the Germans.

This is not the fault of the military government officials directly concerned, most of whom bend over backwards being nice to the refugees. It is probably not even the fault of military government at the top. It seems to be the fault of a lack of definite policy from Washington.

REFUGEES RATE BETTER TREATMENT

Properly caring for thousands of Czech refugees would be no easy problem for military government authorities in the bombed-cut ruin that is Germany. But it could be done. The Army messes could feed them, accommodations other than German camps could be requisitioned. They could be given the privilege of allies, and this is psychologically as well as physically important in view of the rigid caste system which prevails here.

It is true we did not invite the Czechs here, but if these people who fled Communist terror at the risk of their lives are not our allies, then who are? If they are our allies, they should be treated as such, for propaganda reasons if none other.

Of course, not all refugees are coming from pure motives. There are Communist agents among them, and criminals using the cloak of political persecution to escape punishment. But surely it is no insuperable problem to screen them and ship back the undesirables, and it is certainly no argument for treating the refugees as a whole as second-class human beings.

The menace of Soviet communism is not going to be dissipated by words. Europe watches our actions as well as our promises. Czech scrap and our treatment of refugees from communism seem like small matters, but they help to keep Europe dubious about the consistency of our policies.

The Jewish State—Address by Rabbi Irving F. Reichert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the full implication as to what will transpire upon the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine was ably presented at a meeting of the Washington chapter of the American Council for Judaism at the Shoreham Hotel on last Thursday evening. Rabbi Reichert is an outstanding champion of the cause for Judaism, but is opposed to the establishment of a Jewish state. Under leave to extend my remarks I am including his address which I have referred to:

Two and one-half years ago, in November 1945, one of America's most distinguished and eloquent rabbis, a vice president of the Zionist organization of America, participated in a town meeting of the air debate on the question, "Shall we support the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine now?" In his opening sentence he stated: "Telegrams and letters have reached me from all over the country urging me not to have a part in this debate on the ground that Zionism had ceased to be a debatable and discussable question."

With all my heart I wish that he had been right. For a long time now it has been obvious that his assertion was one of those rare instances where the terminal facilities of a preacher were premature. In the 2½ years that have passed since he uttered that pontifical finality not only has Zionism been debated and discussed with steadily increasing vehemence and acrimony but according to a recent editorial in the New York Times, "world public opinion is more deeply troubled by this issue than by any of the crowding crises of our time" (April 16). The Arabs and the Jews of Palestine are discussing it tonight in the staccato bark of rifles and machine guns and the murderous roar of mortars and cannon.

I propose to discuss it briefly with you, much less emotionally and noisily. There has been too much hysteria and too little clarity of perspective on the real issues that are involved. For this obscurity and confusion Zionist propaganda bears a great responsibility. Its appeal to emotion and sentiment to memories of tragedy and terror, its exploitation of obscenities visited upon helpless men, women, and children, its growing promises of a Jewish utopia—these are the tear-jerking techniques that have recruited followers and inflamed them to desperation and fanatical fury. One must make allowance in such a situation. It is impossible to see clearly through blinding tears. It is not easy to discern the pitfalls in the road.

It is my considered judgment that the American Jewish community has been artfully led step by step through camouflaged paths from one concession to another compromise and further appeasement into a veritable mine field which threatens not only to alter profoundly the historic status of the Jews as a religious community, which imperils not only the lives and security of those very Jews in Europe and Palestine who are the intended beneficiaries of Zionism, but puts a fearful strain upon the United Nations organization and may well bring about a third world war.

Beneath the surface of the roiling and the foaming of our troubled political waters, behind the curtain of elaborate rhetoric and impassioned oratory, there is a philosophy and there are assumptions which ought to be clearly understood by Americans—especially by American Jews who are asked to give their support to Zionism. As a rabbi and teacher in Israel I would be derelict to my deepest convictions and to the historic values of our faith if I permitted this philosophy and these assumptions to pass unchallenged.

The Zionist movement is the child of Jewish tragedy and anti-Semitism. It was conceived by a Viennese journalist, Theodore Herzl, who reported the Dreyfus trials in France in the closing decade of the last century. He became so bitterly depressed at the vulgar anti-Semitism of his day that he despaired of any hopeful future for Jews in the western world. He elaborated this mournful conclusion in a book which has become the bible of Zionism, The Jewish State. Just as modern Zionism arose out of Jewish despair, so it has grown prodigously in our time because of the infinitely greater and more shocking tragedy of European Jewry, brought about by the Nazi terror and its aftermath. Five million Jews were destroyed by Hitler. Thousands are homeless, stateless, still languishing behind barbed wire in concentration camps—euphemistically called displaced-persons camps—more than 3 years after the end of the war which promised them participation in the four freedoms for which we fought. It is this continuing tragedy and the ardent and legitimate desire of American Jews to alleviate it which has been effectively exploited by the Zionists and most adroitly turned toward the goal of their political aspects.

For it must be clearly understood that Zionism is not a philanthropic movement. It is strictly political. It always has been. When the Russian revolution emancipated 4,000,000 Jews in whose behalf the movement had been urged, Dr. James Chaim Weizmann explicity stated that, "We have never built our Zionist movement on the sufferings of our people in Russia or elsewhere. These sufferings were never the cause of Zionism. The fundamental cause of Zionism was and is the ineradicable national striving of Jewry to have a home of its own—a national center with a national Jewish life. Again and again official spokesmen and Zionism have repeated this declaration in their higher councils, but they know that western Jewry, particularly American Israel, would turn a deaf ear to appeals for Palestine based upon uncamouflaged political grounds. Accordingly, it is rescue and relief and rehabilitation that are stressed in public appeals. God knows these considerations are desperately urgent, but the real purposes of Zionism are not rescue and relief and rehabilitation. They are frankly political. It is high time that we achieved unity in American life by giving priority to human needs and place the security of Jews in Palestine and Europe before considerations of opportunism and power politics.

Zionism has frequently been presented in the guise of a religious movement. It is not a religious movement. To be sure, the yearning for a return to Palestine was deeply engrained in the old tradition of Orthodox Judaism. It found classic expression in our sacred scriptures, in our religious literature, and especially in the liturgy of the synagog. But note this well: That millenial hope for national restoration, incontestably one of the major aspirations of historic Judaism, was thoroughly religious in its motivations and practices. It was built upon Messianic expectations of a deliverer who in God's own good time would redeem Israel from captivity, restore it to its former country under the rule of a descendant of the House of David, rebuild the temple, and reinstitute the sacrificial cult with all its priestly trappings. That doctrine was built on powerful religious convictions. It gave centrality to God and Torah and the Divine Commandments; it envisioned the reestablishment of the ancient Theocentric State in which religion and government would be inseparably united.

It is a far cry from that historic conception of a restored Jewish state to the program and pattern which is being urged so vociferously and violently today. Why the blueprints of modern political Zionism are not even a reasonable facsimile of the classic Jewish conceptions and formulas for the redemption of Palestine. They do not pretend to be. An exalted Messianism transfigures the one; a secular nationalism dominates the other. In the old tradition God was central; in the new, the corporate Jewish state is apotheosized. The old tradition was unequivocally religious. The new dispensation is unequivocally secular. The old tradition was motivated by piety. The new propaganda is propelled by politics. The old tradition appealed to the Divine mercy in the gentle language of prayer; the new movement is articulated in the truculent idioms of politics, sabotage, lynchings, massacres, and guerrilla warfare.

Reform Judaism rejected the entire Zionist movement. Not even our ancient prophets repudiated the heresies of their day more vigorously than the founders of reform denounced Zionism in all its aspects. "If the reform movement teaches anything clearly," said David Philipson, the acknowledged historian of reformed Judaism, "it is the repudiation of the political and national aspects of traditional Judaism, and the clear declaration that Judaism is a religion with a religious mission."

The fundamental principle of Zionism is that the Jews are a homeless political nation-

ality. The fundamental principle of the American Council for Judaism is that the Jews are a religious community. We are not a nationality and we propose to resist with all the power at our command the efforts of self-appointed spokesmen to turn us into one. Our nationality is American, the same as that of our Catholic, Protestant, or Unitarian fellow citizens, in this land.

During the conference of the United Nations organization in my home city of San Francisco, a renowned eastern rabbi, speaking on behalf of Zionism, cried, "We want to go home, home, home." He modestly announced that he was talking for 10,000,000 Jews. That includes you and me and our children and all the millions of Jews who proudly claim this land as their homeland and desire no other. That includes our coreligionists all over America whose lives and loyalty are welded to this country with every passionate fiber of their being. That includes our workers and industrialists, our merchants and scholars, our warriors and statesmen, our judges and Congressmen, our diplomats and Supreme Court Justices and members of the cabinet, and advisers to the President of the United States.

Some homelessness. Some aliens. Some nonsense.

The simple truth of the matter is that the 5,000,000 Jews in America do not consider themselves homeless. Neither do the 4,000,000 Jews in Russia, nor the Jews in Canada, or South America, or Great Britain, or Australia, or the Scandinavian countries, or any land where Jews have not been brutally disfranchised and expatriated. It is high time to sound a solemn warning—any citizen of this land who puts the center of gravity of his national loyalty in a foreign country is not a good American.

Certainly there are thousands of Jews in Germany and Poland and elsewhere who are stateless, who have endured suffering beyond description, and who desperately desire to emigrate to lands of freedom. And we who are opposed to Jewish political nationalism are just as profoundly concerned with their plight, and just as ardent to yield them every assistance as are the most benevolent Zionists. It is they who destroy Jewish unity—unity on behalf of these tortured people. No wonder that the Jews in the displaced persons camps have changed their minds about going to Palestine. It is an ironic tragedy that that country which Zionists and non-Zionists alike had hoped would be a haven of refuge for our persecuted brethren, has now become the most dangerous place in the world for them.

We just have a solemn and emperious duty laid upon us in the atomic age upon which we have entered. The forces of materialism that are rampant in our time demand spiritual and ethical direction, if our world is not to perish in its blindness. Our own household of Israel are like sheep that have strayed from their shepherd. The secularists among us must be recalled from their ungodly chauvinism, and the anti-Zionists must be challenged to square their religious delinquency with their professions of piety.

I say that these conditions challenge us as never before. History will not forgive us if we fail. If our civilization should indeed destroy itself with the instruments which modern science has placed in our unworthy hands, let some explorer in a distant day, seeking a memorial of us in its crystalline ruins, come upon no such ignoble epitaph as "A kingdom of priests sold its birthright for a mess of pottage," or this pathetic anticlimax "God offered them world priesthood but they failed Him," but rather let him find the record of an unique people that remained constant to its covenant at Sinai, worthy to the last of the divine investiture "'Ye are my witnesses,' saith the Lord, 'and my servant whom I have chosen.'"

Broadening Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 13, 1948

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, there is included herewith a broadcast I made on May 7 over radio stations WBAB, in Atlantic City, and WSNJ, in Bridgeton, on the subject Broadening Social Security:

Three weeks ago I said that our preoccupation with international problems was no excuse for neglecting domestic legislation. Certain fundamental improvements for the social welfare of our people are not only necessary in themselves, but can properly be considered as a part of the program for building up the strength of America. One such problem, about which I talked in some detail last week, was housing. Another, which I want to discuss with you briefly tonight, is social security.

The extension and improvement of the Social Security System has been too long delayed. The record of the preceding Congress was disappointing. After months of consideration, and after the preparation of a very comprehensive report by a staff of experts (I think the report was about 500 pages long), the committee came out with a plan to increase certain benefits $5 per month and made one or two other minor changes. It was little better than nothing.

The record since that time has been entirely blank but now, at last, there is some ground for hope. The Senate Finance Committee has recently published recommendations for expanding the Social Security System to provide protection for virtually all citizens, and to increase payments under the old-age and survivors insurance program, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., former Secretary of State, headed the committee making the recommendations which would extend coverage to 20,000,000 additional workers and their families, and which would almost double payments under the insurance program.

Among those whom the new program would cover are self-employed persons, household workers, employees of nonprofit institutions such as hospitals, church, and charitable groups, and State, county, and city employees.

It has long been obvious that the self-employed have been the victim of a gross discrimination. The small contractor, for example, employing a few workers in his unincorporated business has been required to contribute by pay-roll taxes, but finds himself without protection, although his employees are covered. Among those who have most needed protection are household servants, and in the past they have been wholly unprotected.

The employees of our States, counties, and cities, the great majority of whom do not have the benefits of any local pension or retirement plans, are also entirely outside the purview of the present law. It is proposed that the members of this latter class may have a sort of choice—if they are within a retirement or pension plan afforded by the State or city, they may continue, but if they are presently unprotected, they can obtain coverage under the Federal system.

One present feature which has caused widespread dissatisfaction is that which provides that if a beneficiary earns as much as $15 in a single month, there will be a temporary suspension of benefits. The plan now proposed would increase that earning figure to $35 per month so that there would be less penalty attached to one who was trying to supplement the very meager income now provided by the system.

Legislation of this character must originate in the House of Representatives, so that the published recommendations of the Senate committee are not much more than suggestions to the House committee that it go ahead with the bill which it has under consideration. Here again, as in the case of housing (which I mentioned last week), the Senate has shown the House the way, and the House is faced with the responsibility of action.

However, Congressman DANIEL REED, of New York, who is the chairman of the House subcommittee, has said that there will be definite action on extended coverage. And there is real reason to hope that before the end of this busy session, there will be legislation designed at least moderately to improve present coverage, which is wholly inadequate and unrealistic in the light of modern conditions.

Once again, as in the case of housing, there is a substantial minority which believes that the Federal Government has no responsibility for the social security of our people, and indeed, 25 years ago such a conception would have been thought radical. I think, however, that it is the better opinion, and the majority opinion, that Government has a function to provide on a sound financial basis a basic minimum security against the economic hazards of old age.

Millions of our older citizens, who have gone beyond the peak of their earning capacity, are at least entitled to freedom from dire want. They have largely contributed to society, and society must now contribute to them.

If Chrysler Workers "Hit the Bricks," Who Will Be on Strike—The Corporation or the Workers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 12, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the statement of the Chrysler unions which appeared in the Detroit Free Press:

IF CHRYSLER WORKERS "HIT THE BRICKS," WHO WILL BE ON STRIKE—THE CORPORATION OR THE WORKERS?

Consider these facts:

1. The Chrysler workers did not invent the inflation that has taken them for a ride since June 1946. Inflation was hand-tailored by industry and Congress. Labor's call last year for a price roll-back instead of new wage increases was laughed off. The Chrysler workers don't see anything to laugh about in a weekly income $13 below the minimum level fixed by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics for a city worker's family of four.

2. Chrysler has not bargained in good faith. Chrysler threw its workers a 6-cent offering the way you would throw a dog a bone. No reasons why 6 cents instead of the 30 cents that Chrysler workers need to get back to where they were 2 years ago when price controls were destroyed.

3. Chrysler—with a 1947 profit on investment of 25.6 percent—cannot plead poverty because of a couple of weeks of gas pains

in the first quarter of 1948. The Chrysler workers are not less in need of an adequate income because rival monopolies held up the Nation's gas supply or because leaders of the steel industry are more interested in expanding profits than in expanding productive capacity. The workers' loss of income during lay-offs resulting from gas and steel shortages makes wage increases all the more imperative.

4. Chrysler executives can sit back and say "No" till the cows come home. Chrysler workers face the choice of shutting up and lying down or of insisting on a settlement that squares with the corporation's wealth and their clear need.

HAVE YOU EVER BARGAINED WITH A CORPORATION?

Have you ever been tossed a crumb from industry's table—and told to take it or leave it? The Chrysler workers have. Put yourself in their place. If Chrysler Vice President Herman Weckler had told you to take a $50- or $60-a-year tax cut and make believe it was a wage increase from the corporation, would you be thankful or would you be angry? (Mr. Weckler gave himself a 78.8-percent pay increase last year.)

If John Wagner, labor relations supervisor at Chrysler's Highland Park plant, had called you a "dumb cluck" because you, the wife, and the kids can't manage on your present income, would you purr or would you growl? (That's what Wagner called the men who make Chrysler's cars and Chrysler's profits.)

Do you call that collective bargaining?

CHRYSLER WORKERS HAVE NO APOLOGIES TO MAKE

We have put our case plainly. Since February 27 we have asked Chrysler to prove us wrong or admit we are right. Chrysler has proved nothing but its arrogance and indifference.

Corporations don't eat; corporations don't clothe kids; corporations are not human beings. We Chrysler workers and our wives and kids are flesh and blood and bone and spirit. If we are to labor and produce as free men, the facts of our existence must not be "brushed off" as union propaganda. We must be dealt with as human beings, not as lifeless items in a corporate balance sheet.

If Chrysler's extortionate profits have to dip a little to keep our heads above water, that is as it should be. We have no apologies to make for being human.

THE WAY TO STOP A STRIKE IS TO SETTLE THE ISSUES THAT CAUSE IT

If the public interest is involved in the Chrysler dispute—and it is—then the public also has an interest in the facts behind the dispute. We have presented those facts.

It's Chrysler's move.

NATIONAL CHRYSLER DEPARTMENT AND CHRYSLER LOCAL UNIONS, UAW, CIO.

New York State Legislator Opposes H. R. 5852, Un-American Activities Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 13, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, following is a telegram received from the Honorable Samuel Roman, member of the Assembly of the State of New York, from the Fifteenth Assembly District, which contains more than one-half the voters of my congressional district. Assemblyman Roman is a Republican, a student of legislation, and a distinguished public servant. His views are entitled to profound consideration and respect. I have advised Assemblyman Roman that, although this un-American activities bill has the word "Communist" written all through it, and that gives it a superficial public appeal, for by far the vast majority of our citizens abhor any tyranny, Communist or otherwise, over the mind or the spirit in any form, I am convinced that the great majority of the people of our district, regardless of economic conditions, religious faith, or political conviction who have supported me before will continue to support me in resisting violations of the American tradition and of the basic principles of freedom and democracy, no matter how speciously or plausibly put forth.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 12, 1948.*

Congressman J. K. JAVITS,
Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

I have carefully analyzed the Mundt bill (H. R. 5852) from the vantage point of a member of a great legislative body, the New York State Assembly.

To give to a single public servant, the Attorney General, as does this bill, the power to designate any man or woman as subversive because of their political conditions is abhorrent to everything I have been taught to look upon as American. I agree with Justice Jackson that "if there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation, it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion, or forces citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein."

I am a Republican, but it matters not to me what my neighbor's political affiliation may be. He has a right to differ and to oppose me and my party, and I, as a legislator, have the duty under my oath of office to protect him in his opposition if he be a Communist, no less than if he be a Democrat, or a member of any other political party.

We have grown great as a nation precisely because we have guarded jealously the rights of minorities. Congress can go further in frustrating any alleged subversive groups by reflecting the needs and wants and hopes of the American people than by passing such repressive legislation. Certainly, the Republican Party cannot subscribe to such a bankrupt admission of failure so that legislation such as H. R. 5852 has to be resorted to in an effort to wipe out minority opposition. Frankly, I have always regarded minorities as a blessing in disguise, as they ofttimes point up our deficiencies and alert us by their criticism. The Mundt bill in itself, although cleverly drawn, is a menace to freedom of expression.

At present there happens to be a bipartisan foreign policy to which the Communists are opposed. After November, under a new administration, there may not be this unanimity. One of the major parties may pursue a foreign policy congruent or parallel to that of the Communists. Then where are we?

As Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, a great leader of our party, said:

"Our institutions were not devised to bring about uniformity of opinion. If they had been, we might well abandon hope. It is important to remember, as has been said, that the essential characteristic of true liberty is that under its shelter many different types of life and character and opinion and belief can develop unmolested and unobstructed."

Therefore, I urge you with all the force at my command to defeat the passage of the Mundt bill (H. R. 5852).

SAMUEL ROMAN,
Member of New York State Assembly, Fifteenth District, New York County.

Unselfish Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 13, 1948

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, ever since the termination of World War II it has been apparent that Russia, under the guise of a Communist front, has been busy trying to infiltrate into key positions in the countries of the world opposed to communism. We have seen them work themselves into key positions in several countries of Europe such as the labor organizations, the police force, and the transportation and communication systems. In more recent months it has been quite apparent that they were endeavoring to repeat that pattern in this great, free country of ours. That they were making progress, particularly in certain crafts of the CIO in this country, is now undenied. In fact, about a year ago this situation became so alarming that a drive was begun, and progress has been made in that great labor organization in this country by certain of its officials, notably President Phil Murray and Mr. Walter Reuther, to prevent the left-wingers from taking over that organization. In fact, I feel confident that when the truth is known it will be found that the cowardly attempt to assassinate Mr. Reuther was communistically inspired. It is gratifying to all true, loyal Americans, both in and out of the CIO, to observe that much progress has been made in the direction of ridding that organization of Communist leaders.

And while there appear to be some crafts of that union in which the Communists still have strong power, it is gratifying to know that in my particular section of this great common country, the Communists and left-wingers have been unable to make any substantial progress. In fact, the members of the labor unions of the South will not tolerate this infiltration and domination. Only a few weeks ago a CIO local of the United Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers International of the CIO renounced their affiliation with that international and signed a new contract with the Hercules Powder Co. as members of the Hattiesburg Chemical Workers, also of the CIO.

They have also petitioned the NLRB for an election to ratify this action. The election has been ordered for June 19, and we confidently predict that the action of the officers of this union will be overwhelmingly approved by its members.

Representing the union were A. E. Curry, Jr., president and chairman; W. U. Talbert, vice president; J. T. Dabbs, secretary; and committeemen Harold

Blakeney, Joe Sherrill, George Boone, R. C. Welch, Tom Swann, Danny Weddle, Robert Webb, Robert Burke, and Sam Lindsay. These gentlemen are all good loyal Americans. They are interested in maintaining and advancing the cause of labor generally. They realize that the greatest enemy to the cause of the workingman is communism. They know that the workers of communistic Russia are not permitted to bargain collectively, to strike, or to enjoy the high standard of living of the American workingman. They realize further that if the steady progress of American standards for the workingman is to continue, they must combat the efforts of the Communists to gain control of our American labor unions. They are indeed to be congratulated upon their patriotism and foresight.

STATEMENT

In connection with signing of the new contract, R. R. (Huck) Dunagin, union personnel representative, issued the following statement:

There are 41 international unions affiliated with the national CIO. The overwhelming majority of these unions are noncommunistic. Among these noncommunistic labor unions are the Wood Workers of America, of which the Masonite (Laurel, Miss.) local is a member, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, of which the Laurel Reliance plant local is a member; and the United Gas, Coke, and Chemical Workers of America, with which the Hercules local has voted to become a member.

The officers and leaders of these and many other international CIO unions have filed noncommunistic affidavits with the United States Government. The penalty for falsifying these affidavits is a $10,000 fine and 10 years' imprisonment. There are churches, schools, and many so-called civic organizations in America whose leaders could not and would not file similar affidavits.

However, the international which we are ousting, namely, the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, has not filed noncommunistic affidavits. The leaders of that international have stated that they have no intention of filing these affidavits. To those of us who have read the paper that this international publishes, their reasons for not filing are easily understood.

We believe that the M. M. & S. W. is now communistically dominated.

RACIAL STRIFE

We believe that they are attempting to stir up racial strife and hatred.

We believe that they are working hand in glove with supposedly conservative politicians who do not understand conditions in the South, to create a bloc of votes in the South that will bear the same fruit as the votes of the Harlem district of the State of New York.

We believe that many more local unions of America would throw off their communistic affiliations if management would take the lead in building up good labor relations by fair treatment and honest collective bargaining, as our company has done.

Mr. Dunagin said that as soon as the new union receives its certification from the National Labor Relations Board it will begin work toward helping other local labor unions now affiliated with Communist-dominated internationals (not now certified by the National Labor Relations Board because of refusal to sign non-Communist affidavits) to transfer into certified unions.

In this connection the following editorials from the Hattiesburg (Miss.) American and the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger, felicitating these leaders are submitted:

[From the Hattiesburg (Miss.) American]

A MATTER OF PRINCIPLE

Both the members of the local labor union and the officials of Hercules Powder Co. are to be commended for their courage in breaking with an international labor union that they believe represents interests unfriendly to the general welfare of the Nation.

It takes courage to tackle any problem governed by labor laws because, for the most part, the Nation's newest labor law, the Taft-Hartley act, still is untested.

It takes courage to incur the wrath of a powerful and wealthy international of the CIO, because such an act could precipitate a jurisdictional war that would have a far-reaching effect on the peace and economy of the community.

It takes courage to run the risk of an aftermath of violence.

But these men could not live with their consciences as long as they believe they were members of and were supporting an organization they believed to be a communistically-dominated, and with full knowledge of the consequences of their action broke with this organization.

It restores our faith in our country when men will place in jeopardy material gains for a matter of principle. These men have done a service to themselves and to the community in which they live.

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger of April 19, 1948]

MISSISSIPPI WORKERS LEAVE A "COMMUNIST-DOMINATED" UNION

Ordinarily, it would not be any of our business which union the workers in the Hercules Powder Co.'s Hattiesburg plant chose to represent them. In one way, it may not be any of our business now.

We are confident, however, that we voice the hearty approval of a great majority of Mississippians when we congratulate these workers on their withdrawal from the United Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers (CIO) and their affiliation with the United Gas, Coke and Chemical Workers of America, which also is a CIO union.

Officials of the union from which they withdrew have not filed the non-Communist affidavits required by the Taft-Hartley law.

"The leaders of that international have stated that they have no intention of filing these affidavits," an official of the Hattiesburg local union said. "To those of us who have read the paper that this international publishes, their reasons for not filing are easily understood."

Others among the Hattiesburg workers called the union "Communistically dominated." They ought to know.

That's why we congratulate these Mississippi workers on their withdrawal from this union and their affiliation with a union the officials of which can and will obey the law by filing the affidavits that they are not Communists.

War or Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1948

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, there is included herewith a broadcast I will make on May 14 over radio stations WBAB, in Atlantic City, and WSNJ, in Bridgeton, on the subject War or Peace?:

WAR OR PEACE?

From Tuesday on, the headlines of the world's newspapers have carried the story of the recent talk between General Smith, the American Ambassador to the Soviet Union, and Mr. Molotov. One would naturally expect that any news indicating any possibility of a peaceful settlement would have been hailed with delight, both in official circles and in the press. The first reaction, however, is quite the opposite.

A sample headline appeared in the Washington Post. It said, "United States denies proposing parley with Russia to settle issues; policy reaffirmed by Truman." Are we to assume from this that there is something shameful or wrong about being willing to discuss our many difficulties with Russia? Are we to assume that the policy reaffirmed by Truman is a policy continuing the cold war under any circumstances, and the policy of being unwilling to make further attempts at a peaceful settlement?

The opening of the story stated that official Washington was embarrassed, confused, and annoyed by the Moscow announcement that Russia had accepted an American offer for discussion and settlement of Soviet-American differences. What in heaven's name is embarrassing or annoying about any and all further attempts for peace?

Another headline said, "Bewildered Britain feels note exchange is blunder." Has our course toward war proceeded so far that an attempt at settlement is bewildering, or a blunder?

It is, indeed, bewildering that the news of a possible conference between the United States and Russia to attempt to settle their many differences should be received by the administration in Washington with dismay and embarrassment, and it is indeed, a blunder for the administration to break into print at once with what virtually amounts to a denial of any such suggestion.

There is no excuse for thinking the American position has weakened, because the statement by General Smith is a tough statement. He made it very plain to Molotov that the conduct of the Russian Government was responsible for the present state of tension, and told him that our present strong policy would be continued and even strengthened. But he did say this, "We still do not despair, by any means, of a turn of events which will permit us to find the road to a decent and reasonable relationship between our two countries, with a fundamental relaxation of those tensions which today exercise so unhappy an influence on international society everywhere. As far as the United States is concerned, the door is always wide open for full discussion and the composing of our differences."

Now, that was a proper statement. Of course, the door is open for peaceful discussion. The American people have been clamoring for such further attempts. The willingness of our people to prepare for any eventuality is not to be interpreted as warlike. We surely have enough sense to realize that a war would ruin the victor as well as the vanquished.

The Russian Government seized upon this statement as a definite proposal. Their official reply said that the Soviets favor the desire of the United States to improve our relationships, and agrees to the proposal to discuss them.

Well, it probably was not an official proposal, and the Russians in accepting it as such are indulging in the oriental trick of face saving, but it is no better than childish to argue about who invited whom. The point is that no matter how unreasonable the Russian position has been; no matter how wholly disappointing our previous confer-

ences with them have been, the people of America expect their Government to spend at least as much time in an attempt to restore peace as they spend in preparations for war. It would be encouraging to the world if there was just a little more peace talk and a little less war talk.

We have surely come a long way on the road to war when the city of Washington has been thrown into a diplomatic tail spin at the suggestion that the door is still open for peace.

Our people favor a strong policy with Russia, not a weak one, and we favor backing that strong policy with strength, but believe me, we favor exploring every possible avenue which leads to peace. If the administration does not know this, it better be told.

Baiting Averages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 13, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Guy E. Wyatt:

BAITING AVERAGES
(By Guy E. Wyatt)

The good old game of baseball, a beloved American institution, is with us again.

All winter long the baseball fans of this country have been blowing on their numbed fingers, and taking their pencils in hand to hash and rehash last season's batting averages.

This summer millions of Americans will be going to ball parks to watch their favorite teams set new records.

But just as sure as any sunny day this Summer means a ball game—just so sure are there other millions of people in this country working hard at a "game" to destroy American love of competition and fair play.

This "game" of tearing down American institutions has terms of play which are similar to our national pastime: They have strikes, runs, hits, fouls, errors—but batting averages have been replaced with "baiting averages."

Around microphones, editorial desks, speakers' stands, street corners, and even in parlors, these other millions of people are gathering to raise their "baiting averages." This "game" in some cases is purposely designed, but in all cases, if unchecked, is destined eventually to destroy all American traditions.

To raise "baiting averages" in this new "game," it is necessary to select some institution of a free democracy, some individual or office in that democracy, or program for raising the standards of living, or any cooperative action for the public good, and unfairly criticize, bitterly attack, and deride. Choosing one of these various methods as one would select a bat, you rate your "baiting average" by the cumulative results of your "hit."

Perhaps some sympathetic-minded columnist or news writer or radio reporter will pick up the attack. Should his readers or listeners develop into a pressure group which campaigns against the object of your attack, your "baiting average" will go up 30 or 40 points.

Perhaps you select the Congress of the United States, a Senator or Representative, or some legislation which has received long and intelligent consideration in open hearings and committee meetings. Then you unfairly question, deride or belittle this subject to your friends or anyone whom you can get to listen (you may even use the "bitter attack" for this approach).

If you suceed in creating an unwarranted suspicion or antagonism in the minds of your listeners, your "baiting average" will rise from a fraction to several percent, depending on how well your listeners repeat or enlarge on your statements.

"Baiting averages" fall when you go out of your way to aid or participate in any form of cooperation, with your Government, your employers or your fellow citizens, in actions designed for the public welfare. They suffer a severe slump when you attempt by act, word, or thought to revive the early American ideal of free opportunity for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The ultimate aim of this new "game" is so to weaken the American people, so divide them into emotional groups, that they will in their petty strugglings against each other, wreck their heritage of constitutional Government. The immediate strategy is to get your neighbors and mine to besmirch such cherished institutions as the privilege and duty to elect members of their local and national Governments, the ability to progress in the community; the freedom to work as hard and as long as one's ambition dictates—with the result that they shall then fall easy prey to subversive elements.

To the millions who are unwittingly playing this "game," it should be pointed out that there are many coaches available in this country located all the way from some Washington high officials to local soap boxes. Some may even be found disguised in refinement and intelligence.

Following the practice of all sports lovers to check on the career and performance of coaches and pros, it is interesting to check the background of these foreign-trained coaches under whose direct or indirect coaching so many people are striving to build a "baiting average."

Cases have been recorded where players making such a check have been shocked to find that the "game" is far rougher than they had at first realized from their amateur contests. Those players have withdrawn, but others still blindly follow the instructions of these coaches with unabated ardor.

This spring, this summer, and as long as there are Americans who do not take the trouble to discover what the score is, the new "game" will continue to recruit fans.

Can this be world progress?

There is something nostalgic in the thought of those warm sunny days at the old ball park. There is such a soul-comforting relaxation in these fairly played games plus the fresh air and a healty sunburn—and you can openly and good naturedly cheer or hiss and boo as you desire; without destroying the rules of the game which keep it fair and which brings to us all so much pleasure.

By the way, what's your baiting average?

Milestone Is Reached in "Cold War" Between Russia and America—Which One Began Move Toward Understanding Matters But Little

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 12, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by David Lawrence that appeared in the Washington Evening Star of May 12, 1948, as follows:

MILESTONE IS REACHED IN "COLD WAR" BETWEEN RUSSIA AND AMERICA—WHICH ONE BEGAN MOVE TOWARD UNDERSTANDING MATTERS BUT LITTLE

(By David Lawrence)

A milestone has been reached in the tortuous roads that have been traveled in the "cold war" between Russia and the United States.

Today at last the voice of reason speaks. Both countries through their official spokesmen significantly disclaim any responsibility for the present status of tension between them, and both say they want to find a reasonable basis for discussing their outstanding differences.

This is no time, therefore, for expressions of the chip-on-the-shoulder variety which emanate from propaganda sources. Thus, from abroad a Russian satellite state's propaganda construes the American note as a confession of guilt and a sign of weakness. Likewise, some intimations from anonymous spokesmen in the State Department convey the idea that the United States isn't interested in remaining in a stratosphere of glittering generalities."

What is important is the over-all situation which has changed from a feeling of hopelessness and a belief in the futility of negotiations to an assumption that maybe diplomacy might work out a settlement after all.

WHICH TOOK INITIATIVE

It doesn't matter much which country took the initiative. Last January Russia tried to initiate conversations through Ambassador Murphy in Berlin. For reasons best known to the American Government at the time, the Russian invitation was not accepted.

Today the United States Government is revealed as having taken the initiative on May 4 last. The United States presented a review of its policy and defended its course. But the United States then said to Russia through our Ambassador in words that may become historic:

"We still do not despair by any means of a turn of events which will permit us to find the road to a decent and reasonable relationship between our two countries with a fundamental relaxation of those tensions which today exercise so unhappy an influence on international society everywhere. As far as the United States is concerned, the door is always wide open for full discussion and the composing of our differences.

"My Government earnestly hopes that the members of the Soviet Government will not take lightly the position of the United States Government, as here expressed. They have it in their power to alleviate many of the situations which today weigh so heavily on all international life.

"It is our earnest hope that they will take advantage of these possibilities. If they do, they will not find us lacking in readiness and eagerness to make our own contribution to a stabilization of world conditions entirely compatible with the security of the Soviet peoples."

The key words in the foregoing are "readiness and eagerness" and also "compatible with the security of the Soviet peoples."

HARDEST TASK AHEAD

The American Government has made a real gesture toward ending the "cold war." But the hardest task lies ahead. Quibbling and bickering and overemphasis on technicalities have blocked and frustrated discussions before. If the two countries really want to make an over-all settlement, they must realistically rise above detail and come to grips with basic principles.

Likewise, there are many people in America who feel that a mere agreement in writing is not enough and that there must be further evidence of good faith. This means deeds. It means a cessation of petty quarreling over inspections of traffic in Berlin and Vienna. It means a cessation of communistic threats to constituted governments in Europe and elsewhere.

Psychologically, the Russians grabbed the spotlight by taking an American diplomatic note not intended for publicity and broadcasting it over the radio. This indicates that the Russians have been waiting for a chance to start peace discussions. But it also produces its embarrassments for those here who have been talking as if war with Russia were imminent. It certainly puts a damper on plans to revive the draft—though unless manpower is available, the big appropriations for armament cannot be effectively spent. Also there is the matter of lend-lease help to the military alliance in western Europe. It cramps the style of those who wanted to go further in that direction at this time.

Russia doubtless has acted in the nick of time from her own standpoint—an effort to halt the alliance from developing. Until there is evidence of a change in deeds by Russia, as well as words, however, the military-prepardness program here will probably continue as planned. In fact, defenders of that doctrine feel the Russian initiative is a sign that the military-preparedness attitude of the United States has brought results. The atmosphere is still surcharged with mutual suspicion and distrust.

Jewish Militia of Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 13, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, about 500 members of the George Washington Legion came to Washington yesterday and were received on the steps of the Capitol by Members of both Houses of Congress. They came here representing more than 5,000 American veterans of World War II who have evidenced their desire to join the Jewish militia of Palestine to help restore peace there. From the Capitol they marched to the Washington Monument, where they placed a wreath, and then had their duly accredited representatives call at the White House to present a petition which they had previously presented to the Congress, urging enactment of legislation which will permit them to go to Palestine without losing their American citizenship, and also urging the lifting of the embargo on arms to the Jews of Palestine. Significantly the legion is made up of Jews and non-Jews who have but one thought in mind, and that is establishment of freedom and democracy throughout the world.

My welcome to them was as follows:

History has an inexorable way of repeating itself. In the years ahead our descendants will look back at this day and point with pride to the fact that those who are gathered here today played an important part in making history repeat itself. It is most fitting and apropos that here in the Capitol of the greatest democracy in the world we are able to welcome free Americans who are ready to offer up their lives to perpetuate the freedom of mankind.

Our own American revolution against the tyranny of Great Britain could never have succeeded except for the help of freedom-loving peoples throughout the world. Today you men are embarking upon a venture which will in part repay the debt we owe to those who helped us establish a democracy here. The establishment of a democracy in the Jewish state in Palestine will be speeded to a happy conclusion with your help, so that peace will reign again in that war-torn land.

The Role of the Reserve Officer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD T. MILLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 13, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on May 7 I was invited to deliver an address at the annual convention of the Department of Maryland, Reserve Officers Association, in Baltimore. Under leave granted, there follows an extension of the remarks I made at that time:

Mr. President, distinguished guests, and fellow Reserve officers, I am very happy to have the honor of speaking to this group today. Barring a few weeks between commissions, I have been an active Reserve officer from May 1917 to the present time. One cannot follow an avocation for over 30 years without becoming deeply enmeshed in its problems and traditions. Then, as we all know, something gets into one's blood. As the song says, There's Something About a Soldier. One reason for this comes from the very nature of the service. A civilian soldier or sailor differs from other individuals who have a principal extracurricular interest. War service or extended active duty ceases to be a side line—it becomes, for the time, the sole and all-absorbing vocation. It results in the leading of double lives and this has its complications as all psychologists know.

At this particular period of our Nation's history, I am convinced that the role of the Reserve officer is of major importance to our national welfare and safety. My experiences as a freshman Congressman have more than confirmed the convictions I had on this point from the accumulated impressions gleaned in two world wars and the intervening years of inactive duty.

I will confess that the immediate problem is vastly different from the one I had anticipated at the close of the shooting wars. My principal fear was that our Nation would drift into military indifference and unpreparedness—much as it did in the 1920's. Then we established what, for that time, was a pretty good national-defense program and let it waste on the vine for lack of appropriations and public understanding. The idea that we had won the "war that would end all wars" was all too generally accepted. As I said, I feared a repetition of a similar error unless great efforts were made to educate public and professional opinion alike. There still well may develop such a situation in the future.

But circumstances have brought about a greatly different situation at present. Today we are not, as a people, basking in the comfort of a conviction that there is no possibility of war. Far from it. We are at present engaged in what is called a cold war and have gone perhaps too far in the other direction in fearing that a shooting war is inevitable. I personally refuse to concede this.

The latest compilation I've seen of the number of Communist Party members in all of Europe, which seems to be the major critical spot, was less than 19,000,000 persons. The percentage therefore is very small and included is the Soviet Union which, according to the New York Herald Tribune's research, numbers only 6,000,000 party members. Dangerous as this menace is, both at home and abroad, I cannot believe that there are enough of these fanatics to cause a world catastrophe if we use common sense, stand firmly with restraint, get our own house in order, and keep our powder dry.

Whatever the problem might have been, today the American people are aroused to the danger. The Congress has reacted accordingly. Appropriations for the armed services are being increased over budget requests instead of reduced. There was never a more favorable atmosphere in which to work out a sound and sufficient long-term plan of national defense. But the departments, the services, and the Congress cannot do it alone. It is so vital to our future that it requires effort and sacrifice from all patriotic Americans.

The Reserve officers have one of the principal roles. They share the same tremendous stake with all citizens, but because of training and past experience as leaders they have an added responsibility.

Certain truths we know are self-evident. We must profit from the experiences and failures of the past if we are to survive as a Nation.

Speed, range, and devastating power of weapons, old and new, are ever on the increase. Each new discovery adds to the danger. With the passing of time, the suddenness, scope, and demoralizing effect of any such blow become potentially more serious.

The next big attack would be aimed logically at the industrial areas of the United States. Our wealth and production lines, which have twice saved freedom for the world, are likely to be the first objectives—not Belgium, not the Maginot line, not Pearl Harbor. Even if we have allies who fight as did the Russians at Stalingrad, the British at Dunkerque, the French at Verdun, we cannot count on their giving us the precious time to prepare and deploy, as was the case in the last two wars. Not if we are the first objective.

In the past we have finished with mighty impressiveness, but we have not looked well in the early rounds. Remember Pearl Harbor, the U-boat carnage, Bull Run, and Bladensburg? In the last two wars, God and our allies gave us the necessary time to mobilize our strength. Both times we paid a shocking price in blood and treasure for our unreadiness, but our friends were able to hold long enough to cover our frantic periods of arming and drafting. If there is a next time, we must be strong before the crisis. We dare not rely on any time next time. One of the surest ways of postponing or preventing a third world war is for us to be ever ready for the worst.

What are some of the lessons we must learn from the past as they particularly affect our responsibility as Reserve officers?

First, we have learned that in all our wars the overwhelming proportion of our strength has been drawn from civilian components. Therefore, in time of peace, a far greater proportion of attention, training, and effort must be devoted to the civilian components than ever before. The best officers of the Regular services, not just any officer, should be assigned to work in this field.

Duty with the National Guard or Reserves should come to be a feather in the cap of a Regular officer—not a dull interlude.

Officers must be placed in the highest echelons who have interest and enthusiasm in developing the Reserves. The Navy in recent months has accomplished much by doing that very thing.

The type of career officers—and they are far too numerous for the good of the services—who disdains, ignores, or barely tolerates Reserve officers in the higher brackets should be weeded out, and either retired or put on assignments where there is a minimum of contact with troops and the public.

No one has a higher regard for the fine Regular officers with whom I have been privileged to serve than do I. But, like all experienced older civilian officers I know, I've had too many contacts with the brass-hat type that for some reason or another scorns, patronizes, or depreciates any officer who is not a Regular, and preferably a West Point or Annapolis graduate. The fact that in many cases they were either honestly ignorant of the capacities of the Reserve officers under them or were themselves weak sisters in posts too high for their own capacities, did not alter the harm that resulted.

Unfairness always injures morale. When promotions and decorations are influenced by factors other than merit, the efficiency of any individual or organization will suffer.

Not only must the Regular Establishments foster and encourage the civilian components, not only must they put their best officers in the key training posts, they must assign their ablest planners to work in developing a practical program. That task is not an easy one. But if it is to succeed we must profit from the mistakes of the past.

The Reserve officer that is worth his salt wants to work at being an officer. He needs and should be given responsibility. He does not have to be handled with kid gloves. The hardships and difficulties of service are one of the things that make it worth while and in which he takes pride. But he cannot, even with inactive duty pay, which I was glad to help put through the Congress, be expected to spend much time in attending trivial lectures, in doing silly correspondence courses and so many of the impractical, unbeneficial token tasks that have been characteristic of much of the peacetime training in the past. He wants to be part of a team—to belong to a unit that is capable of performing a military mission. For such a unit the worth-while officer will make heavy sacrifices and he will maintain his self-respect.

It is, indeed, unfortunate that when emergencies have come in the past, such units as were in the making usually have been broken and scattered to the four winds. This has dampened enthusiasm throughout the length and breadth of the Reserves.

Many of us here today will always regret that the personnel of the old Three Hundred and Nineteenth Infantry, which I had the honor to command for many years, did not have a chance to work as a team in time of war. Steps should be taken to build up pride of units in the Reserves. It would be a great asset in a war, which, if it comes, will do so more suddenly than an obsolescent blitz.

Policies must be formed that make maximum use of the many thousands of highly trained and physically fit veterans that have gone back into civilian life in all parts of our land. The American taxpayers have spent billions on their education and training. They are, from a defense point of view, our greatest asset and one that is largely going to waste. Their skill, patriotism, and bravery are a demonstrated fact. Not only have they received technical schooling, but a large percentage have had such schooling as can never be had in time of peace. One of my World War I commanders used to say that the only real school for battle is battle. Of course, one requires good luck in addition to other qualities, to graduate from such a course.

It was a typical failure to use Reserves to the best advantage in World War II, that so many officers who had graduated from this hard school in World War I, officers who had long and successful combat experience, were left to cool their heels in housekeeping jobs in the early days of the war. This was the very time they were most needed and had the most to offer.

But instead of making the most of such assets, many of our battle-wise Reserve officers were forced to stand by and watch untried commanders write their tests with blood of unnecessary casualties. As long as our combat-tested leaders of World War II are young enough and physically able, every effort must be made to keep them connected with the service—even if they cannot devote as many hours to training as is desirable. They have learned already lessons that cannot be taught in any peacetime school.

A plan must be devised to make use of them wherever they may be.

May I illustrate what I have in mind by a personal example. Under present policy, I am told that the reason many of us have not been assigned to an appropriate command, is that the town or place in which we reside is not big enough to be allotted such an organization. Could anything be more demoralizing? An experienced tank officer is to be discarded if he lives where they have no tanks. A field officer is out of a job if his community isn't large enough to support a battalion and so forth. Even back in 1937 we did better than that. I lived on the same farm then and was not considered disqualified, by residence, to command a regiment. From where I live, one can reach Fort Meade or Baltimore more quickly today than 10 years ago.

A good plan for the civilian components will have to avoid such impediments. It will have to provide a way of using to advantage the best material available wherever it may be.

So much for the over-all picture. What has experience indicated that we, as Reserve officers, can do about it? Major plans and policies are beyond our sphere as individuals, one may well say. Yes, that is largely true of us as individuals but not as a group. We are potentially as important a group in peace or cold war as when the last chips are down. Actually, we have a better chance to properly influence the molding of national policy as quasi-civilians than when on active duty. As civilians we can make our views known and scrap for what we believe right without having to go through channels or conform to the policy of higher authority.

There are today many Members in the Halls of Congress who are most receptive to suggestions from such organizations as this. In the Eightieth Congress 47 Members in the Senate and 204 of the House are veterans of one or more wars.

The composite service experience of this group is enormous. They have seen action all over the world in all sorts of capacities and engagements—in ships, planes, and tanks. Their number includes citizen soldiers and sailors and at least one lifelong Regular, and a holder of the Congressional Medal of Honor. Most of them have experienced added personal danger and hardship because of national unpreparedness. Many have gone through the unhappy days of maneuvers, using flags to simulate men, broomsticks to represent machine guns, and delivery trucks in place of tanks.

So far as Congress is concerned then, there is an understanding group before which to lay these problems. But we must also build up the strength of our own group. We must recruit Reserve officers to be members of our association. We must recruit former officers to become Reserve officers. We must remind them that service of country and our obligations as military men do not end while life lasts, no matter how great past contributions may have been.

We must actively strive to cooperate with other components and services and to reduce to mere healthy rivalries any jealousies that may exist. This is particularly necessary with respect to our brothers of the National Guard whose interests parallel our own.

We must campaign to see that employers do not discourage or penalize employees who serve in the Guard or go on active duty with the Reserves. We must insist on high standards in every echelon of our organization. We must put our own house in order.

Inevitably, the result will be successful, if we face our duty as officers, gentlemen, and patriotic citizens.

A Positive Program for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1948

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the CONGRESSONAL RECORD a speech entitled "A Positive Program for Peace," which I delivered over radio station KMO, Tacoma, Wash., on May 12, 1948:

No greater problem exists in America today than the dire need to create and carry out a positive program for peace. The recent statement of the Federal Council of Churches in this regard, expresses the troubled thought and profound desires of millions of Americans of all faiths. It is becoming all too obvious that another war can end only in complete disaster and misery for all.

It is my belief, that in a democracy it is the duty of every citizen to contribute to the clarification of issues and to the solution of the great problems which confront all of us. No one has the right to withdraw from the world of action at a time when all civilization faces its supreme test. All peoples must work and sacrifice to achieve a settlement which will bring peace.

On a matter as important as this I sincerely feel that you as citizens are entitled to a frank and honest statement from your Congressman. This is no time for political fence straddling or double talk. As I talk this evening, however, I ask that you fully realize that we in Congress are charged with the responsibility of making decisions which will affect our future and the future of the world. It is one thing to engage in debate knowing that you will not be called on to decide the final solution and accept full responsibility for it. It is quite another story, when you must take action which will immediately affect the lives of millions of people. In the final analysis history alone can be your only honest judge.

On matters of this nature all of us are prone to seek out scapegoats, or whipping boys to blame for our predicament. Our hindsight is always better than our foresight. It is quite easy to swell up with pride, and boast that had we been called to make the decisions of the past, things would certainly be different now. I sincerely feel that we cannot afford that luxury today. The seriousness of the present situation requires all of us to unite in a positive nonpartisan approach to present and future international problems. What has happened in the past regarding the actions and attitudes of public officials and political parties is water over the dam. If we are to go forward at all we must go forward together.

We cannot today afford the luxury of mere opposition. We must accept our responsibility to advocate and support a positive program designed to meet the present problems and it must be a program possible of attainment. To refuse this responsibility is cowardice and moral dishonesty. Neither intellectual cynicism, nor emotional outbursts,

will contribute toward our efforts to find immediate and future solutions involving the relations of men and of nations. We must first, then, fully realize that we are all under moral obligation to present a workable and attainable alternative program if we reject the recommended solutions of others.

Before discussing specific action designed to establish and maintain peace, I think it important that we examine and understand the nature of peace itself.

Peace is, I think, a quality of heart and mind and soul. It cannot exist in an atmosphere of uncertainty and fear. When nations live in fear of their future then their peace has been destroyed. In the past nations have more often chosen the positive action of war rather than continue the nervous existence of fear.

And there is a second quality to peace, which is justice. Peace without justice is not possible. We Americans have all been guilty of overlooking this basic fact. We all loved peace so dearly that we sacrificed the freedom of others in a vain attempt to keep it. But because appeasement is based on fear, instead of justice, it has always signaled the beginning of trouble. We must, therefore, vigorously oppose injustice in the relations of nations wherever it exists. If we do not take whatever positive action becomes necessary to maintain peace, we shall, by our indecision and wishful thinking, make war inevitable.

Peace requires the absence of fear and uncertainty. Peace without justice is not possible. This is a time for taking stock of reality and facing up to the facts. The most salient fact confronting our civilization is that the hope of one world is frustrated. Today two hostile worlds are in full contest: The eastern bloc headed by the Soviet Union confronts the western democracies. Three possible lines of policy for us are emerging:

1. The first policy is that of the preventive war. It calls for an attack upon the potential enemy at a time and place of our own choosing while the United States retains the monopoly of the atomic bomb. Let us not delude ourselves that victory would be cheap and easy. At the outset the Russians must occupy all of Europe up to the Atlantic seaboard from which they could be dislodged only by large-scale bombardment of cities and communication centers. No military leader has suggested that we could force a Russian surrender without a costly ground-force invasion of Europe and Asia. Even if victory were finally achieved after colossal sacrifices we would find western Europe in a condition of ruin far worse than that which exists in Germany today. Its population would be decimated and overrun with disease. We would have for generations the task of rebuilding western Europe and of policing the Soviet Union. This would be the result of the cheapest victory we could achieve.

2. The second possible policy is maintenance of an armed peace in a two-bloc world which, historically, has always led to war. This course would lead to rebuilding the strength of western Europe economically and militarily to a point where, allied with the United States, it would confront the Soviet bloc with overwhelming strength. This would entail tremendous and steadily accelerating armaments expenditures over an indefinite period, enforce a lower standard of living on the people, and might betray our moral position by propping up anti-democratic regimes as counterpoise to the Russians. But it could have no termination save in a war begun at a less advantageous moment than the preventive war and thus ending even less favorably.

3. A third possible policy is the drive for a workable international organization which has growing and powerful support among the peoples of the west. The international organization movement looks toward a creation of international authority with power sufficient to maintain law among nations. Initially and at every step the door would be open to all nations to federate with the authority and submit to its limited jurisdiction.

Is this a hopeless perspective? I think not. The American proposal for international control of atomic energy was accepted in its essentials by the nations outside the Soviet bloc. Through its abolition of the veto power in the field of atomic energy, it would have had the effect of transferring sovereignty in this field to the international authority. In substance this was a world government in a limited sphere.

The first two suggested policies lead inevitably to a war which would end with the total collapse of our traditional civilization. The third indicated policy may bring about the acceptance by the Soviet bloc of the offer of federation. If they will not accept federation, we lose nothing not already lost. If, as seems probable, the world has a period of armed peace, time and events may bring about a change in their policy

We have then the choice of acceptance, in the first two cases, of the inevitability of war or, in the latter case, of the possibility of peace. Confronted by such alternatives, I believe that all constructive lines of action must be in keeping with the need of establishing a workable international organization.

This can be achieved, but not overnight. In the meantime statesmen must confront today's problems and attempt to solve them, lest there be no civilized world left to govern. The course of events has indicated a growing dependence on armaments at a time when armaments cannot be adequate for purposes of national defense, and a decreasing use of the processes of negotiation and conciliation.

There are no serious negotiations going forward anywhere in the world between the two great powers—the United States and Soviet Russia. Almost everywhere the pattern is the same—total collapse of discussion on the most important problems—in the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, in Berlin, in Korea. I hope for discussion and negotiation at the highest governmental level between the United States and Soviet Russia. To truly represent the people our discussions should be conducted by officials of both major parties representing the President and Congress. Although such discussions could not be effective until the new President and new Congress have taken office the tedious preliminary activity could well begin now. I think these discussions should be conducted on the basis of starting with a clean slate. We should readily admit that the results of Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam were all horrible mistakes. We must lay the cards on the table, and make every desperate effort to stop this steady trend toward war. Of course, it is possible that such discussions may fail. If this happens it will not be because we have not honestly tried to establish a basis for peace. Since our present course will eventually mean war we most certainly have nothing to lose by making this attempt.

And in the meantime, there are some very concrete steps we Americans can take at home and abroad to make peace more possible.

At home we must renew the sources of freedom's strength. We must reaffirm our faith in republican institutions; and we must make those institutions work. We must redefine the goals of freedom. We must substitute for our languid defense of representative government a crusade in its behalf.

We must achieve a truly representative government. We must offer to every freeman, regardless of class or race or color, a full measure of participation in the government of his own affairs. We must move forward more swiftly to strengthen our democracy by strengthening our people. This means better education, better and more housing, better and more medical care, greater production and more equitable distribution, and a constant striving to make equality of opportunity real for all. The economic and social rights of all our citizens must be recognized and scrupulously upheld. If we do these things, we shall have built a defense in the mind of America that no totalitarian attack can ever penetrate.

We must affirmatively assume our de facto leadership of the free world. There must be a national recognition that the future of freedom in all the world is the responsibility of America. America has but recently laid aside the arms with which it fought to preserve freedom from totalitarianism in another form. To secure the peace and to maintain the freedom which it fought to save, let America now accept the reality of its leadership and the awesome responsibilities which have fallen to it.

In this connection I think it necessary that we fully cooperate with and lend assistance to all international programs designed to bring about better cultural and social understanding. To an extent this can be established by an enlarged exchange of students and teachers between our colleges and those of foreign lands, as well as the free flow of educational materials.

We must, I think, strengthen the Voice of America program to insure the freedom of information throughout the world. We must help alleviate suffering by playing an active and leading role in the International Refugee Organization and the World Health Organization.

And above all else we must deal with the displaced-persons problem on a bold and humanitarian basis. Actually we have been the slowest to take in these victims of war and Soviet conquest.

It is my earnest hope that the military strength required of America now, need not be used in the future. The program I have outlined presents, I think, an attainable alternative to eventual war.

Finally, we must not fail to use the sharpest weapon in the arsenal of freedom, the moral base upon which political liberty rests. The proposition that individual man is a creature of dignity and personal worth is the essence of our form of government. Let us send to every part of the globe where men suffer from tyranny the message that America seeks, not a society founded upon class hatred, not a government whose absolute power depends upon fear, but rather, in the highest western tradition, a society based on the brotherhood of man.

Gov. Dwight H. Green

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER B. HUBER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1948

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I observed in the morning Washington newspapers that Governor Green, of Illinois, was in Washington to draft his keynote speech to the Republican National Convention.

Since Governor Green of Illinois is to be the keynoter, I think that the Republicans of the House and of the Nation should be well informed on his record as Governor of Illinois. With this thought in mind, I include in my remarks an article which appeared in the St. Louis

Post-Dispatch on Sunday, May 2, 1948. The article follows:

DWIGHT GREEN ONCE DENOUNCED THIRD TERM AS DICTATORSHIP, NOW SEEKS ONE FOR HIMSELF—POLL OF 6,317 REPUBLICAN LEADERS IN ILLINOIS BY BETTER GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION SHOWS 3-TO-1 OPPOSITION TO MORE THAN TWO TERMS FOR HIM OR ANYONE ELSE

(By Joseph Driscoll)

Dwight H. Green, Governor of Illinois, has been selected by the Republican National Committee to deliver the keynote address at the opening of the Republican National Convention in Philadelphia next June. This is an honor usually reserved for elder statesmen without further political ambitions or for up-and-coming young men who have attracted the public eye and can use the convention platform as a springboard for higher office. Harold E. Stassen, keynoter at the 1940 Philadelphia convention, which nominated Wendell L. Willkie, now is a front-running candidate for the Philadelphia exposition this year.

The keynoter's traditional job is to set the tone for the rest of the convention—to point with pride to the accomplishments of his own party and to view with alarm the failures of the opposition party. Of course, the keynoter never admits that his own party was at fault occasionally or that the opposition somehow may have blundered into doing some good for a change.

Keynoting tradition being what it is—in the past many convention delegates have stayed away from the keynote address and waited for the real business of nominating to begin—Governor Green is not expected to introduce any new ideas into his curtain-raising oratory. It is unlikely, for instance, that he will raise the old third-term issue once dear to his Chicago constituents.

A PERSONAL PROBLEM

Once upon a time Dwight Green, who now aspires to a third term as Governor of Illinois, warned of the danger of third-term dictatorship and called on the citizens to march to the polls to keep politicians from perpetuating themselves in public office. This was in 1940, when Green, a young politico on the make, was running for Governor the first time and, backed up by the Chicago Tribune then as now, likened third-termers to Hitler. Green made it plain that the third-term issue had a lot to do with his support of Wendell Willkie against Franklin Roosevelt. But now Dwight Green wants to be the first third-term Governor in all the 130 years of Illinois Statehood, and he has changed his tune accordingly. In fact, he is singing so low on the controversial subject he won't even discuss it for publication.

But other voices are being lifted to save Green from the danger of self-perpetuation.

POLL OF STATE CONDUCTED

"What Illinois Thinks of the Third Term" is the title of a symposium recently conducted by the Better Government Association of Illinois, with headquarters in Chicago. This organization, as its name indicates, was established to promote better government; chartered a quarter century ago, it incorporates a similar group, the Legislative Voters' League, founded in 1902.

When it began to be rumored that Governor Green had changed his mind about third terms and would like to wrangle another 4 years in Springfield, the BGA received a stream of criticism and complaint from Republicans all over the State, "many of them men and women influential in party affairs, who were aghast at such a departure from Republican principles."

The Better Government Association "believes there should be a constitutional limitation on the number of consecutive terms that may be served by any governor." In this belief, the BGA says it follows "the founders of our State government, who decreed in the original constitution of 1818, and again in the constitution of 1848, that a governor might serve only one 4-year term in any period of 8 years. This was a basic law of the State up to the adoption of the present constitution in 1870.

"When we consider," says the BGA, "the enormous sums now collected and spent by our State government (more than $1,000,000,000 in the present biennium), and the thousands of offices and jobs that may be used by an administration to establish a powerful and corrupt machine, the conclusion is inescapable that a return to the one-term limitation might be desirable for the protection of the people of the State."

GREEN IGNORES QUERY

Because of these convictions, the Better Government Association wrote Governor Green as far back as last October suggesting that a public statement from him that he would not seek a third term would clarify the situation, remove discord, and unite his party in 1948. The usually voluble Green did not reply.

The Better Government Association then decided to get the grassroots opinion of Republican workers and officeholders throughout the State. A ballot with an explanatory letter was sent to all downstate precinct committeemen, to ward and township committeemen in Cook County, to all State officers, Members of Congress, and members of the State legislature, to county officers and mayors and village presidents. In all, 6,317 ballots were sent out, with the individual replies to be held in the strictest confidence.

Judging by the past experience of such polls, the maximum expectancy was a return of 10 percent. Actually replies were received from 26 percent—which the BGA interpreted as proof of the general interest in the third-term issue among Republican politicians. These replies came from 566 cities, towns and villages, representing every one of the State's 102 counties.

The most striking result was that nearly 3 out of 4 Republican leaders agreed that their three-timing candidate was more of a liability than an asset; that he would weaken the party ticket if he persisted in his third-term, self-perpetuation policy.

Of all those queried, only a dozen praised Governor Green. The results of the poll, the BGA concludes, demonstrate clearly that a majority of Republican Party workers in Illinois are opposed to a third term for Green or anyone else.

Although silent now on what he used to call the "danger of third-term dictatorship," Dwight Green was rather expressive in 1940, when he told a union labor audience:

"Labor understands that dictators, or men seeking more power, are the arch enemies of the workers of any land. In Germany dictatorship did not come in one leap, a revolution, a quick seizure of power. It was preceded by exploiting the unemployment and misery of the people and promising them abundant life. Then followed excessive Government spending. Then came destruction of the judiciary, and next, government by decree of the man in power."

BIG ILLINOIS SPENDING

Green's mention of "excessive government spending" is interesting in view of the "enormous sums now collected and spent" by his own State government, as cited by the Better Government Association.

It will be interesting to see whether Keynoter Green decries enormous governmental expenditures in his keynoting at Philadelphia.

Interesting, also, to see whether he pictures himself as a friend of labor in general and the mine workers in particular as he did 8 years ago.

A lot of things have happened to Dwight Green since 1940. One was the Centralia mine disaster of 1947 in which 111 miners lost their lives owing to official and private negligence.

This, it is safe to predict, will not be mentioned in the Philadelphia story.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 13 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, at the request of Mrs. Mary E. Kenny, 1746 Harwood Avenue, Lincoln, Nebr., I ask leave to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by Mr. Warren E. Wright on April 15, 1948, at San Antonio, Tex.:

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, at the outset of this talk with you, I have a very important announcement for you. When our MacArthur for President caravan started out on a Nation-wide tour, we were given a particular assignment to complete. It was to obtain if possible, the acceptance by one of your most distinguished citizens of Texas, the chairmanship of our most outstanding committee, Veterans for MacArthur.

As national coordinator of the MacArthur for President clubs, it gives me great honor to announce the acceptance of the national chairmanship of Veterans for MacArthur by your distinguished fellow Texan, the hero and defender of Corregidor, Gen. Jonathan Wainwright. General Wainwright, who spent the entire afternoon with us has requested that I say to you that "Gen. Douglas MacArthur will go down in history as one of the greatest captains of all time."

THE ANSWER IS PLAIN

Gen. Douglas MacArthur, on duty in Tokyo, Japan, has just cabled Mrs. Mary E. Kenny, Lincoln, Nebr., chairman of the Nebraska MacArthur for President clubs, the following:

"You may be sure that my statement of March 9, that I was available for any public duty to which I might be called by the American people, was not limited to any particular political test but was a restatement of a concept of the responsibility of citizenship on which I then stood, I now stand, and I continue to stand as long as I live.

"MACARTHUR."

Since General MacArthur has stressed his concept of the responsibility of American citizenship, I feel that he would admire the MacArthur for President clubs if a portion of this radio address be given over to:

AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP

Since the founding of our Republic, the world has looked increasingly to the United States for leadership in problems of human values. Our present increased responsibility in global affairs strongly demands that we must continue to merit this leadership among its peoples by the proper conduct within our own Nation on matters of human relations and citizenship.

Just as a successful businessman keeps abreast by taking periodical inventories, a wisely governed people takes a periodical inventory of its citizenry. Group clashes in various sections of the Nation on the question of antecedents and culture has cast some doubt in other portions of the world regarding our ability to administer affairs of state where many different peoples are concerned. To the extent that our people live

harmoniously together, our leadership in global affairs will be respected. Now, as never before, there is need for a positive and dynamic approach to the problem of human relationship and citizenship, in the United States.

The challenge of foreign ideology must be met, for no ideological philosophy anywhere has within it the qualities of our own way of life to solve these problems.

This Nation is indebted to its many people of diverse origin for its present economic, political, social, and military strength. A nation is more than cities, farms, and industries. It is the combined ambitions and efforts of its many people who produce them. We generally believe that the American way of life is drawn from our basic laws and language for which we are indebted to the English portion of our population. In a similar degree, we are indebted to others. The Scotch and Welsh contributed to our invention and industry, the Germans gave us our love of music and helped in industry and agriculture, the Irish brought optimism and a flare for politics, the Jews gave leadership in philanthropy and science, and the orientals contributed to philosophy. The Scandinavians brought a skill in agriculture, the Latins a love of the arts, the Slavs a contribution of industry and literature, and the Negro their spirituals.

To weld these many cultures into a unified Nation without destroying either their dignity or the contributions of which they are capable is the painstaking job that every good American should act out for themselves. The greatest element of living wealth in the world today is American citizenship. Its theme centers on the obliteration of hatred for all religions, racial and national origins, bigotries and prejudices through the exposition of the fact that our Nation is proof that in a Republic such as ours, people of all national and racial strains do live together in peace and harmony. Therefore, good American citizenship carries with it the responsibility of joining hands with all others who have proven their Americanism in bringing understanding to all on what it truly means to be an American.

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR'S LIFE

Douglas MacArthur's life cuts across the national scene—not only is MacArthur a military man par excellence but he is profoundly informed on the problems of peoples and nations—possessed of a brilliant and analytical intellect, he has the reinforcing qualities of diligence in work, thoroughness in investigation, consistency in reasoning, precision in expression, dynamism in action, benevolence in sentiment, firmness in resolve, sincerity in purpose, and nobility in character and aspirations.

He is a student of the history of nations; he knows government and administration as well as the ways of politics and politicians; he is informed on the basic problems of agriculture and commerce, industry, labor, and finance; he believes in the profit system, private property and private enterprise. He is for a simple government and is against making the government an asylum for parasites, incompetents, professional reformers, supernumeraries, and prevaricators. He is steeped in international affairs and knows that America is the object of both emulation and envy of other nations; he knows what made America great and what would bring disaster upon her. He fully understands the American dream and he will direct his efforts to its achievement. Indeed, the problems of a great people are not beyond his intellectual endowments. Their problems in time of war and peace have in him an understanding mind. He will give new blood, new orientations, new impulsions, and new enthusiasms, to the mighty tasks of our Nation.

MacArthur has caught the imagination of the American people and they will follow him cheerfully—that will serve greatly to multiply their collective power. He has found their hopes and fears and he will thus function the better as their leader in these times of stress. The American people are both sentimental and practical, and they know that MacArthur meets their requirements. The candidacy of MacArthur is a positive proposition, resting on nothing but its merits. We are not fighting any other candidate or candidates but we firmly believe that MacArthur has a better grasp of world and domestic affairs than any other candidate now on the political scene.

The American people are having a Presidential election in 1948 and they want to have for their leader the best American available. We believe that American is MacArthur.

These are times of many and extraordinary challenges. We can only trust in God, trust in our cause—the invincibility of right—trust in ourselves and our ability to save this Nation.

In MacArthur we have a leader on whom we can rely implicitly for he has the Americanism, the enthusiasm, the experience, and the unfaltering determination to save America.

The fate of this Nation hangs in the balance. If we are to believe the present administration in Washington, our chances of survival are no better than 50–50.

The dynamite is laid, the fuse is set—awaiting only the touch of a match.

We have taken the viper of communism to our breasts, refusing to believe that its fangs are sharp and its bite fatal.

The overthrow of our Government by force is no longer just a veiled threat—it has become an open boast.

Stalin cannot be tempted with candy, bought off with bribes, or stopped with adjectives. Only known force, stronger, smarter, better organized and integrated than his own can dissuade him from his purpose.

At a time when every ounce of our strength is needed we are bled white by insufferable taxes, due partly to the improvident, devil-may-care abandon with which our substance has been dealt out to the four corners of the earth.

Clumsy handling of labor-management relations has hamstrung our coal supply, restricted the supply of steel, and to a greater degree than we know, stunted our power to produce the implements of war—as well as the necessities of peace.

Meanwhile agents of our potential enemy have wormed their way into high strategic positions, both in Government and industry, to say nothing of the fact that transportation is off 25 percent due to fuel shortages.

The chips are down. If this Nation is to survive we must have:

1. Leadership equal to the emergency. A man, wherever he can be found with the proved ability to meet any situation, no matter how dire—intelligently, firmly, courageously, successfully.

2. A man, wherever he can be found, whom any enemy, because of that man's open record, will respect and fear.

3. A man of organization ability and executive power amounting to nothing short of genius.

4. A man, wherever he can be found, who knows how to integrate forces, and do the most with the least, in the shortest time, and at the least sacrifice of blood and treasure.

5. A man, wherever he can be found, who has demonstrated a brand of statesmanship, capable of protecting American interests against all comers.

6. And, above all else, a man wherever he can be found, who is as utterly and immovably American, as Churchill was and still is British—and as Stalin is Russian. And now we must have a man, wherever he can be found, compassionately sensitive to human suffering, no matter where it exists—but stubbornly pro-American in every situation involving the interests of his fellow countrymen.

There is but one such man.

An all-wise Providence has studiously trained and conditioned him—in body, mind and soul—to serve his country in its greatest hour of peril.

The answer is plain: Douglas MacArthur for President of the United States.

Student Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 13, 1948

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a letter received from Mr. Matthew Williams, attorney at law, of Dover-Foxcroft, Maine, together with resolution signed by 110 citizens; also my reply.

DOVER-FOXCROFT, MAINE, *April 19, 1948.*
Hon. MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Congresswoman,
Second District of Maine,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. SMITH: I am enclosing three petitions signed by various taxpayers and citizens of this town, with a sprinkling of outsiders. These petitions I drew up at the behest of Mr. Robert Linn, who I believe you well know. I am in accord with the general principle and was most happy to help in what manner I could to prepare the petitions and write this letter for Mr. Linn. He is the sole originator of the idea and no credit goes to me or any other—unless it be that a discussion of the idea led to its being put into words and on paper.

The idea is clear, I think, though the wording of the petition may be faulty. Education for the people is the main purpose. That many people have foregone higher education in the past because of limited finances is probably fairly well proven by the ingress to colleges and schools of today of tremendous numbers far in excess of what has been in the past. It may well be that this large number seeking and getting higher education is now getting it because the financial strain on the individual is less—what with Government support, etc. Even were all the GI's thrown out who might be stalling off going to work by means of putting 4 years in college, still I believe the program would show its worth. The marks of the GI's compare favorably with those in the ordinary student classes—both in the past and on the present basis.

This petition is not from voters of another Maine district—it is a petition by some loyal citizens of the State of Maine who want something brought to the attention of Congress—for betterment of all citizens. Please consider it as such. Any rewording, rephrasing, additions, and subtractions we welcome. We simply forward the idea to you and trust that you can speed it forward.

For Mr. Linn and myself—our thanks.

Respectfully,

MATTHEW WILLIAMS.

To the Honorable MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
CONGRESSWOMAN FROM MAINE:

Whereas the Federal Government in its beneficence has seen fit to underwrite college educations, vocational and trade training for many of its subjects, namely, World War II veterans who wish to avail themselves of said training; and

Whereas we are all heartily in accord and sympathy with said program but desire to see it expanded and extended; and

Whereas there are many students in our country who start advanced training and education but have to stop their course short of completion for lack of funds to continue; and

Whereas it seems desirable that some provision be made for these financially handicapped students: Be it

Resolved, That we submit to you, for your consideration, and for the consideration of the Congress now in sitting, if such project be worthy of your consideration as we respectively believe it to be, the following:

That the United States Government provide a loan fund upward to $2,000 in each individual case for any student who is in need of financial assistance to complete his or her education and training, subject to such limitations as may be imposed upon said borrowing as is necessary, said loan to be refunded to the Government in 20 annual payments in the first 20 years following completion of said education and training, so that said repayment shall not be a financial burden to any of the respective recipients.

Robert W. Linn, Ruel Cunningham, Rodney Noyes, Van Eldridge, Rev. Murray A. King, Carroll H. Knowlton, B. G. Wright, Everett E. Hall, Adelard Long, M. H. Gould, Leon Maddodor, Sanger E. Coburn, Rodney Williams, Edith S. Shaw, Levina R. King, Bernard N. King, Marie A. King, Carl Elden, Floyd Engstrom, George Philbrook, Leo Lapointe, Leland Hamlin, Syvella P. Hamlin, Velma Snow, Vena Hamlin, Dover-Foxcroft, Maine.

To the Honorable MARGARET CHASE SMITH, CONGRESSWOMAN FROM MAINE:

Whereas the Federal Government in its benificence has seen fit to underwrite college educations, vocational, and trade training for many of its subjects, namely, World War II veterans, who wish to avail themselves of said training; and

Whereas we are all heartily in accord and sympathy with said program but desire to see it expanded and extended; and

Whereas there are many students in our country who start advanced training and education but have to stop their course short of completion for lack of funds to continue; and

Whereas it seems desirable that some provision be made for these financially handicapped students: Be it

Resolved, That we submit to you, for your consideration, and for the consideration of the Congress now in sitting, if such project be worthy of your consideration as we respectively believe it to be, the following:

That the United States Government provide a loan fund upward to $2,000 in each individual case for any student who is in need of financial assistance to complete his or her education and training, subject to such limitations as may be imposed upon said borrowing as is necessary, said loan to be refunded to the Government in 20 annual payments in the first 20 years following completion of said education and training, so that said repayment shall not be a financial burden to any of the respective recipients.

Lester Lovejoy, Charles E. Cole, Joseph A. Bouley, Dorothy S. True, Perley S. Merrill, Geo. Hill, Walter Tougee, Archie Lyford, John Matyks, Peter Libby, T. W. Lamar, Ada M. Warren, Hazel Thompson, James P. Bishop, Hayford Lunt, Newell Harvey, William Jackson, Clifford Bonsey, Harold Weston, Clarence Tyler, F. LeRoy Annis, Lyman K. Lee, Wallace L. Jenkins, A. A. Adams, Kathryn B. Culley, Pat Chase, E. M. Kitchen, Kenneth Cook, Harold E. Hall, Ora A. Ladd, Paul R. True, R. D. Foss, R. D. Genthner, Dover-Foxcroft, Maine.

To the Honorable MARGARET CHASE SMITH, CONGRESSWOMAN FROM MAINE:

Whereas the Federal Government in its beneficence has seen fit to underwrite college educations, vocational and trade training for many of its subjects, namely, World War II veterans who wish to avail themselves of said training; and

Whereas we are all heartily in accord and sympathy with said program but desire to see it expanded and extended; and

Whereas there are many students in our country who start advanced training and education but have to stop their course short of completion for lack of funds to continue; and

Whereas it seems desirable that some provision be made for these financially handicapped students: Be it

Resolved, That we submit to you, for your consideration, and for the consideration of the Congress now in sitting, if such project be worthy of your consideration as we respectfully believe it to be, the following:

That the United States Government provide a loan fund upward to $2,000 in each individual case for any student who is in need of financial assistance to complete his or her education and training, subject to such limitations as may be imposed upon said borrowing as is necessary, said loan to be refunded to the Government in 20 annual payments in the first 20 years following completion of said education and training, so that said repayment shall not be a financial burden to any of the respective recipients.

Nathan Williams, Tillson D. Thomas, John W. Danforth, E. M. Goodrich, Mrs. Mary G. Whittridge, C. G. Floyd, P. E. Washburn, Hugh Cole, J. A. Reed, Clarence W. Barber, Ira L. Evans, Harold E. True, Carroll W. Ames, F. D. Whitman, Mrs. J. A. Saunders, Norman S. Starbrid, La Forrest Hall, Wm. R. Culley, Eugent F. Martin, Jr., Angus MacNevin, Jr., Arthur C. Dyer, Charles E. Washburn, Alice M. Geuthner, Philip E. Warren, Mrs. Wanda Wiley, W. Ward Webber, Stella M. Ayer, John E. Anderson, Philip C. Smith, N. E. Richardson, Fred Tourtillotie, George W. Sanford, Ed Murrill, M. D., Mayine W. Merrill, Harry W. Bush, Ada R. Barney, Edward J. Webber, Mrs. Sumner T. Oaks, Mrs. Percy E. DeWitt, Philip Clark, S. Fernald Richards, Philip G. Anderson, Max M. Titus, Rev. C. D. Nutter, Annie F. Linn, Orville Laupher, Paul J. Perin, William H. Burdick, Ray H. O'Neil, S. Shepard Sawyer, Norman H. Sawyer, Burton Meisner, James H. Fabian, Dover-Foxcroft, Maine.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 11, 1948.

MATTHEW WILLIAMS,
Attorney, Dover-Foxcroft, Maine.

DEAR MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you very much for your letter of April 19 and the enclosed resolution signed by the many good people of Dover-Foxcroft.

All of this shows a great deal of deep thinking on one of our most important subjects—the education of our younger people. This is a matter that has too long been neglected and forgotten.

It is a tragedy because our youths of today are the leaders of tomorrow and the greatest hope for peace and the high standard of living is through a well-informed and educated public.

I shall introduce this into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with my comments and also present your proposal to the Committee on Education for their consideration.

Sincerely yours,

MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Member of Congress.

Merle Sidener, Founder of Christian Men Builders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1948

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, when Merle Sidener died at his home in Indianapolis last Monday afternoon the world was bereft of one of its most useful and unusual characters. He conceived the idea of establishing an organization of laymen devoted to applying the principles of Christianity to everyday living. He gave to his organization the name Christian Men Builders and besides being its founder he was its president and its directing head for many years until his fatal illness. Its doors were always open to the humblest as well as the most influential laymen and its membership included the widest assortment of men of all trades, avocations, and professions. Under the guidance of Mr. Sidener the organization grew prodigiously in size and influence until it became known throughout the world. Its services, conducted every Sunday morning at its headquarters in the Third Christian Church, were broadcast and were always largely attended but its activities were not confined to the Sabbath.

In many ingenious ways Christian Men Builders under Mr. Sidener's direction devoted its efforts to helping its members over the rough places of life 365 days every year. There is a saying that once a Christian Men Builder, always a Christian Men Builder and the loyalty of its members to each other and to the organization was remarkable. During the war many were the times when Mr. Sidener called on me to invoke the assistance of the agencies of government in sending messages and gifts to his boys in the military and naval services scattered throughout the world. I never knew a Christian Men Builder who was not immensely proud of his membership and around this name of Christian Men Builders developed a close fraternity of mutual helpfulness well grounded in Christian principles.

In his younger days Merle Sidener was a newspaper reporter and later became city editor of the Indianapolis Star. One of his duties in the latter capacity was to manage the coverage of national political conventions for that newspaper, of which I was the Washington correspondent. It was then that I first met him. He graduated from newspaper work into the advertising publicity business, founding a firm of his own. I have never known a man whose executive capabilities exceeded Mr. Sidener's. His decisions were instantaneous and accurate.

Here was a man who without a theological degree of any kind and with only the training of a newspaperman accomplished wonders in guiding his fellow men in right ways of Christian living. Directly and indirectly countless thousands

were benefited by his service and the objectives of his organization. His originality was so great and his field of service so unique I think undoubtedly it may be said that we shall never see his like again.

Recognize the Jewish State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 12, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MAY 12, 1948.

Hon. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Within a few days the new State of Israel will be proclaimed. After 2,000 years of diaspora, the wandering of the Jews is now ended.

The Jews have earned the right to set up their own State. They have been hardened by their suffering, and are determined to defend their homeland with their own lives.

They have shown their true mettle. While you and your colleagues at the State Department were urging that partition could not be implemented, the Haganah took Tiberias and stopped the Arabs at Mishmar Haemek. While the United States urged trusteeship, the Haganah took Safed and Kastel and destroyed the road blocks that impeded traffic from Jerusalem to Tel Aviv. While there were those who still clung to the plan of federalization with a Jewish ghetto in Palestine, the Jews overran Jaffa. While the United Nations floundered about in a sea of words, the Jews proceeded with arrangements for departments of civic and governmental functions; communications, postal service, currency, property custodian, and a police force and militia. They have been developing all the attributes of statehood, and look forward to the day after May 15 when the Jewish state will be officially proclaimed.

They will have the right to ask that the nations of the world recognize this state as a sovereign unit.

It is time to end all the unreal discussions on trusteeship and federalization. The Jewish state is and will continue to be.

Why not do what we in 1776 asked France and Russia to do? Let us recognize the Jewish state.

Partition of Palestine is a fait accompli, and it is our considered judgment that failure on our part to recognize that fact would be a blunder of the highest magnitude. Poland and Guatemala have already indicated that they will recognize the Jewish state after May 15. So, it is understood, will most of the east European states, as well as some of the British dominions and some Latin American countries. We can ill afford to fall behind other nations in an act of statesmanship which both the temper of the times and the incontrovertible facts demand.

The Jewish agency has inaugurated efforts to secure a loan of $250,000,000. In supporting partition, the United States had acknowledged that the new state will need every possible encouragement and assistance. There is no doubt that the United States needs to offer now renewed evidence of the good faith it once showed in leading the United Nations to its decision of November 29. The orientation of the new state toward the western democracies can be crystallized with such cooperation. The suggestion is offered that the United States augment the loan desired by an additional loan of $100,000,000.

Concomitantly, with recognition of the Jewish state, the arms embargo must be lifted, since its continuance is, in effect, an unfriendly gesture toward the newly created state. The British and French will continue to send and sell arms to the Arab countries. The Jews of Palestine who by themselves have succeeded in implementing the United Nations resolution of November 29 must not be placed at so grave a disadvantage. The need to defend themselves will continue, possibly on a greater scale. Their fate cannot be permitted to be a matter of indifference to us. If the arms embargo continues there is no equalization of opportunity between the Arabs and the Jews in obtaining arms. Courage and determination and wit in military planning are on the side of the Jews, as they have demonstrated, but numbers and military equipment are not.

As a Senator from the great State of Montana and a Representative from the great State of New York, and voicing the preponderate opinion of the membership of both Houses of Congress, we ask the minimal from you:

1. Recognition of the Jewish state.
2. Lifting of the arms embargo.
3. Arranging for a loan to the Jewish state.

With assurances of highest esteem, we are,

Respectfully yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate.
EMANUEL CELLER,
House of Representatives.

Jewish State in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 13, 1948

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of May 13, 1948:

WHY NOT RECOGNIZE THE JEWISH STATE IN PALESTINE?

The British mandate in Palestine expires Saturday, May 15, at 12:01 a. m., Jerusalem time—6:01 p. m. Friday, eastern daylight time. There is a report that the British, fed to the teeth with the whole business, plan to jump the gun by 24 hours and call off their mandate duties at 12:01 a. m. Friday, Jerusalem time—6:01 p. m. today, eastern daylight time.

Anyway, the sands are running out with the speed they usually show at the last gasp of an era; and the Palestine question is still in the well-known state of flux.

BYPASS THE UN

The United Nations has done nothing concrete for the embattled Holy Land. Now, it is apparently unable to slice the red tape fast enough to recognize the Jewish state any time soon. That state's existence, the world is assured by the Jewish leaders, will be proclaimed as soon as the British mandate expires.

We would therefore like to inquire: How about the United States recognizing the Jewish state, by whatever name it may be called, as soon as it has a head man (whatever his title) and a foreign affairs minister with whom we can do diplomatic business?

Such recognition would probably stir up a lot of hurt feelings among the United Nations bureaucrats. Undoubtedly it would constitute a United States detour of the UN. Most probably it would irritate the chiefs of the Arab states—King Abdullah of Transjordan and the rest of that crew.

We cannot, however, work up any serious anxieties over these considerations.

HELP THEM TO HELP THEMSELVES

As we see the matter, the facts which count are as follows: The Jews have put up a terrific fight for a homeland. They are now in possession of virtually all the territory they were to get under the UN partition plan. Nobody else has done anything for them, really, though much has been promised. They got there on their own, rather like the American colonists in our Revolution before France lent a helping hand. Jewish armed forces now battling to defend the territory they hold have given an excellent account of themselves.

Wouldn't it be a fine thing and a wise thing, then, for the United States to extend recognition to the Jewish state as soon as such a state comes into being?

That would not obligate us to help the new government maintain itself, by dispatching troops or ships or planes to Palestine. It would open the door to unhampered Jewish purchase of war materials from us, in the same way as we sell such stuff to any other friendly nation whose government we recognize.

On the record to date that is about all the Palestine Jews need to enable them to hold up their end in the Holy Land and convince the Arabs, quickly or gradually as the case may be, that the new state has come to stay and is capable of taking care of itself, thanks.

From that point, permanent solution of the Palestine question—every angle of it—ought to be only a matter of time.

This suggestion is offered for the consideration of the President and the State Department.

Litchfield County, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 13, 1948

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Bridgeport (Conn.) Sunday Herald of Sunday, May 2, 1948:

VACATION PARADISE HIDDEN IN HIGH HILLS—RUGGED LITCHFIELD COUNTY EASILY REACHED BY AUTOS

(By Nancy Hendrick)

If you yearn for the rugged grandeur of Vermont's scenery, you'll be glad to know that Connecticut can provide almost its counterpart in the hills and valleys of Litchfield County.

Perhaps Litchfield's terrain is less rugged than Vermont but it is equally as beautiful and unspoiled as its northern neighbor, its State highways are far better, and it's easier to reach—only 4 hours' drive from even the farthest eastern Connecticut point.

Litchfield sits contentedly in its northwestern corner of the State like a hale and hearty octogenarian, dozing in the sun, proud of his memories of an exciting and honorable past, contented with his peaceful retirement, and still able to get around and enjoy life.

Its county seat, the town of Litchfield, is typical of most of the county. Only industrialized Winsted and Torrington differ from

the pattern of broad, tree-shaded streets, well-kept old colonial homes, and an air of remoteness from the main stream of life.

But Litchfield had a past. Back in the days when the United States was only a narrow strip of civilization torn from the wilderness and the northwest frontier was the Berkshires, Litchfield was an outpost and trading center for that frontier. Agriculture flourished, mills were built along its streams and iron from the Salisbury mines, was forged into chains and anchors.

HOME OF PATRIOTS

At the outbreak of the Revolutionary War, many of Litchfield's reinforcements were sent to Bunker Hill, and Aaron Burr, who had spent the previous year studying law at the home of his brother-in-law Tapping Reeve in Litchfield, enlisted and served in Arnold's expedition to Quebec. Oliver Wolcott was chosen a Member of the Continental Congress and many other Litchfield citizens took a prominent part in military and governmental activities.

The town's protected inland situation and extensive agricultural production made Litchfield a concentration point for Army stores and workshops. After the capture of New York, the northern route through Litchfield became the principal military artery to Boston, and night and day the village resounded with the creak of loaded carts, the pounding of hammers, and the tramp of marching feet.

One of the Revolution's greatest heroes, Ethan Allen, was born in Litchfield and when he set out for Ticonderoga and immortality from his home and forge in Lakeville many stout-hearted Litchfield county patriots went with him.

Elsewhere in the county are many sites and relics of its exciting past. In Woodbury, the Indian Chief Pomperaug, the town's first proprietor is believed to rest beneath a boulder on Main Street. Some 1,500 of Woodbury's sons served in the Continental Army and great stores of rations came from its fertile valley, as well as cash contributions from its hard-working townsfolk.

In scheduled and charming Bethlehem, one of the first theological seminaries in the country was established by the Reverend Joseph Bellamy in 1750.

ORIGINAL CLOCK

On the rolling hills of Watertown, Gen. David Humphreys grazed his imported merino sheep and the strain he developed became in some respects superior to the original stock and Connecticut Red draft cattle, bred in Watertown, found a ready market in other communities.

Watertown's palm-leaf hats and varicolored wool dusters were part of the stock-in-trade of every New England general store, and the Wheeler & Wilson Sewing Machine Co. was organized there.

At Terryville, where the wooden wheels of an original Eli Terry clock still tick off the minutes in the gable end of the Congregational Church, is a memorial to Dorence Atwater, who, a prisoner in the Civil War, compiled a secret record of the Union dead which proved of great value to the War Department.

From North Woodbury, State Highway 47 climbs steadily to hilltop Washington and its sheltered, shaded green. Along this road are many eighteenth century houses, purchased and restored by wealthy summer residents. Artists, too, discovered this unspoiled section years ago. Off this highway is a dirt road which once was the turnpike to Albany.

In the rolling-hill country of lower Litchfield County dairying is the chief industry but farther north in the Taconic Hills, catering to the summer and winter vacation trade has become the principal source of profit.

IMPORTED MASONS

In the State's loftiest corner is Salisbury where the Taconic Hills roll away to the north, Lake Wononskopomuc at Salisbury, Norfolk, and Canaan with plenty of ski trails and jumps where both novices and champions can try their skill. In the summer, in addition to the usual sports, several music festivals are held in the area.

Ore Hill in Salisbury once produced iron ore of the finest quality. Around the pits are clustered the weather-beaten cabins of former miners and the ruins of an old tavern that boasted the longest bar east of Albany.

At Lakeville is the site of the Ethan Allen forge where that Revolutionary hero cast cannon for the Continental Army and guns for the frigate *Constellation*.

Sleepy Sharon was once the site of factories and foundries and was the home of Benjamin Hotchkiss, inventor of the Hotchkiss explosive shell for rifled guns.

An early Sharon patriot, one Adonijah Maxam, was captured by the British and taken to England to be exhibited as a specimen of the boorish race of Yankees, but not many years later the town produced enough wealth and culture to import masons from Italy to work on the homes of early industrialists.

LONGEST NAME

Winsted, in the township of Winchester, for all its industrialization has always been a never-never land.

Talking owls, five-legged cows, and the Winsted wild man are all of the same cloth and it isn't unexpected that a member of the parish was whipped for witchcraft in colonial days.

Southwest in the county are Cornwall, Kent, New Milford, and tiny Bridgewater, all beautiful, unspoiled, and the site of many a legend or historical incident.

Here are Chief Waramaug's palace in New Milford; Lover's Leap, where the Indian Princess Lillinoah perished with her white lover; and Tory's Hole, where members of that unpopular minority used to hide out from the tar-and-feather punishments of the famed Sons of Liberty.

In New Milford, too, is Connecticut's candidate for brook-with-the-longest-name honors. It's the rivulet called Naromiyocknowhusunkatankshunk brook.

American Council for Judaism—Remarks by Mr. Alfred M. Lilienthal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Alfred M. Lilienthal, a prominent Washington attorney and chairman for the Washington Chapter of the American Council for Judaism, presided at the meeting on May 6 held by that chapter at the Shoreham Hotel. Mr. Lilienthal and his organization are rendering a constructive program by keeping the American people informed as to this burning question of establishing a Jewish state in the Holy Land. I include his remarks as part of my own under leave granted:

This evening we meet at a critical moment in the history of Jewry. We are faced by the unmistakable reality that on May 15 the British mandatory government ceases and the Holy Land will be left without a governing body. Bloody slaughter is likely to ensue when the regular armies of the Arab States replace the volunteer troops which have been conducting the fight to date against the Haganah. That is why the American Council for Judaism has taken a strong stand in favor of the proposed UN truce and trusteeship or some type of international control. During this period of trusteeship, peace can be restored and a long-term solution for the Holy Land worked out.

This is a constructive proposal. The American Council for Judaism has been assailed by belittlers as an organization with only a negative program. Is the saving of thousands of lives in the Holy Land negative? Is the establishment of peace and order in Palestine negative? Is the ultimate goal which we seek, the establishment of a unitary democratic Palestinian State negative? The answer to these questions is obvious. Only a fair compromise can avert the impending calamity that is threatening the Holy Land. Partition never can accomplish this. Dr. Albert Einstein in referring to the moderate position taken by that great leader, Dr. Judah Magnes, president of the University of Jerusalem and which is our position, said: "However, besides the fact that the moderates speak for a much wider circle of inarticulate people, they speak in the name of principles which have been the most significant contribution of the Jewish people to humanity. We appeal to the Jews in this country and in Palestine not to permit themselves to be driven into a mood of despair or false heroism which eventually results in suicidal measures. While such a mood is undoubtedly understandable as a reaction to the wanton destruction of 6,000,000 Jewish lives in the last decade, it is nevertheless destructive morally as well as practically."

We totally subscribe to these sentiments of Dr. Einstein. Adoption of our program would permit the eventual emigration to Palestine of displaced persons who wish to go to the Holy Land while it would free from jeopardy the lives of those Jews who have been fortunate enough to find a home and a refuge there. We are fed up hearing a certain organized group claim the complete monopoly of sympathy for their coreligionists while in actual fact they refuse to sacrifice political goals so as to alleviate human suffering. It ill behooves Zionist sympathizers to shed crocodile tears over the displaced persons. The American Council for Judaism is and has been concerned with the fate of the displaced persons—both the 20 percent Jewish displaced persons and the 80 percent displaced persons of other faiths.

No, ladies and gentlemen, there has been much too much emotion and too little logic brought to the question of Palestine. Phrases as Jewish homeland, national Jewish homeland, national Jewish home, and the national Jewish state have been used interchangeably as if these were one and the same, which they are not. It is possible to have a Jewish homeland for emigrees within a democratic Palestinian state without establishing a separate sovereign Jewish nation.

There are those in high places who agree with us. We are honored by the presence of the Honorable LAWRENCE SMITH, Congressman from the First District of Wisconsin. Amongst greetings and regrets on their inability to attend our meeting from many distinguished citizens, including Bishop Angus Dun, Archbishop Patrick A. O'Boyle, Lessing Rosenwald, Congressmen William G. Stratton, and Karl Mundt, we received a letter from Congressman James W. Wadsworth, former United States Senator from New York, and at present serving in the House of Representatives. Part of Congressman WADSWORTH's letter deserves reading:

"I have been deeply impressed for several years by the sincerity and the wisdom displayed by the members of your organization in its approach to the Palestine problem. As a matter of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives I listened with deep interest to the testimony of

your representatives and the recommendations which they made to our committee when we were considering the Palestine problem. And I have also read with deep interest the communications which you have sent to the President of the United States. Looking back over that testimony and recalling those recommendations, and observing today the utter tragic situation prevailing in Palestine, I am convinced that the Council for Judaism has been correct in its attitude and courageous in presenting it. Furthermore, I believe that had persons in positions of highest governmental responsibility followed in principle the recommendations of the Council, far more progress would have been made toward the solution of the Palestine problem. I venture to express the hope that the present tragic situation will not deter your organization from continuing those efforts to establish a better understanding of this problem among American citizens of every religious faith. Ultimately, trust must prevail."

In presenting a program in support of peace for the Holy Land and justice for displaced persons, certainly it is not of us that the quip can be made, "They are only pouring water on troubled oils." If we seek a solution only in terms of the 600,000 Jewish inhabitants of Palestine and raise greater problems for more than 700,000 Jewish inhabitants within the Arab states, what have we accomplished? If we solve the problem for 250,000 displaced persons and raise greater problems for the world Jewish community of 10½ million people, what have we accomplished? In England, long a haven to Jews and the world's homeless, anti-Semitism has raised its ugly head for the first time since Jewry was given equal rights as free citizens in the early part of the nineteenth century. The recent report of the anti-Defamation League reveals that anti-Semitism is on the march in the United States.

Palestine is no theoretical subject to me. Last week when I read the New York Times report of the devastation of the one-time American Army rest camp at Tel Levinsky it meant something personal to me. As a GI in the Middle East in 1944 I stayed at that camp. I had a chance at that time to view Palestine and the beauty of Tel Aviv and I am all the more deeply concerned lest everything that has gone into building the homeland should be lost because of a refusal of both sides to agree upon a fair compromise. Surely if Italians, Frenchmen, and Germans, through two World Wars, could live peacefully side by side within the framework of the Swiss Republic there is no reason why Jew and Arab cannot live peacefully side by side within the framework of a Palestinian Republic.

We cannot avoid the issue of the day. In a modern world people cannot be both a nation and a universal religion. Once and for all we American Jews must decide and make the choice whether nationally we are to be Americans or Jews. We must search our souls and forthrightly take a stand.

There are three paths before us. One is to evade the issue and hide our heads in the sand. As much as many of us would like to, we cannot hew to the middle road. We are deluding ourselves when we think that by keeping silent, we can remain neutral. There are those who have in the past and who will continue in the future nevertheless to speak our voice. Another road is traveled by the political Zionists. A religious nostalgia is no excuse for temporal power. This can only mean confusion and sorrow for Jewry everywhere, for us, for those who have gone to Palestine and for those who should like to go to Palestine.

The third choice is provided by those who advocate peace in the Holy Land under international control with the eventual establishment of a single federated democratic Palestine; the opening of the doors of the United States and all the United Nations to all displaced persons on a nonsectarian basis and the unmistakable rededication to this undeviating principle. Our nationality is American, our loyalty is indivisible, our religion is Judaism and our homeland is in the United States of America. This is the platform of the American Council for Judaism. Consecrating ourselves to this program, we can build for Jewry and for humanity everywhere a better tomorrow in the wake of an unspeakably frightening yesterday and today. With these goals there can be no compromise. Our acts must be courageous and bold. I am confident that we of the American Council for Judaism, together with our friends of all faiths, must help build the kind of a world in which we all wish to live. I pray—I trust—I know—we shall succeed. We must succeed.

Federal Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANKLIN J. MALONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1948

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a statement of Jacob Hulitt, chairman, Philadelphia County Council, American Legion Housing Committee, before the Joint Congressional Housing Committee at Philadelphia, January 8, 1948:

Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee, I am grateful for the opportunity to appear before you. I do not deem it necessary at this late date to call the attention of this committee to the dire need for veterans' housing in our community; nor to burden you with cumulative statistics. This function as well as the technical feature of the Veterans' Homestead Act of 1948, sponsored by the American Legion, will be fully covered by those who are more familiar than I am with these details.

I shall, therefore, confine my remarks to a general statement of what I conceive to be the veterans' position in the premises.

For the record I desire to state at the outset that much of the responsibility for the present deplorable situation must be charged against selfish interests whose obstructionist tactics precluded the possibility of enacting the long range TEW housing bill then, as now, pending in Congress.

That bill would have permitted the Government, in cooperation with local authorities, to subsidize the elimination of slums and the erection of lower cost housing.

This tragic result was brought about by a combination of selfish, greedy, and unconscionable group of builders, real-estate speculators and their lobbyists in unholy alliance with some unprincipled officials in the American Legion, now happily removed from further mischief-doing by our national commander, James F. O'Neil. While this housecleaning has been very wholesome and refreshing, the work is not complete. There are yet cobwebs in hidden corners and a fumigating job to be done. I have every confidence that our present leadership is equal to the task. I know that our national housing chairman, Walter E. Allessandroni, Esq., is bending his energies, his talents, and his progressive ideas to do the job he set out to do. I know also that in this he has the sympathetic support of our national commander.

I trust it will not be amiss in this connection to advert to the fact that I regard the pending legislation inadequate, primarily because it will not answer the problems of the low-income groups. For their purpose we will doubtless need additional legislation in the near future. I know that selfish interests will use their full bag of tricks, including everything else at their command to obstruct our objective. I want to take this occassion to warn them now that we know our strength and we know our weakness and knowing both we shall act accordingly. It is timely to remind them also that it was they that told us that the only thing needed to stimulate private housing construction was the removal of Government controls from building materials. They had their way and we all know the sad result. We are, therefore, unwilling to turn our other cheek—certainly not until we see a regeneration among those who slapped us.

My position, is, and I believe it is also the position of the rank and file, that by all means let us adhere to the free-enterprise system if it works. But let us build houses for veterans in any event and by whatever system of economics that will best serve the welfare of the greatest number of our helpless veterans. I think it is still true that we must be just before we are generous. Perhaps we can build veterans' housing through the media of a pocket edition of the Marshall plan for Americans. If you gentlemen regard my observation as a heresy, please remember that the heresy of today is the orthodoxy of tomorrow. Although you may very properly ignore me as a prophet, you may not ignore my prediction which is that homes for veterans will be built and largely with initial Government funds, economic theories notwithstanding. We didn't dilly-dally when there was a war to be won. Why dilly-dally now? Homes for veterans is a national emergency, and we dare not ignore it. We have a duty to perform; what are we waiting for?

We are not unmindful of the fact that veterans have received and are receiving the gracious consideration of our Government. Indeed, to some small number of specially anointed, the Government has been entirely too gracious. This group needs no assistance from us. They appear to have too many friends in Washington already. To them, the Treasury of the United States has been wide open. Just as it has been wide open to every potentate, tyrant, and opportunist who smiles in our direction. We pour billions of dollars into the bottomless pit of the world for the benefit of our former enemies, friendly enemies, and spurious friends. Every European and Asiatic beggar on horseback and their agents in our National Capital, have their faces turned, like the Mohammedan worshipper, toward the United States Treasury as their mecca. But the boys who made the Treasury of the United States worth while worshipping are denied even shelter. Can't we be a little more equitable?

It is a fine tribute to the spirit of patriotism of the defenders of our country that in face of the past and present unequal burdens and privileges they are silently enduring the sufferings in common with other frustrated and overwhelmed citizens and comporting themselves with patience and courage as becomes heroes and patriots worthy of our beloved country.

But I must say this also, that veterans are slowly but surely learning the power of organization, and while they are patriotic and

patient, they are jealous also, and that when discontent turns to resentment, and resentment passes into exasperation, they will be ready to welcome new men and measures that will grant them relief from political juggling, indecision, and confusion. The ballot of the veteran is just as potent as that of any lobbyist or his master and more numerous.

In the legislation now pending let us remember all veterans alike, without regard to station or rank. If we do not pursue this principle to whom are we to turn in the hour of danger which we all pray will not come, but may come to us, or to those who succeed us, as it did to ourselves and to them. Their valor and their patriotism are not to be idly neglected or overlooked when their services have ceased to be of immediate value. Every instinct of justice and Americanism call upon us to help them as they helped all of us. Every suggestion of wisdom counsels that we omit no opportunity to lighten their burdens and ease their anxiety. By so doing we exalt ourselves to that higher level of patriotism which despises political advantage and embraces the best in the American spirit.

Such are the observations that I gather from the viewpoints of veterans. It is an unrehearsed and spontaneous protest against general insincerity; against the exactions of profiteers and speculators; against the moral blindness of our business leaders too deeply absorbed in the pursuit of wealth; against the indifference in Washington and existing conditions throughout the Nation. It is a protest of the national conscience against the callousness of materialism and greed. It is a protest against national leaders who from their vantage point can change conditions but won't.

Is it for this that mothers' sons were sent to the far-flung corners of the globe to be returned in caskets? Is this the reward for those who fought and bled in the jungles and on beaches and from house to house in France and in Germany?

Gentlemen of the committee, the American Legion is not asking for fantastic castles in the air. We are asking you to look at the balance sheet and see for yourselves what our business and industrial leaders got out of the war—yes, and what they are still getting and what in contrast the common soldier got out of it. We are asking you to judge whether you find any equality anywhere between these groups. We are asking you to say whether this is just or unjust and we leave it to your fairness to render the verdict. We feel satisfied that when you come to deliberate upon these propositions and enact veterans' housing legislation it will reflect the virtues and the justice of our lawmakers and not the vices of the market place. Because we know that your patriotism, your emotions, and your country's welfare are no different than our own. We are confident, therefore, that when you legislate on this all-important matter you will unite your efforts with ours and make our cause your cause also. Let us all take our stations and do our duty. Let us unite with the same strength, the same courage, and the same wisdom which was ours when we faced a common danger and act now as we did then for the common good.

As a Nation we are confronted with many grave problems and many threatening evils. May God grant us the necessary virtues to solve our problems and conquer the evils. Every American depends on you gentlemen and your colleagues in Congress to lead the way and by precept and example show the Nation a nobler standard of life. I ask it in the name of those honored comrades who have found eternal homes; I ask it in the name of their living comrades who are homeless, and finally, I ask it in the name of our glorious country. Amen.

Further Legislative Reorganization Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article written by me which appeared in the May 9, 1948, issue of This Week Magazine, New York Herald Tribune.

The article is as follows:

DEMOCRACY'S BOTTLENECK

These are the times that try not only men's souls but also their governments. Never before has the legislature of the United States felt so keenly a need for action. Not action of desperation that blindly passes reform bills or appropriation measures, but well-thought-out action that may decide whether we are to become a police state, a door mat for oppression, or the strong right arm of world democracy.

One happy step in the last direction was the recent expeditious approval of the European recovery program—after the alarms had been sounded abroad. But the months of tedious wrangling about the ERP that preceded the fall of Czechoslovakia point up only too well the dangers of an inefficient Congress—forced, during emergencies, to yield its powers to the executive branch of the Government or to hog-tie the Nation by making inaction the law of the land.

The spectacle of a well-intentioned representative government struggling with a ponderous and inefficient legislative process to meet a deadline in world history points up the need for further modernization of our congressional machinery. Our antiquated policies do not inspire people facing national extinction to turn to democracy as a solution.

CONGRESS FUMBLED THE BALL

I think it safe to state that never before in its history did Congress have so much information on a major issue as it did when it reconvened November 17, 1947, to consider the European recovery program.

But, in more than a month, only a stopgap bill was enacted. Nearly 5 months passed before even one legislative branch (the Senate) approved a complete program. But in the same 5 months, the Stalinist police state had massed its armed might on strategic borders, stepped up its skilled propaganda campaign against the Marshall plan with "imperialist" United States as the No. 1 target, tightened its grip on eastern Germany, swallowed up Czechoslovakia, and thrown every weapon short of armed intervention into the drive to capture Italy.

Would Russia have acted any differently if the ERP had been a reality, say by the first of February? That is a moot question.

Could Congress have reached this great decision with greater alacrity? That is not a moot question. The answer is "Yes"—if it were organized to deal effectively with the problems that face it as the National Legislature of the greatest peoples' government still functioning in the world. What, then, are the chief obstacles? I would list the following: (1) The two-thirds rule; (2) lack of a report-and-question period; (3) the seniority system; (4) lack of executive-legislative liaison; (5) lack of a joint national legislative policy committee; (6) demands on Members' time for nonlegislative work; (7) trivial functions; (8) lack of mechanical aids; (9) lack of party responsibility.

I recognize that some benefits have accrued from passage of the Reorganization Act in 1946. But that was only a beginning. In fact, some of those who worked hardest on reorganization fear that unless further steps are taken, what has been achieved may actually be more dangerous than if nothing had been done.

1. Under the two-thirds rule for ratification of treaties, it actually is possible for 17 Senators representing 3 percent of the people of the United States to kill a treaty that might have almost universal support of the voters.

No Secretary of State, President, or chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee can ignore the power of this potent minority. Premier Georges Clemenceau flung it at President Woodrow Wilson at Paris in 1919. It is safe to predict that every member of the Soviet Politburo knows about this curious anachronism in our Constitution.

The two-thirds rule also tempts the executive branch to by-pass Congress by means of the executive agreement when quick action is needed, thus contributing to friction between two vital segments of our Govenment. It denies the House an equal voice in deciding foreign policy.

The founding fathers inserted the rule into the Constitution because the House was to be the inferior chamber of the Congress. Adoption of direct election of Senators in 1913 ended the last possible undemocratic distinction between the two bodies, but the two-thirds rule remains as a hang-over. It should be abolished through constitutional amendment. A House resolution to that effect today lies buried in the files of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

2. I place the report-and-question period high on the list of devices that would enable Congress to act intelligently and quickly. Under a bill that I have consistently introduced, not more than 2 hours would be set aside at least once every 2 weeks (but not more than once a week) to allow Cabinet members and other important officials of the executive branch to appear personally before Congress and answer questions prepared in advance.

Part of the period would be given over to questions from the floor. I feel sure that if at the short November-December session, Secretary of State Marshall could have appeared at such a session, and that if subsequently, Defense Secretary Forrestal, former Commerce Secretary Harriman, Interior Secretary Krug, and others had answered questions, Congress could have obtained the information it needed and much time could have been saved in the Senate Foreign Relations and House Foreign Affairs Committees.

3. In attacking the seniority system under which a member moves up automatically to the chairmanship of an important committee on the sole basis of his length of service in Congress, I do not wish to cast any aspersions on my present colleagues.

It should be emphasized, however, that the system could produce a chairman physically unfit to discharge his responsibilities, or one holding views contrary to the majority of his colleagues, even of his own party.

In the latter case, the powers of a chairman are such that he could set up a one-man blockade of an important bill and thus deny Members the opportunity of even voting on the measure. Also, the system makes it almost impossible for sections of our country that are politically fluid to exercise the influence such regions should have because they change their legislators more often.

I favor election of committee chairman by a majority vote of each committee at the beginning of each Congress, said vote taken by secret ballot.

4. It is unfortunate that Secretary Marshall has not continued to develop the excellent liaison with Capitol Hill in the foreign-affairs field inaugurated by Cordell Hull when he was Secretary of State.

If there were regular sessions between Cabinet members and top officials with members of the congressional committees having jurisdiction over their activities, much time would be saved at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue. I would like to see the committees meet jointly on such occasions.

5. Another strong aid in this direction would be a National Legislative Policy Committee composed of the chairman of the committees of both Senate and House. Particularly in times of crisis and when close correlation between taxes, appropriations, and foreign policy is vital, much bickering could be eliminated, and stronger bipartison cooperation achieved.

6. Senators got a full-time executive assistant in the 1946 Reorganization Act, but House Members did not. I do not raise this point in any spirit of petty jealousy. Something must be done to ease the burden of being a Washington representative for 300,000 or more constituents, and at the same time trying to be a Member of Congress.

This personal-representative business is important—politically, because if you don't give this service you may lose your job, and democratically, since the office of a Congressman often is the only place to which a citizen can turn to get help in dealing with the Government. It has been estimated that such representation consumes 80 percent of a Member's time.

7. Under elimination of trivial functions, I refer to such items as having to act as a city council for the District of Columbia, and to the large number of private bills and claims that were not disposed of under the Reorganization Act.

What a painful sight it is to see Congressmen, in full session assembled, acting as town councilmen and arguing over issues like the number of taxicabs to be licensed or the reinstatement of policemen fired from the local force. The colorful former Senator Coleman L. Blease, of South Carolina, once made a speech because he wasn't given a seat in a crowded streetcar.

8. Of course, the biggest timesaver of all would be electric voting. It has been tested for more than a decade and proved practical. In the House, it takes so long to call the roll that one Member can get in from his farm 19 miles distant in Maryland in time to be counted. I estimate that almost a month in legislative days on the House floor would be saved.

9. My final recommendation for the improvement of Congress is the stiffening of party responsibility—a dangerous subject for any Democrat running for election to a higher office. I stand, however, on the thesis that the efficiency of our National Legislature rests in great part upon the two-party system.

That system has proved itself as the most logical, responsive, and successful method yet devised for operating a republican form of government. One party has the responsibility of formulating and carrying out a legislative program; the duty of the minority group is to fight vigorously for its party principles, trying to get the majority of voters to accept them and thereby give it the control of the Government at the next election.

We Democrats have only to look at Europe to see what happens when there is a splintering of parties: the miseries of the French Governments, the infiltration and subsequent accession to power of Communist minorities elsewhere.

I don't want to beat a red herring to death by using the Communist threat as a reason for strengthening party responsibility. But to my mind, there is no better example we can set before the democracies of Europe than a strong two-party system—and a streamlined Congress—solving problems in an efficient, fast-moving and democratic manner.

O'Hara Bill and Federal Trade Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 13, 1948

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by James F. Hoge, of the New York bar, made before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in support of my bill, H. R. 3871:

It is so often said today that administrative law is inevitable that, as victims of the repetition, we are almost prone to believe it. If there is likelihood of such an inevitable trend, here in the Congress is the right place for reversing it, and this bill seeks to do it. For my own part, I think the only inevitability about it is in the minds of some people for whom it is the father to their wish.

For instance, Professor Frederick K. Beutel, professor of administrative law, College of William and Mary, formerly Assistant Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, was quoted with strong approval by one of the witnesses in opposition to this bill. The quotation was from Professor Beutel's article, The Problem of Reform of Administrative Procedure (Federal Bar Journal, April 1945). The quotation did not include a revealing passage in the same article (p. 277):

"The Anglo-American judicial process is a primitive form of forensic contest based upon narrow issues of fact which grew up in a simple rural society more as an emotional release to prevent public violence than as a just way of settling disputes. It has been pointed out elsewhere that this elemental variation of the trial by battle has come down into our complicated mechanized and overpopulated metropolitan society practically unchanged in its structure and wholly inadequate to deal with the problems of justice even in the area properly ascribed to judicial activity."

The argument as put by another writer, quoted with approval by the same witness, is that—

"The trend toward administrative legislation has been accompanied by an even more striking trend toward administrative justice, and a large part of the job of courts has, of necessity, been given over to the administrative side of the government. As the functions of the state continue to expand, the processes of the ordinary law courts are found to be inadequate to cope with the complex problems which arise. Specialized knowledge, which the judges cannot possibly possess, is needed. The common law rules of evidence, designed to prevent untrained jurymen from running riot, hamper speedy determination. Nor can the judicial process deal readily with controversies involving technical and economic data." (A. H. Feller, Administrative Justice, 27 Survey Graphic 494, October 1938.)

Without getting too involved in a discussion of administrative law generally, let us come quickly to the type of administrative law under consideration. This bill is directed at administrative law which combines in the adjudication of cases the multiple offices of complainant, prosecutor, judge, and jury. When we consider this bill we need not be concerned with other forms of administrative law at all. The Federal Trade Commission tries specific cases of specific issues of fact between the Government, in the person of the Commission, and the individual citizen, person, or corporation.

It is axiomatic that one should not be judge in his own cause. That has been so stated for at least 2,000 years. As long ago as 300 years, Pascal put it in these words:

"It is not permitted to the most equitable of men to be a judge in his own cause." (Pascal (1623–62), Thoughts, ch. 4, 1.)

Now it is on that fundamental, axiomatic postulate that this bill is based. It says simply that in cases under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Commission ought hereafter be the investigator, the complainant, and the prosecutor, and that the regularly constituted courts of the land should be the adjudicators.

The bill, therefore, is not novel or strange. The strangeness, if any, is that the Federal Trade Commission or any other agency of Government should demand and insist upon the privilege of trying its own cases before itself and deciding them, and then being immune to judicial review on the findings of fact unless there is no evidence to support them.

Let it be stated clearly at the outset that this bill does not seek to relieve any business interest or any person from the substantive provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act. I know of no one supporting this bill who has the slightest desire or thought that in doing so he may be relieving himself or those for whom he speaks of any responsibility under the substantive provisions of this law. The bill is entirely procedural in nature, it seeks not to amend in one single respect the substantive provisions. In brief, it seeks only to substitute the court for the Commission as the adjudicating forum.

This bill purposes nothing more than that all people accused of violating the Federal Trade Commission Act may be assured the right of a fair and impartial trial in the properly constituted courts; in other words, that they may have that simple, direct, and impartial justice which is allowed under our Constitution to the commonest criminal.

NATURE OF THE CASES AFFECTED

Let us turn to consider whether there is anything in the nature of the Commission's cases under section 5 which justifies the privileged position it holds. The Federal Trade Commission Act makes unlawful unfair methods of competition and unfair acts and practices in commerce. In the year 1938 the Wheeler-Lea Act specified that false or misleading advertisements of food, drugs, cosmetics, and therapeutic devices should be deemed, for the purposes of the act, unfair acts and practices.

False and misleading advertisements and other forms of unfair competition are simply actions for deceit, fraud, cheating—cases of the nature which have been tried in courts since courts were first established—certainly since courts were first established under the English common law. There is no difference between such cases and the ordinary tort action except that here the Government rather than the private party is the complaining litigant. The Federal and State courts try such cases regularly in the nature of trade-mark infringement and in the manifold divisions of what today is called the law of unfair competition.

To illustrate sharply: Under two laws enacted at the same time, the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and the Wheeler-Lea Act of 1938, alleged false representations, if they appear in the labeling of a food, drug, or cosmetic are to be tried in the courts, prosecuted at the instance of the Food and Drug Administration. If the same

alleged false representation—literally the same—appears in the advertisement for the same product, then it is to be prosecuted by the Federal Trade Commission before itself and adjudicated by itself as an unfair act or practice. Or if the alleged false labeling on the package is construed to be unfair competition, it is triable by the Federal Trade Commission before itself as an unfair method of competition.

The information furnished by the Commission in hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of this House on the Independent Offices Appropriation bill for 1948, showed that during the 1946 fiscal year 123 cases were disposed of by orders to cease and desist, orders of dismissal or otherwise, broken down as follows:

	Cases
False and misleading advertising under Federal Trade Commission Act	86
False and misleading advertising under Federal Trade Commission Act, including also violations of Wool Products Act	7
Restraint of trade (conspiracy, price-fixing, etc.) under Federal Trade Commission Act	4
Price discriminations, etc., under Robinson-Patman amendments to the Clayton Act	24
Other Clayton Act cases (secs. 3 and 7)	2

For the same year, the trial examiners submitted final reports in 45 cases, as follows:

	Cases
False advertising	37
Wool Products Act	2
Robinson-Patman Act	5
Restraint of trade (conspiracy, etc.)	1

Just for interest, and as indicating the expedition attendant upon enforcement in the courts, the Food and Drug Administration for the year 1946 disposed of 3,221 cases divided as follows:

	Cases
Seizures	2,835
Criminal prosecutions	350
Injunctions	36

THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

There is no validity in the assertion that the Administrative Procedure Act passed by the Congress in 1946 cures the evils formerly present in the Federal Trade Commission procedure and makes a bill of this sort unnecessary. That statement has been made repeatedly. Two years ago when the Reece bill (H. R. 2390) proposed that the findings of fact by the Commission, upon review in the circuit courts, should not be conclusive unless supported by a preponderance of the evidence, the Federal Trade Commission said that that bill was not necessary because the passage of the Administrative Procedure Act was imminent.

Now the Commission contends that this bill is not necessary because the Administrative Procedure Act has been passed. But it is interesting to note that during the years when various bills for administrative reform were before Congress, the Federal Trade Commission regularly sought to be exempted from their provisions.

The Administrative Procedure Act is not designed to correct beyond some incidental applicability the evils in the Federal Trade Commission procedure. The basic concern of the Administrative Procedure Act is that of administrative rule making, regulation promulgation, rate making, license granting, standards formulating, and so forth.

We do not need to debate whether the Administrative Procedure Act has been or will be an effective instrument for curing evils incident to those administrative functions. It is sufficient and timely enough to say that the act does not and will not cure the evils in the procedure before the Federal Trade Commission because it does not strike at their central source, which is the combination of the adjudicating with the prosecuting functions.

Let me develop this in two ways: (1) the different types of administrative law; and (2) the insufficiency of the provisions of that act itself with respect to Federal Trade Commission procedure.

Numerous agencies have administrative procedures of a legislative character. For illustration, the Food and Drug Administration in enforcing the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, is empowered to promulgate regulations fixing definitions and standards of identity and quality and fill of container for foods; regulations certifying coal-tar colors which are harmless and suitable for use in drugs and cosmetics for purposes of coloring only, and for the certification of batches of such colors; regulations determining derivatives of the barbiturate drugs which are habit-forming and which are to be labeled with a warning of the habit-forming quality; regulations certifying batches of drugs composed of insulin, penicillin, and streptomycin. These regulations are legislative in character and are applicable uniformly and equally to all persons of the class affected.

It is to this form of regulation making that the Administrative Procedure Act is particularly addressed, and if there is any benefit under the Administrative Procedure Act, it is with respect to this sort of regulation making. Such regulations are subject to review by the circuit courts, and the review afforded to them is just as complete as that afforded to adjudications of the Federal Trade Commission in its trial of individual and specific cases between parties. No distinction is made in the act between hearings, decisions, and judicial review of regulations of this kind, and adjudications of the kind in Federal Trade Commission practice.

The Patent Office, with a vast amount of administrative litigation, is not comparable in the least respect with the Federal Trade Commission. For one thing, the Rules of Civil Procedure are applicable in all proceedings in the Patent Office. A great deal of the litigation is inter partes, private parties contesting the registration or cancellation of trade-marks. Some is ex parte between the applicant for a trade-mark and the Patent Office, which perhaps has refused the application. In all of these cases, whether inter partes or ex parte, there is ultimate appeal to the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals and, under the new Trade-Mark Act, access to the Federal district courts under the provisions of section 21 (15 U. S. C. A. 1071).

The Interstate Commerce Commission, frequently referred to, has numerous functions and sides to it. The average person thinks of it in connection with rate making. As with the making of standards and definitions, there is a great difference between the making of rates applicable equally and uniformly to all in a class and the trial of issues of fact between the Government and its citizens.

The Interstate Commerce Commission administers the Interstate Commerce Act, the Motor Carriers Act and a number of minor statutes, and generally regulates common carriers. In addition to rate making, it is concerned with the prevention of discriminatory charges and with the provision of adequate services and facilities. The bulk of its adjudication work arises out of complaints by persons claiming to be damaged by the action of the carrier, and its decision may take the form of a cease and desist order or the awarding of damages to the injured party. These are so-called reparation cases. These are inter partes cases as in fact are also many of the rate cases, for they stem largely from the complaints of private parties. It has been estimated that of the hundreds of hearings involving proposed adjustments in rate schedules, less than 5 percent arise on the Commission's own motion. (Monograph on Interstate Commerce Commission prepared by the staff of Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure, p. 49.) The Commission's actions on service complaints are essentially monitory and in the nature of mediation between parties. Emergency service orders directing the transfer of equipment are usually on petition of the carriers themselves.

The Supreme Court stated some of the salient differences in *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Klesner* (280 U. S. 19, 26):

"The provisions in the Federal Trade Commission Act concerning unfair competition are often compared with those of the Interstate Commerce Act dealing with unjust discrimination. But in their bearing upon private rights, they are wholly dissimilar. The latter act imposes upon the carrier many duties; and it creates in the individual corresponding rights. For the violation of the private right it affords a private administrative remedy. It empowers any interested person deeming himself aggrieved to file, as of right, a complaint before the Interstate Commerce Commission; and it requires the carrier to make answer. Moreover the complainant there, as in civil judicial proceedings, bears the expense of prosecuting his claim. The Federal Trade Commission Act contains no such features."

The Securities and Exchange Commission is concerned with the regulation of security issues, security exchanges and dealers, and public-utility holding companies. True, it has wide powers to direct the simplification of public-utility systems, and may, by refusing to register a security, effectively prevent its public sale without resort to a court in the first instance.

These matters involve, by their very nature, however, intricate questions of corporate finance and organization. It is interesting to note, too, that some years ago the Securities and Exchange Commission itself decided that procedure in the courts, rather than by administrative techniques, offered a more suitable and expeditious means to enforce certain provisions of the statutes (Final Report of Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure, p. 61).

The duties of the Federal Communications Commission with respect to telephones and telegraphs are analogous to those of the Interstate Commerce Commission: the regulation of a public utility. Its functions in the radio field involve the licensing of the channels of radio transmission. The Federal Power Commission is similarly concerned with the licensing of water-power projects. Other commissions and agencies are concerned with the granting of licenses, franchises, and the like. We need not discuss any features, good or bad, pertaining to them because they are different from the ones with which we are involved, and, by their different nature, might require different treatment.

The National Labor Relations Board, prior to recent amendment, was almost identical in its procedure with the Federal Trade Commission Act. In fact, it was modeled upon it. However, that was found unsatisfactory, and in the first session of this Congress the Labor-Management Relations Act was passed in a recognition of the very point this O'Hara bill makes as to the Federal Trade Commission, that is, that the prosecuting and adjudicating transactions should be separated. The amended act attempts to accomplish that within the framework of the Labor Board, wherein the general counsel's office is made a separate and, to some extent, an independent unit, and the Board is, to some degree, insulated as the adjudicating body. The Administrative Procedure Act did not meet the need there, and, notwithstanding

its passage, this change was made in the labor law by this Congress.

When the Administrative Procedure Act is set up as an argument against this bill, considerable reliance is placed upon section 7 of that act with respect to agency hearings. But that action in itself illustrates the insufficiency of the act to govern procedures of the Federal Trade Commission type. For instance, it requires that "no sanction shall be imposed or rule or order be issued except upon consideration of the whole record or such portions thereof as may be cited by any party and as supported by and in accordance with the reliable, probative, and substantial evidence."

In other words, the decision is not required to be on the preponderance of the evidence as should pertain in the adjudication of cases, but is permitted to rest upon "substantial" evidence which is the rule applicable to legislative enactments and to regulations upon legislative delegations.

The all-important difference is that in an adjudication of a specific case, as in Federal Trade Commission proceedings, the decision is supposed to be on the facts as they are, as they are proven to be, while in regulation making such as the defining of a standard or the fixing of a rate, the decision is with regard to the situation as it should be—a standard is promulgated for the future guidance and conformations of those subject to it. A Federal Trade Commission order, like the judgment of a court, is decisive of persons' rights and conduct upon the basis of what they have done. So this section 7 that is urged as a bar to the passage of this bill is in reality a fine illustration of the need for the passage of the bill.

Another section of the Administrative Procedure Act which is relied upon by the opponents of the O'Hara bill in section 10 which deals with judicial review. The restatement of judicial review in the Administrative Procedure Act used more words than previously appeared in statutes pertaining to the different agencies and it may be that the courts will find some words on which they can, by construction, enlarge the review to some extent.

The best appraisal of the provision, however, is the explanation of the American Bar Association which prepared the administrative procedure bill. The explanation pertained to the copy of the bill before its introduction in Congress at which time the section was identified as 9 (f). Section 10 (e) as finally enacted differs in no material respect (only in the arrangement of a few words) from the draft 9 (f). This is how the bar association explained it:

"A restatement of the scope of review, as set forth in subsection (f), is obviously necessary lest the proposed statute be taken as limiting judicial review. 'The objections to judicial review have been generally not to its availability but to its scope' (Final Report, Attorney General's Committee, p. 80). The subsection does not attempt to expand the scope of judicial review, but at the same time care must be taken not to reduce it directly or by implication. Nor is it possible to specify all instances in which judicial review may operate. Subsection (f), therefore, seeks merely to restate the several categories of questions of law subject to judicial review. Each category has been recognized (see Final Report, Attorney General's Committee, pp. 87 et seq.). The several categories, constantly repeated by courts in the course of judicial decisions or opinions, were first established by the Supreme Court as the minimum requisite under the Constitution (*Interstate Commerce Commisison* v. *Illinois Central R. Co.* (215 U. S. 452, 470, 1910); *Interstate Commerce Commission* v. *Union Pacific R. Co.* (222 U. S. 541, 547, 1912)) and have also been carried into State practice in part at least as the result of the identical due process clauses of the fourteenth amendment, applicable to the States and the fifth amendment, applicable to the Federal Government (*New York & Queens Gas Co.* v. *McCall* (245 U. S. 345, 348, 1917))."

If section 10 added anything to the former scope of judicial review, it was simply by the injection of the phrase "whole record." But the bar association's explanation of this is as follows:

"The words 'upon the whole record' are designed simply to assure that the hearing—if one is required by statute—is truly a hearing. If agencies may look only to part of the record of a statutory hearing, and ignore other uncontroverted and uncontrovertible evidence, then obviously the hearing is a mere sham, the parties are put to a needless expense in participating, and judicial review is nothing more than a form. The language does not, and is not intended to, deprive administrative agencies of authority to judge of the credibility of evidence or to appraise conflicting evidence.

Section 10 was written merely in the hope that the agencies subject to it would do better in the future. On the basis of what the bar's report stated and what the report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary said, it was recognized that the law had not been changed; the agencies had just been admonished. Here is what the Senate committee said (Rept. No. 752, 79th Cong., 1st sess.):

"The 'substantial evidence' rule set forth in section 10 (e) is exceedingly important. As a matter of language, substantial evidence would seem to be an adequate expression of law. The difficulty comes about in the practice of agencies to rely upon (and of courts to tacitly approve) something less—to rely upon suspicion, surmise, implications, or plainly incredible evidence. It will be the duty of the courts to determine in the final analysis and in the exercise of their independent judgment, whether on the whole record the evidence in a given instance is sufficiently substantial to support a finding, conclusion, or other agency action as a matter of law. In the first instance, however, it will be the function of the agency to determine the sufficiency of the evidence upon which it acts—and the proper performance of its public duties will require it to undertake this inquiry in a careful and dispassionate manner. Should these objectives of the bill as worded fail, supplemental legislation will be required."

A memorandum of the Justice Department which appeared in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, part 11, page A2987, is very positive, saying:

"Section 10 as to judicial review does not, in my view, make any real changes in existing law. This section in general declares the existing law concerning judicial review. It is an attempt to restate in exact statutory language the doctrine of judicial review as expounded in various statutes and as interpreted by the Supreme Court. I know that some agencies are quite concerned about the phraseology used in section 10 for fear that it will change the existing doctrine of judicial review which has been settled for the particular agency concerned. I feel sure that should this section be given the interpretation which is intended, namely, that it is merely a restatement of existing law, there should be no difficulty for any agency. We may in a sense look at section 10 as an attempt by Congress to place into statutory language existing methods of review."

This confirmed earlier statements of the Attorney General, Hon. Tom C. Clark, in his letter to Hon. PAT MCCARRAN, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, October 19, 1945.

This analysis can be carried further, but it has already gone far enough to show that the setting up of the Administrative Procedure Act against the passage of the O'Hara bill is only a snare and a delusion.

THE COMMISSION'S ADJUDICATION POWER HAS BEEN GREATLY ENLARGED

This bill does not attempt to alter some long-standing principle which has acquired dignity and sanctity through age. The situation to which this bill is directed has become acute since 1938.

The Federal Trade Commission Act was passed on September 26, 1914. Since those early days, the Federal Trade Commission Act has radically changed so that the scope of the Commissions' adjudicating powers has been immeasurably extended and the effect of its orders made the more severe as they bear upon the rights of respondents.

Originally, a Commission order to cease and desist was not enforceable except by the Circuit Courts of Appeal. In other words, a Commission order might be disregarded with impunity and there was no punishment or compulsion available to the Commission. It applied to the Circuit Courts of Appeal and at that time the respondent might make any attack upon the order which was open to him.

The Commission was empowered originally to prevent unfair methods of competition in commerce. In 1938, the Commission Act was amended in numerous important particulars. One amendment gave the Commission enlarged powers with respect to the advertising of food, drugs, devices, and cosmetics. Other amendments which are significant at this point were:

1. Section 5 was amended to include "unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce" as well as "unfair methods of competition in commerce." The change there was slight in number of words used but vast in effect. Thereafter competition did not need to be established. Formerly it had to be shown to establish that the act complained of was "a method of competition" (*Federal Trade Commission* v. *Raladam Co.* (283 U. S. 643)).

2. A provision was inserted in the act by which an order to cease and desist becomes final. That is to say that if the person against whom the order has been entered does not petition for a review, then when the time within which he might petition has expired, or if he petitions, then within a specified number of days after the disposition of the petition, the order becomes final.

3. Next, a provision was entered providing that one who violates an order which has become final "shall forfeit and pay to the United States a civil penalty of not more than $5,000 for each violation" which may be recovered in a civil action by the United States.

Now that worked a vast change in the effect of a cease and desist order. Formerly, as stated, the order was unenforceable and of no practical effect until and unless the Commission at some later time, alleging a violation of it, applied to the Circuit Court to enforce it. Under this amendment of the statute, the only question in the event of a violation of the order in such civil penalty action is whether, as a matter of fact, the order has been violated; not whether the order is valid; not whether the order was in accordance with the evidence.

In addition to the foregoing, Congress added to the Commission's powers by the enactment of the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939. This act regulates the branding of wool and provides for enforcement under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act as well as by proceedings in the courts. While this adds to the adjudicating powers of the Commission, it also affords in part a precedent for the Commission trying cases in court. As for that matter, there are certain provisions in the Wheeler-Lea Act which likewise afford a precedent, i. e., the provisions with respect to suits for injunctions and criminal prosecutions.

ARDUOUS ASPECTS OF PROCEDURE

The Commission procedure for the trial of cases before it, some of them insubstantial in nature, is a luxury that only the wealthy can afford. It is impossible for a small businessman or a small corporation to stand the gaff of one of these proceedings. The respondent must be a large corporation with unlimited resources in order to see one of them through. The only disposition open to the small businessman is to settle with the Commission on its terms or to go out of business.

The vise-like hold and endurance-testing nature of this procedure upon respondents, both large and small, are disclosed by the following circumstances:

1. There is no means for peremptory termination of an unauthorized or a trivial case. The respondent may make a motion to the Commission to dismiss the complaint for want of legal authority or because of cessation of the offense or for any other reason. The Commission may dispose of such motion as it usually does by denying it without prejudice to the renewal of it at the end of the trial. If it does, no interlocutory appeal to the courts is permitted. The Rules of Civil Procedure do not apply. And the courts refuse to entertain suits for declaratory judgment or for injunction to arrest one of these procedures at the inception before it has made its costly run.

In *Miles Laboratories* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (C. A. D. C., 140 Fed. (2d) 683), a suit for a declaratory judgment, the Court held that it was without power to grant relief. As a result, thousands of miles have been traveled with great expenditures of time and money on a case of which the Court made this highly significant statement (685):

"In the present case and on the present record—if the question were open—it might very well be argued that appellant's advertising is neither false nor misleading, when considered in the light of the statutory provision requiring no more than a revelation of all material consequences which may result from the use of the product in the customary way or under the conditions prescribed in the advertisement. But since the matter is not open, we have no occasion to examine or weigh questions of fact or law, since they are in the first instance within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Commission and its decision when made is subject to challenge only as provided in the act; nor is there anything in the Declaratory Judgment Act which changes this result or creates new rights or increases or extends the jurisdiction of the courts (*Doehler Metal Furniture Co.* v. *Warren* (76 U. S. App. D. C. 60, 129 F. 2d 43, 45))."

2. The Commission, to a large extent, has prejudged the case. The act provides that if it has "reason to believe" that anyone has been or is using any unfair method of competition or unfair or deceptive act or practice in commerce, and if it shall appear to the Commission that a proceeding by it in respect thereof would be to the interest of the public, it shall issue and serve a complaint stating its charges and the respondent shall have the right to show cause why an order should not be entered by the Commission requiring it to cease and desist from the violation of the law so charged (sec. 5 (b)).

When Commissioner (now Chairman) Robert E. Freer outlined Federal Trade Commission procedure and practice for the George Washington Law Review in 1940, he noted that a complaint is issued only at the direction of the Commission and that motions with respect thereto are permitted, but he added (p. 323):

"As a practical matter, very few such motions are briefed and argued to the Commission, and a great majority of them are denied, without prejudice to the right of the respondent to renew them at the end of the proceeding. The Commission itself has passed upon the question of its jurisdiction in advance of ordering the issuance of a complaint and in most cases has fully considered the questions raised by the respondent in the motion."

At the end of the proceeding, when proofs have been made, the trial examiner has reported, and briefs have been filed, the Commission may upon request and at its discretion permit oral argument, but, says Mr. Freer (p. 329), "the oral argument is the first contact of the Commission with the case since it directed the preparation and service of complaint, unless it has been brought up beforehand upon a motion."

3. This method of trying cases with what may be called an absentee judgeship—the Commission being the ultimate authority but not being directly in touch with all of the determinative steps—involves far more in the way of formalities than does a case in court where the witnesses are presented before the judge or the jury and heard in regular order; where counsel frequently argue orally at the conclusion of the trial and obtain a judgment from the bench or a verdict from the jury, without further procedure and paper work. In court, under the rules of civil procedure, there are available to the litigants means of discovery, provisions for summary judgment, opportunities to dispose of cases on motions, and opportunities for certain interlocutory appeals, to say nothing of the protection afforded by the rules of evidence and trial procedures enforced by an impartial judge.

4. The Commission can and frequently does take testimony at widely separated places entailing much travel by the parties and counsel. Protracted absences of counsel from their offices and of the parties from their places of business naturally increase the expense. This travel may be as incessant and as long drawn out and as extended in mileage as the Commission pleases, and there is no place to which a respondent may turn for any relief. As stated, the courts refuse to interfere by way of declaratory judgment or injunction, and there is no interlocutory appeal.

5. All of this testimony is reported stenographically and the transcript is necessary for future use in the case. A copy of it is not furnished to the respondent; he must buy his copy at the rate of 35 cents a page. Transcripts run from hundreds to thousands of pages, depending upon the length of the trial.

6. In addition to the transcript, all proceedings by way of motions and appeals from examiner's rulings must be reduced to writing and filed in multiple copies, all of which involves more time and work by counsel and the parties.

7. There is insufficient protection against evidence by unqualified witnesses. Qualifications are disclosed not only in what the witness says but in how he says it and in his appearance and manner upon the stand. In hearings held at distant places, witnesses of meager qualifications may be offered and the testimony received into the record along with the other and used as freely in the briefing and arguing of the case as though it were from a qualified witness.

8. This is an assembly-line method of trying cases. It is trial by organization. A respondent finds himself opposed to an organized mechanism wherein wheels within wheels often grind out of existence the considerations which should pertain to the administration of justice. It leads to what is called an "institutional decision." Such a decision is defined by Prof. Kenneth Culp Davis in an article entitled "Institutional Administrative Decisions" appearing in the Columbia Law Review for March 1948, as follows:

"An institutional decision of an administrative agency is a decision made by an organization and not by an individual or solely by agency heads. A trial judge's decision is personal; the judge hears evidence and argument and decides the case. In the administrative process, evidence may be taken before an examiner, the examiner or other subordinates may sift the evidence, various kinds of specialists of the agency's staff may contribute to the writing of proposed and final reports, and the agency heads may in fact lean so heavily on the work of the staff as to know little or nothing about the problems involved in many of the cases decided in the agency's name. In the institutional decision lie elements of special strength and elements of special weakness of the administrative process. The strength springs from the superiority of group work—from internal checks and balances, from cooperation among specialists in various disciplines, from assignment of relatively menial tasks to low-paid personnel so as to utilize most economically the energies of high-paid personnel. The weakness of the institutional decision is its anonymity, its dissipated responsibility, its partial or complete rejection of the idea that the one who purports to decide must consider the record."

Herein arises that expertness which the advocates of administrative law are prone to assert. The expertness, if any, is not necessarily in the persons of the Commissioners. Tenures of office may vary greatly in time, and at periods there may be considerable turn-over in the membership of a given commission. Likewise, there is no reason for supposing that commissioners may become expert in the wide field of commodities affected in cases of alleged false advertising and unfair competition.

James M. Landis, a former member of the Federal Trade Commission, writing in the Administrative Process, 1938, says, at page 87:

"To assume that any 5, 10, or 20 men have the ability to acquire, within their brief official lifetime, the expertness to comprehend the full range of our industrial problems, from aluminum to zinc, is once more to put our trust in supermen. In the business of governing a nation—to paraphrase Gerard Henderson again—we must take into account the fact that government will be operated by men of average talent and average ability and we must therefore devise our administrative processes with that in mind."

So what expertness exists in a commission is usually to be found in the staff which is frequently, as Professor Davis says, anonymously related to the adjudicating process and without responsibility for the decision. It should be said that if the Federal Trade Commission's staff has acquired expertness in the field of the antitrust laws, the O'Hara bill would not take away the Commission's institutional decisions in that field because it does not apply to the Clayton Act under which such proceedings are brought.

It may also be said that the exercise of expertness and the doing of justice are not always synonymous. Frequently the contrary is the case. The traditional symbol of justice and impartial adjudication is the figure of the Roman goddess Justitia, usually shown with her eyes closed or even blindfolded to signify her delicate and true weighing of the evidence put before her on both sides. It is difficult to visualize the Commissioners in that embodiment, and it is impossible for them to act in that fashion, for the Commission procedure itself debars them from it.

9. On appeal from such institutional decisions, "the findings of the Commission as to the facts, if supported by evidence, shall be conclusive" (sec. 5 (c)). On appeal from a judge's decision, the higher court is permitted to reverse the lower court's findings as to the facts if they are clearly erroneous, which means, as did the old equity rule, contrary to the clear weight of evidence (*Aetna Life*

Insurance Co. v. *Kepler* (C. C. A. 8, 116 F. (2d) 1, 4–5); see Civil Procedure Rule 52 (a) and notes of Advisory Committee on Rules).

CONCLUSION

Manufacturers of foods, drugs, cosmetics, and therapeutic devices have a particular interest in the passage of the O'Hara bill. It would mean for them that the same tribunal would try cases involving both their labeling and their advertising. As it is now, the Federal courts are the tribunals which try the cases in which their labeling is alleged to be misbranded. "Misbranding" is the term used in the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include labeling which is false or misleading in any particular and which fails to comply with the numerous specifications of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. These cases are tried in the courts upon suit for injunction, or in a civil action resulting upon seizure of the commodity, or in criminal prosecution following information or indictment.

The advertising of the commodities is nothing more than an extension of the labeling. The subject matter of the advertising is either identical with that on the labeling, or related to it, or an extension of it. But if the advertising is alleged t be false or misleading in any particular, the Federal Trade Commission is the tribunal which makes the adjudication. In this matter there is the opportunity for conflicts which follow from dual administration and separate adjudication.

How well the courts have served in the effective enforcement of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is attested by Messrs. Daniel P. Willis and William W. Goodrich, attorneys for the Federal Security Agency, in a recent paper wherein they say:

"Experience under this act shows that this regulatory statute, in which courts and juries serve as agents of enforcement, can and does work. The courts have not neglected the responsibilities entrusted to them as a coordinate arm of enforcement; their opinions continue to breathe life into the act; and the public interest has been the guiding principle of decision" (Judicial Progress Under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, Food-Drug-Cosmetic Law Quarterly, March 1948, pp. 16, 34).

Unification of the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 13, 1948

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, as a former member of the Armed Services of our country, and as a Member of Congress who voted in support of the so-called unification bill last year in hopes that it would improve the over-all military picture here in this country, I believe it my duty to call to the attention of the House the article written by Mr. Roscoe Drummond, chief of the Washington bureau of the Christian Science Monitor, in a recent issue of that newspaper.

STATE OF THE NATION—BEHIND ARMED SERVICES DISUNIFICATION

(By Roscoe Drummond, chief, Washington bureau, the Christian Science Monitor)

WASHINGTON.—The public is not yet being allowed to know the full failure of the attempted unification of the armed services.

The public is not yet being allowed to know how disunited the Army, Navy, and Air Force have become at a time when the need for unity was never greater.

The public is not yet being allowed to know that beneath the facade of unification there is greater disunity among the armed services today than before the Unification Act was passed.

Obviously, this condition is not going to get corrected until the facts are faced frankly. Since they are not being faced frankly by the military leaders, since they are being concealed as much as possible from public view, it is evident that the facts must be brought out into the open by those who have access to them. Congress and the country will have to resolve the most grievous service disunities as long as the service leaders themselves are proving either unwilling or unable to do so.

Here are the bald facts which for the most part are being covered up by a screen of military double talk and by fancy words from the civilian heads of the Defense Department:

1. Despite words, the armed services have achieved nothing, in fact, remotely approaching a unified concept for an over-all strategic defense plan by which the United States would be able either to defend itself at home or carry an offense to a potential enemy.

2. There is yet no agreement whatsoever on the respective tactical roles which the Air Force, Navy, and Army shall play in the common defense. There is not only no joint operation in sight, no single command in sight, but no agreement on the assigned role which each should play separately.

3. Furthermore, there is no mechanism within the armed services which assuredly can produce a unified strategic plan of defense and assign the respective roles of each service because the unification bill did not provide a unified command to run the "unified" Army, Navy, and Air Force. The present Joint Chiefs of Staff cannot assuredly produce such a unified plan of defense because, just like the Security Council of the United Nations, it can act only when it is unanimous. Thus, the Navy, Army, and Air Force each has a veto over any plan the others might wish to adopt, and stalemate is the result. Stalemate has been the result for more than a year.

4. Today, instead of the Department of Defense presenting a unified military program and a coordinated military budget to Congress, each of the armed services is competing for money from Congress by presenting to Congress competitive military programs loaded in its favor. In consequence, congressional laymen are being called upon to judge between the competing services and to attempt to devise something of a coordinated military program because the military leaders of the separate armed services are unable to coordinate it themselves. Thus far, there has been no coordination either in the armed services or in Congress.

5. Finally, in face of such disunification at the top, the armed services today are riddled with internecine jealousy, knifing, mutual belittlement, and grand-scale noncooperation.

This is not a pleasant sight. But it is worse than that. It is a dangerous state of affairs.

It deserves to be understood that the present disunification of the armed services does not spring from the so-called unification bill. It is simply that the unification bill has not brought unification because the legislation permitted but did not compel unification.

There is a reason for the prevailing jealousy and disunity between the armed services, primarily between the Air Force and the Navy. The reason is that one of the most delicate, difficult, and far-reaching decisions has to be made right at this time. That decision is which of the armed services—in this instance, whether the Air Force or the Navy—shall be the real, agreed, all-powerful striking force in the plan of American defense.

The nature of this decision explains, though it certainly does not justify, the present state of almost total disunity in the armed services. No decision is being made today. The attempt to do so, when Secretary of Defense Forrestal took the generals and admirals and figuratively locked them up together at Key West a few weeks ago, was a fiasco.

The development of a unified American defense plan, the necessary integration of the armed services to carry out a unified defense plan, and an intelligent allocation of funds based upon a unified defense plan are today all going by default.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 13, 1948

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 7, 1948.

The PRESIDENT.
Hon. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State.
Hon. JOHN W. SNYDER,
Secretary of the Treasury.
Hon JAMES FORRESTAL,
Secretary of Defense.
Hon. TOM C. CLARK,
Attorney General.
Hon. JESSE M. DONALDSON,
Postmaster General.
Hon. JULIUS A. KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior.
Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary of Agriculture.
Hon. CHARLES SAWYER,
Secretary of Commerce.
Hon. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH,
Secretary of Labor.

GENTLEMEN: In the present Palestine crisis affecting so many interests vital to the United States, and the world's hopes for peace, we are constantly being asked for our views and recommendations, and requested to make them known to the executive department. Accordingly, in the light of the best information available to us at this time, we state them here, as we believe that under existing conditions action by the executive department is most urgent.

We are led to our conclusions by the continued and accelerated pace of the warfare in Palestine, the reported and admitted incursions into Palestine on a large scale of non-Palestinian Arabs recruited, trained, financed, equipped and led under the official auspices of the neighboring Arab states to make war on the Jews, and the de facto establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine. It seems clear to us that the attainment of a truce under fair conditions which could lead to a permanent settlement in Palestine, the preservation of the shrines of the three great religious faiths in Jerusalem and its environs, and the withdrawal of the non-Palestinian Arab forces who are now defying the United Nations, rather than the unrealistic effort to get the General Assembly to reverse itself and vote a trusteeship for Palestine, must be the three prime objectives of our policy. To attain these objectives we believe the President should take the following action:

1. Discontinue the embargo on the shipment of arms to the Jewish militia of the de facto Jewish state, until a just truce is attained, or until the non-Palestinian forces armed by the neighboring Arab states, which continue to receive large arms shipments from Great Britain under "treaty arrangements," are withdrawn, and foreign arms are no longer a factor in the Palestine fighting.

2. Provide for the participation by the United States in any effective measures to protect Jerusalem and its environs, and to put these areas under international control as already proposed by the United States representative at the United Nations.

3. Provide for the support of the United States of all efforts which might be made within the framework of the United Nations to apply such sanctions as the Charter provides for in order to bring about compliance with the General Assembly's resolution on Palestine.

Sincerely yours,

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Sixteenth District, Illinois; MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Second District, Maine; CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, Tenth District, Massachusetts; ROBERT J. TWYMAN, Ninth District, Illinois; JACOB K. JAVITS, Twenty-first District, New York; THOR C. TOLLEFSON, Sixth District, Washington; R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, Thirty-sixth District, New York; KENNETH K. KEATING, Fortieth District, New York; J. CALEB BOGGS, Representative at Large, Delaware; NORRIS POULSON, Thirteenth District, California; HAROLD F. YOUNGBLOOD, Fourteenth District, Michigan; ROBERT TRIPP ROSS, Fifth District, New York; EDWARD J. DEVITT, Fourth District, Minnesota; JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, Third District, New Jersey; THOMAS L. OWENS, Seventh District, Illinois; ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE, Third District, Connecticut; FRANKLIN J. MALONEY, Fourth District, Pennsylvania; JAMES G. FULTON, Thirty-first District, Pennsylvania; FREDERICK A. MUHLENBERG, Thirteenth District, Pennsylvania; WILLIAM J. MILLER, First District, Connecticut; GEORGE J. BATES, Sixth District, Massachusetts; JAMES T. PATTERSON, Fifth District, Connecticut; T. MILLET HAND, Second District, New Jersey; GEORGE MACKINNON, Third District, Minnesota; DAVID M. POTTS, Twenty-sixth District, New York; JOHN C. BROPHY, Fourth District, Wisconsin; ROBERT W. KEAN, Twelfth District, New Jersey; THRUSTON BALLARD MORTON, Third District, Kentucky; WILLIAM J. CROW, Twenty-third District, Pennsylvania; EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, Thirty-seventh District, New York; HOWARD A. COFFIN, Thirteenth District, Michigan; GORDON CANFIELD, Eighth District, New Jersey; ELLSWORTH B. BUCK, Sixteenth District, New York; CHARLES J. KERSTEN, Fifth District, Wisconsin; RICHARD B. VAIL, Second District, Illinois; GEORGE H. BENDER, Representative at Large, Ohio.

Security by Proscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 13, 1948

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the Washington Post of April 19 entitled "Security by Proscription." This article sets forth the dangers inherent in the present Mundt bill. While I am of the opinion that the Nation should use its powers to prevent any subversive groups from gaining dominance in the country and the Government and doing injury to its people, the end does not justify the means proposed in this bill. The dangers inherent in it should be understood by every American.

SECURITY BY PROSCRIPTION

There is a specious rationality about the legislation to curb communism approved the other day by the House Committee on Un-American Activities which makes it particularly perilous. Indubitably, Communists and some of their bedfellows are a menace to the body politic; indubitably, their devotion to a foreign country is such that they cannot be allowed to hold positions of trust within our own Government. The Committee on Un-American Activities proposes to deal with them, however, by proscription in the guise of exposure. It would require registration and disclosure of membership and of contributors on the part of the Communist Party itself and on the part of all Communist-front organizations. The justification for this proscription is a legislative declaration that the Communist Party is a "political conspiracy" endeavoring to "subvert the interest of the United States to that of a foreign Communist power."

The Government of the United States is by no means defenseless against the agents of a foreign power or other persons seeking to overthrow it. There is in force at the present time the McCormack Act requiring registration of agents of foreign principles and the Voorhis Act requiring registration of organizations which are agents of foreign governments. There is also a Federal law, the Smith Act, forbidding anyone to advocate the violent overthrow of any government in the United States and another law forbidding the employment of any such person by the Federal Government. It would be a good idea, we think, to test in the courts whether Communists, by mere virtue of their membership in the Communist Party, fall afoul of these laws. The courts are the appropriate place to seek such a judgment.

But legislative designation of the Communist Party and Communist-front organizations as guilty of violating these laws or any other laws having general application is at once a begging of the question and an infringement of the first amendment to the Constitution. If Congress could, at its own unchecked discretion, declare it to be a fact that Communists and their fellow travelers are conspirators, it could do the same about Roman Catholics or trade unionists or organizers of a third party. Justice Prettyman of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia put this succinctly and incontrovertibly the other day in his dissenting opinion on the Taft-Hartley Act Communist-oath case. Congress cannot, he said, "directly abridge a right protected by the first amendment merely by making an affirmation of a fact. If it could, it could flout the amendment with impunity."

The House of Representatives had an unhappy experience not long ago when it tried to forbid the Federal employment of three named individuals, Messrs. Watson, Dodd, and Lovett, only to discover that it had enacted what the Supreme Court ultimately called a bill of attainder. The present proposal has much the same taint. Congress could properly require the registration of all organizations guilty of endeavoring to subvert the interest of the United States to that of a foreign Communist power. It could, if it wished, follow the suggestion of Morris Ernst and require disclosure as to the contributions and expenditures of all organizations seeking to influence public opinion. It could, as Adolph Berle recommended, strengthen the Foreign Agents Registration Act to encompass all agents of foreign powers. But to single out the Communists for special restrictions under the law is to legislate in one of the ways the Constitution specifically prohibits.

In empowering the Attorney General to designate organizations as Communist fronts, the House committee proposal would improve in important respects upon the power to do this given the Attorney General under the President's loyalty investigation order. It would provide for a hearing and for judicial review. But the invidious character of the designation, the failure to recognize that an organization in which Communists have the upper hand one day may be reclaimed by loyal Americans the next, the extreme vagueness of the language defining a Communist front, all serve to make this a most dangerously blunderbuss sort of legislation.

Perhaps the most serious defect of the proposed legislation is its drastic extension of the doctrine of guilt by association. It would forbid employment in the Federal Government or issuance of a passport to any member of any organization designated a Communist front. This is a proscription on so broad and unselective a scale as to be wholly repugnant to the most settled tenets of American democracy. It would catch saint and sinner alike, punish the innocent as well as the guilty. There is not much to be said for medicine that kills the patient along with the germs from which he is suffering.

Farm Land Prices Continue Uptrend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 13, 1948

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article, Farm Land Prices Continue Uptrend, taken from the May issue of the Journal of the American Bankers Association. The article presents the semiannual study of land price trends prepared by the committee on farm land prices of the agricultural commission, American Bankers Association:

FARM LAND PRICES CONTINUE UPTREND

Record prices for grains and meats have had their effect in the farm land price situation as shown by the farm land price index which reached 170 on March 1, 1948 (1912-14=100), according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Thus, farm land prices have advanced to the 1920 inflationary peak for the country as a whole. Some regions are well above the 1920 peak; others are still below.

Considering the increases in farm land prices during the World War II period alone, national figures show that since March 1, 1939, the advance has been 102 percent; and during 1947 it was 7 percent.

States showing the greatest increase in farm land prices during the past year are those in the wheat and beef producing areas. California, Florida, and Louisiana are the only States showing a decrease over a year ago. Undoubtedly, the drop in fruit prices during the latter half of 1947 influenced this trend in Florida and California.

The index shows that during the 12 months from March 1, 1947, to March 1,

1948, farm-land prices gained 11 points—the smallest over-all increase that has occurred in recent years. Voluntary sales of farms have fallen off. This indicates less interest in farm lands at present prices.

Farmers' financial position is the strongest on record. According to BAE, the financial assets of farmers have increased from $4,900,000,000 in 1940 to $22,000,000,000 in 1947. Their total debt at the beginning of 1947 amounted to only $8,200,000,000 as against $10,000,000,000 in 1940. Farm mortgage debt in 1947 of $4,700,000,000 is approximately one-half the mortgage debt carried by American farmers at the end of World War I. Farms, in the main, are in strong hands—they do not need to be sold.

On the other hand, production expenses of farmers have been increasing and reached a record high of 251 percent above the 1910–14 average in January 1948, and dropped slightly in February and March. Continued high expenses augur reduced net farm incomes. It should be remembered that when prices in general start to recede, those on farm commodities tend to drop faster than those on things the farmer buys. Then a reduced net farm income may not support a debt placed on land purchased during high prices.

Bankers should study the recent developments in farm prices, production and expenses. They should check on the purposes for which loan funds are to be used and be sure they are for productive purposes.

What happens in the months ahead to nonagricultural prices and wage rates will affect farm welfare. Further inflation now will drive up farm costs. The Nation's defense program may continue the inflationary boom somewhat longer than would otherwise have been the case.

The continued strength and solvency of agriculture will depend largely upon the good sense of our 6,000,000 farmers and upon their ability to preserve their savings and equities and to maintain their business on a sound basis. Bankers can assist in keeping agriculture financially sound.

HERE ARE SOME THINGS FOR BANKERS TO DO NOW

1. Encourage farmers to build up the productivity of their land in order to increase food production.

2. Discourage borrowing to speculate in farm lands or in farm commodities.

3. Discourage all borrowing based upon high farm prices that might result in excessive indebtedness as farm income returns to more normal levels.

4. Urge farmers to use caution in assuming heavy indebtedness for machinery and equipment.

5. Keep in mind constantly that the sound value of farm land depends upon the capacity of farms to produce a profitable income over a period of years.

6. Encourage farmers to pay existing debts out of present high income.

7. Urge farmers to build up financial reserves through ownership of Treasury bonds and savings deposits.

Congressional Subpena Powers—Professor Corwin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MacKINNON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1948

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the debate upon the necessity of governmental bureaus complying with congressional subpenas I include the following excerpts from the great work by Edwin S. Corwin, published in 1940, entitled "The President, Office and Powers," New York University Press:

Another precedent of great significance from Washington's administration was the first President's refusal in 1796 to comply with a call from the House of Representatives for papers relative to the negotiation of the Jay treaty. The demand was originally fathered by Madison, and presumably reflected the theory of Helvidius that the President's diplomatic role is chiefly instrumental of the national legislative power in the realm of foreign relationship. Washington's declination, nevertheless, he now conceded to be proper so far as it represented the President's deliberate judgment that the papers were "of a nature that did not permit of disclosure at this time." The concession so broadened the force of the precedent that nowadays a President feels free by the same formula to decline information even to his constitutional partner in treaty making, whereas Washington's refusal rested primarily on his denial that the House was entitled to discuss the merits of a treaty. In 1906 a debate arose in the Senate over the adventurous foreign policy of the first Roosevelt, in the course of which the entire ground that had been covered by Pacificus and Helvidius more than a century before was retraveled, Senator Spooner assuming the Hamiltonian part, Senator Bacon the Madisonian. In the face of his general position Bacon conceded that "the question of the President's sending or refusing to send any communication to the Senate is not to be judged by legal right, but (is) * * * one of courtesy between the President and that body."[41] The record of practice amply bears out this statement.

[41] President's Control, p. 197. For a catalog of congressional calls for documents, see Senate Miscellaneous Documents, No. 7, 52d Cong., 2d sess., pp. 232–272. For several instances of refusal of documents by the President, see Warren, article cited in note 39, at pp. 4, 8, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 29. Apropos of a resolution by Senator Penrose early in December 1906: "That the President be requested to communicate to the Senate, if not incompatible with the public interests, full information bearing upon the recent order dismissing from the military service of the United States three companies of the Twenty-fifth Regiment of Infantry, United States troops (colored)," Senator Spooner, of Wisconsin, said:

"Mr. President, I am opposed to the resolution offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania. My opposition to it is based entirely upon the form of it. This resolution does not, so far as the subject-matter goes, fall within the class of inquiries which the Senate has ever been accustomed to address to the President. It implies on its face, Mr. President, a doubt here which I think does not exist; as to whether the Senate is of right entitled to all the facts relating to the discharge of the three named companies or not. Always the Senate, in passing resolutions of inquiry addressed to Cabinet officers, except the Secretary of State, makes them in form of direction, not request. It rarely has happened that a request has been addressed to any Cabinet officer where foreign relations were involved. Where such a resolution has been adopted it has been addressed to the President, with the qualification that he is requested to furnish the information only so far as, in his judgment, the transmission of it is compatible with the public interest.

"There are reasons for that, Mr. President. The State Department stands upon an entirely different basis as to the Congress from the other departments. The conduct of our foreign relations is vested by the Constitution in the President. It would not be admissible at all that either House should have the power to force from the Secretary of State information connected with the negotiation of treaties, communications from foreign governments, and a variety of matters which, if made public, would result in very great harm in our foreign relations—matters so far within the control of the President that it has always been the practice, and it always will be the practice, to recognize the fact that there is of necessity information which it may not be compatible with the public interest should be transmitted to Congress—to the Senate or the House.

"There are other cases, not especially confined, Mr. President, to the State Department, or to foreign relations, where the President would be at liberty obviously to decline to transmit information to Congress or to either House of Congress. Of course, in time of war, the President being the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, could not, and the War Department or the Navy Department could not, be required by either House to transmit plans of campaign or orders issued as to the destination of ships or anything relating to the strategy of war."

In the ensuing discussion it was agreed that information had been sought from the President from time to time on all sorts of subjects; that "we request the President and we direct the Cabinet officers"; that there had "been cases within comparatively recent years where Cabinet officers having been directed by resolution of the Senate to send certain information to it, had withheld entirely or withheld in part, such information by order of the President"; and that there had been no remedy when this happened. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 6, 1906.

President Hoover's refusal to furnish the Senate letters, cablegrams, minutes, memoranda, etc., with reference to the London Navy Treaty (The New York Times, July 12, 1930), evoked from Senator McKELLAR, of Tennessee, a claim of absolute right on the part of the Senate to such documents. The learned Senator said:

"Does anybody doubt that proposition of law, first, that the Senate and the President are co-equal partners in the business of treaty-making, and secondly, that the possession of one or all of the papers and documents in reference to a partnership matter makes them the joint property of all, and that they are all entitled to them? * * * He has the documents and we would have to take them away from him in order to get them. The law says they are the joint property of the two partners—namely, the Senate and the President—but the President withholds them." (The New York Times, July 17, 1930.)

The documents were not forthcoming.

The further question arises, whether the President's duty "from time to time (to) give to the Congress information of the state of the Union" infers the duty to give them such information as the Houses, either of them, may desire, provided he is in possession of it? The answer established by practice from the beginning is that the President is complete master of the situation and is entitled to select both the occasions of his communications and their content. Thus, neither the President nor the Secretary of State is ever directed by the Houses to furnish desired information or papers, but only requested to do so, and then only if it is in the public interest that they should comply—a question left to be determined by the President. More than that, however, Presidents have sometimes intervened to exonerate other heads of departments than the Secretary of State, and even lesser administrative officials, from responding to congressional demands for information, either on the ground that the papers sought were private, unofficial, or confidential that

the demand amounted to an unconstitutional invasion of Presidential discretion.

Nevertheless, should a congressional investigating committee issue a subpena duces tecum to a Cabinet officer ordering him to appear with certain adequately specified documents, and should he fail to do so, I see no reason why he might not be proceeded against for contempt of the House which sponsored the inquiry. And the President's power of pardon, if measured by that of the King of England, does not extend to contempts of the Houses of Congress.

Some of the Reasons Why

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 13, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the May 1, 1948, Atlanta Journal was sent to me by a friend from my district who is visiting in Atlanta, Ga.:

MILK IN THE FROZEN NORTH, MILK IN THE SUNNY SOUTH

Representative MURRAY of Wisconsin, arguing against remitting the penalty taxes on oleomargarine, cited to the House some official statistics which interested us mightily.

He obtained from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics a table showing the average price per 100 pounds of milk received in 1947 by farmer producers in each of the 48 States. We quote six of these prices:

Wisconsin	$3.52
Minnesota	3.43
Iowa	3.82
Georgia	5.57
Alabama	5.37
South Carolina	5.46

Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Iowa produce one-fourth of the milk of the United States. Dairying is the preponderant farm industry of the first-named two and, of course, holds high position in Iowa.

All three States are notable for the prosperity of their agriculture and the market value of their farm lands. Yet they are in a latitude where winters are long and severe, where pasturage is brief in term, where farm labor is high-priced.

How is it that dairy farming is profitable in Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Iowa, whereas complaint is made in Georgia, Alabama, and South Carolina that dairy farming is a losing proposition at basic prices which are 60 percent higher?

What has the frozen North got that the sunny South doesn't have?

Mr. Speaker, the editorial asks the question as to why? There are several reasons why.

Among the reasons are: the Wisconsin farmers are largely second- and third-generation immigrants from northern Europe, where the Germans, Irish, Norwegian, Polish, Danish, English, and other peoples are willing to work with their heads, hearts, and hands: It is a place where these peoples have had an opportunity to acquire their own farms. It is a place where the dignity of labor is appreciated and where the people by their efforts farm their own farms and are not constantly figuring out schemes to farm the United States Treasury. It is a place where all the farmers ask is equal consideration with the producers of other sections, and also equal consideration with other groups of our society. It is not the home of the landed aristocracy with all the evils that are associated with this feudal approach. They wish to, and do, own and operate their own farms and enjoy the privileges and assume the responsibilities of owning a little piece of America. Thousands of the present farmers of Wisconsin are graduates of State colleges and of the State agricultural college, an increasing number of them are high-school graduates and thousands of them have taken agricultural training as part of the high school Smith-Hughes agricultural educational program.

Compulsory National Health Insurance

EXTFNSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 13, 1948

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, the proponents of compulsory national health insurance and socialized medicine would do well to read an article by Dr. Maurice Friedman in Nation's Business, May 1948 entitled "Doctor, My Statistics Feel Funny." Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the article which presents some interesting facts—facts which demonstrate that statistics emanating from government bureaus should be checked and verified by an impartial agency such as the Census Bureau in order to preclude the dissemination of misleading propaganda:

DOCTOR, MY STATISTICS FEEL FUNNY
(By Dr. Maurice Friedman)

DRAFT FIGURES HAVE BEEN USED TO PROVE US A NATION OF WEAKLINGS AND CRIPPLES—LET'S LOOK AT THE FACTS

You're sick. I'm sick. We are all sick. We are a Nation of cripples.

Who says so?

The Federal Security Administration, a governmental agency. So it must be true. Federal officials would never mislead the public and the Congress—or would they?

For many years we have been told that the health of this Nation is deplorable, that large segments of our people go entirely without medical care, and that our present system of medical services is woefully inadequate. Indeed, we have been told that the situation is a national emergency.

We cannot afford to waste time experimenting with modifications of our present system or with voluntary health insurance. We must act without delay, and act radically. We must scrap the private practice of medicine altogether and adopt a compulsory national health insurance directed by a Federal agency in Washington.

If you doubt this, take a look at the "shocking" picture revealed by the draft statistics. Just think, "one-half of our young men, in the flower of life, unfit to bear arms for their country." These sensational words were set to music—the music of emotion. The Federal Security Administration supplied the words and many prominent men sang the tune: William Green, of AFL; James B. Carey, of CIO; Leon Henderson; Harold Ickes; several Senators; and even our President. Leading newspapers joined in the song. Their Washington correspondents dutifully sent in official bureau hand-outs.

What are the facts?

In the first place, it is not true that one-half of our young men were unfit to bear arms. Even at this date the Selective Service System has not finished compiling and tabulating all of the data. But we can get an idea of the true situation by examining a period for which the data have been completed. From December 7, 1941, to December 31, 1943, the Selective Service System examined about 10,000,000 men. Of these, they rejected about 36 percent. At the same time, however, 2,700,000 men volunteered for service and were accepted by the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps. Therefore, the total number of men examined for military service in this period was 12,700,000, and the over-all rejection rate was about 28 percent.

But a rejection rate of 28 percent cannot be dismissed. Isn't the rejection of 3,600,000 men enough to make us disgusted with our scheme of medical services?

According to the Federal Security Administration, the answer is "Yes." According to the official propaganda which you and I are paying for, one-half to two-thirds of all draft rejections could have been avoided by adequate medical care, and are, therefore, evidence of widespread medical neglect.

Again, what are the facts?

The governmental officials who have repeatedly made these statements, who have placed these words in the mouths of many witnesses coming before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, are not physicians. They lack the technical qualifications which would permit them to make any statement whatsoever regarding the relation of draft rejections to medical care. So far the Federal Security Administration has not been able to produce the statement of a single physician to support their guesstimate of draft rejections preventable by medical care.

Dr. Leonard Rowntree, one-time medical director of the selective-service system, ventured the opinion that draft rejections for remediable defects constituted about 15 percent of all rejections. In an independent analysis of the data, I concluded that no more than 20 percent of all rejections could have been influenced by medical care; that is, approximately 6 percent of all men examined.

If Dr. Rowntree was correct, if I was correct, why were so many men rejected? We must remember that the draft boards were not choosing men to play tiddly-winks. The selective-service system had the task of selecting men for combat, men who could be expected to withstand the terrific strains of modern warfare, men who could adapt themselves to the strictly regimented life in the armed forces. The mobilization orders were explicit in defining the type of man wanted. Acting under these specific directions, the selective-service physicians kept one eye on combat requirements and one eye on the lookout for defects which, though not a great handicap, might be grounds for future claims in the form of pensions or free medical service.

Official bulletins of the selective-service system have repeatedly emphasized these facts. These bulletins stress the point that an overwhelming majority of the men examined had been drawn from useful occupation in civil life which they had followed without apparent handicap. Let us listen to the exact words of the officials of the selective-service system:

"There seems to be little doubt that most of the registrants being classed as available for limited military service and a substantial portion of the registrants being classed as disqualified for any military service in the United States Army possess health conditions which would be acceptable for military duty in any army in continental Europe.

"In addition to the nondisqualifying defects, a large proportion of the disqualifying

defects were minor insofar as health conditions are concerned. The loss of an index and middle finger, the loss of a great toe, or the fact that a registrant is less than 60 inches in height is sufficient cause for rejection, but such conditions do not indicate that the registrant is in poor health."

These warnings of the selective-service system were not hidden in any secret archives. There were prominently placed in the very bulletins which the Federal Security Administration was using to scare our people. Indeed, in view of the clear warnings of the officials of the selective-service system, there is no excuse for anyone, with or without technical training, to misinterpret the draft statistics. The members of the Federal Security Administration did not heed these warnings.

They did not heed the unequivocal statement of Col. William Meninger, psychiatric consultant of the Army. With reference to the great numbers of rejections for psychiatric reasons, Colonel Menninger warned against the misuse of these statistics:

"It has been no surprise to the psychiatrists that this segment of the population has been uncovered, and is no special cause for alarm as to the mental health of the Nation. * * * It concerns our family life and educational system. It is intimately linked with the prevailing attitude of the public toward their specific service in the Army. To many men, the security of their homes and their friends and their jobs far outweigh their belief in their importance for and their need by the armed forces. The rejection of this group of men for acceptance to the Army has been widely misunderstood and misinterpreted. The Army, like a football team, needs the best. * * * The fact that a man may be a regular worker, a community asset, is no indication that he can fit into the Army or be an asset to the Army."

The lay members of the Federal Security Administration chose to ignore these warnings by competent medical authorities. These public officials, posing as expert and unbiased advisers to the Congress, persisted in misusing the draft statistics in their advocacy of national compulsory health insurance. For many years they have supplied most of the drive for the enactment of legislation which would affect intimately every person in this country and would subject the professional activities of every doctor to regulations laid down by the Federal Government.

The drive has been successful. Under the terms of a bill now before Congress the Federal agency for the supervision and direction of medical care would be the Federal Security Administration. In other words, the very men who are advising the Congress are now, and have been for years, engaged in a vigorous campaign to enact legislation which would vastly increase their own powers, their own influence, and personal prestige. Against this background, we cannot assume that these men have been free of bias or that they have been acting as impartial scholars.

It is unfortunate that the average person, who is so well-informed about the technique of Fritz Crisler's backfield, the latest development in automatic transmission, or the call prices of preferred stocks, knows so little about health.

How can we measure the health of our community, of our Nation? Granting that the draft rejection figures are almost worthless in this regard, can't we put the selective-service statistics to some use? Yes, we can use these statistics in a limited way and with proper precautions.

Complete records were kept of selective-service examinations. These included the findings not only of the usual physical examination, but also the results of the X-ray examinations and the blood and urine examinations which were done on every man. Some of the men who were accepted for military service had one or more minor defects. These, too, were recorded. Many of the men who were rejected revealed not only the major defect for which they were disqualified, but one or more additional defects. Thus the original data of the selective service include records of every defect, disqualifying or not, uncovered by these physical examinations.

WHAT ARE OUR DEFECTS?

Of what significance are these defects? Are they a measure of our health? Can they be used as a measure of the adequacy of our medical care?

In the first place many of the recorded defects have no direct relation to health or medical care, but are directly related to our educational facilities. Examples are "educational deficiency," "failure to meet minimum intelligence requirements," and the largest portion of those individuals designated as "mentally deficient." Of the remainder of recorded defects, most are structural abnormalities rather than diseased states.

For example, enlarged tonsils, absence of one testicle (congenital) and flat feet were recorded for many individuals although these structural abnormalities had not handicapped them in civilian life. There is the famous incident of the young man who was returned to civilian life because of flat feet and who immedaitely resumed his career in professional football.

It is a bit of irony that many of the recorded defects were not the result of medical neglect, but the direct result of medical treatment. All of the amputations are in this category. Many of them were done as lifesaving measures after serious injuries. Surgical perforations of the middle ear also are in this category. Before sulfa drugs, surgical drainage of the middle ear was frequently necessary.

But still more important is the paradox that the very existence of many defects is evidence of our good health. Before the days of insulin a diabetic child would not live long enough to be recorded as a "defect" by the draft board. Many of the men listed as having tuberculosis would have long since checked in with the undertaker instead of the draft board were it not for modern medical diagnosis and treatment. Many with rheumatic heart disease would never have reached voting age without the supervision of skilled physicians.

Until 2 or 3 years ago children with the more severe kinds of congenital heart disease were doomed to a sedentary existence confined to the bed or wheel chair. Their faces were blue. They could not walk across the room without great effort. About one-half of these children died before puberty. With the miracle of modern chest surgery, these children need not die. Although the surgeon cannot make combat soldiers out of them, he can convert them from bed-ridden invalids into useful and happy citizens. When these children become of age, our draft boards will be able to record even more defects. Shall we operate and save these children? Or shall we let them die off so that our selective service statistics will look better?

Is a corpse healthier than a young man disqualified for military service because of diabetes?

No indeed; we cannot use the selective-service statistics as a guide to the health of our community. They can be of limited use only if we integrate them with other more important data. To measure the health of a community, we must note the frequency of contagious diseases, particularly those which are so closely related to public hygiene, such as typhoid fever and dysentery. We must place proper emphasis on the infant and maternal mortality rates and the morbidity and mortality rates from other diseases. We must make an estimate of the life expectancy of our community. Finally, we must give proper weight to the birth rate. No community can be considered a healthy one if the adult population is able to live but unable to reproduce itself.

Even when all this has been done, valid conclusions can be drawn only by experts because there are so many pitfalls. For example, as a nation or a community grows more and more healthy, the crude death rate (number of persons per 1,000 population dying from all causes) goes down. Eventually, however, a point is reached where continued improvement in the health of the community results in an increase in the crude death rate. In fact, because of our favored position in health matters, the United States, along with the Scandinavian countries and a few others, has already reached this turning point.

POPULATION IS GROWING OLDER

As we learn to control the contagious diseases and the decimating illnesses of childhood, more and more individuals survive to be enumerated in the older age groups. Gradually the composition of the entire population changes. A young community gradually becomes a much older one. Unfortunately, we have not learned to prevent high blood pressure, heart disease, or cancer. We have not learned to prolong the life of man indefinitely. Despite the advances of medicine, man is still mortal, and the death rate for old men is much higher than that for younger men. Thus a progressive and healthy nation may show a rising death rate. Its progress in health would then be reflected in an increase of life expectancy.

Because of the age and several other equally important factors, it is not easy to compare the health of one nation with that of another. Errors are easily made and statistics can be tortured into a frame to support any particular kind of propaganda. It is still more difficult to evaluate the precise role of medical services in the health of a community. In recent years we have heard much about those poor, sparsely settled counties without general hospitals and without an adequate number of physicians. So far as I am aware, there is today no satisfactory basis on which to calculate how many physicians per thousand population is an adequate number.

During the war more than one-third of our physicians volunteered for service with the armed forces. Thus, there remained for the civilian population not more than two-thirds of its ordinary supply of doctors. In spite of this marked reduction in available medical services, maternal mortality was cut in half between 1940 and 1945. During this same period, infant mortality decreased by about 20 percent.

This does not mean that we would have been still better off if all of our doctors had gone to war. It does mean that our health is not determined solely by the number of doctors and the number of hospitals. A striking illustration of this fact is the prevalence of venereal disease in the the armed forces. In the Army and Navy there was 1 doctor for every 250 men which is equivalent to 2 to 3 times the number of doctors in our largest cities. Their services were not only available day and night without cost but special VD control officers pleaded with the men to use the facilities. These special officers conducted vigorous educational campaigns to instruct the men in the use of prophylactic measures. In every town of any size special prophylactic stations were established and kept open all night. At these stations men who had ignored the warnings of the medical officers could obtain early phophylactic treatment after exposure.

In brief, a soldier or sailor could avoid venereal infection or obtain treatment for it at no cost at all, but he did not get venereal disease for nothing. It took money to go

out and pick up an infection. Nevertheless, venereal disease was rampant in every military establishment at home and abroad, and just as with civilians the rate was astronomically higher among colored troops. Indeed, despite the elaborate provisions for medical services in the armed forces, the ratio of the VD rate in colored servicemen to the rate in the white servicemen was precisely the same as it was in the civilians who were examined by the draft boards.

To be sure, medical care is an important element in community health, but it is not the only element, and it frequently is not the most important element. At one time in the Great Lakes region the women were very self-conscious about their big necks. The big necks were not a distinct heredity trait, but were due to the low iodine content of the water and of the vegetables grown in that area. The lack of iodine produced goiters not only in the women of the Great Lakes, but also in the dogs, the frogs, and the fishes. With no significant change in the number of doctors, and certainly no change in the medical services available to the dogs, simple goiter has practically disappeared in both the human and canine population. This has been accomplished by the simple means of adding a small amount of iodine to the table salt.

HOUSING AFFECTS HEALTH

In your own community, geography may not play such an important role. The local housing situation may be much more important, particularly with respect to contagious diseases since they thrive in undernourished individuals jammed into overcrowded and inadequate dwellings.

And, speaking of housing facilities, we cannot overlook the outhouse, which has contributed so much to our humor but also to the spread of disease. There are large areas in this country where the installation of modern plumbing would do more good than the importation of a whole battery of medical specialists. There are equally large areas where the introduction of a safe water and milk supply would yield much larger health dividends than an increase in the capital investment of local hospital facilities.

We cannot do without doctors and hospitals—yet. Even if every individual in every community took full advantage of preventive and public health measures, we would still be confronted with the victims of those degenerative diseases for which we have no preventive measures. But, to a large extent, the number of persons forced to seek medical attention because of illness is a measure of our failure to utilize fully our present knowledge. The quaint belief in some southern cities that "summer diarrhea" is caused by hot weather cannot be accepted as a bit of folklore. The unpalatable fact is that summer diarrhea, like typhoid and other related diseases, is evidence that the people are eating or drinking contaminated food, water, or milk.

Doctors and public health officials can watch over your drinking water and your milk supply. They can inspect your public eating places and warn you of any dangers in swimming pools and beaches. They can advise you in the control of contagious diseases and industrial hazards. But doctors and public health officers do not have the power of legislation on health matters. They alone cannot enforce existing legislation. These functions are properly in the hands of the public and its representatives. Even so, legislation and coercion are not the answer.

HEALTH NEEDS EDUCATION

We cannot legislate good health into being any more than we could create temperance by the passage of the Volstead Act. Good health is not a commodity which the Government can deliver to you in a neat package. It cannot be administered to you out of the doctor's little bag. The attainment of good health requires the active and intelligent participation of every member of the community. Given all the paraphernalia of modern medical science, the well-being of the community will not improve unless the people are sufficiently well educated to take advantage of what is offered. In many sections of the country the chief barrier to improved health is ignorance.

What can you do to improve the health of our Nation? As a citizen you can give your wholehearted support to any effort in your civic organizations to assess the health of your community and to single out and define your most urgent needs. As an individual you can begin your health crusade at home.

It is not enough to protect your family against infection and serious injury. Much of present-day illness is due to emotional conflict. To prevent these functional diseases, and more serious mental disease, there is nothing so important as the character of the home. Your children should have the emotional security that only love and a harmonious family life can give.

Finally, for your personal well-being, seek the advice of your doctor periodically for preventive services. Don't wait until you are acutely ill. The frequency of your regular examinations will be determined not only by your physical condition, but also by your age, and the medical history of your parents and grandparents. Let your doctor be the judge. No man or woman can hope to go through life without a few aches and pains.

In a vast majority of instances, these minor protests are of no more significance than the rattle of a loose tool kit in the trunk compartment of your auto. But some kinds of distress, even though mild, have frightening potentials. Your doctor can teach you to spot the warning signals important in your particular case. You can then disregard the trivia and avoid the status of a hypochondriac who sees a cancer in every wart.

Not every one can afford to play tennis after his sixtieth birthday. For some individuals a jigger of whiskey three times a day is necessary for survival. For others it is poison. Let your doctor review your mode of life, your diet, your habits. He will probably be able to make some worth-while suggestions which will prolong your useful life.

Even with our present level of national income, there are undoubtedly many people who cannot shoulder the entire burden of a major illness. But the distribution of medical care in this country is not dominated by the economic factor. Take a look at your own community. The poor are not being neglected. Admittedly our present methods for the distribution of medical services are far from ideal. We should continue to strive for something better. It is heartening that more than 30,000,000 of our people now have the benefit of Blue Cross hospitalization insurance. Another 20,000,000 have some sort of commercial coverage. In several parts of the country various experiments with prepaid medical care are on trial. From the experience of these enterprises we shall obtain a valuable store of practical knowledge to guide us in our quest for better health.

In the meanwhile there is no need for hysterics. We can well afford to resist any rash political action which would sabotage a system that has enabled us to become one of the healthiest nations in the world. Certainly the health of our country is not in such desperate state that we must rush to surrender complete control of our medical care into the hands of an all-powerful Federal agency—an agency whose members are responsible for the propaganda to convince you that we are a nation of cripples and weaklings.

Letter From the Department of State in Regard to the Amendments Offered to the Rivers Bill (H. R. 2245) To Repeal the Tax on Oleomargarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the Honorable BROOKS HAYS, of Arkansas, has kindly given me a copy of the letter which he received from the Department of State in reply to his letter concerning the two amendments which I offered to the Rivers bill, H. R. 2245. The letter is as follows:

MAY 11, 1948.

The Honorable BROOKS HAYS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. HAYS: With reference to our telephone conversation of May 1, 1948, relating to certain amendments offered by Representative MURRAY to H. R. 2245, a bill to repeal specific taxes on domestic oleomargarine, I find Mr. MURRAY offered two amendments, one of which would have repealed the tax on imported oleomargarine and the other the processing taxes on imported oils used in the manufacture of oleomargarine.

Mr. MURRAY'S proposal to repeal section 2470 of the Internal Revenue Code would have removed processing taxes applicable to coconut, palm, and palm kernel oil. Under the trade agreement which the United States and the Republic of the Philippines concluded July 4, 1946, the United States agreed not to "reduce the preference of 2 cents per pound provided in section 2470 of the Internal Revenue Code of the United States (relating to processing taxes on coconut oil, etc.)." The Philippine Trade Act of 1946 (Public Law 379, 79th Cong.), which authorized the negotiation of the agreement, specifically provided, among other things, for the inclusion of this provision. Repeal of section 2470 would have violated the agreement.

The second proposal, and the one with which I assume you were primarily concerned, would have repealed section 2306 of the Internal Revenue Code. This would have removed the tax of 15 cents a pound on imported oleomargarine (the tariff duty of 7 cents a pound and the import-excise tax on the taxable oil content—section 2491 of the Internal Revenue Code—would remain unchanged).

Failure of the amendment results in the removal by H. R. 2245 of the tax of 10 cents a pound on domestic colored oleomargarine and the one-quarter cent a pound on domestic uncolored oleomargarine, while leaving untouched the tax of 15 cents a pound on imported oleomargarine. While imports into continental United States for consumption have been virtually nonexistent, the Department is concerned with the discriminatory nature of this tax of 15 cents a pound on the imported product. The tax conflicts with commitments contained in a number of treaties and executive agreements, under which the United States agrees to accord imported articles the same treatment with respect to internal taxes as is accorded like articles of domestic origin.

This policy of national treatment, under which imported goods are accorded, on a reciprocal basis, the same internal tax treatment as domestic goods, is a highly important protection for American trade. It is

designed to protect our exports against discrimination in the matter of internal taxes and the danger that such taxes would be used to nullify any tariff concessions that we obtained.

In summary, the Department while sympathetic to the objective of removing internal revenue taxes on domestic oleomargarine regrets, for the reasons given above, that the House did not act favorably on the amendment to remove the 15-cent-per-pound tax (sec. 2306 of the Internal Revenue Code) on imported oleomargarine.

Please do not hesitate to call upon me if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely yours,

WINTHROP G. BROWN,
Acting Deputy Director, Office of International Trade Policy.

It will be noted that my first amendment was contrary to the Philippine agreement, but the Philippines would have been the beneficiaries of the amendment and there is nothing to indicate that they would not be willing to make a revised agreement.

It will also be noted that the Department of State regrets that the second amendment, to repeal section 2306 of the Internal Revenue Code, was not adopted.

This should be ample evidence of my constructive effort to give butter an equal protection to oleomargarine and at the same time save the housewives millions of dollars.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, while plugging for Federal aid to education, Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer, reporter for the Washington Post, has inadvertently done this country a great service by calling to our attention the inconsistency of the flagrant use of American tax money abroad while attempting at the same time to cut down on governmental spending here at home.

Mrs. Meyer says that if we have billions to send to Europe, surely our Federal Treasury cannot be too hard up to help finance primary and secondary education in America. Well, of course it is silly for American taxpayers to be paying the salaries of school teachers in 16 foreign countries while having no responsibility for financing education in this country. I think it would have been more to the point had Mrs. Meyer said that if we would quit appropriating money for foreign countries the sources of revenue available to local and State units of government in this country would be enriched.

Indeed, the statement by Mrs. Meyer advocating nationalization of education may well illustrate how ERP can prove most dangerous by making plausible and thus pushing along our steadfast plunge toward socialism.

Centenary of Washington Monument To Be Observed on July 4, 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 1948

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the observance on July 4, 1948, of the centenary of the Washington Monument the following article by Mr. Edwin D. Neff was published in the April 28 issue of the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald and is an interesting reference to Washington's famous monument:

MASONIC RITE PLANNED TO MARK MONUMENT CENTENARY JULY 4
(By Edwin D. Neff)

The original cornerstone laying which started the Washington Monument on its 36-year climb July 4, 1848, will be reenacted this July 4 by the Grand Masonic Lodge of Washington if present plans of the Board of Trade's greater National Capital committee work out, Chairman Clarence Arata announced yesterday.

Undoubtedly the Alexandria-Washington Lodge, which still owns the trowel used in the original ceremony, will be invited to take part. This ceremony, Arata said, will be the high light of the GNC committee's 3-day celebration of the centenary of one of the most remarkable monuments in the world.

Washington's famous monument, still the tallest piece of masonry in the world, got off to a chill start in 1783 when George Washington himself opposed it. "Too expensive," he is quoted as having said. Actually, it became a notable bargain, since it cost only $1,500—less than the proposed new wing for Children's Hospital.

Probably few other monuments to famous Americans, however, were ever beset with so many embarrassing moments.

Actually, on February 21, 1855, the Washington Monument was "stolen." On that date the now forgotten political group calling themselves the Know Nothings broke into the offices of the Washington Monument Society, which was collecting money for the monument, seized its records, and "elected" themselves officers.

The Know Nothings had been accused of a prior theft in regard to the monument—the famous "Pope's stone," a slab of marble from the Temple of Concord in Rome, contributed by the Vatican. It's still missing.

The "theft" of the monument itself, however, was a bit thick, and the Know Nothings had to give way to the original monument society, owing to the international outrage.

During the 36 years between the cornerstone laying and completion on December 6, 1884, Congress several times voted for and against funds for the monument, and for one 16-year period there was no construction whatever.

When work resumed in 1876, after the Civil War, the structure had shifted, and a new base was needed. A slab of concrete 13 feet 6 inches thick was laid under the old foundations, and today the 555-foot shaft can withstand a supertornado of 145 miles per hour.

There have been snide remarks about our famous monument by geologists and engineers. It is supposed to be built "upside down and inside out," and at one time suffered "tuberculosis." Some say it "breathes" and produces its own "rain." A cat is said to have leaped off the top of the scaffolding at the 100-foot level and scampered away.

The "upside down, inside out" theory came from a National Museum geologist who said the best and most-enduring material lies in the inner part of the upper portion, where there is the least strain. The poorest material, he said, was compressed into the outer portion of the first 190 feet, which bears the most weight and receives the rain wash from the portion above.

Gems of American Prose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 1948

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Hartford Courant of May 12, 1948:

GEMS OF AMERICAN PROSE

Suppose you were asked, on a quiz program, to name the most widely circulated American writings for the past three centuries What would you include on your list of all-time best-sellers? If you're an old timer, you might not have any difficulty in naming the leader of them all. It's the legendary McGuffey's Readers. Yale University Library reports that circulation of that classic has reached 125,000,000 copies since 1834. No other gem of American literature has ever come close to it, and it seems doubtful in these days of less standardized education that any ever will.

Leading in another category, not surprisingly, is the Sears Roebuck catalog, a springtime delight to persons throughout this land. That harbinger of the approaching season has attained a circulation of 14,000,000 copies. The Boy Scouts Manual has its own loyal followers, some 10,000,000 of them. In the next lower bracket of popularity are the booklets of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., which bulge with vital statistics and report medicine's latest advances and their relation to public health. Those booklets have achieved a combined circulation of 1,400,000.

Truth, apparently, is more popular than fiction, besides being stranger. Certainly nothing in the realm of make-believe has ever threatened to rival the popularity of the above-mentioned items. For comparative purposes, consider Uncle Tom's Cabin. Now there is a book that was judged pretty significant in its day, and is credited by some with helping bring on the Civil War. But its circulation? A mere 2,000,000. The same with James Fenimore Cooper's The Last of the Mohicans. Just another 2,000,000-copy affair. Perhaps there is a moral to be drawn about a civilization that prefers the Sears Roebuck catalog to Uncle Tom's Cabin, and vital statistics to The Last of the Mohicans. A critic might call it utilitarian; a defender, practical-minded. But the McGuffey's Readers outdoes them all. As long as that holds top rank, one dares cast no aspersions on America's literacy. Whether they choose to peruse romantic fiction or to scan alluring advertisements, there's no question that 125,000,000 Americans since 1843 have learned to read.

Seventeenth Annual Conference of the Chaplains Association of the Army and Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT TRIPP ROSS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 1948

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by George E. Sokolsky which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on April 14, 1948:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

At the very moment that the Government is forced to seize the railroads of the country because willful men refuse to recognize any factors in life but their personal desires and purposes, a meeting took place in New York strengthening spiritual foundations. This was the seventeenth annual conference of the Chaplains Association of the Army and Navy of the United States.

I looked at their program long and hard. For on its cover was a painting of drowning men and some whom the sea would not devour because of the challenging bravery of others. It is an overpowering picture of loyalty and devotion.

There stand Clark V. Poling, Protestant minister; John P. Washington, Catholic priest; Alexander D. Goode, Jewish rabbi; and George L. Fox, Protestant minister. They stand close together, holding hands as the ship goes down. They died holding hands, a brotherhood in the eternity of God, together as one man.

These clergymen were passengers on the troop transport, the steamship *Dorchester*, which was torpedoed off Greenland in the early morning of February 3, 1943. With complete disregard for their safety, these chaplains made their way on deck and went among the confused, fear-stricken men.

And finally they gave their lifejackets to four sons of American parents—these boys had lost theirs in the hysterical excitement. While others had a chance for life, these chaplains had none. "They died that all men may live in peace."

It is this cover for a program that speaks of America—of love, compassion, humanity—of unity while preserving fundamental and traditional differences. And so it has been during all the sessions of this conference. For, somehow, out of it comes an American religion, one that speaks of God the Father, whose house is of many mansions, and we keep it so—in faith, in kindliness, in brotherhood.

And so in the memorial services it was possible to have a common prayer, known to all and in the liturgy of each separate faith beloved—the Twenty-third Psalm—sung first in that Jerusalem where today men of faith destroy each other over land, which is only dust, while here a service can be presided over by a rabbi, at which the Paulist choristers provide the music.

Those who speak of our people as materialistic do not grasp the core of American civilization which, time after time, tears through the corroding encasement of only too-human egotism and discloses the jewel of human brotherhood.

There it is—a civilization advancing not the idea of force and power and the oppression of men, but the concept of the possibility of a cooperative society of men and women of differing faiths and individual choices living together in the spirit of God.

Essentially, that is what makes America different from all other countries and on that, difficult as it may be for men to live their ideals, we have not compromised.

Our shortcomings are many, but our worthiness is that we acknowledge them. We know the goal and if we often fail to achieve it, we nonetheless always keep our soul's eye upon it. And the greatness of our chaplain's service in the Army and Navy and in the Air Force and the Veterans' Administration is that we do not leave our children at war or in the preparation for or aftermath of war without the ministrations of those who love both God and America and seek to keep them close to each other.

This is symbolized by the shield on the back cover of this program—a shield upon which rests a crucifix lying upon the bosom of the Torah.

And this is the prayer of the final session of this program of those who wear the military uniform of the most powerful Nation on earth:

"God protect our people from the illusion and despair that racks the souls of men who live in tiny spheres. Teach us to be generous and chivalrous in our treatment of the weak. Help us to know the truth and the truth will make us free. Strengthen our confidence in this justice, might, and power. Inspire us to be Thy servants of peace and freedom, and always Thy worthy sons. Amen."

Government by Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 1948

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to insert in the RECORD an article published in the Salem Republican, Salem, Ill., issue of May 11, 1948, a copy of a recent financial letter of Newhard, Cook & Co., of St. Louis, Mo., which punctures and high lights the silly political crisis-after-crisis financial policy of this present administration:

A SUMMARY OF UNITED STATES ECONOMIC SITUATION TODAY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Following is a major portion of the May 6 financial letter of Newhard, Cook & Co., of St. Louis, which, in our judgment, gives a sound picture of today's economic conditions. The letter debunks the need of Government-incited crises to spur business, and clearly shows that no recession is in sight and that business, of its own initiative, is doing well. The law of supply and demand will straighten out difficulties eventually, if Government will let them alone. For one of the clearest pictures of our national situation we have seen for a long time, we present the financial letter of Newhard, Cook & Co., and recommend its reading carefully in detail. These letters were distributed to all Salem Rotarians last Friday.)

The President's Council of Economic Advisers is a vacillating group of men. Their forecast of business has completed several cycles during the past 18 months.

On many occasions they have envisioned clouds in the economic sky and warned the public of impending storms, only to see the clouds vanish. The dominant philosophy of this group seems to thrive on economic storms. In fact, one member of the council made an address on April 3, 1948, in which he asked the rhetorical question, "Can democracy act without a crisis?" He then proceeded to answer the question by showing that it took the crises of 1932 and 1941 to persuade the public to relinquish control of industry to the Government; and he now implies that the dilatory Americans need crisis after crisis to continue persuading them that the Government can lead them into fairer lands across the slough of despond.

It is no wonder then that the reports of this committee are tinged with the economic philosophy of John Maynard Keynes: People, of the government, by the government, and for the government.

CAN'T FIND A CRISIS

At times, however, the economic conditions prevailing in our country are so favorable that it is virtually impossible for the council to dream up an honest-to-goodness crisis. Such are the conditions at the present time and they are reflected in the recent report made to the President.

The report states the belief that business prosperity is a reasonable prospect for several more years, and that full employment seems assured until mid-1951, or longer.

Nevertheless, its Keynesian influence can be detected by the inferences that the Government is causing this prosperous outlook—spending for armament and for ERP. It expresses the opinion that the trend of Government spending is likely to increase until 1951, and that this trend revives the threat of deficit financing and increased taxation.

The report implies that the Government is the savior of our Nation from a business recession, as if the volume of total business would not have continued to rise through the power of our money supply. The fact is that Government spending is an extra layer of business activity laid on top of capacity operations. Up to now there has been no apparent slackening in these virtual capacity operations in over-all domestic production. It is true enough that certain articles are in abundant supply and that others are becoming more available. However, this is largely a dual manifestation of maldistribution of certain productive facilities, and of industrial bottlenecks.

BOTTLENECK IN HOUSES

To illustrate this point, let us consider radios which are apparently in abundant supply. The public seems to have satisfied its backlog of demand for this semiluxury and the pipe line of inventory has been filled. Hence, there is only the normal replacement demand that is now required to satisfy the public, and production may be running slightly ahead of this demand.

Houses, on the other hand, are still at a premium. There are not enough to satisfy the public need. There is then an overproduction of radios and an underproduction of houses, a maldistribution in total productive capacity. However, as new homes are built there will a need for more radios to equip them, so that the shortage of houses is causing somewhat of a bottleneck in the radio industry. As these houses are constructed the equipment demand for radios will spur lagging sales, and then with a larger number of units throughout the Nation the normal replacement demand will be larger. Hence, sales in some lines are slowing down because of this maldistribution of production, but this trend does not reflect a slackening in over-all demand, and these sales will probably pick up as certain bottlenecks are broken.

GOOD BUSINESS NOT DUE TO GOVERNMENT

Failing then to consider this continuing demand by the public, the economic watchmen for the President advise that it is only because of revived Government spending for armament and ERP that employment will remain high and industry will continue at full-scale operations until mid-1951.

This viewpoint underemphasizes the inflation potential in this country and the council is apparently lulled into contentment by the recent lowering of steel prices. The proposed Government spending, however, will stimulate the already dynamic force of inflation and higher, not lower, prices are to be expected. This may lead to talk of price controls, but there will probably be much opposition to such a move in Congress. Let us hope that we will not again come to the artificiality of OPA.

Assuming that price controls will not be reimposed and that prices will be allowed to seek their more normal levels, it is then reasonable to expect a higher dollar value of gross national product and higher personal incomes. If this is so, then the next reasonable assumption is that dollar revenue to the Treasury may increase in spite of the recent lowering of tax rates. If prices are allowed to truly find their correct level through the law of supply and demand, it may not be so necessary to raise taxes next year to meet higher budget figures. And, with the hoped-for pruning of dead timber from Government expenditures by a new administration next year, it may even prevent the need for large deficit financing.

President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial on President Truman appearing in the Boston Post, Boston, Mass., of May 12, 1948.

The American people admire and respect persons of courage in all walks of life. This feeling has special application to persons holding public elective office, and particularly the President of the United States.

The editorial is a deserved tribute to President Truman. He is a leader and a man of courage.

The editorial follows:

CALL IT COURAGE

"Courage," he said, and pointed toward the land. "This mounting wave will roll us shoreward soon * * *."

Thus spake Ulysses, with the valor of a gallant man and the tall optimism of a righteous one.

Come a day in the centuries beyond us, no latter-day Lord Tennyson may ever write such lilting, lofty words about Harry S. Truman.

He hasn't the color of Ulysses. About him there is no clang of swords on shields, nor warriors dashing to the siege of Troy.

His is the mundane lot of being captain of a ship of state, faced not by broadsides of a challenging, wartime foeman, but by astute would-be successors in a peacetime, election year.

It's not an easy lot. In his position he cannot point the guns and fire. Dignity demands that he stand and do his job—and be the target.

Perhaps he hasn't done it well. Any number of candidates to succeed him will tell you that.

Certain things are unfortunate. He hasn't the Presidential figure of a Harding. He hasn't the political skill of riding seven horses that Franklin Roosevelt had.

He is somewhat the average man—any of us—suddenly catapulted by fate into the White House. That may the reason why the man in the street still likes him—even though the king-makers have written him off.

What would we do if we were in his place? We have a feeling that, to the best of our lights, we would do the honest, sincere, fair, and just thing—hewing to the line of Americanism and letting the political chips drop where they had a mind to.

And one thing more, in his place—we would like to have what Ulysses and what Harry S. Truman have in common—courage.

No one can ever take that away from him. In an election year, running for another term, Mr. Truman has displayed a high courage in domestic and international affairs.

He challenged Russia in Greece. He defied Russia in Europe. He plumped for equal rights, knowing it would cost him the South. He went through on John L. Lewis, even when the GOP pulled the props from under him.

In the Thermopylae which certain railroad union leaders created, unmindful of possible resentment of labor in the fall balloting, he stood his ground and forced those forcing the Government to retreat.

Any corner politician, tilting back his derby and whispering out of the side of his mouth, will tell you that it was not smart.

No, Mr. Truman has not been smart. Unlike the rest of us, he has made mistakes. Unlike a lot of us, he has not been afraid to admit his blunders.

It does not matter that he has borne greater burdens and faced greater crises than any President in the peacetime history of America.

He has not been clever. He does not duck, dodge, weasel, or beg questions. He generally meets the problems head-on—as a President should—as an American should—with courage.

And come November, that rare and needed quality in public life which he has shown—unmindful of his own personal fortunes—may garner him a lot of votes.

Foreign Policy—An Inconsistent Crazy Quilt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Leigh White writes from Tripoli, Lebanon, under date of May 10, that our foreign policy in Palestine is actually undermining the Marshall plan program for western Europe. He points out that the Iraq Petroleum Co.'s pipe lines to the eastern Mediterranean have been shut down for the first time in its history. Further, that Greece, Turkey, Syria, Lebanon, Palestine, and the French colonies in north Africa are facing a desperate shortage of petroleum products. It is a fair question, I believe, to ask President Truman and Secretary Marshall just when this crazy-quilt pattern of foreign policy will come to an end so that the people of this country might know what to expect on the international front. I am including Mr. White's article, under leave to extend my remarks, taken from the Washington Star of May 10, 1948:

UNITED STATES PALESTINE POLICY SEEN AS SABOTAGING MARSHALL PLAN AIMS

(By Leigh White)

TRIPOLI, LEBANON, May 10.—The Marshall plan is being sabotaged as effectively by American policy in Palestine as by Soviet policy anywhere in Europe.

For the first time in its history, both of the Iraq Petroleum Co.'s pipe lines to the eastern Mediterranean have been shut down.

Greece, Turkey, Syria, Lebanon, Palestine, and the French colonies of north Africa, consequently, are faced with a desperate shortage of gasoline, kerosene, Diesel oil, and other indispensable petroleum products.

SUPPLIES CUT OFF

All but a small fraction of Iraq Petroleum's daily production of 90,000 barrels is normally distributed to these countries. They now will be dependent on extra shipments of petroleum from the United States and the Persian Gulf.

Every tanker thus diverted—and larger petroleum export production has filled five tankers a week—will mean one less tankerload of oil for countries benefiting from the Marshall plan.

The pipe line to Haifa was shut down following the closing of the consolidated refinery there after Arab workers had gone on strike in a vain effort to deter Jews from seizing control of the city.

The pipe line to control Tripoli was closed down last week by a strike of Arab workers at K–3 and other pump stations between here and the company's production center at Kirkuk.

BRITISH MAY BE MOVED

Because of the increased violence of rioting in Iraq, the company is considering the advisability of evacuating its British personnel from Kirkuk for the duration of the war in Palestine. Company airplanes already have begun to evacuate British personnel from pump stations in Iraq and Syria.

Plans for doubling the Tripoli refinery's capacity to 30,000 barrels have been abandoned.

All work on Iraq Petroleum's new pipe line from Kirkuk to Haifa has been indefinitely suspended, and the company's Haifa office has been permanently transferred to Tripoli.

The new pipe line to Haifa, which has been completed as far as the Palestinian border, would have enabled the company to increase its production by next September to 150,000 barrels.

Another battle in the cold war against the United States has thus been won by the Soviet Union.

Closing down of Iraq petroleum has nullified the Arabian American Oil Co.'s successful effort to increase its production in Saudi Arabia this year from 300,000 to 400,000 barrels.

National Security Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 1948

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply interested in the remarks made at another place concerning the Air Force supplemental appropriation bill. Discussing the confusion

existing within our Military Establishment, it was said:

We must * * * develop a better system for making our large-scale military preparations. Obviously, the Secretary of Defense needs more help. Obviously, the Congress must approach the task with more balance and more understanding.

In fact, it has become painfully clear that no satisfactory method at present exists to resolve the differences between the armed services and to produce an intelligent and integrated plan. * * * The controversy is passed on to Congress and we here are thus required to resolve a technical dispute between professionals. It is utterly preposterous and would be comical if the consequences were not so dangerous.

These few words outline the incongruous position in which Congress has been placed by the controversy raging in the Pentagon. Indicative of the confusion that exists is the fact that the dispute is being settled in our Appropriations Committees and during our consideration of money bills. It is a dangerous method of determining our national security policy.

Yet, I believe that there presently exists a satisfactory method of resolving the present dilemma. I called attention to that method during a speech on the floor on May 3, which may be found on page 5211 of the RECORD. In that speech, I called attention to the provisions of the National Security Act of 1947, and to a method for resolving the military controversy—the intelligent use of the National Security Council.

What is the National Security Council?

It is an advisory body to the President and is composed of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the Military Departments, the Secretary of State, and the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

What is its function?

It is specifically charged with the duty of assessing and appraising the objectives, commitments and risks of the United States in relation to our actual and potential military power and of considering policies on matters of common interest to the departments and agencies concerned with national security.

Is it equipped to function? Its 1949 budget calls for 1 executive secretary at $10,000 per annum, 1 assistant secretary at $9,975, 1 coordinator at $9,975, 4 staff members at $39,900, 1 assistant secretary at $8,180, 1 assistant to the coordinator at $8,180, 4 assistant staff members, 3 research analysts and 14 clerical assistants.

Is it in operation? It has met 10 times since September, I am told, and it has made recommendations to the President, all of which have been unanimous.

If we were to sit down and attempt to formulate specific legislation creating an executive agency for the purpose of bringing some sense out of our military muddle, we could not do much better than to accept as it is the National Security Council, as provided for in the Unification Act.

Unfortunately, we are unable to make use of the recommendations of the body which, in a trice, could resolve all of the differences which have arisen in our consideration of defense measures.

Under the act we created this agency as an advisory body to the President and left him with full discretion as to the publicity to be given to its recommendations. This may prove to be a fatal defect insofar as the usefulness of this agency is concerned. Congress, in passing the National Security Act, probably intended that the President, as Commander in Chief, should be provided with the best possible advice concerning the over-all aspects of national security. But I cannot believe it was intended that Congress, which has the responsibility of providing for the common defense, should not have the benefit of the recommendations of this important coordinating agency. For if the precedent of keeping the recommendations of the Council secret is firmly established, then we shall always be faced with the prospect, as is happening today, of attempting to choose between the conflicting requests of the heads of competing military departments. If the recommendations, on the other hand, are made known, then we in Congress will have the advantage of the considered opinion of the highest representatives of all elements in our national security picture, acting as a group in the best interests of all concerned.

The President, of course, has full power to make known the recommendations of this group. I called upon him to do this on May 3. It is the simplest way to bring order out of the mass of confused recommendations with which the services have bombarded us. It would establish a precedent that would go far toward giving more complete meaning to the Unification Act. I am still of the opinion that the President should at once request the Council for a complete report on our national security objectives and requirements in a form suitable for transmission to Congress.

However, I do not think it wise that we wait upon the President for action so vitally necesssary. I believe we should open for serious debate the whole question of the future usage of this potentially valuable agency. Accordingly, I am today introducing a bill to accomplish that purpose.

The purpose of the bill, which takes the form of an amendment to the National Security Act, is simply this: To make available to the Congress, if the Congress so desires, the recommendations of the National Security Council, and at the same time to safeguard against the release of any information which must, by its nature, be kept secret. It may be that the measure I am introducing will require perfecting, but I submit it in haste because of the overwhelming necessity of preventing further disintegration within our National Military Establishment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed, immediately following my remarks, the text of the bill to which I have referred and an article entitled "Behind Armed Services Disunification," by Roscoe Drummond, which appeared in the May 11 issue of the Christian Science Monitor:

A bill to amend section 101 of the National Security Act of 1947

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (d) of section 101 of the National Security Act of 1947 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) The Council shall, from time to time, make such recommendations, and such other reports to the President, as it deems appropriate or as the President may require, and the President shall, as he deems appropriate or as the Congress may request by concurrent resolution, make the substance of such reports and recommendations known to the Congress, but, in reporting to Congress, the President shall not be required to include any information which the Council decides should be withheld for security reasons."

[From the Christian Science Monitor of May 11, 1948]

BEHIND ARMED SERVICES DISUNIFICATION

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The public is not yet being allowed to know the full failure of the attempted unification of the armed services.

The public is not yet being allowed to know how disunited the Army, Navy, and Air Force have become at a time when the need for unity was never greater.

The public is not yet being allowed to know that beneath the facade of unification there is greater disunity among the armed services today than before the Unification Act was passed.

Obviously, this condition is not going to get corrected until the facts are faced frankly. Since they are not being faced frankly by the military leaders, since they are being concealed as much as possible from public view, it is evident that the facts must be brought out into the open by those who have access to them. Congress and the country will have to resolve the most grievous service disunities as long as the service leaders themselves are proving either unwilling or unable to do so.

Here are the bald facts which for the most part are being covered up by a screen of military double talk and by fancy words from the civilian heads of the Defense Department:

1. Despite words, the armed services have achieved nothing, in fact, remotely approaching a unified concept for an over-all strategic defense plan by which the United States would be able either to defend itself at home or carry an offense to a potential enemy.

2. There is yet no agreement whatsoever on the respective tactical roles which the Air Force, Navy, and Army shall play in the common defense. There is not only no joint operation in sight, no single command in sight, but no agreement on the assigned role which each should play separately.

3. Furthermore, there is no mechanism within the armed services which assuredly can produce a unified strategic plan of defense and assign the respective roles of each service because the unification bill did not provide a unified command to run the "unified" Army, Navy, and Air Force. The present Joint Chiefs of Staff cannot assuredly produce such a unified plan of defense because, just like the Security Council of the United Nations, it can act only when it is unanimous. Thus, the Navy, Army, and Air Force each has a veto over any plan the others might wish to adopt, and stalemate is the result. Stalemate has been the result for more than a year.

4. Today, instead of the Department of Defense presenting a unified military program and a coordinated military budget to Congress, each of the armed services is competing for money from Congress by presenting to

Congress competitive military programs loaded in its favor. In consequence, congressional laymen are being called upon to judge between the competing services and to attempt to devise something of a coordinated military program because the military leaders of the separate armed services are unable to coordinate it themselves. Thus far, there has been no coordination either in the armed services or in Congress.

5. Finally, in face of such disunification at the top, the armed services today are riddled with internecine jealousy, knifing, mutual belittlement, and grand-scale noncooperation.

This is not a pleasant sight. But it is worse than that. It is a dangerous state of affairs.

It deserves to be understood that the present disunification of the armed services does not spring from the so-called unification bill. It is simply that the unification bill has not brought unification because the legislation permitted but did not compel unification.

There is a reason for the prevailing jealousy and disunity between the armed services, primarily between the Air Force and the Navy. The reason is that one of the most delicate, difficult, and far-reaching decisions has to be made right at this time. That decision is which of the armed services—in this instance, whether the Air Force or the Navy—shall be the real, agreed, all-powerful striking force in the plan of American defense.

The nature of this decision explains, though it certainly does not justify, the present state of almost total disunity in the armed services. No decision is being made today. The attempt to do so, when Secretary of Defense Forrestal took the generals and admirals and figuratively locked them up together at Key West a few weeks ago, was a fiasco.

The development of a unified American defense plan, the necessary integration of the armed services to carry out a unified defense plan, and an intelligent allocation of funds based upon a unified defense plan are today all going by default.

Confused Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, the following article written by Mr. David Lawrence appeared in the Washington Evening Star of May 13.

I agree wholeheartedly with the thoughts expressed by Mr. Lawrence:

TRUMAN AND MARSHALL BUSY APOLOGIZING FOR DECLARATION TO RUSSIA—WORDS ADD TO CONFUSION OF AMERICAN PEOPLE ON UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

(By David Lawrence)

Having made a declaration that thrilled the world, the White House and the State Department have since spent most of the time apologizing for it and even minimizing its importance.

Originally designed as a statement to clear up confusion that might exist in the minds of Russians concerning American foreign policy, Secretary Marshall and President Truman now have succeeded in bringing confusion to Americans as to what really is American policy.

In the note, which was carefully prepared inside the State Department a week ago and then read orally by Ambassador Smith at Moscow to Mr. Molotov, there appeared the following sentence:

"As far as the United States is concerned, the door is always wide open for full discussion and the composing of our differences."

Less than 12 hours after that sentence gave the world the first glimmer of hope that the cold war might be settled, President Truman issued a statement reviewing what was in the note and summarizing it as having two salient points, but carefully omitting all reference to the discussion of differences. The omission was a major blunder. It could make millions of votes for Henry Wallace.

MARSHALL'S STATEMENT

Within a day afterward, the Secretary of State, General Marshall, also issued a carefully prepared statement in which the following words appear:

"General Smith did not ask for any general discussion or negotiation. We have had a long and bitter experience with such efforts. This Government has no intention of entering into bilateral negotiations with the Soviet Government on matters relating to the interests of other governments."

When Secretary Marshall speaks of General Smith he refers to Ambassador Smith, who is on leave from the Army and serving as the head of the American Embassy in Moscow.

Just what does Secretary Marshall mean? The words of the American note certainly indicate a desire for discussion of some kind. Why did Mr. Marshall feel it necessary to apologize or to construe the words of the American note as meaning something entirely different from that which the plain words say?

Maybe Mr. Marshall felt that Britain and France wouldn't like bilateral negotiations on matters affecting them. But the Russian note didn't ask for bilateral negotiations, or anything so formal. It merely welcomed the American note with these words, now given out as the official translation by the State Department:

"The Soviet Government shares the desire, expressed in this statement by the Government of the United States of America, to better these relations and is in agreement with the proposal to proceed with this aim toward a discussion and settlement of the differences between us."

Here is a significant pronouncement and the State Department quibbles about the difference between a proposal and a declaration, or the difference between a negotiation and a discussion. Foreign Secretary Bevin, of Great Britain was far more realistic in his speech to the House of Commons when he said that he didn't understand that a conference was being called. He urged a preparatory exchange of views to get at a precise understanding or else any subsequent conference would be futile.

REVIVED OLD CUSTOM

All that the Russians really have done is to revive the old custom of direct talks through diplomatic representatives, rather than conference by klieg light. They, too, see no use in a multipower conference at this time. But if Secretary Marshall doesn't want Ambassador Smith even to talk about the world situation because it might affect the interests of other governments, then the chances of making peace are hopeless.

The American people will rapidly lose confidence in General Marshall as the right man to head the State Department if he adopts too rigid a position on what ought to be the most flexible process in the whole machinery of modern government—conversations between ambassadors and foreign secretaries. In the old days it was considered tactful for two governments to talk first and lay the foundation for conferences with other governments. Resourceful diplomacy is ready always to discuss and talk about anything and everything, but this does not necessarily mean commitment or agreement in the early stages.

The peoples of the world are way ahead of their technical-minded and captious spokesmen who use phrases that mean something one day and then are disparaged the next day. The big news of the year is contained in the dispatches from Moscow telling of the smiles of satisfaction and sense of relief of the Russian people as they watched the news bulletin boards telling about the latest exchange of notes. This reveals that the Russian people, like the American people, have been worried lest inept governmental leaders should lead them into a needless war. Folks behind the iron curtain apparently are human, too, and have had enough of war.

Tariff Termites and the Meat Famine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article and editorial from the Washington Post, Wednesday, April 28, 1948:

"ME AND MINE" TARIFF THREAT

(By Malvina Lindsay)

FOOTING THE BILL

Another drop in the American standard of living, already falling through inflated prices, is threatened by efforts in Congress of high tariff exponents to weaken if not end the reciprocal-trade agreements program, authority for which expires in June.

Opponents of the program are said now to favor a slow death, or a delayed execution for it rather than an outright killing. Thus openly, at least, this country would not pull the economic cornerstone out from under its whole foreign program, including ERP. It would let the termites of restriction do the job.

Aside from the effect of this on future American trade, employment, prosperity, even on war and peace, is the way it would hit the family dinner table, clothes closet, budget. Economic isolationists when they paid their bills might find their tough policy toward "foreigners'" products had backfired. They probably would find themselves paying a little more for more and more kinds of goods—all because duties were being raised or placed on the innumerable foreign products that enter into daily living.

One of the first results of a weakening of the tariff agreements would be a field day in Washington for the strong lobbies for industries whose products enter materially into the cost of living. The consumer would realize that another trade war was beginning when he found himself paying not only the cost of duties on products he needed but also the higher cost of the "protected" articles produced in the United States.

Clothes prices would soon reflect what was going on. Domestic wool producers, who are most vocal for protection for their relatively small industry, were able to get through the present Congress a bill providing for imposition of wool import quotas. The bill was stopped by a Presidential veto.

Silk prices would no doubt reflect rising tariffs levied in protection of rayon and nylon. Gloves and shoes also would be affected. Hide production in this country is inadequate to meet needs and the customer would have the choice of paying the tariff on

imported leather products or higher prices for domestic ones.

Lobbies of the meat packers, the sugar industry, of the makers of watches, guns, chinaware, pottery, carpets, lace, naturally would press for more protection from foreign products if the country started to go nationalist again in trade. The consumer would foot the bill whether he bought foreign or American.

While the tendency at first is to put tariffs only on foreign goods with which an American industry—usually called "infant" and frequently not especially suited to this country since it seldom grows up on its own momentum—is competing, yet as trade war increases, more and more foreign products are put under duties, even those without American competition. This was what happened after passage of the Smoot-Hawley Act. Americans were paying tariff costs on innumerable articles just because these were foreign.

This country has now become so dependent on foreign products that their variations in cost quickly affect consumers' pocketbooks. If tariffs got out of hand, the consumer might eventually be paying a tariff that hurt every time he ate a banana, pineapple, olive; every time he took an ice cream soda flavored with chocolate, vanilla or coffee, or a cup of tea or coffee, or a soft drink whose basis was cocoa leaves or kola nuts; every time he spread his bread with oleomargarine (because of coconut oil); every time he ate a piece of bacon from a hog fattened on feeds containing foreign elements.

He might pay still more for his sugar, half of which he gets from Cuba. It has been estimated that the cost to consumers of the Cuban sugar agreements is around $300,000,000 annually. Hidden costs of tariffs would also get into farm prices as farmers paid duties on fertilizer, seeds, breeds of livestock, or farm machinery that requires imports for its making.

No one knows how much American consumers pay out of their pockets each year because of tariffs. But this will run a lot higher if it's every man for himself again in international trade.

SOARING MEAT PRICES

Despite the month-old strike of the United Packing House Workers, the country's meat output is not much below the level of a year ago. There is as yet no sign of the predicted spring meat famine, although zooming retail meat prices in the District and elsewhere spell individual meat famines for many low-income families. However, the high level of meat prices cannot be dismissed as a temporary squeeze; it may well be a forerunner of worse to come. For the American people have for a long time been consuming more meat than was currently being produced—living off capital, so to speak, without making adequate provision for replacement.

Progressive depletion of livestock numbers has been encouraged by the sustained high level of demand, supported by high wages and full employment, as well as by high prices for grain that have made the feeding of meat animals unprofitable. The shrinkage in livestock numbers since wartime peaks were attained is alarming in its implications. Cattle numbers, for instance, dropped from 85,500,000 at the beginning of 1945 to 78,600,000 at the beginning of this year; hogs declined from 83,700,000 in 1944 to 55,000,000; stock sheep from 49,300,000 in 1942 to 30,500,000. Last January the number of stock sheep was actually the smallest since records began, in 1867.

Obviously, if we were to continue indefinitely to eat into our livestock reserves, a meat famine of appalling proportions would be the penalty for such improvidence. Sometime—and it should be soon—herds will have to be built up. That process will itself reduce consumable meat supplies, since it necessitates withholding breeding stock from the market. Department of Agriculture experts fear that it will be a good many years before this rebuilding process will reach the stage at which demands for meat can be satisfied. Meantime, the natural increase in population is steadily augmenting the number of would-be future meat consumers. Barring an industrial recession that would curtail effective demand for meat, meat prices will probably be high and may go higher in the months to come. For the indefinite future the outlook is distinctly gloomy.

World Health Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 1948

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which was contained in the Boston Globe of April 30, regarding United States participation in the World Health Organization:

WHY THE BLOCKADE?

(By Uncle Dudley)

Six weeks hence the World Health Organization, one of the most important agencies of the United Nations, will open its first international meeting at Geneva, Switzerland. The 27 countries that have ratified the Charter of this useful organization (thus completing the requirements necessary to get it started) do not include one nation which has a stake in the undertaking equal to if not surpassing that of any other country. That absentee is the United States of America.

Why the House Rules Committee at Washington persists in holding up action which would permit our Nation to participate as a full-fledged member in WHO has never been explained. No statement has issued from the committee, elucidating its reasons for pigeonholing the proposal. It is inconceivable that the answer should be related to the size of the monetary contribution the United States would make as a possible member. That would amount to less than $2,000,000—a sum which, set alongside the astronomical proposals being bandied about in the discussion of defense appropriations, bears the relationship of a flea to Boulder Dam.

The American Medical Association, which has played an admirable part in helping to develop the World Health Organization, as well as a parallel agency, the World Medical Association, confesses total inability to understand why the House at Washington is not being permitted to vote on a project whose aims coincide with the advancement of world health on a cooperative basis among all nations belonging to the United Nations. The delay, says the journal of the American Medical Association, is a decided embarrassment to all American leaders in the domain of public health.

If the inaction of the House embarrasses the profession, it works also a direct damage upon the well-being of the citizens of this country. By thwarting full participation of American leaders in the field of public health in the full activities of WHO at the official level, it severely limits and in many cases will actually prevent benefits derived from exchange of the latest scientific knowledge and experience from flowing to our public.

Illustration of the anomalous situation already created can be found in the forthcoming International Congress on Mental Health, which is to convene in August at London. This gathering is the result of proposals from the World Health Organization and UNESCO. Some 47 countries have already signified willingness to participate officially. The United States is the only one whose scientists in this field find themselves obliged, as a result of the inexplicable inactivity of the House Rules Committee, to attempt to meet the responsibilities the event imposes upon them without proper official status as members of WHO.

Yet here is a gathering which will concern itself with some of the most urgent problems today afflicting the lives of citizens and of states. It proposes to explore questions of contemporary mental hygiene ranging from childhood to old age, relating to the individual in industry and in society, touching upon postwar emotional stresses, the correction of psychiatric distortions, the control of emotions leading to war hysteria and better cooperation among the peoples of the world.

This effort has been well described as "one of the most remarkable demonstrations of the world-wide will to peace" since the close of the recent war, and as an attempt, by bringing together the world's greatest psychiatrists, social scientists in all fields, educators and religious leaders, "to seek out the underlying factors that prepare men to fight and kill each other en masse and the means whereby these factors can be rooted out."

The congress in London will be a working congress, not a speech-making convention. The results of the meeting will be passed on to all countries through the appropriate agencies of WHO, its sponsor.

The Massachusetts Society for Mental Hygiene is helping with this project, together with similar groups elsewhere in the country. Its valuable labors would be aided and the cause of human well-being and happiness would be furthered, if the House Rules Committee would permit this country to take its proper place in WHO.

H. R. 2455

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1948

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, you well know my interest in our program to stock-pile strategic materials for national security. As chairman of No. 3 Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee my record in this field is well known.

Every Member of this House knows that this Nation cannot afford to be dependent on foreign sources for its supplies of strategic and critical materials any more than absolutely necessary.

Vice Admiral Sherman recently stated that the United States Navy guards 33 world sea lanes which have become American life lines because 20 strategic raw materials necessary to our national security flow over them. Aside from the initial cost of those materials one can easily imagine the additional expense of such guarding by our Navy and, in times

of war, convoying as well. Yet we hesitate to spend a few extra dollars to increase our own domestic supply of critical minerals and materials, at much less cost than guarding our sea lanes. It is time we became practical about such matters.

For more than a year there has been before the House a bill to increase domestic production of minerals and materials. This is the so-called Russell mine incentive payment bill, H. R. 2455. In my opinion, this bill should be brought out and favorably acted upon before this Congress adjourns this summer. Every Member of Congress interested in national security should demand prompt action on H. R. 2455.

Collier's Award to Hon. Christian A. Herter, of Massachusetts, for Distinguished Congressional Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 1948

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday morning at the White House President Truman presented our colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] the award from Collier's magazine for distinguished congressional service. Members of the President's Cabinet, members of Collier's committee, and guests of the recipients were present. The chairman of Collier's committee, Mr. Eric A. Johnston, presided. He made an excellent statement of the purpose of the award. I wish to include it at this point. Mr. Johnston said:

Mr. President, a number of circumstances are happily combined to make this a truly memorable occasion. This is, of course, the third anniversary of our victory on the European front—the third VE-day. It is also the third anniversary of the presentation of Collier's congressional awards; but, Mr. President, it is also your birthday.

My good wishes to you are both personal and official. For myself and for all the members of the Collier's committee, I wish you long life and happiness.

Each year you have invited us to the White House and have yourself tendered the Collier's awards to one Member of the Senate and one Member of the House for distinguished service to our country.

This year the committee has a present for you. It is not a birthday present, although I am delighted at the coincidence. It is a special award to you by Collier's in recognition of the splendid interest and encouragement you have given to this annual event.

Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I present you with this special award. It is only a token of our heartfelt appreciation. I know that your real reward is the satisfaction you feel in fostering a contribution to the underlying strength of our democracy.

It is fashionable in some circles today to deride and belittle legislative government. Those who indulge in such practice in America excuse it on the grounds that all Americans enjoy the inalienable right to criticize the Government. With that thought I know that all of us agree.

But it is one thing to criticize an individual legislator or a group of them and quite another to ridicule and deride the institution of the Congress itself. Legislative government—the parliamentary system—is the only machinery through which democracy can function; it is the essence of democracy, the very process of democracy—its life blood.

Throughout the world, wherever democracy prevails, the heart of it is a parliamentary system, freely chosen by the people, answerable only to the people. Wherever dictators rule, the legislative assemblies—by whatever name called—are puppets of the dictators, captives of the state, not servants of the people.

Those who condemn the institution of the Congress are condemning democracy, undermining the sovereign right of the people to govern themselves—and the people in our democracy are supreme.

It was this thought which prompted Collier's to establish its awards. It was also motivated by the fact that in a free-spoken democracy, where there is so much diversity of opinion, that a man in public office—regardless of his achievements—is not often honored within the span of his own life. It is sometimes true that a man in politics must die before he is regarded as a statesman.

The purpose of the Collier's award is to give credit to men of achievement while they are still active in the public service.

Our winners have been chosen by a national committee of men and women interested in public affairs, free to make its selections without reference to the sponsor or to anyone else. The first year, Mr. Owen D. Young was chairman; last year, Mr. Chester C. Davis.

Mr. President, the winners of the Collier's awards for distinguished service in 1947 are Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY, of Kentucky, and Representative CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, of Massachusetts.

No two men, perhaps, ever reached comparable distinction in public life by more diverse pathways. And the reasons for which they were chosen by the committee are as different as their backgrounds.

Senator BARKLEY's youth was spent in the hardest kind of physical labor and in circumstances of crushing poverty. But he had an innate flame of determination and ambition which nothing could crush. He wanted an education, and he proceeded to get it by working for it. Any job looked good to him if it furthered his chances to learn.

Representative HERTER was born in circumstances of comfort and security; he grew up in the cultural settings of European and American cities. The best of education was available to him. Had he chosen to do so, he could have pursued a life of ease and self-indulgence. He chose quite the opposite course. He chose work and self-discipline.

But in one respect, our two winners are entirely alike; in their rise to national and international recognition, wealth proved to be no impediment at all.

Senator BARKLEY was chosen because of his constructive and forward-looking leadership and his continuing demonstration of magnificent devotion to the two-party system—a fundamental of our democratic legislative process. He has won the warm regard and whole-hearted respect of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

It was Representative HERTER's singular and fruitful work in the field of foreign affairs which dictated his selection. The Congress and the country itself have had the benefit of his productive background and experience. His voice contributed in great measure to making the House of Representatives a working partner with the Senate and the executive departments in our foreign affairs. The Herter committee has become a household phrase.

Mr. President, I present to you the distinguished Senator from Kentucky and the distinguished Representative from Massachusetts and ask you to tender to them the Collier's plaques and the two checks for $10,000 each which will go to whatever public purposes the recipients desire.

I also wish to include the following article in Collier's magazine of May 15, 1948, by James C. Derieux:

FOR DISTINGUISHED CONGRESSIONAL SERVICE

Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY, of Kentucky, a Democratic veteran of 35 years in the Congress, and Representative CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, of Massachusetts, a Republican junior now serving his sixth year, are the 1947 winners of Collier's congressional awards for distinguished services to the Republic.

At a White House ceremony May 8—VE-day and also President Truman's birthday—these two legislators will receive from the President's hands the handsome silver plaques to commemorate their high services, and in addition to these tokens Collier's will make two gifts of $10,000 each to public purposes designated by the winners. Announcement of the beneficiaries of the gifts will be made at the awards ceremony.

One of these men was born on a small tobacco farm in Kentucky and knew poverty in his youth. He worked his way through college as a janitor. The other boy was born wealthy. He grew up in cultural settings in European and American cities. He attended the best of schools. But today these two men are nationally and internationally respected. The poor boy and the rich boy have traveled different roads toward the same goal of achievement in the public service. Both have arrived. That is America.

This is the third year in which the Collier's awards have been made. Previous winners have been Senators Arthur H. Vandenberg of Michigan and Robert M. La Follette, Jr., Wisconsin, and Representatives A. S. Mike Monroney, Oklahoma, and Jesse P. Wolcott, Michigan. Under the rules of the Congressional Awards Committee no previous winners are yet eligible to repeat.

The purpose of these unique annual awards by Collier's—one to a Senator and one to a Representative—is to stimulate thoughtful attention to the fundamental role of the Congress in our system of government, to emphasize the fact that representative lawmaking bodies are the symbol and a basic necessity for freedom, and to give due and appropriate recognition to the work of individual legislators.

The selections are made by a committee of distinguished Americans, the membership of which is changed somewhat from year to year. Eric Johnston is the present chairman. Last year, Chester C. Davis was chairman, and the year before that it was Owen D. Young.

The committee does not operate under fixed criteria or rules. Each year it is free to do as it pleases. In selecting the winners for 1947, a number of members felt that it would be wise to eliminate avowed Presidential candidates from consideration, lest the award be mistaken for a political endorsement.

Senator BARKLEY was chosen as Senate winner primarily because of his superb loyalty to the two-party system, which he demonstrated continuously throughout 1947 despite great intraparty difficulties. He accepted a change in status from majority to minority leader without any loss of zeal, without a trace of bad temper, and the manner in which he carried on in the interest of party policy and responsibility won for him increased admiration of his colleagues. On domestic matters he forced party-line decisions whenever he could, and thus helped to clarify the issues on which voters must pass in November. But on international matters, he strove for bipartisan effectiveness.

Said committee advisers: "Under conditions that would have caused a less determined man to walk out and rest, he

continued to work for his country through his party." "His good temper was, as always, a good influence in the Senate." "His ability in rough-and-ready debate, his remarkable capacity to argue powerfully on many and diverse issues, and his acceptance of demotion without a trace of venom, made him the Grand Old Man of the Senate last year. As his position came down, he seemed to grow in stature." "By his wisdom, humor, and moderation, plus his devotion to the system, he has strengthened the concept of party responsibility."

Representative HERTER was winner in the House mainly because of his work in the field of foreign affairs. A few years ago the House had only a small part in determining this Nation's foreign policy. But Mr. HERTER believes foreign affairs and domestic affairs can no longer be separated, and that the House should be in on everything of importance.

So great was Mr. HERTER'S zeal for the House to know the full story and meet its full responsibility that he proposed the now famous Select Committee on Foreign Aid, a group of 17 assorted Representatives, organized them into subgroups, planned detailed on-the-spot studies of European needs, and brought the committee home ready to agree on a program. This was one of the most influential committee actions of recent years.

Here is what several advisory opinions say of him: "The changed attitude of many Members of the House, particularly the conversion of some ardent isolationists, can be attributed to HERTER." * * * "He enabled the House to prepare itself for its new role." * * * "His knowledge of foreign affairs has helped his party steer a clearer course on European relief." * * * "He showed that a congressional committee can devote itself wholly to the business in hand, even when traveling abroad."

ALBEN WILLIAM BARKLEY was born in Graves County, Ky., in 1877, the oldest of eight children. His father was a small tobacco farmer and Alben was his main helper.

From ALBEN'S grandmother he heard stories about her cousin Adlai Stevenson, Vice President of the United States under Cleveland; and about another cousin, James A. "Quinine Jim" McKenzie, a Member of Congress who put through a bill to remove tariff from quinine imports.

The tobacco-farm boy thought that if these two cousins could go places in public life maybe he could, too. Young ALBEN signed up at Marvin College, then located at Clinton, Ky. For 5 years he swept and dusted and shoveled and studied, and got his A. B. when he was 21 years old.

STEPPING STONES TO A POLITICAL CAREER

Then BARKLEY read law in the office of Judge Bishop, of Paducah. He learned shorthand, became a court reporter, and at one time or another studied law formally at Emory in Georgia and at the University of Virginia. His first elective office was that of prosecuting attorney of McCracken County, Ky. Next, he was county judge, and then he came to the House of Representatives in Washington where he served 14 years before moving over to the Senate, where he has been for the past 21 years, as majority leader from 1937 through 1947, and as minority leader now.

Senator BARKLEY'S wife, whom he married in 1903, died last year. He has three children.

The story of CHRISTIAN A. HERTER does not follow traditional lines. His father was a well-to-do American artist, living in Paris when CHRISTIAN was born in 1895. The boy attended French schools, and acquired in those early years the beginnings of his understanding of Europe. In 1904 he returned to the United States. He attended Browning School in New York, and Harvard, where he was graduated with honors when he was 20 years old.

The next year HERTER was an attaché of the American Embassy in Berlin. He also served in Brussels, in the Department of State in Washington, at the Paris Peace Conference, in the European Relief Council of which he was executive secretary, and as a personal assistant to Secretary of Commerce Herbert Hoover.

In 1931 he was elected to the Massachusetts House of Representatives, where he continued to serve for 12 years, the final five as Speaker. Then in 1942 he was elected a Member of the National House of Representatives, where he is now in his third term.

Why has this man, wealthy from birth, worked so hard? The deep reason is that CHRISTIAN HERTER was rejected as physically unfit for service in World War I. That hurt. His brother, Everit Herter, was killed in action.

CHRISTIAN HERTER had to do something to satisfy his own desire to serve, and to carry on as best he could for his brother. And so he has driven himself to use fully his naturally fine ability and his rich experience.

Mr. HERTER married Miss Mary Caroline Pratt in 1917. They have four children.

In the course of its studies of 1947 legislation and legislators, the Collier's congressional awards committee conducted advisory polls of Washington reporters, editors, and commentators, and of newspaper editors in every State.

The Washington newsmen suggested 20 Senators and 21 Representatives for consideration. The five Senators receiving most support in this poll were: BARKLEY, FLANDERS, IVES, TAFT, and TOBEY. The five top Representatives: DIRKSEN, EATON, HALLECK, HERTER, and JOE MARTIN. (Arrangement of names is alphabetical.)

Two hundred and forty-four newspaper editors put forward the names of 38 Senators and 51 Representatives. The top five Senators in this poll were: BARKLEY, BYRD, FLANDERS, MORSE, and TAFT. The House favorites were: HALLECK, HARTLEY, HERTER, KNUTSON, and Speaker MARTIN.

The members of Collier's committee were: Eric A. Johnston, president, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., chairman; Chester C. Davis, president, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis; Elmer Davis, commentator, American Broadcasting Co.; Mark F. Ethridge, publisher, Louisville Courier-Journal; Frank P. Fenton, international representative, American Federation of Labor; Mrs. Dorothy Canfield Fisher, author; Douglas S. Freeman, editor, Richmond News Leader; George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion; Albert Goss, master, National Grange; Paul G. Hoffman, president, the Studebaker Corp., Economic Cooperation Administrator; Ernest M. Hopkins, president emeritus, Dartmouth College; Palmer Hoyt, editor and publisher, Denver Post; Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer, journalist and social worker; Frank L. Mott, dean of University of Missouri School of Journalism; Herbert W. Payne, vice president, Textile Workers Union of America; Miss Josephine Roche, president, Rocky Mountain Fuel Co.; Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., rector, University of Virginia, former Secretary of State; John Stuart, chairman, board of directors, Quaker Oats Co.; Channing H. Tobias, director, Phelps-Stokes Fund; and Owen D. Young, former chairman of the board, General Electric Co.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the Members of the House approve heartily of the award to our colleague. He merits richly this recognition of his ability and of his outstanding contribution to the work of this session.

Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Insurance Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 1948

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today two bills which would increase benefits under the railroad retirement and unemployment insurance system. It seems to me imperative, because of the inadequacy of present benefits compared to present living costs, that these measures should become law before this session closes. Neither bill involves any increase in taxes. Existing funds are ample to support the proposed increases. The need is undeniable. There can be no justifiable reason for failure to pass them immediately.

There are more than 20 bills in the House at the moment which affect railroad retirement alone. I have devoted much time to a study of them. I came to the conclusion that the one which best meets the need for increases in retirement income, without endangering the financial stability of the railroad retirement system is H. R. 5993, introduced by the Honorable ROBERT CROSSER, of Ohio, on March 24, 1948. A bill to increase benefits under the unemployment insurance system, H. R. 5875, also introduced by Mr. CROSSER, also seems to me to be sound and worthy of immediate attention.

Both these bills are before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Neither of them has been reported to the House.

The subject of retirement and unemployment insurance benefits is one of interest to all Members of Congress, quite apart from party considerations. The railroad people who are affected include as may Republicans as Democrats, and vice versa.

I am not suggesting that these bills have thus far failed to receive attention because they were introduced by a Democrat. I think we all recognize that in this field certainly Mr. CROSSER has long since risen to the category of statesmanship, as opposed to partisanship. But I want to bring to every Member of this House the sharp realization that the question of increasing railroad retirement and unemployment insurance benefits is a matter of vital importance to both parties. It is a matter that transcends party politics.

It is for that reason, and that reason alone, that I today introduce one bill, to increase retirement benefits, which is identical to H. R. 5993 introduced by Mr. CROSSER on March 24; and another, to

increase unemployment insurance benefits, which is identical to H. R. 5875, introduced by Mr. CROSSER on March 16.

Two years ago a majority of both parties united to pass what is known as the Crosser amendments. The standards then established were adequate for that time. Because of changing conditions since then they are not adequate now however. These two bills which I have just introduced will in effect supplement the original action of both parties 2 years ago. These bills are in keeping with the purpose of the Congress and in reality are a readjustment of the standards in light of changing needs in keeping with the intent of Congress itself.

Our time is growing short, Mr. Speaker. This is not one of those situations which we can handle next year if we do not get to it now. It is literally a matter of making it possible for these deserving people to get enough to eat. I strongly urge that we delay no longer—that we take immediate steps to pass these sorely needed bills.

An Estimate of the Navajo Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 1948

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, for many months I have been disturbed in reference to the condition of the Navajo and certain other tribes of Indians. This Congress has responded to their needs, and a number of my colleagues have done some excellent work in that regard, but there is a big job yet to do. The Navajos are our people and they have a greater claim on the Government of the United States and the resources of this great Republic than any people in lands lying outside of the borders of our country.

My lifelong friend, Mr. F. R. Kingsley, of Minden, Nebr., writes in reference to the Navajos:

> It is a shame this condition exists. * * * Don't stop until every kid is guaranteed an education. You should see conditions on the reservations. I know because I visit them each year.

Mr. Kingsley is a frequent visitor to the reservations because of his deep interest in Indian crafts. I know he speaks authoritatively.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my remarks further by quoting an article that appeared in the Los Angeles Times on May 10, 1948. The article is as follows:

> In all fairness to those people who participated in the Navajo relief drive of last November and December, I wish to state that many Navajo families were destitute—absolutely at the end of their means.
>
> Thousands were without food and clothing and a cold winter coming on. Anyone with eyes could see the hungry, barefoot children wearing thin towels over their shoulders for coats in the cold November wind. Old people, skin and bones, many blind, would sit on the ground by their hogans in silence, knowing no way to get flour to make bread or a warm blanket to wrap around their thin shoulders.
>
> A trip through the reservation, especially to the faraway, lonely places, brought tears to the eyes of men and women alike. They were indignant to learn that such conditions existed here in the heart of our own country. It was these visitors who brought the situation to our attention.
>
> Something must be done immediately to save these helpless, neglected people. The quickest way—a food and clothing drive. Thank God so many people were so generous. The drive helped for the moment. There is still a lack of many things among the families who live far inland from the railroad towns.
>
> The answer to the over-all Navajo problem will not come from donations alone. Water is their greatest need—wells for the needs of the people and for watering their livestock.
>
> Many dams could be built for irrigating small farms. Good doctors and nurses are dreadfully lacking. Able teachers must be provided. Hundreds more Navajo children could be educated at Sherman Institute—a Government school at Riverside—if and when the old buildings are repaired. There is an excellent school at Riverside for the Indians.
>
> The Indian welfare conference, Los Angeles district, California Federation of Women's Clubs, Navajo trails caravan, and other relief drives were not Communist-inspired as some writers hinted.
>
> May I say to those individuals who tell us that hungry Navajos are not hungry and shivering old men and women are not cold, "None are so blind as those who will not see." Even the wealthiest families out there do not have the comforts, medical aid, schools, or food that the very poor of all other Americans enjoy. Life on the reservation is rugged at best.
>
> Mrs. THOMAS H. HUBBELL,
> *Indian Welfare Chairman, Los Angeles District, California Federation of Women's Clubs.*
> SANTA MONICA.

Cancer—A National Peril

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1948

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to insert in the RECORD an editorial by Harry H. Schlacht entitled "Cancer—A National Peril."

This editorial appeared in the New York Journal-American on May 4, 1948.

I should also like to insert a telegram addressed to Hon. William Randolph Hearst by Mr. Elmer H. Bobst, national campaign chairman of the American Cancer Society, commending Mr. Hearst on the publication of this editorial. The editorial and telegram are as follows:

CANCER—A NATIONAL PERIL

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

Conquer cancer. It is our Nation's great challenge. It is our Nation's great command. It is our Nation's great cause.

It is as holy as the Master's command to heal the sick.

It is the prayer of humanity. It is the crusade of the American Cancer Society.

Cancer is the cruelest killer. It is the foe of mankind. It is the common foe of all. It is our common fight.

CANCER CLAIMS ONE PERSON IN EVERY EIGHT

It strikes all ages. It strikes all races. It strikes rich and poor alike. It strikes close to home.

It is not dismissed with the mental comment: "It can't happen to me."

Ever since Hippocrates in the fourth century before Christ identified by name the malignancy, which we now know as cancer, there has been a reluctance by most people to look into the face of this disease.

Indeed, all through the years little has been done to conquer this dreaded malady.

AN OSTRICHLIKE ATTITUDE HAD BECOME THE ALLY OF CANCER DEATH

From little acorns, great oaks grow. And from well-guided efforts, born of great sympathy, can come a tremendous force for good.

And so, a few years ago, the American Cancer Society was born. It represented a valiant band of noble souls dedicated to the conquest of cancer.

And God seemed to smile on them. And, lo and behold, in a span of a short period there are now over a million volunteers at work in every hamlet, city, and State, closing in on the culprit—cancer.

The American Cancer Society is in the forefront of this godly crusade in bringing relief and succor to the suffering and dying.

LET US SUPPORT THE ACS

It is lifting the curtain of hope to millions. It is conducting a long-needed campaign. It is encouraging a research on all fronts. It is dedicated to a finish fight against cancer.

LET US RALLY TO THIS CAUSE

The American Cancer Society is seeking to raise $16,000,000. It is a crusade to cure cancer. It is a crusade to preserve life.

We spent more than three hundred and seventeen billions in the last war. We lost 280,000 lives. We spent less than $2,000,000 in the cancer-research fight. We lost 607,000 lives.

The problem of cancer is no more impossible than the atomic bomb. The enemy is more destructive and indiscriminating than any foe we faced on the battlefield.

LET US GIVE TO SAVE LIVES

If disaster should strike our people we would wish to alleviate the suffering. Yet in cancer we find an enemy that threatens to kill 17,000,000 of our people.

We face a situation too frightful to contemplate. Can we face it with equanimity.

The health of our Nation is a matter of paramount importance to all of our people. Good health is a priceless asset to the Nation and to the individual.

IT IS OUR GREATEST NATIONAL ASSET

All thoughtful citizens must be alarmed by the increasing incidence of cancer. The physician knows the rank and file of our people must understand that this malady is our national peril.

CANCER DOES NOT WAIT FOR THE CONVENIENCE OF ANY MAN

The American people must realize that this monster is extending its terrifying encroachment upon them, not only every day, not only every minute, but with every heartbeat.

CANCER HAS BECOME THE GREAT DESTROYER OF OUR NATIONAL LIFE

There is every reason to believe that with proper financial support devoted to this menacing problem we shall yet find something, which like sulfa and penicillin will destroy cancer.

We must act to protect ourselves. We must act to protect our loved ones.

Let not one say that it is impossible. It is not only possible, but it is being done.

The American Cancer Society has attacked this problem. It presents a program which indicates what can be done, what must be done, and why funds are urgently needed.

We cannot escape our responsibility. We cannot escape the consequence.

OURS IS THE CHOICE

Cancer must be conquered. It can be counted out. It can be done through ACS.

THE CHANCES OF SUCCESS ARE AS GOOD AS WE MAKE THEM

Let every man, woman, and child throughout the land heed the plea of Elmer H. Bobst, the 1948 national chairman of the American Cancer Society:

"Won't you join that ever-growing list of Americans who have thrown themselves wholeheartedly in this work? If you do, I am sure God will smile upon you, and bestow upon you his blessings.

"Every minute of the day and night, millions of prayers are pouring forth from agonized souls—for relief.

"By heeding these cries of suffering, it is within your power to become true servants of the Lord."

THE SUCCESS OF THIS CAMPAIGN DEPENDS ON YOU

O, Heavenly Father—help us to respond to this appeal in a manner that will deserve Thy blessings.

O, God, free from a most horrible curse millions of your children who were made in Thy image, and whose agony has never been exceeded except by the Master of Men.

THE NEED IS GREAT—THE TIME IS NOW

Become a crusader in this holy cause for a healthier humanity. "And therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls. It tolls for thee."

NEW YORK, *May 6, 1948.*

Mr. WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST, Sr.,
Beverly Hills, Calif.:

The editorial, Cancer, A National Peril, by Harry H. Schlacht, and wonderful Burris Jenkins cartoon published in your newspapers May 4 are a magnificent contribution to the campaign of the American Cancer Society which is appreciated by all of us engaged in this crusade to stamp out cancer. We realize that publication was only possible through your public-spirited recognition of the tremendous threat of cancer to America. In effect you are helping to save lives in aiding the program of the American Cancer Society. The fact that the whole tone of your editorial stressed the theme that a power greater than man's is at work certainly reflects an appreciation of your newspapers for their responsibility in molding public opinion which is aptly phrased in their slogan, "Truth, justice, public service." As you probably know I have been associated with pharmacy medicine all my life and I feel that physicians, dentists, and pharmacists naturally play a most important part in the preservation of health and particularly in the promulgation of proper health measures. In view of the tremendously stimulating spiritual tone of Harry Schlacht's editorial we are sending a reprint of the editorial to every physician, dentist, and pharmacist in the United States with a note from me asking that it be prominently displayed in order that patients may benefit from reading it. Once again, Mr. Hearst, a great happiness must surge through your whole being in the knowledge that through your instrumentality it is possible that thousands of lives may be saved.

ELMER H. BOBST,
National Campaign Chairman,
American Cancer Society.

A New Look at Child Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Brock Chisholm, C. B. E., M. D., executive secretary, Interim Commission, World Health Organization, delivered before the National Health Assembly, Washington, D. C., May 14, 1948:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, at this moment I particularly regret that none of the world health organizations nor anyone else has learned to deal effectively with the common cold. If at any moment during my talk I suddenly stop talking, you will know the reason why. I cannot count on my vocal equipment at the moment.

In speaking to you today, as I have been invited to do, about the new look in child health, I am very happy indeed to be given the opportunity. I appreciate this greatly as a gracious gesture to the new, very young, in fact, not yet quite born, world health organization. However, this new look, not so well known actually, predates the other well-known new look which is in the process again of changing the surface contours of the female species. [Laughter.]

This new look about which I am going to speak to you began something over 2 years ago at a technical preparatory meeting in Paris to concern itself with the drafting of the constitution of an international health organization. The conditions of the world were changing rapidly at that time. This was recognized by these people who met together.

At an international health conference in June and July of 1946, 61, and since then 3 others, making a total of 64 nations signed the constitution of the World Health Organization. Incorporated in this constitution is the new look about which I would like to speak to you briefly.

The beginning of that new look is shown in the first statement in the constitution, which is a definition of health. Never again will the makers of dictionaries have to worry about the meaning of this particular word. The exact meaning is now agreed on officially by 64 nations. Perhaps no other word has been so successfully and completely defined as this word "health." I would remind you that any change in this definition will require a two-thirds vote of the nations. [Laughter.] So, we may with confidence say there is one word in the English-American language whose proper use and whose proper definition we can be quite sure of.

Health is defined as a state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being, not merely the absence of disease or infirmity.

This is the new look. This is a recognition by 64 nations that the necessary equipment of the individual has changed, that never again can we regard people who merely have healthy minds in sound bodies or who enjoy good physical health as being healthy. Never again can such people be considered truly healthy.

The requirements for health now go beyond the old definitions. It is recognized that a necessary part of the equipment of every human being is social health, the ability to live in harmony with other people of other kinds with other traditions, with other religions, and with other social systems throughout the world.

A little later in the constitution of the World Health Organization there was another statement which I might read you. "Healthy development of the child is of basic importance. The ability to live harmoniously in a changing total environment is essential to such development."

That is a statement, again, which was signed by 64 nations. There is no doubt whatever as to its meaning. It means that we, all of us, need to take a new look at the way our children are developing. Unless we are very careful, very careful indeed, and very conscientious, there is still great danger that our children may turn out to be the same kind of people we are. [Laughter.] There could be nothing more disastrous than that. [Laughter.] We are the kind of people who have got the world into the mess it is in now. We are the kind of people, as all of our ancestors have been, who fought each other enthusiastically every 15 or 20 years and have done so throughout all history of the human race. Until quite recently that fact was of relatively little importance. When all of the people fought each other, ordinarily only a few thousand or a few hundred thousand or occasionally a few million people were killed. Times have changed. The efficiency of killing now available to the human being has changed the very conditions of survival in the world. The new and efficient methods of killing, the atomic bomb, and far beyond that, the horrible potentialities of biological warfare, have produced a world situation where it becomes quite clear that our previous methods of competitive survival have become utterly obsolete. It is quite clear now that warfare and suicide are synonymous terms.

It is quite clear that we must learn to live in peace with each other throughout the world. If we do not do so, there is little prospect of our children finishing their lives according to the statistical probabilities on which the life-insurance companies depend. In fact, there is little prospect of any but a few of our population, a very small minority, surviving the next 20 or 25 years if we go on being the kind of people we have been, and if we allow our children to reproduce our patterns.

It is well worth our while to look at the way we were brought up, the way we were developed, and hope to find out what is wrong with us so that we may prevent our children from assuming those same patterns.

There are certain things that are clear now about the development of children. It is clear that there are enormous numbers of adults in the world who lack security, who have lacked from infancy, and because of that lack of security are available as followers specifically of those people who have excessive needs for power, who have neurotic needs for leadership, who have vast needs for individual personal importance and prestige. There will always be such people. We can take it for granted that there will be a continual crop of neurotics in the world for quite a long time yet. They are the potential leaders in strange and weird directions, but it is time we begin to do something about the masses of people who up until now have been available as followers of such people.

It becomes clear that the first necessity is to produce a degree of security in small children that will make it unnecessary for them to search for security in peculiar and unworkable ways when they become adults. Some healthly conditions of security are rather well known. I think it is clear to all of us that the first and primary necessity for the assumption of the finding of security on the part of the human being is a need of complete security in small infancy. Complete security in small infancy does not depend even on adequate food

supply or shelter. There is only one thing on which it does depend to the most important degree, unquestionable, all-embracing, obvious love, and nothing else will give a small child that degree of security on which he can build his citizenship, from which he can afford to adventure into a perilous world. If he does not get it then, he will spend the rest of his life searching for it, and searching for it in strange places where it is not to be found. This, then, is the first reckoning.

Second, the child must be given the opportunity of a pattern, not by precept. There is no use whatever in lecturing children about their responsibilities and where they must go. There is only one way in which a child grows into a pattern, and that is by identifying himself with an elder person, a person whom he admires and loves, and so the responsibility of parents and the teachers of young children is to show children in their own persons and in their own habitual patterns the kind of citizenship that will make it possible for the human race to survive in the future. That has not been done widely in the past.

If the child has the opportunity, he will begin very early a progressive development which will continue throughout his life, but this progressive development may be stopped at any stage by a variety of circumstances. The most common is a lack of pattern close to him which will show him the potentialities in the future.

If the child has the opportunity, he will develop mostly in time and space. He will find himself, first, as a person when he is very small. At first he has only feelings which are unrelated to time, space or person, but gradually he learns that he is a person experiencing. He learns something of space. He learns that there are other places beyond his reach. He learns to affect his immediate environment and then his further environment. He learns there are other areas that are not within his immediate purview. He learns there are other people in his environment. He learns about other members of his family. He learns to adjust to those other members and to demand to a degree that they adjust to him.

If he is developing soundly, he very soon develops a relationship, or potential relationship, to other members of his community, which at first is very small, only his own family, but when he is very young he should be, if developing soundly, developing a responsibility toward other members of his family. I remind you again that he cannot be beaten into doing this. There is only one way he can learn it soundly, by growing into the pattern he sees about him.

If he continues sound development, he will assume the same pattern in regard to the community, the local community. He will find his father, mother, relatives, and elders concerned about the conditions in the community. The persons taking responsibility in this field will be people who are admired by his parents, by his elders. He will learn that this is an admirable pattern, this pattern of taking responsibility in things that are needed for the community.

A little later he may develop, if he is soundly developing, a relationship with wider horizons, his State, his province. Eventually, in a few cases (but I think we must face the fact that it is still in only a relatively few cases) we do have people who reach a status of national citizenship. I will remind you, in case you doubt what I am saying, that the status of national citizenship requires an equal degree of loyalty to all the members of the national community, all the members, irrespective of race, religion, or color, or any other group characteristic. Only such people as have attained such status can be regarded as national citizens in the full sense of the term. Up until quite recently, national citizenship was enough. We have gotten by with national citizenship up until now, but now the world has changed, and no longer is national citizenship alone, and that in only a minority of the people, sufficient to preserve the human race in the future.

There is an acute and immediate need for world citizens. There is an absolute necessity in the future for people who will assume responsibility for the welfare of the human race, everything, not just locally, not just nationally, but for the whole human race.

It is this pattern, if showed to children, toward which they may develop, and toward which it is to be hoped that enough of them may approach soon enough, that is the only hope of survival of the human race for another generation or so.

In another field the child develops at the same time, the field of time. At first, in infancy, there is no past and no future. There is only now. Soon the child learns a little of the past and a little of the future. He projects himself into tomorrow and the next day. By the time he is 4 or 5 years old he should be able to give up something today to get something better tomorrow or next week. By the time he has reached his early teens he should be functioning a considerable period ahead of the present. By the time he is in the middle or late teens he should be functioning at least 10 years ahead of the present. He should have a picture of himself in relation to the community. He should have assumed responsibility for what he will be like and what his relationship will be to the community at least 10 years ahead of himself. By the time a person has reached maturity, or that stage of maturity that is appropriate to this degree of evolution of the human race, he should be thinking in terms of at least two or three generations.

Again, in the past it did not matter if time did not develop beyond much the here-and-now stage. In the future it matters, and it matters enormously. Whatever we do, whatever we say, however we expect our children, whatever we say that may be reported in other countries (and things we say are reported in other countries), all people who are truly mature, appropriately mature, to this generation, must consider the effects on the future, not just this year or next, but the far future.

These, for people brought up the way we have been brought up, are difficult concepts. These are extraordinarily difficult goals for us, but we can make them very much easier indeed for our children if we start soon enough, if we catch them young and do not spoil them as most of us have been spoiled.

Particularly, it is highly desirable that the next generation should not be able to fool themselves as casually and as unconsciously and as easily as we have done. They should not be the same kinds of people who can avoid unpleasant things by not looking at them. They should not be brought up, as many of us have been brought up, on a perfectly ghastly symbol that I am afraid many of you have seen in the quite civilized homes. The symbol I refer to is the three little monkeys, one with his hands over his ears, who will hear nothing distressing, who will hear no evil; another with his hands over his eyes, who will see no evil; another with his hands over his mouth preventing his saying anything about it.

This is the epitome of the laissez-faire attitude most of us were taught. If there is evil, we need to see it. Whenever evil lies we need to talk about it. We need to hear about it, and we need to take our responsibility about doing something about it. In this field we need to change our symbolism for our children. It is this teaching of avoiding evil, avoiding seeing or hearing or speaking about it, that has allowed wars to arrive in the past, always to our astonishment, because we did not take responsibility soon enough.

There is a field in which responsibility needs to be shown to children, which in any country, including this one, is rather a delicate matter. It has to do with our social responsibility in relation to social organization. It has to do with our voting, our electing people to positions of responsibility in our governments in every country. Our selection of these people by how we vote puts our lives and the lives of our children in their hands; our human relations as between nations and as between groups of peoples throughout the world are in the hands of the people whom we elect to offices under our governments.

It is very important, indeed, in the future, as it has not been important in the past, or relatively unimportant in the past, that we elect people who are capable of assuming that responsibility and whom we can trust not to allow all of our children to die during the next generation.

The requirements are heavy. The responsibility on legislators and on people in government is immense. It is time we began to assume our responsibility in that field and to recognize that human relations throughout the world are the important matters, not our little affairs at home, not our own little comforts or our local peace, not our own ability to make a little more money or to have a bigger and better car, but the feelings of millions of people in other parts of the world about us. These are the important things. These are the things that are going to keep us alive or kill us off within the next few years.

Our up-bringing has made it very difficult for us to see these matters. It is important that our children should not be so handicapped. The biggest business in the world, and the most important business in the world, the business which outweighs all other values in the world, is the business of rearing children. This has the greatest importance. The world will be what the children of the next generation make it. It is not just a question of these children being able to live in whatever the world may be like 25 or 30 years from now, but it is a question of what kind of world our children will make, because the time has come when it is essential that man should learn no longer to drift but to take charge of his own destiny as we have not been able to do in our own generation. In order to do this our children must be freed of many of our taboos, many of our anxieties, and many of our unfounded fears.

They must be free to think in all directions, irrespective of the peculiar ideas of their parents. We must face the fact that we have many peculiarities.

One sees horrible things happen in relation to children now. One sees evidence of parents exposing their superstitions to children who are developing. One sees grown-up people avoiding the number 13 or something of that kind. We see them teaching children that there is no relationship between cause and effect, that the world is full of magics, that there is no possibility of controlling things, except through rituals or weird magics of some kind or another. Our children in the future, if they are to survive at all, must be realists. They must be able to face reality. They must not have available to them the escapes we have had into a fantastic world that does not exist. They must be able to face the reality of their own natures, of their own aggressive drive. They must learn how to cope with these, as we have not coped with them effectively.

It is in this mental-health field to which the 64 nations call attention, and the result in the social-health field that we find the things that need to be done most particularly in the future. For instance, there is no problem in the world in relation to, shall we say,

malaria, tuberculosis, venereal-disease control, smallpox, diphtheria, and very many other diseases, except a mental and social problem. All of these diseases can be eradicated from the world very quickly if and when we have mental and social health-conscious people. Until we have that it cannot be done.

I finish by reminding you of our personal responsibility in this regard. This is not a matter for us all in the area of making speeches and writing about it. It is a matter for simple words simply put. It is a matter for personal and individual responsibility in relation to our own children and the children in our immediate vicinity. This responsibility is for every person who is sufficiently emotionally and socially developed to take it up, and it is a responsibility which cannot be avoided. [Applause.]

The People Want Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following articles, two of which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of May 12, 1948, and two by David Lawrence in the Washington Evening Star of May 13 and 14, 1948:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of May 12, 1948]

THE PEOPLE WANT PEACE

(By Erwin D. Canham)

It was quite apparent today that the whole world would like to see direct negotiations between the United States and Russia—if there is any chance at all of such talks being successful. But if there is no possibility of agreement—if neither Russia nor the United States is willing to yield from previously irreconcilable positions—then peace talks would be one more deception on the public, one more diplomatic trick.

On May 4, American Ambassador Walter Bedell Smith saw Commisser Vyacheslav M. Molotov. The Ambassador delivered what is called a verbal note in which he made two salient points. These points were later summarized by President Truman as follows:

"The policies of the United States Government in international questions have been made amply clear in recent months and weeks. [By that, Mr. Truman meant the European recovery program and American rearmament.] They [these two policies] have the support of the overwhelming majority of the American people. They will continue to be vigorously and firmly prosecuted. On the other hand, this Government wishes to make it unmistakably clear that the United States has no hostile or aggressive designs whatsoever with respect to the Soviet Union."

But in addition to making these points—and a number of others, with great force and clarity—Ambassador Smith used these words: "As far as the United States is concerned, the door is always wide open for full discussion and composing of our differences."

It is that last sentence which the Russians are said to have construed to be an invitation to direct, two-power negotiations, and which Mr. Molotov accepted. But the statement, as Mr. Molotov must have known very well, was nothing new. It is precisely the same phraseology President Truman used in his rearmament message to Congress on March 27.

It was greatly to Ambassador Smith's surprise, shortly after he left Mr. Molotov on a second interview, that the Moscow radio went on the air with a broadcast which was taken to be an acceptance of an invitation.

Now the big question is this: Is there something hopeful or real or important in the Soviet action in pulling a conference rabbit out of an American diplomatic note? Is it a conciliatory gesture? Or is it a diplomatic trick? Since, if the Russians really wanted to talk seriously and constructively, the last thing they would have done was to have broadcast about it, the unavoidable implication is that we are dealing with nothing more than a diplomatic maneuver.

But it is a maneuver that has had astonishing results. In Moscow, cables Edmund Stevens, The Christian Science Monitor's correspondent, the mood of the people was one of exultant excitement. Street boards where morning papers are posted were beseiged by throngs of readers. There is a very evident desire among the people to see Russian-American relations improved.

And the Moscow Government has been reflecting a milder attitude on many problems. The press attacks on the West have greatly moderated, despite the Italian and Berlin crises.

More important still, Pravda this week published a full and objective summary of Secretary Marshall's speech on the necessity of supporting the United Nations. And I can say from personal knowledge and daily participation that at the Geneva Conference on Freedom of Information, the Russians were unusually conciliatory.

Meantime, in Washington, the response to what was thought to be an American invitation and a Russian acceptance, was equally striking. The shrewd old-timers reserved comment, but a number of other Senators and Representatives plunged in. Speaker MARTIN went as far as anybody when he said: "I think every effort should be made to reach a rapprochement between the two countries. I'm glad to see it's being done." Senator CONNALLY said: "It's a very sensible thing." But Senator GEORGE said the Moscow statement was "just a lot of double talk." And Representative JUDD of Minnesota said it was "another clever move in the Russians' diplomatic warfare."

So peace hasn't broken out, after all. Not even peace negotiations. But the statesmen might very well take note of the extreme eagerness of the people. That is a kind of bargaining weakness on both sides. But it could be a bargaining strength, too, once the Soviet Union is willing to reach firm agreements and abide by them.

However, the two Governments are still very far apart. That is shown in the two notes, which every citizen ought to read and ponder. American citizens can read the full text of both statements. Russians cannot read all of Ambassador Smith's statement. Four salient points, at least, were left out before it was published and broadcast in Moscow.

Those points were, Ambassador Smith's statement that he put the situation frankly to the Russians in 1946; his statement that western Europe and the United States are drawing together in mutual self-protection, but only in self-protection; his statement that the Soviet press has presented a dangerously distorted and erroneous picture of American policy; and his statement that the Soviet leaders have it in their power to alleviate many of the situations which weigh so heavily on all international life.

In view of such omissions, we still have some distance to go before a basis of genuine understanding can be reached between the two Governments and the two peoples. What is clear—and all that is clear—is that both peoples want an agreement.

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 13, 1948]

TRUMAN AND MARSHALL BUSY APOLOGIZING FOR DECLARATION TO RUSSIA—WORDS ADD TO CONFUSION OF AMERICAN PEOPLE ON UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

(By David Lawrence)

Having made a declaration that thrilled the world, the White House and the State Department have since spent most of the time apologizing for it and even minimizing its importance.

Originally designed as a statement to clear up confusion that might exist in the minds of Russians concerning American foreign policy, Secretary Marshall and President Truman now have succeeded in bringing confusion to Americans as to what really is American policy.

In the note, which was carefully prepared inside the State Department a week ago and then read orally by Ambassador Smith at Moscow to Mr. Molotov, there appeared the following sentence:

"As far as the United States is concerned, the door is always wide open for full discussion and the composing of our differences."

Less than 12 hours after that sentence gave the world the first glimmer of hope that the cold war might be settled, President Truman issued a statement reviewing what was in the note and summarizing it as having two salient points but carefully omitting all reference to the discussion of differences. The omission was a major blunder. It could make millions of votes for Henry Wallace.

MARSHALL'S STATEMENT

Within a day afterward, the Secretary of State, General Marshall, also issued a carefully prepared statement in which the following words appear:

"General Smith did not ask for any general discussion or negotiation. We have had a long and bitter experience with such efforts. This Government has no intention of entering into bilateral negotiations with the Soviet Government on matters relating to the interests of other governments."

When Secretary Marshall speaks of General Smith he refers to Ambassador Smith, who is on leave from the Army and serving as the head of the American Embassy in Moscow.

Just what does Secretary Marshall mean? The words of the American note certainly indicate a desire for discussion of some kind. Why did Mr. Marshall feel it necessary to apologize or to construe the words of the American note as meaning something entirely different from that which the plain words say?

Maybe Mr. Marshall felt that Britain and France wouldn't like bilateral negotiations on matters affecting them. But the Russian note didn't ask for bilateral negotiations, or anything so formal. It merely welcomed the American note with these words, now given out as the official translation by the State Department:

"The Soviet Government shares the desire, expressed in this statement by the Government of the United States of America, to better these relations and is in agreement with the proposal to proceed with this aim toward a discussion and settlement of the differences between us."

Here is a significant pronouncement and the State Department quibbles about the difference between a proposal and a declaration, or the difference between a negotiation and a discussion. Foreign Secretary Bevin, of Great Britain, was far more realistic in his speech to the House of Commons when he said that he didn't understand that a conference was being called. He urged a preparatory exchange of views to get at a precise understanding, or else any subsequent conference would be futile.

REVIVED OLD CUSTOM

All that the Russians really have done is to revive the old custom of direct talks through diplomatic representatives, rather than conference by Klieg light. They, too, see no use in a multipower conference at this time. But if Secretary Marshall doesn't want Ambassador Smith even to talk about the world situation because it might affect the interests of other governments, then the chances of making peace are hopeless.

The American people will rapidly lose confidence in General Marshall as the right man to head the State Department if he adopts too rigid a position on what ought to be the most flexible process in the whole machinery of modern government—conversations between ambassadors and foreign secretaries. In the old days it was considered tactful for two governments to talk first and lay the foundation for conferences with other governments. Resourceful diplomacy is ready always to discuss and talk about anything and everything, but this does not necessarily mean commitment or agreement in the early stages.

The peoples of the world are way ahead of their technical minded and captious spokesmen who use phrases that mean something one day and then are disparaged the next day. The big news of the year is contained in the dispatches from Moscow telling of the smiles of satisfaction and sense of relief of the Russian people as they watched the news bulletin boards telling about the latest exchange of notes. This reveals that the Russian people, like the American people, have been worried lest inept governmental leaders should lead them into a needless war. Folks behind the iron curtain apparently are human, too, and have had enough of war.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of May 12, 1948]

HOLD THE DOOR OPEN

The mere opening of the possibility of Russian-American peace talks has vastly excited the world. Despite somewhat sour second-day explanations of the Smith-Molotov exchange, we must still hope for some good result from it. We trust the American Government will also take a positive attitude which will make the most of the shift from emphasis on disagreement to emphasis on the possibility of agreement.

It seems to us that Washington must avoid a negative position. Mr. Molotov plainly twisted the meaning of the American statement. He may have been merely seizing a chance to say—to his own people and to war-weary Europeans—"See, we are trying to make peace with America." He may have been seeking to put Washington on the spot. If so, he surely succeeds if the United States makes no better answer than, "We didn't mean to propose peace talks. We were only using a polite but meaningless phrase when we said, 'The door is always wide open for full discussion and the composing of our differences.'" That's not good enough—whatever Moscow's motives.

If Mr. Molotov was really seeking a settlement, he might well take this approach. He would not want to appear too eager, fearing to injure his trading position. And if Russia means business, surely the United States can at least say, "What do you propose?"

Of course it would be unwise to open negotiations without clear evidence that conditions favorable to success now exist. One essential condition is a situation in which it is to the advantage of both parties to end the current cold war.

There are increasing signs that it has reached a point of diminishing returns for Russia. Successes of the Marshall plan, failure in Italy's elections, moves to unify and arm the west, plus real economic difficulties behind the iron curtain—all these argue that Moscow needs a new policy. It may appear that Washington should now be in no hurry for a settlement. The American position should improve as Europe's recovery and its own arms program advance. But there are sharp stresses in the situation—such as the new risks of inflation—from which Americans would welcome release.

What form could a settlement take? The Smith statement said that certain "manifestations" of American policy which "apparently are unwelcome in Moscow" had been made necessary by the attempts of Communist minorities to seize power in various countries—and would cease when those attempts ceased. Once it was clear Russian policy had changed, these "manifestations" might include recent strictures on trade with Russia; the reshaping of Germany; building of bases near Russia; and military aid to anti-Communists.

Indeed, the most likely direction of peace talks would be toward agreement on spheres of influence, each to keep within its own. It might be worth while to explore the possibilities in a mutual withdrawal of armies.

No such arrangement would be likely to halt Communist agitation in other countries. But neither would it prevent the United States from offering economic aid and democratic doctrine. Such a competition is not one Americans should fear. It is not necessary to rely on Russian promises; reliance would be rather on Russia's own interest in reduced tensions. The west, of course, must guard against being lulled to sleep. And there will remain the possibility that Moscow might try to overrun Europe. But the only real check on such an attempt today are its risks for Russia. Those will mount as Europe's recovery and America's arms program progress.

It seems to us that United States policy today should aim at keeping the American powder dry—and the door to a settlement with Russia wide open.

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 14, 1948]

RUSSIANS NOTE EPISODE SURE TO BE DEBATED BY CONGRESS, PEOPLE—LACK OF VISION SHOWN BY TRUMAN AND MARSHALL ON "OPEN DOOR" QUIBBLING

(By David Lawrence)

Members of Congress have been talking a good deal among themselves about the exchange of notes between the United States and Russia and their reactions range all the way from puzzlement and dismay to grave concern.

The main preoccupation seems to be that at a critical moment in the history of the United States, when billions upon billions of dollars are being appropriated to strengthen defenses and a peacetime conscription bill is under consideration, there should be such confusion about American foreign policy.

To argue that the Russians indiscreetly made a note public that should have kept confidential merely implies that perhaps the American Government was trying to do something clandestinely which it was not willing to avow publicly. To say that the outstanding differences can best be approached through the machinery of the United Nations is to allow the impression to be built that questions which have hitherto been regarded as outside the UN and subject to four-power or five-power consideration now should be taken up by the UN. Both implications are erroneous but they could be derived from the administration's clumsy statements.

VISION SHOWN LACKING

The fact is that the President and the Secretary of State were caught off base. Even if the publication by Russia of the notes was a clever piece of propagandizing, the administration showed itself not quick-witted enough to take the ball on the rebound and turn it to the advantage of this country in public declarations.

What is lacking is vision and imagination—both of which are the primary attributes of statesmanship. The spectacle of the President and the Secretary of State quibbling as to what was meant after months of a cold war by a direct statement that the door is wide open to discuss differences is not likely to inspire confidence either here or abroad.

Too much has been made about the Russian action in making public a confidential exchange. There was no agreement in advance to keep the notes confidential. There is always a risk that things put in writing will become public. And even if they are, cannot the American Government stand by what it wrote? If not, it will be the Russians who will be saying that the American Government doesn't believe one day in what it writes the previous day.

Had the President and Secretary of State welcomed the publication of the notes and then promptly given to the world a list of the outstanding questions on which there are substantial differences of opinion, the public generally would have seen at a glance that mere decision to sit down and talk does not convey much of an idea as to what kind of agreements are going to be made and what guarantees are forthcoming as to how the agreements will be fulfilled. It was a splendid chance for the American Government to restate its whole case.

MISSED WHOLE POINT

But the American Government overlooked something else. It seems to have missed the whole point of the Russian action. Why did the Soviets make public the exchange? Obviously there could have been only two reasons—to start a peace offensive for propaganda purposes without any sincere intention of carrying it out, or else really to find an honorable way of extricating itself from the "cold war."

There is much evidence to support the latter view. The very manner in which the news was handled in Russia—the absence of attacks on the United States in the propaganda and the manifest attempt to calm the fears of the Russian people with respect to war indicate that Russia had her own internal situation in mind in trying to find a way to reverse her external policies.

If this is the basic purpose, then the giving of publicity to the notes was the only quick way the Russians could show the whole world that they were changing their approach. If they didn't intend this, then subsequent inaction or failure to agree would readily expose the artificiality of the device in a few days. Hence the belief that the Russians intend to follow up the peace approach with some action seems more logical than the theory that the whole idea was merely a trick.

The point that the State Department failed to advise Britain and France in advance is a labored one. The United States didn't intend to make the notes public and presumably in due time would have confidentially advised the Allies. The latter now understand that the Russian decision to make the notes public prevented earlier dispatch to London and Paris of these notes.

RIGHT OF SINGLE ACTION

But even if the United States desired to initiate informal discussions alone at Moscow, there is certainly no rule in diplomacy which requires that such decisions be made known in advance. Sovereign governments have the right of independent action in the discussion stages. It is only when commitments or agreements are about to be made that consultation is necessary for allied harmony.

The whole episode now will be debated inside Congress and by the people. The administration seems to have been bewildered by the incident and public opinion may have to crystallize before the President and Secretary Marshall will realize that what they

started to do—talk things out with the Russians—is not a sin and should not be disavowed. Nobody meanwhile is suggesting that armament preparations really necessary for defense be abandoned. The American people don't want to see any weakening where America is in the right, but they also don't want their leaders to be intransigeant when the other side shows an inclination to grasp at an opening for discussion and negotiation.

The Housing Shortage Is Still Drastic—The Country Awaits Action by the House on the T-E-W Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, on April 30, on the National Broadcasting Co. World News Round-Up broadcast, there was a very interesting housing survey which points out that the biggest sore spot of all is still low-rent housing. This is exactly what the T-E-W bill is designed to cure and exactly what has gotten it the biggest opposition. Inadequately housed millions throughout the country wait for action on the T-E-W bill in this session and place their faith in the assurance that it will not die in committee as it did in the Seventy-ninth Congress. Support for the T-E-W bill is not confined to any group, but pervades groups of every character. There is also appended a letter from the Commission on Christian Social Relations of the Episcopal Diocese of New York in support of the T-E-W bill. This is a conservative statement of opinion, and shows the urgency of bringing up and passing a comprehensive housing bill.

The matter referred to follows:

[From the National Broadcasting Co. World News Roundup, April 30, 1948]

JOHN SWAYZE. Now to wind up our spot check of the housing situation over the Nation. As previously noted, conditions in a southern metropolis, New Orleans, and in a New England city, Boston, are still tight but showing encouraging signs. In Chicago and Cleveland, conditions are bad with no marked improvement predicted in the near future.

Westward to Colorado—Denver our example. There are houses for sale in Denver, but they're high. The question is, can you afford the price? If so, some houses are available. Even this is an improvement over 6 months ago. Rentals are extremely difficult to find. Here, in a summer-resort area, one development of the shortage has been the occupancy of mountain cabins the year around. In sum: In and near Denver the housing problem is still acute but showing a dim light.

Southern California has long been one of the worst spots of all and as might be expected will probably remain tight throughout 1949. However, again as might be expected, the area has come up with a touch of the spectacular in the increase of applications for building permits and in the completion of dwellings. During last month alone the homes started in Los Angeles County will, when completed, handle 25,000 people, which is more than twice the anticipated monthly population increase. During March in the entire southern California area, building permits were let for $101,000,000 worth of housing, the largest in history there.

The biggest sore spot of all is low-rent housing. It is the farthest behind.

Incidentally, on a national scale there has been a marked increase in home ownership. Six million more families own their own homes than did in 1940, which means that more than 800,000 families have been acquiring homes each year. It seems certain that the impelling motive in the case of a good many of these families is the fact they had to buy to find a place to live.

Here in the East an interesting project will get under way next month some 25 or 30 miles from New York City. Supervised by famed architect Frank Lloyd Wright, it will be a cooperative suburban development in which the aim will be twofold—to shave high costs and build more livable houses. It will not be precisely a low-cost housing project but anticipated prices are by no means exorbitant on today's market.

Architect Wright will supervise all plans. Materials will be bought in carload lots on a cooperative basis to save money. Some household equipment—possibly stoves and refrigerators—will be bought the same way. As it looks now, most of the houses will probably follow one of Wright's—shall we say "radical" ideas—that of an "open" plan, with few rooms divided in the customary way by walls. Sliding screens can be utilized for this purpose. Lots of glass and built-in furniture is also planned. I propose to keep an eye on this development and give you a report on it as it progresses.

Our spot check over the Nation was consistent in noting the difficulty in finding rentals. New York City is no exception and here the cry is for apartments. In the midst of this, there bobbed into the news the rather extraordinary case of 15 vacant apartments in a very acceptable section, apartments which have been vacant for 3 years. They belong to an estate and no one seems to know where to find the executrix who controls the apartments, not even relatives. Why they are being allowed to stand dusty and vacant is a poser.

COMMISSION ON CHRISTIAN SOCIAL
RELATIONS OF THE DIOCESE OF
NEW YORK,
New York, N. Y., May 7, 1948.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: May I express my appreciation of the fact that you have signed Discharge Petition No. 6, to bring the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill from the Banking and Currency Committee to the floor of the House.

The Episcopal Diocese of New York, at its annual convention in May 1947, by a unanimous vote adopted a resolution supporting the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. We have been deeply disturbed at the delay that has occurred, and are grateful for your assistance in attempting to bring the measure to a vote.

Incidentally, I am disturbed at the willingness of members of the building industry to accept all the benefits of title 6 of the bill, while at the same time they denounce the public-housing features in the most unmeasured terms as "socialistic" or "communistic." Their position scarcely deserves a lengthy rebuttal. It should suffice to point out that Senator TAFT is neither a Communist or a fellow-traveler, nor is the National Catholic Welfare Council, the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, or the American Legion.

I surely hope that you will support the public-housing features of the bill.

Respectfully,

LELAND B. HENRY,
Executive Director.

A Nation-Old Fight Between the President and Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 1948

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, May 13, the House, by a vote of 219 to 142, passed House Joint Resolution 342, which was drawn and introduced by me, and which, if it becomes law, will require those in the executive departments, other than the President and his confidential advisers, to give to the committees of the Congress, under certain conditions, information which is deemed necessary to enable the Congress to legislate and to ascertain whether laws are being properly enforced.

In the early days of the Republic, our first President, George Washington, refused to give to the Congress certain information which it requested. The information had to do with the foreign policy of the Government. Washington was right because the Constitution expressly places foreign relations under the President.

Various phases of the contest between the President and the Congress, growing out of the request by Congress for information in the possession of the various departments and the refusal of the Presidents to let that information be given have arisen. In practically every instance where the request was not abandoned by the Congress, the information has been given to it by the executive departments.

The courts, practically without exception, have held that, as the Constitution places upon the Congress the duty to legislate, Congress is entitled to information in the possession of the executive departments which it deems necessary to enable it to act intelligently. It seems absurd to claim that individuals in the executive departments which exist only because of an act of Congress and of appropriations made by Congress, can tell Congress that what they do and how they spend the taxpayers' money is none of Congress' business.

I certainly would not have introduced this resolution were it not for the fact that since the coming of the New Deal, and more especially since the advent of the Truman administration, the departments have concealed their wastefulness, inefficiency, and protection of known criminals and gangsters, by refusing to give congressional committees information which undoubtedly would result in exposure of executive officers who have been wasteful, inefficient, and playing on the teams of violators of the law.

The Congress requested the Commerce Department to permit it to see the so-called Condon letter, which was a report from the FBI bearing upon the question of the loyalty of a Dr. Condon, employed in a responsible position by the Government. The Department refused. Congress, by a vote of 301 to 29, called for the production of the letter. Then the President took the letter away from the

Department of Commerce and, figuratively speaking, put it in his pants pocket, told Congress to get it if it could. Makes me think of the big boy on the street corner who grabs the little boy's apple, and when the kid asks for it, the big boy says, "Come and get it if you can." The methods of a bully, if you ask me.

Another instance is where, after the four Capone gangsters, who were convicted of a conspiracy to obtain a million dollars from the motion-picture industry—and they obtained more than half a million from union employees—and who were sentenced to 10 years in the penitentiary, were, after serving a little more than 3½ years, paroled through the efforts of attorneys—one, Dillon, the President's personal friend, who visits in the White House and who twice managed Senator—now President—Truman's campaign; another, Maury Hughes, a personal friend of Attorney General Clark. A congressional committee asked for certain information in the files. That information might, and probably would, have told who was influenced, and how, by the hundreds of thousands of dollars paid in an effort to obtain these paroles. But the Justice Department, under Mr. Clark, refused your committee that information. Is Mr. Attorney General Clark playing on the gangsters' team, or is he on our team?

Behind the iron curtain of the departments lies secure incompetence, wastefulness and corruption—and some Reds. Your Congress is denied a look at what lies there in the dark, and which, if known, might give us a clean house, with a few crooks in or returned to the penitentiary.

If the Congress has the courage of a deermouse, it will fight this issue through to the end, pass the proposed legislation over the President's veto and let the Supreme Court, the majority of whose Members hold office by virtue of the Truman and Roosevelt administrations, pass upon the issue. This resolution points the way for an orderly, constitutional method of deciding, once for all, the Nation-old controversy and conflict between the President and your chosen Representatives.

We Must Join the World Health Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that early action will be taken to bring to the floor of the House for debate and decision a bill which was unanimously approved by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs several months ago.

Next month, the first World Health Organization Assembly will meet in Geneva. Unless we take action promptly to give the World Health Organization our active endorsement and support, we will be represented at this Conferense only as an observer, when we should be there as an active leader in this world-wide and worth-while effort.

We helped to create this organization. Our standing and dignity before the bar of world opinion demand that we not boycott or disavow this creature of our own creation. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a portion of a recent editorial on this subject from the New York Times:

The United States was among the original signers of the constitution of this international agency for the good and logical reason that the battle against germs and ignorance was practical. Since then, WHO has been ratified by 35 nations, including Russia, Britain and China; France is expected to come in shortly. Only the United States of the big powers stands aloof. Presumably because of that example, so has all of South America, except Mexico and Haiti.

It is unthinkable that Congress will allow this situation to go unchallenged. Experts have shown that, apart from crucially needed medical aid for children, malaria and tuberculosis have reduced man's productivity by 85 percent. To take the single instance of Europe, where the first ERP goods are arriving, it is elementary economics that the health of those peoples must be safeguarded and disease arrested. The cost to the United States—and WHO has the support of the American Medical Association, the American Red Cross, the American Social Hygiene Association, the American Psychiatric Association and many others—is but $2,000,000.

The question is: Can the United States afford not to join—indeed, to lead—this crusade for physical and mental health?

Visiting Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. OWENS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 1948

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, again today we are blessed with the visit of many students from all over the Nation. Among them are a large group of girls from the Immaculata High School, which is located at Irving Park Boulevard and Sheridan Road, adjoining the shore of Lake Michigan, in the great city of Chicago. The school is located in the new Twelfth Congressional District of Illinois, in which it is my pleasure to be a candidate for election to the Eighty-first Congress of the United States.

I must say again, as I have heretofore remarked, when I have had occasion to meet and talk with students such as are exemplified by those who are here today from Immaculata School for Girls, that they are fine, clean, intelligent representatives of America who should, and undoubtedly will, help to take care of the future of America. We welcome them to the Capitol, and trust that they will return again and again. We also welcome the fine Sisters who have taken the time to accompany the students and whose loving care means so much to them. We trust that their visit will be enjoyable and long remembered.

The Mundt Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a statement adopted by the executive board of the National Lawyers Guild, Detroit chapter, on May 7, 1948. The statement expresses the guild's reasons for opposing passage of the Mundt-Nixon bill, H. R. 5852:

STATEMENT OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD, DETROIT CHAPTER, NATIONAL LAWYERS' GUILD, IN OPPOSITION TO THE MUNDT-NIXON BILL, ADOPTED MAY 7, 1948

Freedom of speech and association are the main foundations of the Bill of Rights. They are of paramount significance to all Americans. Only through the free conflict of ideas can we hope to solve the great riddles of mankind, the elimination of poverty, insecurity, discrimination, and war. Those who would deny the American people the right to seek the truth, by repressing all opposition to our existing institutions, subvert the democratic process and place the lid upon man's progress toward a better world.

As a bar association, we have a special responsibility to help maintain the Bill of Rights and to defend it with all of our resources against invasion from any source. It is in furtherance of this responsibility and in the light of the foregoing democratic principles, that the executive board of the Detroit Chapter of the National Lawyers Guild pledges the chapter's uncompromising opposition to any enactment designed to stifle, suppress or destroy the freedom of any individual or organization of people in America to express and to peacefully urge acceptance of their views on any public issue.

We have considered carefully the provisions of the "Subversive Activities Control Act, 1948" (the Mundt-Nixon bill), now pending in the Congress of the United States. We are satisfied that the bill is inimical to the national welfare of our fellow citizens; violative of their constitutional liberties; and if enacted into law would, in the period between its enactment and its highly probable invalidation by the Supreme Court, usher in an era of repression unsurpassed in this country since the days of the "Palmer raids."

The Mundt-Nixon bill would impose certain requirements and disabilities on "Communist political" and "Communist front" organizations; requirements which, if complied with by an organization, will inevitably destroy it. If not complied with by a subject organization, severe penalities are incurred by the organization, its officers, and its members. If the Congress may by legislative action thus outlaw one type of organization because the political, social, or economic views of such organizations are not acceptable to a majority of the Congress, then by the same token Congress may effectively ban any other type of organization whose principles it deems "subversive."

Although primarily aimed at the Communist Party, the definitions of "Communist political" and "Communist front" organizations are couched in language sufficiently broad to bring under the bill's condemnation virtually every organization which supports a liberal view on any controversial public issue.

There are several specific reasons why we, as lawyers, are opposed to legislation of this character:

First, we see in the Mundt-Nixon bill an attempt by the ill-famed House Committee on Un-American Activities to do on a national scale what the people of Michigan already have repudiated in their demand for a referendum on the Callahan Act, namely, the dictation of thought by a Government official. We are mindful of the injunction of our Supreme Court in *Board of Education* v. *Barnette* (319 U. S. 624, 642):

"If there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation, it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein. If there are any circumstances which permit an exception, they do not now occur to us."

Second, we see in the Mundt-Nixon bill a hodge-podge of words devoid of ascertainable meaning and cunningly calculated to ensnare the unwary and unsuspecting citizen who attempts to exercise his right of free speech and association. As the Supreme Court has reiterated quite recently (Mar. 29, 1948):

"There must be ascertainable standards of guilt. Men of common intelligence cannot be required to guess at the meaning of the enactment. The vagueness may be uncertain in regard to persons within the scope of the act, or in regard to the applicable tests to ascertain guilty."

"The present case as to a vague statute abridging free speech involves the circulation of only vulgar magazines. The next may call for decision as to free expression of political views in the light of a statute intended to punish subversive activities" (*Winters* v. *People of State of New York* (68 S. Ct. 665, 671)).

Third, we see in the Mundt-Nixon bill a modus operandi whereby the political party in power at any given time may, through its own appointee as Attorney General, effectively maintain itself in power by suppressing any attempt to form a new party or to revitalize an old party. The Supreme Court has observed, very pertinently we think, that—

"Every expression of opinion on matters that are important, has the potentiality of inducing action in the interest of one rather than another group in society. But the group in power at any moment may not impose penal sanctions on peaceful and healthful discussion of matters of public interest merely on a showing that others may thereby be persuaded to take action inconsistent with its interest. Abridgement of the liberty of such discussion can be justified only where the clear danger of substantive evil arises under circumstances affording no opportunity to test the merits of ideas by competition for acceptance in the market of public opinion" (*Thornhill* v. *Alabama* (310 U. S. 68 (1940))).

Fourth, the basic vice in this type of legislation stems not so much from the tragic effect it may have upon individuals or groups who may suffer immediate imprisonment or repression, but rather the pervading atmosphere of fear which such a law would inevitably engender in our country; an atmosphere of fear in which speech, assembly, and political association could no longer be the sacred and free privilege of the many but would become a luxury to be indulged in only at the risk of personal exposure and loss of security.

Fifth, and finally, we find the Mundt-Nixon bill constitutionally objectionable because it is predicated upon the discredited and utterly un-American principle of imputing criminality to persons and organizations merely because they associate with others or share on some controversial topics views which are similar to those held by the persons or groups at which the prohibitions of the bill are ostensibly directed. Here again the Supreme Court has admonished that:

"The doctrine of personal guilt is one of the most fundamental principles of our jurisprudence. It partakes of the very essence of the concept of freedom and due process of law. * * * It prevents the persecution of the innocent for the beliefs and actions of others (*Bridges* against *Wixon*).

The views we have expressed herein stem naturally from the purposes for which the National Lawyers Guild was originally created. They reflect the past actions of the Detroit chapter in prominently participating in the successful opposition to the Callahan Act and its presentation to the United States of successful arguments in the Bob-lo discrimination case, the "One-Man Grand Jury" case and the recent restrictive covenants case—actions which in each instance have belatedly received the approval of those who at the outset criticized our course of conduct.

In view of the foregoing statement, the board does hereby direct the civil liberties committee of the Detroit chapter of the guild to take whatever action may be necessary to register and effectuate the chapter's opposition to the passage by the Congress of the Mundt-Nixon bill, including:

1. The distribution of the foregoing statement of the board together with a copy of the guild's analysis of the Mundt-Nixon bill; and

2. The calling of a conference for the purpose of voicing public opposition to the Mundt-Nixon bill;

3. The urging of the Michigan delegation in Congress to actively oppose passage of the Mundt-Nixon bill.

It's the Only Language They Can Understand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 1948

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, it is the hope and prayer of every American that war can be avoided and that a respectable and dignified peace can be established so that the nations of the world may live and prosper together. This is a long-sought ideal and one which has been consistently pursued by the United States in good faith since the end of World War II. Our good faith has been violated and scorned on many occasions by Russia, by using her veto power to prevent peace and by charging the United States with being a war-mongering nation while she, Russia, prepares for war and takes over all the weak nations she can overpower without war. Apparently force and power is the only language she can understand.

I submit herewith a recent editorial by David Lawrence that is well worth reading:

[From the United States News and World Report of May 5, 1948]

"IT'S THE ONLY LANGUAGE THEY CAN UNDERSTAND"

(By David Lawrence)

An expression has emerged recently in Washington which epitomizes the American policy toward Russia.

"It's the only language they can understand"—meaning, of course, military force—is heard often in Congress, at the Department of State, in Cabinet discussions at the White House. It is used to justify the spending of nearly $14,000,000,000 a year for armament in peacetime. It is used as an argument for the revival of the draft system and for the establishment of universal military training. It is behind the new lend-lease program to arm with guns, tanks, and planes the 16 nations of Europe participating in the Marshall plan. The concept represents plainly the consensus in official Washington, irrespective of party or faction.

But what does it mean to the peace of the world when we say: "It's the only language they can understand"?

This expression implies on its face that negotiation or discussion with Russia is futile and that physical force must now be brought to bear, either to frighten Russia into a change of course or to defend ourselves against sudden attack.

"WHY WAIT?"

There is a curious implication, moreover, in the statement: "It's the only language they can understand." It could mean that war should not be postponed. Thus, for instance, if your adversary is going to fight you anyhow, doesn't a certain kind of logic say you are then justified in dealing a preventive blow? Why, it is argued already in various quarters, wait for Russia to rearm or learn how to make atomic bombs? Can there be a balance of power when all the major nations have the atomic bomb?

Winston Churchill makes a significant contribution to this very subject in his memoirs now appearing in Life and in the New York Times. Mr. Churchill writes:

"If the circumstances are such as to warrant it, force may be used. And if this be so, it should be used under the conditions which are most favorable. There is no merit in putting off a war for a year if, when it comes, it is a far worse war or one much harder to win."

The former Prime Minister of Britain wasn't discussing the coming of World War III but the events that led to temporizing policies among the Allies prior to 1939. He was writing primarily about "some principles of morals and action which may be a guide in the future."

Mr. Churchill argues that "those who are prone by temperament and character to seek sharp and clear-cut solutions of difficult and obscure problems, who are ready to fight whenever some challenge comes from a foreign power, have not always been right." He adds:

"On the other hand, those whose inclination is to bow their heads, to seek patiently and faithfully for peaceful compromise, are not always wrong. On the contrary, in the majority of instances they may be right, not only morally but from a practical standpoint.

"How many wars have been averted by patience and persisting good will? Religion and virtue alike lend their sanctions to meekness and humility, not only between men but between nations. How many wars have been precipitated by firebrands? How many misunderstandings which led to wars could have been removed by temporising? How often have countries fought cruel wars and then after a few years of peace found themselves not only friends but allies?"

MORAL FORCE FIRST

Here we have an argument for the use of both moral force and physical force, each in its proper place. The priority should, of course, go to moral force. Unless every resource of the one has been utilized, there must be no resort to the other. But how can we be sure? How can the two be reconciled? Where does the Christian ethics apply or cease to apply?

In his book, The Principles of Christian Ethics, Albert C. Knudson, dean emeritus of the School of Theology, Boston University, writes that no people can condone the suicide of the state. He refutes both pacifism and nonresistance. The law of self-preservation,

he says, is basic. Attack must be repulsed by every force at the command of the state.

The question, however, goes deeper. Is an attack always unprovoked? It is necessary to establish first the rightness of one's own course. This is the true obligation of Christian ethics.

As a companion to the concept of that "it's the only language they can understand," one hears, for instance, in Washington nowadays the statement that "we have done everything we could in our talks with Russia."

Again and again our officials recite with conviction their record of conversations and deeds. Naturally, they are making ex parte statements. In any attempt at objective judgment those who make a policy should not sit in judgment on their own acts.

What is needed is an impartial examination of all the facts—all the records from the very beginning of our important consultations with Russia and our allies which are in any particular related to the issues that have arisen since the end of the war and which are unsettled today.

The Secretary of State, General Marshall, should himself call for the appointment of a commission of 10 or 15 outstanding citizens to whom all testimony should be submitted. The sessions should be open to the public and to the press of the world. The investigation should be conducted independent of the Government.

We in America are prone to take for granted that Russia is 100 percent wrong and the United States is 100 percent right. The essence of any plan to use moral force effectively is to deal honestly with the facts of a dispute. Wrong must be acknowledged where wrong is proven.

EXAMINING OUR RECORD

Congress has a habit of investigating almost everything under the sun. Yet, oddly enough, no congressional committee has publicly investigated Russian-American relations. There have been consultations between the Department of State and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. These are secret discussions. The public has no way of judging the merits of all that has happened in Russian-American relations in the last 3 years.

It may be argued that an investigation by Congress could not but defend our own course at the State Department, for to do otherwise would be "unpatriotic." We come then face to face with the age-old barrier of pride and pseudopatriotim, neither of which has any place in a conscientious effort to examine the facts and avoid indescribable suffering in the world.

THE SEARCH FOR TRUTH

Questions for investigation and debate could be these:

1. To what extent has the policy of the United States been a policy of peace and to what extent has it been a policy of threatening physical force and economic coercion?

2. To what extent has Russia's policy of obstruction been due to aggressive desire and to what extent has it been due to fear and distruct of the United States arising from acts and policies of the United States?

3. Was the declaration of the Truman doctrine more than a year ago a decision for peace or for eventual war—and have the noncooperative attitudes of Russia since the declaration of that policy been based on a previous failure of diplomacy or an introduction by us of the concept that physical force alone must be used because it's the only language Russia can understand?

Examining these and related questions would expose to view all the cross currents of Russian-American relations and impress the world with the fairness and disinterestedness of our approach. It could bring peace. It is worth the effort.

Should war eventually become the only alternative, the American people then could send their youth to battle with a feeling that no other course was possible. Or the American people could gladly spend and tax themselves to the verge of economic chaos to build up a military force adequate to prevent war by the threat of force. The case for such realistic and even necessary conclusions has never been persuasively made.

The New Republic of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 10, 1948, I said to the Congress:

A new state should be proclaimed at once in Palestine. It should be recognized by our Government, and it should be encouraged in every possible way to establish a democracy that will be a bulwark against aggression and against communism.

Today the Jews in Palestine proclaimed their new republic under the name Israel. I know that the land of Israel will spread the true tenets of democracy throughout the Middle East, making it a stalwart bulwark against communism.

On May 9 I joined with some of the finest Americans in our country in preparing recommendations which have been sent to the President and our State Department, urging that the United States be the first to recognize the new Jewish state, to deal with it as a sovereign power, to lift the embargo on arms insofar as it applied to it, and to lend it every assistance in establishing that democracy.

My remarks to this Congress on May 10 are now most apropos.

As an American citizen I greet the new Jewish state. I urge the United Nations to invite it into membership, and I wish it every success in the family of democratic nations.

War-Damage Repair in Baltic Lands May Take Poles 100 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, in today's Washington Star, a very interesting article appeared in which it is stated that Poland is working hard to pump new life into her Baltic coast line, but she has a long, long way to go.

A 1,000-mile tour starting from the Szczecin area northwest to Swinioujscie and eastward to Elblag shows staggering war destruction.

Town after town, village after village are skeletons of standing walls and little hills of debris.

But all have Polish signs and bear the national red-white colors.

ONE-HUNDRED-YEAR TASK INDICATED

There is no accurate estimate available of how long it may take the Poles to restore what war destroyed. But it looks like a 100-year job with the cost running into many billions of dollars.

Szczecin, port city, is fighting its way back to life. Scores of wrecked ships and barges have been removed from the Oder and the waterway reopened to traffic. Many wharves and docks have been rebuilt. Hundreds of homes have been repaired and new apartments built.

But there are heaps of debris and rubble in many of the streets and mile after mile of houses blasted by artillery fire. In Szczecin and along the Baltic where reconstruction is under way, much of the work is being done by hand, brick by brick. Everywhere, in towns, cities, and villages, are little mountains of bricks.

These, salvaged in the clean-up of destroyed areas, are being saved to be built back into homes and business places. The Poles still are sadly short of building materials and machinery.

COMMUNICATIONS REPAIRED

What the Poles have done first was to get waterway, highway, and telephonic communications going. Throughout the whole coastline area, crews are working on highways. Most communications systems are working normally.

In places like Kolobrzeg, Poles have set harbors in operation, and new little ports along the Baltic have been opened for coal shipments. The cities of Koszalin and Slupsk are heavily populated because they appear to have escaped the destruction of other towns and villages. Two factories in Slupsk are making furniture for export.

GDYNIA THRIVING CITY

Further to the east, the city of Gdynia is thriving and prosperous. Gdynia itself escaped major war damage, but harbor facilities were hard hit.

The city of Gdansk, is making a valiant try at reconstruction, but here the job looks even bigger than that of restoring Warsaw.

Vice Premier Wladyslaw Gomulka, says that because of the vast war destruction the lands cannot absorb or provide living places for more than a top of 6,000,000 Poles. This number is expected to be reached by the end of 1949.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to include the following article that appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of May 12, 1948:

YOUNG AND FOOLISH

"You can't get them out from behind the iron curtain."

That was what American officials told a young Hoosier who approached them in 1947 about getting a group of Polish agricultural students over to the United States to study American farming methods and learn about American farm and community life. But the Hoosier, Thurl Metzger, who had been sent to Poland by the Church of the Brethren to check the cattle placed in that country by the church's Heifers-for-Relief Committee, was, in his own words, "young and foolish and didn't realize that it was impossible."

Result: A group of young Poles has been living, working and learning on American farms and in American agricultural colleges since last July. Among other things, they heard 1,400 farm boys and girls at a 4-H con-

gress in Chicago discuss Working together for a better home and world community. When they go back to Poland this summer, they will take more than a knowledge of improved farm techniques.

If a small part of the energy spent in fearing and hating the unknown people on the other side of the fence could be spent in making determined breaches in the fence, the world would be a better place. Does one have to be young and foolish to believe this possible?

Free Judges and Free Peoples

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on free judges and free peoples, delivered by me before the Ohio State Bar Association, at Toledo, Ohio, May 14, last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREE JUDGES AND FREE PEOPLES

Mr. President and fellow Americans, I want to express my deep appreciation for the privilege of being with you here today. It is a privilege to come to the Buckeye State which has, in turn, sent so many of her sons to Washington. It is no exaggeration to state that the caliber of your leaders in the Senate and House of Representatives is so universally known and respected that to merely mention their names is to pay them honor and tribute enough. I refer, of course, to the Honorable ROBERT A. TAFT, son of a great American President, and an illustrious United States Senator in his own right, and the Honorable JOHN BRICKER, your distinguished former Governor and Vice Presidential nominee, and to the members of your House delegation.

VISITS WITH BAR GROUPS

In recent months, it has been a real joy for me to visit with quite a few bar associations throughout our land. In each of them I have found officers and members seeking to make of the American bar a still worthier and nobler institution for the advancement of human progress.

In the 1½ years that I have been honored to serve as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, one of the great privileges which I will always cherish in my memory is that of associating with so many distinguished legal lights throughout our land, men and women in private life and public life, dedicating themselves as servants of the Republic in serving the common welfare.

You and I are interested in pooling our common efforts toward a more judicial system and judiciary. This is part of our earthly mission, yours and mine. It is a high challenge and a great adventure. What nobler responsibility could you and I have than to pass on the lasting values of which we, of this generation, are but the heirs?

We have thus come together not only to talk but to think—to think through our common problems, to think not synthetically, but clearly; not timidly, but boldly.

OUR SUBJECT TODAY

The subject before us today is Free Judges and Free Peoples. Certainly we could not find a subject having greater meaning in the two worlds of today—the world of liberty and the world of dictatorship, the world of light and the world of darkness, the world where law rules and the world where men, yes, despotic men, rule.

We know that one of the greatest contributions of the founding fathers of this constitutional Republic was the setting up of three separate and coequal branches of government for the purpose of checking and balancing any tendencies that might lead to dictatorship. With reference to the judiciary, the founding fathers believed, as well stated in the Federalist Papers, that independence of judges is equally requisite to guard the Constitution and the rights of individuals.

SELECTION OF JUDGES

Against this background, the founding fathers established the plan of selecting Federal judges, by executive appointment, after confirmation by the Senate, assuring to these judges life tenure as a part of a separate and coequal branch of government. Ten of the original 13 States followed this example of life tenure, and, in fact, one or two cases preceded it. In a few cases also, judges were chosen by the legislature. In the years following 1830, within but a short quarter of a century, some 15 States adopted systems of short terms for the judiciary filled by popular election. As a matter of fact, every State admitted after 1846 followed that system. Today only three States, all of whom, incidentally, were among the original 13, retain life tenure, and only two of them have an appointive system in the stricter sense.

We know that the immigrant waves that came to our land brought with them the memory of how an arbitrary judiciary could serve to tyrannize the lives of men and that these new Americans, as a consequence, sought a check and balance on the selection of judges themselves. Today 35 States elect their judges, and some 12 States have had an appointive method more or less corresponding to the Federal system.

MISSOURI SELECTION PLAN

As you and I know, the American Bar Association began its studies on this judicial selection problem as early as 1924 and, as we know also, that by 1937 the house of delegates of the American Bar Association had adopted and recommended a plan which, substantially, has come to be known as the Missouri plan. This plan had as its objective the removal of judges from what we might call political pot-boiler patronage problems and pressures. The plan attempted to avoid selection wholly through either popular ballot or executive appointment. This plan has attracted widespread attention throughout the legal system of the Nation, and already many other States have given it close study.

Behind this search for the most efficient method of judicial selection, there is the deep hunger for a judiciary which, in the words that are inscribed above the pillars of the United States Supreme Court, will provide equal justice under law.

QUALITIES WE SEEK IN JUDGES

It is the desire of the American people to be rid of judges who are selected exclusively by political bosses, judges selected not for actual judicial ability and temperament, but rather in return for favors and with the expectation that the judges will fulfill the dictates of political barons. We seek to cleanse the judiciary of whatever dry rot may be infecting it, just as we seek to eliminate dry rot from the other branches of Government and from our personal lives.

Along with the desire to see men of true judicial ability on the bench is the desire to see men who are unalterably devoted to our American constitutional system of checks and balances. We seek a variety of men properly balanced as to American (not alien) political faith, with no one political party dominating the Federal judiciary.

The last time I had occasion to make a survey of the Federal judiciary, I found that since 1932, of 231 Federal judges appointed, 214 were Democrats and 17 were Republicans. Obviously, such a lopsided overbalance is unhealthy for our American system of checks and balances.

PURPOSES OF SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

It has been the purpose of the Senate Judiciary Committee to try to reflect the deep wishes and needs of the American people in seeking:

1. A balance on the Federal judiciary.

2. Selection of members of the judiciary who possess the judicial temperament, the character, and the ability worthy of these illustrious posts. To this end, we require screening by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the backgrounds of all judicial nominees.

3. To give due opinion and weight to the able judgment of bar groups throughout the land. For this purpose, we have sought to cooperate in securing the ablest judgment of bar associations in each and every judicial appointment that has been submitted by the President to our committee.

So, too, we have sought to discourage the practice of utilizing Federal judges for executive appointments, switching them around like ribbon counter clerks from job to job in the executive branch, and thus impairing the independence of the judiciary.

"The judiciary," wrote Hamilton, "is in continual jeopardy of being overpowered, awed, or influenced by its coordinate branches."

A judge is the human embodiment of an office dedicated to impartial justice and fair dealing, an office which must have the highest possible public respect. A judge, like Caesar's wife, must be above suspicion. The high standard demanded of the Federal judiciary and its complete separation from executive and legislative branches should not be subjected to the erosion of exceptions.

EXECUTIVE BRANCH IS NOW CONSULTING WITH BAR GROUPS

One of the most important consequences of the new procedure adopted by the Senate Judiciary Committee is that, for the first time, the executive branch of Government, even before submitting its nominations to the Senate, has consulted with bar groups. The executive branch knows that the legislative branch will not countenance bypassing the bar, and therefore, the executive branch has taken upon itself the responsibility of consulting initially with the bar as to prospective appointments. I humbly feel, therefore, that the Judiciary Committee has given new vitality to the concept within the United States Constitution that executive appointment shall be made with "the advice and consent of the Senate."

Yes, we are looking for men of caliber on the Federal bench, for men of outstanding ability; for men of supreme stature; for men whose conduct and opinions will serve as judicial beacons. We do not want political hacks on the bench nor do we want obscure mediocrities.

At the same time, in our search for men of stature, we do not want to lose sight of the traits in humble men that make for greatness; the traits of character and balanced temperament; of common sense and broad vision which are too often lacking in those who are otherwise theoretically of high caliber. I have seen good lawyers and even great lawyers make poor judges, and I have seen humble lawyers emerge from virtually unknown standing as distinguished jurists. There is no single formula, no rule of thumb, but we can seek to find minimum objective standards wherever possible.

CONTRIBUTION OF AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

I can see considerable merit in one of the proposals recently considered by the American Bar Association, suggesting that we

establish by law a judicial yardstick of the qualifications for appointment to the Federal bench, to the end that such appointees be citizens of the United States and lawyers who have been admitted to the practice for a definite period of time before appointments and that a reasonable proportion of the Justices of the Supreme Court have a definite minimum of prior judicial experience in the circuit court of appeals, the Federal district courts, or the State courts of last resort, and that all Federal judges be prohibited from accepting assignments other than judicial assignments.

In connection with the American Bar Association, I do want to state that I have received wonderful cooperation from its national officers as well as from State bar officials including your own able leadership. Without in any way minimizing the magnificent contributions which his colleagues have made, may I mention the deep gratitude which I feel and which so many of my associates feel for the splendid work of Judge William T. Ranson, editor-in-chief of the American Bar Association Journal, in pioneering for judicial freedom and integrity.

What happens when freedom fails?

JUDICIARY UNDER DICTATORSHIP

We need only look abroad to the disastrous consequences of executive control of the judiciary. Look to Germany in the years from 1933 to 1945. Look to Russia in the years since the Red Revolution, for the story of what happens when free judges become slave judges and free people become slave people.

In Germany, special volks courts were established to take jurisdiction in broad categories such as political crimes and crimes against the regime. Special judges were appointed for these courts and the right of appeal from their decisions was severely restricted. Religious minorities like the Jews were exempted from the jurisdiction of the legal system and were assigned to the authority of the police. The tenure of judges was altered so that their removal was subject only to the discretion of the Fuehrer. All civil rights, like habeas corpus, were dissolved. The German Reichstag passed a quitclaim bill on judicial independence, subverting the German judiciary exclusively to the Fuehrer.

The Soviet system of justice has been made a hollow shell in the form of class justice which means justice as misconstrued and misinterpreted by the Communist elite which rules that unhappy land. The Soviet secret police established from the very start a defacto method of deciding cases without judicial procedure. It assumed the right to final decision and control over the court. In the words of former Soviet Commissar of Justice Krylenko, its activities "had the character of tremendously merciless repression and complete secrecy as to what occurred within its walls * * * final decisions of life and death with no appeal from them * * * were passed * * * with no rules setting the jurisdiction or procedure." Soviet Russia revolutionary tribunals existed apart from the peoples courts and had infinite jurisdiction over major crimes. Later, they were merged in a new judicial system which still, however, permitted punishment through completely nonjudicial procedures.

Class justice as established by the courts recognizes no difference between a court of law and summary justice. The courts are the weapon of the state. Mr. Vyshinsky, who was formerly attorney general, stated that "Neither court nor criminal procedure is or could exist outside politics."

WE PRAY BUT RUSSIAN GOVERNMENT DOES NOT

Incidentally, it was this very same Mr. Vyshinsky whom I met on a boat returning from Europe last summer. At that time, I shook his hand and told him that each night I prayed that Russia, England, America, and the other nations would have a sincere desire for peace and would be adequate to consummate that desire in some international organization. Mr. Vyshinsky replied, through an interpreter, "I do not pray." The Russian Government acts with this attitude and inflicts the philosophy of Marx and Lenin—"mortal man is sufficient of himself"—and also acts with the attitude of a cynical disregard for human life, with a materialistic obsession for power and with a complete devotion to violence and any other means designed to gain its nefarious ends.

As in many other dictatorships, it uses democratic forms like the courts as a sham and a show, but within their hollow framework it exercises ruthless tyranny.

The Russians will smile if our courts ever become a sham and a show—if we allow political bosses at the national, State, and local levels to pull the strings of judicial puppets.

Thus far in our discussion, we have been considering the vital question of how to safeguard our judiciary and to maintain it as a free and independent judiciary. We are concerned with that question because we know that only with a free and independent judiciary can there be a survival for free and independent peoples and their institutions.

However, in these days of world unrest, it is painfully apparent that among the dangers which menace the free people of this land and other lands are outside dangers and outside pressures.

If we are to protect our free institutions and our liberties, it is no longer enough for us to be concerned solely with domestic problems. We must also be concerned with the forces outside our land which can affect our freedom, our security, and our lives.

It is not enough for us as lawyers and citizens to be concerned solely with the judges and the laws of our land.

As lawyers and citizens, it is increasingly necessary for us to give thought to the laws beyond our borders, the laws between nations—international laws.

In the generation preceding the Second World War, the conduct of international relations was usually defined solely in terms of legalisms and in the expressed objectives of the League of Nations. This approach proved to be unrealistic. Our problem now is to think in terms of international relations and international laws tied to the realities of the present-day situation.

REASONS WHY WE MUST BE CONCERNED WITH INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND INTERNATIONAL LAW

There are four reasons why we must be concerned with international relations and international law.

1. The tragic events of the Second World War have demonstrated the need for our concern with international relations and international law.

We have had the experience of two world wars which have supplied a crucible for the testing of international law.

The rules governing freedom of the seas, the rules governing property in times of war, the rules governing war on land, sea, and in the air, the prohibitions against bombardment of undefended towns and cities, the distinctions between civilians and combatants—all of these rules have changed.

The slaughter of millions of people for political purposes, the liquidation of embassies, the use of black lists in war, the nationalization of private property, these are all part of the fast-moving events which have altered the character of international law.

2. Our ratification of the United Nations Charter formally launched the United States on a new course of world cooperation. Having assumed this obligation, it is necessary for us to make such further contribution as we can to the objective of preserving peace. This means that of necessity we must be concerned with reappraising international law.

3. The Second World War saw cataclysmic changes in the methods of waging war. The entire world has become contracted.

In our own land, in the days when the only dangers to a frontier American settlement came from marauding Indians and stagecoach robbers, our laws could be comparatively simple. With the advancing complexities of a machine and motor age, with the growth of urban communities and the development of gangsterdom traveling in high-powered cars across a continent in a few days, it became necessary for us to have new and more adequate law.

Similarly, with the technological developments which have annihilated space and time and geographic isolation, it is now vital for use to have a revitalized and adequate pattern of international law.

4. In the tragic aftermath of the Second World War, we have discovered the growing spread of the menacing germs of world communism. The existence of the communistic virus in the bloodstream of international relations again makes it desirable for us to be concerned with the problems of international law and its adequacy.

THE BASIC CONCEPT OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

What is international law? It has been called the law of nations. It has been defined as a system of international ethics. As a matter of fact, there apparently is no one completely accepted universal definition of international law. John Bassett Moore once said that the disputants involved in a question of international law are likely to approach "the subject from the point of view of preconceived definitions."

We know also that there is no definite, positive law-giving institution which can write international law and force a State to obey it. In that sense at least there is no international law.

We know, however, that throughout history, States have adopted certain rules and guides for interstate action and that these rules have been referred to as international law.

History has also demonstrated, however, that frequently the rules are discarded or violated when a contracting state believes that they interfere unduly with its sovereignty or its security.

When submarines fired torpedoes on merchant vessels without warning, that was a violation of the accepted rules.

When undefended cities were bombed into eternity from the air, that was in contravention to the accepted rules. When there was no-quarter fighting in the Pacific, that was a violation of the Hague Convention and was a violation of practices which had long standing in the western world. When hospitals were destroyed, when whole populations were annihilated, when armies left a trail of scorched earth—all of these ravaged to some degree the accepted rules which have been considered to be a part of international law.

THE PRESENT GENERAL SITUATION

Despite the ravaging of international law, I cannot agree with those who say that international law is dead. Violations of rules do not abolish the rules.

The Constitution of our land recognizes international law as a part of the laws of the United States. Associate Justice Gray, of the Supreme Court of the United States, said:

"International law is part of our law and must be ascertained and administered by the courts of justice of appropriate jurisdiction, as often as questions of right depending on it are duly presented for their determination."

In other words, international law is real law in the United States.

There have been other periods in world history when we have heard it said that international law was dead. There have been

other periods in world history when struggles for power have outreached the limitation of international law and men have chanted a requiem over the dead body.

However, it is significant that history has demonstrated that after every one of these periods, international law has always been resurrected and revitalized.

To say that international law is violated does not necessarily mean that the violation is made with complete inpunity. When the Japanese began a ruthless program of shocking brutality with the American garrison at Bataan, this aroused a deep-rooted indignation and bitterness which will certainly find expression in the international law of the future.

The custom has been to further the tenets of the Geneva Convention. Violations bring protests and protests can result in unifying support behind a corrective program of international law.

When Manila was bombed in the Second World War, after General MacArthur had declared it to be an open city, that was essentially a reversion to a barbarism even more horrible than the primitive barbarians who drank blood from the scraped skulls of their victims.

We know that there is a basic conflict—an inherent conflict—between the concept of a state acting solely in its own interest in a completely unrestrained manner, and the idea that international law can set up a pattern of rules governing states in their conduct with each other.

There was a time before the First World War when international lawyers could conveniently catalog those regulations which they believed constituted international law—both public and private. At the present time, international lawyers are confronted with an unbelievable legal chaos which has resulted from two world wars within a single generation and from the technological developments, like the atomic bomb, which have blown the whole concept of international law sky high.

At the present time there is a very fundamental clash between the old concept of international law as custom and agreement governing the relations of one state with another, and the concept (which I challenge) of a world government or a world state with the authority to set up regulations governing international affairs.

The different concepts of international law—Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence, the theories of the western world, the doctrines of Soviet Russia, the teachings of the Austrian school of international law, the Japanese concept of international law—have all collided head-on, and in the chaos which has resulted, there is a need for reconciling divergent views and emerging with a generally accepted understanding of what international law actually remains.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND INTERNATIONAL LAW

Early in the seventeenth century, Hugo Grotius gave some expressive substance to international law. His concept was founded on legal and philosophical bases which tied international law to international morality. The League of Nations also attempted to tie morality and philosophy and law in one international bundle.

The League of Nations failed probably because it did not adequately consider the underlying power factors which existed in the world and because the nations were not ready for the League.

The pattern of international law which existed prior to 1914 has presumably vanished in the mists of time, and we are now presumably embarked on a new period of international collaboration—and possibly world government. As a matter of fact, however, that hasn't actually happened. We haven't as yet developed any effective international law within the framework of the United Nations. The necessary vision for this achievement has not come.

The Charter of the United Nations recognizes a very fundamental limitation on the sphere of operation of international law by recognizing a reserved dominion within which a state can act at its own discretion.

Less than 4 months after it was signed, the United Nations Charter came into force on October 24, 1945. During the period between the signing of the Charter and the time it came into force, the radio-activs flames of the atomic bomb had been unleashed on the world.

That brought up the question of whether the United Nations was antiquated even before it came into existence.

The United Nations, however, embodied certain definite changes from the League of Nations, though the United Nations also is only "machinery through which nations can build up the habit of cooperation for the peaceful development of the earth," if there is a will to do so.

The provisions in the Charter recognize that the treatment of the individual citizen is not merely a matter of domestic concern and that the denial of fundamental human rights to a citizen can no longer be lost in the protective haze of national sovereignty.

Article 13 of the Charter of the General Assembly of the United Nations outlines a mandate to the General Assembly to "encourage the progressive development of international law and its codifications."

On December 11, 1946, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted a resolution to establish a committee of 16 members of the United Nations to be appointed by the General Assembly on the recommendations of the President, said committee to study the methods by which the General Assembly could encourage the progressive development of international law and its eventual codification.

All of this means that there is a possibility for a new horizon in international law. It opens up a vista in which we can see continuous attention being given to revitalizing and strengthening international law, if the nations have the will and intent to go forward.

The new United Nations organization, broadly speaking, has embraced the old social and economic institutions of the league, but with it, has new provisions of the rule of the law, new provisions for international economic and social cooperation, new concepts for the protection of human rights and new principles to govern trusteeships. But to make these effective, there must be the vitality and the vision among the nations to carry on.

International law faces the problem of human rights and nationality. Millions of people are stateless. Millions of people have been forced into voluntary exile. Millions of people have labored as slaves in the armed camps of totalitarian states. Genocide has been practiced almost without interruptions since 1931.

In theory the United Nations Organization has set up principles relating to human rights. A commission charged with developing these principles has been at work for some time. There is, however, a tragic lag. Displaced-persons camps are operating in Europe. Human rights are still being ravaged.

Meanwhile, the American Bar Association as usual, has been in the forefront of evaluation and recommendation on this neglect of human rights. In the May 1948 issue of the American Bar Association Journal, we have all undoubtedly read of the bar's proposal for an uncompromising convention or covenant to fulfill obligations under article 55 of the UN Charter so as to secure universal respect for human rights and for implementing of such a covenant through an association of truly freedom-loving nations.

INTERNATIONAL LAW MUST BE BROUGHT UP TO DATE IN MOST ASPECTS WHICH GOVERN INJURIES TO INDIVIDUALS

Before the First World War we considered that international law was applicable only to the relationships between states, but in the last few years we have seen an expansion of so-called international regulations to many activities which involve individuals and states.

The times are certainly ripe for study of the rules governing the use of force for the preservation of international peace. There are agreements and commitments, agreements and commitments which are idealistic, which have been entered into, but there is no indication as to the extent to which they can be implemented.

There have been efforts made to define aggressor states. There have been efforts made to punish individuals who drive their people into war. But there is still no definition as to what constitutes aggression and how it may be identified.

In the world today there is no more serious problem than the expansion of subversive activities by Soviet Russia. As far as we know, in the whole rambling structure of such international law, as we have, there is no precise international legal remedy at hand for the nation whose very life may be threatened by the plotting of another state.

INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

The Charter of the United Nations has annexed to it a statute on the International Court of Justice.

Chapter 14 of the Charter provides for the International Court of Justice and provides that the International Court of Justice shall be the principal judicial organ of the United Nations and shall function in accordance with the statute of the permanent Court of International Justice.

All members of the United Nations are ipso facto parties to the statute of the International Court of Justice. The question of whether the present International Court of Justice should not have an increased jurisdiction is one which should be explored.

THE BASIC PROBLEM OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

Some observers have said that the foundations of international law are just as dubious as they have ever been, and that consequently international law should be abolished—that it should be replaced with the municipal law of a federal system of world government.

That would mean that a part of the sovereignty of every state would be incorporated in that world government. That would mean that every state would concede certain external controls of the conduct of foreign policy and the weapons of war. That would mean the establishment of a world legislature directly responsible to the peoples of the world. That would mean a world police. That would mean a world judiciary. That would mean a world law.

I am not in accord with a program of this type—not yet.

The principal problem of international law is obviously how can international law be transmuted into a living, dynamic force, carefully geared to the fast-moving tempo of our times. This means the principal problem is man himself.

The tremendous cosmic forces which man has encountered in the last war open up such terrifying possibilities that it is quite obvious that unrestricted international action could endanger all mankind.

It is conceivable that effective international law implemented by force could control unilateral national gangsterdom on an international scale before it could destroy mankind. It must be emphasized, however, that that same international law or control must be so conceived as to safeguard rather than jeopardize national security.

AREAS OF EXPLORATION FOR INTERNATIONAL LAW

There are many areas for international law which should be explored. First of all, it is

necessary to reconcile the freedom of action of a state, the freedom of action of a state to protect itself and to secure its own ends—to reconcile that freedom with the growth of an international community and an international law which could be directed at controlling the awful inherent mass-destructive potentiality of bacteriological warfare, jet-propelled explosives, and the atomic bomb.

It is certainly desirable that international laws and regulations—however inadequate they may presently be—be constantly studied and improved. I believe that the committee charged with the codification of international law in the United Nations organization should be given every necessary support for the effective discharge of its obligation.

The most challenging single area of exploration for international law is that one which relates to the power conflict currently existing between the United States and Soviet Russia.

If this conflict is resolved, it would then be possible to reconcile the conflicting concepts of international law of many nations.

There should perhaps be some exploration of the common law of England and of the United States and of the principles of equity as developed in these two countries and as they may conceivably relate to a comprehensive system of international law. There probably should be some exploration of the possibility for vesting the present International Court of Justice with increased power, or at least increased jurisdiction.

It must be emphasized in all of the foregoing, however, that if international law is to develop effectively, it must have behind it the good will of the participating countries.

International law can only be as strong as the will of the people behind it and the confidence which it inspires in the world community.

While we are naturally concerned with strengthening international law, it is quite clear that our primary obligation is to ascertain what is left of international law and what is acceptable to the people of the world.

CONCLUSION

I cannot agree with the kind of thinking that envisions an immediate creation of a world government with legislative power. As a matter of fact, I believe that civilization and man himself could be seriously endangered by such a step at this time.

It seems more desirable that instead, the weight of public opinion be placed squarely behind the machinery which already exists so that this machinery could be used to carry on progressively and effectively in the field of international affairs and international law.

I am very doubtful also of the wisdom of contemplating giving the General Assembly the power to pass statutes having the effect of international law, particularly at a time when the world is so sharply divided. It may be that what the United Nations needs at the present time is not a powerful legislature, but perhaps a more powerful court and enforcement arm.

I should like to emphasize in conclusion that while two world wars and technological developments have eroded away much of the structure of international law as we have known it, nevertheless the Constitution of our land still recognizes international law as a part of the law of the United States. Large areas of international law, as it was understood prior to 1914, still continue to be respected and are still applicable to the regulation of conduct among and between states.

Our problem is to get the nations of the earth to reason together so that the will and desire will be begotten to live in peace; to find acceptable standards of conduct to govern states in their relationships with each other. Our challenge in the future is to find rules for the settlement of disputes in an amicable manner. Our problem in the future is to write effective rules for the suppression and control of mechanical, technological, and organic means of destruction. Our problem and the problem of the world is to seek an orderly, a lawful manner of preventing a repetition of the horrible wars of the past. That is at once the challenge of the future and the hope of mankind.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address which I delivered last night at St. Louis, Mo., on the subject of Palestine.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOGNITION OF PALESTINE

"From the very beginning, likewise, our policy on recognition tallied with the fact that we ourselves had needed such recognition from 1776 to 1783 and could obtain it only if legitimist scruples were disregarded. It tallied with our interest in seeing revolutionary and republican states multiply in a predominantly power-ridden monarchical world. It was our first essay, this policy, in making the world safe for republics. * * * The aim of encouraging the establishment and maintenance of republican institutions was always implicit in our recognition policy, and the policy was not, therefore, a policy of pure de factoism."

The foregoing expresses the American policy regarding recognition as developed in the American Journal of International Law on the Nature of American Foreign Policy, by Prof. Pitman B. Potter, of the University of Wisconsin, appearing in the January issue, 1927, on page 69.

The new Jewish state in Palestine possesses a legitimacy never presented by any other new state in the history of the world. In this respect it is unique.

Most states have been born of revolution. Here is presented for the first time in history a state whose claim to self-government was recognized by the organized opinion of mankind.

The new Jewish state in Palestine is the child of the United Nations. No other state in all the centuries has had so legitimate a birth.

Contrast the position of the American Colonies in declaring their independence of Great Britain and seeking the support of mankind. Men and munitions were allowed to come to us from Europe to enable the infant Nation to survive.

Lafayette, Kosciusko, Von Steuben have been names with which to conjure in America ever since. In Lafayette Park, immediately in front of the White House, the service of these heroes is commemorated in enduring marble as an eternal reminder of their assistance to America in its hour of greatest need.

From that day to this, American boys have been found on almost every battlefield where human freedom was at stake. The Lafayette Escadrille and the Flying Tigers were the symbols of the spirit of an America still carrying on the traditions of those who helped America at its birth.

Recognition of this new nation in Palestine is justified by every precept and practice of America and by the platform declarations of both great political parties in the last campaign.

The voice of America spoke at Lake Success last November when practically all the nations outside the Moslem world declared in favor of the creation of the Jewish state in Palestine. That declaration still stands, and is the warrant for the historic proclamation of this new state.

Lifting the embargo upon the shipment of arms to those who are fighting to sustain the new Jewish state in Palestine should be the immediate order of the day. Our statutes are clear upon this point and brook no such interference as has closed the door upon the shipment of arms to those who are carrying on the same battle for human freedom that America waged with the assistance that came from Europe a century and a half ago.

No legal or other ban exists upon any American boy who desires to volunteer to assist in this great cause. The cause is just. The full weight of disapproval by the United Nations and the United States should rest upon the neighboring Arab countries who are fomenting strife in Palestine in disregard of every obligation under the United Nations.

A ringing declaration denouncing the activities of the Arab League and the Arab countries surrounding Palestine by the United Nations and the United States would instantly bring peace.

Within Palestine itself, no difficulty will be experienced in bringing about harmonious adjustment between all elements of the population. Outside agitators supported by subsidies and royalties flowing through the Arab states and the Arab League are responsible for 90 percent of the difficulty in Palestine today. Stop these funds and the difficulties will instantly cease.

AMERICAN SECURITY

Palestine and petroleum will not mix. From the standpoint of our national security, the oil reserves of the Middle East are not worth a tinker's dam. This is the testimony of every competent military authority.

In the event of any trouble, the American and British oil developments in the Middle East will simply serve the Soviet.

The railroad and truck lines have already been built by American enterprise and generosity direct from the head of the Persian Gulf to the Russian border.

Logistics plus American-built transportation insure possession by the Red Army of the oil wells of the Middle East.

Sacrificing our honor in Palestine for the utterly unattainable oil of Arabia is not only dishonorable but stupid.

We shall lose the whole world and our own soul as well.

Let us be very sure that America gives no occasion for the indictment leveled at the Chamberlain government in 1939 by Herbert Stanley Morrison, leader today of the Labor majority in the British House of Commons:

"The Jews must be sacrificed to the Government's preoccupation with exclusively imperialist rather than human considerations."

Like the foolish dog in Aesop's fable, we shall drop our honor to get our oil and end up with neither.

Yet in the name of oil our national honor and good faith is being tarnished. Subtly, it has been whispered that mideastern oil is vital to our security, and, therefore, our pledges in Palestine must be repudiated.

Confidence in American good faith among freedom-loving people everywhere is the most vital of strategic materials so far as America is concerned. Without confidence among people everywhere in our plighted word, America can never hope to bring into being an indissoluble union of those who love freedom more than life.

In the words of Winston Churchill:

"You are not going to found and forge the fabric of a grand alliance to resist aggression except by showing continued examples of your firmness in carrying out, even under difficulties, the obligations into which you have entered. * * * Never was the need for fidelity and firmness more urgent than now."

America has stood stultified before world opinion in seeking to support—all at the same time: (1) A truce with the Grand Mufti fresh from 5 years in Berlin with Adolf Hitler, his hands still dripping with Jewish blood; (2) a trusteeship for Palestine under some unknown trustee and supported presumably by American arms; (3) and the partition plan solemnly adopted after extensive study by two-thirds of the United Nations. Janus was outdone. This was not two-faced but three-faced.

In the scathing words of Winston Churchill, commenting on Chamberlain and his white paper, one could only say of the President of the United States that "he had reason to complain of his advisers as he had been very poorly briefed." We may now rejoice that his clouded vision has been cleared. May it continue.

What will the world think of a great power that seeks a truce with the Grand Mufti because he defies with force of arms the considered conclusion of practically all the nations outside the Moslem world?

Having defeated Hitler and Hirohito, we find ourselves in full retreat before 7,500 Arab mercenaries who have recently invaded Palestine in deliberate and proclaimed defiance of the decision of the United Nations.

The Minute Men of Concord and Lexington find their spiritual descendants in the embattled hosts of Zion among the hills of Palestine.

The shots of the Haganah are being heard around the world by every ear attuned to love of human freedom and good faith.

A century and a half ago America became a new nation conceived in liberty because other people permitted their sons and their munitions to come to our aid. Embargoes on munition shipments and cancellation of the passports of those who dare to volunteer to fight in the cause of human freedom were fortunately unknown in 1776.

In both the First and Second World Wars, long before the United States was involved, munitions were flowing freely to our ultimate allies, and American boys who loved human freedom more than life were volunteering without restriction to enter the contest all around the world. The Lafayette Escadrille and the Flying Tigers were the symbols of an America still animated by the spirit of 1776.

Americans may well demand of those in authority that the embargo shall be modified to permit arms to go to those who are defending the decision of the United Nations.

American boys have the same inalienable right to volunteer to fight for human freedom in Palestine as in Europe or China. The Old World has no monopoly upon the spirit of Steuben or Kosciusko or Lafayette.

Lake Success must not become a synonym for failure. One Munich for this generation should be quite enough.

The magnificent mausoleum of the League of Nations upon the shores of Lake Geneva at least served for a political generation.

In New York on the shores of the East River there is still proceeding the preparations to build a $60,000,000 tomb for an organization that is being destroyed by its own hand. Its epitaph might well be "erected to the memory of the power of the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem who succeeded where Hitler and Hirohito failed."

In the partition of Palestine the nations of the world were united in supporting a just solution of an age-old problem. To their support came the hosts of those who loved liberty more than life in many lands. In Palestine itself there is a deep yearning for peace among Arabs and Jews alike. The recurring assassinations of Arabs who dare to dissent from the edicts of the Grand Mufti sufficiently indicates the temper of the Arab inhabitants of Palestine.

With twice as many Arabs as Jews in Palestine, why is it necessary for the Grand Mufti to import thousands of hired mercenaries from countries pledged as members of the United Nations to assist in maintaining world order under law?

Is it not even more of a travesty to realize that these mercenaries, hired to defy the decision of the United Nations and the United States, are being paid indirectly but in large measure from the proceeds of American oil royalties. The Transjordan Legion this last month defied the power of Great Britain by invading Palestine, although this Arab force was organized and trained by the British and is today almost entirely supported by a grant of $8,000,000 a year from the British Treasury, now in process of replenishment from the United States.

American intelligence and integrity cannot be so lightly trafficked with. American honor is far more important in this distraught world than Arabian oil.

The righteous wrath of the American people is gradually being aroused against those who would sell American good faith in the world for the will-of-the-wisp of 30,000,000,000 barrels of utterly unavailable petroleum.

Zionism and Zionists are not today on trial. The United Nations rather has its day in court to demonstrate whether the fond hopes of its founders are to be dashed by its failure at the first obstacle.

The great dream of Zion is to be fulfilled in our day and generation because it is profoundly right.

The Jewish homeland is to grow into the Jewish Commonwealth envisioned by its founders and pledged by Woodrow Wilson in the throes of the First World War.

Both great political parties in America have pledged the development of a homeland for Jewis in Palestine. It is clear now that this must mean the implementation of the partition plan and the establishment of an independent commonwealth in the Jewish portion of Palestine.

Here is one of the keys to world peace.

Make no mistake about it. The vision of the last half century of Zionist pioneers will be converted into a reality that will forever serve.

The partition plan will be implemented.

The Jewish portion of Palestine as allocated by the United Nations has become an independent commonwealth. Recognition of this new state of Israel by the United States is a decisive victory in the struggle of the centuries. Much hard fighting, however, still lies ahead, not only in Palestine but in the councils of the United Nations and in maintaining a steadfast policy among those in authority in the United States. "On guard" must still be the watchword.

The rejoicing of today in this great victory must be followed by rededication to the struggle that still lies ahead. "Be careful and be constant" must still be the motto for Zionists everywhere throughout the world.

Salute to the Jewish State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous censent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered at the Salute to the Jewish State by the American Committee of Jewish Writers, Artists, and Scientists, held at the Polo Grounds, New York, May 15 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

After a stinging defeat, and in the opinion of many people an unjust one, an American statesman of half a century ago wrote a poem which ended with these words: "No question is ever settled until it is settled right." Tonight we mark the beginning of a new state and in the inauguration of this state's coming into the sisterhood of nations we are again confirmed in the theory of the poem. "No question is ever settled until it is settled right."

The prayers of the ages, the wailings at the sacred places in Jerusalem, the words of the prophets, the aspirations of the gentile nations, sometimes in conflict but always somewhere in friendship, rush through our minds. An age-old dream realized, but realized with a spirit of uncertainty because men have not become rectified to ideals supported by faith, so long have men accepted the theories of force and lived out a life of fear protected by guns and battleships.

This is a day of great symbols. The outstanding symbol is one tensely religious in its nature, one firmly established in the hearts of men of good will who accept the theory that the world was created for a purpose and that there is meaning in the strivings of men. Link with this the noble thought that man in order to attain his eternal worth must work in partnership with God. In this have we not the fulfillment of the desires of devout hearts.

The next symbol is the symbol of a people coming home to rest after wandering and being scattered the world over. It is fine for any people to be able to say, "This land is mine; here we may work out our dreams of social justice."

The day gives us another great symbol, a symbol of freedom, a symbol of liberty, a symbol where we may take from the experiences of the great American experiment in attaining freedom for man and transporting those ideas back again to the land of their origin wherein we may again shout these words inscribed on the Liberty Bell, "Proclaim liberty throughout all of the land and to all of the inhabitants therefor."

The next symbol is one of a people who have learned the worth of freedom the hard way from seldom having been able to experience it and are now given a chance to practice freedom under their own vine and fig tree. From this standpoint alone, the Jewish state gives promise of proving to the earth that those who have been denied may, given the chance, show how to give and bestow graciously rights, privileges, and freedoms which they have prayed for but seldom had. This day marks in more ways than one the fulfillment of the desire of nations.

The day is a solemn one. It should be a day of prayer, prayer wherein thanksgiving is mingled with an outpouring desire of all men to prove that those who now have a chance may in every sense become worthy. God bless America. God bless Israel. God bless free people everywhere, and may God be thanked for that which has been brought about.

Oil, Guns, and Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address

entitled "Oil, Guns, and Honor," delivered by me on Thursday evening, May 13, 1948, to the Fighters for a Free Palestine, in Madison Square Garden, New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OIL, GUNS, AND HONOR

Oil and water do not mix. In Palestine, unlike water and oil, guns and oil are mixing freely and together they are making a mockery of our national honor.

The attempt of the State Department clique to prevent the creation of a Hebrew state must be stopped at once. Unless this policy is reversed immediately we stand to lose forever the good will and respect of world opinion. In the name of humanity—in the name of common decency, the United States must support the fight for freedom now being waged in Palestine.

When Senators CHARLES TOBEY, WAYNE MORSE, and I summoned an emergency conference in Washington to propose a United States policy for Palestine and the Middle East, we were compelled to take this step since it had become apparent that the vacillation of the State Department was not in the best interests of the United States, does not represent American public opinion and is not consistent with our traditional espousal of freedom and democracy.

I hope to be able in the time allotted to relate the entire story of the manipulation of American foreign policy in the Middle East by the oil interests and to point out how this policy is loaded with danger to the United States and how it promises to wreck the good-neighbor policy and put an end to Western Hemisphere solidarity which Ambassador Austin calls an oak beam supporting American security. I will call attention to our policy of arming the Arab League and supporting the imperialistic policy of Great Britain. I will demonstrate that the consistent opposition to the establishment of a Hebrew national homeland is in direct violation of our pledged word, a reflection on our honor, and a direct repudiation of a century and a half of tradition of courageous and honorable fighting for freedom.

Every person here tonight is to be congratulated for participating in this great gathering and demonstrating faith and confidence in the ultimate success of a great cause. As Americans we must look on the problems of Palestine from two standpoints: First, as Americans who want the solution of the Palestinian problem to be in accordance with what is best for the United States; next, as Americans who sympathize, respect, and actively support the cause of free Palestine in accordance with American traditions.

This issue is not the exclusive concern of the Jews of the United States. The freedom of Palestine is necessary for all Americans, Jews, and gentiles alike. A modern, progressive, democratic state in Palestine is necessary for the United States because of sound political, economic, and military considerations.

The heroic fight which the Hebrews are waging is no more than a replica of the war which our Revolutionary fathers waged to free this country from the tyranny of George III. We, too, were fighting for a homeland, freedom of worship, our independence, and a government and institutions of our own. How can we do otherwise than espouse their cause?

We are making a grave mistake in Palestine. The State Department should be made acquainted with the facts of life. Its approach to the problem is unrealistic, wrong, and un-American.

The policy is unrealistic because it fails to take into consideration the true facts about Palestine. The Hebrews have forged a nation for themselves. This is a fact whether the British like it or not, whether the oil companies like it or not, and whether the anti-Semites like it or not. Perhaps one of these days the Middle East Division of the State Department may become aware of it. A Hebrew nation exists today in Palestine; history and the Dov Gruners, have seen to that.

I do not care to argue or discuss the merits of Hebrew rights in international law. That point is firmly established, although in the eyes of the British and our own State Department Hebrew rights have been consistently ignored.

Both the League of Nations and the United Nations have proclaimed that the peoples of Palestine are ready for self-government. Surely if the semiliterate Arabs of Iraq, Syria, and Lebanon were ready for independence and full-fledged United Nations membership, the people of Palestine are long overdue in receiving their independence and we are long overdue in recognizing them.

Ambassador Austin presented the temporary trusteeship on March 19 as a substitute for the General Assembly's resolution on partition and economic union. Why did the United States reverse its position after going to such lengths to jam partition through the Assembly? The answer reflects on the dignity and honor of our country. I am discouraged that the greed of certain oil interests, the pro-Arab sympathies of certain of our military, and a State Department clique could combine to force this new and ruinous policy on the United States.

Strategically an anti-Hebrew policy is unwise and dangerous. The Combined Chiefs of Staff of Great Britain and the United States, we are informed, are working on the theory that only four bases would be available in Europe in the event that the Continent is overrun by Russia and that we would have to operate from bases in the British Isles, Spain, north Africa, and the Middle East. The base of operations in the Middle East would be Transjordan.

I am not a military strategist, but it seems inconceivable to me that a land-locked, primitive, sparsely populated country such as Transjordan would make a better base than western Palestine. I firmly insist that a strong, tightly knit, well-organized, progressive Hebrew state, with Mediterranean ports, is our best insurance against a Communist-dominated Middle East. The Hebrews have shattered the myth of Arab military superiority and have shown the world that they are capable of defending themselves if left alone. In the Middle East only the Hebrews can be depended upon to be strong and faithful allies against any aggressor should the occasion arise.

The British have renounced their responsibilities under the mandate and are quitting at 1 minute after 6 o'clock tomorrow evening, New York time. In 20 hours from now they will conclude the sacred trust which they have so viciously and flagrantly distorted for a generation. But even now, when they claim to be withdrawing, according to the press, they are still reinforcing their troops in the Holy Land, and seeking to maintain control by shrewd schemes in which we hope the United States is not aiding and abetting.

Dispatches from Lake Success this morning stated that the United States proposed that the United Nations General Assembly appoint a single man to be "a new Palestine high commissioner."

Why does Palestine need a new high commissioner or any outside ruler and why must the United States come forth with this scheme of a new Cunningham for the Holy Land? Why the talk of a trusteeship and the curious attempt to delay the Hebrews from proclaiming the independence of Palestine? It is strange and sinister that the most advanced and progressive country in the Middle East is the only one which has been denied any measure of self-government, and concerning whose freedom there are so many cunning delays.

The British would like to have their cake and eat it too. They would like to see America finance and participate in a new occupation of Palestine under some sort of trusteeship arrangement. Not only will any trusteeship rob Palestine of its independence but with trusteeship inevitably will come the request for American troops, in order to "enforce peace" in Palestine.

I am unalterably opposed to sending American troops to Palestine. They would be no more welcome than the British troops are today. The presence of our troops would replace good will by hatred. We must recognize that an underlying residue of anti-Semitism remains in this country. Any injury to American troops, any loss of life at the hands of either Hebrew or Arab extremists and the Jews of America and all minority groups would suffer. Our troops must not be sent there.

I am familiar with the arguments used to support such a plan: that the United States must assume responsibility for preserving peace; that the United States is the only nation capable of supplying a police force at this time; and that with the announced withdrawal of British forces tomorrow, unless American troops are dispatched, a full-scale war will break out in the Middle East.

I am deeply concerned with the effect that such a move might have on Palestine. I am more concerned, however, with its effect on the United States. I fail to see how American troops, or, for that matter, how the troops of any nation, could peacefully bring together the opposing forces in Palestine.

The British have not been able to disarm the Arab and Hebrew forces and there is no reason to believe that United States soldiers could accomplish this task without being involved in the conflict and without loss of life. Of course, the British would welcome the presence of American troops in Palestine. For us to take over Great Britain's insolvency and replace her as the target of the animosity of all colonial peoples who are battling for freedom against imperialistic powers would be a feather in the cap of the Foreign Office, but it would certainly not benefit the people of the United States.

How can such a policy be reconciled with the interests of the American people? I am in favor of finding a final solution of the terrible problems confronting Palestine. Only a total solution can bring peace and order; but I don't want American soldiers to pull British chestnuts out of the fire. American soldiers must not be used to repress the just struggle for liberation of colonial peoples. With this, I am sure that all real Americans will agree.

There is one significant point in connection with the fighting in Palestine that most people seem to overlook—the forces attacking the Hebrew people do not represent the Palestinian Arabs. The armed gangs of the Arab League and Abdullah's Arab Legion are foreign mercenaries who are aided and trained by the British. Against these forces the Hebrews are successfully defending themselves. If Great Britain and other major powers are kept on the sidelines, the fighters for a free Palestine will settle the issue quickly. America does not need to send troops. We need only to lift our one-sided arms embargo and the Palestinian Hebrews will take care of themselves.

If our State Department persists in a vacillating policy its conduct in regard to the Palestinian question should be investigated. Apparently the American people are never to be trusted by the State Department. We have the tragic incident at Bogota when the Department had first-hand knowledge that trouble was brewing and that an effort would be made to disrupt the Conference. Our State Department was fully aware of the situation but made no effort to enlighten the American people. The State Department officials apparently forget that they are the servants of the people and it is their duty to take them into their confidence on matters of grave consequences. The same sin-

ister circumstances accompany the present situation in Palestine. The Department officials have had complete knowledge of the aggressive moves planned by the Arab League and by the States bordering on Palestine. In fact, our officials appear to have participated in some of the consultations. It is an intolerable situation when public servants contribute to the fomenting of disorder and trouble and then request the American people to send their troops to quell the disorders, which they themselves have instigated.

In my opinion, the background for this is oil. Oil resources in the Near and Middle East have been a dominant influence in determining policy of the United States toward Palestine. Supported by the argument that we are rapidly reaching the end of our own reserves in this country, the fashioners of our middle-eastern policy insist that access to vital oil reserves depends on the friendly attitude of the Arab League, and that therefore we cannot sponsor Hebrew liberty without jeopardizing our national security.

First, I challenge the argument that by appeasing the Arabs we can protect these oil reserves. If and when the Communists desire the oil of the Near and Middle East they will be able to go in and take it. The 10,000 mercenary troops of King Abdullah in Transjordan are the only Arab force worth mentioning. If we are interested in stopping communism and protecting oil reserves in the Middle East we must have a strong ally, an ally who is with us because of conviction and because of mutual interests. There is one sure way of imperiling these oil reserves and that is if we fail to assist progressive forces to establish a strong democratic state in Palestine.

In the second place, I deny the propaganda that our national security is dependent on Arabian oil reserves. The oil interests have duped the American people too long. They purposely confuse their interests with national interests. Because it is to their interest that the Arabian oil fields be on an operating and paying basis, and pay no American taxes, they have secured some American official support. I know that on this continent alone there are adequate reserves to see us through any crisis we might encounter in the next 20 years. At the time of expropriation of foreign oil properties, it was commonly known that the proved fields in Mexico contained three-quarters as much oil as the reserves existing at that time in the United States. Mexico was our chief supplier of oil coming from abroad. We know that oil production in Mexico is deplorably low. Mexico is actually capable of producing at least 1,000,000 barrels a day, yet today it produces less than 100,000 barrels. To increase this production machinery and equipment obtainable only in the United States is needed. What earthly reason is there to go halfway across the globe to expend vital materials and supplies in Arabia when we have adequate reserves on our doorstep? We have only to assist the Mexican people by sending them precious oil casing and machinery; without these supplies Mexican fields will not be developed and will not be available to us in event of war.

We all know the answer. The oil companies are still smarting because their Mexican properties were expropriated 10 years ago. Therefore, they doggedly oppose the exportation of these vital materials and machinery and the participation of American capital, whether private or governmental, in the financing of any development of Mexican oil reserves. In this stand, the oil companies have the fullest support of certain officials of our Government. In the Middle East, because of pressure from the oil interests, the Department of State has gone pro-Arab against world opinion, treaty obligations, international law, common decency, and our own best interests. Simply because these oil interests don't want the Mexican oil reserves developed no power in heaven or earth seems capable of moving our Government officials to permit the exportation of essential machinery and equipment.

In this connection, I might mention that the Army and Navy Petroleum Board is faced with the problem of insuring an adequate supply of oil for the armed forces in the event of war. It is anxious to see increased American production. It is even now asking the State Department to urge the American oil companies to accept Latin-American oil development contracts and pleading that the Government adopt a more liberal attitude in its loan policies for oil-production projects in Latin America.

Furthermore, I understand that the Dutch East Indies have oil reserves totaling some 5,000,000,000 barrels, and a recent survey has disclosed that Formosa has a billion barrels in reserve. With our unchallenged control of the sea lanes of the Pacific, these reserves are accessible and should be developed and utilized. In conjunction with other Western Hemispheric sources, including Canada, these sources can furnish a completely adequate supply for our needs.

In light of this alarming situation, and the security factors involved, I feel it to be my duty as a public official to propose upon my return to Washington that a committee be designated to study this problem, and recommend that measures to be taken to develop oil resources in accessible regions which are essential to the maintenance of the security and economy of the hemisphere.

In view of the gravity of the Palestinian problem, every American should be interested in the policy our Government plans to initiate from tomorrow on when the British mandate ends. The record reveals how the wind is blowing.

There seems to be no doubt then that our State Department and the British Foreign Office are desperately seeking to prevent the establishment of an independent Hebrew Republic in Palestine. According to the press, a delaying message has been sent by the State Department to Palestine.

I predict that Soviet Russia and her satellites as well as some Latin-American states will take the ball away from us and send ambassadors to Palestine; and once again our State Department will have blundered. It is not too late for our Government to get on the right side. There is still time for our Government to act before the dead line.

Our Chief Executive has the power to rectify the grave mistakes of the State Department. If President Truman would appoint an American Ambassador to Palestine on May 15 that act alone would electrify the world and challenge communism in a way no atom bomb could equal. The hope that lies in the hearts of the oppressed, downtrodden, and enslaved peoples of the world would be rekindled. The promise expressed by Winston Churchill and Franklin Roosevelt in the historic Atlantic Charter would achieve its true meaning. The United Nations would be revitalized and America would then take its place where she rightfully belongs, leading the world in a cause worth fighting for—on the side of freedom and democracy.

Freedom fighters of Palestine, raise your flag and proclaim your independence. We cannot recognize a hope, we cannot send arms to a dream, we cannot ally ourselves to a promise. Proclaim your freedom and America, the American people will come clean. Hebrew independence must not be delayed. Establish your government now so that the American people can recognize and help you. Now.

Most of the American people are behind the fighters for freedom in Palestine. Our history is filled with accounts of heroic volunteers who have left the safety and security of this great country to risk life and fortune fighting for freedom in all parts of the world. The Lafayette Esquadrille was a spontaneous demonstration of the spirit of fair play and justice inherent in every American. Americans are by nature in favor of the "little guy" and they are willing to fight in defense of freedom. The request of countless patriotic Americans of all races and creeds that they be permitted to fight in behalf of Hebrew freedom should not be denied. The George Washington Legion must take its place in history alongside the Lafayettes, the Byrons, and the other friends of freedom.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a broadcast by Henry A. Wallace, delivered on Friday, March 19, 1948, over the facilities of the Mutual Broadcasting System.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WALLACE ANSWERS TRUMAN

I wish to thank the Mutual Broadcasting System for this time to answer the attack made the night before last on those who join me in the belief that there is no reason to speak for war, and that there is every reason to work for peace.

We who speak up for peace were accused of dividing the people for evil purposes. But whatever he may call it, I stand with millions of my fellow Americans in opposing Mr. Truman's plans to militarize our country.

We don't want our country led down the road to war.

We don't want young America in uniform at a time when no nation in the world offers any physical threat to our security.

We don't want our fine young men sent overseas to defend the interests of private oil firms and cartels.

If this be treason, spare us the kind of patriotism which insists that might makes right.

When he attempted to brand as Communists those who support our fight for peace, Mr. Truman appealed to prejudice because he could not answer us with reason.

He was trying to give the impression that it is only the Communists who disapprove of his policies of supporting Fascists, kings, and reactionaries around the world; that it is only the Communists who stand for repudiation of the Truman doctrine; that it is only the Communists who fight his plans to draft our young men and militarize the country.

But millions of Americans who stand firmly opposed to his policies know that they are not Communists, and they will not be frightened into accepting militarism because someone calls them Communists.

Mr. Truman has done what other professional politicians have done before him—he has given the Communists credit for all the decent ideas which are advocated in this land of ours.

I don't like to have the President give them credit for ideas that come from Isaiah and Christ, from Jefferson and Lincoln. We all remember the many times Franklin Roosevelt was charged with communism. Like those who used this tactic against Roosevelt, he presents no evidence that I have ever

advocated a single policy inconsistent with the most fundamental American concepts of freedom. Either the Communists are better folks than we have been told to believe or Mr. Truman is giving them such a reputation.

What is it that I have said in opposing the Truman doctrine which gives rise to such attacks?

First, I have said that a policy which seeks to fight ideas with guns is doomed to failure. I said a year ago that the Truman doctrine would not bring peace, but would bring us closer to war. Mr. Truman admitted that in both of his speeches on Wednesday. Only yesterday the very conservative New York Herald Tribune reported that mass executions—political executions—are going on in Greece. The situation there is far worse today than it was a year ago when Mr. Truman went to the rescue of the old royalist crowd.

In the past year I have said repeatedly that peace is not only necessary, but clearly possible. I have said that those who speak of the inevitability of war are criminals. It is a slander against the intelligence of mankind to say that we can't avoid war by use of principle and reason. It is a flat statement that the people aren't intelligent. And if one accepts that notion, he denies the very basis of democracy.

Now in this year since the Truman doctrine was proclaimed with the blessing of the leaders of both old parties, I have said repeatedly that the only purpose it can serve is to terrorize our own people and people abroad. It says quite clearly—and I think falsely—that there is a lot more blood to be shed before we get peace.

Here at home, while the bipartisans have built up their synthetic case of a menace from abroad, our own freedoms have been undermined. Our trade-unions were early victims when the Congress passed the Taft-Hartley law restricting their power to protect the workers. In an atmosphere of hysteria, the administration and the House Un-American Committee have literally terrorized millions of people into silence. I get so many letters—lots of them unsigned—from people who ask me to fight back. They say that they don't dare open their mouths for peace or they will lose their jobs. Speech isn't free when it costs a man his livelihood.

In this past year I have challenged Mr. Truman and his bipartisan supporters to show a single American principle or a single American public interest which would have to be sacrificed to make peace with Russia.

In a hundred speeches during the past year I have affirmed my faith in my country and its institutions. I have stated my conviction that we are being led to slaughter by men who put property and profit above human needs, who put their own immediate interests above the general welfare.

The only answer they give is to cry "Communist," which is a completely demagogic response from men who have responsible positions of leadership.

I am both a businessman and a farmer. I like to make a reasonable profit from the developments I have made in agricultural science. And I would like to see our American system work so well that all independent businessmen and farmers and workers can enjoy the benefits of the very full production which is possible.

But I am an opponent of monopolies and cartels which profit at the expense of the general welfare. I don't like the way they stifle small business; the way they fight labor unions; the way they try to shift the blame for high prices to farmers and workers. Above all, I don't like to see them use their powerful organs—both press and radio—in an effort to dominate the lives of millions of Americans. They have called opposition to monopoly communistic. I call it fundamental Americanism.

Let me put it simply:

I want all the benefits which modern science makes possible—all the wonderful products for better and longer living—made available to all of our people. I am glad that we have the highest standard of living in the world, but I know that we don't have anywhere near the standard of living which lies within our reach. I know that we can't realize our potential abundance, or help raise the standards of living elsewhere in the world, if our energies and resources and science are perverted to produce tools for war.

It is generally considered that the Communists are a menace, but I know that they are no menace if we meet the economic and social problems for which they offer very radical solutions.

I get the impression these days that the people who are most dominated by the Kremlin—by Moscow—are those who oppose everything the Russians do, whether it is good or bad or inconsequential. By their actions they have convinced me that they are more responsive to Moscow than the American Communists with their spiritual and ideological affinity for Communists in Russia. We cannot chart a course for America on blind hate or blind love for what the Russians do.

This word "communism" is a much greater menace than the Communists. The word has been applied to every idea slightly to the left of slavery. I am sure that I could take long passages from the works of Jefferson and Lincoln and get them banned from classrooms on the grounds that they are too radical. This is the sort of nonsense which threatens everything we have built here in America.

If we want peace we must challenge everyone who uses the word "Communist." We must demand that he define exactly what he is talking about. We shall find, I am sure, that it is used most often by men who are afraid to discuss an issue on its merits.

Adolf Hitler made good political use of this red-baiting weapon, but let us remember that his first attack was made on western democracies, not Russia. The same course is being followed today. It is not Russia, but American democracy which is the intended victim of the first attack. It won't work. Housewives may forget the grocery bill for a little while if the menace is built up to huge proportions, but sooner or later they want to know what happened to their dollars while someone was crying "red." Veterans can't be fooled for very long by those who say we can produce anything necessary for war, including barracks for army camps, but that we can't produce homes. Trade-union members know that every strike for decent conditions and every demand for a living wage has been called "Communist inspired." They aren't fooled.

The cry of "Communist" is used against us because we are attacking entrenched interests, because we believe that it is possible to make peace with Russia, and because we know that you can't fight the economic theories of Karl Marx with atom bombs.

In the past year I have advanced a number of proposals which I believe can contribute to the establishment of a durable peace.

The first step, of course, is to call off the Truman doctrine, which was the declaration of the cold war. We must substitute policies of genuine economic aid through the United Nations. This is only possible if we remove from office men whose private interests cause them to adopt policies which are contrary to the interests of the people. I refer, of course, to the bankers and the generals and admirals who have moved into so many key positions in Washington. They aren't evil men, but their personal interests make it impossible for them to serve us well.

Secondly, we must get international control of the middle eastern oil and the other great reservoirs of raw materials which private firms have exploited. They have done it with the support of arms and subsidies paid for by all the people, even though only a few enjoy any profits. We can't afford this kind of risk. We have seen what it means in terms of Palestine and Greece.

Third, we must repair our share of the damage done to the United Nations—and our responsibility is great, even though the administration would like to shift all the blame to others. We have to build the UN, and we can do it, if we will bring our practices into line with fundamental American principles. If we aren't going to lose all of the great moral leadership we had at the end of the war, we must face our own responsibilities for the world crisis.

Fourth, on the home front we have to fight against the restrictions on civil liberties and make our democracy really work. That means that we must do away with poll taxes and lynch law and segregation, the oppressive labor laws, and all the other evil practices which make our proclamations about democracy ring hollow in most of the world.

Fifth, we must stop the trend toward militarization of America which is so profitable to a few entrenched interests and so dangerous to the freedom of all. There must be a united action against the draft and compulsory military training which would regiment the lives of our young people.

Last—and certainly not least—we must look the situation over carefully and calmly find out just what major differences we have with the Russians. Having cleaned up our own delinquencies in matters of civil liberties and interference in the political affairs of Greece, Turkey, France, Italy, Latin-America, and many other places, we can talk with the Russians about the ways to expand freedom everywhere. We shall then have moral authority and the friendship of people in every part of the globe. If there are economic differences—matters of markets and raw materials—we can work them out. We must recognize the ideological differences between the Russians and ourselves and demonstrate our own faith in democracy and the free flow of ideas.

What both the United States and Russia must realize is that in these days when war entails widespread civilian destruction by radiant gas, clouds and bacteria, the only sound military defense is a world-wide good-neighbor policy. Military men are always experts in the last war and amateurs in the next war. What I am saying is that science has now made peace the only possible military security for the United States.

I say furthermore that our present program of trying to run the entire world by force and dollars will lead to limitless demands which will ruin us. One year it will be $400,000,000, the next year $8,000,000,000, the next $40,000,000,000, and so on in rapid progression until war itself soon becomes the only possible answer as domestic discontent rises. That is why I am fighting so hard to bring about a complete reversal of the Truman, Forrestal, Vandenberg doctrine of domestic militarization and foreign support of kings and reactionaries.

There are other things to be done, of course. We need a UN police force. We need a more democratic structure for the UN, with direct representation of the people. We need world law with teeth in it. But we can't get these things until we do the others, and we certainly can't get them by building landing barges, tanks, pursuit planes, atom bombs, and uniforms for our 18-year-olds.

Mr. Truman and the others can raise their false cry of "Communist" but they won't stop us from fighting for peace. They can't stop millions of Americans from coming into the new party and building the political organization that will win the fight for peace. If the few thousand American Communists support Glen Taylor and myself, they are supporting our program. It is the program I have outlined. It is an American program based on our belief in democracy—on our faith in our fellow men—on our faith in their judgment when they are given the facts.

In closing let me repeat my challenge to Mr. Truman and to all the other candidates

for office—I ask them to join me in the following pledge:

"I shall not knowingly accept the support of any individual or group advocating the limitation of democratic action for any other individual or group; nor the support of any individual or group which would restrict the civil liberties of others for reasons of race, color, or creed; nor the support of any individual or group advocating the violent overthrow of the Government of the United States."

Candidates who accept the support of the race supremacy fiends, who would limit the democratic actions of trade-unions, who would restrict the flow of free speech, who support intimidation and campaigns of hate and fear can't join in this pledge.

Those of us who believe in democracy pledge it with pride.

Pay Increase for Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 17 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Justified Pay Raise," published in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram of April 14, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUSTIFIED PAY RAISE

When complaint is heard about the inefficiency of Federal employees, the workers in the postal system are rarely included. As a class, these workers are recognized as being among the best and most efficient in the Government service. In comparison with the responsibilities their duties involve, they likewise are among the most poorly paid.

Up until 1945, postal employees had received no increase in basic pay since 1925. Two raises since then have not brought it to a lavish scale. The beginning postal clerk or letter carrier receives, in this day of high prices, $2,100 a year. The top limit that can be reached after years of service is $3,100, plus a slight addition in longevity pay. The increase won in 1945 virtually was nullified by elimination of overtime work. A similar $400 increase the next year was offset by the rising cost of living.

Three bills to boost the pay of postal workers to a level more nearly in keeping with present conditions are pending in Congress. One of them, favorably reported by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, would add $800 a year to the basic scale of postal employees and would increase the pay of other Government workers by $650 a year.

Undoubtedly a raise in any amount would be welcomed by all Federal employees, but the handlers of mail are especially deserving. Because they started lower in the pay scale, their compensation still lags behind that of comparable Government workers despite the modest gains in 1945 and 1946. Whether or not the $800 a year specified in the pending bill is the proper figure, a raise to the postal employee to prevent him from falling further behind in the cost-of-living race is justified.

In spite of the high costs of government and the need for economy in its operations, Congress can afford to grant a raise to this group of employees purely on the basis that "a laborer is worthy of his hire."

Editorial Tribute to Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 17 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial paying tribute to Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson, from the Washington Post of May 14.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANDERSON'S SERVICE

As Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson proved himself equally adept at enunciating and administering broad-gaged agricultural policies and at fending off unfounded attacks on his Department. In the best sense a diplomat, he knew how to deal with men, particularly his old colleagues in Congress, and his services in the Cabinet will be missed as he enters the contest for the Democratic senatorial nomination in New Mexico. Mr. Anderson occasionally was accused, and rightly, of vacillation. Nevertheless, when stacked up against Mr. Anderson's record of constructive accomplishment, these instances were few and minor. The former Secretary was, of course, first and foremost a champion of agricultural interests, but his view of agriculture was related to the entire economy, and not limited.

This was shown in the role that Mr. Anderson played in encouraging farm production to meet world hunger, even though he was not unaware of the danger of potential surpluses. He also lent useful assistance to the domestic food-conservation drives. At the same time he served the Nation as well as agriculture in keeping Congress forever reminded of the need for adequate long-range farm protection. It will be no easy task to replace Clinton Anderson with a man of like ability. We hope to see him back in Washington.

Utah Reflected in Her Sons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 17 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the transcript of an address I made on the subject of Utah Reflected in Her Sons, broadcast over the facilities of Station KSL, Salt Lake City, Utah, May 11, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UTAH REFLECTED IN HER SONS

I am reading a book written by one of Utah's great men, Dr. Parley A. Christiansen, of the Brigham Young University. The book is a series of essays entitled "All in a Teacher's Day." I am wondering if my listeners would be interested in a series of thoughts on Utahans which we could label "all in a Senator's day."

When I delivered the commencement address at the Utah State Agriculture College a few years ago I said that Utah's first duty is to produce leaders for the Nation. The ideals of our people and of our State are such that we can do that and do it well. Under the democratic system, this, of course, is being done everywhere in America, but that it is strikingly being done in Utah is proved by a report of the visits and a few of the letters received by me from Utahans within the last fortnight.

We hear a great deal these days about the word "proletariate." This word came to life again as part of the vocabulary of the modern Russian movement. The first time I saw the word was in reading Cicero in my old Latin days. Cicero defined a person who belonged to this proletariate as one who did nothing for his state but raise children. The German military idea under the Kaiser when they used to talk of gun fodder is something akin to it. Utah must never produce gun fodder nor must she supply a proletariate. Our ideals and our educational institutions are too fine for that. We want to produce and develop leaders for our Nation. That we can do, and that we are doing, although we are not a rich State nor a powerful State in the sense that other States are powerful and rich. That Utah's influence is being felt the Nation over, yes, even in the far corners of the earth, is truly reflected in her sons.

First, an item that brings gratitude and appreciation to a teacher's soul—two letters have been received from former students who were in one of my classes at the same time while I was teaching at the university. One student told me he has become vice president of the Ford Motor Corp., the other that he is now vice president and general manager of one of the country's biggest corporations, the Nash Kelvinator Co. Then another classmate of these boys has just become president of the National Restaurant Association. This teacher takes full credit for the success of these outstanding Utah boys, but I probably forgot or did not have the foresight to give them A's.

Another former student is vice president of one of America's big paper companies which buys much of its paper from Finland. This young man, though located in the biggest city of the world, speaks of Utah as home. He has traveled extensively throughout Europe in connection with his business and brought with him to my office the other day a top notch Finnish exporter. We talked about Russian-Finland relations because our friend from Finland has just returned from two trips into Russia. He speaks Russian fluently and therefore gained something from his visit to bring to us that other people were not able to get who did not know the language.

An interesting experience of the week was with Lord Beaverbrook and his London Daily Express. You might ask, now how can Utahans figure in this picture. But here is the story. Beaverbrook represents those interests in England who are are opposed to our European recovery plan, cooperation with America, and the British loan. He wants England to stand alone in the world under the old empire structure. I got my name in his feature because I called attention to one of his editorials and labeled it "An Unfriendly Friendly Editorial." His paper liked the term and he gave me another half column. Our Utah missionaries in London clipped the editorials and sent them to me by air mail. Utah is surely close to the world. A paper comes out in the morning in London, we get it the next morning in Washington. No matter what theory you have—one world, two worlds, or a multitude of worlds, we are surely living close to one another and half of the world does know what the other half is doing.

We met another Utahan at the Thomas Jefferson meeting at Columbia University. He is leaving Columbia to join our university after profitable years of experience away from Utah. He is a great man and another great asset to our country.

Then, at the annual meetings of the American Society of International Law held in Washington recently, we met a Utahan who is now municipal judge in one of the big eastern cities. What a wonderful experience to renew acquaintances with old friends in that society who are interested in building a new and better world. The bright spot here was to listen to two men, who have spent their lives attempting to bring about world order, speak about gains, realizing that there is going to be a long struggle, but who find optimistic encouragement almost every day. The people of the world may not be ready for world government, but they are getting ready. They are learning a little bit at a time through practical experience as our people have learned. The growth is slow but it is steady, and it is more and more coming under American leadership, and Utah's contribution is reflected in that leadership. Here again some of the things I have talked about seem far removed from our everyday life, but I want to repeat they are closer to you than any program you have in your own backyard. What happens to you if we cannot keep the American dollar stable? What happens to you if the third world war starts? What happens to you if a jet plane or if something equivalent to the bomb picks one of our towns? Stability and peace mean more to every man, woman, and child who is able to listen to my voice tonight than any other two things we can think of, and Utah is reflected in the strivings for that peace and stability through the tireless efforts of her sons and daughters.

Then, calling in my office was another great man, an educator who has brought national recognition to our State, the president of the National Education Association. This man's election to this place of high honor places Utah in the field of education where she rightly belongs.

I have a letter on my desk from my old university classmate who has just been elected president of the National Bar Association, saying he will be in Washington to visit me this month. This is another great reflection on Utah.

Two young men from Salt Lake came to Washington to testify before one of the Senate committees in opposition to the bill under consideration. These young men were well prepared, modest, and honest, and everyone trusted them and had confidence in what they said. Even the proponents of the bill made comment to this effect. My heart fills with joy when my colleagues in the Senate go out of their way to commend witnesses appearing in their committees, who have come from home, for their forthrightness, straightforwardness, and honesty.

Two former students dropped in to say "Hello" from San Francisco and Oakland; one here on business with the Government as the legal representative of one of the large real estate firms in San Francisco, organized and operated by Utahans—the other representing the Standard Oil of California, a lawyer for that firm. Both of these boys told me that the president of the Standard Oil of California is a Utahan.

Here I have only mentioned, without naming, those Utahans who have visited me in my office or who have written me from elsewhere in the United States or from abroad within the last 2 weeks. Time will not permit mentioning the hundreds of Utahans living in Washington who are successful and who are praiseworthy and who do honor to all of you at home. Our Utah heritage is reflected in all of these young people, they are proud of their beginnings, and when we view their lives and become thoughtful we say, "Only in America can these things happen."

Utah has so much to offer in the way of resources, heritage, and manhood that if our own people would honor each other by emphasizing our strength and assets, not calling attention to our weaknesses, we would grow still further in stature in the eyes of the world. No one then would be able to say like one famous modern author, that the "people in Utah are dead from their shoulders up."

I am for Utah and Utahans. Utah's greatness is truly reflected in her sons, not only in America, but abroad in the world. I am proud to be a Senator from Utah because of the greatness reflected in the people of our State. I am proud to represent Utah people, but if I am thought worthy of being representative of Utah people I am prouder still.

Charles L. Gifford

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1948

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. CHARLES L. GIFFORD, late a Representative from the State of Massachusetts

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most unusual and interesting characters that I have ever known was the late CHARLES GIFFORD, who so ably represented the Ninth Congressional District of Massachusetts. I will remember him for his profound Americanism, his common sense, his high principles, and his sense of humor.

Mr. GIFFORD was a devoted public servant. He made a distinct contribution to his community, his State, and to our great Republic. He has earned his reward.

Recognition of the State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Record of Bungling," from the New York Herald Tribune of yesterday, Sunday, dealing with the recognition of Israel by our Government.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RECORD OF BUNGLING

Mr. Truman was indubitably right in recognizing the state of Israel. But the fact that the porpoiselike progress of American policy toward Palestine has, at this moment, succeeded in bringing the Nation's head above water, affords no confidence that there will not be another plunge. It would be difficult, indeed, to discover in the history of American diplomacy a more peculiar sequence of events than that which has marked the national policy in the Near East, and the vast bewilderment which swept the world on the announcement of the recognition of Israel is a clear warning of danger ahead.

The United States has long been regarded as the principal exponent of Jewish aspirations in the Holy Land. American criticism was an important factor in inducing the British to withdraw from the mandate, and American support for partition was essential to the adoption of that program by the United Nations. This country's reversal on partition was a great shock to world opinion; whether other nations agreed with the American stand or not, they were astonished to find it changed so abruptly and with such a lack of candor. The same reaction, doubled in intensity, will accompany Mr. Truman's recognition of partition. The patent fact that the President's actions caught the American delegation at Lake Success completely by surprise will do nothing to enhance the dignity or the prestige of the diplomatic representatives of the United States.

This is of far more than casual importance in the present state of world affairs. The position of the United States in the eyes of the world is one of great power. There is comfort in that for nations struggling with intricate economic problems and confronting the threat of Communist aggression. But there is also a latent fear, no little jealousy, and some suspicion, which is assiduously fostered by Communists everywhere. If the world comes to conceive of the United States as a fumbling giant, it will be alarmed, because power, ignorantly used, is always dangerous. If the world loses respect for America's moral purpose and steadfastness, the situation will be worse. The most benevolent gestures will be looked on with cynicism and apprehension, and the fast-developing unity of the non-Communist nations will be weakened at the heart.

The ticklish Palestine problem has not been disposed of, so far as the United States is concerned, by the recognition of the Jewish state. Israel is in danger, the war is developing with ominous speed, and America cannot remain complacent. The world, certainly, will be watching critically as American policy develops in the Near East. If the old pattern continues—of alternate strength and weakness, of dodging responsibility until overtaken by events, of big words and petty deeds—the cost to the United States in terms of international respect will be incalculable.

Mr. Truman has expressed the pious hope that foreign policy will be kept out of the coming Presidential campaign. So far as major objectives are concerned, most Americans share his wish. But it is impossible for the voters to overlook, or candidates to ignore, obvious bungling in the conduct of foreign affairs. The Palestine question has been badly bungled thus far, and though the worst effects of the errors may still be repaired, the errors themselves cannot be forgotten.

The President's Off-the-Record Address to Newspaper Editors and Publishers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
O.
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a column entitled "Lighter Vein," by V. Y. Dallman, editor of the Illinois State Register, of Springfield, Ill. Mr. Dallman is a very outstanding newspaperman of our State.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIGHTER VEIN

(By V. Y. Dallman (admiral))

MIRACULOUS REINCARNATION OF HARRY TRUMAN AT PRESS FEAST MAKES HIS NOMINATION CINCH

President Truman was speaking. Four hundred newspaper editors and publishers and an additional 400 guests were according the President of the United States indifferent attention. There was the usual black-tie and evening-gown politeness, but Harry Truman wasn't getting any applause.

Then came as near a miracle in politics as this writer has ever witnessed. We were lolling at ease after a sumptuous banquet in the President's room of the beautiful Statler Hotel in Washington.

The scene was an iridescent dream of beauty. The indirect lighting system shed a tricolor red, white, and blue effect across the ceiling and upon the walls. The deep-red curtain behind the long speaker's table where the President and many dignitaries sat was studded with brilliant stars.

All of this rich color blended perfectly with the deep meaning of the national anthem which the Marine Band orchestra played inspiringly from an elevated stage off to one side.

There was some buzz of conversation and no little smoking of cigars and cigarettes as the mostly Republican audience of men and their ladies of affluence sat back to endure the Democratic President's speech in a twangy voice.

For 15 minutes Mr. Truman broadcast his address. It was echoing across the continent on a great network. He talked about national defense, inflation, Russia, communism, and what not, but it was just another Truman speech.

Then came the miracle.

Occupying a ringside seat only 15 feet from the President, I could study his facial expressions and interpret the personal qualities which always enter into any speech.

Strangely enough, the President's entire personality seemed to change. He had brushed his papers aside, announced that what he was about to say for another 15 minutes was "off the record," and was pouring out his heart as I had never seen him do before.

If he had been a Wilson, a Roosevelt, a Bryan, a Norris or a Vandenburg he couldn't have done better.

Republicans forgot that they were Republicans; Democrats that they were Democrats, as they actually leaned forward seeking to catch every syllable falling from the lips of a man whose voice changed for the better under the pressure of heart throbs as he poured out his soul in an appeal for national unity to prevent war, promote peace and serve mankind here and throughout the world.

What the President said I must not quote, but as he finished his off-the-record address, bowed and with his aides walked across the stage, down the steps and through an exit, he was given a prolonged, tumultuous ovation which continued after he had disappeared.

I saw hard-boiled Republicans turn one to another in surprise. I heard many of them say: "That was a great speech!"

That miracle made history. What the President said to stir those Republican minds and hearts was only a part of the miracle. The surprising companion part was that those Republican hearts could be so warmed by any Democrat and especially by Harry Truman.

Reverberations from that miracle have echoed across the Nation. Time magazine of May 3, 1948, was so moved that it gave preferred position on its first page of National Affairs to the report of that speech by Roscoe Drummond, chief of the Washington bureau of the Christian Science Monitor. It quoted Drummond as saying:

"I put it as a careful statement of fact that I never heard any political personage receive any longer, sustained or more spontaneous applause than came from that group of overwhelmingly Republican newspaper editors. They liked what Mr. Truman had to say and they liked the way he said it. They felt an integrity, a humility, a morality of purpose * * * which stirred their esteem, their regard, and their good will."

Time magazine went on to say:

"A good two score of the guests remarked to Presidential press secretary, Charles Ross, that if Harry Truman carried on his campaign with that kind of effectiveness, 'he'll be a hard guy to beat.'"

As I wired back from Washington to this paper that night, "a new Harry Truman had been revealed." Moreover, from that moment on, there was not the slightest doubt that President Truman would be nominated at Philadelphia for a full term as President.

United States Landholdings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "United States Landholdings," published in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram of April 13, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES LANDHOLDINGS

County officials in California are disturbed, with ample good reason, over Federal ownership of real property within the State. The situation has reached the point that the Federal Government now owns 47 percent of the State's total area, and its acquisitions have taken $900,000,000 in valuations off the assessment rolls. Federal ownership of this land deprives the State and counties of $35,000,000 a year in revenues they would receive if the properties were subject to taxation.

These statistics were gathered for the County Supervisors' (Commissioners) Association, to be used in a plea for Congress for some measure of relief. The plea is one in which local officials of all States and counties might well join. California's plight may be worse than that of some other States, but to a greater or lesser degree the same situation exists in all States.

Senator BYRD, of Virginia, made a report to Congress back in 1943, which showed that on January 1 of that year Federal ownership of real estate comprised more than one-fifth of the entire land area of the country. A table accompanying the report showed some Federal landholdings in every State of the Union. And considerable amounts of land were acquired by the Government after January 1, 1943.

As a rule, federally owned real estate is exempt from taxation, although in some cases payments in lieu of taxes have been made to local units of government which formerly taxed the property. Generally speaking, however, the Government's land acquisitions have placed heavy burdens on adjacent property remaining in private hands, and in some cases they have created financial crises for school districts and municipalities.

Equal Opportunity in Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an address on the subject Equal Opportunity in Education, by Mrs. Eugene Meyer, at the conference on human rights, civil and cultural, at Howard University, Washington, D. C., May 13, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I realize that you wish me to speak today on equality of educational opportunity in the college. But there can never be equal opportunity at the highest levels until there is more equality in the preparation given our boys and girls in our elementary and grammar schools. The children who come from States with less per-capita wealth, or those who come from rural areas and city slums, now have the poorest schools. This militates against their chances of getting into college. But even in our most prosperous States we have neglected the schools and teacher training to such an extent that many of the graduates find themselves handicapped by inadequate preparation for college.

At the health conference last week a dean of one of our leading medical schools stated that only a few of the best schools have a full quota of top-notch students. One-eighth of the students in other medical schools are not the proper material, and we are not producing enough top-flight men for scientific research. Everywhere the bottleneck of talent, said this medical man, is on the lowest level of education. As for the rank and file, I need not remind you that we rejected about 5,000,000 men in the last war for illiteracy and mental or physical instability.

One admiral who is in favor of universal military training said last week that we wouldn't need universal military training so urgently, if only our public schools did a more thorough educational job throughout the country. But, said he, many of our high-school graduates are so badly prepared that we have to begin their mathematics all over again.

In other words, equality of opportunity at the college level is a myth, as long as it depends on the geographical area in which the applicant happens to be born. It is a myth for many others whose schools have lost so many of their good teachers that they no longer give their students a sound education. We have allowed our elementary education to run down to a point where we are endangering our whole intellectual and cultural life.

And we have done this at a moment when as never before, this country is confronted by a demand for the greatest possible number of informed, educated, and mature citizens. We need them for the country's functioning as the world's leading Nation. We need them to maintain our responsibilities toward other nations. We need them for military defense. Above all, we need a

form of defense that transcends mere military power. To be sure, we must be strong enough to wage war. We must be strong enough to prevent aggression that threatens peace. And we cannot achieve the requisite moral, mental, and physical poise to prevent war, unless we underpin our whole social structure with educated people.

Such progress as communism has made among our people is largely due to the fact that its propaganda emphasizes the undeniable weaknesses in our social structure. Secretary Marshall in his recent speech made it clear that communism is not so much the danger to American security as the conditions that give rise to communism. If we use all instrumentalities wisely and courageously to fight those conditions in our own country and abroad, the United States can become, said the Washington Post last week, a master builder. Only with faith in democratic principles can the master builder undermine the master destroyer.

But faith in the power, the resilience and the justice of democracy cannot be sustained in our country, if we ignore our own breeding grounds of communism on the plea that we are too busy cleaning them up in Europe. Unless we mend some of the basic weaknesses in our social structure, such as inadequate educational facilities and inadequate housing, there will be serious unrest in our country. And this unrest will be strongest among your people, for they have suffered the greatest injustices in both areas. But however important the housing problem may be, education is the more vital need, for it is the foundation of our democratic liberties. Without an educated citizenry able to preserve and extend freedom, the Nation cannot endure—least of all when communism flaunts its false but utopian ideology.

Therefore, one of our basic, immediate needs in this country is Federal aid to education. The best bill to achieve it is now in Congress. It has already passed the Senate by a vote of 58 to 22. But it is hung up in the Committee of Labor and Education in the House, because the Republican majority leaders will not give it the green light. Why not? Because they want to balance the budget. Now, I have every respect for the Nation's need of economic solvency. Our expenditures for the Marshall plan, for armaments, for a possible military training program are vast. But the most elementary social needs of the American people cannot be neglected if our people are to be fit to carry out the Marshall plan and a defense program that makes not only for military strength, but holds aloft the moral superiority of democratic principles.

My friends, we have at present a Senate of outstanding ability, courage, and statesmanship. It is a deliberative body in the finest sense of the word. Both the Republican and Democratic leadership have made a distinguished record on national and international questions of the greatest moment. But the House of Representatives has not taken the same broad perspective. To be sure, it has passed the anti-poll tax bill and reduced taxes. And only last week the Speaker, Mr. MARTIN, indicated that the House would pass the measures for the entry of our country into the World Health Organization and for the acceptance of our quota of European displaced persons. This recent statement indicates an awareness of our international social responsibilities. They should be balanced by an equal awareness of the serious social problems that confront us here at home.

Let us examine the House record in regard to Federal aid to education. The hearings have been completed under the able chairmanship of Mr. MCCOWEN, of Ohio. Since the Senate passed the bill with an overwhelming majority a barrage of national organizations and distinguished individuals have pleaded with the Speaker, Mr. MARTIN, to get the bill reported out in the House. Only last week in one single delegation 20 national organizations—labor unions, farm organizations, women's clubs, and professional groups—representing many millions of citizens, called on the Speaker to urge enactment of the education-aid bill at this session. He tells everybody the same thing. He thinks there are enough votes to pass the bill in the House. He is for it, he says. But we are already spending too much money. We can't afford it.

The answer to that argument was made by the United States Chamber of Commerce when it issued its detailed study that proved the close relationship throughout our country between the per capita production and buying power of each State and community to the per capita expenditure on education. But the best analysis of educational finance in its relationship to the Nation's economy is contained in a book recently published by Seymour E. Harris, professor of economics in the Harvard Graduate School of Administration, entitled "How Shall We Pay for Education?" Professor Harris makes out a strong case for increased Federal aid to education. He points out that from 1913 to 1950 (estimated), Federal revenues will have risen about 12 times as much as State and local revenues. Furthermore the Federal tax system responds better to changing economic conditions, is more productive of revenue, and is also less depressing on the economy, dollar for dollar, than the State and local tax systems. The Federal Government should bear larger responsibilities, too, because it has held for itself the most productive forms of revenue. Finally since maleducation in one part of the country affects the rest of the country adversely the Federal Government in the interests of the country as a whole should redress the balance. He reports that State aid for education by 12 Southern States recently amounted to 1.4 percent of the income of these relatively poor States; and 9 wealthy Northern States contributed only 0.65 percent of the income of their citizens as State aid to education. "How much longer," demands Mr. Harris, "will the Federal Government go on spending less than a hundred million per year on the schools of the country, that is, less than 0.3 percent of its income and less than 0.1 percent of the Nation's economy?" To the budget minded Mr. Harris demonstrates that for every billion dollars spent by Government for education the returns in the rise of the Nation's economy would be many times the outlay. That it would also bring about more important if unmeasurable noneconomic gains is almost self-evident, says Professor Harris.

He might well have stated the case more strongly. For all the arguments of the United States Chamber of Commerce and by Professor Harris indicate that if the $300,000,000 provided in the bill for Federal aid to education are invested in strengthening our human resources, that sum will produce more wealth, material, moral, and spiritual, than any other investment of a similar sum.

But in spite of the material and moral arguments in favor of Federal aid to education, and in spite of the overwhelming national sentiment behind it, the power of the Speaker is such that he can nullify the wishes of the people and the Congressmen who represent them. The improper exercise of such power is a stultification of the democratic process. It is an arbitrary disregard of the national welfare. It is a situation as tragic as it is dangerous for the Republican Party. For the social consciousness displayed by the Senate Republicans will not counteract the impression of social indifference that is being made in the House.

It is conceded by the House leadership that no bill for national health protection can pass at this session. A housing bill of some sort may pass, but there is doubt about the most necessary part of such a bill, the provision for public housing. Therefore, Federal aid to education is the only measure by which the Republican leadership in the House can demonstrate its interest in the public welfare. JOE MARTIN, himself, told the press that there is more public interest in Federal aid to education than in any other measure now before the Congress and that the bill would surely pass if it is reported out. Mr. MARTIN has every reason to know about the enormous pressure behind the Federal aid to education bill. Early returns on a Gallup poll not yet completed confirm his opinion that a clear-cut majority of the American people are in favor of the bill. But it ought to interest JOE MARTIN that the majority of these people also say that they are willing to pay the taxes to raise the $300,000,000 to foot the bill.

The question I should, therefore, respectfully like to ask the Speaker is this: Can the Republican Party face the people of this Nation at the coming election without a single measure to its credit that indicates sympathy for our country's social progress and welfare? How does Mr. MARTIN think it will sit with the voters when he tells them that with billions for Europe and for armaments, we can't afford $300,000,000 to educate our own children properly and give their teachers a living wage? How can he continue to plead the need for economy when the people, themselves, are willing to pay the extra taxes to foot the bill? Surely his argument that nothing but the need to balance the budget keeps the Federal aid to education bill bottled up in committee no longer has any validity, if the people are willing to accept additional tax burdens to meet its cost.

The education of millions of your children is at stake, for this bill (S. 472 and its counterpart, H. R. 2593) provides for a just and equitable distribution of funds for the benefit of a minority group in all States which maintain segregated schools by law. Here is the chance to make those schools as good as they should be. If you have not already done so, I beg of you to enlist the interest of your most prominent northern leaders and organizations in the field of politics and welfare to present to Speaker MARTIN the reasons why Federal aid to education is of special importance to the future of your people.

Let me answer here one argument that prejudices some intelligent people against Federal aid to education. Your friends in the North may bring it up—the fear of Federal political domination of our public-school system. There is no institution that is more firmly under local control than education. And the idea that that control can be broken by giving the people back some of their own tax money is mistaken. Moreover, the present bill protects and bolsters local administration with the safest provisions that Senator TAFT's good legal and legislative mind could devise.

Let us also remember that Senator TAFT and many other Senators were formerly the severest opponents to Federal aid to education for just this reason, that it might result in Federal domination of our schools. But they changed their minds when they became convinced through overwhelming evidence that our uneven educational system must become a national concern. On the study of the facts, the Senate reached a level of understanding on this problem, which the House membership has also achieved, but, alas, without the freedom to act upon their convictions.

You may say, Why support a bill that recognizes and strengthens segregated public schools? First, because we need Federal aid to education at once if we are going to salvage what's left of our school system, and segregation cannot be eliminated overnight. Second, because one of the most practical methods of working our way out of segregation is to make Negro schools just as good as

those for white children. And the present bill for Federal aid to education is the first and essential step in that direction.

Now let's turn to the problem of higher education for the Negro. It came over me last week as the highly successful National Health Assembly ended its deliberations that President Truman's administration is assured of a great place in history if only for three reports that he had made, one on civil rights, one on higher education, and the last one on a 10-year health program. All three are sure to have a profound and beneficent effect upon the development of our Nation for years to come. I had no part in the first report but on the other two commissions I can assure you from first-hand knowledge that there were many able members who made it their special business to protect the interests of our Negro fellow citizens and to counteract the disadvantages and injustices from which they suffer in educational and health provisions. Believe me, those experiences heartened me and taught me that a new era of real and honest democracy is dawning in this country.

In the National Health Assembly's report you will find the medical-care section emphasizing that preventive and curative health programs of high quality must be available to all without regard to race, creed, residence, or economic status. More pertinent to our discussion here was the statement of the committee on personnel, which brought out the dire need for training more Negro physicians but added the point I have just been making, that if the need is to meet the demand, education for the Negro must be improved from the first grade all the way up through the college years. At present, said one of the committee members, some of the very scarce graduate school opportunities open to Negroes are not filled because properly qualified candidates cannot be found.

The President's Commission on Higher Education exploded the theory that the Negro has an inherent lower intellectual capacity than the white man and pointed out that differentials in attainment are due to discrepancies in housing, environment, and total cultural experience.

Segregation and discrimination were unequivocally condemned for democratic and practical reasons. We agreed with the Commission on Civil Rights that "The separate but equal doctrine stands convicted on three grounds. It contravenes the equalitarian spirit of the American heritage. It has failed to operate, for history shows that inequality of service has been the omnipresent consequence of separation. It has institutionalized segregation and kept groups apart despite indisputable evidence that normal contacts among these groups tend to promote social harmony." Howard University was singled out as one institution of higher learning that approximates the undergraduate, graduate, and professional schools characteristic of a first-class State university. Segregation was also condemned as costly; the more advanced the field of endeavor, the more wasteful and futile become attempts to justify a double system. The Commission was concerned not only with increasing opportunity of Negroes to enroll in college, but also with enhancing the resources for training for advanced professional degrees, and for doing research. But action is especially urgent in the fields of medicine and nursing, where the practice of barring Negro students from hospitals is another serious obstacle.

To end racial discrimination the Commission recommended:

1. Repeal of segregation legislation.

2. Where such legislation cannot at present be removed because of cultural mores, educational institutions for Negroes must be made truly equal, from the lowest educational level to the highest.

With an eye to practical results, the Commission recommended the strengthening of the private Negro colleges in the South, as the encouragement of every current program would alleviate an intolerable situation.

Another measure recommended was the establishment of regional centers of study attached to strong colleges, open both to Negroes and whites. Let us hope that even without congressional blessing, the Southern States will enter into compact on regional education. Among other things, they should go ahead with the proposal of Meharry Medical College to turn over its total facilities for operation as a regional institution. Since many of the grants which have supported the college, terminate on June 30, the administration of Meharry by a board appointed by the governors of 14 of the Southern States, should help solve its financial problems.

Finally, the President's Commission on Higher Education recommended that all Federal funds to equalize educational opportunities should clearly specify that there be no discrimination in the channeling of such funds. This is fortunately becoming an accepted practice in drawing legislation for education, health, and welfare. The Thomas bill for aid to medical education (S. 2588), written in cooperation with the Federal Security Administration, states that to qualify for funds, schools must not bar applicants on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin, though the bill makes special provision for States having racial segregation laws. The recommendation by the President's Commission on higher education of national scholarships and fellowships subsidized by the Federal Government on a basis of need, character, and ability, to be given in special cases during the last 2 years of high school, should help deserving students to overcome the economic handicap. For without a generous system of scholarships the economic barrier will soon restrict college education to the rich because of inflationary living costs and the pressure on the private colleges to raise their tuition fees.

Only as the opportunity for higher education is equalized for every potential student who has the interest and ability to profit from higher education, can the ideals of democracy in education be realized. The scholarship program was proposed not only for the welfare of the individual but because it is vital to the national interest to develop talent wherever it can be found, regardless of race, color, or creed.

But essential to this and all other attempts to equalize opportunity is the immediate passage in the House of Representatives of H. R. 2953 for Federal aid on the lower educational levels. Only if our children start with an even chance will they have an equal chance in later life.

In conclusion let me say that our country is keenly aware of its responsibilities toward the Negro. I meet this awareness everywhere. If I counsel wisdom, objectivity, and patience in the struggle for equal rights, it is only because those qualities will help us to make the greatest possible progress in the shortest possible time. Our problem today is to learn to live comfortably and successfully with all people who differ from us and out of diversity to create harmonious and satisfying relationships. This holds true of life at home and abroad. Our white children must come to feel in their innermost being, as most white adults do not, that the colored races the world over, are endowed with potentialities as promising as their own. Only through the proper education of our youth can we till the soil out of which will grow new and promising relations between cultural groups. I grant that this is a slow process. But with determination, a few teeth on the legislative front, and the creation of new educational facilities, we can conquer all animosities, all injustice. Then out of what is now little better than a mutually suspicious association can emerge slowly but surely a worthy partnership between equals.

Orville Zimmerman

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. C. JASPER BELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 17, 1948

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN, late a Representative from the State of Missouri

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address delivered by Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, the dean of the Missouri delegation, at the services for Hon. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN held at the armory at Kennett, Mo., April 11, 1948:

Mr. CANNON. We bring back to you today, from the scene of his arduous labor, his transcendent service, and his fruitful triumphs, Missouri's honored son, to rest at last in the soil of the homeland he loved so well.

I shall not speak of his nobility of character, his moral and spiritual power and influence. I leave that to others.

It is my privilege to review briefly the material value, the intrinsic worth of his service to his State, his people, and his country.

As we drove from the airport into this beautiful city, we noted the power lines stretching along the highway, a part of that vast network of REA system reaching across the continent carrying power and light and health and happiness and prosperity to a million farm homes in America, and I remembered with gratitude the large part he had in the establishment and expansion of this great project, probably the most successful of all the Federal agencies created during his service in the Congress.

As we drove through verdant fields, we noted the unmistakable evidences of the scientific application of soil-conservation practices, under legislation reported out and put through the House by his committee, with his effective cooperation, bringing increased yields and conserving our greatest national asset for future generations.

We saw the plowed fields, the ordered land, awaiting seeding, with no menace from the floods which in former years periodically inundated whole townships, now protected by the huge Federal projects, holding back the floodwaters, built and maintained through authorizations and appropriations for which in the last analysis he, and he alone, was immediately responsible.

I thought of all the ramifications of the far-reaching program of rehabilitation which has during his service in Congress brought American agriculture from the abyss of bankruptcy to the greatest prosperity ever known in the history of the world, and of the determining influence he has exerted in its formulation during the crucial years of his membership in the House. If all the benefits which have been received through this program, here in his own section of Missouri alone, could be translated into shining heaps of silver and gold, this building could not contain them.

The loss of his assuring counsel, his invaluable contribution to the work of his committee—the most powerful and the most important peacetime committee of the House, is most untimely. At the beginning of a period in which agriculture must inevitably suffer many reverses—and with the coming readjustments in the personnel of his committee—with the return of his party to power, his would have been, for agriculture, one of the most effective, the most potent influences in America.

I cannot forego reference to his gifted wife. Like most men who have achieved success in public life—he had beside him a

gracious woman, whose wise counsel and devoted comradeship never failed him. More precious than rubies—yea, than much fine gold.

A stalwart son, representing his country on a faraway foreign mission, half way around the globe—who comes now—on the wings of the morning—to stand for the last time at the side of his distinguished father.

They do not mourn alone. A nation—a great people—as represented here by the formal committee officially representing both the House and the Senate of the United States Congress—mourns with them.

Last October, while in Europe, we visted a ruined city. One of the few buildings left was a shattered cathedral, centuries old, still standing in the midst of the wreckage. One wall had been blown out. The sky was visible through gapping holes in the ceiling. And retrieved from the debris was a volume still legible. It was written in a strange language—an unknown tongue. But you could identify the books—and the chapters and the verses. As I lifted it the leaves of the book opened at a place to which many had often turned. And down the page was a verse blurred by the moving fingers of many readers. I could not read it but I knew what it said. It is a universal language of the heart which has come down to us through the centuries. It has brought comfort and consolation to many men—as it brings comfort and consolation to us here this afternoon: "In my Father's house are many mansions. I go to prepare a place for you. If it were not so I would have told you."

Orville Zimmerman

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. STEPHEN PACE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 17, 1948

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN, late a Representative from the State of Missouri

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, the first Congress established the custom of laying aside public business 1 day each year in order that appropriate tributes might be paid to the memory of our departed associates. Being a practice of long standing, it becomes more significant as the years pass.

It seems only yesterday that I was working beside ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN, Representative in the Congress from the Tenth Congressional District of Missouri. His death on April 7 was so sudden and unexpected as to be difficult of realization. Only a few hours before I had been in his company and he seemed so well. While yet in love with life, and even without one word of farewell he joined the host of other great Americans who had passed on before him.

My contacts with ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN were close and constant. He was the third and I was the fourth ranking Democrat on the House Committee on Agriculture and for many years we worked side by side on that committee. Through that close association I learned to know and respect him as a man almost without fault, worthy of my complete confidence, and entitled to my profound respect.

Representing in the Congress a great agricultural section of our Nation, he was naturally concerned about the interest and devoted to the welfare of the farmers of his own district and throughout the Nation. They never had a more earnest or devoted friend and no Member of Congress has ever contributed more toward improving the standards of living of those who till the soil.

His death was a great personal loss to me and I am sure it will be a long time before his own constituency can find a Representative who can measure up in every respect to the high standard established by ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN.

It was never my privilege to visit his district or his home city. I therefore cannot speak of his life before he entered the Congress. But that the RECORD might show the estimate of those with whom he lived at home I include in these remarks the following address by the Honorable John M. Dalton, an attorney of Kennett, Mo., delivered on the occasion of memorial services held by the Kennett Lions Club on April 16, 1948:

Mr. DALTON. We pause today to pay respect to the memory of a great Lion. Since he was a charter member of our club, it always held a special place in his heart, and numerous times he showed his pride in its record of continuous and unbroken service. Holding an active membership for 25 years, he faithfully led the club through one of the trying years as president.

Truly, in his personal life ZIM was a real Christian. His devotion and loyalty to his church was well known, as he taught the men's class, served on the official board, and acted as lay representative at many conferences. But best of all, his faith was a 7-day religion and a way, or a pattern, of life.

For many years he was an active member of the board of education, and in all other matters of public interest he was at the forefront and ready, able, and willing to carry his end of the load.

ZIM never lost interest in his two alma maters—Cape College and the State university. Even at the time of his death, he held his place as one of the regents of Southeast Missouri State College.

His record of achievement in the Congress has added a glorious page—of which Dunklin County can well be proud. The results of his work, his labors, are now living monuments to him in this district.

I have often thought of his work for the rural districts—flood control, agricultural betterment, and rural electrification. The great social changes for the better in rural America were a source of pride to him. His early life in the Bollinger County hills kept him rooted to the soil and alive to the problems of the farm.

True greatness is not in wealth, position, or power, but it is in service. Service to one's city, county, or nation, and service to one's fellowman. By that yardstick ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN was truly great.

My first personal contact with him was in 1923, when as a young lawyer I called for and received help and advice on numerous occasions. Then, too, he gave me many books that I needed. Since 1937 we officed together, and then I really learned to know him and love him.

Many of you did not have the good fortune to know ZIM intimately—and you are the loser. Always was he wholesome, always clean, and usually optimistic that everything would turn out right in the end. In my 11 years of close association with ZIM I never saw him angry but once, and then only when his character had been assailed.

He enjoyed beauty—and nature fascinated him—many times he would come into my office to call my attention to a beautiful sunset or a magnificent sky.

Always was he ready to listen to his friends—attentive to their needs and desirous of furthering their ambitions. I recall in 1940 Mrs. Dalton and I became genuinely alarmed over Germany's aggressions and she thought that our leaders were not too alert. She wrote our 13 Congressmen and 2 Senators and the lone reply was a 4-page letter written in ZIM's own hand—this assurance of interest—this personal and touching response of a busy man made her know that her Congressman was on the job.

Never a man of great financial means—ZIM left to his family not gold and material wealth of great value but a fine heritage of a life well lived. ZIM lives on in our hearts and minds and the world is better and finer because he has passed this way.

Good deeds survive the human trail; kind words never die. Bodies may vanish from the stage of life, but the influence of lives, well lived, continue on.

May I close with this poem that I think most fitting and appropriate for this occasion:

"Not how did he die?
But how did he live?
Not what did he gain?
But what did he give?

"These are the units
To measure the worth
Of a man as a man,
Regardless of birth.

"Not what was his station?
But had he a heart?
And how did he play
His God-given part?

"Was he ever ready
With a word of good cheer
To bring back a smile,
To banish a tear?

"Not what was his church?
Nor what was his creed?
But had he befriended
Those really in need?

"Not what did the sketch
In the newspaper say—
But how many were sorry
When he passed away?"

Raymond Smiley Springer

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 1948

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. RAYMOND SMILEY SPRINGER, late a Representative from the State of Indiana

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, on this solemn occasion, I am privileged to pay respect to my immediate predecessor.

RAYMOND SMILEY SPRINGER served a decade as a Member of this body. He ably and faithfully represented the people of Indiana's Tenth District. It is in their behalf that this brief and inadequate tribute is paid his memory today.

Not many among us are entered upon the public service at a youthful age. Few, too, are so constituted as to devote years of conscientious effort to duty, especially when our cause has been temporarily frustrated by the popular will. Few, indeed, are so ingrained with faith and fortitude as to remain steadfast against formidable odds until triumph is finally achieved.

Yet the life of usefulness that ended so unexpectedly on August 28, 1947, had grown rich and significant in spite of early reversals. Before the evening of his life, Representative RAYMOND S. SPRINGER had been elected repeatedly to his high office, each time by an increasing total of votes. And for him there was the unusual satisfaction of knowing that his personal merit outshone even that of the party to which he paid lasting fidelity.

From humble beginning RAYMOND SPRINGER marched resolutely up life's highway to earn successive distinctions as a practicing lawyer, a circuit judge, a high party leader, and an honored citizen. For all the hours given selflessly to civic and political causes, he yet found time to dedicate a part of his abilities to military and patriotic pursuits, having served as a volunteer in World War I, a National Guard officer, and first commander of the Indiana Department of the American Legion.

When Congressman SPRINGER, stricken at the summit of a successful life, was laid to final rest near his native town hundreds came to mourn a loss shared by thousands. For all else that could be said of this public servant, a minister of his faith pronounced him, simply and sincerely, a good man.

I would give voice today to the feelings of the countless friends he left behind. To them and their children RAYMOND SPRINGER will live on in memory as he did in fact—wholesome, industrious, humble, and human—by all measurements a good man.

Orville Zimmerman

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 17, 1948

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN, late a Representative from the State of Missouri

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the parting of friends is always sad, and the sudden passing of Mr. ZIMMERMAN, short of the Psalmist's promise of three score and ten, pained me exceedingly, because I had formed a deep-seated admiration for him both as Christian citizen and sound legislator.

I know something of the high hopes he had in the field of agriculture, a subject that rested very near his heart. In addition to his heavy duties here in Washington he burdened himself with too many other activities, which though very worthy, were too heavy.

At this time we all realize that silence would best express our sincerest feelings, for words seem only a discord in our sentiment that his passing has brought into our hearts and minds. But since custom demands that one who has spent many years in public service should not be consigned to the grave without at least an attempt being made at expressing, however imperfectly, the sense of loss experienced by those who throughout his life he has benefited, I am trying to set before you some slight sketch of our dear departed friend as I knew him personally, as we knew him in his relation to others, and especially as we all knew him in his good work for the glory and perpetuity of America, which he loved with a filial devotion.

In the sorrow of our parting, when the activity of his human life has ceased, and when our hearts and minds endeavor to fill the void that his going has left in our lives, we can best realize his worth, the need for him each individual soul amongst us had, and his value to the House of Representatives, of which he was so able a defender and whose doctrines he so luminously expounded.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN was extremely sincere and conscientious in all relations of life. I think I can see the honest indignation with which the soul would be stirred by the very shadow of sham or pretense. He had an adamant and unappeasable detestation for him with the two faces, or for him of the fawning ways, or for the cowardly character devoid of the courage of his convictions. We read therein the well-nigh perfect manhood, scorning all pettiness and subterfuge, and strong and fearless in right doing.

The various contributions by this honorable deceased to the promotion, by wise legislation, of the best interest of all America at once stamp him a broad-minded and original thinker.

In the presence of this death, let us realize our obligation to make safe and secure the Government of the people which has been committed to our keeping; let us realize that it can thrive and grow only in an atmosphere of popular devotion and unselfish attachment; and above all, let us ever remember the lessons and admonitions that flow from the useful life which we today memorialize.

John Marshall Robsion

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 17, 1948

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JOHN MARSHALL ROBSION, late a Representative from the State of Kentucky

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, there was genuine sadness and sorrow in our ranks when we received the news that our distinguished colleague, Representative JOHN M. ROBSION, had suddenly answered the final summons. In apparent good health, he had left Washington for a few days in his district; however, the manner of his demise was, I think, in keeping with that which he would have desired. When JOHN ROBSION left us, he took a man's life with him.

Born in a modest home in a Kentucky rugged, mountainous environment, he was a symbol of the heights to which those of humble beginnings may rise in our America. He was always proud of his district, and especially so of the type of people whom he had the honor to represent in Washington. Many a time he reminded the Congress of the early settlements in his community and stressed the fact that most of his constituents had lived in Kentucky for generations. That type of people found expression in the life, the character, and the utterances of this outstanding citizen; lawyer, judge, Senator, Representative, and statesman.

Always fearless and courageous, he was a great orator and one of the most persuasive debaters in the Congress. He was a splendid lawyer and an advocate par excellence. He had an outstanding record as a trial lawyer and, in addition to that, he was a legal fundamentalist.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. ROBSION and I were first elected to the Sixty-sixth Congress; that is, we entered these halls at the same time. A perfunctory acquaintanceship soon ripened into genuine friendship, and his advice and counsel have meant much to me down through the years. We served together on the Committee on the Judiciary. As chairman of that committee, I relied much upon Judge ROBSION, who was chairman of Subcommittee No. 1. His kindly word and his keen sense of humor made him loved and respected by his committee colleagues as well as the committee staff with whom he was a favorite.

Judge ROBSION was on the program of the annual meeting of the American Bar Association in Cleveland last September. Later it was my privilege to talk with Mr. Chief Justice Vinson, formerly of Kentucky, who also addressed the convention. The Chief Justice was an admirer of our departed friend and told me of the splendid address made by our colleague and the comments concerning it by other distinguished lawyers attending the convention. In short, he said: "As a Kentuckian, I was proud of JOHN ROBSION the lawyer."

I was not in Washington the day Judge ROBSION's death was announced, at which time many of our Members spoke in memory of him. I want to add my tribute at this time.

Another mighty oak has fallen and the Commonwealth of Kentucky and the United States of America are poorer. To his family JOHN ROBSION has left a splendid heritage, and the memory of this good and great man will linger with us long.

Raymond Smiley Springer

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 17, 1948

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. RAYMOND SMILEY SPRINGER, late a Representative from the State of Indiana

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the tribute to my good friend and colleague the late RAYMOND SPRINGER. The "Judge," as he was fondly known in Indiana and among his friends on the Hill, was a true statesman. He served his people and the Nation faithfully and well. It can honestly be said that he

gave his life for his country. That is the way he wanted it, I am sure.

During our close relationship in Congress, I learned to love and respect him for his high principles and integrity. He loved his Nation and its greatness. He was sincere in his fight for those fundamental premises which marked its progress, and for the freedom and liberties we enjoy. As a lawyer, he was fully versed in the legal tenets of our Republic, and the idealistic concepts of our constitutional representative form of government. He understood the traditions of the law and their importance in carrying on our way of life which was conceived and dedicated to us by the founders of our country.

From his toil and service in the interest of good government, the people of Indiana were quick to recognize his ability and intelligent leadership. The Republican Party selected him as its standard-bearer for the governorship of the State of Indiana on two different occasions. While he failed to achieve this office in the sweep of the Nation by the New Deal, the loss was not a personal one, but one which the entire State suffered. Later on his district elected him to Congress. Because of his outstanding record, he was returned to the House of Representatives for five terms, and would have continued to represent his people, except for his untimely death.

It has been my pleasure and honor to serve with him. The Nation lost a great man when he was stricken. I shall always be proud of the knowledge of his friendship and having served in Congress with him.

To his wife who is left behind, I am sure that she will find some measure of comfort and solace from the realization that he was so widely admired and respected, and for the record of public service he has spread upon the pages of time to live after him.

Patrick Henry Drewry

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. STANLEY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1948

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. PATRICK HENRY DREWRY, late a Representative from the State of Virginia

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to pay respectful tribute to the beloved memory of our late friend and colleague the Honorable PATRICK HENRY DREWRY, whose sudden passing at his home in Petersburg, Va., on December 21, 1947, brought sorrow to all of us.

He served his congressional district, State, and Nation capably, honorably, and with great distinction for many years.

After he was graduated from Randolph-Macon College, at Ashland, Va., in 1896, Mr. DREWRY studied law at the University of Virginia. Upon obtaining his law degree, he returned to Petersburg to practice.

His first legislative experience was as a State senator at Richmond. During his 8 years in the Virginia General Assembly he was instrumental in the enactment of measures advancing the State highway system and affecting the health department and board of charities and correction. He served as chairman of a commission on economy and efficiency and had a leading part in the enactment of the budget act, which formed the basis for organizing and controlling the fiscal affairs of the Commonwealth.

In his 27 years as a Representative in Congress from the Fourth Congressional District of Virginia, Mr. DREWRY applied to the discharge of his duties the most conscientious and painstaking diligence and industry. He was held in high esteem by his constituents and enjoyed their love and respect.

Throughout his entire period of service in the Congress he was a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and for a large portion of that time was the ranking Democratic member of that committee. He possessed a thorough knowledge of all matters pertaining to the Naval Establishment and was a staunch friend of the United States Navy. He rendered outstanding service throughout World Wars I and II and contributed in large measure to the enactment of legislation incident to the great naval expansion necessary for our successful participation in those conflicts.

"PAT," as he was affectionately known to a host of friends, was a gentleman of highest character and integrity. His quiet, genial manner and sincerity of purpose inspired love and confidence. He was devoted to his family; faithful to his church, loyal and true to his friends; and demonstrated statesmanship to a high degree in his positions of public trust.

I feel a deep personal loss and shall always value the privilege of association and friendship with our beloved colleague.

Patrick Henry Drewry

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1948

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. PATRICK HENRY DREWRY, late a Representative from the State of Virginia

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, gentleness is a quality sometimes mistaken for weakness and flaccidity. Yet true gentleness is, in fact, one of those golden threads that brighten, beautify, and fortify the web of human character.

Paul includes gentleness among the fruits of the spirit, which he lists as "love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance," against which he says there is no law.

Many of the world's great statesmen, leaders, and teachers have been gentle and humble folks. Mr. DREWRY was such a gentleman. Although possessed of good scholastic training and a wealth of successful experience in the principles and application of sound government, his innate gentleness did not allow him to engage in windy opposition and wordy futility anywhere. He seldom spoke on the floor of this House, but he was always intelligently active to help those who voiced his thoughts concerning proper procedure to promote the public weal. His long tenure in public offices of major importance, extending over 36 years, began in 1912 when he became a member of the Virginia State Senate. Being of a scholarly trend his 8 years in that senate very well prepared him for the wider duties he assumed on April 27, 1920, when he became a Member of this honorable body. His knowledge of naval affairs was encyclopedic, and much of the success attending our naval program over the last quarter of a century is due to the arduous and incessant labor of this distinguished deceased.

Mr. DREWRY was a simple man of the people. This prime quality of his nature could only live and flourish in a soil to which simplicity was native rather than of exotic growth. As a man no expensive pleasures tempted him. His aspiration was not in any form of luxury, and his dignity depended not upon artificial adjuncts. The display and the vanity of the world at large were to him matters of absolute indifference. He was at ease in any select company, but the absence of pomp and pedantry was apparent in all he did and in all that he said. He was a silent man all his life, even under provocation; not even his friends knew him very well, which is much to say; but, no doubt, the fact saved him many a stripe, for what our friends know about us can always be found in the notebooks of our enemies.

Mr. DREWRY was one of the few who labored in the interest of sound government and good citizenship with a singleness of purpose and in a spirit of self-denial and self-devotedness truly heroic. Moderate in his views, unbending in his principles, charitable in his judgment, he was a ripe scholar, well versed in the teachings of Washington, Jefferson, and Madison, a clever organizer, a fair-minded and honorable opponent in controversy. He fell in the breach; fell fighting till summoned by the death knell; fell in the most important period of his long and honorable career, feeling that while he had done something he had left much more undone.

Let us with courage and unselfish devotion heed the lessons and admonitions of this magnanimous life which we today memorialize.

Joseph Jefferson Mansfield

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1948

On the life, character, and public service of HON. JOSEPH JEFFERSON MANSFIELD, late a Representative from the State of Texas

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, we do well to arrest our usual activities to pay tribute to some of the chosen leaders who, well beloved and crowned with the

most enviable honors that confidence and station can bestow, were taken from among us in the midst of the administration of their trust and at the moment of the highest possibilities of service. It is the tribute inspired by love of country, as laying aside the differences and controversies which seem but trivial in the face of man's adventures and God's providence, we stand united by the indissoluble bonds of a common patriotism, knowing well that ungrateful republics cannot endure.

Democracy and advancement will not endure if their altar fires are not kept burning by the memory of those who have met the supreme test and have laid down their lives in heroic fidelity and self-sacrifice.

During my long tenure in this body, associating as I have with very many Members, I do not know any Member who was more able and conscientious in the discharge of every duty committed to him than was our late friend and colleague Judge MANSFIELD.

My service here antedated the service of Mr. MANSFIELD by 10 years; but soon after he became a Member we became good and close friends, and in the placid tempo of those earlier years I very much enjoyed, and profited by, his interesting recital of events that began February 9, 1861, when he was born in West Virginia. Several times he told me of his father being in the Virginia military service, opposing secession, but finally casting his lot with the confederacy, in whose service he was killed in July 1861.

This good man was much interested in a proper development of our country, especially the great West, and he here early concluded that he could be of best and maximum service to the whole United States by devoting his talents to the problems of rivers and harbors, concerning which probably no other man knew more.

And what a broad and penetrating preparation he had upon coming to the Congress. Laborer, railroad clerk, lawyer, city attorney, mayor, county attorney, county superintendent of schools, citizen soldier, newspaperman, churchman, civic leader, a foundation that led our friend to reward and renown was indeed well-nigh perfect. And coupled with this wide and valuable experience was a relentless pertinacity that caused him to explore all the highways and byways of legislative lore. Such a man was inevitably predestined for an inordinate success.

But Judge MANSFIELD'S superior knowledge in the field of sound government was not his cardinal virtue. His gentleness and sweetness carried with them an unusual sense of repose in conversing with him, and behind all, whether we view him as Christian gentleman or wise statesman, he met the most exacting test.

This prime quality in his nature could only live and flourish in a soil to which simplicity was of native rather than of exotic growth. As a man no expensive pleasures tempted him. His aspiration was not in any form of luxury and his dignity depended not upon artificial adjuncts. The display and the vanity of the world at large were to him matters of absolute indifference. He was at ease in any select company, and the absence of pomp and pedantry was apparent in all he did and in all he said. Holding tenaciously to the legislative judgments which he had acquired by arduous labors, painstaking study, and wide, original research, and fortifying the grounds upon which he had reached his conclusions, his modest defense of his opinions was as charming as it is rare among legislators. This simplicity of character, so at war with pretense and affectation of all kinds, was supported by a reserve mental force which, when occasion called it forth, was a surprise to those who knew him but superficially. As a man he was endowed with the gift which renders all mental garniture effective—the gift of patient work. He comprehended the scope of every undertaking, and he had the courage to carry it on to a legitimate end, despite any of the adverse circumstances surrounding him.

Judge MANSFIELD taught a lesson of resignation, a lesson of resignation in his practical, personal life that he had striven to teach in all his work. His works indeed shall follow him. Prepared by a long hospitalization, sustained and encouraged in his noticeably feeble health by the deep interest shown in his personal welfare, and the cordial praise of grateful hearts and minds for his unselfish labors in the cause of sound government, he went out of this world. The remarks on this occasion are the best testimony to his worth. It remains for us only to cherish the example of his beautiful, useful life, and to pray that immediately the earthly tie was broken he soon rejoiced in the beatific vision of eternal life.

Not a few beyond his own fraternal association will unite with those in it lamenting that we shall see him here no more, and yet with them will rejoice that his words and examples are still among us, calling men from the wilderness of error to the nurture of righteousness, and the ways of wisdom, which are peace, and which lead to the triumphs of eternal glory.

Thomas Alva Edison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 18 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. George E. Stringfellow before the Rotary Club of Birmingham, Ala., on April 7, 1948, on the subject, Thomas Alva Edison—a Symbol of Free Enterprise. Mr. Stringfellow lives in East Orange, N. J., and is the Kiwanis international representative for the United Nations, potentate of Salaam Temple, A. A. O. N. M. S., president of the New Jersey division, American Cancer Society, and vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc.

I wish it were possible for every man and woman in the United States who is charged with the responsibility of making a living and contributing to the welfare of the people as a whole, to read Mr. Stringfellow's address. It is simple in expression, and therefore understandable in meaning.

In the confused state of thinking of the peoples of the world today, and in view of the fact that millions upon millions of people have been sold a theory or philosophy that the way to advance the masses of the people is to destroy the leaders and those who have been successful in creating and developing the necessities and luxuries of life, it is vital that the presentation of simple facts should be available to all our people to counteract the effect of this false philosophy and teaching. No nation ever raised the living standard of the masses by destroying the leaders and those citizens who have contributed their genius to the creation of things required and desired for the life and happiness of the people. If the leaders, the thinkers, and the creators are pulled down, then the only possible result is injury to the welfare of the people as a whole.

The rights of the common man, as Lincoln termed the masses of our people, must be protected, but likewise we must develop and protect the uncommon man and his rights. Otherwise, the common man can have no hope of satisfaction and success when through study and work and the application of his genius he enters the field of the uncommon man.

Mr. President, this year 1948 commemorates the one hundred and first anniversary of the birth of Thomas Alva Edison, who ranks in the hearts and minds of all thinking men as one of our greatest countrymen. Through his own efforts, under our American system of free men and opportunity, Thomas Edison developed himself from a poor boy into a master inventor, scientist, manufacturer, businessman, and a great humanitarian, in a way which has seldom been equaled and never excelled by any other man. The wizard of Menlo Park, N. J., as he was respectfully and affectionately known, lived from 1847 to 1931, a period in our history which advanced this Nation from a community of frontiersmen to a land blessed with the highest standard of living ever enjoyed by a people as a whole in the world's history.

The lesson of Edison's life should cause all Americans and those in other countries who can familiarize themselves with it to recognize that under a system such as our so-called American system, or one similar to it, which recognizes the importance of true individual freedom and open opportunity for all, the purpose of man should be to create and construct for himself rather than to undermine and destroy the efforts of others.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOMAS ALVA EDISON—A SYMBOL OF FREE ENTERPRISE

It was my good fortune to have been a daily business associate of Thomas Alva Edison, master inventor, scientist, and manufacturer, who is today recognized throughout the civilized world as one of mankind's greatest benefactors.

His inventions and discoveries produced vast industries, millions of jobs, and billions in property values.

It is estimated that the wealth in property values created by the brain of this great genius is more than 20 times the estimated wealth of the great State of Alabama.

Whatever you do—wherever you turn—you see the hand of Thomas Alva Edison—when you listen to a phonograph, when you use a dictating machine, when you send a telegram, when you get a market quotation, or when you listen to your radio, the invisible hand of Edison is there. Edison conceived and built the first moving picture camera and erected the world's first motion picture studio. He is probably best known as the man who invented the electric light, and who in 1882 opened the first commercial generating plant and ushered in the age of electricity.

In their mad efforts to distort, confuse, divide, and destroy the liberties of the peoples of the world and keep their own subjects in complete ignorance of historical facts and world conditions, Communist Russia is today claiming credit for all of the principal inventions, processes, and scientific advancement since the beginning of time.

Very recently, Moscow, the home of deception, distortion, and duplicity, claimed that a Russian invented the electric light; that a Russian invented the airplane; that a Russian founded the science of physical chemistry; that a Russian discovered wireless communication; that a Russian invented the steam engine. These misrepresentations of historical facts serve to illustrate the character and integrity of the present Russian Government whose greed for gold and lust for power threatens the peace of the world.

We are repeatedly told in the press and over the radio that unless we do something about that dreadful disease—cancer—one in eight will die from it. I say to you that unless we do something about that Godless thing called communism, spiritually we will all die from it.

Thomas Alva Edison, a product of our system of government, which some of its beneficiaries would destroy—was reared in a wholesome atmosphere of freedom; in an inspiring atmosphere of integrity; in a productive atmosphere of industry.

Edison got his start in life by risking his own to save the life of a little child. A grateful father rewarded Edison for his heroic effort by teaching him the science of railway telegraphy.

Edison, like Lincoln, Washington, Jefferson, Lee, Newton, Ford, Steinmetz, Wanamaker and other benefactors of the human race was an individualist. These great men who helped give us our heritage and who contributed so much to make this a great country, are often referred to by Henry Wallace and his ilk as reactionary capitalists.

Edison believed that the state exists for the people, instead of the people for the state, as in Communist Russia and other slave and police states.

"There are two emotional impulses within us," said Edison, "which, at times, seem to be in conflict. There is the emotional desire to be free and independent, and there is the emotional desire for security. So long as we retain the kind of government envisioned by our forefathers," concluded the great genius, "we will enjoy both freedom and security."

Edison knew that only freemen can long enjoy security. History is replete with examples of people who traded their freedom for security and lost both. The Italians tried it, the Germans tried it, the Japanese tried it, the Russians tried it, and the British are now trying it. The Communists and their fellow travelers would have us try it.

Edison was a thinker who strove to make others think earnestly, intelligently, and constructively of local, State, National, and world problems. He knew this would produce better understanding among the peoples of the world and thus reduce the possibility of physical combat.

May I give one example of Edison's effort to induce others to think? One of his executives, desiring the inventor's opinion on an engineering problem, submitted a long report to the inventor who skimmed through it and handed it back to his anxious executive pointing to a motto on the wall of his office by Sir Joshua Reynolds:

"There is no expedient to which a man will not resort to avoid the real labor of thinking."

Edison knew that his executive had made no effort to think the problem through. Edison knew that a person would rather walk a mile than think a minute. Edison knew that we are lazier mentally than we are physically.

Edison was unalterably opposed to monopolies, whether they were of government, of management, or of labor. His experience taught him that monopolies make men arrogant, overbearing, and ruthless. We have seen this demonstrated time and again by bureaucrats, by businessmen and by labor bosses.

A case in point is the labor monopoly controlled by labor bosses who hold the destiny of this Nation in the palm of their hands. These labor bosses who control the workers impose their will upon the citizens of this Republic like Stalin imposes his upon his satellites.

If Edison had invented the incandescent lamp last year, here are some of the obstacles to progress he would have faced because of the labor monopoly made possible by politicians who place votes above principles, who place votes above the welfare of the people as a whole—by politicians who fight the monopoly of the product of labor at the same time encouraging labor monopolies:

First, the unions would have to determine whether the lamp workers were in the Glass Blowers Union or in the Wickmakers Union of the A. F. of L., the CIO, or independents.

Second, Edison would have been forced to wait long and dreary months while the unions were settling jurisdictional disputes.

Third, Henry Wallace—that darling of the Communists—that apologist for Joe Stalin—that outstanding "Russia firster"—who finds nothing right with America and nothing wrong with Russia—would spout about the right of man.

Fourth, union bosses would have demanded that every home using electric lights employ a union man to switch them on and off.

Fifth, if Edison had invented the phonograph last year, Caesar Petrillo would have required a trombone player as a stand-by in every home that owned one.

Edison believed in competition. "It is the competitive system as much as anything else that has made us a great Nation," he said. "We need competition to develop better products and better services. Competition raises living standards," he continued.

"Competition is good for business. Competition develops resourcefulness in our citizens. It is good for the individual." Then, with a twinkle in his keen blue eyes, Edison concluded, "Although at times it is rather uncomfortable."

Let us consider for a moment what would have happened to Edison had he lived in a communistic, socialistic, or policed state, toward which we, for the past 16 years, have drifted under the guise of liberalism:

It would have been necessary for Edison to have gone to the bureau of new ideas of the division of engineering of the department of inventions of the office of social improvement for permission to use rare and essential commodities in his experiments to produce an electric light.

It would have been necessary for Edison to have revealed his educational qualifications.

Edison had no educational qualifications. He never attended college. His school teacher judged him addled and sent him home as a moron to be cared for by the State. A loving mother, who herself at one time was a school teacher, laid the basis for his great success. What possible justification would there have been for a bureaucrat to have assumed that Edison could invent an electric light, much less the phonograph and the moving-picture machine, to say nothing of the alkaline storage battery.

Edison would have been denied the use of essential materials for his experiments. There would have been no experiments by Edison. There might have been no electric light, no phonograph, nor the 1,100 other inventions now claimed by the Communists as being Russian-born. These inventions helped to make the world a better place in which to live. Instead of bringing light, warmth, and joy to the world, Edison's ambition and initiative—the mainspring of America—might have been killed by the deadening hand of government control.

We, the beneficiaries of the efforts of Thomas Alva Edison, should thank God that he did not live in a communistic, socialistic, or a policed state. If he had, our living standard today would be immeasurably lower than it is.

After inventing the electric lamp, Edison perfected a process for the separation of low-grade ore which required 10 years of experimentation costing many millions of dollars. Then a freak of fortune laid bare a great field of bessemer ore which obsoleted all of his work. Turning to one of his associates, the tireless inventor shrugged his shoulders and smilingly asked, "Well, what next?"

This is the spirit that helped make us a great people. Common sense demands that we put forth an intelligent effort to keep it alive.

As further exemplification of his unbeatable spirit, of which we are the heirs, Edison set out to invent a new type of storage battery. After conducting more than 45,000 experiments without any measure of success, an associate asked, "Are you not discouraged?"

"Discouraged?" responded the genius. "Certainly not. I have learned 45,000 ways the job cannot be done and I am, therefore, 45,000 ways nearer my goal."

Indeed he was 45,000 ways nearer his goal for the great inventor reached that goal in the next 5,000 experiments.

Edison's inspiration, his principal incentive in life was to advance the welfare of mankind. We, the heirs of this great heritage, must assume the responsibility for its preservation.

Edison had no desire to accumulate great wealth. For example, when one of his managers sent him a financial statement showing a profit of 30 percent on sales, he remarked, "You're making too much money. I would have a better opinion of your managerial ability had you reduced prices, increased your labor rates, and given me a profit of 10 percent instead of 30."

When the inventor took a few hours off to celebrate his seventy-third birthday, in referring to the labor monopoly he said:

"I'm not against the 8-hour day or anything that protects labor from ruthless employers, but it makes me sad when I see young Americans shackle their abilities by conforming to rules which force industrious men to keep in step with the shirkers.

"It used to be fashionable to be ambitious. The employee planned to become an employer; the unskilled man sought to become skilled. A young man was not well thought of in his community if he were not striving for a higher place in life.

"I'm wondering what would have happened to me," continued Edison, "if 50 years ago some fluent talker had convinced me that it was not fair to my fellow workers to put forth my best efforts.

"If my life had been made up of 8-hour days, I do not believe I would have accomplished very much. If the founders of our Republic had been afraid they might earn more than they were paid," he concluded, "this country would not amount to as much as it does."

Edison strove to see how much he could do, not how much he could get, realizing as all

sensible and unselfish people do, that we cannot divide the things we do not produce. Had that been the philosophy of the New Deal and were that the philosophy of the labor bosses today, our standard of living—still the highest in the world—would be immeasurably higher than it is, and the future of our Nation would be immeasurably brighter.

Edison contended that man's integrity is his greatest asset. May I cite an example to illustrate Edison's integrity?

On learning that a product bearing his name had developed defects in service, Edison closed his factory and requested his customers to return their purchases and get their money. The inventor felt that his integrity was involved, and this priceless ingredient was not for sale. He was always careful to see that his customers received a little more than he promised.

The daily application of such integrity resulted in the world accepting Edison as a name you can trust.

Edison lost without whimpering; he won without boasting, and when the game of life was over, he courageously met the Great Referee smiling and unafraid.

Little wonder that the memory of this great American commands a devotion rooted deeply in human gratitude.

Edison's experiments were carried out in our free economy for the benefit of humanity. Uncontrolled and unhampered by "all wise" planners, Edison perfected his inventions and put them into production without kowtowing to overbearing labor czars, without appearing before arrogant labor boards, and without the approval of all-powerful bureaucrats.

Edison puttered away on his own. He often lost, but he never asked the taxpayer, through his Government, to subsidize his efforts or to underwrite the cost of his failures.

The founders of our Republic gave us a form of government which produced Edison, who gave the world understanding, light, warmth, joy, and a higher living standard. Let us strive earnestly to be worthy of their wisdom, philosophy, and sacrifices.

We who believe in freedom of opportunity and the fundamentals of government which made America great should, I think, put forth a well-directed effort to reestablish and preserve that atmosphere conducive to freedom, opportunity, and prosperity.

We, as individuals, would do well, I think, to emulate Edison's integrity, Edison's industry, Edison's philosophy, and Edison's leadership.

Hon. Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah, on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 18 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Atlanta Journal of May 16, 1948, commending the very able address made by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] when the so-called southern regional education compact was pending before the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR FROM UTAH SPEAKS WISE WORDS ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, of Utah (not to be confused with Senator ELMER THOMAS, of Oklahoma), is the scholar of the Congress. He was professor of political science at his State university and the recipient of many honors, national and international. He is a Ph. D., an LL. D., etc., by judgment of great universities.

Senator THOMAS made a notable speech Wednesday in the debate on the southern compact to establish regional schools of higher education for Negroes. The invincible logic, the broad understanding, the essential wisdom of his address seem to have been lost on his colleagues of the North and West, because the Senate voted to bury in committee the resolution providing for congressional approval of the compact.

The Senator himself doubted that congressional approval was necessary; he felt sure that only a strained interpretation of the phrase in the Constitution (art. 1, sec. 10, "No State shall without the consent of Congress * * * enter into any agreement or compact with another State") could apply it to the desire of States to get together in a matter of educational facilities. However, he announced his support of the resolution for congressional assent. He explained why, in these words:

"I believe that the objective will result in bringing about the type of educational facilities and educational institutions which the colored people of the South deserve, which they have a right to demand, and which the law of the land has said they must have. With the cooperation of the State and the sanction of the Nation, I believe the South now has an opportunity to bring about an educational program quite as great in its possibilities as some of the mighty things which have been done in our country."

Professing his own personal disapproval of segregation, because of his background and training far from the Negro problem, he said:

"Under present circumstances and under the present laws of these States, and in view of what the States are trying to do under the instructions set forth in decisions of the Supreme Court, it would be unwise and would bring about the very opposite of what we are trying to do (if Congress were to decree nonsegregation). There are those who think the principle of nonsegregation is just and right, as I do; but everything cannot be done overnight.

"When at last the Southern States are entering into an agreement among themselves, we know a new day is dawning. * * * The way to solve these (race) questions is not to stand absolutely on a principle which cannot be made dominant in our generation, or perhaps in two or three generations, but to go forward as we have gone forward since the Civil War, doing the best possible under the circumstances."

Senator THOMAS then adverted to an aspect of the civil-rights uproar and propaganda which is never referred to by the agitators and the politicians scheming for votes. We cite his words:

"Let me point out something of which we lose sight when we talk about civil rights. We interpret them only from the standpoint of individual rights. The right of association is something, and it is guaranteed by the Constitution. If we take away the equivalent of an individual's civil rights from a group, we may destroy civil rights. We have an idea about freedom of religion, and that implies freedom for religion.

"Are we going to carry our ideas about civil rights to such an extent that we will say that everyone has a right to join any church he wants to join, that every club must throw its doors open, that every educational institution shall carry on its affairs without regard to its own wishes respecting standards?

"Are we going to say, believing in coeducation, that education for the separate sexes is wrong?"

Thus we have had stated on the floor of the United States Senate, by a Member from Utah, the belief held by the great majority of the good people of the South.

The obligation of educational opportunity for the Negro is admitted. To attempt overnight to destroy by statute the customs and beliefs which two centuries have implanted in a section embracing many millions of people will fail and will bring woe to both races. Further, to decree some of the so-called civil rights is to deny the most precious of all civil rights, the right to choose one's own associates.

A disturbing feature of the prolonged debate in the Senate was the introduction of messages from many Negro leaders which made it plain that those Negroes were not interested in higher educational opportunities for their race unless they could be had by admixture with whites.

They didn't want any doctors trained at Meharry.

If the Mundt Bill Is Enacted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following paid advertisement appearing in today's Washington Post:

IF THE MUNDT BILL IS ENACTED, YOU MAY BE THINKING, SPEAKING, ACTING, FOR THE LAST TIME WITHOUT THREAT OF PRISON, HEAVY FINES, OR LOSS OF CITIZENSHIP

We, who have signed this statement, believe it our duty to warn:

That the Mundt bill, proposed by the Un-American Activities Committee, will gag freedom of speech and institute thought control.

That efforts to effect changes in our Government by peaceful, constitutional means may become tantamount to treason, punishable by fines, 10 years imprisonment and loss of citizenship.

That the Attorney General, a political appointee, will be given the extraordinary power to brand and destroy organizations as "Communist" on the basis of vague standards, if he believes that some of their views or activities are similar to some of the views and activities of a "Communist political organization" or a "foreign Communist government."

That a political organization so branded will be required to register, file the names and addresses of all its members, and tag everything it distributes as "Communist." Its members will face imprisonment if they work for the Government, or travel abroad, or if their organization fails to register.

That members of a nonpolitical organization, so branded, will similarly face fine and imprisonment if their organizations fail to comply with the act.

That we already have laws making it a crime to advocate the overthrow of the Government by force and violence, and requiring registration by agents of foreign principals, but this bill denies the accused a trial before a court. The Attorney General is made prosecutor, judge, and jury.

Under our constitutional system, no public official may prescribe what is orthodox in politics, religion, or other matters of opinion. Once such power is granted, liberty is subject to the whim of those in power, and any unorthodox opinion may be suppressed.

It is clear, therefore, that if this bill is enacted, America will have been moved a long way toward fascism.

Accordingly, we urge the Congress to reject the Mundt bill.

The House is voting on this bill today. If you agree with our views please phone or wire your Congressman now. Then arrange to join us in this effort by writing Miss Elizabeth Christman, 2901 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington 8, D. C.

Dr. Smallwood Ackiss, Charles Adamson, Esther Adamson, Byron Allen, Richard A. Bancroft, Eve Bloom, Frank Bloom, Harry E. Brager, Rollo Britten, Rev. Dillard H. Brown, Dr. Henry Arthur Callis, Dr. W. Warwick Cardozo, Elizabeth Christman, Kathleen R. Clift, David Cobb, Dr. W. Montague Cobb, Dr. Paul Cornely, Dr. Merrill Curtis, David Darrin, D. H. Daughetry, Elizabeth Dickerson, Frank Donner, Kermit Eby, Gertrude Evans, Joseph A. Fanelli, Dr. Dorothy Ferebee, Clark Foreman, Mairi Foreman, Joseph Forer, H. M. Forstenzer, Dr. E. Franklin Frazier, Ernestine L. Friedmann, Helen Fuller, Dr. Leon Gerber, Simon Gerber, Alexander E. Ginsberg, Elizabeth Goldman, Marcus I. Goldman, Dr. Donald Goodchild, Herman A. Greenberg, Jan Hasbrouck, M. H. Hedges, Prof. Eugene C. Holmes, Rev. T. Ewell Hopkins, Charles H. Houston, Eugenia Baker Hyde, Mark P. Hyde, Samuel H. Jaffee, George N. Johnson, Dr. Joseph L. Johnson, William S. Johnson, Paul R. Kelly, Josephine H. Kyles, Harry Lamberton, Dr. Isadore Lattman, Belford V. Lawson, Jr., Dr. R. E. R. Lovell, Walter Marlowe, John H. Martini, Dr. C. Herbert Marshall, Rev. James H. Marshall, Frances McAvoy, Angus McDonald, John T. McManus, Elizabeth J. Miller, Janet N. Neuman, Oliver T. Palmer, Mary E. Perkins, Leslie S. Perry, John Perry, Able Plenn, Martin Popper, Evelyn Pressman, Dr. Anna T. Rand, Minnie Frost Rands, David Rein, Alexander Richter, Samuel J. Rodman, Allan R. Rosenberg, Mrs. Bernard Rosenberg, Lillian L. Rosenthal, Elizabeth Sasuly, Robert J. Silberstein, Alfred E. Smith, Helen Hall Smith, Hilda V. Smith, Samuel Spitzer, Rev. Edmund Harding Stevens, Nancy P. Straus, William Walton, Palmer Weber, J. Daniel Weitzman, Dr. E. C. Wiggins, Dr. Thomas A. Williston, Dr. Irving Winik, Bee R. Wolfe, George Wolfe.

WHAT OTHERS SAY

Washington Post: "When exposure takes the form of official stigmatization and is attended by the imposition of severe handicaps, it amounts to suppression. And once this sort of suppression is permitted, it is bound to be applied not alone to actual Communists but to dissenters and nonconformists of every kind. The end is a suppression of liberty in the name of security." (From editorial of Sunday, May 9, 1948.)

New York Post: "Are the liberals really so terrified by congressional threats of purges that they refuse to take the leadership in opposing police state legislation, for fear that they might be labeled "slightly Red"? If so, Congressman MUNDT and his fellow conspirators on the Thomas Un-American Activities Committee have already achieved their primary purpose." (From editorial of April 29, 1948.)

CIO News: "Our chief concern, frankly, is over the effects the measure would have on civil rights and the manner in which it could be used unfairly against labor unions and other liberal groups. * * * The Attorney General—be he Tom Clark or someone who succeeds him in the future—could, through design or error, destroy or seriously harm liberal organizations which have no connection with the Communist Party." (From editorial of May 10, 1948.)

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People: "The bill is a threat to all organizations engaged in the effort to obtain full citizenship rights for all American citizens. * * * It establishes a new standard for determining what is subversive. Heretofore this determination has been made by the courts on the basis of overt acts. Under this bill, opinions, attitudes, and associations may subject one to the charge of participating in subversive activities." (From statement of May 12, 1948.)

American Civil Liberties Union: "The Civil Liberties Union is opposed to all penalties on mere opinion or association. It is un-American in principle. It is ineffective in practice. * * * On all grounds the measure should be opposed by those who cherish the American principles of civil liberties." (From Statement of April 29, 1948.)

National Lawyers Guild: This measure can only be understood as a product of mounting hysteria in our land. In the past we had the alien and sedition laws and the Palmer raids after World War I. They are among the blackest pages in American history. If this measure is enacted, its impact will be far greater * * * while the shadow of freedom might remain, the substance would be lost." (From Statement of May 3, 1948.)

This space has been paid for by the above signers.

Christian Marriage and American Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include, for the consideration of my colleagues, the statement I presented yesterday, May 17, 1948, before the House Judiciary Subcommittee in support of House Joint Resolution 375, which I introduced in the House on April 15, 1948:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for the courtesy and opportunity to present this statement in support of your consideration of House Joint Resolution 375, authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim an annual National Rededication to Marriage Week.

On April 3, 1948, I wrote to the President advising him I was informed he had been requested to proclaim an annual National Rededication to Marriage Week and urged his approval of the suggestion. The reply from the White House indicated that the President desired to be guided in his action, as is customary, by a formal expression of the wishes and judgment of the Congress; in the nature of a joint resolution.

In compliance with the Presidential request and, in accordance with the multitudinous letters I received from all sections of the country, I filed House Joint Resolution 375 in the House of Representatives on April 15, 1948.

In appreciation of the onerous duty burden upon the members of this committee, it is not my intention to intrude upon you with any lengthy, expansive, statistical compilation of figures with reference to the disintegration of home life in the United States. It is rather, my desire, to present, succinctly as possible, the underlying reason and purpose prompting my introduction of this resolution.

As you gentlemen full well know, our beloved country has apparently been ordained by divine providence to lead today's distressed world out of the dark abyss of despair into the light of hope and recovery.

To that end, in the material sense, this Nation has approved, in Christian charity, a substantial program of financial relief to the war-ravaged and depressed peoples of the world. However, essential that program admittedly is, from the pronouncements of our acclaimed leaders, it is becoming increasingly evident they have the profound belief this charitable gesture will be in vain unless it is implemented by a revival of the moral leadership of the United States. We must cement our monetary contribution to world stability by impact of the substantial moral and spiritual values which are the real foundation of America's greatness; those values can be reflected only from the example emanating from American Christian homes and family life. The moral strength of a nation depends upon the individual caliber of its citizens and home influence exerts the deciding factor in molding our future citizens.

It is not necessary for me to recite and enumerate the impressive list of preeminent church, court, social, medical, and criminal authorities who have repeatedly warned of the veritable tidal wave of American unhappiness evidenced by such developments as advancing divorce rates, declining birth rates, rising alcoholism, increasing birth control, alarming juvenile delinquency and regrettable sophistication affecting the Christian regard of the moral obligations and responsibilities of marriage and family life.

It was a definite recognition of these deficiencies that inspired calling of the recent National Conference on Family Life here in Washington for the general purpose of discovering specific means through which the American family might be strengthened for the benefit of its individual members and society.

Undeniably, the two great dangers that this Nation faces today emanate out of a godless philosophy from abroad and a sophisticated immorality from within. The only bulwark that we can set up against the advance of these scourges in America must come from the public expression of our traditional American Christian philosophy which acknowledges the existence of divine providence in our daily social and political manner of life.

When we look upon democracy only from a standpoint of materialism and economic values we have lost sight of the spirit of democracy. We can start with the spiritual values of the Declaration of Independence, we can trace them through the Constitutional debates, the Constitution itself; we can follow them through the preambles of the United Nations Charter and the other sections of the Charter—what do we find—an unbroken thread of great spiritual values as the basis for the ideals of American democracy and survival.

Today, when godless government is seeking totalitarian empire, we must realistically remind ourselves that the eventual struggle will resolve itself into a test of spiritual strength. In these critical times, when our Nation may be at the crossroads of her history, I believe you will agree that it is well for us to reflect and emphasize that divine providence is the secret of our power, the source of our might and the end of all our living. God and His rights can never be a mere incident in our national life if our greatness is to endure. The existence of God's directives can never be repudiated if the glory of America is to be perpetuated.

I realize, full well, that these remarks are open to the observation that this thesis is being proffered on an emotional level; but I submit that it is a thesis which supports a great truth, namely, that when we take away or fail to live up to the spiritual basis of democracy we lose democracy itself.

I need not remind you of the very practical advice of George Washington, "of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports." You will recall the pronouncement of President John Adams in his first proclamation of a day of solemn humiliation, fasting, and prayer when he laid down these principles: (1) That "the safety and prosperity of nations ultimately and essentially depend on the protection and the blessing of Almighty God"; (2) that "the national acknowledgment of this truth is not only an indispensable duty which the people owe to Him, but a duty whose natural influence is favorable to the promotion of that morality and piety without which social happiness cannot exist nor the blessings of a free government be enjoyed"; (3) that "all religious congregations" should "acknowledge before God the manifold sins and transgressions with which we are chargeable as individuals and as a nation"; (4) that this duty, "at all times incumbent, is especially so in seasons of difficulty or of danger." For 171 years our Chief Executives, in peace and war, have constantly rededicated this Nation to divine providence by public proclamations asking His continued blessing and protection.

It is my conviction that to reunite America and assume our destiny of world leadership we need the reestablishment of these moral and spiritual controls of human conduct which throughout our Nation's history have been inspired by our Christian faith in God.

Because of the fact that there exists in the world today godless forces attempting to undermine Christian civilization and because the institution of marriage is the principle foundation upon which our Christian civilization rests and in deference to the authorities who sincerely judge that American family life is being threatened by degeneration, I introduced this resolution and earnestly ask your favorable action upon it.

It is my thought that, with congressional approval and Presidential proclamation, all religious denominations in this country could initiate a simultaneous ceremony of rededication to Christian marriage vows, on a designated Sunday, at the beginning of a week, in which, by conferences, meetings, and public addresses, the national consciousness of America could be concentrated upon the family unit, as the basis of Christian civilization and the foundation for the good order and well-being of the United States.

This blessed Nation of ours has been great in the past; we are great today and if we have the good sense to continue to publicly acknowledge our American alliance with Almighty God, please God, we shall remain great for the momentous responsibilities of tomorrow. Thank you for your attention and your indulgence.

The Truth About the Mundt-Nixon Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr POULSON. Mr. Speaker, members of Congress have been deluged with letters and telegrams opposing the passing of the Mundt-Nixon bill. These communications bear the unmistakable imprint of having been inspired by the same forces which have always opposed the investigation of Communist activities in this country.

Many sincere people, ever mindful and watchful of the protection of the right of free speech, have been victimized by the propaganda circulated by the Communist Party and Communist-front organizations. A reading of the bill will disclose beyond any question that freedom of speech is not curtailed.

The opposition is conducting a scare program to make the people think that this is a "police-state" bill. They have circulated handbills saying that Americans who are opposed to the poll tax, the draft, and UMT, and in favor of the UN's partition of Palestine, are subject to 10 years in jail, a $10,000 fine, or both. They also have the unmitigated nerve to publish statements that Americans can be jailed as Communist conspirators if they favor a low-cost housing program, the abolishment of anti-Semitism and race discrimination, wage increases, public health and medical care, and even hot lunches for school children. These same handbills then go on to urge the election of the third party candidate for Congress. I know this is the situation, because these handbills have been circulated in my own district.

The Mundt-Nixon bill does none of these things. All that it does is to throw the spotlight on Communist political organizations and Communist front organizations. It requires them to register with the United States Attorney General. In the case of Communist political organizations, the membership list must be filed with the Attorney General. It denies Federal Government employment to members of a Communist political organization, although members of a Communist front organization are not so restricted. It denies passports to members of a Communist political organization, although it does not do so to members of Communist front organizations. It requires that all mail and radio broadcasts issued or made by a Communist political organization or a Communist front organization shall be designated as being disseminated by and sponsored by a "Communist organization." It prohibits the deduction for Federal income tax purposes of contributions made to Communist political organizations and Communist front organizations.

The law does not outlaw the Communist Party. The bill provides for an appeal to the Federal courts from the action of the Attorney General.

The real significance of the bill is in the definition of a Communist political organization and a Communist front organization, which in substance is directed against those groups whose direction and control is vested in and exercised by the Communist dictatorship of a foreign country. An organization which does not come within that category (and it should be noted that it must first be proved that it does come within that category) is not subject to the provisions of the act.

The people who owe their allegiance to the United States and not to the world Communist movement whose direction and control is vested in and exercised by the Communist dictatorship of a foreign country can have no objections to the spotlight being focused on the subversive elements of this Nation.

As evidence of the fact that this bill is being misrepresented, I am herewith inserting in the RECORD a copy of the circular which has been distributed throughout my district. It speaks for itself:

AMERICA IS IN DANGER OF BECOMING A POLICE STATE

The un-American House committee has a "sleeper" in the legislative hopper—introduced by Representatives NIXON and MUNDT—entitled "The Subsersive Activities Control Act." This bill is more subversive of our Constitution than the infamous alien and sedition acts of long ago. If passed, this bill could make it a crime to:

Criticize Truman's foreign policy, or any pending legislation.

Oppose UMT and the draft.

Condemn anti-Semitism and Jim Crow.

Fight for a wage increase.

ELIMINATE THESE REPEATED THREATS TO AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

1. Act now. Wire or write Congressman NORRIS POULSON and Senators DOWNEY and KNOWLAND. Demand they help defeat this bill.

2. Elect Progressives to our national and State legislatures: Ned Healy, Congress, Thirteenth Congressional District; Wilbur Gilbert, Assembly, Fifty-fourth Assembly District. June 1 primary.

3. Support the Independent Progressive Party for:

Price control, low-cost housing.

Labor's rights, and civil liberties for all without discrimination.

Security against the hazards of old age, sickness, and unemployment.

Security against monopoly control of America.

Support of the United Nations and world peace.

Hear Henry Wallace speak on 'An American Program for Peace," Gilmore Stadium, Sunday, May 16, 8 p. m.

A Well-Managed Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I have had occasion before to make reference to the operations of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union, particularly in my area in South Jersey. I spoke of the work there of Mr. Phillip Rudick, of the South Jersey joint board, and the conduct of the union generally.

I have noted with interest a recent article by Victor Riesel, which tells an interesting story concerning some of the unique activities of this union on a national scale, which I include as an example of labor-union management, which is of value to the Nation, as well as to the social welfare of its members.

The article referred to follows:

MODEL UNION EASES LIFE OF WORKING JOE

(By Victor Riesel)

You have to be raised a slum kid and play stickball in gutters; or scrounge for a bit of wall smooth enough for handball; or be chased by irate tenants whose basement windows your gang's football smashed; or sob as though it was your last heartache when some annoyed janitor refused to return your twobit rubber ball. You need to have come

up through all these little tragedies to know what grassy plots really mean in the worn-out sections of big cities.

So when I wandered down to a housing project today I knew I had a story to tell to a lot of working Joes—because I saw a site deep in the slums of New York where 80 percent of the land is being turned into gardens and playfields and just 20 percent for apartment buildings. Whoever thought of that has a soul. And a union thought of it, a union with a soul, a union with a feeling for its people.

You ought to know that union. Its members are the skilled tailors who make the clothes for the men in every American family. It's a politically-sophisticated union, a successful union whose New York and Chicago banks lend money to employers as well as duespayers.

I'm talking about Jack Potofsky's Amalgamated Clothing Workers (CIO), which with its 350,000 members in 38 States plays the same balance of power role in CIO today that it did under its late president, Sidney Hillman.

But first let me tell you about those Amalgamated banks, the only labor institutions of their kind, which this week mark their twenty-fifth year. If you don't think labor leaders can be successful businessmen just look at the banks' assets after these 25 years. The New York bank has resources of $37,963,524 and 12,700 depositors; the Chicago bank has over $36,000,000.

That's a long way from 1923 when the Amalgamated first went into business and fought the loan shark racket. At that time it learned that New York's police were being victimized. Some cops were so entangled in the interest-sucking rackets, and so terrorized by the city's trigger-happy mobs that they paid off their full salaries for weeks just to appease the usury outfits. Police suicides were frequent.

The Amalgamated Bank officials, in an era when cops were usually considered "cossacks" by other union chiefs, went to the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association, and said in effect: "Send us all your cops who are indebted to loan sharks, we'll pay off their debts and budget them so they can return the money to us over the years."

Later the firemen, schoolteachers and other civil-service employees were helped to get out from under the loan racket. Still later these banks financed the Amalgamated's belief that union members need not live in slums. Up near Van Cortlandt Park the union built its labor cooperative houses, first of their kind in the country—and the families of 1,500 tailors moved in to pay $11 per month per room. And the new project, just going up today, rents its rooms for $16 each despite the high building costs. That's the lowest-priced housing in New York for new apartments.

It's a big union Mr. Potofsky directs, a union with an annual income of over $3,000,000 and an organizing staff of 200 men and women. When they move in on an organizing drive in some new town they sell more than bread and butter—they can talk of a union which provides $150 surgical and maternity insurance, hospitalization, sick and accident benefits, and old-age pensions—all won without once crippling the industry.

Those organizers sell a union which pays them a nominal $60 to $80 a week, and whose international president lives on less than $200 a week after taxes—no great pickings here. They sell a union which runs a money-saving grocery, an inexpensive children's day camp, a co-op nursery and a Bendix washing machine center among a multitude of other projects.

It's a big union with time for little things for its members—the little things to make life easier, like grass and inexpensive milk. And that's good.

WAC's Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 1948

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to wish Col. Mary Hallaren, in command of the WAC, and the WAC a happy birthday. Six years ago they were created. When I introduced the first bill to create them I had an abiding faith in them. That faith has been fully justified. They have done such good work that the Army has asked that they be made a permanent part of their forces. That proves their worth. It is a tribute to their efficiency and their patriotism. One of the most striking attributes of the WAC is that instead of asking for preferment for themselves they are always seeking an opportunity to serve. Every Wac I have ever seen has expressed gratitude because she had an opportunity to serve. It is a wonderful spirit, and they deserve all the success they have had and much more.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Clarification in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 18 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Clarification in Palestine," written by Walter Lippmann, which appeared in today's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLARIFICATION IN PALESTINE

(By Walter Lippmann)

It is much to early to write off the United Nations as a failure in Palestine. In fact only now, after the events of last Friday, is the Security Council, or the United States as a member of it, in a position to take the kind of action which in the American official view is required by the Charter. This action, said Ambassador Austin on February 24, "must be directed solely to the maintenance of international peace. The Council's action, in other words, is directed to keeping the peace and not to enforcing partition."

Action by the Security Council to keep the peace could not begin until the United Kingdom ceased to be responsible for the government of Palestine and until the state of Israel had been recognized as its legal successor in the territory defined by the General Assembly.

Up to Friday of last week the Security Council could have acted to maintain international peace in Palestine only if Great Britain, as the legal government, had said it was the victim of aggression. Britain did not say this. Therefore, the fighting in Palestine was internal disorder, like the uprising in Bogota, and not a breach of international peace.

Even though the violence was aided and abetted by Arab governments outside of Palestine, there was no case before the Security Council as long as the British Government did not choose to call upon the Security Council for help. This is a crucial point in any understanding of what has happened in Palestine and of what is now going to happen. The problem of Palestine could not come before the Security Council in the form which enables the Council to act to maintain peace until there was a government in Palestine which called upon it for help. Thus, it would have been impossible for the Security Council to take action against the external guerilla forces in Greece if on December 3, 1946, the Greek Government had not requested it under articles 34 and 35 of the Charter. If the Greek Government had taken the position of the British mandatory government, that it was responsible for law and order in its territory and that it was not the victim of external aggression, the Security Council could not have taken action in Greece.

The termination of the British mandate and the recognition of the state of Israel have radically altered and greatly clarified the task of the Security Council. Any invasion of the territory of Israel as defined in the United Nations resolution by the armed forces of Egypt, Syria, Iraq, or Transjordan is now an unmistakable act of aggression which the Security Council is obligated to oppose.

The whole machinery of the United Nations Organization can now be set in motion to arrest the aggression and to bring about a settlement of what is now, and only now, a clear-cut problem of international peace.

There seems to be little doubt that the King of Egypt has actually committed an overt and avowed act of aggression by sending his army and his bombers across the frontiers of Israel. He should be called sternly and promptly to account and ordered to desist.

There is, on the other hand, no evidence as this article is written that the King of Transjordan has committed aggression. The entry of his forces into the Arab portion of Palestine is not an act of aggression since there is now no state and no government in that territory. If he intends to occupy the territory up to the frontiers of Israel, and to respect the international status of Jerusalem, he has as good a legal title as anyone to do just that.

If he does that, the prospects of a peaceable settlement—that is to say of a peace treaty—should be reasonably good. For the Kingdom of Transjordan is a British satellite state. It was created by the British Government, its king was set upon his throne by Britain, its government derives almost all its revenue from Britain, its army is led by British officers, it has been trained and equipped by British Government, and it is bound by treaty to Great Britain.

Therefore, in arranging for a peace treaty between Israel and Transjordan, Mr. Bevin, acting through his delegate on the Security Council, will be negotiating with his agents in Transjordan. Mr. Bevin is, therefore, exceptionally well placed for the role of peacemaker. Since the provisional government of Israel has explicitly and unreservedly accepted the boundaries fixed by the United Nations, the problem of making peace is reduced to persuading the King of Transjordan to come up to but not to cross those boundaries.

It is evident that Mr. Bevin is the man to induce the King of Transjordan to do just that. For Mr. Bevin controls all the inducements. And consequently his is the main responsibility for the prevention of an international war in the Middle East.

Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

BELOIT, WIS., *May 12, 1948.*

Hon. LAWRENCE SMITH,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LAWRENCE: There is a law pending relative to compulsory military training. I thought you might be interested in what one veteran thinks about it. He said, "You know I think we ought to rent the Rose Bowl and armor plate it. Then we could take all these radio commentators, news columnists, Congressmen, profiteers, and others who want war so bad. We could supply them with all the latest weapons—machine guns, ammunition, tanks, etc. Then we could go over to Russia and get the same group over there that are pushing for war and put on a show. We could sell tickets at $100 a throw and give as many performances as necessary. Of course, all the World War II veterans should have priorities for seats on the 50-yard line. We could abide by the decisions that they reach just the same as we have by wars to date. Maybe we could eventually get rid of some of the warmongering, coat-holding murderers instead of the young fellows they have been feeding to slaughter for years."

The only favor I will ever ask of you in return for all the work that I have ever done in your behalf is to have you see to it that Congressman GURNEY and others pushing this bill have an opportunity to read or hear this letter read. Is this too much for me to ask?

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT A. PERKINS,
Veterans' Administration Employee.

Israel Recognized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, a brief and excellent editorial appeared in the Atlantic City Daily World in a recent edition, which while properly hailing the action of the Government in recognizing the new state of Israel, at the same time points out the ludicrous "backing and filling" of the Administration on this problem. It also wisely points out that mere recognition does not solve anything, but is only a step on the way to solution of the Palestinian problem. I think the editorial will be of interest to the membership, particularly those who have been especially concerned with the cause of Zionism, and it is therefore included:

ISRAEL RECOGNIZED

Though American recognition of the newly proclaimed state of Israel constitutes another abrupt reversal of American policy in Palestine, and though the announcement of it came so suddenly and unexpectedly that it caught our own delegates to the United Nations by surprise, the decision itself was a logical and necessary answer to the circumstances existing at the dramatic moment when it was made. It has been left for Senator VANDENBERG to fill in the brief White House statement with a convincing explanation of the essential and compelling reasons for this action. With the termination of the British mandate our Government's decision, says Mr. VANDENBERG, "takes account of the reality that no other authority (than the new state of Israel) can fill what would otherwise be a cruel and dangerous vacuum in this area of Palestine." Thus, in the end, and after the many fumblings and reversals and back-steppings which marked the middle chapters of the story, our Government has returned to the same premises which motivated its strong support of the resolution for partition, which was approved by the General Assembly last November 29. It has recognized that the Jewish state does in fact exist today, as it did even then, and that partition had already become a reality, even before the United Nations urged its acceptance by the two parties.

Recognition of the new state does not and should not call for a halt in present efforts to obtain either a lasting truce in the city of Jerusalem or a peaceful settlement of the issue elsewhere in Palestine. There is every reason why these efforts should be continued and intensified, every reason to hope that despite the movement of Arab troops and the battles already begun, Palestine can be spared the ordeal of a full-fledged war between Arab and Zionist. The prospect of such a war is dismaying in its dreadful possibility. Moreover, as the General Assembly itself has pointed out forcefully, a state of Israel cannot hope to exist and prosper without economic unity of the whole of Palestine. But while these things are true, it is also true that a new state judged worthy to receive recognition must also be judged worthy to have an opportunity to defend itself in action. The decision by the Government of the United States to recognize Israel calls logically for a corollary decision by the same Government to lift its present arms embargo.

The Reds and the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial of the Los Angeles Daily News of Wednesday, May 5, 1948, the contents of which I feel to be very timely at this time:

THE REDS AND THE LAW

The law, as has been said, can't do everything. But sometimes it tries. And when it does it often conjures up dangers readily seen and others dimly outlined.

This is just about the first and last word you can say about the proposed Subversive Activities Control Act of 1948, now amended and reported out by the House Un-American Activities Committee.

What seems to be wrong with this omnibus legislation designed to protect the United States against internal enemies whose avowed aim is to destroy democratic government is (1) that it is an omnibus bill (and therefore bites off too much), (2) that it attempts to do a questionable thing in a questionable way.

That the principle of disclosure ought to be applied to totalitarians of both left and right any thinking person should agree.

It would be a fine thing, therefore, if ideas, issues, and claims of all sorts could be brought before the public, as the President's Commission on Civil Rights has said, by "people who state honestly who they are, what they work for, and who supports them."

This is the big beef against the Communists as well as other "ists." As an ideology communism has a right to compete with any other ism. But because it doesn't compete honestly it gives off a bad aroma. Its secrecy, its undercover, Ku-Klux-like character, its admitted allegiance to foreign control and domination, its tyrannical objectives—these qualities, not its entire ideational core, are what makes communism in the United States resemble the skunk under the back porch.

Communism parallels liberal democracy in many of the aims of social and racial justice it proposes to espouse. But it deviates markedly from democracy in methodology. It appeals to force rather than to persuasion. It openly advocates the use of force to abolish all dissidence. And its tactics are skulking, devious tactics.

For these reasons communism needs to be brought into the open. And so do all other shrouded isms.

The principle of disclosure and registration already is well established: the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Pure Food and Drug Act, the Federal Communications Commission, the lobby registration law.

So far as the Communist Party and other undercover groups are concerned, the public has a right to know who their members are and what they are up to. The public, in other words, has a right to a framework of reference by which it can get better acquainted, as the Civil Rights Commission says, with the activities, sponsorship and background of those who are active in the market place of public opinion.

But where the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1948 gets a bit punch-drunk is in the sweeping administrative determinations it would authorize.

The act, as now amended and ballyhooed by Representative RICHARD M. NIXON, of Los Angeles' Twelfth District, would grant to the Attorney General the authority to determine whether an organization is a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization.

Wherein and why, it might be asked, does Congressman NIXON justify reposing such far-reaching power—power over the actual lives and destinies of individual citizens—in the Attorney General, who is a man and therefore fallible?

The act's postscript to the effect that the Attorney General's findings may be subject to judicial review scarcely ameliorates the police state feeling you get when you read that the Attorney General's opinion (supported by some kind of evidence) is going to determine whether you're ostracized or stigmatized for having once joined in a front to open the gates of Palestine or help the world's hungry.

The danger here is obvious. The danger is that many worthy citizens may be condemned by association; that what may proceed as the result of such legislation would be a vast, unprecedented witch hunt unparalleled in American history since the infamous Alien and Sedition Acts rushed through Congress by the Federalists in 1798.

Moreover, the danger is that, like the Alien and Sedition Acts, the present Subversive Activities Control Act might be used by those in power to suppress their opponents and thereby remain in power.

Ripping the mask off American communism is a good idea. But at the same time we want to be careful not to rip the Bill of Rights out of the Constitution.

Can we force American communism above ground without, at the same time, forcing the loyal opposition so vital to a democratic society underground?

The answer is that by all odds we can't do this by authorizing sweeping administrative determinations, of highly doubtful constitutionality, that when a fellow parts his hair on the left he's un-American.

Does the present bill properly safeguard the civil rights of innocent people who prefer not to part their hair any other way?

Congress should take some time to think this matter through.—R. E. G. H.

Father Edward J. Flanagan, Creator of Boys Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, Father Edward J. Flanagan died in the line of duty last Saturday.

His final moments were spent in Berlin, far from the State of Nebraska where he had worked more than 35 years in the service of American youth. The task he had set for himself was the study of the problems of young people in the former Axis countries of Europe. He had spent some time in this work in Austria. He was engaged in a similar survey in the American zone of Germany when death called.

Although Father Flanagan was a man of God and a citizen of the world, the life span of his service was performed in Nebraska. His first parish was in O'Neil, Nebr. The beginning of his great contribution to youth came in Omaha. Boys Town, the crowning achievement of his genius and faith, became an incorporated Nebraska community in 1937, with its own mayor and council and post office.

Hundreds of Americans will point to the material accomplishments represented in Boys Town, the physical plant itself, its present $5,000,000 building program. Thousands will think of Father Flanagan's deeds in the terms of reconstructed lives. But, millions of Americans—myself among them—will always remember the intrepid priest for his great gift to us, embodied in a single sentence: "There never was, there is not now, nor will there ever be such a person as an all-bad boy."

No man has ever left a finer heritage to the American people than that of confidence in American youth.

No Separate Talks With Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, concerning the present diplomatic relations with Russia, I want to include a very timely and expressive editorial by Spencer Canary, editor of the Sentinel Tribune, of Bowling Green, Ohio:

PEACE TALK WITH RUSSIA

Press accounts of proposed peace talks with Russia again develop the duplicity of Foreign Minister Molotov.

He disclosed the diplomatic letter of our Ambassador Smith, contrary to understanding, and his reply. In doing so he worded his announcement in such a way as to make Russia seem to oblige the United States and thus to win prestige for Russia among European nations.

The United States had better refrain from any separate peace talks with Russia and confine itself to those along with Britain, France, and China appertaining to settlement of World War II. Nothing more we might say regarding our desire for peace could change the Russian Soviet's purpose. It is intelligent enough to understand what we have said and done in the past. It knows we long for peace.

The only benefit which may have come from Ambassador Smith's letter to Molotov may be that it will enable the Soviet to save face. There are signs that it recognizes it has elbowed the United States too many times and thinks it wise to act better, lest its seeming challenge of war is accepted. The Soviet has been losing prestige in Europe.

Italy voted against communism. Greece is beating the Communists. France's anti-Communist government is showing power. Europe's free countries are cooperating. Communists' threats in the Free City of Trieste have not been carried out, and Tito's Yugoslav troops are less pugnacious. The Marshall plan is in action, and Congress is voting military power as a defense measure.

Russia sees these things and will play diplomacy a while; but we must remember the sheepskins of peace cover the Russian bear of communism.

Removal of German Industrial Plants Increases Burden of United States in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks a letter set forth in the New York Times of May 16, 1948, by H. E. Priester, an expert on German and European economic affairs regarding our unrealistic policy with reference to reparations from German industrial plants.

Following is the letter:

GERMAN REPARATIONS—MORATORIUM IS PROPOSED ON PAYMENTS IN CAPITAL GOODS

(The writer of the following letter is the author of a number of works on German and European economic affairs, among them the German Economic Miracle, which in 1936 disclosed the Nazis' economic preparations for war.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The problem of German reparations in capital goods as presented in letters to the editor by such authorities as Julius C. C. Edelstein, Special Adviser to Secretary Marshall, and Albert C. Carr, Consultant to the Inter-Allied Reparation Agency, Brussels, overlook basic economic and technological facts.

The editorial comment of the Times on the letter of Mr. Marshall's special adviser enumerated some general economic considerations against the official prodismantling thesis; the necessity to leave Germany enough resources to subsist without external assistance; the completely changed structure of Germany's economy converting it into another Britain through dismemberment. However, the speaker for the International Reparation Agency supports his thesis with specific arguments already stated by General Clay on October 1, 1947, and later repeated by Mr. Marshall in a letter to Senator VANDENBERG. They can be summed up as follows:

IN DEFENSE OF REMOVAL

The plants to be dismantled are surplus for Germany's peacetime requirements.

These plants are not operative in Germany due to lack of coal, manpower, and raw materials.

These plants are more useful for the European recovery if promptly transferred from Germany to other European countries.

By ignoring the dynamics of economic life the Allied authorities have apparently become bona fide victims of one of the typical statistical lies regarding the first argument of surplus plants. The yardstick for surplus industrial plants is a new level of industry, agreed upon by the bizonal authorities in August 1947, providing for an industrial capacity in the western zones equal to that of 1936.

Unfortunately the industrial capacity of 1936 is an obsolete standard reflecting a going economy with all factories in full production, a complete stock pile of essential and nonessential raw materials, semimanufactured and finished goods, a population properly fed, clothed and housed, and a well-organized transportation and distribution system. Due to the far-reaching structural changes in Germany's economic life wrecked by the impact of war, such an economy has vanished and cannot be revived.

Thus it must be concluded that the official definition of surplus plants in Germany, and the claim for the removal of plant equipment from Germany cannot be sustained.

ROLE IN EUROPE'S RECOVERY

The assertion that the German plants earmarked for reparations would have to remain idle for 4 or 5 years if left in Germany, on account of the lack of coal, manpower, and raw materials, is a remnant of pre-Marshall plan arguing. Meanwhile the administration and the western European countries as well have openly recognized that western Germany must be rehabilitated and integrated into any successful European recovery program.

The western European nations are confronted with almost the same lack of coal and manpower as western Germany. Even now a rate of steel production of only 60 to 65 percent of maximum output is possible in Belgium, France, and Luxemburg, due to insufficient fuel supplies and lack of skilled labor. Thus, generally speaking, the dismantling of German plants cannot be justified as being unworkable inside Germany but workable in some other country.

The shortage in western Germany of iron and steel presented as reasons for dismantling, results to some extent from an unsound economic and dangerous military policy of the occupation authorities. The low production figure of 2,750,000 tons of steel in the Ruhr during 1947 (by an admitted steel capacity of 10,500,000 tons and an existing capacity of about 17,000,000 tons) is caused in great part by the use of low-grade German iron ore instead of high-grade Swedish ore. This policy has been advocated by the British military government for balance-of-payment reasons. Nevertheless, this did not hinder the control authorities in bizonia from listing import requirements of 1,700,000 tons finished steel in 1948, and 1,900,000 tons in 1949.

ORE AS WAR POTENTIAL

From the military point of view it is almost unbelievable that the Allies conserve the dangerous war potential of Germany's low-grade iron ore production including the most modern installation built by Hitler for rearmament purposes and which helped the Nazis so much to keep the Ruhr steel industry in production during the war. If the German heavy industry were forced to rely upon imported foreign ore, the war potential of the Ruhr iron and steel industry would be decisively reduced while at the same time the iron and steel output would be stepped up for the benefit of the whole western European community.

The argument that the plants earmarked for transfer are more useful for European recovery if promptly shipped to other European countries is not valid due to the bottleneck of transportation. This is such that it does not permit the haulage of equipment valued at $1,000,000,000 across the western European territories within any reasonable time.

Overlooked also is the vital engineering problem connected with the moving of complicated industrial installations from one country to another.

Incidentally, the spokesman for the International Reparation Agency has already shifted his arguments and no longer stresses the formerly claimed necessity to "redistribute Germany's surplus industrial plants," but instead advocates the use of specialized German machinery on behalf of western European factories. From the economic point of view this stand is perhaps even more dangerous, because it means the dismemberment of existing plants representing still a great potential production power only in order to get hold of some of their machinery.

The only efficient "dismantling" has been accomplished in the American zone, as recently stated by a prominent Dutch economist, K. P. van der Mandele. He refers to the operation of the Washington authorities who investigated secrets of manufacturing, including patents and formulas of German key producers and by publishing the findings made the whole material available to American and Allied industrialists.

The time has come to look for a new solution to the German reparation problem, a solution which respects the justified claims for security and compensation on the part of the European victims of German aggression, but which does not interfere with the Marshall plan for European rehabilitation.

NEED FOR SOLUTION

The following suggestion might be advanced for consideration:

That the Allied Powers declare a 5-year moratorium for reparation of capital goods. The titles to the factories earmarked for dismantling would have to go to a new Inter-Allied Reparation Custodian," an organization to be established along the pattern of the United States Alien Property Custodian. The Inter-Allied Reparation Custodian would run these factories in his trust with inter-Allied and German management. The production policy, the allocation of raw materials and the distribution of the produced goods would be determined in close cooperation with the authorities in charge of executing the European recovery program in order to synchronize all efforts for the rehabilitation of western Europe.

However, consideration should be given to transferring of ownership certificates of individual plants to the nations to whom these plants were allocated. In a later period those titles could be sold to nationals of the countries in question. In this way of more closely knit economy of the western European nations via the reparation enterprises could be brought about in accordance with the basic principles of the Marshall plan.

H. E. PRIESTER.

NEW YORK, *May 1, 1948.*

Mundt Bill Is a Political Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Mundt bill was introduced for political purposes. It is a part of the 1948 Republican campaign strategy to whip up the prevailing hysteria, and make the people forget about the failures of the Republican-dominated Eightieth Congress. What are some of those failures?

The failure to stop inflation, which has reduced the real wages of the American people 27 percent in the last 2 years, and, incidentally, boomed the profits of big business to an all-time high.

The failure to produce housing for the people at prices they can afford to pay.

The failure to protect the small-business man against giant monopoly and discriminatory allocation of goods.

There is a second political reason for this bill, and I charge the Republican Party with introducing a bill which they know will not pass the other body of Congress, a bill which they know will not become the law of the land, for the purpose of placing progressive, liberal, non-Communist Congressmen, like myself, who hate communism, in a dangerous political position. This is campaign year, you know, and if you cannot successfully attack a Congressman's voting record in his district, you just use the Communist "Red smear" as your next best weapon.

I will say this to the gentlemen who have introduced this bill: that I accept the challenge; I will go into my district and expose this bill for the monstrosity, for the dangerous and unconstitutional measure which I consider it to be. I want to say to the gentlemen who have produced this bill, that I have faith in the good judgment of the people of my district, whom I have represented for 6 years. They know that I hate communism, and that I love democracy. And they know that I will fight communism as long as I live, but I will fight it in the American way. I will not violate the Bill of Rights, because frightened or designing men wish to capitalize on the hysteria of the moment. The people of my district have trusted me to defend their constitutional liberties, and I intend to do that regardless of the political hazard.

One Hundred and Thirteen Thousand Five Hundred Jeeps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter concerning jeeps:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
OFFICE OF THE FOREIGN
LIQUIDATION COMMISSIONER,
Washington, D. C., May 13, 1948.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Further reference is made to our letter of May 4, regarding an estimate of the number of jeeps sold overseas.

We have again conferred with the Army and the Navy, and, on the basis of the best information available in Washington, we estimate that approximately 113,500 ¼-ton 4 x 4 trucks (jeeps) have been disposed of in areas under our jurisdiction.

As was pointed out in our letter of April 26, 1948, this does not include Hawaii, the area to which your original inquiry related.

I desire to emphasize the fact that the figure set forth above is an estimate arrived at by the application of adjustment factors which, though logical, are not supported by any detailed statistical records.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP E. BROWN,
Major General, United States Army,
Acting Foreign Liquidation Commissioner.

Address of Hon. John C. Butler, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, our able colleague, Hon. JOHN C. BUTLER, of New York, who has always been in the forefront of those fighting for progressive legislation, spoke this week before the New York State convention of Post Office clerks at Rochester, N. Y.

His position of seniority in the Committee on Post Offices and Civil Service, his extensive experience, diligence, and ability in the field lend weight to his words.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I set forth Representative BUTLER'S well-received and much-appreciated address:

It is a real honor for me to be here this evening and to address this twenty-first convention of the New York State Federation of Post Office Clerks. I can call to mind no group to which I could speak with less constraint than to this one and similar meetings of postal workers. For I feel that I know each and every one of you; not, of course, by name or face, but in spirit. All of us are here for a common purpose: To do everything humanly possible to add to the great prestige of the Post Office Department, thereby adding materially to the morale, welfare, and well-being of its employees.

Postal workers in general need no praise for their many and excellent contributions down through the years to the advancement of our great Nation. They need no accolade that could be bestowed upon them by any words of praise I might say here tonight. But I do think the thousands and hundreds of thousands of men and women who comprise our postal system should be honored for their efficiency and their faithfulness to duty. And I think you postal workers should accept such honor as a symbol of the vital part the Post Office Department plays in the lives of the American people.

The Post Office Department and its personnel are truly representative of America. Your present Postmaster General, Jesse M. Donaldson, has very aptly defined the type of work you are engaged in, when he stated that, "The postal service is peculiarly the business of all the people."

Indeed, it is the business of all the people. Millions of American homes are without the benefits of electricity; millions of our citizens do not have access to telephone and telegraph services. But practically everyone in America finds the services of the Post Office Department available to him. Its facilities reach out and serve the remotest sections of our country. Every facet of the American way of life touches on and is influenced to a greater or lesser degree by the postal service. Communities spring up and immediately its people are brought into direct communication with other cities and towns through the far-flung facilities of the Post Office Department. This contact with inhabitants of towns near and far is the lifeblood of our Nation; and mail service is the basic communication line of all progress in the fields of business, education, religion, and social horizons. It defies our imagination to conceive of this country long enduring without the services of the Post Office Department.

But great as the postal service may be, its magnificence is but a faithful reflection of the abilities of the men and women who operate it. Its operations are for the large part performed by human hands and human brains. Therefore, postal efficiency is always in direct ratio to the efficiency of the people who make it tick. The world of science has never contrived a mechanical device to read and sort mail. No robot has ever been built to replace the letter carrier on his appointed rounds. And great as have been the technological advancements in the atom-era in which we live, it is highly unlikely that scientists will ever fashion a mechanical contrivance to replace the post office clerk or the letter carrier.

So again I say, I am privileged and proud to be here this evening to add my personal congratulations to you men and women for your share in making the United States Postal Service the splendid Federal agency it is today.

Now, I can almost read your minds at this point. I have a good idea of your reactions to what I have just told you—and I was never more sincere in my life in saying the nice things I have tried to say about the Postal Service and its workers. I have an idea that in effect you are thinking:

"All of what you say is fine, Congressman BUTLER. We postal employees are no less human than other folks. Therefore, we appreciate a pat on the back as much as the next fellow when recognition is given to our share of a job well done. But because we are human, we have to live, we must provide food, clothing, and shelter for ourselves and our families. Rent, taxes, and a thousand other normal expenses have to be met. We are subject to all the frailties of human nature. We get sick. Medical bills come in. Our children must be educated. We want to meet our obligations as an American citizen in our respective communities. And all this costs money—money our present postal salary does not give us. In short, we cannot eat compliments, however sincere they might be. We cannot clothe our children in praise, laudatory as the praise might be—bills cannot be paid by merely pointing to a file of clippings showing that we are honest, faithful, and efficient public servants."

As I look out over this fine audience and note the expressions on your face, I think I came rather close to your thoughts, didn't I?

My friends, I want to assure you here and now that if I appeared to have taken the thoughts right out of your minds, it is only because you took the words right out of my mouth. I am with you 100 percent in your request for a wage scale that will permit you and your families to maintain a decent standard of living. The only system I know of that will insure the progress of our social and economic way of life in America is one that will open up the riches of our Nation to the greatest number of its citizens. That means the men and women who make up the labor market—the butcher, baker, and candlestick maker, along with postal clerks and carriers—must be paid more than a living wage. It is not enough that you take home on pay day merely enough to provide yourselves and your families with the absolute essentials of life. Your wages should permit you to do more than live, you should be compensated in a degree that will enable you to save.

No one realizes more than myself that we are living in the age of the reversible slide rule. You know I have just about come to the conclusion that there are three shades of liars: plain, ordinary liars, darn liars, and then there are statisticians. I mention this because sometimes it is extremely difficult to find an accepted yardstick by which we can measure prices and wages and then make an honest comparison between them. There are any number of systems in vogue to show what constitutes an adequate wage. If you use the charts and figures furnished by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, you arrive at one conclusion; then we have the Heller method that produces a slightly different result, then we have the crystal-ball method and all the other pet theories to show what constitutes an adequate salary.

These various systems are not mentioned in a tone of disparagement. After all, I have a system myself for determining an adequate salary. I don't think adequate compensation is dependent upon how the Joneses spend money or on how much they spend. For instance, there is a striking lack of criteria by which we may accurately determine if an adequate salary allows the expense for an automobile or college education for children. Certainly, these are desirable. But basically, what is an adequate salary? I'll give my definition.

Carlyle once said: "A fair day's wage for a fair day's work. It is as just a demand as governed men ever made of governing. It is the everlasting right of man."

It is in the spirit of Carlyle's definition that I have tried to approach the question of postal salary legislation. What was a fair day's wage for a fair day's work last year, is not necessarily a constant equation this year. Times change, new conditions alter situations, adjustments have to be made to face these new circumstances. That I have tried to do in my thinking along the lines in which you folks are interested.

In May 1947, your national leaders in Washington came to me, along with representatives of other postal organizations. They told me that it was becoming increasingly difficult for you folks to carry on with your postal salaries. And I want to use a brief moment to tell you that you need have no fear about your representation in Washington. I have met them all—Mr. Hallbeck, Mr. George, and the others. They are fine people; they have a good grasp of your problems mostly because I suppose they are up from your ranks, so to speak, but more than that, I think they have that little something over and above the normal level which prompted you men and women to send them to Washington as your representatives. As long as they represent you, I urge you to support them to the fullest. You know, I am a strong believer in organization. I have been affiliated with the International Longshoremen's Association for years. In fact, I have my membership card right here in my pocket—and I believe I am paid up for the current term. Of course, I have no intention of injecting myself in the internal affairs of your fine organization. I don't think anybody will interpret my remarks in that light, but I say to you, join your organization if you are not a member; if you are a member, support those men charged with the leadership of your association.

Well, shortly after our conference last May, I introduced the first of three separate pay bills to provide postal workers with an increase in salary. Unfortunately, nothing was done about my bill before the end of the first session of the Eightieth Congress. Again, during the special session of the same Congress, I introduced a second bill calling for a pay boost for postal personnel; new conditions developed; I took a third look and immediately introduced another bill on March 2 of this year, which called for an $800 permanent increase.

You are all familiar with the action of the House Committee with respect to my third bill, H. R. 5667. To sum it all up, the bill was amended in committee to grant but $585 on a temporary basis—in other words, 14 months following the effective date of the bill, it would become inoperative.

Postal workers were disappointed—or am I guilty of understatement? Charges and countercharges were hurled about, one fellow accused the next fellow of sabotage; we members of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service were alternately damned and praised—letters, telegrams, and telephone calls poured into our offices, and I want to tell you an amazing thing about all this, not all the letters, wires, and calls were in total disagreement with the amended bill reported out by the House. Now don't get me wrong, I am not saying that fulsome praise was heaped on the committee, but the level-headed fellow asked "how come?" He wanted to know if that was the saturation point, and more important, he wanted to know what part of the give and take that accompanies all legislation would be granted the postal worker. Frankly, the idea of temporary legislation was the target of most criticism. True, the suggested figure came in for its share of comment, but the temporary nature of the bill was the most provocative point in the amended bill.

I have told your Washington legislative representative, Roy Hallbeck, where I stand on postal legislation. It needs no repetition here. But if the situation reaches a point where the time element is against postal pay legislation in this session of the Congress, I am going to steer a course that will give you folks the best possible bill under existing circumstances. I earnestly hope that it is exactly what you want and what I think you should have. But I can't see the wisdom of adopting an adamant position, when down in my heart I know you desperately need more money, and I feel that the need is now.

As is usually the case in these gatherings, there are many topics of mutual interest which a speaker could go into at great length. I know that all of you are deeply interested in your new retirement bill. It is natural that you would want to know all there is to learn about it, and I might say that I was happy indeed when the retirement bill was enacted into law. I know how long and hard you people through your Washington offices fought for a change in the retirement system of Federal workers. I was happy to add my small part to the ultimate success of the measure. Perhaps as time goes on we can iron out some of the flaws, add additional benefits, and otherwise perfect the law.

But I won't venture away from the subject which interests you most at the moment. You can count on me to the limit of my individual ability with respect to your salary problem. You have my word on that score.

Now, I do not want to detain you any longer. It has been delightful being here. I have thoroughly enjoyed myself and I hope that we can all get together under the same pleasant auspices at some time in the near future.

Thank you, and the very best of luck to each of you.

Congress Should Promptly Get Before Both Houses a Bill for an Increase in the Pay of Postal Employees and Civil Service Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with reluctance that I call to the attention of the House and of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, in particular, that we should have before us soon a bill providing for raises in pay of postal employees and civil-service employees.

On March 5, 1948, I appeared before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and recommended a raise for these groups. They are entitled to a raise to meet the increased cost of living. They have been held in suspense too long and I hope that the committees of the House and the Senate can agree on a bill and get it to us soon. In the case of postal employees, their pay when measured by its purchasing power, is less than it was in 1939. This is not true of any other group. I do hope that the bill may be presented to the House soon for consideration.

The Civil Rights Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 18 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Both Parties Declared Inconsistent in Stand on 'Civil Rights' Issue," written by David Lawrence and published in today's issue of the Washington Evening Star. The article points out the inconsistency of some of the phases and developments of the so-called civil-rights issue.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOTH PARTIES DECLARED INCONSISTENT IN STAND ON CIVIL RIGHTS ISSUE—TRUMAN AND G. O. P. CHIEFS FAILED TO DENOUNCE MOB VIOLENCE IN MINNESOTA

(By David Lawrence)

There's a good deal of inconsistency if not sheer hypocrisy, in the stand being taken by both Republicans and Democrats on the so-called civil-rights issue.

Here is the city of St. Paul., Minn., which is unable through its police force to protect the right of the citizen to work. Here are a city and a State which have done nothing as yet to punish the 200 or more members of a mob who broke into a plant and kidnaped the personnel and subjected them to violence.

Did any Republican nominee for the Presidency and particularly former Governor Stassen, of Minnesota, denounce the union which permitted such an act of violence? Did President Truman or any Democrat in the Senate or House condemn the action of the union? Have William Green of the A. F. of L. and Phil Murray of the CIO, who are so vociferous about the civil-rights program, said anything about the crime of mob violence in St. Paul, Minn.?

A few voices have been raised in Congress, but they are the exception rather than the rule. The view seems to be that civil rights are the business of the city of St. Paul and the State of Minnesota and that there is no reason to apply Federal laws or Federal power to the situation.

TRADITIONAL VIEW

This has been the traditional view for many decades past. It was the view of the majority of the Senate and House when the Wagner Labor Relations Act was passed, and an amendment was voted on, which, if passed, would have put the protection of the Federal Government behind the establishment of law and order in labor disputes.

The Taft-Hartley Act does forbid economic coercion and interference with the rights of workers to enjoy freedom from interference by labor unions or management. This, however, means only civil steps as against a union which violates the law. Thus an injunction order by a Federal court forbidding a union from engaging in illegal acts would not undo the wrong that has been done by the CIO meat packers employees' union.

Likewise the calling out of the National Guard does not in any way bring punishment to those who trespassed on the property of the employers and injured the employees. The very fact that the union permitted the mob violence and then sent a delegation to the Governor of Minnesota to protest his action in calling out the National Guard indicates that trade-unions often think they are beyond the law.

The theory that lynching of nonstrikers is justifiable is widely held by many union members. The many instances of mass picketing in recent months reveal that violence is considered a more effective way to win a strike than through the processes of negotiation or reason.

So far as the lynchings in the South are concerned, they are few and far between today compared to the violence committed against workers right along in northern States. Intimidation short of violence, is a commonplace of modern trade-unionism.

A SHAMEFUL RECORD

In the case of the outbreak in St. Paul, defiance of the State courts and the city police presents a shameful record which unfortunately has had its parallel in other Northern and Western States. Yet there has not been a single proposal to amend the so-called antilynching bills now pending in Congress so as to cover all forms of mob violence.

If it is within the Federal power to punish local sheriffs and local police who fail to safeguard the lives of prisoners accused of crime, as proposed in pending legislation, it is clearly and logically as much within the Federal power to protect workers who report to a plant for duty during a strike.

The answer, of course, is that the States should be strong enough to protect their citizens. The police power is a State power primarily. There is no good reason to extend it either because of labor disputes or racial conflicts. But the States will weaken and the power to correct abuses will deteriorate in the States unless public opinion is strong in its condemnation. The denunciations of lynching that have emanated from Northern States in recent years have prompted the Southern States to take remedial measures they have never taken before. Likewise, a condemnation of the politically corrupt city governments which play favorites in labor disputes and condone violence, whether from the employer or the union side, will help to form public opinion and strengthen the will of the States to eliminate mass picketing and mob violence on the labor front.

The Mundt Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution from the Veterans' Committee at Harrisburg, Pa., Sunday, May 16, 1948:

Be it resolved, That the Pennsylvania delegation of the Congress be asked to oppose H. R. 5852, known as the Mundt bill, as it represents a force working for the creation of a police state in the United States and is a vicious abridgment of civil liberties.

Unanimously adopted by the Pennsylvania State Council, American Veterans' Committee, in regular session at Harrisburg, Pa., Sunday, May 16, 1948.

World Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mary Spargo in the Washington Post of May 3, 1948, reveals the outstanding humanitarian attitude of the American Medical Association in cooperating toward the improvement of world health. Dr. Morris Fishbein of the American Medical Association, is to be congratulated on this forward step.

The article by Mary Spargo follows:

WORLD HEALTH UNIT VITAL, SAYS FISHBEIN

The United States must join the World Health Organization if the Marshall plan to rehabilitate Europe is to succeed, Dr. Morris Fishbein, editor of the Journal of the American Medical Association, declared yesterday.

Dr. Fishbein told the Washington Post he will appeal to the House Rules Committee and to Speaker JOSEPH MARTIN, Republican, Massachusetts, today for prompt action this session to approve United States entry into the World Health Organization.

Forty-eight nations have now joined, Fishbein said. Latin-American nations, however, are apparently waiting to see if the Congress approves United States participation.

"It is folly to expect the European recovery program to produce real results in increased production," the medical leader declared, "unless the health of the people is improved at the same time."

A sick people, Fishbein pointed out, cannot produce, because they lack the energy and vitality to work. Thus the whole program, designed to increase European production and put Europe back on its feet, is jeopardized unless the World Health Organization can become a functioning body.

The American people should be the first to realize, the medical author declared, the relation between health and achievement, remembering that before the Panama Canal could be built the problem of malaria had first to be solved.

"It is vital," Fishbein said, "for the United States to join this great effort because we have obtained leadership in world health. This country has attained leadership in medical education, medical research, public health, and more than that, has more funds available for health purposes."

Other nations of the world need our leadership in this great enterprise, Fishbein insisted.

HELD DEFINITE RESPONSIBILITY

"It should be a matter not only of pride but of definite responsibility to take this leadership," he said.

In the United States, the AMA editor asserted, tuberculosis, once the great killer, has moved down from first to seventh place. But in many other nations of the world, tuberculosis still leads the killer list. These nations need the benefit of United States knowledge and techniques, Fishbein said.

All the world must unite its efforts against certain of the great killer diseases and plagues, he maintained.

Although this country has learned how to control malaria, one-third of the world is still devastated by the malaria plague, Fishbein declared.

Fishbein, one of the founders of the World Medical Association, said this organization and the World Health Organization together could be expected to standardize health practices, control drug addiction at the international level, standardize biologicals and also promote the interchange of medical students and scientists throughout the world.

MAY OVERCOME 20-YEAR LAG

Better and quicker dissemination of medical information will result from approval of the World Health Organization, Fishbein said, and may overcome the lag of 20 years between medical discovery and its use by private physicians throughout the world.

"The objectives of the World Health Organization are those of peace," Fishbein said, "and it is one organization in which the whole world can unite and in which political considerations play no part."

Fishbein scouted suggestions, sometimes voiced in congressional quarters, that participation in the World Health Organization will mean surrender of some part of the sovereignty of this Nation.

"The American Medical Association," said Fishbein, with a dry smile, "does not propose to advocate anything which would permit an outsider to come in and tell us what to do within our own borders."

INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS STRESSED

He smiled because only a few minutes earlier he had been explaining AMA opposition to any form of compulsory health insurance in this country, on the ground that such a program would interfere with the rights of the individual, both doctor and patient.

His whole emphasis in discussing the World Health Organization was upon its function in making available the best information the world over to all people. The whole program, he said, is one of furnishing leadership and assistance, not of interference and compulsion.

Recognition of New State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted me, I include a speech made by me on May 16, 1948, at a meeting of the Zionist Emergency Council of Washington, D. C.:

Mr. Chairman, in a speech I made in Congress on Friday last calling for the recognition by our country of the new nation in Palestine, now known as Israel, I said, in part:

"There is a welcome stranger seeking our recognition and admission into the council of the nations of the world. A new nation has been established, located in the Middle East. At this very moment its citizens are fighting behind the barricades. It is the new Jewish state in Palestine, which has been established in the face of tremendous odds. It exists. That fact cannot be denied."

In my remarks on the floor of the House of Representatives, I gave a number of reasons why I felt the provisional government of the new nation should be recognized at once by our country.

From the time I first gave study to this great question and world problem years ago as a member of the Massachusetts Legislature, I have strongly held the opinion that the only ultimate solution was the establishment in Palestine of a free and independent Jewish Nation.

As the Boston Post of Boston, Mass., well said in its editorial of a few days ago:

"Not alone to people of the Jewish race, but to all peoples who enjoy freedom in large or small measure, the historic event which makes this day notable in the annals of man will give gladness that democracy has found a new place to live and a new bulwark for liberty has been established where humanity was first cradled."

Since I made my speech in the Congress, our country through the wise, pleasing, and quick action of President Truman has officially recognized the new democratic nation known as Israel.

In doing this, our Government acted upon its own responsibility, which makes our action all the more effective. President Truman acted wisely and courageously. Such prompt action will give strength and courage to the new nation of Israel, to its leaders, and its people.

Throughout the world, and particularly in the United States, millions of men and women of all racial strains, will feel pleased with, and applaud and approve, the wisdom and action of President Truman in having our Government recognize the new nation, and in being the first Government to do so.

The recognition by our Government, as a result of the action of President Truman, is historic in its nature.

Before President Truman's action the new nation was isolated; it had no status to speak of under international law. Our recognition has completely changed the status of the new nation internationally, and will strenghten it internally.

America has again led the way in helping the people of a small and infant nation to obtain the goal of the hopes and ambitions of its people, their sovereignty as a nation, and freedom as a people.

Let us hope that other countries will rapidly follow the action of the United States and give recognition to this new nation.

From news reports in this morning's papers we read that neighboring countries, much stronger than the new nation, are engaging in acts of aggression against it, and are making preparations for large-scale acts of aggression.

They had better think long before they carry out such acts. Any acts of aggression against the new nation will violate the United Nations Charter, and greater still, will arouse world-wide public opinion against the aggressors.

The new nation exists. It has received by our recognition a status under international law. Aggressor nations had better realize that and appreciate what it means.

The Arab neighbors and the new nation can live together in peace and harmony. Instead of thinking of or engaging in acts of aggression, the Arabian armies of Egypt, Trans-Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon should cease acts of aggression, and meet with the representatives of the new democracy to consider and settle problems of common interest and common concern for peace and not for war.

Having officially recognized the new nation, our next and logical step is to arrange at once for an exchange of diplomatic representatives between our country and the new democracy. Such a step on the part of our Government will assist the infant nation to stabilize itself; give it international dignity as well as internal strength, and enable it to more quickly to emerge from a provisional government into a government permanent in nature, from a de facto to a de jure government. Such exchange will also have a powerful influence in restraining or preventing acts of aggression against the new nation. This latter reason is an important one at this time calling for an immediate exchange of diplomatic representatives between the United States and Israel.

In addition to this exchange, our country should lift the arms embargo now in effect and which in its practical application adversely affects the new nation more than it does its large neighbors who are engaging in acts of aggression.

The primary duty of all nations, large or small, is to take such steps as it can and as are necessary for their national defense and continued existence. This duty has particular application when danger is actual or imminent. Actual and direct danger faces the new nation of Israel. Its existence may be mainly dependent upon its ability to defend itself now. If the Arab nations whose armies are engaging in acts of aggression do not respond to the efforts of our country and other countries, and of the United Nations, to stop their acts, and engage instead in peaceful means under international law to solve any problems that may exist or questions that may arise, then such acts of aggression constitute a war against the infant nation.

Whether acts of aggression or wide-scale war, the people of the new nation must and will defend themselves. To do so, their militia must have weapons of war. Justice being on their side, every facility should be afforded them to obtain and purchase necessary weapons of war for defense. In all logic it necessarily follows (1) with a new nation established, (2) with our recognition of that nation, (3) with neighboring countries engaging in acts of aggression designed to destroy the infant nation, that the embargo on arms should be lifted insofar as it applies now to this new nation, and should be continued against the Arab countries.

A welcome stranger, the new nation now known as Israel, has been born. It has received our recognition, and thereby has been admitted into the council of the nations of the world.

President Truman brought this about, its international status, when acting for our country he gave our recognition to this new nation.

Our next logical steps: (1) an exchange of diplomatic representatives, and (2) the lifting of the arms embargo so far as the new nation is concerned, will constitute cooperation on our part at this time to its establishment to the full stature of nationhood, enabling it to thrive with strengh and vigor, and to take its place in the council of the nations, and help in the solution of the trying problems that confront the troubled world of today. It is pleasing and reassuring to know that President Truman at this very moment is considering the taking of these two steps by our Government.

The part I have played in helping bring about the establishment of the new nation of Israel brings great pleasure to me.

Many trying problems confront it now, and will in the immediate years to come, but with sound and true leadership guiding

its ship of state, and with sincere friends throughout the world cooperating with it, I am confident of the future success of the new nation of Israel.

The Farm Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Peter Edson from today's Washington Daily News:

THE FARM VOTE—SACRED COW
(By Peter Edson)

The primary issue in today's labor trouble seems to be a demand for wage increases to meet the high cost of living. Demands for pensions, rule changes, or improved working conditions are secondary. So if anything can be done to remove the cause of the present labor unrest, tightening up on the labor laws might well be delayed till something is done about bringing down the cost of living.

On this Congress has been somewhat backward. The excuse given is that this is an election year, and nothing should be done to upset the farm vote.

Here you have one of the greatest myths in the whole book of political folklore. In 1896 when William McKinley was running, or in 1908 when it was William Howard Taft, candidates had to bow low to get the farm vote. Even up to 1920, when it was Warren G. Harding who ran, more than half the American people lived on farms. But in 1948 all this is changed.

By today's estimates, United States population over 21 years of age is divided roughly 50,000,000 in cities, 16,000,000 in small towns classified as rural nonfarm, and only 14,000,000 rural. This accounts for a possible 80,000,000 voters.

This farm vote is still important to Congressmen who come from strictly rural districts. But based on the interests of the people—percentagewise and on a national average—city population should control 62.5 percent of the votes in Congress, the rural nonfarm population should control 20 percent, the farm population only 17.5 percent.

But there is no denying that today more weight is given to maintaining farm prosperity than to maintaining prosperity for the industrial worker. And there is no point in keeping the city worker broke just to maintain the country cousin in clover. The two problems should no longer be considered separately.

Smart farmers will admit privately that they know farm prices are now too high. They would be satisfied with less.

Even the ultra-conservative American Farm Bureau Federation leadership today recognizes that present farm price policies are courting disaster. Now that the federation has retired farm lobbyist Ed O'Neal to his cotton plantation and installed as president a progressive Iowa farmer in the person of Allan B. Kline, a new kind of farm lobby statesmanship may be apparent after election.

Double parity formulas, trick conservation payments, unreasonable support prices and all the hidden subsidy gimmicks thought up during the depression need a complete overhauling, as pointed out in President Truman's farm message to Congress the other day. But the President's message gave only a passing brush-off to the need for revising farm policy to stop further inflation.

If the country wants industrial peace, the place to begin is on the farm front. Outlawing the Communist Party and tightening up on the labor laws won't stop today's strikes.

Some place, some time, somehow—somebody is going to have to get at the roots of labor trouble. Right now those roots reach back to the farm and too-high food prices.

Fifty-one Years an Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the grand characters of northwest Arkansas is William A. Wenrick, who is, with Jim Tudor, editor and publisher of the Marshall Republican, a weekly newspaper published at Marshall, Searcy County, in the district which I am honored to represent. He is held in deep affection by everybody, old and young alike. He and Jim Tudor, Republican member of the Arkansas Legislature from Searcy County, get along like grandfather and grandson. I am sure Jim does not try to make a Republican out of Mr. Wenrick and Mr. Wenrick does not try to make a Democrat out of Jim.

On April 29, 1948, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch carried an article by F. A. Behymer, staff correspondent of that paper, concerning Mr. Wenrick. Under unanimous consent I insert that article in the RECORD as part of my remarks:

BEEN PUTTING OUT PAPER FOR 51 YEARS—BILL WENRICK CONTINUES TO REACH NEW CRESTS WITH MARSHALL (ARK.) MOUNTAIN WAVE

(By F. A. Behymer)

MARSHALL, ARK., April 29.—The Marshall Mountain Wave, volume 56, number 46, rolled from the press on time last week, its four pages filled with local items and county news, as it has been doing every week since 1897 when, temporarily defunct, Bill Wenrick took it over and revived it so that Searcy County Democrats could have a paper.

For more than half a century the Wave has been coming out on time every Friday, except once when there wasn't any ink in the shop, because promptness is a point of pride with its editor, William A. Wenrick. Nobody can say of him that he ever held the paper for something to happen. Anything that didn't transpire before press time on Friday could wait till next week. As a journalistic practice it had its points, though in the early days it had its drawbacks. As, for instance, when through somebody's impetuosity, the weekly homicide was moved up from Saturday night to Friday night, causing complaints from subscribers that there should have been something about it in the current week's paper. It is something that subscribers never seem to undertand, how a paper can't wait around for something to happen, even something as important as a killin'.

All that is changed now, for Marshall isn't like it used to be. It has been a long time since the town was shot up on a Saturday night. It is a solid and prosperous and growing town. Some say it is growing faster than Harrison, 40 miles up the road, but the Harrison Chamber of Commerce denies this. If for the moment Harrison is not growing as fast as usual, it is just a lull. And look at the Saturday crowd on the Harrison square. Marshall can't match that. Maybe not, but Marshall is not the mountain hamlet it used to be and the Mountain Wave mounts higher week by week.

As an editor Bill Wenrick, it might be said, has always been shorthanded, for he has only one good arm and one good leg, but he has never allowed these handicaps to bother him. It is surprising what can be done by a man with a good right hand to write with and two fingers to peck out a galley an hour at the linotype, even though he has to limp after the news. At 83, starting his second half century as editor of the Wave, he is as alert and chipper as a hippety-hop sparrow and has no intention of retiring to the lazy bench.

When Bill Wenrick came to Marshall back in 1897 he already had his handicaps. He had accidentally shot himself in the right knee when he was a boy and had lost part of his left arm in a job press while learning the printer's trade up in Missouri. Marshall and Searcy County at the moment, did not have the benefit of a Democratic newspaper, which was looked upon by Democratic politicians as a serious detriment. The Mountain Wave, started a few years before, had spent itself. All that remained was a shirttail of type, a couple of job fonts and a Washington hand press, worth about 60 cents, as Wenrick says now, with title vested in Judge V. C. Bratton, top man of the Democrats.

When the politicians found out that Wenrick knew how to stick type they deviled him to take for free the equipment, franchise, and good will of the Wave and, for the love of God, give them a Democratic paper. Wenrick says he was crazy enough to take them up, but he grins as he says it and doesn't really mean it, for he has had half a century of getting out the paper and that is something that gets into a man's blood. The Wave has given him a living and, you might say, he has had rather a full life. Pin him down and he will say he wasn't so crazy after all when he took over and set the Wave rolling again.

In the early days Marshall, back here in the mountains, was what you might call a little wild, with a good bit of shootin' on Saturday nights and frequent killin's, and there was an unreasonable prejudice against putting such things in the paper. Editor Wenrick always preferred to put the good news in the paper and leave out the bad, but when it came to killin's, he just, as he says, gave it like it was, names and all.

It happened, as it was bound to happen. The Wave shop was shot up a few times. The obvious intention was to terrify Bill into leaving out the names, but he didn't terrify. It was a principle with him, something like what in later days came to be called the freedom of the press. He went right on giving it like it was, names and all. There came a time when the more exuberant of the citizenry, although they never could understand it, accepted in principle the freedom of the press and held their fire.

It could have been that Bill was spared the indignity of an occasional beating because he was crippled, but once in the heat of a campaign before an election, he was slugged behind the ear. He could have had the law on the Republican who did the slugging, but he let it pass. "I was never much of a hand to prosecute," he says.

One reason that Bill didn't choose to prosecute may have been, as he cheerfully admits, that he was something of a hell-raiser himself in those early times, holding his own against the town's ablest drinkers on Saturday nights and occasionally, as he says, pawing up a little sand, but he quit the rough stuff back in 1915 and has walked the straight and narrow ever since, enabling the mothers

of Marshall to point him out and tell their boys to grow up and be good men like Mister Wenrick.

That time when the Wave didn't roll on time, there had been a little gully washer that had sent Little Red River on a rampage, making it impossible for the freight wagon to get through from the railroad with the ink that he needed. He wouldn't have been caught short if it hadn't been for his generosity in supplying the ink that Bill Hudson needed the week before to get out the rival Republican paper. There he was inkless but he was not a man to be stopped by a thing like that. The Wave had to come out, though the nearest ink was at Harrison, 40 miles away.

The editor borrowed Judge Bratton's superannuated saddle horse, Old Adler, that had been retired and turned out to pasture and rode away northward. There were serious doubts whether either Old Adler or Bill Wenrick would be seen again, but they made it. Wenrick ran the first side of the paper on Friday and by working on Sunday was able to run the second side on Monday, only 3 days late.

Editor Wenrick is known of all men as a true Democrat, but he doesn't say so in the paper. He has always preferred to stand by and let the Democrats and Republicans fight it out. The only political stuff he ever prints is a piece now and then written by a local politico and signed by him. His rule is no sign, no print. That way he keeps out of one kind of trouble.

Since August 1945, the Wave has been bipolitical, which is something more than neutral. At that time Wenrick and James R. Tudor, publisher of the Marshall Republican, put their heads together and decided there was no sense in getting out two papers in a one-paper town. So they consolidated and now the Wave has two editors, one Democratic and the other Republican. "Between us," says Wenrick, "we manage to keep things pretty level."

An advantage is that the Wave now gets all the news, political and otherwise, that the two papers formerly divided. The boast of the Wave is that it prints all the news without fear or favor and doesn't let anybody say what shall be put in and what shall be left out. The only time Wenrick ever suppressed an item was when a Marshall mother with a star in her window was stricken with an illness. It wasn't in the paper because her boy in the Army was on the mailing list, and if he read that his mom was sick he would be worried. Bill Wenrick left it out and if people want to call that suppressing the news they can make the most of it.

When it comes to boosting Arkansas, Searcy County, and Marshall, the Wave never wavers. In the file is an issue of the Wave of September 1900 in which it was fearlessly stated that "Searcy County, Ark., is the grandest county in the greatest State on the American Continent," and that "Marshall is watched over by the glittering stars and kissed by the dews of heaven." That still stands. The Wave has never taken it back and never will.

There may come a time when Bill Wenrick will have to call it a day and turn over the Wave to his younger partner, but he is not thinking about that yet. Sometimes he thinks he would like to be free to go up there in the shade of the courthouse and pitch horseshoes with his cronies, but life is such a rush nowadays that he never finds the time. He is feeling pretty good and he figures he will keep going until he drops. He has heard that in the jungle when an elephant is worn out it goes apart from the herd and just lies down and dies. That's a good way, says Bill Wenrick, but it's not for him yet. He has to get out next week's paper and it has to go to press on time.

American Health Expert Inspects Pacific Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of the Members of the House will be interested in reading a letter which I have just received from the distinguished director of public health of the city and county of San Francisco, Dr. J. C. Geiger.

Dr. Geiger has an international reputation as one of the outstanding health authorities of the world today. He has just completed a tour of the Pacific area and the Orient, which was made at the request of the United States Navy. His observations on health conditions throughout this vast area will command widespread attention.

Dr. Geiger's letter follows:

Mrs. Geiger and I left on February 7 on the Navy transport *Thomas Jefferson*. We spent a week in Guam on preliminary inspections and then proceeded to Japan, China, the Philippines, and many islands of the so-called trust territory in the Pacific, and then returned to Guam. The Navy personnel afforded me every opportunity to study health conditions of interest to them and to this great port of San Francisco, and, of course, to our own country as a whole.

We were transported by air to many islands, which included the Bonins, the Carolinas, and the Marianas. Our trip to Japan was of great interest. General MacArthur, through his staff, showed us every courtesy. We were able to attend the war trials and see the changing conditions for the better in health in Japan. Along with other Americans, I, too, think General MacArthur is doing a magnificent job.

In China, especially in North China, we had the opportunity to see the changing conditions which are still somewhat chaotic.

The great thrill of our trip occurred in Shanghai, where we were able to spend nearly a week with our daughter, Anita; her fine husband, Paul Bordwell, Jr., and our remarkable grandchild, Ginny, who is beautiful and has red hair. Since she will speak only Chinese, we had a great time understanding each other.

In the Philippines we were accorded every courtesy by the Secretary of Health and the very fine President. Knowing Manila as we did in the past, it was most heartbreaking to see the war damage. I can only express it in terms of distress for all concerned. The harbor is still full of sunken ships.

Our flying experience on various types of planes has left us with many memories, some of which might be classified as disturbing, but on the whole it was a wonderful experience. We made many jumps of 1,400 miles at a time with the greatest of ease and safety. Certainly these Navy fliers and the ships, known as Nats, are the finest and safest in the world.

In closing, I can only comment on the service rendered to this great country of ours by Admiral Charles S. Pownall, Governor of Guam and Admiral in charge of the trust Territory. If General MacArthur is doing a fine job in Japan, Admiral Pownall is doing an equally fine job in administering these Territories.

The health system built up by Capt. C. K. Youngkin, the health officer at Guam, and who was trained in my department, is quite extraordinary, and I can predict for Guam one of the healthiest island possessions the United States has ever been called on to administer.

The weather was quite warm in the islands, cool in Japan, and quite difficult in China. I returned home browner than ever and certainly thinner than I have been in many years, which will do me no harm. Our trip took about 10 weeks.

A Great Diplomatic Blunder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the administration and our military leaders are asking the Congress and the people to support UMT and the reenactment of the draft through selective service, the recent and unfortunate exchange of diplomatic notes on the part of the United States and Russia has not only further confused the Congress and the American people, but has greatly disturbed and confused the people of the world.

The lack of any consistent foreign policy and the blundering of the President and State Department within the past few days seem to have almost closed the door against our Government in making any effort, for the present at least, to promote peace through conferences with Russia.

Unless they meant what they said, it is most unfortunate that the note to Russia was sent at this time. It contained the following language, which the Russians accepted as a suggestion for further peace conferences. I quote:

As far as the United States is concerned, the door is always wide open for full discussions and the composing of our differences. My Government earnestly hopes that the members of the Soviet Government will not take lightly the position of the United States Government as here expressed.

While the record of Russia on prior peace talks has brought only objections to every proposal looking toward peace, yet with the defeat of communism in Italy recently, and the cold war seemingly going against Russia with the constant talk that it might lead to a shooting war, for which Russia doubtless is not prepared, the State Department could not positively know whether or not, on the receipt of this note from the United States, Russia might now be willing to call off the present cold war and seek a peaceful understanding.

The note from our Government, above quoted in part, certainly carried the assumption that we were ready for further conferences, and that we meant what we said. Whether or not Russia acted in good faith in answering that note, again, no one can tell. But when Russia answered the note, the press carried the story in Europe that the people of Russia and Europe were greatly elated and regarded it as the first real hope that the cold war might be settled, followed

by an era of peace. This optimism came about through what we said, and through the reply of Russia which is as follows:

The Soviet Government shares the desire expressed in this statement by the Government of the United States of America to better these relations and is in agreement with the proposal to proceed with this aim toward a discussion and settlement of the differences between us.

Instead of carrying through or making some real attempt to carry through, the President and the State Department immediately began to hedge, side-step, double talk, and apologize, indicating that their statement to Russia had been misunderstood, making a feeble attempt to restate our position, and, in fact, shut the door to peace talks at the present time.

Secretary Bevin, like others of our European allies, had no knowledge that a note was being sent, but had the presence of mind to urge "a preparatory exchange of views to get a precise understanding, or else any other subsequent conferences would be futile."

By backing away from their own proposal, the American Government missed a splendid opportunity to restate its whole case before the world. We lost an opportunity to change, for a time at least, the talk of war to peace, and to start a new peace offensive which might have been the beginning that might find a way to world peace instead of war.

Mr. Speaker, after having sent this, the first message to Russia for peace in many months of constant war talk, and then running away, as it were, from our proposal and slamming the door to peace talks, they unwittingly gave to Russia the very type of propaganda she needs to hold her own people in check, who are reported to be in dire poverty, with the possibilities of causing the Russian war lords serious trouble because of the restless temper and actions of her millions of suffering people.

By reprinting in the press of Europe in the nation she controls, and, particularly in Russia, our proposal, her acceptance, and our failure to follow through with peace talks, she has the most dangerous and powerful piece of propaganda to use against this country she has come upon since the war.

Mr. Speaker, the issuance of this note to Russia, without any notice to France, England and other of our allies in the late war, caused considerable consternation among the diplomats of all the countries of Europe. It is said that neither our Ambassador to England, Mr. Douglas, nor our roving Ambassador, Harriman, had been advised of the existence of this diplomatic note or effort. This note carried the very significant conclusion that if the Soviet Government acted to alleviate conditions earlier referred to in the statement, that they "will not find us lacking in readiness and eagerness to make our own contribution to stabilization of world conditions entirely compatible with the security of the Soviet people." This statement might also have influenced Russia to accept, as it could mean further appeasement at the expense of other countries of western Europe which we are attempting to help through the Marshall plan. It was so construed by some of them.

When Ambassador Harriman heard of the matter in Paris and was interviewed, he was quoted as saying, "If the United States and Russia reach an understanding, it would mean revision of ERP and voting new credits or new distribution to include the countries of eastern Europe; if Russia came to a better understanding, she would be entitled to share." Russia might also have been influenced in this thought of more gifts of billions from the United States.

At any rate, it is apparent that there will probably be no sharing as a result of this note, and the lines of cold war may be more closely drawn as the faint hope of peace was suddenly blacked out while our American diplomats ran in circles and retreated from their position in confusion.

Millions of people in this peace-loving Christian Nation who hate the curse and destruction of war would have preferred that through diplomatic channels the President and Secretary of State would have instantly authorized their representatives to institute peace conferences, exerting every effort to bring about a peaceful settlement of the differences between Russia, our Nation, and our allies. If we did not succeed, it would have been only one more failure. Our national conscience would have the satisfaction that we did our best in another effort for peace and to avoid war. Our people would have more solidly united. Our position would have been stronger before the world, rather than weaker.

Mr. Speaker, in the handling of the Palestine question during the past few months, the administration has changed its position at least four times. How can the people, or the Congress, follow such a foreign policy with any faith or confidence whatsoever? It would appear that the protection of divine guidance is, in fact, the only power under such leadership that can prevent this country from being blundered into war.

Voluntary Segregation for Lawful Purposes Should Not Be Denied

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, in view of the decision of the Supreme Court, I proposed an amendment to the Constitution, which would provide voluntary segregation for lawful purposes constitutional.

The Arkansas Democrat, an outstanding paper of our State, carried an editorial in the issue of Saturday, May 15, 1948, which I think would be of interest to the Members of the Congress and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorial:

WOULD MAKE SEGREGATION CONSTITUTIONAL

Representative OREN HARRIS of this State would make segregation in private affairs constitutional. He proposes an amendment which declares that "the right of any number of citizens to voluntarily segregate themselves from others for any lawful purpose shall not be denied."

His proposal is inspired by a recent decision of the Federal Supreme Court on real-estate compacts. The Court held that contracts which deny use of property to persons because of their race or color cannot be enforced.

There are many such compacts in Northern cities, and the Court's ruling has caused quite a stir. The point is made that it ignores one of the most sacred of human rights—the right of a person to pick his associates, and live among people who have tastes and interests like his own.

Segregation is a fact of life. It exists, not merely between different races, and even creeds, but within races and creeds. People of every blood and belief practice segregation among their own kind. "Like attracts like." There can still be, as there is, fellowship in broader human relationships.

Representative HARRIS would have this fact of life recognized. He would sensibly try to prevent the trouble that would come by disregarding a law which is implanted in the fibers and heatbeat of all humankind.

The State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 16, 1948, the Provisional Jewish Government Council proclaimed Jewish independence and the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine "based on precepts of liberty, justice, and peace taught by the Hebrew prophets." Partition, long discussed, long postponed, is now a reality.

Fortunately the British proposal of setting up a "neutral authority" to govern Palestine was never adopted. It was a stall and would have left the problem unsolved. The British plan was intended to prevent the partition plan from becoming effective by default when the mandate expired. This maneuver failed. Had it succeeded it would have been a surrender to Arab states that rejected the decision of the United Nations Assembly. This appeasement of the Arabs would have disastrously lessened the prestige of the United Nations.

The British rule in Palestine has ceased. Ample notice of their withdrawal was given to the United Nations. Many months of wrangling, futile debates and indecision came to naught. The refusal of the United Nations Council to implement the partition plan, which the Assembly had adopted back in November 1947, produced a stalemate.

In this situation there was only one thing for the Palestine Jews to do, and they did it courageously: On May 15 they announced the birth of a new

Jewish nation, called Israel. The 600,000 Jews in that area are now fighting to maintain their independence.

The quick recognition by our own Government of the State of Israel has redeemed our pledge. Every President since Woodrow Wilson has espoused the aspiration of the Jewish people for a homeland in Palestine. Congress after Congress has gone on record declaring in favor of this homeland.

The Second World War wrought terrific havoc on the Jewish people. Millions of them were the victims of Hitler's madness. At last the scattered remnants will have a haven to which they can migrate and begin to reconstruct their lives.

One further step needs to be taken by our Government. It should lift the arms embargo. The small but brave band of Jews is faced by hostile forces many times larger than their own. Neighboring nations, in violation of the principles of the United Nations, are invading Palestine. Our Government, always friendly in the past to new nations fighting for independence, should permit munitions to be shipped to Palestine. Britain has been supplying the Arabs with arms.

Our Government should support the appeal made by Israel, calling upon the United Nations to intervene to prevent Egypt and other Arab nations from invading Palestine. These invasions are in violation of the spirit and the letter of the principles of the United Nations.

We have an opportunity now to assist the Jews in bringing to fulfillment a 1,900-year dream.

Cause, Prevention, and Treatment of Cerebral Palsy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK A. MUHLENBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following bill introduced by me on May 12, 1948:

[H. R. 6525, 80th Cong., 2d sess.]

A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of cerebral palsy, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the Public Health Service Act, as amended, is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE VII—CEREBRAL PALSY

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 701. This title may be cited as the 'National Cerebral Palsy Act'.

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 702. The Congress hereby finds and declares (1) that the health of the Nation is seriously affected and threatened by cerebral palsy; (2) that as many as 500,000 people in the United States (commonly referred to as 'spastics') have been born with, or have acquired at a later time, damage to the brain which interferes with voluntary motion and coordination and requires special treatment and training; (3) that until comparatively recently, victims of cerebral palsy were regarded as incurables, but new techniques employing new drugs, therapy, and training give evidence of much progress in the treatment of persons afflicted with cerebral palsy; and (4) that the Federal Government should provide for research and investigation with respect to diseases of and injuries to the brain in order to develop more effective means of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such diseases and injuries and to cure the victims thereof.

"NATIONAL CEREBRAL PALSY INSTITUTE

"SEC. 703. For the purpose of improving the health of the people of the United States through the conduct of researches, investigations, public education, and demonstrations relating to the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis, treatment, and restoration of those afflicted by cerebral palsy; assisting and fostering such researches and activities by public and private agencies, and promoting the coordination of all such researches and activities and the useful application of their results; training research workers; training undergraduate and postgraduate personnel in matters relating to cerebral palsy; training parents of cerebral palsied children; and developing and assisting States and other agencies in the use of the most effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and restoration of those afflicted by cerebral palsy, including refresher courses for physicians; there is hereby established in the United States Public Health Service (hereafter referred to in this title as the 'Service') a National Cerebral Palsy Institute (hereafter referred to in this title as the 'Institute').

"DUTIES OF THE SURGEON GENERAL

"SEC. 704. In carrying out the purposes of this title, the Surgeon General is authorized and directed—

"(1) to conduct, assist, and foster researches, investigations, experiments, and demonstrations relating to the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of cerebral palsy;

"(2) to promote the coordination of research, education, and control programs conducted by the Institute, and similar programs conducted by other agencies, organizations, and individuals;

"(3) to make available research facilities of the Service to appropriate public authorities and to health officials and scientists engaged in special studies related to the purposes of this title;

"(4) to make grants-in-aid to universities, hospitals, laboratories, and other public or private agencies and institutions, and to individuals, for research, education, and control (service programs for prevention, diagnosis, and treatment utilizing current or advanced medical methods) projects and programs, including grants to such agencies and laboratory, and related facilities necessary for institutions for the construction, acquisition, leasing, and equipment of hospital, clinic, such research, education, and control;

"(5) to establish an information center on research, prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of cerebral palsy, and collect and make available, through publications and other appropriate means, research and other activities carried on pursuant to this title;

"(6) to secure, from time to time, and for such periods as he deems advisable, the assistance and advice of persons from the United States or abroad, who are experts in the field of cerebral palsy;

"(7) to establish and maintain, from funds appropriated or donated for the purpose, research fellowships in the Institute and elsewhere, with such stipends and allowances (including travel and subsistence expenses) as he may deem necessary to train research workers and procure the assistance of the most brilliant and promising research fellows from the United States and abroad, and, in addition, to provide such training and instruction, and demonstrations, through grants to public and other nonprofit institutions;

"(8) to establish and maintain, from funds appropriated or donated for the purpose of traineeships in the Institute and elsewhere in matters relating to the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of cerebral palsy, with such stipends and allowances (including travel and subsistence expenses) as he may deem necessary to train persons found by him to have proper qualifications, and in addition, to provide such training and instruction and demonstrations, through grants to public and other nonprofit institutions;

"(9) to admit and treat at the Institute, for purposes of study, voluntary patients suffering from cerebral palsy, whether or not otherwise eligible for such treatment by the Service; and

"(10) to adopt, upon recommendation of the National Cerebral Palsy Council, such additional means as he deems necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this title.

"NATIONAL CEREBRAL PALSY COUNCIL

"SEC. 705. (a) There is hereby created a National Cerebral Palsy Council (hereafter referred to in this title as the 'Council'), to consist of the Surgeon General or his representative, the chief medical officer of the Veterans' Administration or his representative, the Surgeon General of the Army or his representative, the Surgeon General of the Navy or his representative, the Chief of the Children's Bureau or her representative, and 12 members appointed without regard to the civil-service laws, by the Surgeon General, with the approval of the Federal Security Administrator (hereafter referred to in this title as the 'Administrator'). The 12 persons appointed shall be leaders in the fields of medical science, who have qualified as specialists in cerebral palsy, the fundamental sciences, education, or public affairs.

"(b) Each appointed member of the Council shall hold office for a term of 4 years, except that any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed, shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and except that, of the members first appointed, three shall hold office for a term of 3 years, three shall hold office for a term of 2 years, and three shall hold office for a term of 1 year, as designated by the Surgeon General. None of such 12 members shall be eligible for reappointment until a year has elapsed since the end of his preceding term. Every 2 years the Council shall elect 1 member to act as Chairman for the succeeding 2-year period.

"(c) The Surgeon General is authorized to utilize the services of any member or members of the Council in connection with matters related to the work of the Service for such periods, in addition to conference periods, as he may determine to be necessary.

"(d) Each appointed member of the Council, while attending conferences or meetings of the Council or while otherwise serving at the request of the Surgeon General, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Administrator, but not exceeding $75 per day, and shall also be entitled to receive an allowance for actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses while so serving away from his place of residence.

"(e) The Council shall meet from time to time to advise the Surgeon General on the conduct of the program of the Institute, and to review and make recommendations regarding requests for grants-in-aid for research, education, and control.

"(f) The Council, with approval of the Surgeon General, shall establish and appoint subcommittees, to deal with various phases of diagnosis, treatment, and training of cases of cerebral palsy, as follows:

"(1) Subcommittee on Prevention, which shall be primarily concerned with obstetrics, to be composed of specialists skilled in—

"(A) obstetrics;
"(B) pediatrics;
"(C) embryology;
"(D) physiology (particularly convulsions and the relationship of cerebral palsy to convulsions or epilepsy suffered by children at an early age);
"(E) asphyxia;
"(F) blood—RH;
"(G) infections occurring early in life (particularly the relationship of whooping cough, and other diseases of children, to convulsions).

"(2) Subcommittee on treatment, to be composed of specialists skilled in—

"(A) physical medicine;
"(B) neurology;
"(C) physiology (nerve contractions, and so forth);
"(D) orthopedics;
"(E) pediatrics;
"(F) pharmacology.

"(3) Subcommittee on Training of Professional Personnel, to be composed of the following:

"(A) the head of an accredited medical school;
"(B) the head of an accredited physiotherapy school or department;
"(C) educators of cerebral palsied persons;
"(D) occupational therapists;
"(E) speech therapists;
"(F) physical-medicine specialists;
"(G) psychologist (testing of the cerebral palsied child).

"(4) Commitee on Educational Research on the Cerebral Palsied Child, to be composed of the following:

"(A) qualified educators;
"(B) persons qualified to conduct clinics and educational forums, for parents of cerebral palsied children.

"CONTROL GRANTS

"SEC. 706. (a) The Surgeon General is authorized and directed to make grants-in-aid, as provided in this section, to States, counties, health districts, and other political subdivisions of States, and to public and nonprofit institutions for the establishment and maintenance of programs for prevention, treatment, and control of cerebral palsy, including the provision of appropriate facilities for care and treatment and including the training of personnel.

"(b) For each fiscal year, the Surgeon General, with the approval of the Administrator, shall determine the total sum from the appropriation authorized under section 707 which shall be available for allotment among the several States and other institutions under this section.

"(c) The Surgeon General shall, from time to time, certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts to be paid to each State from the allotments to such State, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by the amount which he finds that estimates of required expenditures with respect to any prior period were greater or less than the actual expenditures for such period. Upon receipt of such certification, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay in acordance with such certification.

"(d) The money so paid to any State shall be expended solely in carrying out the purposes for which the grant is made, and in accordance with plans presented by the health authority of such State and approved by the Surgeon General.

"(e) Requests for grants-in-aid for control, including education for projects and programs not in State agencies, shall be submitted, reviewed, and paid in manner similar to that established for research grants-in-aid.

"GIFTS AND AUTHORIZATIONS

"SEC. 707. (a) The Surgeon General shall recommend to the Administrator acceptance of conditional gifts, pursuant to section 501 of the Public Health Service Act, for study, investigation, or research into the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of cerebral palsy, or the acquisition of grounds or for the erection, equipment, or maintenance of premises, buildings, or equipment of the Institute. Donations of $50,000 or over for carrying out the purposes of this title may be acknowledged by the establishment within the Institute of suitable memorials to the donors.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sums as the Congress may determine to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

"(c) Such appropriations as are hereafter made to carry out the purposes of this title may be expended in the District of Columbia for personal services, stenographic recording and translating service, by contract if deemed necessary, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; traveling expenses (including the expenses of attendance at meetings when specifically authorized by the Surgeon General); rental, supplies, and equipment, purchase and exchange of medical books, books of reference, directories, periodicals, newspapers and press clippings; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; printing and binding (in addition to that otherwise provided by law); and for all other necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of this title.

"GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 708. (a) This title shall not be construed as superseding or limiting (1) the functions, under any other act, of the Surgeon General or the Service, or of any other officer or agency of the United States, relating to the study of the causes, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of cerebral palsy; or (2) the expenditure of money therefor.

"(b) The Surgeon General shall perform his functions under this title under the supervision and direction of the Administrator. The Surgeon General, with the approval of the Administrator, is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

"(c) As used in this title, the term 'State' means a State or the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

"(d) The Surgeon General shall include in the report for submission to the Congress at the beginning of each regular session a full report of the administration of this title, including a detailed statement of receipts and disbursements.

"(e) The Administrator is authorized to fix the compensation for the services of certain specially qualified scientific and professional personnel concerned with research activities of the National Institute of Health, and the National Cerebral Palsy Institute: *Provided*, That the rates of compensation for positions established pursuant to the provisions of this subsection shall not be less than $10,000 per annum nor more than $15,000 per annum."

SEC. 2. Title VII of the act entitled "An act to consolidate and revise the laws relating to the Public Health Service, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1944, as amended, is hereby redesignated "title VII"; sections 701 to 714, inclusive, of such title are hereby redesignated as section 801 to 814, respectively.

Correction by Theodore W. Schultz of Article by George Weller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 18 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two letters from Theodore W. Schultz, chairman of the Department of Economics, University of Chicago, concerning an article by George Weller, which was placed in the RECORD some time ago.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO,
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS.
Chicago, Ill., March 25, 1948.

Senator C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BROOKS: My attention has been called to the fact that you had placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under extension of remarks an article by George Weller purporting to report on a statement which I made at a seminar in international economic relations at Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., this appearing in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 4.

It is very kind and considerate of you to place these observations of Mr. Weller on what I said at Harvard in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Inasmuch as Mr. Weller in considerable part misinterpreted the main emphasis of my remarks at Harvard, I found it necessary to write a brief note to the Chicago Daily News, which they were kind enough to publish and actually feature as they did in the issue of March 9, 1948, on the editorial page.

I am enclosing a copy of my statement to the Chicago Daily News, in which I attempted to put Mr. Weller's story into more accurate focus.

You may wish, and I would be very pleased to have this statement added to the RECORD. Thank you indeed.

Sincerely yours,
THEODORE W. SCHULTZ,
Chairman.

MARCH 8, 1948.

To the EDITOR OF THE CHICAGO DAILY NEWS:

As a student George Weller gets a low C on his report on my Harvard classroom statement (in the Daily News, Tuesday, March 2.) His big red apple notwithstanding, I must call him to account.

Weller, although sensitive to details and atmosphere, missed last Friday's lesson. I did not analyze the Marshall plan. Nor did I condemn it. Let me review last week's lesson for him:

1. United States agricultural policy has become extremely protectionistic: it is increasingly inconsistent with multilateralism; it does not square with the objectives of the reciprocal trade agreements or with those of ITO. The Wool Act of 1947 dramatizes this inconsistency.

2. The terms of exchange beween farm and nonfarm products will again turn against agriculture—enough to bring farm prices down to 90 percent and less of parity.

3. The Government, then, in an effort to make good on its agricultural price policy,

will (1) hold domestic prices above competitive levels, (2) dump farm products abroad, and (3) revert to production controls.

4. There is a real danger that the European Recovery Program will become a convenient device for dumping American farm products; that it will, in this respect, be used to achieve the price objective of our agricultural policy, and not our multilateral trade objective. (This would be a misuse, but not a condemnation of the Marshall plan.)

We need to become aware of this prospective misuse of the ERP, and establish some safeguards.

5. It is possible to reconcile our agricultural price policy and foreign trade policy, without leaving farm people entirely unprotected in the event of mass unemployment.

6. The way to reconcile this conflict is to discontinue the policy of supporting farm prices in the market, and to undertake instead, in the event of a depression, a policy of compensatory income payments to farm people.

Surely it would be absurd to oppose the Marshall plan (as I did not), simply because it does not resolve the long-standing conflict between agricultural and foreign trade policy.

So much, then, on the lesson that Weller missed despite the calm at Harvard. My grade on his report, I am sure, is overly generous.

THEODORE W. SCHULTZ,
The University of Chicago.

What Happened to the Merited Pay-Raise Bill?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the unwarranted and inexcusable delay affecting pay raises for postal employees and other Federal employees is due entirely to the uncompromising opposition against the pay increase held by a concentrated and dominant force within the majority party now in control.

In view of the tremendous increase in living costs since OPA has been abolished there can be no argument against the reduced amount of pay increase which many Members of the House reluctantly accept as a final and a minimal compromise. Personally, I still hold to the $1,000 pay raise for all Government employees, which, after all the delay, should be retroactive to January 1.

The $1,000 increase provided in my bill was the first concrete proposal before the House. It is unquestionably fair and equitable. It was the wedge that forced the split among the blind economy adherents and brought about the introduction of several compromise bills providing lesser amounts. But where are these bills? Why the lag or is it a stall which is intended to rob the Federal employees of their just claims by reason of being caught in the log jam before final adjournment?

I want to sound a warning to all Federal employees, to be on guard. There is no excuse or reason why the pay raise should not be the law—there is less reason for further delay. There is enough sentiment in Congress to promptly pass a generous measure but even a compromise figure of $600 or $500 per annum providing retroactive pay increase to January 1 could be enacted without any debate. It should be passed now. The leadership of the majority is on trial, the decision is theirs to make. Appropriations are available for everything and for everybody but the faithful Federal employee who must wait until the spirit moves the sluggish mind and the unwilling body of the present Congress.

The situation is critical and needs prompt, positive, and corrective action.

Speech of Hon. Samuel K. McConnell, Jr., of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. WALLACE CHADWICK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. CHADWICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of Hon. SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, JR., of Pennsylvania, at the Hey Day Exercises, at University of Pennsylvania on May 14, 1948:

Immediately after my acceptance of your gracious invitation to speak here today, I inquired of a close friend, now holding an official position with the university, what type of talk I should make on this occasion. He wrote me to the effect that, having been an undergraduate at this university, I should follow along the general ideas of the speaker at the Hey Day exercises when I was a senior on the campus. I had to confess to him that I could remember neither the subject matter nor the name of the speaker.

"Well, SAM," he replied, "the students probably will not remember what you say, either."

So, with that thought in mind, I assure you I have no illusions of grandeur that would cause me to believe that what I say will be remembered by my audience. I only hope it will prove helpful at the present time.

I enjoy and appreciate the opportunity to appear here before you 25 years after graduation from the University of Pennsylvania, and congratulate the senior class and those who are receiving awards today. It is very thrilling to receive the honors after one has striven diligently and honestly to earn them. That experience will occur again and again as you progress through life.

The world is in a state of flux, and it does not yet appear what the future holds for each one of us. Confusion, unrest, and strife are prevalent throughout the earth. It is probably to be expected, for you cannot blow out the brains of millions of people and destroy billions of dollars worth of property without causing terrific economic, political, and social dislocations.

There are people who will express sympathy for you at such a time. They see you in a world that has gone askew. They view it as a dismal place, devoid of opportunity, with no welcome for you.

I have no use for such ideas, nor do I sympathize with you. Rather, do I envy you, deeply and sincerely, as all persons must who are even remotely aware of the tremendous needs of the world today; and where need is, there you will find opportunity.

Are there no problems and needs today? Have we found the perfect solutions for better international relations, for unemployment, for adequate housing, for sound Government fiscal policies, for good labor-management activities, for proper types of taxation, for equitable and sensible racial relationships, for a finely adjusted balance between Federal, State, and local governments, for unity among our people, etc.? Are there no more efficient methods for making things, or for making more of them for more people? The opportunities for service to mankind are unlimited.

The needs will be met, and the problems will be worked out only because of the dreams, the plans, and the actions of individuals. There are people today, some of them well educated in a formal way, who believe that only by the development of a gigantic, automatic plan will things be accomplished. Many of them believe that no idea for improvement is worth considering unless it can be organized into some mighty mass movement involving millions of people. The very sight of hosts of men in brown shirts and black shirts seemed to certain individuals to give authenticity to the rotten and decadent ideas of Hitler and Mussolini. How superficial is such thinking.

We need plans and we need systems, but, above all, we need honorable, intelligent, and sensible persons to manage them. Systems do not run by themselves; always there must be an individual or a group of individuals to put them into operation and to administer them. It has been aptly stated that the history of an institution or of a nation, during a particular period of time, is but the lengthened shadow of an individual.

Yours is a glorious opportunity; the Nation cries out for men who can meet the challenge. A friend of mine, with world-wide contacts, has often stated that it doesn't take many people to accomplish things. A handful of people made Germany Nazi and Italy Fascist. A few individuals started the Communist Party, which, in 5 short years, captured Russia and began to cast its influence throughout the world. Less than 100 people brought about the Renaissance and the Reformation in Europe. Only 10 men produced the Federal Union of America. Dr Welch of Johns Hopkins, with a small disciplined group of young doctors, changed the medical life of America. A small band of Christian disciples along the shores of Galilee affected mankind throughout the centuries; and sitting within the range of my voice at this very moment are some who could affect the course of history.

I believe that you have every reason to look forward hopefully. We are going through a period of uncertainty and strife, which may well be only a prelude to another advance of the human race. Dr. James Henry Breasted, in his fascinating book Conquest of Civilization indicated his faith in a favorable outlook. He pictured man as setting forth on a great adventure, the human adventure. As he looked back and saw what man had achieved in spite of frequent maladjustment and conflict, he was optimistic. Dr. Breasted believed that the years of the past were not futile, but actually were stepping stones to higher levels in the future.

I realize how little I can really give you of advice or experience. The stern law of nature, that everything of value must be earned, stands in the way. I can, however, tell you what I believe the basic requirements are for those who plan to participate after graduation in our economic and government activities. The list is not inclusive, but I believe the essential ingredients are: religious and spiritual faith; a healthy body, especially one that can endure great strains and

stresses; a knowledge of human nature; a thorough grounding in the fundamentals of various systems of government, with special emphasis on our American Republic system, and its tangible accomplishments; a basic understanding of economic ideas and theories; and a balanced viewpoint of all life.

Probably you will say of the first ingredient I mentioned, Oh! that is just religious talk. But you do not have to take my word for it. If you think the ideas, beliefs, and teachings of religion are not right, then test them out. Personally, I believe life will not work out in any other way. Suppose we try to run this country on the basis of complete selfishness, complete dishonesty, complete hatred and complete lust, and then see what happens. If that is the right way to live, then a nation following such ideas should function smoothly and prosper. But you know what would happen. Not a bank would stay open, because the money would be stolen; business would collapse for lack of trust; life insurance policies would not be paid; homes would be broken up; robberies and murders would abound, and chaos would occur. No! it just would not work. We are not perfect, but fortunately, there are enough good people in the Nation to hold it together and keep it going.

Another requirement I have mentioned is that of a balanced viewpoint. A great need of this country today is balance. Life is a continual matter of adjustment and balance. In nature we have watched its operation. The aviator and the builder must observe the law of gravity which is one of equilibrium, or suffer unpleasant consequences. You have seen the effects of too little sleep, of overeating, and of too much or too little exercise. That same lack of balance also has its effect in other activities. Extremes in any part of life bring trouble.

It is evident in many of the problems of the day. In the field of economics, great wealth and extreme poverty, with no middle class, have brought strife and friction throughout the ages. Those who seek complete freedom are in constant opposition to those who advocate absolute control. In labor-management relations, a lack of reason and balance has caused abuses and unrest with troubles today which are apparent to everyone. One-sided laws will increase the tension under which all of us live. We, who are active in public life, have observed the tendency of the extremists to inflate situations to abnormal proportions, which makes it so difficult to find reasonable solutions in an atmosphere surcharged with pressure and excitement.

You are probably aware of the problems created by the complexities of modern life. Transportation, housing, education, medical care, mass production, and Nation-wide strikes, are just a few of the many situations that are pressing for attention and solution. Should they be handled by individual and community action, by the States, by the Federal Government, or by a combination of all of them. Here is the focal point of the argument. The entire concept of what is known as the American way of life is involved. That is the reason I have suggested that those among you who wish to take part in the big job of finding solutions to our economic and Government problems should study all systems of government, with special attention to our American Republic. This will enable you to develop a philosophy of government or a standard to which you can refer while considering the important questions of the day.

It is easy to state the problems, and it is not difficult for one to talk in glowing idealistic terms of the objectives, but oh, how we need individuals who can tell the country in simple, direct language how results are to be achieved; and particularly, how they can be attained without jeopardizing our freedom, or causing more troublesome problems than the ones we are seeking to correct.

This earth has been inhabited for thousands of years by human beings. During that long period of time, most of them have gone hungry and untold millions have starved to death. Then in one small section of this earth, a large number of the inhabitants have had a relative abundance of material things, and very few people have died of hunger. Surely the system of government and economics of that country is worth studying most carefully. It has produced tangible, practical results.

Our forefathers who established our Government knew history and they knew human nature. They sought to curtail power, especially too much central authority and control. They endeavored to make effective the will of the majority, but at the same time they attempted to protect individual and minority rights. Large areas were reserved for State and local action. The entire theme was one of balance of power.

The tendency of some people to have the Federal Government manage more and more activities, even if for good objectives, upsets that balanced structure idea of Government. All roads are leading to Washington, just as nearly 2,000 years ago all roads led to Rome. It is making for inefficiency, for it is obvious that we cannot handle satisfactorily the many duties we now have without adding extra ones.

I shall not tell you how to fight your battle. That is your privilege and your charge. But I do suggest, in all sincerity, that you study and consider all sides of every question. Prepare yourself carefully and thoroughly so that you will be trained and equipped to make a real contribution in the uncertain future years that loom before us. Step forth, then, and let nothing stand in your way. Go out from the cloistered halls of your university, knowing that the world has need of you, and will welcome your offerings, once you compel its attention. "The younger generations," said Ibsen, "are knocking at the door. Shall we wait for them to break it down, or shall we admit them gladly?" The world will admit you gladly, once it sees that you are in earnest, and have something to give.

Some years ago I read with interest a talk given by the president of a large automobile company to young men. It contained this inspiring paragraph:

"At certain epic times and places—under some spur of necessity, exaltation, or faith—man has fortified his spirit, beaten down his fears, and stepped forth as the master of his destiny. At such times and in such places the human race has known its greatest accomplishment and highest dignity. Then courage and character and intelligence have worked their valid miracles; and life has become not a whining and a misery, but an adventure rich and fine."

"Across the fields of yesterday
He sometimes comes to me,
A little lad just back from play—
The lad I used to be.
And yet, he smiles so wistfully
Once he has crept within,
I wonder if he hopes to see
The man I might have been."

I congratulate you today and wish you Godspeed.

Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors Endorses H. R. 5004

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include the following resolution recently adopted by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors of which I was a member before coming to Congress endorsing H. R. 5004:

Resolution memorializing Congress for early passage of H. R. 5004, equality in naturalization bill

Whereas over 33,000 persons of Japanese ancestry made a distinguished contribution during the late war as American soldiers in the armed forces while members of their families and of their race shared with unmistakable devotion the privations and hardships incident to the successful operation of the war; and

Whereas within the last 5 years Federal naturalization and immigration laws have been amended to enable the citizenship and entry of Chinese (memorialized by this board of supervisors), and a few others, small in number; and

Whereas permanent American residents of Japanese ancestry, residents in Los Angeles County for over a quarter of a century and longer, are still excluded from the privilege of becoming American citizens under present laws; and

Whereas residents of Japanese ancestry have over half a century made important contributions to the agricultural development and cultural richness of Los Angeles County; and

Whereas this measure maintains the basic national origins quota system which underlies the Immigration Act of 1924; and

Whereas it is the American way of life to encourage immigrants to become American citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles hereby extends its endorsement to, and memorializes the Congress of the United States to give early passage to H. R. 5004, which gives naturalization to these persons heretofore excluded from naturalization; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to Senators KNOWLAND and DOWNEY, Congressmen NIXON, POULSON, DOUGLAS, McDONOUGH, JACKSON, KING, BRADLEY, HOLIFIELD, HINSHAW, and SHEPPARD, to the Chairmen of the Senate and House Subcommittees on Immigration and Naturalization, to the United States Conference of Mayors and that they be urged to do everything in their power to secure the enactment of this urgent and desirable legislation.

Treatment of Japanese-Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 18 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Proper Way To Right a Wartime Wrong," published in the Des Moines Register on May 14.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPER WAY TO RIGHT A WARTIME WRONG

One of the most interesting—and most American—chapters in the history of private enterprise is the story of how Japanese immigrants, imported as cheap oriental labor, made themselves in a single generation into prosperous, well-educated, American farm operators, small-business men, and fishermen.

Through no fault of their own, all this was wiped out in a few frantic weeks. These were not the weeks between Pearl Harbor

and the battle of Midway, when the west coast lay open to Japanese attack. The forced evacuation of more than 100,000 Japanese-Americans, and the forced liquidation of all their accumulations of a thrifty lifetime, came later.

Here is how one of them tells it:

"The evacuees were usually given 7 to 10 days' notice of the time they would be moved from their homes. But thousands got less time. They had no idea where they would be going, how long they would be excluded from their homes. They were notified that they must report to a railway station or bus terminal at a stated hour, taking with them only the goods they could actually carry.

"This meant they must either sell or rent, loan or store, place in custodianship, or dispose of in some way, all tangible property. This included farms, nursery stocks, growing crops, all kinds of farm machinery, trucks, hotels, restaurants, homes, furniture, and all the multiplicity of commodities owned by the 120,000 people. * * *"

Americans have had a great change of heart since then. We can never make up to these people for what we did to them. But we want to do what we can, since we found out that:

Not a single act of sabotage or espionage was committed by any of the Japanese-Americans, in Hawaii or continental United States.

The overwhelming majority of them remained loyal to the United States, in spite of early Japanese victories and in spite of sometimes atrocious treatment by their adopted country.

Japanese-Americans in the armed services made an extraordinary record for conspicuous gallantry.

There are several things that only the Congress of the United States can do. One is to pass the Judd bill, to put them on the same basis as Chinese in regard to immigration and naturalization.

Another is for the Senate to pass the Evacuation Claims bill, already passed unanimously by the House.

Evacuees cannot sue in the Federal court of claims; time has run out for that. But the Claims bill would have the Justice Department set up a commission to act as a court for settling claims up to $2,500 per person, paid out of funds to be appropriated for this purpose by Congress. Any larger claims would have to be paid through special bills.

This is not an over-generous bill, but since it has been passed unanimously by the House in this Congress, and a similar bill was passed unanimously by the Senate in the last Congress, the thing to do is pass it quickly and worry about larger claims later.

In honor and decency, we can do no less.

Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem from an able and discerning constituent:

PEACE

Aggression, always the common thief of human rights, has now become the most perfidious traitor to God and man.

While he arrays his might, to fight against the peace of the world, prompt resistance, in behalf of stricken neighbors, is the straight and narrow, but the surest way to man's salvation.

Some of the most vocal friends of peace are among the least outspoken enemies of aggression. Are they consistent? These are the facts:

Friends of aggression are the enemies of peace, in Europe, Asia, Africa, Greece.
Friends of peace are the enemies of aggression, in America, or any nation.
Peace must prevail, aggression go; but time is running fast and low.
Why wait until it is too late, to soothe world fear, or banish hate?
Man's deadliest foe, blood-stained and red, is dread aggression's ruthless head.
Become as helpful as you can, but ban whatever injures man.
Free life from strife; but bring help now, to wring world sorrow from our brow.
Too late to hate. Peace needs all now before it is too late to help.
Since time began the wrath sublime hates not the man, but crushes crime.

Shall we, what is left of us, remain free, as God made us? If so, all must decide today, to stay the sinking star of peace, and slow the scorching sun of aggression.

—*Charles M. Himel.*

Taxing the Tax Bureau's Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. DEANE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article, Taxing the Tax Bureau's Facilities, by Richard L. Strout, from the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., published on May 5, 1948:

TAXING THE TAX BUREAU'S FACILITIES

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—A jury has just handed down a verdict on one of the hottest political issues in Washington. It is rare to get such a decisive finding on such a disputed and important subject.

The question is whether the Bureau of Internal Revenue gets enough money; specifically whether Congress was wise last year in lopping $20,000,000 from its funds for economy.

I have always imagined that when I sent in an income-tax report it was immediately scanned by 15 or 20 suspicious revenue agents, maybe more. It gives the average taxpayer, no matter how conscientious, a creepy feeling to think of the bureaucrats somewhere poring over his income-tax return, perhaps at this very minute.

To my surprise, I now discover that the Internal Revenue Bureau actually investigates only about 3 percent of the returns handed in. They are spread out exceedingly thin. But I am getting ahead of my story.

The victorious Republicans in 1947 set about achieving economies with a meat ax. Genuine cries of anguish arose from the Internal Revenue Bureau. The proposed cuts would mean dropping 6,307 enforcement agents. This was being "penny-wise and pound-foolish," it was charged, because every dollar spent on tax enforcement brought in an average of $20 from new tax collections.

Republican leaders were adamant and declared that this and other bureaus were lobbying against economies. Doubtless, some were.

President Truman dumped gasoline on the flames in a statement on signing the appropriation bill. The so-called economy of $20,000,000, he charged, would actually cost the taxpayers $400,000,000 in lost revenue.

Republicans wrathfully replied. There is no question that this issue is now steeped in politics. On March 10, a House appropriations subcommittee revealed the emotional fervor of the dispute in a survey gathered by its investigators at the Bureau of Internal Revenue. These men had discovered empty liquor bottles in the trash in the basement of the Revenue Building. They released photographs of them with a report which charged, as one newspaper put it, that "discipline and administrative control were lax," while a press association referred to charges of "glaring inefficiencies."

Well, what is one to believe in such a dispute?

As it happens, Senator CARL A. HAYDEN, Democrat, of Arizona, inserted an almost unnoticed provision into the appropriation bill, calling for an impartial investigation. Four nationally known fiscal authorities and tax experts were picked by Congress itself to make a nonpartisan, independent survey of what the Bureau is doing, and how much it needs. These four men have just made a 58-page report, chock full of tables and statistics.

To come to the point at once, the four experts find for the Internal Revenue Bureau; they declare its membership is overworked, understaffed, and that enforcement personnel is now spread out so thin that taxpayer compliance is "deteriorating at a dangerous rate."

The four experts find that "neither the revenue nor the taxpayer is properly protected by the present scale of investigation and audit."

The Bureau asked for $208,000,000 in 1948 and got $188,000,000, and the committee says it ought to have $250,000,000. Because of the "economy" cut, the Bureau had to lay off 6,000 enforcement agents; the committee says that instead of over-all personnel of 50,000 it ought to have 67,700.

Is the Bureau efficient? Less than it should be, says the committee, and it proposes detailed changes. But it adds that Canada and Britain are spending proportionately more for tax enforcement than the United States and getting less per dollar invested. Instead of being "demoralized" and undisciplined, the report says the "standards of integrity" maintained by the Bureau are "of a very high order."

Quite apart from any political consideration, the figures on the inadequacy of present enforcement come to the reader as surprising, not to say shocking. There just aren't men or dollars enough to run down the clues of fraud that are now being turned up.

"Unless the staff of field investigators and office employees is augmented promptly, a vast sum of tax revenue will be lost," the survey says.

In view of this report, Mr. Truman's estimate of $400,000,000 lost tax revenue in order to "save" $20,000,000 in enforcement costs seems conservative.

Cost of Foreign Aid to South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, for the past 4 weeks as a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee

on Deficiencies, I have been hearing the testimony of the State Department and other executive departments of the Government in their support of the budget requests for the economic cooperation administration in the first year of the so-called European recovery program or Marshall plan.

The more I hear the more I am convinced that the administration has launched us upon the greatest international give-away program in the history of the world. We have set out in a bald program of exporting dollars to balance the national income and import needs of the so-called cooperating nations.

The goods we provide for the dollars will be sold by the recipient countries; the poor man who needs the goods will part with his own hard-earned money to get them; the political governments of the recipient countries will pocket the receipts to reduce their national debt at the expense of ours.

I have been thinking in those hearings about the cost of the program to the Nation; I have not been thinking about my own State. But a few days ago a request came from some taxpayers in South Dakota for this information. I asked the Reference Service at the Congressional Library for it—and the reply has come back in the form of a table which I am placing in the RECORD with the consent of the House.

Groggy as I am with the costs of the program and the proposed methods of giving away dollars, I am frankly astounded when the cost is translated into a county and county-seat basis for South Dakota. Here it is:

Total cost of foreign aid apportioned on a Nation-wide per capita basis as applied to the population of counties and towns in South Dakota

Counties and principal towns	Population, 1940	Share of all foreign-aid commitments, July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947 (population × $183.03), based on $24,099,211,087	Share of foreign aid proposed under European recovery program, 1948–52 (population × $129.11), based on $17,000,000,000	Share of total foreign aid proposed, 1945–47, 1948–52 (column II plus column III), based on $41,099,211,087	Taxes (property) collected for county, school, township, city, and town purposes, Dec. 31, 1945
	I	II	III	IV	V
Armstrong County [1]	42	$7,687	$5,423	$13,110	$1,855.71
Aurora County	5,387	985,983	695,516	1,681,499	181,266.40
Beadle County	19,648	3,596,173	2,536,753	6,132,926	687,631.88
Huron city	10,843	1,984,594	1,399,940	3,384,534	
Bennett County	3,983	729,008	514,245	1,243,253	121,652.81
Martin city	1,013	185,409	130,788	316,197	
Bon Homme County	10,241	1,874,410	1,322,216	3,196,626	314,032.31
Tyndall city	1,289	235,926	166,423	402,349	
Brookings County	16,560	3,030,977	2,138,062	5,169,039	556,143.04
Brookings city	5,346	978,478	690,222	1,668,700	
Brown County	29,676	5,431,598	3,831,468	9,263,066	1,163,873.22
Aberdeen city	17,015	3,114,255	2,196,807	5,311,062	
Brule County	6,195	1,133,871	799,836	1,933,707	206,862.39
Chamberlain city	1,626	297,607	209,933	507,540	
Buffalo County	1,853	339,155	239,241	578,396	39,414.13
Butte County	8,004	1,464,972	1,033,396	2,498,368	272,866.91
Belle Fourche city	2,496	456,843	322,259	779,102	
Campbell County	5,033	921,190	649,811	1,571,001	153,345.34
Charles Mix County	13,449	2,461,570	1,736,400	4,197,790	395,424.69
Wagner city	1,319	241,417	170,296	411,713	
Clark County	8,955	1,639,034	1,156,180	2,795,214	316,801.29
Clark city	1,291	236,292	166,681	402,973	
Clay County	9,592	1,755,624	1,238,423	2,994,047	283,817.87
Vermillion city	3,324	608,392	429,162	1,037,554	
Codington County	17,014	3,114,072	2,196,678	5,310,750	525,750.73
Watertown city	10,617	1,943,230	1,370,761	3,313,991	
Corson County	6,755	1,236,368	872,138	2,108,506	215,991.28
Custer County	6,023	1,102,390	777,630	1,880,020	164,111.46
Custer city	1,845	337,690	238,208	575,896	
Davison County	15,336	2,806,948	1,980,031	4,786,979	632,167.49
Mitchell city	10,633	1,946,158	1,372,827	3,318,985	
Day County	13,565	2,428,802	1,751,377	4,234,179	468,152.54
Webster city	2,173	397,724	280,556	678,280	
Deuel County	8,450	1,546,604	1,090,980	2,637,584	241,827.60
Dewey County	5,709	1,044,918	737,089	1,782,007	114,123.58
Douglas County	6,348	1,161,874	819,590	1,981,464	209,558.14
Armour city	1,013	185,409	130,788	316,197	
Edmunds County	7,814	1,430,196	1,008,866	2,439,062	253,157.03
Ipswich city	1,002	183,396	129,368	312,764	
Fall River County	8,089	1,480,530	1,044,371	2,524,901	258,027.27
Hot Springs city	4,083	747,311	527,156	1,274,467	
Faulk County	5,168	945,899	667,240	1,613,139	234,984.24
Grant County	10,552	1,931,333	1,362,369	3,293,702	363,008.99
Milbank city	2,745	502,417	354,407	856,824	
Gregory County	9,554	1,748,669	1,233,517	2,982,186	267,915.30
Gregory city	1,246	228,055	160,871	388,926	
Haakon County	3,515	643,350	453,822	1,097,172	122,184.28
Hamlin County	7,562	1,384,073	976,330	2,360,403	240,038.02
Hand County	7,166	1,311,593	925,202	2,236,795	318,795.56
Miller city	1,460	267,224	188,501	455,725	
Hanson County	5,400	988,362	697,194	1,685,556	184,961.75
Harding County	3,010	550,920	388,621	939,541	97,662.19
Hughes County	6,624	1,212,391	855,225	2,067,616	230,490.15
Pierre city	4,322	791,056	558,013	1,349,069	
Hutchinson County	12,668	2,318,624	1,635,565	3,954,189	347,090.28
Parkston city	1,305	238,854	168,489	407,343	
Hyde County	3,113	569,772	401,919	971,691	113,983.29
Highmore city	1,136	207,922	146,669	354,591	
Jackson County	1,955	357,824	252,410	610,234	84,764.09
Jerauld County	4,752	869,759	613,931	1,483,690	166,801.15
Wessington Springs city	1,352	247,457	174,557	422,014	
Jones County	2,509	459,222	323,937	783,159	106,825.14
Kingsbury County	10,831	1,982,398	1,398,390	3,380,788	390,899.40
Arlington city	1,157	211,766	149,380	361,146	
Lake County	12,412	2,271,768	1,602,513	3,874,281	443,806.38
Madison city	5,018	918,445	647,874	1,566,319	
Lawrence County	19,093	3,494,592	2,465,097	5,959,689	609,194.98
Lead city	7,520	1,376,386	970,907	2,347,293	
Lincoln County	13,171	2,410,688	1,700,508	4,111,196	481,061.53
Canton city	2,518	460,870	325,099	785,969	
Lyman County	5,045	923,386	651,360	1,574,746	192,266.98
McCook County	9,793	1,729,413	1,264,374	3,056,787	330,172.07
Salem city	1,185	216,891	152,995	369,886	
McPherson County	8,363	1,528,850	1,078,456	2,607,306	236,606.89
Eureka city	1,457	266,675	188,113	454,788	

[1] County unorganized; attached to Stanley County for judicial purposes.

Total cost of foreign aid apportioned on a Nation-wide per capita basis as applied to the population of counties and towns in South Dakota—Continued

Counties and principal towns	Population, 1940	Share of all foreign-aid commitments, July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947 (population × $183.03), based on $24,099,211,087	Share of foreign aid proposed under European recovery program, 1948–52 (population × $129.11), based on $17,000,000,000	Share of total foreign aid proposed, 1945–47, 1948–52 (column II plus column III), based on $41,099,211,087	Taxes (property) collected for county, school, township, city, and town purposes, Dec. 31, 1945
	I	II	III	IV	V
Marshall County	8,880	$1,625,306	$1,146,497	$2,771,803	$305,047.00
Britton city	1,500	274,545	193,665	468,210	
Meade County	9,735	1,781,797	1,256,886	3,038,683	311,123.00
Sturgis city	3,008	550,554	388,363	938,917	
Mellette County	4,107	751,704	530,255	1,281,959	101,890.24
Miner County	6,836	1,251,193	882,596	2,133,789	206,384.00
Howard city	1,193	218,355	154,028	372,383	
Minnehaha County	57,697	10,560,282	7,449,260	18,009,542	2,173,735.23
Sioux Falls city	40,832	7,473,481	5,271,820	12,745,301	
Moody County	9,341	1,709,683	1,206,017	2,912,700	350,550.08
Flandreau city	2,212	404,862	285,591	690,453	
Pennington County	23,799	4,355,931	3,072,689	7,428,620	767,805.85
Rapid City	13,844	2,533,867	1,787,399	4,321,266	
Perkins County	6,585	1,205,253	850,189	2,055,442	218,677.89
Lemmon city	1,781	325,976	229,945	555,921	
Potter County	4,614	844,500	595,714	1,440,214	151,573.19
Gettysburg city	1,324	242,332	170,942	413,274	
Roberts County	15,887	2,907,798	2,051,171	4,958,969	450,956.13
Sisseton city	2,513	459,954	324,453	784,407	
Sanborn County	5,754	1,053,155	742,899	1,796,054	219,096.78
Woonsocket city	1,050	192,182	135,566	327,748	
Shannon County [2]	5,366	982,139	692,804	1,674,941	22,438.47
Spink County	12,527	2,292,817	1,617,361	3,910,178	480,218.72
Redfield city	2,428	444,397	313,479	757,876	
Stanley County	1,959	358,556	252,926	611,482	90,736.24
Sully County	2,668	488,324	344,465	832,789	120,217.18
Todd County [3]	5,714	1,045,833	737,735	1,783,568	74,745.72
Tripp County	9,937	1,818,769	1,282,966	3,101,735	270,082.86
Winner city	2,426	444,031	313,221	757,252	
Turner County	13,270	2,428,808	1,713,290	4,142,098	394,094.13
Parker city	1,244	227,689	160,613	388,302	
Union County	11,675	2,136,875	1,507,359	3,644,234	363,573.17
Elk Point city	1,483	271,433	191,470	462,903	
Beresford city [4]	1,642	300,535	211,999	512,534	
Walworth County	7,274	1,331,360	939,146	2,270,506	253,476.98
Mobridge city	3,008	550,554	388,363	938,917	
Washabaugh County [5]	1,980	362,399	255,638	618,037	27,582.13
Washington County [6]	1,789	327,441	230,978	558,419	
Yankton County	16,725	3,061,177	2,159,365	5,220,542	466,109.00
Yankton city	6,798	1,244,238	877,690	2,121,928	
Ziebach County	2,875	526,211	371,191	897,402	86,242.93
Total South Dakota	642,961	117,681,152	83,012,695	200,693,847	21,244,866.69

[2] County unorganized; attached to Fall River County for judicial purposes.
[3] County unorganized; attached to Tripp County for judicial purposes.
[4] Beresford city in Union County, 1,282; in Lincoln County, 360; total, 1,642.
[5] County unorganized; attached to Jackson County for judicial purposes.
[6] County unorganized; attached to Pennington County for judicial purposes.

Details will not necessarily add to totals because of rounding.

NOTES.—The figure used in column II for all foreign aid between July 1, 1945, and June 30, 1947 ($24,099,211,087) includes loans, property credits, advances, relief and rehabilitation, and authorizations from lend-lease grants, the International Bank, and the International Fund. This aid was extended to many foreign countries in South America and eastern Europe as well as to western Europe. Some of the authorizations included in the above figure have not yet been used by the recipient countries.

The per capita figures used in columns II and III are based on a 1940 figure of the population of the United States of 131,669,275. The 1940 population figure is used because it is the latest available for many local units of government. However, the population of the United States had grown to an estimated 143,382,000, by July 1, 1947. If the 1947 population figure were used instead of the 1940 figure, the per capita cost of foreign aid between July 1, 1945, and June 30, 1947, would be $168.08 rather than $183.03; and the cost of the proposed European recovery program would be $118.56 rather than $129.11. However, if the population of these localities grew in proportion to the national increase in population, the aid figures would be substantially the same as those shown above.

Sources: Sixteenth Census of the United States, 1940: Population, vol. I, pp. 994–1005, Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce.

Interest Bearing Debts of Taxing Districts in the State of South Dakota as of December 31, 1945, and Classified County Expenditures. Bulletin No. 42, November 1946, issued by the Division of Taxation, p. 19.

Justice Demands That Britain Get Out of Occupied Irish Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the Irish question has not been settled. The freedom of Ireland from the domination of Great Britain has been debated, argued, and fought over for centuries, and not until all of Ireland, including the six northern counties, are given the freedom they justly deserve will the question be satisfactorily solved. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting herewith an exchange of correspondence between William Griffin, editor and publisher of the New York Enquirer, and the Right Honorable Lord Glentoran, M. P., on this subject, which originated with a letter to Mr. William Randolph Hearst from Mr. Griffin that is quite revealing:

JUSTICE DEMANDS THAT BRITAIN GET OUT OF OCCUPIED IRISH AREA

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 6, 1948.*

WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST,
Los Angeles Examiner,
Los Angeles, Calif.:

Britain, France, and America have called upon the Soviet Union to agree to the return of Trieste to Italy, and have been credited with a master stroke of international statecraft.

Trieste was severed from Italy last year in violation of the elementary principles of justice. Every American who loves fair play in international affairs cannot but hope that it will be handed back to the land from which it was torn with such sad and perilous results.

Now it is both pertinent and important to ask: When is Britain going to restore Belfast to Ireland? When is Britain going to withdraw from the six northeastern counties of Ireland which she severed from that country after the First World War?

This severance took place against the vigorously expressed will of the Irish people and in defiance of the fact that not a single Irish-elected representative voted for it.

The question just propounded concerns a problem of vital importance to the economic and national well-being of Ireland, a key nation in the opposition of free men in both hemispheres to the menace of Soviet socialism.

The existence of this problem is the very best evidence of the hypocrisy of Britain in calling for the recovery of Trieste by Italy and in making such a pretense of righteousness in the cause of international peace, freedom, and cooperation.

The man responsible for the cutting off of a sixth of Ireland's territory and the retention of it as a British occupied area was Prime Minister David Lloyd George, of Great Britain.

Twelve years ago I was a guest of Mr. Lloyd George at his home in Churt, not far from London, where he was living as a retired statesman. He introduced Ireland into our conversation, and although our views thereon did not coincide, our discussion was a friendly one.

I recollect his asking me why in my talk with him I had shown myself so interested in Ireland, seeing that I had been born in America. I pointed out that my being an American of Irish descent was an excellent reason for my predilection toward Ireland, that some of my ancestors fought in the American Revolution, and that Americans had always felt grateful to Ireland for the help which she, her sons and those of Irish descent in America gave in that struggle and in the upbuilding of the United States.

After listening to his long account of the circumstances under which Ireland was mutilated under his leadership and placed under a Hitlerian regime, I said that time had clearly shown the grievous harm which partition had done not alone to Ireland's greatest interest but to Britain herself. And I expressed the conviction that he would perform an act of transcendant value to his own country, to Ireland, and to the cause of international peace and cooperation if he were to announce himself in favor of a final Anglo-Irish settlement on the basis of an independent republic covering the whole of Ireland.

He declared that it was impossible for him to do so, and gave the usual British argument that the Irish were not united on behalf of the territorial integrity of their country as a sovereign state.

It is, however, a matter of duly recorded history that Mr. Lloyd George, when Prime Minister of Britain, affirmed in the House of Commons in April 1920, the very year in which he instituted the dismemberment of Ireland:

"If you asked the people of Ireland what they would accept, by an emphatic majority they would say: 'We want independence and an Irish Republic.' There is absolutely no doubt about that. The elected representatives of Ireland now by a clear, definite majority, have declared in favor of independence—of secession."

Nothing can be more at variance with the truth than the argument used by British leaders that Ireland is not a nation (actually she is a far older nation than England) in order to justify the maintenance of a British boundary line of over 300 miles on Irish soil, which sunders highways, towns, farms, and even homes, and which acts as an iron curtain for a totalitarian enclave that has cost Ireland immense economic losses, not to speak of the political injustice occasioned thereby.

It was a British writer of such distinction as G. K. Chesterton who affirmed:

"If Aunt Jane is not a person there is no such thing as a person, and I say with equal conviction that if Ireland is not a nation then there is no such thing as a nation; France is not a nation, England is not a nation; there is no such thing as patriotism on this planet."

And it was another prominent Briton, Herbert H. Asquith, Mr. Lloyd George's predecessor as Prime Minister of Britain, who stated in the House of Commons, in his capacity as head of the British Government:

"There are few cases in history—as a student of history I myself know of none—of a nationhood at once so distinct, so persistent, and so assimilative as the Irish * * * Ireland is a nation. Not two nations, but one nation."

If it is imperative that Trieste be restored to Italy, as an anti-Communist measure, then it is also imperative that the one-sixth of Ireland's soil (an area half the size of Belgium still under British military occupation be returned to Ireland, whose opposition to Soviet socialism is known the world over and whose importance in the fight against the Kremlin's program for world conquest cannot be overrated.

Britain cannot expect the world to be impressed by her professed zeal for peace and justice and progress among the nations while she continues to violate her Irish neighbor's sovereignty in such a flagrant manner, and prevents Ireland from making the recovery and progress so essential to her own welfare, to that of Britain herself, and to the success of the global movement against Soviet socialism.

WILLIAM GRIFFIN,
Editor and Publisher,
New York Enquirer.

(In order to give the other side an opportunity of stating its case, Mr. Griffin forwarded to Sir Basil Brooke, Prime Minister, Belfast, Ireland, a copy of his communication to Mr. Hearst, with a request for a statement from him concerning it. Mr. Griffin is in receipt of a letter from Lord Glentoran explaining that "in the absence of the Prime Minister," he, in his capacity "as President of the Ulster Unionist Council," has been requested to send a reply. His response is as follows:)

STATEMENT BY THE RT. HON. LORD GLENTORAN, MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT

Your telegram to Mr. William Randolph Hearst gravely misrepresents the Ulster situation. The attempt to establish a parallel between Ulster and Trieste is grotesque. Ulster in its present constitutional form was set up by the Government of Ireland Act, 1920, and in December of the following year agreement was reached between five plenipotentiaries (including Michael Collins and Arthur Griffith) of Sinn Fein on the one hand and the British Government on the other. This agreement was ratified by the Sinn Fein Party in Dublin and was the final settlement of the Irish question. The Ulster people did not desire that situation, believing, as they still believe, that continued union between Great Britain and Ireland would have been the best policy. The Ulster Parliament was opened by His Majesty King George V and is the most democratic in the world. Britain's role is not that of an aggressor. The troops stationed in Ulster are United Kingdom troops. They are our own people.

Ulster's friendship and association with America is of very long standing. Fourteen Presidents of the United States were of Ulster stock. This Ulster-American friendship was demonstrated in the recent world war when 300,000 members of the American forces were welcomed and trained in Ulster. Londonderry was virtually "taken over" by the United States and became a vital naval base from which the Battle of the Atlantic was fought. Whereas Ulster welcomed the American forces Mr. De Valera protested against their landing here.

If one of your pressmen comes to Ulster to see for himself, we will give him the same welcome as we gave your gallant servicemen.

Social services and education facilities in Ulster apply equally to all parties and religions. State grants are made to Roman Catholic and all non-State schools and primary teachers' salaries in those schools are paid entirely from State funds.

We were your friends in 1942 when you wanted friends. We will help you again should you want friends—and you may want friends sooner than you think.

(William Griffin, editor and publisher of the New York Enquirer, has issued the following reply:)

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RT. HON. LORD GLENTORAN, MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT

At the outset you declare that my telegram to Mr. Hearst "gravely misrepresents the Ulster situation." This declaration itself does that very thing. The six Irish counties still occupied by Britain cannot be called Ulster. That historic Irish province comprises nine counties, three of which are under the plenary jurisdiction of the Irish Government.

Your assertion that "the Ulster Parliament * * * is the most democratic in the world" is entirely at variance with the actual facts. Those facts are so well known that it is unnecessary for me to dwell upon them. I cannot understand how you gained such a high opinion of your regional legislature.

The policy of neutrality pursued by the Irish Government during the Second World War is now fully understood and sympathized with in the United States, where during the conflict there were some who opposed it. America's feeling on the matter is shown in the acclaim with which Mr. de Valera was received, in an official and popular sense, during his recent visit to this country. No conqueror could have been accorded a more wholehearted welcome than that which this Republic, from the President downward, gave to Ireland's leader.

You are good enough to direct my attention to Ulster's cordial treatment of the 300,000 American troops who came there during the recent great war. With Britain assured of complete destruction at the hands of the Axis powers, were it not for the intervention of the United States on her side, I cannot see anything extraordinary in the treatment accorded our American forces in the six Irish counties under British occupation. Unfortunately, I am compelled to remark that strong manifestations of prejudice toward certain religionists among the American troops were not wanting in Ulster during the war. But that is a matter upon which I do not care to dwell, and I will, therefore, pass it by.

You aver that Ulster owes 'its present constitutional form" to the Government of Ireland Act, 1920, and that the so-called Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1921 "was the final settlement of the Irish question." Now, the aforementioned Government of Ireland Act is not an Irish statute. It is a completely British measure, passed by the London House of Commons of November 11, 1920, which happened to be the anniversary of the armistice of 1918, whereby the First World War was brought to an end. In that conflict 49,000 young Irishmen sacrificed their lives in vain for the liberty of small nations, not to speak of the greater number who were wounded and incapacitated while fighting for the same vain purpose.

Not one Irish vote, from Ulster or anywhere else in Ireland, was cast in the British Parliament on that inauspicious November day, nearly 30 tragic years ago, on behalf of the Government of Ireland Act. The inexorable voice of historic truth tells us that Ireland, one of the oldest nations in the world, was partitioned by the unilateral action of Britain in defiance of the vigorous opposition of the Irish people.

Let us now consider the so-called Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1921, which you affirm "was the final settlement of the Irish question." It did not require exceptional powers of mind to perceive that the settlement encompassed by that agreement (to use your own term)

would not and could not be "the final settlement of the Irish question." That treaty was imposed upon Ireland by the British Government under the Hitlerian threat of "an immediate and terrible war," and was not accepted by the Irishmen who signed it in London and those who subsequently ratified it in Dublin, as "the final settlement of the Irish question." On the contrary, and this was made quite clear to the world in the debates in Dail Eireann which led to its acceptance by that body, it was ratified in the Irish capital as a stepping stone to the attainment of independence for the whole of Ireland, as a republic. All concerned, in Britain and Ireland, were well aware of this.

You state that at the time the final settlement of the Irish question took place the Ulster people did not desire the situation occasioned thereby, believing, as they still believe, that continued union between Great Britain and Ireland would have been the best policy. But you must surely be aware that the leader of your party, the Conservative Party of Britain, Mr. Winston Churchill, one of the authors of partition, and consequently one of the men primarily responsible for the manifold evils which partition has wrought upon both Britain and Ireland, declared in London on April 30, 1948, that Britain's Socialist Government seems to forget that they live on the charity of the greatest capitalist and free enterprise state in the world—the United States.

Britain today is existing upon the bounty of America. That is the happy existence which you and the good people whose spokesman you have the honor to be want Ireland to enjoy by continued union with Britain. But the people of Ireland are of a different mind. They do not want to live upon the toil and sweat of the American taxpayer. They are a self-respecting and self-reliant people. Had the territorial unity of their country been respected by the British Government and their complete independence as a Republic been recognized by that Government after the First World War, they would have shown the world what Irish ability, Irish self-respect, and Irish self-reliance could accomplish when given the opportunity. Ireland can make no real recovery from the effects of centuries of British aggression, while she is shackled by the ball and chain of partition.

You point out that Ulster's friendship and association with America is of long standing and that 14 Presidents of the United States were of Ulster stock. I am surprised that a man of your ability did not perceive how deadly an argument this statement is against the whole case for partition and the denial to Ireland of the independence to which she is entitled, as a matter of long-delayed justice and sound international policy.

Surely you will realize, on reflection, that those mistaken folk in the six-county area who oppose Ireland's territorial integrity and independence are Irish Loyalists (that is, they put allegiance to Britain ahead of their duty to their own country) and as such must be equated with the American Loyalists of the Revolution in my own land. The latter element of the American people were bitter opponents of independence for their country. They had wealth and influence at their command, and they resorted to thoroughgoing misrepresentation of the American cause and were guilty of the greatest excesses in the furtherance of their purpose. Indeed, they exerted themselves to surpassing extent against their native land in their efforts to assist Britain in maintaining her rule over America.

Had they and Britain succeeded in defeating General Washington and his men, America would not have had any Presidents at all (of Ulster extraction or otherwise), nor would she have been able to save the British Empire from annihilation in two globe-shaking wars, both fought in our own time. The Irish Loyalist minority of today and the American Loyalists of Washington's time are one and the same. The former have no right to pride themselves on the achievements of American republicanism.

The most famous American President of Ulster stock was General Andrew Jackson, the outstanding American hero of the Anglo-American War of 1812–15. You are a military man and must be familiar with the story of Jackson's victory over the British forces at New Orleans in 1815, when he annihilated the invaders and gained a triumph over the experienced veterans of the Duke of Wellington which astonished the world.

To show Jackson's feeling toward Ireland and his attitude toward independence for that country as a republic, I will quote from an address delivered by him, when President of the United States, to the Charitable Irish Society of Boston, in 1833:

"I am gratified, sir, at this testimony of respect shown me by the Charitable Irish Society of this city. It is with great pleasure that I see so many countrymen of my father assembled on this occasion. I have always been proud of my ancestry and of being descended from that noble race, and rejoice that I am so nearly allied to a country which has had so much to recommend it to the good wishes of the world. Would to God, sir, that Irishmen on the other side of the great water enjoyed the comforts, happiness, contentment, and liberty that they enjoy here.

"I am well aware, sir, that Irishmen have never been backward in giving their support to the cause of liberty. They have fought, sir, for this country valiantly, and I have no doubt would fight again were it necessary. But I hope it will be long before the institutions of our country need support of that kind."

Neither you nor I ought to have any difficulty in determining what would be the attitude of this great American President of Ulster stock, were he with us today, toward the mutilation of his ancestral land (the land to which he was so devoted and of whose people he was so proud), carried out by Britain and maintained by Britain with a ruthlessness worthy of Adolf Hitler himself. President Jackson longed to see Ireland enjoying independence as a republic. How much better it would be if those mistaken Irish Loyalists in the six Irish countries still under British occupation were to take their stand with Washington and Jackson on behalf of the triumph of liberty in Ireland.

It ought to be obvious that there can be no "final settlement of the Irish question" until Ireland's territorial integrity is restored and her independence as a sovereign republic is recognized by her neighbor across the Irish Sea.

WILLIAM GRIFFIN,
Editor and Publisher, New York Enquirer.

The Basic Precept of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we in this Congress know all too well that "divide and conquer" is a basic precept of communism. At every turn we see it in action. No matter what the problem, we find Communists meddling, never trying to point the way to a desirable goal, but always doing their utmost to confound and confuse. Pretending to be in favor of everything that is good, they aim their poisoned shafts at all sincere supporters of a cause in an effort to get them tangled up in a mass of irrelevant arguments about inconsequentials. The following article by Ray Tucker which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of May 14, 1948, is a fine exposition of the subject:

NATIONAL WHIRLIGIG—RAY TUCKER'S LETTER

Russia's hostile pressures against the United States had a reactionary and repressive effect in this country that is regarded as a more dangerous threat to the western way of life than the eventually ruinous expenditures for foreign aid and national defense which the prospect of world war III has forced upon us.

The fear of Communist fifth columns in peace or wartime has generated a witch-burning campaign that carries a distinct menace to the very civil liberties the United States seeks to preserve.

It is reminiscent of the Red raids, secret arrests, and summary deportations inspired by former Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer in 1919–20, and of the Adams alien and sedition laws of the early nineteenth century—excesses for which the American people grew ashamed when the antiforeign fever had passed.

Anxious Washington observers regard this phenomenon as quite natural and understandable, in view of the behavior of the Kremlin and its allies. But they wonder whether the public in general realizes how far the spirit of suppression of those famous four freedoms has extended at the Capital and elsewhere. They chalk it up as an unfortunate reaction which, although imposed upon us by Moscow, gives Communist propagandists a powerful argument against the greatest and oldest democracy of them all.

Frightened leaders of both major parties have been equally active in promoting these movements.

Although the administration originally pooh-poohed charges that many Commies had infiltrated its ranks during the New Deal regime, Mr. Truman quickly switched to what he considered the popular side. He sponsored a loyalty order which does not permit the accused to learn the charges against him, to enter any defense, or to appeal to the courts. It has been slightly modified, but it is still weighed against the legal rights of the individual.

He approved a proposed directive under which almost all news of executive activities could be withheld from the public. Under it a minor departmental official could label any document as top secret and anybody who revealed its contents thereafter could be discharged and otherwise punished.

These efforts at suppression of information, which would have enabled the Government to operate in the dark with respect to questions involving the national and individual security, were blocked only by newspaper exposés.

The proposed Hoffman Act called for the indictment of any Member of Congress who gave out news previously labeled as "confidential." It would also have penalized any reporter who contributed to its publication. When its significance became known—again through the press—leaders like Speaker MARTIN and majority leader HALLECK marked it for amendment or killing.

The same group which fathered the Hoffman bill—the House Committee on Un-American Activities—now demands the outlawing of the Communist Party and legal action against members of that organization.

Distinguished legal experts hold that such a law would be held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. But they offer the more practical argument that it would drive

Stalin's friends underground and make it more difficult to ferret them out for exposure or punishment.

With Washington setting such an example, the public has not failed to follow suit. Senator TAFT was picketed and vilified when he campaigned in prolabor sections. Riots and rough stuff have punctuated many Wallace meetings. Even President Truman has been booed. Violent clashes mark almost every pro or antilabor rally.

It looks as if Stalin has achieved his primary purpose by getting us to fight among ourselves. It is the same sort of Marxist-Lenin strategy which enabled him to divide and rule the Russians.

The Legal Status of United States Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in the New York Herald Tribune of May 16, 1948, appears an excellent dissertation on communism in this country. It is exceedingly apropos, appearing as it does, while we are in the midst of considering legislation to control communism here. I commend it to the attention of the Congress. It is as follows:

THE LEGAL STATUS OF UNITED STATES COMMUNISM—DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STASSEN AND DEWEY RAISES QUESTION OF EVIDENCE AGAINST REDS

(By Heptisax)

The difference of opinion between Mr. Harold E. Stassen and Gov. Thomas E. Dewey on how to deal with the exasperating Communists in this country will probably be of more popular interest for quite a while than any campaign issue that so far has arisen within Republican ranks. The essential difference is that Mr. Stassen believes that the Communist Party can be outlawed and so should be, without doing violence to the Bill of Rights; while Governor Dewey says that the outlawry of the loud-mouthed Reds would be a violation of the several amendments to the Constitution that safeguard our rights and liberties, and that he is unalterably opposed to it. It is unlikely that either will convince the other in any number of debates, formal or informal. But the reason that 9 out of 10 intelligent readers of the news are going to follow the dispute closely as long as it lasts is that there is this same difference of opinion within the mind of each. Each will be hoping, therefore, to be confirmed by Governor Dewey, or by Mr. Stassen, in one opinion or the other.

Nearly every one who has tried to follow the career of the American Communists is convinced, like Mr. Stassen, in spite of whatever their party constitution may say, that their long-range objective is the substitution of such a system as has been imposed on Russia for our political, economic, and social order, and that they are ready to work toward that by agitation, subversion, sabotage, and finally by violent action, as their spiritual kindred have in other countries. All such persons are as fully convinced as Mr. Stassen is that our native Stalinists operate under instructions from Moscow, and are devoted to the Soviet Union's interest above all else, because they look upon "the socialist fatherland" as the base for the world revolution and hope that the extension of its power in all other parts of the world will finally create conditions which will make revolution by conspiracy, or violence, or both, possible in the United States. Most of us, being fully convinced that the Communist party here has this character and these ambitions, are profoundly irked by the raucous clamor which the Reds constantly make for the protection of the sacred Constitution which Communist doings abroad convince us they would tear to shreds tomorrow if they could, and by the nasty hypocrisy of their appeals to the memories of Jefferson, Lincoln, and, latterly, of Franklin D. Roosevelt. We feel that they are making monkeys of us, and that they laugh cynically every day of their lives at the scrupulousness with which most of us insist their civil rights must be protected, while they work feverishly to get into a position from which they could dispense savage tyranny, à la Russe.

I presume to guess that neither Mr. Stassen nor Governor Dewey would find fault with what I have written up to this point; though each might want to improve on the wording of it. I don't think there are likely to be many doubts in the average citizen's mind about the situation as stated so far. But then the resentful citizen says to himself, or to his neighbor: "Since all this is common knowledge, why do we have to tolerate the machinations of these potential traitors? Why can't we outlaw them and put all known parties to the Red conspiracy where they can do no harm?" Now, what Mr. Stassen has had to say is in essence an echo of this popular sentiment, which all of us have shared in our angry moments.

But the essence of what Governor Dewey says in reply is: "Maybe we can do it, if we are reckless enough of consequences, but we dare not do it because 'common knowledge' is not evidence which any court would accept in the trial of a pickpocket; and when we start accepting 'common knowledge' as good enough evidence for herding sizable bodies of citizens into outlawry, our own security in our civil rights will be hopelessly breached." That is not what Governor Dewey has said in so many words. It is my interpretation of it; but, as I see it, the whole dispute about what to do with the Communists, without repudiating the charter of our own liberties, will turn upon the worth of the evidence that we have against them.

To make sure that the reader understands what I mean when I say that common knowledge is not evidence, let me cite an example. For some years, in the prohibition era, it was common knowledge that Al Capone headed various illegal enterprises and directed the activities of a small army of gangsters, deriving considerable wealth from it all. When mob feuds involved crimes of violence in Chicago, law enforcement officers speculated for publication on the possibility that Capone and company were involved, and innumerable stories about his power in the underworld were published throughout the land. He made no effort to conceal his wealth or to pretend that he had any legitimate source of income. Who did not know that he was responsible for big criminal operations? The answer is that, though his responsibility was common knowledge, nobody ever turned up the evidence to convince a court of his criminal responsibilities; so that, when he finally went to a Federal prison, he was guilty of tax evasion only and a technically innocent man otherwise.

Our Communist problem is a very similar one of getting evidence in support of common knowledge.

And what have we? Mr. Dewey has been quoted as saying in Portland, on May 3, of the FBI: "I venture the opinion that it has evidence right now of their acts, and if we had an administration that wanted to move, it could and would move today to convict them and get rid of them." He was speaking of important underground Red operators who are taking orders from Moscow. Now, I venture the opinion that, if such evidence exists, if the energetic Messrs. Stassen and Dewey can get it into the open, and if it implicates Communist Party officers as such, public opinion will strongly support Mr. Stassen's demand for the outlawry of the party, and will be little moved by Governor Dewey's and Mr. J. Edgar Hoover's contention that it would be inexpedient to drive communism underground. But, meanwhile, what kind of evidence do we have to prove that the Communists are potential revolutionaries and traitors under the Kremlin's discipline? There is more than enough to satisfy me, but I'll admit that it is all circumstantial, sometimes only inferential, and often negative only Such evidence could be assembled in tremendous volume, but whether the whole bulk of it would look like evidence to the Supreme Court, for example, I do not pretend to know. But let me give a few samples at random.

Ever since the first of the year Moscow has been stridently reminding the world that Marx and Engels drafted the Communist Manifesto, a kind of creed for the Communist League, in 1848, and that successful revolutions in many quarters this year would be fitting celebrations of this centenary.

No one can have forgotten how, in that period when Hitler and Stalin were in cahoots, from August 1939 to June 1941, our Communists ranted against defense preparations, denounced Roosevelt as a warmonger, promoted labor trouble in west coast airplane factories, had their peace mobilizers picket the White House, and shouted everywhere that the "Yanks aren't coming." Also no one can have forgotten how this whole line was instantly abandoned when Hitler turned on Stalin, and how the shout went up that "the Yanks aren't coming too late." Also no one can forget who was in London, Chungking, or New York in August 1939, when the Hitler-Stalin entente was announced, how all Red publications went into a dead editorial silence for 2 or 3 days. That worldwide pause for breath might not convince a court that all were waiting to be told how to explain the stunning news, and that the identical line adopted all over the world was no proof of collusion between the Kremlin and party leaders in other countries; but it satisfied me.

In the way of purely negative evidence, as a fairly close reader of Communist publicity I find it worthy of remark that I have never yet found a line of mild criticism, in any party paper, of any Soviet Russian policy anywhere; or any act, however outrageous, perpetrated in the Red puppet states by a local Red dictator. Nor have I ever seen a word of feeble support given an American policy that threatened to run counter to Soviet Russian policy. This I'll admit proves nothing. But, if they would only be a little out of line occasionally, I might not conclude from this slavishly faithful service to Soviet Russia and her agents and disservice to the United States and our friends that our own Reds form no opinions independently of the Kremlin. They protest vehemently here that they never have advocated and never will advocate the promotion of their cause by violent or extraconstitutional means. If they did not so heartily approve violent and irregular Red methods elsewhere, I'd be open to persuasion that these asseverations were nothing more than eyewash.

If they would only once in a while say that the torture and slaughter of landlords by their confreres there in China was against their principles as Americans; or that they deplored juridical murder in Yugoslavia, Rumania, Poland, and Bulgaria as a device to which they would never resort; or that the abominable treatment of German, Hun-

garian, and Jewish minorities in Czechoslovakia, which the Reds there encouraged and exploited, was out of harmony with their championship of minorities here; or that the encouragement which their General Markos, hero of the popular movement of liberation from American-backed Greek reactionaries, has been giving to assassins in Athens by radio, didn't quite meet with their approval; or that the bestial conduct of the glorious Red Army in Hungary was naughty-naughty; or that Communist efforts to keep the south Korean population from the polls by terroristic methods were a little rougher than they would like to see practiced here, I might be less skeptical.

I have here a 20-cent near-silver piece, with the hammer and sickle on it, coined by the Chinese Soviet Republic when the benevolent "agrarian reformers" were at the peak of their career of savagery in south China, which I will send any Red who will convince me why I shouldn't accept this as evidence that his party would not indulge in such practices here—if it dared try.

South Dakota Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, recently there came to my attention an outline of South Dakota's laws affecting veterans, their dependents, and their organizations, compiled by Victor L. Van Leuven, department adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans, 407 South Street, Rapid City, S. Dak.

Most of the potential beneficiaries under these State laws are not aware of the valuable rights, privileges, exemptions, and benefits available to them, under certain circumstances, and therefore I am hopeful that this résumé of South Dakota's veteran laws will come to their attention.

The outline is as follows:

BONUS

A proposed bonus to World War II veterans is to be submitted to the voters in the 1948 general election, providing for payment of 50 cents for each day of domestic service and 75 cents for each day of foreign service.

Veteran must have been a legal resident for at least 6 months prior to entering the service and must have served 90 days or more between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945; must have been discharged under conditions other than dishonorable, or still be in the armed forces.

Payment would have to be made by December 31, 1950.

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Counties may appropriate money to pay the burial expenses of indigent veterans, their wives or widows. Interment cannot be in a potter's field.

A State allowance not exceeding $100 is available for the burial of veterans, their wives, or widows.

Counties may appropriate money to purchase burial plots for indigent veterans, their wives, or widows, and provide for the perpetual care thereof.

Records have been compiled by the State board of health relating to the death and burial of veterans and for maintaining a uniform record system throughout the State. The military department and veterans' organizations assist in obtaining cemetery maps and filing information relating to unregistered burials and other records. Each grave located is to be designated by a separate and distinct uniform marker. A burial permit must contain the military record of the decedent, which record must be filed monthly with the veterans' department of the State.

The county judge is required to apply to the United States for a suitable headstone for veterans. An allowance of $5 is provided for setting the stone in place.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

A conservator for the property of missing members of the armed forces may be appointed by the courts.

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments executed by members of the armed forces.

Administration of oaths and execution of affidavits is provided.

Disability of minority is removed for qualified veterans (or spouse) under the GI bill of rights.

Powers of attorney granted by persons serving in or present with the armed forces are not revoked or terminated without actual notice of the revocation by death or otherwise.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Absentee voting by members of the armed forces is provided.

A State commission enumerated all persons who served in World War II. They did not lose their residence by reason of such absence.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

Certified copies of records are furnished by clerks of courts free of charge when required in support of claims for benefits for veterans or their widows.

Certified copies of vital statistics records are furnished veterans or their dependents free of charge when required in support of claims for benefits.

Free copies of public records are available for wards of the Veterans' Administration under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

The clerk of court is required to furnish, without charge, copies of documents necessary to obtain certain benefits on behalf of veterans under guardianship.

Discharge papers are recorded free of charge by the register of deeds and certified copies are furnished when requested.

It is the duty of the director of the veterans' department, under control of the veterans' commission, to aid in meeting the emergency needs of dependents of men and women in the armed services and to represent the interest of war veterans and their dependents in claims they have against the Federal Government or other agencies growing out of the service of such veterans.

The board of county commissioners may employ a county service officer, who is an honorably discharged veteran, to coordinate State and Federal with local veterans' activities.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS; QUALIFICATION FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

Public-school privileges are extended, free of charge, to all honorably discharged veterans.

Free tuition is available for war veterans in State educational institutions.

Tuition may be waived by school boards or boards of education in any district for nonresident veterans.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Preference is given to a wartime veteran for appointment as director of the State veterans' department.

Preference is given to veterans in public departments, on public works of State and local units, and for appointment as county service officers.

Benefit rights are preserved under the Unemployment Compensation Act.

A uniform second injury act has been enacted.

GUARDIANSHIP

A guardian may be appointed for persons entitled to benefits under the War Risk Insurance and World War Veterans' Acts.

A Uniform Veterans Guardianship Act has been enacted, providing for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran or the minor child of a veteran, to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward. When no suitable person will so act the State veterans' department has the authority to designate an employee to act.

HOMES

Veterans, their wives or widows, may be admitted to the soldiers' home.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

LAND SETTLEMENT BENEFITS

Preference is extended to veterans under the Land Settlement Act.

RECORDS, RELICS, ETC.

A historical commission for World War II has been created.

The State historical society has compiled and published a history of the participation of South Dakota men and women in World War I.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Appropriations are made to provide care for Civil War veterans, their wives or widows, physically unable to go to the soldiers' home for care and treatment.

A war veterans' fund has been appropriated, permitting loans up to $500 to be advanced by the veterans' commission to needy veterans and their dependents.

Savings and loan associations may make or buy and sell any loan, secured or unsecured, which is guaranteed under the GI bill of rights.

Municipalities of the first class are authorized to appropriate funds to issue bonds to provide, operate, and maintain temporary housing for World War II veterans and their families.

Any veteran discharged other than dishonorably up to January 1, 1948, may be restored and reinstated, who at time of entrance into service was qualified to practice any profession, trade, science, or business requiring a license to so practice, without any examination or complying with any rules or regulations. This is retroactive.

TAX EXEMPTIONS; EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

A game bird hunting license may be issued to any nonresident in the armed forces at a nominal fee while stationed in the State.

Pension or compensation received from the United States by veterans is exempt from income tax.

All members of the armed forces are exempt from payment of all interest and penalties on taxes accumulating while in service on all real and personal property owned upon entering the service.

All members of the armed forces are exempt from any and all poll taxes and, if subsequently discharged honorably, are exempt for life from any and all said poll taxes.

A county judge may commit a person mentally ill, but not insane, or convicted of a crime, to a State or Federal hospital for treatment not to exceed 90 days. This applies particularly to veterans who are alcoholics.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

An appropriation is made to aid in keeping a permanent record of the proceedings of the South Dakota Department of the United Spanish War Veterans.

Protection is afforded insignia of veterans' organizations.

It is the privilege of veterans' organizations to assist in the collection of information relating to the burial places of veterans.

Many of the above laws have been enacted by the Legislature of South Dakota through the sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veteran organizations.

At the present time there are some 14 chapters of the DAV throughout the State, most of which have part-time service and employment officers, assisting veterans in their own communities.

In addition to this service on a local level, the DAV maintains an expertly trained full-time national service officer, Arthur Muchow, at the Veterans' Administration regional office, post office box 434, Sioux Falls, S. Dak., who extends all types of assistance to veterans and their dependents, particularly in the technical preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their justifiable claims for various types of governmental benefits to which they may be justly entitled.

DAV MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official voice of America's disabled defenders.

According to its congressional charter of incorporation, Public Law 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law 668, approved July 15, 1942, active membership in the DAV is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities incurred during, or by reason of, active service during time of war in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it.

More and more wounded and disabled veterans of World War II are becoming active members of the DAV.

Eligibles may become life members upon payment of a fee of $100—$50, if born before January 1, 1902—in cash, or by a down-payment of $5 or more, plus such installments as will complete payment of the full fee by the end of the second succeeding fiscal year—ending June 30—after which, if not fully paid, a carrying charge of $5 per year would accrue. A growing percentage are becoming life members. Annual membership is available at $5.

DAV NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Located at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio, the national headquarters takes care of all administrative matters and records, and publishes the DAV semimonthly newspaper, containing accurate, up-to-date information of interest and of value to disabled veterans and their dependents.

The present national commander of the DAV is John L. Golob, of Hibbing, Minn., a severely wounded World War I veteran, who has had a broad background of experience in various local, State, and National DAV activities which qualify him to lead such an organization.

Its national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-treasurer (business manager) of the organization, and editor of its newspaper, since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his able assistant.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The national service headquarters of the DAV is now located in a beautiful building at 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., which was acquired by the outfit in 1945.

In this Washington office are located the Department for Claims, headed by William E. Tate the Department on Legislation, headed by Francis Sullivan; and the Department of Public Relations and Employment, headed by my good friend, Millard W. Rice, who is an alumnus of the University of South Dakota.

In addition to these service departments it has as office manager John E. Freighner, assistant national adjutant. All of these various departments are staffed by trained experts, all of whom are themselves war wounded or disabled veterans.

These DAV national officers know all about the technical complications that disabled veterans must overcome factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration, under the limitations and restrictions of existing law.

Understanding such vexatious problems by personal experience, DAV National Service Officers are naturally more sympathetic than are non-disabled veterans or civilians and are, therefore, generally more effective in helping disabled claimants to comply with technical requirements to prove legal entitlement to benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The DAV has adopted, on a Nationwide basis, a man-job-matching method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans. Less than 7% of the Nation's 2,200,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally unemployable. The remaining 93% are less than totally disabled and must, therefore, supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment.

This scientific approach to a most distressing problem has produced some worth-while results thus far. The handicapped veteran's remaining abilities have been matched with the requirements of the job, rather than stressing his disabilities.

It has been demonstrated by the employment record of such disabled veterans that they have a low absentee record, a low turn-over record, a low accident record, and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been proven that to hire disabled veterans is just plain, good business, bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers, and to taxpayers generally.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation—its military and naval services during time of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as with those who are, or have been dependent upon these heroes, so that other young men who, in the future, may be called upon to make similar sacrifices, will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that if they, too, should also be so unfortunate they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported, as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth, and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

As one who has worked on veterans problems both as a member of a veterans' organization since World War I and as a member of the congressional committee handling appropriations for veterans' affairs for several years, it is a pleasure for me to commend the service program of the DAV; it merits the consideration and support of the entire country.

Reciprocal Trade Act Must Be Extended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERE COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I was a member of the Committee on Ways and Means when the Reciprocal Trade Act was first passed in 1934. For 14 years this policy of the Congress has earned the overwhelming support of the American people. It would indeed be a backward step either to fail to renew the act, or to attach restrictive amendments.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Trade Agreements Act Must Be Renewed" by Hon. W. Averell Harriman, Secretary of Commerce, from the Democratic Digest of April 1948:

TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT MUST BE RENEWED

(By W. Averell Harriman, Secretary of Commerce)

In June of this year the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act comes up for renewal by the Congress. For 14 years this program for reciprocal tariff reduction has been the cornerstone of our foreign economic policy. It has been renewed by the Congress four successive times, and over the years has gained increasing popular understanding and approval.

Nevertheless the fight for renewal of the trade agreements program this year promises to be the most difficult yet. In part this will be due to the continued bitter opposition of a small number of special interests who, more out of fear and misapprehension than actual hurt, have long fought for special protection and high trade barriers.

The greater danger to the trade agreements program, however, is not so much opposition

as neglect. The grave crisis which exists in western Europe and the efforts which the people of those countries are making to restore their productivity and resist the tide of totalitarianism commands the attention of the free world. To help the countries of western Europe make their plans for recovery effective we are now developing a European recovery program. Since the spotlight has been turned on ERP and day-to-day developments in western Europe the trade agreements program, perhaps because of its long-range character, has been left in the shadows.

ERP ONLY ONE PHASE

Adequate and timely action on ERP is absolutely essential, but it must never be forgotten that ERP is but one major phase of our economic foreign policy. The establishment of an International Trade Organization and the drafting of a world trade charter as a code of international commercial ethics is a major element. Another is, of course, the trade agreements program. In a very real sense these are all parts of a single whole and each depends upon the others.

Since before the war our national efforts have been directed toward the building of world economic prosperity through cooperative action with other countries. We have come to recognize that prosperity in the world—like freedom—is indivisible. Prosperity elsewhere is essential to prosperity in America. No nation in an impoverished and unproductive world can long maintain its standards of life.

European recovery will be temporary at best unless the countries of western Europe can look forward to a time when trading relationships among nations are on a more balanced and rational basis. In the chaotic economic conditions which have existed since the end of the war, a multitude of new and dangerous restrictions to trade have been developed. Quantitative restrictions, state trading and currency controls have come into vogue which make tariff barriers seem almost old-fashioned. Unless the countries of western Europe can see their way clear in the long run to develop their trade on the basis of multilateralism and fair dealing, it is difficult to see how they will ever become fully self-supporting and productive. If world trade travels further down the ever-narrowing road of bilateralism, barter and political preference, it can mean only growing economic and political difficulties for all concerned.

This is simply to say that the International Trade Organization and the Reciprocal Trade Agreements program are both essential to the long-run success of ERP.

Conversely, the International Trade Organization and reciprocal trade agreements program can hope to achieve their goals only if ERP achieves a substantial measure of success. At the present time, because of the devastation and dislocation of war, world trade is seriously out of balance. Countries that formerly were highly productive are now barely able to sustain themselves at a minimum level of life. The United States, because of its immense productivity has become the supplier of essential materials to a large part of the world. Because of the disruption of production abroad, we have exported in recent years much more than we have been able to import. The lack of goods available for import has in its wake brought foreign exchange problems and a world-wide shortage of dollars. The countries unable to produce and sell goods to us have not been able to earn funds with which to pay for the things they require from us.

TRADE NOW UNBALANCED

Unless and until production is restored and greater stability is achieved in the great workshop of western Europe, it will be impossible to bring trading relationships into better balance. Prosperous conditions in Europe are essential to our trade not only with that area, but also with other parts of the world. For example, South Africa, Canada, and South American countries have long obtained the funds with which to make purchases in the United States by means of their export surpluses to Europe.

In this fundamental sense the European recovery program is basic to future progress under the trade-agreements program and the proposed International Trade Organization.

The record of the trade-agreements program over the years has been one of continuous achievement. Up until the end of the recent war trade agreements had been negotiated with 29 other countries. They covered an important segment of the commerce between ourselves and the rest of the world. Although they were in operation during a period of extreme abnormality—first, depression and then war and the aftermath of war—they nevertheles demonstrated their effectiveness. Trade statistics show that since 1934 our trade with countries that joined with us in tariff agreements increased more than our trade with other countries with whom we were not able to agree on reciprocal reductions.

LANDMARK IN COOPERATION

The latest and greatest achievement under the act was the general agreement on tariffs and trade drawn up last summer in Geneva. This agreement was negotiated by 23 countries which granted tariff concessions to each other on products accounting for one-half of the total foreign trade of the world. Since the United States accounts for about one-fifth and the other countries for four-fifths of the total trade covered by this agreement, the reduction of barriers will expand trade not only of the United States with other countries, but also the trade of other countries among themselves. This was the most comprehensive attempt ever made to reduce world trade barriers. It represents a landmark in the history of cooperative international undertakings.

The general agreement had an immediate and important effect. It was a symbol of American leadership since it grew directly out of an American idea. Because it represented concrete action it demonstrated that the most important trading nations in the world meant business when they professed their faith in the expansion of trade and the reduction of trade barriers. It showed that they could work together in that effort. It did not cure our present difficulties, but it gave solid cause for hope that in the long run our difficulties could be cured.

POINT HAS BEEN PROVED

The general agreement will not, of course, in itself result in an immediate expansion of our trade. Shortages of goods, disruption of production in many countries, and the lack of foreign exchange still control world economic relations today. But as conditions improve, the concessions arrived at in Geneva will increasingly have their effect.

Fourteen years of progress under the trade-agreements program is testimony to the increasing understanding among Americans and people elsewhere of the benefits to be derived from expanded world trade on a multilateral basis. Many Americans have been fearful of the competition in our markets of foreign goods made by "cheap foreign labor," just as people abroad have been fearful of the competition of "cheap machine-made American goods." These fears have been allayed only as people everywhere have seen in terms of their own lives and their own welfare the benefits of what the economists call the "geographical specialization of labor." In more simple terms, this means that when the people of each country do those things for which they are best fitted, then they and the other countries with whom they trade are all better off.

We trade for goods of all kinds, which range from luxuries to absolute necessities—from Belgian lace and French gloves to table sugar and fats and oils for making soap. From tapioca, ginger, and cocoa for the kitchen to asphalt for our roads and rubber for automobile tires, the list is almost endless.

The things we import provide us with pleasures and comforts as well as indispensable supplies. Some are things we ourselves do not have; some are items which we have, but not in sufficient amounts; and some are things which we could produce—such as hothouse bananas—but only at exorbitant cost. By importing we thereby help hold down the cost of living.

On the other hand, the things we export provide jobs and markets for American farmers and workers. At the present time roughly 1 American in 12 makes his living by producing goods for sale abroad.

More and more Americans are beginning to understand that we are running low on many of the basic materials needed to sustain our industrial civilization. It is a curious fact that many of us, long accustomed to the security of a continent richly endowed with natural resources, have failed to understand fully that we are in many items becoming a "have not" nation.

BASIC MINERALS SCARCE

The Bureau of Mines of the Department of Interior has made very clear the grim facts of our present situation with respect to raw materials. Their experts have stated that the United States now has less than a 35-year peacetime commercial supply of some 21 basic minerals, including petroleum, copper, lead, zinc, bauxite, antimony, tungsten, platinum, manganese, chromite, and nickel. Many of these are of the highest importance in time of peace, and absolutely essential strategic materials in the event of war. To protect our dwindling domestic reserves of many of these items, and to obtain others of which we have no supply or an inadequate supply, a high level of imports is indispensable.

In brief, the time has come when we've got to import to live, and more Americans are realizing that. The trade-agreements program is a vital part of our present and long-range efforts to protect and expand our own standards of life and help other countries to help themselves.

In his memoirs, Cordell Hull, under whose leadership the reciprocal trade agreements program was largely developed, described his satisfaction when President Roosevelt signed the original act in 1934. "At 9:15 on the night of June 12 I watched the President sign the bill in the White House," Mr. Hull wrote. "Each stroke of the pen seemed to write a message of gladness on my heart. My fight of many years for the reciprocal trade policy and the lowering of trade barriers was won."

We have traveled a long road of progress since that June night, culminating in the General Agreement at Geneva. In a larger sense, however, the fight for the lowering of trade barriers is not yet won. Again this year we must see to it that the Congress renews existing legislation without mutilating amendments. Otherwise, the work which already has been done will be seriously jeopardized.

We need extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for three basic reasons:

First, to enable the United States to negotiate tariff agreements with other countries that might want to join the General Agreement of Geneva.

Second, to enable the United States to negotiate revisions in the General Agreement when changing world economic conditions necessitate revisions.

Third, to permit continued leadership of the United States in its program to expand international trade. The importance of this third point in particular cannot be overestimated. We have taken the initiative in the world-wide effort for reconstruction and the development of trade. Free people

everywhere look to us for encouragement and guidance. Our influence in world affairs has become decisive. We must therefore in all our actions behave responsibly and with full consideration of the effects of what we do upon others.

As President Truman said in his message to Congress on March 1 of this year, "The importance of the Trade Agreements Act is greater today than it has ever been. Together with other nations we are engaging in a mighty endeavor to build a prosperous and peaceful world. The financial assistance we have already contributed and the further aid we shall give to nations in Europe and elsewhere constitute a tremendous investment toward world economic recovery. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act by stimulating and increasing flow of trade among nations will contribute strongly to the achievement of this objective. Its extension is essential if we are to complete the work we have begun."

Marines Are Told Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, an incident has taken place which bothers the true friends of labor—those who would like to see labor leaders apply the efforts of organized labor to legitimate aims in good taste. This incident was that unfortunate one over in New Jersey where members of a chauffeurs union shoved some Marines aside when they sought to carry the body of a buddy who had fallen on Iwo Jima.

I shall not try to describe the details of the incident. I merely wish to put in the RECORD two editorial comments upon it, and let the statements speak for themselves. They follow:

[From the New York Daily News of April 28, 1948]

HOW TO LOSE FRIENDS AND ENRAGE PEOPLE

James J. Donnelly, Jr., of Jersey City, N. J., enlisted in the Marine Corps August 13, 1942. He fought through Bougainville and Guam, and for 17 days on Iwo Jima. The bullet bearing his name found him on Iwo, while he was trying to rescue a wounded pal.

Young Donnelly's body was brought home last week and sent to his family for reburial. Eight marines from the Bayonne Naval Base were assigned to act as pallbearers at the funeral scheduled for Monday of this week.

At that point, the AFL United Funeral Chauffeurs and Helpers Union of Jersey City stepped into the picture. This organization in its majesty decreed that the eight marines could not be active pallbearers for one of their own men killed in line of duty. Union rules required that six members of the funeral chauffeurs and helpers outfit must carry the casket from the funeral home to the church, and then place it in the hearse.

Protests were filed with union officials, but they stood their ground. The organized pallbearers went through with the performance as scheduled. Only after the casket reached the grave were the marines permitted to take active part in the services.

The deceased's mother remarked that "if a boy gave his life fighting for his country, I think the least the union could have done is to permit him to be borne on the shoulders of his comrades."

But that made no never mind to the union. The six union pallbearers had to get theirs regardless.

Some fellow once wrote a book called How To Win Friends and Influence People. If Bill Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, should ever feel the urge to write a book telling his boys to lose friends for union labor, and enrage a lot of people, he might well lead off with this Donnelly funeral incident.

[From the Chicago Journal of Commerce of May 3, 1948]

MARINES ARE ROUTED

From the halls of Montezuma to the shores of Tripoli the United States Marines have vanquished their enemies. But the United Funeral Chauffeurs and Helpers of New Jersey (AFL) are apparently a mightier force than the leathernecks.

Eight marines in dress uniform were shunted aside from their posts by the casket of a dead buddy. Six "professional" bearers took over the task of rendering a last service to the late private of marines—at $4 per service, each.

The body was that of a 23-year-old lad who died on Iwo Jima trying to rescue a fallen comrade. Close observers may find a certain contrast between the final action of the fallen warrior and those of his unwelcome pallbearers—a contrast between supreme generosity and a greed which will not be denied even on the brink of the grave.

Today the air is filled with the shouts of political campaigners shrieking for the defeat of candidates who had dared to espouse the Taft-Hartley slave labor bill. Yet acts like that of the funeral chaffeurs' and helpers' union demonstrate that what the Nation needs is more restraint, not less.

There is no moral justification for a union's forcing its services upon those who do not desire them. There should be no legal sanction for this practice.

Judging from the Jersey City incident the impudence of certain labor unions is unabashed even in the presence of death. No doubt, if these gentry had their way, the very harpists among the angels would have to pay tribute to some celestial Petrillo.

The public is sympathetic to the genuine prerogatives of labor. But when a group of marines are elbowed away from the coffin of a comrade by a half dozen dollar-hungry unionists, people of good will are liable to feel more than a little burned up.

Address by Crawford H. Greenewalt Before United States Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. DOUGLASS BUCK
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 18 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, week before last, when the United States Chamber of Commerce held its annual meeting in Washington, the principal speaker at the annual dinner was a young man who recently had been elected president of the E. I. du Pont de Nemours Co., Mr. Crawford H. Greenewalt. Mr. Greenewalt's address was an exceptionally able one; it has been widely and favorably commented on; and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are facing today a crisis in our country's affairs and in the affairs of the world that may well turn out to be the most serious in our history. We see a world ravaged by the results of a devastating war. That war has destroyed many lives and much property, but what is far more important, it has brought about a spiritual decline, a loss of moral fiber in those countries which have borne the major brunt of that conflict. We have proved once more that war is wasteful and degrading; and in the face of that clear demonstration, repeated many times in history, it seems utterly fantastic that reasoning human beings can continue to rely on force and aggression to resolve their difficulties. Our victory has solved no problems, but seems rather to have nourished new and dangerous ideologies, born of want and despair.

In these troubled times the eyes of the world are upon this Nation. Those eyes look upon us with mixed emotions—some with envy for the material things we have, some with the conviction that our way of life must be destroyed if their own is to prosper, some with the hope that we will lead them to new faith and security. But all of those eyes see us, I believe, as the last great fortress of individual liberty.

CONFLICT IN BELIEFS

The core of the present crisis is a conflict of basic beliefs—a conflict between a community of free individuals determining their own destiny, and a community in which each human thought and action is degraded to a condition of complete subservience to the state.

These events have brought to this Nation an opportunity for world leadership which in self-defense it must accept. In accepting it, it seems to me that we must first search our own hearts and minds to see how we have come to the high place we now occupy. We must find within ourselves the courage and conviction to maintain that high place and to discharge the responsibility that greatness invariably brings.

It must be abundantly clear that our strength rests securely on those two vital principles first stated in the Declaration of Independence—that each citizen of this country shall have equality of opportunity—that he shall have individual liberty to pursue his own destiny and to rise to whatever heights his talents will permit.

Our Constitution is founded on these great concepts. Our form of government has been chosen deliberately to safeguard them against attack by demagogs within our boundaries or by aggressors without. Together they provide our people that incentive to strive toward some goal of our own selection, which is man's greatest driving force. Together they assure us the right to retain for our own enjoyment the fruits of our enterprise.

NOT YET THE MILLENNIUM

If we had perfected the practice of Christianity, material incentive would be unnecessary since we would then be content to work for the good of man because of the spiritual reward that service would bring. Unfortunately, we have not reached that millenium, and incentive is essential to drive us forward.

Perhaps in the last analysis the perfection of our motives makes little difference, for no great individual effort, even though motivated by self-interest, has ever failed to carry forward many people in its wake. The big contributions to all progress have been made by a mere handful of individuals, yet their personal rewards are dwarfed to insignificance by the benefits those developments have brought to millions of people. The personal rewards of a Thomas Edison—large as they were—are infinitesimal compared to the

wealth his genius created for millions of Americans.

In speaking about our Constitution and the atmosphere it has created, I am not suggesting that we wrap ourselves in the trappings of the past. No group of men, no matter how great their wisdom, could have written a document in 1787 which would be a complete and full answer to the problems of 1948. The vital thing about that document is its flexibility. It is a dynamic and not a static instrument. It has only one changeless feature—the rights and dignity of man.

It seems to me that the principal thing we have to offer the world is our faith—our fundamental belief in man's freedom of opportunity—our belief in his inherent dignity—that the world is peopled by individuals and not by governments.

REBIRTH OF FAITH IS NEEDED

But man cannot live by faith alone. We must have material substance if we are to aid others; we must have material strength if we are successfully to resist aggression. But it is vitally important to realize that material assistance and material strength can be of no avail unless the faith of the freedom-loving people of the world can be reborn.

If we are to make that attempt, we must make certain that we believe these things ourselves. We must be firm and sure in the fundamental conviction that these principles are the foundation of any material success or spiritual well-being we have or may attain.

It is important to see that the industrial economy which has characterized our development is the result of our freedom to work out our destiny as we chose. We could have become, had we elected to do so, a nation of farmers, or a nation of craftsmen, or a nation of seafarers. We are a nation of free men and we chose an industrial economy. We have become strong in that direction, and it is that industrial power that will enable us to contribute most effectively to a solution of the world's ills.

I have spent the greater part of my working life in scientific endeavors and I have learned by hard experience one guiding principle common to all scientific researches—never to discard the results of a well-demonstrated experiment in favor of a hypothesis that denies those results.

That principle is no less valid in economic and political than in scientific fields. We in the United States launched, some 160 years ago, an experiment in government and economics. While the results have not been perfect, it is nonetheless true that the experiment, by any test that could be applied, has turned out successfully—so successfully that it has never been matched in the long sweep of history in giving such great benefits to such a multitude of people.

THE SEMANTICS OF SLAVERY

Set off against this experiment, we see theories which maintain that our system holds out no hope for humanity, that the only chance for the world—for the United States itself—is to turn to increasing control and domination by government. Socialism, fascism, nazism, communism—they differ only in degree as to application, and the end results of any of them differ not at all. They are semantic rungs in a ladder that reaches from freedom to slavery.

Even if these concepts were only theoretical, we should not be justified in allowing them to persuade us to discard the successful results of our experiment. But there is also experience to go on. These various government-control theories have one thing in common. It is that they have never worked. Whenever and wherever they have been tried, the inevitable result has been decline and despair, chaos, and collapse, sometimes preceded by war, sometimes not.

In the face of this record of constant failure on the one hand, and of success beyond the most optimistic dreams on the other, it seems to me the sheerest madness for any American to allow himself to surrender any part of the faith that has made our experiment successful.

For that faith is the heart and core of our success. Without it we certainly cannot hope to succeed in the future. Without it we cannot hope to convince others that of all the economic and political theories the world has known, ours gives the most to the most people.

FAITH MORE IMPORTANT THAN PROPERTY

And yet if the world is to move forward instead of backward those others must be convinced. I am sure that the rehabilitation of faith is more important than the rehabilitation of property. The material aid we may extend to Europe will avail little by itself. The essence of the European problem is not physical, or material, but one of recreating faith in the ability of the incentive economy to function.

Let us decide, then, first of all, whether we still believe in the results of that great experiment, in those principles of freedom, and, if we do, let us reaffirm their strength validity and eternal vigor. Let us reaffirm it, not halfheartedly and apologetically, but with pride and profound conviction. For those principles are this country's greatest potential export to a disillusioned world.

I have stressed the importance of reaffirming our own beliefs because I fear we have already descended a few rungs on our ladder of freedom. We have accepted Government controls of many sorts; we have accepted a crushing burden of taxation, and we have bartered away some of our freedom as citizens in return for questionable doctrines.

There is involved here a delicate balance. It is manifestly not possible for everyone to have absolute and unlimited freedom. Each of us has agreed, for the common good, to surrender some part of his individual sovereignty to government, so that no individual shall infringe upon or curtail the freedom of others. This is as it should be, for we have not reached that millennium, under which no such controls would be necessary. At the same time, I think we must insist that those controls be held to the minimum consistent with the maintenance of our democratic principles, and that the Government enforce them as an impartial umpire, for the good of the entire country and not for the benefit of any group or groups.

INDUSTRIAL STATESMANSHIP

I have said before that we have selected of our own free choice an industrial economy. It is on that economy that we must rely for our ability to deal both with the world's problems and with our own. To weaken that economy, to rob it of its vitality endangers our national security—yet that seems to be the direction we are taking. The situation appears to me to call for industrial statesmanship of the highest order. That statesmanship, to succeed, must be objective, unselfish, and keyed to the Nation's good.

This is fundamental, but this alone is not enough. Our industrial leaders have a further responsibility which they must exercise. They must take an active part in explaining and defending our economy so that it will be understood by the people. They must be articulate in behalf of the things they stand for.

It would be a fine thing if good deeds spoke for themselves, but they can do so only if the public knows about them. It is high time that the American people are informed of what is right about their system as well as what is wrong with it.

We must make it clear that our industrial economy is a partnership operating for the benefit of every citizen; that it brings us goods and services in great profusion; that it brings prosperity and happiness to our workers; and that it recognizes the rights of property and the merits of thrift by offering a return to those who, having saved, are willing to risk their savings in venture capital to provide the tools for our national production.

Each one of these partners in our industrial economy has his incentive. All of those incentives stem from the same root and, if cultivated, will accomplish results which are for the universal good. We must reject any move that destroys those incentives, since in destroying them we are destroying ourselves and our potentialities.

THE FAILURE IN BRITAIN

We have seen the results of many political experiments that have failed, that have not withstood the test of time, and that have brought unhappiness and lower living standards to the people concerned. In England more than 150 years ago, the industrial revolution was born, and we saw at that time a great transition to an industrial economy. Great Britain for years was one of the foremost industrial nations of this earth, her people strong and her living standards high. Today she is struggling for existence.

She has, of course, suffered greatly as a result of the ravages of two wars, and certainly no nation has given more generously of herself in those conflicts. But her present difficulties go much deeper than that.

There was a failure to recognize the vitalizing effect of free competition and the importance of that competition in insuring a dynamic economy. The willingness to forego competition for the sake of freezing the status quo has rendered the economies of England and Europe progressively less able to meet competition from elsewhere.

England has also suffered for many years under a system of taxation that effectively thwarts all enterprise based on personal incentive. Of what good is it to venture, to plan, and to build, if no gain can come from the success of that venture? History has shown that people are not sufficiently altruistic to work where there is no likelihood of reward.

The final result is nationalization, since only government is left with the money to rejuvenate old industries and to create new ones. And yet when has government, lacking the owner's eye, ever matched the performance of individual enterprise which knows that failure means poverty and oblivion?

THE TROUBLE WITH TAXES

To our great credit we have in this country made very sure that there will be freedom of competition; that there will be no freezing of the status quo; that each enterprise must look to its own laurels and must never cease striving if it is to maintain its position in our industrial scene.

Our present system of taxation, however, goes to the opposite extreme. We have seen during the past year the difficulties all of our corporations, large and small, are having to secure the capital funds with which to carry on the plant expansions they consider necessary and prudent. We know conclusively that the source of venture capital lies in the aggregate savings of those with incomes in excess of $10,000 a year, and it is in this area that our tax laws are most nearly confiscatory. It seems almost tragic that at a time when our strength should be at its maximum we should be undermining the incentives that create that strength.

Here again we are denying the clearest possible evidence; we are denying the results of experiments proved conclusively over many decades. In England we have seen a great industrial power brought low because a people permitted their government to remove private incentive. In this country we have seen an industrial economy grow great and strong because over a long period of time private incentive was given free rein. Against this showing how can anyone deny the vigor

and strength of free enterprise, and embrace the debility that its destruction creates?

WE HAVE NO MIDAS TOUCH

This is not politics or economics; it is basic human nature. I do not know why it should be necessary to belabor a point that seems so obvious. We cannot argue that our natural resources are the most abundant in the world, for they are not. We cannot contend that the problems of production here are less than elsewhere, for they are not. We cannot contend that for us, and us alone, providence intended the cornucopia of plenty, for we have been given no Midas touch.

Certainly our success can be attributed to none of these things.

Yet we have become the most powerful nation on earth. We have found the way to produce in great profusion the things that our people need, whether it be to enjoy a peace or to fight a war.

Our citizens have, per capita, more goods and services than any others in the world. To secure those goods and services we work shorter hours with more time for leisure. We give more attention to education, amusement and self-improvement. We have better facilities for the care of the sick and unfortunate. And with it all, through public and private pension systems, we give security in old age far beyond anything contemplated as recently as the time when most of us in this room were in school.

Even in the depths of the depression of 1932, when our industrial machine had slowed to a snail's pace, most of our citizens still had a standard of living higher than that of other peoples in their periods of prosperity.

We have done all this only because we were free and only because we let man's incentive have full rein. We have done it because we have a system that inspires the greatest effort by the individual. It is free individual incentive and enterprise that is America's greatest national resource.

THE TRUE LIBERALISM

How then can we afford today to permit any infringement of that incentive? To permit such infringement is not liberalism, but its exact opposite. To prevent such infringement is the true liberalism, to which we must adhere.

It is particularly vital today that we be strong and that we keep our industrial system at its maximum vigor and intensity. This would be true even if we had only ourselves to think of. But, in addition to this, we are giving of our substance to assist in the physical rehabilitation of war-torn nations. This great effort can be made effective only if in making it we do not weaken ourselves.

Perhaps also the seeds of another world conflict are being sown. We must not, if it can possibly be avoided, reap that harvest, since the results of that reaping, far from solving any problems, can well destroy our civilization. I do not like to dwell on that possibility. For it is an unfortunate commentary on mankind that his mind and his technology appear to have progressed more rapidly than his spiritual development. Another conflict would certainly be more terrible than the last, and one is led to wonder whether the race toward a higher spiritual development will be won before we have destroyed ourselves.

WE STILL HAVE A CHOICE

There seems to me to be one remedy and that is for the United States so to maintain its strength that aggression will be discouraged and the conflicts that swirl about us will be settled by peaceful means. This strength can come only from a vigorous industrial economy, and it is in this area that we can least of all afford to weaken ourselves.

We are still free to choose which way we shall go. We can choose to meet the challenge of the future by building ever higher our citadel of democracy. Or we can choose to slip backward into the morass of state control. It must be one or the other, for we cannot stand still.

If, as I think we must, we are to meet the challenge we must exercise political and industrial statesmanship of the highest order; we must recapture that dynamic and militant faith in our institutions that inspired the men who founded our country and those who made it great.

We must remain strong, not only to aid others, but so that we can present an invulnerable and united front that no aggressor nation will dare attack.

Can we do this?

That seems to me, for this great Nation, almost an academic question. If we have faith in our heritage, our freedom, and our philosophy, it must be done, it can be done, it will be done.

Agricultural Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, in a radio program, Journeys Behind the News, given in Denver, Colo., on April 19, Dr. Warren H. Leonard was the guest speaker and I wish to extend as part of my remarks his address on agricultural problems in the administration of the Marshall plan in Europe.

Dr. Leonard, professor of agronomy at the Colorado A. and M. College, is an expert upon agricultural problems, with an international background. He has spent 3 years in Europe; after the war he occupied a key position on General MacArthur's staff in Tokyo, in charge of Japanese food production; and he is the author of standard textbooks upon agriculture.

The address follows:

Agriculture has a very important role in the Marshall plan. From the agricultural standpoint, the basic European problem appears to be one of food production to sustain a large population. Europeans are definitely interested in "growing three blades of grass where one grew before" wherever that is possible. The 16 nations of Europe in the Marshall plan should be encouraged to restore their agricultural production to at least pre-World War II standards.

The objectives of the United States should be to make western Europe self-sufficient in staple foods so the people can reach a minimum standard for good health in the shortest possible time and at minimum cost to this country. Because of the strain that the Marshall plan will have on the American economy, the agricultural and other aspects of the program must be carried out as efficiently as possible. Primary emphasis should be on the production of crops that will yield the most food per acre and that can be directly and efficiently used for human food.

In my opinion, the agricultural program of the Marshall plan should be nonpolitical from this standpoint: The most competent technically trained personnel in the United States should be recruited or drafted to carry it out. Production know-how is essential. It may be necessary to make special inducements to the individuals selected in order to obtain their services for such a program.

There are certain basic agreements that the United States should draw up with the European nations.

We should ask all countries in the European recovery program to submit in the English language a 5-year agricultural program. This program ought to include both their plan for meeting their own problems with their own available resources and the amount and kind of additional aid necessary each year. Statstical data should be furnished including crop and livestock production from 1938 to 1947; fertilizer, fungicide, and insecticide use, present stocks, and productive capacity; population; draft power; and farm machinery available and needed.

The participants in the aid program should agree to employ uniform standards of weights and measures satisfactory to the United States in the compilation of statistics and reports; also standard tables and methods for caloric determinations.

All participants in the Marshall plan should be requested to submit a food-position report each year. This should show the kinds and amount of food available and its average caloric value. The computations should include the amount of food available from all sources for the different categories of food consumers based on age and kind of work.

Administrative and technical personnel assigned to the aid program by the United States should be in charge of the initial distribution of agricultural commodities. They should have no responsibility for the distribution of such material within the nation, but should be ready upon request to furnish technical advice on agricultural problems. Under certain conditions, the American Government should withhold or reduce the allowance of supplies on the advice of United States technical personnel. This should be done when it is found that American supplies are being misused or wasted, or when the nation concerned has failed to make efficient use of its own resources.

The nations involved in the Marshall plan should also permit United States technical personnel to conduct independent statistical surveys.

Where available, we should ask compensation in basic minerals, raw materials, or commodities that are likely to be in short supply in the United States. For instance, in return for bread grains, France might send us potash fertilizers, or Sweden might send us iron. These may be stock-piled until needed in the American economy. These materials should not be used in trade competition with the European countries that furnish them.

It would be unwise to permit Marshall-plan countries to use American food in fostering any particular ideology based on race, creed, or color, especially totalitarianism in any form.

What should be the duties assigned to American agricultural technicians? First, they should be required to inform themselves on the needs of the European nations to which they are assigned. They could thus do an adequate job of advising on the agricultural situation, particularly as to the most efficient use of American aid.

We would need to analyze complete data on the acreages, production, and yield per unit area for the principal food, forage, and industrial crops. Information on the cultural practices used in the production of these crops should also be obtained for study.

It will be further necessary to scrutinize land utilization in affected countries to ascertain whether or not the best use is being made of the land for food production, both from a short-time and long-time point of

view. National land policy must be studied to determine the most efficient size of farm unit for the type of agriculture involved. In addition, we ought to consider the use of soil management and conservation practices with a view to the most productive use of the land.

Our people also need data on the nature and productivity of soils for use as a guide in the allocation of fertilizers and seeds. Each European country in the Marshall plan should furnish information for use as a soil-survey inventory; when soil information is not available, our American personnel should be permitted to make their own reconnaissance surveys.

Our experts should review critically statistics on fertilizer imports, production, consumption, and export. Countries that produce excess amounts of fertilizer will be encouraged to export their surplus to neighbors or exchange it for materials produced in the United States. This country actually has a shortage of potassic fertilizers. Food crops should, of course, be given priority in fertilizer allocations. Remember, the importation of fertilizers is less costly than the importation of food.

Where possible, participating nations should be encouraged to produce all of their own commercial fertilizers, particularly of the nitrogen type. Fertilizer factories should be removed from the German reparations lists.

An important principle is to see that local adapted seed of the principal agricultural crops is planted wherever possible. Seed should be imported from the United States only when it cannot be obtained locally in Europe. When imported from the United States, only seed of varieties resistant to European diseases should be used. These varieties must be adapted to the areas where they are to be planted.

Technical personnel assigned to the agricultural program of the Marshall plan will need to study the principal plant and animal diseases and insect pests and determine losses due to them. It is more economical to supply the necessary chemicals for spraying or dusting or dipping than to import food.

The livestock industry in the Marshall-plan nations should be studied from the standpoint of efficient utilization for food, animal products, or for farm power, and livestock feed should be produced so far as possible on land that is not suitable for staple food crops. In general, a livestock industry in Europe should be based on local feeds, avoiding the danger of such expansion that farmers will need to import American concentrate feeds. The livestock imported from the United States should consist only of high-class breeding stock.

Machinery is important, too. However, farm machinery should be approved for Europe only where it will contribute to increased total agricultural production, or increased production per unit area. Machinery imported should be adapted to the size of fields or to the type of farming for which it will be used; thus, animal-drawn or hand-operated implements should be given priority over machinery that calls for gasoline imports from the United States. There is no point in exporting power machinery to countries where farmers are inexperienced in its use. Tractor power is preferable only when European or Asiatic sources of oil are available.

We need to study also the storage of food stocks, particularly the preservation of perishable foods, to determine the losses from spoilage and thus reduce such losses. Measures that can be taken to preserve perishables include dehydration, drying, canning, refrigeration, and the control of storage diseases and insects. High priority should be given to the transportation of food products, especially perishables or livestock.

We need to study some economic factors: These include the transportation of agricultural products, marketing systems, prices, price controls, rationing, and such other factors as generally affect the distribution of food.

The type of agricultural personnel who should be employed to represent the United States in the administration of the Marshall plan is, of course, of paramount importance.

Our experts selected for use in Europe should be without commercial, industrial, or other vested interest in the countries in which they would be stationed. They should be men who place the welfare of the United States and the Marshall-plan nations above personal gain.

Technical personnel for the key positions at the national level should be scientifically trained experts of proven competence. Such personnel include agronomists, agricultural engineers, agricultural economists, animal husbandrymen, horticulturists, entomologists, plant pathologists, and soil scientists. This type of personnel may be found in the United States Department of Agriculture, State agricultural experiment stations, in the land-grant colleges and universities, and in commercial fields. Most of them would be obtainable only on a basis of a leave of absence from their jobs for 1 to 2 years. Consideration should also be given to the utilization of personnel of this kind in the United States as advisers on the Marshall plan, particularly those with foreign agricultural experience.

We must remember this: Only experienced technicians will know what experimental data, statistics, or other information to request from a foreign government. They should be able to interpret this information and develop a sound program without blind dependence upon experts from a foreign government. Furthermore, these men should be competent to advise a foreign government on how to improve its own agriculture.

The county-agent type of personnel would be very useful at the province or district level to serve as field observers or to furnish reports called for by United States technical personnel at the national level. It would probably be unwise to use American county agents in places of key specialization.

The success or failure of the agricultural aspects of the Marshall plan will depend largely on the personnel selected to administer it. After they are selected, they should be given authority free of unnecessary red-tape so that their objectives can be attained as efficiently and economically as possible. Otherwise, the economic burden of the Marshall plan may be disastrous to the United States.

Economic Growth of the South and World Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech which I delivered to the combined service clubs at their luncheon during the Memphis Cotton Carnival in Memphis, Tenn., on May 13, 1948. The address follows:

You accorded me the high privilege and great honor to speak at this joint luncheon last year. To be invited to return again this year imposes a real responsibility which I approach with humbleness.

WREC has repeated its generous offer of radio time and WMC is making a recording of my remarks for a later broadcast tonight. This suggests and requires, as it did last year, reference to a manuscript in order that the time allotted may be fully utilized.

It is a pleasure to add my greetings to His Majesty, King Howard. My last real visit with him was in Paris. As most of you know, he was on the staff of General Spaatz, who retires on Saturday from active service as the commanding general of our Air Forces. Much has happened since that day in France when all our military forces were advancing to complete victory over the enemy. Though still a young man, he has participated in the last two world wars. In these days when the declaring of wars is no longer a prelude to mass murder, one is forced to a game of guessing when a state of war exists. God forbid that His Majesty, the King, will again be called to participate in a third world conflict.

LONG LIVE THE QUEEN

To Queen Barbara, I wish a happy week and a still happier and long life. She is a worthy successor to the charming women who have preceded her in this position of honor. For them to reign over the finest celebration of its kind in the country is a fitting personal tribute.

Last year some of you may recall that I discussed the growth of Memphis, dwelt at some length on the development of the South since the Civil War, sought to discuss general world conditions as they appeared at that time, reviewed briefly the legislative program of Congress as we were seeking to deal with domestic and international questions, and finally emphasized the need for world understanding. It was conceded that our country had come unquestionably to a place of world supremacy and was unqualifiedly placed in the role of world leadership, whether we wanted it or not.

I share with all of you the justifiable pride in the continued growth of Memphis during the last 12 months. No one has to remind us of our progress. In fact, should we go back 2 years, we must recognize the addition of 167 new industries. The steel for the superstructure of our new bridge is being fabricated. The necessary right-of-way is being obtained for the approaches. These approaches will be adequate. Widened and improved in engineering they will add to the beauty as well as the improvement of our traffic-control needs.

INDUSTRY MOVING IN

Huge pay rolls have been added. We build farm machinery in Memphis today. Paper plants have become a new part of our industrial structure. We have new packing plants; others have been enlarged. We are building more good, sound, livable homes than any city of comparable size. Plans are under way for additions to parks and other recreational facilities. The new and modern tuberculosis hospital is about to open.

The dental-school building has been added to the University of Tennessee. A cancer laboratory is assured. All of our educational institutions have grown. Our utilities have enlarged and are supplying the greatest demand in our history. Our telephone communication lines have been lengthened. Women's clubs and all service groups and organizations dedicated to the welfare of Memphis have combined in developing a fine civic atmosphere. Our churches are growing in numbers, in usefulness, but above all in moral and deep spiritual power. We continue to recognize the fine, unselfish service of the Honorable E. H. Crump, Mayor Pleasants, Commissioner Hale, and those associated with them, in the conduct of sound, honest, far-sighted, and efficient government. I emphasize again that this good government

is recognized by the people with whom I must deal as your Representative in Congress.

When last I spoke to you I took considerable time to discuss the growth of the South. While much could be added, I do not now have the time to develop that particular theme. Rather should I express a warning. Other sections of the country have now recognized this development. Many of those sections have become impatient. Others are annoyed and still others live in fear that we are to continue to take more of their industries and many more of their best citizens. Recently, a prominent State official in New England made very caustic and critical utterances about our part of the country. He was taken to task by distinguished Southern leaders. He has since apologized publicly.

SOUTH HAS RESOURCES

Because of that apology and in a sense of fairness, I shall not linger upon his unfortunate statement. It must be said, however, that it has caused serious damage among the misinformed. His speech was an appeal to prejudice, unworthy of a high representative of his State government. The seriousness of that speech lies in its challenge to national unity. He said outwardly what many are thinking inwardly. New England has no natural resources. You find no coal, no oil, and no gas there.

In the South we have the Nation's reserves of fuel oil. We produce 80 percent of the total daily output of fuel. We have large quantities of coal. We still have considerable lumber. Our own city remains the hardwood capital of the world. We have a long and satisfactory work season. We have water power and river transportation. We have excellent highways. Sixty percent of the Nation's minerals are within our earth. We have cotton which warms the poor, feeds the needy, adorns the rich, and contributes to the winning of wars and the maintenance of peace. We have less tuberculosis among our dairy cows than exists in the large dairy areas of New York State. We have the only source of aluminum—bauxite. That is found across the river in Arkansas.

We have come a long way since the Civil War. We had no recovery program to help us. We grew the hard way. For a time we were treated as a conquered province. Many condemned and exploited us. Efforts are again being made to confuse and divide us. This so-called civil-rights program, or couched in any other high-sounding language, is intended to divide us. We had only one lynching in the South last year.

I place our record of murder convictions against any city in the North or East. We do not have gang wars. We do not have highly organized crime.

SEEK TO DIVIDE SOUTH

Every thinking person knows that the so-called Fair Employment Practices Commission is impotent. No law will ever compel a man to bring into his business a person who is obnoxious to his way of life. All of this talk about civil liberties is but an effort to get the mind of the southerner off the high goal to which he has set his reach. They seek to confuse and divide, but I say to those who maintain such a position that they can no more stop the program of the South than they can move the Mississippi River, destroy our rich agricultural lands, remove our coal, our oil, our natural gas, or the determined will of our people to maintain an honorable objection. But I warn you again that we must not be found sleeping.

We had a terrific fight in the House to remove the penalty tax on oleomargarine. Our dairy interests in this immediate section have grown amazingly. Our dairymen sell all of their products. During the war we had to import a lot of milk. They will continue to sell all of the milk, the butter, and by-products they produce. But from the West this time, instead of the East, came a threat that reprisals would be undertaken to hurt our cotton economy should these unfair taxes be removed.

Many States which had laws permitting community property for a long time fought hard against extending this same provision of law to Tennessee and other Southern States.

I voted for the tax-reduction bill which passed over the veto of the President because I thought it was good sense. But I say now that had we not passed the bill in the form which became law, that it may have taken years to secure community property for Tennessee.

FIGHT WILL GO ON

Outside selfish interests are moving in from still another direction. They would seek to stop the TVA development where it is today. The limit of this tremendous hydroelectric development has about been reached, unless funds can be made available for the erection of a large steam generating plant at New Johnsonville in west Tennessee. Failure to build will put a ceiling on our future development. This must not be. We have had rocky days in recent months before the Appropriations Committee in the House of Representatives. We lost our fight in the House by 40 votes. The opposition is determined that this steam generating plant shall not be built. But this does not mean that we are through with the fight, Major Allen.

TVA is an established fact. The Federal Government has invested in the TVA power system approximately $440,000,000. The TVA real property, its generating system, its distribution system, and its earning capacity are all owned by the United States.

It has always been recognized that where hydroelectric power is available for a large part of the year, it is much better business to have a steam plant to operate during the dry months to make the power firm or dependable on a year-around basis.

If this steam plant is authorized, it will be used to firm up additional hydro power, give us about 800,000 additional kilowatts and will result in an estimated $2,000,000 per year in additional revenue to the Federal Government.

When the very splendid trade was made to acquire the distribution of our own local electric power, the TVA purchased the existing steam plant which has been running 24 hours a day, and at this very moment puts into the lines in Memphis 50,000 kilowatt-hours daily.

CHEAP POWER VITAL

We know the value of cheap electricity. New industries must be assured that sufficient quantity will be available at these low rates. It is uneconomical for cities and towns up and down the TVA lines to build their own plants. The success of any great power system depends upon integration. There are times when TVA has excess power. During the war some of the TVA power under this sound integration policy was dispatched as far as the Chicago industrial area. Think of it.

The wartime atomic bomb plant was located in Tennessee because we had the electricity. The combined efforts of great scientists and the productive genius of the Nation used this power to produce the two bombs that shortened the war. The need for that plant exists today as a part of our security program, but should we never have another war, we are promised untold benefits from peacetime development of atomic energy. But let me bring the importance of TVA electricity closer home.

Our harbor development is no longer a dream.

Sufficient money has been authorized to begin work. There will be provided thousands of acres of industrial sites. Those industries which locate here will need electricity. We must have that electricity when the project is completed.

I think it might be well to count some of the blessings which have already come to us and which are threatened by those interests that have recognized the growth of our section and want us to remain static.

Our population in the city and county since TVA has increased more than 20 percent, manufacturing plants have increased 24.3 percent. In the same length of time the number of persons employed in those plants has increased 94 percent. Our retail sales have advanced 121.5 percent and the total spendable income has increased 169.2 percent. While we were adding 32,000 customers to the line, our residential customers were using one-half again as much electricity. One hundred miles of lines were built to serve our farmers in this county, and our bank deposits increased 294 percent. These are impelling figures. This should be proof positive that we must resist the danger from outside interference.

WORLD OUTLOOK IS GRIM

But, my fellow citizens, I am even more concerned about world conditions as they affect our future. We are living in the midst of uncertainty, in a world faced with revolution. This revolution is the result of gradual process of deterioration which has been in progress for many decades. After two major wars a large part of the accumulated wealth of western Europe has been destroyed and along with it the people's hopes and ambitions.

Many of these countries have not made substantial social gains. Our country is far out ahead in everything which promotes happiness, security, prosperity, and development.

Communism is sweeping a great portion of the world, which brings me to the question, What is communism, and what must we do to put it down?

What is communism? I worked pretty hard on this part of it. Because I wanted to answer the questions to my own satisfaction. The answer should be given in two parts—that is, communism as it is commonly thought of, and communism as it actually is.

Most persons think of communism only as it manifests itself politically. They reason that Russians are Communists and Stalin is the head man. The system is rotten principally because Stalin and his secret police are ruthless. Those who disagree are sent to the salt mines, the concentration camps, or are shot.

STALIN LIKE A FUNGUS

Few seem to realize that the gangster, Stalin, is a logical and inevitable consequence of the admission of the socialistic premise. If he weren't the head man, someone equally as bad would be. He is where he is just as fungus is on a muck heap. And you don't get rid of a muck heap by scraping off the fungus. Nor do you rid the world of communism by brushing off the Stalins. The problem is not that simple.

The contest that has to be waged is one of ideologies.

The things that have to be destroyed are bad ideas, not the persons who are foolish enough to uphold bad ideas.

Communism is an idea, a collectivistic idea. It holds that the individual has no rights; that the individual's role is only that of serving the group, that is, the state. Saint Simon put in words what Karl Marx later held to be the ultimate ideal of communism—"from each according to ability, to each according to need."

Such an objective denies, absolutely, the right to private property, that is, the right to the fruits of one's labor. The greater one's ability, the more one acquires, the more one is forced to give up. Obviously, free competitive enterprise would result in no such apportionment of a nation's goods and services as this principle requires. Therefore,

the state ownership of the means of production has to form the keystone of this system.

Now, let's see what happens under this system.

1. The victim, that is the person with ability, is deprived of what he produces. This removes his incentive to produce.

2. The beneficiary, that is, the one in need, who receives unearned rewards, is relieved of the necessity to produce, which likewise, removes his incentive for production.

3. Hence, as production declines, the incentives to production having been removed all along the line, this procedure of coercive collectivism must inevitably lead to arbitrary and dictatorial punishment.

PRODUCTION ESSENTIAL

With voluntary production abandoned, and production being an essential requisite to survival, there is always, and has to be, a way found to "whip up" production among the ever-increasing nonproducers and, also, among those who the authorities think are insufficient producers. Even the original (beneficiaries) soon become the victims of the thing they helped contrive.

There is another way to explain how socialistic or communistic ideas inevitably lead to the political horror which, when experienced, cause even the proponents of these ideas to wail, "But I didn't mean this."

Suppose, for instance, that you take over the financial care of a widowed sister. Do you let her incur whatever bills meet her fancy, or do you, with the responsibility for this phase of her life, exercise an authority consistent with the responsibility? You must reserve the right to exercise authority in this respect or you run the risk of ruin.

SEES LITTLE DIFFERENCE

It is the same when the state becomes a caretaker. In whatever area a responsibility is assumed in that area authority is exercised. The socialistic program calls for the state to be all-responsible. The essential concomitant of this is all-authority. Practically however, this process seldom happens in one fell swoop but, rather, it goes on item by item. Eventually, the all-authoritarian state emerges, at the head of which there has to be, by reason of the nature of the job to be done, a Stalin, a gangster.

Communism and socialism are basically one and the same thing: The state ownership and control of the means of production. The reason that so many think kindly of socialism and hatefully of communism is that the advocates of state interventionism are often thought of as Socialists while the biggest body of practitioners of interventionism style themselves Communists. There is, however, no real division on this point among the Russians. While calling themselves Communists, they call their country the U. S. S. R., the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Communism or socialism is a philosophy to be despised and explained away. It is not merely a military threat to be feared and shot away. (I wish I had more time to develop it.)

We Americans are not seeking war. We are not war mongers. We hate war; we want peace.

We want the whole world to have the opportunities and freedom upon which lasting peace can be brought to all nations.

We are not a capitalistic monopoly. Our roads, telephones, radios, air lines, shipping lines, factories, stores, mines, and forests are not owned by Government but are owned by the people as private citizens. Millions, and many more millions, of the people's dollars are invested in our railroad, automobile, and our steel industries. All of this money came out of the savings of the people. Russia today is the only complete socialistic and communistic nation on earth.

It owns everything, including the people and the profits that people could make on their own labor.

In America, the people own everything, including the Government. In the U. S. S. R. the Government owns everything, including the people.

PEOPLE ARE CAPITALISTS

In America, through our industrial know-how we have turned luxuries into mass production within the reach of everybody. Telephones, bathtubs, gas stoves, radios, refrigerators, electric lights, vacuum cleaners, and automobiles are not luxuries in America. We have over 80 percent of all the automobiles in the world in America. They are owned not by the rich. They are owned by the people. They are the capitalists. Every bit of property our people own is owned because they have saved money out of the greatest earnings ever earned by any people. All of this is a result of the free, competitive system made possible by liberty.

Twelve of our equals decide on the guilt or innocence of anyone charged and brought to the bar. We do not have judges to decide on guilt or innocence. We, the people, decide. The judge pronounces sentence. We elect the judges.

Marshal Stalin said that the war would have been lost without the productivity of America. We produced all of this material and sent food to Russia in addition to what we needed to win our own war and help England win hers.

American production is infinitely greater than Russia's.

PICK OUR OWN JOBS

The secret is that in the United States of America production is free and every producer is free. Every family in our country is self-regulated and runs itself better than any inner circle of the Russians from the Kremlin can run a family. Every man, woman, and child in our country has the right to progress, is automatically given liberty and freedom.

Every one of us can pick out any educational opportunity he wants, the job he wants, and decide personally what he wants to be. We have a simple form of government. It is based on the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Nothing can be done that is not constitutional, and if we want something that is not constitutional we get it when two-thirds of the States vote by a majority of the people to amend the Constitution.

The Russian communistic system grants to man nothing and to the state everything. The state is the sole possessor of liberty and freedom. Our country is a republic. We have achieved the highest living standards, the greatest tolerance, the truest charity—all because of giving liberty and freedom to our people.

The Communist flanks have grown larger. Today the left flank is in the Pacific; the right flank is in the Baltic littoral, including Finland, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark.

The reason for our interest in Italy and Austria, our interest in Spain and Portugal, our interest in Holland and Belgium, our interest in France and Norway, our interest in the Scandinavian countries, is to preserve what remains of freedom.

Reduced then to essentials, what is our problem today? Academic as it may sound, the real problem facing mankind is to eliminate war. Finally, we hope that some day we shall reach that state of human perfection where war, the shame of mankind, has been abolished from the earth. I know it is much to hope for, but to hope for less would be a confession that there is no such thing as spiritual evolution in the world.

Twenty years ago we drove from Memphis a known and admitted Communist who was teaching in one of our schools of higher learning. We cataloged an even dozen others. I am glad that the police officials are alert today to see that none shall knowingly enter our gates with destruction and vicious propaganda.

Now is the time to drive Communists out of every branch of the Government.

If we fail nationally, if we lack the vision, if we lack the courage, the responsibility must be upon our shoulders as well as upon the prime movers who may be abroad.

I hope that another conflict can be avoided. I voted for the European recovery program. I recognize that it is a calculated risk or a gamble. I care not about the rhetoric involved, but if there is an outside hope that we can still avoid another baptism of blood, I will take the chance on that vote because the next decade is going to be pretty dangerous with a storehouse full of atom bombs, with our most inventive minds dealing with jet planes and velocities and speeds, and known before.

MUST BE PREPARED

While spending $6,000,000,000 in an honest effort to rehabilitate a stricken world and to save the people from ruin, we must be prepared if all these efforts fail.

We must spend every dollar necessary to build the greatest striking Air Force, the most efficient Army, the fastest Navy, and the most powerful Marine Force ever conceived. We must supply the manpower. We must enlarge our atomic program. We must keep our country strong within—not for war, but for peace. War is not inevitable, but should it come in the not too far distant future, with God's help we must be prepared to maintain the Christian principles of our land. We must uphold the teachings of the Saviour of the world, who taught us love, not hate.

May we join with leading churchmen of our country in this plea:

We are called to be steadfast in prayer for all the peoples of the world that they may learn the things that belong to their peace; for our Nation and our Government, that they may become willing to serve the purposes of God.

Reversal of Old Policies on Asiatics Is Indicated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1948

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following report from the Nation by Lawrence E. Davies in the New York Times of May 9, 1948:

PACIFIC STATES, REVERSAL OF OLD POLICIES ON ASIATICS IS INDICATED

(By Lawrence E. Davies)

SAN FRANCISCO, May 8.—There are growing signs that the west coast, the part of the country that would be most affected, is swinging around to the view that Japanese and other orientals now excluded should be admitted to the United States under the quota system and made eligible for citizenship.

This is a far cry from the situation in 1924, when Congress passed the Exclusion Act. But it is underscored by such actions as those taken this spring by boards of supervisors in Los Angeles and San Francisco.

They memorialized Congress to adopt the Judd bill (H. R. 5004), which would remove discriminatory citizenship and immigration restrictions against remaining orientals. At least two members of the California delegation have even testified or announced support for the bill. Eligibility to naturalization was extended to Chinese in 1943 and to Filipinos and natives of India 3 years later.

The movement to eliminate racial bars to naturalization now has the backing of educational, religious, and civil-liberties groups, the California Federation of Civic Unity, the Japanese-American Citizens League, American Veterans' Committee, and various posts of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

OUTSTANDING WAR RECORD

Part of the changed attitude is due to the realization that acts of sabotage on the part of Japanese, both in Hawaii and on the United States mainland, were lacking during the war. Part of it stems from a sympathetic awareness that alien Japanese parents, many of whom had spent 20 years or more in this country, raised their nisei children according to American customs and sent sons to war to be wounded or killed while proving their loyalty, now find that they themselves are still barred from naturalization.

Japanese aliens, in California and most other Western States, cannot engage in commercial fishing, cannot lease or buy agricultural land, become members of certain unions, obtain licenses as lawyers, surveyors, pharmacists, vessel pilots, civil-service workers, or engage in many other occupations. They cannot receive old-age pensions.

In 1940 there were 87,933 persons, mostly Japanese, in the United States and Hawaii who could not seek citizenship because of racial origin. Not only would the bill permit naturalization of these aliens but allow the immigration of 1,000 or so Asiatics a year under the quota system.

I Am An American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on May 16, 1948, New York City observed I Am An American Day. It has long been an annual observance in my home city. This year it came at a most propitious time, between the close of the debate and the reading for amendment of a bill to control communism. No one feels the necessity for such legislation more than I. But it must not be hastily enacted. It must have every American constitutional safeguard thrown around it. The following article by Rev. William C. Kernan, which appeared in the Metropolitan Star, develops this theme splendidly:

THE COMMON DEFENSE

(By Rev. William C. Kernan)

I AM AN AMERICAN DAY—MAY 16

I Am An American Day 1948 marks the time for Americans to appreciate their own country even while they go about the important task of improving it.

We are condemned by some as a Nation of hypocrites who profess belief in human rights while denying them in practice.

We answer by categorically affirming that this accusation is untrue. For Americans not only believe in the principles underlying human rights but, to a very great degree indeed, practice them in the everyday life. People who deny this are so accustomed to the freedom which they enjoy that they take it as a matter of course without considering how desperate would be their lot if that freedom were lost to them.

We answer by asking: How would you feel if suddenly your right to speak were denied to you, if your right to worship God were suppressed, if your right to assemble peaceably with your fellow citizens were interfered with by security police?

How would you take it if you were not permitted to supervise the education of your children, or to change your job, to own property or a business, to come and go as you will, or, in the event you were accused of a crime, to have a speedy and fair trial by jury?

How would you regard the invasion of your home, without a warrant, by the police; or strict censorship of radio and press by the state; or the presence of dictator's spies in your office, your factory, on your farm, in your school, your church; even your home?

We answer by underscoring the fact that nothing like that is happening here both because American principles forbid it and American practice is sufficiently in accord with our principles to make it impossible.

We answer by declaring that we have a good country, that we ought to say so, and be grateful to God for it.

This is a fact worth noting. For it means that while the darkness of tyranny falls over other lands, and while dictators look for new ways by which to suppress freedom, people in America are seeking new ways to extend and guarantee it.

In the face of so much Communist propaganda designed to make us disparage all things American, we need, on this I Am an American Day, the encouragement which arises from realizing how mightily America has wrought for human freedom in the past, how bravely and effectively America fights for freedom in this living present.

It is a time for faith in God and confidence in the ways of Divine Providence in our midst. It is a time for the rebirth of patriotism. A time to protect our inalienable rights against the designs of Communists and Fascists to suppress them. A time to answer and rout the enemy at the gate. A time to esteem the sacrifice and triumph of patriots who have gone before us, to acclaim the good in America which lightens our day, to prepare the way for that greater America which, by God's grace, shall be hereafter.

Joseph Jefferson Mansfield

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1948

On the life, character and public service of Hon. JOSEPH JEFFERSON MANSFIELD, late a Representative from the State of Texas

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, when Hon. JOSEPH JEFFERSON MANSFIELD died at Bethesda Naval Hospital here on the night of July 12, 1947, a career of public service that is difficult to equal ended.

Judge MANSFIELD was my idea of a successful man. The following Monday when the House of Representatives held memorial services for him, every type of individual and every type of creed represented in that body rose to pay tribute to the "gentleman in the wheelchair." The tributes lengthened into the longest memorial services ever heard in the House of Representatives.

House Minority Leader SAM RAYBURN, of Bonham, Tex., in announcing the death of Judge MANSFIELD to the House said:

I have served in this House with more than 2,100 men and women in 34 years. That shows how fast we change. * * * They have been men and women of high character and lofty ideals, the majority of them of outstanding ability.

But of all those men and women, none surpassed and few equaled Judge MANSFIELD in ability or in bigness of soul. God never made a finer man nor greater character than Judge MANSFIELD. After 30 years of his loyalty to me, and mine to him, the sadness deepens that I will not see him again, nor again see his like as I have few times in my life—towering, good, just, pure patriot.

Judge MANSFIELD had been in public service nearly all his life. For 30 years he had been a Member of Congress, and his life span had stretched from the time of Abraham Lincoln to the atomic age. The last 25 years of his life was in a wheel chair, paralyzed from the waist downward. A few times I had mentioned his affliction to him, and he would always smile knowingly and say, "But, son, there are so many people in much worse shape than I am."

Here was a man who asked no quarter because of a handicap. He had served faithfully and well his people of the Ninth Congressional District, and he had no enemies in Congress. Here was the epitome of success.

I believe that of all the tributes offered the revered judge, the following from Representative CHELF, of Kentucky, touched me deepest:

Mr. Speaker, I think the first Psalm must have been written about this great and good man who just left us:

"Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful.

"But his delight is in the law of the Lord; and in his law doth he meditate day and night.

"And he shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season; his leaf also shall not wither; and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper."

This I do know—the first Psalm was written to urge and encourage all men to lead and to live the fine Christian life which was that of our dear friend and colleague, Judge JOSEPH JEFFERSON MANSFIELD of the Lone Star State of old Texas.

I recited this little verse to the Judge on his eighty-fifth birthday and he gave me a warm, firm handshape. The twinkle in his eye indicated to me that he liked the thought it expressed:

"Making friends is a lot of fun,
Shaking hands with everyone;
Hearing what each has to say,
As we meet them day by day.
Swapping smiles and trading cheer,
Makes us happy while we're here,
For all the joy of life depends
On the art of making friends."

Such a man was JOSEPH JEFFERSON MANSFIELD, the revered, alert little "gentleman in the wheel chair." He will be long missed and forever remembered in the House of Representatives where his 30 years of service will stand like a great white monument.

Foreman in the Legislative Mill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Labert St. Clair:

FOREMAN IN THE LEGISLATIVE MILL

(By Labert St. Clair)

Authorities on corny jests insist that there are only seven standard joke patterns in the world. The first three involve the tramp, bride's biscuits and mother-in-law side-splitters. The other four center around loafing Congressmen.

My observations over the years have convinced me that nobody can justify the intimation that most Senators and Representatives spend a large part of each day with their feet on their desks. If time would permit, I am sure that a survey of the activities of each of the 531 Members of the two Houses would reveal few deliberate loafers.

Since such a broad canvass is obviously impossible, I have made a case study of the activities of one Member—the majority leader of the House—to help prove my point. I am positive that when you consider the amount of work he does in a day you will agree that he, at least, is active. Further, it must require much effort for the other 434 Members to pile as much proposed legislation and other problems on him as they do. Every bill approved by a committee clears through his office and, additionally, several thousand questions of a private, personal, local, national, and international nature in which Members are interested get his consideration in the course of a year.

Currently, CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Rensselaer, Ind., is the majority leader. In previous years such other able men as John Q. Tilson, of Connecticut, and the former Speaker SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, were among the 75 or more who have held the place. They have differed widely in many respects but one experience they had in common. None ever found time hanging heavily on his hands. Each left his job at night during the regular sessions carrying a headful of unfinished business and wondering how in the short time allotted him he could complete the next day's work.

The floor activities of a majority leader are of such a nature as to create a false impression of his many and varied responsibilities. The galleries see him doing on the floor what really is the lightest part of his job.

Generally, from the time he takes over control of the program at the calling of the House to order, he appears to be a maestro who has all the members of his band harmonizing perfectly.

A visit behind the stage settings will convince you of the fallacy of this impression. His duties are more comparable to those of the entire personnel of a traveling baseball club. He is at once the manager directing general team activity; the field captain keeping tab on individual players; the pinch hitter preparing to step in and deliver a blow at a crucial moment; the mascot trying to produce a barrel of luck; the first base coach encouraging his own men or harassing the enemy, and the clubhouse man seeing that all the paraphernalia are ready before the game starts.

Sounds like more than any one man could do? So I thought until recently when I devoted a day to trailing HALLECK around and setting down his activities. The full time was about 16 hours. He assured me it was about average grist. Here are the high points of a typical day:

8 a. m.: While breakfasting at home, read the House proceedings of the previous day from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, delivered on his doorstep shortly before daylight.

9 a. m.: Arrived at office in Capitol and began to scan important mail. Talked with early visitors and newspapermen. Answered 15 telephone calls. Dictated several emergency telegrams and started answering mail.

10 a. m.: Breaks off to confer with Parliamentarian, committee chairmen, and Speaker JOE MARTIN, with whom he constantly must discuss legislative programs and strategies. These two work as a team in dispatching the business of the House.

11 a. m.: Resumed dictating letters, interrupted repeatedly by telephone calls from Speaker and special pleaders regarding the current and future floor program.

11:45 a. m.: Went to floor to meet committee chairman in charge of bill about to go under consideration, arranging such details as time for speakers, etc.

12 noon: Took over post at majority table and, with Speaker and Parliamentarian cooperating, made the various motions which are necessary to getting House work under way.

12:30 p. m.: Decks cleared of routine, turned control over to chairman of committee which brought in current bill and sat by in role of referee to smooth majority inner-party situations, direct attack on opposition, or speak in an emergency. (Time out for a sandwich; there is no luncheon recess.)

1:30 p. m.: Returned to office to preside as chairman over committee on committees, which makes committee assignments for majority. Talked before meeting with various applicants for committee appointments or transfers.

2 p. m.: Got committee under way and found there were a dozen applicants for two vacancies. Urged sponsors to explain in open meeting reasons why candidates should have job and thus started field day of talk.

2:15 p. m.: Called to floor to straighten out a parliamentary situation which threatened to get out of hand. Mixed good humoredly with minority leadership and made impromptu 5-minute speech.

2:30 p. m.: Resumed chair at committee session. Settled major appointment by inducing all members to compromise.

3 p. m.: Conferred on anti-inflation legislation with Senator TAFT and Chairman WOLCOTT of House Banking and Currency Committee. Answered 10 more telephone calls. Dictated letters.

3:30 p. m.: Attended majority Steering Committee meeting to decide on anti-inflation program.

4 p. m.: Met newspapermen to discuss the legislative program. Resumed dictating. Interrupted by long distance call of 10 minutes from a Pacific coast Republican State leader who felt that a certain bill, if passed, would lose State for GOP next fall. Calmed caller's fears.

4:30 p. m.: Resumed dictating but soon was stopped by hurry-up call from floor for him to have whip round-up majority membership for important vote. Returned to floor and conferred with Members about party matters.

4:45 p. m.: Made closing 10-minute speech on current bill appealing for favorable vote by both Republicans and Democrats.

5:45 p. m.: Made necessary motions for filing committee reports, etc., and House adjournment.

5:50 p. m.: Met with veterans' delegation concerning pending bill.

6 p. m.: Took series of telephone calls, dictated more letters and telegrams, conferred with research staff on material to be used in an address in Chicago.

6:45 p. m.: Left for home to dress for three evening engagements. Read in car summaries of stack of bills.

7:30 p. m.: Dropped in at State association party in downtown hotel, remained a few minutes, called briefly at second meeting of another group in same hotel, and took a taxi to a second hotel.

8 p. m.: Attended dinner meeting of business group.

10 p. m.: Addressed meeting on national problems, including taxes and reduction of Government costs.

11:15 p. m.: Arrived home to find several long-distance calls and telegrams requiring attention.

12 p. m.: To bed and, except for a few calls from morning newspapermen, nothing to do until tomorrow.

Unquestionably, more work is dispatched in the leader's office every day than in that of any other single Member. His office comprises five large rooms and several small ones and various hall spaces. All are utilized.

The fact that the leader's activities lead him regularly over most of the House end of the Capitol, into the Old and New House Office Buildings, and sometimes into the Senate wing keeps his staff uncertain as to his whereabouts when he is not in his office or on the floor. He may be either in or on his way to the office of the Speaker, the chairman of the Ways and Means, Rules, Appropriations, Foreign Affairs Committees, the legislative counsel, or the Parliamentarian—with all of whom he works closely; in the radio room broadcasting or making a platter for national distribution; on the Capitol steps or in the empty House posing with groups of a Member's visiting constituents.

He tries to return to his main office every half hour or so. Visitors there learn the quickest way to reach him is to sit down and wait for him to show up.

PATRONAGE NO PROBLEM

The framers of the House working plan sought to give the majority leader an unusual amount of freedom for independent action. He has only two committee assignments and neither group drafts legislation. He has no patronage to dispense so it is useless to ask him for a job.

Nevertheless, the leader is a powerful figure when the legislative chips are down. That is, when a bill has been cleared by a committee and is ready for floor action. His approval nearly always can give the measure a green light, speeding the bill through to a vote by a special rule and putting the almost solid GOP forces behind it. Since his is the final responsibility for getting legislation through, his wishes generally are yielded to by other leaders. Times come, of course, when he loses a fight, but then, as a good leader, he goes through the motions of pushing the bill to victory, even though in his heart he thinks compared to it limburger cheese smells like attar of roses.

As majority leader, HALLECK never hesitates to speak up at important conferences.

When the President called congressional leaders to the White House ostensibly to talk emergency European aid and then put cost of living first HALLECK quickly interrupted to declare:

"Mr. President, if you put price controls first in your message you'll start an argument which will delay your European relief plan quite a spell."

The President quickly replied that price controls just happened to be placed first and its position could be changed. No change was made.

The biggest single job of a leader is to keep party members contented and voting with him. HALLECK has had good success in

this respect, largely due to his willingness to permit all sides to an issue to present their arguments before he suggests a party stand.

ENCOURAGES COMPROMISE

Recently keen competition developed over the filling of two vacancies on important committees. About a dozen candidates showed up from different States, including one from Indiana. HALLECK called the supporters of all candidates together and told them to present the merits of their men. When the candidates' claims had been set forth HALLECK told the conferees he believed two candidates, neither of whom was his Hoosier brother, stood out and why he thought they should be named. They were chosen, and again everybody was satisfied.

An illustration of how strife may start within a party and call for impartial handling by the majority leader developed a few months ago over the wool issue. Western growers had been receiving a subsidy on wool. Naturally, they desired to retain it and so advised their members, several of whom were Republicans. From the buyers of wool, such as clothing manufacturers, came a loud protest against continuance of the subsidy and then GOP members went into action. When the issue became hot, HALLECK called interested Members of the two sides together and, after extended discussion, they reached a compromise and both Houses passed a bill satisfactory to most Republicans.

New Members naturally turn to their leader with their problems, large and small. To keep them on the right road to political success requires patience and tact. Frequently, many of them, being urged to start orating the minute they land here about almost every conceivable subject, apply for a lot of floor time in which to sound off. In such instances, the leader patiently explains the reasons why it is best for a newcomer to take it easy for a while. Usually they take his advice. The Member who does not take a leader's council and insists on speaking frequently and making unreasonable demands seldom is seen around the House for long.

When HALLECK disagrees with other GOP big guns, he never pussyfoots on taking a stand to make his position clear.

During the recent special session Representative WADSWORTH, of New York, offered a resolution to have the House forego its special session mileage allowance in the interest of Government saving. WADSWORTH made a strong plea for his proposal. Many Members were greatly embarrassed. A majority are men of limited means. Further, they felt they were entitled to their allowance by law. However, the subject of mileage money always is a ticklish one, especially for a candidate for reelection. The opposing candidate often insists that mileage is just so much plain graft. Hence many Members who were afraid to speak their minds on the WADSWORTH amendment squirmed, remained silent, and suffered much.

Not HALLECK. Springing to his feet, he declared vigorously that the Members were entitled to their mileage and the many who could ill afford to sacrifice the modest amounts involved should not be forced to do so. The resolution was defeated by a large vote. Later, many Members, including Democrats, thanked HALLECK for his aid.

Despite the fact that HALLECK is a strong partisan, four of the leading House Democrats, SAM RAYBURN; JOHN MCCORMACK, former majority leader, of Massachusetts; ADOLPH SABATH, dean of the House and leading New Dealer, of Illinois; and EUGENE COX, Georgia conservative, are among his closest friends. On the occasion of RAYBURN'S most recent birthday, it was HALLECK who paid the first tribute to the former speaker. When SABATH was chairman of the Rules Committee, HALLECK, also a member, often defended him against bipartisan attacks. MCCORMACK and the Hoosier bark sharply at each other on the floor and fraternize like brothers in the lobbies, and COX, except on strictly party matters, often votes with the Republicans. Last Christmas, for the first time in history, every House Member got a friendly personal note of greeting from the GOP leader.

FAMILIAR WITH ALL BILLS

The majority leader must know in a general way enough about every document reported by a committee to discuss it if necessary. At the last regular session of the House, nearly 5,700 bills and resolutions were introduced.

All bills must be cleared by committees before reaching a calendar for floor consideration. These four calendars are the Union, which embraces bills involving an expenditure of money and designed to raise revenue; the House, for major bills not raising revenue; the Consent, for minor bills to be considered by unanimous consent, and the Private, for small bills involving largely individual relief cases.

House and Union Calendar bills are the important ones. The House considers them on all except a few days each month which are set aside for the Private and Consent Calendar measures. The Speaker, majority leader, and majority whip pretty largely control the order of calendars. Bills in these groups being top flight, the majority leader has to be familiar with the important angles of each. He studies them as carefully as time will permit, but gets most of his information about them by what is called the absorption method. That is, he discusses the bills with the committeeman in charge of them, gets digests of committee reports from his research staff, and confers with individual interested Members.

At best, however, his information on the measures often is only cursory until debate starts. Then, by careful listening, he gets the drift of the situation. Often it is his job to close the debate for the majority. This is always good to hear especially when it leads to a crossing of rapiers between him and the minority leader, SAM RAYBURN.

Private and Consent bills, being smaller fry, do not require such careful attention of the majority leader, but he knows about them, too. A staff man, W. R. Pitts, briefs these bills and confers on them with the six GOP objectors, three of whom are assigned to each committee. The briefs, on cards, are handed the majority leader before he goes to the floor on these special calendar days.

Being a "free wheeling" speaker, HALLECK seldom prepares an address in advance on a bill. He prefers to catch the debate as it proceeds and then fit his remarks to what has gone immediately before. His extemporaneous remarks seldom require change before being put into the RECORD. HALLECK likes the give-and-take of floor debate and rarely refuses to yield for a question from a Member, regardless of his politics. Hecklers have learned, however, to be prepared for quick come-backs.

OFFICE IS KEPT BUSY

Letters come into HALLECK'S office at the rate of around 200 a day. All except personal mail first is read by his secretary, Jesse Nolph. Routine requests for information are handled directly by him, but about two-thirds of the mail is classified and laid before HALLECK.

Most of the research work for speeches, special articles, and newspaper statements is done by Pitts and the staff. When the writing load gets too heavy, other assistance is called in.

Business and industrial problems always have attracted HALLECK and hence he tries to cover meetings where he may help contribute something to the improvement of economic conditions. Getting businessmen interested in participating to a greater extent in public affairs is a thing he urges constantly. He thinks businessmen can do much more to help public officials in their efforts to improve the present economic situation.

HALLECK is 47 years old, but has been in public life for more than 23 years. He was elected prosecuting attorney of his home county, Jasper, in Indiana, before he was graduated from college and then reelected to the same office three times. He came to Congress in a special election in 1935 and has been here ever since.

The One-Sided Arms Embargo to the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, all of us, regardless of creed or politics, who have supported the Zionist dream of a national Jewish homeland in Palestine, rejoice that the new democracy of Israel now exists and has been recognized by the United States through the statement of the President.

But there still exist many problems, not the least of which is the struggle to obtain even a minimum of defense by the embattled Jews against Arab aggression.

I am confident that the United Nations Security Council will and must invoke all the sanctions provided in chapter 7. Meanwhile, the embargo against shipments of arms to the Middle East continues in force, and operates only to keep the embattled Jews defenseless against the weapons of modern warfare supplied to the Arab forces by the Nazis and by the British.

Under leave, I am inserting a strong editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of May 18, and also the column by Walter Lippmann of the same date:

THE ONE-SIDED EMBARGO

The selection of Dr. Chaim Weizmann as president of Israel's Council of Government, the highest post in the new state, is a deserved recognition of a lifetime of service to the cause which Israel embodies. A scientist of distinction, Dr. Weizmann was primarily responsible for the issuance of the Balfour Declaration, the foundation stone of modern Zionism and of the Jewish state which has been created in Palestine. The respect which his attainments, his integrity and his unselfish struggle for an ideal have won throughout the world will accompany him to his new post.

But Israel will need more than respect for her President, more than sympathy, in the struggle in which she is now engaged. With the formal creation of the Jewish state, and the official entry of the Arab nations into the battle in Palestine, that battle has passed out of the realm of civil strife and has become avowed war. It is a war, moreover, in which Israel lies under a heavy handicap. The Arab states have been armed by Britain; the sale of arms anywhere in the Near East has been banned by the United States. Hence the Arabs have British arms, while the Jews are dependent upon their own resources.

If the war is permitted to continue on its present basis—that is, without any determination by the United Nations of the merits

of the case—the United States must, in simple fairness, lift the arms embargo to permit Israel to obtain arms. The embargo, as it now stands, is a negative act which gives positive aid to the Arabs, and as such is not even consonant with a neutral attitude on the part of this country.

Meanwhile, however, the United States has once more carried the Palestine issue before the Security Council. The effect of such a truce as the Americans have proposed would be to halt the war, leaving the contending forces in their present position, or give the UN the right to declare that whichever side refused to comply would be open to the international penalties of aggression.

The cessation of hostilities in Palestine is a consummation devoutly to be wished. If the Security Council is able to achieve it, the UN will have gone far to regain the ground it lost during the long and pointless arguments over trusteeship and partition. But to enforce a truce will entail the same difficulties over practical measures which bogged down the earlier debates. An Arab spokesman has already said that the American truce effort is not to be taken seriously. If the event proves him correct, the United States will at least have to revoke its own unilateral embargo. And there will be very little time in which to discuss the issue.

CLARIFICATION IN PALESTINE

(By Walter Lippmann)

It is much too early to write off the United Nations as a failure in Palestine. In fact, only now, after the events of last Friday, is the Security Council, or the United States as a member of it, in a position to take the kind of action which in the American official view is required by the Charter. This action, said Ambassador Austin on February 24, "must be directed solely to the maintenance of international peace. The Council's action, in other words, is directed to keeping the peace and not to enforcing partition."

Action by the Security Council to keep the peace could not begin until the United Kingdom ceased to be responsible for the government of Palestine and until the State of Israel had been recognized as its legal successor in the territory defined by the General Assembly.

Up to Friday of last week the Security Council could have acted to maintain international peace in Palestine only if Great Britain, as the legal government, had said it was the victim of aggression. Britain did not say this. Therefore, the fighting in Palestine was internal disorder, like the uprising in Bogota, and not a breach of international peace.

Even though the violence was aided and abetted by Arab governments outside of Palestine, there was no case before the Security Council as long as the British Government did not choose to call upon the Security Council for help. This is a crucial point in any understanding of what has happened in Palestine and of what is now going to happen. The problem of Palestine could not come before the Security Council in the form which enables the Council to act to maintain peace until there was a government in Palestine which called upon it for help. Thus, it would have been impossible for the Security Council to take action against the external guerrilla forces in Greece if on December 3, 1946, the Greek Government had not requested it under articles 34 and 35 of the Charter. If the Greek Government had taken the position of the British mandatory government, that it was responsible for law and order in its territory and that it was not the victim of external aggression, the Security Council could not have taken action in Greece.

The termination of the British mandate and the recognition of the State of Israel have radically altered and greatly clarified the task of the Security Council. Any invasion of the territory of Israel as defined in the United Nations resolution by the armed forces of Egypt, Syria, Iraq, or Transjordan is now an unmistakable act of aggression which the Security Council is obligated to oppose.

The whole machinery of the United Nations organization can now be set in motion to arrest the aggression and to bring about a settlement of what is now, and only now, a clear-cut problem of international peace.

There seems to be little doubt that the King of Egypt has actually committed an overt and avowed act of aggression by sending his army and his bombers across the frontiers of Israel. He should be called sternly and promptly to account and ordered to desist.

There is, on the other hand, no evidence as this article is written that the King of Transjordan has committed aggression. The entry of his forces into the Arab portion of Palestine is not an act of aggression since there is now no state and no government in that territory. If he intends to occupy the territory up to the frontiers of Israel, and to respect the international status of Jerusalem, he has as good a legal title as any one to do just that.

If he does that, the prospects of a peaceful settlement—that is to say of a peace treaty—should be reasonably good. For the kingdom of Transjordan is a British satellite state. It was created by the British Government, its King was set upon his throne by Britain, its Government derives almost all its revenue from Britain, its army is led by British officers, it has been trained and equipped by the British Government, and it is bound by treaty to Great Britain.

Therefore, in arranging for a peace treaty between Israel and Transjordan, Mr. Bevin, acting through his delegate on the Security Council, will be negotiating with his agents in Transjordan. Mr. Bevin is, therefore, exceptionally well placed for the role of peacemaker. Since the provisional government of Israel has explicitly and unreservedly accepted the boundaries fixed by the United Nations, the problem of making peace is reduced to persuading the King of Transjordan to come up to but not to cross those boundaries.

It is evident that Mr. Bevin is the man to induce the King of Transjordan to do just that. For Mr. Bevin controls all the inducements. And consequently his is the main responsibility for the prevention of an international war in the Middle East.

Raymond Smiley Springer

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. A. SIDNEY CAMP

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1948

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. RAYMOND SMILEY SPRINGER, late a Representative from the State of Indiana

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, everyone who knew Representative RAYMOND SMILEY SPRINGER respected his character and sincerity and his ability as a lawyer. He and I entered the Seventy-sixth Congress about the same time and, although I knew him from the first, I did not become intimately acquainted with him until I was assigned to the Committee on the Judiciary. It was there I learned his eminent ability. Congressman SPRINGER in the performance of his duties as a member of that great committee was nonpartisan and always had only the good of all Americans at heart. He was diligent and sincere and a prodigious worker, and all of us loved and respected him.

His life has been one of great public service. He served his country gallantly in the First World War and remained in the Officers Reserve Corps after the war. He served as the first commander of the American Legion in the State of Indiana and continued to serve that organization all of his life. He served the people of his State in a judicial capacity before coming to Congress. Indiana has lost one of her great sons and this country has lost a great American.

Doctor, My Statistics Feel Funny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, in the May 1948 edition of Nation's Business, I have read with more than passing interest an article by Dr. Maurice Friedman, entitled "Doctor, My Statistics Feel Funny."

We have often been confused by statements purporting to give statistical information. In the first place, the statistics frequently are without foundation and cannot be relief upon. Where a premise is false, the conclusion is bound to be erroneous. False premises inevitably lead to false conclusions. Those who handle figures and statistical information should be extremely cautious to ascertain that the facts and the figures are reliable and authentic. Perhaps even greater caution should be used in stating conclusions. At least we should make sure that the basis of our conclusions are well founded.

Dr. Friedman's article is a graphic illustration of how easily the public may be misled and draw erroneous conclusions, based upon facts and figures, which are not authentic, or have not been sufficiently analyzed, before statements are made, based thereon. I trust that this article will be read by all who are interested in the general health condition and physical well-being of the people of this country. It certainly should enable us to breathe a sigh of relief, for the author points vividly to the faulty premises and erroneous conclusions that have been given publicity on this subject.

I quote the article, Doctor, My Statistics Feel Funny:

You're sick. I'm sick. We are all sick. We are a nation of cripples.

Who says so?

The Federal Security Administration, a governmental agency. So it must be true. Federal officials would never mislead the public and the Congress—or would they?

For many years we have been told that the health of this Nation is deplorable, that large segments of our people go entirely without medical care, and that our present system of medical services is woefully inadequate. In-

deed, we have been told that the situation is a national emergency.

We cannot afford to waste time experimenting with modifications of our present system or with voluntary health insurance. We must act without delay, and act radically. We must scrap the private practice of medicine altogether and adopt a compulsory national health insurance directed by a Federal agency in Washington.

If you doubt this, take a look at the shocking picture revealed by the draft statistics. Just think, "one-half of our young men, in the flower of life, unfit to bear arms for their country." These sensational words were set to music—the music of emotion. The Federal Security Administration supplied the words and many prominent men sang the tune: William Green of A. F. of L., James B. Carey of CIO, Leon Henderson, Harold Ickes, several Senators, and even our President. Leading newspapers joined in the song. Their Washington correspondents dutifully sent in official bureau handouts.

What are the facts?

In the first place, it is not true that one-half of our young men were unfit to bear arms. Even at this date the Selective Service System has not finished compiling and tabulating all of the data. But we can get an idea of the true situation by examining a period for which the data have been completed. From December 7, 1941, to December 31, 1943, the Selective Service System examined about 10,000,000 men. Of these, they rejected about 36 percent. At the same time, however, 2,700,000 men volunteered for service and were accepted by the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps. Therefore, the total number of men examined for military service in this period was 12,700,000, and the over-all rejection rate was about 28 percent.

But a rejection rate of 28 percent cannot be dismissed. Isn't the rejection of 3,600,000 men enough to make us disgusted with our scheme of medical services?

According to the Federal Security Administration, the answer is "Yes." According to the official propaganda which you and I are paying for, one-half to two-thirds of all draft rejections could have been avoided by adequate medical care and are, therefore, evidence of widespread medical neglect.

Again, what are the facts?

The governmental officials who have repeatedly made these statements who have placed these words in the mouths of many witnesses come before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, are not physicians. They lack the technical qualifications which would permit them to make any statement whatsoever regarding the relation of draft rejections to medical care. So far the Federal Security Administration has not been able to produce the statement of a single physician to support their guesstimate of draft rejections preventable by medical care.

Dr. Leonard Rowntree, one-time medical director of the Selective Service System, ventured the opinion that draft rejections for remediable defects constituted about 15 percent of all rejections. In an independent analysis of the data, I concluded that no more than 20 percent of all rejections could have been influenced by medical care; that is, approximately 6 percent of all men examined.

If Dr. Rowntree was correct, if I was correct, why were so many men rejected? We must remember that the draft boards were not choosing men to play tiddlywinks. The Selective Service System had the task of selecting men for combat, men who could be expected to withstand the terrific strains of modern warfare, men who could adapt themselves to the strictly regimented life in the armed forces. The mobilization orders were explicit in defining the type of man wanted. Acting under these specific directions, the Selective Service physicians kept one eye on combat requirements and one eye on the lookout for defects which, though not a great handicap, might be grounds for future claims in the form of pensions or free medical service.

Official bulletins of the Selective Service System have repeatedly emphasized these facts. These bulletins stress the point that an overwhelming majority of the men examined "had been drawn from useful occupation in civil life which they had followed without apparent handicap." Let us listen to the exact words of the officials of the selective service system:

"There seems to be little doubt that most of the registrants being classed as available for limited military service and a substantial portion of the registrants being disqualified for any military service in the United States Army possess health conditions which would be acceptable for military duty in any army in continental Europe.

"In addition to the nondisqualifying defects, a large proportion of the disqualifying defects were minor, insofar as health conditions are concerned. The loss of an index and middle finger, the loss of a great toe, or the fact that a registrant is less than 60 inches in height is sufficient cause for rejection, but such conditions do not indicate that the registrant is in poor health."

These warnings of the selective service system were not hidden in any secret archives. They were prominently placed in the very bulletins which the Federal Security Agency was using to scare our people. Indeed, in view of the clear warnings of the officials of the selective service system, there is no excuse for anyone, with or without technical training, to misinterpret the draft statistics. The members of the Federal Security Agency did not heed these warnings.

They did not heed the unequivocal statement of Col. William Menninger, psychiatric consultant of the Army. With reference to the great numbers of rejections for psychiatric reasons, Colonel Menninger warned against the misuse of these statistics:

"It has been no surprise to the psychiatrists that this segment of the population has been uncovered, and is no special cause for alarm as to the mental health of the Nation. * * * It concerns our family life and educational system. It is intimately linked with the prevailing attitude of the public toward their specific service in the Army. To many men, the security of their homes and their friends and their jobs far outweigh their belief in their importance for and their need by the armed forces. The rejection of this group of men for acceptance to the Army has been widely misunderstood and misinterpreted. The Army, like a football team, needs the best. * * * The fact that a man may be a regular worker, a community asset, is no indication that he can fit into the Army or be an asset to the Army."

The lay members of the Federal Security Agency chose to ignore these warnings by competent medical authorities. These public officials, posing as expert and unbiased advisers to the Congress, persisted in misusing the draft statistics in their advocacy of national compulsory health insurance. For many years they have supplied most of the drive for the enactment of legislation which would affect intimately every person in this country and would subject the professional activities of every doctor to regulations laid down by the Federal Government.

The drive has been successful. Under the terms of a bill now before Congress the Federal agency for the supervision and direction of medical care would be the Federal Security Agency. In other words, the very men who are "advising" the Congress are now, and have been for years, engaged in a vigorous campaign to enact legislation which would vastly increase their own powers, their own influence and personal prestige. Against this background, we cannot assume that these men have been free of bias or that they have been acting as impartial scholars.

It is unfortunate that the average person, who is so well-informed about the technique of Fritz Crisler's backfield, the latest development in automatic transmission, or the call prices of preferred stocks, knows so little about health.

How can we measure the health of our community, of our Nation? Granting that the draft rejection figures are almost worthless in this regard, can't we put the selective-service statistics to some use? Yes, we can use these statistics in a limited way and with proper precautions.

Complete records were kept of selective-service examinations. These included the findings not only of the usual physical examination, but also the results of the X-ray examinations and the blood and urine examinations which were done on every man. Some of the men who were accepted for military service had one or more minor defects. These, too, were recorded. Many of the men who were rejected revealed not only the major defect for which they were disqualified, but one or more additional defects. Thus the original data of the selective service include records of every defect, disqualifying or not, uncovered by these physical examinations.

WHAT ARE OUR DEFECTS?

Of what significance are these defects? Are they a measure of our health? Can they be used as a measure of the adequacy of our medical care?

In the first place many of the recorded defects have no direct relation to health or medical care, but are directly related to our educational facilities. Examples are educational deficiency, failure to meet minimum intelligence requirements, and the largest portion of those individuals designated as mentally deficient. Of the remainder of recorded defects, most are structural abnormalities rather than diseased states.

For example, enlarged tonsils, absence of one testicle (congenital) and flat feet were recorded for many individuals although these structural abnormalities had not handicapped them in civilian life. There is the famous incident of the young man who was returned to civilian life because of flat feet and who immediately resumed his career in professional football.

It is a bit of irony that many of the recorded defects were not the result of medical neglect, but the direct result of medical treatment. All of the amputations are in this category. Many of them were done as life-saving measures after serious injuries. Surgical perforations of the middle ear also are in this category. Before sulfa drugs, surgical drainage of the middle ear was frequently necessary.

But still more important is the paradox that the very existence of many defects is evidence of our good health. Before the days of insulin a diabetic child would not live long enough to be recorded as a defect by the draft board. Many of the men listed as having tuberculosis would have long since checked in with the undertaker instead of the draft board were it not for modern medical diagnosis and treatment. Many with rheumatic heart disease would never have reached voting age without the supervision of skilled physicians.

Until 2 or 3 years ago children with the more severe kinds of congenital heart disease were doomed to a sedentary existence confined to the bed or wheel chair. Their faces were blue. They could not walk across the room without great effort. About one-half of these children died before puberty. With the miracle of modern chest surgery, these children need not die. Although the surgeon cannot make combat soldiers out of them, he can convert them from bedridden

invalids into useful and happy citizens. When these children become of age, our draft boards will be able to record even more defects. Shall we operate and save these children? Or shall we let them die off so that our selective-service statistics will look better?

Is a corpse healthier than a young man disqualified for military service because of diabetes?

No, indeed; we cannot use the selective service statistics as a guide to the health of our community. They can be of limited use, only if we integrate them with other, more important data. To measure the health of a community, we must note the frequency of contagious diseases, particularly those which are so closely related to public hygiene, such as typhoid fever and dysentery. We must place proper emphasis on the infant and maternal mortality rates, and the morbidity and mortality rates from other diseases. We must make an estimate of the life expectancy of our community. Finally, we must give proper weight to the birth rate. No community can be considered a healthy one if the adult population is able to live but unable to reproduce itself.

Even when all this has been done, valid conclusions can be drawn only by experts because there are so many pitfalls. For example, as a nation or a community grows more and more healthy, the crude death rate (number of persons per 1,000 population dying from all causes) goes down. Eventually, however, a point is reached where continued improvement in the health of the community results in an increase in the crude death rate. In fact, because of our favored position in health matters, the United States, along with the Scandinavian countries and a few others, have already reached this turning point.

POPULATION IS GROWING OLDER

As we learn to control the contagious diseases and the decimating illnesses of childhood, more and more individuals survive to be enumerated in the older age groups. Gradually the composition of the entire population changes. A young community gradually becomes a much older one. Unfortunately we have not learned to prevent high blood pressure, heart disease, or cancer. We have not learned to prolong the life of man indefinitely. Despite the advances of medicine, man is still mortal, and the death rate for old men is much higher than that for younger men. Thus a progressive and healthy nation may show a rising death rate. Its progress in health would then be reflected in an increase of life expectancy.

Because of the age and several other equally important factors it is not easy to compare the health of one nation with that of another. Errors are easily made and statistics can be tortured into a frame to support any particular kind of propaganda. It is still more difficult to evaluate the precise role of medical services in the health of a community. In recent years we have heard much about those poor, sparsely settled counties without general hospitals and without an adequate number of physicians. So far as I am aware, there is today no satisfactory basis on which to calculate how many physicians per thousand population is an adequate number.

During the war more than one-third of our physicians volunteered for service with the armed forces. Thus there remained for the civilian population not more than two-thirds of its ordinary supply of doctors. In spite of this marked reduction in available medical services maternal mortality was cut in half between 1940 and 1945. During this same period infant mortality decreased by about 20 percent.

This does not mean that we would have been still better off if all of our doctors had gone to war. It does mean that our health is not determined solely by the number of doctors and the number of hospitals. A striking illustration of this fact is the prevalence of venereal disease in the armed forces. In the Army and Navy there was one doctor for every 250 men, which is equivalent to two to three times the number of doctors in our largest cities. Their services were not only available day and night without cost but special venereal-disease control officers pleaded with the men to use the facilities. These special officers conducted vigorous educational campaigns to instruct the men in the use of prophylactic measures. In every town of any size special prophylactic stations were established and kept open all night. At these stations men who had ignored the warnings of the medical officers could obtain early prophylactic treatment after exposure.

In brief, a soldier or sailor could avoid venereal infection or obtain treatment for it at no cost at all, but he did not get venereal disease for nothing. It took money to go out and pick up an infection. Nevertheless, venereal disease was rampant in every military establishment at home and abroad, and just as with civilians the rate was astronomically higher among colored troops. Indeed, despite the elaborate provisions for medical services in the armed forces, the ratio of the venereal-disease rate in colored servicemen to the rate in the white servicemen was precisely the same as it was in the civilians who were examined by the draft boards.

To be sure, medical care is an important element in community health, but it is not the only element, and it frequently is not the most important element. At one time in the Great Lakes region the women were very self-conscious about their big necks. The big necks were not a distinct heredity trait, but were due to the low iodine content of the water and of the vegetables grown in that area. The lack of iodine produced goiters not only in the women of the Great Lakes, but also in the dogs, the frogs, and the fishes. With no significant change in the number of doctors, and certainly no change in the medical services available to the dogs, simple goiter has practically disappeared in both the human and canine population. This has been accomplished by the simple means of adding a small amount of iodine to the table salt.

HOUSING AFFECTS HEALTH

In your own community, geography may not play such an important role. The local housing situation may be much more important, particularly with respect to contagious diseases since they thrive in undernourished individuals jammed into overcrowded and inadequate dwellings.

And, speaking of housing facilities, we cannot overlook the outhouse, which has contributed so much to our humor but also to the spread of disease. There are large areas in this country where the installation of modern plumbing would do more good than the importation of a whole battery of medical specialists. There are equally large areas where the introduction of a safe water and milk supply would yield much larger health dividends than an increase in the capital investment of local hospital facilities.

We cannot do without doctors and hospitals—yet. Even if every individual in every community took full advantage of preventive and public health measures, we would still be confronted with the victims of those degenerative diseases for which we have no preventive measures. But, to a large extent, the number of persons forced to seek medical attention because of illness is a measure of our failure to utilize fully our present knowledge. The quaint belief in some Southern cities that "summer diarrhea" is caused by hot weather cannot be accepted as a bit of folklore. The unpalatable fact is that summer diarrhea, like typhoid and other related diseases, is evidence that the people are eating or drinking contaminated food, water, or milk.

Doctors and public health officials can watch over your drinking water and your milk supply. They can inspect your public eating places and warn you of any dangers in swimming pools and beaches. They can advise you in the control of contagious diseases and industrial hazards. But doctors and public health officers do not have the power of legislation on health matters. They alone cannot enforce existing legislation. These functions are properly in the hands of the public and its representatives. Even so, legislation and coercion are not the answer.

HEALTH NEEDS EDUCATION

We cannot legislate good health into being any more than we could create temperance by the passage of the Volstead Act. Good health is not a commodity which the Government can deliver to you in a neat package. It cannot be administered to you out of the doctor's little bag. The attainment of good health requires the active and intelligent participation of every member of the community. Given all the paraphernalia of modern medical science, the well-being of the community will not improve unless the people are sufficiently well educated to take advantage of what is offered. In many sections of the country the chief barrier to improved health is ignorance.

What can you do to improve the health of our Nation? As a citizen you can give your wholehearted support to any effort in your civic organizations to assess the health of your community and to single out and define your most urgent needs. As an individual you can begin your health crusade at home.

It is not enough to protect your family against infection and serious injury. Much of present-day illness is due to emotional conflict. To present these functional diseases, and more serious mental disease, there is nothing so important as the character of the home. Your children should have the emotional security that only love and a harmonious family life can give.

Finally, for your personal well being, seek the advice of your doctor periodically for preventive services. Don't wait until you are acutely ill. The frequency of your regular examinations will be determined not only by your physical condition, but also by your age and the medical history of your parents and grandparents. Let your doctor be the judge. No man or woman can hope to go through life without a few aches and pains.

In a vast majority of instances, these minor protests are of no more significance than the rattle of a loose tool kit in the trunk compartment of your auto. But some kinds of distress, even though mild, have frightening potentials. Your doctor can teach you to spot the warning signals important in your particular case. You can then disregard the trivia and avoid the status of a hypochondriac who sees a cancer in every wart.

Not everyone can afford to play tennis after his sixtieth birthday. For some individuals a jigger of whisky three times a day is necessary for survival. For others it is poison. Let your doctor review your mode of life, your diet, your habits. He will probably be able to make some worth-while suggestions which will prolong your useful life.

Even with our present level of national income there are undoubtedly many people who cannot shoulder the entire burden of a major illness. But the distribution of medical care in this country is not dominated by the economic factor. Take a look at your own community. The poor are not being neglected. Admittedly, our present methods for the distribution of medical services are far from ideal. We should continue to strive for something better. It is heartening that more than 30,000,000 of our people now have the benefit of Blue Cross hospitalization insurance. Another 20,000,000

have some sort of commercial coverage. In several parts of the country various experiments with prepaid medical care are on trial. From the experience of these enterprises we shall obtain a valuable store of practical knowledge to guide us in our quest for better health.

In the meanwhile there is no need for hysterics. We can well afford to resist any rash political action which would sabotage a system that has enabled us to become one of the healthiest nations in the world. Certainly the health of our country is not in such desperate state that we must rush to surrender complete control of our medical care into the hands of an all-powerful Federal agency—an agency whose members are responsible for the propaganda to convince you that we are a Nation of cripples and weaklings.

Mayor Van Antwerp Supports Taft-Ellender-Wagner Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a statement that has been submitted by the mayor of Detroit, the Honorable Eugene I. Van Antwerp:

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the committee for this opportunity to testify in favor of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

I am here today because I consider the severe housing shortage Detroit's most serious unsolved problem.

The failure of this productive Nation to provide an ample supply of standard housing units for its returned war veterans and other homeless citizens is illogical and inexcusable.

The housing shortage in Detroit is worse today than at any time since VJ-day, two and a half years ago.

The Federal housing survey of Detroit a year ago showed a vacancy rate for rental units of one-tenth of one percent.

Although no survey has been taken since that time, all indications are that we have a zero vacancy factor today.

The Detroit Housing Commission, with more than 12,000 rental units under its control, is in a position to judge the severity of the shortage.

A special study of the turn-over rate in three temporary war housing projects shows clearly that the pressure for housing has been increasing steadily right up to the present moment.

The three projects selected consist of 1,568 units or poorly constructed, temporary apartments heated with coal stoves and equipped only with coal-fired cooking stoves and hot water heaters.

There is a serious fire hazard at these projects. They are flimsy construction, drab and uninviting in appearance and stand on barren mud flats. Although constructed by the Federal Government as part of the war effort and now operated by the city, these units are pretty close to the level of slum housing.

They are the least desirable public housing units in Detroit and the first ones in which a vacancy factor would be noticed in the event that the housing shortage eased even slightly.

Total turn-over in these three projects were as follows:

1945	867
1946	332
1947	240

For the first 4 months of 1948 the rate has remained at the 1947 level.

Total turn-over for the 12,000 units of public housing in Detroit has been less than 100 units per month for the past year and a half.

In addition, there has been a sharp increase in applications for housing at the Commission's tenant selection office, in spite of efforts by the department to discourage applications.

With a total of 3,651 qualified applicants for public housing now on file with the Housing Commission, the department could lock up the doors of its tenant selection office and still have a backlog of prospective tenants that would take 3 full years to accommodate.

The backlog of applications would top 5,000 except for the fact that 2,365 were canceled out 3 months ago because they had remained inactive in the files for periods of 2 to 4 years.

Applications for housing are only accepted from the very lowest income group and from veterans of World War II.

There has been a wide distribution of pamphlets designed to discourage applicants for public housing and the tenant selection office has been moved to a remote address near the edge of the city.

In spite of these steps, the flood of applications continues and seven out of every eight qualified applicants for public housing in Detroit at the present time are being turned down.

The department cannot even consider the plight of the average nonveteran factory worker in Detroit whose income makes him ineligible for public housing.

The tremendous cost of this housing shortage in terms of money and also in terms of human suffering is not easy to estimate.

The city is now looking for a large vacant store or factory for the establishment of its seventh emergency housing shelter to care for the homeless families that find themselves on the street with their furniture in a pile.

In spite of primitive sanitary facilities and communal living quarters, these emergency shelters have filled up rapidly and taken on the character of permanent housing projects.

May I cite the case of one typical Detroit factory worker to show how costly the present housing shortage is?

Andrew Adams is the head of a family of nine and is employed at the Chevrolet Motor Car Co. at a weekly wage of approximately $65.

Mr. Adams was a self-supporting citizen who had received no welfare assistance or charity until his eviction from a rented home on December 15, 1946. The family was evicted because the home was purchased by a veteran.

For the past year and 5 months the Detroit Welfare Department and several private social agencies have worked continuously trying to find a place for the Adams family to live. All these efforts have failed because there were no vacancies for a family of this size.

The situation of the family today is this: Mrs. Adams and four of the children are living with a sister at one address. Mr. Adams and the oldest son are living in a room at another address. Two of the daughters are being boarded out at two other addresses.

The complications due to breaking this family up into four segments because of their housing problem made welfare assistance by the city of Detroit necessary.

The taxpayers of Detroit are now paying a total of $134 a month in rent alone to keep this family going in four separate establishments.

Due to this unusual arrangement other costs were added to the family's budget and further supplementary financial aid was required from the welfare department.

Due entirely and exclusively to the Adams family's housing problem, the taxpayers of Detroit during the past 17 months have had to provide a total $2,446.30 in welfare assistance.

The official report of Mrs. Viola Wickstrom, the welfare department case worker, has this to say:

"The separation of this family into four separate units has had serious consequences. Mrs. Adams talks of suicide and Mr. Adams visits his wife less and less as their visits result in constant quarreling over the lack of a home. The entire family have been growing further and further apart. Mrs. Adams, who is a motherly and very domestic person, has keenly felt the loss of her home and family."

I cite this case for the purpose of illustrating the double-barreled effect of the housing shortage—first, the cost to the public in dollars and cents, and second, the demoralizing effect on one of the city's productive factory workers.

Many instances come to mind of husbands who have been forced to ship their wives and children to distant parts of the country and take up residence in a hotel or rented room.

Every sort of shack, shed, and trailer has been pressed into service in Detroit by families who are struggling to maintain some semblance of a home.

Hundreds of applicants for public housing bring signed statements by competent medical authorities stating that the health of one or more members of the family is in serious jeopardy. Yet the city is powerless to help them.

A sizeable portion of the absenteeism from the city's factories has been attributed to the long, fruitless efforts of families to find rental housing vacancies.

An instance was brought to my attention a few days ago of an unfortunate truck driver who lost his job because of the housing shortage. He had the temerity to permit his wife and three children to use his employer's truck as a place to sleep at night. They had no other home.

The official census figures show that 37,360 families in Detroit are living doubled up or in make-shift housing.

So much for the picture as it exists today.

What are the prospects that the problem will cure itself without any Federal assistance?

They are very dim.

In Detroit during the 14 months ending March 1, 1948, a total of 6,900 new dwelling units were completed as compared with a total of 25,175 new families created by marriage.

Thus we are moving toward a solution of the problem in reverse gear, leaving entirely untouched the job of unscrambling the 37,000 Detroit families that are living doubled up and providing standard housing for the 46,000 Detroit families living in slum conditions.

The sad postwar record of the private home building industry hardly needs amplification from me.

The industry as a whole is seriously sick, just as any industry is sick when it fails in its primary purpose, namely the sale of an acceptable product in sufficient quantity and at a price within the reach of a majority of its potential customers.

In the face of the most serious housing shortage in the Nation's history, the home building industry is producing in small quantity for the higher-income groups only. The complete facts about this unfortunate condition have been described in detail by analysts of such publications as Fortune magazine and the Wall Street Journal.

Very few of the new home buyers in Detroit during the postwar period are happy about the transaction they have made.

The typical comment of the man in Detroit who has just purchased a new home goes like this:

"I shouldn't have bought the house because I cannot afford it. But what else could I do? I didn't have any place for my family to live."

Most of the new home buyers in Detroit have acted under pressure of a serious personal housing problem.

A worker at the Dodge plant came to me about his housing problem last week. He was spending $45 a week out of a $65 weekly pay check to keep his family of five in two rooms of a second-class hotel.

He was in an extremely upset frame of mind and could easily have been led into making an unwise purchase of a home priced far beyond his means.

New homes being built in Detroit, therefore, represent only about a third of the current demand, and with prices at their present high level it appears likely that the needs of most of the potential customers will never be satisfied.

There are several other factors that will make our housing emergency particularly critical during the years immediately ahead.

The Housing Commission operates over 6,000 units of temporary war housing which is rapidly wearing out and under the law must be torn down starting July 25, 1949.

The impossibility of turning these families out in the street under present conditions should be obvious. Very few of these families have accumulated the funds to make a down payment on a new house.

Another problem that haunts us is the plight of the 7,220 families that will be made homeless in Detroit during the next 3 years by the construction of the Lodge and Ford Expressways and other public improvements that have been programed and money appropriated for.

It seems almost incredible, yet entirely within the bounds of possibility, that our great $60,000,000 expressway construction program might have to be called off or postponed because of the housing shortage.

A large percentage of the 7,220 families to be displaced by public improvements are low-income tenant families for whom public housing would appear to be the only answer.

Condemnation awards paid for slum properties in the path of the expressways go to the absentee landlords. The tenant families that are evicted are simply left standing on the sidewalk with no place to go and no funds with which to provide themselves with shelter.

In the face of a severe housing shortage, any municipal government that ignored the plight of these evictee families would be morally bankrupt.

Bad as things are today, Detroit would appear to be heading into much more serious trouble if we allow the housing problem to drift and rely on the vague hope that the shortage will cure itself.

Private enterprise left entirely to itself is not doing the big job that needs to be done.

In what way will the Taft-Ellender-Wagner law hurt private enterprise?

The small speculative home builder has plenty of work to do today and always will have.

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner law, attacking the problem from a half dozen different angles, will bring into the field the big insurance firms and encourage the growth of large housing corporations.

Also, this carefully thought out, bipartisan housing measure will permit cities to continue the all-important slum-clearance job that was begun under the United States Housing Act of 1937.

Under its provisions, private enterprise will also be given an important share of the slum-clearance and urban-redevelopment task.

Sound community planning in Detroit and every other large city of the United States hinges to a large extent on the enactment of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

It would appear that the enactment of this law is being delayed largely because the small home builders and real-estate interests are obsessed with a phobia relating to public housing.

The only people who will be hurt by the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and by public housing are those real-estate interests who are reaping excessive profits due to the housing shortage.

The slum landlord and the speculative home builder will suffer only insofar as the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill expands the construction of homes and increases the total supply of homes.

These interests will then no longer be able to charge for their product "all that the traffic will bear."

To that extent they will suffer.

The real opposition to the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill comes from those real-estate interests that have a direct financial stake in prolonging indefinitely the present housing shortage.

Otherwise, private enterprise has nothing to fear from the law and, in fact, those builders who are really interested in serving the needs of their country will thrive under it.

They have said that public housing does not pay taxes and that it acts as a burden on the taxpayers who live in private housing.

This particular fairy story has been so widely circulated that I suppose there are some who actually believe it.

As far as Detroit is concerned, the facts are these:

During the current fiscal year the Detroit Housing Commission has paid a total of $570,456 in taxes to the city of Detroit, or $50.86 for every dwelling unit of public housing.

This makes the Detroit Housing Commission the tenth largest taxpayer in the city of Detroit.

A survey of 162 typical slum dwelling units in Detroit shows that the average local tax-payment per unit was $24.68, or less than half the amount of taxes paid for each public housing unit.

Average rent for a Detroit housing project unit is $33.02 per month, including heat and utilities, as compared with an average $40 to $60 per month which the typical slum dweller pays to house his family in a single room.

Slums are an expensive luxury for any city. They fall far short of paying their own way in terms of tax revenue and they make it possible for landlords to extract extortionate rents from our citizens who are least able to pay.

Let's take a typical slum rooming house at 4264 Orleans Street, Detroit.

According to the records of the Detroit welfare department, the 35 single rooms in this ancient structure rent for an average of $11 per week per room. Most of the rooms are occupied by families with children.

Thus a rooming house with an assessed valuation of $12,490 brings in gross revenue to the landlord of $18,480 per year.

Is it any wonder that some real-estate interests are opposed to slum clearance?

There is nothing unusual or new about the exploitation of human misery for profit by slum landlords.

It simply bears repeating at a time when the objectives of the Federal low-rent public-housing program are under attack.

They have accused public housing of sloppy and inefficient management.

This is another myth promulgated by the real-estate interests and without any foundation in fact.

The financial balance sheet of the Detroit Housing Commission over a period of 10 years of operation should be sufficient answer.

For the current fiscal year the balance sheet shows an average shelter rent for public housing in Detroit of $24.98. Without any Federal subsidy payments at all, this would have been $25.60.

The Detroit Housing Commission's record on collections of $19,500,000 of rent has been 99.83 percent perfect.

That hardly sounds to me like sloppy administration.

I see no reason for any public official, Federal or local, to make any apologies for the job done by public housing.

It was intelligently planned and carried out and now has behind it a proven record of 10 years of successful operation.

It has been said that public housing is the gateway to socialism or communism.

Let me ask you one question.

If an agent from Moscow was looking for recruits for the Communist Party where could he spend his time to the best advantage?

Would it be at a public-housing project where low-income families pay a reasonable rent for adequate, sanitary housing and are putting away a nest egg against the day when they will be able to buy their own home?

Or could he work to better advantage in the slums of our cities where large families live amid filth and disease and where an extortionate rent is collected for damp, dark, ramshackle dwellings?

Public housing does put slum families on the road to home ownership.

Even at present-day prices, more than 39 percent of all families that moved out of Parkside project in Detroit during the past year purchased their own homes.

Is it likely that an agent from Moscow would have found any Communist recruits among those families?

The answer is clear.

Communism could take over in America some day.

Communism feeds on misery and on the failure of governments to meet the needs of their people.

Our failure to meet and solve this critical housing shortage would help communism. Our failure to clear the slums and put our municipal finances on a sound basis would gladden the hearts of the Communists. Our failure to hold families together and provide a cheerful, healthy environment for our children would meet their approval.

We can stop the spread of communism in America easily—we can help do it by giving every American a decent home to live in and at a fair price that he can afford to pay.

I hope that you will report promptly and favorably on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner long-range housing bill.

Lawful Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, the question of what is lawful money today has frequently arisen in my mind. Accordingly I was much interested in the article on this subject by Sylvia Porter appearing in the Philadelphia Inquirer of May 13, 1948, which is submitted herewith. Naturally, it does not relieve my serious concern to know the United States Treasury considers the term "lawful currency" no longer has special significance.

The article follows:

UNITED STATES PLEDGE ON MONEY IS USELESS

(By Sylvia Porter)

On any $5 or $10 Federal Reserve note in your pocket you will find the statement "this note is redeemable in lawful money at the United States Treasury or at any Federal Reserve bank." At this minute, you probably accept the words "lawful money" as having very special, perhaps sacred meaning. Until now, I admit I've always thought so when I've thought about it at all. But today, because of a curious citizen from Cleveland, I'm smack up against the realization

that to you and me, lawful money no longer has special significance. If anything, this pledge on our money is useless.

Before I proceed with this, let me hasten to explain that I'm not scared about this and trust you won't be either.

But it is an odd sensation to wake up to the fact that a legend written on the paper money of the greatest nation in the world does not mean what it seems to mean.

It comes as a bit of a shock to know that if I trotted over to the Federal Reserve bank in Wall Street and presented a Reserve note for redemption, the officials there could not give me what the books say is "lawful money" at the Reserve.

And it's slightly uncomfortable to understand that most of our paper money is not "redeemable." It is, as Prof. Walter Spahr, of New York University, remarks, "merely exchangeable for other domestic money" and nearly all of that, he adds, "is likewise irredeemable."

It's a little disturbing—yes; a little disturbing for a lot of reasons.

That curious citizen from Cleveland—A. F. Davis by name—started it back in December when he apparently decided to find out what is "lawful money." Davis, I'm informed, is a vice president of the Lincoln Electric Co. of Cleveland.

So Davis wrote the Treasury and the Treasury wrote back. And a few days ago, the National Industrial Conference Board got hold of the letters.

With no comment but under the intriguing headline, "A dollar is a dollar is a dollar," it has just revealed them in its quarterly journal, American Affairs.

Now here goes with the first from Davis to Treasury Chief Snyder:

"I am sending you herewith via registered mail one $10 Federal Reserve note. On this note is inscribed the following:

"'This note is legal tender for all debts, public and private, and is redeemable in lawful money at the United States Treasury or at any Federal Reserve bank.'

"In accordance with this statement, will you send to me $10 in lawful money?"

From M. E. Slindee, Acting Treasurer of the United States, to Davis 2 days later:

"Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of December 9 with enclosure of one $10 Federal Reserve note.

"In compliance with your request, two $5 United States notes are transmitted herewith.'

From Davis to Slindee 12 days later:

"Receipt is hereby acknowledged of two $5 United States notes, which we interpret from your letter are to be considered as lawful money. Are we to infer from this that the Federal Reserve notes are not lawful money?

"I am enclosing one of the $5 notes which you sent to me. I note that it states on the face:

"'The U. S. of America will pay to the bearer on demand five dollars.'

"I am hereby demanding $5."

From Slindee to Davis 6 days later after the usual opening:

"You are advised that the term 'lawful money' has not been defined in Federal legislation. It first came into use prior to 1933 when some United States currency was not legal tender. * * * Since the act of May 12, 1933, * * * makes all coins and currency of the United States legal tender * * * the term 'lawful currency' no longer has such special significance.

"The $5 United States note received with your letter is returned," etc.

Davis pushed the Treasury into admitting that "lawful money" has not been defined by law (!) and into demonstrating that "redeemable" on our paper money is a slippery word indeed.

It's an amusing, provocating correspondence—but its implications are not so amusing as the thoughts provoked not so sweet.

The least we can expect is that the pledges written on our currency be as exact as the English language will permit—not painfully, obviously inexact.

Starving the Watchdog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. DEANE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial entitled "Starving the Watchdog," from the May 1948 issue of the National Municipal Review, New York, N. Y.:

STARVING THE WATCHDOG

Statesmen preach the gospel of States' rights and the need for strong, healthy, local self-government, but when they get into high office where their votes on specific questions can undermine or bolster these obvious basic needs of a workable democracy, they seem to have an unerring instinct, though perhaps unwittingly, for destruction.

Here are three specific current examples of first-rate importance which call for more careful and thoughtful consideration as well as for quick protest from persons and organizations devoted to the preservation of our system.

For 50 years the Government's division of the Bureau of the Census has compiled data on the cost of State and local governments. These figures are of great value to governmental research and civic organizations, to public officials who are desperately attempting to keep government going on a dollar that is a mere shadow of its former self, and to Federal and State agencies which are constantly working to clarify and simplify intergovernmental relationships.

Now the House of Representatives has voted to destroy this work. Its refusal to approve its modest appropriation of $350,000 would have that effect. In doing this, the House voted $50,000 to be used merely to devise a "more useful" program.

Vital as its work has been for many years, the Government's division may not be a perfect operation. Where is one? But improvements can be—indeed, have been—made without stopping a process which should have unbroken continuity, especially at a time when problems of public finance are so difficult. It has been claimed that there is a great diversity in the reports of the various States and municipalities. In a system like ours this is inevitable; and it is just as true in other fields for which the Federal Government gathers data. Progress has been made toward greater uniformity, with the encouragement of the Government's division, but the very existence of the diversity makes all the more imperative a central agency which can reduce these reports to a common basis and present the key data in a uniform and comparable condition.

If it were not so starved for funds, the Government's division could do much,while continuing to gather basic data, to encourage better and more uniform accounting and reporting methods by State and local governments.

Another example is the State Law Section of the Library of Congress which has existed for a quarter of a century. After months of careful study, the Seventy-ninth Congress enlarged this program by establishing a current bill and acts service so that all State bills and acts would be separately checklisted and important acts summarized. This service was chiefly for Federal departments and agencies which needed reliable, up-to-date information on State legislation. The States wanted this service, too, and cooperated fully individually and through the Council of State Governments.

But before the project could be carried through to completion for one single series of legislative sessions, the Eightieth Congress wiped it out altogether.

The third example is the Division of Federal-State Relations in the Department of Justice, which was launched about 15 years ago to work for uniform crime laws among the States and gradually developed into a central clearing house for proposals on uniform legislation generally. Obviously there is much to be accomplished in this field. But in 1947 its funds were cut so low that only a skeleton force could be maintained.

These activities furnish the teeth for the watchdogs over the Public Treasury—the civic and research groups, the taxpayers' associations; yes, and the many public officials who, despite opinion to the contrary, don't like the smell of pork barrels. They need facts. They are constantly asking the National Municipal League questions like these:

What are the per capita tax collections in other States and cities?

What are the laws of other States on elections, rent control, community property, or the regulation of air commerce?

What are the costs and expenditure trends in comparable places for fire and police service, education, health, highway construction and maintenance?

Where is a good job being done for less?

This information can be gathered, analyzed and reduced to a comparable basis only by some central agency which has stability and continuity. It is needed by the millions of citizens who in the postwar years have been staging an encouraging revival of solid efforts to improve local and State affairs.

It is a doubtful economy to withhold these relatively small appropriations—mere chicken feed compared to others of undemonstrated value—in the light of the economy chain reaction which proceeds to all parts of the land on the sound pathways marked out by these coldly burning facts.

The Senate can perform a service by examining these needs in a thoughtful, thorough manner.

Repeal of Oleomargarine Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WISCONSIN STATE
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Madison, Wis., May 14, 1948.

Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Many citizens who are interested in the welfare of the Nation have contacted Members of the Senate by mail, telephone, or telegraph requesting the opportunity to appear before your committee to discuss the results which would follow the removal of the Federal tax on colored oleomargarine. The scheduled hearing is drawing close and I have not been informed that such requests have been granted. May I, therefore, ask that this letter be made a part of the record of the committee hearing on the proposals?

To a large extent, the future economic welfare of our Nation is entrusted to you

and your colleagues and I know that you are aware of that responsibility. This letter is written in an effort to be helpful to you in your deliberations. I shall try to focus attention on the fundamentals of the problem as it affects all of our citizens and to avoid separate agricultural considerations as such, as well as the superficial aspect on which the oleomargarine interests have placed so much emphasis.

THE PHYSICAL WELFARE OF THE PEOPLE OF THE NATION

The physical welfare of our citizens is the result of a nutritious diet. In this the protein and minerals of milk and meat are desirable and necessary.

For every pound of butterfat in milk there are also produced approximately 2.6 pounds of milk solids, not fat. This food is rich in protein and minerals and is generally recognized as an important source of these elements so vital to our diet. Loss of the butter market will mean a further curtailment of our dairy herds and, as a consequence, the production of less milk. Thus, 2.6 pounds of these milk solids will be lost irretrievably for every pound of butter which is replaced by oleomargarine. No one has indicated how this loss is to be replaced. I am confident that none of our dietitians would venture to say that our present diet is such that these proteins and minerals from milk are not necessary.

A reduced demand for milk and butterfat will mean less cattle of the dairy type. Statistics indicate that about 5,000,000 dairy cows and approximately ten to eleven million veal calves are slaughtered for meat annually. To the extent that the number of dairy cattle is reduced through the substitution of vegetable fat for milk fat, the beef and veal available to the American consumers will be reduced. The production of meat per capita has steadily declined during the past two decades. The dairy cow is our most efficient converter of roughage into food for man. Replacement by beef-type cows will not fully compensate for this loss of efficiency. With a further reduction of meat resulting from the loss of a market for butterfat, it would definitely appear that the consumers will be required to pay a higher price for meat—a new cost which would more than offset the tax saving on oleomargarine.

THE ECONOMIC WELFARE OF THE PEOPLE OF THE NATION

Our Government has recognized soil-erosion control as a necessary part of our economic welfare. In recent years we, as a Nation, have become conscious of the need of conserving our soil resources if we are to remain a great Nation. The fostering of a livestock program has been recognized as an integral part of the soil-conservation program. We have already pointed out the efficiency of the dairy cow as a converter of the products of grassland farming into human food. This efficient conversion is essential to successful grassland farming. Many millions of tax dollars are spent annually by Federal agencies in an effort to conserve our soil resources through a grassland livestock program The replacement of butterfat with vegetable fat in our diet will make it difficult, if not impossible, for the Nation to make further progress in grassland farming. The production of vegetable fats now largely used in the manufacture of oleomargarine lends itself to the rapid destruction and loss of our valuable topsoils. It is impossible to justify tremendous appropriations to conserve soil resources and at the same time encourage a type of farming that destroys these resources.

THE BALANCE OF POPULATION AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

World War II is still fresh in our minds, and we cannot have forgotten the contribution which agriculture made to the winning of the war and is making to the winning of the peace. Yet statistics reveal that our rural population is declining at an alarming rate. Rural youth is moving to the cities which hold forth prospects of greater financial return and an opportunity to enjoy a standard of living that many of our farms cannot supply. The rural standard of living has lagged behind that of urban areas, as is shown by the absence of telephones, electric lights, running water, and other modern conveniences throughout rural areas. Churches and schools are other measuring sticks which may be used. The rural people have the same desires for the better things of life as do their city cousins. If the financial returns from farming permitted, they would have the same cultural advantages and physical conveniences as do people in the urban areas.

By its very nature the dairy industry has been the most stable segment of agriculture. In periods of difficult times dairying has been a point of strength upon which the stability of agriculture as a whole has largely depended.

A reduction in the demand for butterfat will place a further financial handicap in the way of a segment of society which, despite recent advances, is still among the lowest income bracket. Presumably, this will hasten the movement of people from the farm to the city.

We have experienced the need of a strong, sound agricultural economy during periods of national emergency. We must not now lend our aid to forces which would further upset the necessary balance in our population structure. We must encourage that segment of our population which produces the food and fiber so necessary to our Nation, to stay on the job.

PROTECTION AGAINST FRAUD AND DECEIT

The people of the Nation have a legal and moral right to be protected against cheap substitutes. This has been a basic philosophy in our State and Federal food and drug laws. Oleomargarine is the one product which has been permitted to be made with ingredients intended to make it taste, spread, melt, feel, and smell like the product it seeks to imitate—butter. The purpose of the pending legislation is to remove the controls once considered necessary when the product is also made to look like butter.

The imitation will then be complete so far as the senses can discern. That fraud and deception may then be anticipated is clearly indicated by the fact that 23 States now prohibit the sale of colored oleomargarine and some foreign countries require the inclusion of some clearly distinguishing ingredient.

Each time butter has been able to prove its superiority oleomargarine has been permitted to augment its composition to maintain its alleged nutritional equality.

A consumer should not be required to submit a product to laboratory analysis to be sure he is getting butter if he wants it. The label does not remain with the product in public eating places. Citizens who want butter should be entitled to the same protection that is afforded citizens buying any other food.

Just this week it was necessary for this department to prosecute a Wisconsin restaurant for using oleomargarine as and for butter. We have also been informed of similar prosecutions in other States during recent months.

Oleomargarine proponents have approached this legislation largely through inducing the American public to think that the American dairymen are a selfish lot interested in protecting their financial returns.

The foregoing arguments relate to the entire population. I doubt that you will find any discussion of these fundamental issues in the vast expensive propaganda campaign being conducted by the oleomargarine manufacturers.

MILTON H. BUTTON,
Director, Wisconsin State Department of Agriculture.

Look! Holes in the Cheese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit for the RECORD an editorial by Mr. Richard Lloyd Jones, of Tulsa, Okla., appearing in the Tulsa Tribune of May 8, 1948. This is a most timely article and should be read by all. It contains human interest and is the exposition of a very sound philosophy, which should inspire us in these times.

I quote the editorial, as follows:

LOOK! HOLES IN THE CHEESE
(By Richard Lloyd Jones)

Swiss cheese is full of holes. But you don't buy the holes, you buy the cheese. The holes add nothing to the weight of the cheese. The holes cost nothing, but the cheese has a market value. It would be perfectly silly to throw the cheese away because it is full of holes. Yet figuratively that is what a lot of our "expert" New Deal economists have been urging us to do.

The industrial and commercial life of the American people, which has brought more comforts, enjoyments, and embellishments to us than any other people on earth have ever known, has been and is the best economic structure man has ever devised. There are holes in this structure. There are faults. But the faults grow fewer as we discover faults and correct them. Progress is a refining process, never obstructive.

It has been a pet pastime of our so-called economic experts to find our faults, grow eloquent in their denunciation, and totally fail to balance the ledger, our assets and liabilities. All they have seen are the holes in the cheese.

We would not be riding in automobiles today, conversing on telephones at our elbows, easing housework with washers and refrigerators unless enterprise had been guaranteed its constitutional rights. But because there have been abuses at times and in places, politicians who elected to call themselves "progressives" began to damn success. Gullible citizens were taught that industrial success was a sin. The late Senator LaFollette began this political presumption and affectation. He built his political strength in his home State, Wisconsin, by making a raid on prosperity. Yet neither he, nor any one of his political henchmen, could give to the people of his own State the social and economic security that was made for them by the very industries he condemned. He built a whole teaching force in the university of his State, dedicated to the sole purpose of finding the holes in the cheese. Blind men who couldn't see the cheese itself. And that kind of stuff was labeled "progressive."

In 1932 along comes Franklin Roosevelt with a whole collection of experts in finding holes in the cheese. For 15 years about all we have heard from Washington is the way we were going wrong, and not a word about the way we were going right. Up to the time of Franklin Roosevelt we had been going so right for a hundred and fifty years that we were the one and the only robust Nation in the world.

So robust that even after 15 years of hole hunting and "liberal" limitations on liberty, the whole world is beginning to cuss because we don't open our gates and let the peoples of the world who have not learned how to take care of themselves come into

our country to share our triumphs. Triumphs which even the New Dealers have not yet been able to destroy.

Every businessman tries to improve his business. If that were not his objective he would not be a businessman. If he finds faults in the operations of his enterprises he tries to correct the faults. If there is friction and resistance which slows down the productive power he tries to eliminate those things that subtract from the maximum of his industrial powers. But he does not pick up the whole shop and junk it because he finds a few correctable flaws.

She is a poor housewife who throws away the whole barrel of apples because she finds a few that are rotten. The intelligent housekeeper sorts the apples. She picks out the rotten apples and keeps the good ones. That is all that industry and commerce have been doing in our America for 172 years. And the political party that persuades the people to put its leader in the White House to condemn progress and organize a raid on prosperity simply betrays the people.

For 15 years, under the name of a New Deal, the people have been so far diverted from the honest deal that made America it has become the pet pastime of political demagogues to denounce prosperity in the name of "progress" and to look upon any commercial and industrial success as a sin.

Not contented with this search for the holes in the cheese this Truman administration has set out to see how many apple carts it can tip over. The Truman boys have gone out needlessly and deliberately to offend the entire southern bloc of States which foolishly have, for 80 years, voted their prejudice rather than their intelligence. But Truman has offended them so far that at long last they threaten to forget their ingrown prejudice and vote against the President who has needlessly offended them.

Nobody but a criminal is for lynching. Nobody but a criminal is in favor of murder. Lynching is murder. It is nothing else. There isn't a State in the Union which does not condemn murder. It is the highest crime. Every State should handle its murder cases according to its own laws. Every State does. As long as lynching is murder there is no need of a Federal statute to be concerned with that form of murder any more than any other form of murder.

If murder by lynching is to be controlled by a Federal law then the Federal Government, by that same logic, should make murder by shooting, by stabbing, by poisoning, by bludgeoning a Federal and not a State offense. We should have a Federal statute governing all the assortments of ways of committing murder. And in the last analysis the Federal statute will be no more than the States' statutes that already exist for murder in all forms.

This Truman administration, furthered by the late President Roosevelt before him, and with Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt endorsing, has tried to make it appear that those who see no reason for a Federal law on murder are brutal inhumans who favor lynching. That of course is a diabolical and contemptible lie against every honest and intelligent citizen of the land. No one favors lynching.

Well, this is just another illustration of how the New Deal tipped over the apple cart and branded the people as reactionaries who would put the cart on its wheels again and the apples back in the box.

It has taken 15 years for the American people to realize what they have done to themselves by following false "liberals." But there is every evidence that at long last the people are alert now.

For 15 years Cabinet officers have been taught that they, and not the elected Congressmen, are the lawmakers of the land. This in violent repudiation of the Constitution which they have taken their solemn oaths to uphold.

For 15 years Federal judges have been taught that any one of them, like that fellow Ben Moore over in West Virginia, can repudiate the people's Congress with brazen impunity.

So long as we lived obedient to the Constitution we progressed. Since the phony "progressives," now under the name of the New Deal, ditched the Constitution we have gone headlong and pell-mell into economic confusions that have put the brakes on progress. Impeach some of these "I am king"-minded Federal judges. Send the autocratic bureaucrats back to the shops where they can go to work and make their wages like honest men.

It is time we quit listening to these cockeyed economists who have been telling us, "Look! the cheese is full of holes." Return to the Constitution and again a resolute America will rise to be the great progressive Nation.

Communism Is Not a Better System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Speaker, the Columbia Heights State Bank, Mr. Arthur L. Gluek, president, a locally owned independent bank, in the district I have the honor to represent, is currently publishing a series of newspaper advertisements exposing some of the falsehoods in Communist propaganda. This series of informatory advertisements was prepared by its executive vice president, Mr. Herbert Woodward. Because of the novel character of this intelligent attack on the falsehoods of communism, and because of the penetrating logic of the advertisements, I include them under leave to extend my remarks:

No. 1

COMMUNISM IS NOT A BETTER SYSTEM

If communism is a better system than ours why do the Russians have armed guards to keep people in?

And the United States has immigration laws and border guards to keep people out.

That proves that when people try communism they want "out"—and those who have tried liberty want "in."

No. 2

IF COMMUNISM HELPS THE WORKER WHY DOES STALIN HAVE MORE SECRET POLICE THAN THE CZAR EVER HAD?

How long would he last if the Russian workers could vote as they pleased?

America does not need secret police to herd the workingman. We don't have millions of spys and informers. We can speak above a whisper when we criticize the Government.

Would you like to live where any peeved neighbor could have you jailed by telling the secret service you dislike dictatorship?

No. 3

AMERICA HAS FREEDOM—FREEDOM BRINGS COMPETITION—COMPETITION LEADS TO PROGRESS

Russia has communism.

Communism brings dictatorship.

Dictatorship leads to bureaucracy and decadence.

They call our system capitalistic. The correct name is competitive. Russia has capitalism.

There the government owns the capital and the bureaucrats manage it. Here the people own the capital and individuals manage it.

No. 4

THE COMPETITIVE SYSTEM UNDER AMERICAN FREEDOM GIVES US 75 PERCENT OF THE WORLD'S AUTOS, 80 PERCENT OF ITS BATHROOMS AND FURNACES, AND 60 PERCENT OF ITS TELEPHONES

Our population of 6 percent turns out 36 percent of the world's production.

Thirty years of communism in the world's largest and richest country has given Russia less than 2 percent of the autos, bathrooms, furnaces and phones. Communism, meaning government ownership, brings inefficiency.

Russia even has to import food. Her best machines are nearly all imported from America or copied from ours.

COLUMBIA HEIGHTS STATE BANK.

American Legion Urges Passage of Mundt Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of the following letter from the director, national legislative commission, of the American Legion, urging active support and vote for the passage of the so-called Mundt bill, H. R. 5852, now being considered by this House. The letter follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 14, 1948.

Hon. GEORGE B. SCHWABE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On behalf of the American Legion, I respectfully request that you actively support and vote for the passage of the so-called Mundt bill, H. R. 5852, now on the House Calendar.

Since its organization, the American Legion has been cognizant of the dangers to our country of all subversive elements and un-American activities. Repeatedly during the past years representatives of the Legion have appeared before committees of Congress, particularly the House Un-American Activities Committee, urging that such legislation as that contained in the Mundt bill, which is in line with the program of our organization dealing with communism, be enacted into law. At the meeting of our national executive committee, held in Indianapolis May 3 to 5, full consideration was given to the Mundt bill, and a strong resolution was unanimously adopted, urging prompt enactment by Congress.

We are aware that a vigorous campaign is being carried on by Communist organizations and Communist fronts in which many misstatements have been made relative to the contents of H. R. 5852. The fact that they are so violent in their attacks on the bill indicates that they appreciate what Congress now intends so far as Communists and their organizations are concerned. The Mundt bill does not outlaw the Communist Party and its numerous front organizations, but provides certain registrations and restrictions which are absolutely essential to our national security.

William Z. Foster and Eugene Dennis, chairman and secretary of the national Communist Party, have made the bold threat that they will not comply with the Mundt bill

should the bill become a law. The American Legion and the American Legion Auxiliary, together with the overwhelming majority of the citizens of our country, feel that the provisions of the Mundt bill should be placed on our statute books.

The American Legion believes that the Congress will not permit itself to be intimidated by the Communist threat, but will promptly pass H. R. 5852.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN THOMAS TAYLOR,
Director, National Legislative Commission.

Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 11, 1948

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, a few years ago on Broadway, Miss Talullah Bankhead did very well for herself in a play called "The Little Foxes." I am reminded of it by a situation prevailing in Congress today which I think is analogous to a situation in the play.

One of the most dramatic scenes in "The Little Foxes" was that in which an old man died because the bottle of medicine which would have saved his life was on a table just out of his reach. He was unable to get to it himself, and his scheming wife stood coldly by and let him die instead of handing it to him.

There are in this country today some thousands of old men and women who are suffering great hardship because the annuities they draw under the Railroad Retirement Act are not sufficient to feed, clothe, and house them properly. The money which would alleviate their distress is available in the railroad retirement fund, but it is out of their reach. They cannot get to it themselves, and Congress, thus far, has been in the position of standing coldly by, letting them suffer and die, instead of making it possible to use that money.

The "bottle of medicine" which would help these aged folks is a bill, H. R. 5993. It provides for only a modest increase in retirement annuities, ranging from 20 to 25 percent, with the greatest percentage increase going to the lowest income groups. The reason the proposed increase is such a modest one is not that these people need only a little help. On the contrary. The proposal has been kept within those limits for the reason that the railroad workers, who pay taxes to support the retirement fund, wanted to be sure that Congress would have no reason to refuse or to delay passage of the bill. They therefore had careful studies made to find out the amount of increase that would be possible without danger to the financial stability of the retirement fund and without resort to a tax increase. The proposals in H. R. 5993 stemmed from those studies.

The bill, if passed, will relieve in some measure the distress of the good American citizens who devoted their lives to the railroad industry and are now too old to work; it will leave the railroad retirement fund in sound condition; and it will not take a cent out of your pocket or of mine, out of the railroads or of the railroad employees. Plainly, this being the case, the proponents of the bill are correct: Congress has no reason to refuse or to delay passage of the bill.

Thus far, however, Congress has done both. The bill was introduced 2 months ago. It has not yet reached the floor. In all fairness to the Members of this House, I must say I feel sure that, given a chance to vote, they would vote overwhelmingly to give these faithful old workers the money they so sorely need and which is there—just out of their reach. It is my purpose today to appeal to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to give the Members of the House that chance. Report out H. R. 5993 immediately so that we may vote upon it promptly and favorably. Give us a chance to remove the resemblance we now bear to the lady in "The Little Foxes" who was so unmoved by human suffering.

Taft-Hartley Law and the Union Worker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, of the 72,000,000 life insurance policy holders in the United States nearly all work for a living. Numerous union members have inquired as to how the Taft-Hartley law will affect their employment as well as their life insurance. The Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association of New York City has prepared an analysis of the 1947 law and I am including it as part of my remarks. I commend it to the attention of every Member:

To All Policyholders:

In order to give those of our members who belong to labor unions dependable information concerning the Labor Relations Act of 1947 (Taft-Hartley law) we have made a careful investigation and analysis of its provisions. We find that many of the public statements concerning this new law are based upon misunderstanding and misinterpretation. Although we believe the law can and should be improved in some of its particulars, it is our considered conclusion that the basic purpose of the law can be summed up as follows:

"To protect working men and women from unfair or discriminatory treatment by either employers or irresponsible union officials and to protect them and their employers and the public from increased costs and higher prices caused by unnecessary work stoppages."

However, in order that you may have a full understanding of the law, we urge that you write your Congressman for a free copy. Ask him for Public Law No. 101. For your convenience we give you below a brief summary of your rights and responsibilities under the law.

WHAT THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW DOES

1. It protects you from discrimination by either your employer or by some irresponsible union official.

2. It protects your constitutional right to quit your job at any time.

3. It protects you from loss of pay caused by wild cat strikes, secondary boycotts, and jurisdictional disputes and requires your employer and union officials to negotiate for 60 days before declaring a strike or lockout—and if you work in a plant whose product affects the national health and safety there can be no strike or lockout until after on 80-day "cooling off" period.

4. It permits your shop to be unionized if a majority of your fellow workers vote for it by secret ballot.

5. It strengthens you in your relationships with your own union by:

(a) Preventing you from losing your union card so long as you pay your dues and legal assessments.

(b) Preventing you being charged a higher fee than other members.

(c) Requiring your union officials to account to you for moneys they receive and spend.

(d) Requiring union officials to declare whether they are members of the Communist Party.

(e) Prevents your employer from giving any of your union officials a bribe or gift.

(f) Gives you the right (in certain cases) to vote secretly on accepting or rejecting an offer from your employer for settling a dispute which affects your job.

(g) Gives you the right to decide for yourself whether or not you wish to join a picket line without fear of losing your job or union card.

(h) Protects your political rights by permitting you to openly support the candidate of your choice without fear of discrimination by your employer or union officials.

(i) Prohibits your union from spending your union dues or forcing you to pay special assessments for political purposes—and likewise prevents your employer from spending corporation funds for political purposes.

(j) Gives you the right to negotiate directly with your employer, in case you have a legitimate grievance over your rate of pay or working conditions.

(k) Gives you the right of individual recourse to the National Labor Relations Board if you have a grievance against your employer or a union official which you are unable to settle successfully—a right which individuals and minorities did not previously have.

6. Gives your union the right to sue your employer for breaking its contract and your employer can sue your union for the same reason. But if your union is held liable for damages the law specifically exempts you from any personal financial liability.

7. Gives you the right to demand a special election if you believe the union, which has a contract with your employer, no longer represents a majority of the workers in your plant.

8. Protects your union from rival unions after it has entered into a contract with your employer.

9. Requires your written consent before your employer can "check off" your dues or assessments.

And now a word about your life insurance.

A principal purpose of the Taft-Hartley law is to protect workers, employers, and the public from unnecessary work stoppages. Strikes and lock-outs prevent workers from keeping up their life insurance. Also, they slow up production, and thus increase the cost of living.

Our country's greatest need is full production at prices people can afford to pay. Work stoppages inevitably cause inflation and inflation lessens the purchasing value of your life insurance dollar.

Ask your wife or corner grocer how much the "bread and butter" value of your life insurance policy has declined since 1940. If your life insurance no longes gives your wife and family sufficient protection against your unexpected death, you should increase that protection by taking out more insurance and

safeguarding its purchasing value by resisting efforts by anyone to lower production and thereby increase the cost of living.

LIFE INSURANCE POLICYHOLDERS PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION

A nonpartisan nonprofit membership association of life insurance policyholders organized in 1940.

Crime Prevention—Low-Cost Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Nochem S. Winnet:

CRIME PREVENTION—LOW-COST HOUSING

(By Nochem S. Winnet, chairman, Crime Prevention Association of Philadelphia)

To talk only of juvenile delinquency is a negative approach to our problem. The positive approach is to seek the causes and try to remove them. The Crime Prevention Association throughout the 16 years of its existence has emphasized the importance of marshaling the constructive forces in the community to combat the destructive ones which cause crime and delinquency.

The preventive efforts of the community have not been in vain because during the year 1947 there was a further decline in delinquency. However, we are still faced with the grim fact that over 7,000 boys and girls fell into delinquency and crime during the past year and the municipal court continued, as in past years, making over 1,000 commitments to various institutions. While we may take comfort in a reduction in the arrests of juveniles and the knowledge that the number of delinquents would be much greater were it not for the preventive efforts of the Philadelphia community, there is no excuse for complacency or inactivity.

The causes of delinquency are many. We have in previous years emphasized the predisposing causes, such as the adolescent age, personality, and mental defects; and precipitating causes in the environment, such as confusion of parents, lack of recreational activities, substandard housing, economic discrimination, etc.

If there is one cause on which everyone is agreed, it is substandard housing. It is a primary cause of delinquency and crime. For all police cases, involving boys under 18, the rate per thousand for the year 1947 was 26.6. In the eighth police district, Poplar to Vine Streets, Broad to Delaware Avenue, an area of substandard housing, the rate was 115.7 per thousand. In the nineteenth district, River to River, Chestnut to South Street, the rate was 88 per thousand. In the first district, Washington Avenue to South Street, Broad to Schuylkill River, the rate was 86.8. In the twelfth district, Poplar to Susquehanna Avenue, Broad to Sixth Street, the rate was 77.7.

Sociologists have ascribed the increase in crime among adults to the same cause. There has been an increase of 21.5 percent in the arrests of young men between the ages of 21 and 24, and an increase of 16.8 percent in the arrests of girls in the same age group. Bad housing causes maladjustment in human lives; maladjustment brings on frustration and hostility to society and ultimately leads to crime.

Lack of decent housing is a great cause of broken homes and is a dominating factor in the large increase in the divorce rate. Any judge who has sat in domestic-relations court can readily attest to this. Many young couples would have had a better chance for a happy marriage relationship were it not for inadequate housing facilities.

The irony is that here is a cause of maladjustment, of delinquency, crime, broken homes, divorce, which can be removed by society. Many evils are much more difficult to combat. For instance, it is most difficult to reeducate parents; to end bias and discrimination; to build and administer needed recreational centers. But homes can be built, slum areas can be removed. The tragedy is that very little, in fact almost nothing, has been done.

As a crime prevention association we must join with other forces in the community in urging an immediate public housing program. In some quarters this is regarded as interfering with private builders. Anyone familiar with the great and desperate need knows that private industry cannot meet this emergency.

The necessities of Philadelphia have been estimated at 27,000 houses annually for the next 5 years.[1] Ten percent, or 2,700 units, are needed for incomes below $1,000 at a rental below $17; 17 percent, or 4,590 units, for incomes between $1,000 and $2,000 at an average rental of $25; 26 percent, or 7,020 units for incomes between $2,000 and $3,000 with an average rental of $42; 20 percent, or 6,500 units for incomes between $3,000, and $4,000, with an average rental of $58. A great percentage of families of delinquents fall into the low income groups.[2]

The needs of most veterans fall within the low and middle income groups.[3]

Can private industry unaided by subsidy build to supply this need? Obviously not.[4]

Undoubtedly, there is no more pressing social problem at the present time than adequate housing. We cannot afford to fiddle any longer while communities burn with this social evil. The Taft-Wagner-Ellender bill must be passed without any further delay. Even that measure is inadequate to meet the needs of all low income families for it would authorize only 100,000 units per year for the entire country. Nor would it meet the needs of large groups estimated at approximately 40 percent of all families which are ineligible for public low rent housing and yet unable to afford new private housing. That bill, however, is a minimum and must be passed. The State, too, must devise a dynamic housing program. The welfare of the citizens is the commonwealth's direct concern. Ultimately it pays the bill of the delinquents, the criminals, and other social evils created by poor housing.

Persons who most need better housing witnessed during the war the miracle of production in this country. We did a herculean job of producing machinery, trucks, guns, tanks, ships, airplanes for the purpose of destruction. It is inconceivable that we have not the ingenuity to marshal that same productive skill for the purpose of clearing our slums and building decent low-cost housing for people who cannot afford any other. This, more than anything, can demonstrate to our detractors the strength of our democracy. I know of no better crime-prevention program for this year than to urge immediate public, low-cost housing.

---

[1] Source of housing figures: Philadelphia Housing Association.

[2] Twenty-seven percent of all spending units in metropolitan areas in the United States had incomes of less than $2,000 in 1946. Forty-six percent of all spending units in metropolitan areas had incomes of between $2,000 and $4,000 in 1946.

[3] Philadelphia veterans who want to rent can pay an average of $30 a month; Philadelphia veterans who want to buy or build can pay an average of $5,300.

[4] Of the 4,533 dwellings constructed in Philadelphia in 1946, four-tenths of 1 percent sold for less than $7,000.

The Imminence of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT M. COLE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me to the convention of the First Congressional District of the Young Republican Club held at Holton, Kans., on April 17, 1948:

The problems which America and the world face today are the problems of peace. They are not the problems of war.

The problems of peace are not easy ones to solve. They are, in fact, much more difficult to solve than the problems of war. It is far more difficult to work together for a more prosperous world than it is to fight each other for the sake of destroying a world, for, when men work together for their own common good, they are bound to admit that there may be two or more methods at hand to assure reaching the desired goal. On the other hand, when men work against each other, they are too often inclined to assert that the particular measure they prefer is the only correct one in spite of all evidence to the contrary, and, when pressed to the point, men who work bitterly against each other annihilate their opponents before submitting to any changes in their original argument—changes, in many instances, which might remove all basis for a world-destroying quarrel.

The basic dilemma of the world today is this: We do not have in Moscow a government dedicated to the proposition that peace is possible, necessary, or even desirable.

Instead the Kremlin today is operating on one premise only, namely, that force, fear, and carefully nurtured ignorance are the only factors which can assure the continuity of governments.

We must prevent America from falling into the same pattern.

Force, fear, and ignorance are more familiar to the Soviets than to Americans. Since its beginning, the Soviet regime has been relentlessly and ruthlessly at war with its own people, its own fallen leaders, and a succession of foreign invaders. It is probably impossible to expect the Soviets to turn abruptly from their well-trodden ways of war to the untried paths of peace, so long as they are ruled by their present fear-ridden oligarchy.

I am an optimist. I believe in the imminence of peace—for this generation—perhaps for many years longer. This can be accomplished by using the past as a guidepost for the future.

Looking at the past, it is reasonable to believe that Mussolini's conquest of Ethiopia might have been forestalled by firm collective action by all the other great powers.

Even a little collective action during this period would have suppressed Hitler without a general war and, possibly, without bloodshed. We know now that if Hitler's troops had been ordered back from the unarmed Rhineland when they streamed into it, Hitler was prepared to resign rather than risk war at that time. We also know that Munich in 1938 was a colossally successful bluff on Hitler's part.

Had Daladier and Chamberlain remained firm against the demands of Hitler at Munich, the generals in command of his armies were prepared to rise in revolt against him. But, because it is just as true, in international affairs as elsewhere, that nothing succeeds like success, this long-planned revolt quite naturally failed to materialize when Hitler

returned from Munich with all he had bargained for.

The aftermath of this bargain is almost too familiar to require review. All of us recall how, when firmly and not too gently rebuffed at Munich, the Soviet Union bargained for security in the coming war—bargained with all comers, and with the control of Finnish and Baltic defense bases as a minimum price—and sold out to Adolf Hitler in 1939. That bargain stunned France and Great Britain who, apparently, reasoned that Hitler could be trusted not to deal with his arch enemy. Within 10 days of its inception, that bargain produced in Poland the beginning of World War II.

Thus, we see the sign posts of the past. Can we read them wisely enough to travel the road of peace and security? If not, we are doomed to untold misery and destruction.

I have some suggestions concerning how we may use these sign posts.

The typical Russian official, I believe, lives from 1 day's end to another in an atmosphere of fear and mistrust—an atmosphere intensified by secret police and tommyguns—and he has learned, through schooling in all cases and through personal experience in entirely too many cases, that to rely on anything other than mutual fear and mistrust is to court annihilation by foreign or domestic enemies. In such a threat-laden atmosphere, agreement is impossible unless it is clearly demonstrated, in advance, that there is no other solution available. In a word, to secure agreement in such an atmosphere, one must be strong and willing at the same time; one must negotiate while giving more than a casual glimpse of the consequences of a failure to negotiate. The Russian, reared in an atmosphere of fear, respects a hard bargainer; but he does not understand a negotiator who does not know and use the full strength of his bargaining, and is always quick to seize what is yielded to him in a moment of weakness. The Russian conqueror differs from his German counterpart in one respect: He knows his limits, and is content to abide by them. Since the days of Ivan, the Terrible, he will proceed to annex any contiguous piece of territory which he is convinced, on the basis of cold-blooded appraisal, can be secured without too much effort on his part.

Define terms which both you and the Russian know you can make stick if necessary, and the Russian will agree with you. But insist on terms which both you and the Russian negotiator know are not likely to stick, and you will find yourself in the unhappy position the Arab experienced with his camel's nose in the door of his tent; you will find that what begins, and continues as a series of small but cumulative requests, ends as a gradual, but, nonetheless, complete eviction from your house and home.

I believe that history shows that you cannot cure a Russian; you just have to bear with him.

Since its inception, the Truman administration has rushed from one extreme to another in dealing with the Soviets. At first, it sought to smother them with kindness, with results that are all too evident all over the world. Since March of 1947, it has veered to the opposite tack.

Let us review here the promise and the fulfillment of our great victory in 1945. The promise, as we know now and sensed then, was great, and it can still be, in great part, redeemed; its fulfillment to date leaves a world to be desired.

Three years ago today, American armies had reached Berlin, and were in position to race for Prague. Three years ago this April, American and British Armies held nearly half of the present Russian-occupied zone of Germany, and were beginning General Patton's bold dash deep into Czechoslovakia, with Prague as an obvious goal. Three years ago this coming August, after destroying the Japanese Navy and flattening two Japanese cities with atomic bombs, American armed forces might have reached Manchuria, as well as Japan, without firing another shot in the uncontrolled anger of warfare.

But this is history as it might have been. That history did not turn out, as it might have, is not the fault of the American armed services. The fault is preeminently one of diplomacy, and, specifically, the give all, take nothing diplomacy of Yalta and Potsdam. If there is to be blame assigned for the devious results, let the blame be assigned precisely where it belongs—at the very doorstep of the White House.

Just as surely as the conferences at Moscow and Tehran ratified Soviet supremacy in the Balkans, and certified that Bucharest, Budapest, Warsaw, and Vienna might, if Russia chose, become Russian conquests to have and to hold, the conference at Yalta, with far less military urgency, assigned both Berlin and Prague to the Russian sphere on identically harsh terms. And the crowning climax, so far as the present administration is concerned, came at Potsdam, which certified Manchuria as a free and untrammeled gift to Stalin.

There is this much to be said for the conduct of the Truman administration with respect to the Russians, what the Truman administration promises to the Russians, it delivers to the Russians. Three years ago, it voluntarily ceded to the Russians many of our German conquests. Not so very long ago, it went to very considerable trouble and expense to send General George Marshall out to China to tell Chiang Kai-shek, in no uncertain terms, to cooperate with the Communists. Only recently, prodded by Congress into a different approach, the Truman administration changed its position, but Manchuria had fallen under almost complete Communist sway. By so doing, it has fulfilled in letter and in spirit the last of its known bargains with Stalin; it has spread the iron curtain around half of Europe and the richest single industrial area of Asia.

It is true that there are those high in government circles, both military and civilian, who would attempt to solve the problem of peace by fear. It is perfectly true that the path to power can be smoothed by fright, but we in America resist such methods.

We must be realistic in a bitter, discouraged world. We must carry a big stick, as we speak softly.

We must have the courage of the strong, not the cowardice of the bully. We must be ready for trouble, not afraid of it.

Many of the signposts today point to the imminence of war. Very close to home, in our own back yard, civil war is raging in Costa Rica and Colombia. Bloodshed, bitterness, and hatred have torn India asunder. Guerrilla warfare in Greece, death and destruction in Palestine, intermittent but constant battles in China, in fact, throughout the world the promise of peace is shattered by falling bombs.

The Communists are now on the march. They have, by infiltration and intrigue, managed to become potent and dangerous threats to many of the major governments of the world. Even our own country is not free from this danger. Men and women in our own country have embraced this doctrine of despair.

It is time, therefore, that we treat the situation realistically. No longer can we coddle this menace. Communism today is not a theory of dictatorship of the proletariat—it is the dictatorship of a privileged few—who would destroy all freedom. They look longingly at America. It is conceivable that, even this year, they might decide to move against us, realizing we are not prepared for war.

I am convinced the United States became involved in World War II because we failed to accept the implications and responsibilities arising out of World War I. We were sick and disgusted with war. Our revulsion led to appeasement and the belief on the part of Hitler that we would never fight again. This time we must be strong enough to enforce the peace. For the present, at least, this requires military strength. I, for one, am ready to do my share.

With all these signposts pointing to the possibility of a war, there are, however, many pointing to peace.

Foremost among these factors making for peace is the fact that it takes years of planning and preparation to produce a major war. World War I required 7 years of intensive planning, and Hitler worked diligently for 6 years before launching World War II. Since no signs of preparation for world war III appeared before 1947 (and most of this so-called preparation is still chiefly in the talk stage), 1948 is not the year of crisis.

Another peace-pointing factor is this: Europe is not working for war. It is working for peace, and working as it never worked before in all its history, since the ancient days of Rome.

The effects of the Economic Cooperation Act, fashioned and passed in its present form, by a Republican Congress, and business managed by Republican Paul Hoffman, are now being felt in Europe. This affirmative move toward peace and security carries with it many promises for a successful conclusion It is a tremendous effort to stem the tide of despair and war.

Some people are saying scornful words about the United Nations. But I disagree with the prophets of failure. It is my considered opinion that this organization is a long step by the nations of the world in the direction of international agreement. It has the necessary machinery, and all we need to do is to use it.

What are the detailed grounds for optimism in Europe?

To put the most imminent possibility first, there is now little chance that Italy, having been shown the path of freedom and prosperity, will tomorrow choose the road to the slavery of communism.

France will continue I believe, to demonstrate its further faith in freedom, just as Italy is making the test tomorrow. Of all the western nations, France has perhaps the greatest potential power of recovery.

The "problem children" of western Europe are Great Britain and western Germany. I believe that Britain can make a gradual, if entirely unspectacular, recovery; one straw which points in this direction is the fact that this week the British pound has sold slightly above par on the French free foreign exchange. The problem of western Germany can, I believe, be solved only if it becomes part of a united western Europe. United with Europe, western Germany can further the peace of the world; set apart from it, Germany is almost certain to destroy that peace.

I do not look for a quick solution to either of the problems of Greece or Palestine, though all of us can always hope for miracles. It is, I fear, rather easy to overstress the importance of local warfare in these areas, especially if an attempt is made to prove that this warfare threatens the peace of the world as a whole.

As for South America and Asia, it is obvious that the United States must look to its laurels in these areas; and I can assure you that the Republican Congress is doing its best to remedy the faults of a recalcitrant Democratic executive branch.

I trust that the voters of America will in November help to assure world-wide peace and prosperity by electing a Republican President. Until the White House understands clearly the difference between agreement and coercion, it will never learn the reasons why it pays this Nation and the world to speak softly while carrying a big stick.

I propose that the Truman administration be taught in November the folly of trying to solve the problems of peace, by appeasement, fumbling methods, and political expediency.

Hon. Cordell Hull Urges That Congress Renew Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERE COOPER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, no one in public life has given greater service to the cause of peace and international good will than Hon. Cordell Hull. As Secretary of State he conceived the reciprocal trade program, which has become the basic foundation of our foreign economic policy. Mr. Hull now has undertaken the honorary chairmanship of the Citizens' Committee for Reciprocal World Trade.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a letter dated May 4, 1948, addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means by Mr. Gerard Swope, chairman, Citizens' Committee for Reciprocal World Trade, enclosing a statement by Mr. Hull in support of renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act:

CITIZENS' COMMITTEE FOR
RECIPROCAL WORLD TRADE,
New York, N. Y., May 4, 1948.

Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: As chairman of the Citizen's Committee for Reciprocal World Trade, I am submitting the reasons why we urge that H. J. Res. 335 should be voted by the Congress without amendment.

Since this letterhead was printed, the committee has grown to a total of 250 members living in 64 cities in 31 States and the District of Columbia. They are identified with banking, business, farm industry, labor, the Church, education and a cross section of civic and public service organizations with a membership totaling upward of 60,000,000 taxpayers and voters. Their political affiliations I frankly do not know; their point of common interest is an issue which transcends party lines.

They have rallied together because of their common fear that the security and the economy of their country would be impaired unless the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is continued in full force and for the traditional 3-year term. This act, which was originated in 1934, has subsequently been extended on four successive occasions after the Congress has conferred with the American people through public hearings. We are confident that, given the opportunity again to express themselves, the people would reaffirm their endorsement of this policy and program. Public opinion polls and other recent measurements of public attitude justify this belief.

There is grave danger that the good which the American people expect from the European Recovery Program will be lost and the billions of taxpayer dollars invested therein will be wasted, if the Congress which voted the Foreign Assistance Act fails to follow through with a parallel vote for continuation of the basic Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Present aid will descend to the level of temporary relief and a doubtful future unless this aid is a part of a long-term program. The return of the still free nations to self-support and permanent recovery depends on continuing and expanding the opportunities for trade. It is wholly unrealistic to expect that this recovery can develop if the greatest trading nation of them all should pull out of the joint effort.

The United States does not face this present critical situation in world affairs with the need to experiment. It has and has had for the past 14 years an established and tested approach to world cooperation.

As Hon. Cordell Hull has recently expressed it:

"The policy embodied in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934 and the program that has been carried forward to give effect to the act were carefully devised and have been amply tested."

The record is already documented to prove that the United States has enjoyed a substantially greater improvement in its trade with those nations with which it has negotiated reciprocal trade agreements than in its trade with other countries.

It is reasonable to presume that, in writing into the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 specific stipulations that the participating nations cooperate in negotiating mutual reductions in barriers to trade, the Congress had in mind the pioneering of the United States in this field through the reciprocal trade agreements program. Indeed, the third and final purpose stated in the act is to aid the participating nations to become independent of extraordinary outside economic assistance by facilitating and stimulating the growth of international trade of participating countries with one another and with other countries by appropriate measures including reduction of barriers which hamper such trade.

This would seem to pledge the United States to the consistency and continuity in policy which Secretary Marshall has emphasized as being so important.

It must be remembered that ERP is far from being an accomplished fact. It has just been launched. For the next several years billions of American tax dollars will be expended in carrying out its purposes. The Congress can be expected to follow closely the manner in which the Foreign Assistance Act is administered. At the same time the American people will be watching the legislative as well as the executive roles in the development of the program. They realize that ERP cannot work in a vacuum. They will reasonably expect that the Congress will keep in mind the over-all situation and take all steps necessary to attain the ultimate objective. Having authorized the expenditure of billions of dollars for European recovery, the Congress can expect the American public's evaluation of any action or inaction tending to jeopardize that investment.

At the same time the peoples of the free nations in Europe will be equally concerned with the interpretation and evaluation of any major moves by us as the dominant economic power. If we fail to continue in its present force and effectiveness a program which these nations have known and participated in during more than a decade, they are bound to interpret this change in policy as a retreat by us toward isolation. They will see the "red light" and start adjusting their economies toward a different future from what they had been led to expect from ERP. Any such adjustments must inevitably lead to totalitarianism in one form or another with consequent loss of our investment in democracy.

Again quoting Mr. Hull: The trade agreements policy and program "have provided a beacon light for the free nations of the world." The Congress of the United States will assume a grave responsibility if it puts out that light.

Respectfully submitted.

GERARD SWOPE,
Chairman.

P. S.—As an attachment to this brief, we are submitting a statement prepared by the Honorable Cordell Hull, former Secretary of State and honorary chairman of this committee.

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE CORDELL HULL, HONORARY CHAIRMAN, CITIZENS' COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCAL WORLD TRADE

Fourteen years ago our Nation embarked upon a policy of international cooperation in expanding world trade as an essential foundation of our national prosperity, international political stability, and lasting world peace. That policy, embodied in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934, and the program that has been carried forward to give effect to the act were carefully devised and have been amply tested. The policy and the program have been reaffirmed by the Congress four times through successive renewals of the act. By the very force of their soundness and continuity, they have won the acceptance of the American people and have provided a beacon light for the free nations of the world.

Today our Nation and all nations need more than ever before to cooperate wholeheartedly in establishing, in as large an area of the world as possible, the conditions of political liberty, economic progress, and enduring peace. The attainment of these conditions of civilized life especially requires that the peoples of the world have an opportunity to trade with one another to their mutual benefit and with a minimum of stultifying restrictions. The trade-agreements program provides the most effective framework for the realization of that opportunity. The continued existence of the program is indispensable if our Nation and all nations are to look confidently to a brighter future.

The devastating war and its tragic aftermath have created enormous difficulties in Europe and in many other parts of the world which have led to economic poverty, political and social instability, and a deep-seated sense of insecurity. Toward helping to alleviate these difficulties, our Nation, in recent weeks, undertook a wise and far-reaching program of economic assistance to the free nations of western Europe and of other parts of the earth designed to afford them such temporarily and desperately needed assistance as would enable them to cooperate with us and with each other to the greatest benefit of all of us. But a program of recovery must have a sense of basic direction and must proceed along a broader and more lasting course.

To this end, it is of the utmost importance that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act remain on our statute books as a continuing instrument of fruitful international cooperation. It is my earnest hope that the Congress which has recently shown the imagination and courage to enact the foreign assistance legislation, will again reaffirm this country's broad and basic policy of international economic cooperation by renewing the present Trade Agreements Act.

Oleo Versus Butter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include two editorials from Chicago newspapers. The following editorial appeared in the Chicago Daily News on May 3, 1948:

OLEO VERSUS BUTTER

The bill repealing the special Federal taxes on oleomargarine has passed the House. It should pass the Senate.

Of itself the new legislation will do little to lower the cost of margarine to the consumer. But it will make it easier for the housewife to buy colored margarine. It should lead to repeal of similar legislation in 21 States where production, distribution, and sale of colored margarine is subject to punitive State taxes.

It should inspire State legislation—where necessary—to protect the public against margarine sold as butter. Correct, conspicuous branding of the package should suffice.

Above all, it should arouse Members of Congress and their constituents to a greater sense of their responsibility as lawmakers and as citizens of a republic.

The story of the margarine-butter fight is a sordid story. It is alarming. It reveals how easy it is for selfish special-privilege groups to dominate Government and work against the best interests of the people as a whole.

Basically the record of the margarine fight is the old story of the battle of vested interests against technological change. It is the story of Petrillo's fight against recorded music. It is the story of the building-trades unions fight against new materials and methods that lessen building costs. It is the story of a determined lobby—the dairy farmers—protecting their advantages on the one hand and on the other denying the public the full economies permitted by scientific progress.

There was a time when margarine was an inferior substitute for butter. In its modern form, oleomargarine is not a substitute for butter. It is synthetic butter.

Eminent nutrition experts have proven that margarine, properly fortified, has about the same nutritive values as butter. It can be produced and sold at considerably less than the cost of butter. Most people prefer butter sufficiently to pay a higher price. But the price difference should be determined by natural competitive factors, not by law.

In its natural state, margarine doesn't have the yellow color of butter. But much butter doesn't have that color naturally either. The dairy interests admit that much butter is artificially colored. Yet they sponsored legislation penalizing artificially colored margarine by heavy Federal taxes. In many States there are State taxes in addition to the Federal taxes.

The dairy lobby successfully fought off every attempt to repeal these punitive taxes. They did it by keeping the margarine bills in the Agricultural Committee of the House, which was packed with legislators friendly to the dairy farmers. Since the margarine tax laws related to Federal revenues the bills should have been referred to the Ways and Means Committee. But the lobbdy flouted this sound rule of procedure for decades.

A little group, headed by Representative ROBERT TWYMAN, of Illinois, mustered enough votes to override the lobby and discharge the Agricultural Committee from consideration of the margarine bill. That brought the issue to the floor of the House.

A break-down of the vote shows numerous splits along the lines of special interests. With few exceptions, Representatives from the cottonseed and soybean areas and the big cities voted for repeal of the margarine taxes. Representatives from the dairy and grain areas, with few exceptions, were against repeal.

In most instances, the special interests of the folks in the home district—not the general welfare—was the compelling motive in the vote.

Congressmen are supposed to consider their own constituents. They are also responsible for the general welfare. They must consider the general welfare more seriously than they have. If Congress doesn't, nobody will. There is no pressure group in Washington to lobby in its behalf.

On May 14, 1948, the following editorial appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune:

OLEO VERSUS BUTTER

We publish this morning in the Voice of the People a telegram signed by a number of gentlemen in Dixon, Ill., asking us to support the dairy interests against the oleomargarine interests in the present struggle in Congress.

We should like to oblige these friends, but in good conscience we can't go along with them. This isn't because we favor one of these interests against the other, but because we aim to serve an interest larger than either of them: the interest of consumers generally.

If oleomargarine were not a wholesome food we should insist that its sale be forbidden, not merely penalized. If oleomargarine were labeled so that the housewife could not readily distinguish it from butter in the package, we should insist that the law requiring honest labeling be enforced. But these points are not in issue. The existing regulations regarding oleomargarine are not intended to protect the public's health or to discourage misrepresentation. Their purpose is to make margarine needlessly costly and unattractive to consumers.

We can see no more sense or justice in such a discrimination than in a requirement that Florida orange growers dye their fruit blue to distinguish it from the California article. In fact, the growers in both States color their oranges to suit the public fancy just as almost all butter makers dye their product for the same purpose. If people want to spread their bread with a yellow substance, we can't see why butter makers should be permitted to satisfy the demand by artificial means without penalty while oleomargarine makers may not do so.

The only reason why the discrimination has persisted as long as it has is the fact that there are more dairy farmers eligible to vote than oleo makers. There are more consumers, however, than there are dairymen, and oleo makers together; and the consumers have not only numbers but justice on their side when they ask that the discriminations be removed.

We Must Cut Unnecessary Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks an article taken from the April 1948 issue of Wisconsin Business, published by the Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce. The article follows:

HOLLOWAY, BACK FROM WASHINGTON, SEES NO CUT IN SPENDING UNTIL VOTERS INSIST ON IT

"Reduction of Federal spending will not be achieved until the rank and file of voters back home swell their cry for economy into an overwhelming din," C. S. Holloway, director of the State chamber's department of business research, declared on his return recently from 2 months' service as consultant on the professional staff of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

"There are still too many self-interested individuals and pressure groups, including some chambers of commerce, who favor cutting Federal spending for everything except their own pet projects."

Spending levels of the Federal Government are largely determined by the members of the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses. The complicated nature of appropriation measures practically precludes effective action to amend them on the floor of the two Houses. Thus, the way members of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees feel about economy is of vital importance.

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and Congressman JOHN TABER, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, are outstanding in their leadership of economy forces. But there are other members of these committees, both Republicans and Democrats, who do not see eye-to-eye with their chairmen. It is particularly important that subcommittee chairman be economy-minded.

The action of the Senate Subcommittee on War Appropriations in hearing the Army civil functions appropriation bill and in subsequently reporting the bill to the full committee with recommendations for restoration of over $102,000,000 cut by the House is a case in point.

Senator CHAN GURNEY, Republican of South Dakota, is chairman of this subcommittee. During 2 weeks of hearings on this bill, practically no effort was made to "put the squeeze" on the advocates of more spending who appeared before the committee in a continuous stream.

In fact, on one or two occasions when witnesses showed how economy could be achieved, they were received unsympathetically and their motives were questioned. Frequently, Senators asked the Corps of Engineers how much they could spend profitably, on any given project. Seldom were the engineers asked how little they could get along on.

An illustration of the plea of special interests for more Federal spending is afforded by the agitation in connection with a Sacramento River, Calif., project. The President, in submitting his budget to Congress, requested that $2,500,000 be allowed to start construction of a ship canal from the ocean at San Francisco to Sacramento, Calif., 100 miles inland.

The House rejected the President's request for this appropriation, apparently on the basis of evidence that a similar inland port constructed with Federal funds at Stockton, Calif., less than 100 miles south of Sacramento, does not even have sufficient traffic to fully pay its own way.

A long parade of witnesses appeared before the Senate subcommittee, pleading for restoration of the $2,500,000 appropriation eliminated by the House.

The civil functions appropriation bill is admittedly a big pork-barrel measure. Congressmen and Senators realize that even a small Government project in their district may enhance their popularity with the voters and therefore their choice of reelection. However, the 1949 pork-barrel is over three times as large as prewar. Apparently some members of the Republican Party are attempting to out-New Deal the New Dealers.

Lord Strobolgi's Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, today's newspapers tell of a rather interesting proposal made by Lord Strobolgi, British

Labor peer, before the annual meeting of the British Labor Party, to "put Great Britain back on her feet."

Lord Strobolgi, who became his party's whip in the House of Lords after succeeding to the Tiel, suggested:

1. A real United States of Europe, with Britain in the lead.
2. Become completely integrated with United States economy.
3. A scientific and orderly redistribution of our population throughout the commonwealth.

Lord Strobolgi went further to say that—

It may take a combination of all three.

And then added:

The Americans, judging by the popularity of the royal family, would be only too happy to join the Empire.

Mr. Speaker, it looks to me like Lord Strobolgi wants to give back to the British Empire 48 States for the 13 which revolted a century or more ago. If he means what he says, then I propose that we take in the Empire as 6 States, for a probationary period, and then permit them, during good behavior, to grow to 13 States.

If Lord Strobolgi is serious, so am I.

I propose that the British Empire be admitted into the United States of America as six States with members of the royal family serving as governors until free elections can be held by the British people.

I propose that England and Wales be counted as one-half a State each, under the governorship of King George VI; Scotland and Northern Ireland as two more one-half States, under the Duke of Windsor; Canada, a full State, under Prince Henry, brother of the King; South Africa, a full State, under joint governorship of Princess Elizabeth and the Duke of Edinburgh; Australia, a full State, under Queen Mother Mary; and Newfoundland, a State, under Princess Margaret Rose.

In time and under good behavior, Mr. Speaker, these States might be subdivided into other States. We would have to guard, of course, against giving the British too large a share in our Government at the outset, lest they try to create Dukes of the Bronx, Jersey City, Jackson County, and the like.

British royalty would have to go. So would titles.

This, of course, could be a gradual process. Various allowances for rents could be cut off and the nobility put to work.

Perhaps, in time, they would grow to like this.

For years the British have looked down upon exploited colonials as beggars.

Now that they are seeking to make begging a dignified profession, maybe they could also learn to like work. They might also be willing to accept the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

I might add that we might welcome the British in the United States, but I do not think we want them putting the King in the White House the next day. We may be interested in the royal family's doings—as Strobolgi says—but that does not mean we want them as our rulers.

As I said before, Mr. Speaker, if Strobolgi is serious, so am I.

Militarism in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. OWENS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune of May 17, 1948:

MILITARISM IN WASHINGTON

Representative TWYMAN'S remarks in the House the other day on the enormous influence of the military in the Federal administration deserve the widest attention. Anyone who will take the trouble as he did to assemble a list of high-ranking officeholders who are also hight-ranking military men cannot fail to be impressed with the danger to the Republic implicit in this militarization of its civil government.

A retired officer, as Mr. TWYMAN reminded his colleagues in Congress, is still subject to military rule and discipline. Laws and decisions to that effect were cited. They establish the status of such men as Secretary of State Marshall and Admiral Leahy, the President's Chief of Staff, and of many other retired officers holding positions of immense influence in the administration.

Other officers still on the active lists have been lent to the executive departments and bureaus. Among those mentioned by Mr. TWYMAN is Col. C. H. Bonesteel who is receiving Army pay while serving as Assistant to the Under Secretary of State.

"We have reversed the fundamental principles of the founders of this country," said Mr. TWYMAN. "We have permitted the civilian operations of this country to become dominated by the military."

This Nation came into existence because, among other reasons recited in the Declaration of Independence, King George "affected to render the military independent of and superior to the civil power." Much the same charge can be leveled against Mr. Truman. The proof of it rests in the ever-increasing number of high-ranking officers given places in the civil government and in the ever-growing influence they wield in the formation of policy.

The Colorado River Issue Climax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a fine editorial from the Los Angeles Times which, in my opinion, most clearly states the necessity for legislation to settle this 25-year controversy on the lower Colorado River, so that the full value of this river may be utilized:

THE COLORADO RIVER ISSUE CLIMAX

In Washington yesterday began the momentous hearings which should end a 25-year controversy and decide the explosive Colorado River water-allocation question for all time.

But there may be shilly-shallying and indecisive action unless California citizens ask—in letters and telegrams to Members of Congress from other States—that the issue be submitted to the Supreme Court for final adjudication. The submission of the matter to the Supreme Court, in fact, is the subject of the hearings begun yesterday before a Subcommittee of the Senate Public Lands Committee. Californians will urge such a course; Arizonans will oppose it.

Why has it become necessary as a last resort to go to the Supreme Court?

Many events during the last few years have combined to render a lasting determination vital and imperative. For one thing it has become increasingly apparent that the differences between California and Arizona over the amount each is to receive from the Colorado River, and the formula for deciding that amount, never can be decided at a conference table. On the basic issues the two States are irreconcilably divided.

Additionally, the increasingly acute need of California for more power and for guaranties concerning its water contracts and of Arizona for additional irrigation water have made the starting of new Colorado River projects necessary. But until certain fundamentals have been decided, it is impossible to embark upon any of these matters because each State claims that the proposals of the other would constitute an unfair drain upon the Colorado's resources.

The Times, following a detailed investigation in 1946, expressed the opinion which it still holds that a Supreme Court action, even with all the uncertainties and delays involved, would be preferable to the futile bickering which was going on then and still is going on. Certainly there are drawbacks to a Supreme Court decision on the matter. Both California and Arizona may get less than they claim. But at least the needed developments then can go forward on the basis of known factors, rather than in the blind atmosphere of hostility and passion.

Nature, incidentally, has played a part this season in the great drama of the contested water. The drought which has scourged Arizona for several years has been broken, particularly in the northern portion, by the best rains and snowpack in a long time. It is quite possible that the cycle of dry years may have been ended, and that the plight of central Arizona will be remedied by natural sources, such as the filling of Roosevelt and Coolidge Dam basins. In such an event, the plea of Arizona that it cannot wait for a Supreme Court decision would be invalidated.

It is quite possible, in fact, that if Arizona were to join wholeheartedly with California and other States of the Colorado River Basin in supporting the move for a Supreme Court decision, the matter could be decided within a year to 18 months. The procedure will be for the Attorney General of the United States to instigate such action to determine the legal validity of the contracts of the United States with the States, involving Colorado River water, and thus get it directly before the supreme tribunal.

This is the purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 145, being considered this week before the Senate group, and of House Joint Resolution 226, which will come up before a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee next week. It is support for these measures which should be written or wired to Representatives and Senators; not California's delegation, because they already are for the Supreme Court test. It also is being urged that friends in other States be asked to write their Congressmen in favor of the two resolutions.

Never has a more important issue confronted this section of the country. Both

California and Arizona are dependent for their civilization upon Colorado River water. At this time, millions of acre-feet of Colorado water are going to waste in the Gulf of California each year because there is no need for it on existing projects. But in the future when increasing populations and possibly dry years make every drop precious, the matter of the legal diversion of the water will be of vital importance.

The only orderly way to handle the matter is to make the division now, under sanction of the Supreme Court, so both California and Arizona can go forward in the sure knowledge of what the future holds for them.

Cure for Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER H. GROSS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pennsylvania Farmer:

CURE FOR COMMUNISM

Much is being said and written about the danger or rather the advancement of communism. The most fertile soil for its development is an unstable and discontented people. If during the last score of years there had as much been done to harmonize the several groups of the American people as has been done to create jeolousy, hatred and discontent among them we would need have no fear of communism.

Our people are not contented with their lot. They are led to believe that they are being imposed upon, that they are not getting a fair deal; that everybody but them is prosperous.

Much is being said by the press, radio, and the consumer about the high cost of living and all too many blame the farmer. The consuming public is led to believe that the farmer is rolling in wealth (at the expense of the consumer, never thinking that the farmer is the greatest consumer in America). The public reads of the large crops and the high prices received, but never stops to consider that the farmer's price has not kept up with what he has to pay. They are told that the cost of labor on the farm has doubled. My record shows that cost of labor on our farm has increased 600 percent in 40 years. If produce had increased at the same rate butter would be selling at $1.50 per pound. The old saying that paper farming is most profitable seems still to be true.

WORE OUT THEIR FARMS

While discussing the triple A bill with an Iowa farmer I asked why he favored it. He replied, "My grandfather settled on a farm in New York and wore it out. Then father and I came down into Pennsylvania and wore out a farm there. Then I went to Iowa, and now our farm is worn out. My sons have no place to go for virgin soil, and the Government should help my sons."

To which I replied, "I believe in soil conservation, but from a different angle. My great grandfather settled on our farm in 1829. He, his sons, his grandsons, his great grandsons, and now his great, great, grandsons have lived and prospered, and now his great, great, grandsons are producing bigger crops than any of their ancestors and that without Government aid (no free lime)—and have been fined by the Government for raising too much.

I think that Hon. WILLIAM J. MILLER, of Connecticut, on March 18, 1948, knew what he was talking about when he at least implied that the greatest advocates of Government subsidies for agriculture were the bureaucrats and lobbyists in Washington, and the lime interests which receive one-tenth of the $300,000,000 or $30,000,000, which the Government appropriates to the Department of Agriculture. We are complaining about our Government costing too much. I am willing that agriculture take the load and ask for less from Uncle Sam. The Government has spent a great amount of money for a so-called subsidy for the farmer. While the farmer is credited with receiving the benefit, it is really a subsidy for the consumer, as its object was to keep the price down to the consumer. I have never received something for nothing and believe that to receive a subsidy is to become a slave.

A few days ago I read that building would not cost as much this year, but that there would be no reduction in wages. The next day I read of the woodsmen in Washington forest receiving $15 to $20 a day and up to $500 a month. This does not sound to me like cheaper material. I wonder where cheaper buildings are coming from. Is it from our benevolent Uncle Sam?

When a people have been depending on the Government for aid and come to where that aid must be curtailed then we need fear communism.

PRODUCES LOAFERS

Government relief, whether it be for agriculture or otherwise, has a tendency to produce indolence and discontent. The best kind of relief is self-made, and is appreciated most.

But what has this to do with communism? It is simply to imply that we need a better understanding of each other. If consumer and producer would come to a common understanding and know each other better, a better feeling would exist among the different groups. Along with the words of Robert Burns, "Would that some power the gifte gie us to see ourselves as others see us," we might add the following, "Would that some power the gift give us to see the other fellow as he really is," then we would find that he is better than we really thought.

America is a land of opportunities. To some this seems a misnomer. To those I would recommend that they go elsewhere, or do as much to develop our opportunities as they are doing to hinder our progress. If we develop our opportunities we will soon discover our "acres of diamonds."

Our opportunity and responsibility today is to save democracy and to save it we must make it work at home. Live up to the traditions of our forefathers and we will defeat communism.

J. A. BOAK.

LAWRENCE COUNTY, PA.

Don't Be Afraid To Pass This Bill!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER R. JONES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter written by one of my constituents from the city of Seattle, who I believe is expressing the opinion of thousands of loyal American voters who are not as vocal on the desirability of the subversive activites control bill as are the Communists who oppose its passage.

SEATTLE, WASH., *May 15, 1948.*

Representative HOMER JONES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JONES: I have just been listening to Opinionaire radio broadcast, and I am, therefore, very much stirred. Mr. Pressman (or Cressman), who was opposing the bill against subversive activities, screeched so much like a Communist, and, like a Communist again, would not answer a straight question of Representative NIXON's, but always threw the fire somewhere else, that I cannot understand why the final vote of four cities went against the bill.

But of course I do understand it, knowing that the Communists think that the end—overthrowing our Government—justifies the means, and therefore they deal almost wholly in lies and fraud and false propaganda. Of course, all their men were on the look-out for this broadcast and probably voted more than once and under assumed names, as is their way.

Now, I do not know to whom I should write in the House, so I will trust that you will place this letter in the proper hands.

I adjure you, do not be influenced by the number of people who write in opposing the bill. Those are all Communists, and doubtless the same person writes in many times over, under assumed names. There are thousands of good and honest folk who do not know how to make their opinions known who would write in in favor of this bill if they just knew how to or understood how things are going. Many, very many, people honestly do not have time to realize the gravity of the situation in the United States. They are too busy earning that living which comes higher and higher now. It takes all the time they have.

Certainly, I am for the passage of this bill regarding subversive activities, as I understand it has to do with taking orders from the Kremlin in Russia. Certainly, I am for it, as every honest citizen of our country is for it, and I am writing for at least a score who never write, but trust Congress to pass those bills that are necessary for the preservation of our way of life and for the welfare of the people.

Do not be afraid to pass this bill. You have all the real worthy citizens who desire good government with you. Pluck up your courage, all of you, and pass the bill. And may God bless and fortify you all.

Very sincerely yours,

C. CONSTANCE BROWN.

State Department Personnel Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, the case of young Sgt. James M. McMillin, who deserted his post in Moscow to become the most recent victim of Communist degradation has focused much attention on the young man and his family. But too little thought has been given to the responsibility of State Department officials in charge of the Moscow Embassy in this matter.

During the war years, every soldier who was entrusted to cryptographic work, which involves handling all kinds of confidential and secret material, was thoroughly screened by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, by personnel officers, and often even by psychologists, to determine whether they were mentally, psychologically, and patriotically fit to be trusted with military secrets.

Now, it appears the State Department has abandoned all the normal cautions and assigns this work to young fellows like Sergeant McMillin, described by his buddies as "impressionable, inexperienced, and, after becoming entangled with a known Soviet agent, taciturn and antisocial."

May I particularly call attention to the account of the background of this amazing story printed in the Washington Post for today, in which McMillin's former roommate in Moscow states that "the higher-ups knew what was going on and took no steps to break it up."

Mr. Speaker, during the war, personnel officers of the Army and Navy supervising those in cryptographic and other work involving secret information took special pains to see that no man remained on a job if there was any question of his loyalty or emotional stability. It is amazing to think that the State Department, which has full information on Soviet activities the world over, would not take the same precautions.

Let us not waste our outrage on a young and impressionable boy. His superiors owe a definite explanation to the people of the United States.

The Washington Post article follows:

BUDDIES TELL OF McMILLIN ENCHANTRESS—TWO EX-ROOMMATES OF CRYPTOGRAPHER SAW HIM "SMITTEN"

(By Sam Stavisky)

Sgt. James M. McMillin, the young GI who deserted his Moscow post for the love of a beauteous Russian agent, was victim of a highly efficient Soviet system of enticing American Embassy men with fascinating women.

Furthermore, McMillin was a cryptographer and as such of particular interest to the bewitching operative.

That's the explanation of the bizarre romance given to the Washington Post by two former embassy aides and GI buddies of the 21-year-old McMillin, who vanished with a Soviet enchantress last Thursday on the eve of his transfer back to this country.

Everybody at the Embassy knows about at the Embassy—military and civilian, high—the former aides said. They added that it's virtually "common practice" for Americans at the embassy—military and civilian, high-ranking and clerical alike—to go for the bait.

STORIES CORROBORATING

The State Department, in disclosing the McMillin episode at a special Sunday night press conference, indicated the GI's entrancement was part of an organized scheme by declaring it to be "obviously seduction and exploitation by an experienced Soviet agent of a young, inexperienced American in a strategic spot."

More direct and to the point, however, were the mutually corroborating stories of Paul F. Beatley, 21, of Landover Hills, Md., and Alex Timm, 23, of Passaic, N. J., both former Army sergeants stationed at the Moscow Embassy.

Beatley, a State Department employee here and roommate of McMillin in Moscow, said that on the day he arrived in Moscow—in September 1946—three different Russian girls phoned him by name to let him know they were eager to welcome and entertain him. He later learned, Beatley said, that this warm greeting was "routine" for all new Embassy arrivals.

Contacted by phone in Passaic, Timm told of a similar cordial reception on his arriving at the Embassy in 1944. "I was out on a date within 8 hours after arrival," Timm said.

The young men said they were briefed from time to time by superiors to be discreet while in the company of Russian women, but were never forbidden to mix socially. In fact, they said, the Americans mixed so well and freely with the Russian hostesses that the American House, where most American personnel live, had at one time a reputation of ill repute.

Only in their description of the girl in the case did the two ex-servicemen differ in relating their experiences with the Moscow Embassy. They agreed that "Galya"—Mrs. Galina Danaeva Biconish—was "exceptionally beautiful," with a near-perfect figure.

Beatley described "Mac's girl" as follows: 21 years old, 5 feet 7 inches, 115 pounds, a beautifully molded face, marred only by an operation scar under her chin, with light-brown hair, "lovely, light, Russian complexion," a smart dresser particularly in American clothes, coquettish. Timm added she was also sexy-looking and a smooth dancer.

But when it came to the question of brains—not mere beauty—the two observers split sharply.

"Galya" was "vain and ignorant," according to Beatley, even though she was an agent of the Russian secret police. This opinion, he said, was based on arguments with her over American-Russian issues. "She didn't think for herself but repeated what she'd been trained to say," said Beatley. She spoke broken English.

On the other hand, Timm insists "Galya" was, to be precise, an enchantress whose sex appeal was but a cover for her cleverness.

When asked how he accounted for the discrepancy in the opinion of "Galya's" intelligence, Timm replied: "In the first place, I know Russian fluently, better than my friend Beatley. And, secondly, I've known Galya for a longer time. I got to the Embassy before McMillin did, and I've followed the romance right from the beginning."

According to the official State Department announcement, the gorgeous "Galya" was—and still is—married to another GI, Sgt. John Biconish, of Binghamton, N. Y., now stationed at Fort Riley, Kans.

Biconish, also 21, left Moscow in the summer of 1946 on Army orders, and had tried to bring his Moscow bride with him, but Russian authorities had refused to grant the necessary visa. Biconish is reported to have started separation proceedings on the ground that his wife would never be permitted to leave Russia.

At Fort Riley, Kans., where Biconish is now a student in the Army Ground General School Center, he was quoted by the United Press as saying:

"I can't understand this," he said. "Galina never at any time asked me about the Embassy or my duties there. She was just a sweet jolly girl and we got along fine."

"She wouldn't even talk politics with me because I would tell her about how superior the American Government was and she was afraid I would be overheard," he added.

After Biconish left, Jimmy McMillin became infatuated with "Galya," according to Beatley. When McMillin broke up with his roommate in an argument over "Galya," Beatley moved in. This quarters partnership lasted but 9 months, the break-up again involved the siren-spy. Beatley moved out after that, "Galya" kept Jimmy constant company when he was not on duty, according to both Beatley and Timm, even cooking his meals.

The two former aides describe McMillin as a tall youth, about 5 feet 11 inches, weighing around 150 pounds, with a thin, handsome face; quiet studious, introvertive, intelligent. He used to be an amiable fellow, but after meeting "Galya"—apparently his first and only girl friend—became antisocial, taciturn, and extremely jealous. "Sometimes he didn't talk to me for days," said his former roommate Beatley. McMillin has been in Moscow for 25 months, Beatley said.

Young McMillin was not pro-Communist in his views, as was the case of Miss Annabel Bucar, a young Pennsylvanian who quit the Embassy last winter after announcing she had married a handsome Russian. Roommate Beatley vouches that McMillin disliked the Russian system and the Russian way of life. "But he was infatuated with the girl," Beatley explains. Beatley believes Miss Bucar's defection to Russia influenced McMillin to take the same drastic step.

(The McMillin case is an odd parallel to the Gouzenko case. Igor Gouzenko, a Russian code clerk, walked out of the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa with secret Soviet files in September 1945. His disclosure of a Soviet espionage network in the Western Hemisphere has been made the basis of the film, The Iron Curtain, now showing in Washington.—Editor's note.)

To both the former associates of McMillin, the GI's desertion came as a jolt.

"After all," commented Beatley, "Jimmy had a girl in Denver—he'd shown me her pictures, and he'd been brought up in the best military tradition. His father is a colonel. Jimmy was a good soldier, too."

In Cambridge, Mass., McMillin's sister, Patricia, 19-year-old Radcliffe College sophomore, declared her brother had been thoroughly indoctrinated in the professional soldier's code of loyalty. He wanted to attend West Point, she said, but had failed to pass the physical exam because of high blood pressure. She refused to believe that her brother has taken off with a Soviet agent.

The boy's father, Col. James McMillin, on an official visit yesterday to the Pentagon from his post in Huntsville, Ala., would make no comment.

But Jimmy's two friends both offered a clue to his strange behavior.

"Jimmy was very impressionable," believes Timm. "The higher-ups knew what was going on and took no steps to break it up."

"Life was hard in Moscow," says Beatley. "Several of the boys cracked up under the strain. We all lived in crowded quarters and got onto each other's nerves. We were being watched all the time by the Soviet police. No wonder some of the boys became psychos and alcoholics."

The State Department, in disclosing McMillin's desertion and disappearance, said there was no doubt that "Galya's" romance with McMillin was connected with her activities as a Russian agent. She continued the affair, it was pointed out, even when the Soviet Government took a dim view of Russians having social contacts with foreigners stationed in Moscow.

It was reported by the Embassy that "Galya" was with McMillin in his rooms, helped him pack, and vanished with him.

McMillin will face an Army court martial for being A. W. O. L. or for desertion if he ever comes back.

The State Department described McMillin as a minor employee, insisting it did not know whether or not he had access to important information. But both friends, Beatley and Timm, say that Jimmy was highly thought of as a code clerk attached to the military attaché's office.

The McMillin case was cited here yesterday by the National Council Against Conscription in supporting its opposition to a teen-age draft.

The council said:

"McMillin was a normal, American teen-age boy when he went into the Army. No American boy would prefer to live in Soviet Russia if he has had a real opportunity to

understand what democracy means. Yet the Army proposes to draft young boys and pit them against experienced Communist agents abroad."

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by Jack Beall on May 1, 1948:

This is May Day—the day traditionally set aside by Communists and left-wingers, all over the world, to hold parades and demonstrations of strength. The Communists of many lands are flexing their muscles today, showing themselves and others how strong they are and trying thereby to throw a scare into the ranks of the opposition.

Although it is not generally known, May Day, as a day of radicalism, goes back as far as May 1, 1776, when a German philosopher named Adam Weishaupt formed his Order of the Illuminati. Herr Weishaupt seemed to be "agin" practically every known institution of society. His program called for abolition of orderly government, abolition of private property, abolition of inheritance, abolition of patriotism, abolition of the family, and abolition of all religion.

It is rather astonishing how closely some of these fit in with the purposes of communism, as originally announced. The announced purpose of Lenin was to form a classless society which, eventually, would not need government. Government or the state would just wither away because in this perfect, Socialist state, there would be no need for it. The Soviets succeeded pretty much in abolishing private property, within Russia, in the sense of tools for production, although they have had to take backward steps, in several regards. The same thing applies to the institution of the family. At first, laws and decrees were passed which weakened the family—notably the great ease with which divorces could be had—but, as time went on, the doctrinaire experimenters realized that the family was a basic institution that could not be lightly tampered with. And the same thing can be said for religion. Tonight, I want to talk about religion in the Soviet Union, and how the Soviet rulers started out to crush religion, entirely, but have had to take several backward steps.

Everyone is familiar with the saying that is inscribed on the walls of the Lenin Museum, at Moscow: "Religion is the opium of the people." That is one of the fundamental tenets of Marxism. The Soviets feel religion is a bad thing, particularly when it tries to compete with a lay religion, the religion of statism which the ruling party tries to foist upon the Soviet millions.

Says Marx, further, on the subject: "The destruction of religion, the phantom happiness of the people, is a necessary condition for their real happiness."

Says Lenin, the high priest of communism: "The purpose of religion is to justify exploitation and to give a reduced-price ticket to Heaven." Another quotation from Lenin is to the effect that all oppressing classes "requires the executioner and the priest."

A recent statement by Stalin runs: "No one can believe in God and be a Communist."

This announced enmity to religion overflowed into action, in three distinct waves of persecution by the Communist Party since 1917. There were let-ups, in between, when the propaganda and persecution were not so intense, and that gives rise to the speculation that perhaps the present let-up is a passing phase and will be replaced by renewed severities, particularly if the church gets too strong.

Soon after the revolution it was very easy to direct hatred toward the orthodox church, because it had been, so long, a part of the Czarist Government. The Bolsheviks closed or destroyed more than 50,000 religious edifices of all sorts and liquidated by murder, exile, or imprisonment 255,000 members of the clergy, of all faiths. These included 200,000 priests, monks, and nuns of the Russian Orthodox Church, 5,000 priests and monks of the Roman Catholic Church, 26,000 rabbis and teachers of the Jewish faith, 17,000 Mahometan mullahs, 2,000 Armenian priests, and 530 Lutheran pastors.

They confiscated sacred vessels, jewels, vestments, ikons, and real estate to the value of $2,500,000,000, and a treasure worth more than a billion dollars.

Besides this, many hundreds of thousands of especially pious laymen were imprisoned or exiled. Many of them suffered the highest measure of social protection, as it is euphoniously called—which simply meant shooting.

Under this onslaught, Christianity returned to the earliest faith of the martyrs. The people risked physical punishment by harboring priests. They risked having their ration cards taken up and their jobs taken away by attending secret church services. It was a very risky business even to do it in the legal Soviet way. Groups of 20 believers had to register with the local Soviet and receive permission to worship, openly. There was always the knowledge that they incurred official displeasure, but such groups did meet. Worship went on. Religious feeling was still stronger than the fear of Soviet reprisal. Gradually, the first fury of the revolution relaxed and people became bolder about going to church.

So, the Communists decided to put on a great educational campaign to stamp out this antiquated superstition, as they called religion. The League of the Militant Godless was formed. It grew to the size of 5,500,000 members. And the word "militant" was well deserved.

Leonard Lyons, who was the UP correspondent in Moscow, tells of the counter-demonstrations that the league put on at Easter. Parades would circle Moscow, going past church after church. They carried flares and banners inscribed in all sorts of ways to belittle and ridicule and discredit religion. They mocked, with laughter and shouts, those devout ones who walked around their churches, with tapers in hand, in the traditional fashion. Says Lyons:

"Blasphemous antireligious tunes blanketed the sonorous chanting of priests and acolytes. The believers, shielding their tapers a little more intently, huddled closer to one another and pretended not to notice. They did not look up to see the grotesque floats and cardboard effigies of priests, deities and kulaks, in ludicrous postures. At the Cathedral of Christ the Saviour, toward which the parades converged, an open-air motion-picture screen was erected, at the very entrance. Antireligious films were being shown on one side of the door, while thousands chanted 'Christ is risen' on the other side. Many a young person hesitated, uncertainly, between the free show outside and the solemn proceedings within."

The League of Militant Godless published two magazines with blasphemous cartoons on such subjects as the immaculate conception. They placarded cities with posters, they satirized religion on the stage and on the screen and helped organize and stock antireligious museums. Many hundreds of churches were turned into such museums.

The high, or perhaps the low, point of their activities came when, all of a sudden, the holiest place in all Russia was blown off the map, right in the heart of Moscow, on the very threshold of Red Square. It was the Shrine of the Iberian Virgin.

They organized propaganda also among school children. The Young Pioneers (something like the Boy Scouts) were plunged into a campaign to eradicate the business of Christmas trees at Christmas. One of the pamphlets gotten out by the Library of Young Atheists and distributed among children, reads: "The struggle against the Christmas tree is the struggle against religion and against our class enemies. Behind the back of Uncle Frost (that's the Russian equivalent of Santa Claus) hide the priest and the kulak."

Children's A, B, C books were also pressed into service as propaganda agencies. B is for Bible—and the accompanying picture shows a red broom sweeping out the Bible, and ikons, with the slogan "Give up fearing gods." The Russian equivalent of V, shows a sinister-looking capitalist in top hat pouring out a stream of poison from a bottle marked "religion."

Children were urged to spy on their parents and report if they had ikons in their homes.

I don't think I should leave the subject of propagandizing children against God without telling how Marshal Tito goes about it in Yugoslavia. In the schools the children are taught atheism. To bring the point home, they are told to pray to God for candy. They pray and nothing happens. Then they are told to ask Tito for candy. At once a shower of candy descends upon them from the skylight.

When the war came, Stalin felt the need of unifying his people as much as possible. So he called off the war on the faithful. The orthodox church heads were called in and agreement was reached that they would wholeheartedly support the government and not try to undermine it in any way in return for more freedom and for the shutting off of antireligious propaganda. The League of the Militant Godless was disbanded. About 8,000 churches were reopened. This period, coinciding with the war, saw a spontaneous recrudescence of religious feeling among the people. The churches were again crowded—one could even see Red Army officers and their families attending. But it was noticeable that only about 15 percent of the communicants were young people. It still was largely a matter for the middle aged and the old. The antireligious propaganda in the schools and among youth groups was having its effect.

Another reason for the relaxing of the ban on worship is that it serves the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. The nations of Slavic peoples, like Bulgaria and Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia, with a large content of Orthodox Greek Catholic Church members, are more easily controlled, with religion comparatively freed, than they would be otherwise. As one writer puts it: "Restoration of the Russian Orthodox Church was roughly equivalent to Russian religious occupation of the Balkans, uniting Europe's Danubian and Balkan Slavs in a Slavic religious continent whose metropolis is Moscow."

With this change in official Soviet attitude toward religion for the great masses of people it is true that religious worship is comparatively more free. I don't think the actual needs of religion are being adequately filled by the numbers of churches which they have reopened. I cite the fact that, for example, in the city of Moscow, late as the year 1944, there was one Roman Catholic Church and this was supposed to serve the needs of all Roman Catholics in the whole of the Soviet Union. There was no other Roman Church from Vladivostok to the borders of old Poland. I hardly think that six theological institutes for the training of priests is adequate for all Russia. Let me emphasize this point, too. The attitude of the Russian ruling class toward religion for the masses has been somewhat modified under necessity,

which may be temporary. But there has not been the slightest change in the attitude of the Communist Party itself toward religion. The Stalinist dictum still stands that "No one can believe in God and be a Communist." This in spite of the brief interlude when Soviet propagandists in Italy—just before the elections—tried to make it appear that one could still be a good Communist and go to church.

Emphatically I say that no one in the Soviet Union who wants to remain in the Communist Party—and that means all those who want to have careers—no one of them can be a churchgoer. Even if a party member is married by a priest, that is enough to get him thrown out of the party. In a country where all preferment is in the control of the party, where every young man who wants to get somewhere has to turn his back on his hopes if he becomes a church member, one can hardly say that religion is free, even though one can go to church without interference from the police. No one in the Soviet Union knows when the period of tolerance may be over, for that matter, and another wave of purges set in. It is very much the fact that, fundamentally, there is a vast antagonism between the monolithic state and religion. For it is religion which stands for the dignity of the individual.

"The State exists for the individual and not the individual for the State" is a fundamental concept of the Christian religion. This is the sort of concept Communists fear and hate. How long it can be tolerated by Stalin that there can be no other gods before him is problematical.

Regarding atheism for Party members, there can be no doubt. Just who the new god is there can also be no doubt. Just listen to this so-called poem by Langston Hughes, a writer for the Communist New Masses and other Soviet-inspired publications. Here it is, in part, in its pristine ugliness:

"Listen Christ,
You did all right in your day, I reckon,
But that day's gone now,
They ghosted you up a swell story, too.
Call it Bible.
But it's dead now.

"Good-bye,
Christ Jesus, Lord God Jehovah.
Beat it on away from here now.
Make way for a new guy with no religion at all—
A real guy named
Marx, Communist Lenin, Peasant Stalin, Worker Me—
I said Me.
Go ahead now, you're getting in the way of things, Lord.—
And step on the gas, Christ.
Move.
Don't be so slow about movin'."

Charles Laceille Gifford

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. A. SIDNEY CAMP
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 17, 1948

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. CHARLES LACEILLE GIFFORD, late a Representative from the State of Massachusetts

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I was introduced to Hon. CHARLES LACEILLE GIFFORD soon after entering the Congress in 1939, but I did not become intimately acquainted with him until his nomination to the Committee on Ways and Means. After he came to our committee, I soon learned his sterling qualities, and as time went on we became intimate friends and I appreciated more and more his high character and his marked ability.

Congressman GIFFORD possessed a keen sense of fairness, and his sparkling wit and cool judgment made a pleasant occasion of many an otherwise dull and weary session. He was a scholar and possessed a store of knowledge from which all of us drew when occasion demanded it. He was an expert on English grammar, as well as parliamentary practices. No man could have been more diligent and constant in his efforts to serve his country on the great Ways and Means Committee than Congressman GIFFORD.

When he departed this life soon after we left for our summer vacation last year, I was greatly saddened. His State has produced many great men. CHARLES LACEILLE GIFFORD stands high among them.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by Jack Beall on May 15, 1948:

A great hubbub has been raised over the recent conversations, in Moscow, between General Smith—our Ambassador to the Soviet Union—and Foreign Minister Molotov.

In sum and substance, what happened was that this country sent a strong note to the Soviet Union, saying that if the Soviets thought we were going to weaken or call off our efforts in behalf of the Marshall plan, in behalf of assisting European recovery, they were very much mistaken. We had been seeing from Russian official statements and in the Soviet press, that the Moscow Government was waiting for a weakening of our attitude because of two things—first, because this year was a political year, a campaign year, when all attention would be riveted on domestic affairs until the Presidential election was settled. And second, because they expected a new depression to hit us, soon. The State Department instructed General Smith to make it clear that our national elections would change nothing and that a possible depression would not reduce our production capacity, presumably for war.

So far, so good. It was a fine idea, I think, for as strong a message as that to be delivered. But at the end of the message we appended a sort of postscript which said that we were unhappy that the Soviet Union had forced us to adopt measures, such as we are now pursuing, and that we did not despair of a turn of events which would permit us to "find a road toward a decent and reasonable relationship, with a fundamental relaxation of those tensions which today exercise so unhappy an influence on international society everywhere." Then General Smith delivered this statement:

"As far as the United States is concerned, the door is always wide open, for full discussion and the composing of our differences. My Government earnestly hopes that the members of the Soviet Government will not take lightly the position of the United States Government, as here expressed. They have it in their power to alleviate many of the situations which today weigh so heavily on all international life. It is our earnest hope that they will take advantage of these possibilities. If they do they will not find us lacking in readiness and eagerness to make our own contribution to a stabilization of world conditions, entirely compatible with the security of the Soviet people."

The State Department did not take any other nation—such as France or England—into its confidence. It did not "consult" in advance. And that seems to have been a serious mistake because, on a thing like this, even if it was not an invitation to Russia to talk things over, alone, with the United States—and Secretary Marshall and President Truman have been very specific on this point and said that there never was such an intention—still it was capable of that sort of interpretation by the other western powers, once they knew about it.

And Molotov saw to it that they knew about it very soon. He issued a statement over the Soviet radio, saying, in effect, that we accept your invitation to a two-power conference to make peace between the east, represented by us; and the west, represented by you.

Of course, that played hob. The State Department has been busy, ever since, assuring the western powers that we were not starting peace negotiations behind their backs, without considering them. It has denied that it invited a conference in the first place. General Marshall has emphasized that what he wanted out of Russia was not words, but action. The message delivered to Molotov by General Smith, when you read it over again, certainly would seem to indicate that we were expecting Russia to show a change in her actions, to show her desire for better relations by breaking stalemates which have existed in the United Nations over a dozen subjects, and in the Allied Control Council in Berlin.

But the message did not exclude, specifically, the idea that we might just sit down with the Russians and talk. That was the bad mistake, so far as the other western countries are concerned. It tended to drive wedges between us and the other powers. They demanded explanations all over the place, showing rather plainly that they thought something was going on about which they should have been consulted, at least.

In the words of Napoleon's minister, Fouché: "It was worse than a crime; it was a blunder."

But what I am really interested in is not the blunder phase, but what it shows about the intentions of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics regarding future peace.

They either do want to negotiate with us or they do not. Quite apart from whether this was or was not an invitation from us to them to consult and come to an agreement, I am putting the problem in this form: Granted that it was an invitation, or that they had a valid right to look upon it as an invitation, are the Soviet rulers really grasping the invitation, or only seeming to, for the propaganda value before the world?

I am trying to get at the real heart of the thing as it affects world peace.

So I ask, did Molotov, in his reply and the manner of making his reply, indicate any true acceptance of the putative offer even though he did say, in so many words, that his country "agrees to the proposal to proceed * * * to the discussion and settlement of differences existing between us."

The very fact that Molotov is a master of diplomacy and knows the correct procedures of that art is almost sufficient, in itself, to show that he didn't care a whoop about holding a conference, even though he said his country was willing to confer. He didn't give two whoops about bettering relations,

either by mending the ways of the Soviet Union, or by sitting down to discuss international problems. Because what he did, or rather, how he did it, absolutely busted up all chance of the very thing he said he was willing to do.

This message from the State Department, delivered by General Smith was a most confidential one. And yet, without consulting Washington, and against all diplomatic usage, Molotov published the text on the Moscow radio, together with his reply. He either had reliable information, or accurately guessed, that Washington had not consulted with either London or Paris. Naturally, if this thing got out, prematurely, at this stage, it would cause trouble—tend to drive a wedge between the western European countries and us. He was, therefore, much more interested in getting this advantage than doing anything which would seriously advance the cause of peace between the two great world powers—his country and ours.

There was also a propaganda advantage. He could readily foresee that if this approach were published to the world, at this stage and in this manner, Russia could scuttle the hope for any real get-together with the West, while appearing to agree to it. In that way, however phony the real Russian intentions were, Soviet propaganda could say to the world: "You see—we accepted, but the United States has backed out—backed out of its own offer. We want peace. The United States doesn't."

Talk about your Machiavellis. Brother Molotov starts out where Machiavelli left off.

What Molotov has actually done is to arrange it so that any efforts to construct a peace edifice would come tumbling down about our ears and that our ears, also, would be very red from the spectacle that he would make of us before the other powers. Do you think that now there would be any chance of conversations or anything else? Do you think relations have been bettered?

There is no doubt but what they are much worse now than they were 5 days ago.

At his press and radio conference on Thursday, President Truman said, with great restraint, that his hopes for world peace had not been improved by the diplomatic exchange. Both George Marshall and Harry Truman know when their faces have been slapped—and incidentally, the faces of the American people slapped. It will be a long time before this Government will place itself in a position of getting its face slapped again.

And if it is true that the Soviet Union wants peace, or needs peace, then perhaps the blunder is not by us but by Molotov, who would rather score diplomatic points, rather ring up a propaganda victory, than to see any solid approach made to peace.

There is one hopeful thing about this whole thing; that is the statement from General Marshall saying what he was inviting was not a conference of words and signatures but action, deeds, really showing that the Soviet Union wanted peace. I think the time has long since gone by when the Soviet Union could stand up before the world and claim good faith in her plighted word. Once it was claimd widely that the Soviet word was as good as its bond. That can never be seriously claimed again, until a complete reversal of its course of action has taken place.

The Soviet Union has proved a world dead-beat. Her signature has bounced too many times. She has run out of credit, because she has run out of credibility. Democratic people need not blame themselves to be taken in originally by a hot-check artist, but they should have their heads examined if they keep on collecting signatures on worthless bits of paper and placing any reliance upon them.

I think I'll just list, for the record, some of the instances of bad faith—of not honoring international commitments, solemnly entered into. These are not cases of just dragging feet and refusing to cooperate with other nations. These are cases where treaties or other obligations have been dishonored, been broken.

First, I might mention the Roosevelt-Litvinoff treaty by which the Soviets were recognized by this country in 1933. We recognized them in exchange for their promise to do various things. One of those promises was: "To respect, scrupulously, the indisputable right of the United States to order its own life, within its own jurisdiction, in its own way and to refrain from interfering, in any manner, in the internal affairs of the United States, its territories or possessions." I leave it to you to judge whether or not the Soviet Union, or its agencies, the Communist Party in the United States, the Comintern or the Cominform, have lived up to this.

If you care to get hold of a book by William C. Bullitt, our first Ambassador to the Soviet Union and originally a friend to that government, you will find a supplement in the back that lists 28 clear cases of treaty breaking. The book is called The Great Globe Itself. The broken treaties include those by Russia with Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. They include the violation of the Covenant of the League of Nations, by the invasion of Finland, for which Russia got bounced out of the League. They include violation of one of the first treaties which the Soviet Union made—the Treaty of Riga, with Poland, back in March of 1921. They include nonaggression pacts and mutual-assistance pacts and treaties of friendship and of respect for sovereignty with half a dozen nations on her borders, including Rumania and Bulgaria. They include the Anglo-Soviet-Iranian Treaty of 1942, whereby the Soviets promised to withdraw troops from Iranian soil not later than 6 months after hostilities had ceased. It took months of world tension and argument, in the United Nations, to get her out, long after the 6-month period had run. They include the Declaration of Tehran, to guarantee the sovereignty of Iran, in violation of which the Soviet Union set up a hostile government in Azerbaijan.

Besides, there is the Yalta agreement, whereby the Soviet promised free and unfettered elections in Poland and promised aid to the liberated people of Europe in solving, by democratic means, their political and economic problems. Poland and the Balkan countries were sold down the river on that promise, and the promise was brutally violated in each and every instance.

The ink was hardly dry on the peace treaty with Bulgaria, guaranteeing civil liberties, than Petkoff was judicially murdered by a government which was controlled from Moscow.

In Rumania, where the Soviet is treaty-pledged to withdraw its army, no less than half a million Soviet troops remain.

The Treaty of Potsdam provided that Germany should be treated as an economic unit and that democratic parties in Germany should be encouraged. Both stipulations have been flagrantly violated and now we are threatened with being pushed out of Berlin, literally, by the Soviets, through treaty-breaking restrictions on transit to and from Berlin.

I suppose we just have to laugh when we think of the Soviet treaty with China, which promises moral and material support only to the National Government of Chiang Kai-shek.

Looking back, it is very hard to see wherein Stalin is any different from the Kaiser or Hitler in regarding solemn treaties as scraps of paper.

And even if Molotov had come to us in the first place asking for talks—or even if the Soviets had modified their actions so that they seemed to have changed their spots—I think we should be, perhaps, more cautious than ever.

Stalin, himself, discusses in a book called Problems of Leninism the difference between strategy and tactics. Strategy, he says, is for the long pull. Tactics are for the short period. They change with the ebb and flow of the revolutionary movement. He said tactics change dozens of times while the main strategy always remains the same—the world revolution and the victory of communism. He quotes Lenin to the effect that revolutionary parties must learn that "victory is impossible without learning both how to attack and how to retreat properly."

"The object of this strategy," says Stalin, "is to gain time, to decompose the enemy, and to assemble forces, so as to take the offensive later."

The meaning, I think, is very clear.

Warmongering and Militarism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered at Boston on May 17, 1948:

There are already disturbing signs and characteristics of the totalitarian police state in this country, said PHILBIN. Pressure for economic and industrial regimentation, the abrogation of civil liberties, and the threatened militarization of the Nation are all leading us in the direction of social and political tyranny. The country is confronted with the evil of supermilitarism. The only barrier to a completely militarized and regimented American body politic is the force of an aroused public opinion.

Warmongering, war scares, and war hysteria have been feverishly generated and flagrantly promoted by those high in official civil and military authority. In countless ways of late a campaign to develop an aggressive war spirit in this country has been carried on and a war fear has thus been produced and spread throughout the Nation which has gravely upset our people and has had disturbing repercussions on the public sentiment of other peace-loving nations friendly to the democratic cause.

It is the aim of these propaganda devices to secure compulsory military regimentation of America. Such a program will ruin and wreck the United States which we have traditionally known. It will enslave our youth at a time when there is no real national emergency, undermine our educational, religious, social, and industrial standards, regiment our economic system and business, reinstate wartime controls over industry and commodities, and militarize the Nation. This permanent militarization means excessive and growing tax burdens, which will be over $22,000,0000,000 for military purposes alone for fiscal year 1949, and threatens the country with stagnation and bankruptcy. The inflationary price-rocketing effects of this and other related programs are already being felt in the markets of America as the average housewife well knows.

There is absolutely no necessity in peacetime to militarize our cherished American institutions of freedom of the individual and freedom of initiative in order to secure the Nation against danger from foreign attack or to prepare it adequately to meet other types of aggression or infiltration which may menace the national security.

A strong impregnable national defense is essential but it must be modernized, streamlined—a fast-thinking and fast-moving Army, the mightiest fleet in the world to protect our bases, our commerce and lines of communication—which we already have—and above all an overwhelming Air Force, such as I have so vigorously advocated, comprised of the latest types of aircraft and invention.

These powerful forces in peacetime under our American system should be manned entirely by professionally trained career volunteers. The evidence conclusively shows that the Navy can get all the men it needs without any form of compulsion, and the Air Corps is now turning volunteers away, and that it is neither wise nor necessary to institute the draft, or any other compulsory system in order to get the limited number of men allegedly required by the Army at a time when there is no national emergency.

Eighteen-year-old boys cannot handle the intricate devices of modern war. Experienced, professional career men, organized voluntarily, well-paid, well-housed, well-treated, and scientifically trained are required for this task. Organized reserves and by all means the National Guard which has rendered such conspicuous service to the country in the past should be built up to adequate strength, though the Army has done virtually nothing along these lines, in fact by the provisions of pending legislation, our great and invaluable National Guard will be completely absorbed into the Federal military bureaucracy of high-ranking officers at an early date.

Under our Constitution the military authority is subordinate to the civilian authority and that is the way it should remain. It should not be permitted to dominate, as it is now seeking to do, the policy-making functions of the Congress. Supermilitarism is no answer to the problems of democracy any more than it is an answer to the problems of national defense in this advanced, scientific atomic age.

Militaristic fascism is just as much an outrage to America, just as obnoxious to our people, just as alien to our institutions as is Marxist communism. Both systems are enemies of democracy and of the spirit of freedom.

Statesmen will have failed in their greatest duty to the people unless they provide a peaceful world, but until that day comes we must be certain that our Nation is prepared against every contingency. Meanwhile, let all true Americans record their uncompromising opposition to revolutionary changes in our pattern of government. Only the force of a powerful public opinion can prevent this most unwelcome result.

Raymond Smiley Springer

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 17, 1948

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. RAYMOND SMILEY SPRINGER, late a Representative from the State of Indiana

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of the late RAYMOND SMILEY SPRINGER I lost a true friend of many years standing. We both entered Congress on the same day. We were both appointed to the Committee on the Judiciary at the same time and sat side by side for nearly 9 years. In that period of time I came to know Judge Springer well. We had many things in common. Of him it can be truthfully said that he was a splendid man, a wise counselor, an able lawyer, and an especially fine representative of his district.

After our party came in control of the House, on several occasions, Judge SPRINGER was selected to preside over the deliberations of the House and he did this with real ability.

He was a many-sided man and whatever he did he did well. His keen sense of humor never failed him. He was exceedingly kind and solicitous about the health of other Members. His first salutation every day was this: "Are you all right?" And this was no mere perfunctory inquiry. It was genuine desire to know that the person addressed was in good health and strength.

Since his going we have all learned his true value and it is impossible to state how much he has been missed. I personally shall always feel that my life has been enriched by knowing Judge SPRINGER as I did and I know that his district, his State and his Nation has lost a truly great man.

The State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 12, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I recently made:

THE STATE OF ISRAEL

The Jewish state is and will continue to be.

It's a simple enough statement. The Jewish state is and will continue to be. As you roll it over and over and over again in your mind the magic of its meaning shines through.

It is an achievement in history as remarkable as any we know. There were times when the bitterness against betrayal was almost too much to bear. But today the blue and white flag of Israel flys high in the wind. The flag is proud and brave—a banner of freedom from bondage. That flag lives. There shall be none to tear it down.

Seven hundred thousand Jews in Palestine looked the world squarely in the face and said, "This shall be," and it is.

While the United Nations were told partition could not be implemented, the Haganah took Tiberias and stopped the Arabs at Mishmar-Haenek. While the United States urged trusteeship, the Hagannah took Safed and Kastel and destroyed the road blocks that impeded traffic from Jerusalem to Tel Aviv. While there were those who still clung to the plan of federalization with a Jewish ghetto in Palestine, the Jews overran Jaffa. While the United Nations floundered about, impotently, in a sea of words, the Jews of Palestine clothed the skeleton of government, breathing life into it. Fighting and creating at the same time—holding back the enemy and withal organizing the functions of state. That meant triple dangerous duty for every inhabitant of Israel. Life and death side by side. The same skill, the same genius for organization, the same sure scientific knowledge, the same sweat and muscle and mind that cleared the wastelands of Palestine have made the dream of Israel come true.

For many, many years I have watched this drama unfold. On the violent stage were scenes of betrayal and murder, intrigue and powerful lusts, dishonor and malice and greed. But if you listened carefully, offstage was the sound of a marching people, a small band, heavy with the burden of tragic memory. You can hear it more plainly now, this sound of marching. And, strangely enough, it is not martial. It is rather like the increasing tempo of a hymn. It's like the heartbeat of a people marching into life, dignity, security.

This is no time to recount the miserable, dishonorable, callous betrayals. The Jews of Palestine gathering their own resources unto themselves have revealed the shabbiness of these acts of betrayal. They could not buy powerful friends with oil, nor threaten uprisings, nor fill the halls of state with sound and fury. Thrice they had to compromise, but beyond that as men of honor, as brave men they could not go. They had work to do, and, by God, they did it. Theirs and theirs alone are the honor and the glory.

Then came the zero hour—6 p. m., our time Friday, May 14. The British withdrew. The mandate ended. The Shofar sounded the call to attend. The words of an historic declaration of independence resounded throughout the world. We hear a modern prophet, David Ben Gurion at Tel Aviv intone:

"Exiled from Palestine, the Jewish people remained faithful to it in all the countries of their dispersion, never ceasing to pray and hope for their return and restoration of their national freedom.

"Accordingly, we the members of the national council representing the Jewish people in Palestine and the Zionist movement of the world, met together in solemn assembly by virtue of the natural and historic right of the Jewish people and of resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations, hereby proclaim the establishment of the Jewish state in Palestine, to be called Israel."

Thus the Republic of Israel is born in the birthplace of the Jewish people.

Our cup of happiness was overflowing. But our rejoicing reached fever pitch with the sudden announcement that President Truman had recognized the de facto Government of Israel.

This action was a stroke of rare statesmanship. President Truman has earned thereby our admiration and praise. The recognition is consonant with cherished American tradition. We, who have zealously guarded our independence for 172 years could hardly withhold independence from the Jews who have sought it for 2,000 years.

President Truman undoubtedly had thrust aside and pushed back some of his misadvisers—the Arabphiles in the State Department—and did what his heart prompted him to do.

In recognizing Israel he recognized an inescapable fact. He proved that power politics, back-stairs intrigue, dubious diplomacy must yield to the real facts in Palestine, where the Jews have set up their state and given it the essentials of sovereignty. The perserverance, the intrepidity, the energy, the wisdom of the Jews in setting up a government, running the trains, carrying the mails, collecting taxes, minting coins, establishing law and order was too much for oil lobbyists, too overpowering to striped pants cookie pushers.

But President Truman saw the true picture and promptly gave the signal of recognition. His action was as refreshing as a cool breeze in the heat of summer.

Undoubtedly the President will follow his encouraging bestowal of recognition of Israel with recognition of Israel's status as a belligerent. The neighboring Arab states have declared war upon Israel, which needs cannon to answer Arab salvos of gunfire. This entails the lifting of the arms embargo for Israel. That relief must follow recognition inevitably as day follows night.

Of course the same forces that stayed Truman's hand on partition will be at work

again to prevent his lifting of the embargo. They shall again be defeated. May that hand that tries to hold back the President be again stayed.

President Truman thus heads a queue of recognitionists. Guatemala has given Israel sovereignty status. Russia, the Slavic countries, the British Dominions, many Pan American Republics will doubtlessly and rightfully follow suit.

That we have gathered here today in salute to the Jewish state is important. What we say here today is important. The Jews of Palestine are not alone and we must tell them so. We must let them know that we shall keep working, working in our way to achieve the universal recognition of the Jewish state, so that in the company of the nations of the world it can take its rightful place in mankind's quest for peace and well-being.

We can help with money and material. The double duty of building the state and defending it still falls heavily upon the Jews of Palestine. Their fate is not a matter of indifference to us. It matters very, very, very much, indeed. There is still this business of the United States arms embargo to deal with. There is the business of British-Arab intrigue to deal with. There are the homeless and dispossessed in DP camps to concern us. There is the economy of Palestine to bolster, an economy which the mandatory power has done its best to destroy.

I do not want to dwell upon these now. But I want you to remember these objectives when this moment of high excitement dies down. We know powerful nations will try to use the Jewish state as a pawn on the strategic chessboard of the Middle East. We shall be more than naive if we permit ourselves the luxury of believing that the Jewish state will find easy universal acceptance of its sovereignty. While we know the sentiment, the overwhelming sentiment of the peoples of the world is firmly on the side of the Jewish state, we know, too, there are those in positions of trust and power in governments who would cast aside moral principles for selfish gain. They have not been too adroit in the game they have played. They have blundered and have lost. But they will bear watching.

The survival of the Jewish state is civilization's test. The Jews came into Palestine with plows, not with guns. The battle today is not for them one of conquest, but of defense. Within the state they are developing social forms of government for free, secure citizens in the democratic framework. It is a land of learning and creation in the arts and in the sciences. Here is a fresh approach in statehood. In it are a promise and a hope that the new State of Israel will prove again the genius that resides in the spirit of man that urges him on to the unending search for liberation and light.

I feel reverent and humble before the achievement of this small group of Palestine Jews who in the fervor of their faith have made this come true. Let us rejoice and exult with them. The people of Zion are home again.

Orville Zimmerman

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. A. SIDNEY CAMP

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1948

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN, late a Representative from the State of Missouri.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, it is hard for me to express my loss in the death of my friend and neighbor, ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN, who was stricken and died suddenly here last month, after diligently and ably serving his State and his Nation for 14 years.

He was one of the first Members of the House to come and introduce himself to me when I entered the Congress in 1939, and as time went on I appreciated more and more his character and his marked ability. His keen grasp of the farm problems of the South, and specially of his native State, was ever uppermost in his thoughts, and no man could have been more diligent and constant in his efforts to raise the standard of agriculture than he.

He was a great lawyer and keenly interested in every important legislative program. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN'S high character and sterling worth were appreciated by every person who knew him. His State has lost one of its greatest citizens, and I extend my sympathy to his bereaved family.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. COLE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by Jack Beall on May 8, 1948:

Good evening. I was talking last week about Soviet atheism and the antireligious character of the Communist Party. I showed, from their own writings and sayings, that the leaders of the Communist revolution regarded religion, not only as the opium of the people, but as something to stamp out. Three distinct waves of religious oppression have swept the Soviet Union, accompanied by organized efforts on the part of the league of the militant godless to harass, belittle, and ridicule religion of all sorts. The power of the state was also turned on, full force, against religion. They blew up churches, converted them to storehouses, stables, and garages, seized billions in church property. They arrested and exiled and murdered priests and made attendance at religious services a perilous thing. While a truce has now been struck up with the leaders of the Orthodox Greek Catholic Church, in Russia, and while it is no longer an act of physical courage for the ordinary persons to go to church, it may be a short-lived truce and there is still strict party discrimination against the church. No Communist Party member can remain on the rolls of the party if he is known to go to church, or even if he gets married by a priest. Since the party is the route to all preferment in the Soviet Union, up to 6,000,000 of the country's most influential people are barred off from organized religion. Atheistic teachings are still prescribed for the Komsomols—the Communist youth organization—and it is noticeable that 85 percent of the churchgoers in Russia, today, are the elderly and middle-aged. The Communist Party hopes that, whereas rigid repressions failed to kill off all religious sentiment, it will nevertheless die off at the roots, through the campaign to bring up young people as atheists.

One wonders how ministers of religion in this country can possibly defend the Soviet Union as being a country where freedom of religion is practiced. It cannot be denied by them that there is no freedom of religion for at least 6,000,000 people. The party militantly prevents them from going to church, on pain of losing their place as party members, their official positions and their preferred status in a hundred ways. The same thing applies to the hordes of young people who are being trained in the ways of the party—there is no freedom of religion for them, unless they renounce all hope of becoming party members.

Even aside from the question of freedom or nonfreedom of religious worship, one wonders how ministers of religion, in this country, can stomach a regime whose leaders publicly announce not only their personal disbelief in God, Christianity, and Christian ethics, but express their official hostility as well.

I was reading the other day the new biography of Lenin, by David Shub—a most useful book on which the author lavished more than 10 years of research—and I came across a description of the scene in which Lenin, at the age of 16, renounced religion. A friend of Lenin's, in his boyhood days, wrote this recollection: "When he (Lenin) clearly perceived that there was no God, he tore the cross violently from his neck, spat upon it, contemptuously, and threw it away."

In effect, the Communists, ever since, have been spitting contemptuously upon the cross. And why ministers of religion, of all people, find themselves mixed up in Communist-front organizations, defending communism, and Communists, becoming Communist and fellow travelers themselves, passes all understanding.

Well, be that as it may, what I want to talk about tonight is the actual religion of Communist Russia, the official state religion. Because they have got one. In the place of the trinity they have placed three men—Marx, Lenin, and Stalin. The new religion which has been fastened on the Soviet Union, in place of the old, is the so-called scientific religion of Marxian "dialectical materialism." As modified in practice, it now has its complicated theology, its dogma, its scholasticism, its mysticism, its saints, its priesthood, its adepts, its special apocalyptic vision—which is its heaven on earth, far removed—and its special hells for the unbeliever.

No less an authority than Arnold Toynbee, in his monumental Study of History, likens communism to a religion.

"In Marxian communism," he says, "we have a notorious example in our midst of a modern western philosophy which has changed in a lifetime quite out of recognition, into a proletarian religion, taking the path of violence and carving out its New Jerusalem with the sword on the plains of Russia. * * * Marx has taken the goddess "historical necessity" in place of Jehovah, for his diety, and the internal proletariat of the Western World, in place of Jewry, for his chosen people, and his Messianic Kingdom is conceived of as a dictatorship of the proletariat; but the salient features of the Jewish Apocalypse protrude through this threadbare disguise."

The Marxian priesthood has sought to canonize, if not deify, both Lenin and Stalin. The odd thing is that Lenin was one of the most modest of men himself and tried to discourage, while he lived, all such efforts. He unconsciously foretold, however, what was going to happen to him when he spoke of other revolutionaries who had preceded him.

"After their death," Lenin said, "an attempt is made to convert them into inoffensive icons, to canonize them, so to speak, to surround their name with an aureole of glory for the consolation and the deception of the oppressed classes, while the real substance of their revolutionary teachings is emasculated, its incisiveness dulled, and the doctrine debased."

If there ever was a description of what has happened to Lenin and his teachings, since his death, that is it. They have canonized Lenin but debased his doctrine.

Lenin's works became a new Bible. His least expression, issued ever so casually, was treasured and regarded as oracular. His smallest word became gospel, for quotation outside its context. A special institute, the Institute of Leninology, was created, with the duty of collecting and deciphering and codifying all his writings, down to the smallest scraps, including those which had been cast into the fire and partially burned. They even pasted together torn-up bits saved from Lenin's wastebasket.

The myth of Lenin's infallibility was created and sedulously nursed by the Marxian priesthood. To this day, any quotation from Lenin has the effect of silencing Communists, even when used by the opposition. They don't argue with it, providing they recognize it as being an accurate quotation. The same thing goes for Stalin's writings. Of course, Stalin has always been able, from the very first, when he seized power, to use Lenin's writings as a text to silence opposition and to justify whatever he was doing, although it was debasement and emasculation of true Leninism.

How ironical it is that Lenin, a man who detested hero-worship and who thought of religion as the opium of the people, should become an embalmed pillar-saint, in the huge shrine on Red Square, where millions come to worship. In the interest, largely, of Soviet politics, he has been deified and his writings given the character of Holy Writ.

His portrait was painted on huge banners, emblazoned on whole building fronts, modelled in statuettes, struck on medals, woven into handkerchiefs, printed, engraved, embroidered, and reproduced millions of times in thousands of ways to be used in the place of the old, displaced ikons. His name was given to towns, factories, clubs, sports grounds and innumerable places and things.

But if Lenin was deified when dead, Stalin has been canonized while still alive. The master propagandists of Moscow know well how to build up the symbol of the state into the awesome presence before whom all quail, against whom none dare to stand—the infallible source of all light, learning, and power—the giver of all good things. They have erected an enormous scaffolding of lies and impostures and perched Stalin at the very top—the hero of heroes of the Soviet Union.

And, too, no less than in the days of royalty, the Kremlin has its courtiers. They try to outdo each other in piling words of honor upon the great man. The least of these words is "genius." In Boris Souvarine's biography of Stalin we learn that the courtiers who fall behind in their adulation of Stalin make themselves suspect and expose themselves actually to dangers. They are regarded as disloyal unless they actively engage in this lavish praise and slavish worship of Stalin.

"Shameless and sordid servility," says the biographer, "suggested a thousands ways of advancement in a career by glorifying the tyrant." This is especially true of men of letters who, hoping to get a better-paid post or a more copious ration card, pour on the praise. They know, says Souvarine, that "Stalin is racked by a most painful sentiment of intellectual inferiority and is particularly avid of praise for his erudition and culture, which are sadly limited."

They seriously prate in their magazines that Socrates and Stalin are the highest peaks of human intelligence. One writes: "In reality, certain pronouncements of Aristotle have only been fully deciphered and expressed by Stalin."

The editor of Izvestia declared in a Soviet Congress: "On the threshold of the new age stand two unequaled titans of thought—Lenin and Stalin. * * * Can anyone really write on anything unless he knows his Stalin? Never. Without Stalin, no one can understand anything or write anything of interest."

Sycophants dredged their minds for all the epithets of praise when the customary ones, like "adored Stalin" and "great architect," and "legendary figure" became a bit shopworn. For a time the phrase "great and beloved," was on all lips—it became almost part of Stalin's name, like a title.

In newspaper editorials, Stalin's name is always printed in larger letters than the rest of the text, just as the name of the Deity is capitalized in this country. When his picture is published, with others, the names are not given from left to right, but, first, Stalin's name is given, wherever he stands in the picture, then the others are listed in the normal order. And speaking of pictures, no home is complete without at least one image of Stalin looking down from a wall. There is hardly a room in Soviet offices where the unsmiling face is not seen.

As an example of the hyped-up oratory which greets Stalin at a party congress, here's one:

"At this moment," says a delegate, "I saw our beloved father, Stalin, and I lost consciousness. The hurrahs resounded for a long time and it was probably this noise which brought me to myself. You will excuse me, comrades, if, finding myself in such a state of bewilderment at the sight of Comrade Stalin, I did not salute him."

Poets unashamedly use the words "thee" and "thou," capitalized, in addressing the great and beloved Stalin. One ode contains these lines:

"Storytellers no longer know to whom to compare Thee,
Poets have not enough pearls with which to describe Thee."

Another writes:

"O, Thou, mighty one, chief of the peoples,
Who callest man to life,
Who awakest the earth to fruitfulness,
Who summonest the centuries to youth."

And so forth.

Stalin's statue is placed on the highest crest of Russia, on Mount Elbruz, in the Caucasus. Another is placed on Stalin Peak, the highest point of the Famir Mountains. It reminds me of the story that is circulated, even by word of mouth in the Soviet Union, about the new statue they erected in Moscow to the Russian poet, Pushkin. When unveiled, it turned out to be a huge bronze figure of Stalin, holding a small book of Pushkin's verses in his hand.

Probably the best examples of how the worship of Stalin is furthered is by the method of ascribing to him, personally, everything good that happens in Soviet Russia. One is inevitably reminded of the God of Creation who marks the sparrow's fall. Every result is achieved, thanks to Stalin's constant intervention in all details. It matters not if it is a problem of producing oil, or of cast iron, or chemistry, or aviation, or the atom bomb, it would seem that Stalin is on the scene, personally directing. He is credited with settling all the chief problems, personally. He foresees everything, has his eye on everything, knows everything, prescribes everything.

This can, of course, have its embarrassments, because it is hard to understand how, with the great and beloved, the all-wise and the all-seeing, there on the spot, or with his finger in everything, so much can go wrong.

That is why, probably, the Politburo sets such great store by show trials, public orgies of blame-placing on others, onto spies, saboteurs, and wreckers, who are made to publicly acknowledge that they are the ones to bear the guilt—not Stalin the Infallible. The Kremlin has taken over the theory, at least, of the Jewish religious symbol of sin bearing—the scapegoat.

This is Jack Beall saying good night from Washington.

"Uncle Joe" Cannon—A Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend a most impressive patriotic ceremony at Greensboro, N. C., on Sunday, May 16, where inspiring tribute was paid to my famous predecessor from the Eighteenth Illinois district, the late Joseph Gurney Cannon, Member of Congress for 46 years and Speaker of the House from 1903 to 1911. The occasion was dedication of a memorial placque on the beautiful campus of 111-year-old Guilford College, only a mile and a half from the home where Uncle Joe was born on May 7, 1836.

Particularly fitting was the fact that the principal speaker for the occasion was "Uncle Joe's" present day counterpart, Speaker of the House JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts. He was introduced to the audience gathered on the Guilford campus and the radio audience as well by the Representative from the Greensboro district, North Carolina's Sixth, the Honorable CARL T. DURHAM, as a man who "dares to work and hope for peace—a courageous man who is undisputedly a leader at a decisive moment in the Nation's history."

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of Speaker MARTIN's challenging address:

My fellow Americans, today we are assembled to do honor to a man whose name is indelibly inscribed in the pages of American history. His ancestors, God-fearing Quakers and Huguenots came through England, Ireland, and Canada to our own New England. Eventually they came to this great State of North Carolina. Here in America they found freedom from religious persecution. Joseph Gurney Cannon was a "Tarheel." He was born in the then Quaker community of New Garden, N C. The rise of Joseph Gurney Cannon paralleled the rise of the Nation whose interests he loyally served. As the United States grew great, so did "Uncle Joe" grow in his work and importance.

He liked the title of "Uncle Joe." It was an evidence of the esteem and affection America had for him. He remained "Uncle Joe" until death came, in Danville, Ill., on November 12, 1926, when he was 91 years of age.

Joe Cannon loved North Carolina. This love was inherited from his father and mother. In later years he vividly recalled the manner of his going from this beautiful State. The big wagons pulled up before the Cannon household; the family goods were loaded aboard. He was placed on top of a wagon alongside his mother and an aunt. As the wagon pulled away on its long trek westward, tears welled in his mother's eyes. "Good-by, North Carolina; good-by civilization," she cried. "I did not understand what she meant," said Uncle Joe later. "I understand it now. She was leaving civilization to go into the western wilds. * * * I think I tried to comfort her, and I remember she kissed me."

That journey westward remained a vivid picture in the mind of Uncle Joe. He frequently recalled the National Pike as it was in 1840 when the journey was made. It extended from Washington toward St. Louis.

It was the common highway of the Nation, linking the East and West. Over it traveled the Pony Express riders, and the stage coaches. Big six-horse freight wagons made way for gaily painted turn-outs of the more prosperous travelers. Said Uncle Joe in later years: "The brilliant Henry W. Grady, of Georgia, suggested that the marriage of the Puritan and the Cavalier took place in Illinois. That may be true, but the courtship certainly began on the old National Pike."

Finally Uncle Joe's folks turned off the pike, stopped in a timber belt along the Wabash River, where today is Annapolis, in Park County, Ind. There they grubbed out a settlement by sweat and toil and perseverance.

Uncle Joe Cannon's childhood was typical of the times. He worked hard. He studied when he could. He played hard. He often studied by firelight. It was better than dip or tallow candles. For reading there were the Bible, Rollin's Ancient Rome, Shakespeare, Aesop's Fables, Plutarch's Lives, and Horace Greeley's Tribune. There was the log school which he attended when possible. There were debating societies to stimulate thinking. One of the high spots of this childhood was a show which came to a neighboring community. It was Van Amberg's great moral show. After much pestering on the part of little Joe, his father consented to let him go with old Uncle Eph, a venerable Negro who worked for the Cannons. Said Uncle Joe later of this momentous occasion: "What held our attention longest was the big baboon, who stood up in the cage man-like, bigger than I was. Uncle Eph was greatly impressed with the animal that bore a resemblance to the human. We stood a long while in front of the cage. Uncle Eph was always respectful and sociable with everybody he met. When we stopped in front of the baboon's cage, he took off his old hat and, with a nod of the head, said, 'How is you?' The baboon stood holding to the bars of his cage and staring at us. Uncle Eph repeated his question. Getting no response he looked the animal over for a moment and said: 'That's right, you keep yo' mouth shut or they'll have you out in the cornfield hoein' corn like me.'"

Uncle Joe Cannon never regarded his childhood as dull. Though he worked hard, he never felt imposed upon. He was a disciple of hard work. He believed fervently that only by hard work could men or institutions progress.

Uncle Joe's father was drowned accidentally. The boy went to work in a country store at the age of 14. His pay was $150 a year. Several years later he determined to become a lawyer. With his savings of $500 he went to Terre Haute, Ind., where he worked and studied in a lawyer's office. Still later he went to Shelbyville, Ill. There he rented a little room on the main street of the town for an office, and hung up his shingle. He settled down to wait for clients who did not come. Soon he married Miss Mary Reed, a school teacher originally from Connecticut. Uncle Joe Cannon always regarded himself as a political accident. In 1872 he was elected to Congress. Two years later he had an experience it always gave him great pleasure to recall. Then James H. Pickerel was his opponent with strong Democratic and "greenback" support. Pickerel was a farmer and stock raiser. He had a prize bull which he used, like some of our modern-day politicians use hillbilly bands, to gather political audiences. When a crowd gathered to look with admiration on the bull, Pickerel would start talking politics.

Uncle Joe later described the experience; said he: "I had an appointment to speak at the county fair at Champaign. While I was making my speech from the stand, Pickerel trotted out his bull a little distance away and began his performance, attracting part of my crowd. It irritated me, but it was a fair game, and I thought I would try to turn the tables. I was about at the end of my speech and realized I could not hold the crowd much longer, so I shouted to the fellows who were drifting over to brother Pickerel, 'I see there are three candidates here—Mr. Pickerel, the bull, and me, and I would like to know whether you are going to vote to send Pickerel or the bull to Congress in my place.' I ran Pickerel and the bull out of the campaign."

Uncle Joe got his first national publicity when he proposed a change in the method of collecting postage on second class mail and banning obscene matter from the mails. He proposed also to restore congressional franking privileges. He made his maiden speech on this proposal. An opponent, William Walter Phelps, of New Jersey, suggested that "the gentleman from Illinois" must have oats in his pocket. Uncle Joe replied that not only did he have oats in his pocket, but also hayseed in his hair. Said he: "The western people generally are affected in the same way, and we expect that the seed, being good, will yield a good crop, I trust tenfold." From then on he became known as the "hayseed Member from Illinois" and reaped reams of publicity in the newspapers throughout the country.

Uncle Joe was a staunch and outspoken partisan. He believed that "when we abandon political parties representing politics in which the people believe, we will fly to anarchy or despotism or both." He believed the Government is established for the people; not the people for government. In some respects he regarded himself as an old-fashioned Democrat because he believed "the farther we get away from local self-government in municipality, in township, in county and State, the less competent we are to be good citizens." Joe Cannon would have resisted with all his might the tendency of the past 16 years of encroachment by the Federal Government on States' rights and home rule. Joe Cannon believed in our system of checks and balances—executive, judicial, legislative. He would have resented and fought the all-too-frequent attacks upon the legislative branch of our Government by the Communists, their cohorts, and the well-meaning, but deceived, individuals playing into the hands of these sordid elements. On one occasion, uncle Joe said: "There is no man on earth so anxious to anticipate the demands of a wise, intelligent and just public sentiment as the Member of Congress who goes back every 24 months to have his commission renewed." He believed in the destiny of America; he believed in the wholesomeness of its institutions.

Uncle Joe Cannon had an abiding faith and pride in the Republican Party. He was a Republican pretty much like he was an American—"up to his ears and over his head." He was a thrifty soul. He abhorred governmental waste and extravagance and inefficiency. If he were here now he would be proud of the record of the present Congress in balancing the budget, after 16 years of deficits, of tax reductions, of a program for an adequate national defense, of the general policy of the Congress based, as it is, on the soundest and most profound principles of our American system.

He would be in the forefront of those urging the expulsion of all Communists, Fascists, and other subversionists, of whatever character or title, from places in the Government.

Uncle Joe Cannon believed profoundly in our American system. He lived in those years when the Nation was still taking form—while America was still becoming great among the nations of the world. He was able to see at work the remarkable efficiency and effect of our American system of free constitutional government, free economy, and free society. He would have resented and fought back with all the fierceness of his rugged love of Americanism against the efforts of those who would stealthily undermine the foundations of our free system and substitute confusion and the authority of a totalitarian Federal Government instead.

America was growing and becoming great in the days of Uncle Joe Cannon's rise because the people had an intense, continuing, and practical interest in their Government. They were sometimes bitterly partisan, but always they were for our American system. They demanded that public officials hew to the line of our American principles or else they ousted them from office.

One of the things wrong with America today—I might say one of the causes of our present troubles and difficulties—is that we are living in an era of too much indifference to government and toward politics on the part of many people. Some people refuse to participate in public affairs in any way. Many of them do not even vote. They are well-meaning citizens. But it remains a fact that so long as they refuse to have anything to do with politics they make it more difficult for the rest of us to keep the operation of our Government out of the hands of self-seekers and opportunists who work intensively at the job of getting hold of public government.

Uncle Joe Cannon believed—and he was correct—that when men and women neglect their Government, and lapse into indifference toward it, and permit elections to be conducted by political opportunists and tricksters, the intelligent people are betraying liberty and our American system. Uncle Joe on many occasions, and in various ways, expressed himself on this subject. He believed it is the business of the citizens to declare the kind of government they want; to elect administrators who promise to give this kind of government; and then to watch those administrators carefully to see that they keep their promises.

If that spirit had prevailed in America for the last 16 years, many of the evils which beset us today would not be bothering us. Many of the conditions of which we complain would have been avoided or modified.

There never has been a time in the history of this Nation when the need is more vitally urgent that we arouse the people to action. We must make sure of an administration which will make a forthright and straightforward approach to these problems with a determination to solve them on an all-American basis, instead of from a standpoint of individual, group, class, or sectional advantage, at the expense of the rest of the country.

Uncle Joe's career in Congress for 50 years was turbulent at times. He faced charges and blasts which would have greatly embittered many men. His name became synonymous with czarism and dictatorship. And yet he rose above these charges and accusations and retained the loyalty, affection, and friendship of his associates regardless of political affiliation.

Concerning one of the most critical fights Uncle Joe Cannon ever had, North Carolina's well-loved Claude Kitchin had this to say:

"I have seen him confront serious and critical situations often; but, in my opinion, the time when he loomed up bigger and stronger and braver than ever was during those two nights and two days fight over what we called Cannonism—on the Norris resolution—in the Sixty-first Congress. I never saw a man in my life who stood forth such a complete master of the situation. He rode the very whirlwinds and directed the storms for his party. While many harsh things on this side and many on that side were spoken during these 2 days and nights of the hottest and most exciting contest the House has witnessed in a quarter of a century, I never saw that gentleman from Illinois lose his temper or his head for one moment." The fight against so-called Cannonism was really a fight against a system which the rules created and which he inherited from former Congresses.

Uncle Joe Cannon always met crises in his life head-on and emerged stronger and greater. His services to his country in the

House of Representatives were given at a time when America made great scientific and industrial strides.

He lived and worked in a world and an age of miracles. He saw the advent of the electric light, the radio, the automobile, the airplane, the motion picture, the typewriter, the telephone. In Joe Cannon's time America was transformed from an agricultural nation into the greatest industrial Nation in the world. He played an important part in that evolution of America. In his time there was no concentration of government power in Washington. America was sound, safe and solvent. The astronomical waste by government which we have today would have appalled and enraged Uncle Joe. During his service as chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations he was called to the White House by President McKinley. He was asked to provide $50,000,000 for the Spanish-American War. Fifty million dollars to fight a war. Uncle Joe thought it was a stupendous sum. Why, today, that amount wouldn't finance a Government project on Catfish Creek.

Uncle Joe would bitterly condemn government by decree if he were here today. Government encroachment upon the individual liberties of our people would have found him in bitter opposition.

He would believe, as we do, that to effect the economies we must have in our national Government doesn't mean our essential services must suffer. We in Congress have demonstrated we do not believe in a penny-wise-pound-foolish policy. We Republicans and patriotic Democrats are determined our Nation shall have a strong military establishment consistent with our increasing responsibility of world leadership. We want a mighty air force equipped with the most advanced models of fighters and bombers; we want a trained Air Force personnel competent to meet, if necessary—and I pray it won't be necessary—any attack of the future. We are not saber rattling. We Americans love peace. We believe that to preserve it we must be adequately prepared to meet the challenge of any ruthless despots who would enslave the world. We must follow this motto: prepare a strong defense for peace. Without preparedness there can be no peace.

You may be assured that we shall create and maintain such a defense for peace and that we shall work unceasingly for that peace.

America is beset today with many vital problems, both national and international. But America has had problems before. We have met them in our true American way and emerged each time stronger than ever. These problems have been met and will continue to be met by strong leadership and common unity among the people.

Uncle Joe Cannon said on his eightieth birthday:

"There are now more great men and great women in the United States than there ever have been in the past history of the Republic. Some one asks, 'Where are they?' and I answer, they are everywhere, following their vocations; but when necessary, whether it be in Congress or in civil life, or upon the bench, in the State legislature; whether it be in diversifying the industry of the country and carrying on the business of the country, whether it be in following the plow or working in the machine shop, there will be found more people capable for self-government and ready to defend the flag than there ever have been since the discovery of America. To you, to all the people of America, from my observations of half a century, I bring this message: have faith. Often you feel that you detect a great uneasiness, an unrest, a threatening undercurrent in this Government. This is neither new nor unusual. I have learned that America will rise to meet her problems. I have learned that good will triumph over evil. Have faith in the Government of your fathers. Show your faith by works to support that Government. Have faith that right will prevail."

I concur with all my heart in these injunctions of that great pioneer statesman from Illinois whom you honor here today as a fellow North Carolinian. I am happy to participate in these ceremonies in tribute to a man who was as American as ham and eggs—a man who was blunt, frank, open. A man who typifies a memorable period in our history when America hewed rough logs and produced rough-hewn statesmen. Uncle Joe Cannon, and men like him, helped make America what it is today—a citadel of liberty, of opportunity, and individual initiative. Let us by eternal vigilance keep it that way.

Debate on Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARY T. NORTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

DEBATE ON COMMUNISM

As the Governor of New York said to the former Governor of Minnesota, there ought to be a law. The kind of law advocated by Governor Dewey would directly make it illegal to carry on any organization, either above ground or below, which is directed by the rulers of a foreign power for the purpose of overthrowing the Government of the United States. And he added some important qualifications: Such a law would not outlaw ideas; it would not outlaw thought; it would make illegal organized conspiracy of fifth columns. The definition has significance because it distinguishes what Governor Dewey wants from what Mr. Stassen wants—which is the Mundt-Nixon bill.

It is a pity that these two Republican candidates consumed most of the time in their radio debate Monday evening over a semantic abstraction—Does the Mundt-Nixon bill outlaw the Communist Party?—instead of arguing about the merits of the bill itself. The Minnesotan claimed there would be no difference of opinion between him and his opponent if the latter would only indorse the Mundt-Nixon bill; the New Yorker asserted that this stand constituted a complete Stassen surrender since the bill, according to its authors, was never intended to make the party illegal. This vagueness as to the issue under discussion made their performance Monday only mildly reminiscent of the great Lincoln-Douglas debates nearly a century ago.

Setting aside for the moment the grave constitutional questions entailed, it is useful to look at the Mundt-Nixon bill in purely pragmatic terms. If it would not, strictly speaking, outlaw the Communist Party, it would certainly have the effect of driving it even more deeply underground than at present. For the party could not afford to operate openly and members could not afford to acknowledge their membership in view of the handicaps and hardships imposed under the bill. Indeed, the party leaders have already made clear their intention to circumvent the measure if it is enacted into law. And such circumvention is all too easy, as the experience in Canada and Brazil made plain.

The bill would also impose severe handicaps on organizations designated "Communist fronts." These, too, would be driven underground, while their members, whether individually innocent or guilty of participation in the Communist conspiracy, would be stigmatized on the basis of mere association. Opinions, rather than overt acts, would be penalized. As Governor Dewey put it, "Stripped to its naked essentials, this is nothing but the method of Hitler and Stalin. It is thought control borrowed from the Japanese war leadership. It is an attempt to beat down ideas with a club. It is surrender of everything we believe in."

According to the New York Governor, there are now some 27 laws on the statute books to protect this country from the subversive activities of foreign agents. This newspaper has repeatedly called for strengthening of the existing statutes as well as more effective administration of them and for legislation that would require the registration and reporting of all organizations engaged in influencing public opinion. Every group soliciting funds from the public should be required to disclose the names of its contributors and account for its expenditures. This would, we think, afford substantial protection against the Communist tactic of raising money for a worthy cause while spending it for anti-American propaganda. It would force the Communists to operate in the open where their objectives would be exposed to the buffets of democratic debate. It would subject Communist ideas to what Mr. Justice Holmes called the best test of truth, "the power of thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market." Americans need not fear such a test.

Stalin's Offer To Negotiate Differences With United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast, made by a distinguished commentator of the Mutual Broadcasting system, Albert L. Warner, on May 18.

It may now be said that Premier Joe Stalin, of Russia, has helped President Truman out of a bad spot. A good many people were not content with the way the White House and the State Department responded to the unexpected Soviet use of the private exchange of memoranda between Ambassador Bedell Smith and Soviet Foreign Commissar Molotov.

Of course it was appreciated that Russia had breached diplomatic etiquette in suddenly publicizing the exchange. It was understood also that Russia had seized upon a small stock sentence near the end of the American note to make it appear that Russia was accepting an invitation to a conference which, in fact, we had never extended. But the hostile reaction of Washington at that moment raised a question. There was some thought that an affirmative reply or an affirmative proposal should thereupon have come from the White House just to make sure that even one chance in a hundred for the improvement of relations between the two countries should not be lost.

But now when the propaganda chiefs in Moscow suddenly spread a statement by Stalin accepting peace proposals by Henry A. Wallace as a basis for discussion, every point made by Washington officials as to the lack of sincerity of Russia in its original publicized statement is confirmed.

If the head of a state is in earnest about having exploratory discussions with another

state and is prepared to show good will and to make some concessions, he does not publicly address himself to the candidate of a splinter political organization who is campaigning in the other country against the head of the government. You hardly go about reducing suspicion or preparing the way for a settlement by supporting the program of a man who is personally displeasing to the head of the state with whom you wish to negotiate. It is the more shocking when the political candidate to whom you address yourself has a foreign affairs policy directly at odds with that supported by the two major parties and the great bulk of the people in that politician's country.

Many people believe that Mr. Wallace has allowed himself to become more or less of a captive of the Communist Party in this country which in turn seems to take its orders from Moscow. When Moscow goes to such a source for the advertised purpose of negotiating differences, it makes for trouble, not for peace.

It is as if President Truman managed to find an oppositionist to the Stalin regime in Russia and publicly accepted the program of that oppositionist as the basis for a discussion of affairs with Joe Stalin. Of course, it would be a hard thing to find such an oppositionist inside Russia. Oppositionists go to their death or to Siberia. It might be necessary to locate some refugee from the Soviet Union and have him enunciate a program.

Of course, by dint of searching it might be possible to find someone inside Russia, frowned upon by the Soviet Government, but still existent. Then, if we followed the example that Stalin has set in addressing Mr. Wallace, President Truman would address himself to this suspected element in Russia.

About the only persons I can think of at the moment who might fit the bill are those Soviet musical composers who have been scolded by the official party in Moscow and told to foreswear thir musical formalism and get into line with the Russian masses and their folk songs.

There is a likeness in these situations. Mr. Wallace is said to have the soul of a composer and his tunes have a wide appeal, unless examined too closely. Now, if President Truman were to have done what Stalin has done he would single out, say, Aram Khachaturian and issue a public statement which might go something like this:

"I think that among the political tunes of recent times which aim at the consolidation of peace, the beautiful arrangement of Khachaturian is the most important development.

"His 'Sabre Dance' cannot be considered just a simple declaration of the desirability of laying aside the sword and settling the differences between the United States and the Soviet Union. The important meaning of the 'Sabre Dance' is that it makes a serious step forward and gives a concrete program for the peaceful settlement of differences."

And then the American President if he copied Stalin's tactics would continue:

"These proposals are known to everybody: A type of formalism which gets away from narrow provincialism and seeks a universal appeal. I do not know whether the government of the Soviet Union approves Khachaturian. Anyhow, he has not been put in jail yet although he has apologized only once. But we think the Khachaturian program could serve as a good and useful basis."

So this hypothetical presidential statement would conclude. The only question is whether that type of procedure would be any more a token of American sincerity than the tactic of Stalin in taking up the program of the minority oppositionist, Mr. Wallace, as the basis for a discussion of differences with the United States Government.

However, this time Washington has not rebuffed Premier Stalin. An official statement from the State Department today characterizes as "encouraging" Stalin's opinion that a peaceful settlement of outstanding problems is possible and necessary. But the State Department goes on to point out that the specific issues listed in Stalin's pronunciamento are not bilateral issues between this country and the Soviet Union. They are of intimate and compelling interest to many countries and have been under negotiations for the past 2 years or more in bodies where other countries are represented, such as the United Nations and the Council of Foreign Ministers.

The State Department goes on to point to the first proposal submitted by Mr. Wallace—and adopted by Premier Stalin—as a basis for discussion, namely, a general reduction of armaments and prohibition of atomic weapons. The State Department makes the rejoinder that a United Nations atomic energy commission has held over 200 meetings on this subject and the commission just yesterday reported its inability to reach an agreement. The break-down came because of the adamant opposition of the Soviet Union to proposals which were acceptable to all other nations, represented on the commission. These proposals were approved by nine nations and rejected only by Russia. To be sure, there were two votes in the negative, but one was cast by the Ukraine which is as much a part of Russia as the State of Massachusetts is a part of the United States.

The State Department goes on to declare that a similar situation, meaning Russian adamancy exists with regard to other issues mentioned in the Stalin statement.

Conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany is another item in the Stalin-Wallace program. Well, that's been an item on the State Department agenda for a long time. It's a good objective. The only thing is that up to now there has not been the slightest encouragement to the making of progress. Unless Russia is willing to review its own attitude now and is prepared to make changes, even as the United States and the other countries concerned, review their own attitude, a proposal to take up this subject does not offer substantial hope.

Another item on the Stalin-Wallace program is defense of democracy and the insuring of civil rights in all countries. That, too, has been on the State Department agenda for a long time. But until Russia stops defining democracy as a form of Soviet dictatorship in which any critic and anybody who stands up for free speech is a Fascist, there is not much use discussing the question again.

It is nice to know, as the United Press reports from San Francisco, that Mr. Wallace's voice quavered with emotion as he heard the great news from Moscow, Stalin accepting his program for international discussion. I am not sure that Khachaturian would have been equally appreciative of the hypothetical statement which I suggested President Truman should have written to him. But until the governments of the two states begin talking to each other through normal private diplomatic channels, it is to be doubted whether tangible progress is being made.

But there is one bit of extraneous encouragement. Even if the form of Russian procedure makes the sincerity of the Kremlin questionable, the reiterated talk of a willingness to discuss matters must indicate that Russia realizes this line of approach has many friends throughout the world. It must be that Russian talk of peaceful discussion is popular in the nervous agitated puppet countries of eastern Europe. It is just possible that the Soviet Government may find itself pushed into a position where it will be less adamant, less aggressive, and therefore ready to make the concessions and show the good will, without which, in mutual form, all this gesticulating, posing, and publicity are of no possible use.

The Brooklyn Tablet Supports the Mundt Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks an article in the Brooklyn Tablet, official organ of the diocese of Brooklyn, as follows:

SUPPORT H. R. 5852

A perusal of the outline of the Mundt bill on another page of this issue will indicate why the Communist Party, its propaganda organs, and its dupes have been exerting every pressure to prevent the enactment by Congress of H. R. 5852, a measure sponsored by the House Committee on Un-American Activities to protect the United States against un-American and subversive forces. Congress has been blanketed with protests, mostly on post cards, against H. R. 5852. Most Representatives and Senators, if not all, are aware of the common source of the protests, but, for the record at least, the mail in support of the measure should, and must, be heavy, forceful, and unequivocal.

We urge our readers not only to write to their Congressmen in support of H. R. 5852 but to make themselves familiar with the outline of the Mundt bill in order that they may instruct others. The Communists have resorted to the most extravagent deceit, lying, and trickery to arouse opposition to the measure. Members of Communist-controlled unions have been presented with petitions to sign against the bill. Unless Americans in favor of the Mundt bill speak out militantly and on every occasion, thousands of their fellow Americans will become the unwitting promoters of communism in America.

The primary aim of the Communists is to create active and strong opposition to the measure; where this cannot be achieved, they will try to belittle and smear it in order to discourage its support. The Daily Worker has accused the Mundt bill of being designed for almost every purpose but that expressly stated in the measure itself. The Communists have labeled it a police-state bill, whereas it is actually an antipolice-state bill. They charge it with being antiunion, whereas its purpose is to free American unions from alien political domination. They assert it is a step to totalitarian dictatorship in the United States, whereas it is the most practical and courageous step yet to be taken to keep totalitarian dictatorship out of the United States. They say it would make every political opposition a crime, whereas its express purpose is to eliminate from American politics the secret, conspiratorial, Soviet methods that threaten to destroy our political system. They accuse the sponsors of H. R. 5852 of seeking to speed up the preparations for world war III, whereas the real object of the measure is to strengthen our national morale by exposing our enemies in order that we may not be the bovine victims of Soviet expansionism.

Americans of Brooklyn have been given an added incentive to take the leadership in the fight to assure the enactment by both Houses of Congress of H. R. 5852, for the leadership of the masses in opposition is in this borough. The Kings highway section of the Communist Party pledged, in an advertisement in the Daily Worker, to raise $10,000 in 10 days to defeat the Mundt bill. The national committee of the party—never allergic to American dollars—raised the ante to a half million dollars for the Nation.

The issues are clearly defined and the fight is on—the Communists have at stake their freedom to wreck America; Americans have at stake their freedom. The Tablet takes its stand in the ranks with every true, militant American in support of H. R. 5852.

Preview in Pasco Heralds Long-Awaited Completion of Columbia Basin Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, the hundreds of friends of reclamation in this body will indeed be interested in the graphic account of the milestone in irrigation history reached May 15, when the first water was turned onto the Pasco pumping unit of the Columbia Basin project in Washington.

It was singularly fitting that the first farm to receive this Columbia River water was that of a young and ambitious Navy veteran who came to the Northwest while in service, fell in love with it, and stayed there. This week, he and the owners of 5,552 acres of thirsty land near Pasco have seen come true a dream that first was born more than 30 years ago.

I am sure that all the grateful people of Washington State join me in saying "Thank you" to the many Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle who have helped, through the instrument of the Bureau of Reclamation and many private contractors, to make this dream come true.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert at this point in the RECORD an accounting of the opening of the first unit of the 1,000,000-acre Columbia Basin irrigation project, written by Mr. James Bracken, of the staff of the Spokane Spokesman-Review:

NAVY VETERAN'S FARM GETS INITIAL WETTING OUT OF CONCRETE-LINED CANAL

(By James Bracken)

PASCO, WASH., May 15.—The Columbia Basin irrigation system went into operation for the first time today. Dreams held for decades by the early advocates of Columbia Basin irrigation were realized when water flowed from the main lateral of the Pasco unit near here onto land never before irrigated.

At 11:10 a. m. Judge B. B. Horrigan, of Pasco climaxed a brief ceremony held at the head of the main lateral of the newly completed irrigation block No. 1 by giving the order that put giant pumps into operation.

SCOUTS RELAY SIGNAL

Judge Horrigan's order was given to Vernon Adamson, a member of Pasco Troop 26 of the Boy Scouts. Young Adamson relayed the order by signal flag to other scouts stationed at intervals along the 1,700-foot-long discharge pipe that connects the head of the lateral with the pumping station on the Columbia River.

About 10 minutes later, the 60-inch pipe was filled with water, the iron outlet valve swung open, and the water began to flow down the concrete-lined canal.

TWO HUNDRED SEE CEREMONY

About 200 persons attending the ceremonies followed the water to the point where it was turned onto the land on the farm of O. C. Gillum, a navy veteran, about a mile below the head of the canal.

Gillum's farm of 85 acres is one of 84 farm units to be served with irrigation water in the Pasco section of the Columbia Basin project which opened today.

There are 5,552 acres of irrigable land in the unit, which lies along the east bank of the Columbia about 14 miles northwest of Pasco and almost directly across the river from the atomic energy town of Richland.

WRESTLING CHAMPION

Gillum, former wrestling champion of the Big 10 Conference, first came to Pasco as physical training instructor at the naval base. Following his release from the service as a lieutenant commander, he moved from Indiana to become a farmer on the new project. His father, W. F. Gillum, will assist him in the management of the farm.

Part of the Pasco unit lands are owned by the Government and part by private individuals and firms. The Northern Pacific Railway is the largest private owner. The Northern Pacific will sell its units to settlers of its own selection, giving preference to veterans. The Government will sell its land to qualified settlers, also giving top priority to veterans. No date has been set for the first drawing of Government-owned farms. Hundreds of names are already on file to receive application forms when they are ready.

SMALL-SCALE PREVIEW

Exceptional interest will attend the development of the Pasco unit because it is a small-scale preview of the larger units of the Columbia Basin project yet to be opened.

The Pasco unit, because of receiving its water directly from the Columbia River through a pumping plant, will have approximately a 2-year head start on the larger units which must await the completion of major canals and reservoirs.

It is expected that answers to many of the problems of irrigation farming in that region will be learned from experience with the Pasco unit.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARY T. NORTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Lowell Mellett from the Washington Evening Star of May 8, 1948.

CONGRESS SEEN FAILING TO DISCOURAGE TENDENCIES TO COMMUNISM AT HOME

(By Lowell Mellett)

If converts to communism are increasing in number in our own country, don't look to the present Congress to check this unwelcome development. This Congress is wasting a great deal of lung-power on the subject and may enact some ill-advised law before it adjourns, but it is doing nothing to discourage the actual growth of communism. Which is to say, it is doing nothing to immunize the American people against communism by making them happier with their lot. Prepared to spend billions elsewhere in the world to stop communism, the Congress spends little more than its breath in the effort to do the same thing here at home.

One day last week Representative DOUGLAS, Democrat, of California, stood in the House of Representatives and told the other Members what every housewife knows. She told them that families of modest means are being crowded to the wall by the cost of living. Mrs. DOUGLAS is an excellent speaker and an attractive woman, easy to listen to and easy to look at. And she had with her an exhibit that was even more eloquent than her words. It was a market basket filled with the necessities of life.

STAY AWAY IN DROVES

Congress Members stayed away from the House that day in droves. At one time there weren't a half dozen Republicans in the Chamber. Very clearly they did not care to be reminded of the cost of filling a market basket these days. They didn't wish to see the tangible evidence of what has happened since they removed the OPA controls. A year ago Mrs. DOUGLAS had demonstrated that in the first 12 months of decontrol, prices on these same articles had risen 50 percent—the basketful costing $15 instead of $10. The Representatives apparently feared her second demonstration might be even more embarrassing.

Actually it was not as bad as they may have feared. Prices have only advanced another 12 percent, or 62 percent in all.

Most Members know, of course, that that 62-percent increase is a serious matter in millions of homes; that food is something families simply have to have. .But since they don't intend to do anything about the situation, the Members don't wish to talk about it or listen to anybody who talks about it.

It's a matter of principle. Most of the Members don't believe in pampering the poor; they believe it destroys their character. Protecting the poor against exploitation would be a form of pampering, in the minds of these Members. Pampering should be reserved for those rugged citizens who can stand it.

So a new tax law is enacted, stepping up the take-home pay of those in the higher brackets by thousands of dollars as compared with the dollars-or-cents benefit to the people of small income.

The natural-gas corporations, making more money than most anybody, are given freedom to collect many additional millions from their customers, including those already seriously worried about the cost of living.

Secret sessions of the Ways and Means Committee are held to consider ways and means of increasing the tariff on various articles and eventually the price of same.

The oil beneath the tidelands, worth untold millions, is removed from the protecting hand of the Federal Government.

Real estate and financial institutions write their own legislation on housing and rents.

The beneficiaries of such legislation, so Congress seems to think, can stand pampering. They are used to it.

The Republic of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 19 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, at the Salute to Israel meeting at Madison Square Garden, New York, last Sunday evening there were two notable contributions, one a message from Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, the other an address by former Gov. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, which I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the message and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MESSAGE FROM MRS. ELEANOR ROOSEVELT TO DR. ABBA HILLEL SILVER AT THE SALUTE TO ISRAEL, MADISON SQUARE GARDEN, NEW YORK CITY, MAY 16, 1948

DEAR DR. SILVER: I am deeply sorry that I cannot be with you at the meeting. I prom-

ised so many times to go to the West Virginia State College and they have made so many plans for Sunday, it was impossible for me to change my plans. My thoughts will be with you at this celebration. I pray that peace may come to those living in the area and that the new Jewish state may flourish and provide happiness and security in the future for all the people.

Very sincerely yours,

ELEANOR ROOSEVELT.

ADDRESS BY FORMER GOV. HERBERT H. LEHMAN AT SALUTE TO ISRAEL, MADISON SQUARE GARDEN, NEW YORK CITY, MAY 16, 1948

We are here to hail the birth of the new Jewish state in Palestine. A truly democratic commonwealth has been created.

The handful of devoted Jews of Palestine—beset on every side by enemies—have shown an epic heroism and determination that has never been surpassed in the entire history of the world. They have succeeded against terrible odds only because they are convinced that they are fighting for a just and humane cause.

Their dedication has been built on an unquenchable desire to gain freedom and security and peace—the right of all liberty-loving people. They have sought, too, to create a haven of refuge for part of the tragic remnant of Jews in Europe—men, women, and children who have languished for nearly 3 years in the displaced-persons camps, or who have suffered indescribable persecution and hatred in many lands.

The creation of a Jewish state is no longer academic. It has become a happy reality through the single-handed efforts of this brave little band of men and women in Palestine. The road will continue to be hard. It will be beset by many dangers and by countless sacrifices. Many have already died; others may be called upon to give their lives. Under no circumstances, however, will these brave and inspired people be swerved from their course.

I have sought to save lives. Every instinct of my being, every action of my life, compelled me to do so. I am confident that this, too, is the spirit of the Jews of Palestine. They have time and again offered to respect a cease-fire order, providing the Arabs would permit them to live in peace and cease their warfare. Every proposal that has been made, however, constitutes complete surrender. This brave people never can or will surrender. They will not barter the yearnings of 2,000 years even for personal security.

I am confident that Americans of all faiths are grateful to the President of the United States for his prompt recognition of the new democracy and that they will approve his course. His action is not only just, but wise. It is in accord with the finest American traditions of freedom and democracy and will give confidence to small nations that justice will prevail.

Those who have established the new state are entitled to the admiration and the wholehearted support of all the American people. America wants all peoples to benefit from the "four freedoms." That is what the new state will offer to all of its residents. The Jewish state, built on the concept of American freedom and equality, brings to the Middle East American standards of living, for the benefit of both Arabs and Jews. It spreads the frontiers of democracy to an area of the world where democracy has never been known. It will preserve and advance the high ideals of American democracy and will be a great bulwark of strength against the spread of totalitarianism either of the right or of the left.

The United Nations in accordance with the spirit and letter of its Charter must take prompt steps against invasion of Palestine by neighboring states. It can do so either through the creation of an international force or through sanctions.

I have always been an ardent supporter of the United Nations. In spite of great disappointments, I still think that in it lies our greatest hope for peace. Its main objective is to preserve peace and to prevent injustice by nation against nation. It can only be successful if it maintains its authority and the integrity of its own decisions. It would be tragic if this great international organization should permit the further unauthorized use of force by some of its own members to flout and defeat its decisions. To permit neighboring Arab states, all members of the United Nations, to invade Palestine, will irretrievably injure the prestige and authority of the United Nations. If the United Nations is to regain its authority and prestige it must at once take steps to prevent breaches of the peace and to prohibit the exercise of aggression by its own members. As yet it has taken no such steps. It has within itself the power to halt aggression by the Arab states. Only through the exercise of its authority to stop nullification of its decisions by recalcitrant member states can its usefulness be maintained.

An effective international authority should be set up in the entire Jerusalem area. It should provide for free access of supplies, as well as of persons engaged in peaceful business. To talk about peace in the walled city without including the entire area is completely unrealistic and self-deceiving.

The new Israel will, in the family of nations, be judged by what it gives to the world, not by what it takes from it.

The ideals of Israel and its spiritual values have over the centuries made a great contribution to the moral law of the world. Ancient Palestine was not only a great and powerful nation, but inspired many of the ideals which have helped to bring to the world justice, law, freedom, and democracy. Its people, throughout their history, maintained a passionate devotion to liberty and brotherhood. The dominating inspiration of their very being was—as it is ours—the ideal of a just and peaceful world.

It is the things of the spirit which made ancient Palestine great. It is the things of the spirit which must make the new Israel great. The new state will be small. Its people and its government will amass no great wealth or power. But if it clings to the ideals of justice, law, brotherhood, and peace—ideals that have been our heritage and our strength over the centuries—it will exert great moral leadership among the nations of the world.

It is my deepest hope and prayer that Israel may again be a messenger of peace and good will to all peoples of the earth.

The Republic of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 19 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by Brig. Gen. Julius Klein, national commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, at the Salute to Israel meeting in Madison Square Garden, New York, Sunday evening, May 16, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Introducing Brig. Gen. Julius Klein, national commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Dr. Emanuel Neumann, president of the Zionist Organization of America said:

No organization outside of the Zionist Organization of America has done as much for our cause as the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, and I therefore have the honor to present to you their national commander, Brig Gen. Julius Klein.

America is redeeming her pledge. We Jewish War Veterans of the United States glow with a special pride tonight. Our fighting comrades in Israel carry on where we left off against Hitler and Mussolini and the Japs.

We are proud—very proud—to be veterans of this great republic that has fought only wars against aggressors—to preserve liberty, justice, and the rights of all men.

We join all fighting soldiers for freedom and democracy in saluting the unconquerable army of Israel.

A 2,000-year-old battle is nearing its climax. Six millions who gave their lives in Nazi crematoria, the immortal Jews who fell as gallant soldiers in the Warsaw ghetto, and our fighting comrades who have made the supreme sacrifice in Palestine, have not died in vain.

We hail and salute the new Republic of Israel, formed like our own great Nation in 1776, by the sacrifices of freedom-loving men, women, and children.

Our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, expressed the will of the American people by a prompt and forthright recognition of Eretz Israel. But the armies of Israel stand today where the Minute Men of America stood in 1776. They have won many victories, but they have not yet won a war. We Americans remember that our own independence was not won until five long years after 1776. We veterans know that victory comes hard and at a terribly high cost. We must face the cold facts of history. Our own independence was won with the help of men of good will who refused to remain indifferent to our cause. We won with the aid of the Lafayettes, the Kosciuskos, the Pulaskis, and the Steubens. We won as well because the governments of these fighters for freedom gave us the tools to fight. The Jews of Israel have upheld the honor and integrity of the United Nations and they deserve no less.

We must never again retreat. We must never again reverse our course. We must now go forward. We must give to the sole defenders of democracy in the Middle East the means to repeal invasion and aggression.

Tonight we call upon our Government to give to the Jews of Israel the same aid it extends generously to all nations defending democracy throughout the world today. If it is vital to support the defense of democracy in Greece and Turkey, it is equally vital to support it in Israel. If we would stem totalitarianism in Europe, we must stem it in the Middle East as well. And we need not send a single United States soldier to Israel. Israel asks only for the weapons to defend their freedom.

For it is not the Republic of Israel alone that they defend. They fight for the right of all freedom-loving men to guard their lives, their homes, and their God-given rights. With full hearts, we say to these fighting men of Israel tonight, we have every confidence you will emerge victorious in the desperate days of combat ahead, just as the fighting founders of our own Nation emerged triumphant in battle before they forged a secure and peaceful Nation. They are keeping alive the magnificent traditions of the fighting Jews of the Warsaw ghetto. They remember that it took the Nazi oppressors 6 days to conquer the Low Countries; 23 days to conquer France—but the Nazi, with all

his might, with all his fire-power, was held back by the Jews of Warsaw who fought with their bare hands for 40 days and nights. These men chose to die fighting because they had endured too long the role of victims.

The Jewish War Veterans of the United States will long remember how these same gallant men fought side by side with America and its allies in the two great wars of our time. We will remember how the workers of Israel gave faithfully of their toil to build bases for our air forces in the Middle East. We will remember how the Jewish families of Israel made us and our buddies welcome in their homes when we were far from our own loved ones.

America and the civilized world hail the new Jewish state. But we know that here in our beloved country there are still bigots and subversives who seek to spread the poison of prejudice and hatred. They will oppose the new Jewish state just as they oppose the unity of all American people here. But they will never challenge our loyalty to the Nation we have served from the day it was born. Ever since the birth of the American Republic, the blood of our people has mingled with the blood of Americans of every religion, of every national origin, of every race, in the creation and the preservation of this Nation as the freest in the world. For Americans, whatever their creed, whatever their origin, there can be only one loyalty and one allegiance.

It is to America alone.

It is because of this that our fellow veterans of all faiths have marched with us in New York, Chicago, and other cities for the freedom of Palestine, just as we marched with them in years gone by for the freedom of Ireland, Poland, Czechoslovakia.

It is for this reason that the distinguished commander of the American Legion, James F. O'Neill, was one of the first to speak out for the partition of Palestine as decreed by the United Nations.

Long days of combat and suffering lie ahead for Israel. It cannot be expected that Israel's enemies will reduce the fury of their assaults. The conscience of the common man stands appalled at the inability of the world's responsible political leaders to come to a just and affirmative resolution that will end warfare in Palestine. Now, if ever, is the time for debate to be concluded. Now is the time for just and firm action.

A new state has been born. The United Nations first decreed it. The President, in the name of the American people, has now recognized it. But the Arabs and their hidden allies continue to assail it. They must and will be stopped.

We are humble in this historical hour, grateful to those who stood loyally by us in the dark days. And among them are those who are on this platform tonight.

We salute you, Mrs. Roosevelt.

We salute you, Mayor O'Dwyer.

We salute you, Senator TAFT.

You are the living proof that justice for the Jewish cause in Israel is not the concern of the Jewish people alone. It is the concern of all the American people.

You are the voice and conscience of America.

Stalin Won't Like Dick Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when Stalin was young he learned the ways of conspiracy. He became expert in these ways as he grew older. He grew up with other conspirators. Those individuals who now hold government power in Russia are wizards in conspiracy. They want to extend their conspiracy throughout the world—to include the United States.

Congressman NIXON as chairman of the subcommittee has rendered the people of the United States a great service. He has offered the country an effective weapon to smash the ambitions of Stalin to maintain the Communist conspiracy in our country. I include in my remarks an editorial from the Azusa Herald, of Azusa, Calif.

RUSSIA WON'T LIKE RICHARD NIXON

RICHARD M. NIXON, our Congressman from this district, is the coauthor of a highly controversial and revolutionary bill that is now making the headlines throughout the Americas, and is probably receiving some attention, too, from Joe Stalin and his inner cabinet.

The legislation will be known as "A bill to protect the United States against un-American and subversive activities."

The bill, if law, would do much to expose the true nature of the Communist Party—its affiliates, its dependence on Moscow, and its borings within the governmental structure of this country. Yet the bill would not outlaw communism or the Communist Party.

Considerable criticism has been leveled at the Nixon-authorized bill because it seeks to control a political party, and the bill itself has been described as un-American, unconstitutional, and fantastic. The Communists have been particularly active in screaming against the proposed legislation, and have lined up, through their devious methods, many liberal and pseudo-liberal organizations to help fight the bill.

The mere fact that the Communists are opposing the bill so vigorously indicates that they know the damage the proposed law can do to the cause of communism in this country.

It is true that the bill is revolutionary, in that it seeks to control the activities of a single political party. But we must remember that the political party at which the bill is specifically aimed is somewhat unique in its own right.

The Communist Party, (yes, it is active in Azusa, too,) is the only political party in the United States that is a foreign-controlled party, taking its orders from a foreign (and presently hostile) regime.

The Communist Party is the only political organization that openly advocates the overthrow of our democratic system, and the abolition of your rights to vote, to criticise, move from one town to another, change jobs, and shop where you please.

If the Communist Party were in control of this country, it would be impossible for an editorial of this nature to appear in public print, and it would be dangerous for you to read such capitalistic propaganda.

It is high time that we Americans give full credit to our country, its high ideals, its high standard of living, and its position of world leadership. During the war—when we were trying to be everyone's friend—we were often called Uncle Sucker instead of Uncle Sam.

In Russia they're still calling us Uncle Sucker. Perhaps that will change when we all get behind a piece of legislation that will make the Communist Party an American institution rather than a Russian political party.

Price Subsidies for Marginal Mines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 19 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an article by Howard O. Gray, mining editor, Joplin Globe and News Herald, entitled "Must, or Should Congress Take the Ball on Prices—Subsidies for Marginal Mines?" The situation described in this article is a very real and serious one for the tri-State area, of which Kansas is a portion.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUST, OR SHOULD, CONGRESS TAKE THE BALL ON PRICES-SUBSIDIES FOR MARGINAL MINES?—MANY TRI-STATE BLENDE PRODUCERS DISPOSE OF SUPPLIES AT FORCED SACRIFICIAL PRICE OF $78 A TON WHILE FEW HOLD IN EFFORT TO OBTAIN HIGHER PRICE MORE IN PROPORTION TO THAT OF GALENA AT $231.65

(By Howard O. Gray, mining editor Joplin Globe and News Herald)

For several weeks and months tri-State zinc concentrate producers have been waiting patiently for Congress to take some action on legislation providing incentive production payments, or action on the part of smelters to increase the price commensurately with that of lead to help sustain marginal output of the district.

It becomes more apparent that certain interests are trying to write off the district, which has produced so much zinc and lead in both war and peace, and has thousands of tons of these minerals in low-tenor and high-cost deposits yet to be mined for our national economy and security.

Yet Congress, having appropriated billions for the European relief program and national defense measures, still dilly-dallies with the administration in respect to relief for the domestic marginal ore producer as provided in such legislation as the Russell bill (H. R. 2455). What influences this inaction and confusion? Could it be the private enterprisers who don't want Government controls of any sort, but do want monopolistic controls of the metal market for themselves?

In respect to the price situation, smelters apparently are satisfied with their $50-a-ton smelting spread on zinc concentrates from the tri-State and most likely a bigger spread on foreign ores when they can get them, which is not so difficult with no tariff protection for the domestic miner.

Slab zinc could have been moved up 2 or 3 cents a pound weeks ago to encourage marginal production, but has any smelter offered to increase the price? It can be repeated that pig lead has gone up 169 percent and slab zinc only 45 percent since the war ended. Just who manipulates the price controls now? It might be well for Congress to look into that angle while the marginal ore producer continues to be hamstrung and hamshackled. A fair price in proportion to that of lead and high costs of mining and living should not be impeded longer, whether it be by the so-called open market route of supply and demand, or Federal aid through subsidies.

Last week found many tri-State producers disposing of their blende supplies at the forced sacrificial price of $78 a ton for both

mill and float grades, but a few still were holding their meager supplies in an effort to obtain its real value based on present conditions and outlook.

Galena on the local market last week continued in good demand at $231.65 a ton on a metal contract basis, with pig lead firm at 17.30 cents a pound, East St. Louis. Slab zinc brings only 12 cents a pound on the St. Louis market.

Blende production last week was estimated at 3,613 tons, a decrease of 41 tons from the week before. Deliveries to smelters amounted to 4,413 tons, with some producers cleaning their bins at the end of the month, as against only 2,654 tons the previous period. Stocks declined 800 tons to a total of 2,400 tons on hand in mill bins at the end of the week.

Twenty-two mine mills and four tailing re-treatment plants were reported operating during the week and compared with the same number a week ago.

Palestine—Getting Some Facts Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the editor of Zions Herald, a Methodist publication, in Boston, wrote an editorial on the Palestine situation which was anything but factual. It appeared in the April 28 issue and in the interest of fair play I include it as part of my remarks at this point:

WE MUST NOT DO IT AGAIN

The tragic bungling by our State Department regarding the partition plan for Palestine is a dangerous sign. The Arab League and a few minority oil interests have been able to force this Nation into a place where the very thing which we condemned Great Britain for doing regarding Palestine is now our cardinal sin. The "red herring" has been drawn into the picture and again churchmen have found themselves confused. In the meantime every anti-Semitic device possible is being used in this Nation to stir up support of the Arabs and their unreasonable demands.

The pathetic attempt to confuse the issue being sponsored by the Gildersleeve-Kermit Roosevelt committee has revealed itself as a diabolical attempt to turn Christian support away from their Jewish brethren and give tacit support for the ex-allies of Hitler, the Arab League. The armistice this committee suggests will accomplish nothing more than giving more time for the Arabs to arm for more war than they have already carried out; the closing of immigration means that more Jews are to languish behind barbed-wire in detention camps in Europe; the demand that Arabs and Jews negotiate a peace means more opportunity for the Arab League to defy United Nations and make a mockery of any attempt to establish world peace.

The world promised all of Palestine to the Jews—then reversed that promise and promised half of Palestine to the Jews. Our Nation proposed a partition plan to United Nations, and the plan was adopted. Now Mr. Warren Austin speaking for our UN delegation has reversed this promise and proposed a weird sort of trusteeship which is to operate as a monarchy and remove all possibility of a thoroughgoing democracy for Palestine.

Surely Christian consciences will not allow this tragic distortion of justice to take place. Our Nation cannot be a party to the establishment of a monarchy any more than it can lend its aid to communism. We must demand that the partition plan be reinstated and implemented at once so that justice can be carried out. Our UN delegates and our State Department must not be allowed to continue their current policy of defaming the true spirit of American democracy. We must send a United Nations police force to Palestine at once to restore order to safeguard both the Arabs and the Jews who have a right to live in peace and in mutual respect.

Mr. Speaker, Kermit Roosevelt has replied, by letter, and emphatically denied the allegations in the above editorial. I include it in my remarks:

MAY 12, 1948.

Mr. EMORY STEVENS BUCKE,
Editor, Zions Herald, Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. BUCKE: I am distressed to see an item entitled "We Must Not Do It Again" in your issue of April 28—distressed because the intemperate tone of the item does not seem appropriate to any publication of a religious organization and because it is packed with factual mistakes.

The "Gildersleeve-Kermit Roosevelt committee" you mention, which is called the Committee for Justice and Peace in the Holy Land, includes such prominent religious leaders as Henry Sloane Coffin, Harry Emerson Fosdick, Paul Hutchinson, Garland Evans Hopkins, and Rabbi Morris Lazaron.

You accuse us of a "diabolical attempt to turn Christian support away from their Jewish brethren" and to stop immigration. On the contrary, we urge passage of the Stratton bill to admit DP's of all faiths to this country. And we advocate for Palestine an agreed settlement, rather than a forced settlement, as the only kind of solution which will allow continued peaceful Jewish immigration.

You speak of the "unreasonable demands" of the Arabs. Is it unreasonable to want to live undisturbed in your own home? Is it unreasonable of the majority of people inhabiting a land to insist that sovereignty over that land must lie in them? The Arabs of Palestine and neighboring states regard political Zionism as another western imperialism similar to the British, French, and Italian imperialism which Arabs have had to fight in recent generations. How else, they ask, would you describe the invasion of a land by people from another continent with the express goal of establishing political domination over the land and its inhabitants?

If the issue of political sovereignty can be removed, the Jews already in Palestine, as well as those who will enter Palestine from the DP camps of Europe, can look forward to lives of peace and security, not to years racked by terror and strife. The bitter controversy over a Jewish political state must be abandoned before it endangers the very existence of the Jewish national home—which is what Zionism was promised by the Balfour Declaration and the League of Nations mandate.

You say that our Nation proposed partition. That is not true. After some misgivings, the American delegates supported partition—very actively, too, but always on the assumptions that it could be peacefully carried out, and that it was a solution which would advance, not retard, the cause of peace. When it became apparent that neither assumption was correct, the administration announced that it was not possible under the UN Charter nor in accord with national policy to impose by force the partition of a country against the will of a majority of its inhabitants.

You describe our subsequent proposal as a "weird sort of trusteeship which is to operate as a monarchy and remove all possibility of a thoroughgoing democracy for Palestine." That is such a completely unfounded charge that I can only assume you have not read the trusteeship proposal. But your talk of thoroughgoing democracy leads me to ask: Would you join our committee in advocating a free plebiscite in Palestine to determine its future government?

Sincerely yours,

KERMIT ROOSEVELT,
Executive Director, the Committee for Justice and Peace in the Holy Land.

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WNBF on May 15, 1948:

Dear friends of the triple cities and my congressional district, may I call to the attention of you housewives a most helpful book of which I now have a limited supply?

This is entitled "Money-Saving Main Dishes" and is furnished my office by the Office for Food Conservation here in Washington.

One hundred and fifty tested recipes, especially prepared by the Bureau of Human Nutrition, are contained in the book to help you save food.

Every member of your family will enjoy new suggestions for mother's time-honored culinary art which emphasize novelties in meat, poultry, fish, eggs, cheese, potato, and bread dishes.

These recipes make my mouth water just to read them over. They offer the latest in a balanced diet and well-rounded meal.

So if you like to eat and want to find out new ways to satisfy the ever-gnawing appetite, write me for this wonderful book, chock full of honest-to-goodness, up-to-date methods of preparing delicious meals.

But, remember, my supply won't last forever. Write me now.

Tonight, I'm going to have a heart-to-heart talk with you people who elected me. I'm going to tell you I need your backing and confidence now more than I ever have since I've served you in Congress.

I've been fighting a lone battle down here against great odds. I've been exposed to the most vicious, un-American attacks that certain individuals at home can possibly launch.

These attackers have lost sight of all perspective in their one sadistic desire to cut my political throat. It makes little difference to them if they drag down representative government and the temple on their own heads.

So long as they are satiated by triumph over the man you elected, it's all right with them. So long as they can fill the newspapers with ridicule, vitriol, vituperation, and abuse against your Congressman, they're happy.

They are, then, happy and willing to jump in bed with the left-wingers and the Reds if they can overthrow the people's elected Representative from this American district. They will go to any lengths to reach their No. 1 objective, eliminating your Congressman, and free government to boot.

You see, they want their own way. They won't let you have any voice, any opinions, any ideas about how your Nation ought to be run.

So, I'm making this plea to you this evening. Stand by the man you elected, for whom these smear artists have no use. I

can't continue to fight them off without your help.

This program was started years ago to defend your Congressman against the snipers whose every word detrimental to me is heralded by agencies of expression unfriendly to me. They have spared no space, no printed word to publicize the most terrific smear campaign ever launched against a public officer.

But with this program I defy them. I will keep on representing you, not them, in our Nation's Capital. I know the scales are tipped heavily in their favor because of their power, their money, and their entrenchment.

But I am determined to keep on voting American in spite of them. I am pledged to fight this Goliath toe to toe with everything I've got, and I know you people are listening in. I know you hear my side of the story, whenever these kings of smear hurl fresh assaults upon the man you have 10 times chosen to represent you.

I realize they have poisoned some by the Hitler technique they have used ever since you first sent me to Washington. That technique, as you know, is to lie about a free Representative and lie about him so much and so often that some people believe the lies.

They would have succeeded in smearing me out of the picture had it not been for this program. Fortunately, for all of us, I have been able to return blow for blow, blocked them at every turn, and by answering their every false accusation, each insinuation, prevented them from accomplishing the character assassination by which Hitler was able to erase one by one the free representatives of the people who stood in his way.

You can be sure, dear friends, I will continue the struggle against these tyrannical forces, at home and in Washington, as long as I remain in the high place you put me.

Thank you.

Railway Employees Tell Their Side of Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, much has appeared in advertising form in our daily press giving the railroad-management picture of the present railroad controversy. There has been little appearing in print giving the employees' views and arguments. In fairness to all, the Members of Congress and the public should get both sides of the picture.

In the Washington Post of May 15, 1948, there appeared an article by Mr. G. E. Leighty, president of Order of Railroad Telegraphers and chairman Employees National Conference Committee, 16 cooperating railway labor organizations. This article gives answer to the many advertisements appearing in the past giving the management side of the story. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert this article in the RECORD, as follows:

RAIL THREAT—A COMMUNICATION

The editorial Rail Threat appearing in the Washington Post on April 30 presents such a gross distortion of facts that you cannot in fairness, fail to give equal prominence to a correction.

The substance of the view expounded in the editorial is that an opportunistic policy of President Roosevelt to avert transportation paralysis by repeatedly ignoring emergency board recommendations that were unacceptable to the unions encouraged the use of strike threats to obtain greater concessions, and that this has reached a point requiring amendment of the Railway Labor Act further to curb the power of labor. The factual premises of this view are wholly false.

The handling of wage and rules issues in the railroad industry on a national basis began in 1932 when labor and management, in direct national negotiations, agreed upon a 10-percent deduction from wages. This was followed by successive agreements providing for the extension and then the piecemeal elimination of the deduction. The only other national movements occurring up to 1941 were the wage-increase movement of 1937 which was settled by mediation prior to any occasion for invoking an emergency board, and the carrier-initiated wage-reduction movement of 1938, which was withdrawn upon recommendation of an emergency board.

In 1941 a national dispute was heard by an emergency board whose recommendations were unacceptable to the employees. Our quarrel was not primarily with the board's findings as to the equities of the case, but with recommendations ignoring those equities and singling out railroad employees for the imposition of a stabilization policy at a time when no general stabilization policy was in effect and when, consequently, the cost of living and nonrailway wages were rising rapidly.

More important to the issue here, however, is the fact that the dispute was settled, not through opportunistic ignoring of the board's recommendations but by the mediatory efforts of the board itself, carried out in the succeeding 30-day period during which the law requires maintenance of the status quo.

In 1942–43 there was again a national movement by both the operating and nonoperating employees. The nonoperating case was heard by an emergency board which reported its findings and recommendations in May 1943, including specific findings that the wage increases recommended conformed with the requirements of stabilization policy. The recommendations were acceptable to both management and labor, and indeed the parties thereafter actually entered into an agreement putting them into effect.

But the settlement was not allowed to become operative because the stabilization director, contrary to the specific findings of the emergency board, disapproved the terms. The 6 months of chaos in the industry that followed, culminating in danger of a work stoppage at the end of the year, all flowed directly from that ill-advised interference.

When the dispute was settled early in 1944 on terms suggested by President Roosevelt, his intervention was necessitated not by the unacceptability to labor of the original emergency board recommendations but by his desire to find substitute terms that would be likewise acceptable to the parties and also could be cast into formulas that satisfied the stabilization director. When these events were reviewed by Congress it addressed itself to the source of the trouble and relieved the stabilization director of authority to disapprove emergency board findings.

In the 1945–46 wage movements the 15 nonoperating organizations and 3 of the operating organizations submitted the issues to arbitration. The awards made were promptly put into effect by agreements signed the next day. Because the increase awarded was less than the pattern that had been established in other industries, and thus operated to widen the disparity between railroad wages and those in other industries, new movements seeking an additional increase were inaugurated in accordance with the procedures of the Railway Labor Act.

In May 1946, these requests were under discussion in conferences with managements; they were not the subject of any strike threat and could not become the subject of such a threat for at least several months. At this stage the issues were settled by voluntary agreements entered into at the request of President Truman and on terms, suggested by him, making up the difference between the increases allowed in the earlier arbitration awards and the generally prevailing pattern, in other industries of 18½ cents. Thereupon the President forced the two organizations which had called a strike to settle on the same terms.

From this brief résumé of railroad labor relations it is apparent that that there is no foundation for your assumption that there is prevalent a practice of ignoring emergency board recommendations or that such a course has received Presidential encouragement. I do not represent any of the employees involved in the current dispute and I do not assume to speak for them. Nevertheless some comment may be in order on the inadequacy with which the press has presented the issues to the public.

Virtually all daily papers of any consequence have been doing a good business in carrying huge paid advertisements presenting the railroad arguments, but there has been precious little objective reporting or editorial comment presenting the facts available from public records. The emergency board report is 99 typewritten pages (exclusive of appendixes), of which 7 are devoted to the wage dispute; the other 92 pages discuss disputes over working rules which the board states originated in 1945. Yet seldom, if ever, does one find in press reports even an attempt objectively to indicate what issues other than the wage dispute are involved, and never is there any commendation of the repeated efforts of the employees over the course of 3 years to settle these disputes by negotiation or mediation.

And with respect to wages the press almost universally reports the issue to be the same as that settled by other employees last fall. Obviously the issue of whether 15½ cents per hour is an adequate increase now when "third round" increases are being negotiated in other industries is quite a different one from the issue decided by the nonoperating arbitration board, which concluded its hearings last August and made its 15½-cent award early in September.

You lament the unavailability of the injunction procedures of the Taft-Hartley Act to avert an impending railroad strike. Have you given any serious thought to the fact that under the Railway Labor Act these railroad unions have been under what is for all practical purposes equivalent to an automatic injunction for a much longer period than the maximum duration of a Taft-Hartley Act injunction?

Because the early stages of a rail labor dispute lack the fanfare of hailing labor leaders into court, the press has little interest in keeping the public informed of what is going on and what the issues are. But when the dramatics inherent in an impending strike are available for exploitation you raise the cry for coercive measures without regard to the restraints that have already run their course.

What is most deplorable, not only in the current railroad situation, but in important industrial disputes in any basic industry, is the alacrity with which the channels of public information raise the demand for injunctions or other coercive measures to stifle the effective expression of labor unrest. It is assumed without inquiry that it is wrong for the employees to enforce their demands by a work stoppage. The possibility that management's adamant adherence to a wrongful position may be responsible for the cessation of essential public services is excluded from consideration.

In the current railroad dispute you no doubt feel that the existence of emergency board recommendations that the employees have rejected is a self-sufficient reason for holding them wrong. But that approach makes the emergency board procedure tantamount to compulsory arbitration, which it was definitely not intended to be.

Emergency board reports have generally proved very helpful in promoting settlements, and even where settlements have not embodied their precise terms they have nevertheless exerted a potent influence in the settlement. But they are not decrees and they are not infallible. In the present situation, a statesmanlike approach would seek objectively to appraise the reasons why the recommendations are not producing a settlement with unions that have an honorable record of fair dealing going back three quarters of a century. Instead, your approach is automatically to condemn nonacceptance of the recommendations.

The desire to deny the right to strike, which the public press is fostering, has dangerous implications for the maintenance and advancement of American living standards. What happens when the right to strike is eliminated is well illustrated by the recent conduct of United States Steel in flatly denying its employees any wage increase despite the company's enormous profits, despite the sharp rise in living costs in the past year, and despite the fact that the increase in living costs is receiving recognition through increased wages to employees who are not disabled from effectively asserting their rights.

The advancement of railroad wages and working conditions has fallen far behind that in other industries during the past 25 years and especially during the last half of that period. The restraints of the Railway Labor Act have without doubt played their part in bringing about that result. Anyone proposing further restraints should do so with ful consciousness that he is proposing the further degradation of the living standards of a very substantial segment of American industrial workers.

G. E. LEIGHTY,
President, Order of Railroad Telegraphers, and Chairman, Employees National Conference Committee, 16 Cooperating Railway Labor Organizations.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

The Condon Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the New London Day on Monday, May 17, entitled "The Condon Report":

THE CONDON REPORT

Passage by the House of the Hoffman bill, designed to compel the executive branch of the Government to disclose information to Congress when House or Senate call for it, brought a sharp rejoinder from President Truman that he will veto this legislation, and admissions from various congressional leaders that they doubted the measure could be passed over his veto. And therein one has the gist of a new clash—and apparently a knock-down drag-out battle, at that—between the President and the Congress. The situation revolves about the charge of a House committee, of course, that Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards, is a "weak link" in atomic bomb security, since he is said to have associated with agents of a foreign power, and so on. The House committee called for an FBI report on an investigation of Dr. Condon. At the direction of the President the Department of Commerce refused to give out the report; the President sent for it and now holds it. He is defying Congress to get it.

No doubt the FBI report on Condon is not of sufficient importance to cause all this furore. But the President, firmly announcing that he has no intention of giving out this report, says he sees a matter of principle in the situation. So should the vast body of voters in the United States, if they value the democratic processes of government, but the principle is the opposite one. For what the President proposes, in the last analysis, is Executive suppression of any information that the President—whether Mr. Truman or any other President—feels he does not want coming to the attention of Congress. In other words if President Truman gets away with it in this instance he is helping to establish a precedent.

Certainly there is serious doubt whether the founders of this Nation intended to permit Executives of the Government to refuse to give any essential information to Congress, for its consideration in passing legislation or, for that matter, in changing the Executive set-up at its pleasure. And there is serious question whether the average voter, if he understood exactly what is involved, would approve of it either. For here is an extension of the new deal theory that the executive agency, or the Executive himself, is above congressional control and direction. Under the New Deal there were many instances of agencies or officials of the Government who did exactly as they pleased, regardless of direction from Congress or attempts to limit them in their activities. Congress discovered a number of instances of this kind but seemed helpless to do anything about it. Or in some instances it was just not disposed to do anything about it because it was New Deal procedure, and a Democratic Congress.

The issue ought to be faced, and squarely, once and for all. Congress establishes practically all these agencies of Government; the people have virtually no control over them except through Congress. It is obvious that Congress should have the authority to inquire into their activities, to examine the record of their acts, without interference from a stubborn Executive and without permitting the agencies or individuals within them to cover up various matters that they do not want exposed to public view. All kinds of misadministration of these agencies might be concealed from public view—from the eyes of the taxpayers, who pay the freight—if this pious device of Mr. Truman's is allowed to stand.

Council for Judaism Opposes Jewish Nationalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Council for Judaism, Washington chapter, has declared its independence from the recently declared Jewish State of Israel. In a joint statement issued last Friday by Alfred M. Lilienthal, counsel for the chapter, and MR. Joseph D. Kauffman, its chairman, the organization took a firm and positive stand against the partition of Palestine into Arab and Jewish states. The statement deserves the attention of the Congress and of the people of this country. It is an excellent reaffirmation of faith and loyalty to the United States of America, as first considerations.

Mr. Speaker, I include the statement referred to as part of my remarks:

COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM DECLARES INDEPENDENCE FROM JEWISH STATE

Alfred M. Lilienthal, Washington counsel to the American Council for Judaism, and Joseph D. Kaufman, chairman of the Washington chapter of the council, today issued the following joint statement on Palestine as Great Britain ended its mandate:

"The British mandatory rule in Palestine has come to an end. The Zionist movement and the Jewish agency have issued a manifesto relying, they say, upon the support of the entire Jewish people, and have declared their intention to establish an independent Jewish state in Palestine. At this time we Americans of Jewish faith wish to declare our complete independence and separation from any state that is, or may be, established.

"Before the UN decision of November 29, the American Council for Judaism opposed the partition of Palestine into Arab and Zionist states. When our country voted for partition, as good Americans we accepted that decision. The United States has retreated from that policy for reasons which are obvious to all, save those who will not see. We support, and will continue to support, the present United States position of trying to bring peace to the Holy Land through truce and international control.

"Lest our silence be construed as supporting demands for recognition of the proposed Jewish state, we speak out and declare once more our unalterable opposition to the establishment anywhere of any Jewish nationalist political entity. The overwhelming concern of American Jewry for the plight of European and Palestinian Jewry has been manipulated and maneuvered to suggest support of political Zionism. Humanitarianism, not political ideology, is the one and only issue on which Jewry is united.

"We reaffirm our belief that, in the modern world, a people cannot be both a universal religion and a nation. We repeat our credo: 'Our nationalism is American, our religion is Judaism, our loyalty is indivisible, and our homeland is only in the United States of America.'"

The New York Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the potent factors in developing American public opinion receptive to a Jewish state was the indefatigable efforts of Ted O. Thackrey, publisher and editor of the New York Post; Charles Van Devander, editor of the Washington Memo—a feature of the New York Post—and his associates, Oliver Pilot, James A. Wechsler, William O. Player, Jr., and John Hohenberg, chief New York Post correspondent at the United Nations. They developed much of the climate favorable to Presi-

dent Truman's declaration of the recognition of Israel.

I, personally, pay tribute to all these potent writers. I admire their sense of justice and fair play. Fearlessly they attacked British perfidy and Arab treachery in Palestine. They were the picadors that constantly prodded the administration. They assailed our delegates at the UN for their fumbling and indecision.

I congratulate the New York Post, its publisher, and corps of editors, correspondents, and reporters.

I herewith offer an example of the paper's contribution to the solution to the Palestine problem, an editorial by Mr. Thackrey, entitled "Security," which appeared in the May 18 issue:

SECURITY

(By T. O. Thackrey)

The United Nations was organized by self-proclaimed peace-loving states to abolish war and make all nations secure from invasion by hostile forces seeking territory, political domination, or both.

Israel, the world's newest state, established as a democracy, is being invaded by Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Transjordan, Iraq, Yemen, Syria, and Lebanan; all in concert under orders of the pro-Nazi exGrand Mufti of Jerusalem, for the purpose of acquiring territory and political domination beyond their individual and collective borders—by force.

All are members of the United Nations.

One is even a member of the Security Council.

Each has deliberately violated the Charter, and definitely announced its hostile and aggressive intention.

The security of the world is involved in the action by the United Nations Security Council—for if it fails to protect Israel, it will meet no such test at any time in the future.

Fortunately, Israel has begun the determination of its own future, by organizing a capable and sound government, supported by its own army, the Haganah and subsidiaries.

Even more fortunately, Israel has won de facto recognition, not only by the United States, fortunately the first to do so, but also by the Soviet Union and by a growing host of other members of the United Nations.

At long last, the Ambassador to the United Nations from the United States is properly taking leadership before the Security Council in demanding that the Council act promptly to halt hostile and aggressive military action in Palestine against Israel, and has called boldly for a formal declaration that a breach of the peace exists.

Forthright as was the beginning made—after so many months of interminable delay—by the United States in coming at last to the support of the Charter and in fact to the implementation of the partition resolution of the General Assembly, time remains of the essence.

If parliamentary procedure is to be exhausted before the actually effective and forceful action of the United Nations is to be employed, it is quite possible that peace itself will have become exhausted, or that the war of conquest embarked upon by Arabia will have carried out its threat to exterminate as many citizens of Israel as possible.

The United States draws attention to article 39 of the Charter, which provides for determining that a breach of the peace threatens or exists, and that measures under articles 41 and 42 can be employed to secure the peace.

The first of these articles provides concerted, but peaceful means, such as economic sanctions. The second provides for the use of land, sea, and air forces.

But meanwhile, hour by hour, even in Jerusalem, the armies of Israel are locked in a death struggle with the invaders, who continue to enjoy the privileges of peace-loving states and amicable relations with the United States and other members of the Security Council.

What is called for, and promptly, is invocation of article 45 of the Charter which provides: "In order to enable the United Nations to take urgent military measures, members shall hold immediately available air force contingents for combined international enforcement action."

Such action is imperative if the security of Israel and the peace of Palestine and the authority of the United Nations are to be obtained.

The United Nations—the hope and trust of the world in evolving an effective machinery for keeping the peace—is involved in the promptness with which such action is forthcoming.

The United States, besides leading the fight for world security, is gravely considering the arms embargo which has been in effect since partition was voted, and which has prevented the defenders of Israel from adequately arming themselves, although Great Britain has armed and continues to arm the Arab legions, at least one of which, Transjordan, is a wholly subsidized state.

It now appears that we have divorced ourselves from Great Britain's perfidy and betrayal. Certainly it is to be devoutly hoped that we have.

For Great Britain's isolation as the real and bitter enemy of peace with justice and democracy in the Middle East becomes more apparent as the Security Council debate drones on.

Great Britain has failed to grant recognition to Israel—after defaulting on the 30-year-long mandate that was to have produced the State which the Jews of Palestine have won by their blood, unassisted.

Great Britain may yet exercise a veto over effective action to secure the peace—having encouraged its breach by the Arab states.

If she does so, a new turning point in history may well have been reached. Her last hope of respect will not be the sole penalty.

In the face of such a failure, the United States, in concert with other members, including the Soviet Union, can—and must—take the forceful action open to members to secure their own national interest without breach of the Charter.

Unconditional support of the only Middle East democracy must—and will—be the only course the people of the United States will approve and support. The longer it is delayed, the greater will be the cost, in lives, in honor.

Salaries of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted me to extend my remarks, I take pleasure in including an interview in Washington between myself and Mr. William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, American Federation of Labor, carried over the air by Station WEVD in New York, on May 11 last. The subject of the discussion was salaries of postal employees. The discussion follows:

Mr. DOHERTY. Congressman LYNCH, the letter carriers of your own district in the Bronx, in fact, letter carriers throughout the United States have asked me to express their sincere appreciation for the interest which prompted you to appear here this evening in behalf of their appeal for an equitable salary. They realize that you have an extremely busy schedule, and for that reason they are doubly grateful that you arranged to be here. And, of course, I join with my coworkers in these sentiments.

Congressman LYNCH. I am delighted to be here, Bill. While it is true that the unsettled conditions of the country and the unrest prevalent throughout the world in general presents exacting demands on the time of Members of the Congress, nevertheless, I always try to find the opportunity and the means to assist my friends in the Postal Service.

Mr. DOHERTY. Well, Congressman LYNCH, the record certainly bears out your statement. As I recall, your service in the House of Representatives began with the Seventy-sixth Congress in 1940, and that you have been successively reelected to each Congress since then, up to and including the present Eightieth Congress. I am happy to say that during your entire congressional service you have consistently been a friend of postal employees.

Congressman LYNCH. Naturally, I am pleased to hear you say those nice things about me, Bill. You can be certain that I want to continue to merit the confidence and support of my friends in the Postal Service. I want to do everything I can to enhance the friendly spirit that exists between you people and myself.

Mr. DOHERTY. To bring your record up to date, Congressman LYNCH, I find that during the public hearings in January on legislation designed to grant postal workers an $800 annual increase in their base pay, you testified in favor of an immediate boost in postal wages. May I ask if anything has occurred in the interim to change or modify your opinion about the need for an upward revision of postal salaries?

Congressman LYNCH. That is an easy one, Bill. I definitely have not changed my mind about postal wages. Four months ago I stated publicly that postal employees were entitled to a salary increase. Nothing has happened since then to alter that opinion. If anything the urgency has become greater for the need of additional compensation for the people who operate what I consider the finest post-office system in the world.

Mr. DOHERTY. You have taken a splendid attitude toward our request for a decent wage scale, Congressman.

Speaker of the House, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., has been widely quoted as stating that "military spending is paramount." Further, that when the military requirements are determined it will be time to see what else can be done. Would you care to comment on the influence military needs should have on postal wages?

Congressman LYNCH. Well, Bill, certainly it is necessary to build a strong national defense. But I can't see how military commitments can be tied in with Federal obligations that affect the very people who will be called upon to aid in smooth operation of a strong national defense. The postal service in war and peace is our basic line of communication. But more than that, I feel very strongly that the postal worker is worthy of his hire, whether we find it necessary to expend huge sums or a very modest amount on military commitments. A fair day's pay for a fair day's work has been the economic philosophy of our Nation since its inception.

The present importance of postal-pay legislation cannot be over emphasized. And it is my personal view that the Congress could well afford to give such legislation a high priority on the congressional agenda.

Mr. DOHERTY. Unfortunately, Congressman LYNCH, too often the postal employees are regarded as the stepchildren of the Federal

Government, particularly, when it comes to an upward adjustment of our wages. If any proof is needed for my statement, I need but cite the tragic instance wherein our salaries remained static for almost 20 years before we were given a small increase, although during the same period our wages were very quickly reduced at the first sign of the depression years of the early 1930's.

Congressman LYNCH. I was not a Member of the Congress then, but I find today that the American people resent shabby treatment directed at postal workers. I think the public knows the letter carrier and his coworkers as a respected member of his own community. More than that, the mailman is a familiar figure in the daily life of our people; the letter carrier has become the universal medium between our Government and the citizens of this great Nation. Very often the mailman who comes to our front door day in and day out, in good weather and bad, is the only representative of our Federal Government that has direct and personal contact with the people from one end of the year to the next. Folks find these letter carriers consistently courteous, considerate, energetic, and helpful. Is there any wonder then that the mailman has built up a fine spirit through the years?

Mr. DOHERTY. Needless to say, Congressman, the letter carriers appreciate the high regard in which the American public hold them. We hope nothing we do will cause our patrons to change their minds about us.

I can assure you that we are interested in our job. We want to give more and better service to the public; but it is discouraging to say the least to find the Congress disinterested in returning in a partial measure our interest and enthusiasm for the postal service.

Congressman LYNCH. That brings us back to my statement before the committee when hearings were being held on the subject of postal wages. I said that it is to the best interest of the country to give postal workers adequate compensation. I feel that a large portion of the pride and interest you people have in your postal work stems from the fact that the proverbial 99¾ percent of the personnel are career employees. When a man or woman decides to make a given job his or her life's work, it is natural that they will develop an intense pride in their job; they will strive to become proficient in their assigned duties. All these things reflect in the over-all efficiency of the business—in this case, the agency of the Government—which employs them. Perhaps the fault lies in the fact that most of us take the postal service for granted. That shouldn't be the case. We must remember that it takes human brains and human hands to operate the Post Office Department. And more important, we must keep constantly before us the fact that the people responsible for the successful and efficient operation of the various services of the postal system have to live; they have to pay bills; and they have to struggle with life's problems the same as everyone else.

Mr. DOHERTY. That brings up an interesting point, Congressman LYNCH. You know, I sometimes wonder if all the people in this country fully realize that postal wages are fixed by the Congress. That they cannot be changed or amended without an act of Congress. Accordingly, under those circumstances, we cannot appeal to wage boards or other agencies set up for the purpose of arbitrating wage problems. And, of course, we cannot strike—and I hasten to add that we have no desire to strike; we have never had any inclinations in that direction; and I assure you we will never entertain the thought.

Congressman LYNCH. Bill, let me say this: Basically you have given the very reason why I maintain that Congress has a moral obligation to adjust postal salaries when the fluctuations in national economy change things in such a manner as to put postal employees at a disadvantage in the price market. And I do not think Congress is satisfying this moral obligation when it admits the justice of your appeal, but acts like the rich man in the story who turned away the beggar from his door because the poor fellow's story broke the heart of the wealthy one. Since you people are totally dependent upon Congress for your salary, I believe that when you present a reasonable case, and document your arguments with facts and figures that cannot be refuted, there is no reason for dilly-dallying around looking for rebuttals that simply do not exist.

Mr. DOHERTY. I believe we have furnished bona fide data to prove that postal wages are lagging far behind present-day prices. The fact is, we obtained our figures from the Government itself. The Bureau of Labor Statistics tell us that prices have increased approximately 30 percent since letter carriers last received a wage increase—incidentally, that was more than 2 years ago. Since that time it has been a constant, and not always successful struggle for postal employees to stay out of debt. They have borrowed to pay their bills—many of them have been forced to disrupt their family life so their wife could go out and find work—and not a few of them have found it necessary to augment their postal wages with income from outside employment—It is not a wholesome situation.

Congressman LYNCH. Did I understand you to say that postal workers are engaged in outside employment after they have completed their post office duties?

Mr. DOHERTY. That is correct, Congressman. They are doing anything and everything to make ends meet. They simply cannot do it on their present postal salaries alone—so they have little choice in the matter, as much as they realize that it is quite possible their secondary job might be depriving someone else of work. We don't want to deprive other people of work.

Congressman LYNCH. Indeed, that isn't a wholesome situation. But there is another point which concerns me, when a person attempts to work around the clock it isn't very long before his health is greatly impaired and eventually ruined. After all, we all know that the human body can stand only so much. I am also thinking of the demoralizing effect this extra work has on their attentiveness and efficiency to their postal work. It seems to me that after a man works hard all day and then goes halfway through the night, there is slight chance that he will be provided with sufficient rest to send him into work the following day with vim and zest. That sort of situation isn't fair to the postal service, the public, or the employee.

Mr. DOHERTY. Congressman Lynch, inasmuch as you represent a district which embraces a metropolitan population, I think it is safe to say that you know how expensive it is to live in our bigger cities, what it takes to compete with present-day high prices. I know that letter carriers in the Bronx, Manhattan and throughout the New York area are having a terrific time trying to get by on their present postal wages. On the strength of all this, do you think that $2,100 a year is sufficient to maintain a decent standard of living?

Congressman LYNCH. Well, now, Bill, I do not want to appear in the role of an economist, but I do not think it would take a great amount of urging to show me that a person simply could not exist today on a salary of $2,100 a year. Even with the use of a reversible slide rule it would be extremely difficult, to say the least.

Mr. DOHERTY. That is exactly the situation which prevails today in the postal service, Congressman. Letter carriers start in the post office at an entrance salary of $2,100 per year. And I am sure that I need not remind you that better than a fair portion of the men coming into the service today are veterans of World War II, many of them are married and have families to support, and they are asked by the richest and most benevolent Government in the world to maintain the American way of life on the munificent sum of $2,100 annually. Of course, if they stay in the service for 11 years they are entitled to eligibility for the top-grade wage scale of $3,100.

Congressman LYNCH. Yes, Bill, I am greatly concerned about those workers in the low-pay grades. I have had a great many letters come into my office from postal workers in my district who are also veterans of the recent war. They feel that offering them $2,100-a-year jobs in this day and time for the work that is expected of them in the postal service, is nothing less than a mockery of the ringing promises of generous treatment they would receive upon their discharge from the military. My correspondence also indicates that many of them are turning away from the postal service as a career in favor of more lucrative employment in private industry.

Mr. DOHERTY. That is true, Congressman. The turn-over in personnel on a national scale is fast becoming a serious problem to the Post Office Department. It is not desirable at all, because the postal service is essentially a career service, there must be new men continually coming into the post office to replace those being separated by death, retirement, and other causes, it cannot be expected that a young fellow starting out in life will be satisfied with a promise that years of diligent and faithful work will have its richest reward in unselfish service.

Congressman LYNCH. And to be perfectly practical, Bill, unselfish service will not put food on the table for those young men, it will not clothe their families, it will not pay for the education of their children, in short, it will not pay any of the tangible financial obligations which all of us must meet in life.

Mr. DOHERTY. I see our time is getting short, Congressman.

Congressman LYNCH. Before we close, Bill, I have just one more comment to make, and this isn't a spot proposition, what I say is entirely on my own, I know that the letter carriers have asked the Congress to approve an $800 annual increase in their basic pay. In my opinion, when all the facts are considered, that is a very reasonable request, in terms of take-home pay, that is, after your sizable deduction for retirement, plus the usual withholding tax, an $800 permanent pay boost will have to be spread pretty thin to do the job. I think you are entitled to the $800 increase you are asking in your base pay, and I want you to know that I will do my level best to see to it that you get it.

Mr. DOHERTY. Again, thank you, Congressman LYNCH, in behalf of the letter carriers in the Bronx and throughout the Nation.

Veteran Bills Passed in the Eightieth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, during the Eightieth Congress—January 1947 to date—24 bills have been passed for the benefit of veterans of both World War I and II. These bills have been signed by President Truman, and are now public laws.

It has been my pleasure to support and vote for these laws. I came to Congress in 1943 as the Representative of

the Nineteenth Congressional District, which includes the eastern part of the city of Los Angeles, the county territory known as East Los Angeles, Bell Gardens, and Cudahy, and the municipalities of Huntington Park, Bell, Maywood, Montebello and Vernon.

During my 6 years of service I have supported 100 percent, all beneficial veterans' legislation because I believe that America owes a debt which can never be fully paid to the veterans who have preserved this Nation. I shall continue to do all in my power as a United States Representative to improve the service of hospitalization, vocational and academic education, life insurance, disability determination, and pension payment.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I insert at this point a compilation of the laws enacted during the present Eightieth Congress:

VETS BILLS PASSED BY EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

Since the Eightieth Congress convened in January 1947, 24 bills pertaining to veterans of both world wars have become law. The bills are:

Public Law No. 5 to extend the time limitation for reinstatement of national service life-insurance policies.

Public Law No. 34, to provide for renewal for a fifth 5-year period the 5-year level premium term-insurance plan for World War I veterans.

Public Law No. 36 to grant officers of the Army and Navy Nurse Corps comparable rank, pay, and allowances with officers of the Army and Navy.

Public Law No. 82 to permit husband and wife to combine their armed-services credit for homestead purposes.

Public Law No. 85 authorizing $35,500,000 to complete temporary reuse housing for veterans.

Public Law No. 115, increasing the revolving fund in the Veterans' Administration from $1,500,000 to $3,000,000 for the purpose of making non-interest-bearing loans to disabled World War II veterans taking vocational rehabilitation courses.

Public Law No. 126, extending until January 1, 1948, the time during which alien fiancées of veterans may enter the United States without being subject to immigration quotas or visa regulations.

Public Law No. 161, to extend for another year the authority to purchase automobiles for World War II veterans who are leg amputees or have suffered the loss or the use of a leg.

Public Law No. 213, to permit the admission to the United States of racially inadmissible alien spouses of veterans.

Public Law No. 254, to provide for the cash payment of terminal-leave bonds any time after September 1, 1947.

Public Law No. 270, to provide a 20-percent pension increase for veterans of the Civil War and Spanish-American War.

Public Law No. 310, to restore the tax exemption status of those members of the armed services removed from former American possessions during captivity by the Japanese.

Public Law No. 314, to authorize the acceptance by officers and enlisted men of the armed services of medals and decorations tendered them by cobelligerent and neutral nations of World War II.

Public Law No. 316, to permit retired armed services personnel to represent veterans' organizations in claims before the Veterans' Administration.

Public Law No. 325, to make mandatory on Federal agencies the rulings of the Civil Service Commission on appeals by veterans for reinstatement.

Public Law No. 337, to improve the Army and Navy medical services.

Public Law No. 338, to increase the minimum allowances payable to disabled veterans undergoing vocational rehabilitation under Public Law No. 16.

Public Law No. 350, to provide cash in lieu of terminal leave for veterans.

Public Law No. 365, to provide additional pay of $100 per month for officers of the Army Medical Corps and Navy Medical Corps.

Public Law No. 367, to refund income tax so paid by any member of the armed services who died on active duty for the year in which death occurred and for the years during which he was in the armed services.

Public Law No. 377, to provide full subsistence allowances for veterans taking on-the-farm training.

Public Law No. 396, to extend veterans preference benefits (civil service) to widowed mothers of certain exservicemen and exservicewomen. Approved January 19, 1948.

Public Law No. 398, to increase by 20 percent the pensions payable to veterans of Indian Wars and the dependents of such veterans. Approved January 19, 1948.

Public Law No. 411, to increase the subsistence allowances to veterans pursuing full-time educational training courses under the GI bill of rights. The measure increased such allowances from $65 to $75 a month for single persons, from $90 to $105 for veterans with one dependent, and to $120 for veterans with more than one dependent. The increased allowances will go to about 1,500,000 veterans and cost around $217,000,000 a year. Approved February 14, 1948.

Atomic Energy Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, recently President Truman vetoed a bill passed by the Congress which would have authorized the Senate to call upon FBI investigations in connection with the confirmation of individuals appointed as members of the Atomic Energy Commission and General Manager. This action by the President was most unfortunate and ill-advised, resulting in further estrangement between the Chief Executive and the Congress and, if upheld, operates as a denial to the Senate of the tools by which to perform its constitutional responsibility in the confirmation of Presidential appointees.

Two editorials on the subject appeared in yesterday's newspapers which are of especial merit, one in the Washington Post entitled "Mr. Truman's Veto" and one in the Washington Evening Star entitled "They Should Work Together," which I include herewith:

[From the Washington Post]

MR. TRUMAN'S VETO

In pursuit of his generally sound doctrine that the President should be master in his own house, Mr. Truman has vetoed the bill authorizing the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to require reports from the FBI on nominees to the Atomic Energy Commission who can hold office only with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President's chief complaint is that five Senators would be permitted, under the bill, to direct the FBI to make a report. That, he fears, would be an unwarranted encroachment upon the executive branch. "The complete independence of the executive branch," he wrote in his veto message, "renders it imperative that the Executive have sole authority over the officers whom he appoints."

If the bill has any constitutional weakness, it probably lies in the fact that it enables five Senators to direct the FBI to act in this particular instead of imposing that duty directly upon the FBI by command of Congress. Certainly there can be no doubt that Congress can require an executive agency to make an investigation and report its findings to Congress. The Atomic Energy Act, for example, instructs the AEC to keep the joint committee "fully and currently informed" as to its activities. To be sure, the President ought to have "sole authority" over officials in the executive branch so far as the performance of their duties is concerned, but the function of prescribing what their duties are belongs to Congress.

This is a problem which obviously requires cooperation between the President and Congress. Mr. Truman emphasizes his great responsibility in making nominations to the AEC and pledges himself to use every facility of the executive branch in uncovering facts about the appointees. He seems to forget that the Senate has an equally grave responsibility, also imposed upon it by the Constitution, to act intelligently in confirming such nominations. We do not think it is unreasonable for Congress to provide that, in meeting this obligation, the Members of the Senate chiefly concerned should be able to draw upon the fact-finding facilities of the FBI. It is not a question of demanding FBI reports that are made to the President, but only of making separate reports for the benefit of the Senators who will have to recommend approval or rejection of the nominees.

It is well to remember, in dealing with questions of this sort, that, while we have a separation of executive and legislative powers, we have one government and not two. An arbitrary attitude on the part of either Congress or the President can upset the normal cooperative relationship which alone enables the American system to function satisfactorily. Congress has attempted various encroachments upon the Executive, and it may be that the President feels it necessary to strike back in a narrow spirit to sustain his position. We cannot help thinking, however, that in this instance he pushes his argument too far.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

THEY SHOULD WORK TOGETHER

The President's veto of the bill authorizing Senate Members of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee to use the services of the FBI to investigate Presidential appointees to the Atomic Energy Commission rested on two main premises.

Mr. Truman's first point was that a law empowering a congressional group to direct the FBI, an executive agency, to investigate the members and general manager of the AEC would be an unconstitutional intrusion by the legislative upon the executive branch of the Government. If the President was persuaded of that, it was his duty to veto the bill, for the principle at stake is important. The remedy, if Congress is sufficiently convinced to the contrary, is to pass the bill over the veto and leave the determination of the constitutional question to the courts.

The other premise was that the objective of the bill was "unnecessary and unwise." This is a conclusion which is open to serious challenge.

The Star has no doubt concerning the loyalty of the present officials of the AEC who would have been affected by this vetoed bill. Nor is there any reason to doubt that President Truman, using the facilities of the FBI, would be careful to check thoroughly

into the background of any one whom he might select for any of these important posts. But this does not meet the point which has been raised by Senator KNOWLAND. It is conceivable that some day another President will be in the White House—another President whose judgment in the matter of such appointments would be open to grave doubt. And it is possible that such a President might name men to the AEC who ought not to be confirmed without the most thorough check of their records.

In that eventuality the Senate would be in a difficult position. For under the law it is required to concur in the selection of members of the AEC, and it ought not to concur unless fully satisfied as to their fitness. The responsibility involved in this is no light matter, since the AEC has been given great powers and the security of the country is in the hands of its top officials. This being the case, it is not possible to agree with the President that the effort to enable the Senate to satisfy itself as to the loyalty of AEC officials, prior to voting for their confirmation, is unnecessary and unwise.

This does not dispose of the constitutional question, of course, and it may be that the courts will agree with Mr. Truman. If so, that ends the matter. But if the courts should share the opinion of Congress on the legal issue, then, in the long view, there would seem to be more prospect of gain than loss in the Knowland proposal. It is too bad that the President and the Senate could not have worked this matter out satisfactorily between themselves, but since that was not done the only alternative is to attempt to pass the bill over his veto and let the courts determine the constitutional issue.

The Soviets and the Nuremberg Trials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Economic Trend Line Studies of April 8 contained an interesting article by Mr. M. J. Bonn entitled "The Crime of War and the Soviets." The importance of this subject in the future of the United States can hardly be estimated at this time. Certainly the Nuremberg trials have set a precedent which could easily boomerang against the best interests of this country. Mr. Bonn has correctly indicated that the verdicts of the Nuremberg trials have set a precedent which cannot be upset by another war. When the next war comes and when it is concluded the victor will be in the position to hang or shoot the leaders of the opposition on the ground that they are war criminals. This is contrary to all concepts of international law.

Mr. Speaker, I am including the article in question, under leave to extend my remarks:

THE CRIME OF WAR AND THE SOVIETS

(By M. J. Bonn)

The publication by the United States of German Foreign Office documents showing the course of German-Russian negotiations in 1939, is causing violent repercussions, even though the documents merely elucidate a situation well known, at least since the Nuremberg trials. During the proceedings, the defense was permitted to hand in a copy of the Treaty for the Partition of Europe. It was observed at that time that the court did not take it into consideration, though its genuineness was not contested. The documents show that the nonaggression pact between Germany and Russia originated with Russia in a tentative talk on April 17, 1939, 2 days after the British Ambassador inquired of the Russian Government whether it would be prepared to give unilateral guaranties for maintaining the independence of Poland and Rumania.

On August 23, 1939, the German-Soviet nonaggression pact was signed. It could be described by friends of Russia as an act of appeasement which did not differ in principle from the one perpetrated in Munich by the western powers. The pact was preceded by a commercial agreement providing Germany with goods essential for waging war. It is more than likely that without the certainty of Russia's being a friendly neutral, furnishing essential goods to Germany, Hitler would not have dared to go to war. The French Ambassador in Berlin, Monsieur Coulondre, reported on June 1, 1939, that Hitler had inquired of Generals Keitel and Brauchitsch whether in a general conflict Germany was likely to prove victorious. Both made the answer depend on whether or not Russia kept out of the conflict. If Russia did, General Keitel answered "Yes" and General Brauchitsch (whose opinion is of greater value) answered "Probably," but both declared that, "if Germany had to fight Russia, she would have little chance of winning the war." It can of course never be proved that Hitler would have drawn back had he been sure of Russia's joining the Allies. But it is quite clear that Stalin, when concluding the nonaggression pact, was fully aware of Hitler's aggressive intentions on Poland. He and Molotov were thus active abettors of the crime of war.

One can hardly accuse Stalin of duplicity for following a course which fit in perfectly with Soviet methods. The Soviets are not bound by western moral standards: They have always acted on the assumption that the end justifies the means. This is part of the Marxist creed, according to which events are gestated by forces independent of individual volition. Soviet statesmen cannot choose between good and bad means, but only between those which secure the prescribed object, which are proper means, and those which do not and are therefore improper. Had Stalin sided with the Allies, he might have prevented the war without getting anything in return for the risk he was running. By joining Hitler, and by signing the secret pact for the partition of Europe, he got a full share of the spoils, so it seemed at that time, without the loss of a single Russian soldier. He got, in addition, a war in which capitalism and nazism could be expected to destroy one another, and bolshevism would be the lucky survivor. So, he signed both the nonaggression pact and the secret pact of partition. (This has been known to the public since the publication of the information in the Manchester Guardian on May 30, 1946.) He started taking over his share of Poland on September 3, 1939. He and Molotov not only abetted but actually participated in the crime of war.

The Nuremberg tribunal, to whom these facts were made known, rightly decided that the war guilt of the defendants was not affected by Russia's share in it. Even on the assumption that they acted at Russia's instigation, their crime was no less, for nobody had forced them to be seduced by Russia.

The facts by now amply documented ought to affect the reparation problem. Russia has insisted all the time on preferential treatment on account of the huge devastation she had suffered from the Nazi invasion. But she was not devastated as an innocent victim of Hitler's aggression, but because Moscow had miscalculated, as it has always done when dealing with nazism. In the winter 1932–33 when a Nazi victory seemed imminent, the German Socialist Party had attempted to form a common front with the German Communists. They did not waste time in going to their nominal leaders, but got in touch with the Soviet Embassy. After some deliberation, Moscow turned them down. For according to the Marxist cliché, fascism (and nazism to Russia is but the German version of fascism) was the stage preceding communism, and the quicker one got through it the better. By 1939, however, the stage had apparently become permanent. The Soviets could no longer count on its rapid disappearance by trusting to the automatic working of imminent economic forces. They had to do something to safeguard themselves and thought it wise to share the plunder. They were very well aware of the criminality of their proceedings. Molotov said to the German Ambassador on September 10, 1939, "To make the intervention of the Soviet Union plausible to the masses and at the same time avoid giving the Soviet Union the appearance of an aggressor," the Soviet Union had to find a cause for its action. The justification announced was, according to the Ambassador's report, that Poland was falling apart, and that the Soviet Union had to come to the aid of the Ukrainians and White Russians threatened by Germany.

Thanks to Hitler's military mistakes, the Soviets were saved and finally got all the lands they had bargained for and a good deal more. They have not only got reparations from Germany, while nearly all innocent victims of Nazi aggression so far have got next to nothing, but a large part of the $7,000,000,000 they so far have gotten away with has been paid for by British and American taxpayers. They had to make good the deficit of their zones due to Russia's turning the resources of her zone away from them.

But there is a much more important issue connected with the recent revelations.

The United States had induced their Allies to prosecute the leading Nazis on the charge "that a war of aggression is a crime and that modern international law has abolished the defense that those who incite or wage it are engaged in legitimate business." On August 8, 1945, the four major Allied governments agreed on the constitution of the International Military Tribunal. It was to prosecute, among other crimes, crimes against peace: Namely, planning, preparation, initiation, or "waging of a war of aggression, or a war in violation of international treaties, agreements, or assurances or participation in a common plan or conspiracy for the accomplishment of any of the foregoing.

"Neither the Tribunal, its members, nor their alternates can be challenged by the prosecution or by the defendants or their counsels."

When the Charter of the International Military Tribunal was published, the United States Government may not yet have had documentary proof of Russia's participation in Hitler's crime against peace. During the proceedings of the Tribunal, the United States certainly became aware of it. It condoned, and so did the other governments, a legal procedure under which one of the judges represented a fellow criminal, a party which had abetted and shared in the crime of the defendants. There can be no doubt that Molotov's share in this criminal conspiracy was greater than that of any other defendant with the exception of Ribbentrop. It is an accepted practice to let a Crown witness benefit for informing against his fellow criminals. But in Nuremberg a hitherto unknown precedent had been created. A fellow criminal was seated on the bench, the defendants had no right to challenge him, and he nearly succeeded in suppressing the evidence of his share in the crime (but for the

previous publication of the pact in the Manchester Guardian, he might have "got away with it."

It can, of course, be argued that the defendants would have been found guilty in the absence of a Russian judge, and this statement may be accepted. But it does not affect the really relevant feature of the case. The United States had insisted that the Nazi criminals should be brought to justice by a spectacular international procedure. It was to establish the principle that war was a crime, and show the world that it was a crime which could be punished by regular legal methods. It had opposed the far simpler method of declaring as outlaws a number of Nazi criminals and giving instructions to the military authorities to have them shot as soon as their identity had been clearly established. Had this been done, Goering, Himmler, and Ley could not have cheated the Allied hangmen. The plan was to impress the world, and especially the Germans, by the stern impartial procedure which subjected actions to penal prosecution which had hitherto not been treated as crimes. It miscarried. For the fact that the Allies permitted a criminal to find his fellow criminals guilty of a crime of which he had been a leading perpetrator (if he had not actually instigated it) has affronted the conscience of all those to whom justice is not a mere formal observation of rules of procedure, especially when those rules have been drafted for a particular purpose. However, just the judgment itself may have been, it has been reached by methods repugnant to the natural feeling of justice of the plain man. As the Allies could not eliminate Russia from membership in the tribunal, which evidently was impossible for political reasons, they should have adopted equally effective, though less spectacular, methods of meting out punishment. As the two arch conspirators, Stalin and Molotov, could not be arraigned before the court, the tribunal should never have been instituted. The American and the British Governments were hardly unaware of the nature of the case. After all, the war against Finland was not a purely defensive action on the part of Stalin. They will find it hard to prove their devotion to abstract justice now that the facts are known to the public at large.

The men who induced the United States Government to insist on judicial proceedings—it was the driving force in the establishment of the court—were both bad psychologists and even worse politicians. They hoped to prevent future wars by making war a crime under international law, punishable by stern international action. The severity of the law was to hold in check the motive for committting the crime. This reasoning was, of course, defective. The fear of being electrocuted may have reduced murders in the United States. It has not stopped them for the very simple reason that the murderer hopes to get away with it. This is far easier in the political world where the would-be criminals are not a mere handful of desperados faced by millions of law-abiding citizens, but powerful states. They plan and start an aggressive war only when they consider themselves stronger than their would-be victims. They will not be held back by the fear of having to face a stern international tribunal, which will pronounce sentence of death upon them after they have lost the war. They are convinced they will win it. If they do, they may very well use the precedent of the Nuremberg trials, and sentence to death those who prepared the defenses against them.

American tribunals are still prosecuting German Government officials and businessmen for the crime of having helped Hitler to prepare an aggressive war. Quite a number of them are bad sinners from a political point of view—an independent German Republic would have been justified in hanging them for high treason. Since the two leading criminals Molotov and Stalin are out of reach, these proceedings are morally not very impressive. In fact it is rather incongruous to see German armament manufacturers being accused of carrying out their government's orders for intensive armament production when it is very well known that the Hermann Goering works, which were to enable Germany to use her inferior ores for war production, were designed by an American firm which doubtlessly paid United States income tax on its profits. Adolf Hitler could not have shot its representatives had they refused to take the contract, but a German manufacturer who had pleaded conscientious objections to making guns would have fared badly.

The verdicts of the Nuremberg tribunal have certainly not created a world system which cannot be upset by another war. There are more armaments and there is more war talk today than during any previous peace period. There are more high-handed arbitrary political actions against weak states than the world has had ever before to put up with. But the Nuremberg trials have established a precedent which will enable the victor of any future war to hang the leaders of its victims as war criminals. The Soviets are already trying to create the proper atmosphere for such proceedings by branding those who dare to oppose them as warmongers. These are the prospective criminals to be prosecuted by a Soviet tribunal after a successful war. Fortunately, the present leaders of the western world have enough moral courage to face this risk.

Jewish State in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD F. YOUNGBLOOD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered at the American Zionist Emergency Council rally, Washington, D. C., on May 16, 1948:

Friday—on May 14, 1948—the Jewish state was reborn in the land of Israel. Today the Jewish state in Palestine is a reality. By the establishment of the third Jewish commonwealth in the history of mankind, the Jews have, at long last, come home to the land of their fathers.

In their struggle for independence, this small but courageous people have swept aside the almost impassable barriers that barred their way to an independent state of their own. In the generations to come our children's children and their children will find inspiration in the story of Zion's rise to nationhood. They will note that in this instance the cause of justice was triumphant only because the determination of one people was unshakable.

The final chapter of Israel as a nation reborn has not yet been written. For the Jews of Palestine there remains the difficult prospect of defending their newly established borders against the invasions of the Arab world. I feel confident that the new Jewish state will be able to withstand any and all military attacks from these directions.

Let us lift the embargo on arms to help them do this. When President Truman, in behalf of the United States Government, recognized the Jewish state of Israel last Friday, the American people wrote a historic chapter to this epic story. The United States, which has been intimately connected with the national aspirations of the Jewish people, has placed its blessings upon the new Jewish state. It was fitting and proper that our Government was the first to recognize Israel.

The history of Palestine during the twentieth century was intimately connected with the history of our own Nation. The Balfour Declaration of 1917 was not issued by the British Government until it had received a prior approval from President Woodrow Wilson. The Anglo-American convention of 1924 recognized the validity of the Palestine mandate and signaled American support for the Jewish national home in Palestine. The legislative and executive branches of our Government, the Republican and Democratic Parties have, through the years, reiterated our Government's strong sympathies with Jewish aspirations in the Holy Land.

During October and November of last year, the American delegation to the General Assembly of the United Nations took the leadership for the partition of Palestine into separate Arab and Jewish states.

Faced with the reality of a proclaimed Jewish state in the Holy Land, we must now create a Palestine policy which must be a realistic one, based on the one hand upon the realities of the moment, and on the other hand dedicated to justice and democracy.

Let us help a great and vigorous people build the nation of Israel.

Viewing the Congressional Scene

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN McDOWELL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith the column of the able gentleman from Kansas, published recently in his newspaper in Independence, Kans.:

VIEWING THE CONGRESSIONAL SCENE WITH CONGRESSMAN HERBERT A. (HUB) MEYER

Today, some 33 months after the end of the most destructive world-wide conflagration in history, the world remains so far from realization of a genuine peace that even strong spirits are becoming cynical. It is embittering to realize that, after so much toil and sacrifice on the part of peoples all over the globe, so much remains to be accomplished.

World communism, as propagated and disseminated by today's Russian overlords, is the single force that has halted the will of the rest of the world to move toward peace. These 33 months have witnessed the unfolding of the giant Soviet plan, whether directly or through their many puppet fronts, to block and cripple every attempt of democratic peoples to establish a firm footing for peace and security in a war-devastated world.

This is the influence that is today forcing another mobilization of military strength on the United States. It is the influence that has prompted us to send billions of dollars—and promises of more billions—to foreign nations not yet fallen into Russian hands, in order to preserve their freedom. We are now starting to build a huge military air force; we are contemplating a new draft and universal military training; we are preparing to store national stock piles of war-strategic materials.

In these 23 months the United States has become fully awakened to the serious threat posed by the Communist policy to freedom and democracy everywhere. Fully, did I say? Unfortunately, that is an overstatement. There is yet an opening in our national security front. The Communist menace is so serious that we cannot, in wisdom, afford to have a single chink in our armor.

The breach in our defense is, indeed, very close to home. The fact is that we have no way of defending ourselves against our own native-son Communists. The Communist Party in America and its masquerading stooge auxiliaries are actually protected today by the laws and Constitution which they seek to destroy by overthrow of our democracy.

These forces, as has been indicated in repeated investigations by Congress, are controlled from Moscow headquarters, and are irrevocably dedicated to the destruction of our forms of government and economy.

On March 17 President Truman appeared before the Congress to ask for immediate action on proposals to strengthen our Military Establishment, to appropriate billions of dollars for the nations of the world who can yet resist the Russian onslaught. Mr. Truman seemed to be acutely aware of the menace communism poses in the world, and still he had nothing to say about domestic Communist forces. He neither suggested nor recognized the subversive groups at work inside our borders. In fact, the President's only statement about this internal threat has been his denial to Congress of the right to obtain information from executive departments concerning the loyalty of Government employees. This frightening inconsistency in our national policy cannot be allowed. There should be no evasion of our leaders' responsibility to challenge a recognized menace in its every source.

Congress has seized the initiative and is now considering the Mundt bill to set up a system for control of domestic Communists and their subversive henchmen. This Communist-control bill has been perfected by the House Committee on Un-American Activities which has been investigating the undercover activities of foreign agents here for 10 years.

This committee, unquestionably the best-informed panel on the subject today, said in reporting the bill:

"The conclusion that the Communist movement constitutes a threat to the security of the United States and to the American way of life is not the cry of alarmists.

"The Communist program of conquest through treachery, deceit, infiltration, espionage, sabotage, corruption, and terrorism has been carried out in country after country and is an ever-growing threat in other countries. There is ample evidence that one of the primary objectives of the world Communist movement, directed from within the most powerful existing Communist totalitarian dictatorship, is to repeat this pattern in the United States."

The Mundt bill seeks to combat domestic subversive activities by making activities aimed toward establishment of a foreign-controlled totalitarian dictatorship in the United States unlawful and punishable by heavy fines, imprisonment, and loss of citizenship; denying Federal employment and passport privileges to members of Communist organizations; requiring registration and filing of financial reports with the Attorney General of all Communist-inspired organizations; requiring all propaganda distributed through the mails and all radio propaganda from Communist sources to be clearly so indicated; denying Federal income-tax exemptions and deductions for "charitable organizations" to all groups on the Communist register.

This is the answer then that your Congress is framing against the insidious menace of Communist traitors on our own soil.

Brooklyn Congressional Delegation Praises President Truman for His Recognition of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

We, Members in Congress, from districts comprising the borough of Brooklyn, city of New York, express our gratitude to President Truman for his recognition of the de facto government of the state of Israel.

This was a stroke of rare statesmanship which has earned widespread praise and which is consistent with our cherished American tradition. We who have zealously guarded our independence for over 150 years could hardly have withheld it from the Jews who sought it for 2,000 years.

EMANUEL CELLER, JOHN J. DELANEY, JAMES J. HEFFERNAN, EUGENE J. KEOGH, ABRAHAM J. MULTER, DONALD L. O'TOOLE, JOSEPH L. PFEIFER, JOHN J. ROONEY, ANDREW L. SOMERS.

Peacetime Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Chester (Pa.) Times on May 18, 1948:

REPUBLICANS IN CONGRESS—GO SLOW

We quote from the ever reliable United States News and World Report in its issue of May 21: "War is a fading prospect. You can write that down as quite definite."

The newsgram section of United States News and World Report goes on to make the unqualified assertions: "As matters stand * * * United States has won, Russia lost, the cold war."

"Communism, at least temporarily, is stopped in western Europe.

"Recovery, underwritten by United States, is getting underway in the non-Russian part of Europe, and is probably to gain momentum as this year wears on."

The foregoing are quotations from the source in Washington which the Chester Times considers has proven the most authentic. The conclusions and suggestions which follow are our own:

The Republican majority in Congress—if it passes a peacetime conscription measure is walking into a political trap laid by the present administration and its military advisers. As soon as such power is handed to the administration, dominated as it is by military men, people will begin the old cry of not changing horses in the middle of the stream.

The Truman administration is under the control of military philosophy. This administration wants to establish peacetime conscription in principle. Instituting peacetime conscription in the United States is contrary to the fundamentals upon which we have built our Nation.

We are told our country is in danger. Our country has very often been in serious danger from foreign powers. That justification of military control today is not valid.

Never in our history have we allowed the military to dominate our diplomatic area. We have always exhausted diplomatic and political methods up to the state of active war before calling in the military. And we have always won our wars. History tells us that no country which has had conscription in peacetime has either kept out of wars or won wars.

One great benefit of being an American has been freedom from fear of military dictatorship, denying the military the right to intrude upon our civilian freedom. In addition, civilians have always felt free to criticize the military, thus providing a check on the military and a guarantee to our complete freedom in a democracy.

Is Congress (and the Republican Party dominates Congress) so stupid that they cannot realize that they are changing the whole form of American life with peacetime conscription of any kind?

Peacetime conscription now would create the chance of military patronage through draft boards in every State. It would not be long before military infiltration would yield tremendous and dangerous power.

Industrial mobilization would have to come along with or even before military conscription.

Voluntary enlistment is the only democratic answer to the problem of keeping up our Army and Navy in peacetime. Figures on enlistments the first 4 months of this year show that a 670,000-man Army, the present authorized strength, with only 250,000 3-year enlistments each year, assuming an attrition rate of 25,000 a year, could be maintained through voluntary enlistments.

Have you thought of the fact that the enforcement of the draft will be almost impossible in peacetime? Will draft board members work without pay when there is no immediate emergency? Consider the cost of conscription as compared to voluntary enlistment: $270 per draftee to $134.70 for each enlisted man. We could afford to make enlisting in the Army more attractive before resorting to draft at this time.

"No" to any peacetime draft is essential if the United States is to go forward as a democracy.

Britain Must Call Off Arab Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, King Abdullah's Arab Legion has marched into Bethlehem and the old city of Jerusalem.

Aside from its violation of the UN Charter, this is an invasion which can be called off in a thrice by Prime Minister Bevin.

The legion is British financed, British officered, British equipped. Bevin brought the legion into Palestine presumably for police duties during the mandate and secretly encouraged it to remain to fight the Jews after the mandate ended.

But Bevin can call off these mad Arab dogs of war if the United States demanded it. Britain would not dare to continue what the United States disapproves. Great Britain is a beneficiary of the United States monetary aid. It can be said that the $8,000,000 British subsidy to the Arab Legion comes out of the American Treasury. Abdullah dances to any tune called by the British. Secretary Marshall should demand that Bevin force the return of Abdullah's Legion to Transjordan at once.

Otherwise the United States is not blameless for the ruthless destruction by Abdullah's tanks, field guns, and flame throwers.

If Secretary Marshall does not bring pressure to bear upon Bevin, to remove the Arab Legion, I shall call upon Congress to amend the Foreign Assistance Act to deny all ERP aid to Great Britain.

Dewey Day—Vermont in the Spanish-American War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address I gave in Montpelier, Vt., on the afternoon of the 16th of May on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the muster-in of the First Regiment, Vermont Volunteer Infantry, United Spanish War Veterans:

VERMONT IN THE SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR

The years have called the roll and taken their toll; those who answer today to their names represent a majority which does not answer.

Time which holds the hourglass and the shears has limited the physical capacity of those who are here today—yet neither the years, nor time can measure nor destroy the spirit or the patriotic ardor of the volunteers of 1898.

That was a day and generation of which all America always will be proud.

You volunteers fought for the country you loved because of your love of it and for it, without hope or idea of any reward, save that which comes to those who find it in the satisfaction of duty done.

You set an example on which foundation the greatness of your country has been erected—patriotism pure and undefiled and unadulterated, to make it possible for all people everywhere to enjoy the benefits and the fruits of the liberty you enjoyed, at no matter how great the cost, or what the price might be.

Too little attention has been paid to the beginning of what never will be the end of the program you established at the cost of blood and treasure, without any hope or expectation of reward, for you were volunteers.

It is an honor to be invited to take part in these proceedings commemorative of the accomplishments of the veterans of the Spanish-American War.

I recall that in 1896, as the cadet salutatorian at the commencement exercises at Norwich University, I delivered an address in which, with all the wisdom born of one who is about to step out into the world to conquer it, I offered the world the solution of all its troubles by suggesting that arbitration was a perfect substitute and a guaranteed panacea for war. That was in June of 1896. The reverberations of my oration had hardly ceased to echo among the hills and valleys of Vermont when the *Maine* was blown up in Habana Harbor. Off and on—and mostly on—we have been in war ever since.

I think of this sometimes as I ask myself, Shall we challenge the effectiveness of United Nations to enforce its decrees unless and until we in the United States recognize the fact that to fulfill our God-given destiny we must be sufficiently prepared to back up our policies? We must be well prepared and have an overpowering Military, Naval, and Air Force Establishment which will command and deserve respect and be able if necessity requires to enforce our demand that the world shall be at peace.

As you veterans of the Spanish-American War so well know, the part which Vermont played, not only with respect to the war with Spain but with respect to the position we occupy today as a Nation, is not fully and generally realized. Whether we Vermonters like it or not and whether we are ready to assume the burden of our responsibility or not, it nevertheless is a fact that the report which Senator Redfield Proctor made to the President of the United States relative to the situation in Cuba was the beginning of something of which neither we nor our grandchildren will ever see the end.

On the evening of February 15, 1898, at 40 minutes past 9, the *Maine*, sent to Cuba as an act of friendly courtesy, lying peacefully at anchor in the harbor of Habana, was destroyed by an explosion, with the loss of 2 officers and 258 men.

After several years the wreck was exposed and a board of inquiry on December 1, 1911, reported that the destruction was due to the explosion of a charge of a low form of explosive exterior to the ship. So the mystery of the *Maine*—which was never a mystery—was solved.

"Remember the *Maine*" became the slogan in '98, and a peaceful solution for our controversies with Spain was made impossible.

Vermonters of this day and generation do not appreciate how great was the influence of Senator Proctor. The speech he made on March 17, upon his return from Cuba, held the attention of the country. He suggested no plan, but the people knew he was for intervention.

On the strength of the report which this able and very distinguished son of Vermont made, the war was fought out of which and as a result of which we became a Nation on which, as used to be said of England, the sun never sets. The magnitude of the problems which confront us only emphasizes the weight of the responsibilities which are ours. We cannot go back. We must step forward. Whatever it may cost, it is worth the price to carry on.

The officers and men who went to war to fight Spain obeyed and exemplified a dominant public sentiment. The people had great confidence in the statements made by Senator Proctor, and it was at that point that Vermont first came into the panorama of the war with Spain.

Vermont played a leading part from start to finish.

When in the autumn of 1897 a man by the name of Dewey became convinced that we were drifting into a war with Spain, he sought command of the Asiatic Squadron. He enlisted the aid of Senator Proctor whose influence with the President was powerful, and on January 3, 1898, Dewey hoisted his pennant on the *Olympia* as commander of the Asiatic Squadron.

The rest and what happened in the bay of Manila on the morning of May 1, 1898, changed the course of history and opened the door through which the United States has traveled to become the greatest world power in all history. This responsibility was not put upon us by our seeking. If ever the destiny of a nation was writ high on the clouds, ours has been.

So began the ending of Spanish misrule and tyranny. This was effected by Commodore George Dewey. The orders which Commodore Dewey, later Admiral Dewey, received from the Navy Department were to destroy the Spanish Fleet. He obeyed.

To complete the naval picture and to add to its luster, the great and decisive battle of the war was fought at Santiago where the *Oregon* took a glorious part in the destruction of Cervera's fleet. The trip the *Oregon* made under the command of Capt. Charles Clark, of Bradford, Vt., has no parallel in history.

The *Oregon* was one of the most powerful of her class afloat. Despite that fact naval experts declared we had no ships in our Navy equal in real efficiency to the swift armored cruisers of Cervera's fleet.

Nevertheless, on March 9, 1898, the battleship *Oregon* was detached from the Pacific Squadron and it started on its long 13,000-mile journey around the Horn, to arrive at Bahia on the 9th of May, having seen nothing of the Spanish fleet which all strategists figured had gone out to intercept the *Oregon*.

Late on the 10th the news came suddenly that Cervera had been afraid to cross the Atlantic to join battle and, avoiding all lanes of commerce, had run back home to Spain.

Eventually the day of false reports and maneuvers based thereon came to an end. Admiral Sampson joined Schley at Key West, and the *Oregon* which had been sailing for 3 months arrived at Key West ahead of Sampson.

The *Oregon* had made a 13,000-mile run, yet it stopped only long enough to throw in fresh coal and steam off ready for battle without even stopping to tighten a crank pin. This cruise of the *Oregon* excited the admiration of the world. Unprecedented in battleship history, it will long preserve its unique distinction.

While all this was happening the foot soldiers and the cavalry were fighting in the cruel heat at San Juan, fighting and enduring the plague and miasma of malaria at Chickamauga. No man who bears a bullet wound or saber scar carries any such reminder of the war with Spain as do the Vermonters who lived through those awful days and nights at Chickamauga and the years of misery and illness which have followed.

You men of the Spanish-American War had a great responsibility which you discharged for altruistic humanitarian purposes. You laid the foundation for making this Government the greatest and most powerful over which the sun rises and sets. Too many people forget this fact.

For what the American people have enjoyed in the way of advancements in all lines since you gave of your blood in 1898 to make these things possible, those who are thoughtful enough to realize what it all means owe you a debt of lasting gratitude.

The Honorable Charles L. Gifford

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1948

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. CHARLES L. GIFFORD, late a Representative from the State of Massachusetts

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to give expression to my feeling of high regard for our esteemed colleague, Hon.

CHARLES L. GIFFORD. Although he preceded me in the House by a number of years, I had the opportunity by reason of my close association with him on committes to know him, perhaps better than many of his original contemporaries who are still Members of the House. I was appointed to the Banking and Currency Committee after he had already served on that committee with distinction for many years. I shall never forget his unfailing humor, and on many occasions, his barbed wit, that could so laughingly drive home his point. On the floor of the House I have myself retreated in confusion as he hurled his good-natured, but nonetheless effective, darts. True, he pierced the armor of his opponents with laughter and wit. His dignified mien belied the twinkle in the eye and those who knew him delighted in his company.

I became a member of the Ways and Means Committee and within a few years thereafter my dear friend on the Republican side also became a member of that committee. It was always a pleasure to serve with him. He was the apogee of partisan republicanism, with the fervor of an American for whom the smell of the soil of Massachusetts, or the tang of the sea off Cape Cod meant home and the United States to him. Withal he was able to view with clear vision the problems of all of us on the opposite side of the aisle, some of whom, like myself, came from the canyon streets of New York.

In the death of Representative GIFFORD the country has lost an able citizen, a distinguished legislator, and an ardent patriot.

Observation Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by the Reverend Robert W. Searle, D. D., which appeared in the Protestant Church Life on May 15, 1948:

OBSERVATION POST

A last column is most difficult to write, even when there is to be only a 4 months' interval before one will speak again. Four months in this rapidly moving and eventful world is a long time and so many things want saying.

There is the plight of those impoverished families hounded unfeelingly from hotels in which the Welfare Department had housed them. What has been heard of them? Oh, just that the fathers were separated from their families and that the mothers and children were herded together in common rooms in "flop-houses." * * * Yes; there have been severe epidemics of scarlet fever and diphtheria and a number of mothers have been moved to mental hospitals; but the great State of New York and the great city of New York are not wasting money on relief. Too much is apparently a much more grievous offense than is too little.

What of those 13 youngsters from one police precinct who, over a recent week end, were hospitalized with knife or gunshot wounds? Fifty thousand children are in that area—and there is play space for less than 5,000.

What of the plight of the hundreds of thousands of homeless families? The powerful opposition wants to strike out the provisions of the T-E-W bill (which would provide a limited amount of public housing for those for whom private industry cannot build), but retain guarantees for loans on more expensive private construction.

What about the rail strike, called by a union which will not allow the workers in its own union-owned hotels to be unionized?

What about the justly merited pensions of coal miners and John L.'s coming bid for power?

What of Palestine and Europe and of the ideological struggle?

What of this threatening atomic age which has filled our hearts with fears, but scarcely altered our patterns of life?

And what of a church which, in spite of the awesome imperatives of the day, lingers complacently in parochial and denominational isolation?

Shall we cry "Peace" when there is no peace, or shall we face life in its fullness and go forth unitedly in the name of Christ to save the world?

R. W. S.

Messages to the "Salute to Israel"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, following are messages received by the chairman, Dr. Emanuel Neuman, and by Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, who was one of the principal speakers at the great rally to hail the new state of Israel, in New York City. Madison Square Garden was filled to the rafters with over 10,000 people, while 75,000 were turned away from the Garden:

MESSAGE TO DR. ABBA HILLEL SILVER FROM SUMNER WELLES

Permit me to send you these words of deeply felt felicitation upon the achievement of a magnificent ideal toward whose realization you have so greatly contributed, and I send you as well the expression of my most earnest hope for the peace and the welfare of the new State of Israel.

SUMNER WELLES.

MESSAGE FROM SIR ELLSWORTH FLAVELLE, CHAIRMAN OF THE WORLD COMMITTEE FOR PALESTINE

As the new Jewish State in Palestine comes into being we offer the felicitations of the World Committee for Palestine, the federation of 30 national non-Jewish organizations, whose members have been sympathetic to and have given moral support for the Jewish homeland project in Palestine. This expression of good will and best wishes for the future is extended especially to the Jewish community of Palestine, citizens of the State of Israel. But we include as well the Jewish community of the world which has rallied in self-sacrificing compassion to the aid of the shattered remnants of European Jewry who have survived the Hitler terror. The sacrificial zeal of the Jews of the world in this connection has aroused widespread admiration from non-Jews everywhere. * * * On behalf of the new Jewish State, Israel, we appeal to the governments of the world for official recognition and support, an admirable lead for which has been provided by the Government of the United States. In the World Committee for Palestine it is our firm belief that the termination of Jewish homelessness by the possession of a Palestinian homeland will be a major contribution to the ultimate peace of Israel and to world peace. In ancient and modern times the Holy Land has never responded in development, productivity, and fruitfulness to any people as it has to the people of the Book and of the Promise. In this magic touch of Jewish settlement and enterprise there is a fresh home for the impoverished masses of the Middle East and for the growth of dynamic democracy.

Sir ELLSWORTH FLAVELLE.

CABLE TO DR. ABBA HILLEL SILVER, CHAIRMAN OF THE AMERICAN SECTION OF THE JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE AND OF THE AMERICAN ZIONIST EMERGENCY COUNCIL, FROM DAVID REMEZ, CHAIRMAN OF THE JEWISH NATIONAL COUNCIL OF PALESTINE AND MINISTER OF COMMUNICATIONS OF ISRAEL

We appeal to the Jews of the world, with American Jewry at the head, to give our fight for freedom all moral, political, and financial support, and to arouse the conscience of the world and its governments to carry out their own decision. With the help of the God of Truth and our unshakable determination, we will be victorious.

DAVID REMEZ.

CABLE TO DR. ABBA HILLEL SILVER, CHAIRMAN OF THE AMERICAN SECTION, OF THE JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE AND OF THE AMERICAN ZIONIST EMERGENCY COUNCIL, FROM THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF CYPRUS CAMPS

Twenty-four thousand Jewish immigrants to Palestine detained in Cyprus camps extend their greetings on the occasion of Jewish State Day. After many years of wandering, we are happy to have the privilege of being the first immigrants to enter the Jewish state.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE, CYPRUS CAMPS.

MESSAGE TO DR. ABBA HILLEL SILVER FROM DR. ISRAEL GOLDSTEIN, CHAIRMAN OF THE WORLD CONFEDERATION OF GENERAL ZIONISTS

On this historic occasion, when Jewish political independence in Palestine becomes a reality, we salute our leaders and colleagues in Palestine and in America who firmly and skillfully waged our political battle, while the incomparable Haganah of Palestine valiantly and successfully waged the battle against Arab aggression. Cognizant of the difficulties ahead, we are confident that all obstacles in the path of the Jewish state will be surmounted and that the world, together with the Jewish people, will have reason to bless the day that the Jewish state was born.

Dr. ISRAEL GOLDSTEIN.

MESSAGE TO DR. EMANUEL NEUMANN, PRESIDENT OF THE ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA AND CHAIRMAN OF THE RALLY, FROM DR. CARL HERMANN VOSS, CHAIRMAN OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF THE AMERICAN CHRISTIAN PALESTINE COMMITTEE

Congratulations to our Jewish brothers on this great day when we celebrate the restoration of Zion. The American Christian Palestine Committee sends its warm good wishes to the new state of Israel.

CARL HERMANN VOSS.

MESSAGE TO DR. ABBA HILLEL SILVER FROM HERBERT BAYARD SWOPE

May the course of the new country be onward and upward.

Israel has won her place among the nations of the world—may she, although small in size, be big in good works.

Israel proclaimed to the world one God; Israel gave the world the Ten Commandments; Israel gave the world the practice of the Sabbath; Israel gave the world its greatest religious figures; Israel will continue her spiritual helpfulness.

She only asks the opportunity to achieve the peace she has so bravely sought. May she become a haven for the unfortunate and

the oppressed; a safe harbor for the homeless; a lamp lighting the world to a new understanding.

One of the first steps for America to take is to put Israel within the operations of the ECA (ERP). Turkey is already a recipient of our attention; Israel is even more important to American future—to world security.

HERBERT BAYARD SWOPE.

On Being an American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article by Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.:

ON BEING AN AMERICAN—A SET OF TRADITIONAL IDEALS, NOT ONE'S ORIGIN, IS WHAT DETERMINES IT

(By Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D. Litt. D.)

Amid all the Babel voices of today's confused world there is no declaration which has in it a prouder boast or a deeper humility, when rightly uttered, than: "I am an American." That simple statement proclaims a creed in which there is no strut nor snobbery.

The lighted dome of our National Capitol, gleaming like alabaster in transfiguration glory, brought always until his death from the sensitive heart of a great American the devout prayer, "God of our fathers, make me worthy of America at its best."

On this day dedicated to the sacrament of patriotism pure and undefiled it is fitting to ask: What does this business of being an American really involve? The discovery of America was not merely the business of Columbus. It is the business of each of us to discover for our own time the full meaning and significance of America for itself and for the world, as pushing on into the great unknown, we hear again the winged words that leaped from the explorer's intrepid lips, "Sail on!" Standing in the prow of the *Mayflower* were those who also discovered America. "In the name of God, amen!" they solemnly avowed as they stepped upon new shores. The years since then have discovered that America was more than a footnote to European history. It was more than an appendix to the old story of courts and kings. It was a brand-new volume in the collected works of God. For America is not just a geographical area. It is primarily an ideal. That means that America is not merely a physical entity. It is a spiritual entity. Being an American is not just a matter of where one was born.

You can't find the answer to the deepest questions regarding Americanism by getting out an atlas or the geography. You have not defined it when you have just bound it on the north, south, east, and west. America is the Pilgrim fathers, the public schools and the temples of religion. America is its legislative halls. It is democracy and opportunity. It is Washington and Jefferson and Lincoln. It is Phillips Brooks and Cardinal Gibbons and Jacob Riis. It is in part men and women who were born under other skies. It is a vast melting pot in which is being produced a richer and more varied culture than the world has yet known.

What, then, is an American? Hawthorne thought Abraham Lincoln the best incarnation of its practical meaning, for, declared he: "In his ruggedness, in his mysticism, in his rather rough humor, in his deep faith in God, in the utter democracy of his nature he is what we want the world to know as a typical American."

Long before he was President, Lincoln, on a visit to New York City, was asked one Sunday morning to make some remarks to a Sunday-school class in an industrial institution. The children gathered there came from the poor classes, the parents of most of them having been born in Europe. Somebody took down that day what Lincoln said to the Sunday-school group. He spoke on "Being an American." Here are two sentences: "You children must always thank God that you have been born in a country where, if you will lead a decent, clean life, trust God and work hard, you can rise. The only things that will limit you are your industry, your character, and your brains."

He was telling those so-called underprivileged youngsters that because they were in America the way was open to the top. So in this explosive day, as defiantly we look enslaving tyranny in the face and boast "I am an American," let us remember that we need more than a map to prove our claim. With sinister forces without pity or conscience at home and abroad betraying, denying and blaspheming all that America at its best stands for, never did it mean so much to stand erect wherever Old Glory floats and, thanking God for America, to sing and pray with Irving Berlin:

"While the storm clouds gather far across the sea,
Let us swear allegiance to a Land that's free;
Let us all be grateful for a land so fair
As we raise our voices in a solemn prayer.
"God bless America, land that I love!
Stand beside her and guide her,
Through the night, with a light from above above.
From the mountains to the prairies,
To the ocean white with foam,
God bless America, my home sweet home!"

And God make me worthy of being an American!

An Up-to-the-Minute Summary of the Middle East Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by Dr. Frank Kingdon, which appeared in the New York Post on May 18, 1948:

TO BE FRANK

(By Dr. Frank Kingdon)

REPORT OF A CONVERSATION

M. What does it mean when we say that the United States of America recognizes Israel?

F. It means that as far as our Government is concerned Israel is a sovereign nation with rights and privileges equal to any other nation.

M. You mean its government has the same standing as those of Britain, Mexico, or Egypt?

F. Yes; precisely that. Israel is a new nation with a legal existence and a government the same as the United States of America.

M. Well, doesn't that mean that the Arabs are invading somebody else's country?

F. Yes. The Arabs are aggressors as far as the United States of America is concerned. They are guilty of aggression just as Hitler was when he invaded Poland or the Low Countries.

M. Shouldn't we do something about that?

F. We certainly should. We should do two things without hesitation. First, we should send notes to the Arab governments telling them that we consider them aggressors and demanding that they call back their armies. Second, we should notify the Security Council that acts of aggression are being performed and demand that it take action according to the UN Charter to deal with such acts as a threat against peace.

M. Suppose the Arabs don't take any notice of us or refuse to stop fighting?

F. Then we should formally declare that they are aggressors and lift the embargo on arms so that the Government of Israel can buy munitions here on the same terms as other nations are buying them.

M. Is that all?

F. No. We should push the case before the Security Council and get joint international judgment on the Arabs with a clear understanding that joint action will be taken against them if they persist in their invasion.

M. But suppose the other nations say they have not recognized Israel?

F. Our case is still good. The only action the UN has taken was the one which voted partition. That is still the UN decision. We can stand on that and present the Arab attack as a violation of it.

M. Isn't this likely to end up with us having to send troops there?

F. No. First of all, the armies of Israel can take care of themselves if they have arms. Second, the Arabs will quit as soon as they realize the rest of the world means business.

M. You believe firmness is the best way to end violence there?

F. Precisely. We can stabilize the whole Middle East by making Israel strong.

Marcella says: Israel can prove that the Middle East has more to gain from arable soil than Arab oil.

Draft May Take Your Boy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, one of the questions the Congress must soon determine is that of how many men we need in the armed services. Obviously in the days ahead demand upon our manpower will be very great. The Nation will look to Iowa for the production of a large share of its food. Our producers must have enough help on the farm. They must have sufficient modern machinery.

Therefore it behooves the military not to ask for more personnel than it can use efficiently. They might well take a lesson from the farmers in Iowa who, during the war, raised bumper crops with the minimum of help.

In accordance with permission heretofore given, I am including a very timely editorial in the May 15 issue of Wallace's Farmer and Iowa Homestead, published in Des Moines, Iowa. The suggestions contained in this editorial are very sound and reasonable and are deserving of

much careful consideration. The editorial is as follows:

Is your boy 19 years old? Or any age from 19 up through 25?

Then the new draft bill may take him. The measure now before Congress plans to draw several hundred thousand new men for the Army, Navy, and Air Force from this age group.

If the draft is necessary to protect the Nation, everybody is bound to favor it. But how necessary is a draft now?

Present strength of the three services is as follows:

Army	542,000
Air Force	364,500
Navy	397,000
Marines	81,000
Total	1,384,500

How many men do we need? The President's budget for 1948–49 listed a total of 1,423,427. We are just 38,927 men short of this now.

After President Truman's request for a draft, Secretary Forrestal presented a new estimate of needs which pushed the total up by 300,000 more.

It is probably as hard for a farmer to guess whether we need 1,400,000 or 1,700,000 men as it would be for a general to decide when to cut hay.

About the best we can do is to try to find some impartial experts who know the business. Plainly, you can't always trust the generals and admirals. They usually ask for more and more men. And sometimes they ask for the wrong things.

Before World War II, the generals asked for too many horses, and not enough tanks. The admirals asked for too many battleships and not enough carriers.

Hanson W. Baldwin, a former Navy officer and, in our opinion, the leading military expert of the United States, has just completed a study of problems of defense. (The Price of Power, Harpers.)

He says the main problem of defense isn't men. It is what you do with the men you have. And how you arm them.

Baldwin thinks the Air Force should be increased to 40,000 men. But he says that the main defect of the Air Force now is that only 31,000 men are in the strategic air command.

Our major weapon in the next war will be long-distance bombers. Yet we put only 3 percent of our armed manpower on this job.

Baldwin says that the Navy has no surface fleet to oppose in the next war. It needs to battle submarines, not enemy battleships or carriers. That means changed equipment. He adds:

"The Navy can reduce with safety its overall manpower; it does not need more than 250,000 to 350,000 men."

The Army, like the Air Force, has failed to put enough of its strength into fighting units. Too many men are wasted in minor chores. Baldwin suggests a slightly larger army, but more men in combat units.

When you add up Baldwin's recommendations on manpower, they come close to the 1949 budget figures.

Maybe we have enough men in the three services now, if the generals and admirals make the right use of them and give them the right equipment.

Back in wartime the Army and Navy used to order three or four times as much stuff as they needed, so as to be sure they had enough. Now they seem to be ordering more men than they need, just to be sure they have enough.

If the Nation needs your boy in the service, you want him to go. So does he. But let's not run up military costs and go short on farm labor until we've made effective use of the men we have.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the tidal wave of propaganda pouring out of the Military Establishment in favor of universal military training, all at the expense of the taxpayers, little has been said as to the ultimate money cost of the program to the citizens. Of course, in these days when a billion dollars means nothing to the professional wasters of other people's money, the fact that the cost for the first year of universal military training will be $890,000,000; the cost for the second year $984,000,000, and the cost of the third year $1,500,000,000, is completely overlooked.

Those who are promoting militarism consider it an insult for a Member of Congress to ask for an answer to a few questions to aid in passing upon the soundness or unsoundness of such proposed legislation.

I feel it my duty as a Representative, especially when dealing with a proposed system that history reveals has been inimical to the liberty of the citizens of other nations, to inquire as to its effect upon our form of free government.

Millions and millions of persons have come to the United States to escape the tyranny of universal military training and peacetime conscription in the country of their origin. Now it is proposed to chain our free people to chariot wheels of militarism. The system once fastened upon our people will continue permanently and will each year become more and more burdensome to the taxpayers. Such a system breeds war, tyranny, and the destruction of liberty.

I believe it is pertinent and relevant to ask a few questions relating to the various aspects of the proposal to Hitlerize our youth:

COMPULSORY PEACETIME MILITARY SERVICE—MALE TRAINEES—INTERROGATORY

1. What would be the average annual number of males called up for training?
2. What would be the probable annual number of rejections?
3. What would be the size of each annual class of trainees?
4. Would standards of mental and physical requirements be as high as in the Regular Army and Navy Establishments, or would substandards for training be adopted?
5. Would substandard trainees be trained for behind-the-lines tasks, such as cooking, kitchen police, hard labor, mental tasks, etc.?
6. If so, what would be the moral and social effect on substandard trainees?
7. Would there be any color lines, or segregation into racial units?
8. If so, what would be the social and moral effect on those so segregated?
9. If not, what would be the social and moral effect on white trainees—especially from sections of the Nation in which color lines are traditionally observed?
10. How many commissioned officers would be required as a standing class of instructors to train the males each year?
11. How many noncommissioned officers would be required as a standing class of instructors to train the males each year?
12. How many privates would be required as a standing army to aid in training each annual class of male trainees?
13. Would these permanent classes of commissioned and noncommissioned officers give rise to a military caste in this country?
14. Has compulsory military training or service in other countries given rise to such a military caste?
15. Would a military caste be dangerous to American free institutions and traditions?
16. Would male trainees be taken from their schools for a year and sent away to barracks or training areas distant from their homes?
17. If male youths were withdrawn from their school work a year, what would be the effect on their school work and training?
18. Would this service be compulsory military service, or compulsory military training?
19. Would this compulsory service violate constitutional provisions against involuntary servitude?
20. What are the points of difference between compulsory military service and compulsory military training?
21. In either case would trainees receive training other than strictly military training?
22. Would trainees be subject to service with regular troops abroad?
23. Would trainees be subject to active military service in police regiments outside their own country?
24. What pay would male trainees receive for their period of training?
25. Should they be trained as a part of the National Guard under control of State governors, or as part of the United States armed services under control of the Federal Government?
26. What would be the period for which trainees would be liable to call for military service?
27. What would be the effect of this liability to call on the business and professions of the Nation?
28. What would be the effect on American agriculture?
29. What would be the period of training?
30. Would a year's training be adequate to train men for aviation, handling of intricate instruments, heavy weapons, high explosives, etc.?
31. Would training courses closely simulate actual modern battle conditions?
32. If so, would such training tend to brutalize youth, break down moral inhibitions, and produce a tough generation?
33. Would trainees be called back at later periods for refresher training?
34. If so, how often after the first training period is ended?

35. What effect would this have on business and the professions?

36. What pensions or other benefits would those trainees injured in training receive? Would such benefits be comparable to benefits paid regular members of the armed services injured in battle?

37. What would the cost of such a training program be to the Federal Government?

38. If we are to have a durable peace, what would be the need for such compulsory military service?

39. What nations, after this war is ended, would be our potential enemies of the future?

40. If a durable peace is not in prospect, how could the United States have an adequate defense without such compulsory military service or training?

41. If a durable peace is not in prospect, would a year's training period be sufficient adequately to train American youth for war?

42. Would the rapid advances in military machines, weapons, and munitions render such training rapidly obsolete unless trainees were frequently called back for refresher training?

43. Will it be possible to achieve a peace so certain and lasting that the Nation would not need a national defense adequate to meet another sudden war?

44. Will the United States be likely to have as much time in any future war to train an Army and to prepare arms and supplies as we had in the first and present World Wars?

45. If not, then is compulsory military training imperative to our national defense?

46. Would the Nation have to keep on hand sufficient arms and ammunition to service an Army of trainees and all Reservists at all times?

47. If so, how large a stock of such arms and ammunition would be necessary?

48. How rapidly would such arms and munitions become obsolescent, or deteriorate to the point of uselessness or comparative uselessness?

49. What probable burden of expense would this throw on the taxpayers?

50. What other countries have had compulsory military service?

51. What has been their experience with regard to the problems outlined in the foregoing questions?

52. What would the effect of such a program be upon the trend of the Nation toward militarism?

The East New York Savings Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle, which is self-explanatory:

BANK'S EIGHTIETH ANNIVERSARY

The Eagle congratulates the officers and directors of the East New York Savings Bank on the occasion of the eightieth birthday of that fine institution. It has a long history of service running back to a few years after the Civil War when life in east New York had Jamaica Turnpike as its center, a narrow highway then called the Plank Road.

When in 1869 the bank's first statement was issued its assets were $25,000. Today it is the country's eleventh largest savings bank with assets of $290,000,000. It opened its Eastern Parkway office in 1926, its Brownsville office in 1931. As the president of the bank for many years, former Judge Edward A. Richards has been a dominant figure in its steady growth and development.

Two Champions of Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial that appeared in the New York Sun on May 17, 1948:

TWO CHAMPIONS OF BOYS

The deaths within a space of about 24 hours of Dr. James E. West and the Right Reverend Monsignor Edward J. Flanagan take from youths, not only of the United States but of the entire world, two of their stanchest champions. Dr. West came from an orphanage where he had overcome a crippling malady to develop, as a young lawyer, such an interest in the social problems of children that he was invited to become chief executive of the newly incorporated Boy Scouts of America. That was in 1911, when the organization had 61,495 boys and leaders on its rolls. When, in 1943, he retired to the honorary post of Chief Scout, there were 1,553,080 active Scouts and leaders, and 10,769,041 other youths had had the valuable training the Boy Scouts provide.

Father Flanagan's work, although carried on within much smaller geographical limits, was also broad in its influence for good. With $90 borrowed to rent a house and with five homeless boys, three of them charged with delinquency, he in 1917 started Boys Town on the outskirts of Omaha, Nebr. Out of that has grown the town of 16 acres, administered by the boys themselves. Its work, as told in print and on the screen, has preached to a world-wide audience on Father Flanagan's text, "There is no such thing as a bad boy." It was significant that death came to him while he was in Germany to help General Clay solve the problems of German boys and after he had made a similar trip to Japan to advise General MacArthur. Boys everywhere have a better chance of success because they have had two such champions as these.

Mr. Speaker, our country has lost two great Americans. The good that they did in their lifetimes will long stand as a shining example of the right way to teach our youth the benefits of democracy and how to live peacefully with one another.

Co-ops Are Big Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William Clark, from the Chicago Tribune of May 9, 1948:

CO-OPS ARE BIG BUSINESS

(By William Clark)

The mammoth plant of the California & Hawaii Sugar Refining Co. overlooks San Pablo Bay at Crockett, Calif., some 20 miles north of San Francisco. It is the biggest sugar refinery in the world. The owning company has a net worth in excess of $20,000,000 and processes the output of nearly 85 percent of all sugar growers in the Hawaiian Islands.

C. & H., as it is known in the industry, is a large corporation. Its operations conform to the general pattern of other large corporations—with one important exception. It is a farmers' cooperative, and as such pays no Federal income tax.

California and Hawaii illustrates the manner in which the cooperative movement has risen from the farm community and the factory workers' meeting place to move in the sophisticated circles of big business. Coming with that rise, the question of the fairness of the cooperatives' Government-bestowed immunity from Federal income tax has assumed increasing importance.

Congressmen, and workers in conventional tax-paying industries, are taking an intent second look at cooperative organizations in an effort to determine what they have become, and how they got that way.

Some of the evidence is startling. Farm-marketing cooperatives handle 75 percent of all fluid milk sold in the United States. They market 55 percent of the citrus crop, 40 percent of the butter, 20 percent of the livestock, and 10 percent of the canned fruits and vegetables. The products of manufacturing cooperatives range from lipstick to insecticides. In the petroleum industry cooperatives operate 9 refineries, own more than 800 oil wells, and control at least 1,000 miles of pipe line.

The latest reports of the Bureau of Labor Statistics list 32,246 cooperative organizations with 20,971,934 members. Current business volume is estimated in excess of $13,000,000,000 annually. Government figures for 1945, the latest available, placed cooperative business volume at $7,182,185,000, but did not include transactions at the manufacturing and wholesale levels.

What is a cooperative? Basically it is an organization formed to sell the products of its members, or to buy goods for them. Some perform both functions. The members of a cooperative are its owners. In theory no profits, as such, accrue to the organization itself but are distributed to the members.

The present round of probes into cooperative organizations is based on allegations that what is true in theory about their profits, or lack thereof, is not the case in fact.

The modern cooperative movement is traced back to a band of weavers in Rochdale, England, who organized a cooperative in 1844 and adopted a set of basic rules known as the Rochdale principles which have guided the movement since. They provide that membership be open to all, that each member have one vote regardless of the number

of shares he owns, and that part of income be devoted to educational activities and expansion with a view toward achieving a new economic order.

The term "new economic order" is recurrent in cooperative literature, side by side with the kind of attack on capitalism and profits usually associated with collectivist groups.

"Cooperation is a radical movement," writes James P. Warbasse, president emeritus of the Cooperative League of the United States. "Those who desire that prevalent economic and social conditions should continue should not enter the cooperative movement.

"The conduct of directors and managers in large wholesale and other commercial departments of cooperation seem conservative. But this conservative tincture is natural. A movement which must carry on intimate relations with capitalistic commerce cannot proclaim its radicalism * * * the fact is not altered that these societies are carrying out the dream of the Rochdale pioneers—they are changing the methods of business."

From the standpoint of Federal taxation there are two principal types of cooperatives—exempt and nonexempt. A cooperative may apply for full exemption from the Federal income tax under section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code if it meets certain conditions—chiefly that most of its voting stock is owned by farmers, more than one-half of its business is transacted with farmer-members, and it gives members and nonmembers the same treatment in paying patronage dividends or price rebates.

It is also possible for a cooperative to avoid paying Federal income tax if it is in the nonexempt class, and here is the storm center of the cooperative controversy. In brief, the treasury asserts a patronage dividend, paid or credited to a member of a cooperative under a previously existing contractual arrangement, does not constitute income to the cooperative. Therefore the cooperative need pay no tax on it.

For example, a member of a cooperative may pay $10 for purchases in a given period. At the end of the period the management of the cooperative determines that the actual cost of that merchandise to the organization was only $9. The member then has $1 coming back to him as a patronage dividend.

He may get it in cash, or the directors of the cooperative may elect to give him a share of stock or certificate of indebtedness, or merely book credit, keeping the $1 to put back into the business. In any case that $1 is not considered taxable income to the cooperative, even when it is kept in the business and used to acquire additional assets.

There is no authority for this treatment of patronage dividends in the Internal Revenue Code. Generally considered, the most important competitive advantage given cooperatives, it climaxed a series of Treasury regulations promulgated to implement and interpret the revenue act.

These rulings, among other things, first applied the exemption law to farmers' purchasing cooperatives, although the law itself named only marketing cooperatives. They first gave exemption to cooperatives organized as corporations (about 80 percent of cooperative businesses are now legally incorporated).

The rulings also (1) permitted exempt cooperatives to act as principals in their own right and not as mere agents of members as required in the 1916 act; (2) permitted cooperatives to accumulate tax-free reserves; and (3) allowed tax-exempt cooperatives to do 50 percent of their business with nonmembers.

There are no official estimates of the amount of income taxes that would be collected if the treatment of patronage dividends were changed. The Treasury has commented, however, that removal of the full exemption status would bring in between ten and twenty million dollars of revenue annually.

Lowell Parker, former chief of staff for the joint committee on internal revenue taxation, has asserted that the loss of taxes from cooperatives of all types is about $300,000,000 annually. The present corporate income tax reaches 38 percent on incomes above $50,000.

Coordinated opposition to the tax status of cooperatives is a comparatively recent development. The cooperative movement, as was seen, is over a century old, but it emerged as big business in the United States only after the Revenue Act of 1916 and the Treasury regulations of the 'twenties.

In 1928 the California and Hawaii Sugar Refining Co. filed claim for refund of its 1927 tax on net income of $1,262,532 on the grounds it had become a farmers' cooperative. The Treasury allowed the claim, which moved then Representative Garner to take the floor of the House and say:

"You can see just what is happening since the Congress undertook to exempt from taxation cooperative farm organizations in this country. These corporations (the corporate owners of C. & H.) have organized for the purpose of avoiding payments of income tax, and the record shows they are making millions of dollars, and up to 1926 had paid more than $1,000,000 in income tax."

Most cooperatives put heavy emphasis on ideals of service in explaining their plans of organization, but William B. Tyler, vice president and general counsel of C. & H., added weight to Garner's argument in testimony before the House Small Business Committee in San Francisco last fall.

"What was your purpose in wanting to become a wholly tax exempt agricultural cooperative?" he was asked by the chairman.

"To save taxes." Tyler replied.

The small business committee is one of two congressional groups that has probed deeply into the question of cooperatives' tax advantages in the last year. The other is the House Committee on Ways and Means, headed by Representative KNUTSON, Republican, Minnesota. Neither committee has made a report of conclusions, but both are expected to make recommendations for incorporation into whatever general revision of tax laws the present Congress effects.

Information placed before these committees shows the surprising growth and diversification of interests achieved by cooperatives. Consumers Cooperative Association, Inc., of North Kansas City, Mo., for example, did nearly $38,500,000 of business last year. More than $22,500,000 of its sales were of products made in its own factories. Its earnings were $3,800,000 against $1,665,298 in 1946.

The company voluntarily abandoned its total exemption status as of last September 1. Until then it had been classed as a fully exempt farmers' cooperative, its line of farm equipment including oil, tires, tubes, accessories, paint, spray, roofing, household appliances, and service station apparatus.

By abandoning its full tax exemption, Consumers will be allowed to do more than 50 percent of its business with nonmembers. It will have to pay income tax on this nonmember business and on net earnings distributed as dividends on outstanding stock. However, it is urging members to exchange their stock, distributed as patronage dividends in the past or sold to acquire more capital, for new certificates of indebtedness in 5- and 10-year maturities.

"The interest paid by CCA on loans—which is really what these certificates of indebtedness are—is an expense item to CCA," explained Glenn S. Fox, finance director. "Interest paid on shares, both common and preferred, is not an expense and must come out of net savings. For this reason CCA won't be paying income tax on the money paid out as interest on the certificates of indebtedness."

The California Fruit Growers' Exchange, well known through its trade name Sunkist, markets more than 85 percent of all lemons sold in the country and more than half of the oranges and grapefruit. In 1941 the Department of Justice brought civil action against Sunkist and others, charging them with conspiracy to fix prices and restrain trade in the citrus industry. The defendants denied their guilt but agreed to the entry of a consent decree enjoining them from further violations of the antitrust laws.

The Farmers' Union Grain Terminal Association, a marketing cooperative, began with $30,000 capital in 1938. Eight years later it had a net worth of more than $10,000,000. It markets grain in 39 States for more than 100,000 members and pays patronage dividends in stock and certificates of equity. Its 1946 net earnings, income-tax-free, exceeded $3,500,000.

Cooperatives are prone to avoid the terms "net earnings" and "profits" where possible. This is illustrated to some extent by testimony before the Knutson committee of M. J. Briggs, general manager of the Indiana Farm Bureau Cooperative Association, Inc. Asked if 78 oil wells recently disposed of by the cooperative were sold at a profit, Briggs said he "could not answer."

"Can you tell the committee whether or not the oil wells were sold * * * at a sum greater than the investment therein?" asked one of the probers.

"Yes," Briggs conceded.

"What was the additional income to the Farm Bureau?"

"Probably $1,000,000."

"Was there a capital-gains tax paid on that increase in value?" the questioner persisted.

"No," said Briggs.

There are many other cooperative organizations whose operations are region-wide or Nation-wide in scope, and a few who engage in international trade. In the year following World War II, nearly 3,000,000 gallons of co-op motor oils were sold to cooperatives in foreign countries.

Spokesmen for the cooperatives build their strongest legal case around the identity of patronage dividends. Reminded that corporate profits are taxable, both as corporation income and later on, when stockholders receive the dividends, as individual income, Karl D. Loos, economist for a group of cooperatives, offered this explanation to the Knutson committee:

"I think there is a distinction (between regular corporate dividends and the cooperative's patronage dividends). The money taxed to the private corporation is in transit; it ultimately goes to the stockholders as investors. * * * In the case of the patronage refund, that goes from the patron to the cooperative subject to the obligation to return it to him. And it goes back to the same one who paid it. It is not going to a third party."

To this argument, the opponents of tax exemption repeat the list of cooperatives who actually keep the excess of income to plow back into the business, and assert that despite the legal clothing under which cooperatives operate, they are really business entities doing business in the same manner as their tax paying competitors.

Last winter Representative KNUTSON, in the course of a hearing, took a moment to comment on transactions of consumers cooperatives association involving oil refineries, pipe lines, and a soft drink bottling plant.

"The chair can well understand why you increased your assets in 1946 from $16,453,161

to $24,804,624 in 12 months," he said to F. R. Olmsted, CCA's general counsel. "It appears that your organization has gone pretty far from the original intent of Congress.

"What so many of you ignore is the huge national debt. Our budget is up in the thirty billions of dollars. We are spending billions of dollars to stop the march of communism. And here at home we are carrying on an active program, subsidized by the Government, that will ultimately lead to the socialization of this country. You are an intelligent man. You know that is true"

"That is right," Olmsted admitted.

"It is inevitable that it will lead to socialization," KNUTSON continued. "Here we have an instance where a tax-exempt organization has increased its assets in 1 year from $16,000,000 to $24,000,000. * * * Where are we going to get the money to run this Government? Where is this tax exemption going to stop?"

Foresight and Courage—Statements and Warnings Regarding Communist Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, if our Nation ever needed foresight and courage in its Government, it is now. Had our Nation's leaders demonstrated foresight and courage in the last 14 years we would not be facing a third world war.

It is not easy to demonstrate foresight and courage. Usually to do so, one must buck a misinformed public, a misinformed press, bought-and-paid-for radio commentators, Government-paid propagandists, and a well-financed "smear bund" that specializes in character assassination. These smearing groups never answer your logic or facts. They only resort to personal smear and character assassination.

I want at this time to take the people of the Nation through the developments of the last 14 years that led up to the coming conflict between Communist Russia and the United States of America. I want to point out clearly my part in trying to avoid this conflict. It is a conflict inflicted by our own stupid leadership. The part I played was not a popular one. It was not an easy one. Like most leaders in Washington, I could have kept still and floated along with the tide. But I did not do so. I faced the facts and had the foresight and courage to issue warning after warning regardless of the consequences and the character assassination by the Communist "smear bund" and their blind puppets.

Here is the record of where I stood and what I said for the past 14 years:

In 1934, when Roosevelt recognized Communist Russia and embraced Russia with open arms, O'KONSKI said:

The United States of America has started on a course that invites the destruction of our form of Government. Embracing Communist Russia opens wide the gate in our country for a fifth column and spy ring rights in our own Government. Pro-Communists will now occupy important seats in our Government. Communist taking over of our Government is now simplified. It has the encouragement of the President of the United States. Within a dozen years the people of America will pay a heavy price for this brazen and suicidal action.

In 1937–38, when Russia attacked Finland and tried to take over Spain, O'KONSKI said:

Russia's aim to communize the world is now clear. Finland and Spain are merely an introduction to what lies ahead. If the leaders of the United States of America were concerned about the future of the world, all shipments of money and goods to Russia should now be stopped. What is more the United States of America should put its foot down and break political and trade relations with Russia, unless she stops her beastly conquest at once. Appeasement of Russia now means we will have to fight her in the near future. Russia is waging war because the United States of America is foolish enough to send her money and goods.

In 1938–41, when Russia and Hitler together were butchering Europe, O'KONSKI said:

The United States of America must now use rare and good judgment. Hitler and Stalin will never get along. Soon they will be at each others throats. In this coming death struggle between Hitler and Stalin, the United States of America must not take sides. These two dictators must be maneuvered into destroying each other. Then and only then will there be peace on earth. If the United States of America joins anyone to destroy the other we will commit national suicide. If either Hitler or Stalin survives the coming conflict we will have an enemy so strong that the outcome will be another world conflict and world war III.

In 1942 to 1944, when the United States of America was sending its best war equipment to Russia while our own boys were bleeding and dying in the Pacific without planes or arms, O'KONSKI said:

It is evident now that in our top positions in our Government there are key men who are more interested in Communist Russia's victory than our own victory over Japan. If our national leaders think Russia will help us fight Japan they ought to have their heads examined. Right now, Russia is sending war materials to Japan that are being used to kill our own boys. The least our Government can do is to refuse to ship help to Russia until Russia stops helping the Japs. Our stupid policy is building Communist Russia to a point where they are already telling us where to go and what to do. The time will soon come when our national leaders will be compelled to give an accounting for this action. Can it be that there are already more Communists than Americans in high places in our Government.

In 1942 to 1944, when lend-lease bill was up giving $6,000,000,000 of war materials to Russia, O'KONSKI said:

Never will I vote to give $6,000,000,000 in war materials to a future enemy. Mark you these same war materials will some day be used against us. What can our President be thinking of. What are we getting from Russia in return for these war materials? What agreement is our President getting from Communist Russia that these war supplies will not be used by Stalin to take over all Europe and eventually us too? Anybody who votes to send $6,000,000,000 of war supplies to Russia without any agreement concerning the future is voting for $6,000,000,000 of war goods to be used against our own boys in the very near future.

In 1944–45, when Germany was ready to surrender and end the war with the United States of America and I introduced a bill to investigate what was the real purpose behind the war, O'KONSKI said:

It is clear now that the purpose of this war is not the defeat of Germany but the building up of Communist Russia. The Morgenthau plan is a crime on civilization. To pulverize Germany when they are ready to surrender to us is uncivilized. To allow our sons to be killed in Europe when the enemy wants to negotiate for peace is criminal. Do the Communists have such control over the White House that Communist Russia means more to them than the lives of our own sons? It is time that the White House made known that the purpose of this war is not to defeat Germany but to build up Communist Russia.

In 1945, when Roosevelt gave the small countries of Europe to Stalin at Yalta, O'KONSKI said:

To any intelligent American the picture is now clear. This is not a war for freedom. This is not a war for the Atlantic Charter. When Roosevelt handed over the small nations of Europe to Stalin he betrayed America. He betrayed the sons who died fighting for a cause. The picture is clear. The White House is controlled by Communists and not Americans. Today it is Latvia, Finland, Estonia, Lithuania, and Poland. Tomorrow it will be Italy, France, Norway, and Sweden. Soon Stalin will take all Europe and then try us. The sell-out of the small countries of Europe to Stalin is the crime of the ages. America will pay a heavy price and soon for this betrayal. With this kind of sell-out in Europe within a year every country in Europe will be threatened by Stalin and taken over by Stalin. At Yalta, Roosevelt laid the seeds for world war III because free people the world over will soon wake up and fight Communist aggression.

In 1945–46, when the first UNNRA bill was up, giving $2,000,000,000 to Europe to be supervised by Communists, O'KONSKI said:

This is not a relief measure. This is a bill to build up communism in Europe. This bill, if passed, will give $2,000,000,000 to Communists in Europe to spread communism in Europe. We have already given the Communists of Europe $14,000,000,000. Why give them $2,000,000,000 more? Why call it a relief measure? This is a bill planned by Communists to help communism.

In 1946, when the second UNNRA $2,000,000,000 bill was up for passage, O'KONSKI said:

Here is another underhanded act to finance world communism. Mark you, that this money and goods will be used against us and soon. The whole UNNRA organization is infiltrated with Communists. This money will be used to turn Europe into a Communist camp. Only Communists will be helped by this bill. It is obvious that there are those in high places in our Government who want Communist Russia to take over the world, with the help of our goods and money.

In 1946, when an Export-Import Bank loan and when a $10,000,000,000 loan to Russia was being advocated, O'KONSKI said:

This is the last straw. If Congress approves more gifts to Russia they are voting to destroy America. Just what forces are

controlling our Nation's leaders? Is there a deliberate plan to hand the United States of America over to Stalin, lock, stock and barrel? What can our leaders be thinking of? Has Stalin's smile captivated our Nation's leaders completely? Is there anybody so stupid to think that Communist Russia is our friend and ally? Already with our money and goods we have built Russia to a point of danger. What really lies behind those who want to give her more?

In 1946, when a bill was up appropriating money to rebuild Germany, O'KONSKI said:

The people should know that while the White House is asking for money to help Germany, our leaders in Germany are still dismantling German industries and giving them to Russians. Why should we spend more money in Germany when in the end most of it will go to Russia? Some day and soon the United States of America will need Germany and its people. Can't our leaders muster enough courage to stop the further rape of Germany by the Russians?

In 1947, when the $400,000,000 Greek-Turkish loan was up for consideration, O'KONSKI said:

Never has our Nation been led so stupidly as it has been for the past 14 years. First they give Stalin $14,000,000,000 of war goods. Now these same leaders ask for $400,000,000 to stop Stalin in Greece and Turkey. To a sane person this is tragic. And while Truman is asking $400,000,000 to stop Stalin in Greece and Turkey, he still permits sending war supplies to Russia. Today, right now, with Stalin threatening Greece and Turkey, boatloads of war supplies from the U. S. A. are still going to Russia. As a Member of Congress I would lose my self-respect if I voted for this bill. Why can't the White House make up its mind. Are we going to stop Stalin or are we going to help Stalin? The American people can't afford to do both.

In 1948, when the Marshall plan was being considered in Congress, O'KONSKI said:

This is supposed to be a bill to stop Stalin in Europe. Yet today three boatloads of war supplies are being loaded in a New Jersey harbor to go to Stalin. Since January 1 to now, 3 months, more than 70 boatloads of war potentials were sent to Russia by the U. S. A. Here we are being asked to spend $17,000,000,000 to stop Stalin in Europe. Yet our President and our State Department permit sending 70 boatloads of war potentials to Russia in the last 3 months. Just what is our leadership up to?

In May 1948 President Truman asks for draft, universal military training, and said there is little hope for peace between Russia and the United States of America; world war III is an accepted fact. We built a monster with our own money and war materials. O'KONSKI has the right to say:

I had the foresight and courage to fight against this for 14 years. But most of the people were too taken up with White House and State Department propaganda. After all, they had billions of dollars to get their propaganda to the people. I had nothing but my voice and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which few get and fewer yet read.

So today Communist Russia, a monster financed by American money and strengthened by American war supplies, threatens to conquer the world. Today we are being asked to draft boys to stop a monster we ourselves built.

Boalsburg, Pa., Is the Birthplace of Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Boalsburg, Pa., is just about in the geographical center of the great Keystone State and is in my congressional district.

Those who have visited this typical American community will recall seeing a plain little marker by the side of the road, which reads as follows: "Boalsburg, An American Village—Birthplace of Memorial Day."

Mr. Herbert G. Moore, when writing for the May 1948 issue of the National Republic Magazine, fully described the community of Boalsburg and the events that led to the first Memorial Day, May 30, 1864.

I am pleased to insert at this point Mr. Moore's article:

BOALSBURG AND OUR FIRST MEMORIAL DAY

(By Herbert G. Moore)

Boalsburg is a quaint little village situated in Centre County, Pa., just off Route 322, in the picturesque foothills of the Alleghenies. It's only a dot on the map, and you as a casual traveler might drive past it without even being aware that it nestled there in the rolling valley beneath a coverlet of oaks and pines and cedars—were it not for a plain little marker by the side of the road: "Boalsburg, An American Village—Birthplace of Memorial Day."

That sign will cause you to stop, and having stopped, you'll tarry. For there you'll learn that there is an America that lies beyond the teeming cities and the towering skyscrapers and the belching smokestacks. The news you read in your daily paper may come from Washington and Wall Street and Hollywood and all the busy metropolises in between, but America—the real America—is lived in such towns as this. Many of us, I'm afraid, never get to know this part of America; few of us make any effort to know it. And that's unfortunate, because it's in villages like Boalsburg that we find the things that made this Nation great—and that are likely to keep it that way. An American village. I like the sound of those words.

You'll learn that the hamlet was named for David Boal, a native of County Antrim in Ireland, who settled here in 1798. A long line of Scotch and Irish pioneers followed—and a few Germans, too. But there have always been Boals, it seems. The people will tell you about John Boal, in whose honor an iron urn stands in the village square, and Pierre de Lagarde Boal, one of the community's most distinguished sons and a career diplomat. And, of course, there was Col. Theodore Boal, a hero of World War I, who upon returning home began to plan a great military shrine to the members of Pennsylvania's Twenty-eighth Division. He brought with him from France trophies picked up on Flanders Field and which were now set in stone bases to the memory of each man who died in battle. Upon the colonel's death in 1938 the shrine was turned over to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as a permanent memorial to all her fighting men, and each year Memorial Day services are conducted in the shrine chapel. Could there be a grander and more fitting place for the people to remember their boys than this "American Village"?

I believe it's impossible to visit Boalsburg without coming away a better American. For instance, you'll come upon a little roadside shrine, which is inscribed: "This simple cross, found broken in the debris of an obliterated French village through which our troops passed, is erected to the memory of our comrades. They died in France for liberty."

Instinct tells you that those words were written by people who believe in only one ism—Americanism. Somehow you know that such people will never listen to the Henry Wallaces who embrace a strange philosophy and who preach a hyphenated form of loyalty—and it makes you feel good inside.

Then there's the old Boalsburg Tavern, which was built in 1819 and has been in continuous operation ever since. It appears today just as it did back in the days when stagecoaches used to stop at its door on their way west out of the King's Highway. And inside you'll find the old Pennsylvania Dutch furniture and the great black iron cooking utensils hanging in the huge fireplaces.

Yes, it's a quaint little village, this Boalsburg, and it's all part of a rich American heritage. But what about that boast of being the "Birthplace of Memorial Day"? It happened on May 30, 1864—or so the townspeople will tell you. It was a pleasant, sunny day, too, and in the little community burial ground behind the village the pioneers of colonial times slept peacefully side by side with the recently fallen heroes of the Civil War.

It was this day that a pretty, young teen-age girl, Emma Hunter by name, chose to gather some garden flowers and to place them on the grave of her father, a colonel who had been fatally wounded while commanding Pennsylvania's gallant Forty-ninth Regiment at the Battle of Gettysburg. And it was this very same day that an older woman, a Mrs. Meyers, elected to strew wild flowers on the grave of her 19-year-old son, Joe, who, as a private in the ranks, had likewise fallen in this decisive battle in the War Between the States.

And so the two met, kneeling figures at nearby graves, a young girl honoring her officer father, a young mother paying respects to her enlisted-man son, each with a basket of flowers which she had picked with loving hands. And they got to talking. The mother proudly told the girl what a fine young man her son had been, how he had dropped his farm duties and enlisted in the Union Army at the outbreak of the war, and how bravely he had fought—she knew it was bravely—until he had been wounded during the first day at Gettysburg. Joe had been an only son, and it was a staggering loss—but she was mighty proud, too.

The daughter respectfully took a few of her flowers as a token and placed them on the son's grave. The mother in turn laid some of her freshly cut blooms on the father's grave. So far as is known the two families had not known each other prior to this day, their paths had never before crossed, but in death the colonel and the private had found a way of bringing their survivors together. These two women had found in their common grief a common bond as they knelt together in that little burial ground in central Pennsylvania where Mount Nittany stands eternal guard over those who sleep there. Nor did they realize at the time that their meeting had any particular significance—outside of their own personal lives; it was just that they seemed to lighten their burdens by sharing them. But as it happened these two women were participating in their first Memorial Day service—or so the good people of Boalsburg will tell you.

For the story goes that before the two women left each other that spring day in

1864 they had agreed to meet again on the same day the following year in order to honor not only their own two loved ones, but others who now might have no one left to kneel at their lonely graves. During the weeks and months that followed the two women discussed their little plan with friends and neighbors, and all heard it with enthusiasm. The result was that on May 30, 1865—the appointed day—what had been planned as a little informal meeting of two women turned into a community service. All Boalsburg was gathered there, a clergyman—Dr. George Hall—preached a sermon, and every grave in the little cemetery was decorated with flowers and flags; not a single one was neglected.

It must have been an impressive ceremony that took place that day in this peaceful mountain-rimmed valley where not so long before the red men had held their councils. It must have been such a scene as this that inspired Longfellow to write:

"Your silent tents of green
We deck with fragrant flowers;
Yours has the suffering been,
The memory shall be ours."

It seemed such a fitting and proper way of remembering those who had passed on that the custom became an annual event in Boalsburg, and one by one neighboring communities adopted a similar plan of observing a "Decoration Day" each spring. On May 5, 1868, just 4 years after that first meeting in the little burial ground, Gen. John A. Logan, then commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, issued an order naming May 30, 1868, as a day "for the purpose of strewing with flowers or otherwise decorating the graves of comrades who died in defense of their country." He signed the order "with the hope that it will be kept up from year to year."

And so it has. Rhode Island made the day a legal holiday in 1874, Vermont in 1876, New Hampshire in 1877. State after State followed until now May 30 is a day consecrated to honoring our glorious dead in every American Territory—Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the Canal Zone—in the District of Columbia, and in all but a few of the Southern States. Ceremonies at first were held to honor only those who had served the Union cause in the Civil War, later the program was broadened to embrace the men who fought in gray as well as in blue, finally to include all heroes who have made the supreme sacrifice in all American conflicts from the Revolutionary War to World War II. Which, of course, is as it should be if Holmes' immortal words are not to become an empty, meaningless phrase—"One flag, one land, one heart, one hand, one nation evermore."

As a matter of fact, Memorial Day—and it should be noted that in 1882 the GAR urged that the "proper designation of May 30 is Memorial Day," not Decoration Day—is now observed by most people as a day when we pay respect to all who have died, in war or in peace, as soldiers or as civilians. To a very large extent Memorial Day has lost its purely military significance and in a broader sense has become the one day in the year when all of us pause in respectful tribute to those who have walked these paths before.

Of course, some people will tell you that this custom of honoring the dead originated in the South. And in a way this is true. Many southern women did strew flowers on the graves of their fallen heroes—no doubt many northern women did too—and several of the Southern States still observe their own dates. Louisiana formerly observed Confederate Memorial Day on June 3, the birthday of Jefferson Davis. This was more recently changed to April 26, a date also observed by Alabama, Florida, Georgia, and Mississippi, while in North Carolina and South Carolina the day is May 10. Virginia has adopted the same day as the North, but it's called Confederate Memorial Day.

But all this does not necessarily conflict with the story told by the people in Boalsburg, and does not weaken the claim which they so proudly make. This writer now has no way of verifying the facts; I cannot state with certainty that there was any connection between the order issued by General Logan in 1868 and the events in the Boalsburg cemetery that day in 1864; I know only what the people tell me. But somehow I like to believe—and I do believe—that Memorial Day, as we know it and observe it generally today, was born in that tiny Pennsylvania graveyard on the outskirts of "An American Village," when a proud mother and a grieving daughter met to scatter flowers over the final resting places of a brave son and a gallant father.

"An American Village." Yes; I like the sound of those words.

Hon. Charles L. Gifford

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. DONALD W. NICHOLSON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 17, 1948

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. CHARLES L. GIFFORD, late a Representative from the State of Massachusetts

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to know the late Honorable CHARLES L. GIFFORD throughout the long years of his duties as a public servant, in the Massachusetts Legislature, and in the House of Representatives of the Congress. He was an outspoken, courageous man who had the best interests of his country at heart. He carried on the traditions of the people from whom he came—the solid, substantial citizens of Cape Cod.

One of the qualities of CHARLIE GIFFORD that I remember best was his ability to gain the confidence of young people. He could talk to them as easily and as intimately as he could talk with the Members of Congress, where he gave such valuable service for one-quarter of a century.

There is little need for me to extoll his virtues to the Members of this body because most of you knew him and could express your sentiments better than I. I do know that the people of this great Republic need more men of the caliber of Congressman GIFFORD

The people of the Ninth Congressional District of Massachusetts recognized these qualities and the deep affection which they held for him is best exemplified in the following editorial which appeared in the New Bedford Standard Times on the occasion of his death:

CHARLIE GIFFORD IS DEAD

The news stories will call him Congressman CHARLES L. GIFFORD, of the Ninth Massachusetts District, but his friends know him better. They know that 25 years in Washington never changed him from the friendly, witty CHARLIE GIFFORD they knew as State representative, school teacher, and cranberry grower. And they will miss him as a friend as much as they will miss him as their living link with the Nation's Capital.

It was his warm human touch that endeared him to thousands and made everyone of them feel just as important as the so-called "big men" in Washington whom he also knew. He was fond of telling about these big men, but never in a boastful way. To him they were full of human frailties, like everyone else. In CHARLIE GIFFORD's mind the little fellows were just as important, and he made them feel that way.

A close student of Government finance, it was his fate to serve his district through Republican prosperity days, the depression, the costly war era, and the postwar readjustment period. In all that time, he never wavered in his support of businesslike expenditure of the public's money and opposition to the growth of bureaucracy.

Perhaps his outstanding trait was his desire to serve his constituents as they wanted him to serve. Repeatedly he would ask, "What do you want me to do? Let me hear from you," in regard to a current issue. He tried as hard as any other Congressman to learn the sentiments and wishes of his district and to vote accordingly.

CHARLIE GIFFORD's sturdy character and affable, approachable manner will be greatly missed. He was a public servant who did his best to serve the public.

Stassen-Dewey Debate Nixon-Mundt Bill, Outlawing the Communist Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks I include the entire report of the Stassen-Dewey debate as it appeared in the New York Times of May 17 because of the wide national interest it evoked and because of the public interest in the Nixon-Mundt bill outlawing the Communist Party. That this bill in its present form outlaws the Communist Party is clear to any person who reads the bill. Section 4 provides:

It shall be unlawful for any person to attempt in any manner to establish in the United States a totalitarian dictatorship the direction and control of which is to be vested in or, exercised by or under the domination or control, of any foreign government, foreign organization or foreign individual.

Thus, by reference to the provisions of the bill, which is the conclusive test of what it does, and ignoring what some individual may say or claim the bill does or does not do, we see that this quoted section 4 of the bill would make illegal the Communist Party in the United States as it is presently constituted and operating. Since it would make it illegal it would outlaw it. You do not have to name an outlaw by name to outlaw him. Jesse James was an outlaw because what he did was illegal under the law. It did not require an act of any legislative body to say "Jesse James is an outlaw." Here the Communist Party would be outlawed because what it is presently doing would be made illegal.

The news report follows:

UNITED STATES HEARS STASSEN AND DEWEY DEBATE—NEW YORKER ASSERTS HIS RIVAL, IN BACKING ANTI-RED BILL, SURRENDERS ON ISSUE

PORTLAND, OREG., May 17.—Harold E. Stassen invited Gov. Thomas E. Dewey tonight to support the Mundt-Nixon bill dealing with Communist activities and said such a pledge

of unequivocal support would satisfy him that the two rivals for the Republican Presidential nomination were in agreement on outlawing the Communist Party.

Governor Dewey, winding up an hour-long radio debate with the Minnesotan, promptly accused him of complete surrender. For the New Yorker said, both the author of the Mundt bill and its sponsoring committee had specifically said that the measure did not outlaw the party.

The candidates, who have been stumping the farthest reaches of Oregon in a drive to win the State's 12 delegates to the Republican convention, faced each other before a small studio audience while the Nation listened in.

They correlated in 20-minute opening arguments all of the persuasive points they had been hammering home in their campaigns. Then, in rebuttal speeches of 8½ minutes each, they tore at each other's contentions.

The Mundt-Nixon bill, which soon became a focal point of argument, was first brought into the debate by Mr. Stassen, who took the affirmative of the question, Shall the Communist Party in the United States be outlawed? He voiced the belief that it would pass Congress in the near future in a form that will definitely outlaw these Communist organizations in both their undergrcund and overground activities.

Governor Dewey sprang to object that his opponent had quoted, in support of a belief that the party would be outlawed under the bill, only "the head of the Communist Party, which is not a very good authority."

Actually, he said, Representative KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, the measure's author, had announced that the bill did not outlaw the party, that he did not look with favor on outlawing it, and that such a step would merely drive the Communists underground.

The Committee on Un-American Activities, backing the bill, likewise had warned that illegalization might drive the party underground, the Governor added.

"The Mundt bill obviously doesn't outlaw the Communist Party," Mr. Dewey asserted. "Mr. Stassen has covered the country from New Jersey to Oregon contending the Communist Party should be outlawed. If Mr. Stassen says all he wanted is my support for the Mundt bill, then he has completely surrendered. For he admits he didn't mean it when he stumped the country from one end to the other."

Mr. Stassen quoted from the bill itself and held that its provisions were sufficient to outlaw the party as now constituted.

The Minnesotan, who opened the debate before fewer than 100 persons in radio station KEX of the American Broadcasting Co., contended that giving legality to the Communist Party aided in building up communism's underground strength.

This, he said, was true in Czechoslovakia, Poland, and other European countries, but it was true as well in Canada and in New York, Mr. Dewey's own State, which had more than one-fourth of the country's Communists.

Coddling of Communists, he contended, increas d the likelihood of war, and he could see no justice in continuing to give legality to a party while the country was taking steps to draft free men in time of peace to build up defenses against Communist aggression. Outlawing the party, he held, would be a move in the direction of peace.

The historic occasion gave Mr. Stassen, former Governor of Minnesota, and advocate of outlawing communism as a primary step toward dealing with its infiltration into American life, an opportunity of repeating in the presence of Governor Dewey his oft-made charge that the New Yorker had distorted his rival's views and then attacked them.

It gave Governor Dewey a chance to marshal anew, as his opponent watched and listened, his arguments that outlawing the Communist Party would violate the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, would itself be immoral and totalitarian, and would not work.

It was one issue on which the Republican rivals had been at direct odds. After many days of negotiations, during which debate plans were discussed and all but dropped, they made the most of their meeting, which took place in the studio of radio station KEX of the American Broadcasting Co., with a small audience on hand. It was broadcast nationally over the networks of ABC and the Mutual and National Broadcasting Cos.

The rivals went to the studio in advance of the 6 p. m. (10 p. m. eastern standard time) opening hour to pose for news photographers and newsreel men. Contrary to an earlier decision, picture-taking was permitted during the actual debate, although flash bulbs were banned.

The jockeying for advantageous position which had marked the long negotiations continued right up to the debate hour. Governor Dewey released at mid-afternoon an advance text of his main presentation, but with notice to the press that he reserved the right to change or alter any part of it during the debate.

The absence at that hour of an advance text of Mr. Stassen's speech was explained by aides on the ground not only that it was not ready but also that if it were handed out ahead of time it would give Mr. Dewey an opportunity to use his main speech as well as his rebuttal period to rebut the Minnesotan's opening arguments.

Mr. Stassen, as upholder of the affirmative, was the first speaker and Governor Dewey, at his own insistence, had the last rebuttal despite the fact that he was on the negative side. The debate was set up entirely on the New Yorker's terms.

Reporters watched the principals and their advisers from two places in the studio. The nonwriting press—that is, publishers, columnists and others who either do not write or did not have to write immediately—occupied four rows of seats in the same room with the debaters.

The active press—reporters who wrote with typewriters on their laps as they watched the proceedings—sat in five tiers of seats overlooking the platform, but separated from it by a glass partition. Fifty-six persons were in this room and six in an adjoining sponsor's booth.

Donald R. Van Boskirk, chairman of the Multnomah County Republican Central Committee, who had presided over the negotiations, served as moderator.

In presenting his case for outlawing the Communist Party Mr. Stassen contended that continuing to consider it legal aided in promoting doubt that Communist organizations in this country were directed from Moscow.

Communist organizations, he went on, have taken every legal advantage extended to them in bringing such nations as Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Rumania under the Kremlin's domination.

CHARGES "QUISLING CLIQUES"

He argued that in all of these countries a legally authorized Communist organization was used to win a vantage point in government, then ruthlessly to break agreements, violate laws and moralities, and finally seize complete control.

Mr. Stassen denounced Communist organizations as "actually fifth columns," not political parties.

"They are Quisling cliques," he went on. "If we are to have the best chance of winning through freedom without the horror of a third world war, the free countries must take action to protect themselves against this fifth column in this unsettled period which has been called a cold war."

This country, he said in his opening speech, lacked "any law to effectively oppose the actions of these Communist organizations either overground or underground."

"There is now no law in America," Mr. Stassen asserted, "to prevent these Communist organizations from secretly developing organizations of hidden members from carrying on secret conspiracies to promote strikes, to stir up hatred between races and religions in America, and from following the directions from Moscow.

"Neither is there any present law to prevent the Communist organizations from maintaining large offices with telephone switchboards and a network of communications to be used in reaching and coordinating these underground activities and in recruiting new members."

Mr. Stassen made it clear he was insisting on maintenance of "complete constitutional rights and liberties in America," including rights of free speech, free press, freedom of conscience, and freedom of religion.

"But there is no constitutional right," he argued, "to carry on organizations above ground or below ground directed by the rulers of a foreign power for the purpose of overthrowing the Government of the United States and taking away the liberties of the people."

The law he advocated, Mr. Stassen said, "would not outlaw ideas, it would not outlaw thoughts" but it "would make illegal organized conspiracies of fifth columns." Such a law was constitutional, he submitted, under article IV, section 4 of the Federal Constitution.

Mr. Stassen finally had a chance to confront Governor Dewey in person in this campaign with the statement, which he has repeated with apparent relish before many audiences, that New York itself has been following a soft, unrealistic policy of dealing with communism, with the asserted result that more than one-fourth of the Communists in the country now were operating in that state.

It was evident there, he argued, that they had taken every advantage and at the same time continued to work underground.

The Minnesotan objected to the "coddling" of Communists on the grounds that this attitude eased the way for the ideology's spread, that it increased the likelihood of war by giving the Kremlin a mistaken opinion of the strength of its own infiltration, and that other free nations were likely to follow our own example with serious results.

Mr. Stassen argued that it was unrealistic to say that outlawing the party would drive the Communists underground, for their greatest activity and power already was below the surface.

Nor could he see the justice in continuing to give legality to the Communist Party while the country was taking steps to draft freemen in time of peace to build up defenses against Communist aggression. Outlawing the party would be a move in the direction of peace, he argued.

He asked Governor Dewey four direct questions:

"Do you agree that the Communist organizations throughout the world are directed from Moscow?

"Do you agree that the objective of the Communist organizations throughout the world is to overthrow free governments, destroy liberties, and bring the countries under the domination of the Kremlin?

"Do you agree that Communist organizations throughout the world are a menace to future peace?

"Do you agree that because of this menace to world peace it is necessary that we require American young men to serve in our armed forces and to take training?

GOVERNOR ANSWERS QUERIES

The first three questions were repeated by Governor Dewey as he began his main

speech with a tribute to his rival's "eloquent discussion," and he answered each of them with an emphatic "certainly."

He paraphrased the fourth question and said: "This entirely begs the question."

It was not a question, he went on, whether anyone was interested in helping Communists to preserve their liberties. Interest, he asserted, is "in preserving this country from being destroyed in the development of underground organizations which would grow so colossally in strength if they were outlawed" as to make it necessary to draft "all young men in the Nation."

Governor Dewey, in demanding that the party be kept out in the open, inveighed against a step which, he argued, would mean that to defeat a totalitarian system this country would adopt totalitarian methods.

Mr. Stassen's proposal not only would not work in this country, he asserted, but would advance the cause of communism rapidly throughout the world.

In his prepared text, Mr. Dewey warned that "this glib proposal to outlaw the Communist Party would be quickly recognized everywhere as an abject surrender by the great United States to the methods of totalitarianism."

"As I have watched the repeated proposal of this easy panacea of getting rid of ideas we do not like by passing a law, I have been increasingly shocked," he went on.

"Stripped to its naked essentials this is nothing but the method of Hitler and Stalin. It is thought control borrowed from the Japanese war leadership. It is an attempt to beat down ideas with a club. It is surrender of everything we believe in. It is a philosophy which I shall fight to the limit of my strength."

CITES CANADA EXPERIENCE

Governor Dewey looked to Russia, to Italy, and to Canada in support of his contention that outlawing the Communist Party would not work. When Canada outlawed the party in 1931, the members went completely underground, the program collapsed of its own weight, and the law was repealed 5 years later, he said.

But Canada, he added, tried the same thing again during the World War when Hitler and Stalin were allied, with the result that although the Communist Party evaporated overnight, Communist treason was harder to catch than ever and the Communists succeeded in developing in the atomic energy field the greatest spy ring in modern history.

Governor Dewey voiced the opinion that the Federal Bureau of Investigation already knew every one of the really important Communist leaders in this country and said that "if we had a national administration that wanted to move, it could and would move today to convict them and get rid of them."

THE STASSEN-DEWEY DEBATE

Excerpts from the speeches made by Governor Dewey and Harold E. Stassen in their debate in Portland, Oreg., last night as broadcast by the Mutual Broadcasting System follow:

Dewey: "I submit that a new law is needed. It should directly make it illegal to carry on any organization, either above ground or below, which is directed by the rulers of a foreign power for the purpose of overthrowing the Government of the United States, destroying the liberties of its people and bringing this country under the domination of the rulers of a foreign power. Such a law would not outlaw ideas; it would not outlaw thoughts; it would make illegal organized conspiracy of fifth columns. Such a law is constitutional under article 4, section 4 of the United States Constitution. [Mr. Stassen] asked me four questions:

"1. Do you agree that the Communist organizations in the world today are under the direction of the Kremlin in Moscow? Certainly.

"2. Do you agree that the world Communist organization is a threat to world peace? Certainly.

"3. Do you agree that the objectives of these Communist organizations is to destroy the liberties of other men? Certainly.

"Finally, fourthly, if you agree to these things, under what provisions of the Constitution—as I glance at my quick notes here—and what legal action are you against outlawing them when we are drafting young men in time of peace to build up the defenses against Communist aggression?

"The last question, of course, entirely begs the question. The question is not whether anyone is interested in helping any Communist preserve his liberties. No one in America has the slightest interest in the Communists. My interest is in preserving this country from being destroyed by the development of an underground organization which would grow so closely in strength, were it outlawed, that it might easily destroy our country and cause us to draft all of the young men in the Nation.

"Now I find that the difficulty here tonight is that Mr. Stassen has not adhered to his subject or his statements. He says he is for the Mundt bill because, says Mr. Stassen, it outlaws the Communist Party. But the fact of the matter is, he is in grievous error. The only authority he quotes is the head of the Communist Party, which is not exactly a very good authority for seeking the truth.

MUNDT'S WORDS QUOTED

"Here's what Mr. MUNDT says on May 14, 1948. 'This bill does not outlaw the Communist Party.'

"On February 5, 1948, Congressman MUNDT said, 'I have been one of those who have not looked with favor upon proposals to outlaw the Communist Party or to declare its activities illegal because I fear such action on the part of Congress would only tend to drive further underground the forces which are already largely concealed from public view.'

" 'What I want to do, said Mr. MUNDT, 'is to drive the Communist functionaries out of the ground, into the open, here patriotic Americans of every walk of life can come to learn their identity and understand their objectives.'

"Now, we have the head of the Communist Party saying that it does outlaw it, and Mr. Stassen says so. Mr. MUNDT, whose bill it is, says his bill does not outlaw the Communist Party.

"So, as between that debate, let us now see what the committee says. After all, here is a committee bill, and the committee presumably knows what its bill does. In short—I have studied the bill—what it says is that it shall be a crime to endeavor to teach, to advocate or to conspire to establish in the United States a dictatorship under the control of a foreign government.

"The Mundt bill does not outlaw the Communist Party, was not intended to, and that is the exact opposite of what the Mundt bill was intended to accomplish and does accomplish.

"The question before us is, shall the Communist Party be outlawed. The only way I know that could be done is to declare by law that people calling themselves Communists would be denied a place on the ballot and that anyone who is a member of that party after it, the passage of the law, should be tried, convicted, and sentenced to prison for a crime.

"I believe in keeping the Communist Party everlastingly out in the open so we can defeat it and all it stands for.

"Now, this outlawing idea is not new. It is as old as government. For thousands of years despots have shot, imprisoned, and exiled their people and their governments have always fallen into the dust. This outlawing idea is as old as communism itself."

Stassen: "I have reached the conclusion that the Communist organizations in the world are absolutely directed by the rulers of Russia in the Kremlin. I have reached the conclusion that the objectives of these Communist organizations in the world are to overthrow free governments, to destroy the liberties of men, and to bring other countries under the domination of the dictators of Russia. I have watched country after country in which these Communist organizations have taken every legal advantage but have recognized none of the corresponding obligations and moralities.

"The most recent and extreme instance is Czechoslovakia. The Communists never had the support of a majority of the people of Czechoslovakia.

"A few weeks ago the overground and underground moving together, Czechoslovakia was betrayed, the liberties of the people were wiped out, and another country was brought under the domination of the Kremlin. These developments do give rise to a danger of war.

"Analyzing what they mean, it seems clear to me that the free countries, including America, do not now have adequate laws to safeguard themselves in the face of this menace. I consider it to be clear that these Communist organizations are not really political parties; they are actually fifth columns; they are Quisling cliques.

"If we are to have the best chance of winning through for freedom without the horror of a third world war, the free countries must take action to protect themselves against this fifth column in this unsettled period which has been called a cold war."

SAYS WE LACK EFFECTIVE LAW

"I do not think it is generally realized in America that we do not now have any law to effectively oppose the actions of these Communist organizations. There is now no law in America to prevent these Communist organizations from secretly developing organizations of hidden members, from carrying on secret conspiracies, to promote strikes, to establishing hatred of religions and races in America.

"Neither is there any present law to prevent the Communist organization from maintaining large offices of telephone switchboards and a network of communication to be used in reaching and coordinating these underground activities and in recruiting new members.

"In facing up to the problem, we must maintain complete constitutional rights and liberties in America. But there is no constitutional right to carry on organizations above ground or below ground directed by the rulers of a foreign power with the purpose of overthrowing the Government of the United States and taking away the liberties of its people."

Revival of Production in Foreign Countries Will Help To Stabilize Prices in the United States

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks an article from the May issue of Nation's Business showing that the revival of production in foreign countries like textile production in Germany and Japan will

help to bring down prices in the United States. Following is the article:

Last year's record high export volume was $19,600,000,000.

There is doubt that this total will be duplicated this year, including ERP.

World economic rehabilitation program brings some big United States orders—but cuts others.

Cotton textile trade now expects export volume about half of last year's.

They blame this unhappy outlook on rapidly rising cotton textile production in Germany and Japan.

One textile agent reports loss of a 1,000,000-yard order from West Africa. He found it went to Germany.

Although exports in 1947 were only about 9 percent of cotton textile output, slowdown in foreign markets has widespread effect at home.

Some fabricators delay ordering, wait to see if relatively greater supply brings lower prices.

Producers explore world markets, seek ways to boost exports, maintain maximum production.

Faith in Self-Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News of May 19, 1948:

FAITH IN SELF-GOVERNMENT

Americans face the choice of being the free and faithful citizens of a Government which they control, or the fear-ridden subjects of a Government which controls them, Donald R. Richberg told the Third National Conference on Citizenship in the Interior Department Auditorium today.

Speaking as an old-fashioned liberal, the widely known labor lawyer called for a reinvigoration of the faith of the American people in self-government.

National and State Governments in the United States, he said, were not created or intended as fit instruments for the establishment and control of a socialized economy. Moreover, it would be necessary to enlarge the powers of the National Government and to make all State and local governments completely subordinate to a practically unlimited national authority, in order to establish and maintain a socialized economy.

"When such a National Government is established," he said, "the American people will no longer be free citizens enjoying self-government. They will become the subjects of a totalitarian government. This means that in reality they will become the subjects of an all-powerful ruling class operating a lawfully established police state.

"That is why Americans must choose today whether they wish to remain free citizens, faithful to the Government established by the Constitution or whether they really believe that form of government has outlived its usefulness."

Mr. Richberg took note of apostles of new political creeds and theories that some irresistible wave of the future was sweeping humanity into a new way of life that is inevitable.

"But," he said, "let us be resolute and uncompromising in our opposition to reactionary reform that calls itself liberalism. Let us have have strength in our conviction that when men lose faith in the only form of government in which individual liberty is preserved, they lose faith in themselves. Then they are no longer free men and women. They are willing to sell liberty for a promise of security.

"If a citizen of the United States believes that his Government should control all property rights, a control destructive of individual liberty, and should accept responsibility for providing all citizens with employment and a State-regulated income, and should establish an economic and social equality for all citizens, he cannot be faithful to our form of government.

"That concept of government is not written into our Constitution. It is written into the Constitution of Communist Russia."

Poverty, injustice, and suffering in other lands may lead their peoples to experiment with new political systems, said Mr. Richberg but why, he asked, should Americans "enjoying greater economic security and more material satisfactions and spiritual freedom than any other people have ever known" experiment with new creeds? "Why," he continued, "should we regard it as a progressive or liberal policy to abandon constitutional restraints upon the powers of our public officials and to invest them with an ever-expanding authority to regulate our daily lives?

"To give the rules of a nation the power to make people prosperous and free from fear is to give them also the power to exploit and ruin people and make them the slaves of fear. Let us continue to withhold such dangerous power from our public officials. Let us retain our powers of self-government rooted in the soil of industrial freedom."

The New State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, this is the first opportunity I have had to express congratulations to President Truman for his prompt action in recognizing the new state of Israel after it was proclaimed at Tel Aviv last Friday. I trust the embargo on sales of American arms to the new state of Isarel will be lifted just as promptly. Justice requires that the new state be permitted to buy from us all the arms it wants and can pay for .

The indomitable courage and fortitude displayed by the Jews of Palestine after many years of hardship and suffering have brought about the culmination of a long and bitter struggle to obtain independence and the creation of a nation which is destined to become one of the strongest bulwarks of true democracy. Their patience and devotion to this great cause has won for them the unstinted praise and admiration of the people of our country and our friendship and support at this time will insure the peaceful and progressive development of a great people in their national home in Palestine.

I am happy to say that ever since I have been a Member of Congress I have been a consistent advocate in behalf of the cause of recognition of the new Jewish state and have all along supported the movement for the partitioning of Palestine, the lifting of the arms embargo, and the establishment of a free flow of commerce and immigration.

The Real Winner in Stassen-Dewey Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I am inserting in the RECORD herewith an interesting and informative editorial from the Daily Argus Leader, published in Sioux Falls, S. Dak. The Argus Leader of Sioux Falls is the largest newspaper published in a five-State area adjacent to South Dakota.

The article follows:

THE REAL WINNER IN STASSEN-DEWEY DEBATE

Viewed from all angles, the real winner in the Stassen-Dewey radio debate last night was Representative KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota.

Stassen refused to be convinced by what Dewey said and Dewey, in turn, refused to be convinced by what Stassen said.

But both agreed that MUNDT'S bill to control communism in the United States was satisfactory.

The bill and what MUNDT had said about it, in fact, constituted the central theme in the hour-long debate.

Stassen referred to the bill as a supporting element in his contention that the Communist Party should be barred.

And Dewey referred to the bill, meanwhile quoting MUNDT on several occasions, as a proposal supporting his viewpoint.

The basic argument in this debate between the two aspirants for the Republican nomination for the Presidency was the question of outlawing the Communist Party in the United States. Stassen wants to outlaw it while Dewey believes the problem should be handled differently.

Both explained and emphasized their viewpoints in the debate. And as the discussion continued, it seemed quite obvious that the Mundt bill, now nearing a vote in the House in Washington, represented a position somewhat in between their viewpoints.

It was this reason why both drew upon Mundt's comments and the purpose of his bill so frequently to illustrate their position in the controversy. Because both men found in the Mundt bill a place where their thoughts met, it is rather reasonable to conclude that the South Dakotan's proposal represents a practical program in respect to Communists, developed in sound harmony with basic American principles of liberalism and freedom.

The debate last night between Stassen and Dewey was one of the notable events of its kind in American history. And there's satisfaction to South Dakotans in knowing that a man from their State, though not a par-

ticipant, provided the comments that drew so much attention and such vigorous endorsement from the debaters.

As the debate continued, one was rather inclined to assume that both commentators would have been happier if their original positions had been that set forth by Mundt instead of that which they assumed. They found in the Mundt bill a defensive position against the more extreme attitudes in the differing viewpoints they had taken. But they could well understand, as the debate developed, that the South Dakotan's proposal contained so much good sense that both were eager to lean on it as a crutch in support of their own attitudes.

George Polk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I have learned with great sorrow of the death of George Polk, the Columbia Broadcasting System correspondent who was found murdered in Salonika, Greece, last Sunday. He was a first-rank reporter in the best tradition of the American news-gathering profession—fearless, fair, honest, and untiring.

At the age of 34, Mr. Polk already had lived much and had won for himself a distinguished reputation.

He was born in Fort Worth, Tex., on October 17, 1913. After 3 years at Virginia Military Institute, he left to take his first job on a newspaper. In 1937 he became city editor of the Fairbanks Daily News Miner in Fairbanks, Alaska, attending the University of Alaska at the same time. Subsequently he joined the staff of the Shanghai Evening Post, where he worked for 2 years, and then became a member of the Paris staff of the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Polk returned to the United States in 1940 to work on the foreign-news desk of the Herald Tribune in New York. In 1941 he was commissioned in the United States Naval Reserve and served as a fighter and dive-bomber pilot in the South Pacific. He was cited for heroism, wounded in action, and spent a year in hospital before leaving the service in June 1944, with the rank of lieutenant.

He returned immediately to the news-gathering profession, covering the White House and the State Department for the Herald Tribune. In November 1945 he joined the Columbia Broadcasting System as Middle East correspondent, with headquarters in Cairo. He was assigned to Greece in the summer of 1947.

Mr. Polk was the son of Mrs. A. R. Polk, of Kirkwood, Mo.

One more name has been added to the casualty list of those who bring us the news from remote sections of the world. Although his voice will not be heard in the future, his deeds will be remembered. He continued to serve his country, even though he no longer wore the uniform of the armed services.

The UN Charter Must Be Amended To Prevent or Control Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to have the Washington Post add its powerful voice to those of Members of Congress and others who long ago perceived that the crux of the problem of maintaining peace is the establishment of workable international machinery to prevent or control aggression. That requires amendment of the charter or the devising of other means if that proves impossible.

Last July 9 some of us introduced resolutions, and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] and I made speeches on the floor urging what the Washington Post now advocates—that the administration wake up and come to grips with the basic issue—aggression.

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs on July 25, 1947, passed my motion to hold hearings, as soon as practicable in this session, on the pending resolutions to strengthen the United Nations. The hearings had to stand aside for 3 months of work on the foreign-assistance legislation. More specific resolutions on the subject of aggression were introduced by 14 of us on March 16, 1948.

The committee has recently completed 2 weeks of hearings on improving the structure of the UN, at which many of the ablest and most thoughtful citizens of this country testified as to their grave concern over the alarming deterioration in our diplomatic relations, the dangers of atomic warfare, the increasingly apparent inability of the United Nations in its present form to deal effectively with aggression, and the necessity for vigorous and determined efforts by our Government to explore to the full every possibility for getting the Charter revised, and/or organizing under article 51 or other provision of the Charter, the genuinely free nations of the world for effective collective self-defense against aggression.

The hearings by the Committe on Foreign Affairs constituted the most comprehensive, thorough, and enlightening study of the whole problem that has been made.

The administration took the position that the resolutions and the hearings were to weaken, or threaten, or disrupt, or go outside the United Nations, notwithstanding our repeated and emphatic statements to the contrary. Unfortunately most writers and newspapers followed the administration line so consistently that I suppose they got to believing it themselves, and missed the real significance of the reforms we are urging.

Anyway, it is most encouraging to have the Washington Post discover, too, that the heart of the matter is aggression, and its prevention. All the essential reforms needed revolve around that. I hope it will now help us get the action it recognizes is long overdue.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Washington Post of May 19, 1948:

MAKING CAPITAL FOR WALLACE

How much capital Henry Wallace collected out of the administration's maladroitness of last week is anybody's guess. But we feel it was plenty. Stalin now has added to the store with his soft answer to Mr. Wallace's open letter to the Soviet leader. Not once, however, did the Wallace communication touch the crux of the Soviet-western problem, though all the items in his compendious catalog led to it, and on one occasion he came pretty close to it.

For instance, Mr. Wallace wants, as the administration wants, a peace treaty with Japan. The snag is that Soviet Russia insists on the exercise of a veto power, which, of course, would mean a Russian-dictated treaty. Why insist on the veto? Way down in his communication Mr. Wallace himself supplies the answer in his reference to the abuse—the Soviet abuse—of the veto power in the United Nations. He excuses the excessive use of the veto power as a symptom, and not a cause of Russo-western conflict, and adds that the causa causans is lack of confidence.

Here is the true point of departure for Russo-western discussion. It leads straight to the missing link that only those who are intent upon making political capital could miss. As the question: To what is due the lack of confidence between the United States and Soviet Russia? Surely it is aggression, direct and indirect. Yet the word "aggression" is not mentioned once either in the Wallace letter or in the Muscovite response. All these words without the key word.

The facts are part of the postwar record. As to direct aggression, the Soviet has added considerable territory since the shooting began in 1938. Annexed lands comprise an area of more than 230,000 square miles, with a population of some 22,000,000 people. In that time the United States and Britain have been pursuing the opposite course. Voluntarily—the British at a rapidly accelerating pace—they have been getting rid of their holdings. The contrast is one reason for the prevailing lack of confidence in Soviet Russia.

The second and much more important reason is the Soviet's indirect aggression. This is what the Soviet and its satellites have been practicing in half a dozen countries. The United Nations has condemned the practice, as exemplified at the expense of Greece. But the practice is not covered specifically in the Charter of the United Nations. The result is that, in spite of the Czech protests at Lake Success, the Soviet-fomented coup at Prague escaped even censure. It is obvious from the reestablishment of the Cominform that indirect aggression is the chief reliance of the Kremlin expansionists.

It would be getting down to cases if the administration were to single out this root of the prevailing lack of confidence. Let us have no more explaining what we don't mean and tell the Russians and the world what we do mean. Surely the object of our policy is to put an end to aggression so that we can get on with the neglected task of reconstruction. The sandstorm created last week and this has put that object in eclipse. All Congressmen report an avalanche of mail protesting against the negative attitude of the State Department. The people want an affirmative policy, and, what is more important, they want to see it pursued. The Stalin-Wallace exchange gives the State Department another chance—in fact, the plain duty—to reduce the confusion to a concrete proposal. Without delay the administration should announce in public an invitation to Soviet Russia to discuss the single issue of

aggression with the view of suggesting jointly a clarifying amendment to the Charter for general approval.

That is the root of the matter. It is as simple as it is fundamental. And, as it happens, all the spadework has been done, and by the Soviet itself. When Hitler first showed his teeth, they were instantly recognized in the Kremlin and no time was wasted in admiring the way he provided bread and circuses for his Germans. To the Kremlin he looked what he was, namely, the embodiment of aggression. Accordingly, on the heels of his coup in the Rhineland, Litvinov invited nonaggression pacts intended precisely to smother indirect aggression. They knew the tools of Nazi indirect aggression. They existed in the large settlements of Volksdeutsch, or people of German origin, in various European countries; that is, the Sudetens in Czechoslovakia. Litvinoff suggested a pledge that an aggressor be so named not only if he invaded another country but also if he gave support to armed bands invading another's territory.

Nothing came of the suggestion, but Moscow did not give it up, and Molotov resurrected it 6 years later, in 1939. And he refined it. After the Sudetens had been used to spearhead Nazi aggression in Czechoslovakia, Molotov proposed treaties to apply "in the case of direct, or indirect, aggression; that is to say, an internal coup d'etat or a political change favorable to the aggressor." Molotov cited as a case in point the absorption of what remained of Czechoslovakia after Munich. This was achieved by "inviting" President Hacha to Berlin and forcing him to sign the agreement dissolving the Czechoslovak remnant. Technically this was legal; actually it was rank aggression.

What is creating the lack of confidence of the free world in Soviet Russia is, clearly, the same conditions that alarmed Stalin about Hitler. Let us apply to Stalin Stalin's remedy, and see what happens. The last ball that Stalin kicked in our direction was muffed. Now that he has kicked us another, there should be no further hesitation. Mr. Wallace's open letter was an unassorted collection of the symptoms of the cause of Russo-western differences. It would be seen for what it is if the administration were to wake up and come to grips with the basic issue.

What the Mundt Bill Will Do

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, after listening to the proponents of this bill, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], and other members of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I have been strengthened in my belief and conviction that this bill, publicized as a means of outlawing communism, is bound to tend to actually make for more communism.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is really a cover-up for our big Fascist combinations, those industrialists in our country who are associated with the German cartels, the power, oil, and other big interests, aided by the National Association of Manufacturers, who are cooperating with the I. G. Farben gang and German industrialists that financed Hitler and who were responsible for the overthrow of the German Republic. Their avariciousness is responsible for the ever-increasing cost of living and their actions are resented by the masses of the American people.

FASCISM AS DANGEROUS AS COMMUNISM

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MUNDT] and Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in reports to the Congress, as well as the Library of Congress report to Congress on fascism, all state that fascism is as dangerous as communism. However, the proponents of this liberty-destroying measure must admit that the bill does not cover the equally dangerous ideologies of fascism and nazism.

The bill gives to the Attorney General extraordinary and extremely dangerous power to designate any of the hundreds of political, labor, and civic organizations in our country as communistic or with being communistic fronts. Unfortunately, due to the hysteria and fear of a large number of people in our country who, impressed with the publicity of the Committee on un-American Activities, together with the propaganda of war-minded militaristic groups and war profiteers, have been further confused and their fears continue. It appears that the aims of the latter groups are to destroy the democracy of our land and to force fascism on us.

If this bill, due to this hysteria, should, unfortunately, pass the House, I am confident that it will not receive the approval of the other body and if, perchance, it should pass the Senate, it will be vetoed by the President.

BILL IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL

Under the provisions of the bill any organization that might be branded as being communistic would be required to file the names and addresses of its members and would face imprisonment if the organization failed to register. Some of the most outstanding constitutional lawyers have gone on record in declaring the bill is unconstitutional because it will restrict free speech and even expression of thought, contrary to the right provided in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

We have now on our statute books laws that clearly prohibit anyone to advocate the overthrow of our form of government by force and many other acts too numerous to mention.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave given me I quote a statement made by John Stuart Mill on Liberty which I feel will be of interest to the membership and to the country, as follows:

A people may prefer a free government, but if, from indolence, or carelessness, or cowardice, or want of public spirit, they are unequal to the exertions necessary for preserving it; if they will not fight for it when it is directly attacked; if they can be deluded by the artifices used to cheat them out of it; if by momentary discouragement, or temporary panic, or a fit of enthusiasm for an individual, they can be induced to lay their liberties at the feet even of a great man, or trust him with powers which enable him to subvert their institutions; in all these cases they are more or less unfit for liberty; and though it may be for their good to have had it even for a short time they are unlikely long to enjoy it.

Mr. Speaker, I quote an excerpt from an editorial appearing in the Washington Post of Sunday, May 9, 1948:

When exposure takes the form of official stigmatization and is attended by the imposition of severe handicaps, it amounts to suppression. And once this sort of suppression is permitted, it is bound to be applied not alone to actual Communists but to dissenters and nonconformists of every kind. The end is a suppression of liberty in the name of security.

Mr. Speaker, I will not encumber the RECORD with the insertion of a few of the many thousands of telegrams and communications which I have received in opposition to the bill, but I will insert at this point a letter jointly signed by many outstanding persons of my city of Chicago, members of the Citizens Committee To Defend the Bill of Rights, which I hope the membership will read, as follows:

CITIZENS COMMITTEE TO
DEFEND THE BILL OF RIGHTS,
Chicago, Ill., May 17, 1948

Hon. A. J. SABATH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The House Committee on Un-American Activities has proposed legislation to control subservice activities through the Mundt bill, H. R. 5852.

This bill is an unconstitutional attempt to silence all individuals and groups who would promote social welfare, economic progress, or political democracy.

We call on you to speak and to vote against this bill, because it would impose a system of thought control as oppressive as the Nazi system in Germany. Providing for registration of certain groups and barring members of these organizations from Government employment and from obtaining passports, it would deny American citizens the right of free assembly and association guaranteed by our Constitution. At the same time, it would prevent, by intimidation, the exercise of free speech by these individuals.

Members of unions could, by this measure, be prevented from using their most effective means to improve wages and working conditions. Strikes would become punishable conspiracies.

Giving the Attorney General power to designate Communist-front organizations, this proposal of the Un-American Committee places in the hands of the administration the power to destroy any, and all, political opposition. This is a final step to a police state.

We cannot preach democracy and at the same time practice fascism. Elections will become idle gestures if such legislation is passed. All of us would be deprived of the elementary right to campaign for and vote for candidates of our own choosing.

Therefore, we call upon you, Mr. Congressman, to defeat this bill and any similar ones presented by this committee.

Very truly yours,

Dr. A. Eustace Hayden, Father Clarence Parker, Nelson Algren, Harland H. Allen, Dr. Charlotte Babcock, Rev. Wm. T. Baird, William Balamuth, Ray A. Billington, Prof. Sophinisba Breckinridge, M. E. Britton, George R. Cermak, Thomas M. Clarke, Carl W. Condit, Gordon M. Connelly, Flora J. Cooke, Charles H. Coyle, Frank Marshall Davis, Prof. John J. DeBoer, Malcolm Dole, Wallace W. Douglas, Borgen Evans, Irving M. Flamm, Edward J. Fruchtman, A. R. Gilliland, Rabbi David Graubart, Pearl M. Hart, Harrison Hayford, Ernest D. Hellinger, Joseph K. Hellmuth, Rod Holmgren, Wallace J.

Kargman, Esther O. Kegan, Ira A. Kipnis, Dr. Robert Morss Lovett, Robert D. Mayo, Curtis D. MacDougall, David Mazur, Prof. Wayne McMillen, Arthur H. Nethercot, Grant Oakes, Rev. Leslie T. Pennington, H. B. Ritman, Samuel Rosenberg, Joseph Roth, Ernest Samuels, Thomas L. Slater, Dr. Maud Slye, L. S. Stavrianos, Irving G. Steinberg, Dr. Walter Verity, Samuel K. Workman.

The following is an excerpt from an editorial appearing in the New York Post of April 29, 1948:

Are the liberals really so terrified by congressional threats of purges that they refuse to take the leadership in opposing police-state legislation, for fear that they might be labeled "slightly Red"? If so, Congressman MUNDT and his fellow conspirators on the Thomas Un-American Activities Committee have already achieved their primary purpose.

And I am sure the following excerpt from an editorial from the CIO News of May 10, 1948, gives labor's concern and views on the pending bill:

Our chief concern, frankly, is over the effects the measure would have on civil rights and the manner in which it could be used unfairly against labor unions and other liberal groups. * * * The Attorney General—be he Tom Clark or someone who succeeds him in the future—could, through design or error, destroy or seriously harm liberal organizations which have no connection with the Communist Party.

I also quote from a statement I received from the National Lawyers Guild, as follows:

This measure can only be understood as a product of mounting hysteria in our land. In the past we had the alien and sedition laws and the Palmer raids after World War I. They are among the blackest pages in American history. If this measure is enacted, its impact will be far greater * * * while the shadow of freedom might remain, the substance would be lost.

In conclusion, I insert an article appearing in the Christian Science Monitor entitled "A Dangerous Doctrine," as follows:

A DANGEROUS DOCTRINE

The House, supporting overwhelmingly the Mundt-Nixon Communist-control bill, moves on its way a measure aimed at ostensible objectives with which most Americans agree. But we would be remiss were we not to warn that the bill could well set in motion more perils to American freedom than it has much prospect of curing.

We say this not without giving due credit to what is, perhaps, the most reasonable and enlightened effort yet to be put forth by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The authors of the bill, Representatives KARL E. MUNDT and RICHARD M. NIXON, have exerted a moderating influence on a committee which has frequently gone off the deep end. The Nixon subcommittee report, upon which the bill was based, showed an encouraging awareness of the delicate task it faced. Yet the specific product of this effort goes much too far.

Some of its provisions would establish in law a dangerous doctrine, that of "guilt by association." It would define the Communist Party as a conspiracy against the United States, and would impute guilt, per se, to anyone even remotely connected with it without regard to whether the person so branded had himself committed acts or uttered words in the interests of a foreign power and inimical to those of the United States.

Had the bill provided for registration of and proper publicity to the connections and sources of support of Communist and fringe organizations (with appeal to the courts afforded groups and individuals affected), and had stopped there, it would have our endorsement. This newspaper has been urging such a measure for a long time.

But, as it stands, the Mundt-Nixon bill threatens invasion of civil liberties to a degree justified only by a clear and present danger which does not now appear evident. As the chief of this newspaper's Washington bureau recently pointed out, the Communists are without power in Congress, in the administration, in the police, or in the armed forces, and what influence they have had in the United States is on the wane.

Then why deliberately let the methods of the very totalitarian dictatorships at which the bill is aimed get even a toe in the door?

The Mundt-Nixon Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for H. R. 5852, the so-called Mundt-Nixon bill to protect the United States against un-American and subversive activities, when the roll is called later on today. I have given this bill and every paragraph of it careful and painstaking consideration and can find nothing whatever in it that will affect the labor movement adversely or seek to destroy any of the rights of organized workers. The Communists may try to convey the idea that this legislation is anti-labor, but there is not a word of truth in such a statement.

Under the leave granted me by the House I include the following editorial published in the Brooklyn Eagle of Sunday, May 16, 1948:

ANALYSIS OF MUNDT BILL SHOWS CRITICS DON'T KNOW ITS CONTENTS

The Mundt bill is a must. It hits the Communists, their dupes, and stooges where it hurts most—namely, in their allegiance to a foreign power.

There is not one word in the bill that prevents anyone from professing communism, shouting his belief from the housetops and urging others to do the same. It has nothing to do with the Taft-Hartley Act, housing, health insurance, or any of the other issues that progressive citizens may wish to promote singly or by united action.

Henry Wallace is one of many self-styled liberals who are making false statements about the bill—and thus helping the Reds. To say that it would outlaw the Communist Party is untrue and ridiculous. It actually brings the party right out in the open where honest men should have no fear.

The sponsors of the bill have analyzed what makes the Communist Party click. They have found, as any honest student of the subject should know by this time, that the Communist Party is a partner in the international conspiracy which would impose a totalitarian government upon democratic nations. It is linked up and directed by agents of a foreign totalitarian power.

It depends for success upon concealing its real identity and seducing innocent citizens into supporting its cause by establishing false fronts. It keeps its world organization in unity by training its officers in foreign lands by means of schools of revolutionary tactics and techniques.

By no stretch of the imagination can it be called American in any sense. Its whole aim and purpose is to destroy the traditional democratic institutions in this and every other country.

These are not merely guesses and hearsay conclusions. It is all down in black and white in the Communist records and the actuality is spelled out in red—in the red blood of its victims—wherever it has been allowed to go on unchecked.

We have yet to read a worth-while criticism of the Mundt bill. We do not see how it can be opposed by any except those who are either ignorant of the Communist movement or have secret sympathies for that way of life. No one who understands the meaning of government, civil rights, real democracy, treason can offer an intelligent argument against it as a whole.

There is room for suggestions for change. But to join the Communists in a blanket denunciation of it is to give way to the hysteria which its opponents attach to its sponsors.

The bill is carefully written and the protection of American citizens who have not voluntarily relinquished their claim to civil rights by joining such an organization is assured. To say that the bill does not allow for due process and appeal to the courts is a barefaced lie.

The Attorney General will have the power to designate which organizations are considered subversive. The evidence upon which he will act will rest on the accumulation of those actions which, taken together, point the finger of guilt at the organization as a Soviet instrument. Circumstantial evidence is a legitimate beginning for such a procedure. The accused, however, can fight the charge right up to the Supreme Court. A nation has a right to defend itself against the organized intrigue of saboteurs. More than that, it has the duty to do so.

Socialists, liberals, progressives, laborites, citizens of any other political or economic hue, except the Stalinists, need have no fear of this bill. It is a protection to them, because it clearly distinguishes them from the organized conspiracy which is the Communist Party. They should go along with it and refuse to be misled by the muddle-headed and the malicious.

The Stalinists have already deluged Congress with a barrage of protests. Those citizens who love America should engulf their representatives with a cloudburst of supporting messages. We hope that all nine of Brooklyn's representatives will have the good judgment to vote for the Mundt bill. It is a must.

Politics as a Field of Professional Activity for Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article written by me which will be published by the Social Sciences Publishers in the Woman's Manual, Pauline V. Young and Fay B. Karpf, editors:

POLITICS AS A FIELD OF PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY FOR WOMEN

(By Helen Gahagan Douglas)

Politics as a field of professional activity is no different from any other field where ability and training are required.

One might say that the chief physical prerequisites for a good politician is a head that can think problems through, a heart that can feel with one's fellowmen, and a skin "seven spans thick" to make one impervious to unwarranted and unjustified criticism. A skin seven spans thick was essential to any lawmaker under the old Iroquois Indian confederacy and was explicitly recorded in their constitution some 500 years ago. Perhaps it should be one of the requirements for a Member of our Congress.

To the extent that women satisfy the initial requirements for politics it is a field open to them as it is to men. I find myself resenting the implication that women are peculiar creatures, fit only for certain types of work. I also resent the constant comparison with men as the ultimate yardstick. If women are good, they're good on their own. If men are good, they also must be judged in terms of their own achievements. But spare me those inevitable and invidious comparisons.

There is practically no field of activity closed to women, per se, except perhaps some types of manual work. Even in that respect, World War II made notable changes. Women were employed as truck drivers, as conductors and motormen, as engineers, firemen, and repairmen in railroad yards, in aircraft and automobile factories. They were used as welders, lathe operators, riveters, blast furnace topmen, and section hands. Even today in the typically masculine heavy industries, women total 13 percent of all production workers.

It is true that men have replaced women to some extent in many of the heavy occupations, with the ending of the war. But women have beyond a doubt proven their ability and their worth.

As a matter of fact, the head of the Women's Bureau, Frieda S. Miller, made the observation recently, during the centennial celebration of the founding of the Women's Bureau, that of the 451 occupational classifications used in the 1940 census, women were employed in all but 9. That is a far cry from the situation in 1836, 12 years before the Women's Bureau was founded, when women were employed in only seven occupations, and those humble ones. And it was not until the census of 1870 that official notice was taken of the employment of women. In that year, 2,000,000 women were recorded as being gainfully employed. Today, about 17,000,000 women are so employed or seeking employment, 28 percent of the total working force.

During the war, the employment of women reached an all-time peak of 20,500,000 in July 1944. The drop in the employment of women since the war has been much slighter than even their champions had anticipated. That means that there are more jobs to go around, and that women have proven their worth beyond all doubt.

The Women's Bureau is shortly to publish a study of the changing occupations of women in the last seven decades that should prove of great interest.

Although women in large numbers are comparatively new in many professional fields of activity outside the home and school, they have proven able, given the training and the opportunity. They have become judges, doctors, lawyers, physicists and chemists, engineers and mathematicians, educators, politicians, and even outstanding world citizens. In the field of public relations and in the business world they have proven themselves able executives and administrators.

Women have made good judges, even in so obstruse a field as tax law, as for example Marion Harron, of my own State of California.

In law, in medicine, in physics (particularly Lisa Meissner in atomic physics), in chemistry, in world affairs, women have left their indelible mark.

Very few men have spoken as simply, as briefly and to the point on international matters as Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt has in meetings in which I have been a participant.

Now that the air has been cleared of fuzzy talk about the type of occupations open to women, what about politics? What have women to contribute that is distinctive?

From the time she is born woman is a politician. At home she must be housekeeper, mother, teacher, judge, and sometimes even jury. What is government but housekeeping on a large scale?

Family life and children are a very important part of a woman's life and must not be belittled. She has much to contribute there and to learn that fits her to go on to community responsibility. If a woman's home life is organized she can find time to do all sorts of things that are essential to her community and to her nation. If a woman can't organize her home, she won't be much good on organization elsewhere.

In her home she meets problems of civil rights, of fair play, of discrimination. In her community she meets problems of housing, of delinquency, of playgrounds and nurseries. She meets these problems and must deal with them in concere terms. Consequently, women come to public life, not as raw recruits, but as seasoned politicians. They're not apt to make quite the same mistakes the male lawmakers do.

Years ago, women's training was such that only after her children grew up, and only if she had the inner drive and the encouragement of her husband and friends, and only if she had the opportunity did she seek further horizons in politics or medicine or law.

Now, fortunately, young people, both girls and boys, are getting good basic training, many of them going on to college and professional schools. They marry, have children, so organize their time that they are able to continue their work. Veterans in particular and their wives have shown what can be done with budgeted time. No longer does woman have to choose exclusively between marriage and a career. Her choice now is marriage, a career, or a combination of both according to her inclinations, her finances, her ability, etc.

Women are in a very real sense the housekeepers of the Nation. It is at home that women first learn the value of the dollar—how much it will buy. The end of all the erudite talk of economic spirals is in the market. Just what happens to a consumer's dollar when it no longer buys 100 cents worth of commodities, but only 60 cents worth, as is the situation today?

It is in seeking the answer to that problem—the devaluation of the dollar—that women enter the field of national economics. Our national economy, and even our international economy is only the extension of the home economy.

In knowing the value of the dollar, what makes it change the plans to stabilize currency on a national and international scale, how effective they are, what obstacles are placed in the way of effectuation, the special interests at work—in knowing these basic economic facts, women become specially fitted to be housekeepers in our national economy.

That title is in no sense derogatory. It is a recognition of special training for a special kind of job.

As members of the community, women find that laws and their making are not abstract problems, but are a necessary outgrowth of having to face problems of housing, delinquency, playgrounds, nurseries, discrimination, directly, not merely in debating societies or in the halls of government.

Women in the home who grow up with their children, who follow their problems and take active part in the problems of the community (through parent-teacher associations and through local civic groups) shortly find themselves, in trying to solve those problems, appearing before school boards, before local governmental bodies, etc.

They find that to intelligently solve their local problems they must know and understand something of the wider problems that face the community and the Nation. Almost before they realize it, they have been caught up in politics in the wider sense, in the sense of statecraft and civil government.

Such a situation is an inevitable one for women to find themselves in, and it is a good one. It enables them to use their experience, their practical training, their instincts, and their hearts for the greater good.

And that, it seems to me, is the real goal of politics.

The Anti-Communist Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include two valuable contributions to editorial comment on the Subversive Activities Control Act, one from the New York Herald Tribune and the other from the Catholic Courier Journal, published in Rochester, N. Y.

The latter was referred to in the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

Rev. P. J. Flynn, the author of the article, with singular clarity and careful analysis, has put his finger on the problem before us which this bill make a sincere and conscientious effort to meet, without departure from constitutional guaranties.

The articles follow:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 18, 1948]

THE ANTI-COMMUNIST BILL

As the House resumes today its debate on the Mundt anti-Communist bill, it has before it many conflicting views. It has the Dewey-Stassen interchange over the outlawry of communism. It has the shrill outcries of the Communists and their sympathizers, as well as the hardly less vociferous opinions of those who want simply to root out communism, regardless of the cost. It has the considered judgment of those who, with Mr. John Foster Dulles, believe the bill to be a praiseworthy attempt to deal honestly and in the American tradition with a very difficult and confused situation. And it has the equally sincere convictions of those who, with Mayor O'Dwyer, still feel that the bill is a dangerous short-cut to thought control and police state regulation.

To this newspaper it seems that neither the opponents nor many of the proponents of the bill have looked closely enough at the bill itself. It is not a police state or a thought control bill; as a matter of fact, it is very carefully safeguarded, in a number of interesting ways, against just those dangers. The safeguards may or may not be sufficient; but at least the bill should be examined for what it actually seeks to do rather than for what it is accused of doing.

The Mundt bill is a singularly intelligent attempt to control the universally recognized dangers of Communist infiltration without violation of the principles of democratic due process. Many reactionaries have been willing to say that due process does not mat-

ter; the Communists should be extirpated by any convenient method. Many liberals have thrown up their hands, saying that communism cannot be controlled without resort to the police state and therefore should not be controlled at all. The Mundt bill denies both of these counsels of despair and makes a real effort to bring the peculiar problem which Communist conspiracy has presented to western democratic society within the legal and social controls which that society has developed.

It does so in two ways: First, by making it a crime subject to heavy penalty to attempt to subvert the Government to a totalitarian dictatorship under Russian control; second, by requiring Communist and Communist-front organizations (declared to be such by the Attorney General, under a specified process and after opportunity for court review) to register, declare their membership, sources and uses of funds. No one here can be declared guilty by association. He is guilty if he can be personally convicted before a court of attempting to subvert the Government to a Russian-dominated dictatorship (a charge under which convictions are at most likely to be very few) but if he is simply a member of a Communist or fellow-traveler organization he is, in general, subject to nothing more than publicity.

There are exceptions to the latter statement. A member of a Communist organization is denied any employment by the Federal Government and denied a passport; both provisions seem to this newspaper extreme. The first might well be modified by making it apply only to Federal positions in sensitive areas; the second is dubious on many grounds, and represents a punitive restriction which ought not to be imposed merely for membership or association. Neither affects the basic principle of the act, which deliberately attempts to single out and define pro-Russian Communist allegiances, which compels publicity for those who accept such allegiance and which makes it a crime to pursue the ends of Communist subversion. The bill would throw a very heavy burden on the courts, and its ultimate effectiveness is questionable. It does, however, sincerely try to do, within the frame of our society, what great numbers of Americans want done. This newspaper feels that it deserves trial.

[From the Courier-Journal, Rochester, N. Y., of May 13, 1948]

ON GUARD—NAME AND ADDRESS—IT'S A CONSPIRACY—LIGHTS, PLEASE, LIGHTS!

(By Rev. P. J. Flynn)

The American Communists are all upset. They will be forced to give their right names if the proposed Mundt bill—"to protect the United States against un-American and subversive activities"—becomes law. And it looks as if it will.

The Communist fifth column in this country is real and dangerous. It takes its signals from Moscow. It operates in secret and moves behind a glamorous front of garrulous but gullible liberals.

Ten years of investigation by the House Committee on Un-American Activities have established these facts:

(1) That the Communist movement in the United States is foreign controlled.

(2) That its ultimate objective with respect to the United States is to overthrow our free American institutions in favor of a Communist totalitarian dictatorship to be controlled from abroad.

(3) That its activities are carried on by secret and conspiratorial methods.

(4) That its activities, both because of the alarming march of Communist forces abroad and because of the scope and nature of Communist activities here in the United States, constitute an immediate and powerful threat to the security of the United States and to the American way of life.

Effective measures for combating the Communist conspiracy in this country are long overdue. Our existing laws against sedition and treason have proved ineffective against the tactics of commnism, which have been evolved by shrewd men who have spent their lives devising methods to circumvent the laws and law-enforcement machinery of any country in which they operate.

Despite the angry charges of the Communists the proposed Mundt bill is not designed to repress the Communist Party. It is aimed at exposure of Communist activity.

The heart of the Mundt bill and that part which has the Communists, including Henry Wallace and the comrades-to-the-comrades, so upset is the section which pertains to registration.

According to the bill, the Communist Party and its front organizations must register with the Attorney General of the United States. This information must include the names of officers, the sources and use of funds, and (for the party only, not the fronts) the names and addresses of all members.

This information will be available for public inspection. Failure to register involves a fine of $2,000 to $5,000 for individuals involved. Officers face the added penalty of imprisonment from 2 to 5 years.

The bill also provides that Communist agents, acting under known foreign control, will lose their citizenship. It shall be unlawful for Communists to accept Federal employment without revealing their connections. It shall likewise be unlawful for any Federal officer knowingly to appoint a Communist to a Government position.

Communists or front groups, to use the mails, must label the wrapper "Disseminated by————, a Communist organization." Broadcasts by these same groups must be preceded by the statement: "The following program is sponsored by ————, a Communist organization."

The Mundt bill is admittedly an unusual legal draft according to our American tradition. But we are dealing with a highly organized conspiracy which does not respect the traditions of law. Communism's recognized weapons are deception and trickery. It is not right that Communists should be permitted to use our American liberties in order to destroy those liberties for all of us.

The foolish fellow-travelers don't like the Mundt bill any more than their friends, the comrades. Perhaps they are embarrassed by the prospect of seeing themselves exposed under a legal spotlight.

But if any American wants to run with the Communists he should be willing to face the consequences. If he wants to act on a red-front stage let us suggest that the footlights of public inspection be turned up so that we can see the act.

Communism threatens the liberties of all Americans. Our national security demands that the floodlights of legal exposure be turned on, so that all of us can see what goes on anywhere in this country. There should be no dark corners of conspiracy in the United States.

The Rebirth of the Jewish State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the simultaneous occurrence of the debate on the great constitutional issues of the Subversive Control Act and the proclamation and recognition of the reborn state of Israel has strained tempers and led to remarks on and off the floor which might better have been left unsaid.

I deem it wise, therefore, to include in the RECORD, under leave, some of the wise and temperate words which have been written and spoken by leaders of American thought in salute to Israel.

Last Monday night, May 17, in New York I was the principal speaker at a mass meeting saluting the new nation of Israel. To make the setting clear, I include a press release issued prior to the meeting:

EAST SIDE SALUTES ISRAEL

Hailing the establishment of an independent Jewish State in Palestine, United States Representative ARTHUR G. KLEIN, Democrat, of New York, will be the principal speaker at a huge "salute to the Jewish State" under the auspices of the Interfaith Committee of the East Side Monday night, May 17, 1948, at Public School No. 4, Rivington and Pitt Streets, 8 p. m., Manhattan.

Congressman KLEIN will report on Our Government on Palestine.

An outstanding feature of the evening will be Jewish music by the widely known Cantor Sholem Katz, of Washington, D. C., and a 10-piece orchestra furnished by Local 802, American Federation of Music, and James Caesar Petrillo, AFM president, led by Sholem Secunda, author of "Bei Mir Bist du Schoen," and playing some of his own works. Cantor Katz was the hero of a breathtaking escape from the Nazis, and made his way to America in constant danger. He has a world-wide reputation as a cantor.

Mrs. Lillian Oringer, president of the Lower Manhattan Chapter, American Jewish Congress, is chairman of the "Salute to the Jewish State"; co-chairmen are Allan Friedman and Herbert Demby; other members of the committee include Dr. David Tannenbaum, Zionist Organization of America; the Reverend Dr. Guy Emery Shipley, a prominent Protestant leader; Rabbi Sheppard Baum of the American Jewish Congress; Rabbi Bernard Bergman of the Misrachi Organization of America; Dr. Donald J. Walton, of DeWitt Memorial Church; and Col. Sol. T. Fink, a member of Haganah.

Among the distinguished guests who also will speak briefly in salute to the Jewish State will be State Senator Elmer Quinn, Assemblymen Leonard Farbstein, Francis X. McGowan, and Louis Di Salvio, and Councilman Samuel S. DiFalco.

With the Interfaith Committee of the East Side, co-sponsors are Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Catholic War Veterans of the United States, American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Veterans' Committee.

Congressman KLEIN is honorary president of the Lower Manhattan Chapter of the American Jewish Congress, and has long been an ardent Zionist and advocate of an independent Jewish state.

MESSAGE OF CONGRATULATIONS FROM HON. JOHN W. M'CORMACK

I am proud to say, Mr. Speaker, that we received from our minority whip, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, a wonderful message of greeting, which I am inserting here because of its noble sentiments:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 17, 1948.*

Hon. ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
Member of Congress,
Care of the Jewish State,
Public School No. 4,
Rivington and Pitt Streets,
New York, N. Y.:

I regret that important official matters requiring my presence in Washington prevent my attending the meeting tonight. I take this means, therefore, to express my pleasure

in the recognition by our country through President Truman of the new democracy of Israel.

I am particularly pleased by the action of President Truman which gives the infant nation international status and strengthens it internally.

Having officially recognized the new nation of Israel, our next and logical step is to arrange at once for an exchange of diplomatic representatives between our country and this new democracy, and, in addition, for our country to lift the arms embargo now in effect against Israel, but to continue it against the aggressor Arab countries.

Many trying problems confront Israel and will in the immediate years to come, but with sound and true leadership guiding its ship of state and with sincere friends throughout the world cooperating, I am confident of the future success of the new nation of Israel.

I congratulate you on the great part that you have played in bringing about this historic event.

To all present I send kindest regards.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Minority Whip, House of Representatives.

HUGE CROWD AT MADISON SQUARE GARDEN GIVES SALUTE TO ISRAEL

Our East Side Salute to Israel drew an enormous throng—far more than could crowd into the room we had. Those outside were estimated at a thousand.

The night before, Madison Square Garden, the vast coliseum where everything from a circus to an ice show can be held, was filled to overflowing with a city-wide Salute to Israel meeting.

I am including here not only excerpts from the speeches which were made at this huge gathering of jubilation and thanksgiving, but also a letter from Hyman Shulson, the representative here in Washington of the American Zionist Emergency Council, who has labored with carefully restrained enthusiasm, against great odds, for the realization of the Zionist dream—labors now crowned with deserved success. The American Zionist Emergency Council has been maintained by four Nation-wide groups of public-spirited citizens: Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America; the Mizrachi Organization of America; Poale Zion-Zeire Zion of America; and the Zionist Organization of America. In my opinion, to these groups belongs all possible tribute for the birth of Israel.

AMERICAN ZIONIST
EMERGENCY COUNCIL,
Washington, D. C., May 18, 1948.

Hon. ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KLEIN: Will you please insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the enclosed message from Rabbi Max Kirshblum as well as the excerpts from the address of Mrs. Samuel W. Halprin at the Salute to Israel meeting at Madison Square Garden, New York City, Sunday evening, May 16, 1948.

I wish to express to you my deepest gratitude and that of the American Zionist Emergency Council for your support and friendship to the Zionist groups.

As a humanitarian in the great American tradition, you have always helped the Jewish people in the struggle for freedom.

With warmest personal regards and all good wishes, I am,

Very cordially yours,
HYMAN A. SCHULSON.

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS OF RABBI MAX KIRSHBLUM, NATIONAL EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT OF MIZRACHI, RELIGIOUS-ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA AT THE "SALUTE TO ISRAEL," MADISON SQUARE GARDEN, NEW YORK CITY, SUNDAY EVENING, MAY 16, 1948

The rebirth of the Jewish state constitutes the greatest challenge in Jewish history, a challenge which a united Jewish people is determined to meet. Friendly nations will surely emulate the noble example set by the United States, which by democratic conviction, by knowledge of her own history, by an innate desire to do the right thing, has found in new Israel an ally, democratically flesh of her flesh, and bone of her bone. It cannot be too long before the finger of history will point out to all freedom-loving nations that the land of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob is their most formidable outpost in the gutted wastelands of neofascists, pashas, and effendi.

But, under all circumstances, however, the road is yet long. The struggle for an opportunity to develop peacefully the state which will be a haven for harried Jews throughout the world, as well as a bulwark for democracy in a medieval Middle East, will yet have to be fought out, though Jews came to Palestine for peaceful, constructive pursuits and for the transplantation of its ancient Hebraic, God-inspired civilization. But that which God has forged, no human hand will ever break asunder. Jewish youth, men and women, boys and girls, will defend this birthright with their last drop of blood.

We salute the Jewish state. We salute the Jewish Army. We salute the visionaries and pioneers of all generations who have prepared us for redemption. We salute those who through self-sacrifice have taken upon themselves to free Israel from her enemies and make her master of her own soul and destiny. May the glory of God rest upon the work of our hands. May the Guardian of Israel watch over and preserve the heroic youth of Judea, who fight valiantly and selflessly for God and country. With the help of the Almighty once again shall out of Zion go forth the law and word of the Lord out of Jerusalem.

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS OF MRS. SAMUEL W. HALPRIN, NATIONAL PRESIDENT OF HADASSAH AND MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE OF THE JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE AT THE "SALUTE TO ISRAEL," MADISON SQUARE GARDEN, NEW YORK CITY, SUNDAY EVENING, MAY 16, 1948

The United States Government should back up its recognition of the new Jewish State of Israel by spearheading a move in the United Nations to evoke the strongest sanctions against the Arab aggressors who are constituting a threat to the peace by their invasion of the new democracy.

All the instrumentalities needed to isolate and punish the Arab invaders exist within the United Nations.

There is only one way to make our recognition of the new Jewish State productive, and that is to press for economic sanctions against the Arabs by the United Nations, and to provide constructive aid to help develop Israel physically and to facilitate the immigration into the country of hundreds of thousands of homeless Jews who wish to become citizens there.

There need be no bloodbath in Palestine if this is done. With the invaders removed, Israel will embark on a program of upbuilding which could astound the world.

As Americans we should take a positive stand in support of the new Jewish state for our own self-interest as well. A strong democracy in the Middle East is a guaranty of protection for the democratic way of life we ourselves enjoy. It will be a bulwark against reaction and oppression, and an outpost where those concepts of liberty and justice which we, too, hold dear can flourish.

FIGHT FOR FREEDOM FRAUGHT WITH DANGERS

The fight for freedom of Israel, Mr. Speaker, has been fraught with dangers.

The base history of Great Britain's perfidy is written indelibly on the pages of time, and no tears of a dishonored empire can ever erase it.

But there have been other attacks on Zionism, perhaps inspired by a proper reason, but certainly carried out in a manner which might have been carefully calculated to hurt the cause of an independent Jewish state in Palestine.

I am taking the liberty of inserting a letter from the Jewish War Veterans of the United States on this point:

JEWISH WAR VETERANS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
New York, N. Y., April 16, 1948.

Hon. ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KLEIN: This is to express congratulations and thanks for the manner in which you handled the delegations which visited you yesterday from the so-called United Committee.

To anyone who has followed your able and consistent efforts to aid in having the United Nations Palestine decision made a reality, it is ridiculous that this motley crew should have come down here to approach you as they did. Their real objective is certainly not to aid in helping to solve the Palestine problem. They are too smart a crowd not to know that their tactics really create an additional public-opinion hazard.

It is my opinion that the Communists used the Palestine issue in this instance for their own ends of fighting the European recovery program, universal military training, and selective service, and to promote the candidacy of Wallace and TAYLOR among those people who are sincerely interested in the establishment of the Zionist state. Our national headquarters directed all posts to abstain from participation in the pilgrimage. You may have noted that our national commander issued a public statement on that subject and condemned the Communist-spawned committee.

With kindest personal regards.

Cordially yours,
BERNARD WEITZER,
National Legislative Representative.

NEW YORK POST SUPPORTS POSITION

Finally, Mr. Speaker, earlier today I made a heartfelt and sincere speech in which I excoriated Great Britain for her sinister role in subsidizing the Arab aggression against Israel and declared that Great Britain could stop the attacks in 24 hours.

I was happy to learn that the New York Post had expressed the same position editorially in the previous day's edition, which I had not seen when I spoke. I now include the lead editorial from the Post of May 18:

SECURITY

(By T. O. Thackrey)

The United Nations was organized by self-proclaimed peace-loving states to abolish war and make all nations secure from invasion by hostile forces seeking territory, political domination, or both.

Israel, the world's newest State, established as a democracy, is being invaded by Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Transjordan, Iraq, Yemen, Syria, and Lebanon; all in concert under orders of the pro-Nazi ex-Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, for the purpose of acquiring territory and political domination beyond their individual and collective borders—by force.

All are members of the United Nations.

One is even a member of the Security Council.

Each has deliberately violated the Charter, and definitely announced its hostile and aggressive intention.

The security of the world is involved in the action by the United Nations Security Council—for if it fails to protect Israel, it will meet no such test at any time in the future.

Fortunately, Israel has begun the determination of its own future, by organizing a capable and sound government, supported by its own army, the Haganah and subsidiaries.

Even more fortunately, Israel has won de facto recognition, not only by the United States, fortunately the first to do so, but also by the Soviet Union and by a growing host of other members of the United Nations.

At long last, the Ambassador to the United Nations from the United States is properly taking leadership before the Security Council in demanding that the Council act promptly to halt hostile and aggressive military action in Palestine against Israel, and has called boldly for a formal declaration that a breach of the peace exists.

Forthright as was the beginning made—after so many months of interminable delay—by the United States in coming at last to the support of the Charter and in fact to the implementation of the partition resolution of the General Assembly, time remains of the essence.

If parliamentary procedure is to be exhausted before the actually effective and forceful action of the United Nations is to be employed, it is quite possible that peace itself will have become exhausted, or that the war of conquest embarked upon by Arabia will have carried out its threat to exterminate as many citizens of Israel as possible.

The United States draws attention to article 39 of the Charter, which provides for determining that a breach of the peace threatens or exists, and that measures under articles 41 and 42 can be employed to secure the peace.

The first of these articles provides concerted, but peaceful means, such as economic sanctions. The second provides for the use of land, sea, and air forces.

But meanwhile, hour by hour, even in Jerusalem, the armies of Israel are locked in a death struggle with the invaders, who continue to enjoy the privileges of peace-loving states and amicable relations with the United States and other members of the Security Council.

What is called for, and promptly, is invocation of article 45 of the Charter which provides: "In order to enable the United Nations to take urgent military measures, members shall hold immediately available air force contingents for combined international enforcement action."

Such action is imperative if the security of Israel and the peace of Palestine and the authority of the United Nations are to be obtained.

The United Nations—the hope and trust of the world in evolving an effective machinery for keeping the peace—is involved in the promptness with which such action is forthcoming.

The United States, besides leading the fight for world security, is gravely considering the arms embargo which has been in effect since partition was voted, and which has prevented the defenders of Israel from adequately arming themselves, although Great Britain has armed and continues to arm the Arab legions, at least one of which, Transjordan, is a wholly subsidized state.

It now appears that we have divorced ourselves from Great Britain's perfidy and betrayal. Certainly it is to be devoutly hoped that we have.

For Great Britain's isolation as the real and bitter enemy of peace with justice and democracy in the Middle East becomes more apparent as the Security Council debate drones on.

Great Britain has failed to grant recognition to Israel—after defaulting on the 30-year-long mandate that was to have produced the state which the Jews of Palestine have won by their blood, unassisted.

Great Britain may yet exercise a veto over effective action to secure the peace—having encouraged its breach by the Arab states.

If she does so, a new turning point in history may well have been reached. Her last hope of respect will not be the sole penalty.

In the face of such a failure, the United States, in concert with other members, including the Soviet Union, can—and must—take the forceful action open to members to secure their own national interest without breach of the Charter.

Unconditional support of the only Middle East democracy must—and will—be the only course the people of the United States will approve and support. The longer it is delayed, the greater will be the cost, in lives, in honor.

The Paradox That Is America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on last Sunday, May 16, the Chaplain of the Senate, Dr. Peter Marshall, delivered a very timely and challenging sermon in the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PARADOX THAT IS AMERICA

(Sermon by Dr. Peter Marshall, on Sunday morning, May 16, 1948)

This is "I Am An American Day." Perhaps it means more to citizens who have been admitted to citizenship by naturalization than it does to native-born Americans, but it ought to have deep significance for all of us in these times when the United States is challenged as never before with world responsibilities. Good citizenship is certainly part of the Christian's duty. Peter wrote in his first epistle:

"Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake; whether it be to the king as supreme;

"Or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evildoers, and for the praise of them that do well.

"For so is the will of God, that with well-doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men:

"As free, and not using your liberty for a cloak of maliciousness, but as the servants of God."

Christ said: "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's."

This, then, is not a day for boasting. Those who are citizens of this good land by reason of birth have no reason to boast, since they had nothing to do with their being born within the United States. They are American citizens because they couldn't help it. They still may be, and ought to be profoundly grateful that God, in His providence gave them this land for a home and its history for a heritage.

Those who have known other lands, and have borne other allegiance, and are American citizens by virtue of the privilege of naturalization, need feel no inferiority in their citizenship, for the simple reason that, accepting the privileges offered to them in the Naturalization Act, they became citizens of this Republic from choice, by exercise of their own free will.

But whether citizens by birth, or by adoption, none should feel pride alone, but rather a pride and a humility at one and the same time—not a pride that boasts, but a pride that is humbly grateful, and feels the tremendous responsibility it entails. For the United States is a paradox in many respects, a glory and a shame, in some things so strong and in others so weak, with so much that is gloriously right about her, and so much that is deeply and dangerously wrong.

Let us, Americans all, consider thoughtfully some of the paradoxes that are America. Let us think of them as Christians who happen to be Americans.

We have the highest standard of living of any nation on earth, if we think in terms of refrigerators, telephones, automobiles, electric lighting, sanitation, diet, gadgets, and conveniences, yet our living as a nation is on a very low level, if we think in terms of crime, divorces, the amount of liquor we drink, the huge sums of money we bet on horse races and other forms of gambling, the low moral tone of our best sellers, the subject matter of our plays and motion pictures.

We are the only surviving Nation in the world, as far as I know, that had its origins in settlements of men and women set up, they declared, "to the glory of God, and for the advancement of the Christian faith," and yet the highest court in our country has just decided that we cannot use public school buildings for religious education. They stressed the fact that we must keep church and state separate, and yet we have for years maintained an Ambassador at the Vatican, since two of our Presidents have felt it necessary for us to have personal communication on a diplomatic level with the Pope, the head of the Roman Catholic Church.

It was our Supreme Court which unanimously declared this to be a Christian Nation. Our charter documents so declared the settlements they established to be settlements of Christian men and women, "to the glory of God and the advancement of the Christian faith." If we are not now a Christian nation, then it is time to repeal the Mayflower compact, to declare null and void the Maryland acts of toleration, and to invalidate the statute of religious liberty in Virginia—in fact, all our historic documents including the Bill of Rights.

When the first amendment to the Constitution was drawn up, we must remember the background against which it was written. The men who were concerned about rights, the men who had fought the long war for freedom, the men who had laid aside their muskets and had stored their powder in some dry place, not knowing how soon again they would need them, sought to ensure that no power or force would be set up or tolerated by the State that would deprive them of their liberty to worship God according to the dictates of their consciences. They were determined to avoid the coercion, the tyranny, and the intolerance which they had known, or their fathers had known in other lands. They would protect themselves from the intolerance of the Roman Catholics and from the intolerance of the Church of England as well. It was not that they wished to have freedom from religion, but that they demanded freedom in religion. Every member of the Supreme Court since John Jay, the first Chief Justice, kissed the Bible before he could sit. This is a poor time to kick the Bible out of the public school.

In this good land we have such beautiful houses and such ugly slums, the latter often right alongside buildings of beauty and imposing grandeur, as right here in Washington. I have seen slums in Scotland and in England, and in other cities in this country,

but none anywhere have been more ugly than those right here in Washington.

Here in America we cherish a document that says: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Yet we are one of only two nations on the face of the earth where people are victims of discrimination because of their color. The other is the Union of South Africa.

Surely it is paradoxical that while we were shipping vast quantities of grain to Europe to feed starving people, we could not persuade brewers and distillers to quit using huge quantities of grain for the manufacture of beer and alcoholic beverages.

Is it not a thing to wonder at, that during the war we were saving tin cans and collecting scrap metal, and then when the war was over, leaving tanks, jeeps, airplanes, trucks, and all kinds of equipment to rot and rust overseas? The statement was made that we did not have the ships to move this material, yet hundreds of ships are rusting at anchor all around our coast in our rivers and harbors.

No nation was ever endowed with more natural resources and no nation was ever more wasteful. We have wasted the good earth, and permit millions of cubic feet of irreplaceable top soil to be washed into the Gulf of Mexico every year. We have wasted our wildlife until we have wiped out many strains of ducks and birds that once were plentiful.

Surely it is a paradox that while in the United States the lot of the workingman is better than in any other country, we should have more difficulty in the relations between management and labor.

We say that our Government is "of the people, for the people, by the people," yet we all know that legislation is influenced by powerful lobbies, openly promoting their own self-interest at the expense of the whole country.

We boast of our rights, and take pride in our privileges, but we have not yet learned that to every right there is attached a duty, and to every privilege an obligation. It is a law of life that with power comes responsibility, yet we have groups of our citizens who seek the power, but shirk the responsibility. We have rights here in America, thank God, rights that were bought and paid for by the men and women who went before us. But it is not the right to do as you please, but rather the opportunity to please to do what is right.

I am an American, and I am proud to be a citizen of this great Nation, before which God has placed a great opportunity and a great responsibility. The responsibilities of greatness have been thrust upon her more suddenly perhaps than upon any other nation in history.

The United States had come of age as a great power—a world-leading power—all at once. She has to grow up overnight. She has to make up her mind about a number of things, immediately. She is not in the position to say, "Well, we'll think about it, and conduct a Gallup poll, find out what the people want to do, and then we'll let you know." She can't do that, for world affairs won't permit.

The whole country has to think, and feel, and act in entirely new and different ways. The United States has to play an entirely new kind of a role. Not only is it strange and new, but in some quarters it is unwelcome. Violent adjustments have to be made, and made quickly. The process is difficult and it is painful. It is already causing anguish among people who don't like it, and who can't or won't see the need for it.

For 100 years, from the Battle of Waterloo to the sinking of the *Lusitania*, America was safe, comfortable, and carefree, and had very few sobering responsibilities in world affairs. For another 25 years, from the sinking of the *Lusitania* to the fall of France, America wielded tremendous power among the nations, but didn't understand it or wouldn't accept and use it. America didn't want the influence, because it meant responsibility, and America didn't want to feel any responsibility for the conditions in any other part of the world.

During that time, the United States was safe mostly because it had weak neighbors, because it had on both sides oceans that were protections before the days of air transport, and because there was a balance of power in the world maintained by Great Britain and her dealings with other nations, and because Great Britain had assumed the role of policeman. Nobody thought of attacking the United States because everybody had too many powerful enemies nearer home.

Other countries held the conqueror at bay long enough for the United States to make up its mind. In the First World War it was Belgium, France, and Britain who bought the time and paid for it. In the Second World War it was China, Poland, Norway, France, and Britain who paid for time for America to grasp what was going on. For a while Britain stood alone, helped, of course, by the material aid made available to her by this country, which agreed to be the arsenal of democracy.

While enjoying this long period of immunity from the vexing threats and counter threats of European intrigue and power politics, the United States maintained only token armed forces, paid low taxes, enjoyed almost utopian liberties, and concentrated on exploiting the vast riches of a whole continent. During this interim, America, it is true, fought two minor wars and a great and bloody civil war and many Indian campaigns, but, for the most part, the country paid little attention to foreign affairs outside the Western Hemisphere.

But she was rather free with her advice to other countries on how they should deal with their problems, usually couched in the highest moral tones. Thus, one heard a great deal in this country about what the British should do with India and with Palestine and with Africa, and so on. This advice was free—it cost nothing to give it—for America did not have to pay the bills for the things it did and the things it told other people to do. Now the days when America can give advice and accept no responsibility for what happens are over.

For the British are out of Palestine—and we are in. Our President put us in by his immediate recognition of the Jewish state of Israel. It is going to cost us something, too, you may be sure of that. The British have withdrawn from India, giving that immense country self-government according to the British pledge to do the same for every colony or dependency as soon as the people were ready to assume the responsibilities of governing themselves.

World events are forcing the United States to choose between alternatives. Now that Great Britain, which has for so long acted as the world's policeman, has resigned, the policeman is no longer on the beat. Britain, depleted and impoverished, bled white by two world wars in which she fought from the first shot to the last, is no longer able to shoulder this world responsibility, far out of proportion to her population and her means.

There are only two nations in the world today capable of being responsible for the peace of the world—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—and the United States of America. So for the United States, the alternative is clear and simple. Either she lets Russia police the world (and Russia is more than willing to do it), or she herself must do it. Either we have the Russian kind of peace or the American kind. There is no other choice.

The time is gone when things that happen on the other side of the world make no difference in America. The realization has been forced upon us that it is indeed one world. Chaos and anarchy, tyranny and human misery in any area of the world constitute a threat and a menace to our own way of life here.

But if the United States is to maintain all that she has and to continue as she is, then our people must be willing to adopt a new process of thinking, a new set of attitudes toward world affairs, and a new sense of responsibility, which is going to cost something. No longer can the Christian citizen be indifferent to politics. No longer can the American shrug his shoulders about what goes on in Europe. America will have to have new world policies for this new world, and that means that we Americans must grow up. The days of our happy, carefree childhood are over.

We have an aircraft carrier in Norway; we have a fleet in the Mediterranean, military advisers in Greece, an airfield in north Africa, an army in Germany and Austria, an army in Korea; we occupy Japan. And all of that because we have learned the hard way that what happens in these places affects the farmer in Iowa, the factory worker in Massachusetts, the lumberjack in the Northwest, and Joe Doaks in his shirt sleeves, with a cigar stuck in his mouth, yelling his head off in the bleachers out at the ball park.

Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, Massachusetts, said recently: "Fundamentally, we face a political—a human—challenge of the very highest order. In spite of our great efforts and vast expenditures, we have been hugely unsuccessful in the battle for men's minds. * * * An enthused America, speaking through its Government, can make American democracy an article of export. The Christian concept of the dignity of man is the strongest revolutionary force in the world."

Yes, but we must export our ideas as the Communists export theirs. It is all very well to send over wheat and money, but unless ideas accompany them, ideas that can fire men's minds and inspire men's souls, then our efforts, however well-meaning, will amount to nothing.

We as Christians who happen to be Americans know perfectly well what those ideas are and must be. They are the very same ideas that inspired the founders of this Nation to establish settlements "to the glory of God and for the advancement of the Christian faith." Those ideas are nothing less than Christianity in action. But it is no longer enough to say that we believe in these things. We will have to implement our faith by our action.

The areas of the world that will be decisive from now on, namely, Asia, Africa, and South America, are the very areas in which the Christian churches have their greatest opportunity in missions. There the doors are open—in Japan and China as never before, in Africa, where the whole continent is stirring. Christianity is the answer. Missions is the solution to the tremendous challenge that faces America. If it is not the answer, then we have no answer, and we have no hope.

But if it is the answer, then what in God's name shall we say when we are asked why we remained silent when we should have spoken.

This is the day when we say proudly, "I am an American," but God is saying, "So what?"

Life in United States as Seen by UN Staff—Article From New York Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article

from the New York Times of May 2, 1948, which gives an interesting picture of the United Nations staff and its impressions of life in our country.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIFE IN THE UNITED STATES AS SEEN BY THE UN STAFF

HERE FROM FIFTY-ODD LANDS, THEY FIND MUCH TO CRITICIZE AND SOME ITEMS FOR GENTLE RIBBING

(By George Barrett)

LAKE SUCCESS, N. Y.—Buried in an out-of-the-way office at United Nations headquarters here there hangs a picture of an Austrian castle. Under the picture, the titled owner, who now lives with his wife in a single room near here, has penned this sad script:

When house and land are gone and spent,
Then learning is most excellent.

Those 13 words tell the story of an anti-Nazi nobleman who now devotes his life, as a United Nations employee, to learning on the highest level—the search for permanent peace.

The picture of the 46-room schloss on Austria's Inn River, jutting from rolling hills with its parapets silhouetted fable-like against Alpine snow peaks, is much more, however, than a nostalgic touch of the past for one member of the international family here. It is a universal symbol of home for all the 1,405 non-Americans who have come to New York to work for the UN—home as it seemed long ago and as they keep hoping it will be again some day.

For surprising as it may be, many of the new arrivals in this country, particularly those from Europe, are lonely and homesick. The translators, précis writers, stenographers and technicians who have come here from 51 member and 5 nonmember nations to operate the machinery of international peace are finding that life in the United States is not quite as copesetic as they expected.

The majority of staff members feel that what they lead here is existence not life—cold, dull, daily routine that is made up of five parts work, four parts commuting and, for the very lucky, one part pleasure. They like being able to buy food and clothes and cars and soap, but as one lonely French girl, pert Demise Feledler, puts it: "When I go back to Paris the only things I shall miss about America will be the material things."

Much of the discontent stems directly from bad working conditions. There is probably no administrative grind anywhere in the world that is as hard as the 10-hour, 12-hour and 16-hour schedules kept by many UN workers. These nerve-wracking hours are compounded by what one delegation aide calls the "diabolic distance" between Lake Success and the rest of the world. (He has figured out that he covers 110 miles a day in commuting, which is roughly equivalent to crossing the whole of Belgium with enough mileage left over to take a 15-minute drive through Holland.)

Moreover, there are special irritants for Secretariat workers. Cab drivers and tradesmen and bar patrons like to go out of their way to tell UN employees that the international peace organization has gone sour, and (this is always a belligerent question) what business do all these foreigners have to come over here anyhow and take apartments belonging to veterans?

One top-ranking official from France finally blew up.

"I'm sick of being told we should be grateful for being here, of people resenting the few rooms we sleep in, of friends asking me if I intend to take out citizenship papers. We are not guests of the United States," he continued emphatically. "The United States did its damndest to get the UN over here and we said O. K., and now we are here to do a job, the most important job in the world. We have every real right to be here—not as guests, but as workers on our own internationalized, non-American territory."

This is no isolated outburst. It is not easy for foreigners to swing into our way of living. Perhaps it is because this is one of the rare places in the United States—with the exception of veterans' hospitals—where the war will never be forgotten. A French section chief, wearing in his buttonhole the ribbon of his country's highest decoration, crosses his legs and reveals the deep prison gashes notched by the Germans above his ankles. A Dutch girl greets a customer in the UN bookshop and as she reaches for a pamphlet she uncovers the mark of a Nazi concentration camp branded on her arm.

Even apart from such sobering, deep-rooted differences, the foreign nationals here are disappointed in many of the lighter aspects of life in America. Finn Tennefjord, in the social-affairs section, for example, recalls colliding on skis one day with the Crown Prince back home in Norway's unfenced spaces, but here, he says ruefully, "signs always say 'keep off,' and I can't come close to nature any more—it's like touching it with a stick instead of my hand."

All this may sound as though everybody in the United Nations Secretariat were miserable about being in America. That is not the case by any means. It is just that in defense against the American tendency to patronize and even belittle foreign visitors and foreign countries our visitors at Lake Success try, naturally enough, to cut us down to size where they can. It should be noted, therefore, that while some of their complaints are acidly critical, many of them are by way of being good-natured ribbings.

The greatest problem, of course, is finding a place to live. The UN has done what it could for its employees, and has helped arrange 3 large centers where 750 of the 2,948 Americans and non-Americans live. Three hundred apartments in Parkway Village, Queens, are now available to the UN, and 680 units eventually will be; 37 nationalities are represented in that single international settlement. The other two principal headquarters for mass living by United Nations staff members are Long Island's Great Neck Plaza project and Manhattan's Peter Cooper Village on the lower east side.

But three-fourths of UN workers have had to shift for themselves. Their shifting has resulted in some highly unorthodox approaches to housekeeping.

On Glenwood Road in the swank North Shore community of Roslyn an imposing mansion, surrounded by 12 acres of velvet lawn, tennis courts, and a private beach, stood idle for some months. A group of United Nations arrivals proposed to the owner that they take over until he could find a buyer. Promptly a manager and two dozen Norwegian, Russian, French, Dutch, Chinese, and Polish nationals installed themselves in the stone mansion.

Everything was fine until the manager up and left, taking most of the furniture with him. To use a Security Council phrase, this was a "situation" of the first magnitude. But their headquarters jobs had prepared them well.

Gathering in emergency session, the employees set themselves up as a trusteeship council and, with a show of unanimity their diplomatic bosses could well emulate, voted to carry their "co-op" without a manager. The "council" appointed a three-nation subcommittee to manage the house, set up special subcommittees to handle groceries, budgetary affairs, and heat. Unfortunately the idyllic arrangement ended a few weeks ago after differences with the owner, and at the moment the little band of ex-residents hope that their own international bust-up is no ill omen for the much-buffeted United Nations.

Another odd approach to housekeeping is the case of four girls and a boat. Joyce Bowran, of Newcastle, England, faced with an eviction notice, was beachcoming one day last spring when she came across a 35-foot cabin cruiser high and dry and badly in need of repairs. She chartered it as was and mustered an Anglo-American crew of three additional girls.

The four girls hammered and scraped the derelict into shape for floating and spent the next 6 months aboard. They stored their clothes and took showers in a Roslyn boathouse. The boathouse rental, docking bills and charter costs for the cruiser came to about $800 for the 6 months, which was a little over $33 a month for each girl.

Food ranks second only to housing among the physical problems confronting UN personnel. The staff members have located the New York restaurants that specialize in their national dishes, but gourmets who like to tell their friends about "real native" foods in some "authentic" spot of France, or Syria, or China would be sharply deflated to hear what Frenchmen, Syrians, and Chinese have to say about the same places.

Consequently, eating at home has become standard procedure with most staff members. Mr. and Mrs. LoShan Peng of Shanghai, for example, drive down to New York's Chinatown every Saturday to purchase a week's supply of Chinese cabbage, spareribs, fresh ginger, bean sprouts, and curd.

The daily marketing trek of Europeans, Africans, Asiatics, and Latin Americans has converted Queens' Parsons Boulevard from a dingy beat into an exotic thoroughfare. Clerks at Codman's liquor store and Moe Baumann's pharmacy don't do double-takes any more when they sight a slit-skirted Chinese chipao, or the silken-soft chugori and chima of a Korean housewife or even the Englishwoman who totes her baby in a knapsack on her back while she shops. But Mr. Codman still can't get over the fact that most of his American customers ask for imported French wines while the French themselves invariably want cheap American wines.

What to wear is a particularly plaguing problem with UN workers. Many of the ladies cling resolutely to their native dress, although sometimes this produces awkward situations. For example, the girls from India were determined to wear their colorful native saris, but learned to their dismay that no one in New York was able to clean and press the voluminous folds properly. Most of the Indian girls here never turned a finger at home—India is a country with millions of cheap servants—but they solved their problem in that sound old practical way; they just haul out their ironing boards every evening and do their own pressing.

India's hot-weather costume, incidentally, was never designed for New York winters, and so there was considerable curiosity here during February's cold spell when one of the Indian girls kept showing up for work dressed with apparent comfort in a flowing sari of light chiffon while everybody else shivered in woolens and tweeds. Discreet questioning revealed that beneath the billowing veils she wore long flannel underwear and two heavy sweaters.

A lot of nonsense has been spread about the way the UN people live, but there is one certified account of the Yugoslav who rented a furnished room and slept on the floor for 5 nights because he didn't understand enough English to explain that the bed was broken. Then there was the group of Chinese who spent the better part of an hour going up and down the automatic elevator in Peter Cooper Village. A sympathetic neighbor offered to show them how to operate the elevator. She was informed—and curtly—that they understood the mechanics and were merely enjoying the ride.

The bizarre and often confusing adjustments UN workers have to make while they are here are exemplified by Lula Martin, who decided to stay in the United States when Franco moved into Madrid. Mr. Martin lives in Montclair, N. J., and it takes him 2½ hours commuting time each way. He has some special problems during his travels.

Montclair is ultraconservative country-club territory. So while Mr. Martin rides the trains in New Jersey and crosses the ferry to New York he reads his English and American newspapers "in honor of my fellow Republicans." When he switches to the New York subway he pulls out Pravda and other Russian journals he subscribes to. At the end of the subway ride he takes the Lake Success bus, and here he turns to his French journals. At night he simply reverses the process.

Sometimes, of course, UN people refuse to make these concessions. An English girl spent last Christmas with 175 other staff members as the guest of Binghamton, N. Y., and she found herself, a Fabian Socialist, billeted in a bank president's house. No respecter of pussy-footing, she shocked her host by arguing gleefully in favor of nationalizing banks and railroads.

The children of UN families show an equal resolve not to knuckle under to American ways. At Jamaica's P. S. 154, 8-year-old Maha Howrani, daughter of a Syrian official, faced the problem of taking the oath of allegiance to the American flag. But she solved it more diplomatically than her elders at Lake Success could have. She makes her pledge in unison with the other pupils, and joins in the salute to the Stars and Stripes, but as she does so she closes her eyes and thinks instead of Syria's flag.

Teresa Anguita, of Valparaiso, thinks that the main difference between life in Latin America and the United States is that the American youngsters are too unbridled. "But after all, their parents were all raised the same way, and you grew up into peaceful citizens, didn't you?" she adds reasonably.

Dating produces some special hazards to international amity. On the American male's courting habits, pretty, dark-haired Luz Arias, of Peru, has definite opinions. "I had an American boy friend," she observes. "But American boys take girls for granted, and they kiss too quickly. They like to rush in, throw their hats around, shout 'Let's have a party,' and start drinking. Maybe that's not bad, but it is not good, no?" Besides, Luz adds dryly, American males are young and immature, no matter what their ages.

A more grave accusation against life in America comes from an English girl, who feels that the various official investigations of un-American activities are appalling and indicative of semi-Fascist tendencies. Life in America is a sort of Hollywood dream existence, she maintains: "So much food you eat, such warm houses, such fine clothes—oh, such very fine clothes!—but over it all there is a heavy pall, a great shadow, a huge cloud—don't you feel it?"

Everybody, of course, wants to know about the average Russian at the UN. If there is any such person it is probably Andrei ———, who used to work in the Ministry of Transportation Building on Moscow's Red Gates Circle. At present he works as a UN research expert and lives with his wife and daughter in a 3½-room apartment in Parkway Village.

Andrei had never eaten grapefruit before coming to America, and it got him down at first, but now he takes to it like a Californian. "It doesn't have to be pink, either," he adds with a grin. A former baseball and soccer star for the Moscow Railroad Institute, Andrei went to a college football game last fall. He doesn't remember the names of the schools, but found the experience interesting except that "it was a little tiresome the way 'conferences' among the players kept holding up the game."

Like most Russians, Andrei spends a good deal of his spare time in museums—any museum. He astounds New Yorkers when he tells them they have nearly 100 museums in their city. This, he always points out, is no mean accomplishment, considering that even Moscow has no more. He skips modern art, like most Russians, on the theory that it is a racket. Perhaps his highest praise is for the ice shows; he compares them with the Bolshoi ballet, and from a Russian that is top approval.

The debit side of life for Andrei in the United States also includes the way American cigarettes deposit tobacco on the tongue (Russian cigarettes have hollow tips) and double bills at the neighborhood movie house. He thought for a while he would take up gum chewing as a conformist member of subway society, but he couldn't go through with it. "Sometimes when you see a young man chew, or even an old man, his face looks not very clever," Andrei observes.

By and large the people of the United Nations are, like Andrei, glad to be here as long as they can't be home. But there is one American custom that comes in for particularly caustic criticism from all UN workers.

A Haitian secretary in the language division tells how she has sometimes sat "unnoticed" in a New York restaurant because of her color, and how the UN friends with her always want to make something of it.

"I never let them," she says. "It gets you nowhere, and anyhow that kind of thing is too unimportant in the whole picture of racial discrimination." She smiles faintly. "Maybe some day the United States will be as democratic as Europe."

Maybe some day the UN people, who live and work without regard for race, color, or creed, can prove to us all that real democracy works. A girl who came from Virginia to work here tells how she got up from her seat in a bus not so long ago when a Negro sat down beside her.

"Now it is almost unbelievable that I ever did anything so rotten," she says. Her face flushes. "I shall always be ashamed."

Seventy-Group Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Congress Deserves High Praise," which appeared in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of Friday, May 14, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS DESERVES HIGH PRAISE

The United States Senate, as the country had earnestly hoped, has joined with the House of Representatives in giving approval to a 70-group air force as the minimum requirement for American security.

In fact, the Senate has gone the House one better in this respect, only two of its Members having voted in opposition to the bill, whereas there were three negative votes in the House.

This, as the Hearst newspapers previously remarked on the occasion of the House vote, is one of the most remarkable and gratifying demonstrations of legislative near-unanimity on a controversial issue in the history of Congress.

Just why the Air Force expansion issue was controversial is, of course, difficult to understand, for the sole chance the United States has of staying out of future war is unquestionably to be found in an air force strong enough to win any future war—specifically, the imminent war which Soviet Russia even now poses as a threat—and it is not our military aviation authorities alone who are of this opinion, but all responsible military and naval leaders share it.

Nevertheless, it is strangely true that the national-defense department made a much lower estimate of the minimum-aviation requirements for national safety and was supported by President Truman.

It is an utterly amazing fact that the national-defense department and the President never asked for more than 66 Air Force groups and in the beginning asked for as few as 34 groups, although Soviet Russia is known to possess a combat air force far superior to our own and for the past year has been outbuilding America in military aviation by the ratio of 12 to 1.

This is an almost incomprehensible attitude, as Senator BRIDGES, of New Hamphire, remarked in the light of the full and ominous knowledge we have of the intentions of Soviet Russia to conduct an aeronautical war against us and of her intensive and continuing preparation to do so.

In determining the size and power of the American Air Force, said Senator BRIDGES, there has been just one question before Congress.

"It is the question of meeting the military potential of just one adversary—Russia. * * *

"In the present unhappy world situation, we know who will attack us if anyone attacks, and whom we have got to be prepared to meet."

It is a good and fortunate thing for the country, in these circumstances, that the Air Force persisted in its advocacy of the 70-group bill Congress subsequently approved, even though it lacked the support of the National Defense Department and the President and apparently incurred their displeasure.

It is especially fortunate for the country that Congress so overwhelmingly, and so nearly unanimously, accepted the appraisal by the Air Force of its own minimum needs.

Even with the 70-group air force now approved, it will be several years before American military aviation can achieve the combat strength thus authorized.

And when that is done, although the American Air Force will be vastly more formidable than it is now and certainly more formidable than the recommendations of the National Defense Department and the President contemplated, it will still be far short of the goal of aviation supremacy capable of defeating Soviet Russia in a future war and perhaps capable of deterring her from launching any future war.

Congress has the highest approval of the country for its alert and decisive action with respect to an adequate Air Force, and it has the deepest appreciation of the American people for the sound provisions it has made for national peace and security.

Where Are We Heading?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, we judge the future very largely by the past. The

American people are concerned today, terribly concerned, as to what lies ahead. Is it to be peace or war? Will Russia be contained without resorting to a shooting war? Can communism be stopped before it embraces the earth? These and kindred other questions lay heavy upon the hearts and minds of our people.

In order to find probable answers to these questions, we should first look at the record of the last 16 years, review that record, and try to learn from the events of the recent past what we may expect to happen in the immediate future. Therefore, let us look at the record.

Mr. Speaker, Franklin Delano Roosevelt secured his 16-year lease on the White House in 1932, the same year that Hitler grabbed power in Germany. President Roosevelt had charge of our foreign policy during all of Hitler's regime and during most of Stalin's Communist expansion program. He had full knowledge of every move these two dictators made leading up to World War II. What did he do about it?

President Roosevelt's first mistake in international relations was to recognize Stalin's Communist dictatorship as a Soviet Republic, entitled to a seat among the family of nations. In exchange for this recognition Roosevelt secured Stalin's worthless promise to stop spreading Communist propaganda in this country. Stalin's promise was not kept and the so-called Dies committee was set up to uncover the activities of Stalin's agents in this country in violation of his promise.

Roosevelt made another bad mistake when he built up Stalin and communism until they have become as great a menace to world peace and happiness as Hitler and Hitlerism ever were. He did this when Stalin had his back to the wall, when Moscow was threatened, when Stalingrad was in rubble by furnishing Stalin $14,000,000,000 worth of war material—war material that MacArthur needed very badly in his campaign in Asia—and thus he saved Stalin and communism for the world. This mistake was further aggravated at Tehran, Yalta, Cairo, and Quebec when Roosevelt continued to appease Stalin by agreeing to his demands, every one of which gave added prestige, power, and territory to the Communist dictator.

A final mistake was made at the San Francisco conference when Stalin objected to proposal after proposal until conditions he demanded were met. We should have gone ahead and established the UNO without Russia. At that time we controlled 75 percent of the military strength of the world. After the UNO was in operation and functioning we could have said, "Now, Mr. Stalin, if you want to join up and play ball with us, all right; but, if not, upon your first act of aggression we will throw against you the entire military might of the world." If our leaders had taken that stand then we would have avoided the world headaches of today.

Mr. Speaker, that in brief is a record of the past 16 years of bungling in our foreign affairs program. Now, what can we expect if we continue to pursue such a vacillating, inconsistent program of appeasement; if we continue to follow the path we have already selected and begun to travel upon? Into what will the Marshall plan lead us? What are our next steps in world affairs to be? These questions are answered so well in a recent editorial in the May 4, 1948, issue of the Chicago Tribune, and the situation confronting us as a result of our mistakes is so well analyzed, that I include that editorial as a part of my remarks:

THE NEXT STEP

The Truman administration and the bipartisan boys in Congress are now talking about a military guaranty for the five-nation western European coalition alined against the Soviet Union. A revival of lend-lease to rearm these countries and such other allies as can be mustered is also recommended.

Before proceeding to these objectives, the schemers thought it prudent to get the Marshall plan passed under false pretenses. It was said originally that the country had the choice of passing the Marshall plan, with its contemplated expenditure of $17,000,000,000 in aid to western Europe over 4 years, or reconciling itself to great expenditures for rearmament against Russia. The Marshall plan was going to stop communism.

Now that the Marshall plan is passed, we learn that it will not, after all, save us the necessity of spending billions on a huge air force, adopting peacetime conscription and a stopgap draft to fill up the ranks, and resigning ourselves to wartime controls over production, materials, manpower, prices, etc. The administration is asking all of these things.

Not only will the Marshall plan fail to save us from these things at home, but it is now admitted that the Marshall plan is not going to save non-Communist Europe from communism. Military guaranties and a return to lend-lease are demanded for the benefit of the very same nations which were supposed to be going to be able to stave off communism if only they were given the benefits of the Marshall plan.

All of this is dreadfully reminiscent of Mr. Roosevelt's progressive steps in 1940–41, when, at first, we were told that we were not going to get into Europe's war; next, that all aid should be given the nations opposing the dictators, but that this help would stop short of war; then, that convoying and the dispatch of troops to Iceland and other points within the war zone were not going to put America into the war, but would keep the war away from America's shores; and, finally, that it was our war, here is Pearl Harbor, we have been attacked, and now please pick up your gun and start firing.

As before, the American people are taken a little distance along the road at a time, beguiled with promises like a reluctant horse enticed with a carrot. The campaign for resumption of lend-lease has been well prepared by the usual lieutenants of New Deal foreign policy: General Marshall, the Secretary of State; Senator VANDENBERG, the me-too Republican champion of the bipartisan sell-out; Representative EATON, the native Canadian who is VANDENBERG's opposite number in the House, and by such other bipartisan Republican servants of New Deal foreign policy as Representative CHESTER E. MERROW, of New Hampshire. Last week the build-up proceeded as follows:

Tuesday. Marshall closeted himself with Vandenberg, Under Secretary of State Lovett, and John Foster Dulles, bipartisan Republican adviser of Vandenberg. Vandenberg emerged to make a speech broadly hinting that the United States would take the lead in strengthening UN through regional defensive alliances.

In Congress on the same day MERROW demanded an American commitment to go to war if Russia crossed any of a series of lines drawn in front of the approaches to the Atlantic, the nations of western Europe, the Dardanelles, Greece, Turkey, Iran, the Near East, the Persian Gulf, China, and the islands of the Pacific. He asked a flat military guaranty to the coalition of Britain, France, Holland, Belgium, and Luxemburg.

Marshall in a speech that day called for continuity of foreign policy (meaning his and Truman's foreign policy) and full support of that policy by the country (meaning 100 percent bipartisanship).

Wednesday. Marshall announced that the Administration was considering some form of military lend-lease for the five members of the western European coalition, while Representative EATON announced that the House Foreign Affairs Committee, of which he is chairman, had asked the State Department for new lend-lease in behalf of non-Communist foreign nations.

Friday. It was denied that Truman would ask Congress to revive lend-lease. Senator CONNALLY, former New Deal chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, said, however, that the request would originate with the State Department, which amounts to the same thing.

Lend-lease will not only hasten the pace of this country toward national insolvency but will put the United States into a position everywhere in the world where it can be taken into war whenever Russia, one of its satellites, or one of the countries to be taken under the American wing chooses to start the firing. We shall surrender the power of decision over our own acts and subject ourselves to whatever fate foreigners design for us.

If Congress caves in once more, we shall be on the threshold of war just as we were in 1941.

Veterans' Homestead Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Members will recall that I have given several brief explanations on provisions of the veterans' homestead housing bill, H. R. 4488. This measure, recently reported from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, is an amendment to the GI bill of rights.

I would like to summarize its provisions:

First. Relies on initiative and individual effort of the veteran.

Second. Will provide housing at prices veterans can afford to pay—limits average cost per dwelling unit to $10,000.

Third. Rental and multiunit housing as well as construction of individual homes is provided.

Fourth. Applies to all veterans of World War II—urban or rural.

Fifth. Makes provisions for community facilities where not otherwise furnished.

Sixth. All expenditures except those for community facilities are on a reimbursable basis.

Seventh. Interest rates at 4 percent or less, with amortization periods as long as 40 years.

Eighth. Channels funds to lending institutions which need money to make GI housing loans.

Ninth. Gives special attention to needs of veterans on the farm.

Tenth. Includes incontestability clause to encourage participation of lenders.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert, at this point in the RECORD, a brief explanation of the provisions of this bill as prepared by the staff of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

VETERANS' HOMESTEAD HOUSING BILL, H. R. 4488

Title: To amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to provide for veterans of World War II homes, and the public facilities necessary therefor, through veterans' homestead associations, and to make available more adequate financing for the acquisition of homes and farms by such veterans.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request). Introduced and referred November 18, 1947.

Analysis: The revised reported version of H. R. 4488 amends the Servicemen's Readjustment Act to permit the Veterans' Administrator to charter veterans' homestead associations, composed of at least five veterans for the purpose of providing housing for veterans. Substantial aid would be given for the construction of multiunit housing to be rented or sold on a cooperative or mutual-ownership basis. Average cost of each family unit limited to $10,000. Authority expires July 25, 1957.

Individual single-unit houses, either rural or urban, could be built by associations and sold to an individual veteran. Homestead associations could not supply permanent financing to purchasers of individual units.

Association financing to be obtained from Veterans' Administrator at an interest rate not more than one-fourth of 1 percent more than rate he is required to pay the Secretary of the Treasury for the capital required. Loans may be amortized over 40 years for rental multiunit housing and 32 years for housing held on a mutual or cooperative basis.

Authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to advance the following amounts:

One billion dollars per year for 5 years to Veterans' Administrator for loans to veterans' homestead associations and such other sums as are necessary to maintain a restricted secondary market for future title III home and farm loans;

Seven hundred and fifty million dollars per year for 5 years for Home Loan Bank Board to make investments in savings banks, cooperative banks, building and loan associations, and similar institutions which are members of a Federal home-loan bank or are insured under title IV of the National Housing Act which will make GI loans of $9,000 or less more readily available to veterans (preference to be given in distribution of funds to those institutions in areas needing capital expansion for veterans' housing and willing to make 100-percent loans to veterans);

One hundred million dollars per year for 5 years to Secretary of Agriculture (acting through Federal land bank loans or Farmers Home Administration loans) to provide farm-loan financing to veterans;

Two hundred million dollars to the Federal Works Administrator for grants, on the customary 50-percent matching basis, for sewer, water, and like facilities required for the housing.

Incontestability for GI loan guaranties is included to encourage participation in loan program.

The only nonreimbursable expenditure required will be the $200,000,000 for the use of the Federal Works Administrator in providing grants to the States in the construction of public and community facilities needed by the associations.

Analysis by section

SEC. 511. Homestead association: Authorizes Veterans' Administrator, on application of five or more World War II veterans, to charter homestead associations for purpose of providing housing. Association authorized to borrow from Administrator at not more than one-fourth of 1 percent in excess of cost of money to Government. Forty-year limit on loans for rental multiunit housing; 32 years for mutual or cooperative housing. Maximum average cost per dwelling limited to $10,000 or less. Membership limited to World War II veterans who have deposited $100 with association; bars membership to Communists or those belonging to subversive organizations. Creates advisory council to aid Administrator in performance of duties under this act. Authority to charter associations expires July 25, 1957.

SEC. 512. Grants for public facilities: Authorizes Federal Works Administrator to aid State or local governments or associations by 50-percent grants for sewers, streets, and similar facilities; $200,000,000 allocated for this purpose.

SEC. 513. Lending institution investment: Authorizes Home Loan Bank Board to make investments in certain types of lending agencies for 5 years; preference to be given institutions in areas where capital for housing is needed and to those agencies willing to make 100 percent GI loans to veterans in an amount not exceeding $9,000.

SEC. 514. Farm loans: Liberalizes provisions for loans to veterans by Federal land banks for farm real estate loans; broadens authority of Farmers Home Administration.

SEC. 515. Secondary market: Establishes a restricted long-range secondary market for home and farm loans which are guaranteed or insured under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. This feature expected to halt the sharp decrease (43 percent) in GI home-loan applications.

SEC. 516. Provisions for funds: Authorizes following amounts to agencies indicated:

(1) One billion dollars per year for 5 years to Veterans' Administration and necessary funds for operation of secondary market;

(2) Seven hundred and fifty million dollars per year for 5 years to Home Loan Bank Board;

(3) One hundred million dollars per year for 5 years to Secretary of Agriculture for use through Federal land banks and Farmers Home Administration;

(4) Two hundred million dollars for Federal Works Administrator.

All of the above to be obtained through issuance of bonds by the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 517. Incontestability clause: This clause makes conclusive any evidence of guaranty or insurance issued by the Administrator as to eligibility of loan and amount of guaranty. Expected to encourage lenders to participate in loans programs to greater extent.

SEC. 518. Termination of second-mortgage guaranty: Terminates 90 days after enactment authority to guarantee second-mortgage loans in conjunction with a primary loan insured by other Federal agencies.

Hearings: By full committee December 18, 1947; January 27, 28, February 19, March 1, 4, April 9, 13, and 15, 1948. (Executive sessions April 20, 21, 27, 28, 29, 30, 1948.)

Reported: May 3, 1948. House Report 1848. Union Calendar 886.

Effective: When enacted.

Republic of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable Henry Morgenthau, Jr., former Secretary of the Treasury, on the Salute to Israel program held at Madison Square Garden, New York City, May 16, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

May is a memorable month in American history. It was in May of 1775 that with the Continental Congress began the provisional government that was to lead to full statehood in the following year. That Continental Congress faced a situation fully analogous to that which tonight confronts the state of Israel. The Congress was led by scholars, merchants, lawyers, farmers, men of peace. They were compelled with little means and against great odds to engage in war against a powerful enemy. The men of that Continental Congress had to build from the ground up all the facilities of government, such as communications, a national army, a national treasury, and all the other arms of a national administration. They were not only threatened from without but had to face enemies from within.

President Truman has magnificently demonstrated the strong parallel between America in May 1775 and Palestine in May 1948. The recognition of the new Jewish Nation, only minutes after it was born, by the greatest democracy in the world, represents the greatest birthday present that this new member of the family of nations could have received. It is in the best tradition of our country that we have been first to recognize the new democracy of Israel.

We have given recognition. That represents the overwhelming sentiment of the American people. It represents a great moral lift to the new state. But recognition must be backed up with action. Action that will promptly put a stop to the aggression and attack of the Arab states. The world must not be permitted to forget that these aggressor states are ruthlessly violating the principles of the Charter of the United Nations—that they are defying the decision and will of the General Assembly—and that by their war on the new state of Israel they are imperiling the peace of the world.

The developments which prompted the United States to recognize the Republic of Israel must also move our Government to act quickly to halt the invasion by Arab armies. It must act quickly to help the democratic state of Israel, which wants peace, to defend the soil which its people have made free with their sacrifice and toil.

We can best serve the interests of peace by making strong the defenders of Israel—by giving them all the moral and material things they need to drive the invaders from their settlements and their cities.

We can best serve the interests of democracy in the Middle East by extending the Marshall plan to aid the great constructive program for recovery that awaits the homeless Jews of Europe, who will enter Palestine in great numbers in the coming weeks and months. I earnestly hope that the facilities of the European recovery program, the Export-Import Bank, the International Bank,

and all such institutions in which our Government is involved, will consider sympathetically any applications that may be submitted by the new state.

The Jewish state is fortified by the courage and faith of its citizens. But we must never forget that a single aim inspired their fight for freedom: their eager desire that the mass of Jews without home and hope in Europe might share in the security and freedom of Palestine. That is a goal in which the Jews of America have shared for decades. Our material and moral support have been extended in increasing measure so that the wanderers might rest at last in their own homeland.

Tonight much will be said here to encourage the Jews of Palestine. Nothing, it seems to me, could be more fortifying to their spirit than our assurance that in greater measure than ever before we shall pour out our resources so that the essential objective of their struggle may be realized through mass immigration to Palestine.

I would call upon this great audience tonight, symbolic of all earnest and self-respecting Jews in America, to dedicate itself in solemnity to the United Jewish Appeal, the one great instrument through which we can strengthen the foundations of Palestine. Far and wide Jews of good will have said after the destruction and despair: Give us a constructive program so that our people will be guided on the road to self-sustenance and self-realization.

This is the moment for which we have been waiting.

The great exodus of the Jews from Cyprus to Palestine has already begun.

In every miserable DP camp in Europe new hope is glowing tonight.

Tonight, wherever Jews are in pain and in want they offer up a prayer of thanksgiving that the hour of their deliverance is nearer.

But more than words will be required if the thousands and tens of thousands are to march across the bridge to Palestine. It will require money—large sums of money, great-hearted sums of money. Now! Today! At once!

If the men and women in this garden will pledge themselves that tomorrow morning they will turn themselves into a great army for the United Jewish Appeal, marching into the homes of the New York community, in a great mission of deliverance they will have realized the meaning of this evening of dedication.

I should like to read a letter sent to me by a Jew who typifies the best in America and in Jewry. It is from Abraham Mazer, who, like Haym Solomon, is a merchant. Mr. Mazer writes:

Hon. HENRY MORGENTHAU,
General Chairman, United Jewish Appeal, New York City.

DEAR MR. MORGENTHAU: It is a source of deepest regret that I cannot accept your invitation to join with you and those of my fellow New Yorkers at the meeting at Madison Square Garden on Sunday night, May 16, to celebrate the founding of the Provisional Government of the Jewish state in Palestine.

It is an occasion for which the Jewish people have been praying for some 2,000 years. It is for me a source of the deepest personal satisfaction that this great moment has come within my own lifetime.

In this hour of great celebration, we are mindful of the generations who have preceded us and who have labored and died to bring this dream to reality. On this occasion we pay tribute to the pioneers who even today are building this State on their own bodies.

On this occasion I am impelled to express my gratitude to God who has brought us to this day and to our people who have been thus rewarded. To express this pride and joy, I would ask you to be kind enough to announce the participation of my family and myself in this great birthday of the Jewish State through a gift of $250,000 to the United Jewish Appeal which is the instrument through which American Jewry strengthens the redemption of our people in Palestine.

In appreciation of your own labors as general chairman of the United Jewish Appeal, I am,

Sincerely yours,

A. MAZER.

I trust that the spirit in which Mr. Mazer greets the founding of the provisional government will be matched by the Jews of this community and of every community in the United States.

In proclaiming the new Jewish state, its provisional government issued a call to Jews throughout the world (and I quote) to "rally to our side in the task of immigration and development and to stand by us in the great struggle for the fulfillment of the dream of generations—the redemption of Israel."

As general chairman of the United Jewish Appeal, I know that I bespeak the will of American Jews, when I say that we accept this call and that we are determined to respond to it to the fullest measure of our resources.

This is the moment. This is the hour of destiny. The Jews of America will surely make the United Jewish Appeal the instrument for the realization of the greatest program for reconstruction in the history of the Jewish people.

Dr. James E. West Dead at 72; First Boy Scout Chief Executive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply grieved to hear of the death on May 15 of Dr. James E. West, the great Boy Scout leader of America. It has been my privilege for over a quarter of a century to have been affiliated with this great organization which was largely developed to its outstanding position in America by the indefatigable work of the brain and heart of this great leader for the boys of America. His own example of overcoming all difficulties through his own personal efforts is an outstanding achievement and a worthy example to every boy in America. Crippled from youth, left alone as an orphan without parental care, having been raised in an orphanage, he arose to the heights of achievement in character development in American youth. Our own generation has had no greater disciple of good citizenship and useful public service than that of our departed leader, James E. West.

I include as part of my remarks the article by the Associated Press appearing in the public press of May 16, 1948:

DR. JAMES E. WEST DEAD AT 72—FIRST BOY SCOUT CHIEF EXECUTIVE—WASHINGTON NATIVE LED ORGANIZATION FOR 32 YEARS

NEW ROCHELLE, N. Y., May 15.—Dr. James E. West, former chief Scout executive of the Boy Scouts of America, died tonight. He would have been 72 tomorrow.

Dr. West died at New Rochelle Hospital which he entered last night.

Hospital authorities said he had been ill for a number of years with an intestinal ailment and took a turn for the worse yesterday.

Dr. West, a native of Washington, had been chief Scout executive for 32 years when he retired in 1943. He later was elected chief Scout. During his tenure as chief Scout executive, an estimated 10,000,000 boys and men had joined the organization.

CRIPPLED IN CHILDHOOD

A crippled orphan in his childhood, Dr. West took part in many programs to aid children. For this reason he was chosen as chief executive when the national Boy Scout movement was organized in 1910.

A year later he became chief Scout executive.

Dr. West was a close friend of the late President Theodore Roosevelt, who named him to the Board of Pension Appeals and later made him an assistant attorney in the Interior Department.

Dr. West is survived by his widow; his sons, Arthur Pratt West, of White Plains, N. Y., and Dr. Robert West, of New Rochelle; and his daughters, Mrs. Adrian Van Sinderen, of New Rochelle, and Mrs. William F. Higgins, Jr., of Bayonne, N. J.

BECAME ACTIVE IN YOUTH WORK

After holding the Pension Board and Interior posts, he became active in many youth programs.

He had led the Boy Scouts for nearly 20 years when President Hoover named him cochairman of a White House conference on youth outside of the home and school.

In 1933 he was named to President Franklin D. Roosevelt's conference on mobilization for human needs. In 1939 and 1940 he served at the White House conference on children in a democracy.

He was author of numerous books, pamphlets and articles about scouting, and was editor of Boys' Life magazine from 1922 to 1943.

Dr. James E. West, the man who made boyhood a career and won the tributes of Presidents, was left at the age of six with no known living relatives, a heritage of tuberculosis and a child's knowledge that nobody wanted him.

His father died before he was born. His mother, Mrs. Mary Tyree West, died of tuberculosis and the child went to what was then known as the Washington City Orphan Asylum.

At the orphanage, the child began to limp. The orphanage authorities decided he was malingering. The matron put him on bread and water and finally horsewhipped him to "break his will."

It was only when a friend of the boy's mother, remembering a promise, visited the child that he was finally examined. The boy was found to have a tubercular hip.

LAY ON BOARD

At Children's Hospital, the boy lay on a board for 14 months with weights attached to his leg. Then the hospital decided he was incurable, and told the orphanage to take him back. The orphanage didn't want a helpless cripple and said so.

Finally, the child was bundled into a hansom cab one winter night. The hackman carried the boy past the unlocked door of the orphanage and left him there with his crutches and a cloth bag that held his few belongings.

So lame he couldn't do the work assigned to the boys, the young West was put with the girls and taught to sew. It was here that another woman who had known his mother, Mrs. Ella Spear, found him. Mrs. Spear brought him a toy oxcart—the first present he had since his mother's death.

By inviting him to her home and giving the boy a book to read, Mrs. Spear opened a new world to the crippled orphan—a world of learning, of family life, of all that he was missing.

He found at the orphanage a small library, usually locked. The boy asked permission to have the library opened to all the orphans. The matron protested that the books might be injured but the youngster would not be denied. He offered to have the books covered and got the other children to help him cover more than 1,000 of them with brown paper.

When he found the other children didn't want to read, he offered to pay them from his own weekly wages of 75 cents, 1 penny for every book they read. That didn't stir their interest, but his next proposal did. He got permission for readers to sit up an extra hour in the evening.

ATTENDED SCHOOL OUTSIDE

That was the beginning of the saga of a man who not only fought to make a life for himself, but was determined that every other child must have a chance.

He got unheard-of permission to attend school outside the orphanage, and succeeded in getting permission for 24 other children. At 16, when he finished the eighth grade, he asked permission to go to high school. His request was refused on the ground that he couldn't do his chores at the orphanage and go to school, too.

But the matron finally agreed to let him try it for a month. To stay in school, he stoked the orphanage furnace, got up once a week at 2 a. m. to haul the institution's wash to the laundry, even took on the additional job of night watchman.

At business high school, he became editor of the school paper, manager of the football team and school librarian. He graduated from high school at the age of 19.

REJECTED FOR JOB

He tried to get a job in a bicycle shop. The proprietor took one look at the youth on crutches and turned him down. But by that time young West was used to refusals. Would the owner take him on if he, a cripple, could ride a bicycle himself? The owner probably figured such a deal would make the turn-down easier.

The next day young Jimmy West was back battered, bruised, but able to ride a bicycle. He got the job.

Then he decided to become a lawyer. He got a chance to read with a lawyer. He trained himself to walk without crutches. Finally, he won a bachelor's and then a master's degree at national university.

To pay his way through school, he got a job at the YMCA. A bad fire at the YMCA burned out the wing where night school classes were held. The directors said they didn't have the money to rebuild the wing.

UNDERTOOK REBUILDING JOB

To the youth who had got all his education the hard way, the end of the night school came almost as a personal blow. He prevailed on the directors to let him take care of the reconstruction, as long as it wouldn't cost them any money. He made the rounds of contractors and teachers with the proposal that they postpone charges for their services until a reopened school could meet their bills. The school was rebuilt and soon had enough enrollment to pay off its debts.

Everything he saw affecting boys had in turn an effect on him—and he did something about it.

A trip to court convinced him a juvenile court was needed. He convinced President Theodore Roosevelt a tribunal should be established, staffed with personnel who knew how to deal with children.

MADE PLAYGROUNDS PERMANENT

It was he, backed by the Playground Association of Washington, who persuaded Congress to appropriate enough money to put the playground movement on a permanent basis here.

He organized and served as secretary of the National Child Rescue League which placed more than 2,000 homeless children in childless homes.

President Theodore Roosevelt, on his urging, called a White House conference on the care of dependent children with Dr. West as organizer and secretary.

Dr. West had decided to open his own law office and had even sent out announcements when, in 1910, a group of men approached him to lead the newly formed Boy Scout organization.

SPENT REST OF LIFE AS SCOUT

Finally, the young lawyer agreed to take charge for 6 months. He spent the rest of his life in the Scout movement.

It was he who was responsible for the twelfth Scout law, "A Scout is reverent." It grew out of his conviction of the need on the part of today's youth for the strengthening of the influence of the church.

He won a congressional charter for his organization, gave the Scouts their handbook, fought to keep the Scouts without racial or religious prejudice, became the editor of Boy's Life, the official Scout magazine, and gave his leadership to support of a reading program for the youth of America.

Many honors and satisfactions came the way of this man who built his life and guided his Scouts on the firm foundation of self-reliance. But two things must have given him great happiness—seeing the national jamboree of the Scouts spread out over his native Washington in 1937 and returning to find the orphanage of his bleak childhood now the modern Children's Village, Hillcrest.

Typical of the honors was the gold medal awarded to him in 1940 by the National Institute of Social Sciences "for distinguished services to humanity."

Truman Should Be Elected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Syracuse Herald-American of Sunday, April 18, 1948, and which was written expressly for that paper by Charles J. Hogen, chairman of the Onondaga (N. Y.) County Democratic Committee.

TRUMAN SHOULD BE ELECTED

(By Charles J. Hogan, chairman of the Onondaga County Democratic Committee who will head Democratic delegation to the national convention)

I earnestly urge our people to make a careful appraisal between now and November of all the facts in the national picture. If they do, I am confident they will vote to keep President Truman and the Democratic Party in power during the present critical period.

Republicans say they should be entrusted with control of the Government at this time because Presideht Truman's policies have failed.

But in view of the fact that Republicans, controlling Congress, have been forced by American public opinion and the dictates of their own hearts and minds, to support the major Truman policies, that argument is funny.

Take foreign relations. Most Americans, I am sure, feel that foreign relations constitute our most perplexing and threatening problem. I think the opinion is quite generally held that if we could get foreign relations on a satisfactory basis—which of course means checking the advance of Russian communism, thus insuring generations of peace—our domestic problems could be ironed out without too much difficulty.

President Truman recommended aid to Greece and Turkey to halt the Communist advance in that section of Europe. The Republican Congress endorsed that program, and put it through.

Then Truman and Secretary Marshall proposed the Marshall plan—the European relief program—to halt the Communist campaign to take over western European democracies. The Republican Congress, after considerable hemming and hawing, approved and put it through.

Truman and Marshall gave their enthusiastic support to the new western European union, devised to halt Russian aggression. So did the Republicans.

Truman named Hoffman to manage ERP. "Fine," said the Republicans in Congress, unanimously confirming the selection.

No thoughtful Republican will assail the Truman foreign policy, for, obviously that policy today is almost as much a Republican policy as it is a Democratic policy. The Republican chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs—Vandenberg—has consistently supported the Truman policies in the field of foreign relations.

Mind you, I'm not criticizing GOP Senators and Representatives for going along with the Democratic administration. They deserve applause for doing so. But they can't argue that the Democratic Party ought to be defeated because we haven't yet solved the problem of how to deal with the Bolsheviks. For they have been riding along with Mr. Truman.

Under the circumstances, it would obviously be illogical to cast out the Truman administration on the ground that its foreign policy had been unsatisfactory, when that policy has been put through Congress by the opposition seeking to displace him. Who among the eager Republican candidates could have under all the circumstances formulated a better program or done a better job?

Then there is the matter of national defense. The argument of some of the Republican spokesmen that Truman should be beaten because our national defenses allegedly have deteriorated is ludicrous.

Who's blocking adequate national defense anyway?

President Truman has stood up firmly and courageously before Congress and urged adoption of universal military service and pending action along that line, restoration of selective service.

Certainly it is not he who has blocked rearmament on an adequate scale. The measures that would insure rearmament on a broad scale are now before the Republican-controlled Congress. They were put there by a President who was brave enough to recommend them on the very eve of the Presidential campaign when he knew the move would hurt him politically. He put defense above his own political fortunes.

I realize, of course, that everyone is disturbed over the turn world affairs have taken. All of us hoped—how we hoped—that when Hitler had been defeated, the victorious nations could live together in peace and mutual understanding. We're disappointed, shocked, and exasperated by Communist plotting, trickery, and bad faith that have all but wrecked our hopes.

But even in this difficult period, when indignation inevitably rises as we read of some new Soviet maneuver or coup, it is our duty

to keep our thinking straight and not be moved by the buncombe that irresponsible and ambitious persons are passing around.

President Truman has been both faithful and courageous in a period that would have tried the patience of a saint. In the field of foreign relations the Republican Party has followed his policies almost to the letter. In the domestic field, I am sure that in the end the GOP will be driven by the logic of events to support his national defense program.

If the Republicans are going to indict the Truman administration, they'll have to draw up a corresponding indictment against themselves. I am confident, when they have all the facts at hand, the American people will vote to uphold the policies of President Truman, for that is the sound, consistent, logical course under the circumstances.

Voluntary Enlistment Versus the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter from Maj. Gen. Edward F. Witsell, the Adjutant General of the Army, together with my reply:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., May 17, 1948.

Hon. ROBERT J. TWYMAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. TWYMAN: I refer to your address to the House, appearing on page 5591 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 11, 1948, subject: Voluntary Enlistment Versus the Draft.

The Army has a 2-year enlistment period and offers to all young men who enlist for such period the same opportunities for specialized training and attendance at service schools as offered to longer term enlistees. The only difference is the fact that 2-year enlistees are enlisted in the Regular Army, unassigned, while the long-term enlistees are permitted an initial assignment choice of any of the arms or services open for enlistment at the time of application.

In general, enlistees with no prior service are held in receiving stations for approximately 4 days, where they are given classification tests and where classification records (Form 20) are prepared and qualified men tentatively designated for schools. The enlistees then report to their training companies for 13 weeks' basic training. At the end of the first 6 weeks of this basic training, the enlistees are again interviewed by classification personnel, to reevaluate their Form 20 and make firm selections of men to fill technical-school quotas. The enlistees not selected for schools are at that time reported to The Adjutant General for assignment at the end of their training cycle. Those selected for school are shipped directly to their respective school assignments by the training divisions upon completion of their basic training. If the applicant is not selected while at the training center to attend a school he may make application at any time during his enlistment period and if qualified be so assigned.

We will be very happy to have a representative of the Army contact the two young men whose letter you quote, and inform them that the Army does have a short-term enlistment and, should they enlist for 2 years, the same opportunities that are offered longer-term enlistees will be offered them.

Sincerely yours,
EDWARD F. WITSELL,
Major General,
The Adjutant General.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 20, 1948.

Maj. Gen. EDWARD F. WITSELL,
The Adjutant General,
War Department, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL WITSELL: This will reply to your letter of May 17, referring to my remarks on May 11. There is no material difference between what I said and what is contained in your letter. I was told by the Army Recruiting Office in Washington that a 2-year enlistment in the Ground Forces would mean that the volunteer would be unassigned and assured of no other training than the original basic training. I was told that he would be given no preference as to the branch of service to which he would be assigned or the area in which he would serve. It is my belief that the Army Ground Forces would obtain more men by lowering the period of enlistment to 2 years. In this way, the Army would fulfill the objectives expected under universal military training and selective service by establishing a reserve of trained men.

While we are on the subject, I can see no reason why the enlistments of men now in the Army could not be extended for a shorter period. I see no reason why a man now in the Army and fully trained should have to reenlist for a minimum of 3 years if he wants to stay in the Army. It seems to me that if enlistments could be extended for 1 year the Army would retain more trained men. There are many men now in the armed services who would be willing to remain if they could do so on a shorter period.

I thank you for your letter and I feel that if the statements contained therein were more generally understood, and if the implied assurances were fully carried out, the Army Ground Forces would have no difficulty in filling their requirements. I also feel that if the Army were to permit men to enlist voluntarily on the same basis as is contemplated in the proposed legislation calling for the reestablishment of selective service, that there would be no need for such legislation.

Thanking you for writing me, I am,
Sincerely yours,
ROBERT J. TWYMAN.

With the United States Army in Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from one of our good citizens who saw service in World War II:

You asked me in your letter if I could tell you something of my experiences. Now that they are over I would like very much to. I was assigned to the Sixty-second Signal Battalion which was located in Sendai (about 200 miles north of Tokyo). I eventually became a staff sergeant. I have very few complaints concerning the Army in Japan. The food was usually excellent and the few occasions when it was not so good were forgivable. We were quite fortunate in being established in a newly built camp which was almost an exact model of camps in the States. They were quite satisfactory. I know that some of the men in other units were not so fortunate as to living quarters, but I do believe that every effort is being made to rectify these conditions. The biggest problem and the biggest source of complaint is recreation. There are simply not the facilities to take care of the men. Those facilities which do exist are not always properly maintained. For example, the movies are in most cases old and in too many cases poor. I believe that all types of movies should be shown, because I know that the type which I enjoy is not the same as many of the other men, but I do object when seven consecutive movies (2 weeks of entertainment) have in the starring roles either Gene Autry or Roy Rogers. The anti-fraternization policy has in my particular station effectively cut all but illicit contacts with the Japanese. I personally feel that the time for such a policy has passed. I do not believe that it accomplishes any objective, including the prevention of venereal disease, but rather that it is driving most of the men to an illicit manner of living.

A fact which a great many people fail to realize is that the morale problems of an occupation army are in many ways different from those of a combat army. It is quite true that fear has no place, but boredom and total disinterest have done their work on many a man. It is quite difficult for the average GI to see that he is accomplishing anything more than subsistence operations. There is not even the lure of future action (which, although it involves horror, is still looked forward to), to interest the man. One respect in which I feel that the Army has completely failed is the troop-information program. I received one indoctrination when I landed in Japan (they told us not to eat the food and that is about all) and one other during the 15 months I was there. This one I think was a comedy. It certainly looked like one. If it had a point it never made it to the 200 men that were gathered to see it. It is quite true that we had troop-information hour every Saturday morning, but it was despised by the officers and enlisted men alike. The people who set it up have prepared briefing discussions which in most cases are read in a dull monotone to the troops. These briefs are not deliberate propaganda, but if you take them word for word, you can very easily get a one-sided, and not always the right-sided, viewpoint of the world. Discussion could eliminate this fault, but there's no discussion. The point which I am trying to make is that the Army is depending on local commanders to carry out a program of troop training. These men have neither the ability, the desire, nor the training to carry out such a program. I think they could very nicely solve the whole situation by developing a really trained cadre to circulate among the various units and conduct the program.

I started out by saying that I didn't have complaints. I hope you will consider the above more as an observation. There are many things which go wrong in the Army. I don't doubt that you hear of them frequently. I personally feel that these are not in most cases the result of a bad system, but in the lack of capable administrators, or in the number of men now in the Army who simply aren't men enough to accept the regimentation which the Army demands. That cannot be blamed on the Army. I hope that you are not under the impression that I liked the Army. On the contrary, one of the happiest moments of my life occurred when I received my discharge at Camp Stoneman in March. I merely maintain that it is possible to get along in

the Army and that conditions are not, in most cases, intolerable.

I suppose the question which I have been asked most since I came home is what is Japan like. You are undoubtedly familiar with the physical appearance and manner of living of the Japanese. I was deeply interested in the effects which the occupation did have on them. As I have said our contacts were extremely limited. I did note, however, that there are several important changes. Perhaps the most noticeable is the new freedom which women have won. It is reflected everywhere and as far as I know is wisely used. The Japanese have been extremely cooperative with us and any trouble can usually be traced to occupation personnel. Their sincerity is a matter for time and/or experts to determine. I feel that the Emperor has lost little of his dignity. That which has been lost has gone to General MacArthur. I wish I knew what the General has accomplished. I deeply resent the fact that information on Japan is not available from SCAP. I believe that we have a right to know the plants and results of SCAP. Military autocracy is not under any conditions in agreement with the principles of democracy. I seriously doubt that it can be justified as a security measure. I also feel that the the censorship is extreme and not at all conducive to good government. In the press of other problems I hope that the Congress will not neglect to conduct a fair, dignified, and nonpolitical investigation of the Japanese occupation. If good has been done it certainly should not be undone, but I do believe that light should be brought upon Japan.

I took advantage of a 10-day furlough to visit China. It (particularly Shanghai where I spent most of the time) is in great contrast to Japan. There is, as far as I could see, very little order in China. There are many policemen and many soldiers, but I don't think they really believe in their government. One local traffic policeman made it quite plain to us that he would be much happier if: (1) We went home; (2) the Government was overthrown; and (3) the Chinese Reds took over. On the other hand our No. 2 boy at the YMCA (Chinese operated) was quite sympathetic to us and hoped to see the Gimo continue his government of China. I don't believe that most of the Chinese know what they want in politics. They do want an end to inflation, a home, food, and heat. They don't have it now. Until they do I don't see how you can talk intelligent politics to them.

Well, I hope that I haven't bored you with all these observations. I don't claim to know a lot about China and Japan, but I do know that until the people of every country have opportunities commensurate with ours in the United States, I and every other fellow and girl is going to have to worry about the next war and maybe fight it. The American birthright of privileges is one that needs to be earned and shared. I hope that the people will realize it.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, teachers, educators, labor organizations and all thinking people in the country will not forget if the progress so far accomplished toward the enactment of Federal aid to schools is lost by failure on the part of the House to act before adjournment. Many of us in the House are anxious that we be given the opportunity to support Federal aid for education on the floor of this House. The matter has been debated by committees for 30 years, and there is no excuse for failure of the House to act with dispatch.

Under leave heretofore granted, I include for the RECORD an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of May 18, from the pen of Josephine Ripley which reads as follows:

EDUCATION IS LOSING GROUND

AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM WASHINGTON

(By Josephine Ripley)

WASHINGTON.—While Congress hems and haws over granting Federal aid to the Nation's schools, thousands of pupils every year are cutting their education short because of inadequate school programs.

More than 1,000,000 children drop out of school each year before completing a high-school education.

Not all of these quit because of dissatisfaction with the value of their educational program, to be sure. Some marry; others are forced by financial circumstances to go to work, and a few withdraw for health reasons.

But surveys show that many, probably the majority, leave because they feel that the school program has little of practical value to offer them. This may be due to poor or indifferent teaching, or inadequate buildings and equipment, or to lack of interesting extracurricular activities.

The 16 low-income States most urgently in need of financial assistance are the ones hardest hit by the exodus. These States are able to spend only $82.16 per pupil for education, in contrast to $163.46 per pupil which is spent by the high-income States.

Educators are alarmed over this accelerated rate at which pupils are dropping out of school. They have reason to be. It means that education in this country is not even holding its own. It is losing ground.

Back in 1931, the record shows that for every 1,000 children who enrolled in the fifth grade, only 310 remained to finish high school. But each year for the next 10 there was a gain, until 1940, 510 pupils out of every 1,000 remained to become high-school seniors.

During the war, the upward trend was halted. Now it has been reversed. Today, only 453 out of every 1,000 fifth-grade pupils remain to complete their high-school education. In other words, 547 drop out.

It is an appalling figure. This increasing tendency to quit school is recognized not only as detrimental to the progress of the individual youngster but to the Nation as well.

"If secondary education constitutes an essential minimum of training * * * the Nation can ill afford the prodigious waste of human resources represented by 547 per 1,000 who leave school prematurely," declared the National Education Association in a recent statement.

Selective Service findings pointed up these educational deficiencies sharply during the war. Not only that, but a comparison between World War I and World War II statistics show that no improvement had been made in those years between in leveling the regional inequalities in education.

The NEA terms this "no less than a national tragedy," which may be traced back to the lack of adequate funds for schools in the educationally underprivileged States.

If Congress should pass the $300,000,000 Federal aid to education bill, much could be done to correct that tragedy.

Proposals for Federal aid in order to give the child in the low-income Southern States as good an education as a child in the richer Northern States are nothing new.

When the draft rejections for illiteracy in World War I brought out the lack of schooling in many States, the American Federation of Labor began a campaign for Federal funds for public schools which has continued for 30 years.

Widespread interest was stimulated by the report of the President's Advisory Committee for Education in 1938, which showed the varying ability of the States to finance schools. This concern was heightened by the loss of teachers, which began to be felt early in World War II.

Lengthy hearings have been held in every session of Congress for a decade, but only twice has a Federal aid bill reached the floor—once in 1943, when after 6 days of debate it was sent back to the Senate committee, and again, in March of this year, when the Senate finally put its stamp of approval on the legislation by a vote of 58 to 22.

Now it's up to the House, and what is happening with regard to the legislation is exactly nothing. The House bill was approved 6 to 2, by a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor almost a year ago, but as yet the full committee has taken no action, and apparently none is contemplated in the immediate future. At least nothing is scheduled.

This delay seems doubly unfortunate in view of the increasing and costly rate at which young America appears to be playing hooky.

VFW Urge Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a letter which I received today from the Department of Illinois Veterans of Foreign Wars urging congressional action on a housing program.

I also include herewith the reply which I made to the department commander:

DEPARTMENT OF ILLINOIS,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
Chicago, Ill., May 15, 1948.

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PRICE. The Illinois Department of Veterans of Foreign Wars encloses a report on veterans' housing in Illinois. After reading it, you will agree that a housing program is an immediate necessity. The House Banking and Currency Committee, which has refused to act on the problem for 2 years, should be discharged at once so that action can be taken. Boiled down, facts are:

Thousands of returned veterans and their families are existing in shacks, trailers, dilapidated buildings, or living doubled-up with relatives.

Complaints run from no toilets, no water, wet basements, filth, mud, no playgrounds, rat bites suffered by children, to generally crowded unsanitary living conditions.

The ordinary veteran with a wife and one or two children earns from $160 to $200 per month, less deductions for lay-offs, sickness, or accidents. On these earnings he can afford to pay about $40 per month for housing. He cannot build and he cannot find anything decent to rent.

Standard construction costs in most northern cities for a four-room house run $10,000 to $11,000; for a five-room house, $12,000 to $14,000. Prefabricated houses cost $8,000 to $11,500 when lot and incidentals are included.

Banking and loan companies will not advance money for new-home construction without substantial down payments, and they will risk only about 30 percent value on GI guaranteed home loans.

Conclusion: Immediate action is necessary. Congress must provide legislative support for the building of rental housing, both private and public. This is the only way to give veterans adequate housing, quickly, cheaply.

Supplementing this rental-housing program should be a provision boosting the GI loan guaranty to $7,500 so that those who desire to build or buy a home can do so.

We ask every Member of Congress to support the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and Members of the House specifically to sign discharge petition No. 6 immediately.

Sincerely yours,

CARL E. RIES,
Illinois Department Commander,
Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Attest:

DR. HELFRICH,
Department Housing Chairman.

MAY 20, 1948.

Mr. CARL E. RIES,
Illinois Department Commander,
Veterans of Foreign Wars,
Chicago 4, Ill.

DEAR COMMANDER RIES: I am in receipt of your letter of May 15, 1948, with which you enclose a report on veterans housing in Illinois.

I am indeed happy to see the Veterans of Foreign Wars taking such great interest in this very important matter. I have been fighting for an adequate housing program since I became a Member of Congress. I am as disappointed as are the members of your organization in the failure of Congress to recognize this great need.

I am happy to be able to advise you that I was among the first 10 signers of a petition to discharge the House Banking and Currency Committee from further consideration of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill so that it could be brought to the floor for prompt action.

You have my full assurance of cooperation in your efforts to secure action from the Congress on a housing program.

I am today inserting your letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that it can come to the attention of all the Members of the House

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

MELVIN PRICE,
Member of Congress.

Postal Salary Increases and the Cost of Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER R. JONES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an article appearing in the April 1948 issue of Western Selling which portrays very vividly the need and justice for a salary increase for Federal employees in the Seattle, Wash., area. The article I include was written by Dr. Nathanael H. Engle, director of the Bureau of Business Research, College of Economics and Business, University of Washington. The comparative costs of living which are indicated apply to city of Seattle in 1939 and the first 6 months of 1947, but are equally applicable to many other areas of our country and are substantially identical to those which might be drawn from a similar study related to Washington, D. C. It should be noted, too, Mr. Speaker, that the latest figures in this comparative table are for 1947 and that the cost of living has continued to rise throughout most parts of the country since that time according to studies made by the Natural Resources Committee, the Bureau of Home Economics, the United States Department of Agriculture, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

COST OF LIVING IN SEATTLE

(By N. H. Engle, director, of Business Research, University of Washington)

Rising prices have hit everyone. The exact effect is hard to measure because of the inadequacy of the statistical data. The most recent detailed statistics on the cost of living in Seattle by major components are for the month of June 1947. More recent figures on the total cost have been released, but they tell only part of the story.

For example, the total cost of living, as reported by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics in Seattle, increased by 55 or 56 percent for the first half of 1947 over the average for the year 1939. The actual cost of living, however, increased by nearly 20 percent more according to our calculations.

Take, for illustration, the typical Seattle family which had in 1939 an income of $2,200 or a little over $40 per week. A study made in the Bureau of Business Research indicates the following disposition of the income of the typical family for 1939, with a comparison showing what it would take in 1947 to maintain the same level of living and allow the same percentage of savings.

Comparative costs

Item	1939	1947 [1]	Percent increase, 1947 over 1939
Food	$677	$1,327	96
Clothing	231	397	72
Furnishings	119	216	82
Housing	374	561	50
Taxes	30	120	300
All other expenses	662	1,026	55
Savings	107	188	76
Total	2,200	3,835	74

[1] First 6 months.

LESS INCREASE IN INCOME

While some individuals and some groups may have enjoyed as great an increase in income as 74 percent, many did not. Consider the plight of the white-collar worker, the annuitant, or the pensioner with fixed income. Many who were in the $2,200-a-year class in 1939 remain there today, or not much above it. For them there is no surplus for savings.

According to the United States Department of Commerce estimates, the per capita income of the people of Washington increased from $588 in 1939 to $1,346 in 1946, and the increase for 1947 probably has been at about the same rate, or a figure about 2⅓ times the 1939 level.

Wages and salaries, which totaled $668,000,000 in 1939, had expanded to $2,268,000,000 in 1944 and were $1,944,000,000 in 1946. Thus the 1946 income of wage and salary workers was nearly 3 (2.9) times as great as that before the war.

REAL INCOME

Total real income of those workers after allowing for the rise in the cost of living was thus over twice as high in 1946 as before the war, as compared with an increase in total real income of about 77 percent for all the people of the State combined.

In King County, according to data compiled by the State department of conservation and development, average hourly pay in six basic industries increased from $0.916 to $1.49 between September 1940–August 1941 and May–August 1946, or by 63 percent. The cost-of-living index over the same period rose by 33 percent. Actual cost was probably higher by 10 or 15 points.

Total pay rolls in the six basic industries, however, more than doubled over the same years. Thus workers in King Country's six basic industries were better off as a whole by some 40–50 percent in real income in 1946 as compared with the last prewar year 1940–41. Even on an hourly rate, they enjoyed a gain of some 22 percent over and above the rise in the cost-of-living index.

To be sure, neither the total income nor the hourly rates measure individual incomes. We have no data available on the distribution of individual incomes since 1939. At that time, wage and salary income receivers were distributed as follows in Seattle:

ESTIMATED DISTRIBUTION

An indirect measure of the distribution of income for 1947 in comparison with 1940 is available from the sample census of housing taken this year. The following tabulation may be of interest for that reason as well as for its direct bearing on the cost of housing.

Percentage distribution of rented dwellings in Seattle metropolitan district, 1940 and 1947

Monthly rental	1940	1947
Under $10	10	1
$10 to $19	35	11
$20 to $29	26	20
$30 to $39	18	30
$40 to $49	7	22
$50 or more	4	16
Median rental (dollars)	22	35

Source: U. S. Census Bureau. There is some evidence that the 1947 total is short about 10,000 dwelling units, chiefly 1-room apartments in the low-income bracket. Allowing for this discrepancy would lower the median rental to $33 and modify slightly the distribution pattern.

The definite and substantial shift in this rental pattern to the higher brackets reflects a similar shift in income distribution. Thus, four times as many tenants were paying $50 or more in 1947 as in 1940; over three times as many paid from $40 to $49, and one and two-thirds as many paid from $30 to $39. Percentages in the lower rental brackets were much lower in 1947, even when allowance is made for a possible discrepancy in the count.

If half of our income receivers get $2,500 or less this year, the content of their living is greatly reduced by the rise of 74 percent over 1939 to an equivalent of an income of less than $1,500 in 1939 dollars.

Those with higher incomes are less severely affected, although very few can look with complacency upon food costs nearly double prewar levels and total costs of living 74 percent above prewar 1939.

RECOMMENDATIONS

These few facts call for appropriate action to halt the rising cost of living. They also point to the spots where the shoe pinches tightest—food, clothing, house furnishings, and housing.

And it is to the immediate advantage of every segment of society to explore all possible corrective measures.

Oregon's Enviable Record of Labor Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oregon Journal of May 14, 1948:

OREGON'S ENVIABLE RECORD OF LABOR PEACE

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, who thinks New York's labor relations record is pretty good and doesn't hesitate to say so, had to do a bit of good-natured backtracking when he looked at Oregon's record for industrial peace. No wonder. There is plenty of justification for the term—coined by Look magazine and used in other national publications—"strikeless Oregon."

Some of the reasons for the Oregon tradition of labor peace came to light at the annual meeting of the Portland labor-management committee yesterday.

This committee is made up of and supported jointly by management and labor. It is headed by Lee Stoll, former director of the State employment service and of the War Manpower Commission. It believes that there is no substitute for collective bargaining under a system of free enterprise. It also believes that the greatest single factor in eliminating the friction and strife that plague many other States lies in labor and management knowing, trusting, and believing in the integrity of one another.

In applying this principle, the Portland labor-management committee has been instrumental, during the past year, in settling five major disputes, moving in and averting strikes, after all efforts at collective bargaining had failed and facilities of the conciliation service had been employed to no avail. It took a hand in 16 other disputes, also at the request of interested parties, and advised with 68 different management associations and individual employers and 47 different unions concerning the best means of maintaining industrial peace. Serious tie-ups were thus averted in the construction, publishing, manufacturing, transportation, and other industries.

The other and equally vital segment of the Portland labor-management committee's program is promotion of job-making projects and industries. This has been carried on in close cooperation with the Portland Chamber of Commerce, the port development committee, the port and dock commissions, and the Oregon delegation in Congress. This, too, pays off.

The over-all result: Continuous production, steadily increasing development of the area, employment at an all-time, peacetime high.

A Gold Star Parent's View on the Subject of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WINNETKA, ILL., *May 19, 1948.*
Hon. RALPH E. CHURCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHURCH: Our only son David was killed in combat at 19. He died for his country and a better way of life for all of us. He did not give his life that England should use American money to arm Arabs to kill his coreligionists in Israel. We cannot stand silent while England makes a Coventry of Tel Aviv. As gold-star parents of an American soldier, we demand that England be brought to an account for the misuse of American money and the violation of the spirit and covenants of the United Nations. The deliberate bombing of civilians in Israel makes a mockery of the cemeteries where our gallant war dead rest under crosses and under Stars of David.

We wish to make the following points clear:

1. England has been the chief beneficiary of billions of dollars worth of American lend-lease.

2. England was the recipient of $3,250,000,000 of a loan-gift from America.

3. To England has been allocated the major portion of the $20,000,000,000 ERP fund.

4. England is using American tax dollars and American lend-lease equipment to kill Jews who are defending their own soil against the ruthless and savage aggressor.

Whatever the garb of the aggressors, the world should know that Bevin of Great Britain supplied the officers the arms and the money to wage war on Israel. The command of the Trans-Jordan Legion is in the hands of Maj. Gen. John B. Glubb and Brigadier R. J. C. Broadhurst of the British Army. Bevin's announcement that these English generals and their subordinate English officers are now acting as private citizens, will not fool anybody. Egyptian planes and the Egyptian Army are British puppets, as are the other attackers of Israel.

We earnestly hope that you will lend your strength and your eloquence to secure immediate aid for the beleaguered Jews of Israel.

With warmest personal regards, we are,

Sincerely yours,

HERMAN LEBESON.

Pensions for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned by the plight of our aged citizens. Our provision for their retirement under what we term old-age assistance is deplorable. Grants made under our existing legislation have always been inadequate. Now that our dollar buys perhaps less than half of what it did when the Social Security Act was passed, many of our good elder citizens are desperate. I wonder how they exist at all. The average payment throughout the Nation is not sufficient to provide one reasonably good meal per day. I repeat this is a deplorable condition. The Congress has a responsibility here. We admitted we had a responsibility when we enacted our existing legislation.

Now, that we have an admitted responsibility, what are we going to do about it? I am one of the Members that has been trying for years to get an adequate pension bill enacted. Each year the rising cost of living has made the need greater and greater. Yet, months go by. Years pass, Congress comes and goes, and our pensions up to this time have become worse and worse. I say this in spite of the token increases that have been made. These increases have not kept pace with the increase in living costs, so, instead of improving this situation it has become more deplorable.

ON SOCIAL SECURITY

From time to time we see the Congress appoint a committee to study social security. Reports of such committees are made from time to time and volumes are printed, resulting perhaps in more and more data, but nothing tangible in the way of a better pension. I realize Mr. Speaker, that the Eightieth Congress has perhaps delayed this matter until we shall not be able to thoroughly overhaul the entire social security program. But, we can, Mr. Speaker, take the time to enact a reasonable old-age pension to take the place of old-age assistance. This is an emergency, and I want to appeal to the Congress to give it consideration before this session ends.

Federal Inspection of Meat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from the Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., was addressed to me as a result of my inquiry regarding the views of the independent meat packing companies on the subject of the Federal inspection of meat.

Last year when the Appropriation Committee recommended that the cost of Federal inspection of meat be passed on to the packing companies, and indirectly to the consumers, I opposed the move on the floor. I said then such a move would destroy free and independent Federal inspection. Because I am still of the same opinion, I support S. 2256.

Under unanimous consent, I insert this excellent letter in the RECORD today so that my fellow Members of this Congress may have an opportunity to study the information contained therein before taking up the Kem bill, S. 2256, tomorrow:

WESTERN STATES MEAT PACKERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
San Francisco, Calif., May 20, 1948.
Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOLIFIELD: Thank you for your inquiry regarding the views of the independent meat packing companies with respect to the bills in Congress relating to the Federal inspection of meat.

We understand that the Kem bill, S. 2256, which provides that the United States shall bear the cost of Federal meat inspection rendered on and after July 1, 1948, will soon come up for consideration and debate on

the floor of the House. This legislation should be supported because its adoption is in the interest and welfare of all concerned.

Federal meat inspection is a most important public service. It prevents diseased and unclean meat from reaching the consumers. Inspectors in federally inspected plants condemn tubercular hogs and cattle and see that they are destroyed for edible purposes in their presence. Thousands of meat animals carrying a host of communicable diseases are detected by the inspectors so that you and I can be sure that we are not eating such unwholesome dishes as broiled tumor on toast, or septicaemia stew, or puree of purulent abscess. As consumers we are wholly dependent upon some governmental agency to guarantee the wholesomeness of our meat.

For 42 years Federal meat inspection has been regarded as a necessary public service, safeguarding the health of the American people. For 41 years, until this past fiscal year, Congress has appropriated funds to support this service. The United States can well be proud of its meat inspection program. It's the finest in the world, but the action taken last year to shift the cost to the packers is threatening to break down this great service. Small packers with limited interState business cannot afford to keep it and will be forced to withdraw to an intra-State trade. Unless the Congress returns Federal meat inspection to its proper status we know for a certainty that many small companies will have to give it up.

And if the Federal Government will not continue to pay for Federal meat inspection, deterioration in the high quality service is bound to occur. For instance, as the smaller plants where Federal meat inspection is now maintained have to abandon such inspection because of the excessive cost to them under the present system, the inspectors will come to realize that their jobs will be eliminated, and it is probable that in some instances, in order to induce the management to continue Federal inspection, the inspectors will be less exacting in their work.

In a system whereby the person being governed or policed must pay the policeman, there is too frequently an idea prevailing that the policeman is working for the individual rather than for the public. When this occurs the purpose of inspection can very well be nullified, and improper, unwholesome, or adulterated products can find their way on the market. A private or semiprivate inspection which the Congress voted last year cannot be depended upon to do the job properly. But if the consumer himself pays the inspector, he naturally has a right to feel that the inspector is working constantly in the public interest.

And here is another important point. As the prohibitive cost of the present method forces smaller companies to give up the service, the Government will be the loser. For instance, before the war there were only five federally inspected slaughtering plants in the State of California. These five companies had all the Government business in this area because the Government will not of course, buy any meat for its troops which does not have the benefit of Federal inspection. Today there are 66 slaughtering establishments in the State of California under Federal inspection and when the Government now put out a notice for the purchase of meat on the west coast, it receives bids from 50 to 55 companies and enjoys prices for its meat that it could not obtain were there only a few companies bidding for this business.

The elimination of the small independent packer from interstate and Government business will create still greater monopoly in our industry, in which today three of the largest companies do approximately 43 percent of all the meat business in the United States. And another half dozen companies doing business on a Nation-wide basis, and you would probably find this proportion in excess of 60 percent. No doubt if the smaller independent packers had to give up Federal inspection, 75 to 80 percent of Government business would have to be done with less than a dozen companies. This merely makes the large companies in our industry bigger and bigger and brings the meat business of this Nation into fewer and fewer hands, which is certainly not to the best interests of the consumer, the livestock producer, or the Government.

The Honorable N. E. Dodd, Under Secretary of Agriculture, in testifying on Federal meat inspection before a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, stated that he is concerned that the smaller packers may be forced to drop Federal meat inspection under the inequitable arrangement. He said, "Of course, in our Department, we would like to see Federal inspection increased, rather than dropped."

Last year 21,183,000,000 pounds of meat was produced in the Nation's commercial slaughtering establishments. Of this amount 16,236,000,000 pounds, or 80 percent, was Federally inspected. We should not jeopardize the health of the people by permitting a fee system that will force many of the packers to abandon Federal inspection or to weaken the effectiveness of the inspection. If Federal inspection is a good enough thing that it is a must in order to ship interstate, and a must for Government purchases and export, then it is good for all the people and should be paid for out of public funds.

Very cordially yours.

E. F. FORBES,
President, Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc.

General Housing Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, one of the bills pending before this House for the past 4 years, is the bill that provides for general housing legislation. Recently the Senate supported S. 866 by a vote of 49 to 35. This vote included 25 Democrats, 24 Republicans for the bill; 18 Democrats and 17 Republicans against the bill. I am happy to note that both Senators from the State of Maine voted for this legislation. But, having become particularly concerned with the delays on this side of the Congress, I joined with 30 Members of my party in signing discharge petition No. 6, to bring the equivalent of the Senate bill up for early action in the House of Representatives. Names of the 30 Members of my party who have taken the same position follows:

1. RICHARD J. WELCH, Fifth, California.
2. ANTONI N. SADLAK, at large, Connecticut.
3. WILLIAM J. MILLER, First, Connecticut.
4. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR., Second, Connecticut.
5. ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE, Third, Connecticut.
6. JOHN DAVIS LODGE, Fourth, Connecticut.
7. JAMES T. PATTERSON, Fifth, Connecticut.
8. EDWARD A. MITCHELL, Eighth, Indiana.
9. CHARLES R. CLASON, Second, Massachusetts.
10. CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL, Eleventh, Missouri.
11. CHESTER E. MERROW, First, New Hampshire.
12. T. MILLET HAND, Second, New Jersey.
13. GORDON CANFIELD, Eighth, New Jersey.
14. JACOB K. JAVITS, Twenty-first, New York.
15. DAVID M. POTTS, Twenty-sixth, New York.
16. WILLIAM LEMKE, at large, North Dakota.
17. GEORGE H. BENDER, at large, Ohio.
18. ROBERT N. MCGARVEY, Second, Pennsylvania.
19. HARDIE SCOTT, Third, Pennsylvania.
20. FRANKLIN J. MALONEY, Fourth, Pennsylvania.
21. GEORGE W. SARBACHER, JR., Fifth, Pennsylvania.
22. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., Sixth, Pennsylvania.
23. JAMES G. FULTON, Thirty-first, Pennsylvania.
24. JOHN C. BROPHY, Fourth, Wisconsin.
25. CHARLES J. KERSTEN, Fifth, Wisconsin.
27. FRANK B. KEEFE, Sixth, Wisconsin.
28. MERLIN HULL, Ninth, Wisconsin.
29. E. WALLACE CHADWICK, Seventh, Pennsylvania.

In addition, I call attention of the Members of the House to the widespread support which this legislation has among the people of the United States, and I attach hereto, by unanimous consent, a list of 61 national organizations which have endorsed this legislation. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members of the House will have an early opportunity to vote on this legislation. Certainly a bill which has the support of the United States conference of mayors, Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Veterans of World War II—AMVETS, American Veterans Committee, the Jewish War Veterans, a wide range of religious, labor, and social organizations, the American Bar Association, and the National Conference of Family Life, is one the Congress should give serious attention to.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, to have an early opportunity to vote for this legislation.

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS IN SUPPORT OF S. 866, THE TAFT-ELLENDER-WAGNER BILL

Alpha Pi Alpha Fraternity.
American Association of Social Workers.
American Association of University Women.
American Bar Association.
American Council on Education.
American Federation of Labor.
American Home Economics Association.
American Institute of Architects.
American Planning and Civic Association.
Americans for Democratic Action.
American Veterans Committee—American Veterans of World War II.

Congress of Industrial Organizations.
Council for Social Action of the Congregational Churches of the U. S. A.
Family Service Association of America.
Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.
Fraternal Council of Churches of Christ in America.
Jewish War Veterans.
Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity.
League of Women Shoppers, Inc.
League of Women Voters of United States.
Methodist Church, Women's Division, Department of Christian Social Relations
National Association of Consumers.
National Association of Housing Officials.
National Association of Jewish Center Workers.
National Association of Rural Housing.
National Beauty Culturists League, Inc.
National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations of the United States of America.
National Builders Association.
National Committee to Abolish Discrimination in CIO.
National Conference of Catholic Charities.
National Congress of Colored Parents and Teachers.
National Congress of Parents and Teachers.
National Council of Catholic Men.
National Council of Catholic Women.
National Council of Housing Associations.
National Council of Jewish Women.
National Council of Negro Women.
National Council of Women of the United States.
National Farmers Union.
National Federation of Settlements.
National Fraternal Council of Negro Churches in America.
National Institute of Municipal Law Officers.
National Negro Business League.
National Negro Insurance Association, Inc.
National Public Housing Conference.
National Technical Association, Inc.
National Urban League.
National Women's Trade Union League of America.
Negro Chamber of Commerce.
Negro Newspaper Publishers Association.
Non-Partisan Council of Public Affairs.
Northern Baptist Convention, Council on Christian Social Progress, Omega Psi Phi Fraternity.
Pan-Hellenic Council. In addition to Pan-Hellenic Council action, the following sororities have endorsed T-E-W by individual and specific additional action: Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Phi Delta Kappa Sorority.
Psi Beta Sigma Fraternity.
Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, division of social education and action.
United Council of Church Women.
United States Conference of Mayors.
Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

National Conference on Family Life, May 5 to 8, Washington, D. C., sponsored by 125 national organizations in its housing section report endorsed S. 866, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, making the following statement:

The Housing Committee of the Conference endorses the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill as passed by the Senate and now before the House, including its public housing program. This measure is the best step that can be taken to insure a steady volume of new housing, reasonably balanced to meet housing needs. It offers a basis for a continuing and integrated national housing program that can be improved in the light of experience and research. It includes a promising beginning at tackling the rural housing problems. Within this framework the necessary reforms in housing standards, finance, and national policy can be worked out. This bill will not solve all the housing problems facing American families, but it is the first indispensable step.

National Veterans Housing Conference, February 29 to March 1, 1948, Washington, D. C., unanimously endorsed S. 866, Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and stated, "The program should be enacted immediately." The conference represented the joint effort of several veterans organizations and was attended by approximately 1,500 delegates from all parts of the Nation.

Military Leave With Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide military leave with pay for members of the Reserve Corps of the Army and Air Force who are officers or employees of the United States Government or the District of Columbia.

This act is made necessary because of insert No. 581, Order No. 33893, amendments to the Postal Laws and Regulations, dated February 3, 1947, which provides that members of the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the United States Army and members of the Air Corps Enlisted Reserve of the United States may be granted leave of absence when ordered to duty for training or instructions, but which further provides that the time so involved must be charged as annual leave or if the employee has no accrued annual leave, as leave without pay.

Members of the other components of our armed forces, to wit, members of the National Guard, Officers Reserve Corps, Naval Reserve Corps and Marine Reserve Corps, are granted 15 days military leave each year without deduction from pay or without charging the time lost to annual leave.

The bill I have introduced is necessary to put all of the members of our armed services Reserves upon an equal footing in this respect. I hope that the bill will be reported favorably at once by the Armed Services Committee and that it can be enacted at this session of Congress.

Support Removal of Tax on Bulk Cosmetics Used in Beauty and Barber Shops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I note with pleasure that the House Ways and Means Committee has reported favorably H. R. 3825, which will remove the wartime excise taxes on bulk cosmetics used in beauty and barber shops in rendering professional services. I had a considerable interest in the committee's attitude toward this legislation since I have also introduced a bill, H. R. 6405, identical to H. R. 3825, which removes the excise tax on bulk cosmetics used in beauty and barber shops.

All through the war years the small-in-size but large-in-numbers beauty and barber industry endured the hardships and inequities imposed upon it by the cosmetic excise-tax law and regulations thereon. A surprisingly large number of my colleagues are well informed on the merits of the case of this industry for excise-tax relief and I feel confident that this Chamber will accept the recommendation of the House Ways and Means Committee and enact the legislation which will bring needed excise-tax relief to this industry whose individual units are small but whose economic health affects 3,000,000 beauty and barber shop owners, operators, and dependents.

In the past several years my office has received numerous complaints from beauty and barber-shop owners concerning the operation of the law and regulations which impose a 20-percent tax on the bulk cosmetics they use in their shops. I studied this tax matter and was amazed to find that this small industry was confronted with a very complicated procedure as a result of the way in which the cosmetic excise tax is imposed and administered. Realizing that these small economic units do not have the means to hire expensive tax accountants or lawyers to keep them in compliance with the law, I came to the conclusion that the beauty and barber industry was entitled to a change in the procedure used in collecting taxes on both cosmetics sold over-the-counter and used in rendering services. I realized that the only way this procedural change can be effected is by removing the 20-percent excise tax on bulk cosmetics used in beauty and barber shops. Reducing the tax will not help this situation, since such action will not bring about the desired and necessary procedural change. For that reason I introduced H. R. 6405 which remedies the beauty and barber industry's hardship by removing the tax on bulk cosmetics used in giving services. As I stated before, H. R. 6405 is identical to Mr. CURTIS' bill (H. R. 3825), and I want to emphasize the fact that this legislation does not disturb the 20-percent tax,

which will still remain in effect on all cosmetics which beauty and barber shops sell. The amount of revenue attributed to sales of cosmetics for use in beauty and barber shops is estimated by the committee staff not to exceed $3,300,000. These figures are based on revenue collections in the fiscal year 1947. Since that time there has been an alarming falling off in receipts of beauty shops which has decreased the amount of taxes collected from this source.

I believe that the tax on cosmetics used in beauty and barber shops should be removed by the enactment of H. R. 3825 for the following reasons:

First. This tax adds to the cost of operating a beauty and barber shop. Shop revenue is obtained, for the greater part, from rendering services; and the bulk cosmetics used are the beauticians' and barbers' tools of trade. A 20-percent tax is just too high on the tools of this industry.

Second. If a barber wants to sell a few bottles of hair lotion he is required by the Bureau of Internal Revenue regulations to sign a certificate that has a deterring effect upon him. I have appended hereto one of those certificates. No one can figure out what it means, anyone who reads one of those certificates will be pressed to get a clear, definite idea of its import, but the beauty operator or the barber does understand that if she or he should happen to use a bottle of lotion bought for the purpose of resale the terrifying certificate says something about "$10,000 or 5 years in prison." Can we blame them for throwing up their hands and refusing to sell cosmetics over the counter in order to avoid signing such a certificate? Is it fair that this logical outlet for the sale of cosmetics should lose profits from the retail sale of cosmetics—profits which they could use when income from services falls off as it has during the past 6 months? Mr. CURTIS' bill and my bill would effect a procedural change which would do away with the necessity by the shops of signing these certificates.

Third. This tax, as presently imposed, is difficult to administer and difficult to comply with since, in many instances, beauty shops are both consumers and retailers of cosmetics. A realistic enforcement of the tax law covering the Nation's 240,000 beauty and barber shops would cost the Government an amount of money which would be entirely out of proportion to the little over $3,000,000 received from the tax on cosmetics used in shops. Moreover, I feel, and my views are shared by others who are fiscal experts, that the removal of the tax on bulk cosmetics will bring about an increased excise-tax yield from sales of cosmetics in a broadened retail market in the shops, which will offset the loss in revenue occasioned by the removal of the bulk-cosmetic tax. In addition, an increased income-tax yield would inevitably follow reduced business costs in the shops and an enlarged volume of retail sales of cosmetics by beauty and barber shops.

I have been so impressed with the merits of the beauty and barber industry's case for excise-tax revision that it has been my privilege and duty to cooperate with Mr. CURTIS in promoting a clear understanding of this industry's tax problem among members of the Ways and Means Committee. I intend to keep up my work for the removal of this unfair tax on beauty and barber shops and I feel confident that a majority of the House will support the legislation to bring to the beauty and barber industry this needed revision of the excise-tax laws and regulations.

CERTIFICATE OF PURCHASE FOR RESALE

I operate the ----------
(State name of beauty or barber shop)
Located at ---------- and
(State address)
hereby certify that all retail package sizes (as distinguished from professional package sizes) of toilet preparations and cosmetics which I purchase from you shall be resold by me and not used in the operation of my beauty (or barber) shop.

I understand that if any of the above articles purchased for resale are used by me in the operation of my beauty or barber shop, or resold by me at retail, I will be liable for tax on such use or resale. It is understood that the fraudulent use of this certificate to secure exemption will subject the undersigned and all guilty parties to a fine of not more than $10,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 5 years or both, together with costs of prosecution. The undersigned also understands that he (or she) must be prepared to establish competent evidence that the articles were actually purchased for the purpose for which stated in this certificate.

Name of shop

Owner or agent

Address

Dated----------

The Treasury Department will not interpose objections to this form of certificate of purchase for resale.

Mundt-Nixon Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of May 20, 1948:

RESISTING OUR REDS

Such emphatic approval of the Mundt-Nixon anti-Communist bill as the House has been expressing this week is more significant of the temper of the American people than of skill or wisdom in the drafting of legislation. The measure itself is of doubtful usefulness, but the popular feeling which the House reflects is all-important.

It is important because it should and doubtless will alert the Federal law-enforcement authorities to a more vigorous administration of the laws we already have for the protection of American constitutional government. It is important because it shows that an immense majority of our citizens abhor the very idea of Communist dictatorship and all its ways.

Our convinced Reds, the sort who are eager to assist under-cover infiltration preparatory to an ultimate violent revolution, are no more than a lunatic fringe. That is not to say that the so-called fellow travelers and innocents' clubs are altogether harmless. They create a great deal of needless friction in labor relations; they undoubtedly offer a spurious attractiveness to the youth of the land whose political beliefs have not settled, who are inclined immaturely to accept anything new or different as good. But this condition is the price we must pay for freedom of thought, which freedom is itself the best and safest assurance we can have against subversion. After all, most boys and girls grow up.

Opinions differ sharply as to whether the Mundt-Nixon bill actually outlaws the Communist Party in the United States. We prefer to accept the opinion of Representative MUNDT and of the Committee on Un-American Activities that it is designed not to abolish the party as such but to force it to carry on its activities in the public view. But we think it is impossible to drive the genuine Communists in our midst out into open. They know the technic of underground campaigning and they like it.

If we sincerely believe, as we profess to, that freedom under law is incomparably better than any species of dictatorship, that the individual has rights of which the State cannot deprive him, we should not begin to betray the political ideals we honor by risking any infringement of that freedom or those rights. Our Constitution permits the people to change it as they see fit; that is a part of the freedom which the Constitution was established to protect.

As for attempts to change the nature of our Government by other than lawful constitutional means, we already have laws enough to punish and defeat them. Will more law cure lax enforcement?

Poland's Present Industrial and Agricultural Economy—Article by William L. Shirer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article revealing some interesting and little known facts about Poland's present industrial and agricultural economy. This news story, written by the well-known correspondent and author, William L. Shirer, appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of May 2, 1948. The information Mr. Shirer gives in this article should receive the widest sort of publicity There is a great need for a clearer understanding of economic trends in other countries if full recovery is to be achieved.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLES, DESPITE LOSS OF LIBERTIES, SPUR RECOVERY BY HARD WORK—INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION 33 PERCENT ABOVE 1938 LEVEL BY END OF LAST YEAR; AGRICULTURE GAINING MUCH MORE SLOWLY; TRADE WITH WEST GROWS

(By William L. Shirer)

For a good many months, little news has appeared in our press from Poland. Nestled safely behind the iron curtain, with democracy of our western kind efficiently stamped

out and the press fully gleichgeschaltet (as the Nazis used to say) and faithfully echoing the Kremlin line, Poland has appeared unusually quiet for a proud land not noted for its placid ways.

What has been going on there since the last elections put the Communists firmly in the saddle? What happens to the economy of a war-ravaged land that has pretty much removed itself from the western world? Has it been doomed by Poland's refusal, forced by Moscow, to partake of the benefits of the Marshall plan?

What goes on in the mind of an individualistic people like the Poles under the new totalitarianism is difficult to learn at this distance. But quite a bit of information is available about the economic situation. On the whole, that situation appears to be surprisingly good, considering that the country was ground down and looted by the Nazis, horribly devastated by battle, rent by partition and upset by a political and economic revolution.

What Poland suffered during the 6 years of war can scarcely be imagined by Americans. An UNRRA report in 1947 spoke of the military operations alone resulting in the most widespread and complete destruction of industrial buildings, equipment power installations, and workers' dwellings, which meant the virtual elimination of large sections of industrial activity.

GOVERNMENT'S ESTIMATE

The Polish Government estimated the damage in the old part of Poland retained in the present boundaries at over $18,000,000,000. In the recovered territories taken from Germany under the Potsdam agreement, a quarter of the industrial facilities was destroyed or had been removed by the time the Poles took over.

But that wasn't all that Poland lost. When Russia took back eastern Poland, the Warsaw government lost 23 percent of its oil, all of its potassium salt resources, and the only area which had formerly produced an agricultural surplus.

On the other hand, in German Silesia it gained immense coal deposits, a highly developed industry and valuable mining resources in such industrial metals as lead, iron ore, and zinc.

The question at the end of the war was whether the Poles, with their nation's population reduced from 35,000,000 to 24,000,000, with many of their best men and skilled workers killed in the war and with a political and economic revolution forced on them by the Russians, would be able to make a go of it in the postwar world.

The question—for the immediate future at least—was soon answered. In no other country in Europe was there such a display of energy for the tasks of reconstruction. The Poles went to work with a vengeance.

THREE-YEAR PLAN

By December 1946 Polish industrial production reached the levels of 1938. By the end of 1947 it was 33 percent above 1938. If the 3-year plan is successful, that figure will be 52 percent by the end of next year.

Like all the other satellite countries, Poland adopted a plan for reconstruction. The Polish 3-year plan provided for the restoration of agriculture and industry to prewar levels. It was calculated on a total capital investment of $3,400,000,000, most of which was to be raised internally by various methods, including compulsory savings. But it was soon recognized that some three-quarters of a billion dollars would have to come from foreign loans.

How to obtain these in the present political atmosphere is a problem the Warsaw government has not yet solved. The Soviet Union chipped in a credit of $450,000,000 to be used for the purchase of Russian industrial equipment over a period of 8 years; Czechoslovakia granted a credit of $150,000,000 on its products to be delivered over 5 years; France granted a credit of $60,000,000 for French goods, and Sweden, Switzerland, Britain, Italy, and Denmark arranged for smaller credits.

Polish economists say if their application for a $600,000,000 loan from the International Bank were granted their capital problems would be largely solved, but the loan has not yet been granted and probably will not be.

BUSINESS WITH WEST

One of the most hopeful signs in Poland's economic recovery is that it is doing an increasing amount of business with the non-Communist west. This is particularly true of its coal business, most of which in the beginning was done with Russia. But after the Soviets got their own mines in the Donbas region running, they reduced their imports of coal from Poland in 1947 from 13,000,000 to 7,000,000 tons, and ever since there has been an increasing amount of Polish coal exported to Sweden, Switzerland, Italy, and other Marshall-plan countries. In fact, this year these countries will receive half of an estimated 25,000,000 tons the Poles are setting aside for export.

Warsaw's refusal, on Moscow's insistence, to join the Marshall plan did not then result, as was first feared, in her breaking off economic relations with the Marshall plan countries in Europe. In fact, since its decision not to have anything to do with ERP was made last July the Warsaw Government has renewed or concluded commercial accords with 15 countries, including Sweden, Italy, Switzerland, Denmark, France, Great Britain, and the American zone of Germany. The amount of annual business resulting from these agreements is estimated in Warsaw at some $600,000,000.

The restitution of Polish agriculture is proving more difficult than that of industry, partly because of the loss of the rich eastern lands, partly because of the destruction of farm houses and farming equipment, and partly because of the almost total loss of livestock during the war.

So far the Communist administration has made no effort to introduce collective farming in Poland. Under Soviet prodding it has set up a system of agriculture machine stations which this year have made farming machinery, especially tractors, available in about half of the rural communities. Rural electrification is also being pushed. Last year electricity was brought to some 1,300 villages—more than were electrified in the whole period between the wars.

But because of the above-mentioned handicaps, the end of the 3-year plan in December 1949 will find Polish agricultural production at only 80 percent of prewar levels.

In working to restore their economy as a whole, the Poles have done a remarkable job. How much they enjoy their hard-won material success, now that they have lost their political freedom, is another matter. A Gallup poll on the subject would be interesting.

The Tidelands Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Tidelands Bill" from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of May 15, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TIDELANDS BILL

The overwhelmingly favorable vote by the House of Representatives on the measure relinquishing Federal claims to sole ownership of submerged and reclaimed lands is a long step toward reversal of a Federal policy that violates a fundamental concept of the sovereign rights of the several States and jeopardizes the financial interests and enterprises of many American communities and all the American people.

The total properties in jeopardy have an estimated value in excess of $100,000,000,000.

The next step in this desired and essential direction must be taken by the United States Senate.

It is of the utmost importance that this be done with a minimum of delay, for opponents of the bill, admittedly lacking sufficient votes to defeat the measure, are counting upon delay to accomplish their purpose.

Both Houses of Congress passed a similar measure last year, but not by sufficient majorities to override President Truman's veto, and since Congress appears even more determinedly of the same opinion now, the House having voted 257 to 29 in favor of the tidelands quitclaim bill, the only remaining question is that of the ability of the Senate to indicate approval similarly in excess of the two-thirds vote necessary to override a Presidential veto.

It is taken for granted, probably correctly, that President Truman will veto the bill a second time, although he will find it necessary to offer a new reason for his action.

On the occasion of the first veto, Mr. Truman did not argue very strongly, and certainly not very persuasively, against the objects of the bill, but he contended that the issue of tidelands ownership was then pending before the Supreme Court and that it was presumptuous of Congress to deal legislatively with a matter awaiting a judicial opinion.

Since then the Supreme Court has upheld the Federal claim of exclusive right in the tidelands, thus depriving the President of the instrument of justification upon which he successfully depended.

So, if President Truman vetoes the tidelands bill again, he will be compelled to deal directly with the objects of the measure, which he was apparently loath to do on the previous occasion.

Mr. Truman's reluctance in this respect is understandable, as Senator DOWNEY, of California, has remarked, since the only real opposition to the tidelands bill reflects the socialistic intention of radical elements within the Federal Government to nationalize the vital industries and resources of the United States.

The tidelands bill does not, as its opponents profess to believe, confer new and unusual rights upon the States and the American people, but reestablishes them in the enjoyment and security of property rights which they possessed for more than a century and a half. These rights, indeed, were their heritage from colonial times and were never before in serious legal dispute or jeopardy.

President Truman's first veto of the tidelands bill, as Senator DOWNEY asserts, was not a gesture of courtesy to the Supreme Court as he pretended, but was an instrument implementing the conspiratorial movement within the administration "to socialize every resource of the Nation"—and his second veto will have the same sinister purpose.

The Senate should not only act as promptly on the tidelands bill as the House has done, but should do so just as decisively. And if President Truman elects to act again contrary to the will of Congress and the vital interests of the American people, let him be assured that he will this time be deprived of the power to prevail.

The Tax on Leather Goods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. McGARVEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. McGARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

THE F. P. HUGHES CO.,
Philadelphia, Pa., May 18, 1948.

Hon. ROBERT N. McGARVEY,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. McGARVEY: The Ways and Means Committee of both branches of Congress has before them the matter of excise tax on leather goods. That is, luggage, brief cases, and personal leather goods.

Because of resentment of the public against this tax, the sales of these products has fallen off to such an extent, manufacturers have had to lay off most of the employees.

The retail stores who buy our products will not place orders, because the public refuses to buy while the articles are taxed. This is causing a large spread of unemployment in the industry.

The loss in wages, and in turn the loss of payment of income taxes is greater than the amount collected on the tax.

For every $1 collected on the tax the Government is losing $2 in income tax.

In the personal leather goods line, men's and ladies' billfolds are taxable while these are necessary requisites for the public today, whereas such items as leather cigarette cases, jewel boxes, etc., are not taxable.

This tax was a war emergency to conserve materials, but now becomes a menace to business, because the public refuses to buy our articles on account of the tax.

May we urge your committee to repeal this tax at once.

We appreciate your interest.

Yours very truly,
THE F. P. HUGHES CO.,
F. P. HUGHES.

Increase of Naval Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poll from the Boston Globe of May 17, 1948:

GLOBE POLL OF PUBLIC OPINION—PEOPLE OF STATE FAVOR RAISING NAVY STRENGTH

A little more than three-fourths of the people in Massachusetts believe the United States should increase the size of its Navy now.

Twelve percent think a larger Navy is not needed at this time, while only 3 percent feel the Navy should be made smaller.

This information was revealed in a recent survey by the Boston Globe poll of Massachusetts opinion.

All groups interviewed, including age, sex, economic, and political, were very much in favor of a bigger Navy now. Leading the support were the men, the lower economic group, and the younger men and women (21–39).

The question asked by Globe interviewers to all those questioned throughout the State was:

Do you think that the United States should increase or decrease the size of its Navy at this time?

The over-all reply was:

	All persons	Men	Women
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Increase	78	80	76
Decrease	3	3	4
The same	12	13	10
No opinion	7	4	10

Four out of five persons in the middle economic group favored a bigger Navy now, while the high and low brackets also agreed to this to the extent of about three out of every four persons.

The response among the economic group follows:

	High	Middle	Low
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Increase	76	80	77
Decrease	4	3	1
The same	12	11	15
No opinion	8	6	7

Cartels or Competition—Article From Christian Science Monitor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, there is a report in the Christian Science Monitor of May 10, 1948 regarding a new study on cartels made by the Twentieth Century Fund. The study, entitled "Cartels or Competition," reveals the underlying adverse effects of cartels on production, prices, and technical improvements. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the newspaper report on this important study.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWENTIETH CENTURY FUND STUDY ASSAILS USE OF CARTELS

(By a staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor)

NEW YORK.—What will the next decade bring in the world's business? Will it see a return to the use of cartels, those private agreements among large business firms to keep prices above competitive figures? Or will it see the world-wide practice of genuinely free enterprise?

The answer rests largely on the United States, according to a twentieth century fund study entitled, "Cartels or Competition?"

A series of fund case studies of actual cartel procedures before World War II indicate the restrictions which were set up in the radio apparatus, electrical appliance, photographic equipment, business machines, iron and steel, nonferrous metals, glass, and optical instruments fields.

According to George W. Stocking and Myron W. Watkins, authors of the fund report, cartels have the following effect:

1. Bring high prices to consumers.
2. Foster inefficiency by protecting high-cost producers.
3. Deter investment and technical improvements.
4. Accentuate the "boom-bust" cycle.

PROFITS TRACED TO CARTELS

United States chemical companies could not possibly show the profits they reported in 1929, 1932, and 1940 if their prices had been competitive, according to the fund study. It traces the reason for these profits to the existence of cartels.

"Eight of the larger (chemical) companies in the poorest business year of the decade, 1932, earned an average of 6.4 percent on invested capital. Their average earnings were double this rate in 1940 * * * and in the boom year 1929 they had profits of no less than 15.1 percent * * * from any standpoint, the profits of the major American chemical companies were above the general industrial average," declare Messrs. Stocking and Watkins.

The study uses the tin cartel as an example of how a world business combine can foster inefficiency. This cartel affected 95 percent of the world's tin production. Tin production over certain quotas became a criminal offense.

By 1933, reports the study, the allowable output had been reduced to one-third of capacity. The prices jumped from 27 cents a pound to 46 cents a pound. By 1934 the price was 56 cents. This made it possible for nearly all the producers to keep prices high enough for sizable profits, according to the fund report. It adds that the cartel granted more liberal quotas to the producers in the high-cost areas than to others.

The study labels these prices a "bonus" to keep high-cost producers in business.

RESTRICT INVESTMENT

The fund points out that cartels have the effect of restricting investment in two ways: (1) By retarding the introduction of new techniques and (2) by restricting the use or limiting the application of old techniques. "* * * Monopolists, or the members of a cartel, do not introduce or permit the introduction of a new process if they can prevent it, unless the total cost of production under the new process is less than the out-of-pocket costs under the old," the study says. Without the driving force of competition, it adds the monopolist will not reduce or destroy the capital volume of his equipment even when he could reduce unit costs by using new equipment, nor will he introduce a new product if he fears it will compete with the old product, for profits from the new product may be gained partly at the expense of the old one.

The whole aim of cartels to stabilize industry leads to investment sluggishness in an age when continued large-scale investment is essential to high-level employment and income, according to the fund's findings. "If society is to solve the linked problems of unemployment and low standards of living in a private enterprise economy, it is imperative not only that new investment opportunities be continually created, but that the channels of investment, in new as well as old fields, be kept open."

SEEN AGGRAVATING CYCLES

The fund report maintains that because cartel-regulated prices tend to be inflexible, cartels also aggravate the boom-and-bust cycle. For example, in order to keep its prices unchanged between 1925 and 1932, one large American company in the nickel cartel reduced its output by 80 percent. As a result thousands of employees lost their jobs.

Retarded investment, as well as inflexible prices, tend to aggravate economic instability. The authors point out that there are only two basic ways to halt a business recession: (1) to find new investment outlets; (2) to stimulate consumption. Cartel policies make both difficult. They discourage consumption by keeping prices high and they act as a damper on new investment by

keeping the industry as close as possible to newcomers and by suppressing technological improvements.

While the study notes that the United States cannot force other countries to give up the use of cartels, it emphasizes that the United States can use its strong example in international business to help offset such a development.

"Judicious policies to prevent cartel restrictions at home and abroad from strangling expanding investment and employment, once these countries are on their feet, may help make the next decade an era of economic expansion," the authors conclude.

War and Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I have received from students of Mennonite educational institutions on the subject of war and military training. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF STUDENTS OF MENNONITE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS ON WAR AND MILITARY TRAINING

The students of Mennonite Biblical Seminary, 4614 Woodlawn Avenue, Chicago 15, Ill.; Bethel College, North Newton, Kans.; and Bluffton College, Bluffton, Ohio, authorize Arnold Nickel, Loris Habegger, and William Keeney, respectively, to express their concerns against UMT and selective service or other legislation of similar intent or purpose. The students of these schools are convinced that no ultimate good can be served our country by resorting to a process of militarization, in the form of UMT or selective service, or in sending arms to other nations to militarize them. We believe that a program of militarization endangers democracy, leads inevitably to war, suffering, destruction, and death. Few Christians have known the sting of war and the crushing effects of conscription better than the Mennonite peoples. The history of our peoples, and the history of all men has, we believe, clearly validated and vindicated the biblical teachings in regard to faith and practice.

The scriptural commands are clear on the matter of the ethics of dealing with the evil in men and with evil systems.

"Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you" (Matthew 5: 44).

"Abhor that which is evil, cleave to that which is good" (Romans 12: 9).

"Bless them that persecute you; bless and curse not" (Romans 12: 14).

"Render to no man evil for evil" (Romans 12: 17).

"If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink" (Romans 12: 20).

"Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good" (Romans 12: 21).

"As we therefore have opportunity, let us do good unto all men (Galatians 6: 10).

We believe profoundly that the highest ultimate welfare of individuals, groups, or nations is served only to the extent that peoples and their leaders believe and live the scriptural injunctions. He who sincerely professes to follow Christ and takes seriously the Bible as his rule of life and faith dare not ignore these eternal truths.

The moral requirement of God through Christ is a profoundly positive way of life which does good instead of evil. It seeks to serve all men everywhere regardless of race, creed, or political sympathy, in needs both physical and spiritual; and though men and nations may betray us, we believe as individuals or nations our highest moral obligation to be that of redeeming men and that this service of love best serves that obligation. Our churches have agencies currently engaged in such service and missionary projects in this in many foreign countries. We are advocating not less but more of this type of positive program, even though there be discomfort, danger, and suffering in its wake.

We are under no illusion as to the implications of the way of life we advocate in terms of the suffering it may entail. Nor do we believe that genuine peace and good will can be bought at a bargain price. Redemptive suffering is at the heart of the Christian way of life, but it is the only safe way ultimately. We say this in spite of the fact that the history of the Mennonites during the greater portion of the 400 years of their existence has been a history of persecution, suffering, death, homelessness and deprivations of every conceivable sort. During the first half of the twentieth century, the Mennonites of Russia, Prussia, and Poland have again seen thousands die a martyr's death, and many thousands more have suffered indignities and tortuous persecutions of indescribable intensity. Their numbers have been decimated and their remnants reduced to slavery or to wandering homeless refugees. Militarism and war has been the scourge which our people have repeatedly encountered and often their only recourse was an attempt to escape. Such persecutions and sufferings have not been entirely absent in this country, especially during the periods of the Revolutionary and Civil Wars, and occasionally in more recent times. It is this evil which was largely responsible for the Mennonites leaving their well-established homes and prosperous communities in Europe and migrating to this country, which offered them a haven of freedom of worship and religion according to the dictates of conscience. We have enjoyed a period of glorious freedom and liberty in this country for which we are deeply grateful. However, we fear that if the scourge of militarism is saddled to this country and her people, the judgment of God is inexorably to follow.

In no way do we want to underestimate the evil in the world today, and the threat which it poses for the Government of this country. We believe that the peril of evil is real today, and the problems confronting governments are stupendous. However, evil is where one finds it, and it is the same no matter by what name it is called. As Christians, therefore, we must seek to avoid condoning and participating in evil, and follow instead the clear instructions of the Bible.

STUDENTS OF MENNONITE BIBLICAL SEMINARY, BETHEL COLLEGE, BLUFFTON COLLEGE.

Record in Congress of Hon. Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I hereby submit an article which outlines the fine record of our distinguished colleague, Congressman ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee:

[From the Nashville Tennessean of April 11, 1948]

ESTES KEFAUVER FOR SENATOR

Tennessee has had a long, long night in the United States Senate. Over the years the record has been studded with vendettas against the TVA, with spineless "me-tooing," with support of the Republicans against the administration, with shameless kowtowing to Ed Crump.

Democratic Tennessee has had to look to Alabama's HILL and SPARKMAN to defend its stake in TVA in the Senate; to Kentucky's BARKLEY to spearhead the fight for administration measures; to Connecticut's MCMAHON to put atomic energy under civilian control; to Texas' CONNALLY to press the fight for the Marshall plan; to Wyoming's O'MAHONEY to oppose the forces of inflation. On these and many other issues of great public moment, the position of Tennessee's Senators has ranged from virulent opposition to belated and reluctant acceptance.

The entrance of Representative ESTES KEFAUVER into the 1948 Senatorial race changes this dark and depressing prospect into one of bright opportunity for the people of Tennessee.

His candidacy offers the means of ending the State's long night in the Senate. By it Tennessee can gain a voice of positive and constructive statesmanship in the councils of the upper House. Through his election the people will be assured of a spokesman who will voice the aspirations of no less than the whole body politic.

Considering both the need and the man, as well as our own dedication to the task of restoring democratic government in Tennessee, the Nashville Tennessean would be remiss in its stewardship if it did not urge upon the voters the tremendous opportunity offered in the KEFAUVER candidacy.

Representative KEFAUVER is, in our opinion, one of the most outstanding younger statesmen in the Nation. It is the opinion of many others also. He was chosen by the congressional award committee of the Colliers' magazine as one of the 10 most distinguished Congressmen in 1946.

Such recognition of excellence has not been an uncommon experience with him. As a student at the University of Tennessee he served as student body president, editor of the college newspaper, and captain of athletic teams. For this leadership in community and State affairs, particularly with respect to his efforts to abolish J. P. courts, the junior chamber of commerce voted him Chattanooga's outstanding citizen in 1938. A unique honor became his last year when he was chosen the first layman officer of the American Political Science Association.

Brought up on an east Tennessee dairy farm, he has lived for the past 20 years in Chattanooga. He has thus had long and intimate experience with both rural and urban problems—a combination which well qualifies him to represent the interests of the whole State.

Mr. KEFAUVER is completely attached to the democratic processes and the principle of popular rule. He has never bowed a knee to Dictator Crump or to K. D. MCKELLAR, despite the patronage power which the senior Senator wielded as chairman of the Post Offices and Roads and Appropriations Committees.

Since going to Congress in 1939 he has had a foremost part in defeating the anti-TVA May, Byrd-Butler, and McKellar bills which both Tennessee Senators were instrumental in putting through the Senate. The same Mr. KEFAUVER bearded the MCKELLAR lion last week before the Malone committee, warning the committee in his presence that the Memphis Senator "will never cease his annual

attacks on the Authority so long as the TVA board retains its high-class good management."

The Chattanooga Congressman in following the principle of responsible party government has been a consistent supporter of the Roosevelt and Truman Democratic administrations. His maiden speech was in defense of the Roosevelt proposal to repeal the arms embargo. From that day on Mr. KEFAUVER, without compromising independence and principle to political partisanship, was prominently and actively engaged in behalf of the leading administration domestic, war, and peace measures.

He was one of those prominent in the passage of the Congressional Reorganization Act of 1946 to streamline the machinery of Congress.

Other high lights of his record are: His fight to curb monopoly and promote small business through amending the Clayton Antitrust Act; and his activity on behalf of rural electrification, farm-to-market roads, the Farm Security Administration, the GI bill of rights, inflation-control measures, and Federal aid for education.

Mr. KEFAUVER is a Democratic liberal, after the spirit of Wilson and Roosevelt. This we applaud, for it is in tune with the long history of the Democratic Party and its eras of greatness. It is in harmony with the aspirations of the people of Tennessee to throw off machine control, free the ballot box, and preserve and expand the benefits of the TVA in our midst.

His election would give Tennessee an assured and consistent friend of the TVA in the Senate, a man of single-minded devotion to the interests of the State and the Nation, and a representative of real political stature.

A measure of his worth is the confusion and bickering which have overtaken the machine politicians and those who hold the strings on them as the result of his entry into the campaign. Apart from him, the choice is, on the one hand, a rejected machine politico whose political conversion to the TVA is so recent that an anti-TVA bill which he supported for years is still hanging heavy-heavy over the region, and, on the other hand, a local and little known judge who takes every cue from Dictator Crump.

As between them, we have no hesitancy in endorsing and recommending Mr. KEFAUVER.

Many Members Pronounced the Mundt Bill Unconstitutional

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, during the recent debate on the Mundt bill—H. R. 5852—various Members on both sides of the aisle raised a question or protested that the Mundt bill was, in their judgment, unconstitutional. I cannot say how many offered that as an objection, but I know the question was raised by several Members, which, in turn, caused other Members to have a doubt. Now, every Member of this body has taken an oath to support and uphold the Constitution of the United States. That fact raises a very practical and vital question when any and all bills are presented to us for consideration and a vote.

What is a Member to do, regardless of the merits of the general purpose of the bill, if in his judgment the language and terms of the measure are clearly unconsitutional? Should he vote for what he thinks the country wants, regardless of the form in which it is drafted? Or should he pit his judgment as to constitutionality against the proponents of the bill and the committee which presents it? Many times I have personally wished that I might know, with as much certainty as one can know prior to a Supreme Court decision, whether a given measure is constitutional according to the highest judicial standards. In the absence of such definite knowledge, voting on a bill which is to my mind questionable in that respect is to me a distressing matter.

Others have thought about this same thing during the years. Let me relate this happening. On June 14, 1940, the venerable statesman, William Tyler Page, then serving the House of Representatives in his sixtieth-odd year of continuous service, said to me during the session that day in substance as follows: "I have just read in yesterday's RECORD what you said about the constitutionality of the bill then up for a vote. I have sometimes thought there ought to be a rule—perhaps a new rule of the House of Representatives—that would cover this question. Would you be interested in such a proposed rule which I have written out?"

Of course, I explained to William Tyler Page that I would be very much interested in his proposal for an additional rule, for I knew of no one more eminently fitted to suggest needed additional rules or modifications of existing rules than that worthy servant who wrote the American's Creed, and who had served his party and the Nation continuously for about 60 years in this branch of Congress. Accordingly, Mr. Page retired to his office and came back after a short interval and presented me a 14-page, double-spaced, typewritten paper, which I hold in my hand. This is written on the stationery of the office of the minority leader, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., having in the upper left-hand corner: "Bertrand H. Snell, First District, New York." I have kept this document with care during the intervening 8 years, and I have thought of its contents many times and have wished several times that it might have been adopted as one of the rules of this body.

If this proposed rule, handed me that day by William Tyler Page, had been one of the rules of the House in effect yesterday when the Mundt bill was before us, we would have had, no doubt, a further official estimate concerning the constitutionality of the bill. I know from talking with several Members on both sides of the aisle that they would have been glad to have had the further opinions of competent lawyers in regard to the measure which the House passed yesterday. Greatly as I prize this document by William Tyler Page, I will gladly turn it over to the leadership of the House, in whose hands it would be most appropriately placed and who could use it most effectively.

Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the special attention of the House to certain statements made by the Honorable THOR C. TOLLEFSON of Washington and printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 14, 1948.

On that day, Representative TOLLEFSON introduced H. R. 6575 and H. R. 6576, bills to increase railroad retirement and unemployment insurance benefits respectively. In doing so, he pointed out that identical bills had already been introduced by the Honorable ROBERT CROSSER, a distinguished Democrat from Ohio. By presenting identical measures, Representative TOLLEFSON hoped to emphasize the fact that the necessity for increasing the retirement and unemployment pay of these good citizens is a matter quite apart from party considerations. Or, rather, it is a subject of equal interest and concern to both parties.

The whole history of the Railroad Retirement Act has been one of bipartisan cooperation. In 1937, when the present system was established, it was the product of a joint effort by railroad management and railroad labor, by Democrats and by Republicans. In 1946, the system underwent extensive legislative improvement at the hands of a majority in both parties. The men and women who will benefit by the Crosser and Tollefson bills (and who desperately need those benefits) include Democrats and Republicans—probably as many of one persuasion as the other.

The main thing is to get them passed and quickly. Neither party can have any legitimate objection, it seems to me, to the bills' provisions. In each case, the proposed increase is modest and reasonable. In each case, the money in the supporting fund is sufficient to pay for the higher benefits. In neither case is there any proposal to change existing tax rates.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I wish to applaud Representative TOLLEFSON's forthright action in introducing H. R. 6575 and H. R. 6576 and to add my plea to his: Let us lose no time in joining forces to bring these bills to the floor and to immediate passage by a vigorous, nonpartisan vote.

Farming—Our Basic Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like

to include the address I delivered on May 3, 1948, at a meeting of the Worcester County Farm Bureau members in Westboro Town Hall, Westboro, Mass.:

The people who are living in our cities are daily growing more and more conscious of the part that agriculture plays in our lives. They are coming to realize that without the products of your industry they cannot live. When all that one has to do to obtain the plentiful variety of foodstuffs which go to make our tables the most bounteous in the world was to stop into a corner grocery store, little thought and less concern was given to those responsible for such ease and comfort.

Today, however, not only the higher costs but the actual shortages of many farm product items have made all thinking people conscious of the tillers of our soil.

The facts which confront us are neither flattering nor comforting to those that live in cities and towns today. We find that while 20 percent of our people still remain on our farms they receive for their labors 10 percent of the national income.

The question immediately arises in the minds of those dependent upon the farm group for their daily bread, how long will we continue to have that daily bread if this condition is not rectified? And how can it be rectified?

It is the problem of every sincere thinking American to a greater or less degree, because certainly you will not be without the foods which you produce, as you will first care for the needs of yourselves and families before any thought becomes available to nonfarm people.

Our economists advise us that within the next 15 years the gross output of our farm lands will not be sufficient to support that number of people who will then be residing in our country if our population continues to grow as reasonably expected. They have also asserted that within 30 days, and continuing through this year, we shall be faced with the most serious meat shortage we have experienced so far.

And why? Because there are less cattle on the farms than there was last year by 8 percent. There are less sheep on our farms than at any time in 60 years.

Statistics compiled by the Department indicate a truly alarming drop in hogs to the extent of there being 42 percent less hogs on our farms than 2 years ago. There are less than 50 percent as many turkeys as there were in 1946.

These same surveys show that there is but a single percent more of milk cows than in 1933—15 years ago.

Our population, however, has increased in those 15 years approximately 16 percent. In 1947 alone there were 3,000,750 babies born in this country, indicating also that there is very likely to be a milk shortage this fall.

Of course, not all farm products have been so affected. The grain famine of last year would appear to be but a memory now. Corn and wheat should be in abundance when the crops are harvested this year. We are informed also that cotton has become very plentiful.

All these facts have been presented to Congress. Generous price-support programs are in the making and are being generally supported as one of the answers to this serious situation. But it is generally recognized that money alone will not meet this situation. Because, even with these programs, it is recognized that the farmer has to pay higher prices for everything he needs. It is also generally recognized that there has been a great migration from our farms to the city, from the soil to industry, over the past 20 years.

At the close of World War I there were 50 percent of our population on our farms. By 1938 there were 26 percent of our total population engaged in farming.

World War II accentuated this migration. Today the percentage is not far from 20 percent. The short hours of labor enjoyed by industry, the attractions and relative ease of city life, the opportunities for entertainment, for advancement educationally, culturally, and otherwise continue to lure farm folks from their ancestral acres.

During World War II, faced with a national food crisis, the contribution toward a victorious ending of the war made by our farmers was second to no other group. Many a farmer toiled with members of his family from early morn until after the sun had set. Not a few labored through workweeks of 70 to 100 hours for the duration of that emergency. This extraordinary effort took its toll. Many farmers found themselves broken in health, weary, ill, and unable to carry on their farms. Many of these retired to smaller holdings or to the city, because it was impossible to maintain larger holdings. Why? Because he found himself confronted with increased costs of labor and everything else so essential to the maintenance of farms, particularly for the dairy farmer. Men who are competent are no longer available. Immigration laws restricted importation from outside the United States

Millions of honest, industrious men and women known as "displaced persons" who cannot even earn a living for themselves in European countries because of the ravages of war are desirous and should be made available to meet this labor situation for our farms are not permitted entry to our country.

To the end that selected individuals from among these people might be permitted to enter this country for this purpose, the Judiciary Committee on the part of Congress has reported out a bill, and I am reasonably confident it will pass, which will permit and give priority to 200,000 of these displaced persons each year for the next 2 years.

I am in hopes that before the end of this year I will be able to assist many of the farmers in my district to obtain from this source sorely needed labor with which to carry on, because I believe that this is an intelligent approach to our main problems in the matter of farm prices and farm labor.

With labor scarce, machinery becomes more and more important. With other Congressmen, it is our hope and our purpose to secure for the American farmer more and more production of tractors and other farm implements and prevent a diversion of much of this equipment to Europe as long as these items are needed here.

From my observation, the outlook for favorable farm prices for at least 3 years more is excellent.

Regardless of all these factors, no matter how well a farmer may operate his farm, there are conditions which by reason of their origin no farmer can overcome. These hazards are fire, prolonged illnesses, hurricanes, droughts. Hail storms may lose an orchardman his entire crop—the reward for a year's labor.

Since farming differs from all other forms of business, the Congress has recently enacted and the President signed an extension of the so-called Frazier-Lempke Act. This act, based upon the theorem that agriculture is basically necessary to the Nation, provides a 3-year moratorium period for any farmer who is unable to meet his bills as they mature, that that farmer rehabilitate his finances without resorting to bankruptcy. While not losing sight of the interests of his creditors, it provides that upon petition to the Federal court in the district, any farmer who finds himself in straitened circumstances shall be protected by the United States of America from foreclosure, suit, or seizure; that he continue to operate his farm to the end that his debts be paid off through composition or otherwise.

In passing the act the Congress acted upon the recommendation of the Joint Committee on Judiciary, which at that time recommended a permanent act, based upon the experience of the past, be enacted within the next 2 years.

Other matters pertaining to agriculture will come before this Eightieth Congress before it adjourns. In acting upon these matters, I would like, and ask your guidance. If there be problems as to which I can be helpful to you, please contact me by letter or otherwise. You have sent me to the Congress as your agent. I assure you it is my desire to fully serve you in that capacity.

Vermont State Republican Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me, I wish to include in the RECORD the address which I delivered at the Republican State Convention at Montpelier, Vt., on May 15, 1948:

We are honored today by the presence of my colleague the Honorable CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana, the majority leader of the House of Representatives.

He has won the place he holds because of outstanding ability, diligence, and by reason of the confidence all of us in Congress have in him and his qualities of leadership.

It will be his business, rather than mine, to outline to you the program and policies to be further pursued and achieved once more to complete the establishment of the Republican Party as the savior of the country.

I will not intrude upon his prerogatives other than to suggest that with the opportunity faced by the party go increasing responsibilities of ever-widening scope.

There are momentous issues before the Congress. Not all of them are of a national defense or international nature, although they have been highlighted. We face vital domestic issues, demanding clear thinking, courage, and forthrightness.

When CHARLEY HALLECK and I first took our oaths of office as new Members of the House back in the Seventy-third Congress, the public debt of the United States was $20,000,000,000; as a result of a profligate Federal administration, $55,000,000,000 by the time war was declared against Japan and Germany on December 6, 1941. Today it has reached the colossal sum of $252,000,000,000. This means that the debt share of every man, woman, and child in the country is some $1,900, or about $7,600 per family. No wonder your Federal taxes are so high.

As a member of the House Appropriations Committee, I tell you quite frankly, it is an unending and a thankless task to attempt to cut Federal expenditures, thereby to lessen the individual tax burden. Many are the man-made obstacles placed in the way. But it must be done.

In many cases it becomes an equally thankless and difficult undertaking to attempt even to keep appropriations at existing levels.

Here is one reason why that is so. There are too many highly organized and integrated pressure groups with their leading advocates holding administrative positions in Government. They have developed a technique of propaganda, persuasion, and pressure which at times can be likened to the heavily loaded blackjack or the cat-o'-nine-tails.

Many instances where the technique has been applied could be cited. Some examples have received notoriety in the press, but the majority have not. But, whether receiving

notoriety or not, the various devices are being used every day. And, for the most part, as they are used to that extent good government, economical government, and enlightened administration of government suffers.

The need was never stronger for a thoroughgoing house cleaning of our Nation's administrative departments. At the same time the necessity for experienced men as your representatives in both branches of Congress—with the courage of their convictions and the fortitude to resist inspired political pressures—was never greater.

When lawmaking becomes legislation by Western Union, or by Gallup poll, a mortal blow has been struck at representative government. If that time arrives your elected representatives need only to be capable of answering to their names and by being able to say two words, either "yes" or "no."

Ours is a rich country. But a country's wealth, like that of an individual, can be squandered and frittered away. Too much of our Nation's substance has already been scattered beyond redemption or recall. We must slow down, otherwise we will have forever wasted our heritage and followed the path taken by those earlier republics that are but memories.

You can play an important part as individuals and as party members to prevent us from following such a course. We must not fall for every money-spending scheme proposed nor for every treasury-raiding plan advanced. Nominate and elect to office—town, county, State, and Federal office—those who place the welfare of the community above the selfishness of the few. In no place is the opportunity to do so greater than right here in Vermont. And when you have nominated and elected such men, not only give to them, but let them know they have your approval and your active support.

As party members you can dictate party policy that is constructive, progressive, and far-seeing. The most enlightened government is not necessarily the one which spends—or promises to spend—the most money. Nor is it one which has the greatest number of people on its pay roll. Federal funds should be as carefully budgeted and prudently spent as the funds of an individual. Efficiency in administration is a requirement that must be met. And control should remain as near the smallest governmental unit as possible. These are principles that need no repeating to a Vermont audience, of course.

I am proud to belong to the Republican Party. I am even prouder to be a Vermonter. I appreciate the honor that the Republican Party and Vermonters have conferred on me by electing me to represent them in Congress. So long as I serve in that capacity I shall be vigorously faithful to the trust imposed.

George Rothwell Brown Comments on the Fancy Social Lobby for the Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to hand to the Public Printer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a few comments upon the trade-agreements program of the eminent news analyst, George Rothwell Brown, which recently appeared in the Baltimore News-Post and numerous other metropolitan dailies throughout the United States.

Mr. Brown's article to which I have just referred, Mr. Speaker, is the following:

(By George Rothwell Brown)

WASHINGTON, May 18.—A very fancy social lobby, according to Capitol cloakroom grapevine, is wining and dining wavering Members of the House of Representatives who may be brought into line behind the State Department's demand for a full 3-year extension of the trade agreements law, with no congressional strings attached.

Whatever may be transpiring nightly across the table at the Metropolitan Club, the fact remains that there are some Republican New Dealers at both ends of the Capitol.

Thus the MARTIN-HALLECK leadership, behind the Ways and Means Committee, and its bill for a 1-year extension, with a congressional review provision, may lose as many as 26 votes on its side of the House. It may pick up a dozen or so Democratic votes.

Apparently the bill prepared by the GEARHART subcommittee of Ways and Means, and reported last week by the full committee by a strict party vote, can be put through the House safely enough.

UNCERTAIN FATE

But at the Senate it will run into the Republican internationalists and its fate there is less certain.

The State Department free traders, headed by former Under Secretary Will L. Clayton, have been emphasizing the fact that a 3-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is essential, for the reason that it is a fundamental part of the whole New Deal foreign policy.

The Ways and Means Committee quickly recognized this fact and took advantage of the administration's theory. The Trade Agreements Act is to expire by limitation, unless extended, on June 12, 1948.

It was not by accident but by design that the 1-year extension bill provides for the continuation of the law until June 30, 1949.

This is the date when the first accounting must be made of the administration of ERP.

Ways and means Republicans want to have all the European recovery data in hand when the tariff law again comes up for discussion.

ITO PLANS

Meanwhile a suspicion is deepening among House Republicans, that the State Department is planning to put the International Trade Organization Charter into effect as soon as Congress adjourns and gets out of Washington for the campaign, without submitting it for approval by either House or Senate.

This is the trade and employment charter drawn up at Geneva last summer, and polished off at Havana early this year.

The State Department gave formal assurance at Geneva last year that the action of Congress would be required for the approval of the Charter.

The indications at the time were that it intended to bypass the Senate, where a two-thirds vote would be required to ratify a treaty, and that the Charter would be submitted to both branches of Congress as a resolution, requiring but a majority vote in each.

It is now feared that the State Department intends to ignore the promise officially made at Geneva, and to declare the ITO Charter in effect, by Executive order, as soon as Congress is out of the way.

PART OF UN

It would base this action presumably on the grounds that ITO is a part of the United Nations, and that sufficient authority for putting it into effect is to be found in the original act of Congress which put the United States into UN.

Meanwhile those who are trying to regain in part the lost powers of Congress in the making of tariffs on imports, have one strong card.

Unless the Trade Agreements Act is extended, it will expire on next June 12.

The strategy of supporters of the 1-year extension bill is to force the Truman administration to take that bill, or get nothing.

Senator Brooks Charts a Course for Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, for an intelligent understanding of the course we must follow as Americans if we are to perpetuate our cherished freedom I can recommend no better reading than the address delivered by Senator C. WAYLAND BROOKS, of Illinois at the Republican State Convention in Springfield.

Senator BROOKS' keen insight into the field of public affairs and his rare ability to give proper voice to sound conclusions have attained and maintained the overwhelming support of Illinois citizens. His challenging address merits the thorough study of fellow Americans everywhere. It charts with clarity a course having for its goal the preservation of the land we love and the principles to which we remain devoted as a liberty-loving people. The address follows:

[Text of speech delivered by United States Senator C. WAYLAND BROOKS at the Illinois State Republican convention, Springfield, Ill., May 10, 1948]

America has many blessings, one of the greatest of them is the form of government under which more than 145,000,000 people have become the freest and most powerful people on the face of the earth. This vast population is made up of every race, creed, and color known to man.

Because of our constitutional form of government with its system of checks and balances, these millions have learned to respect the rights of their neighbors while pressing constantly to alleviate injustices and secure an ever-increasing distribution of benefits and opportunities.

To the progress of this system of self-rule, the Republican Party has played an important and magnificent role. Never, however, did the Republican Party face a greater challenge or confront a greater opportunity than today. The future and fate of our beloved Republic is literally in our hands this year. We are facing a gigantic task of electing our complete Republican ticket—this time to take over the administration of our National Government.

The next administration will face tremendous responsibilities with such present confusion in both our domestic and foreign affairs. This confusion is the natural result of the conflicting programs and illegitimate processes employed to carry them out during the past 15 years.

False promises and false pretenses were the weapons used by the so-called New Deal-Communist coalition to gain and retain their stranglehold on our national life.

These twins of iniquity have run their course and a disillusioned and confused citizenry are turning once more to the stability

of the Republican Party to furnish the stewardship necessary to pilot our ship of state through the troubled waters that lie immediately ahead.

Today we are rightfully proud of the fact that the officers of our national party in preparation for the historic convention to be held in Philadelphia to choose our nominees and adopt our platform of principles, have turned to Illinois and chosen our great Governor, Dwight H. Green, to make the keynote address.

We rejoice with him over the high honor and responsibility that have rightfully come to him. The eyes and ears of the entire Nation will be turned and tuned to him and what he says in that great hour.

This choice of our leader and our Governor for this high honor is a just recognition of his outstanding administration and leadership in Illinois. At the same time it is a tribute to all the Republicans of our State. To the members of his official family, to his fellow State officers, and members of both houses of our legislature, to our splendid men in the House of Representatives in Washington, to our county, district, city, township, and precinct officers, to the workers and loyal citizens who have contributed so much of their thought, their time, and devotion, this is a splendid tribute, well earned and greatly deserved. I congratulate him and you from the bottom of my heart.

This recognition of merit is the result of your efforts of yesterday. The future with its challenge and its golden opportunity lies immediately ahead. In this further gigantic task I am confident you will not fail.

The expression that "These are times that try men's souls" was never truer than today. The men and women who will grapple with the gigantic problems that confront our people will need great intellect, strong hearts, and sturdy bodies. Out of this confusion and chaos, we must bring order, we must establish integrity in public affairs, we must reestablish our economic, military, and moral strength, commensurate with our potential greatness.

We are great because of our faith in and respect for God, because of our faith in and respect for individual liberty, and because of our united determination to remain free ourselves and hold high that torch of liberty for the oppressed people of the world.

A great tragedy is, that as a result of the vacillating and conflicting programs and policies of the present administration, the people of our own country and of the world have had their faith shaken in the integrity and final purpose of our national Government.

This is the inevitable result of deceit, secret agreements, and concealments of the truth on the part of our leaders. It is the natural result of the advancement of communistic influence both at home and abroad.

When the New Deal administration pardoned Earl Browder, and persuaded him to disband the Communist Party in America so they might join hands in their coalition, our confusion started, our national integrity began to disintegrate at home. When the same New Deal administration embraced Godless communistic Russia and glorified her beyond all bounds of reason, the hope of establishing order in Europe based upon freedom of independent nations and justice was greatly weakened.

As a combined result of secret agreements with the Communists both at home and abroad, the future possibility of enduring peace and security was dealt a staggering blow. Thank God, it was not fatal, and there is still time and chance to regain our strength and stature to encourage and demand that those who have freedom may retain it and those who wish it may regain it.

Two years ago the people of the United States realized the hopelessness of further following an administration that could not even agree upon a defense program and whose foreign policy changed with the wind. They were tired of an administration frightening our people with their conflicting cries about inflation and deflation at the same time.

They were weary of an administration talking about the danger of totalitarian powers abroad, while demanding ever-increasing Federal power and controls over every detail of our lives at home.

Fortunately, the people by their votes put an end to irresponsible government in at least the representative branch, when in 1946 they elected a Republican Congress.

Against stubborn opposition on the part of the President, on the part of what remained of his coalition party members, and their vast bureaucratic army numbering over 2,000,000, the Republican Congress has moved steadily on to keep its promises.

First, realizing the already known ill effect and future danger of prolonged tenure in the Presidential office, we promised and we promptly submitted an amendment to the Constitution limiting the tenure to two terms. It has already been ratified by one-half the required number of States.

Second, Republicans promised to protect the rights and interests of veterans. This we have done in a series of constructive bills.

Third, Republicans promised reduction of withholding and other individual income taxes. Three times the Congress passed such bills. Three times the President vetoed the bills, denying tax reduction to the American people. Finally we were able to override his third veto, removing 7,400,000 taxpayers from the rolls and granting relief to 47,000,000 others. By far the greatest amount of tax reduction was attributable to persons with incomes of less than $5,000 per year. It also carried the community-property tax benefits to all our married people alike. The total reduction amounted to $4,800,000,000 annually.

Fourth, the Republican Congress promised and made substantial strides in reducing the exorbitant high cost of Government against the most vicious resistance and propaganda of the administration.

The present Congress has been deeply concerned over the high cost of Government estimated at about $50,000,000,000 a year, or one-fourth of our entire national income.

When President Truman recommended a Federal budget of $37,500,000,000 for 1948, the Congress effected savings upward of $3,000,000,000. This is considered the biggest cut in expenses since the present budget system was established by the American Government in 1923.

Unfortunately, many of these reductions have already been wiped out by the extraordinary expenses made necessary by the folly of previous secret agreements, made and kept from the American people during the war; agreements that have not yet been fully disclosed.

Fifth, the Republican Party promised to rid the Federal Government of Communists and other subversionists who had entrenched themselves in high places. We have worked diligently to keep that promise, but fulfillment will not be completely possible until we take over the executive branch in 1949.

Sixth, the Republican Party promised the enactment of law to improve the relationship between labor and management and to protect the interest of the public. This was done by substantial majorities in both houses in Congress, and was passed over the hysterical veto of the President. Like any other law, it will be subject to modification and change in the light of subsequent experience.

Seventh, the Republican Congress has worked diligently to meet the pressing problems of education and housing; to protect the soil and agriculture of America that has literally fed the world and will be called on to do so for some time to come; to eliminate inequities and advance human rights; to remove all arbitrary controls that would stifle and strangle our private-enterprise system of life.

The Republican Congress has put an end to the rubber-stamp legislation which aided and abetted the false prophets of the New Deal.

We advocated and secured a business administration of our vast contribution abroad and provided a watch-dog committee on the Congress to assure the maximum results of American generosity.

The Republican Congress has put an end to the brain trusts and to must legislation.

We have put an end to Presidential purges.

No longer is our court system faced with the sinister threat of packing by the executive branch.

We have succeeded in part in breaking up the Communist coalition control of our economic life that was dragging us to destruction.

We will finish the job in November. We must gird our loins for the long road ahead to rebuild the strength, solvency, and security of our beloved country; to preserve America, a land of strength and beauty; a land of work and triumph; a land of adventure and opportunity.

We have none of the ancient hatreds, none of the dust of the ages, none of the crumbling shrines of long gone yesterday.

As a nation we still have youth, valiant and vibrant, with a reverent devotion that guards our sacred heritage. We must keep it so.

To this cause we summon the people of America to join our hands; to help us preserve America, this land of the free, and the hope of the liberty-loving people of the world.

Shall the Congress Dare To Exercise Its High Constitutional Legislative Prerogative or Shall It Supinely Surrender to the Free Trade Lobby's Arrogant Demand That It Extend the Trade Agreements Act Without the Dotting of an "i" or the Crossing of a "t"?—Comment of the Eminent News Analyst, George Rothwell Brown.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, because of its timely importance, I am pleased to hand to the Public Printer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the capable pen of the eminent news analyst, Mr. George Rothwell Brown, which recently appeared in the New York Journal and American and numerous other metropolitan dailies published in various parts of the Union.

It is the following:

(By George Rothwell Brown)

WASHINGTON, May 18.—Can Congress now recapture its lost constitutional powers over bills to raise tariff revenue, or has the surrender to New Deal totalitarianism 14 years ago made its recovery forever impossible?

That is the plain question staring the Republican Party of Senate and House in the

face as it approaches a show-down on the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

The issue cannot be dodged. It is between the Constitution or contempt for the organic charter of American Government.

In answer to the Truman administration's demand for another 3-year extension of the act which otherwise will expire nearly a month hence, on June 12, the Republican Ways and Means Committee has reported, through Representative GEARHART, of California, a bill extending the Presidential power over tariff making for only 1 year, or until June 30, 1949.

But the committee has done more than that. It has written into the 1-year extension bill a provision restoring the United States Tariff Commission to the status intended when it was created.

The Tariff Commission was established by Congress as a legislative institution.

After the original surrender of the tariff-making authority by Congress to President Roosevelt in the original Tariff Agreement Act of 1934, the Tariff Commission was stripped of its legislative function and made a pitiful puppet of the executive branch of the Government.

The real power over tariff making, and the destinies of American industry and American labor, was delegated by the President to Secretary Cordell Hull, and from the latter it passed into the hands of underlings in the State Department, who fixed tariff rates—always lower, in the interest of the foreign competitor—in secrecy, behind locked doors.

Under the Roosevelt-Hull system the State Department negotiated all tariff agreements, and would continue to do so under the proposed 1-year extension.

Under the present systen a committee on reciprocal information, in the State Department, established by Executive order, announces that certain hearings will be held.

The Tariff Commission then holds hearings, not before itself, but before the CRI. It then submits its report back to the President, whose creature it has become.

What chance did American industry and American labor have under this system? Not a Chinaman's.

Only the fact that world conditions have been abnormal has saved both from disaster.

The Ways and Means Committee proposes that tariff hearings hereafter shall be held by the body created for that purpose, the Tariff Commission.

The Tariff Commission, in the pending bill, reports to the President, and may report to the Interdepartmental Trade Agreements Committee, also an executive body.

Under the Roosevelt-Hull system, the Trade Agreements Committee made its recommendations to the President, the President approved or amended the committee's recommendations, and if the former, the agreement was signed, and that ended it.

That close corporation of White House and State Department will be broken up if the Republican extension bill is passed.

Under its terms, the Tariff Commission must file its reports with the Ways and Means Committee and the Finance Committee of the Senate.

If the rates in the tentative agreement fall within the competitive area found by the Commission, the President may proclaim them. If the Tariff Commission report is not followed, the President may not proclaim the new rates until Congress has had an opportunity to pass upon them.

Howls of rage are going up from the free traders in Washington. They are screaming that the Trade Agreements Act is being scuttled.

As a matter of fact, this bill does not go far enough toward the restoration of the congressional power over tariff making.

But it is a step—one long overdue—in that direction.

Chickens Home To Roost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission of the House to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Standard-Star published in New Rochelle, N. Y., on May 8, 1948, entitled "Chickens Home To Roost":

CHICKENS HOME TO ROOST

For 15 years the Railway Labor Act of 1926 was a model of efficient relationship between railroads and unions. It had come to be looked upon as a pattern of fair, honest cooperation between employer and employee. It was a labor agreement that worked.

Then came 1941. In November of that year a Presidential fact-finding board reviewed the demands of the unions and announced awards, as had been done ever since the act went into the Nation's laws. The unions brought political pressure to bear upon the occupant of the White House. For reasons of political expediency he yielded, for the first time since the act had become law, ordered the board to lift its sights and look again. The board took the hint, revised its awards upward by 10 percent, and the unions gleefully accepted the new scales.

That was when the backbone of the Railway Labor Act was broken. Since then we have had one threat of Nation-wide strike after another, and, in fact, one complete railway traffic tie-up.

There has been surrender after surrender by Democratic administrations, for once the unions learned that political pressure at the White House could upset fact-finding boards' awards the act had lost its usefulness.

Whatever may come, socialization, nationalization, or chaos, it may all be traced back to that day in November 1941 when politics took over at the throttle. The Roosevelt chickens have come home to roost.

Shrouded Truth in Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Marquis Childs that appeared in the Washington Post of May 19, 1948, as follows:

SHROUDED TRUTH IN GREECE

(By Marquis Childs)

The murder of George Polk, of the Columbia Broadcasting System, in Greece is like a sudden lightning flash in the murky atmosphere of that troubled country. It deserves the fullest investigation, which should have the backing of the Government of the United States.

I saw George Polk in Athens last fall. He was one of three or four really able correspondents in Greece. Both in the war, as a Navy combat flier, and then on his beat in the strife-ridden Middle East, Polk had repeatedly proved his courage, his initiative, his determination.

Because he wanted to get the story behind the surface of the news, he was not content to take government handouts and government favors. In the midst of the intrigues of Athens, he kept his eyes on the main goal—to give the American people the whole story regardless of who might be hurt or offended.

As a consequence, he was resented in high places in the Athens government. He told me last September of the effort to smear him as a Red or a Pink—a favorite technique of the extreme Rightists who dominate the Athens regime. While Polk did not take this too seriously, he realized that he had made enemies because of his criticisms of the failures and stupidities of the Athens government.

That is one reason why the first attempt to put the blame on the Communists, with whom he was supposed to be trying to make a contact in order to interview General Markos, must not be taken at its face value. That is too easy, and the regime in Athens should be made to understand that it is too easy.

This comes at a time when rumors persist of a new build-up to be launched from Athens and Washington—a build-up of the need for American troops in Greece. What George Polk might have said and written when he returned to the United States—as he planned to do—could have interfered with that build-up.

Last winter an article on Greece by Polk appeared in Harper's magazine. It seemed to me to be a critical but a fair appraisal of the muddle in Athens. Nevertheless, the Greek Ambassador in Washington, Vassili C. Dendramis, sent a violent protest to Polk's employer, CBS.

Dendramis' protest was politely rejected by Frank Stanton, CBS president. It was forwarded to Polk in Athens, who considered it a more or less open effort by Dendramis to bring about his discharge. Davidson Taylor, vice president in charge of public affairs, tells me that CBS had complete confidence in Polk and that his decision to come to the United States for a year's study at Harvard as a Nieman fellow had nothing to do with his relationship with the network.

It is because of such reporters as Polk and others that the network has achieved its high standard of news coverage. Edward Murrow, of CBS, in several able discussions of the Greek tangle in recent months, gave full credit to Polk for digging out the background and the facts.

Until recently there were several American correspondents in Greece interested in getting more than the routine news and not at all interested in sending out merely the Government point of view. Among them were M. W. Fodor, of the Washington Post; Homer Bigart, of the New York Herald Tribune; and Constantine Argyris, of the Christian Science Monitor.

Today only Argyris is left in Athens. Recently Bigart's dispatches were severely criticized by Dwight Griswold, administrator of the American aid program, in a letter to the Herald Tribune. Bigart was transferred to Belgrade, but the Herald Tribune says that this was at his own request and that he expects to return to Greece.

We need more than ever today the kind of reporting George Polk was doing in Greece. What is really taking place there is far from clear as the headlines tell of a series of mass executions in Athens.

It is possible that Polk was killed in an effort to establish contact with the Communists and to get an interview with the mysterious General Markos. That is the kind of adventurous reporter he was. But the circumstancees surrounding his death, as reported from Salonika, do rot make it sound that way.

I have lost a friend, a gallant and loyal friend. I last saw him at a wedding party when he was about to marry a charming

young Greek girl. He was gay and very happy.

We have all lost a man who believed in freedom and in truth, and it is a loss we can ill afford.

The Mundt-Nixon Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, since the New Deal administration accorded diplomatic recognition to Soviet Russia in 1933, upon her promise not to propagandize communism in America, it has become obvious, even to the most casual observer, that no opportunity has been lost to propagandize communism in this country. This propaganda has had its origin, its inspiration, its plotting, and its planning in Moscow.

The Mundt-Nixon bill attacks a new situation not now covered by law. That is, a concert of action or conspiracy of individuals to establish a totalitarian political system that stems from another nation or group of nations. This conspiracy of individuals attacks our freedom of religion because the totalitarian state produces intolerance of religion automatically. An attack upon religion is a sure symptom of the totalitarian nature of communism. When the conspiracy or concert of action by individuals seeks to establish an alternative ethics by force, establishing the worship of the state instead of God, that constitutes criminal action, if their loyalty is to another nation. This new modern crime should be punishable in peacetime in exactly the same way that treason is punishable in wartime.

Nothing is more fundamental in the rights guaranteed by the Bill of Rights under our form of government than freedom of worship. In my opinion, too little emphasis has been laid by those seeking to prevent the spread of communism in this country on its subversion of the church as an institution, its fixed determination to annihilate Christianity and all worship of a God that is not the state—the state as bounded by the ideological definitions of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin.

For the benefit of those who have not yet examined the communistic policy and course of action toward God and the church, I should like to quote this official language from page 74 of the Theses and Statutes of the Communist International:

> Only when the proletarian dictatorship has deprived the bourgeoisie of such powerful weapons as the press, the school, parliament, church, the government apparatus, etc., only when the final overthrow of the capitalist order will have become an evident fact—only then will all or almost all the workers enter the ranks of the Communist Party.

And again, all official language, describing a course of action agreed upon and actually put into action at home and charted as the course of action for communistic infiltration in other countries it provides:

> Naturally a struggle must be carried on against the reactionary medieval influences of the clergy, the Christian missions, and similar elements.

And still again, all official language, mind you, this time quoting from the Programme of the Communist International, adopted by the Sixth World Congress in Moscow in 1928, it says:

> One of the most important tasks of the cultural revolution affecting the wide masses is the task of systematically and unswervingly combating religion * * * the opium of the people. The proletarian government must overthrow all state support from the church, which is the agency of the former ruling class; it must prevent all church interference in state-supported educational affairs, and ruthlessly suppress the counter-revolutionary activity of the ecclesiastical organizations.

I could quote endlessly from the official documentation of communism as to its implacable hatred of the church and its determination to eliminate it not only in Soviet Russia but throughout the world, if possible, as a link between man and his God, and I repeat that this more than any other factor makes me, for one, determined to cast my vote and do everything within my power to stop conspiracy to set up a foreign pagan state on American soil.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. SARBACHER, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. SARBACHER. Mr. Speaker, this excellent article by George E. Ijams, director, VFW National Rehabilitation Service, appears in the June issue of Foreign Service, the VFW's official news magazine. I commend its reading to the entire membership of the House.

This factual account is timely and I believe right to the point:

DON'T BLAME CONGRESS

Letters to the VFW National Rehabilitation Service office indicate a widespread belief that the Eightieth Congress failed to appropriate sufficient money for the operations of the Veterans' Administration.

As a matter of fact, Congress has been most liberal in furnishing funds required by the VA, and the record clearly indicates that in 1948 Congress appropriated for the Medical Department of the VA $20,000,000 more than requested. It is because of this generous treatment of our veterans that I wish to correct the mistaken impression which appears to exist.

This is a presidential election year, and many claims and counterclaims can be expected in the coming political campaign. Because of this, it is all the more important that unfounded statements be examined in the light of actual facts. Our old friend Al Smith had something when he said, "Let's look at the record."

Now what does the record show on the 1948 appropriation for the VA? One of our VFW comrades happened to be in charge of the subcommittee handling the VA appropriation this year. He is the Honorable RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, of Massachusetts, ranking member of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 1, 1948, quotes Congressman WIGGLESWORTH as follows:

"It has been represented in veteran circles that the proposed cut on March 31 was the result of the failure by Congress to provide sufficient funds for the fiscal year 1948.

"That, Mr. Chairman, is not the fact. The proposed cuts resulted primarily from the recommendations of the President in respect to the fiscal year 1949, which are substantially below appropriations for the fiscal year 1948, and the determination of the Veterans' Administration to conform to the proposed reduction in personnel, not on July 1, but 3 months in advance of that date, on March 31.

"Let me quote in this connection from a statement that I made on the floor of the House on June 17, 1947, as chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the appropriation for the fiscal year 1948, when this appropriation was under consideration:

"'I want to emphasize, as the report emphasizes, that no recommendation made contemplates any cut in any benefit provided by the Congress for our veterans; that no recommendation contemplates any cut in financial assistance to the disabled, to the widowed, to the orphaned, or in medical care for those who are eligible.'

"And again:

"'The record is clear that the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress have not denied 1 cent or one employee requested for hospitals.'

"As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, we all know that the Congress with respect to the fiscal year 1948 in the medical field made available not only every cent that was requested from the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate but in addition thereto the sum of $20,000,000.

"Second, it has been represented in veteran circles that the proposed cut on March 31 was due to the fact that representatives of the Veterans' Administration had been told by the Appropriations Committee of the House that they could not come back for a deficiency appropriation.

"That, Mr. Chairman, is not the fact. The representatives of the Veterans' Administration who made the assertion have admitted on the record before your committee that they can find nothing in the record to justify that statement.

"There will have to be additional money for the fiscal year 1949 over and above the President's recommendations either for salaries or for terminal leave.

"The effect of approving the recommendation of your committee and allowing $3,000,000 for the Veterans' Administration is to authorize the retention for the time being on the rolls of the Administration some 3,000 more persons than are recommended by the President in respect to the fiscal year 1949, and to give General Gray the force which he says is necessary to cover all essential services for our veterans.

"I know it is unnecessary to state that the Congress will always provide whatever funds are shown to be necessary for the proper care of our veterans."

The above not only clears up the misunderstanding about Congress giving the VA all of the money required, but also clarifies a statement frequently heard around Washington, that the Appropriations Committee had informed the VA they could not come back for a deficiency appropriation.

In all fairness it must be admitted that any shortage of funds for VA personnel must be charged to the great overstaffing of that agency during the past 2½ years. Many

high-salaried jobs and units of organization were established which produced little, if any, beneficial results. The VA has actually become staff-heavy, while there is a crying need for personnel in the lower salary brackets in regional offices.

The answer to the problem of appropriations for salaries in the VA does not lie in an appeal to Congress for more funds. That action would merely serve to hasten demands for another economy act. The answer lies in the ability of the new Administrator, Carl Gray, to abolish useless staff jobs and nonessential units of organization so that the money previously wasted on such jobs can be utilized for the employment of personnel so badly needed in the operating services of the regional offices. After all, the VA was not established for the purpose of providing high-salaried jobs for certain favored but unnecessary persons—it was created to give prompt, sympathetic, and efficient service to disabled veterans and to the widows and orphans of those who gave their lives for our country.

Gen. Carl Gray has been in office only a few months. He has a tremendous job, and we do not expect him to know all the answers in such a short period of time. Nevertheless we sincerely hope the studies he is now making will indicate to him the necessity for changing the chaotic and cumbersome organization established 2½ years ago, and creating a streamlined organization designed to carry out the legitimate functions of the VA with a minimum of overhead expense.

We should not charge Congress with the deficiencies of the VA. Congress has been more than patient and generous to date in providing everything needed to enable the VA to do a good job. If the new Administrator lives up to his splendid reputation as a business executive, and we believe he will, we are confident he will act quickly to correct the glaring and most expensive deficiencies which now prevail in the Veterans' Administration.—George E. Ijams, Director, VFW National Rehabilitation Service.

Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the decision of extending the Trade Agreements Act is as pressing as it is important and the responsibility of continuance of the act, like the welfare of the American people, dependent upon it, rests squarely upon the Republican majority now in control of this House. I place the responsibility squarely upon them, because of their determination to destroy its effectiveness and the underlying desire to fall back upon the iniquitous Smoot-Hawley tariff law which brought to this Nation and to the world the horrible economic conditions existing between 1929 and the date when the Trade Agreements Act helped to restore sanity and trade between nations. This plan, the masterful work of Cordell Hull, has proved its economic value to a disturbed world during the past 14 years, but only to a limited degree. The real promise lies in the peaceful future which we trust is in prospect. In peacetime, not in wartime, will its real and maximum value come to be recognized. Thus far, however, by every rule of reason the reciprocal trade agreements were sustained by an overwhelming majority of every segment of our people. Merchants, manufacturers, farmers, and industrial workers joined with shippers, chambers of commerce, and trade unions in supporting the repeated extensions of the original Trade Agreements Act, and support it as enthusiastically today.

It is a simple test which may be applied to determine your stand to help you make your decision whether you are for or against trade agreements. You are either for the expansion of world trade or stagnation. You are for prosperity for all the people or for the prosperity of a few favored people.

You are in favor of your own welfare or you favor the bloated plunderbund which fattens on robber tariffs while the people starve.

You are selling your apples on world market through the Trade Agreements Act or you are for selling apples on the street corners under the Smoot-Hawley tariff.

You are in favor of a policy of live and let live or a selfish withering policy of economic isolation—you favor peace or you favor war—but let me direct your attention to what others think of the Trade Agreements Act. They are more forceful and eloquent than the reasoned arguments which I am able to advance.

The one from our own Detroit News of May 15 captioned "Tariff Walls Promote War" is for various reasons a very illuminating editorial.

The other clipping on the same "reciprocal trade act" captioned "A Communication" originates with Robert H. Patchin, vice president, W. R. Grace & Co., of New York, a representative businessman who in the past has given valuable testimony to the Committee on Ways and Means. He is a shipper doing business in the international market made possible only through the export of American goods and the import of needed foreign goods. He is in a line of business which not only lives by international trade but promotes and expands the volume which is reflected in our prosperity.

The items referred to follow:

[From the Detroit News of May 15, 1948]

TARIFF WALLS PROMOTE WAR

The extent of popular ignorance about the Trade Agreements Act, as revealed by an America Speakes poll, is astounding and depressing.

The act has existed for 14 years. It was the crowning achievement of the career of former Secretary of State Cordell Hull. Congress has extended the law four times, in each instance to the accompaniment of much debate. Under it, agreements have been negotiated with 27 foreign countries for reciprocal lowering of import tariffs to stimulate foreign trade.

Yet, according to the poll, two-thirds of the people questioned knew nothing of the act, or of the agreements, or of their purpose.

It is something that the one-third who did know were found to favor continuing the law by the overwhelming majority of 8 to 1. Moreover, poll takers found this majority in the main to feel very strongly on the subject.

However, you can easily discover in the indifference of the other two-thirds the reason for the temerity of those in Congress reportedly planning to scuttle tariff trading, when it comes up for renewal, as it must before June 30.

It is always when the citizens are indifferent toward an issue, perhaps too complex for ready understanding, that interest-serving minorities get in their best licks.

The reverse, of course, is also true, a fact pointing to the way to salvation of the trade agreements.

Friends of the act must begin making a noise in its behalf, attracting attention to it and the curiosity that will spread knowledge of what it is.

It should be noised around:

1. That tariff walls are the enemies of peace.

2. That American protectionism following World War I played a leading part in setting the stage for World War II.

3. That lowered tariffs now are essential to Europe's economic recovery, to American prosperity, and to the survival in the world of democratic capitalism.

If these truths can be brought to the attention of the people the trade agreements will be saved, for, as the poll shows, people have only to know about them to be for them.

[From the Washington Post of May 19, 1948]

RECIPROCAL TRADE ACT—A COMMUNICATION

Aside from its relation to our bipartisan foreign policy and ERP, may I cite some reasons why Congress should not permit the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to be crippled by amendments such as have been proposed by the Ways and Means Committee, with the minority dissenting, but should be extended for 2 or 3 years. Among these reasons are:

1. The act (RTA) is the only medium yet here devised by legislation for selective adjustment of tariff duties through which, at the same time, the United States obtains reciprocal concessions in foreign tariffs.

2. If it lapses, existing agreements, some 40 in number, will remain in effect for their prescribed terms—in no case more than 3 years. But the President will no longer have authority to make, in order to meet possibly changed conditions, adjustment of duties, up or down. With the act in effect, such changes in existing agreements can be negotiated within prescribed limits. The agreements contain escape clauses which can be availed of in the case of excessive importation or frustration of our benefits by action of other governments. But the lapsing of the right of the President to adjust rates after negotiation would rob the whole trade agreement structure of the flexibility which is one of its qualifications and which will be needed as world trade returns to normal.

Amendments limiting the President's negotiating authority or subjecting it to the possibility of congressional veto would complicate, delay, and place in jeopardy new agreements or changes in old.

It is likely that other countries as well as the United States may desire adjustments which would make modification desirable but this will be impossible or made extremely difficult if the act lapses. Either would be accepted as a forewarning of disintegration and eventual termination of all agreements.

3. The lapsing of the act would be notice to the world that the United States is changing its tariff policy. But no alternative policy has yet been formulated. The American tariff today is the act of 1930 (Hawley-Smoot) as modified by the trade agreements in force and by application of the most-favored-nation principle of extending the agreement concessions to all nations which grant us similar favorable treatment in return.

4. Is the country or the Congress prepared to revert to readjustment of the tariff only by general tariff revision, by Congress, at infrequent intervals? For many decades it has

been found practically impossible to legislate on the tariff selectively; that is, without an entire overhauling. The risk of precipitating a general revision has been too great to risk. The business and political unsettlements brought or aggravated by some general revisions are well remembered.

The tariff of 1930 provides for adjustment on a basis of comparative foreign and American cost; but this did not work in the early thirties when last essayed. Could it work in the present unsettled era of unstable currencies, trade controls, etc.? That the tariff-making power resides in Congress is a constitutional fact. In the RTA Congress delegated, within prescribed limits, its tariff-making power to the Executive, just as it had delegated its powers in other fields such as interstate commerce, public health, etc. Such delegation has been found almost imperative where flexibility of administration is desirable. Congress has always been able to take back its tariff-making power because it was never delegated for more than 3 years. But it chose to extend the act four times.

Our trade with countries with which we had agreements grew more rapidly than where there were none before the war. The policy evolved by Cordell Hull was the first check to the competitive tariff raising that started in the twenties. It was a factor in knitting closer relations with Latin America and expanding trade with the sister Republics.

During the war they had little effect, for the United States was the only great supplier. The world bought goods wherever obtainable. As more normal conditions are restored, the agreements will be tested. It is improbable that all will wholly satisfy. This signifies that the present is a dangerous time to strip the President of authority by negotiation with friendly countries, with whom we are cooperating in so many other ways, to adjust tariff relations in a way that will speed the recovery of world trade.

Extension of the act unchanged for 2 or 3 years will keep the tariff out of the campaign at least as a major issue. If shortcomings and defects are developed, they can be corrected without scrapping the whole reciprocity idea. Both parties have sanctioned the principle in the past. Moreover, such an extension would probably effectively work against any premature demand for another general tariff revision.

Nobody favors the wholesale sweeping away of the tariff or laying American industry open to an inundation of foreign goods. The act and the agreements are proof against this. But the United States does need and can safely absorb more foreign goods. They are needed for our life and industry, to supplement our own waning national resources in a number of strategic lines, to better balance our chronic excess of exports and to recoup some of the vast amount being advanced to other nations to aid their recovery.

The RTA and the agreements have been so much discussed in terms of obtaining concessions from others that their defensive character has escaped due attention. However, they can be so administered as to check discrimination against American commerce. The whole spirit of the act and the agreements is that of nondiscriminatory multilateral foreign trade.

While some restrictions are being tolerated on the part of other countries in the interest of the recovery effort, these may well become irksome and extremely unfair. About 20 of the agreements now in effect are subject to termination on 6 months' notice by either party; all are terminable in the event of unduly prejudicial results. It is unlikely that any important country would like to be without one of these agreements in case the United States should suggest its termination unless discriminatory practices were terminated.

Of course no act is sacrosanct. The big question is whether the RTA is to remain a reciprocity act in principle or be frustrated.

The amendment proposing extension for only 1 year instead of 2 or 3 as hitherto would keep it under a sword of Damocles and precipitate another renewal struggle next year. The proposed amendment detaching the Tariff Commission from negotiation but empowering it to set limits on the tariff-adjusting power already delegated by Congress to the President is a far-reaching change. This, with the proposed requirement that any agreement must run the gantlet of a congressional veto within 60 days if the President does not conform to the Tariff Commission "metes and bounds" is a form of double jeopardy.

So little time remains before June 12 that failure to extend the act for a greater period than 1 year and binding it with crippling amendments would be a shock to the world and accepted as a blazing signal of isolation.

ROBERT H. PATCHIN,
Vice President, W. R. Grace & Co.
NEW YORK.

The Death of the Reverend Peter A. Brooks, S. J., Is a Great Loss to Milwaukee and Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in the year 1673 the black-robed missionary, Father Jacques Marquette, paddled his canoe along the shores of Lake Michigan where the great city of Milwaukee now lies. Father Marquette came to a wilderness to help open it up for civilization. The chief sign of the civilization which he represented was the cross he carried with him. A great university was founded years later by the Jesuits honoring the name of the priest-explorer.

Marquette University is a center of learning in the Middle West. It has had famous presidents—the confreres of the missionary, Jacques Marquette, maintaining civilization in our country under the same sign—that of the cross.

One of the greatest presidents of Marquette University, who added fame to the institution, last Sunday slipped away to leave the presidency of Marquette and join the companionship of Jacques Marquette, the priest-explorer. Father Brooks we bid you adieu—for a while.

I include the following editorials of the Milwaukee Sentinel and Milwaukee Journal on the death of the Reverend Peter A. Brooks, of the Society of Jesus:

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel of May 18, 1948]

FATHER BROOKS

The sudden and unexpected death of the Rev. Peter A. Brooks, S. J., is a very definite loss, not only to the great university he headed with such signal ability, but to all Milwaukee. And the sorrow that is so profound here in his home city will extend throughout the Nation, to every community which has sent a son to Marquette in the years of his administration.

Father Brooks, while a great churchman and a great educator, was no recluse. He was a public-spirited citizen, ready at all times to lend his great abilities and the resources of the great university to movements for the public welfare.

He had been a businessman and a fighting soldier in the First World War before taking up his studies for the priesthood and the Jesuit order, in which he rose to positions of great trust and responsibility which he discharged with fidelity and outstanding ability.

And in his life work he never lost the human touch which endeared him to his faculty and to the thousands of students on Marquette's rolls.

It is saddening when a man in the prime of life, at the zenith of his powers, is summoned from his useful and valuable work. But when a brief life has produced not only professional success, but has been adorned with conspicuous service to humanity, it should be remembered that in a relatively brief space he did the work of a long and great lifetime.

All Milwaukee, Catholic, Protestant, and Jew, will join in reverent sorrow at the departure of a good man, an earnest and zealous priest, a profound scholar, a great administrator and a citizen of whom any community would be justly proud.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of May 18, 1948]

MARQUETTE'S SUDDEN LOSS

Many persons in the community will join Marquette University in mourning the loss of Father Peter A. Brooks, S. J.

His greatest interest lay in the institution that he had attended and then had returned to head. His activity in establishing the building fund and his action to expand Marquette's facilities for the use of returning veterans will be notable monuments to his career.

To hail Father Brooks as a public-spirited citizen and as an able administrator is not enough. He was a man of great human feeling. His interest in bettering the lot of the Marquette faculty members, his earnest desire to maintain a close, personal relationship with the student body, his concern with alumni affairs, were evidence of this. Many is the student, or alumnus, of the university who treasures today the memory of a cheering and sympathetic message received in an hour of sorrow from Father Brooks.

Marquette had every reason to expect more years of leadership from its able and friendly president. The shock of his death is the greater because it was so unexpected.

Polk Death Laid to Greek Rightists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Drew Pearson that appeared in the Washington Post of May 20, 1948:

POLK DEATH LAID TO GREEK RIGHTISTS

(By Drew Pearson)

George Polk, the American news commentator, whose bullet-pierced, bound-up body was found in Salonika Bay, wrote me a letter about his troubles with the Greek Government. Based on this letter and otherwise, evidence points to the probability that

rightist forces within the government were responsible for Polk's murder.

In the first place, only the Greek Government had access to his broadcasts. Only they knew how critical he had been of Greek rightist attempts to sabotage the American reconstruction program.

In addition, all sorts of obstacles had been placed in Polk's path. The Greek Government did not want him in Greece and did everything possible to get him out. Here is a sample of Greek obstruction:

"During the past 4 days, I've been trying to make arrangements for flying to Salonika," Polk wrote. "I've been to the foreign ministry press section, to the Greek air force headquarters, to the Greek commercial air line, and to the Government air travel priority department. Today, after 4 days of leg work and innumerable telephone calls, I have not succeeded in making any arrangements.

"Everything is tied up in red tape. The air lines will not say whether they have a seat or not. First, I've got to produce a priority; but I can't get the priority until I give the seat number and flight number and date of the plane I will take. So, back and forth I've been like a tennis ball. The plan is to make me fret myself into a tizzy—or perhaps give up the trip. Yet if I made an issue of all this red tape, everybody would blandly say that Polk is simply 'impatient.'"

POLK WAS A BATTLER

George Polk was a fighter, whether as newspaperman or in the service of his country. During the war as a Navy pilot he was in the thick of the battle of Guadalcanal, broke his back in a crash landing, came home to fight for unification of the Army and Navy.

In Greece, George fought the grafters and the right-wing extremists. An article in Harper's Magazine told a revealing story. In writing to me, he told how reactionaries in the Government sought to discredit American newsmen who were critical. Apparently he had some premonition of trouble, for he said: "The right wing is trying to get a number of us discredited or removed from Greece."

"Royalist 'Ethmos' has denounced 'irresponsible' correspondents who write 'unfavorable and misleading' stories about the Greek Government," George continued.

"The attack upon the correspondents is being made by the Royalist political group known as the Populist Party. Under leadership of Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister Constantine Tsaldaris, key Populist members throughout the Government appear to be implementing a carefully devised offensive.

GREEK ENVOY CRITICIZES

"As an illustration of the method of attack, consider a letter concerning me written by Greek Ambassador Vassili Dendramis, an ultra-rightist supporter of the Tsaldaris clique. Strangely enough, Dendramis wrote to CBS president, Frank Stanton, complaining about my article on Greece in the December Harper's Magazine.

"However, my case up to the present is rather mild compared with the attack being made against other outspoken reporters on the scene. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs has just written to the Christian Science Monitor complaining that their correspondent in Greece, Constantine Argyris, is guilty of using offensive language in dealing with Greek Government officials and also is guilty of drunkenness at interviews. Knowing Argyris as well as I do—and having the highest respect for his professional attributes—I know this charge is a lie.

"Another correspondent who has drawn Greek right-wing fire is Ray Daniell, of the New York Times. He arrived in Greece unaccompanied by his wife and when his articles proved displeasing for the right-wing politicians, they spread malicious slander about Daniell.

"Yet another reporter who had provoked the Greek right-wing is Homer Bigart, of the New York Herald Tribune. At the moment, being a newcomer in Greece, Bigart is getting the 'treatment' that others of us already have had. In particular he is being denounced by name as a Communist; he is being ridiculed for 'looking at things upside down'; he is being refused interviews by persons he needs to see for news purposes—such as Foreign Minister Tsaldaris.

"The pattern of the right-wing's attack on the other American correspondents here is clever—public denunciation plus official refusal to allow a reporter to visit the civil war areas; instead, there is a clever plan of making news work in Greece as difficult as possible for critical correspondents.

"In addition, now that so many correspondents are writing such critical stories on the dominant right-wing faction of the Government, there are a number of vague hints that 'somebody is likely to get hurt.'"

Speak Up for Your Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1948

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, in the April 1948 issue of Good Housekeeping magazine there appeared a very timely message to everyone in this great land of ours. Let each of us take inventory of the good things of this land and express our patriotism to others in everyday language. We should analyze our faults and seek to correct them.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the article entitled "Speak Up for Your Country," by Harrison Smith, which appears in the April issue of Good Housekeeping magazine:

SPEAK UP FOR YOUR COUNTRY

(By Harrison Smith)

As a man must believe in himself to have the strength to carve out his own destiny, so must a nation. Our strength and our wealth, the abundance that flows from our mines and factories and farms, have now obliged us to assume the leadership of half the world in a time of dire peril. But unless the people of our Nation believe in it and its destiny, we cannot expect the rest of the world to have the faith we lack. Lacking unbounded faith in the goodness and rightness of our motives, we will be in danger as great as any we have faced in our entire history.

That danger is now plain for all to see. It does not stem wholly from the threat of a third world war, in which the belligerents can use atomic weapons and other awesome products of the scientists' laboratories. No, the immediate danger is not of a shooting war but of a slow weakening of our will to resist the ideological warfare that is going on now and sometimes is called "the cold war."

In our battle to resist dictatorship and an economic life that is alien to us, we must fight now for our own conception of how man should live and by what laws be governed. We must fight first in Europe, then wherever else peoples are threatened with the loss of their liberties and in danger of succumbing to native totalitarian rulers, whose true masters would be Russian Communist dictators. The radio waves of all the world echo the harsh eloquence of the battle. It has become for us a duty and a necessity to stop the progress of this creed of subservience wherever it seems to be overwhelming weaker nations. It feeds on hunger and general misery, and consequently we must fight this cold war with money and machines and weapons, as well as with ideas.

But all the wealth we can spare from our rich economy will not suffice if the people throughout the world we are striving to help do not trust us as a firm and determined and righteous leader in a world struggle.

Every American is now a part of this war. He may, according to our laws, believe what he chooses. He can be ideologically an atheist, a Communist, an anarchist. He is entitled to express his opinions. But he must not conspire with those who would attempt to destroy the Government of the United States by force, as French Communists have conspired to destroy the Government of France, with the aim of setting up a dictatorship controlled by Russia. He must not, in other words, be a traitor to our country. For the time being, our own liberties under our Constitution are safe; but they must be protected by a kind of patriotism new to us and yet as old as time. We have allowed our faith to be overwhelmed by criticism and attacks on the essential meaning of America—the nation that once appeared to be a prodigy, a new light in a world in which the common man was universally enslaved.

It is an instinct of man to hope and pray for a better life, if not for himself, then for his children. There are millions on the other side of the world who have been taught that communism applied by the police state is the beter way, and who are willing to sacrifice for it rights that are as essential to us as our very existence.

It is not in those millions of people who have never known the meaning of freedom that our hope for a new world society lies. The echoes of the torrent of strong American words that once burned their way to the heart and mind of an awakening Europe, promising man equality and liberty, cannot now penetrate the borders of Russia or into the states it dominates. We should read and heed again the eloquent sentiments that for nearly two centuries have promised freedom and hope to suffering mankind: the sentiments uttered by our patriots in time of stress and embraced in our Constitution.

Patriotism in our time is not dead, though its true accents are now rarely heard. The man who tries to use simple declarative sentences in announcing his belief in America's destiny, its ideals, and its Government may be called a patrioteer, accused of somehow profiting by any expression of his love for his country.

Some of our intellectuals and our liberals have few words to waste on so vital a subject; they are so endlessly and virtuously attacking our faults that they cannot see that the sun still blazes in the sky. They are not to be despised, for their service to the country is of incalculable value. But they have instilled a state of mind in many people that silences too many tongues, though in other ways Americans are not given to self-deprecation.

It should not be necessary in an analysis of our virtues to halt and count the number of people lynched in this country year before last, or to list our sins against ourselves, our intolerance against our fellow citizens who differ from the majority in race, color, or religion. This constant reminder, displayed without any attention to the splendid background of our exuberant and industrious Nation, has brought misfortune to us twice.

It is exceedingly unfortunate that the press of other countries has for long had the habit of exhibiting our worst aspects. It can be argued that the First and Second World Wars might not have started if the Germans and then the Japanese had thought we could so quickly turn civilians into soldiers, arm them

with such weapons as the world had never before seen, and produce the goods and material to supply all the nations leagued with us in the deadly contest.

Patriotism must be revived, must be stated again, in simple terms. We do not need Fourth of July orations to convince ourselves that we are great, and that in us, the strongest and wealthiest nation on earth, there is neither arrogance nor any deep hatred of any other country. It is known that we have the qualities of mercy and compassion, that we are generous beyond the average of mankind. It should not lessen the value of these virtues before the bar of world opinion that our generosity has become the principal weapon in this war of words in which we are engaged with so formidable and hostile an antagonist.

Let us recognize and calmly analyze our faults, so that in time we may correct them. But let us also, and with humility, list the proofs of our strength, our patience, and our endurance, for the world must know, before it is too late, what our qualities are. And we must put into the balance that we are now united in our determination that there shall someday be a fellowship of the nations of the world, so men everywhere may stand upright, as free men should, and go about their appointed tasks without fear, confident of their future. That is our aim; our appointed destiny is to lead the world toward this millennium. If we fail, the race of man may fall with us, and the twilight of barbarianism may once more darken the earth.

The Mundt-Nixon Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES K. FLETCHER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Francisco (Calif.) People's World of May 13, 1948:

EMERGENCY CALL TO ALL COMMUNIST PARTY CLUBS AND MEMBERS

The fight against the Mundt-Nixon bill is the first line of defense of American democracy! It must receive priority as the single most important task facing the labor and progressive movement today.

We call upon all Communist Party clubs and all members of the Communist Party to provide fighting leadership in their community, shop, and industry, in the campaign to defeat this un-American Fascist measure. Every decent American, every single person and organization that wishes to preserve American democracy, must be aroused to action in order to prevent the pro-Fascist forces from shackling our country under a police state.

We call upon every Communist Party club to immediately take the following steps:

1. Every club must immediately organize its participation in the campaign for the next period. This should be done at an emergency club meeting if necessary, or at a regular club meeting if scheduled within the next day or two.

2. Without waiting for the next meeting, clubs and individual members should immediately step up all activities in connection with the campaign, directing pressure not only on California Congressmen, but also on Senators DOWNEY and KNOWLAND, and on the Senate Judiciary Committee, ALEXANDER WILEY, chairman. This should include wires and resolutions from every group and every individual who can be gotten to speak out, regardless of their views on other issues.

3. Distribution of leaflets should take place on the widest scale possible. In addition to the State leaflet which comes off the press May 14, counties, sections, and clubs should issue their own leaflets, continuing this throughout the campaign.

4. Clubs, sections, and counties should circularize labor and community organizations and prominent individuals with letters and literature on the menace this bill represents, urging them to demand its defeat.

5. Open air meetings should be organized at once in the parks and on street corners, to arouse your community to action on the bill.

6. Make sure that every organization, every union in your city and community is aware of the danger of this bill. Join with them in fighting the bill in every way possible. Methods which are being used by organizations fighting the bill include resolutions, delegations to Congressmen and public officials, public protest meetings, tables on street corners where telegrams can be signed as literature explaining the danger of the bill is given out, and other public actions.

Every club, every member must be active in this crucial campaign.

Urgently yours,

WILLIAM SCHNEIDERMAN,
For the State Board, Communist Party of California.

Patrick Henry Drewry

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1948

On the life, character, and public services of Hon. PATRICK HENRY DREWRY, late a Representative from the State of Virginia

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, deeply as I regret the passing of my distinguished predecessor, the Honorable PATRICK HENRY DREWRY, I am highly honored to take this opportunity to pay my tribute to my esteemed friend.

The county from which I hail, Appomattox, was among the counties that constituted the old Tenth District of Virginia, and when that district was broken up under the reapportionment, Appomattox, along with Buckingham and Cumberland counties, was made a part of the Fourth Congressional District. Mr. DREWRY was the Representative of the Fourth District and I, the Commonwealth Attorney of Appomattox County. I came to know him very well and favorably, and my contacts with him throughout the years up to the time of his passing were most pleasant. I was proud to call him my representative, as I had familiarized myself with his legislative experience, particularly with reference to his achievements in behalf of the people whom he represented. His record in Congress was that of an able, painstaking, hard-working, faithful, and conscientious representative, not only in representing efficiently and promptly the interests of his constituents where they came in contact with the Federal Government, but also in supporting legislation which had for its object the promotion of the welfare of the people of his district.

As evidence of the very high esteem in which he was held by the people of the Fourth District, I can point to the fact that he served them for over 27 years, and during that time he had only one campaign to make for reelection, and at that time the people of the district showed their continued confidence in him by returning him to this body as their Representative. It was with pleasure and with a sense of honoring a man to whom honor is due that I supported him in his desire to continue his representation, as well as in his efforts in behalf of the welfare of the district.

Prior to his coming to the Congress of the United States, Mr. DREWRY served with distinction in the State Senate of Virginia, representing the senatorial district comprising the city of Petersburg and the county of Dinwiddie. While in that body, he worked industriously in behalf of the people of his senatorial district, and secured the passage of important measures of benefit to them, as well as to the people of the State at large. Among these can be mentioned the vital-statistics bill and a resolution providing for a commission on economy and efficiency which prepared the budget bill. He presented that bill to the legislature and was successful in having it become law. He was one of the ranking members of the committees on finance, courts of justice, roads, public institutions, and chairman of fish and game. In all of these committees he was active in promoting measures which have since received the approval of the people of the State. He was the patron of the bill providing for the setting aside of funds from the automobile licenses for the maintenance and upkeep of roads. He was also the patron of measures for the health department and for the board of charities and corrections, which work appealed to him very much and constituted his main efforts in legislation. He was chairman of the State auditing committee and had been chairman of the economy and efficiency commission and chairman of the commission appointed by the Governor on the budget, besides holding other positions of honor.

Mr. DREWRY was elected to the Congress on April 27, 1920, and was sworn in on May 10, 1920. Practically all of his congressional committee work during his years of service in this body was with the Naval Affairs Committee and he was for many years the ranking member of that important committee. He served as chairman of the committee during the absence of its distinguished chairman, Mr. VINSON, of Georgia. Upon the merger of the old committees on Military Affairs and Naval Affairs into the Armed Services Committee he became an outstanding member of said committee and with his usual energy and patriotism, worked to bring about the enactment of legislation that would keep the armed forces of our country always in a state of preparedness to meet any eventuality.

Mr. DREWRY also served as a member of the Democratic National Congressional Committee from 1922. In 1935, he was elected chairman of said committee which position he held to the day of his death. This committee has charge of the campaigns of all Democratic can-

didates for the House of Representatives. He worked untiringly in behalf of the candidates of his party and during his tenure as chairman of this committee his efforts met with signal success. He was recognized by the leaders of the Democratic national organization as a man of unusual political astuteness and he was always ready and willing to lend his energies to the advancement of the interests of the Democratic Party.

In his work on the congressional committees of which he was a member, as well as in the chairmanship of the Democratic National Congressional Committee, he did not neglect the interests of his own people, especially with reference to agricultural matters; securing appropriations for the Appomattox and James Rivers and for marking historic places in Virginia, such as national military parks on the battlefields around Petersburg and at Appomattox. In addition he obtained for them numerous benefits, including the construction of public buildings in his district, notably at Petersburg, Hopewell, Emporia, Blackstone, and Lawrenceville.

I know that I have only partially covered Mr. DREWRY'S achievements during his long and eminent career, but they are all well remembered by the people to whom he endeared himself. I wish to bring my remarks to a close by paying my own personal tribute to this distinguished son of the Old Dominion. I hold his memory in the very highest esteem and consider that in his passing from public life the people of the district, of the State of Virginia, and of the Nation have lost an able and valuable servant.

Danger to Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I am including an article from the Washington Post by Marquis Childs on the subject of the Mundt bill which was passed yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how far we are going to drift, but certainly if we continue to shackle the liberties of the American people as we have been in the last year or so, we will find ourselves in a completely totalitarian state. It seems that every time we wish to correct an evil we do so by infringing the civil rights of the people. It cannot go on much longer, and the only way it can be checked is for the American people to learn what the Congress has been doing. For this reason, I have many times made statements pointing out this danger, as well as inserted important articles into the RECORD.

The article follows:

DANGER TO FREEDOM

(By Marquis Childs)

The House of Representatives has approved a piece of legislation the like of which has never been seen under the American form of government with its guarantee of freedom to speak, freedom to worship, and freedom to vote. It would give to the Attorney General of the United States powers so broad that he could regulate and coerce the thought of millions of Americans.

In its first test, the Mundt bill won approval by more than 7 to 1. It got the votes of those very Representatives who talk loudest against regimentation and the power of the state.

In this and two following columns, I want to analyze that bill in relation to the problem of freedom versus security. The Stassen-Dewey debate has helped to put the issue in the forefront of public interest. But even so, most Americans, distracted by the problems of living in a period of soaring inflation, are hardly aware of what is at stake. It is high time, in my opinion, that they understand the issue.

In the haystack of fact and fiction that the House Un-American Activities Committee has put together, the pattern of the conspiratorial Communist intrigue is clear enough for anyone to see. It has been spelled out many times before, perhaps most clearly and authoritatively in the report of the Canadian Royal Commission that investigated the conspiracy directed by Soviet agents to steal secrets from the government in Ottawa.

Such a conspiracy is illegal, immoral; it shatters all the relationships of faith and confidence that hold a society together. Therefore, says Representative KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, there ought to be a law.

MUNDT'S intentions are clear enough: This is an evil and we can abolish it by law. He and his colleagues put a great deal of time and study into drafting the Mundt bill. In my opinion, that bill threatens the foundation of the house of freedom. It gives a grant of almost dictatorial power that could be used not merely to check the Communist conspiracy but to end all independence of thought in this country.

The bill, in section 4, provides that it shall be unlawful for any person "to attempt in any manner to establish in the United States, totalitarian dictatorship, the direction and control of which is to be vested in, or exercised by or under the domination or control of, any foreign government, foreign organization or foreign individual." It goes on with even more specific language and provides penalties including imprisonment up to 10 years.

As Representative JOHN CARROLL of Colorado pointed out in the debate, this would include the Communist Party, and therefore the bill outlaws the party even though its sponsors say it does not do so. Harold Stassen said the same thing in his debate with Governor Dewey.

Under the bill, Communist-front organizations must register with the Attorney General and publicly make known in a variety of ways, the fact that they are Communist-front organizations. The bill sets up four tests to determine whether a front is under the control of a Communist political organization.

The fourth test is the position taken or advanced by it (the front) from time to time on matters of policy. If it fails to pass some or all of the tests, then it is reasonable to conclude that it is a front organization and therefore subject to the law. This conclusion can be reached if the Attorney General decides that the front's views and policies are in general adopted and advanced because such views or policies are those of a Communist political organization, a Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement (previously defined).

One of the methods commonly used by Communist political organizations, the bill sets forth, is the inciting of economic, social, and racial strife and conflict. It is not hard to see how the power granted to the Attorney General could be stretched to cover any organization or individual advocating social or economic change of any kind.

Here, in my opinion, is the essence of the danger. The power granted the Attorney General would not have to be stretched very far to cover organizations proceeding in a wholly American way to advocate reforms that might not be popular with the majority or with powerful minorities. Judicial review is provided, but this remedy would come after an organization had been publicly branded as Communist.

Before this can appear in print, the bill may be amended. But in the opinion of many who have studied it, no amount of amending can remove the danger to freedom inherent in it, nor will amending make it constitutional.

Great Britain Is the Aggressor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, Great Britain stands indicted and convicted at the bar of world opinion as the aggressor against Israel.

The blood of martyrs should lie heavily on the brow of Ernest Bevin tonight.

There can be no doubt about public reaction.

I am inserting, under leave, two editorials, one from a stanch Democratic paper, the New York Post, and one from an equally stanch Republican paper, the New York Herald Tribune, expressing virtually the same point of view, and also extracts from a recent message of the American Christian Palestine Committee.

It is obvious that this country cannot stop with recognition of Israel, but must take the logical next steps, lifting of the arms embargo to Israel and immediate extension of cash loans and credits to enable this newest member of the family of nations to survive.

[Editorial from the New York Post]

THE TEST

(By T. O. Thackrey)

There is a deadly conspiracy against the peace of the world and the continued usefulness of the United Nations within the Security Council.

Great Britain is a member of that conspiracy.

Syria, representing the seven Arab States in the Arab higher committee which have defied the United Nations directly, is a member, supported by Great Britain.

China, posing as a democratic ally and seeking funds and military assistance from the United States, has joined the conspiracy.

And the conspiracy is succeeding.

These active enemies of action by the United Nations to prevent the spread of war in the Middle East are being permitted by the United States and the Soviet Union to talk the authority of the United Nations to death.

The United States and the Soviet Union both granted recognition to Israel as the government of that portion of Palestine outlined in the November 29 General Assembly resolution which both supported. Yet they have permitted action on the declaration

that peace has been breached to be delayed indefinitely by the quibbles of Great Britain and her Arabian allies.

Both within and without the United Nations parallel and positive steps must be taken at Lake Success and the White House to force a halt to the invasion of Palestine by the Arab nations—nations who have formally declared war, and are engaging in hostile action outside their own borders with the avowed purpose of seizing territory, exercising political control, and dismembering Israel.

The United States need not ask who the aggressors are—the aggressors are self-proclaimed, and their proclamation has been made directly to the United Nations itself.

The war is declared to be upon Israel—but it is in fact even more serious and grave a matter—though the security of Israel is an obligation upon the United Nations, and particularly upon the United States and the Soviet Union, in view of their prompt recognition.

The war is upon the United Nations.

Palestine as a whole is the concern of the United Nations, the successor to the mandated power, and the United Nations, as well as the United States, has authorized a direct trusteeship for Jerusalem, an Arab majority state and a Jewish majority state.

Jerusalem is being laid to waste by Arab armies acting upon the orders of seven Arab states, whose forces without exception are operating beyond the borders of those states. The objective, clearly stated, is twofold:

1. To murder as many of Jerusalem's Jews as possible.

2. To seize Jerusalem by force from the United Nations and hold it sovereign to one or more Arab states, none of which has right or title in it.

This is war—and the Security Council knows it.

Israel is being attacked by would-be invaders from sovereign Arab states, who have ordered their armies to march upon it and have notified the United Nations secretariat in explicit terms.

But the very presence of these armies on the soil of that part of Palestine set forth by the United Nations for creation of an Arab state is a hostile act against the United Nations—for the armies are those of nations holding neither sovereignity, right, or title to the land, nor overlordship of its population.

The hope of the enemies of the United Nations is that the great powers of Russia and the United States, out of fear and suspicion of each other, will permit the matter to be debated at Lake Success until Palestine has been made an international graveyard—and the United Nations itself buried there.

The United States must break this deadly conspiracy.

In the United Nations we must state what the United Nations already knows beyond dispute—that the Arab states of the Higher Committee have broken the covenant, are making aggressive war, and must be branded the outlaws promptly, and demand that sanctions, together with whatever force is needed, be employed at once to halt the war itself.

At Washington the President must act to lift the embargo to the defenders of Israel and keep it in force against the hostile Arab states which have openly defied us and the United Nations.

Further, Great Britain should be notified that we will not countenance continued support of the Transjordan troops now engaged in hostile aggression on Palestine soil.

Only these strong and bold measures will bring peace.

All else is death—not merely to the defenders of Palestine but to international agreements for halting aggression in favor of peace.

If that is permitted to fail in a test with the defiant Arab invaders of Palestine, what greedy country will not be able to defy the united power of the world?

The test is now.

And today—not 6 months after debate has been exhausted, as was the case from November until May 15—is the time when action is imperative.

The action will be taken if President Truman's declaration last week was more than the political aphorism the sneering British have tried to brand it.

[From the New York Herald-Tribune]

GLUBB PASHA AND HIS LEGION

Brig. John Bagot Glubb Pasha is an officer of the British Army who has been seconded or loaned to the King of Transjordan. Glubb commands the Arab legion which yesterday was reported dropping shells into the Jewish section of the old walled city in the heart of Jerusalem. The legion is the most efficient and best disciplined force at the disposal of the Arabs in Palestine. Indeed, the course of the fighting there to date suggests that it is the only efficient and disciplined force the Arabs have. At a time when the army of Israel was winning victories in several parts of Palestine, the legion was thrown into the battle for Jerusalem, and may be turning the tide there.

The Arab legion is British trained, British equipped, and British led. Glubb Pasha is the senior of 40 British officers, 30 of whom were, like him, seconded to Transjordan, the other 10 having been directly enlisted by King Abdullah. The British Government maintains that its military aid to Transjordan and other Arab states is in accordance with its treaty obligations. It cannot agree that these states have committed acts of aggression, since it does not recognize the existence of the State of Israel against which the aggression is taking place. And it announces that it will keep on supporting the Arab countries unless and until the United Nations rules the Arab invasion of Palestine illegal.

It was possible to sympathize with the British desire to extricate themselves from the mess in which they had become involved in Palestine. It is less easy to understand this passive connivance in Arab intervention now that the British have cast off all responsibility for the welfare of Palestine. The fact that the British seek to hide behind legal technicalities, makes their course no more acceptable.

From the point of view of national or international law, all is confusion in Palestine. The boundaries of Israel have not been defined. The partition boundaries have no real legal status, since the Security Council has taken no decision on partition. Under the circumstances, the British could find as much legal justification, and a great deal more moral justification for a policy of real neutrality in Palestine than for their present course. Much better uses could be found for the British officers, the arms, and the money that are being used against the Jews. The British Government might well consider whether there is any objective it is likely to achieve in Palestine that is worth the price Britain will pay in good will all over the world for connivance in Arab aggression.

MESSAGE FROM THE AMERICAN CHRISTIAN PALESTINE COMMITTEE

I now quote extracts from the moving and eloquent appeal of the American Christian Palestine Committee, of 41 East Forty-second Street, New York:

The truly great moments of history have been relatively few in our world. Seldom has human idealism culminated in an event which shapes the course of world affairs for generations to follow. We are celebrating such an event today. A Jewish state has once again come into being on the distant shores of the Mediterranean, in the ancient and hallowed land of Israel. Biblical prophecy has ben fulfilled in our time. We wish to convey to the people and the government of the Jewish state the deep emotion that is felt today by all true Christians and all true Americans.

For 2,000 years the Jewish people have withstood attempts to annihilate them. They have endured persecution and discrimination, and they have seen mighty empires bent on their extermination go down to destruction. Throughout those long years, their faith in their ultimate destiny was unbroken; their confidence in the fulfillment of the prophetic vision of the return to Zion was unshaken.

We welcome this brave people to the community of nations, and we are confident that its contributions to our own age will reflect the high spiritual and moral values which emanated from the ancient Jewish commonwealth. A nation which has at all times been sensitive to higher truths; a community of God seekers, of seekers after world morality and the brotherhood of man—such a nation is indeed an acquisition for the world.

The Jewish state exists. But men of small vision would destroy it. There is no peace in Zion today. The Jewish state stands alone and embattled. As in the days of the prophet Daniel, and as in the days of the Maccabees, Israel must once again defend the right to freedom and to peace. All of us are involved in this struggle. None of us will escape the awful guilt that would be ours if we should be indifferent to the brutal onslaught on the Jewish state. Behind the Arab aggression against that state stand narrow minded and selfish interests, some of them—to our shame—linked with the most powerful governments in Christendom today. This must stop. We must at last recognize our inescapable moral duty to grant to the Jewish Nation the same right of independent existence which is enjoyed by all other nations.

We are hopeful that strong ties of mutual understanding and friendship will link the new Jewish state with the people and Government of the United States of America. Our own republic was founded on the ideals enunciated by the Jews of old. Now that a revived Jewish state has reappeared on the map of the world—a nation inspired by the same principles of liberty and human progress which animate our own country—it is eminently right that we extend a helping hand to the Jewish state, which is at one and the same time the youngest and oldest of nations.

Mr. Speaker, time is flying, and lives are being lost, while our great country, strong in our strength and living freedom, still hesitates to insure the freedom of Israel.

American Taxpayers Are Paying for Great Britain's Arab War of Annihilation Against Israel

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the real aggressor in the bloody undeclared war of annihilation against the new Jewish state of Israel is Great Britain, and American taxpayers are paying the bill.

Without exception, the Arab states warring against the defenseless Jews

have their hands deep in John Bull's pocket.

Egypt, Iraq, and Transjordan are actually on England's pay roll. The others have taken bribe after bribe. The regular troops now demolishing the Holy City are British led, trained, and armed.

That great Christian country, England, is encouraging the utter destruction of Jerusalem, the most venerated city in all of Christendom and Judaism, and, because the British Empire is bankrupt and functioning only on American loans and credits, American taxpayers are footing the bill.

Our Government has at hand the kind of sanctions which the brutal and unrelenting British foreign office can understand.

We can shut off the flow of money, food, clothes, and machinery under the British loan and the European recovery program, and I intend to ask the Appropriations Committees of both Houses to refuse to appropriate any money for any nation guilty of subsidizing aggressive warfare.

The next step, having already recognized Israel, is to lift the embargo against shipment of arms to Israel, and to advance funds to enable the new nation to beat off its enemies and establish a stable government in peace.

American Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 21 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial written by Harry H. Schlacht, and published in the Journal-American and other Hearst newspapers on I Am An American Day, May 16, 1948.

When our country was established, a motto, "One out of many," was adopted. This referred to the unity of the Federal Government, which was created out of many States. Today one out of many describes well the American people. American culture has gained much from the high ideals which have become ours as a result of the bringing of the best of all cultures of all lands into ours. Good blood and good thought from many peoples now contribute in the making of America, and when they act or speak they are Americans all.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO GREATER GIFT THAN AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

Today America celebrates I Am An American Day. It is a glorious tribute to our new citizens. It is an all-American expression of Americanism. It is dedicated to every nationality, race, and creed. It was fathered by the Hearst newspapers. It is now a national holiday.

The best blood of every nation floweth strong within our veins.

America is the land of many races but of one people. From that blend of blood, from that coalescence of courage, from that fusing of hardship, from that synthesis of ideals, came America of today.

She has mothered every people from foreign hills and plains.

There is no geography to American manhood. There is no sectionalism in American patriotism.

Our native and foreign born share the same traditions. They are not all of one nationality. They are not all of one religious belief. They are not all of one origin, but they are all one in the service of our country.

America has welded them together, wreathed with liberty their brow.

We recall the story of the Assyrian. In his country there was no opportunity. He was but a straw in the wind. He came to America. The straw in the wind became a man.

We are a God-loving people. We are a liberty-loving people.

America is the light of liberty. It is the shrine of democracy. It is the best hope of humanity. It is the light of the world.

'Neath the Stars and Stripes they flourish.

Our citizenship is the spirit of our independence. It constitutes the lifeblood of our people. It circulates with every heartbeat of Americanism. It represents the teachings of the founding fathers.

"I am an American." No nobler words have ever been penned or uttered by man. No declaration can mean more than that simple phrase. No gift can be conferred by any nation on any person, greater than the gift of American citizenship.

We are all Americans now.

Down the vista of the past comes the call of the mighty men of our history whose illustrious example bids us to beware of the adventurous derelicts who seek to weave a crown of thorns for our brow.

They would blight our people with the poisonous fumes of communism. They would exchange our rich inheritance for godless communistic pottage brewed in the cauldron of tyrants. They would tear down our blessed flag and unfurl the darkness of the Red flag.

Woe to them whose lips shall pronounce it. Woe to them whose hands shall be raised to accomplish it. Living they shall be despised. Dying they shall descend to the vile dust—unwept, unhonored, and unsung.

New citizens of America, we salute you. You are the hope of today. You are the hope of tomorrow. You are the hope of all our tomorrows.

May our flag speed the birth of a new day for all mankind. May our flag be the rainbow in the storms of life. May our flag be the beam that smiles the clouds away.

Give your best to America; America has given its best to you.

Guard blessed America, God bless America.

Civil Rights in Minnesota?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 21 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Civil Rights in Minnesota?" published in the Atlanta Constitution of May 20, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS IN MINNESOTA?

We have been listening intently for a shattering blast of righteous indignation from those who profess to be ardent champions of the civil rights of man. We have watched the great eastern papers, whose editorial tongues frequently lash out in wrath when injustices, real or fancied, occur in the South. More particularly have we held an open ear toward the various Presidential candidates, including the incumbent, hoping to catch even a hint of displeasure at one of the most cruel illustrations of disregard for human rights we have seen in many months.

All has been silence.

It seems to be the common view in Washington that the mob violence used by CIO meat packers last week is a matter for the State of Minnesota to deal with. But the fact is the State has done nothing to punish those who broke into a packing plant, wrecked the machinery, assaulted those who were working and kidnapped some 25 or 30 of their number. Yet, those in Congress and in the administration who are most vociferous in their clamor for the civil rights program, so-called, are conspicuous by their silence in the wave of anarchy that engulfed St. Paul. Not even Harold Stassen, Minnesota's former Governor, has had a word to say about this insurrection.

William Green and Philip Murray, both advocates of the civil rights program, have failed to condemn the use of mob violence by strikers. Their silence gives assent to the use of force which deprives citizens of their right to earn a livelihood.

In all the South last year there was a single lynching. This crime is the only crime which has been on the steady decline since the First World War. Mob violence by organized strikers—murder, arson, dynamiting, and sabotage—have shown spectacular increases, particularly in the East and the Midwest, chief centers of indignation against the South.

Moreover, the right to work, recognized by law and custom as among the inalienable rights, is increasingly abused with impunity.

The hypocrisy of a civil rights program which applies to one section of the country but not to others by now is obvious to voters everywhere. And the inconsistency of those who would punish the South, because of its political impotence, but give silent assent to equal injustices elsewhere is revolting.

Russian Approach to Peace Discussions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 21 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Keep the Door Open, Mr. President," written by David Lawrence, and published in the United States News of May 21, 1948.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEEP THE DOOR OPEN, MR. PRESIDENT

(By David Lawrence)

ADMINISTRATION'S REJECTION OF RUSSIAN APPROACH TO PEACE DISCUSSIONS DIFFICULT TO JUSTIFY—FORMS AND TECHNICALITIES, PRIDE AND PRESTIGE MUST YIELD TO GENUINE DESIRE FOR PEACE

In Moscow, the Associated Press and United Press dispatches tell us, the people last week stood eight and nine deep reading the news

bulletin boards upon which were displayed the texts of the notes exchanged between the United States and Russia. The people nudged each other with satisfaction. They smiled with a sense of relief. They were revealing their previous concern about war. Even behind the iron curtain it now seems the people had known that relations with the United States were tense. They didn't like it and hence welcomed the new steps.

We in America also were thrilled by the news. Then suddenly our Government began pouring cold water on the whole thing, or, as some Members of Congress noted, the President slammed the door that we ourselves had just opened.

The points we tried to make in our official statement of explanation seemed trivial by comparison. Certainly the Russians took the initiative in making the notes public. But we and other governments have done the same thing on occasion before. The rule is that, if it is intended to keep an exchange confidential, agreement to that effect should be made in advance. None was made in this instance. The Russian leaders felt happy to break the news to the public. It was to their interest to do so. Maybe our notes gave them a convenient way to reverse their own policy. They used our notes as a lever. So what?

Russians sensed opportunity

As to the captious criticism that we didn't inform other governments in advance, this is inconsequential. No government is under obligation to tell another government everything it says in diplomacy. Only when commitments or agreements are reached or likely to be affecting the interests of other governments is it necessary to notify other governments.

What is most important is that the Russians grasped the opportunity the United States gave them. It is beside the point to say that discussion had always been our policy, that the door had always been open. It is sufficient to note that in recent months our military men, anxious to get Congress to spend many billions in armament appropriations, have talked openly of Russia as the nation from whom attack was to be expected. Similarly, we had adopted the Marshall plan for direct aid to Europe, and lately a plan has been under consideration in Congress to begin lend-lease of military equipment and supplies to the new five-power military alliance known as the Western European Union, and aimed at Russia.

Russians tired of "cold war"?

In face of all this and the months of "cold war," the United States suddenly said in a formal note that "the door is always wide open for full discussion and the composing of our differences." This meant something significant to Russia. It wasn't just a piece of routine comment by a diplomat to a foreign minister. It was properly construed by Russia as a sincere approach by us. Whether the Russians are tired of the "cold war" anyway, whether they see themselves frustrated by the Marshall plan, and hence are anxious to extricate themselves from the dilemma, may not be known for some time. But certainly the thesis that the whole thing is just a Russian trick or peace offensive to cause us to curtail our military preparations is hardly plausible. For such an artificial policy would in a few days reveal its spuriousness. Besides, Russia knows that we wouldn't stop military preparations on the basis of a single exchange of notes.

More significant is the fact that the Russians told their people what was happening and handled tactfully and with restraint the later press reports of official coolness in Washington after the notes were published.

It is conceded that the Russians are often inscrutable when it comes to sudden reversals of policy. Where we change Prime Ministers or Presidents, they change ambassadors. A new envoy is coming this week to the UN to replace Gromyko. Presumably new instructions have been sent.

Officials apparently have grown so accustomed to the crisis atmosphere that they sound a bit disappointed when something in the picture changes and a move for peace emerges.

A charitable explanation of our own behavior at the moment could be that the President and Secretary Marshall didn't want to seem too anxious. Hence they handled almost with indifference the Russian acceptance of our suggestion for further discussions. Maybe this was intended to make Russia come forward with something concrete. But such an interpretation makes of us, not the Russians, a devious-minded government afraid to stand behind our own words.

There is, moreover, too much emphasis today in the press on face-to-face meetings between tops of governments, too much emphasis on big international conferences—as if they were the only ways to do business when governments want to recede or make concessions. Conference by klieg light isn't as effective as private discussion to explore issues and then full conferences in public for ratification of things agreed upon. Old-fashioned diplomacy is the only way to save face for retreating governments.

But assuming that the Russians aren't really ready to make fundamental concessions, should we allow ourselves to be placed before the world in the position of opening the door one day and slamming it the next?

We are supposed to be the idealists of the world—the leaders in moral force. We are supposed to have the courage of our convictions. What was there to be ashamed of in our suggestion that we begin discussion with Russia of our existing differences? What does it matter who published what first? What possible interest have the peoples of the world in whether the form of these notes was one thing or another and whether we followed the proper etiquette in failing to notify France and Britain in advance?

The fact remains that the White House tells us the notes were carefully considered by the President and Secretary of State and our Cabinet before Ambassador Smith presented them.

What to do now

Even if we did handle the whole thing clumsily, it is more important now to go forward—to assure the world that we mean what we say.

It is important to continue discussions with a specific agreement as to publicity and methods of handling future notes.

It is important to reiterate tl at the American Government is building up its armament because this is an uneasy world and we will not weaken our preparedness until this Nation and our weaker allies feel secure. Words alone will not suffice. There must be deeds on both sides. This is the way to restoration of faith and trust.

The American people, whose sons must go forth to make the supreme sacrifice, do not care about forms and technicalities. They are interested primarily in the substance. They want peace maintained if it is humanly possible to do so. They are not concerned with prides or so-called prestige. They are concerned with honesty and sincerity in international affairs. They are interested in tolerance and restraint, and all those characteristics of a truly Christian approach to peace. These have been defined again and again in the lessons taught the world for 2,000 years and more—from the days of the prophets of Israel and the teachings of Jesus to the present day.

Acknowledging error

Mr. President, the people want the doors kept wide open. They want the American Government to talk and talk and talk, until reason comes into its own. It may take weeks or months, or even years—but it is because the people have confidence in the ultimate triumph of reason that they urge an unswerving devotion to these methods.

If these approaches fail, if we are attacked or threatened, the American people would then go to battle with a clear conscience.

What happened last week, however, must prey on our consciences. For we were guilty of backtracking on our own words. We must promptly undo that wrong. To avow an error is to strengthen our own chance to convert others. We can teach Russia by example.

We must manifest even more our will to peace lest the purpose of our armament be misunderstood.

The whole world wants the doors to peace discussion kept wide open and American statesmanship must hold those doors from ever being slammed again.

Tribute to the Late Sydney B. Williamson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAPMAN REVERCOMB

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 21 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent out of order to have placed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Mr. Harry O. Cole, who was formerly resident engineer and later in charge of the completion of the Pacific locks of the Panama Canal. This address was delivered at the annual meeting of the Panama Canal Societies of the United States, at Washington, D. C., on May 8. This able address by Mr. Cole was in honor of the late Sydney B. Williamson, builder of the Pacific locks of the Panama Canal.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, distinguished guests, and especially my friends and fellow Canal diggers, you have signally honored me tonight and at the same time have assigned to me a very difficult task of doing justice in undertaking to pay tribute to the memory of one of our greatest Canal engineers—a man who was loved and revered by all who knew him, the late Col. Sydney B. Williamson.

In all my professional life no man stands out in my mind more vividly; no man commands from me more profound respect, as an engineer, a friend, associate, and as a man of his word, than Colonel Williamson.

I first met Mr. Williamson in July 1908, when he came from the Canal to the States in search of an engineer to assist in the designs of the construction plants for the Pacific division. It was my honor to be selected. Thereafter I was associated with him as his principal assistant for over 4 years on the Canal from 1908 to 1912, when he left Panama to undertake important work in Europe. Then I took over Mr. Williamson's work and supervised the completion of the Pacific end of the Canal which included the Pacific locks.

In 1916 Colonel Williamson took charge of the designs and construction of two of the largest copper-plant developments in the world—the Chile Exploration Co. and the Braden Copper Co. Again I became his assistant and relieved him, when he was made a lieutenant colonel and sent overseas to France, where he made a splendid record in World War I.

Just prior to his going to war, both of us were offered war jobs about the same time.

The news of this was circulating around our New York offices. We met by chance, head on, in the corridor and the following conversation ensued: "Cole, I hear you are going to war." I parried, "Mr. Williamson, I hear you are going to war." Then Mr. Williamson made the following unforgettable statement, "Now look here, Cole, we are engaged in spending a hundred million dollars to produce copper to help win this war; you know damned well we cannot both go away now, because no one qualified would be left here to take over our work. This is the greatest war in the history of the world. My grandfather was a military man, my father was a brigadier general in the Civil War. I am a VMI graduate and served in the Spanish-American War. Now, if I die and go to heaven without having served in this war, my father will kick hell out of me." Needless to say he went to war, and I stayed.

My last visit with Colonel Williamson, was at a dinner at the Army and Navy Club at Washington in 1931, shortly before he finished his important work as member of the Interoceanic Canal Board. While on that Board he prepared the final report on the possibility of building the Nicaraguan Canal and on the plan and estimate of cost for converting the present Panama Canal to sea-level. He indicated to me that he thought the latter could be done successfully if it were ever required, but he passed the subject briefly with little enthusiasm, apparently doubting that it ever would be undertaken because he could see not reason for it. He definitely did not advocate it.

Colonel Williamson needs no eulogy on my part for those of you who have had the honor and privilege of being associated with him.

In recent months we have heard considerable criticism of the Panama Canal, especially concerning the Pacific end. That requires that I make specific comment to keep the record straight. It seems to me proper and fitting at this time to set forth some of the historical facts leading up to and including the building of the Panama Canal, particularly the arrangement of the Pacific locks.

In 1879 the distinguished French engineer, Godin de Lepinay, presented a plan to the Paris Congress, then considering the Panama Canal, in which he urged the construction of two terminal lakes about 80 feet high, the joining of the lakes by a channel through the Culebra, and connecting the lakes with each ocean by locks, one at Gatun and the other at Miraflores. His idea was not adopted at the time. However, necessity finally forced its revival many years later.

On August 3, 1906, Chief Engineer John F. Stevens, after bringing about the decision for the high-lake canal, proposed to build all the Pacific locks in one flight at Agua Dulce, just as he planned them at Gatun. Something occurred to cause Mr. Stevens to change his mind. What that was I have never learned.

However, on August 23, 1906, Mr. Stevens submitted a different plan, with a one-lift lock at Pedro Miguel and a two-lift lock at La Boca. This plan was adopted and the work started. Later, after Mr. Stevens' resignation in 1907, construction difficulties were encountered at La Boca.

On December 9, 1907, the new chairman and chief engineer, George W. Goethals, recommended the La Boca locks be shifted to Miraflores, and this was approved.

On December 22, 1907, Chief Engineer Goethals placed Mr. Sydney B. Williamson in charge of the building of the Pacific locks, and later in charge of the entire Pacific division. Thus, Mr. Williamson, then a civilian, became the directing head of one of the three great construction divisions of the Panama Canal. The Pacific division included all construction south of the Culebra cut.

As many of you old timers may remember the question of the Pacific locks was much discussed at that time. There was considerable doubt as to the best arrangement of them. In an effort to solve that question, Col. William L. Sibert, division engineer of the Atlantic Division, on January 31, 1908, proposed a plan for combining the Pacific locks at Miraflores, but this plan was not adopted, for reasons to be stated in a moment.

Consequently, though Mr. Williamson did not originate the Stevens-Goethals plan for building the Pacific locks in two parts—at Miraflores and Pedro Miguel, it did become his job to execute the plan.

It should be explained here that the particular reasons why Colonel Sibert's proposal was not adopted, was because much work had already been done on the Stevens-Goethals plan, and the change would have caused a long delay in the completion of the Canal. Any delay at that time would most certainly have had serious repercussion in the United States and become the cause of a political attack on the entire Canal project—at a time when the President was urging the earliest possible completion of the Canal in anticipation of war.

Even as it was, as many of you well know, we just did complete the Canal and have it ready for operation in the nick of time for World War I. It is clear now that the decision made at that time, to build the locks at Pedro Miguel and Miraflores was extremely fortunate for the entire Nation, and perhaps for the whole world.

Furthermore the location of the locks would have had to be changed again, because adequate rock foundations were not available for three lifts at the selected Miraflores location as evidenced by the north approach wall of Miraflores locks which had to be supported on some 250 eight-foot diameter concrete caissons ranging from 40 to 70 feet down through Cucaracha formation to bed rock.

May I at this point quote some excerpts from a recent letter I received from Col. George R. Goethals:

"I have never since had a job where I felt more in direct control than in driving the caissons for the Miraflores north approach wall and reporting to you.

"The Pacific division had a spirit I have never since found in any of my work. It was a grand outfit to work under, over, and for. I am mighty proud the records show me as foreman on that part of the work."

This spirit in the Pacific division was inherited from our leader, Colonel Williamson. That was the spirit that built the Canal.

Now after 30 years of operating the Canal the problem of the transit of vessels through the Canal locks and channel are clearly understood. Those who had the task of building the Canal were without this knowledge. None had experience with either the engineering or the operational problems at Panama. Their greatest job was the taming of the two great engineering monsters, the Chagres River and the Continental Divide. They accomplished their task.

The Canal as it exists today is not perfect. Operational records have revealed many difficulties and hazards to shipping. The knowledge of them could only have been gained through years of navigational experience.

Changes in the plan of the Canal are needed. Probably the most outstanding need today is a Pacific terminal anchorage at the 85-foot level to match that on the Atlantic side at Gatun. To provide this basin will require some radical changes in the present lock and dam system on the Pacific side.

I would like to discuss this matter in detail, but not on this occasion. However, I do want you to know that I have made an intensive study of this subject, including the most careful examination of all available data, engineering, operational, and even the security, about which we have heard so much in the last 2 years.

I am convinced that the Terminal Lake plan is not only the most feasible but the most sensible way to modernize the Panama Canal, and that the failure to adopt this plan would be a grave mistake. Such a failure would probably delay any action for many years to come, because the present public interest could not easily be aroused again, were it allowed to die.

Stevens, Goethals, Sibert, Williamson, and Gaillard were all great leaders, great engineers, and men of vision. I knew them all. Were they here today, they would, in my opinion, be the first to recognize the need for changes to facilitate shipping operations, and, I am sure, would be in the first ranks of those to support sound operating improvements to the Canal. On the other hand, they would strongly oppose anything that would jeopardize its safety and usefulness. They knew the dangers at Panama from personal observation.

While I am on this subject, I want to point out that the recent studies at Panama recommending the conversion of the present lake canal to sea level were made without the advice of those who have first-hand knowledge of the difficulties and hazards encountered in the building of the present Canal. They are certainly the ones best qualified to advise upon the major engineering questions, and any report that does not consider their views is fatally deficient.

Before me are many familiar faces of former associates on the Canal. Time will not permit much reminiscence but I should like to mention a few of the most outstanding happenings on the Canal, that after more than 30 years are still fresh in my memory and no doubt yours too, such as:

The torrential rains, that at times poured down at a rate of 3 inches in a half an hour.

The floods that swept down the river valleys in tremendous rolls; causing even the small, more or less dormant streams to become roaring rivers in a few minutes, flooding locks, low-lying construction work, and railroads; causing slides and endangering the lives of thousands of our workmen.

The dense night fogs that often occurred throughout the length of the Canal before the formation of the Gatun Lake.

Those tremendous, unpredictable land slides. Of course, as you know, slides occurred throughout the entire Canal, but were most serious in the Culebra cut. These slides were terrifying. Millions of cubic yards were often cascaded into the cut, with a magnitude and frequency that increased as the gash in the great Continental Divide was deepened. I have known scores of families to be rescued from their homes in a single night in these sliding areas, while their houses were moving and twisting off their foundations to become wrecks, as the huge slide moved on into and completely blocked off the Canal cut, and created havoc with steam-shovel work and railroad transportation for weeks at a stretch.

Many of you, who were there during those dark and frightful days on the Canal, will never forget the heroic deeds performed by that illustrious sanitarian, General Gorgas, in ridding the Isthmus of deadly yellow and blackwater fevers, and bringing malarial fever under control, thus making it humanly possible to live and carry on our work. In fact, it was General Gorgas who made it possible to build the Canal at all.

Who can forget the gloom that spread over us all when those mountains bordering the Canal would, without warning, go on a rampage and make the completion of the Canal appear to be almost a superhuman task?

Seldom did a day pass without something of an unexpected nature happening. Never was there a job that required greater resourcefulness to keep it going at full speed. No man on the Canal showed greater resourcefulness and ability in overcoming the scores of difficulties encountered on the construction work than Colonel Williamson.

Were Colonel Williamson with us today, he would join with the late C. A. McIlvaine, in saying, "The Panama Canal was the great love of my life, the one thing I have encountered worth devoting my life to." That is the way all the men and women who built the Panama Canal feel.

I want you to know that some of us who had the unparalleled engineering experience of building the Canal and know at first hand about its serious problems and dangers, have some very definite ideas on the recent recommendations for the conversion of the present Canal to sea level, and we know that the public is not being as adequately informed on this question as it should be. At the right time we shall be heard. It is your duty to write your views to your Representatives and Senators on the subject.

Many eminent canal engineers have from time to time expressed themselves in strong opposition to a sea-level canal at Panama for reasons based upon definite knowledge and experience. Among their statements, the most eloquent, the most forceful, and the one most historically based, was made by the former chief engineer, John F. Stevens, on July 13, 1927, before the American Society of Civil Engineers. When discussing the sea-level controversy of 1906 and the decision of Congress to build the high-lake-type canal, he stated.

"I have been privileged to be of some little service to my country, and the greatest service I ever gave to it was the part I took in preventing foreign votes from foisting a nameless, useless, sea-level canal (as proposed by the majority of the consulting board) upon a too-credulous American people."

These words of Stevens are just as true today as they were when he said them. We are now in another critical period for the Panama Canal.

I feel it my duty to warn you and the American people that, if this so-called sea-level conversion project is undertaken, it may prove to be the practical destruction of the Panama Canal and disruption of the world's maritime shipping, for an indefinite period of time, to say nothing of the futile and wasteful expenditure of billions of dollars and the blot on the reputation of the American engineering profession that could never be erased.

Civil Rights and Liberties for Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ZALES N. ECTON

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 21 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from a radio address by a young Indian from the Crow Indian Reservation, of Montana, who is now one of the elevator boys in the Senate Office Building. The address was given over Station WARL, last Saturday, by Thunder Bolt Left Hand.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the radio address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES FOR THE INDIANS

Much has been said in and out of the Congress and by the President concerning civil rights and liberties for racial and minority groups of our country. The Constitution guarantees such rights to every person under the American flag. There is, therefore, no legitimate excuse why any segment of our people should not enjoy them. The President has repeatedly urged their enjoyment by those to whom they have been denied.

These rights have been declared the inherent right of every American citizen under the American flag and its Constitution. The respecting and safeguarding of these rights rests with both the executive and judicial branches of the Government. Every segment, every racial group, and all minority groups of our country are entitled to enjoy these rights without interference from any group, individual, or departmental heads of the Government. The Truman civil-rights program, aimed primarily at the South's social sectional problems, must be interpreted and accepted as an attempt to permit and let all the people, all over our country, enjoy these basic human rights of simple justice.

Using this as a basis for our premise, the Indians of the United States ask, "What about us?" Let the President answer this question, which we submit is perfectly in order and is a logical conclusion of his civil-rights program. Let someone answer the question: Why has he not seen to it that the Indians, the first inhabitants of our country, are allowed to enjoy these advocated principles of justice he so ardently advocates? Let someone answer the charge that dictatorship reigns on every Indian reservation of the United States and that every Indian reservation superintendent and District Indian Office director are little czars with powers outside of the review by the courts. Let someone further answer the charge that the Indian soldier, after helping to smash and squash tyranny and iron-hand control of peoples of foreign lands, return to their reservations to immediately begin submission to Indian Bureau officials and dictatorship.

The time has long arrived and gone when we should practice what we preach about civil rights and liberties under the American flag. It is hypocrisy and double talk of the lowest order to permit it to exist a moment longer in the United States and against the Indians. We should clean and put our own house in order in this regard before we publicly proclaim, as we have been doing, such rights for the world at large.

The Indians themselves have appealed to the Congress in person to forthwith abolish such injustices under the Indian Bureau and the Interior Department.

The Indians suffer a repression of their rights under regulations promulgated by the Indian Bureau and approved by the Secretary of the Interior which have the force and effect of law and that operate to control completely their lives and property. I refer to the Indian Bureau's individual Indian money regulations, which places their total wealth in the hands of the reservation superintendent, whose word is final, and in some instances personal like or dislike of individual Indians for any reason can easily be reflected in reprisals by denying the issuance or nonissuance of their money deposited to his official checking account in a Government depository by existing law. This is cruel, non-American, and should be forthwith remedied in the cause of simple justice.

The control of the proceeds from the sale of the Indian's lands likewise operates under the whims of approval or disapproval of reservation superintendents.

The control of individual Indians by the forced use of their grazing allotments under regulations which permit reservation superintendents to take the lands of a minority group who have not agreed to such units, place them in grazing units without the consent of the owners, lease them out to stockmen, then take and deposit the proceeds therefrom to his official checking account and disburse the same in his discretion to the owners, which policy should not be tolerated.

The accounting system for all these activities is antiquated and under no review by the Indian affected. He can do nothing but sit by and make appeals to Members of Congress occasionally. American public opinion alone and the American public, which pays the bill to the tune of approximately $1,000,000,000 since 1903, must demand a change of the existing system.

Fractionated heirship cases, impossible of use by anyone of the heirs and also nearly impossible of break down of the rentals that have accumulated to the credit of such estates now threaten ownership of such cases and also burden the taxpayers of the country with needless and senseless expenditure of yearly appropriations from the people's Treasury to constantly employ a large staff of employees on every Indian reservation to try to cope with the problem of handling such estates. The Congress should promptly demand an end of this "cat chasing its tail" operation of the Indian Bureau.

The big problem of Indian administration can be reduced to four main heads as follows: Health, education, law and order, and individual rehabilitation. All others are merely money-appropriation devices of the Indian Bureau. With these four necessary activities only, the yearly appropriation of the Congress for the Bureau of Indian Affairs can be cut to one-half or less, instead of the $59,472,082 requested in the President's budget for 1949, that covers a multitude of activities. One-half or less of the amount requested it is presumed can satisfy the actual needs of the Indians.

Employees on every Indian agency should be reduced to only that number which is actually and absolutely necessary.

This is the problem of the Congress, and I am sure the people, when they know the facts, will demand a change.

Antimonopoly Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 21 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, for roughly a year and a half there has been pending before the Judiciary Committee Senate bill 104. The subcommittee considering the bill consisted of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and myself, as chairman. Last week a majority of the subcommittee reported favorably on the bill, and it is now before the full committee. In my judgment, if the bill is passed it will do more to help the rank and file of the people of this country than any other legislation enacted since the passage of the Sherman Act and later the Clayton Act. In support of the view of the majority of the subcommittee, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Disappearing Little Business," which was published in the Tennesseean, of Nashville, Tenn., under date of May 19, 1947. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Monopoly Bill Buried," published in the Chicago Sun, May 14, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nashville Tennesseean of May 19, 1947]

DISAPPEARING LITTLE BUSINESS

Those who wonder what has become of the noble wartime pledge to save little business can read the answer in what is not being done with the Kefauver-Murray bill to put a stop to the merger movement.

The Eightieth Congress not only refuses to be frightened by the alarming consolidation movement, but it also refuses to do anything about it. The Kefauver-Murray bill will not be allowed to see the light of day.

Reasons to be frightened, however, are not lacking. They are clearly and simply detailed in the Federal Trade Commission letter on the Present Trend of Corporate Mergers and Acquisitions to the Senate.

According to the FTC, there have been 1,833 mergers between 1940-46, most of them since 1944. More than one-third of these have been in three industries—foods, nonelectrical machinery, and apparel. These fields are traditionally small-business fields.

Even more alarming is the fact that more than 60 percent of the mergers have been horizontal combinations; that is, absorptions of concerns in the same business. Horizontal combinations have been the most fruitless of all types of mergers. Practically none of them ever result in any gain to consumers in lower prices or better products. Such profits as they make are the result of monopoly control and scarcity high-price policies. Horizontal combinations replace owners with managers, drain profits out of localities where the business has been developed, reduce communities to a colonial status, raise prices, and in other ways victimize communities.

Most of the mergers reported on by the FTC were carried out by our 250 largest corporations, which already control approximately 70 percent of usable manufacturing facilities and employ half of the industrial labor force. Some of these corporations practically decimated certain fields of small business.

The Kefauver-Murray bill would put a stop to this process of devouring American small business and destroying the competitive capitalist system. In a few years it will be too late.

[From the Chicago Sun of May 14, 1947]

A MONOPOLY BILL BURIED

We address ourselves today to a bill which is not in the limelight, which is not about to be passed by Congress, which is not the center of lively controversy. If this seems a rather negative subject to discuss, we ask the reader to reflect that the very absence of interest in S. 104, introduced by Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, is a commentary on the spirit of the times.

JOE MAHONEY is a veteran of the wars against monopoly. More clearly than most other men the Senator has consistently seen and warned against the dangers of the steady concentration of economic power that goes on year after year despite our national habit of paying lip service to competition and small business. Often he might as well be hollering down a rain barrel, for all the good it does. Yet what he has to say is still worth listening to.

The Nation is now in the grip of one of its periodic waves of corporate concentration. The last one was in the latter part of the twenties. Since 1940, and particularly since the middle of 1945, mergers of business firms have been proceeding at a faster and faster rate. A recent report of the Federal Trade Commission shows that in the fields of manufacturing and mining alone, five times as many mergers took place in 1946 as in 1939.

Here is monopoly taking shape before our eyes. Here is the relentless growth of big business aggregations which a few years from now Congress and consumers will be worrying about. Here is the swallowing of little firms by big firms which spells diminishing competition, growing restraints on trade, developing rigidity of the economic structure.

Why isn't something done about it? More than 30 years ago, Congress passed the Clayton Act, which was intended to prevent corporate mergers by the acquisition of stock where the effect might be to lessen competition or promote monopoly. But corporation lawyers found a way to achieve the same purpose by acquiring a firm's assets instead of the stock. The Supreme Court, during the twenties, ruled that if such a merger has been accomplished there is nothing the Federal Trade Commission can do about it except to require divestiture of the stock—which, without the assets on which it rests, is, of course, worthless. This section of the Clayton Act, then, is a dead letter.

Senator O'MAHONEY's bill, sponsored in the House by Representative ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, is a simple proposal to amend the Clayton Act so that its original purpose would be restored. He would make illegal monopolistic mergers accomplished by acquisition of assets as well as by acquisition of stock. He would give the Federal Trade Commission power to stop such mergers or to dissolve them should they be illegally made in the future.

For years the Federal Trade Commission has been pointing to this loophole in the antimonopoly laws and urging that it be stopped up. The temporary national economic committee, which made the most comprehensive congressional study of our economy system yet, recommended such an amendment. President Truman's council of economic advisers, in its 1947 report, proposed it as one means of strengthening the antitrust laws, enforcement of which it considered essential to the economic health of the Nation.

But S. 104 stays out of the limelight, is in no apparent danger of being passed, is buried in a profound congressional boredom. Monopoly, as Mr. Luce might say, marches on.

Taft-Ellender-Wagner Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include two resolutions concerning S. 866, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill. It is my understanding that hearings on this bill will be concluded on May 28 by the House Banking and Currency Committee, and it is my hope that a favorable report will be submitted as soon thereafter as possible.

STATEMENT ADOPTED BY CLEVELAND INDUSTRIAL UNION COUNCIL, APRIL 28, 1948

One of the major problems of the American people, and particularly those in the low-income level in large urban centers, is the imperative need for homes. Such need is demonstrated in Cleveland by many statistics prepared by different individuals and organizations.

The salient facts of the current situation show the following:

As of August 15, 1947, the area rent office declared an immediate minimum need for 60,000 new housing units in Cleveland.

In the entire year of 1947, there were authorizations for only 2,017 new housing units in Cleveland, all of which were out of reach of the low-income group where the greatest need prevails.

According to the real property inventory, family units in Cuyahoga County increased at a rate of 6,216 per year from 1940 to 1948.

The solution to this problem is in a vigorous, well-integrated program sponsored by our Federal Government to provide homes for our citizens with adequate subsidization where need is shown. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill (S. 866), now under consideration by Congress, provides the basis for such a program.

That section of this legislation which provides a means of clearing slums and building public housing for low-income groups is under bitter attack from those real estate and building interests which desire enormous profits out of the misery and suffering of the people.

The Cleveland Industrial Union Council reaffirms its support of and the imperative need for a national housing program such as is embodied in S. 866 and call on our representatives in Congress vigorously to support the adoption of this legislation with no weakening of that section which provides for slum clearance and public housing.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE GREATER CLEVELAND COMMITTEE FOR RETURNED SERVICEMEN APRIL 29, 1948

Whereas there is a severe housing shortage among all income groups in the city of Cleveland, forcing thousands of Clevelanders to live in substandard housing; and

Whereas over 9,500 veterans of World War II in the greater Cleveland area have applications for housing pending at the Cleveland Veterans' Information Center; and

Whereas many of these veterans are in the low-income bracket and are unable to secure adequate rental property or to purchase their own homes; and

Whereas the Senate has passed Senate bill 866, known as the Taft-Ellender-Wagner general housing bill, which provides for a comprehensive housing program for all income levels: Be it

Resolved by the executive committee of the Greater Cleveland Committee for Returned Servicemen, That the House of Representatives be, and is herein, petitioned to enact at an early date the Taft-Ellender-Wagner nonpartisan and noncompetitive general housing bill in the same form; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all the Ohio Members of the House of Representatives, and to members of the House Banking and Currency Committee, and to members of the House Rules Committee with the request that they do everything in their power to bring about the passage of the bill for which we are hereby petitioning.

Rural Youth and Civilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ZALES N. ECTON
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 21 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address by one of the outstanding young men of Montana, Mr. Bill Michael, of Billings, Mont., president of the Future Farmers of America.

The address was delivered before the Montana Stock Growers Convention last Saturday.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bozeman (Mont.) Daily Chronicle of May 16, 1948]

FUTURE FARMER STATE PRESIDENT GIVES OUTSTANDING ADDRESS AT CONVENTION OF MONTANA STOCK GROWERS SATURDAY

(By Bill Michael)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following address, entitled "Rural Youth and Civilization," was delivered by Bill Michael, Billings, 1948 president of the Future Farmers of America. It was the youth's own preparation, and it made such an impression on the Montana Stockgrowers' Association that Jack Milburn, Grass Range, director and newly elected second vice president of the association, in a resolution from the floor at the closing session, termed it, in his opinion, "the most outstanding speech that we have heard at this convention." Milburn, in his resolution introduction, declared that Future Farmers are potential members of such organizations as the Montana Stockgrowers. He said adult organizations should encourage the work of the Future Farmers of America and keep informed about the objectives and purposes of it.)

It is indeed a pleasure and an honor to have this opportunity to address this group. I have as the title for my talk "Rural Youth and Civilization," or perhaps we could term it "What Part Will America's Agriculture Play in the Future of Our Country?"

The people of rural areas have been for centuries the contributing factors toward the success of governments and even of civilization. Even in early Rome during Caesar's time the farmers and people of the rural areas were the mainstays of the civilization itself. But after the Roman agriculture failed and corruption and graft became the determining factors in Rome, Roman civilization soon died. This same situation has taken place many times during the history of the world. In places such as ancient Babylon the agriculture was destroyed along with the government and what was once a highly productive fertile farming region is now a badly eroded stretch of barren waste and desert. But still in northern Europe during the Dark Ages the church and agriculture kept what little was left of civilization alive. These early farmers were, indeed, the forerunners of our present-day agriculture. Their tools were crude and few had any education to speak of, their farming methods were as crude as their tools; but later when agriculture became stronger and the church more forceful, governments began to flourish again. Then came the discovery of this great United States and its subsequent development. Our most important industry at that time was agriculture, just as it is today. Many of America's leaders came from the soil—George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and later Abraham Lincoln. These men were farmers, they had the qualities of leadership and a sense of duty. They realized then that American agriculture must be kept productive because they were even at that early date practicing soil conservation and were carrying out extensive rotation systems; but even at that time educated, foresighted farmers were few and many of our natural resources were wasted because they were believed to be inexhaustible. Forests were cut down and the timber burned. Natural gas and coal beds were deliberately burned.

A farm was worn out and the occupants moved on to the next stretch of land, cleared a new farm, one-cropped it to death, and moved on again. Yet, in spite of the fact that they didn't realize the need for conservation they did succeed in developing the greatest system of government known today. This they accomplished because they were willing to cooperate and had the ability and will to follow the few leaders available. As the years passed by our Nation became well settled and it was then that our people began to realize the need for conservation; they began to see the need for more training in agriculture and they began to realize that our national resources could be exhausted. These individuals aided in the establishment of the Soil Conservation Service to help farmers and ranchers develop rotation systems and use good conservation practices. Still there were the individuals who were not trained for the occupation of farming and who continued to farm as grandpa had farmed. These individuals did much to help the dust storms of 1929 and the early thirties which caused the Dust Bowl. Perhaps through the use of good farming practices the Dust Bowl could have been prevented. It was once said "that those who cannot lead and will not follow will naturally obstruct." And when all farmers have been trained for their occupation they will be more willing to conserve our resources for they will then realize the importance of saving the soil to prevent another Dust Bowl. They will see the need for cooperation and will follow the leaders of their community. For once the soil is gone our people and our civilization will perish. Perhaps we should have started our conservation program by first training the farmers and practicing that knowledge. This is what we are accomplishing indirectly by the training of our rural youth. Youth and the soil are the world's greatest resources. One is dependent upon the other and the two will determine what the future will hold. We must educate our youth so that they will realize the importance of good farming and good living.

Today I read the tragic story of a young man, an average American boy living in an average community. This boy desired fame and wealth and after his home was broken by divorce he quit school and went into the world to become a big shot. Two months later this young man received his fame and fortune. His picture was on the front page of the paper and beneath it were the words, "Wanted for murder."

This young man's life could perhaps have been a rich and useful one if he had had the proper training in his home and in school. Too many young people today are growing into manhood and womanhood unable to shoulder responsibility of any kind or description. Is this the type of person we want to have in Government offices, in charge of large businesses or in charge of America's agriculture? Certainly not. We have too many of those individuals in public offices and agriculture today. This fact is exemplified by the story of the two bureaucrats in Washington who had by some mistake on their part, a fairly substantial sum of money on hand and could not decide upon any means to dispose of it. Finally the one fellow, being the brighter of the two came up with a solution:

He said, "We'll build 17 bridges in Nevada, 12 in Arizona, and 2 in Utah and then we will start digging."

The second fellow being rather amazed asked, "What will we dig?"

The first fellow replied, "We'll start digging rivers under the bridges we've built."

The inability of so many people to shoulder responsibility successfully is indeed a grave situation. And it is caused merely by a lack of proper training in the home and in the classroom. Parents should consider it their obligation to give their children the correct kind of guidance, see to it that they realize the benefits derived from religion and good spiritual life, and that they receive as much education as possible. On the other hand, instructors in grade schools and high schools should impress upon the youngsters that good character, honor, and the truth should be the guideposts for life for every individual. The rural youth of America have splendid opportunities for character and leadership development through the Future Farmers of America and 4-H Clubs. FFA was founded in 1928 to give farm boys leadership ability. Many young men have received much good practical training not only along the lines of leadership and character building but also along the lines of good farming and good livestock management. If we can only continue to give the rural youth of America this kind of training through FFA and 4-H Clubs, and if parents everywhere and instructors will take it upon themselves to be character builders and practical educators we may develop a generation of good, competent, and intelligent citizens which this Nation and this world can use so well—a generation of young men and women who will be able to successfully combat the problems facing the world and our Nation today. When and if we can educate our youth thoroughly we may have international peace and national security; for we will be fortunate enough to have capable people in charge of America's future.

I firmly believe that rural America can and will hold true to the best traditions of our national life and that we as farmers and stockmen can exert an influence in our homes and in our community which will stand solid for our part in that inspiring task.

Mutual Responsibilities of Government Employees and the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Responsibilities of Government Employees Toward Their Government; Responsibilities of Government Toward Its Employees," delivered by me before the professional employees of the Department of Agriculture on May 20, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESPONSIBILITIES OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES TOWARD THEIR GOVERNMENT; RESPONSIBILITIES OF GOVERNMENT TOWARD ITS EMPLOYEES

As the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, it has been my privilege and pleasure to discuss what seems to be a rational approach to a fair balance between the Government's obligations to its employees and the employees' obligations toward their Government.

As many of you doubtless know, our committee is charged with the responsibility of preserving and advancing the welfare of those 2,000,000 persons who are employed to perform the administrative functions of the Federal Government. Your responsibilities begin where ours leave off.

We, in the Congress, have the task of composing the Federal laws of the land, at least in rough outline, and revising them at intervals after determining how they have operated. From there you, on the administrative side, devise the regulations which have the force and effect of law, and carry out the general purposes of the law to a specific fineness, even in some cases to an individual basis. You, in the executive branch, can change your regulations, though the basic law itself must be changed by the Congress.

Regulations have flexibility. The law is adaptable to the degree that the courts interpret it and so the relations between the Congress and the executive branch are closely allied, each in the common cause of providing a better quality of Government.

In the discharge of obligations, one to the other, too often we lose sight of the balanced relationship without which we cannot acquire the true objective. We often hear discussions of individual rights and we all like to think of ourselves as being individuals first and, second, as members of society. The meaning of terms should always be borne in mind. Those terms are "responsibility" and "rights." Perhaps nothing could have brought more clearly to our attention the strict necessity for maintaining the quid pro quo between rights and responsibilities than the dropping of the atomic bombs over Japan. These bombs threw us closer together. At the same time, we were physically dividing the Japanese with deadly explosives.

I am reminded of the young immigrant who had just left shipboard in New York harbor and who was so ecstatic with the voice of new-found freedom that he began to wave his arms recklessly and his hand struck a bystander on the nose, whereupon the bystander protested that it was a very poor demonstration of appreciation of the liberties we afford to our new citizens. The immigrant, not to be subdued by such protest, declared that it was his understanding that in the land of liberty we could all shout for joy and have our freedom of movement. "Yes," said the man whose nose had stopped the newcomer's arm, "but your liberty ends where my nose begins."

I tell this little story simply to show that rights and liberties are but a part of responsibilities. For every responsibility others owe us, there is a companion responsibility we owe to them. This is fully as true in the Federal Government civilian service as we can ever find it anywhere else in this daily hurly-burly.

For each accepted right surrendered, there is a new responsibility as counterpart to compensate for such relinquished right. For example, we know that though there are great numbers of strikes in industry, the common welfare cannot condone strikes against the Government which might be viewed as a first step toward rebellion and so, when a person enters the Government service, though he might have remained the citizen who earned his livelihood in private employment and reserved to himself certain rights—including that of striking—he automatically parks that right as he crosses the threshold to Government employment. There are some who would say such persons should not be required to surrender such prerogative and that he should bring his rights with him wherever he moves. On the other hand, the Government has some rights as well and exercises its opposition on those rights in those cases where it desires to lay down its rules for employment. It does not require that the citizen not strike but it does specify that, if he intends to work for the Government, there are rules to which he must conform, and rule one is support of the Government which supports him. This is a partnership such as each of you, in your everyday work, engages with your associates in carrying forth the program which the Secretary of your department has laid down as good and useful for all the people.

Next, there is the question of loyalty—a word we hear so frequently. As you know, the President has his own program for promoting loyalty to our form of government. There have been some attempts in recent months to legislate on the subject of loyalty. In our committee we have had certain legislation proposed which would test and dispose accordingly of the quality of loyalty found in the individual. For my own part, and I know I speak the feeling of others on our committee, the bill to which I have reference will not advance the cause of loyalty toward the Government, and it is not a fair test of what the individual has in his heart. As I read the legislation, the bill would enable any administration to do away with all opposition, whether it be political, ideological, sociological, or any other form of opposition. Quite plainly, in my opinion, the legislation would allow all the Democrats to fire all the Republicans, or all the Socialists, or all the Farm-Laborites, or the Independents, and, in turn, the Republicans some day might be in a position to fire all the Democrats, all the Socialists, and all the others. In my belief, it is part of the Government's responsibility toward the employee to avoid imposing upon him such drastic legislation as to make it oppressive to the point of leaving him at all times without ability to exercise his conscience and so, until now, our committee has seen fit not to vote approval to the bill to which I have referred.

Having disposed of some of the more fundamental points to be regarded as part of Government employment, I believe particularly in the type of work in which you are engaged, including the professional, the scientific and technical jobs, that the Government could do no better at this very time of the year than to visit the important school campuses and enter into a process competitive with that engaged in by industry, such as the large corporations as General Motors, General Electric, Westinghouse, and many others, to induce the fresh and active minds of young America to find their way into Government service.

It seems to me Government should place every opportunity within easy grasp of these newcomers. They should be encouraged to provide the new blood to which our Government is entitled. Yes, we do have a limited sort of apprenticeship for younger persons, including selection through the junior professional assistant examination and through the administrative intern program. Yet I regret to say that I am far from being convinced that the number of ways in which we are inviting these transfusions into the Government service are other than meager and limited.

Having discharged this part of its obligation to its new personnel, the Government, in return, is entitled to some assurance that if it provides benefits competitive with private employment upon investment of the best efforts of these new employees, the latter will agree to remain in the service sufficiently long for the Government to obtain a noticeable return upon its investment in them in the form of time, training, and expense. In my opinion, it is in line with good social practice and public policy for the employee to bind himself to his job in appreciative recognition and in due proportion to the extent to which Government has expended the effort to make the service far more attractive than it is today.

In making these remarks, I am not differentiating between young men and young women, because the latter should be given fully the same opportunities in the expectation that they intend to exert their best efforts to carve their careers with the customary aspirations, of course, that marriage and homemaking may intervene.

As replacements for those whose employment shows a high turn-over in the early years of service, I believe the Government should provide itself with stand-by facilities. This is to say that for every newcomer who departs the service, the Government should find means of providing a quick replacement.

There are those conditions which we see today which are not good for Government or the individual. We hear charges and countercharges on who, in high positions, is subversive, and professional societies are marshalled in defense of certain of their fellows who are accused of lackadaisical loyalty, which loyalty, in the opinion of some, is only relative. I believe we have exaggerated this demand for loyalty. The hard core of Government personnel is entirely reliable from all viewpoints and the civilian Government is in completely safe hands. Personally, I am perfectly willing to leave the determination of the loyalty factors to the President, just as we have already done, and to continue to appropriate those amounts indicated to assist him in carrying out the program.

Recently, you will recall, the Government has recognized its responsibility toward its employees by enacting Public Law 426, the new retirement act, of which I am the proud coauthor. To me, this is merely recognizing the responsibility toward personnel which is only common justice. It is the hope of those of us on the committee that this legislation will go far toward further promoting the morale of Government employees that they may do a better job and that, in turn, they will recognize their responsibility to Government itself.

Responsibility between employer and employees further extends to the phase of advancement within the service. It seems to me that promotions from within must be further recognized to the end that, unless there are persons outside the service with extreme and sensitive skills without which the Government would be the definite loser, promotions should not go to those not already within the service. It should be a definite activation within the Government to further recognize the interest of the Government in this direction. There is an acute need for positive, within-service training programs whereby practically all personnel are on a training schedule, either training others below them to succeed to higher positions or being trained themselves to move upward on an escalator system. The details of this kind of program have been discussed informally from time to time yet, to my knowledge, there has not been any adequate recognition of its need.

It is true that some may say that the Congress should take the initiative and provide the funds. On the other hand, the Congress should be presented with a concrete training program. There have been programs of necessity to train personnel most of which, however, have been brought about by the stress of war. There are others for individual profit but the Government has not yet stepped in and done its own service-wide training job.

The Government is a business separate and apart from other kinds of businesses. It does things differently. Its methods are such that one may not directly step in from a position outside the Government and be completely oriented. There are other Government functions unduplicated in any other line of human endeavor. These differences need to be recognized and the training programs should be geared accordingly. I should like to hear from those in positions to present a concrete program in order that our committee may have the opportunity to give it full consideration and, I believe, its full sanction. It would be best to follow this approach in view of the need for obtaining substantive legislation on which the Appropriations Committee could base the granting of funds necessary to implement the program.

We in the Post Office and Civil Service Committee recognize our obligation toward Government employees and their dependents because they are engaged in operating the world's largest civilian business which includes approximately half a million employees in the postal field service and 42,000 post offices throughout the United States, its possessions, and Territories.

We know we are engaged in important committee work when it is realized that, to this committee, has been reposed the responsibility for legislating for the Bureau of the Census, which Bureau is the fact-gathering branch of the Government, having to do with the vital statistics of the entire popu-

lation. We know, also, that the Post Office Department, which is a tremendous channel of communication for all the people, is a business in itself. There are some who believe the postal system should be self-sustaining. There are others who maintain it should be entirely on a service basis and that the rates to patrons should be only contributory. So, here again, our committee is called upon to determine the responsibility of the Government to all the people and to the employees who operate the system.

Our committees in Congress are becoming more specialized in their scope and activities. Today we have the benefit of staff assistants on whom we can call for modern data. It has been found necessary to recruit this assistance because of the complexity of Government and the shortened time in which Congress now allows itself to perform its functions each year. Today we have fewer committees and fewer committee assignments but we also have more subcommittees and, consequently, more subcommittee assignments. The staff functions for committees are still in the experimental stage and need yet to prove their worth but I am of the opinion that such services are well worth the investment.

And here again we have an example of Government's responsibility toward its employees, especially on our Post Office and Civil Service Committee where all who desire may receive advice and such services as are available. Our committee, without question, has the greatest mail traffic and perhaps the greatest telephone relationships with the public of any other committee of which I have knowledge.

I was interested in studying the testimony of Mr. L. F. Kneipp, the executive officer of the organization of professional employees of the Department of Agriculture. Mr. Kneipp appeared before our subcommittee, of which I was a member, to discuss salaries in Government employment. Mr. Kneipp is a former Assistant Chief of the Forest Service, identified with that bureau from 1908 to 1946.

He made the point that $65 a week is the average Federal professional worker's salary. At the same time, he mentioned skilled labor receiving from $77 to $90 a week. He further said that the $65-a-week average is sufficient only to buy one suit of clothes for a man. Mr. Kneipp made the further fine point that "it is generally conceded that our destinies now depend upon the developments in the sciences. Yet a young physicist with a doctor's degree, obtained after an investment of education in college training, can expect, during his first few weeks of work, about the same salary as that received by the average slaughterhouse worker. If he is brilliant and becomes a moderately top-flight scientist, he can, eventually, hope to earn perhaps as much as a Washington bricklayer. A chemical engineer will start at about the same salary as that of the average kettleman in a chemical plant. If he is diligent, he can hope, at the end of 4 or 5 years, to make as much as the average coal miner."

We, in the committee, recognize this as an acute situation. It may well be that education is becoming so universal and commonplace that the supply of personnel from the campuses is creating a bear market, to use a stock-exchange term.

Until better methods are found, it would appear to be necessary to engage in a highly selective process of recruiting, similar to the system I mentioned at the outset, in competition with the larger industries who, until now, have demanded and, in many cases, obtained the best available because of the keenly appropriate inducements they have to offer.

It seems to me that it behooves you, through your organization, both professional and union, to begin taking stock: Just where do you stand in this brave, new postwar world, and is your location in the vast picture of human endeavor in proper relation to the contribution you are making to the success of your job and to the contribution the Government is making in expectation of that success.

I know that there are some scientific and professional groups in Government working through their professional societies and other associations to bring about adequate recognition of quality workmanship. If, in your belief, Government has moved slowly in this field, the acceleration may well come from your side of the table.

Some of you will remember in 1940 the Reed committee conducted hearings in the Supreme Court Building to determine what was taking place in the field of professionalism in the Government. A great deal of information was adduced in the legal profession, as well as scientific and related activities. However, we were in the defense period at that time and the whole discussion resolved itself largely into an academic matter and, so far as I know, there have been few concrete conclusions carried out despite the numerous findings and many recommendations resulting from the committee's studies.

I believe it now is time to have appointed another such committee which might be more heavily weighted from the scientific field, now that we are living in an age of nuclear physics and the splitting of molecules and atoms, radar and jet propulsion and many other of the Buck Rogers' type of devices. It is time for you to take stock—it is time for the Government to do likewise.

The whole procedure might well take the form of a joint commission on which could be represented the legislative branch, the executive branch and from among the latter in their fields those in industry and on the campuses and in the laboratories who can present the best product of active minds that the Government and the people, their employees and the world at large, may have the full benefit of this constructive discussion. Perhaps the Reed committee was created a few years too soon or a few years too late. It concluded its work at a time when it was least possible to carry into execution the fine features of its report.

And, in its deliberations, this joint commission might well explore the whole field of responsibility, each to the other. We in the legislative branch are most likely to hear from those who want their rights in Government service spelled out letter by letter and syllable by syllable, with the accent on the proper syllable. This is good—it should be done. I hope we never come to the time when we don't talk about rights. We can also talk about privileges but we must also give to employees what balance there shall be in the scales when we weigh responsibilities and rights, with equal accent upon each.

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Before Wisconsin State Telephone Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 21 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered at Madison, Wis., before the Wisconsin State Telephone Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SERVICE TO AMERICA AND THE WORLD

I want to express my deep appreciation to your distinguished officers and to your members for the privilege of addressing you here today. It is a pleasure from many standpoints—to meet old friends in your able organization and to make new ones to return to Madison so near the date of our State centennial, and to discuss with you some of the mutual problems that we face in America in this year of 1948.

DEVOTION OF TELEPHONE COMPANIES TO SERVICE

I thought that I might take as my theme a little motto that I saw on one of your bulletins, "Service first." Certainly, there are few organizations like the telephone companies of Wisconsin and throughout the Nation, which have fulfilled that motto more devotedly than you have. All during the wartime and postwar era, with labor costs mounting, with material scarce, with taxes high, with a shortage of skilled operators and repairmen, with a tremendous burden of telephone calls and with a hundred other problems which you know better than I, you evidenced your devotion to the public welfare, to the community interest by keeping the calls going through in spite of all the difficulties you faced.

OUR BILL OF OBLIGATIONS

I think that your spirit is one that all of us might follow in our personal affairs and the affairs of state and nation, and yes, the world. You and I have heard much of what the world owes us in recent years. We have heard much about the wonderful rights and benefits of American citizenship, but we haven't heard much about the obligations of American citizenship, the obligations to serve the common welfare.

Let us then consider the bill of obligations that you and I have in this atomic age, accompanying our Bill of Rights.

To the degree that you and I fulfill our bill of obligations in personal affairs, to that degree our city, State, and Nation, will be able to fulfill their respective responsibilities.

Certainly, in this age of technology where men and nations are ever more dependent upon one another, it is essential that we recognize our community of interest and our community of responsibility. No man lives unto himself alone, particularly in these technological times.

Over the years, it has been my pleasure to receive many communications from your organization and its members, to meet with your officers and delegations, and discuss with you the problems that affect Wisconsin's telephone companies.

UNDERSTANDING BY CONGRESS OF COMPANY'S PROBLEMS

I do want you to know that Congress is not unaware of the problems which the Nation's telephone companies, particularly small independent telephone exchanges, face. I want you to know that this particular legislator can appreciate the difficulties which you experience. After all, you are a public utility, whose rates, whose services, whose operating practices and expenses are subject to close scrutiny and regulation by public officials. You are faced with the problem of competing for labor in the labor market and of paying wages which you can stand under your present financial set-up, which will neither be too high for you to bear nor too low, and which will be in accordance with wage practices in your particular area.

I believe that the Congress should be very careful in attempting to establish uniform standards for these 48 varied States. We know that the cost of living varies tremendously in rural and urban areas and among different States, and it is difficult, if

not impossible, for some bureaucrat in Washington to decide just what the wage standard should be in Madison, or Milwaukee, or Racine, or Oshkosh, or Appleton, or Green Bay, or Superior, or anywhere else in our State. We who believe in the free-enterprise system believe that it should be principally governed by the natural laws of supply and demand as affecting the product and as affecting labor and every other item in our economic set-up.

PROBLEMS FACED BY LEGISLATORS

I know that you in turn have an appreciation and understanding of the problems which we in Washington face. Sometimes you may get a bit impatient at delays by the Congress in taking action on specific subjects. Sometimes you may feel that the Congress is arbitrary in its approach. Yet, I know that you will bear in mind the fact that right now there are 8,000 bills pending before the Senate and House and that these bills cover the gamut from A to Z of every subject of American political and social and economic life.

To give an illustration, before the Judiciary Committee, of which I am chairman, we have received over 1,200 bills, of which we have processed well over 700. Before the end of the Eightieth Congress, we intend to clear our docket so that no one will ever say that this particular committee was negligent in its duties to the American people. In that Judiciary Committee alone, we receive bills pertaining to the Federal judiciary, to antitrust laws, civil rights, patents, immigration, naturalization, nominations to the judiciary, legal codes, administration of the courts, and many other problems. We are trying to be adequate to them, as I know you are trying to be adequate to your problems.

THE NEED FOR HARD WORK

But whether you are in Washington, D. C., or in Madison or anywhere else, there is one universal answer to your problems and mine—and that is the answer of work. Let us never forget that. Let us never fall for the phony, alien idea that Congress, by legislation, can accomplish the millennium or that someone can do for us a job that we should do for ourselves. It takes sweat to accomplish anything that is good in life. It takes work on the part of the people in the traditional American manner rather than a wave of the legislative wand in Washington, D. C., or an order signed by some official in the Nation's Capital or in the State capital.

NEED FOR NATIONAL UNITY

We are coming up to important elections in our State and Nation—the next few months will see the air filled with political charges and countercharges, with accusations and claims and perhaps discussion of personalities.

But "let's keep our eyes on the ball," so to speak. Let us never forget that we are all Americans—whatever our political faith, whatever our race or creed or color or land of origin and then, when the political show is over and the people have come to the polls in November, let's draw our ranks together and stand before the world with traditional American unity.

You and I must remember that every single deed and every single word performed or uttered on the American scene is closely watched by the people of the world. They are looking to us for guidance and direction. They are noting our strengths and weaknesses and it is up to you and to me to give them the light that they are seeking. That is a part of our responsibility, of our obligations to serve the world.

REVISION OF MINIMUM WAGE ACT

I know that two particular problems these days are especially on your mind. The first is with regard to the revision of the Fair Labor Standards Act, which is now being considered in the Senate Labor Committee by a subcommittee, which is reviewing Senator BALL's bill, S. 2386, and the bill by Senator THOMAS of Utah, S. 2062. I understand that Senator BALL's bill is somewhat more flexible than the latter measure and retains a clause exempting operators in central offices serving less than 500 telephones, which is presently in effect under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

I am not a member of the Senate Labor Committee, but I have not hesitated to make recommendations to it in the past and I try to follow its work with close attention. Court decisions in recent years, as well as executive branch interpretations, have emphasized the necessity for a reappraisal of the Minimum Wage and Overtime Act, if it is to be adequate to present-day needs for business expansion, freedom, and enterprise. I believe that in this FLS Act, as in all legislation, the responsibility of the Federal Government is to create an atmosphere and to create conditions under which business enterprise can best develop. I think that we have recognized the falsity of the 1930's concept that it is the business of Government to crack down upon business, to regiment business, to direct business along channels which Washington bureaucrats determine as best in the Nation's interest.

TAXES ON COMMUNICATIONS

But there is another particular concern which I know has caused real anxiety and problems in your mind, and that is the present telephone service tax which levies an excise amount of 15 percent on local service calls costing over 25 cents. This act was placed in effect during wartime as a war measure, in order to raise needed revenue. The question now is whether or not this levy is necessary in the postwar era. Can our Federal revenues stand withdrawal of what is obviously a very burdensome tax? Can we redefine "luxury" to exclude telephone service? We all know that telephone service is definitely not a luxury since communications are so absolutely essential to personal and to business life. Of course, the communications tax is a part of a whole network of other excise taxes which may have to be considered with it.

In taxes particularly, I believe that it is the business of Government to help private business to fulfill its functions without needlessly burdensome levies. While we must meet our tremendous national debt and other obligations, obviously in some cases the levying of taxes does not help Uncle Sam's fiscal problem but rather hurts it, because it hurts private enterprise, prevents expansion and thus, in the long run, prevents the accumulation of more revenue for Uncle Sam.

On this issue, as on all other issues, I would like you to feel that my office and I, in Washington, are ready to serve you at all times, to get the benefit of your counsel and judgment, to take up your problems with congressional committees and executive agencies, to supply you important information, and otherwise to fulfill our obligations.

That returns us now to this matter of obligations. As United States Senator I have felt that it is my business, in effect, to place service first as my motto, and have sought to fulfill that motto during my 9 years in the Senate.

What, then, are our individual responsibilities and what is the responsibility of our Nation in this atomic age?

INDIVIDUAL CITIZEN'S RESPONSIBILITY

I feel that the individual citizen's responsibility is manyfold:

1. First off, I believe it is his responsibility to play an important, constructive role in his own local community, to help contribute to community health and prosperity, to help create jobs or businesses or to expand our standard of living, to make of his community the cleanest, finest possible place in which to live, in which to raise his children and others' children.

DISPLAYING AMERICAN LOYALTIES

2. I feel that it is up to each individual citizen to display the traditional loyalties and allegiances of American citizens, allegiance to God, allegiance to country, allegiance to the principles which made our Nation great. To do this obviously we must understand the foundation principles of our Republic, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, to understand their meaning in our times. It is essential, I believe, that each of us should have a real understanding of each of the Constitution's provisions and of our system of checks and balances, if we are to fulfill our functions as intelligent, public-spirited citizens in these times. That's why, for example, I've been sending to honor graduates of each of our Wisconsin high schools—in Madison and elsewhere—a copy of a book on the United States Constitution—the civic bible of America—with my compliments.

MANIFESTING SPIRITUAL TRUTHS

3. In our personal lives—yours and mine—it is up to us to radiate constructive qualities, to manifest the peace, the harmony, the joy, the wholesomeness, which were meant to be ours as children of one universal God. All about us we feel the influence of negative forces, we feel the impact of doubters and scoffers and pessimists predicting new depressions, foreseeing new wars, and all sorts of other calamities.

You and I don't help matters if we aggravate with our gloom those present conditions which are admittedly serious, but which are not impossible to solve. We don't help by manifesting unhappiness, misery, or woe, but we do help by keeping a smile on our faces and a "song in our hearts," by going about our daily business, knowing that we are going to be adequate to our problems, knowing that we are going to solve them in the American way as all preceding generations of Americans have solved their problems.

You know I wrote a little book, which some of you may have read, entitled "Laughing With Congress," trying to get across this idea. It is the idea that even so vital an organization as Congress with all its grim problems—the atomic bomb, housing, foreign policy, high prices—even Congress needs a wholesome laugh now and then in order to maintain its balance and perspective. So let's keep smiling and roll the dark clouds away. That's practical, horse-sense philosophy.

EXAMPLE OF SERVICE BY WISCONSIN PIONEERS

Certainly, the men and women who built Wisconsin, the pioneers who hacked their ways through the wilderness, who built their rough-hewn log cabins, who cleared the soil, who reared their children amidst privation, certainly these Badger pioneers knew what it was to fulfill the bill of obligations. They didn't seek to serve self alone; they sought to serve their fellowman and all those who were to follow. They planted seeds, laid foundations, and you and I have grown within the shade of those trees they planted, and we have built upon the foundations which they laid.

May it be said of us in future times that we, in turn, planted seeds and laid still stronger foundations for a still brighter tomorrow of the Wisconsin and America to come.

But it is not enough that you and I each fulfill our individual citizens' roles in this Republic. It is important that our beloved America fulfill her role in this sorely confused and stricken world.

AMERICA'S ROLE OF LEADERSHIP

Make no mistake about it, America has been precipitated to leadership among the nations of earth. We have no alternative but to lead. Since the end of the Second World War, we have invested over $30,000,000,000 in postwar recovery and rehabilitation. You and I both know that unfortunately a con-

siderable amount of this sum may not have been spent in the best purposes and may, to some extent, have been squandered. We know that we have committed postwar policy "boners" such as failing to oversee the adequate administration of the money which we have given. At the same time, we recognize that our whole postwar foreign policy has been a gamble, a risk, and a calculated one, to prevent a third terrible world war and to help halt the march of communism.

Part of that gamble has already paid off in Italy where the Communist forces suffered a very serious set-back at the polls, but there will be other challenges coming.

Obviously, I don't mean that America's foreign policy should consist exclusively of giving gifts. On the contrary, you and I know the worst thing a man can do in the world is make another man perpetually dependent on a giver's largesse, instead of looking to his own resources and his own qualities to see him through. What I do mean is that America can give untold amounts of the spiritual powers, the spiritual vitality which made our America the land of peace and freedom which it is. Each of us has relatives abroad or friends or acquaintances. You and I can write to those relatives telling them the truth about America. Each of us belongs to organizations, to churches, to veterans groups, to fraternal societies which may have ties with fellow organizations across the seas. It is up to us to play our role in these groups in order to impact their foreign counterparts with right thinking, American thinking of freedom and liberty.

It is through measures such as these, I believe, that we can fulfill our bill of obligations to our country and to ourselves in these times.

CONCLUSION

I want to thank you ever so much for your kind attention to these comments. It has been a real thrill to get together with you here, and I hope that I may have the pleasure at an early occasion again.

In the meanwhile, I repeat, I want you to feel that the office in 427, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., is your office. You sent me and my staff to Washington in order to serve you, to serve the State and the Nation, and I hope that you won't hesitate at any time to call upon us whenever we can be of information or assistance or aid to you in all matters affecting national affairs or your personal affairs. We are trying to do our level best in fulfilling our obligations as I know you will continue to do your grand job in fulfilling your obligations to the people of Wisconsin.

Collier's Accused of Faking in Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to have printed in the RECORD one news story and two articles by George E. Sokolsky which have appeared during the past few days in the Washington Times-Herald. They follow:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 21, 1948]

COLLIER'S ACCUSED OF FAKING IN POLL—JUGGLED TO CHEAT TAFT, SAYS WRITER SOKOLSKY

Collier's magazine last night was charged with juggling the results of its annual poll to cite a Senator and a Congressman for distinguished congressional service in order to keep the prize from Senator TAFT (Republican) of Ohio, a candidate for the Republican Presidential nomination.

The charge was made by George Sokolsky in the column he conducts in this newspaper. Sokolsky cited figures to show that the magazine ignored the vote of 28 Washington newspapermen and some 200 newspaper editors.

The prize was awarded by the magazine to Senator BARKLEY (Democrat) of Kentucky and to Representative HERTER (Republican) of Massachusetts. The award carried a gift of $10,000 to each winner to be given to public purposes they select.

The prize machinery is complete. The awards are made by a committee of 20, which this year was headed by Eric Johnston, movie czar. In the past the committee has followed recommendations of newspapermen and editors in two polls.

This year the committee, selected by the magazine, ignored the results of the two ballots, Sokolsky reported.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 21, 1948]

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Collier's magazine each year gives a prize to a Member of the United States Senate and to a Member of the House of Representatives "for distinguished congressional service. Along with the citation, a gift of $10,000 is given to each winner to be given to public purposes designated by the winner.

This year the prizes went to ALBEN W. BARKLEY, Senator from Kentucky, and CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, Representative from Massachusetts.

Both are able men, Senator BARKLEY having led his party for many years; Representative HERTER having made a masterly investigation of conditions in Europe in connection with ERP. BARKLEY is a Democrat; HERTER, a Republican.

The set-up surrounding this prize-giving is complex. Collier's keeps out of it except for a representative in Washington, James C. Derieux, who acts as liaison between the publishers and a committee which makes the final selection. This year the committee was headed by Eric A. Johnston and consisted of 20 members.

In order to be adequately advised, the committee is provided with considerable data, including two polls. According to the set-up, the committee forms its own conclusions and it may ignore all the polls and all the data provided.

Why Collier's bothers busy men to make decisions which may be, and this year were, ignored, it is difficult to understand. Perhaps, if the pollees knew that their votes did not count, they would save themselves the effort.

The polls are kept confidential so that usually the candidates for the prizes as well as the public assume that the final decision of Collier's committee in some way reflects the polls.

For instance, 28 Washington newswriters, editors, broadcasters, and columnists were polled this year in an "advisory poll." They were asked to make first, second, and third choices. Twenty candidates for the senatorial prize appeared and the top five for first choice were as follows:

Taft	12
Barkley	3
Flanders	3
Ives	3
Tobey	2

An advisory Nation-wide poll of daily newspaper editors for the Senatorial prize shows for the top five as first choice:

Taft	113
Vandenberg	45
Byrd	21
Morse	9
Barkley	6

For the House of Representatives, the first five for first choice among the Washington newswriters, etc., shows:

Herter	16
Eaton	3
Halleck	2
Joe Martin	2
Dirksen	1

The Nation-wide poll of daily newspaper editors for the first five for first choice shows:

Joe Martin	47
Hartley	42
Herter	31
Knutson	14
Halleck	12

Regarding the senatorial prize, the winner on the basis of both these polls would have been Senator ROBERT A. TAFT; for the representative prize, it would lie between CHRISTIAN HERTER and JOE MARTIN. In spite of TAFT's preference in both polls, the committee chose BARKLEY, who was second in one poll and fifth in the other.

There is much to be gleaned from these polls as to national interest and popularity, and as to that, there will be further reference in this column.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 23, 1948]

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Let us have a look at the advisory Nation-wide poll of daily newspaper editors for the Collier's prizes. The top 10 for first and second choices for the Senator who this year provided the most distinguished services shows:

	First	*Second*
Taft	113	36
Vandenberg	45	35
Byrd	21	35
Morse	9	7
Barkley	6	6
Flanders	6	6
Ball	5	17
Ferguson	5	10
Connally	5	3
Ives	3	6

Of these 10, the poll shows that 7 are Republicans. Although Collier's ignored the newspaper editors' judgment, passing over four names to reach Senator BARKLEY, the fact remains that the only New Dealer among the 10 is Senator BARKLEY.

TAFT received more votes by eight than the remaining nine added together. This is particularly significant because the poll was taken on a Nation-wide scale, covering all parts of the country and all shades of political opinion.

The fact that the Collier's committee, headed by Eric Johnston, chose to ignore this poll, rejecting TAFT, who received 113 votes, and accepting BARKLEY, who received 6 votes, is something that requires a better explanation than that the committee had decided to disregard candidates for the Presidency. What, even if that is true, is the excuse for disregarding BYRD and MORSE, who are not candidates?

Considering the Washington newswriters, editors, broadcasters, and columnists, altogether 28 of them, TAFT received 12 as first choice, 2 as second choice, 2 as third choice; BARKLEY, 3 as first choice, 2 as second choice, five as third choice. On the first choice, TAFT leads BARKLEY, 4 to 1. But this, too, is ignored by the Collier's committee.

If the first 10 senatorial names are studied in the Washington poll, 9 out of 10 are Republicans; namely, TAFT, FLANDERS, IVES, TOBEY, FERGUSON, HICKENLOOPER, SMITH, VANDENBERG, and WHITE. Only 1 Democrat appears among the first 10, BARKLEY, and he got the prize.

This is one of the most amazing showings in all this curious prize business. TAFT leads the field among Nation-wide editors,

113 to BARKLEY'S 6; among Washington newsmen, 12 to 3, but BARKLEY gets the prize.

Precisely what additional information did the Collier's committee have before it that made Senator BARKLEY'S services in the present Senate of greater distinction than those of Senator TAFT.

It is interesting that such Washington newsmen as Robert S. Allen, Bert Andrews, Frank Kent, Thomas L. Stokes, none of whom is a rock-ribbed Republican, voted for TAFT for first choice.

Yet the Collier's committee ignored their recommendations as it did the Nation-wide poll of daily newspaper editors. There must be a reason.

The most plausible but unsatisfactory explanation is that the Collier's committee desired to avoid endorsing a candidate for the Presidency. But that has nothing to do with the prize which is designed to honor a Senator and a Representative for distinguished services in a particular year.

James C. Derieux says in Collier's:

"The committee does not operate under fixed criteria or rules. Each year it is free to do as it pleases. In selecting the winners for 1947, a number of members felt that it would be wise to eliminate avowed Presidential candidates from consideration, lest the award be mistaken for a political endorsement."

If that is the explanation, it should have been made in advance of taking the polls. The pollees, in that case, would have known that they could not vote for TAFT, VANDENBERG and JOE MARTIN.

As it stands, many must wonder whether the committee did not reach its conclusion after the vote was in and BOB TAFT came first.

Veterans' Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1948

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on the relative advantages of the veteran cooperative housing provisions in H. R. 4488, the proposed veterans' homestead bill, as against the cooperative provisions in S. 866, the proposed long-range housing bill.

While the aids to cooperatively owned veteran housing projects provided by S. 866 may possibly prove to be a step in the right direction, they would in any event fall far short of the benefits for this type of housing which are contained in the veterans' homestead bill.

Under the homestead bill, dwellings purchased on a cooperative basis will cost the veteran much less, both in terms of monthly carrying charges and in terms of total costs. Monthly costs under the homestead bill will run more than 15 percent below costs under the T-E-W bill because of first, lower initial costs made possible by FWA grants, lower interest cost on construction money, and the elimination of excessive speculator's profit and contingency allowances; and, second, reduced financing costs because of the lower cost of money to associations.

Not only will monthly costs to the veteran be lower, but under the homestead bill he will own his home in 32 years against 40 years under the T-E-W bill. This will give him ownership free and clear 8 years sooner, and will reduce his total financing costs by more than 40 percent.

As evidence of the very substantial savings in both monthly costs and total financing costs to the veteran under the homestead bill as compared with the T-E-W bill, I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD a table attesting to such savings.

And finally, let me point out that while cooperatives under the T-E-W bill must find a lender willing to make them a 40-year at 4 percent, homestead associations, because they will be assured of their financing, can go right ahead and build the homes our veterans need without delay.

Cooperatively owned housing relative costs per unit to veteran under S. 866 and H. R. 4488

	S. 866, long-range housing bill (40-year loan at 4 percent)	H. R. 4488, homestead bill (32-year loan, at 2½ percent) [1]
Purchase price	$8,000.00	[2] $6,800.00
Down payment	400.00	[3] 400.00
VA gratuity credit		[4] 128.00
Amount of loan	7,600.60	[5] 6,272.00
Monthly costs to veteran:		
Payment to principal and interest	[6] 34.20	23.77
Property taxes ($200 per year)	16.67	16.67
Hazard insurance ($15 per year)	1.25	1.25
Maintenance and administrative ($160 per year)	13.33	13.33
Total monthly costs to veteran (excluding heat and utilities)	65.45	55.02
Percent reduction in monthly costs under homestead bill		16
Percent reduction in total financing costs to veteran over the life of the loan		44

[1] The associations will probably be charged an interest rate of about 2½ percent on funds loaned to them by VA; this includes the margin of spread of ¼ of 1 percent allowed the Administrator. The Secretary of the Treasury will probably charge about 2¼ percent on the moneys advanced on such loans, as it is believed that the "average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States" (sec. 516 (c)) during the initial period of lending activity will be between 2 and 2¼ percent. At present that average rate is in the vicinity of 2 percent.

[2] A 15 percent reduction in unit price is assumed. This reduction will be made possible by a 5 percent reduction in land improvement costs by virtue of FWA grants, and a 10 percent reduction due to (a) elimination of speculative profits, (b) reduction and recapture of unused contingency allowances for uncertainties, and (c) savings in interest on construction money.

[3] Although it is probable that associations will make predominantly 100 percent loans, a down payment of $400 is assumed in both cases to make possible a comparison of monthly ownership costs on a uniform basis.

[4] Gratuity credit is equal to 4 percent of guaranteed portion of the loan; in this case 4 percent of $3,200 (50 percent of $6,400).

[5] $6,400 loan amount reduced by amount of gratuity credit ($128).

[6] Includes an allowance for the average monthly cost to the veteran of the ½ percent FHA mortgage insurance premium.

Hon. William M. Whittington of Mississippi Drafted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, on March 4, last, I caused to be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages A1373 and A1374, a series of laudatory editorials from the Mississippi press praising our esteemed colleague, the Honorable WILL M. WHITTINGTON, the able Representative from the Third Congressional District of Mississippi, and lamenting the fact that he had announced that he would not be a candidate for reelection to the office in which he had so long and ably served.

I now have the pleasure of offering for the record an editorial from the Clarion-Ledger, an outstanding newspaper published at Jackson, Miss., rejoicing in the fact that Congressman WHITTINGTON had yielded to the pressure from his friends and constituents generally, and had been literally drafted to succeed himself in the Eighty-first Congress.

But that is only a part of the story. After Mr. WHITTINGTON publicly announced in February of this year that he would not be a candidate again, there were a number of prominent and able men from the Delta section of Mississippi, comprising the Third Congressional District, who announced that they would be candidates to succeed our colleague in the August primaries. But so strong was the disappointment of Congressman WHITTINGTON'S constituents at his announcement that he would not be a candidate that they set out to draft this able Representative for further service. Whereupon the distinguished gentlemen who had announced that they would seek the seat to be vacated by Mr. WHITTINGTON announced that if he would consent to offer himself for still further service in the Congress that they would voluntarily withdraw from the race. After much further solicitation and deliberation Congressman WHITTINGTON accepted the mandate of his people. The other candidates withdrew and the members of this body are now assured the benefit of the association, counsel, cooperation, and ability of this distinguished Mississippian.

The editorial follows:

REPRESENTATIVE WHITTINGTON LITERALLY DRAFTED AGAIN

It is a rare occurrence, but men sometimes are literally drafted to serve or to continue to serve in public office. When it happens, it is the highest of tributes to a man's character, to the value of his services, and to public confidence in him.

Congressman WILL M. WHITTINGTON is thus being drafted for another term in the office he planned to relinquish this year.

We recently noted the move in the Third Congressional District to persuade Mr WHITTINGTON to reconsider his plans to retire at the end of his current term, and to assure him unopposed election if he consented. We noted that this was a matter of State-wide interest and concern.

It is a pleasure now to note the success of the movement. Mr. WHITTINGTON has agreed to seek reelection for one more term. The two prominent candidates who had announced their intention to run for that office if Mr. WHITTINGTON was not a candidate for reelection supported the draft and announced they would actively support him.

This makes very improbable any opposition to the veteran Representative. It makes very probable the overwhelming defeat of any ambitious politician who does oppose him.

We congratulate Third District citizens who sponsored this draft, and again congratulate Mr. WHITTINGTON on the recognition thus given the value of his services.

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Washington Daily News:

[From the Washington Daily News of May 21, 1948]

A WORSE HOLE FOR THE GOP

Republican leaders in the House of Representatives are trying to put President Truman in a bad hole on the issue of extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Next week they will ask the House to pass a bill, written after secret committee hearings, to renew the act for a single year, with amendments that would almost abolish the President's authority to make trade-promoting agreements with other nations.

Mr. Truman objects strongly to this bill, and with good reason. He wants, and should be given, a 3-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act without crippling amendments. But if House and Senate pass the bill in its present form, and he vetoes it, the act will die on June 12. That would suit the high-tariff Republicans just fine. They would realize next month, instead of next year, their hope to destroy the trade program, which is a cornerstone of American foreign policy and of the European recovery plan. And they would tell the country that Mr. Truman's veto caused its destruction.

However, we don't believe they could fool the American people about that. Their scheme is too transparent.

If the reciprocal-trade program is hamstrung or butchered, next month or next year; if America's face is turned backward toward economic isolation and logrolled high tariffs; if mounting barriers to international trade defeat progress toward peace and prosperity, here and abroad, the people will know exactly where to place the blame.

They will place it on the Republican leaders of Congress. Those misguided men, we think, are digging for themselves and their party a worse hole than the one they have dug for Mr. Truman.

[From the Washington Daily News of May 24, 1948]

EXPERT WITNESS

Alfred M. Landon, Republican, has come out in support of President Truman's plea for full 3-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act without crippling amendments.

Republican plans to renew the act for only 1 year threaten the entire European recovery program, says Mr. Landon. Those plans have taken form in a bill approved, after secret hearings, by the Republican majority of the House Ways and Means Committee. And the committee's chairman, Representative HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota, asserts that Mr. Landon doesn't know what he's talking about.

"It is evident," says Mr. KNUTSON, "that he has accepted the State Department's version without independent investigation."

How's that again? In 1936 Mr. Landon was the Republican candidate for President. The GOP platform pledged repeal of the Reciprocal Trade Act. Mr. Landon, loyal to that platform, went the limit on that issue. In speech after speech he told the voters that American agriculture and industry faced destruction because, under the act, tariffs had been lowered on such things as cheddar cheese and babassu nuts.

When the votes were counted Mr. Landon had carried Maine and Vermont.

Talk about independent investigation. On one subject, at least, bitter personal experience has qualified Mr. Landon as a foremost expert. Nobody has better reason than he to know how disastrously opposition to reciprocal trade and support of schemes to boost tariffs can hurt the Republican Party.

An American Pension To Take the Place of Old-Age Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOBY MORRIS
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, there is sentiment, increasing sentiment, throughout the entire country in support of our united friendly request for action on old-age pensions in this session of the Congress. The people know that we can pay a reasonable old-age pension. They know also that it can be enacted to take the place of old-age assistance without involving the other aspects of the Social Security Act.

Typical of this interest in the field is a resolution unanimously passed by American Pension Club, No. 1, of Minneapolis, Minn., addressed to the honorable chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, a copy of which was sent to my office. The resolution is self-explanatory and is as follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *May 21, 1948.*

Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KNUTSON:

Whereas members of Minneapolis American Pension Club, No. 1, have noted, with keen interest and heartfelt appreciation, the glowing tributes, words of love, praise, and endearment that have recently been placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by many Congressmen eulogizing mother, all of which is most proper, fitting, and very commendable; and

Whereas there is now an abundance of proof, both in and out of Congress, that thousands upon thousands of these same noble American mothers are living today—through no fault of their own—in stark poverty, suffering, and privation; who must exist today upon the niggardly allowances doled out to them through an inadequate, inefficient, and regimented system called old-age assistance; and

Whereas there is a friendly, united, and constructive effort now being made by more than 200 Members of the House of Representatives, under the able leadership of Congressmen GERALD LANDIS and TOBY MORRIS, to enact a liberal, uniform Federal old-age-pension program in this Eightieth Congress; and

Whereas these same Congressmen have respectfully requested that you and your honorable Ways and Means Committee send the Landis old-age-pension bill, H. R. 781, or some similar bill, to the floor of the House for consideration and a vote in this session of Congress; and

Whereas to defer this grave and vitally important legislation for some future Congress to handle would only perpetuate and add to the poverty, misery, and discouragement of these devoted American mothers: Therefore be it

Resolved by Minneapolis American Pension Club No. 1, in regular meeting assembled, That we respectfully and prayerfully request that you and your honorable committee, cooperate with the above-mentioned Congressmen and send to the House of Representatives the Landis old-age-pension bill, H. R. 781, or some similar bill, so that this Eightieth Congress may prove to all American mothers the sincerity of its eulogies by its works.

Read and unanimously adopted May 21, 1948.

Respectfully yours,
AMERICAN PENSION CLUB, NO. 1,
MINNEAPOLIS.
CHARLES F. MARTIN,
Club President.

Attest:
MAMIE M. STEABNER,
Club Secretary.

Our Government Must Cooperate With The People To Wipe Out Cancer, Infantile Paralysis, and Heart Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE
AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C., May 13, 1948.

The committee met at 10 o'clock a. m., pursuant to call, in room 1334, New House Office Building, Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WOLVERTON, of New Jersey). We have before the committee for consideration today H. R. 977, a bill introduced by Mr. STEVENSON, a bill to provide for the mobilization of the scientific resources and knowledge of the United States for the purpose of seeking the causes and cure of cancer, poliomyelitis, and certain other degenerative diseases of mankind.

We will now have as our next witness our distinguished colleague from the State of Wisconsin [Mr. STEVENSON].

I know of no one in Congress in recent years who has given more study and careful consideration and taken a more sympathetic interest in matters of the kind provided for here in this bill than has our distinguished colleague from Wisconsin. We are very glad to hear from you, Mr. STEVENSON.

Mr. STEVENSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I want to thank you for your courtesy in giving me this opportunity to appear personally before your group. On behalf of H. R. 977 and in behalf of all of the bills of a similar nature that are before this committe .

May I say that I introduced H. R. 3939, in September 1945, which had as its goal the research for the discovery and cure of cancer and infantile paralysis. After introducing that bill, I heard from many sources from all sections of the United States asking me why I did not incorporate in the bill other so-called incurable diseases. In response to those many requests, I introduced H. R. 977 which includes in addition to provision for

research for the discovery and cure of cancer and poliomyelitis, also research for discovery of the cure of other degenerative diseases.

The bill provides, among other things—

That in order to secure the full development and application of the Nation's scientific and technical resources for the national health and welfare, there is hereby established in the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the National Medical Research Foundation—hereinafter referred to as the Foundation.

The Foundation is authorized and directed to initiate, conduct, and support scientific research with respect to the cause and cure of cancer, poliomyelitis, rheumatic fever, Bright's disease, asthma, arthritis, leukemia, encephalitis, arteriosclerosis, aplastic anemia, rheumatic heart disease, diabetes, and other degenerative diseases of the human race.

The powers and duties of the Foundation shall be exercised by a governing board—hereinafter called the Board—of four members, consisting of the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, a representative of the American Medical Association to be nominated by said association, and a representative of the American Cancer Society to be nominated by said society, and a member of the American Heart Association to be nominated by said association. The members of the Board shall serve without compensation, but shall be allowed actual and necessary traveling expenses, and the expenses of subsistence—or a per diem in lieu thereof—when engaged away from home in the duties of their office.

Section 6 of the bill provides an appropriation to enable the Foundation to carry out its powers and duties in the amount of $10,000,000 annually, to remain available until expended.

Private research suffers from the crippling restrictions of lack of sufficient funds and scientific equipment. With groups of scientists working together and with many such groups stationed in a number of centers throughout the country and supplied with the best and most advanced instruments and equipment, the cooperation of these brains and scientific equipment, with their consequent exchange of ideas and plans, will advance the research immeasurably. The program contemplated under the provisions of this bill will draw together the talent and energy which the problem of eradication of degenerative diseases demands. In order to accomplish this we must assure scientists and the keenest brains of the medical world a decent and an assured income and the most modern scientific laboratories in which to carry out their research programs.

To find the cause and cure for degenerative diseases the Government must become a partner in such research, and thus make it possible to abandon the inadequate methods of prewar medical research and adopt in their place modern method such as were used in the discovery of the atomic bomb.

Considering the vast mortality from degenerative diseases in this country, assistance from the Government is an absolute necessity.

The purpose of this bill is to make possible the cooperation of the best scientific and medical brains of the country and the construction of research laboratories and institutions throughout the United States, equipped with the most modern scientific machinery and apparatus, where the keenest brains of the world may carry on independent research, with one purpose and determination in mind—the establishment of the cause of and to discover a cure for degenerative diseases.

Mr. Chairman, one American dies from cancer every three minutes, 20 every hour. It is estimated by the American Cancer Society that there are now 500,000 people who have cancer, and that 17,000,000 of those who are alive today will eventually die from that dread disease. In other words, one out of every eight of our population who are now living will die from cancer; and, more tragically, cancer deaths are increasing year by year. In 1900 the number of deaths from cancer was ninth, and today it is second on the list.

Only heart disease kills more people annually than cancer. One hundred and seventy-five thousand people die from cancer every year.

In World War II, 273,000 American boys died in action. In 1942, 1943 and 1944 approximately 500,000 Americans died from cancer. Between Pearl Harbor and VJ-day cancer killed 607,000 Americans, more than twice the number killed by our enemies in the war. It is the greatest killer of women between the ages of 35 and 55, and the second greatest killer of men. Approximately 2,000 children die from cancer yearly.

According to a Gallup poll, 87 percent of the people in the United States have indicated their approval of scientific research at the expense of Government, to find ways and means of preventing or curing cancer; and 72 percent of the people of this country went on record as being personally willing to pay additional taxes to provide funds for research. Approval of a scientific-research program to discover the cause and cure of degenerative diseases was found among all major groups of our people, American men and women of all ages and levels of society, ranging from 82 to 91 percent. More than three out of every four persons in all groups in this country indicated their willingness to pay higher taxes personally in order to be assured of scientific research to find the cure for degenerative diseases under Government supervision, such as is provided in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard from people and institutions from all parts of the country, and from every State, including insurance companies, veterans' organizations, farmers' organizations, women's groups, physicians, and surgeons, who approve and endorse this bill, which would provide a foundation to conduct and support scientific research to find a cure for cancer, infantile paralysis, rheumatic fever, rheumatic heart disease, and other degenerative diseases.

We all know the ravages caused by infantile paralysis which has been raging throughout every State in the Union during the past years. In my own State of Wisconsin 50,000 children were stricken with infantile paralysis during 1946. Epidemics of poliomyelitis have been plaguing every community in our Nation from time out of mind.

Infantile paralysis is a disease which is an increasing menace to public health because of the increasing frequency of epidemics with an increasing death rate throughout the United States. Hardly a single community has escaped an epidemic of severe intensity. About 80 percent of the cases are children below 15 years of age but the disease may attack people of all ages.

Experience has shown us and has proved that infantile paralysis has not been conquered by the usual endowments and foundations and march-of-dimes drives established in this country for that purpose. There have not been sufficient funds provided to make it possible to assemble a sufficient number of scientists and medical men and women to make the concentrated attack that is necessary to wipe out this scourge of the human race.

With reference to rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease, I am told by experts in heart disease that rheumatic fever is a disease that attacks various organs of the body, particularly the heart, joints, blood vessels, the skin, and the brain, and that death or permanent disability occurs in many cases because the majority of patients who may have recovered from the acute attack of rheumatic fever have permanent heart damage, leaving them with the so-called rheumatic heart diseases.

This disease usually attacks infants and young people. At the House of the Good Samaritan in Boston, members of the faculty of the Harvard Medical School followed the cases of 1,000 children who had been stricken with rheumatic fever for a period of 10 years. They found that at the end of 10 years 203 of the 1,000 children were dead, and of those who survived, 135 were so incapacitated they were forced to lead sedentary lives; 209 could not participate in any competitive sports, and of the 1,000 children studied only 439 could lead a normal existence. These scientists also state it is expected that further mortality and disability would occur among these children in the period after the first 10 years following the attack of rheumatic fever.

Dr. O. Hendley of Philadelphia states that the life expectancy of individuals with rheumatic fever or rheumatic heart disease is less than 35 years in contrast to a life expectancy of 64 years for the general population.

Mr. Chairman, the magnitude of the problem of rheumatic fever is great. These diseases are the commonest cause of death of children between 5 and 19 years of age, and the second commonest cause of death of those between 19 and 24 years of age. In New York City the number of deaths from rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease is five times as great as the combined total of deaths of six common reportable diseases.

Rheumatic fever was prevalent among the members of the armed services during World War II. In the Army and Navy and in the air services thousands of cases of rheumatic fever developed.

The funds which have been made available through endowment and private subscriptions for research into rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease to date have been comparatively small. These funds have not been adequate even to start research study along the lines of rheumatic fever. Funds that have been allocated to the various States for rheumatic heart disease have been almost entirely used in programs for the care of rheumatic patients and not for research purposes. During the war the large number of cases of rheumatic fever developing in the Army, Navy, and air services required the expenditure of huge sums of money used entirely for the care of patients who were members of the armed services.

At a recent meeting of the American Heart Association the following resolution was adopted:

This conference is strong in favor of the extension of public programs supported by Federal funds for the study, prevention, and treatment of rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease.

Sufferers from rheumatic fever are predominantly among the lower-income groups. This investment of Government funds annually to establish the Foundation provided for in this bill will repay the taxpayers of the United States many-fold. Rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease are serious public-health problems. They deserve adequate attention and the concentrated scientific effort of the best brains of this country to find a cure therefor.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on for hours describing the ravages of degenerative diseases.

The key to success in the discovery of the cure of the degenerative diseases through scientific and medical research can be brought about through large-scale cooperative research by physicians, chemists, biologists, and other scientists, just as this was the key to the success in the discovery of the atomic bomb by the Manhattan Engineering District. The discovery of the cure of degenerative disease is no more impossible than was the development of the atomic

bomb. The outstanding results accomplished by organized research on atomic energy prove that this country has the facilities to make degenerative and so-called incurable diseases as rare as is typhoid fever and diphtheria today. With the funds and scientific know-how and the cooperation of the best scientific and medical brains of this country, miracles can be accomplished in less than 2½ years under pressure of war in the atomic field. Medical science and research can profit from the new technique and the tools developed in atomic research, with the aid of the brains and energy of many of our scientific experts who contributed to the medical part of the Manhattan project.

What is needed in order to find a cure for these dread diseases is a sustained attack, enlisting the best scientific and medical brains of this country. The efforts of a cooperative force of brains and Government funds, forming a research foundation as provided in this bill, will bring together the talent and the energy necessary to find the cure for these diseases. Research of this kind demands that this Government adopt similar methods as were used in the discovery of atomic energy. The vast multitude suffering from these diseases makes it absolutely necessary that the Government get back of a program of this nature. With the cure of degenerative diseases as its goal, and a foundation set up and backed by the United States Government with funds appropriated by this Congress to carry out the program, I have no doubt we will find the scientific and medical brains to solve the problems and provide the cures for all degenerative diseases.

I was very glad to hear the very eminent witnesses before your committee this morning and learn their views.

Supplementing my statement, I would like to call your attention to a letter which I received from Dr. Parran, Surgeon General of the United States, in response to an inquiry of mine asking him what amounts had been been appropriated by the Congress for the past 10 years for cancer research, polio research, and for the specific research to find a possible cure for other degenerative diseases. In this letter which Dr. Parran wrote me, he made the significant statement that of the diseases mentioned in H. R. 977, specific appropriations had been made for cancer, tuberculosis, and venereal diseases only. Dr. Parran said: "While considerable research has been conducted in connection with the other diseases under general authority contained in various legislative enactments, information is not available as to the amount expended for each disease. The diseases have not been identified either in specific legislation or appropriation language and accordingly the accounting records reflect only overall expenditures. For this reason the following tabulation shows the amounts appropriated for the three diseases financed through specific appropriations, and consolidates the amounts made available for all other diseases."

And then the doctor set forth the amounts that were appropriated by the Congress for 1938 to 1947, inclusive. I have attached that to my statement, which I would like to call to your attention because it brings out a point and the reason why I think special legislation is necessary in order to secure research pointed toward these specific diseases.

For instance, in 1938, Dr. Parran says Congress appropriated for venereal-disease research $175,950.

For tuberculosis, nothing.

For cancer research, $400,000, and for all other diseases combined, only $1,423,569.

In 1939 appropriation for venereal diseases jumped to $3,156,557; for tuberculosis, nothing; for cancer, the same sum, $400,000; and for all other diseases, $1,645,292.

In 1940 the amount appropriated for venereal diseases jumped to over $5,000,000, with nothing for tuberculosis; $570,000 for cancer, and about the same amount for all other diseases.

In 1941 the amount appropriated by Congress for venereal diseases was over $6,000,000, with nothing for tuberculosis; about $570,000 only for cancer research, and $2,500,000, approximately, for all other degenerative diseases.

In 1942 the amount appropriated for venereal diseases was almost $9,000,000, nothing for tuberculosis, and only $565,000 for cancer research; and about two and a third million dollars for all other research for degenerative diseases.

In 1943 the amount appropriated for venereal disease research was $12,500,000, only $201,249 for tuberculosis research, while the amount appropriated for cancer research again dropped to $534,870, and about $2,500,000 was appropriated for all other degenerative-disease research.

In 1944 the amount for venereal disease research appropriated by the Congress was $12,367,000 and the amount for tuberculosis only $158,747. The amount for cancer was again reduced to the small sum of $530,000, and for all other degenerative diseases the amount appropriated was about $2,693,711.

In 1945 the amount appropriated for venereal disease research was $12,383,291; tuberculosis then got a little more than $2,333,000; cancer stayed at about the same amount, $561,000; and for all other degenerative diseases, about $2,150,000.

In 1946 the amount appropriated for venereal disease research was $11,949,000; for tuberculosis, $6,047,000; for cancer, $548,700; and for all other degenerative disease research Congress appropriated $3,146,642.

In 1947, which is the last year that I have figures for, Congress appropriated the enormous sum of $16,628,000 for venereal diseases; for tuberculosis, $7,994,000; for cancer, $1,772,000 (then Congress really began appropriating for cancer research); while for all other degenerative diseases the amount was $6,354,755.

Those are very significant figures. It was that idea, and the knowledge that there was not much being appropriated for research for tuberculosis or cancer and for all other degenerative diseases that prompted me at first to introduce H. R. 3939 in 1945, later following up with the present bill, H. R. 977.

In closing I want to say that I was very much pleased when the Seventy-ninth Congress passed the National Science Foundation bill sponsored by your chairman, Mr. WOLVERTON. I was very much pleased with the way his bill handled the goal and aim of H. R. 977, by the establishment of special commissions as provided in section 4 of the present bill, H. R. 6007.

But I was disappointed later to learn that the President had vetoed the bill. I am very much disappointed that in the present bill sponsored by your chairman, Mr. WOLVERTON, the Senate has seen fit to delete the provision in section 7 of H. R. 6007, establishing a commission for special research for a cure for cancer, polio, rheumatic heart disease, and all the degenerative diseases, which reads as follows:

"To establish for such period of time as it may determine a special commission on cancer, on heart and intravascular diseases, on poliomyelitis, and on other degenerative diseases."

I think the bill should have that provision incorporated in it, and that the bill this committee authorized should have that particular section and provision reincorporated, and that it should be passed with that provision in it.

I want personally to thank this committee for the good work they have done and the long hearings they held in the Seventy-ninth Congress, and the wonderful work that was done by your chairman, Mr. WOLVERTON, in getting out the bill that the House passed practically unanimously and that the Senate passed as S. 526. I trust that the House will pass the bill in its original form as sponsored by your chairman, by unanimous vote when we have that opportunity, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. There are many members of this committee other than the chairman who have been interested in this type of legislation. I have in mind the services that have been rendered by Mr. PRIEST over a good many years, who has been interested in this type of work.

Mr. STEVENSON. I am aware of Mr. PRIEST's work, that he worked intelligently and hard over a long period of time.

The CHAIRMAN. And I also want to say that Mr. HESELTON has produced legislation dealing with these subjects.

Mr. STEVENSON. That is why I included every member of the committee in my commendation.

The CHAIRMAN. We appreciate the fact that you recognize that this committee has been interested in this welfare type of legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. I have just a few figures, and in addition to the table which you have given.

These are the appropriations within the Public Health Service.

In 1948, fiscal year, there was appropriated for the control of venereal diseases $17,399,500 and estimated program for 1949, fiscal year of $17,300,000.

For the control of tuberculosis, 1948 appropriation was $8,000,000; for 1949, the estimates are $9,329,000 and for mental health activities' appropriation in 1948 was $4,250,000, and the estimated amount for 1949 bill will be $7,416,000.

The appropriation 1948 for the National Cancer Institute, operating expenses of $14,500,000.

The estimates for 1949 were $14,000,000.

Appropriation of 1948 for heart research was $974,500 The estimates for 1949 are $1,500,000.

I am certain that that is gratifying to all of us who are interested in the welfare of our fellowman to see that there is a growing recognition on the part of Congress of the importance of providing appropriations and adequate appropriations, for these particular diseases, and as you have pointed out they might well do so with respect to other diseases of the degenerative type.

We thank you, Mr. STEVENSON.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. BECKWORTH.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I just want to personally thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his efforts to do something about cancer, Mr. STEVENSON. I have been privileged to talk with you a number of times with reference to the bill you introduced, almost from the time you introduced your original bill, and I know your concepts. Until this battle is won there should be no let up in any way with reference to fighting the battle. I do know that you have done a great job and I greatly appreciate it, and the people who have written to me about your bill, from time to time appreciate it also.

Mr. STEVENSON. I appreciate the encouragement you have given me, Mr. BECKWORTH, from time to time in my efforts, and I thank the chairman for bringing those figures down to date for 1948 and for 1949, which I did not have.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. PRIEST.

Mr. PRIEST. Just one expression—I also want to express my appreciation to the interest of the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEVENSON] in this subject. I appreciate what you said about the science foundation bill and the viewpoint that the bill as introduced currently by our distinguished chairman should be passed with those provisions for the special commissions in the bill.

Assuming that a bill with those commissions such as were in the bill last year were

enacted or might be enacted into law, Mr. STEVENSON, then would you believe that a bill such as your H. R. 977 also should be enacted, or do you think one would take the place of the other?

Mr. STEVENSON. I meant to convey the idea that I was quite satisfied with the way the committee handled it in the Seventy-ninth Congress. I think that covers the aim and the goal that I have in mind in H. R. 977. It would please me very much if the same way of handling the situation were carried out in the Eightieth Congress. I want to say to you, Mr. PRIEST, that your work along this line and especially your work on your bill for research in mental health was a great inspiration to me.

Steel Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT TRIPP ROSS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Washington Post of May 21, 1948:

STEEL PENSIONS

The steel workers' union has kept its pledge not to strike for wage increases, but it is dickering with the United States Steel Corp. for health and welfare benefits in connection with a general drive to induce the steel industry to finance a comprehensive social insurance program. The union is asking for life insurance policies for employees, retirement policies of $1,500 yearly at age 65, sick pay, and hospitalization benefits. Furthermore, it wants United States Steel to finance the entire cost of the program which would, it is estimated, be equivalent to a wage increase of between 9 and 10 cents per hour per employee. The steel workers are also hoping eventually to obtain monthly pensions of $150 for all retired steel workers that would cost about 13 cents an hour per employee. United States Steel has offered to pay half the cost of a less ambitious program embracing life, accident, and sickness insurance. The company is prepared to put its plan into effect within the next few months, and negotiations are expected to begin shortly on the issues in question between the company and the union.

The failure of Congress to expand the coverage of the old-age insurance system, to raise benefits above present inadequate levels, and extend the system to embrace health insurance and hospital benefits has given an impetus to union drives for such protection that is quite understandable. Nevertheless, it raises many questions as to the effect on the Government's system of social insurance of the growth of private-systems of insurance applicable to particular companies and industries.

Employers in covered industries and their employees now make contributions from pay rolls to finance the Federal system of old-age insurance, and employers also contribute to federally supervised State systems of unemployment insurance. In time, we trust, these public systems will expand and their beneficiaries will be given much more adequate protection than they now have to protect them from destitution in old age and other ills to which the flesh is heir. Private pension benefits adding to the costs of social insurance should, therefore, be adjusted with reference to these governmental benefits and be regarded as supplementary payments. Otherwise, opposition to liberalization of the governmental program will surely arise among employers subjected to multiple levies. Pensions, too, will vary widely from industry to industry as private pension systems multiply, some employees obtaining more protection than is essential, while others are likely to encounter increased opposition to reasonable demands for more adequate benefits under the Federal and State systems.

Hence the drive for union security gives rise to problems calling for serious study on the part of legislators. What the country needs is social security for all, not simply for a few strongly organized unions able to obtain extra large benefits that set them apart from their fellow workers as specially privileged segments of the working population.

Civil Rights in Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the South has been the recipient of much solicitous concern, generously tendered by self-appointed guardians of human rights and civil liberties. It has never been necessary to twist the arm or exert unusual pressure in order to stir storms of protest and howls of condemnation from those whose consciences are shocked and whose souls are seared by violations of human dignity and denial of human rights, provided the shocking occurrence takes place south of the Mason and Dixon's line.

The northern professional guardians of civil liberties must have been looking the other way recently when some violations of human rights took place in Minnesota. The Atlanta Constitution in its issue of May 20 has so ably called the occurrence to their attention, that I desire to insert the editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is as follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS IN MINNESOTA?

We have been listening intently for a shattering blast of righteous indignation from those who profess to be ardent champions of the civil rights of man. We have watched the great eastern papers, whose editorial tongues frequently lash out in wrath when injustices, real or fancied, occur in the South. More particularly have we held an open ear toward the various presidential candidates, including the incumbent, hoping to catch even a hint of displeasure at one of the most cruel illustrations of disregard for human rights we have seen in many months.

All has been silence.

It seems to be the common view in Washington that the mob violence used by CIO meat packers last week is a matter for the State of Minnesota to deal with. But the fact is the State has done nothing to punish those who broke into a packing plant, wrecked the machinery, assaulted those who were working and kidnapped some 25 or 30 of their number. Yet, those in Congress and in the administration who are most vociferous in their clamor for the civil rights program, so-called, are conspicuous by their silence in the wave of anarchy that engulfed St. Paul. Not even Harold Stassen, Minnesota's former Governor, has had a word to say about this insurrection.

William Green and Philip Murray, both advocates of the civil rights program, have failed to condemn the use of mob violence by strikers. Their silence gives assent to the use of force which deprives citizens of their right to earn a livelihood.

In all the South last year there was a single lynching. This crime is the only crime which has been on the steady decline since the First World War. Mob violence by organized strikers—murder, arson, dynamiting and sabotage—have shown spectacular increases, particularly in the East and the Midwest chief centers of indignation against the South.

Moreover, the right to work, recognized by law and custom as among the inalienable rights, is increasingly abused with impunity.

The hypocrisy of a civil-rights program which applies to one section of the country but not to others by now is obvious to voters everywhere. And the inconsistency of those who would punish the South, because of its political impotence, but give silent assent to equal injustices elsewhere is revolting.

Just in case it might be contended that the Atlanta Constitution was moved by bias or prejudice, I want to follow up its editorial with one from the Washington Evening Star of May 15, entitled "Minnesota Mob Rule," and one from the Washington Post of May 15, entitled "Minnesota Mob." I insert these editorials herewith:

MINNESOTA MOB RULE

The disgraceful spectacle staged by CIO packing-house strikers in Minnesota can be traced to a tendency in this country over the past 10 years to tolerate lawlessness by unions that would not be tolerated from anyone else.

This began with the sitdown strikes in the automobile industry. Then came the so-called mass picket line technique, which is really a form of mob rule itself. When some of the States tried to curb these lawless tactics, the Supreme Court, referring indulgingly to what it was pleased to call the give-and-take of the picket lines, came to the rescue of the unions. Congress has not taken any effective corrective action and the local communities generally have been either unable or unwilling to act.

The country is now witnessing in Minnesota one inevitable result of extending special consideration to particular groups. That episode began with a refusal by the strikers to heed a court order limiting the number of pickets. When the outnumbered local police attempted to enforce the order they were beaten and driven off. Office workers, not on strike, were forcibly prevented from entering the packing plants. Finally, some 200 men, including strikers, broke into the plants, where some 50 maintenance workers were on duty. These men were beaten with clubs and driven out. Some were taken out to the woods and beaten. Others were held as hostages, according to the news reports. To round out their night's work, the mobsters then proceeded to smash equipment and furnishings in the plants.

Now that the Minnesota Governor has called out the National Guard, it is to be expected that order will be restored. But the country has not heard the last of this sort of thing, and will not hear the last of it, until we begin to treat lawlessness by unions precisely as we would treat lawlessness by any other group.

MINNESOTA MOB

The resort to mob action at the strike-bound Cudahy packing plant at Newport, Minn., on Thursday night is a disgrace to unionism and a humiliation to the Nation. Press reports of yesterday indicate that 200 men invaded the packing plant during the night, wrecked parts of it, released 200 hogs, injured several employees, and carried away 30 persons as hostages. This sort of violence is likely to destroy whatever chance the workers had of winning their strike and to

cost the union dearly in terms of prestige even though the officials of the union may have had nothing to do with organization or execution of the raid.

Apparently, the trouble began when the pickets around the plant refused to limit their numbers in accord with a court injunction. The sheriff failed to open the picket line because his force was too small to fight its way through. The strikers may have become desperate because 200 men and women identifying themselves as both union and nonunion employees had called on Governor Youngdahl, said they wanted to go back to work, and asked him what he was going to do about the violence that was keeping them away from their jobs. Whatever the circumstances, however, this sort of mobbery in Minnesota is no more excusable than mobbery in Mississippi or Alabama. Organized labor would do well to cooperate with the State authorities in exposing those who are guilty and in breaking up the lawless picketing from which the trouble apparently stemmed.

Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to a letter written me by E. W. Axe, investment counsel and economist of New York City, in reply to a letter which I wrote to him earlier in the year about the dangers of inflation and the importance of taking counter-inflationary measures. It will be noted that this letter was written after the passage of the tax reduction bill. So that what the writer says is of current importance. The letter seems to me to analyze with great clarity the economic forces involved. It reads as follows:

E. W. AXE & CO., INC.,
New York, N. Y., April 24, 1948.

HON. ROBERT HALE,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HALE: Since I received your letter of January 13 commenting on the question of inflation and counter-inflationary measures I had in mind writing you on this subject, but the question is so complicated and so involved with others, such as European relief, that it is difficult to see one's way through to a conclusion.

There is one point, however, which seems to me quite clear; that as between the conflicting objectives of checking inflation and reducing taxes, it is far more important to reduce taxes. At present levels taxes obstruct or prevent the undertaking of new enterprises, the expansion of existing enterprises, and even the maintaining of our present supply of plant and equipment. I come in contact from time to time with persons who have plans for the development of new products or other business operations and some of these, although involving risk, look promising. Always, however, this sort of thing calls for an investment of at least several hundred thousand dollars and by its nature such an operation cannot be undertaken by more than one or at the most a few individuals. A venture of this sort would be too hazardous unless the amount were limited to say, a tenth or less of an individual's business capital, so that it could be interesting only to persons possessed of resources totaling over six figures. But in these brackets and even lower, additional income is almost worthless, because of taxes. So that what would otherwise be a promising business development cannot be undertaken. Similar considerations, as well as restrictions upon accumulating surplus, also prevent the building up of manufacturing and other enterprises.

Under these conditions sooner or later our supply of equipment goods is bound to decline. According to some calculations, in fact, it is actually today lower than 20 years ago, and this in spite of the tremendous amount of new technical ideas that are normally developed in this country. A century ago England led the world in manufacturing efficiency and ability to produce goods of good quality at low cost. Largely because of the vicious system of taxation progress stopped and later England's capital equipment actually began to deteriorate; so that today most of her plants are obsolete. This will continue as long as taxes and other obstructions to business continue. It is happening here now and the deterioration will accelerate unless there is a reduction in taxes to a point which will make it possible for individuals and corporations to accumulate capital.

It is the wish to accumulate wealth and the possibility of doing so, together with the tremendous inventiveness and ingenuity which the human mind displays when it is not restricted, that has built up the great manufacturing industries we have today. It seems absurd that the control of business by the State can produce anything like the same results. The evidence is in the opposite direction, and of course confiscatory taxation means control of business by the State.

Although the evils of inflation are many, the business machine can go on operating under inflation—certainly under the type of inflation that we have now or could have in this country. Over the centuries the purchasing power of money has declined and this has not prevented the building up of capital equipment. It would be desirable to have a stable price level but that a rise in prices will prevent progress is untrue. I am strongly on the side of sound money and think that a return of the gold standard and to a banking system somewhat similar to that of the old National Bank Act would be very constructive. But as between this and reducing present taxes, which sooner or later will certainly ruin the country, it seems to me to be no question at all.

In any case it seems idle to talk of curbing inflation by high taxes. Inflation has been created over the past 16 years and nothing that can be done now will have more than a temporary effect. It is possible of course to produce a temporary decline by frightening investors into a panic, but the debt is there and the inflated bank credit and only the most violent measures (such as the Soviets put into effect a little while ago) could change the situation to any important extent.

In short it seems to me that in the long run the prosperity of the country, and indeed its existence, depend upon continuing to raise the quantity and quality of the goods and services which business produces. In the long run this can be done only by increasing and improving capital equipment. Under present tax conditions it is impossible to do this and, on the contrary, deterioration has already set in. As compared with this problem, whether goods sell for less or for more dollars is not very important. In the long run business can adjust itself to any price level but confiscatory taxation not only checks progress but sooner or later prevents business from functioning at all.

Faithfully yours,

E. W. AXE,
President.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette:

SKULDUGGERY IN THE HOUSE

Just as we suspected, Republican skulduggery has been afoot behind the closed doors of the House Ways and Means Committee, which last week went to work on—in the underworld sense of that phrase—the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. After 6 days, the committee, following the advice of the GOP House leadership, voted to extend the trade law for only 1 year instead of the 3 years sought by the administration.

One need not be a Philadelphia lawyer to read in this further evidence that the old guard Republicans, confident of victory in November, intend to kill the Hull trade program. With a cunning proper to the crime, they have now put off acting before the campaign. Evidently, even they realize that great numbers of their own and independent voters would desert the GOP this year, if it reared again the banner of high tariff.

Yet that is just what the party—in the House, at least—seems to be doing. Else why this playing the footpad? Why, indeed, were the general public and the press excluded in the first place from committee sessions on legislation as vital to this country's prosperity and the world's peace as the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act?

That law has been in effect 14 years. It has boosted our trade with every nation with which we have negotiated reciprocal pacts. It has induced the big trading countries of the world to join with us in a postwar effort to end international economic warfare—the sure harbinger of shooting warfare.

A freer trade is the very basis of our carrying through the Marshall plan—otherwise, to restore Europe's industry without opening markets for its products would be the operation rat hole of all time.

Moreover, how can the rest of the world buy our goods—and thus help sustain our own employment and standard of living—unless we are willing to take a fair share of its exports? This is not a problem to be met just this year, but for decades to come.

Enough, then, of secrecy. The tariff is a vital—perhaps the most vital—issue in our foreign policy. If the Old Guard Republicans are out to scuttle the reciprocal trade system—and thereby repudiate their past two Presidential candidates and the overwhelming sentiment of the American people—let them declare themselves like honest men. The public has a right to know before November whether the Republican Party is still the party of isolationism.

This Is No Time for America To Say "No"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD,

I include the following editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal of May 19, 1948:

THIS IS NO TIME FOR AMERICA TO SAY "NO"

We believe the State Department is seriously, even dangerously wrong in flatly refusing Stalin's bid for a conference. It is still not too late for President Truman to reverse this unconstructive policy.

We ought to sit down and talk to the Soviets. It does not matter now how we were forced into that position, whether by Russian guile or our own naïveté. Nor does it matter who initiated the action, whether it was Ambassador Bedell Smith, Henry Wallace, or Joseph Stalin. The only thing that really counts is this: The vast majority of people in the United States, in Russia, and in the world want peace. We cannot afford to leave a single stone unturned along the rocky path that leads toward that goal.

Maybe nothing will come of a conference between Russia and America. It still would be worth the trying. Perhaps Henry Wallace will gain strength for his candidacy as author of the letter which Stalin hails as "a good and fruitful basis" for an agreement. That is a small consideration compared to even the tiniest hope of settling a controversy that is tearing the world apart. Furthermore, Wallace would pick up thousands of disillusioned voters if the Government cold-shouldered a peace plan because he was the author.

The vital point now is for us to meet the Russians on ground we know is solid beneath our feet. We have every right to require evidences of good faith from the Kremlin, to make certain we are not fooling ourselves and the world. We can ask Russia in advance, for instance, to stop blocking the will of the United Nations on atomic energy and on Greece.

Both of these areas of disagreement are named in the Wallace agenda. They are not merely what Stalin calls "basic questions of difference between the U. S. S. R. and the United States," however. Let's take atomic energy. A United Nations Commission has debated this question since January 1946. Nine members of the commission came to full agreement on the only way to outlaw atomic warfare, through a tight system of UN inspection. The only two members who differed were the representatives of the U. S. S. R. and the Soviet Ukraine. The majority plan was first proposed by Bernard Baruch, but it is no longer just an American plan. It is the program called essential by all members of the Atomic Energy Commission outside the Soviet orbit. The Commission has just given up the job and reported a deadlock to the UN Assembly, with the full blame laid directly at the door of the Kremlin. Let the Soviets break this deadlock to show they mean to cooperate in building a peaceful world.

Let's look at Greece. Here again the difference is between the Soviet Union and the rest of the world. Two UN commissions and a subcommission have declared after investigation that Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Albania, all Soviet satellites, are molesting Greece. Everybody on those commissions agreed on the facts, with the exception of Russia and her satellites. Nobody doubts that Russia could call a stop to the guerrilla activities her Balkan allies are perpetrating. If she means business about peace, let her call the dogs off of Greece and give that little country a chance to recover from a war that has never ended in that part of the world.

Every item on the Wallace list offers infinite difficulties for Americans trying to lay a cornerstone of peace with Russia. We could at least sit down and start talking with them, however, if they gave proof of sincerity by breaking the UN deadlock on Greece and atomic power. The world could then see a genuine chance of negotiating a lasting peace.

Even then we would have to be much more careful than we were at Yalta and Potsdam. We could not accept, as we did on those occasions, the Russian interpretation of civil liberties, and noninterference in domestic affairs of other nations. The Soviets would be quite prepared to say at once that they would agree with us on these points, which are cited in the Wallace letter. The trouble is that they give an entirely different meaning to these phrases. They hold, for instance, that the people of Russia today enjoy full civil liberties. No interpreter, no matter how skilled, can bridge the gap between Russian and English on such phrases. We will have to find some way to nail down these general terms and leave no room for interpretation.

We cannot make agreements with Russia, in other words, which do not mean what they say. That only adds to the tragic confusion of the world. We cannot go into a conference with the Soviets without guarding every action against fraud and misrepresentation. But above all, we canont afford to say we will not talk peace with them. The whole world lives in dread of a Russo-American war. Not everybody outside this country realizes the truth about American opinion, that 99 percent of our people would make any honorable sacrifice to avoid such a conflict. We must prove that fact by our actions.

The Mundt-Nixon Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio interview with me on May 9, 1948, over Station WCAE, Pittsburgh, Pa.:

ARTHUR GAETH. Congressman EBERHARTER, I believe I understand that on Thursday for five short hours the House of Representatives in Washington will discuss and vote on a bill which the Washington Post and other newspapers hold will do as much or more to destroy our Bill of Rights than anything introduced. That's the so-called Mundt-Nixon bill, H. R. 5852. What was the origin of this Mundt-Nixon bill?

Mr. EBERHARTER. The bill originated in the House Committee on Un-American Activities. This committee has a consistent record of hostility to labor. It has intervened in the affairs of a number of unions, in strikes and in labor political campaigns. Its methods were described by the late President Roosevelt as sordid. It has bragged that it has a blacklist of 1,000,000 Americans. This bill is the logical and inevitable result of the committee's activities over the past 10 years. It is an attempt to make the prejudices and practices of the committee the law of the land.

Mr. GAETH. Congressman, what are the main provisions of the Mundt-Nixon bill, called the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1948?

Mr. EBERHARTER. In that bill Congress would declare that there exists a world Communist movement. Persons and organizations who by certain methods carry out the objectives of the world Communists can be deprived of their citizenship, including native-born Americans, and punished by $10,000 fines and up to 10 years imprisonment. Now that would not be so bad in itself. But when they include and list the methods we come up against a strange thing. First, for instance, it says, "disruption of trade and commerce."

Mr. GAETH. Now that's supposed to be an illegal activity, and could they stretch that to include the rights of labor to strike?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Definitely, that interpretation, under the language of the bill, would be a logical interpretation. And another thing—the inciting of economic, social, and racial strife or conflict.

Mr. GAETH. Now, does that mean or could that include the working for public housing, rent control, health insurance, or even the FEPC?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Why, definitely. Under the language that could be an interpretation because if you advocate, for instance, the FEPC, the Attorney General could very well say that you were stirring up racial strife. Now another thing here they have—dissemination of propaganda calculated to undermine established government and institutions.

Mr. GAETH. Now established government and institutions, that could then be interpreted as working to abolish poll taxes, white primaries, lynching in the South, publishing the voting records of Congressmen and PAC work?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Definitely, that interpretation is also a logical one because whenever you, by propaganda, endeavor to change the law of the land, you are establishing a different type of regulation or government, and therefore, that interpretation could be easily made. Now, the Attorney General designates organizations as Communist political organizations or Communist-front organizations. The only proof necessary would be the Attorney General's opinion that it is reasonable to conclude that the organizations or individual's views and policies are the same as those of the world Communist movement. The elementary right of court trial is denied.

Mr. GAETH. That means, of course, that the Attorney General's office has a policing operation and that he defines just what the standards are in that policing operation?

Mr. EBERHARTER. He could come to that conclusion, and as I read the bill, he does not even have to have a prima facie case if he can reasonably conclude that the same views are held by an organization as the views of some foreign government, for instance, he could declare it a Communist-front organization without benefit to those accused of court trial before a judge or jury.

Mr. GAETH. Now, the Mundt-Nixon bill directs the Attorney General to list an organization as a Communist political organization or Communist-front organization on the basis of reasonable conclusions. If they have some or all of the characteristics set forth in the bill, such organizations are required to register. Is this a democratic procedure in the spirit of our Bill of Rights?

Mr. EBERHARTER. This is a completely undemocratic procedure. It is a judgment handed down by one man, the Attorney General, without benefit, as I said before, of judge or jury. The entire principle of requiring registration as a condition to exercise our freedom of speech and assembly is violative of the Bill of Rights. As the Supreme Court said in *Thomas* v. *Collins*, "As a matter of principle a requirement of registration in order to make a public speech would seem generally incompatible with an exercise of rights of free speech and free assembly." Now, the vague, all-inclusive standards set out by the bill are so sweeping that any and all organizations may come under the Attorney General's ban. For example, one of the characteristics, according to the Mundt-Nixon bill, of a Communist political organization is the extent to which its views and policies are the same as those of such foreign governments or foreign organizations. Now, if an organization opposes, say, our Government's reversal of the Palestine partition, it runs a risk of having the same views or policies of some foreign government. If

an organization advocates nationalization of any industry, it runs the same risk.

Mr. GAETH. We have set up what the bill actually sort of entails and includes. Do we need this bill, Congressman EBERHARTER?

Mr. EBERHARTER. In my opinion, it is completely unnecessary. We have laws on our books which deal with criminal subversive acts. The Smith Act makes it a crime to advocate the overthrow by violence of the United States Government. The McCormack Act requires the registration of agents of foreign principals. The Voorhis Act requires registration of organizations which are agents of foreign governments. The Attorney General has only to prove his case in a court of law before a jury of American citizens to get whatever action is necessary. But the Mundt-Nixon bill is designed to deliberately get around the requirements of proof that unlawful acts of criminal conduct have been committed. The Mundt-Nixon bill is designed to outlaw ideas and the free expression of ideas, and not criminal acts.

Mr. GAETH. It's sort of an hysterical sweep, then, that adds to the hysteria, instead of calming the country, which, of course, it needs at the present time.

Mr. EBERHARTER. To me it's very alarming that such a bill could ever be presented to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. GAETH. Congressman EBERHARTER, have the American people had time to find out what this bill actually means?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Not only have the American people not had time, but Congress itself has been in the dark about this bill. Extraordinary secrecy surrounded the drafting of the bill. No hearings were held on it. The committee is trying to rush the bill through before Congress itself has a chance to study it.

Mr. GAETH. And I understand Congress will, or the House will, have only 5 hours of general debate next Thursday in which to consider this bill?

Mr. EBERHARTER. The Rules Committee gave only 5 hours on a measure of greatest importance to every citizen who believes in the right to have ideas of his own and to express them to his friends and neighbors and to the American public.

Mr. GAETH. Now, Congressman, you may remember that the late Fiorello LaGuardia was called a Communist at a congressional hearing when he spoke in favor of public housing. David Lilienthal was smeared as a Red because he wanted public power developed of the TVA type. As a matter of fact, even the income tax was labeled "Socialist" when it was first broached in this country. Supporters of the abolition of the poll tax, opponents of white primaries in the South have been called Communist. The Mundt-Nixon bill states that anyone who subverts the interests of the United States by aiding the accomplishment of either the immediate or the ultimate objectives of the world Communist movement comes under the penalties of the act. Do you agree that supporters of rent control or public housing or antitrust laws, as well as opponents of universal military training, could be included under these provisions?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Definitely, that is certainly true. Every major step forward in our history from Jefferson's day to ours has been attacked as furthering the objectives of communism. The late President Roosevelt came in for his share of this kind of wild talk. FEPC has been called on the floor of Congress the beginning of a communistic dictatorship the like of which Americans never dreamed. That was by Congressman RANKIN, a member, by the way, of the Un-American Activities Committee, and he approves this bill. The committee called CIO-PAC by far the most sinister of all Communist coalitions. During the committee's Hollywood hearings a movie was referred to as containing communistic propaganda because the villain was a banker. With this background, such a sweeping provision would cover everything and anything. It reveals how far down the road this country is going in its hysteria.

Mr. GAETH. I think it also indicates why some of the important newspapers in the country are already attacking this provision. For instance, the Washington Post in denouncing the Mundt bill in an editorial on April 19, said: "If Congress could at its own discretion declare it to be a fact that Communists and their fellow travelers are conspirators, it could do the same about Roman Catholics, or trade-unionists, or the organizers of a third party." Now, let's go into another phase of the Mundt-Nixon bill. Will this Mundt-Nixon bill build up a blacklist?

Mr. EBERHARTER. It builds up a blacklist running into the millions by requiring the registration of the membership of a Communist political organization; and by requiring that the records of Communist-front organizations be open, it builds up a blacklist in all sections of our society. Not only would it mean a blacklist among workers in shops who might belong to unions so designated, but it would include anybody who signed a petition with which the Attorney General might not agree. Furthermore, this blacklist is based on the unconstitutional principle of guilt by association. It will hit the rank-and-file members. If you had reasonable grounds to believe that your fraternal lodge was communistic, you are guilty and subject to 2 years' imprisonment and $5,000 fine. Join an organization, stay in one, if its leaders do not register you are guilty under this bill not only if the organization does anything, but also if the organization is allegedly being used by the world Communist movement.

Mr. GAETH. Now, those are all issues and problems which, of course, are of deep concern to us and about which we think, I believe, you think, something ought to be done. Certainly if this type of legislation were placed on the statute books of the United States, we'd be in for some serious difficulty if we continue to live in a hysterical era. And we're now, of course, in the midst of hysteria. I want to thank you, Congressman, for your consideration, answers, statements you have made. I'm certain our listeners will appreciate hearing your appraisal of this bill. Certainly this appears to be hysterical legislation not in line with the intent of our Constitution. It aims at fighting an evil by methods which history shows us dictators have used to gain power. This legislation aims at making a totalitarian state impossible, but if this legislation were enacted it would actually be a step in putting a totalitarian state into operation here in the United States.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I agree with you, Mr. Gaeth, I appreciate your giving me this opportunity to state my views.

A Program for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an address delivered on May 14, 1948, by Hon. William E. Warne, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, at a luncheon before the Seattle Chamber of Commerce on A Program for Alaska:

Seattle is in a position to know the problem and the challenge of Alaska. Seattle has been the link between Continental United States and Alaska. You know that after 80 years of ownership by the United States, Alaska still remains a nearly empty land.

Communication and trade between the States and Alaska can and must be improved. Seattle, of course, will continue to play an important role in the flow of people and goods to and from Alaska.

The opportunity for Alaska is an opportunity for Seattle. Your wholesale warehouses will supply goods and equipment for Alaskan settlers and workers, old and new. Your steamship and air lines are today the principal means by which people and goods move to and from Alaska. The Alaska trade of Seattle has bulked large in its history.

The businessmen of Seattle naturally have had a direct interest in Alaska, which may have served to obscure the general lack of interest over the years in the progress of the Territory. The Territory was isolated and largely dependent on ocean transport. Maritime rates to Alaska have been high; shipping has been hazardous. The high prices in Alaska have deterred both settlement and trade, despite the great natural resources of Alaska.

Seattle can expect to contribute substantially to future Alaskan trade, but I am sure that you sense, as I do, the interest of other Pacific seacoast ports. They wish to share in the Alaskan trade. Besides that, modern cargo planes can already deliver from the East or Middle West into the interior of Alaska in perfect condition in a fraction of rail and steamer time and at rates already competitive with rail and steamer. If you businessmen of Seattle wish to maintain your place in the Alaskan picture of tomorrow, you will have to be alert and progressive. The test will be the extent to which you improve your services to Alaska and adjust costs. Increased trade, lower unit costs, reduced prices—this is the formula to keep you abreast of Alaskan development.

Recent events have transformed the conditions affecting Alaska. The war in the Pacific revealed its strategic importance. Great works were built in and for Alaska. The Alaskan Highway, for example, supplied the first modern route by land between the States and Alaska. The pivotal importance of Alaska in strategic matters is self-evident. Alaska today is a crossroads on the new airways that crisscross the North. As a result, the Nation is beginning to recognize that Alaska never again will be a land apart. By good fortune, the need for the development and the settlement of Alaska is matched by the opportunities for stable economic development. That is why the Federal Government has become concerned with the need for strengthening the economy of Alaska and for encouraging its settlement.

Before I tell you something about the present plans for Alaska I would like to remind you of the Federal interests in Alaska. In the Interior Department alone, to name but one, the following bureaus and divisions have program responsibilities in Alaska: Division of Territories, Land Management, Indian Affairs, Mines, Geological Survey, Fish and Wildlife, and the Park Service, while the Power Division and the Oil and Gas Division have direct policy interests. Besides the Department of the Interior, other Federal departments have important responsibilities: Army, Air Force, Navy, Commerce (especially the Civil Aeronautics Administration), Agriculture, Federal Works, Federal Security, Post Office, Housing and Home Finance, Justice, and Treasury. The coordination of the planning and execution of the activities involved in these programs, from preliminary through final stages, involves a concept which has until this last year been lacking. This is the task which we have undertaken in the past year, and great progress has appeared. Much more can be done toward bringing about a sound governmental program in Alaska worthy of the vast potentialities of the region.

President Truman and the Secretary of the Interior have taken the keenest interest in Alaska. A year ago the President asked the Department to take the initiative in formulating a comprehensive and adequate pro-

gram for long-term development. First, the heads of the Interior bureaus and agencies were asked by Secretary Krug to present to Congress a coordinated departmental program for the fiscal year 1949. The urgency of the situation made it obligatory upon the Department to formulate its programs in terms of activities equal to the demands of the world situation. The Alaskan program of the Department for the first time was presented as a "package" before the House Appropriations Committee during the February hearings. Although the committee's final recommendations are not known, the overall program approach was received by the committee with great interest and apparent approval. I made the presentation and I was most encouraged.

Besides the streamlining of Alaskan activities within the Department by concentrating them officially under an Assistant Secretary, Secretary Krug invited other Federal agencies with Alaskan responsibilities to participate in an Interagency Committee on the Development of Alaska. The invitation was accepted with enthusiasm. The committee, which I serve as chairman, began its work in November 1947. Four subcommittees have been established, one on transportation, one on housing and community facilities, one on health, education, and welfare, and one on resource policy and development. The committee and its subcommittees have made invaluable contributions to the drawing of a program for Alaska.

On the basis of reports of the committee and its subcommittees and on the basis of some additional work in the Department, a program for action has been formulated. It presents a practical approach by which the Federal Government, the Territorial government, local bodies, and private individuals can collaborate in a program to meet certain of the most urgent needs of Alaska. The program for Alaska, summarized below, needs and deserves broad support.

1. Statehood for Alaska should be granted and should become effective as soon as possible. It will give the people of Alaska the dignity, the responsibility, the powers, and the representation in Washington which they need in order to carry their proper share of the load.

2. The entire transportation system, by water, land, and air, to, from, and within Alaska, must be improved and expanded so that military and civilian needs can be fully met. The rates must not handicap the people and the business enterprise of Alaska. Some of the aspects of the transportation program follow:

Improved shipping services to and from Alaska, with Government subsidy, if needed, to reduce rates to a level which will promote development.

Complete rehabilitation of the Alaska Railroad by 1950 to provide cheaper and more dependable service from tidewater to interior Alaska.

Reconstruction and hard-surfacing of the trunk road system within Alaska and the extension of new roads into areas which promise development.

Negotiation with Canada for the improvement of the Haines cut-off and for a hard-surfaced road across Canada to Alaska.

Investigation by the Department of the Interior, the Department of the Army, and the State Department of the economic and strategic desirability of completing a railroad from the States to Alaska.

Improvement of civil air facilities in Alaska.

Federal harbor and dock improvement program for Alaska.

3. Land settlement on a considerable scale will require governmental cooperation. The present machinery for opening to settlement land in the Alaska public domain is antiquated. It is no more suited to modern conditions than the old motor car, with a crank on one side, which ran forward but not back, which we made at the time the present land law was enacted. In order to encourage permanent agriculture settlement in Alaska, there is need for:

A means of establishing settlement areas on certain portions of the public domain, for subdividing such land into tracts for family-size farms, and for reserving appropriate tracts for municipal and industrial purposes.

Provision for transferring these lands to individuals and groups for settlement.

Governmental assistance in financing settlement and land development, and in preparing lands and facilities necessary for settlement.

4. Industries are also necessary and must have whatever assistance is required to get them under way. Private enterprise must be encouraged to establish and operate these industries. If the Government has to show the way by developing power and other facilities, by building pilot plants, by making loans for industrial development, it must not hesitate. The ordinarily slow processes of piecemeal development cannot now meet the needs or fulfill the national interest. An industrial development corporation with ample resources and broad powers should be provided by the Congress, to exercise such powers as:

To encourage and promote the investment of private capital in industrial, agricultural, commercial, or related enterprises.

To make loans for the establishment of such enterprises.

To facilitate the development of synthetic fuels from coal in Alaska.

5. The mineral resources of Alaska are known to be large, but our present information respecting these resources is wholly inadequate. Thorough exploration throughout Alaska is necessary. Plans are necessary so that access to critically needed minerals can be provided by roads and railways, and so that power and other facilities for mining can be available.

6. Public utilities and other community facilities are absolutely essential to sound growth, and at present woefully inadequate. A comprehensive program for such facilities already has been prepared by the Federal Works Agency. It should be made effective promptly and the necessary funds provided, with Federal assistance in part. Facilities are needed most urgently at Anchorage and Fairbanks. Works to be constructed will include hospitals, health centers, schools, streets, water and sewage-disposal systems, and other like construction.

7. Alaska has enormous hydroelectric power possibilities. New electric power is fundamental in the establishment of a pulp industry and other industrial enterprises, as well as in the meeting of residential and commercial requirements. The public interest is paramount in this field and the Government is already active elsewhere on a grand scale. Here in the Northwest, the benefits from such enterprises as Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams are impressive. We must extend our thinking on power to the large undeveloped power resources of Alaska. The potentialities of such development are great and the responsibility is ours. Both studies and action are needed and neither should be delayed.

8. No region can attract and sustain a large and contented population without health facilities. Because of the circumstances of climate, isolation from the medical resources of the States, and the special health problem of the native people, the Government must take the major responsibility for providing health facilities. The Territory and the people will help, of course, to the extent of their abilities. This calls for hospitals and expanded public health service. More doctors, dentists, specialists, nurses, and technicians are needed in Alaska. The building of a mental hospital is an obvious feature of such a program. The present plan of holding mental patients in jails and then sending them to a private institution 2,000 miles away is unworthy.

9. One of the knotty problems which deters Alaskan development is that of native land rights. Volumes have been written about the legal, economic, social, and ethical implications of this question, and I certainly shall not undertake to condense them for you today. Let it suffice to say that the Interior Department wants to see the question settled fairly and permanently. The Department believes that this end can be achieved by negotiations with the natives, with resulting agreements to be subject to congressional approval, as required, and agreed payments to be provided out of the general fund of the Treasury for lands relinquished, if any and if needed. Such agreements would insure protection of the rights of the natives, would clear the way to their permanent use and enjoyment of the areas awarded to them, and would also clear up the question of title on other lands, thereby encouraging industrial and other development.

In addition to these programs, we feel that the Inter-Agency Committee for the Development of Alaska should continue its joint studies and discussions and that all the affected Government agencies should intensify their own efforts in Alaska. Among other things, the committee is considering what special measures, if any, would be needed to facilitate settlement in Alaska of an appropriate number of carefully selected persons from war refugee camps in Western Europe. Many of these refugees had their homes in areas where climatic conditions are similar to those of middle Alaska.

I have told you what the Government is doing and proposing. The action taken by us will be controlling in the fate of Alaska. The Nation cannot afford in these days not to face squarely its responsibility for its safety and welfare. The responsibility in Alaska is an essential and very important part of our National obligation. In fulfilling the program we need your understanding. We would like you to engage in some self-searching. What is the chamber doing about Alaska? What are your affiliated organizations in Alaska doing? How can the fishery, shipping, and the wholesale enterprises of Seattle contribute most effectively to the promotion of a sound, healthy and permanent settlement and economy in Alaska? The answer you give will be important to yourselves, to the Federal Government, and most important, to the people of Alaska and the United States.

Annual Encampment of Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, the veterans of Foreign Wars will hold their annual national encampment in St. Louis commencing August 29 and lasting until September 3. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an excerpt taken from Foreign Service, the monthly magazine of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, for the month of June 1948:

"MEET ME IN ST. LOUIE, LOUIE!"—TWO OVERSEAS BUDDIES MAKE A DATE FOR AUGUST 29–SEPTEMBER 3

JOE CIVILIAN,

VFW Member, Anywhere, U. S. A.

DEAR JOE: Well, Joe, when I wrote you last month I said "Meet me in St. Louis," and I thought you knew what I was shooting at.

But maybe you haven't been a member long enough to get wise.

Anyhow, Joe, it's the national encampment of the VFW and, believe me, you don't want to miss it. I was like you, I guess, back in Boston in September 1946. I was a member, even then—joined up out at Pearl but, to tell you the truth, I didn't know much about this VFW business either.

I had a date that night in Boston. About the first of September, I guess it was. My date and myself went downtown to take in a movie. Everywhere we looked we saw VFW caps and uniforms. Lots of oldtimers, but plenty of young Joes too. They were all over the place, singing, marching in the middle of the streets and having a heck of a lot of good-natured fun.

I asked somebody "What gives?" and he said "Mean you don't know, and you've got a VFW button on, too?" Then he told me it was the VFW national convention.

Well, we went over to the Statler for a beer and we hadn't pushed our way through the crowd in the lobby more than 30 feet when I bumped smack into old Dave. You remember Dave, in our old outfit. At that time, he was a post commander somewhere back in Ohio. Before we knew it, he had rounded up five or six others of the old gang, and, brother, I'd hate to tell you what time I got my date back home that night!

Well, Joe, Cleveland last year was more of the same, and I'm telling you I wouldn't miss St. Louie for all the tea in China, and, by the way, Joe, that date I had in Boston will be there too, only this time she's the Mrs. and she's something or other in the auxiliary. We're making it on vacation time, Joe, and from what they tell me St. Louie is just about tops for things to see and do. Just seeing that big parade is worth all the expense of going.

And, Joe, I got hep to a lot of things at Boston and Cleveland. Don't let anybody tell you a vets' convention is all fun and frolic. 'Tain't so, Joe. There's plenty of right down serious work—the boys go to it like they mean business. They have their fun, but they're plenty serious about doing things for the GI who's in hard luck, and especially about the wives and kids of the ones that didn't get back. You should hear some of their arguments on the convention floor.

I remember when I was a kid hearing mom kid the old man about not wanting to miss a VFW convention. She used to say he just wanted to get away on a binge. But I've found out, Joe, that there's more to it than that. They have fun, plenty of it, but take it from me, pal, there wouldn't be any GI bill or widows' pensions or other real benefits for vets today if dad and the others hadn't put in plenty of work at VFW encampments.

Read your Foreign Service in July, Joe, and get the low-down. Save some of the shekels from that good job you told me about and let's make it a date in St. Louis, August 29 to September 3. Be seein' you, pal.

As ever,

JACK.

The Manganese Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. RUSSELL
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I feel the Members of the House will be interested in a very brief article which appears in Washington Party Line, by Robert S. Allen in the current issue of Collier's for May 29, 1948. This situation, I believe, is admirably met with the Russell bill, H. R. 6623. Gentlemen, the time is short. Let us not continue to be dependent upon foreign sources for any strategic or critical metal or mineral that is possible of production in our own country. I quote the article:

If you are in any way interested in metals, grab on to every ounce you can get hold of—fast. Already in very short supply, steel, copper, zinc, lead, chromium, and so forth, will be even scarcer 6 months from now when the big defense and foreign recovery programs get into full swing. And the scarcity will continue for some time to come.

NOTE.—The manganese situation is so serious that National Security Resources Board officials are privately discussing the desirability of instituting a Government project to devise a method to produce steel without manganese. The United States is dependent almost entirely on foreign sources for this vital ingredient; 35 percent has been coming from Russia.

What Communist Rule Would Mean to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following article by Dorothy Thompson, which appeared in a recent issue of the Washington Evening Star:

ON THE RECORD—WHAT COMMUNIST RULE WOULD MEAN TO UNITED STATES, AS REDS MIGHT DESCRIBE IT

(By Dorothy Thompson)

If the Communists told the people what they tell themselves, they would say:

"The social system of the United States demands radical overthrow. Its institutions, Constitution, Congress, courts, schools, and free associations are but reflections of the economic system. The destruction of capitalism cannot be accomplished while maintaining the existing government and social institutions, including civil liberties and the existent codes of morality.

"The establishment of communism requires a total dictatorship whose primary business is to maintain itself in power against all opposition by any and every means."

TO SEIZE LAND

"It must take over immediately all public communications; take over without compensation all industries employing more than a handful of workers; purge courts and substitute party judges; rewrite textbooks and remove unreliable teachers; compel all professions to join party-controlled organizations or be barred from practice by refusal to join or failure to conform; break resistance from farmers, the most numerous and dangerous of our enemies, by taking away all land capable of yielding more than bare subsistence; and put hostile personalities of known public following immediately into prison.

"Since the purges, unfortunately essential for success, will unemploy millions whose labor nevertheless is demanded by the State, these will be organized in labor brigades under armed guards and employed at the most menial tasks for a diet sufficient to sustain life, provided they are initially in good health.

"It is incorrect to think that American organized workers certainly can be counted on to give cooperation. It is, therefore, essential to break and disband their organizations and reform them under Communist leadership in a single labor front. Since their new employers will be state trusts, no excuse will exist for hostile agitation which, together with strikes, will be ruthlessly proscribed."

INTERNAL SPY NET

"We must not deceive ourselves that there will not be long-continued resistance. Therefore, among all bodies of workers there must be a spy for every 20 or 30. Each apartment house, residence block, and office must have one, and for this purpose criminal elements and professional police spies from the previous regime can be employed. Youth, in natural rebellion against its elders, will—when properly indoctrinated—prove invaluable informers concerning resistance in their homes.

"Among such a people as the Americans singularly unadapted to being pushed around, the problem of mass support will be acute.

"We must not err in thinking that all or most of the people now supporting us—in the various front organizations and the Wallace party—will see the revolution through in its most ruthless aspects. To a dangerous extent all American classes have been imbued with inordinate respect for human life and bourgeois moral squeamishness. While it is advisable to use these people as allies for the conquest of power, many of them early will prove disloyal and have to be purged, with temporary bad repercussions on the minds of their followers."

TO APPEAL TO LOWEST STRATA

"Yet our dictatorship must have some mass support. We shall find this in the lowest mental and moral strata of the population. Therefore, initially, we must permit indiscriminate lootings of properties, encouragement to bands to take residence in better-class homes and possession of farms. This will furnish us with initial dynamic force and with tens of thousands of individuals who will thereafter carry out our bidding on pain of being dispossessed of what they have acquired thievishly.

"In all this we run the risk of civil war. Fortunately, however, the United States does not possess a large army whose garrisons, mutinying, might overthrow our plans.

"We realize the catastrophic nature of such a revolution, which will entail so great a dislocation of the economy as to cause, in all likelihood, a period of mass famine. Nevertheless, it is our duty as Communists always to take the long view."

A United Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include three editorials and a newspaper article by Dorothy Thompson:

[From the Washington Post, May 18, 1948]

GREAT DESIGN

Mr. Churchill went back to Henry IV (1589-1610) for the inspiration of the move-

ment to federate Europe, but, in fact, the author of the great design was Henry's great minister and mentor, the Duc de Sully. It was not till 28 years after Henry had died that Sully attributed to his late sovereign a project for welding together a European federation. Both of them were so impatient to improve French society that they were prepared to go to almost any length in order to promote a peaceful environment out of the perennial conflict over religion. The memory of both of these remarkable men is revered in French history.

An alliance rather than an association was primarily in Sully's mind—an alliance against the House of Hapsburg. Yet forms of association, intended to knit Europe together as well as to intimidate Austria, were set forth. Under the great design the constituent states of Europe were to be allowed representation in a general council, though there was a recognition of the inequalities of power in the provision that major powers should have four representatives and minor powers two. Force was to be used in keeping the peace through an international army. Nothing, alas, came of the scheme. Indeed, Sully offered it as an ironical memorial on what might have been, as if in the circumstances of the day the idea itself was too farfetched to be thought of except as an essay in Utopia.

Actually, as we have seen, Sully's project was half utopian, half practical. But it was the idea that caught the fancy of succeeding philosophers. Down the years the Sully memorial was taken up as the basis of a federation movement. The first thinker who approached the problem ethically was Immanuel Kant, who, though agreeing with such philosophers as Hobbes and Hegel that man was by nature selfish and base, believed that history had proved to mankind that organized states catered to self-interest. He thought that when men came to realize that rival societies or states were just as disastrous to self-interest as individual rivalry, they would federate their states. The League of Nations was greatly indebted to the principles enunciated by Kant.

Most important in the Kantian approach is the suggestion that only free peoples could associate in a true federation movement. Without liberty and equality assured to the individual, a federation, in Kant's mind, would be without meaning or substance. Kant thus had a moral idea as well as enlightened self-interest back of his project. Mr. Clarence Streit's Federal Union is the only one of the modern ideas on federation or world government that carries out the Kantian doctrine, though the British Commonwealth is a demonstration of it. "Every state for the sake of its own security," said Kant, "may and ought to demand that its neighbor should submit itself to conditions similar to those of the civil society where the right of every individual is guaranteed."

Association to secure peace and justice is what mankind needs, more than an alliance simply to defend peace. But, as in Sully's time, the realization of danger without a common defense precedes the realization of the advantage of peaceful association. We have already seen the beginnings of this approach in the Vandenberg-Lovett resolution on the regional system in Europe and the "revision" of the United Nations. All that is contemplated at present is a nexus across the Atlantic based on mutual help in defense. This could perfectly well come into being under articles 51–54 of the UN Charter. Article 51 provides for collective defense, articles 52–54 for regional arrangements. But if these were activated in tying together the nations on both sides of the Atlantic, and the organization built out of the cession of some sovereignty to a Federal authority, the foundation of an organized free world rather than a mere alliance might well be in prospect. At least the community of mankind would be made visible in the way that has been envisaged all the way back to Henry IV and Sully.

[From the New Orleans Item of May 10, 1948]

AT THE HAGUE

Again Winston Churchill has struck out boldly at the shackles of national sovereignty. His call for the immediate formation of a United European Assembly, to pave the way for eventual federation, is a challenge that cannot be pushed aside if the present leaders in western Europe intend to gird themselves against possible disaster.

But Mr. Churchill's address at the Hague before the "Congress of Europe," wherein 22 nations were represented by 600 delegates, has a special meaning for America, too. There can be no misunderstanding when he says: "I was anxious at first lest the United States of America should view with hostility the idea of a United States of Europe, but I rejoice that the great Republic in its era of world leadership has risen far above such moods."

The British statesman's anxiety is understandable, for 1 year ago the American Government was still reluctant to take official notice of the widespread popular support accorded by our citizens to the concept of a United States of Europe. Only by successive reinterpretations has the Marshall plan now arrived at a point reached sometime ago by a great many informed people here and in Europe.

Fortunately, time has not yet run out. With generous material aid and moral encouragement, the American Government and its people are committed to the rehabilitation of Europe through cooperative endeavor. It remains for the free peoples of Europe to band together in common effort to attain a security and prosperity denied their separate entities. In that effort, they are assured of America's active support.

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 11, 1948]

BIRTH OF A NEW HOPE

It was not simply because of a warm Dutch sun that a crowd of more than 10,000 packed a great public square in Amsterdam on Sunday. The huge audience was there to listen enthusiastically to eloquent appeals for an ideal that has come to capture the imagination and earnest support of ever-growing numbers of Europeans, regardless of nationality or station in life. The ideal—a federated continent—is centuries old, but never has there been so widespread a desire as now to do something concrete to lift it out of the realm of the abstract into the realm of the real.

There is a reason for this, of course. The Second World War and its aftermath have demonstrated that free Europe cannot recover its old vigor and remain free if it keeps on being a wilderness of separate and clashing sovereignties, nursing old grudges within itself and perpetuating its ancient political and economic rivalries. In an immediate, short-range sense, the independent part of it—the part on this side of the iron curtain—must move toward greater and greater unity as swiftly as possible. It must do so to protect itself against the pressing danger of falling victim in piecemeal fashion—one country at a time—to the Kremlin's relentless drive to spread the Red tyranny everywhere.

Beyond that, in a long-range sense, the European peoples must work for the eventual creation of a continent-wide federation, including the states currently dominated by Moscow. They have compelling reasons for this. In the first place, because the economies of eastern and western Europe are complementary and interdependent, meshing them together would raise the living standards of all Europeans. In the second place, a continental union would promote an enduring peace by bringing Europe's strength into line with that of America and Soviet Russia—a development that would create an international balance of power far safer than the one that exists now.

Before the outbreak of the Second World War, the idea of federation, though interesting, had little more than an academic meaning for Europeans. But today they see it in a different light; they see it as something vital to their future political, economic, and military well-being. That is why the 10,000 in the Amsterdam square on Sunday loudly cheered Winston Churchill's call for union as a bulwark against tyranny. That is why they cheered former French Premier Ramadier when he hailed the "Congress of Europe" at The Hague as "the birth of a new hope." That is why that congress—though unofficial, though sponsored by no government—has won world-wide attention and attracted distinguished delegates from no fewer than 21 European lands, including several behind the iron curtain.

All this is significant as evidence of how the ideal of a continental federation has gained great and constantly increasing public support. Total fulfillment may not be realized for many decades to come, but genuine progress is being made through nongovernmental undertakings like The Hague Congress and history-making official enterprises like the 16-nation European recovery program and the new union of Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg. The eventual creation of a united Europe is no longer an unattainable goal. The more the peoples of that continent think about it, the more they will regard it as essential to their happiness and the closer they will come to achieving it. The new hope seen by M. Ramadier is not an empty one.

ON THE RECORD—CHURCHILL'S CONCEPT OF UNITED EUROPE OFFERS NEW HOPE OF MIDDLE GROUND

(By Dorothy Thompson)

Speaking in Amsterdam on Sunday to 30,000 cheering persons, Winston Churchill again lifted the banner, which he was the first to raise, for a free united Europe.

He declared that a united Europe must be "safe from foreign aggression or inroads," and that it must be a Europe in which men will be proud to say "I am a European."

What he was proposing was nothing more nor less than a European nation in which, regardless of the form of its economy, tyranny—which is internal rule by naked force and essentially non-European—will be outlawed.

That this should come to pass is, in the opinion of this columnist, the one way to a pacification of relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union, provided we understand the necessities for the preservation of such a revived European civilization.

LEADS TOWARD WAR

"A united Europe must be safe from foreign aggression."

Yes. But it will not be safe until we clearly abandon the concept responsible for the present precarious situation, leading inevitably toward war.

That concept, expressed at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, has resulted in the division of the world into two great power orbits. In turn, this has brought about the division of Europe into Russian and American satellites, into eastern and western zones, drawing a battle line between two non-European powers through the center of European civilization.

This holds a fearful menace for Europe, for the United States, and for the Soviet Union.

It disregards the essential facts of civilization.

Situated between the two poles—USA and USSR—Europe is neither western nor eastern, but middle. It is neither a Russian nor

an American civilization, but something specific in itself and different from either. It is an area which must be refilled with its own life and power, and relieved of the tensions that now pull it in twain.

This means that Europe must be—all of it—a neutralized area between the United States and the USSR, with no inch of it any part of a cordon sanitaire of one great power against the other. For it is precisely along such fixed lines of cordons that conflicts inevitably sharpen into war.

ANSWERABLE TO HISTORY

Both the Soviet Union and the United States are answerable before the bar of history for a power policy which, if not abandoned by both, will wreck the world and themselves. Each is pusuing the chimera of strength through power instead of peace through diversity and equilibrium. Each is obsessed by the one-world concept which, in its present dynamic, leads inexorably to one master state, to be achieved by just one more war.

The concept is Caesaristic and anticivilization, marked by an advanced condition of paranoia. It is anticivilization because it not only divides the world into two military orbits but also into two ideological orbits, revolutionary and counterrevolutionary. This carries the Soviets into a Trotskyism they had abandoned and the United States into a reaction we likewise had abandoned, and all because we allow no fresh life to grow independently between us.

It is anticivilization because it disregards the very existence of civilizations, each drawing from its own history, traditions, and necessity its peculiar and distinctive patterns to enrich the manifold picture of human life. It therefore tends, not toward progress and liberation but toward rigidity and stagnation.

God forbid that there should ever be either a Soviet or an American world. For if there were, there would be neither a Russian Union nor an American Republic, but an amorphous anarchy controlled by armies, and splitting at every seam.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the House because of illness on May 3, the one hundred and fifty-seventh anniversary of the signing of the Polish Constitution in 1791, one of the world's great documents of freedom. Under special orders, 1 hour was set aside so that the Members of the House could pay respectful tribute to the observance of the Polish day of freedom and all it represents. I wish at this time to include the remarks I would have made on that day had I been present.

No people in history have undergone more bitter persecution and suffering in the name of human liberty than the Polish people. Their history is replete with struggle and sacrifice. We in America can well be grateful to Poland and to the Americans of Polish extraction for what they have contributed to our country, from its beginning. What the Fourth of July represents to us here in America, the 3d of May represents to all true Poles—to those in Poland and in exile, and to the millions of our fellow citizens of Polish extraction in whose hearts burns the same love of freedom that drove Kosciusko to fight on the side of a few small colonies against one of the great powers of Europe. Today Poland lies under the heel of a government which takes its orders from Moscow. She is again suffering oppression and is denied the rights to have a government representing the will of her people. It is my sincere hope and prayer that it will not be long before we will all rejoice that Poland and its people are once again celebrating freedom from tyranny.

Our American Pension Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. BUTLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by me on May 11, 1948:

It is a genuine pleasure for me to be home in Buffalo for this splendid occasion. I have a deep sense of interest in this district as it is my district, and it is also my appointed task to represent it in the Congress of the United States. It is not only my duty to meet with you and report to you on occasions when it is convenient for me to do so. It is my pleasure as well. I am not only a citizen of Buffalo and your Representative in the Congress, I am also a member of and one of the original collaborators who formed our American pension organization. It is therefore with a sense of genuine pride that I can participate in our rally of the Buffalo area as one with you in this organized effort to promote national patriotism and pensions.

While we are a young organization, only slightly over 1 year of age to be more exact, we have come a long way since the first conferences were held contemplating the formation of an organization. We are perhaps the youngest national pension organization in the country. In spite of that, we are today the second largest, and I should say, growing rapidly. Who knows? Perhaps we shall be the largest and so soon that it may surprise us all. This is not said to criticize or discredit the work of any other organization that is sincerely working for either pensions or patriotism. Ours is a cordial and friendly attitude toward all other organizations, including pension organizations. In this regard I should like to pay my respects to the General Welfare Federation particularly. That organization has been cooperating in our united effort to obtain action on pensions in this session of the Congress. Their representative in Washington, Rev. Dr. Boorde, is closely in touch with the American Pension Office and also with the Members of the House who are heading the drive. We have enjoyed a most cordial and friendly relationship and have worked together as one in Washington in behalf of the cause of better pensions now. We also note the work of other pension organizations. I hear that State organizations in Michigan, in Illinois, in Colorado, in Indiana, and in other States are showing a fine spirit of cooperation with the work of our national organization. This spirit of good will and cooperation is as it should be. Certainly those of us who are sincerely interested in a cause will welcome the aid of others who are working in behalf of the same cause.

I am pleased furthermore with the patriotic aspects of our American pension clubs. I am aware that it was largely because of this aspect that brought this organization into being. We do know, to our profound sorrow, that there are those among us in America, who are beneficiaries of all of the blessings that come with citizenship in the greatest country on earth, and who do not appear to appreciate the blessings that they so richly enjoy. I am addressing myself now to those who would seek to undermine the Republic and worth to change it for some other form. In Washington we know them as Communists, fellow travelers, pinks, and various other names. It is a characteristic of these people to work their way into good American organizations. Then they become most ardent and enthusiastic workers, ostensibly for the cause for which the organization exists. By their apparent outstanding service they work their way to top or strategic and influential positions or offices. Then they begin to talk and exploit their hazy but high-minded philosophy, frequently paying service to a so-called higher type democracy and a new kind of freedom, security, yes, a new order. To promote it they become eager to criticize our Government. They find fault with property right. They condemn our party system. They seem to ally themselves with the little people against so-called big people. They may take either side of an argument in order to keep an argument going, thus aiding dissension and disunity. They are quick to support all kinds of reform and thus get a chance to attack, or discredit something, or anything that may be traditionally American. Yes, they follow a pattern. That pattern is becoming known to our people in practically every walk of life. They are now and have for some time been working like the very parasites that they are, in all types of organizations. They are in the Government, yes, in all branches of the Government. They are in the political organizations. They are in the schools and colleges, in the patriotic and fraternal societies, in labor unions, business and industrial organizations, in pension organizations, as you here so well know, yes, and they are also burrowing into the church of the living God. They are a plague that blights and damns all forms of our social, political, spiritual, and economic life. I am glad that the American Pension Organization does not invite them to its membership. I am glad you have a twofold purpose.

I am proud that the first of those purposes is patriotism. It should be clear to all that unless the Republic survives against this threat of communism and every other enemy that would destroy it, that any pension legislation even though enacted, would be worse than useless. So, we say to Mr. Un-American, though he be Communist, fellow traveler, Fascist, Nazi, or whatever type enemy of the Republic he may be; we say boldly and clearly, This is an American organization and we do not have room for you. By making this crystal clear, we shall not perhaps be bothered with this malady of saboteurs boring from within to weaken or misdirect our organization in its work for its sound and worthy objectives. By maintaining this charged atmosphere of patriotism, we shall be able to discern and to deal with any one of them that might by chance slip through our guard and become a member. I was much interested in this aspect of our organization from the very first, and am extremely proud of it now.

Yet, we do not indulge in anything that might be termed a witch hunt. We adhere closely to our declared constructive objectives. We take neither side on any subject not contained in our stated objectives. We seek to win by making friends and promoting the things that are good, as we see them. We have no time to fight against or oppose extraneous evils or promote even other good things on which there might be a division of

opinion. By building constructively on sound and reasonable objectives, we shall make the friends and enlist the support necessary to win our just and reasonable cause. That we are right in these assumptions is attested by the great strides that we have made. It is phenomenal. No pension campaign in Congress in the history of the pension movement can compare with the progress that we have made in this Congress.

When the Eightieth Congress opened we did not have even a bill to present. We had no program. We had very little organization in the field and none in the House of Representatives. We did have a deep and abiding conviction that something should be done in the pension field toward these two important objectives. Let me name them again, "patriotism and pensions." We knew that there was a great majority of the people in the United States, and a great majority of the Members of Congress as well who would agree with us in our sound and reasonable views.

A few of us got together. We wanted to work out a program for the House of Representatives and for the country that would express and embody our views. The result is our American pension program. It is working. It is seeking to unite every pension advocate of good will, who is true to his or her country, in an effort to enact into law a generous, uniform, American, pension for all citizens unemployed above the age of 60 and without a means test.

We proceed in a friendly way. We abstain from taking sides on extraneous issues. We ask for a reasonable pension, $60 per month to take the place of old-age assistance in this Congress. We feel that no one can say that $60 is too much. Once this is achieved we shall review our positions and set our new goals. Many of us would like to have the pension up to at least $100 per month. But, we know the easiest and surest way to $100 is to get $60 first.

We have come a long way toward our goal. Starting in this Congress with nothing, we now have the signatures of 197 Members, according to our last stated report, already signed in favor of our program. We expect to have a majority by the time our bill reaches the floor. We are hopeful it will be yet in this Congress. Also that we shall not only succeed in bringing the bill to the floor but we shall make it law.

Let me say again, in conclusion, that I am happy to be a part of this sound and patriotic pension movement. I value my associations with the leaders in this cause both in Washington and in the field. Folks like Mrs. Lorich and all you good workers right here in Buffalo, Paul Chase and the fine staff at the state office in Syracuse, Russell Saville, Beecher Hess, Thomas Laite, and the staff in Washington. These fine folks are not only the leaders in this pension work to me, they are my personal friends as well. I want to pay them, and all others in this cause, a tribute. It has meant some very real sacrifice to bring this organization into being. It has meant personal sacrifice for all of them to make the progress that has been made. But, good friends, it is worth it all. Let us think what it will mean to every American when we know that every father and mother of us all will be assured of a reasonable pension, a cash income, every month so long as they shall live.

Sunday was Mother's Day. I say to you, that even the young people of our Nation will be immeasurably benefited if they could know that we had the American pension operating to make secure and comfortable not only their own, but all American mothers. Do you not think they will support us in this cause? Just ask them if you have a question. In all of my experience, not one single one has failed to agree. Yes, the cause of pensions is an American cause. It is the cause of all Americans. Therefore, I am, I repeat again, proud that we have an American pension cause.

Newspaper Editors' Poll of Senators For Colliers' Prizes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article under the heading "These days" by George E. Sokolsky, published in the Washington Times-Herald of May 23, 1948.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Let us have a look at the advisory Nation-wide poll of daily newspaper editors for the Collier's prizes. The top 10 for first and second choices for the Senator who this year provided the most distinguished services shows:

	First	Second
Taft	113	36
Vandenberg	45	35
Byrd	21	35
Morse	9	7
Barkley	6	6
Flanders	6	6
Ball	5	17
Ferguson	5	10
Connally	5	3
Ives	3	6

Of these 10 the poll shows that 7 are Republicans. Although Collier's ignored the newspaper editors' judgment, passing over four names to reach Senator BARKLEY, the fact remains that the only new Dealer among the 10 is Senator BARKLEY.

TAFT received more votes by eight than the remaining nine added together. This is particularly significant because the poll was taken on a Nation-wide scale, covering all parts of the country and all shades of political opinion.

The fact that the Collier's committee, headed by Eric Johnston, chose to ignore this poll, rejecting TAFT, who received 113 votes, and accepting BARKLEY, who received 6 votes, is something that requires a better explanation than that the committee had decided to disregard candidates for the Presidency. What, even if that is true, is the excuse for disregarding BYRD and MORSE, who are not candidates?

Considering the Washington newswriters, editors, broadcasters, and columnists, altogether 28 of them, TAFT received 12 as first choice, 2 as second choice, 2 as third choice; BARKLEY, 3 as first choice, 2 as second choice, 5 as third choice. On the first choice, TAFT leads BARKLEY 4 to 1. But this, too, is ignored by the Collier's committee.

If the first 10 senatorial names are studied in the Washington poll, 9 out of 10 are Republicans; namely, TAFT, FLANDERS, IVES, TOBEY, FERGUSON, HICKENLOOPER, SMITH, VANDENBERG, and WHITE. Only one Democrat appears among the first 10, BARKLEY, and he got the prize.

This is one of the most amazing showings in all this curious prize business. TAFT leads the field among Nation-wide editors, 113 to BARKLEY'S 6; among Washington newsmen, 12 to 3, but BARKLEY gets the prize.

Precisely what additional information did the Collier's committee have before it that made Senator BARKLEY'S services in the present Senate of greater distinction than those of Senator TAFT.

It is interesting that such Washington newsmen as Robert S. Allen, Bert Andrews, Frank Kent, Thomas L. Stokes, none of whom is a rock-ribbed Republican, voted for TAFT for first choice.

Yet the Collier's committee ignored their recommendations as it did the Nation-wide poll of daily newspaper editors. There must be a reason.

The most plausible but unsatisfactory explanation is that the Collier's committee desired to avoid endorsing a candidate for the Presidency. But that has nothing to do with the prize which is designed to honor a Senator and a Representative for distinguished services in a particular year.

James C. Derieux says in Colliers:

"The committee does not operate under fixed criteria or rules. Each year it is free to do as it pleases. In selecting the winners for 1947, a number of members felt that it would be wise to eliminate avowed Presidential candidates from consideration, lest the award be mistaken for a political endorsement."

If that is the explanation, it should have been made in advance of taking the polls. The polees, in that case, would have known that they could not vote for TAFT, VANDENBERG, and JOE MARTIN.

As it stands, many must wonder whether the committee did not reach its conclusion after the vote was in and BOB TAFT came first.

The Problem of Minorities and Catholic Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Problem of Minorities and Catholic Action," delivered by me before the Edward Douglas White Council, Knights of Columbus, Arlington, Va., on May 22, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PROBLEM OF MINORITIES AND CATHOLIC ACTION

I am happy to be with you this evening to celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of your council and to have the privilege of being your guest and speaker.

Eight years ago the Holy Name Society, of Alexandria, Va., invited me to speak at their communion breakfast. I called attention to the importance of making use of our Catholic heritage to influence Latin America and promote good will and inter-American solidarity. Today there is room for Catholic action in other equally important fields.

The problem of racial minorities is of transcendental importance because on its solution depends the peace of the world. The Catholic Church, as we all know, has always taken the lead in the protection of racial and religious minorities. However, there is room for positive action on the part of Catholic laity, and it is for this reason that I have chosen the problem of minorities and Catholic action as the subject of my address this evening.

I am sure that we are all agreed that the most pressing problem facing the American people today is that of preserving peace. Our world is being threatened today as never before. Every sincere American is praying that

there be no third world war. The millions of men who survived the horrors of the last war are not interested in fighting another. The mothers and fathers of draft-age sons are praying for peace. Why are they worried? Why is half the world living in terror and fear? Any thinking person knows why the peace of the world is threatened today. Only two powers remain in the world capable of waging total war—the United States and Soviet Russia.

The United States is not militaristic or warlike. Our manhood, however, is always ready and always willing to defend the country and to champion the weak and fight against evil; but war itself has never been popular with Americans. In every war in which we have been engaged our men fought willingly but always with the hope that after the bitterness of war they could return to their homes and live in peace. The sacrifices of those who gave their all in Africa, Europe, and the Pacific would be a mockery if we who remain do not dedicate ourselves to the task of achieving that peace for which they gave their lives.

Totalitarian communism, the evil monster created by the wedding of Germanic nihilism and Slavic genius for intrigue and organization threatens to engulf western civilization. To defend ourselves we can create armies, air forces and atom weapons, but if we fail to attack the idea of communism we cannot succeed.

The most potent argument used by the Communists is the infringement of civil rights in western countries. They call attention to discrimination in the United States and in South Africa and offer hope to the oppressed racial minorities by promising freedom and equality under communism.

The political crises in the world today have their origin in minority problems. The internecine warfare in India has its roots in racial, religious, and economic differences among Moslem and Sikh, Brahmin, and Untouchable. The Balkans are a tinder box because of mutual hatred of Slav and Italian, Serb and Croat, and of Greek and Bulgarian. The situation in Trieste is dynamite. An explosion there might well cause another world conflagration. In Palestine, Arab and Jew are at each other's throats killing and maiming because of racial, religious, and possibly economic antagonism. So long as such conditions exist anywhere in the world there will be danger of war. If we in the United States sincerely desire peace, it behooves us to concentrate our efforts to the amelioration of the plight of minorities in our own country and to urge our Government to do likewise in its foreign policy.

The problem of minorities is the offspring of the materialistic philosophy of our so-called modern age. Atheistic materialism has undermined Christian culture and replaced its economic, social, and ethical concepts, and in so doing has accentuated the problem of minorities; for so long as the spiritual nature of man is denied, the state is free to do whatever it will with the individual. The next step follows logically—the state is glorified instead of God. The importance Christianity attached to the human individual and the family is overlooked. The state as a collective whole is all powerful.

We have a perfect example in Hitler's Germany and in communistic Russia. This evil, however, is not a monopoly of the Nazis or the Communists. We suffer from the same affliction ourselves. When Americans become so obsessed with the materialistic side of life that they overlook, and often abuse, the rights of fellow Americans because of religious, racial, or color differences they are behaving like Nazis. There is no essential difference in Hitler's mass sterilization and human soap factories, Stalin's slave labor and concentration camps, and our chain gains, starvation wages, lynchings, and racial discrimination.

This philosophy is really foreign to our country. Historically our country is religious. Our Nation has grown great because our people believed in God. The colonists were God-fearing people. The Pilgrim with his Bible, the Marylander with his rosary had one thing in common—the presence of God in their daily life and an awareness thereof in their every action. The immigrants who followed the colonists were generally poor and humble people and deeply religious. Our institutions are founded on the sanctity of the individual, the brotherhood of men and belief in God. The Senate and House of Representatives are opened and closed with prayer. In spite of our religious heritage the atheistic materialism which brought ruin to Germany is now threatening the United States. In the talk to the Holy Name Society, which I mentioned before, I said: "When God is driven from the hearts of the people the nation is in danger. History shows us that people who do not believe in God must perish."

What are we doing when we practice discrimination but driving God from our hearts? This great liberty-loving country often denies the rights of orientals, Negroes, Jews, and Mexicans. Are we not forgetting God when we do so?

Last Easter at the beautiful Franciscan Monastery mass was celebrated by persons of every nationality and color—Chinese, Indians, Latin Americans, Syrians, and Negroes all were worshipping the same God, and we can be sure that in His eyes they were all equal.

The position of the church in regard to racial minorities is one we can be proud of. The church has followed the teachings of Christ. Christianity is not the exclusive possession of any people. Christ did not look to race or color and the church has kept faith with Him. St. Paul said that all are one with Christ. The church has always taught that doctrine.

I wish I had time to recount the story of the church in America. Our history has not been fully described. The tremendous mission accomplished by the Catholic clergy in the Spanish and Portuguese New World has been grossly overlooked by American historians. The fight they waged to protect the rights of aborigines is one of the most glorious pages in history. Through the efforts of the church and its enlightened doctors, the rulers of Spain officially adopted the policy of treating the Indians as subjects and vassals of the crown. This was in spite of the opposition of the Spanish Conquistadores.

The policy of the Catholic pontiffs in sponsoring the education of native priests and the appointment of native bishops carries out the doctrine of racial tolerance preached by Christ in the Parable of the Good Samaritan. The protection which Pius XII extended to the tormented Jews of Europe illustrates the position of the church. That record is perfect. However, it seems to me that we Catholics in the United States might well interest ourselves in the problem and undertake its solution.

We must realize the grave danger to all minorities if any minority is abused. I am sure we all realize how the church would suffer if bigotry held sway. If intolerance for the Negro is not controlled, eventually the same intolerance and bigotry will be directed against religious minorities. The 20,000,000 Catholics of the United States, though small in numbers, are powerful in influence because of the soundness of their doctrines. When Catholics endorse the racial tolerance advocated by Christ and expounded by the church, they are also in harmony with the principles of our country. Catholics are on the right side.

If we grant that communism threatens our very existence and that its most potent argument is discrimination, and if we as Catholics intend to fight communism and to fight it every step of the way, then we should start right now and remove from our own hearts any vestige of ill will or intolerance toward our fellow Americans because of religion, race, or color.

We are proud of the remarkable victory of the Government in Italy. Communism was halted in its tracks. The reason for the victory is attributed by the Italian Communist leader, Pagliotti, to Catholic action. We can lick communism in the United States if every Catholic dedicates himself to eliminating intolerance at home. Communism cannot make headway when there is no dissension. The task is not impossible. Christian Switzerland is an example of what can be done toward solving racial and religious differences. The people of Switzerland preserve distinctive social, cultural, and religious heritages but they are united in a common political front because they practice the eternal truths of the Prince of Peace. Surely we can do as much in the United States. We know that the principle of tolerance is right; it is time for us to practice it.

In closing, I would like to recall the story of the four chaplains who, after their ship was torpedoed, gave up their places in the lifeboats so that others could be saved. In those last harrowing moments two Protestant ministers, a Catholic priest, and Jewish rabbi comforted the terror-stricken passengers and as the ship went down, four men joined hands and went down praying to the same God.

Today's Legislation and Tomorrow's Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject "Today's Legislation and Tomorrow's Insurance," prepared by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] for delivery before the annual convention of the American Association of Insurance General Agents, at the Mark Hopkins Hotel, San Francisco, Calif., May 17, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY'S LEGISLATION AND TOMORROW'S INSURANCE

Volumes have been spoken and written respecting the problems of the insurance industry since the decision of the Supreme Court on June 5, 1944, in the now famous Southeastern Underwriters case. Some of these problems, perhaps, are fanciful; others are quite real. Public Law 15 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, with which you are familiar, was the first step in dealing with this host of real problems. But that law was not—and I intend no pun—was not insurance against Federal regulation in the future; nor was it blanket insurance against enforcement of the Federal antitrust laws, after July 1, 1948, with respect to the entire insurance industry.

The events subsequent to the passage of Public Law 15 need not be recounted in detail. You are familiar with them. But perhaps it would be well to take brief note of the situation as it stands today.

Thirty-five States, two Territories, and the District of Columbia have enacted rate regulatory laws in 1947 and 1948, mostly along the line of the commissioners' and all-industry committee recommendations, and generally referred to as the N. A. I. C. bills. Fifteen of these State laws and those of the two Territories and the District of Columbia are closely patterned after the all-industry N. A. I. C. bill. The other 20 follow the general pattern but with modifications.

It should be noted that California's statute departs, probably more than do the laws of many other States, from the all-industry, N. A. I. C. pattern.

It should be noted also that legislation regulating insurance generally was passed by the States of Alabama, Maryland, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas in 1945; and by Kentucky and Mississippi in 1946. Louisiana, New York, and Virginia have had, for a number of years, legislation providing for regulation of insurance rates. Thus a total of 45 States have acted affirmatively.

That indicates the general coverage, by State law, of the field of rate regulation.

Of course, there had been numerous acts passed by the various States, generally referred to as fair-trade-practice measures, and also a number of laws for accident and health regulation. It is reasonable to believe that the statutes now on the books constitute the umbrella of State regulation with which the industry will come to the rapidly approaching date of June 30, when the so-called moratorium provisions of Public Law 15 expire.

The arrival of July 1, 1948, will bring squarely within the field of Federal law enforcement any practices by the industry which may be held violative of Federal acts, and which are not regulated by the States. Among the Federal laws which will be applicable to the insurance industry on July 1, 1948, are: First, the Sherman Antitrust Act; second, the Clayton Act; third, the Robinson-Patman Anti-Discrimination Act; fourth, the Federal Trade Commission Act; fifth, the National Labor Relations Act, as amended by the Taft-Hartley law; sixth, the Fair Labor Standards Act; and, seventh, the Merchant Marine Act of 1920. Agents generally are not vitally concerned with the last three of these acts. However, the other four are of concern.

Remember that Public Law 15 does not go off the books on June 30. It merely shifts its emphasis. It is only the so-called moratorium provisions which expire.

Public Law 15 is today's law, but it is tomorrow's law as well. Tomorrow's insurance, as well as today's, will feel its impact.

In enacting this law, Congress held out an invitation to the States to deal affirmatively and effectively with those activities and practices of the insurance business which might otherwise be the subject of Federal regulation. Until now, the emphasis by the industry, and by the States, has been laid upon those practices chiefly concerned with rate-making.

But there are other practices, inimical to the public interest, which, if not regulated effectively by the States, will of necessity be regulated by one of the Federal acts which I mentioned a moment ago.

You will recall that prior to the Southeastern Underwriters decision many associations of insurance companies or agents, or both, had rules and agreements generally referred to as the "single counter rule," under which a company could not have more than one agent in a specified area; the "limitation of agency rule," under which a company could not have more than an agreed number of agents in a specified area; the "nonintercourse rule," under which a member agent was prohibited from exchanging business with nonmember agents; the "in or out rule," under which a member agent was prohibited from representing an insurer unless all the insurers' local agents were members; and various other rules of similar nature. It is encouraging to note that most, if not all, of these practices which are discriminatory or restrictive have voluntarily been given up, without impairing the rights of either the company or the agents. Certainly such practices are recognizable, and it does not require a court decision, or action by the Federal Government, to make the parties to such agreements know that their action is restrictive or discriminatory.

Where such practices are absolutely necessary to the proper functioning of a legitimate enterprise, and where the public interest is protected by proper regulation pursuant to affirmative State law, it would seem that the tests of Public Law 15 has been met. However, it should be pointed out that where any practice, either by the insurers, the agents, the brokers, or any other segment of the industry, is engaged in as a result of contract or agreement, and such practice is contrary to the public interest, then if it is discriminatory, or if it is in restraint of trade under the general rules laid down by the various court decisions dealing with the Sherman Act, the enforcement branch of the Federal Government has a duty to step in and take action.

In order to get the picture clearly in mind, it is necessary to understand that Public Law 15 of the Seventy-ninth Congress operated in two spheres: The sphere of congressional policy and the sphere of regulation. In both spheres it looked to the future.

In the sphere of congressional policy, the act made the declaration that the continued regulation and taxation, by the several States, of the business of insurance, is in the public interest.

But while this declaration of congressional policy is also a declaration of public policy, at least until overruled or modified by a subsequent Congress, the power of any subsequent Congress to change this policy could not be foreclosed. In recognition of this fact, the Congress also provided, in the policy declaration clause, that—and I quote—"silence on the part of the Congress shall not be construed to impose any barrier to the regulation or taxation of such business by the several States."

That provision is law, and the States are therefore free to regulate and tax the business of insurance; but only so long as Congress does not act affirmatively to withdraw that right from the States or to impose Federal regulation.

What should be clearly understood is that Congress has not agreed to remain silent. It was the sense of the Seventy-ninth Congress, and I believe it is the sense of the present Congress, that the States should be given every opportunity to regulate the business of insurance in their own way; and so long as the States are making an honest effort at such regulation, and appear to be protecting the public adequately, I do not believe the Congress will wish to move into this field.

On the other hand, the business of insurance is one which touches closely the lives of the people. The Supreme Court has decided that insurance is interstate commerce. The Congress has, therefore, a duty to be vigilant, in the public interest, to see that the business of insurance is conducted in a manner fully compatible with the public interest.

While it is my opinion that Congress will not wish to move into the field of insurance regulation so long as the States are successfully regulating the business, I think we must recognize that silence on the part of the Congress depends primarily not upon the extent or type of regulation imposed by the various States, or by any State, but rather upon the success of such regulation.

I say "the success of such regulation," although it is implicit that such success will depend in large part upon the cooperation of the industry and upon the degree of self-regulation which the industry imposes.

Anything in the nature of an insurance scandal, in any State, might well be taken by the Congress as an indication of the failure of State regulation, and we might then find Congress taking over, as it has every right to do.

So much for the sphere of policy.

In the sphere of regulation, Public Law 15 of the Seventy-ninth Congress had two major provisions. As amended and extended, Public Law 15 exempts the business of insurance, and acts in the conduct thereof, from the provisions of the antitrust laws until July 1, 1948.

After that date the act provides the antitrust laws are to apply to the business of insurance "to the extent that such business is not regulated by State law."

Interpretation of this language must be in the light of the enforcement problem which is presented.

The Sherman Act and the Clayton Act have not been wiped from the books. They are, by the affirmative language of the Congress, to be "applicable to the business of insurance to the extent that such business is not regulated by State law" after July 1, 1948.

That does not mean that all of the business of insurance in a particular State is exempt from the antitrust laws if any particular proportion of such business is regulated by State law. The question of the applicability of the antitrust laws can arise, and will arise, only when some particular practice is made the subject of complaint. The United States attorney to whom such complaint is made will then have to determine whether the particular practice complained of is regulated by State law.

If State regulation has been imposed—if the State has taken effective jurisdiction of the particular practice in question—we can assume that the decision will be that the Federal antitrust laws do not apply. But if the particular practice complained of is one which the State has not by law attempted to regulate, over which the State has not asserted jurisdiction, then it would be the duty of the United States attorney to proceed to enforce the antitrust laws applicable to such practice.

This point has special importance for several segments of the insurance industry. It is important, for example, with respect to agents and brokers, in view of the common practice, in many States, of fixing fees and commissions by agreement.

If a State has not asserted jurisdiction in this field, and has not attempted to regulate this practice, we must assume applicable Federal laws will be enforced.

State regulation in such a field, to constitute an effective assertion of jurisdiction, probably would have to meet certain minimum standards.

The State law would have to be explicit with respect to the practice which it is sought to regulate. Probably, also, the State law should be prohibitory rather than permissive. That is, it should prohibit the particular practice except in accordance with specified procedure and subject to State approval, rather than simply in terms permitting the practice in question.

Machinery should be provided for regulating the practice, and the law should designate an authority, in either some official or some agency of the State, to exercise the State regulatory power. It should lay down general standards to govern the discretion to be exercised by such authority. Probably, also, it should include provisions for public notice, and opportunity for hearing, in advance of the exercise of such discretionary authority, and there should be some provision for appeal from the decisions made by such authority.

What I have said applies, of course, not only to the matter of fees and commissions for agents and brokers, but to any practice in any sphere of the business of insurance.

The thing to remember is that in the enforcement of the antitrust laws, the Depart-

ment of Justice and its agents will be required to determine, in each case, whether the particular practice which is made the subject of a complaint is a practice over which the State has asserted jurisdiction and which the State is regulating. The question will not be whether insurance as a whole, or any particular proportion of the business of insurance, is regulated by State law in the particular State.

Therefore, if a State has enacted laws which regulate 90 percent of the business of insurance in that State, the mere fact that the other 10 percent is not specifically dealt with by State law probably would be construed to mean that, for purposes of the enforcement of Federal antitrust laws, that particular 10 percent will be considered as not regulated by State law, and if that 10 percent includes any practices which are in violation of the Federal antitrust laws, such practices will be subject to prosecution.

On the other hand, it is not required that the assertion of State regulatory authority over a particular phase or practice of the insurance business shall provide the most effective regulation possible, or that it shall be equally as strict as the applicable Federal law in the same field. Congress has recognized the right of the States to apply their own public policy in the regulation of the business of insurance. The important thing is that the State, with respect to the particular field of insurance or sphere of insurance activity, or the particular practice in question, shall have asserted its authority and imposed its regulatory powers.

To sum up, after the deadline of July 1, 1948, has passed, there will be generally speaking, two ways in which Federal power could be brought to bear upon the business of insurance. One of these ways would be through the enactment of new legislation by the Congress. This is not likely to occur unless the attention of the Congress is directed forcibly to what it may consider the failure of State regulation or enforcement. This might, in fact, be simply a failure of the industry to police itself; but the result would be the same. Congress is not bound by any specific rules. Its power to act is unlimited. It probably will not act further, in this field, so long as it is satisfied the public interest is being served and protected; but any event, or series of events, which leads the Congress to the conclusion that the public interest requires regulation, will lead almost certainly to the imposition of such regulation.

The second way in which Federal power can impinge upon the business of insurance after next July 1 is through enforcement of the Federal antitrust laws. In this field, broad generalities will not be considered. Furthermore, specific results will not be considered. There is no question of whether the public interest is or is not being served and protected. The sole question, with respect to any practice complained of, will be whether that practice is regulated by State law. If it is not so regulated, then that practice will be subject to the Federal antitrust laws, and it will be the duty of Federal officials to enforce those laws.

Thus, for purposes of enforcement of Federal laws, the question is one strictly of legal construction. The inquiry will be, Is this practice regulated by State law? Not: is it effectively regulated, or is it wisely regulated; but simply is it regulated?

But in deciding the future course of action by the Congress, it will be results which control. Whether Congress reasserts its jurisdiction over the field of insurance will depend not upon the degree of State regulation, nor even upon the degree of good faith in State regulatory efforts, but upon the effectiveness of State regulation in protecting the public.

To speak quite frankly, it seems most likely that even partial and ineffective regulation by the States may satisfy the Congress if the industry is so careful and so circumspect that the public interest remains fully protected. But a breath of scandal, a small suggestion that the public is being victimized in any way, might be enough to set the legislative wheels rolling. Once let Congress be convinced that the public is not being adequately protected, and there will be no legal questions asked, no excuses sought or accepted. The power of the Congress to act in the field of insurance is plenary, and Congress will act if it becomes convinced that the public interest demands action.

One more word of caution before I conclude. Do not make the mistake of interpreting what I have said to mean that the insurance industry must direct its efforts toward hiding its shortcomings. Congress is not going to play the part of Rip Van Winkle. Neither will Congress play the ostrich, and stick its head in the sand. Congress has not washed its hands of this problem. It has simply given the States an opportunity to regulate the business of insurance. The results are being watched, and will continue to be watched, most closely and with great interest. It is a friendly interest, because most Members of the Congress, I believe, feel as I do, and as the Congress has itself declared, that the continued regulation and taxation by the several States of the business of insurance is in the public interest. But if State regulation, plus industry self-policing, is not effective, it will not take a Paul Revere to awaken Congress to that fact.

By the same token, no single segment of the insurance industry can expect to demand that it have things all its own way, without running into trouble.

It is generally recognized that the agents and brokers are the producers, and as such represent numerically by far the largest segment of the insurance industry. On the other hand, it is also generally recognized that the business of insurance is in itself one of the greatest, if not the greatest, in this country, and since it touches the lives of every one of our citizens, it is a most important segment of our economic life. With such truths self-evident, it is clearly in the public interest, as well as in the interest of those in the insurance business, to take every step necessary to preserve and foster the continued growth and well-being of the insurance industry. Without recognition of the importance of the insurance industry to the whole Nation, it is difficult to solve each particular problem as it may arise, particularly when it concerns, as is often the case, only a particular segment of the industry. We must never lose sight of the eventual goal of assuring free enterprise an opportunity to work to the greatest benefit for the general public, and for its own profit, without at the same time demanding freedom from competition rather than freedom of competition.

These statements are made to you by a friend and in the most friendly way. They are made to you by one who was shocked, to say the least, when the Supreme Court declared the insurance industry to be in interstate commerce.

My continued friendly attitude toward your great industry has been evidenced in many ways—in none more emphatically than in the enactment of Public Law 15. It is as a sincere friend of your great industry that I have presented to you today plain facts in plain language. My expressions may seem drastic in some respects; my utterances may place too much emphasis on stern realities; but my sole intention is to bring to you, as one interested in the insurance industry, a down-to-earth realization of conditions as they are, with the law as it is today and as it may affect the insurance industry of tomorrow.

Before Order of B'rith Abraham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me before the Order of B'rith Abraham, in New York City, on May 23, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, I, CHARLES TOBEY, gentile, am here today to speak to you of Israel very seriously, on a subject close to your hearts and mine, namely justice for the Jewish people, in the matter of Palestine and citizenship, and to demand that the decision for partition of the United Nations be carried out.

The disillusionment of peoples provokes tragic and dangerous conditions.

The Jews down through the years have been the most peaceful people in the world, with no resort to violence, and when, relying upon the good faith and assurance of a great government, they claim what was promised them, and what they are entitled to, they are persecuted and killed.

The matter of the Jewish homeland was taken before the General Assembly of the United Nations and, after extended investigations, on November 29, 1947, the Assembly voted for the partition of Palestine, granting national states in Palestine to both Jews and Arabs.

The long years of waiting were over, so we all thought.

Then came disillusionment.

So much has happened in rapid succession on the Palestine situation that it is well at this time to pause and look the facts squarely in the eye.

The United States stands before the world in support of certain policies on Palestine and on international relations generally in the troubled postwar world. Our policies are:

1. The United States has worked to safeguard the Holy City and its sacred relics and traditions from war and violence. Where does Britain stand? At this moment, forces of the Arab Legion of Transjordan, financed, equipped, and officered by the British Government, are shelling the city of Jerusalem with British artillery.

2. The United States has consistently followed a policy supporting the actions and decisions of the United Nations. The General Assembly, by solemn resolution on November 29, 1947, by more than a two-thirds margin, approved the partition plan creating a Jewish state, a Palestinean-Arab state and an independent United Nations trusteeship for the Holy City and its environs. The British Government repeatedly stated its acceptance of the United Nations decision, although it declined to cooperate in implementing it. The United Nations partition resolution stands unchanged on the books today. The United States Government immediately and properly gave recognition to the provisional Jewish government established in the Jewish state within the frontiers approved by the United Nations. Other governments have followed suit, and many more are expected to grant recognition. On this issue before the whole world, the United States and Soviet Union see eye to

eye, in acceptance of the decision of the United Nations. Where does the British Government stand? In recent days it has gone back on its earlier statement and has declined to recognize the Jewish state or to give its rights in Palestine any greater credence than the claims of certain Arab groups to sovereignty over the whole of Palestine.

3. The United States is against military aggression anywhere in the world. We have offered a resolution in the Security Council of the United Nations to stop the flagrant aggression taking place in Palestine today, with the armies of Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, Transjordan, and Saudi Arabia all crossing their own frontiers to enter another country, bomb and destroy property, and attack and kill the inhabitants thereof. Lebanon has even gone so far as to seize American citizens on an American vessel and throw them into concentration camps, for no other reason than that they were traveling to a port in the state of Israel which has been recognized by the Government of the United States. Where does Britain stand? Britain has announced that it will continue to finance, arm, and officer the Arab Legion of Transjordan, the strongest of these invading forces, which have flagrantly marched beyond their own frontiers to invade, attack, and forcibly seize sovereignty over another state and people. And Britain does this notwithstanding that its representative in the Security Council has repeatedly pledged that the Arab Legion would be withdrawn from Palestine soil before the termination of the mandate on May 15.

4. The United States Government and the two Houses of Congress are now earnestly engaged in considering ways and means of strengthening the United Nations and improving the effectiveness of its machinery to prevent aggression and promote peace and security throughout the world. Where does Britain stand? Britain today is in point of fact an aggressor in Palestine and an obstructor of our efforts in the United Nations. Britain wants to make another Ethiopia out of the Palestine issue, to debate and consider, to discuss juridical questions the United Nations has already decided, and to propose inquiries into facts which are clear to every child with a capacity to read and comprehend. Britain talks of treaty obligations to the Arabs, but no obligations are stronger than Britain's commitments under the United Nations Charter to facilitate peaceful settlement and to avoid aggression. We would never recognize any such agreement or treaty arrangement to justify Russian aggression against its neighbors or Yugoslavian aggression against Greece. Peace in Palestine stands on no other footing and the issue is no more complicated than that.

5. The United States believes in throwing its full resources into the effort of peace-loving peoples throughout the world to oppose aggression and to promote the economic conditions in which human liberty and material well-being go hand in hand. These were our guiding principles when we projected our programs of lend-lease during and after the war, when we threw all our manpower and wealth into the struggle against Axis military might, when we granted special postwar loans to Britain, and when we recently adopted the far-reaching European recovery program, which I strongly supported. Are the events now taking place in Palestine the outcome of our generous and disinterested service to our fellow man? Are we to forget that in the most critical hour of World War II, the United States took Sherman tanks from its own armored divisions and sent them to Montgomery's aid in time to hurl back Rommel at El Alamein on Egyptian soil? Do we have no recourse when we read of $1,500,000 in lend-lease aid to Egypt for tanks and other vehicles alone, as well as disposition of $42,000,000 worth of war surpluses to Egypt at a loss of almost $30,000,000? Will we stand silently by and see those same tanks and vehicles leading the advance of Egyptian forces, or see Egyptian military aircraft take off from airfields which we may well have assisted to build, expand, or equip, for the purpose of bombing and strafing the Jewish city of Tel Aviv in Palestine? Will our taxpayers accept without protest a situation whereby we give aid to Britain under ERP while Britain out of another part of its exchequer expends millions to finance, equip, train, and officer the military force of an Arab state which is now engaged in flagrant aggression, even to the point of wrecking and destroying the most hallowed parts of the holy city of Jerusalem?

I trust that these questions will be in the forefront of the appropriate committees of Congress, the Banking and Currency Committee over which I have the honor to preside, the Foreign Relations Committee presided over by the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate, and the Appropriations Committee presided over by my colleague from my own State of New Hampshire. But even more urgently, I trust that these questions are being fully and immediately explored by those in the executive branch of the Government who make policy and determine allocations of supplies, funds, loans, and advances paid for by the taxpayers of the United States. And most important, I trust that the arms embargo self-imposed by our own Government at a time when peace seemed possible, will now be removed so that the Jewish State may be enabled to purchase here the means to defend itself, to defend the fruits of incredible labor and sacrifice in building the Jewish homeland the past 30 years, and to defend the integrity of the United Nations as the arbiter of the rule of law in the world. The provisional recognition which President Truman gave to the de facto authority in the Jewish State is a mockery unless it carries with it the belligerent rights to which the provisional government of Israel is entitled under international law, including the right to purchase arms in self defense. Too long have we followed a Palestine policy of reliance upon words alone. Unless we lift the embargo, we are a party to the British and Arab aggression in Palestine today. The American people say: "Lift the embargo, so as to discourage further Arab aggression and strengthen the will of the people of Israel to survive and build a nation dedicated to liberty and justice, in the land where those ideals first found expression in Holy writ.

As has been well said, the United Nations and the present administration are on trial before the world, as to whether we meant what we said, and whether our actions and pronouncements were genuine, and intended to bring about constructive action, or were merely intended to have a temporary effect, to circumvent the basic issues involved.

Let America issue forthwith a stern warning to the Arab states calling for an end to the sabotage of the United Nations decision.

Let America insist upon immediate use of the proper United Nations agencies to provide international military protection for Palestine Jewry, and make immediately available the necessary military force, to implement the United Nations decision on Palestine.

And also immediate equipment of the Haganah under United Nations auspices, to enable this Jewish constabulary defense force to carry out police powers, within Jewish territory in Palestine.

So, to you who share with me a common interest in this great problem, and further share in the hope and insistence that this great country of ours, which we love, shall measure up to its own great traditions down through the decades, I leave with you in closing the words of a great American, John Hay, distinguished Secretary of State of a few decades ago, words of high purpose and high resolve, bespeaking the carrying out of God's will.

We should apply them to this problem today and in their spirit move forward to meet our objective:

"Not in dumb resignation
We lift our hands on high;
Not as the nerveless fatalist,
Content to live and die.
Our faith springs like the eagle's
Who soars to meet the sun,
And cries exulting unto Thee,
'O Lord, thy will be done!'

"When tyrant hordes are trampling
Upon the common weal
Thou dost not bid us bend and writhe
Beneath the iron heel.
In thy name we claim our right,
By sword of tongue or pen,
And even the headsman's ax, may flash
Thy message unto men.

"Thy will—it bids the weak be strong;
It bids the strong be just;
No lips to beg, no knee to bend
No brow to beat the dust.
Wherever man oppresses man
Beneath the liberal sun,
O Lord, be there, Thine arm make bear
Thy righteous will be done!"

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to insert a table of veterans' benefits compiled by the VFW National Rehabilitation Service.

Government benefits available to veterans and their dependents

[Prepared by the VFW National Rehabilitation Service, June 1948]

Type of benefit	Basis of eligibility	Nature of benefit
Compensation for service-connected disability (use VA Form 526. Apply to VA regional office).	Payable for disease or injury incurred in or aggravated by military or naval service in line of duty, provided discharge was under other than dishonorable conditions.	Rates from $13.80 for 10 percent, in multiples of $13.80 to $138 for total disability in wartime cases, and $10.35 to $103.50 in peacetime cases. Additional benefits payable, such as $42 for the loss of arm, leg, or eye in wartime cases, and $31.50 in peacetime cases. Helplessness, blindness, multiple amputations, etc., carry rates from $240 to $360 in wartime and $180 to $270 in peacetime.
Pension for non service-connected disability (use VA Form 526B. Apply to VA regional office).	Veteran must be permanently and totally disabled, credited with 90 days or more wartime service unless discharged sooner for line of duty disability, with discharge under other than dishonorable conditions.	The rate is $60 per month, increased to $72 on attainment of 65 years, or after continuous receipt for 10 years. Annual income over $1,000 is bar if veteran has no wife or minor children, with $2,500 limitation having wife and/or minor children.

Government benefits available to veterans and their dependents—Continued

Type of benefit	Basis of eligibility	Nature of benefit
Readjustment allowance (unemployment benefits. Apply at United States or State employment office).	90 days or more active service or discharge for disability in less time, under other than dishonorable conditions, between Sept. 16, 1940, and July 25, 1947.	Rate of $20 per week less any weekly wages received in excess of $3. Time limit 2 years after discharge or 2 years after July 25, 1947, whichever is later. 52 weeks maximum depending on length of service. Self-employed may receive difference between net earnings and $100 per month.
Out-patient treatment, authorized by the Veterans' Administration (VA Form 10-2827).	To relieve service-connected disability. (Not for non-service-connected disability.)	Includes the supplying of medicine, bandages, syringes, etc.
Dental treatment authorized by the Veterans' Administration.	Individual missing or defective teeth must be rated (same as disability) as due to service.	VA will authorize the extraction, filling, or replacement of such teeth, and treatment or replacement of other teeth affected therey.
Prosthetic appliances (letter or apply in person).	To relieve service-connected disability, disability for which veteran was discharged from service, or non-service-connected disability for which hospitalized by VA.	Includes artificial limbs and eyes, braces, trusses, orthopedic shoes, special clothing, crutches, canes, wheelchairs, eyeglasses, etc.
Hospitalization authorized by the Veterans' Administration (use VA Form 10-P-10).	(1) For service-connected disability, (2) if discharge was for line-of-duty disability, and (3) for non-service-connected disabilities to war veterans, and (4) to peacetime veterans in receipt of compensation. Discharge under other than dishonorable conditions.	Service-connected cases may be cared for in any hospital authorized by the VA Non-service-connected cases in VA hospitals only, when beds are available.
Domiciliary care (soldiers homes under Veterans' Administration. Use VA Form 10-P-10).	Same as for hospitalization; except that applicant must be incapacitated from earning a living and have no adequate means of support; need for domiciliary care to be medically determined.	This applies to VA hospitals only, when beds are available.
Seeing-eye dogs and electronic mechanical equipment for blind (use VA Form 10-2630).	Furnished to service-connected blind cases with loss of vision both eyes 20/200 or less. (Industrial blindness.)	The VA will pay expense of training veteran in use of dog and for dog's medical attention. Approved electronic equipment will be furnished by the VA.
Automobiles or other conveyances (use VA Form 4502).	For loss or loss of use of 1 or both legs at or above the ankle resulting from World War II service. Application must be completed prior to July 1, 1948.	VA will pay cost of automobile, including freight and special appliances not to exceed $1,600 in individual case. May be new or used car, truck, tractor, or similar conveyance.
Loans, guaranteed or insured by the Veterans' Administration.	90 days' active duty, some part of which must have taken place between Sept. 16, 1940, and July 25, 1947. Less than 90 days if discharged for service-incurred disability. Discharge must be under conditions other than dishonorable.	Veteran seeks his own lender. VA does not lend money. Loans may be obtained for a home, real estate, construction, business, farm, etc. May not be used for automobile, unless automobile is necessary in a business. VA will guarantee 50 percent of the loan up to $4,000 for real estate and $2,000 for non-real estate. The VA merely acts as a surety for the lender in the event the veteran fails to pay. Contact lending institutions to negotiate a loan.
Vocational rehabilitation (Public Law 16 as amended).	Active duty, some part o. which must have taken place between Sept. 16, 1940, and July 25, 1947. Discharge under conditions other than dishonorable. Minimum of 10 percent service-connected disability or retired from service because of disability, in either case causing a need for vocational training.	Training expenses paid up to $500 per year. Special equipment furnished. Travel allowances, loan benefits, advisement and guidance mandatory. Work toward a definite job objective to create employability. Minimum allowance of $65 for the veteran without dependents or $90 for a veteran with dependents. If in full-time institutional training: $75 if no dependents; $105 for 1 dependent, and $120 for more than 1 dependent. The subsistence when added to the compensation must equal $105 for the veterans without dependents drawing less than 30 percent, or $115 for a veteran with dependents drawing less than 30 percent. Veterans drawing 30 percent or more must have their subsistence and compensation total $115 for a veteran without dependents or $135 for a veteran with a dependent, plus additional allowances for children and parents dependent upon him.
Education and training (Public Law 346 as amended.	Active duty between Sept. 16, 1940, and July 25, 1947. 90 days service required, some part of which must have been spent between the above-mentioned period. Discharge must be under conditions other than dishonorable. If discharged for service-connected disability you may use either Public Law 16 or Public Law 346 but Public Law 16 would be to your advantage if you have a compensable disability.	1 free year of education plus the time you were in the service, up to 4 years maximum of training. All expenses of tuition, books, etc., paid up to $500 per year. Subsistence allowances of $90 for the veteran with dependents or $65 for the veteran without dependents. For institutional training: $75 if no dependents; $105 for 1 dependent, and $120 for more than 1 dependent. On-the-job training has a limitation on wages and subsistence, whereby the combined amounts cannot exceed $210 for the veteran without dependents, $270 for the veteran with 1 dependent, and $290 for the veteran with 2 or more dependents. In event these amounts are exceeded, a proportionate decrease in subsistence "of $65 or $90" is made.
Reemployment	Any person having honorable service in the armed forces subsequent to May 1, 1940, who is qualified to perform the duties of his position and makes application for reemployment within 90 days after discharge is entitled to reemployment.	If position was in the employ of the U. S. Government, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia, the person shall be restored to such position or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay. If position was in the employ of a private employer, such employer shall restore the person to his former position or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay unless the employer's circumstances have so changed as to make it impossible or unreasonable to do so. If the position was in the employ of any State or political subdivision thereof, it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that the person should be restored to such position or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay.
Employment	Ability to work.	Counciling and placement service provided by the U S Employment Service or the State employment service where application is made.
National service life insurance	Service between Oct 8, 1940, and Sept. 2, 1945, both dates inclusive. Term insurance may be continued for a limited number of years (8 years on policies issued before Jan. 1, 1946, and 5 years on those issued on or after that date) or it may be converted to 1 of 6 permanent plans which build up cash values. A total disability income provision will be granted upon written application, satisfactory proof of good health and payment of the necessary extra premium.	Death benefits are paid according to the mode of settlement selected. Waiver of premiums becomes effective after 6 months continuous total disability that begins prior to age of 60. To those policyholders carrying the total disability income provision, $5 per month will be paid for each $1,000 of insurance. Pay benefits commence on the first day of the seventh month of such total disability and are payable as long as such total disability continues.
U. S. Government life insurance	Service in the armed forces between Oct. 6, 1917, and July 2, 1921; need not have applied but must have been eligible to apply. Evidence of good health (medical examination) satisfactory to the Administration must be submitted. U. S. Government life insurance was available to peacetime members of the armed forces up to Oct. 8, 1940. Term insurance was extended for a fifth 5-year period. Special additional disability benefits may be obtained by an extra premium agreement.	Death benefits paid according to mode of settlement selected. Upon due proof of total permanent disability the insured will be paid $5.75 per thousand per month during such permanent disability and all premiums will be waived during such disability. Amount of payments on account of total permanent disability will reduce amount payable to beneficiary on account of death. Monthly income of $5.75 per thousand will be paid those policyholders carrying total disability riders after a 4-month waiting period. Unlike benefits paid on account of total permanent disability, payments on the total disability rider do not reduce face of policy.
Civil-service preference	Active service in time of war, or service in a campaign or expedition for which a campaign badge has been authorized; service-connected disability; wife of a service connected disabled veteran when the veteran is disqualified by the disability for civil-service appointment along the general lines of his usual occupation; widow of a veteran, unless she remarries.	Additional points in examination; restriction of certain examinations to persons entitled to preference; experience credits in examinations for military or naval service; experience credits for uncompensated service; waiver of age, height, and weight requirements; waiver of physical requirements; waiver of members-of-family requirement; waiver of apportionment requirement; precedence on registers; review by Civil Service Commission of agency's reasons for passing over veteran and selecting nonveteran from certificate; reopening of examinations; credit in reduction in force for active service in armed forces; preference for retention in reduction in force; transfer when employing agency's functions are transferred, or employing agency is replaced by another; certification for another position for which the person is eligible, upon resignation, dismissal, or furlough; written notification of reasons for discharge, suspension, furlough without pay, reduction in rank or compensation, or debarment for future appointment; advance notice, with right to appeal to Civil Service Commission, of discharge, suspension for more than 30 days, furlough without pay, or reduction in rank or compensation; entry on and certification from civil-service registers and reemployment lists upon separation or furlough without pay; restoration to civil-service registers upon resignation; waiver of time limits in reinstatement and reappointment.
Review of discharges (use A. G. O. Form 94, NAVEXOS Form 1297 or USCG Form C. G. 10034).	Any discharge not the result of general court martial may be reviewed. Any blue or yellow discharge not the result of trial by general court martial may be reviewed.	If discharge is changed by action Army, Navy, or Coast Guard Board, entitlement to benefits under the GI bill may be in order.
Review of retirement cases	Officers of the armed forces separated from the service by action of a retiring board, without pay, or by reason of permanent physical disability incurred in line of duty while in commissioned status.	Three-fourths of base pay. Not paid concurrently with compensation or pension. (Army retirement only handled by the Veterans' Administration.)

Government benefits available to veterans and their dependents—Continued

Type of benefit	Basis of eligibility	Nature of benefit
Death compensation, widows and children (VA Form 534) service connection.	Death of veteran must be result of disease or injury incurred in line of duty. If death is subsequent to service, discharge must have been under other than dishonorable conditions. Payable to unremarried widows, and to children under the age of 18 years, with extension to age of 21 years if attending school approved by VA. Marriage bars a child.	The monthly rates of compensation for widows and children where death was due to wartime service, or due to extrahazardous service, are as follows: Widow, with no child $60; widow with 1 child (with $15.60 for each additional child), $78; no widow, 1 child, $30; no widow, 2 children (with $12 for each additional child, equally divided), $45. The monthly rates of compensation for death due to peacetime service are as follows: Widow, with no child, $38; widow, 1 child (with $10 for each additional child); $49; no widow, 1 child, $19; no widow, 2 children (with $8 for each additional child, equally divided), $20.
Death pension, widows and children (VA Form 534) non-service-connected.	Payable to widows and to children under the age of 18 to age of 21 years if attending school approved by VA. 90 days or more active service in World War I or World War II required, unless discharge was for disability incurred in line of duty. Discharge must have been under other than dishonorable conditions. In World War II cases it must be shown that veteran had at least an ascertainable service-connected disability at time of death.	Monthly rates of death pension for widows and children are as follows: Widow, no child, $42; widow, 1 child (each additional child $6), $54; no widow, 1 child, $21; no widow, 2 children, $52.40; no widow, 3 children (each additional child $4.80), $43.20. Not payable to a widow without a minor child or children during a calendar year when her annual income exceeds $1,000 or to a widow with child or children whose annual income exceeds $2,500.
Social security provisions	Payable to widows and minor children of veterans who served not dishonorably between Sept. 16, 1940, and July 25, 1947, having had at least 90 days active duty or having been discharged for disability incurred in line of duty, provided death occurs within 3 years from date of discharge and VA compensation or pension is not payable.	Monthly benefits are based on amount accredited to fund out of veteran's earnings or amount fixed by statute. These are paid to widow while caring for minor children of the veteran or to the children during minority. Widow without children becomes eligible at age of 65.
Reimbursement of burial expenses (use VA Form 8-530).	Payable in case of any wartime veteran discharged other than dishonorably and any peacetime veteran in receipt of compensation at time of death or who was discharged or retired for disability incurred in line of duty.	A sum not to exceed $150 is available as reimbursement for burial expenses of veteran. Person who defrays such expense should make claims.
Accrued compensation or pension (VA Form 534 by widow or 601 by other person).	The term "accrued" compensation or pension has reference to those monthly payments due the veteran or other claimant at the time of his or her death, remaining unpaid.	Payable to the veteran's widow; if no widow, to his minor children; or otherwise may be used to reimburse the person who bore the expense of the claimant's last sickness and burial.
Burial flags (use VA Form 2008)	A United States flag will be furnished to the next of kin of any war veteran or a peacetime veteran after serving at least 1 enlistment or who was discharged from the service by reason of a disability incurred in line of duty, provided that service was not terminated under dishonorable conditions.	The flag to be presented to the next of kin.
Burial in national cemeteries	Under the provisions of secs. 281 and 282, title 24, U. S. Code, deceased personnel who die on active duty with the armed forces of the United States, or after retirement therefrom, or who served during peace or war, and whose last discharge was honorable, are entitled to burial in a national cemetery.	Burial in national cemetery.
Headstone or grave marker (O. Q. M. G. Form 623 is required only where erection is to be in a private cemetery).	The veteran must have served honorably during his last period of service.	Will be issued to the next of kin.
Death compensation, dependent parents (VA Form 535), service connected only.	Death of veteran must be result of disease or injury incurred in line of duty. If death is subsequent to service, discharge must have been under other than dishonorable conditions. It must be shown by factual evidence that dependency exists.	The monthly rates of compensation for death due to wartime service or due to extra hazardous service are as follows: Dependent mother or father, $54; dependent mother and father, each, $30. The monthly rates of compensation for death due to peacetime service are as follows: Dependent mother or father, $30; dependent mother and father, each, $20.
6 months' death gratuity (forms are supplied by service department to designated beneficiary).	Death incurred in service and must have been in line of duty.	A sum equal to 6 times the base pay at time of death. Includes flight pay where applicable and increase for sea or overseas duty.
Arrears in pay (forms are sent to designated beneficiary by service departments).	Where death occurs in service. Cause not a factor	Amount due the deceased, classed as pay, is payable to the next of kin or designated beneficiary.
Mustering-out pay	Termination of service under honorable conditions, initial payment is made upon discharge.	$300 for persons serving 60 or more days outside limits of United States. $200 for person serving 60 or more days but not outside limits of United States. $100 for persons serving less than 60 days.
Terminal-leave pay	Termination of service under honorable conditions	Amount as computed by respective service departments.

New York Federation of Post Office Clerks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by the senior Senator from North Dakota before the New York Federation of Post Office Clerks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To my friends in Greater New York who are members of the large and valuable family of postal system employees, I bring greetings and the assurance that my colleagues of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee join me in expressing interest in their welfare and that of their families.

During Christmas week, when New York was beset by its heaviest snowstorm, the mail still went through without interruption and without delay. You in New York have the distinct asset of the efficient operation of the pneumatic tube system which distributes the large tonnage of mail which courses its way through the great city each 24 hours.

Nevertheless, it still is necessary that the human element be definitely on the job at all hours to keep even the flow of postal matter through sleet and snow, rain and cold.

It is during those times that we are reminded of the earnest and loyal manner in which the men and women in the postal system perform their duties, diligently and alertly.

As several of the members of our committee have said repeatedly, one needs only to gaze through any post-office window to see that employees are on the job and are working hard at the job. The postal system has the distinct advantage of being close to the people. Those in the postal system are not in the business of taking anything away from the citizen, but rather bringing it to him, whether it be tiding of gladness or sadness, of good fortune to friends or misfortune to loved ones.

The postal field service has grown up with the people, and the people have grown up to know and appreciate an efficient postal service whose efficiency is so well associated with those who collect, sort, and distribute the mails, whether it be first-class, parcel-post, second-class matter, 1-day-old chicks, or a new dress from the mail-order house.

The postal system is the big reliance in which our people place their trust in transporting parcels containing medicines, food, and clothing to the people of Europe who are now stricken more than during the time of war. The whole society today gravitates around our transportation and communications systems which are the links between our people and the whole world.

Today the pay roll in the postal service in a single year is $1,261,000,000, which is paid to approximately 500,000 regular and substitute postal employees. New York, with its one-tenth of the Nation's population, and with its many large cities, receives a large share of this huge pay roll.

These postal employees are your neighbors and friends. They are responsible citizens. Because of the steady salaries in the Post Office Department communities look to postal employees as the source of a great part of their business. In other words, postal employees are good customers and, like other average families, they have dependents, all of whom must have the same necessities and conveniences of life as others. They buy homes and automobiles when they have the money; they buy good schooling if they can afford it, and they purchase such of the luxuries as their incomes can afford, even as you and I.

The postmaster in his community is regarded as a representative citizen. He has to be of high moral character in order to be nominated and, of course, confirmed by the Senate, if he is to serve in any of the first-, second-, or third-class post offices, and so the officials and employees around him, wherever he is to be found in the post office at Anytown, United States of America, are good, solid citizens. They believe in the best Amer-

ican traditions which they strive to uphold. They are god-fearing. They meet their obligations as true Americans.

When war befalls us the postal field service is represented on the foreign front. In the last war the postal service contributed more than 51,000 employees to the armed forces. Some postal employees were restrained from joining the fighting part of the war and were assigned here in New York to the Army post office and to San Francisco in the fleet post office and elsewhere to work out the huge puzzle of routing mail and parcels which kept up the morale of our fighting men and patriotic women wherever they were. They bound these military and naval personnel close to the bonds and hearth sides of their families. The postal service is an American system. It is part of us and a distinct portion of our institutions.

We all know that Government employees do not bargain for their working conditions and their salary provisions in the popular sense of the word. Their bargaining, in contrast to collective bargaining in industry, is with the Congress, which we might call the board of trustees for the Nation.

For many years we in the Congress have taken the position that what appears to be reasonable is what should be granted to the postal employee, whether it be sick leave or annual leave, salaries, working conditions in general, retirement benefits, and all the other many features of Government employment. This rule of reason has dominated the thinking of the Congress which, in turn, has depended upon the employees and officials of the respective departments and agencies for advice and for the basis on which to proceed in laying down the rough contours of law. This brings me to the immediate subject of salaries. As chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service I introduced bills to provide $1,000 additional salary to each person in the Government service, including the post-office employees. These bills were based upon the firm conviction that it would take at least $1,000 to bring the Government employee up to a point of parity with those in industry because, as I have pointed out, the Government employees cannot bargain and he may not strike to obtain satisfaction on his demands and rightful needs. He must wait for those of us in the Congress to recognize him and obtain these necessary adjustments for him. This is not always done speedily because there should be an educational campaign in advance to provide the popularization of the necessity.

Today we have to compete with all manner of issues abroad on the international front and many on the national scene, and so Government-employee legislation, including, of course, postal-employee legislation, often has to await its best opportunity, in competition with such momentous events as the European-recovery program, popularly known as the Marshall plan, and industry-wide strikes, tax legislation, appropriation bills, and all the multiplicity of proposals which seem to get priority in the Congress.

It has come now to the point where only after we have sent our billions abroad do we seem to have enough money left to attend to the essentials of our own people; and so it appears to be with Government salaries. Today under the current legislative reorganization act, a budget is composed and some of the largest amounts are earmarked for international-relief purposes or military preparations.

It seems to me we are losing our sense of proportion and neglecting the things so obviously near to our everyday life when we seek to avoid recognizing the needs of our own people through a representative group which serve the Government in civilian capacities, both during time of tranquillity and national emergency.

I have been in all sections of this country several times during the last year, and I have yet to hear anyone remark about excessive Government expenditures. Frankly, I have not even heard complaints about taxes. Both of these subjects appear to be useful at times for attracting votes, but the voters themselves are not originating the issues.

I believe the Nation wants the Government to perform its best service to the people and at the lowest cost, but is willing at all times to pay any additional costs if it means paying those who perform the service their fair salaries, based upon what they are entitled to receive. This applies quite definitely to the postal system, where all regular vacancies are soon to be filled on a permanent basis.

In addition, the Postmaster General has just submitted to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, a schedule of revised postal rates. This represents the third effort on the part of the Post Office Department, to assist our committee in arriving at a fair return to the Department, based upon the service performed for the respective classes of mail handled.

You may remember that more than a year ago I introduced Senate Resolution 43 and our committee held extensive hearings on the subject of rates. This resolution called for a complete study of the entire postal-rate structure. To date it has been difficult to find anyone who has been willing to pay 100 percent to meet the expenses of carrying the class mail each group deposits in the letter boxes. Only the first-class mail still pays its own way. This class mail customarily is the kind which you and I use in writing letters. Of course, business mail travels at a deferred rate, as do newspapers, periodicals, parcels, and circular mail.

Then there are other subsidies which, if actually charged to their source, would assist the Post Office Department in coming out of the red and into the black. It is generally conceded that the Post Office Department does not receive credit for the service it performs, and thus we have a tremendous deficit, now approaching $350,000,000.

But whatever the deficit, and no matter how long we have to live with it until we overcome it, those who serve the Post Office Department, including my friends in local No. 10 of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, and all others doing similar work, must be paid in accordance with the precept that the laborer is worthy of his hire. If we must continue to have deficits, those deficits should never be passed on to the men and women who perform the routine chores for Uncle Sam. They are not responsible for the deficit; they are here to give us service of the best kind and for the proper amount of salary they so justifiably deserve.

I am not prophesying too definitely on what the outcome of the postal pay increase will be. Everything we do in Congress is subject to last-minute revisions and even in conference between the committees of Senate and House, there are times when we have to give and take to gain some of the points we think are the most important. But I can remind you that as early as last summer, when the cost of living had not reached its present height, I made the announcement that in my opinion, a $1,000 salary increase was not too much. As a matter of fact, the staff of our committee has found in its impartial inquiry that almost $1,200 would be necessary to bring the postal employee up to a point of parity with employees in industry and in order to purchase the products made by industry.

And whatever the final figure will be, I continue to point to the fact that it would have been lower, had it not been for my insistence that it be $1,000. Practically every bill that went into the legislative hopper on the subject of Government salaries was composed with an eye to the $1,000 amount, which I have been well able to substantiate during weeks of testimony, as represented by 600 pages of transcript on the hearings.

There were those appearing before our committee to support the need for adequate salary who knew full well their membership were entitled to receive $1,000 but who pulled their punches and were too timid to make known the facts as they are.

I am proud to say that the New York Federation of Post Offices Clerks, of which my friend Ephraim Handman is president and Patrick J. Fitzgerald is secretary, and the New York branch of the Railway Mail Association, stood with me foursquare to achieve the $1,000 figure, as did the national leadership of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks. I am particularly pleased that the 7,000 members of the New York federation gave me their sincere support.

It is always a great comfort to know that those whom we try to serve can be counted upon to supply their full and unequivocal support in full measure. This adds confidence and inspiration to carry on in doing the things we know should be done.

It was because of the ardent campaign in favor of a better civil-service-retirement system that we have on the Federal law books, effective 4 days ago—on April 1—the most liberal retirement plan the Government employee and his family have ever had. The new act is now Public Law 426.

Even salary and retirement are not the final issues concerning postal legislation before our committee. They are only the beginning. Next year I intend to examine the requirements of those in the postal service, under Public Law 134, which is the Postal Classification Act. This act was put together hurriedly and there are many inequalities apparent in it. Were it not for the fact that we have been delayed in working on retirement and salary legislation, this problem would have been examined this year. There are so many improvements to be made in the postal service and in Government service in general, that our main problem has been to apportion our committee's time to the study of these matters in the light of their greatest urgency.

The Republic of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram from former Secretary James F. Byrnes to Dr. Abba Hillel Silver read at the Salute to Israel meeting at Madison Square Garden, New York City, and the Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., on Sunday, May 16, 1948.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

I wish to convey my greetings to your meeting celebrating the establishment of the State of Israel. For a long time I have followed with sympathetic interest the great efforts to build in Palestine a homeland for the homeless, tempest-tossed Jewish people yearning for freedom. I take considerable satisfaction in recalling how in December, 1946, while Secretary of State, after a conference with you, Dr. Wise and Mr. Goldman, I secured from the British Foreign Secretary written assurance that His Majesty's Government would give serious consideration to the possibility of partitioning Palestine between the Jews and the Arabs. I urged this as

probably the best means of encouraging the two peoples to work out their common destiny on the basis of equality. That effort failed. At that time I suggested if such a plan could come from the United Nations it would have the best chance of general acceptance.

Last November the General Assembly did propose a partition plan that was actively supported by the United States. The Jewish people accepted the United Nations proposal. Jewish blood has been freely shed in support of that proposal. Despite the difficulties still to be overcome, I am convinced the United States now has taken the right course. It will not only give comfort to the Jewish people but will give strength to the United Nations.

May Israel live, may the law again go forth out of Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. May the peoples of the Holy Land now beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks.

May they by their example teach us to live in peace so that nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore.

JAMES F. BYRNES.

Memorial Day Sermon at Tenth Annual Military Memorial Field Mass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Memorial Day sermon preached by the Right Reverend John Keating Cartwright, Ph. D., rector of St. Matthew's Cathedral of Washington, D. C., on the occasion of the tenth annual military memorial field mass, on Sunday, May 23, 1948, in Arlington Amphitheater, at Arlington, Va. This is an annual service sponsored by the general assembly fourth-degree Knights of Columbus of the District of Columbia, and participated in by 103 Catholic organizations from all over the United States. The celebrant of the mass was the Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle, D. D., Archbishop of Washington.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORIAL DAY SERMON, 1948

In the midst of life we are in death.

Such is the age-old maxim of grim human experience. Perhaps there is no place where its truth comes home to us with more force than here in Arlington Cemetery.

On the one hand, we are surely in the midst of life. All about us is the luxuriance of springtime in these beautiful Virginia hills. The growth of grass and herb and bush and tree, the activity of insect and bird and beast, asserts itself in all but tropical abundance. Outside this walled garden is the throbbing movement of a great city that is in some respects the capital of the world. And we, consciously living creatures amidst this world of life, respond with the pulses of our own vitality. It seems to us for the moment that we live more intensely because we are subject to the suggestions of the gloriously living spring.

Yet, in the midst of life we are in death.

Among the living grass, under the living trees spreads out in serried ranks the army of the dead. Beneath the feet of us who live are the still remains of those who have lived. We meet the evidence and realize the certainty of death. We check our voices and bow our heads. The major chords of the triumphant symphony of spring are changed suddenly to the minor key of another theme. Happiness gives place to awe, and glory becomes solemnity. There is a presence all about us of a cloud of ghostly witnesses. Our earthly concerns are hushed in this presence of those who have long ago laid down their weapons and given up their interest in earthly defeat and victory, in human joy and sorrow. We seem oblivious for a moment of our driving ambitions, our heated passions, of both our sloths and our energies. We are brought before the majesty of death that shames most of the concerns of life into futility.

So here today we condense within an hour the realization of the strange paradox that underlies all our human life. So we reenact the drama in which we are always engaged, the drama of passing from life to death, from death to life.

The Memorial Day which approaches is the Nation's day for paying a tribute of respect and gratitude to the soldier dead for that which they did for all of us. It is the office and honor of the soldier, not that he takes life, but that he offers his own life for that of his brethren and to preserve their liberty and restore their peace. All of those who lie about us have risked their lives for us. Some of them have actually given up their lives. Over these tombs hovers the glory of sacrifice. So we come here today with reverence and thanks. We lay on these tombs the bright beauty of flowers hoping thus to express our feelings toward those who have served us so unselfishly.

This much we do in common with all our fellow-citizens. All of them, no matter what their creed, no matter what their faith concerning life and death—all of them have at least the natural virtues of thankfulness and civic piety. All decent and honorable men and women can rise to respect the heroism of those that have given their lives for us all. Therefore it is an elementary act of citizenship to join in the tribute of Memorial Day.

For some who come here perhaps this is all. For to some death is simply the end. For them life is only a strange, unaccountable, precious yet transitory accident. And so death is only the falling of the curtain upon the play of life. As a strange chance of nature life begins. It develops, strengthens, matures. It wanes, dwindles, and expires. The human person becomes a part of the complex life around. It serves its uses for its own time. It wins recognition, friendship, love. It undertakes a soldier's obedience to the needs of its country. It bears a soldier's hardships, meets a soldier's dangers, languishes in the mystery of pain. Then it is gone. It was a flame that burned beautifully and briefly. Now the ashes of life are ready to go back to the ground. Those who remain behind look on, are silent for a moment of ceremony, come once a year to pay a tribute of memory to a nobility that is now nothingness, then go back to life's business which for them too will end. Thus the pagan faces death: some in questioning, some in fear, some in courage, some in indifference, some in regret, some in despair, each comes to the moment that is the disappointment of all ambitions, the frustration of all hopes, the severance of all friendships, the cancellation of all loves, the defeat of all victories—each comes to death that is the end.

Some in questioning, some in fear, some in courage, some in indifference, some in regret, some in despair. These are the pagan ways of meeting death. But some meet death in faith. And that is the Christian way.

For Christians do not believe in death. They believe in life. We are Christians because we take our watchword from Him Who died only to rise again. "I am the Resurrection and the Life. He who believeth in Me although he be dead shall live. And everyone who liveth and believeth in Me shall not die forever."

Therefore we Christians reverse the grim old adage, "In the midst of life we are in death." For us it is true to say "In the midst of death we are in life." We see that it is the very essence of life on earth that it is the preparation for a better life. Between these two lives death is only a passageway. At one end is a life short, imperfect, marred with every limitation. At the other a life free, spiritual, unhampered, eternal with God in heaven. For others death may mean darkness, dismay, defeat, corruption, annihilation. For us it is a window through which the rays of everlasting sunlight fall athwart the world of this darkness to give it the blessedness of hope. Others, seeing only what meets the eye, may think that the human personality in death loses its substance, becoming a mist before it becomes a nothingness. We know that personality is made whole through death. The Christian lives, trying to live as Christ lived. The Christian dies clasping the image of Christ's death. The Christian rises to meet the risen Christ. "I am the resurrection and the life. He who believeth in Me, although he be dead shall live. And everyone that liveth and believeth in Me shall not die forever."

So not only on Memorial Day but at all times we carry the memory of the departed. The parting from those we loved is real, but it is only temporary. Their living souls abide under God's hand. Their buried bodies rest expecting the resurrection. They are gone before us with the sign of faith, and they rest in the sleep of peace. In life and in death they made themselves one with Christ; on their baptized foreheads was placed the sign of His redeeming cross; in their minds lived the image of His incarnate person; on their lips living and dying was breathed His holy name; at their departure their limbs were consecrated back to Him in extreme unction; as their eyes closed on this earth their spirits began the vision of the life everlasting. They have died to the world, but they have waked to live to God. They are to us fallen asleep, but we do not sorrow for them as those sorrow who have no hope. Christ in His resurrection triumphed over death. And these, waiting to arise with Christ, are the trophies of that resurrection.

This place where we stand is a shrine of generosity and self-sacrifice. Therefore, it is easy to think here of the glorious Christian hope of immortality. The men who are buried here did not merely cherish life as do the beasts. They honored life in knowing the purposes of living. Mere existence, mere security, mere instinctual survival did not seem to them worthy of life. Life was not worth the living unless it could be lived with honor and liberty. Peace was not worth the having unless it could be had with dignity and justice. They saw in life not the mere reactions of the physical complex to the animal duty of self- preservation. They knew that life must be dedicated to a transcendent good. In this faith they laid down their lives. In this faith surely was implicit the belief that they were sons of God. Surely, the God who gave them the inspiration of self-sacrifice will not be contented to reward them only with the decaying laurels of human praise. Surely, He who every year brings over their resting place the bright glory of the earthly spring will not withhold from them His higher benedictions. Surely, He whose example was the fountain of their unselfishness will crown their heroism with timelessness of light and love.

So, in face of this solemn mystery of death we share as Christians the joyfulness of the springtime. Like the ancient prophet, we see

the resting place of the dead transformed into the gathering place of their undying spirits. And over them we hear as he did the voice of God:

Behold I will open your graves and will bring you out of your sepulchers, O my people, and you shall know that I am the Lord. * * * And I shall make a covenant of peace with you, and my tabernacle shall be with you, and I will be your God, and you will be my people, and my sanctuary will be in the midst of you forever.

So, in face of the solemn mystery of death we are filled with the joy and peace of believing, for He is King of Death who is the King of Life. We are followers of Christ in life, in faith, in love. We are followers in hope as well—of that Christ whose earthly life rose out of the fountains of the Godhead, whose death was in the hands of His own will, whose body rose in glory of resurrection, whose person (soul and body) ascended into Heaven, who sitteth eternally at the right hand of God, who shall come to judge the living and the dead, whose face those that believe in Him shall see, whose friendship those that serve Him shall know, whose life those that live with Him shall share the glory of the risen life that is the true destiny of the immortal soul.

The New Mexico Plan for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to refer to a letter from Maj. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley, who has had a long and distinguished record of public service. The letter concerns the New Mexico plan, devised to build business careers for veterans and to benefit all the people of his State. An active member of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and of the Disabled American Veterans, General Hurley has long had a deep concern in veterans' affairs.

General Hurley's New Mexico plan interests us in this Eightieth Congress because the plan will be helpful to the interest of the citizens of all of the 48 States who also wish to raise the standard of living of their people.

I ask unanimous consent to have General Hurley's letter and the plan inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and plan were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SANTA FE, N. MEX., *May 6, 1948.*

Hon. STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BRIDGES: In your plan to develop our great West under such legislation as the Veterans' Economic Development Corporation Act, I consider it a privilege and an honor to be invited to join you and Senator BUTLER, the chairman of the Senate Public Lands Committee; Senator BUCK, of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency; Senator CAPEHART, of the Senate Committee on Small Business; Senator DWORSHAK, of Idaho; Senator KNOWLAND, of California; Senator ROBERTSON of Wyoming; Senator CAIN, of Washington; Senator MORSE, of Oregon, the chairman of the Veterans' Subcommittee of the Senate Committee of Labor and Welfare; Senator FERGUSON, of Michigan; House Chairman WOLCOTT, of the Banking and Currency Committee; EDITH ROGERS, the chairman of the House Veterans' Committee, and the other 30 distinguished sponsors of this important legislation.

Senator BUTLER has dramatically called attention to the unlimited opportunities for this program in the development of the economic resources of the West. He correctly states that millions of acres of dry land can be brought into production by irrigation. He points out that the development of vast mineral resources and of hydroelectric power, and the bringing in of new industries, all under the American system of free enterprise and equality of opportunity, will bring prosperity to the 11 Western States. These States now have a population of 16,000,000.

Not only will the suggested program raise the level of prosperity of those 16,000,000, it will create support for 60,000,0000 people at the same high level of prosperity when all of the resources are adequately developed. I favor the Veterans' Economic Development Corporation Act for all of the Western States; in fact, for the United States. But especially, I propose to make it effective in the State of New Mexico.

BOOST STATE INDUSTRY

At the present time only 25.6 percent of the available labor in New Mexico is engaged in basic industries—agriculture, mining, construction and manufacturing. The other 74.4 percent is engaged in the service industries; transportation, public utilities, trade and finance, and the service divisions. Thus, this segment of industry has become top-heavy and the law of diminishing returns operates to the disadvantage of our people.

Under the New Mexico plan that I am proposing, there will be an increase of the basic industries, that is, of agriculture, stock raising, mining, construction, and manufacturing. This, in turn, will offer excellent opportunity for profitable enterprise. As we increase our basic industries, we can make use of the many scientific processes, trade secrets, and patents that have been developed at home and captured by our veterans in enemy countries. All of these can be used to the commercial advantage of businesses in every American community.

I have been amazed at the estimate that American experts who made the inventory of these materials in Germany have placed on their value to this country.

My plan for New Mexico envisions the use of all these aids in the development of New Mexican resources. Inasmuch as water is a limited commodity in New Mexico, primarily my plan envisions the proper development of all the water resources of the State. My plan safeguards the rights of water users as they exist at present. Many of the water projects can be self-liquidating.

DEVELOPMENT NEEDED

Water development, soil conservation, reclamation, protection of the forests, can all be accomplished without destroying the rights of the people who have made a living in these areas for generations. In fact the development as I envision it will enhance the prosperity of those who now live on the land. This program will enhance the agricultural activity and promote the cattle, wool, and dairy industries of New Mexico.

The plan envisions the encouragement and the development of all the mineral resources of the State under the American system of free enterprise and equality of opportunity.

We favor the research for and analysis of all the mineral resources of New Mexico by both Federal and State agencies (including the Federal Bureau of Mines) for the purpose of stimulating discovery and development. Especially do we recommend the search for and development of strategic metals and minerals necessary to the defense and prosperity of the Nation. The present system of purchasing abroad strategic minerals at high costs creates unnecessary dependence of the United States on other nations.

This plan for New Mexico envisions the enhancement and protection of every commercial industry now operating in the State and the building of new commercial enterprises to keep pace with the development of the resources of the State.

In this plan I am thinking primarily and particularly of the many thousands of our veterans and other citizens who are looking for an opportunity to help themselves while carving out new economic developments under the Veterans' Economic Development Corporation, or little man's RFC, which the veterans' organizations term "one of the most constructive pieces of veteran legislation ever to be introduced."

Any plan we evolve for the development of the resources of New Mexico that will promote commercial, agricultural, industrial, water, and mineral development, can be emulated, perhaps improved upon, by our good neighbors in Mexico. This may help to secure hemispheric solidarity and prosperity for both nations.

Senator BRIDGES, in accordance with your request, I have written this rather sketchy letter, but for your further information I am attaching an outline of the New Mexico plan, the purpose of which is to promote the economic welfare of the people of New Mexico.

Sincerely yours,

PATRICK J. HURLEY.

THE NEW MEXICO PLAN

The New Mexico plan is designed to develop under the provisions of the Veterans' Economic Development Corporation, the resources of the State to promote the prosperity, welfare, and health of all its people. Career opportunities for veterans as well as continued full employment for others would be fostered through the development of needed new businesses, the modernized productivity of agriculture, the utilization of unused natural resources, and the implementation of needed self-liquidating public projects.

The veterans' corporation, with authority to extend credit totaling $5,000,000,000, will direct its loans toward supplementing the loans of banks and other existing private lending agencies, and the capital needed will derive from existing public money. No appropriations from Congress will be necessary, as only profitable self-liquidating projects will be considered.

Planning activities would be on a State, county, regional, or community level. The State planning board, with the assistance of a know-how committee composed of technical experts, would plan for the physical development of the State, cooperating with other State agencies in the preparation of programs. It would also assist regional and county committees (which would plan for county and regional projects) and community planning boards, giving technical advice and assisting in the coordination of State, county, and community plans. It would further extend technical assistance to individuals, new businesses, and projects.

Since the veterans economic development program is essentially a grass-roots program—designed to serve small business and industry and agriculture in the community—emphasis on planning would be on a community level. Thus, while the State planning board and know-how committee would engage in planning on a State-wide basis, their primary function would be to serve the interests of the communities and to bring to bear the cooperation of the Federal Government on local projects whenever advisable and necessary.

Because of this emphasis on local planning, the following outline on State and community planning will list specific opportunities

for development and expansion under the section on community planning.

FOREIGN AID

Ambassadors, ministers, and technical experts of friendly nations seeking our help under the Economic Cooperation Administration and other forms of aid have shown great interest in applying this State plan to their own countries. In their opinion, the plan will speed modernization of their economy and enable the people in their communities to become increasingly self-sufficient. This economic development plan will increase two-way trade between the people in the communities of the United States, of Mexico, and of other countries for the increasing profit and security of all the people.

It is the belief of American authorities that the application of this plan in the communities of friendly countries will help provide a firmer foundation upon which our financial aid at Government level to these countries will rest. Further, the State plan may be put into effect abroad without cost to the American taxpayer as no appropriations of public money are required.

COMMUNITY PLANNING

1. Local planning board established, representing industry, finance, business, agriculture, labor, sciences, the professions, veterans, religious groups.

2. Planning board sets up a know-how committee.

3. Planning board outlines program of activity, receiving assistance in organizing and formulating programs from State planning commission or State know-how committee.

a. Inventory to determine present and future economic needs, including preparation of town and agricultural maps on the following:

(1) Population distribution and trends.
(2) Property-tax surveys.
(3) Land use.
(4) Zoning ordinances.
(5) Traffic studies.
(6) Recreational-facility requirements.
(7) Health and welfare survey.
(8) Community-center redevelopments.
(9) Highway maintenance.
(10) Fire protection.
(11) Water supply.
(12) Housing.
(13) School system.
(14) Farming—acreages, crop production, livestock.
(15) Utility services.
(16) Transportation service—airport, etc.

(a) Uses facilities of Federal, State, and regional agencies for fact-finding and making projective studies.

4. Opportunities for development and expansion.

a. Local industries.
(1) Needed expansion of existing industries.
(2) Needed new industries.
(a) Research for new products.
(b) Use of captured enemy patents and new processes.
(c) Use of natural resources.
(d) New industrial uses for agricultural products.
(3) Processing plants for local products.
(4) Assembling plants for local markets.
(5) Service industries.
(6) Retail trade.
b. Land use.
(1) Land conservation.
(a) Irrigation—surface and underground water resources.
(b) Reforestation.
(c) Erosion control.
(d) Soil treatment.
(e) Fertilizers.
(2) Water power development.
(a) Utilities.
(b) Industrial uses.
(c) Agricultural purposes.
(d) Home.
(3) Agricultural practices.
(a) New methods of farming and live stock improvement.
(b) New farm enterprises and better use of land resources.
c. Commerce.
(1) Sales development—new market centers in growing communities.
(2) Farm cooperatives.
(3) Export development opportunities.
(4) Shipping.
(a) Assembly, processing, and warehousing facilities.
(b) Harbor improvements; feeder lines.
(5) Air transport.
(6) Trucking.
(7) Freight.
d. Mining.
(1) Geological surveys.
(2) Development of mineral resources.
(3) New uses for mineral products.
e. Tourist and recreational areas.
(1) Beaches and artificial ponds and lakes.
(2) Wood trails and roads, camping areas.
(3) Sports, fish, and game stocking.
(4) Restoration of historical areas, scenic improvement.
(5) Hotels, cabins, and restaurants.
(6) Stream and pond pollution control.
(7) Handicrafts.
f. Public service (self-liquidating).
(1) Utilities and power development.
(2) Transportation of passengers.
(a) Bus.
(b) Streetcar.
(c) Train.
(d) Air travel.
(e) Boat.
g. Public health and welfare (self-liquidating).
(1) Medical clinics.
(2) Fire prevention.
(3) Sanitation.
(a) Stream-pollution abatement.
(b) Sewage disposal.
(c) Garbage disposal.
(4) Hospitals (improvement and/or expansion).
(h) Public works and public improvements (self-liquidating).
(1) Housing.
(a) Multiple low-rental units.
(b) Prefabricated and industrial housing.
(2) Parking areas and buildings.
(3) Municipal projects.
(i) Education (self-liquidating).
(1) Colleges, professional and trade schools (improvements and/or expansion).
(2) Housing to accommodate veteran students.
(3) Community recreation centers.
(4) Vocation and social guidance.
(5) Rural school program, consolidation and transportation.

STATE AND REGIONAL PLANNING

1. State planning board established, representing industry, finance, business, labor, sciences, the professions, veterans, and religious groups.

a. Supplements and implements work of existing state planning agencies.

b. Cooperates with and serves community planning boards.

2. Planning board sets up a State know-how committee composed of technical experts in various fields.

a. Know-how committee gives technical advice to planning board, to community know-how committees, to county or regional committees, to individuals, to new businesses and projects.

3. Planning board outlines program of activity, receiving assistance in organizing and formulating programs from State know-how committee or State planning commission.

a. Takes inventory to determine present and future economic needs of State and geographical area, preparing State, regional, and county maps and statistical studies.

(1) Uses facilities of Federal, State, and Regional departments and agencies for fact-finding and making projective studies.

4. Planning board relates county, community, and intra-State regional plans to one another, thereby eliminating overlapping, confusion, and unprofitable enterprises and projects.

5. Planning board cooperates with other States on regional projects in same geographic area, such as power developments, land conservation, etc.

(Specific opportunities for development and expansion outlined in detail in section on community planning.)

Wallace Forgets History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. (EDWARD) A. MITCHELL

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Daniel M. Kidney from the Washington News of May 15, 1948:

WALLACE FORGETS HISTORY

(By Daniel M. Kidney)

Henry Wallace's statement to the Chrysler strikers in Detroit that he is "the first Presidential candidate ever to address pickets" is disproved by persons who recalled the Presidential candidacies of the late Eugene V. Debs and the more recent ones of Norman Thomas.

Both of these men ran repeatedly on the Socialist ticket and each not only talked to pickets but walked with them during and between Presidential campaign years.

It would never have occurred to Dr. Debs that gentle Hoosier Socialist, to call workers the common man, as does Mr. Wallace. To him they were comrades, and not in any modern Communist Party sense. He really meant it.

Mr. Debs ran for President as the Socialist candidate five times. He polled his largest vote (almost a million) when he was still serving in Atlanta prison for opposing the World War I draft.

In those days Henry Wallace was best known as the son of a Republican Secretary of Agriculture from Iowa. Later he turned Democrat, was rewarded with two Cabinet posts and the Vice Presidency, and now is running his own third party with Communist help.

His talking to strikers and bragging about it would make Debs fighting mad, according to men who knew the Terre Haute labor leader well. For Debs was a genuine worker. His radicalism came more from the banks of the Wabash than from Marx and Moscow.

Upon his death in 1926 at the age of 70, New York Herald Tribune had this to say of him:

"There is no evidence that he even understood or responded to the grim gospel of the German evangelist Karl Marx."

"There is no proletariat in Indiana; there is no class conflict. The Hoosiers are all free and equal economically as well as politically. There is no hated bourgeoise to destroy."

The Hoosiers themselves felt much the same way about him. Unlike Mr. Wallace's current reception in his native Iowa, Debs was welcomed home to Terre Haute by 50,000 fellow townsmen after President Harding commuted his prison sentence. And the

Terre Haute district then and now keeps a Republican Representative in Congress.

How the Hoosiers felt about their homegrown radical who would walk with pickets without thinking it was a common touch, was summed up by James Whitcomb Riley's verse:

"And there's Gene Debs, a man that stands
And jest holds out in his two hands
As warm a heart as ever beat
'Twixt here and the judgment seat."

The Administration and the Palestine Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS RIZLEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, the story is told that a teacher applying for a position in the public schools in a remote section in Oklahoma found that the members of the school board were in violent disagreement as to whether the world was round or flat, and in order to avoid the controversy and make sure that he was successful in his bid for the school, in answer to a question propounded as to what he would teach in respect to the earth being round or flat, made the statement, "Gentlemen, I am prepared to teach it either way."

The administration in Washington seems to have had the same attitude in respect to the Palestine situation. I desire to call the attention of the House to three timely editorials from the Daily Oklahoman, dated May 17, 18, and 19, respectively, dealing with the attitude of the President on the subject:

[From the Daily Oklahoman of May 17, 1948]

IGNORING UNITED NATIONS

Had Moscow instead of Washington extended that precipitate recognition to the fledgling state of Israel, her action would have been denounced throughout our extended country. Only the lesser breeds of the Wallace bailiwick would have approved the quick-triggered action. Others would have seen in the recognition a studied affront to United Nations and an open threat to the peace of the world. But it is the President of the United States who has chosen to by-pass the peace-promoting agency at Lake Success and recognize a de facto government even before some of the world capitals had heard that such a government exists.

Whatever else this abrupt action of the President may be it is a cavalier snub to United Nations if not an official repudiation of that vast organization in all matters that happen to interest our national administration. If the adjusting of the tragic differences which prevail in Palestine are not the business of the United Nations, then it has no legitimate business at all and had just as well adjourn without delay.

And just how it is humanly possible for United Nations to solve the world's distressing problems if the most powerful of all nations refuses to accept its good services and announces the determination of the most powerful republic to do exactly as it pleases? If United Nations is to be impotent in the very country on whose soil it is domiciled how can it possibly possess any potency in the distant countries of Europe and Asia?

An unfortunate aspect of our country's abrupt intrusion into the edge of his Levantine tragedy is that the man who issued the announcement of recognition is a candidate for the Presidency in a closely contested campaign. No matter how pure Mr. Truman's motives may be and no matter how righteous his stand may be, the American people will not be unaware of the political implications of this official pronouncement. Among his adherents his stand will be hailed as a master political maneuver. By his opponents his course will be denounced as a callous political maneuver dictated solely by political considerations. It is disquieting even to hear it hinted that a President of the United States would dare to imperil the peace of his country for the sake of his own political fortune.

Whether the flag and the marines will presently follow this proclamation into the harbors of Palestine now remains with the battle gods. Our country has been known to walk backward into war while passionately avowing its determination to avoid involvement. It could do such a thing again.

While the possibility of war is an eternal threat, we are neither expecting nor predicting that war will be insured by Mr. Truman's frantic dive into the midst of this Palestinian fracas. But if war should by some evil mischance become our bitter portion, let us go into it like honest men with every citizen knowing what his Government is doing. Let there be no unctuous avowals of peaceful intentions at the very time our Government is trying to provoke a chosen antagonist to deliver the first blow.

But no matter whether we are to have peace or war, Mr. Truman has given a staggering and possibly a mortal blow to the prestige of United Nations.

[From the Daily Oklahoman of May 18, 1948]

CONSTITUTION NOTWITHSTANDING

The recent action of our Government in renouncing the program of partition in Palestine was the action of one man.

The situation which created the necessity for calling the Assembly of the United Nations together to consider the creation of a trusteeship for Palestine was a situation brought about by one man.

The proclamation of recognition of the new-born nation of Israel was the proclamation of one man.

It was just one man in high official station who committed our country against partition, in favor of international trusteeship, and finally to the recognition of a nation that is even yet wrapped in its swaddling clothes.

Of course, the Constitution provides that a foreign treaty must be confirmed by the Senate before it can become effective. But apparently there is a loophole somewhere through which the President may take a course of action that cuts the treaty-making responsibility of the Senate into so many shreds.

Of course, the Constitution clothes Congress with the sole power to declare war. But somewhere there is a loophole in the constitutional structure through which the President may invite war and even render it inevitable.

Either by subterfuge or by an unwarranted assumption of power the President can convert the treaty-making power of the Senate into a nullity. This Mr. Truman has clearly done.

Either by subterfuge or the assumption of an undelegated power the President can commit the country to a course that points directly toward the maelstrom of war. This, undoubtedly, has been done by Mr. Truman.

By sidestepping and evading the plain mandate of the Constitution a President can commit the country to a foreign program that may have no support at all among the American people or even lead the country into a war in open disregard of the people's wishes. Thus, the people's protection against foreign alliances and foreign wars can be brushed aside by one man.

In the late unhappy world conflict (which now hints disturbingly of a bloody renewal) Americans most passionately made a fetish of democracy or popular rule. Since the cessation of the conflict the people have been urged vehemently to neutralize the appeal of communism by making democracy work here at home.

But isn't popular rule converted into an exploded myth when one man can formulate just any foreign policy he wishes to dictate and place his country squarely on the road that leads to ruinous war?

And just why should we damn the policies of the totalitarian when a single man in the White House can kick in the teeth a half-dozen friendly nations who have never done us any wrong or inflicted the least injury upon our national interest or against our national flag?

Back to old-fashioned democracy is a cry with considerable merit. But back to the American Constitution would bring the country vaster profit and infinitely greater prospects of peace.

NO CAUSE FOR HATRED

If by any malign chance the United States should be sucked into the war that is now full blown in western Asia, it would be the first war in two generations that called upon the American people to fight an enemy they had never been led to hate.

Stories of Spanish atrocities and of Weyler's cruelties had stirred bitter anger against the Spanish armies of occupation before we invaded Cuba. Stories of German atrocities and the waging of submarine warfare against our shipping had roused the people to fighting pitch before we went to war with the Kaiser. And it certainly was a thoroughly angered people who drew the sword after the attack on Pearl Harbor.

But there is no present anger against the Arab nations. How could there be? Never since the close of the war with Tripoli has any Arab people ever done the least thing that could possibly offend the American people as a whole.

[From the Daily Oklahoman of May 19, 1948]

BUT WHAT IS IT?

When President Truman voices the devout hope that the year's campaign may be conducted on domestic rather than foreign issues he leaves one question of paramount interest completely unanswered. Just what is the position of the United States on foreign issues? The American people would possibly rally unanimously around the President's foreign-issue standard if they only knew what his position is.

But if the Presidential record on the Palestine problem is to be taken as any criterion, no American born of woman can possibly tell what the President's position is. In a pure arithmetical sense, the President has taken three contradictory positions on that one important issue and now seems preparing to take the fourth. He has opposed partition and he has recognized partition. He has demanded a trusteeship to be directed by the United Nations and he has stabbed trusteeship beneath the fifth rib without any warning of what he had in mind. He has pleaded for world peace only to take a step that might conceivably plunge the world into a third world war.

No living American, however shrewd and forevisioned, can possibly tell what Mr. Truman's position will be tomorrow. He may be lending powerful aid to the cause of world pacification or he may be imperiling the peace of the world by his lightning change of front and by his amazing ineptitudes.

He has startled the American people by his continued reversals of position. He has dis-

mayed the world by his catch-as-catch-can foreign policy. And he has made his country the laughing stock of all the delegates who sit in the assembly of the United Nations. And he voices the pious hope that none of his frantic gyrations on foreign policy will be permitted to figure in the year's campaign.

Manifestly foreign issues would receive scant mention in the year's Presidential contest if the President's programs were fully American, completely honest, demonstrably sincere, and universally understood. But how can the people be assured it is any of those things with the President reversing himself and changing his position with every changing breeze? Suppose that the people decide by unanimous voice to support the President's foreign policy, are they going to support United Nations control, partition of Palestine by universal agreement, the suppression of partition by United Nations trusteeship, or the enforcement of partition by unilateral recognition? How can any man ever born tell what the President's foreign program really is?

BEGINNING TODAY

It's entirely too early to begin petitioning the President and Congress to get the boys out of the Palestinian trenches by Christmas. But it may be exceptionally good time to begin to petition the President and Congress to keep the boys out of the trenches right now.

Missouri Personalities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD a portion of an address by the Honorable John T. Barker, distinguished Missourian and former attorney general of our State, before the Lawyers' Association of St. Louis. The address contains delightful anecdotes about some distinguished Missourians and their contemporaries who, in times past, have played conspicuous parts on the national scene.

There being no objection, excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSOURI PERSONALITIES

Mr. President, distinguished guests, members of the Lawyers Association, ladies, and gentlemen. I thank you for the invitation to address your association. It is a great honor for a Kansas City lawyer to be invited to address a meeting in St. Louis.

I am going to speak of Missouri and some of its characters of long ago. Your forefathers and mine settled here more than a hundred years ago. They came up from the southland, from the Carolina's Virginia, and Kentucky, through the Cumberland Gap. They came from the eastland, over the mountains of Pennsylvania, and across the prairies of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. Here, the sturdy lad from the far New England States, met and wed the sweet faced maiden of the southland, and they peopled Missouri with a great and mighty people. On every hill they built a church and a graveyard, where they sleep tonight. In every valley they built a schoolhouse, where their children were taught to read and write. They made Missouri a great State, and it was the day of opportunity, and the land of possibility. Where a boy with only a modest education, and of humble birth, but with an honest heart, might use that, as a bridge to span the chasm of obscurity and oppression, to occupy the highest office within the gift of the American people, as one Missouri boy does today.

Missouri is the most diversified State in the Union. Here, grows cotton, corn, wheat, oats, hay, and alfalfa. Here are the finest cattle, horses and mules. Beneath the surface lies large beds of coal, lead, and zinc. On every farm is an orchard. On two of its borders, may be found two great cities, and through it courses two of the great rivers of the world, the Mississippi and Missouri.

One hundred and twenty-seven years ago, Missouri, upon being admitted to the Union, sent the great Thomas Hart Benton to the United States Senate, where he remained for 30 years, the first 30-year Senator. He was the most egotistical man in public life. Arrogant and haughty. He spoke in Carrollton in 1849 at the old fairgrounds. People came from miles around in covered wagons. He referred to himself as "Benton." Never said "I." He began speaking at 1 o'clock in the afternoon and spoke until dusk. When he had concluded, an enthusiastic admirer leaped to the platform and offered the following resolution:

"*Be it resolved*, That Thomas Hart Benton is the greatest living American; and be is further

"*Resolved*, That Thomas Hart Benton is the greatest American that has ever lived; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That Thomas Hart Benton is the greatest American who will ever live."

This resolution was enthusiastically and unanimously adopted by the audience, after which Benton stepped up to the front, and said, "Benton thanks you—you have done him but simple justice."

While he was writing his book Thirty Years View, his publisher, Harper Bros. wrote him as to how many copies they should print. He replied, "Ascertain from the census how many people in the United States can read."

He was debating nullification with the great South Carolina statesman, John C. Calhoun, in the Senate, and announced that he would answer Calhoun the next day at 2 o'clock. That night Calhoun was prostrated, and Benton arose in the Senate, and said, "Benton will not speak today, for when God Almighty lays his hands upon a man, Benton takes his off."

Benton was the greatest intellectual and moral force in the United States Senate for 30 years, commanding far greater respect than either of his talented contemporaries, Webster or Clay, but even his greatest admirers conceded that his egotism was colossal. He was the only Senator west of the Mississippi, and looked after all the country to the Facific. He was the Father of the West, and responsible for the settlement of that country. More than any man of his time, he foresaw that the future of the United States depended upon the acquisition of that western country. He foretold that with it we would become the greatest power that the world had ever seen, and that without it we would have in close proximity powerful enemies which would keep us reduced to a third rate power. For more than 30 years he dominated the politics of his State and very largely of this country.

Probably no Missourian has ever had a life of as much excitement and glamour as Benton's. His daughter Jessie, became the wife of John C. Fremont, the first Republican candidate for the Presidency. She has been glorified by Irving Stone in "Immortal Wife." Her school girl friend and neighbor Julia Dent, married U. S. Grant, and became the first lady of the land—Jessie just missed.

Three daughters in history immortalized themselves for the great love they had for their fathers. The love that existed between Aaron Burr and his daughter Theodosia was a beautiful thing. He directed her education, and before her tragic death she wrote that she had rather not have lived than not to have been his daughter. Jessie Benton worshipped her father, Thomas Hart Benton, and helped him prepare his speeches and was always in the gallery when he spoke. Kate Chase had a great love for her father, Chief Justice Salmon P. Chase and was the political power behind him. Each of these daughters tried to make their father the President of the United States, but they failed.

Benton was a fighter in every way. He killed one man in a duel, and had a pistol fight with Andrew Jackson in a bar room at Nashville. Jackson carried his bullet in his shoulder throughout life. They made up when they reached the Senate, and Benton was Jackson's majority leader during his entire term. He won every fight for Jackson, defeating Webster and Clay in all battles. Yet history makes heroes out of the losers, and forgets the winner.

One hundred years ago Edward Bates was the leading lawyer in St. Louis. He was a candidate for the Republican nomination for President at the wigwam in Chicago in 1860. He was defeated by Abraham Lincoln, who thereupon made him his Attorney General. He had coal black hair and a snow-white beard, as shown by his picture. Someone called Lincoln's attention to this, and Lincoln said: "Yes, Mr. Bates uses his chin more than he uses his head."

Two of Missouri's great personalities, seldom mentioned today, were James Shields, of Carrollton, and Carl Schurz, of St. Louis. Shields came to the United States from County Tyrone, Ireland, 123 years ago (1825) when but 17 years of age. He had a fine education, and a knowledge of military tactics. He was admitted to the Illinois bar in 1832, and elected to the State legislature in 1834. In 1840 he was elected State auditor, and in 1843 was appointed to the Supreme Bench. In 1845 he was appointed Commissioner of the General Land Office in Washington, by President Polk. In 1846 he was appointed a brigadier general and had a glorious record in the Mexican War. He planted the American flag on the heights of Chapultepec, and led his troops into the City of Mexico, and raised the Stars and Stripes over the Halls of the Montezumas. A picture of his Chapultepec engagemennt is in the corridor of the Capitol in Washington, and General Shields can easily be recognized leading his troops. He fought side by side with U. S. Grant, George S. Meade, Joseph E. Johnson, Robert E. Lee, James Longstreet, George E. Pickett, and Stonewall Jackson. The State of Illinois presented him with a diamond-hilted sword, as did South Carolina. He was appointed Governor of Oregon Territory, and in 1849 was elected a Senator from Illinois, and took his seat with Douglas, Webster, Clay, Calhoun, Benton, Chase, Breckenridge, Jefferson Davis, and many others who were to play a part in the division of the Union a few years later. At the end of his term the legislature was Republican and he was defeated. Moved to the new State of Minnesota, and was immediately elected to the United States Senate. When Fort Sumter was fired on he tendered his services and his sword to his old rival, Abraham Lincoln, who sent him to the Shenandoah Valley to fight Stonewall Jackson. At Winchester, he defeated Jackson, the first and only time Jackson was decisively defeated. He was wounded, and invalided out of the Army. He moved to Carroll County, Mo., and purchased a farm near Carrollton, and practiced law. Carroll County was named for Charles Carroll of Carrollton, who, when signing the Declaration of Independence, was told that there were so many Carrolls in the colony that King George would not know which one to look for, if the English won. He thereupon added "of Carrollton" to his name. In 1879 Shields

was chosen the third time, and from the third State, as a United States Senator, and has the unique record, unparalleled by any other man in the entire history of the United States, of having served as a Senator from three States. He was chosen by the State of Illinois as its representative in the Hall of Fame in Washington, where his statue may be seen today. In 1910 Congress erected a monument at his grave. The State of Missouri dedicated a monument to him in Carrollton.

One of the most bizarre happenings in the life of Shields was the duel he almost fought with Abraham Lincoln. While he was living in Springfield, Ill., a series of articles appeared in a local newspaper holding Shields up to ridicule. He had a typically fiery Irish disposition and pride and immediately demanded from the editor the name of the author. Either from the editor or some other way he found that the articles had been written by Mary Todd, whom he and Lincoln were courting. Shields spoke to Lincoln about it, and Lincoln chivalrously assumed the authorship, and refused to apologize. Shields then challenged him to a duel which was accepted. On a fine spring morning, therefore, Lincoln and Shields, together with their seconds, and doctors, crossed the Mississippi River about where Alton, Ill., is located, to Missouri soil. Just as they were about to strike each other with words, the seconds affected a reconciliation satisfactory to the parties, and the party returned to Illinois. Shields, together with Douglas courted Mary Todd, who turned them both down in favor of Lincoln whom she believed would go farther along the road of life than either of his rivals. History has conclusively demonstrated that her judgment was right.

Ninety-six years ago (1852) Carl Schurz came to the United States with a wife when he was only 23 years of age. He could not speak a word of English. Lincoln appointed him Minister to Spain in 1861. He resigned to fight in the Union Army as a brigadier general. In 1867 he went to St. Louis to live, and edited the Westliche Post, a German newspaper. Was elected a United States Senator from Missouri in 1869, and succeeded by the great Cockrell. Appointed Secretary of the Interior by Hays in 1877, and served 4 years in the Cabinet. He was a master of rhetoric, and one of the most eloquent men in America. It was said that he had the eloquence of Demosthenes. He took a place in the front ranks of the Senate from the start, and was the equal of any Senator. He showed superior ability over the great Conkling on many occasions. Finally, Conkling took to rattling a newspaper when Schurz spoke, and otherwise showed his temper and annoyance. Henry Waterson in his memoirs says of Schurz:

"He was a stubborn spirit not readily adjustable. He was a nobly gifted man, but from first to last an alien in an alien land. No man of his time spoke so well or wrote to better purpose. He was equally skillful in debate, an overmatch for Conkling and Morton—whom especially in the French arms matter—he completely dominated and outshone."

* * * An overmatch for the great Conkling. And yet he is not in the hall of fame. Missouri should have put him there. He wrote the life of Henry Clay in two volumes in 1887 for the American Statesmen series, and it is one of the finest histories in America. He was editor of Harpers magazine for many years, and spoke all over the United States. The only real genuine political reformer who ever lived. Campaigned for Fremont, Republican in 1856; Lincoln, Republican in 1860 and 1864; Grant, Republican in 1868; Greeley, Democrat in 1872; Hayes, Republican in 1876; Garfield, Republican in 1880; Cleveland, Democrat in 1884. Out of the country in 1888; Cleveland, Democrat in 1892; McKinley, Republican in 1896; Bryan, Democrat in 1900; Parker, Democrat in 1904.

Eighty-seven years ago (1861) Montgomery Blair of St. Louis was Postmaster General under Lincoln. He lived at Silver Spring, Md., about 12 miles from Washington. When the Confederate General, Jubal Early captured Silver Spring in 1863 there was nothing to prevent him going on to Washington, and capturing it, and perhaps President Lincoln. But his men found several barrels of bourbon whisky in Blair's cellar, and stopped to sample it long enough for Lincoln to rush troops to the defense of Washington. General Early was thereafter called "Too late Early."

* * * * *

James S. Green, of Canton, was elected to the United States Senate 92 years ago (1856). When 12 years of age, he attended a camp meeting where the speaker was a noted Christian minister from Kentucky. While listening to this great orator young Green appeared to be hypnotized and fell asleep. With great difficulty he was awakened, and from that day had the voice and gestures of this preacher. He sympathized with the South, and followed Benton all over Missouri. He was one of the great men of his day. During the Civil War he frequently made stump speeches on the streets of Canton for the southern cause. As the town was under the control of Iowa troops, this did not set well, and he was arrested and put in prison. He had practiced law with Lincoln in Illinois and knew him well. He would find some one to send a telegram for him and would wire the President of his plight. Lincoln always sent a telegram to release Jim Green, as he did not mean anything. He was the uncle of Judge James F. Green and the great-uncle of Judge Ernest A. Green.

James G. Blaine, in his 20 years of Congress, says of James S. Green, of Missouri:

"James Stephen Green, who was so prominent in this legislation, who prepared and reported the bills, and who was followed by a unanimous Senate, terminated his public service on the day Mr. Lincoln was inaugurated. He was but then 44 years of age and had served only 4 years in the Senate. He died soon after. No man among his contemporaries had made so profound an impression in so short a time. He was a very strong debater. He had peers, but no master, in the Senate. Mr. Green, on the one side, and Mr. Fessenden, on the other, were the Senators whom Mr. Douglas most disliked to meet and who were the best fitted in readiness, in accuracy, in logic, to meet him. Douglas rarely had a debate with either in which he did not lose his temper, and to lose one's temper in debate is generally to lose one's cause. Green had done more than any other man in Missouri to break down the power of Thomas H. Benton as a leader of the democracy. His arraignment of Benton before the people of Missouri in 1849, when he was but 32 years of age, was one of the most aggressive and successful warfares in our political annals. His premature death was a loss to the country. He was endowed with rare powers which, rightly directed, would have led him to eminence in the public service."

Few States have produced more able men than Champ Clark, James A. Reed, Joseph W. Folk, Herbert S. Hadley, William J. Stone, and David R. Francis. Four of them were candidates for the Presidency.

Seventy-three years ago (1875) Champ Clark went to Wichita, Kans., to practice law. He had no success and was slowly starving. The son of a wealthy cattleman was graduating from high school and had to write a thesis on Plato. No one had ever heard of Plato in Wichita, but someone told the proud father that the new lawyer had been president of a college in Kentucky, so he hired Champ to write the thesis. He agreed to do so for $100 and a railroad ticket to Missouri. He went to Bowling Green and became famous. In Wichita, at that time, Wyatt Earp was city marshal; Edward L. Doheny, the millionaire oilman, was the clerk in Clark's hotel; and Shanghai Pierce was still driving cattle over the Chisholm trail.

Champ Clark went to Congress, became Speaker of the House of Representatives, and had a majority of the votes for President in the Democratic convention at Baltimore in 1912 for eight ballots, but William J. Bryan and the two-third rule beat him, and Woodrow Wilson was nominated and elected.

Sixty-one years ago (1887) James A. Reed went to Kansas City from the State of Iowa. He was elected prosecuting attorney, mayor, and then United States Senator for 18 years. In Washington today they speak of him as one of the immortals. He was undoubtedly one of the greatest orators and debaters ever in that body. John Randolph, of Roanoke; Stephen A. Douglas, of Illinois; James A. Garfield, of Ohio; and James A. Reed, of Missouri, were the greatest debaters ever in the Congress. He defeated the League of Nations after World War I. He was aided by Senators Lodge, of Massachusetts; Borah, of Idaho; Wheeler, of Montana; and Johnson, of California, but they did not have the punch to do the job—they needed Reed. Whether the League would have prevented World War II no one knows. I once heard Newton D. Baker, President Wilson's very able Secretary of War, say that he thought the League would have worked, but no one knew. He said that once he was standing before the Pyramids in Egypt, and he turned to his guide and said, "How old are the Pyramids?" The guide shook his head and said, "Only Allah knows."

Reed was a candidate for the Presidency twice but could not get the nomination. He started out to support Governor Folk in 1912, but when Folk withdrew placed Clark in nomination at the convention.

Fifty-four years ago (1894) Herbert S. Hadley went to Kansas City from Kansas. He just missed being President. He was Theodore Roosevelt's floor manager at the Chicago convention in 1912. When it looked as if Taft and Teddy had the convention tied up, and that neither of them could win, if nominated, the Taft forces offered to switch to Governor Hadley, of Missouri. This infuriated Teddy, and he fought it out with Taft, and was defeated. Taft was defeated by Wilson when Teddy bolted, and ran independent. Had Roosevelt accepted Governor Hadley as the Republican candidate, he would have been nominated, and probably elected. As it was, he retired from politics when his term as Governor expired in 1913.

Fifty-four years ago (1894) Joseph W. Folk went to St. Louis from Tennessee. He made a national reputation prosecuting bribe givers and bribe takers, while circuit attorney of St. Louis. Defeated James A. Reed and Harry B. Hawes for the nomination for Governor in 1904, and was the only Democrat elected in Missouri that year. He ran for the nomination of President in 1912, but when Champ Clark carried the State, he withdrew. Became counsel for the State Department at Washington when William J. Bryan was Secretary of State, and represented Egypt before the League of Nations.

One hundred years ago (1848) William J. Stone was born in Kentucky. Came to Missouri as a young man. Elected to Congress for 6 years, Governor for 4 years, and a United States Senator for 15 years. His debates with Maj. William Warner in the campaign of 1892 when he was elected Governor, equaled the Lincoln-Douglas debates, 50 years before. Chairman of the powerful Foreign Relations Committee in the Senate during World War I. Voted against that war, but after it was declared voted for every bill to aid in its prosecution, and his loyalty was never questioned.

Eighty-two years ago (1866) David R. Francis went to St. Louis from Kentucky. Became mayor in 1886, and Governor in 1888. Secretary of the Interior under Cleveland, and Ambassador to Russia under Wilson during World War I, and spoke to Russia in the language it understood. President of

the great World's Fair in 1904. Died a very wealthy man.

Like Daniel Webster, who lies in his grave at Marshfield of a broken heart; like Henry Clay, who sleeps under the highest monument in Kentucky of a broken heart; like William H. Seward, who was buried at Auburn of a broken heart; like Salmon P. Chase, who sleeps in his grave at Cincinnati of a broken heart; and like Chester A. Arthur, sleeping in his rose-covered casket at Albany of a broken heart, Champ Clark sleeps in his grave at Bowling Green; James A. Reed sleeps in his grave at Kansas City; Herbert S. Hadley sleeps in his grave at Jefferson City; and Joseph W. Folk sleeps in his Tennessee grave, all of a broken heart. They missed the Presidency. Talmadge said:

"From all the graves of Presidents and ex-Presidents there sounds out this solemn charge: 'Be content with such things as you have. You brought nothing into the world and you can carry nothing out. Having food and raiment, be therefore content.'"

While history records that Harry S. Truman is Missouri's first President, some historians disagree. Ninety-nine years ago (1849) David R. Atchison, Missouri's United States Senator, had the peculiar experience of filling the shoes of a President of the United States for 1 day. President Polk's term expired on March 3, 1849; President Taylor was to be inaugurated on March 5, because March 4 fell on Sunday. As President pro tempore of the Senate and having been elected 16 times to that office, Senator Atchison and many historians have always claimed that the Presidential succession law automatically made him President for that 1 day. Either the responsibility of the office, or arduous duties just before, made him unusually tired, for like many of his predecessors, and many of those who have followed, he slept throughout his entire term of office. Senator Atchison was in disagreement with Senator Benton on nearly every question. He was for slavery, Benton was against it. He followed the southern block, Benton the northern block. He was a very able man and had to be popular to be elected President of the Senate 16 times. He is buried at Gower, Mo.

Eight-five years ago (1865) Mary Tobin was born at Princeton, Mo. She was a good-looking girl of 20 when she ran away from home, and went to Denver, Colo. She then went to the mining town of Leadville, and worked in a restaurant. She met and married Johnny Brown, a hard-rock miner, and moved to his two-room cabin on the side of a mountain. Shortly thereafter, Johnny found a gold mine, and sold it for $200,000. He asked for and received it all in thousand-dollar bills. Keeping $1,000 to celebrate in the Saddle Rock Saloon, he gave Mary the remainder to keep. As she was the boss of the kitchen, and built the fires in the kitchen stove, she placed the $199,000 in the stove and went to bed. Johnny came home about 2 o'clock in the morning with some of his drunken pals, and as it was cold, lighted a fire in the kitchen stove, and proceeded to fry some ham and eggs. The noise awakened Mary, and she frantically tried to rescue the money, but only burned her hands. She cried and cried, but Johnny told her not to worry that he would find a better mine. He did. A few months later he found a real gold mine, and when asked to sell it, said, "No, it can't burn in the ground," and took several million dollars from the mine. He and Mary went to Denver, built the biggest house in town, and sent out invitations to a large party. A band was secured from Kansas City and a New York chef hired. But no one came. Denver was snobbish and because Mary had been a waitress, refused to receive her. It made her very angry, so she went to Europe for a long time. Johnny remained in Denver, but sent her many thousand dollars each month. She became famous all over Europe, and entertained royalty. Finally, in 1912, she returned to America, on the ill-fated *Titanic*. It struck an iceberg and sank. Mary was walking on the deck, with high boots, a couple of coats, and lots of clothing, as it was cold. The men made a run for the lifeboats, but Mary drove them back, with a little pistol Johnny had given her to protect herself at the mines. She then filled the boat with women and children and gave them most of her clothing. And forced two men into the boat, and compelled them to row away from the sinking ship. Her boat was rescued the next day, and all saved. Most of the other passengers on the *Titanic* were lost. They called her the unsinkable Mrs. Brown.

She returned to Denver, and the whole town turned out to welcome her home. Johnny finally died, and she was told by the probate court that she was only left the income from $100,000. She replied, "Why, I burned twice that much in a cook stove." She went to Florida, and while sleeping in a hotel, a fire started, and the guests became panicky. She again took her pistol and drove all the men away from the stairs, and rescued all the women and children. She was then called "The unburnable Mrs. Brown." She died in 1932. She and Johnny were great friends of United States Senator H. A. W. Tabor of Denver. They prevailed on Tabor to build an opera house, which he did. It is called Tabor's Grand Opera House today. When it was finished, Mary took Senator Tabor to see the furnishings. Over the stage was the picture of a man. Tabor asked whose picture that was, and Mary said, "Shakespeare." Tabor said, "Shakespeare, who the hell is he, and what did he ever do for Denver? Take his picture down, and put mine up." This was done, and the picture of Tabor is on the wall today.

In conclusion may I pay a tribute to the lawyer. Since "the morning stars sang together" the lawyer in every age and in every clime has been the outstanding character in history. He has made governments and has destroyed governments. At all times he has been a great moral force, and his life has been an inspiration to youth. He has been the best beloved, and the most trusted man of his day. He framed every constitution and prepared every code of laws. In the history of every country, his has been the hand that protected life, property, and liberty. Every law to aid the administration of justice was drawn by a lawyer.

He is the leader of his community. Interested in civic matters, he teaches Sunday school, and is active in chambers of commerce. His voice is heard from a thousand platforms in support of all moral movements. His influence has developed civilization and he has made the world a safe place in which to live. He has guided and shaped the destiny of his nation, and is by far, the most attractive personality, and yet his name does not appear on the pages of history. You hear of him only when attending memorial services. No monument has ever been erected to a lawyer.

Taxes on Cosmetics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the House Ways and Means Committee, and particularly the gentleman from Nebraska, Congressman CURTIS, of that committee, for favorable consideration of and a recommendation that H. R. 3825, a bill which has for its purpose removing wartime excise taxes on bulk cosmetics used in beauty and barber shops in rendering professional services be enacted by the Congress.

My bill, H. R. 6511, is identical with the Curtis bill, H. R. 3825, and was introduced by me pursuant to many requests from the barbers and beauticians in my State to do something toward getting rid of this wartime tax.

A study of the operation of the existing tax law in respect to the excise tax which my bill seeks to remove, discloses a quite complicated procedure as a result of the imposition and administration of this particular tax. Everyone knows, of course, that the average barber and beautician does not have the means to hire expensive tax accountants or lawyers to guide them, so that they know they will be in compliance with the law. For that reason the beauticians and the barbers are certainly entitled to a change in the procedure for the collection of taxes on cosmetics sold over the counter and used in the rendition of service.

The tax as presently imposed is very difficult to administer and difficult to comply with. In many instances beauty shops are both consumers and retailers of cosmetics.

There are more than 240,000 beauty and barber shops in the United States. The cost to the Government to enforce collection of this tax under the complicated procedures involved, is completely out of proportion to the something over $3,000,000 received annually from the tax on the cosmetics used in the shops of the barbers and beauticians.

I am hopeful that before the Congress recesses or adjourns that the legislation dealing with this subject will have finally been enacted into law.

Sell the American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Small Business Review:

LET'S SELL THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

(By Ivor A. Trapolin, realtor, member of Real Estate Board of New Orleans; chairman, Anti-Communist Committee, Young Men's Business Club of New Orleans; Instructor, College of Business Administration, Loyola University of the South)

In America we have a job to do—a vitally necessary job. We have to stop the spread of world communism—this is certainly not as simple as most folks think. The tremendous infiltration of this foreign ideology in every country in the world has not taken place overnight. It has been a matter of decades.

The secret of this infiltration can be better understood by contrasting the basic difference of the German method of conquest with that of the Russian. Hitler held up the Germans as the "master race," the "rightful rulers" of the world. The Germans were

never able to rely on a large fifth column in any country because their appeal was to Germans only. They were, therefore, forced to battle the world for their supremacy—they failed.

The Russian version differs in that it makes a deceptive appeal to certain groups in every country of the world. "The Proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains" is the bait held out to the nonowning classes. This class is aroused to rise up and support every revolutionary movement against the existing social and political order of things. As a reward they are deluded with the promise of the classless society in which men will be "free and equal." To ensnare the masses clever Communist propaganda cloaks itself in hypocritical double-talk about democracy and human rights. To exploited peoples, to those suffering under unjust political, social, and economic conditions this appeal of communism, although damnably false, operates as a subtle charm to attract the unwary and the unthinking. Despite the emphatic refutations by numerous qualified authorities of the religious, economic, political, and social philosophy of communism, it lives on as a "sacred lie" to deceive the tens of millions. The best refutation of communism, however, is not to be found in the sermons of priests and ministers, nor in the elaborate arguments of economists and sociologists, but in the thirty-odd-millions of human beings, mostly Russian dissenters, now languishing in the filthy and inexpressibly inhuman slave-labor camps in the Soviet utopia.

STALIN CALLS FOR STRIFE

Stalin's version of world conquest calls for the fomenting in every nation of strife, confusion, and class-hatred as preparatory measures to the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. These tactics in each country are engineered by a Moscow-directed corps of skillfully trained agents operating in conjunction with native party members, fellow-travelers, parlor pinks, and befogged liberals. Those most easily deceived by Communist trickery are the underprivileged, the exploited, the uneducated—those who hear of democracy but enjoy few of its blessings. It is with these citizens especially that our job of stopping communism must be concentrated. We must sell democracy to them by making it work for them. If we succeed we need not worry about the possibility of any carbon copy of Stalin being set up in the White House. If we fail, we have but to look to Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and numerous other Soviet-shackled nations to know what America would look like.

There are undeniable abuses in our American system and these abuses condition the soil in which thrives the poisonous growth of communism. These are hard facts, and the sooner we have the courage to face them the sooner we will be relieved of Red shadows on our horizons. Even though our system at its worst, is infinitely better than communism at its best, if there is such a thing, this gives us no cause for complacency. Ours, therefore, is the job not only to unmask Communist sophistry—this is a negative tactic—but to labor positively to eliminate those aspects of our democracy which give deceptive plausibility to Communist indictments of private enterprise. We must institute reforms to improve our system. We of business must be the first to face this great challenge. The question is whether we will be big enough to accept this challenge and start building a better America for all Americans. If our profit system is to survive, we must make our free enterprise system serve all the people so that every man willing and able to work may insure for himself and his family a reasonable participation in the abundance with which America is endowed. This does not mean that society owes any man a living, but it does mean that society owes every man the opportunity to make a living.

PEACE IN INDUSTRY

One of the most pressing problems facing democracy is to establish peace with justice in industrial relations. If this is not done, there is no assurance that we can withstand the Communist onslaught.

Russel Porter, economic analyst of the New York Times, in a signed article in that paper, June 29, 1947, stated that:

"If we have labor-management cooperation instead of class war, we can continue to solve through high productivity the fundamental social and economic problems that have reduced the rest of the world to chaos or slavery. If we solve these problems, we can keep American democracy strong enough to prevent a third world war."

It has long been known that the workingman is looking for more than mere wages as his reward for participation in industrial life. In addition he seeks security and protection from job loss. He worries about the uncertainty of the future, the uncertainty of earning power, the uncertainty of physical risks, accidents, disease, and old age. In viewing this problem, Charles Luckman, president of Lever Bros., made this significant comment:

"One of my earliest surprises was the discovery that the prime factor at the heart of industrial warfare is frequently the need for security. Whether we like it or not, we are faced with the fact that a worker who feels insecure is only half a worker and contributes grudgingly to our national productivity. A major part of any program designed to bring industrial harmony and spur production should be security—the security that is insured by realistic pension plans that enable the worker to regard the future without fear, by adequate insurance for the employee against sickness and accident, by company-paid life insurance that will protect his dependents in the event of his death."

COOPERATION NEEDED

Management has just touched the surface of studying the solutions of the problems facing both itself and labor. Management has just begun to realize that scientific engineering must be complemented by human engineering. Scientific engineering when combined with human engineering means greater efficiency of the use of men, materials, and machines. It means better understanding and more peaceful relations. A significant number in management have come to know that good labor relations is the most profitable investment they can make. Henry Ford II puts it this way:

"Mass production is achieved by both machines and men. If we can solve the problem of human relations in industry, I believe we can make as much progress toward lower costs during the next 10 years as we made during the past quarter century through the machinery of mass production."

The problems in industrial society must be approached cooperatively. Management cannot do without labor, nor labor without management. They are interdependent units—what benefits one, benefits the other; what hurts one, hurts the other. But, unfortunately these basic principles have not been sufficiently grasped by either management or labor. In the words again of Charles Luckman: "Much of the division between business and labor in our country today stems from the fact that we have forgotten our togetherness, and are now dreaming our dreams apart. Our battles are being fought along the frontiers of ignorance and fear."

ELIMINATE SUSPICION

Very many in management fear labor, and very many in labor fear management, because both are not adequately aware of or interested in the rights and privileges of the other. The resulting mutual suspicion and distrust add fuel to the flames of strife and contention. It is this strife and contention that must be eliminated or at least notably lessened if America is to survive as a free nation.

"If such giants as labor and management engage in a struggle for dominance within the delicate mechanism of the American economy neither can win and democracy is bound to lose. They will all go down together in chaos or in the regimentation which will arise from public demand to avoid chaos. Free unions, free management, free enterprise, and a free people will survive or will disappear together." (Goals of Cooperation, published by the National Planning Association.)

Recognizing the gravity of the situation many top industrialists are advocating training courses to be offered to workers whereby they will be given the opportunity to study and to prepare themselves for greater responsibilities in the new industrial society. Gen. Robert W. Johnson, chairman of the board of Johnson & Johnson goes even further in stating:

"Training can do much for workers and also for management. But training is not enough in our complex world. We Americans live by virtue of an economic system which few understand but which can be gravely damaged by ill-informed groups. The dangers of this are obvious. The cure, I believe, is for business to take on the duty of educating all who work with it in the realities of economic life. Does this mean that workers must go to college, along with future physicians, bankers, and nuclear physicists? That question is not so absurd as it seems, for much that goes into a college education is as useful to a line operating as it is to a professional man. On the other hand, our system of colleges and universities cannot deal with the multitude of American workers, and to furnish them education throughout their adult lives."

General Johnson says the solution, as he sees it, "is to bring adult education into offices, factories, and stores. Much of it will be given on company time, and it will be offered to everyone from president to office boy or sweeper. Understanding is needed at every level of our economic set-up and education will not be successful upless it reaches everyone."

LOYALTY IS EARNED

This type of thinking is not as isolated as many seem to believe. Clarence Francis, chairman of the board of General Foods Corp., in addressing the Fifty-second Annual Congress of American Industry sponsored by the National Association of Manufacturers made this deeply significant observation:

"You can buy a man's time.

"You can buy a man's physical presence in a given place.

"You can even buy a measured number of skilled muscular motions per hour or day.

"But you cannot buy enthusiasm, you cannot buy initiative, you cannot buy loyalty, you cannot buy devotion of hearts, minds, and souls.

"You have to earn those things."

If with sincerity we start earning those things by implementing positive programs of industrial statesmanship, our future will be assured. Management, of course, cannot do the job alone. Government plays its part by setting down the rules of the game. It can, of course, do more; it can see to it that more of the underprivileged, uneducated are taught how to make a living, how to use their hands in skillful occupations. Instead of more institutions of higher education, let's have more vocational schools—schools founded for teaching our citizens the art of production, more schools for plumbers, electricians, plasterers, farmers, roofers, carpenters, furniture makers, tinsmiths, etc. By this approach we will give to all Americans the ability to make a living and to play more meaningful roles in American life. Eric Johnston, former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, has stated, "Capitalism is not safe, until every man is a capitalist."

Radio Address to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over Station WNBF on May 22, 1948:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, although I received many letters from you housewives, requesting copies of the handy cookbook I offered on this program last week, I still have a few more. Therefore, if you believe the way to a man's heart is through his stomach, and want to learn a few extra tricks of how to whet his appetite, and at the same time save money, be sure to write me. I'll be glad to mail you this cookbook free as long as they last.

Next week I am coming home again and have already two important speaking engagements.

On next Friday evening, May 28, I have been invited by Jack Masey, president of the Oakdale Taxpayers' League, to address this patriotic group.

On Memorial Day, Monday, May 31, I have been honored by Commander Izzy Chernin with an invitation to address the large crowd which always assembles at the courthouse in Binghamton to honor the heroes of our Nation's wars. I certainly look forward to this brilliant occasion and hope to see many old friends there.

The other day I spoke in Congress in favor of the bill which provides for the exposure of America's commies who want to overthrow our Government here. My speech follows:

"Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received a heavy packet of mail, and as I ripped open its cover out fell more than 200 petitions, averaging 15 names each, demanding that as their Representative I support the Committee on Un-American Activities. These petitions were from the Triple Cities area, from Binghamton, Johnson City, and Endicott. They are accredited signatures. They are the 3,000 signatures of men and women who are honest, forthright Americans, who are in every walk of life, and of all races and creeds. They are Americans first, last, and always. I feel it my bounden duty to come before the House today to say that these petitioners have every right to expect action on my part to see their wishes carried out.

They expect me to take action against the foes of our country, and I am voting for this bill today to keep faith with them. There has been much talk during the past few days about whether this bill will affect the basic rights of Americans. I have been through this bill carefully. I cannot point out any part of it that will do any such thing.

In the State of New York the supreme court some months ago ruled that unless you have ample proof a person is a Communist, it is libelous to call him a Communist. A jail sentence hangs over the man who dares refer to the name. I would be very hesitant before I labeled anybody a Communist or to call any names unless I had pretty good proof that a man was a Communist or a member of a subversive group.

So it seems to me that those who are afraid of losing fundamental rights, at least in the State of New York, should look to the ruling which was made by the supreme court of that State. For that reason, I cannot see where anyone needs to be apprehensive or afraid. I would be the last to advocate going on a witch hunt against any citizen of the land or any group or organization that is patriotic and aboveboard.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it is my sincere, honest conviction that every subversive group in the country should be examined and that the light of publicity should be put upon that group or individual so that we know where they stand.

Centainly a Representative of the people cannot stand idly by after all the repercussions we have had on our domestic front in the past 2 or 3 years and turn his back to the danger. Who will say there are not subversive groups or individuals in the country going out and attempting to stir up trouble and to overthrow our American form of government?

It is my fervent hope this bill we pass today will accomplish what we intend it shall, the exposure of all individuals, groups, and organizations whose purpose is to overthrow our beloved country.

Taft-Hartley Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of an address delivered by Mr. James L. McDevitt, president of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, in answer to an address by the Honorable EDWARD MARTIN, of Pennsylvania, on the Taft-Hartley law before the annual convention of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, in Pittsburgh, Pa., on Monday, May 3, 1948:

I trust the delegates will take their seats so that we may have your attention, and I hope that Senator MARTIN can remain with us a bit, because I feel his address this afternoon touched on a number of very serious matters that seems to me requires some defense on the part of your officers. Surely, it requires an answer.

I agree with Senator MARTIN thoroughly when he said that this is an institution where you can come and express your views, and that is America, where we can have an honest difference of opinion and where we have a right to express it.

The Senator has taken the occasion this afternoon to defend his position with respect to the adoption of the Taft-Hartley law. There is no question about it but that the Senator has that privilege—and I am sure that he will agree with your chairman that we, too, have the right to express to the Senator our reaction to his thinking, with respect to the justification of the Taft-Hartley law.

I listened with a great deal of interest to Senator MARTIN'S comment, particularly to his reference to the fact that he picked up the issue of the Pennsylvania Federationist of last January, and the subsequent issues, and discovered that in the opinion of the editors he was against labor. May I say to the distinguished Senator we plead guilty—that is exactly what we said. I shall now proceed to tell you why we said it.

The Senator knows we pleaded with every Member of Congress from Pennsylvania and with our Senators to vote against adoption of the Taft-Hartley law; to vote against it because it was designed to cripple the rights of our people. It was going to create a grave injustice—we went to Washington, and the good Senator was kind enough to make arrangements for me and the committee to meet with the Pennsylvania congressional delegation. We appreciated that courtesy. And there we sat for probably 2½ hours, at which time they gave me the floor and the opportunity to outline to the congressional committee, including Senator MARTIN, our specific objections to that measure before it was adopted. I took great pains to point out every section of that proposal to which we had objections and to show the Congressmen and Senator MARTIN exactly what we said it would do if adopted—and at the conclusion of those remarks I asked the delegation if they didn't think I had better stop so they could have an opportunity to tell me where I was wrong. Surely, the Senator will agree when I say to you that there was no criticism on my analysis. The only comment to me, in my presence, was complimentary. Of course, I thought we had made some mistakes, but I know one mistake we didn't make—that was to attempt in any way to mislead the Members of Congress and our distinguished Senator. We were absolutely honest, as the record will prove, and as, too, the developments will prove up to this hour.

We are now the victims of the most vicious legislative act any human mind could conceive.

I am appreciative of the problem with which the Members of Congress and the distinguished Senator found themselves confronted. They are not members of the trade-union movement, and we cannot expect they would be able to take a bill of that size and understand fully all of its meaning, just by reading it. No; we didn't expect that. And that is why we took the pains to go to them to outline our problem, in a plea for their aid, to prevent the passage of this measure.

It has, for the first time in the history of the American labor movement in this century, prohibited and forbidden the trade-unionist and his colleagues the right and privilege of sitting down and signing a closed contract with an employer who is willing to sign one with you.

And then that cute little provision—financial responsibility—those two infamous words. The Senator ought to know that at this hour in Pennsylvania there are $750,000 in financial suits against the A. F. of L. unions for alleged violations of contracts.

No; there is nothing wrong with the Taft-Hartley law.

They are going to tell us now, whether we can charge certain amounts for initiation fees—certain amounts for dues. I say, that is not warranted.

I agree with the Senator in his remarks when he said he wasn't sent there to legislate for any particular segment—he was sent there to represent all the people. With that, I agree thoroughly. But his actions in this particular instance certainly belie that particular comment.

Have you, Mr. United States Senator, and those distinguished Pennsylvania Congressmen, legislated an act that would provide for limitation of initiation fees and dues by the Pennsylvania Bar Association, and by the insurance companies of Pennsylvania, controlled by Mr. Grundy and more of these vicious outfits, and the professional engineers, and others? That would be legislation that affects all of the people. But not so, in this case. There isn't another soul mentioned in the Taft-Hartley Act, but labor—nothing mentioned about the contractors' associations and their fees. Oh, no. Strictly for our benefit.

And I remember very clearly our Senator's words before the Harrisburg convention—and believe me, I was impressed by it, and I thought he meant what he said. He stated then, and repeated in his address today, that "he would not vote for punitive legislation." Believe me, Senator, this is the most punitive law we have ever witnessed. You will see, as days roll on, the

results in the senatorial and congressional elections as a result of the adoption of the Taft-Hartley law. It is punitive—it is unfair—and it is vicious.

There isn't anything being said or that can be said about the American Federation of Labor with respect to their adherence to communism. The Senator himself said we are free of that—and God knows, we are. We are as law-abiding citizens as he will find in any segment of our people in the United States. As to whether or not there have been abuses—he has been our Governor and is presently our United States Senator, and he has been a resident of Pennsylvania since the day of his birth. I don't believe the Senator can say he has knowledge of any such practices being carried out within the State of Pennsylvania. And so I can say, there is no justification for the kind of punishment given to us through the adoption of this law—and then, that further provision—the killing of the Norris-LaGuardia Act that we had so much respect for; that act that freed us from injunctive slavery. That, too, was wiped out by the provisions of this law.

And, when the Senator states that he warned us about too much government in business—I agree with him. We didn't want too much government in business—but business did cry out and the National Association of Manufacturers and the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association insisted that they be relieved of government interference—and so, our distinguished representatives relieved business of government interference and gave us twice as much as business ever had.

We can't do anything now. If there is going to be a strike as a result of negotiations breaking down after months and months of effort—it doesn't matter how long we went through it—we start all over again and serve a 60-day notice and have a fellow by the name of Ching come in, or one of his assistants—and the limit of their mediation capacity is to inquire whether or not there is any differences, and if there is, report it back to Mr. Ching, and he, in his philosophical way, with his feet up on the desk, will say, "Sooner or later, fellows, they will get together." Oh, God, save us! That is another thing they have done—knocking the teeth out of the Department of Mediation. It is now the servile slave of the NLRB. Oh, what an unholy alliance. And all to protect us.

And our Senator says, "Your basic rights all remain unchanged." I am sure he overlooked a few things, there.

Basic rights have been materially changed. I pointed out one of our fundamental rights, the right of a closed shop, when it is agreed upon between industry and labor. I pointed out another basic right, the right of labor to bargain collectively without fear of injunctive process. I pointed out another basic right we lost—to determine initiation fees and dues, and other matters vital to the welfare of an organization, and that right is granted to all other types of organizations in our State and Nation. I think they are basic. They say your right to organize has not been interfered with. I wish the Senator and Congressmen had a position as a business agent with our organization, to see if our rights have not been interfered with. I would like him sitting across the desk from Secretary Bohr and myself to find out what we do each day. Three-quarters of our time is spent answering questions about the Taft-Hartley law and how to save some little organization in Squedunk where a difference has arisen with their employers—and the employees are afraid to strike because of the danger of financial suit.

I think they are the principle basic rights that we have been denied.

The distinguished Senator has said, too, with respect to the legislative problem that he wanted it clearly understood with all the emphasis at his command that "I will support labor's legislative proposals when I am convinced they have right and justice on their side."

It is hard to know what you mean by that. As a matter of fact, we know we are entitled to our rights and justice, but we have been denied it. I am not going to say to you that we are perfect—that would not be fair; that would not be true. Nor is any other segment of our people perfect. If you say we should not have jurisdictional strikes, I, personally, am going to agree—we should not But if there is any way to prevent them, I am for it. And so, if you, Senator, can find a remedy to apply in that respect, then you shall have the answer to all the wars in the world—because they, too, are jurisdictional.

Finally, Senator, I want to say to you that we, of the labor movement, have been very seriously disappointed with your actions in connection with this matter, and when we listed you as having been against us with respect to this legislation, we listed you and 27 Congressmen that did likewise. And it may seem a bit harsh, because there are things you have done for which we have praised you. But I repeat again, in line with the consistent policy of this organization over the years, we never fail to reward a friend and never fail to oppose a person that does us an injustice. We are amenable to reason at all times—and I say to you, Senator, and to all your distinguished colleagues, that you have done a serious injustice to our people and you have an opportunity to rectify it. The people of Pennsylvania are asking that it be rectified and rectified as speedily as possible because if it is not, we have no course but to continue to plead with our people, their families and their friends, to become a little more politically conscious. No more 1946 staying at home. We will get our friends out and do our utmost to bring about the defeat of those people who were against labor, and have consistently refused to make amends.

I am going to conclude. Time does not permit me to go all over the Senator's address. I merely wanted to point out the highlights to him because the Senator chose that subject to speak on this afternoon, I know that he appreciates that we have afforded him that opportunity, but that we too, must necessarily defend ourselves when we are criticized. I like healthy criticism. I am sure all of you do, yet, at the same time you certainly want an opportunity to present your side of the question.

Now I have concluded. If the Senator desires to say anything in connection with my remarks, I would be very happy to make that time available.

(The Senator forbore to make any further statements, or to refute the answer of President McDevitt to the original speech of Senator MARTIN.)

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PARKE M. BANTA
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. BANTA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to me by Mr. Virgil C. James, of Cuba, Mo., dated May 12, 1948:

JAMES REFRIGERATION CO.,
Cuba, Mo., May 12, 1948.

Hon. PARKE M. BANTA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BANTA: Why is it that the present administration, in its alleged efforts to halt communism, itself employs and utilizes methods and practices which are part and parcel of totalitarian technique? First we were told there would be a meat shortage this spring if rationing was not reinstated, but you hear nothing more of the shortage now, and plenty of choice cuts are temptingly displayed in all butcher shops. Then they dress up the scarecrow of gas and oil shortages as an excuse to bring back rationing in those items. Or else it is steel; in fact, the particular commodity makes little difference, but the fact that someone somewhere wants to clamp on a rationing system does make a vast, fundamental difference to our American concepts. The same force is, to my mind, evident in this tub thumping to put over UMT and the draft; regiment, control, direct the lives of others, regardless of their own wishes, desires, or even the truly best interests of the country.

I still do not think that UMT or perhaps even what they call a "temporary" draft is necessary, if the proper incentives were given the voluntary enlistment system. On the contrary, however, here is an example of how they treat the actually existing and available manpower. My younger brother, William, is a second lieutenant, Reserve Air Force, and at his own expense for the past year and more has been going to Scott Field, flying and atending Reserve meetings; so far there has been no pay attached to it. Monday he went in to fly, but was told that on account of the threatened rail strike they had to conserve their available gasoline. That was O. K., except for the fact that the day before, Sunday, the Navy and Marines put on an air show over St. Louis, burning up thousands of gallons of gas uselessly, and contributing little, if anything, in the way of actual flight training to the participants. Such things tend to cause serious-minded and patriotic young men, fully trained pilots, to drop the Reserve, or will, unless remedied soon by appropriate legislation so that they are paid at least something for their time and efforts. These men hence become practically lost to a possible future defense program; so the services proceed to draft a bunch of raw, green youngsters and spend millions to whip them into some kind of shape, whereas comparative thousands or even hundreds spent effectively in the right way would do the job much better; conserve the trained manpower already available, encourage voluntary enlistments, and similar measures. But no, there has to be a big, regimented mob taking orders from the big and little Caesars, Hitlers, Stalins, call them what you will, it isn't democracy or Americanism, but sinister totalitarianism.

Sincerely,

VIRGIL C. JAMES.

Eastern Air Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on March 30, 1948, a certificate of appreciation from the American Legion was presented to Eastern Air Lines in recognition of the sincere appreciation of the more than 3,000,000 members of the American Legion for the outstanding record of Eastern Air Lines in the employment of physically handicapped veterans of World War I and II.

This certificate was presented by Past National Commander Paul H. Griffith of

the American Legion, at the Ansley Hotel in Atlanta, and was accepted by Capt. Eddie R. Rickenbacker, president of Eastern Air Lines, one of America's outstanding citizens.

In accepting the certificate Captain Rickenbacker paid a splendid tribute to the handicapped veterans employed by his company. Referring to the satisfaction they are giving as employees, he said:

Our veterans do their work so well that the only sign which could possibly identify any Eastern employee with a group of handicapped veterans would be the fact that a veteran, as a rule, does a better than average job, despite his handicap.

Our experience has been that these men are superior with regard to absenteeism, accident frequency, and labor turn-over. Maybe this is because these veterans—in having lost some of their physical equipment in the service of their country—have gained something infinitely more valuable in the way of courage, stamina, responsibility, and mental alertness.

The internal factors that made the veteran a good soldier, help to make him an even better worker. For the real measure of a man is in his thinking and in his doing—not in his limbs.

I hope that Captain Rickenbacker's speech will have a general circulation among handicapped veterans, and among employers. To the handicapped veterans it will carry a message of hope and inspiration. It will give renewed assurance to them that American employers are anxious to provide for them opportunities equal to those available to their nondisabled competitors. To employers it will be a testimonial to the good qualities of these handicapped veterans and a reminder of our responsibility to provide a place for them in industry.

Speaking further with reference to these veterans Captain Rickenbacker said:

I have a twofold purpose in turning what should be a short acceptance speech into a somewhat longer one.

The first is that I hope to reassure veterans who have suffered the loss of an arm, a leg, or both in the war, that their usefulness is far from over, and that there are and should be plenty of places for them in American business and industry.

The second is that I pray and hope the pioneering work done by Eastern Air Lines in this particular field will continue to serve as an example to employers generally throughout the country.

There are still disabled servicemen to be employed. I wish we could take care of them all, but unfortunately that is impossible. However, our policy is to place as many of them where we can, as rapidly as we can.

High among our responsibilities as businessmen is the employer attitude toward disabled veterans. Neither the Japs nor the Germans could kill these men. Let us at home, in this instance the employer, not kill the gallant spirit that survived the horrors of war and the impairment of handicaps incurred by war.

The master of ceremonies at this presentation was Harris H. Clark, assistant veterans' employment representative for Georgia. He was also chairman of the EAL award committee.

The invocation was delivered by Col. Albert K. Matthews, retired Army chaplain. Dr. W. E. Burdine, Georgia department commander of the American Legion, welcomed the distinguished guests. Remarks on employment of the veteran were made by Perry Faulkner, Chief of Veterans' Employment Service. J. P. Kelley, veterans' employment representative for Georgia, introduced Past National Commander Griffith, and Atlanta's Mayor W. B. Hartsfield expressed the appreciation of Atlanta and Georgia to Captain Rickenbacker.

Appropriate songs and musical selections were rendered by Miss Virginia Holley and Mrs. Annie Mae Norton.

It was an occasion which should be productive of greater opportunities for a fine group of Americans, our physically handicapped veterans.

Depleting America's Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, we have a grave decision to make—a decision whether we are going to continue the America we know, or substitute an America we know little about—the America of the millionaire internationalists and the one worlders.

Today I am not talking to the betrayers of our Nation. I am not talking to any foreign nation, or to any enemy with foreign ideologies in our midst. I am talking in defense of our Nation—in defense of our homes. I am talking in behalf of the youth of this Nation—in behalf of the fathers, mothers, and wives, whose sons and husbands will again have to do the fighting and the dying on foreign battlefields.

This unless Congress and the people show more firmness in resisting the multimillionaires and international clique in our State, Commerce, and other executive Departments of Government. This Nation cannot stand and survive four more years of our present stupid foreign policy. The Marshall plan is a betrayal of the Nation. It is selling America down the river to the lowest bidder.

The question is, Shall we blindly follow false leaders and give away America's natural resources? The question is, Shall we blindly follow and accept the delusions of our President? Yes, shall we continue to follow the advice and suggestions of our Secretary of State?

I speak with deep conviction on the deceptive Marshall plan. It is a wolf in sheep's clothing. It is not a plan to feed the hungry but rather a plan to bribe and arm part of the world against another part. It is an armament race. An armament race is but an undeclared war. It always has and always will end in war.

General Marshall, together with Morgenthau and FDR, created the mess in which we find ourselves. He, as Chief of Staff, together with Morgenthau and FDR, halted General Patton for weeks so that Russia could invade Germany and take Berlin. We are now paying for that mistake. Whatever price America may have to pay in life, limb, health, and dollars will be the result of the blunders made at Tehran, Quebec, Yalta, and Potsdam.

We have already depleted our national resources from over 11 to less than 9 percent of the world's supply. I submit that we have no moral, legal, or constitutional right to do so. This Nation, born amidst the sufferings of Valley Forge, is not ours to betray or destroy. It belongs to unborn millions as much as it belongs to us. It is the property of future, as well as of living, Americans. . The step that we are now taking is a betrayal. It leads to inevitable depletion of our natural resources and to ultimate destruction. Lincoln was right when he said that this Nation would never be destroyed unless we ourselves were its destroyers. We are now asked to accept, without question, the false propaganda of international profiteers that infest the various departments of our Government. Take the profits out of the Marshall plan, and there will be no Marshall plan.

These profiteers are interested in increasing their financial gains, by selling products to foreign nations that rightfully belong to Americans. They are interested in having these nations pay for these goods with our American dollars—gifts—the Marshall plan. This at the American taxpayers' expense. They are more interested in themselves than in the future of our Nation.

The trouble with this Government, since the days of President Harding, has been that the President has had too many millionaires in his Cabinet. We have gone from the Mellons to the Sumner Welleses to the silver-topped Stettiniuses, the Lovetts, the Claytons, the Grews, the Harrimans, the Rockefellers, and scores of other international bankers and international businessmen—all products of, or alined with Wall Street.

The false propaganda that the Marshall plan will prevent the spread of communism in Europe comes with poor grace from those who recently were more or less closely associated with Joe Stalin. It comes with poor grace from those who went to bed with Stalin at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, and betrayed not only this Nation, but the world. Surely no one is so dull as to believe that you can bribe the Reds or that you can buy friendship.

The American people object to our making the same mistake we made when we sold Japan millions of tons of scrap iron. They know that some of this scrap later found its target in the bodies of their sons. They know that, in case of war, some of the war material we are now giving to Europe will again find its target in the bodies of their sons.

Today I am criticizing erroneous policies. It is rather with pity than with scorn that I shall discuss 15 years of disastrous blunders—15 years of crises, emergencies, and war. I shall discuss the mistakes and blunders that have brought us to the verge of world war III.

I am sorry that our President came before a joint session of Congress and virtually proclaimed himself the infallible one—the keeper of the peace. His record on foreign affairs is just the opposite. It is fallible. He told us that henceforth we must prevent not only international strife, but civil strife within any nation. This by force of arms

via the stupid and dangerous Marshall plan.

Germany's ambition was to consolidate the Nordics against the rest of the world. Our President goes one step further. He takes on the whole world. He forgets that the one-worlders of the past, Caesar, Alexander the Great, Napoleon, and Hitler all failed. The President might well profit by their failures. No man and no nation is powerful enough, intelligent enough, and resourceful enough to govern the whole world.

I had thought that long ago the one-worlders and the internationalists for profit had been deflated. I had thought long ago that Stalin's behavior had driven such internationalists as former Justice Roberts and other misguided souls into the cyclone cellar. Unfortunately, these one-worlders and millionaire profiteers continue to bob up when you least expect them. They woulu deplete and give away our natural resources, and after that destroy our liberty by bungling us into world war III. May "God forgive them for they know not what they do."

How much longer can we, with less than 6.2 percent of the world's population, possessing less than 7 percent of the world's area, and with less than 9 percent of its natural resources, continue to be an international Santa Claus to inefficient, and in some cases grafting, foreign politicians, and corrupt governments?

Our national debt, with future obligations, now amounts to over $523,000,000,000. This is about five times the total indebtedness of the rest of the world. It is about twice the normal value of all the property in the United States. The end is not yet. If we continue this international lunacy, then it will be just the beginning.

The total expenditures of our Government from its birth in 1776 to 1933—157 years—were less than $90,000,000,000. This included the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Indian Wars, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, and World War I, up to 1933, and, in addition, all the other functions of our Government. Compare this $90,000,000,000 with the over $687,000,000,000 spent in the last 15 years—the Roosevelt global era.

I wish to warn Congress that what it is doing does not meet with the approval of the American people. I wish to warn the foreign agents and foreign representatives that the American people will repudiate Congress' action on November 2, 1948. I am giving this warning to foreign nations so that they may not say they were taken by surprise.

We are not going to continue to be an international WPA. We are going to elect a real American President. A President who will get rid of the Reds, the pinks, and millionaires that now infest the executive departments of our Government. A President who will not continue to sell America short.

If President Truman's foreign policy is continued, there will be very little liberty left anywhere, not even in America. The four freedoms and self-determination, the Atlantic Charter, will have been thrown to the four winds. The truth is that we and the world were betrayed by secret commitments at Tehran, Quebec, Yalta, and Potsdam.

Unfortunately, the President still insists on carrying out the policies of the former President—Morgenthau's revengeful policy of dismantling even Germany's necessary rehabilitation industrial plants. Army officials inform us that this revengeful policy has already cost us millions, and if continued, will cost the taxpayers millions more. The President, too, believes that we can buy international friendship. He, too, would give to beggar nations that which belongs to the American people.

At the same time, the President asks a reduction in the cost of living. He believes this can be done by regimentation—dictatorship. He is mistaken. Congress cannot, by passing any law, increase the food supply. It cannot replace depletion. We cannot reduce the high cost of living by meddling in other nations' civil affairs. Neither can we reduce it by creating a dictatorship at home. The President ought to know that we have had enough of bureaucracy and regimentation.

The President ought to realize that we cannot give away the food and products that Americans need—creating scarcity—and at the same time, reduce the cost of living. He should know that you cannot give away your cake and eat it too; that you cannot give away your meat to foreigners, and have it for your own family at the same time. He ought to know that you cannot give away America's shirt, and still have and wear it.

The President should know that high taxes, foreign gifts, and loans, and the Government's foolish attempt to bribe good neighbors are solely responsible for the high cost of living. The Federal Government now takes, directly or indirectly, 57 cents, on an average, out of every dollar earned. That means a direct increase in the cost of living of 57 percent.

Then, after the 57 cents has been taken out of your earnings, and you wish to buy groceries or a suit of clothes, the person selling it, will have to add his 57 cents to break even. There alone is an increase to the consumer in the cost of living of 114 percent due to Federal taxes.

Our Uncle Sam, because of his foreign flirtations, has become the greatest extortionist. He is our most burdensome dependent. If your income is $2,000 above exemptions, he takes $332. Your Uncle extracts his pound of flesh regardless of whether you can continue in business or not.

In addition to the income tax, there is the luxury tax. Your Uncle makes the ladies pay for their lipstick, face powder, and other cosmetics. If you smoke, Uncle Sam dips in heavy, and takes many a puff in taxes. If you drink, he takes many a sip with you in taxes. If you take a ride on the train, your Uncle takes a ride with you by taking an additional 15 percent in taxes. If your wife buys a fur coat, he pulls out 20 percent of the fur for himself in taxes.

There are already 73 hidden taxes on a single hot-dog sandwich, 126 on a pair of shoes, 154 on a bar of soap, 148 on a pair of overalls, 125 on a cotton dress, 205 on gasoline, 195 on farm dresses, and last, but not least, 52 on a loaf of bread. Surely we have had enough of taxes.

Since the war we have made loans and gifts to foreign nations amounting to over $35,000,000,000. These nations buy in competition with the consumer, and with your money drive the price up. In addition, your Government, using your money, also enters into competition with the consumer.

The time has arrived for clear thinking. The Nation cannot continue to go deeper into debt. Every man, woman, and child now owes the Government $4,296 for debts and future obligations. It is true that you have not given a note and mortgage on your home, but there is a blanket mortgage—a tax lien—on you, your children, and your home. Over one-half of all you eat, drink, or use goes for the payment of this tax.

How are we going to reduce taxes and balance the budget when the Executive keeps plunging the Nation deeper into debt by making foreign gifts? The President now asks for another $24,000,000,000. How can we balance the budget, if we are going to arm half the world against the other half? How long will we be a first-class nation if we continue to deplete our raw materials?

We live in an age of international deception. We are influenced by dishonest propaganda over the radio and in the metropolitan press—propaganda paid for by grafting officials of foreign governments with our taxpayers' money.

It is time that America stop being gullible. In World Wars I and II, it was "war to end all wars," "four freedoms," and "I say again and again and again your sons will not be sent to foreign battlefields." Time proved all these slogans false. There are no "four freedoms" for any people—not even for our own—and our boys again did the fighting and the dying.

After World War II, it was "Give us UNRRA, and there will be everlasting peace." UNRRA cost us billions, but there is no peace. Then came the International Fund and the International Bank, conceived at Bretton Woods and born at "Dumb Barton" Oaks. These institutions have already fleeced the American taxpayers of billions, and will fleece them of billions more, unless we wake up in time and put an end to this disastrous foreign policy.

Next came the extension of the reciprocal trade agreements. This at the expense of the American farmer and laborer. Then came the British gift of $4,400,000,000, and the cancellation of $34,000,000,000 that she owed us. Each and every one of these acts was to produce lasting peace.

Yet, in spite of these false assertions we are in a worse mess than ever before. We are now plagued with the Marshall plan. This plan is simply another gift mostly to Britain. When we made her the other loan, she promised that it would last 3 years. However, Wall Street, and her own multimillionaires got away with that $3,750,000,000 in 1 year. So Wall Street and the British hatched the Marshall plan.

There are some who say they are not interested in politics, but intelligent people know that everything in America is

in politics. The housewife, when she cannot get meat, sugar, wearing apparel, or other necessities of life except at exorbitant prices, knows that this is the result of our erroneous foreign policy.

When the veteran cannot get a home, or building material to build one, he knows that the shortage is due to our foreign bureaucratic bungling. When the American farmer cannot get implements with which to produce crops, he knows that these implements are in international politics.

We know that these shortages—the high cost of living—are due to the fact that much of America's needed goods are on the ocean. We know that these goods are bought by foreign nations with our taxpayers' money. This is the result of our Government's foreign policy. We know that America is being sold short. Americans forgotten—foreigners preferred.

I repeat that the time has come that we take care of our own people first, and then, out of our surpluses, and not out of our necessities, take care of others.

Let us give a living annual wage to common labor on the American standard, and ultimately abolish slums. There must be an economic floor below which no human being is permitted to fall.

Let us give to labor employment assurance rather than unemployment insurance. To insure idleness is economic waste. We must make it possible for all able-bodied men and women to labor and to provide themselves with food, fuel, clothing, and shelter. We must make it possible for the youth of this Nation to become self-supporting.

Let us give cost of production to the farmer for that part of his products domestically consumed. We must preserve and protect the domestic market for agriculture, industry, commerce, and labor. We must prohibit importation of agricultural or industrial products until a price equal to the cost of production on such domestic products has been reached. We must protect American producers from the manipulation of foreign exchange, and from all raw materials and manufactured goods, produced abroad by labor living below the American standard.

There must be an intelligent old-age compensation; security from want. Any person who has worked from the ages of 20 to 60 has produced enough wealth to last for life. If such a person finds himself in financial distress and without the means of a comfortable livelihood, then it is because society appropriated the wealth he created. Therefore it is society's duty to protect such a person from want.

We must also resurrect, protect, and promote individual enterprise. We must give to small business a square deal, not a New Deal with stacked cards, points, and loaded dice.

We must never forget that veterans come first. It is the duty of the Government to see that the veterans are put into the same position as they would have been in if they had never been inducted into the armed forces.

We must rewrite and simplify our whole tax system. We must protect private property and enterprise from confiscation by taxation. We must protect small business and individual enterprise by eliminating the economical domination of corporate monopoly. Property rights are but human rights when rightly distributed.

In conclusion, may I warn you that there are other dangers that confront us besides Communists. The international gang that is depleting our Nation of its natural resources for a profit is just as dangerous to our future well-being as the Communists. Let us get rid of both of these elements by merciless publicity. Then communism and internationalism will have lost their charm.

The way to get rid of communism is for all branches of our Government to again observe the Constitution—the Constitution that protects minorities and the unfortunate from unwarranted persecution in the name of prosecution.

I repeat the time has come to build America strong. In place of the Marshall plan, let us return to the George Washington plan. It worked for over 150 years. It built the most powerful and most prosperous Nation on earth. It did not sponsor squandering our wealth in a futile attempt to buy foreign friends with American dollars.

The time has come for Congress and the American people to repudiate these actions that verge on treason, not only to America but to the world. The time has come to stop blindly following blind leadership.

No. 1 Citizen of the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it has been well said, "You can take the boy out of the country, but you can't take the country out of the boy."

I know that is true. Thirty-nine years ago I was born on a farm in central Texas and there I grew to manhood, working, as all farm boys do, in the day-to-day chores of farm life—milking cows, chopping cotton, helping dip the cattle.

The passing years have not erased the memory of that farm life with its blessings and its many perplexing woes. For that, I shall be eternally thankful.

Frankly, my first-hand acquaintance with farm life has made me a better Representative of the people during my 11 years in Congress. Only a man who has lived the farm life, who has depended upon the soil for his livelihood through lean years and bountiful years, can fully appreciate the wants and needs of the farmer.

THE HOPES OF THE CHRISTIAN WORLD

Today, more than ever before, it is urgent that the problems of the farmer be understood by men in high office. The farmer is the No. 1 citizen of the peace. Upon the output of the farmers of America rest the hopes of the Christian world for a lasting peace.

To understand this—to comprehend the supreme importance of the farms in the world today—let us look for a moment at the world around us. Let us see what is happening in Europe, in Asia, in the whole world.

In Europe, an old familiar picture is taking shape once more. The title has changed, the characters are different—but the plot is the same. One after another of the small nations of that unhappy continent have fallen prey to the vengeful vultures of the Kremlin. Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Albania, and Czechoslovakia have fallen. Finland, Sweden, and Norway rest uneasily on the brink of terror. Only last winter, a bare 16 votes kept France free of the clutches of Communist domination. A titanic effort will be necessary to save Italy from the onward march of Moscow.

We have seen that pattern before. Hardly a decade ago the same tragic routine was being enacted by Hitler and his legions. Now, Stalin has replaced der fuehrer, and the mustached man in the Kremlin is repeating, chapter by chapter, verse by verse, the Nazi pattern of domination.

The red hands of communism are reaching out for the throat of freedom around the globe—in Europe, in China, in South America, and even in our land.

Can an honest man doubt what is in store for us if we repeat the mistakes that led us into World War I and World War II? I think not. The hand of the future is written plainly on the wall for all to see. If we ignore the warning, this time our mistake may well be fatal.

What was our mistake last time—and the time before that? What blunder was it that pushed us into two world wars and cost us a terrible price? It was the blunder of doing too little, too late.

We listened to those men—the Bryans, the Coughlins, the America Firsters—who shouted, "Don't follow the warmongers, don't draft our boys, don't strengthen America's military forces."

In World War I, the Kaiser heard those cries and believed America would not challenge this march to world power. In World War II, Hitler and Hirohito heard those same cries and continued with their war-making.

RUSSIA FIRSTERS SCREAMING NOW

Now, again, the America Firsters and the Russia Firsters are raising their voices and screaming, "Warmonger," at those who would make this Nation strong. If we listen again, we can surely expect to pay with our lives for our folly.

I, for one, do not believe the people of this country intend to repeat the mistakes of World War I and World War II. The world has changed a lot since 1916 and since 1941—our people have learned much. They have grown wiser and more mature and they do not intend to follow the irresponsible clowns this time.

Yes, I have a great faith in the people of America. This time, I believe the people are ready and anxious to do what is necessary to win the peace. What they most want—and most desperately need—is leadership—strong, courageous, and active leadership by men who can get the job done.

How then does the farmer fit into this picture? As I said earlier, the farmer is the No. 1 citizen of the peace. His role,

I believe, cannot be overemphasized. Let me explain.

CHRISTIAN DEMOCRACY VERSUS GODLESS COMMUNISM

In this world today, the globe is divided between two great forces—Christian Democracy and Godless Communism. America is the fountainhead of Christian Democracy, Russia is the wellspring of godlessness. Lying between these two lands is the battleground of peace—the small nations of Europe, the lands of Asia, and other freedom-loving countries of the world.

These people were left hungry and desolate and without hope by the ravages of war. Communism has sought to thrive upon these miseries, by promising much and delivering nothing except terror, murder, and suppression.

Democracy's only hope is to provide more than promises, more than empty words, more than stiff-necked diplomacy. Democracy must roll up its sleeves and get to work—answering the cries of the hungry with food, replacing desolation with construction, replying to hopelessness with a new and active faith.

The key to the future is food, for food will surely win the peace.

THE ARSENAL OF PEACE

The farms of America are the arsenal of peace. This must be recognized by all. If the farmer is tied in red tape, if he is ignored disregarded, or kicked around—as he sometimes has been in the past—it may be impossible for him to produce the crops we must have to win the peace.

It has been my experience in the past that the farmer receives more promises—and less proof—than any other segment of the population. He needs more than promises now. He needs action. Promises don't dam gullies and prevent the soil from washing away. Promises don't supply the current for electric lights in rural homes. Promises don't keep farm prices high.

When I first came to Congress, the land of central Texas was being wasted and washed away. The soil was at the mercy of the elements. Farmers in the area still lived in darkness, with their only light supplied by flickering kerosene lamps. Prices were low and the future uncertain. Even if a man raised a respectable crop, the untopped roads made it hard to get the produce to market.

The farmers did not need promises—they needed action. That is why, when I came to Congress, I devoted my greatest energies toward serving the farmer, toward making his lot better, his standard higher, his future brighter.

At the head of the list I placed soil conservation. A farmer is no richer than the soil he farms. The soil is our God-given treasure—given to us to use for our profit, or waste to our eternal loss.

ENOUGH FOR SOIL CONVERSATION

From the beginning, I have fought those who sought to limit the Government's soil conservation work. I knew that if the farmer was given a little help, he would do the job himself, and do it well. The farmers of the Tenth District and the farmers of Texas have proved that true. Today, Texas farmers are saving the soil, enriching it, increasing its abundance and profiting more every day because of this program.

Next, there was the problem of rural electrification. When I came to Congress, nearly every city in Texas, large and small, was almost completely lighted. The city dwellers enjoyed the benefits of electric current, but the farmers did not. Only 3 percent of the farmers had electric lights.

FARM FOLKS DESERVE SAME COMFORTS AS CITY PEOPLE

I, for one, could not accept the idea that farm folks must live in darkness and discomfort, while city people enjoy the benefits of our modern civilization. The farmer is the foundation of our Nation. He must not be treated as a second-rate citizen.

So I pledged myself to work for the day when lights would burn in every rural home in my district. We dammed the Colorado. We turned its floods into electric current. Today we have made available lights for the farm boys and girls of central Texas to study by. There is electric current to do the work for the farm wives and mothers, to help the farmer increase his yield and increase his income.

I am proud of that accomplishment. But I shall not be satisfied until every farmer in Texas who wants lights can have them.

KEEPING FARM PRICES UP

Conserving the soil and lighting the homes, important though it is, is just part of the job the farmers need done for them by their Representatives. The farmer—more than any other producer in our society—is at the mercy of a sometimes ruthless, always unpredictable, market situation.

He gambles his life's saving to raise a crop, because the Nation must have food. But if the market drops, he loses everything, while the market speculators, the middlemen, and other officials who never leave their air-conditioned offices make a profit.

That is why I have always supported a strong price-support program for the farmers' crops. It is the least we can do to give the farmer the buying power—the guaranteed income—he must have to continue as a fundamental part of our society.

It is particularly important now—in these times of high prices—that the farm price support program remain strong. I have fought, and will continue to fight, efforts to cut price supports. To cut those supports would be like cutting away the underpinnings of our whole economic structure.

A BLACK-TOP ROAD TO EVERY HOME

After all these things have been done for the farmer, one more thing is vitally important: roads. If the farm family cannot travel easily and in all weather to market, to church, to school, then it does not have and cannot have its fair share of prosperity.

My goal has been to see a black-top road built to serve every farm family—not merely for my district, but for the whole State and Nation. I cast my vote in 1945 for legislation insuring that for every 2 miles of main-line highways built with Federal funds there would be 1 mile of farm roads—good, all-weather, black-top roads—built in the rural areas.

That is not enough. There is more to be done. But I am proud that we are taking this step in the right direction.

These have been my principal goals as a Congressman, representing a district of the people I know best—the farmers. Throughout my service in public office, I intend to keep these goals uppermost in my actions.

Now, more than ever before, it is imperative that this country devote its energies unsparingly to bettering the life of the farmer—increasing his productiveness, increasing his reward, improving his future. We must not forget that the peace will be won on the farms of America. We must always remember that the farmer is the foundation of our freedom—the No. 1 citizen of the peace.

Reduction of Cost of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following press release by Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill:

UNCLE SAM, YOU'RE NEXT

United States Steel, General Electric, Westinghouse, Bendix, and some other companies, have announced price reductions on many items affecting the cost of living. This seems to be an honest effort to stop the inflation spiral by men who are in a position to do something about it. Will their action be followed by others?

Uncle Sam, you're next. Are you going to cut the price of government?

Whatever private persons may do will be worth little unless government—the biggest spender and waster of all—cuts its costs. And not only the Federal, but State and local governments as well. You can get a government bulletin on every subject, except on how to reduce the cost of government.

Let's face the facts. United States Government bonds—which are still the best securities in the world—would probably go below par right now except for artificial price support.

Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, quotes Mr. Allan Sproul, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, as follows: "Without our support (Federal Reserve System) under present conditions, almost any sale of Government bonds, undertaken for whatever purpose, laudable or otherwise, would be likely to find an almost bottomless market on the first day support was withdrawn." Senator BYRD adds: "This must be considered an alarming statement."

Our national debt is greater than the combined debt of all other nations in the world. Last year, Government cost us $9,000,000,000 more than food. Government waste is everywhere. Here are some samples.

The United States Post Office Department lost $300,000,000 last year. The loss is charged to you.

The Government has liquidated the Jersey Homesteads project. Houses costing $20,000 were sold as low as $2,800. The loss is charged to you.

The Government buys potatoes at a cost, with freight, of $4 a bag and sells them for 1 cent a bag.

Comptroller General Lindsay Warren, the sleepless watchdog of the dollar, reports: "We have developed an extravagant hodgepodge of duplications, inefficiencies, and inconsistencies * * * 75 different bureaus and agencies connected with transportation, 15 dealing with public housing, 14 with forestry, 64 with gathering statistics."

The taxes to support this crawling heap of bureaucrats make all prices rise—including the price of homes. So the administration goes in for public housing and 90-percent loans.

With Government bonds on as thin ice as is indicated above, the administration proposes to extend social security. This in the face of the fact that every social-security card has already lost nearly half of its value since 1940.

Having bled the States white by Federal taxes taken from them, the administration proposes "Federal aid" for education, housing, health, etc. The socialists and politicians cry for more of the sovereign cure—spending.

It is shocking that in the prosperous period from 1940 to 1947, the number of persons getting public assistance has gone up and up. Public relief has become big business.

Who will drive the money-changers from the temple? Where is the Andrew Jackson who paid off the last penny of debt? Where is the Grover Cleveland who vetoed hundreds of bills that robbed the public till?

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

Public Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the housing bill which the Senate passed some time ago is apparently stalled. The New York Herald Tribune of today has in it a very fine editorial entitled "Stalled Housing Bill." I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with a news story from the Detroit News entitled "Public Housing Barred by House GOP Chiefs," and an article entitled "Public Housing: Congress Is Expected To Reject It in Late Gesture to Economy," published in the Wall Street Journal of May 24, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 24, 1948]

THE STALLED HOUSING BILL

After less than 2 weeks of hearings in the House Banking Committee, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill is stalled again. According to the House schedule it should now be on the floor. Instead, a muggy atmosphere of silence prevails, rumors of compromise are heard, and the suspicion is growing that this promising and badly needed bill will be buried in committee. That is precisely what happened 2 years ago when Chairman WOLCOTT of the House Banking Committee first played his dog-in-the-manger role. Today the consequences and penalties of obstructionism are far greater.

In the 4-year-long effort to establish a compromise national housing policy, the strong bipartisan support this bill has enlisted emerges as its unique characteristic. The principal Senate vote on the bill saw 24 Republicans and 25 Democrats on one side, and 18 Republicans and 17 Democrats on the other. Both parties shared in writing the bill and debating it. Yet the penalty of bipartisanship is the reluctance of party leaders on either side to give the bill strong party support. Fearful of accentuating divisions within parties, leadership has found refuge in a do-nothing attitude, in dodging and weaving to keep out of the spotlight public interest has thrown on the measure. The potent reward in politically uncertain urban regions has not yet strongly attracted either party.

At a stalemate, the attention of the bill's supporters turns logically to the discharge petition, now circulating in the House, that has enlisted more than a hundred of the 218 signatures that are needed to get the bill onto the floor. Certainly if the House committee does not act on the bill, the signatures on this discharge petition will be the sole means of separating the bill's friends from its enemies. As we count it up, there are a considerable number of Representatives in the House who would do well to consider this unequivocal method of announcing their intention of supporting the bill. They should declare themselves now.

[From the Detroit News of May 21, 1948]

PUBLIC HOUSING BARRED BY HOUSE GOP CHIEFS

(By Blair Moody)

WASHINGTON, May 20.—The House Republican leadership has decided to kill the controversial $6,500,000,000 public-housing section of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

This was revealed by one of the leaders, who said a polite ultimatum will be presented today to Senator TAFT (Republican), Ohio, chief Senate backer of the housing measure.

TAFT will be given the alternative of accepting a bill without public housing or seeing the whole measure killed. This would also mean the end of FHA-insured mortgages and provision for cooperative financing of veterans' homes. These powers have already expired.

WAIT TAFT REACTION

The decision to slough public housing was made at a meeting late Wednesday, attended by Speaker JOE MARTIN, Majority Leader HALLECK, and Representative WOLCOTT (Republican), Michigan, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, which has charge of the legislation.

How TAFT will react is not known. The Senate, under his leadership, refused to accept a House bill extending the FHA-mortgage sections of the bill alone.

One House leader said he thought TAFT would surrender the public-housing program for which he has been fighting for months, and which has been the basis of bitter political criticism of him within his own party. This also has been a major share of TAFT's claim to as great or greater "liberalism" than Harold E. Stassen and other Republican Presidential candidates.

LIBERALS MAY REBEL

TAFT has indicated to both MARTIN and HALLECK that he would rather have what he can get than no bill at all, one Republican said. He added, however, that other Republicans in the Senate, notably the New England liberals, FLANDERS, Republican, of Vermont and TOBEY, Republican, of New Hampshire, might raise the roof.

One of the heaviest lobbies ever put on in Congress has been fighting the measure ever since TAFT first brought forward the public housing features 2 years ago. Real estate interests are generally credited with great influence with several members of the House Banking Committee, which can bottle up the measure.

A counterlobby was put on, led by veterans' organizations and the mayors of a number fo important cities, including Mayor Van Antwerp, of Detroit. The committee turned a cold shoulder to the pleas of Van Antwerp and others that the housing shortage is the No. 1 problem of their communities.

FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND UNITS SOUGHT

As it passed the Senate, the bill carries funds for construction of 500,000 public housing units over 5 years, including 100,000 in the first year. It also includes less controversial features to continue the Government-backed financing for private building.

TAFT and other public housing advocates say that private building has found no way to construct houses or apartments at a cost low enough to be rentable by the lowest-income groups.

Representative WOLCOTT, after the meeting with MARTIN and HALLECK, said the "basic difference between the Senate and House lies in the fact that the Senate is concerned about the long-range problem while the House wants to centralize on licking the present emergency."

The public-housing program is essentially a long-term proposition, WOLCOTT said.

[From the Wall Street Journal of May 24, 1948]

PUBLIC HOUSING—CONGRESS IS EXPECTED TO REJECT IT, IN LATE GESTURE TO ECONOMY—HOUSE GOP LEADERS THINK TAFT WILL AGREE, TO SAVE REMAINDER OF HIS BILL—BUT THAT'S EXPENSIVE, TOO

(By W. C. Bryant)

WASHINGTON.—It looks as if the housing industry will stay in private hands.

Republican policymakers in the House feel pretty certain they have stopped the Federal Government from launching a big public housing program.

This public dwelling scheme, whereby Uncle Sam would help provide 500,000 dwellings for low-income families, is one feature of the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill. It passed the Senate last month, and is pending now in the House Banking Committee.

If the GOP leaders are right, they have headed off a proposal that would cost taxpayers over $250,000,000 a year for decades to come. To achieve this, however, they are willing to accept other provisions of the same bill that provide Federal Insurance for home mortgages, a government guarantee of minimum returns on privately-owned apartments, and special aid for rural home builders.

PARLEY IN PRIVACY

These lawmakers pin their hopes on a series of conferences between Senator ROBERT TAFT and Chairman JESSE WOLCOTT, Republican, of Michigan, of the House Banking Committee. The first of these private meetings has already taken place.

Mr. WOLCOTT will head the House conferees after this legislation passes the House and goes to a compromising parley between the two chambers. Senator TAFT will not be a conferee, but, as author and principal backer of the bill, he will have great influence behind the scenes.

The House leaders do not expect Mr. TAFT to renege on his support for subsidized public housing, which he believes is the only way to provide satisfactory dwellings to the lowest-income group. But after the first meeting, they feel pretty sure he will agree at the last minute to accept a truncated housing bill in order to save its life. The House won't pass the bill until next month, and it could easily die in the last-minute rush for adjournment unless he does agree.

More is really at stake in the WOLCOTT-TAFT conferences than just the public-housing provision of this bill. The talks represent genuine though perhaps belated efforts to get the House and Senate in agreement on costly legislation. Heretofore, GOP efforts to reduce or hold down expenditures have been hampered by disagreements between leaders of the two bodies on precisely where to economize.

Senate chiefs may have been stirred by the defeat they suffered themselves the other day in efforts to pare $200,000,000 from a bill authorizing new rivers and harbors projects.

House leaders have been opposing other costly measures only to find the Senate ready to pass them. In this category are the bill for Federal aid to education, which would cost $300,000,000 a year ultimately, and a $590,000,000 pay raise for Federal workers. These two proposals, plus public housing, mean $1,000,000,000 a year.

LOOK AT WHAT'S LURKING

Lurking in the background are schemes to defray medical bills and hospital expenses with Federal funds, to grant special housing aid for veterans, and to bestow bigger outlays for soil conservation, roads, and reclamation.

The public-housing scheme is a good illustration of how such Federal-aid programs tend to grow more costly, once the Federal Government is committed to them.

Uncle Sam would enter into contracts with local governments that might run for as long as 40 years under the long-range housing bill. Federal contributions for public housing would start at about $32,000,000, plus $100,000,000 for slum clearance, in the first year. In the fifth year of the program, they're scheduled to cost $160,000,000, plus $100,000,000 for slum clearance. By then the United States Government would be helping support and supervise half a million public units.

But, Mr. WOLCOTT recalls, some of the witnesses before his committee aren't satisfied. They want the Federal Government to help support 2.5 million units and thus increase the cost fivefold. He thinks this indicates what will happen in years to come, if Congress embarks on this sort of program.

There is already a provision in the bill, too, for Federal loans totaling $1,010,000,000 to local authorities for slum clearance, in addition to the outright grants for publicly owned dwellings.

OTHER ITEMS OF EXPENSE

Public housing is, of course, only one of the items in the housing bill that may have expensive implications for the taxpayer.

The Senate wrote in a provision for the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans up to $250,000,000 over a 4-year period to farmers who need help in improving their homes, plus cash subsidies up to $10,000,000 a year for those who can't meet even the charges of this Government financing.

For urban and suburban inhabitants the Federal Housing Administration would continue to insure mortgages, and investors in rental units could apply to the Federal Government to guarantee them a return of 2¾ percent on their investment each year, plus 2 percent amortization, until 85 percent of the original outlay was paid off.

But the GOP chieftains may be willing to accept such items, if they can get the Senate to give up the public-housing feature.

Cost alone is not the only argument used against public housing. Real estate boards and builders oppose it on the grounds it will put the Federal Government in direct competition with them. In time of shortages of building materials, it will divert scarce products from private residential construction. They will say it will not help solve the present critical shortage of housing because the public units admittedly won't become available in any numbers until 1950 at the earliest.

On the other hand, Senator Taft and his supporters contend public housing built during the depression has permitted families to be moved out of slums and rehoused at rents within their means. The Senate committee that first approved the legislation used a sliderule and came out with a proclamation that "the total cost to the Government of taking a low-income family from the slums and providing it with a decent home for an entire year has amounted to only $95."

In attempting to head off public housing, Mr. WOLCOTT must contend with some rebels in his own ranks. When the bill was first referred to his committee, members who feared he would bottle it up indefinitely, got up a petition to discharge the committee of all responsibility for the bill. Had they succeeded, the bill, replete with its public housing provision, would have been brought up on the House floor. Two Republicans from Mr. WOLCOTT's committee were among those signing this document.

Nevertheless, the GOP chieftains feel sure they can out-wait the public housing forces, bring up and pass a bill without this Government-ownership provision, and maneuver it through the House-Senate conference. They feel more sure of this now that they have exchanged views with presidential candidate Taft and find him most anxious to get some kind of legislation on the statute books before adjournment.

Federal Mine Safety Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial published in the United Mine Workers Journal of May 15, 1948.

In this connection, I would like to advise the Membership of the House that I have on the Speaker's table a discharge petition, No. 18, which would bring to the floor legislation to put teeth into the Federal mine inspection law.

I am sincerely hopeful that there will be a sufficient number of the Members of this House interested in mine safety to complete this petition and force this legislation to the floor for consideration before the end of the present session of Congress.

The article from the United Mine Workers Journal follows:

OPPOSITION TO MINE SAFETY CODE TOLD BY BUREAU OFFICIAL AS HE QUITS PAY ROLL

Shocking revelation of one of the important underlying factors that has made it impossible to obtain a Federal mine safety code with real Federal enforcement powers is offered by an Associated Press interview with Daniel Harrington, recently retired safety chief of the United States Bureau of Mines.

In this interview sent out on the Associated Press wires May 1 and published by many newspapers in the coal regions, Harrington is quoted for the first time publicly as wishing to abolish the present Federal Mine Safety Code, which was authorized by the 1946 and 1947 bituminous wage agreements.

As a matter of fact, he has been opposed to the code from the start, the interview disclosed, but admitted he didn't have the courage to speak up publicly while he was on the Federal pay roll. What he may have said privately to encourage operator resistance to the code and congressional inaction is, however, not covered by the interview. It is clear, however, that the code has had an enemy on the inside from its beginning.

It is worth recalling at this point that the code was actually drafted in final form by the Bureau of Mines and is described officially as "a reasonable code of standards and rules pertaining to safety conditions and practices in the mines."

In no sense is it a UMWA safety code, although the miners and the operators both made suggestions. The final draft was the Bureau's own and in issuing it, the statement was made:

"Certainly no code can be effective unless it has the wholehearted support of all interested parties. The Administrator bespeaks such support for this first attempt at a comprehensive, industry-wide safety code."

Now it is revealed that the Bureau's own safety director, certainly an interested party, had such serious mental reservations that it is evident he was in no position to give it the wholehearted support requested by his superiors. Harrington told the AP he thinks the code should be replaced by tentative standards like those that were in effect before the code was adopted.

Under such a system of tentative standards, with the Bureau simply making recommendations, Harrington said:

"The operators could take the recommendations they want and leave the ones they didn't want."

This is precisely what the operating officials of the Centralia No. 5 mine did and what hundreds of operators are doing now because Congress has failed to give Federal mine inspectors the power to enforce their recommendations—all of which apparently does not disturb Harrington, for he states:

"As long as coal is mined in the quantity this Nation demands there will be disasters such as that which killed 111 men at Centralia, Ill., over a year ago."

This appallingly callous attitude on the part of the man who until a few days ago was chief of safety of the Bureau of Mines is in the face of the fact that in 1947 there were 64,165 coal miners killed and injured while working in the mines. Six major disasters, including Centralia, took a toll of 179 lives.

And in a report to Congress by the Bureau only a short time ago covering 9 months under that anemic, futile measure known as Public Law 328 which was enacted by Congress after the Centralia disaster, a law that provides only for reports but no Federal enforcement, it was stated that Federal inspectors had checked on 12,786 serious violations of the Federal Mine Safety Code. The report further says that of this number:

"Action was not taken to correct 6,060 (47 percent) of the violations; correction of 1,344 (11 percent) was less than half completed; correction of 981 (8 percent was more than half completed; and 4,411 (34 percent) were corrected completely."

On the basis of similar reports from State mining departments, it was observed that the Bureau of Mines and State agencies are practically in agreement that no action was taken to correct nearly half the violations reported.

This, then, is the type of enforcement we obtain even with the present Federal code, yet Harrington wants to scrap it and leave safety once more completely at the mercy of the coal operators. Even without a code and with the Bureau restricted to making safety recommendations, Harrington argues, "Ultimately most of its proposals would be adopted because of the force of public opinion." The record of dead and maimed mine workers cries aloud in refutation of this farcical argument.

The final quote from the Harrington interview is really a little gem of burrocratic thinking. Here it is:

"When we have a code, we have to stay in a rut, because this code is a compromise and very difficult to alter."

What he seems to be objecting to here is that the Federal Mine Safety Code does set some standards and limits the authority of the burrocrats to relax them at the behest of the operators.

It is evident from the Harrington interview that, as the mine workers have long been aware and have repeatedly charged, there is something rotten in the Bureau of Mines. Congress has blood on its hands in this situation for it has failed now for more than a year to enact legislation to provide Federal enforcement teeth for the code.

Now that Harrington has let the cat out of the bag, maybe we can hope for some action.

Inaugural Address of President Chiang Kai-shek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, on October 10, 1911, the Chinese Revolution began. There followed almost 4 decades of struggle which would have broken a less sturdy people and a less devoted and determined leadership. The struggle was against the traditions and habits developed during 4,000 years of monarchical despotism; against widespread poverty, illiteracy, disease, and opposition to change; against Manchus, warlords, unequal treaties, foreign concessions, Japanese militarists, armed Communists determined to destroy the republic and set up a Communist dictatorship subservient like all such regimes to the Kremlin.

Yet in spite of all these obstacles and in the midst of the fierce struggle still raging, the Chinese Government has moved steadily toward the adoption of a modern constitution, held elections under it and carried out its pledges to institute constitutional government.

On May 20, the extraordinary man, risen from the common people, who has held China together through unbelievable difficulties and disasters was inaugurated as China's first elected president. Despite all the dangers ahead it marks a historic forward step. Under leave to extend my remarks I include the sober and straightforward, yet challenging and inspiring address and statement of policy which President Chiang Kai-shek gave on that occasion:

SERVANT OF STATE AND PEOPLE

The National Assembly has in accordance with the constitution elected me President of the Republic of China. Beginning today, I am a public servant of the state and of our people. For 20 years I have been at the helm of the state. I greatly regret that because of the prolonged campaigns, first against the Communists and later against Japan, the goals originally set for reconstruction have not been attained. Henceforth, we should endeavor to introduce democracy, to undertake reconstruction and to achieve progress in the midst of renewed military operations against the rebels.

In assuming office today, uppermost in my mind are the difficulties encountered by Dr. Sun Yat-sen and our revolutionary martyrs in establishing the Republic, the circumstances in which our nation finds itself today, and also the hopes entertained by our people at large for the future. I am fully aware of the heavy responsibilities that are now mine.

For 40 years I have dedicated myself to affairs of the state. My only concern has been consistently one of how best I could be of service. Nothing, therefore, could be farther away from my mind than to become President of the Republic.

No nation is ever built by one man, nor in a day. Since the people of our Nation have seen fit to entrust me with these responsibilities, I hope they will also give me the necessary support to do what is expected of me.

ALLEGIANCE TO THE CONSTITUTION

I wish to avail myself of this opportunity to impart to our people what in my opinion are the paramount needs of our country and whither our Government and people should direct their common efforts:

The adoption of constitutional rule is an unprecedented event in the history of the Republic. It has come at the end of a long period of trials and tribulations, during which our early revolutionary martyrs and our heroes in the recent war have laid down their lives. Hence, it is incumbent on every one of us to cherish what we have thus newly accomplished.

It is for the sake of national tranquillity and our people's welfare that the constitutional regime is being inaugurated. If our nation should still fail to advance toward unity, independence, and progress, and if the status of our people remains unimproved as before, then constitutionalism will have lost much of its meaning.

First of all, now that the Constitution has taken effect, it is up to us to see that it is actually enforced and does not remain on paper. The enforcement, therefore, is as much the duty of the Government as that of the people as a whole. We must respect the Constitution, for this is the way to foster a law-abiding spirit in us.

Meanwhile, it is imperative that the people all understand what democracy really is and learn to live accordingly. It should be realized that democracy is a way of life, and it finds expression not only in politics but also in economic and social activities.

Citizens of a democratic country do not forsake their rights nor do they evade their obligations. It is democratic for a minority group to obey the majority. However under no circumstances should the majority usurp the rights of the minority. Conversely, no minority should ever dictate to the majority. Everyone should have self-respect. He should have the chance to express his views, but he should also be prepared to accept criticisms and to make personal sacrifices in the interest of the common good.

In my new office, I shall endeavor to set an example for the Nation by pledging my complete allegiance to the Constitution. It is my hope that by so doing I shall succeed in inculcating in our people democratic habits and thus lead our country on the road to true democracy. This is especially important at this juncture when our constitutional rule is being launched. In discharging our offices, both I and my colleagues in the Government are determined to stay within the bounds set by the Constitution, thereby laying a good foundation for democracy in China.

ERADICATION OF ANTIDEMOCRATIC FORCES

Our Constitution was adopted with a view to solidifying our sovereignty and protecting the rights of our people. What our country needs most today is unity, liberty, and progress. By rising in armed rebellion and by upsetting social order, the Communists have become an obstacle to national unity and an enemy to liberty and progress. We must muster the Nation's strength to eradicate these antidemocratic forces which have been creating disunity, terror, and destruction.

Following the formation of our constitutional Government, further steps must be taken to improve and strengthen our military affairs so as to bring the campaign against the rebels to a successful conclusion at an early date. This is necessary in order to deliver our people in the Communist areas from indescribable sufferings and to remove the present threat to our very existence as a Nation.

At the same time, we must coordinate our political, economic, educational, and social activities with our military efforts against the rebels. The present military campaign was not brought on by friction between political parties. Much less was it caused by conflicting interests. It is a war between democracy and totalitarianism, between forces of unity and those of disunity, between patriots and traitors, between liberty-loving people and oppressors, between those who want to see China continue as an independent nation and those who seek to subjugate her.

In effect, this is an all-out war on the part of the Chinese people to save their nation from collapse. I firmly believe that the strength which comes from the people through self-awakening is what it takes to defeat the rebels, however ferocious they may be. Likewise, it is my conviction that comprehensive political, economic, and social reforms are among the most effective ways to remove the Communist menace once and for all.

It is for the purpose of safeguarding the foundations of our Republic and protecting the people's welfare that I am now calling on all freedom-loving and patriotic Chinese to close their ranks and rally behind the campaign against the rebels. This is the way to shorten the period of hostilities and to hasten the restoration of peace and order throughout the country. Then and only then will there be domestic unity and peace.

Our country hardly has had time to recover from the ravages of 8 years of war of resistance against Japan when the Communist conspiracy suddenly took on even more serious proportions. As a result, plans for demobilization, rehabilitation, and reconstruction were upset with serious effects on all aspects of our national life.

ADMINISTRATIVE, LEGAL REFORMS

Today our Nation is confronted with a serious crisis. That we have political and social shortcomings is undeniable. These shortcomings should be promptly remedied. However, any reforms, to be effective, must be enacted into institutions and laws and must answer the needs of the majority of the people. Furthermore, they must differentiate between what is fundamental and what is tributary and must be implemented by concrete measures of enforcement.

Following the commencement of constitutional rule, we have improved our institutions. Thus, relations between the Government and the people have become much closer. As I have been entrusted by the people with the Presidency, I shall grasp this new opportunity with the greatest sincerity and determination and see to it that the government takes necessary steps to effect needed administrative reforms.

In my opinion, the principal task of the new government is to purge itself of corrupt officials, to enforce discipline, and to uproot all practices of officials using their positions to serve personal interests. On the other hand, ways must be found for the new government to draft worthy and able citizens into service as a way of invigorating the administration and thereby raising its efficiency.

A system of postperformances examination must be enforced so that awards and penalties will fall where they are due. Efforts

must be made to ascertain real needs of the people. Making believe and procrastination, which have been prevalent in the officialdom, must be done away with. The people must be relieved of extra-legal levies and exactions. Above all, laws and orders should be simplified, powers and responsibiilties must be clearly demarcated, and law-enforcing organs must be unified. All duplicating and impractical laws and regulations should be removed from the statute books. In short, we must enhance the dignity of law and order and afford protection to legitimate rights. All citizens might be equal before the law, and there should also be equal opportunity for all citizens to perform their duties and to develop their individual abilities and potentialities.

PRINCIPLE OF PEOPLE'S LIVELIHOOD

In economic affairs, we must practice the principle of people's livelihood as a means of raising the standard of living of the people as a whole. Provisions for national economy and social security in the chapter on fundamental national policies in the new Constitution are based on Dr. Sun Yat-sen's teachings. Consequently, we do not need to look elsewhere today for ways of solving China's economic and social problems. Following the establishment of the new Government, I and my colleagues shall exert ourselves with this in view.

On one hand, we should take effective steps to stabilize our currency, balance our national budget, regulate credit and banking and improve means of transportation in order to force the commodity prices to level off and to save our people from their plight. On the other, we should steadily effect land reforms, protect tenant farmers, extend farm credit loans, all for the purpose of equalizing land ownership. We should also eliminate speculation and tax excessive profits.

Meanwhile, we should extend cooperatives, encourage agricultural and industrial production, protect legitimate business enterprises and welcome foreign investment. Thus more goods will become available to the people.

It has been our consistent view that the two principal goals of the Three People's principles are political freedom and economic equality. Among the first tasks to which the new Government should apply itself is to move toward them through adopting concrete plans and employing practical and definite steps. We hold it to be self-evident that the interests of the state are also the interests of the great majority of the people.

This will be the new Government's guiding policy in domestic affairs.

RESPONSIBILITY TO UNITED NATIONS

As to the new government's foreign policy, I propose to explain it in three parts:

First, concerning the United Nations. Following its establishment, the new government's first task, insofar as foreign policy is concerned is to continue to support the United Nations and to strengthen it. Article 141 of our constitution clearly prescribes China's obligations vis-à-vis the United Nations.

We fought against the Axis Powers for 8 years and made heavy sacrifices because we had hoped that the ideal of world peace as signified by the United Nations would become a reality. It is true that the United Nations is as yet not powerful enough to maintain world peace. Because of the numerous setbacks the United Nations has encountered during the past 2 years, many have become dubious about its future. In fact, some have even begun to question whether the UN is worth having. On the contrary, because of the existence of such misgivings, we should redouble our efforts to sustain and strengthen it.

Insofar as China is concerned, we did not bear principal responsibility for the failure of the League of Nations. However, if the United Nations should, unfortunately, fail too, we cannot evade our share of the responsibility to mankind and to posterity. This is because China was one of its sponsor nations and has been a permanent member in its Security Council.

POLICY OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

Second, concerning international cooperation in general. Since the surrender of Germany and Japan, relations among the Allied Powers have deteriorated. In place of cooperation, there is today mutual suspicion. The Chinese people are greatly disturbed over this state of affairs. China's policy, however, has been one of peace and cooperation. In dealing with any issue requiring international cooperation, we shall never be guilty of seeking self-interest or of neglecting the world's need for peace, prosperity, and progress.

Economically speaking, our industries and commerce cannot be compared with those of other countries. However, this shall not deter us from participating in international trade and tariff agreements.

In political matters, though we still have an armed rebellion at home and though the general educational standards of the nation are still comparatively low, we have not hesitated to participate in the Freedom of Information Conference and other projects calling for international cooperation in the social and cultural fields.

We have regarded peace and cooperation as the two of the highest ideals in international relations since the end of the recent war. The Chinese people, both those at home and others residing abroad, have had happy and cordial relations with the peoples of other nations. In the spirit of equality and reciprocity, they have been constantly endeavoring to promote friendship and mutual respect.

It is true that for our economic recovery we shall need international assistance. But we fully realize that only through self-help could we make international aid really effective. Following the establishment of the new government, we shall continue to adhere to our policy of international cooperation, and shall carry out a program of self-help at the same time.

MAGNANIMITY TOWARD JAPAN

Third, concerning China's attitude toward the conclusion of peace treaties. At the time of the Japanese surrender, I declared that China would not seek revenge for what Japan had inflicted on the Chinese people. It has been my belief that, either toward Germany or toward Japan, members of the United Nations should one and all adopt a policy of magnanimity. This cannot be construed as a sign of weakness. On the contrary, reasonable magnanimity points the road to the attainment of our lofty ideals.

In connection with Japan, we believe two points deserve attention. One, the Allied Powers should do their best to foster the growth of truly democratic forces in Japan, so that there could be a genuine change in that Nation's political and social systems and in the thoughts of the Japanese people with a view to uprooting Japanese militarism. Whether our policy of magnanimity will prove successful depends on whether our efforts are realistic. Two, China has no excessive demands to make of Japan. After having suffered from Japanese aggression for more than 8 years, China cannot but ask the other powers to recognize that she is entitled to a special position when the Japanese peace terms are to be decided.

The above-mentioned three points represent the major policies in our external relations. As Dr. Sun Yat-sen has pointed out to us, the Chinese people should discharge their duties and enjoy their rights as befitting a civilized nation. This means that internationally we should seek to strengthen ourselves by our own efforts and externally to secure equality for China in the community of nations and at the same time to offer cooperation to other nations. In this spirit, our country shall make its contributions toward upholding international righteousness and the preservation of world peace.

TURNING POINT IN NATION'S HISTORY

In assuming office today, I realize that at home we have yet to suppress an armed rebellion and to stabilize our economy, and that in the world at large solid foundations for peace have yet to be laid. I cannot deny that the path before China is beset with troubles. Much less can I deny that the task of rebuilding our nation is a difficult one. Our basic conditions for democracy are still deficient. But the forces of the times have already pushed us onward on the road to constitutional democracy. No matter how many obstacles may block our way, we have to move forward.

My experience after having been in the service of the nation for the last 40 years has led me to believe firmly in Dr. Sun Yat-sen's axiom: "Success will come to any measure that conforms with the natural laws, that follows the course of human understanding, that keeps in step with world trends, that answers the people's needs, and that has been discovered by men of superior intelligence." Therefore, with utmost sincerity and determination, I am accepting this sacred charge of saving the country from peril, rebuilding it, and bringing about democracy in the country. It is my hope that leaders in all walks of life, civilians and soldiers alike, will demonstrate unity of purpose and faithfully perform their duties. In particular, I hope they will give me and my colleagues in the new government faithful counsel and assistance so that a good foundation may be laid for unity, independence, liberty, and equality of the republic. I shall always make the people's interests and the state's welfare my own. I shall always welcome advice, and I shall loyally discharge my duties so that the task before us all can be successfully completed.

This is a great turning point in the history of our nation. Personal success or failure, nay even life or death, no longer enter into my consideration. My only wish is to serve the state and our people, for this has been my lifelong ambition.

Salary Increase for Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PARKE M. BANTA

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. BANTA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to me by Mr. Ed Powell, of Cabool, Mo., dated May 12, 1948:

MISSOURI FEDERATION OF
POST OFFICE CLERKS,
Cabool, Mo., May 12, 1948.

Hon. PARKE M. BANTA,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BANTA: Since the salary-increase bill for needy postal employees is apt to come up before the House next week or so, I thought that I should write you and let you know that every postal clerk in this land is looking to you, among all those others, to give us aid. Not a pat on the head, and not a "Well done, boy," but rather a substantial increase in compensation, that our families may finally rid themselves of that feeling of insecurity that has been so dominant for the past 2 years.

On some cards mailed out by the employment agency down here at Mountain Grove,

Mo., I noticed that the job offerings included the job (in the State of Kansas) of construction helper—common labor—$1 an hour. Is that the category the average postal clerk falls in? The entrance salary, after a rigid examination, and loyalty investigation, etc., is exactly 5 cents an hour more than that paid for the cheapest type of common labor. I don't hold that the inexperienced beginner construction man doesn't deserve the wage offered. What I'm bringing out is the fact that if the Government of this United States expects the personnel responsible for efficient operation of the United States mail to continue to render as good service in the future as they have in the past, they are going to have to show a little concern and soon. Of course if the Government actually believes that the United States postal clerks are worth no more to it than a common laborer, she should abolish her rigid entrance examinations, physical requirements, age limits, all regulations, except that of being on the job 8 hours a day, and even then the postal service will offer no better a position than that of carrying bricks to a bricklayer on a residential construction job. When the Government makes the aforementioned changes, I'll stop complaining and go get myself a nice construction job with no demerits to bother with.

It would save me a lot of typing if you would include this letter in one of your extension of remarks. I'd like for as many other Representatives as possible to know what the postal clerks are thinking. After all, we can't ask the Postmaster General for a raise, or we'd already have it. Nor can we ask the President. We have to ask Congress—well we've more than asked, we've begged and pleaded. How about it?

Your friend,

ED POWELL.

Republican Bill on Reciprocal Trade Presents Campaign Problem for Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of Thursday, May 20, 1948:

PROBLEM FOR REPUBLICANS

If the Republican Party does not wish to go into the national campaign correctly tagged with the same label of economic isolationism which has cost it heavily in the recent past, then it is time for Republican Presidential aspirants and others highly placed in the party's councils to take a hand in an important issue on which debate is about to begin in Congress. This issue is the life or death (by strangulation) of the Hull reciprocal trade agreements program.

The law giving the President power to negotiate such agreements will soon expire. In Washington the House Republican steering committee has decided to sanction a single year's renewal of it, instead of the 3 years' renewal urged by the President and frequently granted by Congress in the past. Moreover, this single year's extension would be hedged with restrictions which would cripple the law in operation.

For example: The Tariff Commission, now an integral part of the agreement-making process, would henceforth be set up as a censor over the authority of the President to exercise the powers which have already been delegated to him in this field by Congress, and any action of the President which did not conform to the Commission's views could be vetoed by Congress, acting within the next succeeding 60 days. The term 60 days would not mean merely 60 days by the calendar. It would mean 60 days of continuous legislative session, leaving out possible adjournment or recesses for holidays, etc. The uncertainties resulting from this complex and inflexible system would heavily, and in many cases fatally, handicap the President in his tariff negotiations with other countries. No foreign country would know whether or not the President's word would stick.

Apparently the House Republican steering committee would like to strike a blow at the Hull principle of reciprocity without seeming to oppose that principle too openly. Hence these roundabout restrictions. But this device of crippling the principle while seeming to favor it would be easily exposed in an election campaign. The result could certainly cost the Republican Presidential candidate many votes among people who believe that peace and prosperity both depend in substantial measure upon the lowering of barriers to trade and the promotion of close economic relations among the world's democracies.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Press of May 21, 1948:

A ROAD TO DISASTER

When high-tariff Republicans in the House clamped down their own iron curtain, and behind it held secret hearings on the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, it became plain that they were up to no good.

Even so, they didn't quite dare condemn this wise and popular law to die next June 12, as it would if Congress failed to renew it.

But they intended to restrict the authority it gives the President to make two-way agreements with other countries for the lowering of barriers to international trade. And they meant to allow it only a brief new lease on life, hoping that after the elections a Republican President would help kill it.

Their intentions now have taken open form in a bill, drafted behind that "iron curtain." This bill would cripple the Reciprocal Trade Act with amendments and renew it for 1 year instead of the 3 asked by President Truman. The bill has been approved by a strict party vote—15 Republicans to 9 Democrats—of the House Ways and Means Committee. And Speaker MARTIN and other Republican leaders in the House have given it their blessing.

Enactment of this bill would be a terrible, if not fatal, blow to the European recovery program, hitherto given general support in Congress.

It would amount to notifying the world that America is turning back to economic isolation. America offers to help other nations toward prosperity and peace, one of the conditions being that they act to promote freer world trade. How can we expect the condition to be met if America herself starts retreating down the old, disastrous road of restrictive tariffs?

Perhaps the high-tariff Republicans don't care what happens to the recovery program and the world. Let them give thought, then, to what their bill could do to their own party and its hopes for election victory.

For many years one of the Republican Party's heaviest handicaps has been a public suspicion that too many of its leaders take orders from selfish business interests. Can the Republican Congress now afford to confirm this suspicion? Can it afford to tell the American people that a Republican victory next November would be followed by a swift return to the evil logrolling system of writing tariffs? We think not.

We know that the United States cannot afford the damage this Ways and Means Committee bill would do. It should be rejected. Congress should renew the Reciprocal Trade Act, without hamstringing amendments, for three full years.

Imperialism in Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following, which is an article that appeared in the Washington Evening Star of May 20, 1948:

IMPERIALISM IN GREECE

TO THE EDITOR OF THE STAR:

The first week of May 1943 will be recorded in the history of Greece as one of the blackest weeks in the annals of Greek mankind. One hundred and fifty-two persons, men and women, were shot in 1 day—May 3—plus hundreds of others, since the date the Americans went to Greece as "Samaritans."

The crime for which these people were shot was that they took part in an uprising in December 1944, fighting for their freedom.

But was it a crime to revolt and fight for freedom? Our own American Nation was founded as a result of such an uprising.

The Greek people took part in World War II from the very beginning. For 6 months they successfully fought the invading hordes of Mussolini. Then the Nazis had to step in to assist their Italian Fascist allies. Because of poor leadership, the Greek people were surrendered to the Nazis, while the King of Greece and members of his government, plus most of the Greek aristocracy, fled to Egypt. But the Greek people, the heart and soul of Greece, those who fought the Italians and Germans, remained in Greece, and they continued to fight for freedom, following the instructions of the international leaders, Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin.

Organizing their own armies, the Greek people took to the mountains, and for 4 years successfully fought the enemy, for which they were highly praised by the English general staff. When the Germans retreated to the hills in 1944, with the guerrillas of Greece pursuing them, the English Army demanded the right to land in Greece as tourists, and the Greek people were kind enough to grant them permission to land.

However, once in Greece, the English Army followed its traditional policy of imperialism and attempted to rule the country as a colonial possession.

The Greek people, after fighting the Nazis and Fascists for 4 years for their freedom, refused to allow that freedom to be denied by their so-called allies, the English, and they rose up in December 1944, demanding the

evacuation of the British Army. Men, women, and children, thousands of them started to march, unarmed to their own capital, Athens. They were ordered to stop and when they refused, they were fired upon. Men, women, and children were killed. Since then none of the English who fired upon the innocent and unarmed Greeks has been punished in any way. But 1,400 Greeks were convicted and sentenced to die because they took part in an uprising for their freedom.

These 1,400 Greeks were held in jails all over Greece. Now after 4 years they are being taken out in groups and executed at the whim of the present Greek Government.

These executions and reprisals will not stop the fight of the Greek people for freedom and democracy. They will continue to fight for their freedom from imperialism and the right to develop their own democracy. All they ask is that foreign intervention be stopped and they can forge their own destiny.

COSTAS ALEXIOU.

Asking for Proofs of Soviet Sincerity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include two editorials from the Detroit News of May 19, 1948. They are both excellent articles, and I believe they express the true feelings of the great masses of American people.

W. K. Kelsey is regarded as our outstanding journalist and correspondent. He writes a daily column in the Detroit News entitled "The Commentator." The editorials follow:

THE COMMENTATOR
(By W. K. Kelsey)

ASKING FOR PROOFS OF SOVIET SINCERITY

Said our Government to Russia: "The door is still open for discussion."

Said the Russians: "Then let's discuss."

Said Washington: "Goodness gracious sakes alive! Stalin must have something up his sleeve! We didn't really mean getting together and talking things over."

Said Stalin: "Why not discuss on the basis of the Wallace suggestions"

Says Washington: "Are you sincere? If you are, give us substantial proofs."

At least, that's how it appears to the Commentator. The fact is, Russia is talking to the world at large, and our Government is talking to nobody. There is no direct exchange of conversations. As long as this goes on, the Russians, if they play the game skillfully, can get the better of us, because they are appealing to a strong popular sentiment in all nations for world peace.

To ask Russia for proofs of her sincerity is of little avail unless the proofs required are specified; and if specific proofs are demanded, the Russians can claim that such matters are properly subjects to be taken up in the discussions.

In the diplomatic game, you do not ask your opponent to toss away even small cards.

There is only one way to find out if the Russians are sincere, and this is to engage them at the table and play the game. What are we afraid of? That the Russian cards are stronger than ours?

WHY THE RUSSIANS MAY WANT TO DISCUSS

If we admit such a fear we should ask ourselves why, then, the Russians want to discuss. To discuss is to explore, not necessarily to reach agreement. By discussing, we commit ourselves to nothing; we listen to the other chap's views and state our own, to find if any agreement is possible.

If Russia wants discussions in the belief that by superior argumentative power she can acquire something in exchange for nothing, we should be able to show her that she is wrong—in which case we lose nothing.

If she wants discussions in the hope that she can show the world that we are all wrong, and that she is right, we should be able to convince ourselves that the strength of our position is such that the demonstration is sure to fail.

The alternative to an exploration of the possibilities of agreement is continuance of the cold war, with the danger that it will develop into the real thing, which no person in his senses wants.

But it may be that the reason Russia is not only willing, but apparently eager, for discussions is that she realizes at last that American strength and determination are too much for her, and that it would be more profitable to come to terms.

Such a decision on Russia's part would be completely logical if her leaders really believe in the Marxist argument that time is on her side, that capitalism must fail eventually under its own weight, that the triumph of communism is certain.

If Stalin & Co. do not believe in that phase of the Marxist doctrine they may believe in another point in Communist teaching—that capitalism can survive only by continuous expansion, and such expansion leads inevitably to war.

In that case they must gravely fear that the cold war, accompanied by American plans for increasing the armed strength of the United States, is bringing a real war ever nearer. And the Russians have seen enough of war to know how destructive the last one was, and how much more destructive another, fought with atomic weapons, would be.

Therefore, it would be better to discuss peaceful arrangements while there is yet time

HELP FOR WALLACE; WHERE IS STASSEN?

There is another possible explanation of Mr. Stalin's moves.

He may believe that by pressing for discussions at this time he is strengthening Henry Wallace's campaign and making him the next President of the United States.

It is scarcely conceivable that Messrs. Molotov and Gromyko and Vishinsky, who are clever men and good observers, could have sold him on such an idea. They, better than anyone in Russia, should know the political temper here, and how impossible it is for a new party with a vamped-up organization to win against strong traditional parties.

Nevertheless, the negative attitude of the administration toward the Russian advances is bound to disgust many Americans who are sincerely desirous of peace, and to make them more willing to give Mr. Wallace a better hearing than he has enjoyed so far

And where is Harold Stassen left? In his book Where I Stand, he reported a conversation he had with Stalin in which Stalin, in April of last year, told him: "The U. S. A. and the U. S. S. R. systems are different, but we didn't wage war against each other, and the U. S. S. R. doesn't propose to. If they could cooperate during the war, why can't they cooperate today in peace? Given the wish to cooperate, of course; but if there is no desire to cooperate, even with the same economic systems, they may fall out, as was the case with the U. S. A. and Germany." This is similar to what Mr. Stalin is saying today.

"Since my return to the United States," Mr. Stassen reported, "many have asked me whether Stalin was sincere in his assurance that the two vast powers can cooperate. I don't know. * * * I believe that peace and cooperation between Russia and the United States are possible."

Does Mr. Stassen still hold that view? If he does, it is high time for him to speak out. "I don't know." Is he in favor of trying to find a yes-or-no answer?

He is a highly active candidate for the Presidency. He can scarcely afford to remain silent. His advocacy of the banning of the Communist Party in the United States is not a direct answer to the question of whether he favors discussions.

TRUST, BUT KEEP THE POWDER DRY

Oh, for 1 month of another Franklin Roosevelt in the White House at this time—or any other American statesman with courage enough to keep his mind resolutely made up, and to go anywhere, at any time, to assert his faith in America and to explain what this country means.

Hanging back and quibbling can bring no advance in the cause of understanding and world peace. Wondering whether Mr. Stalin is sincere gets us not a step forward. The thing to do is to find out, and the way to find out is through discussion. We have made the tentative offer; not only has it been accepted but some of the questions to be discussed have been mentioned by the Russians, with the addendum that there are still others that can be talked over.

Oliver Cromwell is credited with having said, "Put your trust in God, but keep your powder dry."

We can keep our powder dry and still talk and work for peace. We can arm from head to foot, but, nevertheless, not only keep the door open for discussion, which was our suggestion, not Russia's, but really engage in discussions.

What have we to lose? Or have we already lost trust in God and in the Prince of Peace?

WE SHOULD HAVE BEEN READY WITH A DISARMAMENT PROPOSAL

Premier Stalin's overture for a discussion and settlement of Russo-American differences once more has caught the Washington administration flat-footed.

It is perhaps a 100-to-1 bet the overture was intended to be rejected. The Russians frequently betray amazing ignorance of American politics. At least, however, they would know that Henry A. Wallace, whose open letter Stalin proposed to dignify as the basis of discussions, is an election opponent of both major American political parties.

That fact should not affect the issue. However, it appears probable the Administration was counted on for reluctance thus to exalt the statesmanship of its left-wing political foe.

There was enough else, in any event, to promise Stalin's peace feeler a cold reception. Molotov's offer to negotiate had brought forth Washington's embarrassed refusal. It must have seemed unlikely to Moscow that the heavy-footed Americans would have shifted policy meanwhile.

Thus the second instalment of a one-two propaganda punch could be delivered with slight risk of embarrassment on the Russian part by an unexpected American acceptance.

It could safely be assumed that the Americans obligingly would convict themselves before the whole world of rejecting an offer of Russo-American understanding, which, in its achievement, would have revived the world's faltering hopes for UN and peace.

That this should be the outcome is deeply regrettable on either of two grounds.

In the first place, America naturally does want peace. Even the one chance in a hundred of the Russian overtures being sincere is not something to be lightly tossed away.

In the second place, Stalin's bid was in such terms that the Russian bluff, if it was a bluff, could have been instantly countered in a manner reflecting credit on America.

Both in Wallace's letter and in Stalin's summarization of it, the first point proposed

for discussion was general reduction of armaments and prohibition of atomic weapons.

Here was an opening for which Washington should have been ready with an American counterproposal of universal, total disarmament—under the safeguards of full supervision and inspection by UN.

If Russia truly is prepared to live within the letter and spirit of the UN Charter, disarmament would satisfy her needs for national security—as it would ours—making possible a real settlement of other differences between the two nations.

If not, her rejection of such a proposal would leave the world in no doubt of which nation is actually for peace under law.

The News may be forgiven for writing that in a spirit of I told you so. This newspaper, with just such a situation in mind, long has urged that the only tenable position for a peaceable America is one of readiness at all times to propose or welcome universal disarmament.

People can understand that; they can understand that a law-abiding world should need no arms, except those UN itself might retain.

They may have trouble in understanding why peaceable America should reject Russia's bid—however carefully phrased—for a settlement including general armament reduction.

Britain's Policy in the Holy Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on Sunday, May 23, the Denver Post published an interesting and challenging article by Barnet Nover, one of the most penetrating writers and observers of these troubled times, on the subject of Britain and Transjordan, a policy of perfidy.

Mr. Nover's statement is a terrible indictment of a neighbor who has drawn heavily upon our bounty for 8 years. Unfortunately, Mr. Nover's conclusions cannot be successfully refuted or challenged. It is high time, therefore, to bring these things out in the open and I ask unanimous consent to insert the Nover statement in the appendix of the RECORD where the whole world may read it and where this diabolical policy of perfidy may receive the attention which it deserves.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLICY OF PERFIDY—BRITAIN AND TRANSJORDAN

(By Barnet Nover)

WASHINGTON.—There are few more shameful incidents in British history than those having to do with the role which the Labor government has been playing in the tragic events that have been unfolding in the Holy Land.

Nominally, having abandoned the mandate over Palestine and withdrawn her troops and officials from that country, Great Britain no longer has anything to do with the struggle now raging between the Arabs and the Jews.

This happens simply not to be the case. The plain truth of the matter is that Great Britain is involved up to her neck in the Palestine imbroglio. The only difference between the role she is now playing and the role she played as mandatory is that this time her actions do not even have the pretense of impartiality and this time Great Britain is not acting directly but through a puppet.

The puppet is King Abdullah of Transjordan.

Transjordan had no existence until it was created by Great Britain. It could not survive the withdrawal from it of the financial support which Great Britain has regularly granted it. The Transjordan Army—the Arab Legion—is a British mercenary army, paid for out of funds supplied by the British exchequer, equipped with British arms and uniforms, trained and led by British officers. The legion's commander is a British subject—Brig. John Bagot Glubb, known as Glubb Pasha.

Together with some 30 other British officers, Glubb has been seconded or loaned to King Abdullah. Great Britain has taken no action to recall him. It has refused to suspend the subsidy to Abdullah which accounts for four-fifths of the revenue which Abdullah receives. And Britain's pledge to remove the Arab Legion from Palestine on or before May 15 proved to be a fraud.

Under British law, the accomplice to a crime of violence is just as culpable as the individual who carries it out.

Applying their own rule to them, therefore, the British bear a heavy responsibility for what has been happening in the Holy Land since May 15, and particularly for the destruction and damage resulting from the Arab Legion's military action inside Jerusalem.

The suspicion is strong and there is weighty evidence to back it up that Transjordan's role in Palestine is not merely the reflection of Abdullah's ambitions but also represents the calculated purposes and policies of the London Government.

The story was set forth in great detail with a wealth of documents in a special supplement published by the Nation. There has been no denial by London that the documents are not authentic.

Further evidence of Britain's continuing—and sinister—role in Palestine comes from Lake Success.

In a new and desperate effort to end the bloodletting, the United States recently proposed that the Security Council of the United Nations invoke chapter VII of the Charter, the chapter dealing with action to be taken against those who perpetrate acts of aggression.

The plan of the United States, in substance, was to enforce the peace. Actually, a long step in that direction could have been taken by Great Britain herself simply by demanding that Abdullah remove his army into Transjordan, or at least confine it to the Arab portion of Palestine.

This plan went aground on the rock of British opposition. Sir Alexander Cadogan, the British representative on the Council, threatened to use the veto to prevent the American plan from going into force. The threat was enough. Once again the United Nations demonstrated its utter incompetence and puerility. This time the culprit was not Russia, but a nation whose statesmen have so often declared their fealty to the new world organization.

There is a great deal of talk in the United States about the need of revising the Charter.

The Charter needs revision. But what is needed even more is a real willingness on the part of the member nations to live up to the principles of the Charter. So far as the Palestine problem is concerned, Great Britain has been weighed in the scales and tragically found wanting.

Danger of War Receding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENDERSON LANHAM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, the waves of fear and alarm of war that surged over our people following Russia's seizure of Czechoslovakia and her other aggressive moves throughout the world are subsiding.

Now there are many evidences that Russia does not want war. Our firmness with Russia, our promptness in giving aid to the stricken peoples of Europe, and our swiftness in strengthening our military forces seem to have resulted in bringing Russia to a more reasonable and conciliatory attitude.

Even after discounting the apparent propaganda and efforts to bolster Henry Wallace's third-party candidacy, there is evident on her part a desire to come to some understanding and settlement of our problems without war.

Our preparedness and aid to Europe and China have probably averted war. But we must not rely entirely upon our preparedness program. If we stop here, our very efforts to get ready for war may lead us into war. Now that Russia is showing signs of a change in attitude, we must explore every means of getting along with her and other nations of the world on a basis of brotherhood and friendship. We must win Russia to the idea that war is folly and never settles anything. Peoples everywhere must learn that men must live together as brothers or cease to live at all. Another war with atomic weapons and disease germs could well destroy civilization.

Is the world so bankrupt in spiritual and intellectual ideas that we must continue to try to settle our national differences by war instead of by reason, and upon the basis of brotherhood and justice? If it is, then we and our civilization are doomed.

This is not an easy task. It will require the best and sanest minds in America, and the enlistment of all the spiritual forces and weapons at our command. We must think and talk peace instead of war. We must be prepared, of course, to defend ourselves if war does come. But to resign ourselves to the belief that war is certain means the suicide of civilization.

In the March 26 issue of the United States News, there is an editorial by David Lawrence, entitled "The War Nobody Wants," which should be required reading for every literate person in America. Among other things Mr. Lawrence says:

Can we not mobilize the consciences of men to sit in judgment in our disputes and

find a way to resolve them? Is man so deficient in intelligence or ingenuity that he can no longer use his head and must resort to his fists to settle differences of opinion?

What, then, to do about it?

Let the President ask the Russian Government to appoint a mission of outstanding citizens to come to Washington. Let the American Government appoint a mission of outstanding citizens to go to Moscow.

Let's start from scratch. Let's not condemn reason in advance by saying it is futile. It will be natural for each side to continue military preparedness. That's inevitable. But can we not hope that intelligent human beings will brush aside pride and try to find a way to make military co let unnecessary, especially if both sides approach the problem sincerely and honestly and give evidence of mutual good faith?

It's worth a trial.

We owe it to the people of both countries whose sons will have to be sacrificed if we fail to prevent war.

Fortunately, our scientists realize even better than we laymen the threat that modern weapons of destruction bring to our very existence. They are thinking in terms of united action to prevent war, and even in terms of world association or world government. So are our great spiritual leaders and even our industrial leaders.

OUR FINAL CHOICE

In the Readers Digest of January 1948, there appeared an article written by W. T. Holliday, president of the Standard Oil Co. of Ohio, entitled "Our Final Choice." Here is the most sensible word I have seen about the practical steps to be taken to set up some sort of world government that might save human civilization from destruction.

He suggests that the United Nations call a constitutional convention of all the nations of the world, for the formulation and adoption of some skeleton form of world government to settle international problems without war. This constitution could provide that it should become effective upon adoption by three-fourths of the nations just as our own Constitution became effective when it was ratified by three-fourths of the States.

He proposes that this world organization function, not by sending armies to conquer other nations, but through international courts, which would punish the individual who tried to stir the nations to war, instead of punishing whole nations. The pattern for this was set in the Nuremberg trials. Decisions of the international court would be enforced by something similar to our police force and the marshals of our Federal courts. If you haven't read this article, do so. You owe it to yourself and your country.

The Great Rehearsal, a new book by Carl Van Doren, tells the story of the formation of our own Union from the Thirteen Colonies, and points out that the difficulties that face us today in forming an international government for the preservation of peace are no greater than those overcome by your founding fathers who formed this great Federal Government under which our 48 States now live and prosper.

The peoples of the world may not yet be ready for such a world government though there is one veteran of the last horrible war who is giving all his time, energy, and effort toward this end. This young veteran, Cord Meyers, Jr., says that time is running out for us to save the world from destruction.

If world federation is not yet feasible, then we must strengthen the United Nations so that it can function to prevent war. It is my earnest hope that this may be accomplished speedily, for I, too, am convinced that it is later than we think.

The same Cord Meyers, Jr., who is president of the United World Federalists, Inc., in an interview with Wellington Wright, an Atlanta Constitution reporter, explained that his organization which is a merger of six groups seeking the same ends, is seeking support for changes in the Charter of the United Nations to give that body the power of a world federal government. Some of the proposed changes are: First, power to enforce and administer law on individuals, as well as nations, in respect to matters pertaining to security and armament production; second, to regulate certain particularly dangerous aspects of atomic-energy development; third, sufficient direct taxing power to support itself; and, fourth, an international police force and inspection system under sole control of the revitalized United Nations.

By such methods—

He said—

we can avoid a competitive security race which will create the tensions leading to another world war.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee by a vote of 13 to 0 has adopted a foreign policy resolution calling for strengthening the United Nations by: First, United States support for regional defense pacts provided that such pacts remain under the scope of the United Nations Charter; that they are entered into on a self-help basis and are carried out to the extent of creating a joint general staff, standardizing armaments and agreeing on mutual tasks in the event of war; and provided that consent of Congress is obtained in each instance where a United States guaranty is involved; second, maximum United States efforts to curb the big power veto in the UN; third, efforts by this country to provide a world police force for UN; and, fourth, an attempt by the United States to secure the regulation of world armaments under dependable safeguards against violation.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee is also studying a plan for strengthening the United Nations.

While I agree with Secretary of State Marshall, that we should not undertake to go so far in our efforts to strengthen the United Nations that we drive Russia from membership therein, I am sure that every effort should be made to get Russia's cooperation.

I do not mean in anything I have said in this speech to imply that we ought to appease Russia in any way. The day for appeasement is gone. Our firmness is paying off. We must continue to be firm but at the same time keep the door open for cooperation with Russia if and when she shows by her acts rather than her words, that she wants to settle our differences at the peace table rather than by war.

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Press of May 20, 1948:

THE FLOOD BATTLE, AGAIN

It looks like the public and civic leaders of this district might as well make up their minds that once a year, at least, it will be necessary to fight the flood-control battle all over again.

It was a fight to get the flood-control program started. Not until this district had suffered a number of major catastrophes did we get started.

And every year since the program was begun it has been necessary to go to Washington to keep some economy-minded power in Congress from whittling down the appropriations.

Republican leaders tried to whack $200,000,000 out of the general appropriation bill for flood control and rivers and harbors work. Luckily, the Senate defeated this short-sighted scheme.

Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, lightly told the Senate that there is no hurry about flood control and that another year or two won't make any difference.

Senator TAFT, of all people, ought to know better. Senator TAFT comes from Cincinnati. Only this spring Cincinnati had a bad flood. We don't know what that flood cost the business and people of Cincinnati, but it was a sizeable sum and it would go a long way toward paying for the flood-control construction planned for the next year.

"Another year or two won't make any difference."

Oh, no?

For one thing, it costs money to interrupt a project such as a flood-control dam once it is started. It isn't economy to daily with the job. It is only putting off.

More important, no one—not even Senator TAFT—knows when a flood may strike. Maybe there won't be another major flood for "another year or two." And maybe there will be several. Anyway, little floods also cost money, and sometimes lives.

The people of western Pennsylvania have fought too long for a real flood-control program to surrender to such talk as that of Senator TAFT. And so have the people downstream, including the residents of Cincinnati, who also will benefit from this program.

Senator TAFT's decisive set-back on this issue doesn't end the battle, however. The Senate increased the appropriation for flood control and river and harbor improvements. So the bill now goes back to the House, where it may run into some more Republican penny pinchers.

In their battles for the flood-control program in the last 3½ years the people of western Pennsylvania have had a hard-fighting, resolute friend in United States Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, Philadelphia Democrat.

When it comes to the flood-control program, Senator MYERS' staying powers have been matchless. He patiently and diligently has followed every bill affecting the program. He has given the alarm at every sign of danger. He has exerted himself effectively in behalf of this program at every opportunity.

He has done a good job on flood control.

Merchant Ships and Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the American merchant marine must maintain the great effectiveness that it exercised during the war. Without such a merchant marine, our national security is in danger. Admiral Louis Denfeld, United States Navy, Chief of Naval Operations, says that ships are the key to our national existence, speaking at the annual National Maritime Day dinner of the Propeller Club of the United States, port of New York, on Saturday last, and I am including herewith the news item from the New York Times of May 23, 1948, covering his address:

DENFELD DEMANDS BIG TRADE FLEET—ADMIRAL, AT MARITIME DAY DINNER, SAYS SHIPS ARE THE KEY TO OUR EXISTENCE

The strongest United States Navy conceivable would be crippled without the backing of an adequate merchant marine, and the American people should realize that our merchant fleet and our national existence are inseparable, Admiral Louis Denfeld, United States Navy, Chief of Naval Operations, declared last night.

Speaking at the annual National Maritime Day dinner of the Propeller Club of the United States, port of New York, in the Waldorf-Astoria, Admiral Denfeld recalled that in the last two wars this country had had to salvage its martime strength from the depths by a combination of "eleventh-hour fast thinking, gigantic labor, and a lot of good luck."

"We have squeezed by each time," he said, "and afterward, with utter complacency, we have repeated our historic error and permitted the American flag to fade from the seas. It may be difficult for Americans living remote from the sea to appreciate their own and the Nation's dependence on ocean-going ships. There must be some reason why the history of our merchant marine is a graph of steep ups and downs. This is one of the down times—it happens after every war."

The admiral declared that unless this Nation chooses to fight the next war on its own soil, it must be assumed that it will be necessary to transport at least 7,000,000 men, the number carried overseas in World War II.

He added that for this task ships will be needed, and, reviewing the status of the Nation's present fleet of potential transports, he pointed out that our present troop-lifting capacity "would meet less than one-half of the need, if the need were no greater than last time."

Admiral Denfeld cited also the need for moving all the food, munitions, fuel, and equipment that an Army needs, plus the supplies that would have to be shipped to our allies. He said the present tanker shortage alone would foot-make soldiers out of the best mechanized army and air force because of a lack of fuel.

Returning to the complacent attitude of the public toward the status of our American merchant marine, he asserted that so long as our surpluses were exported and our deficiencies supplied from abroad, it has not seemed to matter much to Americans what nation's ships carried the commerce. He deplored the fact that while we were subsidizing foreign-flag fleets with American dollars and depriving ourselves of the ships and the trained men to form our national lifeline in time of war, it didn't seem to matter to our people.

The admiral asserted that this country was attempting to circumvent disaster by putting its resources on the side of international peace and order, but he cautioned against gambling our national existence wholly on the ability of our friends abroad to recover health and strength.

He declared that we must also look to our own security, and added that this meant equipment, know-how, and manpower. The admiral maintained that this did not mean having these essentials in military sufficiency alone, but that the whole country must be industrially in gear.

"In that system of gears," he continued, "the pivot wheel is the merchant marine. You can well dismiss anything you have heard about a 24-hour war. And one thing that can make a long war longer is the lack of an adequate American merchant marine."

Other Maritime Day observances in this area included a formal review of the cadet-midshipmen at the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, Long Island, with Rear Adm. Monroe Kelly, commandant of the Third Naval District, the reviewing officer. A 14-foot floral wreath was cast into the upper New York Bay at the Statue of Liberty in memory of deceased seamen and airmen.

Is Russia Prepared To Make War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Henry J. Taylor, from the current issue of Reader's Digest:

IS RUSSIA PREPARED TO MAKE WAR?
(By Henry J. Taylor)

Can Russia make war on the world? This is the No. 1 question that confronts us today. Russia's war plans must be based on her industrial economy, as must ours at home. Information about the Soviet Union's economy is not abundant, but numerous fundamental facts are available. Let's start with the population and the layout of the country itself. It is a mistake to think of Russia as an immense territory of unlimited wealth and possibilities.

Russia is 45 times the size of Germany. But more than one half of her area is forest, nearly a fifth is desert or semidesert; only an eighth of the remaining land is really fertile. To support a population of 192,000,000 people, Russia has only about as much acreage as the United States has to support 142,000,000 people. Accordingly, Russia's production of food has always lagged far behind her increasing population. The truth is that Russia has been, and will probably continue to be, one of the starvation lands of the world.

Some 50,000,000 of Russia's people are so thinly dispersed in remote regions that they are lost in the vast forests and tundras. Hence Russia's productive population is only about the same as that of the United States.

Most of Russia's industries are concentrated in a triangle which extends from Leningrad and the Ukraine, on the west, to the new industrial regions of Central Siberia. This is only a fraction of Russia's total area, but it is the main source of her economic development. The triangle is highly vulnerable.

The Soviet Union's industrial output today is not as large as our country's was at the turn of the century, 48 years ago.

We know the war damage in Germany, Italy, Japan, and England. Russia was the most war-damaged of all. Russia lost 53 percent of her railroad rolling stock, 45 percent of her steel production, 44 percent of her electrical power capacity, 55 percent of her coal production, one-fourth of her livestock, millions of homes, buildings, bridges.

At war's end the Soviet economic potential had dropped from 42 percent of America's capacity to only 25 percent. If all should go well in the Soviet Union—and all is not going well—Russia in 1951 would have the industrial capacity we had in 1904—44 years ago. By 1960 her output would reach ours in 1918.

When Stalin introduced the present (fourth) 5-year plan on February 9, 1946, he said: "The fundamental task consists in restoring the prewar level in industry and agriculture, and then exceeding this level by more or less considerable amounts. * * * Perhaps three new 5-year plans will be required to achieve this, if not more. But we must do it." Much is revealed if you study that basic program carefully, analyze Stalin's targets, and base your conclusions on communism's optimistic figures—even though Russia has never yet fulfilled a 5-year plan.

Stalin announced that his goal for oil production was 60,000,000 tons a year by 1951. Free America passed that figure 28 years ago. In 1947 we produced 270,000,000 tons. Russia's supply of usable petroleum is still so short that she turns to coal and other hard fuels whenever possible.

Swedish combustion engineers in Russia today find that 30 percent of Russia's coal production is burned in her locomotives. Another 30 percent is used to produce electric energy. So only 40 percent is left for all coal-burning Soviet industry, including coke for steel. Stalin wants his present 5-year plan to boost coal production to 500,000,000 tons a year by 1951. America passed that figure 30 years ago.

Stalin calls for an output of 60,000,000 tons of steel at the end of his present 5-year plan, or the next one. America was producing nearly 50 percent more than that before the end of the last war.

Russia lacks several important strategic materials for war-making—tungsten, molybdenum, tin, antimony, and, most of all, rubber. She has no secure lines of overseas transportation by which to obtain natural rubber; and she has not been able to build the complicated plants required for the production of synthetic rubber.

The outstanding weakness of the Soviet Union, however, is her transportation. Externally, as far as available ships are concerned, she is not badly off. Her prewar merchant tonnage of 1,000,000 gross tons—about the size of Sweden's—was approximately doubled by American lend-lease gifts and postwar acquisitions of ships from Germany, Italy, and Finland. Moreover, Japanese shipyards are now scheduled to construct 175 vessels for Russia, in exchange for coal and coke.

The size of the Soviet Union, however, makes tremendous demands on its limited internal transportation. Roads are few and poor. About the only highways of importance are those leading from Moscow north to Leningrad, west to Minsk, and south to Kiev and Kharkov. Trucks are used principally in the cities.

Russia lacks a canal system, such as that which does the bulk of heavy transportation work in Western Europe. She has no inland water routes except a few large rivers, which are frozen much of the year. Accordingly, 83 percent of Russia's internal freight must be moved by rail. But even in her industrial

triangle, the rail system is amazingly inadequate. Her rail mileage is comparable to ours 76 years ago—in 1872. Yet it must serve and coordinate a country about three times as large. There are only about 57,000 miles of railroad in all Russia, as against our 226,000 miles today. Rail transportation is the No. 1 bottleneck in the Russian economy. It will handicap Russia for years to come.

Even under the present 5-year plan, Russia is building only 4,500 miles of new lines. The reason is that her prewar rail network, concentrated in the western part of the country that fell into Nazi hands, was badly damaged and priority must be given to its reconstruction. Russia's most ambitious rail transportation undertaking is the so-called South Siberian Magistral, paralleling the Trans-Siberian line. It is also worth noting that 3,000 miles of trackage, mostly in the Urals and Siberia, is being electrified.

Russia is being forced to replace much railroad equipment. Many old locomotives are in service and all kinds of rolling stock have been confiscated from Germany and satellite countries. Soviet designers, the Swedish engineers find, copy American locomotives, and they are producing good ones.

We can learn much about Russia from a study of the Soviet automotive industry. State-owned and politically dominated, as is all Russian industry, it does not produce any basic motorcar design of its own; it copies American or British cars, with minor changes. Even so, Russian automobiles shake themselves to pieces, and the average life of a Russian-made light passenger car is only 8,000 miles.

The Soviet Union's use of manpower tells us a lot about her warmaking potential. In Problems of Economy, a Moscow journal, the electric-power generating station at South Amboy, N. J., is compared with the station at Kemerovo, Russia. These plants are identical in output. Yet the American plant employs 51 persons; the Soviet, 480. The American power plant has 17 office workers to do the paper work. The Soviet station has 91. In the over-all picture, 11 men are required to produce 1,000 kilowatts of electricity under the Communist economic system; in the United States, 2 men are required.

The situation in the coal fields is also revealing. In our country more than 90 percent of all bituminous coal mined underground is mechanically cut, and about 60 percent is mechanically loaded; only 4 percent is mined by pick and shovel. In Russia, a large proportion of coal is dug by hand.

Soviet coal mines, like all Soviet industry, are full of nonproducers. Swedish mining engineers who recently visited the Russian Donbas coal region found one Soviet engineer, supervisor, technician, political commissar or armed guard for every four slave-labor miners actually digging coal. The number of people subject to forced labor in Russia is probably greater than the number of industrial workers at liberty. But slave labor in a Communist economy does not produce with the efficiency of freemen in a free economy.

Russia's man-power pool is the greatest in the world, except for that in China and India. Yet there are fewer trained technical people in the whole of Russia than we have in Illinois. Careful estimates show that, even by 1960, Russian production per man is expected to be only half as great as United States production per American producer was 30 years ago.

In Stalin's three earlier 5-year plans, attempts were made, via state-controlled trade schools, to train skilled workers. By 1939 these institutions had provided only 1,000,000 such workers. Progress in that direction remains slow today. Stalin's current 5-year plan aims to provide 6,000,000 trained technical workers. Yet Russia would then have trained only about as many persons as there are making automobiles and driving trucks in the United States.

We in the United States, however, must discount the size of our total economy. For whereas 60 percent of present Soviet industrial production can be devoted to military purposes—because the Russian people's standard of living is so low—not more than 40 percent of America's total production can be made available for military needs without considerable effect on us and on the stability of our economy.

Another point to bear in mind is that controlled plants in satellite countries are helping offset Russia's deficiencies. Still, Russia has always looked to western Europe, England, and America for imports and technical aid, and she is getting less outside production or technical help now than before the war. The recruited German, Swedish, and Swiss experts have achieved most in four fields: Electronics, aircraft design and production, shipbuilding and armament manufacturing.

What about the atom bomb? When can Russia make the bomb, and produce it in stock-pile volume?

Top-ranking American and British scientists are convinced that Russian scientists know the general workings of the bomb, although they may not know certain steps in completing the chain reactions of the atoms: How to "shoot it off." But the most difficult problem for the Russians is the complex factories needed to make an atom bomb. Our bomb stands as the apex of an incredibly complicated industrial pyramid. Radioactivity danger, for example, requires robot control; divisions of an atomic-bomb plant must operate indefinitely without human attendance and without shutting down for machine maintenance. At this practical level in advanced science and precision performance the Russians are backward; in technique and productive capacity, the key industries for production of the atom bomb in the Soviet Union today average 22 years behind these industries in the United States.

Let's assume, however, that Russia can create the industries, coordinate them on the scale necessary, and make the bomb. By the time Russia will have produced her first bomb, the United States should be expected to have an atom-bomb stock pile equal to 18 years of Soviet production.

In summary, then, what is Russia's economic potential for world war?

Russia is the great disturber of the world. The Russian menace to peace is appallingly real. But Russia is far weaker than is ordinarily believed. She could be very strong in fighting a defensive war in or near her homeland. But she is too weak, and for long years will remain too weak, to attack America or strike out like the industrialized Axis Powers of 1939—Germany, Italy, and Japan.

Russia's strength is in her geographical location, her vast area in Europe and Asia, which covers one-sixth of the earth's land. This geographical position is almost impregnable. And the defensive strength which it gives her enables her to behave toward us the way she is behaving. By her political power grabs outside her borders, her fifth-column pressure groups, her psychological warfare in various countries including our own, Russia can create and sustain indefinitely a dangerous world of turmoil which weakens all other countries without much cost or effort to the Kremlin.

Russia does not want actual war and does not intend to have it. The men in the Kremlin saw how America hurt Germany in the last war. They do not propose to have their country hurt in the same way.

The Kremlin has a better idea. Russia is pursuing it every hour of every day: Russia wants us to do so many foolish and costly things at home and abroad—over and beyond the things that are of strategic importance—that we will commit economic suicide. Everything she says and does today is dedicated to cracking our economy by overstraining the American free-enterprise system. She expects us to lick ourselves by our own confusions and overexpenditures and knock ourselves out in our own gymnasium. That would leave Russia untouched. She knows that the key to our world power is our home power, and that when home power is lost world power is lost.

Our task is to realize that this is Russia's fundamental plan. We must make all our policy decisions for the future with that fact in mind.

Decision of Republican Steering Committee on Reciprocal Trade Presents the Party and Its Presidential Candidate With an Embarrassing Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of May 15, 1948:

NO PLACE FOR COMPROMISE

The House Ways and Means Committee, on a strictly party division, voted 15 to 9 yesterday against extending for the customary 3 years the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934. The committee's action was plainly taken at the party-policy level, since it was patterned on a decision made 24 hours earlier by the Republican steering committee.

The Ways and Means Committee apparently did not have the temerity to scuttle the Hull tariff program completely. Perhaps it feared that this would provide the Democratic Party with too dangerous an issue in the coming elections. What it did was to compromise on the issue by extending the legislation for only 1 year and adding at least one amendment.

This action has been taken after 6 days of hearings conducted behind closed doors, with neither the press nor the general public admitted. These are hardly fitting circumstances for considering any major change in a law which has been on the statute books for 14 years. Moreover, if we are to take the word of Mr. FORAND, Representative from Rhode Island, who is himself a member of that subcommittee, the latter, after holding its hearings, did not even meet to discuss the terms for the bill's extension. If this is true it lends much force to Mr. FORAND'S observation that "the Republican steering committee legislates for the House Ways and Means Committee."

In deciding to maintain the Hull trade program while at the same time reducing the period of its extension for the 3 years asked by the President, the Republican steering committee would seem to be attempting to play both sides of the street. It can defend itself technically against the charge that it has repudiated this key legislation in American foreign economic policy—legislation which was supported by the last two Republican Presidential candidates, by the party's own platform of 1944, and according to opinion poll, by nearly 85 percent of the American public. At the same time the committee apparently wishes to make it possible for the party to pose, as it has so frequently done in the past, as the friend of those vested interests which depend upon high-tariff walls for the perpetuation of their economic well-being.

In our opinion the Republican steering committee has presented the party and its Presidential candidate with a decidedly embarrassing issue, and one which is going to become more embarrassing as the campaign progresses. We find it difficult to believe, in fact, that any self-respecting candidate will accept it. You don't compromise on such issues as economic isolationalism.

International Wheat Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations is studying the international wheat agreement, which the Senate will be called upon to ratify as a treaty. The ratification of this agreement would be a grave error and will have disastrous effects on this Nation's economy.

This agreement would require that three nations—the United States, Canada, and Australia—export 500,000,000 bushels of wheat each year for a 5-year term under a maximum and minimum price, ranging from $2 to $1.10.

This, as all Members know, is much below the current prevailing price for wheat. The United States is to export 185,000,000 bushels per year, but who is to pay the American farmer the difference between the ceiling or agreement price and the prevailing price? This Congress will be called upon to make up this difference through appropriations.

Thirty-three nations are to be the importers of this wheat. They have the controlling voice in the entire program and agreement. And the agreement is nothing more or less than an international OPA. We apparently are unwilling to accept an OPA at home. Why should we permit our American wheat farmer to be penalized by an international OPA?

Another very important aspect of this problem is this: Two other important wheat-exporting nations are not members of the agreement. Those nations are Russia and Argentina. Both these countries will be selling their wheat for whatever the market will bear. An OPA will not work unless it is absolute. It is not absolute since it does not include two of the most important wheat-producing nations. An OPA will fail if there is an uncontrolled black market. This wheat agreement could not possibly work and attain its objectives with two black marketeers, Russia and Argentina. Is there any reason why the United States should be committed to sending 185,000,000 bushels of wheat yearly to 33 nations, the majority of whom I understand are receiving assistance under the Marshall plan, at a price below the prevailing world market price?

Another, and to me the most disturbing feature of this agreement is this: Setting this low ceiling on this tremendous amount of wheat, below parity prices, will tend to establish the world price, and thus the domestic price. It will tend to bring the price of wheat below the actual cost of production.

Many, many times I have tried to point out to Congress that we must keep our farm prices high, not inflationary, but high, for unless we do this, we will find that our entire economy will suffer. Our farm wealth and raw material wealth—of which our Nation's wheat production is a leading factor—generate all income, which in turn keeps the wheels of our entire economy turning. This is not theory, it is fact, and is borne out by figures for any period in history, in all nations of the world. We cannot sell the farmer short without hurting everyone, professional man, laborer, industrialist.

Last year I attempted to point out the folly of this type of thing. My remarks, appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 21, 1947, challenged the efforts of the State and Agriculture Departments to involve the United States in an economic dictatorship governed by a system of international cartels, and dictated by foreign powers.

Let us now arouse ourselves to the danger of this insidious agreement. If we fail to protect our interests, the United States will not long remain strong and be in a position to challenge communism throughout the world and at home. Why should we do our darndest to legislate a depression? Hadn't we better wake up to what is being sold our people through misleading information cloaked in high sounding, noble phrases?

We must thwart this effort to knock the props out from under the American farmer and consequently out from under the entire economy of the United States.

An Outline of the Progress of the City of Syracuse, N. Y., During the Past 100 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, with the phrase United in Progress as its inspiration, the great city of Syracuse is now celebrating its centennial anniversary. In the past 100 years, Syracuse has developed into a center of great industry, commerce, and culture. Its population is in excess of 220,000 and is the transportation and business hub of the Empire State.

The villages of Syracuse and Salina voted to incorporate as a city on January 3, 1848, after receiving permission through an enabling act of incorporation passed by the New York State Legislature on December 14, 1847.

A vigorous proponent of incorporation, Harvey Baldwin, was elected mayor at the first municipal election on March 7, 1848. In a highly acclaimed speech, known as The Hanging Gardens of Babylon, Mayor Baldwin forecast an expansion of the city population to 100,000 within the century. Little did he imagine that his prediction would more than double in reality.

The development of Syracuse actually began around the Erie Canal near Clinton Square, which was the center of trade for Syracuse village, and around the salt springs of Onondaga Lake, the center of industry in Salina village. The combining of the two villages brought about the advantages of location along a vital transportation route, and the area of a growing salt industry. This was sufficient to provide a stimulus that led Syracuse to become one of the few cities today to have representation in all the 20 basic industrial classifications in the United States. Encouraged by the ideal geographical location, the people of Syracuse worked in unity so that Syracuse is now the fourth largest city in the State of New York.

These forefathers built well, and the heritage and prosperity from this firm foundation have come down to us through a century of progress in every aspect of our community life—religion, education, culture, industry, and commerce.

Our slogan, adopted for our centennial year—United in Progress—was selected because it so aptly typifies that spirit which has built Syracuse and that continues to keep Syracuse among the Nation's most progressive municipalities. This unity of purpose among all of the people of Syracuse is the moral strength that binds our community together.

This unity of purpose is symbolized, too, in the centennial seal, the basic design of which is the cluster of five arrows crossed by a broken arrow. According to legend, Hiawatha, an Onondaga chieftain, stood before the chiefs of four other great tribes, the Senecas, Cayugas, Oneidas, and Mohawks, and broke a single arrow in his hands. This showed the weakness of disunity among peoples. Then he held five arrows in his hand, each arrow representing a tribe, and because of their combined strength they could not be broken. Though considered only a legend, it nevertheless is the basis for our most cherished civic principle—unity and willingness to work together for the betterment of all.

The friendly relations that exist between management and the 58,000 workers in our 400 diversified industries producing typewriters, air-conditioning equipment, washing machines, gears, laundry equipment, chemicals, automobile parts, radios, television, radar equipment, pressure die castings, steel, candles, pottery, electrical equipment, farm implements, and many others emphasize the wholehearted indorsement of our people to this principle of progress and unity.

In observing its centennial year, Syracuse is engaged in a great civic undertaking. Such an observance as planned demands imagination and hard work, and the commission appointed by Mayor Frank J. Costello is accomplishing its task with enthusiasm and zeal.

The commissioners are Mr. Jerome B. Rusterholtz, chairman; Mr. Richard H. Pass, Mrs. H. Paul Nelligan, Mr. Robert G. Soule, Mr. Thomas J. Corcoran, Mr.

Crandall Melvin, and Mr. H. Hiram Weisberg.

Cooperating with the commission are 25 participation and working committees representative of every segment of our community, including our two great educational institutions, Syracuse University and LeMoyne College.

The commission and these committees are producing a continuing observance throughout this year, climaxing in centennial week, August 14 through 21 when a historical spectacle with a cast of 3,000 will be presented on a 400-foot stage for eight nights in Archbold Stadium. It will make all of our people conscious of the great heritage that has come down to them through the years, conscious of the importance of their city in the State and in the Nation, and determined that we shall prosper and grow still greater in the years ahead.

The Subversive Activities Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, although the Daily Worker continues to castigate the Subversive Activities Control Act and all those who supported it, the prevailing editorial comment in the responsible press favors the legislation, recognizing clearly the distinction properly drawn in the measure between communism as a political, economic, and social theory and communism as a world-wide conspiracy, dedicated to the establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship, wherever it is allowed to flourish unchecked.

Valuable contributions to the discussion are furnished by the accompanying editorials from the New York Times, Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, and Washington Evening Star, which, under leave to extend my remarks, are set forth here:

[From the New York (N. Y.) Times]

THE MUNDT BILL

It would be difficult to quarrel with the premises which are stated in the opening paragraphs of the Mundt bill, which has just been passed by the House of Representatives with the support of a large majority of the members of both parties. Certainly the evidence is overwhelming that, as the bill states, "there exists a world Communist movement which, in its origins, its development and its present practice, is a world-wide revolutionary political movement whose purpose it is, by treachery, deceit, infiltration into other groups, espionage, sabotage, terrorism and any other means deemed necessary, to establish a Communist totalitarian dictatorship in all the countries of the world through the medium of a single world-wide Communist organization." This, we believe, is undeniable; and it is equally true, as these paragraphs go on to say, that a movement of this kind and with this purpose "presents a clear and present danger to the security of the United States and to the existence of free American institutions.

Precisely what the Mundt bill does to meet this danger is a question on which supporters of the bill themselves do not agree (nor do Mr. Stassen and Mr. Dewey). Some think, and others do not, that it would outlaw the Communist Party, and the language of the bill itself is not precise enough to settle the point definitively. If the bill becomes a law in its present form, a very considerable burden of interpretation would in fact be thrown upon the courts.

Whether because of this, or for other reasons, we are now told in the Washington dispatches that the Senate is likely to pigeonhole the House bill and let it quietly expire. This, we believe, would be a grave mistake. The very size of the House majority—a majority of more than five to one—calls for serious consideration of this issue by the other branch of Congress; and the issue itself, the issue created by an increasingly aggressive international Communist conspiracy, is one which does not warrant either indifference or delay. We believe, therefore, that prompt hearings should be held on the House bill by the appropriate committee of the Senate, for the purpose of clarifying both the problem with which the measure deals and the remedies which it provides. The country does not want, nor would the Constitution sanction, a law which attempted to control the political beliefs of American citizens. But the country can properly seek, and the Constitution surely would not deny, proper and adequate safeguards against intervention in American politics by agents of a foreign power.

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle]

AIM GOOD, METHODS SAFEGUARDED

No more important opportunity for the exercise of intelligent discrimination exists than that presented by the Mundt bill which has passed the House and now is before the Senate.

The bill is an honest attempt to meet the danger of Moscow-linked subversive Communist activity without impairing the constitutional rights of American citizens.

Its purpose is clearly stated in this paragraph of the report of the House Un-American Affairs Committee:

"The committee has intentionally not recommended legislation which will deal with so-called theoretical communism in the United States. We are seeking rather to strike at the American cadre of the foreign-directed Communist conspiracy. We believe that if its criminal activities are prosecuted, its false fronts exposed, and its foreign assistance and direction cut away, the movement in the United States, standing alone for what it is, will be overwhelmingly defeated. We are willing to permit the theories of communism and democracy to clash in the open market place of political ideas in America, but we insist that communism not be allowed to have the unfair advantages in this conflict of the unrestricted use of illegal means, the cloak of secrecy and fraud, and the assistance and direction of a foreign Communist dictatorship."

An important feature of the bill is that any person or organization which feels it is unfairly included in the Attorney General's list of foreign-dominated Communist or Communist-front agencies has the right of appeal to the courts, which may overrule the Attorney General's decision.

Certainly no one who has his eyes open can ignore the fact that American Communists are not just another political party of honest, if most of us think ignorant, zealots.

Links to the Moscow police state have been evident in its past history; and perhaps the clearest indication of its members' ignorance and gullibility is that many of them do not yet understand how in Russia itself the Communist theory has been obscured by the ruthless methods of the dominant small clique that is in control.

The Mundt bill attempts to steer the difficult path between doing something about an insidious danger and avoiding the very police-state methods which it is the aim of the subversives to set up here.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star]

THE AMERICAN COMMUNISTS

There are two ways of evaluating the Mundt bill, which is designed to restrain some and expose other activities of the American Communists and their friends.

One way is to condemn the bill on the basis of provisions it does not contain and things it would not do. A very impressive case can be made out against the measure by setting out hypothetical situations and applying to them provisions which are not in the bill. There has been a good deal of this sort of criticism. But it is worthless because it has no basis in fact.

It has been contended, for example, that Henry Wallace's third party might have to register as a Communist-front organization if this bill becomes law. Since this contention is typical of much of the ill-informed criticism, it is worth examining.

Among other things, the bill is aimed at Communist political organizations, and Communist-front organizations. These terms are defined in the bill. A Communist political organization is one that is under the direction and control of the world Communist movement. A Communist-front organization is one, other than a Communist political organization, which reasonably is found to be (1) under the control of a Communist political organization, (2) primarily operated for the purpose of giving aid and support to a Communist political organization, to a Communist foreign government, or to the world Communist movement, or (3) one whose views and policies are adopted and advanced because they are those of a Communist political organization, a Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement. Before any organization can be held to be a Communist-front organization, the Attorney General, after full investigation and a hearing, must affirmatively find it to be such. Then, as a further safeguard, the accused organization is given the right to have its case reviewed by the Federal courts, including an appeal to the Supreme Court.

When anyone suggests, in the light of these provisions, that the Mundt bill would apply to the Wallace third party or any comparable group he is simply confessing ignorance of the facts or a dismal lack of confidence in the integrity of the Congress, the Attorney General and the Federal courts.

The other way of evaluating this bill is to examine the provisions it actually contains and the things it actually is intended to do.

This bill is predicated on the conclusion that the American Communist movement is foreign-controlled, that its ultimate objective is to overthrow free American institutions in favor of a Communist dictatorship controlled from abroad, that its activities are carried on by secret and conspiratorial methods, that these activities constitute an immediate and powerful threat to the security of the United States, and, finally, that present laws are not adequate to deal with the Communists.

The proposed new law tackles the problem from four directions. First, it makes unlawful, and subject to severe penalty, "all activity which has as its purpose the setting up of a totalitarian government in the United States under foreign control." This has nothing to do with theoretical communism, freedom of thought, etc. It is aimed squarely at activity intended to set up a Communist-controlled dictatorship in this country. The second approach is found in the registration provisions, which would re-

quire that the names of officers and members of Communist political organizations and the names of the officers, but not the members, of Communist-front organizations be filed with the Attorney General. The third approach is to deny passports to members of Communistic political organizations in an effort to restrict contact between American Communists and their international comrades, while the fourth is to deny Federal employment to anyone who knowingly belongs to a Communist political organization.

There is no use blinking the fact that this bill, if it becomes law, will mark a significant departure from the traditional American approach to problems of this kind. But it is also important to keep in mind that the Communist concept of world revolution and the methods used to implement it are also new to our experience and dangerous to our existence.

The bill, in the Star's opinion, represents in its sponsor's words a sincere effort "to protect freedom from those who would destroy it without infringing upon the freedom of all our people." If enacted, its constitutionality would be subject to the judgment of the courts, and the protection of the courts would extend to all individuals and groups accused under it. How effective it will be remains to be seen, but it deserves a trial and it is to be hoped that the Senate will concur in the favorable action taken by the House.

Veterans Want Housing Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a letter I have received from the American Veterans' Committee:

AMERICAN VETERANS' COMMITTEE (AVS),
Washington D. C., May 21, 1948.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As you know, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner long-range housing bill has now passed the Senate. The American Veterans' Committee (AVC), as well as other veterans' organizations, is keenly interested in having this bill approved during this session of Congress.

Veterans have been waiting for action on housing long-range legislation since they were demobilized and found this country facing the greatest housing crisis in history. Since polls and studies by veterans' organizations have repeatedly shown that housing is the No. 1 veterans' problem, there is no doubt that veterans will judge the record of the Eightieth Congress primarily on the basis of what is due on housing.

At the recent National Veterans' Housing Conference in Washington, delegates from the American Veterans' Committee, the VFW, the Jewish War Veterans, the Catholic War Veterans, the American Legion, as well as a number of smaller veterans' organizations voted unanimously to ask the Members of the House to sign discharge petition No. 6 to bring the TEW bill to the House floor.

Despite the fact that the House committee is now holding hearings on housing legislation, we feel that it is still vitally important that all friends of housing for veterans sign the discharge petition. We feel that all supporters in the House of the excellent legislation passed by the Senate should make their support vividly clear to all by immediately signing the petition.

We understand that to date over 120 Members of the House have signed this petition. We would like to ask if you have signed this discharge petition and, if not, if you plan to sign it in the near future. We would be pleased to hear your views on housing and if you should desire any further information as to why we believe action on the TEW bill is so important we should be happy to have a representative call on you at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

CHAT PATERSON,
National Chairman.

California in Review After a Century of American Control—Immigration and the Melting Pot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a lecture by Rockwell Dennis Hunt, Ph. D.:

CALIFORNIA IN REVIEW AFTER A CENTURY OF AMERICAN CONTROL—IMMIGRATION AND THE MELTING POT

(Seventh in a series of eight public centennial lectures by Rockwell Dennis Hunt, Ph. D.)

Dr. GREENE. Tonight, Dr. Hunt is going to lecture on a very important subject, one that affects us very greatly in California today just as it has always affected California while she was a subject of other countries and after she became a State of the United States. Dr. Hunt's subject this evening is, Immigration and the Melting Pot. Dr. Hunt. [Applause.]

Dr. HUNT. Our order for tonight is a very large one. First of all in this matter of the melting pot, if the United States is rightfully to be regarded as a melting pot, then we may say, as one has said, that California is a melting pot within a melting pot.

The first phase to speak of most briefly will be that pertaining to Arcadian days in California. There came into California early in the nineteenth century a few blue-eyed men, something different, and the senorita was quick to perceive that. Very briefly, the coming of some of the Americans, and some of the English, Scotch, Irish, and other nationalities, but mostly Americans, in the nineteenth century before the gold days, resulted in this very interesting intermarriage in a good many instances. It seems to me that not enough attention had been paid to that sociological phase of life in Arcadian California. These homeseekers were attracted by these young women—girls, senoritas, of the California land, and that attraction seemed to be reciprocal. And it came to be the boast of some of these young ladies, and a resolve, that they would not get married until they married someone with blue eyes. You can imagine how some of their dark-eyed suitors liked that kind of a resolution; but, nevertheless, that was acted upon in more instances than one. The native young men were quite displeased with the progress that some of these interlopers were making.

Now, the Christian names of a good many Americans, and others, were changed to correspond to the Spanish usage, and we would say Juan instead of John, Jose instead of Joseph, Enrique instead of Henry, and so on. The words of Spanish usage were very commonly applied to this very small minority of immigrants in California among the homeseekers and settlers.

In the year 1830 there were about 500 foreigners in all the territory of California, or west of the Sierra Nevada Mountains. By 1846 the number had jumped to about 1,200, and of those 1,200 approximately three-fourths were Americans. The fact that the American predominated in all these years of settlement in California helps to explain the ease with which the United States acquired California a little later. Of these early marriages, just a limited number I might mention. John Gilroy, after whom the town of Gilroy is named in the Santa Clara Valley, was the first one of these outsiders to marry, taking Maria Clara Ortega as his wife. And then one of the rather famous pioneers was Joseph Chapman, who married also into the Ortega family. William E. P. Hartnell, whose name is frequently met with in the history, married Maria Teresa de la Guerra. The de la Guerras were a very prominent family in those days and also later. Alfred Robinson also married a senorita of that family. William Heath Davis married Maria Jesus Estudillo—also a rather prominent name among the Spanish Californians. William A. Richardson and Jacob Leese, and others, likewise found among these daughters of the land their life companions. Henry D. Fitch was the man whose romance with Josefa Carrillo was, perhaps, the most startling and surprising of all, which I cannot go into tonight but which you will read with a great deal of interest. Governor Echeandia, of the Mexican power, greatly interfered with the plan of these young people; but in the end the blue eyes prevailed. There was Abel Stearns, one of the distinguished American settlers of these early days from the South, who became a man with large holding and great wealth in cattle, sheep, and horses. He was reported to be—and I don't like the word—ugly in appearance: we would say, perhaps, homely; but that was compensated for in large part by the fact that he succeeded in winning Dona Arcadia Bandini for his companion, and she was very beautiful, so that evened the matter up rather well—at least to his satisfaction. He was commonly called "Donabel"—his name was Abel. Of course he was a Mexican Don. To hold the Mexican usage, "Donabel" was more permanently applied to him than any other name. Jacob Leese married a sister of Gen. M. G. Vallejo, and they had sons and daughters. Perhaps the most astonishing of all is that the four daughters of General Vallejo married foreigners and established families. All I need to say beyond this is that in the end many of these marriages, these alliances, were happy and successful, and many of the good people in public life and in private life of today are descendants of some of these alliances. It is not difficult at all to find names that will answer to that for purposes of illustration. There are the Del Valles; the Biscaluz'—one, the sheriff of Los Angeles County for many years; the Carrillo family; the Pachecos, and others that might be mentioned that come down to our time, and are a sort of succession from these early marriages which, in a way, represent a more completely perfect melting pot by far than some of the later and more discouraging things I have to talk about.

For now I must proceed to talk about the Chinese. The first Chinese coming to California were welcomed as our fellow citizens by the people of San Francisco. It was only a matter of a year or two until their number grew to such an extent that they were no longer so welcomed, and by the year 1850 there were literally thousands of Chinese. We have already made reference to the fact of the Chinese in the mines, how they were treated there, and how in the early fifties a good many of the mining towns had regular Chinatowns, their people driven out from the best claims and compelled to work over the tails of the ground where the white

miners had been. They came in in very considerable numbers beginning almost immediately with the turn of the half century—1850. Now the opposition showed itself in many ways with hostilities to Chinese immigration and to the Chinese themselves, because those who came were almost exclusively what we called, or were, the coolie class. Sometimes it was not exactly fair to apply that term, but neverthless it did seem to fit the situation better than any other term used. I like that better than something worse, which was the term "pigtail," so commonly used; and everybody, even the small boys of the time, would speak of John Chinaman, and every Chinese person was referred to as a John, and each one seemed to be looked upon as a cousin of every other Chinaman.

Now there was the Burlingame Treaty of 1868 which gave mutual assurances between the United States and the Chinese Empire, and that admitted the theory of free immigration; but years before 1868 agitation had become marked against free immigration on the part of the Californians. And when I say "the Californians," I mean the great majority of them, not simply a few, because the feeling became very general. It never became wholly unanimous, but certainly it was very, very general. Now as the numbers grew, the feeling became more acute and more intense.

Most of these Chinese immigrants came in under, or as a result of, an organization called the Chinese Six Companies, a sort of a socio-economic organization which has been greatly misrepresented and misunderstood, and yet stood for some kind of mass immigration. The individual Chinese person amounted to practically nothing. It was a mass movement, and the independence of the individual was almost at a vanishing point. They were grouped together. There was a sort of not only mob psychology but almost servitude on the part of these Chinese. They were beholden to those above them. The antipathy toward them grew and grew until it came to its height. In a single year more than 20,000 Chinese came into California, and in 1876 it is recorded there were 116,000 Chinese in California alone. When this antipathy reached its height, the feeling against them also reached its height of intensity; it rose to a pitch of mob hysteria, a very general feeling on the part of the Californians.

It was during that rising tide of antipathy toward the Chinese that the notorious demagogue arose, named Denis Kearney. A very interesting study indeed is this person, and what he did, and what he stood for. He was great at haranguing people, especially the laboring people, and he placed himself at the head of the great labor movement in San Francisco and California in general—and made harangue after harangue. He used most intemperate language, only "intemperate" is too mild a word to describe the language he did use. It was incendiary—inflammatory. But every oration of his, every harangue, ended with the slogan, "The Chinese must go." He received a wonderful reception, great applause, great power, and prestige.

About that time there was beginning to be a demand for a new constitution for California. And that was one way, in the minds of some of the people, of getting at the Chineses question. It had not become actively a national question. It was not being discussed very actively up to this time in Congress, and the Californians had difficulty in bringing about the end they desired. Understanding some of the situation that obtained during those years, and I speak now of the later sixties and the seventies, and particularly after two special events, first the completion of the Pacific Railroad in 1869, when something like 9,000 Chinese laborers were turned loose, people who had been employed by the railroad in construction work, and then, again, adding more fuel to the fire after the hard times of 1873 and 1874 all over the Nation, and expressing themselves vigorously in California in the middle and later seventies—at such a time as that there was real alarm in California on the part of serious-minded persons.

This is intended to be, of course, an historical lecture, and there is not opportunity to enter at length into the arguments for and against the attitude that was held toward the Chinese and similar questions, which, in themselves, would be most interesting. I do wish to refer to one book along that line to illustrate somewhat the intense situation that some of the people realized or felt at that time. This book is called Last Days of the Republic, and it was written by Mr. P. W. Dooner. It is an alarmist book. A good many will read it and laugh and scoff at the ideas presented; but this man, and he was not alone, took the situation very seriously. Let me read the concluding sentences of this book:

"Forever occupied and diverted by its factions and its politicians, in their local intrigues for the acquisition of political power, the ship of state sailed proudly on, too blinded by her preoccupation and too reliant in her strength to bestow a thought upon the perils of the sea. She sighted afar the foam of the maelstrom, and tossed her haughty pennants in sovereign disdain of its power. But its current was around her, and she glided unconsciously to her doom. In vain the exercise of her giant strength; in vain that her factions, in happy forgetfulness of their petty antipathies, united their powers to save! Too late! She was hurled, helpless and struggling, to ruin and annihilation; and as she sank, engulfed, she carried with her the prestige of a race; for in America the representative of the one race of man, which, in its relation to the family of men, had borne upon its crest the emblem of sovereign power since the dawn of history, saw now the ancestral diadem plucked from its proud repose, to shed its luster upon an alien crown. Thus passed away the glory of the Union of States, at the dawn of the twentieth century."

The illustrations in this book are as lurid as the text itself. There is the picture of a mandarin sitting in the White House, a Chinese governor at Sacramento, and the frontispiece is a glowing picture saying, "The Ship of State glided noiselessly to her doom." Now in order that you might not be too much alarmed about that, I will read one sentence from the preface of the same book. The author says:

"I have simply done my duty in a matter of deductive research, and submit the result of my labors—hoping, meanwhile, that some timely act of administrative foresight may avert the impending catastrophe, which, at this period, menaces not only our civilization, but, indeed, our very existence as one among the nations of the earth."

Now when the Chinese were coming in tens of thousands to this country, do you wonder that there was agitation for restriction—for exclusion? Wouldn't you and I have done the same thing when we saw our brothers working, being baffled and defeated in competition with these people of low-standard living, and alien thought, alien religion, and alien social structure? Would we have put up with it? I think it is rather natural that there should have been a very strong revulsion of feeling against the Chinese cheap labor on different grounds. And I myself, fortunately, am old enough to remember some of the ways the Chinese were treated and some of the agitation of those days back in the 1870's. I remember that one day in a grove almost across the street from where I lived in the city of Napa, Denis Kearney came up from San Francisco to give the Fourth of July oration, and I sat on the fence and saw him in the distance waving his hands. I came that near to the agitator, as a small boy.

Now, just a few more words about the Chinese in California. The matter became a discussion of national import. Congress brought about (to omit some particular steps) the Exclusion Act of 1882, which met the demands of many of the people of California after the new constitution had been adopted and after it had set forth a number of sections very hostile to the Chinese; and this was to extend over a period of 10 years. At the end of 10 years there came a renewal for another 10 years under the name of the Geary Act of 1892. The substance of the act was perpetuated in 1902 and confirmed in 1904, to be made permanent. Chinese exclusion was permanent, referring especially to the Chinese labor, coolie type, and making certain exceptions in regard to commercial people, students, and officials. So there was the policy of permanent exclusion from 1902, or more fully from 1904. There were still later phases of this Chinese question; but, for the most part, it became quiescent, and the question of the alarm of Mr. Dooner was answered—the Chinese were not to come in. I am not now discussing the wisdom of this particular act, but I am simply recording facts that happened. Agitations largely subsided; but before the end of the agitation on the Chinese question another great question, which proved to be even more acute and possibly more serious in its world repercussions, arose in connection with the Japanese. So we must take a little time to discuss that very important and highly critical situation.

The first Japanese came largely because many years before Commodore Perry had been over to the Far East and had practically, by show of force, opened the doors of Japan, which had been a walled nation in a state of isolation for a long, long time. These first Japanese were likewise welcome to California. They did not come as early; in fact there was only a very small number until after the Chinese question had reached its height. Only 218 Japanese are reported to have come to the United States between 1861 and 1870. Practically negligible. In 1872 there came an embassy to negotiate regarding commercial relations between the United States and Japan, and the men on this embassy were treated with distinguished consideration. But by the year 1891 the numbers of Japanese coming to the United States for the first time exceeded 1,000 in a single year. And by 1900 there had been a big jump in the number of Japanese coming, reaching at that time more than 12,600. In 1910 the number was 72,187. In 1920 the number is given as over 111,000 Japanese.

Now, the Japanese inherited much of the antipathy that had been felt toward the Chinese. They also were from the Orient, and the feeling toward the Japanese was carried right over to a large extent when people saw the Japanese coming toward them, which, again, was rather natural; but the Japanese population proved to be of a different type from the Chinese.

So, as Denis Kearney had been haranguing the people, especially the labor people and the Workingmen's Party, ending his orations with the slogan "The Chinese must go," so, now, in 1886, for the first time, we heard the slogan "The Japs must go," and that was Dr. C. C. O'Donnell in San Francisco. He also is a character in the history of San Francisco. In 1900 a large mass meeting was held in San Francisco. One reason why the Japanese came in such large numbers was that Hawaii had been acquired in 1898, and many came from what had been called the Sandwich Islands into California and into the United States, and, like the Chinese, most of the Japanese who came to this country came to California, so that the overwhelming majority of them were in our own State.

In 1905 the San Francisco Chronicle, of which Mr. Mike DeYoung was the stanch editor, carried a series of articles inveighing against the Japanese and Japanese immigration, and coming out for their exclusion. That created considerable excitement, and also added fuel to the fire that had been enlarging in the way of opposition to the Japanese; but not as intense as what happened a little later.

Then came a great school controversy in San Francisco. Now that meant the city and county of San Francisco decided, through its board of education, first, that there should be established separate schools for the Japanese and Chinese and other Orientals, and that children of those nationalities would be segregated and sent to those schools instead of mingling with the white children in the ordinary public schools. Of course one reason for that was that the Japanese boys—there were at first only a few of the girls and women—were very much older than the primary children of the white race, and their parents and the people did not deem it wise that these little children should be in the same room and seated side by side with these large boys of Japanese race. That was simply one of the reasons for the segregation, and it had some force. At any rate, the order for segregation came and that was most violently protested by the Japanese. They contended that it was opposed to humanity and in violation of treaty regulations, and they did not propose to stand for it—they must simply bring about a radical change.

The question arose to national importance. How could a city or State in our Union of States deal with a question that had international import? This was made to be an international question—strongly so—so we must look a little further into that situation which came to be very acute and threatened to produce some serious international incident. President Theodore Roosevelt intervened and he, of course, declared that this being an international question, the State of California, or any other State, was not competent to deal with it in that sort of manner and through his intervention this act of segregating the schools was rescinded, and yet not altogether wholeheartedly. The same feeling continued. The question was not settled even by rescinding the order for segregation. Then what happened?

President Roosevelt was very forceful and also a man of taet and he brought about, without very great delay from that period in 1907 and 1908, what we know as the gentleman's agreement. The gentleman's agreement is something that I think should be a little more explicitly described, so I quote this statement·

"The Japanese Government under the gentleman's agreement shall issue passports to the continental United States only to such of its subjects are are nonlaborers or are laborers who, in coming to the continent, seek to resume a formerly acquired domicile, to join a parent, wife, or children residing there, or to assume active control of an already possessed interest in a farming enterprise in this country."

The main point of this was that a gentleman's agreement was entered into to the effect that the Japanese Government should not issue passports to the continental United States to its subjects, generally speaking, with the exceptions noted.

Now the gentleman's agreement, I think in all fairness it should be said, was lived up to quite faithfully by Japan for a considerable number of years. In fact, one of the unfair tactics against Japan has been stating how many people came into California and the United States during those years, but not mentioning the fact that more of their people went out of the United States than those who came in. That, I say, is unfair and untruthful, or at least it misrepresents the actual situation.

Then we come to something more drastic in the way of an act in California. That is the Japanese Exclusion Act of 1913, called the Alien Land Act. In other words, it is called the Webb Act. And it was directed especially against landholding by Japanese. There are different degrees and different phases and different steps and I can undertake only to afford a fair glimpse of the situation and cannot be wholly accurate, for many details must be omitted.

There was a great storm of protest, greater than anything preceding probably, on the part of the Japanese and the Japanese Government when this land act was adopted by the Legislature of the State of California. Of course, protests were made—vigorous protests. Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan was sent out to California to intercede with the legislature not to pass a certain measure which was deemed again to be of international character and beyond the scope of the powers of the State; and how was Mr. Secretary Bryan treated? In spite of his intercession, coming from President Wilson, the legislature persisted and passed an anti-Japanese act—which made the matter more difficult, more acute, and brought further and more vigorous protests. In 1917 came a general immigration act which was against European immigration in general. Then in 1919 we have another phase.

In 1919 the great peace conference was being held in Versailles following the First World War, and at that very time the agitation in California, and the legislation already on the books, and other laws or bills being proposed, brought a very delicate situation into the international peace conference in Europe. And there again the Californians were admonished to keep away from that. Of course, they did to some extent, but there again the feeling persisted. The feeling was intense. Here were those tens of thousands of Japanese. They were going into different occupations and professions. They were definitely undermining Americans and other white labor in the matter of wages. They belonged to another race and they were the subject of violent agitation on the part of different organizations. The chief organizations opposing their immigration were the Grange, the Native Sons of the Golden West, and all labor organizations—definitely opposed to them. These went on record again and again against the Japanese immigration.

The sentiment against the Japanese immigration was practically as general as it had been against the Chinese immigration. But the Japanese were not so mild; they were not so supine; they were not willing to take this attitude toward the acts that they alleged were being perpetrated against them. It is more easily understandable, I think, to a person who has actually seen it, and viewed some of this feeling in the State, than to those who come in afterward and look upon it as pure abstraction and have no human feeling about it and do not understand how the Californians really felt, and why they felt that way. Well, that is rather serious, so I will lighten it by a little anecdote of the two good ladies who were visiting some years ago. One of these ladies said, "I have two children; I am afraid to have any more." The other said, "Is that so, my dear? What is the trouble What makes you feel that way?" She replied, "I read the other day in a magazine published by the Native Sons that every third child born in California is a Jap."

Now that anecdote illustrates something that is significant. The Japanese birth rate was very high and the birth rate of many good Americans was dwindling. Just as Mr. Dooner thought there was to be a real inundation of the Chinese until we would be simply engulfed, so there was even more feeling on the part of many intelligent people, as well as many of the mob spirit, that the Japanese were not only going to inundate the country but that the Japanese imperial power had a definite policy of world supremacy including, of course, the United States—first California and to the Rocky Mountains, and ultimately the whole territory of the continent—and that was no mere myth. That was a very deep feeling on the part of many. I am recording it because it helps us to understand the intense feeling there was, and we cannot do justice to either the American side of it or the Japanese side of it unless we understand some of the feeling on both sides.

The crisis came in 1924. But before that it will be well to revert more explicitly to the visit of Mr. Bryan to Sacramento. He came for the purpose of counseling with the members of the legislature and cooperating with them in the framing of a law which would meet the views of the people of the State and yet leave untouched the international obligations of the United States. That would not satisfy—did not satisfy—the people of California. The crisis of 1924 was because of the overhauling of the immigration policy of the United States in that great bill, including what the Japanese considered an affront to them in particular, it being understood not only by that law but by previous enactments that those people who were not eligible to citizenship should not be permitted to come to the country; and, of course, there was the law against the eligibility of the orientals—the Chinese, the Japanese, and some others—so that they could not become citizens by adoption as other immigrants could and, therefore, when the immigration law was overhauled and the quota basis was assigned to other nations, there was no quota assigned to Japan.

This bill, even before it was a law, brought great feeling and excitement on the part of the Japanese officials. And Mr. Hanihara, representing Japan, made the remark that the enactment of this bill into law would have grave consequences. That was strong language for the American Congress. The fact is, the using of that phrase "grave consequences" was accepted by some American leaders in Washington as being a veiled challenge to the United States, and therefore they would not be intimidated in that way. They, therefore, hastened the passage of that very bill which was supposed to bring grave consequences, and the bill was enacted into law in 1924.

I think it is entirely true that the enactment of that law brought a spirit of resentment on the part of multitudes of Japanese including many, if not most, of their leaders in politics and government that was never dissolved completely until after the Second World War. And it helps to explain the attitude of the nation of Japan toward the United States. This bill was signed by the President of the United States, but he did express regret at the particular part in it that seemed to reflect on Japan, although Japan was not mentioned by name in the bill, of course.

What are the different aspects of the Japanese question? Many. Some as follows: The living standards are very different; the Japanese could get along on food, clothing, and the comforts of life on a much lower plane than the Americans were willing to accept. With the coming of the women, especially the picture brides of a certain period, the Americans came to feel that simply meant more people working in the fields. You would go out in the early morning and find Japanese working in the lettuce fields with their children being cared for out there, if cared for at all. You could go out at sundown and they were still out there working. They worked all kinds of hours, and at low wages, and for low returns, dragging down the requirements and the standards of the American labor. That was one very important aspect of the situation. Another was the political aspect—politically—especially as pertaining to the noneligibility to citizenship on the part of Japanese. No matter what they did, they were

Japanese and therefore they could not become citizens of the United States. And, of course, there was the social aspect; the matter of education; the matter of culture; the matter of the Japanese schools being maintained; and other phases of life peculiar to the Japanese.

I mentioned a moment ago the "picture brides." Many of the Japanese men for some years were able to secure wives by an exchange of photographs. They were not permitted to go to Japan, and vice versa, but one could receive the photograph of a young lady in Japan and send his own photograph and thus solemnize their marriage by a mere exchange of photographs, never having seen each other at all. That was put an end to because it was thought to be subject to a good deal of abuse, but it did obtain for a number of years and was undoubtedly a subject for considerable abuse and wrongdoing.

The main thing that many of the Americans felt toward the Japanese, as well as the Chinese, was this: They wished to keep California white. They had expressed it that way. "This is a white man's country."

One other item that intrigued me I saw in the morning paper I shall mention. One of the Nisei, American-born Japanese, who died in the service of the recent war, having performed heroic deeds, is having a ship named for him. I pause just a moment to say I like that. I think that is a good omen. It is a recognition of the fact that during the recent war many of those Japanese-Americans, American citizens, acquitted themselves nobly and greatly assisted the American cause. In saying that I do not mean to say that the whole of our activity toward the Japanese, even the American Japanese, was wrong. I will not have time to discuss the merits of the evacuation of the Japanese at the time of the early part of the war. I can see, as an American, as a Californian, reason for that evacuation. Thirty-five thousand Japanese in Los Angeles County alone. Great plants being erected and developed for airplanes, for centers for activity of a warlike character. Several thousand of those Japanese were alien Japanese. Others were of doubtful loyalty. I am simply saying that I can understand something of the reason for the evacuation of the Japanese in their own interests as well as in the interests of the American protection and defense.

That is not all of the subject of the melting pot. But I hasten to mention—scarcely more than mention—a few other items that would be worthy of discussion. The next would be about the Filipinos. Cheap labor again. The Chinese are gone. The Japanese were moving out. Next came the Filipinos, particularly after the acquisition of the Philippine Islands following the war of 1898. Now, the Filipinos were not citizens, but they were in a sense nationals. In 1923 there were about 2,400 of the Filipinos that had come to California, but within a decade following that there were 35,000 of them. Opposition developed toward them after a few years. There was some violence, although not very many examples of violence. There was demand for exclusion of the Filipinos. The question was not very active, however, since the war, and now since the Filipino independence we hear very little about it as a question.

Another question that might have become important, but never did assume any great magnitude, was the question of the Hindus in California. There was a time when there was some feeling being aroused against the presence of a number of Hindus, not a large number, but threatening to be large.

Another question that is of considerable importance in its sociologic-economic aspects is the presence of the Mexican labor. This was not very important until 1918 and 1919, when there was great need of foreign cheap labor in the absence of these other nationals, although even before that time there had been some question in the Imperial Valley. Our dependence upon the Mexicans, however, increased and for several years we have had an arrangement with the Mexican Government for cheap labor from Mexico to harvest our crops. I have been told directly by a grower of tomatoes, for example, that he could not depend upon the whites as pickers of tomatoes for various reasons, but he could depend upon the Mexicans. He said they were slower, they were more patient, they got results, and they did not quit. That is just an illustration of one of the crops that large numbers of Mexicans have been used to harvest. Seasonal labor, of course, becomes a very important problem there; also the maintenance of those people through the winter, and the arrangement that they should be returned to Mexico.

Then still another phase of the melting pot might call for mention of what perhaps unhappily has been called the Okies and Arkies, these people coming from the Dust Bowl and other parts of the Middle West in very considerable numbers in recent years, presenting a problem of an economic and also of a social character. It must be mentioned simply in passing as one of the ingredients in this melting pot of ours. The work of our melting pot is not completed yet, either nationally or from the standpoint of the State.

We came to the conclusion as a nation some years ago that we had been trying to absorb, to assimilate, and to amalgamate with the races of the world a little too rapidly. "Free country, open to the world—come in unrestricted numbers." And it gave us the title of "the melting pot," but that figure of speech was overworked, as a good many people think now, in general, as well as in California in particular. There is today great need for statesmanship on this very important question in California and in the Nation. Recognizing the humanity of men, the brotherhood of men, and the Fatherhood of God, we have an ideal set before us, but I conclude by saying that we may be now and then in a little danger of being like the hasty philosopher who said, "God is not in a hurry, but I am."

H. R. 5004 Wins Support in Honolulu

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu on April 27, 1948, urging the enactment of H. R. 5004, which extends the privilege of naturalization to the Asiatic and Pacific peoples:

Resolution 185

Whereas a bill to provide the privilege of becoming naturalized citizens of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, to make immigration quotas available to Asiatic and Pacific peoples, and for other purposes, known as House bill No. 5004 was introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress on January 19, 1948; and

Whereas United States citizens of Asiatic and Pacific ancestry residing in the city and county of Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, have demonstrated that persons of Asiatic and Pacific ancestry possess the capacity and ability to be good and loyal United States citizens and are deserving of the privilege of becoming such citizens; and

Whereas the removal of the existing ban against the immigration and the naturalization of such peoples is a desirable step toward improving the faith and confidence of other nations in the United States and the democratic principles of its people and Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu—

That the Congress of the United States of America be and it is hereby earnestly and respectfully requested to extend the right of naturalization to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence and to make immigration quotas available to Asiatic and Pacific peoples as provided by House bill No. 5004 introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress on January 19, 1948, which is now before the Judiciary Subcommittee of said House of Representatives; and

That duly authenticated copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee of the House of Representatives, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

Introduced by N. T. Teves, Ben Dillingham, M. D. Beamer, J. M. Asing, M. C. Pacheco, R. M. Kageyama, Noble K. Kauhane, supervisors.

Date of introduction April 27, 1948, Honolulu, T. H.

Approved April 29, 1948.

JOHN H. WILSON,
Mayor, City and County of Honolulu.

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein a statement on behalf of extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act by James D. Mooney, president and chairman of the board of Willys-Overland Motors at Toledo, Ohio.

This statement was made by Mr. Mooney at America's Town Meeting of the Air over the American Broadcasting Co. network May 11, 1948:

Mr. Denny, fellow speakers, ladies and gentlemen, as Mr. Denny has told you, I am speaking from Chicago, the center of the Grain Belt. Every farmer in the Mississippi plain has a great stake in the tariff problem because he is so dependent on the overseas markets. The overseas markets set the price for all the grains he raises. His surplus production of wheat must be sold overseas. Furthermore, if he is to be paid for his wheat, we must import raw materials, special food products like coffee and tropical fruits, and even some manufactured or hand-craft goods from the countries to which we ship the wheat.

Right at the very beginning here I want to challenge the people who are attacking the reciprocal trade-agreements program to inform themselves on how our domestic prices are affected by overseas markets. I wish they would go to the wheat pit in Chi-

cago and the cotton exchange in New York and find out that the price levels for these commodities with export surpluses are determined by world market prices. The American farmer and cotton grower, therefore, take world prices.

If, meantime, we overprotect our prices on manufactured goods, we create a gulf between the prices the farmer gets and the prices he pays for things. Thus, we create the basis for another crash and depression like 1929, and those following years, when many of us were reduced to bread lines and selling apples.

It has become one of the traditional arguments by the old boys who want to cure all our domestic economic evils by putting the tariff higher and higher—that we must protect our infant industries.

Even before the war, our American industries had become quite grown-up. Nothing was going on in Europe, in England, France, Germany, Italy, or Belgium, in the industrial field, in anything from steel to motor cars, that was serious competition for us. During the war, American industry literally armed the world to defeat Germany and Japan. During the war, the industrial plants overseas were generally bombed out and still lie in ruins.

Therefore, anybody who talks about protecting American industry from European competition deserves being taken no more seriously than somebody who might be suggesting that Joe Louis and Gene Tunney need protection from Andy Gump.

Now, another pat slogan repeated over and over again by the high tariff boys who want to turn the clock back about 50 years is that we must protect the American workman against "cheap foreign labor." This was good nineteenth century thinking, in the days of hand labor. But we produce differently now, with plants, equipment, and tools to support and extend the American workmen's efforts. The results of our methods speak for themselves. Here, again, I repeat, we should brush away our fears. There actually is no such bogeyman left under the bed.

It is true that our fellow American workmen need protection in this foreign situation. But our principal concern, now in 1948, should be in the field of taxes and inflated prices, which are putting a heavy hand on the family budget.

For instance, if we go ahead with spending $5,000,000,000 on the European recovery program and don't get anything back for it, because we prohibit imports, this means that every man, woman, and child in America will pay $40 out of his pocket. For an average family of five this means $200—which would be a tidy sum if we could save it, for the family vacation or to help pay the doctor bills.

Finally, I want to say a word about the so-called dollar shortage that is slowing up, and threatens to cripple, our export business.

I want to say to all of my fellow Americans that there is nothing very complicated about foreign trade. It is only made so by some of the theorists who like to deal in big words and make things obscure.

I can tell you, after 30 years' experience with overseas countries, that anybody who has passed his grammar school fifth grade arithmetic and who knows how business is done between the farmer in Kansas and the manufacturer in Cleveland can, with a little time, understand foreign trade.

The principles are the same. The dollar shortage exists in our American foreign trade because the overseas countries are selling comparatively little here—the only place where they can get dollars for their products.

Therefore, if we want a healthy foreign trade for the benefit of the American farmer, the American workman, the American consumer, and taxpayer we must encourage imports to pay for our exports.

Accordingly, I believe with sincere conviction that we ought to extend the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Veterans' Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1948

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Lt. Comdr. Tyrrell Krum, Times-Herald Veterans' Editor:

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

(By Tyrrell Krum, lieutenant commander, United States Navy, retired)

In these halcyon days of million-dollar legislative lobbies whipped up by the fulminations of razzle-dazzle press agents and high-pressure "public relations counselors," it was with a genuine sense of relief that I was able recently to witness a real drama of tense human emotions on this old stage of life.

I was sitting at my typewriter when a trio of fine-looking young men, their arms linked together and carrying white canes tipped by a circle of red at the bottom—silent symbols of the sightless—walked quietly up to my desk and struck out their hands.

The shorter of the three lads, his empty eye sockets, and scarred face speaking volumes, spoke softly:

"We're three ex-GIs from Baltimore, Mr. Krum. We've been reading your articles in the paper and listening to your broadcasts for a long time. We know of what you're doing on behalf of veterans. And we're wondering if you might give us a little help."

I pulled up chairs and the trio sat down. I asked them their names. I want you to know them, too:

Thomas J. Kennedy, Jr. of 3213 Gwynns Falls Parkway was a Marine out in the Pacific during the recent fighting.

He had his eyes blasted out by Nip machine-gun fire while squirming across the beach at Bougainville.

Murray Salkin, of 3929 Clarinth Road, was a corporal in one of Patton's outfits in the United Kingdom during the preinvasion of the Continent.

One day while on maneuvers up in Scotland he stumbled upon an unaccounted-for mine which had been planted on the beach during the days when Britain stood alone in the face of the threat of Nazi invasion.

The third man was August A. Seifert Jr., of 118 Alendale Street, a member of the rampaging 80th division that plowed across France.

He was stopped in the Battle of the Bulge. It was he who had no eyes whatever.

Now to get on with their story.

"We've been waiting and hoping upon hope for word from Washington that Congress had finally passed Senate bill 1391. As you know, commander, this bill which went through the Senate last summer and is now stuck in the House, would provide automobiles for veterans who lost a hand or two and for blinded veterans who lost their sight in the war.

"We've just about given up hope now that anything will be done, because we read that Congress is getting ready to adjourn in 3 or 4 weeks.

"After all, it's only a matter of getting the Senate bill to the floor of the House. There's no doubt that it will go through in a waltz. But how can it be done—with time running out on us?"

I might explain that from my soundings of opinion on the Hill, the lads were correct that S. 1391 would go through without a hitch, once it had the chance to get on the floor for final vote. But like so many other pieces of veterans' legislation, it's caught in a legislative straitjacket.

What it would do is give to war veteran arm and hand amputees the same deal that a previous bill, long since in operation, is doing for men who suffered the loss of pedal extremities. And it also provides for a free automobile for blinded veterans.

There are today in this country of ours some 3,500 handless and armless veterans of the Second World War. There are also some 1,500 blinded veterans. Limitations on the cost of the cars are set at $1,600 apiece.

That certainly wouldn't bankrupt this Nation. And it would adjust an obvious discrimination on behalf of one segment of disabled veterans over another equally deserving group.

Those maimed and disheartened men aren't looking for handouts. They want a car in order that they might pursue worthwhile business endeavors. They want a chance to fight their way out of the darkness of despair that has enveloped them. I think they should have it.

How about it, ladies and gentlemen of Congress? They asked that I write this piece. Here it is.

Have you any conception of what it means to face a lifetime of total blackness?

Retirement Pay of Railroad Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of bills before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on which I hope the House will have a chance to vote in the immedate future. One is H. R. 5993, introduced by Mr. CROSSER, of Ohio. The other is H. R. 6575, introduced by Mr. TOLLEFSON, of Washington. Although one was introduced by a Democrat and the other by a Republican, they are identical. The aim of each is to bring the retirement pay of railroad workers up to an amount which at least approaches the subsistence level.

Although the House Committee has not yet managed to schedule hearings on these bills, hearings on an identical bill in the Senate (S. 2437) have just been completed by a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I want to read into the RECORD certain statements made before that subcommittee by Mr. William J. Kennedy, chairman and impartial public member of the Railroad Retirement Board. I hope the members of this House will remember and be guided by them whenever the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce gives us a chance to vote on H. R. 5993 or H. R. 6575.

In urging an increase in retirement income for aged railroaders, Mr. Kennedy testified in part as follows:

As you well know, a retirement system must be adequate to provide a fair amount of security when, because of old age or disability, an employee is no longer able to work. During his working years, the employee's wages should provide a living for himself and those dependent upon him. During his retirement, however, the monthly benefits from the retirement system must take the place of the wages. Although no retirement system provides benefits to replace entirely the wages formerly earned by the employee, it should nevertheless be the aim of any retirement

system to provide benefits in an amount which bears some reasonable relationship to wages.

When the formula for computing retirement benefits was enacted in the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, that formula bore an appropriate ratio to wages as they existed at that time; and in the light of the cost of living at that time, the formula produced a monthly amount of benefits which was considered adequate, particularly for those with long years of service. Since that time, however, two significant changes have occurred; wages have been increased considerably, reducing substantially the ratio between benefits and wages, and the cost of living has also greatly increased, with the inescapable result that the present formula provides benefit amounts which no longer have any reasonable relationship either to wages or to the cost of living. For all practical purposes, the benefits have in fact been reduced because the amount of goods and services which the benefit amount can purchase now is far less than it could buy in 1937.

A retirement system normally is intended to enable the retirement of superannuated employees so as to provide opportunities for promotion of the younger men; otherwise, the industry would be burdened with an unduly large number of men in the older years. With this in mind, retirement of such employees should be encouraged. I submit that the present situation offers very little incentive for older men to retire from service. Those who have already retired have been unfortunately trapped; they can no longer return to service because, in order to retire, they had to relinquish rights to their former jobs; and the seniority system prevalent in the railroad industry prevents their returning to work. Those, however, who are still in service, although they may have all the necessary qualifications for retirement, are often compelled to continue in service as long as health permits (and, unfortunately, often longer) because obviously, they cannot afford to retire on the benefit amounts payable under the present formula. The undesirable result of this is that senior men continue to hold on to their jobs, thereby burdening the industry with an unduly large proportion of men in the ages when they should retire; and at the same time keeping the younger men from the promotions to which they are normally entitled. It is startling, but nevertheless a fact, that there are now more living persons over 65 who have credits under the Railroad Retirement Act but who have not applied for annuities than there were when the 1937 act was adopted. There are now approximately 90,000 such persons, over 60,000 of whom are still working on the railroads. This is bound to create dissatisfaction. The industry itself should be manned by younger men wherever possible upon the orderly retirement of the older men; and the younger men should get promotions as soon as possible. It stands to reason, of course, that an increase in the amount of the retirement annuities would have the effect of enabling a large number of older men to retire and thus provide promotional opportunities for the younger men.

In view of the Board's belief that benefits should be increased, it has made a careful study of the present financing of the act to determine whether additional benefits can be financed. The present tax rate was found by the last actuarial valuation, made as of the end of 1944, to be almost exactly the rate calculated to be necessary on a level-cost basis. Since that time experience has shown that some of our assumptions for the valuation were too conservative. Particularly is this true of the estimated future pay rolls. New calculations based on $4,300,000,000 as the level of pay rolls indicate that present benefits are overfinanced to the extent of a little over 1 percent of the tax rate.

Our cost estimates indicate that the benefits proposed in the bill will increase payments under the Retirement Act by approximately 20 percent, which would be within a range of about 1 percent either way from established rates. In view of this, the Board believes that the present schedule is completely adequate. In any event, such estimates as can be made of disbursements year by year in the future indicate that no tax increase would be necessary for about 40 years if all assumptions prove correct. At that time there would be a reserve of over $4,000,000,000 in the account. It is probable that future tax requirements are as likely to go down as up when all things are considered. In view of this, I am confident that the present tax rate is adequate to finance the increases in benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act, as proposed by Senate bill 2437.

Billy Stanley: Farmer, Good Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, today, with considerable pride, I salute a fine West Virginian, Billy Stanley.

Billy is a leading young farmer of Mason County, W. Va., and is now gaining national recognition for his general farm activities. The following statement from the Point Pleasant Register by the editor, Mr. Edward Swint, tells the story. Billy is an all-around American boy, farmer, and good citizen.

The statement follows:

BILLY STANLEY GETS A COVETED AWARD

The Southern Agriculturist's current issue has named a Mason County boy "Young Southerner" for June, and in so doing came forth with the following paragraphs:

Hats off to Billy Stanley, Young Southerner for June, whose excellent work entitles him to this award.

Billy, who is a graduate of the Point Pleasant High School, Point Pleasant, W. Va., is now living on a 240-acre Kanawa River Valley farm, and is farming in partnership with his father.

He was awarded the state-wide Farm Mechanics contest and received $100 from the National Future Farmers of America Foundation Fund, etc.

Billy has constructed a modern milkhouse and installed the equipment necessary for cooling and handling milk. All the plumbing, wiring and construction work was planned by Billy and completed by him with the able assistance given by his father.

Billy installed an electric pump to provide running water for the milkhouse, dairy barn and other outbuildings.

During the past year Billy has repaired and serviced all the machinery on the home farm, and he plans to add a home farm shop to the newly constructed machine shed.

This outstanding Young Southerner has now established a herd of 30 dairy cows and his latest shop projects have been a milk cart and tractor drawn sled with rollers for taking up electric fence wire.

The editors of Southern Agriculturist join with Billy's vocational agricultural teacher, Clifford Dunn, in saluting this young Southern farmer. Billy's framed award is on its way.

California in Review After a Century of American Control—Unfinished Business of Our Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a lecture by Rockwell Dennis Hunt, Ph. D.:

CALIFORNIA IN REVIEW AFTER A CENTURY OF AMERICAN CONTROL—UNFINISHED BUSINESS OF OUR TIMES

(Eighth in a series of eight public centennial lectures by Rockwell Dennis Hunt, Ph. D.)

Ladies and gentlemen, to be satisfied with past achievement is to fall short of possible attainment. California has had a marvelous record, full of brilliant achievement, not without mistakes, but the question for us now is, how do we prepare for the expansive future that lies out ahead? Where do we go from here?

Perhaps in no better may can I introduce that than to offer these quotations from two prominent writers. First I refer to Hubert Howe Bancroft. The last of his many books is called In These Latter Days, published in the year preceding his death; and he began that book with a query: "What is the matter with the United States? We grow in strength but not in grace; we are intelligent but we are not sensible." The concluding words of this volume affirm that "political supremacy is slipping westward, and that henceforth in the affairs of the Nation California is a force to be reckoned with, of which the party in power at Washington, whatever it may be, will do well to take notice. At the ultimate west," he declared, "lies the ultimate ocean, around whose opulent shores inexorable destiny has laid out the grounds whereupon man is to achieve his ultimate endeavor. There is no farther west * * *."

The other author I wish to quote from briefly is Mr. John Hittell, brother of Theodore Hittell, prominent historian of California. His well-known book, The Resources of California, was first published in the year 1863, in which he boldly prophesied:

"California will occupy in the hemisphere of the Pacific, as a focus of intellectual culture, a position similar to that long held by Attica in the basin of the Mediterranean. Looking confidently forward to such a result, hoping to see much of it accomplished in our own time, let us endeavor to lay a broad, solid, and generous foundation for the political, industrial, and educational greatness of our State; let us be proud that we have taken part in a work which has contributed much and will contribute more to stimulate commerce and extend civilization; and, as a consequence, to enrich and benefit mankind; a work which will be forever prominent in the history of humanity."

That was written and published in 1863. This same thoughtful writer, still referring to the future of California, concludes this valuable book with this striking sentence: "She can and she will sustain a population of 20,000,000." The population that has been flowing into California has not been perfectly integrated. We, in some humility, may confess that in certain regards we are bigger than we are great. It is time to take account of stock, to reap some of the harvest of the past and bring it to the use of the present. If history is the statesman's

bluebook, as Woodrow Wilson said, we should all be of statesmanlike mind and quality. We should all consult the oracles of history and learn by the past achievement, errors, glories, and defects, something that will help to guide us in our course for the future.

A number of items of unfinished business have occurred to me. Some may have been mentioned already in an incidental manner, but it will be well for us to group these together, as far as time permits, and carry them away with us for further consideration. Some will demand rather solemn thought.

First, it seems to me that California needs, and needs badly, a new constitution. The constitution of 1879 was never wholly satisfactory. It was not satisfactory to the farmers; it was not satisfactory to the labor people; it was not satisfactory to any large group; and it was not satisfactory to the people as a whole. It was created at a time of great unrest. And that has been noted by the historian, Theodore Hittell, who remarked: "There can be no doubt that the constitution of 1879 was framed and adopted at a very unfortunate time and under very unfortunate circumstances. The people were too angry and desperate to make a good constitution." It was just following the height of the fever of the anti-Chinese movement. There was great agitation, great unrest. There were serious labor disturbances. There were many haranguings, much pettifogging, and a great deal of low-type oratory in those days just preceding the making of this constitution.

The constitution itself was never a satisfactory constitution, basically, because among other things there was a great deal of purely statutory material brought into the constitution instead of all of it being fundamental principle and law. The constitution is the fundamental law of the land, not a mere statute, and a great bane has been from the beginning of this constitution that it has included too much statutory material instead of fundamental constitutional law and principle. This constitution was more than three times as long as the constitution of 1849. It was almost five times as long as the Constitution of the United States. James Bryce observed that this is an example of how a constitution should not be made. So there was plenty of criticism, and just criticism, to be leveled against the constitution, and not the least because it has been amended time out of mind. I dare say there is not one of us here who knows how many amendments have been made to the constitution of California, adopted in 1879. And who knows what the constitution is now? It reminds us of the time of the "no-government period" in early California history, when people said: "Here are these Mexican rules and laws, but we do not know what they mean, and we cannot even find them. We hardly believe there is any law in California." Of course, the other extreme might be said now: "There is so much law packed into the constitution of the State that it is all too commonplace."

Well, as far back as 1932 the people of the State voted by initiative measure to proceed to the preparation of a new constitution, and it was up to the legislature to call a convention of delegates to form the constitution. The legislature has never to this day called such a convention. But a new move has been introduced, and apparently making very slow headway, and a large constitutional committee has been created; and the last item that I have seen in the public press is to the effect that somebody wants to study the matter further and is therefore pleading for more time. The will of the people has not been met—has not been realized for a good many years; so I would impress it upon those who are thoughtful and urge that wherever there may be right influence forcibly brought to bear, to see to it that a new constitution is really prepared for the State.

One reason, to mention one alone, I think why we have not had that constitution up to now is because there is a fear of reapportionment, particularly concerning the State senate. As you know, there are a very limited number of State senators, and in one case a State senator may represent a population almost at the vanishing point; in another case a senator may represent several millions of people. The question arises, Is the present method of representation fair, just, and adequate? Or should the whole subject be renovated and a new kind of apportionment provided?

Now a very practical item of business for the future pressing upon us is that of creating more and better highways for transportation. This we all admit, I think. We are all so grateful for the progress that has been made and is being made, but somehow we are not able to keep up with the demand. The demand is terrific for better methods of transportation, better highways, better freeways, so that people can go and come without losing so much time. I have been many times to some big gathering, such as a football game with 100,000 people in attendance, and it does not seem like a civilized incident to observe the thousands, and tens of thousands of automobiles, entangled and taking time—sometimes hours of time—to become extricated and to get going on the highway.

There must be better ways, and there are provisions being made for considerable improvement, but we often make unnecessary detours by direction on the part of those who are not well advised. I do not know technically about many of the special questions. Therefore, I do not try to enter into them. Looking at it broadly, however, as a bystander, I can see the necessity for pressing this matter; the necessity for getting the best engineering assistance that can be had; and then have people who are not advised and not prepared and not technically qualified to stand aside and let progress go forward. The improvements are needed now, and not day after tomorrow, for in just a little while any present arrangement will become either obsolete or obsolescent.

Hence I would advocate strongly that we should avoid this political jockeying for advantages in the matter of freeways and highways and get the job done and allow the people to use them. If now a person can travel from San Francisco to Los Angeles in 40 minutes of time, which has actually taken place, it means that some of you will see the time before many years when it will be quite possible to make the trip from San Francisco to Los Angeles in less than 15 minutes. I do not say by automobile. This is an indication of the incredible progress we have made, and are making, in the field of transportation. Little objections must be brushed aside. We must be permitted to build largely, and plan nothing little, along the line of highways and freeways and airways for the future.

I have noticed, thirdly, that there is talk, at least, of a considerable campaign in this fair city of ours for cleaning it up, and I think there is an item of unfinished business along that line, not only for this city, but for many of our California cities. Of course, it is proper that we should begin at home. I am a comparative stranger in the city of Stockton, but I will confess to the feeling I have indulged when I have gone up and down some of the streets, and that is that a good many barrels of excellent paint could be used to splendid advantage in the city of Stockton. Also, not confining my remark to this city, I have been distressed more than once in driving about in different parts of the State to find acreage, sometimes whole fields, where the tarweed, or the thistle, or some other noxious weed, has been permitted to take possession. That should not be. Along the highways in a good many cases we see weeds, and trash, and other things, that are not good for the esthetic sense. They are not good for the production of crops, and not good in any sense, either economically, esthetically, or morally. It is time for more of a clean-up in cities, so that there will be nothing we can possibly call slums in our cities at all, and thus make progress, remembering, after all, that cleanliness is next to godliness.

That leads me to just a few remarks on the subject of health—public health. I am well aware that some of the topics I am taking up tonight are subject to more or less controversy, and if I can stimulate your own thought, even though it may not entirely agree with my own thinking, the object will have been served. Now there has been a very vacillating policy, if policy it can be called, regarding the subject of public health in California. For a good many years there have been advances apparently and then retreats, and the net result is pretty close to the zero point.

In the meantime a majority of our people do not have the proper medical and proper dental care. That is a confession, a very true confession, that one makes with some degree of humility. Now in 1917 there was appointed in California a social insurance commission, but it follows that it died an untimely death the very next year. In 1933 the question of health insurance was received somewhat actively, and growing out of that revival there was a determination reached on the part of the California Medical Association in 1934 to make a great, extensive, and exhaustive survey of the dental and medical care in the State of California. I happened to be a consulting member among the economists to assist in that survey about a decade ago, and thus I was brought somewhat near to the subject, knowing personally the director of the survey and his consulting economists and other members of the committee, representative of the leading universities of California.

What happened? The survey was made. Hundreds of field workers were employed. The survey was better and more exhaustive by far, than anything of the kind that had ever been undertaken in California before, and the director drew up the results of his findings and made recommendations. One member of the commission, of which I was a member, retired; the other four remained. When the matter was presented to the California Medical Association—and it was that body that had sponsored the enterprise at the start and had spent money in directing and conducting this great survey—the leading members, a majority at least, would not accept the recommendation of the director and would not even permit the findings of the director to be printed in the form of a book which would be a substantial report of the work of the director and the commission. Now I cannot tell the entire story tonight; but when this report was finally made in abridged form with the idea of presenting it to the State legislature, it was promptly sidetracked, and a number of other measures were presented and practically nothing was done.

Now in a more recent time, within the last 2 or 3 years, the present Governor of California—Gov. Earl Warren—has on two or three occasions recommended a plan, of what some people have called social or socialized medicine, but more properly a plan for advancing the cause of the public health. What has happened? I am not aware of anything in a large way that has happened; and, therefore, I regret that I must say now after this vacillating policy, or lack of policy, the majority of the people of California are still without proper medical and dental care.

Another phase of that question is, we do not have in California anything like an adequate supply of hospitals. In some localities, in some of our great cities, there is al-

most a 50-percent deficiency in the matter of hospital beds. All over the State, generally speaking, we are in arrears in that important subject. There again we should awaken to the situation and remember it is a part of our civic obligation as well as our educational duty to look after these matters and to help to complete some of these items of unfinished business. The issue is pressing.

Well, that grows into another subject related to our city life—our cultural needs, just to mention a few items under that head. While we have made wonderful progress, and this city is making good progress, and some other cities also, nevertheless there is much to be done to advance ourselves in the presence and appreciation of good music. There is need for music halls, auditoriums—spacious, beautiful, artistic.

We should have in our cities here and there a great, beautiful arch commemorating some wonderful historical event. We should have more of the splendid statuary ornamenting our public places and our streets. There should be more galleries where people could enjoy themselves and have the uplift of the esthetic taste. Our museums are doing a great and fine work, but this can be greatly extended as fast as they have the financial backing to go forward, and a museum, like a library, should not be a place of death and inactivity but it should be an educational institution; it should be a living institution throughout.

I think there should be beautiful avenues of trees. It is sometimes distressing to go along a street that could be so beautiful and find here a straggling tree, and there another tree of another variety, without uniformity, without sense of beauty. Why not have beautiful avenues, some perhaps with the magnolia, some with the oak, and some with other varieties? Make them lanes of beauty.

I pass now to another subject that grips our city life, and most unpleasantly. That is the problem, which is indeed a problem for the future, of alcoholic drinking. I am well aware of what has happened in this city, and in the country, and more or less in the world during the past 30, 50, or 75 years, but I must confess that here is a problem that is far from solved today. We must hand it to the future for study and for solution. California's reputation, so far as this problem is concerned, brings our noble State pretty close to the bottom—or the top, if you talk about consumption of liquor. I have been distressed personally about this matter, particularly about drunken driving. The situation I regard as intolerable. So I present it to you for further thought and earnest consideration.

Another topic that California must face, in my opinion, fairly and squarely some day is the question of gambling. Many forms of gambling are now illegal. Here and there we hear or read of some prosecutions and some convictions because of illegal gambling. On the other hand, certain forms of gambling have been legalized, and is it any wonder that the people are confused on that subject? As for me, I have no economic defense, I have no moral defense, I have no religious defense for the practice of gambling. And I make that statement generically, not excepting one little form of gambling or another little form. Gambling is seeking something for nothing. There is an old Latin motto which reads "ex nihilo nihil fit"—from nothing, nothing comes; and you cannot make an equation simply by using one side alone. Ten dollars equals zero. But for every $10 received there should be $10 value given. There is no economic defense, fundamentally, for the practice of gambling.

Another topic in which California has no very proud position—and kindly excuse me if I am not a booster for everything California does—is the subject of divorce. California leads. Hollywood is in California. Whereas scarcely a generation ago there was, speaking approximately, 1 divorce for every 10 marriages, and a few years ago one divorce for every four marriages, if the present trend is projected and continued for the next 15 or 18 years, the outcome would be one to one. One divorce for every one marriage. That is a social question that assumes the utmost gravity. It is tending to disintegrate and destroy the family as an institution, and many of our best practices and institutions are based upon family life, so I present that as an item of unfinished business with a degree of anxiety, urging that we change the trend radically in the best ways we can command so that instead of coming one-to-one there will have been reached the climax and the turning of the tide in the opposite direction before too long. It is a tragedy—particularly it is a tragedy for the children, for the rising generation—that there should be so many divorces. There again cannot we take some lesson from the practice of the beautiful Arcadian days of early California where divorce was practically unheard of—divorce was almost unknown.

Another question which I must touch briefly on in passing, a very important question, is that of our racial problem. And that is highly important in our own State of California. We have discussed at some length the question of the melting pot, the problem of Chinese immigration, coolie labor, the problems of excluding the Japanese, and what arose from the presence of the Filipinos, then the Mexicans, and still other races. Now we still have two or three aspects of the race problem, very acute and very prominent and most consequential in our midst today. Two of these that were not specifically mentioned and discussed in a previous lecture, I mention now.

First, is the question of the Negro. The Negro population, as we all know, in California has increased very greatly. We also know that the Negro has been made much more conscious of his prowess, his position, and his possibilities since the recent war; and he does not propose always to stand aside or to be shoved about by white people or anybody else. It is a great question to know what to do and how to do it wisely.

Still more recently, in some of its aspects at least, is the question, to be very frank, of the Jew in our midst. There are those, and many of them, who deliberately are cultivating anti-Semitism, hatred, and antagonism for the Jewish race. It needs study; it needs action. The latest book by Mr. Carey McWilliams is entitled "A Mask of Privilege." It deals chiefly with the subject of anti-Semitism.

The time that remains, and that is not much, I would like to devote chiefly to the subject of conservation. Some remarks have already been made on that very large and far-reaching subject. The natural resources of California are marvelous, but they are not inexhaustible. The natural resources, as we may review the subject, include the forests, the mineral products, water, and the land itself. Great natural resources. I would like to add to that list wild game, which oftentimes is forgotten or overlooked. Wildlife is an important resource in California.

The mineral resources bring to our attention, perhaps chiefly, black gold—far more value coming from the petroleum than from the gold mines, and this dates back practically in California to the excitement of 1859 and 1860. I shall not burden you with a large number of statistics about the production of oil. I might, however, call your attention to the Business Outlook, published by the Wells Fargo Bank & Union Trust Co. of San Francisco, for the 26th of February, which states:

"Petroleum production and consumption in the Pacific territory are of the highest in history, crude oil output mainly in California having risen 47 percent since December 1941, to meet in part a 63-percent increase in the consumption of all petroleum products."

Another item is, fuel-oil consumption continues to exceed the production, reflecting the strong demand for large quantities used to make gasoline and Diesel oil.

It is hardly necessary to state there has been tragic waste of wealth in connection with the oil industry. Many times I have driven over Signal Hill on the edge of the city of Long Beach, and I think it is safe to say there are at least four times as many wells and derricks on that hill as are necessary for the best production of oil in that area. Wildcatting in oil is very expensive business, and if one person can drive a well down in to a pool and extract that oil, then another wishes to do his part and also secure his share of oil from that same pool, showing the need of regulation and coordination in that great industry—simply one of the mineral industries of the State of California.

The forests are doing better. There is not so much exploitation of the forests as there was several years ago, before the time of Theodore Roosevelt and Amos Pinchot. Now also we are learning the lesson that trees for timber can be grown as a crop and not simply harvested once and for all. And there are corporations now acting on that principle, which is wholesome and logical. If the time comes when this is not profitable to private corporations, it seems to me that then, or possibly even before, we should have a National or State industry and thus there should be proper conservation of the trees. This does not mean trees should never be used for lumber; but there should be a wise use and provision for the future growth of the trees, and not have denuded hills and mountains but a beautiful stand of timber.

Coming to the conservation of land, I would like to make one or two general remarks about the Central Valley project. A great majority of the acreage of California is not cultivated. Some years ago, not more than one-tenth of the territory was subject to cultivation. We hardly realize the vast extent of the deserts and arid regions and of the overwhelming mountains until we travel about in these particular areas.

This is the time when the public mind has been more focused upon the subject of water, drought, and land conservation than perhaps in any other time in our memory. It is important—extremely important—to conserve the land to have it produce that which it is best qualified or suited to produce. There is much erosion. You have seen and I have seen great gullies, great washes, that have been destroying valuable land; and we have seen great areas that have been destroyed by a crude type of hydraulic mining. All these matters should be taken into consideration as being of public interest and not simply as objects for private profit, or neglected, whether through ignorance or willfully.

Water is the economic problem of California for the future. Most of us did not realize that the water-table for years has been quite steadily receding and is now dangerously—alarmingly low. You and I may think we have no particular stake in a problem of that kind but it is meaningful for all the citizens. We are all concerned in the future of California. What are we going to do for the supply of water for the great metropolitan area of Los Angeles, for example, which, in my time, has gone up into the Owens River Valley in 1909 and 1910 and brought vast quantities of water down through this aqueduct to the San Fernando Valley and Los Angeles for distribution, many thinking in 1910 that the supply would suffice for all time; but it was a matter of only a comparatively few years when that supply was used up. No longer is it nearly sufficient. Now the great water supply coming from the

Colorado River is serving 14 different cities and towns. In the meantime the population is growing by leaps and bounds, so that at this very moment there are probably at least 4,000,000 people in Los Angeles County alone, and there is no sign that they are stopping. They will come and keep coming, but what are they to do if the water supply gives out?

The two main sources, as you probably know, for the future supply that are being thought of are the Columbia River, which is very far away, and the Pacific Ocean. For my own part, I, of course, do not know what the future bears, but I believe that ways and means will be found for utilizing the water of the Pacific Ocean for the future supply. That can be done some day in an economical manner. We know now that it can be distilled, but it is so expensive as to be beyond question. The time will come, I firmly believe, because I am aware that now many are experimenting and doing research and laboratory work on that very problem, when the water of the Pacific Ocean can be changed and made usable for irrigation and other purposes at an economical level. That will be, I think, our great future supply of water.

I would not feel satisfied to leave this question of conservation without mentioning the chief item of all, and that is human conservation. There is no need of conserving the land, and the forests, and the wildlife, and the minerals, unless we conserve humanity. Therefore human conservation is the noblest and greatest of all conservation. That involves the work in the school—the day school, the evening school, the school for elementary children, the high school, the college, the university, the church, the temple, everywhere, conservation of human energy, conservation of human life. Such conservation will not take care of itself. It requires wise planning and careful thinking, just as we require planning in the conservation of land, and our mineral resources, and our wildlife, to conserve humanity.

What I have said, in large part, is rather gloomy in character, but is pointing a way toward a future that may be bright and even resplendent. California has a future as well as a past. One of the most brilliant pieces of engineering conceivable is that shown in the Golden Gate bridge. Haven't we somewhere social engineers who are big enough and bright enough and statesmanlike enough to make a bridge between the different castes and different groups in human society—employer and employee, management, and labor, this race and another race? What a beautiful bridge that would be. It would bridge the different peoples and the different races in such a way that there should be ultimately inaugurated a real brotherhood of man. We would all have something of the spark of humanity and love and the essence of democracy.

Let me close this series by bringing out another thought entirely extraneous to the lecture itself. It is a gratuitous contribution to suggest to you what I think are 15 decisive events in California history. You are aware of a book written by Mr. Creasy many years ago called Fifteen Decisive Battles. I present without discussion Fifteen Decisive Events in California History for you to consider, and differ from, and offer substitutes as you may wish.

1. Discovery, by Cabrillo, September 28, 1542.

2. Founding San Diego Mission July 16, 1769, may be called The Natal Day of Alta California.

3. Juan Bautista de Anza Expedition, 1775 and 1776.

4. Jedediah Smith Expedition overland into California, 1826.

5. Gillespie Mission to Fremont, causing his return to California, the Bear Flag Episode, and what followed.

6. Sloat raises the American flag at Monterey on the 7th of July 1846.

7. Marshall discovery of gold, January 24, 1848.

8. The admission of California into the Union, September 9, 1850.

9. The election of Leland Stanford as war governor of California, 1862.

10. Completion of the Pacific Railroad and driving the golden spike, May 10, 1869.

11. Discovery of oil in California as a great commercial product, coming out of the excitement of 1859 and 1860.

12. Hiram Johnson's election as Governor in 1910, bringing about the expulsion of the Southern Pacific from politics.

13. The Panama Canal completed, 1915.

14. Passage of the Immigration Act of 1924, with all its consequences.

15. The United Nations Charter drawn up and adopted, San Francisco, 1945, new world organization to preserve peace.

Ladies and gentlemen, "Where there is no vision the people perish." "Righteousness exalteth the nation, but sin is a reproach to any people."

I have appreciated your attendance and your patience in these lectures.

New Hampshire Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, most veterans are not fully aware of their legal rights to various benefits, privileges, preferences, and exemptions, as extended to them, under certain circumstances, by the laws of the great State of New Hampshire.

I am, therefore, pleased to present, for their information, an outline of such laws, as compiled by A. Richard Zurfluh, national service officer for the disabled American veterans, who has his offices with the Veterans' Administration Regional Office, Manchester, N. H.

This résumé of New Hampshire laws, affecting veterans and their dependents and organizations, is as follows:

BONUS

A bonus, not exceeding $100, was paid to veterans of World War I, their heirs or legal representatives.

A bonus, not exceeding $100 ($10 for each month of active service) is payable to World War II veterans who served honorably for at least 91 days prior to December 31, 1946, and were bona fide residents at time of entry into the armed forces. Applications should be made to the office of the Adjutant General, State House, Concord, N. H., on AG Form 30, filed through city or town clerk or the recognized veterans' organizations. There is no deadline in the present law for filing applications.

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

A State allowance is available for the burial of indigent veterans. The Governor may draw warrants to defray funeral expense up to $100. The vouchers are to be sent to the State veterans' council.

Towns may appropriate money to certain veterans' organizations for decorating graves of veterans on Memorial Day.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

A conservator may be appointed for persons serving in the armed forces.

A soldier in actual military service, or a mariner or seaman when at sea, may dispose of his movables and personal estate as he might heretofore have done.

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments executed by members of the armed forces.

Evidence of presumed death or absence may be admitted.

Disability of minority is removed for qualified veterans under the GI bill of rights.

Fiduciary powers are suspended during war service.

Protection is granted to persons acting under power of atorney granted by members of the armed forces.

Wills may be proved if attesting witnesses become incompetent or are unavailable in the armed forces.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

It is the duty of the State service officer to assist veterans or their dependents in securing all the benefits or preferences to which they may be entitled under any State or Federal laws or regulations.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS; QUALIFICATION FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

Area vocational schools and State trade schools have been established for veterans.

Registration of practitioners in the armed forces as professional engineers within 2 years after discharge is provided.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Aid is extended to children of veterans who were killed in action or died from other causes while serving in the armed forces of the United States between April 6, 1917, and after July 2, 1921. Amount, $150 maximum per child per year with free tuition in State institutions of secondary or college grade.

In all public schools of the State, one session, or a portion thereof, during the weeks in which Memorial Day and Armistice Day fall, shall be devoted to exercises of a patriotic nature.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Preference is given to veterans in public employment.

Towns and other political subdivisions, including the State, guarantee reemployment to those who served in the Armed Forces if written notice is given within 90 days after discharge.

Members of the State veterans' council must be veterans.

Preference is given to veterans in appointment as employees of the State liquor commission and in public departments and on public works of State and local units.

Benefit rights are preserved under the Unemployment Compensation Act, policemen's retirement system, and the teachers' retirement system.

The State veterans' service officer must be a veteran.

EXEMPTION FROM EXECUTION, GARNISHMENT, ETC.

Any pension or bounty money allowed by law of the United States before it comes into the hands of the defendant is exempt from trustee process.

GUARDIANSHIP

A Uniform Veterans' Guardianship Act has been enacted with modifications, providing for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran or the minor child of a veteran, to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

HOMES

Veterans may be admitted to the soldiers' home.

MEDALS, CERTIFICATES, ETC.

A certificate of honorable service and a medal of honor is awarded each resident of New Hampshire who served in the military and naval forces of the United States during World War I.

PATRIOTIC HOLIDAYS

Cities may appropriate money for the observance of Memorial Day, Independence Day, and other holidays.

Towns may appropriate money for the observance of Memorial Day, to be expended through certain veterans' organizations.

RECORDS, RELICS, ETC.

The adjutant general and State historian are authorized to prepare a roster of all residents who served in the armed forces of the United States or its Allies during World Wars I and II with a roll of honor, containing the names of those who died in the service, to be placed in the statehouse or on the statehouse grounds.

RELIEF

Aid is extended to veterans, their wives or widows, and children, in their own homes

TAX EXEMPTIONS; EXEMPTIONS FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Special hunting and fishing licenses are issued to members of the armed forces.

Members of the armed forces are permitted to operate vehicles without renewing their expired operators' licenses, with refund of any unused portion of the registration fee.

Registration plates for the New Hampshire State Voitures of La Societe des 40 Hommes et 8 Chevaux (American Legion), for use on motorized locomotives, are issued for $5.

Disabled veterans and their unmarried widows are exempt from peddler's license fee.

Servicemen and disabled veterans of World War II, and their widows, are exempt from payment of poll tax.

Veterans are exempt from the special poll tax levied to raise the fund for the soldiers' bonus.

Certain professional and occupational licenses are reinstated within 1 year after the termination of services in the armed forces, all fees and penalties being tolled for the period of service.

Property belonging to the GAR, the USWV, VFW, American Legion, and DAV is exempt from taxation.

Property owned by veterans, their wives or widows is exempt from taxation to the extent of $1,000.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Appropriations are made for the New Hampshire Veterans' Association and military organizations.

Towns may appropriate money toward the expenses of annual State conventions of any State organization of veterans.

Sale of artificial flowers or miniature flags on the street or in public places is permitted by certain veterans' organizations and other recognized charitable, fraternal, labor, or military organizations.

Unauthorized wearing or use of the badge of the GAR or the American Legion to obtain aid or assistance is prohibited.

Unauthorized wearing or use of the insignia registered by any veterans' organization is punishable by fine not to exceed $100 or by imprisonment for not more than 60 days.

Armory privileges are extended to veterans' organizations.

The American Legion has quarters in the statehouse.

Towns may appropriate money to provide a suitable meeting place for a post of the GAR, USWV, VFW, American Legion, Disabled American Veterans.

Much of the above legislation has been enacted by the New Hampshire Legislature through the sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veterans' organizations.

The DAV maintains two expertly trained full-time National Service Officers at the Veterans' Administration Regional Office, Manchester, N. H., who render all types of assistance to veterans and their dependents, particularly in the technical preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their justifiable claims for various types of governmental benefits to which they may be lawfully entitled.

DAV MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official voice of America's disabled defenders.

According to its congressional charter of incorporation—Public Law 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law 668, approved July 15, 1942—active membership in the DAV is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities incurred during, or by reason of, active service during time of war in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it.

More and more wounded and disabled veterans of World War II are becoming active members of the DAV.

Eligibles may become life members of the DAV upon payment of a fee of $100 ($50 if born before January 1, 1902), in cash or by a down-payment of $5, or more, plus such installments as will complete payment of the full fee by the end of the second succeeding fiscal year (ending on June 30), after which, if not fully paid, a carrying charge of $5 per year would accrue. A growing percentage are becoming DAV life members. Annual membership is available at $5.

DAV SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM

Realizing the need for extending assistance to all veterans and their dependents after the close of World War II, the DAV entered into an agreement with the Veterans' Administration and the American University in Washington, D. C., back in 1944, to train some 400 World War II handicapped veterans to become national service officers. An intensive 6-month special course was set up, followed by 18 more months of on-the-job training in three different regional offices of the Veterans' Administration, under the supervision of old-time, long-experienced DAV service officers.

The members of the tenth and last class of such trainees received their diplomas in May 1947 and are now completing their job training in all parts of the country.

This is the most intensive and ambitious program yet attempted by any veterans' organization to provide, without cost to the applicants, expert aid and assistance in the solution of the many problems confronting veterans and their dependents.

No veterans' organization has any more extensive and effective Nation-wide service staff to take care of the problems of all veterans and their dependents, and particularly those who have service-connected disabilities, than the DAV.

During the more than 28 years of its service activities, the DAV has sponsored and supported much liberalizing legislation on behalf of disabled veterans and their dependents.

Liberalized application of such laws, too numerous and too technical here to set forth, has, each year, been brought about by numerous conferences with officials of the Veterans' Administration and other governmental agencies.

DAV NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Located at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati 6, Ohio, the national headquarters of the DAV takes care of all administrative matters and records, and publishes the Disabled American Veterans' semimonthly newspaper containing accurate, up-to-date information as to all existing and pending legislation, Presidential Executive orders, court decisions, opinions of the Attorney General, Comptroller General and VA Administrator, VA regulation, service letters, circulars, and other instructions, as well as much other information of interest and of value to disabled veterans and their dependents.

The present national commander of the DAV is John L. Golob of Hibbing, Minn., a badly wounded World War I veteran, an insurance agent in private life, who has had a broad background of 28 years of experience in various local, State, and national DAV activities which qualify him to lead an organization composed exclusively of America's disabled war veterans.

Its national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-treasurer (business manager) of the organization, and editor of its newspaper since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his able assistant.

The largest bank in Cincinnati—the Fifth Third Union Trust Co.—has, for 28 years, been the depository for the funds of both the DAV and its incorporated trusteeship, the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation. Officials handling funds have always been adequately bonded by the Fidelity & Deposit Co., of Maryland.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The national service headquarters of the DAV is now located in a beautiful building at 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C., which was acquired by the organization in 1945.

In this Washington office are located the department of claims, headed by William E. Tate; the department on legislation, headed by Francis Sullivan, and the department of public relations and employment headed by Millard W. Rice. In addition to these service departments, the DAV service headquarters has as its office manager, John E. Feighner, as assistant national adjutant. All of these various departments are staffed by trained experts, all of whom are themselves war wounded or disabled veterans.

These DAV national officers know all about the technical complications that disabled veterans must overcome factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration, under the limitations and restrictions of existing law, as legalistically interpreted and as administratively applied.

Understanding such vexatious problems by personal experience, DAV national service officers are naturally more sympathetic than are nondisabled veterans or civilians and are therefore generally more effective in helping disabled claimants to comply with technical requirements to prove legal entitlement to benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled.

DAV SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The DAV has freely rendered technical help to thousands of disabled veterans each year in obtaining compensation for service-incurred disabilities, medical treatment, hospitalization, insurance benefits, pensions for dependents of deceased veterans, vocational training, civil-service appointments, and last, but really first in importance, suitable, gainful employment.

During the past 18 years, for which records are obtainable, the paid national service officers of the DAV have extended service as indicated by the following brief résumé: Claims handled, 1,525,753; total monetary benefits, $132,512,111.87.

Additional compensation payments thus obtained for thousands of disabled veterans and their dependents, who might not otherwise have been able to procure such needed benefits, have converted such beneficiaries from local liabilities, into community assets.

It is, of course, not practicable, in a brief statistical résumé, to indicate the many different types of service extended by service officers. Many liberalizing precedents have been established by the decisions obtained, which subsequently have proved of value to hundreds of thousands of disabled veterans having similar claims, the results of which cannot be computed from service records.

DIFFICULTIES OF PROVING SERVICE ORIGIN

Most citizens agree with the DAV that the Federal Government should bear the burden of providing for the Nation's defenders, but only when it has been established that the veteran's disabilities were incurred in or aggravated by his military service.

To prove service connection of a disability, however, is not an easy task, except where official records show its inception in service. An equitable claim cannot necessarily be legally established.

Many different factors may make it extremely difficult, and in many cases impossible, for a veteran factually to prove that his disabilities were caused by his war service, even though actually service-incurred or aggravated.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The DAV has adopted, on a Nation-wide basis, a man-job-matching method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,100,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally unemployable. The remaining 93 percent are less than totally disabled and must, therefore, supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment.

This scientific approach to a most distressing problem has produced some worthwhile results thus far. The handicapped veteran's abilities have been matched with the requirements of the job, rather than stressing his disabilities. It has been demonstrated by the employment record of such disabled veterans that they have a low absentee record, a low turn-over record, a low accident record, and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been demonstated that to hire disabled veterans is just plain, good business, bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers, and taxpayers generally.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice must be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation, its military and naval services during time of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as with those who are, or have been, dependent upon these heroes, so that other young men who in the future may be called upon to make similar sacrifices will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that if they, too, should also be so unfortunate they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

It is a pleasure for me to commend the service program of the DAV and I am sure it merits the consideration and support of the entire country.

The Pay of Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, we must do something about raising the pay of postal workers before we go home this summer. The postman and his associates have been faithful workers on the American scene ever since before the Revolutionary War when Ben Franklin directed the mails. Whether or not the mailman rings once, twice, or three times, you can always bet your bottom dollar that he is going to ring. He is a reliable, conscientious public servant. The same is true of all postal workers. They and other Federal workers are entitled to a boost in pay so that they can have some opportunity to combat the tremendously high cost of living. This fact was vividly brought home to me today in a letter received from a constituent in St. Paul. She enclosed part of a column written by Mr. Paul Light, a popular columnist on the St. Paul Pioneer-Press. Here is what part of the column said:

TAKE-HOME PAY $38

"DEAR PAUL: Wanted: Men able to pass rigid physical and mental examination to work for $38 a week. Must be willing to work outside in all types of weather. One hundred percent honesty required as this is a position of great trust. Apply any United States post office."

The above, Paul, is too horribly true. The starting salary for a letter carrier is $2,100 which, after 5 percent has been deducted for retirement, leaves him with less than $40 for his week's work. That is no salary to offer a man in a field where you should expect—and get—industrious, faithful, and efficient public servants. However, because of their inability to strike and because of the fact it takes an act of Congress to obtain a wage raise for these men, it appears as though the postal employees will continue to be ground into poverty. The general public, if they appreciate their postal service, which for certainty can assume a position alongside of death and taxes, could help our cause by writing their Congressmen telling them that they believe we are deserving of a raise. The time is short, though, as Congress is planning on recessing by June 15.

When my good constituent, Mrs. Alice G. Mulrooney, sent me the enclosed clipping, she told an interesting story about her postman. Let me tell it to you in her own words. Here is what she said:

I just read the enclosed from Paul Light's column—feel sure you are doing what you can for this worthy cause. The Government is surely "poor pay" for these men who never fail us—and who do much "above and beyond the line of duty." Let me illustrate what I mean. As you know, I can go downstairs only once a day because of my illness, and since there is no one in the house at 8:30 in the morning when the postman rings twice, I drop a long cord from a window in my bedroom at the end of which is a snap clothes pin. The kind postman snaps out the letters I am mailing and snaps in those received. And what is more, the kind man provided the clothes pin. I used to just drop the cord with a weight on end—one day he brought the clothes pin from his own home. Please pay these servants of the public more money.

With kindest regards,

ALICE G. MULROONEY.

The example Mrs. Mulrooney cites is only one of the faithful and courteous services being rendered to the American people by the United States postal employees. How can we expect them to work for $38 a week. It is shameful.

I urge that the Rules Committee manifest alacrity and hurry the pay increase bill to the floor of the House for consideration and early passage.

Fred Bradley

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1948

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. FRED BRADLEY, late a Representative from the State of Michigan

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it was a year ago this month, on May 17, 1947, that our beloved friend, FRED BRADLEY, departed this life to rest in eternal peace. Yet, the memory of his blue eyes, his shy smile, his friendly voice, and his firm handclasp live with us today as we pay tribute to his memory.

I felt honored to number FRED BRADLEY among my friends. He was a man's man and was greatly admired by all who knew him.

FRED BRADLEY won his mark as a businessman and as an industrialist even before he won his mark as a legislator. Ever conscious of his obligations to the people, he seldom failed to consider the welfare of all groups while working and voting here. He was a Republican all his life and proud of it, although he was not a bitter partisan.

A native of Chicago, Ill., where he was born on April 12, 1898, FRED was a comparatively young man when stricken in death. Yet he had won high fame before his death. His untimely summons prevented even higher honors.

FRED attended Rogers City (Mich.) High School, and Montclair Academy in Montclair, N. J., and graduated from Cornell University in 1921 with a bachelor of arts degree. He married Miss Marcia Marie Hillidge, of Front Royal, Va., on November 20, 1922. Well known to many Members of the House, Mrs. Bradley has borne this great sorrow with courage and equanimity.

FRED was a member of the Westminster Presbyterian Church, Kiwanis International, Delta Chi Fraternity, and the American Legion. He was elected to the Seventy-sixth Congress and to each succeeding Congress until his death.

I can never think of him without recalling the immortal words of Tennyson:

Break, break, break
On thy cold gray stones, O sea!
And I would that my tongue could utter
The thoughts that arise in me.

O well for the fisherman's boy,
That he shouts with his sister at play!
O well for the sailor lad,
That he sings in his boat on the bay!

And the stately ships go on
To their haven under the hill;
But O for the touch of a vanished hand,
And the sound of a voice that is still.

We who knew FRED BRADLEY cannot—we will not—forget him all the days of our lives.

Women's Role in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article I prepared for the Woman's Manual, published by the Social Sciences Publishers, Pauline V. Young and Fay B. Karpf, editors:

WOMEN'S ROLE IN POLITICS

As voters, as political workers, and as officeholders, what part do women play? What part must they play if our world is to hold together?

Women have the keenest sort of interest in what their dollars will purchase at the grocery store. They have the most intense longing to see peace established upon earth so that their children will not have to be blown to pieces in a new war. Women want adequate educational and recreational facilities, child-care programs, and social-security benefits.

Women understand the need for these things more clearly than do men. Yet too often they fail to realize that to get these things they must give time and energy, must work as they have never worked before, and must work together.

Consider the potential strength of women. In 1940 they are reported to have cast 45 percent of the votes. During the war years their total vote exceeded that of the men. In 1946, according to estimates of the United States Census Bureau, women who had reached the age of 21—the voting age—outnumbered men who had reached that age by 1,171,948.

Here are some figures submitted to the United Nations by Judge Dorothy Kenyon in a report rendered in January 1948.

Women of the United States purchase 80 percent of the consumer goods, own 70 percent of the Nation's wealth, inherit 80 percent of the Nation's life insurance, control 47 percent of the corporate stock of the country's businesses, own 65 percent of the savings accounts.

These facts and figures give some indication of what women can accomplish if they will. Women can make this country what they want it to be. That is a terrific responsibility.

As yet, women have only taken the first steps in carrying out their political obligations and grasping their political opportunities. They have worked devotedly at all the routine but highly necessary tasks, such as addressing envelopes, door-to-door canvassing, and telephone duty. They have served as county chairmen, State chairmen, and national committeewomen. They have raised money, made speeches, and written campaign literature. But too often women have stayed at home from the polls when nothing of immediate and direct concern to them appeared to be involved. Too often women active in politics have placed undue emphasis on personal prestige. Too seldom have qualified women been willing to undertake the strains and stresses of running for public office.

In all these matters, women in the labor movement, union members, and members of auxiliaries have set a fine example to their more disorganized sisters. In spite of the fact that the working woman has already two jobs—her work and her home—she has been willing to give herself to the task of getting out the vote; to campaign for candidates who have the interest of the people at heart; and to mobilize public opinion behind sound legislation. Her efforts have been intelligent and effective. But even so, the problem has constantly been, "How can we get more women interested? How can we get them to understand what is at stake for them and their families?"

As I talk with individual women and meet with women's groups, I am constantly confronted with the remark, "What one person can do seems of so little account." Women frequently become discouraged because they do not see that their contribution is making any impact on the tremendous problems of our day.

Good union members know the answer to that one. They know that it is the strength of the group that counts, not that of the individual. They know that it is the goal that is important and that the smallest task that contributes toward the realization of that goal is a necessary part of the total effort. Union women can do much to bring this sense of the importance of concerted effort to women who have not experienced it. Such women neither know the joy that comes from working as part of a group nor understand the necessity for self-discipline that teamwork imposes. Yet teamwork is an absolute essential of effective political action.

What can be done to make the political work of women more effective? I would like to suggest a few do's and a few dont's for women in politics.

1. Build up your fellow workers. The person who is generous toward others seldom waits long for recognition. An atmosphere of praise will bring forth the best in those who are already active, and will encourage those who may be hesitating about getting into the strenuous and often discouraging whirlpool of political activity. Gratitude is such a rare quality that it means much also to your elected officials. They are very happy to receive a word of approbation to offset the many brickbats that come their way.

2. Accept responsibility. Women frequently complain—and often with justice—that men are glad to have them do political errand running, but are unwilling to let them share equitably in policy making. One way to qualify for greater responsibilities is to carry through completely every task undertaken, no matter how small, and no matter what other duties arise to make this difficult. You can then rightfully claim recognition and opportunity.

3. Study the issues and the candidates. Women in politics should take pains to have facts at their fingertips. Generalities are not good enough; nor should decisions be made on emotional grounds. The stereotyped figure of the reactionary Congressman with the wide hat and big cigar is an effective emotional symbol, but no substitute for real knowledge of the issues and real thought about them.

4. Demonstrate your ability in policy-making. Instead of complaining because you are not taken into the inner circle, try to create a situation in which you will have a chance to demonstrate your ability. Once proved, it will be harder for the door to be shut in your face thereafter.

THE DONT'S

These can be disposed of in short order. They are related to certain personality difficulties with which women often have to struggle. We all know the woman who gains recognition through her nuisance value. She is not asset to her party or to herself. The prima donna who demands special consideration at every moment is also a difficult type. There is also the woman who lacks self-confidence and who must be constantly encouraged. These women need to grow in maturity.

The woman who expects special privileges because of her SEX is a pain to the men and a handicap to other women as they seek to win acceptance.

Sometimes women seek to wield power by short-cutting the rules of parliamentary or political party procedure. This never works in the long run. Such a woman is an ineffective leader and is always deposed sooner or later.

Finally, the lot of a woman in politics is often difficult, frustrating, and exhausting. The best way to meet these bumps is to laugh them off. When the mimeograph machine breaks down; when you've done your best, only to meet with a mean criticism; when a week's work turns out to be useless because of someone else's mistake; when you feel that you can't stand the whole mess another moment—laugh it off. A relaxed approach gets things done.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH THIS PICTURE?

In spite of their numbers and their potential influence, in spite of the fact that women constitute the largest single division of the population, here is the record of women as officeholders in the United States at the end of 1947:

United States House of Representatives	7
United States Senate	None
Cabinet	None
Federal judges	3
Governors of States	None
Members of 48 State legislatures (of whom only 7 are State senators)	211
State supreme courts	None
Lower State courts	49

Nine States have no woman legislator, nine others only one. Thirty States have no woman judge.

I am not implying that women should be elected merely because of the fact that they are women. But it would seem clear that it is essential to sound democracy that our largest group should be more adequately represented than it is at present. It should not be more difficult for an able woman to secure support than for an able man. It would not be if women realized their strength.

Some women have shown us what can be done. We are all proud of the place won by Eleanor Roosevelt in international affairs, by Katherine Lenroot in the field of child welfare, by Ruth Bryan Owen and Daisy Harriman in foreign service, and by Frances Perkins in the field of labor. We need more like them.

WHAT CAN WOMEN ACCOMPLISH?

What can women hope to achieve if they marshal their forces, improve their techniques, and play the role that is open to them in politics? The possibilities are breath-taking. Women could: Stop inflation; prevent monopoly; conserve our national resources; elect an enlightened Congress; abolish racial discrimination; build a peaceful world.

Women could do this. Will they?

Joseph Jefferson Mansfield

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 17, 1948

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JOSEPH JEFFERSON MANSFIELD, late a Representative from the State of Texas

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the first men whom I grew to know well when I first came to the House of Representatives was "JOE" MANSFIELD, who even then was looked upon as one of the older Members of the House.

Through the years, he stood like a stone wall for the principles which guided him during a long and fruitful life. As is well known, at the time of his passing he was the oldest Member of the House of Representatives from the point of age and one of the oldest Members from the point of service. He came to Capitol Hill at the beginning of the Sixty-fifth Congress and he remained a stalwart Democrat and a stalwart believer in Americanism until he passed to his reward in the sweet by-and-by.

Born on February 9, 1861, at Wayne, W. Va., then a part of Virginia in the period before that State split up on account of the War Between the States, JOE MANSFIELD moved to Texas by covered wagon in 1881. He engaged as a laborer on farm and in nursery, later as baggage master and freight clerk on the railroad. He studied law while carrying out his regular work and, in 1886, he was admitted to the Texas bar. He was appointed city attorney of Eagle Lake, Tex., in 1888, and elected mayor of Eagle Lake in 1889. He become county attorney of Colorado County in 1892, and county judge of Colorado County in 1896, serving in that post for ten consecutive terms. Also he held the office of ex officio county school superintendent for 12 years and, as receiver, conducted the fiscal affairs of the city of Columbus, Tex., for 10 years.

A fighter for the right as he saw the right all his life, JOE MANSFIELD organized two companies of Texas Volunteer Guards in 1886, holding commissions from the adjutant general of Texas, first as second lieutenant, then as first lieutenant, and finally as captain. He was appointed as adjutant of the Fourth Texas Regiment with rank of captain. For several years he was acting chairman of the committee on grievances and appeals, Masonic Grand Lodge, and in 1912–13 was grand master of Masons in Texas. He established the first newspaper ever published in Eagle Lake and for several years was editor of the Colorado Citizen, of Columbus, Tex. He was for several years assistant chief of the Columbus Fire Department and for 20 years vestryman of St. John's Episcopal Church. He married Annie Scott Bruce, of Eagle Lake, in 1888, and she preceded him in death by many years.

JOE MANSFIELD had a long life. He had a colorful life. He had a full life. We who remember him today know that—

Somewhere tonight, among the hills of heaven,
He'll walk with all God's stars around him;
And we who lost him here on earth.
Grow happy knowing God has found him.

Shipment of Tobacco to Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, not long ago we were told about American goods rotting in Greek warehouses. Now I have an Associated Press dispatch which tells us that American cigarettes are rotting in Germany.

This Congress has approved a joint recovery program with 16 countries in Europe under which we ship our wealth and the wealth purchased with our dollars from other countries to help put the Socialist governments of Western Europe on their feet. It seems that the undernourished and underclothed Europeans must have free tobacco as an incentive to help produce the food and clothing they need so much. We have been told that without free tobacco they would not be likely to work as hard in producing things for which they have a dire need, so American taxpayers must underwrite the shipment of $100,000,000 worth of tobacco during the current 12 months. This amounts to a dolar's worth for every adult man and woman in the country. This sum should provide more than a billion packs of tobacco or something over five or six packages for every adult in the participating area. It is a little difficult for me to believe that these cigarettes are needed by starving people in order to get them to produce for themselves.

If our shipments of tobacco are allowed to rot in Germany where we are in control, what happens in countries where the tobacco is turned over to the Socialist politicians who are fighting so hard to keep in office? Perhaps this free tobacco is an incentive for these foreign politicians to remain in office, or, could it be that there are politicians in this country who think that ECA approved orders might keep tobacco prices up and help them at the polls. Perish the thought.

National Conference of Catholic Charities Endorses the Taft-Ellender-Wagner Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, Members have been contending for a long time that the Taft-Ellender-Wagner comprehensive housing bill, S. 866, now pending before the House Banking and Currency Committee, represents the answer to a deep-seated need as well as an immediate emergency. It is for this reason that it has gained the active support of leading social, welfare, and religious organizations in the country. This deep-seated need and the capability of this bill to fill it is reflected by the following letters from the National Conference of Catholic Charities. Many are concerned lest the T-E-W bill die in the Eightieth Congress as it did in the Seventy-ninth Congress. It would not only be a tragedy for millions of Americans, especially of veterans living in substandard housing accommodations or doubled up with others, but it would be a signal failure on the part of the Congress to accept a national responsibility where it seems clear that only such acceptance will lead to an adequate solution of a problem basic in the daily lives of our people:

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF
CATHOLIC CHARITIES,
Washington, D. C., May 20, 1948.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JAVITS: May I respectfully call to your attention the attached letters addressed to the Republican and Democratic leaders in the House of Representatives, by representatives of 26 great national organizations with reference to the national housing policy proposed in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, S. 866, on which hearings are now being held by the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

Many of us who have devoted our lives to the service of others have pointed out again and again that the truly Christian American home is one of the great bulwarks of democracy. It is one of the strongest defenses against the inroads of communism in our life. American families, now living in so-called homes which are unfit for human habitation, should be given an opportunity to raise their families under conditions which will make it possible for them to discharge their social and religious obligations, and prepare them for the great objective of all Americans, namely home ownership.

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, with its public-housing provisions included, would make progress toward that objective. It would help also to foster cooperative home ownership for families of middle and low income. Every possible safeguard has been established in the proposed legislation to make certain that housing developments under the ownership of local housing authorities are tenanted by families of very low income who must come from slum dwellings and that the provision of such shelter does not encroach on legitimate private enterprise.

We insist that to insure a democratic and Christian America, we must begin by removing one of the worst cancers on our social and economic life—the slum.

Respectfully yours,
Rt. Rev. Monsignor JOHN O'GRADY,
Secretary.

MAY 5, 1948.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SPEAKER MARTIN: The organizations with which we, the undersigned, serve have been active over a period of many years in urging the development of a national housing policy and passage of legislation which would stimulate production of new housing for all income groups. It was, therefore, with considerable satisfaction that we witnessed the Senate passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, S. 866, by a truly bipartisan vote.

However, we recall that similar action was taken by the Senate in 1945 and, fearful that again this measure may be lost through failure of House action, we call upon you to lend the full support of your office to assure favorable and speedy action within the House of Representatives. The strong bipartisan support of this measure indicated by Senate vote is encouraging, and it is hoped that such support will be equally effective in the House. Final enactment by the present Congress of S. 866 as passed by the Senate is so fundamental as to transcend all party lines.

We, who address you, agreed upon housing objectives several years ago. One of them was then, and still is, a federally aided public housing program for families of low incomes whom private enterprise cannot serve with decent housing now or in the foreseeable

future. These self-supporting citizens have the American right to look to their Government for the kind of assistance that will afford them an opportunity to occupancy of decent housing in which to raise their children.

We, therefore, urge passage of the entire bill, including the public housing section as passed in the Senate, free from any emasculating amendments.

It is our firm conviction that S. 866, in the form just passed by the Senate, achieves as fair compromise of all issues involved as would appear attainable at this time.

Sincerely yours,

Rt. Rev. Monsignor John O'Grady, Secretary, National Conference of Catholic Charities; Mrs. Elizabeth Christman, Secretary, Nation Women's Trade Union League; Leslie Perry, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Thomas B. Keehn, Legislative Secretary, The Council for Social Action of Congregational Christian Churches; Joseph Anderson, American Association of Social Workers; Lee F. Johnson, Executive Vice President, National Public Housing Conference; Mrs. Stanley G. Cook, Legislation Chairman, National Congress of Parents and Teachers; Mrs. Mary McLeod Bethune, Founder-President, National Council of Negro Women; Mrs. Joseph M. Welt, President, National Council of Jewish Women; Miss Marjorie L. Temple, Legislative Program Associate, American Association of University Women; Mrs. Floyd McNaughton, American Home Economics Association; Chat Paterson, American Veterans Committee; Rev. H. Conrad Hoyer, Executive Secretary, Division of American Missions, National Lutheran Council; Philip Shiff, Jewish Welfare Board; Col. Paul V. Betters, United States Conference of Mayors; Irma Piepho, Administrative Assistant, National Council of Catholic Women; James S. Mitchell, Executive Secretary, National Council of Catholic Men; Sydney Maslen, Chairman, National Council of Housing Associations; Dr. George F. Zook, President, American Council on Education; Boris Shishkin, Secretary, Housing Committee, American Federation of Labor; Leo Goodman, Executive Secretary, CIO Committee on Housing; John W. Edelman, Washington Representative, Textile Workers Union of America; Russell Smith, Legislative Secretary, National Farmers Union; Anna Lord Strauss, President, League of Women Voters of the United States; John C. Williamson, Assistant Director, National Legislative Service, Veterans of Foreign Wars; Charles S. Rhyne, General Counsel, National Institute of Municipal Law Officers.

Orville Zimmerman

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1948

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN, late a Representative from the State of Missouri

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with heavy heart that we think again of our departed colleague and friend, ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN, who passed away only 6 weeks ago, on April 7, 1948, after serving so long and so well his beloved Tenth District of Missouri.

ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN will be remembered long among those of us who knew him best, for he had the qualities of friendliness and tolerance and understanding in full measure. These endeared us to him and we were saddened at his untimely passing.

Born on a farm in Bollinger County, Mo., December 31, 1880, he attended country school at Glen Allen and later attended Mayfield-Smith Academy at Marble Hill. He graduated from State college at Cape Girardeau, Mo., in 1904, and from the University of Missouri in 1911 with the degree of bachelor of laws. He was admitted to the bar of his native State in that same year, and began the practice of law at Kennett, Mo.

A volunteer in World War I, he was a member of the Lions Club, the American Legion, the Masonic fraternity, and the Methodist Church. He was a member of the board of regents of State college at Cape Girardeau, Mo.

A Democrat by rearing and by sentiments, ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN was not prejudiced in his thinking. He numbered his friends among both Democrats and Republicans, and, indeed, the only qualification he demanded of any man was that he be an American in deed and in truth. We can say, with the poet, that—

I would that my father had taught me his creed,
The creed of the keepers of sheep;
Taught me his creed as he taught me his craft,
As we sat with the flocks on the steep,
As we sat with our flocks 'neath the yew trees,
He piping his troubles to sleep,
Piping on reeds I had sat on,
Piping his sorrows to sleep.
O that my father had taught me his creed,
The creed of the keepers of sheep.

Lebanese Seizure of American Citizens Is an Outrageous Indignity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the startling news that a British vassal state, the Republic of Lebanon, had the temerity to send armed police aboard an American vessel in time of peace, and to remove 41 American citizens and throw them in a concentration camp, came upon an incredulous citizenry last Thursday.

I immediately sent the following telegram to the Secretary of State.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 20, 1948.*

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE,
Department of State, Washington, D. C.:

The seizure of American nationals by Lebanese officials, and their ensuing imprisonment, constitutes an outrageous indignity against the United States which demands the most rigorous accounting by the Lebanese Government. I urge that not only the Lebanese but the British Government be held to account for this action which is reminiscent of the search and seizure by the British which precipitated the War of 1812. It is my belief that Great Britain should be barred from all benefits under ECA until her vassal states in Middle East have been ordered to halt their aggressions toward Israel and England has recalled all British subjects in Arab forces and has ceased supplying weapons of war and political support.

ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
Member of Congress.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that if the United States can cut off certain supplies from Russia it can cut off the same kind or other supplies from Great Britain.

NO PROSECUTIONS FOR RECRUITING

While I do not for a moment recognize the right of the Lebanese to seize any American citizen except as the result of an overt and legal crime, I did take note that the Lebanese Government defended its action on the grounds that the men seized were Zionists of military age.

We have laws prohibiting the recruitment or the enlistment of American citizens for foreign wars. We have often honored them in the breach when the national temper sympathized with the cause; and indeed I do not recall any instance of successful prosecution under these old statutes.

However, I made several telephone calls to various officials, and was assured by one officer of the Department of Justice that the Department had indeed made an extensive investigation of allegations of illegal recruitment and procurement of supplies and material for Palestine destination; but that no basis had been found for the filing of criminal charges.

INDIGNATION SHARED

That seems to dispose of the Lebanese claims, and of innuendoes that the passengers of the *Marine Carp* were flying under false colors.

My indignation is shared by many other Americans, and under leave I am inserting at this point an editorial from the Washington Post dated Monday, May 24, which follows:

PROTEST TO LEBANON

The War of 1812 was due in large part to the resentment aroused by the British practice of searching American vessels for British seamen and deserters from British naval vessels—a proceeding that frequently resulted in American seamen as well as British subjects being carried off. The Lebanese Government does not have even the excuse of mistaken identity to offer in defense of its outrageous action in removing American citizens from a vessel flying the flag of the United States. Its only excuse appears to be fear that the American Jews who were forcibly removed and interned might join the Jewish fighting forces in Palestine.

So gross a violation of the rules governing international intercourse between nations at peace is indefensible. Failure to respond to the demand of the United States for return of the captives would justify the severest kind of reprisals. Yet it seems to us that the State Department's protest ignores the major issue by emphasing the fact that all bearers of American passports, irrespective of race, color, or creed, are entitled to equal protection of the laws of the United States. Of course, they are. But, so far as we can see, the Lebanese have not been guilty of discrimination in the way suggested by the State Department's communication. Only Jews were seized, to be sure, but that was because it was only Jews whom the Lebanese had reason to fear as potential fighters. The

offense of the Lebanese Government that calls for rebuke is its invasion of American territory by boarding an American vessel and taking away American citizens. It is merely confusing to drag in an issue that is utterly irrelevant, insofar as the present controversy is concerned.

WITHHOLD FUNDS FROM GREAT BRITAIN

Quite spontaneously, a number of public figures echoed my own demand for the exercise of sanctions against Great Britain by the United States in the form of cash penalties against ECA and other funds. You read the debate in another House in which firm commitments were made to this end.

One of the advocates of such sanctions is the New York Post, which in the Sunday, May 23, issue published the following stirring editorial:

WE MUST "PUT UP—OR BE SHUT UP"

(By T. O. Thackrey)

The outrageous and hostile action of the Lebanese government in abducting 41 American citizens from an American steamship and lodging them in jail or concentration camp merely serves to illustrate the degree of contempt in which the United States has been held since our failure to match our lip service to partition with action.

The United States was fast gaining a reputation which reversed Theodore Roosevelt's maxim of speaking softly and carrying a big stick.

We talked endlessly, but the Arab states, encouraged by Great Britain, have drawn the conclusion that we are merely a nation of words and not of action or even promise of action, except, perhaps, in our attitude toward any difference with the Soviet Union, the world's only other great power in fact.

Fortunately, the sharp protest delivered by the State Department yesterday to Lebanon, demanding the immediate release of the citizens so outrageously abducted, carried the warning that the United States takes a most serious view of such high-handed conduct.

It was heartening, also, to learn of the instructions sent at the same time to the United States diplomatic officials in Egypt, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Syria, and Transjordan, in view of the open threats of Egypt and other Arab Higher Committee States that citizens of the United States bound for Palestine could look forward to capture and detention.

In plain language, our representatives have been instructed to make it clear that the United States will not tolerate action interfering with its citizens, and a particular point is made of the reminder that no distinction may be made among our citizens with respect to race, religion, or color.

Clearly, even more unmistakable evidence of our earnestness may be required to reestablish the unmistakable character of our purposes.

The Arabian states have been encouraged by Great Britain to believe that the United States will be too craven and too fearful of a rupture with Britain to maintain support of a rule of peace and law in the Middle East, either within or without the United Nations.

It may yet be necessary to drive home the point in some such manner as was done by Secretary of State John Hay under President Theodore Roosevelt just after the turn of the century, when an American citizen, John Perdicaris, was abducted in Morocco by the Riff bandit Raisuli.

The Sultan of Morocco was warned in much the manner that we have now warned Lebanon, Egypt, and their allies. Warships were sent at once to the scene. Marines were landed to guard the United States consulate. And finally Secretary Hay sent his history making, cryptic but clear message to the Sultan:

"Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead."

His release was prompt, and the United States achieved a reputation for saying what we meant, and meaning what we said, which did not begin to be questioned in the world until our sad desertion of all-out support for the General Assembly's decision last November on Palestine.

The contemptuous abduction of our citizens by Arab states is not the sole instance in which we must in a fashion peculiarly characteristic of our spirit, put up or shut up.

It would have a salutary effect on the hot-blooded invaders of Jerusalem from British-backed Transjordan, for example, if we made effective use of contingents of the United States fleet now in the Middle Eastern section of the Mediterranean to land a force for the protection of the United States consulate and the very large number of American citizens in the Holy City.

Are we, by any chance, less concerned with the lives of our citizens in Jerusalem and the safety of our consulate there, then we were in 1904 when the security of only one citizen was involved?

Within the United Nations Security Council the battle of words drones on—between Great Britain and her puppet allies, who support invasion of Palestine, extermination of the new nation of Israel and destruction and capture of the United Nation's own free city of Jerusalem, and the United States in our efforts to uphold the Charter and secure the peace.

But in Palestine the war rages on; British Transjordan army makes a war of conquest and destruction upon Jerusalem and Palestine's UN areas; Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, Yemen, Saudi Arabia, all have sent their armies beyond their borders to do Great Britain's bloody bidding.

Here, too, effective action must be begun at once, and there is an excellent example to start with:

Great Britain, as a receiver of funds from the United States Treasury in the name of economic recovery, boasts of sending an $8,000,000 annual subsidy to Transjordan solely for the purpose of making war—war directed at the state of Israel recognized by the United States, and against the Palestine mandated sections relinquished by Great Britain to United Nations sovereignty and responsibility.

Under ERP, countries are required first to make use of their own available resources for recovery and reconstruction before receiving funds from us to make up the marginal gap.

It is certain that the $8,000,000 Transjordan subsidy is being used outside Great Britain, for destructive purposes, rather than at home for constructive purposes.

No funds whatever should be permitted to Great Britain until she has made a proper use of this $8,000,000 resource now used to make war contrary to the Charter of the UN itself.

And finally—but most immediately important—we must take positive and direct action to assist Israel, the only democratic state in the Middle East, defend itself from the hostile warfare of eight nations bent on her destruction by force of arms. The eight include, of course, Great Britain.

The arms embargo to Israel must be lifted at once.

In the face of continued supply of arms, military assistance, and matériel to Arabian invading armies by Great Britain, we can do no less.

Israel deserves at least the right to purchase the means with which to stave off mass murder until the conscience of the world can awaken to the ghastly crime against humanity being defended in cold blood by Great Britain, Belgium, China, and Syria in the Security Council.

The way should be cleared, also, for a military and an air force mission to the world's newest independent nation, now battling for its life.

We were quick to act with such missions to China when that vast country was under attack by Japanese invaders—and China has betrayed that long-extended material friendship by turning away from the tiny little country defending itself against the invasion of seven hostile neighbors.

One-tenth of that concern for democracy and justice in the Middle East will not only assure the independence of Israel, but make it clear that we do, indeed, uphold the United Nations Charter which forbids aggressive war of conquest and the extermination of a free people.

DON'T FINANCE BRITAIN'S WAR AGAINST ISRAEL

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am inserting the factual appeal made by the American Zionist Emergency Council as published in the newspapers Saturday, May 22:

AMERICA: DON'T FINANCE BRITAIN'S WAR AGAINST ISRAEL

On April 16, Sir Alexander Cadogan, Great Britain's chief delegate to the United Nations, made an official statement reaffirming previous undertakings of the British Government to withdraw the Transjordan Arab Legion from Palestine before May 15, the date of the termination of the British mandate. These official undertakings of His Majesty's Government have been unabashedly and cynically broken.

The Arab Legion has not only remained in Palestine, but has both before and after May 15 engaged in open aggression against Jewish settlements in the area of the Republic of Israel, as well as in the area of the Arab portion of partitioned Palestine. With British officers at its head, the Transjordan Arab Legion is at this very moment bringing death, destruction and desecration to Jerusalem and its holy places. In open defiance of the United Nations' cease-fire resolution, which was designed to safeguard the Holy City and to which the Arabs had consented, British-led Arab legionnaires are obliterating some of mankind's most sacred shrines in their murderous assault on civilization itself. The urgent appeals of Christendom's leaders have fallen on deaf ears.

The responsibility for these attacks—for the loss of life and property inflicted by the British-financed, British-trained, British-supplied and British-controlled Arab Legion—rests squarely on the Government of Great Britain. The use of a puppet's army may save the lives of British soldiers and may be exploited as a technical subterfuge, but it does not diminish Britain's culpability.

Having sought to create the impression in American public opinion that the Arab Legion is no longer under British command, and having failed in that attempt, the Foreign Office in London has now announced that it will not halt its monetary subsidy and supply of arms to Abdullah's legion unless and until the United Nations decides that the Arabs are acting illegally. This shocking statement coincided with an official inspection of the Arab Legion's positions around Jerusalem by Brigadier Glubb, a British officer officially assigned by the War Office to command the Transjordan Legion. Furthermore, the British Foreign Office has announced that Great Britain will continue to supply arms, money, and officers to the armies of other Arab states as well.

Great Britain has thus openly admitted its active participation in the war against Israel, a state created on the basis of a decision by the overwhelming majority of the United Nations General Assembly, and a state first recognized by the United States of America.

These facts should be known by all, and the inescapable conclusions therefrom acted upon. Great Britain today supports Arab aggression from Transjordan, Egypt, and Iraq with money which comes from the American Treasury; with money supplied by the taxpayers of America.

If moral principles, human decency, justice in international relations, and the expressed will of organized mankind have no effect upon the Government of Great Britain, the time has come for the United States to deny to Britain the funds to supply Arab aggressors. The United States Government cannot be expected to finance indirectly an organized onslaught on a friendly state. Nor can peace-loving American citizens—Jews and non-Jews—be expected to contribute to the British-led Arab war to annihilate Israel.

AMERICAN ZIONIST EMERGENCY COUNCIL.

John Marshall Robsion

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 17, 1948

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JOHN MARSHALL ROBSION, late a Representative from the State of Kentucky

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, our hearts are saddened each time we think of the departure of JOHN MARSHALL ROBSION, our Republican colleague from Barbourville, Ky., who served with us so long and so well, but passed away last February 17.

JOHN ROBSION was from a famous district—Kentucky's Republican Ninth—and he made it more famous in the councils of the National Legislature. A Republican from beginning to end, he numbered his friends in the thousands among both Republicans and Democrats and among the rich and the poor. He was, as all his friends agree, able to walk with kings, but could keep the common touch. His speeches here in the well of the House rang with sincerity, honesty, justice—he spoke of the simple things of life and thrilled us with his ability to penetrate to the heart of an issue in common everyday words.

John Robsion looked like a son of the American soil, as he was, and he was proud of his background and heritage. There was about him no sham, no false show, no tinkling pride. He knew that without charity, man becomes as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal. JOHN ROBSION had faith, hope, and charity in full measure and he exhibited each quality like a bright jewel for all who would come and see.

He was born and reared on a farm and attended the common schools of Knox County, Ky. He received a degree from the National Normal University of Lebanon, Ohio, and also attended the Ohio Northern University, of Ada, Ohio, and Holbrook College, at Knoxville, Tenn., and he received the degree of bachelor of laws from Centre College, Danville, Ky.

After teaching in the public schools of Kentucky and at Union College, Barbourville, Ky., he engaged in the practice of law. He was a delegate to the Republican National Conventions in 1916, 1928, 1936, 1940, and 1944. He was elected to the Sixty-sixth, Sixty-seventh, Sixty-eighth, Sixty-ninth, Seventieth, and Seventy-first Congresses, and was appointed to the United States Senate on January 9, 1930, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of the Honorable Frederic M. Sackett. After serving out his term in the Senate, JOHN ROBSION again ran for the House of Representatives. He was elected to the Seventy-fourth Congress and reelected to every subsequent Congress until his death.

A crowning achievement of his life, and one that revealed the esteem with which he was held in his own country and among his own people, was his election without opposition in 1946. He received 60,000 complimentary votes.

We who worked with, and knew, JOHN ROBSION intimately know best the deep void created by his untimely passing. He was one of the noblest representatives of them all, and people throughout the Nation today will pay tribute with us to him, as they mourned with us at news of his passing.

The United States and the World Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, as a contribution to the current debate on the fundamentals of American foreign policy and the reorganization of the United Nations, the following excerpts from the address of James P. Warburg before the American Academy of Political and Social Science on Saturday, April 3, 1948, entitled "The United States and the World Crisis" are a distinct contribution. This thoughtful and thorough analysis commands the same deep consideration, regardless of my own agreement or disagreement with the individual points or that of others, which obviously went into its preparation.

THE UNITED STATES AND THE WORLD CRISIS

Your President, ladies and gentlemen, is a wise man. I say this because it was presumably he who designated as your over-all topic "How to achieve one world." In our present state of anxiety and confusion, this is a refreshingly hopeful and, I think, accurate statement of the world's problem.

* * * * *

Make no mistake about it—there is going to be one world. There is going to be one world no matter what foreign policy we pursue. The only question is by which of three possible means our world is going to be unified. We shall shortly see either a Russian-dominated world, or an American-dominated world, or a world united under world law and governed peacefully on the federal principle.

If we pursue our present course, it seems almost inevitable that we shall sooner or later come to an armed conflict with the Soviet Union. The fact that our Government now recognizes this conflict as a possibility must be evident to anyone who has carefully followed recent events and studied the President's latest proposals.

The chances are that we should win a war with Russia. As of today our industrial capacity is infinitely greater than that of the Soviet Union—something like four times as great, according to recent estimates. Our Navy controls the seas. We have bases in Alaska, Japan, the Middle East, Britain, and Iceland from which our bombers could reach most of the Soviet Union and which would be difficult for Russia to capture from us. Russia has no corresponding bases from which to reach most of the United States. We have at least a substantial head start in atomic and bacteriological weapons. If the war comes reasonably soon, we are almost certain to win it. * * *

We are considering war as an undersirable but nevertheless possible alternative to a peaceful solution precisely because we are reasonably sure that we could win a war against Russia.

* * * * *

Let us picture the cheapest victory imaginable. Let us imagine that we could be sufficiently Machiavellian to get the war started in our own way and at a time of our own choosing. Let us assume that we could loose atomic and bacteriological destruction upon the Soviet Union without Russian retaliation upon the United States. The first thing the Russians would do would be to occupy all of Europe up to the Atlantic seaboard. There would be nothing to stop them. In the same way the Russians would occupy large parts of northern China and all of Korea. In order for us to force a Russian surrender, we should then have to pulverize not only the Russian centers of production but the cities of Europe as well—we should have to poison not only Russian crops and reservoirs but the crops and water supply of Europe and the Far East. And then let us be optimistic enough to imagine that we could force a Russian surrender without a costly invasion by our ground forces of Europe, Africa, and Asia.

What would be the result of this cheapest of all imaginable military victories? So far as western Europe is concerned—and remember, it is western Europe that we should, in the first instance, be fighting to save—it would immediately be overrun and plundered by the Red army. Next it would be reduced by us to a condition of ruin far worse than that which exists in Germany today. Its cities would be dust and rubble, its crops and water supply poisoned, its population decimated and infected with hitherto unheard-of pestilence. The same thing would be true of most of Russia and large parts of China and the Far East.

Can you picture the Western Hemisphere as an island of prosperity in such a world? Can you picture what it would mean to try to rebuild such a world? Can you imagine what it would involve to occupy and police the Soviet Union? Can you envisage what it would be like to be a member of the all-conquering American master race?

* * * * *

What, then, is the alternative?

Certainly the alternative is not to fold our hands and do nothing. Nor is the alternative a policy of appeasement. Either of these courses would mean an unthinkable acceptance of a Soviet or Communist-dominated world, or else a war of doubtful outcome fought in desperation to preserve our independence at a time of Russia's choosing.

The alternative that I see is an awakening on our part to the true nature of the present world crisis—a jettisoning of our present foreign policy—and the rapid development of a substitute which could still save western civilization from the suicide toward which it is now rushing under our leadership.

* * * * *

I submit that a partial basis for a just and honorable peace was laid down in the Atlantic Charter and reaffirmed in the United Nations Declaration of January 1942. Russia, Great Britain, and the United States signed this declaration, along with all the other na-

tions then fighting the Axis. Among other things, the signatories renounced territorial annexations and any territorial changes which did not conform to the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned. I submit that these pledges were abrogated at Tehran and Yalta, when the Western Powers purchased Russian help in the war against Japan by agreeing to Soviet annexation of territory in Europe and Asia and to the division of the world into spheres of influence. At the time, because we did not know how near Japan was to the end of its rope, this seemed necessary in order to win the war—or to save lives and win the war more quickly. Mr. Roosevelt had been told, when he went to Yalta, that an invasion of the Japanese home islands would cost over half a million American casualties.

* * * * *

Let me make myself perfectly clear. I am not in the least interested in defending against false or exaggerated charges those masters of distortion and prevarication who sit in the Kremlin. But I am concerned with the fact that we are beclouding our own judgment and reason by attributing all our troubles to the Soviet Union. I am concerned with the fact that, because we blame Moscow for everything that has gone wrong, we prevent ourselves from seeing the truth, at a time when only a clear recognition of the truth can save us from disaster.

* * * * *

Before I go on to suggest a different analysis of the world problem and a different approach to its solution, let me summarize the case against our present policy as I have stated it thus far.

1. Our present policy rests upon the belief, clearly stated by the President, that the Soviet Union alone has caused and is causing the world crisis. This belief is buttressed by four charges: (a) That Russia alone has refused to cooperate in and has actively sought to prevent the making of a just peace; (b) that Russia alone has violated agreements which, though imperfect, could have created the basis for a just peace; (c) that Russia alone has obstructed the work of the United Nations; and (d) that Soviet destruction of the independence and democratic character of the eastern European nations and Soviet intentions to carry out the same ruthless design in Western Europe are the causes of the present threat to world peace.

2. Starting from this analysis, our present policy pursues the single negative aim of stopping Russia, which we at first tried to achieve with dollars and bluff and are now preparing to accomplish, if necessary, with our own military force.

3. Our present leaders are reasonably sure that we could win a war with Russia, if the issue is not too long postponed. They, therefore, consider that war—though undesirable—is a possible last-resort alternative to a peaceful solution.

I have so far submitted two major points for your consideration:

1. That, if we fight Russia, we shall probably win; that we shall thus prevent a Russian-dominated world and ourselves achieve world domination; but that, in order to defeat Russia, we shall first have to hand western Europe over to Russian occupation and then destroy it ourselves; that even the cheapest victory imaginable in an atomic and bacteriological war would merely leave us triumphant among the ruins of Western civilization, facing an impossible task of reconstruction and the consequent ruin of our own moral character and physical well-being.

2. I have called your attention to certain facts of history which, to me at least, suggest that the basic analysis upon which our policy rests is over-simplified and in part incorrect. Without in any way justifying what the Russians have done, I have tried to show that it was not Russia alone which destroyed the basis for a just peace; that the inter-Allied agreements reached would not—even if they had been kept—have furnished the basis for a just peace; that Russia was not the only nation which violated them, nor the only nation which undermined the United Nations; that it is only partly true to say that Russia has destroyed the independence and democratic character of a whole series of nations; and finally, that neither the precise nature of the apparent Russian design upon western Europe nor its origin is clear beyond peradventure of doubt.

That is the case I have tried to make so far. I should now like to submit to you that, whatever the wrongs committed by the Soviet Union and whatever the true motivation and present purpose of Russian policy, the world crisis and the present threat to world peace are caused by four major factors, three of which have nothing whatsoever to do with the Soviet Union.

The first factor, as I see it, is that we are in a technological revolution, at least as far-reaching in its implications upon human society as the industrial revolution of the late eighteenth century. This technological revolution has shrunk a world formerly divided by oceans, mountains, and deserts into one world—one little world—in which there can be neither peace nor prosperity for any people unless there is peace and prosperity for all peoples. The technological revolution has also vastly increased the problem of feeding the world's population, because it has greatly prolonged human life, eliminated to some extent the occasional mass slaughter by pestilence, and has in general decreased the death rate far more rapidly in the world's backward areas than higher living standards have so far reduced the birth rate. Finally, the technological revolution has made war between nations into a threat of genocide.

The second great factor is that we are living in a socio-economic revolution, accelerated and sharpened by the destruction wrought by two great wars. The whole Eastern Hemisphere is suffering from shortages. Its machinery of production has been worn out or destroyed, its raw materials depleted, its populations exhausted, its managerial power-groups dispersed or dispossessed. The middle-class structure of Europe has been undermined by a series of expropriations, by the depreciation of currencies and by almost totally inhibited formation of new private capital. Similarly, the colonial and feudal structure of society in the world's backward areas, and especially the traditional structure of Asia is tottering. Colonial empires are in the process of liquidation, giving rise to new problems for both the peoples emerging into freedom and the peoples whose living standards were in the past supported by colonial exploitation. In other words, a large part of the world is in a state of fundamental and far-reaching change.

The third factor in the current crisis is that an accelerated process of elimination among the great powers has caused the world's military, political, and economic power to become concentrated in only two poles of superpower—the Soviet Union and the United States. This has destroyed the only mechanism for preserving peace which the world has ever known—the mechanism of preventing armed conflict through a precarious balance of power. In the history of the world we have had peace only so long as an ever-shifting alinement of sovereign nation-states could keep any one nation or group of nations from acquiring a preponderance of power sufficient to let it believe that it could safely resort to a trial of naked force. A balance of power is, in the long run, impossible without room for maneuver among the nation-states. There can be no room for maneuver when power is polarized in only two nation-states. There is then room only for an armament race between the two rival powers. This means that we have come to the end of the long period of international anarchy—that we have come to the end of that part of human history in which men could live within nations under law while nations lived among each other in a state of jungle anarchy.

These, as I see it, are the three primary causes of the present crisis in world affairs. None of them has anything whatever to do with the nature or intentions of the Soviet Union. We should be in a world-wide technological, social, and economic revolution if Marx and Lenin had never lived or written. We should be living in a state of no longer tolerable international anarchy if power had become concentrated in any two superpowers other than Russia and the United States.

I do not for one moment deny that there is a fourth and very important cause of the present world crisis. The Soviet Union has without doubt been cynically fishing in troubled waters. It has exploited the world-wide socio-economic revolution in order to propagate the Communist ideology. It has exploited the existence of international anarchy among the sovereign nation-states in order to gain every possible advantage for itself. The Soviet Union has obstructed the making of a just peace; the Soviet Union has pursued a ruthless course of action; the Soviet Union must not be permitted to expand its sphere of influence any further.

* * * * *

Two positive implications flow from this critical analysis of our present approach to the world crisis. Let me express them in terms of what I think should be the two broad aims of our foreign policy. As I see it, these should be:

First. To throw our great moral and economic strength behind the emerging non-Communist progressive movements throughout the world, respecting the native characteristics of those movements, irrespective of whether or not they conform to our particular prejudices and predelictions.

Second. To throw the full weight of our military and economic resources behind a United Nations which we openly declare our intention of building into a world government.

If these were our positive aims—and, if we pursued them with intelligence and determination—a large part of our present limited and negative objective would automatically be realized. We should then have drawn to our side those existing forces which can and will, if supported, stop communism and which can and will achieve one world. We should, in other words, achieve the stopping of communism as a by-produce of a positive policy.

I realize that these things cannot be accomplished overnight. In the meantime, there remains the immediate problem posed by the present aggressive attitude and action of the Soviet Union. How are we to deal with it, pending the development of a new and constructive policy?

First. We can declare ourselves. While it is true that we cannot overnight win to our side the progressive forces in the world nor make the United Nations into an effective world government, we can overnight make up our minds that this is what we want to do. The mere declaration of such a change in our outlook and policy could profoundly and dramatically affect the present somber world picture. Secretary Marshall's courageous pronouncement of last June had an almost miraculous effect upon the tired, discouraged, and frightened peoples of Europe—even though they well know that there could still be many a slip between promise and fulfillment.

Second. We can make hash of the Kremlin's two fondest hopes. In effect, these two hopes are one and the same—the hope that we shall fail to maintain our social and economical health here at home—and the hope that we shall fail to carry through, over the next few years, our avowed intention to help the rest of the world get back upon its feet. To make hash of these hopes will require not only determination but far more careful planning than we are now doing here at home, together with considerable self-discipline and sacrifice on the part of Americans in every walk of life.

Third. We can stop the armament race. We can cut into the increasingly dangerous vicious circle of preparation for war in which the Soviet Union and the United States are presently engaged. We can do this only if we bring ourselves to realize that the threat to western Europe—and via western Europe to our own security—is not primarily a military treat and cannot be met by military force—that it is essentially a moral and political threat which must be met by moral and political means.

What, then should we do about the President's latest proposals for UMT and selective service?

* * * * *

It would be irresponsible and futile to try to stop the armament race by opposing the specific measures of preparedness which our President has demanded. To do that at this moment and without bringing about a complete change of policy would merely discredit the dwindling authority of our Government and issue an open invitation to further Soviet aggression.

We can and must stop the armament race by insisting that our Government revise its basic analysis of the world crisis—that it develop and proclaim a new foreign policy and a corresponding domestic policy which will truly harness our great human and physical resources to the peaceable building of one world. Unless we can do this, we shall very shortly be spending something like $20,000,000,000 a year on our Military Establishments. We are spending over half that amount already. Surely it must be plain that, even with without a reduction of taxes, we cannot spend 40 percent of our national budget on armament and at the same time effectively help the world to recover. If we do this, we shall be on our way to becoming a garrison state. On the other hand, think what it would mean if—instead of adding $10,000,000,000 to unproductive armament—we should add half that amount to a broader and more generous recovery program, aimed at helping the progressive forces throughout the world. Think what it would mean in the way of restoring world stability if—instead of doubling our military budget—we were to double our recovery program at only half the cost to our taxpayers.

If ever there was a moment which should bring together all parties, all candidates, and all citizens in a common effort, it is this moment in our history, for at this moment we alone hold the power to turn the world from suicide toward unity and peace.

Our strength in the past has flowed from a native courage and a native wisdom of a better future. Our power of attraction has flowed from our natural affinity with all peoples everywhere seeking change for the better. Recently fear of change and a newly discovered affinity for the status quo have all but drained that reservoir of good will of which Wendell Willkie wrote before he died.

Let us halt and about face before it is too late. Let us refill the reservoir of our strength at its ancient sources. Let us recapture courage and common sense and the vision of a future fit for man.

Charles Laceille Gifford

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 17, 1948

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. CHARLES LACEILLE GIFFORD, late a Representative from the State of Massachusetts

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there comes a strange tug of emotion and deep sorrow to my heart when memory turns back to the experiences I had with CHARLES L. GIFFORD, my friend and colleague from Massachusetts, who passed from this temporal body on last August 23, after a long and distinguished career.

Those of us who knew CHARLIE GIFFORD intimately loved him best. There was, there is, no finer man who ever walked across the threshold of the Congress of the United States, or cast a vote for the principles for which he and all true Americans stand.

CHARLIE GIFFORD was a Republican, but he was not a bitter partisan, and he had as many friends on the Democratic side of the aisle that divides us as he had on the Republican side. All who knew him, when they learned of his death, rose up to call him blessed.

I was particularly fortunate, I believe, to have been thrown closely to him all the days of his adult life. A Representative of the Ninth Massachusetts District, he came from Cotuit, Barnstable County, Mass., where he was educated in the public schools and taught school and became a businessman. He was elected to the Massachusetts House of Representatives in 1912, serving until he was elected to the Massachusetts State Senate in 1914. He remained there until 1919. I knew him at that time, for I was fortunate also to be serving in those two bodies in the same period in which he served our Commonwealth so well.

Charlie was elected to the Sixty-seventh Congress in 1921 and was reelected to every succeeding Congress.

Always, and I can say it with the greatest sincerity, he was kindly, thoughtful, helpful. He has been and will be sorely missed by every Member of the Massachusetts delegation and by the tens of thousands of friends and acquaintances whom he knew and served so long in Congress.

When we think of CHARLIE GIFFORD today, in memory of the years we worked and laughed and lived with him here, we remember again that:

Death is only a quiet door,
Set in a garden wall;
On gentle hinges it gives, at dusk
When the thrushes call.

Along the lintel are green leaves,
Beyond the light lies still;
Very willing and weary feet
Go over that sill.

There is nothing to trouble any heart,
Nothing to hurt at all
Death is only a quiet door,
In an old garden wall.

Great Britain Is the Arch-Conspirator Against the World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have referred before to the unregistered propaganda activities of one Benjamin Freedman, of New York, who is one of the spiders in a vast international network of Arabian intrigue and propaganda.

Mr. Freedman has been an unwilling witness under cross-examination in a New York magistrate's court for over 3 weeks, and his testimony is more and more exposing the shabby role played by Great Britain against her wartime ally, the United States.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT REOPENS INVESTIGATION

I am happy to be able to say that the Department of Justice has shown great interest in the testimony given by Freedman. During previous investigations Freedman denied any act of his requiring registration the McCormack-Voorhis foreign agents laws; now under oath, in open court, he is admitting to activities and to expenditures and to commissions which clearly bring him under the provisions of those acts.

I do not want to make any prophecies; but I feel sure that before he is dismissed from the stand that the disclosures made will cause red faces at the minimum, in the British Foreign Office, in our Department of State, and in other exalted quarters, such as this House, and the Washington office of the Arabian American Oil Co.; and at its worst it may prove a major incident in the cold war of the British against the United States.

Under leave, I am inserting two statements. One is a column by the widely known journalist, Edgar Ansel Mower, as originally published in the New York Post; the other is a copy of a telegram sent to the President by Herman Hoffman and James H. Sheldon of the Anti-Nazi League of New York.

When the full Freedman story is told it will be seen that both plots dovetail, and that both are products of the scheming British imperialists—one in the Arabian Peninsula, one in the United States.

BRITISH AIM TO RULE MIDDLE EAST THRU PUPPET KING ABDULLAH

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Here is the real explanation of Britain's current plot against Palestine, the reasons for which have mystified the entire world. I cannot disclose the identity of my informant—but here are the facts.

The world has not been able to understand Britain's secret motives in disarming the Jews while arming the Transjordania Arabs; the motives for permitting British officers to accompany the Transjordanian invaders while Britain was sabotaging the United States eleventh hour plan for a trusteeship over the holy places. Why, people ask, should his majesty's government stoop to a final offensive against its Jewish wards just when

Britain was withdrawing from Palestine altogether?

Here are the answers:

Britain does not expect to stay out of Palestine, at least not out of all Palestine. Britain expects to stay out of the state of Israel. But Britain is very much in Transjordania—and expects to remain there.

Transjordania can, however, serve Britain adequately only if it can be enlarged in a certain way. The frontiers of partition drawn by the UN Commission do not satisfy Britain's ambitions for King Abdullah.

These frontiers leave to the Palestinian Arabs northwest Galilee along the Lebanon border—which British plans do not require Abdullah to possess. Yet to permit northwest Galilee to go to the state of Lebanon would alarm unduly the Christian half of the Lebanese. Therefore, the Jews can be permitted to acquire northwestern Galilee.

In exchange, Abdullah must obtain most of the Negeb, that wedge-like portion of Palestine that extends from the Mediterranean down to the Red Sea. This would make Transjordania the only country in the Middle East except Egypt that fronts on both the Mediterranean and the Red Seas. A railway line connecting a Mediterranean port, perhaps Gaza or a place farther west, with Aqaba on the Red Sea, would parallel the Suez Canal. Thereby Britain, forced out of Egypt, could both defend and control the Suez Canal from the eastern side.

For this reason the Jews must be forced to yield the coveted portion of the Negeb which the UN commisison bestowed upon them. This they would never do voluntarily. Therefore it must be captured by Abdullah's British-armed and British-officered Arab Legion. At this point the Jews could, the British believe, be compelled to give up the Negeb in exchange for western Galilee.

But this is not all of Britain's plans. Abdullah's present kingdom is, with the exception of a narrow strip along the river Jordan, a desert waste. Its capital, Amman, is a Bedouin village. The British are planning to let him (Abdullah) take over a new and splendid capital, namely, Jerusalem itself.

If Abdullah can seize the Holy City, take over the Arab areas of central Palestine, add the Negeb, link up a port on the Mediterranean with Aqaba on the Red Sea, then his country will be one of the most important in the entire area. Arab Transjordania and not Jewish Israel will become the radiating center of occidental influence in the Middle East.

Occidental influence would mean British influence.

This joint British-Arab dream can be brought about only subject to three conditions:

1. There must be no trusteeship that will let American and French forces back into the area. More important, there must be no international trusteeship over the holy places, for otherwise Abdullah could not make Jerusalem into his capital city.

2. Abdullah's armies must be strong enough to wrest Jerusalem from the Jewish Haganah. This they can best accomplish under British leadership. Therefore the British commander and the British officers must remain with the Arab Legion unless and until the United Nations makes this impossible.

Finally, Haganah must be defeated quickly or it cannot be defeated at all. Once ports of Israel are open to the free influx of Jewish volunteers and Jewish war matériel, Haganah will quickly become unbeatable. Therefore Abdullah must take what he covets now—or never.

To make sure that Abdullah would take all the quick tricks, his troops were brought into Palestine in advance—by the British. The Palestinian Arabs who might help him were armed in advance—by the British. And the Jews who are now opposing him were disarmed in advance—by the British.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington D. C.:

The integrity and prestige of our Government is directly involved in the abject failure of the United Nations to follow the recommendation of our delegate, Senator Austin, that sanctions be imposed against the Arabian Government if they refuse to stop their willful invasion of the Holy Land. Since England can, under existing treaties, control the movement of the principal Arabian army involved, that of Transjordan, and since England and China have been large beneficiaries of our Government to the extent of billions of our funds, we earnestly urge that America impose her own sanctions by stopping further allotments from our European-aid funds to England, China, and any other of the United Nations which refuse to heed the call of humanity and justice. This presents a great opportunity for our country to take the first decisive step to stop the needless slaughter of a people and put an end to military aggression against the new state which you have so justly and signally recognized. We also respectfully suggest that you act at once on the request to compel the resignation of Loy W. Henderson, particularly in view of sworn testimony concerning his relationships with pro-Arab agents and propagandists as elicited during the past 10 days in New York City Magistrate's Court, and in view of his refusal to explain or justify these connections or to accept an invitation to attend a hearing for that purpose.

NON-SECTARIAN ANTI-NAZI LEAGUE,
HERMAN HOFFMAN,
Chairman, Board of Directors.
JAMES H. SHELDON,
Administrative Chairman.

ATTORNEY GENERAL CALLS CITIZENSHIP UNITED STATES PEERAGE

It is well to bear in mind, as we consider these British conspiracies, and the outrage to American citizenship in the seizure of American citizens by Lebanon, what the Attorney General, the Honorable Tom C. Clark, said just the other day about American citizenship, and I am going to quite just a few paragraphs from his Citizenship Day speech of May 18.

It is with genuine pleasure that I have the opportunity to participate in the Third National Conference on Citizenship. I shall always cherish the privilege of being present at the birth of this conference in Philadelphia 2 years ago, and of being invited again 1 year later to join you in the second anniversary in Boston.

I wish every American could have been here and witnessed the inspiring massing of the colors by these beautiful young women. It brings forcibly home to us the significance of this meeting. As President Truman so aptly said in his greetings to the delegates at the opening session yesterday—This is "a conference so timely and so important." And what could be more important than an assembly of Americans dedicated to the building of a better America and a better world.

The Apostle Paul, on the occasion of his arrest during a riot in Jerusalem, drew the attention of his captors when he proudly exclaimed: "I am a man—of Tarsus—a citizen of no mean city and demand to be heard."

Two thousand years later, in this year of 1948, a friend traveling abroad was standing in line for customs inspection. He heard the inspector in clipped tone ask the man ahead; "Subject of what country?"

The man to whom the question was addressed exclaimed, "Subject of no country. I am a citizen of the United States!"

Many of us, however, have been in the habit of taking our citizenship too much for granted, especially in peacetime. We seem to overlook the fact that United States citizenship is the most precious asset in the world. I wish that you could know of the infinite pains that we in the Department take to protect the rights of the individual. Attorneys spend days sometimes to make certain that individual freedom is preserved Of course this work does not make the headlines—because the person involved is more often little known. But to us there is no common man—citizenship is the peerage in these United States.

I can conceive no greater joy than being an American citizen, but I can also conceive no greater duty. Especially is the latter brought home to us in these anxious times when an aching world is struggling to find a cure for its baffling ills.

Through the ages, the spirit of man has yearned for individual liberty; but ours was the first nation in the history of mankind to build a way of life on equality, opportunity, justice and freedom of spirit.

Yes, it is immeasurably more. Our heritage includes the things that mankind has longed and searched for since the dawn of time. Here we may travel freely, speak our thoughts, worship in our faiths, select our vocations, start our business, choose our friends, own our homes, and live undisturbed under the law. The employee of today may become the employer of tomorrow. Ours is truly the land of equal justice and opportunity for all, and ours is the responsibility to see that no iron curtain shall shut out justice and opportunity.

Raymond Smiley Springer

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 17, 1948

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. RAYMOND SMILEY SPRINGER, late a Representative from the State of Illinois

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, our hearts are saddened again as we think once more of the death of RAYMOND SMILEY SPRINGER—"RAY" SPRINGER to those of us who knew him intimately. He passed away on August 28, 1947, after having served in Congress since his election on November 8, 1938.

RAY SPRINGER was noted for his party fealty and his sterling Americanism. Deeply versed in the history and literature of his native Indiana, he was as much at home in conversation with a trained economist as he was with one of the plain dirt farmers of his Indiana district.

People throughout Indiana and throughout the Nation mourned with us at news of his death and they will pay tribute with us today as we recall the life and experience of this fine legislator.

RAY SPRINGER, who came to Congress from Connersville, Ind., was born near Dunreith in Rush County, Ind., April 26, 1882. He graduated from grade and high schools there, attended Butler University, in Indianapolis, and graduated from the Indiana Law School at Indianapolis, with an LL. B. degree, in 1904. He served as judge of the Thirty-seventh judicial circuit of Indiana from 1916 through 1922.

He was a captain of Infantry in World War I, and remained a lieutenant colonel of the Infantry in the Officers' Reserve Corps until the time of his passing. He served as first State commander of the American Legion in Indiana in 1919 and 1920, and as national executive committeeman from Indiana for the American Legion, 1929 through 1931.

When the Republican Party was at a low ebb in Indiana, RAY SPRINGER sacrificed his time, his money, and his energy to helping rebuild it into a winning team. He was himself candidate for Governor on the Republican ticket in Indiana in 1932 and in 1936.

RAY SPRINGER was a thirty-second degree Mason, a member of the Elks, Eagles, and Knights of Pythias lodges. A member of the Forty-and-Eight, he was active in veterans circles until he died.

When we think of RAY SPRINGER and his patriotism, his selfless service to God and the country that nurtured him, we think of the words inscribed on the monument to Benjamin Hill, in Atlanta, Ga.:

He who saves his country saves all things,
And all things saved will bless him.
He who lets his country die, lets all things die,
And all things dying curse him.

Certainly, we can say on the basis of his life and works RAY SPRINGER is blessed by everyone and by all things He helped to save his country by service in war and in peace.

New York Young Republican Supports Reciprocal Trade Agreements Renewal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution adopted by the board of governors of the New York Young Republican Club at their meeting on May 11, 1948, represents their recognition of the economic position of the United States in the world and of the fact that the keystone of our foreign policy is our own economic policy. The place of the reciprocal trade agreements program in the hopes of the whole democratic world for economic recovery and for resistance to the tide of communism, or any other kind of totalitarianism, underlies the need for this program:

Whereas an expanding flow of world trade is essential for the maintenance of America's high standard of living and for the continuance of our present prosperity; and

Whereas the goods and services needed by war-ravaged Europe and Asia for reconstruction cannot be supplied indefinitely by America on a loan or gift basis without America receiving goods and services in return; and

Whereas the success of the European recovery program hinges upon the ability of the 16 cooperating European countries to trade among themselves and with the rest of the world; and

Whereas the Economic Cooperation Act specifically provides that the participating countries are required to conclude agreements to reduce barriers to trade; and

Whereas since its inception 14 years ago the reciprocal trade-agreements program has been the cornerstone of America's international economic policy, proving in practice its underlying principle of multilateral nondiscriminatory trade between nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of governors of the New York Young Republican Club recommends the immediate passage of legislation extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in its present form until June 12, 1951.

Patrick Henry Drewry

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 17, 1948

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. PATRICK HENRY DREWRY, late a Representative from the State of Virginia

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we are fortunate, in this life, for the friends we make and the influences that play upon us because of those men. One of the friends I am privileged to have made and one of the influences that has helped me much is due to the life of PATRICK HENRY DREWRY, a Democrat, of Petersburg, Va., who passed from this life on December 21, 1947, only a few days before the celebration of Christmas.

PAT DREWRY had served in this body from 1920 until the day of his death without interruption. He was here when I first came to Congress and I grew to know and to love him through the many years of our service together. My heart warms when I think again of his fine bearing, his friendly smile, his words of deep meaning uttered here on the floor of the House of Representatives. We who served with him were fortunate indeed to have had this influence in our lives, to have been able to list him among our friendships. It was my privilege to have been a guest in his Virginia home and to have enjoyed the warm hospitality of him and his wife.

PAT DREWRY was from deep in the heart of Virginia. Through his veins flowed the blood of the old South, with all its grand traditions and its emphasis on the finer things of life. He was a Democrat, but never a bitter partisan and he numbered his friends in the thousands, among Democrats, Republicans, and Independents.

Like many of us, PAT DREWRY had served in the State legislature before coming rewarded by his people with a higher service. He was a member of the Virginia State Senate from 1912 to 1920. Now, his Master has called him to a still higher service, and while we who knew him truly wish that this call could have been delayed, it is too late to do other than to wish for his loved ones a respite from their grief and for him Godspeed in his new post of responsibility.

TVA New Johnsonville Steam Plant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEWART
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 25 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I made this morning before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations on the TVA new Johnsonville steam plant.

There being no objection, the statemen was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am disappointed because of the failure of the House to provide an appropriation for the steam generating plant proposed to be constructed by the TVA at New Johnsonville, Tenn.

I do not want to be guilty of repetition, but I would like to, as forcefully as possible, emphasize the importance, and indeed the absolute need for the construction of this steam plant.

I am advised that New Johnsonville was selected by TVA as the site for the construction of this large steam plant because it is near the center of the so-called load growth in west Tennessee. They have urged the need for this plant to supply firm power for TVA's constantly growing electrical system, so that all customers, domestic and industrial, may be assured uninterrupted service, especially in the event of severe dry weather conditions.

There has also been a large increase in the use of electricity due to the rural electrification extensions which are now being built all over Tennessee into the rural or farm areas.

I would like to point out that this location at New Johnsonville is on the lake created by the Kentucky Dam on the Tennessee River, a few miles from its mouth, and that it is near the Kentucky coal fields from which coal may easily be procured, and which can be made available by both rail and water transportation. In addition to this, New Johnsonville is near to the natural gas lines of the Tennessee Natural Gas Co.

I would like to call to the attention of the committee the fact that I believe this plant is necessary as a national defense measure. The security and safety of the Nation would be highly increased by its construction. It is a fact, I am advised, that during the recent war, TVA current was used in the manufacture of at least 50 percent of the aluminum which went into the manufacture of combat airplanes during the crucial hours. Thence, with the passage of the recent 70-unit Air Force bill, it seems to me that the importance of this steam plant looms larger than ever.

Certainly world conditions are unstable and certainly airplanes will figure a most important part in the future safety of our country. It was in the Tennessee Valley also that much war activity of all kinds was seen, and the use of TVA power was tremendous. In the valley are located the Alcoa aluminum plant near Maryville, and the Reynolds metals plant in north Alabama.

TVA has a responsibility in connection with the dams that have been built along the river, quite aside from developments of electrical energy. First, they must respect navigation on the river and keep sufficient water in the channels to insure the movement of traffic, and second, they must maintain the lakes behind the dams at such a

level as will give full protection in the case of heavy rains or floods. Therefore, in the case of extreme dry weather, the manufacture of a firm, steady and adequate supply of electricity is always a problem and the erection of steam plants is about the only answer.

I would like also to impress upon the committee an important fact, and that is that TVA is a reality whether it is looked upon favorably or not. By the construction of TVA, the Government has withdrawn all of the Tennessee Valley from the competitive field of private industry insofar as the wholesale production of electricity is concerned. The entire Tennessee Valley is wholly dependent upon TVA for electrical power. For obvious reasons private competition could not possibly be persuaded to invest in the construction of an electrical plant in competition with TVA. Therefore, the construction of this steam plant would not involve the principle or issue of private enterprise versus Government operation.

The valley having been committed by the policy of the Government to the production of public power or electricity, it, therefore, is the definite obligation of the Government to make the system adequate and efficient, and the responsibility on the part of the Government to make this appropriation cannot, in good faith, be overlooked. We have no other way to make available the power needs for that area and for the whole valley, and it seems to me that this argument alone should be most effective. It makes no difference whether TVA is liked or disliked; I repeat it is a reality and that there is no other way for the people of the valley to procure electricity, and the construction of this plant will not compete in any way with private enterprise.

In addition to this, the entire TVA system, in which the Government has invested many millions of dollars, will be paid for by revenue produced by the system. The Government will be repaid by a withdrawal of earnings from TVA, and the Government will continue to own the TVA system even after the original amount of the investment is returned. All of that, as I understand it, was provided by the plan set up last year.

I urge the construction of this plant.

Persecution of Religious Orders—Article From the Washington Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 25 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, another horrible example of the inhuman attitude of Soviet-dominated dictators is afforded in a press dispatch published in the Washington Post today, Tuesday, May 25.

It recites the series of murders, imprisonment, and expulsion in Albania during the recent persecution of religious orders in that land.

Because it affords a clear understanding of the kind of life which can be looked for under the Communist regime, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks the article in question.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of May 25, 1948]

PRIESTHOOD DECIMATED IN ALBANIA

VATICAN CITY, May 24.—All but one of the Catholic hierarchy in Albania have been jailed or killed, Vatican sources said today.

The exception is the Bishop of Pulati, 71-year-old Msgr. Bernard Shlaku, who is in the mountains.

Vatican sources said the country's clergy, both regular and secular, also has been decimated. These sources said:

Of the 70 secular priests in all Albania, at least 12 have been slain and others are in jail.

Of 54 Jesuits, 17 priests and 14 lay brothers of Italian nationality have been expelled.

Italian nuns have been expelled and practically all religious institutes and orders have been suppressed.

All Catholic schools are closed, Catholic action forbidden, and Catholic printshops confiscated.

Health and Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 25 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a very excellent editorial on the relation between a healthier nation and the preservation of free enterprise. This editorial appeared in the May 20 issue of The Machinist, an intelligently written and most effective organ of one of the country's most outstanding labor organizations.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILL A HEALTHIER NATION WEAKEN OUR FREE ENTERPRISE?

Maybe this comes under the head of looking a gift horse in the mouth, but we think the new look being worn by the medical associations ought to be examined with caution and care.

Up to now some medical associations have gone to the lengths of blackballing any doctor who went to work for a medical cooperative. In 20 States the medical associations have lobbied through laws that prohibit union and cooperative health plans to provide medical care. All this with the aid and comfort of the Journal of the American Medical Association.

Now, spokesmen for the medical associations who attended the National Health Assembly in Washington say they are dropping their opposition to health-insurance plans, but they are still opposed to the bill for universal health insurance (S. 1320).

The doctors' organizations are for prepaid health-insurance plans, but they are against the bill that would start the plan working. That, they say, would be socialism.

That but has been the pay-off word for the bitterest opponents of social progress for the last 16 years. Conservatives are always in favor of progress in principle but never in practice.

As for socialism, that's the same cry that was raised against social security, the Wagner Act, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and every other piece of social legislation. Any plan that would help a majority of the people is socialism until it is adopted. After that the free-enterprise system always seems stronger than ever.

We look at it this way:

When a man's house is in flames the city fire department is able to put out the fire without jeopardizing our free-enterprise system. So it could be with disease. There is no reason to suppose that a healthier nation will weaken free enterprise.

Certainly, next to unemployment, there is nothing a workingman fears more than the doctor bills that follow sickness in the family. The universal health-insurance bill would help take care of those doctor bills for all of us.

Working people want this bill enacted at this session of Congress, the medical associations notwithstanding.

Achievements of the Democratic Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following keynote address delivered to the North Carolina State Democratic Convention at Raleigh, N. C., on May 20, 1948, by Col. William T. Joyner:

Mr. Chairman, Governor Cherry, distinguished guests and fellow Democrats:

I approach my task today with an overwhelming feeling of humility. You to whom I speak have left your pressing and important personal affairs and have traveled long distances from all of the regions of this great State in order that you might make your personal contribution to good government, in order that you might express your faith in the principles which have made the Democratic Party the great champion of the average man, in order that you might renew your allegiance to the party which you have so ably aided, in order that you might go back to the people in your communities with a refreshed spirit of allegiance and enthusiasm. By coming here today you have given the strongest evidence of your fine spirit. It is you, and men and women such as you, who have made the Democratic Party what it is. In your hands is the destiny of the Democratic Party. There is nothing which I can add to your knowledge. There is nothing which I can add to your stature. Two things I may do. I pay tribute to your patriotism, to your unselfishness, and to your contribution to good government. Possibly I can put into words some of the things which you have expressed by your lives.

As time marches on, men are becoming more and more concerned with government. As maturity and an added measure of wisdom have come to our Nation, there has emerged the national conviction that man is the most important thing in this world and that government, next to religion, is the greatest concern of men.

The citizens of the United States are deeply interested in government. The new voter is giving serious and troubled thought to the important problems of government. He is seeking to find which political party has in it those elements which will best promote the welfare of North Carolina, of the United States, and of the world. He is, I firmly believe, willing and anxious to look at history to determine which party to follow today.

I firmly believe that the Democratic Party in North Carolina and in the Nation has in it those elements which will best promote

good government and human welfare. I will tell you why I so believe.

From the findings of scientists and from the records of history four conclusions are as clear as crystal:

1. Man is the supreme creature of the earth, the supreme handiwork of the Creator.

2. Character is the most important, the most divine element in man.

3. The advancement of man is the one great objective of life, and the greatest objective of government.

4. That government is best which has the greatest regard for the average man, which is the closest to the average man, and which leaves to the average man the greatest possible freedom of choice as to his conduct.

In these United States, government has most nearly achieved the objectives which I have just stated, namely, the promotion of the advancement of the average man, the achievement of the greatest freedom for the average man.

There are two great political parties in the United States—the Democratic Party and the Republican Party. Both have long and accurately recorded histories. Which party has been and is now most sincerely committed to the advancement of the average man and to the preservation of the greatest measure of his freedom? I think that the answer must be the Democratic Party.

Its record is written in the advance of the individual to a place of greater achievement and freedom than that obtained by the citizens of any other nation in the world.

The Democratic Party has been the champion of liberty, freedom, and fair play, which the average man has enjoyed. It has developed most of the great men who have championed the cause of liberty in every great crisis through which our country has passed—Jefferson, Jackson, Wilson, Roosevelt. What party and what country, from the beginning of recorded history until now, has furnished a series of great leaders who have done so much for the great mass of common men as have these illustrious leaders of the Democratic Party.

The Democratic Party has always placed the rights and freedom of the average man above the material prosperity of a few. The guiding principle of the Democratic Party has always been that the freedom and prosperity of the individual on the bottom of the heap of humanity shall be put foremost, that growth must start at the bottom.

It is my deep and firm personal conviction that the welfare of the great mass of the people of this State and of this Nation, the safety and the progress of the Democratic form of government, and the advancement of man as such will best be promoted by the continuation in power of the great Democratic Party in North Carolina and in the United States.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY RECORD

You, who have worked so faithfully and so well in the Democratic Party, know best what has been its splendid record and you know best what have been the fine attributes of its leaders.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY IN THE NATION

We can well take pride in the national record of that party. Its Presidents have exemplified its qualities. From Jefferson through Truman Democratic Presidents all have been men of outstanding honesty and integrity and devotion to the common man. True it is, that all of them have made some mistakes. Until perfection in man is reached, possibly millions of years from now, every man must make some mistakes if he is to accomplish anything. Some of those Democratic Presidents have been touched with the fire of genius, as were Jefferson and Jackson and Wilson and Roosevelt. Some of them have had to tread the lower paths of the average man, which you and I must walk. But all of them have been honest, sincere men who have been guided by the fundamental principle of putting man above money and freedom above the concentration of power. And all of them have been men who have drawn their strength and their power and their force as leaders from the great mass of the Democrats in the United States devoted to Democratic principles and with a love for the Democratic Party organization.

Since the Democratic Party returned to national power in 1932 its accomplishments have been unequaled in our country's annals. Time does not permit a detailed recounting of them. I merely mention three of the many fine accomplishments.

1. The tremendous advance in the welfare of the average man, accomplished by its program for social security.

2. The greatest strides in history in the improvement of the economic condition of the farmers, resulting in large part from its agricultural program. Here I remind you that in the depression years the Democratic agricultural program saved our farmers from economic destuction.

3. The inspired leadership, now happily followed by the people of both great parties, towards world organization, world peace, and world advancement of democracy and freedom.

Of course some mistakes have been made in the advancement of all of those objectives All great movements must have in them something of trial and error. But, for the 16 years of Democratic national administration, the movement of the mass of our people has been steadily forward and upward and always characterized by the emphasis upon the welfare of all of the people. And now, today, the National Democratic administration continues to move forward. Such vital matters as social security, agriculture, world organization, and world peace are moving under Democratic leadership.

CIVIL-RIGHTS ISSUE

I cannot leave the subject of the National Democratic Party without referring to an issue, about which we have recently read so much, the so-called civil-rights issue.

That issue is whether relationships between the people of the white race and the people of the Negro race can best be left to slow, orderly, natural, friendly, and flexible adjustments under the laws of the States in which the constant and frequent contacts occur, or whether they can be adjusted best by national laws enacted for all of the States by the United States Congress.

That issue is fanned, I think, by the impatience of ideologists, by the intolerance of extremists and by the fears of some political leaders with an eye to pressure-group votes in very close States.

Let us approach it, if we can, unemotionally, and first look at some facts.

Under our Federal Constitution the vote of a State for President is cast by State electors. Since the early days of our Nation the full electoral vote of each State has been cast as a unit. A majority of the votes cast in a State, no matter how small that majority may be, controls the full electoral vote of that State. This is how it works. In 1940 in North Carolina there was a Democratic majority of 395,352 votes, approximately 400,000. That majority controlled North Carolina's 14 electoral votes for President.

In 1940 in Michigan a bare majority of 6,926 votes controlled Michigan's 19 electoral votes.

In 1940 the 120 electoral votes of five close States, Michigan, Wisconsin, Indiana, Illinois, and New York were controlled by an aggregate majority of only 285,078. This was approximately 115,000 votes less than the North Carolina majority of 400,000 which controlled only 14 electoral votes.

So the pressure on political parties to appeal to a floating fringe vote and to minority pressure groups in close States is tremendous.

May I here suggest to those of you with greater political experience and wisdom than I posses, that it might be well to support strongly a proposed constitutional amendment designed to minimize the menace of minority pressure groups in our national politics by requiring that the electoral vote of each State for President reflect the percentage of the popular vote cast in that State.

I resume my recounting of facts.

On June 26, 1944, the National Republican Party adopted its platform. Its defeat in 1940 and the small majorities in close States were fresh in its memory. It saw fit to adopt a so-called civil rights plank. Incredible as it may sound, on the 26th day of June 1944, 20 days after the heroic invasion of France and while our young men were fighting and dying for their and our existence in the far places of the earth, the very first statement in that Republican plank proposed interference with the placement of men in battle. It proposed investigation and elimination of alleged racial segregation in the armed forces.

Thereafter followed specific planks pledging Federal laws governing the hiring and firing of employees, the enforcement of criminal laws and the determination of the qualifications of voters.

In July, 1944, the month following the Republican National Convention, the Democrat Party met in national convention. It adopted a milder and less specific civil rights plank. It said that Congress should exert its full constitutional powers in protecting civil rights.

Obviously there is and there will continue to be wide-spread differences of opinion among reasonable and honest men as to how to achieve the best racial adjustments.

In North Carolina I think that the great majority of clear and unemotional thought of the people of both races is to the effect that racial adjustments can best be left to the States and to the communities in which the racial contacts occur. Our thought in North Carolina is based upon our experience in North Carolina.

In the past 80 years the Negro in North Carolina has made marvelous progress. I venture to say that since 1870 the Negro in North Carolina has made more progress in intellect, in character and in economy than has ever been made in 80 years by any race in all of the history of mankind. He has not made that progress alone. He has received aid at home. The Negro has received increasing sympathy, understanding and help from the white man in North Carolina.

As illustrative of the white men's attitude in this State, I go back to that illustrous leader Charles Brantley Aycock. He insisted upon educational opportunity for the Negro—opportunity which the Negro could not possibly pay for—education which was a heavy financial burden on the white taxpayer—a burden borne by him understandingly and uncomplainingly. Aycock said, and I quote from one of his great speeches delivered in the year 1903:

"As a white man I am afraid of but one thing for my race and that is that we shall become afraid to give the Negro a fair chance * * * My own opinion is, that so far we have done well, and that the future holds no menace for us if we do the duty which lies next to us, training, developing the coming generation so that the problems which seem difficult to us shall be easy to them."

No finer long-time objective for North Carolina's treatment of the Negro race could be stated. Since 1903, as you and I know from personal observation, North Carolina Democrats have followed that advice and have lived up to that admonition. North Carolina has made an honest and sincere and continuous effort to improve the relationship between the white and Negro races and to give to the Negro race the opportunity to develop and improve its condition.

Among other things, we have abolished the poll-tax requirement as a qualification for voting. So-called lynch law has been reduced to the point of practical disappearance. The State deals with absolute equality in its educational expenditures in the public schools—actually spending in its elementary schools more dollars for each Negro child than for each white child, paying Negro teachers on precisely the same basis as white teachers, and, incidentally, employing more Negro teachers than are employed in all of the combined States north of the Mason-Dixon line.

I do not say that the goal has been reached, that perfect adjustment has been achieved yet. But there is every reason to believe that North Carolina will continue to improve the quality of the relationship between the races in this State and improve the condition of the Negro race in this State, if the flames of emotional resentment are not fanned by Federal compulsion.

To support that prophesy, I invite any impartial factual study of what is occurring today in my own home community, in Raleigh, the capital of this State, in assistance to the Negro race in education, in welfare work and in the administration of justice.

Racial issues are not political issues at all. The handling of racial problems and the improvement of relationships between white men and Negro men and the advancement of the Negro race can best be handled in the several States, in the communities in which the constant contacts occur and in which the problems arise.

I believe that those are the serious convictions of most of the clear-thinking men of both races in North Carolina.

But again I say that men in the Democratic Party, particularly men not close to the actual working of racial adjustments, differ in their conclusions about these matters. Then the proper way, the democratic way, to determine those differences is by debate and action within the Democratic Party.

There has been talk in other States of revolt against the national Democratic Party. I can think of nothing so ineffective. I cannot think, I do not think, that any revolt is threatened in North Carolia.

A so-called revolt, the refraining from voting the national Democratic ticket in 1948 because of the civil-rights issue within the party, could only result in aid to the national Republican ticket. The Republican Party has gone much, much further in its advocacy of Federal interference in racial adjustments than has the Democratic Party.

Before any Democrat even thinks about going fishing on election day, let him look at the Republican record. Let him look at the Republican 1944 platform. Let him see what the Republicans say in their 1948 platform. Let him note that in 1944 at the height of the great war the Republicans threatened to disturb the placement of soldiers, whereas, under the present Democratic administration the military and naval men are given a free hand today in putting soldiers where they can serve best, where they can, in the opinion of the military experts, secure the most effective results with the least loss of life.

Possibly I have devoted more time to this issue than it deserves. To sum up all that I have said, this issue can be solved best at home, but the differences of opinion about that in the national Democratic Party are matters for solution within the ranks of the national Democratic Party.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY IN NORTH CAROLINA

Now let us look at the Democratic Party record in North Carolina.

We can be very proud of that record. It merits and demands the continuous support of our people.

What State in the Union has equaled or paralleled the growth, development, and progress of our State for the benefit of the average man since it has been under Democratic management. From Aycock to Cherry the march of progress has gradually gathered speed until today it is in high gear and is going forward at such a rapid pace as to outstrip all of the Southern States in almost every category of progress.

If you suggest public schools? I would recite the record which shows $100,000 spent in 1900, and $65,000,000 in 1948, with more to come by way of increased salaries in the near future. I can point with pride to the greatly increased opportunity which places a high school within the reach of every child in North Carolina. I must tell you that more than 5,000 school busses transporting 350,000 children per day for a total of 37,000,000 miles per year make the most outstanding record of transportation in the world. Although the teachers need some increase in salary, which in due season will be had, yet I think it only fair to say that these salaries have been increased 62 percent during Governor Cherry's administration. I should also mention that the public schools are now receiving more money per year than was the whole general-fund budget the year before Governor Cherry came into office.

If you mention roads—then under Democratic administration you have a record beginning with only dirt roads in 1900. Since that time under democratic administration, we have constructed more than 12,000 miles of hard-surfaced roads, and have improved 48,000 miles of secondary roads. During the past 3 years, we have launched on a program of secondary-road improvement, which, when completed will give us an additional 30,000 miles of all-weather roads. The Democratic Party is anxious to provide good roads for all its citizens. Since two-thirds of our people live in the rural areas, it is our duty to make all-weather roads accessible to the farmer, the school bus, the churchgoer, the mail carrier, and the doctor. Such a program is now under way and will be pursued with vigor until completion.

If you inquire about health, then I would advise that there is no safer place in which to be born or in which to live in the whole Southland than North Carolina. Life expectancy has been greatly increased and the death rate has been cut in half. The fevers which were formerly a scourge of great segments of our population are scarcely heard of today. Preschool care for children is doing much to give to each child an equal opportunity to see clearly, to hear well, and to understand fully the assignments of the classroom. And during the present administration the legislatures of 1945 and 1947 authorized a further step in State-wide medical care, and appropriated several millions dollars to assist in building hospitals in needed areas.

If you inquire about finances—North Carolina during recent years has arranged to pay off its general fund debt. No further taxes will have to be levied or collected for that purpose. And thanks to the members of the general assemblies of 1945 and 1947, who followed the very sound advice of Governor Cherry, provision was made for the building needs of the various institutions of the State in the sum of $50,000,000. No money will have to be borrowed, or interest paid, because of the building needs of the State institutions, for many years to come.

Furthermore, we have a reserve fund for $30,000,000 in the general fund which will insure State employees and school teachers in the event of a business decline in the country against a sharp and sudden curtailment of salaries.

North Carolina has pioneered in the establishing of an integrated and centralized department of revenue. Its tax policy has been administered in a modern, efficient, and economic way. The cost of collecting all taxes last year amounted to less than two-thirds of 1 percent. But what is more important, much more important, the difficult job of collecting taxes has been carried on in North Carolina in a fair and equitable manner with a view to even-handed justice to taxpayers.

Has there ever been a time when our fiscal affairs were in better condition, or when we were in better position to look with confidence toward additional progress in the public service to our people?

CONCLUSION

In conclusion I ask that you look at men. I ask that you review in your minds the 12 Democratic leaders whom the party since 1900 has honored by elevation to the highest Democratic position in this State—to the office of Governor. Those individuals, from Aycock to Cherry, and their records make an unanswerable argument for continuing the Democratic Party in power in North Carolina.

I ask that you look, and I know that you will look with saddened eyes, at the records of three Democrats who have passed away since this party last assembled in State convention, the beloved and honored Josephus Daniels, O. Max Gardner, and Josiah William Bailey. And listen as the spirit of each of those great men says to you and to me "Attention, Democrats. Close ranks. Forward March."

But those men, those Governors, those departed leaders, great as they were, did not make the Democratic Party. Rather the Democratic Party produced and made those men. The great mass of the people in the Democratic Party, working with devotion to character and to freedom and to the advancement of the average man, produced those leaders.

I like to think of the Democratic Party, and I believe that I think correctly of the Democratic Party, as a thing of substance, a thing of life and fiber, a thing built on sound, fundamental principles and growing from year to year as it looks and moves forward. Next to its bed-rock principles—its character—the most significant feature about this political party is its continuity. It goes forward from year to year—from administration to administration—from generation to generation. And as it goes forward it grows. Since the days of Jefferson, since the days of Aycock, the Democratic Party has gone forward and it has grown in character, in strength and in the regard of the people.

The future of the Democratic Party depends upon its determination to continue its march forward, to continue to advance in its measures for the welfare of the people.

And the Democratic Party, as long as it is steadfast in its principles, as long as it is honest and rugged in its character, as long as it steadily moves forward, as long as it is loyal to its history and to its organization, will continue to grow in North Carolina.

You have been so very gracious in the attention which you have given to me that I am led to hope that you may not be offended if I conclude this address on a personal note.

It has been my great good fortune that throughout all of my life I have been under the influence and the tutelage of a man whom I regard as a great Democrat of two generations, a man who is in this gathering today—my father, Dr. J. Y. Joyner. He will be 86 years of age this summer. He has worked in and for the Democratic Party continuously for 65 years. He has voted the straight Democratic ticket for 65 years. Never once has he departed from the Democratic principles or from the Democratic nominees.

On the 7th of last August the good people of LaGrange, his home community, helped him celebrate his eighty-fifth birthday with a public gathering. Fittingly enough, the celebration exercises were held in a place very dear to his heart, the auditorium of the

LaGrange Public School. At the conclusion of a very moving program, reviewing 85 years of life, he was called on to speak. After expressions of appreciations, he closed his remarks with this statement—and I quote:

"This is my eighty-fifth birthday, but I am not through. I am not quitting—not yet. The memory of all that you have done will warm my heart, will brighten my journey through the rest of my days. Tomorrow, with new inspiration, new zeal, new faith, new courage because of today, I will face the future, my face toward the rising sun; my marching orders: forward toward the goal of a better world, a better Nation, a better State, a better community. I am marching forward. Will you march with me?" I end the quotation.

At that moment Mr. Josephus Daniels arose from his seat on the platform and waved the audience to its feet and led the crowd in shouting, "Yes; we will march with you."

Steadfast, loyal, honest, progressive Democrats, I call upon you to march forward.

H. R. 4488, Veterans' Homestead Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, there is no matter pending before this Congress more important than the urgent necessity for action to relieve the housing shortage. This shortage is acute in my home district.

While discussions are going on concerning various housing measures and their various provisions, this session of Congress is every day approaching nearer its closing date.

There is one housing bill to which there is no opposition insofar as I know. This is House bill H. R. 4488, which is known as the Veterans' Homestead Act. It was unanimously reported out of the Veterans' Affairs Committee on May 3, and I believe that it will overwhelmingly pass the House if a rule is granted bringing it to the floor for consideration. The veterans of the country are squarely behind this bill. Within the past 3 days I have received numerous telegrams, letters, and resolutions from veterans' organizations in Georgia, both State and local, urgently calling for prompt action in passing the Veterans Homestead Act. I have received telegrams and letters from State officers of veterans' organizations, among them being the following: Dr. W. E. Burdine, department commander, Georgia Department, the American Legion; Joseph S. Crespi, State commander, AMVETS; Tom Bobo, vice chairman of the housing committee, the American Legion, department of Georgia; W. H. Vandiver, adjutant of the Georgia department AMVETS; Eric Smith, editor of the Georgia AMVETS; Bill Bowdoin, chairman of the housing committee, Georgia department, AMVETS; Marvin W. Medlock, commander-elect, fifth district, department of Georgia, the American Legion; Bill Todd, commander, Atlanta Post, No. 1, and chairman of the veteran's preference committee, department of Georgia, the American Legion; R. K. Whiteford, adjutant, Harold Byrd Post, No. 66, the American Legion, Decatur, Ga.; E. E. Sisk, commander, and W. B. Jones, adjutant, East Atlanta Post, No. 159, the American Legion, Atlanta. I attach these telegrams, letters, and resolutions hereto, in order that Members may realize the unanimity with which the Veterans' Homestead Act is sponsored and urged by the veterans in my home district and State:

ATLANTA, GA., *May 24, 1948.*

Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS,
Congressman, Fifth Georgia District,
House Office Building:

The Georgia department of the American Legion definitely desires the passage of H. R. 4488 housing legislation. Your full support of this legislation is requested.

Dr. W. E. BURDINE,
Department Commander.

ATLANTA, GA., *May 21, 1948.*

Congressman JAMES C. DAVIS,
House Office Building:

Urge immediate consideration and passage of H. R. 4488.

JOSEPH S. CRESPI,
State Commander, AMVETS.

AMVETS OF WORLD WAR II,
DEPARTMENT OF GEORGIA,
Atlanta, Ga.

Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

Re Veterans Homestead Act, as amended.

DEAR JUDGE: Thank you very much for the copy of the above legislation in which you have worked so hard to bring about in behalf of the veterans. As you put it, the changes on the original bill have now made the pending legislation of good use and benefit to the veteran, and I am hopeful that your continued efforts will be successful in this matter.

With personal regards to you from the boys back home.

Sincerely yours,

JOE CRESPI,
State Commander, AMVETS.

(Copies Department headquarters, national headquarters.)

Let's get H. R. 4488 made into law. It should be workable, useful, and fill a need.

J. S. C.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF GEORGIA,
Atlanta, Ga., May 21, 1948.

Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS,
Congressman, Fifth District, Georgia,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE: It will be greatly appreciated by me and my committee, which is the State housing of the American Legion and I as vice chairman, for you, to support H. R. 4488 and see that it is brought to the floor.

Many thanks.

TOM BOBO,
Vice Chairman, Housing Committee,
Department of Georgia, the American Legion.

ATLANTA, GA., *May 21, 1948.*

Congressman JAMES C. DAVIS,
House Office Building:

H. R. 4488 most necessary for benefit of all veterans.

GEORGIA DEPARTMENT AMVETS,
W. H. VANDIVER, *Adjutant.*

ATLANTA, GA., *May 21, 1948.*

Congressman JAMES C. DAVIS,
House Office Building:

Respectfully urge early passage of H. R. 4488.

THE GEORGIA AMVETS,
ERIC SMITH, *Editor.*

ATLANTA, GA., *May 24, 1948.*

Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS,
House Office Building:

Request passage of H. R. 4488, EDITH ROGERS veterans' homestead bill.

Regards.

BILL EOWDOIN.

ATLANTA, GA., *May 23, 1948.*

Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR BROTHER DAVIS: Bill Edens informs me that the Veterans' Homestead Act, introduced in the House by Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts, and known as H. R. 4488, has an excellent chance of passing if it can be brought out of the committee.

Since the veterans' housing program is one of the most important pieces of veterans' legislation now in progress, I would appreciate anything that you may be able to do to bring the above-mentioned bill before the House for its consideration.

We have no doubt of your interest in the welfare of veterans and we know that you will do all in your power to aid them in this matter: for which, we thank you.

With kindest personal regards, I remain,

Fraternally yours,

MARVIN W. MEDLOCK,
Commander-elect, Fifth District, Department of Georgia, the American Legion.

ATLANTA, GA., *May 24, 1948.*

Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS,
Member of Congress, Georgia,
Old House Office Building:

As the Legionnaire who openly fought for an active housing program on floor of New York national convention, I address this telegram to you. I have personally studied H. R. 4488 providing for veteran homestead associations and checked status of housing programs pending in the Congress. Compared to other bills pending it has in my opinion best chance of getting on floor for vote and passage. Bill referred to is not cure all nor perfection but in my opinion is step in right direction. While bill does not provide means of getting homes for citizens of low-income bracket it is believed that additional legislation will come through at later date to remedy that sad condition and aid in clearing slums. Bill referred to does provide for veterans and I believe great majority of people want veterans given a preference. Since early January, I have traveled throughout Georgia, campaigning as candidate for Legion State commander and I know our veterans are fed up on promises of homes with very little positive means of accomplishment. I urge you in behalf of all veterans to exert your utmost effort to get veterans' housing bill passed during this session of Congress. Please present to Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, Chairman of Committee on Veterans' Affairs my high regard and appreciation of the efforts of she and her committee in behalf of veterans. I wonder if she knows of the undetermined number of veterans who call her Buddy. Please express to her and the committee my appreciation of many courtesies extended Representative from Georgia Fifth Congressional District. Please plead with Mrs. ROGERS to bear down with everything in the book to get the housing bill on the floor and passed at this session of the Congress. Veterans did not use the

buck system when the war was on and we do not like the buck that has been passed so many times on veterans' housing. I believe I speak for untold number of veterans when I urge you to get for us positive action now that will lead to homes for veterans. Remember me to ROBERT TRIPP ROSS and GEORGE SARBACHER. Thank you, and again I affectionately call you our Veterans' Veteran in Congress.

BILL TODD,
Commander Atlanta Post No. 1, and Chairman Veterans' Preference Committee, Department of Georgia, the American Legion.

ATLANTA, GA., *May 21, 1948.*

Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS,
House of Representatives:

Harold Byrd Post, No. 66, the American Legion, representing 1,020 members at regular monthly meeting by unanimous vote urges you to support with all your power Homestead Act of 1948 under H. R. 4488 and bring this to the floor of the House.

Regards.

R. K. WHITEFORD, *Adjutant.*

Resolved, That East Atlanta Post, No. 159, the American Legion petition the United States Congress to enact the provisions of H. R. 4488 covering Veterans' Homestead Act, as this legislation is desperately needed to relieve the housing shortage now existing throughout the Nation: Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be furnished Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS, United States Congress, Washington, D. C., for immediate action.

Unanimously adopted by East Atlanta Post 159, the American Legion, Department of Georgia, this 20th day of May 1948.

E. E. SISK,
Commander.
W. B. JONES,
Adjutant.

Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Affairs Committee have provided a brief but comprehensive analysis of the veterans' homestead housing bill, H. R. 4488, which summarizes its provisions and the results to be accomplished if and when this legislation is enacted. This analysis is as follows:

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

VETERANS' HOMESTEAD HOUSING BILL,
H. R. 4488

Title: To amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to provide for veterans of World War II homes, and the public facilities necessary therefor, through veterans' homestead associations, and to make available more adequate financing for the acquisition of homes and farms by such veterans.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request). Introduced and referred November 18, 1947.

ANALYSIS

The revised reported version of H. R. 4488 amends the Servicemen's Readjustment Act to permit the Veterans' Administrator to charter veterans' homestead associations, composed of at least five veterans for the purpose of providing housing for veterans. Substantial aid would be given for the construction of multiunit housing to be rented or sold on a cooperative or mutual ownership basis. Average cost of each family unit limited to $10,000. Authority expires July 25, 1957.

Individual single-unit houses, either rural or urban, could be built by associations and sold to an individual veteran. Homestead associations could not supply permanent financing to purchasers of individual units.

Association financing to be obtained from Veterans' Administrator at an interest rate not more than one-fourth of 1 percent more than rate he is required to pay the Secretary of the Treasury for the capital required. Loans may be amortized over 40 years for rental multiunit housing and 32 years for housing held on a mutual or cooperative basis.

Authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to advance the following amounts:

One billion dollars per year for 5 years to Veterans' Administrator for loans to veterans' homestead associations and such other sums as are necessary to maintain a restricted secondary market for future title III home and farm loans;

Seven hundred and fifty million dollars per year for 5 years for Home Loan Bank Board to make investments in savings banks, cooperative banks, building and loan associations, and similar institutions which are members of a Federal home-loan bank or are insured under title IV of the National Housing Act which will make GI loans of $9,000 or less more readily available to veterans (preference to be given in distribution of funds to those institutions in areas needing capital expansion for veterans' housing and willing to make 100-percent loans to veterans);

One hundred million dollars per year for 5 years to Secretary of Agriculture (acting through Federal land-bank loans or Farmers Home Administration loans) to provide farm-loan financing to veterans;

Two hundred million dollars to the Federal Works Administrator for grants, on the customary 50-percent matching basis, for sewer, water, and like facilities required for the housing.

Incontestability clause for GI loan guarantees is included to encourage participation in loan program.

The only nonreimbursable expenditure required will be the $200,000,000 for the use of the Federal Works Administrator in providing grants to the States in the construction of public and community facilities needed by the associations.

Analysis by section

Section 511, homestead association: Authorizes Veterans' Administrator, on application of five or more World War II veterans, to charter homestead associations for purpose of providing housing. Association authorized to borrow from Administrator at not more than one-fourth of 1 percent in excess of cost of money to Government. Forty-year limit on loans for rental multiunit housing; 32 years for mutual or cooperative housing. Maximum average cost per dwelling limited to $10,000 or less. Membership limited to World War II veterans who have deposited $100 with association; bars membership to Communists or those belonging to subversive organizations. Creates Advisory Council to aid Administrator in performance of duties under this act. Authority to charter associations expires July 25, 1957.

Section 512, grants for public facilities: Authorizes Federal Works Administrator to aid State or local government or associations by 50-percent grants for sewers, streets, and similar facilities; $200,000,000 allocated for this purpose.

Section 513, lending-institution investments: Authorizes Home Loan Bank Board to make investments in certain types of lending agencies for 5 years; preference to be given institutions in areas where capital for housing is needed and to those agencies willing to make 100-percent GI loans to veterans in an amount not exceeding $9,000.

Section 514, farm loans: Liberalizes provisions for loans to veterans by Federal land banks for farm-real-estate loans; broadens authority of Farmers Home Administration.

Section 515, secondary market: Establishes a restricted long-range secondary market for home and farm loans which are guaranteed or insured under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. This feature expected to halt the sharp decrease (43 percent) in GI home-loan applications.

Section 516, provision for funds: Authorizes following amounts to agencies indicated:

1. One billion dollars per year for 5 years to Veterans' Administration and necessary funds for operation of secondary market;
2. Seven hundred and fifty million dollars for 5 years to Home Loan Bank Board;
3. One hundred million dollars per year for 5 years to Secretary of Agriculture for use through Federal land banks and Farmers Home Administration;
4. Two hundred million dollars for Federal Works Administrator.

All of the above to be obtained through issuance of bonds by Secretary of the Treasury.

Section 517, incontestability clause: This clause makes conclusive any evidence of guaranty or insurance issued by the Administrator as to eligibility of loan and amount of guaranty. Expected to encourage lenders to participate in loans program to greater extent.

Section 518, termination of second-mortgage guaranty: Terminates 90 days after enactment authority to guarantee second-mortgage loans in conjunction with a primary loan insured by other Federal agencies.

Hearings by full committee December 18, 1947; January 27, 28, February 19, March 1, 4, April 9, 13, and 15, 1948. (Executive sessions April 20, 21, 27, 28, 29, 30, 1948.)

Reported May 3, 1948. House Report 1848, Union Calendar 886.

Effective when enacted.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly urge that now, while there is still ample time to enact this bill in both the House and the Senate, a rule be immediately granted to bring this legislation to the floor of House for action. Again I say that so far as I have been able to ascertain, there is no objection anywhere to this bill. It will solve the problem of the housing shortage for the veterans at least, and the housing needs of veterans constitute no small part of the housing shortage. I urge prompt action on this measure.

Hearing Before United States Maritime Commission Respecting Removal of Certain Ships From Olympia, Wash., to Cathlamet Bay, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 25 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a great deal of interest has been exhibited in my State, and also in the State of Washington, with regard to an issue pending before the Maritime Commission concerning the selection of sites for the permanent berthing of Maritime Commission ships, the so-called moth-ball fleet of the Maritime Commission.

On May 5 there was a hearing before the Maritime Commission, participated in by delegates from Oregon and Washington. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD certain portions of the transcript of that hearing, so it may be readily available to the people both of Oregon and Washington who are interested in the outcome of that hearing.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Before the U. S. Maritime Commission, Department of Commerce Building, Washington, D. C., Wednesday, May 5, 1948]

ORAL ARGUMENT IN THE MATTER OF DECISION OF THE UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION TO REMOVE ITS PERMANENT RESERVE-TYPE SHIPS FROM TEMPORARY ANCHORAGE AT OLYMPIA, WASH., AND PROCEED WITH DEVELOPING PERMANENT SITE AT CATHLAMET BAY, OREG.

PROCEEDINGS

Chairman SMITH. Gentlemen, by recent action, the Commission decided to remove its permanent reserve-type ships from the temporary anchorage at Olympia, Wash., and proceed with the development of its permanent site at Cathlamet Bay in the Columbia River. The purpose of this meeting is to hear protests from the representatives of the State of Washington. Washington was not represented at the original hearing, which, by the way, was suggested by Commissioner Carson. So we are here to listen to the protests of the State of Washington and also to give the representatives of the State of Oregon an opportunity to be heard.

Much has been said about the strategic location of our reserve fleet in the great Northwest. The choosing of the fleet site is the responsibility of the Maritime Commission. However, we recognize the fact that strategic areas are defined by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I notice that the Navy is well represented here. I will later call upon them for an expression of their views as to strategic locations.

It is true that our fleet sites were chosen after thorough examination of many sites by a committee from this Commission, aided by experts from other agencies of Government. In choosing a fleet site we must consider the silting and the scouring rate, current, limited mooring areas, and interference with fishing and logging operations.

The Commission settled upon Olympia as a temporary site, and that was against the protests of the citizens of Olympia.

Now, it is probable that there will be discussed here this morning the question of fresh water versus salt water for the protection of laid-up ships. I have heard of paints that will protect ships against corrosion and salt water, but, frankly, I have never seen one. Perhaps the Navy can enlighten us on that later on.

I do know that barnacles are damaging to ships and that barnacles cannot live in fresh water. A good many years ago I had the experience of having a ship go to South and Central America, and once it would anchor in fresh water the barnacles would all die within a week.

On the other hand, some years ago I had a floating drydock in the Philippines, and we docked the main pontoon once every 5 years. We would find the hull coated with 5 to 6 inches of oystershells, and the oystershells actually protected the metal. The metal was clean underneath.

Perhaps someone can tell us whether there are any oysters in Puget Sound. I don't know.

We have asked the Navy to allocate floating dry docks to each fleet site. The Commission believes that by doing its own docking for preservation only, much money may be saved in towing to the nearest shipyard. The shipbuilding interests protest this, claiming that the Maritime Commission will eventually work into the ship-repair business. This we do not want to do, and, of course, the dry dock alone cannot repair ships because you must have machine shops and ship-fitter shops and other facilities.

Also, we no longer have a revolving fund and we do not have a single dollar that is available for the repair of ships.

Finally, I want to say that there will no doubt be discussion as to the allocation by the Navy of available dry docks to the northwest area. I believe that we will make the best progress by first asking the Navy its views on the items to be discussed, and then we will hear the State of Washington and later the representatives of the State of Oregon and any others who may be recognized by the Chair.

Admiral Mills, are you prepared to give us your views?

Admiral MILLS. Yes.

Chairman SMITH. Will everyone who talks please give his name to the reporter in order to save confusion?

ARGUMENT OF VICE ADM. EARLE W. MILLS, CHIEF, BUREAU OF SHIPS, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Admiral MILLS. Vice Adm. Earle W. Mills, Chief of the Bureau of Ships of the Navy Department.

I have had referred to me through the section office, several communications bearing on the question of moving the Maritime Commission's reserve ships from the Puget Sound area to Cathlamet Bay in Oregon.

I want to state, Mr. Chairman, that the Navy has participated in a joint board in which the Maritime Commission has had representation, in which this question of reserve-fleet sites to some extent has been discussed.

The last record that I have of that area in which the Maritime Commission desired to concentrate its ships from the northwest was at Youngs Bay, which is just to the westward of Astoria; whereas the present position involves establishing a base, as I understand it, in Cathlamet Bay which is just to the eastward of the city of Astoria. As far as I understand, they are only separated by about 10 miles.

I am not familiar with the details of what the Maritime Commission proposes to do with respect to the establishment of a base for lay-up in Cathlamet Bay. I received, at my request, on the 16th of April—I have not been furnished with any record of what the Commission proposes to do with respect to Cathlamet Bay—but I have, as I said, received a summary plan from the Maritime Commission with respect to the establishment at Cathlamet Bay. I would like to state that it is the Navy Department's view that it is entirely the responsibility of the Maritime Commission where they put their reserve merchant fleet. We have never taken any other stand on it and we do not take any other stand now.

I also would like to say that, with respect to paragraph 2 of the Maritime Commission's statement, in which they state that the care and preservation of Government-owned merchant vessels in reserve fleets is an activity that, when carried on by employees of the Maritime Commission, cannot be considered as an entry of the Government into the field of private enterprise, I would like to state that a very heavy towing expense would have to be faced if it were contemplated that the vessels would be in competition with commercial vessels for drydocking. The Navy considers that that is the business of the Maritime Commission, and certainly offers no exception to that statement.

The only point that I see where the Navy may be concerned in this matter in any manner whatsoever is the question of allocation of drydocks. Fortunately or unfortunately, I don't know which—I am beginning to think unfortunately—that is at the present time the responsibility of the Navy Department.

The Congress did not see fit during the recent war to set up separate repair facilities for the vessels operated by the Maritime Commission. I can only assume from that that it was the intention that the repair of these ships be accomplished by commercial enterprise.

At least in our estimates of available work and in our interest of trying to see that a reasonable Naval Establishment be maintained, and at the same time, in the interest of national security, that a reasonable private shipbuilding and repair enterprise be maintained, we have assumed that the repair of merchant vessels would normally be carried out by private enterprise.

We have agreed, in principle, that when drydocks were made available that were surplus to the Navy's needs and could be made available without contravening contracts which we have had in existence as a part of our responsibility to furnish repair facilities, that we would, in accordance with the law, naturally offer such dry docks for such use as the Maritime Commission may see fit to make of them. We have attempted to allocate those drydocks, insofar as it is possible to do so, in accordance with certain strategic principles having to do with the existence of shipbuilding or repair facilities that require the use of drydock in certain areas.

I think that is the basis of the dispute—if you might call it a dispute—that arises here today. The question of issue with respect to this particular drydock involved, YFD–68, concerns a drydock which we propose to move from the vicinity of San Pedro, Calif. In a letter to the Maritime Commission, dated January 12, we told the Maritime Commission that it was contemplated that four or five docks would become surplus. That was before the President's message with respect to the armed services delivered before Congress. Since that time, upon direction of the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations, the Navy is now engaged in making resurvey of our requirements for drydocks.

But on the basis of trying to find out what we would do in the event that we could make drydocks available, we asked the Maritime Commission for an expression of its views and whether it could use drydocks on the basis of allocating YFD–68, on the basis of existing facilities to the Puget Sound area, YFD–69 to the Columbia River area, and several other drydocks which the Maritime Commission did not show any interest in, one of which is now in Pearl Harbor and another smaller one which was apparently too small for their uses.

I realize that the Maritime Commission has a number of sites. I don't believe, frankly, that it is going to happen any time in the near future that the Navy can assure that any drydocks will be available in any such numbers as is required by the Maritime Commission to outfit all of its lay-up sites. That can only be done by the withdrawal of contracts or the abrogation of contracts which the Navy has now with certain private shipbuilding interests for drydocks which have a high percentage of use.

We are making a study of that problem also from the point of view of determining whether or not the use factor in any of the drydocks under any of our contracts is sufficiently small to justify our breaking away and taking these drydocks for the purpose of making them available either for naval allocation or for the Maritime Commission.

With respect to the question of the Cathlamet Bay specifically, I have no observations to offer on that outside of the following: I don't care where you move the ships from, but I doubt the wisdom of concentrating all of the ships at Cathlamet Bay in addition to the Navy Reserve base at Astoria. I question the wisdom of that, because I think it will create difficulties for both the Maritime Commission and the Navy in the event of an emergency. It will be extremely difficult to reactivate all of those ships in that area in the face of the shortage of commercial repair facilities that exist in the Astoria region at this time. The purpose may very properly be to build up the facilities in the Astoria area. If that can be done, and if we can have some assurance of

it, the Navy certainly would offer no exception.

However, I do raise that as a question, that right at the present time we are increasing our work load in the Astoria region. We have increased it constantly since we have put the reserve base in there. We have 426 small ships in reserve at Tongue Point base. I made a check only the day before yesterday with the supervising inspector who has just been ordered from duty out there to duty on the east coast. I asked him to come and see me on his way in change of duty, and he told me that it was his opinion that they were utilizing all of the available labor that is out there in the Astoria vicinity at the present time. If any particular amount of repair work is contemplated by the Maritime Commission at this Cathlamet base, it will pose a question in trying to made additional facilities available. That is purely from the general standpoint of observation. You can call it a personal opinion if you want to do so, or you can call it the Navy Department's view. It is merely expressed for what it is worth.

Considering that the Navy drydocks are in extremely short supply at the present time, I would like to add a third statement to the two that I have already made, and I will review the three statements in just a moment.

The third observation I want to make is that the drydocks of the size that the Maritime Commission is interested in, which run from 12,000 to 18,000 tons, are in extremely short supply at the present time, and no allocation to the proposed Cathlamet base can be made in any event until the Navy's resurvey of the strategic requirements for floating drydocks is completed. That is now under way and will be finished just as soon as possible.

In our letter of January 12 to the Maritime Commission we did not state that we had declared ahy drydocks to be surplus. We stated we contemplated that such drydocks would be surplus, but, as I said a while ago, that was previous to the President's message to the Congress on the state of preparedness of the armed services. This is a part of that condition.

There has been much talk raised here about the relative merits of fresh water and salt water. The Navy has done a lot in the development of under-water paints, and the experiences which I am going to relate to you now are the Navy's experiences. The experience of the Navy is founded on very practical results and the Navy is prepared to back them up.

There has never been a statement made by the Navy at any time that salt water was better for the preservation of ships than fresh water. That would be a nonsensical statement a make. If any such statement was made, I repudiate it because it was not made with any official basis.

I will say, however, that, as far as I am concerned, and as far as our experience is concerned, fresh water or salt water has not been a controlling factor with the Navy as to its choice of a site for laying up its reserve vessels. I say that because we have a hot plastic paint which we have found to be very successful in preventing the growth of barnacles in salt water—even water that is as salty as the normal salt water of the ocean. The water in Puget Sound is slightly less salty, not much less so, than that of the open ocean. The water at Astoria is brackish. It is not fresh water. It runs about one-eighth or one-ninth of the salinity of sea water outside the entrance of the river. There is sufficient salt in the water at Astoria to promote some corrosion. It is infinitely better, from the standpoint of using a normal paint, in inhibiting corrosion or the formation of barnacles than is water of the salinity of open-sea salt water.

I hope that straightens this matter out.

The only thing that I want to make clear is that the Navy has considered that as one of the minor factors as to where we would put a ship for lay-up purposes. I might state that we have had definite experience with both fresh and salt water.

We have a number of ships laid up in Green Cove Springs, in Florida, where the water is absolutely fresh. As far as the under-water body is concerned, our experience down there has been that the water is very good; as far as the upper portion is concerned, our experience has been very bad. That would seem to indicate that there are many factors that enter into this question of taking care of ships. Also, whereas the interiors of our ships at Green Cove Springs are, in my opinion, in excellent condition, we have been having quite a time there because of the frequent changes in the weather—moisture and hot sunshine and then moisture again and more hot sunshine. That raises havoc with any type of preservative applied for the protection of the outside of the ship.

A comparison of the actual corrosion on the underwater body when using the plastic paint, between ships laid up at Charleston and ships laid up at Green Cove Springs, we find only a grass formation at both places. One is salt water and the other is fresh water. We find about one-half as much grass on the Green Cove Springs ships as we find on the Charleston ships. Neither one of those conditions is serious and neither one serves to do any particular harm to the bottom of the ship.

However, there is one point that I failed to make clear, and that is that you have to take more care in protecting exposed shafts or any exposed opening to a valve if you are going to lay up the ship in salt water than if you are going to lay it up in fresh water. With that one exception, I would definitely say that, as far as the Navy is concerned, the salinity of water is not a controlling factor as to where we lay up. We attach more importance to the natural suitability of the site, the proximity of repair facilities for taking care of those ships, and an abundant supply of labor in the area for carrying it out.

Exclusion from the public is a factor that the Navy considers, but not materially so. We have ships laid up in what you might call urban areas. We have them laid up in the extreme of Green Cove Springs down in Florida, which is far removed from any particular amount of civilization; at least, there are only small towns in the vicinity. I consider that to be a minor factor, as far as we are concerned, and as long as the citizens of the community do not have any particular objection to the presence of those reserve ships.

The question of silting up, which was touched on by Admiral Smith, is an important factor in our considerations, particularly where you have currents, particularly where you are near the mouths of rivers. If you have currents where a lot of silt is being transported, you have to expect that if you lay up ships in the path of those currents that are carrying heavy loads of silt, there will be considerable shoaling and deposit of sand and material which will require constant dredging in order to keep that area open.

We have that trouble right in the mouth of the Cooper River at Charleston. We have very decided trouble with that there. I would imagine that we are not going to be bothered with it very much at Tongue Point in the Columbia River because we are out of the current and the ships that we are handling at Tongue Point are small ships. But we do have quite a number of them there.

As far as the exteriors of the ships are concerned, we have found the area to be on a par with the area farther north. They are both rainy areas, and from that standpoint we have to watch the top sides very closely. They are not as bad as the Florida area because they are not subject to the alternate spells of very hot sunshine that follow the rain in Florida. Neither the mouth of the Columbia River nor the Puget Sound area has any particular draw-backs from the standpoint of ship preservation.

The Navy's views on this matter are quite simple, and they might be reviewed as follows:

1. The Navy feels that the question of moving reserve merchant ships from Puget Sound to Cathlamet Bay, Oreg., is a matter that must be resolved by the Maritime Commission.

2. The Navy questions the wisdom of concentrating both naval reserve ships and merchant reserve ships in areas so close together as Cathlamet and Tongue Point. Such action will create serious difficulties with reactivation in the event of an emergency because of the existing shortage of commercial repair facilities in the Astoria area.

3. Navy dry docks of the size requested—12,000 to 18,000 tons—are in extremely short supply at present and no allocation to the proposed Cathlamet base can be made in any event until the Navy's resurvey of its strategic requirements for floating dry docks is completed.

I believe that completes my statement on this subject, Mr. Chairman. I would be very happy to answer questions from anyone with respect to this matter.

Chairman SMITH. Are there any questions from the Commission?

(Whereupon there was no response.)

Chairman SMITH. Are there any questions from the representatives from the State of Washington?

(Whereupon there was no response.)

Chairman SMITH. Are there any questions from the representatives of the State of Oregon?

Mr. NORBLAD. I have a question.

Admiral, you speak of the water being brackish at Astoria. Does that include Cathlamet Bay and Youngs Bay?

Admiral MILLS. I am including the water from the mouth of the river up to about 10 miles east of Astoria; in other words, up the river for a distance of about 10 miles.

Mr. NORBLAD. Above Astoria, about 20 miles above the mouth?

Admiral MILLS. That is right.

In other words, I would say that we have definite salinity recorders around the area of Astoria. The water there runs somewhere in the neighborhood of 200 or 210 grains per gallon. Accordingly, outside sea water will run around 1,700 or 1,800, somewhere around there.

Mr. NORBLAD. That is the point that I was making, that there is a difference between Astoria and Cathlamet Bay. Astoria is relatively close to Youngs Bay but Cathlamet Bay is up the river from Astoria.

Admiral MILLS. It is right adjacent to Tongue Point.

Mr. NORBLAD. That is right, but there is a difference in the way of mileage between Astoria and Cathlamet Bay, is there not?

Admiral MILLS. Yes; there is. I said it was about 10 miles, as I know it.

Mr. NORBLAD. Has the matter of shipbuilding facilities in Portland been considered by the Navy in its survey of repair yards?

Admiral MILLS. Yes. The shipbuilding facilities in Portland were used quite widely by the Navy during the war. The situation that we are in with respect to that, sir, is not a question of still trying to build up shipbuilding facilities. Right at the present time, in time of peace, there is no question about it that we have more shipbuilding facilities than we can use.

The Navy was quite responsible for extending the capacity of the shipbuilding industry in Portland. I think we made a report on that some years ago. I believe I have a copy of it here. That report indicates that we increased the berthing area in Portland Harbor by some 420 percent over what it was in 1940; we increased the drydocks to 150 percent; we increased the drydocks in that area from two to five; we increased the employment in repairs and conversion there

some 325 percent. That was all done on the basis of comparison with the Puget Sound area and the San Francisco Bay area and the San Pedro and Long Beach area. We tried to give all four areas a proportionate increase in facilities to match operating tonnages in and out of the ports.

Incidentally, in that drydock arrangement there the Puget Sound increase was a 100-percent increase and the Portland increase was 150 percent. The San Francisco Bay area increase was 120 percent and the San Pedro and Long Beach area increase was 100 percent.

Mr. NORBLAD. The point that I am making is that the ship-repair facilities of the Columbia River are approximately the same as those of the Puget Sound area, are they not?

Admiral MILLS. I would say not.

Mr. NORDBLAD. They are at least adequate in the Portland area, are they not?

Admiral MILLS. They are adequate for the amount of services that we had up there during the war. On that basis I would estimate that they are approximately two-thirds of what they are in the Puget Sound area.

Mr. NORBLAD. I am speaking of the amount of work that might be contemplated. Having the bases placed in Cathlamet Bay, with the Portland yards nearby for repair facilities, that would be adequate for the purpose, would it not?

Admiral MILLS. Only by a long tow 100 miles up the river. The chairman referred to that.

Mr. NORBLAD. There is also a tow from Olympia to Seattle, is there not?

Admiral MILLS. Yes.

Mr. NORBLAD. About 30 or 40 miles, is it not?

Admiral MILLS. Thirty miles, thirty-two miles.

To answer that question specifically, I would say that there are more facilities close enough in the Puget Sound area than there are in the mouth of the Columbia River. That is just a factual statement from my experience in the matter.

ARGUMENT OF THE HONORABLE HOMER D. ANGELL, REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS, FROM THE THIRD DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF OREGON

Mr. ANGELL. I am HOMER D. ANGELL, Congressman in the Third District of Oregon.

I know that the suggestion has been made in these proceedings that the drydock that has been allocated to Portland be moved. The people in my district are very much concerned about that. The shipping interests feel it would be a great mistake if that drydock was moved to Portland, that it would place Cathlamet Bay at a very great disadvantage.

Admiral MILLS. Mr. ANGELL, I am quite cognizant of that situation and I would like to make one thing clear in connection with that.

The Navy definitely has not the slightest objection, provided the drydocks can be made available, to giving drydocks for the use of the Maritime Commission as rapidly as we can do so. The only reason that the suggestion was made that YFD–69, which is now at Portland, be utilized by the Maritime Commission if it moved its ships down to Cathlamet Bay is that we felt that that dock can be made immediately available. That dock is now on a month-to-month lease basis by the successor of a company which is operating the old Kaiser Swan Island yard.

You are suggesting that that dock could be made available as a matter of convenience if the Maritime Commission wanted a dock at an early date. That has nothing to do with the ultimate solution that may be arrived at in this matter. As far as I personally am concerned, and I am sure as far as the Navy is concerned, we would be very happy for the Maritime Commission to have other docks when they may be available.

That is the question. They are not available now, sir.

Chairman SMITH. We will now hear from the State of Washington.

Are you prepared to make your statement first, Senator CAIN?

Senator CAIN. I am, sir.

Senator MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a brief statement here before the Senator talks to the Commission.

Unfortunately, I have an appointment at the White House on another matter. I will be gone for about 15 minutes and I will be back later. However, at the outset I want to express my appreciation for this opportunity. I know that Senator CAIN requested a delegation to the so-called rehearing on this matter, Unfortunately, both of us were absent in the States on business at the time set for the hearing. We had no knowledge it was going to happen that way and we deeply appreciate the opportunity the Commission has offered us to present our case at this time.

Judging by the number of witnesses in this room, I am sure that the hearing will still be in progress when I return. I want to say, however, that whatever the junior Senator says on this matter in my absence is an expression of my views also. We have discussed the matter at great length and are in complete agreement on our views concerning the situation. He has a knowledge of many of the details and I am sure that he will give you an adequate representation of how we feel about it.

Chairman SMITH. Thank you, Senator.

I am sure that had a postponement been requested at the last hearing it would have been granted. The State of Washington was not adequately represented but nobody complained about it.

Commissioner CARSON. Mr. Chairman, before the Senator proceeds, I would like to say something for the record.

Senator MAGNUSON, I want it shown in the record that when this matter came to my attention as being on its way to the Commission's docket, I suggested, as the chairman mentioned, that in view of the fact that—as I remember it—Mr. Christy Thomas had talked to me about this briefly, and in view of the further fact that some correspondence had come in from different people in the Puget Sound area that we do hold a hearing, I was considerably concerned and amazed to learn by hearsay that it had been represented that I had suggested the time for the meeting when you, Senator MAGNUSON and Senator CAIN would be absent from Washington. I did not know that, and when Senator CAIN phoned me from the Pocific coast I informed him immediately as to the status of the matter and told him that I was going to phone the chairman. The chairman was away on other business that afternoon.

I told Senator CAIN that I would see to it that you are afforded the opportunity to be heard, and it was made a matter of record in the Commission's meeting before the day was out.

ARGUMENT OF THE HONORABLE HARRY P. CAIN, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Senator CAIN. HARRY P. CAIN, junior Senator from the State of Washington.

At the outset, Mr. Chairman, I should like to suggest that I speak in the name of our senior Senator, Mr. MAGNUSON, as well as in my own name. I prepared a rather brief statement this morning on the basis, sir, of what I understand some of the facts and rumors to be. I have no intention whatsoever of being misleading or uncertain or cloudy in presenting in part the State of Washington's point of view and how happy it is that this hearing is being held publicly in order that any statements I might make which are unintentionally incorrect can be straightened up and corrected without delay.

The Washington delegation in Congress, Mr. Chairman, very deeply welcomes this opportunity to meet with the Maritime Commission and with our friends, the gentlemen from the State of Oregon, in the sincere hope of effecting a friendly settlement of a situation which, apparently and obviously, has caused some misunderstanding, much of which I hope has been unnecessary.

I think it is most important that at the outset that the position of the Washington Senate and House Members be made perfectly clear. Our position in the matter before us is simply to request that the status quo be maintained with respect to the Maritime Commission's reserve fleet presently located on Puget Sound. At no time have we, either individually or collectively, made overtures to anyone to move from Oregon waters a single ship of the reserve fleet now anchored in the Columbia River; nor have we ever proposed or even entertained the thought of any action which would deprive the State of Oregon of any facility operated by or under the control of either the Maritime Commission or the Navy in conjunction with Oregon's ship repair and construction industry.

We are not asking and never have asked that the reserve fleet in the Columbia River be moved to Puget Sound. We are not asking and never have asked that any facilities in the Columbia River be moved to Puget Sound. We do not seek anything that Oregon has in this respect, and we regret deeply that apparently some of our Oregon friends have labored under such a misapprehension.

What we request and desire is that our reserve fleet on Puget Sound be permitted to remain where it is. We want only the status quo to be maintained, and we firmly believe, on the basis of what we conceive to be the facts, that this is both an honest and a fair request which is essential to the welfare of an important segment of our industry and to the national security. We should like to develop for the record what, in our considered opinion, constitutes good and sufficient reason to maintain the status quo with respect to the ships of the reserve fleet now moored on Puget Sound. At the same time, we would like to take up elements of this situation which have, we believe, been the basis for our mutual misunderstanding in this important matter.

I should like, Admiral Smith, to refer to the record very briefly. So far as I know, the first knowledge that the Washington delegation had that the Maritime Commission was contemplating the transfer of the reserve fleet from Olympia, Wash., to Astoria, Oreg., was about the middle of February 1948. Subsequently, on February 21, 1948, I wrote to the Chairman of the Maritime Commission, as did other Members of the Washington delegation, reporting that we had heard such a rumor and pointing out the result that the move would have on the Puget Sound ship-repair industry. I requested that the Commission afford me the opportunity to appear before it prior to the adoption of any such policy.

The Maritime Commission replied very promptly and within a few days, stating, in substance, that such action was admittedly under consideration but that before a final decision was made, I and other members of the delegation would be given the opportunity to discuss the matter with the Commission. Similar replies were made to other Washington delegation members.

Some 5 or 6 weeks later, on April 10, 1948, which was a Saturday, my office was advised by letter that the Commission would conduct a hearing the following Wednesday, April 14, on this subject matter. Unfortunately, both Senator MAGNUSON and I were on the west coast at the time and because of the brief notice we could not rearrange our business and our itineraries in time to permit our attendance at the hearing. However, both Senator MAGNUSON and I, by telephone, subscribed to a delegation statement which was duly filed with the Commission on the

occasion of the hearing. The statement set forth the position of the Washington delegation in clear and positive and unmistakable terms.

I am not prepared, Mr. Chairman, to say how much consideration the Commission has given to our views previously in the matter, but it seems important to me to note that within the hour after the hearing adjourned the Commission actually placed in effect the policies to which we are taking exception today.

On that point I should like to bring to your attention that there is an indication—and I say this openly and frankly, as you gentlemen would expect me to do—that the Commission may have decided its policies prior to the hearing. This is indicated by a letter dated March 16, 1948, and written to Mr. Gary Smith, president of the Shipbuilders Council of America.

Mr. Smith protested the Commission's consideration of operating its own drydock and repair facilities. The letter said, in part—and I should like to quote:

"The Maritime Commission in its meeting of March 5, 1948, formally considered the several contentions made in your letter, including your reference to National security, and has decided that its position remains unchanged; that is, that it will be in the best interests of the Government to accomplish bottom inspection and preservation of vessels in permanent reserve at the fleet sites utilizing Government-owned drydocks and civil-service personnel."

From my point of view, it is both unfortunate and to be regretted that one of the Oregon Congressmen was quoted immediately after the previous hearing as stating to at least two newspaper reporters in this city that the hearing was necessary to entertain the views of the Washington delegation, but that the policies presumably adopted formally at that time were decided sometime prior to the hearing and that the entire matter was—in the words used by him, so I am told—"both cut and dried."

I think, Mr. Chairman, it is equally important that the Maritime at no time prior to the April 14 hearing afforded any member of the Washington delegation a bill of particulars indicating the action contemplated. We were all surprised at the seemingly—and I am not certain that it is so—hasty action taken in this matter and at the scope of the policy which the Maritime Commission adopted, apparently without any prior consideration for its position with respect to defense and national security or prior conversations with the Navy.

That develops in major detail the progression of the situation in the light of the facts as we think we understand them to be.

I should now like to simply ask several questions, most of which will be asked with the intention of straightening out in the minds of all present any points which may need emphasis.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I should very much like to know from the members of your Commission, sir, if you or they have knowledge of any instance in which any Washington delegation member has ever proposed that the Columbia River reserve fleet or any facility used in conjunction with the Columbia ship-repair industry be transferred to Puget Sound. We are naturally most concerned and anxious to irradicate this thought from the minds of our esteemed and very respected friends from Oregon, and we invite the Commission to show us, the Washington State delegation, where such a move has ever been advanced on any single occasion.

Then, Mr. Chairman, I and other members of our delegation would like to know if any member of the Maritime Commission has ever represented to any member of the Oregon delegation that such action has ever been suggested by any Washington Senator or Congressman, or, in fact, by anyone else who might have represented himself as being officially a speaker for what the best interests of the State of Washington might be construed to be. If that is not the case, Mr. Chairman, I should like to know from what source this absolutely false report has emanated. It is important that we straighten it out.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, we have come this morning to ask the Maritime Commission, in face of these facts which I have laid before you and the facts which are to be laid before you during the course of this hearing today, to consider reversing your previous position in order that you might authorize the maintenance of the status quo with respect to your reserve-fleet ships now moored in the waters of Puget Sound. Although we stand completely ready to be advised to the contrary, we feel that this request is justified by the testimony which I have attempted to develop and which will be developed. We feel that the Maritime Commission therefore has no alternative but to reconsider its previous action.

Mr. Chairman, in your preliminary remarks you mentioned, among other important items, that you felt—at least I so construed—a continuing opposition by responsible people in the Puget Sound area of the maintenance of ships in the waters of Puget Sound. In an effort to clarify that situation I should like to quote from a letter received by me under date of April 16, 1948, from Mr. F. W. Mathias, of the Olympia Chamber of Commerce. I should like to quote the following paragraph:

"There were some protests made by property owners who had property near or away from the water front and principally in the vicinity of Gull Harbor and Butler's Cove. We checked on these protests and claims that property values would be depreciated. Members of our chamber of commerce committee followed up such claims, and when they, the committee offered to purchase the property at the original or even above the original purchase price, there were no offers of property for sale. A few oyster men had made a protest. So the State Pollution Commission held a hearing, and with the evidence submitted at this hearing the oyster operators went through their complaint."

Mr. Chairman, as of this morning I have received a wire from Mr. James E. Louden, industrial department of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce. The wire is addressed not to me but to Mr. Christy Thomas, manager of the Washington, D. C. headquarters of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, at 621 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C. The wire is dated May 4 and reads as follows:

"The mayors of Port Townsend, Port Angeles, Shelton, Tacoma, Olympia, Seattle, Anacortes, Everett, Bellingham, and the chambers of commerce of each of those cities have telegraphed the Maritime Commission protesting the decision of the Commission moving vessels stored in Puget Sound to Colorado River. All urge retention of ships Puget Sound."

I merely wanted the record to show that there was a considerable segment of interest in retaining the ships in communities adjacent to the city of Olympia.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I want to say that our Washington delegation believes there is no sound reason for moving ships presently in Puget Sound waters to the Colorado River. You may convince us, sir, that our position is wrong. If we are convinced we should certainly want to support any decision which you may reconsider or make anew.

Even more important, I think that after we straighten up the merits of where the ships actually ought to be we should consider the need for reconciling the misunderstandings which have developed as a result of charges and countercharges between the members of the delegation of the State of Oregon and the members of the delegation of the State of Washington and the Maritime Commission itself. Some very serious allegations have been made about individuals among those three groups. It is for that reason that I have said so plainly what some of those accusations actually were.

I spoke by telephone from Los Angeles to Mr. Joseph Carson, whom I have known for a long time as a very good friend, a member of the Commission. I said, "Joe, they are telling me in Washington that you conspired to arrange this hearing when Senators MAGNUSON and HARRY CAIN were out of the city." I also said, "Joe, it is very important that we have a meeting where everybody can lay those cards face up."

In addition to that, there have been references made to the fact that among us in the Washington delegation there have those who have connived and conspired to get the Maritime Commission to move the ships presently located in Oregon waters to the State of Washington. That not only is not true but it is important that people know that it is not true. I sit on the left of a man with whom I work and whom I admire, and very recently his feeling has been: "It is too bad that we are failing to cooperate one State with another."

From our Washington delegation's point of view, there is, as there always has been, a desire to do business harmoniously and effectively and in a friendly way with the State of Oregon. I think, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that you have rendered a public service in permitting us to present our plans in favor of maintaining ships presently in Puget Sound where they are, while at the same time permitting us to allay whatever rumors and suspicions and allegations have been promiscuously and unnecessarily made, to the end that we walk out of this door in full understanding of what the facts before us actually are, what they have been, and what they will continue to be.

I am grateful for this opportunity of being heard.

Chairman SMITH. Senator, I have never visited the Colorado River or the Puget Sound area, nor have I visited all of these places that you have mentioned receiving messages from. I am open-minded on the subject and I am certain you will find the rest of the Commission is open-minded.

Perhaps my colleagues can correct me if I am wrong, but to answer your questions, the record will show and I know of no case where we had received a request from the State of Washington or any of its representatives to move ships out of the Colorado River to Puget Sound. I also do not recall that Oregon has ever asked that we move them from Puget Sound to Portland, although there has been a fight about getting a drydock in its place. But you certainly have not, to the best of my knowledge, asked o move any ships to Portland from the Puget Sound area.

I will ask if any of the other members of the Commission have any such recollection.

Commissioner CARSON. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the so-called movement matter, the Commission has had cause to explore the possibilities of placing all of the reserve fleet in readiness wherever located. I do not know where we will get on that. I do not know whether anything will be done.

It might be observed at this time that the Commission has no money to repair any ships; not only do we not have any money in the 1948 budget but there is nothing in the 1949 budget for that purpose, either. I think that is something that should be made clear.

Insofar as any prospect of the repair of vessels now in the reserve fleet is concerned, I think it is only fair to state that unless and until the time arrives that the Congress feels that it is proper to appropriate money for that purpose, and in a considerable sum, that it is just chasing a will-o'-the-wisp, in my opinion, at least, to suggest that there is going to be any repair work done, no matter where the fleets are situated, because there just is no money to do it with.

Now, I think that, in view of the emergency that might exist, or might be believed to exist—and I so stated to Mr. Christy Thomas after the conclusion of the short hearing that

was held the other time—that the movement of vessels from any place where they are now situated, if they are close to repair facilities, might, in my opinion, very well warrant a further look to indicate whether we are going into an emergency program. In a word, and just speaking for myself, you would not deliberately move ships away from the vicinity of repair facilities if you assumed that you would use those facilities.

Now, that is just an observation that I am making. I do want to say that I was considerably disappointed that—perhaps I misunderstood—when I did not find any response to the effect that that was a new approach and perhaps should be explored. You see, there are 20 vessels up there that I do not believe it is ever intended to move because they are due ultimately for scrap.

Senator CAIN. Mr. Chairman, might I ask two questions?

Chairman SMITH. Yes, sir.

Senator CAIN. I should first like to ask a question of Commissioner Carson.

Commissioner Carson, you remember, do you not, the conversation we had when I was in Los Angeles?

Commissioner CARSON. I do.

Senator CAIN. And you remember the charges which were relayed to you by telephone as being those which others were making against you?

Will you satisfy not only my curosity but my desire for accurate information also as to what steps, if any, you might have taken to arrange a meeting when two of your friends were absent 3,000 miles away?

Commissioner CARSON. Yes.

I think I stated to you at the time that I would take the full responsibility and would assure you that you would be given a full opportunity, you and any other member of the Washington delegation to be heard in connection with this matter. I think I further pointed out at the time that I was a little surprised, in view of the fact that you and Senator MAGNUSON were out of the city, that a postponement was not asked for when we were down here that last time, either on the ground that you were out of the city or on the ground that the time was too short.

I think I am speaking for the Commission when I say that had any intimation of that kind been made it would have been freely and quickly done without any question whatsoever.

Senator CAIN. I think I can answer that question.

In the first place, I am satisfied that the Admiral meant exactly what he said, that he would have agreed to any postponement. On my return from the west coast I quite naturally raised the question: Why was not a request for a postponement made? I was satisfied with the answer: because of the circumstance that the two Senators were away.

Some of the delegation were importantly busy doing other things. The entire matter came up rather rapidly. It appeared to be lopsided in that one delegation was here in its entirety and the other delegation was hardly represented at all. I think there was just a normal tendency to forget to make a request which would have been the most obvious thing to do. I myself am inclined to think that our delegation, under the circumstances, was not to be criticized for having failed to make the request. But it is good to know publicly in the record that a request would have been met, as, in fact, it is being met by this opportunity to be heard today.

Admiral Smith, my only other question will be asked in an effort to make this record very clear. After that, consideration of where ships ought to be situated is certainly in order.

In my remarks I mentioned that it is said of your Commission—in one letter indicates as much in a casual sort of way—that a decision to move the ships had been made a considerable time prior to the hearing which was held on the 17th of April.

Now, if I am in order in asking this question, sir, I should merely like to have you give us your attitude toward that problem, because we would not want to think that any hearing was ever held by any responsible public body merely as a bit of window dressing, which certainly has been the charge made against the Maritime Commission.

Chairman SMITH. Well, Senator, the record will show what the facts are.

I know that this matter has been under discussion by the Commission and its staff for months. I also know that we decided that we would not issue any instructions until we had held a hearing. Frankly, I cannot say whether a decision was made. It could have happened before the hearing. But I do know that if a decision had been made the record will show that nothing was to be done until we had given everybody a chance to talk. Nothing has been done yet.

Now, perhaps you gentlemen of the Commission can enlighten me on that.

Commissioner MCKEOUGH. Mr. Chairman, to straighten the records—and I want to have the record as straight as anybody does—I am quite sure that the files of the Commission would indicate that a determination had been reached long before any request for a hearing emanated from any source. The selection of the reserve fleet site was an accomplishment, as I recall, basing my recollection on memory alone, to be sustained or corrected by the record later, the selection of the permanent site was made as much as 2 years ago. That had been accomplished to a considerable extent before I had reached the Commission as a member. No other member now on the Commission had been appointed in the Commission at that time, and the appointment of each of them now sitting was subsequent to my appointment.

It is my further recollection that a decision was reached only after experts of the Committee itself, coupled with those that had been employed by the then existing Commission to supplement and implement the studies made by the members of the Commission's staff, were consulted.

On the question of whether or not the site that is under discussion was determined upon at that time as a permanent site, I think the record will have to be reviewed and the information definitely stated from the record as to the date of determination for selection of this site as a permanent harbor or sanctuary for whatever number of vessels were to be dispatched to the Northwest section of the country.

Personally, my only acquaintance with any question that was to be raised by any Members of Congress with relation thereto came only within the period of the last few weeks. As a result, there apparently were some visitations on the part of people who naturally were interested in what was to be the final determination with relation to what possibility there might be of having some repair work made available to the existing facilities in the various sections of the country.

I think some allusion was made here to a communication addressed to the Shipbuilders Council. I think that reference was made by the Senator from Washington.

Senator CAIN. I read such a paragraph; yes, Mr. Commissioner McKeough. We had such a letter from the Shipbuilders Council, in which they rather at great lengths protested the location of dry docks as the permament reserve fleet site.

With the indulgence of my colleagues, I would like to proceed at least to express my recollection of the correspondence and the determinations reached by the Commission in relation thereto.

I think that the Shipbuilders Council—and I have no quarrel with it; I am personally acquainted with one or two of the officials of that group—I think they were seeking to develop something that in some manner would indicate their point. There must be their total responsibility. I was not in consultation with them at the time of their writing of the letter. They sort of wanted to imply to the Commission that the Commission was apparently on a venture to interfere with private enterprise as related to the shipbuilding and repair facilities of this country in seeking drydocks from the Navy as surplus drydocks under the existing law that was passed by the Congress, under which any surplus material sought by one agency of government from another would be delivered without transfer of funds to the petitioning agency. I do not know that the law provided that the agency having the surplus was to in any way be permitted to determine the use of that surplus by the petitioning agency. I think the law implies, by its silence in that respect at least, 100 percent responsibility as to the use to be made of such surplus by the petitioning agency after it received the surplus.

I am sure that I can speak for my colleagues in this respect when I say that this Commission in no way seeks to intrude upon private enterprise in any direction. It has a responsibility under law to safeguard, preserve, and protect hundreds of millions of dollars worth of vessels paid for by the people of this country as the permanent reserve fleet, in conjunction with the determinations reached by the Joint Chiefs of Staff as to the types and numbers of the vessels that are to constitute such reserve fleet. The Commission has cooperated very fully—and deserves no compliment for having done so—with the Joint Chiefs of Staff in that direction. It has, as I indicated, made very serious investigations as to the desirable locations in which to place these vessels valued at hundreds and millions of dollars, and it is required under law to adequately protect against deterioration of that required husbanding efforts.

The Shipbuilders Council, apparently having been made acquainted with the fact that this Commission had petitioned the Navy for drydocks to be located at these permanent reserve-fleet sites, probably with justification, assumed that this Commission was to petition the Congress for many, many millions of dollars with which to place the necessary facilities adequate for the maintenance work in the way of ship repair at these sites. That was never indulged in or conjectured by this Commission. This Commission, I think, has on several occasions recorded its determination to adequately care for its requirements in protection against deterioration of these vessels. It has felt that periodic bottom inspection should be made, which obviously could not be made without the facilities present in the way of a drydock. There was never at any time any indication that ever left this Commission and went out to any segment of the public that the Commission was trying to intrude into the shipbuilding and repair activities now engaged in by private enterprise.

Speaking for myself, I can add that I in no way considered the periodic inspection of bottoms of the vessels will deny the shipbuilding interests of this country one dollar's worth of repair work. I am speaking now of work done with the aid of the Navy drydocks in the event that we ever get them.

The only purpose of the Commission is to determine, in the discharge of its duty, what, if any, deterioration has resulted from the length of time which the vessels are now husbanded in these various locations. There must be some accumulation and some damage. I speak purely as a landlubber. The only familiarity I have with barnacles is what I have heard discussed by those in the Navy and those that go to sea. I presume that Admiral Mills implied that there must be some accumulation and some damage. He must have at least implied in his statement that the requirement of the Navy to protect the bottoms by some new type of paint application that such was the case.

Now, all we wanted was to have the Navy furnish us the drydocks so that our people in charge of that work could periodically check the ships over for a period of time, place them on drydocks, scrape the bottoms, if necessary, and spray the paint or place the paint thereon.

Now comes the question of why we did it. Under the law we are required to perform this work here as prudent businessmen. When I am reminded of the language of that act I am somewhat flattered by that language. But if we were to tow the boats from these locations periodically to the nearest facility possessing drydocks, I think that the members of the Congress would be perfectly justified in severely criticizing the judgment, or, rather, the lack of it in the event we did that sort of a performance. We are attempting to do the work to preserve the fleet at a minimum of cost and the maximum of protection to the hundreds of millions of dollars entrusted to the care of this Commission.

With relation to the comment made by my colleague, Mr. CARSON, as to the budget picture, I will say that we do not have $2 to spend for repair of any vessel in the reserve fleet, from the permanent reserve fleet standpoint.

So that there will be no confusion, I might add for the record that we have chartered a maximum total of one thousand four hundred and some odd vessels during the past 2 years at what we believe to be—and I hope that the Members of the Congress will so construe it to be—a prudent arrangement to permit American operators to engage themselves with chartered vessels to take care of the relief program, beginning immediately after the war, continuing under UNRRA, and then, we hope, continuing under the temporary relief of the Marshall plan at the present time.

That is, when we pull these ships from these temporary sites we have to put them into operating condition. Fortunately, we had the money at that time with which to do the work, and we have recovered for every dollar that we spent many, many times the dollars and cents spent, in the way of income to the Federal Treasury.

Now, the contract provides that when they return after they have finished their use by the charter that they shall be in the same condition of operation, usual wear and tear excepted. So there is a contribution made by the use of the ships by the charter program in that when they return to the permanent sites they will be in good condition and, therefore, not in need of any repairs, because they must be repaired and put in shape so that they will be in the same condition as when we first chartered them to the user.

I hope that this is not a misconception on the part of the gentlemen from Washington, Oregon, or even—if you will pardon me referring to my native State—Illinois as to what the situation is here. I should like to say to those that are present—and I recognize one or two of the gentlemen here representing the Shipbuilders' Council—that if they have any hope of many vessels in the permanent reserve fleet sites being put into operating condition that are not in that status now, it must come, as I see it, by initiation on the part of the President of the United States in a recommendation to the Congress for whatever the emergency may be—which God forbid should happen again—to appropriate a sufficient amount of money to permit us to put into shape those vessels that are not now in shape and that will be placed in the permanent reserve fleet sites.

I think I might add, with pardonable pride, for the benefit of my colleagues and their devotion to duty, that without any request from the defense arm of our Government we initiated on our own several months ago a survey, gathering together whatever data our people had received from the Army or the Navy. We felt, as citizens, that there was a disturbance in international relations, and we had our reserve fleet people make a survey. They gathered together whatever information they received from the Army and Navy who would use the ships in wartime. They requested that information so that they could screen it, ship by ship, to determine how many dollars might be needed in the event an emergency came upon us so that we would be prepared to know, at least, approximately, in a very hasty way what would be the money requirements and the requirements of time and, incidentally, utilizing 100 percent of the available ship-repair sites in the country privately operated, operated not by us but by private enterprise.

We made known those figures and those results in a letter addressed to the President some few weeks ago. If we had not initiated the study several months ago and we were asked quickly to give that kind of data to the President and the Congress, we would not have had it. So I think it is fair and not immodest for me to say on my part and in behalf of my colleagues that we initiated that on our own responsibility.

I can only say to the shipbuilders' council that if they had looked to the Commission to spend $2 in repairing any ships in the reserve fleet, that it will only happen by authority of the Congress and appropriation of the money and instructions from the Congress to spend the money now and to make all the ships ready that will be there.

I ask your pardon for having spoken such a great length of time but I thought we owed it to the record to review the picture, to indicate that the selection of the site initially, Senator CAIN, was not a haphazard and a hasty and a recently acted on decision.

Chairman SMITH. I think that you will find, Senator, that we did not prejudge the hearing, that the record will show that our policy had been set up where these fleet sites were to be. As a result of that hearing, the Commission decided not to establish a base at Cathlamet Bay but to proceed with the development of its sites there. I believe that is the way it is; I am not sure.

Senator CAIN. Admiral Smith, with your indulgence I would like to make an observance or two to see if I can completely understand the position which has been taken by the Maritime Commission.

I have gathered, beneficially, from the observations thus far made, that for a period covering several years and recent weeks and months the Maritime Commission has been developing two decisions revolving around the following two questions.

Question No. 1 is: Should there be permanent lay-up sites, and where should such sites be located?

That decision in the affirmative has resulted from several years of continuing and constant study and research and thought.

Is that a correct assumption on my part, Mr. Commissioner McKeough?

Commissioner MCKEOUGH. Yes, sir.

Chairman SMITH. That is correct, as far as my information is concerned. A statement will be made by the Chief of the Bureau later. After thorough investigation, some 15 sites were discarded entirely.

Senator CAIN. Yes.

We are trying to resolve some misunderstanding here. I think that is leading in that direction.

I have in front of me what purports to be some information from your Maritime Commission offices:

"The Maritime Commission requested United States Engineers Corps on January 16, 1947"—that is a long time ago—"to make a survey and preliminary plan for permanent fleet site John Day Point.

"On January 28, 1947, Commission requested United States engineers to survey this site for a dry dock location. A final estimate of preliminary plans received by the Commission from United States engineers from February 25, 1948. Estimated cost, including administration building, approximately $2,500,000.

"Colonel Jewett, of the United States engineers, was notified by telephone on April 9 that a letter was prepared authorizing engineers to proceed with construction dated April 9, 1948. Letter signed and actually sent on April 15, 1948.

"Engineers assume notification April 9 sufficient to begin construction."

From my point of view, that would be the final evidence that a decision in favor of a permanent site on the Columbia River had been made by the Maritime Commission.

The second decision that was developed, if I understand it correctly, is an answer to this question: Should vessels presently in temporary sites anywhere be moved to permanent sites, and when should they be moved?

Therefore, I construe that on the date of April 14, when Mr. MAGNUSON most unfortunately was not able to be here, a decision was made at that time not concerning establishing a permanent site anywhere but covering the advisability, from the Commission's point of view at that time, of moving ships in a temporary site in the waters of Puget Sound to the Columbia River.

Mr. Chairman, in speaking for my State, do I thoroughly understand the facts in this case as I just assumed them to be?

Chairman SMITH. I was called out of that meeting, but Commissioner McKeough volunteers to answer. I wish he would reply.

Commissioner MCKEOUGH. I think, Senator, that I can say yes to the questions which you raised. However, there is a possible qualification.

Senator CAIN. Yes, sir.

Commissioner MCKEOUGH. As I recall it, we have never instructed our people to move any vessel from the current temporary site to what would be the ultimate permanent site. I may be in error on that. I have to depend upon my memory; I do not have the record in front of me. And there is a very plausible reason for that.

Mr. Hickey, how many vessels are there in the current site?

Mr. HICKEY. One hundred and twenty-eight in Astoria and 58 in Olympia.

Commissioner MCKEOUGH. According to the records, how many will ultimately be scrapped?

Mr. HICKEY. About 18 in the Olympia site will be scrapped and probably 5 in Astoria.

Commissioner MCKEOUGH. That means that there will be 40 left at the Olympia site and 18 will be scrapped?

Mr. HICKEY. That is right.

Commissioner MCKEOUGH. No decision has been made as yet. We do not know yet what we will do with the vessels.

Does that answer your question, Senator?

Senator CAIN. I think it does, because I think we are getting into the correction of this situation.

As I see it, the State of Washington is on very sound ground in discussing with the Maritime Commission our feeling that the ships presently in the temporary site should not, for reasons which we will attempt to define, be moved at this time or at any time in the foreseeable future to the waters of the Columbia River or anywhere else. We could take that position if we wanted to do so. But we are not on sound ground in arguing with the Commission concerning the merits of the establishment of a permanent site which was actually established long before the hearing on April 17.

Commissioner MCKEOUGH. I think so, Senator.

Is that right, Mr. Hickey?

Mr. HICKEY. Yes.

Senator CAIN. I think I can state that our delegation is here to indicate to you gentlemen that there is sufficient reason to maintain the ships that are presently in the waters of Puget Sound. I know that my colleagues are prepared to give a justification of our position from our point of view.

Again I wish to express to you my grateful appreciation for this opportunity to be heard here.

Commissioner MCKEOUGH. Speaking for myself, Senator, I just want to say that whatever the decision will ultimately be with relation to the 40 ships, it must resolve itself from the Commission's viewpoint. I am sure that you will agree that there could be no justification for our setting up a crew for the preservation of a minimum number of 40 ships for many years to come if we have 160 ships at Astoria, and that is the permanent site selecte . by the Commission after study. I am quite sure that while the State of Washington might regret that we will be compelled, on the basis of efficiency and economy, to move the 40 ships, that it will be on that basis alone. In the event of its determination to so act, I am quite sure the Commission will be willing to again discuss the matter with the delegation from the State of Washington.

Senator CAIN. I think that I am on safe ground in saying that I assume, expect, and hope that the delegation from the State of Washington is desirous of being guided by the facts which might or might not at any given time result in the ships being moved to the waters of the Columbia River or somewhere else, or remain where they are. But, in passing, I might say that it is most interesting that the information we get this morning so nearly clears the air that we know for the first time what we are all talking about.

Chairman SMITH. Senator, there is one item that has not been mentioned. We are going over all of the ships with the Army and Navy Maritime Committee to decide which particular ships, by name, will remain in permanent lay-up, and that work is well along now.

Senator CAIN. And it will take a considerable length of time yet before final decisions are made

Commissioner MCKEOUGH. Before final placement in the permanent site.

Chairman SMITH. I would like to ask you, Senator: What is the labor market at Olympia? Is it good?

Senator CAIN. I understand that the present labor market at Olympia is excellent at the present time, as a whole; that it is adequate to provide whatever service the Maritime Service may need for its 60 ships.

Commissioner CARSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that one thing has not been mentioned thus far, the movement of 40 ships. I understood that 20 at least, and that is reduced to 18 now, were not contemplated to ever be moved because they were destined for scrap. Of course, prudence would indicate that you would not move a vessel that was destined for scrap until it had been sold for that purpose, and the purchaser would then designate the point at which he was going to cut up the ship. But it would cost a lot of money to tow 40 ships from Puget Sound down to Astoria.

I am speaking only for myself now when I reiterate something that I stated before and which I am not sure I stated in the previous meeting. I know I stated it later after we broke up and were talking. I said that, in view of the possibility of activation of all of the reserve fleet, it being a possibility, that I, for one, would certainly not favor the incurring of that expense and the moving of those vessels away from a place where obviously there were facilities for doing the repair work, unless and until it had been determined that there was not going to be any repair work to do or after they should have been put in repair.

There is also another reason. If we went into any considerable program for emergency purposes, it is only common sense to assume that there will be enough business to eliminate competition. The total reserve fleet is about 2,600 vessels, and when you measure the facilities in the United States as a whole, if you were to put that fleet of all of those vessels into tip-top shape in a hurry so that they would be ready to meet any emergency, there would not be a contest between vicinities and between years. It would largely be a question of allocating the work to the yards that could take care of it. There just would not be available facilities to do it on any other basis. You would have to use all of the facilities to their utmost.

Do I make that clear?

Senator CAIN. Very clear.

Commissioner CARSON. We have no money with which to do repair now, but if the Congress in its wisdom and the executive department should decide that we should put all of those vessels into first-class shape, it would tax to the utmost every facility in the country. The facilities would be asked to take them instead of trying to get them.

Senator CAIN. Obviously, you are not qualified as yet to say what ships should be repaired first and where.

Commissioner CARSON. That is right.

Chairman SMITH. Perhaps Senator MORSE has some questions.

Senator CAIN. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, and with that of Senator MORSE, I would like to be excused because of another commitment. Senator MAGNUSON will return to satisfy any inquiries that may be made of the Washington delegation by the Commission. Until Senator MAGNUSON returns, the Washington delegation is entirely at your service, led by Congressman JONES.

Chairman SMITH. Thank you, Senator.

You may proceed, Senator MORSE.

ARGUMENT OF THE HONORABLE WAYNE MORSE, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM OREGON

Senator MORSE. May it please the Commission.

I am pleased to inform the Commission that I speak also for my senior colleague, Senator CORDON. My colleagues from the Oregon delegation in the House are either here or are represented by assistants from their offices. I know that Congressman NORBLAD and Congressman ANGELL, and Congressman STOCKMAN are here, and that Congressman ELLSWORTH is represented.

If I were trying a lawsuit, gentlemen, on this matter, I would at this point either rest my case or move for nonsuit. But because my good friend, Senator CAIN, has raised some questions as to some misunderstanding that may exist between the Washington and Oregon delegations, and because I want the record to be perfectly clear as to our understandings or misunderstandings, I will briefly comment on the first subject matter that has been raised here today but which, after all, is quite irrevelant to the merits of the real issue that is before us.

May I say at the outset that the real issue before us is whether or not the decision reached by the Maritime Commission in regard to the establishment of permanent sites for the berthing of ships is a sound decision. There is no relevancy at all to that issue of allegations concerning misunderstandings, in spite of what my good friend from the State of Washington, Senator CAIN, may say concerning charges and countercharges. But I do think he certainly is entitled to have the record perfectly clear as to the position of the two Senators from Oregon as to that irrelevant subject matter.

Concerning the hearing on April 14, I want the record to show that neither of the Senators from Oregon knew anything about that hearing until we received notice that such a hearing was going to be held and that we were welcome to attend to present any point of view that we might care to in regard to the subject matter of the hearing.

I want the record to be perfectly clear that the junior Senator from Oregon, prior to that hearing, at no time conferred with, conversed with, or consulted with any member of this Commission, including Commissioner Carson.

It was my understanding that when we came to that hearing the legal situation of the hearing was simply this: The Commission, in accordance with its well-established procedure, announced to the delegations and to the public that it had reached a tentative decision in regard to the location of permanent berthing sites as to ships, that one of those locations was Cathlamet Bay, that it was offering an opportunity to the delegations of the two States which apparently were most directly concerned to make representations in regard thereto.

I did not know—and I think the record is perfectly clear that the Commission did not know—that the two Senators from Washington were not in the city. However, I think it is interesting for the record to show that the Washington delegation was represented in the sense that a formal statement was filed and put into the record of that hearing in regard to the State of Washington, represented through its delegation, in regard to the subject matter of the hearing. As the record shows, the members of the congressional delegation of Washington at that time were represented by one person from their offices who served as the filer of that statement. That is the way I recall it, but the record will speak for itself on that point.

The first point I want to make perfectly clear for the record is that the two Senators from Oregon—and I am sure I speak for the entire delegation—raised no objection to the hearing of the subject matter. In fact, if either Washington Senator had called me on the telephone prior to our coming down here on April 14 and had informed me that they would not be in the city—because I did not know they were not in the city—I myself, as a matter of senatorial courtesy, would have asked for a postponement of the hearing, just as they, in turn, joined in my request for a postponement of the second hearing which was set an an earlier date than today, when I was out of town and asked to have the hearing postponed until May 5.

Now, as to charges as to whether or not any member of the Oregon delegation made a statement that the hearing on April 14 was a cut-and-dried affair, I know of no such statement. I do know, however, how easy it is for people in public life to be maligned, and I am going to continue to presume that no such statement was made. I think it was perfectly clear, judging from the spirit in which we met here on April 14, that there was little that the Oregon delegation needed to say at that time, because we found ourselves completely in agreement with the decision made by the Commission in regard to the site at Cathlamet Bay.

We were disturbed—and the record shows our disturbance—at the information that was made available to us at that time at that hearing, that there was opposition on the part of the Navy. The record will speak for itself on that point.

Also, we were informed at that time that certain representations had been made by officials of the Navy that it was just as well to leave the ships in salt water as in fresh water. As I said at that time, that was a surprise to me, because in my conversations with the Navy during the past 3 years, when the issue as to the permanent berthing of ships first was raised, the representations of the Navy then to me were that they were seeking fresh-water sites for the storage and the berthing of ships.

I cannot recall the exact date, but it was in the neighborhood of 2 years ago that there was, in fact, considerable concern about the permanent berthing of ships in Lake Washington, because it was felt that it might have an adverse effect upon the use of the lake or the shores of the lake for home sites and

estates. There was a feeling that at least some assurance ought to be given that if ships were going to be berthed in Lake Washington it should be on a temporary basis rather than on a permanent basis. It was at that time that there was a considerable amount of interest shown for the Youngs Point location at Astoria for ships. The record shows this morning that there were some 130 ships removed to that site.

I now want to put Senator CAIN completely at ease in regard to any misinformation that has been supplied him, that it is the position of the two Senators from Oregon that we charged the Washington delegation with trying to get ships away from Oregon. I have never made any such charge. My senior colleague has never made any such charge. I know of no facts that would support any such charge.

However, gentlemen, our position, specifically, is this: That we are opposed, because we think the merits of the case do not support the position of the Washington delegation, to the position of the Washington delegation that the tentative decision of his Commission as to the location of permanent sites for the berthing of these ships and, in particular, Cathlamet Bay, should be reversed. Although Senator CAIN very rightly says that they do not seek to take anything from Oregon, we need to examine into his argument a bit to point out that, of course, that the Washington delegation does seek to reverse a decision of this Commission which would establish a permanent site at Cathlamet Bay and which would, if established and effectuated, of course, cause the movement of ships not only from Puget Sound but, I assume, from other quarters to Cathlamet Bay for permanent berthing.

I will dwell on that point a moment longer, gentlemen, because, after all, the issue before us is: What pattern is to be established in the setting up of permanent sites for the berthing of ships?

Now, once the final decision on that matter is reached, then I think it is perfectly clear that the Commission cannot justify keeping a small number of ships now located in temporary sites at those temporary sites when permanent sites have finally been decided upon.

I want to also say for the benefit of my good friends from Washington that the record is prefectly clear concerning the cooperation of the Senators from Oregon and, in fact, the entire Oregon delegation, with the delegation from Washington on matters of mutual interest in the Pacific Northwest. It would be most unfortunate, it seems to me, if we do not continue that fine cooperation and teamwork relationship which has existed between these two delegations because we have many problems of mutual interest.

I suggest one main premise on which to continue that cooperation, and that is, namely, that after we have all had our say and have presented our arguments on the merits of a given proposition and after the Government agency which has jurisdiction to render a decision does decide, then it behooves us, it seems to me, to accept the decision of that Government agency if on rehearing we cannot present facts which justify a reversal of its tentatively announced policy

That is my position as to the issue here. The record is perfectly clear that there has always been the utmost cooperation by me on every issue that has affected these two sister States.

Now, gentlemen of the Commission, I do no blame the members of the Washington delegation for seeking a reversal of this decision on the merits. That is their responsibility, it seems to me, as representatives in the Congress of the United States properly protecting the economic interests of the people in their State, to see to it that all they can say in support of their position has been made a matter of record.

I have done it many times since I have been in the Senate in behalf of my State. But the important point that I want to call to the attention of the delegation from Washington is that after the record is all made, after the final decision is made, then I think that as two delegations we must continue to stand together in support of what we believe to be the best interests of the Pacific Northwest.

My good friend from Washington, Mr. CAIN, points out that, as I recall his statement, it is the position of the Washington delegation that they seek to follow only that course of action which will best protect the national security, and, secondarily, protect to the best possible extent the economic interests of the State of Washington. I quite agree with him that the major premise in this discussion ought to be what is in the best interest of the national security. This is not a Washington problem; it is not an Oregon problem; it is not even a Pacific coast problem. It is a national problem. I think that if we can make a case in our respective States for showing that national security will be best promoted by a site within our State, that it is our duty to do so. But we ought also to stand on the record and support the decision when it is made.

So I repeat that my good friend from Washington does seek a decision and a reversal of the study already made by the Maritime Commission and that therefore the burden of proof rests on the Washington delegation to show that the decision of this Commission is not supported by the preponderance of the evidence in the case. That is why, at least up until this moment in this hearing, I would be inclined to move a nonsuit if we rested the case at this point.

Now, as the Commissioner has already pointed out, the record is perfectly clear that when we met on April 14 we knew that a decision had been reached and we knew that a hearing was being given to determine whether or not that was to be a final decision. I assume that, in view of the postponement, with which I am in hearty accord, the purpose of this hearing today by way of rehearing is to give the Washington delegation an ample opportunity to present its facts in support of its contention that the tentative decision of the Commission should be set aside and another decision should prevail.

I think I have covered the points raised by Senator CAIN when he commented upon the possibility of a member of the Commission advising the Oregon delegation that the Washington delegation sought to move ships from Oregon to Washington. No such representation has been made by any member of this Commission, either to the junior or to the senior Senator from Oregon, or, I am also advised, to any of the rest of the members of the Oregon delegation.

That is my specific answer to that point raised by Senator CAIN. We know of no attempt on the part of the Washington delegation to get ships moved from Astoria to Puget Sound. We have made no such charge.

Gentlemen of the Commission, let me comment now on the merits of this case. We think the record made by the Commission itself in its own survey, its own report on this matter, speaks for itself, and we rest on those findings. We think we need add no more to the evidence accumulated by the Commission itself in support of establishing a permanent base at Cathlamet Bay.

But I do want to say a few words, Mr. Chairman, in regard to the testimony here this morning of my good friend Admiral Mills of the Navy because the position of the Navy involves a drydock issue and the position of the Navy here this morning also involves a survey of previous positions taken by the Navy in regard to the location of permanent berthing sites.

Admiral Mills very rightfully points out in his opening statement that the Navy takes the position that it is up to the Maritime Commission to determine this question. I think he is absolutely sound on that and I think that is exactly where the Navy should rest. But let us analyze the admiral's argument a bit further.

Admiral Mills points out that heavy towing charges will be involved if ships are located at Cathlamet Bay and drydock facilities are likewise not provided at Cathlamet Bay. He points out that drydocks and the location of the drydocks is the responsibility of the Navy. I interpret this argument or representation of Admiral Mills, of course, to be in the nature of qualifications of the major contentions of the Navy that the chief responsibility for the setting up of permanent berthing places for the ships is the responsibility of the Maritime Commission. The Navy says in one breath that that is true, but it points out, and quite rightly so, on the basis of present jurisdictional powers, that the jurisdiction over drydocks is the Navy's.

I want to point out that I think the location of drydocks involves a great national interest, for the reasons that Admiral Mills himself implies in his argument here this morning. If the Maritime Commission decides that it is sound national policy to locate a permanent berthing site at the Cathlamet Bay location, then I say it creates a responsibility on the part of the Navy, recognizing the jurisdiction of the Maritime Commission to so decide to cooperate with the Maritime Commission in seeing to it that a surplus drydock is moved into Cathlamet Bay to service these ships.

Now, may I digress a moment to make it perfectly clear that it is not the position of the Oregon delegation, nor has it ever been the position of the Oregon delegation, that extensive ship repair work should be done at Cathlamet Bay. It is our position, of course, that in the interest of economy and in the interest of diversification of our naval operations on the Pacific coast we should have at Cathlamet Bay a drydock that will take care of the bottoms of these ships. If I understood the Chairman of this Commission correctly this morning, the only position the Commission has ever taken is to have a drydock there so that the bottoms of these ships could be serviced and so that any minor repairs to the bottoms of these ships could be made, and major repairs, I assume, in the interests of economy would continue to be made at the great shipbuilding and ship repair centers at Puget Sound and in the Portland area.

The admiral talks about towing costs and that Olympia is only some 20 or 30 miles from the repair yards in Puget Sound. I have been informed that the principal cost and expenditure of towing is, of course, not the distance of the tow but the preparation for the towing, the getting ready for the towing, the putting under operation of the towing. Although there is additional cost, if you go some miles beyond the 20 or 30 mileage that the admiral mentioned, it is not a major part of the expense. The major part of the expense is the so-called get-ready-tow expense.

It is my opinion that the practices of the past in regard to towing for major repairs will and should be continued and that any fear that either Puget Sound or Portland is going to lose any substantial amount of repair work as a result of what towing will be involved for major repairs if these ships are located at Cathlamet Bay is of little materiality in this hearing.

I want to also point out that Admiral Mills this morning, as was represented to us at the hearing on April 14, points out that there is what is called a commercial drydock, at Swan Island in Portland, and that to the extent that the Navy has taken any position in regard to that particular drydock, the position has been that for a period of the emergency or a temporary period consideration should be given to the possibility of moving that drydock from Portland to Cathlamet Bay.

Well, I do not like to find myself in unpleasant differences with the Navy, gentlemen of the Commission, but I must say in behalf of the two Senators from Oregon that we think that the Navy makes no case for any such suggestion as that. The Navy well knows the great need for that drydock in Portland and the Navy well knows that if it effectuates a proper diversification of the Navy program on the Pacific coast, that drydock would be used to a much greater extent than the Navy at the present time is making use of that drydock.

The Navy also knows that the suggestion of moving the Portland drydock to Astoria, as I said at the April 14 meeting, even on an emergency or a temporary basis, excluding for the moment the consideration of the cost of any such move, with the thought of subsequently moving the drydock back to Portland, is a suggestion on the part of the Navy that is bound to develop just the type of misunderstandings that are developing between the Navy and the Oregon delegation.

There is great unemployment in the Portland area now among the skilled laborers and among the shipbuilding and ship repair workers. It is an area of unemployment today. The Portland Labor-Management Committee, which is comprised of outstanding employees and representatives of labor in the ship-construction field and the ship-repair field as well as other fields, made representations to our delegation as to the need of increasing ship activity in Portland. We have called that to the attention of the Navy and we intend to continue to call it to the attention of the Navy.

However, we also want to make very clear to the Navy that we are satisfied, as a delegation, that there are other Navy drydocks which can be rented to civilians. We do not propose to take one out of Puget Sound. There are other drydocks in the Pacific which we think a full discussion will show are in the category of surplus drydocks and which could very well and properly be moved to Cathlamet Bay once this Government decides that Cathlamet Bay should be the berthing site for a permanent reserve fleet. We certainly think that the Navy should take the necessary steps in cooperating with this Commission once that decision is reached, to see to it that a drydock is moved into the Cathlamet Bay area.

I am also interested in Admiral Mills' discussion of fresh and salt water and his discussion of a plastic paint. I sincerely hope that they have found a paint which will save us the great losses that we suffer to our ships from barnacles and other growths because of the attachment of those barnacles to the ships in salt water. This is apparently a new and recent development of the Navy because heretofore, I repeat, the Oregon delegation has been informed by representatives of the Navy, that, as far as storage is concerned, as far as lay up is concerned, there is less upkeep, less bottom repair work that has to be done in fresh water than salt water. It seems to me that the burden of proof is now on the Navy to come forward with scientific evidence showing that their previous representation is no longer correct.

Admiral Mills also participates in that very interesting fallacy which we hear in so many of the Government's representations: argument based upon percentages. I have dealt in the field of statistics for a great many years, gentlemen, and I know that very frequently you can make a case look good by saying that you have increased services to a certain area by so much percentage. But when you get down to the materiality and extent of a claimed increase, when you get down to the actual amount of repair work that has been increased, the labor supply that has been taken care of by the increase, the unemployment that has been handled by the increase, you usually find that the percentages mean very little. Labor cannot eat percentages.

I respectfully submit that Admiral Mills' discussion of percentages in this case leaves me rather cold. The fact is that we need, in the interest of national security, widespread diversity of the Navy program on the west coast. I think the admiral knows very well that we do not feel in the Oregon delegation that the Navy has sufficiently diversified its program on the west coast in the interest of national security, and I wish to emphasize that statement this morning for his benefit.

The admiral says that the Navy has not the slightest objection to giving a drydock to the Commission as soon as they can complete a survey and a study concerning the location of their drydocks and what ought to be done with them from the standpoint of a sound Navy program. I am glad to hear that. I hope that the study will be expedited and that in a short period of time the Navy will reach a final conclusion on a matter that has been hanging fire now for a considerable length of time.

But the point is that the admiral's own statements here this morning show that the Navy has suggested that a drydock be moved from Portland to Cathlamet Bay. I repeat what I said at the last hearing, that when you sit in the position that we sit in, the Oregon delegation, and such a proposal comes from the Navy, then, of course—the Navy knows it—there is bound to be immediately stirred up a conflict of interests between Portland and another section of our State. I think it is very strange that this is the drydock which the Navy should first decide upon as the possible drydock that ought to be moved to Cathlamet Bay.

I have asked the Secretary of the Navy, in behalf of the delegation, to supply us with a location of the drydocks owned by the Navy in the Pacific, and a statement as to the justification for leaving those drydocks in their present position. I am sure that in due course of time that information will be supplied the Oregon delegation and then we will be in a position to discuss with the Navy whether or not its decisions in regard to drydocks are decisions that ought to be further inquired into.

In conclusion, gentlemen, and by way of summary, let me assure the two Senators from Washington that there is no misunderstanding as far as the Oregon delegation is concerned.

I see now that my good friend, Senator MAGNUSON, has returned. I assume that he is aware of the representations made by his junior colleague concerning misunderstandings between the two delegations.

The Oregon delegation denies the misinformation that was given to Senator CAIN and Senator MAGNUSON in regard to the position of the Oregon delegation. We take the position that the only issue pending in this case is simply this: Do the merits support the tentative decision of the Maritime Commission to establish a permanent berthing site for ships at Cathlamet Bay, Oreg.?

It is our position that the merits support the Commission's position and that the burden of proof rests upon the members of the Washington delegation to show that the decision should be reversed. Therefore on the basis of the Commission's own findings and the facts presented by the Commission itself we rest our case, awaiting rebuttal.

Mr. NORBLAD. Might I say a word here briefly, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman SMITH. Yes.

ARGUMENT OF THE HONORABLE WALTER NORBLAD, REPRESENTATIVE TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES FROM THE FIRST DISTRICT OF OREGON

Mr. NORBLAD. I am Congressman Norblad, of the First District of Oregon; residence, Astoria, Oreg.

I would like to say that I concur with what Senator Morse has said. He has made a very able presentation of our case. I want to add just one or two things in addition to what he has said.

First of all, the question was raised by the Navy with reference to the labor factor at Astoria. I personally believe, and it is my understanding, that there is adequate labor supply at Astoria. But, for the sake of argument, assuming the Navy to be correct, there is the Portland market which is located a short distance away, a matter of about a 100-mile drive.

You can recall the developments in the shipyards there during the war. The admiral gave you those figures. Much of that activity has now been shut down and there are hundreds and hundreds of men who are familiar with the shipbuilding trades who are available and willing to come to Astoria immediately, I am sure, to do whatever work will be required by the Commission. As a matter of fact, I am sure the Commission can in a very short time, get more men in the Astoria labor market than they would need.

Another observation that I would like to make is with reference to the water at Astoria. There was some mention made by the Navy with reference to that. I am advised by the Maritime Commission's engineers that the water at the proposed site at Cathlamet Bay is the purest of any of the sites that the Maritime Commission has in the United States. I believe there are about a dozen sites.

Commissioner MELLEN. I cannot believe that statement. I do not believe that it was made, either.

Mr. NORBLAD. The statement was made to me.

Commissioner MELLEN. Can you show it in documentary evidence in any form?

Mr. NORBLAD. I cannot. That statement was made to me orally in my office.

Commissioner MELLEN. You said "Any of the sites."

Mr. NORBLAD. Any site.

Commissioner MELLEN. Not confining the statement to Oregon or Washington?

Mr. NORBLAD. Yes, sir. That was the statement that was made. I stand to be corrected, but that was the statement made to me.

Chairman SMITH. Mr. Hickey will speak later and I believe that he will cover that point.

Mr. NORBLAD. All right, sir.

In conclusion, I would just like to state that, as has already been said, the decision of the Commission was not a hasty one. It was a matter taken up and studied by the Commission for a year or two before it was finally decided upon. It was a matter that the Commission thought was to the best interests of our taxpayers to render the decision that they did render and that it was in the interests of our national defense and our welfare. I respectfully request that the Commission abide by that decision.

Chairman SMITH. Is there any rebuttal by the Navy, Admiral Mills?

Admiral MILLS. I have no further statement to make, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, may I make a statement here?

Chairman SMITH. Yes, sir.

ARGUMENT OF THE HONORABLE HENRY M. JACKSON, REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS FROM THE SECOND DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. JACKSON. I am Congressman HENRY M. JACKSON, of Everett, Wash., representing the Second District of Washington.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make just a brief supplementary statement.

I believe there are two issues apparently that have arisen here: One is the removal of the fleet from Olympia to Astoria and the other is a question of a drydock.

Now, as to No. 1, our delegation feels quite strongly that the status quo should be maintained—that the present facilities should continue on at Olympia.

As to No. 2, so far as I am personally concerned, the question of a drydock, it seems to me, is entirely a matter of strategic determination on the part of the Navy. Assuming that there is the necessary activity in the Puget Sound area, the dock should be allocated there. If the business is not there, then it should not be allocated there, I think that is quite evident.

If the Navy feels, from the standpoint of strategic concern, that an extra dock should be held in reserve in Puget Sound, or that there should be some similar arrangement, I think that is a matter of expert determination. It is a matter that I, at least, do not feel personally qualified to speak on.

Chairman SMITH. Are there any questions of Senator MORSE by members of the Washington delegation?

(Whereupon there was no response.)

Commissioner CARSON. Mr. Chairman, there was part of one question that Senator CAIN posed in his statement that I would like to answer.

Senator MAGNUSON. I might say that I have read the statement.

Commissioner CARSON. Yes; but I would like to answer for the record right now.

I have never heard from anyone any suggestion that any member of the Washington delegation had suggested or intimated that he had any intention of suggesting that the vessels now located in Cathlamet Bay be moved to Puget Sound. There may be some further observations that I may make for the record later on, but for the purpose of accuracy I want to first look through my files with respect to some thoughts that I may have in connection with what others may have had in mind. But so far as the Washington delegation is concerned, I have never heard it intimated by anyone that the vessels be moved to Puget Sound. I took pains to verify that through the secretary, through the office of one of the members of the Washington delegation. That was my view all along, and I said I want to be sure.

I asked him straight out: "Have you heard any suggestion on the part of any member of the Washington delegation that that be done?" I am sure that he made an exhaustive inquiry, and he said, "No." That confirmed the view that I had.

I may have something more to state for the record later.

Senator MAGUNSON. I have a brief statement to make here, Mr. Chairman, if I may.

Chairman SMITH. Proceed, Senator.

ARGUMENT OF THE HONORABLE WARREN G. MAGNUSON, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM OREGON

Senator MAGNUSON. Having gone over this matter previously, I do not have too much to say to what has already been said. I regret that I had to leave when I did, but I did have this other conflicting appointment.

It seems to me that this entire matter settles down to an analysis very ably given just a minute ago by Congressman JACKSON. Puget Sound is an important body of water. It is an important shipbuilding center. It is an important ship repair center. It is important to the Navy, it is important to the Maritime Commission, it is important to the defense of the country. We just feel, at the outset, that any storage of Maritime ships should contemplate Puget Sound.

In the original plan, in which many of us participated when this fleet was being laid up, both the Navy and Maritime, Puget Sound played an important part. We did get a few ships at Olympia. We even think that we should have had more ships, let alone lose the ones that we have. There are more ships in Oregon today and in California than there are in Puget Sound, and what few we did get we feel play an important part in the future plans which involves the Navy, the Maritime Commission, or our national defense.

I do not think the Navy's position is inconsistent at all. I do not quite agree with the contentions that Senator MORSE has made concerning the Navy's position that they ought to cooperate with the Maritime Commission. I am certain that they had at all times attempted to do so. Surely the Navy has an interest in this matter. The Navy is clothed with the responsibility of advising and making plans for the defense of this country. And that includes ships. It includes ships of the Maritime Commission. During the war, cooperation between the Navy and the Maritime Commission was of the highest character.

All the Navy says here today is, in effect, that there should be the diversity that so many speakers have talked about. Part of that diversity involves Puget Sound.

I am not very much concerned about a drydock in Puget Sound. Perhaps we need one and perhaps we do not, but surely it plays a part in the laying up of Maritime Commission ships. It plays a part in the whole maritime picture.

I am not very much concerned about the drydock at Portland. I think if they need a drydock they ought to have one. No one wants to take that away from them. Perhaps they need two drydocks.

I am not very much concerned about a site in Cathlamet Bay. That may be desirable, but we do think that it is desirable also to have a lay-up site in Puget Sound. That is all that we are asking.

Someone said it is not quite the status quo. It is the perfection now of some sort of overall plan. That plan includes some ships in Olympia. I do not like to see a move by the Maritime Commission, a trend, which may result in the Maritime Commission going into the ship-repair business. I do not believe that is the intention. But when these things happen you start a chain of events, and that is often what results. You put a ship up in drydock—it makes no difference what the location is—and there is something wrong with the ship. You are not going to take it off the drydock and tow it some place else and then put it in another drydock to do the repair work.

Puget Sound has just as much importance in maritime plans as Portland has. Perhaps it is not as important percentagewise because Portland was loaded up during the war, but we have a shipyard that needs the work. We have a shipyard that the Navy and the Maritime Commission want to keep in standby operation. Some of this work should be done up there.

The difference between the fresh and salt water, as has well been pointed out, is not a controlling factor. It may be a controlling factor in some cases, but the Navy is perfectly right in submitting their tests. They have had experience in laying up ships ever since the war and they know something about the difference in the deterioration of ships laid up in different types of water.

We only say here that you can call the Cathlamet site a permanent site or the Olympia site a permanent site, or by any other name, it does not make any difference, but we just want to keep these ships up there where we think they belong, where we think they serve the best interests of the Nation, and where we think they also serve the best interests of keeping the maritime alive in Puget Sound, which is an important thing to both the Navy and Maritime Commission.

There is a great deal to be said about the point that Cathlamet Bay does happen to be close to Tongue Point and that you will have a great concentration in that area. Perhaps some of the members of the Commission have been there, but if you have not, I will say that they are almost together and if anything should happen there would be quite a concentration of ships right in that one spot. The navy yard being further away, Puget Sound does provide a better site. When the Navy stores these ships way up the sound, there is more of a diversification of the two fleets.

As I said, I do not come here talking about the status quo. I should come here complaining about the fact that the Portland area and Oregon and California still have more ships than we have without this move. I just want to endorse what Senator CAIN has said. We are very much in agreement on this, and I am sure that Senator MORSE and he will both agree that there is no misunderstanding between the two of us. We are just fighting for Puget Sound and they are fighting for the Colorado River; that is about what it amounts to.

That is the way things work up on the Hill. Sometimes those things have to be resolved and be decided by what is the blueprint and the mechanics of both the Maritime Commission and the Navy.

We want to keep our ships. We think we can do it up there just as cheaply and economically as any stored elsewhere. As a matter of fact, I have heard that these ships up in Olympia mostly are ships intended to be scrapped. That is what I have heard; I do not know it for a fact.

Commissioner CARSON. Twenty of them.

Senator MAGNUSON. They look like good ships to me. That is as of the last time I saw them, which is no later than last Saturday.

I think the question can easily be resolved. The Maritime Commission probably has some plans for Cathlamet Bay which are justifiable, but that does not mean that they should forget Puget Sound, because Puget Sound is there and there are the ships and we can handle them. We can do it just as economically as anybody else. We can leave the drydock out because that is a matter where both the Maritime Commission and the Navy have to decide upon the need. Perhaps we do not need a new drydock in Puget Sound; perhaps we do. Portland may need another drydock. But whatever the work load is going to be, both places should be kept going. We may need them both quicker than we imagine.

I again want to thank the Commission for giving us the opportunity of having this so-called reexamination of this entire matter.

Senator MORSE. Mr. Chairman, if the Commission will permit me, I would like to have not more than 2 minutes to comment on my good friend from Washington's point of view.

I quite agree with him as to what the major issue is here, but I want to point out that the task of this Commission was to make a study and reach a decision as to where our permanent lay-up sites were to be. I think the record is perfectly clear that we cannot in the interests of sound economy proceed with so many temporary sites for these ships. It was brought out here this morning that, of course, the cost of maintaining 40 ships here and 120 ships here and another number someplace else is the reason for this Commission trying to lay down a uniform pattern as to permanent sites.

Now, Senator MAGNUSON is quite right that their interest is to try to reserve some of these ships for Puget Sound. But I want to point out, when he speaks about the program of Puget Sound, that when you compare the activity of the Navy in Puget Sound as compared with the activity of the Navy anywhere else on the Pacific coast down to San Francisco, Puget Sound is and will continue to be the major center for Navy operations in that section of the country. The activated ships of the Navy go in and out of Bremerton. Bremerton will remain the major repair center for major repairs of the Navy in that area.

We are dealing here, gentlemen, with the question: Where are we going to put the mothball fleet of the Maritime Commission? Where are we going to put the ships that are not activated and are not to be activated in the immediate future?

May I digress just a moment to caution the Commission not to assume that there is an

immediate danger of a necessity for the activating of a very large number of Navy ships now in mothballs. I have been listening to Navy witnesses now for some 13 weeks in the Armed Services Committee, and the record of that committee will speak for itself. We must be on the alert, as far as activation of our fleet is concerned, but it certainly is not contemplated to put into immediate activation any large number of ships now in mothballs. There is no appropriation for it thus far and there is no expressed need for any great activation. So you gentlemen are confronted with the problem of where you are going to put the mothball fleet.

Now, if you are to look at the Navy program on the Pacific coast, then you should look at the entire Navy program in the Puget Sound area. Let me tell you that these 40 ships are just a drop in a very large bucket, as far as the Navy program in Puget Sound is concerned.

I want to say to my good friend, the Senator from Washington, that the responsibility of this Commission is to fix permanent sites, and once those sites are selected then the ships in temporary sites should in the earliest possible period of time be moved to the permanent sites. If Cathlamet Bay, in the opinion of this Commission, on the basis of facts presented to you, is the site for a permanent berthing of these ships, then, of course, ships not only in Puget Sound but elsewhere also in present temporary sites should be moved to Cathlamet Bay.

The two delegations should continue in this instance, as in past instances to accept the decisions once handed down after full hearing and rehearing in accordance with the merits of the facts upon which the Commission has acted. That is the position of the Oregon delegation.

Senator MAGNUSON. Why not have three permanent sites, then?

Senator MORSE. That is for the Commission to decide. It must decide whether we need one, two, three, or any number of permanent sites.

But I respectfully submit that after the Washington delegation has presented whatever facts it has on the merits, then it is the jurisdiction of this Commission to determine where the permanent sites are to be. Once the Commission has determined that, then it is not for us, for either the Washington delegation or the Oregon delegation, or a delegation from X, Y, Z State, to take the political position that we should then insist that a temporary site should be maintained, after a Commission charged with the maintaining of permanent sites has reached a decision.

Commissioner CARSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question to clear up, as far as possible, what I think might be a misconception flowing out of a statement that Senator Morse has made.

It is my understanding that we have no money for repairs, nor do we contemplate making repairs. We only have money appropriated for preservation.

I wanted to point that out. I think there has been no evidence, as I understand it, as between minor repairs and major repairs. We only have money appropriated for preservation and for that purpose only, and I do not believe that preservation and repair are in the same category.

Senator MORSE. Will the Commissioner permit a question?

Commissioner CARSON. Yes.

Senator MORSE. Is the Commissioner of the impression that the junior Senator from Oregon took the position that repair work was to be done at Cathlamet Bay? If so, I will let the record speak for itself. At least, I intended to make it clear that I thought the need of the dry dock was to keep the bottoms of the ships in repair, and by that I assume we mean to keep them clean, keep them so they can be put out to sea free of barnacles, keep them painted. In other words, just keep the bottoms in repair, and that repair proper would be done in one of the major ship repair yards of the west coast.

Commissioner CARSON. I think what we have been contemplating here—at least it has been my understanding—is that you would call "repair" removing and replacing plates and getting into work of that kind, whereas just treating the exterior portion of a hull, possibly by painting or the like, would not be considered as "repair."

Am I right about that, Mr. Hickey?

Mr. HICKEY. That is right.

Chairman SMITH. I think that Mr. Carson's observation was prompted by the fact, Senator MORSE, that you did say "preservation and minor repair." We do not intend to do minor repairs, but, of course, we must dock a ship to know what repairs it needs and it may be convenient to do whatever work is necessary.

Senator MORSE. That is my understanding. I consider painting and removing barnacles as minor repair work. You need a dry dock to do it.

Commissioner CARSON. That is minor repair work.

Senator MAGNUSON. Of course no one denies the right of the Maritime Commission to decide where they should keep their mothball fleet. If you would want to carry the thing to its logical conclusion you would put them all in the same place. You must arrive at a happy medium somewhere between diversification and concentration. Our position is that there would be too much concentration if all of the ships went down to Cathlamet Bay, that economies must be tempered by, first, the Navy's position on what might be the best thing for national defense; and, secondly, of course, the cost and available facilities for moth-ball fleets; and, thirdly, the factor of where they are now must be taken into consideration; and the labor element is also involved.

We contend that whatever ships you have in Puget Sound and whatever ships you might put in there in the future, if you do put any more in there, that that site meets all of those requirements and that the Maritime Commission's plans to establish sites for these moth-ball fleets must of necessity include Puget Sound, in the interest of all these factors.

I do not question your responsibility to do that. All the things have to be included and we just do not think we should be left out of any plan that the Maritime Commission has for the preservation of its fleet within its responsibility, and we think that some of the determining factors in this case adequately show that even economy-wise that fleet that is now in Olympia could be handled at Puget Sound and handled with no more dollars-and-cents cost than it can be handled at Cathlamet Bay.

Another factor to be taken into consideration is the control. We have no objection at all to what the Commission might want to do insofar as the fleet in Cathlamet Bay is concerned. Instead of having just the two fleets you may possibly have three. And you can call it permanent or anything that you want to call it. The Maritime Commission has the responsibility of selling these ships also. They can get rid of them. They want to put them on the seas.

I hope there is no misunderstanding regarding the feeling of any of our delegation concerning the responsibilities of the Maritime Commission.

Senator MORSE. Mr. Chairman, we rest our case on the record.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a statement here.

Chairman SMITH. Proceed, sir.

ARGUMENT OF THE HONORABLE HOMER R. JONES, REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS FROM THE FIRST DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. JONES. I am HOMER R. JONES, Representative to Congress from the First District of Washington, which embraces the city of Seattle and the great Puget Sound Navy Yard at Bremerton.

I just want to concur in all of the statements made by our distinguished Senators from Washington and Mr. JACKSON from the Second District, and to have the record show the members of our delegation that are present here today.

Mr. TOLLEFSON of the Sixth District is here and also Mr. HOLMES of the Fourth District and Mr. HORAN of the Fifth District. They are all here but Mr. MACK.

I just want to thank the Chairman and the members of the Commission for the opportunity presented us at this rehearing here today.

Chairman SMITH. Thank you, Mr. JONES.

I think we might call upon Mr. Hickey of the reserve fleet to tell us briefly of the number of sites that were examined and the relative salinity found at those sites.

The Navy has stated that salinity is not a controlling factor, the relative salinity between the two sites under discussion.

ARGUMENT OF F. E. HICKEY, CHIEF, BUREAU OF THE RESERVE FLEET

Mr. HICKEY. I would just like to briefly give you the whole picture of the entire country as to the Reserve Fleets. We have been working on surveying sites since 1944. We selected certain temporary sites because we were not sure as to how many ships we would have ultimately, and we have selected a few permanent sites.

In fact, before I get to that, I want to say that we have just abolished the site at Brunswick, Ga., because we did not have enough ships there and we were taking care of that work in Wilmington and the James River.

We originally planned, if possible, to have two permanent sites on the Atlantic, two in the Gulf, and two in the Pacific. As time went on, we then got worried about the Pacific because they took many ships out of layup. Those ships that were in operation took cargoes to the European area and they terminated on the Atlantic Coast. Of course, it was unreasonable to expect them to bring ships around to the Pacific. So for a while we did not know just how many ships we were going to have.

Just recently we came to the conclusion that we should have a permanent site on the Pacific. We could not put ships in at Suisun Bay in California due to silt, which was the result of putting ships in there. That caused a sort of baffle effect which resulted in silting. So we made up our minds we would have to go to the North Pacific.

We examined 76 sites up there in the North Pacific. We conferred with the various Government agencies, with the United States Engineers, with the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Weather Bureau, the United States Navy, the Defense Plant Corporation, the Kaiser Vancouver Shipyard. Mayor Chapman Scott made a separate survey for the Commission, as did Todd Shipyard; also Frederick R. Harris, Inc., consulting engineers.

We conferred with the city of Portland, the Everett chamber of commerce, and then the Reserve Fleet made its own special little surveys, too. I made part of these surveys and my assistant, Mr. Gorman, made several others, as did our superintendent out there in the North Pacific at the present time.

We came to the conclusion that the best figures that we could get from every source are that we probably will have in the permanent reserve in the North Pacific about 220 to 225 ships.

At the Astoria site we first looked at Youngs Bay, but it is more exposed and we finally selected, after consulting with the United States Engineers, the site inside of Tongue Point.

We took 44 tests. These tests are going on all of the time in all of the fleets. We test the water about 1 or 2 feet under the surface

to get surface water and about 16 feet below because that is about the depth that we have to consider.

I want to clarify some of the statements that have been made. In Cathlamet Bay where we propose to go, the water is fresh. We have been told it is practically fresher than the water we drink here in Washington. I am not going to make any comparison between that water and any other fleet, because it varies, but it is as fresh as we can hope to get. That is a little in conflict with what the Admiral there said, but the samples, the tests taken by our people in the North Pacific show that. There is some college up there that has been running those tests through the laboratories and in the Portland area there is an outside testing laboratory. They are not made by the Government at all. We pay for those tests and they are still continuing.

Now, one of the salt conditions, that is, a brackish condition is not considered one of the most serious things. We want protection from storms, tides, and currents. The studies that we have made have attempted to develop the cheapest possible and satisfactory and adequate method of laying up these ships. We don't build piers and tie the ships up to them because that is a tremendous expense. They are placed in units at anchor. They are balanced and anchors thrown out both ways. We have found that quite satisfactory where you have sufficient area available.

There has been some confusion up here. I think some of the gentlemen found out that the United States engineers had done some work for us out there and they assumed that we had gone ahead on this site regardless. But in order for us to go to the Commission and make recommendations as to the cost of site at Cathlamet Bay, it has been necessary to have the United States engineers to go out and sound all of that area and make borings, because that is the way you get your estimates of your cost of dredging. Also, in order to see whether we could put a drydock in there or not, we asked them to go in further and make soundings there. Those are things that Senator CAIN referred to, but that is only a preliminary phase. After making our studies we can go to the Commission and say, "It is estimated the cost of developing this site is so much." That is just the customary preliminary work in engineering activity and it is not necessary to develop the site at all.

Now, as I say, there are only 58 ships at Olympia. We got those in there over some protests, of course, and we naturally felt that it was all right to go ahead with the promise that we would remove them in due time, and we called that a temporary site.

Senator MAGNUSON. Promise to whom?

Mr. HICKEY. To the Chamber of Commerce there and those people.

Senator MAGNUSON. To the Chamber of Commerce?

Mr. HICKEY. Yes, in Olympia. And they published a big ad in the paper, a letter from our superintendent, saying that we tried to act in accordance with the feelings of the people up there and telling them that there would be a certain amount of labor involved there for awhile and that it was a temporary fleet for the time being. You know, it was an effort to induce them to let it stay there. And now, of course, I do know they feel a little differently about it. However, that is the reason. We made all of our plans accordingly.

Naturally, we want to get one location, because that means one overhead. It means one set of tugs, one set of patrol boats, one office force, and you can absorb certain of the work in with your general preservation crew. That is the reason that we came to the Commission with this recommendation.

This situation is no different here than it is in any other part of the country. We have the same thing elsewhere. We did at Mobile, the Tensaw River. It costs a little money to put a cut-off there but it is highly desirable.

In this particular location the site is very well protected from the winds, storms, and I think it is to the south. There is some pretty high land there. It also was surprising to us that this water was as fresh as we discovered it to be. We have been taking these tests during freshets and during droughts, if they have any droughts up there. I don't believe they have them in that part of the country, but I mean at times other than at freshets. That is the way I will express it.

Those are the figures that we got, that that water is fresher than water that we are drinking right here in Washington.

Senator MAGNUSON. You would not advise drinking it, would you?

Mr. HICKEY. Yes. My assistant went out there and scooped some of it out of the river and drank it just to find out what it was like. Mr. Gorman will testify to that himself.

Senator MAGNUSON. I think the record should be clear on this Chamber of Commerce matter, about these ships at Olympia. There are some people who have homes along there. They are very few in number but they are apparently people who belong to the Chamber of Commerce and they are quite influential. They are far beyond the average people of Olympia. They made some protests, but there were only some three or four property owners and it was a minor protest. Apparently, however, they had the Chamber of Commerce act on it.

Now may I ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman SMITH. Yes, sir; certainly.

Senator MAGNUSON. Mr. Hickey, assuming that we agree on all you say about the Cathlamet site—and it is probably a good site—is there anything wrong with the Olympia site?

Mr. HICKEY. Well, yes. It means an additional expense in maintaining those two fleets up there and a small fleet of that nature.

Senator MAGNUSON. How much is it going to cost you at Cathlamet Bay? What is your estimate?

Mr. HICKEY. You mean to operate the fleet?

Senator MAGNUSON. To establish the base.

Mr. HICKEY. Well, I think about $1,900,000 for dredging.

Senator MAGNUSON. For dredging?

Mr. HICKEY. Yes.

Senator MAGNUSON. Do you have to dredge at Olympia?

Mr. HICKEY. No; we don't, but it is in salt water up there.

Senator MAGNUSON. You do not agree with the Navy that that is the controlling factor?

Mr. HICKEY. No; it is only one of the factors. We have taken ships out of there that had 4 inches of oysters and shells on them that have gone into the shipyards. The animal action is quite active up there.

Senator MAGNUSON. What is the action down in Cathlamet Bay?

Mr. HICKEY. We have not had any of that at all. We don't have any barnacles.

Senator MAGNUSON. How many ships do you have in Cathlamet Bay?

Mr. HICKEY. One hundred and twenty-eight ships at the present time.

Senator MAGNUSON. How many ships do you have in California?

Mr. HICKEY. In California we have about 299.

Senator MAGNUSON. You have 299 in California and 128 in Cathlamet Bay and 58 in Puget Sound, do you?

Mr. HICKEY. That is right.

Senator MAGNUSON. Do you want to take our 58 ships and add them to the collection at Colorado River fleet?

Mr. HICKEY. Well, the idea was to put it under one overhead. I would like to tell you the benefit that Puget Sound could get out of that.

The Commissioner McKeough referred to considerations being given by the President right now on maybe the repair of these vessels, in line with what the action and the appropriations are that are being made to the armed forces, and we have held up action on this. If the decision had been made and we were told to go ahead we would have held up moving any ships at the present time because if they are going to be repaired they will naturally be repaired in the Puget Sound area.

Senator MAGNUSON. You mean they will not be hauled up the river to Portland?

Mr. HICKEY. I am talking about the ships in Olympia. They would be repaired there. But the ships that are in Cathlamet Bay, when they put these out to bid, a lot of them may be going up there. So you see it is not as bad as it sounds.

Chairman SMITH. What are the conditions of weather protection and holding ground at Olympia?

Mr. HICKEY. Well, it has been fairly good and we have not had any trouble so far.

Commissioner MELLEN. Mr. Hickey, there are some things that disturb me a great deal. All of these reports that you give about the analysis of the water, were they taken under the same conditions and at the same time or about the same time or in the same general area that Admiral Mills referred to?

Mr. HICKEY. It would not seem so, but we tried to take them periodically all over the year.

Is Mr. Himmler here?

Mr. HIMMLER. Yes.

Mr. HICKEY. Can you straighten us out on these tests, please, Mr. Himmler?

Mr. HIMMLER. Yes.

Every 2 weeks samples are drawn at several locations right at the fleet site. Samples are drawn approximately 18 inches under the surface and at 16 feet. Those go into commercial laboratories for analysis.

Apparently, the confusion you have there, Mr. Commissioner, is a comparison between the two fleet sites.

A mean average at 44 tests at Olympia shows 1,553 grains per gallon of sodium chloride. Cathlamet Bay shows 4 grains per gallon. This is at the actual site, not in the general vicinity

Similar tests are made at each of the fleet sites every 2 weeks, that is, samples are taken.

I believe that there has been a misunderstanding through transmission of word here. The Cathlamet site is the freshest site on the Pacific Coast and not the freshest site of all the fleets. I believe that is what caused the confusion in the Commissioner's mind.

Commissioner MELLEN. That is right.

Mr. NORDBLAD. I stand corrected. May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman SMITH. Certainly.

Mr. NORDBLAD. The Tongue Point Naval Base is a short distance away from the Cathlamet site, is it not?

Mr. HIMMLER. It is not a great distance.

Mr. NORDBLAD. Yes. There is a bus there that runs between these two points.

Mr. HIMMLER. These tests are taken right at the fleet sites.

Mr. NORDBLAD. This taken further up the river?

Mr. HIMMLER. Yes.

Senator MAGNUSON. I do not think there is any question but that we all agree that the Puget Sound water is salt water and that the Columbia River is fresh. It is at least partially fresh. But, in my opinion, the question here is whether or not that should be a controlling factor in determining where to place the fleets.

I am sure that if you break down the figures for the life of the ships involved, you will find that the cost of moving them and probably the cost of dredging, which you always have to do at those California sites, will just about bring the figures to the point where there will be no difference between keeping them at Olympia or Cathlamet in terms of dollars and cents.

Mr. HICKEY. We have figured all that out. We have figured on a 20-year lay-up. I mean that is the figure we have been going on. We have had a figure on a long-range lay-up.

Senator MAGNUSON. Yes; but I am sure that if you take into consideration the normal life of any ship, whether it is to be scrapped or sold or chartered, you will find that there will be not much difference in the cost at all. It will probably be even more economical to keep the ships at Olympia, considering the improvements that have to be made at Cathlamet Bay to keep the ships there.

Mr. HICKEY. I might tell of the change of opinion of the chamber of commerce up there would seem to amuse you a little bit.

Senator MAGNUSON. There is also the consideration of national defense, and dispersal will, of course, cost something. It adds a little to the cost.

Mr. HICKEY. We were afraid at one time that we would not have enough ships to make a permanent site.

Chairman SMITH. Gentlemen, if there is nothing more to be brought before the Commission, we stand adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 12:45 p. m., the hearing on the above-entitled matter was adjourned.)

Let's Have a Vote on Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing concern regarding the failure of this House to act on the housing legislation. Mail which comes to my office from a wide variety of sources indicates that outstanding leaders in American society are anxious that this House proceed with action on housing legislation before it adjourns for the political conventions.

The Right Reverend Monsignor John O'Grady, secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, in urging passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, has this to say in a letter to me:

Many of us who have devoted our lives to the service of others have pointed out again and again that the truly Christian American home is one of the great bulwarks of democracy. It is one of the strongest defenses against the inroads of communism in our life. American families now living in so-called homes which are unfit for human habitation should be given an opportunity to raise their families under conditions which will make it possible for them to discharge their social and religious obligations, and prepare them for the great objectives of all Americans, namely, home ownership.

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, with its public housing provisions included, would make progress toward that objective. It would help also to foster cooperative home ownership for families of middle and low income. Every possible safeguard has been established in the proposed legislation to make certain that housing developments under the ownership of local housing authorities are tenanted by families of very low income who must come from slum dwellings, and that the provision of such shelter does not encroach on legitimate private enterprise.

We insist that to insure a democratic and Christian America we must begin by removing one of the worst cancers on our social and economic life, the slum.

WIDESPREAD SUPPORT FOR HOUSING

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill has as wide public support as any bill that has ever been before Congress. The following list is indicative of the cross sections of population which are interested:

Rt. Rev. Msgr. John O'Grady, secretary, National Conference of Catholic Charities; Mrs. Elizabeth Christman, secretary National Women's Trade Union League; Leslie Perry, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Mrs. Stanley G. Cook, legislation chairman, National Congress of Parents and Teachers; Mrs. Mary McLeod Bethune, founder-president, National Council of Negro Women; Mrs. Joseph M. Welt, president, National Council of Jewish Women; Miss Marjorie L. Temple, legislative program associate, American Association of University Women; Mrs. Floyd McNaughton, American Home Economics Association; Chat Paterson, American Veterans' Committee; Rev. H. Conrad Hoyer, executive secretary, Division of American Missions, National Lutheran Council; Philip Shiff, Jewish Welfare Board; Col. Paul V. Betters, United States Conference of Mayors; Irma Piepho, administrative assistant, National Council of Catholic Women; James S. Mitchell, executive secretary, National Council of Catholic Men; Thomas B. Keehn, legislative secretary, the Council for Social Action of Congregational Christian Churches; Joseph Anderson, American Association of Social Workers; Lee F. Johnson, executive vice president, National Public Housing Conference; Sydney Maslen, chairman, National Council of Housing Associations; Dr. George F. Zook, president, American Council on Education; Boris Shishkin, secretary, housing committee, American Federation of Labor; Leo Goodman, executive secretary, CIO Committee on Housing; John W. Edelman, Washington representative, Textile Workers Union of America; Russell Smith, legislative secretary, National Farmers Union; Anna Lord Strauss, president, League of Women Voters of the United States; John C. Williamson, assistant director, national legislative service, Veterans of Foreign Wars; Charles S. Rhyne, general counsel, National Institute of Municipal Law Officers.

CONGRESS SHOULD VOTE ON HOUSING

Included also is an editorial from the New York Times of May 25, 1948, which deplores the fact that this important bill has become a political football:

LET'S HAVE A VOTE ON HOUSING

There are disturbing reports from Washington that measures embodying a comprehensive long-range housing program again may be lost in the shuffle of last-minute legislative deliberations. There is danger that all of the debates, hearings, and studies which have been inspired by the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill may go for naught, and that the measure may not even be reported out of committee unless some congressional leaders cease their filibustering and delaying tactics. A group of influential Members has been quoted as saying at this late hour that they will not support the bill unless all its provisions relating to public housing are eliminated.

In their zeal for the cause of private enterprise these legislators appear to have overlooked the obvious fact that speculative builders and investors never have met, and never will meet, the urgent need for decent shelter for millions of low-income families, and that Government aid to fill this gap has become a recognized social and economic necessity.

In this election year, and in the face of a continued shortage, it is deplorable that housing should have become a political football. No worthy purpose could be served by further delay. It is high time that Members of Congress should have an opportunity to show how they stand on this important question.

IS HOUSING BILL BURIED IN COMMITTEE?

An editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on May 24, 1948, is also included:

THE STALLED HOUSING BILL

After less than 2 weeks of hearings in the House Banking Committee, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill is stalled again. According to the House schedule it should now be on the floor. Instead, a muggy atmosphere of silence prevails, rumors of compromise are heard, and the suspicion is growing that this promising and badly needed bill will be buried in committee. That is precisely what happened 2 years ago when Chairman WOLCOTT of the House Banking Committee first played his dog-in-the-manger role. Today the consequences and penalties of obstructionism are far greater.

In the 4-year-long effort to establish a comprehensive national housing policy the strong bipartisan support this bill has enlisted emerges as its unique characteristic. The principal Senate vote on the bill saw 24 Republicans and 25 Democrats on one side and 18 Republicans and 17 Democrats on the other. Both parties shared in writing the bill and debating it. Yet the penalty of bipartisanship is the reluctance of party leaders on either side to give the bill strong party support. Fearful of accentuating divisions within parties, leadership has found refuge in a do-nothing attitude, in dodging and weaving to keep out of the spotlight public interest has thrown on the measure. The potent reward in politically uncertain urban regions has not yet strongly attracted either party.

At a stalemate, the attention of the bill's supporters turns logically to the discharge petition, now circulating in the House, that has enlisted more than a hundred of the 218 signatures that are needed to get the bill onto the floor. Certainly, if the House committee does not act on the bill the signatures on this discharge petition will be the sole means of separating the bill's friends from its enemies. As we count it up, there are a considerable number of Representatives in the House who would do well to consider this unequivocal method of announcing their intention of supporting the bill. They should declare themselves now.

The Roosevelt-Truman Golden Era of Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 25 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a highly interesting and very informative article entitled "The Roosevelt-Truman Golden Era of Reclamation." The article is by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and it is published in the Democratic Digest for May 1948.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROOSEVELT-TRUMAN GOLDEN ERA OF RECLAMATION

(By Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY)

The people of 17 States—more than one-third of the whole Union—are directly interested, and all the people of all the States are indirectly interested, in the reclamation and public power development which, throughout the 3 years of his administration, has constituted one of the major programs of President Truman.

It is a program which stands in mortal peril at the hands of the present leadership of the Republican Party, and every citizen who knows how important it is to America and to all the world that our natural resources should be fully developed should be acquainted with this issue in preparation for the 1948 campaign.

THE TRUSTS IN ECONOMY'S CLOTHING

The attack upon reclamation and power development, though clothed in the garb of economy, is in reality an attack upon public power. It has been launched by those who would delay, if not prevent, the completion of those gigantic Government water projects of the West which provide vast new energy sources for the expansion of agriculture, industry, and commerce.

The 17 Western States which are directly concerned stretch from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean and from Canada to Mexico. In the 6 years between 1940 and 1946, the population of this area increased two and one-half times as rapidly as that of the Nation as a whole, and more people are still following the westward trail into these States. They are coming from the East and the South and the Middle West. They are young men and women filled with the same spirit of adventure, the same constructive energy, and the same faith in the future which characterized the immigrants who first blazed the trail across the continent. They are filled with the same faith and the same vision that motivated Thomas Jefferson when he conceived and carried through the historic Louisiana Purchase.

It is true that in his first budget message to Congress at the beginning of 1946, President Truman recommended the most extensive reclamation program ever requested of Congress. It is true that for the years 1947, 1948, and 1949, he has recommended the largest expenditures for reclamation and power development that were ever asked of Congress. This fact has prompted Republican leaders to denounce these expenditures as New Deal spending which ought to be curtailed.

Wasteful and extravagant they call the program—ignoring the fact that the value of the crops grown in 1946 upon the 4,500,000 acres to which the United States Reclamation Service has supplied water amounted to $532,000,000, or more than one-third of the total investment by the United States Treasury in such projects since the reclamation service was established 46 years ago.

RECLAMATION PAYS—IN DOLLARS

Agricultural production for only 10 years will amount in value to three times the cost of all these projects in all 17 States; yet that takes no account of the income derived by the Federal Government from power revenue. The transformation of the unused water resources of the West into public power was not seriously commenced until the administration of F. D. R. began. Prior to his administration, the vision and the leadership was lacking to overcome the opposition of vested private utility interests.

But now the public investments launched by the New Deal are already beginning to pay handsomely. In 1947, revenue in the sum of $22,000,000 was derived from the sale of power by the reclamation service. It is already clear that in 1948 that revenue will amount to at least $24,000,000.

The completion of the five great projects now under way in the Missouri River Basin, the Grand Coulee on the Columbia River, the Central Valley in California, the Davis Dam and the other structures which will be erected in the future in the basin of the Colorado River, and finally the Big Thompson project in the State of Colorado, will produce steadily expanding power revenues to repay over and over during the coming years the total investment of public funds.

No one need have any doubt of this prophecy. The cold figures before us constitute irrefutable proof. In my own State, the Kendrick project, one of the first to be approved by the Roosevelt administration, produced 32,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power and $134,000 of revenue in 1940, the first year of operation. In 1944, these figures had increased respectively to 117,000,000 kilowatt-hours and $510,000. This is a small project when compared to the Grand Coulee in the Columbia Basin, which in 1942 produced 763,000,000 kilowatt-hours and $1,210,000, as compared with 5,800,000,000 kilowatt-hours and $9,229,000 in 1944. The power projects which are embraced in the Missouri Basin plan—already authorized and initiated by President Truman and a Democratic Congress—will through all the years to come pour millions of dollars into the Federal Treasury in direct revenue, justifying every dollar of expenditure.

RECLAMATION PAYS—IN OTHER WAYS

Production of agricultural crops and revenue derived from the sale of power do not, however, constitute the only returns from these projects; for each of them results in the building of new homes, the construction of new towns, the establishment of new business and industry which afford new opportunities for people in all trades, businesses, and professions. This all means new tax revenue for counties, cities, States, and the Federal Government itself. It means new enterprise for every productive facility in the Union. Steel, lumber, and raw materials of every kind pour into the 17 reclamation States from all the other States to carry on the construction. Private capital is invested by large contracting corporations to do the work. The electric energy which is developed promotes mines and industry which in turn promote the investment of private capital; and all together this cumulative constructive effort constitutes the magnet which is drawing millions of people to the West and laying the foundations for a new commercial and industrial empire which will benefit the whole country.

This vast achievement is one of the results of the courage and vision of Democratic leadership. It is true, as our Republican friends properly assert, that the reclamation program was initiated by President Theodore Roosevelt 46 years ago in 1902, but it remained for President Franklin D. Roosevelt and President Harry S. Truman to put it into high gear.

The golden era of reclamation did not open until 1933 when President Roosevelt launched the new program with Secretary of the Interior Ickes directing the work. Now President Truman and Secretary Krug are carrying on. From small beginnings in the first 10 years, the work slowly gained momentum, and although by 1932 some 3,500,000 acres had been brought under water, the average annual appropriations up to that time did not exceed $11,000,000, and the vast concept of multipurpose projects for power, flood control, and recreation as well as for agriculture had not yet been undertaken.

It is definitely true that under Roosevelt and Truman expenditures were increased. As against a total of $330,000,000 from 1902 to 1932, the expenditures since 1932 have amounted to $1,184,000,000, or an average of $74,000,000 each year. But this money was not wasted. This money was profitably invested. Whereas the first 30 years saw a full or supplemental supply of water distributed to 3,500,000 acres, the next 15 years, under Democratic leadership, added reclamation developments of such expanse that by 1947 5,000,000 irrigable acres could be serviced, construction was under way on 48 new projects—including the three greatest river basins of the United States—and power installations were planned which will add 3,250,000 kilowatts to existing hydroelectric power-generating capacity. There are now 32 power plants on operating projects with a capacity of 2,500,000 kilowatts. When this program, conceived and initiated under Democratic leadership, is completed, the public power installations will produce almost 6,000,000 kilowatts annually.

This means an end to power shortages. This means a supply of low-cost hydroelectric power, which will enable the West to produce for the Nation's stock pile and for industrial use mineral resources which as yet have not been touched. Thus the Government, with the money of the people, will be creating opportunity for the people to found and to maintain in the far West a new and prosperous competitive economy. Thus will the Government create the conditions which will distribute industry throughout the country and break down the concentrated control of our economy, which produces monopoly with all its attendant evils.

SETTLERS PAY LARGE SHARE

Let no one imagine that the cost of these projects to the United States Government is a burden for the taxpayers. Quite the contrary, a substantial portion of the expense is paid by the settlers themselves in construction charges and rentals for irrigation water. From the beginning of the reclamation program until the present date, settlers upon these vast reclamation projects have repaid into the Treasury more than 95 percent of all the accounts receivable for operation and maintenance charges. The payments have amounted to $61,272,000 out of a total of $61,912,000 due.

More than that, when the Mineral Land Leasing Act was signed by Democratic President Woodrow Wilson back in 1920, it provided that lessees of mineral lands, oil and gas, coal, etc., upon the public domain should pay royalties to the Federal Government on the total value of production. These royalties were divided into three parts, 10 percent to go to the Federal Treasury to bear the cost of administration, 37.5 percent to go to the States in which the minerals were produced to help the States build roads and maintain public schools, and 52.5 percent to the reclamation fund to be used for the construction of these wealth-producing reclamation projects for the future.

Early in 1946 Congress passed and President Truman signed a bill which I had introduced to stimulate the search for oil upon the public domain. When that bill was passed, oil and gas royalties were running at the rate of $10,500,000 annually. In 1947 those royalties had risen to $16,914,000. The total royalties collected under the leasing act from the beginning through the year 1947 amounted to almost $150,000,000. Vast deposits of minerals remain as yet undeveloped and this royalty income will continue through the years to enrich the reclamation fund. Thus the payments of the settlers, the proceeds from mineral royalties, and the sale of power as well as the revenue derived through ordinary Federal taxation on the new businesses which are brought into existence by the program, will repay the reclamation investment over and over again.

This is the record which cannot be denied. This is the justification of the vision of Thomas Jefferson. Yet the program is resisted by those who would drive the Government from the field of public power, put

an end to the construction of all Government electric installations, and turn the people over to the exploitation of selfish corporate interests.

REPUBLICAN ATTACK PREDICTED

Monopoly, power monopoly, is working constantly behind the scenes and even at the public hearings of the Appropriations Committee to prevent the expansion of reclamation. Selfish interests would rather see these great water and other natural resources lie undeveloped than to see the Government develop them, although the record amply proves that only the Government can do the job which has to be done. After the elections of 1946, I made so bold as to assert publicly that the newly elected Republican Congress would endeavor to carry out its extravagant campaign pledges of economy by putting the ax to appropriations of the United States Bureau of Reclamation. In a guest editorial written for the Denver Post, I asserted that blind cuts would be made at the expense of reclamation, power, and progress, and I called upon the West to alert itself to the danger.

The character and extent of the Republican attack was even worse than I had foreseen. President Truman, who in 1946 had sent a budget recommendation to the Congress for the expansion and speeding up of construction, in 1947 sent to Congress an even larger recommendation. This was immediately made the center of attack in the House Committee on Appropriations which proposed a cut in the recommended budget from $145,000,000 to $62,700,000, a reduction of 57 percent. Had the decision of the House committee been final in this matter, every great reclamation project now building or under construction would have suffered. Construction would have been postponed for years and inestimable damage would have been done to the future productive capacity of the Nation. Having learned of the projected slash, and knowing how serious a blow would be dealt to the whole country and particularly to the West, I made public protest; and when it was realized what was happening, resentment throughout the West piled up in such speedy and effective manner that we were enabled in the Senate to restore a substantial part of President Truman's recommendations—but not enough to forward the building of the West as rapidly as the Truman budget would have authorized.

Republican leadership began to back-track, and Senator TAFT, adverting to the fact that Theodore Roosevelt was the sponsor of the Reclamation Act back in 1902, quoted a plank from the Republican platform of 1944 which he said placed his party in favor of a comprehensive program of reclamation. Even Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, trying to counteract the flaming hostility of Chairman TABER of the House committee, felt called upon to take the floor to say, "We Republicans are committed to it (reclamation) * * * we will translate party pledges into action."

This was a far cry from the declaration of Senator BRIDGES on the floor of the Senate on June 20, 1946, when, denouncing the appropriation for reclamation which was being made by the Democratic Congress that year, he said, "This bill is the worst money grab the Senate has enacted for a long time * * * a slap at private enterprise and economy * * * socialization of the electrical industry." Thus was the real cause of Republican opposition revealed—the determination to shackle public power.

That the purpose of Republican leadership in the House of Representatives was actually to kill reclamation development for years to come was evidenced by its reduction of the appropriations for investigation and planning of new projects. It takes years to collect the necessary data to plan a major reclamation project. President Truman requested $5,000,000 for this purpose. The House cut that request to $125,000 which was adding insult to injury. Had this cut been sustained in the Senate, all reclamation planning would have ceased. The Bureau of Reclamation would have been demobilized and the resources of the West would have reverted to the hands of concentrated economic power.

When this bill to cut funds for reclamation in half was reported to the House in 1947, a motion was made to send it back to the committee to have these funds restored. The vote on this motion was the acid test of where House Members stood on reclamation. Republican leadership wanted the cuts to stand and Republican Party discipline was so strong that many Republican Congressmen, even from States which most needed reclamation and power development, voted as the Republican leadership directed. There were 35 Republican Representatives from Western reclamation States who voted against sending the bill back to the committee to have the President's budget figures restored, while Democrats from the same States voted 37 to 1 for reclamation. The motion to recommit was lost, 140 to 197. Republican leadership had its way in the House, and the recapitulation of the vote shows distinctly how the two parties stand on this issue of such great imprtance to the West and to the whole country. Only 9 Republican Members of the House voted to send the bill back to the committee, while 186 registered their support of the plan of the Republican leadership to cut the appropriations. The Democratic Members, however, voted 130 to 11 against the crippling slashes of the Republican leaders.

This show-down vote illustrates better than speeches or promises the still fundamental differences between our two major political parties. The Democrats championed the cause of advancement, opportunity, and better living for our people. The Republicans, true to form, championed the cause of big business and power monopoly. Chairman TABER, of the House Appropriations Committee, in a characteristic phrase, described the storm of resulting protests against the false economy he was preaching as "only the squeal of a stuck pig." This was the same Representative TABER who early in 1947 ventured the opinion that rural electrification was getting three or four times too much money, and who was quoted as saying that he saw no need for the continuance of REA by the Government, although the record shows that these electrical cooperatives have used the loans from the Public Treasury to such effective and efficient purpose in improving rural life and expanding rural business that they are ahead of schedule in repaying the loans to the United States Treasury.

HUMAN VALUES OF RECLAMATION

Reclamation and power are bringing better living and more production to countless thousands of rural homes. Reclamation and public power are creating more opportunities for rural settlement. The program initiated by President Roosevelt and maintained by President Truman is creating many new opportunities for veteran settlement. Back in 1944, when I was urging the authorization of the Missouri River Basin project, I sought information from the Reclamation Service on the demand for settlement opportunities. I knew from my own correspondence that many soldiers still in the Army were looking forward to the time when they might settle upon land, and in response to my inquiry, testimony was submitted to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation by Director Bashore of the Bureau of Reclamation and William E. Warne, who is now an Assistant Secretary of the Interior, that thousands of young men still in the service were writing to the Interior Department for information as to how they could obtain reclamation homesteads.

My proposal to turn over to the Bureau of Reclamation for soldier settlement certain lands that had been used for relocation centers during the war was enacted, and hundreds of applicants filed for every available homestead. Each one was taken immediately upon the offering. Although last fall Secretary Krug outlined a reclamation construction program which by 1954 would, if the Bureau were permitted to carry it out, increase the irrigated lands served by Federal projects by about 5,000,000 acres and make approximately 50,000 new farms available, even this program would not be large enough to meet the demand of veterans. The record of Republican leadership and of the Republican Congress is clear that the program would be seriously in danger if the Republican point of view should prevail.

Expert electrical engineers tell us that the western rivers will produce at least another 26,000,000 kilowatts of hydroelectric power in addition to what now exists or has been authorized. The forces which have opposed public power may be depended upon to oppose every Federal appropriation and every Federal project designed to develop this new treasure house of electric energy. The far-seeing program of reclamation, with its assurance of the development of natural resources, is the hope and opportunity of the Nation to meet its destiny of progress for all the people in the American tradition. It cannot safely be entrusted to the tender mercies of the leaders of the Republican Party who have too clearly demonstrated their complete lack of sympathy with it.

It took 23 days of committee hearings and more than 3,000 pages of testimony before the Senate Committee on Appropriations last year was persuaded to restore a portion of the cuts which had been decreed in the House bill. Western governors and leaders, without regard to party, had rallied to the cause and had come to Washington to testify in support of the recommendations of President Truman. But the fight is not over. The program will be resisted year by year in the future as it has been in the past by men of little vision who look at reclamation in the light of cold dollar signs on a budget balance sheet, and by the spokesmen of monopoly who want the development of no natural resources unless monopoly is in the saddle.

Reclamation cannot be measured by such standards. It cannot be carried on by men of such standards. Reclamation must be entrusted to men of vision and leadership who are willing to carry out the program which has been so successfully advanced under the recommendations of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman. Reclamation is the conservation of natural resources. By putting to work that which is now wasted, it will turn arid lands into rich food-producing areas and transform the destructive torrents of unharnessed rivers into wealth-producing energy for the service of man.

Let us look at just one of these great projects for development of the Missouri River Basin, a joint undertaking by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers. This project proposes to harness the Missouri River for the benefit of its widespreading basin, which embraces millions of acres in the nine States of Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, North and South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Iowa, and Missouri. When this has been done, the "Big Muddy," which is now constantly bearing rich soil off to the sea, will become a life-giving artery for all the future.

This job will require the construction of a hundred or more large dams and reservoir units, each with its own part to play in the great system and plan. Some will control and prevent floods, some will store water for irrigation, others will produce power—and working together as one great unit, they will cre-

ate opportunities for prosperous and cultured living that never before existed. They will also improve navigation, make possible more efficient silt control, create municipal and industrial water supplies, promote conservation of fish and wildlife, create new recreational facilities and assist in abatement of water pollution.

This project alone will bring life-giving water to some 5,000,000 acres of rich but now arid land, land that will produce more food for a hungry world. The Missouri River Basin contains about 16 percent of the hogs, 18 percent of the cattle, 24 percent of the sheep, and more than 17 percent of the land in the United States. Today it has only 5.2 percent of our population—but when its resources and possibilities are fully developed, it will offer homes and better living to many thousands of American families. It is perhaps the largest engineering project ever undertaken by man, and presents a challenge that is worthy of the world's greatest Nation. I presented the plan for this great project to the Congress on May 5, 1944, in Senate Document 191 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, a book of more than 200 pages, exclusive of its many maps and charts. It was the result of many years of work and study by Government engineers, and it is but one of several great projects now in the blueprint stage.

This is the day of the builder. It must be the day of the builder, and a day of vision too, if we are to rehabilitate the old world and build a better new one. More and better farm land is a basic need. Reclamation points the way to secure it, and increased production points the way to peace.

If we want our Government and our country to continue on the road of progress, we must be practical and realistic in politics. Such a course for America can only be assured by continuing a progressive Democratic administration in Washington and by electing progressive Democrats to the Congress.

Here again in reclamation and public power, we find the contrast between the party of the people and the party of privilege. The party of the people, the Democratic Party, has always believed that the powers of Government should be used to raise the standard of living for all by doing those things for the people which they cannot do for themselves; but the party of privilege, the party of the reactionaries, is committed to the theory that the powers of Government should be exercised primarily for the benefit of the classes.

It is the difference between the voice of Jefferson and the voice of Daniel Webster. Jefferson was criticized as a reckless spendthrift when he authorized the purchase of the Louisiana Territory. He knew it was an investment—and because his program was carried through, the United States is a greater, wealthier, and more powerful nation than it otherwise could have been. Contrast the vision of Jefferson with that of Daniel Webster who, as long ago as 1852, threw all the power of his great eloquence against the development of the West because he lacked vision to see the future.

"Mr. President," said he in the Senate in October 1852, opposing the program for the development of railroads to open up the West, "I will never vote one cent from the Public Treasury to place the Pacific Ocean one inch nearer to Boston than it is.

"What do we want," he thundered, "with this vast worthless area—this region of savages and wild beasts, of shifting sands and whirlwinds of dust, of cactus and prairie dogs? To what use could we ever hope to put these great deserts or those endless mountain ranges, impenetrable and covered to their very base with eternal snow? What can we ever hope to do with the western coast of 3,000 miles, rockbound, cheerless, uninviting, and not a harbor on it?"

The fight for progress is never ended. Every generation must wage it anew. In the campaign of 1948 reclamation and public power will be a central focus of this age-old conflict. On the one hand will be the clear and courageous record of 16 years of Democratic progress under Roosevelt and Truman, and on the other will be reaction under Republican leadership which in the Eightieth Congress has amply demonstrated its hostility to the full development of reclamation and public power.

Increase Retirement Pension for Railway Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1948

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 months I have been waiting for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to report on H. R. 5993 and give me a chance to vote for a cost-of-living increase in railroad pensions. Nothing has happened on it so far, but I see that a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare held hearings on an identical bill, S. 2437. I wish the Members of this House would consider carefully the statements of some of the witnesses at those hearings. If they do, I think they will want to join in a concerted effort to get some action on this matter before the adjournment of this Congress.

Mr. William J. Kennedy, the chairman and public member of the Railroad Retirement Board, who has no ax to grind either for management or for labor, pointed out that the average retirement pay for ex-railroaders is only $70 a month, and that the typical minimum annuity is only $50. He then made these interesting comments, which I quote:

> The consumer's price index for moderate income families in large cities, prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, is a measure of changes in the cost of living. This index fixes the average for 1935–39 at 100. In January 1948 it had increased to 169.
>
> The result is that the average annuity of $70 has now a value compared to 1937 of only $41; the maximum of $120 a value of $71; and the normal minimum for regular railroad employees of $50 a value of $30. No further demonstration seems necessary to support the proposal that the formula be revised so as to produce a greater benefit amount.

Another witness stated that there are many of these aged people who do not get over $50. One case cited, and described as not unusual, was of a retired railroader who each month draws the munificent sum of $17.50 for the support of his wife and himself. The same witness declared that meat has become a luxury that is simply beyond the financial means of many of these people.

Mr. Lester P. Schoene, attorney for the Railway Labor Executives' Association, stressed the reasonableness of the increase proposed by S. 2437—H. R. 5993 in the House. He stated:

> The percentage increase in retirement benefits proposed is less than one-third of the percentage increase in the cost of living. It is only considerations of financial stability in the railroad retirement account that justify holding the increases within the limits proposed. The high levels of employment and the increases in wage rates that have developed in the intervening years have resulted and will continue to result in bringing revenues into the fund considerably in excess of revenues expectable a few years ago. Revised cost and revenue estimates, made in light of these changed conditions but taking due account of the ups and downs of business cycles, indicate that the increased benefits proposed in the bill can be met without increasing the tax rate and without threat to the soundness and stability of the retirement fund. It is believed, however, that, at least until more experience has been had with postwar conditions, increases more nearly approaching the increase in cost of living would create an undue risk of requiring increases in the tax rate that might be so substantial as to constitute an unfair burden upon the younger employees and future entrants into the service.

With the need so clearly defined and the availability of supporting funds so apparent, I submit that there can be no possible excuse for allowing this session of Congress to end without granting this slight relief from hardship to the loyal railroaders of both parties whom we represent.

RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BENEFITS (H. R. 5875) AND TAXES (H. R. 5711)

H. R. 5875, introduced by Hon. ROBERT CROSSER, of Ohio, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, would provide a sorely needed increase of 25 percent in benefits under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. Organized railway labor heartily endorses H. R. 5875 and urges Congress to enact it.

H. R. 5711, introduced by Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania, and now under consideration by the Ways and Means Committee, would reduce unemployment insurance contributions for the railroad companies at the expense of railroad employees. Organized railway labor is against H. R. 5711 and urges its defeat.

When Congress established the railroad unemployment insurance system it was aware that the program did not provide all the features which would be considered necessary to an adequate system. It was aware that the drafters of the legislation had kept the benefits down to a point where, according to the best estimates available, they could be financed by a pay-roll tax of only 3 percent.

In 1946 Congress determined that some desirable liberalizations could be made in the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act without any increase in taxes. Those liberalizations were, accordingly, made.

Since 1946 two things have happened. The cost of living has risen 25 percent. Wage increases and a continuance of the period of high railroad employment started during the war years have combined to bring unforeseen amounts of money into the unemployment insurance fund. The more money there is in the fund, the more it earns in interest. Consequently, the fund now contains a very comfortable reserve. The benefits it supports, on the other hand, have become hopelessly inadequate. The benefits stood still while wages increased and living costs skyrocketed.

How far benefits should ultimately be increased, and what additional improvements can be made without increasing the existing tax rate are matters that require careful analysis. That analysis is being made. In the meantime, however, with ample funds available, there can be no excuse for denying to those who are unemployed by reason of illness or lack of work a benefit increase which will restore their purchasing power to the level Congress established when it set the 1946 benefit rates under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

There is no question in anyone's mind that the present fund can support a 25 percent cost-of-living increase in railroad unemployment benefits without impairing its financial soundness. H. R. 5875 would provide that 25 percent increase. Railway labor asks Congress for its immediate passage.

The railroad companies, of course, see the substantial reserve in the railroad unemployment-insurance account as a chance to get a reduction in their taxes. To that end they are supporting H. R. 5711, which would have the disastrous effect of reducing railroad taxes immediately from the present rate of 3 percent to a mere one-half of 1 percent.

The same people who are pressing for passage of this drastic reduction were insisting, less than 2 years ago, that the benefits now being paid under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act would cost more than 3 percent of pay roll. Without offering any actuarial or factual basis for their sudden aboutface, they now insist, with equal vigor, that a figure of one-half of 1 percent will be sufficient.

The position of the railroad labor organizations on this whole question is, briefly, this:

First. The most pressing problem is an immediate increase in daily benefit rates by the conservative amount of 25 percent.

Second. There are no figures to show that the fund could survive a severe depression if it were weakened by the slashing tax cut proposed by H. R. 5711.

Third. Congress cannot intelligently consider the question of adequacy of taxes apart from the question of adequacy of benefits.

Fourth. The railroads have obtained rate increases and fought wage increases on the grounds that they had to pay taxes of this type. Having won the rate increases, and fought the wage increases so successfully that the average nonoperating railroad worker draws about 17 cents an hour less than the average worker in comparable jobs in other industries, the railroads now propose to eat their cake and have it, too, in the form of a tax reduction that would net them, they estimate, $120,000,000 a year.

Fifth. A million and a half organized railroad workers favor H. R. 5875 and unconditionally oppose H. R. 5711.

Mr. Speaker, before Congress adjourns I hope that we will take favorable action on the Crosser bill H. R. 5875. The 25 percent increase in retirement benefits is badly needed. There is plenty in the fund to pay it. Gentlemen, let us not adjourn until this bill is passed. There is no real opposition to it. Then why not take action at once?

Federal Aid for Higher Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Columbia (Mo.) Daily Tribune of May 19, 1948:

FEDERAL AID FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

The increasing cost of going to college and the increasing desire to do so on the part of young Americans has raised the question of expanded Federal aid for higher education at a time when Congress is already considering Federal aid for the lower schools. Columbia, like all other university towns, has a particular interest in this question.

President Truman's Commission on Higher Education has recommended a Federal program of scholarships, research grants, and other aids to students and colleges which would cost around $500,000,000 a year. This program is too elaborate and probably too impractical to receive consideration at the present session of Congress, but a permanent national policy on higher education will become more urgent in the near future, as the veterans' scholarship program begins to taper off.

Although the average citizen doesn't realize it, American colleges and universities are already receiving well over a third of their operating income from the Federal Government. Federal support for universities rose tremendously during the war, but it was a substantial sum before the war. This support has come about piecemeal—by special projects, separately considered. So the initial action by Congress may consist of coordinating Federal aid to higher education under a broad, long-term program rather than expanding it to any extent.

In no other country in the world has there been a scholarship program on the scale of the GI bill of rights under which thousands of veterans are now going to school. In addition, many other scholarships and research programs are being carried on by the Army and Navy, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of Agriculture, the Public Health Service, and numerous other Federal agencies.

The number of students at colleges and universities has risen to well over two million and at present about half of them are veterans receiving Federal aid. But despite the great increase in Federal aid, the proportion of the national income going to pay for higher education is smaller today than during the depression of the 1930's.

Before the war, public funds for higher education came mostly from the States—about 26.5 cents out of every dollar spent. Publicly controlled schools got 70 percent of their support from public funds, privately controlled institutions only 3.7 percent. Since the war, traditional distinctions between these two types of institutions have begun to disappear. The so-called "free schools" have been increasing their tuition fees more rapidly than the so-called "fee schools," and the fee schools now are actively seeking public funds to offset the loss all private schools have taken because the burden of taxation during the past two decades has made it impossible for individuals to be as liberal in their gifts. Returns on existing endowment funds have also decreased due to the lowering of interest rates.

With few exceptions, the States and local communities are hardly able to supply additional funds for higher education. Before the war, State and local taxes were about a third higher than Federal taxes. But now it is the Government at Washington that takes over four-fifths of the country's tax money. If we are going to let the Federal Government take such a huge portion of our tax money, then we will have to expect more Federal aid for education all along the line, no matter what we think about the dangers to freedom of thought that may be involved in this procedure.

National Housing Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1948

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Detroit Free Press of May 10, 1948:

NATIONAL HOUSING SHORTAGE—AN EMERGENCY

In an extemporaneous address before the National Council on Family Life, President Truman declared that the housing shortage in this Nation has become "almost fatal." He pleaded for favorable action of the House on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner Housing Act, which already has received Senate approval.

We can understand the President's concern over the situation which the T-E-W bill is designed to correct, and we applaud the vehemence with which he discussed it.

This measure has several aspects. The features of most vital concern at the moment are a provision authorizing the construction of 50,000 low-cost housing units annually for 10 years and provision for public assistance in large-scale building developments.

Once before the House killed this proposed bill, which twice has had Senate approval. At present it is tied up in the House Banking Committee, and there is grave reason to fear that it will remain there unacted.

Opposition to the T-E-W bill is said to stem from real-estate interests, who profess to see in it all sorts of bugaboos. It is said to be socialistic, communistic. It is subsidization, its enemies claim, and, therefore, un-American and uneconomical.

That it involves subsidization is admitted. But the bigger question is whether or not subsidization is warranted in the face of an acute emergency.

And who will deny that America's housing situation long ago became a national emergency?

The Eightieth Congress apparently is willing to base its pretensions to fame on its action in reducing income taxes and financing a tremendous program of foreign aid. It has materially increased the size of the country's defense system and is expected to pass a draft law.

But in making secure our outer borders, can Congress stop there? Are not our internal problems perhaps just as vital as those pertaining to our foreign relations?

President Truman thinks so. So do a lot of other people from whom Members of the House never have heard.

Mr. Truman told of the plight of a veteran and his family who had to live in a trailer in a park because he could not find a house or apartment where he could bring his baby and his dog.

It was a pitiful case, and told by the President of the United States, a highly dramatic one.

But is it an isolated instance?

It is not. It is duplicated in every industrial city across the land, not once but thousands of times.

The plain fact is that there simply are not enough places in congested areas for people to live. And that is not the exclusive misfortune of the poor. It applies to all classes of Americans.

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner law may not be the ideal solution. Government in business rarely is.

But it is the best possibility that we have seen. Actually, it is the only possibility.

A social evil exists in the United States and it must be corrected.

Private enterprise, through no fault of its own, is incapable of coping with the situation.

Therefore, if a 10-year program of subsidization is necessary, let us have it. We doubt if it will prove fatal to the United States. For a good many years, we have been subsidizing the farmers. Is it any less American to bail out distressed industrial workers and city dwellers?

America is paying a stiff price for congressional failure to apply the only remedy at hand.

We wish some of the Congressmen who are sitting on the bill could come to Detroit and ride out Hamilton Avenue or similar streets and see the type of slums in which our people are forced to live. And we say "forced" advisedly. If Congress has any doubts about that, let them come here and try to find a house or apartment for rent at a price that the lower- or middle-income groups can afford.

If they would examine our slums they would find answers to a lot of things. Juvenile delinquency, the increase in crime frequency, civil and labor unrest, disease, loss of public revenues through decline in tax values.

These are not just cant words for the lexicon of professional social workers or do-gooders, they are real conditions, unescapable conditions, which confront a very substantial portion of our population. They are facts—right there for anyone to see who will not go about with his eyes closed.

The time for debate, for knuckling under to private interest has long passed as far as America's housing problem is concerned.

Congress had better get busy.

Speech of Hon. W. John Kenney, Under Secretary of the Navy, Commemorating the Fiftieth Anniversary of Admiral Dewey's Victory at Manila Bay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I wish to include in the RECORD the speech made by the Honorable W. John Kenney, Under Secretary of the Navy, at the State House in Montpelier, Vt., on May 16, 1948, the fiftieth anniversary of Admiral George Dewey's victory at Manila Bay:

Governor Gibson, Congressman PLUMLEY, United Spanish War Veterans, and citizens of Vermont, today, the Navy shares with the State of Vermont and the city of Montpelier many proud and inspiring memories. The honor that has been conferred upon me to represent the Navy on this commemorative occasion, and thus to recall an epochal event in our Nation's history, is deeply appreciated.

Half a century and the ravages of two bloody and ferocious world-wide wars have intervened since the Battle of Manila Bay. Yet, the memory of the brilliant achievements of that great American citizen from Vermont and our country's first and only naval officer to be honored with the rank of Admiral of the Navy shines like a beacon through the years.

It is, therefore, most fitting that we should pause in 1948, amid the persistent shadows cast by six recent years of ruthless killing and incredible suffering, to look back to 1898.

Dewey's swift and decisive naval victory, and his, General Merritt's and General Green's subsequent conduct of the campaign that resulted in the surrender of the city of Manila were among the most humane conquests in history.

In comparison with victories of corresponding importance in modern warfare, they involved a relatively infinitesimal loss of life. No coldly calculated or sadistic inhumanities were inflicted. The people of the city of Manila underwent a minimum of inconvenience and hardship. The rules of war were scrupulously, even chivalrously, observed by victor and vanquished throughout the action, both at sea and on the land.

Today what contrasting memories are awakened by the mention of the name Manila, or by Corregidor, Cavite, and Bataan.

But these same historic names also remind us of the fact that twice in 50 years our guns have roared amid those same distant islands to free oppressed peoples and to break tyrannic strangleholds.

Twice during that span of years our Navy has fought on opposite sides of the globe and won in the face of grave uncertainties and heavy odds. Congressman PLUMLEY—past president of Norwich University, where Admiral Dewey and so many of our distinguished military leaders prepared for the Naval Academy and West Point—has this afternoon reminded us of the epic of the Battle of Santiago and the U. S. S. *Oregon*, and every school boy and girl is familiar with the great naval victories of World War II.

And now, because our Nation again is dedicated to the cause of freedom, we again are faced with the necessity of maintaining balanced fleets in two critical and widely separated areas of the world—Europe and the Far East.

And today we must do this virtually alone and without the full measure of Britain's once vast sea power.

Let us not overlook the fact that long ago it was Britain's sea power that made possible the carrying out of the Monroe Doctrine while our own sea power was in its infancy. Nor should we forget, particularly on this occasion, that it was her warships that were significantly interposed at Manila between the arrogantly superior and troublesome fleet of Germany's Vice Admiral von Diedrich and the determined squadron of Commodore Dewey. It was that persuasive demonstration of Britain's sea power and friendship that helped avert an incident that might have engulfed our Nation in a major European war.

The cooperative application of that same sea power in both World Wars stood the United States in such good stead and is so gratefully remembered that there is little need to be reminded further. However, because it was applied to the point of exhaustion in World War II, Britain's sea power today is actively represented by a relative handful of ships scattered throughout the world.

So today—whether we want it or not, whether we like it or not—destiny has endowed America with the major share of the enormous responsibility of supporting not only the security of this hemisphere, but the peace and security of the entire world. And that calls for a far-ranging United States Navy—powerful, efficient, alert, and up to date—on the sea, under the sea, and in the air; in short, a balanced Navy with the Marine Corps as a most vital component.

No one of our three armed services has the complete answer to modern warfare or the sole formula for the preservation of our security. Our land, sea, and air forces are mutually dependent. Therefore, our Military Establishment must be composed of properly proportioned elements from each of those three members of its combat team. Each must have its own essential weapons so that all are capable of rendering mutual support, for any future war will employ all members of that team. At times the Air Force may play the predominant role, with the Army and Navy conducting operations to make possible the most effective use of Air Force weapons; at other times the predominant role may be played by the Navy or by the Army, with the other services in support.

In any war in the foreseeable future our defense against an enemy assault—whether here at home, or at our outlying protective bases, or at sea—cannot be solely in the air. Moreover, an offensive which strikes at vital points within the enemy homeland or at its protective bases cannot be solely an air offensive. Conclusive victory, involving the capture and occupation of enemy strategic areas, can be accomplished only through a coordinated effort of our three services.

In the initial stages of conflict the Navy is the most effective striking force to secure vital bases and sea areas, to destroy enemy submarines and their supporting bases, and to deny access to the enemy to sea lanes.

In addition, our Navy must protect essential trade routes, sources of vital raw material, and ocean lines of communication. The cargo ships, ammunition ships, and tankers that supply our Army, Navy, and Air Force must also be protected by naval vessels. To do all this we must control the sea and the air above it. I hardly need remind you of how successfully we exercised that control in World War II, or how Dewey's control of the sea at Manila made possible the command of the land.

Though other nations today have little naval power in the way of surface ships, the modern, high-speed submarine is tremendously destructive and dangerous, especially in large numbers. Our naval research program and our Navy's hunter-killer forces of high-speed carriers, planes, and destroyers are our Nation's first line of defense against this potential menace.

The winning of World War II depended on the race for technical supremacy. Our country and our Allies won that race in the nick of time. Had Germany's buzz bombs, V-2 rockets, and high-speed submarines been employed a year sooner than they were, the invasion of Normandy might never have occurred. That is why Congress has appropriated large sums for research and development and that is why the Navy is conducting an extensive antisubmarine research and development program.

In spite of the cost in dollars, we must be continually prepared; continually alert. Our Military Establishment is asking Congress to take only the prudent steps that any democratic country should take if it does not wish to bow to force or the threat of force. The lessons of history have plainly taught us that unilateral disarmament or statements of good intentions are not sufficient in a world where force still is used as an instrument of foreign policy.

From Admiral Dewey and other great leaders, naval and civilian, the Navy has inherited the spirit of preparedness and has striven always to be prepared regardless of handicaps and discouragements.

But until the recurring cycle of war and peace is positively broken we must maintain our Nation's military strength and be ready to mobilize our industrial power for war.

In our search for peace we must remember, as Washington pointed out to the First Continental Congress: "If we desire to secure

peace it must be known that we are at all times prepared for war."

Last month at the commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of Cuban independence the President called upon us "to refresh our faith in freedom and to rededicate this Nation and ourselves to the principles of liberty, justice, and peace."

In the years between those two declarations, tragic break-downs have occurred on history's highroad due to past failures to be adequately prepared to check despotism on the rise. From those bitter lessons it now is plain that the road to lasting peace must be paved with a composite of military, industrial, and spiritual power. This is the road that all America must build. This is the road we must constantly watch over and maintain.

Trade Curbs Laid to Fear of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1948

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article:

TRADE CURBS LAID TO FEARS OF WAR—HERTER TELLS PARLEY THAT THEY WILL HAVE TO BE DISSIPATED BEFORE CONTROLS ARE LIFTED—DEFENDS CHANGES IN ACT—DENIES HOUSE GROUP PROPOSALS EMASCULATE PLAN, INFLUENCE RETURN TO ISOLATIONISM

Fear of war is the first major handicap which must be overcome before world trade can be freed from Government controls, Representative CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, Republican, Massachusetts, said yesterday. He also declared that proposals of the House Ways and Means Committee for legislative changes in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act "will not undermine either the theory or practice of the act."

Allaying fears expressed in foreign trade and other circles that the revisions planned by the House committee would emasculate the act and influence a return by the United States to economic isolationism, Congressman HERTER expressed the belief that the proposals may well set a pattern which could remain in force much longer than the present practice of giving the President practically unlimited power of negotiation of trade agreements.

Representative HERTER was the principal speaker at the world trade luncheon, sponsored by the New York World Trade Week Committee and cooperating organizations at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. About 1,000 attended the luncheon, at which James S. Carson, vice president of the American and Foreign Power Co., presided.

GETS CAPTAIN DOLLAR AWARD

Robert F. Loree, chairman of the National Foreign Trade Council, Inc., was named as the recipient of the 1948 Captain Robert Dollar Memorial Award, in an announcement by Sam G. Baggett, vice president of the United Fruit Co., member of the award committee. Presentation of the award to Mr. Loree in the form of a gold plaque will be made in November at the national foreign trade convention here.

Prizes also were awarded to New York City high school students who participated in a contest on world trade.

Joan Bernadac, Central Commercial High School junior, was awarded first prize, a set of the Encyclopedia Britannica, for her world-trade scrapbook. Robert Rosan, of Bronx High School of Science; Jerome Sattler, of James Monroe High School, and Donald Hoyt, of Metropolitan Vocational High School, also were awarded prizes.

Congressman HERTER, who, as vice chairman of the House Select Committee on Foreign Aid, headed a special delegation of Congress to Europe whose report played a major role in the legislation for the European recovery program, said:

"In my opinion, there is no need of fear on the part of those who favor the principles of the reciprocal trade agreements with respect to the new House proposals.

"In effect, three changes have been made in existing procedure. The first calls for studies and hearings on a given set of commodities to be made by the Tariff Commission instead of the Committee on Reciprocity Information, which is an interdepartmental committee. The views of every department of the Government can, of course, be given to the Tariff Commission, but the Commission has been created as a bipartisan technical commission whose responsibility it is to give the kind of advice provided for in the new proposals. I do not feel too concerned over substitution of this body for an interdepartmental committee.

"The second change has to do with the submission of certain agreements to the Congress. The President is free to negotiate tariff changes within the brackets reported to him in secret by the Tariff Commission as being the upper and lower limits to which the Tariff Commission believes he can properly go without serious injury to American business.

"Should an agreement stay within these limits, then that agreement becomes effective immediately. Should the President go beyond the upper or lower limits set by the Tariff Commission, he is then required to submit the agreements to Congress together with the Tariff Commission report and his own reasons for having gone beyond the recommendations made to him. Congress then has the privilege by a concurrent resolution of both branches to negative the entire agreement provided it does so within 60 days. If it does not act at all within that period, the agreement then becomes effective."

Touching upon the proposed 1-year limitation, Representative HERTER described this as proper for the reason that a newly elected administration coming into office next January ought to have the right to make its own recommendations in the setting of a pattern for its term of office.

"The first year of any new administration," he added, "is likely to be the honeymoon year and it is therefore very probable Congress will follow whatever lead is given to it in this matter by the Chief Executive. So far as I know, practically every candidate for that position has already expressed himself in favor of continuation of the principles of negotiated instruments rather than the fixing of tariff schedules by Congress itself."

With respect to the lifting of governmental controls upon foreign trade, Representative HERTER expressed the belief that the process would be a slow one.

Office of Technical Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1948

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I have received recently:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, May 18, 1948.

The Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: We appreciate very much your letter to Secretary Sawyer of May 13 in which you express interest in continuation of the Office of Technical Services, and request an indication of what will result if proper funds are not provided for the fiscal year 1949.

Funds for the operation of this activity are appropriated for the period ending June 30, 1948. The Department's request of $520,000 for fiscal year 1949, however, was excluded from H. R. 5607 (H. Rept. 1433) as reported to and approved by the House. This amount was appealed to the Senate and $200,000 was restored to the bill as reported to and passed by the Senate (S. Rept. No. 1166). The bill is now awaiting action by the conference committee.

The amount requested for fiscal year 1949 was considered by the Department to be a minimum requirement to continue technical services to business as described in the budget presentations to Appropriations Committees of both Houses. The reduced amount of $200,000 will necessitate proportionate reduction in volume and quality of technical services which may be rendered to business. While it is planned to continue the processing and dissemination of technical reports emanating from the Government's research program, it will not be possible to keep pace with the number of available reports or to describe these reports to business beyond simple listing of title, price, and publication number. Moreover, it will be necessary practically to eliminate the servicing of technical inquiries beyond those necessary in staff assistance for the National Inventors Council. As you probably know, the National Inventors Council is a voluntary group of leading American scientists and others experienced in development and utilization of inventions who advise the Department in solving military and government problems through inventive proposals.

In accordance with your request, copies of the written budget presentation and the statement of appeal to the Senate are attached. We shall be glad to supply such additional information as you may desire.

Very truly yours,

F. R. CAWLEY,
Budget Officer.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1948

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 24, I introduced in the House an exact duplicate of the bill passed by the Senate authorizing the appropriation of $300,000,000 for Federal aid to education in the several States and in the Territories of this country. I did this to facilitate the speeding up of the enactment of this measure, by both Houses of Congress. If the House Committee on Education and Labor favorably reports the measure, the delay of a conference can be avoided by the substitution of the bill I introduced, or the substitution of the Senate measure for the pending House bill introduced by Representative

McCOWEN, of Ohio, and the measure can go directly to the President for action.

More people throughout the country are interested in and favor Federal aid to education than favor any other measure now pending before Congress.

The Federal Government is taking from the taxpayers of the States so much money through income and other taxes that at least $300,000,000 should be sent back to the States and Territories to help educate their children.

The greatest possession of the people are their children. At this time, when the National Government is proposing to draft for military service boys and young men from 19 to 25 years of age, and at a time when there is an unprecedented increase in the birth rate of the Nation, and when there is a woeful lack of educational facilities throughout the land, there should be no further delay in enactment into law the bill that has already passed the Senate.

It is as important and every bit as imperative for the National Government to aid financially in the training, education and preparation of our boys and girls for the duties of life in order that they may make good and useful citizens wherever they go as it is to train them to fight and, if need be, to die for their country. This aid should be extended for the further reason that thousands of competent, able young men and women, on account of the poor pay they receive as teachers, are being forced to give up the great profession of teaching and go into other professions and other callings to earn sufficient money to live decently and to support and rear their families.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in my remarks two editorials, one from the Knoxville Journal, of Knoxville, Tenn., the other from the Washington Post, both of which strongly support Federal aid to education.

This measure, Mr. Speaker, should be brought before the House for a vote.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal of May 16, 1948]

FEDERAL-AID-FOR-SCHOOLS BILL BARS COMPLETELY ANY FEDERAL CONTROL—TENNESEE NEEDS IT MORE THAN MOST

Tennessee school teachers within the past year have had salary increases which, though long past due, were quite substantial percentagewise. The average annual increase was $450, but it is well to remember that the reason this amount looks so good from a percentage standpoint is that Tennessee teachers' salaries have over the years been among the lowest in the Nation. As of this good day, only five States in the Nation are paying lower average salaries to teachers than is Tennessee. You can get an idea of how we stand by comparing the $1,530 paid a beginning teacher with a bachelor of arts degree with the average salary of all teachers in the Nation, $2,550. Several States by statute fix the minimum beginner's salary at $2,400.

It is not surprising that a regrettable number of persons now teaching are not qualified, or that a fourth of the 20,000 teachers in the State this year do not have enough training to obtain a teacher's certificate. Nor is it surprising that young men and women now being educated in the public-school system look askance at teaching as a profession. Teaching, as a profession, is in competition with all other kinds of activity and when in many fields men and women with no specialized training of any kind can make more than a teacher of many years' experience, it is no wonder that getting competent teachers is a problem.

Furthermore, in Tennessee the situation is made more acute by a rising birth rate, creating an ever-growing demand for teacher personnel. The 1940 birthrate was 55,000, to be compared with a 90,000 figure for 1948.

As a step toward meeting this situation, the last legislature enacted a sales tax. That accounted for the greater part of that average increase of $450 on each Tennessee teacher's salary. While this helped, it was not adequate, and whether future legislatures will see fit to devote any greater part of the sales tax collections to education is highly speculative.

There is only one other recourse left, and that is to the Federal Government. This move has been put off both by ordinary citizens concerned about education and by school people themselves as long as possible, for the reason that the opposition to any kind of Federal control of education in the various States is repugnant to almost everybody. Teachers themselves have been, and are, strongly opposed to have school policy dictated from Washington.

It was not until the introduction in Congress of a Federal aid bill that completely relinquished Federal control, while providing Federal financial aid to schools, that people all over the country made up their minds to look to Washington for help.

Such a bill has passed the Senate and is now pending in the House. It is purposed to help all States, especially those in greatest need, to equalize educational opportunity by setting up a minimum, or foundation, school program. It specifically provides that the money will be given with no strings attached, so far as the dictation of policy is concerned. That, as is the case now, will be left to the individual States and to the localities within them.

Other provisions are as follows:

Amount involved will be $300,000,000 per annum.

Each State will receive $5 for each child of school age. The remainder of the fund, about $250,000,000 will be distributed to the States in proportion to their needs and to their own efforts to take care of those needs.

In States where schools are maintained for separate racial groups such schools shall receive Federal funds in proportion to the population ratio of the minority racial groups to the total population of the State.

The funds must be spent by the States to help pay teachers' salaries, the salaries of other employees, for instructional supplies, and other current school costs in elementary and high schools only.

Federal funds cannot be used to take the place of, or substitute for, State and local school dollars. If after June 30, 1952, a State spends less than 2 percent of the income of all its citizens for public-school purposes, it thereby becomes ineligible for any part of the Federal funds.

The Federal funds are paid by the United States Treasury Department, upon requisition by the United States Commissioner of Education, to the State treasurer, and by him, upon requisition of the State board of education or other regularly established State educational authority, to local public-school boards. The funds can be paid only to public agencies under public control. The spending must be done by the local board of education or other public agency. By such agency the Federal funds can be spent for whatever current school purposes State and local school dollars are spent under State constitutional and State statutory provisions. Expenditures are audited by the States in the same way State and local school expenditures are audited. A report of such audit is made to Congress through the United States Commissioner of Education.

Readers of the Knoxville Journal know without being reminded that this newspaper is bitterly opposed to the current concentration of power in Washington; our fondest hope is that with a change of administration in November States' rights in the sense they were planned by the founding fathers will be returned to the States, and that bureaucratic government shackled on the Government by the Roosevelt-Truman regime will be reduced to the prewar minimum.

We do not feel that this Federal aid for schools bill in any way contravenes our conviction, or that it should disturb any other citizen who feels the same way we do about big government. The bill described strongly and specifically bars out Federal control by reason of the $300,000,000 contribution proposed. Vigilance on the part of the teachers, the public, and conscientious national legislators can keep it that way.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of May 25, 1948]

UP TO THE HOUSE

The House of Representatives cannot continue to ignore the Federal aid-to-education bill, passed overwhelmingly by the Senate, without grave injury to its own prestige and to the national interest. It can be safely said that no other pending legislation has been so carefully reviewed or so widely endorsed by appropriately interested national organizations and by distinguished citizens from every walk of life. This measure, in more or less its present form, has been before Congress for no less than 5 years. Urgent as the need for it was in 1943, the increase in living costs and the deterioration in the country's public education system has now made its adoption altogether imperative. Without Federal aid, the public schools of many States face imminent break-down.

The measure awaiting action by the House had bipartisan sponsorship led by Senator TAFT in the Senate. It provides for a simple grant-in-aid program on an equalization basis to enable States lacking adequate financial resources of their own to improve their school facilities and especially to increase the scandalously low rates of pay which have been responsible for a tragic exodus from the teaching profession. Under its terms, the Federal Government would make available to the States $300,000,000 a year so that children everywhere in America may have a fair chance in the competition of American life.

It is argued by opponent of this measure that the Federal Government cannot now afford to spend $300,000,000. The sum is a substantial one. It amounts, for example, to a little less than the sum which Congress has decided the country can afford to spend each week for military defense. It amounts to slightly more than the cost of building two of the proposed superaircraft carriers. Perhaps the economy-minded Members of the House ought to think of education as an adjunct to national security. The prevalence of illiteracy and ignorance among the young men of America proved very costly indeed from the point of view of selective service during the war. Can the country afford, viewing the matter strictly from the standpoint of security, to neglect the education of its youngsters?

Viewing the matter from the more general standpoint of the Nation's welfare in peace, can any society consecrated to the concept of self-government afford to let its youth grow to maturity incapable of intelligent participation in the democratic process? Federal aid to education is in itself an economy measure—a measure, this is to say, designed to economize and conserve the richest resources of the country. Enactment of this vital measure is now a direct responsibility of the Republican leadership in the House. That leadership will stand convicted of the most profligate sort of parsimony if it fails to act, before the Eightieth Congress adjourns, for the protection of American children.

Under Japanese Bondage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1948

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a simple and revealing eyewitness account of the Japanese occupation of Guam, and the subsequent liberation by American forces. The article speaks for itself.

UNDER JAPANESE BONDAGE

(By Maria C. P. Perez, January 14, 1945)

Two and a half years of hardship and sorrow passed before we again beheld the Stars and Stripes flying over Guam, our once peaceful island. All of the hatred and contempt in our hearts gave place to love and joy as we once more were given back our freedom—that freedom we have yearned for and have suffered so much for. We realize now how dearly one must pay to be free.

The day (December 8, 1941) Guam was bombed by Japan marked the beginning of the reign of terror under the Japanese Imperial Government in this island. The planes bombed the objectives for 2 days and the invasion took place on the third day. By that time the people had already evacuated the city of Agana. The alarm was sounded Monday morning when the news of the bombing of Sumay reached Agana. Every vehicle available at the time conveyed the panic-stricken people to the outskirts of the city. Few died among the Americans and the natives during the invasion.

There being no defense of any sort, Governor McMillin had no other alternative but to surrender to the Japanese commander, Ayashi. All Americans were taken prisoners of war, even the American priests and the Spanish bishop. On Thursday morning we were ordered to appear before the commanding officer at the plaza. Each person was given a piece of cloth about 3 inches long and 2 inches wide with Japanese figures written on it. This we understood was a pass. There, flying over the heads of the populace was the rising sun—a flag of hatred and treachery. Where was Old Glory, the flag of liberty? It was lowered while the flag of hatred and treachery was to fly over Guam in its stead.

What kept the spark of hope in our hearts stirring even after the Church of God, our one consolation, was closed? Our prayers; our cry to Heaven for endurance. Days passed into weeks and weeks into months and still we hoped. Men were compelled to work in defense projects while women and children labored in the fields from morning till night. Food was becoming scarce as time passed. While at work, I saw children open their lunches and turn away. Yes, they were grateful to have that little bit, but what of those among them who just didn't have any? I have seen mothers staring with pain-filled eyes at the sky, praying perhaps or asking for strength to bear the burdens of this life of struggles.

There was one amongst the mothers who wanted, oh, so much to live through all the hardships, but her heart failed her. This was what I experienced. The hardest experience of all—to lose one's mother. It would have been easier to bear the hardships if a mother were there to help and care, but with her gone what was left? A broken home. The Japanese did all this to us. They, themselves, implanted hatred in our hearts. Even with all the cruel treatment of the Japanese we never gave up hope. Death was considered a blessing for it was an escape from despair.

At last, on June 11, 1944, the American planes bombed Guam. Fear of the unexpected gripped the hearts of the people. Dugouts and tunnels served for air-raid shelters. After a week's air raid the American ships started shelling the island. It was at this time, while taking 15 minutes' rest, that we saw a seaplane circling over us. It was feared by everybody, for it was that plane which directed the fire of the ships. It was a miracle that nobody was killed that day. We heard the whistling of a cannon shell as it approached. Then, horror of horrors, what was that object whirling toward us? Terror-filled eyes were focused as if hypnotized on that object of destruction. Trees in the way were uprooted by the impetuosity of it. Death was so near that I could sense the stiffening of the bodies to receive the onslaught of the shell. But, thank God, death was not meant for us yet. It was incredible, yet it really happened. For there, not 12 feet away from us, the shell fell and burrowed through the earth. We shuddered as we looked at one another. Those few seconds seemed an age to us who had been waiting for the end to come. The captain had the unexploded shell taken over to headquarters, for a souvenir, I suppose.

Several weeks passed after this incident occurred before the people were put in concentration camps. On July 14, at 10 o'clock in the night, we were ordered to pack food and clothing and meat in front of the captain's quarters. A long-drawn cry for help went to the heavens. Children were roused from sleep and prepared for the journey. At 12 o'clock everybody was at the appointed place. Our destination was Mata Talofofo.

We started our long trek to Mata. There was a pale moon that night of nights, sending its feeble rays over the troubled world. But we were grateful even for that weak light. The trail was rugged and muddy. What were the feelings of the people? I saw some faces distorted with pain, while from the eyes of others flashed hatred. All throughout the journey we could see the flares and hear the explosion of shells nearby. Rest was not to be thought of, for the Japanese guards were always on the alert for those who loitered behind on account of weariness and fatigue. Every now and then I could hear a heart-rending moan from among the crowd. Children exhausted from walking were carried or urged to continue. At last, after many weary miles of hard walking, we came in sight of our goal. Fear was in everybody's heart—what was there at our journey's end?

We arrived at our destination. Hungry? We were starving. The little food we had was divided among the children to satisfy their hunger. Weary and hungry, the people scattered in search of sheltering places to rest their tired limbs. It wasn't the body only that was exhausted, but also the mind.

Men hurriedly built small huts and the people at last settled themselves to live their hard lives at the concentration camp. All the huts were camouflaged so that they would not be seen by the planes. Every morning at 5 o'clock we would gather by the trail under the trees to make a salute for the Emperor in Japan and to bow to the captain and his officers. * * *

Food was scarce before we were camped. Now in camp, men risked their lives to go out in search of it. We ate once a day in order to save what food we had. Some of the people, by now, were eating coconuts to live. Food of any kind was so hard to get that many of the men volunteered to go to Barrigada, our former residence, to bring back food left behind by the people. Every one of us knew the difficulties those men would encounter, but what would happen should all the food be consumed? The men departed on their journey. Several of them returned wounded by shrapnel or bullets while the rest of them continued. We had to have food, at least for the children. Once as I passed a hut, I saw a little girl stretching her arms to her mother, begging for food. What could the mother do? With bitter tears in her eyes she clasped the child to her bosom and started crooning. Gradually, the child closed her tired eyes in sleep. I dragged my feet along the trail, my eyes stung by unshed tears. This scene was taking place everywhere. What was to become of us, die of starvation or die by the hands of the Japanese? God, alone, knew. Early the next morning, the men returned with a cart load of food. Hope lighted in the people's faces that day. There was food for the children.

On Sunday morning (August 1) all the Japanese officers left for destinations unknown. Slowly but surely the spark of hope in our hearts was fanned into a flame that shown out of sunken eyes. We sensed deliverance from Japanese terrorism to be near. It was in the afternoon, 2 days later, that there was a commotion at the end of the camp. A woman was waving her arms, signaling to the people. Then I heard the words, "The Americans are here." Did I hear right? With my heart almost bursting, I rushed up over the hill and beheld a multitude of men, women, and children. But my attention was elsewhere. Just in front of me was a man, tall and dark, with features happy, but tired. Was I dreaming? With tears long kept back, wetting my face, I approached the man as one in a dream and timidly touched his arm. He turned toward me and there I beheld a face seen only in dreams. He smiled a smile long to be remembered. I couldn't speak for a moment, my heart was so full. Silently we shook hands. "Hello, don't you feel tired?" I asked. He replied, "All the weariness is worth the joy we gave you, lady." He asked me many questions concerning the Japanese and their treatment to the people. As I mentioned some of their cruelties to us, his eyes would flash fire.

The officer in command shouted to his men to fall in. The marine bade me goodbye and walked away. I looked about me, yesterday, under the hands of oppression the people were almost in despair; today, hope and gratitude were written on their faces. I looked at the marines lining up, those men who left their homes to fight for freedom. They were dirty and tired, but did it matter? In their eyes shown the light of love and liberty.

Freed at last! Delivered from a future of slavery. All the heartaches and sufferings are gone; only memories, bitter and sweet, are left behind.

The commanding officer told us not to fear anything, because they were camping in the neighborhood of our own camp. Early the next morning a hot breakfast was prepared for the men. During breakfast the Colonel made a speech. He told us how hellish the war was, of the campaigns in the Pacific, of his surprise in finding the natives English-speaking people. He ended his talk by requesting us to pack the things we needed most and leave the place because the enemies were retreating to this part of the island.

By 2 o'clock everybody was ready to start. What a difference was our march to freedom from our march to the concentration camp. The steps were lively, the air was filled with laughter. Scouts were sent ahead to reconnoiter the road. After we had covered 3 miles we rested by the roadside while Lieutenant Rogers and two of his men went in search of water. Did the Japanese care for our needs? If a person died of thirst, let him die for all they cared. The three men returned without any luck and we continued our journey. There was a soldier walking in front of me; a girl wounded by a machine gun bullet was carried on a stretcher. Every once in a while he would go over and ask the girl, as gently as a woman, whether she would like a drink of water. She would nod her head in assent.

How different from a Japanese soldier! All the sick people were taken to the ship that was near shore.

While crossing a hill overlooking the sea, we held our breath, for there, so far as the eye could see, were ships of the United States. The sun was a great white ball in the sky, yet, nobody felt the heat, we were that happy. Birds were twittering in the trees, while a flying "grasshopper" flew over our heads with the pilot waving at us, as if to assure us that everything was all right. We quickened our steps so that we could reach our destination before dark. About a mile farther on we reached Ylig Bridge. This bridge was so destroyed in some places by bombs that it took the people about 2 hours to cross it. After this our going was easier. About a quarter of a mile beyond we turned left to a much-used trail. Here it was cool and shady, the leaves overhead interwove themselves forming an arch. We arrived at Manengon Camp just as the sun in all its glory was slowly sinking in the west. That was the first time in two and a half long years I had ever noticed the sunset. With gratefulness to God and unbounded happiness in my heart, I realized once again that the deliverers were not a dream. They were real and the deliverance was lasting. On the morrow, and the ones to follow, our definite proof of this would be those beautiful, powerful, and protective Stars and Stripes.

May God bless them forever.

Remarks on Resignation of Hamilton Robinson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1948

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, Saturday morning newspapers carried a news item of particular interest to me and it should prove interesting to all Members of Congress for in that news item we find the answers to questions asked the State Department by a Member of the House last March.

I refer to a statement of Hon. FRED E BUSBEY that will be found in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page A1912. The statement, entitled, "What's Wrong With the State Department?" concludes with the following:

Does the State Department now contend that Mr. Robinson was qualified and, at the time of his appointment, had experience to qualify him for the position of Director of Office of Controls? Does the State Department now contend that they did have knowledge of the matters developed herein and will the State Department now deny that Mr. Robinson should have been removed from office several months ago?

The news item to which I referred revealed the resignation of Mr. Hamilton Robinson as Director of the Office of Controls of the State Department. While the news item reports State Department sources as saying that Mr. Robinson's resignation was entirely voluntary, I feel sure that there would have been no resignation had it not been for the indefatigable efforts of a Member of this body.

Mr. Speaker, we have listened to speeches about Reds and radicals in the State Department. We have read article after article on the same subject. We have passed riders to appropriation bills that would permit the State Department and other Government agencies to terminate the employment of any officer or employee for security reasons.

We appropriated several millions of dollars to enable the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Civil Service Commission to carry out the provisions of President Truman's order to rid the Government service of those persons whose loyalty is questionable.

It is my understanding that some Government agencies have utilized the power and authority of the appropriations rider, but I have yet to learn of one single person being removed from the service under the provisions of the Executive order.

However, one point must be made clear. I am not questioning the loyalty of Mr. Robinson and neither did Congressman BUSBEY. Mr. Robinson was placed in a position that required him to pass on the loyalty of 20,000 State Department employees. He was simply not qualified for the position and should not have been appointed to the position. That was the sole question raised by Congressman BUSBEY. Mr. Robinson's resignation is a late, but frank, admission of the correctness of the Congressman's contention. Mr. BUSBEY is to be congratulated for his untiring efforts to keep our Government agencies aware of the absolute necessity of placing well-qualified individuals in important positions.

Mr. Speaker, we are yet to learn if the State Department will benefit by the Robinson experiment. Appreciating the fact that Secretary of State George C. Marshall must handle many important problems personally, I sincerely believe that the selection of a successor to Mr. Robinson is of such importance that he should give it his personal attention. If the right man is selected for this important position the people will not be shocked by the appearance, from time to time, of scare headlines in the daily press shouting about some employee of our Embassy in Moscow or any other place turning traitor to our country and embracing communism.

The UPW (CIO) at the Veterans' Administration Hospital in Brooklyn, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and leaflet issued by United Public Workers of America, CIO:

UNITED PUBLIC WORKERS
OF AMERICA, CIO,
FEDERAL WORKERS UNION, LOCAL 20,
New York, N. Y., May 18, 1948.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Attached find a leaflet issued by the UPW (CIO) at Veterans' Administration Hospital, Manhattan Beach, Brooklyn 29, N. Y. Last week two investigators from the Veterans' Administration Branch Office No. 2, New York, came to our hospital and questioned numerous union members as to who is active in the union, who distributes leaflets, who is the chairman, what do we talk at our meetings, and so forth.

We have a strong union in the hospital that is fighting for pay raises, promotions, to eliminate discrimination, and so forth. We know that this investigation is an attack on our union. They are attempting to frighten union members by grilling them.

I urge you to protest these antiunion tactics. Already the Mundt bill is in effect at this hospital. It is hoped that you will mention this action taken by the VA by either inserting it in the remarks of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or by protesting to the Veterans' Administration.

I will be glad to give you further information.

Sincerely yours,

HERMAN EPSTEIN,
Chairman.

WHERE WERE YOU BETWEEN OCTOBER 1, 1900, AND MAY 19, 1950

Why is our union being attacked? There are many reasons for this concerted attack. It wasn't just an ordinary investigation. It was a carefully planned move to smash our union. You know that there were no violations of the Hatch Act. What then?

Let's look at our record:

1. Our union is waging an all out campaign fight for wage increases. We are urging all Federal employees to write to their Congressmen telling them that you want a pay increase. What is wrong with that? Where are the violations? Why the investigations?

2. Our union is fighting for elimination of discrimination of all Federal employees. We won a victory in this hospital when we urged that the column labeled "race" be eliminated from forms used in personnel. We won that hard fight. What is wrong with that? Where are the violations? Why the investigations?

3. Our union meets with personnel. Our union meets with the manager. We are always ready to cooperate with the hospital for the benefit of patients and employees. We suggested that a game room be built for the employees. We ask for locker rooms, showers, utility room space. We fought for the reduction of the dinner meal price. All this for the employees. Is there anything wrong with that? Where are the violations? Answer that one.

4. Our union takes up appeals for the employees. We are always fighting for a fair break for our employees. Ward attendants can vouch for this. Kitchen helpers can vouch for this. Clerical employees can vouch for this. Why the attempt to scare, frighten, intimidate Federal employees in the hospital?

5. Our union is always taking up the problems of employees in regard to promotions. Federal employees yearn for security. We are always fighting lay-offs. Wasn't the union in Washington fighting for the restoration of cuts in the present VA budget? What's disloyal about that? Why all the fuss? Why the investigations? Answer that.

We are familiar with the Hatch Act. We know it forbids political activity. The United Public Workers of America (CIO) exists solely for the purpose of helping Federal employees get promotions, pay raises, a

fair break, and the elimination of discrimination.

What then, Mr. Shaw and Mr. Dumpert? What are your reasons? Our union is strong. It will never waiver. Attack our union and you attack all Federal employees who are for better conditions—pay raises, security, no discrimination, etc. What is your choice? Witch hunts or security. Make your hospital 100 percent union.

Joint the union today.

Issued by Manhattan Beach Branch, Local 20, UPWA (CIO), May 17, 1948.

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1948

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include editorials from several newspapers and copy of a telegram from Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce relative to extension of reciprocal-trade agreements:

IS THE UNITED STATES TO GIVE UP WORLD LEADERSHIP BY REPUDIATING TRADE AGREEMENTS?

Sylvia Porter, New York Post, May 17, 1948:

"The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was the great achievement of Cordell Hull. When we passed that law back in 1934, we told our friends everywhere that we had abandoned our deceptive, destructive high-tariff policy, that we were ready to live up to our economic place in the world. Actually, it's more than a law now—a law to allow lowering of trade walls, to permit our customers to balance their purchases from us by sales to us, to stimulate international commerce. It's a symbol of America's good faith. And who would deny the importance of such symbols in these days?"

Christian Science Monitor, March 8, 1948:

"Now the United States has put itself on record before the whole world as seeking means to increase the flow of world trade. Its leadership led to the Geneva conference last summer which, in turn, led to the Havana meeting now working to draft a charter for an ITO. Failure to renew the Reciprocal Trade Act not only would be a severe blow to the ITO program but would damage American prestige as a world leader."

Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, March 8, 1948:

"Congress should extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for another 3 years. Theoretically this legislation is sound. Although it has been in effect 14 years, obnormal conditions abroad have denied it a fair test in practice.

"At least it should be kept alive until world trade has regained the degree of equilibrium necessary to prove definitely the worth or worthlessness of Cordell Hull's recipe for peace through the freer exchange of goods among nations."

New York Herald Tribune, May 9, 1948:

"While the Republican Party has traditionally favored high tariffs, we do not see how it can now fail to renew this act (reciprocal trade) which is an essential part of a national rather than a partisan foreign policy. * * * The policy of lowering trade barriers should be sustained on the grounds of economic common sense as well as on the grounds that it is politically essential to the success of American foreign policy."

Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette April 12, 1948:

"The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which will soon be up for renewal, shows that willingness (to import) to all the world. It must be extended * * *. For reciprocal trade, far from an academic matter, is the very cornerstone of the world order we are trying to establish."

Telegram to Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN, dated May 25, 1948, from Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce, Pittsburgh, Pa.:

"This organization strongly favors 3-year extension Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

"JAMES H. GREENE,
"Executive Vice President."

Appropriations for Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1948

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert at this time an article by George E. Ijams, director, VFW National Rehabilitation Service, appearing in the June 1948 issue of Foreign Service.

This article corrects misrepresentations by uninformed people to the effect that reduction in personnel forces by the Veterans' Administration resulted from decreased appropriations by a Republican Congress.

Mr. Ijams is to be congratulated for his forthright action in apprising veterans of the correct situation.

The article follows:

DON'T BLAME CONGRESS

Letters to the VFW National Rehabilitation Service office indicate a widespread belief that the Eightieth Congress failed to appropriate sufficient money for the operations of the Veterans' Administration.

As a matter of fact, Congress has been most liberal in furnishing funds required by the VA, and the record clearly indicates that in 1948 Congress appropriated for the Medical Department of the VA $20,000,000 more than requested. It is because of this generous treatment of our veterans that I wish to correct the mistaken impression which appears to exist.

This is a Presidential election year, and many claims and counterclaims can be expected in the coming political campaign. Because of this, it is all the more important that unfounded statements be examined in the light of actual facts. Our old friend Al Smith had something when he said, "Let's look at the record."

Now what does the record show on the 1948 appropriation for the VA? One of our VFW comrades happened to be in charge of the subcommittee handling the VA appropriation this year. He is the Honorable RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, of Massachusetts, ranking member of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 1, 1948, quotes Congressman WIGGLESWORTH as follows:

"It has been represented in veteran circles that the proposed cut on March 31 was the result of the failure by Congress to provide sufficient funds for the fiscal year 1948.

"That, Mr. Chairman, is not the fact. The proposed cuts resulted primarily from the recommendations of the President in respect to the fiscal year 1949, which are substantially below appropriations for the fiscal year 1948, and the determination of the Veterans' Administration to conform to the proposed reduction in personnel, not on July 1, but 3 months in advance of that date, on March 31.

"Let me quote in this connection from a statement that I made on the floor of the House on June 17, 1947, as chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the appropriation for the fiscal year 1948, when this appropriation was under consideration:

" 'I want to emphasize, as the report emphasizes, that no recommendation made contemplates any cut in any benefit provided by the Congress for our veterans; that no recommendation contemplates any cut in financial assistance to the disabled, to the widowed, to the orphaned, or in medical care for those who are eligible.'

"And again:

" 'The record is clear that the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress have not denied one cent or one employee requested for hospitals.'

"As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, we all know that the Congress with respect to the fiscal year 1948 in the medical field made available not only every cent that was requested from the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate, but in addition thereto the sum of $20,000,000.

"Second, it has been represented in veteran circles that the proposed cut on March 31 was due to the fact that representatives of the Veterans' Administration had been told by the Appropriations Committee of the House that they could not come back for a deficiency appropriation.

"That, Mr. Chairman, is not the fact. The representatives of the Veterans' Administration who made the assertion have admitted on the record before your committee that they can find nothing in the record to justify that statement.

"There will have to be additional money for the fiscal year 1949 over and above the President's recommendations either for salaries or for terminal leave.

"The effect of approving the recommendation of your committee and allowing $3,000,000 for the Veterans' Administration is to authorize the retention for the time being on the rolls of the Administration some 3,000 more persons than are recommended by the President in respect to the fiscal year 1949, and to give General Gray the force which he says is necessary to cover all essential services for our veterans.

"I know it is unnecessary to state that the Congress will always provide whatever funds are shown to be necessary for the proper care of our veterans."

The above not only clears up the misunderstanding about Congress giving the VA all of the money required, but also clarifies a statement frequently heard around Washington, that the Appropriations Committee had informed the VA they could not come back for a deficiency appropriation.

In all fairness it must be admitted that any shortage of funds for VA personnel must be charged to the great overstaffing of that agency during the past two and a half years. Many high salaried jobs and units of organization were established which produced little, if any, beneficial results. The VA has actually become staff heavy, while there is a crying need for personnel in the lower salary brackets in regional offices.

The answer to the problem of appropriations for salaries in the VA does not lie in an appeal to Congress for more funds. That action would merely serve to hasten demands for another Economy Act. The answer lies in the ability of the new Administrator, Carl Gray, to abolish useless staff jobs and nonessential units or organizations so that the money previously wasted on such jobs can be utilized for the employment of personnel so badly needed in the operating services of the regional offices. After all, the VA was not established for the purpose of providing high-salaried jobs for certain favored but unnecessary persons—it was created to give prompt, sympathetic, and efficient service to disabled veterans, and to the widows and orphans of those who gave their lives for our country.

Gen. Carl Gray has been in office only a few months. He has a tremendous job, and we do not expect him to know all the answers in such a short period of time. Nevertheless, we sincerely hope the studies he is now making will indicate to him the necessity for changing the chaotic and cumbersome organization established 2½ years ago, and creating a streamlined organization designed to carry out the legitimate functions of the VA with a minimum of overhead expense.

We should not charge Congress with the deficiencies of the VA. Congress has been more than patient and generous to date in providing everything needed to enable the VA to do a good job. If the new Administrator lives up to his splendid reputation as a business executive, and we believe he will, we are confident he will act quickly to correct the glaring and most expensive deficiencies which now prevail in the Veterans' Administration.—George E. Ijams, director, VFW national rehabilitation service.

Israel Recognition Abortive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, two or more wrongs do not make a right. Mistakes added onto mistakes simply make greater mistakes. Continued sacrificing of principles for political expediency will destroy national character. We have been doing these things in our dealing with the Palestine situation. The American people will arrive at a correct conclusion when in possession of all the facts. Thus far, they have been deluged with Zionist propaganda and have known little of the other side of the Palestine question. An article appearing in a recent issue of the New York Times, by the president-elect of American University, of Beirut, Lebanon, is factual and important. I, therefore, place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

OUR RECOGNITION OF ISRAEL—AUTHORITY OF PRESIDENT QUESTIONED, TREATMENT BY PRESS CRITICIZED

To the EDITOR of the NEW YORK TIMES:

The announcement by the Zionists of the establishment of their state, Israel, seems to have been accepted by the American press as if it were a solution to the problem of Palestine. The President's unprecedented haste to recognize this embryonic, unproved state has gone without criticism in spite of his autocratic omission from consultation of the Department of State or of the American delegation to the United Nations. It is high time that Americans began to be more critical in their approach to international affairs.

The Zionist declaration of independence was contrary to the expressed wish of a majority of the United Nations, who realized that such an overt act would make impossible a truce in Palestine and would precipitate action by the Arab states. There has been no criticism yet directed at the Zionists for thus flouting the United Nations. Yet criticism is surely deserved and should be forthcoming. We are only too quick to criticize the intransigence of the Arabs, which is relatively pale by contrast.

ACTION OF PRESIDENT

The President's curiously personal, unilateral pronouncement of recognition took no account of the United Nations, undercut his own delegation to the United Nations, bypassed the advice of the National Security Council, of the area experts in the State Department, the Military Establishment, and the Central Intelligence Agency, to say nothing of the Congress.

Such a decision, so hastily and secretly taken, on a subject freighted with such import for world peace and security that the United Nations has spent months on it without reaching a decision, is not only dictatorial but dangerous in its many implications. Yet there has been no criticism from the press, which is supposed to be the guardian of our democratic principles.

The President's action has, in effect, made a mockery of United States participation in the United Nations, has given our blessing to the intensification of divisive nationalism rather than to the principles of friendship among nations and conciliation of international differences, has aligned this country in opposition to the sovereign Arab Nations and to the entire Moslem world of 300,000,000 people. Yet there have as yet been no questions raised concerning the right or authority of the President single handedly to commit this Nation to such an astounding and dangerous program.

In the General Assembly the reaction of the Arab representatives to word of America's recognition of Israel should give us profound pause. Duped, betrayed, were words they used. And why not? They had for weeks negotiated with confidence in the good faith of the American delegation, which was trying desperately to arrange a truce in Palestine. In the very midst of those negotiations word arrived of the President's action. Our own delegation was shocked and embarrassed.

SERIES OF BLUNDERS

The only comparable situation in our recent experience was the attack on Pearl Harbor while Nomura and Kurusu were supposedly conducting discussions in good faith in Washington. On that occasion we were on the receiving end—and we didn't like it. Yet now the general impression given in the press is that the Zionists and the President are somehow admirable, while the Arabs merit no consideration anyway. This is a far cry from the spirit of fair play which is supposedly typical of Americans. In reality it is the most discreditable performance yet in a whole series of American blunders relative to Palestine. Of this one we should be profoundly ashamed.

If America sincerely wishes to destroy the hopes of the world in her wise leadership in this time of crisis, she is taking the right path by embarking on a program of duplicity for reasons of supposed political expediency. I cannot believe that when the implications of our Palestine action are made plain to the American people they will fail to make a sincere effort to rectify it. For the benefit of our future, both at home and abroad, I pray that it may not already be too late for such an effort to bear fruit. There is no time to lose.

STEPHEN B. L. PENROSE, Jr.,
President-elect, American University of Beirut, Lebanon.
CHEVY CHASE, MD., *May 16, 1948.*

Time To Get Action on Housing if We Believe in Saving Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, further proof of the growing concern about housing is contained in the attached clipping from the Catholic newspaper The Tidings, published by Rt. Rev. Thomas J. McCarthy, of Los Angeles, Calif.:

TIME TO GET ACTION ON HOUSING IF WE BELIEVE IN SAVING HOMES

(By Rev. George G. Higgins)

The married couple of the present day and age is called upon to practice a degree of personal heroism such as the twelfth or thirteenth century monk was seldom called upon to practice.

Obstacles to Christian family living seem greater today than perhaps in any other age. One of the greatest of these obstacles is the housing shortage.

It takes a house to make a home.
There are no two ways about it.
A home needs a house.

Chesterton struck the root of the matter when he wrote:

"We live in a time when it is harder for a free man to make a home than it was for a medieval ascetic to do without one."

And yet his words are even more tragically true today than they were when he first expressed them 20 or 30 years ago—more tragically true because it is so much more difficult today for so many thousands of our people to find a "house" (or an apartment or even a trailer or a tourist cabin) in which to try to make a Christian home.

All this is by way of leading up, however, indirectly, to a discussion of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill which, let us hope and pray will have been passed by the House before this column appears in print.

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, in spite of the almost unprecedented measure of bipartisan political support which has rallied behind it in an election year, is being doggedly opposed by important segments of the real-estate industry and by certain self-appointed defenders of the faith—or the superstition—of free enterprise.

The charge is made that the bill is socialistic because, among its other laudable provisions, it authorizes the continuation of low-cost public housing for low-income families.

LOGIC OF FAITH

Your eighth-grade nephew—at least if he attends a school which follows the curriculum and uses the readers of Catholic University's commission on American citizenship—can tell you that such a charge is nonsense.

He can probably also tell you why it's nonsense in the light of Christian social teaching.

Your nephew knows—if only by the logic of the faith in which the parochial school instructs him—that the Government not only has the right but the inescapable obligation to support the cause of Christian family living to the extent of its legitimate powers.

And how? Among other ways, by encouraging private enterprise, through reasonable incentives, to provide decent housing for our citizens and, if necessary, by actually subsidizing the building of dwellings for those poor unfortunates for whom private enterprise is either unable or unwilling to provide accommodations.

If this is socialism, then the Popes and the bishops of the United States are Socialists—and so are Senators ELLENDER, WAGNER and TAFT.

Ridiculous? Of course it's ridiculous. But if the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is defeated, it will be defeated largely because of such ridiculous name calling.

Some ridiculous things can be taken calmly and with an easy-going smile. But those of us who really mean it when we say that the family is the basic unit of society, and that marriage is a sacrament instituted by Christ Himself, haven't any right to smile indulgently at the antics of vested interests

who would make it even harder for a freeman to make a home—and to find a house in which to make that home.

VETERANS' NEED FOR HOMES

From the veterans organizations I include the following:

A letter from the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Illinois, with whose conclusion I wholeheartedly agree—immediate action on housing is necessary. I do not include the booklet which they sent me because I am advised that each Member of the House has received a copy.

MAY 15, 1948.

Hon. HELEN G. DOUGLAS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN DOUGLAS: The Illinois department, Veterans of Foreign Wars, encloses a report on veterans' housing in Illinois. After reading it, you will agree that a housing program is an immediate necessity. The House Banking and Currency Committee, which has refused to act on the problem for 2 years, should be discharged at once so that action can be taken. Boiled down, facts are:

Thousands of returned veterans and their families are existing in shacks, trailers, dilapidated buildings, or living doubled-up with relatives.

Complaints run from no toilets, no water, wet basements, filth, mud, no playgrounds, rat bites suffered by children, to generally crowded, unsanitary living conditions.

The ordinary veteran with a wife and one or two children earns from $160 to $200 per month, less deductions for lay-offs, sickness or accidents. On these earnings he can afford to pay about $40 per month for housing. He cannot build and he cannot find anything decent to rent.

Standard construction costs in most northern cities for a four-room house run $10,000 to $11,000; for a five-room house $12,000 to $14,000. Prefabricated houses cost $8,000 to $11,500 when lot and incidentals are included.

Banking and loan companies will not advance money for new home construction without substantial down payments, and they will risk only about 30-percent value on GI guaranteed home loans.

Conclusion: Immediate action is necessary. Congress must provide legislative support for the building of rental housing, both private and public. This is the only way to give veterans adequate housing, quickly, cheaply.

Supplementing this rental housing program should be a provision boosting the GI loan guaranty to $7,500 so that those who desire to build or buy a home can do so.

We ask every Member of Congress to support the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and Members of the House specifically to sign Discharge Petition No. 6 immediately.

Sincerely yours,

CARL E. RIES,
Illinois Department Commander,
Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Attest:

B. HELFRICH,
Department Housing Chairman.

From the American Legion publication, the National Legionnaire, dated May 1948, I include an article on housing which contains the remarks of National Commander O'Neil who vigorously supported the change in position made by the American Legion:

HOUSING

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.—Having agreed to support the amended Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, now that it provides definite priorities for veterans, the American Legion was moving to add its own amendments to the legislation to make it a real veterans' housing measure.

Endorsement of the bill was voted by the national executive committee of the American Legion on the recommendation of Walter E. Alessandroni, of Philadelphia, Pa., chairman of the national housing committee.

The favorable action came after National Commander James F. O'Neil personally took the floor and made a dramatic pea for adoption of Chairman Alessandroni's report.

In its resolution on the TEW bill, the NEC directed that the American Legion, through its national legislative director, immediately present to Congress further amendments to the measure to incorporate in it all the provisions of its own Veterans' Homestead Act of 1948.

Chairman Alessandroni told the NEC that the TEW bil' (S. 866) as amended by Senator RALPH E. FLANDERS, of Vermont, and passed by the Senate on April 22, provided definite priorities for veterans and thus removed the chief ground for American Legion objections to the measure.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED

The NEC adopted the following resolution on the TEW bill as submitted by Chairman Alessandroni:

"Whereas for 2 years veterans have desperately needed adequate, reasonably priced housing; and

"Whereas the Congress, public agencies, and private enterprise have been unsuccessful in providing sufficient quantities of such housing for veterans; and

"Whereas the American Legion's Veterans' Homestead Act of 1948 (H. R. 4488) provides the best means of providing such housing for veterans; and

"Whereas the TEW bill, as amended by Senator FLANDERS in conformance with the report of the Joint Congressional Investigation Committee on Housing, has cured many of the objectionable defects of the previous TEW bill; and

"Whereas the Flanders amendments do not provide the aid for veterans' housing as contemplated by the Veterans' Homestead Act of 1948, and, therefore, the measure is deficient as an omnibus housing bill by failing to provide sufficiently for the veterans: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the director of the National Legislative Commission be directed to present to the Congress further amendments to Senator FLANDER'S amendments to the TEW bill to incorporate therein the provisions of the Veterans' Homestead Act, as modified by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee print, dated March 28, 1948; and be it finally

"Resolved, That the national executive committee of the American Legion in meeting duly assembled * * * hereby goes on record in support of the action contained in the first resolving clause above set forth and orders specific compliance."

O'NEIL STATEMENT

National Commander O'Neil vigorously supported Chairman Alessandroni. He said, in part:

"I have traveled some 83,000 miles since September 1. I have had an opportunity to talk with thousands of veterans, Legionnaires and non-Legionnaires, about this subject of housing. I have made it a point to do so. This is the most urgent issue before the country today, as it affects veterans.

"I don't think we can ever stand in very good grace before anybody if we are willing to accept Federal subsidies for ourselves and indicate we want them denied to anybody else. I don't think we want to stand in that position.

"I find myself in accord with the report of your housing committee as submitted through your National Economic Commission in this resolution. I say to you this is a critical period and if you delay it, and continue to delay it, in the hopes you are going to postpone the day, you are only kidding yourself. Very frankly, you are kidding yourself and the Legion if you assume that position. This is critical to the veteran who is in need of housing. Some of them have been forced to double up. All of us here are in comfortable circumstances, or most of us are, but I want you to think about the veteran who is forced to double up with others. He finds himself, because of economic conditions, looking to rental housing. He can't get it. He is looking to the American Legion for assistance and we want to duck behind something that is not really the issue. I say to you, in my opinion we can take action here without violating any of the resolutions or mandates of the national organization as they relate to housing."

RETAIN PUBLIC HOUSING FEATURE

I also include a communication from the San Francisco Planning and Housing Association which includes substantial factual data for titles V and VI of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. In my judgment it contains a convincing argument for the need for both public housing and urban redevelopment.

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING
AND HOUSING ASSOCIATION,
May 20, 1948.

Hon. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN DOUGLAS: Now that the Senate has passed the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, the Nation looks again to the House of Representatives to carry forward this good work by the quick passage of the bill in the same form as approved by the Senate. This means leaving in title VI—the public housing provisions—around which there has been considerable controversy, but without which too large a part of our population continues to face a depressed housing situation.

San Francisco alone has deferred public housing projects comprising about 1,200 units. Surveys as far back as 1940 showed that San Francisco needed to replace more than 30,000 substandard housing units. The 1,200 units are only the well-known drop in the bucket but their achievement should prove heartening.

The San Francisco Chamber of Commerce and the United States Bureau of the Census studies last fall showed that population increases, returning veterans, and new families gave San Francisco 24,000 doubled-up families. We have 12,000 temporary war emergency and veterans' housing units which must be replaced within the next few years.

Real-estate ads in our papers indicate virtually no listing of homes for sale under $15,000. This is confirmed by inquiry of realtors who say that they rarely have units placed with them below that figure and who say that the $15,000 is usually for a 5-room bungalow. These bungalows before the war would have sold for $5,000 or $6,000. You are familiar with the story of veterans' housing loans which makes the secondary mortgage market for such financing an essential part of the TEW bill.

Of the few rental units advertised, $125 now appears to be the bottom monthly rental. With negligible exceptions, veterans in this area reported that they could pay rent or make monthly purchase payments of no more than $40 to $48. Only about 15 percent of our residents can pay as much as $85 per month. You are aware, too, of the need to provide rental housing, both public and private, at rents which the bulk of our people can afford. These few facts state the case for the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

Each year civic-minded citizens in this community have looked to the Congress for affirmative action on a national housing policy and for a program of sufficient substance to help relieve the drastic shortage. We feel that the housing market will be jeopardized if through no alternative, families continue

to buy homes beyond their means. We believe that the provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill will tend to stabilize the home-building industry as well as to make possible a substantial supply of housing.

If you have not already done so, will you be good enough to sign discharge petition No. 6 which will place the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill before the House membership for a vote? Will you also lend your full support to the bill when it reaches the floor? We will deeply appreciate hearing from you.

Yours very sincerely,

MARION BEERS HOWDEN,
Chairman, Housing Committee.

PROLONGED HOUSING HEARINGS DEPLORED

Part of the written statement of Edward Weinfeld, president of the National Public Housing Conference, is included here because, as he says, "we who believe in decent homes for all Americans will not be a party to such delaying tactics." The point of view of the National Public Housing Conference is well known. Excerpts from Mr. Weinfeld's statement to the House Committee on Banking and Currency follow:

"Chairman JESSE WOLCOTT, of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, expressed the desire of holding full, but comparatively brief hearings when S. 866 passed the Senate some weeks ago," Weinfeld stated. It is assumed that the time taken by Government witnesses who have explained the measure will be assigned to proponents, although in some instances they expressed opinions neither pro nor con.

"It is important," said Weinfeld, "to have those who oppose the measure express their point of view in full. In the hope, therefore, of expediting a final decision, the National Public Housing Conference yields its time to the opposition, believing, of course, that the committee in executive session will give full consideration to the statement that the conference presented.

"The housing bill was talked to death in the Seventy-ninth Congress," Weinfeld stated. "It cannot be permitted to happen again."

Admiral Louis E. Denfeld Speaks Concerning Our Merchant Marine and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1948

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend herewith in the RECORD a splendid and timely address by Admiral Louis E. Denfeld, United States Navy, Chief of Naval Operations, before the Propeller Club of the United States, port of New York, on the occasion of its twenty-sixth annual banquet in observance of National Maritime Day, Saturday, May 22, 1948. This address points up in an excellent manner how essential our merchant marine is to our entire national defense picture.

My pleasure in joining you tonight in the observation of National Maritime Day is deeply personal, because I can greet you as "fellow members of the Propeller Club." I was elected to honorary membership in the Propeller Club in Honolulu last year, and I esteem the honor. Honorary memberships in so many organizations are like being given a free lot in a cemetery. The recipient hasn't any use for it, and the donors have to wait a long time for the pay-off.

But I like to feel that honorary membership in the Propeller Club has to be earned before the election, not afterward. This organization does not exist for pleasure or profit, but for service. Its ultimate service is to the Nation. Its membership is of men whose eyes are focused beyond the horizon, and so have the point of view of us in the Navy.

This gathering, duplicated in so many cities throughout the country, will emphasize to all Americans that our merchant marine and our national existence are inseparable. The Navy does not have to be reminded of that. I am here to testify, not so much to you as to all thoughtful Americans my words will chance to reach, that the strongest United States Navy conceivable would be crippled without an adequate merchant marine. By the same token, a merchant marine such as we all dream of would be impotent without a powerful Navy to insure it the freedom of the seas.

It may be difficult for Americans living remote from the sea to appreciate their own and the Nation's dependence on oceangoing ships. There must be some reason why the history of our merchant marine is a graph of steep ups and downs. This is one of the down times. It happens after every war.

In the past two wars this country has had to salvage its maritime strength from the depths by a combination of eleventh-hour fast thinking, gigantic labor, and a lot of good luck. We have squeezed by each time. And afterward, with utter complacency, we have repeated our historic error and permitted the American flag to fade from the seas.

So long as our surpluses were exported and our deficiencies supplied from abroad, it has not seemed to matter to America what nation's ships carried the commerce. That we were subsidizing foreign fleets with American dollars by that process didn't matter. That we were depriving ourselves of the ships and the trained men to form our national lifeline in time of war—that didn't matter. We only think about such things when war is upon us, when the foreign merchantmen enter their own country's military service, and America finds herself blockaded by her own maritime insufficiency.

Uncle Sam has always played his lucky number in the past and it has always come up—so far. Perhaps there are nothing but lucky numbers in his pocket. But to my way of thinking, and I know it is yours, a ship in the hand is worth two on the ways when a crisis meets us as in 1917 and 1941.

The President, in his recent message, pictured the world situation very clearly. That picture was no ham-and-eggs art. The fact is that the United States is leading the fight for an orderly, stable world for a very practical reason. If that fight is lost, so are we. There are those who don't want any kind of a world unless they are in charge of it. They would rather be boss of a whole world of hungry peasants, denied every human ideal and dignity, than to risk being shown up by free men.

We are trying to circumvent such disaster by putting our resources on the side of international peace and order as it is established and maintained by justice and decency. But we cannot afford to gamble our national existence wholly on the ability of our friends abroad to recover health and strength with our help. We must also look to our own security, and this means equipment, know-how, and manpower. It does not mean having these essentials in military sufficiency alone. The whole country must be industrially in gear.

And in that system of gears, the pivot wheel is the merchant marine. I am paying this audience no flattery in that assertion. I hardly need remind you that over 70 percent of the world's surface is water and that the United States is essentially an island. Our dependence upon overseas commerce is so great that we could not maintain our living standards in peace or our existence in war without it.

Our great steel mills have long been a symbol of American industry the world over. They would shut down overnight if manganese were lacking. Yet we must import by way of the sea 97 percent of all manganese required to keep our mills running. Another example: The wheels of this Nation would stop turning if our supply of tin were cut off. Tin is a principal ingredient in most engine bearings. Our railroads, our factories, our airplanes, absolutely depend upon the merchant ships which transport every last ounce of the tin used in this country.

Those are but two examples. The list goes on and on. The positive necessity of not only maintaining, but increasing the import of those vital materials in time of war, makes crystal clear the need for a strong merchant marine. You will not call me prejudiced if I say that, in time of war, the merchant marine is only as strong as the Navy that keeps the sea lanes open. We must have the combat vessels to hunt down any enemy on the sea, and under it, and over it, as well as to protect the convoys.

During the last war a handful of German submarines was slowly—but with ever-rising tempo—bleeding industrial America to death. Not until the Navy devised its killer groups of light aircraft carriers, destroyers, and destroyer escorts, was that menace abated, the wolf packs scattered, and our convoys given an even chance. Sinkings dropped from a peak of nearly three a day to less than two a month.

Antisubmarine warfare is one of the Navy's busiest activities in war and one of its most active studies in peacetimes. The major purpose of antisubmarine warfare is to protect the merchant marine, the cargo carriers, and the troop carriers.

But the Navy gets as much as it gives. The war in the Pacific demonstrates that reciprocity of service between men who live on the sea. Japan was hemmed in, blockaded, her armies isolated, by the unbreakable noose the United States Fleet drew around the Island Empire. The factor that enabled the fleet to fight 10,000 miles from base was the continuous line of supply furnished by the cargo ships and tankers. From every pierhead on the west coast the burden bearers set out to the farthest Pacific with everything from ammunition and aspirin to zinc. It was like a bucket brigade of ships. It was front-door delivery of America's industrial output to the ships on the Okinawa picket line.

It is that combination of fighting ships and cargo ships that kept the continental United States unscarred in the last three wars.

Unless we choose to fight the next war on our own soil for a change, we can assume we will have to transport at least the 7,000,000 men carried overseas in the last war. It seems to me that war is one contest where the advantage is with the visiting team. For that we need ships. As of today, however, we possess only 92 passenger and passenger-cargo ships convertible to transports. Plus the 70 transports of the armed services, our troop-lifting capacity would meet less than one-half of the need, if the need were no greater than last time.

But transporting men across the seas also requires that they be supplied with all the food, munitions, fuel, and equipment a modern army needs, plus a generous margin for emergency. On top of that, our allies would have to be supplied. Being the arsenal of democracy also demands that we be democracy's delivery boys. In the last war, American shipping of all categories hung up a record of nearly 700,000,000,000 long-ton

miles of cargo. The total passenger miles for personnel transported overseas was in excess of thirty-three billion. There is no reason to doubt that that effort would not only have to be equaled in another war. It will more likely have to be doubled. Yet we are today found without a reserve of tanker tonnage along that would for lack of fuel make foot soldiers out of the best mechanized army and air force we could send abroad.

An adequate merchant marine can no more be built overnight than an adequate Navy can. In World War I we spent about $3,500,000,000 for emergency ship construction and ended up with inferior ships 2 years after they were needed. In the last war we had the good fortune to be more forehanded. As a result, by the end of the war we had amassed nearly 6,000 ships, all of which were needed and all of which were used.

Of those, somewhat less than 2,000 are active today. Fourteen hundred are in reserve. The rest have been disposed of in one way or another, with 1,100 sold to foreign flags. If any comfort is to be derived from this uninspiring picture it is that the ships, in terms of the next emergency, are already obsolete. My protest is not at the shipping taken off the seas but that it is not replaced.

If we have another war, in the next year or the next 50, we are not going to be given 2 years notice, as we were in the last two wars. I believe that 1 minute we will be as much at peace as we are tonight—maybe not as well fed as we are tonight—and the next minute we'll be in war up to our knees—or maybe our necks. But any foreseeable war, no matter how suddenly it comes, will be a long one. You can well dismiss anything you have heard about a 24-hour war. And one thing that can make a long war longer is the lack of an adequate American merchant marine.

What is an adequate merchant marine? Adequacy is measured in terms of delivery, of getting what we want where we want it when we want it. And the next war won't be geared to 10-knot cargo ships. Scientists are confident that submarines can be made to travel 25 knots or better submerged—and I am not just talking about American submarines. They already can dive twice as deep and stay submerged ten times as long as the old U-boat.

Yet in the last war, when submarines were slower than most ships, the German U-boats cost us one-tenth of all the money Congress appropriated for the whole war. The new submarines will be able to overhaul any merchant ship now afloat not expressly designed for speed. That one sentence alone is an unanswerable argument by itself against reliance upon a merchant fleet built for a past emergency.

And we haven't even got that.

Of course, in peace time we have to fight against public inertia. We are constantly up against the point of view illustrated by a fish merchant I know. He was asked if he thought television would ever put newspapers out of business and he said no, emphatically not because you can't wrap up herring in radio.

The recent action of the Maritime Commission asking bids on seven combination passenger-cargo ships represents the first step toward building the kind of merchant marine America needs—and needs right now. The plans of the United States Lines to build a large, fast passenger liner for use in the trans-Atlantic service adds another encouraging note. It is only one note where there ought to be a full symphony, but it is an incentive for other shipping operators.

The testimony given last month before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee by Secretary of the Navy Sullivan gives assurance that the highest Government quarters are earnestly concerned with our shipping needs. Mr. Sullivan spoke for the National Military Establishment, with President Truman's approval, and the concrete proposals he presented were shortly afterward recommended by the President himself to the whole Congress. These include a request for $90,000,000 for new merchant-ship construction in the coming fiscal year as a beginning to meet the national security requirements.

In terms of ships, this program hopefully envisages the eventual construction of 50 passenger types suitable for conversion to troop transports, with capacities ranging from 2,000 to 10,000 men each. In net effect, it is the minimum needed over and above the total ships now available for transport use. In addition it is proposed to build the important national defense feature of increased speed into a certain number of tankers constructed for commercial use where the owners are willing to accept that form of subsidy.

It is hoped that this program will receive the approval it so obviously deserves. As a naval man, my emphasis has been the contribution of the merchant marine to victory in the last war and, if such be our lot, the next war. I would far rather see a great American merchant fleet proudly fulfill its equally vital function in peace. But I will leave this thought with you, that the lack of an adequate merchant marine in peacetime brings us more certainly into the orbit of war. A would-be conqueror with no greater sea-power than a navy of submarines might well be tempted to gamble on such a prime weakness in our defenses.

I give you the Navy's heartfelt wish that for our country's sake, not only today but every day shall soon be national maritime day.

Is Congress Ready To Repudiate ERP by Crippling Trade Agreements?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1948

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following excerpts from recent newspaper articles on the Extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act:

Neal Stanford (Christian Science Monitor), April 22, 1948:

"Should Congress fail to renew the Trade Agreements Act, it would put itself in the anomalous position of pressing on others what it is unprepared to do itself. For in the ERP legislation * * * there is a clause requiring the 16 participating countries to 'cooperate to reduce barriers to trade among themselves and with other countries.' As one administration official put it, does Congress intend to practice what it preaches?"

Arthur Krock (New York Times), April 27, 1948:

"If Congress should fail to renew or should emasculate the RTA, it would be forbidding the United States to do the very things it requires of the nations under the Marshall plan."

Frank Kingdon (New York Post), May 7, 1948:

"Antediluvian Congressmen are trying to set back the clock by defeating renewal of the reciprocal trade agreements by reestablishing a bankrupting policy of high tariffs. If they succeed, every European recovery dollar will be worth 10 cents and we shall plunge with Europe into an even bigger depression than in 1929."

Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times of April 8, 1948:

"Congress last week, by approving the Marshall plan, set out to rebuild the workshop of Europe.

"Little has been heard, however, of the necessity for a companion piece of legislation which will enable the European workshop, when it is rebuilt, to find expanding markets for its goods.

"The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act expires June 12. Unless it is renewed, a cornerstone of our foreign economic policy will have disappeared.

"The Marshall plan provides dollars with which a Europe broken by war can recover its capacity to produce. But pump priming cannot go on forever. As soon as the 16 European nations are able, they will want to earn the dollars they require, and to repay the dollars they get in the form of loans. They can do so only by selling goods to somebody who can pay for them in dollars.

"The number of dollars available will depend, in the end, upon the amount of buying Americans do abroad. And the amount of foreign buying will depend to a great extent upon the level of our tariffs.

"Under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, Congress grants limited authority for the administration to reduce tariff barriers in exchange for comparable concessions by other countries. Experience has shown that this is the best practicable way of reducing trade barriers. If it isn't done by negotiation, it usually isn't done.

"The act has been renewed successively in 1937, 1940, 1943 and 1945. This year above all—when we are investing billions in European recovery—it should be renewed again."

Dallas (Tex.) News of May 9, 1948:

"The stubborn fight that is being made in Congress against extension of reciprocal trade agreements is illustrative of the equally stubborn inclination of the American mind to think in isolationist terms. The same man who thinks—or thinks he thinks—and shouts for American acceptance of responsibility in world affairs will do an about face without any seeming consciousness of inconsistency when the lick log is put down before him. Some of the leaders in the fight against extension of the reciprocal trade program are loudest in their declamations on behalf of the ERP, World Bank and other vital parts of our foreign policy.

"Under the reciprocal trade agreements act * * * Congress transfers extensive tariff adjustment authority from itself to State and Commerce Departments. The only valid objection to it should be part of the general objection to such surrender of authority by the legislative branch of the Government. Here again is inconsistency among congressional leaders because some of the loudest present opponents of renewal of the program have also been consistent advocates of delegating congressional powers to the administrative agencies. As a matter of fact, the intricate and detailed matter of tariff writing and continual tariff adjustment under the stresses and strains of present international conditions—is logically the duty of an administrative agency, subject only to the overall guidance of national policy through Congress."

Detroit (Mich.) News of May 6, 1948:

"To scuttle tariff trading would be to scuttle also not merely the accord on reduction of international trade barriers recently won by this country at the Havana meeting; it would scuttle also the whole American foreign policy aimed at restoring world economic relationships on a basis favoring, so far as may be, the survival of private capitalism. Besides which, there is to be considered the effect of such an American retreat on the European recovery program."

Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune of May 12, 1948:

"Republicans won the gratitude of the Nation for their enlightened contributions to nonpartisan foreign policy. In an election

year, even the most vote-conscious members of the party ought to see the advantage of including the reciprocal-trade program in that policy."

Boston (Mass.) Herald of April 27, 1948:

"To oppose extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act at this time would be particularly stupid. In the first place, it is an integral part of the Nation's foreign policy which the Republicans have supported in so many other respects.

"Any high-school pupil can understand that there can be no effective political cooperation if, in the economic field, we are antagonistic to our would-be friends. What could be more provocative than to scrap a tariff policy which the whole world has hailed as a manifestation of America's good intentions? What could be more objectionable than for us to tell our friends abroad, much in need as they are, that we won't buy their exports? What could be more contradictory than to say in the Marshall plan that we want to help them to the tune of many billions only to turn around and deny them the markets here which would cut down their need for our aid and ultimately reduce our outlay under the Marshall plan.

"Besides, ever since the United States took the initiative in promoting world economic cooperation at Bretton Woods in 1944, our Government has progressively sponsored programs which depend upon lowering tariffs. Our widely advertised objective has been to create conditions of multilateral trade as freely as possible. We are the champions of freedom in trade as in other areas of human activity. Not free trade per se, but trade as free as practical considerations make possible. No program has yet been devised which assures a progressive lowering of tariff barriers by the United States as fairly and effectively as that which has been conducted for 14 years under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, a law originated by Democrats which copies a principle inaugurated earlier by Republicans."

Los Angeles (Calif.) Times of March 27, 1948:

"A good moral case can be made for the Reciprocal Trade Act and it probably should be extended even though it will have little immediate effect on our foreign trade. For an American sanction of freer trade is a sort of bolster or blessing to the Marshall plan.

"It may be argued * * * that we cannot preach a freer trade to the ERP countries if we do not continue to practice a relatively free trade ourselves. The extension of the Trade Agreements Act would fulfill the moral part of the bargain we are driving—and ERP is a bargaining instrument—with the countries of Europe."

Denver (Colo.) Post of March 10, 1948:

"The United States is the only strong champion of reasonably unrestricted trade in the world. The reciprocal trade act is the only tool we have to implement that trade program. Failure to renew it would play directly into the hands of Russia and leave the Marshall plan as a temporary expedient with no sustained policy to back it up."

Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer of April 27, 1948:

"The reciprocal tariff act is needed more now than ever before. In fact, if the United States did not have such a law, the European recovery program would make it imperative that this country have such a law. The law does precisely what we are requesting of the 16 European countries we are assisting. Certainly, the United States cannot demand, as the price of assistance, that other countries lower trade barriers and, at the same time, raise its own barriers."

Washington Post of May 14, 1948:

"If Congress refuses to extend the act for the requested 3-year period, it will be equivalent to undermining the very laws it has recently approved to further world trade recovery."

Urgent Case for Federal Aid to Education Without Federal Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1948

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, on April 1, 1948, the Senate passed S. 472, the Federal aid to education without Federal control bill by an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 58 to 22.

I introduced this same bill in the United States House of Representatives on February 12, 1947. A similar bill under Republican sponsorship, H. R. 2953, was later introduced in the House and on June 6, 1947, was reported favorably by the House Subcommittee on Education. It was my privilege to testify before this committee for both bills because my main interest is in the cause of education and the welfare of our Nation. Although nearly a year has elapsed since H. R. 2953 was reported favorably, this bill has not yet been acted upon by the House Committee on Education and Labor.

There is a clear mandate from the American people to complete the enactment of Federal aid to education without Federal control in this session of Congress. It goes beyond party lines. It is expressed in polls of public opinion, in the editorial comments of the Nation's press, in the testimony before the committee, in the messages which all of us are receiving from the people of all the States. And above all, there is the responsibility for the future educational opportunities of the Nation's children. The way this responsibility is met will largely determine the future of America.

The debate and vote in the Senate show conclusively the immediate need of this program. The public reception of the Senate's action has shown beyond denial also that popular sentiment in the Nation recognizes education as a national responsibility and favors Federal assistance in the present educational crisis.

Nearly every day additional Members of the House in response to the wishes of their constitutents are expressing their support of H. R. 2953. The delay for enactment of this legislation falls squarely upon our shoulders as thousands of American children are denied the educational opportunities demanded by this age—opportunities which are easily within the economic capacity of the world's wealthiest nation. The annual cost of Federal aid to education would be less than one-twentieth of the 1-year appropriation for European recovery. The expense of Federal aid to education would be less than 1 percent of the Federal budget.

Why then is the House waiting when the opportunities of education will not wait—opportunities which once passed up are gone forever? It is our great Nation that suffers. I fully believe that this bill will be passed by a large bipartisan majority when it does come to a vote in the House of Representatives.

Some opponents of this legislation say that Federal assistance is not needed. I would like to point out to these people that our low-income States, generally, are making by far the greatest effort in school support and yet they cannot possibly bring the per pupil expenditure up to the national level because of the very limited source of taxation. These poorer States have the greatest number of children—children who later migrate all over the United States seeking better opportunities. Consequently, it is the Nation that loses because of their lack of educational opportunities when they are young. Other opponents say that it will kill initiative. However, in reality this bill is designed to stimulate interest, activity and initiative of local communities in educational affairs.

It is entirely consistent with established practices for the Federal Government to help the various States in supporting public education. The tradition for Federal aid to education goes back to 1785. Since then, numerous grants of both land and money have been made to the States for school purposes. All of these drew the full cooperation, and no objection, from the States concerned. In no case has the Federal Government dominated the educational systems of the various States concerned. The Federal aid to education program, as proposed in the pending legislation, will not be thrust forcibly upon any State. On the contrary, it gives specific and definite assurance against Federal control. Each State must take formal action, accepting and setting up procedure for operation of the program. If a State does not want to do this, it need not do so. The Federal aid legislation is an absolute States' rights home-rule bill.

The Federal funds would be supplementary only. If the Federal Government invests $300,000,000 annually in Federal aid for schools, this would be only about 10 percent of the funds spent by the State and local governments for public elementary and secondary education. It is argued that control eventually follows the source of money. If this is true then this comparatively small ratio of investment will assure local control. The States will contribute by far the greatest part of the school funds. But the 10 percent of Federal funds would, in many places, mean the difference between desperate school conditions and the sound system which we should have throughout the country. It would mean that every child in the United States would be assured at least the minimum of educational opportunities. Surely, every child has this right. But it is being denied millions of children in the Nation today.

Every day we are coming to a greater realization of the close relationship between education and national defense. Because of conditions beyond our control, it is necessary to spend great sums of money to strengthen our material security. The soundness of such investments are accepted by our leaders and the American public. But we lose the advantages of becoming physically secure if, in the meantime, we fail to develop our people in mind, body, and character.

In the last World War, 12.3 percent of the rejections for service in the armed forces were attributable to educational deficiencies. In general, the States with the highest rate of rejections were the States of lowest relative expenditure for public education. In addition, there was a high, positive correlation between the records made by individuals and the educational opportunities provided for them by their respective States. Also, in general, the States which provide the poorest educational opportunities are failing to produce their relative share of outstanding scientists. Thus, the neglect of our human resources affects most directly any steps which we might take in military preparedness. Therefore, apart from all other factors, we cannot escape the realization that Federal aid to education is a definite part of our national defense.

If we succeed in maintaining world peace, it will be largely because we have the wisdom to educate our people for effective participation in our democratic processes—democratic processes which place high value on the individual and the brotherhood of man. If war should come again, the future of democracy will depend once more upon the courage, loyalty, and training of our youth—youth from every State in our great country.

Darkness in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1948

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a very timely article on the unfortunate plight of Poland today. This article, which appeared in the Worcester Telegram of May 17, 1948, is written by Dr. W. Elmer Ekblaw, professor at Clark University, Worcester, Mass., a noted author, lecturer, and editorialist on international affairs:

DARKNESS IN POLAND

(By Dr. W. Elmer Ekblaw, Clark University)

It is a time of darkness in Poland. The somber shadow of tyranny behind the iron curtain, and bitter oppression and cruel regimentation, have made of a happy, cultured people a nation of serfs and slaves without hope of liberation, without opportunity for spiritual and intellectual expression. Except as promise for a better, happier future, the glorious history of Poland, the long, brilliant record of her illustrious men and women, is blurred over with the tragedy of her present subjugation and control by a power barbaric centuries behind her in culture and refinement.

The long, proud history of Poland as the bulwark of defense against Mongol and Tatar invasion, of defense against barbarism and paganism, of defense against savagery and oppression by militant hordes out of the interior vastenesses of Transcaspia, is for the time forgotten by the western peoples, whose frontiers she so long, so faithfully, and so successfully guarded. The debt of western civilization to Poland's patient and unwavering resistance to Oriental invasion and sovereignty is recorded in the blood of her brave citizens and soldiers who stood watch upon the eastern horizon, who fought courageously and triumphantly again and again in the course of past restless centuries.

Russian perfidy never attained such depths of utter degradation as when her armies called upon the Polish underground to launch the offense against the might of Hitler, and then flagrantly and ignobly denied them support and aid when it was most solely needed. Confident of their ultimate victory over both the sadly weakened Poles and the already defeated Germans, the Russians, in callow and selfish betrayal of the cause of their Slavic allies, waited to enter Warsaw until German reprisals had well-nigh annihilated the Polish patriots. No crueler betrayal, no more sordid selfishness, has been recorded in the bitter history of our twentieth century struggles.

The heavy hand of totalitarian Russia now directs the course of Polish life and destiny. There is no freedom, no prosperity, no security, no individual peace in Poland. There is no happiness, no content, almost no hope The folkways of the glorious Poles are, for the time being, completely Russianized. There seems to be no chance for Polish opposition to change the present course of subjugation and tyranny. There seems to be little hope that the Poles can ever again raise their heads high in pride of Polish culture, Polish history, Polish blood. There seems to be no possibility of the lifting of the iron curtain, and no brake upon the wheels of Russian imperialistic aggression.

But right and justice inevitably prevail. The strength of Polish character, the will of Polish pride, the purpose of Polish patriotism have not been broken. It is always darkest before dawn. The iron curtain will be drawn in due time by the indomitable faith and courage of the Poles themselves, and the bright light of freedom, and justice, and faith will again shine upon a happy, prosperous and glorious Poland, her brave people, her splendid culture.

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1948

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of May 20, 1948:

RECIPROCITY

Old-fashioned, down-right lies continue to be part of the stock in trade of the New Deal politicians, but the specialists have found more clever ways to deceive. One of these may be described as "calling 'em what they ain't."

Lies fool their thousands—redefinitions fool their tens of thousands.

These thoughts are brought to mind by the recent outbreak of editorials, radio speeches and other forms of propaganda endorsing President Truman's demand that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act be extended for three more years.

Some of the authors of these essays probably know enough about the technical phases of tariff issues to realize that what they are saying is preposterous—but say it anyway, with their tongues in their cheeks.

Most of them, however, probably know very little about the subject, and, possibly with the best of intentions, have let themselves be deceived; and are happily playing the game of those who fooled them.

Nine out of ten of the writers make a very simple assumption, which has only one weakness—it just is not so. They assume that because the law calls these trade agreements "reciprocal," they must have something to do with the principle of "reciprocity."

Unhappily, as Abraham Lincoln pointed out, even if you call a dog's tail a leg, it still only has four legs—because calling a tail a leg does not make it one.

Likewise, calling these agreements "reciprocal" by statute does not make them so in fact.

There is no reciprocity in the reciprocal trade agreements. Anyone who thinks there is has not taken the trouble to find out. And anyone who has gone into the subject, and still asserts that these agreements are reciprocal, is simply guilty of plain and fancy prevarication.

Yet experts are appearing on every hand, defending the trade agreements because everyone believes in reciprocity, and trying to argue that, because the Republicans endorsed reciprocity back in the 1890's, they are repudiating McKinley when they challenge the present program.

It is true that McKinley wrote a reciprocity program into the tariff law while he was still a Congressman, before he became President. Trade agreements were entered into on the basis of this McKinley law; but it was vetoed, and the agreements canceled, by a Democratic President, Cleveland.

All this is summarized in the Republican platform of 1896, on which McKinley was elected.

Superficially, it must seem to the casual reader of today that both the Republicans and the Democrats have somersaulted from their positions, so that the Republican attitude now is a hand-me-down from Cleveland, and the Democrats are trying to copy McKinley.

Rather illustrious newspapers and services have been trapped into this fallacy. For example, the Gallup poll recently took a straw vote on the subject, one finding of which was that two-thirds of the American voters don't know what a "reciprocal trade agreement" is. That figure probably is low. Certainly it was obvious, both from the wording of the questions, and the language of the press release, that the Gallup staff didn't know either. They were talking about reciprocal trade agreements and reciprocity as though the two were synonymous. But they aren't.

The average citizen probably has a pretty fair idea of what reciprocity means. If he doesn't, the dictionary can help him out. Reciprocity, as a tariff policy, means exactly what the word implies.

Nations always have special friends among the other countries of the world. It may be a matter of geographic nearness, as Canada and the United States. Or it may be a special political dependence of the one on the other, as Cuba or the Philippines for this country. Or it may be a purely commercial tie, because one of the countries is the major buyer of the other's principal crop—just as we buy most of Cuba's sugar, Brazil's coffee, etc.

Now, the theory of true reciprocity is for those two countries, having such a special connection, to get together and work out a special trade treaty for each other's benefit.

Nation A makes a pact with nation B, in which each cuts its customs duties to the other. Nations C, D, E, etc., do not share in these reductions—otherwise, the agreements would have little value to either of the signers.

That's real reciprocity. How do the reciprocal agreements work? Nations A and B sign a reciprocal agreement—and promptly nations C, D, E, etc., get the advantage of all the reductions in tariffs. Nation A may have made considerable concessions in order to get the special rates from nation B—but all the other countries, which made no concessions whatever, get the same reductions.

What's reciprocal about that? Reciprocity means give and take. But under the trade agreements, only one foreign country gives

the United States of America anything in return for its tariff reduction—and all the other countries take the benefits.

The law recognized this defect and attempted to meet it by limiting trade agreements, on any given article, to the principal producer of that commodity. But since the Supreme Court has declined to accept jurisdiction over the trade-agreements law, there is no way whatsoever to make the President or State Department live up to this (or any other) provision in the act. Many trade agreements have been signed with minor producers of the goods affected.

The trade agreements are nonreciprocal in another sense as well. As stated above, reciprocity means give and take. Under the principle of reciprocity, we would make tariff slashes only in return for equivalent concessions on the part of the other signer. If he changed his mind, then the deal would be off.

But under the reciprocal agreements it doesn't work that way. For example, recently Mexico decided she didn't like the concessions she had agreed to make to the United States of America in return for certain tariff cuts. She withdrew some, and invalidated the others with quotas.

Did this result in cancelling the reciprocal agreement? Oh, no! The State Department ruled that our concessions had to continue, and the President backed the Secretary up. Yet it would be the height of absurdity to call this reciprocity.

The truth of the matter is that the use of the word reciprocal as descriptive of the trade agreements in the statute was a very clever but completely dishonest piece of business by the New Deal followers of Cordell Hull.

The whole scheme is a tricky way of trying to do under cover what the Democrats have lacked the nerve to do in the open—to smash down this country's tariff protection, and replace it with free trade.

For all the steady stream of abuse of it by persons who wouldn't know an ad valorum from an import license, the Tariff Act of 1930, definitely setting forth protection as the binding principle of our trade relations, is still on the statute books—and the Democrats in 16 years haven't dared try to repeal it.

They haven't had to. Under the trade agreements act, tariffs were cut in half on a great many items (two-thirds of our imports, incidentally, are on the free list of the act of 1930 because they are noncompetitive). Then in 1945 Congress allowed a further cutting in half of the rates, so that at present most of the key commodities shipped into this country are subject to only 25 percent of the 1930 rates.

That is true wherever these articles are produced; true whether or not the producing nation has made any concession to us in return for this reduction; true whether the labor which manufactured the commodity is slave, low-paid or subsidized; and true whether or not the country in question has lived up to or repudiated the promises it made in connection with the agreement.

Pretending this is reciprocity is either exceeding stupid—or remarkably dishonest.

Dead Men Tell No Tales in Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Drew Pearson that appeared in the Washington Post of May 22, 1948:

DEAD MEN TELL NO TALES IN GREECE
(By Drew Pearson)

Dead men tell no tales. That was why Greek terrorists tied the hands and feet of George Polk, CBS correspondent, shot him in the back and dumped him into Salonika Harbor. Polk couldn't struggle much. His back had been broken when he crash-landed at Guadalcanal and his spine was patched with metal plates.

George had been severely critical of the Greek rightist regime and so, because dead men tell no tales, he was bumped off.

However, from the blue dead lips of George Polk comes a tale which may shake the graft-ridden Greek Government to its rotten core. Certainly it will tell the American taxpayers what they are entitled to know about the millions of dollars they have dumped into Greece.

For what the murderers of George Polk did not know was that he had written letters before his death—letters which still live.

"We are fighting a tough battle over here," Polk wrote me before his death. "My feeling about Greece is that we should get in or get out, all the way. The situation is too grave for half measures.

"Of course, the State Department hopes to stave off drastic decisions until after the United States Presidential elections; but even our poorly informed American Embassy doubts that this can be done.

"Yet, when a reporter writes this kind of report, he comes under attack by the royalist right-wingers who are squeezing the country for their own benefit—and sending dollars out in diplomatic pouches as fast as possible. Specifically, these crooks hope to get a number of American reporters now working in Greece discredited or moved.

AMERICAN PEOPLE SHOULD KNOW

"Nevertheless," continued Polk, "I think the American people deserve to know the kind of political machine that is rolling roughshod over the very nice Greek people."

Polk then proceeded to tell how the propaganda line of both the Communists and the dominant right-wing Populist Party has become identically the same.

"Both," he said, "are charging the United States with interference in internal Greek affairs; both are charging that Washington desires to use the Greek people for the creation of an American empire.

"For example, the secret radio station of the Communist-led Greek guerrillas has said: 'The United States is interfering in Greece to suck Greece's blood for nourishment of American imperialisms.'

"Simultaneously the Athens royalist press has started plugging the same line, charging the United States with trying to establish a puppet government in the Greek capital so that Greeks will fight America's war against the Soviet Union.

"Greece's second-largest newspaper, royalist Vrathini, has declared that 'if one observes the notices being issued to the Greek Government by American Administrator Dwight P. Griswold, one must conclude that these were formulated in Tokyo, addressed to the conquered Japanese or some other gangster-dominated country * * *. Ironically these tactics are being used by a people who, through grave blunders, surrendered Europe to the worst of enemies and now are trying to win the war which was lost at Yalta and Potsdam * * *. Further, the Americans—and our other allies—are chiefly to blame for the misery, devastation, and loss of life in Greece during the past year because of refusal to give the Greek Army sufficient arms for use against the bandits in the hills'."

POLK'S PROPHECY

Prophetically, Polk then put his finger on something which has started to come true.

"For the moment," he diagnosed, "the right wing is playing things carefully because Populist leader Tsaldaris and henchmen do not want to upset Greece's opportunity to be included in the European recovery program. But once Greece is included, the right wing is prepared to move fast—break up the coalition government, form a new one run in dictatorial fashion, send parliament home, replace 200 key administrative officers of the army, police, security officers, prisons, and put into effect dynamic policies."

It was only a short time after the Marshall plan was applied to Greece that 250 Greek political prisoners were shot by the Government in retaliation for the assassination of Justice Ladas.

Are Republicans Going To Retreat to Isolationism by Modifying Trade Agreements to Death?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, the reciprocal trade agreements are coming up for debate in the House tomorrow.

I am introducing in the RECORD today editorial excerpts so that the Members may have an opportunity to examine the thinking of a wide cross section of editorial opinion on this very important measure.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is well for us to remember that support of reciprocal trade agreements is in no sense partisan. It is a policy that has been endorsed by both major political parties. Sound trade arrangements are fundamental to the establishment of political peace in the world.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has assumed world leadership in the international economic field. Are we now to retreat to the pre-McKinley days?

Attached are the editorial comments from around the country:

Marquis Childs (Washington Post), May 4, 1948:

"The trade program is essential to world recovery. If a Republican victory is to mean an end to that program and to revival of old-fashioned protectionism, then we are entitled to know it."

Roscoe Drummond (Christian Science Monitor), May 13, 1948:

"Isn't the reciprocal-trade policy needed by the Republican Party? Three leading contenders for the GOP Presidential nomination are strong supporters of the Reciprocal Trade Act—Stassen, Vandenberg, and Dewey. Can the GOP afford to enter the campaign by repudiating the position of its leading candidates for the Presidency? If it does, it will be exhibiting in the foreign field the same kind of division the Democrats are exhibiting in the domestic field."

El Paso (Tex.) Herald, March 3, 1948:

"We believe that, as Mr. Truman says, the interests of domestic producers have been and will be carefully safeguarded in negotiation of reciprocal agreements. We know that, in the past, the Republican Party has done itself great damage by championing high protective tariffs, represented as beneficial to industry and agriculture but actually harmful to the vast majority of Americans. We hope that now, when so much is at stake, Republicans in Congress will not succeed in putting their party back on that road to disaster."

Baton Rouge (La.) State-Times, March 4, 1948:

"There is no valid argument for killing the reciprocal trade law. Its extension will be

as much a moral builder as a direct stimulus to international trade. If we double back in our tracks and do not extend the law, we will have returned to isolationism and shirked one of our duties of world leadership."

Memphis (Tenn.) Press-Scimitar, March 3, 1948:

"We believe that, as Mr. Truman says, the interests of domestic producers have been and will be carefully safeguarded in the negotiation of reciprocal agreements. In the past, the Republican Party has done itself great damage by championing high protective tariffs, represented as beneficial to agriculture but actually harmful to the vast majority of Americans. We hope that now, when so much is at stake, Republicans in Congress will not succeed in putting their party back on that road to disaster."

Johnstown (Pa.) Tribune, March 4, 1948:

"The Trade Agreements Act was designed by former Secretary of State Hull, and it has formed the basis of our foreign economic policy for the last 14 years. Its purpose is to reduce trade barriers between nations and contribute to the flow of international trade. Since these are the aims of all our recent steps to improve relations among nations, refusal to renew the act would be interpreted as a step backward to isolation. That would be unwise now, when we are trying to rebuild the economy of western Europe at substantial cost."

Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, May 3, 1948:

"How can this Nation say to others that they should lower tariff barriers if we plan to drop our own program for reciprocating. The United States has had one disastrous experience with high tariffs. The Hawley-Smoot tariff of the late 1920's virtually choked off our foreign trade, hastening and making more severe the world depression that followed. It should be clear by now that we can no more live in economic isolation than we can live in political isolation."

Manchester (N. H.) Union, May 12, 1948:

"The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has been the keystone of our trade policy for the past 14 years. As such, it has become a sort of symbol of our good faith in seeking to promote world economic cooperation. That being so, the lapse of the act now or an extension that was obviously a prelude to its death a year from now would be interpreted abroad as an abandonment of a policy of cooperation and a return to economic isolationism.

"The result would be seriously to hamper the operation of the European recovery program and all other measures based on the hope of trade exchanges to help promote world recovery. * * * The death of the Reciprocal Trade Act would also make the tariff once more a butt of political log-rolling."

Ernest Lindley (Newsweek), May 17, 1948:

"Probably the least objectionable compromise would be a straight one-year extension of the act in its present form. But even that would be widely interpreted here and abroad as only a stay of the death sentence until after the election."

New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, May 10, 1948:

"The Trade Agreements Act has made it possible to negotiate agreements with other nations not only to reduce tariffs but to stop the use of underhand trade tricks.

"The American people want the act renewed as it is. They have shown this in public-opinion polls. Trade experts want the act renewed. A reversal of this policy because of traditional but unrealistic partisanship would be dangerous to the economic peace of the world."

Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, April 21, 1948:

"The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act expires early in June. The Republicans in Congress, from all appearances are not very keen about reenacting it.

"This, if it presaged a return to the days of tariff barriers would put the United States in the impossible position of trying to build up other nations with financial aid and, at the same time, trying to knock them down in a trade war in which we have all the weapons.

"If there ever was a time when the United States needed a world of freer trade—not free trade but intelligent trade—it is now."

Wall Street Journal, March 17, 1948:

"We do not believe producers, by and large, need to be sheltered from outside competition. The 'pauper foreign labor' argument has pretty well lost its force, if indeed it ever had much. We think Congress should extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Whatever it does by amendment to give Congress some sort of rein over the executive branch should be done cautiously. To return the making of specific tariffs rate schedules to the floor of the House and Senate would be an unfortunate step backward at a time when world trade expansion depends in great measure on American leadership."

Kansas City (Mo.) Star, May 2, 1948:

"If we now fail to adhere to a consistent trade policy and, in public effect, abandon our reciprocal program, old suspicions would almost inevitably be reawakened just when the Communists are searching eagerly for chinks in our new international armor. Moreover, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act bears a special significance because its adoption in 1934 offered the first concrete evidence that the United States might be preparing to break away from blank isolationism and recognize the interdependence of all nations in the modern world.

"To drop that program at this juncture would open up for our friends the unwelcome prospect that we had commenced to swing again in the opposite direction—back to the isolationist doctrine of live alone and like it. They know—and we should know—that it is only one short step from economic noncooperation to political lone-wolfship. Indeed, in practice they are indistinguishable. We must lead in every field of international relations or retire to a hermit's existence all along the line. That is why the fate of the extension bill assumes such vital consequence in the total picture of our foreign policy."

Washington (D. C.) News, April 29, 1948:

"An American about-face toward economic legislation such as these Republicans seem to have in mind would be a tragedy to this country and to the world. It could mean failure of the ERP, loss of billions of American dollars, and defeat of the world's best hope for enduring peace. In this issue the Republican Party * * * faces a crucial test of its fitness for the momentous responsibilities of the next 4 years."

Washington (D. C.) Star, March 5, 1948:

"At the moment, since we are far from being in need of enlarged foreign markets, it may seem academic to stress the fact that trade is a two-way proposition. But we have over 50 percent of the world's productive capacity, and when the extraordinary current buying demand at home and abroad tapers off, we will want as many overseas outlets as possible to prevent factory shut-downs and large-scale unemployment. The reciprocity program which amply protects our domestic producers is designed to operate to that end. The Republicans will be making a grievous mistake if they fail to renew it."

Watertown (N. Y.) Times, April 15, 1948:

"Surely a Congress which had the foresight to implement the Marshall plan will not emasculate the Reciprocal Trade Treaty Act, which is almost as important for world recovery as the Marshall plan * * *."

"The Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act of 1930 did much to promote the world depression and to create a condition which permitted Hitler to obtain power in Germany 2 years later. We must not turn the clock back. We must not listen to the high tariff men who think in terms of a past and regrettable age. The Reciprocal Tariff Act must be preserved. To wreck it would be to wreck our European recovery program."

Chicago (Ill.) News, May 6, 1948:

"If Congress is misled into requiring House and Senate approval for any tariff-cutting agreements negotiated, protectionist log-rolling would probably combine to defeat them all. The Bogota conference revealed the determination of Latin America to build up their own industries, and, taking a lead from the early history of the United States to protect these and other world conditions, the Administration should have the latitude it seeks to negotiate treaties that will be mutually advantageous."

Kansas City (Mo.) Times, May 10, 1948:

"It has been demonstrated repeatedly that Congress is not fitted to handle the details of tariff acts. Because of the inevitable log-rolling and the interference of pressure groups, Congress always makes a mess of fixing duties. Its last attempt with the Hawley-Smoot tariff provoked retaliatory duties and was an important factor in setting off the great depression of the 1930's.

"* * * Although the Reciprocal Agreements Act has been working well, every time it is up for renewal, the effort is made to let Congress have a say in the making of duties. Washington reports that this familiar sort of attack to destroy the effectiveness of the reciprocal trade agreements is now under way. Its success would lead to a reversion to the old log-rolling type of tariff that sickened the country in the years following the first world war. And this reversion would come just at a time, when, as Secretary Marshall says, the United States ought to be leading the world into an era of expanding foreign trade by removing restrictions that are hampering its growth."

New York Post, May 7, 1948:

"Any refusal to extend the act (trade agreements) unamended for the full 3 years requested will be the tip-off that many Republicans are reverting to type. A type which can scarcely be trusted to guide America to responsible world leadership in the demanding days to come."

San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, April 7, 1948:

"Reciprocal trade has been the ruling policy of the United States in its foreign economic relations for 14 years. It is part and parcel of our whole tariff structure; it is at work right now in a vast, complex world pattern of exchange of goods and there is no justification at all for the apparent determination of a few strategically placed foes of this policy to strangle it. * * * Passage of the European recovery program has given a wholly new significance to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. * * * What kind of sense would it make for the United States now to reject the very course for which we have exacted their pledges? Failure to extend the reciprocal-trade policy would be taken by the world as a signal of American retreat into economic isolationism * * *."

Protestant Episcopal Diocese of New York Resolutions on DP's and Federal World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the following resolutions adopted by the annual convention of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of New York held in the Synod House, Cathedral Heights, N. Y., on Tuesday, May 8, 1948, on the subject of dis-

placed persons and federal world government are indicative of the profound concern with which those responsible for the spiritual life of our people view the moral implications of our failures in international relations. One great moral issue is whether we will redeem our promise to save the DP's from the living death of the DP camps or return to countries of persecution, and find new homes for them. In this moral issue we must lead as it is only by our leadership that it can be solved. In its resolution on Federal World Government the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of New York seeks to answer the aching question of people everywhere whether there is an alternative to war, preventive or otherwise. The spelling out of this alternative and its development and implementatior are the most urgent problems before us.

DIOCESE OF NEW YORK,
SECRETARY OF CONVENTION,
New York, N. Y., May 21, 1948.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JAVITS: As secretary of the convention, I certify that the enclosed resolutions on displaced persons and federal world government were adopted by the annual convention of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of New York, held in the Synod House, Cathedral Heights, New York, Tuesday, May 8, 1948. The convention is the legislative body representing the clergy and lay delegates of the 235 parishes and missions of the diocese of New York.

In accordance with the instruction of the convention, I am forwarding the resolutions to you, in the earnest desire that you will do all in your power to accomplish the purposes set forth in the resolutions.

Respectfully,

R. A. D. BEATY.

DISPLACED PERSONS

One year ago the annual convention of the diocese of New York by unanimous vote adopted a resolution to "approve the plan to admit up to 40,000 displaced persons." Congress has taken no action on this proposal. Due to the Communist coup in Czechoslovakia there are actually more displaced persons in Europe today than there were a year ago.

Canon Almon Pepper, of the national council, after a tour of displaced persons camps in the autumn of 1947, substantiated the almost unanimous reports of first-hand observers: The displaced persons are in their present status primarily because of their opposition to and fear of communism. They are making heroic and skillful efforts to help themselves under almost impossible conditions. They are good material for the strengthening of this country both economically and politically.

Meanwhile a bill has been introduced which proposes to admit 50,000 displaced persons under restrictions that are administratively almost impossible, and which makes the serious blunder of giving legislative recognition to the Russian annexation of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and eastern Prussia, contrary to the established foreign policy of the United States.

Be it therefore, Resolved, That the Diocese of New York in convention assembled reaffirm its position with reference to the admission of 40,000 displaced persons; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the chairmen of the appropriate committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, to the Senators from New York, and the Representatives whose districts lie within the boundaries of the diocese.

FEDERAL WORLD GOVERNMENT

The general convention of the Episcopal Church in September 1946, adopted a resolution on the United Nations and stable world order which read in part as follows:

"Whereas the establishment and maintenance of world law supported by an adequate means for its enforcement is inescapably necessary for the preservation of our civilization; and

"Whereas this necessity makes clearly evident the moral obligation of all peoples to release and share some part of their absolute sovereignty in the interest of world peace: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church urges the President and Congress of the United States to take the lead in seeking to persuade the nations to grant to the United Nations jurisdiction and power, not subject to veto, to enact and enforce throughout the territories of all nations, laws and regulations to control the development and use of atomic energy, to supplement and extend existing international agreements for the protection of health and welfare, and as rapidly as possible to extend the principle of world government to other fields which affect or may affect relations between nations and the peace of the world, and

"Whereas for the establishment of enduring peace, a much stronger instrument of world government is requisite than is the United Nations as at present constituted: Be it further

"Resolved, That this convention declares its conviction that peace among people and between nations can be maintained only under law; which involves a representative legislative body, elected by the people of the constituent nations, whose laws shall be addressed to the citizens individually, interpreted by the people's courts and enforced by an executive answerable to the people."

The course of international relations, both within and without the United Nations, since the adoption of this resolution have added impressive and frightening testimonies to the need for a world federation with actual, though limited, legislative, executive, and judicial powers. Peace treaties with Germany, Austria, and Japan have yet to be written. No control has been established over atomic energy. There is actual warfare in China, Greece, and Palestine. The one world, which is the only guaranty of our survival, is already divided into two worlds, and the minds of men everywhere are tending to turn away from an effort to prevent a third world war toward effort to win it. In this situation, so threatening to every human principle, and to the very continuance of our civilization, the Church must once again call upon men and governments to seek the way of justice and of peace.

Be it, therefore, Resolved, That the diocese of New York in convention assembled, reaffirms its support of the proposals of the general convention of our Church, and urges immediate, forthright, and courageous action on the part of the President, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States toward the formation of a true federal union, either by amendment of the Charter of the United Nations, or, if that proves impossible, through the formation of a regional defense pact, under the provisions of chapter 8, paragraph 52, of the present Charter; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the chairmen of the appropriate committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, to the Senators from New York, and the Congressmen whose districts lie within the boundaries of the diocese.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. DEANE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1948

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I have been impressed with the almost unanimous sentiment expressed by the press of this country in support of the reciprocal trade-agreements program. Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include several statements that have recently appeared in leading business journals of this country in strong support of the immediate renewal of the Trade Agreements Act.

MAGAZINES

The Friend, March 11, 1948:

"Reports of Republican hostility to the President's request for a 3-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act are disquieting. The reciprocal-trade-agreements program has been one of the most constructive parts of United States foreign policy. The central feature of the program is the delegation to the President of authority, within limits, to negotiate changes in tariff rates. Republican politicians say that each particular agreement should be approved by Congress, a practice which in the past has enabled minorities who benefit from high tariff rates to disregard the general interests and prevent each particular reduction. Reduction of trade barriers and increase of world trade are necessary to world welfare, on which the maintenance of peace depends. The reciprocal-trade-agreements program is a well-tested method of promoting those necessary ends. Failure now to renew the trade-agreements program would be a major tragedy."

America, March 20, 1948:

"It is the sincere hope of many friends of freer world trade that no obstacles will be put in the way of progress toward greater exchange of goods between nations. This goal would become remote indeed if the United States were not in a bargaining position in world trade circles. The reciprocal-trade-agreements program must remain an instrument of our foreign economic policy."

World's Business and Importers Guide, March 1948:

"The leadership which the United States has taken both at Geneva and at the UN Conference at Habana in spearheading the drive to reduce barriers to world trade is in reality foundation work that could lead to a long period of world peace. * * *

"In 1934 the reciprocal-trade program was the first United States effort to scale down restrictions on world trade on a give-and-take basis. Goods that we needed flowed more freely to us, and the market for our exports widened. Even to this day there is no evidence in the files of Congress that any United States industry suffered from this program. On the contrary, our trade and abundance grew."

Export Trade and Shipper, April 5, 1948:

"Importance of renewing the act (Reciprocal Trade) in its present form is seen in the ITO charter recently concluded in Habana. This charter is merely a set of policies for clean trading in international commerce. They are merely principles which have been accepted by delegates from 54 nations but still have to be ratified by their governments throughout the world, including the United States. Reciprocal trade agreements are the implementing instruments of these ITO principles."

Fortune, May 1948:

"Congress is faced almost immediately with what amounts to a test vote on extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Negotiation of reciprocal trade agreements has been authorized for 14 years. The authorization has been four times renewed. Over the years, this policy has brought tariffs down to about pre-World War I levels. Its contribution to the current unbalance in trade is modest but French wines, British woolens, Canadian whisky, and a thousand other products are a little cheaper and therefore have a little larger market, present or potential than would otherwise be the case. This is as it should be and extension to allow further negotiation is in order."

Nation, May 22, 1948:

"It is unnecessary to repeat at this late date the many sound arguments in favor of the foreign trade policy embodied in this act, which first became law in 1934 and has been periodically renewed ever since. But in recent years, new and even more impelling reasons for retaining it have been added. During the war, many controls of trade and currency had to be enforced. It was uncertain whether other nations would ever be won back to gradual removal of obstructions to international commerce. On the insistence of the United States, pledges to do so were included in every fundamental agreement on which the postwar economy is supposed to be built. The only possible alternative is a system of planned international trade. The billions of dollars invested in world recovery by the American people would be imperiled, not to speak of recovery and peace itself. * * *

"To suggest upward revision of duties at a time of full employment, the largest profits ever known, and a soaring cost of living is wanton folly. If the industries which want higher duties fear foreign competition in some future depression, they should be reminded that the Smoot-Hawley Act was passed in 1930 and that it was followed by the most disastrous years of depression on record."

Hydrogenation Processes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1948

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I have received from Hon. J. A. Krug, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., May 20, 1948.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I am returning herewith my letter of May 4, concerning patents relating to the hydrogenation of coal and coal products. In reply to your note on the letter, essentially all of the material brought back from Germany, including both microfilms and copies of patents, has now been translated and analyzed. The coal hydrogenation plant being erected at Louisiana, Mo., has been designed to a considerable degree on the basis of the information contained in the patents and reports that were seized in Germany.

I have also been advised that Dr. L. L. Hirst, chief of the demonstration plant at Louisiana, Mo., has forwarded to you a detailed letter concerning their application of the German patents in the plant design and construction, and giving a brief description of some of the features of the German patents in which you were interested.

Copies of our correspondence are being forwarded to the Research and Development Laboratories at Pittsburgh to determine if they can throw any further light on this patent situation. If additional information is available, it will be sent to you.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior.

Fight To Save Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1948

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Detroit News of May 22, 1948:

FIGHT TO SAVE HOUSING BILL—F. D. R., JR., BACKS TAFT AGAINST HOUSING GROUP

(By Blair Moody)

Senator TAFT and Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., teamed up today in a fight to save the public housing and slum clearance provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

Roosevelt blasted into the open the private effort of House Republican leaders, previously reported only by the Detroit News, to force TAFT into a deal in which he would abandon public housing to save other provisions, including FHA, which they otherwise threatened to kill.

TAFT sharply refused, throwing the fate of the whole measure, including the provisions wanted by the real estate lobby, into doubt.

HALLECK ACCUSED

Roosevelt today laid responsibility for the effort to slough public housing in the lap of Majority Leader CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana. HALLECK, Roosevelt said, is engineer of the wrecking crew.

The son of the late President, national housing chairman of the American Veterans' Committee, predicted that TAFT would refuse to sell his housing bill down the river.

Roosevelt charged that "a Republican wrecking crew of Speaker MARTIN, HALLECK, and Representative WOLCOTT, Republican, of Michigan, presented an ultimatum to TAFT that unless he accepted the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill without public housing they would attempt to prevent House action on any housing legislation this session."

(Actually, as reported in Thursday's News, the decision was made by MARTIN, HALLECK, and WOLCOTT, but the ultimatum was presented by HALLECK and WOLCOTT.)

Roosevelt declared that "the move, engineered by HALLECK, was inspired by WOLCOTT's discovery that the House Banking and Currency Committee was ready to report the T-E-W bill as passed by the Senate.

"By a narrow margin the House committee is now in favor of the T-E-W bill with the Senate provisions for public housing and slum clearance included," Roosevelt said. "The wrecking crew, headed by HALLECK, is now determined to attempt to delay hearings so that the bill will not be reported to the floor."

Roosevelt said proponents of the bill will refrain from testifying further to "make delaying tactics difficult." (WOLCOTT told the News Friday that a bill should be ready after 1 week's further hearings.)

PREDICTS REBELLION

"Without TAFT's support the HALLECK plan is doomed to failure," Roosevelt said. "The Senate vote demonstrated that the measure has broad bipartisan support. Rank-and-file Republican Members of the House will rebel against the attempt of a few leaders to save the bacon for the real-estate lobby."

Roosevelt asserted that the T-E-W bill, including its public-housing provisions, now has the support of every major veterans' organization, including AVC, Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion (which changed its position after a restudy of the issue and some reported loss of membership), and the AMVETS.

"Veterans demonstrated at the national veterans' housing conference in Washington this spring that they are unanimously behind the T-E-W bill," Roosevelt said. "We do not believe this Congress will say 'No' to the concerted demand of the veterans for housing."

Virden Should Not Resign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, in the current controversy over the resignation of John C. Virden of the Department of Commerce because of his daughter, whose views he completely repudiates, it is appropriate to consider the foundation of our beliefs and to urge that his resignation should not be accepted in the interests of our own freedoms. The Washington Post today in an editorial which follows invokes the ancient law of the Old Testament which is followed in the moral law of the Christian era in refusing to condemn the fathers for their children or the children for their fathers, as a doctrine abhorrent to modern society.

THE LORD COMMANDED

It is told in the Book of Kings that "in the second year of Joash, son of Jehoahaz, king of Israel, reigned Amaziah, the son of Joash, king of Judah. * * * And it came to pass, as soon as the kingdom was confirmed in his hand, that he slew his servants which had slain the king, his father. But the children of the murderers he slew not: according unto that which is written in the book of the law of Moses, wherein the Lord commanded, saying, The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, nor the children be put to death for the fathers; but every man shall be put to death for his own sin." And for some several thousand years every civilized nation has obeyed this commandment.

We Must Look Both Ways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, on the 21st of May 1948, in celebration of Maritime Day, I made an address before the Propeller Club of the city of Savannah, Ga., the port from which the *Savannah*, first steam vessel to cross the Atlantic sailed in 1819 on her memorable voyage.

I publish the address herewith as it may be of interest to those concerned with the American merchant marine:

WE MUST LOOK BOTH WAYS

Just a few days ago I attended a banquet of a well-known society whose membership rules are based upon certain requirements of past service. It was a pleasant occasion with all the talk reminiscing of days gone by. After the banquet one of the guests remarked that she must do something to get these fine people looking toward the future instead of gazing steadfastly into the past, no matter how glorious that past might have been.

This remark seems peculiarly applicable to the merchant service of the United States. The merchant marine has a past in which there are periods of glory, and in which there are times of nearly utter despair. If we go back into the days of clipper ships—those days when our New England States had the finest stands of timber for ship construction; in which our people had not yet become imbued with the slogan of "Go west, young man. Go west"; in which wages in this country were on a par with those of Europe—we can recall that the tall masts of American ships were in evidence in all parts of the known world. We know also that in those days many of our wealthy New England and New York families of today salted down the foundations of their fortunes through earnings from ships bringing in tea from the Far East, whale oil from the frigid waters of the earth, slaves from the dark continent, and sugar from the islands of the Caribbean. It is romantic to look back to the days of sail and to rebuild in one's mind the tales of storm and calm, of piracy and of high adventure, when the stars in our flag were few and all of our great West was under the sovereignty of foreign potentates.

But with the advent of iron ships, with the arrival of steam for propulsion, with the War Between the States to take our whole energies, and with the opening of the West, our merchant marine virtually disappeared from the seven seas. The war with Spain required us to buy foreign bottoms to carry coal and troops. During the voyage of the Great White Fleet around the world, in the days of the Presidency of Theodore Roosevelt, we used foreign ships almost entirely for fleet supply. The outbreak of the First World War caught us short of everything in the way of a merchant marine. Yet, here was the beginning of our second phase of glory, for we did produce ships, we did obtain ships, until near the end of that war we had some two thousand merchant vessels carrying armed guards and guns of a sort. America had built the first bridge of ships to Europe—a feeble bridge when compared to the vast fleet which was to come in World War II, but, nevertheless, a real accomplishment. After the peace, our merchant shipping commenced dropping back into insignificance, where it remained until the revival brought about in the 1930's under the jurisdiction of the War Shipping Administration and of the Maritime Commission.

And then the third phase of the glory of American merchant shipping got under way and carried on through the Second World War. These years saw the greatest shipbuilding program of all history planned and accomplished in the United States. It saw ships spring up as if by magic; saw ship construction on small rivers and even in the fields of the Middle West; saw ships taken down from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico via the Mississippi River and its connections to Lake Michigan at Chicago. Yet, as in all earthly matters, the end came and with that end the beginning of another possible disintegration of the American merchant fleet. From the end of the war until the present, we have sold approximately 1,150 ships foreign; sold enough to bring nearly every fleet of our world war allies above its tonnage level of prewar days; sold enough to put these small-investment ships with their low-paid crews into competition with our American-flag ships for many years to come. We have also sold a lot of ships to American operators, which is as it should be, and we have chartered, and we are still chartering, many ships to these same Americans.

Unfortunately, the world tonnage is rising so steadily, due to modern construction from foreign yards, that we are having a pretty steady return of chartered ships to the Maritime Commission for lay-up, because of lack of sufficient cargo offerings to utilize all bottoms available.

However, we are still in the boom of ocean transportation brought about by the war and continued since, to a limited extent, by the demands of European reconstruction. We still have a good vessel tonnage in operation, both privately owned and under charter from the Government. The great need which confronts us is to find ways to maintain as much of this tonnage as possible under the American flag. We recognize that world conditions may greatly reduce offerings of cargo within the next few years. We recognize that we can't expect to keep more than a fair share of the world's trade. We know that it will require special assistance of some kind to keep our ships in foreign commerce when the lean days come, and so we must explore all possibilities and arrive at logical conclusions in the near future, thus giving us the time to write our decisions into law before the days when maximum assistance will be needed.

And so, having looked a little at the past, let us take a glance at the present before trying to peer into the future.

We have heard a great deal about the vast shipments to be made under the Economic Cooperation Administration, formerly the European recovery program, and before that the Marshall plan. There will be big shipments, but the total water-borne commerce is not expected to be increased materially; in fact, that from the United States may be decreased. Since the end of the war this Nation has been supplying a large part of the goods needed for the rebuilding of Europe. Although it hasn't been advertised so extensively, the contributions of the United States, through its European relief funds, its aid to Greece and Turkey, its share of assistance for occupied states, its support of its own troops and nationals, its obligations under UNRRA, its closing out of lend-lease, and its shipments on account of purchases from abroad, has been exporting just about as much, or even more, than it is expected to do in the immediate future.

I know it will be difficult for you to accept these figures, but they are authentic and show that the United States has contributed toward world recovery since May 1945:

Contributions to:	
United Nations	$29,289,349
UNRRA	2,700,000,000
World Bank	3,175,000,000
Lend-lease	2,163,000,000
Advances to foreign nations:	
Surplus property	1,148,000,000
Loans to Great Britain and the Philippines	4,390,000,000
War Department grants	1,771,926,293
Export-Import Bank	2,931,209,176
Greek-Turkish loan	400,000,000
Liquidation of lend-lease	500,000
Relief, war-devastated areas	350,000,000
International Relief Organization	71,073,000
Military relief in occupied areas	600,000,000
Interim-aid bill, 1947	597,000,000
Total, exclusive of ERP	23,076,995,818

And yet some say we are a race of shylocks.

The new program under ECA is prohibited from making purchases in the United States at prices above certain stipulated levels—these levels being set so as to prevent an excessive rise of prices in the domestic market due to large Government purchases. You will recall that in the immediate past it has seemed that prices have been maintained and advanced by the calculated use of Government purchasing in such commodity markets as wheat, petroleum products, etc. While I do not believe that deliberate manipulation has been proved beyond a doubt, yet the Congress thought the coincidences of Government buying and price changing in the domestic market so peculiar that it endeavored to protect the American public against price rises which might be brought about by leaks in information of prospective governmental operations or by deliberate crookedness on the part of employees trusted with inside information.

So, all in all, we do not expect any increase in ocean tonnage due to the new program. And here let me explain, for the sake of clarity, that the program is officially known as the European relief program, or ERP for short, but that it is being administered by an organization known as the Economic Cooperation Administration, or ECA for short. I know that this is confusing, but you might as well become accustomed to it, and, after all, it isn't quite as bad as our late, but not lamented, PWA and WPA, in which the first two letters were merely transposed, and which, to this day, leave me in complete ignorance as to which was first in our lives, and which did what, and why one couldn't have done what both are reputed to have accomplished.

Now, let me set forth what has seemed to me to be a basic policy of our State Department for some years. I do not say this is State Department policy—I say merely that my observations make me believe that it is the fundamental philosophy behind State Department moves in connection with overseas commerce under the American flag. There are certain nations which do not have sufficient resources to permit of sufficient industrial development to support their populations through production or earnings ashore. One may put the Scandinavian states, the Netherlands, Greece, Italy, and some others in this category. Naturally, then, they turn to the sea, where they seek to operate a carrying trade wherever cargo offers. They are to be commended for such efforts. Then we have the United States, where industry and resources are such that the population can earn a living of some sort within its borders. Our wages are higher than those of other nations, and we can seldom meet foreign competition in the overseas trade without Government aid. On the basis of having the goods carried by those who can do it cheapest, there seems little justification for American overseas shipping. If we accept that thesis, the logical thing is to let these have-nots carry the goods at sea and keep the haves busy at their various jobs ashore.

It seems to me that the State Department accepts this theory as the proper basis of world commerce at sea, and that its every effort and recommendation is to make it effective through favoritism to foreign carriers and by placing stumbling blocks in the way of our own shipowners and operators. It is perfectly natural that this philosophy, seemingly indulged in year after year by our State Department, presents an obstacle of no mean proportions for, from time to time, it seems to permeate our whole governmental system and to pour water upon the fires of every effort to build up and maintain a sufficient merchant marine under the American flag. I don't know what can be done to change this condition. I have no solution to offer at the present time. I suggest merely that you keep this thought in mind and understand some of the difficulties which beset the path of American-flag ships in foreign trade.

There are many of us who do not go along with the idea that the great bulk of American exports and imports should be carried in foreign bottoms. We believe that the people of the United States should have a place in the ocean trade, both for the protection of our economy in eras of peace, and for the safety of the Nation in time of war. We feel we must carry approximately 50 percent of both incoming and outgoing cargoes if we are to have that basic fleet required for the national safety, and if we are to build and maintain enough ships to keep a minimum nucleus of shipyards and shipbuilders in being. Ship designing and ship construction, especially in the higher levels, are extremely technical and are not derived from any other occupation. We either have the men who know how to design and build ships, or we do not. If we do not have them, it is a long and very expensive task to develop these skills under the stress of war. Yet, the fate of the Nation may depend upon our ability to produce ships in quantity with the utmost rapidity. We must not take unnecessary chances in this respect. We must build ships and, after they are built, we must keep a sufficient number in active service throughout the world.

So let us look into the future and see what's ahead on our present course, and what we might accomplish with slight changes in present practices.

We hope that the 50-percent carriage provision in ERP will so maintain our overseas fleet that there will be work for at least all privately owned ships up to the end of the relief program. I have seen this 50-percent requirement criticized by union papers because this mandatory shipment in American vessels applies only "to the extent such vessels are available at market rates." These critics are playing right into the hands of those who opposed any percentage requirement for shipment in American vessels, on the ground that union labor would force rates up as soon as definite requirements became effective. I assured the critics that this would not be the case, and I have since stated, for the benefit of both the operators and the workers, that they must play the game square for all concerned—otherwise they can expect no preference in the future. Honesty of purpose is a basic requirement for continued success in any walk of life, and it was only through the confidence of the Members of Congress in the maritime fraternity, as represented by its advocates on the floor of the House, that this percentage provision was written into law. I fully expect it to be honored by all concerned.

At the end of the relief program we must expect a drastic reduction in American shipping in the overseas trade, unless we are prepared to continue operating subsidies for practically all ships engaged therein. It should be up to the Department of National Defense to determine the number and type of ships needed for the national defense. The Maritime Commission should then decide what routes must be kept in operation under the American flag in the event of war or national emergency and should determine what ships will be needed thereon. Combining this determination with the requirements for national defense, the Maritime Commission should then work out a building program to provide and maintain the required vessels in ways best suited to the interests of the United States, that is, what routes should be kept under the American flag, what types of ships employed thereon, what kind of operators should be entrusted with the respective routes, and what incentives are necessary to allow American-flag ships a practicable return on investment while paying a satisfactory wage scale to personnel engaged in these operations. When this is all included in one presentation, the President should submit it to the Congress for study and action thereon.

Quite naturally, such a program would not be accepted by the Congress just as submitted. That would be expecting just too much of human nature. We people in Congress think we know something about these matters and wish to have our say. We feel that we know the temper of the people with reasonable accuracy, and we are responsible for the raising of money. However, the method outlined should produce a workable plan, without too great an expense considering our present-day responsibilities, and it would wrap the whole thing up in one package rather than having it scattered about like pretty packages beneath a Christmas tree.

The accomplishment of a plan such as suggested above will require a strong Maritime Commission, the Chairman of which holds the full confidence of both the President and the Congress. Such a Chairman will be blasted all over land and sea by irate shipowners, or would-be operators, who will not like his methods or his decisions for, try as one will, the problem of building up and maintaining a merchant marine such as I have suggested will be impossible of accomplishment with seeming fairness to all concerned. Yes, the Chairman will need to be a strong man, indeed, but the glory of his accomplishments should be sufficient for any man's reward.

And here are a few of our problems concerning only certain phases of the industry.

First. The present practice of the Maritime Commission of restricting subsidized operations on any one route to only one operator. I believe this is in effect now on all but one of the established subsidized routes. Is this good practice, or should expanded trade on that route be allotted to another subsidized operator? Fairness would seem to dictate that exclusive subsidized privileges should not be maintained. Yet, is it not safe to conclude that increase in trade on a route has come about largely through the efforts of the established operator; that the creation of additional terminal organizations may not be in the best interests of economy; and that, when retrenchment comes so that the route may not provide cargoes for all subsidized voyages, a grand row will ensue in determining which operator is to suffer reduction in subsidized ships.

Second. How should available Government-owned ships be distributed in charter arrangements, that is, should those lines which own American-flag tonnage be given preference over those nonowners whose business is to operate chartered bottoms—American when obtainable and can be made to pay, or foreign when available in the world markets? I would not attempt to argue this question here for it has too many ramifications, but I should like to leave it in your minds.

Third. How shall we invigorate the coastwise and intercoastal services so they may once more take their proper places in the whole picture of American shipping? Railway, truck, and automobile transportation have so cut into these services that they cannot operate at a profit by conventional means unless some aid is provided. Yet, these services are the very finest reservoirs for quickly available ships for national defense. Discussions are now being held regarding trailer-carrying ships for coastal runs. These would be fast ships, carrying conventional trailer bodies between ports, and having adequate passenger quarters to reestablish the coastwise passenger traffic. The claims are that, with special terminals, these ships could operate at a substantial profit, could relieve much heavy truck congestion on our main highways, and could furnish employment for truck drivers at both ends of the run. Exploratory discussions for the benefit of intercoastal shipping include the provision of special terminals for handling goods in large containers, changes of railroad rates on through shipments, as well as construction and operation subsidies. The continuation of intercoastal service is dependent upon some reasonable solution of these problems.

Fourth. How are we to continue to provide decent service for the people of Alaska who are scattered through an immense territory at a density of almost zero to the square mile? Commercial business is very seasonal. Military and naval shipments are not dependable for revenue. Distances are great. Handling charges are immense. Volume of shipments is small when compared to the number of voyages needed for the best interests of the Territory. In all, this problem is as bad as the proverbial Chinese puzzle, unless Uncle Sam is going to step in and hold the sack, as usual.

And now to top off all our troubles, let me invite your attention to the grand total of funds provided, at the expense of the American taxpayers for the relief of foreign nations. As I have stated previously between May 1945 and January 1948 the total was $23,076,995,818.

Going back somewhat we find that the total foreign-aid bill of American taxpayers during World Wars I and II and up to January 1, 1948, was $80,812,922,000.

Then let us add the expected expense of the present Economic Cooperation Administration, that is, $17,000,000,000 proposed for the next 4 years, and we have the stupendous figure of $97,812,922,000.

But the end is not yet, for we hear rumblings of another lend-lease program for military equipment needed by western European governments. And after that, what then?

Gentlemen of the Propeller Club of this great port of Savannah, I have tried to tell you of a few of the problems that are ahead in the field of American shipping. I have merely mentioned our contributions to other peoples of the world. God grant that we may find men with the intelligence, ability, and integrity to steer the ship of state through such perils as confront us, until it sails smoothly on the waters of prosperity and security for all the people of America.

Trade, a Two-Way Street

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, one of the finest newspapers of the country is the Boston Herald. The only thing I have against it is that it is one of the strongest Republican newspapers in the country. I am hopeful that some day those who run that paper will see the error of their ways and become converted to the true cause of the principles and policies enunciated by the Democratic Party. However, in all fairness, and trying to be tolerant, I must confess that I consider this newspaper one of the outstanding papers of the country in its fairness in its news columns. Occasionally it has an editorial that commands my attention. I do not mean to leave the impression that I am unfairly critical of its editorials, but from an affirmative angle, once in a while it has a splendid editorial.

Last Sunday it carried a splendid editorial entitled "Trade, a Two-Way Street," which comes out strongly in

favor of the extension of the Hull reciprocal trade program without the contaminating, destructive amendments contained in the bill we will consider today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks this splendid editorial appearing in this very fine newspaper, the Boston Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The editorial is as follows:

TRADE, A TWO-WAY STREET

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act expires next month, so it is especially significant that this coming week has been designated as World Trade Week. It is quite probable, too, that the Congress may act during this week to mangle or continue the present law. It would be most unfortunate if the Republican Party acted from political motives on a matter so basic to our whole foreign policy. Tragic, too, because the party has in other respects been so admirably nonpartisan in dealing with matters of foreign policy.

True, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is a Democratic measure in the sense that it was championed and initially approved by a Democratic administration under the leadership of Cordell Hull. But it was a Republican idea to originate with the GOP, the party whose failures have almost always been closely connected with insistence upon high tariff policies.

It is well to consider what this act is and what it does. Until its enactment tariff laws were passed by Congress in arduous, often scandalous proceedings which were drawn out many months, even running into years, to be sure that every local vested interest had the very greatest freedom to exert whatever pressure, good or bad, to win for some section a tariff concession which might be bad for the whole country. Even opponents of the present Trade Act usually admit the evils of the old logrolling method.

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act constitutes a grant of the congressional tariff-making power to the executive department of the Government for a stated period of years and subject to precise limitations as to the extent of tariff concessions which can be granted. The theory of the act is one of reciprocity, namely, you give us a break on what we can sell to you, and we will give you a break on what you can sell to us. You lower your tariff on automobiles and we will lower ours on olive oil, nuts, human hair, manganese, or something else. It is a Yankee trading sort of arrangement between governments which must, in any event, have the final say as to tariff rates.

The procedures of the executive department for handling tariff reductions are naturally not ideal to those interests which would find it easier to accomplish their ends by dealing with politically minded Congressmen rather than with experts in the State Department and Tariff Commission. Every industry affected by a possible tariff reduction is given opportunity to lay its case before the Government experts who are supposed to be fully informed as to the competitive position of any given American industry before authorizing negotiators to consider granting a concession to a foreign government to admit at lower tariff rates some product or commodity which competes with American industry or agriculture. By far the majority of farmers and businessmen testify that it has worked out very well on the whole. Moreover, President Truman has agreed to suspend any agreement where it is shown to hurt American industry.

Why is the continuation of this act so vital? Because it has proved to be the only practical way to deal with the tariff question without vast injustices either to American industry or our friends abroad. It is especially vital now that we are committed by both major parties to helping to strengthen western Europe. In the long run the only way our foreign friends can get the dollars to pay for our exports and pay off their American loans is for the United States to buy as many of their exports as possible.

Trade is a two-way street. We cannot only sell. We must also buy. It would be the height of inconsistency, if not of absurdity, for the world's greatest creditor nation to repeal the law which is the only certainty we have that tariffs can be kept at such a level that our debtors will be able to repay us. Let's keep trade going both ways.

Increased Railroad Retirement Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, substantial increases in railroad retirement annuities and survivor benefits to meet today's high cost of living are provided for in a bill I have introduced today.

In presenting this bill, H. R. 6704, I wish to explain that it provides for increases that on the average will amount to some 30 to 60 percent in the annuities of those who have retired or will retire in the next few years. These persons are now only entitled to annuities based on living costs and wages prevailing in the early 1930's.

The bill also provides for an increase in the annuities of those who retire years hence. This is in addition to the automatic increases under the existing law resulting from the present higher wage level.

Furthermore, the bill provides an increase of 20 percent in the amounts paid widows, orphans, and parents of deceased railroad employees.

The bill also restores a provision that was in effect before the 1946 amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act. This provision guarantees that the total amount of benefits payable an employee and his survivors will not be less than the employee paid into the fund in taxes, plus interest.

A further provision of the bill postpones until 1952 the impending 1949 increase in the retirement-tax rate to be paid by both employer and employee.

The increased benefits provided by the bill are not in excess of what the Railroad Retirement Board has informed the committee the fund can support.

The increase in the cost of living in recent years is so clear to all of us that it needs no proof.

On the other hand, the annuity formula in the Railroad Retirement Act was originally fixed in the early 1930's and was based on living costs and wages at that time. Amounts which were considered adequate in 1937 and the next few following years have not been increased—except for some increase in the minimum amount payable.

It is clear that the annuities which retired persons are now receiving are inadequate to cope with the higher living costs.

The same situation, moreover, will exist as to those annuities of employees who will retire in the near future, for even the next 15, 20, and to some extent 30 years. These annuities also will not fully reflect the currently higher wage levels of today.

This fact comes about because under the present benefit formula annuities are based on the average wages for the entire period of railroad work up to 30 years. It would require many years of work at the current higher wage levels to raise these averages very much and in turn to show an appreciable effect on benefits.

Thus anyone retiring today or in the future will receive an income cut down because of the lower rates of pay he received many years ago.

Accordingly, even though railroad wages on the average in 1948 are up approximately 75 percent over those in 1937, these increases in wage rates, as the Railroad Retirement Board says, have had no effect on benefits awarded before the increases, very little effect on those awarded since, and will have an appreciable effect only on those which will be granted many years in the future.

This situation seems to me to be intolerable.

I have long supported and followed closely the operation of the railroad retirement system. I have always been in full accord with its purposes. I am firmly convinced, however, that annuities and benefits, which the retirement system provides, must be adequate to permit the retired or disabled employee to maintain himself in reasonable comfort and decency.

At the same time I am firmly of the opinion, as I know all of us are, that the amount of benefits promised by the retirement system must in nowise jeopardize the soundness of the fund.

The Railroad Retirement Board has informed and assured me that increased benefits now might be paid without jeopardizing the fund and without necessitating any increase in tax rates. It states that this possibility arises from the fact that present rates of collection from the employees and the railroads were based on a lower total pay roll than that now being paid. With the current higher total pay roll, collections on the present tax schedule from employees and railroads could allow greater benefits without impairing the soundness of the fund. This will continue to be possible to the extent the pay roll remains around its present level.

I, therefore, have given conscientious and thoughtful consideration to the finding of a sound and equitable way of increasing the benefits paid and to be paid to retired and disabled employees, and their surviving widows and orphans, commensurate with increased cost-of-living and current wage levels.

On this general subject our committee has had some 24 bills introduced during the present Congress. Many propose to reduce benefits paid, and to reduce the present tax rate. Others purport to

grant tremendous increases in benefits, apparently with no thought of what higher tax rates would be needed, or the devastating effect on the soundness of the retirement fund. Some propose to help retired employees. Others propose to boost annuities of those who in the long run will have had the benefit of working at today's higher wage levels. Some seek to help the relatively lower paid employee; others to assist primarily the employees in the higher compensation brackets; and yet others provide a straight percentage raise across the board. Some build up the estate of an employee dying with no survivors; few seek to help those present and future survivors who must struggle with the changed living costs.

To all of these differing objectives, and many others, I have given careful and sympathetic attention. My bill seeks to meet the most desirable objectives, providing substantial increases for all with due regard to the comparative position of today's and tomorrow's annuitants and also survivors of railroad workers and maintaining the integrity of the retirement fund.

The bill first provides for a straight 10-percent increase across the board for all annuities, present and future.

Those retiring 30 or 40 years hence, of course, will also have had the advantage of their annuities being calculated at current higher wage levels, with the automatic increases which this will give. Those retiring before that time, as well as those now retired, are prevented by the act's present formula based on averages over past periods from obtaining any such assistance.

My bill therefore would put those who have retired or will retire in the next 10, 15, 20, and up to 30 years, on the same basis as though they always had been earning on today's higher wage level. It does this by readjusting the past compensation used by the Railroad Retirement Board in calculating monthly annuity benefits to reflect the rise in wage levels and living costs in the past decade. To take these into account it appears would require that compensation prior to 1940 would have to be considered as increased by some 75 percent with corresponding smaller increases in succeeding years up to 1948.

This seems to me to be the quickest, fairest, and most feasible way of meeting the present and imminent burdens of those retired and retiring. I estimate that on the average this provision, together with the 10 percent above-mentioned, will increase annuities now being paid by some 30 to 60 percent, with comparable increases in annuities of those retiring in the future.

The minimum annuity is increased from $50 to $60 per month for the regularly retiring employee.

Today's living problems affect not alone the retired or retiring employee. They confront the worried widows, orphans, and aged parents of those who have died. To aid their situation the bill further provides for an increase of 20 percent in the benefits they now receive.

Other provisions of the bill are self-explanatory. There still remain on the retirement rolls some of the pensioners taken over from the private plans of the carriers when the system was established. They would obtain a straight 20-percent increase in pensions.

The provision in the Railroad Retirement Act before the 1946 amendments relating to total benefits to be paid an employee and his survivors is restored. This will not be less than his tax payment plus interest.

On the basis of Railroad Retirement Board representations, the present tax rate seems adequate as of today to provide the needed receipts to take care of the costs of the system as increased by the bill's provisions and to keep the system on a sound actuarial basis. While the operations under this revised plan and the effect of present conditions are fully appraised, the tax rate is maintained at current 5¾-percent rates for the next 3 years. The ultimate increase to 6¼ percent is retained but is deferred from 1952 to 1955. Such an ultimate rate is needed over the long run to assure financial support for the benefits of the system.

I am attaching some illustrations of the effect of the various provisions of the bill on benefits provided, comparing these with the payments under the present act and also with a straight across the board increase as proposed in some bills before the committee.

Case 1—Retirement in 1940 with 30 years of service (27 prior, 3 subsequent to date of act)

Assumed compensation per month during—		Monthly annuity		
Prior service	1937-39	Under present act	As proposed by Wolverton bill	Flat rates proposed by other bills
$80	$100	$50.00	$79.29	$60.00
$120	$150	62.85	104.04	75.42
$160	$200	79.20	127.71	95.04
$200	$250	91.70	132.09	109.80
$240	$300	103.80	132.60	124.56

Case 2—Retirement in 1950 with 30 years of service (17 prior, 13 subsequent to act)

ASSUMED COMPENSATION PER MONTH AS FOLLOWS

Years	Individual A	Individual B
Prior service	$100	$125
1937-39	125	170
1940-42	150	190
1943-45	175	210
1946	185	220
1947	195	230
1948-49	210	250

MONTHLY ANNUITIES ARE AS FOLLOWS

Present act	$65.25	$77.85
Proposal of Wolverton Bill	97.52	113.28
Flat rate of other bills	78.62	93.42

Case 3—Retirement in 1967 with 30 years of service

ASSUMED COMPENSATION PER MONTH AS FOLLOWS

Years	Individual A	Individual B
1937-39	$100	$125
1940-42	115	150
1943-45	130	160
1946	150	180
1947	170	200
1948-49	190	225
1950-59	200	250
1960-66	225	300

MONTHLY ANNUITIES ARE AS FOLLOWS

Present act	$83.10	$97.35
Proposal of Wolverton bill	97.88	115.15
Flat rate of other bills	99.72	116.82

Case 4—Retirement in 1978 with 30 years of service (all subsequent and after 1947)

ASSUMED COMPENSATION PER MONTH AS AS FOLLOWS

Years	Individual A	Individual B
1948-49	$125	$150
1950-59	150	200
1960-69	175	225
1970-77	200	250

MONTHLY ANNUITIES ARE AS FOLLOWS

Present act	$81.60	$95.50
Proposal of Wolverton bill	89.10	105.05
Flat rate of other bills	97.20	114.60

Illustrative survivor annuities in respect to employee who died at the end of 1946 and who was continuously employed since 1937

Average monthly remuneration	Aged widow		Widow and 1 child		Widow and 2 children	
	Present	Proposed by Wolverton bill	Present	Proposed by Wolverton bill	Present	Proposed by Wolverton bill
$100	$26.81	$32.17	$44.69	$53.63	$71.50	$80.00
$150	30.94	37.13	51.57	61.88	82.50	99.00
$200	35.06	42.07	58.44	70.13	93.50	112.20
$250	39.19	47.03	65.32	78.38	104.50	120.00

I am confident that a careful study of the provisions of this bill will demonstrate that it will provide a substantial increase in the monthly payments to pensioners, annuitants, and their survivors. I will press for the early enactment of the bill. It represents a sincere and honest desire to be helpful to those who are faced with the difficulty of meeting the present high cost of living on the meager payments now provided by the Railroad Retirement Act.

Jewish State in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, at a special service at Beth El Temple in Norfolk, Va., the congregation adopted a resolution concerning the newly formed Jewish state. This resolution was sent to me by Rabbi Paul Reich. I take pleasure in quoting below the resolution:

Whereas Almighty God has deemed it fitting to make possible the creation of the Jewish state in our time; and

Whereas a Jewish state has been proclaimed by our brethren in Palestine, on the 14th day of May 1948; and

Whereas for the first time in almost 2,000 years, on this Sabbath candles of Palestine Jewry will burn on the soil of a Jewish state: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the worshippers present at a special service held at Beth El Temple on Friday evening, May 14, 1948, to invoke divine help for the success of the Jewish state and for peace in Palestine, express their complete confidence in the wisdom of the proclamation of the Jewish state, in their moral and material support to their fellow Jews in Palestine; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, Secretary of State, Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, Congressmen of this State and district.

What We Are Buying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Journal of May 24, 1948:

WHAT WE ARE BUYING

Developments of almost daily occurrence are exposing the existence of an internationalist scheme to socialize the world—and to do so mainly at the expense of the American ystem of free enterprise.

The scheme, and the schemers, may be seen in action in a set of resolutions or declarations recently formulated at the third session of the Economic and Employment Commission of the United Nations, held at Lake Success.

In a purported program to control inflation by "reducing" high prices, the Commission presented what the New York Herald Tribune called "a fistful of good advice to nations."

The flaw in that definition is that none of the "advice" was "good" and little of it deserved the name of "advice."

It was simply a propaganda restatement, in part, of the collectivist theory of a "planned economy," applied to the world at large instead of to separate countries and supported by nothing but a few familiar and somewhat stale fallacies.

The first fallacy—one that has been persistently applied to our own postwar problems—was the bland reassertion that "inflation * * * can fundamentally be combated only by increased output of essential goods."

The "fundamental" fact about the existing inflation—and the basic reason for high prices—is an excess of purchasing power, in the rest of the world as well as here, in the form of printing-press or fiat money and swollen bank credit caused by the socialistic practice of deficit financing of huge governmental expenditures.

Increased production is necessary to relieve the world's shortage of goods.

But production itself generates purchasing power—a natural process which in the existing circumstances would be equivalent to increasing still further the already excessive money supply.

In view of these positive facts, production itself may be an inflationary factor in a period of inflation when the first requirement is to reduce the money supply.

The only remedy—as postwar Belgium has shown—is currency and fiscal reform to eradicate the cause of a condition of which high prices are only a symptom.

The United Nations Commission further exhibited its essential socialism and its addiction to doctrinaire vagaries by proposing that nations should also "fight domestic inflation by rationing, coupled with price control and progressive income taxation."

Two of these items—rationing and price control—comprise the chart for a world-wide OPA.

This country has not had time to forget the evils of black markets, of scarcities and of misbranded inferior goods from which we suffered under our wartime OPA.

Europe today has both rationing and price control—and hunger, as well as black markets.

For an example, German farmers are unwilling to sell much of their produce to the cities at fixed prices in irredeemable paper money; while American taxpayers are spending hundreds of millions of dollars a year to ship food to Germany.

As for progressive income taxation, it appears in revolutionary literature—and in the Communist manifesto, no less—as the first of 10 procedures postulated by Marx and Engels as their program for overthrowing a capitalist system of free enterprise.

We have a progressive confiscatory income tax in this country; and in this country a resultant lack of venture capital for investment is rapidly bringing our era of industrial and economic development to a close.

Americans should give this United Nations scheme for world socialism close attention, for they are paying for it.

They are paying a small part of the bill in their contributions to the United Nations itself and its monetary institutions.

They are paying a much larger part through the Marshall plan, which has been so devised, as its own documents disclose, as to be actually and absolutely an instrument to support, guarantee, and extend state socialism in Europe.

Here we discern the most fantastic fallacy of all in the schemes of the international planners.

The Marshall plan is supposed to contain Russian communism.

It proposes to do so by destroying European freedom and substituting a form of Marxism which is itself a phase of communism.

For socialism in any guise requires regimentation and compulsion to make it work.

Thus the welfare state necessarily becomes a servile state out of which comes the police state.

That is what the American people are buying for themselves and the world, and they ought to realize it before they find themselves broke.

Racial Segregation in the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WIRT COURTNEY

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter addressed to me by H. L. Allison, commander, Colored District, American Legion, Department of Tennessee, who resides in Clarksville, Tenn., in my district, and is the duly elected State commander of all the colored Legion posts in our State.

His views are so sound and well considered, so sane and so refreshing at this particular time, that I want to bring them to the attention of the country generally.

AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF TENNESSEE,
Clarksville, May 3, 1948.

Hon. WIRT COURTNEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is my earnest desire to register a protest against the recent statements of certain leaders of the Negro race which were made during the course of recent hearings before the congressional committee considering certain problems of national defense in which resistance to military service was advocated because of segregation.

These statements do not reflect the thinking of the masses of our people whose record of loyalty in all crises confronting our Nation has been above criticism and beyond question.

While it is generally recognized that there is an injustice of certain existing laws as they operate against the race we are loyal to our country and we believe that the remedies for any injustice lie within the framework of the Constitution, and that these injustices can, and will, be satisfactorily adjusted by both races working together on the basis of mutual good will and understanding toward that end.

The Negro needs do but very little thinking to recognize his share of responsibility for the enactment of these so-called Jim Crow laws, and he must devote much time and effort toward correcting the evils within his own group which will result in the development of sentiment on the part of the general public which will make the repeal of this legislation acceptable as well as mandatory.

We must realize the fact that respect cannot be legislated; it must be earned. Time, money, and effort must be expended by all concerned to raise the cultural and economic standards of the masses to the end that such restrictions as are now imposed may be lifted without doing violence to the cultural and economic standards of the citizenry as a whole.

Least of all must we pay heed to the siren call of leaders who advocate what amounts to no less than treason.

It would indeed be gratifying to all of us if less publicity were given to the statements of misguided radicals who assume the toga of race leadership and more to our leaders who have the best interests of the race at heart.

I trust that you will give this letter your full consideration because I am one who is in intimate touch with all of the phases of this problem and have on occasion provided leadership in my humble way which has been productive of interracial good will within our own community.

Before and during World War I, I was a member of Tennessee's only Negro National Guard unit and was in command when I became a battle casualty. We were stationed at Nashville, Memphis, and Camp Sevier, S. C., where we were associated with other units of the guard, and we got along well together.

We were later designated as Company K, Three Hundred and Seventy-second Infantry, and were brigaded with the French Army throughout our tour of duty on the western front.

I have reason to believe that I speak for the men of this unit who survive, as well as the members of the American Legion who represent a cross-section of our group in Tennessee, when I say that we resent the implications of possible disloyalty to our country, and we pledge ourselves anew to defend her against all enemies from within and without.

Very truly yours,
H. L. ALLISON,
Commander, Colored District,
American Legion,
Department of Tennessee.

Synopsis of the Tax-Revision Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the tax-revision bill which is being introduced today contains approximately 80 changes in the Internal Revenue Code. This bill is the first attempt since 1942 to revise the Internal Revenue Code for the purpose of correcting tax inequities and for the purpose of furthering the administration of our tax laws. The bill is the result of extensive hearings, which covered a period of over 2 months, and during which a great number of witnesses from all over the country appeared before the committee. This bill involves no reduction in tax rates and the revenue loss will be not more than $400,000,000, most of which will not arise until after 1949. Of the eighty-odd amendments contained in this bill, approximately 35 were suggested by the Treasury and the remainder were proposed either by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation or by the members of the Ways and Means Committee. A general tax revision was promised to the American public in the last congressional election and this bill is the fulfillment of that promise.

A summary of some of the important amendments contained in this bill follows:

1. Net operating loss carry-over: Section 136 of the bill amends the net operating loss carry-over. A 5-year carry-forward and a 1-year carry-back is substituted for the 2-year carry-forward and 2-year carry-back allowed under existing law, and the continuance of the net operating loss used in the carry-over is redefined in order to eliminate the current discrimination against those businesses with fluctuating incomes.

2. The Dobson case: The effect of the decision in the Dobson case was to prevent the same review of cases appealed from the Tax Court as is now provided in cases appealed from district courts. The bill (sec. 301) in effect gives the appellate courts the same power of review over Tax Court decisions as over the decisions of the United States District Court in a case tried without a jury.

3. Capital gains on nonresident aliens: Section 143 of the bill provides that nonresident aliens who have been within this country for less than 90 days during a taxable year are taxed on such capital gains as were realized in the United States during their presence in this country. If the nonresident alien is present 90 days or more then the tax applies to all such capital gains during the entire taxable year, whether or not the nonresident alien is present in the United States at the time the sales took place. The 30-percent tax on net capital gains provided in this bill applies only to those nonresident aliens not engaged in trade or business in the United States. Nonresident aliens who have a place of business in United States are taxed on capital gains.

4. Contemplation of death: The bill (sec. 204) changes the rule dealing with the taxability under the estate tax of transfers in contemplation of death. The existing law is that all such transfers are includible in the gross estate and provides a rebuttable presumption in favor of the Government that transfers made within 2 years prior to death are in contemplation of death. The new law extends this presumption for 3 years prior to death, but provides that any gift made prior to 3 years from date of death of the decedent is not to be deemed to have been made in contemplation of death.

5. Employee-stock options: The underlying purpose of the new provision in this bill (sec. 137) is to increase incentive in employees and to eliminate the uncertainty existing as a result of the current regulations based upon the Smith case (*Commissioner* v. *Smith* (324 U. S. 177, 1945)). Under the present law the general rule is that an employee exercising an option to purchase stock from his employing corporation receives taxable income at the time of the exercise of the option to the extent of the difference between the market value of the stock at the time of the exercise and the option price. Under the provisions of the bill the imposition of a tax at the time the option is exercised is avoided, and in the ordinary case where the option price is approximately equal to the fair market value of the stock at the time the option is granted, no tax is levied until the employee sells his stock purchased under the option, if the employee has held the stock for a period of 3 years or more after the date upon which he exercises the option. The difference between the option price and the selling price is to be taxed as a long term capital gain. If, on the other hand, he sells the stock on a date which is less than 3 years after the date upon which he exercised the option, the gain realized is divided into two parts. The portion which represents the difference between a fair market value at the date the option is exercised and the price actually received at the sale of the stock is taxed as a capital gain. Special rules are provided to govern cases where the option price differs materially from the fair market value at the date the option is granted.

6. Surtax on corporations improperly accumulating surplus: The bill contains three amendments (sec. 125) of section 102 of the Code which provides for a surtax on corporate earnings improperly accumulated. The first amendment puts the burden of proving that an accumulation is beyond the reasonable needs of the business on the Commissioner in certain proceedings before The Tax Court, providing the taxpayer files a statement of his protest as to any deficiency, indicating the reasons why he believes the earnings were properly accumulated. The second amendment provides that the net long-term capital gain of any corporation shall not be included in the tax base on which the penalty tax under section 102 is imposed, but this does not prevent such gains from being considered in determining whether other income was accumulated beyond the reasonable needs of the business. The third amendment provides that dividends paid within 75 days after the close of a corporation's taxable year may, at election of the taxpayer, be deducted in computing the corporation's income for the purposes of the penalty tax under section 102.

7. Family partnerships: The bill (sec. 142) adds a new section 191 to the Internal Revenue Code. This new section provides in general that related members of a partnership shall be partners for purposes of Federal income tax if they meet the tests which are set forth in this new section. Family partners qualifying under section 191 will determine their distributive share in the manner provided in the bill. Partners who do not meet the test set forth in the new section 191 are not, however, denied status as partners but they are restricted to the present law in determining whether or not they are partners and to what extent they are recognized as partners for income tax purposes. Section 191 deals with partnership taxable years beginning after December 31, 1947, and also affords retroactive relief for any of the years 1941 through 1947 at the election of the taxpayer.

8. Life insurance under estate tax: The bill (sec. 203) eliminates the premium-payment test as a determinative basis for including insurance on a decedent's life payable to specific beneficiaries in the decedent's gross estate. Under existing law insurance on a decedent's life payable to specific beneficiaries is taxable either (a) if the decedent at the time of his death possessed incidents of ownership, or if, (b) and to the extent that the decedent paid the premiums on the policy directly or indirectly. The bill eliminates this later test.

9. Exemption from the additional estate tax for members of the Armed Forces: The bill (sec. 213) continues an exemption from the additional estate tax for persons who were killed or who died as a result of wounds, disease, or injury incurred in the line of duty during World War II. Similar provision was provided for such persons, under the estate tax, who served in World War I. Provision is made in the bill for the refund without interest of any overpayment of an estate tax resulting from the adoption of this amendment.

10. Annuities under the income tax: The bill (sec. 104) revises the present formula applied to annuities under the individual income tax by eliminating the so-called 3-percent rule which excludes from taxable income the portion of the annual receipt in excess of 3 percent of the price the annuitant paid for the annuity. The bill substitutes for this exclusion determined under the 3-percent rule a constant yearly exclusion which will add up to the amount of the annuitant's consideration if he lives out his life expectancy. Like the present 3-percent rule, the new formula will apply both to purchased annuities and those paid under contributory pensions and profit-sharing plans operated by Government agencies and private industries.

11. Extension of additional allowance for military and naval personnel: Under existing law the first $1,500 of yearly compensation received by commissioned officers on active duty and all compensation received by enlisted men are excluded from income tax. These exclusions apply only to compensation received prior to January 1, 1949, and this bill (sec. 107) extends the exclusion to compensation received between January 1, 1949, and January 1, 1950.

12. Gain or loss in connection with certain corporations liquidating: The bill (sec. 129) clarifies the existing law in connection with certain corporate liquidations by providing that if a corporation sells its assets just prior to liquidation there shall be no gain or loss recognized to the corporation. In order to be eligible for this treatment, however, the corporation's assets must be sold within the 12 months preceding the distribution to the stockholders and a plan of liquidation must be formally adopted before the sale of the assets and the Commissioner notified within 30 days of the adoption of the plan. The distribution to the stockholders during the 12-month interval must be complete except for assets retained to meet contingency liabilities and expenses. This provision is made necessary by the Court. *Holding Company case* (324 U. S. 361).

13. Pension and profit-sharing plans: Under the present law pension benefits or death benefits paid to a survivor-beneficiary under a pension or profit-sharing plan approved under the terms of section 165 (a) of the code, or a pension plan of the Federal, State, of local Government is included in the

estate tax. Under the provisions of this bill (sec. 205) amounts paid to the surviving beneficiary under (1) private pensions, annuities, profit-sharing or stock-bonus plans which meet the requirements of section 165 (a), or (2) pensions, annuities, or retirement plans of the Federal, State, or local Governments are exempt from the Federal estate tax. This exclusion extends to death benefits as well as the survivors rights under an annuity. The bill (sec. 252) also excludes from the gift tax the designation of the employee's surviving beneficiary. This, like the estate tax inclusion, is available only to beneficiaries under (1) approved private pensions, annuities, profit-sharing or stock-bonus plans, or (2) pension annuities or retirement plans of the Federal, State, or local Governments. The bill also includes technical amendments dealing with the income-tax treatment of plans which qualify under section 165 (a) of the code and a further amendment which relates to certain unqualified plans.

14. Soil conservation: This bill (sec. 110) provides that amounts spent for soil conservation by farmers be treated as expenses deductible in the year in which they were incurred. Under existing law farmers are frequently required to treat such amounts spent for soil conservation as capital outlays.

15. Marital deductions in case of life insurance or annuities: The bill (sec. 208) amends section 811 (e) (1) (G) of the Internal Revenue Code by extending the marital deductions under the estate tax to life insurance optional settlements where (a) the proceeds of insurance on the life of the decedent are left at interest and (b) a surviving spouse (1) is entitled for life to all such interest payable annually or at more frequent intervals and (2) has power to appoint to himself or his estate the entirety of the proceeds. Under the present law the marital deductions created by the tax-reduction bill of 1948 is available only in a situation where some part of the principle is to be invaded each year.

16. Gift-tax exclusion for future interest: Under the present law there is no annual exclusion of $3,000 for gifts of future interests made by a donor during the year. Under this bill (sec. 253) the law is changed to include gifts of future interest under the annual $3,000 exclusion.

17. Taxation of estates and trusts and their beneficiaries: The present law relating to the tax treatment of estates and trusts, is both technical and complicated and this bill endeavors to simplify the law. The bill (sec. 140) provides that a beneficiary is taxable only on the part of the income as defined in the terms of the trust instrument (or local applicable law), which is also included in the gross income of the trust for tax purposes. Under present law distributions are in some cases taxable to the beneficiary even where the amounts involved do not represent taxable income to the estate or trusts. The bill also provides that income received by the beneficiary will be taxable to him in the same way as if he had received it directly, rather than through the estate or trust. As a result of this rule a long-term capital gain received by the trust or estate and distributed, will also be considered for tax purposes, as a long-term gain in hands of the beneficiary.

The above are only some of the major provisions in H. R. 6712 which includes also provisions relating to wages paid to dependents (sec. 118); services rendered for a period of 36 months or more (sec. 126); sales of livestock (sec. 134); foreign-tax credit (sec. 138); bad debts (sec. 112); last-in first-out inventory (sec. 108); distribution of stock on reorganization (sec. 128); and credit for taxes on foreign countries and Puerto Rico.

Diplomatic Relations With Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Rothwell Brown from the New York Journal of May 24, 1948:

THE WOODRUFF POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

WASHINGTON, May 24.—In taking official and tamely submissive cognizance of the impudent exchange of notes between Premier Stalin and private citizen Wallace, the Truman administration has stultified itself, and brought discredit upon the State Department.

Mr. Gromyko announces at Lake Success that a basis has been laid for negotiations, but neglects to say whether they are to be conducted directly between the two self-constituted principals.

The State Department's supine attitude in the face of Soviet Russia's calculated insult in openly establishing diplomatic relations with an American politician, running for the Presidency, leaves little room for hope of resentment by official Washington.

We may expect to hear any day now, that Henry and Pal Joey have signed a treaty of peace and that the formality of having it ratified by the Senate will be dispensed with.

It will simply be put into effect by ukase and Secretary Marshall notified by a souvenir postcard showing a picture of the Kremlin in Moscow.

In view of the State Department's failure to give to Henry Wallace the scathing blast he deserves for usurping the functions of government, we may expect that Premier Stalin's deliberate interference in an American Presidential election also will go unrebuked.

To such a condition of fuzzy-minded befuddlement has our State Department fallen.

It was not like this in the olden days.

Stalin's offense is the first historic instance of the direct injection of a foreign government in an American Presidential campaign in 152 years.

Toward the end of Washington's second term, the French Directory threatened to sever diplomatic relations with the United States, with a view to defeating the President for reelection, and electing Jefferson, as a friend of France, precisely as Stalin now seeks to defeat Truman, and elect Wallace as a friend of Russia.

On November 15, 1796, as the Presidential electors were about to vote, Paris announced the suspension of diplomatic relations, the directory not knowing that Washington had already decided not to accept a third term.

"It was," says Professor Bemis, in his diplomatic history of the United States, "a flagrant case of a foreign nation seeking to interfere with the domestic politics of a sovereign people in order to accomplish its own interests. It was the only instance where this influence was ever brought to bear in an American Presidential election."

The only one till now.

How did Washington meet the issue? He met it in September 1796 by issuing the farewell address:

"Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow-citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake; since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government * * *."

"It was these sentiments," says Dr. Bemis, "which by a safe margin of only two electoral votes elected John Adams over Thomas Jefferson as the successor of George Washington and the supporter of his foreign policy."

Once again a foreign government, not revolutionary France, but revolutionary Russia, interferes in an American election, to secure a President sympathetic to its policy.

It is an outrageous and intolerable piece of effrontery, both by Wallace and by Stalin, yet neither is slapped down by the Truman administration.

"How are the mighty fallen."

Mundt-Nixon Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask permission to insert in the RECORD a recent radio talk I delivered over Station KMO in Tacoma. The purpose of this talk was to analyze for my constituents the provisions of the Mundt-Nixon bill and to answer the various questions concerning the intent and scope of the act itself.

The address follows:

Last week the House of Representatives passed by a vote of 319–58 the Mundt-Nixon bill. In my opinion, this legislation was one of the most difficult and controversial the Eightieth Congress has considered. I can think of no legislation which has come up during my term of Congress that has been subjected to more misrepresentation and false interpretation than this so-called Mundt-Nixon bill. It is no wonder that widespread confusion exists regarding the actual provisions of this measure and its merit.

During the last week and a half I have received several hundred communications from individuals who reside in the Sixth Congressional District on this measure. Many of them stated opposition to the bill because, as it had been represented to them, they felt it was in violation of our constitutional liberties and our Bill of Rights. Others registered their approval of the measure because they felt that some action was necessary to restrict the activities of the Communist fifth column in America. And then there were those who merely wrote asking information as to what the bill would and would not do if enacted into law.

Because I cannot answer each of the letters individually in the detail they warrant I am taking the opportunity now to discuss the provisions of this legislation and to answer to the best of my ability the questions and objections concerning the measure which you have raised. I shall insert this radio talk in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and will be most happy to forward copies to those who desire them upon request. Please address such requests to THOR C. TOLLEFSON, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

This legislation presents the most basic problem free governments face today. It is the problem of preserving our free institutions in the face of a concerted attack from totalitarian forces, both Communist and Fascist. The problem is especially acute since it places us in the position of having

to decide to what extent we can allow freedom of movement to those who would destroy the freedom of our society and establish in its place a tyranny that recognizes and allows no opposition. In other words, can we as a free people remain free if we give to our enemies the very means by which they will destroy our freedom. The answer is not a simple one. In this field we deal to a large extent in the complicated and complex pattern of degrees. Our task is to find a safe middle ground so that in protecting ourselves from those who would destroy our freedom we do not in the process use totalitarian methods. In many respects this problem is much the same as that facing our western civilization in the argument of political freedom versus economic security.

In this case we Americans feels that neither economic security nor political liberty are possible unless both exist and complement each other. We feel, in other words, that economic security without political liberty will not last and that political liberty without economic security is mere mockery. The same situation exists in this problem of freedom versus license. In this situation we must find the middle ground which will make possible the existence of freedom with adequate restrictions against the activities of those whose purpose it is to destroy our free institutions.

This bill H. R. 5852 represents, I believe, a fair and sane approach to the very difficult problem of controlling subversive Communist activities in the United States. The bill is aimed at accomplishing four major objectives.

1. It classifies as a crime activities which in any manner seek to establish in the United States a totalitarian dictatorship under the domination of a foreign power. In this respect it definitely strikes at the unquestionably subversive aspects of a Russia dominated Communist Party in the United States.

2. It requires any political organization under foreign domination engaged in activities to establish a totalitarian dictatorship in this country to register with the Attorney General. This provision in effect will require the Communist Party of the United States of America to register all its members with the Attorney General so long as it remains under foreign domination and attempts to establish in this country through any means, whether peaceful or by force, a totalitarian dictatorship under the control of a foreign power.

3. The bill denies Government employment to members of the Communist Party and makes it a crime for any Government official to knowingly employ a Communist for a Government job. In this way the measure seeks to protect our Government from fifth columnists operating under the orders of a foreign power.

4. The measure seeks to cut the threads which bind the International Communist conspiracy together by restricting travel of members of the American section of the world Communist movement. This is accomplished by denying passports to members of the Communist Party. This provision, in effect, will mean that American Communists like Earl Browder or William Z. Foster will not be allowed to shuttle back and forth between the United States and Moscow or Russian-dominated areas for the purpose of furthering the ends of the international Communist conspiracy.

The major intent and purpose of this legislation are to accomplish these four objectives.

The first thing we should consider in discussing legislation of this nature is the actual necessity of such legislation. In other words we must first determine whether or not existing legislation is inadequate to deal with the problem of subversive activities in this country. Congress has over a period of years passed several laws which were directed specifically at curbing the subversive activities of Communists in the United States. The Alien Registration Act of 1940 made it a crime to advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence. Without doubt the use of force and violence is a basic principle to which all Communist Party members subscribe. The present line of the party, however, is to avoid wherever possible the open advocacy of force and violence and thereby evade the existing legislation. Consequently, the act has not been an effective instrument in dealing with Communist activities.

The McCormack Act of 1938 required registration of individuals who act as agents for a foreign government or authority. The Voorhis Act required the registration of organizations which are agents of a foreign power.

These acts were directed against both the Nazis and the Communists. They did not prove effective, however, against the Communists due in part to the skill and deceit which the Communists have used in concealing their foreign duties. In his testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee the Attorney General of the United States pointed out some technical weaknesses in the acts which I have just mentioned. The Attorney General with a great majority of expert witnesses who appeared before the committee during its legislative hearings agreed that existing laws were inadequate to deal with the Communist threat. They further agreed that new legislation was essential. It is clear then, I think, that existing legislation is not adequate to deal with the problem of subversive activities in the United States. It is necessary then that additional legislation be enacted.

During the last few minutes I have attempted to outline for you the four major purposes of this legislation and have attempted to show that existing laws are not adequate to deal with the problem of subversive activities. I would now like to discuss the specific questions you have asked me in your letters and answer, if possible, some of the objections which have been raised against this legislation.

Many of you expressed opposition to this measure because you had been told that the bill would outlaw or seriously hamper the third party in the coming elections. The fear has been expressed that the third party, since it is in agreement with many of the policies of the Communist Party, especially in the field of foreign affairs, would be classified as a Communist-front organization and as a result its activities restricted and its officers smeared. In answering this question I would like to call your attention to the language of the bill itself defining a Communist-front organization. This definition was carefully drawn having in mind the necessity and desirability of excluding the third party. Let me quote briefly from the bill: "The terms 'Communist-front organization' means any organization in the United States, other than a Communist political organization, and other than an organization having substantially all the ordinary and usual characteristics of a political party." This language then specifically excludes the Wallace Party or any other organization having the characteristics of a political party. The charge then that this legislation would outlaw or restrict in any way the activities of the so-called third party is without foundation.

I have also received letters questioning the effect this legislation might have in restricting the legitimate activities of labor organizations. In this connection, I would like to again repeat that the activities of an organization are in no way restricted unless that organization is under the domination and direction of a foreign power and its activities are directed toward establishing a totalitarian dictatorship in America under the control of a foreign power. Legitimate activities of legitimate labor organizations in this country do not fall under that classification. Mr. Lewis Waldman, general counsel of several large A. F. of L. labor organizations stated several days ago in the New York Times, as follows: "I have read the Mundt bill carefully. In my opinion, one thing is certain about it. There is nothing in this legislation that will affect the labor movement adversely or prejudice its rights in any way. All talk about this bill being antilabor is just so much nonsense, unless you believe that to be anti-Communist is to be antilabor." On several occasions before this measure was voted upon by the House of Representatives, I discussed its contents in considerable detail with the recognized leaders of the railroad-labor organizations and the American Federation of Labor. On no occasion did the officials of either of these two bodies express opposition to this legislation.

Others of you have written me expressing concern over provisions of this bill which deal with so-called Communist-front organizations. Some of you have felt that an unfriendly administration or Attorney General might classify a legitimate American organization as a Communist-front group for the sole purpose of smearing that organization, its officers and its members. Others of you have been afraid that sincere people who are members of organizations which they did not know were Communist-front groups would be unjustly persecuted and embarrassed. If the provisions of this bill made either of these two activities possible I certainly would not have supported it. It is interesting to note that the Attorney General now issues from time to time a list of organizations which he designates as subversive. There are no particular standards for him to follow in making these determinations, since none have ever been laid down by the Congress itself. The Attorney General does not hold hearings at which an organization charged with being subversive is permitted to come in and present its side of the case. Quite the contrary, the Attorney General holds hearings, ex parte, without any opportunity for the accused organizations to be heard. In other words, under the present situation the Attorney General publishes lists of organizations which he considers to be subversive without giving the officers or members of these organizations an opportunity to present their side of the case. Without question, this activity of the Attorney General and any other Federal or State subversive activities committees stigmatizes organizations and their members without due process of law. The authors of the Mundt-Nixon bill recognized this present situation and as a result very definitely defined a Communist-front organization as follows: (1) It must be under the control of the Communist Party, (2) it must be primarily operated for the purpose of giving aid and support to the Communist Party, or (3) its views and policies must in general be those adopted and advanced because such views or policies are those of the Communist Party. It is necessary to show under this legislation that the Communist-front organization intended its views and policies to be those of the Communist Party. This bill, in effect, will, for the first time, establish real legislative standards for determining the character of subversive organizations and will provide greatly needed safeguards in the way of open hearings, cross-examination and court reviews for accused organizations. In this respect, the bill represents a great improvement over the present confused situation. It establishes quasi judicial procedures which must be followed in determining whether or not an organization can be classified as a Communist-front group.

Contrary to popular conception the bill does not require the registration of members of Communist-front groups. In no case does the bill call for making public the names

of members of Communist-front organizations. The bill goes so far, in fact, as to give members of the Communist Party itself 120 days to resign from the party if the party is found by our courts to be the agent of a foreign power and, therefore, is required to register a list of its members. Considerable controversy has raged over whether or not this legislation outlaws communism or the Communist Party itself. The answer to this question is not a simple "Yes" or "No." The bill in no way, however, outlaws communism as an ideology. An American citizen, under the provisions of this bill, is 100 percent free to advocate Communist principles so long as he is not a member of an organization controlled and directed by a foreign power whose purpose it is to establish a totalitarian dictatorship in this country under the domination of a foreign power. In other words, if the courts of our country definitely determine that the Communist Party of the United States is directed and controlled by a foreign power and that its activities are directed toward establishing a totalitarian dictatorship in this country under the domination of a foreign power then the members of the Communist Party must register with our Department of Justice and their activities will be declared illegal. The bill does not, however, in any way outlaw or restrict the activities of a legitimate American Communist Party which the court determines to be free from foreign domination and control. As long as the Communist Party of this country acts as an American political party, with a program evolved by American citizens and applicable to America, it has nothing to fear from this legislation.

During the brief time of this discussion, I have attempted to make clear the purposes of this legislation and have, I think, showed that existing legislation is inadequate to cope with subversive activities in our country. I have read from the bill itself to show that the third party, or any other political organization not under the control of a foreign power, is in no way restricted by the provisions of this measure.

I have pointed out that the measure is a great improvement over the existing situation in that it definitely defines the character of a Communist-front organization and establishes definite judicial procedures which must be followed before any group can be designated as a Communist-front organization. In this way, the courts of the land will determine which organizations are or are not Communist-front groups.

By quoting the statements of labor leaders themselves, I have shown that this legislation in no way restricts the legitimate activities of legitimate American labor organizations. I have pointed out that railroad labor organizations and the American Federation of Labor have, in their discussions with me, voiced no opposition to this bill.

I have pointed out that this bill will outlaw the activities of the Communist Party only to the extent that the party itself is directed and controlled by a foreign power and engages in activities designed to establish here in America a totalitarian dictatorship under the domination of a foreign power.

After careful study and considerable thought I have reached the conclusion that this legislation is essentially sound and worthy of my support. I recognize that there is still room for improvement in the language of this measure and I am, therefore, at present working with representatives of labor and the authors of the measure to draw up certain specific recommendations to be presented to the Senate Judiciary Committee, which will conduct hearings on the measure before any action is taken by the Senate itself. I have attempted in this brief period of time to answer the more important questions which have been raised concerning this legislation. If you desire a written copy of this discussion, please write me in care of the House Office Building, Washington.

Address of Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARVE TIBBOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address of United States Senator EDWARD MARTIN, of Pennsylvania, before the Republican State Committee of Pennsylvania at Philadelphia, Saturday, May 22, 1948, entitled "Meeting the Issue in a Period of Great National Crisis":

This Republican State Committee and the coming Republican National Convention are meeting in a period of great national crisis.

It is fitting that both these meetings should be held in Philadelphia. This city has been the rallying ground during most of the emergencies in American history.

On this sacred soil were found the leaders, the principles and the inspiration for the birth of this Nation and for its salvation from peril in one dark hour after another.

Here the Declaration of Independence set forth American faith in the God-given rights of humanity and in the duty of government—not to rule the people—but to serve them and to protect their freedom.

Here were drafted the Articles of Confederation, our first experiment in national unity.

Here was framed the American Constitution, the greatest state document of all history. It established a system of government that has outlasted every other government then in existence; a form of government so strong, so flexible, and so enduring that it can and, God willing, shall live forever.

It was here also in Philadelphia, 92 years ago this June, that the Republican Party held its history-making first convention.

That convention wrote a charter of principles just as true, just as inspiring today, as it was in that earlier crisis.

The delegates to that convention in 1856 issued a call which the Republican convention next month may well echo. It was "addressed to all the people of the United States, without regard to past political differences or divisions, who are opposed * * * to the policy of the present administration * * * and in favor of restoring the action of the Federal Government to the principles of Washington and Jefferson."

The first resolution ever adopted by the Republican Party in national convention has been the party's watchword since. It touches the issues of this very day:

"*Resolved*, That the maintenance of the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Federal Constitution are essential to the preservation of our republican institutions; and that the Federal Constitution, the rights of the States, and the Union of the States must be preserved."

That first Republican platform also touched upon foreign policy. It protested against fraud and force as diplomatic instruments, a matter about which we present-day Republicans are still protesting.

The words of that Republican platform of 92 years ago ring timely and true. Republican faith in freedom and the Constitution have stood like the Rock of Gibraltar. The platforms of the Republican Party have charted all the progress, all the expansion and all the prosperity which this Nation has enjoyed in the last four score years.

This is the year, and the hour approaches, for the American voters to renew their faith in the first principles of freedom, sound economics, and good government.

Do you recall the Democratic platform of 1932—the one which promised to cut Federal expenditures by 25 percent, reduce the Government pay rolls and slash the taxes? Do you remember that platform which promised balanced budgets? Do you remember the platform promise of sound money and the promise to turn out the bureaucrats?

Ladies and gentleman, that was a fine platform. I recommend that the Democrats dust it off and adopt it again when they convene in July. For it is as good as new. It has never been used. It has been discarded and forgotten.

There is, however, one platform which the New Dealers did follow. If you read the 1932 platforms of the various parties in that campaign, you will discover that the New Dealers followed closely—not the platform of the Democratic Party—but rather the platform of the Socialist Party.

For the past 16 years these brain trusters have had their spiritual home in state socialism—no matter what they call themselves.

Today we are emerging from long and destructive years of deficit financing by an administration whose slogan was, "Tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect."

We have seen Federal administrations pyramid agency upon agency, bureau upon bureau, board upon board, and one commission upon another. We have seen them arrange the alphabet into jaw-breaking combinations as part of a scheme to perpetuate government by socialistic planning.

Subsidies, grants, price controls, and loans that were never meant to be repaid, have largely replaced sound, common-sense business methods. The meaning of the word economy was forgotten. Planned scarcities were created in food and other necessities of life to the detriment of our people.

Self-reliance and trust in local self-government have been insidiously sapped by Federal propaganda, urging the people to turn always to Washington for whatever they wanted—large or small. Our economy, based on individual enterprise, has been seriously damaged.

I know it is easy for the Republican Party to be critical. It is easy to turn the searchlight on the sins of the New Deal and to show how it has led this Nation down the road toward state socialism. But our Republican Party is not merely a party of criticism. We are the party of constructive Americanism.

We are on our way to an all-Republican Federal administration. When we reach that goal in January, we will have cooperation and teamwork at Washington.

But let me sound a warning now. We must not attempt to out-deal the New Deal. We must have a positive, progressive platform and a candidate of courageous, patriotic Americanism, who puts principle above expediency.

The Republican Party must stand on the record of the Eightieth Congress and prepare the way for a more glorious record when the next Congress takes over in January with a Republican President in the White House.

The coming campaign is more than a mere job of politics. It is a crusade of education, of evangelism, of patriotism and principle. The time is at hand for all Americans to stand up and be counted.

There are three major questions to be determined, and very largely they will be decided in this year's election.

One is the question of whether we care enough for the American system of government under the Constitution to insist that it be restored to its full force and vigor.

We have drifted farther and farther away from the Constitution's principles. Under New Deal misgovernment the judiciary is no

longer the bulwark of our liberties. Congress is no longer the primary writer of laws. The inalienable rights of the individual are no longer guaranteed and enforced by government, but are surrounded at every point by reservations and restrictions incompatible with the spirit of the Declaration of Independence.

We are in the midst of what has sometimes been termed a revolution by consent—although a far more accurate name would be "revolution by deception."

The second great issue of the day is inflation. Inflation has been in process ever since the beginning of the New Deal—ever since this country abandoned its time-honored sound money policy.

In a spree of inflation jitters, the Federal Government has expended incredible billions of dollars. The administration is spending in this current year more than all the people and all the business enterprises of this Nation have earned in some single years during the present generation.

And still the spending trend is upward.

Where is all this money coming from? The fact is that we are passing the bills over to future generations in the hope that citizens yet unborn will be able and willing to repay the debts of our own improvident, spendthrift Government.

Actually, the great bulk of our spending is inflation money. It is printing-press money. By no conceivable process could the Government redeem its present currency with either gold or any other tangible commodity.

Yet when the Republicans in Congress have tried to close down this reckless flow of spending, we have met with resistance at every turn. When we wanted to cut the taxes, so that the incentives for work and for the production of wealth would be greater, we were blocked with vetoes—and now that the taxes have been cut anyway, the administration is bent on spending faster than ever.

It is argued that much of the current spending is to protect ourselves against the foreign power which this same administration appeased into a world menace.

But I tell you, most earnestly, that this Nation can't save the world with printing-press money, and we can't save ourselves by going broke.

It's time to wake up the American people to the stern realities, and to break up their financial delusions of grandeur.

We can defeat inflation only when we stop the flow of printing-press money, cut down the cost of Government, and stimulate greater production.

The third great issue is in the field of world policy. Here especially the American people are crying for aggressive and enlightened leadership.

And in this field it is beginning to be apparent that the present regime has run its course. It is too haunted by its own mistakes, its own limber-back policies, and its betrayals of its friends, ever to hope for success short of war.

Can there be peace without appeasement—peace, not merely for our own times, but for the far-distant future?

What can be done? No one knows till we try.

If such a peace is possible, it can only be achieved through a fresh start, a new beginning, untarnished by past blunders, and directed by men who have the high moral courage to stick to what is right.

Uncle Sam's diplomacy needs backbone quite as much as it needs a mailed fist.

While military might is necessary under present conditions, force alone will never build lasting peace. There has to be abiding faith in justice, and there has to be a relentless determination to keep one's promises.

The uninvited ghosts at all peace conferences possible to conceive under the present administration will be the victims of their past betrayals.

Do you remember when the worst chapter of appeasement toward Russia, of which the New Deal was guilty, occurred? It was at the very time when our own military strength was the greatest in our history, and by far the greatest in the world. Military strength alone will not take the place of moral courage.

There are times when I think our foreign policy has the blind staggers. For 3 years there has been incompetent fumbling with world peace—and peace is farther off today than when the war ended. These are three lost years in history.

The American people have just one chance for enduring peace—for peace that is more than an armed truce—for peace with justice.

That is to recall from power all those who have led us into the valley of darkness, confusion and chaos. Put in command untrammeled leadership, which will not be committed by, or entangled in, the mistakes of the past, a leadership which can give new inspiration and restore confidence to the task of world organization for lasting peace.

Let us strive to make the United Nations work. Let us make our own Western Hemisphere regional alliance closer and stronger.

Let us encourage the growth of the new western European alliance and if necessary, a compact among all the liberty-loving nations bound solemnly for mutual protection and world peace. All standing against any Godless aggressor nation.

This should be the first job of the Republican President.

Each day we witness increasing evidence that the Democrats are torn by strife, dissension and hatred. If they are unable to provide leadership for their own party what right-thinking American would be willing to entrust to that shattered and discredited party the destinies of our country and the world?

Leadership to solve the problems of the home front and the critical world situation must be furnished by the Republican Party, which stands today strong and united.

Fellow Republicans, in a small way this present gathering, and in a larger way the Republican National Convention, will serve to crystallize the Republican position on the great issues of the times.

Today we are facing these problems on historic soil. Looking over our shoulders, are men like Washington, Franklin, Hamilton, Jefferson, Madison and all the other great patriots of America's beginnings.

They met to solve other grave issues in other times in this same city of Philadelphia. May the spirit of these forebears strengthen and guide us as we face the crisis of today.

Let us rededicate ourselves with the words of the Great Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln, the founder of the Republican Party.

"With firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in."

Kansas' Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, recently there came to my attention an outline of Kansas' laws affecting veterans, their wives, their widows, their children, their orphans, and their organizations, as compiled by Eugene Boyd, 410 North Handley Street, Wichita, Kans., who is department adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans.

Many of the potential beneficiaries under these State laws are not aware of the valuable rights, privileges, exemptions, and benefits available to them, under certain circumstances and, therefore, I take this opportunity to make this résumé of Kansas' veterans laws available to them.

The outline is as follows:

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

A county allowance is provided for the burial of indigent Union veterans, their wives or widows, and certain other veterans. Burial may not be in a potter's field. Relatives may be allowed to conduct the funeral. Provision is made for the removal of the remains of certain soldiers from abandoned cemeteries and pauper burying grounds.

Counties may provide metal grave markers for soldiers' graves.

A county allowance is provided for headstones for graves of Union soldiers.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments executed by members of the armed forces.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND DUTIES

Absentee voting is provided for inmates of soldiers' homes and hospitals.

Absentee registration and voting is provided.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

County commissioners are authorized to employ a veterans' agent and to levy an annual tax of not to exceed 1 mill for his salary and expenses.

The fee for administering an oath or giving any official certificate to a veteran, his widow, orphan, or legal representative for use in connection with a claim for pension, bounty, or back pay, or for giving the certificate required on a voucher for collection of periodical dues from the pension agent is limited to 15 cents.

The office of veterans' affairs and veterans' advisory committee are to advise veterans as to their rights in obtaining State and Federal benefits.

The adjutant general is required to furnish, without charge, a certificate of military service in accordance with the records filed in his office.

Free copies of public records are provided for wards of the Veterans' Administration under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

Public officials are required to furnish as many free copies of the records of veterans and records of births of children of veterans as may be necessary or requested in connection with pension claims.

County register of deeds must record discharges and other official records of military service and, upon request, furnish certified copies.

The Adjutant General is required to record discharges and official records of military service free of charge, such record to be made from the original discharge or other record, or from a copy certified to by a city, county, or State officials as true copy. No such city, county, or State official may charge a fee for certifying to the correctness of true copies of original discharges or other official records.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS

Coordination of State educational and vocational guidance programs has been accomplished by the Office of Veterans' Affairs, Board of Regents, Department of Public Instruction, and the Board of Vocational Education.

Exemption from military training is provided and appropriate allowance of credit is given for time served in the armed forces to students in land-grant colleges and universities of the State.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Coordinated programs have been worked out between the office of Veterans' Affairs, Unemployment Compensation Division of the Department of Labor and Industry, and other State agencies.

The director of State civil service shall be notified to reinstate any employee returning from authorized military leave.

No vacancies are created in public offices by reason of absence of officers and employees in active military service.

Preference is given to veterans under State civil service. In examinations disabled veterans are credited with 10 points and other veterans with 5 points in addition to their earned rating.

Preference is given to veterans in appointment and employment in public departments and on public works of State and local units.

Benefit rights are preserved under the Unemployment Compensation Act, as well as under the State school-retirement system.

Two of the members of the Board of Managers of the State Soldiers' Home shall be veterans of one or more wars. The third member of the board may be the widow, mother, sister, or daughter of such veteran.

EXEMPTION FROM EXECUTION, GARNISHMENT, ETC.

Claims under the World War Veterans' Compensation Act are exempt from attachment, garnishment, and execution except by order of the court for support of wife and minor children of the claimant. Such claims are not the subject of assignment, transfer, or power of attorney.

Money received as pension from the United States by a debtor, within 3 months next preceding the issue of execution, attachment, or garnishment is exempt if the pensioner makes affidavit that it is necessary for the maintenance of a family supported by the pension.

GENERAL EXTENSION OF BENEFITS

All rights, privileges, and immunities enjoyed by veterans of any war previous to World War II are extended to World War II veterans.

GUARDIANSHIP

A Uniform Guardianship Act has been adopted with modifications, providing for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran, or the minor child of a veteran, to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

HOMES

Veterans, their wives or widows, children, or mothers may be admitted to the Soldiers' Home and Mother Bickerdyke Annex.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

Special privileges and benefits are extended to World War veterans and their dependents in county memorial hospitals.

LAND-SETTLEMENT BENEFITS

Preferences are authorized to World War veterans with respect to State aid in purchase of farm homes.

MEETING PLACES, MEMORIAL BUILDING PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Any patriotic order or association may acquire or dispose of real estate, including suitable buildings for holding meetings, and may purchase, own, control, or dispose of stock in a corporation having for its purpose the building or management of such accommodations for holding meetings.

Counties and cities may vote bonds or incur indebtedness for erection of suitable memorials commemorating achievements of their citizens in the armed forces. Memorials may consist of a building, monument, arch, or other structure, or improved highway, park, or boulevard.

NATIONAL GUARD SERVICE

Veterans are exempt from State military duty.

PATRIOTIC HOLIDAYS

Cities may appropriate money for the observance of Memorial Day, to be expended through veterans' organizations.

RECREATIONAL BENEFITS

Cities in counties adjoining United States military reservations may acquire, establish, and maintain buildings, rooms, and facilities for the recreation and entertainment of United States soldiers, their relatives and friends.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Savings and loan associations may make loans guaranteed under the GI bill of rights.

Veterans are granted second injury fund benefits.

Veterans, their wives, widows, and minor children are to be supplied with the necessaries of life in their homes.

TAX EXEMPTIONS; EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Time of return of income tax declaration is extended, with exemptions.

Application for the registration of vehicles owned by members of the armed forces may be signed by close relatives.

Veterans are entitled to a free license to operate a delivery and baggage wagon.

Veterans are entitled to a free license to vend, hawk, and peddle goods, wares, fruits, or merchandise not prohibited by law.

Exemption is granted from payment of annual professional and occupational license fees accruing while in military service; renewals may be made within 6 months after discharge from the armed forces.

Fees are remitted to dentists and dental hygienists while on active duty with the armed forces.

License and registration of cosmetologist or manicurist is renewed after termination of service in the armed forces.

Property of veterans' organizations is exempt from tax.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

The unauthorized wearing of insignia of certain veterans' organizations is punishable by a fine of not more than $20 or imprisonment for not more than 30 days, or both.

Headquarters are established in the State memorial hall for the Grand Army of the Republic, American Legion, and United Spanish War Veterans.

War veterans' organizations are extended the use of memorial parks in first-class cities.

City appropriations may be made for the observance of Memorial Day through veterans' organizations.

American Legion posts may keep machine guns for exhibition purposes.

Much of the above-mentioned legislation has been enacted by the Kansas Legislature through the sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veteran organizations.

The DAV, which has some 15 chapters throughout the State, maintains four full-time national service officers, under the direction of Homer R. Pelton, at the Veterans' Administration regional office, Wichita, Kans.

These DAV experts extend all types of assistance to veterans and their dependents more particularly in the technical preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their justifiable claims for various types of governmental benefits to which they may be lawfully entitled.

DAV MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official voice of America's disabled defenders.

According to its congressional charter of incorporation — Public Law 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law 663, approved July 15, 1942—active membership in the DAV is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities incurred during, or by reason of, active service during time of war in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it.

More and more wounded and disabled veterans of World War II are becoming active members of the DAV.

Eligibles may become life members upon payment of a fee of $100 ($50, if born before January 1, 1902), in cash, or by a down payment of $5, or more, plus such installments as will complete payment of the full fee by the end of the second succeeding fiscal year (ending on June 30), after which, if not fully paid, a carrying charge of $5 per year would accrue. A growing percentage are becoming DAV life members. Annual membership is available at $5.

DAV NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Located at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati 6, Ohio, the national headquarters of the DAV takes care of all administrative matters and records, and publishes the Disabled American Veterans semimonthly newspaper, containing accurate, up-to-date information of interest and of value to disabled veterans and their dependents.

The present national commander of the DAV is John L. Golob, of Hibbing, Minn., a severely wounded World War I veteran, who has had a broad background of experience in various local, State, and national DAV activities which qualify him to lead an organization composed exclusively of America's disabled war veterans.

Its national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-treasurer (business manager) of the organization and editor of its newspaper since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his able assistant.

The largest bank in Cincinnati, the Fifth Third Union Trust Co., has, for 28 years, been the depository for the funds of both the DAV and of its incorporated trusteeship, the DAV Service Foundation. Officials handling funds have always been adequately bonded by the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The national service headquarters of the DAV is now located in a beautiful building at 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C., which was acquired by the organization in 1945.

In this Washington office are located the department of claims, headed by William E. Tate; the department on legislation, headed by Francis Sullivan; and the department of public relations and employment, headed by my long-time good friend, Millard W. Rice. In addition to these service departments, the DAV service headquarters has its office manager, John E. Feighner, as assistant national adjutant. All of these various departments are staffed by trained experts, all of whom are themselves war wounded or disabled veterans.

These DAV national officers know all about the technical complications that disabled veterans must overcome factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration, under the limitations and restrictions of existing law, as legalistically interpreted and as administratively applied.

Understanding such vexatious problems by personal experience, DAV national service officers are naturally more sympathetic than are nondisabled veterans or civilians and are, therefore, generally more effective in helping disabled claimants to comply with technical requirements to prove legal entitlement to benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled.

DIFFICULTIES OF PROVING SERVICE ORIGIN

Most citizens agree with the DAV that the Federal Government should bear the

burden of providing for the Nation's defenders, but only when it has been established that the veteran's disabilities were incurred in or aggravated by his military service.

To prove service connection of a disability, however, is not an easy thing to do, except where official records show its inception in service. An equitable claim cannot necessarily be legally established.

Many different factors may make it extremely difficult, and in many cases impossible, for a veteran factually to prove that this disabilities were caused by his war service, even though actually service-incurred or aggravated.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The DAV has adopted on a Nation-wide basis, a man-job matching method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,100,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally unemployable. The remaining 93 percent are less than totally disabled and must, therefore, supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment.

This scientific approach to a most distressing problem has produced some worthwhile results thus far. The handicapped veteran's abilities have been matched with the requirements of the job, rather than stressing his disabilities. It has been demonstrated by the employment records of such disabled veterans that they have a low absentee record, a low turn-over record, a low accident record, and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been demonstrated that to hire disabled veterans is just plain, good business, bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers, and taxpayers generally.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation—its military and naval services during time of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as with those who are, or have been, dependent upon these heroes, so that other young men who, in the future, may be called upon to make similar sacrifices, will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that if they, too, should also be so unfortunate they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported, as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth, and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

It is a pleasure for me to commend the service program of the DAV, which makes me very proud to be one of its members.

The Role of Labor in Community Betterment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a splendid and constructive address made by Harvey W. Brown, president of the International Association of Machinists on May 26, 1948, before the National Community Conference of the National Council for Community Improvement in Washington, D. C.:

THE ROLE OF LABOR IN COMMUNITY BETTERMENT

Organized labor is vitally interested in any plan or program of community betterment. The industrial character of the United States has caused this country to become more and more a Nation of urban centers, which have sprung up around our industrial establishments. The concentration of business and manufacturing has likewise made necessary the residence in these communities of the employees who make up the labor force of industry.

It was this concentration of workers near their employment which gave birth in our early history to the slum dwelling, to overcrowding, and to the poverty-stricken conditions of whole community areas which have blighted the face and the history of so many great and small communities in the United States. The conditions of community life, no less than conditions of the workshop, were responsible for the initial organization of the trade-union movement. Organized labor, therefore, has a fundamental interest in the betterment of communities.

Where and how a worker lives is naturally determined by where and how he works. A union member works, like everybody else, in order to live. The essence of trade-unionism is to improve the living conditions of working men and women. And members of organized labor are as anxious as any other group in society to improve communities for themselves, for their own families, and for everybody else. Of course organized labor believes that unless a man can earn adequate wages, unless he is protected at his work against the threat of injury or disease, unless he can attain a degree of security in his work—then he cannot participate fully in the social and cultural life which makes up the community in which he lives.

Unfortunately, because of this necessary concern of labor with the economic side of existence, many people outside the labor movement have reached the conclusion that unions are solely economic and materialistic in their outlook and in their activities. The truth is just the opposite. Man is not solely an economic creature. He produces, he earns, he consumes, he plays, he possesses, he loves—he lives. And the union member, no less than his brother in other walks of life, is a whole man.

Over the history of American industry, the wage earner has used his unions in many ways. In the earlier years trade-unions were beneficial associations, designed to provide assistance to sick or injured members and to the families of those deceased. Then the workers turned their attention to things social and political, and through their unions participated in the struggles for such objectives as the abolition of the property requirement for voting, free public schools, and homesteads in the West.

It was not until the latter years of the nineteenth century, when the closing of the western frontier cut off the last avenue of escape from a wage-earning existence for the vast majority of workers, and when the rapid mechanization of industry pushed the skilled worker down another peg in the production scale, and threatened him with economic oblivion, that the modern trade union movement, with its emphasis on wages, hours, and conditions of work, came into being.

Experience shows that as the workers in a given plant, industry or locality, approach the attainment of their economic goals, they are able and anxious to turn the full force of their union into other channels of activity. Trade unions do participate in community betterment programs when they are approached and they also do so, I am glad to say, on their own initiative.

When I was thinking over what I was going to say at this meeting today, there came to mind occasions when local groups of the International Association of Machinists took part in what I would call community betterment activities. And they did so without any prompting and without any fanfare and as a matter of course. Here are just a few examples which have occurred recently:

In Wichita, Kans., our organization in that district raised $1,200 for a new YMCA building.

The Buck of the Month Club maintained by our local at the Lockheed plant in Burbank, Calif., donated some $16,000 to the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts and the YMCA, to help finance camps and playgrounds in the San Fernando Valley area.

Members of our Bronx and Manhattan local donated more than 1,000 gifts last Christmas to the veterans at Kingsbridge Hospital, including a 16-millimeter sound motion picture projector.

Our district organization in St. Louis donated more than $23,000 to construct a play center for children and turned it over to the Salvation Army to administer.

A group of our members in Indianapolis has just given a combination radio, phonograph and recorder to the disabled veterans at the Billings Veterans Hospital.

Our members in Richmond, Calif., have been particularly active in community affairs. Last year our two locals in that city, backed by the district office in Oakland and by the California Machinists' Council, worked with civic, business, and other labor groups to influence the Maritime Commission to release for private use the Richmond shipyard facilities, which had been put in mothballs. A delegation to Washington, which was successful in obtaining the release and in providing jobs for some 10,000 local workers, was headed by the business agent of the Machinists' Union in Oakland.

Just this spring one of our locals in Richmond, Calif., produced a juvenile musical show to raise money for the city recreation department. The net proceeds amounted to more than $1,000. The Richmond Independent, commenting editorially on the activity, said:

"In the light of their activities over the past few years, the machinist motto 'Serving Richmond Proudly,' aptly describes a high sense of responsibility and stamps this group as a leader in the development of this great community."

In presenting these few examples, I don't mean to imply that this is the limit of the International Association of Machinists' participation in community affairs. And, of course, examples of similar activity can be produced by every other labor organization in the country. The important facts from the viewpoint of persons and organizations interested in community betterment are that labor is interested in this activity, and that, when labor becomes active in the field it is a great force for improvement.

Whether or not labor is active in a given community depends largely, at least so far as our union is concerned, upon certain factors in that community. Aside from a few rules laid down in our constitution for general guidance, our local and district organizations operate with a large degree of autonomy. In fact, the absence of central control would probably astonish some who are not familiar with the democratic character of the International Association of Machinists. But that's the way our organization is built, and if I know the machinists—and I have worked with them for many years—that's the way their organization will remain.

The problem of obtaining labor's participation in community betterment is, then, one which must be worked out at the local level. And success or failure in arousing labor's active interest in this subject will depend largely upon two factors; first, the economic status of the workers in the area; and second, the relative degree of respect which the organized labor movement enjoys in the community.

In dealing with labor, either at the bargaining table or the community planning council, it is important to remember that the union as an institution reflects the ambitions and aspirations, the fears and the feelings of the men and women who make it up. You would not expect to obtain constructive contributions to community betterment from the poor or the outcast. However, in the many towns and cities throughout America where labor has been recognized as a force for industrial and social progress, and where its members are respected members of the community, you can expect and you will obtain the full support of local unions in improving your and their communities.

Certainly no group has a greater interest at stake than that possessed by the industrial wage-earning population. Even though modern transportation has made it possible for people to live farther from their place of work than was possible in the early years of our industrial history, most wage earners still live in the urban centers which have sprung up around industrial establishments.

In its industrial work force the community possesses a group of citizens who are directly concerned in the fruits of community betterment. Here are to be found the folks who cannot get out of town to the seashore or the mountains for the summer; they need recreational facilities in the communities where they live. Here are the children who will use the playgrounds. These are the people to whom traffic accidents are not mere statistics, but a matter of suffering and death. And they who earn their daily bread in wages, are vitally interested in the type and quality of industry attracted to and retained by the community.

If the community is an average one, two out of every three of its industrial wage earners are members of organized labor. In the local unions, developed and maintained by their members for organized activity, the community has at hand a ready-made instrument of group participation in local affairs and betterment projects. The organized workers are used to planning and working through their unions. They know how to cooperate in collective activities.

The examples of our union's community activity which I mentioned earlier is one indication of how effective labor-union participation can be. During th war, when labor's participation was actively sought on a national level, we had outstanding examples of widespread union activity in industrial and community affairs. In such programs as the joint production drives of the War Production Board, the war-bond campaigns and all the other varied national emergency activities, American labor wrote a chapter in cooperative activity which speaks for itself. In the nature of those wartime activities the community will find a guide to the role of labor in continuing peacetime programs of improvement and betterment. Generally speaking, experience in wartime programs indicates that the labor union is the best instrument for obtaining mass employee participation in programs within industry. Unions can serve with equal effectiveness at the community level.

Because the union is the creation of its members, they will cooperate most willingly in programs in which the union as an organization is given a position of responsibility. The individual incentive to participation is increased because other members of the group are participating and because the request for activity arises from within their own participating organization.

The alternative means of reaching the industrial wage-earning group are not so effective. The very fact that the local labor movement has been ignored is, in itself, a deterent to many workers. When a program, which involves their welfare and requires their cooperation is brought to their attention by their employer or by some civic group in which they have no direct voice, it is not the same as if they are invited to participate directly through their own organization which is a part of the organized structure of all communities. To many wage earners, and particularly to those whose active interest is essential to the success of labor participation, community failure to ask direct cooperation by the local labor movement is evidence of the community's unwillingness to accept labor as a partner in its affairs.

Community betterment, of course, is not confined to activities which require financial contributions. Communities are administered by their duly elected officials. But, as everybody in this audience knows, the official administrations are greatly influenced by the attitude of influential business and civic organizations which function in the community. Many of our cities own their present improved reputation to the watchfulness and to the improvement campaigns of these civic-minded groups. Organized labor has played its constructive role in this phase of community betterment and trade unions should be included in similar future community-improvement campaigns.

The fact that I was invited to take part in this conference as a representative of organized labor is an indication of the increasing interest of community-planning groups in obtaining the cooperation of that movement. Labor welcomes the opportunity.

We of labor are part and parcel of the Nation and of the communities which make it up. We are proud of our Nation, we are proud of our communities. We are anxious to cooperate in every program designed to improve them. Organized labor can offer to community-improvement groups the interest and activity of 15,000,000 wage earners. We know how effective their participation can be. In many communities throughout the country today, local unions are leaders in community-betterment programs.

The mobilization of the vast resources of organized labor in every community is a challenge to the community-improvement movement. The means to this end is simple. It consists merely in recognizing labor as a full-fledged and valuable partner in community life.

The Story of Okinawa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, until the late war few of us had ever heard of the island of Okinawa. Because of its obscurity there had been comparatively little information available about it or its people. Mr. Garland Evans Hopkins, who is the associate foreign secretary of the Methodist Church, is also president of the society known as the Friends of Okinawa. The Story of Okinawa, a brief sketch of the island and its people, written by Mr. Hopkins, is quoted below for the information of the Members:

THE STORY OF OKINAWA

Since April 1, 1945, the people of the United States have become aware of the existence of a small island called Okinawa. They have seen its name in connection with bloody battles and they have heard the stories which returning soldiers have told. However, when they have sought further information in encyclopaedias or at libraries, they have learned that no such information is available. If all the printed material on Okinawa to be found in the English language were combined in one volume, it would still be a small book, and much of it would be in error for there has never been an English authority in Okinawa. This little booklet draws from Okinawan, Japanese, and Chinese sources in presenting a brief story of Okinawa.

Okinawa is geographically, as well as historically, the key island of a curvilinear chain of islands lying southwest of Japan proper, stretching 775 miles in a northeast, southwest direction toward Formosa. This archipelago consists of 11 major island groups comprising approximately 150 islands and atolls. Most western histories give the name Loochoo Islands to the group. Economically they are of little value to anyone but themselves; strategically they command the sea approaches to the China coast between Foochow and Shanghai and are a southern door to the Japanese Empire.

Throughout the history of the Loochoos, Okinawa, the largest of the islands, has been the dominant and uniting force and cultural center. Sixty miles in length with a breadth that varies from 2 to 16 miles, the island is approximately 485 miles in area. In other words, it is less than half the size of the State of Rhode Island. Hills and peaks occupy a large portion of the island and give little in return. Here and there are a vein of coal, a deposit of inferior iron ore, some manganese. There are a few salt flats in southern Okinawa and in that section, too, considerable limestone and travertine are found. Few of these have any commercial value and Okinawa has been forced to earn her bread by trading. This contact with the rest of the Orient, together with the strategic location of the islands, has given Okinawa prominence in Oriental history far out of proportion to her size.

Ancient Okinawa was divided into three parts—Hokuzan, the "North Mountain" kingdom, included all of the island lying north of the isthmus between Ishikawa and Nakadomari; Chuzan, the "Central Mountain" kingdom, lay between the isthmus and a slightly curved line running from Naha to Yonabaru; Nanzan, the "South Mountain" kingdom, was all of the island below the Naha-Yonabaru line. In the early history of Okinawa even these were subdivided into feudal baronies over which the local "anji," or lord, was all-powerful. Gradually these "anji" were brought under the control of an overlord or king. Because of its harbors and terrain, Chuzan early developed into the most powerful and most progressive of the kingdoms. It can almost be said that its history is the story of Okinawa, for only here and there were significant contributions made by the other kingdoms.

The early history of Okinawa is a combination of fact and legend. Often it is difficult to separate the two. Her total history is the story of a small nation struggling to maintain her national sovereignty and identity, sometimes against the Chinese, sometimes against the Japanese. Only a devoted and patriotic vigilance on the part of her rulers and statesmen saved her in past times. Only American arms could save her after the last half century of Japanization.

The first known historical fact about the Loochoos is that Chinese emissaries visited them, presumably reaching Okinawa in 605

A. D. Unable to understand the language, the mission failed to obtain any information except what was gained through observation by the travelers. A similar mission failed to gain submission and tribute in 610. Evidently the emissaries were impressed by what they saw, for in 611 they considered the islands worth the outfitting of a punitive expedition which anchored in Naha harbor and sent a demand for nominal capitulation and a payment of tribute from the King of Chuzan. Receiving an unfavorable reply, a force landed and burned the royal palace, carrying off a number of captives.

Little is known of the history of the island for the next 500 years. A Japanese mission to China was forced by storm to land on Okinawa in 743. Whether they entered into any diplomatic relations or trade agreements with any of the kingdoms is unknown. Some trading with Japan and China, and probably with Formosa and the Philippines, seems to have grown up in this Okinawan dark age, but legend supplies about the only basis for any account of this period in the island's history. Great lords rose and fell; petty wars were sometimes waged. In miniature the Okinawan scene was the story of feudalism all over the world.

In 1187 Shun Ten, Anji of Shimajiri in the Kingdom of Nanzan, usurpe the throne of the Tensonshi ancient rulers, and established himself as king of all Okinawa. He was the grandson of Asato, powerful lord of Shimajiri, possibly a connection of the royal family whose daughter had married Minamoto Tanetomo, a renowned warrior of the Genji Clan, who fled to Okinawa when the Genji were defeated by the Keike in one of their long and bloody struggles for the control of Japan. There are many legends of Minamoto's prowess, legends upon which the Japanese capitalized to the fullest after the Okinawan annexation. He is said to have been a great archer who wielded a bow of such size and strength that no other mortal could compete with him. Subsequently he returned to Japan and died in Kagoshima. It is through him as the father of Shun Ten that the Japanese came originally to claim Okinawa. They reckoned Shun Ten a Japanese lörd (whether this claim was made during his lifetime is unknown) and upon this based the claim that not only Okinawa but all of the Loochoo Islands were under the jurisdiction of the Princess of Satsuma (Kyushu).

The Shun Ten dynasty lasted for three generations, until in 1259 a powerful anji in Chuzan rebelled and seized the throne. Eison of Chuzan was a combination of rough warrior, skilled diplomat, and wise statesman. He quickly reunited the torn kingdom and, turning diplomat, achieved the annexation to the Kingdom of Okinawa of the 17 islands of the Kerama Retto in 1284 and the entire Amami O Gunto in 1285. This was accomplished at the request of the inhabitants of these islands, not unlikely prompted by oriental realism. During his reign a lively trade with Japan sprung up. It was in this period that Buddhism was introduced into Okinawa, being brought in by the Japanese.

In 1290 and again in 1297 the great Kublai Khan sent his emissaries to the King of Okinawa in an attempt to bring the islands under his political sway. The missions attempted to extract payment of tribute from Okinawa, but the Okinawans refused to be intimidated. In prewar American propaganda regarding Okinawa a great deal of emphasis was placed upon the close economic and cultural relationship between China and Okinawa, supposedly existing since the "dawn of history." The evidence seems to point to the contrary, for every attempt of the Chinese to exploit the islanders was unsuccessful during the first 700 years of Okinawan history. It was not until the rule of the pro-Chinese king, Satto, in the fourteenth century, that any appreciable amount of influence from the Chinese came to bear on Okinawa.

King Satto ruled from 1350 to 1395. During his long reign Okinawa emerged from its position as an isolated island kingdom into a place of prominence as a Pacific trading center. One of his first steps was to dispatch a mission to China. This occurred in the year 1372, shortly after the rise of the Ming dynasty. Gifts of sulfur and horses were carried to Emperor Hun Wu, the conqueror of the Mongols and the founder of the Mings. The mission was highly successful, laying the basis for increased trade relations and paving the way for future friendly relations between the two countries. Hun Wu sent Satto gifts of silk, pottery, porcelain, and iron tools. From that time on Satto paid regular tribute to China. Friendly relations between Okinawa and China continued from this time until the latter part of the nineteenth century. Trade increased and Chinese traders came to Okinawa in such large numbers that Satto granted them a concession area in Naha where many of them settled and through which the overflow of the wealth and culture of China under the Mings was poured into Okinawa.

King Satto died in 1395 and was succeeded by his weak son, Bunei. During Bunei's reign Mamun, Anji of Sashiki in Nanzan, became very powerful. He revolted against Bunei, defeating his army and killing him in 1421. With typical oriental respect he refused to take the throne for himself but established his father, Sho Shisho, as king. Upon Sho Shisho's death Mamun became king, assuming the name of Sho Hashi, and ruled the kingdom united by his wars. Trade was encouraged under Sho Hashi, and soon Okinawan ports of call included Foochow, Manila, Saigon, Batavia, and many another trading center in China, Japan, Korea, Formosa, the Philippines, Indonesia, Thailand, and the Malay States.

The wealth and prestige which this trading brought to Okinawa naturally attracted the attention of the Japanese. In 1851 Japan demanded the payment of tribute by Okinawa. Rather than risk an invasion the king agreed, despite the fact that he was also paying tribute to China. This was the beginning of the dual tribute which Okinawa continued to pay for centuries.

With the exception of a brief and futile rebellion around the year 1460, the wars of Sho Hashi, 1415–30, were the last battles on Okinawa until the American invasion in 1945.

The Sho Hashi dynasty came to an end in 1469 when its last unhappy member, Sho Toku, was either murdered or forced to commit suicide by his leading general, Matsigani, who had begun life as a blacksmith in the town of Okuma. Matsigani then seized the throne and assumed both the surname and coat-of-arms of Sho Hashi. He took the name of Sho En and his nineteen generation dynasty is called by that name.

With the enthroning of Sho En began a dynasty which was to rule in peace for 5 centuries. These were centuries in which great changes were to occur in both eastern and western worlds, changes which were bound to have an impact upon even a small, insular kingdom. And in her own sphere Okinawa was to play a leading role, the role of a small, buffer state caught in the timeless struggle of two great eastern nations, each fighting to emerge as the dominant oriental power. Peace had had to be purchased at great sacrifice in many of the reigns, but with Sho En peace had assumed almost the aspect of a religion. Indeed, part of the force at work on the Okinawan ideology was the Buddhistic teaching of serene living and spirtual satisfaction as the chief goals in life.

The great ruler of the Sho En dynasty was King Sho Shin, who came to the throne in 1477. By that date the public had progressed sufficiently in its thinking and there was wealth enough to enter into a great program of public construction. What Okinawans refer to as "the golden age" had begun. Sho Shin made his capital city of Shuri, already the cultural center of the kingdom, the show spot of the nation. Under his direction building after building was constructed, each of them blending Chinese, Japanese, and Okinawan styles and motifs. The old royal castle, situated on an eminence overlooking the city, was refurbished; the palace grounds were beautified, gardens were laid out, and a pond called Tzutan was dug below the castle. Even before Sho Shin this castle was the scenic pride of Okinawa. The main building, at the highest point of eminence, was a three-story audience chamber; nearby there were two smaller audience chambers. The one to the north was a Chinese style wooden building called Uishi-Wu-Udn. Here emissaries from China were received and entertained in a typically Chinese fashion. To the south stood Fee-Nu-Udn where representatives of Japan were received. It was built in Japanese style. The three buildings offered a splendid study in the differences—and similarities—of architecture in the three countries. Other buildings close by were used as residences by the royal family. Unfortunately the castle, along with everything else in Shuri, was destroyed by American bombings and shellings. The ramparts can still be distinguished and much of the foundation masonry is still left. All of Shuri's parks and public buildings, many of them dating from the time of Sho Shin, are gone. Only the shell of a small Methodist Church and the crumbling walls of a few other buildings remain of the ancient and historic city.

It was during the reign of Sho Shin that a code of conduct and etiquette was formulated and a tea ceremonial similar to that of other oriental countries came into existence. Perhaps it would be more nearly correct to say that Sho Shin codified the accepted etiquette and ceremonials of his time, making them a pattern for future generations of Okinawans. He also defined the existing class distinctions, listing only royalty, nobility, and commoners. This was, in effect, the abolition of serfdom, for no Okinawan was classed lower than a commoner.

Generally speaking, the pattern of government in Okinawa from the time of Sho Shin to the end of the Sho En dynasty was that of a limited monarchy. The influence of Taoism is clearly discernible in the political system which developed under Sho Shin.

Okinawa's troubles with the Japanese began in 1590 when the Prince of Satsuma requested Okinawa to send assistance to the Japanese in their war with Korea. The Okinawan king flatly refused to take part in the Korean aggression. The result was that in 1609, soon after the disastrous Korean war had ended, the Prince of Satsuma dispatched a fleet and an army against the Kingdom of Okinawa and rapidly subdued Amami O. Tokuno, and Okinoyeravu. He then landed on Okinawa and captured King Sho Nei. The captured king was removed to Japan where for several years he was entertained and flattered. He was then returned to Okinawa where he found the Japanese had taken over and had reorganized all the departments of government. They had exploited the country and had brought its golden age to an abrupt conclusion. The people were faced with abject poverty; the king was forced to cede the Amami O Gunto to Satsuma. Sho Nei died in 1620 and was succeeded by his capable son, Sho Ho, who was to prove himself a skillful diplomat and a wise ruler.

Suddenly the whole situation was altered. As a result of the Korean aggression China closed all her ports to Japanese vessels. This was a blow felt by all of Japan and by none more than the Prince of Satsuma. In 1636 the Tokugawa shogunate, then in control in Japan, clinched its policy of isolation by forbidding any foreign commerce, except for a few Dutch ships which were permitted under a special agreement with Holland. However, because of the status of the Kingdom of Okinawa, still under the control of the Prince of Satsuma, Japanese ships were allowed to enter and trade at Okinawan ports. This was a significant exception not only because of the benefit Okinawa was to derive from the concession, but also because it clearly showed that the Shogun did not then consider Okinawa a part of Japan. The exception was based on the then existing control of the islands by the Satsumese. Later developments were to clearly bear out this indication. The Shogun did not consider that his overlordship of Japan extended to the Kingdom of Okinawa after the reinstatement of the King, even though the Prince of Satsuma still exerted considerable control over all matters of importance both foreign and domestic.

Whether or not the idea was a product of Okinawan diplomats or arose from the desperation of the Prince of Satsuma who was certainly not in accord with the Shogun, or both, someone remembered the tributary relationship which had long existed between China and Okinawa before its interruption by the Satsumese invasion. However it came about, the Okinawan, as usual, worked a bad situation around to his own advantage. Tributary payment to China was resumed with the consent of the Satsumese, and Okinawan kings continued to receive investiture from China as well as from Japan. The Okinawans thus gained a monopoly on all non-Dutch foreign trade with Japan. Okinawan ships plied the seas as in former years, bringing products from China and other oriental lands for transshipment to Japan. The silver age of Okinawa, only slightly less renowned than the golden age of Sho Shin, had begun.

The Golden Age had been an age of strong Chinese influence. In a lesser manner the Silver Age was a period of Japanese influence, though Chinese emissaries were still received in the old Chinese audience chamber as in the days of Sho Shin. It is said that when the Chinese missions would arrive in Okinawan cities, the Japanese would withdraw from view, all stores would remove Japanese goods from sale, and all Japanese currency would be hidden away. This would continue for the period of Chinese visitation, after which the Japanese would return to sight, their goods would reappear and their currency would become again coin of the realm. It was during the Silver Age that Okinawan literature began to flourish. Hanezi Choshu wrote the first history of Okinawa. Okinawan opera or musical drama reached its height at this period also; more than a hundred of these have survived, the most popular of which are those of Tamagusuku Chokun and Tasato. The Silver Age also produced the novelist and short-story writer, Fishicha Chobin, and Onna Nabe, a poetess of great ability.

The great man of the age, however, was Gushi Chan. During his lifetime Satsumese interference was at a minimum because of the economically profitable expedient of keeping Okinawa satisfied if the Satsumese were to continue to have access to foreign goods and markets. Individual and national wealth were mounting rapidly. Under the leadership of Gushi Chan the nation embarked on a large program of forestation, soil conservation, crop improvements, and river control. He was also an authority in economics and under him Okinawa's share of the profits on transshipment of goods increased. He laid the foundation for a sound, national economy even after the days of prosperity, then enjoyed, had long been forgotten.

A number of factors entered into the decline that set in around the latter part of the seventeenth century. Conditions in Japan and China had steadily grown worse and buying power was not as great as it had once been. Much more modern ships than those of which Okinawa could boast had appeared from the western world and had gradually confined Okinawan trade entirely to transshipments from Japan to China, or vice versa. The beginning of the end was the appearance in Okinawan waters of foreign ships bent on opening trade relations with Japan, particularly attracted by the peculiar situation which existed between that country and Okinawa. In 1844 the French arrived, to be followed in 1846 by the British. Then in 1853 Commodore Matthew C. Perry of the American Navy arrived and was finally successful in concluding a treaty with King Sho Tai, as well as accomplishing his much better known mission of opening the doors of Japan and ending her long period of isolation.

With the restoration of the Meijis the Japanese began to think in terms of empire. The Kingdom of Okinawa was the first victim of the new Japanese program of expansion which had as its goal the domination of the orient. In 1871 the process of annexation was begun by the issuance of a proclamation attaching Okinawa to the Kagoshima prefecture. In 1872 Japan notified all foreign nations that she was annexing Okinawa and assuming responsibility for all foreign relations and treaties between that kingdom and other powers. King Sho Tai, last ruler of the Sho En dynasty, was reduced to the viceregal rank of Marquis. In 1879 he was taken to Tokyo to assure that no revolutionary movements would arise around his person. In the meantime, Okinawa was subjected to a very thorough reorganization of her government, judiciary, and law enforcing agencies. Social and economic changes were also instituted. In that same year Okinawa was reorganized as one of the prefectures of Japan. Naha became the capital, replacing the ancient capital of Shuri. Immediately there began an intense program of propaganda and education aimed at the complete integration of the island into the Japanese structure. However, an underground nationalistic movement came into existence and continued up until the time of the American invasion. It was vocal as late as 1940 when the prefectural librarian, Shimabuku, was removed from office for publicly denouncing the intensified attempts at Japanization which came with the war.

During World War II Okinawa served as a bastion of strength for the Japanese Empire. On April 1, 1945, the Americans invaded the island, and after heavy fighting and great losses captured it. They were greatly surprised to find themselves looked upon by many Okinawans as liberators rather than conquerors. This viewpoint has maintained throughout the occupation, despite the fact that nonfraternization has been more rigidly enforced there than anywhere else in the world. In 1946 a semblance of self-government was organized under the Army of Occupation, with Koshin Shikiya as Governor.

This is the story of the past of Okinawa. No one can now predict her future. In large measure, the future will be determined by the Pacific Peace Conference. Already there are indications that power politics will use Okinawa as a pawn. It is to be earnestly hoped that whatever decision is reached will be based upon the will of the Okinawans expressed in an internationally conducted plebiscite.

GARLAND EVANS HOPKINS.

Fourteen Years of Deposit Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York Sun of Saturday, May 22, and is evidence of a well-deserved tribute to a Government agency that has discharged its functions creditably. The editorial in fact is testimony to the business judgment and efficiency of the present Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Maple T. Harl, of Colorado, and to his predecessors, the Honorable Walter T. Cummings and the Honorable Leo T. Crowley, aided by such distinguished assistants as James E. Markham, Chief of the Division of Liquidation.

FOURTEEN YEARS OF DEPOSIT INSURANCE

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which guaranteed most of the deposits of 13,597 banks as of last December 31, is now 14 years old; its first 14 years have been characterized by generally excellent management and by absence of major banking panics. It might take such an unfortunate event, which now seems difficult to imagine, to prove whether the capital funds of the Corporation, now $1,006,089,000, are adequate to underwrite about $100,000,000,000 of bank deposits. With the recourse that the Corporation has to the Treasury for emergency funds, and with the huge capital it has amassed over 14 years from earnings and from assessments upon the insured banks, it is in a much better position to meet all possible obligations than it was in its early years, when the character of bank assets was poorer and the number of failures, now zero, was greater.

In the 14 years 407 insured banks had financial difficulty and closed; all but three required the aid of the FDIC. The 404 receiving aid had 1,323,977 depositors and $512,000,000 of deposits; 98 percent of those deposits were promptly made available without loss to the depositors. It cost the Corporation $26,769,000 in losses and liquidation expense to do this, plus its own operating costs of $51,661,000, but its 14-year net income after that outlay was $923,486,000. All but $82,604,000 of the original $150,000,000 capital supplied by the Treasury has been repaid. All the $139,000,000 additional capital originally supplied by the Federal Reserve banks has been repaid in full. It's a good record.

The Military-Controlled Selective Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I am inserting a statement by Roscoe S. Conkling, lieutenant colonel, Army of the United

States, World War II, member, Presidential Appeal Board, National Selective Service Headquarters, 1942–45:

Selective service during the last war was set up by Congress on the theory that local and appeal boards composed of civilians from the same communities as those to be drafted would decide who should remain at home to provide the necessary supplies and services and who should be sent into the military forces. Upon a registrant's actual induction into the Army, Selective Service officials were to relinquish jurisdiction over him entirely and the military was to take over, but until that moment military officials were to have nothing to say about him.

It has always been a fundamental of Americanism that the military be kept subject to civilian control—the very antithesis of a highly militarized Germany and other militarist-ruled nations. It was therefore quite natural for the Selective Service Law of 1940 to provide (sec. 1) (a) (2)): "The President * * * shall establish within the Selective Service system civilian local boards and such other civilian agencies, including appeal boards and agencies of appeal, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. * * * No member of any such local board shall be a member of the land or naval forces of the United States, but each member shall be a civilian who is a citizen of the United States. * * * Such local boards * * * shall have power within their respective jurisdictions to hear and determine, subject to the right of appeal to the appeal boards herein authorized, all questions or claims with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from training and service under this act of all individuals within the jurisdiction of such local boards. The decisions of such local boards shall be final except where an appeal is authorized. * * * Appeal boards and agencies of appeal within the Selective Service System shall be composed of civilians.

Section 10 (a) (3) provided for the appointment by the President of a Director of Selective Service and such others as he deemed necessary and, again emphasizing civilian controls, permitted the assignment or detail of active and retired or reserve officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard "to carry out the provisions of this act (except to offices or positions on local boards, appeal boards or agencies of appeal established or created pursuant to section 10 (a) (2)" of the act.

From the above it must be at once apparent that the execution of the Selective Service law, by the simplest and most clearly expressed statute law, was to be entirely and exclusively a civilian operation.

MILITARY OFFICERS TOOK OVER

Yet all the personnel having to do with "appeals to the President" were Army officers acting for and under the immediate command of a major general who was by the Chief Executive vested with final authority, even to overrule civilian appeal boards.

First of all, by Presidential regulation the governors of the States were made responsible for the execution and administraton of the law in their respective Commonwealths. Governors, of course, are civilians, but from the outset the part played by them was merely that of interested onlookers. The draft was administered in all its details from a Washington bureau, called National Headquarters of the Selective Service System, headed by one man whose every thought, desire, and whim was the law for most of the vast number of "officers" under his command throughout the States as well as at Washington. From the beginning of draft operations it was the outstanding effort of these "officers" not alone to aid in the administration of the Selective Service Act but to guess at and anticipate or conform with the personal viewpoint of the National Director of Selective Service and his chief executives whether that viewpoint were consonant with the law or not. The first Director of Selective Service was a civilian, Dykstra by name, whose term of office was short-lived and who long since has been forgotten. The reason his incumbency was so brief was that even before the actual enactment of the law, a group of Regular Army officers, then working at the War Department, took over and so completely asserted themselves that Mr. Dykstra started and ended his career in Selective Service as a mere figurehead.

A committee, known as the Army and Navy Procurement Committee, went about the country commissioning, subject to the Regular Army officer's approval, real estate operators, stock and bond salesmen, lawyers, insurance agents, and Government employees, most of whom were within draft age. With these and a host of newly commissioned young peacetime Reserve officers, together with a veteran of the last war here and there, the Washington headquarters quickly became a formidable group of colonels, lieutenant colonels, majors, a few captains, and occasionally a lieutenant. Nowhere could be found a "civilian" except among the clerical staffs. The civilian director soon resigned to be succeeded by a major as "acting Director" who in a matter of a few months found himself promoted to lieutenant colonel, colonel, brigadier general, major general, and finally, as a general, was named Director of Selectve Servce. At the end of the war there were about 150 military men in the Washington headquarters, mostly colonels and lieutenant colonels, with a few majors and captains.

VOLUME OF CONTRADICTORY DIRECTIVES CAME FROM MILITARY HEAD OF SELECTIVE SERVICE

It was an open secret among national headquarters personnel that the Washington Bureau was overstaffed and overorganized, as were most of the State headquarters; and that the extraordinary volume of administrative memoranda, local board releases, directives, and the never-ending new rules and regulations constantly emanating from the militarized national State headquarters, were so contradictory, confusing, and disturbing in their dictation of every imaginable detail that the hard-working, patriotic, and unpaid members of local and appeal boards time after time became desperate even to the point of resigning.

When a local or appeal board member saw in print a new regulation, it appeared impressive indeed. It was the law. But Presidential rules and regulations were made or changed almost daily by the simple process of one of the uniformed division heads of national headquarters merely dictating his ideas to his secretary and securing the draft director's, or one of his top colonels', often hastily written approval of it, thereby vesting in it the authority of the Government of the United States of America. The President was, in fact, never bothered with these matters; he never even discussed Presidential rules and regulations. All his authority and interest were delegated to the Director of Selective Service, a major general of the Regular Army.

For the first 39 months of the operation of the draft law—from September 16, 1940 until December 5, 1943—instead of the 6,442 local and their respective appeal boards of civilians throughout the country finally determining who should go into the Army and who should be deferred, the National Director of Selective Service himself became the final arbiter of a registrant's classification. Thus we had, in effect, a single Regular Army officer in Washington whose whim of the moment decided what classification a registrans should receive, whether he resided in Maine, Oregon, California, Florida, or any of the other 48 States of the Union.

"PRESIDENTIAL APPEALS" WERE ACTUALLY REFERRED TO THE GENERAL

This evasion of the law was accomplished by providing for appeals to the President from the decisions of appeal boards. Of course, the President never saw nor is it known that he ever expressed any desire to consider any of these appeals. An appeal to the President meant nothing more than an appeal from an appeal board decision—which according to the law should have been final—to the Director of Selective Service himself. Thus he personally was given the opportunity of deciding in any way he saw fit any registrant's case, for he was also authorized by his own self-made regulation to reach down into any appeal board and appeal its decisions to himself, ostensibly "on appeal to the President." He established a group of commissioned officers to review and recommend in the approximately 30,000 appeals taken under this usurpation of authority up to December 5, 1943, but while these recommending officers were hard working and conscientious men, they were in many instances rigorously bound by the Director's trends of thought, and in most instances recommended what they guessed he wanted or what he definitely made known to them was the way certain types of cases should be decided. These "Presidential decisions," when returned to the State directors, gave them the ideas of how their superior officer (for all State directors were brigadier generals, colonels, majors, captains, etc., under command of the major general, Director of Selective Service) felt about things, and thus his desires filtered down to the appeal and local boards. If by chance an appeal board had different ideas and refused to conform with trends emanating from the Director's Washington headquarters, the State director or the Director himself could appeal to the President, and the National Draft Director on appeal to the President would reverse them and that was that. Thus in effect the classification of registrants rather than legally being ordered by civilian local and appeal boards was in fact determined, whenever it was deemed desirable, by a Regular Army general in Washington, and the idea of civilians controlling their communities' selective service operations became an empty theory.

For example, a New York City policeman had no more right to deferment from military service under the law than did a drug store clerk or a subway guard unless the local and appeal boards of his jurisdiction decided under the circumstances and existing conditions he should not be taken from his job, and as we have seen, "The decisions of such local boards should be final, subject to the right of appeal to the appeal boards herein authorized." Mayor LaGuardia's administration, however, felt that they were beyond the law and didn't want their municipal organization interfered with. So a deal was made by Mayor LaGuardia and the Washington Selective Service Bureau by which all New York City policemen of 2 years or more of service in the police department, irrespective of their age and military liability, should not be drafted. Many local and appeal board members felt they had good and sufficient reason for denying deferment to stalwart young policemen since it inevitably meant sending someone else to war in their places, and ignoring directives, held them I–A. Moreover, they read the law and found that their decision was final. But the State director, a brigadier general, or the New York City director, a colonel, appealed such cases of nonconforming appeal board members direct to the National Director, ostensibly to the President. That done, the local and appeal boards' decision was entirely disregarded and the LaGuardia-National Director agreement, irrespective of the merits of the case, was honored, the policemen stayed home from war, and someone, perhaps the drug store

clerk or the subway guard, was inducted into the Army in his place and stead.

"REPLACEMENT SCHEDULE CLASSIFICATIONS" BYPASSED CIVILIAN BOARDS

A flagrant repudiation of the law was the innovation of "replacement schedule classifications." A new set of Presidential regulations suddenly issued by the Director of Selective Service in the fall of 1942 transferred the function of classification of registrants from the civilian local and appeal boards to the National director, State director, and any employer engaging other than in agriculture, more than a prescribed number of men.

The employer took his list of draft-aged employees to the general or colonel who happened to be the State director of the State wherein his business was located. Employer and State director talked over the list, the employer bargaining with the State official that he would release, by not seeking industrial deferment for them, certain registrants at once or in 30, 60, or 90 days; certain others, 6 months hence, and others in over 6 months. On what basis favoritism, or how much bargaining was indulged in, was not vouchsafed the local or appeal boards. When the State director and the employer arrived at an agreement the employer's replacement schedule, which was evidence of the agreement, was filed at State headquarters. For every registrant the State director and employer had agreed should be deferred, the latter then promptly filed with the local board a prescribed form (42A) requesting the 30, 60, 90-day, 6-month, or more-than-6-month deferment arranged for, and stamped it "replacement schedule accepted as of (date of agreement)." This meant that the State director had agreed that this registrant should be deferred for the time indicated no matter what the local or appeal board thought of it, and some other registrant must be substituted for him in the monthly quota call. Completely gone was any thought of the civilian boards deciding who should go to war and who should be deferred and remain at least temporarily at home on his job. In fact, the State director, a military officer, was set up as the classifying authority.

Now before the replacement schedule edict was issued the employer had in most if not in all instances already filed the 42A form requesting deferment and setting forth his reasons therefor as every seeker of deferment because of industrial occupation had been required to do since the beginning of the draft in September of 1940. The local board had examined it, inquired into the registrant's "necessity"—which had to be established to its satisfaction—held hearings, perhaps inspected the employer's plant and tried in every way to make a just decision in order that if actually necessary to a necessary industry the man be left there, but if not, then be called into service rather than that another be sent in his place—the backbone of the selective service theory from its origin in 1917 being that no man should be sent to war in another man's place. If the local board decided the registrant was not "necessary" to industry, the employer could appeal. The law said the appeal board decision was final. Under the replacement schedule edict of the Washington bureau, however, it made no difference whether both local and appeal boards agreed unanimously that the registrant should not be deferred. The State director and the employer's decision must be upheld.

One State director, for instance, insisted, against the unanimous opposition of the local and appeal boards, that a dog food maker was necessary to the war effort and should be deferred since he had approved it by way of a replacement schedule. And the draft director of New York City appealed to the President insisting that his decision deferring as necessary to the winning of the war a young buyer of one of New York's fashionable ladies' sportswear establishments should be upheld because he had approved it via replacement schedule operations. Occasionally meritless contentions were lost on Presidential appeal, replacement schedules notwithstanding, but the great majority were not.

FARM WORKERS DRAFTED DESPITE LAW

On November 13, 1942, Congress, fearing the inroads the draft was making in the ranks of young and necessary farm workers, and seeking to preserve the food supply of the Nation, amended the law (by the Tydings amendment) to read that, "Every registrant found * * * to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation * * * essential to the war effort, shall be deferred * * * until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained." That law by its unequivocal wordage ordered draft boards to stop drafting farm workers until the farmers could obtain satisfactory replacements for them, and thus maintain uninterrupted food production. Four days after the law became effective the Washington draft headquarters, deciding this enactment should be executed only in accordance with its own ideas, by local board memorandum No. 164 officially notified every local board throughout the country that "in the classification of registrants engaged in agriculture local boards will apply the provisions of the Tydings amendment * * * the regulations, and this memorandum"—meaning this "directive." And "this memorandum" directed that the only registrants who "may be considered" for agricultural deferment are those "for whom it is established that a suitable replacement cannot be obtained." Farmers in the agricultural sections of the country whose lands were becoming unproductive and their livestock neglected because of labor shortages insisted to the local boards that their helpers be deferred as the law provided "until a satisfactory replacement could be obtained," but were shown the National Draft Bureau's directive rewriting the statute and informed that they must then and there establish that a "suitable replacement cannot be obtained." Of course, with the high wages of war plants luring every available worker, a great scarcity of every type prevailed and farmers could not compete with the wage scale offered by shipyards and other war suppliers.

And so the farmer, put to the impossible task of proving that a suitable (the act said "satisfactory") replacement could not be obtained, saw his helper promptly drafted into the Army by the Washington Bureau's directive which rewrote and defeated the letter and intent of an act of Congress. Thousands and thousands of farm workers were, by the wording of that directive, removed from agriculture.

With food shortages and prices soaring, it has been estimated that 2,000,000 young men inducted into military service from the farms were not returning after their discharge from the services.

DRAFT LAW CHANGED TO CONFORM TO MILITARY POLICIES

Many attempts at court action following alleged draft illegalities in the building of our citizen Armies and Navy proved futile because the courts decided they could not review acts of administrative agencies.

In any event, in December of 1943, over 20,000,000 men having been registered and most of them classified by Army officers' arbitrary commands, the legislative section of the Selective Service National Headquarters prevailed upon Congress to so amend the draft law that in a large measure the statute was made to conform with the practices built up by this military bureau in evasion or irrespective of its original provisions, rather than conforming practices to the law.

To a military mind a superior's order is an order. The Director of Selective Service, who was unquestionably an able man, was nevertheless prodded constantly by the War Department for more and more men. His was a trained military mind. The order must be obeyed, law or no law.

One result of the military control of selective service was the discovery one morning in April 1944 that the Army had 300,000 more inducted men than the Army thought it had—300,000 American civilians. That had been due to the "directive" induction of so many who would otherwise have been deferred during late 1943 and early 1944, had the draft been civilian operated as the original law prescribed. Orders had been obeyed blindly, ruthlessly, all down the line. The Director had obeyed his superiors' orders to take legions from their homes, and multitudes had to be sent back after giving up their jobs, planning for their families while away, and arranging the many things necessarily involved in a prolonged if not permanent absence with the armed forces in wartime. Many of these registrants were later called back into service after the Army heads had taken time to reorient themselves and correct their errors.

The ease, speed, and finality with which the Washington military hierarchy took over selective service during the last war should warn our citizenry that the American tradition of supreme civilian control of this Nation is in jeopardy; that militarism has passed the creeping stage and is now on the march.

Mundt-Nixon Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include a very informative radio address by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER]:

THE MUNDT BILL

(Transcript of speech on the Mundt-Nixon bill delivered by the Honorable HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, of Pennsylvania, over National Broadcasting Co. network Friday evening, May 21, 1948)

The Mundt bill, which was passed by the House of Representatives on Wednesday, raises issues as fundamental as any which the country has faced since the Constitution was adopted in 1789. I was one of those who opposed the Mundt bill on the floor and voted against it. I do not think I have to explain that I am opposed to communism in principle, and practice, and am aware of its dangers.

The issues which the Mundt bill raise are fundamental, in my opinion, because they go to the very heart of the democratic process, which is freedom of speech. The wise men who founded this country in the eighteenth century had in their own lifetime gone through a bitter struggle to preserve freedom of speech. To make their victory secure, in this country, they wrote into the Constitution, as the first amendment, a declaration that the Congress of the United States might not abridge "the freedom of speech or of the press or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for redress of grievances."

Now, 159 years later, this same old problem of the power of the Government to curb free expression confronts us in a new guise.

Communism asserts that the way to progress and prosperity lies through the estab-

lishment of a dictatorship which will impose by force a uniformity of opinion and political belief. As citizens of a free country, we repudiate this idea. We know that it is false—false in logic and false in history. How shall we combat it?

The answer which the Mundt bill gives is that we shall fight it with its own weapons and deprive it of freedom of speech, giving it exactly the same treatment which it has in store for us should it succeed. In other words, the Mundt bill proposes to make it illegal to advocate communism in the United States.

Now, to my mind, this is a fatal error. This means that we sacrifice our traditions in order to preserve them. It is nonsense, and dangerous nonsense.

The proponents of the Mundt bill will tell you very seriously that the bill does not do this. They say they have tried to draw a bill which will curb communism without endangering our constitutional liberty. They say the bill does not outlaw the Communist Party. I say that in these contentions they are wrong, and I can prove it from the bill itself. Here is what it does:

The first section describes the world Communist movement and says that its aim is to establish a totalitarian dictatorship in all the countries of the world. It says further that these dictatorships are to be under the control of a world Communist movement which has its headquarters in a country which we know to be the Soviet Union. I do not disagree with these findings.

The bill then goes on to describe a Communist political organization, which is an organization under the control of the world Communist movement and having the same objectives, namely, to establish totalitarian dictatorships. The bill then lays down rules requiring Communist political organizations to register with the Attorney General. When they register they must list the names of all their members and leaders.

Up to this point, I agree that the Communist Party is not outlawed. But then comes the stinger; section 4 of the bill makes it a crime, punishable by $10,000 fine and 10 years in jail and loss of United States citizenship, to act in any manner with intent to establish a totalitarian dictatorship under Communist control in the United States. Notice the words "any manner." That means writing, or speaking, or offering a constitutional amendment, or running for Congress, on a Communist platform. Now, the leaders and members of the Communist Party do these things. Their names are disclosed under the registration provision of the bill. And the inescapable conclusion is that the Department of Justice must prosecute every single one of them for a crime.

This is not all. If the Communist Party does not register with the Attorney General, as required by the act, and the leaders of the Communist Party have already announced that they will not register, then section 10 of the act provides that they all must be prosecuted in the courts for remaining as members of the Communist Party. Thus, the bill exposes all Communists to criminal prosecution either way—if the Communist Party registers and if it does not register. Once this bill becomes law, it will be a crime in the United States to be a member of the Communist Party.

To my mind, this is outlawing the Communist Party, and I do not see why the proponents of the bill try to gloss over this fact. It is there in plain unmistakable language.

The question remains, is such outlawry a good thing or not? The weight of opinion says it is not. FBI Director Hoover says it is not; Attorney General Clark says it is not; so does President Truman; so does Senator Taft; so does Governor Dewey; and also, by implication, so do the members of the House Un-American Activities Committee. Why do these distinguished people feel this way?

In the first place, such outlawry is unconstitutional. The freedom of expression which is the foundation stone of democracy, laid by our forefathers in the first amendment, means freedom to express ideas, even if they are unpopular, dangerous, even subversive. This is the principle our forefathers bled and died for, and this is the principle which has made our country great.

This does not mean that we are defenseless against communism. Far from it. Governor Dewey has counted 27 laws which can be used against Communists when they get out of bounds and indulge in illegal behavior. They can be prosecuted for sabotage, espionage, conspiracy to overthrow the Government. They can be compelled under the Federal Corrupt Practices Act to disclose their contributions and their political expenditures. We have laws to protect the security of the United States. It is not necessary to indulge in dangerous unconstitutional experiments.

In the second place, outlawing the Communist Party, as the Mundt bill does, is dangerous because it will drive the Communists further underground where they will be harder to reach.

There is another danger which this bill carries, and that is a danger to liberal and progressive organizations which may, under the complicated procedures of the bill, be accused of being Communist fronts.

There are organizations which are actually created and controlled by the Communist Party and fraudulently set before the public as innocent institutions. On the other hand, many bona fide organizations have at one time or another been infiltrated by Communists, but these bona fide organizations have succeeded in throwing out all communistic sympathizers. The House Un-American Activities Committee has never made any distinction between these two types of organizations. It has smeared anti-Communists who have been fighting communism within the ranks of bona fide organizations. The procedures of the Mundt bill, in my opinion, do not clear up the confusion which the Un-American Activities Committee has done so much to create in this field. The bill gives the Attorney General tremendous powers in the vaguest kind of language. There is grave danger that he will smear innocent citizens as Communist fronts, and it is certain that the Un-American Activities Committee will be constantly pressuring him to do so.

Aside from the fact that this bill violates our basic political ideas, my greatest objection to it is, that it seems to me the wrong way to handle communism.

The greatest strength of the Communist Party lies not in its methods of conspiracy, nor in its foreign ties, nor its practices of treachery or deceit, but in its appeal to the victims of social injustice and economic hardship, and to those who desire to better the condition of their fellowmen. The best attack against communism is to prove that this appeal is a hollow fraud; to show that the Communist Party is not truly concerned with social reform and that the measures and tactics which it advocates are not capable of achieving it.

I believe that the democratic ideal on which this Nation was founded is still strong enough to defeat the undemocratic principles of communism. There are many others who feel as I do. Many organizations, such as Americans for Democratic Action, who are strongly opposed to communism, have aided in the fight against the bill. I do not believe that we have to violate our own principles in order to destroy communism. I think we can do the job much better, if we rely on our own traditions, protecting ourselves as we must from crime and violence, but meeting false political ideas with true political ideas, and working constantly to create a better life for all Americans.

Wainwright Shipyard, Panama City, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 26 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a premature and incomplete report on the Wainwright shipyard, at Panama City, Fla., by the War Investigating Committee, did an injustice to that shipyard. That has been pointed out in a protest made by the Chamber of Commerce of Panama City, which was published in the Panama City (Fla.) Herald. I ask unanimous consent that the chamber of commerce correction, as it appears in the newspaper article, of that premature and inaccurate report, may be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE PROTESTS SENATE REPORT ON WAINWRIGHT—UNFINISHED INVESTIGATION WAS CONDUCTED BEFORE COMPANY HIT STRIDE, BOARD SAYS

A Senate investigating committee's report that Panama City Shipyard man-hours and costs were excessive, irrespective of contribution in merchant tonnage, today was protested by directors of the Panama City Chamber of Commerce, and Florida's Representatives in Congress were asked to clarify and remedy the damaging statements.

Charging that the report of the Senate committee was only half finished and misleading statements do Panama City area and the J. A. Jones Construction Co. untold damage, the trade board directors countered with excerpts from a Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta report which shows rapid reduction in time and costs after the yard swung into full-time production.

YARD IN INFANCY

The Senate committee report, said chamber of commerce officials, showed that the investigation did not extend past April 30, 1944, when the yard practically was in its infancy.

"For several months we have been hearing stories circulated by official Government agencies as well as private firms, that they were not interested in Panama City as an industrial service center because of the bad record made in costs and man-hours during ship-construction days," said officials.

"Cost in man-hours and dollars was excessive, and Panama City had the highest man-hours of any yard constructing Liberty ships, and was second highest in cost," was the general theme of often-repeated stories coming into the chamber office.

"At first," said directors, "we were not concerned since it is a known fact and one of record that at the final point of production the J. A. Jones Construction Co., and its workers, was commended by the Maritime Commission for having the second least cost in man-hours and total production cost of any temporary six-ways Liberty shipyard in the Nation.

"However, we finally instigated an investigation which showed the statements were obtained from a report by the Senate special committee investigating the national defense program and was entitled 'Merchant Shipping Senate Report No. 10, Part 18, Eighty-seventh Congress, Second Session.'"

MISLEADING

The report stopped short in April 1944. "Consequently," said trade board directors,

"it is misleading to the extent that any person reading the conclusion reached by the committee would obviously think that the labor found in the Panama area was neither adequate nor able."

In refutation of the comment, the Chamber quoted from the monthly review of the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta issued on December 31, 1945.

The report, entitled "Reconversion in Panama City" contains a full and acceptedly-authentic survey of the production cost over entire operation of the J. A. Jones Construction Co.

The statement (from Federal Reserve Bank) is as follows:

"Man-hours per hull were reduced from 1,408,680 in November 1943 to 530,000 in November 1944.

"During the same period, the number of days a ship remained on the ways before launching, was reduced from an average of 134 days to 42 days, and the number of days in the outfitting dock declined from 29 to 15.

"Later on, production time was reduced still further. The last Liberty ship was launched in 30 days and outfitted in nine."

Directors here pointed out that "even this report did not take into consideration the fact that the company and its employees were required to change from Liberty ships to tankers, to aircraft cargo carriers, and back to Liberty ships during latter part of its operation. Nor does it include the fact that the company was required to take other ships off other companys' ways and finish them.

"Further proof of the fact that the report issued by the Senate investigating committee is misleading, exists in the fact that at the time their report was concluded, the *Samuel G. French* was launched (April 22, 1944) after requiring 668,549.01 construction hours, while the *Edwin H. Duff*, coming after all the above-mentioned change overs and delivered on July 27, 1945, took only a total of 448,822 hours, or a reduction of 33⅓ per cent over the last ship delivered in the period covered by the Senate committee's report," declared directors of the chamber of commerce.

The Federal Reserve bank statement further stated that "from January 1944 to August 1944, the Jones Co. reduced employment from 15,000 to 10,500 and at the same time they increased total production about 50 percent."

Trade board directors concluded: "The evidence as contained in this half-finished report of the Senate investigating committee has done untold damage to the entire area, since its evidence has been taken as conclusive when actually it told only a portion of the story.

"In view of the fact that authentic statistics are available which show that the Panama City area and its labor, fuel, management, public housing assistance, cooperative attitude of citizens, transportation facitities, etc., provided one of the outstanding wartime production jobs in the country, we request that our representatives in Washington see that this report be labeled as it should be—'incomplete'—and that a statement be issued correcting the erroneous impression it has given."

Taft-Ellender-Wagner Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, which was unanimously adopted by the Lemuel T. Boydston Post, No. 94, of the American Legion in Cleveland, Ohio, at its regular meeting on May 3, 1948:

Whereas the absence of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for veterans is one of the most pressing needs of the country—becoming more acute every day; and

Whereas to meet this problem the United States Senate has passed a comprehensive bill, known as the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, which provides, among other things, provision for FHA insurance up to 95 percent of the construction costs of veteran cooperative housing; construction of low-rent housing, as well as special provisions for paraplegic veteran cases; and

Whereas the American Legion national commander, James F. O'Neil, was a sponsor of favorable passage of this legislation in the department convention of his home State of New Hampshire, which convention did endorse the bill prior to his election as national commander; and

Whereas National Commander O'Neil has appointed as a new chairman of the American Legion National Housing Committee, Walter Allesendroni, of Philadelphia, who advocated before the Pennsylvania department convention favorable action on this bill, and this department did also endorse the bill; and

Whereas the housing problems for veterans in this and other communities of the Nation demand immediate attention: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Lemuel T. Boydston Post, No. 94, hereby approves passage of Taft-Ellender-Wagner national housing bill; be it further

Resolved, That the Ohio delegation to Congress and more specifically the Honorable FRANCES PAYNE BOLTON, Hon ROBERT CROSSER, Hon. GEORGE BENDER, and Hon. MICHAEL FEIGHAN be and are hereby petitioned to do everything within their power to bring about early passage of this bill by the House of Representatives; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to each of the above representatives and copies sent to the daily and weekly newspapers; be it further

Resolved, That copy of this resolution be sent to Cuyahoga County Council with request for approval by the House of Representatives, and forwarding, through channels, to the Legion National Headquarters.

Unanimously passed at regular meeting of the Lemuel T. Boydston Post, No. 94, American Legion, Monday, May 3, 1948.

CHARLES L. NUNN,
Commander.
LA PLACE F. TURNER,
Adjutant.

The American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that our young people should be encouraged in every way possible to take an active part and interest in our democratic form of government and to realize the many benefits we all enjoy because of it. It is not enough merely to provide formal education for each generation, as too often a real appreciation of our democratic processes escape us unless we can participate in, and learn more about, this Government of the United States.

I sponsored a contest for the high-school students of the Sixth Texas District to encourage these young people to record their thoughts on important topics. I am proud to announce the winner of the essay contest in Hill County, which was so ably conducted by County Superintendent J. C. McKamie. Miss Virginia Woodruff, of the Abbott High School, Abbott, Tex., has been declared the winner, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include her essay entitled "The American Way of Life":

THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

(By Virginia Woodruff, Abbott, Tex.)

The American way of life is based upon the democratic form of self-government. Since the beginning of America, men have fought to secure their individual liberties and their rights—even from the first group of men who drew up the Articles of Confederation. The men of America kept on working until the original Constitution of the United States was written. The Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, is our fundamental doctrine of faith. The Constitution, the supreme law of the land, promises us our constitutional rights.

America is not a dictatorship. Democracy and discipline work hand in hand. Elections take place in wartime or any other time without disturbances. The individual who loses the election falls into line and follows the majority of the people. The American people are very cooperative. Anyone may criticize and openly denounce Congress, the President, or even the Supreme Court, provided they do not slander or libel individual persons. People have freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of press, and the right to assemble peaceably and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

The people all over the United States work in unison in whatever they do. Everything is unified. From New York to Seattle most Americans speak the same language, read the same magazines, and have the same standards of living and the same philosophy of life. Public opinion is usually of continental magnitude. Standard towns are all over the United States—that is, a town with its 5- and 10-cent store, its red A & P market, its neo-Gothic churches, and the colonnade of its local bank. The farmers, tradesmen, storekeepers, school teachers, loggers, factory hands, and other workers are distributed all over the country. There is less bitterness than in any other country.

American society is not exactly without class, but privilege is kept down. You are expected to be a citizen; nothing more, nothing less. You are not supposed to get ahead of the next fellow in line. Most Americans want comfort for their families, health, the opportunity to build their own security, the leisure to relax, friends to enjoy, and time to live. They do not want to be pushed around. They do not want to push anyone else around. They are not afraid of any future; they have a hand in shaping—and are willing to take a hand, or do their part. Americans are ready to join in any reasonable scheme for international organization. It is not out of kindness or pity that one should help others. It is in self-defense. A country cannot remain secure and prosperous in a disparing, panic-stricken world.

The real America is the giant that the world looked up to—a giant that could produce the miracle of victory. American principles can be discovered in London, France, or Russia. In these places you may see an American flag or some other symbol of America.

America—successful in the field of culture—is dominant in the field of production.

Because of the progress of applied science there is close association between industry and culture. The fact that the Nation is peace loving is one reason for its success; another reason is its scientific organization.

A greater percentage of Americans complete university courses of study than any other people of the world. America is a land of public libraries, beautiful art museums, and symphony orchestras. Americans are familiar with good literature, paintings, and music.

This sweet land of liberty is called the land of plenty. There are huge wheat harvests; timber sufficient to house decently every American and enough to rebuild most of Europe; steel, copper, and aluminum surpassing the combined production of all the rest of the world; grass for several hundred million sheep and cattle; hydroelectric plants droning out 70,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy. There is a chance for general prosperity. There are ample goods for everyone. The Americans possess half a continent with nearly all essential resources necessary for production of goods. By this unique combination the Americans have built the highest standard of living ever known and this they have called the pursuit of happiness.

"Liberty," said the late beloved William Allen White, "is the only thing you cannot have unless you are willing to give it to others."

The rattlesnake of the western country is typical of an American. He moves his own way, takes his part in life, and usually goes unnoticed. However, if his security is in danger, he coils swiftly, and usually tells the world he will fight for his way of life. We, the people, go soberly upon our common way, giving and taking—but once our security is in danger, we are ready to fight.

Yes, ours is the American way of life. It has not come to us easily; it has been shaped by Americans through their sweat, their tears, and their blood. As a token of our appreciation, we swear that those who gave their lives shall not have lived in vain.

Summing up the American way of life, we should be proud of America, proud of her strength, her resources, her people, and her future. Yes, and, proud without fear.

Now the Sun Never Sets on British Perfidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under consent, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD another brilliant editorial from the pen of T. O. Thackrey, editor and publisher of the New York Post, which precisely expresses the opinion that millions of Americans hold in regard to Great Britain, together with specific and practicable suggestions for American action.

In plain words, Great Britain is waging a cold war of her own against American interests more dangerous and more subtle than anything being done by any other of our wartime allies, and it is high time that the United States should be as pugnacious with Great Britain as with any other country.

The British Empire, regardless of the political coloration of its temporary government in the United Kingdom, is waging a desperate struggle to survive in a world for which it is no longer fitted; the ancient saurian monsters disappeared from earth eons ago in the same way when their environment would no longer support their huge bulk.

I have gone along with proposals to protect the Empire against a collapse which might take down with it the economic stability of the world; but to prevent economic collapse we do not have to subsidize vicious immorality of the kind now being publicly displayed by depraved British statesmen.

NOW THE SUN NEVER SETS ON BRITISH PERFIDY

(By T. O. Thackrey)

Defiance and delay. Anything, in fact, that will contribute to advancing achievement of the goal of Great Britain and her Arabian allies and puppets in the Middle East—death to Jews, and death to the new nation of Israel.

This is the pattern and this is the continuing program underwritten by the bitter British, who have decided to ruin where they could not rule.

In that decision, Great Britain has become so determined to encourage the invasion of Palestine and the destruction of the nation over which she exercised a League of Nations mandate with our consent for 30 long years, that she has become completely reckless of the consequences, even to her, of wrecking the United Nations in order to appease and aggrandize the war-making Arab league.

Mr. Bevin's hostile and suicidal policy has as a corollary the deliberate stirring up in Great Britain of the counterpart of Hitler's anti-Semitic diatribes which preceded the war on the world of that Nazi machine, in which he was so ably assisted throughout that war by the British-made ex-Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, now Britain's ally in the war to complete the extermination of Jews in the Middle East—and elsewhere.

In London, and in the United Nations, the British policy is so completely without honor, justice, or reason beyond blind hatred married to cupidity, that the neatest hypocrisy of the age has been concocted in a bootless effort to confuse the issue, and these shameful perversions have been mouthed, by instruction of Mr. Bevin, by men of greater character and deeper integrity, who should have proved their continued possession of both by resignation rather than stultification.

When the Foreign Office spokesman for this once respected Empire issues statements declaring that his Government cannot cease arming and supplying and leading its Arab puppets in this unholy war until or unless the United Nations brands the Arab states formally as aggressors, at the same time that the British Ambassador in the United Nations is leading the fight against such a declaration in the face of overwhelming evidence to the contrary, the malicious deviousness of the policy is obvious.

When, in addition, Great Britain's spokesmen imply that they would join to stop this assault on the very meaning of the United Nations Charter outlawing aggressive war—if the Security Council so voted—and in the same breath let it be known that Great Britain would exercise her Security Council veto to prevent action to stop the aggression, there is no other word so descriptive and meaningful as perfidy.

It is a tragedy written deep into the blood-soaked sands of Palestine that from November 29 until May 16 the United States of America permitted consideration of private oil profit and of a surface amity with Great Britain to join in the delaying action and accept British policy leadership—and befuddlement—in turning away from enforcement of the will of the majority of the world's nations known as the General Assembly.

It would be a catastrophe if the dogged and violent antagonism to the United Nations' effectiveness toward the Jews, toward Israel, and now toward the United States being enflamed by Mr. Bevin should again succeed in turning us from the honorable and just course we have been pursuing for the past 9 days.

We have been too patient with the dark empirical schemes of our wartime ally and debtor, and with the forgetful Chinese and the bamboozled Belgian Ambassadors who have allied themselves with the UN wreckers.

After lifting our embargo on arms to permit Israel to defend her people from history's most wicked and unfair assault, we should proceed at once to these positive steps to make it clear that our actions match our professed beliefs:

1. Land American marines and Air Force contingents in Jerusalem to protect American life and property and the religious shrines of the world's faiths, against destruction, and offer to place these forces under the command of the military committee of the Security Council to enforce the peace decisions of the United Nations until substitute force can be found.

2. Offer Israel at least the minimum lend-lease material and military aid being poured into China, Greece, and Turkey—none of whom face the type and kind of threat surrounding Israel, ringed about by the armies of five invading United Nations members whom Britain has joined in tearing up the action clauses of the United Nations Covenant.

3. Demand an accounting of all lend-lease supplies and equipment now being used by Great Britain to replace arms being shipped to the Arab war-makers, in order to transfer these supplies to Israel.

4. Take joint action by the United States Senate and House in refusing appropriations for ERP assistance to Great Britain, China, or Belgium until those nations demonstrate that they are using their own resources constructively for peace—rather than supporting the bloody, destructive warfare launched with their approval in Palestine.

5. Demand—not suggest—removal of Egyptian, Iraq, Transjordan, Syrian, Lebanese, and Yemenite armies from the soil of Palestine, whether they are tresspassing on Arab Palestine, Israel Palestine, or both.

6 Demonstrate unequivocally that the United States of America will take any action required, alone if need be, in concert with other nations if possible, to uphold the Charter of the United Nations and keep its covenants and decisions inviolate—whether the defiance of world peace comes from the east or the west—middle eastern Arabia or London.

Mr. Speaker, I am including also a brief news item from the same edition of the Post which shows that enlightened public opinion in England is not in sympathy with the Bevin policies.

A BRITISH VIEW OF WHAT BRITAIN SHOULD DO

Reviewing developments in Palestine, the New Statesman, a British weekly journal of opinion, say that "the question now is not whether Israel will survive but on what terms will it live together with its neighbors."

The New Statesman, quoted today in a release of the British Information Services, an agency of the British Government, adds that in consequence "the task of the British Government is not difficult to discern.

"In the first place, evacuation, begun under conditions of most sensible cooperation between the British field commanders, and Haganah, must be completed as soon as possible.

"In the second place, a clear directive must be given to Abdullah. In the eyes of everyone in the Middle East, the Arab Legion is a British instrument and our policy will be judged by its behavior. We should give instructions that it should limit its military

operations to policing areas allotted to the Arabs under the partition plan."

"The recognition of Israel, by both the United States and Russia," the magazine continued, "has rendered it virtually impossible for the Arabs, even if they were militarily strong enough, to liquidate the Jewish state in defiance of the two world powers. The Mufti's dream, shared by millions of Arabs throughout the world, has been shattered."

Are We To Repeat the International Trade Blunders Following World War I?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, recently I have received communications asking me to support H. R. 6556, which is the Gearhart bill brought before the House today under a gag rule with no opportunities of amendment. Some of my constituents asked me to support the Gearhart bill and to extend the reciprocal trade-agreements program longer than a period of 1 year by amending the Gearhart bill. Under the gag rule today, there was, of course, no possibility of amending this bill.

I take it that those constituents whom I have just mentioned were friends of the reciprocal agreements program, fathered by Cordell Hull and constituting the basic feature of our commercial policy in international affairs during the past 14 years. I find it necessary to vote against the final passage of H. R. 6556, and I wish to make this word of explanation to my constituents who have asked me to support the reciprocal trade agreements program and to continue it.

This bill, H. R. 6556, was brought before us today under a gag rule which means no amendments could be offered. It is called an extension of the reciprocal trade program, and I fear some of the friends of that program may be deceived by its name and by its preamble, for it clearly says: "A bill to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes." I feel that in reality this is a Republican measure really designed to end the reciprocal trade agreements program.

I say this because extending it for 1 year in time only, instead of 3 years as formerly, will be virtually the same as no extension at all. Not only that, but this bill contains some tricky provisions in its 1-year extension which would change the nature of the program completely, and this is done, not by the friends of the reciprocal trade program, but by its avowed enemies. This Gearhart bill looks in the direction of Republican high tariffism of years ago.

It is surprising that so many Republicans supported the Marshall plan and yet are now favoring this legislation which undoubtedly will run counter to the Marshall plan. Sensible and broadly drawn foreign trade relations is the very heart of the Marshall plan—and without reciprocal trade relations the Marshall plan will be ineffective. This Republican move looks very much to me like the Republican policy of the twenties, which encouraged sending American dollars abroad, but forbade foreign goods admission here.

We know the result of getting the Old World in debt to America, and then refusing any steps on the part of the Old World to pay that debt. It is not a good thing to send our dollars abroad to build up industries, and especially war industries, to be used against us. Neither is it good policy for America to refuse beneficial trade with a rehabilitated Old World. There is a middle ground, and a wisely administered reciprocal trade program is needed to cover that middle ground. In my judgment, H. R. 6556 is not a measure designed or capable of meeting that need.

Crisis in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, there is a crisis in human events in Palestine today. American prestige and honor are at stake in the Middle East; and at stake also are the very lives of a million Jews who are attempting to create in the sands of Araby a democracy very similar to our own here in the United States.

The question is, will the British Empire, as usual, sacrifice national honor to expediency?

Under leave, I am inserting several editorials from New York newspapers on the subject, and also a press release from the Mizrachi Organization of America covering a reception in my honor Monday afternoon:

[From New York Post of May 24, 1948]

NOW IS THE HOUR

(By T. O. Thackrey)

Arab shells and bombs, supplied by Great Britain with American tax funds, are blasting away at Hebrew University and Hadassah Hospital in Jerusalem, among other objectives.

These two institutions are wholly American owned.

If we are not sufficiently moved by humanitarian considerations for the lives of the people being destroyed by the murderous invaders, what has become of the principle of protection of American property from the enemies of peace?

At no other time in American history has our Government been even-tempered and patient with assaults by outlaws on the American flag or the institutions over which it legitimately flies, or the human beings over which its protection is presumptive.

The President's heartening note to the hostile Arab sovereigns and to Great Britain's puppet state of Transjordan made it clear that there is no distinction to be tolerated among American citizens with respect to their creed, color, or race.

It is time to apply that injunction with respect to citizens and wholly American-owned institutions in the battle zones as well.

It does not even require the long-overdue lifting of the arms embargo, which prevents Israel from adequately arming her citizen soldiers in defense of the world's newest democratic nation, to act and act promptly in taking the necessary steps to protect these and other institutions from destruction by armies bent on conquest.

The President can, and should without further delay, order the defense forces in the Middle East—which include vastly superior naval contingents and naval and Army Air Force contingents within striking distance, and the traditional United States Marines, to effect a landing in force in Jerusalem without delay to afford the basic protection for which our defense forces have been so highly organized.

This is not a United Nations matter, nor does it require time-wasting considerations of protocol and weary debate. Direct action to protect basic American interests, when the threat is not merely imminent but when the fact is well established, is not only within our right but a clear first duty.

Certainly this action in itself will restore a measure of peace to the Holy City and afford some opportunity for a cessation of the bloody assaults which are reducing the mecca of the world's great religions to blood-stained rubble, all because of the murderous determination of Arab invaders to let nothing stand in the way of furthering Hitler's plan for extermination of Jews and anything and everything allied in any way with them.

The Arabs have shown that they neither fear nor respect the flag of the Red Cross, international symbol of mercy.

They are hourly demonstrating their contempt for the American flag and the institutions over which it flies, as well.

Action within 24 hours is imperative.

The President must act boldly and courageously—and promptly.

Meanwhile the citizen soldiers of Israel are ringed about by their enemies—and ours—and the enemies of the principles of the United Nations Charter which pledged the world to outlaw aggressive wars of conquest.

While we carefully weigh the hair-line considerations which are delaying the lifting of our embargo on arms to Israel in the face of urgent need, scores of men and women and children are being murdered by British-inspired Arab mobsters and troops—dying without even the chance to fight for their lives because we continue to deny arms and aid.

We must not—we cannot—permit the bitter British conspiracy in the United Nations to prevent us from taking this desperately necessary step at once. To do so is again to play the British-Arabian game—a ghastly game of assassination.

At last the United States Senate is becoming aroused to the truth of the Middle East war plot by Great Britain, and effective action is beginning to block ERP funds and American lend-lease material from reaching British hands for transfer—or substitution for war supplies already transferred—to the Arab invaders.

The investigation of Great Britain's—and China's—perfidious role must proceed with full speed to halt this monstrous war on humanity itself.

But as the United Nations solemnly contemplates suicide by neglect of its very purpose, and as the Senate debates and investigates, the President has the chance—and the duty—to act.

Land American forces at once to protect American lives and property, including the hospitals and the university, in Jerusalem.

Lift the embargo on arms to Israel—at once.

What are we waiting for, Mr. President? The irrevocable decisions rendered by death for the human beings who only seek what we ourselves have sought—a little freedom, a productive peace, and a safe home at last after 2,000 years of wandering and penury?

[From the New York Times of May 25, 1948]

CROSSROADS IN PALESTINE

Events in Palestine now stand at the crossroads between peace and continued war. Hope for an agreed solution, well-nigh smothered by the smoke of battle rolling over the Holy Land, may have taken a new lease on life as a result of two new and apparently interconnected developments. The first of these is the request of the Arab states, made in the face of their previous boastful and intransigent pronouncements, for a 30-hour and then a 48-hour extension of the deadline for the cease-fire order requested by the Security Council of the United Nations last Saturday and promptly accepted by Israel. The Council responded last night by giving the Arabs until Wednesday noon. The second is the new effort by the American and British Governments to reach agreement on a common policy regarding Palestine, in order to put an end to a situation which not only hampers United Nations action in a matter in which for once, if for different reasons, the United States and Russia appear to be in accord, but which also threatens to undermine western solidarity in the far broader issue between the west and Russia.

The real meaning of the Arab request, transmitted to the Arab member of the Security Council from Amman, the capital of Transjordan, where Arab leaders have been in consultation, must still be disclosed. It may amount to no more than an effort to gain time in the hope that the Arab forces may complete the conquest of Jerusalem before the new deadline expires. But it may also indicate some sober second thoughts among the Arab leaders who, while continuing to breathe defiance and to demand the unconditional surrender of Israel, nevertheless plead that the cease-fire appeal was received too late for adequate consultation within the specified time, which keeps the door open for acceptance. The stout fighting qualities of the Israelite armies are without doubt one determining factor in the situation. But the decisive factor will be the degree of unity in Anglo-American policy. On that score the past few days appear to have brought at least some progress.

This progress, achieved in Anglo-American conferences in London, has revealed itself not only in the direct appeals by Washington and London to the Arab states to comply with the United Nations order but also in British hints that in case of refusal the British officers now leading Arab forces may be withdrawn and an embargo placed on further shipments of arms to the Arabs. This does not go as far as the American move in the Security Council to stop Arab aggression, which Britain refused to support, but it may be taken as the first indication of British willingness to apply sanctions. This willingness is emphasized by the London statement that Britain considers her obligations to the United Nations to be above those she has under treaties with the King of Transjordan.

If this developing Anglo-American unity induces the Arab states to follow Israel in proclaiming a truce, it would not only mark a triumph for the United Nations but provide the most hopeful chance for the survival of Arabian Palestine and of Israel. For one of the fundamental facts of the situation is that each is economically dependent on the other. That is why the United Nations solution of the problem provided not only for partition but also for economic union.

If, on the other hand, the hope aroused by the Arab action turns out to be vain, and if the Arab forces continue their war against Israel, it will be the responsibility of the Security Council to take further action to put an end to what is now an international war. What form this action should take must depend on the developing circumstances, but the way to United Nations sanctions with American and British support apears to be opening up. It is difficult to see how the Arab states could stand up under such pressure, particularly if it were accompanied—as it should be, if the Arab states defy the cease-fire order—by a prompt lifting of the American embargo on the shipment of arms to Israel.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 25, 1948]

THE FACTS ARE IRREVERSIBLE

The Security Council's diluted cease fire order failed yesterday to bring a cessation of the more or less random killing going on in Palestine. It did bring an Arab request for a 48-hour extension, a meeting of the Arab League to consider its answer, a demand by the United States that the Arab armies accede to the order and, probably most important of all, a similar demand by Great Britain. The British have gone so far as to hint, at least, that if the war is not stopped they will withdraw the aid of their officers and their subventions from the Arab states.

They have done so, most probably not for any legal or ethical reasons (the law and the ethics alike are involved now beyond any possibility of disentanglement) but because it is increasingly evident that this is the only practical course. Israel has been successfully established. The Arabs' war against it is not, except for those who are killed or mangled in its course, amounting to very much. The Arab Legion has been fighting its way with difficulty into Jerusalem; but Jerusalem was isolated from the beginning, it was not awarded to the proposed Jewish state by the General Assembly resolution, and there is reason to believe that the Israeli Republic would be glad to be relieved of responsibility for it. Except for some militarily ineffective bombing, the Egyptian, Syrian, and Lebanese forces have done almost nothing; and the impression is that to make any serious assault on Israel and the centers of its strength will call for far more energy, unity, and resolution than the Arab armies have so far displayed.

An Arab spokesman in Cairo yesterday made the rather revealing comment that "if this huge machine which the Arabs have set in motion is stopped (by the cease fire order) it will never work so smoothly again." That (which certainly could not be said of the Israeli army) seems to indicate the situation rather exactly. Israel cannot now be abolished. But the Arabs can, it would seem, be convinced that their assault upon it is hopeless; that they cannot get United Nations support for their aims, but they can make an agreed peace with Israel now likely to be much better than anything to which their desultory war can possibly lead. The best, indeed the only, chance of statesmanship is to bring home this situation to them, not to feed them with hopes that they can somehow get the powers to reverse facts which history has made irreversible.

[News release issued by Mizrachi Organization of America, New York, N. Y., May 24, 1948]

BRITAIN CAN HALT ZION HOSTILITIES IN 24 HOURS, CONGRESSMAN KLEIN ASSERTS AT MIZRACHI RECEPTION—NEW YORK DEMOCRAT SAYS HE WILL FIGHT FOR WITHHOLDING ERP LOAN FROM BRITAIN UNLESS SHE STOPS WAR AGAINST ISRAEL

NEW YORK, N. Y.—Congressman ARTHUR G. KLEIN, Democrat, New York, today bitterly assailed Great Britain "as the real aggressor which is mulcting the American taxpayer for funds to carry on her dastardly undeclared war against the new state of Israel." He said that "Bevin and his ruthless foreign office could halt the Arab invasion of Israel in less than 24 hours by lifting a finger, or by addressing a penny post card to Amman, Transjordan. It's as simple as all that."

The New York Congressman spoke at a reception tendered him this afternoon at the Hotel Astor by the Mizrachi Organization of America for "the devoted service he has rendered the Jewish people as a vigorous proponent in the Halls of Congress for the Jewish state and the United Nations." He is also a sponsor of the annual dinner of the Mizrachi Education and Expansion Fund which will be held at the Hotel Astor on Sunday, June 20.

KLEIN told 150 religious Zionist leaders that "without exception the Arab states now warring on the peace-loving citizens of Israel are on Britain's pay roll. Unless Bevin immediately puts a halt to the warfare now being waged by British-sponsored armies in the Holy Land, I will begin an unrelenting campaign in the Halls of Congress to shut off our flow of money, food, clothes, and machinery which we are providing under the British loan and the European recovery program." He also stated his intention "to ask the Appropriations Committee of both Houses to refuse to appropriate any money for any nation guilty of subsidizing aggressive warfare."

He said that "the Arab Legion troops now demolishing the Holy City are British led, trained and armed. That great Christian country, England, is encourging the utter destruction of Jerusalem, the most venerated city in all of Christendom and Judaism, and, because the British Empire is bankrupt and functioning only on American loans and credits, American taxpayers are footing the bill."

Klein added that the next step for the American Government, after already having recognized Israel, is to lift the embargo against the shipment of arms to Israel, and to advance funds to enable the new nation to beat off its enemies and establish a stable government in peace.

He protested against the seizure of American nationals by Lebanese officials, and their incarceration, which he said constitutes an outrageous indignity against the United States. He demanded that Lebanon and the British Government be held to account for this action, which is reminiscent of the search and seizure by the British which precipitated the War of 1812, and insisted that the United States call upon England to recall all British subjects in Arab forces and cease supplying weapons of war and political support.

Commenting on the Mizrachi plans to inaugurate the Mizrachi Home Front for Israel at the forthcoming religious-Zionist annual dinner, June 20, Mr. Klein said: "More than ever before free men must fight for their freedom against aggressive Fascist forces. Therefore, it is indispensable that a home front be developed here and in all countries of the world in order to back up with manpower and resources those fighting for liberation in the front lines.

The Mizrachi Home Front for Israel will be financed by the Mizrachi education and expansion fund which supervises the preparation and training of Mizrachi young pioneers on the religious-Zionist hachsharah, agricultural training center, at Cranbury, N. J.

It was pointed out by Max S. Rosenfeld, prominent New York businessman and chairman of the annual Mizrachi dinner, that the Mizrachi Home Front for Israel will be a campaign to mobilize American Jewry's manpower and resources behind the state of Israel—a campaign which will last as long as and until the boundaries of Israel are made secure against all aggressors and the Jewish people can begin to develop their homeland in peace and stability.

Mr. Rosenfeld said that the entire Nation-wide religious-Zionist movement will

join the home front and that delegates from all parts of the Nation will participate in the annual dinner at which the home front drive will be launched.

Taft-Ellender-Wagner Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include herein an address I made over Station WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Thursday evening, May 6, 1948, on the housing situation:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, what are we going to do about the housing crisis?

The press and radio have a bad case of war nerves and there is much talk about the plight of people in far-off countries. But what about the homeless people of the United States?

We are going to dole out billions to help other nations, and to build up our military strength. In the present state of world affairs, this is a necessary investment. The money to finance these projects does not come out of thin air. It must be earned by the brain and brawn of Americans who must have decent wages and decent housing if they are to do the right job.

I say that we also need a Marshall plan here at home to break the back of the housing shortage.

Like children we are quite destructive. The atom bomb is currently the peak of our development. It takes a war to wake us up and produce a flood of things called weapons. Twice in this century we have amazed ourselves and others by our industrial power to turn out instruments which kill and lay waste.

But when it comes to peace, we slacken in our zeal. We are unable to construct in quantity sufficient shelters for our people.

If we can do the hard job of producing for war, why can't we do the easier job of producing for peace? Of course, there is no reason why we can't, except that a few people believe in a planned scarcity to keep prices up. At the cost of human misery.

Our children are fascinated by such stories as The Old Lady Who Lived in a Shoe and The House That Jack Built, not realizing in their innocence that such stories have their counterpart in the real world. In the United States today there are many overcrowded slum districts as broken-down, unfit for use, and dangerous as old shoes. And there are not enough new homes under construction because they cost too much "jack" to build.

The children regard us as grown-ups who know all the answers. But unless we do something to provide adequate shelter for them—and soon—they will properly blame us, when they come of age, for the poor health and juvenile delinquency which go hand in hand with a wretched environment. And we shall have no alibi for failing them because we have the means as a nation to prevent it.

Here is the picture and the challenge.

President Truman estimated in his recent housing message that during the year 1947 1,000,000 new homes were begun. These included temporary accommodations. The number actually completed was 854,000. On the other hand, there were over 900,000 marriages. Without taking into account the huge backlog—the need for catching up with the war years during which there was very little home-building—we are not keeping up with the demand of newly married couples.

There is no prospect for any improvement in the situation during 1948 unless we adopt a bold and imaginative program. The earlier estimate that a goal of 1,000,000 new homes might be reached by the end of this year failed to consider the price and shortage factors which will result from the Marshall plan and the defense program.

I was talking to a real estate man the other day and he told me that much as people need and want new houses they will not buy them at the inflated prices now prevailing. "You can't blame them," he said. "No one is anxious to get stuck."

This is contagious. Financiers and builders are becoming very cautious. The danger of lending money for construction as we approach the top of the inflationary spiral is curtailing progress.

The veteran is the hardest hit of all. He went forth to hazard his life in the perils of war to protect his home, or to save his right to start a home under the American standard of living. He came back to find that the housing shortage was forcing him to take others into his own home or to find that after marriage, he and his bride would have to start family life in a single room or a trailer camp.

Even the new home he might buy if he were one of the so-called lucky few is a doll house with tiny rooms and not enough of them.

We are concerned about the problem of birth control. But while we argue about it in principle, we are, in fact, forcing it upon people who want a family because it is the most precious experience in life. Through lack of a realistic and concerted effort to provide decent housing, we are denying to millions of our people, a fundamental human right.

No wonder that many of our veterans are disillusioned and bitter. I for one would not blame them if they marched on Washington and demanded that the Government, through Congress, step in to remedy a situation which private agencies are unable to handle.

Those who follow the trends are worried by the number of veterans who have been obliged to give up homes which they purchased in desperation at prices over their heads.

Furthermore, about 2,500,000 married couples live with other families, which is a 50 percent increase since 1940. This is an explosive situation from any point of view.

The volume of residential building in 1947 was second only to the all-time high established in 1925, but even this falls far short of meeting the need. With food and clothing, housing constitutes one of the three primary and immediate needs to support life. It cannot wait on vague assurances that the problem will take care of itself sooner or later. If this were a poor country there would be no choice. But we have the technical know-how. And the war proved that we have the energy once we stir ourselves.

First off, we must set as our goal the building of sufficient rental housing.

Normally 60 percent of the population are renters. In 1947, however, only 10 percent of the new construction was built to be rented.

Why have we failed?

There are three principal causes.

One is cost. The prices of homes have increased 100 percent or more above the 1940 level. Veterans who were supposed to be the chief beneficiaries of the postwar housing development just can't buy at current prices. Millions who want homes of their own have been priced out of the market.

The second cause is the scarcity of building materials, and, occasionally, of skilled labor. Considering our wartime production records, this is hard to understand. It is due to the peacetime scramble for certain basic raw materials, such as steel and lumber, which are used for purposes other than housing. Part of this fault also lies at the door of the building industry itself and its cumbersome system of distribution. From top to bottom it is slowed down by restrictive practices which are a hangover from the leisurely past.

The building industry has not kept in step with the times. It has failed to take advantage of assembly-line techniques. It sticks stubbornly to handicraft operations. All suppliers of building materials band together to quote uniform prices to all customers. No builder is allowed to buy at wholesale prices. All down the line, from manufacturer to jobber to retailer, there are mark-ups piled on mark-ups. Before the house is started there is a mark-up from 75 percent skyward on the cost of materials.

The small-scale activities of builders has also added to the cost. Before the war there were 200,000 builders in the United States, but 86 percent of them put up only four houses or less a year. If the automobile industry, by comparison, had tens of thousands of manufacturers, each making from 20 to 50 cars a year, the price of a car would be beyond the reach of millions who now own them—thanks to mass-production methods.

Clearly, the building industry itself must get on the ball and streamline its techniques. We need concerns which will build several hundred houses at a time, using power equipment and production-line efficiency for larger volume at lower unit cost.

The third cause responsible for the housing shortage is the fear of a sudden deflation which would pull the rug from under builders and investors alike. This discourages rental projects.

Both the speculative builder, who wants to turn over the complete house quickly to realize a profit, and the investment builder, who wants a steady annual yield over and above his operating costs, are hedging against expansion.

New York City is one community which has tackled the problem of providing low-cost housing, with determination. Several large rental developments are under construction. New York State and New York City have public housing programs with funds set aside for subsidies. Most other cities must rely upon Federal subsidies for this type of housing and these are not available yet. In Massachusetts, within a few weeks, a State board of housing will start functioning under the $200,000,000 State Veterans' Housing Act recently signed by the Governor.

The act provides for the construction of dwelling units in the various cities and towns that apply. The State will guarantee the bonds, both as to principal and interest, and will pay a subsidy of 2½ percent of the cost of the project annually, so that rents can be kept at reasonable rates.

Types of houses would have to conform in general to Federal housing regulations because the act provides that if Federal funds for low cost housing become available, such city and town projects shall be turned over to Federal housing authorities.

Which brings us to the heart of the problem.

The national housing bill has passed the United States Senate, but the real estate interests are out to kill it in the United States House of Representatives.

Briefly, this measure seeks to stimulate the building of 15,000,000 new homes by 1958. It also provides for Government subsidy of 500,000 dwelling units for the Nation's lowest income families within 5 years. Those eligible for tenancy in such units would be families which cannot afford to pay more than $25 a month for rent.

The public housing provision represents only 10 percent of the entire project. The rest concerns private investment rental projects. These would be encouraged through

legislation insuring 90 percent mortgage loans and yield insurance.

These proposals can be amended to give builders of rental housing the same tax incentives that were given to manufacturers during the war. Through fast amortization building will be stimulated with a minimum of red tape.

This means that the investor would not be taxed on the additional profits that he puts back into the project through amortization.

The national housing bill faces a stiff fight in the House of Representatives. A petition to get the bill out of the House Banking Committee, so that the people will have a chance to see whether their Representatives are for or against them, is supported by the five Democratic Representatives from Massachusetts.

This is election year. The time is ripe for you to press home your demands for immediate steps to relieve your housing crisis.

Get behind the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill.

Write to those of your Representatives who have not declared themselves on this urgent question. Express your wish that effective action be taken to step up the building of homes for Americans at this session of Congress.

Make your Government responsive to your welfare.

Do this without delay.

Is a Public Official To Be Held Responsible for the Political Views of All the Members of His Family?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to include the text of a broadcast which was delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System by Mr. Joseph C. Harsch on Friday, May 21. This discusses a matter of principle of considerable public importance.

THE MEANING OF THE NEWS

It would seem to me that an obscure item of news from Czechoslovakia yesterday might well be read against a piece of today's news from Washington. Yesterday's story told of the arrest of several persons in Czechoslovakia. The crime for which they were arrested was that of being related to men who had fled the country to escape the Communist regime. Those who had fled were presumably anti-Communist. Those who stayed behind are suspected of being the same, not by their actions, but by association. Now this is not a new phenomenon in the Communist world.

Many a man, woman and child in Russia has been sent to Siberia for being a member of the family of a person deemed disloyal to the Soviet regime. Nor is the practice unknown to history in some other countries. The Nazis used it as one of their most effective methods of discouraging disagreement with the regime. Nazi records unearthed since the war show that many a German concealed his doubts about the Nazi regime simply because he knew that if he acted according to his conscience his parents, wife, children and even those farther removed would go to the concentration camp for him. One of the most dramatic cases is that of Field Marshal Erwin Rommel who was given a choice of either suicide or the degradation of his family. Field Marshal Rommel chose suicide. This sort of thing is all very familiar when it involves a Communist or a Fascist state. In fact, it has happened down through the ages in any state which is totalitarian. And in older days an absolute monarchy could be quite as much a totalitarian dictatorship as the Fascist or Communist varieties we know in our own times. Of course, such things could not happen here. Or could they? Today we learn that a Member of Congress has demanded the resignation of an official of the Department of Commerce. The reason for the demand is that the official has a daughter who has taken a job in the Washington office of Tass, the official Russian news agency. There is no question about the two facts mentioned. The daughter is working for Tass today. The father is a prominent official of the Department of Commerce. But there is another fact of some importance. The father disapproves of his daughter's action—so strongly that they have not spoken to each other since the daughter went to Tass in January. In spite of this third fact, the Member of Congress still believes that the father should be deprived of his Government position. It just happens in this case that the father's livelihood does not depend on his job. But suppose it did? An effort is being made to deprive him of his job not because of anything he has done himself. His own loyalty to the United States is not in question. His only guilt is that a member of his family has taken a road which he and most of the rest of us consider to be wrong. The issue here is the same as the one in Czechoslovakia. Is a person to be held responsible for the political views of all members of his family? And is a person to be subject to the loss of his good repute and perhaps of his livelihood because some member of his family chooses to adopt unorthodox lines of thought? In Russia it happens every day. It is happening now in Czechoslovakia. It happened in Germany under the Nazi and in Italy under the Fascists. It happened in Spain in the days of the Inquisition—and again under the Falanga. In England during the last war it did not happen. John Amery was a traitor to his country and paid with his life when finally captured. His father nevertheless served his country, in the cabinet, honorably and free of suspicion. The English visit punishment upon the guilty one, not upon his relatives. We might think twice about whether we are going to go the English way, or the way of all those regimes which enforce orthodoxy of thought by using relatives as hostages.

This is Joseph C. Harsch in Washington.

The Late Thomas C. Wasson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, this is the first opportunity I have had to publicly note with extreme sadness the heroic death and burial the day before yesterday of a good friend and great American, the consul general of the United States in Jerusalem, Thomas C. Wasson.

Tom Wasson was a kindly, clean-cut, God-fearing man whom it was my good fortune to meet and come to know quite intimately upon my visit to Athens last October with the House subcommittee in charge of appropriations for the Department of State.

When I arrived in Athens, where he was at that time stationed, I happened to be a very sick man. Tom Wasson took personal charge of me from the moment I landed from our plane and kindly hovered about my sickbed for the next 5 days as though I were his blood brother. He made me feel there just was not enough he could do to aid me. He called on me three and four times a day. His pleasing smile and sympathetic solicitude for my recovery did more to help me than the medical ministrations of the skillful physician he so promptly ordered to prescribe for me.

May God, in His mercy, rest the soul of one of the finest members of our Foreign Service it has been my pleasure to know. Little did I suspect when I was his guest a few months ago that he would, such a short time thereafter, become one of the first two American casualties of the Battle of Israel, slain by the bullets of a sniper. I pray for his eternal reward.

Palestine: Must the United States Send Troops to the Middle East?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, for some weeks the Middle East situation has been headline news. On May 11, 1948, it was my privilege to participate in a friendly debate with that outstanding soldier, lecturer, and traveler, Capt. Michael Fielding, over radio station WGN, Chicago. The program, Your Right To Say It, is produced by Mr. Ward Quaal and the moderator, Dr. William S. Stokes, of the University of Wisconsin. These two gentlemen are rendering a valuable public service to radio listeners in the Middle West. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include part of the radio program:

MUST THE UNITED STATES SEND TROOPS TO THE MIDDLE EAST?

Affirmative: Capt. Michael Fielding, world traveler, lecturer, commentator.

Negative: Congressman LAWRENCE H. SMITH, Republican, First District, Wisconsin; member House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Moderator: Dr. William S. Stokes, University of Wisconsin.

Produced and directed by Ward Quaal.

"I disagree with what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it."

Announcer NORMAN KRAEFT. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome to America's most popular radio debate. WGN is happy to present Your Right To Say It, dedicated to Americans everywhere and broadcast in the best tradition of our cherished right of freedom of speech. In this debate series both sides of each issue are presented by outstanding persons from the fields of government, business, and education. No scripts are necessary and there is

no censorship. At the close of the program we will tell you how to obtain copies of tonight's debate.

And now to introduce tonight's speakers, I am pleased to present our moderator, professor of political science at the University of Wisconsin, Dr. William S. Stokes.

Dr. STOKES. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, the issue for debate this evening is the highly explosive and extremely important question: Must the United States send troops to the Middle East? This dispute arises out of the bloody struggle between the Arabs and the Jews in the Middle East; out of the strategic importance of that area to the United States; and the issue is brought to a climax by the fact that the British are going to leave Palestine on May 15. Under such circumstances, Must the United States send troops to the Middle East?

Our two debaters will each have 5 minutes for an introductory argument, after which they will attempt to answer the questions of our studio audience. They will have a chance for give and take and rebuttal, and will end the debate with a final summary of their respective points of view. Then, I would like to invite the members of our listening audience to vote on this issue. Just send in a card or letter to Station WGN with your vote—a yes or no will do very well—and I will announce the results next week.

Ladies and gentlemen, our debaters are ready. Let us turn to the affirmative of the issue: Must the United States Send Troops to the Middle East? Your Right To Say It is happy to welcome back to our debate platform one of its most dynamic participants, a well-known world traveler, lecturer, and radio commentator, expert on the Middle East, having spent much of his life there. He was in the area in the summer of 1947, and is going back next month.

Ladies and gentlemen, Capt. Michael J. Fielding.

Captain FIELDING. Ladies and gentlemen, whether or not the United States must eventually send troops to the Middle East hinges, as I see it, on three clear facts. First, that the Russians have shown that they will inevitably fill any military or political vacuum left by democracy in the strategic areas of the world; second, that, in the present competitive struggle between communism and democracy, Russia invariably seeks to create in these strategic areas those conditions which favor her—conditions of instability, civil strife, and chaos. Then, there's this third fact: Of the world's strategic areas, the Middle East is undoubtedly the most strategic. It's a land bridge connecting Europe with Asia and a recognized crossroads in global communications. It is so strategic, indeed, that it is now a military axiom that any nation achieving domination there, is well on the road to world domination.

Now, let's apply these facts to the explosive situation threatened by Britain's relinquishment of her Palestine mandate 4 days hence. For the past hundred years, the British, as recognized leaders of the democratic world, found themselves saddled with the need to supply the military strength in the strategic regions necessary to safeguard the democratic idea against aggressors or the encroachment of any antagonistic political philosophy. In the Middle East specifically, they served to thwart the Russian design which has had its roots deep in that nation's history. Russia, even in Czarist days, had cast covetous eyes on the Middle East because of its military, political, and economic significance. Moreover, the Middle East offered an alternative route to the Dardanelles as a means of reaching the eastern Mediterranean and the warm waters of the Persian Gulf. Thus Britain's presence in Palestine meant infinitely more than merely keeping peace between Arabs and Zionists. Now that her troops are being withdrawn, a serious military vacuum is created, a vacuum which Russia will traditionally attempt to fill unless stopped.

There is now none to stop her save the United States as the only remaining power able to do so effectively. What many of our leaders and people must still learn is this: Like it or not, we have fallen heir to Britain's leadership role. Unless and until we are able and willing to step into her shoes in the strategic areas vital to the survival of democracy, we shall never succeed in dealing with Russia effectively. And that means backing up our leadership with American arms where necessary. Can we permit Russian power to flow into the Middle East vacuum created by Britain's withdrawal? The answer, as I have already attempted to show, is "No." How, you may ask, can the Russians fill this vacuum? Unhappily, our blundering approach to the delicate Palestine issue has provided the answer. Our championship of partition, or even trusteeship, will have to be enforced if it is to work. Whatever its final decision, the United Nations will have to enforce that decision or face oblivion. In such an event, Russia, as a member nation, can claim an equal right to participate in this enforcement. She has already insisted that she intends to do so. And all that Russia needs is a military foothold in Palestine; she can then find innumerable reasons to grab off lines of communication through the Middle East to sustain her troops there.

But, even if there is no enforcement action, Russia will benefit. A full-scale war between Arabs and Zionists will create the very conditions which Moscow always seeks to create for herself, conditions of instability, civil strife, and chaos. This conflict, if permitted to develop, will provide the excuse for the same kind of outside intervention seen in Spain. And you may be certain Russia won't pass up the chance. If such intervention takes place, and there is already acceptable evidence that it is doing so even now, we shall find ourselves forced to prevent the Russians from fishing in these troubled waters to their long-range advantage and our long-range peril. To permit exclusive Soviet influence in this strategic region would dangerously jeopardize our own hope of victory in another global war. As Germany, Korea, and Greece have demonstrated, the only practical way to stop Russia is our willingness to commit power to thwart her expansionist designs. And to contain the Russians in the Middle East will take American power since, as the United Nations deliberations already indicate, no other troops are to be made available for this task.

For reasons of domestic politics in an election year, we were the ones to assume the lead in Palestine, and so now even our democratic friends in the United Nations have come to regard the impending chaos in the Middle East as an American responsibility, to be resolved by American military power. If Russia is to be prevented from gaining the upper hand there, it is a responsibility we cannot afford to ignore or evade much longer, if only because it involves our own security, both as a nation and as the new democratic leader in the world.

Dr. STOKES. Thank you, Captain Fielding. Ladies and gentlemen, we have heard the affirmative of the issue Must the United States Send Troops to the Middle East? Now, let us hear the negative.

Your Right To Say It is honored to introduce the Republican Congressman from the First District in the State of Wisconsin, member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Honorable LAWRENCE H. SMITH. Congressman SMITH.

Congressman SMITH. Thank you, Dr. Stokes.

My answer to the question is "No." The way to settle disputes is not by the show of force or the use of it. From where I sit, it is obvious that we are developing a military complex in this country. To organize and maintain an adequate national defense is necessary in view of world conditions, but to use that force outside the United States in time of peace is a hazardous undertaking.

The sending of troops to the Middle East now is at best a temporary and expedient course. It does not solve the problem. But, it might very easily spark world war III. The Middle East is the most explosive spot in the world today, if we can believe our experts, and even Captain Fielding who is in the category of experts, and the use of United States troops would be resented in that area by the people who live there. Further, if United States troops go in, so will Russian troops. Is that what we want? Our military advisers are very fearful of such an event.

No; force is not the answer in the Middle East. The great need is for the promulgation of a sound foreign policy based upon our national interests and consistent with the rights of the people who live there. The job is a diplomatic, not military one. Who knows what that policy is now in that troubled area? The situation is critical, but no one can tell what the State Department will do in view of its past record in the Middle East.

On November 29 of last year it pushed through the partition of Palestine and on February 24 it reversed that policy because of the resistance of our military people. This "on again, off again" policy put us from the frying pan into the fire with the whole Moslem world. To dispatch troops now is a confession that our diplomacy has failed and that our only hope is in the show of military force. I do not agree. Such an exhibition is unnecessary, yet a conflict exists which is serious and dangerous to world peace and the welfare of the United States.

Notwithstanding the present bad situation, our aim still is and must always be a striving for a peaceful settlement. It is obvious to everybody that the existing partition plan offers not the slightest hope of peace. What was expected to be a self-enforcing plan has proved to be a pious hope. An overwhelming military force would now be required to implement the plan. More than 75,000 experienced British troops have failed to keep order. Would it take a greater force of Americans than British? Who knows? The people of this country are not prepared for that step. Troops mean war and war never settles anything. Recently in a war we knocked off one dictator and got a devil in the exchange. Two world wars and no freedom from fear. What a record. So, the job is still one for the diplomats acting under a foreign policy that is based on equity and justice.

What is the way out? Briefly I have four suggestions:

1. Suspend all efforts to implement the existing partition plan for Palestine by military force.

2. Appeal to the warring factions to keep the peace while the Palestine question is given further consideration by the United Nations.

3. The UN should seek a solution within the provisions of the Charter in view of the threat to international peace and security.

4. And as a last resort refer the dispute to the International Court of Justice.

The road to peace is a rough one. But the United States must use its influence toward seeking a peaceful solution of the problem before resorting to a display of force by sending troops to the Middle East. This Scripture portion is pertinent: "Not by might nor by power, but by My spirit, saith the Lord God of Hosts."

Dr. STOKES. Thank you, Congressman SMITH.

Statement of Hon. Edward W. Staves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an excellent statement on H. R. 6572 by the distinguished State Senator Edward W. Staves, chairman of the Massachusetts Legislative Committee on Highways and Motor Vehicles, who is an outstanding expert and authority on the improvement and modernization of trunk highways, post roads, transportation, and related subjects.

The statement follows:

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, with assistance from the Federal Public Roads Administration, has just completed the preparation of a 10-year highway program calling for the expenditure of $750,000,000 designed to provide the State with adequate, modern, and safe highways.

As a first step in carrying out this program, the Legislative Committee on Highways and Motor Vehicles of the Massachusetts State Legislature has reported favorably a bill authorizing a $100,000,000 bond issue.

Among other things, the bill authorizes the expenditure of money for studies to determine the desirability and feasibility of revenue-producing traffic facilities. In addition, it authorizes a study for the purpose of determining the feasibility and practicability of a revenue-producing, self-supporting interstate through expressway from the Connecticut State line to the New Hampshire State line together with suitable easterly and westerly connections.

In our whole pattern of highway improvements in Massachusetts, it is possible that one or two highways, a few bridges, and possibly one vehicular tunnel might be constructed as toll facilities.

During the implementation of this $750,000,000 highway program, if the State legislature decides to make some of these facilities toll facilities, it will be because the State feels they are peculiarly fitted to the user-pay principle and thus will permit additional construction to be undertaken without placing a drain on an already overburdened State highway fund.

I believe it is only proper that the States reserve the right to make the determination whether or not they will establish toll facilities. Naturally, if such a decision is made, we would like to receive the same measure of Federal aid as would be provided if these few projects were financed from our highway-fund revenues.

It is important that we not lose sight of our objectives: an adequate and modern system of public roads. The States should not be discouraged from obtaining this objective by whatever means they consider desirable. Thus, the financing of a much-needed highway facility through tolls, where feasible and practicable, should not preclude the granting of Federal aid.

H. R. 6572 will enable the States, without loss of Federal aid, to undertake earlier construction of the few facilities that would lend themselves to toll financing—facilities whose construction might otherwise be postponed in order to make maximum use of State funds for the matching of Federal funds on Federal-aid projects.

I, therefore, appear in favor of H. R. 6572 and urge its approval by this committee.

Purcell Smith Private Power Lobby Must Be Stopped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following statement I made before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the TVA New Johnsonville steam plant:

The additional power which the New Johnsonville steam plant will supply is needed to serve the power demands of the municipalities and cooperatives which have already exceeded present TVA power capacity. The alternatives suggested by Purcell Smith, head of the private utilities lobby, are ludicrous, unjust, and technically primitive. I am sure this committee will give careful scrutiny to the figures and statistics with which Purcell Smith seeks to weave a strangling net around the healthy growth of TVA. Purcell Smith continues to uphold the long and dismal record of inaccurate interpretations and short-sighted conclusions which the private power interests have always shown since many years before the Tennessee Valley Authority even came into existence. Gross misrepresentations were made by private utility spokesmen at hearings before the House Appropriations Committee. First, utility witnesses misinformed the committee as to the proportion of TVA's direct sales to industry bear to its total sales. TVA's report on total direct sales include sales to the United States Government of such as the TVA chemical plant at Muscle Shoals, the atomic energy plant at Oak Ridge, the Milan ordnance plant, the Huntsville arsenal, Camp Campbell, the Smyrna air base, and other military establishments. Comparisons of total volume are meaningless because TVA sells to private industry large quantities of interruptable power which cannot be sold to the municipalities and cooperatives, and such power can be disposed of in only two ways: (a) By sales to a few industries which can use it in their operations; (b) by exporting it from the region to private power companies which can use it in their systems.

In the fiscal year 1949 less than 45 percent of TVA's total sales will go to its direct customers, including the Government and including interruptable power sales. The point which the Smith lobby is trying hard, but hopelessly, to make is that if TVA's power supply to industry were made available to municipalities and cooperatives there would be no need for the steam plant at New Johnsonville. Here is a perfect example of the power lobby's complete lack of understanding of the TVA system. It would be illegal for TVA to deny power to industries it has contracted to serve. Beyond this it would be strictly against the public interest and would wreck companies which have made large investments, particularly during the war at the request of the Government and with the assurance that their power requirements would be met.

No one can deny that TVA has served the people of this area by bringing the greatest good to the greatest number. Before TVA came into being the private power interests, which held the destiny of this great section of our Nation in the very palm of their hand, acted as a drag on the healthy growth of this region. Let us examine the figures. When the private power companies served this area there were 225,000 residential and domestic consumers using an average of 600 kilowatt-hours at an average cost of more than 5 cents per kilowatt-hour. Today TVA serves 700,000 domestic and residential consumers using an average of 2,500 kilowatt-hours a year at a cost of 1½ cents per kilowatt-hour.

Before TVA the private power companies served only 1 in 28 farms. Today TVA through a progressive and enlightened program of rural electrification serves every other farm in the area with electricity, an essential tool of modern agriculture. Every consumer of electricity in this area will testify to the fact that TVA has been a stimulus to free enterprise and the stepping stone by which this formerly industrially impotent region has been able in a short span of years to become popularly known as the arsenal of democracy.

No one can deny that TVA has been administered expertly and its projects carried out with efficiency. Eyed from any direction it has been a good business proposition. TVA has paid back into the Treasury of the United States $23,000,000 in cash. Some $92,000,000 has been repaid through reappropriation for the building of additional facilities. Last year TVA earned an income at the rate of 5½ percent and over its entire period of operation a little over 4 percent has been earned on its power properties. If TVA is allowed to expand, and its expansion record to date has been 100 percent to the good, TVA will ultimately repay every cent invested in it. If the private power lobby is allowed to put a ceiling on the power supply in the Tennessee Valley it will jeopardize this investment and adversely affect the 5,000,000 people in the valley.

The facts speak for themselves. TVA's projected steam plant at New Johnsonville should be approved and its construction allowed to begin without further delay.

Will Congress Mutilate Reciprocal Trade Act?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, enclosed are telegrams protesting the gag rule under which the Reciprocal Trade Act has been brought to the floor by the Republican leadership. One telegram is from the National Foreign Trade Council, and the other is from the Washington office of the Citizens' Committee for Reciprocal World Trade:

TELEGRAM SENT TO SPEAKER MARTIN—COPY TO REPRESENTATIVE DOUGHTON

MAY 25, 1948.

The National Foreign Trade Council strongly protests foreclosing adequate opportunity for debate and amendment of H. R. 6556 which so vitally affects the foreign trade and international economic relations of the United States.

EUGENE P. THOMAS,
President.

Board of directors: John Abbink, McGraw Hill; Sam G. Baggett, United Fruit Co.; S. M. Bosh, Bethlehem Steel Export; L. C. Boos, United States Rubber Export Co.; Willis H. Booth, Intertype Corp.; Theodore Brent, Mississippi Shipping Co., Inc.; Samuel Broers, Firestone, International Co.; B. C. Budd, Packard Motor Co., Export; Charles Cain, Jr., Chase National Bank; A. G. Cameron, Good-

year Tire & Rubber Co.; Charles R. Carroll, General Motors; James S. Carson, American & Foreign Power Co.; Percy Chubb 2d, Chubb & Sons; W. W. Coleman, Bucyrus, Erie Co.; W J. D. Dixon, the Texas Co.; P. L. Douglas, Otis Elevator Co.; E. A. Emerson, Armco International Corp.; James A. Farley, Coca-Cola Export Corp.; James A. Farrell, Jr., Farrell Lines, Inc.; Robert F. Loree, chairman; Walter L. Faust, Socony Vacuum Oil Co., Inc.; J. D. Fletcher, Caterpillar Tractor Co.; Berent Firele, International Basic Economy Corp.; Walter Geist, Allis-Chalmers Mfg. Co.; John L. Gillis, Monsanto Chemical Co.; W. L. Gray, First National Bank of Boston; Basil Harris, United States Lines; W. L. Hemingway, Mercantile Commerce Bank & Trust Co; W. R. Herrod, director, General Electric Co.; W. J. Hobbs, Coca-Cola Co.; G. C. Hoyt, International Harvester Co.; W. P. Hunt, chairman, William Hunt & Co.; E. D. Johnson, Standard Oil of New Jersey; Fred I. Kent, Bankers Trust Co.; H. J. Keresey, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co.; P. A. Kinnock, American Trust Co.; W. E. Knox, Westinghouse Electric Co.; John C. Leslie, Pan-American Airways; Alex MacKenzie, Union Carbide & Carbon Corp.; Clarence E. Mayer, Standard Vacuum Oil Co.; Sydnor Oden, Anderson, Clayton & Co.; Frank C. Page, International Telephone & Telegraph Co.; Robert H. Patchin, W. R. Grace & Co.; Warren L. Pierson, Trans-World Air Lines; Stanley Powell, California Packing Corp.; R. I. Roberge, Ford Motor Co.; Edward Riley, General Motors Corp.; Joseph C. Rovensky, Morris Plan Corp. of America; A. D. Simpson, National Bank of Commerce; W. H. Stanley, William Wrigley, Jr., Co.; William R. Strelow, Guarantee Trust Co., New York; William S. Swingle, Wendell R. Swint, E. I. Dupont de Nemours Co.; C. B. Thomas, Chrysler Corp.; R. F. Warner, Frazer & Co.; Brayton Wilbur, Wilbur, Ellis Co.; George W. Wolfe, United States Steel; John A. Zellers, Remington Rand; A. B. Sparboe, Pillsbury Mills, Inc.; H. A. Stanton, Norton Co.; A. Stuber, Eastman Kodak Co.; A. E. Thayer, California-Texas Oil Co., Ltd.; Wilbert Ward, National City Bank of New York; Thomas J. Watson, Jr., International Business Machines Corp.; William B. Wimpenny, Sharp & Dohme, Inc.; C. M. Wynne, Overseas Industries.

WASHINGTON OFFICE, CITIZENS' COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCAL WORLD TRADE.

The following telegram was sent to the Republican and Democratic leaders of the House of Representatives:

The Honorable JOSEPH MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

The undersigned strongly protest debating a basic change in our foreign economic policy under the closed rule granted by the Rules Committee. This combined with closed hearings held by the Ways and Means Committee has eliminated possibility of full and enlightened discussion of an issue of such far reaching importance to world recovery. We believe that failure to renew the RTA Act for 3 years in its present form will undermine our leadership in world affairs and be a disastrous blow to peace and stability.

Marjorie L. Temple, Associate Legislative Program, American Association of University Women; Leon Henderson, National Chairman, Americans for Democratic Action; David Manly, Secretary, American Office Supply Export Association; A. Powell Davies, American Unitarian Association; Chat Paterson, National Chairman, American Veterans Committee; Rev. J. M. Dawson, Public Relations Secretary, Baptists of the United States, Joint Conference Committee on Public Relations; Henry A. Atkinson, Director, Church Peace Union, World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches; F. C. McKee, Chairman, Committee on Public Affairs; Ray Gibbons, Director, Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches; Philip J. Gray, secretary, C. A. Richards, Member Administrative Committee, Foreign Credit Interchange Bureau, National Association of Credit Men; C. Lloyd Bailey, Legislative Representative, Friends Committee on National Legislation; Anna Lord Strauss, National President, League of Women Voters of the United States; Thelma Stevens, Executive Secretary, Department of Christian Social Relations, Methodist Church, Women's Division; Helen Hall, Chairman, National Association of Consumers; Harry Ratcliffe, Executive Secretary, National Council of American Importers; Mrs. Joseph M. Welt, President, National Council of Jewish Women; Russell Smith, Legislative Secretary, National Farmers' Union; Jane Evans, Vice President, National Peace Conference; Mrs. J. Austin Stone, Secretary, National Women's Trade Union League; Fern Colborn, Legislative Secretary, Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., Board of Christian Education; Ruth M. Worrell, Executive Secretary, United Council of Church Women; Lloyd Klenert, International Secretary Treasurer, United Textile Workers of America, AFL; Mrs. Dana Converse Backus, Interim Chairman, Womens' Action Committee for Lasting Peace; Mrs. Annalee Stewart, President, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; Henry W. Laidler, Executive Secretary, League for Industrial Democracy; Mrs. James Irwin, National Board, Young Women's Christian Association; Gerard Swope, Chairman, Citizens Committee for Reciprocal World Trade.

Irrigation, Power, and Reclamation Projects in the Southwestern United States

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose here to inform the Congress how the Secretary of the Interior, Julius A. Krug, and the Attorney General, Tom Clark, have been overriding the program of the President with regard to irrigation, power, and reclamation projects in the southwestern United States.

I wish also to show how these Cabinet officers are seeking to establish the policy of the Federal Government in opposition to explicit instructions of the White House and the Bureau of the Budget.

Recently, Budget Director James E. Webb was obliged to write letters to two congressional committees criticizing reports from the Interior and Justice Departments which flagrantly defied the program of the President or omitted important information that would have made clear the views of the White House.

In these letters Mr. Webb took the unprecedented step of repudiating the positions of these Departments.

I shall place in the RECORD the correspondence between these Cabinet officers, the congressional committees, the Budget Bureau, and myself.

I shall disclose the fact that after 10 months of confusion, concealment and delay, the Departments of Interior and Justice have been forced to expose to Congress not only their own ineptitude but their callous disregard for the clearly defined program of their Chief Executive.

Mr. Webb found it necessary to write strongly worded letters to these committees in view of the fact that Secretary Krug had defied the President's program and the Budget Bureau, and Attorney General Clark omitted significant material from his letter to the committees.

The Budget Bureau has been most explicit in regard to issues of this kind, and in particular to the legislation now pending before these committees. The Bureau has made clear the program of the President, and the Bureau's statements reflect the policy of the White House. In a report issued in July 1947, the Interior Department included the Central Arizona project in a proposed list of developments on the Colorado River.

At that time Secretary Krug had before him a letter from Mr. Webb stating that—

> Authorization of any of the projects inventoried in your report should not be considered to be in accord with the program of the President until a determination is made of the rights of the individual States to utilize the waters of the Colorado River system.

The case arose out of the controversy between California and Arizona over claims to the waters of the lower Colorado River. Hearings on California's proposal to place the conflict before the Supreme Court are now in progress before the House Judiciary Committee. Similar hearings recently were completed before the Senate subcommittee. The bills, Senate Joint Resolution 145, and House Joint Resolutions 225, 226, 227, 236, and H. R. 4097, are all identical.

This proposed legislation, of which I am one of the authors, considers the 25-year-old fight between California and Arizona over their respective claims to Colorado River water. The controversy rests on the fact that the two States interpret differently a series of Federal statutes known as "the law of the river." Countless conferences during the past quarter of a century have failed to produce a settlement. Now California and Nevada have joined in proposing the issues be placed before the Supreme Court for final adjudication. Arizona is fighting this proposal.

Because the United States, with tremendous investments in developments on the Colorado River, is a necessary party to the proposed Supreme Court suit, the only way California can get into the court is through an act of Congress giving consent that the United States be made a party.

As this same time, Arizona is seeking congressional authorization for a gigantic irrigation project in central Arizona

to cost approximately a billion dollars. Money for this project is being sought by Arizona despite the fact that, because of the interstate fight over water rights, there is no assurance that water would be available for the project.

The Budget Bureau has stated in letters to the Interior Department that no authorization for such a project should be sought until the water right conflict is settled. This is the program of the President.

Mr. Krug was obliged to take formal notice of this instruction, and included Mr. Webb's letter in the report.

Thus, Mr. Krug was fully apprised of the President's program, of the view of the Budget Bureau, and understood that any authorization for projects on the Colorado River was conditioned upon a settlement of the water rights controversy between California and Arizona.

This was simply good business. Certainly the Government should not invest a billion dollars in a project for which there might be no water. And this assurance could not be had until the conflict was settled. But the Interior Department continued to promote the central Arizona project, and lobbied for it, in defiance of the White House.

The legislation calling for the water controversy to be placed before the Supreme Court was introduced in both Houses near the conclusion of the last session of Congress. At that time Mr. Krug was asked for his views on these bills.

When Secretary Krug had not complied with this request by April of this year, I wrote to Mr. Webb as follows:

The Senate Committee on Public Lands and the House Committee on the Judiciary several months ago referred Senate Joint Resolution 145 and House Joint Resolution 227 to the Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice for reports.

The Senate Committee has set Senate Joint Resolution 145 for hearing May 10. The House committee is expected momentarily to set a date for hearing on House Joint Resolution 227 sometime in May.

It has become the practice of the Department of Interior, in submitting reports on legislation, to include a stereotyped phrase at the conclusion of its report, to the effect that there has not been time to clear their report with the Bureau of the Budget.

I do not want this to happen in this instance. Accordingly, I suggest that you notify the Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice that you are aware of these hearing dates, and expect the departmental reports to be submitted to you in time for clearance before such reports are transmitted to the respective committees.

Nevertheless, when the Senate hearing began on May 10, no Interior Department report had been submitted. It finally arrived on the fourth day of the hearing, but only after Senator MILLIKIN, the chairman, had forcefully demanded it each day.

The Interior Department report had been sent to the Budget Bureau, and Mr. Krug had received a letter in reply from Mr. Webb clearly stating the program of the President and the views of the Budget Bureau.

Here are the relevant parts of Mr. Webb's letter to Krug, dated May 7, 1948:

While there is no objection to the presentation by the Department of the Interior of views respecting such subjects as it believes are pertinent * * * to the resolution pending before the Senate committee, such views should not be considered as indicating any commitment * * * as to the relationship to the program of the President of proposals for legislation to authorize construction in, and the further development of, the Colorado River Basin by agencies of the Department of the Interior.

There is agreement among all agencies concerned as to the urgent need for resolution of the water rights issues involved. I do not believe, however, that resolution of such issues through litigation would bar further development of water resources of the Colorado Basin during the period of such litigation.

While supporting California's contention that the controvery between Arizona and California should go to the Supreme Court, and proposing some amendments to the legislation, the Interior Department report contained conditional provisions which made me believe that it had not in fact been cleared with the Budget Bureau.

These provisions were for the concurrent enactment of legislation authorizing construction by Interior of projects in the lower basin of the Colorado. They were based on the plea that litigation in the Supreme Court would be protracted, and would delay development.

And in his report the Secretary of the Interior had the audacity to suggest that if there was any doubt about the existence of a justiciable controversy between Arizona and California, that doubt could be dispelled by authorizing the construction of the Central Arizona project.

He said this notwithstanding the plain statement in Mr. Webb's letter to him, of July 1947, that "the authorization of any of the projects inventoried in your report should not be considered to be in accord with the program of the President's until a determination is made of the water rights controversy on the Colorado River.

After reading the Interior Secretary's report on May 13, when it arrived before the Millikin committee, I called upon the Budget Bureau to state whether the report was in accord with the program of the President.

As a result of this inquiry, we now have the astonishing confirmation that the Secretary of the Interior, in reporting to Congress, has paid no attention to the program of the President.

And also, as a result of my inquiry, Mr. Webb saw the necessity of writing letters to the Senate and House committees repudiating the position taken by Mr. Krug. Mr. Webb also sent the committees copies of his letter of May 7 to Secretary Krug. This was done so that the committees would be in no doubt as to the President's program and the views of the Budget Bureau, which Mr. Krug had ignored.

The Secretary of the Interior had been told two important things by Mr. Webb: First, there should be no commitment as to authorization of a Colorado River project; and, second, that litigation in the Supreme Court of the controversy over water rights would not halt development of resources on the river.

How Secretary Krug respected this policy of the White House is shown by his report.

Mr. Krug called for authorization of the central Arizona project, and stated bluntly that litigation would injure development. He openly defied the President and ignored the Budget Bureau, although the Bureau had disapproved his proposal for concurrent legislation authorizing new river projects before the water controversy is settled. He refused to approve of the litigation unless he was given assurance that he might go right ahead with construction of new projects—projects for which there might be no water.

Secretary Krug took an opposite position to that of the White House and the Budget Bureau by stating that he was "fearful that many years, perhaps decades, will elapse" before the proposed litigation could be concluded. He said this in defiance of the administration policy, and in the face of the opinions of eminent attorneys that the litigation, involving only the interpretation of Federal documents, would be swiftly concluded.

In view of this defiance on the part of Secretary Krug, and as a result of my inquiries, Mr. Webb addressed his criticising letters to Senator MILLIKIN and Representative MICHENER. These letters are virtually identical, and therefore only the one addressed to Mr. MICHENER is included here.

Mr. Webb's letter, dated May 20, to Mr. MICHENER:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Bureau of the Budget.

MY DEAR MR. MICHENER: It has been called to my attention that the language of the report submitted by the Secretary of the Interior * * * is susceptible of misinterpretation by reason of the fact that, while a clear statement is made of the relationship to the program of the President of the resolutions themselves, no statement is made of the relationship to the President's program of the proposals advanced by the Secretary for the enactment of legislation authorizing construction in and further development of the Colorado River Basin.

To correct any misunderstanding which already has arisen and to prevent further misunderstanding, I have today requested that my letters of May 7 to the Secretary of the Interior and the Attorney General be inserted in the record of the hearings of the Senate committee * * * A copy of my letter to Senator MILLIKIN is attached. I shall be grateful if you will consider these materials and decide whether they should also be inserted in the record of the hearings before your committee.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. WEBB,
Director.

Mr. Webb had the soundest reasons for writing these letters. Cabinet officers were defying or ignoring the President and the Budget Bureau in such a way that congressional committees might be confused or deceived. Mr. Webb wanted the facts on the record.

His letter also effectively knocks in the head any hope of Arizona that the Budget Bureau is willing to let the Interior Department go ahead with plans for the central Arizona project unless and until the water controversy is first adjudicated in the Supreme Court, as demanded by California.

In the course of disclosing this extra insubordination by the Interior Department, the Budget Director also brought to light a highly interesting omission from

the report of the Attorney General on the legislation to carry the water controversy to the Supreme Court.

Although it had been requested more than 9 months before, the Attorney General's report reached the Senate committee on May 10, the day hearings began. It was signed by Peyton Ford, the assistant to the Attorney General.

The Justice Department report had been submitted to the Budget Bureau for clearance, and Mr. Webb had written a letter about it to Attorney General Clark.

In this letter Mr. Webb said:

> There is no objection on the part of the Bureau to the submission of the proposed report to the committee. The proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President if amended, as suggested by you in the second paragraph of page 2 of your letter.

In its report to the Senate committee, the Justice Department suggested several amendments to the proposed legislation, and the report concluded:

> In view of the foregoing considerations, the Department of Justice is unable to recommend enactment of the measure in its present form.
>
> The Director of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of the report.

The Attorney General's report left out the most crucial paragraph of the Budget Bureau's expression of the views of the President. Mr. Webb had told the Attorney General that the proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President if amended as suggested by the Attorney General himself.

But the Attorney General forgot to say that.

I can see only one conclusion to be drawn. Neither the Secretary of the Interior nor the Attorney General intend to concern themselves with the views of the President. They have ignored the President's program, as well as the instructions of the Budget Bureau.

It is now very clear that the legislation which would take the water controversy before the Supreme Court is in accord with the program of the President, if amended in the technical respects proposed by the Department of Justice, which are matters of procedure.

Both the Justice and Interior Departments have deliberately suppressed this fact in their reports to Congress; and the Interior Department has instead presented counterproposals for expansion of its construction program which are directly in conflict with the program of the President.

The entire text of the letters to which I have referred here, follows herewith:

APRIL 26, 1948.

Re Senate Joint Resolution 145 and House Joint Resolution 227.

Mr. JAMES E. WEBB,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
State Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WEBB: The Senate Committee on Public Lands and the House Committee on the Judiciary several months ago referred Senate Joint Resolution 145 and House Joint Resolution 227 to the Departments concerned for reports. These Departments are the Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice.

The Senate Committee on Public Lands has set Senate Joint Resolution 145 for hearing May 10. The House Judiciary Committee is expected momentarily to set a date for hearing on House Joint Resolution 227 sometime in May.

It has become the practice of the Department of the Interior, in submitting reports on legislation, to include a stereotyped phrase at the conclusion of its report, to the effect that there has not been time to clear their report with the Bureau of the Budget.

I do not want this to happen in this instance. Accordingly, I suggest that you notify the Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice that you are aware of these hearing dates and expect the departmental reports to be submitted to you in time for clearance before such reports are transmitted to the respective committees.

I call this to your attention and make this request, having in mind the comment of the Bureau of the Budget on the Interior Department's comprehensive report on the Colorado River, in which you stated in substance that the authorization of any of the projects referred to therein would not be in accord with the program of the President unless the water controversy is first determined. These resolutions are for the purpose of effectuating such a determination prior to the construction of new consumptive projects in the lower basin.

In this connection may I point out that in mid-May the comments of the States will be submitted, according to the procedure prescribed by the Flood Control Act of 1944, upon the Interior Department's report on the central Arizona project.

As a precaution I suggest that you advise the Department of the Interior that you will require that their report on this project be cleared through the Bureau of the Budget.

Respectfully yours,

NORRIS POULSON,
Member of Congress.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., May 20, 1948.

Hon. NORRIS POULSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington 25, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. POULSON: This will confirm the several conversations which have taken place between representatives of the Bureau of the Budget and your office with respect to your letter of April 26, 1948, relative to S. J. Res. 145 and H. J. Res. 227.

It now appears that the report of the Secretary of the Interior on the resolutions is susceptible of misinterpretation and has been so misinterpreted. A résumé of the situation is set forth in the attached copy of a letter addressed today to Senator MILLIKIN. A similar request for insertion of my letter of May 7 to the Secretary of the Interior in the record of the House hearings is being addressed to Representative MICHENER. A copy of this letter also is enclosed.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. WEBB,
Director.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., May 20, 1948.

Hon. EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MILLIKIN: It has been called to my attention that the language of the report submitted by the Secretary of the Interior with respect to Senate Joint Resolution 145 is susceptible of misinterpretation by reason of the fact that, while a clear statement is made of the relationship to the program of the President of the resolution itself, no statement is made of the relationship to the President's program of the proposals advanced by the Secretary for the enactment of legislation authorizing construction in and further development of the Colorado River Basin.

In order to correct any misunderstanding which has arisen and to prevent further misconstruction of the Secretary's report, there is attached a copy of my letter to the Secretary of the Interior dated May 7, together with my letter of the same date to the Attorney General. Representatives of the Secretary of the Interior agree that it would be desirable to clarify the record of the hearings before your subcommittee by the insertion of this letter and the attachments at the appropriate place, if you concur in such action.

This situation is also being called to the attention of the House Committee on the Judiciary and a copy of my letter to the chairman is attached for your information.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. WEBB,
Director.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., May 20, 1948.

Hon. EARL C. MICHENER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MICHENER: It has been called to my attention that the language of the report submitted by the Secretary of the Interior with respect to House Joint Resolution 225 and related resolutions is susceptible of misinterpretation by reason of the fact that, while a clear statement is made of the relationship to the program of the President of the resolutions themselves, no statement is made of the relationship to the President's program of the proposals advanced by the Secretary for the enactment of legislation authorizing construction in and further development of the Colorado River Basin.

To correct any misunderstanding which already has arisen and to prevent further misunderstanding, I have today requested that my letters of May 7 to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Attorney General be inserted in the record of the hearings of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on Senate Joint Resolution 145. A copy of my letter to Senator MILLIKIN is attached. I shall be grateful if you will consider these materials and decide whether they should also be inserted in the record of the hearings before your committee.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. WEBB,
Director.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF
THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., May 7, 1948.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Thank you very much for affording me the opportunity to comment upon the draft reports recently forwarded to you and proposed for submission to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with respect to Senate Joint Resolution 145 and to the House Committee on the Judiciary with respect to House Joint Resolutions 225, 226, 227, and 236, and H. R. 4097. All of the foregoing resolutions are designed to authorize commencement of an action by the United States to determine interstate water rights in the Colorado River.

The time set for the Senate hearings made it necessary for you to send a draft which had not received your final approval. However, congressional interest and queries and the result of consultation by members of the staff of the Bureau of the Budget with your representatives and those of the Department of Justice convince me that you should have at hand as definite a statement as I can give

you of the relationship of the several proposed resolutions to the program of the President. To this end I am enclosing a copy of my formal clearance letter addressed to the Attorney General respecting his report on Senate Joint Resolution 145. His comments have equal applicability to the several House resolutions referred to above. I shall appreciate it, therefore, if in submitting your report to the committee you will indicate that enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 145 would not be in accord with the program of the President unless so amended as to take into account the points listed in my letter to the Attorney General, upon which I am informed there is substantial agreement between the Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice.

It seems to me that at this time relationship to the President's program of the other matters discussed in your proposed report should be left open. No proposed legislation respecting them, so far as I am aware, is far enough along to be considered at the forthcoming hearing. Accordingly, while there is no objection to the presentation by the Department of the Interior of views respecting such subjects as it believes are pertinent to the consideration of the resolution pending before the Senate committee, such views should not be considered as indicating any commitment, at least at this time, as to relationship to the program of the President of proposals for legislation to authorize construction in, and the further development of, the Colorado River Basin by agencies of the Department of the Interior.

There is agreement among all agencies concerned as to the urgent need for resolution of the water-rights issues involved. I do not believe, however, that resolution of such issues through litigation inevitably would bar further development of water resources of the Colorado River Basin during the period of such litigation. It also is problematical as to whether all agencies would agree on the need for the general authorizing legislation that you suggest. When agreement is reached on any particular project, I feel that the usual legislative method for authorizing it would be preferable to a general authorization, no matter how carefully circumscribed with the kinds of criteria you suggest on page 3 of the reports before you.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. WEBB,
Director.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., May 7, 1948.

The honorable the ATTORNEY GENERAL.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: Receipt is acknowledged of Mr. Ford's letter of May 6 enclosing a report proposed by the Department of Justice for submittal to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs relative to Senate Joint Resolution 145, upon which hearings have been scheduled for Monday, May 10, 1948.

There is no objection on the part of the Bureau of the Budget to the submission of the proposed report to the committee. The proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President if amended, as suggested by you in the second paragraph of page 2 of your letter, in such a way as: (a) To waive the immunity of the United States to suit and permit the States to bring such actions as they may desire if the Congress feels that it is necessary to take such action in order to compose differences among the States with reference to the waters of the Colorado River; (b) to place a reasonable limit on the time for the bringing of such action; and (c) to insure that in any such action the United States would have the right to defend and also to assert any affirmative claim which it may have or wish to assert in connection with the subject matter of any action filed pursuant to the legislation. In this connection it is suggested that you may wish to consult with the Secretary of the Interior concerning proposed amendments which have been developed by his office to accomplish the foregoing purposes.

A copy of this letter and of your report are being sent to the Secretary of the Interior for his information.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. WEBB,
Director.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., May 13, 1948.

Hon. HUGH BUTLER,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: The views of this Department have been requested on Senate Joint Resolution 145, a joint resolution to authorize commencement of an action by the United States to determine interstate water rights in the Colorado River.

After reciting that "the development of projects for the use of water in the Lower Colorado River Basin is being hampered by reason of long-standing controversies among the States in said basin as to the meaning and effect of the Colorado River compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act, the California Limitation Act (Stats. Cal. 1929, ch. 16), various contracts executed by the Secretary of the Interior with States, public agencies, and others in the Lower Basin of the Colorado River, and other documents and as to various engineering, economic, and other facts," Senate Joint Resolution 145 provides that the Attorney General shall commence "a suit or action in the nature of interpleader" against the States of the Lower Colorado River Basin "and such other parties as may be necessary or proper" and "require the parties to assert and have determined their claims and rights to the use of waters of the Colorado River system available for use in the Lower Colorado River Basin."

Since the basic facts bearing on the Lower Colorado River Basin's water supply are already well known to your committee and are readily available in House Document 419, Eightieth Congress—this Department's report on the status of its Colorado River investigations—I shall not burden this letter with a repetition of them. Neither shall I attempt anything more than the very summary statement, which appears later in this letter, of some of the questions that are agitating the Lower Basin States. It was in part to these unresolved questions that the Commissioner of Reclamation referred when he concluded (see his letter to me dated July 17, 1947, printed in House Document 419, page 5) "that a comprehensive plan of development for the Colorado River Basin cannot be formulated at this time" and "that further development of the water resources of the Colorado River Basin, particularly large-scale development, is seriously handicapped, if not barred, by a lack of a determination of the rights of the individual States to utilize the waters of the Colorado River system."

It is indeed desirable that these controversies be settled. This Department has urged more than once that this be done. Its latest expression on this subject is contained in the letter of the Commissioner of Reclamation to which I referred in the preceding paragraph. The Commissioner there concluded "That the * * * States of the lower Colorado River Basin should be encouraged to proceed expeditiously to determine their respective rights to the waters of the Colorado River consistent with the Colorado River compact." I approved that conclusion at the time it was written and I am convinced that it is altogether sound.

These statements were made in the hope that the States would be able to compose their differences without resort to litigation. It may well be that interstate negotiations have not yet been carried as far as they could profitably be carried. Certainly I wish to urge that your committee give serious consideration to the possibilities which this method—or that of interstate arbitration—offer for the solution of the lower basin's problems before it decides upon a course of action with respect to Senate Joint Resolution 145.

The committee may also wish to consider the authority of the Congress to determine for itself where and how the waters of the lower Colorado shall be used and whether this authority, whatever it may be, has been exhausted by the Congress' approval of the Colorado River compact subject to the condition, which has been complied with, of California's enacting a self-limitation act or by the exercise of the authority given the Secretary of the Interior by section 5 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act to enter into contracts for the storage of water in, and its delivery from, Lake Mead.

Additional factors that should, in my judgment, be given serious consideration before action is taken on this joint resolution are the probability that the litigation that would follow its enactment will involve not only the lower-basin States (athough they are the States primarily interested in it) but the upper-basin States as well; the near certainty that, unless all parties to the litigation are willing to enter into a stipulation covering basic water supply data, the litigation will be quite protracted; and the possibility that the pendency of this litigation will be seized upon by those who are unfriendly to further development of the Nation's water resources generally, or to such development in the Colorado River Basin specifically, to delay authorization of badly needed works in that basin.

Previous instances of interstate water litigation have not been marked by speedy adjudications. I am fearful that many years, perhaps decades, will elapse before the suit which Senate Joint Resolution 145 contemplates could be concluded. Such a delay would work a real hardship on communities in the Southwest and, perhaps, throughout the basin unless means were provided to carry forward the development of noncontroversial projects in the meantime.

I could not say, therefore, in any event that there would be no objection to the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 145 unless I could also be assured that progress in the development of the Colorado River Basin and in the use of its waters would not be halted by such litigation. Such assurances would, I believe, be best evidenced by the enactment of a bill, prior to or concurrently with the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 145, authorizing the construction by the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation or the Office of Indian Affairs, of those projects, wherever they may be located in the Colorado River Basin,

1. which have engineering feasibility, economic justification, and financial feasibility (allowance being made under the last factor for the nonreimbursability of that portion of the cost of these projects which is properly chargeable to navigation, flood control, silt control, recreation, salinity control, and the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife);

2. for which there will be an adequate water supply regardless of the outcome of the litigation;

3. which (a) are consistent with full economical development of the water resources of the Colorado River system and of the particular basin, whether upper or lower, in which the proposed works are located, (b) will permit the States of the two basins to fulfill their obligations under and achieve the benefits of the Colorado River compact, and (c) will allow the United States to carry out its obligations with respect to the delivery

of water under the Mexican water treaty; and

4. which fit in with a plan, which should be embodied in the legislation, for the pooling of revenues from new hydroelectric plants developed in the Colorado River basin to aid irrigation developments in that basin.

Beyond the problems that I have just mentioned there are various questions that need to be considered carefully in connection with the language of Senate Joint Resolution 145 itself, should it be the opinion of your committee that litigation is the only appropriate remedy remaining available for the settlement of the controversies that now exist among the States of the Lower Colorado River Basin. If the present preamble to this joint resolution, for instance, is intended to set out the substance of the United States cause of action in the proposed suit, or if it is likely so to be construed, it seems quite certain that the contemplated suit would be dismissed by the Supreme Court, for it can hardly be said that an action predicated upon a fear that developments which have not yet been authorized would be frustrated, if they were authorized by a holding that the necessary water was not available for them constitutes a "case" or a "controversy" within the meaning of article III of the Constitution. It is entirely probable that the Court would hold that such a suit called for an advisory opinion rather than for a judicial determination.

To say this, however, is not to say that there is no adequate basis for an action through which all or most of the controversies that now exist among the States of the Lower Colorado River Basin could be determined, if it is the belief of the Congress that resort should be had to litigation for that purpose.

It is a fair assumption, I believe, that in the event such a suit as Senate Joint Resolution 145 contemplates were to be brought in the Supreme Court, the principal parties to that suit among the States would be California and Arizona. A review of statements made by the spokesmen for these two States at hearings before the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation on H. R. 5434, Seventy-ninth Congress, before the Senate Committee on Public Lands on S. 1175, Eightieth Congress, and before the House Committee on Public Lands on S. 483, Eightieth Congress, and of the comments by the two States on this Department's report on a plan for the development of the Colorado River indicates that the core of the legal aspect of this controversy between Arizona and California lies in certain provisions of section 4 (a) of the Boulder Canyon Project Act. This section, in permitting the Colorado River compact to become effective upon its ratification by six States of the basin, including California, did so only upon the condition that California agree "irrevocably and unconditionally with the United States and for the benefit of the States of Arizona, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, as an express covenant and in consideration of the passage of this act, that the aggregate annual consumptive use (diversions less returns to the river) of water of and from the Colorado River for use in the State of California * * * shall not exceed 4,400,000 acre-feet of the waters apportioned to the lower basin States by paragraph (a) of article III of the Colorado River compact, plus not more than one-half of any excess or surplus waters unapportioned by said compact, such uses always to be subject to the terms of said compact." Legislation evidencing such an agreement was enacted by California in the statute cited in the preamble to Senate Joint Resolution 145.

Confining my attention to this section of the Boulder Canyon Project Act—it being impossible to predict all of the issues that may be raised by the various parties to the proposed suit—four major problems would appear to be in dispute between California and Arizona. I may summarize them in question form thus:

(1) Are the 1,000,000 acre-feet of water for which provision is made in article III (b) of the Colorado River compact surplus or apportioned within the meaning of section 4 (a) of the Boulder Canyon Project Act? That is, is or is not California entitled to share in the use of III (b) water?

(2) Is the flow of the Gila River, for purposes of determining the water supply of the Colorado River Basin, to be measured at the mouth of the stream or elsewhere? And, as another aspect of the same problem: Is beneficial consumptive use by Arizona of the waters of the Gila to be measured, in terms of diversions from the Gila River less returns to that river, or in terms of the depletion of the virgin flow of that river at its mouth?

(3) Is the water required for delivery to Mexico under the treaty with that nation to be deducted from surplus water prior to determination of the amount available for use in California under section 4 (a) of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, or is California entitled to use a full one-half of the surplus diminished only by so much of the Mexican requirements as cannot be supplied from the other half?

(4) Is the burden of evaporation losses at such reservoirs as Lake Mead to be borne by California and Arizona in proportion to the waters stored there for each of them, or is the burden of these losses to be fixed in some other fashion?

The bare statement of these questions, the knowledge that there is disagreement between Arizona and California about the answers to be given them, and the fact that, if the contentions of either State are accepted in full and if full development of the upper basin within the limits fixed by the Colorado River compact is assumed, there is not available for use in the other State sufficient water for all the projects, Federal and local, which are already in existence or authorized would seem to indicate that there exists a justiciable controversy between the States. Should the Congress, however, entertain doubt about the existence of such a controversy, it could dispel that doubt by authorizing the construction of the Central Arizona project, a report which has been prepared by this Department and has been sent, pursuant to the provisions of section 1 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, to the States of the Colorado River Basin and to the Secretary of the Army for consideration and comment.

It is probably true that, in view of the existing physical water supply in the Lower Basin—a supply which is as ample as it is chiefly because the upper basin States are using far less than the 7,500,000 acre-feet apportioned to them by the compact—the situation is not such that the Court would be warranted in granting an injunction against either California or Arizona if it were found to be using more water than it is entitled to use. The controversy, nevertheless, appears to be of the sort that would justify the Court's determining the rights of the parties and definitely adjudicating their respective interests in the waters available to the lower basin. It matches in every particular the requirements for a "case" or a "controversy" in the constitutional sense of these words as those requirements were spelled out by the Supreme Court in *Aetna Life Insurance Company* v. *Haworth* (300 U. S. 227, 240 (1937)). "A 'controversy' in this sense," the Court said, "must be one that is appropriate for judicial determination. * * * The controversy must be definite and concrete, touching the legal relations of parties having adverse legal interests. * * * It must be a real and substantial controversy admitting of specific relief through a decree of a conclusive character, as distinguished from an opinion advising what the law would be upon a hypothetical state of facts. * * * Where there is such a concrete case admitting of an immediate and definitive determination of the legal rights of the parties in an adversary proceeding upon the facts alleged, the judicial function may be appropriately exercised although the adjudication of the rights of the litigants may not require the award of process or the payment of damages. * * * And as it is not essential to the exercise of the judicial power that an injunction be sought, allegations that irreparable injury is threatened are not required."

I have spoken thus far as if this controversy were of concern only to the States. Let me state briefly the interest of the United States. The United States has invested heavily in developments for the benefit on both sides of the river. These works include the Hoover, Davis, Parker, and Imperial dams, the All-American Canal, the San Diego aqueduct, and the Yuma, Gila, and Salt River reclamation projects. They also include the Colorado River and San Carlos Indian irrigation projects, and the Headgate Rock, Coolidge, and Ashurst-Hayden dams serving those projects. All of these developments are tangible evidence of the Federal and Indian interests in a development of the area that is not yet complete. But they are more than this. They are also the means by which thousands of families live and by which the Nation benefits from a region which is rich with water and poor without it. In these people and in a continuation and expansion of the benefits which the area can yield, even more than in its financial investment, the United States has an interest to protect.

Among these people, the United States has an especial interest in the protection of the Indians. That their stake in the Colorado River Basin is a very large one is made plain in the pages of House Document 419 devoted to the present and prospective development of Indian lands. That their rights to the use of the waters of the Colorado River system for the irrigation of these lands will be an important element in any settlement of the Lower Basin's problems, whether that settlement is accomplished by litigation or otherwise, is made plain by many legal precedents. Notable among these is the decision of the Supreme Court in *Winters* v. *United States* (207 U. S. 564 (1908)), that a reservation for Indian use of lands within the area of an Indian cession carries with it a reservation of such waters, within the ceded area, as may be needed to make the reserved lands valuable for agricultural pursuits or otherwise adequate for beneficial use, and that such a reservation of waters has priority from the date, at least, when the lands involved were reserved for Indian use. The obligation of the United States to maintain the prior water rights of the Indians of the Colorado River Basin, and to enforce the immunity of these rights against displacement by action inconsistent with their status as interests protected by Federal law, is one that has been recognized by all seven States of the Basin in the provisions of the Colorado River compact itself.

The vital concern of the United States in the waters of the Colorado River also stems from its traditional guardianship over navigable streams, the particular responsibility which it has taken on itself with respect to the Colorado by having entered into a treaty with Mexico, and its authority (asserted in section 5 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act) to control the use and disposition of the waters impounded behind Hoover Dam—all of which clearly make it an indispensable party to any general litigation involving water rights in the Colorado. But, quite apart from these broad policy considerations, the specific Federal developments, existing and potential, on both sides of the river are, as I have pointed out, so extensive and so important that, if those on either side are threatened by claims as-

serted on the other, the United States has a clear interest in seeing those assertions defeated.

It likewise has an interest in knowing what its obligations are under the various water-storage and delivery agreements that the Secretary of the Interior has entered into with Arizona, Nevada, and several California agencies under the authority given him by section 5 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act. The validity, meaning, and effect of those agreements depend upon their conformity to the relevant provisions of the Boulder Canyon Project Act and the documents related to it and, therefore, depend in part at least upon the answers to such questions as those previously outlined in this letter.

I have not attempted to examine the merits of the contentions made by the spokesmen for Arizona and California on these questions. Assuming, however, that there is some merit to both sides on all four of the major questions, it is obvious that there are many answers, in terms of the number of acre-feet of water which California may use under section 4 (a) of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, that might conceivably be given. Using the long-run average flows shown in this Department's report on the Colorado River Basin as a basis for computations, the answers might range from as much as 6,250,000 acre-feet per year to approximately 4,000,000 acre-feet. Likewise, there is a great range in the amount of water from the Colorado River system which might be found available for use in Arizona. The maximum might be somewhat over 3,500,000 acre-feet, the minimum nearly as little as 2,250,000 acre-feet.

The water which California projects, Federal or other, now in existence or under construction will require when they are in full operation is a great deal more than the amount which that State is entitled to use if all of Arizona's contentions are taken to be true. Similarly, the water which Arizona projects now in existence, under construction, or authorized will require when they are fully developed is much more than the supply available to that State if all of California's contentions are taken to be true.

It may be, of course, that the Supreme Court would not agree with all of the contentions of either of the States. For the present, however, the purpose of this discussion is to emphasize the fact that the United States has an interest of its own in the proposed litigation, that if Senate Joint Resolution 145 becomes law the United States may have to take a position before the Court independent of that taken by either of the States, that it is highly desirable that this likelihood be anticipated and recognized in the proposed legislation, which is before your committee, and that the constitutional basis for the Federal developments in the lower basin ought, therefore, to be clearly asserted in this legislation if it is to be enacted.

While I am thus convinced that the United States would have a large stake in the outcome of this proposed litigation, I am not prepared to say that the onus of instituting the suit should be cast, as the present language of Senate Joint Resolution 145 proposes, on the Attorney General. It would, I believe, be better for the United States merely to allow itself to be joined as a party defendant in the litigations.

If the Congress determines that a joint resolution along the lines of Senate Joint Resolution 145 ought to be enacted, then, in addition to the incorporation therein (or in other legislation enacted prior thereto) of provisions authorizing those developments in the basin that can be appropriately undertaken pending conclusion of the litigation, the joint resolution should, in my opinion, be amended by substituting for its present text language substantially as follows:

"Whereas there are controversies of long standing, particularly among the States of the lower Colorado River basin, over the meaning and effect of certain provisions of the Colorado River compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, the California Limitation Act (Stats. Cal. 1929, ch. 16) and other documents related thereto; and

"Whereas those controversies affect the various projects in that basin for impounding, regulating, and using the waters of the Colorado River and its tributaries, a commercially valuable interstate stream system, the construction of which the Congress has heretofore authorized, or may hereafter authorize, in the exercise of its constitutional powers to provide for the general welfare of the United States, to regulate commerce by promoting the comprehensive development of the Nation's water resources, to implement and carry out the obligations of the United States to Indian tribes and to foreign nations, to make needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property of the United States, to protect the rights of the Indians to priority in the use of the waters reserved or otherwise available for them, and to provide for the national defense; and

"Whereas the Secretary of the Interior, on behalf of the United States, has entered into various agreements with States, public agencies, and other parties in the Lower Colorado River Basin relating to the storage and delivery of Colorado River water, and the validity, meaning, and effect of these agreements depend upon their conformity to the provisions of the statutes and other documents hereinbefore referred to; and

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States, in *Arizona* v. *California* (298 U. S. 558), held in effect that there can be no final adjudication of rights to the use of the waters of the Colorado River system without the presence, as a party, of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved, etc.*, That consent is hereby given to the joinder of the United States of America as a party in any action or actions commenced within 2 years from the effective date of this act in the Supreme Court of the United States by any State of the lower basin of the Colorado River, as that basin is defined in the Colorado River compact, for the adjudication of claims of right asserted by such State, by any other State, or by the United States, with respect to the waters of the Colorado River system available for use in that basin."

The Bureau of the Budget has advised me that the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 145 would not be in accord with the program of the President unless amended in such a way as—

(a) To waive the immunity of the United States to suit and permit the States to bring such actions as they may desire if the Congress feels that it is necessary to take such action in order to compose differences among the States with reference to the waters of the Colorado River;

(b) To place a reasonable limit on the time for the bringing of such actions; and

(c) To insure that in any such action the United States would have the right to defend and also to assert any affirmative claim which it may have or wish to assert in connection with the subject matter of any action filed pursuant to the legislation.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT TO
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., May 7, 1948.

Hon. HUGH BUTLER,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This is in response to your request for the views of this Department concerning the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 145) "To authorize commencement of an action by the United States to determine interstate water rights in the Colorado River."

The resolution would direct the Attorney General to commence a suit or action in the nature of interpleader, in the Supreme Court of the United States, against the States of Arizona, California, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah, to require the parties to assert and have determined therein their rights to the use of the waters of the Colorado River system available for the lower Colorado River Basin.

An investigation of the situation discloses that at the present time there seem to be conflicting interests or claims, at least between the States of California and Arizona, with respect to rights to the use of the waters of the Colorado River in the lower basin of that stream. That conflict, among other things, would involve interpretation of the Colorado River Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, and related statutory enactments. What conflicts there may be among the other States mentioned in the joint resolution are obscure. It appears, however, that there are no present conflicts in need of judicial determination between the United States and the States in the Colorado River Basin. Here it may be noted that there has been no request by any agency of the Federal Government to this Department for the institution of an action for the purpose of determining the rights of the United States in the lower basin of the Colorado River. In the absence of such a request with adequate supporting data, it would not be in accord with the policy of the Department to institute such an action on its own initiative on the basis of the facts at hand.

Since it appears that, at the present time at least, there are no conflicts between the United States and the several States involved in the proposed legislation which are in need of adjudication, it is fair to assume that the legislation has been proposed for the purpose of affording at least some of the States an opportunity to present their differences and conflicting claims to the Supreme Court for settlement. *Arizona* v. *California* (298 U. S. 558 (1935)) was instituted by Arizona to have adjudicated certain rights to the unappropriated waters of the Colorado River. In that action six other basin States were named as parties defendant. The Supreme Court dismissed that action on the grounds that since the United States was an indispensable party and had not consented to be sued, the suit could not be maintained.

The decision of the Supreme Court in *Arizona* v. *California* made it clear that the type of relief desired by the States in a suit between them cannot be had in the absence of legislation giving the required consent. It is to be noted that Senate Joint Resolution 145 would provide for the appearance of the United States as a party plaintiff in such litigation. However, since the principal and perhaps the only controversy exists among the States, it is suggested that Senate Joint Resolution 145 should be amended so as to waive the immunity of the United States to suit and permit the States to bring such actions as they may desire if the Congress feels that it is necessary that their differences with reference to the waters of the Colorado River in the lower basin thereof be composed. It is further suggested that such amendment require the bringing of such an action by any or all of the States involved within 1 year from the effective date of the legislation, and that in any such action the United States should have the right to defend and also to assert any affirmative claim which it may have or wish to assert in connection with the subject matter of any action which may be filed pursuant to the legislation.

It is noted that the bill, as presently drafted, contemplates the bringing of a suit or action "in the nature of interpleader." It

is suggested that, regardless of the form in which the legislation may pass, any limitation on the discretion of the plaintiff, as to the character or the action or suit to be filed, should be eliminated. It is believed that the plaintiff, in litigation of this importance, should have complete discretion as to the nature of the action to be filed.

It has been suggested that there is some question as to the existence of a justiciable controversy. That question itself can be determined authoritatively only by the Supreme Court. Cogent arguments can be made in support of, and also against, the existence of a justiciable controversy. Presumably, all aspects of this question will be thoroughly presented and vigorously maintained by different States in case the question is presented to the Supreme Court.

In view of the foregoing considerations, the Department of Justice is unable to recommend enactment of the measure in its present form.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of the report.

Yours sincerely,

PEYTON FORD,
The Assistant to the Attorney General.

European Reliefers Want Our Money Without Any Embarrassing Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I read a dispatch from Paris under the headline "Doubts voiced in Europe as to ERP success." The article states that many Britons, Frenchmen, and other Europeans are wondering if ERP is going to be as satisfactory as expected.

It seems they are very much worried over four things.

They seem to fear that the American Government is going to insist that they get to work themselves.

They fear that strings will be attached to the program which will not permit them to continue down the Socialist road of managed economies that lead but to bankruptcy.

They fear very much that we shall insist on calling a spade a spade, and insist on their using their own initiative in the future.

According to this article, the four most startling impressions which alarm these Europeans are:

1. That the Americans are going to put a stop to anything that smacks of Socialist planning in Europe.

In other words, these Europeans believe that the success of ERP rests on our taxpayers providing all the luxuries that the Socialist politicians have promised them from the cradle to the grave.

2. That the sale of all industrial equipment and machinery to Russia and eastern Europe from the 16 Marshall plan countries will be banned by the United States.

Here again these European leaders seem to think that ERP success is based on the free furnishing of machinery which they can resell to those behind the iron curtain.

3. That the 16 countries are to be forced to devalue their currencies to conform to real values.

In this case they seem to think that ERP success depends on our maintaining European currencies at the inflated level that the socialist governments would like to think was their real value although they have absolutely no relation of real value. Witness the controls and black markets.

4. That the United States will insist that the British-controlled sterling area be broken up.

We were told when we passed the British loan that England would resume dollar payments and thus free the assets of others that were tied up in sterling. Now it seems our foreign friends believe that ERP's success depends on our maintaining a sterling-area in which countries will trade with Britain but will never receive currencies they can use to buy American goods.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that if ERP recovery depends on the assumptions of these Europeans it can never succeed for it would take more money than can ever be bled from American taxpayers to support these socialist governments and their unbalanced budgets. The longer they put off the stabilizations of their currencies, the worse the debacle is going to be.

The end of this article advises these frightened Europeans to wait until Mr. Hoffman has his money and the freedom to frame his administration policies.

I certainly hope that the Appropriation Act will be so worded that Europeans will receive no aid unless they remove all socialist restraints on recovery and make a serious attempt to balance their budgets in real and not fictitious values.

Will Congress Mutilate Reciprocal Trade Act?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, when the House Ways and Means Committee decided to break with tradition and to hold closed hearings on the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, the Citizens' Committee for Reciprocal World Trade, in protest, held a people's hearing on RTA on May 14 at the Mayflower Hotel. More than 50 business, farm, labor, veterans' and public affairs organizations testified in support of a 3-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act without amendment.

The honorary chairman of this committee is the former distinguished Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull.

I include the opening remarks by Mr. Gerard Swope, chairman of the Citizens' Committee for Reciprocal World Trade:

When the House Ways and Means Committee decided to break with tradition and restrict hearings on extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to closed sessions of a subcommittee, the Citizens' Committee for Reciprocal World Trade decided that it should create a public forum in which interested citizens could express their views with representatives of the press present to report whatever developments they may consider newsworthy.

On each of the four previous occasions when Congress has reviewed this legislation and then extended it, the full Ways and Means Committee has held public hearings where qualified citizens have been able to state their positions and where the press has been able to attend and to report not only the testimony but more particularly the types of questions asked by committee members and the general attitude of the committee toward the witnesses.

This open discussion has been an essential factor in acquainting the voters at large with the issues involved, and it has been useful to the great body of Congressmen who could not personally attend the hearings. I am told that there are some 128 Members of the present Congress who have never been exposed to this type of review of the Trade Agreements program; hence, it would seem especially important that they be given the advantage of knowing how business, farm, labor, and civic groups feel about this basic national policy.

In any event, the announcement that we were organizing these people's hearings on RTA has been accorded strong editorial support not only here in Washington but in newspapers from New York to San Francisco as well. Apparently, the leadership in the House Ways and Means Committee seriously underestimated the breadth and the depth of public concern as to the fate of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act which has given consistency and continuity to our international trade policy for a decade and a half.

To the development of this record of continuity, forward-looking members of both the major parties have contributed, and still are contributing, importantly. Evidence of this bipartisan cooperation in facing the new challenges of the postwar world is the interest shown in today's meeting by representatives of both parties. It encourages us to hope that, as the RTA legislation moves out of committee into general debate, this bipartisan approach will be reflected in further extension of the Trade Agreements Act.

More than 40 separate organizations representing a good cross section of American life have signified their intention of testifying here today to their support for extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in its present form and for the customary 3 years. And there may well be still others in this audience who will want to add their voices, either as representatives of organizations or as individuals, to the chorus of endorsement which is reflected in the findings of the Gallup poll published here only yesterday. That measurement of public attitude toward RTA, if you did not happen to have seen it, shows 80 percent in favor, only 8 percent opposed, and 12 percent uncertain of the persons questioned who know something of the purposes and performance of the reciprocal trade-agreements program.

At the same time I want to emphasize that these hearings are open to opponents as well as supporters of the legislation. As of last evening, no one had asked for time in which to oppose RTA; and all three leading opponents who were personally invited have declined. Presumably, the opposition is content to rest its case with the testimony it gave in the closed hearings of the House Ways and Means Subcommittee.

As you know, this present hearing will be followed by a luncheon at 1 o'clock, at which Senator Barkley, the Honorable William L. Clayton, and Mrs. Dana Backus, president of the Women's Action Committee for Lasting

Peace, will speak. As I shall preside at the luncheon, I am asking Mr. H. Harvey Pike, of New York City, to take over as chairman here. Long identified with trade between the United States and the Caribbean and a former vice chairman of the Foreign Policy Association, Mr. Pike is thoroughly familiar with world trade conditions.

The question may be raised that he obviously has a special interest. But hasn't each and every one of us, as taxpayers and as citizens, an equally obvious special interest through our personal stake in the long-term success of the European recovery program? Billions of our dollars are involved, and we must act as intelligent lenders if we expect the European nations to be solvent borrowers.

Mr. Pike, please carry on from here.

Mr. Speaker, I now include a press release issued by the Citizens Committee Reciprocal World Trade, dated May 12, 1948, giving excerpts from speeches made and a list of the participating organizations:

WASHINGTON, May 14.—Rallying to register their support for a 3-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, representatives of more than 50 business, farm, labor, veterans' and public affairs organizations testified today at a people's hearing on RTA at the Hotel Mayflower. The meeting was sponsored by the Citizens' Committee for Reciprocal World Trade, of which Cordell Hull, former Secretary of State, is the honorary chairman and Gerard Swope, prominent industrialist, is chairman. H. Harvey Pike, New York sugar broker, presided at the hearings.

President Harry S. Truman, in a special message to the meeting, said: "Secretary of State Marshall has truly pointed out that the trade agreements program has never been so important as now to us and the rest of the world. The United States is throwing tremendous effort, through the European recovery program and other measures, into helping other free nations to help each other in meeting their economic emergencies. * * * We are equally convinced that their economic welfare is vital to our own prosperity and security."

Before introducing Mr. Pike as the presiding officer, Mr. Swope said: "When the House Ways and Means Committee decided to break with tradition and restrict hearings on extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to closed sessions of a subcommittee, the Citizens' Committee for Reciprocal World Trade decided that it should create a public forum in which interested citizens could express their views with representatives of the press present." He added that the announcement of the hearings had been given strong editorial support by newspapers throughout the country, indicating that the House Ways and Means Committee had seriously underestimated the breadth and depth of public concern as to the fate of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Introduced into the record of the hearings was a statement by a representative of the National Foreign Trade Council, which said: "This is a critical time in world economic affairs. * * * Other nations are waiting only for a signal from the United States to embark on nationalistic programs which would make the trade barriers of the thirties seem inconsequential. Failure to renew the Trade Agreements Act, or hampering its effectiveness by amendment which nullified administrative operation, would be taken as such a signal."

First to appear in the parade of witnesses was Vice Adm. Emory S. Land, president of the Air Transport Association of America. "European recovery is based on the expansion of foreign trade and the elimination of trade barriers," he pointed out. "The extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is essential to successful implementation of United States foreign economic policy. * * * This is not a question of politics, it is a question of American leadership."

As spokesman for the Americans for Democratic Action, Seymour E. Harris, professor of economics at Harvard University, said: "We can survive economic isolationism but at a much lower standard of living. We are not likely to survive world war III, toward which we would make an important contribution through supporting economic isolationism."

Appearing for the Committee for Economic Development, Howard S. Myers, director, stated the committee's policy: "We strongly favor continuing to lodge the authority for negotiating reductions where it now lies, as the only way to avoid objectionable past practices. We hope that the Congress will act promptly in renewing and strengthening the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act."

The American Watch Assemblers Association was represented by James Bevans, its counselor, who said: "To this association, it is unthinkable that we should abandon this trade-agreements program at the present time when the conditions of the countries of the world is so deplorable and * * * taxpayers have contributed so much to restore those countries." He added, "Before the people of this country are taxed to support an industry, there should be no question but that such industry is properly placed and efficiently operated."

The national board of the YWCA was represented by Mrs. James Irwin who stressed that "if we fail to extend RTA at this time, if it is restricted or extended for only a limited period, other nations will doubt our intentions. If these nations know they will be able to export to us, to balance their imports when more normal conditions return, their production and recovery will be stimulated."

Labor has a great deal at stake in the trade-agreements program, Stanley Ruttenberg said, as spokesman for the CIO. "Many industries would be unable to operate and many workmen would be out of jobs if the United States did not import vital materials—and on the other hand our exports promote domestic employment," he added.

Other representatives of labor appearing in support of the legislation included those from the Textile Workers Union of America (CIO) and the United Textile Workers of America (A. F. of L.).

Mrs. J. Borden Harriman, former Minister to Norway, appeared as spokesman for the Committee on Public Affairs and urged a 3-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act for our own economic self-interest, for our own protection in the battle of ideologies, and in the interest of world peace and prosperity.

CLAYTON URGES RTA SUPPORT AT LUNCHEON

At a luncheon following the hearings, William L. Clayton, former Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs and now special consultant to the State Department on the reciprocal trade agreements, spoke on the urgency of extending the present act for 3 years. Other speakers included Mrs. Dana Converse Backus, chairman of the Women's Action Committee for Lasting Peace. Mr. Swope presided.

Other supporting organizations represented at the hearings included: American Association of University Women, American Farm Bureau Federation, American Chamber of Commerce of Cuba, American Chamber of Commerce of France, American Civil Liberties Union, American Office Supply Exporters Association, American Veterans Committee, AMVETS, American Unitarian Association, Associated Exports, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Catholic Association for International Peace, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Church Peace Union, Citizens Conference for International Economic Union, City Club of Chicago, Commerce and Industry Association of New York.

Also, Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, Foreign Credit Interchange Bureau of the National Association of Credit Men, Friends Committee on National Legislation, General Federation of Women's Clubs, Importers' Association, Inc., of Chicago, Inter-Racial Press of America, International Association of Machinists, International Flag of Peace Association, League for Industrial Democracy, League of Women Voters of the United States, Women's Division of the Methodist Church, National Association of Consumers, National Council of American Importers, National Council of Jewish Women, National Farmers Union, National Peace Conference.

Also, National Women's Trade Union League, Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, Overseas Automotive Club, National Standard Parts Association, Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, Twentieth Century Fund, United Council of Church Women, United Nations Council of Philadelphia, United Packinghouse Workers of America, United States Associates of the International Chamber of Commerce, United States Cuban Council, United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Young Republican Club of New York.

Individual corporations represented included: The American Exporter, Baldwin Locomotive Workers, Bank of America, Caterpillar Tractor Co., Coca-Cola Export Co., Henry Diston and Sons, Goodyear Tire & Rubber Export Co., W. R. Grace & Co., Hollingshead Corp., Scott Paper Co., Sharpe & Dohme, Standard Vacuum Oil Co., Symington-Gould Corp., and S. S. White Dental Manufacturing Co.

TEXT OF THE PRESIDENT'S TELEGRAM

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C.

GERARD SWOPE,
Chairman, Citizens' Committee for Reciprocal World Trade:

It is most gratifying that at this critical time a group such as the Citizens' Committee for Reciprocal World Trade is so wholeheartedly supporting the continuation of the trade-agreements program. That program is an essential and integral part of our national policy of seeking, through cooperation with other nations, to advance prosperity and peace at home and in all other countries. Only with sincere and informed support from our citizens can any of our national policies be expected to succeed.

Just now the Congress, for the fifth time in 14 years, is considering extension of the Trade Agreements Act. American citizens overwhelmingly approve and support renewal of the act and continuation of the program. The Citizens' Committee for Reciprocal World Trade is an outstanding example of the cross section of public interest from which the support comes.

Secretary of State Marshall has truly pointed out that the trade-agreements program has never been so important as now to us and to the rest of the world. The United States is throwing tremendous effort, through the European recovery program and other measures, into helping other free nations to help each other in meeting their economic emergencies. We are doing this in the firm conviction that by bettering their economic condition they have a better chance of achieving political stability and maintaining their national integrity. We are equally convinced that their economic welfare is vital to our own prosperity and security.

Circumstances have given the United States the economic leadership of the world.

We have consistently exercised that leadership in the direction of better living standards and better international relations throughout the world. We cannot now turn back from this goal and start again down the road toward the mirage of economic isolationism. To be consistent and retain our leadership we urgently need the tested and effective mechanism of the reciprocal trade agreements program. The renewal of the Trade Agreements Act without crippling amendments and for a satisfactory period of time is essential to give us this mechanism.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Is It Wicked for Farmers To Make Money?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, there are some people in this country who apparently think that it is a crime for a farmer to make money. They are strong for prosperity, but they hate to see the farmer have any part of it. A typical expression of this attitude is contained in an article appearing recently in the Washington Daily News by Peter Edson, well-known Washington columnist, entitled "The Farm Vote—Sacred Cow." This article is so biased against farmers and contains statements so far from the truth that it ought to be challenged.

Mr. Edson begins his article by calling attention to the fact that the proportion of our population engaged in farming is rapidly declining, and goes on to state that while in the past Congress might have been justified in giving some consideration to agricultural problems, that because of the decline in the number of farmers no particular attention need be paid to them now and that there is no political harm, at least, in kicking farmers around. Mr. Edson says:

> By today's estimates, United States population over 21 years of age is divided, roughly, 50,000,000 in cities, 16,000,000 in small towns classified as rural nonfarm, and only 14,000,000 rural. This accounts for a possible 80,000,000 voters.
>
> This farm vote is still important to Congressmen who come from strictly rural districts. But based on the interests of the people—percentagewise and on a national average—city population should control 62.5 percent of the votes in Congress, the rural nonfarm population should control 20 percent, the farm population only 17.5 percent.

Mr. Edson then goes on to say:

> But there is no denying that today more weight is given to maintaining farm prosperity than to maintaining prosperity for the industrial worker. And there is no point in keeping the city worker broke just to maintain the country cousin in clover. The two problems should no longer be considered separately.
>
> If the country wants industrial peace, the place to begin is on the farm front. Outlawing the Communist Party and tightening up on the labor laws won't stop today's strikes.
>
> Some place, some time, somehow—somebody is going to have to get at the roots of labor trouble. Right now those roots reach back to the farm and too-high food prices.

In other words, according to Mr. Edson, it is not John L. Lewis or Philip Murray or the Communist leaders in labor who are causing our trouble today. It is the wicked farmers who have forced prices up so high that city people can no longer exist and have to strike for more money. Well, that is very interesting, if true. Mr. Edson does not cite any facts to back up his statement, and cannot do so. But I am afraid there are some as prejudiced as he who will accept his conclusions without proof.

FARM INCOMES LESS THAN ONE-HALF NONFARM INCOMES

But before blindly condemning the farmer as the villain in the piece, let us take a look at the facts. What about the incomes of farmers as compared with the incomes of nonfarmers? What about the increase in food prices as compared with the increase in wages and consumer incomes? Facts on these matters are readily available to Mr. Edson or anyone else who desires to obtain them. Let us see what they are.

Well, according to Government statistics, for 1947 the per capita income from farming for persons on the farm was $725. That is a good deal more than it was before the war and it sounds fairly good in comparison. But how does it compare with the per capita income of the nonfarm population? What was that in 1947? It was $1,480, or slightly more than double that of the average farm income.

PEOPLE ARE LEAVING FARMS BECAUSE OF HIGHER INCOMES IN CITIES

That ought to settle the question, had it not? But here is something else to back it up. We all know that if one part of our economy is more prosperous than any other, there is a drift of people into that particular activity. If farmers are so prosperous today at the expense of their city cousins, you would expect that there would be a rush of people to the farms in order to get in on some of this easy money. But here again, the hard cold facts tell just the opposite story. This year there are 2,500,000 fewer people on the farms than we had in 1941. But during the same time, our nonfarm population increased by 12,500,000 people, and that notwithstanding the fact that the birth rate on the farms is much higher than it is in the cities. The people who left the farms to work in industry, as well as many of the boys who went in the Army, have not come back to the farm because they are making more money as downtrodden workers in the city than they can make on the farm.

INCOMES AND WAGES HAVE ADVANCED FASTER THAN FOOD PRICES

Now, let us look a little further into Mr. Edson's contention that food prices are keeping city workers broke. What are the facts there? Well, the latest Government figures show that for March 1948, food costs were 102 percent above the average for the years 1935–39. That is quite a little jump, is it not? But what was happening to people's incomes during the same time? Just this: The average nonfarm income in this country from 1935–39 was $625. In 1947 it was $1,480, or an increase of 136 percent, as compared with 102-percent increase in food costs. During the same period factory weekly earnings increased 119 percent, so that the wo.kingman in the city was still ahead of the game, compared with prewar, as far as food costs are concerned.

But here are some more figures, and I think they furnish the best test as to whether Mr. Edson is right in his contention that we are "keeping the city worker broke just to maintain the country cousin in clover." These figures show the percentage of total income in this country which is currently being spent for food, as compared with prewar. For that period 22 percent of our total income went for food. For the year 1947, 26 percent of our total income was spent that way. That looks as if the consumer might be getting pinched somewhat. But here the figures are deceiving because in 1947 the average consumer in this country was consuming 16 percent more food than he consumed in the prewar period; and what is more, this increase was mostly in the foods that the nutritionists say should be consumed in larger quantities for the maintenance of health. That is, people were eating more dairy products, more meats, more poultry, and more fruits and vegetables. So that, for this 4 percent in increased expenditures in food, the consumers of this country were getting 16 percent more food and better food than they had before the war. If people were consuming today on an average the same amount and kind of food that they consumed prewar, they would be spending only 18 percent of their income for food, which is less than they have ever spent for food as far back as we have any figures on the subject. These figures show up Mr. Edson's statements for just what they are—100 percent bunk.

PRICES OF PRACTICALLY ALL FOOD CROPS FIXED BY SUPPLY AND DEMAND

Another thing that is implied in Mr. Edson's article is that food prices today are being kept up by reason of Government support prices, which Mr. Edson infers are being applied in underhanded, tricky sorts of ways. Here is what he says:

> Double parity formulas, trick conservation payments, unreasonable support prices, and all the hidden subsidy gimmicks thought up during the depression need a complete overhauling.

If Mr. Edson means by this that the general level of farm prices is being kept up through Government supports, he is wrong again. There is temporary legislation on the books, passed during the war, which provides for support prices on certain agricultural commodities. That legislation was passed for the purpose of protecting farmers who were asked to expand their operations and to go into the production of new and unfamiliar crops because they were especially needed; and also in order to enable farmers to reconvert after the war period to peacetime production. The idea was the same as contained in provisions made for business, to enable farmers to expand their production during the war and to swing back into peacetime production after the war was over. The only difference is that the provisions for business cost the taxpayers of this country a lot more than did those for agriculture.

But what are the facts as to support prices? Simply this: There is no important agricultural commodity today

which is getting any benefit from support prices, and the only cases where any price supports on food crops are in effect, either wholly or partly, are those involving a few minor commodities. In those cases the support is at 90 percent of parity which, after all, means less than fair prices to the farmer. The provisions authorizing this support expire on December 31. Note also that the prices of which consumers are complaining are those of commodities on which prices are being made by supply and demand, such as grains, livestock and meats, milk and milk products, and poultry, as well as some fruits and vegetables.

The fact is, some farm prices are declining at this time and they are declining much faster than food prices. A lot of the declines have not been reflected at all in lower prices to the consumer. For instance, wheat dropped about 70 cents per bushel in February and the price has stayed just about the same ever since. Nevertheless, the average price of bread is as high as it was before the drop, and in some places it is higher. During the recent meat strike, meat prices to consumers went up, but prices on livestock to farmers declined.

FARMERS CANNOT FIX PRICES OF THINGS THEY SELL

Now, just what is it that has brought about an increase in farm and food prices during recent years, and what is holding them up to their present levels? Is it anything that farmers are doing? Well, that question almost answers itself, because there is no way by which farmers can control the prices of their products. No individual farmer can do a thing about what he gets for his product. All he can do is take it to market, ask what the price is, and if he does not like it, he can haul it back home. Most farm products are perishable or semiperishable. They have to be sold at a certain time, so the farmer is at the mercy of the buyer and the consumer.

Unlike labor and industry, farmers do not go on strikes or stop production in order to hike prices. I mentioned awhile ago that food consumption in this country had gone up 16 percent per capita, but agricultural production, as compared with prewar, has gone up 35 percent. That is notwithstanding the fact that there are fewer people on the farms and that farmers are still suffering from an acute shortage of machinery and fertilizer. Now, suppose that farmers had followed the example of some of their cousins in the city and had cut their production by going on strike, or by slowdowns, or the other methods which are used as weapons by organized workers to secure higher income? Suppose, instead of increasing their production 35 percent under great difficulties, farmers had kept on producing at the same rate they did before the war. Where do you suppose farm prices would be today?

Another thing which may or may not interest Mr. Edson and those who think with him, is that production costs on the farm have advanced tremendously. The wages of farm labor are up almost 300 percent and every article which the farmer uses in production has advanced substantially. The farmer may be handling quite a bit of money nowadays, but with expenses as they are, his bank account at the end of the year is not nearly as large as outsiders might suppose.

WHY FARM AND FOOD PRICES ARE HIGH

Now, let us get back to the question of what is holding up farm prices today. There is just one answer, and that is supply and demand. Our per capita consumption of food is 16 percent above prewar. Our population has increased over eleven millions since that time. So demand is high and, with a greater national income than we ever dreamed of in this country, people are bidding against each other for food items. That is one part of the story.

The other part is that during and since the war, this country has sent vast quantities of food abroad. This food has not only saved the lives of millions of people, but has been an important part of our foreign policy. It is our atomic bomb as far as the cold war is concerned, and if we win that war, it will be largely because of the redoubtable efforts of American farmers in increasing production in spite of some pretty serious handicaps.

The fact is, when supply and demand are operating, farm incomes in this country move right along with industrial wages. It is almost uncanny, but over a period of many years, going back at least as far as 1920, cash receipts from farm marketings and the wage earnings of factory workers have been almost the same. The only time when there has been any great variation was during the war when we had a ceiling on farm prices and no ceiling on wages. At that time, factory wages were substantially in excess of the total receipts from farm marketings. As soon as price ceilings were removed, however, the relationship between the two figures was again restored and for 1946 and 1947 they were almost identically the same. For 1946, cash receipts from farm marketings were $24,519,000,000, and wage earnings of factory workers were $24,221,000,000. The preliminary estimate for 1947 shows cash receipts from farm marketings to be $30,000,000,000, and wage earnings of factory workers to be $29,500,000,000.

If we have another round of substantial wage increases, it is almost certain that in the end it will result in another increase in food prices. I am not suggesting it, but if Mr. Edson really wants to reduce farm prices, the quickest way it could be done would be to reduce industrial wages. Those reductions would be reflected almost immediately in lower farm prices, for the simple reason that housewives would reduce their buying, and supply and demand would take care of the situation.

WHAT WOULD MR. EDSON DO ABOUT FARM PRICES?

Mr. Edson makes some sweeping generalizations, but nowhere does he say what he would do about farm prices. Perhaps he is in favor of price ceilings. If so, is he in favor of ceilings on wages, on freight rates, on steel, on farm machinery, and on all the other articles that farmers buy? Or does he want to establish an OPA on farm prices while wages and other prices keep on soaring? Judging by the tenor of his article, that is probably just what he wants to do.

MR. EDSON ENCOURAGES STRIKES AND DISUNITY

Mr. Edson says, "Outlawing the Communist Party and tightening up on the labor laws will not stop today's strikes." Without agreeing or disagreeing with Mr. Edson on that, it can well be said that neither will articles like Mr. Edson's stop strikes. Indeed, if people generally swallow his unfounded, misleading statements and accept the biased conclusions which are contained in the article, it can well have the effect of encouraging strikes.

It is unfortunate that anyone should write such an article at this time when the American people are confronted with so many grave problems at home and abroad. This is a time for unity in thought and action, not for class strife and group hatred. I know of nothing which is better calculated to bring about disunity and dissension among our people than mischievous, demagogic articles such as that written by Mr. Edson.

District of Columbia Home Rule Bill Should Be Amended To Protect Civil Service and Veterans' Preference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, there are many features in the bill under consideration which I consider questionable. However, I shall address my remarks primarily to title 14 of the bill which provides for the appointment, classification, and retirement of officers and employees of the government of the District of Columbia.

Section 1402 of the bill provides that all incumbents of positions in the government of the District of Columbia shall, on the effective date of the act, be given civil-service status upon passing a noncompetitive examination and upon being certified by the head of his department.

There will be approximately 10,000 District employees plus 5,000 school teachers who will be given civil-service status under this provision. Also, under this section these employees of the District government will be eligible for transfer to positions in the Federal Government and have competitive classified civil-service status to the same extent as employees in the Federal Government. I question the advisability of such a procedure because it violates the basic precepts of a merit system. Further, the result will be that an additional 15,000 employees will be added to the Federal pay roll, each of whom will have the right to take positions in the Federal Government which have been reserved for veterans and those who pass competitive civil-service examinations.

While this provision would give one the impression that the employees in the District government were to be on the same level as civil-service employees in

the Federal Government, you will observe that in section 1403 persons may be appointed to positions in the District government from "registers of persons who have by virtue of special examinations qualified for positions in the government of the District." I consider this provision equally objectionable because of the fact that persons could get in the Federal Government through "special examinations," be appointed to positions in the District government and then transfer to the Federal Government. Also, section 1403 provides that residence in the District shall not be required for eligibility for appointment to certain positions in the District government.

Section 1404 deals with the noncompliance of the District with requirements of the Civil Service Commission. It provides that the Civil Service Commission shall not have complete authority over the practices of the District government with respect to the selection, classification, or retirement of officers and employees of such government. On the contrary it provides that the joint congressional committee shall be advised of such wrongful practices. This is not in conformity with regular civil-service procedure in the Federal Government, because the Civil Service Commission has adequate authority over such practices in the Federal Government.

On the basis of the foregoing it is obvious that in providing for a civil-service system in the District, the act does not set up a proper civil-service merit system. It is neither fish nor fowl and its resemblance to the present Federal civil service is only coincidental. It appears that a feeble attempt has been made to provide a semblance of a civil-service system in the District government without including a true merit system.

Mr. Speaker, this bill also violates the provision of the law which unfortunately is not being complied with at the present time, that provides for apportionment of employment in the District of Columbia from the various States in accordance with their population. Unless this bill is properly amended, citizens and residents of States outside the District of Columbia will have little chance at the jobs in the departments in the Nation's capital. As a matter of fact, if we follow the terms of this proposed legislation, most of the jobs will be filled by people who reside in the District. This, of course, is in violation of the intent and the purpose of the Civil Service Act when it was enacted by Congress.

Will Congress Mutilate Reciprocal Trade Act?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article by George Ericson from the Christian Science Monitor, May 1, 1948:

In a world preoccupied with antagonistic ideologies, possible wars and defense preparations, some notable progress, nevertheless, has been made in paving the pathways down which peace may find its way. These pathways are those of international trade. The biggest roadblocks to the free flow of trade since the 1930 Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act have been removed by the reciprocal trade treaties negotiated by former Secretary Cordell Hull, by the Bretton Woods agreements, the 23-nation Geneva tariff pacts, creation of the International Trade Organization at Habana in March of this year, and by the European recovery plan.

The proponents of freer trade are not to be permitted to rest easy, however. Next month the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act comes up before Congress for renewal. On June 12, the act, which is widely regarded as the cornerstone of America's foreign trade policy, and which has been extended four times in the 14 years since enacted, expires. Its benefits have been so well attested that its defeat seems unthinkable. Yet there is a substantial body of opinion in Congress which has expressed an intention of defeating the RTA or of saddling it with amendments which would emasculate it.

RECORD OF REPUBLICAN OPPOSITION

If there are those who think that the danger to the reciprocal-trade policy has been overdrawn, a look at the voting record in Congress should be illuminating. Including the original enactment, there have been five tests of congressional opinion on the act. In only one of these, and that was in the war year 1943, did the Republicans in both Houses, by majority vote, favor the legislation. On the other four occasions, that is, in 1934, 1937, 1940, and 1945, the Republicans were overwhelmingly opposed to the Hull trade program.

Of course, it could be said that since the last adverse Republican vote 3 years ago, much has happened in the world to show the futility of any legislative action tinged with isolationism. Therefore, it might be argued that the Republicans, who today control Congress, would not endanger the good results obtained at Geneva and Habana by crippling the Hull program. And, too, it is evident to GOP leadership that repudiating the policy of reciprocity would, in effect, negate a central principle of ERP legislation, itself a bipartisan piece of work, that the 16 signatory nations pledge themselves to cooperate in the reduction of trade barriers.

CRIPPLING AMENDMENTS TALKED

Nevertheless, there is a high-tariff group in Washington which, while it pays lip service to trade as a two-way street, gives evidence of doing by indirection what seems too difficult by direct assault. The proposal is to approve the act, but to require that individual trade pacts hereafter must first be approved by the Senate, while permitting existing agreements to stand. This amendment would be based on the theory that a trade pact can be considered a treaty, and all treaties are subject to Senate approval. A proposition of this kind would hamstring the State Department, since it could subject every agreement to interminable delay or dispute.

There is also a measure of support for placing or keeping tariffs on imports which would equalize production costs here and abroad. This, say the proponents, would protect United States producers against the influx of goods made by cheap labor in nations with a much lower standard of living. However, there are no reliable measuring rods for reducing comparative costs of production in different countries. And there are, moreover, the fluctuations in foreign exchange which is another factor militating against an acceptable formula for arriving at a standard of cost.

CONGRESS WANTS FINAL CONTROL

It is possible that better statesmanship will prevail and that no radical changes in the act will be made, at least none that would damage the prestige of this country as a defender of multilateral trade. It is understandable that there are legislators who are jealous of the prerogatives of Congress whom they feel has been by-passed by the authority accorded the President to grant tariff and trade concessions by proclamation.

Probably no material harm would result if the Congress adopted one amendment now proposed which would permit a reciprocal trade pact to become effective after a short period if not rejected by majorities in the House and Senate. This would return to those bodies final controls but would leave, in essence, freedom for the State Department to act.

There can be no quarrel with the principle that trade should be progressively freer. Nor is there much disagreement, in commercial circles, that United States trade is in heavy unbalance and that this country should expand its imports substantially. In the long run, imports should balance exports, unless, of course, this country is to continue on a course of giving away its products outright for an indefinite period. The latter cannot be regarded as practical, either from an enonomic or political standpoint.

MORE IMPORTS GRAVELY NEEDED

Imports cannot expand in the same proportion as exports since the productive facilities of Europe are only beginning to emerge from a state of almost complete economic collapse. But with the broad functioning of ERP will come the gradual repair of mines and factories, and the expectation that Europe may largely raise its own food. Then heavier imports by the United States will not only become a factor in combating inflation but will assist in slowing up the depletion of our natural resources.

Last year, exports by the United States totaled $14,400,000,0000 a dollar gain of almost 50 percent. Imports, however, rose only to $5,700,000,000 from $4,900,000,000, a gain of but 16 percent. Exports thus exceeded imports in 1947 by $8,700,000,000, an excess topped only twice before in American history, and that during the war years 1943 and 1944. Such a huge excess of exports cannot possibly be counterbalanced by loans or by imports, visible or invisible. For a time, at least, the United States should resign itself to the giving away of goods, since the foreign-aid program has become a function of national defense.

RECIPROCITY ABOVE PARTISANSHIP

But, in a world where shortages are widespread and much is produced abroad of which the United States has need, tariff barriers based on partisanship are the height of folly. Every time that tariff cuts have been proposed or made effective, a cry has gone up about selling certain industries down the river. But actual instances of American industry being hurt are notable for their absence. The boon to the whole economy from reciprocal pacts, on the other hand, cannot be gainsaid.

The American people have already shown through Gallup polls their desire to have the Hull trade program continued. Renewing the RTA would be in line with the ideals of world cooperation expressed in many international conferences by United States trade representatives. Legislative obstructionism now when Congress has just allocated billions to help put Europe on its feet would seem like the veriest sophistry. United States policy should be all of a piece.

We Need a Better Social-Security System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, when a citizen of this country has labored until he reaches age 60 he ought to be able to retire on a pension or social security benefits adequate to maintain him for the remainder of his life. But he cannot do so under our present laws. That is why I have sponsored legislation to increase the pension benefits under our social-security system and to reduce the eligible age limit from 65 to 60.

PRESENT RATES INADEQUATE

Today the average benefit for a retired worker is approximately $24.90 a month and the average benefit for a retired man and his wife is $39 per month. The average family benefit for a widow and two children is $48.20 per month.

These penurious rates do not provide security. Actually such benefits do not come close to providing for the bare necessities of life. How can we fairly call such a system social security? It serves only to pauperize our citizens who are eligible to receive it and gives them a subsistence lower than that provided for citizens in many countries that were devastated by the late war. How can the Congress of the United States expect the elderly and dependent people of this country to keep body and soul together under such a system? How can it be expected that they can preserve their self-respect? Even under normal conditions our present pension and security allowances would be meager enough. But prices have skyrocketed since the end of the war. The cost of living has nearly doubled. But in spite of that fact, pension and security allowances are practically at the same levels as they were before and during the war. This is indeed a sad commentary on the ability of the most prosperous Nation of the world to fulfill a just obligation to so large a segment of its own citizens. There is no excuse for it, Mr. Speaker, and it ought to be corrected before this session of Congress adjourns.

OUR OWN PEOPLE FIRST

Since the end of the war we have embarked on a program of financing the social and economic problems of practically every other nation on earth. In the last two and one-half years, we have given away to foreign countries over $25,000,000,000. We are trying to stop communism in Europe and Asia by making the people of those countries prosperous and happy. It is said that communism feeds and thrives upon poverty. Therefore, it is said that if we make the peoples of other countries prosperous with our money, it will stop the spread of communism. But what about making our own people secure? I submit, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot carry upon our shoulders the financial responsibility of the entire world. No nation has been able to survive such a program and if we do not stop it pretty soon, we will be as bankrupt as the nations we are seeking to save. Charity begins at home. Why do we not first of all provide for the security of millions of our own citizens before taking on the burdens of Europe and Asia? Our first duty is to our own people.

RETIREMENT WITHOUT CHARITY OR DOLE

Every citizen in this country who works for his living has the inherent right to look forward to the day he can retire and live his remaining years on an adequate pension, without charity from his friends or a dole from his Government. He is entitled to a workable social-security system which will provide him this kind of protection.

Social security is not charity. It is not Government relief or a dole. It is a system whereby employer and employee, with the aid of the Federal Government, combine to establish a reserve fund which will protect the American worker and his dependents after retirement age. That is the principle upon which the system should work—and would work if Congress provides the necessary legislation to permit its proper functioning.

In addition to the fact that the present law does not provide adequate security, it has some other very important defects. Only a small segment of the American people are covered by it. Millions of people have no protection under it at all. In fact, there are more people omitted under the law than are included within its provisions. The law must be amended to rectify this discriminatory situation.

There is no reason for denying social security benefits to self-employed persons. In many cases these people are no better off financially than those who have an employer. Yet millions of our people who are technically self-employed can obtain no retirement benefits under our system no matter how badly they may need it. Small-business men and professional groups fall within this category. My bills would correct this injustice. In addition, there is the farmer and the State and municipal employee and domestic workers who likewise are denied these benefits. There is no basis or justice for such discrimination.

In short, the whole system of social security needs revision. It never can be practical or workable as long as it excludes more people than it covers. Furthermore, there is the problem of overhauling the rate structure. People cannot live on pensions or annuities which are inflexible and do not take into consideration periods of rising prices and inflation such as we have today. A man and his wife, or a widow with dependents, should receive a minimum of $100 per month in order to take care of their basic requirements in decent American fashion. The President of the United States recently advocated the revision of these laws and by so doing he has approved the legislation which I have been sponsoring for several years.

Congress should not adjourn before it takes care of this desperately important problem of raising social security levels and expanding its coverage. These improvements are long overdue. We can build a better and more prosperous America only by guaranteeing the retirement security and well-being of our own citizens.

Shall We Continue To Give Away Our Birthright of Liberty for a Mess of Communistic Pottage?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I am including an article from the Olean (N. Y.) Times-Herald of May 24, 1948:

PLAYING TO THE GIMMES

(By Frank Tripp)

In a shooting war we're tops, if there's glory in that. We've never been licked. We can conscript our youth and win, but not our diplomacy it seems.

A letter from an American who gets around, has been 20 years abroad, now is in Africa, says:

"What in the world is the matter in the United States? Our statesmen and our country are laughingstocks everywhere I go. I am so lost for answers and so ashamed that I can hardly hold up my head."

What a catastrophe! When the richest, finest, freest land on earth is jeered by the very peoples whom we are asked to feed and make free—to the point that our own countrymen cannot hold up their heads in foreign lands.

It is a product of our own national life. We can pin the wilted rose on a philosophy which comes so close to communism that it's frightening. We are deserting the franchise of our fathers. The thriftless are becoming Government dependents, and our politicians are coddling them for their votes. Respect-commanding, rugged Americanism has gone out the window.

There is in America, and has been since 1932, a concept preached to workers, in schools, in pink parlors by crackpot socialites and even from some pulpits, that gnaws at the very vitals of our freedoms. It is communism's pal. It leads millions to think that the Government owes them a living. It prompts office seekers to encourage that hope.

It is the concept that the American way, our Constitution and Bill of Rights, the safeguards created by the first Americans, are out of date; should be modernized to fit the troubled world, at colossal cost to us—one world.

One world—but whose?

If you will think a minute, you'll remember that these concepts originated with politicians, the shrewdest we've ever known; with brain trusters and job-hungry satellites who became legion. It became a way to get elected, and stay elected; the New Deal.

New Dealism was distorted, amplified, multiplied even beyond the dreams of its author. Depression made it thrive. Self-seeking demagogues preyed upon the plight of the people and led part of them to distrust and hate the other part. It deceived so well that it even crossed party lines.

Thus came to this country the very thing upon which communism flourishes; war to the hilt between the haves and the have-nots. Have-nots who have more than the princes of other lands.

So many of the men we elect, and so many they appoint to pilot us through greed-lashed seas, are so afraid that they'll miss the votes of the misguided, exploited masses that the ship of state flourishes near the shoals.

And just who are the suckers?

Revolution threw out and murdered the Czars of Russia, the cruel, oppressing ruling class. The world found a measure of justi-

fication. Just what did the Russian people get out of it?

They got another ruling class that now seeks to rule the whole world. While the comfort and riches for which the people rebelled are consumed in cold war, with shooting war in prospect, to force others, including us, down to Russia's miserable level.

They got war, want, murder, more greed, no peace, no plenty. They lost their church, their press, their very souls. They got only lies, propaganda, darkness. That's the communism that we suffer to be preached on our street corners—and say a man can espouse and still be an American.

There is a danger in this country that must be faced. It is akin to the thing that robbed the Russian people of the fruits of their revolution. Dependence upon government—a country-wide epidemic of gimmes.

To rule themselves people must sustain themselves; must have rugged personal independence, as our fathers had when they established this Nation. The more the people depend upon the Public Treasury, accept aid and sustenance from it, the farther they move away from self-government, the stronger, more dominant, wasteful, and oppressive government becomes.

Playing up to the gimmes gets votes—buys them with the very money that the recipient pays in hidden taxes. It is legal for a candidate to buy his way into office with the taxpayers' money.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, nearly every request to the Federal Government for funds is for the purpose of carrying out some project intrinsically desirable. They embody objectives which we can generally agree should be attained in some way or another. Our big problem in Congress is to study the over-all picture and limit Federal commitments to what we can afford to pay in money and, more specifically, in manpower and materials.

Senator EDWARD MARTIN is Pennsylvania's candidate for President of the United States. The Pennsylvania delegation at the Republican Convention in Philadelphia will support him unanimously; the Pennsylvania Republican Members of Congress have endorsed him unanimously. No real great strides toward Government economy can be made until there is a man in the White House who will do his best to trim expenditures. For the past 2 years, the Republican Congress has fought a steady battle for economy against the President and an executive department believing in more and more spending.

At this time, I am sure the fine speech of Senator EDWARD MARTIN, delivered before the annual convention of the Pennsylvania Bankers Association at Atlantic City on Wednesday, May 19, 1948, will be of interest and value to all. I include it herewith as part of extension of my remarks:

It is not unusual, when help is needed, to turn to the banker.

That is why I welcome and deeply appreciate this opportunity to discuss with you one of the grave problems confronting America.

I am glad to be here today, because, as a Member of the United States Senate, I need your help. America needs your help.

I don't mean the kind of help you are normally called upon to provide—cash or credit. The problem I want to place before you has to do with money, but I don't want to borrow any.

On the contrary, I want your help to convince the people of the United States that they should spend less of the so-called Government money.

About a year and a half ago the people of the United States elected a majority of Republicans to Congress. They placed Republicans in control of the House of Representatives and the Senate, because the Republican Party was pledged to a platform calling for economy in government.

As a consequence of that election, we came to Washington convinced that the people wanted us to reduce the swollen cost of government and to cut the national debt substantially. The record of the Eightieth Congress shows that we made a good start in that direction and gave the people the benefit in the form of tax reduction.

And then what happened? The same people who had voted for economy began to indicate, in one way or another, that they really did not mean it.

Many of them told Congress that they wanted more Government spending to pay for a great variety of benefits. The pressure groups swarmed into Washington from all directions, representing business groups, welfare and educational interests, and even State and city governments. Of course, they favored economy, provided it did not affect their own pet projects, but only hit the other fellow.

It was quite a surprise to Congress, I must admit. But nevertheless, there are a lot of us who still believe that national economy is the best thing for the long pull; the only way to assure national security and solvency.

And that is where you bankers have tremendous influence.

As American citizens, it is your duty to take part in running this Nation. That is the duty of every citizen, whether he is a banker, businessman, professional man, industrial worker or farmer.

But as bankers, there is a special obligation upon you to take an interest in our Government. You are in close contact with every kind and size of business. You are in contact, as well, with all kinds of Americans.

Perhaps a large part of your contribution to the success of the American form of government can be to teach people that the benefits they receive from Washington are largely fictitious in that they come out of the pockets of the people, themselves. The Government has nothing to give to the people except that which the people pay for, either in cash or in lower living standards.

Perhaps you can find a way to make graphic the appalling increases in the cost of Government—Federal, State, and local. In 1940 the total was about $17,500,000,000. This year the figure is in excess of sixty billion.

One of the most difficult problems facing us is how to dramatize economy, and make people understand how desirable it is.

It is easy enough to paint a glowing picture of benefits which they derive from Federal spending. It is easy to visualize broad ribbons of concrete highways, great airports, letters with wings carried swiftly by a subsidized air mail; expanded Federal educational and medical services, and the like.

Yes, it is easy to paint pictures like this and to stimulate public demand for more and more from Uncle Sam. It is easy to turn on floods of letters, telegrams, and visits by delegations, all demanding support for spending projects.

Some people think it is a never-ending game of put and take in which Uncle Sam is always putting and they are always taking. And all free.

That is why the average Member of Congress receives 100 letters supporting a spending project for every one urging economy. That is why economy-minded legislators, who try to husband the people's money carefully, sometimes find themselves reviled and ridiculed as skinflints, as if it were not easy enough to vote "Yes" on any spending project and so gain a cheap popularity.

It is easy to do all this, because benefits from spending—some of them false—are so simple to dramatize.

But how do you dramatize economy? How do you make people understand that fervent crusading for not spending is important to the solvency of our Nation and to the future we will hand on to our children?

Since going to the Senate, I've spoken in many States. Over and over I've preached the thing I believe with all my heart and soul—that this Nation must have less government, less bureaucracy, and less loose spending.

My experience is always the same.

When I talk economy I get applause. People crowd around me and say that I was exactly right. They urge me to continue the good fight back at Washington—to cut down spending, reduce the bureaucracy, and prevent the Federal Government from swallowing up the States and local subdivisions.

What happens after that is the tragic part. They quickly forget. Then, along comes somebody selling a new bill of goods, demanding new projects for the Government to finance, new ways of spending. It sounds like something for nothing. There is glamour in that kind of government.

They, in far off Washington, will be paying for it. We, right here, will benefit from their money.

Gentlemen, for 15 years arguments like that have been sweeping people off their feet. Congress after Congress has appropriated vast sums of money because the people back home—hypnotized by these demagogic arguments—have been demanding more and more spending.

We are today victims of a New Deal theory—that we can spend ourselves into prosperity. The tragedy of this theory is that it becomes a chronic bad habit—like the dope habit.

First we prime the pump when depression comes along. Then we prime the pump when there is no depression. Finally, we are priming the pump even in times of inflation. Yes, that is what has happened to us.

Expensive grants-in-aid, such as the depression era agricultural adjustment program, still continues. Need I remind you that wartime and depression temporary agencies still continue—now on a permanent basis? Need I remind you that this form of drug appears so easy and so pleasant that we are prescribing it anew today?

It is odd that a man who will fight desperately to protect his personal solvency, and will refuse to spend beyond his means, sees nothing wrong when the Government goes on a spending spree and goes deeper and deeper into debt.

The great problem, as I said before, is to convince the American people that it is even more to their benefit and to the benefit of their children and grandchildren to reduce Federal expenditures and lower the national debt. This will result in lower taxes, opportunity for the individual, and will safeguard national solvency.

I don't want our people to wake up some morning in the future and find themselves teetering on the edge of a precipice, the kind that caused Britain such anguish. I want

our people to regain their balance now. I want our people to use the yardstick of private morality and private solvency in their consideration of Government spending. I want them to remember they are the children of hardy, self-reliant pioneers.

Their forefathers said, "I'll do it, myself." They did not turn to government to handle every difficult problem for them. In that way, I believe, lies strength and long-time real prosperity for this country. But, unfortunately, that rugged highroad does not have the same appeal as the broad low road paved with Federal benefits.

Our people must be made to understand that the seemingly endless stream of subsidies and grants-in-aid and the growing bureaucracy, always lead to more centralization in government. If we continue to centralize, if we continue to lean more and more upon Washington, without doubt we shall drift into some form of socialism. Then the state will cease to be the servant of the people. Instead the people will become the servants of the state.

Many educators and even some businessmen have advocated for the United States something similar to the socialistic experiment in government which controls Great Britain. What has happened there could happen here. Government control has become Britain's biggest industry.

There the Ministry of Food tells 47,000,000 Britons what to eat for each meal.

The Board of Trade tells them how much clothing they may buy.

The Ministry of Health controls the building and repair of homes.

The Ministry of Fuel determines who may drive automobiles and where they may drive.

Their Treasury prescribes what foreign countries they may visit.

The Ministry of Agriculture tells them when they are allowed to kill a pig.

The Ministry of Supply parcels cut steel and other goods for industry.

And so on.

This, mind you, is not being done under the stress of wartime emergency. This is England in peacetime, under a socialistic system of government, which expects to retain its rights as dictator over all these things, even if Britain should regain its former prosperity.

America has not come to that. Please God, it never will. But, if millions of Americans delude themselves into believing that Washington is the fountain of plenty from which all bounties flow—and that they don't cost anything—then we are likely to come too close for comfort to this British socialistic pattern.

We are riding for a terrible fall, with an unpleasant landing, if millions of Americans continue to insist that the Federal Government should step in and run more and more functions of our life—both by regulation and by financing.

The founding fathers created a Constitution, embodying a Bill of Rights, which, over the years, has been a suit of shining armor to protect the ordinary citizen from encroachment by unduly officious government. I wonder what the forefathers would think if they could see millions of citizens busily removing this armor, by urging more and more power upon the Central Government.

To our people, I say, learn that public money is private money. Learn that the seemingly easy Federal spending of today will have to be paid for tomorrow in your sweat, your tears, and even a share of the liberties and privileges which have belonged to Americans since our Nation was founded.

Learn that the Federal Government can give the people only what it takes from the people. In fact it will give back 20 or 30 percent less. Up to now, local taxing and financing have proven more economical than remote control taxing and financing from Washington.

Give Washington a real public demand for economy. Give us an alert, informed public and a vigilant, free press to demand cuts in Federal expenditures and to stand firm on that point, meeting all challenges of expediency.

Then this Government will really buckle down to the job of saving money. It can be done. The room for savings is there, if we understand that we cannot afford everything we would like the Government to buy, any more than the private incomes of most of us will permit us to have all the luxuries we should like to buy.

Here is one way to economize:

Cut all departmental budgets except those concerned with national defense and the care of disabled veterans.

Refuse consideration of new nonessential spending proposals.

Study the existing subsidy and Federal-aid programs carefully, with a view to eliminating or reducing their cost.

Take a firm stand that this country in peacetime has no right to have 2,000,000 and more civilian employees on its pay roll.

Eliminate many of the new Federal functions added in recent years, particularly those not basic to a constitutional republic.

This may sound to some like a Spartan program. It is very mild, indeed, compared to the harsh steps Britain and other nations have been forced to take since the war. If we do our cutting now, a major operation will not be required. It will be successful. The patient will live and thrive.

I prefer that to waiting and gambling with the future.

Yours is a powerful organization of practical men. Your membership combines expert knowledge of business and finance with genuine concern for the welfare of our country and its people.

America is fortunate to have many other organizations that work, as you do, for progress and civic betterment.

Such organizations should take leadership in developing a better understanding of the true nature of so-called Federal aid. They should be in the forefront of the fight to reduce Federal spending and to check the trend toward a socialistic pattern of government.

That will help to preserve America as a land of freedom and opportunity—strong, dynamic, and solvent.

It Is Time Now To Equalize the Rates of Compensation Payable for Wartime- and Peacetime-Connected Disabilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, all Members of Congress are vitally interested in any legislation which will improve the conditions of our veterans and their dependents. Legislation has been recently introduced which intends to equalize the rates of compensation payable for wartime and peacetime service-connected disabilities and to increase the pensions of dependents of peacetime veterans.

The Regular Veterans' Association, of which my personal friend, W. M. Floyd, is national commander, has been in the forefront of the fight to advance programs of justice and equality for both the wartime and peacetime veteran. His organization is strongly supporting bills introduced in the House and Senate.

Of interest to the Members of the House and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is an article on this subject entitled "Parity of Wartime and Peacetime Pensions" in the issue of the Regular for April-May 1948. It is inserted into the RECORD along with these remarks, because I think it worth reading.

The article is as follows:

PARITY OF WARTIME AND PEACETIME PENSION

The Regular Veterans' Association is in full battle array in support of H. R. 5402 and its companion bill, S. 2160. These bills were introduced in the House and the Senate, respectively, by Representative J. HARRY MCGREGOR, of Ohio, and Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama. They proposed to equalize the rates of compensation payable for wartime and peacetime service-connected disabilities, and to increase the pensions of dependents of peacetime veterans.

National Commander Floyd has never ceased fighting for the equalization of disability compensation, and his vigorous and all-out campaign for the particular legislation now proposed, for which he is responsible, is roaring along on its way—on its way to success if the fervent hope, the strong heart, the great fighting ability, and the long hours of heartbreaking labor of the national commander can make it so.

A large percentage of the members of the RVA are World War II veterans, many of them being peacetime servicemen before war was declared. These war veterans became members of the RVA because they came to realize through their war service in every part of the world, the value of trained and experienced peacetime Regulars. They became members of the RVA because they believe in a strong and efficient national defense. They believe that men who give years of their lives in the peacetime service of our country, should be given security on a par with wartime veterans who receive their basic training from the peacetime soldiers. An untold number of lives were saved in war because of the preliminary training received from the Regular service.

The policy of the Veterans' Administration is to award pensions on the basis of the disabled veteran's inability to earn an average living for himself and his dependents. It is not known what recomendations, if any, will be made by the Veteran's Administration on the legislation presently proposed. In the past, however, the Veterans' Administration has held that the peacetime veteran disabled in line of duty, is not entitled to awards equal to those made for wartime veterans. Because of the policy ostensibly adopted in awarding disability compensation, we cannot understand nor see any reason for discrimination between peacetime and wartime veterans.

Servicemen of the Regular Establishment are American citizens. Disabilities incurred in line of duty affect them economically and otherwise in the same manner as similar disabilities incurred by war veterans. They are all human beings. They are all subject to the same physical injuries and diseases. All of them should be given equal consideration by our Government, and we believe that the American people intend that they should.

A great deal more could be said in favor of the equalization of disability pensions. But now, direct action means much more than words. Every veteran, every reader of the Regular, can help secure justice for disabled peacetime veterans. Write to your Congressman and to your Senator asking them, as their constituents, to give their support to H. R. 5402 and S. 2160.

Israel: American Council for Judaism States Its Position on This Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including, first, a statement just issued by the Washington Chapter of the American Council for Judaism, on the rather touchy subject of Israel, the new Jewish state in Palestine. This group declares "that Israel is a foreign state to Americans of Jewish faith and is not the state or homeland of the Jewish people." It is time that such a statement should be made and the local chapter of the American Council for Judaism is to be commended for its forthright statement. At this point I include the entire statement which appeared in the Washington Post this morning:

JUDAISM UNIT STATES POLICY

Jews who are citizens of other nations can in no way be represented by the new state of Israel, the Washington Chapter of the American Council for Judaism declared yesterday.

The chapter's executive committee, meeting for the first time since recognition of the new state by the United States, drafted a statement of policy in which it said:

"We emphatically declare that Israel is a foreign state to Americans of Jewish faith and is not the state or homeland of the Jewish people. It cannot bestow rights upon them or exact obligations from them."

HOPE FOR PALESTINE PEACE

The statement expressed hope that this Government, through the United Nations, will succeed in bringing peace to Palestine.

The Council's program, it was stated, will be:

1. To make clear the sharp distinction between Judaism and Zionism and between Israelis (citizens of the state of Israel) and Jews who are citizens of other nations.

2. To insist that no Jew or organization of Jews can speak for all the Jews of America.

3. To deny the validity of any claim to the existence or control of a "Jewish bloc" vote in the United States.

TO CONTINUE ITS WORK

4. To continue to seek increased immigration opportunities in the United States and elsewhere for displaced persons of all faiths and national derivations.

The statement said the World Zionist Movement participated in proclaiming the provisional government of Israel and that it was hoped that both the Zionist movement and the provisional government would recognize the necessity of "making clear the complete * * * national severance of Jews who are citizens of other nations from this new state."

"The future of 5,000,000 Americans of Jewish faith," it was declared, "lies in a nation free from segregation or divisiveness. The goal and privilege of every American of Jewish faith is to become part of American life, equal in rights and valued in service to his fellow citizens."

Mr. Speaker, I am also including in my remarks a timely editorial that appeared in a recent editorial of the Christian Science Monitor. Those who clamor for a policy in Palestine that puts this country at odds with the British had better think twice.

EIGGER THAN PALESTINE

The United States and Great Britain need each other's support more than they need the support of either Arabs or Jews.

If that fact is given its full weight in American and British policies for Palestine, a solution of the conflict there can be achieved. If that fact is given its full weight, the prestige of the United Nations can be repaired and even enhanced through the Palestine test. The fact, indeed, must be given full weight if the problems of adjusting American-British relations in the European recovery program are not to be dangerously distorted by suspicion and resentment.

This is a moment when American-British cooperation needs reaffirmation on the world front in more specific and positive terms than merely the agreement between Secretary Marshall and Foreign Minister Bevin not to talk to Russia. It needs to be reaffirmed at those points where Soviet manipulation can exploit secondary disagreements, like Palestine, to the confusion of American-British public sentiment—a confusion almost certain to condition top-level decisions either as to substance or timing.

We are convinced that the headlined misunderstanding between the United States and Britain over Palestine is only a part, and a lesser part, of the American-British approach to this challenge to peace. After all, this misunderstanding finds expression chiefly in discussions before the UN, and the reactions of American and British public opinion.

Let us examine it briefly. It consists of American charges that the British are abusing UN technicalities to permit British aid to the advancing Arab armies. For their part, the British are pointing out that President Truman's swift recognition of Israel has complicated the task of bringing the warring peoples to an agreement.

The exchange is not confined to these points. It tends to cover the entire range of Palestinian difficulties ever since Britain accepted the League of Nations mandate and full responsibility for enforcement, and Americans began to give free advice, free from responsibility.

If this goes on, it may obscure a good many opportunities besides those in Palestine. But before the flurry gets too thick it may be useful to point out that there is at least one point of similarity in the American and British moves in the UN. This suggests that private diplomacy may already be aware of other possibilities of fruitful collaboration.

Let it be noted that the Security Council's questions to Arab and Jewish authorities was initiated by the United States. But it served to slow down the process by which the Arabs might be charged with illegal acts it, like British moves, tended to put brakes on UN action.

Thus it provided time for British good offices to operate in Arab quarters and for American and British diplomacy to work out an approach to stop the fighting before it leads either side into acts that might be called full-scale aggression.

This is a slight enough indicator of possible American-British cooperation. Even so, it may be more dependable than all the sound and fury.

In any event, it is to cooperation between Britain and the United States that the world must look for peace in Palestine. We say this even in view of Russian support for the American position in the UN—a support which can have no influence on the Arabs, and which may result only in inserting a thin edge of a wedge into Anglo-American friendship.

The question which the fighting in Palestine raises for the United States and Britain, therefore, is bigger than Palestine, and a right answer to it will include a right answer for Palestine.

The Situation at a Glance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, there has just come to my attention a letter dated June 1948 known as the American Ordnance Letter which is sent out every month by the American Ordnance Association to its paid membership.

This is a timely letter in view of the fact that under ERP the satellites of Russia are to be beneficiaries of our largess. How long will our citizens yield to the self-serving propaganda of selfish groups of internationalists? An epidemic of self-serving emergencies has cost the American people billions upon billions of dollars and the racket continues. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the American Ordnance Letter:

THE SITUATION AT A GLANCE

AMERICAN ORDNANCE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., June 1948.

DEAR MEMBER: There has been a great change in our economy since I wrote my May letter. I will try to give you the high lights as I see them.

After the turn of the year we reached a second peak in the postwar boom, and it seemed as if we would obtain the much-needed correction during the balance of this year, continuing into 1949.

Production had very generally caught up with demand at current price levels; pipelines were filling up; commodity prices began easing off; food prices were dropping rapidly. It did seem as if, finally, a real recession had set in and would continue for a year or more, then probably level off to form a new plateau on which we could safely rebuild on a sound basis.

Congress then cut taxes, and large payments to veterans were made which, in themselves, would not have affected the orderly recession hoped for.

Then the Government, noting that people were quieting down and trying to lead normal lives once more, seemingly decided it was time we should have another "emergency." The propaganda boys got to work again—this time to sell us the idea that war with Russia was just around the corner, that Russian subs were off our coast in the Pacific, and that we should therefore have universal military training, the draft, and should appropriate added billions to rebuild a new war machine.

I am strongly for adequate protection—we should be strong enough to make it unhealthy for any nation to attack us. But I am against all this Government propaganda designed to scare the country and its Representatives in Congress into using snap judgments and making foolish decisions in order to advance political ambitions.

In other words this recent propaganda was, possibly, based 25 percent on fact and 75 percent on "bunkum." And the country fell for it.

There is no question in my mind but that political expediency has had more to do with this new "emergency" than anything else.

Anyway we are now confronted with an entirely new situation where boom conditions will likely prevail for many commodities; where recession will continue for others;

and where depression conditions are likely to be forced on others. The reason for assuming this mixed trend is that we are to undergo a partial mobilization of industry instead of complete mobilization. Meanwhile our economy is once more to be overloaded, and further inflation will result.

Those who are best informed are not looking for a shooting war in the near future. Apparently Russia does not want a "hot" war at the present time, as she knows she would ultimately be defeated. Another world war might even result in a Russian civil war and the elimination of the Communist gang which has been browbeating its nationals.

What is more likely is a continuation of the cold war, where Russia will prod here and there in the hope of finding weak spots which she can exploit without an open break.

* * * * *

WE SHOULD LIKE INFORMATION

Why can't the Government lay off its propaganda of selling emergencies to the Nation? Is it afraid to come out frankly and tell the truth?

Why should we be rearming now? Has anyone heard the real reason? What is being concealed?

If the Government gets the Nation in the jitters to a point where it begins to spend billions of dollars for rearmament, a huge shipbuilding program, and a huge air force, what does it propose to do with all this material if it is later found that somebody has made a mistake?

It seems to me that we are entitled to the whole truth and nothing but the truth without propaganda. Rearming at this time is probably justified, but I believe we all would like to know the facts.

I also fail to see why we are rushing into another huge debt to be piled on the present debt until we have put our own house in order. There may be a good reason, but we have a right to know it.

What has been done to reduce the President's original $40,000,000,000 budget? Everyone seems to agree that it is at least one-third larger than it should be. Why hasn't it been cut to proper proportions?

Why are we voting huge sums for added veterans' benefits; haven't the veterans already been amply provided for? Why do we have to underwrite another huge housing program at this critical time, to cost billions, to provide houses which will likely prove too expensive for those for whom they are intended?

Is it possible the Government is deliberately trying to bankrupt the country? It would seem so.

And why are we so intent on fighting the Communists all over the world when we are allowing them to undermine our economy at home?

Why haven't we done something to put an end to the abuse of power by our national unions? Are we afraid to act? Are our politicians thinking more of their own jobs than they are of our national security?

See what happened in Colombia, where the national unions combined with the Communists to take over the country. A dozen national labor bosses could, and probably would, do the same thing here in America if they found it to be of advantage to themselves and if the proper opening presented itself. Yet we allow this hazardous condition to exist.

What was our present Congress elected for? Didn't the voters demand that the power of the national unions be broken up? What is Congress waiting for?

E. B. GALLAHER.

The Mrs. Earl Browder Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD some details to substantiate my claim that Mrs. Earl Browder should be deported to Russia.

THE MRS. EARL BROWDER CASE

When it appears that officials in highly important Government positions definitely lack the necessary qualifications for the positions to which they have been appointed, it is my opinion such officials should be removed. When the record reveals that officials do not know how to evaluate evidence, when they ignore the facts, or render opinions not based on facts, it is my opinion such officials are not qualified for a position wherein they would be called upon to render opinions.

I refer, specifically and pointedly, to the proceedings in the case of the wife of Earl Browder.

Raissa—Irene—Berkman was born in Russia January 1, 1897. She graduated from the University of Leningrad in 1917. She met Earl Browder and they were married September 15, 1926. She remained in Russia until the latter part of 1933 when she entered the United States illegally from Canada. Two children, both born in Russia, accompanied her into the United States.

She remained in this country unmolested for almost 6 years. On October 30, 1939, an application was made for a warrant of arrest in a deportation proceeding, but before the application was acted upon, her husband, Earl Browder, on November 15, 1939, submitted a petition for the issuance of a nonquota immigration visa to his wife.

On the consideration of Browder's petition the record revealed that he had been married before his marriage to Raissa Berkman and that the earlier marriage had been dissolved by a divorce granted in Moscow on April 25, 1926. Inasmuch as Browder had presented no evidence that would indicate he was in Russia at the time the divorce was granted, as well as the time of his marriage to Raissa Berkman, action on his petition was withheld pending submission of the necessary evidence. Browder never submitted the evidence and therefore his petition was denied.

The warrant of arrest in deportation proceedings was issued on August 7, 1940, and Mrs. Browder was given a hearing on August 13, 1940. The presiding inspector found that Mrs. Browder was not in possession of an unexpired immigration visa and recommended that she be deported to the Soviet Union. On an application for suspension of deportation the Board of Immigration Appeals, on October 29, 1940, held Mrs. Browder to be deportable for the reasons given by the presiding inspector. The Board held that the record raised a substantial doubt concerning the eligibility for entry into the United States by Mrs. Browder and that such doubt was not removed by any evidence introduced in her behalf. The Board further said that Mrs. Browder's testimony on the subject of the Communist Party was evasive and hardly credible. The application for suspension of deportation was denied and her deportation to Soviet Russia ordered.

However, the Board referred Mrs. Browder's case to the Attorney General and that official stated, on October 30, 1940, that on the record a different conclusion could not be reached, but should Mrs. Browder desire to come forward, at any time prior to deportation, with evidence to dissipate the doubts raised by the record, she would be permitted to request that the hearing be reopened.

What was the testimony of Mrs. Browder that caused the Board of Immigration Appeals to conclude "was evasive and hardly credible"?

Mrs. Browder testified she first entered the United States at an unknown Canadian port about November 1933, that she did not have an immigration visa and that she intended to remain permanently in the United States. She stated she had done some research work for her husband in connection with his writings and speeches and had done some secretarial work for him in his capacity as general secretary for the Communist Party. In addition, Mrs. Browder stated—and I want all of you to pay particular attention to this—she had no interest in and had given no thought to the aims of the Communist Party of the United States; that she was not a member of any political party of the United States and had no connection with any government whatsoever.

Is there any wonder that the Board of Immigration Appeals said that Mrs. Browder's testimony was hardly credible? Let us remember, gentlemen, this is the testimony of the wife of the titular head of the Communist Party of the United States, a woman who, as I will show you later, was very active in the Communist Party program.

On October 29, 1940, a warrant of deportation was issued. This warrant was not executed because of the war in Europe and because of passport difficulties.

Thus the case of Mrs. Earl Browder waited for the next move. Three years elapsed before the next step was taken by Mrs. Browder. During that time many things happened. The Hitler-Stalin pact went the way of all agreements of totalitarian governments. Germany attacked the Soviet fatherland and the European war was no longer an imperialist war. President Roosevelt was no longer a war mongerer and the Yanks-are-not-coming slogan of the Communists had to be hurriedly changed to meet the needs of Soviet Russia. Then came the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor and the United States found itself a cobelligerent of Soviet Russia. Next came the first meeting between President Roosevelt and Premier Stalin at the Tehran Conference in the closing days of 1943.

All of these events are mentioned because it is apparent that each played some part in the events that followed in the case of Mrs. Browder.

On January 19, 1944, Mrs. Browder withdrew her request for a suspension of the deportation order and made a motion to reopen her case so she could apply for voluntary departure and preexamination. Ten days later the Board of Immigration Appeals granted the request. At the reopened hearing Mrs. Browder again testified. The presiding inspector again found that Mrs. Browder was evasive regarding the Communist Party and again he recommended deportation. The case then went to the central office of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and that office recommended voluntary departure. The Board of Immigration Appeals, on April 5, 1944, directed that the order of deportation issued on October 29, 1940, as well as the warrant issued under the order of deportation, be withdrawn; that Mrs. Browder be permitted to leave the United States voluntarily; and that upon approval by the State Department of her preliminary application for an immigration visa, a preexamination of Mrs. Browder be authorized.

Keep in mind, gentlemen, that this was the same Board that held on October 29, 1940, the testimony of Mrs. Browder to be "evasive and hardly credible" and that she had not removed the substantial doubt created by the record. Also keep in mind, gentlemen, that the Attorney General held, on October 30, 1940, that Mrs. Browder could, upon her request, move to reopen the case for the purpose of submitting evidence "to dissipate the doubts raised by the record".

Let us follow the record closely. Mrs. Browder did move to reopen her case on December 2, 1943 but as she did not submit any new and material evidence the motion was denied. Did she renew her request to reopen her case for a suspension of the deportation order and come forward with any evidence that would dissipate the doubts raised by the record? Of course not. The record from this point on indicates most clearly that Mrs. Browder knew exactly what to do and knew perfectly well how to proceed. On January 19, 1944 she withdrew her request for a suspension of the deportation order and made a motion to apply for voluntary departure and pre-examination.

Now we get to the reasoning of the Board of Immigration Appeals in support of their decision of April 5, 1944 that the order of deportation and the warrant be withdrawn; that Mrs. Browder be permitted to depart voluntarily and that her pre-examination be authorized.

To begin with, this so-called Board of Appeals said that the rehearing was accorded Mrs. Browder in order that she have the opportunity to dissipate the doubts created by the first hearing. If this is true then the record is confused, and in my opinion, most of the confusion in the record is the wholly unwarranted opinion of the Board of Immigration Appeals of April 5, 1944. It is to be remembered that the original hearing was on a request for suspension of the deportation order and that the Attorney General had ruled that if Mrs. Browder desired to come forward with evidence to dissipate the doubts created by the record, she could do so at any time before deportation. Mrs. Browder did so move on December 2, 1943, but offered no new evidence. She then withdrew her request that the deportation order be suspended and with that withdrawal she forfeited any further consideration of that particular phase of her case granted by the Attorney General.

But let us not get too technical. For the sake of brevity let us agree that the purpose of the rehearing was to afford her the opportunity to submit evidence to dissipate the doubts created by the record. What was the evidence offered by Mrs. Browder that brought such a reversal from the Board from a conclusion that Mrs. Browder's testimony was "evasive and hardly credible" to a conclusion of this explanation, is reasonable.

Briefly, Mrs. Browder testified that she graduated from Petrograd University in 1917; that she had studied law which included a course in political economy; that her interest was not political economy but was education, specializing in criminology and delinquency of young children; that she took no active part in the overthrow of the Czarist regime but was in full accord with the movement; and that she had never been a member of the Communist Party in Russia.

Mrs. Browder also testified she had met her husband when he was engaged in writing and journalism and that she knew nothing of his political theories. She said she had no knowledge of his connection with the Communist Party until after he was elected general secretary of the party. She further stated that she had done some research for her husband, such as typing and finding special quotations in reference to Thomas Jefferson, all of which was done at home. She said she knew only a few of her husband's political associates as the maintenance of her home and the care of her three sons occupied most of her time and she had little time left for political matters.

Mrs. Browder did say she had read the Communist manifesto, the program of the Third International, and parts of Das Kapital, but had not studied them; neither had she made a sufficient study of communism or the capitalist system to form an opinion and did not believe she was competent to discuss the question.

Mrs. Browder's statements apparently made some impression on the membership of the Board of Immigration Appeals for the Board decided that the previously created doubts regarding Mrs. Browder had been dissipated by the last hearing; that there was nothing but favorable comment regarding her character and demeanor during the years she lived in the United States and that upon full consideration of the entire record, and because of her three United States citizen sons, she should be permitted to leave the United States and be granted preexamination.

Is it the function of this Board of Immigration Appeals to accept as true every statement made by an alien without any effort to determine the truth of the matter? Are we to believe that the members of this Board of Immigration Appeals are so naive as to swallow everything Mrs. Browder said as being gospel truth and that they knew nothing of the Communist doctrine of evasion and falsification?

Before going any further let us review the testimony of Mrs. Browder before the Immigration and Naturalization Service and try to determine if she was honest in her declarations and testimony.

First, Mrs. Browder testified that she met her husband when he was a journalist and writer and that it was not until after he was elected general secretary of the Communist Party did she discover he was a member of the Communist Party. She said they were married in Russia on September 15, 1926. As Mrs. Browder did not say when she met her husband we look to him for that information. Testifying before the House Committee on Un-American Activities on September 5, 1939, Browder said he first visited Russia in 1921 in connection with a trade union conference. What he did not tell was that the conference was a congress of the Red International Labor Union and that he attended as a delegate of the Communist Trade Union Educational League. Be that as it may, Browder testified his next trip to the Soviet Union was in 1926. So we now learn that he met his wife in 1921 or 1926. Further, Browder stated he was elected general secretary of the Communist Party in 1930, so if we are to believe Mrs. Browder she knew her husband was a member of the Communist Party before she left Russia.

Next, Mrs. Browder testified she was not a member of the Communist Party in Russia. On this question your attention is invited to the testimony of William Nowell, a former Communist Party leader who stated he attended the Lenin School in Moscow from September 1931 to December 1932 and while attending that Communist school he was introduced to Mrs. Earl Browder and knew her as being connected with the OGPU. Committee on Un-American Activities Reports, volume XI, pages 7021, 7026, November 30, 1939.

Next, Mrs. Browder denied membership in any organization of any kind in this country except a parent-teacher association. I submit to you that the following information should prove to the exclusion of any doubt that Mrs. Browder willfully and deliberately falsified.

Mrs. Browder is listed in the House Committee on Un-American Activities Reports, volume 1, page 313, along with her husband, as a member of the New York State Committee of the Communist Party. In 1936 the Daily Worker, official organ of the Communist Party of the United States, listed Mrs. Browder as a delegate to the Communist Party National Convention.

The same Communist publication in 1938 listed Mrs. Browder as a speaker at the New York State convention of the Communist Party.

On May 27, 1938, Mrs. Browder delivered a report to the Commission on National groups at the Tenth Convention of the Communist Party of the United States. This report is published in the September 1938 issue of the Communist, an official publication of the Communist Party of the United States, under the title "For a Correct Approach to the Problems of the National Groups" and is credited to "Irene Browder." Just a casual glance at this speech should be sufficient to convince even the Board of Immigration Appeals that Mrs. Browder was not worthy of belief under any conditions or circumstances. Mrs. Browder opens her report with the following words:

Comrades, our commission is a very representative one and includes many leading comrades who know and understand the problems of the national groups. I shall attempt in my remarks to emphasize some of the more important features of our work and to direct the discussion around the vital issues concerning us.

The words "our" and "us" appear throughout with monotonous regularity and leave no doubt that Mrs. Browder was speaking as one of the comrades. As to her membership in the Communist Party, I quote further from Mrs. Browder's report:

The June 1937 plenum of the central committee of our party called for a decisive turn in broadening our conception and approach.

Mrs. Browder referred to "Comrade Lenin," and at one point said:

Following the needs and experience of our own party, on the basis of Lenin's teachings, the new draft constitution, which this convention will consider, proposes as a rule for membership in our party that every party member must be a citizen of the United States or have expressed the intention of becoming a citizen in the near future.

In conclusion, Mrs. Browder said:

While we have made only a beginning, the consciousness and understanding of our leading comrades and the party membership with regard to the work among national groups, as demonstrated at our State and section conventions, represent a great step forward in the struggle to win the national groups for the democratic front in our country.

The May 1939 issue of the Communist carries another article by Irene Browder on the same subject. Throughout this article Mrs. Browder refers to "our party" and "our work."

The April 1939 issue of the Communist has an article by Irene Browder entitled "Tribute to a Great Leader." In this article she refers to "the glorious Communist Party of the Soviet Union."

The September 1939 issue of the Communist has an article entitled "The National Groups in the Fight for Democracy" by Irene Browder. I will quote but one paragraph from that article, and that paragraph should be sufficient to convince the State Department and the Immigration and Naturalization Service regarding Mrs. Browder's political affiliations. She said:

American Communists are now beginning to study and to master the history of their own country. That also means that we must study and master the history of our own party, which is destined to lead our country into its next higher stage of historical development. If we are moving in this direction today with much greater understanding and energy, a great deal of credit for this must be assigned to the inspiration imparted to our work in this field by the great and new history of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union, which our party has been studying with such enthusiasm for many months.

If the remarks credited to Mrs. Browder do not mean that she is a Communist, officially or unofficially, then words have no meaning.

Next, Mrs. Browder testified she had read the Communist Manifesto, the program of the Third International, and parts of Das Kapital, but had not made a study of them. She said that she had not made a sufficient study of communism or the capitalist system to form an opinion and that she did not believe she was competent as an expert to discuss the question. And to this statement of Mrs. Browder the Board of Immigration Appeals said:

This explanation is reasonable remembering that the respondent (Mrs. Browder) is by occupation a housewife.

I am firmly convinced that a studied consideration of the articles accredited to the pen of Mrs. Browder definitely reflect that she is far more informed on the subject of communism and capitalism than she would have us believe.

Next, Mrs. Browder testified that she knew only a few of her husband's political associates and that the maintenance of her home and caring for her children left but little time for political activities. I submit, gentlemen, that the known record of Mrs. Browder's activities belies the statement she made under oath to the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Now let us turn to the decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals. They held there was no direct evidence of any kind that Mrs. Browder is or was ever a member of the Communist Party in this country or in Russia; or that she had views in common with those who thought the Government of the United States should be overthrown by force and violence. Did that board expect Mrs. Browder to offer "direct evidence" that she had been engaged in secret police work in Russia; that she was a member of the New York State Committee of the Communist Party; and to submit copies of her speeches to official assemblies of the Communist Party? The evidence was available to the Board of Immigration Appeals and I submit that their failure to secure such evidence is nothing less than nofeasance.

Further, the Board held that Mrs. Browder's life both in Russia and the United States, as revealed at the last hearing, is consonant with her testimony. Now, I do not know who testified about Mrs. Browder's life in Russia and in this country unless it was Mrs. Browder, and if she did, the conclusion of the Board on this point is certainly misleading. But regardless of what person testified, the fact remains that Mrs. Browder entered this country illegally and this fact was apparently given no consideration by the Board.

Further, the Board concluded that the previous doubts existing in Mrs. Browder's case had been dissipated by the last hearing and that there was nothing but favorable comment regarding Mrs. Browder's character and demeanor during the years she resided in the United States. The presiding inspector was of the opinion that Mrs. Browder was still evasive on the subject of the Communist Party and he recommended deportation. The Board of Immigration Appeals, on the same record, reached an entirely different opinion. The conclusion is inescapable that the Board of Immigration Appeals did not arrive at its decision on the facts in the case.

Once more let us review the record to determine if the proof requested in the very beginning of Mrs. Browder's case was ever presented.

Earl Browder had contracted a previous marriage and this marriage was dissolved by a divorce decree in Moscow on April 25, 1926, less than 5 months before he married the present Mrs. Browder. I know nothing of the divorce laws of Russia, but I do know that Earl Browder was never a citizen or permanent resident of Russia and that there are questions of residence and jurisdiction that govern the granting of divorces. As far as I know, proof that Browder was in Russia at the time of the divorcement from his first wife, or of his marriage to his second wife, was never submitted to the Immigration and Naturalization Service. No comment was made by the Board of Immigration Appeals on this missing evidence.

Thus the way was cleared for Mrs. Browder to apply to the State Department for a visa permitting legal entry into the United States. Her case was considered by two interdepartmental committees, one primary and the other a review committee. The State, War, and Navy Departments, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service were represented on both committees. The primary committee voted five to nothing against granting Mrs. Browder a visa. The review committee voted four to one against granting a visa and it is understood that the State Department cast the one vote in favor of granting Mrs. Browder a visa. The case then went to the Board of Appeals on Visa Appeals. This Board was comprised entirely of political appointees of President Roosevelt and this Board overruled the State, War, and Navy Departments, as well as the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Immigration and Naturalization Service. The result: advisory approval on Mrs. Browder's application for a visa was granted by the State Department in July 1946. On September 1, 1944, the Immigration and Naturalization Service preexamined Mrs. Browder and found her to be admissible to the United States as an immigrant.

On September 8, 1944, Mrs. Browder received a Russian non-preference-quota immigration visa by the American consul at Montreal, Canada, and on the same day Mrs. Browder reentered the United States on the basis of that visa. But before Mrs. Browder received this visa, her attorney, Carol King, began a series of correspondence with the United States

consul at Montreal regarding procedure for obtaining a visa. The consul advised Attorney King that Mrs. Browder might come to Montreal if she wished, but she might be found ineligible under the immigration laws. It is very apparent that Attorney King took heed of this warning, because the official concerned submitted an affidavit to Secretary of State Hull that he had conducted only a token examination of Mrs. Browder, after being informed by his superior that instructions had come from Washington to grant the visa regardless.

This same attorney, Carol King, represented Mrs. Browder on the occasion of the rehearing. Carol King is probably the most active barrister on behalf of Communists in the United States. She was counsel for John Strachey, Harry Bridges, Hans Eisler, as well as many others, and, according to the report filed by the Civil Rights Congress, she has received the major part of the money paid out by that Communist defense organization for attorney fees.

Let me give you a few of the details regarding the maneuvering of some Government officials to ease the way for Mrs. Browder's legal entry into the United States.

I have related how Mrs. Browder's attorney, Carol King, began corresponding with the office of the American consul in Montreal for information regarding entry and how an employee of that office replied that Mrs. Browder could come to Montreal, but might be found ineligible. Mr. Julian L. Pinkerton related that immediately prior to the letter of inquiry from Mrs. Browder's attorney the consulate at Montreal had received a notice from the State Department which was approximately as follows:

> The American consul in charge at Montreal is informed that no objection is perceived to the issuance of immigration visa to Raissa Browder (Mrs. Earl Browder).

Mr. Pinkerton said that in the usual course of visa proceedings an applicant for a visa is never identified as the wife of anyone and that there is no doubt but that the person preparing the notification to the Montreal consul wished to make certain that anyone handling the case would be aware of the fact that Raissa Browder was the wife of Earl Browder, head of the Communist Party of the United States.

Mr. Pinkerton stated it was at this point that he prepared the letter to Mrs. Browder's attorney in which he warned that Mrs. Browder might be found ineligible under the immigration laws to receive a visa; that later on Mr. Callahan—James E. Callahan—of the Montreal consul office told him of receiving a call from Mr. Travers, Chief of the Visa Division of the Department of State, and that Travers had said the letter to Mrs. Browder's attorney had caused concern among the friends and advisers of Mrs. Browder; that the visa must be issued to Mrs. Browder and that Travers had said his chief had said that a refusal of the visa at this time would be very embarrassing.

Mr. Pinkerton said that Mr. Callahan had made it very clear that he—Pinkerton—must approve this case of Mrs. Browder for a visa when she came. It was a week later when Mrs. Browder appeared at the consulate and was assigned to Mr. Pinkerton by Mr. Callahan who said, "We are issuing this visa." Mr. Pinkerton said his examination of Mrs. Browder was only a token examination; that the questions he propounded to Mrs. Browder were of no importance whatever, inasmuch as he had been given orders by Mr. Callahan not to ask embarrassing questions of Mrs. Browder.

This was the procedure by which the wife of the then No. 1 Communist in the United States was permitted to legally enter the United States.

It is to be remembered that the Immigration Act of 1924 places squarely on the shoulders of the consular officer the authority to decide who shall and who shall not be granted immigration visas.

Does the Congress of the United States enact laws only to have some officials of Government agencies deliberately and wilfully violate them?

On April 12, 1946, Mrs. Browder filed a petition for naturalization in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York. I ask, gentlemen, is this woman to be allowed to perjure her way into United States citizenship as she has perjured her way out of deportation? Will the Secretary of State say what action he intends to take to correct the arbitrary and illegal action in the case of Mrs. Browder? Will the Attorney General state what action he intends to take to prosecute Mrs. Browder for perjury?

The public is entitled to know who and what sinister influences were at work to bring this about.

Mrs. Browder's application for citizenship should not only be denied in view of the evidence I have presented, but a thorough investigation of this matter should be made by the Committee on Un-American Activities to ascertain who is responsible for having permitted her to enter the United States under the conditions she did. Furthermore, those officials of our Government who were responsible for such a flagrant violation of our laws should be exposed to the public and necessary steps should be taken to revoke the visa Mrs. Browder received and she should be deported to Russia at once.

Railroad Retirement Annuities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, we now approach the closing hours of the present session of the Eightieth Congress. The calendars are heavily loaded and time is limited and being utilized for general debate and consideration of the bills. It is now evident certain legislation will not be acted upon by the Congress, while at the same time some very important measures will be considered.

There is now before the Congress a proposal which should be acted upon without fail. I refer to H. R. 5993, a bill to increase railroad retirement annuities by 20 to 25 percent. This bill has not yet reached the floor. Its importance might be signified in the following manner: As we all know, the cost of the necessities of life continues to advance. The Government's fiscal policy, largely controlled by the White House and the Congress, moves onward towards more inflation of prices. The buying power in the open market of the savings of the previous employees of railroads and wherein these employees are now on a retirement basis continues to decline. This decline in purchasing power of the savings of these faithful servants is primarily due to the Government's fiscal policy. Therefore, the Government, and by this I mean the White House and the Congress, must bear a special responsibiilty in removing from these people the economic squeeze in which they now find themselves. The approval of this bill would give these retired servants material relief at this particular moment.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, the calendars are loaded and time is of the essence, but there are no great time consuming obstacles connected with consideration of this bill. There should not be any material opposition, and I say this because additional appropriations are not involved. The dollars required to finance this increase will flow from the present retirement tax schedule which is sufficient to meet this modest requirement. The need for the increase is here and I repeat, no appropriations are required. Therefore, there is no reasonable excuse for delaying the approval of the legislation. The proponents of H. R. 5993, I am informed, called upon expert actuaries to calculate for them how much of a benefit increase was financially feasible within the present tax limits. H. R. 5993 is the answer from the actuaries.

Half a Loaf for the DP's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from America for May 15, 1948:

HALF A LOAF FOR THE DP'S

The high hopes entertained by many Americans that Congress would take action for displaced persons on the wide humanitarian basis of the Stratton bill have apparently gone glimmering—the Stratton bill has evaporated, died in committee. But the pressure of public opinion and a growing realization of the gravity of the situation seem to assure that some aid will soon be

proffered the DP's by congressional action (cf. "Congress and the DP's," America, May 8, p. 102). Two bills are now pending, the Fellows bill (H. R. 6163) and the Wiley bill (S. 2242). The Wiley bill has nothing to recommend it; it would admit only 50,000 DP's a year for 2 years, on a basis so selective as to be discriminatory. The Fellows bill is preferable; it would admit 200,000 in 2 years; permit 15,000 DP's now in the country to become citizens; give priority in admissions to skills in short supply in the United States labor scene. But one unrealistic restriction in the Fellows bill is that by which DP's admitted would be charged off against 50 percent of the national immigration quotas. Now it is precisely the countries with a low immigration quota which have given the world the DP's. If all the Balts, for example, who are now DP's were admitted under the Fellows bill, the admission of other Balts would be mortgaged for up to 166 years. This is one of the features that must be amended; there are others that Congress must face realistically and equitably if it is to proffer the DP's a good half loaf. It is to our shame that we have apparently denied them the whole loaf—the Stratton bill—but even half a loaf is better than no bread, and the eyes of those thousands of DP's are looking to our shores for bread—bread of wheat, yes, but even more the bread of freedom.

Patently Political

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor sets out some very sensible thoughts in regard to recent legislation before Congress:

PATENTLY POLITICAL

The House in approving the Hoffman bill, 219 to 142, has moved Congress one step nearer a position which, in our view, is clearly unconstitutional and patently political. The bill is a byproduct of the Condon incident. It would compel Cabinet officers and other officials and employees of the executive branch to turn over to Congress any information that body calls for on penalty of fine and imprisonment.

The measure is unconstitutional, we believe, because it violates the equality and independence of the three branches of government established by the organic law of the Nation. The bill exempts the President. But all Cabinet officers and executive departments are but extensions of the Presidential arm.

The bill is patently political because it represents an attempt by a Republican Congress to force a show-down with a Democratic President on a nonemergency issue at the same time this same Congress is deferring action on some exceedingly important matters until (it hopes) there is a Republican in the White House.

Why such a scramble to get hold of the Commerce file on Dr. Edward U. Condon? Even the confidential FBI report, upon which the Committee on Un-American Activities based its as yet unsupported charges, stated that nothing subversive or disloyal had been found in Dr. Condon's conduct.

Yet these same Congressmen are trying to keep the Atomic Energy Commission in political suspense until after the election. They so far won't even talk about stand-by powers to restrain the inflationary effects of tax reduction and the 70-group air program.

Congress has tried this sort of thing several times before in American history. The Presidents, regardless of party, have stood their ground. And the courts have upheld them. The Hoffman bill seems headed for—and deserves—the same kind of reception.

Taft-Hartley Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from American Federation of Labor Weekly News Service for May 25, 1948:

TAFT-HARTLEY LAW OPPOSITION RISES AMONG UNION WORKERS—AFL POLL RESULTS SHOW MARGIN AGAINST LAW NOW 15 TO 1

WASHINGTON.—Sentiment against the Taft-Hartley Act is increasing rapidly among union workers, according to the semifinal returns of the poll being conducted by the AFL News Service through the labor press.

The 10-to-1 margin registered in opposition to the law in April has been boosted to 15 to 1 in the latest returns from the poll, which follow:

Against Taft-Hartley law	33,817
For Taft-Harley law	2,107

This vote, taken by secret ballot, represents an unchallengeable consensus of opinion among union members throughout the country and emphasizes the fact that the rank and file solidly support the efforts of their union leaders to have the Taft-Hartley Act repealed.

Efforts have been made in recent weeks to discredit the AFL poll on the ground that the number of votes cast constitutes only a small percentage of the total AFL membership. In fact, one radio commentator, suffering from the misapprehension that ballots were being sent to each individual union member, ventured the assertion that those who did not vote were thereby indicating that they favored the Taft-Hartley Act.

However, the facts are that the poll undertook to obtain only a sampling of rank and file opinion on this issue, not a referendum. The number of votes cast thus far constitutes a far greater total than the Gallup poll or other professional public opinion polls customarily seek to obtain.

In conducting its poll, the AFL Weekly News Service published sample ballots which it asked the labor press to reprint. When this was done, the reader had to clip the ballot from his paper, mark it, address an envelope to the poll department of the AFL Weekly News Service, affix a 3-cent stamp and mail it. These details are set forth here to make it clear that under such circumstances no huge vote could be expected.

Furthermore, the conditions of the poll were deliberately established to keep the totals down to sampling proportions and to make certain that each vote was individually cast in a separate envelope.

It would have been comparatively simple to print ballots in bulk and distribute them at local union meetings to register an enormous vote, but if this had been done, the poll would have been criticized as not being a fair expression of individual opinion.

This method was tried out, at the request of officials of the International Molders and Foundry Workers Union, at a few of their local unions. The vote cast was 5,264 against the Taft-Hartley Act and only 76 in favor of it.

The overwhelming sentiment among union members against the Taft-Hartley Act, as evidenced in the AFL poll, has been borne out at the secret union-shop elections conducted by the NLRB. The unions have been winning more than 99 percent of these elections and more than 85 percent of all workers eligible to vote have cast their ballots in favor of the union shop. These election results are especially significant because of the expectation of the Taft-Hartley Act sponsors that if the workers were given the opportunity to vote on the question of compulsory union membership, they would reject it. The outcome has been such a boomerang to the Taft-Hartleyites that they are now pushing amendments to the law eliminating the requirement for union-shop elections.

Next month the final tabulations of the AFL poll will be published.

Counting of Electoral Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 27 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared which concisely gives the arguments for Senate Joint Resolution 200, which provides for a constitutional amendment under which electoral votes for President and Vice President would be counted in proportion to the popular vote. I have also tried to find any arguments which may have been made in the past against the proposal, and I have sought to find the answers to those arguments.

In addition to my statement, I ask that a copy of the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS

The Senate Judiciary Committee in May 1948 reported out favorably Senate Joint Resolution 200, which provides for a constitutional amendment so that the electoral vote for President and Vice President will be counted in proportion to the popular vote. After many years of study, this proposition, embodied in House Joint Resolution 9, has received a unanimously favorable report from the House Judiciary Committee. This great reform is, therefore, closer to enactment than it has been at any time in history.

SUMMARY

To summarize this proposition:

1. It provides that in electing the President and Vice President of the United States the electoral vote be counted in proportion to the popular vote. The electoral college is abolished. The electoral vote is retained.

2. It eliminates a source of real potential danger which stems from the present possibility that the candidate receiving a ma-

jority of the popular vote would receive a minority of the electoral vote. (This has already happened three times.)

3. It ends the present system whereby the winner in every State effectively gets credited with all the votes, including those which were cast against him.

4. It ends the present practice of concentrating Presidential politics on these States having the largest populations and consequently on the voting minorities in those States.

5. It would, for that reason, be a deterrent to fraud and chicanery.

6. It means that the votes which a candidate receives in one State (even though they may be a majority in that State) will be added to the votes he receives in other States—instead of being all given to his opponent in every State where the opponent is ahead.

7. It spreads the Presidential campaign and any subsequent Presidential political activity into all the 48 States.

8. It tends, therefore, politically speaking, to break up so-called solid or one party areas.

9. It preserves completely the rights of the small States (who still retain the two-vote credit for their two Senators).

10. It recognizes that the electoral college system has never functioned as originally conceived by the framers of the Constitution.

11. It discourages the tendency to select Presidential nominees only from among the residents of those States having a significant electoral vote.

12. It avoids the possibility (exercised in 91 cases) that State legislature might intervene and deprive the people of their rightful voice in the selection of the President.

13. It eliminates the need for throwing a Presidential election into the House of Representatives where each State, regardless of size, has only one vote.

14. It can in no event apply to the 1948 election.

15. It confers no partisan or sectional advantage.

HISTORY

1. The present system is neither fair, honest, accurate, certain, nor democratic. Let me give a few historic illustrations:

In 1912 Woodrow Wilson, with 42 percent of the popular vote, received 82 percent of the electoral vote. In 1936 Roosevelt, with 60 percent of the popular vote, received 98 percent of the electoral vote. In 1940 he received 54 percent of the popular vote and 84 percent of the electoral vote. In 1924 John W. Davis received 6,000,000 popular votes which brought him no electoral votes, while from 2,000,000 other popular votes he received 136 electoral votes. In 1932 Hoover received 15,800,000 popular votes, and over 13,600,000 of them brought him no electoral votes. In 1912 Wilson received one electoral vote for each 14,500 popular votes, while Taft received only one electoral vote for each 435,000 popular votes.

2. An undue influence is given to minorities by the present system.

In 1884, in the State of New York, Cleveland got 563,084 votes while Blaine got 562,001 popular votes. A bare 1,000 majority in popular votes gave Mr. Cleveland all of the electoral votes of the great State of New York. Thus, a change of 600 votes in New York would have elected Blaine President. Should a similar situation again arise, as well it might, the Communist Party in the State of New York alone could determine who was to be President of the United States.

3. Three Presidents have taken office who had a smaller popular vote than did their opponents—Adams in 1824, Hayes in 1876, and Harrison in 1888.

In 1824, 460,000 popular votes were cast. Andrew Jackson led his nearest opponent, John Quincy Adams, by about 50,000 votes, but because he lacked a majority over his three opponents, Jackson's election was thrown into the House of Representatives. As a result of the manipulations of Henry Clay, Adams—the minority choice—was elected over Jackson for President.

In 1876 there occurred the famous Hayes-Tilden contest. In that election, 8,336,888 popular votes were cast. Of these, Hayes polled 4,036,298 and Tilden 4,300,590. But because of the archaic electoral-college system, Hayes had a margin of one electoral vote which gave him the Presidency, even though he had received 264,292 less votes than Tilden. In this case, only wise counsel, to which Tilden patriotically contributed by his course of moderation, prevented uprising and possible violence.

In 1888, Grover Cleveland lost the Presidency in spite of the fact that he received more popular votes than Benjamin Harrison. In this election there were 12,000,000 popular votes cast. Cleveland received 5,556,543, while Harrison got 5,175,582. Again the minority candidate took office due entirely to the illogical operation of the electoral-college system.

EXAMPLES

Let us take the most extreme case—of the so-called Solid South. Let us assume that in 1944 the pending amendment had been in effect and that the popular votes had been as was actually cast in 1944. (Very probably the Republican vote would have been bigger because, if this amendment had been in effect, the Republicans would have campaigned in the South. There are those who think that Governor Dewey might have received at least 1,000,000 more popular votes there.)

The following table illustrates how the votes would have been divided and counted in certain Southern States:

	Popular vote		Electoral vote		Electoral vote under H. J. Res. 9	
	Roosevelt	Dewey	Roosevelt	Dewey	Roosevelt	Dewey
Alabama	198,918	41,740	11		8,540	2,601
Arkansas	148,965	69,781	9		6,595	2,685
Florida	339,377	143,217	8		5,265	2,374
Georgia	268,187	56,506	12		9,508	2,606
Louisiana	281,564	67,770	10		8,078	1,939
Mississippi	158,515	2,742	9		7,022	185
North Carolina	527,399	263,155	14		9,309	4,950
South Carolina	90,601	4,547	8		7,601	321
Tennessee	268,707	200,311	12		7,272	4,705
Texas	821,605	191,425	23		16,127	3,827
Virginia	242,276	145,242	11		6,860	4,112
Total			127	0	92,237	28,906

If in Ohio the Republicans received 40 percent of the vote and the Democrats received 60 percent, the Republicans would be credited with 10 electoral votes and the Democrats 15. Under the present system the Democrats would get all 25.

OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSAL

Few objections have been raised to this proposed amendment. Of these objections, the more important ones seem to be that the proposed amendment would impinge upon State political power; that it would encourage splinter parties; and that if reform is to be made, it should also include the abolition of the electoral vote, and the election of the President and Vice President by simple, Nation-wide popular referendum.

In answer to the first objection, the proposed amendment in no way disturbs the jurisdiction and authority of the States over the franchise and elections. The proposed amendment in no way meddles with State sovereignty or the right of the States to specify the qualifications of its voters or the manner in which they shall vote or have their votes counted. We leave the purity of the ballot box entirely within State control.

To the second objection that splinter parties would be encouraged, it is submitted that the proposed amendment would in no way disturb party organization, responsibility, or authority. Under the proposed system, any candidate and any party to win must get the most votes throughout the country as a whole. This is an honest and democratic process. A party that can win through such process deserves to win. A party and its leaders must, under the proposed method, lose or win on merit and through popular democratic judgment. Under the proposed amendment, splinter parties and splinter-party candidates, if they be evils, would be lesser evils; they would have much less bargaining power than under the existing system.

To the third objection, i. e., that the electoral vote itself should be scrapped and a Nation-wide popular vote substituted, there are several answers. To do away with the electoral vote and substitute instead a direct popular vote would make national campaigns a matter of complete national control; it would obliterate State lines altogether in Presidential elections. Again, it would reduce voting within the States to the lowest common denominator. For example, the State of Georgia has an 18-year-voting age. All States, to be on a parity with Georgia, would have to reduce their voting age to 18 years under an absolute, direct, popular vote. Again, under such a system, sectionalism would be aggravated rather than ameliorated. In a sectional controversy it would become a contest of gathering up the greatest volume of votes in a particular area for the purpose of outvoting some other particular area. Furthermore, the direct popular vote would open up the small State-large State controversy. As a practical matter, no such amendment would ever secure ratification by the necessary number of States because small or sparsely settled States far outnumber the others. These States would not give up the slight advantage they have through the number of electoral votes accorded them under the Constitution.

Senate Joint Resolution 200

Resolved, etc., That an amendment is hereby proposed to the Constitution of the United States which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by three-fourths of the legislatures of the several States. Said amendment shall be as follows:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of 4 years, and together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term, be elected as provided in this Constitution.

"The electoral college system of electing the President and Vice President of the United States is hereby abolished. The President and Vice President shall be elected by the people of the several States. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most

numerous branch of the State legislature. Congress shall determine the time of such election, which shall be the same throughout the United States. Until otherwise determined by the Congress, such election shall be held on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November of the year preceding the year in which the regular term of the President is to begin. Each State shall be entitled to a number of electoral votes equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which such State may be entitled in the Congress.

"Within 45 days after such election, or at such time as the Congress shall direct, the official custodian of the election returns of each State shall make distinct lists of all persons for whom votes were cast for President and the number of votes for each, and the total vote of the electors of the State for all persons for President, which lists he shall sign and certify and transmit sealed to the seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate. The President of the Senate shall in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives open all certificates and the votes shall then be counted. Each person for whom votes were cast for President in each State shall be credited with such proportion of the electoral votes thereof as he received of the total vote of the electors therein for President. In making the computations, fractional numbers less than one one-thousandth shall be disregarded unless a more detailed calculation would change the result of the election. The person having the greatest number of electoral votes for President shall be President. If two or more persons shall have an equal and the highest number of such votes, then the one for whom the greatest number of popular votes were cast shall be President.

"The Vice President shall be likewise elected, at the same time and in the same manner and subject to the same provisions, as the President, but no person constitutionally ineligible for the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice President of the United States.

"SEC. 2. Paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of section 1, article II, of the Constitution and the twelfth article of amendment to the Constitution are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 3. This article shall take effect on the 10th day of February following its ratification.

"SEC. 4. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

Address to Texans by Hon. W. Lee O'Daniel, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 27 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address which I made at Fort Worth, Tex., on May 20.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

How do you do, ladies and gentlemen, and hello there, boys and girls. This is your United States Senator, W. LEE O'DANIEL, speaking over the Lone Star chain, direct from the studios of WBAP–820, in my old home town of Fort Worth, Tex.

I made this special trip from Washington to Texas for the purpose of letting all of you folks know whether I will be a candidate for reelection to the United States Senate. My definite decision on this matter was made a long time ago, but that decision has been kept a secret and no living person has known up until this week what it was. If anybody ever intimates that they knew my decision in this matter, they will be misrepresenting the truth. In a speech I made in Texas in October of last year I stated that my decision had been made, but that I could see no good reason to relieve the strain on the professional politicians by telling them what it was at that time. Before I make my decision known, as I shall on this broadcast, I want to briefly review a few of the many accomplishments during my tenure in office as your public servant.

At the time I was elected Governor, I found that the great rank and file of the voters of this State had written into the constitution of Texas four constitutional amendments. These amendments promised payment of old-age assistance, aid for dependent children, aid to the blind, and they committed the State to the policy of paying one-half of the cost of retirement pay for our school teachers. Now the politicians had run for office on these promises, but they had been very careful after they were elected to office not to do anything about them. The result was that when I became Governor no provision had been made to meet the obligation of the State to pay old age pensions, aid to dependent children or aid to the blind. In fact, the only money being received in the pension fund was a few dollars coming from race-track gambling, liquor taxes, and borrowed money. The teachers had for several years been putting up their half of the money to provide teacher retirement, but the State had not put up one thin dime.

I took the position that the people of Texas had written these amendments into the constitution and that therefore it became my duty as Governor of Texas to see that these promises were carried out in good faith. You are all familiar with the battle I put up down at Austin to get the money to meet these honest obligations of the State and it was during my administration that the tax bill was passed to pay these obligations. And you old folks in Texas who are drawing pensions today, you dependent children, and you blind people who are being cared for today, and you school teachers who are receiving from the State the money to balance your contribution to this fund can remember that it was during my administration that the tax bill to provide all of this money was passed. You have had two Governors since me, but no tax bill has been passed since my administration, hence it is very obvious that I can justly claim the credit for these services being financed during my administration. Anybody making claims, or boasts, to the contrary is twisting the truth.

When I saw the war clouds gathering; when I saw that industry throughout this Nation was going to be called on to deliver the production necessary to enable us to win a world war; when I saw sit-down strikes and violence of every form tying up industrial development throughout this Nation, I recommended to the Texas Legislature that a law be passed making it a penitentiary offense for any person by the use of force or violence to interfere with any other person engaged in a lawful vocation. This law was passed during my administration, with the result that no other State in the Union went through the war period with as little labor trouble as we had here in Texas. I led the fight for that legislation when it was extremely unpopular, and as your Governor, I won the fight, and the people of Texas profited thereby.

An enormous deficit had been built up in the general fund of this State prior to my administration. This had come about for the simple reason that it is always popular for politicians to appropriate money, but very unpopular to levy taxes. Your State government had therefore resorted to the disgraceful practice of paying State debts with hot checks. To stop this bad practice, I proposed, the legislature passed, and the people adopted a constitutional amendment to put the State on a cash basis. As a result, your State is now on a cash basis, with money in the Treasury, and the debt entirely wiped out. Many other things too numerous to mention were accomplished. I mention some of these things, which are all in the record, simply to remind you who are listening tonight that when you honored me with the office of Governor of this State, I kept my promises to the rank and file of the people. I did what I told you I would do. I am proud of the record, and I think the citizens of Texas are likewise proud of the record.

Now, friends, you will recall that when I was elected United States Senator for the short term and then when I was elected for the long term, that in both of these campaigns I had as opponents a number of men who were regarded as the top-ranking politicians in this State. You will recall that Washington was practically evacuated when the New Dealers, with all their henchmen and the labor racketeers with all their money bags came to Texas and joined in the battle to try to defeat me for United States Senator. But, my friends, the coattail riders skidded into the ditch and the gold-dust twins bit the dust. During that campaign I said from every stump in Texas that I did not propose to go to Washington to be a "yes man" for anybody. I said from every stump in Texas that if I had to go to Washington and sit there and wait until the representatives of the CIO, the AFL, and some of the other big labor bosses came around and told me what to do, then I would prefer to stay in Texas. I said then that if the price of being elected required me to subscribe in advance to all of the Red philosophy then being preached and practiced by the New Deal, that I preferred to stay in Texas. I did not wait until it became popular to criticize the Communists. I told the people then what I thought about these termites who were trying to destroy democratic government in the United States. It was a great campaign and the common citizens of Texas again triumphed over the professional politicians by reelecting me as their candidate.

Now, friends, let me briefly review my record in the United States Senate. In addition to opposing communistic and socialistic legislation, and fighting against squandering and giving away the taxpayers' money, and fighting the rapid encroachment of Government into the field of private enterprise, and the Federal destruction of States' rights, I introduced many bills and amendments designed to improve labor relations. Now, of course, Congress did not immediately pass all of these bills which I introduced, but, thank God, I had the satisfaction last year of sitting in the United States Senate and voting for the Taft-Hartley labor bill which, with probably one or two exceptions, contained every bill, amendment, or principle which I had been demanding and fighting for throughout the years, and it became the law of the land. I had the satisfaction of seeing the predictions which I had made come true and I had the satisfaction of seeing an enraged public throughout this Nation demand the

very legislation which I had for many years been advocating, and they put enough heat on Congress to force them to pass it.

I also introduced a constitutional amendment which would limit the tenure of office of all elected Federal officials. The Senators would not vote to include themselves in this limitation, but we did succeed in submitting an amendment to the States for ratification that will, if and when adopted, limit the tenure of the Presidents and Vice Presidents hereafter to not more than two terms of 4 years each. I am glad to have taken an active part in bringing about this great reform. It has taken this Nation over 160 years to find out what George Washington knew and warned us against, namely, that it might prove very disastrous to the people of this Nation to keep a President in power more than two terms. I certainly hope it will not take another 160 years for the people of this Nation to find out that it is just as dangerous to their welfare and security to keep Senators and Congressmen in public office for a longer tenure than is given to Presidents and Vice Presidents. It is my honest opinion, based upon observation and a study of the subject, that you will have better laws enacted by Congress if you will limit each Senator and each Congressman to one terms of 6 years. I believe that Senators and Congressmen would be more careful about the kind of laws they enact if they knew they would have to go back home at the end of 6 years and live under the laws they enacted.

I am very happy about these two pieces of constructive legislation which I advocated and helped to enact in the United States Senate, and for other pieces of constructive legislation which I supported. While I have not gotten all of the good laws enacted that I would like to see enacted and have not gotten all the bad laws repealed that I would like to see repealed, there is one thing of which I am especially proud and that is that you cannot blame me for the deplorable condition this Government is in, because during my entire tenure I voted against all the New Deal legislation that has put our Nation in such a deplorable condition.

Now, friends, I am not going to take time here on this broadcast to go into detail about the corruption in your government at Washington. For many years I have constantly warned you about it, and by this time most everybody has found out that everything I told you was true. I not only told you that the New Deal administration was destroying our American form of government, but that it had sold the Democratic Party, lock, stock and barrel, to the Communists, Socialists, labor leader racketeers, and other subversive groups. I told you all that many years ago. The things that have happened since then have certainly convinced most every true Democrat in Texas and the entire South that what I said then was true. Today the Trumans and Wallaces and Taylors and Farleys and Roosevelts, all Democrats hatched in the same nest, and nearly every one of the so-called big shots in the Democratic party, are desperately grappling at each other's thoats, and like a kitchen full of kettles, are calling all the pots black. Yes; our once great Democratic Party today lies in ruins, sabotaged from within by its own leaders. Just as sincerely and just as accurately as I forewarned you 5 or 6 years ago about the inevitable destruction of the Democratic Party, I now warn you again that unless there is a complete housecleaning in Washington and a complete reversal of our foreign and domestic policy, our great American form of government as we have known it up until 1932, will inevitably crumble and fall and lie in ruins, scuttled from within by your own selfish, unfaithful or mislead public officials.

You folks who are listening will remember that when I was campaigning in Texas I told the people from every stump in this State that our State Department, which was charged with the responsibility of conducting our foreign affairs, was absolutely honeycombed with Reds, radicals, and Communists. During the last 18 months you have seen a situation grow up in this country where the President of the United States found it necessary to put the whole machinery of the Federal Government in motion to try to clean the Reds and radicals and Communists out of these Government departments. But, my friends, the housecleaning which I had urged for so long was at least 4 years late in getting under way. And I am not so sure that the announced housecleaning is not in reality only a whitewashing process. Today you are witnessing the President of the United States refusing to give to your elected Representatives in Congress the FBI reports on high public officials whose loyalty is under suspicion.

It is not necessary, nor do I have time on this broadcast, to point out to you the fact that the whole record of our State Department in Washington and our executive department in Washington in dealing with foreign affairs has been a total failure. All that is necessary for you to do is to review the record of the Atlantic Charter and the conferences at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. No blacker page was ever written in the history of any government than the betrayal of the American Government in the plans there proposed and accepted. When those conferences were all over, and when the record was written, it left the dictatorship of communism spread all over Europe. The Communists, through diplomatic and secret agreements, had won control of about one-half of all Europe and we had betrayed Poland, Czechoslovakia, Finland, and other democracies that had a right to believe that the solemn word of America was worth 100 cents on the dollar. But now the blunderbusses in Washington all say they hate Communists.

They have taken a perfumed bath and have walked out on the balcony with wings sprouting in all directions and proclaimed that they are now endowed with wisdom from on high and that they are not going to make any more errors. Incidentally, and at the same time, they are asking the American taxpayers to provide them with about $20,000,000,000 more money so they can fill the pockets of the former OPA'ers, WPA'ers, and other do-gooders and send them over to Europe to strut in all their glory and give our taxpayers' hard-earned money to those people over there so they won't join Uncle Joe in his campaign to take over all of the rest of Europe which we have not already given to him.

I want to say to you now there is only one language that the Russians understand and that is the language of military might. Sending boat loads of money to broken-down politicians in Europe to help them bolster up their sinking Socialist and Communist governments is not going to win the battle for democracy. We are going to have to build a military machine big enough and strong enough to force the Russians back where they belong and keep them there. By the time we get this all-powerful and invincible military machine built, let us pray that there will be a new executive department of government in Washington, composed of honest and experienced American citizens who possess enough intelligence and enough courage to use it and thereby establish peace in the world before the cost of maintaining this gigantic military machine and keeping up the other outrageous expenditures, brings about the bankruptcy of our own Nation. * * * I voted against pouring out these billions of dollars to bolster up socialistic and communistic governments in Europe, but I have voted for, and I expect to continue to vote for, every intelligent piece of legislation designed to give us the military power to protect America in this hour of peril.

Whether or not the beating of the war drums in the executive branch of our Government has been caused by their honest belief that we are in danger of another war, or whether it was merely for the purpose of putting into operation another gigantic spending program for the purpose of trying to perpetuate an inflationary false prosperity in the hopes that it will reelect them, is a debatable question. These Reds and Communists and political termites who are hovering around the throne of the executive department of this Government and who are in positions of administration advisers in many foreign nations of the world, have definitely made up their minds that during the next emergency they expect to complete the total regimentation of this Nation. They expect to bring back control of allocation of materials. They expect to bring back price control. They expect to bring back rationing and subsidies. They expect to impose wage control and salary limitations. They expect to impose profit control. They expect to proceed down the line under the guise of protecting private enterprise, to destroy the last nation on the face of the globe that still enjoys free private enterprise. Unless the people of this Nation are alert and active these very things are going to happen in this Nation, and they are going to happen within the next 2 or 4 years.

When we entered the Second World War I proposed on the floor of the United States Senate that we freeze profits right where they were and levy an excess-profit tax of 100 percent on all war profits, regardless of whether they were earned by individuals or corporations. If that had been done we would not have had much inflation, we would not have had any OPA, and we would not have such an enormous public debt as we have today. But Congress was packed with too many New Dealers who were in control and wanted more bureaus, more spending, more controls, more political patronage, and more Federal jobs. They got it. The corporations got their excess profits. The laboring men got high wages which were immediately taken away from them in withholding taxes and higher prices for the cost of living. In giving you these facts I am doing so because I consider it my duty as your public servant to keep you fully informed.

Now, friends, you have highly honored me by electing me to two of the highest offices the people of Texas can give—Governor of Texas and United States Senator from Texas. You have doubly honored me, after reviewing my record, by reelecting me to both of these two high offices. You have bestowed upon me all the honor and trust that could ever be bestowed, regardless of how many more terms I might serve. In appreciation of all of this I have given to the people of Texas and this Nation 10 of the best years of my life. It has been 10 years of strenuous work. I have served you faithfully, honestly, and conscientiously all of this time, and I think I have earned the right to come back home and take a rest, and, at least for a time, devote my efforts to my own personal affairs. I, therefore, chose to not seek reelection.

While history shows that most people who get on the Government pay roll generally stick there until they get kicked out or are carried out in a wooden box, I am proud to have been able to choose my own course, and get in of my own free will and get out of my own free will.

Under existing conditions, up until 10 years ago, I had always been able to make a good living for my family in private enterprise. I am not so sure that I can do that under the conditions which prevail today caused by

New Deal destruction of our private enterprise system, but I am willing to try. I have made no decision, however, as to what line of work I shall take up. My health is still good. I want to keep it that way. I have won every political race I ever made, thanks to you good citizens of Texas. It is certainly a grand and glorious feeling to be the undisputed and undefeated champion in four of the most hotly contested political campaigns ever waged in Texas. Your generous endowment of honor and trust upon me is greatly appreciated and shall be cherished by me and my family as long as we live. To my hundreds of thousands of true friends, I find it extremely difficult to find words to express my deep appreciation of your true and unswerving friendship, loyal and unlimited support, and active and full cooperation. I thank you from the bottom of my heart. I shall be eternally grateful to each and every one of you. As your Governor, and as your Senator, my daily prayer has been for God's guidance in making all decisions on public matters and casting my vote on the right side of all questions. I never asked God to get on my side, but always asked Him to keep me constantly on His side. Some people have said many evil things against me, but never has anything been said or done that provoked any bitterness in my heart against any human being. So, having done my duty as your trusted servant, I expect to enjoy the opportunity to come back home to the State I love and live among the people I love, and again rub shoulders with the common citizens of this great State as in years gone by.

I want to sound a word of warning, however, to all these self-sanctified New Dealers, Communists, patronage peddling politicians, and other governmental termites, that I have not lost interest in public affairs. The people of Texas have been too good to me for me to come back home and draw up in my shell. In not offering myself as a candidate for reelection I am not going to do like the professional politicians usually do, and that is, attempt to tell the people who my successor shall be. I do not intend to, either directly or indirectly, aid or endorse any man for United States Senate in this race. That is a matter for the people of Texas to decide and I intend to stay absolutely out of it—unless some of the candidates stick their necks out by dragging my name into the race. If they do, I might find it necessary to come back down here to Texas and make a few pertinent remarks. By not seeking reelection this year I do not mean that I am forever and completely eliminating myself from politics, or from seeking public office at some future time. I am burning no bridges behind me or in front of me.

Now, friends, I have given you my decision. I have told you why I made that decision, and that it was made a long time ago. Recently letters have been literally pouring in to me from friends in every part of the State urging me to run again. It is hard for me not to yield to this tremendous demand, because I like to please my friends, and I am absolutely positive that if I should enter the race I would win it by a bigger majority than ever before. I expect there will be the same old clique of defeated opponents (and remember, folks, there are a lot of them) and their comrades, who will holler that I did not run this year because defeat was certain. That will be nothing new for them to say. They have always said defeat was certain and they have always been wrong. Even if I were to keep on running and keep on getting elected the rest of my life until I died in office, some of them might even then accuse me of dying to avoid certain defeat at the next election. I think the people of Texas know I have never given a great deal of consideration to the free advice and kind of remarks of my ever persistent but eternally disappointed opponents. And I know that you folks don't pay much attention to what they say.

Friends, let me again warn you about the danger your Nation faces from within. There is a well-organized, determined effort being made to take over complete control of those who sit in the law-making bodies in Washington. This threat to the welfare of our Nation is real and it is dangerous, because it is a Nation-wide campaign of labor racketeers, Communists, parlor pinks, and worst of all, some folks who are looked upon as decent business and professional men who make a living out of politics. You can save your Government only by the selection of the right kind of public officials. When you seek to determine for whom you are going to vote for United States Senator, look behind the curtain and find out all the facts about every candidate. If there are no candidates in the Senate race now who suit you, go out and find one who does suit you and put his name on the ticket. You have plenty of time between now and June 7 to do it. This Nation faces grave peril. Don't let anybody slip and slide into public office who does not come up to your standards. You people who are sitting serenely at home remember this: When the Communists took over Czechoslovakia they did not send their army in to accomplish their purpose; they did the job from within, with home-grown stooges. Citizens of Texas, wake up. Your liberty and your right to own your own business, your right to work at the calling of your choice, and many other sacred rights are in jeopardy. It is time for the leadership of the politicians to be replaced with the leadership of the people.

As I close this speech, as I announce my intention to retire for the present from public service, I do it with a clear conscience. I have stood and fought for the rights of our people when it was unpopular to oppose the dictators in power. I have led the attack against those interests which I believed were trying to wreck the economy of this country for selfish gain. I expect to return immediately to my job in Washington to serve the remainder of my term. Under these trying times I am glad I can stay there to look after your interests instead of deserting my public duties to come back here and campaign for reelection. If anyone listening to me tonight would like to have one or more copies of this speech, write to me in care of the Senate Office Building at Washington.

All of you folks know that I was brought up in humble surroundings, among humble people. That created an honest atmosphere. All my life I have rubbed shoulders with the rank and file of the common citizens—the salt of the earth. In my sojourn in Government circles I have communed with the high and mighty, but when my present term expires at the end of this year, I will, with perfect ease and as a matter of my own personal choice, enjoy coming back home and again rubbing shoulders with the common citizens of this grand and glorious State. I can come back among you with a clear conscience, and look every citizen straight in the eye and say that your welfare was constantly uppermost in my mind during my 10-years as your hired hand.

I want to thank God for looking after me while I have been serving you, and I beseech Him to continue to bless all of us and to pour out his blessings on this Nation, and on this State. May He impress upon each and every citizen of Texas his obligation to this State and to our Nation. May He bless each of you, your home, your family, and your humble servant. I love Texas and I love the people of Texas, and I'm coming back home to be with you again.

This is your United States Senator, W. LEE O'DANIEL, Democrat of Texas, speaking from Fort Worth, wishing you one and all a most pleasant good night.

Living—1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 27 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address on the subject Living—1948, by Gov. Earl Warren, of California, broadcast over the facilities of the National Broadcasting Co., May 16, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, as the national conventions approach, campaigns for the Presidential nomination become more intense. The debate quickens. Personal differences make up the political headlines. These things are the fireworks of democracy in a Presidential year, but they are not the essence of the democratic process. A statement of party principles, reducible to understandable programs at the conventions, is even more important today than candidates. The greatest contribution of the candidates in these final weeks can be made, not by particularizing on minor differences, but by building up party unity upon great objectives important to the people of America.

Leaders of the Republican Party must preserve unity of thought and action. Such unity is vital to the national welfare today, because there is no hope of it in the Democratic Party. That party is torn asunder by sectional, racial, and ideological dissension. It is incapable of presenting a united leadership for the solution of the critical problems that have overwhelmed the national administration. It is not necessary to fix the blame for this. We must, however, face the fact.

It is all the more important, therefore, that the Republican Party avoid losing its strength and usefulness in division over personalities, detail, or sectionalism. We must not permit the Republican Party to advocate one thing in one part of the country and something else in another. Party membership should represent the same fundamental beliefs that can be brought to bear upon any national problem, foreign or domestic.

I believe that the leaders of the Republican Party are in such fundamental agreement and that, if impersonal efforts are made to do so, we can unite on great objectives.

Republican leaders must remain closely allied and cooperative in their approach to the problems of the day—so willing to sacrifice personal pride and position for the national welfare that the Republican Party will be able to write in clear, unmistakable terms a program worthy of the confidence, not merely the momentary fancy, of the American people. Every part of that program should be written, not in vote-catching phrases, but as a frank explanation of our approach to every issue.

Because the Republican Party has not been in power for 16 years, the public does not know exactly what it would do if returned to power. But, the people want to know, they have a right to know, and we must let them know with candor and without equivocation.

I am sure the American people want to know whether the Republican Party has grown with the years, whether it has learned from the world-shaking events of recent

years. Does it propose to turn the clock of government back to prewar time, or does it propose to face the problems of this day in the light of changed and changing conditions? Does it understand the need for a higher concept of our Government's duty to its people and to the world? Does the Republican Party nourish any secret longing to return to isolationism, or does it intend to dedicate itself wholeheartedly to the great strategy for world cooperation and lasting peace?

The American people would like to know, I am sure, whether the Republican Party fully realizes the tragic suffering wrought by the last world-wide depression. They want to know whether we are alive to the dangers of a new boom and bust era. They want to know if the Republican Party is a forward-looking, progressive party—a party of the people as distinguished from a party of reaction, pressure groups, and special interests.

For my own part, I am confident that the leaders of our party want it to be liberal in the finest sense of the word—the servant of all the people. I am certain, therefore, that if we define our position properly, the American people will acclaim the result, and whoever the choice of our convention may be, will rally to him—and to the program for which he stands.

The times in which we are living demand this kind of political leadership. It would be a national tragedy if for any reason our party should fail to produce it. We are living today in a state of suspended existence. We are not engaged in a shooting war, neither are we at peace. We gloss over the situation by saying that we are in a cold war, but that cold war at times becomes very hot and is always dangerous.

It is 3 years since Germany surrendered, almost that long since Japan capitulated. It is likewise 3 years since we formed the United Nations with its concept of one world. Yet today real peace seems farther away than at that time. There is a world-wide sense of frustration because the peace for which men fought and died has not been achieved. Actually more of our time, energy, and money is of necessity being devoted to preparation for war than to the cause of peace. Our domestic and international affairs are abnormal to the point of real danger.

We are living in an artificial economy—one that is based on transient programs that are keeping employment high, while the purchasing power of the American dollar is diminishing. This abnormal situation will continue unless our full production can increasingly be turned to peacetime goods and services for our own people, and into the channels of normal world trade.

Temporarily we are pouring out our factory goods and farm products by the billions to the stricken peoples of the world—and rightly so. But we are making little postwar progress toward better housing, health, education, security, or conservation of our natural resources. It is the phenomena of our age that as we pour out billions for world recovery to both friends and foes of the late war, we find ourselves quibbling over programs essential for improved living conditions in our own country. It is about time for us to realize that the better world which we are trying to create for mankind depends very largely upon the strength of the United States—which strength in turn depends upon the opportunities we afford our own people to achieve a good life.

So long as there are States or parts of States where impoverished schools deny a basic education to the children living there; so long as a large percentage of our hard-working, self-respecting Americans cannot afford medical care; so long as a large percentage of our housing is substandard or in slum conditions; so long as workmen with years of life ahead of them, are cast-off without the benefit of a broadened social-security program; so long as our natural resources are being inexcusably wasted; just so long will America lack the strength to raise living standards here at home and fulfill at the same time the world obligations which we have assumed in recent years.

I believe the Republican Party at the coming convention can reduce to writing—and what is more important—translate into action—a simple program which will enable our country to fulfill its commitments abroad and still produce enough to insure a more comfortable life for all our peope. I believe we can do this without Government handouts, without regimentation of our people, without the introduction of any strange or foreign ideologies, but strictly within the letter and spirit of the Constitution of the United States and its inspiring preamble which reads:

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic transquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do establish this Constitution of the United States of America."

This is not ordinary language. It represents the experience, sacrifice, and wisdom of centuries. It is the epitome of our American faith—the grand design for our national progress—past and future.

I would have the Republican Party—my party—write its program not only in simple language but in the spirit of that preamble. I would start by saying that we shall have one law for all men—a law under which everyone may enjoy the full exercise of all rights of American citizenship. I would emphasize the place of the family in American life. I would provide the opportunity for every family to live in a neighborhood of decent homes, with adequate protection to the breadwinner against involuntary unemployment caused by illness or economic reasons. I would provide for an expanded system of social security for those men and women decreed by industry to be unemployable although their span of life has been extended by the progress of medical science.

I would keep the rules of conduct for employer and employee fair, recognizing the obligations of both to the general public. I would provide a system within the means of each family under which it could preserve its health and insure its wealth-producing capacity. I would insist that every American child, regardless of creed, race, or residence, be given the basic education which will enable him to make a living in the field of his choice, to appreciate the rights of others and to understand his own rights in the life of our Nation.

Such a program should also call for an inventory of our natural resources and pledge their conservation for the use and benefit of our children as well as ourselves. We are told that when our Nation was formed there was an average of 9 inches of fertile topsoil throughout the land, but that erosion and improvident use since that time have reduced it to 6 inches. We are further told that 500,000 acres of fertile topsoil flow into the ocean unnecessarily each year, and it has been stated that the equivalent of a $10,000 farm flows out of the Mississippi Basin into the Gulf of Mexico every 30 minutes. In some parts of the country our forests have been denuded by ruthless cutting practices, although we know that forests can be harvested and preserved in the same manner that orchards are harvested and preserved.

In my own State, through improvident use, fire, and insect infestation, our stand of merchantable timber has been reduced by half in the past 100 years. The story of my State is the story of the others.

Much of our wildlife is becoming extinct. In the West, where there are great snow-capped mountains and deep canyons for water storage, flood waters having potential hydroelectric power sufficient to supply every farm, factory, home, and business in the region, flow aimlessly into the sea.

This is sheer waste because the electrical energy that can be developed from these streams would not only turn the wheels of factories and the pumps of farms, but would quickly pay for its own development and leave the waters undiminished. The development of this hydroelectric power becomes largely the job of Government, because water can and must be utilized for many different purposes.

The conservation of all these human and natural resources need not be done entirely by the Federal Government, necessitating as it would centralization of administration in Washington. But, the Federal Government should help the States fulfill the basic needs of conservation of our country. In this way our Nation, with its resources strengthened, could produce not only the essentials for our people, but much that is needed in other parts of the world.

I believe we should write plainly and simply that the Republican Party believes in world cooperation; that it acknowledges the responsibilities incident to the leadership which our country assumed during and since World War II; that it guarantees our Nation will keep those commitments; and that we will keep ourselves militarily and economically strong in order to fulfill these obligations in all parts of the world. We should pledge ourselves to the success of the United Nations, or to its successor, if, unfortunately, the future should decree that we must have two worlds instead of one world. We should make it plain that we are not interested in the type of government other nations have so long as those governments are the will of their own people; are not controlled by outside domination; are cooperative with their neighbors and the United Nations, and are not unfriendly to us.

We should say frankly that we do not intend to impose American institutions either political or economic upon other countries any more than we will acquiesce in the imposition of Soviet totalitarianism or communism upon such countries. Our concern will be with aggression, to prevent which we fought two world wars. We will oppose it wherever it occurs in this world to the extent of our ability and in accordance with the realities of the situation.

It is upon this issue of aggression that we in the United States must take our stand. It is the one urgent issue that must be met now and settled. If it is, all other points of disagreement between nations, political or economic, can be resolved in peace. If it is not, there can be no freedom from fear even for the strongest, and the clouds of war will always be hovering over the horizon.

We must not permit the fear of communism to dominate our lives, however—despise it as we may. Our people are not Communists, and never will be, so long as we continue to advance human welfare under our system. Communists can bray at our system, but every American knows that this country of ours has come a long way in the past few generations—further than the rest of the world has come in many centuries. We can go still further in our own time, and if we just keep on going, there will be no place for communism in America.

Fellow Americans, our vision of the future must be based upon faith in our institutions, not upon fear of others. We must live by principles of enlightenment, not by expediency. In assuming national leadership the Republican Party must stand first of all for public integrity. It must make frankness its mode of dealing with the people. It

must make efficiency its method for conducting the affairs of government, and, finally, it must make human helpfulness its great and guiding ideal. Upon these principles the Republican Party must organize and stand—integrity, frankness, efficiency, and helpfulness. They constitute the very foundation for a better Nation and a better world.

Tax Outlook Not So Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Boston Post on the grave financial strain that our Government will face during the next years.

This editorial demonstrates conclusively that in view of our heavy commitments the recent cut in taxes was irresponsible.

TAX OUTLOOK NOT SO GOOD

Just when the American people were congratulating themselves on the first reduction in Federal taxes in a great many years, and when the workers were beginning to rejoice in the increase in take-home pay resulting from that tax reduction, Senator HARRY F. BYRD sets forth a forecast of the Federal Government income and outgo for the next several years which indicates that the tax relief is going to be very short-lived.

Senator BYRD is one of the ablest students of Government finance in either branch of the Congress. He has been a consistent fighter for greater economy in Government expenditure and a staunch exponent of private enterprise. He is no alarmist, but the outlook he presents is not a pleasant one.

In a recent speech in the Senate he dealt with the proposed Government budgets for the next three fiscal years. The figures he set forth had been checked with the executive officials of the Government and allowance was made for a 5-percent variation either way. But as he said, "the likelihood is that the expenditures will be more, rather than less than those now proposed."

For the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1948, the official estimate is for expenditures of $43,800,000,000 and income of $40,000,000,000, leaving a deficit of $3,800,000,000. For the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1949, the outgo is estimated at $47,500,000,000 and the income $40,000,000,000, leaving a deficit of $7,500,000,000; while for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1950, the projected outgo is $49,600,000,000 and the income remains stationary at $40,000,000,000, increasing the deficit for that year to $9,600,000,000.

Figures are pretty dry reading, but here is a total forecasted deficit for the next three fiscal years of approximately $21,000,000,000. Obviously something must be done about it very soon, and in Senator BYRD'S opinion it means that an increase in taxes will have to be made.

He says: "It can readily be seen that we face shortly an increase in taxes of $10,000,000,000 which, pyramided upon existing taxes, will place a crushing burden upon private enterprise and the taxpayers of America. The projected deficit of $7,500,000,000 for the 1949 fiscal year will make it necessary to pass a new tax bill next spring."

Evidently President Truman, who twice vetoed the tax-reduction bills until the last one was finally passed over his second veto, was more realistic than the Congressmen who were trying to please the public. The President was honestly telling the people the facts when he said the Government's commitments were such that a tax reduction was impossible, and the Congressmen who were making up the budgets must have known that.

Secretary of the Treasury Snyder, in a current news release in which he asks the banks to cooperate with the Treasury in selling Government savings bonds, says that "the combination of tax reduction and increased Government expenditure probably spells the end of debt reduction from budget surplus in the next year."

In the light of Senator BYRD'S analysis Secretary Snyder is understating the case. If the national debt is not increased, rather than decreased, with this $21,000,000,000 deficit piling up in the next 3 years, it will be a miracle.

Republican State Committee of Pennsylvania and the Pennsylvania Delegation to the Republican National Convention Endorse Senator Edward Martin as the Republican Candidate for President of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, on Saturday, May 22, in the city of Philadelphia, the Republican State Committee of Pennsylvania held its organization meeting in the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel.

At this meeting there was presented a resolution endorsing the Honorable EDWARD MARTIN, former Governor of Pennsylvania and present United States Senator from Pennsylvania, for the Republican nomination for President of the United States.

That resolution was adopted unanimously and with enthusiasm.

On the same date, at a meeting of the Pennsylvania Republican delegates to the Republican National Convention, a resolution concurring in the action of the State committee was adopted by unanimous vote.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the texts of those resolutions as part of my remarks, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE REPUBLICAN STATE COMMITTEE OF PENNSYLVANIA AT PHILADELPHIA, MAY 22, 1948

Whereas the people of the United States are looking to the Republican Party for inspirational, patriotic, and courageous leadership to meet the growing crises arising out of the tragic incompetence of the present administration at Washington; and

Whereas there have been repeated and convincing demonstrations of the failure of the present administration to uphold respect for constitutional government, to cope with the problems of inflation or to deal adequately with communistic aggression abroad or infiltration at home; and

Whereas in the person of the Honorable EDWARD MARTIN the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has a native son eminently qualified by exceptional ability and broad, successful experience for such national leadership; and

Whereas the Honorable EDWARD MARTIN, as Governor of Pennsylvania, as United States Senator, as civilian-soldier who rose from private to major general, and in a host of other public responsibilities has exhibited steadfast patriotism, righteous resentment against attacks upon the American traditions whether made by Communists or others, ability to deal with public issues fairly and competently, as well as the breadth of vision and the tenacity of purpose necessary for meeting the great problems of the day; and

Whereas the 28 Republican members of the Pennsylvania congressional delegation, at a meeting March 10, 1948, adopted a resolution calling attention to the eminent qualifications of the Honorable EDWARD MARTIN and unanimously endorsed him for the Republican nomination for President of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Republican State Committee of Pennsylvania, in session assembled this 22d day of May 1948, in recognition of his sturdy Americanism, his outstanding administrative ability, and his wise statesmanship, hereby proudly and enthusiastically declare the Honorable EDWARD MARTIN, United States Senator from Pennsylvania, to be the unanimous choice of this committee for the Republican nomination for President of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That we, the members of the Republican State Committee of Pennsylvania, urge the Republicans of all States as well as all other public-spirited men and women of whatever party, to join us by endorsing and supporting this call upon him for further service to our Nation and the world; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Pennsylvania delegation to the Republican National Convention, with the recommendation that appropriate action be taken by that delegation in support of the Honorable EDWARD MARTIN as Pennsylvania's candidate for the Republican nomination for President of the United States.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED MAY 22, 1948, BY THE PENNSYLVANIA DELEGATION TO THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION

Whereas the Pennsylvania Republican delegation in Congress, by unanimous vote on the 10th day of March, 1948, adopted a resolution endorsing the Honorable EDWARD MARTIN, United States Senator from Pennsylvania, for the Republican nomination for President of the United States; and

Whereas the Republican State Committee, in session assembled in the city of Philadelphia, this day, the 22d day of May, 1948, adopted a resolution proudly and enthusiastically declaring the Honorable EDWARD MARTIN to be the unanimous choice of that committee for the Republican nomination for President of the United States; and

Whereas the Republican State Committee has recommended appropriate action by this body: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the duly elected delegates of Pennsylvania to the Republican National Convention of 1948, do hereby concur in their action and bring to the attention of the Republican National Convention the outstanding qualifications of Pennsylvania's distinguished native son, United States Senator EDWARD MARTIN, for President of the United States.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 27 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in a recent issue of the Honolulu Advertiser, one of the leading daily newspapers published in the Territory of Hawaii.

The subject of the editorial is Only the People Can Gain Statehood for Hawaii. It is an exceptionally frank and a splendid statement of the situation as many friends of Hawaii see it today. I hope this editorial will get the attention not only of the Members of Congress, but that it will have wide circulation throughout the Nation, including the Territory of Hawaii. Such comment by the people of Hawaii, in my opinion, will accomplish far more for the cause of statehood than any amount of money appropriated by its legislature to be used in wining and dining congressional parties or others, either here or in Hawaii. I congratulate the editor of the Honolulu Advertiser for this enlightening editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONLY THE PEOPLE CAN GAIN STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Senator KNOWLAND gave Hawaii solid food for thought when, upon the failure of his statehood resolution, he expressed the belief that the people of this Territory have depended too much upon lip service in the Senate. A natural reluctance among Senators to take the statehood bill away from the committee in which it was frozen accounted for some of the votes against the Knowland resolution. That was self-evident. Still it was equally evident that too many Senators are not yet convinced of the advisability of admitting Hawaii to the Union of States at this time.

The people of Hawaii know that this is a mistaken impression and so it is timely to consider why it exists. An outstanding reason is found in attempts that were made to conceal Communist infiltration into the life of the Territory. Nothing could have been more futile than the denial of this known fact. The Members of the Senate had a right to feel affronted that their intelligence was rated so low.

Communist propaganda was openly distributed here during the water-front strike. Known Communists agitated soldier mass meetings here designed to break up the American Army's fine fighting machine at the close of the war. Communist propaganda reappeared on the plantations during the sugar and pineapple strikes, and is still being circulated here at frequent intervals. These things are known to the Federal authorities and to the Members of Congress.

So when spokesmen for Hawaii told the United States Senate that there is no communism in Hawaii, or said the Communists in Hawaii can be counted on the fingers of one hand, they established a firm doubt as to this Territory's veracity in all matters. Where truth would have served to build confidence in Hawaii's ability to cope with communism and other disloyalty as a State better than it can combat them under a Territorial status, a childish effort to blink the facts had exactly the opposite effect.

Then, too, there was the fell influence of an irresponsible labor leadership that had to be combatted in the minds of the Senators. The invasion of Hawaii's labor organizations by mainland emissaries of Harry Bridges, and the direction of labor strife here by Bridges himself, in person and by overseas telephone contacts, did not give Hawaii a good reputation for ability to handle its own affairs. Notwithstanding the unquestioned American loyalty of the rank and file of island labor, the strength of a leadership that followed directly the Bridges line was not looked upon favorably at Washington.

The climax of doubt was reached when Jack Hall, personal representative of Bridges in Hawaii, was able to dictate an 18-day deadlock in the house of representatives in Hawaii's legislature. This political domination, by remote control from Bridges, was less than reassuring to observers at the National Capital. That the deadlock was broken and the Hall-Kauhane leadership discredited was not sufficient to offset the damage that had been done. Reams of testimony, honest and factual, that proved far beyond reasonable doubt Hawaii's capability for self-government in the best traditions of Americanism could not dispel the doubt that arose from the one unfortunate and ill-timed show of political strength made by the Bridges' cohorts.

Senators who insisted on deferring statehood have promised to come to Hawaii before the next Congress and see for themselves who is running the islands and their governments and how, which places upon Hawaii's political and civic leaders, and all the people of the Territory, a grave responsibility.

There will be elections this fall. Their outcome will not go unnoted in Washington. Nor will the acts and conduct of Hawaii's new legislature escape observation.

If men and women who are truly representative of loyal Hawaii go into office, and conduct themselves as the community has the right to expect, the effect will be favorable and should lead to admission of the Territory to statehood at the next Congress. If the people of Hawaii fail to heed that obligation, the outcome of their next statehood campaign may be as disappointing as this one has been.

No individual; no committee or commission, can gain statehood for Hawaii. That is a job the people of Hawaii have to do for themselves. Their first duty is to do a good job at the polls.

America, the Land of Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, why has America become great? How did America achieve greatness? Why is our American standard of living 10 times as high as the standard of living found anywhere else in the world? The answers to these questions are all to be found in the following dramatic story entitled "One Hundred One Displaced Persons Versus Sixty Million Employed."

Mr. Speaker, I include this dramatic story, told by the Ceco Steel Products Corp. of Chicago, as the major part of my remarks because it answers in full the rhetorical questions I have propounded:

ONE HUNDRED ONE DISPLACED PERSONS VERSUS 60,000,000 EMPLOYED

In a strange new land they stood—these displaced persons. Silent men with grim tasks ahead worked purposefully and with little thought of the fatigue that racked their weary bodies. They were building a new community—their community.

Women, hollow-eyed, their white, drawn faces mirroring pain, went about setting their humble homes in order. On every side was hunger, privation—the plight of desperate people—a picture of Europe, 1948? you ask.

No; a picture of America, 1620.

For here, 101 displaced Pilgrims—men, women, and children of the new America—freedom-loving people all, were beginning a

791170—25843

new way of life. They were meeting critical shortages, and overcoming them—shortages of all the things that make for decent living—food, clothing, shelter; shortages that relatively were the greatest our Nation has ever known.

There was a 100-percent shortage of almost everything on that day, 328 years ago, when their storm-battered ship nosed into the quieter waters of rock-studded coastal bays. Yes; a shortage of everything except courage—a belief in the dignity of man—a passionate desire on the part of each to live as he liked.

Perhaps it was the strong driving force of the urge to be free men that enabled them to solve the critical shortages of their day. For you see, no one could pass a law providing new homes or schools, nor were there any homes here ready for them to occupy.

So, with bare hands and primitive tools, they individually dug from the earth and cut from the forests their own homes and schools. Ceaselessly and endlessly they worked at their simple tasks, struggling for necessities—looking ahead, not behind—building a heritage for millions of Americans to come.

Are we less courageous than they?

Is war-scarred Europe more destitute than they were?

Is there less hope in our time than theirs?

Are our shortages more acute than 100 percent?

There is a simple answer to those questions and to the problem they pose. It is a word. A short word, without glamour, but a virile word of dynamic force; a word, that in its simplicity, might be overlooked, but a word so powerful as to be virtually magic.

* * * * *

It is work—a four-letter word for continuing prosperity, for preserving freedom in America and for providing hope throughout the world. As we said before, everyone must work more, produce more—management and labor.

Suppose we look at the simple mathematics of the problem. There just aren't enough homes, schools, hospitals, roads, to satisfy the needs of all—not enough steel, automobiles, freight cars, food—for America and the rest of the world. How can more of these scarce things be made available sooner, and at lower prices?

We, like you, have heard many so-called cure-alls. Some say too many have too much money, they bid against each other for scarce things and thus keep prices ever moving upward, so taxes must be raised, not lowered—must be kept high to draw off excess money. Credit must be curtailed so

buying will be slowed down. Or prices must be regulated and goods rationed.

Others say do not buy unless your needs are desperate, quit eating certain foods certain days, don't build now, don't, don't, don't, "verboten." It all has a familiar ring somehow. It's a creed of hopelessness—of negation.

Let's hear a new voice in America, raised high in a mighty crescendo, drowning out those voices of fear. Yes, a new voice of hope, which will say in clear unmistakable tones of triumph—

"Let's do something; yes, let's trade do for don't."

We of Ceco believe the American way to solve the problem of shortages and high prices is one of action, one of doing, of making more things, not buying less of what we have, of increasing prosperity, not dividing misery. And prosperity comes from making a lot for all, not dividing a little with all.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article in the Washington Post of this morning which illuminated the darkening scene in Palestine:

BRITISH IN PALESTINE—LETTERS IN THE TIMES OF LONDON

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Last Friday the Washington Post reprinted a letter on British policy in Palestine written to the Times of London by the Right Honorable L. S. Amery, former Secretary of State for the Colonies and Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs in the twenties. Following are a reply to Mr. Amery's original letter by Lord Altrincham and Mr. Amery's subsequent rejoiner. Lord Altrincham was formerly Sir Edward Grigg. Well known in Washington, he was Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for War and later British Minister in the Middle East.)

It is painful to differ publicly from an old colleague, and more particularly from one with Mr. Amery's outstanding record of service to the commonwealth. But the very fact that he writes with such authority compels me to say that his reflections upon the character of the British mandate in Palestine seem to me a caricature of what most Englishmen have felt about it for the past 30 years.

He asserts that we had the right to interpret the mandate as we thought fit. If that was the case, the white paper of 1939, which was indorsed by Parliament is manifestly of greater validity than the Peel commission's advocacy of partition, which was not.

But few in fact have interpreted our right under the mandate as one to do what we pleased. I have been intimate since the spring of 1921, when the mandate was very young, with all the inner currents of opinion which have molded British policy in the Middle East, and I can only say that Mr. Amery's cynical attitude toward the mandate in no way resembles that which governed most English minds.

However different their views upon the policy most likely to achieve the end in view, a great majority of Englishmen have been guided by the conviction that they must strive to reconcile the Jewish claim to a national home with Arab interests and Arab patriotism if the purpose of the mandate was to be honorably fulfilled. They have, in fact, regarded our task as one, before all else, of impartial mediation, and our duty under the mandate as a solemn obligation in that sense to the powers whose indorsement we sought and obtained.

In this interpretation of the mandate, proclaimed by Mr. Churchill as Colonial Secretary in 1922, the best of Jewish opinion has always been upon our side. That we have failed to carry it out is due in no small measure to those who have regarded the mandate as a mere instrument of policy, encouraged Zionist extremism, and sown fear throughout the Arab world.

Palestine in consequence is given to the sword; but the time for mediation will assuredly return. In preparation for that day let us move the United Nations by every means in our power to recapture the spirit in which the mandate was originally intended and applied—to show, that is, that they will act as true and impartial mediators, and not as individual self-seekers or interested partisans.

ALTRINCHAM.

TORMARTON, ENGLAND.

My old friend Lord Altrincham has, I fear, misunderstood the purport of my letter. In it I emphasized that the primary responsibility for policy in Palestine was, and still is, ours, and that it is mere self-deception to make out that we have handed back to international authority a task which it imposed on us and which has proved beyond our capacity.

As for the mandate, I never suggested that we had a right to disregard its terms. All I was concerned to point out was that the policy was antecedent to the mandate, and was, in fact, carried out by successive governments, more particularly in 1939, in accordance with their views of the needs of the situation without much regard to those of the Mandates Commission.

In any case our pledge under the mandate was an addition to, but could not in any sense be a subtraction from, or substitution for, our own original responsibility. I entirely agree that it was a responsibility to both Arabs and Jews, and I believe that we did endeavor for many years to carry out that responsibility in the impartial spirit of fairness to both sides for which Lord Altrincham pleads.

What is more, our responsibility inevitably grew with the years. Whatever the merits or demerits of our original policy, we were faced after the war, on the one hand, with the existence in Palestine of over 600,000 Jews who regarded it as their home, in which they, and such other Jews as would join them, were entitled to live as of right and not on sufferance (to use the language of Mr. Churchill's 1922 White Paper which governed our policy for 17 years); and, on the other, of the equally passionate conviction of Arab nationalism that Jews were not in Palestine as of right but could remain only as a minority under an Arab government entitled to veto all further immigration.

The responsibility for that position could not be shuffled off by saying, as Mr. Bevin has continually said, that we could have no part in any solution with which both sides were not in agreement. There was not, and is not, any possibility of agreement by discussion.

The only question was whether we were prepared to fulfill our responsibility to both sides by imposing whatever we believed to be a fair settlement, or were resolved to clear out and leave the solution to mutual slaughter and destruction. To throw that responsibility on the United Nations was an evasion of our own duty to Arabs as well as to Jews for which the wretched inhabitants of Palestine are now paying dearly.

Jerusalem is today a battlefield. St. George's Cathedral has been shelled. Your correspondent's vivid description of the sacking of a Jewish settlement gives only an advance picture of the destruction of the peaceful work of regeneration, for which not only Jewish settlers but British administrators have toiled, and of which both were rightly proud. Arab armies, equipped and trained by us, are marching in, and unless checked by the unaided efforts of the Jews, are likely to complete the undoing of 30 years of British policy and Jewish effort.

I say nothing of the disastrous effects on our whole position in the Middle East of so humiliating an abdication. What further consequences may flow from the cynically irresponsible policy of His Majesty's present government only the future will show.

L. S. AMERY.

LONDON, ENGLAND.

Foreign Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion and criticism with regard to the manner in which this measure providing for the extension of the reciprocal trade agreements comes to the floor of the House for consideration.

I have, generally speaking, opposed what is known as a closed rule. That is, a rule whereby the Members are required to either vote for or against a bill without amendment. So I say, there can be abuses in the adoption of the closed rule if the policy is carried too far. It should be explained I believe that the question involved here is not with regard to any particular changes that may be made in the legislation, except the one question, namely whether the extension should be for 1 year or 3 years.

So the record may be clear on this point, I am advised opportunity will be given after the debate is closed to vote on a motion demanding that the bill be remanded to the Committee on Ways and Means, with instructions to return it forthwith providing for an extension of agreements for the 3-year period, so those who want the agreements extended for 3 years rather than 1 year at a time, will be given opportunity to vote on that quesiton.

In view of unsettled conditions throughout the world and considering that so many agreements of various kinds are being made between the United States and foreign countries, it seems to me that no harm can be done by extending reciprocal trade agreements for a little more than a year as is provided under this legislation. By that time Congress can look it over and determine whether any changes should be made before further extensions are granted.

Frank C. Waldrop's Appreciation of Committee To Investigate Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, it is generally agreed that the only threat to the peace of the world today is communism and the one and only agency of the Congress of the United States, or for that matter any department of Government that has accomplished anything constructive toward exposing and acquainting the people of our country with the dangers of this menace is the House Committee To Investigate Un-American Activities.

This committee has done a great service to the people of this country and deserves the praise and support of every patriotic American who believes in our republican form of government. Down through the 10 years of its existence the committee and its individual members have been the target of a well financed and well organized campaign by the Communists and their dupes in a dastardly attempt to smear and discredit the good work which has been done. It is high time that the people of this country realize that those who try to discredit, yes, and eliminate such a wonderful committee do not have the interest and welfare of this Nation at heart.

In this morning's Washington Times-Herald there appeared an editorial by a great American, Frank C. Waldrop, which should be read by everyone. I wish to congratulate Mr. Waldrop on this splendid article and under leave to extend my remarks, I include it at this point in the hope that many people who did not see it in the paper will read it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

AFTER 10 YEARS

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

There passed quietly yesterday an important date in American history, namely, the tenth anniversary of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Do not be deceived by the clap-trap concerning this committee you read and hear from timid people who call themselves liberal. It is the most important body in Congress. It is doing the most vital work of any agency in the Government. It is doing that work well and honestly.

Of course you never hear any such statements as the above from the liberals. They put in all their hours viewing with alarm and deploring the committee's methods.

Let's back off a little and look at the record, just to see who is right. The first fact is that in Moscow, Russia, there is the world headquarters of a conspiracy that aims to overthrow our Government by force and violence.

The conspirators have stated their aims publicly, repeatedly, and consistently. Not only that, they have even been so bold as to explain their methods. These are:

(1) To use all available legal weapons in every country, such as the vote, the labor unions, the money system, the schools, the press, and the offices of government.

And (2) to use every available illegal method, such as murder, forgery, bribery, perjury, spying, and fraud.

From their point of view they are only doing what comes naturally. For their point of view is that a state of war exists between them and every government in the world, everywhere, at all times, until every government in the world truckles to their will.

When you are at war with another country you do whatever you think necessary to win that war. Communism is at war with us, at all times, under all conditions, in all cases. The Communist policymakers said so, years ago. Their acts ever since have been right down the line in accord with that declaration of war.

Part of their war making, and only a part of it, has shown itself in the operations of a group in these United States which calls itself the Communist Party.

To gain the maximum legal protection, this party has claimed that its purpose is to elect people to public office and to influence legislation by Congress and the States as our ordinary domestic political parties do.

Of course the difference between the Communist Party and any other political group in this country is obviously on the basis of one single test. Do you know of any other political group in the United States which openly, publicly, and consistently follows a line directed by the government of a foreign nation?

The Communists of the United States do follow the dictates of a foreign power.

Ten years ago they were not alone in such matters. There were at large in the United States of America agents of several foreign powers pulling and hauling at us. Most notable among these were the German, French, Italian, Japanese, British, and Russian.

Of these the British and French, through long, historic ties and with their superb knowledge of our country, were very successful and so far as the record shows, were able to get along in a thoroughly legal way. Not so, the others.

The pressure of foreign influences upon American thought and action had become so acute by 1938 that on May 26 of that year the House of Representatives felt it necessary to direct an investigation by a special committee.

It was an unprecedented assignment, brought on by unprecedented conditions. The very name of the committee, "the Committee on Un-American Activities," was a symptom of that. What, ordinarily, is un-American? The committee had to work that out as it looked at the actual state of life and affairs in the country.

Mr. Roosevelt, then the President, thought he knew. He sent for the then chairman of the committee, Representative Martin Dies, Democrat, of Texas, and told him to go after the Nazis and the Fascists, but to leave the Communists alone.

Fortunately for this Republic, Martin Dies was too much of a patriot to let the President dictate to him in that. Mr. Roosevelt was playing politics. Dies wasn't.

Roosevelt, with his fatal vanity that made him believe he was smarter than everybody else, thought that he could use the Communists in domestic American politics yet avoid the necessity of a pay-off.

Well, look at the record and see if he was right.

So on May 26, 1938, the House Committee on Un-American Activities came into being. It's first attack was on the Nazis. You doubt it? Go look up the hearings.

The very first witness the committee ever heard was one of its investigators, who had joined the German-American bund to get the dope on it. He put the dope in the record. Then, and only then, did things begin to happen to the bund.

Evidence brought out by the committee goosed the Department of Justice and other law enforcement agencies into action so that successfully the German, Japanese, and Italian outfits making free with this country on behalf of foreign powers, were broken up.

The first anti-Communist witness before the committee was a union leader. His name was John P. Frey and he was head of the metal trades union, AFL. His testimony was overwhelming, accurate, and everything he foretold of communism's effect on unions has come true.

But because the Communists had such a strong position inside our Government, they were able to blunt the attack with great success for a long time.

Today, they are in full flight, running down the same road that the Nazis, Fascists, and Japanese have gone. The credit for this achievement goes to the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

If this Republic survives its war with communism, that committee will deserve public appreciation ahead of any other organization in the Government. Never forget it.

The Press and the Present International Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. DEANE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an address, The Press and the Present International Situation, delivered by Mr. Thomas L. Robinson, president and publisher of the Charlotte News, Charlotte, N. C., delivered before a dinner meeting of the Statesville (N. C.) Lions Club. The Members will, I feel sure, Mr. Speaker, read this address by Mr. Robinson with a great deal of appreciation since the gentleman comes to grips with that fundamental and essential need for a free press not only in the United States, but throughout the world. I can and do wholeheartedly agree with Mr. Robinson that if we can break down more of the barriers which still bar the way to freedom of news from all nations, we will have a much better chance to obtain permanent peace.

The address follows:

THE PRESS AND THE PRESENT INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

I am indeed honored to have been invited by Senator HUGH MITCHELL to be your guest speaker this evening. I have the greatest admiration for the work of the Lions International, and I know that your Lions Club here in Statesville, under the fine leadership of President Dan W. Rigby, is one of the most outstanding civic clubs in the State. I salute you for the work which you are accomplishing in many fields, especially in that of bringing about greater understanding and good will among the people of all nations.

As a newspaperman I am particularly interested in the part which I feel the press can play in developing greater understanding through a freer exchange of information, particularly at this time when the international situation is charged with tenseness and uncertainty.

Recently I returned from the meetings of the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington, and also the annual sessions of the American Newspaper Publishers Association. At both gatherings the most urgent and significant topic was this problem of encouraging a more thorough exchange of information between all the nations of the world.

This world freedom of information, which is the right of all peoples to know what their governments and others are doing, is not just a generalized cliché. It is a vitally important goal, and if we can obtain enough information about our world neighbors, and if we can clear the air of festering hatred and mistrust, so much of which is based on an inadequate exchange of information, it may not be too late to avert another world war.

Wilbur Forrest, one of the distinguished editors of the New York Herald Tribune, who toured the world several years ago to observe press conditions, made some pertinent observations in a chapter entitled "Freedom of News," which is included in the recently published volume Late City Edition.

I would like to quote three paragraphs from Mr. Forrest because they present so concisely a picture of the problem.

"A survey this year of world press conditions by 70 correspondents of American press associations in 54 countries, dominions, or dependencies, indicated that only 16 governments have press freedom comparable to that of the United States; 21 practice partial repression such as control of newsprint, licensing, subsidizing, or local laws prohibiting criticism of the government; 8 support monopolistic, semiofficial news agencies; and 9 make no pretense of permitting any measure of press freedom.

"During 1946 there has been built up an infamous record of indirect censorship of the press in various parts of the world. Some governments have barred foreign correspondents from whom outright support in their articles could not be guaranteed. Others have suspended newspapers because of unpalatable articles. There have been police raids on newspapers by way of intimidation. At least one government forbade its newspapers to publish accounts of student riots which were taking place.

"In all of these countries, millions of people daily are being deprived of news and information. In many of them the government controls all media of communication and information and uses this to spread propaganda designed to reflect a favorable view of government activities, whether in national or international fields. It was in this manner that Hitler, Mussolini, and the Japanese dictators led their people into World War II."

There is not a greater or more skillful fighter in this crusade for world freedom of information than Kent Cooper, the able executive director of the Associated Press.

Mr. Cooper says: "My reason for seeing hope through world press freedom is based upon personal, minute, and intimate observations in countries of every continent of how the distortion of fact and the suppression of truth have led to two World Wars."

In his great book, Barriers Down, published in 1942, Mr. Cooper tells the dramatic story of the vital relationship between world news and world peace.

In 1914 Kent Cooper began a courageous and successful fight which lasted 25 years to break down a triangular monopoly of world news. As you may recall, three European press agencies had an arrangement bound and tied by ironclad contracts dividing the world between them. Reuters, the British news agency, controlled the news from the British Empire, Egypt, Turkey, and the Orient. Havas, the French news agency, covered France and the Latin countries. Wolff, the German news agency, reached out and covered the so-called Nordic nations as well as Russia and the Balkans. There were other smaller agencies such as Stefani in Italy, but they were almost all subsidiaries of the three big agencies.

These news agencies were part of the imperial set-up in their own nations. All except Reuters obtained a subsidy from their respective governments. But they were all agents for national propaganda. Even Reuters played the game of the British Foreign Office, and like the others was devoid of real objectivity and freedom in reporting the world news. Reuters, Havas, and Wolff were privately owned bureaus conducted for profit. Havas indeed was also an advertising agency, holding a virtual monopoly in France. Therefore, it could and did work both sides of the street. It worked this way. No Havas, no international advertising in France, Chile, and Spain. Owing to their close alliance with their respective governments these three news agencies controlled most sources of political and social news. They either repressed or censored news at the whim of their government masters. It was a most unhealthy situation by any standards of press freedom.

For the newly organized Associated Press to circumvent these three powerful foreign news agencies was at first impossible so there was only one thing for the AP to do and that was to make exchange arrangements with these three agencies. The trouble with the exchange of news was that Reuters, Havas, and Wolff took the liberal amount of news they received from the Associated Press, and boiled it down so that Europeans read mostly about our American crimes, divorces, scandals, and the antics of millionaire playboys. These three big foreign news agencies never gave the United States an opportunity to put its best foot forward through a well-rounded presentation of all of our American news. Things naturally got badly out of perspective, and Europeans obtained from their newspapers a very distorted picture of life in America.

But after the long-term contracts expired, Kent Cooper won his great battle, and on the eve of the Second World War the Associated Press was firmly established all over the world as an impartial, unbiased organization dedicated to the principles of giving all the people of every nation an untainted exchange of world news. Kent Cooper rightly believes that if these barriers to a free and fair exchange of world news had been completely broken down sooner than the eve of the Second World War, the struggle might well have been averted. In other words, the establishment of world freedom of information is a more powerful agency for permanent peace than even international diplomacy, because as you know, diplomacy carries the threat of force while freedom of information conceals no saber and bears only the promise of enlightenment and understanding.

The greatest benefit that the press can bestow on man today is to keep him informed, accurately, fully, honestly, not with information slanted to favor or disfavor one clique, ideology, or government, but with news completely objective and unbiased. Thomas Jefferson, in discussing the role of the press, once wrote:

"The basis of our Government is to be found in the opinion of the people. The very first object should be to keep that right to express our opinions; and were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers, or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter."

The only way the United States press can carry out the high and noble function which Jefferson set forth for it is to remain free. Freedom of the press is just as vital to you gentlemen as it is to us of the newspapers—or as it was to the Sage of Monticello. In these days of easy catch phrases and political labels, it is important to define what we mean by freedom of the press.

We do mean the freedom of any citizen or group of citizens to start a newspaper.

We do mean the right of the honest newspaper to give to the public, without censorship or restrictions of any kind, all the news that's fit to print, and to offer honest criticism and honest comment on events of the day and on the Government of the day.

We do mean—or should mean—something even greater. For the freedom of the press you can, in my view, substitute the words "freedom of the people"—the freedom of the people to read what newspapers they prefer; the freedom of the people to read the views of all political sides; the right of the people to have a choice of newspapers and not to have carefully selected and carefully censored newspapers thrust down their throats by governments, political parties, or dominant but self-seeking cliques.

Even with the free-press proviso written into the United States Constitution, we have found that freedom of the press is not the assured thing we believed it to be. We have found that it has bitter enemies on both extremes of politics—the extreme right and the extreme left.

We realize, too, that the world is moving on, blindly, uncertainly, and haltingly, to new concepts of human society and government and international relations. We are witnessing a mighty world struggle for mastery between the Anglo-Saxon form of democracy and European forms of totalitarianism—totalitarianism of both the left and the right.

In this struggle one of the greatest weapons democracy can possess is a free, clean, and honest press.

Yet, even inside the democracies that conception has its enemies. Let me say that it also has its good and loyal friends, among them you wide-awake businessmen, who use the press wisely to advertise your products.

I shall explain that later. At the moment my purpose is to tell you what I have found on how our enemies work inside a democracy. In America and Britain our enemies are on the extreme left of politics—unlike Spain, prewar Germany, and Italy, where it was the extreme right that destroyed the usefulness of the press.

For some years past I have watched the left industriously attempting to undermine the whole structure of public confidence in both the press and advertising in America.

They have gone about their task cleverly and subtly in a hundred different ways—in pamphlets, by the introduction of bills in Congress, in books, in radio speeches, through orders of departments and regulatory commissions in Washington, in political speeches, and in every-day conversation.

The method has been a long campaign of mixed innuendo, frontal assault, and sly slander. The public has been told that their newspapers are politically and factually dishonest; that newspaper monopolies—the press lords—have banded together to dupe and deceive the people; that the advertising industry exerts a sinister influence behind the scenes, blackmailing newspapers to follow certain political or other policies detrimental to the people.

Most of these things are plain and damnable lies. The obvious facts disprove them, for the circulations of the great metropolitan newspapers of America are well divided between liberal and conservative views and all receive maximum and approximately equal support from the advertiser. Washington is a good example. It has four newspapers—the Times-Herald, Post, Star, and News. Their political viewpoints range from middle of the road to conservative, on the one hand, and liberal, on the other. The smallest circulation is 113,000. Anyone in Washington can buy and read any newspaper he wants to, and between the editorials and the col-

umnists every line of political thought from extreme right to extreme left is available to the reader.

But what is more important is the honest news presentation in the news columns. A statement from Henry Wallace or John L. Lewis will get as much front-page space and as big headlines in any Washington newspaper as a statement from Dewey or the spokesman for the mine owners—perhaps more space and blacker headlines.

In other words, the Washington newspaper reader has a wide choice of newspaper presentation of all political colors—well divided in numbers of newspapers and well distributed in sales. The same is true in New York, Chicago, and in the smaller cities and towns, for in these days of rapid transportation there is hardly a hamlet more than a few hours from at least one great center of population with multiple newspapers.

In England, a more compact nation geographically, four national dailies represent the viewpoint of the right—the Daily Express, Daily Mail, Telegraph, and Sketch. Their total circulation is 7,600,000. On the left, there are likewise four—the Daily Mirror, News-Chronicle, Herald, and Daily Worker. Their total circulation—7,600,000. The Times, of London, is of the center. Where is the discrimination, when numbers of newspapers are the same and circulations are the same.

Yet the traducers of the British press have so far succeeded in sowing the seed of doubt that they have obtained from Parliament a Royal Commission to investigate the press. This is a great victory for the enemies of a free press, for the public will not appreciate the legal and political subtleties involved and will regard both the press and the advertisers as being on the defensive, facing grave charges against their honesty, integrity, and sincerity. What is it that these enemies of the press, both of the right and left, are really after?

The answer is the totalitarian state—the state which knows what is good for all of us and which arrogates to itself and the right to order our lives down to the last detail.

And make no mistake. Fascism can be born of the left as well as the right. Do not forget that even Hitler named his party the National Socialist Party and placed the emphasis on socialism in the early days. Mussolini was once a rabid and fanatical socialist.

Why is the press under attack in Britain and the United States, the world's two outstanding democracies, almost the last strongholds today of human freedom and the lands which gave birth to our conception of human freedom? Because a free press is the enemy of the absolute state. The whole conception of the free press is abhorrent to those who believe in the totalitarian ideal. What they forget is that their Godlike state assumes Godlike men to run it, and, alas, there are too few Godlike men today.

Politicians are, in fact, all too human. The best of them have their fair share of human vanity, and the best of them at times dislike the press intensely. For a free press has a knack of deflating human vanity. It criticises and debunks—sometimes a little cruelly perhaps. It is merciless in exposing folly and even corruption in high places. In fact, it is an astringent, and the victim very rarely enjoys the astringent process.

The idea of a controlled press, therefore, can be very attractive to the politician, particularly if he follows a creed which fanatically believes itself to possess a monopoly of all human wisdom and all human good.

Therein lies a terrible danger, for it is an easy step to move from control of the press to using the press as an instrument of Government propaganda. Human nature being what it is, that means party propaganda for the party in power. It means the editors enter the pay of the Government of the day, telling the people what the party wants them to know and suppressing or distorting all facts that might undermine the people's confidence in their masters.

Let's review the process as we have seen it since the First World War. The Russians did it openly. They simply declared that a free press was anticommunistic, and, therefore antisocial and promptly turned the entire country's newspapers into a series of Communist loudspeakers.

Hitler was slightly more subtle. He left the newspapers nominally in private hands but applied savage sanctions if they offended against the party.

Happily, these outright methods are not possible in the mature and politically wise democracies. Here the enemies of press freedom must use the subtler methods I have aready described.

In fighting our particular battle, the advertisers and the advertising industry are our greatest allies. That is one of the reasons the pinks in Washington have sought so diligently to hamstring the advertising industry since the early thirties. The advertisers are the people who make it possible for editors to keep their newspapers clean and incorrupt.

This is not sufficiently understood by the layman. He does not always realize that it is the advertising revenue which enables Pegram Bryant to distribute the Statesville Daily at 5 cents a copy, and Mr. Huskins to sell the Record at the same figure. Without that revenue, I doubt if we could sell our newspapers at less than 25 cents a copy, thus depriving vast numbers of people of their democratic right to know what is going on in their own land and how they are being governed.

It is the advertising industry which keeps the newspapers free and spares them the temptations of political corruption and worse things.

No other nation's press has as clean a history as that of the United States. In the early days of the British press, all newspapers were dependent on subsidies from governments or political parties. Even the Times was once in the pay of the British Treasury. Not until the development of advertising was it able to throw off the shackles and grow into the great and powerful instrument of democracy that it is today

Other lands were not so fortunate. It is instructive to look at the prewar history of the French press. France had many newspapers, but a poor and weak advertising industry. Some French newspapers took subsidies from the French Government. These lulled the people into a sense of false security by telling them that they were safe behind the mighty Maginot Line; that they had the world's greatest army and an up-to-date air force.

It gave them no hint that their army was obsolete and ill-equipped; that their air force was practically nonexistent; that the Maginot Line was a fraud and a delusion.

Other French papers took subsidies from the Communists. When war broke out, they told the people that this was just another capitalistic struggle to make money for rich munitions manufacturers; that the people had no part in it and should sabotage the war effort in every way.

Worst of all, others took money from German and Italian agents. These told the French people that once again the British were trying to get the French to fight their battles for them; that the British were wickedly warmongering against those two noble humanitarians, Hitler and Mussolini.

There were honest French newspapers, but the confused, bewildered, and by now cynical French people had been so undermined that in three short weeks of actual fighting they became the victims of the most appalling national collapse in history.

I venture to say that had France possessed strong and powerful advertising industry to give it a strong and powerful press, these evil things would not have been and the course of history might have been changed.

In closing, I would like to stress the fact that if we are going to build a firm and permanent world peace, we must keep before us the phrase which Mr. Kent Cooper coined. That phrase is simply "the right to know." As Mr. Cooper has pointed out time and time again, the people have the right to know the truth, and only the truth will make us free.

An American Looks at a New Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to insert an editorial by Walter Winchell, which appeared in the Daily Mirror of May 20, 1948. The title of this editorial is "An American Looks at a New Nation," and is as follows:

WALTER WINCHELL IN NEW YORK—AN AMERICAN LOOKS AT A NEW NATION

Wars are the result of old hates—and the cause of new ones. I respect the leaders of the new state of Israel for accepting the issue of force. They had no choice. But though they are defending themselves by force, they have set an example for the civilized world by fighting without hate. They have not called upon the civilized world to exterminate the Arabs: They merely asked all decent people to help them defend their homes. They did not order out all Arabs within their new boundaries. Nor did they treat them as prisoners. Instead, this new land of refugees called upon all Arab inhabitants to play their part in the development of the state, with full and equal representation in all its bodies, provisional or permanent.

Even as the Arab League battered at their frontiers—the concept of justice in these men is so great—they did not hold the individual Arab at their mercy—guilty of the crime of the Arab League. Not only did they not punish him but with their free hand (with the other they had to hold the revolver with which they were defending themselves) they assured the Arab in their midst that he was not only their fellow man but their fellow citizen if he chose to be.

Thomas Jefferson himself could have struck no greater chord for all peoples. For the history books (even though the new state was born in war) the government did not assume dictatorial powers. Its first act was to put in motion the wheels of democracy, even though it was compelled, at the same time, to roll forward the artillery to defend the republic.

Nor was this the only parallel to Thomas Jefferson and our own Republic. The Republic of Israel is not a state for Jews alone. In the face of a proclaimed Arab holy war, the Republic of Isreal announced it would guard the sanctity of all shrines, including Moslem. It guaranteed absolutely the freedom of conscience and worship of all, including Arab. It guaranteed equality of education to its Arab inhabitants, and it guaranteed equal citizenship to all regardless of race, creed, or sex. The state of Israel paved the path of civilization—by refusing to turn isolationist even against its present enemies.

The Republic has had good reason to hate by common standards. Many of its citizens are refugees from Hitler's mass executions. Many have relatives who are still DP's or who have been killed by governments. In the presence of aggression, the destruction of their homes, the killing of their families on the soil where they have a right to be, they have refused to hate even the people they fight. As their flag is raised aloft it is stained with no blood but their own—shed in battle. This is something more than a historical example; it is living evidence that the people of this Republic can be believed when they say they fight only for peace.

Since the new nation came into being lawfully, by United Nations vote, and since its declaration of independence proclaims its dedication to the United Nations—and its acts prove it—the world faces far deeper moral crisis than Israel faces in her military one. There is moral crisis in a community when the police flee and the citizens pull down their shades because a man is being robbed in the streets. The issue is beyond the man who is being robbed. Unless the robber is stopped, the only question is—which mob of gangsters will rule the community?

Mere recognition of the new state is not enough. It begs the question of law and order. Every citizen who draws breath has a right to defend himself against a felony. It is no answer, when a felony is in progress, to rush the victim of the holdup a police permit. In the commission of a crime against him a citizen is entitled to more than permission to purchase a pistol. He is entitled to the assistance of the police. By the time he gets his own weapons he may be dead or seriously injured in addition to being robbed.

In the narrow space in which the Haganah must fight it had to start to defend itself in a pincers of Arab forces. That its heroic defense has held off the invaders does not duck the moral issue. A war is not an athletic contest; it is a fight for life. The police do not act as referees between gangsters and lawful citizens. They stop the gangsters, and reserve patrolmen are on instant notice in case the arriving officers need help. They stop the criminal by superior force. The United Nations faces the same issue.

Principle is not a matter of geography. The wrecked cities of Europe and 40,000,000 innocent dead prove it. It is now the Republic of Israel (in 1948) as it was the Kingdom of Ethiopia (in 1935), the Republic of Spain (in 1937), and Czechoslovakia in both 1938 and 1948. There is this exception: A war was fought to bring about international law and order.

If the major powers of the earth are prepared to turn their backs on the United Nations as they turned their backs when Japan attacked Shanghai in 1931 and when Mussolini attacked Ethiopia in 1935, the United Nations is as dead as the League of Nations. That sentence may be punctuated with atomic bombs on even American cities—as Goering's bombs on London punctuated Chamberlain's death sentence for Czechoslovakia.

There is either full law or no law. Blackmailers can never be paid in full nor can criminals be appeased. An appeasing policeman is no longer a representative of law and order. He is a fellow criminal of the man he should be arresting. His failure to protect one lawful citizen is a signal to all criminals that the community is unprotected.

The temperance and justice of the leaders of the new state approach majesty. There are no recriminations from the past—but a dignified request for all decent people to join in peace for the future. They have offered common citizenship where the common blood of Jew and Arab has stained the sand. They have offered cooperation to all nations, including Britain—remembering the graves of Jew and Briton alike mark the path of the Eighth Army.

These people have felt the full weight of years of sorrow—and it has cleansed their hearts of all hate. They prove that by their integrity to the ideals of democracy—even as they fight for their lives. At least they die with peace of mind. Do not mistake the call from Israel as a cry for assistance from a local war. It is the cry of peaceful world citizens calling for world forces of law and order—without which you are likely to be killed.

Congress Should Act Without Delay Upon H. R. 6454, Favorably Reported by Committee, To Provide for Retirement of Federal Employees Engaged in Extra-Hazardous Work.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw to your attention recent action of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service favorably reporting H. R. 6554 which provides for the retirement of employees at the age of 50 after 20 years of Federal service in the apprehension, investigation, or detention of persons suspected of or convicted of offenses against the United States. I am interested in this bill because the Department of Justice Medical Center for Federal Prisoners is in my district at Springfield, Mo. I have long been acquainted with the dangers which the personnel of this institution must face every day, and know considerable about the difficulties of administering an institution of this kind. This bill, H. R. 6454, incorporates the provisions of my bill, H. R. 6123, introduced earlier, to accomplish essentially the same purposes.

The Federal Prison Service, and particularly the hospital for mentally afflicted at Springfield, is one of the most hazardous employments in the entire civil service. There are about 2,500 prison guards and other employees whose everyday duty requires them to face dangers and tensions which shorten materially their years of usefulness. In the past 10 years, for instance, more than 350 prison officers have been seriously assaulted by inmates of these institutions, and almost 1,300 have been involved at one time or another in some riot or major disturbance. In the past 2 years, two officers were killed and 17 seriously wounded. The institution at Springfield is a typical example of the hazards of this sort of employment.

During the past 10 years 54 officers at the Springfield institution have been seriously assaulted by prisoners. In each case the injury was sufficiently serious to require hospitalization, leave or time off. In addition, there have been 276 instances of attacks or attempted assaults where the injury was not quite so serious. There were 44 separate occasions of riots, strikes, or threat of concerted action which created situations extremely dangerous to the officers.

Within a period of the past 18 months there have been seven retirements on disability of officers from this institution—men whose ages were 39 to 55, suffering from hypertension, coronary thrombosis, or other cardiac disease brought on or aggravated by the tension, pressure and reaction to the hazardous environment in which they worked. Of these retirements two men have already died. Four other officers have died during sick leave from duty undergoing treatment for hypertension, heart attack while separating inmates fighting with kitchen knives, rescuing other severely assaulted officers, and breakdown under the strain of prison duty.

One officer who estimates that he has been attacked personally many times during his employment at the medical center over the past 9½ years tells of his experiences in this language:

> There are numerous incidents, bizarre and revolting, riots and near riots, physical encounters, and attacks that go to make up the pattern of the average workday for an officer of the Federal Prison Service. To report briefly on only a few: I entered the service in 1940 and remember well the first inmate I found trying to take his life by hanging with the cord from his pajamas. Another time, an inmate apparently lying in bed reading, suddenly attacked with a sharppointed pork chop bone he had smuggled from the dining room.
>
> I was on duty as corridor officer the evening of the riot in building 10-C. The constant danger I assumed on this post of other units in building 10 joining in the riot and assaulting my post en masse was enough to prostrate a nervous man. None except those who went in to put down the riot could realize the terrific tension and strain under which we labored.
>
> Early in the spring of 1945 my post was tower No. 6. Suddenly one day I saw one of the prisoners charge for the double fence, climb over the inner fence, and was doggedly trying to surmount the outside fence. He seemed deaf to all my commands and admonitions of what I must do unless he halted. I realized "here it is," I may have to shoot this man or even kill him. The shock of the realization of taking such action against a person who is not mentally responsible as I threw the shell into the riot gun and raised it to my shoulder will haunt me as many days and nights as I shall live.
>
> These incidents are only a few examples of the many, many that fill each day of the life of a prison officer to make him old and nervous long before he should be. I know that only a few years of such employment leave lasting telltale marks on every officer's physical and mental health.

Anything movable is a weapon for attack—chairs, mops, pieces of beds which have been torn apart, tools used by prison labor crews on outside jobs. All the unskilled labor assignments are performed by prisoners as no workmen are hired. Every article used by a prisoner on his work detail is a potential weapon for assault or attack upon the custodial officer who instructs or guards him.

It is simple justice to permit these officers to retire after 20 years of this kind of service. The cost of the bill will be small because the number of employees who stay in the prison service continuously for 20 years is small. For instance, out of the approximately 2,500 officers

who will be affected by this bill, only 101 now have 20 years of service and the annuity they get under this bill would be only approximately $1,600 a year, which is about what they would get if they were required to remain in the service until they had reached the age of 60. As a matter of fact, I think that this bill will save the Government money since it will undoubtedly reduce the amount of turn-over in the prison service, which is now approximately 35 percent. If more prison officers can be induced to remain in the service, training costs and other costs incident to high turn-over will be kept at a minimum.

To carry out the sentences of the court takes its toll of human energy and human lives just as surely and as inevitably as does the investigation of crime and the apprehension of the criminal. Consequently this bill will not achieve fully its express purpose unless all Federal employees engaged in the investigation, apprehension, and custody of offenders against Federal laws are included as one group. They are all loyal public servants working industriously and courageously to protect the public. They deserve this slightly more generous treatment on retirement than does the ordinary civil servant in recompense for the hazards they have assumed and the physical and nervous energy they have expended.

Precedents for this bill can be found in existing laws which recognize that those employees who have unusually hazardous jobs may retire at an earlier age than others not filling jobs requiring unusual physical strain. The statute making it possible for agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to retire at the age of 50 gives evidence of the fact that Congress wishes to make special provision for persons holding law-enforcement jobs involving the handling of criminals. Officers and enlisted men of the armed services may also retire at an early age largely because of the hazards connected with their vocation and also because the nature of their service requires alert, strong, younger men.

On this latter point it is pertinent to point out that this bill probably will not cost the taxpayer anything additional. This is due not alone to the fact that the small salaries in this work lead few to stay with it for 20 years and thus few will benefit. Nor is it due to the fact that the bill will cut the cost of training replacements for the 35-percent annual turn-over in personnel. A younger, more alert group of prison officers would undoubtedly be able to reduce considerably the number of escapes and prevent property damage which would bring about a considerable reduction in the present cost of these items, amounting annually to almost a quarter of a million dollars. Most of the escapes are preventable and largely due to the older personnel, which is loyal and diligent but physically unable to cope as effectively as younger personnel with the tough guys who inhabit our Federal prisons. All in all, this bill seems definitely in the public interest. I want now to express the hope that it will receive early and favorable consideration by the Congress as it has in the committee which had hearings on it and after careful deliberation reported it favorably for consideration by the House. I intend to pursue this matter in every session of Congress until it becomes law.

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of May 26, 1948:

WHERE DO THEY STAND?

Our whole Nation, together with a good part of the rest of the world, has reason to be deeply disturbed by the way in which the Republican leadership of the House has handled the President's request for a 3-year renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

For the Republican leaders, besides denying the request, have erected virtually insurmountable barriers against any effort in the House to modify the wishy-washy substitute they have offered. Having barred the press and public from the committee hearings on this substitute, they now have gone all out with their steamroller by adopting a rule arbitrarily limiting debate to 3 hours and forbidding amendments to the measure.

This high-handed and essentially undemocratic procedure is designed to push through a bill that would extend the reciprocity program for only a year. The bill, moreover, would contain a potentially crippling proviso allowing for a congressional veto on any agreement not in keeping with standards set by a newly organized and independent Federal Tariff Commission—an arrangement that would place a huge question mark over the ability of the executive branch to negotiate trade pacts.

In declaring that it would be better to let the whole reciprocity program die than to enact such a measure, Secretary of State Marshall may have exaggerated a bit. But certainly it is a measure that gives rise to the gravest misgivings. And it justifies this suspicion: That its authors, though they profess otherwise, would not be at all displeased if it should have the effect of slowly but surely destroying our reciprocal trade policy and paving the way for a return to the days of high protectionism when tariff-making was primarily a business of selfish and reckless logrolling in Congress.

Is that what the Republican leadership really wants? Does it want to do away with a program that has been an integral part of our foreign policy for the past 14 years? Does it want to nullify the effort to promote peace and prosperity through quid-pro-quo tariff concessions of a mutually beneficial nature? After having joined with the rest of Congress in insisting that the Marshall-plan nations must commit themselves to reciprocity, does it now want to place our Nation in the position of refusing to practicee its own preachments? In short, does it want to give the impression that we are going to try to do the impossible thing of being political internationalists on the one hand and economic isolationists on the other?

In this election year, the American people—most of whom have been shown to be strongly prorec'procity in the public opinion polls—have a right to know just where the Republican Party stands on this issue. The House measure tries to face both ways, but it succeeds only in making the GOP seem bent on taking a long step backward to high protectionism. What have the Presidential hopefuls to say? They should speak out, one way or the other. The matter is much too important—both for ourselves and the world at large—for silence or pussyfooting.

Hon. Karl Stefan, of Nebraska, Honored by Philippine Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a citation given to the Honorable KARL STEFAN by the Philippine Republic.

Mr. STEFAN is the dean of the Nebraska delegation. He is finishing his seventh term as a Member of the House of Representatives. He is one of the hard working conscientious members of the Appropriations Committee. He brings to the committee a deep and well-balanced knowledge of foreign affairs. His services to this House has been most valuable.

Many of our colleagues may not know that Mr. STEFAN rendered great service to the Philippines during this past World War. He had frequent contacts with the loyal Filipinos who so stubbornly resisted the Japanese occupation. This additional honor coming to Mr. STEFAN is well deserved. A description of the citation follows:

REPRESENTATIVE STEFAN HONORED BY PHILIPPINE REPUBLIC

Representative KARL STEFAN, of Nebraska, was presented with a medal Friday, May 21, 1948, by the Republic of the Philippines for his distinguished service while a member of the Philippine Constabulary.

This is not the first occasion on which the dean of the Nebraska delegation has been singled out for high honors by the Government of the Philippines. Since the end of World War II, he has received the Meritorious Service Medal of the National Volunteers of the Philippines and the Medal of Military Merit by the Philippine Commonwealth government. Congressman STEFAN is an honorary brigadier general in the National Volunteers of the Philippines.

One may well consider what these medals mean. The Meritorious Service Medal recognizes Mr. STEFAN'S long-time association with and his inspiration to the National Volunteers of the Philippines—an organization which formed a hard and efficient inner-phalanx of resistance during the late Japanese occupation. The Medal of Military Merit constitutes an expression of gratitude to Mr. STEFAN on the part of Philippine Government for his broadcasts to the Filipino people during their darkest hour, in which he successfully urged them to be steadfast on the side of the United States and liberty. His latest honor—the Medal of the Luzon Campaigns—represents Filipino official acknowledgement for what he, as a member of the Philippine Constabulary, did to bridge the gap between the crucial period of the first Philippine liberation and the beginning

of the immediate ancestor of the present government, from 1904 to 1907.

KARL STEFAN'S achievements have been justly compared to a major military victory won by the modest genius of a sincere and patriotic American. I join with his many friends and with the Philippine Republic in commending him wholeheartedly for what he has done for all of us. It must, indeed, be a great satisfaction for him to know that there are scores, even hundreds, of American boys who are alive today because of what he has the vision to see and because of what he had the courage and ability to do.

Address of Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL K. McCONNELL, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from an address by United States Senator EDWARD MARTIN, of Pennsylvania, before the Southeastern Regional Conference of the Pennsylvania Council of Republican Women, in Philadelphia, Friday, May 21, 1948:

There is no organization that serves the Republican Party with deeper sincerity or more loyal devotion to its principles than the Pennsylvania Council of Republican Women.

It is always a pleasure to meet with you because you are strong and united, fighting always for good government, for the happiness and welfare of our people, and for the success of the Republican Party.

That is why I say with fervor and deep appreciation to this Southeastern Regional Conference: Thank God for the Council of Republican Women.

We Republicans in Pennsylvania have much to be thankful for. We are fortunate indeed to have at Harrisburg a Republican administration under the leadership of our able and distinguished Gov. James H. Duff. With your help that administration is faithfully carrying out the Republican pledges of honest, businesslike, and efficient government in keeping with the time-honored policies of the Republican Party.

We are grateful also that Pennsylvania is represented in Congress by a hard-working Republican delegation of 28 members whose splendid record of service has reflected great honor and credit upon them and upon our State.

Our Congressmen, standing together as a unit for the best interests of Pennsylvania and the Nation have been a mighty factor in the success of the Eightieth Congress.

That Congress, elected in protest against the misrule, mismanagement, and mistakes of the New Deal, has done a grand job in less than a year and a half.

It cut the heavy burden of wartime taxation. It passed a new labor relations act to protect the individual worker against the arrogant labor leader and the unscrupulous employer.

It reduced regimentation by the Federal bureaucracy. It deprived a reluctant President of emergency war powers extended into peacetime to control the national economy. It is hacking away at the cancerous growth of bureaus and agencies which has spread through the Nation's body.

There was much more we could not do because an unfriendly administration has fought us tooth and nail. You know we finally rammed the tax cut through over three Presidential vetoes.

In our efforts to cut reckless spending, we have encountered road block after road block—trap after trap—resistance after resistance. Worst of all has been the propaganda financed by taxpayers' money—and administration pressure to spend more and faster than ever.

In November the people will remove that danger to America's future by electing a Republican President and reelecting a Republican Congress. Then we will have cooperation and teamwork at Washington.

But before that time, a lot of work must be done. Our party must close ranks so that we can work in unison for the election campaign. You women of the council are captains and generals in the Republican organization. When we nominate the next President of the United States we Republicans, men and women, will stand together for American progress under the Constitution and the principles of the Republican Party.

The Republican Party must stand on the record of the Eightieth Congress and prepare the way for a more glorious record when the next Congress takes over in January—with a Republican President in the White House.

I think our party must chart a course to guide us back to the ideals responsible for our greatness. Let me offer, in brief outline, some suggestions:

1. A strong America can preserve world peace. We must build greater military force, including fully trained manpower. We must develop an industrial and agricultural blueprint which can be translated into quick, positive action.

2. To preserve our freedom America must be solvent. We need a Republican administration with the courage to say "no" to nonessential Government spending, waste, extravagance, and unnecessary subsidies and grants.

3. We must encourage individual initiative and enterprise. We must stop the drift to the socialistic pattern of government which denies individual liberty and teaches complete dependence upon government.

4. We must reverse the current of New Deal concentration of power at Washington. We must restore the States and local government their rightful functions and allocate to them areas of taxation with which to adequately finance those functions.

5. We must continue our efforts to maintain proper balance between labor and management. We should stand ready to make whatever changes experience proves necessary to make the new Labor Relations Act more effective. At the same time we must safeguard the fundamental rights of labor and the dignity of the individual worker.

6. Agriculture is the basic industry of America. We must assure continued high production on our farms because we can never have too much production of food. Our party must strive to give the farmer better roads, better markets, improved living conditions, and greater educational opportunities.

7. We must fight the rising spiral of inflation by ending the issuance of printing-press money; reducing the cost of government and encouraging the further expansion of production.

8. America's resources are not inexhaustible. We must save our streams, our topsoil, and our forests. A governmental conservation program is of paramount importance to future generations.

9. We must work for better understanding, tolerance, and good will among Americans of every race, color, creed, and national origin. Our party must stand firm in opposition to those who spread bigotry, hatred, prejudice, and discrimination.

10. The Republican Party should encourage participation in political affairs by the youth of our country. We should do everything possible to stimulate interest in the American system of government. Our party must follow a policy that will keep open the doors of opportunity for every boy and girl.

11. We must take leadership in a moral and spiritual reawakening to lead us back to the ideals of self-reliance, industry, thrift, tolerance, and love of God which imbued our pioneer forefathers.

12. The Republican Party must continue with redoubled vigor its fight against the spread of communism. Our party forced the unwilling Truman administration to take its first steps toward driving out the Communists and other disloyal elements from positions of trust in the Government. We have turned the searchlight of exposure upon this dangerous philosophy that threatens the freedom and liberty of our people. We must finish this job. We can do it because our party is not infested with Communists.

In a troubled world, torn by conflicting philosophies of government, the power and influence of the United States is the only remaining hope for peace, freedom, and justice.

The evils that beset the world today are the cruel result of appeasement of Communist Russia, years of blundering by succeeding Democratic administrations, and the betrayal of small nations that were our friends and allies.

America will gain in strength and power as a force for peace in the world when we abandon the policy of secret commitments and deals. We must get back on the course that gave American diplomacy a foremost position of honor and prestige in the world.

The Democratic Party has failed at home and abroad. Its leadership is bewildered and befuddled.

The time is at hand for the Republican Party to take over. United behind strong, courageous, patriotic candidates and with a progressive, positive platform of real Americanism we will march to victory in November. We will reelect a Republican Congress and we will put a Republican President in the White House.

New York Young Republican Club Supports Straight RTA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the following telegram just received expresses the viewpoint of progressive Republicans favoring a straight extension of the reciprocal trade-agreements program. The final legislative result is yet to come in, and this telegram shows what it should be:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 26, 1948.*
Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS.
House Office Building:

Most strongly urge your outspoken insistence on passage of a reciprocal-trade program which will conform to obligations undertaken by United States in Economic Cooperation Act, and to need of western Europe to sell to United States. We believe failure by United States to permit large-scale imports from western Europe will continue

their dollar shortage and require ever greater American aid. We believe only possibility of restoring economic health to western Europe, thus removing its dependence upon United States, is to permit greatest possible flow of trade as contemplated by reciprocal-trade program. Emasculation of this program at this time may have disastrous economic and political consequences.

HENRY V. POOR,
President, New York Young Republican Club.

World Health Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, United States membership in the World Health Organization is finally to be acted on by the House this week. This will be just in time to enable the United States to participate in the first meeting of the organization to be held in Geneva next month. The WHO represents one of the most worth-while activities which the United States could undertake in the international field.

On May 18 I had the privilege of participating with a group of young people in the American Broadcasting System program, "Youth Asks the Government," with John Edwards as moderator. At that time we discussed fully the implications of the United States joining the World Health Organization, and generally agreed that it was a splendid cooperative effort which we should support.

The purposes of the organization may be briefly stated to be five:

First. To control endemic diseases in certain countries to prevent them from becoming epidemic in other parts of the world.

Second. To sponsor international medical research.

Third. To agree on international sanitary conventions and uniform quarantine conventions.

Fourth. To standardize medicines.

Fifth. To control medicines and medical supplies which are in limited supply such as insulin.

Evidence of the excellent functioning of the World Health Organization has already been seen in its great help to the Egyptian Government in mobilizing international assistance to combat a cholera epidemic in the summer and fall of 1947, and in the work of three committees of international medical experts endeavoring to solve the problems of tuberculosis, malaria, and venereal diseases which have been given top priority.

Thirty-eight nations—eight nonmembers of the United Nations—have already joined the World Health Organization. Membership by the United States has been pending for about a year and it should be gratifying to our own people and to the world when membership is consummated by action of the House; the Senate acted on July 7, 1947, and the House Foreign Affairs Committee reported the bill favorably on July 17, 1947.

Another indication of the importance of this organization is found in the experience of New York City which in the spring of 1947 spent well over a million dollars in administering 6,350,000 smallpox vaccinations to its citizens because of a case of smallpox brought from Mexico.

I have always favored very much our joining the World Health Organization, and consummation of the membership of the United States in that organization this week by the action of the House should be most favorably received by all our people and the peoples of the world.

We Need To Preserve This National Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER R. JONES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. JONES of Washington, Mr. Speaker, a considerable volume of waterborne cargo not directly connected with the activities of the armed services, the movement of which is directed by various agencies of the Federal Government, is being handled through marine terminal installations operated by the armed services and carried on ships operated by the Army and Navy, and on commercial vessels used at either commercial or special published rates per ton, by time charter or other charter for an entire vessel or portion of a vessel.

The merchant marine fleet and the publicly and privately owned port facilities available for handling commercial cargo are geared to handle the peacetime commerce of the Nation, and are dependent on such commerce for their very existence. It is paramount in the over-all program of national security that the extensive investment in the Nation's merchant marine and marine terminal facilities be preserved and maintained and available for use by the armed services in the event of any war.

In recognition of this and out of concern for adequate preservation of a considerable national investment, the Northwest Marine Terminal Association comprising all the major marine terminal operators in the States of Washington and Oregon, by resolution adopted early in the month of May, is urging that the various agencies of the Federal Government, controlling the movement of water-borne cargo not directly associated with the activities of the armed services, route such shipments wherever practicable through commercial port facilities and on vessels of the merchant marine. If this procedure were put into practice, positive advantages would result to the Government, the armed services, and to the private and public port facilities of the country and be of vital importance in strengthening an important adjunct of our national security.

Our Dealing With China Makes a Sorry Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial in the Saturday Evening Post of May 8, 1948, entitled "Our Dealing With China Makes a Sorry Story":

OUR DEALING WITH CHINA MAKES A SORRY STORY

At Yalta, President Roosevelt conceded to Comrade Stalin the right to resume the old Czarist policy of turning Manchuria into a Russian satrapy, which the Japanese had successfully challenged in 1904. So, what China had expected to get back from Japan, as one of the fruits of 8 years of grueling warfare, the Russians got for about as many days of real campaigning in that part of the world. President Roosevelt agreed with Comrade Stalin that the Chinese were not to be told of this bargain at their expense until Uncle Joe was ready to demand their assent to it. It was about the rawest treatment of a trusting ally to which this country has ever been party.

Although President Truman was still consciously the heir to those Roosevelt policies whose later abandonment the Daily Worker and Henry Wallace now lament, he had to appear to believe that Stalin and his Chinese Communist stooges would not abuse these advantages, but would respond to gentle coaxing with sweet reasonableness. So he sent Gen. George Marshall to China to persuade Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek to make peace with the Reds through coalition—that is, take them to his bosom. Chiang knew from twenty-odd years' experience that the Communists would consider peace on one condition only—the right to eat out his vitals and toss his hide into the Yangtze.

In 1924 Dr. Sun Yat-sen was persuaded to take the Reds to his bosom. The Third International instructed the Chinese Communist Party to get into his government and practice a policy of parasitism. With the guidance of a small army of Russian advisers, they did this to such good purpose that, by the spring of 1927, Moscow's General Galen thought he had all of China's armies in leash, while Comrade Borodin was so much the boss of a puppet Chinese Government in Hankow that China's addition to the grand Red union seemed certain. But overconfidence made the Reds arrogant. They bullied Chinese generals and fostered antiforeignism. The powers put 37,000 armed men into Shanghai, and Chiang Kai-shek kicked over the traces and sent the Russians packing. So about all that an American mission, sent out nearly 20 years later to justify the Roosevelt policies, could tell Chiang was that he, who had fought his way out of one Red conflagration, did not know the beneficent nature of fire. That was adding insult to injury.

The worst consequence of that Marshall mission was that many months, during which the national armies deferentially stood still, were employed by the Communists to build up strong defenses, behind which they recruited northern soldiery and equipped them with the arms that the Japs had surrendered to the Red Army in Manchuria. By the time General Marshall came back to America the Reds were ready to go. They are still going.

Since the end of the war with Japan, inflation has been eating the heart out of China. It has made the intellectuals, many

of whom are living on the Chinese equivalent of corn pone, loud exponents of peace at any price. The Reds foster that craving. Even Chinese students in this country, who want to take their degrees back to a better market, mutter about buying peace with Chiang's scalp and dealing with the Reds later. Inflation, executions, conscription, and the ruinous ebb and flow of warfare have laid the masses of the people open to Red appeals against both the Government and the Americans.

Meanwhile, this country has provided the apologists for Moscow's Far Eastern policy with every facility for abusing "the utterly corrupt Chiang Kai-shek regime," to which we were so lately indebted for keeping China in the war those eight ghastly years, and for "containing" something like 2,000,000 Japs. How this stuff sounds in Nanking as it comes off the great American sounding board is easily imagined. The Communists are now promoting the same murderous antiforeignism that they did in 1927, when they thought they had China in the bag. But this time, if the long-winded Mao Tse-tung becomes China's Tito before the Americans get these few simple facts about the Chinese state of mind into their heads, it will be a long while before Americans go back. This, we imagine, would be all right with our fellow travelers.

Amendment of Railroad Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN C. SNYDER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call the attention of Congress, and particularly the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to pending amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act. In my judgment, some definite action should be taken on these proposed amendments at the present session.

From information I receive, the average payment to retired railroad workers is $70 a month. Many of these retired workers get as little as $50 a month.

All of us know that the cost of living is high; likewise we know that even if an individual owns his own property, it is impossible to maintain a decent standard of living on $70 a month. Food, clothing, doctor bills, property taxes, and many other items have to be paid.

In 1937, $70 a month could reasonably meet current living costs. Today that sum is inadequate. In fact, so far as retirement benefits are concerned, a retired worker's position today is not comparable to his 1937 position.

The amendment, as proposed in H. R. 5993, will not require any additional tax or assessment. It can be financed out of present funds. The increase ranges from 20 percent in the higher to 25 percent in the lower pay brackets. This increase is modest in view of the present cost of living.

There are other proposed amendments dealing with unemployment insurance which should also have the attention of the committee and of the House. It will serve no useful purpose to consume time in talking; that will not remedy the situation—action is needed.

We are approaching the tentative date set for adjournment. Our work will not be complete unless consideration is given to these measures.

Who Are the Guilty?—Youth Asks the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the New York Post and Home News has made an outstanding contribution to the effort to root out juvenile delinquency at its very sources by its publication of a series of seven articles, beginning May 17, 1948, called Who Are the Guilty, by Henry Moscow, with Irving Lieberman, Alvin Davis, Henry Beckett, Joseph Kahn, and Bennett Schiff. The first five articles deal with specific case histories of boys and girls who have committed violent antisocial crimes such as murder and who in so doing have destroyed not only their victims but themselves. The purpose of this series is not to make capital out of youthful wantonness, but to expose the conditions which made their actions almost inevitable. I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the last two articles of this series of seven because they sum up the causes and suggested cures of juvenile delinquency.

I believe that Members and the people of this country will recognize the challenge as well as the responsibility to take active steps to remove the deadly breeding grounds for juvenile delinquency of the young people who are the backbone of our national strength.

While the cases illustrated in the articles are dramatic ones involving murder and other crimes, these are exceptional cases, but juvenile delinquency in its less sensational form, is even more harmful in its effects on our youth. Hundreds of thousands of children are living broken, unhappy, and potentially antisocial lives because of inadequate guidance, play, and living space. This situation has long been recognized and although great efforts have been made on the part of a few socially conscious people, relatively little has been accomplished because of a lack of over-all organization and adequate funds to carry out ofttimes excellent plans which never get beyond the blueprint stage.

In an attempt to help remedy this state of affairs I introduced H. R. 4646, to authorize the expenditure of public funds for the assistance of State and municipal youth projects. If this legislation is passed, the Federal Government would assist the States and municipalities, as well as recognized private groups, to provide recreational and educational opportunities, physical, mental, and psychiatric examinations and health services, facilities and services in the nature of vocational-training projects, and actual employment projects in schools, hospitals, and camps for the benefit of young people who have difficulties in adjusting to community and family life. The bill requires that each State and local youth program assisted must make provision for citizenship-orientation programs to inculcate in the youth the principles of a democratic form of government which are the roots of the spirit and strength of the United States.

The articles follow:

WHO ARE THE GUILTY?—HOW SOCIETY FAILS YOUNG DELINQUENTS

(By Henry Moscow, with Irving Lieberman, Alvin Davis, Henry Beckett, Joseph Kahn, and Bennett Schiff)

"I protest against the crimes and mistakes of society being visited upon them. All of us have a share in it."—The late Clarence Darrow, in his plea for mercy for Leopold and Loeb.

What are society's crimes and mistakes?

In preceding articles of this series, The Post-Home News has given the case histories of half a dozen young murderers and has attempted to show that their crimes were in a sense inevitable, in the light of society's failure.

This is the summing up:

Take Edwin Codarre, a murderer at 13. His grandparents were insane. His mother married an alcoholic at 15. His homelife was confused by the presence—at one time—of both a father and a stepfather.

"Most juvenile court judges have come to the conclusion that the basic cause for juvenile delinquency lies with parents who are ill-suited for parenthood. Juvenile delinquency starts before the conception of the child," says Judge Philip A. Gillian, of Denver's pioneer juvenile court.

"We ask for a blood test before marriage," says Edwin J. Lukas, Executive Director of the Society for the Prevention of Crime. "Why not a parenthood test? In school, we teach children to cook, but there is no preparation for parenthood, the most hazardous of all operations."

LINES OF DEFENSE

The home, obviously, is the first line of defense against crime in children. But not every home can be made ideal; the school is the second line of defense.

"The school, because of its constant and intimate contact with children, occupies a strategic position in the prevention of juvenile delinquency," says the National Conference on Prevention and Control of Juvenile Delinquency.

Problem children in New York's schools are supposed to be referred to the bureau of child guidance.

"We are not meeting the need," confesses Dr. Frank J. O'Brien, head of the bureau. If his staff were doubled tomorrow it still wouldn't be large enough, he says. Teachers and principals refrain from referring cases because they know the bureau is overloaded with work.

At least 10 percent—90,000—of the city's 900,000 school children need the bureau's attention, Dr. S. Harcourt Peppard, the bureau's assistant director, estimates.

The bureau handled 14,845 cases last year, of which 11,002 were new. It closed 12,497 after the maximum amount of service possible had been given. A follow-up on 247 disclosed that 14.2 percent of the children had become completely adjusted, 20 percent showed marked improvement, 30.9 percent were moderately improved, 12.2 slightly improved, and 22.7 unimproved.

Worth while, as far as it went.

But 11 of the bureau's 23 units lack a psychiatrist. There are 15 vacancies—and 3 men on leave—among the psychologists, of which each unit should have from 1 to 3. There are 22 vacancies in the psychiatric social worker category. Some of these jobs

are filled by substitutes, but there are no subs for psychiatrists.

The difficulty is largely a shortage of trained workers. The entire United States has 4,500 practicing psychiatrists, needs at least 15,000.

A child guidance bureau psychiatrist starts at $8,000 a year. Some psychiatrists in private practice make $100,000 a year.

Fifteen times the present number of psychiatric social workers are needed. (They get $3,900 to start.)

O'Brien would like to set up his own training program. The board of education budget doesn't provide one. Requests for funds for the purpose, made to Federal and State Governments, have got lost in red tape.

"The evolution of juvenile crime begins in school truancy."—Prof. Raymond Moley.

Attendance officers are important cogs in the machinery of crime prevention and correction. Most are poorly trained. Under new rules, however, they must have had 2 years of college and have spent 18 semester hours studying child psychology, behavior problems, treatment of delinquents, and other phases of welfare work.

Salaries run from $2,700 to $3,900. So there are 68 vacancies—including the 3 top jobs.

A case load of 50 would be high. The present load is 75.

So it is not surprising that 25 percent of felonies are committed by youths.

The longest step forward taken by any court toward treating them intelligently has been that of General Sessions, which has a clinic with three psychiatrists and a psychologist. In 1947, the clinic examined 3,010 persons, including 833 under 20. Only a few dozen of the 833 were treated, although Dr. Leo C. Orenstein, clinic chief, is known to believe all youthful offenders on probation should receive treatment.

OVERCROWDING EVERYWHERE

Hugh Coughlin, killer of Patrolman Julius Mirell, was one of the 833 examined. He was not treated.

On the basis of the clinic's report and probation officers' findings, some offenders are sent to Bellevue or Kings County hospitals for observation.

In the lower courts, magistrates must send cases to Bellevue or Kings County because there are no clinics in those tribunals.

Bellevue psychiatric facilities are 15 to 20 percent overcrowded. Youths of 16 are kept in the same prison ward with adults. Psychiatric hospital and clinic together handled 26,000 cases last year. There is a long waiting list.

Bellevue has 14 psychiatrists to handle this multitude. The top man gets $6,650. There are 26 assistant psychiatrist posts, but 6 are vacant.

Kings County, similarly crowded, is short 3 psychiatrists and 3 assistant psychiatrists of the 16 and 6, respectively, that it is allowed.

"Probation is a nonpunitive method of treating offenders. * * * Unless he (the offender) is helped to gain insight and develop a socialized attitude, he will again find it necessary to explode into criminal behavior under the pressure of day-to-day problems of living."—Irving W. Halpern, Chief Probation Officer.

FUND SHORTAGE ACUTE

"New York State's probation laws are quite advanced and progressive, but they are not enforced in most New York City courts because the community has not provided sufficient funds to enforce them," writes Paul Blanshard and Edwin J. Lukas. "Probably one-half of the adolescent boys convicted of crime in the city are never investigated by a probation officer."

(General Sessions, alone among the courts, makes two visits to probationer's homes, and one employment check.)

"No full time employee should be required to make more than 180 investigations a year, or carry an average supervision case load of more than 50 probationers," say Blanshard and Lukas. In Connecticut, the case load is 30. But even in General Sessions here, the load exceeds 50.

These are some—but by no means all—of society's failures. What are we going to do about them? Until we do something, prison gates will continue to work like revolving doors.

WHO ARE THE GUILTY?—WHAT TO DO TO CURE YOUTH DELINQUENCY

(By Henry Moscow, with Irving Lieberman, Alvin Davis, Henry Beckett, Joseph Kahn and Bennett Schiff)

There is no silver bullet for juvenile delinquency.

There is no penicillin to clear it up in 24 hours.

But "it is not more and more research that is needed before we act," writes Dr. Frederick Wertham. "What we do need now is an attempt to coordinate and interweave the agencies we have and the facts we know."

We know: "The home cannot be expected to do the whole job. * * * Some homes are too poor and too crowded; in others, both parents are working." (Authority: Austin H. MacCormick, executive director of the Osborne Association, Inc.)

Remedy: Since most children get in trouble when they are on their own, we need more supervised programs to keep them occupied. * * * This means more than parks, playgrounds and swimming pools. We need musical activities, dramatics, arts and crafts, hobby work, dances, club meetings, hikes, picnics. * * * Too many school buildings are dark when tawdry amusement places are blazing with light." (Authority: MacCormick.)

We know: "The average school teacher lacks the necessary training in mental hygiene. * * * And it is not fair to expect them to recognize an early problem case, which is the task of an expert in the field." (Authority: Dr. R. S. Banay, author of Youth in Despair.)

Remedy: "A trained social worker or a teacher trained in dealing with school-parent-community relationships should be assigned to every school. * * * Each district with a high delinquency rate should have its own child guidance clinic. * * * To alleviate the shortage of psychiatrists, psychologists and psychiatric social workers, the board of education should authorize a training program for child guidance personnel." (Authority: Report of the Citizens' Committee on Children.)

Michigan has a system of specially trained visiting teachers for "children of school age who are now showing certain evidences of maladjustment" and to provide a long-term program for the prevention of delinquency. The results have been excellent.

We know: "Truancy is often an early and important symptom of personal and social break-down." (Authority, same report.)

Remedy: "The attendance officer * * * should be sufficiently oriented in mental hygiene to know that the truant may need treatment. * * * A large portion of the staff of the attendance bureau should be trained case workers. Further study may reveal that the attendance bureau should be a unit of the child guidance bureau. * * * Truancy court does not appear to fit the pattern needed for reconstructing future citizens." (Authority, same report.)

We know: That psychiatric treatment in New York City is inadequate, both for offenders and nonoffenders. (Authority: Dr. George S. [illegible]venson, medical director of the National Committee for Mental Hygiene.)

Remedy: Every general hospital should have a psychiatric set-up like Bellevue's. (Authority: Dr. Morris Herman, assistant director of Bellevue psychiatric facilities.) Diagnostic psychiatric facilities should be provided in the lower courts and the general sessions psychiatric clinic should be expanded. The department of correction should have its own psychiatric set-up. (Authority: Dr. Sam Parker, city director of psychiatry.)

We know that probation staffs are undermanned. (Authority: Chief Probation Officer Halpern and all other experts consulted.) Most probation officers get $1,800 to $2,700 a year. There has never been a promotional examination. (Authority: Lloyd Thomson, president Probation Officers' Association.)

Remedy: Raise pay. (Authority: Annual report of the magistrates' courts.)

We know that there is no adequate place in which to confine a mentally defective young delinquent. Warwick turns them down. Napanoch and other institutions of its kind do not distinguish between juvenile and adult.

Remedy: Establish a highly specialized refuge for offenders with minds younger than their bodies, equipped with complete psychiatric facilities. (Authority: Halpern.)

We know that we need to coordinate the agencies we have. (Authority: Dr. Wertham.)

Remedy: Break the city down into communities, and establish in each a clearinghouse where schools, police, social agencies, hospitals, etc., would pool their data and operate with vastly increased efficiency. (Authority: Charlotte Carr, director of the Citizens' Committee on Children, and Dr. Stevenson.)

A somewhat similar suggestion is made by County Judge Leibowitz, who proposes a public morals station alongside each public health station, to keep an eye on liquor and gambling dives and on the headquarters of juvenile gangs.

A start in this direction has been made. The 2-month-old New York City Youth Board, with a staff of four and supported by the city and the State, is coordinating facilities for youth and preparing a blueprint of all agencies, including private ones, area by area. It will recommend establishment of additional playgrounds, day camps, housing projects, and will provide the money for some of them.

Many private agencies are striving to supply our lacks. Madison House, for instance, plans a mental hygiene clinic, to provide psychological examinations for lower East Side children.

Most advanced, perhaps, is the Council Child Development Center, supported by the Jewish Board of Guardians, the Lt. Lester N. Hofheimer Estate, and the New York section of the National Council of Jewish Women. There each family is studied as a unit. Not only the children, but their fathers, mothers, brothers and sisters, are examined from the standpoints of psychiatry, psychology, pediatrics, and social work. The service, nonsectarian, cares for from 60 to 100 children, providing limited treatment on on outpatient basis.

A follow-up survey disclosed 51 percent of treated cases—but only 31 percent of nontreated cases—had recovered. The council would appear to be pointing the way.

The recommendations set forth in this article may seem costly. But crime—in cash and human misery—is much more costly. For that statement, no authority is needed.

I. G. Octopus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following

editorial from the New York Post of May 26, 1948:

I. G. OCTOPUS

Perhaps we were a little too eager during the recent war to find a solitary archfiend on whom we could concentrate our hate. It was child's play to single out the Hitler gang and make it do as the symbol of all we detested and were determined to destroy.

Yet it may be judged one of our greatest contemporary blunders that we didn't bother to look behind Hitler and condemn the sinister figures who were really making it possible to spin the swastika's crooked path through Europe, with Hitler's obedient aid.

The devil is dead, his henchmen are hanged, and too few Americans care that Nazi industrialists are being treated with leisurely tolerance at the German war crimes trial.

The tight-lipped, lean faced schemers of the Krupp combine and I. G. Farben cartel; the men who plotted global conquest and backed Hitler's advances as just another front in their colossal drive to rule the world—these men may escape punishment at Nuremberg. And now they may wriggle off scot-free with the help of United States Army personnel.

At stake in the Nuremberg trials was the momentous question whether international law would go on record with the judgment that industrialists who stand in attempted anonymity behind aggressors are just as guilty of conspiring against humanity as the militarist who commands the troops. The court has apparently decided that they are not. It has ruled that the steel, dye, and munitions defendants are not guilty of helping to plot the last war!

Thus, international law seems to have defaulted before its greatest rival, the cartel, which would submit the world to the rule of economic combines, dominating nations and continents with their own law of profit, plunder, and perfidy.

It's hard to see how the Nuremberg Court could judge the 23 Farben defendants innocent. The story of the giant dye combine's duplicity has been unfolding for nearly half a century and informed citizens should know it well.

It's a matter of record that in 1932, Farben openly cast its lot with Hitler by accepting the Nazi's support of its synthetic gasoline research program. And that in 1933, Farben helped stave off Nazi collapse by giving the party 400,000 marks, the largest contribution of any single firm.

And what was it besides aggression, calculated, and cold hearted aggression, which led I. G. Farben to prepare for the last two world wars by reaching out and gaining control over industrial concerns throughout the world?

IG took pains to conceal its farflung holdings with false fronts. But it worked stealthily to deny its foreign "partners" vital technical information. It carefully manipulated the industrial growth of other nations so that they would be unprepared when war broke out.

Why, then the Nuremberg timidity when it came to passing judgment on these supergangsters who with their octopus combines would strangle the world?

Is it a coincidence that the trial rules at Nuremberg were laid down by Gen. William Draper of Defense Secretary Forrestal's old Wall Street banking firm of Dillon, Read & Co. which helped to finance the German steel trust?

Is it a quirk of chance that the judges of the trial were largely picked by former Assistant Secretary of War Howard Petersen whose law firm often represented I. G. Farben in the United States courts?

A group of American small-business men think it's no coincidence. One thousand Cleveland industrialists clearly suspect that the Army has decided to restore Krupp-Farben power, probably in an attempt to strengthen western Germany—at any cost—against possible Russian aggression.

And that men who might entertain some affection for the German combines were allowed to play a part in the trials so that Nazi industrialists would not be destroyed.

The businesmen from Cleveland have demanded that the Senate investigate the conduct of the Krupp-Farben trials on the basis of documented charges.

We second the motion.

Communism in Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present herewith the following editorial from the Charlotte Observer entitled "Communism in Colleges."

COMMUNISM IN COLLEGES

Some of the textbooks to which young minds are exposed in our leading colleges, avers the Gastonia Gazette, "would shock millions of American citzens if they could read them." Well, such an assertion by a reputable and reliable newspaper is calculated to shock its readers, as is the further editorial statement that—

"By direction and indirection, communism, socialism, and the other isms are praised to the skies. The Soviet Union always gets an admiring hand—and the cruelties, injustices, and plain viciousness which are the hallmarks of any police state are glossed over. Nationalization of industry is urged for this country. * * * Enormous care is taken in picking out defects in the capitalist system and in making the inexperienced student believe they are typical."

Which colleges? Which textbooks? The answers might surprise many of us.

The Gazette, of course, properly points out that not all educators have become dupes of the Communists and Socialists and not all textbooks reflect a totalitarian attitude, but it asserts that "enough do to seriously distort the outlook of the young on the world they live in."

Is the Gastonia daily misinformed or unduly alarmed? Or has it given the real explanation of the popularity of Henry Wallace and his third party movement on some university and college campuses?

The newspaper has considerable support in a recent article by Frederick Nelson, in the Saturday Evening Post, which includes this paragraph:

"Another point against the survival of our democratic system is the state of mind of an important section of America's intelligensia. * * * Young people are taught that the achievements of successful men are due solely to social conditions; that there is no law of supply and demand, only the greed of rapacious businessmen, and that the function of taxation is not to raise money for public purposes but to hamper the successful for the delight of the unsuccessful."

The Gastonia Gazette is absolutely right in its conclusion, which should have the endorsement of all loyal Americans, whether or not they have anything to do with the conduct and policies of our colleges and universities, that—

"It is one thing to describe and explain communism, fascism, socialism, and all other types of government. It is a very different thing to so warp the truth as to make these systems seem superior to the American system. * * * That issue must be faced by those who are responsible for American education."

Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to agree with the remarks published in the above editorial. Not only are the textbooks used in some colleges shocking with their reference to communism by innuendo and otherwise, but likewise in some cases members of the faculty are subject to severe criticism. During the past I have received personally complaints from persons who have been students at a great university in New York. These students and former students have been very critical of the attitude of some of the instructors. They have given me illustrations to show that communism is being allowed to color the instruction. The views which some of these instructors have advanced are nothing short of shocking to the red-blooded Americans who live throughout this Nation and who believe that communism is inimical to the survival of this country.

Recently a great American, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, has been made the president of Columbia University in New York. I was very happy when I heard of the selection of General Eisenhower for this high position as presiding officer of one of the world's greatest schools. I feel that General Eisenhower, as soon as possible, will make a careful study of communism in Columbia University and will wipe out all trace of subversive influences. In this work, when he begins it, he will have the backing of the people of the United States of America and will have the plaudits of those of us who believe communism has no place in the American way of life.

Peace and Tariffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Daily Californian editorial page, dated Friday, May 21, 1948:

PEACE AND TARIFFS

The Congress of the United States has an opportunity to strike a decisive blow for world peace. Within the next few days, the question of the renewal of reciprocal trade agreements between the United States and other nations will come up for review. Congress must act on these agreements before June 12 or the program will die.

Reciprocal trade agreements were first negotiated by Cordell Hull, former Secretary of State, in 1933. They were designed to eliminate one of the major roadblocks in the path of peace—tariffs.

As a result of the restrictive Fordney-McCumber and Smoot-Hawley tariff measures of the 1920's and 1930's, America had made a major contribution to depression and ultimate war. President Franklin D. Roosevelt saw the danger ahead, and together with Secretary Hull, worked out the reciprocal trade program.

Essentially, the program called for reduction of tariffs on specific commodities both

by the United States and by the individual countries with whom the agreements were signed. For example, we would reduce the import tariff on Australian wool in exchange for Aussie reduction of tariffs on American automobiles.

These agreements were extended to many countries on many items. During the 15 years they have been in operation, tariffs have been reduced on thousands of items.

Of course, when compared to the general world tariff picture, these reductions were virtually insignificant. There was, and still is, a long way to go. And we must not forget that a world beset by tariffs can never be a peaceful world. We have learned that the hard way.

Even the slight gains made during the New Deal era will be swept away if some men in Congress have their way. The protectionists, still living in the days of Cleveland and McKinley, fail to see the danger of a return to high tariff barriers, which can only result in suspicion, distrust, depression, and war.

Let us not go backward. Reciprocal trade agreements must not only stay—they must be liberalized and extended.

Aviation Education in the Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT TRIPP ROSS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a House concurrent resolution urging that the Congress establish a special committee to study and report on the value of aviation education in the standard curriculum of all elementary and secondary public school systems throughout the Nation.

This is in line with the statements made in my speech entitled "Youth Flight Training" delivered in the House on May 19, in which I pointed out the vital importance and necessity of teaching our youth the fundamental principles of the science of aviation in order that America would continue to lead the world in all fields of aeronautical endeavor.

American boys and girls who, as they attain maturity, have had a sound education in basic aviation subjects and who, as a result of this education, aspire to own and fly their own airplanes are the hope of our Nation's future advancement in world aviation. It is in their air-mindedness, their intense interest in all things aviation, that we will owe our national security and welfare and our leadership in an industry which has revolutionized world economy, international and political relationship.

Returning Economic Isolationism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Marquis Childs, printed in the Washington Post, Thursday, May 27, 1948:

RETURNING ECONOMIC ISOLATIONISM

(By Marquis Childs)

Several times in this column there have been references to Republican leaders who want to take the country back to the log-rolling tariff days of William McKinley. They have ganged up in the House to extend the reciprocal trade agreements for only 1 year and with amendments which would hamper this system of insuring the free movement of trade across national boundaries.

Now, from a friendly correspondent in Iowa, I learn that I have done McKinley an injustice. McKinley, the creation of Mark Hanna, the white knight of Republican oratory, was actually ahead of the party of today. Or, at any rate, he was ahead of the potent GOP leaders who believe they can sidetrack the reciprocal trade issue.

On September 5, 1901, President McKinley make a speech at the Pan-American Exposition in Buffalo. It was his last public utterance. On the following day he was shot by an assassin, and he died 8 days later.

That was a singularly significant time in the history of the Republic. The Spanish-American War had pushed America's vital interests in the far Pacific, with responsibility for the Philippines. While most Americans in that comfortable era were not aware of it, the days of isolation were numbered.

In that last address McKinley talked of the new era and of American responsibilities with something like prophetic vision. On the subject of trade, McKinley said:

"The period of exclusiveness is past. The expansion of our trade and commerce is the pressing problem. Commercial wars are unprofitable. A policy of good will and friendly trade relations will prevent reprisals. Reciprocity treaties are in harmony with the spirit of the times; measures of retaliation are not. If, perchance, some of our tariffs are no longer needed for revenue or to encourage and protect our industries at home, why should they not be employed to extend and promote our markets abroad?"

Even as he was speaking those final words, McKinley was waiting for the Senate to act on a dozen commercial treaties providing reciprocity—treaties that were caught in the jam of political pressures. Log-rolling Senators could easily kill off those individual treaties. They could, and did, pick them off one by one.

That was a major reason for the Hull Trade Agreement Act. It was intended to take such reciprocal tariff reductions out of politics and put the whole business in the hands of an interdepartmental committee that would consider it from the point of view of the economic good of the Nation.

Now, the little band of men who run the House mean to put it right back into politics, and all their double talk does not conceal that fact. Secretary of State George C. Marshall has said that passage of the 1-year extension, with its crippling amendments, would be worse than no extension at all.

Unless the Senate can act with exceptional speed and determination, that is just what we will get. The chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, of Colorado, is a fair-minded man. It is inconceivable that he would use the high-handed tactics of the House which kept the hearings secret and dismissed opponents as mere meddlesome clubwomen .

Open hearings before MILLIKIN's committee would at least give the opposition a chance to present its views. Even though the time is so short, with the present Trade Agreements Act expiring on June 12, the debate on the Senate floor promises to be hot.

Those in favor of the present law, and this includes many Republicans, believe they can knock out the crippling amendments. But they would be likely to pay for that victory with a compromise which would mean extension for only a year.

Here is an issue that gets down to whether the Republicans are capable of accepting responsibility for Government in the middle of the twentieth century. The nations of western Europe have followed the United States' lead in moving toward a World Trade Organization built around reciprocal lowering of tariffs. If that policy is now repudiated, western Europe wil feel that we have run out on the kind of program which would make a real rehabilitation and reconstruction possible.

It is high time that the Republican Party caught up with William McKinley.

Why Buy Polish Coal When American ERP Coal Is Free?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article which appeared in the New York Times this morning. This article clearly shows that the countries of Europe will take all the free goods they can from the United States if we are going to be foolish enough to keep dishing it out:

EUROPE RELUCTANT TO BUY POLISH COAL—WESTERN LANDS PREFER TO GET UNITED STATES FUEL DESPITE BASIC AIM TO BE SELF-SUPPORTING

(By Michael L. Hoffman)

GENEVA, May 26.—A stiff test of the European countries' determination to hasten their independence of United States economic aid is being made in the series of all-European coal meetings now going on in Geneva.

The booming Polish coal industry is forcing the issue by offering more than 500,000 tons of additional coal for export in the third quarter of this year for allocation among the European importing countries. With minor exceptions, this coal will be of the types that are generally substitutable for the coals Europe is buying from the United States at a rate that has been averaging more than 2,000,000 tons a month.

If 500,000 tons of Polish coal were substituted for United States coal, a dollar saving of more than $10,000,000 could be expected.

Coal experts, however, are very doubtful at present whether all the Polish coal that will be allocated by the Economic Commission for Europe Coal Committee will be taken up by the importing countries. For a variety of reasons, many importing countries prefer to continue spending dollars rather than to make the adjustments necessary to make Europe more nearly self-sufficient in coal.

One important reason is that many countries expect to get dollars from the Economic Coordination Administration. Another is that it is difficult to agree on satisfactory payment arrangements with the Poles under the existing bilateral payments agreements.

This is not the first, but it is probably the most important case where the availability of United States financial aid has served to retard rather than speed up the adjustments necessary to improve Europe's capacity to fend for itself economically. It is recognized here as a very serious case for the coal committee, which represents the oldest continuous machinery for dealing internationally with general European economic problems arising after the war.

Agricultural Giant—Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY O. TALLE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article from the latest bulletin published by Corn Industries Research Foundation of New York City:

AGRICULTURAL GIANT—IOWA

Often we wonder what the United States would do without Iowa. What might happen, for instance, to the rest of the country if Iowa should suddenly get mad and secede from the Union? Fortunately for the other 47 States and the District of Columbia, that is a remote prospect. For Iowa, ranking twenty-fourth among the States in size and whose area is but 1.8 percent of the whole United States, supplies 10 percent of all the Nation's food.

This piece, let us say at the outset, is no booster's job and was not inspired by the Des Moines Chamber of Commerce. Other States have their points, too. We wouldn't trade our Hudson Valley acre for a comparable area of ground anywhere in Iowa. (One summer, on what topsoil we have between our rocks, we even grew a third of a bushel of corn.)

But we have been looking into some Iowa statistics and we are impressed. Farm-wise Iowa is far out in front of all other States. In corn, Iowa is the center of the universe, as everyone knows. She leads the Union by a big margin almost every year, though occasionally Illinois is snapping at her heels in the corn race. In fact, according to our source, Illinois was so bold as to nose out Iowa in the bad corn year of 1947. But in 1946 Iowa's 634,000,000 bushels represented more than 20 percent of all United States corn, more than 10 percent of all the world's corn. The Hawkeye State's corn crop has been valued at over half a billion dollars in several recent years. What Iowa might do with corn, if she really let herself go, is anybody's guess. As it is, she devotes less than one-third of her land to corn growing.

But her agricultural exploits are not confined to corn. Growing oats on less than one-sixth of her land, she leads all other States in oat production. In production of hogs, poultry, eggs, creamery butter, combined grain crops, value of all livestock and poultry, number of cattle on feed, Iowa outranks all the rest. In certain smaller and more specialized categories she has lapped the field, setting a pace which no State can match. Her production of timothy seed, for instance, is 59 percent of the Nation's total.

According to the United States Census of 1940, Iowa had more horses and colts on farms than any other State could boast. You may say that a State shouldn't boast of a big horse population, which may be indicative of agricultural backwardness in a power age. You can't say that of Iowa, though. For again the United States Census (1945) credits her with having more tractors on farms, and more of all farm implements combined, than any other State.

Despite Iowa's amazing output of farm commodities, her farmers quite obviously spend a good deal of time enjoying life—away from their contour plowing, seeding, and harvesting. A greater percentage of farmers own automobiles in Iowa than in any other of our sovereign commonwealths (90.2 percent as against United States average of 58.1 percent), and these Iowans have 102,000 miles of roads, in their own State, to travel on. They have 8,900 miles of railroads, too, and no town in Iowa is so far from a railroad that it can't hear a long whistle on a night when the wind is right. (This isn't an Iowa first, but it's a fourth—only New York, Illinois, and Texas have more miles of track.)

Iowa's farmers' "level of living" is rated by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics not as highest in the Union but as third. Based on a United States average of 100, Iowa's index is 162. Only New Jersey, with 176, and Connecticut, with 170, are better off. The Bureau has a system of computing the "level of living" of a State's farm population by the percentage of farms with electricity, telephones, autos, and the value of farm products sold or traded. Iowa's farm income in 1946 average $8,597, nearly twice the national average of $4,322. Despite a hunch which we sometimes entertain, that the highest possible "level of living" would be one without any electricity, telephone, or automobile, we have no doubt that most Iowa farmers really enjoy life.

Statistics such as those cited, however, prove that Iowans don't let fun interfere too much with farm production. With only 36 percent of all her people living on farms—some 200,000 farm families averaging 4.6 persons per farm—how did Iowa get that way? How did she achieve her rank as United States farm champion?

The Iowans are smart farmers, no doubt, but that doesn't fully explain Iowa's top rank, for other States have smart farmers, too. What may explain it, at least partly, is another statistic—another Iowa first which we haven't mentioned up to now. It is the fact (USDA is our source) that Iowa has 25 percent of all grade A farm land in the Nation. Remember, her land area is but 1.8 percent of the United States total.

God gave Iowa that grade A land, but Iowans are smart enough farmers to keep it grade A.

The Arms Embargo Must Be Lifted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans who have always had a friendly attitude toward Great Britain have been forced to recognize in the last few months that there is no essential difference between the bloody tyranny of the British in Ireland and the bloody tyranny of the British in Palestine.

There is a close parallel in the history of the two countries.

In both, England is the villain.

I shall not now take time to labor that point. The analogy is too obvious.

I have today sent a telegram to the President of the United States urging an immediate lifting of the embargo on arms to the Middle East. Under consent, I am inserting the text of that telegram in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

EMBARGO DISCRIMINATES AGAINST ISRAEL

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 27, 1940.*

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House:

I urge you with all the earnestness and sincerity at my command to lift at once the embargo against shipment of arms to Palestine in the light of new evidence that the Arab aggressors are receiving support in terms of troops, money, war matériel, and supplies from Pakistan.

The Associated Press today reported from Karachi the decision of the Pakistan Parliament to send combat troops to help the Arabs in Palestine.

Arab newspapers repeatedly have boasted that both regular and irregular forces have received weapons, transport, and other supplies from both India and Pakistan.

Conceivably these could have been in part American surplus from the Pacific theater through commercial channels.

Een Freedman testified in New York that he had negotiated for the establishment of a machine-gun factory in New York for the obvious purpose of circumventing the embargo.

It is a known fact that the British Government has sponsored, aided, trained, and led Pakistan troops, and that with British support the Moslem League forced partition of India. Now Pakistan opposes partition of Palestine.

The American embargo discriminates against Israel.

Arab forces have many sources of supply in their war of annihilation; the Jews have none.

Even in petroleum the British-controlled oil companies have imposed their own unofficial but stringent economic sanctions against Israel. They have shut down the refineries in Haifa in Jewish territory and have cut off the movement of oil. Offices of the Iraq Petroleum Co. have been moved to Lebanon.

The embargo must be lifted.

It could be of no value to impose a belated embargo on arms shipments to all of Asia.

In the cold war of the British Empire against American national interests and international prestige a further embargo would be meaningless.

In Israel 1,000,000 embattled Jews, armed only with their courage and the rightness of their cause, face annihilation before the barbarous onslaught of the Islamic world, backed by the perfidious might of Great Britain.

They need supplies, food, oil, credit, and above all, the weapons of defense, as well as your continued sympathy and moral support in world councils.

The people of Israel are waging the battle of American democracy against the crushing weight of British imperialism and double-dealing and the aggression of feudal and fanatical Moslems who are deliberately laying waste the Holy City of Jerusalem, the birthplace of Christianity and of Judaism.

Humanity implores your enlightened leadership to permit the Jews to arm themselves.

ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
Member of Congress.

PAKISTAN PROVIDES TROOPS FOR ARABS

The immediate reason for this telegram was an obscure item in the New York Times, which I insert below; however, I drew on many other sources for the full text, and most of all on my emotions, which tell me that the United States cannot safely follow the lead of Great Britain and still retain our honor, our prestige, nor our safety and independence.

Great Britain cannot be trusted. Empire is dominant.

To the dream and the fact of world empire Great Britain will sacrifice anything.

PAKISTAN TROOPS TO AID ARABS

KARACHI, PAKISTAN, May 26.—Pakistan will send fighters to help the Arabs in Palestine

and representatives to establish contacts with the Arab League. This decision was taken by the Ministerial Moslem League Party in the Pakistan Parliament, which appointed a Palestine aid committee.

STATE DEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENCE MADE PUBLIC

Because of some statements made today, I am including correspondence from the Department of State which I am for the first time making public, which may establish certain historical facts in correct perspective.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 3, 1948.

Hon. ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. KLEIN: Acknowledgment is made of the receipt of your letter of January 23, 1948, regarding current developments in Palestine.

Under authority contained in the Neutrality Act of 1939 and the Export Control Act of 1940, the Department decided early last November to refrain from licensing arms shipments to Palestine and neighboring countries. This decision was taken because the United States Government believed it necessary to discourage armed conflict, which might make a peaceful settlement of the Palestine question more difficult. No change is now contemplated in this policy.

It may be recalled that the General Assembly of the United Nations made detailed recommendations on November 29, 1947, with respect to the future government of Palestine. The United Nations Commission has already commenced its deliberations, and it is understood that the general problem of the maintenance of internal law and order in the various areas of Palestine is one of the first subjects under consideration.

As one of the members of the United Nations, the United States Government is following these deliberations as well as current developments in Palestine with close attention and with the hope that the peoples of Palestine will cooperate in the peaceful implementation of the General Assembly's resolution.

For your information there is attached a copy of a statement relating to the general policy of the United States Government regarding Palestine, as well as two official releases on the shipment and transfer of arms to the troubled areas of the Near East.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. BOHLEN,
Counselor
(For the Secretary of State).

[United States Mission to the United Nations.
Press release No. 260, October 10, 1947]

1. The problem of the future government of Palestine confronts the General Assembly of the United Nations with a heavy and complex responsibility. The General Assembly, having assumed responsibility for making recommendations to the United Kingdom on the subject, must do everything within its power to evolve a practical solution consistent with the principles laid down in the United Nations Charter.

2. The United States delegation feels that the urgency of the problem is so great that the General Assembly must recommend a solution at this session. The degree of urgency has been brought to our attention by continued violence in Palestine, by the context of the Special Committee's Report, and by the statement of the delegate from the United Kingdom regarding the recommendations of the Committee and future British responsibilities in Palestine.

3. During the past weeks this Committee has had the benefit of the views of several members of this Committee, and has heard statements by the representatives of the Arab Higher Committee and the Jewish Agency for Palestine on behalf of the peoples primarily concerned. The United States delegation believes that this discussion has been of material assistance and hopes that it will continue on the broadest basis.

4. It may be recalled that as a result of the First World War, a large area of the Near East, including Palestine, was liberated and a number of States gained their independence. The United States, having contributed its blood and resources to the winning of that war, felt that it could not divert itself of a certain responsibility for the manner in which the freed territories were disposed of, or for the fate of the peoples liberated at that time. It took the position that these peoples should be prepared for self-government and also that a national home for the Jews should be established in Palestine. The United States Government has subsequently had long and friendly relations with the independent states which were created in the Near East and is happy to note that most of them are members of the United Nations and have representatives present at this meeting.

5. It may be recalled, with regard to Palestine, that in 1917 the government of the United Kingdom, in the statement known as the Balfour Declaration, announced that it viewed with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people and that it would use its best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of that object, it being clearly understood that nothing should be done which might prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country. In 1923 the objectives stated in this declaration were embodied in the League of Nations mandate for Palestine which was entrusted to the government of the United Kingdom as mandatory. As the United States was not a member of the League of Nations, a convention was concluded between the United States and the United Kingdom in 1924 with regard to American rights in Palestine. The Palestine mandate is embodied in the preamble to this convention. The United States consented to this mandate. Members of this committee are aware of the situation which subsequently developed in Palestine and of the many efforts which have been made to achieve a settlement. We now have before us a report of the special committee of the United Nations with regard to the Palestine question.

6. The United States delegation supports the basic principles of the unanimous recommendations and the majority plan which provides for partition and immigration. It is of the opinion, however, that certain amendments and modifications would have to be made in the majority plan in order more accurately to give effect to the principles on which that plan is based. My delegation believes that certain geographical modifications must be made. For example, Jaffa should be included in the Arab state because it is predominantly an Arab city.

My delegation suggests that the General Assembly may wish to provide that all the inhabitants of Palestine, regardless of citizenship or place of residence, be guaranteed access to ports and to water and power facilities on a nondiscriminatory basis; that constitutional guaranties, including guaranties regarding equal economic opportunity, be provided for Arabs and Jews alike, and that the powers of the Joint Economic Board be strengthened. Any solution which this committee recommends should not only be just, but also workable and of a nature to command the approval of world opinion.

7. The United States delegation desires to make certain observations on the carrying out of such recommendations as the General Assembly may make regarding the future government of Palestine. The General Assembly did not, by admitting this item to its agenda, undertake to assume responsibility for the administration of Palestine during the process of transition to independence. Responsibility for the government of Palestine now rests with the mandatory power. The General Assembly, however, would not fully discharge its obligation if it did not take carefully into account the problem of implementation.

8. Both the majority report and the statement of the United Kingdom representative in this committee raise the problem of carrying into effect the recommendations of the General Assembly. We note, for example, that the majority report indicates several points at which the majority thought the United Nations could be of assistance. It was suggested that the General Assembly approve certain steps involved in the transitional period, that the United Nations guarantee certain aspects of the settlement concerning holy places and minority rights, that the Economic and Social Council appoint three members of the Joint Economic Board, and that the United Nations accept responsibility as administering authority of the city of Jerusalem under an international trusteeship.

9. The United States is willing to participate in a United Nations program to assist the parties involved in the establishment of a workable political settlement in Palestine. We refer to assistance through the United Nations in meeting economic and financial problems and the problem of internal law and order during the transition period. The latter problem might require the establishment of a special constabulary or police force recruited on a volunteer basis by the United Nations. We do not refer to the possibility of violations by any member of its obligations to refrain in its international relations from the threat or use of force. We assume that there will be Charter observance.

10. In the final analysis the problem of making any solution work rests with the people of Palestine. If new political institutions are to endure, they must provide for early assumption by the people themselves of the responsibility for their own domestic order. Acts of violence against constituted authority and against rival elements of the local population have appeared in Palestine over a period of many years and have greatly increased the difficulties of finding a workable solution to this complex problem. Certain elements have resorted to force and terror to obtain their own particular aims. Obviously, this violence must cease if independence is to be more than an empty phrase in the Holy Land.

11. Mr. Chairman, we must now consider how this committee is to take the next step in dealing with this question. If the committee favors the principles of the majority plan, we should establish a subcommittee to work out the details of a program which we could recommend to the General Assembly.

12. The recommendations reached by the General Assembly will represent the collective opinion of the world. The problem has thus far defied solution because the parties primarily at interest have been unable to reach a basis of agreement. This is a problem in the solution of which world opinion can be most helpful.

[Department of State. For the press. December 5, 1947, No. 949]

In view of the current disorders in the Middle East, the United States is discontinuing for the present licensing of all shipments of arms to the troubled areas. The shipments of arms and ammunition licensed to the countries of the Middle East area effected during 1946 and the first 10 months of 1947 are as follows:

Country	Description	1946	1947
Egypt	Arms	$50.00	$709.63
	Ammunition	658.10	222.17
Lebanon	Arms	X	800.00
	Ammunition	X	2,020.09
Syria	Arms	X	X
	Ammunition	X	X
Saudi Arabia	Arms	X	2,060.00
	Ammunition	X	306.44
Transjordan	Arms	X	X
	Ammunition	X	X
Iraq	Arms	432.00	X
	Ammunition	X	X
Palestine	Arms	X	X
	Ammunition	X	X

Similarly this policy extends to this type of article which may be located outside the United States, including transfer and retransfer of lend-lease arms and ammunition and the sale of United States surplus arms and ammunition.

[Department of State. Background material for the press. December 10, 1947]

The transfers of military supplies, lend-lease, and nonmilitary war surplus to the countries of the Middle East affected by the arms ban during the years of 1945, 1946, and 1947 were as follows:

Country	Description	1945	1946	1947
Egypt	Arms	None	Lend-lease 280 caliber .45 submachine guns.	9 mine sweepers, war surplus.
	Ammunition	None	None	None.
	Nonmilitary	[1] $9,338,000		
Lebanon	Arms	None	None	200 caliber .45 submachine guns, war surplus.
Syria	do	None	do	150 .45 caliber submachine guns, lend-lease; 567 caliber .38 pistols.
	Ammunition	None	do	None.
	Nonmilitary	None	do	Do.
Iraq	Arms	None	do	Do.
	Ammunition	None	do	Do.
	Nonmilitary	[2] $89,000		
Saudi Arabia	Arms	None	None	Do.
	Ammunition	None	do	Do.
	Nonmilitary	[1] 1,672,000		
Palestine	Arms	None	None	Do.
	Ammunition	None	do	Do.
	Nonmilitary	None	do	Do.
Transjordan	Arms	None	do	Do.
	Ammunition	None	do	Do.
	Nonmilitary	None	do	Do.

[1] For 3-year period.
[2] For 3-year period to private citizens.

THIS IS NOT THE WAY TO PEACE

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am inserting an excellent editorial from the New Leader of May 22:

THE NEW NATION OF ISRAEL

To bewail the tragic suffering of Jewish DP's and the bloodshed in Palestine, without a positive program for solution of both problems, is futile. Lamentation alone is merely immoral evasion. With the emergence of the new Jewish state of Israel—a development which required 2,000 years of history in its consummation—the situation in the Middle East changes qualitatively. Prior to the proclamation, there existed two subject peoples—regardless of the formal terms used in describing their status—under mandate rule. The mandatory power is now abandoning the territory of Palestine. The prompt recognition of Israel by the United States through President Truman, and the subsequent recognition by the Soviet Union and other nations, give solidity and permanence to the status of Israel. It is already making its way into the society of nations.

A positive choice of political policy decrees responsibilities. The United States has not always demonstrated, in the middle-eastern situation, that it could be counted upon to support its stated policy. The British, for example, asked the United States on a number of occasions—prior to the recent changed situation—to assume its obligations as a world power by collaborating in Palestine with troops and money to aid in the implementation of whatever policy the UN might decide upon. The United States did not choose to accept this invitation, and has followed a wavering line. But all that is now past history. Truman recognized Israel and it is therefore incumbent upon us as a great and responsible nation to follow a consistent policy from now on.

Obviously, the first step for us to take is to lift the arms embargo which currently restricts supplies of war from being sent to the Jews. Any nation established and recognized as such has the right to secure for itself the means of self-defense. We did not choose to allow the Spanish loyalist government to do so at the time of the Spanish civil war—with disastrous effects. Out of that holocaust, caused by the totalitarian countries using Spain as an experimental battlefield, came World War II. The neutrality we chose then was false. We would be abandoning our own present policy and our hope for peace in the Middle East if we did not immediately enable Israel to defend itself from the Arab invasion.

Fortunately, it seems likely that such a lifting of the arms embargo will be announced soon. Already there have been important expressions, by Democratic and Republican leaders, of the hope that this embargo, which is anachronistic and immoral, will be relegated to the dustbin of history.

The emergence of Israel allows at last for immigration into that state, restricted only by the number of Jews surviving Hitler's massacres and the capacity of Palestine to absorb them. They will come from the camps of Cyprus, from the European DP camps, and from the Arab countries, where 900,000 Jews are in great danger. These transfers of population must be viewed by all decent persons as humane and long overdue. In addition, the New Leader urges prompt passage of the bills before Congress which will permit DP immigration into the United States of DP's—Jewish and non-Jewish. It is hypocrisy to lament the miserable status of the DP's in Europe and then dawdle as our Congress has with these bills to alleviate their status by making it possible for a too-small portion of these tragically situated people to come to the United States.

But no felicitation on the new state of Israel can be complete without recognition of the heroism of the steadfast elements in the Jewish cause who have fought so valiantly for the erection of a nation which they could call a homeland. Responsible leaders of the provisional Government of Israel want peace. They know that the new state to flourish must have peace. Economic cooperation and political amity with the Arabs must be made an actuality. It is therefore urgent that the United States develop a program to insure peace. It is understandable that there should be genuine concern over the holy places in Jerusalem, but we also believe that the lives of Jews and Arabs are also holy—and hence a peaceful solution of the continuing conflict in the Middle East must be achieved.

Finally, the stand of the United States Government, that is, recognition, must be brought into line with a comprehensive world program. The only nation that stands to gain by continued bloodshed in the Middle East is the Soviet Union. Both the Jews and the Arabs stand to lose. Facts are facts, and past opinions must be put into abeyance; the Jewish state exists, and shall continue to exist. But there must be peaceful cooperation between the Jews and Arabs. There must be democracy in the Middle East as throughout the world. The new state of Israel has much to gain from a prowestern orientation in the world crisis; it goes without saying that the western powers have equally much to gain from a pro-Israel stand.

The UN is faced with the fact of Arab aggression against the state of Israel, exemplified by the bombing of Tel Aviv. Unless action is taken, Cairo and other Arab cities will almost certainly be bombed in retaliation in the natural course of self-protection for Israel. This is not the way to peace.

The possibilities of achieving a peace of moderation, of justice, are disappearing as time goes by without fruitful action. There is some satisfaction in retrospect after a tragedy; there is always some solace in knowing what happened so that we can prevent disaster from happening again. But we have had plenty of disasters—and we are sick of solace—this time we want peace. As we, too, well know, world peace and survival may be the stake. If it is no longer a matter of winner take all, it is certainly true that all will be losers, and what is lost will be all we have.

European Recovery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all regret the impoverished conditions of the European peoples. Every American is filled with the milk of human kindness and wants to do all in his power to alleviate the suffering of people unable to help themselves. However, as has been said so often, the problem is not merely one of relief, but primarily one of recovery. American taxpayers cannot go on forever carrying the rest of the world on its shoulders. If the European standard of living is to be raised permanently, it will have to be the result of their production and trade.

If we are to assist the peoples of western Europe, we must get at the roots of the trouble and dig it out. The root of the trouble, as I see it, is the continued bungling of bureaucratic socialism. Let me illustrate: Many of the western European countries have raised their production indices to prewar levels. One of the chief reasons that their prosperity

does not compare with the prewar situation is the share of the national income that the governments consume. If Europe's entire production was available for personal consumption, these countries would all be far better off than they are today. According to the recent study by UNESCO's Economic Commission, the British Government in 1938 consumed 14 percent of gross national production, whereas in 1946 it consumed 24 percent. As a result of this, personal consumption fell from 74 percent in 1938 to only 67 percent in 1946, when the United Kingdom was dependent upon foreign sources for 4 percent of the production it consumed. If government consumption had not increased, the average Briton would be far better off today.

If the bureaucrats could be thrown out and free enterprise allowed to rule, it would not be long before goods available for personal consumption in western Europe would surpass that of any prior known period. As this United Nations study shows, while employment has risen in many parts of Europe, the productivity per man-hour is definitely below prewar Europe as a whole.

If this productivity is to be raised, the Europeans must have an incentive to produce, and the only way they can get that incentive is to lift socialistic restrictions so that he who produces more than the average worker can enjoy more than the average rations.

Mr. Speaker, the best place to start a European parade to a free economy is in western Germany, where we call the tune. Inasmuch as Germany has always been continental Europe's biggest buyer and supplier of goods, our best contribution to European recovery would be a revitalized Germany. I hope the ECA will lead the way by freeing the channels of German trade and thus relieving the pressure on American take-home pay.

UN Charter Revision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of May 23, 1948:

ANTIREVISIONIST FALLACIES

Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG's "working paper," designed to support the United Nations and give American aid to "regional and other collective arrangements for collective and individual self-defense," should be considered carefully in the light of its origin as well as its aims.

Unanimously approved by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, this declaration of the Senate's view on policy, would also pursue "voluntary agreement to remove the veto from all questions involving pacific settlements of international disputes and situations, and from the admission of new members."

Two goals which appear related are sought by this declaration. We will assist the countries of western Europe with military help, pending executive and legislative approval, provided they help themselves. This gives substantial backing to the western European federation growing out of the Marshall plan, but particularly to the Brussels conference countries, Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg, which are working out a hard-and-fast military alliance.

The second goal of the declaration is obviously to head off the widespread public demand for revision of the United Nations Charter. This demand has found expresion in a score of resolutions in the House of Representatives. Hearings on UN revision ended a week ago before the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Secretary of State Marshall and Warren R. Austin, American ambassador to the United Nations, testified against any revision at this time because, with the known objections of Russia, the world organization might be killed.

VANDENBERG's "working paper" is the product of the conference held 3 weeks ago in the State Department by Secretary Marshall, John Foster Dulles, Republican foreign policy adviser, and the Michigan Senator.

The best assessment we have noted of this administration's endeavor to circumvent public opinion was made by Ely Culbertson, interested as a conscientious citizen in world peace, in his testimony before the House committee 10 days ago.

Culbertson, who spoke in Cleveland Friday night before the International Affiliation of Sales and Advertising Clubs, told the House group that Marshall and Austin were "men of the past" who "are apparently oblivious of the elementary fact that between the San Francisco Conference (establishment of the UN) and today there are not 3 years, but 3,000 years—there is a vast gulf, created by the Hiroshima bomb."

"What," Culbertson asked, "has the present, impotent, veto-ridden United Nations accomplished to remove the atomic cloud now gathering over the homes of the world?" It grieves me deeply to observe that in his testimony before this committee, the Ambassador (Austin) had no place for the atomic bomb, although he did find room for exalting the present United Nations in its achievements for "aiding Peru to establish refrigeration and storage facilities for its fishing industry."

Culbertson called VANDENBERG's "working paper" a "walking paper, leading exactly nowhere," because it depends on voluntary agreements to limit the veto, a method that has repeatedly failed. Then he posed the question that reveals the contradiction and the unreality of the Vandenberg-State Department document.

"How could the State Department attack the revision of the United Nations on the grounds that it might wreck the UN by reason of Russia's opposition, and at the same time advocate a military defense alliance obviously directed against Russia?"

The man who has done so much to crystallize public opinion on the great issue of collective security then expressed succinctly the feeling of millions of his fellow Americans:

"Our only hope of averting the third world war is through a revised United Nations, and the only formula which is both effective and acceptable for such a revision is a formula which provides specific methods for the elimination of three basic defects in the present structure of the United Nations—the elimination of the veto in matters of aggression, the elimination of the atomic and armament race, and the establishment of a tyranny-proof, but powerful international police force."

These aims, unfortunately, may not be achieved at this session of Congress, but the groundwork has been laid for early action at the next session. By attaching appropriation items to its resolution, the House has made sure that its views will be heard and that the Vandenberg "working paper" will not be passed, as was intended, without House concurrence, merely as an expression of Senate opinion.

It is difficult to understand the attitude of the administration. Certainly defense of the western European nations is essential, but it is only a temporary stopgap until an effective United Nations is created as an instrument of international peace. One complements the other. If they do not, then the only answer is conflict.

An End of Racial Barriers to Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the April 29 issue of the Stockton Record, of Stockton, Calif. It is gratifying to have this continuing evidence of support for my bill, H. R. 5004, which seeks to accomplish the desirable objectives noted in this editorial.

AN END OF RACIAL BARRIERS TO CITIZENSHIP

Now in the hearing stage before the House of Representatives is a bill introduced by Representative WALTER H. JUDD which would terminate racial discrimination in granting United States citizenship. This barrier now exists for all persons of Asiatic or Pacific origin except Chinese, Filipinos, and natives of India. Largest of the racial groups involved are the Japanese and the Koreans.

The Judd bill is in keeping with naturalization legislation which was enacted in 1943 and 1946. In those 2 years the process was liberalized to include Chinese, Filipinos, and natives of India. Consistency calls for the elimination of all discrimination.

There need be no fear of a flood of immigration from the Orient. Present arrangements permit, for example, the influx of 100 from India and 105 from China each year. Similar quotas for all Asiatic and Pacific peoples would allow the admission of not more than 1,700 persons a year.

Aside from the fact that the United States remains the only major power which still indulges in the anachronism of racial discrimination as regards citizenship, there are two important reasons why the bill should become law. There now are nearly 90,000 persons residing in the States and Hawaii against whom the present law operates, about 55,000 of them Japanese. In addition to the loss of Federal rights of citizenship, these people are the victims of related alien land laws in 12 States. Because of the status of their parents, native-born Americans find their rights and privileges clouded.

The second reason involves the prestige and influence of the United States abroad. During the war the Japanese enemy used the American discrimination policy as a powerful propaganda weapon. The policy continues to be a sore spot which antidemocratic governments are probing successfully in psychological cold warfare which seeks to discredit the United States.

Democracy in the United States will take on new meaning to millions of persons when they no longer are prevented at least from aspiring to American citizenship.

Statements by General Motors Corp. and United Automobile Workers, CIO, With Regard to New Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 28 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD statements issued by General Motors Corp. and United Automobile Workers, CIO, concerning settlement of the new 2-year contract between them. These statements were issued at the time the agreement was reached.

I make this request because of the unusual importance and interest attaching to the agreement reached between negotiators for the United Automobile Workers, CIO and the General Motors Corp. for an immediate wage increase of 11 cents an hour, with provision for quarterly adjustments upward or downward to correspond with changes in the cost of living and with an additional novel provision for an unconditional 3 cents an hour increase now and again next year.

I suggest that Senators who are interested in this new development in labor-management relations and in wage policy note particularly the comments which the UAW-CIO has made with respect to the 1940 base used in computing the cost-of-living adjustment and the 2 percent, or 3 cents an hour, rate of increase provided in the agreement.

While General Motors Corp. is to be commended for breaking the united front of big industry against any wage increases, attention should be given to the UAW-CIO criticisms, on the grounds of inadequacy, which led that union to describe the settlement as "a victory only in the context of today's economic and political reaction" and "essentially a holding operation."

The union describes as—

Unsound and unwise the assumption that workers can expect no more than to remain on the economic treadmill, inching up 3 cents an hour per year, while management and stockholders reap profits proportionately far in excess of that amount. This is still the trickle-down theory of prosperity, slightly modified.

But the union adds:

The modification is extremely important, however, because, in making it, General Motors has accepted the principle that prices and profits are a concern of labor. This is progress.

The union also rededicates itself to its campaign against price increases and calls upon the whole American public to join in the fight to stop inflation.

Referring to the quarterly cost-of-living adjustment in wages which would permit a 1-cent increase in hourly wages for each 1.14 change in the BLS cost-of-living index, the union states:

It is our sincere hope that it never becomes necessary to use the provisions of this agreement providing automatic increases to correspond with rises in the Bureau of Labor Statistics cost-of-living index. Our members are not interested in the wooden nickels of inflation; they are interested in purchasing power.

In support of its statement that such a wage increase does not justify price increases, the union states:

In the auto industry, 1947 financial reports issued by seven major passenger car assemblers, including General Motors, show that they could absorb a wage increase of this size, grant equivalent percentage increases to their salaried employees, and roll back retail prices of their passenger cars by $230 each. After doing all this, they would still have a profit of 6 percent after taxes on their stockholders' investment. Six percent is one-third greater than the average profit rate of all American manufacturing corporations during the years 1936–39 when profits were considered normal for wartime excess-profits-tax purposes. Therefore, any attempt to pin the blame for future car price increases on wage settlements such as this one must be recognized in advance as an unwarranted attempt to shift responsibility from management, where it would belong.

The fight to achieve economic stability and continuing prosperity is still to be won. The union recognizes the need for a continued fight against inflation in the following passage from its statement on the General Motors agreement:

Inflation has been given new impetus by ERP needs and the national defense program. This will temporarily conceal the fact that rising prices and lagging wages are squeezing American consumers out of the market for farm and manufactured goods. The problem of obtaining a healthy balance between wages, prices, and profits is still before us. It is the Nation's No. 1 piece of unfinished business.

I recommend study of both the General Motors and UAW-CIO statements by every Senator who is interested in steps toward achieving stability and continuing prosperity with a steadily rising standard of living for the American people.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Following is a statement issued by the General Motors Corporation concerning the 2-year agreement reached with the United Automobile Workers, CIO:

"A 2-year agreement has been reached between General Motors and the UAW-CIO based on the mutual acceptance of a wage adjustment formula designed by the parties to promote prosperity and stability and protect and improve the standard of living of General Motors employees. It is hoped that this agreement will be found to be an important step forward in industry-labor relations. This wage adjustment plan includes:

"1. A cost-of-living adjustment based on the consumer price index of the Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics of 100.2 for 1940 and 169.3 for April of this year and the average wage rates of 1940 and the present rates. This cost-of-living adjustment has been determined to be 8 cents per hour.

"2. An annual improvement factor to increase the standard of living of workmen. The company has agreed to underwrite this at 3 cents per hour.

"3. Quarterly adjustments in the cost-of-living factor to be based on the Bureau of Labor Statistics cost-of-living index.

"4. Wages under the formula and contract provisions have been stabilized for 2 years.

"THREE OF ELEVEN CENTS IS FIXED RISE

"Under this formula the immediate increase for all employees eligible will be 11 cents per hour, of which 3 cents represents the annual improvement factor and 8 cents a cost-of-living adjustment. The improvement factor calls for an additional 3 cents per hour which will be added to the base pay of all eligible employes starting May 29, 1949.

"It is hoped that the cost of living will come down. It has been agreed that only 5 cents of the 8 cents will be subject to reduction so that if a sufficient decline in cost of living occurs the workmen will immediately enjoy a better standard of living. Such an improvement would be in addition to the 3 cents an hour annual improvement underwritten by the company.

"The first quarterly cost of living readjustment will be made in the first pay period starting after September 1, 1948, and will be based on the July consumers price index published by the Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics, which is expected to be released late in August.

"As an example of how this plan works, if an employee under this agreement is now earning $1.50 per hour, his wages will be increased immediately by 11 cents per hour to $1.61 per hour, of which 8 cents is cost-of-living adjustment and 3 cents the beginning of the annual improvement factor.

"TO SEE BLS INDEX IN AUGUST

"If approximately 3 months from now the cost-of-living index has increased or decreased importantly, his wages will be increased or decreased accordingly and in line with a table incorporated in the agreement. In no case will the rate of such an employee be reduced to less than $1.56 per hour during the first year of the agreement regardless of how much the cost-of-living index may decline during this time.

"At the beginning of the second year of the contract such an employee will receive another 3 cents increase, bringing his base pay to $1.59 per hour for that year. He will also continue to receive a cost-of-living adjustment unless the cost-of-living index has declined sufficiently to eliminate a cost-of-living allowance. If the cost-of-living index should fall below such a point, he will still continue to receive the $1.59 per hour for the second year of the agreement."

The following statement was issued by John W. Livingston, UAW-CIO vice president, and T. A. Johnstone, assistant director of the union's General Motors Department.

"The UAW-CIO will recommend to the General Motors workers acceptance of this offer from the corporation. It is a far-reaching victory in a period when powerful and greedy forces in American finance and industry were determined to block wage increases or even reduce wages while prices continue to rise.

"It is not only a victory for the General Motors workers themselves. It is a victory as well for the rest of the UAW-CIO's 1,000,000 members and for all American workers because it will assist them, in a period of hysterical reaction, in getting a small measure of economic justice.

"It is a staggering defeat for the 'no wage increase' policy launched by United States Steel and General Electric and copied by the Chrysler Corp.

"It is a staggering defeat for the wage-cutting policy proposed by John S. Bugas for the Ford Motor Co.

"The wage increase means $55,000,000 a year in increased purchasing power for the 250,000 General Motors workers covered by the UAW-CIO contract. Applied to all of the 1,000,000 UAW-CIO members, it will mean at least $220,000,000 a year. Directly and indirectly, it will add at least $1,000,000,000 (a billion dollars) to the buying power of workers, small storekeepers, and others whose living standards have been cut by inflation.

"It is a certainty that the whole of American industry, including the automobile industry and General Motors, can absorb at

least this much wage increase without passing it on to consumers in higher prices.

"Because that is so obviously true, the UAW-CIO at this time rededicates itself to its campaign against price increases, and we call upon the whole American public to join with us in the fight to stop inflation. It is our sincere hope that it never becomes necessary to use the provisions of this agreement providing automatic increases to correspond with rises in the Bureau of Labor Statistics cost-of-living index. Our members are not interested in the wooden nickels of inflation; they are interested in purchasing power.

"The UAW-CIO has fought consistently and vigorously for a roll-back in prices. Speaking for the entire union, President Walter P. Reuther stated last fall that we preferred a roll-back in prices to a wage increase. We meant that sincerely, and we tried to work it that way. But the failure of industry and Congress to meet their social responsibility to the American people made it necessary—in the only way left open to us—to protect our members against continued increases in the cost of living.

"Having won some measure of that protection, we shall continue to press with all our strength the carrying out of our broad over-all program of progress with and not at the expense of the community. The first and immediate target in that program is the high cost of living.

"Our statement that this wage increase, even if applied universally, by American industry, does not justify price increases is not merely an idle claim. It is supported by industry's own profit figures.

"In the auto industry, 1947 financial reports issued by seven major passenger-car assemblers, including General Motors, show that they could absorb a wage increase of this size, grant equivalent percentage increases to their salaried employees and roll back retail prices of their passenger cars by $230 each. After doing all this, they would still have a profit of 6 percent after taxes on their stockholders' investment. Six percent is one-third greater than the average profit rate of all American manufacturing corporations during the years 1936–39, when profits were considered normal for wartime excess-profits tax purposes. Therefore, any attempt to pin the blame for future car price increases on wage settlements such as this one must be recognized in advance as an unwarranted attempt to shift responsibility from management, where it would belong.

"The UAW-CIO will continue to fight on both the political and economic fronts for long-run policies necessary to insure economic stability, and expansion of our productive plant to sustain full production, distribution, consumption, and employment at steadily rising standards of living for all.

"Two years ago the General Motors workers went on strike for 113 days, demanding wage increases to maintain take-home pay without increasing prices. We offered to cut our demands to the amount General Motors could pay without increasing prices. The American people supported that strike and the principles for which we fought. But the General Motors workers were let down by a reversal of administration policy when, on the excuse that pending wage increases required it, a $5 a ton increase in steel prices was approved. That began the stampede back to normalcy that became official in June 1946 when Congress killed effective price control and the forces of inflation were turned loose.

"Inflation has been given new impetus by ERP needs and the national-defense program. This will temporarily conceal the fact that rising prices and lagging wages are squeezing American consumers out of the market for farm and manufactured goods. The problem of obtaining a healthy balance between wages, prices, and profits is still before us. It is the Nation's No. 1 piece of unfinished business.

"Substantial as it is, the UAW-CIO regards this victory as essentially a holding operation. It can be termed a victory only in the context of today's economic and political reaction. Nevertheless, we are recommending its acceptance by General Motors workers as their contribution to industrial peace, even though it does not represent all they are entitled to and is far short of the contribution which General Motors could and should make to a sturdy, healthy, and equitable national economy.

"In the first place, the base date for measuring wages in terms of buying power is 1940, when an army of 8,000,000 unemployed provided striking testimony that wages were far too low to sustain full employment.

"In the second place, instead of sharing its dangerously inflated profits beyond a cost-of-living adjustment based on a depressed 1940 wage, General Motors offered an annual increase of 2 percent or 3 cents an hour as a gesture toward keeping the workers' purchasing power abreast of the increased output resulting from technological advance in the national economy. This figure itself short-changes the principle involved. But it is important that the General Motors Corp. now has conceded the principle that General Motors workers are entitled to a share in the growing output of an expanding economy. However, to establish a rate of wage increase without first establishing a healthy wage-price-profit relationship is to attempt to freeze the present unhealthy relationship in which prices and profits are too high and wages too low to maintain stable prosperity.

"Third, the UAW-CIO accepts the provision for quarterly wage adjustments to correspond with changes in the BLS cost-of-living index only because most of those in control in government and in industry show no signs of acting in the public interest. They are enforcing a system of private planning for private profit at public expense.

"Fourth, the assumption that workers can expect no more than to remain on the economic treadmill, inching up 3 cents an hour per year while management and stockholders reap profits proportionately far in excess of that amount is unsound and unwise. This is still the trickle-down theory of prosperity, slightly modified. The modification is extremely important however, because, in making it, General Motors has accepted the principle that prices and profits are a concern of labor. This is progress.

"In spite of these criticisms of the settlement, we believe that in accepting it the General Motors workers will be making a substantial contribution to the economic health of the Nation and to the welfare of their fellow Americans. We recommend its acceptance on that basis and we in the UAW-CIO shall continue to inform, educate, and organize ourselves, in cooperation with other workers, farmers, and men of good will, to build a Nation and a world of abundance, security, and peace."

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 28 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Trade-Agreements Issue," from the Baltimore Evening Sun of May 24, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRADE-AGREEMENTS ISSUE

In the battle over renewal of the Trade Agreements Act, which comes to the floor of the House this week, economic isolationism will be the underlying issue. Political isolationism has been so often defeated since the war that it is definitely weakened and dying. The United States is so firmly committed to the discharge of the political responsibilities which its position as a great power entails as to leave no doubt as to the final demise of the doctrine that we can preserve our institutions and our security by shutting ourselves off from outside events, after the manner of the Manchu dynasty in imperial China.

The companion doctrine that our economic security—or our prosperity, to use the more general term—depends on our shutting out imports from foreign countries is also on its way out. The logic of events is against it. There are some segments of American industry and agriculture which still hold to this doctrine, however, and it still has its spokesmen in Congress. The ranking Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee in particular are its exponents, and their position enables them to exercise an undue influence on that party's stand with respect to the trade-agreements issue.

Republicans have by no means consistently opposed the trade agreements. In 1943, with a Presidential election just a year distant, 145 Republicans in the House supported a 2-year extension of the act under which the trade agreements are negotiated and only 52 voted against it. The vote was closer in the Senate, but even there 18 Republicans registered themselves for the renewal and only 14 opposed it. In 1945, the Republicans swung back decisively against the act in the House. The party divided 140 to 33 against the 3-year extension voted at that time. In the Senate, however, the vote on extension was close. A preponderance of Republican Senators supported crippling amendments which were inconsistent with the act's purposes, but once the amendments were lost, 15 Republicans voted for the 3-year extension, as against 16 voting in the negative.

In between the two votes had come the Presidential campaign of 1944 in which Mr. Dewey argued that the trade agreements policy was of Republican origin. While the vote of Republicans in the House the following year seemed to repudiate this claim, it is not without basis. Mr. Cordell Hull is, to be sure, the author of the one effective program for reciprocal tariff bargaining which this country has ever had. His credit on that score in history is secure. Moreover, the Hull program was initiated by a Democratic administration in 1934 and it has been backed by the consistent votes of Democrats in Congress.

Still it must be conceded, that at the very time when the Republican Party was putting high tariff laws on the statute books, some of its more enlightened spokesmen were saying that the time had come for this country to adopt a policy based on reciprocal tariff bargaining with other nations. James G. Blaine actually tried to apply this policy while he was Secretary of State during the Harrison administration. President William Howard Taft negotiated a reciprocity treaty with Canada in 1911. Both of these attempts broke down, because Republican majorities in Congress failed to provide the votes necessary for ratification. The national leadership of the party outside Congress was enlightened enough to see the advantages of the policy even though congressional support was not forthcoming.

There is also the case of William McKinley. During his service in Congress McKinley had been the chief author of the high-tariff act which bore his name. His first administration had been marked by the passage of the Dingley Act with still higher duties. But in 1901, just before his death, he declared that:

"The period of exclusiveness is past. The expansion of our trade and commerce is the pressing problem. Commercial wars are unprofitable. A policy of good will in trade relations will prevent reprisals. Reciprocity treaties are in harmony with the spirit of the times; measures of retaliation are not. If perchance some of our tariffs are no longer needed for revenue or to encourage and protect our industries at home, why should they not be employed to extend and promote our markets abroad?"

This passage boiled down means, simply, that prohibitive tariffs are out of place in a mature industrial nation with an exportable surplus of manufactured goods. This was a good argument in 1901 and it is an even better one today. Ours is far more of an industrial economy with an exportable surplus of manufactured goods than when McKinley spoke. Moreover—and this is a point he did not mention, and perhaps could not foresee—we are forced to draw an increasing proportion of our raw materials from abroad. Thus, our interest in promoting a broader exchange of goods and services with other nations is constantly expanding.

Consider the facts: At the turn of the century, our exports were still largely made up of agricultural products and crude materials. By 1939, the last prewar year, crude materials and crude foodstuffs comprised only 21 percent of our shipments abroad, and 53 percent of those exports consisted of manufactures. In the same year, only 19½ percent of our imports were of manufactured goods, while crude materials and foodstuffs made up 45 percent.

In other words, we had become a great manufacturing Nation even before the war and the development of our industries during the past 8 years has carried that process even further. Our service as the arsenal of democracy since 1941 has made us the most powerful industrial nation in the world. Just what proportion of our exports will be of manufactured goods when trade settles down cannot be predicted, but assuredly it will be higher than in 1939. Hence the need for using our tariff-bargaining power to further our exports will be far more pressing than in McKinley's time.

The great question is, will the Republican Party in Congress recognize this and vote to extend the act under which the trade agreements are negotiated without crippling amendments? Or, in other words, the question is, will the congressional spokesmen of the party recognize the inevitable march of events, which enlightened leaders of their party have seen for years and which Senators and Representatives themselves accepted as a basis of policy in 1943? If they do they will renew the Trade Agreements Act without the crippling amendment which their less enlightened leaders have proposed.

Reflections on a War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 28 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Reflections on a War," published in PM on Thursday, May 27, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REFLECTIONS ON A WAR

On the question of aggression: After the Arab refusal of a truce, can there be doubt any longer that the Arabs are the aggressors in the Middle East war? To be sure, the Arab states have dressed up their refusal with "political conditions," to make it look like something different. But only the willfully blind will have their sight obscured by such disguises. The Arabs, who have all along counted on the success of a concerted three-pronged attack with superior armor, artillery, and planes, are playing for time. They want to justify their aggression by nailing down a victory. If the UN Security Council allows them to get away with it, no act of aggression in the future by any nation will be too barefaced and cynical to be tried.

On Bevin and the British: There is something tragi-comic in the spectacle of Ernest Bevin throwing up his hands in horror when he heard of Truman's conversations with Chaim Weizmann, as President of the new State of Israel. The British, it seems were trying to persuade King Abdullah, of Transjordan, to adopt a truce; but the bombshell of the Truman-Weizmann conversations has now made that impossible.

The British are following their classic pattern of Middle East diplomacy. First, they create the Arab League, arm the Arabs, equip, officer, and finance their armies. Having done this and having watched the Arab armies fall upon the Jews of Israel, they then argue that any effort to help the victim of the aggression will inflame the strife. While still continuing to arm the Arabs, Bevin has closed the port of Haifa against boatloads of Jewish DP's from Europe. Toward President Truman he adopts the shocked attitude a fireman might have when, seeking to put out a blaze, he sees a novice feeding it with fuel.

This British attitude would have its comic aspects—if men and women and children were not dying every day because of it.

Eye on the object: There is a danger in our concentrating too hard on the British phase of the struggle. We run the risk of forgetting that the British, no matter how hypocritical their policy is, are not the decisive element in the problem. The decisive element is bound to be the policy of the American Government and the attitude of the American people.

The cries of "perfidious Albion" are, on this issue, true enough. But in the first place, I suspect the British Government relishes these cries. Bevin wants hard to convince the Arabs he is their true friend and champion. As for alienating the Americans, he is willing to run the risk—even the calculated risk of an inquiry into the channeling of Marshall-plan aid. This gives Bevin a chance to pose as a virtuous and needy ally who is being subjected to economic pressures while he stands up for a principle. His present policy of trying to line up against American policy the nations of the western union bloc which American aid has created, is an example of how far he is willing to go in playing the strong man. He feels confident that the Russian scare can always be counted on to bring us back into the fold.

Despite these tortured British maneuvers, let us not lose our heads. We must keep our eye on the object. The British will continue to aid the Arabs, but that will not by itself win the war. Far more dangerous are the British tactics to confuse American opinion here at home. It is America which is strong. America whose weight can swing the UN Security Council into a decision on the obvious facts of Arab aggression and Arab diplomatic sabotage. It is America which can act to strengthen the position of Israel. If America acts—in the UN and on its own—nothing that Bevin can do will count in the balance.

The greatest and the youngest: The swing of American policy on the Middle East is finally in the right direction. The meeting between President Truman and President Weizmann—between the head of the world's greatest democracy and the head of the world's youngest democracy—had something deeply touching and symbolic about it. Even if nothing else had happened at that meeting, it would have been important merely because the meeting took place. In a world where men live by symbols, this is one that history will cherish. Americans, so many of whom felt dishonored by the previous policy of back-track on the UN decision, can now begin to look at themselves in the mirror. And the beleaguered people of Israel can feel they are not wholly friendless.

Weapons and time: There are now two essentials in the Palestine war, if we are to prove to the Arabs that murder does not pay. One is to get to the fighters of Israel the weapons—planes, tanks, artillery—that they need. The other is to get them there in time.

These two essentials apply both to the United Nations action and to United States action. We talk of sanctions, or penalties, to be imposed by the UN against the Arabs as aggressors, under chapter VII of the Charter. But the gist of those sanctions is to quarantine aid to the Arab states and release aid to Israel. This will be futile if it is not done immediately. The Arabs know it, and that is why their UN delegates have so obviously been playing for time—endlessly decoding the messages from their governments while the Security Council has waited. The Arabs know that every hour counts. These same hours, ticking away while the UN fails to take action, may decide the fate of the UN itself.

Action by the UN means, in essence, the clearing of the way for quick action by the United States. Inaction by the UN will mean that action by the American Government is all the more pressing. Here again, time is crucial. Delay will mean not only the death of people; it will mean the frustration of American policy and honor. The lifting of the embargo on arms, the granting of a loan to Israel for defense and reconstruction: these actions, hinted at by Dr. Weizmann after his interview with President Truman, are to America's interest and America's honor. They are not hand-outs. They are concrete steps we must take for peace in the Middle East and the survival of the United Nations.

I think the American Government will take these steps because the American people overwhelmingly want them. They admire the courage the people of Israel have shown. And they know a case of aggression when they see it.

MAX LERNER.

Wisconsin's Friendship Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 28 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have previously commented on the floor of the Senate regarding Wisconsin's Centennial Friendship Fleet, which is an in-

spiring symbol of Wisconsin's debt to the Old World, and, indeed, of America's gratitude for all the Old World has given to us. It is a symbol, too, of what America has given to the Old World.

In this connection, Mr. President, there appeared an interesting editorial in the Beloit (Wis.) News on May 10 entitled "Wisconsin's Friendship Fleet." This editorial called attention to the wonderful work of the Wisconsin Manufacturers' Association, whose president is Mr. William J. Grede, in making this centennial friendship fleet possible. Mr. Walter Geist, of Milwaukee, is president of the Centennial Friendship Fleet Committee, and he, like all his associates, is to be congratulated on the magnificent work which they have untiringly devoted to this splendid endeavor, and at this time I ask that the text of the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN'S FRIENDSHIP FLEET

Most attention in the State this year is being directed toward the centennial observance of the admission of Wisconsin into the Union, but there are events that occurred in Europe at that time that had a profound effect upon this State's future history.

The revolution in Germany, as an example, prompted the movement of thousands upon thousands of Germans to the United States during the period of 1848 right up to the outbreak of the Civil War.

The year of 1848 also marked the first Swedish settlement in this State near Hartland. A special observance is being planned to commemorate that event. Many Danish families came from their homeland to settle near Racine. Norwegian families had arrived in Wisconsin earlier, establishing large settlements in the vicinity of Muskego and in southern Rock County.

These migrations from Europe gave Wisconsin a sturdy stock of industrious and freedom-loving people, who came to this new land not alone to improve their lot but to exercise their beliefs openly and without fear. That is why Wisconsin has, in general, been a leader in agricultural, industrial, and educational development as well as in political and social advancement.

Somewhat as a recognition of what the Scandinavian and other countries of Europe have provided for Wisconsin in years past, the Wisconsin Manufacturers' Association in cooperation with the State centennial committee is arranging to send a fleet of ships carrying Wisconsin products to several of those countries. The four ships that will carry the supplies, including food, have been designated as the Wisconsin Centennial Friendship Fleet.

Purposes of the Friendship Fleet are:

To internationalize the Wisconsin centennial this year.

To demonstrate that Wisconsin is a good place to live.

To attract immigrants, especially farm help, from nations well represented here.

To give aid, through gift packages of food and clothing to needy persons in Scandinavia and the Low Countries.

To strengthen the ideological ties between the people of the United States and those of other countries.

The first of the Friendship Fleet to sail will be the *Ornefjell* from Milwaukee May 27 bound for Norway. The second vessel, the new motorship, Ternefjell, will make its maiden voyage from Racine in June bound for Denmark. A third ship will leave later for Sweden and a fourth will carry a cargo for the Low Countries and Baltic ports.

Although the ships' cargo will consist of machinery and other articles for individual firms, primary emphasis will be placed upon the gift parcels of food and clothing. Emphasis will be placed, too, upon the advantages Wisconsin has to offer for those who wish to come here as their forefathers did.

Arrangements for the first ship's departure to Norway are now being made. Norwegian clergymen in the State as well as other Norwegian leaders, are to be asked to assist in the project.

The articles most desired in Norway, according to Norwegian seamen who have docked in Milwaukee recently, are sugar, cake flour, canned meat, fats, rice, chocolate syrup, dehydrated eggs, canned cheese, dehydrated soups, coffee, oatmeal, dry milk, and cocoa.

Other articles deemed most needed include wearing apparel, cotton goods, woolen yarns, wash cloths, sheets, and soap.

These gift packages will be particularly welcome in Norway as no facilities for the distribution of CARE packages have been set up in that country.

This project being advanced by the Manufacturers' Association is something new and different in the promotion of aid to the peoples of Europe and in establishing closer relations between Wisconsin and those countries which in years past furnished many of the men and women who helped to build the State.

Address of Hon. Helen Gahagan Douglas, of California, Before the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I ask to include a speech I made before the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America at their convention in Atlantic City, N. J., on May 13:

I am extremely happy to be here today and I am grateful for the response. I am proud that the great Amalgamated likes me because I like it and its members.

We have nothing to fear in our democracy except ignorance and apathy. Your union has led the way in bringing understanding of issues and of the responsibility that each of us has in preserving our liberties and in raising the living standard of our own people and the people of the world.

A long time ago, under Jefferson, we won our political freedoms. Except for the poll tax, we have established political democracy in this country.

But the battle that was started by Jackson, carried on by Wilson and heightened under the magnificent leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt—the battle for economic democracy has not yet been won.

Economic democracy is the issue in this election, as it has been in past elections: Are the people going to be served, the great mass of the people in the country, or are special interests going to be served?

What are the issues that confront this Nation, which are not partisan in any sense of the word?

There are two great issues: One is to support and strengthen the United Nations and win for ourselves a lasting and enduring peace.

And the second is to remain economically sound in this country, and maintain and improve our present standard of living.

Remaining economically sound—keeping a high standard of living in our own country is essential so that our people may be willing and eager to approach the problems that they must help solve in the world.

Peace depends to a large extent on whether or not we can balance the budget here at home, and I am not talking about the national budget, I am talking about the housewife's budget.

Where do we stand today? We have been led down a road that leads to certain depression. Depression will serve neither the Democrats nor the Republicans, and it will not serve peace and it will not serve any nation in the world. It can only mean disaster for all.

I want to give you a few facts:

A year ago I made a report to Congress, one year after price controls had been discontinued.

You'll remember that the NAM in full-page advertisements in newspapers throughout the country promised that if price controls were only removed production would increase—there would be goods for everybody at prices they could afford to pay—and a better tomorrow.

Too many Congressmen swallowed these promises hook, line, and sinker—without any regard for existing economic facts.

Removing controls has thrown us into a spiral of inflation. It has cost the American consumer billions of dollars. I reported last year on the NAM's better tomorrow and found it far short of the promises that were made. This year we are even worse off than we were last year.

The NAM, however, has been doing fine. Corporation profits are 90 percent higher than they were during the all-time high year of 1945. And these profits were realized after taxes had been paid and after wage increases were granted to industrial workers.

On the other hand, food prices have gone up ruinously, as every housewife knows. I reported last year to Congress that in the 9 months following the death of price control, basic items in every housewife's budget—such as bread, milk, fats, eggs, flour, meat—cheap cuts of meat—soap—had risen 50 percent.

After 9 months of NAM-sponsored decontrol the housewife had to pay $15 for the same amount of food she could get for $10 under OPA.

And let's see what another year of the NAM's "better tomorrow" has brought. This year my market basket showed that prices have gone still higher. You pay $16.23 this year for what you bought for $10 under OPA.

Under OPA a pound of butter cost 65 cents. Last year it cost 82 cents; and it cost 93 cents today—in the lowest priced chain store in Washington. Three pounds of ground round steak cost $1.35 under OPA, $2.07 last year, and $2.76 today. And so it goes.

Baby foods and vegetables have gone up even faster in wholesale prices this last year than meats. As I told the Members of Congress, behind these high price increases in baby foods and vegetables is the serious threat of malnutrition for a whole generation of our children—veterans' children. And remember that in 1947 4,000,000 babies were born—1,000,000 more than in any previous year.

I found that the total over-all cost of living, since 1946, had gone up 25 percent, and this, mind you, after that so-called drop we have heard so much about. That drop wasn't worth two thin pennies to any housewife.

In 1947 the personal incomes of the people of the United States were $184,000,000,000—$30,000,000,000 over 1946; but did people have $30,000,000,000 more to spend? No. Not even after the two big wage boosts that labor received. They spent less, their buying power dropped because of the increase of 25 percent in the rising over-all cost of living.

This changed that $30,000,000,000 increase into a $7,000,000,000 drop in buying power.

When people don't earn enough to meet their daily needs, they dip into their savings if they have any. Then, when their savings are gone they sell their bonds—war bonds. Then when they don't have any more war bonds they borrow, and the head of the family goes into debt and mortgages the future income of the family.

Let's look at the incomes of American families living in cities: Two out of every three families in 1946 had total family incomes less than $3,500 a year. Two out of every five city families in America earned less than $2,500 a year.

At present prices you don't have to be a mathematician, you don't have to go through some course in higher economics to know that American families are going broke.

Because people are not able to make ends meet and have to sell their bonds and then borrow money, today the consumers of America are in hock to banks, stores, loan companies for a total of $13,000,000,000. That is $3,000,000,000 over the all-time high of 1946, and almost twice as much indebtedness as we had in 1929, when the cork was pulled on the spending power of the American people and we were hurled into depression.

Then the last ugly turn in the road is relief. Have we reached that turn? I don't know. Relief increased in 1947 16 percent over 1946. For every 100 persons on relief in 1946 there were 116 in 1947.

As I said in Congress, does this mean that we are going "over the hill to the poor house" with the GOP and the NAM? Remember, the NAM told us that if we would just take off price controls we would have everything our hearts desired, at a price we could afford to pay. Well, the NAM has been doing all right but what about the housewife?

Oh, I know, the NAM tells us that labor brought this upon itself. It tells us that wages caused these higher prices. I have heard—we have all heard over and over again the story of the spiral which makes labor the guilty party.

Let me call your attention to the fact that on top of the increased wages which the corporations have paid to their workers they have added a very great increase in profits for themselves.

In the latter part of 1946, following the first round wage increase, profits of all corporations were running over seven billions larger than in 1945. In other words, after paying more in wages, corporations added to their prices enough to come out with an annual rate of $16,000,000,000 profits, after taxes, for themselves compared with nine billions in 1945.

This was repeated with the second round wage increase of 1947. Again the corporations soaked the consumers and came out with another $2,000,000,000 addition to their profits, after taxes, for a total of $18,000,000,000 at the end of 1947.

Between the wages which corporations pay their workers and the prices which they make us consumers pay are the profits which they keep for themselves. On each of these two occasions they made the wage increase very profitable to themselves. In fact, they made a substantial profit on every dollar workers won from them in higher wages.

Meanwhile, inflation has reduced the standard of living of wage earners by roughly 20 percent. The weekly wage of the average factory worker today is $52.51. To regain 1945 living standards, this weekly wage would have to be $62.41.

What has been the answer in this Congress to these problems?

It presented and passed in the Congress three programs:

1. Hatched up and passed in the special session a voluntary allocations bill. I am not going to waste any time on that. The Democrats were never for it and the Republicans have probably forgotten about it. If they haven't, everybody else has. Indeed, no one ever took it seriously in the first place.

2. Passed a second rent bill to further decontrol rents and therefore increased the cost of living.

3. Passed a tax bill which provided an increase in the take-home pay, after taxes, for those with an income of $3,000 of 3.2 percent; for those with an income of $25,000 an increase of 18.5 percent; for those with an income of $250,000 an increase of 58.4 percent. The tax program was inflationary in every respect.

What it did was to take the great war debt we still have to pay and lift it neatly off the shoulders of the big corporations that are now making the highest profits in history and place it on the backs of the workingmen and women of the country, the majority of whom earn less than $3,500 a year.

Obviously something must be done. If we have eyes in our heads to see, ears to hear, and brains with which to think, we know something must be done. We are willing to appropriate billions of dollars to stop communism around the world, but we are not willing to take the simplest measures to stop the conditions which may breed it here.

My answer to communism is to build healthy, sound communities. That means that we have to work to elect progressive people to put through the measures that make for better communities.

A bill was introduced in the Senate a few months ago by Senator WAGNER, of New York, that great man to whom we owe so much, and Senator THOMAS of Utah, another outstanding servant of the people. It was a bill that called for a price freeze as of the beginning of this year. It called for allocations and priorities on our basic materials. It would set up again an Administrator over a price-control program for the country. I introduced that bill in the House the other day, and I said to the Republican leadership, for the sake of all the families in America, I beg of you to take action to put through this bill now.

We cannot use steel for juke boxes when we need it for pipes to bring gas into factories. Detroit was shut down last year because they didn't have fuel needed to run its factories for two weeks. Hundreds of thousands of people were thrown out of work, and they will be thrown out again next winter unless Congress acts now.

We are short of fuel in the country, not because we haven't got fuel, but because of a lack of production and transportation equipment. We cannot break present bottlenecks and produce facilities urgently needed without allocation and priorities of basic materials.

If Congress were willing, and I said this on the floor of the House, if Congress were willing to roll back prices, reestablish a balance between profits, wages and prices, I would then vote for a freeze on wages. I know that is not popular, but we are facing a real crisis.

If we keep on going as we are now in the present unchecked inflationary spiral, the wage earner will never catch up, and when the depression comes—as it will—the low income groups in the country will be hit hardest.

This problem isn't easy, but it can be licked. We have everything with which to work. If we restore a balance between wages, profits, and prices and increase the production of basic industries during the next two years, we will come out of this period stronger and healthier than we have ever been before.

If we have a depression in this country, do you think the American people will be able to continue the European recovery program? It is sheer idiocy to think that we can. I am one of those who believe we must help a devastated world get back on its feet, not because we are afraid of communism, or any other "ism," but because we cannot sit by with folded hands when others are suffering from starvation, and expect to build peace in the world. We cannot carry out our plans for foreign aid if our own economy crumbles.

We must work together as a team, because we are in this as a team. If we have an atomic war and are blown to another star, we will all be blown out of here together—Republican, Democrat, and I. P. P'er, laborer, manager, and farmer.

Let's give to this hour the leadership that is needed. Things look black, but it is when they look black that true statesmanship is needed. It is when things look hopeless that we pull in our belts and say, "We'll win because we know what is right, and we'll fight and fight until we get it."

What is right for this hour is a Congress that will lead us toward the united world that men desire and which we must have, lest we all perish.

Manufacturers Continue Protests Against Excise Tax on Ranges and Water Heaters

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following timely article relative to excise taxes on ranges and water heaters from the May 1948 issue of the Stove Builder:

MANUFACTURERS CONTINUE PROTESTS AGAINST EXCISE TAX ON RANGES AND WATER HEATERS

(By Samuel Dunckel, managing director, Institute of Cooking and Heating Appliance Manufacturers)

In October 1941, Congress imposed a 10 percent excise tax on the manufacturer's wholesale price of electric, gas, and oil cooking and water-heating appliances, of both commercial and domestic types. With the exception of the war period, when it was fully recognized that the added tax revenue was needed for war purposes, the manufacturers of these two products have been active in their efforts to get this tax removed, on the basis of the fact that these appliances are household necessities and not luxuries.

The Institute of Cooking and Heating Appliance Manufacturers, through its special tax committee headed by Bruce R. Tritton, vice president of the American Stove Co., has worked actively in urging the manufacturers to bring this important matter to the attention of their congressional delegations. The association has appeared at every committee hearing, in both the House of Representatives and the Senate, when excise-tax legislation was under review, and has also worked through its registered legislative representative, Henry H. Morse, formerly vice president of the Florence Stove Co.

During recent weeks when general tax legislation has again been under consideration by the House Ways and Means Committee, the institute has urgently requested its members to make personal contacts with their Congressmen and Senators. We believe it is of paramount importance for this tax to be removed because it is inflationary, adds an undue burden to the housing costs of veterans and others establishing new homes, and because the tax is beginning to be a deterrent to business in this industry.

In the early days of this session, Congressman KNUTSON, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, expressed the opin-

ion that excises should be cut, perhaps to the extent of $1,000,000,000, certainly a minimum of $800,000,000. Late in April he announced the abandonment of his plan for such a substantial cut in excise taxes this year, but stated that he believed some cut would have to be made in the communications tax and possibly in the tax on furs and cosmetics. All three of these come under the heading of war taxes because normal peacetime tax rates were doubled in the early days of World War II.

To confirm the statement made by Congressman KNUTSON, we also quote the following statement sent to a leading stove manufacturer by one of the outstanding Republicans in the Senate:

"I wish we could do away with all excise taxes, but this is entirely impossible under existing fiscal circumstances because the Government gets an enormous revenue from this total source (I believe the figure is something like $7,000,000,000 a year). It is next to impossible to deal with these repeals on an individual basis, because any one repeal immediately becomes an omnibus bill for all the rest. As you know, all tax legislation has to originate in the House. We had hoped that there could be a general excise revision this year. But I believe the House Committee on Ways and Means has now decided that it is impossible to proceed with the matter at the present session."

We are forced to the conclusion that there is little likelihood of getting tax relief now, but we are firmly convinced that manufacturers must continue to work unceasingly on this project in the interests of the buying public and of our dealer customers who are beginning to get sharp reaction to this high tax on appliances. For that reason we should like to have you review the following background material on this tax situation.

ENACTMENT

The excise tax on electric, gas, and oil cooking and water-heating appliances was imposed in the Revenue Act of 1941, for a two-fold purpose: Primarily, to restrict consumption of essential materials needed for the national defense; and, secondarily, to raise revenue for national defense. The original bill as passed by the House limited the tax on the products of this industry to electric appliances only and did not include gas and oil appliances. Subsequently, the Senate Finance Committee added gas and oil cooking stoves and water heaters in order to avoid any unfair competitive situation.

Section 3406 of the Revenue Act of 1941 also imposed excise taxes on various other types of consumer durable goods, but did not by any means cover all such products. Since that time this section has been amended and some of the products originally covered under the section are now free of excise tax, presumably because they are considered essential to the domestic economy. Of the more common household appliances, washing machines were never subject to the excise tax, and vacuum cleaners which originally bore a 10-percent tax were exempted by an amendment passed in 1943.

The Senate Finance Committee's report on the Revenue Act of 1943 contained this statement regarding the removal of the tax on vacuum cleaners:

"During the early part of the emergency, an excise tax was placed on vacuum cleaners. At the present time the tax is meaningless, since the article has not been manufactured since 1942. It does, however, threaten to put this industry at a competitive disadvantage as compared to producers of other untaxed electric appliances when manufacture is resumed. It was, therefore, felt advisable to repeal this tax now."

Congress, by adopting the vacuum-cleaner amendment in 1943, recognized the importance of avoiding discrimination in the imposition of excise taxes.

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF REPEAL

1. The tax was enacted as a temporary measure to curtail production.

The circumstances under which most of the excise taxes were imposed by the Revenue Act of 1941, and the remarks at committee hearings and in Congress at that time, indicate that these impositions were intended to be, and are, temporary measures and not a part of the permanent tax structure of this country.

In his testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives prior to the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1941, Leon Henderson, then Administrator of the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply, made this statement, which expresses one of the principal reasons for the enactment of the excise taxes at that time:

"Turning first to the proposals for excise taxes, the only case which may be made out for such additional taxation at the present time from a total defense point of view must rest upon its effectiveness in discouraging civilian production which competes with the defense program for men, materials, and machines. I have divided the excise-tax proposals of the Treasury into three groups. First, taxes on goods and services of mass consumption which in no way compete with the defense program. These are deflationary, unnecessary, and highly inequitable. Second, taxes on luxury items which likewise do not compete with the defense program. These are deflationary and unnecessary, but they are not so objectionable from the viewpoint of equity. And, third, taxes on articles, such as automobiles and refrigerators—a whole range of things—which compete very heavily for materials, productive facilities, and skills with defense production. This is the type of excise which is called for today."

Inasmuch as excise taxes on essential consumer goods are not a permanent part of the American system of taxation, and those on cooking ranges and water heaters were enacted as temporary measures for reasons which no longer exist, it seems to be clearly evident that they should now be repealed by Congress.

As long ago as July 1945, just before the end of the war, Hon. Fred M. Vinson, then Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, said in his report to Congress:

"Nearly all sales and excise taxes should be eliminated. They put an unfair and hidden tax on those with low incomes; they restrict markets for business."

2. Cooking stoves and water heaters are essential home appliances absolutely necessary to the health and welfare of the entire population.

They are not luxuries, and should not be classified for tax purposes with such luxury articles as jewelry, furs, amusements, cosmetics, and luggage. Ranges are used to cook three meals a day, and are used even more frequently when there are babies or invalids in the home. Their prime essentiality cannot be questioned. The need for water-heating equipment is almost as universally recognized as is the need for a range on which to prepare food.

3. The present tax schedule is discriminatory because it places a tax on certain household appliances while exempting others less essential.

As has been stated, vacuum cleaners and washing machines are free of tax. So are furniture, floor coverings, draperies, and many other items of household equipment. The reasons which impelled the Congress, in 1943, to remove the tax on vacuum cleaners to avoid a "competitive disadvantage as compared to producers of other untaxed electric appliances," are equally valid to support the removal of the excise tax on stoves.

4. The tax discriminates against low-income groups.

The excise tax on stoves is not borne by the manufacturer, but is passed on to the buyer and often pyramided in the process. It is a tax which bears hardest on the low-income groups, because purchases of cooking appliances and water heaters are not postponable if a new home is being established or if equipment in use has broken down and needs replacement.

5. It is illogical to impose a 10-percent tax on the purchase of two of the most important household necessities at a time when the Government is making every effort to reduce the cost of veterans' housing.

A returning veteran, reestablishing a home or building a new one, may purchase, tax-free, furniture, floor coverings, draperies, washing machine, vacuum cleaner, and other items of household equipment. Yet, the cooking range and water heater which he must have for his family's health are subject to a 10-percent excise tax.

6. The elimination of the tax will help to keep stove prices down, in line with the Government's policy.

The stove industry has made every possible effort to keep prices down in spite of rising labor and material costs.

Because distributors and dealers frequently mark up the excise tax along with the cost of the appliance, consumers would be saved substantial amounts, if the excise tax on cooking appliances and water heaters were removed.

7. The removal of taxes would stimulate production and employment.

Up to this time, stocks of ranges and water heaters have flowed steadily through the channels of distribution to ultimate users because of the tremendous backlog of demand which was built up during the war period. This situation is now rapidly changing. Backlogs of orders are declining and the industry is entering a buyer's market. The elimination of excise taxes will give a new impetus to the demand for ranges and water heaters, thereby assuring continuous production and increased employment.

TWO BILLS INTRODUCED

As a result of the industry's activities in 1945, Senator ROBERT A. TAFT introduced an amendment to the tax law of that year, which would have revoked the entire section of the code imposing taxes on our appliances. His bill was passed without opposition in the Senate, but was later used as a trading point in the conference committee meetings and was deleted from the bill submitted in the conference report.

A year later, Congressman JOHN BROPHY, Republican, of Milwaukee, introduced a bill removing the tax on ranges and water heaters, but his proposal has been pigeonholed in the Committee on Ways and Means. The only excise-tax measure which passed the House during the first session of the current Congress was one proposed by Mr. KNUTSON and recommending the removal of the tax on the first $25 of a purchase of costume jewelry, completely eliminating the tax on certain kinds of photographic equipment, and on musical instruments sold to public institutions. That bill, too, has been pigeonholed, but this time by the Finance Committee of the Senate.

CONCLUSIONS

Unquestionably the principal reason why it has been so difficult to get favorable consideration of the proposal to remove the tax on ranges and water heaters has been the steady upward trend of collections under section 3406 (a) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code, under which this tax is imposed. The following is a tabulation of collections under this section for the fiscal years ending on the dates indicated:

June 30, 1942	$18,000,000
June 30, 1943	7,000,000
June 30, 1944	5,000,000
June 30, 1945	12,000,000
June 30, 1946	25,500,000
June 30, 1947	65,600,000
9 months ending Mar. 31, 1948	63,500,000

The Republican majority in Congress recognizes that it has gone as far as possible in over-all tax reduction in view of rapidly rising costs of rearmament in this country, and of the European recovery plan for 16 countries outside the Russian orbit in western Europe. This fact is hardly disputable, but we believe that there are more equitable ways in which equivalent tax revenues can be raised than by a discriminatory tax on the most essential of all household appliances. For that reason, members of the industry producing either ranges or water heaters, are urged to keep this problem constantly before their congressional representatives so this unfair tax imposed on the buying public, often without its knowledge, can be removed at the earliest practicable date.

Rift With Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 28 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Rift With Britain," by Marquis Childs, published in the Washington Post today, May 28, 1948.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON CALLING
(By Marquis Childs)
RIFT WITH BRITAIN

A new British Ambassador is taking over in the big red brick mansion that was designed by Sir Edwin Lutyens to house His Britannic Majesty's envoy to this country. Forty-three years old, Sir Oliver Franks, who has never held a prior diplomatic or political post, faces at the moment of his arrival a grave crisis in the relationship between the two countries.

In the hope that it may be averted or somehow miraculously solved, there is a tendency on both sides of the Atlantic to say little about it. But this head-in-the-sand attitude cannot hide the seriousness of what is happening and, even more important, what can happen.

The cause is, of course, Palestine. There, in that tragic trouble center, the fearful consequences of both British and United States mistakes and failures are all too apparent.

The basic error is that the two countries have pursued separate and often competing policies, just as though the peace and stability of the world did not depend on a decent, practical working relationship between the two powers.

The British, in the Middle East, have gone right on playing the old-fashioned game of power politics. They have behaved as though nothing had happened since 1914. The game of pitting sheik against pasha, and pasha against sheik, could therefore be pursued in the merry old way.

The United States has followed first one line and then another line, the end result being a kind of irresponsible zigzag, with first one side irritated and angry and then the other side thrown into a frenzy. To many looking on from outside our borders, United States policy has seemed to be directed frequently by the expedience of domestic politics and at other times by so-called realists urging the need for oil reserves.

There have been some who have foreseen the disaster to which all this could lead. One was Lord Inverchapel, the retiring British Ambassador, who is returning to his Scottish estates after more than 40 years spent in the capitals of the world.

A longtime friend of Dr. Chaim Weizmann, the extraordinary genius who is now president of Israel, Inverchapel clearly foresaw where British policy was leading. He could, however, do little to alter that policy beyond the warnings that were contained in his urgent dispatches to the Foreign Office in London. It was a peculiarly difficult and unhappy position for a skilled diplomat who, in the war years, had seen in Chungking and Moscow the horror growing out of the errors and follies of another time.

The fact is that British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin has an emotional fixation on the whole question of Palestine. He cannot see it with any detachment. And this same emotionalism is reflected in important segments of British public opinion.

A matter of timing comes in here that worries responsible policy-makers.

Because, after lengthy hearings and extended debate, both Houses of Congress adopted the European recovery program, most people have assumed that that business is out of the way. But not at all. Under the powers he has taken unto himself, Chairman JOHN TABER of the House Appropriations Committee has held more than a month of separate hearings on ERP. The Senate Appropriations Committee is also holding separate hearings.

Whether they will attempt to cut the total of $5,300,000,000 authorized by Congress for European recovery is a question. Any cut in the amount will interfere seriously with the main objective of the program, which is the recovery of western Europe.

It is just here that the issue of Britain and Palestine comes in. The propaganda is growing to prevent funds from going to the British which they might use to send arms to the Arabs in the Middle East.

This is likely to find expression on the floor when the debate on the appropriation begins. It might well coincide with the economy plans of TABER and others. It would coincide also with an isolationist, anti-British bias from other quarters.

The consequence, it should be recognized now, could be ruinous to the entire European recovery program. Communism alone would gain, which is why joy among men in the Kremlin must be unconfined at the potentialities of the Palestine war.

London and Washington must quickly come to an agreement. That is the first task of the new Ambassador. The present drift, with surprises and recriminations from both capitals, is wicked folly, risking all the hopes for a stable and decent world.

Baptists Criticize Truman on Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on May 19, 8,000 delegates to the ninety-first annual session of the Southern Baptist Convention overwhelmingly voted against a motion to commend President Truman for his speedy recognition of the new Jewish state of Israel. I am including as part of my remarks an article by Mr. John N. Popham, bearing a Memphis, Tenn., date line and which appeared in the New York Times on Thursday, May 20:

BAPTISTS CRITICIZE TRUMAN ON ISRAEL—REFUSE COMMENDATION, CONSIDER SPEEDY RECOGNITION AS PLAYING POLITICS

(By John N. Popham)

MEMPHIS, TENN., May 19.—The 8,000 delegates to the ninety-first annual session of the Southern Baptist Convention overwhelmingly voted today against a motion to commend President Truman for officially recognizing the new Jewish state, Israel.

From the remarks made for and against the proposal and from the attitude of the delegates it was apparent that the defeat of the motion stemmed entirely from a desire to rebuke President Truman for "playing politics with the Jewish vote" during a national election year.

The proposal, broached by the Reverend Ed Solomon, of Jacksonville, Fla., editor of the Baptist Witness, drew from Dr. L. E. Barton, of Montgomery, Ala., convention parliamentarian, the statement that "I'm not very hot for sending anything to the President for recognizing Israel. The President was not doing anything for Palestine and then he saw he had lost the Jewish vote, so he recognized Israel 21 minutes after it had been declared a state by the Jews. It was strictly a political measure."

In a standing vote less than 100 delegates rose to signify favor for the motion. Virtually all stood in opposition.

Military Training and the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein, first, a recent statement of 83 college presidents in opposition to military training and the draft; and secondly, a resolution of the Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church at a church conference recently held at Boston to the same end.

These impressive pronouncements further indicate the widespread and determined opposition of diverse American religious and educational groups to pending proposals for the militarization of our institutions in the name of national defense.

To secure the Nation I favor a strong, all-powerful national defense embracing mighty Army, Navy, and Air units integrated and adapted to modern scientific advancements in the methods of warfare, but organized on the traditionally American voluntary basis which provides for professional career personnel rather than transient conscripts.

The matters referred to follow:

Eighty-three college presidents, including Robert Hutchins, University of Chicago; Rufus Harris, Tulane University; F. X. N. McGuire, O. S. A., Villanova University, Pa.; James A. Colston, Georgia State College; and W. C. Giersbach, Pacific University, Oreg., today attacked the proposal for selective service and universal military training now before Congress.

The complete text of statement and list of sponsors follows:

"We believe it would be a serious mistake for the United States to begin a policy of peacetime military conscription. In addition to the fact that peacetime conscription has not prevented war, we do not believe

that a case has been made for adoption of selective service now. Not only have our own military leaders assured us that 'war is not imminent,' but they have cast real doubt upon the need for a peacetime draft. The testimony of the Air Force and the Navy that they can get enough volunteers and that only the Army needs a draft, raises a question as to the wisdom of drastically changing our peacetime tradition and establishing a compulsory system for just one of the three military branches.

"The Army has not shown conclusively that it cannot get enough volunteers. It is still turning down thousands of recruits because it has lifted its passing grade from 70 to 80 in the Army general classification test. We can see no reason why the grade could not be lowered to 70 for the time being.

"We also believe that the Army should thoroughly revise its court-martial system in harmony with the demands of veterans' organizations so as to safeguard the rights of enlisted men. In addition, if the Army would modify its officer-caste system as suggested by the Doolittle Board, more men would undoubtedly enlist. Improved housing for enlisted men is also important.

"Conscription ought not to be established as a peacetime policy. Not only does it mean more military influence in our domestic life, but it is a further step in the direction of an armaments race. If the United States accepts the draft and in effect makes force and the threat of force the basis of our foreign policy, we shall make it difficult ever to build a genuine peace. Tension and conflict among nations will seem normal.

"Democracy cannot thrive if the resources of our Nation are steadily poured into weapons and the energies of our people are diverted into military service. Democracy can defeat communism only if it has a greater dynamic and a better program to offer the peoples of the world. We do not believe that a proposal for compulsory military training and service is a step in the direction of either peace or freedom."

The list of sponsors is as follows:

Eugene S. Briggs, president, Phillips University, Enid, Okla.

Howard C. Ackley, president, Green Mountain Junior College, Poultney, Vt.

J. Evan Armstrong, president, Armstrong College, Berkeley, Calif.

Henry J. Arnold, president, Hartwick College, Oneonta, N. Y.

C. H. Becker, president, Wartburg College, Waverly, Iowa.

A. D. Beittel, Talladega College, Talladega, Ala.

Howard J. Bell, Jr., president, Jamestown College, Jamestown, N. Dak.

Conrad Bergendoff, Augustana College and Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Ill.

F. A. Beu, president, Western Illinois State College, Macomb, Ill.

Raymond W. Bixler, president, Ashland College, Ashland, Ohio.

Rufus D. Bowman, president, Bethany Biblical Seminary, Chicago, Ill.

Gervas A. Carey, president, Pacific College, Newberg, Oreg.

James A. Colston, president, Georgia State College, Savannah, Ga.

C. Ernest Davis, president, La Verne College, Calif.

Luther J. Derby, president, Ferrum Junior College, Ferrum, Va.

Charles S. Detweiler, acting president, Bacone College, Bacone, Okla.

Bertram W. Doyle, dean, Louisville Municipal College, Louisville, Ky.

Walter A. Erley, president, Sherwood Music School, Chicago, Ill.

Mother M. Erskine, president, College of the Sacred Heart, Grand Coteau, La.

Eugene S. Farley, Wilkes College, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

T. O. Firing, president, Evanston Collegiate Institute, Evanston, Ill.

Very Rev. John A. Flynn, C. M., S. T. D., president, St. John's University, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Sister Mary Frederick, president, Dunbarton College of Holy Cross, Washington, D. C.

Ellis A. Fuller, president, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky.

K. R. Galle, dean, Arkansas City Junior College, Arkansas City, Kans.

W. C. Giersbach, Pacific University, Forest Grove, Oreg.

Walter A. Groves, president, Centre College of Kentucky, Danville, Ky.

Walter B. Hammer, dean, Estherville Junior College, Estherville, Iowa.

George H. Hand, president, Fairmont State College, West Virginia.

W. H. Harless, president, Gila Junior College, Thatcher, Ariz.

Rufus C. Harris, president, Tulane University, New Orleans, La.

S. J. Harrison, Adrian College, Adrian, Mich.

Victor P. Henry, president, Lindsey Wilson Junior College, Columbia, Ky.

H. S. Hilley, president, Atlantic Christian College, Wilson, N. C.

W. P. Hieronymus, president, Midland College, Fremont, Nebr.

Cecil E. Hinshaw, president, William Penn College, Oskaloosa, Iowa.

Dr. H. D. Hopkins, Defiance College, Defiance, Ohio.

Robert Hutchins, chancelor, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Sister M. Ildephonse, president, Mount Mercy Junior College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

Mordecai W. Johnson, president, Howard University, Washington, D. C.

Thomas E. Jones, president, Earlham College, Richmond, Ind.

William C. Jones, president, Whittier College, Whittier, Calif.

Marvin C. Knudson, president, Pueblo Junior College, Pueblo, Colo.

William F. Kraushaar, president, Texas Lutheran College, Seguin, Tex.

H. J. Long, Greenville College, Greenville, Ill.

John Long, president, Southern Christian Institute, Edwards, Miss.

Very Rev. D. P. Lyons, S. S. E., president, St. Michael's College, Winooski Park, Vt.

Alton C. Mamath, president, Los Angeles Pacific College, California.

Samuel D. Marble, president, Wilmington College, Wilmington, Ohio.

William F. McConn, president, Marion College, Marion, Ind.

Wm. M. McCreery, Sterling College, Sterling, Kans.

Robert W. McEwen, president, Blackburn College, Carlinville, Ill.

A. C. McGiffert, Jr., president, Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago.

Francis X. N. McGuire, president, Villanova College, Villanova, Pa.

J. C. McMillan, president, State Normal and Industrial College, Ellendale, N. Dak.

J. D. Messick, president, East Carolina Teachers College, Greenville, N. C.

J. C. Nichols, acting president, Fenn College, Cleveland, Ohio.

Henry Olson, president, Buena Vista College, Storm Lake, Iowa.

Albert S. Parker, Jr., president, Hanover College, Hanover, Ind.

Louise Pearce, M. D., president, Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

W. W. Peters, McPherson College, McPherson, Kans.

Edwin McNeill Poteat, president, Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, Rochester, N. Y.

Nathan M. Pusey, Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis.

Lloyd L. Ramseyer, Bluffton College, Bluffton, Ohio.

George N. Reeves, president, Chapman College, Los Angeles, Calif.

Irvin T. Richards, president, Cambridge Junior College, Cambridge, Mass.

Lawrence Rose, dean, General Theological Seminary, New York City.

F. W. Schroeder, president, Eden Theological Seminary, Webster Groves, Mo.

H. Leon Sheppard, president, Arnold College, Milford, Conn.

G. Morris Smith, president, Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove, Pa.

Harlond L. Smith, director, New York State Agricultural and Technical Institute.

Sister M. Sylvia, Marywood College, Scranton, Pa.

Harold Taylor, president, Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville, N. Y.

Albert L. Turner, dean of Law School, North Carolina College, Durham, N. C.

G. T. Vander Lugt, president, Central College, Pella, Iowa.

S. A. Watson, president, Friends University, Wichita, Kans.

F. E. Welfle, S. J., president, John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio.

David Andrew Weaver, Shurtleff College, Alton, Ill.

L. A. Welliver, president, Westminster Theological Seminary, Westminster, Md.

Herbert D. Welte, president, Teachers College of Connecticut, New Britain, Conn.

Gilbert F. White, president, Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.

Robert Wilken, O. F. M., president, Catholic Teachers College of New Mexico, Albuquerque, N. Mex.

Samuel Young, president, Eastern Nazarene College, Quincy, Mass.

COMMISSION ON WORLD PEACE
OF THE METHODIST CHURCH,
Chicago, Ill., May 25, 1948.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It is of the utmost importance that we inform you of the overwhelming opposition to any form of peacetime universal military training or conscription evidenced in the vote of the general conference of the Methodist Church, meeting in Boston, April 28 to May 8, 1948.

This action of the highest authoritative body of the Methodist Church expresses the official attitude of the church. The statement of opposition as adopted is attached. The vote was six or more to one in opposition.

We earnestly hope you will help to defeat peacetime military conscription measures now pending.

Ever sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. BOSS, Jr.,
Executive Secretary.

THE COUNCIL OF BISHOPS AND THE GENERAL CONFERENCE ON THE SUBJECT OF UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND PEACETIME CONSCRIPTION

The episcopal address adopted unanimously by the bishops of the Methodist Church and signed by all of them includes the following references: "The implacable opposition of Methodism to universal military training," and "would the three billions of dollars advocated for universal military training bring greater security to this land than a similar three billions used to perfect our educational life, to provide proper security for old age and those who are incapacitated, arrange to bring thousands of young people from overseas to study in our universities, to learn of our democracy and to return with our democratic ideals to their own lands? We are being high-pressured into unwise ways by men who lack wisdom."

The general conference of the Methodist Church, by an overwhelming vote of its approximately 800 delegates—with only a handful of votes against—adopted the following statement:

REDUCTION AND CONTROL OF ARMAMENTS

"We recognize the need of national defense. When nations rely primarily on military force, both the spiritual and economic foundations of peace are undermined. Fear

and suspicion increase the danger of hostilities; the diversion of wealth to this channel withdraws it from the constructive pursuits of peace. The militarization of the public mind reduces the possibility of the free interplay of ideas. We emphasize the following statement from the Episcopal address:

"'Religious leaders and men charged with political responsibility must face a fundamental fact. Ideas cannot be destroyed by military force. It is possible to destroy the cities of an enemy, to bring his armed forces to surrender, in a word, to defeat him as far as the physical power to resist is concerned. But an ideology cannot be suffocated by poison gas nor demolished by atomic bombs. Ideas are conquered by better ideas whose truth has been revealed in practices that enrich personality.'

"The Charter of the United Nations opens the way to halting the armament race. On December 16, 1946, the General Assembly passed a resolution which includes principles and general procedures for the control and reduction of armaments. We regret that more has not been done to implement this action. We call upon our governments to take the lead in making this action effective.

"Seven church-wide organizations of the Methodist Church, led by the council of bishops, have declared their opposition to any system of peacetime universal military training. We reaffirm this stand. We appeal to the United States to give bold leadership looking toward the universal abolition of peacetime conscription by or through the United Nations."

The Housing Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered over Station WIND, in Chicago, on May 21, 1948:

THE HOUSING SITUATION

Good evening. I would like to talk with you about housing. We are all aware that there is a serious housing shortage. At present prices, comparatively few people can afford to build or buy or even rent new houses

About 3 weeks ago the Senate passed the Taft-Ellender-Wagner long-range housing bill which I hope will be enacted into law during this session of Congress. Unfortunately, a similar bill has been bottled up in the House Committee on Banking and Currency for over 2 years and the Republican Members, constituting a majority of the committee, are now delaying action on the Senate bill.

In the last year, I have received thousands of letters and telegrams from people in Chicago describing their housing problems. Most of those needing living quarters most desperately are veterans who came home to find the available space taken and people living on low fixed incomes who are simply not able to secure housing facilities at prices they can pay.

This housing shortage is not new. The late President Roosevelt, years ago, said that one-third of the Nation was ill-housed, which is true today.

Though the President created several housing agencies in the hope of providing decent housing quarters, unfortunately, the real-estate operators and construction contractors have thwarted in every way the efforts of these Government agencies and impeded the efforts of Wilson Wyatt, former housing expediter who, no doubt, had he been given any real aid or cooperation, would have been able to relieve the housing shortage to a great degree. Unfortunately, he was, in every way, opposed by the real-estate operators and contractors who claimed that if restrictions were removed they would be able to build a sufficient number of homes to meet the needs of thousands of ex-servicemen and American families.

One of the first acts of the Republican Congress early in 1947 was to pass a law abolishing priorities for home construction. It was the claim of the Republican majority that if private capital and contractors were not restricted in their procurement of housing materials, they would be able to construct low-cost homes. That promise was not kept as you know and, instead, the contractors devoted themselves to the building of $10,000, $15,000, $20,000, and $25,000 residences, which are out of reach to ex-servicemen and people of average income.

In 1947 about 2,000,000 married couples were living doubled up in homes with other families. Nearly 300,000 married couples were living in rooming houses and tourist camps and hotels. In 1948, it is estimated there are more new families than there were in 1947.

Not only in Chicago, but throughout the entire country, we have had a particularly severe problem because of our greatly increased population.

During recent months the problem has rapidly become even more serious. A survey made by the Census Bureau in April 1947 shows that of the 1,344,000 housing units in the Chicago metropolitan district, only 2,310 were actually available for rental purposes and only 385 were for sale.

Anyone familiar with renting conditions in Chicago knows that the high rents demanded for these vacant units could not be paid by our ex-servicemen or families living on small incomes.

In addition to this shortage of houses, there is another issue involved. Millions of American families are compelled to live in substandard shelters and in slums because they can find no other places available.

Those statistics do not, in themselves, tell the entire story, but I am sure each of you knows from personal experience—as I do—how serious the problem is.

To add to the difficulty, we have shortages of material and shortages of skilled labor. Unfortunately, a large part of the houses now being built are built to sell at prices only a minority can afford. I might say, here, in all fairness to our builders, that they did, last year, build houses which, however, were only available to people having incomes of $10,000 and upward. Even so, the total number was less than one-half the number that competent authorities estimate is needed every year to bring about an adequate supply of homes.

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill which was passed by the Senate several weeks ago is certainly not a perfect housing bill. That was admitted by its most ardent proponents in the Senate during the debate. But in contrast to previous efforts, it has a long history of study and consideration and is designed as a long-range coordinated plan in contrast to the piecemeal legislation of recent years.

This proposal originated in 1945 when a special committee was established to study the housing problem. After lengthy hearings, legislation was introduced in 1946, which was passed by the Senate but was not enacted into law because the House failed to act.

Again in 1947 the same bill was favorably reported to the Senate and during the recess of Congress subcommittees held further hearings throughout the country to determine what changes and improvements could be made.

The purpose of the new bill passed in the Senate is to establish a long-range housing program, to coordinate the activities of all housing agencies now in existence, and to provide effective Government aid and encouragement for the construction of public housing throughout the Nation for all income groups.

Here are some of the provisions in this bill: It provides for a program of technical housing research to help the housing industry reduce building costs. It increases the amount available for loans and improves home-financing arrangements. It provides encouragement for prefabricated and large-scale site construction and for large-scale building. It offers certain tax benefits in connection with rental housing to encourage building for rental. I might say, in this connection, that normally considerably more than one-half of our houses are built for rental; but this ratio is now reversed so drastically that only a small percentage are built for rental. Surveys demonstrate that those who most need housing prefer to rent or must rent.

Particular attention is given to the problems of veterans. For example, the bill provides that when groups of five or more veterans get together to build homes, they can receive loans up to 95 percent and can also be provided with technical assistance. Veterans' preferences for available housing will be extended. GI loans are made more attractive to financing institutions. The various preferences for veterans are made available to families of veterans who were killed or died during their period of service. This bill provides a sound, realistic approach to the solution of the problem we have had with us for so long. However, the States and the municipalities cannot relax their efforts. This shortage cannot be solved overnight by Federal legislation alone.

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill has been opposed by some on the grounds that it is socialistic and that it is primarily a public housing bill. That charge is not justified by the facts.

Under one section of this comprehensive bill there is a limited program of public housing for low-income groups where the State and local authorities specifically request it. Yet here, too, the principal purpose is to encourage and expand private construction. Under this bill 92½ percent of the construction is for private sale or private rental, for the benefit of the great majority of people in middle-income groups who are unable to find suitable housing.

It would indeed seem strange, if in this Nation of great wealth and tremendous production, we could not provide housing consistent with the other components of our standard of living. We sometimes forget that we gave our veterans every moral guaranty when they were fighting that when they came back they would return to a normal mode of living. Certainly the present living quarters of many of our veterans could hardly be described as normal.

The present housing conditions are a serious reflection upon the Republican Congress who promised so much. It would be a betrayal of our obligations if we did not make every effort to change this condition which was often lamented but never alleviated during the 1930's owing to the Hoover crash, and which, because of the almost complete stoppage of building during the war, resulted in postwar crisis.

If the Republicans fail to pass the bill as they have failed to enact other legislation in the interest of the millions in the low-earning group, namely, the white-collar worker and people of low, fixed incomes, their dream of victory this year will never come true.

I suggest that you write to your Congressman urging him to cooperate in forcing the

House committee to report the bill out and to vote for the bill when it reaches the floor of the House.

What They Said

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following press release by Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill, former Representative from Indiana:

WHAT THEY SAID

"I do not want, and I will not accept, the political support of Henry Wallace and his Communists" (Harry S. Truman, 1946).

"The only thing I regret, the only thing, is that my nomination meant the defeat of Wallace" (Harry S. Truman, 1944).

"I think Henry is perfect. I like him. He's the kind of fellow I want around. He's honest. He thinks right" (Franklin D. Roosevelt, 1940, when he dropped Garner for Wallace).

"I welcome the support of anyone who will help keep the President in office" (Harry S. Truman, 1944).

"American Communists * * * will in 1944 support Franklin D. Roosevelt for President of the United States" (Earl Browder, 1944).

"Harry Truman can find courage in the knowledge that he is fighting in the brave and goodly company of Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Wilson, and Roosevelt" (Henry Wallace, 1946).

"If Truman is nominated, our Democratic Party is sunk, and if he is elected the country is sunk" (former Governor and Ambassador, George H. Earle, 1947).

"The Soviet Union is enti led to take such steps as it may judge best to create a regional system in eastern Europe" (Sumner Welles, Assistant Secretary of State, 1945).

"I think they (the Communists) are a greater menace than Hitler was" (W. Averell Harriman, former Ambassador to Russia, 1948).

"The war is but a step in the revolution" (Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, 1944).

"Is there a single reason why we cannot make a peace to end the cold war?" (Henry A. Wallace, 1948).

"It is not only senseless but criminal to wage a war for the destruction of Hitlerism camouflaged as a fight for democracy" (Molotov, 1939).

"All nonsense about sovietizing the Baltic States is only in the interest of our common enemies (Molotov, October 1939).

"The friendship of Germany and the Soviet Union, cemented by blood, has every reason to be lasting and firm" (Stalin, 1939).

"For more than 2 years American and British politicians have considered Czechoslovakia as their easy potential prey" (Andrei Gromyko, 1948).

"General Marshall has just testified that notwithstanding these vast postwar military expenditures our military defense is a hollow shell" (Senator HARRY F. BYRD, 1948).

"War is neither imminent nor inevitable" (Rear Adm. E. M. Zacharias, 1948).

"$172,000,000 spent by American taxpayers to help kill 20,000 Greek guerrillas works out to $8,600 per guerrilla * * * An additional $275,000,000 * * * means $22,500 per guerrilla which seems a pretty high price" (Harold L. Ickes, 1948).

"President Roosevelt is within the law sending munitions to Stalin. The lease-lend law gives him that discretion. * * * But in his discretion he could have refused. * * * Who is our new friend? He is an Asiatic Mongol who turned Norway, Denmark, France, Belgium, Holland, Greece, and England over to Hitler's bombers. He let Hitler crush Poland and for his reward, crept over that stricken land like a ghoul plundering the dead. He is the rapist of Finland. * * * 'He who lies down with dogs will get up with fleas,' as Poor Richard says" (Pettengill, in this space, October 1941).

"Don't write Wallace off. * * * He is in the doghouse now, but in another year or two he may * * * head the peace parade to Moscow" (Pettengill, October 1946).

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

Jenkins Bill Is Unconstitutional Imposition on Free Trade and Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5645, the Jenkins bill, to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes, is, in my opinion, ill-advised, unconstitutional, and not only would create trade barriers among the States, but is in fact an imposition on domestic free trade and on private enterprise and initiative. Enactment of this proposed legislation would tend to destroy a legitimate form of business and would create a very dangerous precedent. The potential ultimate effect of such legislation on private enterprise and on States' rights can scarcely be conceived.

Before going further, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the fact that a certain proponent of H. R. 5645 has stated for the record that those in Delaware and other States who engage in a mail-order cigarette business are bootleggers. As everyone knows, a bootlegger is one who enages in a business which is in violation of the law.

With the greatest possible emphasis, I wish to state that I will not stand idly by while such unfounded and abusive statements are made concerning those people in Delaware who are engaged in a mail-order cigarette business. It must be wholly clear to anyone that the operation of such a business in Delaware is conducted honestly and in full compliance with all existing legislation. It cannot be construed in any sense as being illegal; and, consequently, the facts themselves refute and prove to be wholly untrue any charge of bootlegging.

As a matter of fact, it appears that those proponents of H. R. 5645, by making such a charge, are merely admitting the incompetence of their own State officials to obtain compliance with the statutes of their States and their desperate need for the help of certain people in Delaware to enforce the laws in these other States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all the Members of this House to give fullest consideration to the provisions of this bill and their probable consequences. For example, this bill, in complete contravention of constitutional rights, subjects a citizen of one State to the laws of another State. Furthermore, this bill requires a citizen of one State to become, at his own expense and without remuneration or reimbursement, a law enforcement agent for another State. Passage of this bill would have a vital and drastic effect upon numerous, wholly legitimate private business enterprises.

I ask the Members to determine in their own mind, in a fair and unbiased manner, whether the legislative body of any of our States has the right or the power to enact legislation which would immediately affect and require compliance by citizens of other States. I feel sure that the Members will agree at once that such a situation would be not only highly undesirable, but clearly and definitely an invasion of State's rights and the well-established and fully guaranteed rights of private citizens.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the relatively small revenue-raising results of this bill cannot offset the dangerous and far-reaching effects of the proposed legislation. Consequently, I most sincerely urge the Members to vote to defeat this measure, which is invidious and in contradiction of our long-established, world-proclaimed concept of government and justice under the law.

The Navy Speaks Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N. Y., May 20, 1948, entitled "The Navy Speaks Up," and an article appearing in the same newspaper on May 19, 1948, entitled "Navy's Plea for Heavy Carrier Cites Record in Jap Air War":

[From the Buffalo (N. Y.) Evening News of May 20, 1948]

THE NAVY SPEAKS UP

Whatever the cause, it is good to note that the case for naval aviation has finally begun to get a hearing in Congress. Heretofore, as the News pointed out last week, the Navy has been virtually muzzled while the Air Force has been pictured as the exclusive proprietor of air power. The jobs that sea-based aircraft can do as well or better, and the fact that naval aviation is also a vital arm of air power, have all but been ignored. But whether it be a change in policy or only a temporary slipping of the gag, the Navy has begun to speak up.

Appearing before a House subcommittee to urge that construction of 13 other ships be suspended so the money could be used for a giant carrier, Secretary of the Navy Sullivan made his case for naval aviation

bluntly and forthrightly. It was, so far as we know, the first time since unification that the Navy has spoken so plainly about the relative merits of carrier-based and land-based aircraft. To make his point, he cited with just pride the Navy's air record in the Pacific war.

During that war, 29 major United States carriers experienced 3,285 days of actual combat—days during which the ships or their air group engaged in actual battle with the enemy. And in all that time, only five of these carriers were sunk, three by Jap carrier aircraft, two by submarines. "Not one fleet or light carrier," Mr. Sullivan notes, "was lost during the entire war as the result of an attack by land-based aircraft." That should dispose of the old chestnut that carriers are unreasonably vulnerable to land-based air attack.

As for the job that carrier aviation did in that war, and presumably can do again if a major landing operation becomes necessary—the job of winning and holding air supremacy where it counts—listen to Secretary Sullivan's description of the 3-month-long Okinawa campaign:

"Four hundred and fifty thousand men in the Ground Forces were ashore to do that job. To transport them and to keep them supplied * * * a fleet of over 1,200 ships was required. To do that job those ships had to stay in restricted waters close to shore. The only close air support was furnished * * * from carriers.

"The Japanese * * * lost 7,830 aircraft, of which number 4,155 were shot down by the Fleet that came to stay. During those entire 3 months * * * when the Japanese were making their most hysterical and desperate kamikaze attacks * * * and lost 7,830 airsraft, they did not succeed in sinking one single American carrier, one single American battleship, one single cruiser or one single transport." In that engagement, the Navy operated 63 carriers (including escort carriers) against at least 8,000 enemy aircraft; not one American carrier was sunk, only 13 were damaged, and only 5 were damaged seriously enough to force withdrawal.

The Navy makes no effort here to confuse its air-power functions with the Air Force function of strategic bombing. But it has at last made the claim, and backed it impressively, that the Navy, too, has a vital job to do in winning and holding control of the air over hostile beaches, ports, and coastal hinterlands. This is more than it has claimed previously—apparently more than it has been allowed to claim. It should help to give a better-balanced understanding of what air power really is.

[From the Buffalo (N. Y.) Evening News of May 19, 1948]

NAVY'S PLEA FOR HEAVY CARRIER CITES RECORD IN JAP AIR WAR

(By James L. Wright)

WASHINGTON, May 19.—Gradually the muzzling of the United St te. Navy for the glorification of the Air Force is being relaxed.

Until a few days ago it was impossible to get anything like an official comparison of the effectiveness of naval aviation and land-based planes of the Army Air Force in World War II, but the appearance last Friday of Secretary of the Navy John L. Sullivan before the Heavy Munitions Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee has had the effect of partially removing the official gag.

To justify his recommendations to Congress that completion of 13 new naval vessels be suspended indefinitely, so the money might be spent instead on a giant aircraft carrier "because of the more immediate operational need in case of emergency," Secretary Sullivan had to go into some detail on the achievements of naval aviation and its plans for the future.

HEAVIER CARRIERS PLANNED

"We seek," said he in summarizing his arguments, "the suspension of the construction on 13 vessels in which we could at some future date incorporate the developments which our research may indicate.

"While deferring the completion of these ships, funds in lesser amounts are sought in the defense budget for the fiscal year of 1949 to lay down a shipbuilding and conversion program of prototypes which will insure that your Navy continues to take advantage of the latest in science and research."

After the hearing the full committee approved his request as well as a bill to let the Department of Defense hang on to about 200 surplus World War II plants as a reserve.

Mr. Sullivan told the committee that the Navy contemplates the use of much heavier carriers, with the faster and heavier naval aircraft now being developed, and that these ships and carriers "are to play their effective role in the national defense." He revealed that jet aircraft will be introduced on a large scale in both land-based and carrier-based types.

SUB TYPES STRESSED

"This new construction and conversion program," said the Secretary, "is planned to give the Navy the prototypes of the new ships which are necessary if the Navy is to keep abreast of the trends of attack and defense and perform the missions assigned by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

"One of the primary missions of the Navy is to become progressively more competent in methods of submarine and antisubmarine warfare. This task requires the development of prototypes of the latest submarine and antisubmarine vessels. The construction program in the original 1949 estimates very reasonably and realistically calls for the construction of one specially designed antisubmarine ship, the construction of four new submarines of the latest types, and the conversion of two existing submarines for special services."

WOULD CONVERT ONE CARRIER

"One naval mission of the greatest importance is to control the air over the sea and over hostile beaches, ports, and coastal hinterlands so as to be able to attack and strike home decisively at targets vital to the success of naval operations. This naval mission must not be confused with strategic bombing, which is a primary function of the Air Force.

"In order to give the Navy prototypes of the heavier carriers which will be required when the faster and heavier naval aircraft presently being developed are to play their effective role in the national defense, the original estimates for 1949 call for the conversion of one Essex class fleet carrier so that it may handle these present planes.

"In order to give the Navy a prototype carrier able to base some of the naval aircraft of the future, the President's program calls for the construction of one new, large, flush-deck carrier."

DEFENDED BY JET PLANES

"The size of this carrier is dictated by the size and weight of the carrier aircraft of the future.

"There has been some public comment that this carrier would be unreasonably vulnerable to land-based air attack. Any realistic appraisal of the chances of our carriers, including the flush-deck carrier, against land-based air must assume that our carriers will be operating jet aircraft. Whatever margin of performance characteristics might have existed in favor of land-based aircraft over carrier-based aircraft before and during the last war, this margin has been appreciably reduced by the introduction of jet aircraft into both land-based and carrier-based types. Very conservatively, therefore, we can go back to the experience of the last war and evaluate the vulnerability of carriers, including the flush-deck carrier, to land-based aircraft."

CITES WAR RECORD

"The United States operated 20 fleet carriers and 9 light carriers during the war. These 29 carriers operated 461 months in forward areas subject to enemy land-based air attack. These 461 months are exclusive of time spent in the United States for routine overhaul, time on shake-down, etc.

"Of these 29, we lost 3 fleet carriers and 2 light carriers. Two fleet carriers and one light carrier were sunk by Japanese carrier aircraft, one fleet carrier and one light carrier were sunk by Japanese submarines. Not one fleet or light carrier was lost during the entire war as the result of an attack by land-based aircraft. Incidentally, the three fleet carriers sunk were all lost during the first year of the war before the Navy developed its technique of fighting fires."

LESSON OF OKINAWA

"These statistics are, of course, based upon the use of conventional-type bombs and torpedoes. The experiments at Bikini have proved, however, that a fast-moving fleet is an unprofitable target for an atomic bomb.

"In the onward march on Japan it became necessary to take the island of Okinawa. Four hundred and fifty thousand men in the Marines and Ground Forces went ashore to do that job. To transport them and to keep them supplied with ammunition, food, medical supplies, and equipment of all kinds a fleet of over 1,200 ships was required. To do that job those ships had to stay in restricted waters close to shore. The only close air support was furnished to the ground troops by naval and Marine aviators from carriers.

"I do not have the number of aircraft the Japanese had available in that engagement, but I do know that they lost 7,830 aircraft of which number 4,155 were shot down by the fleet that came to stay."

ONLY LIGHTER SHIPS LOST

"During those 3 months from March 22 to June 22, 1945, when the Japanese were making their most hysterical and desperate kamikaze attacks on these 1,200 ships, only 231 ships were damaged by enemy action and many of these were quickly repaired. Only 36 American ships were sunk. Of this number 12 were destroyers, 2 were destroyer escorts and the rest were smaller craft. In other words, in a 3-months' engagement in which the Japanese lost 7,830 aircraft, they did not succeed in sinking one single American carrier, one single American battleship, one single cruiser or one single transport.

"In that engagement we operated 63 carriers, of which 18 were Essex class, 7 were light carriers, and 38 were escort carriers."

ALL VALUABLE TO NAVY

"Not one carrier was sunk and only 13 carriers damaged in a 90-day conflict against at least 8,000 aircraft, and only 5 were damaged seriously enough to require withdrawal.

"All of thse prototype ships, including the flush-deck carrier, which the Navy is requesting in its new construction program, will be most valuable additions to the fleet and will strengthen the Navy in maintaining surveillance over the large sea areas of the globe and insuring the uninterrupted use of the sea lanes which are so vital to the existence of the United States."

Secretary Sullivan appeared at the Capitol, primarily to recommend the suspension of construction of the battleship *Kentucky* and the large cruiser *Hawaii*.

He said that the *Kentucky* and *Hawaii* would be more useful to the fleet if they are used as guided-missile ships.

Recognition of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I am including an article which appeared ir the New York Times on May 20, written by Stephen B. L. Penrose, Jr., president-elect of the American University of Beirut, Lebanon. Mr. Penrose is an outstanding educator and well acquainted with the problems in the Middle East. It is a most timely contribution in view of the situation that now exists in the Middle East.

OUR RECOGNITION OF ISRAEL—AUTHORITY OF PRESIDENT QUESTIONED, TREATMENT BY PRESS CRITICIZED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The announcement of the Zionists of the establishment of their state, Israel, seems to have been accepted by the American press as if it were a solution to the problem of Palestine. The President's unprecedented haste to recognize this embryonic, unproved state has gone without criticism in spite of his autocratic omission from consultation of the Department of State or of the American delegation to the United Nations. It is high time that Americans began to be more critical in their approach to international affairs.

The Zionist declaration of independence was contrary to the expressed wish of a majority of the United Nations, who realized that such an overt act would make impossible a truce in Palestine and would precipitate action by the Arab States. There has been no criticism yet directed at the Zionists for thus flouting the United Nations. Yet criticism is surely deserved and should be forthcoming. We are only too quick to criticize the intransigence of the Arabs, which is relatively pale by contrast.

ACTION OF PRESIDENT

The President's curiously personal, unilateral pronouncement of recognition took no account of the United Nations, undercut his own delegation to the United Nations, bypassed the advice of the National Security Council, of the area experts in the State Department, the Military Establishment, and the Central Intelligence Agency, to say nothing of the Congress.

Such a decision, so hastily and secretly taken, on a subject freighted with such import for world peace and security that the United Nations has spent months on it without reaching a decision, is not only dictatorial but dangerous in its many implications. Yet there has been no criticism from the press, which is supposed to be the guardian of our democratic principles.

The President's action has, in effect, made a mockery of United States participation in the United Nations, has given our blessing to the intensification of divisive nationalism rather than to the principles of friendship among nations and conciliation of international differences, has aligned this country in opposition to the sovereign Arab nations and to the entire Moslem world of 300,000,000 people. Yet there have as yet been no questions raised concerning the right or authority of the President, single-handedly to commit this Nation to such an astounding and dangerous program.

In the General Assembly the reaction of the Arab representatives to word of America's recognition of Israel should give us profound pause. Duped, betrayed, were words they used. And why not? They had for weeks negotiated with confidence in the good faith of the American delegation, which was trying desperately to arrange a truce in Palestine. In the very midst of those negotiations word arrived of the President's action. Our own delegation was shocked and embarrassed.

SERIES OF BLUNDERS

The only comparable situation in our recent experience was the attack on Pearl Harbor while Nomura and Kurusu were supposedly conducting discussions in good faith in Washington. On that occasion we were on the receiving end—and we didn't like it. Yet now the general impression given in the press is that the Zionists and the President are somehow admirable, while the Arabs merit no consideration anyway. This is a far cry from the spirit of fair play which is supposedly typical of Americans. In reality it is the most discreditable performance yet in a whole series of American blunders relative to Palestine. Of this one we should be profoundly ashamed.

If America sincerely wishes to destroy the hopes of the world in her wise leadership in this time of crisis, she is taking the right path by embarking on a program of duplicity for reasons of supposed political expediency. I cannot believe that when the implications of our Palestine action are made plain to the American people they will fail to make a sincere effort to rectify it. For the benefit of our future, both at home and abroad, I pray that it may not already be too late for such an effort to bear fruit. There is no time to lose.

STEPHEN B. L. PENROSE, Jr.,
President-elect, American University of Beirut, Lebanon.
CHEVY CHASE, MD., *May 16, 1948.*

Our American Watchmaking Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, during the war our American watchmaking facilities were given over almost entirely to the war effort. This resulted in a situation in which over 80 percent of the American market for watches was taken over by the Swiss watch industry. The net result of this flood of Swiss watches was to saturate the American market for watches, thereby removing all chance of a backlog of demand to encourage and stimulate the American watch industry to expand and rebuild.

The 1936 Swiss trade agreement promised so much but resulted in so little. In fact, it is one trade agreement that has injured an important American industry to the great detriment of our national defense. Both Army leaders and Navy leaders warned against entering into any trade agreement that would weaken or injure the American watch industry because of the importance of that industry to our war effort and our war needs, but the State Department ignored those warnings. Today our watch industry is suffering as a result of our so-called reciprocal trade program.

Mr. Speaker, the situation confronting the watchmaking industry of America today is so well analyzed in the following editorial taken from the Chicago Tribune of Wednesday, May 26, 1948, that I submit it as an essential part of my remarks. This editorial deserves the careful consideration of those Members of Congress that so enthusiastically supported the administration's proposal for a 3-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act.

FOREIGN COMPETITION FOR AMERICAN WATCHES

The American watch industry which gave up most of its regular business during the war in order to turn out precision instruments needed by the Army and Navy has been shabbily treated by the Government in the postwar period.

The Swiss, aided by the reciprocal trade agreement negotiated by the foreign-minded clique in the State Department, were able to entrench themselves in the market here while the American manufacturers were serving their Government. The number of Swiss watches imported increased nearly tenfold, from an average of less than a million a year, as shown by a publication of the United States Tariff Commission in 1936, to more than 9,500,000 a year. This was greater than the combined total of our prewar imports and our own production.

In 1945, in belated response to public opinion, Washington asked the Swiss to restrict their shipments of watches here to 40 percent of American production "during the period of reconversion of the domestic watch manufacturing industry." Quotas were supposed to have been imposed for about a year and a half, but importation in great quantities nevertheless continued.

Actually, thanks to its own insistence when the reciprocal trade law was enacted, the State Department lacked any authority at the time to impose quantity restrictions or even suggest them. Moreover, the State Department's request to the Swiss was taken with a grain of salt, as the theorists in the State Department had sought and are still seeking to outlaw quantity restrictions and have condemned them in drafts of a charter for an international trade organization.

The Swiss trade agreement was negotiated in 1936. Last year, when the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act was up for extension, President Truman issued Executive Order 9832 directing that "in every trade agreement here after entered into" there should be included a provision that if any concession has the effect of increasing the importation of any article so as "to cause, or threaten serious injury to domestic producers of like or similar articles, the United States shall be free to withdraw the concession." The Tariff Commission and not the State Department is to determine the question and is required to hold hearings and allow parties to present evidence.

In compliance with the order, the new clause was written into the agreements negotiated at Geneva last year, but was without effect upon deals made before the war. In any event, the Tariff Commission has recently indicated its belief that the concessions granted at Geneva will not be felt here for some years to come.

The Executive order does not set up standards for determining when an American industry is being hurt enough to cause suspension of concessions. The Trade Agreement Act expires on June 30. It should be allowed to lapse, to allow a free hand in foreign-trade matters to the new administration which takes office 8 months hence. The State De-

partment ought to be busy negotiating with other governments for writing the escape clause into the prewar trade agreements. But that is really too much to expect of the internationalists who manage our foreign affairs.

A New Land Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD G. ROHRBOUGH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from The West Union Record, entitled "A New Land Policy."

A NEW LAND POLICY

A new national land policy, designed to halt the destruction of the Nation's agricultural land and water resources, and geared to the needs of America's steadily increasing population for food, clothing, and other agricultural products, was recently offered to the House of Representatives by Congressman CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of Kansas, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture.

There is nothing more important to the people of America than the conservation of their agricultural land and water resources. It is a matter that transcends everything else in importance and vitally concerns every living soul in America. Any policy or measure designed to halt the waste and destruction of the Nation's land and the Nation's water resources deserves the hearty support of every citizen.

The United States has never had any land policy looking toward the conservation of its land or the prevention of waste and destruction of its land. Every landowner has been allowed to use his land in any way whatsoever. If he wanted to destroy it or to render it unfit for production he has had the privilege of doing so. If, in his ignorance, he wished to farm it in such a way as to cause ercsion to rob it of all its fertility and make it useless to future generations, there was nothing to deny him that privilege.

We believe in liberty of the individual, but not in the liberty to infringe upon the rights of his neighbor, nor in the liberty to destroy any of the Nation's natural resources, nor in the liberty to help make the world poorer or less habitable for future generations. No one should have the liberty to do those things. A person should have no more right to do those things than he has to destroy his neighbor's home or kill his neighbor's livestock or to take the life of his neighbor.

Upon the conservation of the Nation's agricultural land depends the life of the Nations inhabitants for it is the soil that supplies all the food with which life is nourished and sustained. How vital it is that the productivity of the soil be conserved. Could anything be more important to the welfare of humanity? Is there anything in which people should be more interested?

The greatness of the United States is due chiefly to the productivity of its soil, but that productivity is fast being diminished. It is said that about 500,000 acres of the soil of the United States are being washed away every year and most of that which is not being washed away is becoming less productive every year. It has been estimated by reliable authority that 3 acres of good or average cropland are required to feed and clothe one person. The population of the United States is increasing every year by about 2,000,000 persons. Hence, it is seen that, if 3 acres of land are required to feed and clothe 1 individual, 6,000,000 acres of new or additional cropland are required every year to feed and clothe the normal yearly increase in population. The number of acres required to feed the yearly increase in population and the number of acres that are washed away every year make a total of 6,500,000 acres. The American people are thus eating into their reserves of agricultural land to the extent of 6,500,000 acres every year. At that rate it cannot be long until all the reserves of productive land will have been used up.

If aggressive measures are not soon taken to conserve the land and make it more productive, the time is coming when the land will not be able to feed and clothe the people of the United States in the way in which the people have always been fed and clothed. That time is coming just as surely as anything can possibly be, and it will not be so very long in coming, either, if measures are not soon adopted to stop the waste and destruction of the croplands of this Nation and to make them more productive.

The United States Government has been doing something to conserve the land, but what it has been doing has not been nearly enough. The county conservation agents are doing a good work and deserve the cooperation of every citizen. But all they can do is to advise farmers how to farm the land so as to conserve the soil. A farmer does not have to pay any attention to a conservation agent; he can go ahead if he wants to and destroy the fertility of his soil and render his farm unfit for farming by those who come after him; and there is nothing the conservation agent can do about it.

There is nothing the Federal Government could do that would be more worth while, that would do more for the welfare of the Nation, than to adopt effective measures for the conservation and improvement of the land of the Nation so that the American people can continue to be the best-fed and best-clothed people of the world.

Just think of what could be done toward conserving and improving the agricultural land of this Nation with one-half of the money that the Government is spending for purposes of war. Just think of what could be done to improve the condition of mankind if the billions that are being spent to destroy life and property should be spent to make the world a better place in which to live.

Antimonopoly Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 28 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three editorials dealing with the subject of antimonopoly, and in particular, with Senate bill 104.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Tennessean, Nashville, Tenn., of May 13, 1946]

STATURE OF THE FTC

The Federal Trade Commission, which in theory supervises businesses with capitalization far in excess of the twenty-four billions under the watchful eye of the Interstate Commerce Commission, is a pygmy in stature in comparison with the ICC. The reasons for the arrested development of the FTC lie in the hostile record of the courts to that body and the failure of Congress to remedy the glaring defects of the system of regulation it has set up over business.

Now that the war is over, the FTC again calls the attention of the legislators to the program of reform recommended by the Temporary National Economic Committee With the march away from competition stepped up to a dead run, Congress cannot afford to remain indifferent to legislation which will put the brakes on the gallop toward monopoly.

Carefully drawn measures to restore constructive competition within our economy are already before the law makers. Among these are the Kefauver bill to amend the Clayton Act so as to prevent the acquisition of plant as well as stock of a corporation in cases where such acquisitions lessen competition. There are also the proposals for Federal licensing of corporations, which was advocated by Bryan and Theodore Roosevelt and is now urged by Senator O'MAHONEY, the registration of trade associations so as to prevent these bodies from acting in restraint of trade, a sweeping reform of the patent system, the compulsory elimination of basing point systems, the elimination of State trade barriers, the decentralization of industry, the regulation of mergers partly on the basis of size, and the stiffening of the penalties against violators of the antitrust laws.

Only through such a multiple reform program as this will it be possible to attain and maintain a free system of enterprise. Corporations, monopolies, patents, trade associations, and private property are man-made. They must be controlled and regulated for the benefit of man by man-made laws.

[From the Tennessean, Nashville, Tenn., of May 26, 1945]

PLUGGING THE HOLE

Chairman Ewin L. Davis of the Federal Trade Commission very properly described the passage of the Kefauver antimonopoly bill as "the acid test of our faith in the feasibility and desirability of maintaining a free and competitive system of private enterprise."

So long as corporations can legally acquire the physical properties of interstate competitors, just so long will monopoly continue to thrive in the United States like the proverbial green bay tree. There is no question but that this practice is a violation of the common-law principle on which the original antitrust act was erected and likewise a transgression of the spirit of the Clayton Act, which sought to outlaw all practices which tended substantially to promote monopoly by lessening competition and restraining trade. Unfortunately, the 1914 law omitted physical property from its list of capital which it said could not be acquired by a competitor when such acquisition tended to restrict competition.

The Kefauver amendment cannot undo the damage which has resulted from this omission. The amount of consolidation in business in the 24 years after the passage of the Clayton Act dwarfed the amount of concentration effected in the 24 years between the passage of the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act as a skyscraper dwarfs a solid masonry building. Yet the Kefauver plan will call a halt to the march of monopoly, which threatens to go into double-quick time with the end of the war. Evidence of an already increased tempo was reported recently by a Chicago newspaper, which disclosed the buying up of small corporations by big business out of its huge reserves has been progressing at an alarming rate in that metropolitan area.

By requiring proposed mergers to undergo the inspection of the Federal Trade Commission, the Kefauver measure would raise that body to a position of authority in the field of business comparable to that of the Interstate Commerce Commission in the transportation field. For the sake of free enterprise and constructive competition, it is a "consummation devoutly to be wished."

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune of May 27, 1947]

MERGING THE RICE MILLS

Some localities through Louisiana and the Rice Belt probably won't like it, but rice milling evidently is going "big business."

A very considerable segment of the milling industry will be consolidated through the $15,000,000 corporation formed in the East to take over five Louisiana mills and six mills in Texas and Arkansas. There are other strong units in the milling business, but this is the most ambitious merger project yet undertaken.

The gradual change in merchandising methods and the possibility of increasing domestic rice consumption through "brand" advertising of packaged rice constitute one of the forces behind the merger movements. Eventually most of our Latin-American markets will revert to the cheaper Asiatic rice and American industry will have to look to a larger domestic market to alleviate the effect of any burdensome surpluses.

But the consolidation of the rice mills is not all to the good any more than is the recent merger movement among the cotton mills. It could substantially reduce the competition among buyers for the rough rice. Moreover numerous small or medium-sized communities which until now could boast an independent, home-owned industry will become merely host to a unit in chain system under absentee ownership or control.

The merger announcement does not say whether the Federal Trade Commission has approved the program as coming within the antitrust laws. Where the law prohibits mergers by the purchase of stock, if that tends to create a monopoly, it leaves a loophole whereby the consolidation can take place through the purchase of "assets." Congress has been urged by the FTC and other groups to change the law, but a great many independent industries are being lured into "big business" mergers while our Congressmen deliberate.

Development of the Columbia River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 28 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Morton J. Tompkins, master, Oregon State Grange, to the Oregon chapter, Methodist Federation for Social Action, Portland, Oreg., March 5, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF THE COLUMBIA

A few years ago, some of you will remember, I had the privilege of visiting England—wartime England. I saw people fighting for their lives—fighting for their livelihood and their liberties—seeking to prove that food and freedom are not incompatible; that democracy can provide the staff of life as well as a way of life.

I talked to many people in England—people in all walks of life. The talk was not so much of the war, but rather what was to come after the war. Whether, through the democratic process, we could really attain the "four freedoms"—for victor and vanquished alike; whether we could achieve the economy of plenty upon which an enduring pesce could be built.

I answered many questions about our great northwest country—its size, its wealth, its population. In blacked-out shelters, I told them that we produced a fifth of the Nation's wheat—wheat they needed; a third of the Nation's apples—apples they had eaten; and half the Nation's timber—timber with which they hoped to rebuild their war-blasted slums.

OUR UNTOUCHED RESOURCES

I mentioned that we had the largest dedeposit of undeveloped phosphates in the world, the largest block of unharnessed water power on the continent. And I remember how one old miner's eyes lighted up when he heard that. For nearly all of England's electricity is generated from coal. He could not understand why we had not developed our water power, especially since England had to draft men to work in the coal pits.

They had heard of the Columbia River, of course, but they were surprised to learn that it was bigger than the Tennessee. They were amazed at the size of Grand Coulee Dam, but they were more interested in what was being done by the Tennessee Valley Authority. For to them the TVA was a new idea, something different, challenging, daring—perhaps a way to achieve the abundance which democracy must provide if it is to survive. But these Englishmen could not understand why, in view of the outstanding success of the TVA, the idea had not spread. Why a basic approach that was good for a river system like the Tennessee was not equally valid for the Missouri and the Columbia.

TENNESSEE VERSUS COLUMBIA

I think it is time to ask ourselves the same searching question. To take stock of our own achievements and shortcomings. To compare our own regional development with the Tennessee. In 1933 the Federal Government started actively to develop both rivers.

One, the Tennessee, drained a much smaller area—a country eroded, depleted, impoverished. The other, the Columbia, a colonial empire of forests and mountains and fertile valleys, relatively new.

Fifteen years have passed. In the Tennessee we find the best-developed river system in the world—22 dams controlling the waters from their source high in the North Carolina mountains down to the mighty Kentucky Dam facing the Ohio River. And the benefits have been channeled to the people throughout the region. A broad soil-building program has enriched and revitalized their lands and restored the pride of their farm people.

POWER PAVES THE WAY

New processes and new industries have been developed throughout the area with the tremendous blocks of electrical power generated at the dams. A higher and still higher standard of living has come to the people of the Valley. By common consent, virtually every kilowatt is marketed through publicly and cooperatively owned systems. A regulated inland waterway has come into existence. Of even greater importance, the floods which annually spread like a plague through the Valley have been banished by complete river control. So has malaria, once the scourge of the South.

TVA has left its imprint, triumphantly and permanently, on the daily lives of the Valley's people, even changing the color of the rivers, which barely a decade ago swirled yellow with topsoil across the countryside. As one old farmer near Knoxville put it, "The old Tennessee is like crystal now. My boys can swim in it."

TVA WORLD FAMOUS

I need not tell you what TVA has meant to the South nor to the Nation. For its enduring achievements have been the subject of scores of books and thousands of magazine articles. A constant stream of foreign visitors—engineers, economists, statesmen—have visited the Tennessee Valley and brought its story and its promise back to their own lands. That is why we hear of plans for a Danube Valley Authority, a Jordan Valley Authority, and so many others.

Before we ask why TVA has succeeded so magnificently, let us compare our own achievements. Our mighty Columbia, as you know, drained a region infinitely richer—newer, larger, more varied in its resources. We started off without comparable problems. We already had a much higher standard of living, a better educated population, a more favored climate, a preferred geographical location, with so many more natural advantages.

THREE DAMS VERSUS TWENTY-TWO

True, we have made great strides. But we have not begun to realize the possibilities of our magnificent resources. Instead of a fully controlled and regulated river like the Tennessee, we have a river system only a fraction developed. Three dams instead of the twenty-two-odd dams in the Tennessee system. While floods have disappeared on the Tennessee, we still suffer millions in annual losses from the Willamette and the Kootenai and other unruly streams. We still talk of our great inland seaway, but a deep-draft vessel cannot yet even venture to Bonneville. Although we boast nearly half the Nation's undeveloped water power, TVA has harnessed almost twice as much as we have. More important, they have channeled the benefits of their hydro power to all the people of the region, while we have largely turned it over to absentee-controlled monopolies. A Chinese wall has kept the power out of southern and eastern Oregon and away from Idaho and Montana.

OUR PROBLEMS INTENSIFY

Here in the Northwest the precious topsoil of our farmlands is being washed to the sea in ever-increasing quantities. Our major rivers become increasingly polluted. Our mining of forest and fisheries continues unabated. We are cutting our timber faster than it grows, depleting our fisheries until even the Indians rise up in revolt. Our mighty phosphate resources of eastern Idaho—key to fertility of the soil—are virtually untouched, a shameful contrast to the magnificent strides of TVA in this vital field.

We are a new country, a favored land, and people from all over America have come to share our native bounty. In Oregon our population has increased nearly 40 percent since 1940. And since the end of the war our growth has even exceeded that of California. Times are good and we are patting ourselves on the back. We do not note that, ominously enough, employment opportunity is not keeping pace with the growing population. Although we have more people employed than ever, our rate of unemployment is twice the national average.

OUR LIGHTS GO DIM

Ironically, in a region blessed with the greatest hydroelectric resources in the Nation, we are actually faced with a power shortage. And to us that is doubly serious. For here in the Northwest we have no other source of fuel—no oil, and little gas or high-grade coal. Our mills are slowing down, our new aluminum industry coming to the end of its growth. Our hope for a great diversified light metal is stopping far short of realization. We are shipping out tons of raw aluminum instead of finished articles, just as we shipped out our timbers as Jap squares prior to the war.

Only here in the Northwest are there the huge potential blocks of low-cost power for a major electro-chemical industry. But most of our water power is still undeveloped, needed transmission lines still unbuilt. So, the chemical industry is beginning to look abroad for its needed power.

HOBBLING OUR POWER

In the face of these problems, a hostile Congress has slashed appropriations for McNary Dam from $30,000,000 to $20,000,000. A pittance of $42,000 has been recommended by the House committee for the important Foster Creek Dam—instead of the $750,000 needed for preliminary work.

In the months ahead our power shortage—a shortage that will reach down into the lives of our people, on their farms, and in their mills and shops—this shortage will be intensified instead of relieved. Unless drastic steps are taken, it will not be met for half a dozen years. And the relief that Congress offers is a series of laws like the Rockwell and Miller bills to hamstring us further—to raise our power rates unjustifiably and isolate our dams in their river canyons.

This is not, as you can see, a chamber of commerce talk. Not an exuberant pat on the back, but rather an effort to face our problems and analyze them. To ask why we have not gone forward with a unified program to develop our river system, to develop our rich resources. What has TVA that we do not have?

UNITY OR CONFLICT?

First of all, TVA has a truly multiple-purpose program—to develop a river for all its values—navigation, flood control, power, and the rest. Theirs is a regional program, not a political football. And theirs is a unified program, with 1 agency instead of the 30 overlapping and conflicting bureaus that we have here.

As John Gunther said of the Columbia: "A river does not recognize bureaucratic frontiers—any more than it recognizes State lines. Above all, the region as a whole needs systematic research, over-all research, coordinated with a plan which can be converted into a coordinated program under a single budget. But this is impossible under the present arrangement, with its duplication of authority and lack of integrated leadership. Each Federal agency reports individually and separately to Washington, and the result is crippling. No one knows what is going on in the other agencies and no one wants to intrude."

LOCAL FEUDING

Those are John Gunther's words. They explain in some measure such basic conflicts as the one between saving the salmon and building the dams on the Lower Snake River; the opposition of the Army engineers to pooling the power revenues to permit building new irrigation projects, the clash over who is to build the vital dam at Hell's Canyon, or whether a private power company can ruin this project by plucking out the heart of the reservoir for its selfish use.

In brief, along the Columbia there is no unified plan or program such as TVA has brought into existence on the Tennessee. There is not even the shotgun wedding of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers which was effected in the Missouri Valley at the insistent demands of the governors of the affected States. There is no logical division of work, no over-all agency even to get existing bureaus to work together. There is anarchy instead of authority, competition instead of cooperation.

THE "RED HERRING"

Such a situation is ideal for the forces of monopoly which seek to exploit the resources of the region for their own selfish ends. That is why a constant stream of propaganda has poured out against a Columbia Valley Authority. That is why so many front organizations have been created to oppose a unified regional agency. That is why TVA, with its magnificent record of achievement, has been besmirched and called communistic and totalitarian, in spite of the fact that the governors of all seven States of the valley area have unanimously endorsed it.

What can we as citizens do to achieve for this region a public policy tied to our fundamental human needs and aspirations, dedicated to the same, rational, prudent, and productive use of our resources? How can we assure the development of these resources to meet the expanding needs of our region and our Nation?

START AT HOME

Certainly we cannot expect someone from outside the area to provide the solution, neatly packaged and tied. We must develop within our Northwest States intelligent and organized support for a single regional agency—at least to plan and program our development—to administer it, if not to execute it.

Perhaps you can take the lead, meeting with your companion chapters in Washington and Idaho and Montana, to get this major problem before the people, to make them understand that we need democratic control at the regional level, a piece of Washington brought here to the Northwest to take care of the needs of the people of the Northwest. For until we have support and agreement within the region for such a policy, certainly we can expect little help in that direction from the National Congress.

On the State level I would like to invite your active support on two directly related problems on which the Oregon State Grange is working—to save our forests and to save our water-power sites from uncontrolled exploitation. We have initiated a measure to levy a tax of 25 cents a thousand board feet on logs, to be used for reforestation and research.

YOUR HELP NEEDED

We have also referred to the people Senate bill 99, which was passed by the legislature at the behest of the Idaho Power Co. over the veto of the Governor. This bill, if it becomes a law, would surrender our valuable water-power sites to the private utility monopolies and probably stop the construction of Hell's Canyon Dam on the Snake River, a project nearly the size of Boulder Dam. To make the people understand the full implications of this dangerous bill, we need the assistance and support of civic-minded citizens in every community.

I believe the campaign against Senate bill 99 and in behalf of the initiative measure for reforestation can be the starting point in an educational program that will arouse our people to the vital import of protecting their valuable resources. We can make them realize here in the Northwest we have opportunities which stagger the imagination, but that only as we organize to protect and develop our resources can we assure to our children the promise of plenty rather than the prospect of poverty. As master of the Oregon State Grange, I extend to you an invitation to work with us toward that common goal.

Outline of Part of California Veteran Laws Compiled by Irwin J. Landis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 28 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on May 11 I inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an outline of part of the California veteran laws, as compiled by Mr. Irwin J. Landis, director of rehabilitation of the Disabled American Veterans, 1816 South Figueroa Street, Los Angeles, Calif. I ask unanimous consent to have the remainder of this résumé printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUARDIANSHIP

Guardianship of estate of incompetent veterans is provided. Some officer designated by the board of directors of the Veterans' Home of California shall act as guardian for the home which is made a corporation.

The Uniform Veterans' Guardianship Act provides for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran or the minor child of a veteran, to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

HOMES

Cities may provide and maintain homes for veterans soldiers, sailors, and marines who have served the United States in any of its wars.

Counties may maintain homes for veterans.

Property owned by the California Soldiers' Widows Home Association is exempt from taxation.

Restrictions have been made on the sale of liquor near veterans' homes.

Restrictions have been imposed on speed of vehicles on grounds of any veterans' home or United States Veterans' Administration facility, or on highways bordering such institutions.

The board of directors of the Veterans' Home of California may enter into contracts with the Federal Government for performance of services or manufacture of articles by disabled members of the home or for providing vocational training for members.

The department of social welfare may grant aid to blind persons who are inmates of a home or institution maintained by any fraternal, benevolent, or other nonprofit organization regardless of whether the person has agreed to pay for his maintenance upon receipt of a pension.

The Veterans' Home of California may secure the services of nonresident physicians who are authorized to practice for a year.

Veterans' home has been established for aged and disabled honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, marines, and members of the Coast Guard of the United States who have served in the armed forces during a war period, or are eligible for hospitalization or domiciliary care in a veterans' facility in accordance with the rules and regulations of the Veterans' Administration. Gifts are acceptable. General appropriations have been made.

Women's Relief Corps Home has been established for the care of ex-Army nurses and wives, widows, mothers, and dependent, destitute, unmarried daughters and sisters of Union veterans. General appropriations have been made.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

Admission may be made of insane soldiers and sailors in the service of the United States to a State hospital upon such terms as may be agreed upon between the State department of institutions and the proper United States agency.

Apprehension is provided for escaped and paroled patients and inmates of any hospital or facility operated by the Veterans' Administration.

The Uniform Guardianship Act provides for commitment of an incompetent veteran to a Federal hospital.

Congress has been urged to establish hospitals in certain mineral-spring areas to pro-

tide spa treatments for returning invalid soldiers and sailors.

FARM AND HOME PURCHA ES

The State department of veterans' affairs is authorized under provisions of the Farm and Home Purchase Act to assist qualified California veterans of all wars to acquire farms and homes. The department will provide up to $7,500 for the purchase of a suitable home or up to $13,500 for the purchase of a farm capable of supporting the veteran and his family. The amount advanced by the State is repaid by the veteran in moderate monthly payments, at a low rate of interest, over a period determined by the department, usually 20 years.

Eligibility for farm and home purchases is limited to California veterans. A veteran as defined by the act is a person who served on active duty in the armed forces of the United States in time of war, who received an honorable discharge or was released under honorable conditions, and who is a native of California or was at the time of entering the service a bona fide resident of the State. If the veteran was a minor at the time, he must have resided in the State for 6 months immediately preceding his entry into the service. Reference also is made in the law to certain specific classes of persons who are not included in the definition of "veteran."

A veteran may add funds of his own to the amount which may be advanced by the State, providing the total valuation of the property, as determined by the department's appraisal, does not exceed $10,000 for a home or $15,000 for a farm. The difference must be paid in cash, however, since no secondary financing is permitted.

No veteran may receive the benefits of the act if, as a result of a farm purchase he would become the holder of real estate exceeding $15,000 in value or as a result of a home purchase he would become the holder of real estate exceeding $10,000 in value.

An initial payment of 5 percent is required in connection with the purchase of a home, and 10 percent in a farm purchase. The department may waive the initial payment if the veteran is refinancing under the act property owned by him and in which he owns, prior to purchase by the department, an equity of at least 10 percent of the appraised valuation of the property.

The balance of the amount advanced by the State will be amortized over a period fixed by the department, but not exceeding 20 years. The interest rate on the unpaid balance is redetermined periodically in accordance with economic conditions within a range of 2½ to 4 percent, and is currently 3 percent.

The department will not finance the construction of houses, nor purchase any property that is under construction or repairs, but will examine plans and specifications of proposed buildings and appraise land selected for construction when properly submitted by a qualified veteran. If approved, a commitment for purchase of the property, when completed upon such terms as the department may prescribe, will be issued to the veteran applicant.

A farm applicant will be required to have sufficient training, experience, and financial resources to qualify him to operate a successful farming business. A home applicant will be required to have steady employment or reasonably assured permanent income.

All applicants approved for the purchase of farms or homes are required to apply for coverage under the home-protection plan of life insurance. This plan provides term insurance in the amount of the deferred balance of the contract. In the event of the death of the insured, the department will apply the proceeds of the insurance to the unpaid balance of the contract, thus guaranteeing the beneficiary of the insurance clear title to the property. If the applicant cannot pass the physical examination required to obtain insurance, his application for a farm or home purchase still may be approved.

Contract holders are enabled to make substantial savings on fire insurance coverage for homes and farms purchased under the act through a flat rate contract with a group of insurance companies. Home properties are insured for 75 cents per $100 of valuation for a 5-year term, and farms are insured for $1.50 per $100, regardless of location or type of construction. Savings under this plan average approximately 50 percent as compared with usual fire-insurance rates.

A veteran desiring to purchase a home or farm under the State act should file a preliminary application to establish eligibility at any office of the Department of Veterans' Affairs. The forms also are available at county veterans' service offices and community service centers. The original copy of discharge or release from service, or a certified or photographic copy, must accompany the application.

A certificate of eligibility, which has no expiration date and is valid until used, is issued to each eligible applicant. The veteran then may arrange for a personal interview with a representative of the department for the purpose of determining his personal qualifications, financial background, etc. If found qualified, the applicant will be authorized to select suitable property for appraisal. If the property selected is rejected by the department as unsuitable for purchase, the veteran will be given an opportunity to select other property.

MARRIAGE

Premarital examination certificates for military personnel may be signed by United States Army or Navy medical officers.

MEDALS, ETC.

Awards are made to members of the National Guard and Naval Militia who distinguish themselves in the service of the State or of the United States.

MEETING PLACES, MEMORIAL BUILDING PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Cities may provide and maintain memorial halls, etc., for use of veterans' associations.

Counties, cities, and towns may lease property or may acquire property and sublease it to veterans' associations at a rental to be fixed by the municipal governing body.

Counties may provide and maintain memorial halls, etc., for the use of veterans' associations.

District agricultural associations and counties may construct war memorial buildings in accordance with the State Contract Act.

Memorial districts may be organized for the purpose of providing and maintaining halls, etc., for the use of veterans and veterans' associations.

NATIONAL GUARD SERVICE

Credit is extended for time spent in active service of the United States.

RECORDS, ETC.

Condolence was extended to the bereaved families and friends of the American fliers executed by the military authorities of Japan.

Rolls of honor were established containthe names of State employees in the armed forces.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Banks, credit unions, industrial loan companies, insurance companies, building and loan associations, personal finance companies, mortgage loan companies, mortgage insurance companies, trust companies, fiduciaries or fiduciary institutions may make loans to veterans under the GI bill of rights.

A postwar-employment reserve fund has been set aside to be appropriated by the legislature for public projects and improvements that will provide postwar employment for citizens released from the armed forces.

Postwar rehabilitation has been provided.

The veterans' welfare board is constituted a public corporation to provide veterans useful employment and the opportunity to acquire farms or homes for profitable livelihood on the land, including veterans who entered the armed forces prior to November 12, 1918.

The veterans' home board of directors may contract with the Federal Government for performance of services or manufacture of articles by members of the home or for vocational education of the members.

TAX EXEMPTIONS: EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Exemption has been granted to posts of the American Legion or other veterans' organizations holding a boxing contest, or sparring or wrestling match, the proceeds of which inure exclusively to the benefit of the organization.

Civil War veterans are exempt from fees for fishing and hunting licenses and licenses to take fur-bearing animals for profit.

Members of the armed forces may fish without a license during the war-emergency period.

Exemption is granted for annuities for personal injuries or sickness resulting from active service in the armed forces in computing income tax.

Contributions or gifts to posts or organizations of war veterans are exempt, or to the special fund for vocational rehabilitation of veterans authorized by the World War Veterans' Act of 1924.

Military compensation is deductible under Personal Income Tax Act. Extension of time for filing returns by members of the armed forces is granted.

Proceeds of any war-risk insurance policy of any veteran of World Wars I and II are exempt from inheritance tax.

Chauffeurs' licenses issued to persons who have entered the armed forces shall not expire by limitation until after 6 months after the end of World War II.

Persons in the naval or military service operating a vehicle owned or controlled by the United States are exempt from procuring an operator's or chauffeur's license.

Certain veterans are exempt from fee for license to distribute circulars and to hawk, peddle, and vend goods, wares, or merchandise, except intoxicating liquors.

A constitutional amendment was adopted December 20, 1924, authorizing the legislature to pass an educational poll tax and provided that veterans be exempt. It has not been enacted thus far. It would exempt National Guard men from payment of the street poll tax.

Continuation of collection agent's license has been provided.

Licensed accountants are exempt from payment of annual fee during active military service.

Licensed personal-property brokers are exempt from payment of the $100 fee for investigating license applications upon discharge from military service. The collection of certain loans without a license is permitted.

Licensees are exempt from payment of the annual tax and registration fee for practice of medicine while engaged in full-time active service in the Medical Corps of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps.

Licenses of chauffeurs in the armed forces shall not expire during the period of service and the 6 months following the end of World War II.

Renewal of licenses issued to persons under the California Real Estate Act, the Business Opportunity Act, or the Cemetery Brokerage Act, and the payment of fees are not required during active military service.

Licenses of insurance agents are renewed after termination of active military service.

Professional or vocational licenses may be renewed within 60 days after termination of military service.

Personalty and realty owned by veterans' organizations are exempt from taxation. The State Board of Equalization shall prescribe procedure and forms to be observed or used in this connection.

Property to the amount of $1,000 of veterans or their wives, widows, or widowed mothers, and of pensioned widows, fathers or mothers of veterans, real property owned by the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic and all property owned by the California Soldiers' Widows' Home Association are exempt from taxation. A proposed amendment to extend the tax exemption to those in various services in time of war was ratified at the general election in November 1944.

Property used by religious organizations to provide temporary lodging for members of the armed services is exempt from property tax.

Sale of real property to enforce the collection of taxes and the privilege of redemption are postponed for the benefit of persons serving in the armed forces, applicable to such sales during the years 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1946. Right of redemption was extended until July 1, 1947.

Veterans serving in the armed forces may make and file affidavits claiming tax exemptions.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

State publication is required of the reports of the VFW, GAR, DAV, USWV, and the Military Order of the Purple Heart.

Anyone who sells or offers to sell or give away a poppy, badge, or label, falsely representing that it is sponsored, endorsed, or offered by a veterans' organization, or who falsely represents that a poppy, badge, or label is sponsored by a veterans' organization is guilty of a misdemeanor.

The unauthorized wearing or use of a name or insignia registered by a veterans' organization is a misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment for not more than 60 days or fine not to exceed $100.

The unauthorized wearing or use of the insignia of certain veterans' organizations is a misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment for not more than 60 days or fine not to exceed $100.

Counties, cities, and towns may lease property or may acquire property and sublease it to veterans' associations at rental to be fixed by the municipal governing body.

Counties may provide and maintain memorial halls, and so forth for the use of veterans' associations.

Memorial districts may be organized to provite and maintain assembly halls, and so forth for the use of veterans' associations.

A room at the State Capitol shall be set aside for the Grand Army of the Republic to be used as headquarters and for the care and storage of books and papers relating to that organization.

Counties and municipalities may extend relief to veterans and their dependents through military, naval, or marine organizations created for the purpose.

Exemption is granted to posts of the American Legion or other veteran organizations holding a boxing contest or sparring or wrestling match the proceeds of which inure exclusively to the benefit of the organization.

Income-tax exemption is allowed for gifts or contributions to posts or organizations of war veterans or to the special fund for vocational rehabilitation of veterans authorized by the World War Veterans' Act of 1924.

Property tax exemption is granted to personalty and realty owned by veterans' organizations.

Most of the above legislation has been enacted by the California Legislature through the sponsorship of veteran organizations.

The Civil-Rights Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 28 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me from Atlanta, Ga., dated May 16, 1948, several speeches, and some newspaper comments on the subject of civil rights.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATLANTA, GA., *May 16, 1948.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: I am sure our leading men of letters take pains to express our appreciation of you and your manly, fearless stand on simple justice and human rights, but I don't know if any colored men "of the streets" engaged in menial, dirty, low-paid labor ever try to let you know how we feel. I have no education (as you will soon know) and have labored 50 years to get some for my boys.

Of late I have been interested in this regional school plan because it was in the field of higher education for my children (medicine) that I was made poor for life.

I struggled to graduate seven from college without credit or assistance of any kind from my State, county, or city taxes, but then I could keep them at home in private schools and pay a little. John D. Rockefeller, Andrew Carnegie, Spelmans, and Julius Rosenwald and others—God bless them—did the rest and were berated by my State for their charity.

When I found I had to support not one, not two, but three to become doctors of medicine with no place in the State nor any benefit from my tax paying, the burden became heavy.

Two went to University of Michigan, one to Meharry. Penalized for being nonresidents the burden was made heavier, coupled with feeding and clothing outside of my own State drained every resource I could muster and cost me more than twice the strain placed on white men in Georgia for the same accommodations. This to say nothing of the humiliation caused by being forced to beg admission to another State's schools, thereby admitting the charge that mine were of such a low grade of humanity that admission to the University of Georgia or Emory University was impossible.

Mine are through. I am 67 years by the calendar and 25 years more by additional hard labor but my interest cannot stop. I must fight on so I write to tell you that without resolute men of your type we would still be in 1865, and I thank you from the bottom of a labor-worn, almost completely discouraged heart.

I revere, aye, love Meharry Medical College, but it is for the manly dignity given it by those democratic, human loving Meharry brothers, who respected a man to the extent that the man was able to respect himself. If southern governors who talk regional for the South and act regional for Negroes only should ever take over that institution we of the dirt, the smoke, mop and broom will wear our fingers to the bone to get money to send our boys somewhere else.

I fear this State, in spite of Supreme Court decisions, is yet bent on forming a hole in the wall for Negro State schools and basement, alleyway, professional joints to circumvent it.

As one without education I thank you in the name of the thousands of us who toil to get it for others and wish for you the success that justly belongs to a statesman of your caliber.

Respectfully.

[Radio broadcast by Thunder Bolt Left Hand, Crow Indian, over Station WARL, Arlington, Va., Saturday, May 15, 1948]

CIVIL RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES FOR THE INDIANS

Much has been said in and out of the Congress and by the President concerning civil rights and liberties for racial and minority groups of our country. The Constitution guarantees such rights to every person under the American flag. There is, therefore, no legitimate excuse why any segment of our people should not enjoy them. The President has repeatedly urged their enjoyment by those to whom they have been denied.

These rights have been declared the inherent right of every American citizen under the American flag and its Constitution. The respecting and safeguarding of these rights rests with both the executive and judicial branches of the Government. Every segment, every racial group, and all minority groups of our country are entitled to enjoy these rights without interference from any group, individual, or departmental heads of the Government. The Truman civil-rights program, aimed primarily at the South's social sectional problems, must be interpreted and accepted as an attempt to permit and let all the people, all over our country, enjoy these basic human rights of simple justice.

Using this as a basis for our premise, the Indians of the United States ask, "What about us?" Let the President answer this question, which we submit is perfectly in order and is a logical conclusion of his civil-rights program. Let someone answer the question: Why has he not seen to it that the Indians, the first inhabitants of our country, are allowed to enjoy these advocated principles of justice he so ardently advocates? Let someone answer the charge that tyranny and dictatorship reign supreme on every Indian reservation of the United States, and that every Indian reservation superintendent and district Indian Office director are little czars with totalitarian powers outside of review by the courts. Let some further answer the charge that the Indian soldier, after helping to smash and squash tyranny and iron-hand control of peoples of foreign lands, return to their reservations to immediately begin submission to Indian Bureau tyranny and dictatorship of the same kind.

The time has long arrived and gone when we should practice what we preach about civil rights and liberties under the American flag. It is hypocrisy and double talk of the lowest order to permit it to exist a moment longer in the United States and against the Indians. We should clean and put our own house in order in this regard before we publicly proclaim, as we have been doing, such rights for the world at large.

The Indians themselves have appealed to the Congress in person to forthwith abolish such injustices under the Indian Bureau and the Interior Department; yet, the Congress has done nothing. They have demanded in the name of simple justice and honor a voice in the selection of their Indian Commissioner and reservation superintendents; yet, for unexplained reasons, the Congress, which is supreme in Indian administration, has not acted to correct this crying situation. The question is: When will it so act?

The Indians suffer a repression of their rights under regulations promulgated by the Indian Bureau and approved by the Secretary of the Interior which have the force and effect of law and that operate to control completely their lives and fortunes. I refer to the Indian Bureau's individual Indian

money regulations, which places their total wealth in the hands of the reservation superintendent, a total stranger, with no other interests than the salary he draws monthly, and whose word is final and whose personal like or dislike of individual Indians for any reason can easily be reflected in reprisals by denying the issuance or nonissuance of their money deposited to his official checking account in a Government depository by existing law. This is cruel, non-American, Stalinic in design and operation, and should be forthwith repealed in the cause of simple justice.

The control of the proceeds from the sale of lands likewise operates under the whims of approval or disapproval of reservation superintendents.

The control of individual Indians by the forced use of their grazing allotments under regulations, which permits reservation superintendents to take such lands, place them in grazing units without the consent of the owners, lease them out to white stockmen, then take and deposit the proceeds therefrom to his official checking account and disburse the same when it suits his pleasure, to the owners, can find no counterpart anywhere except in Russia, under Stalin.

The accounting system for all these activities is antiquated and under no review by the Indian affected. He can do nothing but sit by and make appeals to Members of Congress occasionally which, so far, has brought no relief, let alone repeal of the system. American public opinion alone and the American public, which pays the bill to the tune of $1,000,000,000 since 1903, must demand a change of the existing order.

Fractionated heirship cases, impossible of use by any one of the heirs and also nearly impossible of break-down of the rentals that have accumulated to the credit of such estates now threaten ownership of such cases and also burden the taxpayers of the country with needless and senseless expenditure of yearly appropriations from the people's treasury to constantly employ a large staff of employees on every Indian reservation to try to cope with the problem of handling such estates. The Congress should promptly demand an end of this "cat chasing its tail" operation of the Indian Bureau.

The big problem of Indian administration can be reduced to four main heads as follows: Health, education, law and order, and individual rehabilitation. All others are merely money appropriation devices of the Indian Bureau. With these four necessary activities only, the yearly appropriation of the Congress for the Bureau of Indian Affairs can be cut to one-half or less, instead of the $67,879,927.20 requested by the Indian Bureau for 1949, that covers a multitude of activities. One-half or less of the amount requested it is presumed can satisfy the actual needs of the Indians.

Employees on every Indian agency should be reduced to only that number actually and absolutely necessary. Five or six on most reservations can do the job instead of several hundred on each reservation, all feeding from the public or Federal feeding trough, and a horde of them yearly go out on a life pension, whom the taxpayers must feed until they die.

This is the problem of the Congress, and I am sure the people, when they know the facts, will demand a change.

Unsegregated Higher Education a Challenge to the Church

(By Channing H. Tobias)

One would think, from all the noise and furor coming up out of the South following the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights and the issuance of the President's message on the same subject, that existence itself depended upon the segregation of the races. Mr. Truman has been accused of blasting at the white supremacy rock of ages simply because he has insisted that it is not necessary to do violence to the personality of one racial group in order to uphold the dignity of the other. There are thousands of white people in the South who agree with the President but who are not disposed to argue the case once politicians have raised the cry of Negro domination.

Now I maintain that in spite of the storm of protests that a sectional press has blown up to cyclonic proportions, the real South has not yet been heard from. Certainly the Negro one-third has been given no opportunity to express its views, and the white masses have been given little encouragement to do any thinking on the subject at all. It seems to me, therefore, that such a situation as this presents a great challenge to the Christian church leadership of the South. For the church can be the medium through which the masses of the people may be encouraged to substitute thought processes for prejudice in the treatment of these controversial issues.

As a matter of fact, a beginning has been made. The Methodist Women of the Southeastern Jurisdiction on March 4, 1948, assembled at Orlando, Fla., passed the following recommendation on civil rights:

"As Christian women of the Methodist Church in the Southeastern Jurisdiction Women's Society of Christian Service, we call ourselves and the vast constituency from which we have come to repentence for our sins and a renewal of our commitment to the task of making Christian principles live in this Nation. Therefore, as a specific and immediate step in this direction we recommend that Methodist women acquaint themselves with the content and full implications of the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights by studies, discussions and practical action to implement the same in the community and Nation.

"We recommend also that women of the Methodist Church seek to remove every barrier that separates members of the family of God in the church, and to build a Christian fellowship where ideas, experiences, facilities and action programs may be shared with freedom on a basis of full participation."

Another instance is the spring issue of the Southwest Review, published at Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Tex., which carries as its feature article a thoughtful analysis of segregation in higher education under the caption "Separate but not equal," by Dr. Charles H. Thompson, editor of the Journal of Negro Education, Howard University, Washington, D. C. The interesting thing about the appearance of this article in the Southwest Review is the fact that it is recommended by the editors as a stimulating, provocative expression of opinion on the highly controversial issue of whether or not the time has come for southern educational institutions to admit on the higher levels qualified Negro men and women as students. It has been noticeable that in considerable numbers faculty members and students of the University of Oklahoma, the University of Texas, the University of Arkansas, and the Alabama Polytechnic Institute at Auburn have taken issue with the officials of these institutions on the question of admitting Negro students to graduate courses. In Dr. Thompson's article he brings these facts to the attention of southern readers, and makes his appeal to the church constituency back of Southern Methodist University to give support to this ever-growing liberal sentiment. Up to the present time I have heard of no unfavorable reactions to the Thompson article.

On the basis, then, of what seems to be a liberal trend in southern thinking on the question of the admission of Negro students to graduate and professional schools in the South, I want to appeal to my southern readers to approach this question with open minds. Assuming, therefore, that I have a sympathetic hearing, I desire to present two observations that I think have a bearing on this question:

First, unsegregated higher education of white and colored people in the South would not be an entirely new experience. Such well-known institutions as Berea College in Kentucky, Maryville College in Tennessee, and possibly others that I do not know about, at one time or another, had white and colored students studying together and living side by side in the dormitories. It was not until under political pressure State laws were passed compelling the separation of the races that these institutions consented to conform to the segregation pattern. I have talked with white and Negro graduates of these institutions and have yet to find one who reported any but the most pleasant relationships while they were pursuing their courses under unsegregated conditions. There is even an instance where a celebrated Negro Presbyterian minister of North Carolina, who was trained at Princeton University, returned to North Carolina to establish a private school in which he received as students white men, some of whom became distinguished in public life.

The second point I want to make is that there are several instances where colored students are studying along with white students in the South today. Certain theological seminaries in Kentucky, Virginia, and Texas have quietly opened their doors to select Negro students and without making any issue of the fact are dividing the word of truth with them without any opposition from white students. The University of Delaware has opened its doors to qualified colored students. The University of Arkansas is training a Negro law student at the university, although it is being done in such a way as to conform with State law. During the past football season a Negro athlete played on the Harvard team in the regular game with the University of Virginia at Charlottesville and was given an ovation by 47,000 persons who witnessed the game. There was a similar experience with two Negro team members of Penn State College in the Cotton Bowl game with Southern Methodist University at Dallas, Tex., on last New Year's Day.

What I make a plea for is that when graduate and professional education of the races is discussed, the question be asked as to what would be involved in admitting well-qualified Negro students to southern institutions that is not already in practice in other relationships in southern life? I am a native of Augusta, Ga., and can recall as a small boy seeing white and colored men working together as clerks in the post office of that city. Through all the years, from that time up to the present, white and colored men have worked side by side as clerks and carriers, not only in the Augusta post office, but in dozens of offices throughout the South. I insist that there is nothing more in relationships that obtain in civil-service work of this kind than would obtain in graduate and professional schools. The usual program involves: Registration, attendance upon lectures, the use of laboratory and library facilities, the passing of examinations, and the receiving of degrees. I can think of no contact in connection with such a program that differs one iota from the contacts I have described above.

I believe, therefore, that it is possible to make an entirely unemotional, commonsense approach to this whole question, and it is my hope that the Christian churches of the South may move courageously ahead to a study of the issue that will lead to the adoption of a sane, constructive, Christian program. Such issues have too long been left to demagogs and politicians to exploit for selfish purposes. Let the church show the way.

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun of May 12, 1948]

RACES MINGLE SMOOTHLY 13 YEARS AT UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

A 13-year-old experiment in inter-racial public education is working so quietly in the University of Maryland Law School that the State is hardly aware of it.

There are 24 Negroes in the student body of 400, and four Negro graduates practicing in Baltimore. Since 1935, when the Court of Appeals directed the university to accept the first law student, 39 Negroes have entered.

In all those years, according to both white and Negro students and Dean Roger Howell, there has not been a single unhappy incident of any kind. There is no segregation and by and large the experience with Negro students is about like that with whites.

"LIKE ANY OTHER GROUP"

"They're like any other group," Dean Howell says. "They have good students and poor students among them. All relations here are normal so far as I know, and have been from the start."

Scholastically, the Negro record is somewhat poorer than the white. About a third of those now in school are in "scholastic difficulty," Dean Howell says. Of the 39 who have entered, 4 have been graduated, none with outstanding records; 11 have withdrawn (10 because of poor scholastic standing) and 24 are still in school.

Four Negro students now in school are doing exceptionally good work, two of them women.

WOMEN RATED HIGHLY

Mrs. Juanita Mitchell, a former social worker with a master's degree in sociology from the University of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. Elaine Davis, a teacher at Douglas High School, stand so high that they are now on the board of the Law Review, and contribute articles.

Mrs. Mitchell says, "There is no segregation at all, and relations are completely good.

"All the American people need is leadership, but sometimes the colored people have to take the initiative, as they did in the Murray case (of 1935) * * * People are really decent, and we have wonderful relations at the school.

"Just by way of contrast I can look out of a classroom and see a hospital sign across the street; colored entrance."

PLANS TO PRACTICE HERE

Mrs. Mitchell, in the second-year evening class, plans to practice law here; she will be the first Negro woman lawyer in the city.

The student council representative of Mrs. Mitchell's class is Eugene C. Hess, a University of Alabama graduate who has a daytime job with an oil company here. He says of the interracial experience:

"It's my impression that the colored people in school now are exceptionally high type people, and that in a situation not exactly normal have conducted themselves commendably.

"There were nine who started in my class, and of that group I would say it was about like any small group of white people you'd find. There were a couple of very good students and a couple who were poor.

"TWO ARE PRETTY BRIGHT"

"Two of them are bright; I suspect one of them is brighter than I am.

"I've talked with them often, and I get the impression that they are studying law to use in fighting for civil rights, which is natural, I suppose.

"The thing that has impressed me most is the dignity with which they conduct themselves. * * * I have been impressed with the complete lack of any untoward incidents."

Donald Gaines Murray, the young man who entered under court order in 1935, is now senior member of a law firm with two fellow University of Maryland graduates, Calvin Douglass and Ernest Perkins.

BUSINESS PRETTY GOOD

He says business is "pretty good" at his Pennsylvania Avenue offices, that he works on some civil rights cases, and has "two or three" white clients.

There are only two Negro law firms in Baltimore, and about 25 individuals in practice, Murray says. His own firm is only 2 years old, and was opened when he came back after 3 years overseas with the Army.

"My experience in the school was perfectly normal," he says. "I don't know what my standing was; I'd guess I was in the second third of my class.

MANY CASES IN COUNTIES

"We're doing a fair business, but it's like starting all over again when I first went into practice. A good deal of our practice is out in the counties, where there is not a single Negro lawyer.

"I wanted to go to the university school instead of some other one up North because I didn't have much money, and because I wanted to make contacts here at home.

"For example, Judge Niles, who wasn't a judge then, taught me admiralty law; such men get an idea of what their students can do."

Murray was an Amherst graduate when he entered the law school; he had gone there on a scholarship.

ASSISTANT CITY SOLICITOR

Calvin Dougless, a Murray partner, is now an assistant city solicitor, and is busy outside the firm much of the time.

Perkins, the third member, is a recent graduate.

The other graduate now practicing is William H. Murphy, an Oberlin graduate, and a nephew of Carl Murphy, editor of the Afro-American.

These four were the first graduates under the present system of nonsegregation in the law school but they had predecessors.

In 1889, two Negroes, Harry S. Cummings and Charles S. Johnson were graduated. The next year Cummings became Baltimore's first Negro city councilman. His son, Harry, Jr., is now a first-year student in the law school.

JOHNSON THIRD IN CLASS

The younger Cummings has worked in the probation office of the supreme bench of Baltimore City for 18 years. He says he does not know whether he will practice law after graduation, or use his background in connection with other work.

According to his records of his father's graduating class, Johnson stood third and Cummings fifth in a class of 80.

Two other Negro law school students are in the probation office and will soon be graduated.

Cummings says of his law school experience: "It couldn't have been better. It has been congenial in every particular, and there are absolutely no signs of segregation. Everything has been perfectly normal."

STUDENTS ARE MATURE

The comment of Dean Howell and Eugene Hess is that students of both races on the graduate level are sufficiently mature to assure the smooth working of the system.

Dean Howell, however, says: "I don't know why we have so many Negro students now. The law profession in Baltimore is crowded now, for both whites and Negroes. The profession is concerned about the many new graduates going out."

He said there had been no complaints from Negroes who have failed that they were forced out because of their race. All students, he said, are treated equally, and accepted on an equal basis.

British Help to Arabs Seen as Giving Stalin Excuse in Own Coups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the Washington Star of May 26, 1948:

BRITISH HELP TO ARABS SEEN AS GIVING STALIN EXCUSE IN OWN COUPS—UN LOOKS ON, BUT FAILS AGAIN TO MAKE ONE OF BIG POWERS BEHAVE

(By David Lawrence)

There must be red faces in London just as there are red faces in Washington. For the headlines tell a strange tale that savors of hypocrisy and makes the argument of the European democracies seem hollow.

For here is a big nation helping another conduct a war. It is not a war against communism or an ideology this time. It is a war against an infant nation struggling for survival. The United Nations, formed to stop wars, looks on interestedly but is again unwilling to make one of the big powers behave.

When Yugoslavia and Bulgaria and, later, Czechoslovakia were overrun by the Russian totalitarians, the democracies pointed to such action as aggression—as infiltration into a weaker state. But the answer of Russia was that her vital interests were at stake, that she wanted a friendly neighbor within her sphere of influence.

DOMINATED BY BRITISH

Today the Arab states each with their totalitarian bosses—hardly different from Dimitrov in Bulgaria and Tito in Yugoslavia—are dominated by British policy and British subsidies. A British-trained army, subsidized by the British Government, helps the totalitarian ruler of Transjordan to fight against a neighboring state which is striving to set up a democracy.

It was Britain which created Transjordan out of the Syrian territory which was a part of the British mandated area. It was Britain, too, which told the other governments always that this sphere of influence was a natural means of protecting the British Empire's life lines and her oil supply. This is the kind of imperialism which gives the Moscow Communists their argument for doing the same thing within their sphere of influence.

Inside the United Nations it is Britain now which obstructs and opposes where only a few weeks ago it was Russia using her veto to prevent a settlement from being imposed from the outside.

The British claim that the United States should not be disturbed as they are merely protecting American interests in the Near East. But it is worth recalling that Britain's willingness to share her power with America in the Arab areas is of recent origin. American oil companies got their concessions in the Near East only through State Department pressure for the "open door."

It might recalled, too, that the British broke the strike in the oil fields of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. in southern Iran only by sending a division of troops from India to a point in Iraq near the Iranian frontier—a method of pressure on Teheran which differs little from the Russian pressure with troops on the border of Iran.

TEST OF SINCERITY

Two wrongs never make a right. Two imperialistic policies do not balance one

another. But the United States, which is giving so generously of its funds to bolster the democracies of western Europe, cannot with a straight face make an argument about the disinterestedness of the western democracies as long as the British Government assists the Transjordan armies to make war on the infant republic of Israel.

There are many Americans who never shared the view that the territory now known as Israel should be set aside as the home of a religion but merely as the territory of Palestinians of the Jewish faith. Today, however, the question has ceased to be one as between factions of Jews. It has become a test of the sincerity of a major power which in the face of legal recognition by the United States Government allows one of its satellites to make war on such a legally recognized government and then blandly asks that the buck be passed to the United Nations. Only when the UN declares the military action of the Arab states to be illegal, the British say, will they refrain from giving aid to Transjordan. The moment the United States recognized the little Republic of Israel it became an act of war under international law for Great Britain to render aid to the enemies of the state that was being recognized.

It will be difficult hereafter for Foreign Secretary Bevin to accuse Stalin and the Russian Communists of expansion when, in reality, parallel tactics are being used by Britain to protect her own material interests, all in the guise of "empire security."

Broadcast to Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by me to the Secretary of State:

MAY 27, 1948.

Hon. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
The Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On page 6462 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dated May 26, 1948, there appears an account of a broadcast in Spanish to Latin America on February 2, 1948, by the National Broadcasting Co., in cooperation with the Voice of America. As I understand it, this is part of our world education program which Congress created under the supervision of the State Department to tell all nations about democracy in America.

According to this report, the good State of Alabama and the cities of Birmingham, Montgomery, and Mobile have been held up to ridicule and grossly misrepresented to Latin America and the world by an instrument of our Federal Government. The tactics employed appear strangely similar to those being used against us by Communist Russia today. The RECORD shows that Utah, Texas, Nevada, Pennsylvania, and other States were likewise slandered and misrepresented on other Voice of America broadcasts.

Mr. Secretary, as a Member of Congress who supported the Voice of America and believes strongly in its high purposes, I would appreciate an explanation of these broadcasts. I call upon you for a full statement of the facts. It is inconceivable to me that authorities of the State Department or the National Broadcasting Co. would allow the foreign policy of the United States to be undermined in this manner, especially during this period of international crisis. I find it exceedingly difficult to understand how such programs could have been broadcast time after time with no responsible supervision. The taxpayers of this country who are paying some $27,000,000 for our Government's information program are entitled to know how such a deplorable blunder could come about. If this amount is not enough to do the job properly, then the program should be limited to those phases which can be handled effectively and well.

Mr. Secretary, if the reports made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are true, this is a shameful commentary on Congress, on the State Department, and on the National Broadcasting Co. Those who plotted this bold, subversive maneuver are not fit for American citizenship. I am sure, Mr. Secretary, that you will deal properly with those under your supervision whose negligence permitted this serious occurrence.

Please understand that I am writing you in a spirit of deep respect and in all earnestness so that we can cooperate to insure the welfare and security of our beloved Nation.

Respectfully yours,

LAURIE C. BATTLE.

Subversive Activities Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that no one will dare accuse the Protestant Council of the City of New York of being communistic in thought, affiliation, or in any other way. The following is an article which appeared in the Brooklyn (N. Y.) Eagle on May 26, 1948, showing that group's opposition to the Mundt-Nixon bill:

PROTESTANT GROUP ASKS SUBVERSIVE CONTROL BILL'S K. O.

The human relations commission of the Protestant Council of the City of New York today expressed its opposition to the Mundt-Nixon Subversive Activities Control Act and suggested instead that a more judicially-minded committee than the House Committee on Un-American Activities conduct any study of Communist and Communist-front activity.

"We believe that it is necessary to make provision for enabling citizens to identify totalitarian movements whether Communist or Fascist and that there is need to throw light on organizations which are directed for purposes adverse to the interest of our democracy but we think that the Mundt-Nixon bill has important defects and we are convinced it should be defeated," the commission said in a resolution sent to New York Representatives and Senators, congressional leaders, and President Truman.

The resolution decries the undue amount of hysteria which has been stirred up in the United States, and says, "we do not believe that effective action on this or any other issue can be properly planned or wisely considered in an atmosphere of hysteria."

It says defects in the bill are that it includes the imposition of guilty by association, gives undue and arbitrary authority to the Attorney General, and that the terms are too vague.

Brooklyn members of the commission are Mrs. Henry A. Ingraham and the Reverend Dr. Phillips Packer Elliott, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church.

Repeal of Oleomargarine Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. (EDWARD) A. MITCHELL
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poll from the Minneapolis Tribune:

MINNESOTA POLL—LARGE NUMBER IN STATE FAVOR REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAX

Action of the House Wednesday in voting to repeal the 10-cent special Federal tax on each pound of oleomargarine meets with the approval of many Minnesotans, according to a State-wide survey by the Minnesota poll.

Forty-eight percent of the State's residents favor repeal of the tax. Another 2 percent offer qualified approval. Excluding people who express no opinion, a majority of Minnesotans would approve of doing away with the tax.

Chief opposition to repeal exists among the State's farm people.

On the question of doing away with the ¼-cent-per-pound Federal tax on uncolored oleo, State opinions are divided. Many people say the tax is too trivial to be a matter for concern.

Among people who use oleo in their homes (31 percent say they're oleo users), 73 percent favor repeal of the 10-cent tax on colored margarine, and 56 percent want the ¼-cent tax on the uncolored variety done away with.

The survey was completed while the oleo battle was brewing in the lower House of Congress, but prior to this week's House action. Minnesota poll interviewers asked an accurate cross-section of Minnesotans 21 years of age and older, in all parts of the State, a series of questions about oleo, the first being:

"Is oleomargarine used in your home at the present time?"

The replies indicate that some farmers are among oleo users:

	All	City	Town	Farm
	Pct.	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*
Yes	31	38	32	15
No	67	59	64	84
Don't know	2	3	4	1

Forty-eight percent of the members of families affiliated with labor unions report oleo is used in their homes, compared with 30 percent of families not so affiliated. (Farmers are excluded from the union breakdown, because questions about union affiliation are asked only in cities and towns.)

The survey indicates that the rise in butter prices within the last year has greatly stimulated the use of oleo. Interviewers asked people now using oleo:

"About how long has your family been using oleomargarine—for less than 6 months, from 6 months to a year, or longer than a year?"

The answers:

	Percent
Less than 6 months	31
6 months to 1 year	30
Longer than 1 year	36
Don't know	3

The remaining questions were asked of all people, whether or not they use oleo. One was:

There is talk in Congress of cutting out the special Federal tax of 10 cents a pound on colored oleomargarine. Would you favor or oppose doing away with that tax?"

The replies:

	All	City	Town	Farm
	Pct.	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*
Favor	48	60	47	25
Qualified favor	2	1	3	3
Oppose	24	19	39	61
Undecided	15	20	11	11

The 2 percent giving qualified approval say they would be willing to see the tax repealed "provided oleo is not passed off as butter"—that is, if it does not have the same yellow color as butter.

People who favor tax repeal say "it would make oleo cheaper"; "there's no reason for the tax"; "butter prices would come down"; "it isn't fair—margarine is the poor people's food and shouldn't be taxed"; "it's a discriminatory tax."

Those opposed to repeal say "the tax protects our farmers"; "repeal would jeopardize the butter industry"; "there's a danger that margarine would be sold as butter"; "if the tax were repealed, margarine would go as high as butter"; "the farmers should be given the break."

The final question was:

"What about the Federal tax of one-fourth cent a pound on uncolored margarine—do you think that tax should be kept or done away with?"

The answers:

	All	City	Town	Farm
	Pct.	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*
Done away with	40	48	43½	23
Kept	41	28	43½	62
Undecided	19	24	13	15

"It's not important enough to bother monkeying with," say some people who favor retaining the quarter-cent tax. Others say "any tax on margarine is a protection to the consumer against being cheated."

Those favoring the repeal of the quarter-cent tax say, "Why tax margarine—people who can't afford butter are the only users and they can't pay a tax"; "there's no tax on butter"; "let's have oleo cheaper"; "oleo is a necessity, not a luxury."

New State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the statement which I made at the rally at the Shoreham Hotel in Washington the evening of May 16:

Greetings to the new Jewish state of Israel. It is the hope of Americans that this new country will lead a movement for peace and tranquillity in the Middle East and will show the way for progress and cultural development. This new state is located in the land where moral religion and culture had its very beginning. For several decades it has been the haven for Jews from many countries who have been able to contribute to the culture and development of a land which would otherwise be barren. It should be well equipped to take its place in the family of nations and make its contribution toward the peace of the world.

The prompt recognition of this new Jewish state by the United States is logical and should avert the confusion which would otherwise prevail. The British Government has terminated its mandate and assistance should be rendered to this new country to enable it to maintain order. Christians, as well as Jews, are interested in the preservation of the Holy Land.

Under the mandate and in spite of obstacles, great advances were made in Palestine in health, science, agriculture, and the arts. It is to be expected that these advancements will be more rapid under the Jewish state. The benefits will be far reaching.

We who love our own independence and freedom should and do wish success to others in their efforts to attain the same objectives that were sought by the founders of our own country. It is my hope that the United States will continue to assist the Jewish state in its efforts, and that our early recognition of this new country will serve as notice to other nations of our desire to be helpful. We hope that the action taken will be another step toward world peace for which we all hope and pray.

Postal Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press:

POSTAL SALARIES

Many of the bills now pending before Congress may not see action before adjournment time because of the press of more important legislation. But when the Air Force, draft, and anti-Communist measures have been settled there is one bill among the heap that will be left which every American will want passed. That is the proposal to increase the pay to postal employees.

Most citizens are reluctant to sanction a pay increase for any Government employee because of the feeling that persists to the effect that all such employees are riding the gravy train. There is no such feeling in the case of this group of workers. Of all the Government enterprises in existence there are few which operate as efficiently as the postal service. And of all the persons employed by the Government few give as full a measure of service in return for their pay as those in the postal service.

Take a look at the man who delivers your own mail, for instance. You never think of him unless he fails to bring you an expected letter. But day in and day out he makes his rounds, in the sweltering heat of summer and in the cold treachery of winter's snow and ice. He never fails nor falters and he never shirks his duty. He has a thousand bosses, the people he serves. And after his long years of service are through he can look forward to retirement on a small pension plus whatever money, if any, he has been able to save from his meager earnings.

We want a strong air force, we want defense against communism; but we also want to see a just reward given those who serve us all without complaint. Through inflation and depression, war and peace, shortages and plenty they go quietly about their duties. Let us hope they will not be forgotten.

Communism Seeks Special Privilege To Practice Fraud, Deceit, and Secrecy—The Mundt-Nixon Bill Says "No"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the Mundt-Nixon bill removes the secrecy and would expose the fraud and underhanded methods which is practiced by communism. This, the Communists claim, would outlaw their party and destroy it.

Publicity has destroyed a lot of things the American people do not want, and the Communists will have to take their chances with the rest.

Can you imagine how long the American public would stand for secrecy, fraud, and underhanded methods by the two major parties of the Nation? The Democrats and the Republicans. They must register and file their membership in all States in the Nation and expose their views and policies for public approval or disapproval every 2 years for Congress and every 4 years for President. Why should not the Communists do the same thing?

This is what the Mundt-Nixon bill does and what the people of this Nation want done.

I submit herewith a recent editorial from the Los Angeles Times, which states the question of the Mundt-Nixon bill very well:

A SHORT WAY WITH COMMUNISTS

Even one of the Presidential candidates in the debate at Portland seems to have been a step behind events in anti-Communist legislation. Harold Stassen apparently believed Monday night that the Mundt-Nixon bill would outlaw the Communist Party. Mr. Stassen wants the Communist Party outlawed; therefore, he favored the Mundt-Nixon bill, which would, according to his interpretation, prohibit that party's political activities.

The bill in its original form would have outlawed the Communist Party. But it was rewritten and the outlaw provision, which we believe was objectionable, was taken out. Representative MUNDT, in a report on the revised bill, writes:

"We are willing to permit the theories of communism and democracy to clash in the open market place of political ideas in America, but we insist that communism not be allowed to have the unfair advantages in this conflict of the unrestricted use of illegal means, the goal of secrecy and fraud, and the assistance and direction of a foreign Communist dictatorship."

The Mundt-Nixon bill, as it was reported by the House Un-American Activities Committee, would set up the following procedures:

The United States Attorney General is instructed to investigate, holding open hearings, and if he decides the American Communist Party is part of a world conspiracy, under foreign control, the party can appeal to the courts. If the courts uphold the Attorney General, the machinery for exposure is set in motion.

The party leaders then are required to register, giving their names and addresses and the correct names and addresses of all party

members. If they do not comply, they can be fined $5,000 and jailed for 5 years.

After registration, party leaders and members are free to enter any political activity except to advocate the overthrow of this Government by force or violence or to urge setting up here of a dictatorship under the control of a foreign power. If they do these forbidden things they may be fined $10,000, jailed for 10 years, and lose their citizenship.

In the case of Communist-front organizations the Attorney General follows the same procedure. If the courts support his findings he must require the officers, but not the members, of such organizations to register. But any Communist-front member, like any Communist, may be fined, jailed, and deprived of citizenship if he takes part in a conspiracy to set up a foreign-controlled totalitarian dictatorship.

A Communist Party member could hold any elective office, but he would have to make known his party membership. But he could not hold a nonelective Government job.

No Communist could apply for a passport. This provision, the committee explains, is aimed at cutting the liaison between American Communists and the Muscovite brethren.

Opponents of the bill object to it as "proscription," as "attainder," as a drastic extension of the doctrine of guilt by association. They find violations of the first amendment, although the referral to the courts, as provided in the bill, seems to confute them.

Most emphatically they point out that there already are laws which can be invoked to deal with the Communists on the grounds covered by the new bill—the McCormack Act, requiring registration of agents of foreign principals; the Voorhis Act, requiring registration of organizations which are agents of foreign governments; the Smith Act, forbidding anyone to advocate the violent overthrow of any government in the United States; and the law forbidding employment of any such person by the Government.

This is their best and most telling argument, for these laws are in fact competent in the danger zone of Communist activities. But the difficulty is that the executive branch of the Government has had little inclination to apply these laws against Communists. This curious reluctance is underscored by the report, heard before President Truman could know anything about the Mundt-Nixon bill except that it was anti-Communist, that he would veto it if it got to him.

The courts, especially the Supreme Court, have shared the reluctance of the executive branch in interpreting the general statutes as applying to Communists and seem, in some cases, to have frustrated the intentions of Congress.

Congress, reflecting the wishes of the great majority of the American people to expose and restrict Communists, evidently must be specific. The Mundt-Nixon bill, or something very near it, is necessary. It is a special solution for a special problem.

The End of the Rope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENDERSON H. CARSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include a poem by Margaret Nickerson Martin, of Jackson, Mich., a vice president of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, entitled "The End of the Rope." I am sure this little poem will be a challenge, not only to the members of the fine group with which Mrs. Martin is actively associated, but to all of us who become discouraged in these days of stress and strain to—tie a knot in the end of the rope and hang on!

When you've lost every vestige of hope,
And you think you are beaten and done;
When you've come to the end of your rope
Tie a knot in the end and hang on.

Have courage; for here is the dope
When you stand with your back to the wall;
Though you've come to the end of your rope
Tie a knot in the end and hang on.

You're not licked; do not sorrow and mope
As your friends seem to all disappear;
When you've come to the end of your rope
Tie a knot in the end and hang on.

Long Live Eretz Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the New York Journal-American of May 15, 1948, entitled "Long Live Eretz Israel" by Harry H. Schlacht, as follows:

LONG LIVE "ERETZ ISRAEL"

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

"And the ransomed of the Lord shall return and come with singing unto Zion."—Isaiah.

Hail Israel. Hail the Jewish state.

The Lord has heard the cry of Israel. The Lord has brought them forth from suffering unto joy, from darkness unto light, from slavery unto freedom.

Today marks the twentieth-century deliverance of God's chosen people.

The Jewish people have kept their appointment with destiny. The Jewish state is now history.

The Hearst newspapers have through the years been the foremost champions of a homeland for the Jews.

Today we can heard the voice of God ringing throughout the world: "Let my people live." And in His spirit may we see the bright star shining in the Middle East.

It will be the land of the free. It will be the home of the brave.

The Maccabean spirit lives again in the might of her army composed "of the people, by the people, and for the people."

It will be an independent state. It will strive for world peace. It will strive for world cooperation.

"Hini omed domm befne! Degel techelei lewan."

"I stand at attention before this white and blue flag."

The Bible and the Talmud will once again become the religious guide of the Hebrews.

The Maccabean soldiers will defend the Hebrew soil.

The Jewish Parliament will ring with the eloquence of new Disraelis, Gambettas, and Castelers.

A new Josephus will arise to record the growth of the Jewish state.

Jewish culture will rise anew 'neath the flag of white and blue.

We shall see the light coming from the valley below.

We shall see the end of the Galut.
We shall see the end of the ghettoes.
We shall see the birth of a new man.
We shall see hillsides of Israel bloom.
We shall see groves and forests.
We shall see villages and towns rise again.
We shall see the birth of a new civilization.

The Holy Land which nurtured Christ will be the light which will illuminate the world.

The United States is the first government to give its official blessings to the Jewish state.

This is in accord with the loftiest principles of justice, and with the noblest dictates of humanity.

Long live the Jewish state. Shalom.

We Will Still Need Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1948

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the country's need for ships was demonstrated again during the last war. However, many believe that men and supplies can be transported by air with practically no need for ships. A comparison of transportation by planes as against ships for cargo carriers states that to transport 100,000 tons a month from San Francisco to Australia would require by sea 80 cargo ships, 8,400 crewmen, 8,250,000 gallons of fuel oil per month, 20 trips per month, no tankers. To transport the same cargo a month by air would require 12,078 planes, 329,400 flight- and ground-crew men, 519,890,000 gallons of gasoline and oil per month, 32,941 flights per month, and 234 tankers.

Mr. Speaker, I want to include the article in the United States News and World Report entitled "Limits to Military Supply by Air, Advantage of Ships for Delivering Munitions," as follows:

LIMITS TO MILITARY SUPPLY BY AIR—ADVANTAGE OF SHIPS FOR DELIVERING MUNITIONS

Air strength is fast being accepted as a sort of cure-all for United States military problems.

But limits to what air power can do are showing up in some fields. Official studies show big drawbacks in use of planes to supply overseas bases, for one thing.

Sea power and land power still are vital, even in a strictly air war.

Air power, as the answer to United States defense problems, is high in popular favor. The Air Force is getting almost all of the men, money, and planes it asks.

The airplane, in fact, is beginning to be regarded as the weapon to solve all military problems. Yet it is turning out, in practice, that there are more limits to the effectiveness of air power than has been realized. A top-ranking United States commander in wartime has complained that the Air Force is the least mobile branch of the military service, because it is so dependent upon highly developed ground service.

A wartime study by the Army Air Forces now is available that reveals another basic field in which air power is limited. This is the field of long-range transport. It deals with getting munitions and supplies in quantity to overseas bases in wartime.

The chart on these pages shows what the Army Air Forces found as the practical problem in seeking to substitute aircraft for cargo ships for that long-range transport. The suggestion had been made that planes take over the task of carrying cargo from the United States across 6,600 miles of sea to Australia. The Army airmen figured these comparative costs of moving 100,000 long tons a month by air and by sea:

SHIPS AGAINST PLANES

The job of supplying Australian bases was found to require either 80 cargo ships or 12,078 transport planes.

By sea, shipment of those supplies would call for 20 cargo-vessel sailings a month and, allowing 4 months for the round trip, would involve a total of 80 ships in constant use.

By air, shipment of the same amount of cargo, the airmen found, calls for 32,941 airplane trips a month. On the basis of a 7½-day round trip, plus 2½ days for overhaul, each plane would require 10 days for a complete cycle. Thus, in order to operate the needed 1,098 flights a day, 10,980 planes are required for actual operation. Then, to cover normal attrition and planes out of service for major repairs, this total must be raised to 12,078 planes for the air operation.

If air transports were used, moreover, about 8,000 planes would be in the air at all times over the 6,600-mile route—or at least one plane for each mile of the Pacific between San Francisco and Australia. And a plane would be landing or taking off every 40 seconds from each end of the route every hour of the day and night.

Manpower needed for the two methods of supply would amount to 39 times as many men for the air operation as for the shipments by sea. Moreover, a large portion of the total available force of trained airmen would be needed for the air-transport job.

For ships' crews, 105 men, plus gun crews, are required for each vessel. This amounts to 8,400 seamen in all.

For planes' crews, five men are required for each plane—the pilot, copilot, navigator, radio engineer and flight engineer. But these men are not allowed to fly more than 120 hours a month, and since actual flying time in the 7½-day round-trip flight averages 80 hours, each crew could complete only one and one-half trips each month. Thus, it would be necessary to have two complete crews for each plane, one set at each terminus. In all, the 10,980 operating planes require 109,800 flight-crew members.

In addition to those flight crews, each plane would require another 20 men on the ground along the route. This includes personnel to handle maintenance, cargo, weather reporting and communications. They would be located at San Francisco, Honolulu, Canton Island, Nandi, New Caledonia, and Williamtown in Australia. Total flight and ground-crew personnel for the air operation thus comes to about 329,400 men, all of them highly trained technicians. That total is about the strength of the entire present United States Air Force.

All of these plane and ground crewmen, in turn, would require services of Army troops at each base and fueling station. These would include medical, quartermaster, ordnance and other service troops, as well as antiaircraft and ground combat troops for protection of those bases from enemy attack.

Fuel needed for the war-cargo shipments is figured at about 63 gallons of high-octane gasoline and lubricating oil for the transport planes to each gallon of fuel oil for the cargo-ship operation. Cost of the plane fuel, of course, greatly exceeds the cost of an equal amount of ship's fuel oil.

For the ships, about 8,250,000 gallons of fuel oil would be needed each month in hauling the required tonnage.

The planes, however, require an estimated 504,800,000 gallons of gasoline and about 15,100,000 gallons of lubricating oil each month. This is only slightly less than the monthly rate of 660,000,000 gallons of petroleum products used by all of the armed forces during the peak year of World War II.

Tanker ships then would be required in large numbers just to supply gasoline and oil for the planes at overseas bases. That job would call for 234 tankers, or about three times the number of ships needed to do the original supply job by sea.

This tanker requirement is based on a need for 437,521,984 gallons of gasoline and oil at overseas fueling points each month. The fuel would be carried by large 3,360,000-gallon tankers, with 130 of those ships sailing each month. As an average of 1.8 months is required for the round trip to Hawaii, New Caledonia, Australia, or other fueling spots, a total of 234 ships thus would be kept in constant operation. No tankers would be needed for the sea operation, as the cargo ships do not need to refuel during a round-trip voyage to Australia.

In addition, the overseas ground-crew personnel needed for the air operation require 35,292 tons of supplies each month, including their provisions. This would keep 10 more cargo ships in continuous operation, or would involve about a 50-percent increase in the number of planes used.

Conclusions of the Army Air Forces study were that, even with an unlimited number of cargo planes available, supplying a full-scale overseas base by air is impractical. If the vast amount of fuel needed were somehow obtained, many more ships still would be needed to carry gasoline and oil to overseas refueling points than are needed to carry the supplies by sea instead.

What it means is that, in the field of long-range transport, air power has basic limitations in wartime. The 100,000-ton cargo problem involved must be multiplied many times for a war effort the size of the last European conflict, but the conclusions from that problem remain. What air power can do to win modern wars is important, but this official study indicates that sea power and land power still are to play a vital part even in any future conflict to be fought mainly in the air.

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Boston Herald of May 26, 1948:

GAG AND GOP

The Congress, being predominantly Republican, is writing a prelude to the Republican National Convention. For a body supposedly mindful of prevailing public opinion, it is acting very peculiarly with regard to several vital issues, and, indeed, if it continues on the same track, may very well have penned an introduction to the GOP platform which could prove extremely embarrassing to the party, as it certainly would be to the most likely Presidential nominee. As of the moment there appears to be substantial agreement among the Nation's best-informed political commentators—writers like Arthur Krock, Walter Lippmann, and Roscoe Drummond—that Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG is the likeliest GOP choice for top honors.

Suppose, now, that Congress goes through with this ridiculous gag-born butchery of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. We refer to the bill which the House Rules Committee has sent to the floor for action today under a closed rule which bars floor amendments. The bill was hatched in secret without full public hearings and is now to be considered under the least democratic of House procedures. All of which is sufficient to suggest that there must be something vitally wrong with the bill. Obviously the authors are scared to death of public opinion. And well that they should be. There is scarcely a national farm, labor, or representative business organization in the country which does not support the trade program. Hence, the bill is an affront to public opinion.

It should be fully apparent, therefore, that congressional approval of this sneak measure would deeply stain an otherwise admirable record by the Eightieth Congress. And it will be the record of this Congress upon which the Republican Party will be judged in large measure when the voters go to the polls. It would embarrass the platform writers at Philadelphia and Senator VANDENBERG, if nominated, would have to repudiate it.

The excuse given for the gag rule is the necessity for speed. Oh, yeah? Mind you, this is the same committee, dominated by LEO ALLEN, which has kept the peacetime draft bill from floor action for months. And it talks about speed. Also, it was Mr. ALLEN'S Rules Committee which bottled up the bill for United States participation in the World Health Organization. Our distinguished neighbor, the Providence Journal, has rightly called the Rules Committee action on these three measures neo-isolationism.

What we would like to know is how the Republican Party hopes to lead the country from the White House for 4 years if its Congress begins to act like an ostrich, vintage of 1920. We sincerely hope that the House will act today on the trade bill as if had some idea of the realities of this year of our Lord, 1948.

One Hundred and Fifty-seventh Anniversary of the Adoption of the Polish Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, at a meeting of the Polish-American Congress, Inc., eastern district of Missouri, held in St. Louis on May 23, an address was delivered by former Premier Mikolajczyk in celebration of the one hundred and fifty-seventh anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution in 1791. The following resolution was adopted, which I respectfully commend to the attention of the membership of this Congress:

We, of the eastern division of Missouri of the Polish Congress, urge the following resolution:

Whereas we hold these truths to be self-evident that the people of Poland and the true Republic of Poland, have become and are enslaved, engulfed, ensnarled, and enveloped within the clutches of the greatest threat to world peace, the cancerous scourge

of communism and its influences emanating from the U. S. S. R.; and

Whereas we hold these truths to be self-evident that the people of Poland and the true Republic of Poland are no longer a free, independent, and democratic nation; and

Whereas we hold these truths to be self-evident that the people of Poland have suffered, sustained, and endured unjust miseries, tortures, starvation, oppression, and indignation and that they had had their boundaries decimated, and their religion desecrated; and

Whereas we hold these truths to be self-evident that the country of Poland is the most martyred nation of Europe; and

Whereas we hold these truths to be self-evident that millions of the people of Poland have become displaced persons, and have no home, no homeland, and very little hope of obtaining and sharing in the God-given right of freedom; and

Whereas we hold these truths to be self-evident that the people of Poland and the true Republic of Poland are extending their hands of brotherhood to the people of the United States of America, and with fervent prayers upon their lips, and pleading tears of agony upon their faces, they are hoping and praying that we, the people of the United States of America, shall free them from the bondage of communism that shackles them within the iron curtain of communistic Russia; and

Whereas we hold these truths to be self-evident that the guaranties as set forth in the Atlantic Charter and in particular "the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live," have been broken and violated; and

Whereas we hold these truths to be self-evident that all God-fearing and God-loving people of the United States of America, including the more than 6,000,000 people of Polish ancestry, true and loyal American citizens, are deeply grieved over the tragic plight of the people of Poland: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved—

1. We strongly urge the United States of America to maintain a firm stand in the present international crisis to prevent the further spread of communism which is the greatest threat to world peace.

2. We strongly urge that the United States of America extend its every possible aid to the beleaguered people of Poland and to all other subjugated nations.

3. We strongly urge the restoration of all guaranties as set forth in the Atlantic Charter.

4. We condemn the loss of Poland's freedom and independence.

5. We condemn the emasculation of her boundaries and her territorial rights.

6. We condemn the quartering of Russian troops upon Polish soil.

7. We condemn the destruction and loss of free elections in the true democratic Republic of Poland.

8. We urge that the solemn pledges made to Poland that she shall be a free and independent nation be fulfilled and sustained.

9. We urge the immediate enactment of a bill which would admit displaced persons from Europe into the United States of America.

10. To the real Republic of Poland, the most martyred nation of all, we send our compassion and love. In silent prayer we bow our heads before Almighty God invoking His strength for her sustenance and fortitude in her hour of trial.

11. To those representatives of our Government, to those members of the press and the radio, and to all champions of freedom, who are espousing the cause of right instead of might, we extend our deepest gratitude.

It is these declarations that we make most sincerely, as fervent American citizens, having a filial love for Poland, and ever maintaining our love and loyalty to the United States of America, being aware of our own liberal heritage and believing most strongly in our American way of life, we hope and pray that the sacrifices that we have made shall not be in vain, that the people of Poland, of all other subjugated nations shall enjoy freedom, and a just and Godly peace for the spiritual progress and welfare of all the world; and be it further

Resolved, That appropriate copies of this resolution be endorsed and mailed to President Harry S. Truman, Senators Forrest C. Donnell and James T. Kem, and Congressmen Walter C. Ploesser, Frank M. Karsten, and Claude I. Bakewell, and to the press of this community.

Done at St. Louis, Mo., this 23d day of May 1948.

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS,
EASTERN DIVISION OF MISSOURI,
GEO. GURNIACK, *President*,
PETER J. WOJCIECHOIESKI, *Secretary*.

Strategic and Critical Minerals and Metals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON H. CARSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include an article by John M. Peart, of the Erwin News Service, which gives a fair analysis of the conditions now existing in the United States with regard to the stock pile of strategic and critical minerals and metals.

We can ill afford, at this critical period in our Nation's existence, to consciously permit depletion in resources of those upon whom we must depend for our supply of critical minerals and metals.

Mr. Peart's article follows:

Small-mine owners throughout the United States again have entered the limelight of congressional investigation.

The small-mine controversy has waged for years, in fact, since the end of the First World War. The situation has its many angles and answers. It contains even pathos, such as the case of a widow in Georgia who has waited years for compensation for the death of her husband, death in the small mine he operated to help get more coal for the war effort.

According to the records obtained from Representative HENDERSON H. CARSON, of Canton, Ohio, World War II, just as World War I, brought a rash of Government promises to the operator of every mine in the United States. Men who owned small lead, copper, manganese, silver, or coal mines were offered all sorts of inducements, such as loans, subsidies, and decentralized special services to increase their rate of mine production. They were paid subsidies especially by the Metals Reserve Company, a branch of the War Production Board, which also created special markets for the metals and minerals as they were mined.

In a speech in the House last February 3, CARSON cited case after case that clearly gave evidence that the miner had been completely forgotten with the cessation of hostilities. Many of them had failed to gain their original investment in their good faith to the Government's intense drive to obtain the necessary metals and ores, as well as coal, to wage the war against the Axis.

CARSON emphasized the fact that Congress had intended to pay for the metals and the production costs, as well as other expenses incurred by the miners in the line of duty. He used the text of former Senator James E. Scrugham, of Nevada, in a speech the Nevadan delivered to the miners at Phoenix, Ariz., shortly after the adoption of the Contract Settlement Act, on August 7, 1944. The speech promised payment by the United States for the speeded production of underground metals, and it promised them immediately. However, history has repeated and the same incident that followed World War I is again recorded. It has been 3½ years since the passage of the Contract Settlement Act, which was to work hand in glove with the Metals Reserve Company and the War Production Board to insure prompt payment of the people of the industry for their efforts and invested capital.

Since the end of the war, mine contractors large and small, from Georgia to Montana and Arizona, have tried unsuccessfully, through court action, to obtain fair compensation. And to give a true picture of the scrambled predicament of the whole organization, Carson pointed out, "It has been proven that in one place a stock pile of manganese ore was furnished under parallel conditions, yet, the costs of one have been paid and the other rejected, for no apparent reason.

The very apparent confusion and frustration of the entire contract settlement act is made woefully apparent by the case of the Georgia widow. Her husband was killed in his private mine and at the time of his death was covered by the Government's insurance clause in the act, and by a commercial company at the same time. Because he was operating the mine in accordance with the Government specifications, and not those of the insurance company, she has been denied all payment. She has not received his return of money invested in the mine to further its wartime operation. She has been living from hand to mouth, Carson reports, with no settlement of her case.

As a result, Carson has introduced H. R. 4928, now before the House Judiciary Committee, a bill providing payment of the War losses incurred by the miners in every section of the United States.

The end of Carson's House speech was particularly significant when he said "I find many fellow Members of Congress insisting that we acquire, from the European countries, as part of our war bounty, large supplies of critical minerals and metals to be stock-piled here for future use in a national emergency.

"Before we do that, and before we send continued shipments of billions of dollars abroad, I respectfully suggest and urge that we pay our duly acknowledged debt, at best but a few millions, to our own loyal and proven producers of these necessary materials. With me they come first."

The History of Oleo Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERLIN HULL
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, while the bill is pending to repeal all Federal taxes on oleomargarine, now fixed by law at one-fourth cent per pound on uncolored oleo and 10 cents per pound on yellow-colored oleo, it is interesting to receive a communication written by W. N. Moore,

of Chicago, relating the story of oleomargarine from the beginning of the movement to stop the sale of oleo or "butterine" as butter.

Mr. Moore is an Illinois farmer who has had wide acquaintance of the movement from inception. His business experience has included the manufacture and sale of butter and of oleo as its competitor. He knew of the extensive sale of colored oleo as butter, and the system of bootlegging oleo in all large centers before the taxes were imposed. He warns that repeal of Federal taxes will again bring back the same system of bootlegging competition with the healthful product of the dairy farms.

The discussion of the subject by Mr. Moore is both interesting and valuable and is as follows:

THE OLEO TAX LAWS

The oleo tax-repeal law has passed the House of Representatives and is now before the Senate for action. The time is short.

No Member of Congress nor any leader of public opinion should take a positive stand upon this legislation—either for it or against it—without first exploring the facts that led to the passage of the present laws and the consequences that grew out of them. Likewise, he should carefully consider the repercussions that are likely to occur if the oleo-tax laws are now repealed.

There has been comparative calm on the oleo front for about 30 years. In that time there have been few violations and the consumer has had ample protection against fraud, and the oleo manufacturers have prospered. However, in those 30 years many bright young men have risen to positions of importance and influence in the legislature halls—in the oleomargarine business as well as in the dairy industry without any knowledge of the history of the oleo-tax laws. As of today, most of those men view these laws as simply nuisance-tax laws.

The oleo-tax laws are legally tax laws for revenue, although those taxes seldom amount to more than enough to administer the law. That was the intention. It was desired to put the burden upon the consumer at the lowest possible figure.

The oleo-tax laws are intended to extend beyond the revenue feature. They are expected to enable the Government to put wholesome restraints upon the illegal sale of oleomargarine in any form. They resemble the liquor-tax laws.

In view of the importance of the action about to be taken by the Senate, this condensed history is compiled and presented.

THE AUTHOR

This writer was a member of the group which first proposed the 10-cent tax on oleomargarine colored any shade of yellow. He has ever since supported the vigorous enforcement of the law of 1902. Originally he was a manufacturer of creamery butter, and was among the first to sell creamery butter in cartons. In 1909 and 1910 he was employed as assistant to the president of a company which was then the largest manufacturer of oleomargarine in the United States. Because of his experience and success in selling butter in cartons, he was assigned the undertaking of selling all the products of that oleomargarine factory in cartons. This he accomplished and in so doing increased the sale by about 40 percent. He received a surprise bonus for the job he did, and retained the friendship of his employer, until the death of that employer many years afterward.

He is now a farmer in Illinois. Among the several products of his farms, he grows soya beans and hopes to continue to do so. Currently he is also engaged in selling butter and other dairy products in a large way.

He retains his fundamental interest in the oleo tax laws and their enforcement. He would regret to see them repealed now. He feels such a repeal would be disastrous to the oleomargarine manufacturers as well as to the dairy interests. And in any event, the butter consumer can get only the worst of it.

He has no fight with either group. He has friends in both camps.

THE HISTORY OF THE OLEO TAX LAWS

During the Franco-Prussian War in 1870 the French Army pieced out their scant butter supply by adding oleo oil to butter. They felt justified in doing so, as scientists of those days held the oleo fat in the cow was the source of the butterfat found in milk. This theory has been long since exploded. After the war the secret of this process of adding oleo fat to butter was brought to the United States. Further experiments were made, and a big improvement in methods and results were effected.

Along in the 1880's a very acceptable blend of butter, oleo oil, and neutral lard was put on the market under the trade name of Butterine. The manufacturer sold it for what it was, but it was invariably sold to the consumer as pure butter. This practice was condoned when the butter supply was short, but with the rapid development of the dairy interests, it was a severe block to the sale of pure butter, except at prices unprofitable to butter producers. At the time Butterine had about 80 percent of fancy creamery butter, which made the cost about 2 cents per pound under the cost of fancy pure butter. Consequently the farmers in 1886 induced Congress to put a tax of 2 cents per pound on Butterine in order to equalize the cost. No mention was made of color. It was always colored.

To meet this situation the Butterine manufacturers steadily reduced the quantity of butter used, until the spread in cost between Butterine and butter rose to about 10 cents per pound. It was still all sold to the consumer as pure butter. The Government made no effort to check the practice. They were interested only in the collection of the tax.

The effect of this situation is disclosed in the record that while in 1888, shortly after the tax law went into effect, the price of fancy creamery butter rose to 38 to 40 cents in the winter time, but 1893, 10 years later, it wasn't possible to get the price above 20½ cents for the best butter, while the general run of table-grade creamery butter sold between 13 and 16 cents, and dairy butter was selling at 6 to 12 cents per pound.

The situation was so bad that farmers were selling off entire dairy herds.

Under the leadership of Mr. Charles Y. Knight—then a dairy paper editor but afterwards inventor of the "silent Knight" automobile engine—a small group, of which this writer was one, evolved the idea of putting a tax of 10 cents per pound upon all butterine to again equalize the cost to manufacture butter and butterine.

Under the presidency of the Honorable W. D. Hoard, ex-Governor of Wisconsin, the National Dairy Union was formed. Charles Y. Knight was secretary and manager. They found ready support from dairy farmers, who joined the National Dairy Union in thousands. Nevertheless, it took several years to work up enough sentiment to assure the actual passage of our bill by Congress. However, at this point our lawyers advised caution. They feared that later the Supreme Court might declare our law as unconstitutional because it might appear to them that it was an attempt to virtually prohibit the manufacture and sale of any kind or color of butterine. So under the guidance of our lawyer, the bill was rewritten to make the 10-cent tax apply only to butterine made with any shade of yellow, while the tax on butterine sold in its natural color, white, to the consumers would pay a tax of one-fourth cent per pound. This difference was considered a sufficient inducement to get the consumer to accept it in its natural color, and over the years it has worked out that way.

The bill was passed in 1902. The name of the product was changed oleomargarine. The law has been taken to the Supreme Court several times for various reasons. In every case the Supreme Court has upheld the law.

In the early years, the application of the law was disappointing to the Dairy Industry. They soon found the markets flooded with colored oleomargarine upon which the 10-cent tax had not been paid, and sold as pure creamery butter and at a price near, but just below the price of the best creamery butter.

The process was for a buyer to get white oleomargarine in bulk and in quantity. This white oleomargarine was then taken to a hidden basement or barn and colored yellow. It was then sold to the consumer as butter, through fly-by-night so-called tea or dairy stores, or from a basket on the arm of a so-called farmer at the housewife's back door.

This all led to a national scandal.

Meanwhile, the manufacturers were selling their product for exactly what it was, but were demanding cash on the counter before the white oleomargarine was released to the buyer.

Finally, the Attorney General ruled that any manufacturers who sold white oleomargarine which was afterwards sold fraudulently as yellow oleomargarine upon which the 10-cent tax was not paid, or if it were sold as pure creamery butter, would be declared an accessory to the crime.

In the end, several manufacturers were indicted, and prosecuted under this interpretation but so far as I remember only one was convicted. The company and the salesmen were fined heavily, but the president of the company was sent to jail.

Meanwhile, dozens of "moonshiners" were convicted and sent to jail. About this time there was another break in the butter market. Taken all together this combination of events got the oleomargarine business upon a sound and honorable basis. The manufacturers confined their efforts to selling white oleomargarine in cartons—and with a capsule of color in the carton for the use of the housewife. At first these color capsules were used extensively by frugal housewives, to fool their husbands as a joke; after the joke was over the average housewife never used the color capsules at all. They find their way to the garbage pail. Have verified this situation by interviewing housewives in retail stores. They now laugh at the idea of going to the trouble of coloring a product that is in no way improved by the addition of color.

For the past 30 years the housewives have saved millions of dollars from the fact that the oleomargarine they buy costs only the price of oleomargarine and not the price of butter. Also, the oleomargarine manufacturer has been engaged in an honest business—he sells his product for what it is, he has avoided continual friction with the dairy interests, and he has prospered by it. His volume has grown with the increase in population. One old-time manufacturer told me the other day that, if necessary, he would contribute to a fund to help defeat the repeal laws. He says he can sleep nights now but if the law is repealed, he will have bootleggers for customers, and be constantly in fear of his life or liberty.

Now comes a group of younger men who know nothing of the history of the oleo-tax laws, and under the theory that the oleo taxes are only nuisance taxes, want to return to the conditions that existed before 1886 and long after 1902. I can say, confidently, out of a wide and long experience, that to repeal the oleo-tax laws at this time would be to release an economic atomic bomb at a most unfortunate moment.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF REPEAL

Manufacturers of oleomargarine may expect an almost immediate revival of all the evils of the early days under the 1902 law.

If an immense "bootleg" business grew up when the excess spread between white oleomargarine was 10 cents per pound or less, what can you expect at a time when butter is selling at 30 to 50 cents per pound above the price of white oleomargarine? If the racket prospered when surrounded by all kinds of restraints and punishments, what can you expect when all restraints are off?

There is little to fear from the oleo manufacturers or well established retail outlets. But where there was one "moonshiner" in 1908, there are 1,000 today. They have been trained in the illegal liquor business—in the black markets and in hundreds of other rackets. Some are naive enough to think the situation we are now facing can be handled under the Pure Food and Drugs Act, or similar acts. They will find that such laws can handle the manufacturers and established retail outlets, but they are wholly impotent when dealing with thousands of individual racketeers.

On the other hand, creamery men are going to be in a constant war to protect their well-known brands. Competition is apt to rise in a thousand places. So far as butter is concerned, they will be dealing in a demoralized market, with a constantly decreasing volume. Those who handle or manufacture oleomargarine as well as butter, will find the losses in the butter market and the value of their investment in the dairy field, will far outweigh any gain by a temporary increase in their oleomargarine departments.

The consumer is now well protected from fraud. With the repeal of the oleo taxes she will be frequently victimized into buying colored oleomargarine as butter at the price of butter. She may gain some temporary advantage from a lower price for butter, but she soon will be faced with war conditions, under which it was impossible to get butter at any price. Farmers will rapidly sell off their cows, which are so located that their product cannot be sold as milk, for under the prices apt to exist for butter, these cows will show a big loss.

In 1944 there were 41,257,000 cows, heifers, and calves on the dairy farms. In 1948 there are only 37,336,000 head. If this cow population goes down a couple of million more, as it surely will, there is very little chance to ever have enough butter to go around. Meanwhile farmers having lost their outlets through butter will have to get more for bottled milk, etc. Instead of the consumer benefiting by the repeal law, she will be faced with an even higher cost of living.

There is much misunderstanding about the saving the consumer will make when the 10-cent tax is repealed. The facts are, that under normal prewar conditions the sale of all kinds of oleomargarine was between 300,000,000 and 350,000,000 pounds per year, or at that time maybe 3 to 3½ pounds per capita. Of this only about 1 percent or say 3,000,000 pounds is sold as 10-cent tax oleomargarine, and of this probably not over 1,000,000 pounds is sold to housewives—and then only to young housewives who are buying oleomargarine for the first time. The increased sales in 1943 and 1944 was because of war needs. The upsurge in 1947 and 1948 is because of extreme shortage not only of butter but more especially of other cooking fats.

If nature is allowed to take its course, all the dairy products and cooking fats will soon readjust themselves as to volume and as to price, but if the oleo tax laws are repealed the whole food industry is going to be in turmoil for several years.

On the one hand, there will probably be a rush to have liquor and other excise taxes reduced, because the tax on oleo was repealed.

On the other hand, the dairy farmers are not going to take it lying down. If this repeal bill is passed, you can expect an immediate campaign to have them put back on again. To back up this campaign, State laws will probably be introduced to put prohibitive taxes on any food containing cottonseed oil, soya bean oil, coconut oil, and many more.

Farmers are now very sensitive to any hostile legislation or any market action that makes any phase of agriculture unprofitable.

This repeal bill is much more far-reaching than most people think.

It seems like an ill time to monkey with a buzz saw.

The time to act is now.

If you agree substantially with the thoughts herein expressed, suggest you wire your Senator at once and get everyone like-minded to do the same.

W. S. MOORE.

Old-Age Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. LOVE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer of May 27, 1948:

SUFFERING OF THE OLD

The United States Government now has issued a social security fund of some $10,000,000,000, and yet the shrinking value of the United States dollar is making very hard times for the elderly and aged people of our country. We have seen their sufferings here in West Virginia and the same is true for the rest of the country.

"Squeeze of living costs on people who draw social security checks is at a critical stage," says the United States News. "Pay for retired couple is at an average of $23.48 a month. Benefits are shrinking as prices rise.

"Result is that less than half the workers who have paid for their insurance and who have reached 65 are actually retired. More than half of those who have benefits due them are continuing to work for a living. The number in that situation is growing at the rate of 55,000 a year. And thousands of workers who have taken their benefits and retired are forced to draw relief payments, too.

Our view is that Congress sooner or later must face up to this situation and we would like to see it done now. Part of the difficulty, of course, is that what we have is an insurance system operated by politicians and controlled by them. In reality, social security is a form of compulsory insurance. It appears, however, to be definitely fixed, for better or for worse, in the American way of things.

The manner in which old people are cared for is a measure of the true worth of any civilization. When they are neglected and are made to suffer, often through exigencies beyond their control, it constitutes a reproach on any civilization. On the other hand, a serene and unworried old age as bodily ailments impair the human frame, is a glory to any civilization.

We should like to see Congress make the necessary adjustments. Our State government of West Virginia likewise has been neglectful in this matter. Surely a Government rich enough to squander billions upon billions of dollars upon fanciful projects in Europe should muster the resources to take care of our own aged American citizens who have toiled and in many instances given their sons that our country might survive.

Subject of Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted to extend my remarks, I include herewith a radio address by Mr. Thomas D. Russell, president of Russell Manufacturing Co., Alexander City, Ala., over radio station WRFS. To my mind this is a masterpiece on the pertinent subject of politics. I commend it to the attention of the Members of the House.

SUBJECT OF POLITICS

Today I wish to speak to you on the subject of politics. Please understand from the start that I am not running for public office, nor am I advocating the election or defeat of any particular candidate. I simply wish to talk to you about candidates in general and politics in its broadest sense.

On Tuesday you go to the polls to choose the men who will represent you in the various elective offices to be filled at this election. The choice of these officials rests entirely with the majority of the votes cast by you. This country is still one of the few places in the world where the people themselves can choose freely and without coercion any candidate they think is best qualified for the job.

During every election the air and the newspapers are filled with charges and countercharges—with lavish promises. I think it is high time for us to sit down and seriously and carefully consider each and every issue and each and every candidate.

First and foremost, I urge each one of you to be sure that you cast your ballot. This is your duty as a citizen who is entitled to vote. What a howl you would raise if anyone threatened your right to cast your ballot. Bloody wars have been fought to guarantee the freedom of the ballot and any country which denies or infringes on this right is a dictatorship and its people are merely slaves of the state. If you, the voter, do not take your responsibility seriously and vote on each and every issue, then you are not fit to have that right. Furthermore, if any person is so dishonest or lacking in principle that he would buy or sell a vote for money or personal favors he should be disqualified and public opinion should brand him as a disreputable citizen. If you are willing to let others decide all these things for you, then what right have you to complain of the kind of government you get?

The second obligation you have is to use your ballot intelligently. Study the issues to be voted on and if you are not sure in your own mind, find out the facts from others whose judgment you respect. If rival candidates are involved, give serious consideration to their qualifications for the job in question.

It is easy for a candidate to promise anything, and he usually does, in order to secure your vote. The average platform of a candidate should not be the deciding factor in reaching your decision. Look at most any

platform. They promise good roads, better schools, more pensions, particularly old-age pension, higher wages, higher farm prices, more homes, more cars, more food, more pay, less work, lower taxes, lower living costs, and so on and on and on.

Now any person with an ounce of intelligence knows full well that no one man, or for that matter, no group of men can give you all of these things. How can you have lower living costs and higher wages; how can you have bigger pensions, better roads, better schools and expect lower taxes? After all, there are certain fundamental laws of economics that cannot be changed no matter who holds office or what they do. We are simply kidding ourselves if we think otherwise. Thousands of schemes have been tried in thousands of different forms, but no scheme has ever yet succeeded in doing away with our basic laws of nature and economics.

How then can you intelligently decide between rival candidates for office? The surest way I know is to study the men themselves. Ask yourself these questions: Is he honest? Is he sincere? What has he accomplished? What are his qualifications for the job? What education has he had? What experience? How is he regarded by his associates? Is he a man who is familiar with the duties of the job he seeks? Has he the necessary character and dignity to command the respect of the office he seeks? Will he carry any weight with the other members of his group, or will he be looked upon as a clown, or at best, a general nuisance?

All of these questions are of the utmost importance in choosing officials for any office, regardless of what it may be. You cannot elect a man to office and expect him to be anything except what he has already proven himself to be. A crook will still be a crook—an ignorant man will still remain ignorant. A show-off will still be a show-off, except he will do it at your expense instead of his own.

I have heard many people say about some candidate—"Since he got in office he has the big head. He does not come around to my place and shake hands any more and ask me to vote for him." Now I want to ask you a question and I want you to answer honestly. How much good could a public officeholder do who spent his time going about his area shaking hands and kissing babies when he should be in his office attending to the business and duties of his job. I cannot answer for you, but for myself, I would rather have less handshaking and more work, less speeches and more attention to the needs of the people.

Never having had any experience in politics and being more or less ignorant of the finer points involved, I can only view the situation as I would view my own business, which I do know about. I would hate to imagine the mess that our mills would be in if we used the same method of selecting our officials as the average voter uses in selecting men to run their affairs in public life. Just suppose, for instance, that we would choose one of our superintendents because he promised to give everybody more money and less work, or because he promised to double our production and at the same time lower our costs. Suppose we chose him because he went around making speeches and shaking hands and bragging about how ignorant and humble he was. Suppose he had no experience whatever in running a cotton mill, but because he was a farmer, or a well digger, or a circus clown and wore red socks and green suspenders we should select him to run a mill. You know as well as I do what would happen to that mill, and mark my words, the same thing will happen to your Government. Now all of this may sound absurd, but, nevertheless, it is happening all the time and will continue to happen unless we, the voters, wake up and face the facts of life.

If you have good, honest, intelligent men in office you had better keep them there. Perhaps they do not vote on every issue or act on every occasion as you would have them. However, I doubt seriously if any 10 of you would agree on any 10 separate issues. An officeholder is not supposed to represent you or me alone, he is supposed to act in the interest of all the voters of his area.

Some of the men running for office in this election have long, honorable records that they have made while in office; they have done their jobs well, and they are highly regarded by their fellow officials. They have reached the point where they are experienced and capable and carry respect. Their opinion carries weight and when they speak they are listened to with attention. They have worked for years to reach this point where they are really experienced and know the job. They lead clean, honorable lives that would be an example to our coming generations.

Then what happens? Someone who wants a job comes along and tries to get their office. They attack him with every form of unfair and often untrue statements and insinuations. They appeal to the ignorant and the prejudiced. You know as well as I do that there are a lot of people who are "agin" most everybody and everything on general principles. Sometimes I wonder how they manage to live with themselves. The job seekers I am talking about will promise anything. They can assure you that should they be elected you will have greener fields and a brighter tomorrow. Surely you people have more intelligence than to be taken in by such "hobokum."

We are facing one of the gravest crises in the history of our country. The next few years may well decide the fate of our Nation for generations to come. Now, as never before, we need men of knowledge, men of courage, and men of ability to handle our public affairs. Now is not the time to swap experience for vague promises. We must have able men in office or we ourselves will suffer the consequences.

On the other hand, if we have incompetent men in office, then we should remove them and put competent men in their place. But, be sure, absolutely sure, that they are competent and have proven ability before you elect them. Above all things, never vote for or against a man for personal reasons, or for any reason at all, except to be sure of selecting the best man available for the job. You will never have good officials or good government if you vote through ignorance, or prejudice, or spite, or any other method instead of common sense and good judgment.

Again, I want to emphasize that I am not speaking in behalf of any candidate for public office, neither am I speaking against any particular candidate. I have my own opinion about the various candidates and I honestly believe that I have reached that opinion through a careful study of their abilities and backgrounds. How I shall vote is my own business and how you vote is your own business and that is as it should be. This is still a free country and it is up to you and me, as a voter, to keep it free.

My only plea to you is to get out and vote next Tuesday and to vote with intelligence.

Hon. Charles R. Robertson, of North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, a most fitting tribute was paid to our esteemed colleague, CHARLES R. ROBERTSON, in a publication in his home State of North Dakota. Mr. ROBERTSON has always been a constructive leader in Congress on farm matters. He takes a great interest in the work of our Agriculture Committee, and has at all times been most cooperative and helpful. His suggestions are always sound, and you can tell that they come straight from the grass roots of his great agricultural State of North Dakota. Mr. ROBERTSON is making a great contribution to American agriculture.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I should like under unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the article to which I make reference entitled "ROBERTSON Takes Strong Stand on Farm, Water Legislation."

ROBERTSON TAKES STRONG STAND ON FARM, WATER LEGISLATION

Congressman CHARLES R. ROBERTSON, representing North Dakota at large, has been one of the outstanding leaders of Congressional farm thought and action. By virtue of the fact that he serves as a member of the powerful House Committee on Appropriations, where all money bills must originate, he has been in a particularly advantageous position to look out for the interests of farmers generally, and North Dakota specifically.

URGES MORE FUNDS FOR REA LINES

This year for example, Mr. ROBERTSON appeared personally before the Agriculture Subcommittee on Appropriations on several different occasions. He urged increased funds for Rural Electrification. The House committee approved $400,000,000 in loans for fiscal 1949—$100,000,000 more than the Presidential approved estimate. A deficiency Subcommittee on Appropriations recently approved an additional $175,000,000 for REA loans for fiscal 1949—to be used between now and July 1—bringing the total available for fiscal 1948 to $400,000,000.

In an urgent plea for continuation and expansion of the Soil Conservation Service, Mr. ROBERTSON asked for additional funds from the Agricultural Subcommittee. Six million dollars more than the Budget Bureau asked was approved by the House.

Last year Mr. ROBERTSON was active, both behind the scenes in committee and on the floor of Congress in support of agricultural appropriations.

PLAYS LARGE ROLE IN WATER PROGRAM

Congressman ROBERTSON has played an outstanding role in accelerating the program of water resource development in the State of North Dakota. He appeared before both Senate and House committees and has argued for this development on the floor of Congress at every opportunity He diligently worked with North Dakota people interested in these projects and with the subcommittees of appropriations responsible for evaluating the worth of the North Dakota program.

As a result of his efforts, more money is being spent today in North Dakota for the development of our water resources than has ever before been expended. Mr. ROBERTSON is extremely conversant with the problems, and has been working hard to "put water on the land" in North Dakota before another dry period hits.

WORKS TO MAINTAIN HIGH FARM PRICES

Mr. ROBERTSON has taken the lead in advocating a Federal program to insure the maintenance of high farm prices. A difficulty which should always be kept in mind is the fact that only one Member of the House of Representatives out of five comes from farm areas. Naturally the other four coming from nonfarm areas would like to see cheaper butter and cheaper farm products. On many occasions and in private conversations Con-

gressman ROBERTSON has called the attention of Congress to the importance of farm prices. They are the basis of our entire national economy, for every farm dollar generates $7 of national income. Not only does the farmer own two-thirds of the productive capital of the Nation, but he is the greatest consumer, though he represents only one-fifth of the total population.

Congressman ROBERTSON has been working for an extension of the Steagall amendment providing price supports for farm commodities. Unless farm prices remain high, another depression will result, for in every instance in history a farm price decline has dragged the rest of our economy down with it.

In an address to Congress last December, Mr. ROBERTSON spiked the rumor that farmers are profiteers and that high prices are the result of this profiteering. He pointed out the fallacy of the belief that rationing of farm products and price control could work successfully to stop inflation. Only through increased production by our farmers can we have an increasing standard of living, and the farmer must receive fair prices for his products or his production will decline.

PRESENTS FARM CASE ON OLEOMARGARINE

The mistaken belief that elimination of the tax on oleomargarine will bring down the cost of butter will result in action on such legislation at an early date. Mr. ROBERTSON has presented the case of the North Dakota farmer to the House Agricultural Committee and to Congress. The tax on uncolored margarine is but a quarter of a cent per pound. Removal of the 10 cents on colored oleo will take away the only protection the consumer has today. It will not bring down the cost of oleo, and it cannot bring down the cost of butter, which at a dollar a pound is a good buy considering other prices, and the cost of labor involved in production of butter. The most it will do is hurt the dairy industry, and thereby hurt the soil fertility of the Nation. North Dakota, which ranks seventh in butter production, will be one of the States most seriously affected. Mr. ROBERTSON will carry this matter to the floor of Congress when oleo legislation is considered.

ROBERTSON INTRODUCES MANY VITAL BILLS

In addition to taking part in hearings before the House Agriculture Committee and other committees hearing legislation vital to farmers, Mr. ROBERTSON introduced a number of important farm bills, some of which are listed: H. R. 483 provides for the payment of a bonus of 30 cents per bushel on wheat and corn produced and sold between January 1, 1945, and April 18, 1946. H. R. 2002 provides for the splitting of income between husband and wife for tax purposes, a provision which was incorporated in the tax reduction bill just passed over Presidential veto. H. R. 4041 to bring the Federal land bank back to North Dakota. H. R. 4855 provides for the entry free of duty of twine used for bailing hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding materials.

FIGHTS HARD FOR FARM LEGISLATION

A few of the more important measures endorsed and supported by Congressman ROBERTSON enacted into law are: (1) Extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation, (2) extension of price supports for wool, (3) emergency legislation to curb the deadly and dreaded hoof-and-mouth disease in Mexico, and a bill establishing a research laboratory to seek for a means of controlling and eradicating this disease, (4) Federal Aid Highway Act extension—first session—and an increased program calling for the expenditure of $1,500,000,000 in the next 3 years, 30 percent of which would be used to develop farm-to-market and rural post roads—second session. (5) Copper import tax suspension to solve the copper bottleneck holding up REA progress. (6) the extra session anti-inflation law providing for voluntary agreements rather than price control and rationing.

Housing Bill Not Socialistic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in the issue of the Detroit Free Press under date of May 17, there appeared a second and a forceful editorial relating to the unsolved, pressing housing problem.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include it at this point:

NOT SOCIALISTIC—T-E-W BILL IS VITAL TO NEEDS OF DETROIT

Not so very many years ago Detroit took pride in the fact that a higher percentage of its citizens owned their own homes than any other city in the United States.

In those days Detroit's slogan was, "Where life is worth living."

Since then things have changed. Two wars, and a fairly complete economic adjustment, have given Detroit a wholly new complexion.

The change has not, in many respects, been a happy one.

To a great extent we have been fighting a losing battle to make and keep this city the kind of place where life is worth living.

A good many solid citizens have given up and moved into the suburbs. The older parts of the town have deteriorated into slums, and no means has been devised to check this creeping blight.

One evidence of the city's failure has been in the housing situation. Blight on the one hand, and a rapidly increasing population on the other, have combined to make inadequate the number of decent homes available for its citizens.

What Detroit needs and needs desperately, is large scale face-lifting, by which its slums and blighted areas can be eliminated, and replaced with rental housing to meet the requirements of various income groups.

One way that can be accomplished is through Federal aid. Detroit's municipal income is not big enough to do the job in the face of all the other services which must be provided.

For that reason it is necessary to look to Washington, to the sort of relief that is contemplated in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. The purpose of the bill is to furnish help for cities like Detroit which are unable to save themselves.

The T-E-W bill, sponsored by Senator TAFT, has passed the Senate and is now bottled up in a House committee. There is grave danger that it will die there because of opposition on the part of the national real-estate lobby, which regards it as a socialistic measure. Private enterprise, the bill's foes contend, can do the job better if left alone.

Nearly 15 years ago the Detroit Public Housing Commission was set up as an authority to build and manage public-housing projects financed by Federal aid.

It was touch-and-go whether or not Detroit would get these projects because of opposition of real-estate and building interests.

Their arguments against these projects were exactly the same as those voiced now against the T-E-W bill.

Fifteen years the private builders have had to correct the situation and do what they claim they alone can do best.

They have not failed, because they have not tried, or because they do not really want to better conditions. They have failed because of circumstances with which they cannot cope.

What would have happened to Detroit during the last war if those public-housing projects had not been available to help provide for the influx of war workers?

They met an emergency need. But, while peace has come, the emergency has not passed.

Mayor Van Antwerp, lobbying last week in Washington for the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, made a dramatic presentation of the situation in Detroit.

He told of one old structure on the lower east side with 35 rooms renting for from $8.50 to $12 per room per week, bringing the owner a total income of $18,480 a year. The property is assessed at $12,490.

The building has inadequate toilet facilities for the number of people who live in it. Tenants use community kitchens. There are no yards or grounds around it.

Van Antwerp may have used the most extreme example he could find, but there are thousands of others which are nearly as bad.

And to correct this situation with public aid is called socialism.

Then it is socialism to publicly support the tuberculosis and other hospitals which draw most of their patients from quarters like these.

We think that rent gouging of the brutal type that is practiced by too many Detroiter slum property owners breeds more communism than all the manifestos that Karl Marx ever wrote.

Anyone familiar with the facts will agree that housing conditions were largely responsible for the outbreak of race rioting in Detroit in 1942.

We admit the argument of the opponents of the bill that private enterprise is much more desirable than Government in business.

But we reject the contention that it is socialism when Government has to step in where private enterprise cannot handle the situation to protect the public peace, health, and safety.

As Republican Senate leader Senator TAFT coauthored, sponsored, and guided to Senate passage the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

We never have been able to discover in Senator TAFT anything remotely suggesting the tinge of socialism. His most avid enemies never hinted that he was a radical—especially those who cannot forgive him for also fathering the Taft-Hartley labor law.

Taft-Ellender-Wagner opponents, both in the House and in public groups, would do better than to resort to demagogic tricks. They should take a larger view of the situation—an emergency situation in Detroit and many other industrial cities.

They should regard this housing bill as an emergency measure—one which can be repealed once the need for it passes, and private enterprise is able to shoulder the burden.

Without it, under existing circumstances, the outlook for the future of our great cities and the people who live in them, will remain pretty bleak.

Panama Canal Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the problem of the Panama Canal is one of the greatest issues now before the country. There appeared in the United

States Naval Academy Alumni Association monthly magazine Shipmate, in May 1948, a very informative article by Arthur Stanley Riggs, entitled "The Panama Question."

As you know the United States Naval Academy Alumni Association is composed largely of men whose lives have been associated with ships—their building and navigation. They understand the importance of the canal as a means of transporting ships. The editor of this magazine is Rear Adm. C. E. Coney, a former captain of the port of the Atlantic terminal of the Panama Canal.

Accompanying this article in Shipmate is a biographical note of its author:

Arthur Stanley Riggs, who contributes to Shipmate for the first time in this issue, is an archaeologist, art critic of distinction, historian, and accomplished lecturer specializing in the Spanish and Italian fields. His lifetime of travel, residence, and research in Europe, Africa, and the Far East, his long study of canals and their problems, and his service afloat and ashore in the Navy, in which he holds the rank of commander in the Reserve, preeminently qualify him to treat simply and forthrightly the great issues now facing the country in the improvement of the Panama Canal.

Outstanding among Commander Rigg's historical and biographical books are the Spanish Pageant, the Romance of Human Progress (just going into a new Spanish edition in Buenos Aires), Titian the Magnificent, and Velazquez: Painter of Truth, all published by the Bobbs Merrill Co. The two lives of the great painters, though new in 1946 and 1947, have already been hailed as the standard biographies of their subjects.

I recommend that every Member of Congress take time to read this informative article on the Panama Canal Question, and I am including it herewith:

THE PANAMA QUESTION

(By Commander Arthur Stanley Riggs, USNR, retired)

Half a century ago, when Turkey was front-page news quite frequently, we heard a great deal about the eastern question. Today the Panama question poses a problem much more vital to us, and one regarding which there has been so much loose talk and so little comprehension that some clarification seems in order.

The Western Hemisphere interposed a solid mass between ports of the Atlantic and those of the Pacific. The advantage to all shipping of canals, by affording short cuts to desired objectives, finally awoke the French to action, and without fully realizing what they were doing, they undertook in 1882 to cut the Western Hemisphere in two. The story of their great work—heroic yet tragic—the recital of the chicanery and mistakes which eventually wrecked the French effort, need not be retold here. Neither need the American experience, which resulted in completing the Panama Canal and putting it in operation in 1914. We have always rather fancied ourselves for doing that tremendous job. It was an accomplishment. But American engineers have always conveniently minimized or overlooked the fact that, except for Gorgas' conquest of the fever that was such a grim nuisance, we merely enlarged upon and completed what the brilliant French had imagined, planned with uncanny skill and carried far toward completion before we thought anything about it in a practical way.

Both nations, however, made one serious mistake which today faces us as something to be rectified if the Panama Canal is to function to its greatest advantage. Ships are not made of rubber, and the man has yet to be born who can triumph over the often incalculable, and always gigantic, forces of nature unless he knows the precise answers before he begins fighting. Explorers, diplomats, engineers, and businessmen dreamed out the Canal. Engineers planned it. Engineers and contractors built it. From the purely engineering standpoint they did a magnificent job and created an eighth wonder of the world. But ask the man who has to conn an unwieldly tanker through the Gaillard cut, with sharp rock ledges on each bank, and your vocabulary will probably be considerably extended, and intensified to richness. No advice on design, so far as the writer knows, was ever sought from the men most capable of giving it: the men who take the ships through. As a consequence, the Canal in certain aspects is far from satisfactory; it presents unjustifiable hazards; its record of casualties is greater than is generally realized. And now on top of this comes a plan to make those hazards still more prominent by increasing the proportion of the Canal subject to danger.

As a matter of plain statement, the Panama Canal question, which has assumed major proportions since the end of the war, is far from being what it is generally considered to be. Public Law 280 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, which provided for an examination of the facts and for recommendations for the improvement of the Canal, is a curiously worded document, especially in differentiating between "interoceanic commerce" and "security" with reference to the "national defense." What inference must the layman inevitably draw from such blundering statements? The function and sole reason for the existence of the Canal is the transit of vessels of every sort from ocean to ocean as quickly, as safely, and as easily as possible. The needs of commerce cannot be considered as apart from the national defense because they are one and the same. The only practical solution of the commercial problem solves the defense problem automatically.

The atomic-bomb scaremongers are frightening nobody but themselves, and their panic has led them into arguments indefensible at best. Closely analyzed, attack by atomic missiles would affect both types of canal equally in two main respects, prove more serious in two others to the sea-level artery, and be approximately the same for both in the case of damage to locks and dams, with the balance a little to the worse for the sea-level type. Governor Mehaffey frankly admitted the complete vulnerability of the sea level or any canal in his testimony on January 20, 1948, before the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, in the words: "* * * whatever kind of canal you have, you must have adequate defenses." This demolishes authoritatively the argument in his own report that the sea-level type affords a greater degree of security than the high-level lake type, and shows the inconsistency in the thinking of the sea-level advocates.

If we consider security in detail, the first item to stand forth is the restricted channel in each type of canal. Even a near-sighted bomber could hardly fail to note that the 30 miles of channel blasted through the terrain at sea level is a bigger and far more obvious target than the 7 miles of Gaillard cut. Argument on that score is impossible. No modern bomber could possibly miss either one, and robot missiles, unless brought down out at sea, would have four times more likelihood of damaging the sea-level channel than of striking in Gaillard cut. Radiological contamination of the water of the high-level lake would be serious, but against that we can foresee a more extensive land contamination all along the edges of the sea-level ditch. At either side of the Isthmus the principal harbors and foci of population—Panama, Balboa, Cristobal, and Colon—would suffer equally regardless of canal types.

When control of the Chagres River freshets is considered, the sea-level canal is far more vulnerable than the high-lake type because of the length, size, instability and greater number of its control structures, including the spillways. Moreover, since the sea-level type requires a tidal lock or gate, that fact makes its structures as vulnerable as the high-level lake type, with the added feature that the reconstruction and replacing of the enormous gates would be a time-consuming job, especially during war time. While it was going on—assuming that the channel itself was not damaged, which seems unlikely in the circumstances—vessels could safely use the canal only during the short period immediately before, during and immediately after slack water. In the the high level, the draining of Gatun Lake by breaching its dams would leave the locks empty until the lake could be refilled. In either case, admitting radiation, the availability of labor to do the dangerous work of repairing war damage, constitutes a grave and unanswerable problem.

The bomb-scare experts who recommend the sea-level canal, moreover, avoid pointedly the entirely reasonable assumption that if the canal has any strategic values to us, it has the same values to any foe capable of defeating us. No power is likely to attack it seriously—neither Germany nor Japan did so during the war despite ample opportunity—for the excellent reason that it might wish to use the canal for its own purposes, or keep it functioning for the sake of its moral effect upon our neighbors. Altogether, the atom bomb in itself seems negligible as a serious factor in any remodeling or new construction. The Governor in his report to Congress evidently has misconstrued the law, and instead of suggesting the best operational canal that can be economically achieved, recommended something that not even faulty interpretation of a mischievously worded law can legitimize.

Besides the atomic bomb nonsense, there is the much graver matter of misleading engineering generalities to be considered in the Digest of the Governor's Report, which affords insufficient basic or essential engineering data. The plates illustrating it are all mere one-dimensional sketches. If anything ever called for detailed four-dimensional studies of the most meticulous accuracy, this is surely it, and no attempt to discuss the plans without such data would be anything but wasted time. But the report's omissions are as significant as its vagueness. It completely fails to mention the disasters attending the construction of the great dams at Fort Peck on the Missouri and Belle Fourche in South Dakota, to cite only two of several examples.

In both cases the best engineering experience and skill had worked out what were considered almost perfect structures under material conditions as nearly completely homogeneous as are ever likely to be encountered. Yet at Fort Peck, while construction was going on, more than 5,000,000 cubic yards of material suddenly rolled down into the reservoir, so swiftly that men were caught up in it and perished before their companions' eyes. The whole disaster was over in 10 minutes. The foundations of betonite and shale had simply sheared off, and the collapse was the result. Belle Fourche failed because a very dry season had lowered the water level, and about five or six hundred feet of the upstream side gave way and slid down into the reservoir.

Since such failures have been repeated in what might be regarded as ideally conceived and planned structures, what can we possibly expect from the tremendous structures at Panama? What about attempting subaqueous excavation to depths as great as 147 feet? What about many miles of control embankments of earth and rock to be built in swamp and water between 70 and 80 feet in depth and later dewatered on the canal side? Will not the equilibrium of the geological strata

be immediately disturbed all the way from Gatun to Miraflores, just as it was as Belle Fourche? The final catastrophe might easily occur when the rapid unwatering, from a plus 85 feet, the present lake level, to sea level, is undertaken. Removing the tremendous pressure of that depth and weight of water will unbalance the valley floor between canal and embankments, and large-scale movements of the different strata are practically a certainty in consequence. Belle Fourche was merely the primary example, on a small scale. The Panama affair would be colossal.

During the 27 years between 1914 and 1941 the Panama Canal more than fulfilled its designed purpose of permitting the passage of any vessel—except for the two giant Cunarders, meant only for the North Atlantic runs and an occasional cruise—between the two oceans. None but a few experts thought of studying the published records to learn exactly how well it was performing its function, and what accidents had for one reason or another, occurred. Then came the war, larger armed vessels, a tremendous growth of both manufacturing and international trade, and Congress foresaw the present canal would probably be inadequate to the steadily increasing traffic at some period in the not distant future. The alternatives before the lawmakers were apparently simple: improve and enlarge the present canal, or dig a bigger one.

At this point the new school philosophy of disregarding cost entirely when governmental activities are concerned thrust up its ugly head and intruded upon the scene. The argument it advanced was, boiled down to its fundamentals, that we destroy the existing canal, dig and build a bigger one, and forget both the billions of dollars and the increased taxes it would cost, the indeterminate time it would take to complete the project. A great task for a great people; a monumental achievement. It may be unkind to suggest such a thing, but to the man who thinks things through, the proposition smells very much like either boondoggling on a titanic scale or the grossest attempt ever made to raid the Treasury annually for years by the men who devised the scheme and would put it into effect for the benefit of the contractors who excavate the ditch, build the dams, and provide the heavy machinery.

As always happens when a national undertaking of the importance of the canal is being considered, besides the inevitable opposition suggestion, there springs up a crop of weird fancies so absurd they dismiss themselves from serious consideration. Certain self-styled experts urge that we tunnel through the Continental Divide for miles, lay a railway 20 tracks—more than 100 feet—wide, hoist our 50,000-ton battleships and monster carriers up on huge flatcars, and shoot them through from sea to sea. Other experts carry their flights of fancy even further, and assure us that they can lay a railroad that will climb across the Divide on the Isthmus of Tehauntepec, and make our largest and heaviest craft scoot over with all the ease of the "daring young man on the flying trapeze." Not so fantastic but presenting numberless difficulties and all but incalculable cost in time and money are the schemes for interoceanic canals in several other locations.

One vital factor overlooked by all these dreamers is the cold table of statistics issued by the Panama Canal of the tonnage floated through, the cash receipts from it, the costs of operation, and the showing of a profit only by juggling the figures, when in reality the deficit caused by the canal's operation runs to millions annually. Cut that revenue by building another canal, anywhere, and we shall have two deficit-producing liabilities instead of one, two vulnerable points of attack should an enemy be tempted, and a capacity so much more than adequate for any foreseeable emergency or normal growth than an extra canal assumes the proportions of a meretricious display of our power and wealth. War is concentrated waste, but it is understandable that the national requirements in time of war sometimes make it necessary to forget all about cost for the sake of production. The pernicious notion that we can go on forever spending fabulous sums on futile whimsies such as the sea level canal, the inter-American highway and the Canol project, and paying interest without amortizing the debt appreciably, in the end spells ruin.

That there is nothing academic about this is given startling confirmation by a comparison of the figures for excavation of the sea level canal over the 10 years estimated necessary for its construction, with the actual excavated yardage of the present canal. The figures are most effective—and shocking—when tabulated—

1906–1916: Total excavations, including slides—267,000,000 cubic yards.

1949–1959: Ditto for sea level, not including slides—1,069,000,000 cubic yards.

In a word, the Governor's report urges us to try to excavate four times as much material, three-fourths of it solid rock, in the same length of time as was required for the existing channel, notwithstanding the strong probability of greater stratigraphic disturbances than occurred before. All this, we are asked to believe, could be accomplished without interfering with the routine operation of the present waterway. How many of the engineers who have had actual working experience on the Isthmus would endorse such a dream?

The Panama question before the country today is in one sense simplicity itself. We know that some 15 years hence we shall need greater capacity if the world and commerce continue their usual growths. The obvious thing is to increase the capacity of the present canal, if possible without interfering with its daily operation or hazarding its existence. This is the thrifty, the safe, and the businesslike thing to do. The drawback to it is that the amount of actual work—excavation, construction, supplies, special machinery, etc.—is relatively small, the length of time the work would require to complete equally short, and the total bill, even under inflation, not only an amount we can safely pay, but which will not add dangerously to the tolls charged for ship transits.

Contrast that with the beautiful dream of the men who say we must have a sea-level canal. This means the practical destruction of considerable parts of the existing canal and the abandonment of the rest for ship transit, the excavation of a yardage still incalculable because nobody can determine what the final effects of disturbing the unstable strata would be; the laborous building up of many miles of the enormous dams already mentioned; the creation of special machinery for deep subaqueous dredging, and the building of special repair shops where that machinery can be kept in fair working condition most of the time; the thousands of skilled and day laborers, expert machinists, foremen, surveyors, clerks, cooks, supply staff, doctors, nurses, pharmacists, and all the rest who would make up an army of size; and the time, estimated at from 5 to 20 years, for which the bill as now seen attains the modest total of somewhere between the minimum of two and a half billions as published in the Digest of the Governor's Report, and the probable maximum of ten to fifteen billions of dollars. To any sane layman who considers the problem as he would an individual investment, on the basis of wise use of money for the sake of accomplishing a given purpose at a cost within the means available, there seems only one possible answer.

That answer, so far as any solution has been developed to the present time, seems to be the terminal lake plan. Without the slightest interference with the operation of the canal, the terminal lake solves the very embarrassing present lack of terminal-lake anchorage facilities at the Pacific end of the Canal, and by so doing increases its capacity to the point where we need have no anxiety about any demands we can foresee. The sea-level plan, which would make an entirely new waterway, might easily prove after it was begun, to be impossible to complete because of the nature of the terrain and its reactions to vast excavation and sudden unwatering. Against doubt, certainty is preferable; against vast expenditure over many years, reasonable expense for a short and determinable time meets the requirements.

Very few Americans have any idea of the defects that, almost as much as the exigencies of increasing traffic, make it necessary to improve the canal, and the generally docile acceptance by the public of anything the government says is good has contributed to a widespread indifference and the assumption that everything at Panama is exactly as we all would have it. Unfortunately this is far from the case. To begin with, when the canal was taken over from the French, its practical operation was not considered. The engineers thought that water deep enough to float vessels with a few extra feet to spare, and wide enough to permit two craft to pass in even the narrowest parts, assured safe navigation. Shipping men were not consulted, and the opinions of the pilots who handle vessels in transit were not demanded. In consequence, a number of serious errors was incorporated in the design. Ever since the Canal was opened these have been causing delay, inconvenience, and accidents.

Briefly stated, the outstanding defects are the entire lack of any high-level anchorage at the Pacific end of the Canal; the creation of a bottleneck at the Pedro Miguel lock which delays traffic severely; lockage surges in Gaillard Cut which complicate navigation and make passage through the rocky cut more hazardous. In addition to these and other things, Gaillard Cut is affected by fog on the average of one night in three during every year. These land fogs may descend early in the evening and remain until after daylight. While they are present it is impossible to move any vessels because the reduced visibility throughout the entire 7 miles of the rock-bound cut makes navigation too dangerous. It may be observed in passing that the sea-level cut asked for would be 30 miles long, and the water surface more than 85 feet lower, with the inevitable consequence that the fog area would be far greater and its dissipation under the rays of the sun probably slower because of the greater depth of the cut and the increased height of the surrounding banks, thus multiplying the obstacle many times over.

The terminal lake plan, already mentioned, is the only project for improvement which has taken all these and other facts into full consideration. Today vessels which have to wait to enter the canal from the Pacific are obliged to moor at Balboa or lie to outside. To obviate this disadvantage, the terminal lake plan provides in the simplest possible manner for berthing inside the canal area itself, with moorings for 20 to 30 vessels. As normal traffic during nocturnal fogs is well within the capacity of this proposed anchorage at the Pacific end, it is clear that this scheme affords shelter for both present and anticipated traffic.

Creation of this Pacific terminal lake at high level balances the Canal perfectly, as it provides at Gatun Lake level an anchorage at the Pacific end corresponding to that already existing at the Atlantic end of the Canal. Moreover, it does so as an incident to its major task of removing the bad bottleneck at Pedro Miguel. As everyone knows, the Pacific locks are divided into two sets, with a single stage at Pedro Miguel, then a mile

or so of Miraflores Lake, and then the double stage Miraflores locks to sea level. By clearing this obstruction across the south end of Gaillard Cut with the removal of Pedro Miguel lock, placing all three stages together in a new location at Miraflores, and throwing a dam across the present Miraflores two-stage locks, the Canal is made open and clear for traffic all the way from Gatun to Miraflores, the dangerous surges cease to exist, and water now going to waste will flow into the new Miraflores Lake, thus supplementing the Gatun Lake watershed by 35 square miles, and improving navigation from the most practical angle. The added feature that the Canal will continue in use during the remodeling except for the relatively few hours required to shift from one traffic lane to another, contrasts sharply with the sea level operations, which might close the Canal to all traffic for an indeterminate period. Best of all, estimates made by even the proponents of the sea-level Canal show that the terminal lake plan at the wildest outside guesses of its opponents cannot cost more than a fraction as much as the sea level. Besides its much lower cost, its advocates assert that it can be completed in 4 to 6 years without interfering with traffic, as contrasted with 5 to 20 years for the rival proposition.

When the terminal-lake plan is completed, it will work. No human being can tell whether it is even possible to complete the sea-level canal, if started, and he would be rash indeed who would say that for safety, facility, and capacity it could ever approach what experience has already shown us is practical in the present Canal. We are approaching the fork in the road today. When Congress takes the canal matter up for decision, there will be a bitter battle—a triple fight—to decide the level of the waterway, to confuse the issues by windy arguments combining the national security and commercial utility, and to set in motion a job to last probably 20 years and provide lifetime occupation for an army of dependents.

Should this proposal become law, the taxpayer will have to foot the tremendous resulting bill for something of less value than we now possess. It is all very well to say that it will merely be added to the national debt. It will, but the shipowners and operators who have to pay the greatly increased tolls such a canal would require are certainly not going to suffer. They will naturally pass on the added charges to the public. The ultimate consumer pays the bill every time, either directly or indirectly, generally without the slightest notion of what he is paying for or why he pays.

The whole thing boils down to the perfectly clear issue of whether we are going to serve ourselves with a practical utility or a case of almost perpetual headaches and bills.

Mineral Position of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 28 (legislative day of Thursday, May 20), 1948

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article published in the Wall Street Journal of May 24. It has reference to the mineral position of the United States and to the bill I introduced. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Mining Congress Journal, dated May 1948, for the same purpose.

There being no objection, the article and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOVERY PROGRAM RAISES FOREIGN DEMAND FOR ZINC, LEAD, COPPER—JUNE DELIVERY ORDERS FOR COPPER UP AS DOMESTIC USERS SEEK SUPPLIES BEFORE VACATION SHUT-DOWNS

[From the Wall Street Journal of May 24, 1948]

Demand for copper, lead, and zinc—from domestic and foreign consumers—last week continued active and in excess of available supplies. Inquiry for these metals from foreign sources in recent weeks has shown a steady increase. This is apparently the result of the European recovery program.

At the same time a 4-year, $80,000,000 a year subsidy bill was approved by a House Public Lands subcommittee. Its sponsors assert it meets practically all the objections voiced by President Truman when he vetoed the subsidy bill last year. It was estimated about two-thirds of the $80,000,000 a year will go for copper, lead, and zinc.

Domestic copper consumers are asking for good sized tonnages for June delivery with orders booked for that month already aggregating more than 66,000 tons. Bookings for May delivery total around 112,000 tons. This indicates that consumption of the metal for the current and succeeding months will remain satisfactory. Some industry members were inclined to attribute part of the large June bookings to consumers' desires to get in supplies before the general vacation shutdowns by manufacturers during the first half of July.

The continued large demand for copper, some trade sources note, is being maintained at a time when reports are current of declining business and more competitive markets for the goods of manufacturers of copper products such as the wire mills and the brass mills.

Meanwhile, consumption of copper remains in excess of domestic mine output and continues to call for large tonnages of foreign metal to make up the deficit.

The domestic price held firm at 21½ cents a pound, delivered Connecticut Valley. Producers of copper abroad report substantial inquiry for the metal from France, Switzerland, Italy, and India. The large producers' price held unchanged at 21½ cents a pound New York for foreign origin metal, while custom smelter sellers of foreign metal obtained 22⅛ cents a pound at Tacoma.

There was no change in the copper-scrap situation. Custom smelters' buying price for refinery making grades remained at 18¾ cents a pound for No. 1 heavy copper-wire scrap. In the brass-ingot division, however, some makers were out of the market as buyers of scrap materials.

An interesting development in the lead market last week was the statement of Andrew Fletcher, president of St. Joseph Lead Co., with respect to price prospects and the use of substitutes. Mr. Fletcher told a gathering of businessmen at Flat River, Mo., that the lead price of 17½ cents a pound was high as compared with the lead price prior to World War II. But, he said, when compared with the present commodity prices it is equivalent to the 9 cents and 10 cents a pound after World War I as against commodity prices at that time. He added that if the commodity index should continue to rise because of continued inflation, he then would expect an even higher price for lead.

Another development in the lead market was the passage by the House of a bill which suspends the import duties on the metal until June 30, 1949.

Strikes still kept closed the Santa Barbara and San Francisco Mines in Mexico.

The tight supply situation in lead continues with demand well in excess of metal available. The price held firm at 17½ cents a pound, New York. Foreign demand remains heavy and the price firm at 16¾ cents a pound at Gulf of Mexico ports.

Zinc-industry members are keeping a close watch on Washington subsidy bill developments. Inquiry for prime western and special high-grade zinc remains large with supply limited. The domestic price held firm at 12 cents a pound East St. Louis.

India was seeking special high-grade zinc in the foreign market last week. Europe also was asking for various grades of zinc. The price for foreign-origin metal of prime western grade was 12¾ cents a pound at Gulf of Mexico ports.

[From the Mining Congress Journal for May 1948]

MUST MERCURY MINING DIE?

Legislative and executive indifference to domestic mercury mining is slaying a vital industry. Already at a dismal low in the face of prices established by the Spanish-Italian cartel, the industry can only cast a jaundiced eye upon rising Yugoslav competition with "Mercurio Europeo." While these various European producers cut prices in their scramble to secure credits payable in dollars, they also achieve the result of making our economy entirely dependent upon their production as a source of quicksilver. We may hope, but without any certainty, that this result is not their major objective.

In any event, if domestic mercury mining is allowed to die and ever a future emergency faces us, there will be late and lusty wails of mourning from our war industries.

Let's see what has been taking place to force mercury mining into the struggle of operating at 1938 prices with 1948 costs. In January 1946, mercury sold at $105 per flask and underwent an almost steady decline to $83.50 at the end of the year. During 1947, in addition to imports from established sources, a further narcotic was administered by dumping the Japanese mercury stock pile on the open market.

From a price of $79 per flask at the close of 1947, quotations have further declined to range from $75 to $78 per flask. Italy has a stock pile of an estimated 30,000 flasks and made offers in March at $73 per flask, duty paid in New York, with tentative proposals to cut that price if necessary in order to sell.

Obviously the doubtful outcome of the Italian election had a potent influence on Italian mercury prices prior to April 19. Had the April election resulted in the success of the Communists, this huge stock pile would have been valueless. Even now, the lack of stability in Italy encourages sales at any price as long as it is payable in dollars. The fact that Italy possesses 50 percent of the world's productive capacity of mercury may have considerable bearing upon Russia's desire for control.

According to the most recent official figures, which are for March 1948, more than 2,000 flasks of metal were imported in that month. During May, about 12,000 flasks of Spanish metal entered along with additional imports from Japan, Mexico, and Italy. With average annual consumption about 30,000 to 35,000 flasks, the imports during the months of April and May, barring expanded usage of the metal in the mercury turbine and other new developments, should be ample to supply the Nation's needs for half a year.

Mercury is an essential ingredient in the array of raw materials required for the prosecution of war. If war comes, it is highly probable that shipping hazards will place European mercury in uncertain if not impossible supply. In the light of this contingency, what is actually taking place in quicksilver mining within our borders is of the greatest importance.

Only three or four mines are operating, and these are contemplating closure as hope for an improved market price fades. The richer ores are being mined and ore profitable to mine before the war is being left untouched. Cordero has already shut down following a fire which gutted the change house and damaged the shaft. Bonanza and Hermes are operating with a skeleton crew and anticipate a shut-down on June 1. New Idria is preparing for closing July 1, and the possibility of long-continued operations at Sonoma is doubtful. This will be the end of an industry active for over 100 years.

Mr. Schuette, an authority on mercury, points out on page 31 of this issue the fact that successive wars bring about greater demands for mercury. Stock piling of mercury is a partial answer to the problem of supply. A more important segment of the picture is the stock pile of know how.

Once closed, mercury mines will fill with water, equipment will be sold or will deteriorate, and experienced crews will scatter. When the men with the intimate knowledge of these deposits disperse, then the Nation has a real reason for concern.

In 1939 a healthy quicksilver industry was urged to greater production and within 4 years was able to produce at the rate of 5,000 flasks a month. After a complete shut-down, only at great cost and with considerable delay can an effective industry be built anew.

If domestic mercury mining is to meet the demands that will surely be placed upon it in the event of national emergency, a minimum nucleus of a healthy industry must be maintained. One suggestion to this end, advanced by quicksilver producers with considerable persuasiveness, would call for underground stock piling, with the Government providing an incentive to develop and maintain quicksilver reserves in mines kept in a going condition—and at the same time reducing the incentive to exploit such reserves—at a cost not out of line with maintenance charges on aboveground stock piles.

Whatever the best solution may be, the basic question—Does the Government want to keep the quicksilver industry alive?—calls for an answer in the very near future.

Women in the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARY T. NORTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1948

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Marquis Childs, from a recent issue of the Washington Post:

WASHINGTON CALLING—WOMEN IN THE HOUSE
(By Marquis Childs)

Someone the other day went to the trouble of discovering a typical Member of the House of Representatives by averaging out ages, weights, heights, and so on. The result was a pretty average middle-aged individual.

It may be because the average age is so very average that the women Members of the House stand out in distinguished contrast to the great gray mass of males. Because the prejudice against women in high office is still a factor in American politics, they just naturally have to be better than the men. I believe a statistical average of the awareness, the ability, the intelligence of the 7 women as set against the 425 men in the House would show that the ladies have an overwhelming advantage.

Two of the women Members are engaged just now in extremely interesting political contests. One is MARGARET CHASE SMITH of Maine, a Republican, and the other is HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS of California, a Democrat.

Because she had liberal convictions and refused to swallow the third-party line, Mrs. DOUGLAS is in the middle of a three-way fight in her district in Los Angeles. The Wallaceites tried to make her take a stand against the European recovery program and, when she said no, they entered a third-party candidate against her.

Mrs. DOUGLAS is running in both the Republican and the Democratic primaries, which is possible under California law. At the same time, with the primaries on June 1, she is fighting on the floor of the House for the issues she considers most important.

First on this list would come inflation and the cost of living. In season and out, Mrs. DOUGLAS has fought for some easement of the pressure that is working such hardship on millions of salaried families all over the country, and especially in her own district.

Once she came onto the floor with a market basket full of groceries and with a sales slip showing what they cost as compared with a sales slip of a year before. It was a dramatic demonstration of what the high cost of living really means to the housewife.

Mrs. DOUGLAS was one of the little band in the House to stand up against the Mundt bill to outlaw communism in America—a bill that, in the opinion of many, would coerce all independent thought.

In Maine, Mrs. SMITH is in a contest that is equally tough. She is running for the seat in the Senate made vacant by the retirement of Maine's elder statesman, Senator WALLACE WHITE. In the primary, equivalent to election in Republican Maine, she has two formidable opponents. They are Horace A. Hildreth, the present Governor, and Sumner Sewall, a former Governor.

Those who know Maine say it is a close race, with the odds slightly in favor of Mrs. SMITH. She is waging a vigorous campaign, practically commuting between her home State and Washington in these crowded final days of the congressional session, with the Maine primary coming on June 21, the date the GOP convention opens in Philadelphia.

Being a Republican from Maine, Mrs. SMITH is considerably more conservative than Mrs. DOUGLAS, a Democrat. But with her conservatism goes a sense of responsibility which is a lot more than mere stand-patism.

Thus, the other day, she pleaded with the House for a revision of the social-security program which would correct great injustices that exist today. As Mrs. SMITH said, study after study has pointed out the need for a drastic overhauling, yet nothing is done. She was particularly concerned over the plight of the aged who are trying to exist on pitifully inadequate old-age assistance.

Because they are closer to the tasks of daily living, women can have a more immediate sense of what a law will do in actual practice. In an article she wrote recently, Mrs. DOUGLAS put it this way:

"As members of the community, women find that laws and their making are not abstract problems but a necessary outgrowth of having to face problems of housing, delinquency, playgrounds, nurseries, discrimination—directly, not merely in debating societies or in the halls of Government."

Congress would be improved, in my opinion, with a higher proportion of women Members, particularly if they had the qualifications of Mrs. SMITH, who is now serving her fifth term in the House, and of Mrs. DOUGLAS, who is running for a third term. I hope they are both returned to Washington so that the Congress and the Nation can have the benefit of their practical, responsible approach to the big problems that confront us all.

Child Health and Slums

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, all children—rich and poor alike—have today a better chance to survive birth than did their ancestors. Great forward strides in prenatal and childbirth care, in medical techniques and their application have saved the lives of uncounted children from the hazards which take their toll of newborn babies. In 1946, United States infant mortality reached an all-time low.

For the underprivileged child, however, there is a hazard in the second phase of his life which comparatively little has been done to correct. That hazard is the slum housing in which so many underprivileged babies, saved at birth by improved public-health and social-welfare measures, must live.

That slum housing and slum surroundings menace the child's health is a matter of record. It has been demonstrated statistically by Nation-wide as well as local studies. The National Health Survey, conducted by the United States Public Health Service, disclosed that in overcrowded homes, characteristics of the slums, communicable diseases common to childhood occur not only with markedly greater frequency than in good housing neighborhoods, but at an earlier age. Significant is the fact that the higher rate of fatality in such diseases is among the very young. The Survey disclosed, too, that overcrowded homes produced a 75-percent higher incident of secondary cases of tuberculosis among children under 15 years of age.

SLUMS MENACE CHILD HEALTH

The clearest relation between overcrowded slum housing conditions and infant mortality was shown by the United States Children's Bureau's study of birth records in eight cities. This found that the death rate of infants in overcrowded homes was two and one-half times that of infants in uncrowded homes.

Local studies pointing in the same direction—that slum conditions are a menace to child health—have been made in a number of cities. In Detroit, a study of a slum area showed infant mortality six times the normal rate. In Mason City, Iowa, it was found that two areas of bad housing were responsible for four times as many cases of child mortality in proportion to population as in the average residential neighborhood.

BUT GOOD HOUSING IMPROVES HEALTH

Since the slum is a complex of poverty, poor nutrition, lack of medical care, lack of education, and other factors, it has been difficult to determine the extent that substandard housing per se is a factor in sickness and death. But, it is incontrovertible that bad housing, with its lack of sunlight, air, and space, is detrimental to health.

More positively, recent studies of families moved from slums to public housing

projects actually show improved health and lower morbidity records. One such study, made by Dr. Jay Rumney, in Newark, N. J., shows 15 percent fewer infant deaths, 45 percent fewer cases of tuberculosis, 31 percent fewer cases of children's diseases in the housing project as compared with areas of slum housing similar to that from which the public-housing tenants moved.

In Cincinnati, Ohio, the Cincinnati Housing Authority reported infant mortality in a housing project was one-fifth of that in an adjacent tract of slum housing and less than one-third of the rate for the city. In the slum tract, infant mortality was twice as high as in the rest of the city. There is sufficient evidence to indicate that the provision of good housing is a positive step that would yield tangible results in the attainment of improved child health. We must act now to clear slums, and supply housing for underprivileged families at rents they can afford. The only program to bring that about is offered by the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill on which we must have affirmative action by the House before the close of this session.

COMMITTEE SITS ON BILL

The House Committee on Banking and Currency has been sitting on this much-needed bill for 4 years; but they are not trying to hatch the bill, they just want to lay an egg, to use theatrical parlance.

Like every other humanitarian person, I find myself most moved by the plight of children.

In New York we have performed miracles in slum clearance; we still have a vast task before us.

The magnitude of that task is told in the report to the mayor of New York, and in Mayor O'Dwyer's reply, which already has been made a part of the record of the hearing by my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

BANKS ARE ON STRIKE

But there are other and serious considerations. In the statement in support of this bill which I shall submit to the committee in the next few days, I point out that the failure of the committee to take any action is stagnating the residential-construction industry.

Banks will not make loans as long as there is a possibility that they can get 4½-percent loans with all risk taken out.

They are on an interest strike.

The authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase GI loan mortgages was taken away a year ago by this Republican Congress, and there is no secondary market for such paper. The RFC extension bill merely insured the continuation of the Federal National Mortgage Association to discount FHA notes.

ISSUE MAY INSURE DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS

This is only a partial answer to the needs of residence builders.

The full answer lies in the bill, S. 866. It is small comfort to a Democrat who really wants the T-E-W bill passed to reflect that this one issue alone may well determine that my party will be restored to majority power in the next Congress.

I certainly want to see the Government returned to the people by the election of a Democratic majority; but I will gladly sacrifice the advantage of this issue to get the bill out of committee and enacted into law.

The need for houses is paramount to any political consideration.

Time for Action—Now!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the testimony of John W. Edelman and Leo Goodman, representing the Congress of Industrial Organizations, in support of S. 866, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, before the House Committee on Banking and Currency on May 20, 1948.

In view of the time schedule imposed on the House of Representatives in the next 3 weeks, it is my sincere conviction that the Banking and Currency Committee should conclude its hearings by June 4 so that a bill can be reported in time for action before the anticipated recess or adjournment on June 18 or 19. If there is a real resolve or intention on the part of the leadership to get this vitally important legislation on the floor for a vote, ways could be found to expedite and complete the hearings, without further delay.

The citizens of the United States who are going through the heartbreaking search for a place to live, who daily face the task of extracting some decency out of indecent places in which to live, have a right to know what this Congress expects to do about housing. They have a right to know whether this Congress intends to embark on a housing program that will meet the needs of the American people, or whether it will continue to do only what the powerful but short-sighted real estate lobby wants it to do.

The testimony follows:

In opening our statement on behalf of the Congress of Industrial Organizations we wish to place in the RECORD two or three formal declarations on housing by the CIO. We believe this is important, not merely to establish the fact that our representations on this legislation are completely in line with instructions from our rank and file, but also to indicate that our position on this whole problem has been consistent over a period of years. In 1944 the CIO adopted and widely circulated a document by its president, Philip Murray, entitled "The CIO Reemployment Plan." This proposal was adopted at a time when it appeared that serious dislocations would occur in our economy at the conclusion of the war. President Murray had this to say on housing and city reconstruction in his 1944 reemployment plan:

"Our inability to provide ourselves with decent shelter has been a major failure of our civilization. The slums, the run-down areas and congestion of our cities are a menace and a disgrace.

"We must go in for the complete reconstruction and decentralization of our great metropolitan areas and for a program which will give good shelter to every family, urban and rural, regardless of income, throughout the land.

"The slum clearance program must be resumed at once on an ample scale. Our slums should be eliminated, substandard housing supplanted and blighted areas reconstructed within 10 years after the war.

"We must have teamwork between private and public initiative in the housing field. Both have their responsibilities. Private builders should forget their senseless and expensive war on public housing. There is more than enough for all to do.

"There must also be Government help for cooperative housing.

"We should lay plans now to build not less than 1,500,000 new homes every year for at least the next 10 years. Planning and land purchase must get under way at once with whatever Federal assistance may be necessary.

"Our city planning must become more imaginative and bold. It must take in whole metropolitan areas. It must include industrial and commercial facilities as well as hospitals, schools, recreation, and shelter.

"We should tear down industrial plants which are badly located with respect to the life of the community, and build new ones in the right places. We should tear up transportation facilities which destroy the recreational possibilities of our water fronts and lay new tracks at the right places. We should reconstruct most of our docks and harbors. We should clear out whole neighborhoods in downtown areas and build airports or plant parks.

"Our cities should be rebuilt completely. They should be broadly decentralized. New towns should be founded on the outskirts. Open country should be brought downtown.

"City tax structures must and can be reorganized on a metropolitan basis to facilitate these changes. Only planned decentralization, indeed, can save our big city finances, which are imperiled by inevitable and planless dispersion and blight.

"There is work here for millions of men for a generation. The demand for building materials and for new industrial plants, equipment, and machinery will be immense."

The Congress of Industrial Organizations and its various affiliates have, through the years, consistently adopted formal resolutions on the subject of housing legislation. We mention this fact not for the sake of history, but rather to demonstrate that CIO has been constantly aware of the need for sweeping reforms in the field of housing. We shall quote the resolve section of the resolution adopted by the eighth constitutional convention held in Atlantic City, N. J., in November 1946:

"*Resolved*, That this convention of the Congress of Industrial Organizations petition the President and the Congress of the United States, to:

"(1) Meet one of the foremost problems through a reinforced and strengthened overall housing program based on a recognition of the magnitude of the needs of the homeless veterans and our slum families, while at the same time appraising realistically America's potential productive capacity to meet this need.

"(2) Raise the sights of the housing program to 2,000,000 units a year.

"(3) Enact the general housing bill, S. 1592.

"(4) Wage an all-out campaign for the maximum use of existing facilities through temporary requisition of unused housing, the allocation of hotel space to veterans, the use of feasible and convenient resort facilities, and immediate stoppage of discrimination against families with children.

"(5) Enact an amendment to the Patman Act which will permit the leasing of war asset plants under nominal leases, make direct grants to the National Housing Agency for the provision of development funds and

loans for working capital to assure manufacture and erection of 1,000,000 assembly-line homes a year.

"(6) Enact a further amendment to the Patman Act to permit the Federal Government to mass purchase industrialized housing, and to distribute them through local housing authorities for rental to homeless veterans and others.

"(7) Limit profiteering in housing so as to assure occupants that they will have decent homes at a cost they can afford.

"(8) Increase the amount of money available for premium payments from $400,000,000 to $600,000,000 to assist producers to step up production of critical materials in the face of decontrols on building materials.

"(9) Eliminate all deferrable and nonessential construction to assure adequate supply of materials for veterans' housing.

"(10) Encourage labor and veterans to form their own cooperative housing groups, which can deal directly with the producers of industrialized housing and sharply reduce the cost of marketing houses by reducing middlemen profits."

At Boston, Mass., in 1947, the ninth constitutional convention of the CIO not only called for the enactment of the current version of the omnibus housing bill which we described as the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, but in the report of the executive board a considerable section was devoted to housing. We quote one passage from this report:

"It is plain that the great need in housing is to produce homes in quantity at moderate cost. The problem is to realize from the mass production of housing the savings that American industrial experience has shown can be made through large scale operations, and also to achieve through technological improvements still other economies in money, in time, in labor, and in materials."

During the several years that various versions of the T-E-W housing bill have been before the Congress, the CIO has testified repeatedly, urging enactment of this kind of legislation. The CIO's basic position in respect to the housing problem in this country has been consistent and has been stated, restated, and elaborated time and time again. We have published a small library of pamphlets designed to build public support for a comprehensive housing program such as is contained in the present bill, which we support and seek to have adopted.

We offer recommendations for major modification of only two sections in this legislation.

BUILDING MATERIALS

In opening our statement we wish to reemphasize one fundamental point which we have endeavored to make in connection with housing legislation whenever we have been given an opportunity to do so. While we insist and urge that S. 866 must be passed, we go on to add that the Congress, in our judgment, will find it necessary to take supplementary legislative action to increase the supply, control the costs, and allocate the use of building materials if the program envisaged in the T-E-W bill is to be actually achieved. We stress the point about building materials because we do not wish to give that vast body of Americans who are, as the song says, "looking for a home," a feeling that all their housing troubles will be over if and when this important piece of legislation becomes law. If our economy had not changed so drastically since the war, when plenty of building materials were to be had at a moderate cost, then this enabling legislation might have been sufficient without further governmental action. But with current conditions being what they are, governmental intervention in the building materials picture is essential and imperative. At the risk of laboring the point, let me repeat that we urge adoption of S. 866 at once, because until it becomes law, the second step, that of dealing with the materials problem, is not feasible. Certainly we do not advocate that public moneys be used to expand the production of building supplies which would be used to enrich speculative builders. S. 866, if properly administered, should set in motion such reforms and advances in the field of home construction that not only would the factory-built or the prefabricated house become practical, but there would be a much more economical and efficient use of traditional materials and processes.

THE NEED

We shall assume in this presentation that the entire membership of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives, several of whose Members served on the Joint Congressional Committee on Housing, have read the reports on the hearings conducted by the Joint Committee in 35 cities throughout this country. Before preparing this statement we quickly reviewed most of this voluminous testimony, all of which we have studied at one time or another. The only conclusion any thoughtful and open-minded citizen can come to after studying this record is that the proponents of the T-E-W bill have built therein a solid and irrefutable case. Numerically, probably more witnesses appeared in opposition to this type of legislation; moreover, many humble citizens were openly discouraged from speaking up for the T-E-W bill simply because they had been warned that if they spoke in favor of T-E-W they would be asked, accusingly, "Can you give a technical analysis of this legislation section by section?" An effort was made to create the feeling that unless the prospective witness had an expert understanding of every line and every phase in this exceedingly technical bill that he or she was not qualified to register approval or disapproval of this legislation. Yet, despite these handicaps, the facts themselves as revealed by all the witnesses demonstrated the absolute need for governmental intervention in the housing picture. Probably the most effective witnesses for the T-E-W bill were its avowed opponents. Here was a committe which was popularly assumed to be exceedingly friendly to the groups in our society who customarily and doggedly attack public housing in any shape or form. Yet even before such a forum it was not possible to elicit even a whisper of a constructive alternative suggestion for dealing with one of the gravest social problems of our day. The home builders, the materials men, the real-estate people, all of them recited over and over again identically phrased attacks on governmental aid of any kind for the consumers of housing, while seeing no contradiction whatever in their implied or flatfooted insistence on very special governmental gratuities or guaranties for the builders, sellers, or financiers of housing.

These Nation-wide hearings were not organized on any systematic basis so as to develop new data on the need for more housing or for certain types of housing, but the amazing similarity of the facts and figures presented by consumer, labor and pro-housing witnesses in widely separated parts of the country, on every phase of the question of need, on the absence of rental housing, the high cost of new homes and the ever mounting severity of the shortages, served to drive home the need for action with absolutely relentless effect.

If, in view of all that is known on the housing question in the United States today, there is still any disposition to give the slightest credence to the calculated mendacity of those who have attempted to say that a scarcity of homes is indeed a surplus, then it is useless indeed to attempt to debate this issue in a rational and democratic fashion. We wish to remark here that these regional hearings constitute an amazingly authoritative and interesting synthesis of the case for prompt passage of the legislation now before you.

In the whole history of American legislative effort there have been few cases on record where so many communities, areas, and even whole States, had an opportunity to bring a cross section of their population to testify for or against a measure having to do with basic human needs.

PUBLIC HOUSING

In these regional hearings a small mountain of evidence was piled up on the specific question of public housing by the members or representatives of local public authorities who testified. If you will carefully review this testimony in sequence, as we have done, you cannot fail to be impressed by the competence of these presentations and the unique body of factual data which was presented. Not only is the tone of the testimony calm and reasoned, but the material is exceedingly comprehensive and ably organized. We find the total effect of these differing presentations to be almost formidably convincing. The local housing authorities supplied facts out of almost 10 years' experience with the operation of projects in local communities. The support for public housing by all these local people came about not as a result of any political or ideological bias, but as a simple logical deduction from the facts with which they had become completely familiar.

We submit that the case for the public-housing sections of S. 866 has been brilliantly and sufficiently spelled out in the record of the regional hearings so that additional arguments would be largely redundant.

Very few trade-union members have ever been eligible for tenancy in public-housing projects. You can be reasonably sure that if a small group of union members still live in these projects they are no doubt facing eviction because of the income-limitation provisions of the law. There are, of course, many hundreds of thousands of very low income workers holding membership in trade unions; we have a long way to go yet before we reach any wage millerium. But these low-income families are seldom found in the places where there are public-housing projects. The point I am making is simply that organized labor has gone all out for the public-housing provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, but not as a matter of direct self-interest for its own members. We are for this program because we believe that the most elementary social justice and civic sense demands that the low-income groups in our society be given at least equal opportunity to enjoy the advantages of decent, safe, and sanitary housing as any other group in society.

The financial formula adopted in the original Wagner housing bill and put into practice by the old United States Housing Authority, has not been improved upon despite the constant pounding it has taken from critics in Congress and elsewhere during an entire decade.

As citizens of our home communities the members of organized labor have not grown insensitive to continued existence of substandard housing. As a matter of fact, the moving around during the war years has sharpened and heightened the sensibilities of millions of American citizens in this respect. The squalor which is almost universal in all our urban centers, large and small, is no longer taken for granted. The need for slum clearance and a redevelopment of our blighted areas is felt as keenly by everyday factory workers and housewives as by planners and professional social workers. We who have lived on the edges of the slums and who are inconvenienced and disgusted by the crowded disorder and civic mess of our cities and towns, are more constantly and personally reminded of the need for a

wholesale attack on these problems than are those who are confronted only intermittently with such facts of life.

Public housing projects, both the old subsidized types and many of the Lanham act permanent war housing jobs stand out today in city after city as object lessons demonstrating that we can vastly improve the quality, both physically and otherwise, of our city life if we are willing to override the narrow, selfish habits of mind which lead to the creation of these miserable conditions.

The one point we wish to make regarding the public housing section of the bill is that we insist that no legal requirement or political pressures be brought to bear on local housing authorities to accept as tenants only a narrow fringe of our fellow citizens whose income is so low that they have become very special problems in our society. No local public housing authority can create a really normal community in one of its projects if it is obliged to live up to such an unfair, unjust, and unreasonable requirement. A very rigid interpretation of a regulation to admit only the very lowest income persons to public housing projects might have the effect of ruling out all prospective tenants, despite an admitted and glaring need. We insist that we stick to the principle that public housing take in a cross-section of those persons whose economic status rules them out as customers for nonsubsidized projects. This permits some discretion in tenant selection without violating in any way the essential principle of the act which, as we see it, is to provide standard housing for those whom private industry cannot, or will not, serve.

INTEREST RATES

The CIO strongly opposes those several sections of S. 866 which allows the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, to raise interest rates to 4½ percent. The Congress should limit interest rates to a maximum of 4 percent on all loans for housing built for profit by private builders. But interest rates on money loaned to any type of nonprofit housing should be limited by law to not more than ¼ percent over the rate which the Government itself pays for money. In practice that would fix maximum rates at less than 3 percent on this type of project. On all guaranteed loans for housing, that is, where the Government takes the whole risk, the interest rate should only be as much as the Government pays on the money it borrows, plus a quarter of one percent to cover the cost of handling, etc. The late Fiorello LaGuardia, former mayor of New York City, emphasized this point in the testimony he gave before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee last year. The Veterans of Foreign Wars in testifying a few days ago, took the same position.

Anyone with even a little practical experience in the field of building knows this question of interest rates is just not debatable. If the Congress permits the rates to go above 4 percent for any kind of insured loan, then you have said goodbye to your hopes for any large amount of housing for moderate income families. This country must face up to the tough economic fact that interest on loans for building must never go above 4 percent or else the bulk of those of our fellow citizens who need new homes, either for rent or especially for sale, are priced right out of the market.

The Congress should realize that this is the case and eliminate those sections of S. 866 which will surely bring the entire banking and insurance business of America down on the necks of the Housing Administrator and the Treasury pressing for the top interest rate made permissible by this legislation. We urge that the National Legislature assume the responsibility for this decision and not leave any ambiguity about it whatever.

The CIO is not at this point talking about limiting interest rates on money put up by someone who takes a genuine chance of a loss. We are talking about loans where there is no genuine risk. The people who buy FHA-insured mortgages are not taking any risks in the ordinary sense of the word; the reason FHA loans are popular is because the Government has built a business which will pay back borrowers in the rare case where such a mortgage goes sour. That tremendously important fact has been completely obscured in the minds of the general public by the terminology which has been used and the legal rigmarcies which the ordinary home buyer has to go through.

We ask for the lower rates of interest—that is, interest at not more than one-quarter percent above the going rate paid by the Government on savings bonds, etc.—for housing projects which are strictly nonprofit in character. The Government will draw up appropriate regulations to carry out this intent. These projects must be sold or rented to persons whose income is not above a certain amount. Generally speaking, those eligible for housing, entitled to these loans, constitutes that group in society who earn just a little too much to be eligible for subsidized housing, but who still cannot afford the shelter which the ordinary private builder provides. We are not asking any Government assistance for this large group in our society, excepting technical advice from the housing agency which will help them plan and build their cooperative or nonprofit projects.

The housing built with these low-interest loans will be standard housing in every respect. There is only one chance in a billion that the Government would ever lose a dime on a single unit so built under this section of S. 866, and only in the event that the Government does an inadequate job of supervising, either the site selection or the construction of such units, could there be an iota of risk involved, insofar as protection of Government guaranties on the money is involved. Both common sense and statistics demonstrate that there will be a far greater demand for any and all types of shelter for sale or rent at moderate cost—roughly, for sums ranging from $35 a month to about $50 or $55 a month—for many years to come.

VETERANS' HOMESTEAD BILL

Title IV of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill provides for FHA insurance of 40-year mortgage loans at a maximum interest rate of 4 percent to finance moderate rental housing projects developed by nonprofit cooperatives. These mortgages would cover up to 90 percent of the value of the completed projects, except that in the case of cooperatives made up primarily of veterans of World War II the mortgage could cover up to 95 percent of the value of the project.

To assure adequate financing for cooperative housing developed under this provision, title IV also provides that the facilities of the National Home Mortgage Corporation proposed to be established under title II of the bill, or of any other Federal corporation established to make or purchase real-estate loans, will be available for mortgages insured under this cooperative housing provision.

While not expressly stated in title IV, the legislative history of this cooperative housing provision makes it clear that it is contemplated that the FHA will extend technical advice and assistance to housing cooperatives in the planning and development of projects. Directions to this effect are contained in the recommendations in the final report of the Joint Committee on Housing and in the report of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on the Flanders amendments to S. 866.

These provisions have certain advantages over the proposals for veteran's housing cooperatives contained in the Veterans' Homestead Act: (1) as contrasted with the lack of any standards of construction or appraisal in the Veterans' Homestead Act or any provision for supervision or inspection of construction, the T-E-W provision would require conformity to FHA minimum standards and FHA inspection of construction; (a) the Veterans' Homestead Act contains no provisions for technical assistance to cooperatives which would therefore require these voluntary organizations to rely entirely upon private sources for such assitance. The T-E-W proposal contemplates that technical asistance would be made available by the Federal Government.

The one real advantage of the financing arrangements for veterans' housing cooperatives contained in the Veterans' Homestead Act is the provision for direct Federal loans to the cooperatives at an interest rate of one-fourth of 1 percent above the cost of the money from the Treasury. The CIO has, of course, recommended and urged an amendment to this section which would make the cheap money available to all bona fide nonprofit cooperative or mutual projects. The CIO endorses and supports the general intent and purpose of the Veterans' Homestead Act but believes that in practice the veterans would obtain even better results by setting up their co-ops under the terms of title IV of the T-E-W bill with the lower interest rate incorporated in it. It would seem quite clear to us that upon reflection the veterans' groups would see the enormous advantages in having competent supervision of all construction and such help as might be needed in planning their projects.

Moreover, the CIO feels strongly that the bulk of the veterans of this country would be better off—as indeed all citizens would—if all the housing activities of the Government, both for veterans and nonveterans, were centered in the same over-all agency. The fact is that the Veterans' Homestead Act does not completely exclude all nonveterans from its benefits. We feel that it is inevitable and desirable that some mixing of veterans and nonveterans will occur in these moderate priced nonprofit housing co-ops, and we believe that the one housing agency can handle the affairs of veterans at least as ably and sympathetically as they are dealt with by the Veterans' Administration.

At this point we wish to place ourselves on record as predicting that from among both organized labor and veterans' groups there will quickly spring up a great many associations seeking to take advantage of this section of the T-E-W bill. As we see it, what the Government would be doing would be to encourage and assist a vast army of self-reliant, go-ahead, thrifty young families of limited income to pool their energies and resources and by adopting certain well thought-out techniques of mutual assistance achieve savings, which will certainly be significant and which should be substantial, in the cost of shelter. Today the group that would be eligible for this type of housing suffers in a no-man's land; it supplies virtually no customers to private builders, and is not eligible (or willing, for that matter) to live in subsidized projects. In practice private contractors would build the houses for these nonprofit groups; the contractors would, of course, make profits. Outside of the lower interest rate that would apply, the savings would result from the elimination of certain promotional overhead costs and selling costs, and from such economies as could be effected through large-scale operations.

It is our conviction that hundreds of thousands of working people are only waiting until this law is passed to start organizing themselves to be able to get a lot of moderate-priced housing started. We cannot conceive of any step that this Congress could take which would do more to contribute to the morale and general well being of the American community than the enactment of

the T-E-W bill with these suggested, necessary changes.

URBAN REDEVELOPMENT

Early in the life of the CIO, those of us who worked on the problems of providing adequate housing for millions of members of our organization who lived in the cities, came to the conclusion that redevelopment of our cities was an absolute prerequisite to the elimination of slums in order to achieve more healthful living environment and adequate standard of living for our members.

After years of intensive effort and energy, we prepared a memorandum on postwar urban housing, copies of which have been made available to the committee, along with this statement, which points out the necessity of planning a national program of urban developments. We are happy that S. 866 takes some first steps in this direction. We wish that it went further along the lines of the recommendations in our memorandum. We hope that the Congress, in passing S. 866, will recognize that their approach to this problem, though a beginning, is only a first step in the more substantial program which is needed if this blight of our cities is to be eradicated and prevented in the future.

This committee, in our judgment, has an obligation to the underhoused residents of this country. It should and must act quickly on this bill which has been under consideration by the Members of the Congress and its various subcommittees for some 4½ years. Early action would make it possible to implement the provisions of the bill during the present construction season and some alleviation of the housing shortage could be expected within the present year. The time for action is now.

Foot-and-Mouth Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Corn Industries Research Foundation, New York City:

FOOT-AND-MOUTH LOOMS AGAIN

No one who reads a farm magazine or a newspaper can have escaped the current upsurge of alarm over foot-and-mouth disease.

The United States has waged an 8-month campaign against a recent spread of foot-and-mouth (or hoof-and-mouth, or aftosa, or call it what you will) in Mexico. Our side mounted a force of 2,000 men, 1,500 pieces of heavy Army equipment, and 35,000,000 United States dollars. But the fight—in certain aspects resembling a second Mexican War—has been unequivocally lost. The American forces have withdrawn from the field. We have met the enemy, but he is not by any means ours.

There remains, as salvage from our original hopes and perhaps as some psychological balm to the conscience of a defeated force, the single chancy assignment of a holding operation, to contain foot-and-mouth disease within its limits as of February 1—300 miles from our border. A 750-mile quarantine line crosses Mexico from east to west.

Correspondents returning from the front estimate that the prospects of successfully holding this line against the spread of the infection are dubious. One reporter, Paul Friggens of the Farm Journal, likens our quarantine line to the Maginot of still fresh and painful memory, and recalls that the latter was outflanked. Foot-and-mouth may jump our borders at any time, he concludes, adding that it's a miracle it hasn't done so already.

The United States force launched upon this campaign with its high command's calculations focused upon a single enemy—the disease itself. But long before the 8 months were up, headquarters realized it was fighting another and even more formidable foe—the Mexican people. Many of the cattle-keeping peasants are primitive almost to the level of savagery. Totally ignorant of the threat implicit in this disease which was running through their herds like fire through dry grass, they were suspicious and fearful of any intruder. Very few can speak English; indeed, often they have difficulty in conversing among themselves, so different are their dialects. Virtually all of them hate the gringoes with an inborn hatred nourished by the legends of two American invasions in the past.

In the back-country villages of these people, and in their unfenced pastures, the cattle of a hundred owners find common grazing ground and casually trade back and forth the virus of aftosa. The people do not take the disease as seriously as we do. The death rate of aftosa isn't high, and the few cattle that die of it can be left to the vultures. Those that don't die can lead their miserables lives, furnish some meat when slaughtered, or, as oxen, pull a cart or a plow somewhat better than even a strong man can. Poor cattle, thin cattle, sick cattle—these the people had always seen. The aftosa didn't make much difference. It was hard to believe that an ox that wasn't even sick, but just exposed to the sickness, should be shot. Even a sick ox wasn't likely to die, and as long as it didn't die it was an asset, maybe the only asset a man had. You didn't shoot a sick ox, any more than you shot a sick man.

Then the Gringoes come, with their strange talk, their strange-looking implements. They consult with the town's presidente, maybe with the padre, and after such consultation the people learn that their cattle must be killed, to check the spread of this illness which is supposed to be so evil though it hardly ever kills. To check the spread into the rest of Mexico—but more probably, as they surmise into the United States. Maybe there is talk of the $8,000,000,000 American livestock industry being threatened. To protect that industry the Americans will pay you $50 for each ox slaughtered, $5 for each pig or sheep. But you can't salvage even the hide of your slaughtered ox. And after it is killed, how do you work your land? So if you have a couple of oxen, which are your total security and capital goods, and if you make eight pesos for yourself and your family on a good day, what does the $8,000,000,000 American livestock industry mean to you?

It meant, as this American expeditionary force found out, a sinister look coming into dark and doubtful eyes. It meant rumors—jumping the jungles and the unfenced fields faster than the aftosa itself—of ugly American designs to destroy Mexico's meat supply by killing Mexico's cattle. It meant closely guarded American camps at night, and apprehension of the rifle shot that might come at any time.

It mean, in the end, defeat.

And the foot-and-mouth rages on in Mexico. That 750-mile quarantine line, no matter how thoroughly patrolled, can scarcely contain the infection. There are too many ways for it to spread.

If it gets into our country—into Texas, say, and from Texas to God knows where—the damage could be incalculable. It wouldn't be our first bout with foot-and-mouth—we have had five others in the past. In the most serious one, more than 170,000 sick and exposed animals—mostly cattle and hogs—were slaughtered. But that was some 20 years ago. Today people travel oftener and farther than they ever traveled before. Texans by the thousands are motoring, or going by train or air, to Oregon and Wisconsin and New York, and people in every other State are getting into cars or planes and radiating fanwise all over hell and gone. Every one of these travelers, leaving or entering a foot-and-mouth-infected area, is a potential bearer of the virus. Unless an outbreak could immediately be localized, isolated and stamped out, there is no telling where it might end or what its ultimate toll might be, in terms of meat and milk supplies.

And what, in turn, would be the effect on the grain crops which support our meat and dairy animals—chiefly, of course, corn? Corn is linked so closely to cattle and hogs that any serious reduction of cattle and hog numbers would be reflected in the corn crop. Conceivably the number of acres planted and of bushels harvested could be vastly reduced. How, we ask ourself, would this affect corn prices, and eventually the supply-and-demand factors in other grains, other crops? How, indeed, might it affect our whole agricultural economy?

The answer is pretty involved, but certainly not pretty. In a world already full of alarms, perhaps we shouldn't look for another which, so far, only threatens. But the time to prevent an American outbreak of foot-and-mouth is before it starts. A network of regional research laboratories for the most intensive study of vaccines, and any other preventive measures there may be, seems to us the top-priority agricultural need of 1948.

Meanwhile, cattlemen everywhere should be alerted for the first sign of an outbreak, an convinced of the urgent necessity of reporting it when it appears.

The Dowry of the American Citizen of Czechoslovak Origin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been altogether too much of the spirit of take and altogether too little of the spirit of give on the part of most foreign powers. When the attention of a Member is drawn to an instance of giving that instance becomes an important occasion.

It is a matter of pride to me, since I was born in what later became Czechoslovakia, to observe that Czechoslovakians who later became American citizens invariably gave of themselves, their culture, their sturdy industry, to their adopted country. They gratefully accepted our constitutional liberties. But they were not content with mere acceptance. They gave themselves—and their children are still giving themselves—that our Nation shall be preserved and that those rights which all Americans mutually cherish should be continued for posterity.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is with deep satisfaction that I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article Tuesday Was Always a Nightmare, from the October 17 issue of Woman's Day, since this article so accurately and sympathetically portrays the dowry that Czechoslovakians brought to their beloved United States.

TUESDAY WAS ALWAYS A NIGHTMARE

(By Annette Victorin)

Every Monday, Maminka (that means mother in Czech) washed clothes for the Kirk family. Mrs. Kirk selected Maminka from all the women in the block. Maminka boiled all the white clothes, blued them twice, and starched the intricate pieces just right. On Tuesday she ironed and mended. And before supper we delivered the finished laundry. And that was where the nightmare came in.

When I came home from school, Maminka sent me to Ocasek's butcher shop. She told me to get half a pound of soup meat off the ribs, three bones with marrow in them, and 4 pounds of leaf lard. She always chopped the swanlike leaves into small squares, put them in a deep pot, and cooked them gently until rendered. Then she strained the hot lard through a cheesecloth and stored it in a stone crock.

I liked to go to Ocasek's butcher shop. Mr. Ocasek greeted me with, "Tak, na zdar slecno," which means in Czech, "So, hello, young lady." The way he said it I knew he liked me. Then he tore off a half of a frankfurter and handed it to me over the counter.

"Umm," I grinned every pleased. He never threw it at me the way he did at Mamie Cerny and Lizzie Putz.

As I was leaving, Mr. Ocasek called after me, "Tell your mother not to forget Friday."

Friday was the day the ladies would gather in the back of Ocasek's butcher shop to strip feathers from geese and ducks. That was so he could display them in the window for Saturday's buying. The ladies could keep all the feathers they stripped. They also got some giblets for their work. For extra good measure Mr. Ocasek let Maminka take home lots of drippings. Maminka combined the drippings with milk and dots of butter and poured this mixture over stale buns. She baked this, and Tatinek (which means father in Czech) smacked his lips over this dish.

I didn't go to Malik's bakery on Monday or Tuesday. Because we still had lots of Houska and Kolacky left over from Saturday. Maminka baked pans and pans on Saturday morning. She would wrap up what was left over on Sunday in a heavy linen cloth and it kept in the flavor and moisture for days.

Then all of a sudden, I looked up and there was Mrs. Daly in the kitchen.

"How ya coming along, Mrs. Hornak?" she asked, as her eyes took in the crisp laundered heaps.

Maminka smiled and sighed. Then she pulled out one of our unpainted chairs and said invitingly, "Some coffee, yes?"

Mrs. Daly sat down. Maminka boiled the milk first. Then she mixed it half and half with the strong black coffee. She gave me just a little bit in my own small cup, the one I got from Mrs. Topinka for wheeling her baby around on Saturday mornings. It had three fat cherries stuck out in relief and two green leaves edged in luxuriant gold.

"Take some," Maminka offered Mrs. Daly, shoving the plate of cottage cheese and prune-filled Kolacky toward her."

"Don't mind if I do. Nobody anywhere bakes like you do, Mrs. Hornak," and she swallowed another mouthful with vim.

Mrs. Daly lived on the third floor in the back of the old frame building. We lived on the same floor in the three front rooms. The Dalys had the long back stairs that ran outside, all to themselves. There were seven in the Daly family and three of them were boys.

Mrs. Daly sniffed the air. "Cabbage?" She watched Maminka as she fried the flour in a bit of the rendered lard. It looked good as it changed from sleazy white to golden brown.

Maminka kept stirring it all the time, then added some hot water. She poured the smooth roux over the cooked cabbage. Then she added some vinegar and brown sugar, and stirred with the fat wooden spoon which Tatinek had carved out for her. Finally, she dotted the cabbage with minced brown onion. The fumes of this concoction were so palate stirring that Mrs. Daly pretty near drooled.

"I gotta try that someday," she threatened. "You Bohemians sure can put zip in your victuals."

"S'm this, s'm that. Caraway seed—cinnamon, lemon rind—dried mushrooms," and Maminka smiled, her plump cheeks flushed. Maminka's command of English was still in its infancy, but everyone said she was catching on fast. When I told anyone that we were in America just a little over 3 years they scarcely believed me.

Anyway, what Maminka meant was that proper flavoring glamorized a bewhiskered recipe. All the Daly's food tasted flat.

At last Mrs. Daly got up and left. It was almost 4 o'clock now. Tatinek would be home for supper at quarter to 7. So I began to help Maminka pile the ironed sparkling clothes into the big wide basket. This was always the time when that wave of uneasiness began to rise within me.

"Enny," Maminka called out to me. She always called me Enny, although my true name was Anna. "Enny," Maminka repeated, "curls." She was holding the box which held strips of butcher linen about an inch wide, and a few leather curlers. My heart sank. I had forgotten tomorrow was Arbor Day.

So, today, I not only had to hold the basket of laundry on its way to the Kirks' and walk pass Harold's house. But I had to do it with my hair in rags. It was unthinkable and gave me a pain in my heart. I went over to the kitchen sink and held the tin cup under the rushing water. Maminka always put a little sugar into the water to make my curls tighter. I looked at the splasher over the wooden sink. It was embroidered in red chain stitches and said:

"Kde Se Dobre Vari,
Tam Se Dobre Dari!"

Translated from Czech, this meant "Where there is good cooking there is happiness."

The tin cup was running over. I turned off the water. Tomorrow, at Healy School, we were going to plant trees. I was going to sing as I had so often done before on special days. And when I sang I had curls.

One afternoon, as I was hanging up my clothes in the back of the room, I overheard my teacher, Miss Stearns, say to the principal:

"Anna has a tear in her voice; it is really promising."

Which was silly, of course, because I knew even if I was only 7 years old that you have tears only in your eyes.

The song I would sing tomorrow was something about—

"Dark brown is the river,
Golden is the sand,
It flows along forever,
With trees on either hand."

The older boys were to dig holes and we would dedicate the catalpa, poplar, and maple trees. Each tiny tree was a penny and our room had bought 36 of them.

I knew I sang nice because no one made any noise when I sang. And once I caught Harold looking right at me. Harold lived on Emerald Avenue. He wore velvet knickers and always said, "Hello, Whitey." But he went right on. All the other boys talked with me and played marbles or hop skip, but not Harold. Even at recess he had a book and leaned against the iron rail in the playground and read.

"Tak Pojd," Maminka reminded me again. That meant "Come on," so I sat down for the ordeal. Maminka wound my long strands around half of the rag strip. She moistened my hair a little with the sugared water. Then she wound the rest of the strip upward, covering the hair wound around the first part of the strip. When she got back to the top of the long curl, she made a knot that almost pulled the scalp off my head.

I had 16 curls which was a record in the neighborhood—16, tight as wires, sticking out of my head rebelliously. I guess it was the way I felt inside that made them stick up so viciouslike outside. But if curls were to be nice looking you had to put them up and sleep with them all night. Maminka said my hair uncurled was like a bunch of fresh straw flung out on a field under a blazing sun.

Maminka walked over to the basket and together we pulled it down the long stairs into the street. The wagon was already waiting. It was bright red with American Express written across the side. When we put the basket on it, we began to walk south on Union Avenue. Maminka always pulled the wagon when the basket was full. I pulled it back home, empty. Now I walked beside the wagon, holding the basket with my right hand. The sun was very bright although the spring air was cool.

I looked at Maminka sideways. Why did she have to wash clothes for other people like the Kirks? Why didn't the Kirks wash their own clothes? Why did I have to walk down the street, holding the basket? But I knew. That dollar and seventy-five cents which Maminka received went into the building loan. I had heard Tatinek and Maminka talking about it. Some day, they said, we would have a house with grass in front and in the back, too, not just iron railings and cement all around like we had now.

I tried to curb my resentment at the stiff curls that grew heavier each minute. We were getting closer to Harold's house now.

"Let's cross the street," I dared to suggest to Maminki, but nothing happened. This was the way we had brought the laundry back for 2 years. This was the way we would travel today.

And then Tuesday became a nightmare. For there was Harold, out of nowhere, walking right toward us. I could tell by his lips he was whistling. I pressed both my hands on top of the basket which made my walking sideways. I hoped this would disguise my identity. Maminka looked at me sharply and stopped to admonish:

"Dej si pozor," which meant, "Be careful." Just then Harold passed us. I did not look up but I heard him say, "Hello, Whitey."

"Lo," I answered meekly, my eyes glued to the pile of clothes. I felt my curls stand upright, and I knew I looked a fright.

When we reached the Kirk's house we walked into the gangway to the back of the house. I heard the piano and knew Gwendolyn was playing. She was the girl I admired and detested all at the same time.

Maminka knocked and Mrs. Kirk came out to help with the heavy basket. We sat in the kitchen as Mrs. Kirk carried the laundry away. A huge hammered-out silver lamp stood in the middle of the kitchen table. I kept looking at the hand-painted cereal set lining the walls. It was so pretty. Gwendolyn was still playing.

"Go in and listen to Gwendolyn, Anna," Mrs. Kirk motioned to me kindly. I looked at Maminka, who nodded. But I didn't move.

"Bez," Maminka said, which meant "Go" and I knew by her tone that she meant it. I got up and walked into the front room. It was thickly carpeted. There was a beautiful rose-painted lamp hanging from the ceiling and heavy green-satin curtains graced the door. It was the loveliest parlor I had ever seen, and the piano was wonderful. Gwendolyn was still playing.

She wore a red plaid dress with a black velvet jacket over it. Her dark hair hung in one thick braid down her back. I liked the dress and the jacket but when I saw her shoes—they were red leather with black patent-leather tops. Silk tassels dangled from each top. I had flattened out my nose

looking at them in Hoft's shoe store on Halsted Street for weeks. I craved those shoes almost as much as I dreamed of owning a piano.

Gwendolyn saw me but kept right on playing. Then she stopped suddenly and laughed. She lifted two of her fingers to her head in grotesque style and snickered: "Curls." And she made it sound as though they were dead rats. Then she added, "Sissy."

With this she skipped right past me through the dining room and into the kitchen. I followed her like a drooping dandelion. Mrs. Kirk was transacting the financial end of the laundry arrangement with Maminka. Then when we were ready to leave she went to the door with us and called out gaily: "Anna, do come over and play with Gwendolyn sometime, she'd love to have you."

Maminka smiled and nodded and I gave the wagon a vicious jerk. And before you knew it we were back on Emerald Avenue and almost back to Harold's house.

And then, right near the corner, Tuesday became a nightmare again. I don't mean really that Harold was a nightmare. He was about the nicest boy I knew. But meeting him twice with my curls sticking out like candles and the wagon and the laundry and everything was a nightmare.

I began to pull the wagon harder. As Harold came nearer he said, "I'll pull." And, before I knew whatever, he had taken the handle out of my hand. I looked at Maminka. Then the three of us walked along together. Oh, everything was wonderful.

"Nice," Maminka offered not particularly to anyone.

We kept on walking down Emerald Avenue. No one said anything, not for two whole blocks, except that Harold kept on whistling all the time. It was a song called "Smarty" and everyone was playing it on the gramophone all the time.

Then Harold said, "Gonna sing tomorrow?"

"Uh, huh," I answered.

He began to whistle again and when we got to another curb he gave the wagon such a jerk the basket fell out. Maminka helped straighten it out again and we walked on. When we came to the corner where we had to turn toward Union Avenue again, Harold said, "I'm going," and left us.

"Thank you, Harold," Maminka called after him. Then we pulled the wagon into the back yard and took the basket upstairs.

It was close to supper now and Tatinek would be home very soon. So I put the newspapers over the white tablecloth on the small wooden table in the kitchen. We always ate in the kitchen except on Sundays. Then we ate in the parlor and used the linen in the third drawer of the highboy.

I took out three plates from the pantry, then forks, knives, spoons. I brought Tatinek's ash tray. And I put his slippers under the table.

The whitewashed walls of the kitchen suddenly looked pretty. Soon Maminka would light the gaslight and we would sit down to our piping soup with the little dried mushrooms, floating on top.

"Beseda coming tonight," Maminka offered. I had almost forgotten. That meant eight friends of Tatinek would come over after supper and sing. They all wore black derbies and had mustaches and laughed a lot. Tatinek would get out his violin and play "Kde Domov Muj." Then before they left he would play Anton Dvorak's Humoresque.

Next week they would all meet at some other house. But tonight they would come to our house and sing many songs. Maminka would warm up some of the left-over Kulas and make a big pot of coffee. I would hear them talking long after I was in bed.

And tomorrow would be Arbor Day and my hair would be out of the rags and in shining fat curls. I would sing "Dark Brown Is the River."

Oh, Tuesday was always a nightmare, but not today. And I thought, as I heard Tatinek running up the stairs, how wonderful it was to live in America.

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Gould Lincoln, from the Washington Evening Star:

RECIPROCAL TRADE ACTION BY GOP CALLED STUPID—WILL CREATE IMPRESSION ABROAD THAT HIGH TARIFF IS COMING BACK

(By Gould Lincoln)

The Republican House of Representatives has taken its expected crack at the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and the system of agreements which has been built up over a long period of years. It does not reflect any great amount of intelligence or intelligent thinking on the part of the Republicans. Instead of extending the present act, a substitute proposal for 1 year was written into a bill and passed by the House. While the substitute ostensibly keeps the trade agreements system alive, it undermines the whole, makes administration more difficult, and leaves to a log-rolling Congress the final determination, under certain conditions.

More disturbing than the proposed changes in the law, however, is the impression which may be created abroad—an impression that the United States is going back, particularly if the Republican Party is successful at the polls in November, to the good old high protective tariff, shutting masses of foreign goods out of the country.

MISTAKE SEEMS INCREDIBLE

Of what earthly use is it for this country to pour billions of dollars into a recovery program for Europe and then strangle European industry by erecting barriers which will prevent the sale of its products in the greatest market in the world—America? It makes no sense whatever. Further, if the United States sets the example, other nations will follow by raising higher and higher trade barriers, until freedom of world trade will become so restricted that another economic catastrophe will take place.

It seems incredible that the United States will make such a mistake—or even that the Republican Party can make such a mistake—again. After the close of the First World War, and after the Republican Party had taken over control of the Federal Government, lock, stock and barrel, Congress put through a high tariff bill—incidentally the last Republican general tariff bill ever to go through. At that time the European countries, war torn as today, owed America and Americans other billions of dollars. What chance they had of paying their debts to America vanished into thin air. The trade war was on, and it was a contributing factor to the depression which swept the great nations of Europe and finally brought the depression of 1929 to this country—a depression which was responsible for Republican defeat in 1932—and thereafter.

SAME OLD ELEPHANT

Now a Second World War is ended, and the Republicans are on their way back to power. They already control Congress, and they hope to control the White House next year. It has been said that the elephant never forgets—is it possible he never learns? World conditions today are vastly worse than they were in 1929. Yet the elephant seems inclined to perform in the same old way.

The veteran Representative DOUGHTON, of North Carolina, Democrat, formerly chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee and the author of the original Trade Agreements Act of 1934, commented causticalally during the House debate on the present bill. Representative GEARHART, Republican, of California, chairman of the subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee which wrote the bill, has always been opposed to the reciprocal trade agreements program. Mr. DOUGHTON suggested, therefore, that for Representative GEARHART to sponsor a bill to extend that program is "like an agnostic trying to revise the Bible."

The Gearhart bill is more harmful in what it implies than in what it actually does. It continues the present law in effect, with modification, for 1 year. President Truman has asked an extension of the law, without change, for 3 years. The Gearhart bill also curtails the power of the President to make trade agreements, providing that if he cuts tariff duties more than the Federal Tariff Commission recommends, Congress, within 60 days, may nullify his action.

If the Senate concurs with the House action, President Truman will have to determine whether he prefers no law at all to the watered-down Republican version, for the existing law is due to expire June 12. A veto could kill the new bill.

Count the Votes Fairly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE F. LEA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution adopted the fairest method then available and now available for the allotment of votes to the States in the election of a President. It assigns electoral votes to each State primarily in proportion to its population and two votes to each State, regardless of population.

Under this plan the electoral vote is the common unit available to register the national will as between the States.

The unfortunate part of the Constitution, so far as our electoral system is concerned, is that it has no provision that assures minority voters in any State that their votes shall be computed in the ultimate count. It gives the individual State no assurance that the votes cast by the different groups of its citizens will be counted in accordance with the allotment the Constitution makes to the States. It does not require that the voters of the State will have their votes counted as cast.

The fundamental and splendid purpose to be accomplished by House Joint Resolution 9 and Senate Joint Resolution 200, pending in Congress, is to provide a just system of computing the result of the

election so that the votes of all will be counted as cast and in accordance with their allotment to the States.

ILLUSTRATIVE TABLE

I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a table, No. X, showing the apportionment of State electoral college votes under the present system and the proposed system embodied in House Joint Resolution 9 and Senate Joint Resolution 200, now pending in the two Houses of Congress, covering the 21 Presidential elections from 1864 to 1944, inclusive.

The first section of the table shows the electoral votes received by the two leading candidates in each of those elections. The second and third sections show the popular votes received by those candidates; their percentages of the total vote and what the electoral votes would have been if computed as provided in the pending resolutions before Congress. In the fourth section, similar information is given as to minor parties.

I have heretofore placed in the RECORD at length many examples of the impossibility of the present system ever providing a reliable and fair method of computing the votes as between the candidates for President.

TABLE X.—*Apportionment of State electoral votes*

APPLICATION OF FORMULA CONTAINED IN SEC. 1, LINES 5–16, P. 3, H. J. RES. 9 (80TH CONG., 1ST SESS.), TO THE POPULAR VOTES CAST FOR PRESIDENT FROM 1864–1944

Year	Present system					Republican			Democratic			Other		
	Total vote, popular	Electoral vote				Popular votes	Percent of total	Electoral votes under H. J. Res. 9 formula	Popular votes	Percent of total	Electoral votes under H. J. Res. 9 formula	Popular votes	Percent of total	Electoral votes under H. J. Res. 9 formula
		Republican	Democratic	Other	Total									
1944	47,976,263	99	432		531	22,006,285	46.0	223.8	24,776,864	51.6	294.7	1,193,114	2.5	12.5
1940	49,820,312	82	449		531	22,304,400	44.8	214.6	26,826,742	53.8	310.0	689,170	1.4	6.4
1936	45,647,117	8	523		531	16,679,583	36.5	175.6	27,476,673	60.2	340.3	1,490,861	3.3	15.1
1932	39,751,458	59	472		531	15,761,841	39.7	189.6	22,821,857	57.4	327.6	1,167,740	2.9	13.8
1928	36,811,717	444	87		531	21,391,381	58.1	291.9	15,016,443	40.8	231.6	403,893	1.1	7.5
1924	29,091,417	382	136	13	531	15,725,016	54.1	258.8	8,386,503	28.8	191.4	4,979,898	17.1	80.8
1920	26,768,528	404	127		531	16,147,249	61.2	299.9	9,140,864	34.7	212.6	1,080,415	4.1	18.5
1916	18,527,863	254	277		531	8,533,507	46.0	222.1	9,127,695	49.3	284.3	866,661	4.7	24.6
1912	15,031,169	8	435	88	531	3,483,922	23.2	113.9	6,286,214	41.8	246.7	5,261,033	35.0	170.4
1908	14,887,133	321	162		483	7,679,006	51.6	230.8	6,409,106	43.1	226.9	799,021	5.4	25.3
1904	13,523,519	336	140		476	7,628,834	56.4	268.5	5,084,491	37.6	179.0	810,194	6.0	28.5
1900	13,964,518	292	155		447	7,219,530	51.7	217.3	6,358,071	45.5	217.2	386,917	2.8	12.5
1896	13,813,243	271	176		447	7,035,638	50.9	215.3	6,467,946	46.8	221.3	323,627	2.3	10.4
1892	12,043,603	145	277	22	444	5,190,802	43.1	186.2	5,554,414	46.1	202.7	1,298,387	10.8	55.1
1888	11,385,808	233	168		401	5,444,337	47.8	185.8	5,540,050	48.7	202.9	401,421	3.5	12.3
1884	10,058,390	182	219		401	4,849,680	48.2	189.7	4,912,696	48.8	200.5	296,014	3.0	10.8
1880	9,211,050	214	155		369	4,449,053	48.3	175.1	4,442,035	48.2	181.9	320,002	3.5	12.0
1876	8,412,605	185	184		369	4,033,950	47.9	177.1	4,284,757	50.9	188.1	93,898	1.2	3.8
1872	6,467,073	300	66		366	3,597,070	55.6	205.0	2,834,079	43.8	159.1	35,924	.6	1.9
1868	5,724,701	214	75		289	3,015,068	52.7	156.1	2,709,633	47.3	132.9			
1864	4,024,792	212	21		233	2,216,067	55.1	129.8	1,808,725	44.9	103.2			

[1] Votes of the National Party are included in the "Other" column, but not in the "Total vote" column.

Source: Tables prepared by Legislative Reference Service.

ELECTIONS OF 1896–1916

I also place in the RECORD table XI, illustrative of two elections which may be regarded of much significance in our political history. They illustrate the defects and uncertainties of our present method of electing the President and the need of counting the votes under a certain and just rule.

TABLE XI.—*Comparison of elections, 1896 and 1916*

	1896		1916	
	McKinley	Bryan	Hughes	Wilson
1. Population represented by votes	30,276,280.95	30,312,757.41	42,154,950.62	45,179,110.21
2. Percent of total popular votes	50.9	46.8	46.0	49.3
3. Percent of electoral votes	60.602	39.37	47.83	52.165
4. Electoral vote under proposed plan, 2-vote allotment	38.328	45.374	38.082	52.550
5. Votes credited contrary to way cast	4,213,903	1,512,442	4,860,101	3,702,385
6. Result under present method (electoral votes)	271	176	254	277
7. Result under proposed method (electoral votes)	215.3	221.3	222.1	284.3

NOTE.—In the 1916 election other candidates would receive 24.6 electoral votes.

This table computes the election results between the two principal candidates in the elections of 1896 and 1916. The first row of figures gives the population represented by the votes of these two candidates in that election. It will be observed that the population represented by the votes for Bryan exceeded the population represented by the votes for McKinley by a slight margin.

The significance of these figures is due to the fact that the Constitution allots electoral votes to the States primarily in proportion to population. So, on a basis of population represented by Bryan's total vote in proportion to the States they represented, he had a slight lead for the Presidency.

The election of 1896 emphasizes and illustrates the rule of the Constitution under which the voting power of each State is fixed primarily by its population and not by its number of voters.

The second line of figures gives the percentage of the total popular votes received by the two candidates.

From this it is seen that in 1896 McKinley had 50.9 percent of the popular votes of the country and Bryan 46.8. This is a case where the plurality of the population, as represented by the votes of the States, slightly favored Bryan but the popular vote of the country favored McKinley.

Under the Constitution the voting power of the State is based on its population and not on the number of its voters.

There always has been a marked disparity between the number of persons per hundred who vote in the various States.

In view of the disparity of voting in different States it was recognized at the time the Constitution was written and it has ever since been recognized that the individual voter in his State is not a common voting unit as compared with the people in the States of the rest of the country.

In the election of 1940, which was a census year, and one in which the greatest vote of our country was recorded, in 2 States less than 10 out of 100 persons voted; in 7 States, between 10 and 20; in 2 States, between 20 and 30; in 8 States, between 30 and 40; in 26 States, between 40 and 50; in 3 States, between 50 and 54. The average number voting was 38.02 percent. These figures show the very radical difference in the number of people who vote in each State.

PERCENTAGE OF ELECTORAL VOTES

The third line of figures gives the percentage of the electoral votes as received under the present system. McKinley, with a little less than 51 perecnt of the popular votes, had over 60 percent of the electoral votes. Bryan had a little over 39 percent of the electoral votes, but 7 percent more of the popular votes.

In 1916 Hughes had 47.83 percent of the electoral votes, while he had 46 percent of the popular votes. This is an unusual parallel of popular votes with

electoral votes. This comparative agreement, however, does not rest upon an equal basis so far as separate votes in the different States were concerned.

The election of 1896 was characterized by overwhelming majorities by both candidates in the respective sections of their greatest strength. The election of 1916 was one in which popular sentiment ran in a more even line.

ALLOTMENT OF TWO ELECTORAL VOTES REGARDLESS OF POPULATION

Line 4 of the table gives the electoral vote under the proposed plan as to the two-vote allotment. There are two rules under which the electoral votes are allotted to the States under the Constitution: First, on the basis of the population of the State; and second, two votes to each State regardless of population.

These two votes are disposed of by the voters of the State the same as any other two electoral votes; however, all the electoral votes of the State except these two are given it in proportion to the population. As the total population of the States greatly vary, manifestly they do not have a mathematical relation to the population as do the votes granted in proportion to population. Apparently the election of 1896 would have gone to Bryan instead of McKinley on account of this two-vote allotment if the system proposed had then been in effect. However, there would have been no injustice in such a result. It would have been in harmony with the constitutional rule under which the States are given a definite formula as a measure of their voting rights.

The most accurate and just method of election that is possible is by a method of computing votes that correspond to the constitutional formula which grants electoral votes to the State.

The portion of the rule granting voting rights in proportion to population is as just as any rule can be.

The second phase of the vote formula which grants two votes to each State regardless of the population does not have the mathematical relation to the population, but it is in harmony with the voting powers of the little States with the big States in Congress. The extension of greater voting rights to small sections is common recognized in legislative districting and in the upper and lower houses of various legislatures. In fact, the voting rights of the States are in exact accord with the voting rights of the State in Congress. Each State has the same number of electoral votes that it has votes in Congress.

The fundamental requirement as to counting votes between the States is to find the common unit with which to measure the votes in every State. The popular vote clearly does not afford such a unit. The unit voting system cannot afford such a unit. The relative population of the States is the fundamental and proper basis for a unit vote between the States. The division of the State vote according to the popular vote within the State is the only fair way for the division of the State votes.

In the election returns no distinction is made between these two classes of votes. However, it is interesting to note the different assignment that would be made of these two votes under the present method and under the proposed plan.

In the election of 1896, McKinley carried 23 States and Bryan 22. Under the ordinary unit rule these votes would be distributed 46 to McKinley and 44 for Bryan. Under the system of allotment proposed, dividing these votes in proportion to the popular vote received by each candidate in the State, Bryan would have received 45.374 electoral votes on account of the 2-vote allotment and McKinley would have received 38.328. So, on account of the two-vote allotment, Bryan would have received a little over seven electoral votes more than McKinley, due to the division of those votes to the candidate in proportion to his popular votes in the State.

In 1916 Hughes carried 18 States and Wilson 30. If these votes had been counted according to the ordinary unit method Hughes would have had 36 votes and Wilson 60, but under the proposed plan Hughes would have had over 38 and Wilson over 52. The remainder of the 96 electoral votes would have gone to third parties, which cast 866,000 votes at that election.

The figures just given clearly indicate how much fairer it is to give credit for the two-vote allotment in proportion to the popular vote within each State than it is under the unit plan.

The example just given here is a mild one contrasted to others that might be cited. In 1944 President Roosevelt, with less than 54 percent of the popular vote, received 72 percent of the electoral votes, and Dewey 24, leaving Roosevelt a clear assignment of 48 electoral votes distributed under this two-vote allotment. Under the proposed plan Roosevelt would have received 54.167 of the electoral votes and Mr. Dewey 40.801.

The fairness of the proposed method as compared with the present method is so apparent as to need no argument.

CREDITING VOTES CONTRARY TO WAY CAST

However, line 5 of these figures points out a situation in the present method of electing the President that is obnoxious to any man who believes in fair play.

Line 5 shows the votes credited in the electoral college in these two elections contrary to the way they were cast by the voters of the States. The total vote for McKinley was 7,035,638. Four million two hundred and thirteen thousand, nine hundred and three were credited to McKinley, though the votes were cast for his opponents. At the same election, Bryan polled 6,467,946, and he received credit for 1,512,422 votes cast for his opponents.

Thus, of votes credited to the candidates which were cast for their opponents, McKinley received 2,701,461 more than Bryan. Each candidate received credit in the electoral college, in the States he carried, for all the votes of all his opponents, including the minority candidates.

Crediting one candidate with the votes that another received is a triple offense. It deprives one candidate of the votes to which he is entitled, and it gives to another candidate the votes which he has not earned.

Again, this false method of crediting votes deprives the States, in part, of the relative voting power to which they are entitled under the Constitution. It applies part of the votes of her citizens contrary to their will. The votes of a large part of the country are confiscated because they are nullified by this method of computation.

There can be no just system of electing the President by any system which takes votes from one candidate and credits them to another.

Neither can there be any logical rule for the counting of votes that permits such a procedure.

In the election of 1944, 40 percent of the votes cast were credited in the electoral college contrary to the way they were cast.

No candidate can get a vote that does not belong to him without taking it from some candidate to whom it does belong.

DISPARITY BETWEEN ELECTORAL AND POPULAR VOTES

Line 6 indicates the electoral votes as divided between the candidates in these two elections under the unit method of computation. McKinley, with 50.9 percent of the popular vote, received 60.62 percent of the electoral vote, a difference of 9.72. Bryan, with nearly 47 percent of the popular vote, received less than 40 percent of the electoral vote. This made a percentage variation between the popular votes and electoral votes of 21 percent. The difference in the popular vote was only 4.1 percent.

This variation is not unusual. Similar variations in popular vote from the electoral vote have run from 3 percent to as much as 40 percent. It is reported that an average variation between the popular votes and electoral votes for several decades has been over 18 percent. Obviously there can be no logical relation between popular votes and electoral votes counted by the unit rule.

In 1916 we had a close election without the sweeping sectional divisions that marked the election of 1896. States represented by the vote of Hughes had a population of over 3,000,000 less than the States represented by the Wilson vote.

Line 6 shows that in the election of 1916 Hughes received 254 electoral votes, and Wilson 277. Without the California vote, Wilson lacked one vote of securing the majority necessary to election. The ultimate count gave Wilson less than 4,000 plurality in California. That plurality carried the one vote that gave Wilson a majority in the electoral college and the other 12 votes of the State. The plurality received by Wilson in California was less than 5 percent of the popular votes given for each electoral vote of the State.

Thus, one-twentieth of the votes required to secure one electoral vote controlled the vote of the Nation. Without that plurality in California the other 578,000 votes of his plurality would not have saved him from defeat. And that, even though the votes cast for him represented 3,000,000 majority of the population.

DIFFERENCES IN COMPUTING ELECTORAL VOTES

On line 7, we have the electoral votes as they would have been counted under the proposed plan, which would have

given the election to Bryan over McKinley by 6 votes.

In the election of 1916 there was a popular vote of 866,000 for third parties. It happened that the third parties were mostly in States carried by Hughes. So the result under the proposed plan would be that the Hughes electoral vote was cut down to 221.3, and Wilson's would have been 284.3. The third-party candidates received votes equal to over 24 electoral votes. Under the present unit system all those minority votes would have been credited to one or the other of the two leading candidates.

THE SOLID STATES—THE SOLID SOUTH—SOLID REPUBLICAN STATES, 12

The longest period of fairly stable relations between the two parties was from 1876 to 1892, inclusive. The outstanding feature of that period was the two solid blocks of States—one in each party that remained steadfast to its allegiance during the whole period. During those five elections there were 12 Republican States that voted solid each time, and 11 Democratic States. The total vote of each block was quite similar. During that same period there were 8 States that voted with the Republicans four times out of the five elections, and there were 3 States that likewise alined themselves with the Democratic Party. This left a limited group of States in the doubtful column. In the whole period the Democrats had a plurality in four out of five of these elections. The plurality of Cleveland in 1892 was small, with a three-party vote and division of the electoral vote. The relative strength of the two parties was practically the same as in the four preceding elections, but the distribution of their votes was radically different.

In 1896 there was a spectacular campaign based on a clearly defined economic issue. It resulted in new alinements based upon sectional views as to the economic problem involved. There were sweeping realinements. Again, distinctive realinements were the very possible departure from the old two-block situation between the two parties.

Since 1928 we have had four elections, which have practically forgotten the old realinements, with the exception of the southern group. We apparently face a more independent voting period in which party allegiances have lost much of their old-time stability. No one can now count on who will gain or who will lose by the proposed changes in the method of counting the votes. Whether there be a gain or a loss it will be just to the country.

In any event, the proposed method provides for both a just system of alloting the votes and a just system of counting them. Unfortunately, that cannot be said for the present method. This method provides fair rules of the game.

The proposed plan in operation would leave no solid blocks of States. Votes wherever located would count and share in the results. Each State would become of concern to the powers that be. No party would have little if anything to gain by stirring up sectional or racial hatreds. Every individual State could step out of the block status to its own best advantage and to that of the Nation.

CIO Calls for Liberalization of the Nation's Social Security System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter that I received from Mr. Van A. Bittner, chairman of the CIO social-security committee, which follows:

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., May 26, 1948.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Congress of Industrial Organizations calls upon you for immediate and effective action to improve this Nation's social-security System.

Millions of Americans—in and out of unions—have been urgently demanding action by the Congress to make the social-security system effective in a time of inflationary pressures.

President Truman, in his recent message, has set forth a minimum program for social security improvements which should be acceptable to both the major parties. The advisory council of the Senate Finance Committee—composed of leading citizens in every walk of life—agreed unanimously on many recommendations for social-security legislation. Scores of organizations of every type have taken similar positions.

The issues involved are so basic that ordinary political considerations should not be permitted to cause delay in the enactment of these proposals.

There can be no excuse for failure to provide decent benefits to the aged, to widows and orphans, to persons sick or unemployed or unemployable, to those whom ill fortune has robbed of a chance to earn a decent livelihood.

These people need our help. They need it now. As a group they have meager resources. They have suffered most from rising prices which have cut their already slim level of living. Without improved social security there is no visible solution to their desperate needs.

President Truman's message to the Congress called for improvements of at least 50 percent in the benefits paid out under the old-age and survivors' insurance program; extended coverage; reduction in the qualifying age for women to 60 years; addition of programs for temporary and permanent disability insurance; improvement in assistance for the needy through higher grants to the States.

This is a minimum program. The CIO feels that Congress could well adopt more extensive legislation, particularly in regard to the development of a national system of unemployment insurance and temporary disability benefits.

The working people of the country will be shocked if the only action taken by this Congress in social security is to exclude people from protection as was done by the law on news vendors, enacted over the President's veto, and by the Gearhart resolution on independent contractors which has been passed by the House and reported favorably by the Senate Finance Committee. This is a sorry record in the face of great and growing human needs.

On behalf of our own members and of millions existing on small fixed incomes, we urge the Congress to improve the Social Security system. There still is time. Millions of Americans will be looking to you and your colleagues for help and assistance.

Sincerely yours,

VAN A. BITTNER,
Chairman, CIO Social Security Committee.

Ore Ships for Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the Russians are focusing their entire attention on coal and steel. Without steel the march of communism stops. Knowing this, the Russians are bending every effort to push steel expansion, with greater capital investment than ever before, exceeding that of 1947, and I am including a news item from the New York Times of May 25, 1948:

SOVIET IS FOCUSING ON COAL AND STEEL—WORK ON OTHER PROJECTS IS CUT IN CONCENTRATING ON PLANTS TO BE PRODUCTIVE IN 1949

(By Will Lissner)

Soviet industrial leaders have adopted a new approach to the expansion of the country's industrial economy, one by which they hope to make up for the lag behind the plans in 1947 and to achieve ambitious goals in 1948, information gathered from Russian sources disclosed yesterday.

The Soviet leaders hope to get new factories, mines, power stations, and other productive units into action this year by ordering a drastic curtailment of work on many projects and concentrating all available resources on projects that can be brought into production before 1949.

The steel and coal industries will be among the prime beneficiaries of the policy of concentrating on short-term projects, according to analysis of recent Soviet news and technical reports made by Dr. Harry Schwartz, a specialist in Soviet economics. The expansion of productive capacity in these industries last year fell seriously below annual goals and the industries became two of the most serious bottlenecks in the Soviet economy. Expansion of their production would have more than a proportional effect in raising total Soviet output.

TO PUSH STEEL EXPANSION

Under the plan recently announced, the iron and steel industry's new productive capacity installed and in operation this year is to be three times the amount of new capacity added last year.

Large increases in new capacity added are also planned for the coal, oil, electric-power, and machinery industries. The volume of new capital construction in the meantime industries this year is planned to be 2.3 times as great as in 1947, according to the Soviet sources.

To make these additions to plant and equipment and materials supplies possible, the Government has assigned 60,000,000,000 rubles for capital construction in this year's budget. Last year's budget allowed less than 50,000,000,000 rubles for it.

For the lag in fulfillment of the 1947 plans the construction industry has been blamed. The basic difficulty, in the view of the Soviet critcs, seems to have been poor planning and coordination throughout the industry.

FEW NEW PLANTS COMPLETED

Soviet leaders have particularly charged that resources were unwisely scattered on

many different projects, with the inevitable result that few plants, plant additions, or dwelling units were finished.

Thus the Ministry of Building Materials fulfilled 60.3 percent of its 1947 capital-investment program, but only 23.1 percent of its plan for putting new factories into operation. The ministry charged with construction of new military and naval enterprises, which has always enjoyed special facilities and priorities, was also criticized for failing to fulfill its program and was ordered to improve its work.

The failure of these ministries to get enough new productive units into operation seriously threatens fulfillment of the 5-year plan at a time when the regime had adopted as a goal the fulfillment of the plan by 1949 instead of 1950.

Total industrial production last year was probably about half of the goal for 1940. To come as close to doubling output as possible, heroic measures were obviously needed. Hence the decision to concentrate construction on projects that will yield raw materials, energy and goods this year was dictated by circumstances.

Under this new program, current output would be accelerated at the cost of long-range expansion. Long-term projects, which might eventually yield proportionately much greater increases in output, would be postponed in whole or in part. Besides making some phases of industrial expansion more expansive, the program raises the danger of introducing economic dislocations of the kind that made wartime expansion costly in many countries.

What effect this new approach will have on housing construction for industrial workers is not made clear. Housing construction is far behind plans. Under the 1947 plan, 13,800,000 square meters of public housing space were to have become available, but only 9,000,000 were completed.

Great dissatisfaction is reported from many areas of the Soviet Union over the continuance of the extreme housing shortage. The Soviet press has published many complaints that the labor turn-over and worker dissatisfaction traceable to the housing shortage had had serious repurcussions upon production.

Mr. Speaker, that is the Russian program for the future. Steel and more steel, but what are we doing in America to meet the great increased peacetime needs of steel, let alone to maintain our national security. Nearly 90 percent of the steel of the United States is produced in the Great Lakes States of Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania and New York. The iron ore that feeds these furnaces comes by ship from the Lake Superior region, and this can only be moved by ship for a period of about 8 months annually because of weather conditions. There is no other way to move it except by ship. The greatest tonnage moved in any one year was 92,000,000 tons. If it could be moved by rail the cost would be prohibitive, and would amount to 920,000, carloads of 100 tons each plus nearly 800,000 carloads of 100 tons each of limestone and coal. In fact thousands additional freight cars would be required and there is no steel to make such a tremendous number of railway cars. Even if the steel were available, existing railroad facilities could never haul the additional load. So that the steel supply of this country for national security as well as commercial use, hangs on this security line of some 312 bulk ore-carrying ships. These ships are the real national security and without this fleet in good condition we have no steel for commercial use let alone national security. This is a slow going obsolete fleet and the saddest thing of all is that 25 ships are from 1 to 10 years old, 5 are from 11 to 20 years old, 35 are from 21 to 30 years old, 93 are from 31 to 40 years old, 143 are from 41 to 50 years old and 11 are from 51 to 53 years old.

Since the passage of the Shipping Act of 1936, no Government provisions have been made with reference to replacing this fleet, and no effort to make it a modern fleet equal to our postwar demands, let alone to protect our national security. If these ships were replaced under the shipping act at the present rate of possible building, it would take more than 20 years. Up to this time nothing has been done from the Government standpoint to protect this first line of national security.

Mr. Speaker, the Russians have and will bend every effort for steel, in addition to our giving them nearly one billion dollars worth of goods including heavy goods and machinery, while at home we stand by with an obsolete ore fleet which is the life line of national security. Something should be done immediately to modernize and equip the ore fleet for national security.

Foreign-Trade Zones and Air Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Thos. E. Lyons, executive secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, before the Miami Foreign-Trade Forum, Miami, Fla., May 20, 1948:

For the past 14 years several Government agencies concerned with foreign trade have joined with the United States Chamber of Commerce in observing what was formerly known as Foreign Trade Week and which last year was rededicated as World Trade Week. The new slogan represents more than a change of words—it indicates an entirely new approach to peace and prosperity. Because of the ever-widening importance of World Trade Week, I am happy to take a part in its observance and especially to be here in Miami at your invitation to participate in this important Foreign Trade Forum.

Over a period of many years we as a nation harbored the idea that our country could continue to prosper solely on our domestic trade. Those were the days which followed the building of a vast network of railroads to open up our western empire. World War I abruptly changed our thinking in this respect and beginning in the early 1920's we seriously started to encourage and expand our foreign trade—mainly exports. We also advanced funds to help start the wheels of industry abroad, but on the commercial side we were so eager to sell our goods abroad that we ignored the simple truth—that to sell abroad we must in turn buy abroad. We overlooked the fact that foreign trade is a two-way street.

Today, after another world war, we realize that foreign trade is more than the commerce between two nations. In order to have a prosperous country we must have a prosperous world and the trade between two foreign countries very often supplies the dollars which spell business for American industry.

In these days of heavily unbalanced exports, the importance of increasing our imports is of special concern to the Department of Commerce. Wherever possible the functional work of its Office of International Trade has been adjusted to extend to importers services similar to those which heretofore have been available to exporters. The Office of International Trade is trying in many ways to increase the volume of imports into the United States. For the first time in its history the import trade opportunities listed in Foreign Commerce Weekly take up more space than export opportunities. Recently general instructions were sent to the United States Foreign Service Officers that they give as much attention to exports as to imports. Representatives of the Department were sent abroad to coordinate with the various missions and consular offices the work of developing imports.

The Office of International Trade has recognized the importance of foreign trade zones in this program to encourage imports along with consignment and reexport trade.

I think some of you might be interested to learn the background of these foreign trade zones and how they may relate to this program. Foreign trade zones were authorized by an act of Congress in 1934 after many years of effort on the part of legislators, port officials, and businessmen to get the legislation enacted. These zones are the American prototypes of the European free ports or free zones which have successfully operated for centuries on the Continent. It should be emphasized here that neither the free part nor the free zone has any remote connection with free trade—they are operative and useful only in countries having high or complicated tariff schedules.

The legislation which was sponsored by Congressman EMANUEL CELLER is merely permissive so far as the Federal Government is concerned. Under its terms either public or private corporations may apply to the Federal Board, created by the act and consisting of the Secretary of Commerce, chairman, and the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Army for authority to establish and operate a foreign-trade zone. The purpose of the law is to provide segregated areas in ports of entry where foreign merchandise may be unladen and warehoused without application of customs laws. While in these zones foreign goods may be mixed with domestic merchandise and manipulated in various ways but not manufactured or exhibited. Such merchandise may then be exported or brought into customs territory upon payment of proper duties. These zones are policed by customs guards, and customs officers are stationed there to provide for entry of imported merchandise into the United States.

A foreign-trade zone is now established in in the port of New York and another in the port of New Orleans and a third zone is to be opened in San Francisco on June 10 next. Following extensive economic surveys officials in the ports of Los Angeles and Seattle are now preparing the necessary exhibits to accompany formal application which they plan to file with the Foreign-Trade Zones Board in the near future. The New York zone has been in continuous operation since it was opened in 1937 and in spite of war restrictions provided an indispensable service to shippers. In recent years the percentage of foreign goods reexported—one of the barometers for determining usefulness of the zone—has ranged between 25 and 45. Another interesting observation concerns the unbroken stream of official visitors from other ports who travel to the Staten Island zone to observe its workings. These officials are not limited to United States ports but many come from

abroad. During the past year representatives from China, Egypt, and Denmark have registered there.

Free ports and foreign-trade zones have for centuries been associated solely with waterborne commerce and for this reason it has not been difficult to establish a formula by which the probable success of such a facility if established in a particular port could be measured. These zones—and I am speaking of waterside facilities—benefit commerce when they are located at points (a) where there are crossroads of traffic and lines of transportation with other countries engaged in international trade; (b) where there are ample banking facilities; and (c) where there are businessmen capable of influencing the establishment of market centers and buying habits. Very often a community can develop one or both of the latter two elements but the first-mentioned—ample shipping—must be present at the outset. Usually when a port is fortunate enough to develop extensive international shipping services, the other factors follow as a normal sequence.

However, the world is moving at an accelerated tempo and we now find a virile new media—air transport—challenging the conventional forms of transportation both in the international and domestic fields. This newcomer has almost overnight carved out new trade lanes based on geographic advantages and reduced distances rather than on the factors which influence surface transportation.

With the remarkable development of air traffic we may be approaching an entirely new phase in the possible utility of the foreign-trade zone, something that was not remotely contemplated in 1934 when the Celler Act was passed. However, it is interesting to observe that while air cargo transport was in its infancy the framers of the Foreign-Trade Zone bill anticipated our air future and wrote into the law provisions for inland zones (not adjacent to water) as well as for zones at shipside.

The Facilitating Subcommittee of the Air Coordinating Committee, in a recent report entitled Simplified International Air Transportation, stated that, among other things, the existence of many conflicting documents for cargo is making the air-freight business difficult and unnecessarily cumbersome. The report then pointed out that substantial progress in this field is not likely to occur until specific changes and improvements are made, one of which was the necessity for providing customs clearance and warehousing on the spot at all major international air terminals. The report also listed several other time-consuming and costly requirements and formalities, many of which the Foreign-Trade Zone was especially designed to overcome. While the Air Coordinating Subcommittee may not have realized it they were certainly drawing a picture of a foreign-trade zone.

The Foreign-Trade Zones Board earlier recognized the possibility of such a development in its annual report for 1946, in which it was stated:

"Due to the rapid increase in air cargo, several communities concerned with the development of international air freight are now studying the question of establishing foreign trade zone facilities at airports of entry. Although foreign-trade zones were primarily designed to aid ocean commerce and shipping, the Celler Act alo authorized their establishment at points not necessarily served by water carriers. If these zones can be satisfactorily located at or near international airports, they may eventually aid in developing our vital air commerce."

Now my friends I can assure you that the foregoing comments were not incorporated in the Board's annual report for the purpose of goading or encouraging any community to proceed with immediate plans for opening a foreign-trade zone for foreign air commerce. The Board was merely recording a factual development and at the same time indicated that, if and when such inland zones were needed for this trade, no supplemental Federal legislation would be required.

Today there is scarcely a commercial center in the world which cannot be reached by scheduled air passenger service in 60 hours or less. This dependable service for passengers will in time be extended to cargo in cases where it is adaptable to air transport. As the traffic increases transportation costs will be reduced accordingly. I may be charged with crystal gazing but such optimism is necessary when estimating future air progress. You will pardon my reference to a talk which I made here in Miami in January 1944, more than 4 years ago, before the local Propeller Club, when I stated that in time air cargo rates which were then 90 cents a ton-mile—several times the rail express rate—would be reduced substantially. Present-day rates of 50.44 cents per ton-mile amply support the statement I made at that time. One prominent leader in the airplane construction field now speaks of a practical rate of 26 cents a ton-mile—using planes exclusively designed for cargo. In my earlier Miami talk I also mentioned that air lines were then approaching a 10,000,000-ton-mile figure of air cargo a year. For 1946 the nonscheduled air carriers alone accounted for a ton mileage of twice that figure. As their personnel is composed of World War II veterans it can be assumed that these nonscheduled carriers were not in operation 4 years ago. Companies operating on scheduled flight account for 14,000,000 ton miles for the year 1946.

You Miamians are well acquainted with the vast network of local air services but for the benefit of those who may read this speech I want to quote from an article which was prepared in the Miami district office of the United States Department of Commerce and which was published in Foreign Commerce Weekly of August 23, 1947:

"The city (Miami) is a focal point for 8 of the world's major 'great circle' air routes. It is served by 3 domestic and 5 foreign air lines operating on international schedule, and also by 43 unscheduled charter lines which do a booming international business. Southernmost major city in the United States, Miami represents the shortest distance between the United States and virtually all major sectors of the Latin-American area."

Meeting in Montreal last month the International Air Transport Association, representing 70 air lines, approved the first tariff ever devised to cover passenger journeys throughout the world by any mode of transportation. I understand that a similar tariff for cargo is being considered by the association. If such a plan can be devised it will greatly stimulate air cargo traffic. It would also increase the potential value of the foreign trade zone as a halfway station for the receiving and dispatching of cargo between carriers. Another forward step in the field of air commerce was the recommendation by the Congressional Aviation Policy Board that "the Federal Government should sponsor the design and development of prototype transport and cargo aircraft intended primarily for commercial use."

There is now pending in Congress duplicate bills introduced by Congressman CELLER and Congressman BUCK which among other changes provide for manufacturing and exhibiting in foreign trade zones. A hearing on the bills before the House Ways and Means Committee was held last week. No objections were interposed by any interest. If the bill is enacted the exhibiting feature should make the foreign trade zone considerably more important to Miami business interests. Miami has been contemplating a development along this line for many years.

In conclusion, let me mention the fact that one of the first free airports in the world was opened a year ago last April at the Shannon Airport, Irish Free State. At this time we have not received any detailed reports on the operation but I understand that the plan is working out all right.

Last year the Republic of Panama set aside a part of its new airport at Tocuman as a foreign-trade zone. I understand that several United States concerns, including a large Pacific coast printing firm, plan to use the new zone. My counsel to you is watch such developments so that our own gateway airports of entry will not be left behind by failure to provide modern facilities for our ever-growing air commerce.

Landis Act Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER R. JONES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

STATEMENT TO HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE HEARING ON LANDIS ACT FUNDS SUBMITTED BY HON. HOMER R. JONES, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, FIRST DISTRICT, STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, favorable action on the matter before you is of great importance to four school districts in the First District, State of Washington, which I represent.

These school districts—Winslow, Bremerton, Silverdale and South Central, King County, Wash.—are community areas greatly affected by wartime incurred enrollments which have not been in any appreciable way relieved during the post-wartime period. Military and naval installations and related established industries in these communities have continued operations in such a degree that anticipated slackening off of student enrollment in the schools has not resulted in fact. Currently, from the most recent estimates made available to me by the respective superintendents of these school districts, the enrollment is tending upward. The Bremerton school district, for example, has a present enrollment of approximately 7,000 in contrast to a 1940 enrollment of less than 3,100. All four of these school districts have extended themselves within the limitation of statutory financial capacity to take care of the added burden, and are still limited detrimentally in maintenance and operation funds and handicapped with inadequate plant facilities. The importance of favorable action on the issue before this committee to these, and similarly situated school districts in all the other States, is very obvious. I want to urge favorable action by the committee continuing the availability of funds to established school districts qualifying under terms of the act.

Statistics based on fiscal 1948

South central school district (45M–277):	
Total cost of operation	$277,824
Local revenues	261,064
Allotted FWA-Landis	16,760
Winslow school district (45M-278):	
Total cost of operation	217,420
Local revenues	189,177
Allotted	28,243
Silverdale school district (45M-287):	
Total cost of operation	362,157
Local revenues	322,588
Allotted	30,505
Deficit	9,064

Bremerton school district (45M-285):	
Total cost of operation	1,463,313
Local revenues	1,422,570
Allotted	39,151
Deficit	1,592

How the Yield-Insurance Program Would Operate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the yield-insurance plan proposed in title IV of S. 866 is intended to encourage and facilitate increased debt-free equity investments in new moderate rental housing by private institutions through the insurance by the Federal Housing Administration of a minimum annual return on and a minimum annual amortization of such investments. The principal requirements and operating provisions of this plan as set forth in S. 866 are summarized below.

TYPES OF INVESTORS ELIGIBLE

Participation in the yield insurance plan would be open to any individual, corporation, or other business entity found qualified by the FHA from the standpoint of business experience and facilities and possessing the necessary capital to undertake the long-term investment. By the nature of the plan, it would appeal to that type of investor having sufficient resources to finance 100 percent of the cost of a rental housing project and interested primarily in long-term security of principal and the assurance of a moderate but secure return on that principal. Such investors would include insurance companies, savings institutions, trust and endowment funds, and so forth.

ELIGIBILITY OF PROJECTS AND DETERMINATION OF RENTS TO BE CHARGED

To be eligible for yield insurance, a rental housing project would have to meet the test of economic soundness—as in the case of residential mortgages insured by FHA under title II of the National Housing Act—and would be required to meet FHA standards as to quality and design and as to size and type of dwellings. The FHA would also be required to satisfy itself as to the need for additional rental dwellings at the rents to be charged in the locality where the project is to be located.

The rents proposed for the project would also have to be suitable for families of moderate income in the locality concerned. At the same time, the initial rent schedule would have to be sufficient at least to cover the operating expenses of the project, including the usual reserves, together with a minimum annual amortization of 2 percent of the original investment and a minimum annual return of 3½ percent on the outstanding investment. It should be emphasized that this minimum annual return of 3½ percent is in no sense the maximum that might be earned by any project insured under the plan; as explained more fully below, under favorable conditions the annual return could substantially exceed this rate provided the other requirements of the plan were met.

The initial rent schedule of an insured project would be subject to approval by the FHA at the time of insurance; no further review of the rent schedule by FHA would be authorized except in the event that the investor should wish to increase the rents above this schedule, in which case the approval of FHA would be required.

DETERMINATION OF THE RATE OF RETURN ON INSURED PROJECTS

As explained above, the initial rent schedule approved by FHA would contemplate sufficient net revenues, after all expenses and the usual reserves, to provide at least for the minimum annual amortization allowance of 2 percent of the original investment and for a minimum annual return of 3½ percent on the outstanding investment. If actual earnings in any year exceeded this amount, the bill provides that the excess earnings would be divided equally between increased net return and increased amortization of the investment up to a maximum net return of 5 percent for any one year. Any excess earnings above that level would be credited entirely to increased amortization.

There are numerous circumstances under which the annual return could exceed the minimum rate of 3½ percent, as defined in the bill. First, the initial rents for every project would not necessarily be limited to a level supporting only that minimum rate of return, provided the rents were still suitable for families of moderate income in the locality. Again, if a project were operated with unusual efficiency or had a highly favorable occupancy ratio, the operating expenses and vacancy loss contemplated in setting the initial rent schedules would be reduced, with a consequent increase in net earnings.

Finally, since the investor's outstanding investment in the project would be decreased by at least 2 percent each year through the repayment of capital incident to the minimum annual amortization allowances, the dollar amount of net earnings necessary to produce a 3½-percent return on the outstanding investment during the first year of the project's life would represent a progressively higher percentage of return on the remaining outstanding investment in each succeeding year. Consequently, if an investor were able to maintain his initial rent schedule and his initial net project earnings for a number of years, the annual rate of return in the later years would be substantially higher than 3½ percent. Under these conditions, the return on the outstanding investment, after allowance for increased amortization, would be 3.68 percent in the fifth year, 3.98 percent in tenth year, 4.44 percent in the fifteenth year, and 5 percent in the nineteenth year.

This same factor would place the investor operating under the yield-insurance plan in a relatively flexible position to make downward rent adjustments if required by competitive market conditions without impairing his minimum annual return on his outstanding investment in the project. From this standpoint, the investor operating under the yield-insurance plan would be in a more advantageous competitive situation than the equity holder in a rental housing project covered by a high percentage mortgage which typically requires a level rate of debt-service payments throughout the term of the mortgage with consequent serious financial problems if sizable rent reductions become necessary. The yield-insurance plan in no sense requires the investor to reduce his rents as his investment becomes amortized but it would make it possible for him to do so if necessary to meet competitive conditions at some later date without embarrassing him financially.

It should be emphasized also that the distribution of excess earnings above the minimum annual return of 3½ percent, as between net return and amortization of the investment, would be required solely for the purpose of the yield insurance contract. From the standpoint of the investor, since the project would be wholly owned and debt-free, there would be no ceiling on the earnings available for amortization and net return, other than that imposed by the initial rent schedule.

It should also be pointed out that whereas the interest rate secured by lending institutions on rental housing mortgages is a gross rate subject to the usual servicing costs and overhead expenses of the institution in originating the loan, the return to the investor under the yield-insurance plan would be a net return, after all expenses of management and administration.

EXTENT OF GOVERNMENTAL SUPERVISION AND REGULATION

The provisions of title IV of S. 866 contemplates the minimum degree of governmental supervision and regulation of yield insurance projects commensurate with adequate protection of the Government's position.

The supervisory authority proposed in the yield-insurance provision is substantially similar to that long established by the National Housing Act in the case of rental housing projects financed by mortgages insured by FHA under sections 207 and 608 of that statute. In the case of those projects, FHA is authorized to approve initial rent schedules and subsequent applications for increases in rents, to examine annual financial reports, and to regulate the owning corporations as to rate of return.

Aside from the necessary approval of yield-insurance projects prior to insurance and the review and approval of the initial rent schedules, subsequent Federal participation is limited to the review of annual financial reports, the determination of the validity of claims for insurance, and the review of requests for rent increases above the original rent schedule. The review of financial operating statements is essential for the protection of the insurance fund, but this review would be for insurance purposes only.

SHARING OF THE RISK BETWEEN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND THE INVESTOR

The objective of the yield-insurance plan is to induce a substantial volume of investment in moderate rental housing by responsible, long-term investors through Federal insurance contributing to security of both the investment and of a minimum return on the investment. However, this Federal insurance would not underwrite all the risk of such investments; the investor would share part of the risk and at the same time would retain effective financial incentives to efficient management which would increase his rate of earnings.

The principal features of this risk sharing and the principal limitations of the insurance are as follows:

First. Under its insurance contract, the FHA would guarantee the investor a minimum annual amortization of 2 percent of his original investment plus an annual return of not more than 2¾ percent on the outstanding investment. In any year in which the net earnings of the project failed to return these amounts, the investor would file an insurance claim for the difference, which would be paid in cash. An annual insurance premium of not exceeding one-half of 1 percent of the outstanding investment would be charged against the operating expenses of the project and paid into the FHA's Housing Investment Insurance Fund. While the faith and credit of the Federal Government would be pledged behind this fund, the plan contemplates a self-sustaining program, as in the case of other types of FHA insurance.

Second. The insurance would run only to the above amounts and would not compensate the investor for any operating losses which might be incurred before provision for amortization and net return.

Third. The insurance contract would remain in force, unless terminated by the investor, until 90 percent of the original investment has been amortized. However, as a further limitation to the FHA's total insurance liability, when and if the FHA has paid out insurance claims on a project totaling 15 percent of the original investment, the FHA would have the right to take title to the project upon payment to the investor of interest-bearing debentures of an amount equal to 90 percent of the outstanding investment at that time. In such case, of course, the investor would lose 10 percent of his outstanding investment. It should be remembered that this investment represents his own capital.

Fourth. To limit the potential losses of the investor, if and when a project has sustained operating losses before amortization and net return, which are not covered by the insurance, to the extent of 5 percent of the original investment, the investor would have the right to convey the property to FHA, again in return for debentures up to 90 percent of his remaining investment in the property. Before sustaining operating losses, project reserves would have to suffer a decline of at least 45 percent from the level contemplated by the original rent schedule.

Fifth. The FHA's total contingent liabilities under the plan would be limited to an aggregate of $1,000,000,000 at any one time under outstanding insurance contracts and commitments to insure.

It should be noted that a 10 percent loss of capital funds invested is a considerable loss for the type of investor most likely to operate under the plan, and should assure the continued interest of the investor in efficient management of the property. It should also be noted that any return on investment above 2¾ percent would be entirely on the basis of the operations of the project rather than on the basis of insurance and efficient project operation by the investor, is therefore essential to satisfactory earnings.

Shame in Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under consent I am inserting in the RECORD a number of editorials concerning the shame in Israel. Through them all runs the theme of the hostility of British interests to American interests.

The first is from the conservative Philadelphia Inquirer, dated May 21, 1948:

SHAME, BRITANNIA, SHAME

Great Britain's open connivance in Arab aggression in Palestine, in support of the Arab legions now seeking to level Jerusalem with their bombs, is a shameful blot upon that nation's history.

British-paid mercenaries in the Transjordan Army are the spearhead of the invading forces in the Holy Land. They are commanded by officers in the British Army headed by Brigadier John Bagot Glubb Pasha. They are armed and equipped by the British. Their king, Abdullah, is on the pay roll of the British Empire.

And while British policy in the Near East makes Great Britain a cobelligerent of the Arabs in their war against the new state of Israel, British policy in the United Nations seeks to hinder in every way every move that might stop the uneven conflict and prevent further bloodshed.

It is the British who have taken the lead in fighting the American proposal for a United Nations-enforced truce in Palestine, backed up if need be by the imposition of economic sanctions and the use of armed force.

When this measure was presented by the United States delegate, this newspaper predicted that it would be immediately enmeshed in debate and disputation that would subject it to endless delay. What was forecast has happened—with the British leading the way in opposition to the resolution.

No steps toward truce, but every possible move to help the Arabs execute their plans for extermination of the Jews: that has become the key policy of Great Britain.

England's traditional sportsmanship, even evidenced when her landed gentry ride to the hounds and allow the fox some opportunity for escape and freedom, is missing. Surely the hunted, the beaten, the depressed Jews might be given a sporting chance to escape the annihilation the world's most educated people are prescribing for them, even if they deny them any shading of humanitarianism.

There have been other chapters in world history when bands of colonists had to battle for their lives against the overwhelming odds Britain massed against them. We doubt most earnestly that if Winston Churchill were leading that government he would be employing Mr. Bevin's tactics.

They are tactics established to support alleged allies who deserted them in World Wars I and II. Tactics established to maintain a divide-and-rule formula. Tactics established by cold-blooded expediency and without moral justice. Tactics established by Mr. Bevin in setting up the Jew as a scapegoat to divert minds from Bevin's monstrous failures. Tactics established to maintain the economic supremacy and complete control that British capital possesses in the Middle East, so that it shall not be disturbed in any respect.

It is British policy to pay annual subsidies to support King Abdullah's troops. It is British policy to continue sending arms to the Arabs, in accordance with its treaties with the Arab states, unless the United Nations should designate them aggressors. And it is British policy to do everything possible at Lake Success to make sure the Arabs will not be termed aggressors—even as they march into Palestine.

The shameful unfairness of British support for the Arabs and British hostility toward the Jews, which leaves the latter defenseless while arming their enemies, is made even worse by the fact that it is the American taxpayer who is footing the bill for the British supplies sent the Arabs.

American funds granted under the Marshall plan are intended for European recovery, not for the purpose of maintaining the frail framework of far-flung British equities in all the corners of the earth. The American taxpayer never intended his money to be employed to help Britain's Arab mercenaries kill Jews.

If, because of British hamstringing, we cannot act through United Nations machinery to stop this war, the Government of the United States should take immediate steps to prevent the outrageous diversion of its own funds for the implementation of this ghastly aggression.

The second is a column by David Lawrence as it appeared in the Washington Star of May 26:

BRITISH HELP TO ARABS SEEN AS GIVING STALIN EXCUSE IN OWN COUPS—UN LOOKS ON, BUT FAILS AGAIN TO MAKE ONE OF BIG POWERS BEHAVE

(By David Lawrence)

There must be red faces in London just as there are red faces in Washington. For the headlines tell a strange tale that savors of hypocrisy and makes the argument of the European democracies seem hollow.

For here is a big nation helping another conduct a war. It is not a war against communism or an ideology this time. It is a war against an infant nation struggling for survival. The United Nations, formed to stop wars, looks on interestedly but is again unwilling to make one of the big powers behave.

When Yugoslavia and Bulgaria and, later, Czechoslovakia, were overrun by the Russian totalitarians the democracies pointed to such action as aggression—as infiltration into a weaker state. But the answer of Russia was that her "vital interests" were at stake, that she wanted a "friendly" neighbor within her "sphere of influence."

DOMINATED BY BRITISH

Today the Arab states, each with their totalitarian bosses—hardly different from Dimitrov in Bulgaria and Tito in Yugoslavia—are dominated by British policy and British subsidies. A British-trained army, subsidized by the British Government, helps the totalitarian ruler of Transjordan to fight against

a neighboring state which is striving to set up a democracy.

It was Britain which created Transjordan out of the Syrian territory which was a part of the British-mandated area. It was Britain, too, which told the other governments always that this "sphere of influence" was a natural means of protecting the British Empire's life lines and her oil supply. This is the kind of imperialism which gives the Moscow Communists their argument for doing the same thing within their "sphere of influence."

Inside the United Nations it is Britain now which obstructs and opposes where only a few weeks ago it was Russia, using her veto, to prevent a settlement from being imposed from the outside.

The British claim that the United States should not be disturbed as they are merely protecting American interests in the Near East. But it is worth recalling that Britain's willingness to share her power with America in the Arab areas is of recent origin. American oil companies got their concessions in the Near East only through State Department pressure for the open door.

It might be recalled, too, that the British broke the strike in the oil fields of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. in southern Iran only by sending a division of troops from India to a point in Iraq near the Iranian frontier—a method of pressure on Tehran which differs little from the Russian pressure with troops on the border of Iran.

TEST OF SINCERITY

Two wrongs never make a right. Two imperialistic policies do not balance one another. But the United States, which is giving so generously of its funds to bolster the democracies of western Europe, cannot, with a straight face, make an argument about the disinterestedness of the western democracies as long as the British Government assists the Transjordan armies to make war on the infant republic of Israel.

There are many Americans who never shared the view that the territory now known as Israel should be set aside as the home of a religion but merely as the territory of Palestinians of the Jewish faith. Today, however, the question has ceased to be one as between factions of Jews. It has become a test of the sincerity of a major power which in the face of legal recognition by the United States Government allows one of its satellites to make war on such a legally recognized government and then blandly asks that the buck be passed to the United Nations. Only when the UN declares the military action of the Arab states to be illegal, the British say, will they refrain from giving aid to Transjordan. The moment the United States recognized the little republic of Israel, it became an act of war under international law for Great Britain to render aid to the enemies of the state that was being recognized.

It will be difficult hereafter for Foreign Secretary Bevin to accuse Stalin and the Russion Communists of expansion when, in reality, parallel tactics are being used by Britain to protect her own material interests, all in the guise of Empire security.

The third is from the New York Times of May 27:

THE ARAB ANSWER

Faint hopes for peace in Palestine, revived by the recent Arab request for more time to consider the cease-fire order issued by the Security Council of the United Nations, have again been dashed to the ground. The Arab states insist on attaching to their acceptance of such an order conditions which for practical purposes amount to a flat rejection of it. These conditions, which would require the abolition of the new state of Israel, the virtual disarmament of its army and the cessation of immigration, are in fact nothing less than an Arab demand for unconditional surrender and a complete Arab victory. They would not only require a reversal of accomplished facts in Palestine itself, and a return of the whole issue to the period before the mandate and even the Balfour Declaration promising a national home in Palestine, but would also entail abandonment of a basic policy of the United Nations and a reversal of the foreign policies of the United States, Russia, the Union of South Africa, and other nations which have already recognized the new state of Israel.

Whatever else may be said of the Arab cause, it is evident that such a position is not only unrealistic and unacceptable but in effect amounts to a defiance of the United Nations, which recommended the partition of Palestine and issued the cease-fire order which Israel accepted. Beyond that, and beyond all the complex legalities of the whole long controversy, there stands the fact that the Israel state has come into existence by the right of every people to self-government and independence; that this state has attained international standing by virtue of the recognition extended to it by other nations, and that it is now fighting for survival against attack from other states. And while it has always been true that new states, like the former American colonies, must make good their claim to independence by their own blood and treasure, the special role which the United Nations and the United States have played in respect to Palestine now confronts both with a situation that imposes new responsibilities.

The United Nations has the task not only of giving effect to its own recommendations but also of carrying out its primary obligation to safeguard the international peace and security that have obviously been broken in Palestine. In that task it can continue to seek a solution by peaceful means under chapter VI of its Charter, or it can begin to consider more forceful action under chapter VII. The United States has already called for such stronger measures, though it bowed to Britain's demand for a last appeal for a truce. That appeal has now failed. It is deeply to be hoped that the next step will be Anglo-American agreement on the resulting problem, so as to fortify western solidarity on the broader issue between Russia and the West and enable the Security Council to present a united front.

Meanwhile, whatever action the Security Council does or does not take, the United States still has the right and the responsibility of taking action in conformity with its own policy and tradition. Mindful of its own orgins, this country has always supported the right of other peoples to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness under governments of their own choosing. Having extended recognition to Israel, it can do no less than recognize Israel's right to fight for its life. It should be our purpose and our policy at least to equalize the conditions of that fight. This means that we have both the right and the moral duty to lift the embargo on arms which the Arabs are able to obtain but Israel is not. Arab rejection of the cease-fire order has removed the last need for hesitation on that point, and it is to be hoped that President Truman will act accordingly.

The fourth is from the New York Herald Tribune of May 27:

THE ARAB REJECTION

The Arab nations have, in effect, rejected the United Nations appeal for a cease-fire in Palestine. True, their reply was not worded as an outright rejection. The conditions stipulated were, however, so extreme that they could obviously not have been accepted by the Jews or, for that matter, by the United Nations. The very fact that any conditions were made amounts to a rejection, since the Security Council had demanded an unconditional truce.

This places the Arabs on very difficult moral ground. The Jews had already agreed to respect the cease fire if their enemies did likewise. The Security Council, having been defied by the Arab states, is now in a good position to take action against them. It should immediately direct all members of the United Nations to desist from giving further military or economic aid to the countries that have refused to observe the cease fire.

Such a resolution would affect primarily or exclusively Great Britain. It is unlikely that it would be ignored. There has already been strong criticism in the British Parliament and in the press of the participation in the Palestine war of British officers in the Arab Legion. The Foreign Office has been reported considering their withdrawal.

But yesterday Mr. Eevin reiterated in the Commons his intention not to do so except in accordance with a United Nations resolution. Such a resolution is therefore needed for this reason, if for no other.

A second urgent need is for a real Anglo-American understanding on Palestine policy. The discussions recently undertaken to this end in London and Washington seemed at first to hold some promise, but they have borne no visible fruit. It may be that they were torpedoed by Mr. Truman's remark—reported by Mr. Weizmann and so far not denied—that there would be no trouble about an American loan to Israel for military purposes. The British are right in calling this promise "ill-timed" and "unfortunate." It is also, we regret to say, characteristic.

But the ineptness of American diplomacy cannot excuse the basic stupidity and futility of Britain's imperial policy of supporting the Arab princes. It is hard to see why the British should believe that, at a time when they are withdrawing all their forces and relinquishing their responsibilities, they can succeed in a policy which was never a success when they had overwhelming military force in the area. It is even harder to understand why, in pursuit of such a policy, they should be willing to jeopardize the excellent British-American relations which have grown so close over the last 10 years, and on which the peace and security of the free peoples of the world ultimately depend.

The final selection is from the Washington Post of May 28:

CEASE FIRE

It is our firm conviction that the cease-fire order in Palestine—which the Arabs have flung back in the United Nations' face by the device of a counteroffer—failed because of British noncooperation. A British officer is in personal command of the artillery bombardment of the Holy City, and even the British acknowledge that the Arab Legion and King Abdullah would be helpless without British support. In these circumstances the failure of the peace move at Lake Success will only worsen Anglo-American relations, and these are as bad as they were when the war debts were lost in an Anglo-American wrangle.

On both sides—the United States and Great Britain—there have been faults. The British undoubtedly have much to complain about in the gratuitous advice and criticism that in time past came from an irresponsible America. The mandate was a thankless task. And the prepartition kibitzing from the United States did not make it any lighter, but, on the contrary, added to the difficulty. Perhaps the most egregious example of vexatious interference was the Truman letter to Premier Attlee last year on the eve of Yom Kippur. At the time we called it "a particularly crass example" of politicking. Equally, however, there is a case against the British for the unhelpfulness they have contributed to the kaleidoscopic grapple with the Palestine problem which has been going on in the United Nations. The Germans have the only word for British conduct at the beginning of this grapple. It is schaden-

freude—pleasure in another's misfortunes. When the United States got imbedded in the complications of Palestine, all that came out of Whitehall was a series of horselaughs.

Surely both sides of the account can now be considered squared. As Mr. Amery, the second of whose powerful letters to the London Times is reproduced on another page, says, partition of Palestine was inevitable, or, as General Smuts puts it, a historical necessity. Lord Salisbury, one of Britain's greatest foreign ministers, once said that the first and greatest error of statesmanship is to stick to the carcass of a dead policy. This primary lesson has escaped Mr. Bevin, yet history, let alone common sense, is against him. Moreover, he would be contributing to the general harmony if he would quit this particular carcass and join with the State Department in seeing what can be done to promote peace, not merely in Palestine but in the entire Middle East. Bevin's is the consistency of a poohbah—leading the fighting Arab legion and joining with the UN in a cease-fire order.

There is more than a suspicion that the Arab effort so far has been aimed at promoting a "fix" in Palestine. The fighting, at any rate, has been minor and indecisive, and "face" on both sides has been preserved. Even the Jews failed to bar the Arab legion as they did the Lebanese—that is to say, by blowing up connecting bridges. But the sands are rapidly running out of any "fix" that may have been in mind. The waning prestige of the United Nations in this matter cannot brook any further delay in calling to account those who refuse to obey its cease-fire order. President Weizmann has pleaded with the United States to take unilateral action in raising the embargo against arms to Israel. Such a course, in our view, would be unwise at present. Nothing more should be done till the United Nations has been given a chance to act, and if the United Nations fails, then the United States should consider itself released to take the necessary steps of coercion. The British should be told that at last the United States means business—that it will not stand idly by while the United Nations is reduced to the same impotence that overcame the League of Nations over Ethiopia.

Address by Hon. Thomas J. Brogan, Former Chief Justice of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with unanimous consent granted, I enclose herewith in extension of my remarks an address delivered at the fifty-first annual banquet of the American Irish Historical Society at the Hotel Biltmore in New York City on May 1 by one of New Jersey's most distinguished citizens, Hon. Thomas J. Brogan, who until his recent resignation was for many years chief justice of New Jersey. Justice Brogan's eloquence is equal to his scholarship, which is by no means confined to the field of law.

The address follows:

It is a cherished privilege to speak at the dinner of your distinguished society. In the more than 50 years of the society's existence, many men of stature and importance have recalled to your mind, eloquently and with historical truth, the part that was played and the contribution that was made by Irishmen and Irish families in the development and success of this still youthful Republic—our beloved United States.

That, I take it, was the basic purpose for which this society was founded—to reveal to the world the history of the Irish element in the composition of the American people, and to place the Irish element in its true light in American history. So stated the letter that was sent to many of our forebears on December 26, 1896, which, within a month thereafter, resulted in the founding of this American Irish Historical Society. From that time to the present, we gather annually in reverent and proud recollection, lest we forget the great men of the Irish race and the outstanding contributions which they made in the establishment and development of these United States.

We may be pardoned if we refer briefly to Ireland's offering to our own beloved Republic. She had much to offer for the achievement and vindication of those principles which are our foundation stones—the freedom and dignity of the individual and the right of self-determination for all nations, great and small. That such was Ireland's mission; that with boundless devotion, she undertook its accomplishment; that centuries ago she brought Christian civilization to all Europe, are truths that defy challenge. And that in accomplishing that mission she thereby established the basis of our cherished American way of life is to us a matter of profound conviction.

Ages agone, when brutal instincts and coarser senses ruled the mainland of Europe, smothering the spiritual faculties of mankind, it is said that the Greek mind rose "like a lily above the pond"—giving fragrance and beauty to its culture and art. But art and culture were not enough. Nor did the brilliancy of the minds of Aristotle and Plato dissipate the deep gloom of ignorance and vice that enshrouded mankind. For there was nothing to elevate the mind of man toward his God. And, regardless of the Greek academy where philosophers met and in spite of the culture of naturalism that prevailed, the light of that ancient civilization faded into an abysmal darkness which covered the earth and its unhappy people. It was then, indeed, a glorious ray that shone out in the western sky—a beacon of a new spiritual civilization shining out from the altars of an Irish chapel, illuminating its own place and shedding a radiance that reached continental Europe. This light of Christian civilization from Ireland has through the centuries become a gift to the world and all its people—materially, intellectually, and most important of all, spiritually. Let me dwell a moment on each of these contributions in that order, so far as our own country has been the recipient.

On the material side, you know the facts as well as I, but lest we forget, they should be mentioned. From the very birth of this Republic, in the war for our independence, the Irish flocked to our standard, as they had to the righteous cause of other people in other lands. With the troops of Washington, they, too, left red footprints at Valley Forge. From Bunker Hill to Yorktown, they fought and died in the cause of freedom. The student of history will attest it, and no honest man will question the devotion of the Irish to these United States. Commodore John Barry is justly called the father of the American Navy—a monument in our Nation's Capitol attests that fact. General Sullivan of New Hampshire conquered the Iroquois in our early days. His Irish mother used to say that she worked in the fields carrying in her arms the future Governor of Massachusetts, with the Governors of New Hampshire and Vermont tugging at her skirts—for three of her boys became governors. The troops of Mad Anthony Wayne, the hardest fighters in our Continental Forces were always referred to as the "Line of Ireland." Half of Washington's Continental Army were Irish. And who willingly forgets the gallant young man from Donegal, General Richard Montgomery, who died for our country before the cliffs of Quebec? Need I mention the victor at New Orleans and that one of our great Presidents was Andrew Jackson?

The services of the Irish at the first real crisis in our history—the Civil War—are too well known to require more than passing mention. Among the great generals who led the northern Army was the immortal Phil Sheridan. And who does not recall Meagher at Fredricksburg?

I shall not mention the First or Second World Wars, nor the contribution of Erin's manhood to our Allied armies—that would require the rest of the evening.

What now about the Irish intellectual and spiritual offering to our country and to the world? Her gifted sons have left their imprint on civilization through the barefooted monk with his gospel of Christianity; the singing minstrel with his harp. Their mission was the salvation and happiness of all people.

If Ireland's heroes in the service of America were valiant—as they were—surely her missionaries and her saints were greater still in their service to mankind. Her heroes accomplished epic deeds with elemental splendor, against fearful odds, and paying for their valor with their lives. Would that a Scott or a Dickens would come upon the scene and breathe life into those courageous spirits from Sarsfield to Collins so that our boys and girls would understand and appreciate the soul of Ireland's magnificent manhood. But it would take the forensic genius of a Daniel O'Connell fittingly to portray the contribution of the Irish saints and scholars who rekindled the light of faith in Europe and spread it throughout the world. In very truth it was they who revived western civilization when it lay prostrate; it was they who brought Christian civilization to continental Europe; it was they who nourished, preached, and defended the freedom of man and inviolability of the individual through the generations, until at long last this Christian civilization, this freedom and dignity of man has become the priceless heritage of America.

H. V. Morton has an eloquent chapter on the offering of Irish scholars and saints to Europe's regeneration. From their homeland hills they had seen the lamps of faith and learning extinguished one by one all over Europe, and this historian recites for us a veritable litany of Irish scholars and saints who brought all Europe to the fold of Christian civilization. In his book, In Search of Ireland, he points out that:

"Century after century saw them sailing off into sunrise or sunset to clothe the land with Christ. St. Fridolin, the traveler, crossed the Rhine and set up the cross at Seckingen; St. Kilian converted Gozbert, Duke of Urzburg; St. Columbanus went through Burgundy with 12 other Irish monks and founded the monasteries of Luxeuil and Fontaines; St. Gall, one of his monks, pushed on over the Alps into Switzerland and founded the monastery known by his name; St. Frusa, son of a South Munster prince, passed through France and founded a monastery at Lagy, near Paris; Virgilius, Abbot of Aghaboe, explored France and became Bishop of Salzburg. There was Cataldus, educated at Lismore, who became Bishop of Tarentum. There was John Scotus Erigena, the great Greek scholar, who taught philosophy in Paris at the court of Charles the Bold.

"And on the walls of Derry a man remembers the best-loved of them all, Columcille, Dove of the Church, who founded the monastery in Derry in the year 546. There could have been nothing on the hill above the Foyle but perhaps a grove of oak trees. The word Derry, or Daire, means oak or an oak wood. We can imagine the young saint, for he was then only 25 years of age, building

a little oratory of oak boughs and listening at the end of his day's labors to the wind going through the leaves. When he was far away in after years on his work of evangelization, he used to think of Derry. He once wrote that the angels of God sang in the glades of Derry and that every leaf held its angel. He died before the high altar of his church at the age of 75 and in the year 596."

These and a thousand more revived Christian civilization. And this task of bringing the evangel of immortality to all people continues on to the present day. I am reliably informed that Ireland each year sends an average of 1,000 missionaries to the nations of the world. What an offering from a people whose land is smaller than the State of Maine; less by half in population than the city of New York, whose mission throughout the years was the spread and defense of Christian civilization, whose master passion has ever been the love of freedom.

Is freedom of speech dear to the people of our country? It was part and parcel of the Irish spirit from the very beginning and in defense of it she, who never fought a war to subjugate a neighbor, suffered the vilest servitude in the history of oppression.

Is freedom of religion an indispensable part of our fundamental law and inalienable heritage? Ireland endured unspeakable suffering for century upon century without yielding this God-given right.

The over-all principle for which she struggled was Christian civilization—in whose very bloodstream is the basis of democracy. We speak of democracy loosely, it seems to me, as a form of government—it is basically rather a spirit of government and Ireland through long centuries necessarily must be recognized as one of its greatest defenders and leading exponents. The freedoms which our country is even now defending anew and has defended in two devastating wars, at a dreadful cost of the flower of our young manhood, is nothing more or less than the thesis or principle which Erin ever cherished and finally vindicated—the inviolability of the individual based on the Christian doctrine of the immortality of the soul.

Southern Ireland has adopted a constitution which, it is hoped, will soon embrace all of Ireland. This constitution has a bill of rights, which is a model of Christian justice; this constitution, like our own, is a pattern of pure democracy—at once the hope and encouragement of the downtrodden people of the world.

Our own country is now sorely troubled with the momentous tasks of vindicating democracy and living up to its covenant for self-determination for all people, great and small. Our leaders in Government and in thought, looking to the east at Europe, to the south at our neighboring Latin America, to the far-off India and China, state with perplexity that the situation is "not reassuring." We may venture an opinion in the best democratic mode. We are not merely confronted with a contest of economic theories or ideologies—this is a struggle to preserve the freedom of nations and of mankind. Communism, this smothering ideology against which we strive, would relegate all who oppose it to the firing squad, or the slave camp to die of starvation, or worse. This contest will determine whether American civilization shall survive against the surging challenge of an immoral, antireligious Marxian philosophy. This is an atheistic movement on the march—its purpose the elimination of God and the enslavement of the soul. This is a war to the death between the demon from the bottomless pit and the crucified Redeemer of mankind.

There was a time, not long since, when we made light of a few parlor pinks—now we have Red college professors who laugh at logic and scoff at syllogisms; there was a time when we raised our brows at doctrines in labor relations that assailed our economic system, now the labor unions are struggling to protect themselves from Communistic domination; there was a time when public officials who toyed with the Red fringe were disapproved by the rest of us, now we find that this traitor-type has infiltrated into high places where he would remake the state and tear its bill of rights into tatters.

Our people dread and hate war—war drags men down to savagery and leaves its mark on the Nation's soul. And it is an evil mark. We are brought to our best when our spiritual nature reaches its highest and the tears of sorrow and of joy have welled up from our very hearts. We reach that sublime state when we realize in humility and sorrow, that recently we have traveled the wrong road, that we have been deluded. And our spiritual nature is now aflame in the realization that our lofty hopes and unselfish aims—that freedom of life and spirit should be the dear possession of all people, great and small—have been mocked and our aspirations for small nations turned to ashes in our mouths. Instead of high purpose achieved, we know that whole nations have been enslaved and despoiled by the cruel hand of brute strength—thousands of helpless victims murdered in the name of justice, and innocent blood shed in wholesale religious persecution.

The picture is not a pleasant one, but the prospect is perhaps not as hopeless as it seems to be. The Irish in centuries past invaded a continent spiritually and brought it Christianity, civilization, and peace. And at that time the Continent of Europe was enshrouded in a medieval darkness as completely as the waters cover the sea. The Irish came to this continent in our infant days, courageously and in numbers when we were hard pressed and, with disciplined valor, helped us win our independence and establish our Republic. And our 13 little States, or Colonies as they were contemptuously called, were sorely in need of that help. The world needs help now. In the providence of God, may we not hope to see a cavalcade of Irish missionaries—saints and scholars—accept the challenge of atheistic materialism and in spiritual invasion go forth to do battle for the tradition of the west—for Christian civilization. Not with sword in hand, or bomb from the air, but with the faith, hope, and love of our Divine Lord again brought to spiritually starved, unhappy people. At the moment, in our mind's eye, we can see the Hill of Tara, at sunset—as the sun sinks in the west. There stands silhouetted against the sky the mitered figure of St. Patrick, crozier in hand. He makes the sign of the cross over his people, and blesses the monks and scholars, whose mission once more is the evangelization of Europe and far-off Russia.

Let us hope that it is God's will that mankind's dilemma may thus be solved, and that this will be Ireland's next contribution to the happiness and welfare of America—of humanity—and of the world.

The Atomic Energy Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, fiddling with fission is a new phrase which during the next few weeks may be heard often in debate on both sides of the Capitol dome. The phrase was coined by the drafters of minority views on a bill now under consideration to extend the terms of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission to 2 years.

Designated as a bill to extend the terms of the Commissioners the proposed legislation would seem to be an endorsement of the present group of atomic energy directors. But the bill is not what it seems. Actually it is a measure to circumvent the original Atomic Energy Act of 1946, which set up procedure for the appointment of Commissioners by the President. In so many words it is a bill devised to avoid action on the nominations of the present members of the Commission which were submitted to the Senate by the President on April 20, 1948.

Signers of the minority report, and I was one of them, say the bill would impair the efficiency of the atomic energy program, which is one of the four main pillars of our national defense. They gave several reasons but chief among them is the charge that this action dissipates the spirit of political nonpartisanship in which the entire atomic energy program was conceived and established.

As a member of the Joint House and Senate Committee on Atomic Energy, I, as have all other members of the committee, found the Commission fully cooperative in every move to further this most important program. I have been on the committee since it was created under the act of 1946. During that time I have seen no evidence in committee session that should cause any member of our congressional group to withhold endorsement of the present membership of the Commission.

I brought up this point in a recent meeting. The only excuse given to me for the introduction of this particular bill was that it would avoid a fight. My answer to that was that if the committee believed the Commission has performed well, has advanced the project and has given evidence that they are fit men for the jobs they hold they should be confirmed by the Senate and our joint committee should support the President's recommendation wholeheartedly. That would be the right thing to do.

However, if the evidence were to the contrary and if the present Commissioners are incompetent, their terms should not be extended for 2 years—not even a year. They should be summarily dismissed. It would be wrong to keep them.

But our committee, knowing as it does that the Commissioners are doing splendid work, now seeks to compromise because some political forces threaten to fight the President's nominations, sent to the Senate in accordance with the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act.

I say that when the evidence is so clear-cut that fair-minded men have no difficulty in distinguishing which is the right side of the issue and which is the wrong side, it is not the time for compromise; rather, this is the time to insist that politics be forever removed from the atomic-energy program.

President Truman is merely following the law in submitting the nominations at this time. The next occupant of the White House will eventually name four of the five members of the Commission, each of whom will serve for 5 years thereafter. Truman's nominees will not be

permanent members. When you consider these facts, you must come to the conclusion that the opponents of confirmation must be singling out the present Chairman of the Commission, Mr. Lilienthal. He has the 5-year appointment under the President's recommendation, and since he is the incumbent Chairman, it was only natural that he would receive it.

Why the fight on Mr. Lilienthal? Because he did such a splendid job with TVA. Yes, I see lurking in the shadows of this fight the fine hands of the power lobby. They just do not like Mr. Lilienthal, and never have, although the records will show that neither Mr. Lilienthal or the TVA has ever done anything to hamper private power development. As a matter of fact, Mr. Lilienthal had established fine working relations with private power companies that saw in TVA a source of power to augment their own production. An examination of the financial structure of these companies will show them in better shape today than they were before TVA.

I am sorry the majority on our joint committee has declined to join those of us who believe that now is the time to let the country know politics have no place in their great program. These Commissioners, who have done such a remarkable job, deserve a better reward than is vouchsafed for them in this politically motivated bill.

The Preservation of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a most able and timely speech delivered by Representative JOHN W. BYRNES before the North Dakota Junior Chamber of Commerce convention, at Devils Lake, N. Dak., on May 27.

Representative BYRNES' most excellent speech on national and international affairs was a great contribution to the convention of outstanding young North Dakotans. Wisconsin may well be proud of the record he is making in this Congress. He is recognized as a great leader among the younger people all over the United States.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I assure you it is a great pleasure to participate in this gathering of members of the Junior Chamber of Commerce of North Dakota. It is an inspiration to see the younger element of American business so keenly concerned with the problems of improving conditions under which they live in their communities, their State, and their Nation. Your concern over these various problems is evidenced by the discussions that have taken place as part of your convention program. It was amply demonstrated in the resolutions which were adopted by your convention this morning.

I was particularly pleased to see your convention go on record to express your concern over the need to give attention to the proper strengthening of our armed forces.

I want to discuss frankly with you tonight what appears to me to be the fundamental problem facing this Nation and the world. I want to impress upon you, as representatives of the young element in American business, the importance of your stake in that problem. I want to discuss with you the manner in which we in the Congress are meeting that problem and the difficulties which we are encountering.

I don't think I have to tell you the nature of the fundamental problem of the Nation and of the world.

That problem is the preservation of peace.

It is the problem of preserving the peace in the world while retaining the American way of life at home. You and I and the American people must face squarely the issues involved in the solution of that problem. It is made compellingly urgent by the advent of potential mass destruction through scientific warfare; it is made increasingly difficult by the rise of a political doctrine which is based upon the abrogation of the basic rights of men.

A preservation of peace is of special concern to the young men of America. They have historically fought the wars of mankind; they have inevitably picked up the rubble when the guns fell silent. You, representing the youth of American business, will fight the next war and will live in the wilderness it creates if we now fail in the campaign for peace.

We have, then, a significant obligation. Ours is the opportunity to enlist the fire, the spirit, and the optimism of youth in the formation of a program for peace. Ours is the solemn duty to insure that our program for peace is based upon principles of individual freedom and the hopeful promise of the American way of life. We must not fail in this duty, this obligation, this fateful opportunity.

I want to emphasize at the outset that half-hearted measures based upon faint-hearted support will not surmount the obstacles to peace. What is needed is a great boldness springing from an understanding and united people. Our efforts for peace must emerge clear and strong from the purifying crucible of public opinion. An aroused America, in time of war, has demonstrated her potential for destruction; an aroused America can surpass that effort in building for peace.

In the development of a united public opinion, we representatives of youth have a significant role. We must channel our energy into the creation of positive and constructive action and away from indecision, negation, and wishfulness. We must fully and critically assess the policies and actions of our national leaders. We must constantly be on the alert for obscurity of motive, faulty planning, and maladministration. We must demand complete information; we must beware of secrecy, inconsistencies, and half truths. I hope to demonstrate later, by specific example, what I mean by the intelligent use of our critical faculties to defeat these handicaps to unified action.

We are faced, of course, in our program for peace with what appears to be a great inconsistency. This apparent inconsistency has been seized upon by those whose allegiance lies closer to the steppes of Russia than to the plains of America. This apparent inconsistency is in arming ourselves when our aim is peace. The fellow travelers have seized upon this paradox to insist that we are embarking upon a militaristic program designed to lead this Nation into aggressive warfare.

We must frankly admit that the dangers of militarism are great and must be guarded against, but it is a strange distortion of the truth to charge that the defense steps we must take in the best interests of our national security are designed to further aggressive aims. It is strikingly clear to me, and I know it must be to all of you, if the United States is to assume leadership of an uneasy world in which a totalitarian police state is once more at large that we must back up our words with calm and confident strength. We can ardently wish that we did not have to do so; we can look fondly back upon the good things that our military expenditures would buy, but we are faced squarely with the realities of the present-day world. If our program for peace is to succeed, if our generous aid to the free nations of the world is to become effective, if we are to stand as a bulwark against further Soviet aggression, then we cannot wishfully lapse into a state of weakness and indecision. It is the unanimous hope of the American people that the sacrifices we must make in order to strengthen our armed forces will demonstrate to the world that once again we stand straight athwart the path of tyranny.

Yet, united as we are in our determination that the country shall be made strong, we in the Congress have faced, and are continuing to face, many disheartening examples of confusion and indecision.

There is an almost complete unanimity among the Members of Congress that the strengthening of our armed forces shall take place. Unfortunately, there is almost as complete a disagreement as to how we shall go about that job.

Our disagreement and our confusion stems from the disagreement and confusion that presently exists among the leaders of our Military Establishment. I know that you, too, must certainly have sensed this feeling of confusion.

The fact is that we in Congress are confronted with completely dissimilar estimates of the situation. We are faced with conflicting viewpoints as to objectives. We are asked to place varying degrees of emphasis upon one arm of our national defense or the other.

As ordinary people, with an imperfect knowledge of strategical concepts or technical implementation as of our strategy, we have traditionally had to rely upon the military for guidance in matters relating to our defense. Yet, today, when the question of what kind of an armed establishment we should build is receiving congressional review, we are confronted with conflicting advice from those we have traditionally relied upon for our facts.

The conflict among the Armed Services strikes heavily at our sense of proportion and balance at this particular time. We had assumed that the unification of the armed forces would at least bring about unification at the policy-making level. We have found to our complete dismay that this is far from being true and that unification in practice has only served to bring into sharper outline the deep differences between the strategical theories held by the three elements of our armed establishment.

I need not go into detail concerning the conflicting requests that have been made of Congress by representatives of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. Suffice to say, there is a deep and elemental cleavage of thought between these members of our national defense team.

To me, it is apparent that the confusion over what we shall do stems from a basic confusion over what we are trying to accomplish. It stems from the failure of the administration to define clear-cut objectives and, for that purpose, to make intelligent use of the machinery furnished to it by this Congress. The confusion of Congress in regard to national security stems from the confusion inherent in the administration's attempt to implement policy without first having disclosed the nature of that policy.

Shall we plan to mobilize at once a defensive and deterrent force for the support of Europe, as has been suggested by Mr. Walter Lippmann? Should we plan for an atomic war in 1952, as has been suggested by a Presidential commission? Or, should we do both, simultaneously and with dispatch? What is our objective—both for the short and the long term? What is the nature of the crisis?

We should neither be lulled into a false sense of security as happened prior to the last war, nor panicked into taking ill-considered or hit-and-miss action through ignorance of the whole situation. We should be given the facts and those facts should come from the source best equipped to obtain them.

Wherein lies our failure? Why are we foolishly debating means when no decision has been reached as to objective?

I can only hazard a guess, but it is apparent to me that our present national confusion springs from the administration's failure to utilize intelligently the machinery made available to it in the much-maligned Unification Act. Many of our past failures can be traced to the failure of the executive branch to take advantage of laws passed by Congress, or the failure of Congress to insist upon the best possible use of the machinery it has made available. I believe here that we are confronted with another one of those examples.

It was the intent of the Congress in passing the Unification Act to provide for the effective, strategic direction of the armed forces, for their operation under unified control and for their integration into an efficient team of land, naval, and air forces. Under that act certain machinery was set up.

The first title provided for the coordination for national security and that, incidently, is exactly what we have not had during this first great test of the legislation. By the very first section of title I, the act provided for a National Security Council. Under the act it became a duty of the Council to assess and appraise our objectives, commitments, and risks and consider policies on matters of common interest to the departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security. It is the duty of the Council under the act to make such recommendations and other reports to the President as it deems appropriate or as the President may require. Under the National Security Council was established the Central Intelligence Agency which, in effect, is an arm of the Council, furnishing it with every available bit of information on every aspect of foreign capabilities and intentions.

It is very apparent from this very hasty summary of the duties of the National Security Council that it was and is the highest level policy-making body as concerns our national security. For this reason its membership was spelled out very carefully. Its membership includes the highest level policy makers not only of our military policy but of our foreign and domestic policies as well. The Council is headed by the President and its members are the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

Here then is a governmental body specifically given the function of determining what our objective and our over-all security policy shall be. It specifically includes representatives from all of our military departments. It specifically includes the Secretary of State, so that there may be intimate cooperation between the conduct of our foreign affairs and the means to enforce our commitments. It specifically includes the Chairman of the National Resources Board who may be expected to know the impact of any defense program upon the national economy. It has access to information not available to any other agency.

If any governmental unit or group of men can speak authoritatively of our objective in the field of national security, if any governmental agency can speak with great authority on the question of implementing our national policy, I can think of none that can do so with greater prestige than the National Security Council. I can think of no other agency or legislative machinery that the Congress could provide that would be more capable of bringing order out of a monumental chaos in which our defense requirements have become involved.

What are the recommendations of the National Security Council in our present dilemma? That, gentlemen, is a question that you and I and the Congress and the people of the United States should be asking.

The plain fact is that we do not know what those recommendations are.

It is true, of course, that the reports and recommendations of the Council are the property of the President. He has the implied power under the act to do as he sees fit with the recommendations of his highest level policy-recommending body. I do not question his power to keep such recommendations and reports secret as he may see fit, but I seriously question the wisdom at this particular time of keeping under cover the specific recommendations of the Council concerning the dilemma which confronts us as a result of the conflicting requests of the Secretaries of our armed branches. It is for this reason that I requested the President, only a short time ago, to make known, as a public service, the recommendations of the National Security Council.

Consider our present situation. We have heard the recommendations of Mr. Forrestal, Secretary of Defense and a member of the Council. We have heard the recommendations of Mr. Symington, the Secretary of the Air Force, a member of the Council. We have heard the recommendations of the Secretary of the Army, a member of the Council, and we have heard the recommendations of the Secretary of the Navy, a member of the Council.

These recommendations, however, have shown no unanimity of opinion as to objectives or as to methods. These recommendations have served more to confuse than to illuminate.

Yet we find that the Security Council has been in operation since September of last year and that it has met 10 times up until this date. We find that it has made recommendations to the President and that these recommendations thus far have been unanimous.

Let us assume that the Council has made recommendations concerning this specific problem which confronts us today—our national-security objective and the kind of armed forces needed to implement that objective. If they have made such a recommendation, and they would certainly be remiss in their duty if they have not, that recommendation has been unanimous. In other words, all members of the Council have agreed.

If this is true, then consider these unexplainable paradoxes.

If Mr. Forrestal's recommendations are the recommendations of the entire Council, then Mr. Symington, since he disagrees with Mr. Forrestal, is in apparent disagreement with the recommendations of the entire Council. Yet Mr. Symington is a party to the unanimous recommendations of the Council as a whole.

On the other hand, if Mr. Symington's recommendations more nearly reflect the recommendations of the entire Council, then Mr. Forrestal, since he takes issue with Mr. Symington, is in disagreement with the recommendations of the entire Council. Yet he, too, is party to the Council's recommendations.

If neither concept is the concept of the Council, or if the Council's recommendations are a blend of the two, or a radical departure from either, then both of these gentlemen are in serious quarrel with recommendations to which they have both previously agreed.

The point is that we do not know who, if anyone, is championing the considered views of a deliberative body which represents the highest levels of all elements concerned in our national-defense picture, nor do we know whether an integrated policy, with clearly defined objectives, has ever been enunciated by this body.

And it is this failure to specify our objective that is preventing Congress, supported by enlightened public opinion, from intelligently providing the type of armed establishment that is necessarily required. The formation of a cohesive, national-defense policy with which to back up our foreign commitments is seriously endangered. Without a cohesive policy our national security is in jeopardy.

The Secretary of Defense testified, for instance, that he will continue to rely heavily on any recommendation that the Joint Chiefs of Staff may make with regard to the proper composition of a balanced force.

I believe that this unfortunate tendency to place in the hands of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a strictly military group, the last word concerning our national security planning, has placed us in our present unfortunate dilemma. It has lead our Secretary of Defense, time and again, to reassemble his Joint Chiefs of Staff, to reformulate recommendations which have previously been wrecked by the testimony of the individual Chiefs of Staff themselves.

Of course, the balance of our armed forces rests on the strategic plans of the Joint Chiefs, but our failure, thus far, has been to determine upon what foundation our strategic plans must be based. Certainly they can be based upon nothing other than a clear understanding of what our objectives actually are. In this sense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff are not the final determining factor in our national security planning. The formulation of our national strategy, of which our military strategy is only a dependent part, rests with the National Security Council.

In other words, gentlemen, it is high time, as we pursue our policy toward peace through strength, that we decide who shall formulate our national-security policy. Shall we leave it in the hands of the Joint Chiefs of Staff with their imperfect knowledge of the entire situation, or shall we make effective use of the National Security Council, upon whom the Joint Chiefs of Staff must necessarily lean for direction? If we decide upon the former course, then we can well abandon the Council and save the $200,000 a year that it costs to operate this particular body. I believe its abandonment would be a most unwise course.

Without benefit of the information which only this council is in a position to furnish, we, the Congress, will be required to legislate blindly. Our only choice will be to evolve a program which represents the views of that branch of service whose case is most forcefully presented. And, this is a dangerous risk to take. Yet, it is difficult to see how we can arrive at any other result unless our objective is made clear. That objective cannot be made clear until those responsible for our national policies tell us what those policies are. It is for this reason, that the President should make known the recommendations of the Security Council. I believe it is our only hope for giving full meaning and life to the Unification Act for which we all have such great hopes.

It is for reasons such as this, that I say to you that our program for peace must be accompanied by an intelligent sort of criticism which will eliminate obscurity, faulty planning and maladministration. At this stage of the game, we cannot hope to blunder our way to a satisfactory solution of the thousands of problems with which the world is

beset. We cannot hope to achieve the great goal of peace unless we insist upon the very best kind of leadership from those who are responsible for our foreign, domestic, and military policies.

In the formation of that type of criticism, which is only possible in a Nation such as ours, a Nation dedicated to the preservation of freedom, I enlist the particular support of you who represent the forward-looking youth of American business. In this way, we can bring life and meaning and hope to our program for peace. With a strong faith in our own traditions and institutions, with an abiding determination to succeed, we can bring to bear the tremendous impact of the strength and vitality of young America in the crucial struggle ahead. Conscious of our strength, confident of the righteousness of our cause, proceeding with intelligence as well as with enthusiasm, we can win the fight for an honorable peace.

Republican Approach to Domestic and International Crises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by Gov. Earl Warren, of California, on May 27, 1948, over the American Broadcasting Co.'s network.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, most of the Presidential primary elections have now been held. The delegates of the Republican Party will soon meet in Philadelphia. I am confident they will regard their work, not merely as a political opportunity, but as a national responsibility.

I say this because the present crises in both our domestic and international affairs require a new and vigorous approach. Such an approach will, I believe, become the responsibility of the Republican Party.

I do not claim that the safety and welfare of the Nation are party goals. They are American goals. Both great parties must compete for their achievement. The issues of the day cannot be regarded as a political football—except in the one sense that, when one party fumbles, it is up to the other to carry the ball.

That there has been a fumble is evident from the fact that today—3 years after the surrender of Germany and Japan—we have yet to write the treaties necessary to restore peace with our former enemies. What is more important still, we have failed to settle relationships among the victors themselves. Instead, we find ourselves engaged in a cold but very dangerous war.

It is small satisfaction that some other nation is largely to blame for all this. We must measure up to our own responsibilities. We cannot afford to fumble or fail at this time in our history.

Largely as a consequence of the present international situation, the American people are disappointed and uncertain. After a terrible depression and a more terrible war, they envisioned an opportunity for personal development and a measure of security for themselves and their families. Instead of making these gains, they now find themselves living precariously in a superficial prosperity. Slowly but surely they are losing out in their desperate struggle for family solvency. The terrific pressures of high taxes and high prices are almost overwhelming. There is the ever-present fear of depression should a break occur in our inflated economy.

Americans are questioning the initiative, the resourcefulness, and the frankness of the present national leadership. They are bewildered by the policy failures of the past that have made necessary the shifting and the about face of the present. They would like to know why their leaders did not make it clear 3 years ago, when we were geared to carry on with the job, that World War II was not really ended, that the peace had yet to be secured, and that the world economy had yet to be restored.

Is it any wonder, therefore, that the American people are looking for a change? It is for this reason that the Republican Party must rise to the heights of a new order of politics in keeping with the needs and expectations of the Nation.

Every Republican leader, every candidate for the nomination of its convention, must strive to think of our country first, the party second, and himself last. Each must make his contribution of talent, experience, and good will to a program that will make sense to the American people and revive their confidence in the future.

What should be the program of the Republican Party?

In the first place, it should dedicate itself to what I have described as a new order of politics: It must bring to our national administration personal and organizational integrity so strict at the higher levels that it will permeate the whole Federal service.

It must bring to it an efficiency of administration that will break down the old belief that Government cannot operate as effectively and economically within its sphere as does comparable private business.

It must restore frankness in dealing with the people, based upon the belief that the people, given all the facts, will understand and support their Government with whatever degree of patience is required to gain worthwhile objectives.

It must make human helpfulness its goal, ever bearing in mind that Government represents, not things, not impersonal organizations, however vocal and powerful, but human beings in the little families and homes of the Nation.

These things have always been ideals. They have been practiced to a great or lesser degree during our national history. But in this modern day when Government has greater responsibilities than ever before, they are absolutely essential.

I am convinced that, if we steadily elevate the standards of Government, if we restore a sense of confidence and participation between Government and the people, we will find that there is literally no limit to what this country of ours can accomplish.

I am one who believes that a united America can work out a strategy for world peace just as successfully as we worked out a strategy for victory in the war. To do this, however, we must keep ourselves militarily strong until world cooperation is on a firmer basis than it is today. We must be strong to keep the commitments we have made to ourselves and to a world that looks to us for leadership. Our membership in the United Nations contemplates and requires that we do this until that agency itself is strong enough to assert and enforce the sanctions necessary to prevent aggression in any form. We cannot, in safety or in conscience, let the United Nations down. Surely the world cannot stand the collapse of its second attempt in little more than a quarter of a century to implement world cooperation as a substitute for world-wide war or fear of war.

To restore our military strength we must now reverse the process of a premature dismantling of our armed forces. For nearly 3 years we permitted them to deteriorate to the point of almost abject weakness. But whatever the mistake of the past, we must correct it now.

The need for organized economic assistance to war-exhausted nations was just as obvious and urgent 3 years ago as it is today. Yet, we failed to move adequately at the time. We delayed for nearly 2 years, and then launched a belated program after our economy had been reconverted on the assumption of business as usual.

Again, whatever the mistake of the past, we must now follow through with this world recovery program so far as possible without weakening ourselves. We must use every safeguard, however, to make sure that this economic assistance results, not in mere transitory relief, but in permanent reconstruction that will enable the nations benefited to move forward as soon as possible on their own.

I am sure that if we make up for lost time on these two vital programs—if we keep ourselves militarily strong, and if we work for the reconstruction of friendly nations, however painful and expensive these programs may be, our compensation will be a steady improvement in the effectiveness of our foreign policy, a reversal of the futility and failure that characterized it after Yalta and Potsdam.

As we increase our trade with other nations, the national administration must see to it that this international trade is carried on, not on any basis of exploitation, but with the realization that all nations of the world—not America alone—must industrialize. This is the only way in which the world can overcome an all-too-universal poverty that stems from overpopulation and antiquated production methods.

Furthermore, the economic health of our own Nation and the world requires that we, as a great creditor Nation, realize that world trade is a two-way street, that we must buy from other nations if we expect to sell to them. We must, therefore, assure other nations a market for the raw materials and other essentials which they produce and which we need. We can either use or stockpile them as a partial offset to the dollars and resources we are pouring for world reconstruction.

To restore our military strength, to carry out our foreign recovery program and at the same time keep America economically strong, is a challenge of tremendous magnitude. It has never been faced by any other nation in history. That we can meet it, I have no doubt. We accomplish a miracle of even greater magnitude in wartime, and there is no reason why we cannot accomplish a similar miracle under the less onerous conditions of peace.

That our task involves a constant threat of shortages and inflation is apparent—and the threat is dangerous. There is no magic formula to avoid economic disaster except, perhaps, the one magic word—production—all-out, uninterrupted, useful production for ourselves, and, as far as possible, for the world.

To come to grips with inflation and to protect the value of the American dollar we must avoid a resort to further deficit spending and make regular and substantial payments on our present enormous national debt. We must, therefore, derive a national revenue through taxation sufficient for that purpose.

I firmly believe, however, that the resources, the know-how, and the energy of America can step up production to a point consistent with the eventual further lowering of our Federal taxes.

To stimulate increased production the Federal Government must take the lead, not through repressive regimentation or unworkable controls, but through an expression of national policy made clear to busi-

ness, labor, agriculture, and the public. This policy should strive for the stabilization of agricultural prices, industrial prices, and wages, and a relationship among them that is fair to each group and to the consuming public.

A national administration that knows what it is doing, one that has the confidence of the Nation, can bring about a result comparable to the war effort of our country.

Leadership is the thing most urgently needed to put into effect a nationally supported, all-out production program. We must maintain industrial peace through the constant improvement of the collective bargaining process; adjust our tax laws to move surplus capital into essential, productive enterprise; stimulate Government and private research for new or improved methods; develop skilled workmen and managers through vocational training; curb monopoly and its artificially fixed prices wherever they appear; induce savings through widespread individual purchase of long-term Government securities, and stimulate the will of our people to greater individual production for the common good.

But, there is even more involved in our mobilization for peace and production. First, there are our natural resources—rich, but not inexhaustible, available for use, but not for waste. We can no longer regard their wise development as mere matters of deferable public works. They are vital, urgent, and wealth-producing—the keys that will unlock our potential for greater production.

Then, there is the equally important battle line for social welfare and security. It is a delusion to think that we can meet our problem by providing incentives for the investment of dollars without at the same time providing incentives for the progress of our working millions toward better living.

These are the elements of the challenge we face today. I firmly believe that the Republican Party understands this challenge, and is prepared to help the American people meet it, not only successfully, but magnificently.

Road to the North

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD an article by Richard L. Neuberger on the Alaska Highway. No American writer knows the Alaska road better than Dick Neuberger, and I know his story will be of interest to the Congress. With our northern frontier becoming more important all the time, with the likelihood of Alaska becoming a State, and with the need for means of communication with the Territory, this story will bring us up to date.

The article follows:

ROAD TO THE NORTH—ALASKA HIGHWAY NOW OPEN FOR THE FIRST TIME TO UNRESTRICTED PLEASURE DRIVING

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

PRINCE GEORGE, BRITISH COLUMBIA.—Alaska is off beyond the far end of Main Street now. This summer, for the first time in history, the average American motorist can drive his car to the headwaters of the Yukon River. The Royal Canadian Mounted Police, who patrol 1,221 of the Alaska Highway's 1,523 miles, have just lifted travel restrictions on the famous wilderness road which the United States Army Engineers constructed during the war as an emergency route to the far north.

The Alaska Highway is heavily graveled with a surface 26 feet in width. Curves are gentle and banked, and few grades exceed 6 percent.

The principal difficulty for the driver who sets out for Fairbanks via the highway will be the distance between stores and garages. There are no repair facilities, for example, between Lake Teslin, Mile 804, and the mounted police post at Whitehorse, Mile 918. This is equivalent to the distance between New York and Atlantic City without any place to get gas, a tow car, a cheese sandwich, or ice-cream cones for the youngsters.

What will be the approximate cost of an automobile journey into the spectacular outdoors of the sub-Arctic? The North Pacific planning project, sponsored jointly by the Governments of Canada and the United States, has made detailed estimates of probable expenses on the wilderness road.

COST OF THE TRIP

It says it would cost $1,294.82 for four adults driving to Fairbanks and back from Chicago. The amount would include depreciation on the automobile.

This is how the expenses are itemized:

Food	$408.00
Lodging	306.00
Gasoline	133.06
Oil	22.58
Maintenance of car	132.64
Tires and inner tubes	49.34
Depreciation on car	107.20
Miscellaneous	136.00

The trip would require 34 days. This aims at 400 miles a day while on American roads, 300 miles a day on Canadian trunk roads, and 200 miles daily on the Alaska Highway itself. Total distance traveled on the round trip would be 7,460 miles. The allotted time would allow some leisure for sightseeing, fishing, hunting and enjoyment of the other attractions of the greatest uninhabited solitudes left on the North American Continent.

Most entries by road into western Canada from the United States occur either near Winnipeg or Vancouver. Some take place through the Sweetgrass Hills of Montana into the prairie provinces of Alberta or Saskatchewan. The southern terminus of the Alaska Highway is reached via Edmonton. The 480 miles of road between Edmonton and the jumping-off point at Dawson Creek are sure to be the most trying on the trip. This stretch is dusty in dry weather, slippery and pocked when it rains.

PROVISIONS FOR TRIP

A motor journey to Fairbanks involves precautions far beyond those of the ordinary automobile trip. Mosquito netting is advisable. Insects are an actual menace when the ice in northern lakes and ponds begins to break up in May and June. Every car should carry an extra supply of oil and at least one spare drum of gasoline. When supply points are more than 100 miles apart, no chances can be taken. Nowhere along the Alaska Highway is there a delicatessen just around the corner, so in the trunk should be a hamper of canned goods, hardtack, dried fruits, and perhaps a round of cheese and a can of coffee.

Blankets and warm clothes are also advisable. North of the fifty-third parallel skim ice is not unusual even in midsummer.

Because of the sun, restless sleepers are advised to take along eye pads which can be worn in bed. Near the road's northern end, along the Tanana and Yukon Rivers, there is some light all night in summer. Men can play baseball at Fairbanks at 1 o'clock in the morning on June 21. Motorists on the Alaska Highway who do not bring fishing tackle will regret it.

SCENERY ON THE WAY

The Alaska Highway, extending over a distance as great as that from New York to Duluth, is both rewarding and disappointing so far as scenery is concerned. The first 900 miles, to the upper Yukon settlement of Whitehorse, is no more spectacular than many stretches of road in Oregon, Montana, or Colorado. But beyond Whitehorse, where the highway is crossed by the narrow-gage White Pass & Yukon Railway for its only grade crossing, loom the peaks of the St. Elias Range, among them 19,850-foot Mount Logan.

On the outer ramparts of the St. Elias, along the steep slopes of blue Kluane Lake, the road attains its scenic apex. This picturesque body of water has been compared with Crater Lake in Oregon, but it is far wilder in surroundings. This is Canada's greatest big-game country. Moose and caribou crash through the underbrush, grizzlies loll on rocky ledges. The mounted police allow no animals to be killed, except in self-protection, for 1 mile on each side of the Alaska Highway. Fishing licenses are not required, but a hunting license in the Yukon costs $100. Birds such as grouse and pheasants may be shot for $5.

Gov. Dwight H. Green, of Illinois, in the National Spotlight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, gratifying national recognition has come to Illinois with the selection of Gov. Dwight H. Green as keynoter and temporary chairman of the Republican National Convention. The choice of Governor Green by party leaders pays proper tribute to the successful leadership the Governor has provided for the Republican Party in Illinois as well as the important role of the State itself in national affairs.

Governor Green's keynote address will serve to inaugurate a national campaign regarded in Republican circles—and elsewhere, too—as certain to lead to victory in the Presidential election this fall. His is the signal honor—and grave responsibility—of outlining in broadest terms the path Republicans propose to follow in leading the Nation from its present political chaos to a realm of stability at home and abroad.

Governor Green is eminently well qualified for the task. Illinois citizens recall with pride his achievements, first as a fighting prosecutor of gangland disorder in Chicago, then as a brilliant challenger of the entrenched New Deal city machine in Chicago, and ultimately the leader of the successful drive to return the Republican Party to power in the State of Illinois when he was first elected Governor in 1940. Through two administrations his service to this State and his devotion to his country combined to name him entirely without opposition as the gubernatorial standard bearer for the third time. Only outstanding per-

formance merits that type of confidence. The Governor has given that type of performance.

Selection of Governor Green as keynoter has given new impetus to frequently mentioned consideration for a place on the national ticket. Unquestionably, he is the "favorite son" choice of the Illinois delegates to the national convention. What will happen in Philadelphia remains veiled in the uncertainties of the future. But two factors are reasonably definite. One is that the nominee of the Republican convention will be the next occupant of the White House. The other is that in the naming of the nominee, Illinois and its distinguished governor will have an important voice.

Further recognition of the significance of the role awarded to Governor Green has been given in an informative analysis written by Gould Lincoln, highly able political writer for the Washington Star and an outstanding national political columnist. The article, entitled "Can a Keynoter Nominate Himself?" was published in the editorial section of the Washington Sunday Star May 30. Under permission granted to extend my remarks I include the text of Mr. Lincoln's revealing and complimentary comment:

CAN A KEYNOTER NOMINATE HIMSELF?—DWIGHT GREEN COULD TALK HIS WAY INTO GOP TICKET; RECORD IS IMPRESSIVE IN BOTH LAW AND POLITICS

(By Gould Lincoln)

The roll assigned to "favorite-son candidates" for the Republican Presidential nomination this year is an important one. They are expected, collectively, to hold enough delegates in line to tie the Republican National Convention in bowknots until the party bosses—or some of them—can make the necessary deals to nominate a candidate satisfactory to them. This is what is called "an open convention," a convention in which the candidates who have really wide support among the voters may be finally and definitely sidetracked.

No reflection upon "favorite-son candidates" is intended. Many of them are men of very high caliber. This year's crop contains men who would make as good a Chief Executive as the so-called national candidates—candidates who have support for nomination in States other than their own.

Typical of the "favorite-son" group is Gov. Dwight H. Green, of Illinois. For 8 years he has served as Governor of the third most populous State in the Union. He is a candidate now for a third term—and unless all signs fail, he will be reelected. Further, he has been selected by the committee on arrangements of the Republican National Convention to be temporary chairman and keynote speaker of the convention. It is upon Mr. Green, therefore, that the spotlight will turn first when the Republican cohorts assemble in Philadelphia.

GOOD RECORD AS PROSECUTOR

It has sometimes been the dream of keynote speakers at these national conventions—Republican or Democratic—that they will do such a keynoting job that the Presidential nomination will finally come round to them. It's not an impossibility—and in Mr. Green's case the keynote speech will be put across by an excellent speaker. Mr. Green has a good voice and plenty of drive and punch. As a general rule, however, favorite-son candidates for the Presidency have in the back of their heads an ambition to become the party's nominee for Vice President—and some of them have landed. It is in that role that the Illinois Governor may have the better opportunity—particularly should Governor Dewey, of New York, or another easterner win first place on the ticket.

Mr. Green, by the way, is another of the Republicans now in high office who started up the political ladder as a prosecuting attorney. Mr. Dewey is the outstanding example—for he was first United States attorney and then was elected district attorney of New York County, and in those offices gave the country a great thrill as an enemy of the rackets and crooked politicans. Harold Stassen forged to the front in Minnesota politics as a district attorney, too, and so did Gov. Earl Warren, of California.

PROSECUTED CAPONE

Governor Green's record as a prosecutor stands up well with any of them. It was Al Capone, Chicago's outstanding gangster and racketeer, who was instrumental in first turning the spotlight on Mr. Green, then a special attorney for the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Mr. Green developed a flank attack on Capone under the income-tax laws. He was sent to Chicago, where he had a major part in the prosecution of the gangster. He also was successful in sending to jail Al's brother Ralph and other bootleg barons. Later, in 1935, Mr. Green was United States attorney—the Democrats being unable to agree at the time on whom President Roosevelt should appoint in his place. In that office he sent to jail Louis Piquett, Dillinger's mouthpiece, and Jon Paul Chase, "Baby Face" Nelson's companion in the Barrington shooting in which Nelson was killed.

Mr. Green was a flourishing lawyer in Chicago with a wide practice at the age of 43 in 1939. The Republicans were anxious to oust Mayor Ed Kelly—the Democratic boss of the State. The only Republican who had offered to run against Kelly was former Mayor William Hale (Big Bill) Thompson. Republican Party leaders went to Green and pleaded with him to run. Thompson, they figured, was out of the question. Mr. Green finally consented. He had 77 percent of the Republican vote in the nominating primary, and made a surprisingly good contest for mayor in a city which had been overwhelmingly Democratic, although Kelly was elected.

OUTPOLLED ROOSEVELT

A year later, Mr. Green was the choice of the Republicans for Governor. He was elected and his total vote was 50,000 votes better than that of President Roosevelt, who carried Illinois in the Presidential election in 1940. He was reelected in 1944—although in that year the State also went for Roosevelt, demonstrating again Mr. Green's vote-getting ability.

As Governor of Illinois throughout World War II, Mr. Green had plenty of knotty problems, which he handled successfully. He was a veteran himself of the First World War, serving in the Air Corps. He believes today that air power should come first in the country's defense program.

The Illinois Governor is a Hoosier by birth. He attended Wabash College in Crawfordsville, Ind., and it was there he got the nickname "Pete," which has stuck to him ever since. It may have been in Indiana that he got his taste for politics, too. It has been said that all Hoosiers are either politicians or writers, and some are both. At the end of 2 years in college, where he had played football, Mr. Green was in the Army Air Corps. He was sent out to the Pacific Coast as an instructor and was there when the war ended. He took a turn at Leland Stanford, and then went to Chicago University for a law course.

Illinois' delegation to the Republican National Convention is large and important. It has 56 votes to cast for any Presidential candidate who tickles its fancy. No candidate this year entered the State's Presidential preferential primary. That primary is only advisory—but it still gives the voters an opportunity to express themselves. Representatives of General MacArthur and Mr. Stassen were on hand the last filing day with petitions signed and ready, placing their candidates in the primary. Neither, apparently, cared to file unless the other did. So, after hours of eyeing each other, both went away without making an entry in the primary. Governor Green had no plan to enter this primary, and would not have done so. The expectation was, however, that the Illinois delegates would line up for Green on the first ballot in Republican National Convention, irrespective of the result of the preferential primary.

That expectation still persists. Among the Illinois delegates, however, are supporters of Senator Taft, of Ohio, Dewey, Stassen, and Vandenberg, who may jump on the second ballot—or even on the first—to the candidate of their choice. Governor Green, for his part, will endeavor to hold the delegation together until the time arrives to make a tenshot, and then to deliver it to the winning candidate. It's the kind of thing that can be done by a large State delegation—with a great deal of political benefit to the man who engineers the maneuver and to the State which makes a Presidential nomination virtually certain.

SAYS HE HAS NO FAVORITE

Until the recent Dewey-Stassen fracas in Oregon, where the New Yorker defeated the Minnesotan in debate and then in the preferential Presidential primary, Mr. Stassen was making wide headway among the Republicans of Illinois, especially among the younger crowd. Mr. Dewey appeared to be second choice, TAFT third—despite the fact he has had a pat on the back from the Chicago Tribune—and VANDENBERG fourth. The trend to Stassen, however, has been somewhat checked by the Oregon results.

Governor Green asserts flatly he is playing no favorites—particularly since he has been named temporary chairman of the national convention and its keynote speaker. He does not intend, he says, to step down from the temporary chairmanship to become the floor manager of any of the Presidential candidates, as did Mr. Stassen, who was keynote speaker and temporary chairman of the Republican National Convention in 1940. Mr. Stassen went to work for Wendell L. Willkie and helped bring about his nomination. The Minnesotan was Governor of his State at that time—but too young to become a candidate either for a Presidential or Vice Presidential nomination. Mr. Green, who is 51, is in a different position. He is well past the 35-year age requisite for a President of the United States.

The Illinois Governor has long been a personal friend of Governor Dewey. A report was published last summer that the New Yorker had offered Green the Vice Presidential nomination for his support for a Dewey Presidential nomination. The report was flatly denied, and it was suggested at the time it had been circulated to embarrass Governor Dewey, and perhaps Mr. Green himself. It is certain, however, that Governor Green has consulated all the important Presidential candidate camps—Taft's, Dewey's, Stassen's, and so on, regarding the keynote speech he is to make at the Philadelphia convention. Mr. Green has, in addition, spent several days in Washington going over the issues carefully with leading Republican Members of Congress. The speech will, it is said, be a forward-looking document when it is completed, embodying policies on which Republicans generally can agree.

NO BACK SLAPPER

Mr. Green himself, in past speeches and interviews, has assailed the handling of foreign affairs by the Truman administration, referring to the United Nations as an impotent debating society, and as a dismal failure. He has not turned his back on Ameri-

can aid to war-torn Europe, but has cautioned that American resources, while vast, are not unlimited.

In appearance the Illinois Governor is decidedly prepossesssing. He has an athletic build, prematurely gray hair, and ruddy complexion, and is always well groomed. He is no back slapper, but is a good mixer and has many friends. A hard worker, he frequently stays on the job—either in Springfield or Chicago—until the early hours of the morning.

During his administration Illinois has been redistricted for congressional elections, the first time since 1901. Seven earlier governors had tried their hand at getting a redistricting law passed and failed. The situation had become utterly ridiculous—with one congressional district containing about 1,000,000 people and another only 170,000. The State has 26 congressional districts under the new law. Thirteen of the districts are in Chicago and Cook County and 13 are down-State.

The finances of the State, under Mr. Green's administration, are in excellent shape. At the same time he has done much, in cooperation with the legislature, to build up State institutions, including mental hospitals, teachers' colleges, and the University of Illinois. He has been successful, too, in putting through a liberal cash bonus for veterans of World War II.

No Governor of Illinois has been elected for three consecutive terms. If Mr. Green wins next November he will have established a record. The prospects for a Republican victory in the State are excellent. For the first time in years the Republicans polled more votes in April primary elections than did the Democrats. Illinois, with its big vote in the electoral college, is a key State in any presidential election. Decidedly, should his political fortunes take Governor Green out of the gubernatorial contest and place him on the Republican national ticket, he would be helpful in carrying this great Midwestern State for the GOP.

Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I direct your attention to an editorial, Voice of America, from the Huntington (W. Va.) Advertiser. The Advertiser is a Democratic paper and edited by Mr. Clyde A. Wellman.

I congratulate the editor and agree that it is almost incredible such a thing could happen. However, we may go a step farther and say it is incredible that Congress would vote money to support a program when it was common knowledge that the program has been controlled and operated by left-wingers ever since its inception.

A resident of Huntington, my home town, wrote to me some time ago and stated that he was in Hungary last year and heard the Voice of America program beamed to that section, and believe it or not, the program opened with the playing of the International, the Russian anthem. This program has been exposed repeatedly and I am pleased to tell my people that, having knowledge of the stupidity and negligence displayed, I have always voted against the appropriation. Its stated objectives are good, but for some reason it has always managed to get into the hands of counterfeit Americans.

The editorial follows:

VOICE OF AMERICA

The Voice of America, a radio program sponsored by the State Department, and beamed to foreign countries, is supposed to portray the life and history of the American people.

Here is what people in certain Latin American areas heard recently when they tuned in on the program:

"New England was founded by hypocrisy and Texas by sin.

"Utah, that's where men have as many wives as they can support.

"In no other part of the United States has the colored race struggled and suffered so much as here (in Alabama)."

The National Broadcasting Co., to which the program was "farmed out," has announced the firing of the script writer who produced the slander. But this sabotaging of a program that was intended to build up friendship for America abroad won't stop there and shouldn't. Two groups, one in each branch of Congress, are investigating and President Truman has ordered a personal inquiry.

Considering the nature and purpose of the Voice of America program, it is almost incredible such a thing could happen. Good American dollars from the taxpayers' pockets finance these foreign broadcasts. No effort should be spared until responsibility is definitely fixed for the stupidity and negligence that have made a well-meaning Government undertaking a joke among people both at home and abroad.

Floods in the Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD a letter from the American Red Cross and an accompanying report. I want to congratulate the Red Cross on the work it is endeavoring to do in the flood-stricken States of Montana, Idaho, Washington, and Oregon.

I am also in touch with the Northwest Division of the United States Corps of Engineers, and I have wired Lieutenant Colonel Beaudeau at Bonners Ferry, Idaho, to rush all possible assistance to the town of Troy, Mont., whose mayor wired me of the grave situation there.

We of the Northwest are depending on what the Red Cross and the Corps of Engineers will do, and should the necessity arise, the congressional delegations from Montana, Idaho, Washington, and Oregon will unite in their efforts to obtain needed relief and assistance.

The letter and report follow:

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS,
Washington D. C., June 1, 1948.

The Honorable MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: The attached summary of the flood situation in Oregon, Montana, Washington, and Idaho has just been received from our Pacific area office in San Francisco. I thought you might be interested in seeing it.

Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars was allotted today as an initial appropriation to meet the emergency needs of the disaster sufferers. Additional funds will be made available as needed. Over 50 trained disaster workers have been assigned to assist the affected communities.

Sincerely yours,

COLIN HERRLE,
Administrator, Disaster Relief Service.

PACIFIC NORTHWEST FLOODS, 2:30 A. M., JUNE 1, 1948

Information given in attached summary is based on telephone and telegraph reports received last night from Red Cross chapters in counties affected. In a number of other cases, those with question marks (?), we know that counties were affected, but no definite figures could be obtained; damage and destruction to homes was probably not very great.

It is estimated that approximately 80 percent or approximately 6,000 of the families affected will need partial or complete rehabilitation assistance from the Red Cross. Earlier reports indicate 17 persons lost their lives in the States affected last week. No confirming reports of deaths at Vanport have been received yet.

Of the 4,000 homes in Vanport, indications show that a large number were destroyed and the balance seriously damaged. Twelve shelters were in operation by the Red Cross in Portland yesterday, and additional ones will be opened as needed for evacuees from Vanport. The great majority of families affected, however, are living in private homes, hotels, churches, and other buildings. Many of these will undoubtedly move to Red Cross shelters during the day. Housing will be major future problem.

The upper Columbia River is falling. Flood stage at Portland yesterday was 29 feet and a crest of 30.5 feet is expected tonight.

Red Cross made an allotment of $250,000 yesterday morning to meet initial emergency needs of disaster sufferers. Additional funds will be made available as needed.

Summary report (2:30 a. m. June 1, 1948) Pacific Northwest floods, from San Francisco headquarters of the Red Cross

	Families affected	Persons being fed	Homes destroyed	Homes damaged
Montana:				
Flathead County	60	120	------	------
Lincoln County	45	------	------	45
Mineral County	35	60	------	35
Sanders County	15	------	------	15
Idaho:				
Benewah County	70	1	1	49
Bonner County	30	------	------	------
Boundary County	250	600	50	300
Clearwater County	25	------	1	12
Idaho County	500	------	4	196
Nes Perce County	6	------	------	1
Shoshone County	35	9	15	------
Washington:				
?Pend Oreille County	(?)			
Spokane County	20	140	(?)	(?)
?Benton County	(?)	300		
Franklin County	150	250	(?)	(?)
Okanogan County	500	650	(?)	(?)
Chelan County	75	16		
Kittitas County	35	------	(?)	(?)
Walla Walla County	30	(?)	(?)	(?)
Yakima County	200	250	------	------
Clark County	534	135	------	270
Cowlitz County	300	400	------	150
?Asotin County	------	------	------	------
?Ferry County	------	------	------	------
?Wahkiakum County	------	------	------	------
Whitman County	18	------	------	18
Oregon:				
?Clatsop County	------	------	------	------
Umatilla County	12	50	------	12
Wasco County	8	------	2	6
Multnomah County (Portland Chapter)	4,800	1,000	4,000	300
?Colombia	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)
Total	7,553	3,981	4,073	1,409

Federal Aid for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. M. (DON) WHEELER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, it is a lamentable fact that there are millions of American children who are today failing to have educational opportunity afforded them commensurate with the high standard of living of which we so proudly boast in this country. It is true that we have more of many of the material things of life than any other country. Our children have access to fine automobiles, radios, and many other luxuries of life but we have sadly failed in providing for them adequate educational facilities.

We Americans like to say that all men are created equal although we realize that basically this is not true for there are some who are born with more basic intelligence than others but there are none of us who adhere to the American concept of equality who would say that all men should not be afforded equal opportunity to develop our inherent capacities. No; we all agree that all men should be afforded equality of opportunity, yet we seem willing to sit idly by while the facts of our educational set-up in this country stare us in the face with the fact that our action or inaction completely belies our words.

There are those who would adhere to the theory that the childen in any one particular section of America should be afforded educational opportunity in proportion to their parents' ability to pay for this opportunity. These are the ones who would deny a child the full fruits of the American way of life simply because the child's parents happen to live in a section of the country where economic circumstances preclude educational opportunity commensurate with that offered children in other more highly favored sections of the country. These are the ones who would say to a child that although he is born in God's image in the land of the free and the home of the brave, he must remain in the education hinterland simply because geographical accident decreed that he be born in the East, South, West, or North or because his parents and neighbors happen to live in an area which has not been as well blessed economically as some other section.

A great deal has been said about such things as higher minimum wage rates, public housing, civil rights, and many other social and economic questions. It seems to me, however, that we are prone to allow immediate issues and problems to obscure from our vision the basic fact that all of these problems would tend toward solution if the basic problem of ignorance could be solved. I sincerely believe that ignorance is the root of most of our social and economic ills. I do not mean by this that I think mere academic education will solve our problems overnight but I do believe that more and better educational opportunity being furnished our children would begin to work as a potent yeast that would eventually leaven the whole loaf of our body politic. Knowledge instead of legislative decree is the thing that will rid this country of prejudice and bigotry. Instead of telling the people what they must do toward ridding our land of unwholesome fears and prejudices let us place in their hands the lamp of knowledge that they might find their way to a better and brighter day. Oil for this lamp is greatly and presently needed in the form of Federal aid for education.

At the end of World War II we Americans found thrust upon us a role of world leadership which we did not want and which we are poorly prepared to perform. We were willing to send our sons and our goods to the four corners of the world to fight against oppression but we did this in the hope that, once the fighting was over, we would be allowed to come home and forget the rest of the world and its woes. We have not been allowed to do this but have found that the rest of the world is looking to us for material aid and spiritual leadership in the postwar era. It will be difficult if not impossible for this Nation to fulfill its new world role unless the population is fully informed and conscious of its obligations. Since only through an educated, intelligent electorate can we maintain a democratic government, it is necessary that we believe deeply, passionately, earnestly, in our public-school system. Although not bombed during the war as were European schools, our own schools suffered great disasters during the war and are still disintegrating as surely as though they had been blasted by heavy bombers. Our public schools are faced with a crisis of such great proportion that it is not an exaggeration to say that democracy itself is at stake.

By emphasis on public education and due regard to Christian principles this Nation became a mighty citadel of economic, social, and military strength, and rose to world leadership. But today other large nations are exceeding us in their educational efforts, and the situation is being reversed. The attitude that "it just does not pay to teach any more" is becoming prevalent among those who might consider teaching in this country. The teacher shortage is acute and is becoming worse in that tens of thousands of teachers are deserting the classrooms. Because of the teacher shortage, 2,000,000 children who last year were deprived of adequate education, were thus cheated of their rightful heritage and denied an adequate preparation for American citizenship. For lack of teachers, 6,000 schools were closed last year and 75,000 children had no schooling of any kind. Mr. Speaker, can we allow this situation to continue? Do we not owe our children more than this? If democracy fails and materialism takes over the world, will we not be largely at fault for not having done a better job of providing facilities for the attainment of knowledge? Yes, the blood of democracy will surely be on our hands if we fail in this patent duty.

Because thousands of qualified teachers have left our schools for better paying positions, we have employed about 125,000 teachers in the United States on emergency or substandard certificates. This amounts to about one out of every seven. Before the war there were only 2,300 serving on such substandard licenses. Sixty-one thousand teachers in our schools today have no education beyond high school. If the present rate of issuance of substandard licenses is allowed to continue, half the children in the United States will be taught by substandard teachers in 10 years. Mr. Speaker, would you go out and license 125,000 miners to practice medicine? No, you would not. Then why should we countenance the licensing of 125,000 unqualified teachers?

Since 1941 over 350,000 of our best teachers have left the public schools. Of the Nation's 850,000 teachers, 20 percent are new to their jobs each year—double the turn-over that occurred before the war. It is expected that 75,000 teachers will leave the profession this year. School officials are agreed that this unprecedentedly high turn-over, unless checked, will lead to an unstable and weakened school system. Many years will be required to bring our school system to the degree of stability presently found in any one of the other major countries of the world. It is necessary that teaching become a profession of distinction as in the other great countries, where teachers know that they have lifetime positions.

The basic trouble with our Nation's schools is inadequate financial support. The average American classroom teacher today receives only about $40 per week. Rural teachers on the average receive less than $30 a week. Despite recent salary increases the teachers are still the financial stepchildren of the Republic. A peculiar distortion of values has arisen in this country which results in teachers receiving less for cultivating the minds of children than garbage collectors receive for picking up waste. In Detroit, for example, the prison cooks begin at $2,736 a year, comfort-station attendants at $2,222, and dog catchers at $2,485. The garbage-collector foremen receive from $4,761 to $5,238 and rat-exterminator foremen from $3,095 to $3,942. Detroit's teachers on the other hand begin at $2,094 after completing 4 years of college training, plus showing unusual ability in guiding children and a superior knowledge of one or more specific subjects.

While the United States of America spends only 1.5 percent of its national income for education, Great Britain spends 3 percent, and the Soviet Union about 8 percent. The United States of America is now spending a lower percent of its national income for schools than at any other time in recent years. During the depression we spent about $2,000,000,000, or 5 percent of a national income of $40,000,000,000. Now we are spending for our public schools only about one and one-half billion of a national income of one hundred and sixty-five billion. At the same time we are spending three billion for beer, nearly

four billion for cigarettes, and close to nine billion for liquor.

In general, the morale of our teachers is the lowest it has ever been. For the first time in history, teachers have gone out on strike in many of our cities. The strikes and threats of strikes are the result of the neglect and pauperization of our school system. For too many years we have turned away when the teachers called for assistance. Closed schools are a symbol of our sick democracy.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford for our schools to fail because of a penny-wise and pound-foolish fiscal policy. We cannot afford to say that we do not have money with which to educate our children and at the same time spend billions purchasing material things for the people of the rest of the world. It is fine to spend billions in order to keep our neighbor's house from burning, but the part of wisdom would dictate that we dampen our own roof so that our own house may not burn. This can be done for a very small fraction of the amount we are spending on the European recovery plan. While we are preparing to spend billions on ERP, it seems that we can certainly afford to spend the $300,000,000 it would take to initiate the Federal aid to education program which passed the other body in the form of S. 472.

Mr. Speaker, in an effort to give the membership of this House an opportunity to express themselves on the question of Federal aid for education, I have recently filed Discharge Petition No. 19, which is now on the Clerk's desk. We cannot afford to let the Eightieth Congress come to a close without having provided aid for our faltering schools. I do not see how the elected Representatives of the people can go home this summer with a clear conscience until we have prepared ourselves to look our children in the face and say that we have at last started in the direction of providing adequate educational facilities for all of them.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House a very pertinent and timely editorial from the Atlanta Constitution under date of May 25, 1948. I include this editorial in its entirety for the benefit of the membership.

A NATIONAL TRAGEDY IN THE OFFING?

With less than 4 weeks remaining before Congress' scheduled adjournment, it appears increasingly probable that the Federal aid to education bill will not be passed.

And that will be a national tragedy.

The measure, which passed the Senate by a vote of 58 to 22, has been bottled up in the House Committee on Education and Labor for nearly 2 months now. And there are no signs that it will be reported out in time for action at the present session.

This situation exists despite the fact that the vast majority of those, such as Senator TAFT, who formerly opposed the measure have now realized its need. Indeed, there are no more eager advocates of Federal aid than in some States which stand to bear a relatively large share of the cost. This is because they are recognizing the fact that much of their population is made up of persons educated in other sections.

The Chicago Daily News, for instance, cites the Senate committee report, "Due to increased population mobility, future citizens of areas in which there is the greatest concentration of wealth are being educated or neglected in the less-privileged area," adding, "This consideration applies with particular force to Chicago, whose industrial and other opportunities offer a powerful attraction to this migratory population. * * * Our Republic has as its foundation the equality of opportunity. We are not even remotely approaching that idea in the kind of education offered to all our children."

Anyone who bothers to investigate can readily determine that even if they spent every dollar of their revenue on education, there are a number of lower-income States which could not possibly provide schools on a par with those of the more prosperous States.

They must have Federal aid if their children are indeed to have an equality of educational opportunity.

And if, as now seems likely, the current Congress fails to give it to them, it will be not a sectional but a national tragedy.

ERP Funds Should Not Be Used by Great Britain To Prejudice Eire Against Northern Ireland—Six Northern Counties Should Be Given Freedom To Join Eire

REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to comment briefly upon the stand which the State Department appears to be taking in regard to the partition of Ireland, which was forced upon that country over 25 years ago, and which Great Britain maintains to this day. If we make inquiry at the State Department regarding this matter, we are told that this is a domestic question which is to be settled between Great Britain and Ireland, and that it is not a matter on which the United States Government can properly take a stand.

Despite this attitude, when it comes to the distribution of funds under the European recovery program, this country is definitely taking a stand in favor of the forced partition of Ireland by reason of the unequal treatment which we are affording Eire as compared with Northern Ireland. In the case of Northern Ireland we are offering a grant of $3 for every dollar which we make as a loan, whereas in dealing with Eire we are demanding that every dollar which they shall receive shall be as a loan and must therefore he repaid. In short, we are taking a definite political stand favoring Northern Ireland in opposition to the rest of that country.

What justification there can be for this unusual situation which we have created is certainly not apparent. In a country the size of Ireland, the economic conditions do not vary to such a degree as to explain this difference in treatment. The small section of Ireland consisting of six counties, which constitute the British dominated and British controlled country of Northern Ireland with Belfast as a capital, does not differ materially from the other 26 counties insofar as their economic situation is concerned. Both sections of the country are agricultural in aspect, and each contains an equal amount of industry, although the industry in the north is confined to a smaller area. The same people occupy both sections of the country, only the form of government differs.

In Northern Ireland the parliament is subject to British domination and the country is policed with British troops. In Eire, with its capital in Dublin, the parliament is similar to our own Congress, being elected in democratic elections and entirely free from outside control or subjection. The constitution of Eire is based upon our own Constitution; their republican form of government is a representative democracy, just as our own country is.

The Irish people are entirely free from the inroads of communism, and in Eire, there is not even the taint of socialism, such as exists in Great Britain today. In spite of this situation, we are offering to Great Britain, under the Marshall plan, $300,000,000 as an outright grant, along with a loan of another $100,000,000; whereas we are making Eire eligible for a loan only and we are demanding that they must repay every dollar which they receive from us.

It is well known that the Belfast government is subsidized by Great Britain through a grant of more than $40,000,000 annually, while the government in Eire must rely solely upon its own resources and its own revenues. As a result the money, which we are sending to Great Britain, will in part be used to finance the British control and domination of Northern Ireland. The funds which the Belfast government will receive, through London, will be three-quarters gift and one-quarter loan, whereas the funds going to the free government in Dublin will be exclusively in the form of a loan. In this way, we are deliberately taking a political stand in Ireland to the detriment of the free and democratic section of the country and to the advantage of the British controlled six counties in the north.

Our State Department is, in effect, telling the people of Ireland that they would fare much better were they subject to British domination than they can as a free and independent people. What capital the British will make of all this in Ireland remains to be seen, but certainly this country has no right to play such a part in a domestic question as to favor Great Britain's maintenance of a police state in Northern Ireland. By our action, we are upholding Britain's arm while it wields a club over the heads of the Irish people. We are supplementing Britain's unfair and unequal treatment of Eire in a most direct manner.

For the purpose of illustrating the manner in which England conducts her business with Eire, I need only cite one example and that is the matter of the purchase of cattle, which is the primary and major agricultural pursuit of the Irish people. England has a fixed price at which she purchases cattle from the English people, which is the same price

she pays to the people of Northern Ireland. Yet when it comes to purchasing cattle raised in Eire, then England demands that these cattle be sold at a lower price than those of Northern Ireland. The price so fixed is also lower than that at which the cattle can be sold on the European market. Interestingly enough, Great Britain refuses to buy the cattle of Eire unless the price is fixed below both the European market price and the domestic English or Northern Ireland price. Under these circumstances, I wonder how badly Great Britain may be in need of foodstuffs, when she refuses to purchase unless she can do so at a price below the normal market value; or is it just a case of Great Britain finding it more important to reduce the economic standards of the people of Eire below those of the people of Northern Ireland, even at the expense of allowing her own people in England to go hungry?

Regardless of what may be England's purpose, certainly this country should not be a party to this further attempt of the British to dominate the welfare of the Irish, nor should we join in that effort by ourselves discriminating against the people of Eire in a similar manner. If conditions in Northern Ireland justify the making of a grant of three out of every four dollars which find their way into that country, then the conditions of the rest of Ireland certainly call for the same treatment. In fact the economic condition of Eire will be worse than that of Northern Ireland, if they are compelled to sell their cattle at prices below the market, since cattle is their main agricultural product, as well as their main export product.

By reason of the stand which we have taken in the matter of loans, we are definitely putting the stamp of approval upon the British domination of Northern Ireland, whether we are willing to admit it or not. In spite of the fact that the Irish people have repeatedly expressed their desire for a united country, free from the outside domination or control of foreign powers, and have constantly fought to obtain their freedom, we have done nothing to assist them in their pursuit of independence. We have talked a great deal about the rights of small nations freely to determine their own form of government, but by our actions we are encouraging the domination of Ireland by a foreign government, and that in spite of the expressed wishes of the people.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the State Department should demand that the British bring to an end the partition of Ireland; should demand that there be an elimination of the police state in Northern Ireland; and that until this is done, then this country should refuse to advance funds to Great Britain under the Marshall plan, because to do so would mean that we are in effect placing our approval upon this forceable partition of Ireland and the continuance of the police state in Northern Ireland. The State Department should take a realistic view of this situation and insist upon an end of the partition of Ireland in order to avoid the embarrassing position of being opposed to an undivided Ireland.

Jean Chappelear, National Spelling Champion, 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, all the world loves a champion and I have the honor of representing the Fourteenth Congressional District of Ohio which has produced the champion for 1948 in the Twenty-first National Spelling Bee, sponsored by the Scripps-Howard, the Akron (Ohio) Beacon-Journal, and other leading newspapers from New York to California. The contest for the Akron area was under the very capable supervision of Miss Frances Murphey, spelling bee editor, whose kindness and understanding have been a source of great encouragement to the contestants.

The champion, Miss Jean Chappelear, who will be 14 years of age in June, is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Lewis Chappelear, Jr., with whom I have the pleasure of acquaintanceship. They live in the small community of Black Horse in Portage County, Ohio, where blond, blue-eyed Jean earns money in her spare time by acting as a baby-sitter.

Jean has displayed the perseverance of a real champion in that she entered three spelling bee contests locally before finally getting into the national championship this year for the first time. Her determination to win inspired her to study spelling for 3 years, 2 hours daily, under the excellent coaching of her mother and with the assistance of her teachers. This persistent effort resulted in her attaining her goal, the national championship, and also gave her a great knowledge of words and their meanings and enlarged her vocabulary immeasurably. Although spelling is her first love, her other grades in school are high and she won honorable mention in the State scholarship eighth grade contest. She will enter Ravenna Township High School next term. I am particularly pleased that Jean wants to be a teacher and that she will put her first prize of $500 check in either war bonds or in the bank to help pay for a college education. An additional prize was a week-end trip to New York City, the first visit for Jean to our Nation's largest city.

Jean's talents extend to the field of music—the piano and the clarinet. She plays the clarinet in the Ravenna Township Band, having participated in quite a few State contests. In fact, I am told, there was a State contest the same week-end of the spelling bee, and Jean had to choose between the two. I am happy that she chose to spell.

The Washington Daily News of May 29 gives this account of the bee:

Jean says she owes her victory mostly to her prayers. Throughout most of the 5-hour bee, she prayed. It wasn't noticeable at first, but when the going got tougher she closed her eyes tight and the audience could see her lips move. When the bee was over, someone asked her what she held clutched so tightly in her hand. It was a penny which her 3-year-old sister had kissed for luck and given to her before she left home, she said.

Jean's victory gives me a feeling of pride, not only because she lives in my district and my State, but in a larger sense because she is a shining example of youth at its best—alert mentally, conscientious and preserving in purpose, with unswerving faith in themselves and in the future.

Many are alarmed about present-day youth. True, they read the comic books but they also read their school books. These youngsters competing in the national spelling contests—capable, self-reliant, resourceful—would not suffer by comparison with their grandparents' generation. They possess a whole new vocabulary that would have been meaningless to other generations. They can spell and define words that cannot be pronounced by their elders. With proper guidance, these young citizens will shoulder the burdens of tomorrow and successfully cope with the problems of the atomic age.

Taft-Ellender-Wagner Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill which would furnish 15,000,000 new homes over a 10-year period, is necessary to provide decent housing for all Americans. In spite of the obvious merits and worthy objectives of this important measure, the opposition maneuver of "talking it to death" is jeopardizing its chances of passage during this session. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the May 31, 1948, edition of the Washington Post which, in my opinion, reflects the opinion of the majority of the American people regarding such stalling tactics:

T-E-W BILL

It is difficult to believe that a majority of the Members of Congress wish to face their constituents without having passed the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Yet that measure appears to be in grave danger of being talked to death. Several weeks ago it cleared the Senate. Recognizing both the importance of the comprehensive national housing policy which the bill outlines and the widespread public demand for its enactment, the House Committee on Banking and Currency took up the bill and hearings are going forward. With many witnesses yet to be heard, however, it is feared that the hearings may continue for another 2 weeks and thus seriously jeopardize the chance of getting it onto the statute books.

Considering the vast amount of work that has gone into the shaping of this bipartisan measure and the urgency of launching the 10-year housing program it would authorize, loss of the bill in the adjournment log jam would be a national misfortune. Laudable though it is to hear every viewpoint on legis-

lation so intimately affecting the public interest, a time comes when talk has to be cut off in favor of action. In our opinion, that time is rapidly approaching in the case of the T-E-W bill. Its chance for passage should not be jeopardized merely to permit the repetition of arguments that have been heard many times already.

The United States News Reports on China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the United States News and World Report carries two interesting stories on China in its issues of May 21 and May 28, 1948. Because the Members of the Congress should have a real understanding of the situation in that unhappy country, I am inserting these news reports so that we may be aware of the difficulties confronting us there.

The articles follow:

[From the United States News and World Report of May 21, 1948]

AID TO CHINA: IS IT WASTED?
(Reported from Nanking)

More United States aid for China, now on its way, won't stop the Communists. That's the way experts on the ground see it.

New aid goes on top of $3,000,000,000 already advanced, but Chiang Kai-shek still is losing, and inflation still is raging.

Feeling among non-Chinese is that China is bogging down with graft, profiteering. United States dollars can't win the civil war.

The thing that impresses an American correspondent returning to China after a 2-year absence is the defeatist attitude toward the outlook for stopping Communist gains. On every hand, in Shanghai and here in the capital of Nationalist China, there is a feeling that additional American aid is not going to affect the situation much.

At this time, the United States is preparing to put in an added $463,000,000 of aid to China. Aid given since the war ended amounts to between $3,000,000,000 and $4,000,000,000. This aid, however, has not stopped Communist advances. The studied opinion of almost every American and other non-Chinese political and military expert in this country is that no amount of help from the outside can restore the Nationalist strength. What is required, instead, is extensive reorganization and reform of the political, economic, and military set-up. That doesn't seem to be in sight.

In the United States, there is some suggestion that American troops should be used to help stop the Communists. Over here, military opinion is that such a step would be highly impractical. American forces, the opinion is, would only get bogged down, lost in a vast expanse of Chinese territory, with the prospect of little aid from Nationalist armies that would be glad to have their fighting done for them.

There seems to be little general understanding of the size of aid that the United States already has given and is giving.

Aid to China, officially reported, has been $1,400,000,000 since the war's end, including $728,000,000 of military aid. In recent months this further aid has been given:

Surplus American ammunition in the Marianas Islands, great quantities of it, is being sold to China at 1 cent on the dollar of procurement cost. The Chinese were sold 150 C-46 transport planes, which cost an average of $276,000, for $5,000 apiece. All surplus Air Force equipment in the Pacific was sold to the Chinese Government on January 31 for a nominal price.

Nearly 100 American naval vessels, valued at $70,000,000 have been transferred to the Chinese Navy without cost. Nationalists obtained 130,000,000 rounds of rifle ammunition and a number of arms and ammunition dumps. Earlier surplus-property deals gave the Chinese title to fixed installations and movable property in China and movable property on 17 Pacific islands with an original cost of approximately $824,000,000.

Besides this, the United States has trained and equipped 39 divisions of Chinese troops since the war ended. For more than a year, an American Army advisory group, consisting of about 1,000 officers and enlisted men, has been trying to help the Chinese Nationalists to reorganize and train their armies along efficient lines.

Results of aid are not very great. In spite of all help, the Nationalist position has deteriorated steadily in the civil war with the Communists.

Since the resumption of the civil war, an American military expert points out, the Nationalists have not crushed a single Communist force nor won a single victory of real significance. The Communists, on the other hand, have annihilated entire Nationalist armies—including several composed of American-trained and equipped divisions. They have occupied thousands of square miles of territory, as shown by the map on page 29. They hold all of Manchuria except a thin salient along the Mukden-Changchun railroad.

The Japanese arms and equipment turned over to the Communists by the Russians at the end of the war have been used up, the American expert says, but the Communists are fighting on with arms captured or purchased from the Nationalist armies or produced in small arsenals in Manchuria and North China.

The capture, or purchase, of Nationalist arms has become such a boon to the Communists that Nanking's own defense minister says the Communists would have nothing to fight with if the Nationalists did not lose such large quantities of arms and equipment to them. An American military observer in China feels that the way things are going it is only a matter of time before the Communists will occupy most of China. By a matter of time he means years, rather than months.

Internal troubles in Nationalist China have kept pace with military reverses. Inflation is raging. Paper money in circulation has reached the astronomical sum of 70,000,000,000,000 Chinese dollars, an increase of 20 times since 1947. American observers assert that millions of United States dollars are being smuggled out of the country and huge stocks of goods are being hoarded for speculative purposes at the very time the United States is advancing the Nanking Government funds to maintain essential imports.

China's real problems stem from the character of Chiang Kai-shek's government, in the opinion of almost every observer interviewed here and in Shanghai. Their composite appraisal goes along these lines:

The Kuomintang Party Government of Chiang consists almost exclusively of landlords, propertied war lords and generals of one military clique or another, bankers who profit from wartime speculations, and professional politicians vying for power. The Government cannot mobilize or obtain the cooperation of the people.

The Communists, on their side, have succeeded in mobilizing the peasants with promises of land for the landless. The Nationalists promise land reform over and over, only to increase taxes or demand a larger share of crops. The result is that most peasants are apathetic toward the Nationalist war effort, or openly hostile to it. One sign is the fact that draft-age men fro a the farms are swarming into the cities to escape forcible conscription.

One of the best-informed Americans in China says that self-destruction has to be the policy of the Chiang Kai-shek government. As he sees it, if the Kuomintang carries out the reforms necessary to defeat the Communists, it will destroy itself as a party dictatorship. If it doesn't carry out the reforms it will be destroyed by the Communists or by disintegration. But reforms are easier to demand than to accomplish. The reform programs set up by the Government last year are generally regarded by non-Chinese as window dressing for the benefit of the United States.

American policy is to prevent China from going Communist, but military experts on the ground are at a loss as to what course the United States can take to turn the tide in the civil war. They are convinced that American help—in whatever quantities—cannot be effective against the Communists until the Nanking Government is prepared to put itself on a more democratic basis and end its one-party rule.

Objective of the latest United States aid program is to prevent collapse of the Nationalist Government. Paul G. Hoffman, head of the Economic Cooperation Administration, looks to Roger D. Lapham to keep tight supervision over the $338,000,000 that will go to China for reconstruction projects and to finance essential imports. Without these, inflation may get completely out of control.

A breathing spell is what Americans hope to give the Nationalist Government with the new aid program. They say the degree to which the Chinese cooperate in making this aid effective will be a factor in determining further assistance.

On one thing first-hand experts in China—official and unofficial—are agreed: Short of an American expeditionary force, no amount of United States aid or intervention can check the Chinese Communists so long as the Nanking government fails to make essential changes in its structure and otherwise put its house in order.

[From the United States News and World Report of May 28, 1948]

CHINA'S WASTE OF UNITED STATES TRAINED TROOPS

(Reported from Nanking)

Modern armies that the United States built up for China have been wiped out in 2 years. Facts now brought to light show what happened:

Chinese generals broke up "Americanized" divisions, let supply lines get snarled, turned United States weapons over to green troops.

High-cost venture in military aid turns out to be a waste, has not made a dent in the war against Chinese Communists.

It is possible now to report what has become of the Chinese armies trained and equipped by the United States at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars.

Two years ago, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek had 39 crack divisions, set up and armed by the United States in one of the most thorough military ventures ever undertaken by Americans abroad. United States officers down to the grade of sergeant trained the Chinese, directed their supply system and did everything except actually lead the men into combat. Now hardly a trace of these divisions remains.

Seventy percent of the troops have been lost, thousands of them killed.

Much of their American equipment is gone, too. A big share of it has passed into the hands of the Communists the troops were trained to fight. Captured American weap-

ons now form a substantial part of Communist equipment.

What has happened to these picked troops can be pieced together from interviews here with Chinese officials and American experts preparing a new $125,000,000 military-aid program for Nationalist China. In the opinion of official observers, corruption and Nationalist Army politics did much to destroy the effectiveness of the Americanized Chinese fighters. But the big trouble was the inability to fit modern fighting units into an archaic military system.

Originally the 39 divisions were organized into 13 Chinese armies of 3 divisions each. But as soon as the American officers were withdrawn, and before the troops went into action, all except three of the armies were reorganized. More than half the American-trained divisions were broken up.

The troops were scattered through the whole Nationalist war machine and swallowed up in poorly trained and poorly led regular divisions of the Nationalist armies. Quickly they lost all they had gained in United States training and equipment.

Chinese commanders complained that American standards were too high for the Chinese armies. United States arms were redistributed. Where the United States had provided every man with a gun, the Chinese commanders—with more men than arms—parceled out the weapons at the rate of one gun to three or five men. Experts on the ground say that the demoralization common among ordinary Chinese troops soon engulfed the divisions trained by the United States.

Three armies, made up of nine of the best "Americanized" divisions, went into action intact. All three—the New First, New Sixth, and the Seventy-fourth—have been shattered or destroyed during the last year.

The Seventy-fourth Army was all but wiped out a year ago as a result of poor military intelligence and bad leadership. The Army was sent to attack a point where the Communist headquarters was supposed to be located. The information was erroneous, and the Seventy-fourth marched into a Communist trap. When the Communists attacked the commander of the Seventy-fourth led his troops into nearby hills under cover of night and ordered them to dig in. Too late they discovered the hills were so rocky they could not dig defensive emplacements.

Next morning the Communist artillery opened up on the exposed Nationalists. According to neutral military observers, 12,000 American-trained Nationalist troops were killed in a matter of hours. Only a few thousand escaped death or capture. The Seventy-fourth Army's American arms and equipment were seized by the Communists.

The New First Army, the best-trained and equipped army the Nationalists had, was a victim of military politics, in the opinion of experts in China. The New First was commanded by Gen. Sun Li-jen, graduate of the Virginia Military Institute and intensely pro-American. Sun led the New First in the Burma campaign and took it to Manchuria to fight aaginst the Chinese Communists early in 1946.

The fact that General Sun was not a member of the Whangpoa military clique that rules most Nationalist forces got him into trouble with Gen. Tu Yi-ming, the area commander, General Tu ordered the crack Army broken up into small units to guard towns, bridges, and railroad strong points. As a result, the Communists were able to pick off the guard units, one by one.

The New First also found it could not get replacements of American arms intended for it. The weapons it needed desperately were distributed by the area commander to other Chinese armies which had not received American training. These ordinary Chinese soldiers didn't know how to use United States equipment, consequently its effectiveness was lost.

The New Sixth Army was seriously hampered by poor intelligence, as was the New First. The Americanized troops were natives of South China and were regarded as foreigners by the local people in Manchuria. Inhabitants, bitter at what they regarded as another invasion of their homeland, refused to cooperate with the New Sixth. As a result, the army had trouble getting information concerning the strength and the movement of the Communist force it was opposing.

Other troubles beset the New First and New Sixth armies, which wound up as about the only intact units out of the thousands of Chinese soldiers the Americans schooled and equipped for the war against the Communists.

The Nationalists put off calling up local man power for army service, with the result that thousands of the Americanized troops were immobilized in garrison towns and strategic strong points. The Communists, on the other hand, generally organize the local inhabitants as soon as they occupy an area, freeing the regular Red army troops for offensive operations.

The failure of the Nationalists to maintain the supply system set up by the United States forced the New First and New Sixth to live off the land. In addition, the two armies were almost paralyzed for want of arms, equipment and other essential supplies. Trying to fit the Americanized armies into China's outmoded military organization without an adequate supply service finally proved disastrous. The Communists, moreover, cut Nationalist communications so often that the Manchurian armies were isolated for months at the end of an exceptionally long supply line.

Lack of a central training and replacement system also contributed to the destruction of the American-trained and equipped divisions. During the Manchurian campaigns, when the Americanized armies suffered losses, they received untrained or poorly trained recruits as replacements. With inferior troops constantly being infused into their ranks, the quality of the New First and New Sixth armies progressively deteriorated.

The two armies finally became completely demoralized. They were kept in combat, without rest or relief, for 2 years. Most of the time they were inadequately supplied and practically all of the time they were fighting a losing war.

The Americanized troops, men from south China, were unaccustomed and unprepared for the bitter Manchurian winters. Twenty-five to thirty-five percent of the soldiers perished or were immobilized as a result of the cold. Minor wounds often resulted in amputations or death because of inadequate medical facilities.

In the end American training and American equipment were unable to withstand the dead weight or inertia, ineptness and, in some cases, corruption within the Chinese military. Remnants of the New First and New Sixth armies have been split up and reorganized into new armies. But they have lost their American equipment and hardly a trace of their American training remains.

The efforts of the United States experts to advise Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek in connection with a proposed streamlining of his military organization have, for the most part, met with little success. For 2 years the American Army advisory group has worked in Nanking and in Chinese Army training centers established under United States guidance. But, as one American officer puts it, "It is obvious from the way the war has gone that our work has had no tangible effect on the course of the fighting in the civil war."

An infantry training center now is operating in Formosa. Thirty American officers are assisting the Chinese in the project. Only one division is under training there now, but more troops are expected to enter soon.

However, many of the Americans are skeptical of the outcome because of the history of the 39 United States trained and United State equipped divisions that have all but vanished after 2 years of Nationalist defeats.

Democracy Versus Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that our young people should be encouraged in every way possible to take an active part and interest in our democratic form of government and to realize the many benefits we all enjoy because of it. It is not enough merely to provide formal education for each generation, as too often a real appreciation of our democratic processes escape us unless we can participate in, and learn more about, this Government of the United States.

I sponsored a contest for the high-school students of the Sixth Texas District to encourage these young people to record their thoughts on important topics. I am proud to announce the winner of the essay contest in Limestone County, which was so ably conducted by County Superintendent C. H. Laurence. Mr. Jack W. Hawkins, Groesbeck High School, Groesbeck, Tex., has been declared the winner, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include his essay entitled "Democracy Versus Communism":

DEMOCRACY VERSUS COMMUNISM

(By Jack W. Hawkins, Groesbeck, Tex.)

Here in the United States we have achieved the zenith in government. Although it does have its imperfections, our Government, with its system of checks and balances, is the most perfect in the world. Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of religion are all necessary under our system.

As opposed to democracy, there is only one other form of government—autocracy, whether it be in the guise of fascism, communism, or an absolute monarchy. At present, communism is the greatest menace to the freedom of the world.

Communism is a doctrine filled with contradictions. For instance, Communists insist all men should be equal, but in Russia there exists a caste system second only to India's.

Freedom of speech and the press are impossible under communism. They are essential in a democracy. Freedom of religion is not allowed in a Communist state because religion teaches the importance of the individual.

There are no checks and balances in the Communist system. One man or group of men dictates the policies of the state. Under democracy the legislative branch of the government balances the executive branch; the judicial branch balances the rights of the people, etc.

Compare the position of the people of the United States and of the Soviet Union. In the U. S. S. R. the common people have enough merely to live but in the United States the common man often has extra comforts such as a home, an automobile, etc.

The leaders of Communist-controlled nations denounce capitalism and capitalists. This is so absurd when they are the greatest capitalists in the world. They control the lives of millions of people. They are the only people who benefit from communism.

Democracy is government of, for, and by the people. It is government with the consent of the governed.

Communism is the result of democracy turning to mobocracy. It is the result of the masses forgetting the rights of the individual and thereby losing not only mass rights but individual rights as well.

Orderly democracy brings about representative government with rights of each man carefully guarded through a written constitution which insures against monopolistic government.

Communism is government monopoly. It is ownership of a nation and its people by one man or a few men under the guise of it being owned by all men. Under communism, the people own nothing. They are slaves. Under democracy the people own everything. Each man is a sovereign.

General MacArthur's Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD my own remarks and include the reply of Gen. Douglas MacArthur to the invitation extended to him by the Senate Appropriations Committee. I also wish to include a cablegram sent to General MacArthur from H. L. Hunt, of Dallas, Tex.

Mr. Speaker, when the Senate Appropriations Committee issued an invitation for the general to return, they did so, noting that in the past, their requests had always been observed. It seems that Secretary of the Army, Royall, merely transferred the request of the committee to the general, and of course, this put him in an embarrassing position. Secretary Royall should have issued an order for the general's return, because that is what the Appropriations Committee of the Senate expected. They wanted the general here by June 4 or 5 to give testimony on moneys being expended in Japan. It does not seem possible for the Congress to legislate wisely for Japan without having the man here who has been responsible for carrying out the orders given to him by the State and War Departments. It is my opinion that many of these orders could be questioned by the Congress and the general himself. He does not make the policies—they are transmitted to him by the State and War Departments. Following is the general's reply to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

TEXT OF MAC ARTHUR MESSAGE

No man could fail to appreciate the friendly and generous spirit prompting the invitation of your distinguished committee. It reflects a high order of devotion to the public interest that you ignore much-discussed political implications in order to insure that the views of none which might contribute to the sound orientation of American policy and action go unheeded.

You may be sure that I have wished earnestly ever since the end of the war for the opportunity to return to my native land, but the heavy pressure of my duties here and the paramountcy of the public interest have left me no justification for so doing from motives unofficial or personal in character. In normal circumstances, I should respond at once to your present invitation as a citizen of the Republic and sit in with you frankly to state my views, whether they might parallel or cut across already determined policies or concepts being advanced by others.

But the existing circumstances are not normal and my return at this time, however sincere its purpose, would be misunderstood and condemned by many as politically inspired and much that I might be obligated in good conscience to say would lose its effect under the impeaching process of doubt thereby aroused in the public mind. Furthermore, on the question of appropriations affecting the Far East concerning which my views specifically are requested, the basic policies are already determined and in effect, leaving only the detail of appropriations yet to be resolved. As to this theater, I have already directly and through representatives, expressed my views on such detail and there is little that I could add to what has already been said thereon and is now before the Congress.

Apart from this, it would be peculiarly repugnant to me to have it felt that I sought to capitalize to political advantage as so many have frankly urged, the public good will which might manifest itself upon my first return to American soil following the Pacific war period, for such good will would find its inspiration in the victory which crowned our Pacific war effort to which countless Americans, living and dead, contributed by unfailing and invincible devotion. Usurpation of such good will by me to serve a political end would be a shameful breach of their faith and a betrayal of the mutual trust on which was erected the cornerstone to the Pacific victory. On the other hand, following settlement of the political issues to be resolved next month, I should feel free to place myself fully at your disposal should you still desire clarification of my views on this or any other matter affecting the public interest.

Nor do I see in passing events such cause for concern as would render the time element one of paramount urgency, and I am therefore hopeful that you will find my appearance at such later date no less satisfactory for your purposes.

I have been peculiarly fortunate in recent months to receive on this detached outpost the views of many of our citizens on the contemporary issues which confront American life. They have been thoughtful and intelligent views, frankly and fearlessly expressed, and have left me with a renewed conviction that our country's destiny in the hands of its citizens, when fully informed, is perfectly secure. Indeed, were I permitted to give but one word of advice toward the safeguard of the national interest, I should elect to urge that we reaffirm the basic concepts which safely guided our past, and above all else regain some of Lincoln's faith in the wisdom of the people.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, in the fourth paragraph of the general's reply he states he would be glad to—

Sit in with you frankly to state my views whether they might parallel or cut across already determined policies or concepts being advanced by others.

It would be interesting to have the general's views on these policies.

The following wire was sent to General MacArthur by Mr. H. L. Hunt, of Dallas, Tex.:

I feel that it is a mistake for you to reject the invitation to return to this country and make available your advice and views concerning the Nation's problems and future safety. Regarding your reference to Lincoln's statement that the wisdom of the people can be trusted, the people cannot wisely choose unless they are informed. Without being, President Lincoln could not have saved the Union and his immortal precepts would not now serve to inspire mankind and he would not have been President except for permitting the voters to see, hear, and evaluate him. You modestly refrain from publicizing yourself for the reason that yo are the symbol for the success of the Pacific campaign. However, it can be a far greater disservice to those who nobly sacrificed in this campaign if you partially withhold your availability to save the Nation from an imminent major war. You have the rare courage to keep the Nation strong enough that it will not be taken from without or within. This is a request for you, a wise man, to change your mind and submit yourself to public appraisal in this country, fully offering yourself as President of the United States. I believe that your policy of determining issues strictly on the basis of right or wrong will set a new standard of excellence in our Government so as to become an example to succeeding administrations, enabling you safely to retire after one term to the rest which you will have so fully earned. I am expressing these my views to the public.

The Southern Negro and the Civil-Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WIRT COURTNEY
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. E. H. Harrison, a business and civic leader, of Clarksville, Tenn., in my district, recently sent me a letter that came to him from I. D. Mitchell, pastor, and Robert W. Wells, church agent, of the Wesley Chapel Colored Methodist Church of Clarksville. This letter sets out so well the philosophy of the Southern Negro, especially his reaction to the so-called civil-rights program, that I thought it should be brought to the attention of Members of Congress.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this letter, which follows:

CLARKSVILLE, TENN., *May 17, 1948.*
To Our Good White Friends of Clarksville.

DEAR FRIENDS: The Wesley Chapel Colored Methodist Episcopal Church, located at 618 Franklin Street, is facing a little crisis and must raise $2,500 to remodel both our church and parsonage, which stand badly in need. We must beautify our church and pay off some pressing obligations.

This church is one of the oldest churches in this city. It was organized by the former Southern Methodist Church in 1870. This church, through the years, has rendered incalculable service to the people of this city. It has made and is making a very definite contribution to the social, moral, and religious well-being of the Negro resident of that section. Because of its constituency, it is doubtful if any Negro church in the city

has a larger opportunity for constructive services in the way of social uplift and good citizenship. It is in a real sense a community church and is endeavoring to minister in a most helpful way to the underprivileged.

This church is badly in need and is handicapped because of condition and must be repaired. The members of our church are poor but they are worthy; they have worked heroically and given sacrificially in the effort to meet the obligation, but because of their limited resources, we have been unable to raise these needed funds.

This church is one of the oldest Negro organizations in this city. This church is a child of the former Southern Methodist Episcopal Church and was set apart in 1870, just after the War Between the States. For 200 years, the only place where he could give expression of his yearnings and aspiration to his God was his religious gathering. The church has been his greatest school.

Many of our Negro fathers and black mammies worked as slaves in your homes and on your mother's and father's plantation. There is a close tie between the southern white man and the southern Negro that only they can understand. There are no two races that can get along like the southern Negro and the southern white man. There is no problem between the Negro and the southern white man if let alone. The Negro is not losing any sleep over the proproposed civil-rights program because it is a vicious attempt to take from the States the right to manage their own affairs. Good southern Negroes do not want all of this stuff that is inspired by communistic agitators of all races; passage of such a law would be the end of your social order and the death blow to the traditions dear to the hearts of the people of the South and of equal interest to both races. There is no Negro born in the South who wants to live apart from our white friends and there is no Negro born in the South who wants social equality. We do want social justice, better understanding and equal opportunity. We want our own churches and schools, our own places of amusements. We teach our Negro boys and girls from our pulpits that racial integrity is best attained by racial purity and solidarity. We teach them that they must train to be better servants along industrial lines.

Slavery was a blessing to the Negro. Our white masters wrought well in their days whatever may be said of the hardships of slavery. It must be admitted that the slave owners turned out 4,000,000 men, women, and children better trained in trades and industries, morals, manners, and religion than any 4,000,000 since.

We came here without a language, today we speak the proud Anglo-Saxon language which seems destined to become the language of the world. We confess that we owe our freedom to the American white man. We look upon you as our leaders and our friends. You own the banks, the money, you make the laws, you administer them. You control the ballot and we are your subjects, we obey your laws and wherever you find the Negro preacher and his church you do not find communism, gangsters, mob violence, nor racial troubles. The Negro preacher teaches against such evils. We realize that the promise of social equality is a sham and an attempt to use the Negro for political purposes; if this matter is let alone time, religion, and education will work all of this out. We realize that the South is the Negro's home and our friends are in the South. The best way to have law-abiding Negroes in Clarksville is to help to make Christian Negroes. The church is interested in the standard of the life patterned in Christ and incarnated in His earthly career for the establishment of social order that is brotherly, just, merciful, loving, kind, and considerate of all men everywhere. We need the church now as never before, and if the church is to be the church and if it is to bring the entire world to the foot of the cross, it must exert definitely in the affairs of the State. It is clear that worldly men reflect their attitude toward life in laws which they enact by the administration of these laws. If we are to have permanent peace, and God grant that we may, the church universal must make itself felt in the Christianized opinions of the world. No peace will be permanent that is not formed in the atmosphere of the church and influenced by the ideals for which the church stands.

The democracy which the United Nations fight to preserve has its deep fountain in the principles of Jesus Christ. We are sending this appeal to every good red-blooded white man and woman of this city, asking that you please come to our rescue in helping us to raise this needed fund. The general church will give us $1,000 if we can raise the $1,500. We have a new pastor—Rev. I. D. Mitchell—and his wife, and as our house and parsonage needs remodeling badly, we are asking you to help us to raise this money. We have our church agent here this week to help us, and we know that all good white people are willing and ready to help any good worthy cause. Our pastor is doing more for our people and church than any pastor we have had.

Please make your check to the Wesley Chapel C. M. E. Church and send to Robert W. Wells, church agent, 618 Franklin Street, Clarksville, Tenn., and we will gladly acknowledge your donation and the money will be spent wisely. No money that you will ever spend will bring you a greater blessing than the money you may give to help this worthy cause.

I. D. MITCHELL,
Pastor.
ROBERT W. WELLS,
Church Agent and Sponsor.

Extract From Address of Gen. Julius Ochs Adler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following extract from the address of Gen. Julius Ochs Adler at the seventeenth annual conference of the Chaplains' Association, May 13, 1948, in New York City:

I now turn to a phase of our preparedness about which I should like to speak quite bluntly. There is a growing feeling through the Nation which I believe may have merit and to which subject I should like to address myself for a few moments during our conference today. With full realization of all the implications involved, I must confess to a mounting sympathy with those who demand that the Communist Party should be outlawed in the United States.

Some of our citizens protest, "But what about our freedoms? Would you violate our Bill of Rights? Aren't you infringing free speech?" The other side replies: "Of course not. We want only to save our freedoms and protect the Bill of Rights."

None of our freedom is absolute, nor could it be and long survive. Freedom of the press does not include the right to print the libelous or obscene. All of our freedoms are restricted at the point where their abuse might imperil the rights, comfort, or safety of the community as a whole. Why then should we absolve from restrictions a group whose loyalty is not to this Nation or its flag, whose demonstrated creed is the extinction of freedom wherever they get power, whose aims are the overthrow of everything we have gained through many decades of pain and struggle? Is it not inconsistent for us as liberals to invoke freedom of speech for those who would use our misguided indulgence to destroy the very freedom which we had accorded them?

We have always been a tolerant Nation. I like frequently to bring to mind a sentence from a letter written in 1790 by George Washington wherein he stated concisely his views on this subject:

"Happily the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens in giving it on all occasions their effectual support."

Even though we have always been a tolerant people, many contend that existing and implicit in the Bill of Rights is the right to be intolerant of intolerance. Perhaps the time has now arrived to exercise that right. The Communist creed has neither the spirit to give and take toward us nor to any ideology at variance with their own—no rule of live and let live. It is as narrow and as intolerant and as godless a set of purposes as ever man established by which to guide himself. Perhaps we should act toward the Communist Party as we would toward any other proved danger which hinders us in our preparedness for peace.

I am not unmindful of the arguments of those who, although opposed to the Communist Party and all it stands for, nevertheless, believe it would be wrong or unwise to outlaw it. Some ask, "Would not outlawing the Communist Party merely drive it underground?" This sounds like a cogent objection, the other side maintains, until it is examined closely. If the party and all of its activities were open and aboveboard, if its objectives and operations were as visible as those, say, of the Republican and Democratic Parties, it would, indeed, be unwise to force it underground. In fact, in such circumstances, it would neither be necessary nor warranted to outlaw it.

It is further contended that the Communist Party is already largely underground—at least, those activities which are inimical to American safety and well-being are underground. Infiltration, conspiracy, sabotage, organized turmoil, and agitation all mask under a hundred innocent-sounding names behind a thousand unsuspected fronts. In a practical sense the Communists do work underground and only a small facade of their structure is visible to the public eye.

Let us not drive the Communists underground; rather let us recognize that that is where they have always been. By depriving them of the designation of a legal American party, it is further argued we may also deprive them of the complacent partnership of many non-Communists who see no harm in going along because, after all, it is a legal party, isn't it?

Then there is a second argument mustered by those who are hesitant to outlaw the Communist Party. "Let's not make martyrs of them," they urge. The rebuttal to this particular point of view is in the following vein: Can we with clear conscience fail to attack wrong merely because the wrongdoers might raise the hue and cry of martyrdom? Perhaps then we should spare all un-American groups—the Ku Klux Klan, the Christian Fronters, the bigots, and subversives—on the grounds that they might complain loudly that they have been cruelly mistreated. The danger of casting the Communist Party in the sympathetic role of martyrdom, the argument continues, is a calcu-

lated risk which, if necessary, we should not hesitate for a moment to take.

Finally, there is a third objection to the proposal to outlaw the Communist Party which runs along these lines: "Totalitarianism, wicked as it is, must not be fought with totalitarian methods. To outlaw a political party because its aims are abhorrent is not the American way. In so doing we relinquish just that much of our democracy."

This statement has a superficially persuasive ring and is not to be dismissed casually. None of us wants to become totalitarian in order to fight totalitarianism. I am reminded of the story of a little, strait-laced, midwestern community which was shocked and dismayed to hear that a nudist colony had been set up at the edge of the town. A sheriff's posse was sworn in and proceeded to visit the penalty of the law on the malefactors.

But the nudists saw the posse approaching and started to run. The sheriff and deputies followed in close pursuit. But it was a hot, humid day and the minions of the law, uncomfortable and impeded in the chase, gradually shed their clothes to increase their speed. When the nudists were finally caught it was hardly possible to distinguish the pursued from the pursuers.

Certainly we must not be guilty of the sin we seek to extirpate. Our democracy is stanch enough to stand comparison with any political system. The free and open interchange of ideas is a part of the vitality and growth of our liberty and this process I would not impede. I might add that I believe we fought two wars to preserve it.

The confusion arises when we affix the word "party" to Communist as we would to Republican, Democratic, Socialist, or Liberal. The Communists differ from the others in these following respects and therefore, it might well be argued, are ineligible for the immunities and privileges that we grant to legitimate parties as the natural product of our political philosophy and heritage:

1. The origin, orientation, and direction of Communist policy is not American.

2. Its membership is not public.

3. Its program is one of secret infiltration and sabotage, disguising both its source and aims.

4. Communism does not believe in the basic freedoms nor does it grant them where it is in power. However, to accomplish its destructive purposes, it vehemently insists on those freedoms whenever they are available.

Therefore, let us not be deceived by the word "party." No citadel of liberty is likely to fall if we deprive the Communists of the franchise we traditionally accord to legitimate political parties. On the contrary, perhaps our liberty would thereby become stronger and more secure.

In making up our minds on this controversial issue, I would recall the following extract from an address by Abraham Lincoln delivered at Baltimore on April 18, 1864:

"The world has never had a good definition of the word 'liberty' and the American people just now, are much in want of one. We all declare for liberty; but in using the same word we do not all mean the same thing. With some the word 'liberty' may mean for each man to do as he pleases with himself, and the product of his labor; while with others the same word may mean for some men to do as they please with other men and the product of other men's labor. Here are two not only different but incompatible things called by the same name, 'liberty.' And it follows that each of the things is, by the respective parties, called by two different and incompatible names—'liberty' and 'tyranny.'

"The shepherd drives the wolf from the sheep's throat, for which the sheep thanks the shepherd as his liberator, while the wolf denounces him for the same act, as the destroyer of liberty, especially as the sheep was a black one. Plainly, the sheep and the wolf are not agreed upon a definition of the word 'liberty'; and precisely the same difference prevails today among us human creatures."

In urging preparedness on a wide front, I do not desire to give the impression of a fear that a shooting war is either near or inevitable. However, we can drift toward war if we are apathetic, disinterested, careless, or ill-informed. We must have a positive policy and a positive program. We must be aware of our strength and blessings and share them to the limit of our power with all the peoples of the world who, like us, cherish human rights and human dignity.

Winston Churchill put it cryptically in his speech on May 7 last at The Hague before the Congress of Europe looking toward a plan of European unity when he said "We welcome any country where the people own the Government and not the Government the people."

To you chaplains in whose hands lie the spiritual and moral guidance of our armed forces, to all of us on whom falls some small share of the responsibility of leadership, is given a great task in the days ahead. The task is preparedness and the objective is peace. I am confident if we fulfill the task we shall attain the objective.

A Plea for Those Who Send Relief Packages Overseas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, Miss Dorothy Thompson in her column in the Washington Evening Star which follows, under leave to extend my remarks, has called attention to governmental inertia and red tape which militates against the extension of voluntary assistance to our brothers and sisters across the seas in accordance with genuine American traditions.

On December 2, 1947, I introduced a bill to reduce by one-half the postage charges on shipments overseas of food, clothing, medicine, soap, and other necessaries falling within the general classification of relief supplies. Hearings were held before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, which, perhaps properly, took the position that such legislation, if enacted, should become a part of the then pending European recovery program.

Subsequently, after extensive hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, a provision to extend relief to those who customarily send packages overseas was incorporated in the measure reported to the House. After some changes this became section 117 (c) of Public Law 472, approved April 3, 1948.

Under the provisions of this legislation, the Administrator for Economic Cooperation is charged with the duty of prescribing rules and regulations for the use of funds made available under this law to pay the ocean-freight charges from the United States port to the designated foreign port of relief packages consigned to persons residing in one of the participating countries. In addition, he is directed to enter into an agreement with the foreign country for the use of deposits of that Nation's currency derived by the United States from the operation of the provisions of this law in order to defray the cost of transporting such relief supplies from the foreign port of entry to the consignment point of the package.

Under this arrangement, when completed, one who sends foreign relief packages would be required to pay only the cost of transportation from the point of mailing to the appropriate United States port. I am informed that the effect of this reduction should be, in most instances, to lessen postage charges to an extent even greater than the one-half contemplated in the measure which I sponsored.

Although it is appreciated that the consummation of the necessary arrangements to put these provisions of the law into operation requires some time and considerable study and collaboration between the Administrator and the Postmaster General, I am hopeful, and emphatically urge, that every effort be made to complete the formulation of these rules and regulations in order that this relief to generous Americans, envisioned by this legislation, may be expedited in every possible way.

Back in my district, my office is in the Federal Building, which houses also a branch post office. Even under present high postal rates, there is a constant stream of my warm-hearted constituents pouring into this post office lugging heavy packages to be sent to friends or relatives overseas who are in such very great need of these items, which we in this land of plenty are often too much inclined to take for granted. Close ties of blood or national origin, in most cases, bind the American givers to the foreign recipients. Those who thus generously share their substance with the less fortunate are usually in modest circumstances and feel keenly the pinch of the postage charges on these packages. To send a 22-pound gift, the permissible limit for most countries, costs over $3. Many try to send a package every week. Frequently, in the case of bulky foods or second-hand clothing, the postage charges exceed the actual value of the contents.

In my judgment, it is important that this form of international generosity be encouraged by speedy implementation of the provisions of the law passed early in April.

Further encouragement should be furnished by extending the benefit of additional income tax deduction to these generous donors. To that end, on December 16, 1947, I introduced a bill to permit the deduction, as a charitable contribution, of the value of such packages sent overseas. At the present time, if one draws a check to the CARE organization or one of the other established agencies, that amount is deductible for income-tax purposes. The effect of thus limiting this benefit, however, no doubt unintentionally, is to grant tax relief to those least

needing it, while denying it to the most deserving.

The large majority of these packages sent overseas to specific individuals are dispatched by those who must make real sacrifices in order to extend this generous assistance. They are required now to detail the contents of the package and value it, so that there would appear to be no administrative difficulty in the way of permitting them to take an income-tax deduction for the value of these gifts, which certainly can properly be considered contributions for a charitable purpose, although they likewise represent the source for creation and dissemination of a very large measure of good will toward this country and all of its people, an asset, the value of which in these critical times cannot be over-emphasized.

The other matter which Miss Thompson stresses in her timely comments certainly deserves every effort toward correction by Government officials. That has to do with the extensive forms and regulations with which one must comply in sending packages abroad. Her plea for relaxation of the rules and exhibition of a cooperative attitude on the part of the public officials who handle these arrangements should certainly not go unheeded.

It is my hope that the many Members of Congress who have evidenced a sincere and enthusiastic interest in the legislation to which I have referred and who joined in the campaign for the incorporation of these postal concessions in the Economic Cooperation Act, will continue to bring the pressure of their valuable influence to bear upon those charged with the administration of this law to put its provisions speedily into operation, as well as to urge further tax relief measures which will act as an additional spur to such generous activities on the part of our own people.

The article above referred to follows:

ON THE RECORD—RELIEF GIFTS SENT ABROAD ARE FENALIZED BY POSTAL REGULATIONS AND MAIL COST

(By Dorothy Thompson)

On Tuesday, Secretary Marshall called for more voluntary American relief for human suffering abroad. He said other countries—considering their limited means—were giving more than the United States.

I wonder whether Secretary Marshall himself ever has undertaken to send packages to Europe, and whether he can explain why United States postal regulations apparently do everything they can to penalize the impulse.

The other day we cleaned our clothes closets of superfluous clothing. Suits, trousers, shirts, dresses, and shoes, rejected because they no longer fitted or were out of style, were assembled—the rejection made more radical by the knowledge of the desperate clothing situation in most of Europe.

These, insofar as they were soiled, were dry cleaned and then, according to regulations, packed in cartons estimated to hold 22 pounds.

Our clothing collection, augmented by friends, filled two such cartons.

Now they had to be weighed on the bathroom scales, for if they were an ounce over 22 pounds and more than 72 inches in diameter, the post office would reject them. One containing shoes was overweight, and two pairs of shoes—does anyone know what shoes mean to Germans and Austrians?—had to be taken out, requiring repacking.

DUPLICATE FORMS

Meanwhile, duplicate forms were filled out, listing item by item the contents of each package, and their estimated value.

These were to go to a German friend—a woman of great character, widow of an anti-Nazi hanged by Hitler—who is engaged in social work and in a position to make wise distribution.

But we could not hail a taxi, take both packages to the nearest post office, and be done with it. According to the rules, only one package once a week can be sent to the same person by the same person anywhere in continental Europe.

We were tired of those bundles and knew how to beat this game. One member of the family took a package to one post office, a second to another—easy in New York.

Postage is 14 cents a pound, so we parted with $6.16, in addition to two taxi fares.

We could have simplified matters by sending these packages—destined for Berlin—to an acquaintance in military government, with the request to deliver them there. Then we could have shipped 70 pounds for 43 cents. This is what thousands, wishing to help persons in Austria or Germany, are doing. But, of course, this is not the duty of military government.

Our friend happens to live in the American zone, where neither food nor clothing is dutiable. But if she lived a few blocks away in the British or French zone, we would be unable to find out from our postal authorities in New York whether or not the gift was dutiable.

The easiest thing to do is to make a list of recipients and place orders week by week with reliable institutions like CARE, SAFE, CARITAS, or the trade-union-supported Arbeiter & Wohlfahrt. The latter organization has food packages ranging in price from $3.75 to $7.75.

But these do not cover items that are desperately needed—such as soap, tooth-paste, tooth brushes, bandages, and band-aids, iodine, and other simple drugs, combs, washcloths and household linen.

It would seem as though our authorities wish to discourage giving to individual families. But Americans are contributing generously to Europe through taxation, although most of them are hard-pressed to make ends meet. Yet hundreds of thousands have friends and relatives for whom they will make additional sacrifices.

There is no systematic collection of offcast clothing either, though out of the closets of this country a whole nation could be decently covered.

So if Mr. Marshall wants an outpouring of voluntary aid, we suggest that the process of sending it be simplified and cheapened. If one stands in line at any city post office, one is touched by the number of people bringing packages and forking out for high postal rates. Many of them look as though they could ill afford the sacrifice.

No Second-Class Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, you have heard the expression "second-class citizen." Have you given any serious thought to the implications of this designation? Do you realize that such a distinction could split our Nation in two? In view of the so-called revolt on the part of some southern Democrats, it is high time for each one of us to face the issue squarely.

Let us first review a little history. The founding fathers of the United States drew up a Declaration of Independence proclaiming that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights. Among these rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. When the War of Independence had been won, the framers of the Constitution went a step further to secure and maintain these rights by incorporating them into a bill of rights guaranteeing freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of the press, and equality before the law. This, then, is the basic foundation of our democracy.

In a report submitted early this year by the President's Committee on Civil Rights, four essential rights were stressed:

First. The right to safety and security of person.

Second. The right to citizenship and its privileges.

Third. The right to freedom of conscience and expression.

Fourth. The right to equality of opportunity.

To my mind, the last should be first, because I am personally convinced that if each individual is secure in his equality of opportunity, the other three rights will fall more naturally into place, as do the pieces in a puzzle when one has gotten the keystone clue established. A person who has equal opportunity feels that he has a fair shake, as the saying goes. He has his chance to build and maintain his self-respect and dignity as a personality. If one is usefully employed—or doing a job that utilizes to some extent the natural or cultivated abilities—if one is adequately compensated, the individual develops a sense of security, of well-being, of satisfaction. He is far less likely to develop biases against his fellowman. As a matter of fact, I believe that if each individual were assured of equality of opportunity in education, housing, health, recreation, transportation—without any distinction drawn as to race, creed, color, or national origin, national unity would be solidified in an amazingly short space of time.

If, as on other sad occasions, the American people succumb to the errors implicit in racism—sectionalism—divisiveness, if they congeal into mutually hostile and suspicious groups, into two classes, the Herrenvolk and the Sklavenvolk, the masters and the slaves—then all solutions will be impossible.

Americans are constantly orating about their great heritage of freedom and equality. It is a matter of extreme national pride. This is quite understandable, as the record in this direction has been progressively good, but we must admit it has been spotty and any student of history will tell you that some of our perfomances have been disgraceful, to say the least. But we are entering a new era of human relationships—or rather, we hope we are—and we have this advantage. It is never too late to mend a mistake or curb an injustice. We know

the problem. Racial hatreds and group intolerances must be eliminated. It is a challenging situation and one which we must meet head on or be defeated. Will intelligent Americans permit themselves to be victimized and degraded by malicious propaganda, whispering campaigns, directed against foreigners, against Jews, against Negroes, against Catholics. Will we permit the cherished American dream of freedom and equality for all our citizens to be perverted into a Fascist nightmare?

Intolerance is bad economy. Prejudice, like crime, does not pay. Thomas Paine, the celebrated pamphleteer, warned during the American Revolution, "Prejudice, like a spider, makes everywhere its home and lives where there seems nothing to live on." Discrimination is destructive, not only to those who are on the receiving end but to the perpetrators of such evil. Will we Americans be so foolish as to induce political and economic chaos by such idiocy? Is it not clear to us now that when we erect barriers on the grounds of race or religion, we hamper and retard the fullest expansion of our political, cultural, and economic society?

My answer—and your answer—should be insistence upon the passage of legislation which will set up a Federal permanent fair employment practices committee. The right to a job, regardless of race or religion, is the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. As some of us know, the opposition to FEPC is well organized but if the liberal elements in the community will take a lesson from our huge cooperative effort during the prosecution of the most complex war in history, we will avoid the strong undertow of anti-Semitism, anti-Negroism, anti-Catholicism, and other forms of racial and religious intolerances. We will not be overcome by the waves of bigotry. We will dig into this fight for a militant, dynamic, progressive democracy. Each attack on our objectives must be met with a counterattack, point and counterpoint, argument for argument. Freedom is everybody's job.

For instance, opponents to FEPC argue that such a law is futile, in that prejudice, they say, cannot be legislated out of existence. True, but this law will employ sanctions, a potent weapon, which will deter the biased employer or corporate entity from inflicting his or their prejudice upon the economic life of another, within the limits of Federal jurisdiction. We are told discrimination can best be eliminated by education, and I am all for it. I am the first to admit that considerable progress has been made in this field, aided and abetted by religious and educational leaders in many communities. But the problem is colossal, and this process is too pedestrian for the present crucial situation. It is a problem which requires an attack from a legislative approach as well.

The now defunt FEPC was established by President Roosevelt in an Executive order dated June 25, 1941. The effectiveness of the FEPC was due almost entirely to its success as a mediation body in persuading a union or employer to revise the particular policy or practice under complaint.

Presently there are only six States which have laws directed against discrimination in private employment. The legislation enacted in New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Connecticut have strong enforcement provisions. In those States an employer may no longer hire or fire an employee because he is a Jew, or an Italian, or a Negro, or a Catholic, or a Baptist. This does not mean that an employer must hire a Negro, or a Mexican, or a Presbyterian. He has the right of choice, depending upon the needs of his business and the quality of the service required, but he cannot reject an individual solely on the grounds of race or religion. In New York an employer or employment agency may not advertise, use application blanks, or question prospective applicants with the intention of discriminating in any way except on occupational qualifications.

A few cities—such as Chicago, Minneapolis, New York, Cincinnati, have enacted ordinances designed to prevent discrimination in employment practices, but such statutes vary and some are directly solely at municipal employment.

One does not have to do a great deal of addition and subtraction to appreciate that a more equitable solution would be a Federal statute. The opponents of such legislation advance the theory that a permanent FEPC would infringe on States rights. Let us examine this hoary argument for a moment, inasmuch as it is the bulwark of special interests and sectionalism.

States, under the Constitution, cannot regulate the areas of interstate commerce, Federal employment, and Federal contracts, which would be embraced by this bill. It should be stressed that purely local businesses would not be affected. A Federal FEPC would apply only to that portion of a State's industry which is in or which affects the stream of interstate commerce or under contract to the Federal Government.

We are also told that a permanent FEPC would interfere with private enterprise, that Government would step in and tell a man how to run his business. "Free enterprise," so-called, permits of considerable license, too much so in some instances, as witness our strangling monopolies but, nevertheless, such license is not unlimited. We have antitrust laws which can be invoked and which should be invoked more frequently. Corporations and individual employers are subjected to the restrictions and requirements of the public welfare—under governmental supervision, otherwise free enterprise could easily descend into commercial cannibalism.

A permanent FEPC will establish impartial machinery for the satisfaction of grievances and for interpretation. This is a must.

There are other discriminations which require the spotlight of attention. Negro and liberal groups have raised their voices in protest against the continuance of segregation in the armed services. That this practice should persist after the splendid record of Negro troops abroad is almost unbelievable. Their prowess was lauded by the British, the Australians, and their own commander, General Eisenhower, who commended the courageous service of colored soldiers during action in north Africa and elsewhere in the European theater. The Negro women willingly served in the Army Nurse Corps and enlisted with the WAC, the WAVES, and SPARS. After these valiant efforts, are we to continue to tell them "You must live in the barracks on the other side of the camp. You must eat your meals there too." Perhaps we can pick a special place for them to die, too, just to complete the program for them.

Minority groups run into heavy handed, callous discrimination in the matter of education. I would revoke or prohibit any Federal grants in aid to any State educational institution that is discovered invoking numerous clauses or provisions in its selection of students.

Liberal groups have worked for years trying to secure the passage of Federal anti-poll-tax legislation. The same is true for antilynching statutes. But a steady coalition of reactionary Republicans and southern Democrats has caused even the most intrepid of legislators to use a soft-footed approach.

Regardless of the fate of the various civil-rights bills now pending in the House, it is becoming increasingly more evident that the liberals in Congress cannot ease such bills through the Senate. Such legislation would face certain southern filibuster of unprecedented determination. The only hope may be to invoke cloture.

Allow me to remind my fellow citizens that our American civilization, in contrast to all others, is the culture of no single race, no single creed, no single nation. Historically, we are a composite of the toil and energy, the blood, the sweat, the tears, the sacrifice, and the intelligence of countless millions who came as immigrants to our shores or who were brought here in bondage from Africa. Walt Whitman, of whom Brooklynites are so justly proud, joyously stated, "This is not a nation, but a teaming of nations."

To the stubborn hate peddlers, to the despicable demagogs, let us give one firm answer: There shall be no second-class citizens in these United States.

Harry S. Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Thomas J. V. Cullen, Democratic chairman of Orange County, N. Y., and editor of the Spectator, at the Orange County Committee dinner at Mitchell Inn, Middletown, N. Y., on May 24, 1948:

Your support of this dinner is appreciated greatly. As an annual institution it can be a material influence in the building up of the Orange County Democratic Committee.

We are on the threshold of a Presidential campaign that is of vital moment to America. The future of every person within the Nation and over the world will be influenced by the decision made in November. Shall we continue under Democratic leadership a social and economic program designed for the welfare of all the people, which in the past has given them a new hope, or shall we return to a reactionary Republican rule which closed the banks, bankrupt business, impoverished farms, and idled the workingman?

The American people, mindful of the issues at stake, will not reject democracy, but will entrust it with the power to undertake new and greater progress. Americans are beginning to identify the inept and obstructionist record of the present Republican Congress—our present Congresswoman is a glaring example—which has done nothing to adjust America to the new atomic era, with the uncertainty and the do-nothingism of the Coolidge and Hoover era. We have awaited forward-minded action by Congress on many important postwar problems. We have waited without avail.

To mention just one thing, what has been done about housing? I see on my travels here and there a few rows of unlivable shacks with some such sign across them as "Gov. Thomas E. Dewey has done this to the veterans." The notice should continue, "but Governor Dewey doesn't have to live here." In November the choice of the man to lead the United States will be made. The choice lies between some undisclosed unknown candidate of the Republican Party, whose weakness and unavailability has been disclosed forthrightly to the people in Wisconsin and New Hampshire, in Oregon and in Nebraska, and the Democratic candidate under whom we prosper and under whom the world turns from communism to peace. He is our present leader, Harry S. Truman.

Mr. Truman is acknowledged to be a man of action and decision who, since his induction into office, has been faced with crises of a magnitude unsurpassed in world history. When President Roosevelt died in April 1945, the war with Germany, Japan, and Italy was still raging. Peace with Germany and Italy on May 7 was made while President Truman was America's Commander-in-Chief. The atomic bomb was ready that summer. The decision on its use was made by President Truman. He saved the lives of an unknown number of American boys—perhaps of yours and of mine—when this, the most potent instrumentality the world has ever known, ended Japan's dream of empire at Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August of 1945. Permanent peace and the settlement of all future international problems without war are a possibility under the new United Nations. President Truman, following President Roosevelt, has been an ardent advocate of a strong United Nations. Every law designed to build international peace and national prosperity was forced on Congress by President Truman. President Truman inspired the recent Italian campaign which gave pause to communism.

He demanded the European Recovery Act which, with the reorganized military might of America, is ending the dream of Stalin for European and world domination. The recognition of Israel as a nation, after but a few moments of independent existence, is evidence of the spirit of our President as well as his sympathy with those who battle in the cause of freedom.

On the home front at the war's end, Mr. Truman was confronted with the need of converting industry from war production to its normal pursuits. He was faced with the problem of returning 10,000,000 young men and women from the armed services to civilian life, to their homes and to their schools and to their work, without dislocating our economic system, without stopping the wheels of industry, without distressing the farmers, and without reducing laborers to want. These presented hazards to the national welfare as difficult as has ever been faced by an American President.

Everybody knows how quickly America went from war to peace without deprivation or hardship to any class. This was accomplished despite the upsetting conduct of a Republican Congress which, by the removal of controls and by the income-tax reduction favorable to those in the higher bracket, has increased the cost of necessities to all-time highs, and brought uncontrolled inflation to our doors.

Today there is prosperity in America, and peace. Banks are stronger than ever before. Industry is working to capacity and earning beyond the dreams of avarice. Retailers and wholesalers and marketers of all sorts are enjoying unprecedented incomes. The outstanding debt of farmers is at its lowest level and their income is at its highest. Their newly painted homes and barns brighten the countryside in all the States of the Nation. Their equipment is modern and labor-saving. The men who work in factories and in offices are earning beyond previous peaks. They approach old age complacently. They are insured against distress from temporary loss of a job. There is peace now and forecast of peace for the future, and this peace is had without the shadow of a foreign tyrant or by his leave. There is prosperity now for all and not for the favored few.

Whatever your politics or creed, your color, or your race, if you want to continue prosperous at home and with peace in the world, your best hope is Harry S. Truman.

Are Communists Loyal to United States?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, any doubt as to where the loyalty of American Communists would be in the event of a conflict between the United States and Russia will be resolved by reading the testimony of William Z. Foster, chairman of the Communist Party of the United States before the Senate Judiciary Committee on May 28. In testifying against the subversive activities control bill, Mr. Foster made it crystal clear that members of the Communist Party of the United States would not support the United States in any conceivable war with Russia. He further declared that in the event of a conflict with Russia, the Communists in this country would use every means to end the war on "democratic terms." These terms in substance could only be the Soviet's terms, for, according to Mr. Foster, such a clash could only be an "imperialistic war" in which the United States would necessarily be the aggressor.

Some revealing verbatim extracts from Mr. Foster's testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee as reprinted in the New York Times of May 30, follows:

Question (by Senator HOMER FERGUSON, Republican, of Michigan). Suppose that an American came into an armed conflict with Russia, where would the Communist Party's stand be, your Communist Party?

Answer. I will be frankly glad to answer that for you.

Question. Where would you stand?

Answer. The Soviet Union is a Socialist Union.

Question. That is right.

Answer. A nonimperialist country.

Question. I do not agree to that.

Answer. We will discuss that, too. Maybe you will have to withdraw some of your objections.

Question. Tell me where your stand would be?

Answer. Give me a chance and I will be glad to explain it to your satisfaction.

CALLS RUSSIA NONIMPERIALIST

Question. I will be very patient if I get that answer.

Answer. The Soviet Union is a Socialist country, and a nonimperialist country. It is dedicated to the proposition of peace and its whole record has been a record of fighting for peace. If attention had been paid to what the Soviet Union said before World War II, there would not have been any World War II, and Mr. Churchill just said so in his memoirs.

Question. Do you know what Ribbentrop and Molotov did about dividing the world before the World War?

Answer. Please let me explain. You asked me to explain a question, and I will do it completely.

Question. I don't see how that part of the answer has anything to do with the question, but go ahead.

Answer. I am describing to you the policy of the Soviet Government is a peace policy. The fact of the matter is an exchange between the Soviet Government of letters indicates that the Soviet is not only that but hundreds of people all over the world.

Question (by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, chairman of the subcommittee). You will not take all week answering that question.

Answer. Any war, therefore, the Soviet Union being committed fundamentally to the proposition peace, any war that may be developed between the United States and the Soviet Union can only be an imperialist war at the instigation of Wall Street, and we Communists are against all imperialists' wars.

Question (by Senator FERGUSON). Therefore—

Answer. Just a minute, please. Whether that war be directed against Russia, Great Britain, France, Italy, or wherever it is we are against imperialist wars of all kinds.

DEMANDS PROOF OF MURDER

Question (by Senator FERGUSON). Then you would be with Russia?

Answer. What we would do in the event of such a war is we would fight to terminate that war at the earliest possible moment with a democratic [peace].

Question. On whose side, on the Russians' side?

Answer. A peace that would conserve the interests—

Question. Whose side would you fight on?

Answer. Listen, you can't make me say things—

Question. I am not trying to. I am trying to get an answer.

Answer. I am telling you what we would do in the event of a war and what our position is. We are against all imperialists' wars, whether it is against Russia or anybody else.

Question. But you are in favor of Soviet wars?

Answer. We are not in favor—Soviets do not make wars. No Socialist country makes wars.

Question. All this penetration, all this murder and all that goes on to penetrate is not war, in your opinion?

Answer. That is just red-baiting. First of all, there is no murder and war. Where is there murder? Please tell me.

Question. But you would be on the side of the Communists in the case of this war?

Answer. In case of this war we would be on the side of immediate democratic peace. We would not support any imperialist war. We have never done so.

Question. You would be against America?

Answer. Then America would be against the democratic peace. Is that what you are telling me? Not only would the Communists be for a democratic peace, but so would the American people, all except a handful of monopolists here who are trying to run the world.

HOLDS RUSSIAN ATTACK IMPOSSIBLE

Question (by Senator WILEY). What if Russia attacked America, where would you be?

Answer. Russia would never attack America. You are asking me an impossibility.

Question (by Senator FERGUSON). How is that impossible? How do you know it is impossible?

Answer. Because a Socialist government is not an aggressive government.

Question (by Senator WILEY). What did she do to Poland?

Question (by Senator FERGUSON). What did they do to Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia?

Answer. I just recited to you what they did.

Question (by Senator WILEY). They did not plan a march into Poland when Hitler went in one side, they did not go in the other side and take half of it, no?

Answer. They marched in there, that is right. This was just Russian land that the Polish Government had——

Question. Let us assume a hypothesis here. What if Russia should attack America, where would you stand?

Answer. You are not going to assume anything of the kind, with me. Such an attack cannot take place. You might as well try to say if Washington went up in the air at a higher level, what would I do in the cellar, or something. I can't conceive of such a proposition.

ASKS: "WHAT PENETRATION?"

Question (by Senator FERGUSON). Then what is the purpose of this infiltration, this penetration in America of the Communist party?

Answer. What penetration?

Question. You think there is not any?

Answer. I want to say this: We have a Communist party in the United States, and I have been a member of this party and its antecedents for 48 years, 48 years; 13 years before the Soviet Government was born. Socialism springs native to all countries.

Question. You said that Russia never had.

Answer. It is not a conspiracy. There are 500,000,000 people in the world today following native Communist leadership, and to try to reduce that to the status of a conspiracy is ridiculous. Nobody would undertake that except some red-baiter in America who has so little faith in the system that he is blowing so much about and such a great inferiority complex toward communism that he will find any kind of wild explanation to explain away realities.

Question. What do you say about the war against Russia, the last attack of Russia on Finland? Was that an aggressive war?

Answer. Listen, Finland showed where it stood in the war. Finland was the tool of reactionaries of every stripe. It showed where it stood when it joined up with Hitler, in the war.

Question. I see what you mean, then, that if the country that is attacked by Russia is not Communistic.

Answer. There is no such country.

Question. Then there is no aggression by Russia?

Answer. There is no such country. I will tell you what the matter is with the world. What is the matter with the world is that this is the big lie of the present situation. The United States is out to dominate the world, and it is carrying on the most aggressive campaign of imperialistic expansion in the entire history of the world.

Question (by Senator FORREST C. DONNELL, Republican, of Missouri). I want to ask you about your first interest being in the United States. Were you asked in 1939 what you would do in the event Russia should declare war on this country, and if so would you support the United States in that war?

Answer. I stated many times what we would do.

Question. What would you do?

Answer. We would fight to bring that war to a democratic termination at the earliest possible moment.

Question. Would you serve under the flag and in the Army and Navy of this country if such a war were declared by Russia against this country?

Answer. We are given no alternative to that. We would be drafted and that is all there is to it. My answer to the question is just exactly what I said. We are opposed to such a war. We think that all those who are advocating war, and the Committee on Un-American Activities is one of the principal warmonger agencies in the United States. They are attempting to get the United States into war with the Soviet Union, a war which will destroy the United States, which will destroy the United States and most of the world with it. We are against such a war, and go down the line fighting it. If they precipitate such a war, we would use our level best interest to bring it to the earliest possible democratic conclusion that then be just to America, just to the Soviet Union.

"NOT GOING TO FIGHT AT ALL"

Question (by Senator FERGUSON). Would you fight on America's side?

Answer. That is ridiculous. We are not going to fight at all. We are going to fight to bring it to an end.

Question. You will not fight at all?

Answer. Only to bring the war to an end.

Question. You said you would serve because you had to?

Answer. I say as far as—would you take—no.

Question. Would your heart be on America's side if you had to serve just to keep out of jail?

Question (by Senator DONNELL). In other words, would you willingly serve or unwillingly serve in the Army and Navy of this country under such circumstances?

Answer. I have stated that we are not going to fight against the Soviet Union. We are not going to fight any imperialist war.

Swiss Competition With the Jeweled-Watch Industry in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, today Swiss competition has garnered almost 87 percent of the jeweled-watch market in the United States, with the kindly assistance of the State Department.

It would be bad enough if this happened to an ordinary industry. But high officials in both the Army and the Navy have stated in effect that the preservation of the jeweled-watch industry is necessary to the defense of our Republic. It is elementary that countless timing instruments, gadgets, and pieces of all kinds of equipment needed in war can only produced by factories with the machinery and skilled workmen to produce jeweled watches.

A nation with no jeweled-watch industry cannot train these artisans overnight. It takes years and years.

The German war machine was dependent upon the Swiss watch industry for its delicate mechanisms. It is that same Swiss watch industry which today is in competition with the American jeweled-watch industry.

In considering measures to protect and preserve the American jeweled-watch industry, we are not hurting commodities and industrial products war-torn countries are using to rebuild their export markets. We are not discriminating against the Marshall-plan countries. We are dealing with one nation only: Switzerland.

While the free traders in the State Department encourage increased imports of jeweled watches, thereby stifling the growth in this Nation of an industry of vital importance, Great Britain is an example of realistic recognition of the necessity for encouraging the creation and maintenance of a watchmaking industry.

The contrast between Britain's attitude and that of our own Nation in maintaining a jeweled-watch industry is startling to contemplate.

Here we have our State Department not only ignoring legitimate complaints of the American industry that reduction in tariff duties on watch movements and parts under the Swiss trade agreement has resulted in almost complete usurpation of the American market by Swiss competition, but the State Department at the same time has proved itself unable or unwilling to get the American industry desperately needed machinery replacements from Switzerland and has turned a deaf ear to all pleas for establishment of a quota upon the importation of watch movements from Switzerland.

Great Britain, on the other hand, has afforded her jeweled-watch industry monetary protection plus sponsoring the creation of a national college of horology for the purpose of developing and expanding the craftsmanship so essential in times of national stress.

Congress scientifically established in 1930 Tariff Act rates of duty upon imported watches which enabled the American watch industry to expand with the growth in consumer demand for watches. But the State Department has misconstrued the congressional purpose until today highly-skilled American watchmakers are in danger of finding their craftsmanship an unsalable item and America will have lost a vital factor in national-defense.

The American watch industry wants no Government subsidy to compete with Swiss watches in the domestic market. It asks, and rightfully should have, the benefit of adequate tariff protection if it is to continue to maintain its highly skilled ranks of workers.

Mr. Speaker, our country has a great responsibility in this world. We must be strong in order to defend the right. We cannot be so unless we change our policy in respect to this industry. A potent, growing jeweled-watch industry is of primary national concern.

It will be a sad day for America if, in time of national emergency, she must turn to Switzerland or have to beg a more forward-looking nation for precision instruments solely because our Department of State has given away a birthright in order to promote a fetish of international free trade.

Is Britain Fomenting Third World War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wichita (Kans.) Sunday Beacon:

IS BRITAIN FOMENTING THIRD WORLD WAR?—WRITER CHARGES EMPIRE PLOTTING AGAINST NEW STATE OF ISRAEL

(By Alfred A. Strelsin)

LAKE SUCCESS.—The British Empire, desperately bent on delaying its decline, is embarked on a gigantic conspiracy directed against the people of the State of Israel, that might well prove the volcano that will erupt into World War III.

Skilled British secret agents, working throughout the Middle East, are as much a part of this plot as are their dupes, the Arab states, whose armies are whipped into battle for the first time since the Moors were driven out of Spain in 1492.

The native forces of Egypt, Syria, the Lebanon, Transjordan, and Iraq, which refused to join the war against the Axis and organized fifth columns, saboteurs, and rebellions against the Allies, now decided to follow the siren song of the British agents. Like as many tarbooshed and burnoosed Hessians, they fight in a war waged for alien interests on foreign soil, lured into this bloody adventure by British promises of loot and ephemeral territorial gains.

It is an established fact that there are not enough Palestinian Arabs in all the armies engaged in the war to permit the establishment of a single battalion. The war is fought by a motley group of armies held together by but one common denominator—the instigation and technical coordination of British advisers.

PLOT APPARENT IN UN

Here in the United Nations at Lake Success, only contours of this gigantic conspiracy have become apparent in recent days, but there are still too many mysteries left which require immediate clarification if one desires to view the Palestine tragedy in the proper perspective.

Why did Britain's Sir Alexander Cadogan oppose the American suggestion that chapter VII, article 39 of the UN Charter be invoked to stop the unprovoked aggression of alien Arabs in the Holy Land?

What motivated the decision of His Majesty's Government to allow hundreds of high-ranking British officers to serve as advisers, staff and combat leaders with the invading Arab armies?

What motivated the Foreign Office statement that Britain will continue to supply arms and ammunition only to the Arab armies?

Who are the personalities the British Government maintains in the Middle East to pull the strings in a manner reminiscent of a best J. Phillips Oppenheim thriller?

The answers to these questions can be pieced together from the many fragmentary bits of information which are available on the highest diplomatic level. Together they form a revealing mosaic of oriental intrigue unsurpassed even in the rather lurid history of policies and practices in the Middle East.

One has to view the British plot in its chronological sequence to comprehend its magnitude, ramifications, and perilous character.

ATTLEE'S DECISION

The morning after the general elections of 1945, Britain's new Prime Minister, Labor's colorless Clement Attlee (whom Churchill called a sheep in sheep's clothing), agreed to two momentous decisions: one, to liquidate British rule in India, and the other to pull out of Egypt. Neither decision was voluntary. It was compelled by British public opinion, and by the violent pressure from the countries involved.

Had Britain possessed the physical power after World War II to fight for the preservation of the Empire, she would have continued to disregard her oft-repeated promises of freedom to both India and Egypt. But Attlee and his new Foreign Minister, Ernest Bevin, woke up to power with the realization that there was no strength left in the British arsenal to prevent the march of time.

Britain decided to retrench her position in a world over which she ruled as master for more than 300 years. The task of retrenchment was assigned to the imperial general staff and its new chief, Field Marshal Lord Montgomery.

Montgomery insisted that the Middle East be made into an exclusively British region with all other interests subordinated to that end. He was impelled in his decision by three major considerations:

(1) The loss of India with its 400,000,000 people;

(2) The forced expulsion of Britain from Egypt; and

(3) The lure of oil riches in Transjordan and the Negeb region of the present state of Israel.

It was decided to replace the former life line from London to Singapore by the new empire route from Jerusalem to Capetown; to compensate the loss of the Egyptian bases with new ones in Transjordan and Palestine, and to prevent the oil-bearing Negeb from passing into any but British control under any and all circumstances.

OIL WEALTH KEPT SECRET

The Negeb's potential oil wealth was kept such a sealed secret that a special report for President Roosevelt was prepared in only one copy, the whereabouts of which is now wrapped in diplomatic secrecy.

Early in June 1946 Field Marshal Montgomery flew to the Middle East to acquaint his generals on the spot with the new British strategy for the region. He held a series of conferences in Cairo, Jerusalem, and Amman. The most important of these was held in Government House in Jerusalem, on June 16, 1946. It was attended by all the top-ranking officers of the British Imperial High Command in the Middle East, including the notorious pro-Nazi, Jew-baiter Gen. Sir Evelyn Barker.

At this secret conclave it was decided that the establishment of Jewish colonies in the Negeb must be prevented at all costs, and that under no circumstances should Britain permit its inclusion in any Jewish scheme for a homeland under the Balfour Declaration; to keep it under British control as long as the mandate endured in Palestine, and thereafter pass it on to Transjordan, the marionette kingdom over which a mere dozen of Britons rule with an iron hand.

The implementation of the Montgomery plan was assigned to Brigadier Patrick Andrew Clayton, omnipotent director of Britain's Middle Eastern Intelligence Center, one of those queer Britons who loses his head in an irrational infatuation with the Arab world. Working directly with Clayton were highly placed resident agents in every one of the Arab countries, as well as Britain's most prominent long-range saboteur and intriguer, Sir Edward Spears, whose love for the Arab is motivated by his hatred of the Jews. Spears was instrumental in plotting the revolt in Syria against France at the time she was fighting by Britain's side in World War II. Once the French were removed from the Near East, Spears devoted his entire time and energy to the conspiratorial plot against the Balfour Declaration. In this campaign, he did not hesitate to sink to the lowest levels of anti-Semitism, reminiscent of Hitler's halcyon days in Europe.

Under these highly placed accomplices, a vast network of British agents is engaged in the execution of the anti-Israel program. Among these agents are diplomats, from humble third secretaries up to ambassadors, and professional soldiers, from noncoms to generals.

The whole world now knows that the soldiers of King Abdullah are British mercenaries whose pay, arms, rations, uniforms, and even officers are supplied by Britain. The world does not know, however, that very few of the soldiers of the so-called Transjordanian army are actually recruited from among King Abdullah's 350,000 poverty-stricken nomadic subjects. They are picked up by sharp-eyed British recruiting agents all over the Middle East wherever the homeless, persecuted Kurds, Druses, and Arab nomads roam.

Neither is it known that the port of Aqaba, assigned to the State of Israel by the United Nations, is used even now, after the termination of the mandate, to supply the Arab Legion with contraband arms over and above their supposed contractual agreements with the United Kingdom. A major power smuggling arms to its hired gunmen.

An impartial observer reports from Amman that British officers and noncommissioned officers were sent by the British Army to Transjordan to serve as "instructors" with the Arab Legion. The fact is that these "instructors" act as gunnery officers with the Transjordanian heavy artillery, since no native soldiers know how to handle the complicated newly arrived 25-pounders.

The British commander of the Legion, Brigadier John Bagot Glubb, is in charge of the unprovoked assault against the women and children crammed into the Jewish districts of the old city in Jerusalem. He also commands the other contingents of his legion against outposts of beleaguered Israel. The whole operations plan for the Transjordan and Iraqi armies was drafted by British staff officers, some of them smuggled into Amman in the guise of diplomatic attachés.

BRITISH ACTIVITIES VEILED

The activities of British military and diplomatic agents in other Arab countries is deliberately veiled by an elaborate smoke screen of calculated secrecy. But it is still possible to break through this screen.

According to their own sources, the whole middle eastern area except Syria and Lebanon is militarily controlled by officers from the British Army:

1. There is a British military mission in Iraq, consisting of a minimum of 18 officers and 10 noncommissioned officers. Their function is to advise on the supply and training of the Iraqi Army and to supervise its reequipment from British sources. Two additional officers and nine noncommissioned

officers were provided by the Royal Air Force to aid in the development of an Iraqi Air Force, using the fields built by the RAF both before and during World War II.

2. There is a British military mission in Saudi Arabia, consisting of 9 high-ranking officers and 36 other ranks.

There is a British military mission in Egypt, composed of hundreds of high-ranking officers. This mission has supervised the delivery to Egypt of scores of military aircraft, including those now used in the wanton air raids against Tel Aviv. The mission also arranged for the delivery of command and scout cars, now spearheading the Egyptian advance into Palestine, as well as Bren-gun carriers, which lend considerable mobility and enables the Egyptian Army to maneuver at great speed in the wide open desert.

4. The drafting of the Egyptian operations plan against Israel is known to be the work of two British generals, now known by the names of Russel Pasha and Fitzpatrick Pasha. Even the Egyptian military censor who passes on the cables which American correspondents file to their papers in the United States is an Englishman by the name of Arnold Delaney. The very communication in which the Egyptian Government boldly advised the UN of the violation of Palestinian territory by its troops was drafted by Britain's Mr. Cooke, who is the de facto head of the Egyptian chancelory.

5. Britain has a whole string of diplomatic agents called political officers, assigned to every one of the Embassies and Legations she maintains in Egypt, Transjordan, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Lebanon, and the Yemen. They are all violently pro-Arab and anti-Jewish, this being a criterion of assignment to a middle eastern post. These agents are directly responsible to the Political Intelligence Division of the Foreign Office, an autonomous bureaucracy within a bureaucracy, world famous for its skill in diplomatic intrigue and the ruthlessness with which it carries out all its allotted tasks.

This army of secret agents is financed from both vouchered and unvouchered funds. According to official records, the vouchered funds placed at the disposal of diplomatic agents in the Middle East amount to an annual total of over $70,000,000, a truly exorbitant sum if compared with the $2,300,000 allotted to all their diplomatic missions in 20 Latin-American Republics.

The unvouchered funds allotted to these same British agents are even greater. They are paid from the profits of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., a Government-owned corporation, whose income is used to pay for the undercover expenses of the British Government. The middle eastern liaison officer of Anglo-Iranian is the fabulous British agent Colonel Underwood.

It is an extravagant luxury, indeed, to spend these millions on the expense accounts of these British spies and saboteurs of the Middle East when at home the people of Britain are reduced to a starvation diet—allegedly due to lack of funds.

This vast network of intelligence officers combine under the aegis of His Majesty's Government with 33,000,000 alien Arabs to contest a few thousand square miles of territory in which live less than 700,000 Jews, many of them survivors of Nazi terrior. This number includes the aged and the infirm, the women and the children. Israel has no sponsor even remotely resembling Great Britain whose hand-picked diplomats and best soldiers are at this very moment participating in the subjugation of the renascent state.

While for Britain it is a remote war on distant battlefields motivated by imperial greed and profit, while for the alien Arabs this is a frivolous adventure in which only foreign soil is involved; for the Jews of Israel this is "Custer's Last Stand." They are pressed together in their tiny area with no road back to the countries in which still stand the gas chambers and stoves in which 6,000,000 of them perished.

"If Israel's friends merely give lip service in terms of recognition, then Israel will be compelled to resort to whatever means she may have at her command," so stated an important official of the new state, who pointed out to me that "since we do not have the mass of manpower that our attackers have, and since we are strangled for ammunition and war matériel by embargoes and blockades, we, if forced by abandonment or apathy of our friends and the unchecked onslaught of our enemies, will resort even to bacteriological warfare. We deplore even the thought of the use of such horrible weapons; but if the world abandons us, we will have no alternative."

It is essential that we draw our own conclusions from this rather disturbing picture now unfolding in its gruesome reality and may, if unchecked immediately, flare up into a general conflagration.

PLAYING WITH FIRE

In promoting the Arabs' unholy war against Israel, Britain is playing with the fire of World War III. Even the half-hearted efforts of UN to prevent such a development was recklessly thwarted by British delegate Sir Alexander Cadogan upon cabled instructions from the Foreign Office in London. The cable was signed "Bevin."

The arsonists of the British Foreign Office seem to be unaware of the danger inherent in their game. If the UN is sabotaged, if fighting is allowed to develop into large-scale war, the friends of both sides will line up on separate fronts, plunging the world into a general holocaust, dividing and destroying it again. While in World War II the struggle was waged for transcendent issues, against the evils of Axis totalitarianism, this time it will be over the rather obsolete issue of British imperialism.

We of America, who have always admired the sportsmanship and fairness of the individual Briton, deplore that the present British hierarchy is stupidly creating a distinct and active anti-British public opinion throughout the Unted States.

Arab armies moving against defenseless colonies of women and children under the command of British martinets and British planes with "Egyptian" insignia hastily painted on them bombing the open cities of Israel, emulating the Nazis' Rotterdam exhibition in calculated genocide, will destroy the last vestige of respect left for the British in this country.

There is no time to lose. What is today the ganging up of millions against a handful of people might tomorrow be World War III.

Britain must be prevented from thus plunging the world into an abyss from which there will be no return or recovery. This is the greater meaning of the war against Israel. This is the greater urgency which must drive the United States, today the world's foremost power, to act before it is too late.

Sale of Coal and Asphalt Deposits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, on April 28, I appeared along with others from my State before the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the House Public Lands Committee to urge favorable action on House Joint Resolution 363, which ratifies a contract heretofore entered into by and between Secretary of the Interior Krug and the Principal Chief of the Choctaw Nation and the Governor of the Chickasaw Nation of Indians of Oklahoma for the sale of coal and asphalt deposits to the United States.

As part of my testimony, I submitted a prepared written statement which I desire to include as part of my remarks:

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE SECOND OKLAHOMA CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS OF THE PUBLIC LANDS COMMITTEE ON WEDNESDAY

Mr. Chairman, I desire to take this opportunity of thanking you and each member of the committee for conducting hearings on this very important piece of legislation to the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians of Oklahoma, and giving me an opportunity to appear in support of House Joint Resolution No. 363.

The contract entered into by and between the principal chief of the Choctaw Nation and the governor of the Chickasaw Nation with the Secretary of the Interior on behalf of the United States pursuant to the provisions of the act of June 28, 1944 (58 Stat. 483) is fully set out in the resolution.

This contract was signed by the above parties on October 8, 1947, after all the enabling legislation passed by the Congress in the act of June 28, 1944, had been completely carried out.

It heretofore has been stated by the witnesses who have preceded me, and I wish to impress that fact, that the purposes of this House joint resolution is to fulfill a treaty obligation between the United States and the Choctaw-Chickasaw Nations of Indians known as the Atoka agreement and the supplemental agreement, ratified by the Congress on June 28, 1898, and July 1, 1902, respectively. It is not a gratuity by any sense of the word.

These coal and asphalt deposits were reserved from allotment to individual Indians of the two tribes in accordance with the provisions of section 58 of the supplemental agreement approved July 1, 1902.

Before discussing the price of $8,500,000 which was agreed upon by the contracted parties as being a fair and equitable price which the Government is to pay for these coal and asphalt deposits aggregating approximately 370,000 acres, I would like to state that there have been two separate appraisements of this property made by the Government; one known as the "Cameron appraisement" and the other the "Rutledge appraisement.

The first survey was made in 1909 and the value placed upon the workable coal deposits, leased and unleased, was $12,319,039. The second survey was made by Mr. Rutledge in 1918 and the value placed on the coal deposits, leased and unleased, was in the sum of $14,461,041.73.

The difference in the two estimates of value according to those in charge of the appraisements was due to the fact that the Cameron appraisement covered only coal which was considered workable and the Rutledge appraisement covered all the coal considered workable or unworkable. It would, therefore, conclusively appear in view of these two appraisements, which, as I said a moment ago, were made by the Government and not by the two tribes involved, that the Government is not buying a "white elephant."

On the other hand, I fully believe the two Indian tribes will receive a fair value in the sum of $8,500,000 for their deposits in view

of what already has been received in royalties and sales. I would say further, Mr. Chairman, that a vast majority of the living enrolled members by referendum written ballot, approved this contract by a vote of 4,947 to 310. I feel sure that if all the living enrolled members had voted, the ratio of approval would have been much greater.

I make this statement because I know letters have been written by some members of the two tribes to Members of Congress protesting the approval of the contract on the ground of inadequacy of consideration, insufficient notice of election, and an unfair tabulation of the ballots by the superintendent of the Five Civilized Tribes Agency. In my judgment there is no foundation for such charges.

The asphalt deposits have never been considered to be of great value and therefore were not appraised in the first appraisement, but the Rutledge appraisement estimated the value at less than $100,000.

I desire to call the committee's particular attention to the provisions of section 59 of the act of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 641) commonly known as the Choctaw-Chickasaw supplemental agreement.

This act provided for the sale of the coal and asphalt lands and deposits which had been leased under the Atoka agreement and all other lands principally valuable for their coal and asphalt deposits. This sale was to be at public auction for cash within 3 years from September 25, 1902 and was to include both the surface and the coal and asphalt deposits leased and unleased. I wish to emphasize the fact that here was a solemn treaty obligation entered into by our Government and these tribes of Indians where it was specifically agreed that these deposits would be sold at public auction within 3 years after the supplemental agreement was ratified on September 25, 1902 by referendum by the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations.

For some reason or other, best known to Congress itself at that time, in the annual Departmental Interior appropriation bill for the fiscal year of June 30, 1905, which is known as the act of Congress of April 21, 1904 (33 Stat. 189) there was a provision withdrawing the leased coal and asphalt lands from sale until the further direction of Congress. When Congress passed this act it specifically and deliberately violated the sanctity of the treaty obligation heretofore entered into with these two tribes.

With the best of motives, no doubt, Congress on April 26, 1906 (34 Stat. 137) passed an act entitled "An act to wind up the affairs and provide for final disposition of the Five Civilized Tribes in the Indian territory," which is now Oklahoma. But, in passing this act, it postponed the sale of both the leased and unleased coal and asphalt lands until all the then existing leases should expire, or until such time as might be otherwise provided by law.

According to the record, it would seem that Congress again changed its mind when it passed the act of June 21, 1906 (34 Stat. 325). This act authorized the Secretary of the Interior to appraise the tribal coal deposits and to make practical and exhaustive investigation of the character, extent, and value thereof. For this purpose, it appropriated an amount not exceeding $50,000 of tribal funds to make this appraisement.

The next important act passed by Congress affecting these deposits, came on February 8, 1918 (48 Stat. 433). This act authorized the Secretary of Interior to sell at public auction the tribal coal and asphalt deposits, leased and unleased, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by him. There were other provisions contained in this act with reference to the number of tracts a purchaser could acquire and the prohibition of the sale of any tract for less than the appraised value, etc.

Then came the act of February 22, 1921 (41 Stat. 1107), which authorized the Secretary of Interior to reappraise and sell the remainder of the tribal coal and asphalt deposits under rules and regulations to be prescribed by him as to terms and condition of payment. This was the last act until June 28, 1944, passed by the Congress affecting the sale of these coal and asphalt deposits.

Now, after almost 50 years, the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians of Oklahoma are at the doors of the Congress of the United States, beseeching and imploring the Members thereof to do no more than what these nations have always done, to wit: carry out its treaty obligations.

Since Congress has failed to sell these coal and asphalt deposits during these many years, I think it is only fair and equitable that our Government should keep faith with its Indian wards by ratifying this contract.

It is my considered judgment that in the consideration of this resolution the Congress of the United States is on trial not only before these two tribes involved, but before every Indian tribe throughout the United States, as well as the bar of public opinion. Personally, I cannot conceive of my Government doing anything but what is fair and just in this instance, in view of the treaty obligations and the historical background of this transaction.

It would seem to me that this committee, Mr. Chairman, has no other alternative than to ratify the contract entered into by and between the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes of Indians and the Secretary of Interior in behalf of the United States Government. I, therefore, so respectfully urge.

Thank you gentlemen, most kindly.

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Albuquerque Journal of May 28, 1948:

MUST HAVE FLOOD CONTROL

The Rio Grande again is discharging its flood waters through the Middle Rio Grande conservancy district where more than one-fourth of the population resides.

The turbulent stream is threatening the lives and property of the residents. It is also wasting water that should be conserved for use in this valley and in the lower Rio Grande Valley.

The chances are that we will escape any serious loss, although it is too early yet to predict how successful the conservancy district will be in holding the flood waters from spreading out over fertile lands.

But this spring flood again emphasizes the necessity of the Middle Rio Grande project which has been recommended by Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, and approval of which is now pending before Congress.

This flood danger which reoccurs every few years will bring disaster some spring unless action is taken on the project, and the river harnessed, the water conserved and put to beneficial use of the residents of this and the lower valley. Every year that the work is delayed, the river will silt up more, the water level rise, and the danger become more serious.

Members of Congress who fight or are reluctant to approve flood-control and reclamation projects in the West, as many are doing now in seeking to cut down appropriations, fail to understand these problems. They are prone to label the requests for river improvements as pork-barrel legislation. There may be pork in some of the items which come before them, but there isn't in this Rio Grande project, and in most of the reclamation demands.

These Congressmen need to study and understand the needs of populations which are threatened. They need to be sold on the value of development of our rivers to prevent devastating floods and economic loss, and to provide more irrigated lands for the production of food, and to support our ever-increasing population.

The United States is pouring out billions of dollars for foreign relief and aid and hardly blinking an eye. Legislators need to evaluate the demands more closely and spend money at home on projects which have been investigated and recommended and will contribute to the health and prosperity of our own population.

Compensation of Employees in the Railway Mail Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINGATE H. LUCAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, in order that other Members may know what specialized skill is required in the Railway Mail Service, proving the necessity for the payment of a living wage to these Government employees, I insert in the RECORD the following letter of Mr. Harry A. Meissner to the editor of the Fort Worth Star-Telegram:

A LOT OF MEMORY WORK

EDITOR: What are the duties and requirements of a railway mail clerk? He is the fellow who sees that your letters get to the post office for which they are intended. He is the man who speeds the mail through the night so that the one for whom it is intended might receive it at the earliest possible moment.

Does he know what to do with mail for all towns? Yes, he sure does. In addition to knowing where to send mail for the whole world, he must know exactly the location of every post office in his State and some of the adjoining States. He is examined on every post office in the State and must correctly locate at least 97 percent or be given a failing grade. Failure means demerits and repeated failures mean dismissal from a highly specialized service.

How can a man remember all of the 2,160 post offices in Texas? That is the question advanced by all new clerks as the goal seems almost impossible. He is given books and maps, instructions, the date when his first examination is due, and told to get busy. When he starts to study he finds many towns named after girls such as Alice, Anna, Alma, Camilla, Charlotte, Christine, Delores, Donna, Edith, Edna, Electra, Elsa, Florence, Henrietta, Hortense, Inez, Irene, Jean, Josephine, Larue, Lela, Leona, Lillian, Lorena, Louise,

Loraine, Margaret, Marion, May, Maypearl, Myra, Olivia, Patricia, Pearl, Penelope, Rowena, Vera, Violet, Winnie, and many others, including Seven Sisters and Twin Sisters.

He also finds Albert, Alfred, Alvin, Aubrey, Benjamin, Charlie, Chester, Claude, Clyde, Clint, Curtis, Dale, Douglas, Elbert, Elmo, Floyd, Franklin, Fred, George, Gregory, Guy, Harold, Irving, Ivan, James, Jasper, Leo, Leroy, Luther, Melvin, Otto, Thomas, Vernon, Warren, Weldon, and Wilmer.

Texas also has its own Paradise, Eden, Elysian Fields, Utopia, Jericho, Devine, Shepherd, Nazareth, and Trinity. It also claims a Tokio, China, Orient, Fairbanks, Nome, Scotland, Edinburg, Ireland, Dublin, Shannon, London, Liverpool, Normandy, Paris, Amherst, Holland, Geneva, Moscow, Palestine, Malta, Turkey, Athens, Troy, Italy, Rome, Florence, Naples, Genoa, Carthage, Egypt, Trinidad, Bogota, and Sidney.

The new clerk is amazed to find that Los Angeles, San Diego, Frisco, Oakland, Bakersfield, Portland, Salem, Helena, Nevada, Omaha, Lincoln, Burlington, Augusta, Boston, New London, Concord, Albany, Mount Vernon, Westpoint, Rochester, Buffalo, Trenton, Newark, Harrisburg, Pittsburg, Detroit, Columbus, Dayton, Cleveland, Decatur, Washington, Richmond, Jamestown, Lexington, Memphis, and Atlanta are actually towns in Texas.

In addition to Washington, Lincoln, and Cleveland, he finds familiar names of past Presidents such as Garfield, Tyler, Taylor, Buchanan, Pierce, Jefferson, Harrison, Taft, Wilson, Coolidge, Hoover, and Roosevelt. And he could not help but notice the similarity of Nursery, Orchard, Postoak, Pine, Cottonwood, Hackberry, Mesquite, Little Elm, Magnolia, Boxelder, Evergreen, Maple, Plum, Pecan Gap, Waltnut Springs, Apple Springs, Cedar Hill, Pearland, Orange Grove, Ashwood, Willow City, Tanglewood, Thicket, Bushland, Forrest, and Notrees. There are also Okra, Rice, Rye, Vineyard, Fruitland, Grapevine, Fruitvale, Grapeland, Bluebonnet, Clover Leaf, Rosebud, Violet, Cactus, and Blossom.

Such towns as Cheapside, Cash, Cost, Price, Sample, Dime Box, Dinero, Thrift, Thrifty, Goodrich, Richland, Ringgold, Goldsboro, Silver, and Security get the new clerk to thinking about the very low rate of $1.14 per hour which he will receive for his efforts. However, to make him smile a little are the Texas towns of Jolly, Happy, Welcome, Smiley, Bells, Fife, Loco, Valentine, Sunnyside, Pleasant Valley, Loving, Pep, Eureka, and Geronimo.

If the clerk were making a little more money and if he had the time, he might take a Holliday from Industry and Commerce, get a Blanket or Comfort and possible visit Coldsprings, Frost, Polar, or Winterhaven. He might find Buffalo, Antelope, Quail, Snipe, Peacock or, if he had Hooks, he might catch Salmon. He could cover Miles from Friday to Munday. He might even see a Stockman on a Bronco throwing a Loop of a Lariat on a Whiteface Maverick. If he wanted to extend his vacation he could Call, Telephone, or Telegraph. Yes, all of them are Texas post offices.

To keep this study from being too dry he notices Best and Veribest, Gillett and Edge, Fry and Crisp, Ace and Spade, Grit and Sand, Gem and Crystal City, Gary and Cooper, Douglas and Fairbanks, Petty and Cash, Dawn, Sunset, and Rising Star.

He makes out fairly well so far. But now he has run into some brain twisters such as Cedar Bayou, Cedar Creek, Cedar Hill, Cedar Lake, Cedar Lane, Cedar Park, and Cedar Valley. The last one takes him into Valley Mills, Valley View, Valley Wells, Smithson's Valley, Silver Valley, Pleasant Valley, Valley Junction, Pear Valley, Garden Valley, Water Valley, and Valley Springs. The last of the valleys brings him to more springs such as Apple Springs, Buffalo Springs, Camp Springs, Carrizo Springs, China Springs, Dalby Springs, Dripping Springs, Hughes Springs, Lytton Springs, Magnolia Springs, Myrtle Springs, Park Springs, Pine Springs, Red Springs, Richland Springs, Roaring Springs, Sipe Springs, Sulphur Springs, Sutherland Springs, Thorp Spring, Walnut Springs, Coldspring, Spring, Springtown, Springdale, Spring Branch, Spring Creek, Rocksprings, and so on far into the night.

This railway mail clerk, new though he may be, must do just as all the railway mail clerks have done who have gone this way before him. He must either memorize the exact location of not less than 2,100 post offices in his first year of service or be dismissed from the service. He is told that this is necessary to keep the postal service as efficient as it has been for many, many years. Without such efficiency could you depend on your letters reaching their destination very soon? Will the service stay efficient when Congress only offers the men $1.14 per hour.

HARRY A. MEISSNER,
Examiner, Railway Mail Service.

Natural-Gas Shortage in the Detroit Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address which I delivered over station WWJ in Detroit, Mich., on Thursday, May 27, 1948:

NATURAL-GAS SHORTAGE IN THE DETROIT AREA

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, I welcome the opportunity to talk with you tonight on a burning issue confronting the people of Michigan, and I don't mean to be humorous when I say that this burning issue is Michigan's natural-gas supply.

Unless this issue is met and answered without any further delays, our citizens are going to have to face it next winter in a most drastic form—face it with cold homes, closed factories, unemployment, and another boost in the cost of living.

I have before me as I speak a printed report of the hearings entitled "Fuel Investigation," which were conducted last February by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives. I was a principal advocate of the hearings and had already taken steps to bring the Michigan gas shortage before Congress when this committee scheduled the witnesses from Michigan. I also attended hearings and have since followed with great interest the efforts to prevent another gas shut-down from occurring next winter.

In my opinion, the people of Michigan are entitled to know more about this gas shortage, its origin and its solution, and the causes for its continuance, than it is possible for them to obtain from the newspaper reports, the comments of public officials and utility officials, or even from the testimony they have given under oath. The people of Michigan need this information not only for their own counsel and protection but also so that they may rally their strength to protect the cause of good government in Michigan and at Washington against the clever deceits and manipulations of selfish interests who are capitalizing on the gas shortage to serve their own aims.

It is time to rip aside much of the fakery and the buck passing in which officials of local and State governments also indulge, so that responsibilities for failures may be pinned down, should our Michigan people be forced again to endure the severe losses and discomforts and worries of unemployment caused by another gas shut-down next winter.

When I speak of buck passing, I want to call your attention to a growing habit of our State administration—from the Governor down to the office boy—to sit and twiddle their thumbs and complain that they can accomplish nothing to increase Michigan's gas supply until after some other Government agency—in this case the Federal Power Commission—has completed some other action related to the gas situation.

In order to be fair with our Republican Governor of Michigan, I wrote him on May 25, somewhat along the lines of this criticism, because I believe that he, too, has been induced to a course of action which merely aggravates and cannot possibly solve the gas shortage. I shall refer more directly to that particular matter in a moment.

Since the conclusion of the Washington hearings in February, the newspapers have repeatedly carried to their readers the 1,000 and 1 remedies advanced to cure our gas-service deficiencies in Michigan, but have you, the readers, also been told how, one by one, these simple and marvelous cures have vanished from sight, as the practitioners have concentrated on the symptoms of the disease rather than its cause?

The cause of Michigan's gas shortage is not in Washington, it is not in Wall Street, it is not in Detroit, it is not in the gas fields. The cause of the gas shortage, ladies and gentlemen, is primarily in Lansing, Mich. The cause is in Lansing because it is there where men of high public responsibility, particularly in the Governor's office and in the Michigan Public Service Commission, have been unwilling to recognize and to remove—with the tools at their command—the basic conditions which have created and even fostered the shortage of this most essential commodity in Michigan, namely, natural gas.

If it were possible for the people of Michigan to separate our Governor from all the other burdens of his office—if it were possible for the people then to hire our Governor, who is exceptionally well trained in the law, as their own special counsel in gas utility matters, then I believe the people of Michigan would shortly receive from their special counsel, our honorable Governor, this kind of report:

First, he would say to us, there is a violent, head-on clash in Michigan of two conflicting philosophies of public-utility operation. He would say to you that these conflicting philosophies are represented primarily by two great corporations whose total assets mount into the hundreds of millions of dollars. He would tell you that the names of these two huge corporations, locked in mortal combat, are the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. and the Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co.

Our Governor would speak also of the nature of the philosophies which are in such conflict, and would tell us in what degree those philosophies are in accord with the true American concept of free enterprise. The facts of the situation would compel him to state that the philosophy guiding the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. is simply this:

"We, the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., hold a monopoly in the distribution of gas at Detroit, Grand Rapids, Muskegon, and in other Michigan cities. This monopoly is a monopoly in fact, rather than in law, in Detroit, for the simple reason that we, the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., hold no franchise which grants us the monopoly by a popular vote. Franchises of that character, held by us formerly, have long expired, and our monopoly continues to exist merely because the representatives of the people—

yes, the people themselves—are almost powerless to end the monopoly.

"Accordingly, we, the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., through our use—or, maybe, our misuse—of the power and revenues growing out of our monopoly are able to dictate without fear of effective popular opposition, the terms and conditions under which we shall increase the volume of the commodity we sell. This is because other interests, having gas to sell to us, must bow to those conditions, or be denied an opportunity to market their product in the area under our absolute domination. And by this very power to keep this market closed to others, except under terms we dictate, we gather new strength with which to perpetuate our monopoly at Detroit."

Our Governor, as the people's special counsel, would tell us other things repellent to the average American's standards of decency and fair play, as exemplified by the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co.'s philosophy. He would tell us that the gas company follows the policy that the end justifies the means. In other words, that the people are better off under a monopoly where competitive enterprise is choked, and that one of the tasks of the monopoly is to lull the public into accepting the methods by which the truth of the existing situation can be concealed or distorted. One of the measures so employed by the monopoly is to employ or subsidize such persons who exercise a strategic influence in Government circles, in order that the guardians of the public good may be deceived or their good intentions frustrated.

A recent example of monopoly's operations, under its peculiar philosophy, may prove helpful. We know, of course, that our city of Detroit is one of the world's foremost industrial centers. We realize, now, that Detroit industries are so dependent upon natural gas in their processing that, without natural gas, they would quickly close their gates and, in short order, the effects of such shut-downs would be felt over the Nation, and even across the world. Therefore, in the reasoning of monopoly, it is necessary that an agent of monopoly, answerable to monopoly, shall be placed in a key position in Detroit's industrial heart. Of course, it would be inadvisable that such an agent's true status should be widely advertised.

Following this philosophy of monopoly, it is therefore understandable that Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. should bring into its employ—under the guise of labor-relations counsel—a particular man whose name is John L. Lovett. Mr. Lovett, peculiarly enough, is general manager of the Michigan Manufacturers' Association. In that position it is possible for him to withhold from members of that association such information as might be injurious to the philosophy of monopoly and to so influence the thinking and the conclusions of the membership, through control over information, as to keep high the barriers raised by monopoly to a competitive supply of natural gas.

Now, let's watch this agent of monopoly in action. Let us suppose that our Governor, as special counsel to the people of Michigan, has the time and opportunity to follow the devious workings. He would, knowing human nature, expect that monopoly would quickly seek, in any emergency, to rally the people's very own champions to monopoly's false standards. Meetings of Michigan industrialists might readily be summoned at the State capitol, and a program for State action to meet the gas shortage might be proposed. Our Governor might also be urged to solicit the assistance of the President of the United States in some phase or another of the situation where, unknown to Governor and President alike, the objectives of monopoly itself—and not the public interests—are advanced.

Just exactly this type of procedure by the agents of monopoly has recently been followed in the Michigan gas-shortage controversy. The purpose has been to deceive, if possible, even the elected leaders of our State and our Nation, but the attempt shall not succeed.

Instead I urge upon the government of the State of Michigan that it inform the world that the rights of its citizens shall not be trampled; that the enterprise of Americans everywhere can find the door standing wide open in Michigan; and that the natural-gas shortage in Michigan shall be ended, not according to the rules of monopoly versus the public, as laid down by the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., but according to the rules of free, competitive enterprise in the sale of natural gas without hindrance or interference.

It would be a travesty, indeed, should our sovereign State of Michigan bow to the terms and conditions of an increased natural-gas supply such as the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. seeks to impose. It is a fact undenied by the record that Michigan Consolidated has, in the beginning, attempted to bar the sale of natural gas after 1951 from the present source of supply, so far as millions of people in the Detroit area are concerned, and that Michigan Consolidated, only after prodding by officials of a Federal agency, has agreed that a restricted volume of such gas now so important to Michigan's welfare shall be enjoyed by the Detroit area after 1951.

And so, in conclusion, ladies and gentlemen, let me urge you again to beware of some of the buck passing that is occurring among public officials of the State of Michigan in their efforts to defend their failure to remove the basic causes of the gas shortage that afflict our general prosperity and well-being. Let the State of Michigan, once and for all, state in unmistakable terms that competitive enterprise will be afforded adequate opportunity under law, and not by the whim and caprice of bureaucratic underlings, to bring adequate natural-gas supplies to Michigan. There, in the simple American way, is the one sure guaranty of reaching a basic solution of our State's gas-shortage emergency.

I thank you and good night.

Home Rule for Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted me by the House, I appreciate this opportunity to insert in the RECORD an article by me appearing in the May issue of the American Foreign Service Journal entitled "Home Rule for Washington."

I hope that the Members of Congress will take the time to read this article because it is an effort to explain the present situation in Washington and what the Subcommittee on Home Rule and Reorganization of the District of Columbia attempted to do in H. R. 6227. The article follows:

HOME RULE FOR WASHINGTON

(By Congressman JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS)

While our friends in the Foreign Service are again striving to make the world safe for democracy, some of us here at home are seeking to democratize the government of our Capital City. If you have not been back to Washington since the war, you may not have heard that there's a fight going on there, too, a fight to restore democracy in the District of Columbia. It has become the current cause célèbre in your Nation's Capital.

I started the fight a year ago when I introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives. This resolution authorized the House Committee on the District of Columbia to study the District government and bring in recommendations for its modernization and for home rule. Responding to the rising clamor of voteless citizens and growing signs of ineptitude in the local administration, the House passed my resolution and laid the job in the lap of its Subcommittee on Home Rule and Reorganization with a modest grant to finance the study.

This subcommittee consists of the author, who is its chairman, and six other Congressmen. Three of them are Republicans: JOHN J. ALLEN, JR., of California; HOMER R. JONES, of Washington State; and ROBERT N. MCGARVEY, of Pennsylvania. And three are Democrats: CHARLES B. DEANE, of North Carolina; ROBERT E. JONES, JR., of Alabama; and JOHN L. MCMILLAN, of South Carolina. During the past year we have made an intensive nonpartisan study of this perennial problem with the aid of a small staff and the help of the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress. We have examined the present government of the District, compared it with forms of government in other comparable American cities, held extensive hearings, and received many criticisms of the present set-up and numerous suggestions for change. Inspired by the belief that democracy, like charity, should begin at home, we have taken our assignment seriously and have worked hard.

The upshot of our efforts is a new charter for the city of Washington. This charter is embodied in a bill "to provide for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia." I introduced it in the House of Representatives on January 12 last and on the same day Senator BALL, chairman of the Senate Home Rule Subcommittee, filed an identical bill in the Senate. Since then joint hearings have been held on these companion measures, they have been revised and perfected in the light of public criticism, and at the present writing they are awaiting action by the District Committees of both Houses. Despite international complications and congested congressional calendars, I believe that there is a good chance at long last of favorable legislative action this session on home rule for Washington.

We Americans like to think of the city of Washington these days as the center of world democracy—the capital of the democratic world. For the free peoples of the earth—those who are left—are looking to the United States and its capital city for spiritual and material sustenance in these critical times. Today the city of Washington has grown to almost 900,000 inhabitants. More people live here than in 13 States of the Union. They pay millions in taxes, are exceptionally literate, and have all the earmarks of an advanced culture. But they have no representation in Congress and elect none of their local officials.

In the capital city of the world's greatest democracy you might expect to find a model system of local self-government. But if you examine it as I have done during the past year as chairman of a congressional investigating committee, you will find a patchwork set-up that looks like a political Donnybrook Fair. The present government of Washington, which was established in 1874 as a temporary arrangement, has continued down to date by a process of drift and neglect, not in pursuance of any governmental principle or deliberate desire to deprive its residents of home rule. From a mere handful of agencies in 1874 it has grown like Topsy, until today

there are more than 60 local agencies rendering services to the people of the District. The whole set-up is incredibly complicated, cumbersome, and confused.

The authors of the Federal Constitution gave Congress power "to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such district * * * as may * * * become the seat of the Government of the United States." By "exclusive" they meant to exclude the States of Maryland and Virginia from any legislative authority within the Federal District. But the founding fathers did not contemplate that the residents of the National Capital would be voteless and voiceless. James Madison, who was the chief architect of the Constitution, informed the people in The Federalist that the inhabitants of the Federal District will have had their voice in the election of the Government which is to exercise authority over them. And he went on to assure them that a municipal legislature for local purposes, derived from their own suffrages, will of course be allowed them.

During the first half of their history—from 1802 to 1871—the people of Washington and Georgetown enjoyed a large measure of local self-government, electing their mayors and town councils. And from 1871 to 1874 they had a territorial form of government—similar to that of Alaska and Hawaii—with a governor and council appointed by the President and a House of Delegates elected each year by the people. In addition, the people were allowed to send a speaking but nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives as the Territories do today.

The new charter which my colleagues and I have drafted would restore home rule to Washington after a lapse of 70 years. Its objectives are threefold: (1) to relieve Congress as much as possible of the burdensome housekeeping functions of the District of Columbia while still retaining essential control in Congress as required by the Constitution; (2) to create a representative local government for the District chosen by qualified electors; and (3) to provide an efficient and economical government for the Capital City.

I believe that the adoption of our charter for Washington by Congress and its ratification by referendum will relieve our national legislature of an onerous city-council job which it ought not to have in these times when great issues of peace and reconstruction are pressing for its attention. Approval of the charter will also modernize the administrative structure of the city government which has become hopelessly outmoded and obsolete. And I am confident that it will result in better municipal services to the people of Washington at no more, and perhaps less, cost to the local taxpayers.

Our program has won overwhelming support among the newspapers and people of Washington. With a few exceptions it has been endorsed by most of the civic and social groups in the community. The opposition—such as it is—has come from those who fear the extension of democracy into the Nation's Capital because of racial prejudice, from those who fear that they may have to pay enough taxes to provide adequate municipal services, from those who might lose posts of honor or remuneration in the event of a change, or from those whose minds are so closed that they fear change in any form.

The Auchincloss-Ball bill provides the council-manager form of government for the city of Washington. Modeled on the structure of the private business corporation, this is the most efficient form of local government that the United States has produced. It was first adopted by Staunton, Va., in 1908, and has since spread to 800 American cities. Students of American Government believe that council-manager government is preferable to either the commission or mayor forms.

The qualified voters of the District of Columbia would elect a 12-man District Council and an 8-man Board of Education for 4-year terms in nonpartisan elections at large. The Council would be the governing body of the city and would pass ordinances on matters of local concern that would be immediately effective. It would also appoint a District Manager who would serve for an indefinite tenure at the pleasure of the Council. The manager would be the chief executive officer of the District government and would be responsible to the Council for the entire municipal administration, except for the Department of Education, which would be administered by a Superintendent appointed by the Board of Education, and except for half a dozen boards and commissions which would be directly under the District Council.

Among the larger cities having the manager form of government today are Hartford, Rochester, Richmond, Cincinnati, Toledo, Dallas, Kansas City, and Oakland. One hundred and twenty-five American cities have adopted this form of government during the last 2 years.

Under the Auchincloss-Ball program a new joint standing congressional committee on the District of Columbia would be established in place of the present District legislative and appropriation subcommittees in both Houses. The Joint District Committee would be composed of 15 members, of whom 9 would be Representatives and 6 would be Senators. Two of the House members and one of the Senate members of this committee would also be members of the Committee on Appropriations.

The Joint District Committee would have four main duties: (1) Review all local legislation proposed by the District Council and recommend action thereon to Congress. (2) Review all bills pertaining to the District of Columbia which are introduced by Members of Congress and report thereon to Congress. (3) Serve as a liaison between the Congress and the District of Columbia on all matters of concern to Congress collectively or individually. (4) Keep constant watch as the agent of Congress on the conduct of the District government.

The Joint District Committee would be given ample funds to employ an expert professional staff to assist it in the performance of these inspection and review functions. The staff would attend all meetings of the District Council, District budget hearings, meetings of the Board of Education, and other local agencies so as to keep fully informed of District problems. It would be the eyes and ears of the joint committee, helping it to supervise the day-to-day operations of the District government. It would be the official Bureau of Municipal Research for Congress, performing the functions of similar bureaus of municipal research in many American cities today.

Federal interests in the seat of the National Government would be protected, under the proposed program, in four main ways:

1. By the creation of a joint standing committee of Congress on the District of Columbia, in place of the present District legislative and appropriation committees, to maintain continuous oversight of the conduct of the local government.

2. By the power of Congress to veto legislative proposals submitted by the District Council, within 30 days of their submission, by joint resolution.

3. By the power of the President to veto all general legislative proposals for the District within 10 days after their approval by the Congress.

4. By the right of Congress at any time to amend or annul the organic law for the District.

A unique feature of the home-rule plan is the so-called dual voting scheme. Qualified electors of the District would include all persons, regardless of race, color, or creed, who have maintained a place of abode or have been domiciled in the District for 1 year; who are citizens of the United States; and who are 21 years old. To qualify as an elector a person would not have to surrender his legal residence or domicile in any State. Many persons who live and work in Washington have retained legal domiciles in their native States and may vote there in State and national elections. Under our plan their voting rights in their home States would not be jeopardized, so far as Congress is concerned, if they also qualified as voters in the District of Columbia.

Most of the States have assured us that there is nothing in their constitutions or election laws which would prevent their citizens from voting in local elections in the city of Washington and have indicated their willingness to cooperate with Congress in this dual voting plan. The purpose of this proposal is to maximize the size and improve the quality of the District electorate. Thousands of Government workers who have kept their State ties have a special knowledge of public affairs derived from their experience in the Federal service. Directly or indirectly, they also pay local property taxes in Washington. It would be a pity to dilute the local electorate by excluding them from the franchise. It would also result in taxation without representation.

In order to qualify for elective office, as a member of the District Council or the Board of Education, our bill also provides that candidates must be District domiciles who have resided in Washington 1 year. Thus persons domiciled elsewhere will not be able to pass ordinances for or spend the money of District taxpayers.

The Auchincloss-Ball bill would also give the District of Columbia almost complete control over its own fiscal affairs. Federal agencies would discontinue their present activities as budget officer, banker, bookkeeper, disbursing officer, and fiscal control officer for the District. Instead, the District government would be authorized to budget, appropriate, spend, borrow (within limits), deposit, disburse, and account for its own funds. Local tax bills would be drafted in the first instance by the District Council and then submitted to the Joint District Committee for review, recommendation, and congressional action.

The annual District budget would be prepared by the District Manager, amended after hearings by the District Council, reviewed by the Joint District Committee, and finally revised by the District Council in the light of the committee's recommendations. District accounts would be subject to an independent post audit by the General Accounting Office whose report thereon would be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

One of the knottiest problems in framing the new District charter has been to devise a formula for determining the annual Federal payment to the District which would be at once clear, simple, automatic, and fair to both the Federal and District Governments. Why, you may ask, should Congress make any contribution toward the cost of the government of the District? There are several answers. First, because of the national interest in the District of Columbia. The District has been the seat of the National Government since 1800. The Nation has invested hundreds of millions of dollars here over the years in public buildings and improvements, in national memorials and beautiful parks, which must be maintained and protected. The value of Federal real estate in the District of Columbia has increased until it is now 31 percent of the total value of all real estate here.

Meanwhile, the land area owned by the United States in the District has gradually expanded until it now accounts for 42 percent of the total land area within the city of Washington. The American people are

also concerned that the President and the Members of Congress and the Justices of the Supreme Court and all the other Federal officials and employees in Washington should receive adequate municipal services and should be protected in the exercise of their duties. Federal personnel accounted for 17 percent of the total population of Washington in 1947. Thus there is plenty of tangible evidence of the national interest in the national capital.

A second reason why Uncle Sam should help support his Capital City is because the local government renders a variety of services to the 200,000 Federal employees who live here. The District provides them with police and fire protection. It supplies them with water, public libraries, parks, and recreation facilities. It educates their children in the public schools, operates hospitals for their health, extends relief to those in need, and renders a variety of public welfare services. It builds and maintains streets, highways, and bridges for their travel and convenience. And it provides many other inspection and miscellaneous services to Federal employees and private citizens alike. The provision of all these local services results in District governmental costs on a per capita basis in excess of those in comparable cities. There are some who believe that this excess should be assumed by the Federal Government through appropriations especially designated for this purpose.

In the third place, it is argued that some Federal payment is due the District because all federally owned land and improvements in the District are now tax exempt. In other words, the District is deprived of any tax revenue from 42 percent of its land area. In other cities the chief industry pays the prevailing tax rate on its real property. In Washington the chief industry—the Federal Government—is tax exempt, although it disburses millions of dollars every month in pay rolls here and attracts more millions in tourist expenditures. As the Federal area expands and the private area contracts within the fixed limits of the District, while the cost of local government steadily rises, the tax burden of the dwindling number of private property owners mounts, tending to drive them in increasing numbers over the District line into nearby Maryland and Virginia. An adequate Federal payment would compensate the District for this loss of tax revenue and help to arrest the flight to the suburbs.

Presumably for such reasons as these the United States Government has made some contribution to local government expenditures in the District of Columbia throughout the history of the Federal city. National allotments for the support of local government in the Federal district have passed through three main stages since 1790. Until 1878 there was no fixed system. Aggregate payments by the United States over this 89-year period were 39 percent of all local expenditures. From 1878 until 1925 Federal payments were made on a fixed-percentage basis. From 1879 to 1920 (42 years) they amounted to 46 percent of District expenditures. From 1921 to 1924 (4 years) they were 36 percent thereof. Since 1925 there have been annual lump-sum allowances ranging from $5,000,000 in 1937 to $12,000,000 in 1948. Under the lump-sum system there has been a continuing decline in the relative importance of the Federal payment as a source of support for the District government.

From the Southard committee in 1835 to the Auchincloss committee in 1947–48 there have been many official investigations of the fiscal relations of the Federal and District Governments. And they have reached quite diverse conclusions as to the form, basis, and amount of Federal allotments. In some reports they are treated as a matter of right; in others as a matter of equity and grace. None have denied that the Federal Government should bear the expense of improvements designed particularly to advance the District as the seat of the National Government. But many have concluded that District residents and property owners could reasonably be expected to pay taxes for local purposes at least equivalent to the taxes paid by residents and property owners in comparable American cities. There has been in the reports no unanimity or even a clear consensus of opinion as to the continuing basis for the allotment and the amount to be paid by the United States.

After wrestling with this thorny problem for many months, my own committee first suggested in its preliminary report that the Federal Government should pay taxes to the District on the basis of the value of its properties and the local tax rate. We thought that this was a fair measure of the Federal interest in the District of Columbia. But objections to it were raised in our hearings on the ground that it would create a precedent for State and local taxation of Federal real estate throughout the Nation. We also considered Federal employment in the District as a possible basis, but this fluctuates so from year to year that it seemed impractical.

Perhaps the least objectionable formula would be to base the Federal payment on the net land area owned by the United States in the District which is presently 15.7 percent of the entire net landed area of the District. Known as the Overton-O'Mahoney formula, it has been twice approved by the Senate in recent years. It would yield an estimated Federal payment of about $15,000,000 in 1949. At the present writing, however, my committee has tentatively decided to recommend the ratio of the Federal payment to total locally derived revenues in 1948—14 percent—as the basis. Under this formula the Federal allotment would amount to 14 percent of the local revenues of the District government, and would fluctuaate with them from year to year.

A survey of the fiscal relationships of foreign governments with their capital cities, made before the war, showed that foreign capitals were not specially favored by national subsidies or grants for operation and maintenance of local functions simply because they are capitals, unless they were either in the initial stages of development or were rendering specific services for the National Government in return. Apart from Australia, where there are special arrangements, the government recognized a legal obligation to develop or maintain its capital. In capital cities generally the attitude of local interests toward the National Government indicated that indirect advantages derived from being the seat of government more than balance any special financial burdens which might be imposed by the presence of Government offices.

In none of the capital cities located in Federal districts was national property taxable unless it was revenue producing. In Canberra, where municipal and commonwealth enterprises are synonymous, so-called local taxes are not assessed or collected on Federal property because the Government does not tax itself. In Oslo the Norwegian Government pays all municipal taxes, excepting real-estate taxes, on its revenue-producing grain monopolies, flour mills, and other enterprises. In The Hague the Government pays municipal taxes like other institutions insofar as special payments are appropriate from the nature of the taxes—for example, the Netherlands Government pays the municipal street tax for all its buildings. In Paris the French Government pays municipal taxes on the properties that form part of its private domain and generally on all revenue-producing properties. In every country laws governing local taxation of government properties or enterprises are alike for all cities in the country, including the capital. If a government pays certain local taxes in the capital, it pays similar taxes in all other cities.

As amended in committee, the Auchincloss-Ball bill now provides for a nonvoting District Delegate in the House of Representatives. The Delegate would be elected by those qualified voters who are domiciled in the District of Columbia, for a 2-year term, at the same time other Members of Congress are elected. District residents who have retained State domiciles will be able, of course, to vote for Members of both Houses of Congress in their home States. I believe that a District Delegate to the House would be a valuable addition and would carry much of the local work load. He would be familiar with District problems and would act as its spokesman on Capitol Hill, just as the Delegates from Alaska and Hawaii now do for those Territories. He could introduce the joint resolutions on District legislation and check on their legislative progress. He would also receive petitions, consider local grievances, and otherwise care for District residents—thus freeing other Congressmen from such burdens. As a member of the Joint District Committee, he would be very useful in acquainting other members of the committee with the District viewpoint. Washington was represented in Congress by a nonvoting Delegate from 1871 to 1874 during the territorial regime. A return to this practice now will appeal, I think, to those who have been sincerely urging national representation for the District of Columbia.

We are also recommending that District voters be given an opportunity to decide whether or not they want this new form of government in an official referendum to be held next November. Then, if a majority of the voters approve of the charter, it will go into effect. Otherwise, not. I believe that such a popular referendum on the proposed charter would be democratic; it would be popular in the community; and it would be in accordance with similar practice in the States. If the voters ratify the charter, it will forever silence the criticism that home rule had been imposed upon the city against its will. The referendum would resolve for all time the doubt as to whether or not the District wants self-government. And a favorable decision would give the new government the sanction it could not otherwise have.

Viewed in the larger perspective of our times, I see this undertaking as part of a general effort to strengthen and adapt the machinery of American Government to the needs of the times in a dangerous age. The Foreign Affairs Committees of the Congress are wrestling with the machinery of international organization. The Hoover Commission is tackling the task of reorganizing the executive branch of the National Government, greatly distorted and distended by the Second World War. In the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Congress went far to modernize its own internal machinery and methods, though much remains to be done in this field. Four States (New York, New Jersey, Georgia, Missouri) have recently revised their constitutions, and one-third of the States are actively engaged in the effort to modernize their fundamental charters. Eight hundred American cities, towns, and counties had adopted the manager form of government by the end of 1947—125 of them in the last 2 years.

And now Congress is seeking in this legislation, to improve the organization of the Government of the District of Columbia and to restore a considerable measure of self-government to the National Capital City, after a lapse of three-quarters of a century.

The present voteless and disorganized character of the local government here is a standing invitation to hostile propaganda.

In these perilous times I believe the Nation cannot afford the luxury of having its national legislature perform the duties of a city council for the District of Columbia.

In the Capital City of the world's greatest democracy the American people have a right to insist upon a more modern and efficient form of government.

The people of the District themselves are looking to Congress to equip them with a governmental structure which will at once provide them better and more economical public services and safeguard the Federal interests in the seat of the National Government.

In my opinion, we cannot expect Washington to remain a politically depressed area, on the one hand, and capital of the democratic world, on the other.

Palestine—The United Nations Truce Offer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, peace in the Holy Land is universally desired, the tenets of all three great religious faiths place justice on an equal basis with peace. There is appended hereto the Palestine truce resolution of the United Nations Security Council together with an editorial on the subject from the New York Herald Tribune of May 31, 1948. As the editorial states there are inequities in this truce brought about by what seems to be the lingering will of Great Britain to favor the Arab cause. The truce offer implies, at least, good faith by Great Britain as a Security Council member, and a cessation of her support of the Arab cause:

RESOLUTION ON PALESTINE

LAKE SUCCESS, N. Y., May 29.—Following is the text of the amended British resolution on Palestine as adopted tonight by the United Nations Security Council:

The Security Council, desiring to bring about a cessation of hostilities in Palestine without prejudice to the rights, claims, and position of either Arabs or Jews;

Calls upon all governments and authorities to order a cessation of all acts of armed force for a period of 4 weeks;

Calls upon all governments and authorities concerned to undertake that they will not introduce fighting personnel into Palestine, Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Transjordan, and Yemen during the cease-fire; and

Calls upon all governments and authorities concerned, should men of military age be introduced into countries or territories under their control, to undertake not to mobilize or submit them to military training during the cease-fire;

Calls upon both parties and upon all governments to refrain from importing or exporting war material into or to Palestine, Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon, Syria, Saudi Arabia, Transjordan, and Yemen during the cease-fire;

Urges all governments and authorities concerned to take every possible precaution for the protection of and access to the holy places and of the city of Jerusalem, including access to all shrines and sanctuaries for the purpose of worship by those who have an established right to visit and worship at them;

Instructs the United Nations mediator for Palestine, in concert with the true commission, to supervise the observance of the above provisions, and decides that they shall be provided with a sufficient number of military observers;

Instructs the United Nations mediator to make contact with all parties as soon as the cease-fire is enforced with a view to carrying out his functions as determined by the General Assembly;

Calls upon all concerned to give the greatest possible assistance to the United Nations mediator;

Instructs the United Nations mediator to make a weekly report to the Security Council during the cease-fire;

Invites the states members of the Arab League and the Jewish and Arab authorities in Palestine to communicate their acceptance of this resolution to the Security Council not later than 6 p. m., New York standard time, on June 1, 1948;

Decides that if the present resolution is rejected by either party or by both, or if, having been accepted, it is subsequently repudiated or violated, the situation in Palestine will be considered with a view to action under chapter VII;

Calls upon all governments to take all possible steps to assist in the implementation of this resolution.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 31, 1948]

A COMPROMISE TRUCE

The cease-fire order voted by the Security Council over the week end has the advantage of being a compromise between British and American views. It is an advantage which few will underestimate. The drift toward a complete separation in their ideas and policies, which might ultimately have led to armed support of the Jews by the United States while Britain continued and increased its aid to the Arabs, has been an ominous one for the recovery of Europe no less than for a settlement in the Near East. What the London "Economist" has called "war by proxy" between the two English-speaking countries, upon whose cooperation so many hopes are founded, would certainly jeopardize the fulfillment of the European recovery program. A timely awareness of this danger resulted in talks between Mr. Bevin and Mr. Douglas last week, and the first sign of concessions by the British. The support which we later gave to truce proposals originated by Britain brought nearer a reconciliation and accord.

The moral force of this truce order is considerable. Not only is it backed by a major portion of world opinion, but it reflects an overwhelming need. The fighting in Palestine has progressed to full-scale war, with all the destruction which war brings in human and material terms, and with all the danger it evokes in a highly inflammable world situation. Every road to a settlement must be explored to its end. The proposed truce would at least allow the efforts of mediation under Count Folke Bernadotte to be pursued in quietness.

Having said this much, it is necessary to say also that, despite salutary amendments, the truce terms favor the Arabs, both theoretically and in practice. Under Britain's influence the Security Council has sidestepped any suggestion of aggression by the Arabs and has lent no touch of moral support to the claims of statehood put forth by Israel. It has, moreover, opened the way to an eventual settlement in Palestine different from the partition for which the Jews have already expended so much blood and sacrifice. On the practical level, the truce terms have been broadened so as to preclude the admission of new arms into the Arab countries as well as into Palestine proper; yet the chief disadvantage still falls on the Jews. For within the Arab states there are already the arms necessary to a prolonged war; but Israel's hope has been in the gathering of new supplies. For the same reason the prohibitions against training and mobilizing new recruits is a handicap for the Jewish forces.

A truce is by nature an expedient, and represents at best an approximation of justice. But peace, if it is to be lasting, must be based on something more than compromise. We must keep the hope that England and the United States will be able to agree on fundamentals, as they have now agreed on an expedient. There can be no such agreement unless the facts of partition and the legitimacy of a Jewish state are recognized.

Power Shortage in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have taken the opportunity to present to the House the critical importance of developing in an adequate, unified, and far-sighted manner the vast water resources of the great Central Valley Basin of California. It is a tragedy to my State that it has required an acute shortage of electrical power—a shortage which neither the lack of rain nor the great numbers of people coming to our State are sufficient to excuse—to make crystal clear to all our citizens that we must change our methods. We must now unify our Central Valley development under the United States Bureau of Reclamation, which for more than 45 years has been successfully carrying on the great work of western reclamation under the terms of the national reclamation law.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by Mr. C. J. Haggerty, secretary of the California State Federation of Labor, before the Central Valley's project conference held on April 24, 1948, at Governor's Hall in Sacramento, together with the April 28 issue of the Weekly Newsletter of the California State Federation of Labor:

ADDRESS BY C. J. HAGGERTY, SECRETARY OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR

I am glad to be here, and I am glad to see you here. It is high time that we came together. It is high time that we find out how we got into our trouble, and time to find how we are going to get out of it. For we are in trouble.

They told us we wouldn't be in trouble; they told us there would be no shortage of power; and they are placing large ads in the newspapers to explain that the blame lies anywhere but on themselves. I am talking about the great company to which we have given a monopoly on power, trusting to it to take care of the power needs of the Central Valley and of northern California. It is true that as long as 2 years ago the United States Bureau of Reclamation warned that we were heading toward a shortage, and with foresight asked Congress to appropriate money to generate power and to transmit it. But the president of the P. G. & E. set himself against

this measure of prudence and precaution and vision. He exerted his influence to persuade Congress not to appropriate money for California. He assured Congress we did not need it. He said to the Appropriations Committee, "There is no power shortage now, there has been none, and there will be none in the future."

I don't have to tell the members of my organization now that the prophesy of the P. G. & E. was false I don't have to tell them that Central Valley is a labor issue. They tell me. The shortage of power is reaching into their pockets now. It is cutting down their take-home pay. The State director of industrial relations made a study recently, and he can tell us how many thousands of employees have had their earnings cut, and by how many dollars, and by what percentage. My members are glad he made that study, but they no longer need studies to know that power shortages cut wages.

What the members of the California State Federation of Labor want to know—and there are a good million of them—what they want to know, is how much more are their earnings going to be cut, unless our representatives in State and Federal Government begin to listen to better advice than they have been taking up to now?

The P. G. & E. blames the power shortage on the failure of rains, on the war, on the new immigrants to California, in fact on almost anybody except themselves. They find it very convenient to forget all they have done to block the building of Central Valley. But they have made their own record, and enough of it is public so that they cannot escape the burden of its consequences. Their chickens are coming home to roost.

I am not going to recount here all the times, nor all the many ways by which the private-power moncpoly has worked to throttle down the investment of public money to develop our water and power resources. There is not time to name all the occasions on which it has used its influence to persuade the national Congress to vote down appropriations for building our Central Valley. Those efforts to block us began at least as early as 1922, and they are continuing in Washington, D. C., right down to this present month of April 1948.

The P. G. & E. has lots of ways of getting blocked what it wants to have blocked. One of them is to send its officials openly to Washington to explain that those people in California who would like Congress to appropriate more money for California's Central Valley are mistaken. Another way is to support with money received from your rates one of the highest paid lobbyists in Washington. I do not pretend to know what other ways private monopoly has to get its blocking work done, but the details of some of its less-open methods, employed in the past, have been spread with strong disapproval upon the records of government committees, where they stand for all to read.

You can't always tell when the voice you are hearing is the voice of the P. G. & E. simply by listening to its sound and trying to take note of the direction from which it comes. The reason you can't tell is because the company seems to have its Charlie McCarthys distributed around liberally, and some of them aren't sitting on the P. G. & E.'s knees where you can see them, either. But they are Charlies just the same, whether they know it or not, whether they turn up in farm organizations or in labor meetings or in veterans posts or in civic clubs, or anywhere else.

I said you can't tell them by their voice. But if you listen carefully, you can tell them by what they say. They say that to make appropriations in Washington to build transmission lines for power in California is duplication and a waste of the taxpayers money. What they mean is, that they want to build the lines themselves in order to have the privilege of collecting handsomely from the rate payers in California.

They say that government competition with private enterprise (they don't say private monopoly) isn't fair, because they pay taxes and the Bureau of Reclamation doesn't pay taxes. What they mean is, that they are glad to collect taxes from you to turn over to the State in return for the monopolistic privilege of collecting power rates from you. And they mean, besides, that they find more profitable to themselves the so-called regulation of rates by the public utilities commission, than they would find some genuine yardstick competition from an agency that has at heart the interest of the user of the power.

They say that the officials of the Bureau of Reclamation want to rule the valley. What they mean is, that they don't want their own private rule challenged by an agency dedicated to the welfare of all the people, and controlled by the people.

They say that the reclamation officials are bureaucrats and make propaganda and ought to be impeached. What they mean is, that reclamation officials will enforce the law they are sworn to enforce, are unwilling to leave in the dark the public which pays them to keep them informed, and want to see the full light of day turned on all attempts to undermine or to circumvent the reclamation law.

In 1933 the P. G. & E. made one of its big efforts. It tried to stop the Central Valley project dead in its tracks before it could get started. It tried to keep us from building any dams at all in Central Valley. It said California couldn't use the power we would generate if we did build them.

In 1933 the people of California were on the alert. In the election guide placed by the State in the hands of every voter before the Central Valley referendum was this warning:

"You will be flooded with propaganda against this measure—propaganda issued by the power companies with your money.

"But this issue is clear cut. This act will help your State. It will reduce your power rates. It is vital to every laboring man, every farmer, every businessman. It will bring you millions of dollars in rate saving, jobs for 25,000 unemployed now on charity rolls at public expense. And its great benefits cannot and will not cost you 1 cent.

"Vote for your own interest. Vote 'yes.'"

The people did vote for their own interest. They turned down the advice of the power companies and their Charlie McCarthys of that day. Then the United States Bureau of Reclamation took hold of the Central Valley Project, and dirt began to fly in the foothills and along the canal routes.

With a sense of having done well, the people relaxed from their great effort to win victory in 1933, and gradually sank into sleep, thinking all was settled and well. Hadn't they voted for dams and public transmission lines and steam plants? Wasn't the Bureau of Reclamation securely and responsibly in charge? Yes, that was all true. But the private power interests did not sleep; they bided their time. They had to wait a long time, but they knew their opportunity when it came, and they sneaked up on it quietly, so as to waken nobody.

Before I tell you how they seized their opportunity, let me tell you an old story, a story that has become a California legend. It's a story about how clever men managed to prove to the Government that land they originally had claimed under the swampland law, really had been swamp. If it was swamp, then it was theirs, and cheap. Well, in a proceeding long ago over who was legal owner of a certain piece of land, one claimant testified under oath that he had traveled all over it in a boat, proving that it must have been swamp. According to the story, it developed later that his testimony was literally true. He had gone over the land in a boat. But the boat which he navigated had been mounted securely on a wagon truck, and had been drawn by horse team over dry ground. The swamp turned out to have been desert.

There are a lot of stories of how land monopoly was created in the Central Valley, which I'm not going to tell now. But I am going to tell you what they whispered in the ear of Congress during the war in 1944. Most of us didn't hear that whisper, then.

This is what they whispered. They said, "We don't want reclamation in the Central Valley, we want flood control." Now everybody who stops a minute to think, knows that reclamation controls the flood waters and uses them to generate power and to irrigate land. What else has reclamation to make use of except the floodwaters?

But in 1944 the power interests and land monopolists saw their opportunity. So they climbed into their little boat and rowed down the corridors to the committee rooms on Capitol Hill. To prove that desert was really swamp, what they said to the Congress was, "We don't want reclamation; we want flood control." In the midst of the confusion and the bustle of the great struggle to win the war, Congress didn't take the trouble to look underneath that rowboat, to see whether the trucks and wheels of a wagon might not be there. Congress accepted the testimony for flood control at face value, and proceeded to authorize the Army engineers to build dams on the Kings, Kern, American, and other rivers in the Central Valley. On the strength of a slogan as phony as a horse-drawn rowboat on a desert—most of the Members of the Congress not realizing what they were doing—they busted into smithereens the engineering, the economic, and the legal unity of the greatest reclamation development in the United States of America.

One time and another, there are a lot of men who have taken seats in that rowboat rolling down the corridors of the Capitol. I am not going to tell you about them all, but one of our Senators sits there all the time and won't be budged, and the other is likely to climb in when the interests explaining how they want not "reclamation" but "flood control," are most in need of a bit of help to make it crystal clear that desert isn't really desert, but just plain "swamp."

There are a lot of others here to address you, so I am going to cut my talk short, by telling you only a little bit about one the rivers, the Kings, and about the Congressmen from the San Joaquin Valley who seated themselves in the rowboat, so they could make a more nautical appearance when testifying that the development of Kings River was not "reclamation," oh, no, not "reclamation," but only "flood control."

Long ago the Bureau of Reclamation had the first authorization to reclaim the water resources of the Kings River, all of them. These two Congressmen weren't satisfied to get behind that authorization and secure promptly the appropriations to give us the power and irrigation we need. No, one of them introduced instead a competing bill to give the Kings River to the Army engineers. Then, in 1944, when the Bureau of Reclamation asked for money to begin prompt construction, the other Congressman stood up in the rowboat and told Congress we didn't want any money for power and reclamation; all we wanted, he said, was "flood control." And he killed that appropriation for power and irrigation to serve his own district, in 1944.

I am sorry to say that in the printed records I can find nothing to indicate that the State engineer of California, whose professed pride is in the development of the waters of our State, lifted either voice or pen to help get power and irrigation on Kings River started in 1944. He, too, must have been sitting in the rowboat.

Indeed, I'm sure he was there, because the next year, in 1945, he found his voice readily enough and joined the others chanting "flood control." Although he had not found wait-

ing difficult in 1944, in 1945 he just couldn't wait any longer to get Pine Flat Dam started by the Army engineers, without any power, of course.

Nineteen hundred and forty-four was only 4 years ago. But in that time we've had time enough to look under the rowboat. Now we can all see the dry ground underneath, and the wheels of the wagon, and the hoofs of the horses plodding along in the dust. But because we let that rowboat roll by without inspection in 1944 you have to turn out now before a hearing of the Federal Power Commission on May 17 in Fresno, in order to keep the P. G. & E. from taking dam sites on the Kings River, where the power plants of the Bureau of Reclamation were blocked by the Congressmen from the valley.

It isn't only power that the landlubbers in that rowboat are getting away with. You veterans, and you family farmers with sons who hope for a better chance to farm when excess landholdings are sold off in obedience to reclamation law, you know now that the engineers do not intend to give you full and strict enforcement of that law. What move have they made to enforce it, even though the chairman of the Flood Control Committee on Capitol Hill gave the most explicit assurances on the floor of Congress that the 160-acre water limitation would be applied for the public benefit?

And the story on the Kern and on the American Rivers will be like unto the story on the Kings.

To you men of labor whose earnings already have been trimmed by power shortage, and to all others who do not know when your income, too, will be trimmed for the same reason; to you farmers whose water supplies for irrigation have been running short, and whose power bills are growing; to you veterans who believe that the 160-acre water limitation ought to be enforced; to you business and professional people whose prosperity depends, not upon great holdings with laborers alternating between feast and famine, but upon thriving communities of working farmers supplied with plenty of cheap power and smaller power bills; to all of you I say that the way out of our trouble is to repair the unity that was broken by the Flood Control Act of 1944. Our program is for full development of the water resources of the entire valley basin by the Bureau of Reclamation under the terms of the great national reclamation law. In this struggle to deny special benefits to special interests, and to distribute fairly and equitably the wealth and welfare which reclamation can bring, the California State Federation of Labor will be found by your side, fighting to the finish.

[Weekly News Letter from California State Federation of Labor, April 28, 1948]

CENTRAL VALLEY'S PROJECTS CONFERENCE MAPS FIGHT AGAINST POWER AND WATER SHORTAGES

SAN FRANCISCO.—Approximately 800 delegates, representing farmers and organized labor throughout California, assembled at the mass convention of the Central Valley's project conference in Sacramento at Governor's Hall on Saturday, April 24. Keynoting the convention, George Sehlmeyer, master of the State Grange and chairman of the Central Valley's project conference, emphasized the threat to employment and agriculture as a result of the deepening power crisis brought on by the P. G. & E.

C. J. Haggerty, secretary of the California State Federation of Labor, delivered the principal speech, reviewing the fight that has been waged against the power utilities, which have sought to circumvent the full development of adequate water and power for the benefit of agriculture as well as the urban centers.

The gathering decided to set up a permanent investigating committee to probe the expenditure of funds by unknown persons, corporations, and the treasury of California, and to bring to light subversive and disruptive activities against development of the State's power resources, to demand that the public utilities commission explain why it did not warn the State of the power crisis a year ago. It reaffirmed its position to continue to fight for the construction of multiple-purpose power and water installations by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior rather than by the Army engineers, and for retention of the 160-acre limitation; to bring suits against P. G. & E. to refund stand-by charges running into millions of dollars paid by the farmers for power they never received. The P. G. & E. was scored time and again as being an obstructive monopoly, serving its own economic interests rather than the general welfare of all the people in the State.

C. J. Haggerty addressed the morning session in which he outlined the main phases of the development of the fight for State power and the objectives for which the conference should strive.

A great number of the delegates represented AFL trade-unions throughout the State of California who are vitally interested in this fight for cheap water and power.

It is hoped that as a result of this convention, the Central Valley's project conference would be resuscitated to become an active and functioning body, molding as well as mobilizing all the forces in the State of California to oppose the present efforts to emasculate the Central Valley's projects development.

The new executive committee elected by the convention will undoubtedly implement the decisions that were reached. Future meetings will be held by this body, with the likelihood of another huge convention some time in the future.

A New Look at the Oil Picture—What's the Matter With the Oil Business?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a copy of a speech delivered before the International Oil Congress, Tulsa, Okla., May 18, 1948, by the Honorable Ernest O. Thompson, chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission. The oil conservation and regulatory body of the Nation's greatest oil-producing State is the Texas Railroad Commission.

This publication was sent to me by Elmer Patman, attorney, of Houston, Tex., and I agree with what he said concerning Colonel Thompson that—

Aside from the fact that I consider Colonel Thompson the best-informed man on oil in government service, this speech is particularly pertinent, in my opinion, at this time because of the thought and simple clear-cut approach made to the problem discussed.

I have personally known Colonel Thompson for 25 years and I have never known a more sincere, conscientious, and effective public servant in my life. I consider him the world's outstanding expert on petroleum.

His address was as follows:

People are asking this question: "What is the matter with the oil business?" The answer is simply, there is nothing the matter with the oil business—nothing except growing pains.

All over the world people are using more petroleum products. Those nations who have used oil in the past are demanding ever-increasing petroleum supplies. The countries who used little or no oil heretofore are finding petroleum a truly great blessing. Everywhere in the world more oil is demanded.

No longer is it a matter of selling petroleum products. The problem today in oil is to fill the ever-greater demand—world-wide.

You know, it is so easy to find fault and criticize the other fellow. On every side you hear talk of what's wrong with the city, what's wrong with the State, the Nation, and what's wrong with the world. We are in the critical period of fault finding.

How much more refreshing life could be if we would put more accent on the positive. Look for the good. Be constructive.

Actually the oil industry has done one of the most remarkable supply jobs in all history. It is unexcelled. We oiled the war successfully. Oil contributed hugely to our victory in the air, on the sea, and on the land all over the globe.

I personally know from inspection on the ground in the field of combat that the oil was delivered when, where, and as needed. The oil industry is one of the forgotten heroes of this last war and War I.

We, as a people, are too impatient to give this great wartime heroic industry materials and time enough to bring the oil-production plant up to date in view of the undreamed of increase in demand for gasoline, oil, and petroleum products.

It is my deliberate judgment that within 2 years the oil supply will be adequate. I hope I may say, with modesty, that this is an informed opinion.

Keep in mind that before War II we had great overproduction of oil in America. Large unneeded and wasteful stocks of crude were on hand in tanks above ground. Enormous new oil fields were discovered in the United States, and the oil from these new fields had to be permitted to orderly share in the market demand. Room had to be made for their output. Overproduction staggered the industry.

The oil-producing States, the industry, the State regulatory bodies, and the courts worked sensibly, reasonably, and legally together to solve this problem of orderly production control to prevent physical waste in the production of this natural resource.

The problem was solved and today there is no industry, in my opinion, better prepared and better fortified to meet the growing demands of the coming years.

The very fact of too much oil made vitally necessary the study cooperatively by business, lawmakers, and scientists. Then followed the passage by the oil States of wise conservation laws, controlling the production of oil and gas to prevent physical waste in such production. Market-demand laws were passed which say that production of oil in excess of market demand is waste.

The legal prevention of waste is as old as the common law. Nobody in his right senses wants waste committed in the production of an irreplaceable natural resource.

These laws, both market demand and waste prevention in nature, have been upheld by all of our courts, including the United States Supreme Court.

Conservation of oil and gas in the United States is thoroughly grounded in public opinion, accepted and practiced by the industry and thoroughly ingrained in our laws. Conservation is here to stay.

Conservation means the orderly production of oil and gas in a manner that will prevent waste and protect correlative rights of the owners. Conservation does not mean the locking up of our resources.

At the present time, the market-demand statute plays no part in oil-production con-

trol. The market-demand law comes into play only when production exceeds demand. This is simply because the market demand today exceeds the oil that can be produced under sound engineering principles. This is quite a transition from the old days of overproduction. Then the question was how to have ratable takings—giving every producer a fair share in the market.

Today America is producing every barrel of oil it is possible to produce under sound engineering production practices. We could, of course, produce more oil for a short while, but such a procedure would do irreparable harm for the wells and would mean less oil in the end. Much oil would be left in the ground unproduceable by known methods.

The most efficient rate of oil production is that rate which will, in the long run, get the most oil out of the reservoir. The most efficient rate of flow, if followed, will cause to be left in the ground the least possible amount of oil under presently known methods.

Under our old open-flow method of oil production, we left in the ground in the United States, unrecovered, perhaps 100,000,000,000 barrels of oil in the older oil fields. In the old days, we let oil wells gush and blow their heads off. The pressure was prematurely dissipated. This wasteful procedure resulted in a very small percentage of recovery. In that way we left those estimated 100,000,000,000 barrels of oil in the ground.

Research may show, and I think will show, how to recover many billions of barrels of this hidden oil—hidden in the rocks and sands of old thought-to-be-depleted oil fields. The industry and our institutions of learning are everywhere at work on this research. We are going forward with conversion of natural gas into gasoline. Experiments and pilot plants are showing the way to get petroleum out of shale and coal economically.

Science is going forward with demand. Research is the order of the day, both by industry and colleges and schools all over the land.

The Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Krug, announced in Tulsa in May the most heartening thing yet heard from Government. It was that the Government of the United States is not going into the shale oil conversion business. He said rather the Government would encourage private industry to do this job. This sort of Government encouragement to industry will renew our faith in American ideals. Such a Government policy will take fear out of the hearts of the oil industry. It restores hope and faith in free enterprise.

Lately we have been hearing much talk about nationalizing our oil industry. Many articles have been written and at least one book has been published, finding fault with the oil industry in that there have been spot shortages of gasoline and heating oil in the United States.

We are a very impatient people, and it seems we cannot gracefully tolerate even spot shortages of anything the lack of which inconveniences us in the slightest. Little credit, if any, if given to the great achievement of today's all-time high petroleum production. It's an outstanding industrial achievement. We should be proud of such results in industry.

When we point out that we are far ahead of even wartime output in oil, the critics simply yawn and say, where is my refiner going to get the crude oil he needs? Or where are my constituents going to get their heating oil?

Eighteen committees of Congress are investigating the oil shortages. The Armed Services Committee has just released a report calling serious attention to our need for 2 million barrels additional oil daily for military purposes, should war come. This committee gives the industry six short months to show that the needs can be met. A bill was introduced in this Congress, setting up complete Federal oil control (the Hartley bill). This bill, of course, got nowhere. But its very introduction was a threat of Federal control.

The very fact that so many committees of Congress are working on oil shortages keeps many oil company executives going to Washington, testifying in Washington—preparing for testifying and coming back from Washington that the wonder is they have any time to attend to business. Washington has just about become their real headquarters.

All because of a few spot shortages of gasoline and heating oils. Are we not a little impatient? Should we not rather give credit for the magnificent job that has been done instead of faultfinding over minor shortages.

It should be remembered that from 1941 through 1945 no steel was available to bring the oil plant up to its needs. The only supplies furnished were for wartime products, such as aviation gasoline. Still every war need for oil was promptly met.

Had the generally predicted depression come after VJ-day, as was so direfully forecast, we would have had a surplus of oil. The market demand would have been far below supply. The oil plant, before the war, was set up for about 5,000,000 barrels per day capacity. That capacity was far beyond the fondest dream of the most optimistic oil economist. No one ever, before the war or at any time during the war, seriously thought that peacetime postwar America would by 1945 consume or market 5,000,000 barrels of oil either here in America or in export.

Such demand seemed fantastic.

Overproduction beyond market demand was the posed problem. For years the oil surplus in the United States had been the problem. No one I have heard thought differently. If so, they kept it very secret.

How quick the transition. It is just another chapter in the American success story. Our frontier is still to be explored industrially. This temporary shortage is being met by the expenditure of $4,000,000,000 by the oil industry to bring the plant from five to six million barrels daily capacity.

Research, scientific advances, American initiative and free enterprise—if left unhampered and unfettered by Government interference, will get the job done—and done in an orderly fashion. The less interference, the more promptly this job will be accomplished. The oil industry stands as one of the greatest monuments to private enterprise. It is the supreme vindication of the American way of life in business.

Central Valley Project Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, a great convention was held in Sacramento at Governor's Hall on the 24th of April. Called by the Central Valley project conference, it was attended by some 800 citizens and delegates from farm, labor, veteran, and other civic organizations.

The chairman of the conference is George Sehlmeyer, master of the California State Grange, and the chairman of the resolutions committee at the Sacramento convention was C. J. Haggerty, secretary of the California State Federation of Labor.

The shortage of power in California this spring has only served to spread more generally among our citizens an awareness of the stakes in the long struggle against monopoly which the Central Valley's project conference and its affiliated organizations have been making for years.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the declaration of principles adopted by the Central Valley project conference at Governor's Hall:

P. G. & E. STRANGLING CALIFORNIA'S ECONOMY, DECLARES CONVENTION

DECLARATION OF PURPOSES

Adopted by the water and power convention assembled April 24 in Governor's Hall, Sacramento, under auspices of the Central Valley Project Conference.

1. We view with apprehension the water and power shortages now being endured by the people of California and we warn against the dangers to our economy inherent in the failing supplies of these life-giving resources.

In light of this alarming situation, we are shocked and alarmed over what is apparently a well-financed and well-directed campaign of vilification directed at the one public agency implemented by law and capable of developing a positive program to save this State from future disaster—the Bureau of Reclamation now building the first dam and other works of the great Central Valley project.

We are convinced that these attacks are managed and financed by interests seeking to seize the fruits of public interprise in order to privately profit from the expenditure of Federal money. We rebuke such selfish interests and unite behind a broad program for the immediate and comprehensive development of the unused water and power resources of California for the benefit of all its people.

2. We have noted and we endorse the public utterances of Governor Warren when he urged that we "put every drop of water to work"; that transmission lines must be built to convey the power from Shasta Dam to the users, and his other statements urging rapid completion of the Central Valley project, Folsom Dam, Monticello Dam, and other public works. To this end we urge that the people of California, united by the common need, unanimously support the comprehensive plan of the Bureau of Reclamation for the Central Valley Basin, designated to put to work for all possible purposes all of the undeveloped waters of the great Central Valley and contiguous areas. We endorse all other financially feasible multiple-purpose water and power projects for other parts of the State.

We urge Governor Warren to implement his public utterances and expressed ideals by rebuking and correcting members of the governor's official family who consistently sabotage and obstruct these great plans for water and power development by lobbying against them at State expense delaying and hampering the quick and orderly building of these works. We hold that the State government should be a militant and enlightened leader in seeking Federal funds, under existing Federal laws. We hold that State employees, elective or appointive, have no legal or moral right or standing in using State funds with which to pay their expenses for frequent trips to the national capital to lobby against Federal laws or to present their personal viewpoints on matters not clearly defined by the State legislature as the policy of the State of California. We

hold that the practice of using State funds to pay such expenses is unlawful and cannot be justified from any standpoint.

3. We urge immediate expansion of our public power generating and transmission facilities and their tie-in to public and private power works of the entire Pacific coast and mountain States of the West. We envision for California and the West a private-public power grid, similar to and an extension of that already in existence in the Northwest, to insure maximum use of all available power producing and transmission facilities, now in existence or capable of being developed in the foreseeable future. We do not urge a public power monopoly or any measure hampering the legitimate operations of private initiative in the power field. But we do most solemnly warn the private-power company that its continued schemes to thwart public enterprise in this field will so arouse the people to action that the company's participation in this profitable endeavor may be ended altogether.

We are aware of our vanishing supplies of oil and other fuels required for agricultural, industrial, and domestic purposes or for auxiliary generation of electric power, and we are determined that those supplies shall be conserved by substituting the natural and nonwasteful resources of hydroelectric power, developed by all possible means and with the greatest possible dispatch.

4. We are grateful to the Congress for providing funds, and to the bureau of reclamation for planning and building these works, and we bespeak the further and urgent attention of Congress to our great need for their completion and expansion. However, we do urge the Congress to clarify the separate functions of the Corps of Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.

We recognize while it was the obvious intent of Congress in the 1944 flood control act, to assign the building and operation of predominantly flood control projects to the Army and predominantly conservation projects to the bureau, the language of this law is so ambiguous that its intent is being misinterpreted and openly flaunted.

The Corps of Army Engineers today may boast of its invasions into the field of conservation. And because the Army is not bound by the protective clauses of the reclamation law, the big land and power interests, eager to nullify and evade these public safeguards, are backing the Army's forays into the reclamation program. We have protested, and continued to protest, assignment to the Army of such projects as Pine Flat, Isabella, Folsom Dam, and other obviously conservation works in the heart of the Central Valley project.

We urge an immediate halt to the invasion of this and other fields of civilian activity by the military. We recognize and affirm that military control of the basic resources of the State and Nation is an issue that goes far deeper than a mere jurisdictional dispute between two Federal agencies and that it is a dangerous step toward militarization of our economic and political life, a threat to our democratic way of life. Congress should take immediate steps to halt this trend before it is too late.

5. We urge strict adherence to another time-tested principle of Americanism and equality of opportunity in the development of our water resources—that of the family-type farm. Many efforts have been and are being made to destroy or nullify the 46-year-old 160-acre provision of reclamation law. This fair and just provision, we hold, simply means that each landowner, regardless of how much land he owns, is entitled to an equal share of water developed by interest-free Federal money, his equal share being water enough for 160 acres, or if married, for 320 acres. Big corporate and often absentee landowners have spared no effort or money in their efforts to crush this law as it applies to California's Central Valley. Unable to win outright repeal in the face of overwhelming popular support of this law, these interests now seek its evasion by promoting State or Army assumption of the project. In the interest of fairness to small landholders and of opportunity for war veterans and others to secure a foothold on the land, these subversive schemes must not be allowed to succeed.

6. Finally, we see the positive need of establishing once and for all a means by which the preponderant majority of the people of California in all walks of life, may make known their united beliefs, opinions, and desires on these matters. We cannot continue to go to the Congress for authorization and funds to build these needed works—works too expensive for private or State financing—talking in a babel of quarreling voices. We must have a definite policy established as the official policy of the State of California and its people and for which all, with decent regard to democratic government, will strive to attain.

We cannot rely further upon our luck, or our climate, or our vaunted destiny. We must act at once to provide ample supplies of low-cost water and power for our farms, for our cities, for our industries, lest we see progress halted in its tracks and turned back at the border of our State where eager thousands of families seek homes and gracious living in our midst.

By their present rule-or-ruin tactics, the big self-seeking power and land interests are betraying our State in its present crisis and seeking to sell out its golden opportunity for future greatness.

A united California can meet this, the greatest challenge in our history; a divided California will surely fail.

We invite all other organizations, groups, and individuals in California to join with us in an all-out effort to solve these basic problems through united action.

United Nations Building Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, while the Congress considers the approval of the loan agreement between the United States and the United Nations, which will provide $65,000,000 for building of the United Nations permanent center in New York, the money being fully secured, the editorial views expressed on this subject will be of interest to Members. There follow editorials from the Detroit News of May 27, the Washington Post of June 1, and the New York Times of May 27. In view of the fact that it is clear now that the Congress will express itself on means for strengthening the United Nations, the debate on the subject of building the UN center will have had its full effect, and we shall be encouraging the UN to develop and prosper, we shall be giving it solidity and permanence, and we shall be underwriting our faith in it at the same time that we specify the lines along which we will work to see it strengthened. These are excellent ways in which to insure the success of our efforts to strengthen the United Nations.

[From the Detroit News of May 27, 1948]

WE OWE IT TO OUR FAITH IN UN

Those Congressmen who at present are hesitating to vote the loan of $65,000,000 to the United Nations for construction of the headquarters in New York may feel they have some support for their position from the latest Gallup poll. It shows that only one American voter in five thinks that UN is satisfactory.

But reason replies that UN can never succeed unless its main chance is provided by intelligent support from this country.

We are not giving it that when our legislators hesitate to act on this matter mainly because of the desire to avoid "unnecessary spending" in the face of an election.

Because the site is in the United States—at our invitation—there is no way to finance the building project except with dollars, and we are the only nation in position to provide the dollars.

We could, of course, make an additional loan to other states under ECA, and they could send the dollars back to us to finance the UN building. But that would be outright foolishness.

We can agree at this point with the four out of five that UN has not been satisfactory. But we will add to that that it will never be satisfactory so long as Americans continue to think of UN mainly as a refuge which will give us sanctuary from our national responsibilities in the existing world crisis.

It will never work on any such basis.

Because we are the strongest Nation on earth, UN can never develop the requisite strength except through strong support by this country.

That means a continuing willingness to take unilateral action in those affairs which require a courageous stand by this country, instead of passing the buck and then decrying UN because the matter isn't handled.

Likewise, it means a willingness to invest our dollars now in a great historic experiment which has no chance of success if, through lack of faith, we deprive it of our backing.

[From the Washington Post of June 1, 1948]

CONFIDENCE IN UN

After all the concern voiced on Capitol Hill over strengthening the United Nations, it would be the height of inconsistency for Congress to deny the UN the means with which to establish its permanent home in New York. We are confident that Congress does not intend to let the UN down in that fashion. The danger is that legislation approving the $65,000,000 interest-free loan negotiated between Delegate Warren Austin and UN Secretary General Trygve Lie in March may be shunted aside in the adjournment rush. A long road remains before the loan can be made effective. Authorizing legislation must be reported out by committees and passed by both Houses, and then funds themselves must be voted. To accomplish all this by the latter part of June will require spirited leadership. Meanwhile the United Nations remains, in effect, a sort of nervous tenant leasing quarters at Lake Success. If nothing else, this transient atmosphere presents a poor psychological background for deliberations so intimately connected with world peace.

The urgency of the loan is increased by the fact that plans are at a standstill until the money is forthcoming. Land donated to the UN along New York's East River has been cleared, and everything is in readiness to begin construction. The $65,000,000 will provide for an office building, a library, a large conference hall to house the General Assembly and another meeting hall for the Security Council and other UN bodies. New York City already has evinced its faith in the

venture by authorizing accompanying improvements costing $13,000,000.

There is no question about the soundness of the investment; the entire amount of the loan will be recoverable. All that remains is for Congress to meet its responsibility toward the organization it helped create. Perhaps an end can be put to the dawdling by reflection on the probable consequences if Congress should fail to act. Not only would our delegate stand repudiated before the nations with which he is dealing, but, far worse, the inaction would be widely interpreted as a vote of no confidence in the United Nations.

[From the New York Times of May 27, 1948]

A HOME FOR UN

The agreement for a $65,000,000 interest-free loan from the United States to the United Nations for the erection of a permanent home for that organization in this city was signed more than 2 months ago by Senator Austin and Trygve Lie. It still lacks congressional approval. The matter must be brought to a prompt vote if it is to be disposed of at this session.

The legislative delay seems to hang chiefly on the fact that this is a political year. Some Members of Congress feel that if they can dawdle along without facing a vote their future prospects will be improved. Everybody else is ready to go. All plans for a group of fine buildings on the East River are complete. The city has authorized improvements to the approaches which will cost about $13,000,000. The power machinery of the builders stands idle, waiting for the word of command to start work.

As an ordinary business risk the proposal is indisputably sound. Every dollar put into the enterprise will be recoverable. But there are considerations far beyond and above that. We have committed ourselves to this project. Or national prestige, as well as that of the United Nations, is involved. If we believe our own assertions that we are backing the UN to the fullest extent, and hope that it may survive and expand as the world's first guaranty of future peace, we should be prepared to prove it. Congressional approval of this loan would supply proof in a substantial manner. Senator IVES' and Mr. JAVITS' joint resolution should be passed without further delay.

Britain's Conduct

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a reprint of a letter addressed to the editor of the London Times by Hon. Lyall Wilkes, which appeared in the New York Post on May 28, 1948:

BRITAIN'S CONDUCT AS REVIEWED BY THE EMINENT ENGLISHMAN LYALL WILKES, MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT, IN HIS LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF THE LONDON TIMES, ON MAY 22, 1948

To the EDITOR OF THE LONDON TIMES:

SIR: Maj. Gen. Sir Edward Spears, in stating that Zionism has endangered British bases in the Mediterranean and represents a threat to British strategic interests, surely conveniently forgets not only that many of the present Arab political and military leaders, including Fawzi El Kawukji and the Mufti, either spent the war in Germany working for Hitler or had to be interned by us, but forgets also what happened in the Middle East between 1939 and 1945.

In 1944 Brigadier Glubb (now leading the Arab Legion in its assault against Jerusalem, and no pro-Zionist surely), writing when the Arab war effort was still close enough to defy even Foreign Office attempts to romanticize it, said:

"At the time of these operations every Arab was perfectly convinced that Britain was finished forever and that it could only be a question of weeks before Germany took over Arabia. The Iraqis were perfectly sure of this or they would not have declared war on us * * * in brief, during the 6 weeks before the fall of Baghdad every Arab was convinced that we were done for. Every Arab force previously organized by us mutinied and refused to fight for us or faded away in desertion. (Pp. 214–215 of Somerset de Chair's The Golden Carpet.)

No doubt when Glubb wrote this he would remember (what General Spears has forgotten) that, although the Jewish population in Palestine was only half that of the Arab, more than twice the number of Jews volunteered for service to protect our Mediterranean position; and that at the time when the Iraqis declared war against us, and British tanks had to be driven into the Abdin Palace yard to compel King Farouk's consent to the appointment of a pro-British Government under Nahas Pasha, Haganah men were being dropped as British agents in enemy territory, that Haganah was recognized by GHQ as the one reliable local defense force and Palestine the one base whose loyalty was never in doubt for a moment.

And what now? No doubt if British officers and British-supplied tanks and airplanes continue the destruction of Jewish settlements and life, we shall earn the bitter hatred of the Jews of Palestine. Is that surprising—a symptom of Zionist original sin? It is a policy of choice for the British Government which will determine whether Israel becomes once more an ally, as in the war, or an enemy beleaguered by British arms and equipment who must look elsewhere for aid for sheer survival. And may I say that our attitude—that Israel must show itself capable of functioning before being recognized by us—would sound more honest if it were not troops trained and equipped by British military missions and the British officered and subsidized Arab Legion, which were at war with Israel to prevent precisely that functioning?

Does public opinion at home appreciate (as it does abroad) that every tank and airplane now being used by the Arabs has been supplied from the United Kingdom; that the British air mission is still functioning in Iraq; that British missions are now working, training, and reequipping Arab armies in Saudi Arabia and Iraq; that between 1945 and 1947 we supplied Egypt alone with 40 military aircraft, 38 scout cars, and 298 carriers, apart from a great quantity of small arms and light equipment; that the Arab Legion now waging war is wholly subsidized by us with £2,000,000 a year and is commanded by 38 British officers; that Transjordan under the March 1948 treaty is bound to "undertake not to adopt in regard to foreign countries an attitude which is inconsistent with the alliance or might create difficulties for the other party thereto"; that no word of protest has come from the British Government at the Arab invasions, but that the Jews within the boundaries given them by the United Nations partition decision (which still stands) are denied arms by the British?

Finally, the foreign office viewpoint conveyed by your diplomatic correspondent on May 20 that "it should not be assumed that Transjordan is acting as an aggressor until it can be shown that she has acted aggressively towards another State" (obviously meaning a State recognized by us) smacks a little too much of the legalistic chicanery of the thirties which reduced Japan's war on Manchuria to the status of an incident and in so doing destroyed the League of Nations. Will we never learn that we cannot subsidize aggression in the Middle East and oppose it in Greece or Persia, that to climb now into the grandstand and attempt to wash our hands of responsibility for the slaughter perpetrated by our Spitfires and British trained and officered Arab troops is conduct utterly unworthy of the traditions of a great nation and indicates a moral degeneration within the political leadership of this country far more alarming than any signs of a merely materialistic or economic decline?

I am, sir, yours, etc.,

LYALL WILKES.

House of Commons, May 20.

(Presented as a Public Service by International Latex Corp., Playtex Park, Dover, Dela.)

("You and every man in business are trustees of this Nation and the world.")

Mr. Speaker, I commend this letter specifically to the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] so that during the course of his threatened investigation of the International Latex Corp. he does not overlook the fact that English sentiment is also overwhelmingly against Britain's misconduct with reference to the state of Israel.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I append a copy of an editorial from the Virginia Farm Bureau News entitled "We Should Know Better":

WE SHOULD KNOW BETTER

The reciprocal trade-agreements program under which the United States is attempting to work out with other nations some sensible and constructive adjustments in international tariff barriers is getting a little more than its share of unjust and ill-founded criticism from people who, judging from their pronouncements, have taken a very narrow view of the situation.

We are generally unanimous in our opinions that in order to have continued prosperity in this country we must maintain our export markets for the surpluses which we produce. However, we are by no means in agreement on the subject of imports—we want to sell but generally we balk like a sick mule when other nations wish to sell us something—too many of us think that international trade should be a one-way street. Those of us who think of international trade in this manner are guilty of muddled thinking, to say the least.

The standard of living of any nation may be measured by a very simple formula: Total production plus imports minus exports equals the total of goods and services available for domestic consumption. Whenever exports consistently exceed imports our standard of living is lowered—not raised. Under the reciprocal trade-agreements program we are attempting to bring about a proper balance between our exports and imports.

At the present time we are solving the problem of dollar shortage in foreign countries by gifts and loans of such size as to all but stagger the imagination, and some of us are so foolish as to consider this a sound basis for long-term prosperity. Have we so soon forgotten the fool's paradise in which we lived prior to the collapse in 1929?

We must help other nations get back on their feet, yes, but except from a humanitarian standpoint our expenditure will be a very poor investment unless we can work out with other nations a sensible program which will return to our people in the way of imports, material benefits equivalent in value to the goods and services made available through exports to peoples in foreign lands. While our present policy of permitting our exports to vastly exceed the amount and value of imports may be fully justified by existing emergency conditions, if followed for any considerable period such a policy can only lead to the early exhaustion of our natural resources and the impoverishment of our people. It is high time we stopped thinking of our supplies of such things as iron, copper, and petroleum as inexhaustible and give some thought to the conservation of these materials along with our vital soil.

Even here in the South there are those who would gladly consign the reciprocal trade agreements program to the ashcan. What disposition, may we ask, do these people propose to make of the South's enormous surpluses of tobacco and cotton? Rather than let these commodities rot in our warehouses might it not be better to exchange them for some of the potash, nickel, tin, chrome, manganese, ore, rubber, and drug ingredients along with a great many additional items in short supply which our friends across the seas can furnish us to the mutual advantage of all parties concerned?

Let us not again shut ourselves up like a clam behind tariff walls reaching to the sky or stick our heads in the sand like an ostrich and try to fool ourselves into thinking that we can get along and let the rest of the world go hang. If we do this eventually we will learn to our sorrow that the immortal query, "Am I my brother's keeper?" has economic as well as spiritual implications.

We should know by now that excessively high tariffs not only lead to economic stagnation here and abroad—worse still they lead to war.

The Pacific Regional Conference on UNESCO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago a great conference was held in San Francisco, Calif., to which more than 3,000 official delegates of major organizations in the Pacific-coast region came at their own expense. This was a meeting entitled "The Pacific Regional Conference on UNESCO," and was established to afford members of the major private organizations in this country, particularly those from the seven States and two Territories in the Pacific region, an opportunity to develop a specific means by which they and their organizations and communities can contribute to the great work of the international United Nations' Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

To me this meeting is particularly significant in that it indicates that the people of this country have by no means given up the fight for peace. They will mobilize and work as constructively for peace as they do for war if given proper leadership and assistance.

The following is an editorial which appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle on May 13, 1948:

GRASS ROOTS UNDERSTANDING OF UNESCO FUNCTION

The 3,000 delegates assembling today in San Francisco to take up the work of UNESCO are not world-famous personages like the statesmen who 3 years ago met here to write the Charter of the United Nations. But 3 years of experience with UN has clearly shown the need for acquiring the support and understanding of ordinary men and women in order to achieve the aims and purposes of the Charter. UNESCO is a harness in which individuals and organizations can pull toward peace.

The initials stand for United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. It is one of 12 specialized agencies of the UN, and its basic plan of operation is to bring all the aids of science, education and culture and all the means of modern social institutions to bear upon the problems of world peace. The theory of Pacific Regional Conference, meeting here, is that men and women of good will should study the potential uses of science, education, and culture in developing international understanding.

These may sound like lofty generalities, but if they do, they are misleading. For the agenda of discussion which the delegates from seven Western States, Hawaii, and Alaska will thrash over today, tomorrow and Saturday are full of hard, practical, specific ideas and searching questions.

Take the agenda on communications. "How much communication is there through the iron curtain?" it asks. "Is communication growing more difficult or less? Is propaganda warfare desirable? Is it desirable for the United States if the Russians indulge in it whether we do or not? Is an objective and factual propaganda possible?"

Equally apt questions are posed for discussions on cultural interchanges, education, human and social relations and the natural sciences. Beneath the high-sounding statement that its ultimate function is to help mankind build a peace, UNESCO offers these provocative explorations of how you go about doing that highly desirable job.

Nothing so tidy as a Charter can come out of these deliberations among 3,000 persons. You don't remove ignorance, hatred and fear and resolve misunderstandings and suspicions merely by writing a preamble of intent to do so. UNESCO does not deal with only 11 nations in a Security Council or with 58 in a General Assembly, but rather sets out to reach the individual mind at the grass roots all over the world. It is gigantic assignment.

Reflections on a War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by Max Lerner, which appeared in PM on May 27, 1948:

REFLECTIONS ON A WAR

ON THE QUESTION OF AGGRESSION

After the Arab refusal of a truce, can there be doubt any longer that the Arabs are the aggressors in the Middle East war? To be sure, the Arab states have dressed up their refusal with political conditions to make it look like something different. But only the wilfully blind will have their sight obscured by such disguises. The Arabs, who have all along counted on the success of a concerted three-pronged attack with superior armor, artillery, and planes, are playing for time. They want to justify their aggression by nailing down a victory. If the UN Security Council allows them to get away with it, no act of aggression in the future by any nation will be too barefaced and cynical to be tried.

ON BEVIN AND THE BRITISH

There is something tragi-comic in the spectacle of Ernest Bevin throwing up his hands in horror when he heard of Truman's conversations with Chaim Weizmann, as President of the new state of Israel. The British, it seems, were trying to persuade King Abdullah, of Transjordan, to adopt a truce; but the bombshell of the Truman-Weizmann conversations has now made that impossible.

The British are following their classic pattern of Middle East diplomacy. First, they create the Arab League, arm the Arabs, equip, officer, and finance their armies. Having done this, and having watched the Arab armies fall upon the Jews of Israel, they then argue that any effort to help the victim of the aggression will inflame the strife. While still continuing to arm the Arabs, Bevin has closed the port of Haifa against boatloads of Jewish DP's from Europe. Toward President Truman he adopts the shocked attitude a fireman might have when, seeking to put out a blaze, he sees a novice feeding it with fuel.

This British attitude would have its comic aspects—if men and women and children were not dying every day because of it.

EYE ON THE OBJECT

There is a danger in our concentrating too hard on the British phase of the struggle. We run the risk of forgetting that the British, no matter how hypocritical their policy is, are not the decisive element in the problem. The decisive element is bound to be the policy of the American Government and the attitude of the American people.

The cries of perfidious Albion are, on this issue, true enough. But in the first place, I suspect the British government relishes these cries. Bevin wants hard to convince the Arabs he is their true friend and champion. As for alienating the Americans, he is willing to run the risk—even the calculated risk of an inquiry into the channeling of Marshall plan aid. This gives Bevin a chance to pose as a virutous and needy ally who is being subjected to economic pressures while he stands up for a principle. His present policy of trying to line up against American policy the nations of the western union bloc which American aid has created, is an example of how far he is willing to go in playing the strong man. He feels confident that the Russian scare can always be counted on to bring us back into the fold.

Despite these tortured British maneuvers, let us not lose our heads. We must keep our eye on the object. The British will continue to aid the Arabs, but that will not by itself win the war. Far more dangerous are the British tactics to confuse American opinion here at home. It is America which is strong, America whose weight can swing the UN Security Council into a decision on the obvious facts of Arab aggression and Arab diplomatic sabotage. It is America which can act to strengthen the position

of Israel. If America acts—in the UN and on its own—nothing that Bevin can do will count in the balance.

THE GREATEST AND THE YOUNGEST

The swing of American policy on the Middle East is finally in the right direction. The meeting between President Truman and President Weizmann—between the head of the world's greatest democracy and the head of the world's youngest democracy—had something deeply touching and symbolic about it. Even if nothing else had happened at that meeting, it would have been important merely because the meeting took place. In a world where men live by symbols, this is one that history will cherish. Americans, so many of whom felt dishonored by the previous policy of back-track on the UN decision, can now begin to look at themselves in the mirror. And the beleaguered people of Israel can feel they are not wholly friendless.

WEAPONS AND TIME

There are now two essentials in the Palestine war, if we are to prove to the Arabs that murder does not pay. One is to get to the fighters of Israel the weapons—planes, tanks, artillery—that they need. The other is to get them there in time.

These two essentials apply both to the United Nations action and to United States action. We talk of "sanctions," or penalties, to be imposed by the UN against the Arabs as aggressors, under chapter VII of the Charter. But the gist of those sanctions is to quarantine aid to the Arab states and to release aid to Israel. This will be futile if it is not done immediately. The Arabs know it, and that is why their UN delegates have so obviously been playing for time—endlessly decoding the messages from their governments while the Security Council has waited. The Arabs know that every hour counts. These same hours, ticking away while the UN fails to take action, may decide the fate of the UN itself.

Action by the UN means, in essence, the clearing of the way for quick action by the United States. Inaction by the UN will mean that action by the American Government is all the more pressing. Here again, time is crucial. Delay will mean not only the death of people: It will mean the frustration of American policy and honor. The lifting of the embargo on arms, the granting of a loan to Israel for defense and reconstruction: These actions, hinted at by Dr. Weizmann after his interview with President Truman, are to America's interest and America's honor. They are not hand-outs. They are concrete steps we must take for peace in the Middle East and the survival of the United Nations.

I think the American Government will take these steps because the American people overwhelmingly want them. They admire the courage the people of Israel have shown. And they know a case of aggression when they see it.

MAX LERNER.

"As Bravely as They Die"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chief of Staff, United States Army, delivered yesterday afternoon at Longmeadow, Mass., at Memorial Day reburial of Corp. Edward K. Wilkin, Company C, One Hundred and Fifty-seventh Infantry, Forty-fifth Infantry Division, Medal of Honor winner who was killed in action April 18, 1945, in Germany:

Here on the long green meadows of this tranquil New England town, we have come to do honor—not alone to one brave soldier—but to the generations of earnest young men who left their homes to defend them at Concord, Antietam, San Juan, the Argonne—and in the snows of the Ardennes.

For as long as free men have lived, worked, worshiped and reared their families under these elms, so long have their sons been summoned to arms against those who would covet or destroy them. In generation after generation they have been forced to quit these quiet homes in your peaceful valley to fight—and sometimes to die—in conflicts visited upon them by issues that seemed remote from their everyday lives.

From the chancelleries of London, Paris, Berlin, Rome, Tokyo, and Moscow, those bitter struggles that have scarred the progress of all mankind eventually spanned the seas to invade the snug parlors and warm kitchens of these colonial homes. And as these world struggles have wasted the youth and resources of nations, they have also left behind them sorrowing women and empty chairs in the houses on this green.

It is easy for us who are living to honor the sacrifices of those who are dead. For it helps us to assuage the guilt we should feel in their presence. Wars can be prevented just as surely as they are provoked and therefore we who fail to prevent them must share in guilt for the dead.

I have not come here today to consecrate war and its evils for the sacrifices war has produced. For every man in whom war has inspired sacrifice, courage, and love, there are many more whom it has degraded with brutality, callousness and greed.

Rather we are gathered here to take comfort and strength from those of our dead who have already given this Nation so much. We have come to learn—if we can—how men might live as charitably together in peace as they died for each other in war.

We have come to ask why it is that our young men must spend their bodies against the Siegfried line—why it is men cannot live as bravely as they die.

In our hatred and renunciation of war, we must not forget that the roots of conflict flourish in the faults and failures of those who seek peace just as surely as they take shape from the diseases and designs of aggressors.

While the American people have within themselves the moral strength, the power, and wisdom to marshal their forces against aggression in whatever form it affects—we cannot feign innocence through indifference or neglect of struggles that bring on wars. We have suffered enough in two world wars to know that noninvolvement in peace means certain involvement in war.

Either we shall employ our strength, power, and conscience boldly and righteously in defense of human dignity and freedom or we shall waste those reserves for peace and default to the forces that breed new wars.

This lad we buried today is partly the victim of your folly. He is the victim of your folly and the folly of all the peace-loving peoples who turned their backs on the ills of the world. For at the very time those aggressors at whose hands he met his death conspired against the peace of the world, we blinded ourselves to their threats and by our shameful inaction countenanced their starting attack.

Secure in distant and peaceful towns like these, clinging to comforts, refusing risks, seeking safety in refuge and refuge in words, we recanted power and conscience to side with those who sought peace at any price. Too late we discovered the price was too high; and to keep our freedom we paid in the bodies of our young sons.

If the United States ever again stoops to expedients to avoid the difficult decisions that come with leadership, the heavy burdens that come with defense, we shall once more run the dangers of all half-way measures and waste our strength and conscience as a weathervane rather than a force.

If we cringe from the necessity of meeting issues boldly with principle, resolution, and strength, then we shall simply hurdle along from crisis to crisis, improvising with expedients, seeking inoffensive solutions, drugging the Nation with an illusion of security which under those conditions cannot exist. If we are to scamper from crisis to crisis, fixing principles and policies to the change of each day, we shall place ourselves supinely and helplessly at the mercy of any aggressor who might play on our public opinion and decimate our forces at will.

To live bravely by convictions from which the free peoples of this world can take heart, the American people must put their faith in stable, long-range policies—political, economic, and military—programs that will not be heated and cooled with the brightening and waning of tension.

The United States has matured to world leadership; it is time we steered by the stars, not by the lights of each passing ship.

On this Memorial Day, as we take leave of this brave soldier—Corpl. Edward Wilkin, Army of the United States, Medal of Honor—we pay homage as he would have us do, to all his fallen comrades—to the strong, the weak; the leaders, the led; the brave, the fearful; to all who perished where only God could witness their charity to their fellow men.

Proudly—but reverently, sadly—we honor them. We pray they will ever rest in peace.

Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the other day I had occasion to be at a hearing conducted by the Corps of Engineers of the Little Rock district on a proposed flood-control dam over the Archey Fork of the Red River in Van Buren County in the district which I represent.

On the way to the hearing, I fell into conversation with young James W. Littleton, head of the management branch of the Corps of Engineers of the Little Rock district. He, although born in Louisiana, has naturally fallen in love with Arkansas after becoming a resident of our State. He was gently chiding me for my part in the exchange with our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] about Arkansas. He had written the following statement as his reply, and I think it is a worthy reply and should be inserted in the RECORD. Under unanimous consent I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD as part of my remarks:

"THAT AIN'T THE WAY WE HEARD IT"

As recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, dated March 18, 1948, Congressman GROSS from Pennsylvania asked the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. HAYS, if the following state-

ment was true: "The Arkansas farmer gets up in the morning at the alarm of a Connecticut alarm clock, buttons his Chicago suspenders to Detroit overalls, washes his face with Cincinnati soap in a Pennsylvania pan, sits down to a Grand Rapids table, eats his Chicago meat with Tennessee flour, cooked with Kansas lard on a St. Louis stove. He put a New York bridle on a Kansas mule, fed with Iowa corn. He plows a farm covered with an Ohio mortgage with a Chattanooga plow. At the end of the day he says a prayer written in Jerusalem, crawls under a blanket made in New Hampshire, only to be kept awake by an Arkansas dog—the only home product on his place."

Our reply could be that the farmer's alarm clock was made in Little Rock, the buttons on his suspenders in Pocahontas, his work clothing in Morrilton, the soap in Little Rock, his shoes in Batesville, the dining table in Fort Smith, and the aluminum for the pan was mined at Bauxite. He cooked his home-grown meat, which he took from his frozen-food locker, using butane gas from Magnolia. He usually has a lighter breakfast of apple juice from Rogers, or tomato juice from Monticello tomatoes, rice crispies from rice raised at Stuttgart, with strawberries from Bald Knob. He raised so much corn last year by using ammonia nitrogen fertilizer made at El Dorado and agricultural chemicals and insecticides at Jacksonville, that he bought a tractor—which he operates with oil from El Dorado—and sold his mule. He fattened his hogs and beef cattle on the corn last fall to get top prices on the Kansas City market. Before going to bed last night, this Arkansas farmer, while reading under his fine lamp made at the Westinghouse Electric Co. plant in Little Rock, had a good laugh as he read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which was printed on paper made at Camden. He knew that Congressman GROSS didn't know how well he slept on that felt mattress made at Carlisle or if his blame dog awakened him that he would fill him full of lead mined at Lead Hill.

The Road to Ruin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the Pittsburgh Press of May 27. It is aptly titled "The Road to Ruin," for it is concerned with the effort being made to scuttle the reciprocal trade program, despite its direct bearing on the success of the European recovery program. Simply by reciting international trade history, resulting from our tariff laws, the article presents a cogent argument for extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act without crippling changes.

THE ROAD TO RUIN

Yesterday, while most Americans were looking the other way and thinking about something else, House Republicans passed a bill to choke the reciprocal trade program to death with red tape.

We cannot believe the Senate will agree to such a foolhardy measure—not at a time when Congress is voting upward of $5,000,000,000 a year to keep alive the peoples and revive the industry and commerce of Europe and Asia.

The only hope we have of getting anything back for our money is to revive world production and exchange of goods, which Congress has just made a condition precedent to Marshall plan aid.

Let us recall what happened, as an immediate and inescapable consequence, the last time a vote in Congress signaled a turn toward American economic isolationism.

The measure then was the Smoot-Hawley tariff of 1930. It sailed through the House by a 69-vote margin. The Senate, always more responsible in such matters, approved it by a margin of only 2 votes.

More than a thousand leading American economists signed a statement warning that the Smoot-Hawley tariff would bring on world-wide economic distress. But President Hoover made the mistake of signing the bill, and it became law in June 1930.

The fat was in the fire.

A month later Spain and Italy raised their tariffs against American goods. In September Canada followed suit. Switzerland started a boycott of American products.

In November the Democrats won control of the House—the Smoot-Hawley tariff and the spreading depression were the main issues.

Next year things got worse.

Austria, Hungary, Italy, and Yugoslavia signed trade agreements detrimental to the United States. France and Spain signed a treaty, withdrawing the most-favored-nation treatment of United States goods. France applied the quota system, limiting imports from the United States.

American investors with billions invested abroad stopped receiving interest on their loans—then stopped getting payments on the principal. Mr. Hoover was forced to declare a moratorium on all the old World War I debts. The Austrian Credit Anstalt—biggest bank in central Europe—collapsed.

In 1932 it was really tough. Spain and Italy signed an exclusive trade treaty. Great Britain raised import duties. The Imperial Economic Conference, held at Ottawa, established Empire preference duties, effectively barring United States goods from all the Dominions.

In another American election, held that year, the Democrats captured the rest of Congress, and the executive departments which they have held since.

American exports had been $5,241,000,000 in 1929. In 1930 they were $3,781,172,000; in 1931, $2,377,982,000; in 1932, $1,576,151,000.

The British started blocking sterling. Hitler came into power, and with him German Finance Minister Hjalmar Schacht and his blocked marks. World War II was in the making.

Do we want to go through something like that again?

Taft-Ellender-Wagner Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include herein a news item appearing in the National Legionnaire of May 1948 stating the endorsement of the American Legion of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill:

HOUSING

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.—Having agreed to support the amended Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, now that it provides definite priorities for veterans, the American Legion was moving to add its own amendments to the legislation to make it a real veterans' housing measure.

Endorsement of the bill was voted by the National Executive Committee of the American Legion on the recommendation of Walter E. Alessandroni of Philadelphia, Pa., chairman of the National Housing Committee.

The favorable action came after National Commander James F. O'Neil personally took the floor and made a dramatic plea for adoption of Chairman Alessandroni's report.

In its resolution on the T-E-W bill, the NEC directed that the American Legion, through its national legislative director, immediately present to Congress further amendments to the measure to incorporate in it all the provisions of its own Veterans' Homestead Act of 1948.

Chairman Alessandroni told the NEC that the T-E-W bill (S. 866) as amended by Senator RALPH E. FLANDERS, of Vermont, and passed by the Senate on April 22, provided definite priorities for veterans and thus removed the chief ground for American Legion objections to the measure.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED

The NEC adopted the following resolution on the T-E-W bill as submitted by Chairman Alessandroni:

"Whereas for 2 years veterans have desperately needed adequate, reasonably-priced housing; and

"Whereas the Congress, public agencies and private enterprise have been unsuccessful in providing sufficient quantities of such housing for veterans; and

"Whereas the American Legion's Veterans' Homestead Act of 1948 (H. R. 4488) provides the best means of providing such housing for veterans; and

"Whereas the T-E-W bill, as amended by Senator FLANDERS in conformance with the report of the Joint Congressional Investigation Committee on Housing, has cured many of the objectionable defects of the previous T-E-W bill; and

"Whereas the Flanders amendments do not provide the aid for veterans' housing as contemplated by the Veterans' Homestead Act of 1948 and therefore the measure is deficient as an omnibus housing bill by failing to provide sufficiently for the veterans: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the director of the National Legislative Commission be directed to present to the Congress further amendments to Senator Flander's amendments to the T-E-W bill to incorporate therein the provisions of the Veterans' Homstead Act as modified by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee Print, dated March 28, 1948; and; be it finally,

"*Resolved*, That the national executive committee of the American Legion, in meeting duly assembled hereby goes on record in support of the action contained in the first resolving clause above set forth and orders specific compliance."

O'NEIL STATEMENT

National Commander O'Neil vigorously supported Chairman Alessandroni. He said, in part:

"I have traveled some 83,000 miles since September 1. I have had an opportunity to talk with thousands of veterans, Legionnaires and non-Legionnaires, about this subject of housing. I have made it a point to do so. This is the most urgent issue before the country today, as it affects veterans.

"I don't think we can ever stand in very good grace before anybody if we are willing to accept Federal subsidies for ourselves and indicate we want them denied to anybody else. I don't think we want to stand in that position.

"I find myself in accord with the report of your housing committee as submitted through your National Economic Commission in this resolution. I say to you this is a critical period and if you delay it, and continue to delay it, in the hopes you are

going to postpone the day, you are only kidding yourself. Very frankly, you are kidding yourself and the Legion if you assume that position. This is critical to the veteran who is in need of housing. Some of them have been forced to double up. All of us here are in comfortable circumstances, or most of us are, but I want you to think about the veteran who is forced to double up with others. He finds himself, because of economic conditions, looking to rental housing. He can't get it. He is looking to the American Legion for assistance and we want to duck behind something that is not really the issue. I say to you, in my opinion we can take action here without violating any of the resolutions or mandates of the national organization as they relate to housing."

Russia's Expanding Bases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of May 23, 1948. The article was written by Mr. Ansel E. Talbert, brilliant aviation editor of that great paper. Mr. Talbert springs from a long line of distinguished South Carolinians and we are proud of him.

RUSSIA EXPANDING BASES IN SIBERIA AND FAR EAST

(By Ansel E. Talbert)

The Soviet Union, striving today for control of Europe, at the same time is expanding with all possible speed the war potential of Siberia and of major Soviet bases in the Far East.

This development, although long-range and not connected specifically with any present tension between the United States and the Soviet Union, is being brought increasingly to the attention of American strategists. On a foundation supplied by Soviet 5-year plans—each of which stressed the development of war industries and logistics in Siberia—American military men are building up a detailed picture of what is happening right now east of the Ural Mountains

They are doing this with the aid of data from many sources. These include political refugees escaping into Middle East areas, former high Soviet officials who have chosen freedom, the secret records of Germany during the Hitler-Stalin pact when the Nazi war machine received quantities of supplies and raw materials from Russia, and a variety of other sources.

THE 5-YEAR PLAN

The present great Stalin 5-year plan, scheduled for completion in 1950, calls for a considerable strengthening of the Red Navy, now known to be primarily an undersea striking force.

The plan states: "The building of a strong and powerful Navy for the U. S. S. R. shall be ensured. New vessels and bases shall be built * * * construction of ports in the Far East completed."

The Soviet Navy's complex of far eastern submarine bases centering at Vladivostok, eastern terminus of the Trans-Siberian Railroad, it has been learned, already includes Nikolaevsk on the lower Amur River, Petropavlovsk in southeast Kamchatka, and Nikolskoe in the Komandorskie Islands, only 180 miles west of American-held Attu.

Integration into the system of Port Arthur and Dairen in south Manchuria and of Seishin and Rashin in northeast Korea is now under way.

During the winter of 1939–40 when the Hitler-Stalin pact was in force, a group of German submarine specialists went across Siberia to Vladivostok, where they were entertained by Admiral Ivan Yumashev, chief of the Red Pacific fleet and then only a commander. They visited the Komandorskie Islands.

Today former Nazi technicians who helped to build the reinforced concrete submarine pens of St. Nazaire and other ports of France and Norway, which proved almost impervious to strategic bombing during World War II, are traveling the same route.

THREAT TO SUPPLY LINES

Parts for large numbers of German-type XXI schnorkel submarines, which can cruise submerged for long periods, fell into Russian hands when the Soviet Army occupied eastern Germany.

It is obvious to American strategists that a primary assignment of submarines of this type in event of war in the Pacific would be to attempt to cut the vital ocean supply lines of the United States. Among the most important of these supply lines are the ones between Seattle and Alaskan ports and between the west coast and Japan, center of United States strategic air power in the Far East. Submarines might also launch rocket missiles.

The Soviet Union's red banner armies of Siberia, with headquarters at centers along the Trans-Siberian Railway, are receiving intensive training in the subzero cold of the Siberian north to increase their efficiency and mobility in Arctic regions.

Staging areas back of the Amur River line of fortifications and around the defense of the vulnerable Lake Baikal tunnels are being prepared by battalions from the network of corrective labor camps organized in Siberia. One of the largest units of the network is the so-called Magadan complex in eastern Siberia.

Many Japanese prisoners of war are also being trained on Siberian territory, possibly with an eye to future military use, in the event of war, against American heavy bomber bases in the Japanese islands.

FORWARD AIR BASES SET UP

Forward air bases of the Red Air Force have been constructed at East Cape and other points on the Chukotski Peninsula opposite Alaska. These do not have the elaborate installations of United States Air Force bases. By American standards, Soviet aircraft in the Far East, including American-built Bell P–39's—many of which were flown in the Soviet Union during World War II by way of Alaska—are largely obsolete.

There are a number of new aircraft factories in Siberia, however, which may now be turning out jet aircraft and B-29 type bombers.

W. Stuart Symington, Secretary of the Air Force, has disclosed intelligence reports stating that Soviet Russia now possesses an exact copy of the P-84 Thunderjet fighter and several four-engine jet bombers in the flight-test stage.

The third 5-year plan, made public early in 1939 by Vyacheslax Molotov, then Soviet Premier, stressed the intensive development of Siberian industry together with what he called regional independence. For many years more than 73 percent of all Russian oil and a much higher percentage of gasoline came from the area of the Baku fields in southwest Russia.

Published details of the 1939 plan stated that a second Baku would be developed in a new oil-bearing area between the Urals and the Volga.

In announcing the present great Stalin plan scheduled to run from 1946 through 1950, official Soviet sources disclosed the formation of a special ministry of the oil industry of the eastern districts of the U. S. S. R. The same sources stated that during World War II the new fields gave substantial service in supplying oil to the Soviet armed services.

By the end of 1950 the Soviet officials said, output of the second Baku would have increased eleven-fold over 1940. This development would be important to the industries, transportation systems, and armed forces of the Soviet Union in European Russia as well as Siberia, for oil is known to be one of the weakest points in the entire Soviet structure.

Only recently Austrian Government officials complained that the oil fields there were being ruined by Soviet demands far beyond normal capacity of the fields.

In evaluating Soviet Russia's Siberian activities, most top American strategists consider the over-all picture. They believe that a major aim of Soviet attempts to communize Europe is the occupation as soon as possible of any advanced base sites which the United States might utilize in the future for bombing strategic objectives inside Russia.

Gen. Carl A. Spaatz, Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force, made a statement in this connection a few days ago which probably was better understood in Moscow than in many political quarters in Washington. He said: "We have not yet reached the point where we can carry out sustained bombings at great distances— and I don't know when we will."

Soviet activities in the vast stretches of Siberia between the Urals and the Pacific, an area more than twice as wide as the United States, actually represent the first attempt in modern history to organize on a continental scale a network of air-sea-land bases supported by strategically dispersed war industries.

America's war industry definitely is not so dispersed.

A disclosure of the possible uses to which this industrial-military organization might be put in the future is contained in a strategic estimate prepared by the staff of the Alaska Command, headed by Lt. Gen. Nathan F. Twining, and shown to this correspondent in Anchorage. The estimate stated:

"It is not beyond the realm of future possibility that guided-missile attacks could be made against the large west-coast cities of Seattle, San Francisco, and Los Angeles from bases in northeastern Siberia."

Although the logistical support of such guided-missile bases is almost certainly beyond present capabilities of the Soviet Union, a glance at any polar projection will disclose reasons for the Alaska Command's concern. Eastern Siberia is the nearest land area in Russian hands now, or likely to be for some time, to any of America's west-coast industrial centers along great circle air routes, the shortest distance between two points.

What was written of guided-missile attacks of the future is equally true of long-range bomber attacks of today, assuming that Russian pilots willing to undertake a one-way trip can be found and that Alaskan air defenses and military logistics are left in their present undeveloped and inadequate state.

Fiddling With Fission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

from the St. Louis Star-Times of May 28, 1948:

"FIDDLING WITH FISSION"

"Fiddling with fission," the Democratic minority in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy calls it, and it is an effective phrase for summing up the Republican effort to keep President Truman from reappointing members of the Atomic Energy Commission for full terms.

Republican determination to let partisan politics enter an area of national policy that was supposedly fenced off from such interference when the Atomic Energy Act was passed last year is so brazen as to defy any defense. Banking strongly on a victory in the Presidential election, Senate Republican leaders want all five jobs on the Commission open to appointments by a Republican President. The present law provides for appointment of all five to staggered terms of from 1 to 5 years from next August. The proposed amendment would reopen all five jobs after 2 years.

Representative MELVIN PRICE, of East St. Louis, who filed the report of the five-man Democratic minority on the joint committee, says private power lobbyists are backing the 2-year plan. In view of the power lobby's dislike for Chairman David Lilienthal, this seems plausible, for it is entirely conceivable that the Atomic Energy Commission will some day have to decide on policies for development of atomic power sources. Naturally, Mr. Lilienthal can be expected to favor public development of atomic power—as now provided by law—over any plan to turn it over to private interests.

But beyond all this is the prospect of complete collapse of the high nonpartisan objectives set up for the Federal atomic energy program. With such a collapse would come breaks in the continuity of work which can ill afford interruption. For the present, certainly atomic energy development is primarily a matter of national defense. The Republican theory that it should be made subject to partisan decisions is no more defensible than would be a proposition to let party loyalty and service dictate appointments of generals and admirals.

Leading scientists have repeated their warning against mixing politics and atomic study. But the word of the scientists is hardly necessary to show the layman the dangers of the course GOP leadership seems intent upon taking.

Truman Builds Up the Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by W. K. Kelsey, the commentator, that appeared in a recent issue of the Detroit News:

THE COMMENTATOR
(By W. K. Kelsey)

TRUMAN BUILDS UP THE PARTY

President Truman continues to build up, for the record, the Democratic case as it must and will be presented in the platform, whether he is the party's nominee or not. And the Republicans in Congress continue to give him all the help they can.

Almost daily the President either asks Congress to enact some measure he favors, knowing that it will not, or prods Democratic leaders to try to get action on bills that the Republicans in control of both Houses are blocking.

So far this week, Mr. Truman has asked Congress to expand the social security system, which it will not do, and has summoned his own party leaders to demand passage of a 75-cent minimum wage, and the Federal aid to education measure. Before Congress adjourns for the convention, he will have thought of other matters to be written into the Democratic platform, along with denunciation of the Republican Party for failure to put them through.

It is to be noted that in his appeals this week, the President has had his eyes on a multitude of voters.

His social security program alone would add an estimated 20,000,000 persons to the rolls, and increase benefits to several millions more. The 75-cent minimum wage would affect still more millions, especially in the South, where Mr. Truman's championship of that measure may undercut the opposition of politicians to his renomination.

Similarly, Federal school aid is popular with southerners who, though heavily taxed for education, are still unable to bring their school systems up to the average national level.

Thus bit by bit Mr. Truman strengthens his own cause by taking advantage of Republican failure to grasp these issues and do something about them.

GIVING THE DEMOCRATS A FAT ISSUE

The House Republicans have now come to the President's aid in fine style, by voting to renew the reciprocal tariff bill for only 1 year instead of 3, with what Secretary of State Marshall has characterized as "crippling amendments."

On the plea that haste is necessary, because the present law expires June 12, the Rules Committee forbade all amendments on the floor, despite Democratic promises to hold debate on them to a minimum to save time.

Wednesday, the Republican majority jammed the bill through, even members who denounced the tactics of the Rules Committee voting for it. These included Representative COFFIN of Detroit, a city vitally interested in foreign trade as free as it can reasonably be made; he sacrificed his principles for party regularity. So did Representative EATON, of New Jersey, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, knowing and admitting that the bill was wrong.

The measure now goes to the Senate, where it faces the same necessity for haste. That body is expected to pass it, if for no other reason than to put President Truman on a hot spot. For the President will then have the choice of vetoing the measure and thus killing it, for there are not enough votes in Congress to pass the bill over his veto, or of signing it unwillingly despite the fact that Secretary Marshall has said it would be better to let the present law die than to enact the House bill.

Thus the Republicans are playing fast and loose with a fundamental Government policy, for purely political purposes.

They are rewriting themselves the party of high protective tariffs at a time when both the political and economic future, not of this country alone but of the world, demands freer trade.

How can we continue to point out to the nations of Europe the advantages of lowering or removing all barriers to international trading, while at the same time denying that in our case there are such advantages?

NEW LIMITS ON BARGAINING POWER

Under the present law, the President negotiates through the State Department, lower-tariff reciprocal arrangements with foreign countries. That is, we agree to lower our tariffs on certain goods exported by those countries, and they agree to lower their tariffs on certain American goods.

By Executive order the President in 1934 set up a Committee for Reciprocity Information, composed of representatives of seven Government agencies interested in trade and tariffs. Its present chairman is the vice chairman of the Tariff Commission, and it contains one other member of that body. The committee goes extensively into every question of reciprocal tariff reduction, and holds hearings on them. It then makes recommendations to the President.

Moreover, by an Executive order of 1947, the Tariff Commission is directed to investigate alleged injuries to American producers, arising out of reciprocal tariffs, and to recommend remedial action.

It would appear that the American producer is well enough protected by the Committee for Reciprocity Information and the Tariff Commission. But the Republicans don't think so.

The new bill takes away the powers of the committee. It turns investigations over to the Tariff Commission, and authorizes it to fix limits to which tariffs may be lowered—or raised. If the President declines to follow the advice of the Tariff Commission in negotiating a reciprocal trade agreement, Congress will have power to approve or disapprove his proposals.

VOTING AGAINST NATIONAL INTEREST

What the bill passed by the House does is to nullify the Committee for Reciprocity Information, which is concerned with building up our foreign trade, without the sacrifice of any important American interest, and to exalt the Tariff Commission, which is interested only in the fairness of customs schedules fixed by Congress.

At a time when the Government is trying to promote foreign trade, the sale of American goods abroad and the receipt of foreign goods in payment for them (which is the only way in which trade can be conducted), Congress has decided to impede and limit the President's power to make reciprocity treaties in order to give political protection to American producers who already have, under present law and executive order, all the protection to which they are reasonably entitled.

This is the partisan political view, opposed to the best interests of the Nation and of the world.

It is noteworthy that many Republican Congressmen see the matter in that light, even though only five of them had courage enough to vote against the bill. The six Representatives of Detroit were evenly divided, Republicans against Democrats. Of the Republicans, one knew better, and the other two are faithful rubber stamps.

Reciprocal Trade Extension Is a Crucial Test of the Bipartisan Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saginaw (Mich.) News of March 4, 1948:

DEMS, GOP ALL THE SAME? WATCH TRADE PACTS VOTE

President Truman has asked Congress to extend for another 3 years the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, that otherwise is to expire next June 12. If the public's common belief is correct that today there exists little to dis-

tinguish Democrat from Republican in fundamental thinking, this requested legislation makes a good test.

The issue over which Democrats and Republicans traditionally fought was high protective tariffs or low tariffs for revenue purposes only. Republicans overwhelmingly have taken the strongly isolationist stand in support of high tariffs.

Those who think that issue isn't so clear now need only review the congressional vote on reciprocal trade agreements since they were first advanced by former Secretary of State Hull, and enacted for the first time 14 years ago. In five extension votes, Republicans only once gave their majority support to the measure. That was in 1943 in the midst of the war when our Government felt a close kindred spirit with our allies.

All other votes in both the House and Senate were so heavily opposed by Republicans that they represented clearly the party's historic thinking. Protect home industry and agriculture against underselling competition from abroad—that has been the GOP's protective tariff plank. Will it continue to remain in the platform?

The reciprocal trade agreements negotiated in recent years have been aimed especially toward helping to recovery the 16 cooperating nations within the framework of the Marshall plan. If economic reconstruction within those nations is to become a fact, the United States must be willing to accept imports of their products as well as pour out its streams of goods for overseas consumption as is contemplated in the Marshall plan.

The essence of the plan for European recovery is anything but isolationist in concept. And Republican leadership headed by Senator VANDENBERG is carrying the ball in its behalf.

The public is well aware of Senator VANDENBERG'S conversion from his once solidly isolationist viewpoint. The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has seen, perhaps more clearly and certainly more articulately than any Democratic Congressman, the inseparable relationship of the United States to the rest of the world.

Representative WOODRUFF, Republican, of Michigan, suggests some of the changed thinking among Republicans as they view this tariff issue in the light of today's international economic disruption. He says, "I think, with some of the changes we have in mind, that we'd be justified in keeping the policy." But he can't quite hide the old GOP fears as he views the potential revival of Europe through Marshall plan aid:

"If the recovery plans we now have are successful," the Bay City Congressman warns, "just wait and see what foreign countries will do to our economy. They may be underselling on agricultural as well as manufactured goods." These are the horns of the dilemma with which the traditional protective tariff adherents wrestle.

How Republicans vote in the requested extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will demonstrate more convincingly than anything else whether they have truly thrown off their isolationist cloak. If they do, it may well be said that not too much difference exists between the fundamental thinking of the Republican and that of the Democrat.

British Palestine Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the New York Post on May 28, 1948:

LION OR JACKAL?—THE BRITISH SYMBOL CHANGES AS BEVIN'S POLICY DISPLACES THE BALFOUR PROMISE

(By Observer)

An official spokesman of the Foreign Office said a few days ago that Great Britain must support the Arabs in their war against the Jews because of the great alliance with the Arabs during World War II and their contribution to the Allied victory. This announcement is not overburdened with truth. But at the same time Ernest Bevin pretends to be impartial. On May 25 Churchill asked in Parliament whether Bevin "will bear in mind the great importance of our pursuing an even-handed course of strict impartiality at a time when we are resigning our responsibilities in Palestine?" Mr. Bevin replied: "I have done that. I have quite a clear conscience on that." At the time he spoke, British officers were directing fire at the Jewish sections of Jerusalem.

When, in 1942, the onslaught of the Axis armies reached their greatest proportions, and they descended on the Middle East from the Caucasus in the north, from Libya in the south, and from Burma in the east, and when the Sunday editions of newspapers carried large maps showing three converging black arrows, Churchill made a most desperate speech, in which he conceded "the great peril that threatens the British Empire."

At that time the only people in the area between the converging arrows that came to help, voluntarily mobilizing itself and rushing to el-Alamein in invaded Egypt, and that built up an efficient part of the Eighth Army under Montgomery, were the Jewish people of Palestine.

"Out of a Jewish population of half a million, 137,000 registered for service the moment war broke out," writes Pierre van Paassen in his book, The Forgotten Ally. All of them were volunteers, since Palestine, as a mandated territory, had no conscription. This would be equivalent to 45,000,000 volunteers in the United States. At the time when Montgomery took over from Auchenleck the command in Africa, a quarter of the troops on the African front, according to van Paassen, were Jews. The more than 30,000, combat soldiers—the defenders of Tobruk, the sappers of the desert, the parachutists who descended behind Rommel's army—were Jews.

"Palestine furnished to the British armies in Libya, Eritrea, Ethiopia, and Somaliland, thousands of doctors, nurses, and dentists." Thousands of truck drivers with their trucks, medical supplies and food for the Eighth Army. "In the fateful hour when Britain's fate hung in the balance, and when Rommel boasted that as far as he was concerned it was all over but the shouting, the little land of Palestine placed at the disposal of the British Empire and its armies in the Near East an industrial apparatus of 7,000 factories, large and small."

"The Jewish Palestine was one of the imponderables that turned the tide against Hitler at the moment when he and almost the whole world least expected it."

For 4 years the Mediterranean route was impassable—Italy ruled at its center. Supplies from England, and also from America, had to be shipped around the continent of Africa, a route longer than the equatorial circumference of the globe, over submarine-infested waters. But for Palestine, its production and its volunteers, the army of Montgomery would have been beaten.

At the time of this great emergency, Ibn Saud of Saudi Arabia supplied the army of Montgomery with not even a single donkey. The Egyptian royal family and the Ministers of Egypt were in direct contact with Rommel; the Egyptian military staff spied for Rommel; and all was prepared for the triumphant entry of Mussolini and Rommel into Egypt. Iraq had already perpetrated its stab in the back, having declared war against the British on May 2, 1941. Syria and Lebanon were under Vichy rule. But the Jews of Palestine helped to quell the rebellion of Iraq, and guarded the pipe lines from there to Haifa in Palestine. Besides almost a million Jews served in the Allied armies all around the world.

In the fable, a wolf had a bone stuck in his throat and was choking. In his distress he begged help of a crane, promising eternal friendship and every favor. The crane put his head into the wolf's mouth and removed the bone with his beak. When he asked the promised reward, the wolf replied: "Is it not enough that I did not bite off your head when it was in my mouth?"

But the British Lion actually tried, and still tries, to bite off the head of the Jewish crane.

As late as 1944, when refugees from Hungary and Rumania could have been saved from Hitler's death camps, Great Britain slammed the doors of Palestine in their faces. When the war was over Britain hunted down Jewish survivors of the death camps with the Royal Navy, killing some, imprisoning all the others.

A fortnight ago the British murdered, with the hands of the Arab Legion, 300 men, women, and children of Kfar Etzion. Today British officers direct the shelling of Jewish Jerusalem, its university, its synagogues, its hospitals.

The greatest retribution that could be inflicted on the British for all this is the transformation of the Lion into a cowardly and ungrateful creature, the degeneration of a once noble nation into the spiritual heirs of Hitler.

The Navy's Carrier Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial and letters from the Washington Post and the Washington Evening Star:

[From the Washington Post of May 21, 1948]

GIANT CARRIER

It is impossible to conceive of the 65,000-ton aircraft carrier approved by the House Armed Services Committee as merely an instrument for naval fleet support. If the carrier still has justification, as we believe it does, then that justification is a means of carrying war to the enemy in the early stages. The approval by the committee is tantamount to recognition that the naval air arm does have a definite, if auxiliary, strategic mission in complementing the work of the Air Force in attaining air superiority.

Defense heads apparently have agreed on giving the Air Force primary responsibility for attacks on an enemy's homeland. To fulfill that responsibility it will be necessary either to operate from such overseas bases as can be obtained in friendly nations or captured from the enemy, or to concentrate on long-range bombing from bases in or near this country. Though important improvements are being made, mass long-range bombing is not now a practical possibility. To be sure, one of these days it will become practical. But until it does, there is a gap in offensive power that must be filled. That

is the utility of the mammoth carrier. It is to be designed to cruise in distant waters and to permit the launching of naval planes with a 1,700-mile radius capable of handling the atomic bomb.

The criticism undoubtedly will be made that so huge a vessel, with a loaded weight of up to 80,000 tons and costing a minimum of $125,000,000, will constitute a prime target for enemy attack. That criticism is not wholly valid. The increase in tonnage does not mean a comparable increase in dimensions over present carriers; the purpose of the change is to permit more runway space and less superstructure. It is doubtful, for example, whether this carrier would afford even as large a target for enemy air attack as a concentration of nonmovable air bases. Moreover, it is doubtful whether an enemy with limited numbers of atomic bombs would risk wasting several on such an objective, especially since tests have demonstrated that atomic bombs are most effective against naval units when they are huddled together rather than dispersed. The principal vulnerability of the carrier to air assault would be in dive-bomber or kamikaze attacks, which, when used by the Japanese proved relatively ineffectual. To be sure, the carrier would afford prey for submarine torpedoes; but judging from previous experience it would require several hits to disable the vessel.

The fundamental aim of military preparedness now, as in the past, is to be able to strike back at an enemy with crushing force as quickly as possible. The supercarrier seems to us a useful interim implement for achieving that end. While the Air Force retains its responsibility for delivering the knock-out punches, it is only sensible to recognize the Air Force's present limitations and to take whatever other measures are necessary to assure a ready offensive force.

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 26, 1948]

TWO AIR FORCES A BLESSING

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

I see by the papers that one of the greatest airmen of our time, General Spaatz, intends after his forthcoming retirement to devote his talents to fighting the Navy in order to prevent this country from being "saddled with two air forces." He already is leading the fight to block the Navy's plans for building a 60,000 ton supercarrier.

This is an amazing spectacle, and indicates a sad lack of understanding on the general's part as to what the Navy can contribute toward survival in the air age. Unfortunately, this lack of understanding is not confined to General Spaatz. It is shared quite generally by the American public.

Our splendid Naval Air Force, with its self-sufficient mobile bases, makes it possible for this country to have a tremendous advantage over any enemy in a future war. If we have the wisdom to exploit and improve this advantage, in conjunction with our 70-group air force, it can make this country invincible in the air. A hard hitting, fast moving Naval Air Force, with carrier air bases cruising wherever there is salt water, can be the difference that makes our command of the air overwhelming. We are not saddled with this advantage—we are blessed with it.

The Navy has itself to blame for the sad state of affairs in which we find a great airman like General Spaatz leading the fight to throw away a powerful and unique air weapon. The general and the public cannot be expected to appreciate what the Navy can do in the air age unless the Navy itself gives them the benefit of expert advice from the men best qualified to give this advice, namely, the naval aviators who have spent the best part of their lives building up our Naval Air Force. The taxpayers are entitled to this advice, but top level Navy policy denies it to them.

Ever since the fight over the so-called Unification Act started, nearly 2 years ago, the naval air experts have been gagged, and are still gagged. They are told that in their public utterances they must avoid controversial subjects. Of course, General Spaatz's statement makes the very existence of naval aviation a controversial subject, and therefore bars any public discussion of it by the Navy.

The official purpose of this gag is the laudable one of promoting cooperation between services, and speeding true unification. But its actual result, which is daily becoming more imminent, is the undermining of an important and exclusively American source of air supremacy.

C. T. FORCE.

[From the Washington Post of May 27, 1948]

GIANT CARRIER

Please accept congratulation on your all too brief editorial of May 21 entitled "Giant Carrier," written with an acumen both noteworthy and commendable.

Potent as air power is within its scope, one should not forget, through any process of wishful thinking, that even our most capable bombers, with loads, must operate against any worth-while enemy from (and back to) numbers of bases within feasible distances not only for themselves but for their escorts as well.

In particular, the beginning of a campaign may not be the Roman holiday which we hope it will become. The difficulty is not so much the magnificent power of our high explosive, but rather how to get enough of it exactly to where we want it to do the damage.

Although there has been wonderful technological progress in planes, the lessons of the western Pacific in these matters should be remembered. Then too, with the progress in planes have come disturbing problems of bases, their numbers, increased size, and fantastic logistic requirements. Bases must be taken, secured, held, and served.

It is quite true that land bases of a system once secured are immobile. Advance toward the enemy requires movement of bases by some process, or else new bases. It is no less true that integrated and trained air power is an essential aim of any worth-while Navy. It would not be inappropriate to add to your contribution that two capable carriers may be four times as valuable as one, and four may well be valuable in similar ratio.

G. J. ROWCLIFF,
Rear Admiral, United States Navy (retired).
WASHINGTON.

Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Crittenden County (Ark.) Times of May 29, 1948:

KEEP BUILDING THE SOIL

Although the Federal Government failed to meet its obligations to Crittenden County farmers through the payment of its share of expense for soil-building projects, those who cooperated with the conservation program in the county in 1947 will find the money spent for the work a justifiable expense.

Last year the farmers carried out more soil-building projects than ever before in the history of the county. The record is commendable and reflects the advancement being made in agriculture today.

The statement "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty" applies to our soil as well as our national life, says Alex Stirewalt, of Gilmore, our Crittenden County Agricultural Adjustment Administration Committee head.

While there is much being said about increasing military strength, it must be remembered that the real strength of the Nation is rooted in the soil and too often and too long the soil from which we get our food is taken for granted.

Only by keeping our soil productive through the use of conservation practices can we be able to keep our Nation strong. Farmers of Crittenden County will have another opportunity to do their share of this important job this year.

We are certain they will not fail.

Essay on Franklin Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert an essay written by Vivian Waters, of the Luray, Va., High School, which won first prize in a contest by the Luray, Va., Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Another prize awarded by the Daughters of the American Revolution for the student most proficient in American history was won by Lois Broyles who had a grade of 98.5.

The essay follows:

FRANKLIN ROOSEVELT

Franklin Roosevelt was born on January 30, 1882, at the family estate near Hyde Park overlooking the Hudson. His father, James Roosevelt, was a wealthy landowner, a vice president of a railroad and a minor member of the diplomatic service under President Cleveland. His mother, Sara Delano, was an exceptionally able woman who sprang from a merchant-shipping family. Franklin was the fifth cousin of President Theodore Roosevelt. From private tutors he passed through Groton School and then entered Harvard where he studied hard and took part in football and rowing. After graduation he entered Columbia Law School and finished his work in 1907. Then he began law practice with a leading New York law firm.

March 1905 he married Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, his sixth cousin.

Throughout his life he regarded himself as an active farmer and liked to be called a country squire.

During World War I Roosevelt was Assistant Secretary of Navy.

Roosevelt was a strong believer in the principles of the League of Nations.

In the summer of 1921 infantile paralysis became rife in many places. Roosevelt was going to his cottage at Campobello, New Brunswick, where he heard that a forest fire was raging nearby. He and his two sons spent hours clearing brakes and wetting underbrush. Then half exhausted he returned home and went in swimming. Then sat down in his wet bathing suit to read his mail. He retired to bed with what he thought was a heavy cold. But found it to

be infantile paralysis. His legs were paralyzed.

With careful exercise, winter treatments, and swimming at Warm Springs, Ga., he gained his strength back. He continued an active legal practice and formed the firm of Roosevelt and O'Connor in 1924.

In 1933 he was elected President of the United States.

In 1939 Roosevelt gave more than 16 acres of land to the Government from his Hyde Park estate. He also gave a $350,000 library. The building was financed by the Democratic Party and houses his public papers. It is maintained by Government funds as a memorial to Roosevelt.

In April 1945 Roosevelt was at his cottage in Warm Springs for a brief rest. On April 12 he signed numerous documents and studied state papers. A portrait painter was making sketches of him when he fell over in his chair and said, "I have a terrible headache," and became unconscious. A few minutes later he died.

He was buried at his Hyde Park estate.

In June 1945 the "Little White House" at Warm Springs was given to the American people as a shrine.

Roosevelt was President for 12 years. The crowded events of these 12 years made Roosevelt's career one of the most interesting of modern times and gave him a place with Washington, Lincoln, and Woodrow Wilson as a world figure.

Heap Plenty Bureaucrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of bulletin No. 21, released under date of June 1, 1948, by the research office of the National Association of State Chambers of Commerce under the heading of "Federal spending facts."

As a member of the Interior Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, and particularly since I was chairman of the appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, I am delighted to note that the research office of the National Association of State Chambers of Commerce approved of my portion of the report of our Interior Subcommittee, and quoted at some length therefrom.

The release, entitled "Heap Plenty Bureaucrats," follows:

"HEAP PLENTY BUREAUCRATS"

There are 10,994 employees on the pay roll of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, according to the April report of the Civil Service Commission.

The last census figures give the total Indian population of the United States as 333,969.

This means that there is one Indian Service employee today for every 30 Indians in the United States.[1]

The primary objective of the Indian Reorganization Act passed by Congress in 1934 was to help the American Indian achieve eventually his economic independence. Today we find that little progress has been made in accomplishing this worthy purpose in the intervening 14 years.

In its report this week on the Interior Department the House Appropriations Committee says: "The paternalistic control exercised in many instances (by the Bureau) has tended to retard, rather than expedite, the advancement of the Indians. The successes of individual Indians have been attained not because of programs promulgated by the Bureau of Indians Affairs, but in spite thereof. The continued supervision by the Bureau over education, health, economy, welfare, and other activities of the Indians has often resulted in discouraging self-reliance of the Indian. It has caused him to rely less and less upon his own resourcefulness, and to become more dependent upon Government help and supervision."

A businessman recently said, when testifying before a Senate Committee on the Indian Affairs budget: "In these days, when we hear so much about equal rights and privileges for racial minorities, even as an international policy, I say that our treatment of the original inhabitants of this American soil makes a disgraceful exhibit."[2]

The history of the Indian Service seems to demonstrate once again that bureaucracy's natural tendency to perpetuate itself renders it incapable of accomplishing a purpose whose fulfillment calls for the eventual liquidation of that bureaucracy.

ALVIN N. BURGER,
Research Director.

[1] The Indian Service's own estimate of the Indian population is 393,622. This makes 1 employee to every 35 Indians. A check of the enumerating methods of the Indian Service and the Census Bureau, however, satisfies us that the census estimate comes closer to the true picture.

[2] Mr. Fred E. Schluter, president of Thermoid Corp. Mr. Schluter is a member of this association's committee on Federal expenditures.

Communism's Way With the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Sunday, May 30, 1948:

COMMUNISM'S WAY WITH THE FARMER—REDUCTION OF LANDED PEASANTS TO SERFDOM, A STANDARD EXERCISE OF RED POLICY

(By Heptisax)

Those persons who are familiar with theoretical and applied Marxism, on the one hand, and with the American farmer's habits of thought, on the other, have always taken it for granted that the American farmer does not have to be forewarned and forearmed against the blandishments of the Red agitator. This assumption is based on the knowledge that what communism has in store for the rural population of any country, in which its agents win control, is the socialization of the land and the reduction of that population to the status of a vast herd of two-legged livestock, the property of the proletarian state. That is a fact which can be confirmed from scores of books on Marxism and Leninism, with the stamp of Moscow's approval on them; and from any sketch of Russian history from 1917 to the present.

But to assume for this reason that the American farmer's mind is impregnable to all Bolshevik blandishments, one must first assume that he is thoroughly familiar with Communist policies and achievements, or one must assume that, when the Communist approaches the honest agrarian he is equally honest, and tells him just what will be in store for him if he helps to promote, or fails to oppose, a proletarian revolution. Neither of these two latter assumptions is justified. The average farmer does not know the traditional Marxist attitude toward "the land hungry peasant" as a natural enemy; nor has he heard of the well tried way in which he can be "neutralized" and then reduced, "with much circumspection and step by step," to state serfdom. (The last two quotations are from the American Communist Party's official English translation of Third International "theses.") Nor is it the least bit likely that any Red agent will give any American farmer, even the poorest share cropper, or Mexican contract laborer, an inkling of what the Marxist plans for him. The cultivation of discontent, or resentment against capitalism, and the organized expression of these feelings, is job enough now for the Communist agitator in "the advanced countries."

Now, this is not a scare piece. I am not working up to sensational revelations, for I have nothing startling to reveal. I am not going to suggest that a Muscovite effort to subvert the American rustic's faith in American institutions has made any headway worth mentioning; for it has not. I simply want to say that this work is not being wholly neglected. The Communist Party of America, like every other, had to accept 21 conditions when it joined the Comintern, some clearly implying a readiness for treason in the event of trouble with Russia. Condition 5 reads, in part: "A systematic and regular propaganda is necessary in the rural districts. The working class can gain no victory unless it possesses the sympathy and support of at least part of the rural workers and of the poor peasants. * * * It should be carried on through Communist workmen of both city and country who have connections with the rural districts. To refuse to do this work, or to transfer such work to untrustworthy half reformists, is equal to renouncing the proletarian revolution."

The Third International was dissolved about 5 years ago, but anyone who thinks that this stern injunction is no longer binding on the American Communist is a simple soul, indeed. Whether bound or not, he is at it. If I wanted to invite a libel suit that would be hard to defend. I could name half a dozen crypto-Communist publications with big rural circulations, in which no word of Marxist doctrine ever appears, and scarcely a favorable mention of Soviet Russia, but in which the business of undermining the less sophisticated American's faith in his country's politico-economic system is carried on with great zeal. As for workmen of the Red persuasion who are supposed to win the confidence of the agrarians, real workmen in that role may be scarce; but the efforts being made by various labor leaders, whose close contact with the Communists is well known, to ingratiate themselves with farm organizations and cooperatives, are beginning to be conspicuous. Then don't forget that the Communists who are so tirelessly boosting the stock of Henry Wallace, farmer, are particularly appreciative of the fact that, though no major farm group has formally approved his candidacy, great numbers of weary toilers on the land are tuning in to hear him cry out against preparations for war and to assure them that this country has no irreconcilable difference with Russia.

I am ready to agree off-hand that the sum total of these efforts do not so far amount to a hill of beans. But it is presumably sowing little germs of doubt in a great number

of not too well-informed minds, which germs the Reds would make a far more strenuous effort to feed, if we were to have that economic setback, or runaway inflation, for which all good Communists pray to the shades of their prophets. With farm incomes down and debts taking on the aspect of hideous specters, the spade work done would make it easier to generate hatred of Wall Street, and possibly to promote serious demonstrations against landlords and bourgeois creditors.

This country's military strength depends in no small part upon its economic health. When it comes to manpower our strength depends in no small part upon the people's confidence that our politico-economic system provides equal opportunity more fairly than any other, and can, through representative government, be made still fairer, without blasting it to bits. Our peacetime influence everywhere abroad depends almost wholly upon confidence abroad in our ability to keep our economic health and in our people's devotion to our system.

It is naturally the Communist's business to undermine our health and to destroy confidence in it here and abroad; and if he can do just a little of that on the farm front he is doing it where it can do a lot of damage. In a passage from the 21 conditions quoted above, the Reds confess that there is no use contemplating a revolution until the cooperation of some part of the peasantry is assured. Proletarians must eat, and so must commissars. But so must Democrats and Republicans eat; and the fellow who can put even a small percentage of food producers in a mood to cut off the food supply is in a position to slip a knife into our vitals.

It is the purpose of this article, therefore, to suggest that in planning defenses against communism it should be the serious concern of the Government, farm organization leaders, labor leaders, and farm journal editors to plan the defense of the farmer's mind against the subversion of his Americanism. Of course, we all know that words do not pay off mortgages or keep up farm equipment in hard times, and that the best defense of sound Americanism is a sound economy and a relentless fight to keep opportunity open. But next to that comes information. We have the most intelligent, patriotic, and shrewd farm population in the world; and no Communist would get very far with even the poorest share cropper, as I've said, if the history of the peasantry in modern Russia, and the peasant's place in Marxist philosophy were clearly understood by our rural population. I can give no more than the skimpiest outline of the kind of information that the American "peasantry" should have in the space that's left; so I propose to return to this theme 2 weeks from now. But here is that outline.

Nearly a century ago Karl Marx told the Communist League that the victorious revolutionary industrial proletarians should not trust the peasantry with possession of the land. It made petty bourgeois capitalists of them, hostile to socialism. A ruling proletariat, at the mercy of a hostile peasantry, was unthinkable. Labor colonies should work big-scale farms for the state. After the 1917 revolution, when Lenin proposed to buy the peasantry's help in the business of liquidating the landed gentry, all his orthodox Marxist friends screamed heresy at him.

But Lenin, who never repudiated a doctrine but never let a doctrine get in the way of an expedient, was able to show that if the peasants didn't get the land there would be no liquidation of the aristocracy, no food for the precious proletariat, no food for the army and, finally, little or no army. His wisdom prevailed, and a peasant army beat off every counter-revolutionary effort—for the sake of the land. But do you suppose that Marx's warning was forgotten? By no means.

Three years later, with Lenin firmly established in the dictatorship and Stalin having much to do with the drafting of policy "theses" for the Third International, a complete program for taking the land away from the peasants step by step and nationalizing agriculture was adopted as world policy by the Second Comintern Congress. Anyone who wants to study it in detail and see how closely Stalin has followed it should read Theses on the Agrarian Question, starting on page 132, in Blueprint for World Conquest, published by Human Events. The text is that adopted by the Communist Party of America.

The process is simple. The rural population is divided into four groups, according to economic status. At the top are the landholding aristocrats who do no labor. You get all the peasants to help you bump them off and reward the poor with land—all of it if you must, some of it if you are strong enough to start socializing the rest. Then you organize the poorest elements, day laborers, the landless, and the most wretched tenants, keeping two groups of middle peasants at least neutral, until the down-and-outers are ready for action and you are strong enough to give them proletarian and police support. Then out they go, and the land is more thinly divided. Then you persuade the remaining small fry, on their tiny, uneconomic plots, of the advantages to them of pooling their land so that farming can be mechanized and modernized. The forms of persuasion depend upon the pigheadedness with which these little people cling to their antisocial land hunger—and to the police powers that you have meanwhile built up, of course. Finally you have them all herded into these closely disciplined agrarian industries—bound to the land as their great-grandfathers were, except when you want to siphon off manpower into the army or into serfdom to the machine.

If this program is studied in detail, it becomes beautifully clear that the highly touted agrarian reforms in eastern Germany, Bulgaria, Hungary, northern Korea, and wherever reforms are in progress, are the duly prescribed first steps in the old program for reducing a hoodwinked free peasantry into state serfdom. The grand finale to this program of mixed violence and chicanery, as envisaged in these theses, under the dictatorship of the now sanctified Lenin, is of particular interest to any American who rejoices in possession of a little place of his own. The proletariat, when it has secured for itself a complete and absolute submission, will reorganize the whole (agricultural) industry on the basis of wholesale collective production. But more of this later.

The Failure of the GOP Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I append the following editorial from the Staunton News-Leader, Staunton, Va., of May 30, 1948, entitled "The Failure of GOP Congress":

THE FAILURE OF GOP CONGRESS

Republican leaders of Congress, in setting June 19 as adjournment date, have fixed a goal that means dangerous delays in enacting much-needed legislation. All of the important measures now under consideration cannot possibly be passed, even if the legislators, responding to the appeal of Chairman TAFT, of the GOP Policy Committee, work night and day. Should Congress decide to recess instead of adjourn, a post-conventions session means there will be poor attendance and inadequate attention to the Nation's business, for with one-third of the 96 Senate seats and all 435 House seats at stake in the fall election, Members are going to be more interested in looking after their political fences than legislation.

Senate and House leaders are expected to meet Tuesday to decide upon the legislative program which will be undertaken in the 3 weeks remaining before adjournment date. First place, reported the Associated Press yesterday, has been given to the bill to admit European displaced persons; second place goes to the draft; third to a resolution by Senator VANDENBERG favoring a western European defense alliance. Any one of these measures could tie up business for the rest of the session.

There remain a number of appropriations bills, which will be rushed through without proper consideration; universal military training, which has obviously been sidetracked because of mistaken political fears; Senate action on the House bill destroying the reciprocal trade treaty program, authorization for which expires June 12 unless the Senate acts; the Mundt bill outlawing the Communist Party, which can just as well lie in Senate committee; the Truman civil-rights program and social security extension, neither of which are politically dangerous and will be sidetracked with pleasure; extension of the terms of the Atomic Energy Commissioners, which will certainly require a decision, either on the Republican effort to limit extension to 2 years, a palpable play for gaining partisan control under the expected GOP administration, with dangers of exploitation of atomic energy for private rather than public benefit, or on full terms.

House action on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner long term housing bill may be attempted, but it can hardly be effected before June 19, for the bill has strong opposition. The Senate may get around to repeal of the margarine tax, which after House passage won another smacking victory in the Senate Finance Committee. There is some prospect that Senators may try to force consideration of an anti-lynching bill, but this means a certain filibuster and responsible Republican leaders may be expected to use all of their authority to prevent the measure reaching the floor. Another controversial matter is the bill, passed by the House, granting the States control of tidelands for oil development, and it is improbable that this will be included in the rush legislative program. Doing so would threaten the whole program of "must" measures.

The sad truth is that the Eightieth Congress has talked too much and transacted too little business. Some Members have blocked vital measures by injecting extraneous questions, such as "civil rights" amendments to the imperative draft bill. There have been too many efforts to garner votes by fighting for revolutionary changes favored by various minorities, and these efforts have slowed down the work of Congress to such an extent that the jam of bills which are necessary to the proper functioning of the government and to the national safety cannot be broken in the time available.

This much is certain: The Republican majority has forced the GOP to enter the election campaign with a record of broken promises as to economy and with black marks for destruction of the reciprocal trade program and for jeopardizing the defense program. The prospect of a Republican President in the White House, backed by majorities in Congress, is dark indeed when one

thinks of a return to economic isolation, exploitation of tidelands oil and atomic energy for private interests, and continued refusal to adopt a national defense program which would discourage Russian aggression, save our occupation forces from another "Pearl Harbor," and strengthen our voice in world affairs.

GOP Vote-Getting Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frederic W. Collins from the Providence (R. I.) Sunday Journal of May 30, 1948:

GOP APPEARS UNABLE TO PRODUCE VOTE-GETTING SOCIAL LEGISLATION—RECORD IN CONGRESS CALLED HARDLY THE PRIZE PACKAGE PARTY PLANNED TO HAVE READY FOR VOTERS—LIST OF MUST BILLS CUT IN JUNE 19 ADJOURNMENT RUSH

(By Frederic W. Collins)

WASHINGTON, May 29.—It looks as if the term-end jam in Congress would mean the sacrifice of a good deal of the social legislation the Republican majority had planned to fit into its record for 1948 campaign purposes.

In general the Republican leadership had hoped to time its achievements so that it could turn out in the second session of the Eightieth Congress a group of welfare measures which would be new, bright, and shiny attractions for the electorate in a Presidential year.

This strategy was adhered to during the first session, when the Republican enactments of broad public interest were limited to the Taft-Hartley Act and the outlawing of portal-to-portal pay. At the end of that session, the Republicans looked forward to a lot of politically effective do-gooding upon their return.

But it was later than they thought. The press of business, notably the European recovery program, became so great and so compellingly important in the second session that lesser measures had to be pushed aside. Failure of House Republican committees to see eye to eye with the Senate on what constitutes liberal legislation also accounted in some instances for the GOP slow-down.

With appropriations bills piling up, the list of "must" measures has been pared down by Republican policy makers as they point for a June 19 adjournment.

Among the measures which are almost certainly lost, although they would have been of substantial political value to the Republicans, are a general tax-revision bill prepared by the House Ways and Means Committee, and an extension of social-security coverage to make some 3,000,000 employees of State and local governments eligible for Federal old-age benefit insurance.

Picking at the coverlet are several measures of even wider popular interest. A long-range housing program may get through, although that is doubtful, and if it does it will almost certainly be stripped of public-housing features.

Federal aid to education does not appear to have a good chance. There is no promise of a national health program. Not much chance is accorded proposals to increase the minimum wage from 40 cents to 75 cents an hour. Repeal of Federal taxes on oleomargarine faces a difficult course. Only by the most drastic parliamentary steps can the Republicans hope to put through a civil-rights program which they had hoped would win them votes in populous Negro centers of the North while having the second great advantage of embarrassing the Democratic Party.

There is considerable hope that the Republicans can put through some sort of a draft bill, which will be an enactment of doubtful political advantage to them; a renewal of the farm price support program; the Vandenberg statement of policy in support of a western European alliance, and legislation allowing the entry of displaced persons from Europe.

HANDFUL OF ACHIEVEMENTS

Apart from these enactments, the Republicans can claim full responsibility or credit for only a handful of important measures—the afore-mentioned Taft-Hartley and anti-portal-pay acts; an income-tax cut; unification of the armed services; the Presidential succession bill; the proposing of a constitutional amendment limiting a President to two terms, and the creation of a commission on the reorganization of Government which may have splendid results, but too late for election purposes.

It can share credit equally with the President for doing its part in the European recovery program, provided the appropriations come through intact; for the implementation of the Truman doctrine; for interim aid to Europe, and generally, for a manful devotion to bipartisan foreign policy. An acceptable extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act may be worked out, but it is doubtful if anything the Senate Republicans achieve in that direction can entirely redress the political advantage incurred by the performance of House Republicans on this issue.

The Republicans had some bad luck. Nobody told them in time that the world was going to need just about as much attention as the American voter in the first 2 years of the Republican restoration in Congress. But, all in all, the record, for whatever reasons, is scarcely the prize package the party had planned to have ready for the 1948 Presidential voters.

The Full Life of a Lawyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include extracts from the sermon delivered by Rev. Miller, of Geneva, Ohio, at the funeral of Hon. Lyman K. Chambers, former president of the Ottawa Bar Association, on the subject The Full Life of a Lawyer:

The long life of public service of this lawyer might well be called a "full docket." Over 50 years were spent in serving the public, as teacher, lawyer, mayor, etc. He had a full docket of grief to bear. He, like his Savior, was "a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief." He was fortunate that he could make his home with his brother Ben's family. Such kindness will not go unrewarded. You will remember that Paul said that we should "Bear one another's burdens, and so fulfill the Law of Christ."

He served a little as a defense attorney. He had little ill to speak of anyone. He defended people in and out of court. He knew that to have friends one must be a friend. You know I think that all of us might well become defense attorneys in these days when so many people's characters are being ruined by idle talk. More of us should ask for circumstantial evidence, for exhibit A, B, etc., when we hear people bearing false witness against our neighbors.

A similar legal term, "advocate," I would like to mention. John 2:1 reads: "We have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ, the righteous." An advocate is one who pleads the cause of another. Jesus, the great New Testament Lawgiver, pleads our cause before God. He told us to come to Him. Hear Him as He says, "Come unto Me all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Also "Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted." And again, "He that confesseth Me before men will I also confess before My Father which is in heaven." Yes; Christ is our Advocate, and we gladly turn to Him for help. James Montgomery has put this thought beautifully for us in the last two verses of his hymn, In the Hour of Trial:

"Should Thy mercy send me sorrow, toil, and woe;
Or should pain attend me on my path below:
Grant that I may never fail Thy hand to see,
Grant that I may ever cast my care on Thee.

"When my last hour cometh, fraught with strife and pain,
When my dust returneth to the dust again;
On Thy truth relying, thro' that mortal strife,
Jesus, take me dying, to eternal life."

A lawyer is familiar with judgments. We must all face trial some day before a supreme court composed of the Great Trinity—God, His Son, the Holy Spirit. Like all good jury members, these three will be impartial, looking not upon the outward man, but upon his heart. We must all face judgment day. Here will be determined our acquittal or indictment. It will be "Well done thou good and faithful" or "Depart from me."

Circumstantial evidence, we are told in the Word of God, will be: whether we on earth were found feeding hungry, quenching thirst, taking in strangers, clothing naked, visiting the sick and imprisoned or found not doing these kind things. Remember, friends, these things must be done in His name as Christians. For example, I am not a Mason. Therefore I cannot do these things as a Mason, because I do not bear the name. These good acts must be done as a Christian, not as just a good moral person, for us to stand acquitted on judgment day.

The case of this lawyer, Lyman Kelsey Chambers against trials of life on earth below has been dismissed. The supreme court has the verdict which none of us know. It is on the Lamb's Book of Life, not our ledgers.

Yes, as far as this lawyer goes it is now written on his shingle "Court adjourned." This life is but a petit jury affair. The life to come is one much greater—a grand jury affair. We can all go to our home over there if we keep Jesus' commandments.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by Jack Beall:

Good evening, I want to talk tonight on the Mundt-Nixon bill against subversive activities. There seems to be a lot of confusion about what it does and what it does not do. A somewhat typical case was the radio debate the other night between Governor Dewey and Mr. Stassen on whether the bill outlawed the Communist Party.

Governor Dewey was quite right, in his quotations of the framers of the bill, to the effect that they had no intention of outlawing the party. They have said it over and over again that this was not their purpose. If they had meant to do that they would have gone much further and forbidden places on the ballot to Communist candidates and things like that.

What they are saying to the Communist Party is this: "We are setting up certain standards of conduct, in this cold war between the United States and world communism. We insist that your connection with and domination by the World Communist Party, directed from Moscow, shall cease. We also insist that, if you claim to be a legitimate political party, you act like one and make available, for public inspection, your membership list, and your financial statements. If you do not do these things, then there are certain penalties."

That is the situation in a nutshell—the boiled down residue of what the bill seeks to make law.

It is entirely up to the Communist Party to decide whether they would obey such a law or not. It is in their power to do either thing—obey the law or disobey the law. If they disobey the law they are subject to the penalties. Like anybody else who disobeys the law they have gone outside the law—they have outlawed themselves.

Suppose that there had been no law against bank robbery, for example, and a lot of it had been going on. People got sick and tired of it and said that this new kind of robbery was henceforth to be against the law. Well, the bank robbers all over the land, in a sort of organized way, get very indignant about it and say, "You can't do that to us. It is a new law, for one thing—making something a crime that wasn't a crime before. You can't outlaw us like that. We're going to keep right on robbing banks." Query: If they do, have they been outlawed or have they outlawed themselves?

Every law, when broken, results in the outlawing of the person breaking it, so far as that particular law is concerned. It is quite within the power of the Communist Party, United States of America, to decide which it shall be. If they disobey the law, when and if it becomes law, they have only themselves to blame if they do outlaw themselves.

One of the funny things about this whole situation is that the claim is made, on behalf of the party, that it can't afford to register its membership. Representative MARCANTONIO, of New York, who has a 100-percent voting record on things favored or not favored by the Communist Party, put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the other day a brief on the exposure section of the Mundt-Nixon bill.

"Communist has become a bad name in this county * * *" says the brief. "Many organizations could not survive if they had to adopt a Communist label. Even a frankly Communist organization cannot survive if it must, by listing its members, subject them to these (serious economic, social, and political) disabilities."

That is what I call admitting themselves out of court. They say they would have to disband if they labeled themselves for what they are, and labeled their literature for what it is. This is in perfect accord with what I have been saying throughout this series of talks on communism, now more than 8 months old. I had been saying it is a conspiracy that cannot stand the light of day, that cannot stand inspection, whose chief enemy is truth and exposure. Now, in a brief, that may or may not have come direct from the Communist Party itself, it says the same thing. It is saying "you can't do this to us, you mustn't make us tell the truth about ourselves. We wouldn't have a chance in the world to stab you in the back if you did. It isn't liberal or constitutional of you to defend yourself by exposing us. We couldn't live then."

Well, in the clutch, I think the people of this country would prefer that the Communist Party, an underground, fifth-column conspiracy, which now admits that it can't stand the light of day and can't work its will on us, except in the dark, should perish rather than be permitted to keep on the way it is going. It doesn't gain much sympathy from the American people by crying out now that we are unfair, we won't stand still and permit them to come up on us in the dark and knife us.

The main things that the bill says the Communist Party must do is to divorce itself from its foreign control, for the purpose of establishing a totalitarian dictatorship in this country and to register its officers, its membership and financial affairs, and label its outpourings as sponsored by the Communist Party. They seem to confess that they have been trying to establish a totalitarian dictatorship in this country, under control of a foreign power when they confess that they couldn't go on doing their job if they were forced to expose themselves. They seem to confess that they are acting as a hidden fifth-column when they say they might as well disband if they had to come up into the light of day and stand on their own feet and be counted. You would think from their brief that they had a case for righteous indignation, saying that restraint by exposure is as invalid as direct outlawry.

In other words, let nobody in this sleepy, stupid Nation try to expose spies, saboteurs, borers from within, actual or potential, who are getting ready for the day when comes the revolution, or when comes the war with Russia. It is unconstitutional for this country to undertake its own highest duty of self-preservation, from an outfit which has already announced its full intention with regard to all capitalistic countries and, now that we are the only country standing in its way, has redoubled its efforts against us, in particular.

They complain that we are violating our own first amendment of the Constitution, guaranteeing free press and free speech, because this particular bill does not strike at a clear and present danger. In other words, we cannot protect ourselves just because the Communists, they say, are not a present danger. Well, aside from the fact that the proportion of Communists now in this country is far larger than the proportion of Communists in Russia, at the time when Nikolai Lenin seized power; aside rom the fact that communism has, either physically or politically, taken over 14 countries, or dominates them; aside from the fact that they used their fifth column, inside those countries, to soften them up, before the taking over, or domination; aside from the fact that we are supposed to be the No. 1 enemy of communism in the world and all the hate and vitriol of their propaganda is concentrated on us; aside from the fact that the United States Government was highly fearful that overt, hot war might break out between the two countries, no longer than a month ago; aside from the fact that when that war comes, the Soviet Union will have the world's best organized fifth column of spies and saboteurs—even lodged inside our most sensitive departments of Government—ready to hamstring us in every way, from stirring up mutiny in the armed services to tying up shipping and communications and fomenting strikes in the entire electrical industry, without which no war weapons can be constructed—aside from these little items, I suppose there is no clear and present danger.

Inciting to riot is a crime, isn't it? Inciting to rebellion, I'd say, is no less a crime, and they are doing it now, every day, with every new convert they make. Just because the rebellion that the Communist Party would incite them to is dependent on a later signal from the Kremlin, at a time when the Kremlin judges is the ripe time for crippling our economy, or causing civil disturbances or "turning imperialist war into civil war" (as they have expressed it thousands of times), does not alter the fact that it is a present danger. If a man lights the fuse to a bomb, it is a present danger, until it is put out, no matter if the fuse is a long fuse or a short fuse, a slow burning fuse or a fast burning. The thing is lit.

The rather odd and inconsistent part of the Communist pleading is that they cannot function any more as a fifth column if they are forced to expose themselves, while at the same time, pleading that they are not a danger, in this time of cold war which may become hot at almost any time.

The Mundt-Nixon bill does change a couple of old concepts. They have modernized the remedy for modern perils. They realize that fifth column penetration is a means of overthrowing governments, just as truly as by force and violence, and it applies a remedy to it. Also it realizes that cold wars can lead to dangers comparable to hot war. Heretofore, treason was a crime which could be maintained only in time of war. Now, the bill, in effect, applies it to a period of quasi peace, or cold war, like the present.

The theme, that it has got to be done under the direction and control of a foreign government, runs all through the bill. Under the Mundt-Nixon bill, not only would it be a crime to try to set up a totalitarian dictatorship directed from Moscow, but also it would be a crime to try to set up a German Nazi, Italian Fascist, Spanish Falangist, or Japanese Black Dragon form of dictatorship. This proposed law is not to impose thought-control, as the commies charge, but to prevent overt actions—actions which turn this country into a satellite of a foreign dictatorship. It tries, in the words of Congressman MUNDT, to "cut the umbilical cord" between Soviet Russia and the Communist Party, United States of America.

One of the most interesting things about the bill is that it takes the Communist Party at its word, in one respect, and tries to make it live up to that word. The Communist Party claims that it is a legitimate political party, like Democrats and Republicans. But unlike the Democrats and Republicans, it doesn't like publicity about its members, and about its finances. They want to have their cake and eat it, too. They want to be a full-fledged party, but they don't want to undertake the responsibilities of a regular party They want secrecy about their membership rolls and finances, although a great many States require members of the various parties to register their names.

Said Congressman MUNDT on the floor of the House, during the debate: "We say to the Communist Party: 'Since you claim to be a political party, we will write the rules of the game, making you function as a political party. We will require you to act in the open, like a political party; require you to accept the responsibilities of a political party * * * and register the names of the people who belong to your party. Stand up and be counted * * * let the people know who you are.'" He further says: "If they can prove that they are operating as a political party, they shall have the same rights of propagandizing and collecting contributions as any other party."

Otherwise, he says, "We will make you label your stuff as propaganda," and then, "no

longer can you sneak through the mails, disguised by some fancy, high-powered, euphonious name, as patriots, when actually you are engaged in the subversive process of burrowing, undermining, disrupting and corrupting America."

It seems to me that, taking them at their word and making only the same rules apply to them as a party, which apply to the other parties, is only fair. One of the things which this country has handled, with more or less success, is the matter of labelling articles truthfully, or advertising them truthfully. We have the Federal Trade Commission for that, as well as pure food laws and other laws. Why shouldn't there be a law to force organizations to paste on true labels, brand themselves rightly, not sell under false pretenses? Why should any organization, even one which uses lies and false fronts as a matter of principle, like the Communists, be allowed to get away with it, any more than the Government would allow a poison to be labelled "honey," or any more than a community would allow a saloon to be labelled as a church?

What privileged position have the followers of Lenin and Stalin just because Lenin told his Communists that they should (and I'm quoting) "use any ruse, cunning, unlawful methods, evasion, and concealment of truth?" Why should we grant them any privileged position just because they have been counseled by their leaders to use not only legal, but illegal methods, to accomplish their aims?

There are some points of weakness about the Mundt-Nixon bill, parts which can possibly be changed or eliminated in the Senate. But for the most part it is a good bill, a necessary bill, a long-needed bill (and the Attorney General has testified that he could use a registration statute now). And it would be an effective bill. One needs only to listen now to the Commies, as they set up their loudest and longest howl. They convince me that the bill would be effective, once it's enacted into law, by the magnitude of their reaction, even while their friends and spokesmen in Congress are saying that it wouldn't be effective.

The way they are scurrying around reminds me somewhat of an ant nest which has had kerosene poured on it, or vermin that has suffered a sudden dousing with DDT. It convinces me that this bill, once enacted, would be a most effective instrument for either forcing the Communists to give their right names, or become entirely illegal. Even if they go underground more than they are at present, this law provides a rather sharp instrument for prying them out of the ground and lodging them where they ought to be. We have never had that before. It's high time we did.

This is Jack Beall saying good night from Washington.

Navy Public Works Bill, Sandy Point, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial:

THE SANDY POINT CONTROVERSY

Sometime this week the House of Representatives will vote on the Navy public works bill. Baltimore and Maryland are concerned with this bill because, as it is finally presented, it authorizes the construction of an airfield on Sandy Point, just south of the Magothy River and just north of the Severn.

Discussion has raged over this proposal for at least 2 years. Exaggerated claims and charges have been made on both sides. But when all is said and done, the fact remains that Baltimore and Maryland will surely suffer if the field is built in the proposed area, whereas the Navy has never fully proved that no other site is suitable.

No Marylander, certainly no informed citizen of this State, would stand in the way of a proper development of the facilities of the Naval Academy. The relationship has been so close, over so many years, that most of us have a feeling that whatever is good for the Academy is good for us.

But the Chesapeake Bay also is vital to Maryland. It is, perhaps, the major asset of the State: It provides much of our food. It carries our commerce. Its low shores and its pleasant waters provide our chief relief from the rigors of our tropical summers.

For more than a generation, the Armed Forces, both the Army and the Navy, have been taking the bay over, not bit by bit but in large chunks. Most of these extensions have been clearly justifiable and local interests have been willingly sacrificed to the general good.

But in the case of the Sandy Point airfield, the Navy has never made a wholly convincing case. Here is one of the most beautiful of the peninsulas on the western shore. There are a few big estates, but mainly those who enjoy it and the waters which surround it are small folk whose achievement or ambition is to own or merely to rent a small cottage—"shacks" they used to be called—along tidewater.

Leave out of account the perturbation of the Gibson Islanders. They have a case, but in all probability the airfield will not harm them as much as they fear. Consider only that Sandy Point is one of the few remaining areas near enough to this rapidly expanding city of ours where the new generation will be able to find that bit of the shore of the bay which is the traditional aim of almost all of us.

Bearing this in mind, it seems to us that the Navy should have made a more thorough, a more conscientious effort to find another suitable location. Moreover, we believe that if the Navy did in fact make such an effort, it would find such a site. It might be a few miles farther from Annapolis than Sandy Point, but what are a few miles compared to the considerations we have listed? What are a few miles compared, indeed, to the continuation of the happy relationship that has endured for so many generations?

Fortunately for all of us, the bill as presented can be amended on the floor. We hope that one, at least, of the Maryland Congressmen will move to strike out the authorization of the Sandy Point project. We hope that he will state the case for Baltimore and Maryland not in the exaggerated terms which have so far marked the discussion, but instead in well-considered sentences which reflect the feelings of our people in this matter.

It is obviously not the task of outsiders to tell the Navy what area should be chosen as a substitute. Some say that Andrews Field, which the Army built but has all but abandoned, could properly be used by the Navy under the unification plan. Others say that land is available south of the Severn. Perhaps half a dozen other suggestions have been made. Let the Navy decide.

The main thing is that the Congress consider the interests of the people of this State before voting to take away from us another useful part of our heritage.

Veterans' Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast made by me at Portland, Maine:

VETERANS' HOUSING

Since VJ-day, and even before, this country has been face to face with a critical housing shortage. For obvious reasons this prolonged deficit was particularly hard on people who were uprooted or moved from one location to another—including millions of veterans of World War II. Today, nearly 3 years after the surrender of Japan, the housing shortage is the most serious and difficult problem confronting our veterans.

Yet it was the plain intent of Congress that veterans should have priority when it came to renting or buying homes. Moreover, that clear intent was expressed in the GI bill of rights, which was designed to give veterans that priority.

Then how does it happen that so many ex-GI families are living doubled up or in quarters that represent no priority whatever? The answer was made in a prophetic statement by the American Legion over a year ago. I quote: "This year—1947—it is not likely to be the shortage of housing that will deprive the veteran of satisfactory homes, as much as it will be the high cost of adequate housing."

What we all feared has come to pass. Veterans are being forced out of the market despite their priorities. Yes, it is true that about a million and a quarter veterans have managed to get homes under the GI bill of rights. By and large, however, these represent the highest income group of veterans. And now this spring has virtually dried up. Just walk into your nearest bank or savings and loan association and try to get a GI loan to build or buy a home. The usual answer is "Sorry, we are not making any more GI loans." And consider this startling fact: According to a special Census Bureau survey, only 3 out of 10 former GI's in 1947 were living in the same house they occupied in 1940.

Faced with facts like these, the American Legion concluded that a solution must be found which will permit a veteran of average income to get adequate housing within his ability to pay. And this solution must fit the pattern of our democratic free-enterprise system.

With that purpose firmly in mind and guided by the realities which our veterans face, the Legion drafted the Veterans' Homestead Act. They requested me as chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee to introduce H. R. 4488. This I did in December. I am happy to say that nearly 30 other Members of Congress joined me introducing identical bills.

But before discussing this proposed bill, the Veterans' Homestead Act of 1948, I want to remind you again that neither public housing nor the GI bill of rights can meet this problem. Public housing—and this includes the proposed Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill—is aimed at the bottom 10 percent of our income groups, the charity-relief level. On the other hand, the loan provisions of the GI bill leave veterans who want homes at the mercy of speculative real-estate charges which today will run from 15 to 100 percent above cost. For all practical purposes, this

limits veterans' home ownership to the top 10-percent income group. In fact, less than 5 percent of the veterans can afford homes costing $15,000 or more.

Under existing practices and procedures the vast majority of veterans, the middle-income group, get no benefit whatever in their search for adequate housing.

The Veterans' Homestead Act of 1948 is aimed squarely at the home-seeking veterans in that middle 50 percent. It is based on the actual experience and success of nonprofit veteran corporations in obtaining low-cost housing through their own efforts.

Let Baton Rouge, La., serve as an example. There a locally organized housing association, composed entirely of World War II veterans, has built livable homes in a well planned, convenient and agreeable environment with water and sewer lines, electric and gas facilities. It has curving paved streets and sidewalks. It has trees, lawns, and gardens, and within walking distance of their jobs for most of the breadwinners of this development. Over-all costs to the new home owners represent no more than a reasonable rental.

Out of this and similar experiences came H. R. 4488. After extensive hearings, this bill was unanimously approved by the entire Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House.

The bill declares, and I quote, "it is the intent of the Congress to provide means of ownership and financing, within the framework of our private enterprise system and without vast expenditures of public moneys, whereby veterans themselves, associated together within their own communities, can build, buy, or rent homes upon terms which veterans can afford; and to provide the public facilities essential to such homes without the imposition of additional financial burdens upon veterans who may be owners thereof or tenants therein."

There is very little lost motion in H. R. 4488. It authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to issue charters to five or more veterans "of ability, good character and responsibility who organize a veterans' homestead association."

Membership in the association is limited to veterans and each member is required to deposit $100 as a down payment toward the purchase or rental of a home. The association will be nonprofit and will sell or rent houses at cost. The cost of housing built or bought by an association is limited to $10,000 per family unit, on the average; and no loan can exceed $10,000 per unit. No housing purchased from an association can be sold for 3 years unless it is first offered for resale to the Association at the original price—with fair allowance for depreciation or improvements made by the buyer.

The earlier experience of veterans' nonprofit housing corporations revealed two very serious obstacles—the cost of finance and the cost of improved land.

Both of these obstacles are dealt with in H. R. 4488. As first introduced, the bill provided that associations would get short-term loans direct from the Veterans' Administration for initial expense, and long-term loans would come from the sale of association bonds to the general public. Since the bonds were to be unconditionally guaranteed by the United States and the interest tax exempt, it was expected that they would carry a low rate—about 2½ percent. This same version of the bill also empowered the associations to make low-interest loans to individual association members for the purchase of homes.

From the knowledge gained by our committee through extensive hearings, we decided to change these financial arrangements somewhat. The Veterans' Administrator now is authorized to make either short- or long-term loans direct to any association. The interest rate on these loans shall be one-fourth of 1 percent above the going rate payable by the Administrator to the Secretary of the Treasury. This, also, should result in an interest rate to the association of about 2½ percent.

Under the version reported out by my committee, the associations can continue to build homes of all types and to operate and manage multiple-unit or cooperative housing. But the individual veteran who buys his home from the association cannot borrow directly from them. He can, however, borrow from a bank or building and loan association at 4 percent. To make these loans possible the proposed amendments permit the Home Loan Bank Board to invest in such lending institutions on condition that the funds are earmarked for loans to members of veterans' homestead association.

There are two main reasons for this change. One is the fact that about one and a quarter million veterans already are committed to home-purchase loans at 4 percent. The other is that some associations, especially the smaller ones, might have found it impossible, in view of the costs involved in servicing small mortgages, to make individual loans to members at rates as low as 4 percent.

Another significant new provision is designed to create what is called "a secondary market" for these real-estate loans. Under its terms the Veterans' Administrator is authorized to purchase these loans at par under certain conditions. This will add further assurance that local banking institutions will have money available to lend to the individual veteran.

The final important change in H. R. 4488 permits 4 percent housing loans to veterans living on farms. The Federal land bank and the Farmers Home Administration are designated to carry out this provision, after receiving a certificate of eligibility issued by the Veterans' Administration.

Undoubtedly these various loan provisions will help many veterans' associations overcome the first obstacle which I mentioned a moment ago—the cost of financing decent homes.

Well, what about the other obstacle—the cost of improved land? We all know that certain facilities are necessary to make a home livable—schools, streets, sidewalks, water, sewers, gas, and electricity, to mention only a few—and these improvements are costly.

We know, also, that improved land in most urban areas is scarce and very expensive, and is becoming harder and harder to get.

H. R. 4488 goes right to the heart of this problem by authorizing the Federal Works Administrator to make grants on a matching basis to municipalities and veterans' associations for construction of these essential facilities. The grant will be made only when the Veterans' Administrator determines that it is required for the housing of an association and then the public body must agree to reduce the assessments or other charges by an amount equal to the grant.

These are the main features of H. R. 4488. It is not a magic cure-all, it doesn't raid the Federal Treasury or promise pie in the sky. But this bill does attack two of the toughest problems that veterans' housing has encountered. Best of all, it leaves the initiative and the responsibility for housing right where it belongs—back home in the local homestead associations. It gives our veterans the chance they have been asking for—the chance to help themselves.

The bill is on the calendar. I have asked for a rule or suspension of the rules. The bill should pass and pass at once if the veterans are to be given leases.

Assistance for DP's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Sunday, May 30, 1948:

MANY STATES ARE EAGER TO ASSIST DP'S—GOVERNORS REPORT ON JOB OPENINGS—100,000 ARE NEEDED, 50,000 IN NEW YORK; HOUSING STILL PROBLEM

(This is the first of two articles on the attitude of State governors and their administrations toward the problem of the 1,000,000 displaced persons in Europe. The New York Herald Tribune sought the Governors' views on a great issue now before Congress.)

The United States can easily absorb an initial influx of up to 100,000 of Europe's army of 1,000,000 displaced persons, according to a canvass of State governors just concluded by the New York Herald Tribune.

Substantial numbers of DP's could find useful employment and a hearty welcome in the New York area, the survey showed, although housing would continue to be a problem in almost any community.

Governors Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, and Alfred E. Driscoll, of New Jersey, and Acting Governor James C. Shannon, of Connecticut were in general agreement in their responses to queries from this newspaper, that DP's could fill the need for skilled workers in many fields in their States.

FIFTY THOUSAND JOBS IN STATE

Governor Dewey estimated, on the basis of a study by the State department of labor, that 50,000 DP's could fill job vacancies in New York State alone.

Governor Driscoll said New Jersey could absorb "at least its full quota," and cited a variety of positions in which opportunities exist.

In Connecticut the late Gov. James L. McConaughy, in a reply received before his death—and with which Acting Governor Shannon later said he was in full agreement—said his State needed, as an example, 1,000 women skilled sewing-machine operators. He pledged that Connecticut "will make every effort to do its share in any program in the American tradition of hospitality and humanitarianism."

FLORIDA CITES OPENINGS

In Florida, Gov. Millard F. Caldwell, after a State chamber of commerce survey, reported that the State could take a maximum of 10,000 DP's.

In general the governors sought skilled workers, especially in the textile, garment, and chemical industries, but many needs were developed for capable agricultural workers, for dairymen, for tobacco hands, for trained nurses and for domestic servants.

No commitments came from the Governors of California, Illinois, Massachusetts, Missouri, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Texas, and the executives of several other States said that the DP problem was still under study.

Governor Dewey's reply follows in full and contains the questions asked of him and his answers. The same questions were asked of all governors.

NEW YORK

1. Question. Can you estimate the absorptive capacity of your State for displaced persons?

Answer. A year's study by the New York State Department of Labor of this subject has revealed that a substantial number of job vacancies could be filled by displaced persons on the basis of their training and experience as submitted by UNRRA. The labor department's report estimates this number at 50,000.

2. Question. What are your State's outstanding needs in industrial and agricultural labor?

Answer. In the field of manufacture and construction, there is need of certain types of skilled workers with specific industrial experience. The State employment service of the department of labor lists 74 occupations, almost all of which require skills as persistently unfillable in the localities where the local offices of the service operate. These include garment workers, makers of tools, carpenters, masons, electricians, plumbers, sheet metal men, and miners. In New York City, there is demand for cabinetmakers, jewelry workers, optical grinders, and polishers, pressmen and compositors, repairmen on motors and other machinery.

Hospitals are in immediate need of nurses, attendants, and other help. State institutions suffer from lack of staffs.

There is a State-wide shortage of laborers of above-average strength and endurance for work in factories and mines.

New York State farmers are in especial need of help on both a seasonal and year-round basis. New York faces a serious labor shortage in the harvesting of food crops. Hundreds of farms are abandoned or idle in this State because of the labor shortage. Farmers generally are undermanned.

On a seasonal basis, New York State can use most of the 3,000 farmers receiving assistance in the United States zone in Germany.

3. Question. Is the State government surveying the situation, or are private agencies doing the job?

Answer. Over a year ago the New York State Department of Labor, under the direction of Industrial Commissioner Edward Corsi, undertook a study of job opportunities in New York State for employable displaced persons. The purpose of the study was to determine how many displaced persons might be employed in the State at prevailing wages without creating unemployment among present State workers.

4. Question. Can you summarize opinion in your State about the displaced persons problem?

Answer. Placement of DP's raises the question of housing, a very serious question in view of the housing shortage. However, farm and domestic labor, for instance, would not be seriously affected. The housing shortage moreover, is more acute in the industrial areas, where work opportunities are fewer than in rural areas and in towns and villages.

It is obvious that New York, like other States, cannot accept any serious number of DP's without careful planning. A free, unregulated movement of DP's would create problems both for ourselves and for them of a serious social nature. Churches, social agencies, labor and management must unite in this planning to meet such needs and factors as employment and housing.

NEW JERSEY

Governor Driscoll replied:

"A preliminary survey by several of our State agencies indicates that New Jersey can absorb at least its full quota of displaced European persons if they are admitted to the United States during the next few years.

"There is a need in our State for labor of various types in many fields of agricultural skills, particularly in dairying and general farming, but also on poultry and fruit farms. Since many New Jersey farmers originally migrated from central European countries, personal and language adjustment of displaced persons from these countries would be relatively easy.

"We also have a need for female domestic workers and trained nurses as well as for both male and female institutional attendants, and for workers in these fields as well as in many of the agricultural jobs, the problem of our housing shortage would not particularly apply.

"In industry the greatest demand for any specific type of skilled labor appears to be in chemical work for men and sewing-machine operation for women. There is also a need for some male foundry workers and female laundry workers. Some of the foundry work and a few other jobs are in the unskilled category. These industrial needs must, however, be balanced against our critical housing shortage. We will be prepared to accept as many displaced European persons in these categories as housing facilities will permit.

"The survey is being continued in order to determine precisely the number of people for whom employment can be found and the particular skills required. We are not merely eager to secure the specific types of workers needed. We hope that at the same time we may be able to provide a haven for men and women who want only an opportunity to become self-supporting and independent and to make constructive contribution to society. The present plight of these people is an indication that thay have been victims or active opponents of totalitarianism, and are therefore well able to appreciate and contribute to our American way of life."

CONNECTICUT

The late Governor McConaughy replied:

"State and private agencies in our State have been called upon to make a detailed study of potential homes and employment for displaced persons in the event of their admission to the country.

"The problem of absorbing these victims of dictatorship and war is tragically acute. It will require careful planning to prepare for any assimilation of these people which will present them with those elements of opportunity for hope for the future and at the same time make their presence a contribution to our economic, domestic, and social life. Connecticut will make every effort to do its share in any program in the American tradition of hospitality and humanitarianism.

"We could find prompt employment for about 1,000 women skilled sewing machine operators. There is some need for additional men in certain skilled trades, such as tool and die making and electronic engineering. There is need of year-round agricultural workers, and dairymen and tobacco workers. The absorptive ability of our industries thus depends on the type of worker available and his experience but, chief of all, his ability to find a home in a State already critically short of homes.

"It must be realized that Connecticut, a small State, has an intensely concentrated population normally. In its role as a major war industrial State, Connecticut attracted a record number of new workers. A large percentage of these people are still with us, working in our industrial plants. No eastern State has had as great a percentage growth since 1940.

"Our foremost problem currently is to provide adequate housing for our own veterans before we can estimate the number of DP's that can be absorbed. To this will be added the necessity of discovering housing for any incoming group.

"In addition to the extreme housing shortage in the State, our lack of knowledge regarding the training and skills of the DP's precludes the possibility of approximating the number of industrial and agricultural workers that can be assimilated into our economic life."

Shall America Adopt Peacetime Conscription?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Rev. E. Paul Weaver, Huntington, Ind., broadcast by Station WTRC, Elkhart, Ind., May 20, 1948.

Reverend Weaver has devoted a generous portion of his remarkable talents and energy in opposition to the current proposals for universal military training and service. In this short address he has persuasively and cogently summarized the arguments against these proposals:

Mr. Chairman, friends of the radio audience, citizens of Elkhart County and surrounding community, I am happy to address you this evening on this subject which is so important to our national existence, "Shall American adopt peacetime conscription?"

There is one thing that all of us have in common. All of us love America. My ancestors came to these shores just about 200 years ago, because America appeared to them as a land of freedom and great promise. I was reared in these great traditions. I believe in the American way of life. All of us love America. If we did not love this country we should not be so deeply concerned that it should not go down the path that would lead to its self-destruction.

Recently I have returned from our Nation's Capitol, where for 2 weeks I studied carefully the testimony being presented to the House Armed Services Committee. I have seen the clever trick that is being played in an attempt to get Congress to provide for permanent compulsory military training. When it became evident that Congress would not pass UMT temporary selective service was demanded in the President's address on March 17. On the 18th of March when Secretary of Defense Forrestal testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee he appeared to be so surprised by the request of the President that he had no plan to offer the committee (p. 43, SASC hearings). However, by April 12 when Secretary Forrestal testified before the House Armed Services Committee the following conversation occurred:

"Congressman HÉBERT. I understood you to say that selective service is merely a temporary measure?

"Secretary FORRESTAL. Yes, sir.

"Mr. HÉBERT. Which will be on the books so long as you do not have UMT; is that correct?

"Secretary FORRESTAL. Yes, sir; that is right.

"Mr. HÉBERT. Then it will be as temporary as some of those buildings on Constitution Avenue which were erected during World War I and which are still there—if we do not have universal military training?

"Secretary FORRESTAL. That is my opinion." (House and Senate Committee hearings, p. 6114.)

Let no one be confused. The program calls for permanent peacetime conscription and regimentation. Its advocates want all they can get. They will start with a little if they cannot get all at the first attempt. After studying the situation carefully I am convinced that the program calls for more than permanent peacetime conscription for mili-

tary service. It follows its logical course to conscription of labor and regimentation of capital and industry, in fact regimentation of all life. If we should follow such a course in an attempt to defeat a totalitarian dictatorship abroad we should inevitably find ourselves the victims of just such a system here in the America we love.

I live in the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana. We in the Fifth District are happy to have as our Representative the Honorable FOREST HARNESS, who loves our American way of doing things. I have found Mr. Harness to be a statesman of unusual courage. If our American way of life is preserved by this Congress, all America will be in debt to Mr. HARNESS and his investigations of the agencies of the Federal Government which have been using our money to control the thought of this Republic. His investigations of the War Department's illegal and improper propaganda activities for UMT helped to turn the tide from the way of regimentation.

If we felt that peacetime conscription were really necessary to our security, I know that Congress would pass a law to that effect without hesitation. I talked with dozens of Congressmen. I know that they feel that they are not getting the truth from the administration. I predict confidently now, contrary to the predictions of so many, that neither UMT nor the proposed Truman draft will pass in this session.

Just yesterday I received my copy of the minority report of the House Armed Services Committee and signed by Congressmen SHORT, BISHOP, HEFFERNAN, PHILBIN, and HAVENNER. It is a masterful summary of the case against the Truman draft.

The responsible officers of the Air Force testified that they felt that even for a 70-group program the Air Force does not need selective service. Likewise on the same day, April 13, the men responsible for our Navy testified that they felt that the Navy can get its men without selective service.

On March 31, 1947, the Army grades were raised to 80. At the present time the Army is turning down almost 50 percent of the men applying for service, although they must admit that men with grades under 80 did splendid jobs during the war. In fact men with grades of 59 were used. The Army claims that men with grades under 80 make up an unusual percentage of the men in the guardhouse. Dr. Alonzo Myers, an infantry captain of World War I, told the House Armed Services Committee that "the Army has so many minor regulations that it would take a good memory to obey all of them." (House Armed Services Committee hearings, p. 6472.)

It was pointed out in the minority report of the House Armed Services Committee that "the Army has deliberately refrained from making all-out efforts to utilize voluntary recruitment methods. Just as little interest has been shown in supporting the Reserve establishments as long as the Army feels that universal conscription is obtainable, so the Army has been unwilling to pursue energetically the problem of making Army service more desirable to the average potential soldier" (minority report, p. 8).

Many believe that if the Army would reform its system according to the suggestions of the Doolittle report, Army life would be more attractive to the average young man. The minority report also stresses the observation that "to date the record of the Army in refusing to build up either the Organized Reserves or the National Guard borders on a national scandal. The testimony before our committee established clearly that the Army has followed a policy of deliberately ignoring the Reserves as a means of exerting pressure to get universal military training" (p. 8).

The argument that hooks more people in favor of peacetime conscription and UMT than any other is the story that has been fed very cleverly to our Gold Star Mothers. It has also been fed to the patriotic organizations as gospel truth. I should like to have the people examine this clever fiction very carefully.

The proponents of a regimented society argue that if we had UMT and/or peacetime conscription those gold stars would not be there. They say that the reason that we lost so many boys is that we did not have UMT. "If only we had had UMT," the conscriptionists sigh. What is the truth?

The relative casualty lists disprove this fiction. Here are the casualty lists of soldiers killed in World War II according to General Marshall's estimates: Countries with peacetime conscription—U. S. S. R. lost 7,500,000 (1 for every 22 inhabitants); Germany lost 2,850,000 (1 for every 25 inhabitants); Japan lost 1,506,000 (1 for every 46).

The Nation without UMT and/or peacetime conscription—the United States lost 295,904 (1 for every 500 inhabitants). (These figures do not include civilian deaths by bombings.)

During the war the Army insisted upon a teen-age draft together with an unfulfilled promise to parents that boys would be given adequate training. In October 1942, Congress was asked to lower the draft age to 18. The United States News of March 9, 1945, stated "The Senate wrote in a provision that youths of 18 and 19 could not be sent into combat without receiving at least a year's training. That provision was killed by House and Senate conferees after they were assured that draftees would be given all the training necessary to make good fighting men. Gen. George C. Marshall, Army Chief of Staff, appealed to Congress * * * to 'trust our judgment and our insistence that we fight only with properly trained units, to see that each soldier has adequate training before he enters combat.'"

The New York Times reported on December 9, 1944, "Because of a large increase in the percentage of youth that are being drafted, the Army has changed its policy and is now sending 18-year-old soldiers overseas as infantry and as armored force replacements, Robert P. Patterson * * * disclosed today." The United States News of March 9, 1945, also indicated that Secretary Patterson had said in general that all men would get about 8 months' training before going into combat. The News added: "Even then the names of 18-year-olds were showing up in casualty lists. Boys who had been graduated from high school in June were being reported killed and wounded in December."

I hope that every Gold Star Mother realizes that the Army had inducted approximately 8,000,000 men. According to General Marshall's last biennial report, only 1,500,000 of these were combat troops. We know that there were millions of men in the Army over 20. If the Army had kept faith with the parents would they have sent the 18-year-olds into combat? I hope that the decision to send our 18-year-olds into combat while the Army had millions of more mature men was not made by men who have been endeavoring to sell UMT to America for almost 30 years.

The Army has tried to create the impression that if the United States had had UMT, the casualties could have been prevented. This is attempted in both the War Department pamphlet of January 1947 and the UMT bill H. R. 4278. Most of us who think soberly will realize that these 18-year-old boys who were sent into combat had just finished high school. They would not have had UMT even if UMT had been the practice of America.

It does not seem to be honest to blame the casualties of the last war upon the absence of peacetime conscription. The Nation's leading military analyst, Hanson Baldwin, in the January 5, 1945, New York Times, discussed this question. He assigned the blame for the casualties of the Battle of the Bulge at least partly to inferior equipment. He attributed this situation to the "conservatism and traditionalism in the Army mind, complicated organization in the War Department," etc.

The Gold Star Mothers who have seen through this clever ruse at transferring the blame for the loss of their sons, are among the most ardent opponents of UMT and the peacetime draft. At the Indiana State Pastors Conference in January 1948 a lady collecting all the material about peacetime conscription available, looked up with tears in her eyes as her gold star was noticed. She remarked, "Yes, I have another son who is only 15." She does not want to turn that boy over to the same group that took away his older brother. It would be most ironical, if after the older brother has offered his life to defeat the regimented militarism of Japan, we left MacArthur behind there to root out that militarism and peacetime conscription and set up a democracy, while we in America proceeded to set up a system of militarism complete with UMT and peacetime conscription.

Millions of people who deeply love the American Way of life are opposed to UMT and/or the proposed Truman draft because they have read the following statement:

"It is clear to anyone who even stops to think that in case of a coming war the entire Nation would have to take up arms, that therefore millions would be driven towards the enemy with bad, insufficient, or half-finished training. One must nevertheless not forget that the shortage of trained soldiers could easily lead, at the beginning of a war to losing that war.

"The Army educates them only to be reliable decent members of the community, men who in the hour of need and danger will feel themselves united in loyalty with the Nation, and should fate confront them with the sternest ordeal, will defend the freedom of our people with bravery and honor."

That statement was made, not by a loyal American, but by Adolph Hitler in Mein Kampf when he was trying to sell his Nazi youth movement to the German people.

When I testified before the House Armed Service Committee on April 23, I was asked, "What do you suggest we should do to stop Russia?"

To that question I replied, "I think we must not follow the method of Russia; but we must approach Russia with some positive action. We cannot defeat communism, which is an idea, with guns. We must learn that. You cannot stop an idea with a gun. You drive it in further. But you can stop an idea with a more powerful idea, and the more powerful idea is the Christian ideal of democracy. Jesus Christ taught respect for the human personality, and our Government today has lost it. It is time that we find it again. If we have the ideal of a Christian democracy, which our ancestors had, we will defeat communism not only in America, but we will stop it in Russia. The iron curtain is not so high but what Russia will hear of the democracy which is working in America. But if we fail to make it work here, they will have a good, fertile bed for their ideals here in America." (HASC hearings, p. 6592.)

I still agree with that statement. We must make our democracy work. We must reaffirm our faith in the American way of life. We must say "No" to every effort at unnecessary regimentation. UMT and the Truman draft are only a beginning. When my hostess requests, "Will you keep your fork, please," I know that there is something more coming. In the case of UMT and the Truman draft there is also something more coming. I would warn us solemnly, "It will not be pie and cake." God helping us we can yet resist these steps toward regimentation and these efforts at Federal thought control.

(The material which is not otherwise documented in this statement is found in the Report of the Hearings of the House Armed Services Committee on Selective Service, pp. 6584–6593.)

Address of Hon. Spruille Braden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. Spruille Braden, before the Sons of the American Revolution at the Waldorf-Astoria, Monday, April 19, 1948:

Always it is an honor to join with the Sons of the American Revolution in commemorating the Battle of Lexington. But I am especially grateful for the privilege of addressing this old and distinguished organization tonight because of the significance this anniversary acquires in these troublesome times.

As the sun rose 173 years ago today, Major Pitcairn and his British troops found themselves confronted at Lexington by about 50 minutemen, under Capt. John Parker. It was he who then gave the famous command, "Stand your ground. Do not fire unless fired upon, but if they mean to have a war, let it begin here."

Now on a vastly greater and more menacing scale, our freedoms—along with those of all humanity—are threatened once again. In the face of this crisis, I believe Parker's heroic words, just as accurately and just as succinctly as when they were uttered, express the spirit and will of the American people. That is to say, we ardently desire peace, we do not seek a conflict and will not fire unless fired upon, but we do propose to stand our ground. It is unbelievable that the Soviet could be so brutally insane as to precipitate another world conflict. But if they are, then we can retreat no further and can only repeat Parker's phrase, "If they mean to have a war let it begin."

Because in the years leading up to Lexington, the colonists with stoic forebearance accepted outrage heaped on long continued abuses—the Stamp and Regulatory Acts, the tea duty, the impressment of citizens, and even the Boston massacre—George III and his ministers totally misapprehended the American attitude. He and his minions did not understand that for us it was neither a question of economic well-being, nor of convenience, and that the American position rested upon the deepest foundations of principle, of liberty, and of justice. They labored under the fatal error that unanimity was lacking amongst the several Colonies. They blunderingly believed that the loudly protesting loyalists represented public opinion in this land. They gained the absurd idea that we could be frightened into inaction or even submission.

First Kaiser Wilhelm, and later Hitler, Mussolini, and the Japanese militarists repeated George's grievous and costly miscalculations. Their fate should be a warning for others not to deceive themselves as to what is the ingrained national attitude of the American people, as strong today as ever: We will suffer and sacrifice much to keep the peace but there is a limit beyond which we will not yield. Greatly as we desire peace and not war, far more do we want right and not wrong.

Unfortunately, a small coterie of power drunk absolutists in Moscow do not yet seem to have learned this lesson from our history. Wholly misinterpreting American character, they delude themselves that we will remain inert because we have for so long permitted them to heap outrage on abuse; that we will continue to appease because we have not more vigorously objected to their repeated violations of the Atlantic Charter, the United Nations declaration, and all of the other solemn agreements to which both they and we are committed. They have persisted in their insidious infiltrations and seizures of the governments of other nations because we did not more strenuously object to their absorption of three Baltic States and did not prevent their domination of Poland, the Balkans, and lastly Czechoslovakia. They, like George III, labor under the fatal error that in an emergency we will not overnight, sacrificing wealth and comfort, become a united nation, inherently devoted to principle, liberty, and justice. They believe the false premises and the, to say the least, ingenuous mouthings of the new or third party leaders. They seem to think we are frightened because in recent months we have only protested diplomatically the shooting down of American soldiers. They do not realize that we have tolerated all these and many other things solely because of our fervent dedication to peace and because we wish to deal generously with a former associate.

There are no easy, automatic solutions to the crisis of dissension and confusion, which now envelops the earth. We must feel our way, correcting mistakes so quickly as possible and realizing that our choices often will be not between good and bad, but rather to pick the lesser evil. However, there do exist some proven charts for action, which should help us to emerge from this maze of animosities and disorder. On a few of these procedures, I should like to comment.

For instance, I hope that we as a nation soon will recognize the validity in human relationships of the old saying, "Give a knave an inch, he'll take an ell." This verity works in geometrical progression; if you let the knave take an ell, then he'll take a mile and so on more and more, until he has encricled the globe and there is nothing left to give or take. The only way is to stop him in his tracks at the first inch, or so soon thereafter as possible.

In this connection, I would cite two recent incidents:

1. On January 14, 1948, two uniformed United States Army officers, attached to our Legation in Budapest, were illegally and unwarrantedly arrested in Hungary by Soviet troops, deprived of their small arms, kept incommunicado and as prisoners transported to Austria, where they were released the next day at the intervention of American military authorities there. It was not until February 7, that we mildly protested to Moscow—and, apparently, that is all we have done about it.

2. Recently an American soldier in Vienna, simply because he would not get off the sidewalk into the gutter in front of a Russian headquarters, was beaten down by a rifle butt and shot in the shoulder with a dum-dum bullet by a Soviet guard. He lay in that gutter unaided for 45 minutes. To date, I have seen no mention in the press of even an official protest.

Incidents of this kind, confront us with extremely difficult decisions. On the one hand, if we refuse to tolerate such indignities and forthwith exact adequate apologies and assurances that they will not be repeated, we must be prepared to enforce our demands. Our ultimatum may lead to war. On the other hand, failure to take summary action will enhance the aggressor's prestige and increasingly encourage him to commit further and worse affronts until a point will be reached when our tardy ultimatum will not be accepted at full value, will cause the aggressor to lose face, and so will be rejected. Then, for a self-respecting people, the only course is to fight. Hence, in cases like these, we must recognize that whatever is our decision, it may bring war. However, a protracted sufferance of such incidents will make war well-nigh inevitable; whereas there may be at least some hope of avoiding it, if at an early moment we firmly demand that our rights be respected. The surest way to keep the peace is to stop these things at their beginnings.

Let us not forget all the Nazi provocations which preceded war and that, after Munich, Hitler disdainfully referred to Chamberlain and Daladier as "little worms."

As incidents such as I have described, coupled with Russian tactics in general, have been multiplied and intensified over the last couple of years, they have at least served the useful purpose of awakening our people to the nature of Stalin's and his satellites' objectives and methods. For a long while, it seemed as if many of our citizens, both in and out of Government, like the three monkeys, could neither see, hear, speak nor, I might add, think any evil when it came to our so-called ally, the U. S. S. R. This state of affairs was especially distressing to those of us who repeatedly and officially over the last several years have sounded alarms in these particulars only to have them go unheeded. These warnings have been proven more than justified by recent developments in several neighboring republics and notably so by the tragedy in Bogota, Columbia.

My first-hand experience has been limited to this hemisphere. But even here, the Politburo's infiltrations and intrigues have for long been made readily apparent by the activities of the various Communist parties. It has been equally clear that these activities, after as well as before the publicized liquidation of the Comintern, were coordinated and directed from Moscow. I might add that the Communists, being nationals of the countries where they operate and with easy access to large masses of workers are more difficult to discover and expose and are, therefore, more dangerous than were Hitler's agents, who mostly were readily recognizable as foreigners.

We must not neglect the grave threat that if war does come, these Communist traitors equipped with bacteriological and other death-dealing instruments of modern science could wreak great havoc in our midst.

The transparent objective of the Kremlin dictators is to extend both their direct and indirect domination, and incidently communism everywhere. Their techniques and their ultimate intentions have been avowed openly and repeatedly in speeches and documents. The record has been consistent and so manifest that no longer can any one, who is not utterly visionary, have any doubts on this score. These dictators must keep going or, like a man on a bicycle, they fall. To gain their ends, they have employed and will continue to employ any means, no matter how henious—deceit, subversion, terror, murder, and revolution. Anyone, who will do these things will not hesitate to resort to armed aggression if they think they can get away with it. Since the end of World War II, their successes undoubtedly have added confidence, strength, and momentum to their determination. Therefore, unless the Praesidium in Moscow can be diverted from its present course war is possible.

A third conflagration and its consequences would be horrible indeed. Nevertheless, despite the United States doing everything within the bounds of honor to avert it, some incident or a change in Russian policy from present subversive methods to outright aggression might force a conflict upon us.

In this connection, there are behind the present crisis certain other fundamental considerations.

Not only do our security and the preservation of peace require that Soviet expansion and communism be stopped, but the persistence of civilization itself demands that the iron curtain be pushed back. For as Toynbee says in his Study of History, "When a frontier between a more highly and a less highly civilized society ceases to advance, the balance does not settle down to a stable equilibrium but inclines, with the passage of time, in the more backward society's favor." Toynbee's conclusion, based on man's oscillating progress through the ages is patently applicable to the present crisis. True, any attempt to push back the iron curtain might bring a war, which could destroy civilization. Per contra, unless Soviet expansion is contained our western civilization surely will fall before the retrograde system of Communist Russia.

Having been privileged for more than 3 years to represent the United States in the peace negotiations which settled the bloody and ferociously fought conflict between Bolivia and Paraguay in the Chaco, I was enabled at close range to study the causes of war. I reached the definite conclusion, fully supported by history elsewhere; that it could be set down practically as a law of nature that if mutual fears and suspicions endure between two nations, which are in close proximity each to the other, war becomes inevitable. Please note that I say "inevitable." but not necessarily imminent. As a matter of fact, these conditions of fear and suspicion existed between Bolivia and Paraguay for several decades before hostilities began.

The point I wish to make is that certainly mutual fears and suspicions now exist in full measure and modern transportation and communications place us in close proximity to Russia. The inescapable deduction is that unless these fears and suspicions can be dissipated, eventually there will be a third world war.

Perhaps, on the basis of comparative military potential, it could be argued that we have no reason presently to fear the Soviet. Perhaps, even by taking all adequate precautions we can maintain this margin of safety. I hope so. Unfortunately, however, to eradicate suspicion is almost impossible, not only because of the perfidy demonstrated at every turn by the Politburo and their satellites, but also because at least since the time of Ivan the Terrible distrust has always characterized both the domestic and foreign politics of Russia.

In the light of all these discouraging circumstances, self-evidently we must within reason be prepared militarily and in all other ways against the contingency of Russia sooner or later precipitating a war. In this we should rely on quality in both men and matériel—not on numbers—and never permit this country to become militarized. The mere fact we do so prepare may help to defer or even to avoid hostilities entirely.

But we cannot depend on military measures alone. Simultaneously we must exhaust every possible alternative to avoid war, to preserve peace, and make it permanent.

As a prerequisite to success in this undertaking, we must abide by that ingrained national attitude so courageously demonstrated by the colonists. We can compromise within principle but never with principle, on that we stand unswervingly. Eschewing hysteria and saber-rattling, we must act with firmness and perseverance, decisiveness, and justice. There must be self-respect, respect for others who merit it, respect for the rights of all (including the Slavic bloc), and scrupulous respect for the sanctity of our agreements and obligations. Although, of course, if the other party breaches his commitments, we are per se relieved of ours. Only in these ways can we win the respect and confidence of other peoples, render our leadership effective, and gain and keep them as collaborators.

Other nations cannot be expected to go along with us when, as their statesmen allege, our vacillations and reversals in policy embarrass and confuse them and indicate that we neither know what we want nor what to do. We must recognize that, like it or not, the mantle of leadership for the democratic peoples of the world has fallen on our shoulders. We must assume this obligation, heavy though it be. There is no other country sufficiently strong to undertake it.

Nor will free peoples confidently accept our leadership when they see us playing up to Fascists, whose materialistic interpretation of existence, exaltation of the state, and contempt for human values, parallels the communistic ideology. Fascists and Communists alike envy, fear, and hate our democratic-capitalistic way of life because it offers so infinitely more to mankind—the greatest individual freedom and highest living standards of all times—than their systems ever have or could, and because its survival spells their doom. It is for this reason that on occasions they join forces, as Hitler and Stalin did in 1939, against the democracies. If given an opportunity, they will do so again. In fact, Nazis, thoroughly drilled in police state methods, today occupy important posts with the Communist regimes in the Balkans. Also, due to our intervention, the German Junkers, militarists, and Nazis have twice failed to win world hegemony. In their next attempt, they might well ally themselves with Russia in order to knock us out first, hoping afterwards to take care of the Soviet. Already, General Von Paulus and other prominent German officers are aligned with Stalin. Therefore, we must exercise the utmost caution in dealing with Fascists everywhere and, especially, in the rehabilitation of Germany, not to strengthen them lest we create a Frankenstein's monster and powerful allies for the U. S. S. R.

If we proceed with high moral integrity, calm judgment, and resolution, other nations will follow our lead, but we should count with none too much, because all governments very naturally are motivated in large measure by what they believe is their own best interest. Thus with rare exception, there is little real affection between nations. Also in any community, an individual who possesses as much wealth and power as all of his neighbors put together will be envied and probably not be too popular. That is our position today in the community of nations. Finally, it should be emphasized that friendship can never be bought.

I assert these facts because in our endeavors to preserve peace and freedom we must depend on what we do ourselves, everyone of us, not on what some other nation does. We must, like Captain Parker and his minutemen at Lexington, be entirely self-reliant, centering all of our requirements in ourselves.

We cannot effectively oppose the socialism of communistic Russia or any other type of statism so long as we encourage or even permit so much of that evil virus to remain in our own body politic. The spread of statism, government controls, and planning, all over the globe, including the United States, is, in itself, a grave peril. These procedures are irreconcilable with sound economics and unless extirpated will grow, impoverish us, and so weaken our moral fiber, under the ensuing regimentation, as to make us ready victims for the Soviet and communism or some other brand of totalitarianism.

On this aspect of the present crisis, it is timely to quote the English historian, E. L. Woodward, who cites the effects of the planned economy of the later Roman Empire and points out that the measures of Diocletian and Constantine were esteemed just as necessary in their time as is the emergency legislation of today. Intended for a critical situation, this legislation was perpetuated until it brought the collapse of a top-heavy bureaucracy and the emergence of feudalism. Both our officialdom and the public at large should, as Professor Woodward says, know something about the unwilled regression of a civilized society into conditions which made possible the Dark Ages. How many of those engaged in post-war reconstruction, he asks, or how many persons in authority, know anything of this previous warning that there are limits to the amount of planning from above which a society can bear without loss of vitality, initiative, and, in the last resort, power of self defense against the incursions of barbarians?

No longer can we allow government to usurp the functions of private enterprise, to interfere with and to plan our every move for us, to mount controls and regulations on top of controls, and to tax individual initiative and opportunity out of existence. If we cannot make our democratic system of free enterprise flourish here, if we let it go by default so that government takes over and runs our lives for us, then the lights of freedom everywhere will be extinguished for a long time to come.

The prudent man so that he may carry adequate insurance economizes on other items—luxuries and even, perhaps, some necessities. Our Government must do exactly the same to build and maintain a sound military establishment. It should do so by substantially cutting the budget otherwise and not by eternally passing the load on to the taxpayers. Fourteen years in Government service convince me this could be done, if there were a will to do so. The Federal, State, and municipal bureaus cannot go on spending and taxing at a rate (even after the recent reduction) in excess of $1,000,000,000 a week without, as I have said, discouraging individual initiative and drying up the flow of capital into the rehabilitation and increase of our mineral and other production, our railroads, power, and industrial plants. It was the genius and skills of the American people, coupled with the tremendous productivity and performance of these enterprises, that enabled the armed forces of the United States to win two world wars. To maintain and augment the capacity of both our individual citizens and our industries will give us the sinews wherewith to win if again we are forced to fight. For this reason alone, a return to our free, competitive, private enterprise system will so strengthen our economy, our morale, and the Nation as a whole as to give pause to Russia and her satellites. It will constitute a mighty insurance for peace.

If, Heaven granting, we do secure peace, then the well-being for all, resulting from the successful operation of our democratic system and free economy, may inspire others to profit by our salutary example and thus eradicate the malignant virus of statism elsewhere.

The minutemen won at Lexington because they had faith in God, faith in principle, and faith in themselves, individually and collectively. With such faith, we, too, can face the future with confidence.

Big Event for West Memphis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from

the Crittenden County (Ark.) Times of May 29, 1948:

A BIG EVENT FOR WEST MEMPHIS

The port of West Memphis is open.

The port of West Memphis is something more than just a sign on the Arkansas bank of the Mississippi River across the river from Memphis. It's now a beehive of activity and will be for several weeks to come.

Tuesday, the first shipment of river cargo consigned to West Memphis was received. This, we hope, is the beginning for a river-rail terminal at West Memphis and the fact that West Memphis was selected as the most adequate site on the Arkansas side of the river for unloading this cargo is certainly evidence of the need of terminal facilities here.

On this first shipment to come to the port of West Memphis a saving of approximately $30,000 is being realized by the shippers in freight rates because of differentials which exist. Think what a saving could be realized over a period of time if adequate terminal facilities were available here.

The opening of the port of West Memphis is a big event for West Memphis. It is likewise a big event for the State of Arkansas and the entire Southwest area.

The Periodical America Supports the Mundt-Nixon Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in the May 29, 1948, issue of America, a Catholic review of the week, is an editorial containing an excellent analysis of the Mundt-Nixon bill which I wish to include in my remarks:

THE MUNDT BILL

The main provisions of the Mundt bill, passed by the House 319 to 58 on May 19, may be summarized as follows:

1. The Congress makes a finding of fact that there exists a world-wide conspiracy to set up totalitarian dictatorships under the control of a single foreign power; that this conspiracy operates in the United States; that it presents a "clear and present danger" to our democratic freedoms and our national security.

2. The bill defines Communist political organization and Communist-front organization. The acid test is not that certain doctrines or policies are adopted, but that the organization is under the control of a foreign power in the interests of world communism; or, in the case of front organizations, that they are controlled by, or exist primarily to aid, the political organization.

3. The bill penalizes heavily any attempt to establish in the United States a totalitarian government under foreign control; all acts intended to facilitate the establishing of such a totalitarian government; participation in the management, direction, or supervision of any movement aiming at one of the foregoing; conspiracy to violate any of these prohibitions.

4. Communist political organizations must register annually with the Attorney General (a) the name under which they operate, (b) the names of their officers, (c) the names of their members. Communist-front organizations must register their names and officers, but not their membership. These registration lists are to be open for public inspection.

5. The Attorney General may investigate a suspect organization to determine whether it is subject to registration. The organization may appeal his finding to the United States District Court in Washington and to the Supreme Court.

6. Failure to register an organization, and membership in an unregistered Communist political organization—but not in a Communist-front organization—subject the offenders to fine and imprisonment.

7. Registered organizations, if they use the mails or the radio, must clearly identify their literature or programs as emanating from "a Communist organization."

8. Registered organizations lose tax exemption, and contributions to them are not deductible for income-tax purposes. Members of Communist political organizations are ineligible for Federal employment, and may not receive or use United States passports. Conviction of any of the acts listed under No. 3, above, entails loss of citizenship.

The intent behind these provisions is simple enough. The bill does not aim at hampering any legitimate political activity. Americans are left free to hold and promote Marxist doctrines, if they so desire. What the Mundt bill tries to do is to prevent a foreign power from using our political machinery, our mails and our radio to its own nefarious ends. In so far as any Americans lend themselves to the international Communist conspiracy, the bill forces them to do so openly and denies them those political facilities which honest citizens enjoy.

In the New York Times for May 19, Anne O'Hare McCormick gave it as "a conclusion that cannot be too heavily underlined" that "the present struggle is 'the war.' If the political battle is won, there is little likelihood of a military conflict." That is the paramount consideration. That is why a veteran liberal like Adolf A. Berle, chairman of the Liberal Party, while urging more careful drafting in spots, can go along with the Mundt bill. That is why the bill deserves support.

Failure To Extend Reciprocal Trade Program Would Be a Breach of Faith to Countries of Western Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pontiac (Mich.) Press of March 11, 1948:

RECIPROCAL TRADE MUST CONTINUE

Within a few weeks Congress must face the important issue of extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

This legislation, which recognizes the important economic fact that foreign trade must flow in two directions, expires in June. Its extension for 3 years has been recommended by President Truman.

The case for extension is strong.

It's essential to ERP's success.

To permit the act to lapse would amount to a breach of faith with those countries we want welded into a west European barrier against Communist expansion. Failure to extend it would hamper the work of the Havana Trade Conference now in progress. The aim of that conference is to restore healthy world trade.

Yet extension is far from certain.

GOP sentiment isn't reassuring.

Many Republicans in both Houses are cool toward the President's proposal. Some are openly hostile. Unless prodded by informed public opinion they would vote for a retreat to prewar economic isolationism. Only once in fact have Republicans given extension a majority.

That was in the war year of 1943.

The American Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I think one of the best comments on the so-called Mundt bill, passed by the House last week, appears in the following editorial of the Washington Evening Star of May 22, 1948. This is a wonderful summarization of the provisions of the bill. It expresses with clarity and considerable precision the situations which the measure seeks to cover.

THE AMERICAN COMMUNISTS

There are two ways of evaluating the Mundt bill, which is designed to restrain some and expose other activities of the American Communists and their friends.

One way is to condemn the bill on the basis of provisions it does not contain and things it would not do. A very impressive case can be made out against the measure by setting out hypothetical situations and applying to them provisions which are not in the bill. There has been a good deal of this sort of criticism. But it is worthless because it has no basis in fact.

It has been contended, for example, that Henry Wallace's third party might have to register as a Communist-front organization if this bill becomes law. Since this contention is typical of much of the ill-informed criticism, it is worth examining.

Among other things, the bill is aimed at Communist political organzations and Communist-front organizations. These terms are defined in the bill. A Communist political organization is one that is under the direction and control of the world Communist movement. A Communist-front organization is one, other than a Communist political organization, which reasonably is found to be (1) under the control of a Communist political organization, (2) primarily operated for the purpose of giving aid and support to a Communist political organization, to a Communist foreign government, or to the world Communist movement, or (3) one whose views and policies are adopted and advanced because they are those of a Communist political organization, a Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement. Before any organization can be held to be a Communist-front organization, the Attorney General, after full investigation and a hearing, must affirmatively find it to be such. Then, as a further safeguard, the accused organization is given the right to have its case reviewed by the Federal courts, including an appeal to the Supreme Court.

When anyone suggests, in the light of these provisions, that the Mundt bill would apply to the Wallace third party or any comparable group he is simply confessing ignorance of the facts or a dismal lack of confidence in the integrity of the Congress, the Attorney General and the Federal courts.

The other way of evaluating this bill is to examine the provisions it actually contains and the things it actually is intended to do.

This bill is predicated on the conclusion that the American Comumunist movement is foreign controlled, that its ultimate objective is to overthrow free American institutions in favor of a Communist dictatorship controlled from abroad, that its activities are carried on by secret and conspiratorial methods, that these activities constitute an immediate and powerful threat to the security of the United States, and, finally, that present laws are not adequate to deal with the Communists.

The proposed new law tackles the problem from four directions. First, it makes unlawful, and subject to severe penalty, "all activity which has as its purpose the setting up of a totalitarian government in the United States under foreign control." This has nothing to do with theoretical communism, freedom of thought, etc. It is aimed squarely at activity intended to set up a Communist-controlled dictatorship in this country. The second approach is found in the registration provisions, which would require that the names of officers and members of Communist political organizations and the names of the officers, but not the members, of Communist-front organizations be filed with the Attorney General. The third approach is to deny passports to members of Communist political organizations in an effort to restrict contact between American Communists and their international comrades, while the fourth is to deny Federal employment to anyone who knowingly belongs to a Communist political organization.

There is no use blinking the fact that this bill, if it becomes law, will mark a significant departure from the traditional American approach to problems of this kind. But it is also important to keep in mind that the Communist concept of world revolution and the methods used to implement it are also new to our experience and dangerous to our existence.

The bill, in the Star's opinion, represents in its sponsor's words a sincere effort to protect freedom from those who would destroy it without infringing upon the freedom of all our people. If enacted, its constitutionality would be subject to the judgment of the courts, and the protection of the courts would extend to all individuals and groups accused under it. How effective it will be remains to be seen, but it deserves a trial and it is to be hoped that the Senate will concur in the favorable action taken by the House.

New Jewish State in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 5, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

President Truman's recognition of the de facto government of the State of Israel is consistent with the best of American tradition. It is now more important than ever that our Government establish and maintain a thoroughly consistent policy toward the new Jewish state. The courageous people of this new independent state are struggling to defend their established borders from the invasion of the Arab world.

Our Government has always shown strong sympathies for Jewish aspirations in the Holy Land and we must stand by these great and vigorous people in their hour of need. We Americans who have zealously guarded our independence for the last 150 years are now privileged to help a small but courageous group in their just struggle for independence in the rebirth of the free Jewish state.

Electronics for Air Lanes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 2 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Achilles Heel," which appeared in the April issue of the Boeing Airplane Co. magazine. The article, written by Mr. Harold Mansfield, former Seattle newspaperman and now director of public relations and advertising for the Boeing Co., deals with the development of electronics for our air lanes.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACHILLES HEEL?

(By Harold Mansfield, director of public relations and advertising)

In January 1928, a rain-washed 40-A chortled up to the hangar at the Salt Lake City flying field. Two passengers emerged with coat collars about their ears and gratefully accepted a lift in a mechanic's car to the Hotel Utah to await the passing of the storm.

In January 1948, a four-engine luxury liner followed a beckoning hand to its precise place beside three similar planes on the concrete apron of the Salt Lake City airport. Attendants in rain uniforms rolled up the big ramp, and the plane's 50 passengers amassed behind a previous plane load at the customer service counter. Here they were to receive their coupons and meal checks to the Utah, Temple Square, Newhouse, Belvedere, New Grand, and Traveler's Motor hotels for the night.

The intervening period represents two decades of progress in air transport—but not in facilities for keeping it operating. Speed, comfort, motive power in its most streamlined form, but weather still holds the upper hand.

Despite electronic developments that could be used to overcome it, weather still has a shackling effect on air operations, as can be seen by the list of accidents on domestic scheduled air lines for 1945 and 1946. Check off those accidents in which the pilot could not see where he was going and you would eliminate 78 percent of all passenger fatalities for this 2-year period.

Actually, most of the accidents referred to were attributed to pilot error, but the conditions which made possible the error were a result of obscured visibility in bad weather or darkness, or both.

For the year 1946 the elimination of such accidents would have brought the passenger fatality rate down to 0.23 per 100,000,000 passenger miles instead of 1.20. The air lines would have virtually equaled the widely accepted safety record of railroads and busses, which had 0.18 and 0.19 passenger fatalities per 100,000,000 passenger miles, respectively.

The record wouldn't have remained as good for 1947. Although the fatalities that occurred when flying blind were only one less than the year before, those due to other causes, principally equipment troubles, were much greater. These causes, however, are being removed by other means. But the last acknowledged obstacle to mass transportation by air, cargo as well as passenger, is the lack of adequate all-weather navigational and landing aids.

A BUSINESS PROBLEM

While the safety problem resulting from weather is the most spectacular, most compelling, a close second is the business problem. Flight cancellations due to weather last year cost the airlines an estimated $40,000,000. For many lines it represented the difference between profit and loss.

There were other, perhaps greater, intangible losses affecting future patronage: the growing, unspoken inflammation of the three hundredth passenger to be "hoteled" by a weary passenger agent after a typical grounding at 3 a. m.; the man who didn't fly because he couldn't take a chance of a flight cancellation that would cause him to miss his appointment; the wife who didn't fly or talked her husband out of it because "There are so many accidents!"

Air transportation's market growth possibility, once rail and bus safety is matched and schedule reliability established, is alluring.

This business expansion is by no means limited to diversion of present surface traffic. Just as the application of steam power and electricity increased world shipping in 100 years 30 times as much as it had increased in the previous 3,500 years, so it is expected that fast, economical, continuous-schedule air transport will create more and more completely new traffic.

The Economic Bureau, Analysis Division, of the Civil Aeronautics Board, reports a measurable minimum of $1,500,000,000 in current consumer purchasing power available for domestic air travel at the approximate price level of air transportation, or the price level that appears shortly attainable. The airlines to date have obtained only about 20 percent of this potential.

The Air Transport Association predicts a 50,000,000 annual passenger potential in 5 years—four times the present volume. One air freight operator computes a potential traffic of 5,000,000,000 ton miles by 1952. That's 74 times the present volume, which admittedly only nibbles at the edges of an enticing market.

These combined passenger and freight prospects, if realized, would require a transport fleet of 3,500 planes instead of the present 750. Who can picture such a fleet in daily commerce without a system that brings complete freedom from weather obstructions? Not all the hotels in the suburbs could cope with the cancellation of one night's flights with such a volume, nor could all the available passenger agents quell the panic at the counters.

A MILITARY NEED

Yet, urgent as it all sounds for commercial aviation's future, the greatest urgency is not commercial but military. Thirty-five hundred transports is approximately the number used by the Air Forces in the first 18 months of the war. Under the stepped-up speeds and needs of postwar conditions, it is surely the minimum that would be needed for quick transport support of a defense emergency.

Peacetime military aircraft procurement, always limited by budgets, is channeled mainly into combat planes rather than transport types. Yet air transport equipment can become one of the most critical needs in coping with a sudden defense emergency. If surface transportation arteries were bombed out, or a submarine blockade were successful, it might even become the key to survival. Removal of the obstacles to commercial air transport's growth is therefore a problem of national importance. While it won't eliminate the need for military transports, a great

operating fleet of airline planes will provide a big reserve of emergency transportation capacity—and an economical means of maintaining it.

How good are the chances of a prompt solution of this problem?

The need is for eyes to see through the fog. Before the war, radio provided the nearest answer, extremely helpful but faulty at times. Since the war, electronics has opened the way to full solution. Not all the equipment is at hand but the technical means are available. They've been tried out in military aviation. They've already proved a boon to ocean ships, ever leery of the hazard of bumping thousands of tons of weight into a fog-obscured obstacle at 10 or 20 knots.

If good for ships at that speed, why not much more so for planes at 300 miles per hour?

The answer has not been quite that simple. Because of the very speed of operation, airlines want the equipment fool-proof before it is adopted for use. So does the Civil Aeronautics Administration. Technical disagreements on this point have abounded.

And by no means all the problems are confined to aircraft landings. Of the 117 domestic passenger facilities in 1945 and 1946 involving obscured vision, 91 resulted from hitting a mountain in the fog (or darkness) and the remaining 26 involved low visibility landings. Yet the availability of a solution of this is also present in electronics—in airborne radar.

CRASH AVERTED

Devices of this type, used regularly by the military, and by commercial planes on an experimental basis, have proved extremely successful. One outstanding example of radar preventing "collision" accident comes not from an airborne set, but from a ground controlled approach station. Last year a GCA crew at Yokata Air Base, Japan, while viewing their scope, saw a lost B–29 heading for a mountain. The men contacted the bomber by radio and had the pilot do a sudden change of course, preventing a certain crash.

Proponents of the value of electronic aids point to the record of Air Material Command's All-Weather Flying Division. This group set up an "airline" flying over the Alleghenies, and with bases near Washington, D. C., and Wilmington, Ohio. In a little less than a year they made 600 flights entirely on instrument, from take-off to landing, without one cancellation or delay due to weather.

An air-line crew, experimenting with radar while flying freight between Seattle and Alaska, not only was able to pick out and dodge icing conditions and storms, but radioed other planes on the same run to tell them where to fly.

Last year, after a momentous public recoil from the shock of a series of winter accidents, the CAA requested $13,248,000 for a navigational aids program involving 68 high intensity approach lighting installations, 25 surveillance radar sets, 23 ground control approach installations (electronic) and 68 instrument-landing systems (radio). Congress, at first receptive, lost interest when the proponents split completely on the merits of the various systems, and each held its ground as implacably as Molotov versus the Western powers. The Congress finally appropriated only $751,706 for navigational aids, and provided for just three radar installations for the network of 582 major airports. The country's $1,000,000,000 public airport system remained weather-bound for want of the equipment to keep it in service.

Since then much good ground has been covered. A joint group representing all the previously warring interests, called Special Committee 31 of the Radio Technical Committee for Aeronautics, has now presented an all-inclusive recommendation. It proposes an immediate program to install available equipment, both ILS and GCA, and a longer range development program involving complete traffic control through automatic electronic means.

PLANE IDENTIFICATION

The committee sees in the former a means to eliminate accident hazards and to decrease cancellations during the period of air-traffic growth in the immediate future. During this period the more mature over-all system can be perfected to handle large-volume traffic.

It sees in the latter system not only a means to make mass commercial transportation practicable on an all-weather basis, but also to permit large scale military operation if necessary. This, the committee feels, would completely bog down if forced to operate in volume with present inadequate facilities. More than this, it sees a means to identify all planes in the traffic pattern aloft, a system capable of detecting the harbingers of an aerial Pearl Harbor that might this time be a Long Island Sound.

Not only have the technicians reached substantial agreement, but the various recently appointed boards studying air policy have uniformly endorsed the urgent need for such a program. Said the Congressional Air Policy Board: "Civil and military aviation are indivisible in assessing total American air strength. * * * Airport and airway aids have not kept pace with demands of increased operations and larger, faster aircraft. Already crowded, the system could not handle a wartime flow of air traffic."

The President's Air Policy Commission stated: "* * * a carefully worked out program for these aids together with its rapid implementation has become a top priority for civil air transportation."

A PUBLIC PROBLEM

The program is beyond the ability of air lines to finance. It is a public program affecting both the national defense and the public welfare. There is a case for Government assistance in the provision of such facilities, states the House Interstate Commerce Committee, "similar to the provision of roads, bridges, road-lighting, and traffic-regulating systems for highways and marine channels, lighthouse, and other aids to shipping."

"Historically, people have geared their lives to the fastest means of transportation," declared John Alison, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Air, in a recent luncheon discussion of the important role ahead for air transport. Aviation needs merely to be able to see where it is going, and its inherent advantages will do the rest.

But as in the heel of Achilles, aviation's strongest tendon can be its most crippling one. It has the ability to go anywhere, take the short cut, without roads or rails, with no bridges to wash out, no tunnels to clog. But because of this freedom it can also get off the "road" and into trouble. As traffic grows to the volume already in sight, it is unthinkable to turn this mass loose without precise channels that will be just as certain in bad weather as in good.

A means, fortunately, is available—in electronics. The need is present—a military-defense necessity. The plan has been presented and is ready for action. It is another project for a busy Congress, but a gravely important one.

The greatest danger is that in the welter of demands upon Congress the program might be passed up, or if undertaken, left unfinished in subsequent years because it is ambitious, costly, and its significance not too well understood by the public. If this happens, it would be more than an arrow to the heel of air transportation. It could well be the Achilles heel of the national-defense program itself, should an emergency arrive sharply on the wings of supersonic attack.

Let Us Remember Our Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 2 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, my attention has been called to a poem entitled "Let Us Remember Our Dead," by Harry H. Schlacht, which appeared in the New York Journal-American of last Sunday, May 30. I think it is deserving of inclusion in the RECORD, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET US REMEMBER OUR DEAD

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

O blessed dead. And for the soul
Of him who for his country dies,
O Lord, is there a higher goal
Than that won by his sacrifice?

America bows today with pious reverence at the shrines of our heroic dead.

It is Memorial Day. It is a day of sacred memories. It is a national holiday.

Yesterday they lived with us. Today they live within us.

To the aged it brings a picture of the past. To the young it brings a challenge of the future. To the child it is a day of reverence.

Let us crown in our hearts those heroes of ours, and cover them with beautiful flowers.

The flag is at half mast. The loom is hushed. The wheels of industry stand still. The Nation decorates the graves of our martyred dead.

They beam upon us from the heavens above and like celestial luminaries shine forever on our pathway.

To them we bring our homage, the best we have to give.

They have gone to join the heroes of Bunker Hill. They have gone to clasp the hands of those who suffered at Valley Forge. They have gone to live with those who fell at Gettysburg. They have gone to meet those who died at Chateau Thierry.

They have all won a hero's niche in God's heavenly temple of fame.

We will cast poppies into the sea in loving memory to our sailors who sleep in the depths of the deep. We will decorate the graves of our unknown soldiers. We will remember our deathless dead who lie buried here and in foreign hills.

Who they were, none knows. What they were, all know. But whatever land their graves, marked or unmarked—they are ours still.

The morning sun will gild with light
The stars will keep holy watch at night,
The winter will spread soft palls of snow,
The summer flowers about them will grow,
The birds will sing their sweet springtime call,
God's love and mercy guard them all.

They are the priceless legacy of the centuries. They are the spirit of America sweeping onward under the star of destiny.

Their deeds unite to light up the fire on the shrines of human glory which shall spread its illumination throughout the world.

Today we feel the compulsion of their presence. Today we realize the significance of their presence. We can hear their voices saying, "We still live."

If ever clouds should cast their portentous gloom over the capital of our beloved land; if ever fiends of discord should seek to smite our eagle from its holiest altar; if, then, patriotic Americans should tear our flag from the grasp of sacrilegious hands and bear it bravely up to float on land, on sea, and in the air in all its brilliant luster—upon its streaming folds will be written, "We still live."

O heroes of humanity, you will live as long as America shall live.

In your holy name we highly resolve that you "shall not have died in vain," and that our American way of life "shall not perish from the earth."

The eyes of the world are focused on America. In it, rests the hope of mankind. On it, rests the fate of civilization.

Let us all pray today for the day when men and women everywhere will join us in the comradeship of peace, when we need no uniform except the uniform of the heart, when we need clothe ourselves only with the principles of right, when nations will become united in one great family.

The laws and rights shall equal twine
And hands and hearts in peace combine,
To make all earth, one temple of the free
Where men shall dwell in chainless majesty.

Ten Years of Vigilance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1948

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following statement on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Ten years ago, on May 26, 1938, Congress adopted House Resolution 282 of the Seventy-fifth Congress, which authorized the establishment of a Special Committee on Un-American Activities. Seven years later, it was made one of the standing committees of the House of Representatives.

As a member of the committee from the very beginning, and its present chairman, I would like to outline some of the high points of its often turbulent yet successful career.

First, however, I would like to pay tribute to the many distinguished Members of Congress who have served on the committee since it was established. Their perseverance, their courage, and their moral conviction were indispensable to the accomplishments of the committee, particularly in view of the highly controversial nature of its field of investigation. It should be remembered that at no time in its decade of existence was the committee, or its members, spared from a relentless, bitter opposition stirred up by the subversive forces which the committee was delegated to investigate. In addition, the committee, at least in its initial stages, faced a woeful paucity of precedent and an even more woeful lack of funds. Despite this, thanks to the caliber of its members, the committee made striking progress from the very start.

The members of the staff of the Committee on Un-American Activities are selected for their ability, without any regard to their political affiliation. I am very proud of our committee staff and the wonderful job it is doing. The chief investigator of the committee, Mr. Robert E. Stripling, has been with the committee since its inception in 1938, with the exception of a year and a half that he spent in the Army. The personnel of this committee, like the membership, contribute time and effort far beyond their regular duties in carrying on the work which has proven to be of vital importance to the security and preservation of our country.

I am presenting herein a brief sketch of significant committee accomplishments for each of the years since 1938. From an over-all viewpoint, however, it may interest you to know that the committee in the last 10 years has heard a total of 998 witnesses, taken 19,651 pages of testimony and issued 48 reports. For those who might have heard that favorite Communist slander that the committee limited itself to the investigation of Communists and ignored the Fascists, I might point out that more than one-fourth of the 19,651 pages of testimony concerned Nazis, Fascists, or Japanese subversive activities in the United States.

The very first investigation by the special committee in 1938 involved the German-American Bund, which was discredited in large part through our efforts. By the time war was declared on Hitler, the committee had amassed a vast store of information regarding Nazi and Fascist fifth-column activities in this country, and our Nation was fully prepared to meet the problem.

Today, when communism, the totalitarianism of the extreme left, has replaced nazism as the supreme threat to human freedom throughout the world, the committee can point with pride to its veritable storehouse of evidence on the Communist fifth column within the United States. The committee also has prepared a concrete legislative program to cope with the problem.

There is little doubt that Communist fifth columnists in this country would have become far less entrenched and consequently far less of a menace to our present national security if the committee had not for years been almost the only voice of protest against their traitorous machinations. The committee's investigation of the Communist movement dates back to 1938; our first annual report called attention to the party as a segment of a world-wide scheme to establish a Communist dictatorship by forceful and violent means. But it is only recently, as practical demonstrations of the true nature of the Communist conspiracy are manifested in one country after another, that the committee has felt satisfied that our Government fully appreciates the seriousness of the problem, and that we are no longer a voice crying in the wilderness.

The committee is grateful for the steadfast public support it has always enjoyed. The American people, through their representatives in the Congress, have each year given the committee overwhelming votes of confidence.

That such support has been invaluable to the committee is almost too obvious to mention. But I want the public to know that it is because of its support that the committee can report in regard to the foremost problem before the world today, that the committee—

First. Has been the only Government agency which has endeavored to educate the American people on the nature of the Communist problem.

Second. Has published the most comprehensive series of reports and studies of communism ever printed in the United States by a public of private agency.

Third. Has accumulated for the use of Federal agencies one of the country's most exhaustive files on Communist individuals and organizations.

Fourth. Has pioneered in establishing standards by which Federal, State, and local governments may judge Communist and Communist-front organizations and their members.

Fifth. Has laid the basis for remedial legislation to handle the problem.

Here are some of the highlights of the committee's work year by year.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES IN 1938

The first investigation undertaken by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its initial year of operation was an exposure of the activities of the German-American Bund. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities took up where the McCormack committee left off in 1935, and received testimony showing that the bund, working under the direction and orders of Nazi Germany, was helping flood the country with Nazi propaganda and had a reserve force of 5,000 uniformed storm troopers.

Some attention was devoted at this stage to the activity of Italian Fascist groups in this country, through expert witnesses.

During 1938, the Special Committee on Un-American Activities heard about 100 witnesses on the subject of communism, fascism, and nazism.

An investigation of certain aspects of the Works Progress Administration revealed that "a large number of the employees" of the Federal theater project were Communists or fellow travelers; and that Communist activities were openly carried on in the Federal writers project. As a result of this investigation, these projects were abolished by the Congress.

Communist attempts to seize control of labor unions, particularly in the CIO, were exposed by the committee's investigations. The Communists' part in organizing and leading the sit-down strikes that afflicted the country in 1936 particularly in the automobile industry in Michigan, was exposed.

Testimony showed that the Communists had seized many strategic posts in the Farmer-Labor Party in Minnesota.

On the basis of standards carefully formulated, the committee revealed as Communist fronts the following organizations: American League for Peace and Democracy, Workers Alliance, International Labor Defense, Friends of the Soviet Union, International Workers

Order, American Student Union, National Negro Congress, American Youth Congress. These organizations were subsequently placed upon an official list of front organizations announced by the Attorney General.

Testimony showed that the Communists were violating the Neutrality Act by recruiting in the United States for Loyalist Spain; Justice Department action was asked. When indictments finally were obtained years later, the Attorney General dismissed them, confessing that too much time had elapsed between commission of the unlawful acts and the prosecution of them. This investigation disclosed the first attempt by the Communists to form an international military force subject to Soviet direction, a phenomenon which has become more apparent recently.

In more than 450 pages of testimony, the committee delved into a detailed analysis of the Communist movement, both nationally and internationally, national and international Communist-front organizations, leading officials of the Communist Party throughout the country, Communist finances, propaganda distributing centers, foreign language and English Communist publications, Communist schools and camps, Communists in educational institutions, and activity in the Army and Navy, their activity among American youth, the unemployed, the theater, Negro and national minority groups, the farmers, and other groups.

Considerable testimony was devoted to the activities of Harry Bridges in the maritime industry. Subsequent efforts by the Immigration Department to deport Bridges were unsuccessful.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES IN 1939

In 1939, Fritz Kuhn, leader of the German-American Bund, appeared before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on two occasions. Subsequently, Kuhn in November 1939, was convicted of larceny of bund funds. He was deprived of his citizenship in denaturalization proceedings in March 1943. With the help of the committee, his organization was thoroughly discredited.

Ralph Townsend was first exposed as a Japanese agent by the committee in August 1939. He was sentenced to prison in June 1942, after pleading guilty to violating the Foreign Agents Act.

Earl Browder, then general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States, admitted under oath before the committee in September of 1939, that he had traveled under false passports, information that was not known to the country at the time. In January 1940, Browder was convicted of passport fraud in the courts and sentenced to the penitentiary.

William Weiner, financial secretary of the Communist Party, was called in for testimony in September 1939. He was shortly thereafter convicted of passport fraud, a conviction in which the work of the committee had been an important factor. Under plea of illness, however, he has not served a day's imprisonment.

The work of the committee was also an important factor in the conviction of Nicholas Dozenberg for passport fraud. He was arrested in 1939, 3 months after the committee revealed his espionage work as an agent of the Communist International.

As a result of false testimony before the committee in August 1939, Fraser S. Gardner, a paid secret agent of William D. Pelley, Silver Shirt leader, was convicted of perjury.

As a result of committee work, Bookniga, a Soviet propaganda agency, pleaded guilty to charges of not registering as a foreign agent.

Exposures by the committee led to a decision by Arno Rissi and Mrs. Leslie Fry, west coast Nazi and Fascist leaders, to flee the country.

The committee cited as fronts of the Communist Party the League of American Writers, and numerous organizations attempting to provide aid to the Spanish Loyalists' cause in Spain's civil war.

The committee revealed that Communist leadership was entrenched in the following 10 CIO unions: National Maritime Union; United Cannery, Packing, and Allied Workers; Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Electricians; Fur Workers International Union; International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union; Transport Workers Union; United Office and Professional Workers Union; American Communications Association; United Electrical, Radio, and Mechanical Workers of America; United Furniture Workers of America.

On October 30, 1939, the committee made public the names, positions, and salaries of 563 Government employees located in Washington, D. C., who were members of the Communist front group, the American League for Peace and Democracy.

Many witnesses were called in to testify in connection with the committee's investigation of Nazi and Fascist groups in the United States. In addition to Fritz Kuhn, the committee called in George Deatherage, leader of the Knights of the White Camellia; Henry D. Allen, former Silver Shirt member; and many former bund members.

Among the many prominent Communists and former Communists brought before the committee in its investigation of the Communist movement were William Z. Foster, chairman of the Communist Party of the United States; Earl Browder, its general secretary; Benjamin Gitlow and Jay Lovestone, former Communist leaders; and Walter G. Krivitsky, former member of the Soviet military intelligence. A number of financial and commercial rackets of Communist origin were exposed in the testimony of Dr. D. H. Dubrowsky.

The committee published a comprehensive 967-page report, including 231 exhibits of original documents, which showed the nature and aims of the Communist Party, its connections with the U. S. S. R., and its advocacy of force and violence.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES IN 1940

William Dudley Pelley, leader of the pro-Nazi Silver Shirt Legion of America, dissolved his organization immediately after he appeared before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in February 1940. By bringing him before it the committee also enabled the law to apprehend the elusive Pelley for unlawful acts in North Carolina.

A committee member, Jerry Voorhis, of California, introduced a bill which was enacted, to require foreign-controlled agencies like the Communist Party, and the German-American Bund to make public record of pertinent facts about themselves. This led the Communist Party to formally disaffiliate with the Communist International, the world Communist organization.

The committee exposed wholesale fraud and corruption in the election petitions of the Communist Party in many States such as Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Kentucky, Ohio. This resulted in more than 100 indictments and between 50 and 60 convictions.

The committee published a 414-page report on the activities of Nazi organizations and individuals in the United States, including German Government diplomatic and consular agents. Among those exposed were Dr. Frederic Auhagen, head of the Nazi-front organization, the American Fellowship Forum; Manfred Zapp and Guenther Tonn, officials of the pro-Nazi Trans-Ocean News Service. Auhagen was convicted in court of being a Nazi propaganda agent and the Trans-Ocean News Service was convicted of failing to register as a foreign propaganda agent in July 1941. The convictions were obtained on the basis of documentary evidence which the committee turned over to the Justice Department. Hans Ackermann and his wife were exposed as pro-Nazi propagandists, and deportation proceedings were subsequently brought against them.

Late in 1940, a 60-page committee report was issued regarding tons of Axis propaganda being unloaded by Japanese steamships on the west coast of the United States. This led to immediate action by the Post Office Department, which ordered such material seized on arrival.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES IN 1941

In 1941 the committee exposed the Communist affiliations of four high-salaried OPA officials; and informed the Justice Department that 1,124 other Federal employees were members of subversive organizations. It should be noted in this connection that despite the furor from official sources at that time, the President in recent months has asked for millions of dollars to rid the Federal Government of Communists.

The committee investigated the American Peace Mobilization and found it to be a Communist front. This study furnished valuable material regarding the tactics of Communist fronts in wartime.

The committee by extensive investigation showed that Communist leaders were at the head of the following sabotage strikes which plagued the Nation in 1941: Allis Chalmers plant in Milwaukee; Harvill plant in Los Angeles; Vultee Aircraft in Los Angeles; International Harvester at Chicago; Aluminum Company of America in Cleveland; North American Aviation Company in Inglewood, Calif.; New York City transportation tie-up; lumber industry strike; strike by Mine, Mill, and Smelter Work-

ers Union at Trona, Calif. Here again we find valuable source material on Communist tactics in industry during wartime.

In May 1941, the committee published a 178-page report containing many original documents of the German-American Bund, which were subsequently used by the prosecution in the trial and conviction of G. Wilhelm Kunze, a Bund leader. Kunze had been interrogated by the committee in October 1940.

A 101-page report illustrating the Communist control of the Transport Workers Union, CIO, was also published by the committee.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES IN 1942

The committee sent to the President of the United States a list of approximately 17,000 persons identified with Nazi movements in the United States.

A special 287-page report was published exposing the subversive activities of the Japanese in the United States; this report showed that committee investigations had revealed before Pearl Harbor that Japs had detailed information regarding all of the naval craft of the United States and knowledge of fleet positions around Pearl Harbor. The committee report also described Jap fifth column work in Honolulu and in the United States. A direct result of the report was the removal of the Japanese population from vital west-coast areas.

The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, leading in the campaign to defend the Communists, was investigated and found to be a Communist front. This organization was later listed as such by the Department of Justice.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES IN 1943

A subcommittee of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities held hearings in Los Angeles, Calif., and Parker, Ariz., and Washington, D. C., in an investigation of Japanese relocation centers. Subcommittee findings that disloyal and loyal Japs were not segregated in these centers led to announcement by War Relocation Authority that such a policy would be followed. Committee evidence that the administration of such centers was lax and inefficient, and that release of Japanese from the centers was being arranged through a dangerously loose procedure, led to the transfer of the War Relocation Authority to the jurisdiction of the Interior Department.

Hearings were held on Communist activity in the leading aviation plants in California, and Communist cooperation with representatives of the German-American Bund during the period of the Stalin-Hitler pact.

A 260-page report was issued, the first section of which was a comprehensive digest of Axis agents and organizations in the United States, and the second half of which was a handbook on Japanese subversive activities.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES IN 1944

On March 29, 1944, a special report outlining how Communist leadership had become entrenched in 21 important CIO unions, many of them highly strategic to the national welfare, was issued. These included 10 unions whose Communist penetration was announced by the committee as early as 1939. The 21 unions are: American Communications Association; International Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians; International Fur and Leather Workers Union; International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union; International Union of Fishermen and Allied Workers of America; International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers; International Woodworkers of America; Marine Cooks and Stewards Association of the Pacific Coast; National Maritime Union of America; State, County, and Municipal Workers of America; Transport Workers Union of America; United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing, and Allied Workers of America; United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America; United Farm Equipment and Metal Workers of America; United Gas, Coke, and Chemical Workers of America; United Office and Professional Workers of America; United Packinghouse Workers of America; United Shoe Workers of America; United Stone and Allied Products Workers of America; United Federal Workers of America; United Furniture Workers of America.

The report contained detailed records of the most outstanding Communist leaders in the labor movement.

Subsequent hearings dealt with the National Citizens Political Action Committee and the interlocking relationship between its members and numerous Communist-front organizations.

Witnesses also testified regarding Communist penetration and control of the shipbuilding unions in Baltimore.

A total of 160 organizations were also officially cited by the committee as fronts of the Communist Party.

Before prosecuting the 29 alleged seditionists, whose mass trial began in Washington, D. C., in 1944, the Department of Justice made active use of the committee's pro-Nazi and pro-Fascist files for almost a month.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES IN 1945

The Committee on Un-American Activities was established as a standing committee of the House on January 3, 1945, with EDWARD J. HART, of New Jersey, serving as chairman from January to July 1945, and JOHN S. WOOD, of Georgia, serving as chairman from July 1945 through 1946.

The committee investigated radio programs conducted by Government agencies and received information that the program of the Office of Price Administration was allegedly fostering the spread of racial hatred and religious prejudice. As a result, the author of the program and two officials resigned their positions and the committee discontinued further investigations. The committee also investigated the radio program of the United States Department of Agriculture after it had been alleged that it permitted a pro-Soviet propaganda broadcast over the American air waves. In an effort to curb radio propaganda from all parts of the country, the committee placed a number of radio commentators under scrutiny. Committee Chairman WOOD introduced remedial legislation in the form of bill No. 4775 which was aimed at regulation of radio propaganda.

Earl Browder and William Z. Foster appeared in hearings on the activities of the Communist Party.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES IN 1946

The committee investigated the various means and methods employed by subversive organizations in collecting and disbursing funds.

Among such disbursing organizations was the Sound View Foundation controlled by three directors who determined which Communist-front groups were worthy to receive help. Joseph R. Brodsky, notorious Communist attorney, headed this organization which commanded vast sums of money for subversive allotments.

Another typical disbursing agency was the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, created in New York in 1942 by combining the Exiled Writers Committee, the American Committee To Save Refugees, and the United American Spanish Aid Committee. Its activities consisted of collecting money for members of the international Communist ring posing as refugees.

After hearings at which members of the executive board appeared, it was clear that the sponsors and officers, with few exceptions, were admitted Communists and fellow travelers and that, because the advertised objectives of the group and its associated Spanish organizations acted in concert with the foreign policy of the Soviet Union, it should be compelled to register as an agent of a foreign government under the terms of the Voorhis Act. The Attorney General later listed the organization as subversive.

The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee refused to allow the committee to inspect its books. As a result, 18 leaders of the organization were cited for contempt of Congress by the House of Representatives, and were subsequently convicted by the District court juries in Washington. The United States Court of Appeals has already upheld the conviction of 11 of these leaders.

Louis F. Budenz, former managing editor of the Daily Worker, official Communist newspaper, presented voluminous testimony on the inner workings of the Communist Party in this country, emphasizing the tight control maintained over its every move by the Soviet Union.

Gerald L. K. Smith, head of the former America First Party, was also questioned at length by the committee regarding his antiracial propaganda.

The committee launched investigations of the activities of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, both Communist-front organizations. In the course of this, the organizations refused to respond to committee subpenas ordering that the books, records, and papers of the organizations be produced before the committee.

Refusal to produce such records resulted in contempt citations by the House of Representatives against Richard Morford, then director of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, on August 2, 1946, and against George Marshall, chairman of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, on

August 1, 1946. Both were convicted for contempt by a District court jury in Washington, D. C., in the spring of 1945, and sentenced to serve jail sentences and pay fines.

The committee recommended:

That the Congress create an independent commission to investigate and order discharge of any employee of any Federal agency whose loyalty is in doubt.

That the Department of State and the Department of Justice be required by law to publicize every 6 months names and identity of foreign agents.

That the Department of Justice establish a division for the prosecution of subversive elements.

That the Attorney General report to the House the number of prosecutions instituted under the Voorhis Act and the McCormack Alien Registration Act.

That legislation should be enacted to restrict Federal employment to citizens and that only citizens be allowed to hold office in labor unions.

That legislation be enacted that all alien Communists be deported and that a screening process be imposed.

That legislation be enacted to restrict the benefits of tax-exempt privileges.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES IN 1947

Gerhart Eisler was exposed by the committee as the No. 1 agent of the Communist International in the United States. His refusal to be sworn in at a committee hearing February 6 resulted in a court sentence of 1 year in jail and a $1,000 fine for contempt of Congress. He was also convicted in Federal court of passport fraud, and sentenced on March 24, 1948, to serve 1 to 3 years in jail for this violation of the law.

Leon Josephson was exposed as the official procurer of false passports for agents of the Communist International and his refusal to appear before the committee resulted in a Federal court conviction for contempt of Congress. He has been sentenced to serve 1 year in jail and pay a $1,000 fine for contempt.

The United States Supreme Court has refused on two occasions to review the conviction of Josephson for contempt. The Communist's appeal to the highest court had challenged the constitutionality of the committee. This stand by the Supreme Court, as well as that of numerous lower courts, who have penalized other Communists for contempt of the committee, should serve as a conclusive refutation of those who have held that the committee is "illegal" and "violates the Bill of Rights."

Hans Eisler, Hollywood composer, and brother of Gerhart Eisler, was exposed as a member of the Communist Party in Germany and head of the International Music Bureau, with headquarters in Moscow, who concealed his Communist affiliations when he entered the United States. The committee recommended deportation of Eisler; such proceedings were subsequently brought by the Government, but suspended when he agreed to leave the country voluntarily.

Eugene Dennis, general secretary of the Communist Party in the United States, was sentenced in Federal court to serve 1 year in jail and pay a $1,000 fine for contempt of Congress. The charge resulted from his refusal to give his true name and other essential information during committee hearings.

In May of 1947 a subcommittee proceeded to Los Angeles, Calif., to investigate alleged subversive influences in the moving-picture industry. After taking the testimony of a number of important persons in Hollywood the subcommittee returned to Washington and recommended that a full-scale investigation be made and hearings conducted on this subject. Accordingly, in October 1947, the committee held extensive hearings in Washington, at which hearings 10 Hollywood screen writers and directors, who refused to tell the committee whether or not they were Communists, although the committee had documented evidence of their party membership, were cited for contempt of Congress. Two of the ten, John Howard Lawson and Dalton Trumbo, have been convicted in a district court and sentenced to the maximum penalty of a $1,000 fine and 1 year in jail; the cases of the remaining eight have been deferred until an appellate-court decision can be obtained on the Lawson and Trumbo convictions. Although only the first phase of the committee's investigation into Hollywood Communist infiltration has been completed, considerable evidence has already been produced to show determined efforts of the Communists to capture the industry, and the industry itself has responded with a number of efforts to clean its own house.

The House was appraised of the fact that the Soviet Union was taking advantage of America's lax security rules to engage in "legal" espionage. Particular instances cited were a handbook on strategic American construction compiled by Amtorg Trading Corp., official Soviet agency, as well as the fact that Soviet agencies have obtained practically every one of America's industrial, chemical, and military patents.

The committee held public hearings in March on bills to curb or outlaw the Communist Party, and leading experts on communism testified, such as William C. Bullitt, William Green, and J. Edgar Hoover.

Public hearings held by the committee to investigate Communist infiltration into American labor unions resulted in exposure of Communist influence within the leadership of local 248 of the United Auto Workers, CIO, which directed the recent Allis-Chalmers strike; of the national organization and various locals of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, CIO; and of Local 22, Food, Tobacco, and Agricultural Workers, CIO, which directed recent strike at Winston-Salem, N. C.

Victor Kravchenko, former high Soviet official, told the committee of the role that many official Soviet representatives in the United States play in unofficial espionage.

Walter Steel, who has been active in combating subversive activities in the United States for many years, submitted 427 pages of testimony on Communist activities in this country.

The committee issued a 56-page report, giving documentary evidence that the Communist Party of the United States is an agent of a foreign power; 26,000 copies were printed.

The committee issued a report exposing the American Youth for Democracy as a Communist-front organization among college youth, which is actually the successor of the Young Communist League. Although 5,000 copies were printed, a reprinting is now under way because of the large demand for the report. Copies have been sent to all the colleges in the United States.

The committee issued a report which exposed the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist front using professed interest in improving southern social and economic life as a smokescreen for Communist purposes; 5,000 copies were printed of this report, which was distributed among colleges, newspapers and community organizations in the South.

The committee issued a report showing that the Civil Rights Congress is a Communist front interested only in defending individual Communists and the Communist Party; 4,000 copies were printed.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES IN 1948

A special subcommittee on legislation, headed by Representative RICHARD M. NIXON, of California, held public hearings between February 5 and 20, to determine what legislative steps could be taken to counteract the menace of the Communist fifth column within the United States. Some of the Nation's best-known experts on constitutional law, as well as experts on Communist fifth-column activities were called to testify. The 28 witnesses, whose testimony comprises 500 printed pages included Dr. William Y. Elliott, professor of government, Harvard University; Tom C. Clark, United States Attorney General; Robert B. Milam, representing the American Bar Association; Adolph A. Berle, Jr., attorney, professor and former Assistant Secretary of State; Attorneys Donald Richberg, Louis Waldman, Morris Ernst; Samuel N. Birnbaum, New York, department judge advocate, representing the American Legion; Edgar C. Corry, national commander, AMVETS; Raymond Moley, editor of Newsweek; Admiral W. H. Standley (USN retired), former Ambassador to Russia; and Ferenc Nagy, former Premier of Hungary. The subcommittee had before it for consideration the following bills referred to the committee; H. R. 4422, introduced by Representative MUNDT to require registration of Communist Party members and H. R. 4581, introduced by Representative MCDONOUGH to define communism and make its practice a treasonable act; and H. R. 2948, introduced by Representative DONDERO to regulate and control the operation of foreign agencies within the United States.

As a result of this study, on April 28, the committee reported out with amendments H. R. 5852, a comprehensive Communist control bill aimed primarily at cutting the ties of the American Communist Party with the Soviet Union and bringing the party's activities out into the open. The bill provides heavy penalties for anyone attempting to establish in this country a totalitarian dictatorship dominated by a foreign government; it requires Communists and Communist-front organizations to register with the

Attorney General and to label their propaganda for what it is; it forbids employment to Communists in the Federal Government and the granting of passports to Communists.

On May 19, 1948, the House passed H. R. 5852 by a roll-call vote of 319 to 58.

The committee on May 10, 1948, issued a 160-page heavily documented report to prove that the Communist Party of the United States is an advocate of overthrow of our Government by force and violence. One of the most popular reports issued by the committee, the original printing of 2,000 copies was exhausted almost immediately and orders for at least that many more copies have accumulated. The report is now being reprinted.

The committee heard a number of witnesses during a series of executive hearings. These hearings included investigations of American forms of fascism, Communist activity among student veterans, the adequacy of our immigration laws in barring subversive aliens, and atomic security.

A preliminary report to the committee by its special Subcommittee on National Security stated that its investigations had shown Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards, to be one of the weakest links in our atomic security. The committee's inquiry into this matter is continuing at the present moment.

There has been a constantly mounting demand for information from the voluminous files of the committee. Whereas, back in February 1947, there were 53 requests from Members of Congress for information and 92 visits from agents of Government departments seeking information, during the month of April 1948 the committee received 101 requests from Members of Congress and 406 visits from Government agents. During the entire period from January 22, 1947, through May 20, 1948, the committee received a total of 1,087 requests from Members of Congress for information involving 6,374 individuals and 1,163 organizations. During the same period it received 3,198 visits from Government agents.

Over a period of the last 12 months the committee has distributed more than 85,000 copies of its reports or hearings on subversive activities. This does not include the thousands of committee reports and hearings distributed by the document room, Government Printing Office, Library of Congress, and individual Members of Congress.

The Dinner-Table War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a very fine editorial by the well-known writer, Dorothy Thompson, on the margarine issue, which appeared in the June 1948 edition of the Ladies' Home Journal:

THE DINNER-TABLE WAR

(By Dorothy Thompson)

The 60 years' war between butter and margarine has been a remarkable example of the inconsistencies practiced by some upholders of private enterprise. Private enterprise should, according to its own principles, uphold fair competition. For fair competition, as opposed to monopoly, whether of the state or of powerful private interests, is the single strongest argument that can be advanced in behalf of the private-enterprise system.

Private enterprise is, in general, opposed to Government interference or regulation, except of such economic institutions as are, by their nature, monopolistic. Yet one inconsistency in this attitude is that actually private enterprises, while resisting regulation or restriction of themselves, often do not hesitate to invoke Government restrictions against their competitors. Behind this, also, is the very dubious theory that one man's loss is another man's gain, leading logically to the belief that what injures one industry must profit another. Actually the Christian concept that what is good for one is good for all is, in the long run, much nearer practical truth.

At the first emergence of a table fat which could substitute for butter, originally called oleomargarine, and composed—as it no longer is—of purified animal fats, the dairy interests of America went to arms in what has had many of the charcteristics of a war, howbeit bloodless. With the great influence that the organized dairymen were able to exert, they managed to put margarine in a class of pariah foods. Since the product was always pure and nutritious, and steadily became more so, they were unable to invoke the Pure Food and Drug Acts against it, even after these acts came into being. So what they invoked was the tax power.

During all the decades that margarine has been on the market, it has carried a special discriminatory Federal tax, actually amounting to an internal protective tariff for butter. This tax, on yellow margarine, has amounted to almost a quarter of the cost of the product, and it has been compounded by additional discriminatory laws, varying from State to State. In some States the sale of yellow margarine has been prohibited; in others, retailers have had to pay license fees to carry margarine on their shelves; in some States manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers, and restaurants have all had to pay license fees, thus compounding the costs passed on to consumers. And in at least one State taxpayers, many of whom cannot afford butter for themselves, are compelled to purchase it for State institutions, where margarine is legally barred.

Yet, in spite of all this, the per capita consumption of margarine has steadily mounted, while the per capita consumption of butter has declined. Thus, the dairy interests, while waging a highly successful war against a competitor, have shown no evidence of the victory on their own books.

The theory behind the struggle—like the theory behind all such struggles between competitors—has been that by penalizing one product the consumer would be driven to purchase its rival. In the particular case of butter, the situation was further complicated by the fact that dairy interests traditionally assumed that the sale of butter was the standard measurement of the prosperity of the industry. But this has also found nothing in fact to justify it.

All dairy products derived from fluid milk, and the production and sale of fluid milk, ice cream, cheese, and so on have steadily risen. The only dairy product that has declined in per capita consumption has been butter. The dairy interests have attributed this decline to their rival, margarine. But it is a very great question whether margarine has had anything whatever to do with this. The real reason is that the price of butter has driven it off the tables of low-income homes. The growing demand for other, less expensive, dairy products, especially ice cream, has diverted butterfat into more salable dairy products, actually competing with butter, and raising its price. The dairy farmer does not suffer as a result. His product does not bring him less because it is going into other channels. But the development leaves butter as a luxury article—exactly as much of a luxury article as heavy whipping cream.

But meanwhile, the dairy interests, in their war against margarine, have been, I think, suffering from a complete misunderstanding of the economics of the household, and greatly underestimating the power of their primary customers—women—to circumvent all attempts to make them spend their money in any one way. There is a lesson here, which all promoters of products should learn.

The ordinary American household lives on a budget: so much for rent (or, for the home owner, taxes, and probably interest and amortization); so much for food; so much for clothing; so much for recreation; so much as a reserve for emergencies. The average American family will always spend the same proportion of the family income for each of these categories. If the family income goes up, the amount spent will be changed. The family may then spend more for food, but not a higher proportion of its whole income. And if food prices go up—which is equivalent to a decrease of income—the housewife will not change her budget, but will reduce costs by purchasing cheaper products.

The normal basic American diet includes bread, cereals, sugar, coffee, milk, table and cooking fats and oils, vegetables (especialy potatoes), and proteins in the form of eggs, meat, and legumes. The housewife buys the best she can afford in conformity with family tastes.

Now, right here, this question of tastes will always baffle all attempts to regulate consumption in any free consumers' economy. When prices go up, the housewife always changes what she buys. Instead of steaks, she will buy shoulder cuts for ragouts and stews. Or she will go in for substantial cheese dishes or macaroni or spaghetti, or eat more fish, or serve large pots of baked beans.

All along the line she will reconsider her purchases to fit the family budget. If eggs are out of sight, she will do away with cakes requiring several eggs and bake a gingerbread mix. Instead of ice cream she will serve her family packaged puddings. And instead of butter there will be margarine on the table. But each change will be made in accordance with family tastes. And these are simply unreckonable.

A meat-eating family, for instance, will give up all desserts for more meat. Other families would rather not eat meat at all, if it has to be in the form of stews. They would rather have fried eggs. There are families who would make very great sacrifices of things other families consider essential, in order to have butter. (My family is one such.)

On the whole, the housewife chooses no substitutes because she prefers them. She chooses what offers approximately the same nourishment at less cost and takes account of the family's tastes. Margarine has been scientifically proved to be exactly as nourishing as butter; its present content of wholly vegetable oils plus skimmed milk and vitamins is actually no greater departure in table fats than the substitution of vegetable oil fats for cooking is a departure from the once universal use of pork lard and beef suet.

But the housewife must provide her family with necessities—taking account of their tastes and allergies. And what happens is that, having figured out what she has to have to nourish her family, she spends what is left on the luxuries they love.

When she finds that she has a few dollars per week over and above actual needs, she purchases special treats with that surplus. Thus, to the pounds of margarine for everyday use, she purchases ounces of butter for special occasions—or for some particular member of the family who particularly cares about butter.

If one sees exactly how a household economy works it ought to be obvious, even to lobbyists, that a tax on any particular food actually works out as a tax on all food. For the tax is not, really, a tax on any one thing, but a tax on the consumer's purchasing power. If the housewife has to pay 10 cents more than she should for margarine, because of a tax, she does not rush to buy butter, which costs more than twice as much; she simply has 10 cents less to spend for anything—including butter. Even if the dairy lobby had been able to raise the price of margarine to equal that of butter, the housewife of moderate means would still not be driven to buy butter. She would then buy neither margarine nor butter, but feed her family bread and drippin's, bread and jam, peanut butter, or other spreads.

All industries dealing in luxury products should, if they are wise, do everything in their power to keep down the prices of basic necessities. For luxuries can be purchased only out of budget surpluses. To think that by increasing the price of an inexpensive product you can increase the use of a more expensive competitor is like arguing (with Marie Antoinette) that if the price of bread goes up families will eat more cake; or that if the price of milk goes up they will consume more cream; or that if the price of cloth coats go up, they will buy mink—or that if the price of butter goes up they will buy caviar.

Nor is anything to be gained by warning people against imitations, if imitations protect the consumer. Margarine has never been sold as butter; it is a packaged product, clearly marked. To say that it imitates butter by having a yellow color is completely irrational, since if a golden color is the mark of pure butter, butter is imitating butter. Butter is yellow only when made from the milk of cows feeding in green pastures. When cows are dry fed in winter, the color of their butter is just off-white, and no yellower than natural-colored margarine, which the laws have forced the manufacturers to bleach. Most butter is colored, and by the same process that has been forbidden margarine manufacturers.

The essence of free competition is fair competition and honest rivalry. In a well-to-do country, every good and honest product can stand up in its own class. But when any product, no matter what it is, tries to defeat a competitor by reducing the consumers' purchasing power, it will turn out to be defeating itself as well. Every cent taken arbitrarily from the housewife's pocketbook is a cent taken away from something she might otherwise buy—even from the very product which is thus protected.

This, it seems to me, is the larger and more universal lesson to be learned from the dinner-table war of butter against margarine.

Confusion Over UMT

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Indianapolis Star of May 31:

CONFUSION OVER UMT

A Gallup poll printed in Sunday's Star shows that 55 percent of the American people favor some sort of universal military training for 18-year-olds. It also shows that 62 percent don't believe in drafting men in school and that 59 percent believe in giving incentives for enlistment to build a voluntary army.

These are confusing figures and they indicate the confused state of mind of many Americans over the whole UMT idea. The Star is convinced that if the American people knew the specific features of the Army's UMT program they would overwhelmingly reject the whole idea.

This program proposes to train 18-year-old boys for 6 months of basic training. Then those who refuse to take special military training in school, reserve units, or the National Guard would be forced to take 6 months more technical training. But that would be the end of it. None of these boys would be required to join the Reserves. None could be forced into service without a draft law. None could be sent overseas. None would be trained and ready to fight after they had been out of the UMT program for a year. Within a few years their training would be valueless, unless kept up.

The Army is betting $4,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money that the UMT program will so interest these boys in military life they will voluntarily choose to keep up their training in some sort of Reserve outfit. This is pure wishful thinking. If experience is any criterion, the percentage of boys who keep up their training will be very small after 1 year in UMT.

The Star believes that the armed services have not yet made a determined effort to get voluntary enlistments and to put a well-planned Reserve system to work. The Army is turning down thousands of volunteers because they do not meet arbitrary educational requirements. We are convinced that the armed services could produce a voluntary program of Reserve training that would attract many young men. We are convinced that voluntary enlistments could fill up the ranks of the armed services if the military brass hats really wanted a successful voluntary program. We believe that the UMT program is a $4,000,000,000 boondoggle that would not provide adequate defense, and would seriously impair the rights of millions of American boys.

Flag Day, 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday June 2, 1948

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, President Truman has issued the following proclamation:

Whereas on June 14, 1777, the Continental Congress adopted the Stars and Stripes as our national emblem; and

Whereas Americans of varied heritage, creed, and race have found refuge from oppression and surcease of fear under the protecting folds of Old Glory; and

Whereas in our day the American flag symbolizes the realization of the ideal of freedom in a world where that ideal is insecure; and

Whereas it has properly become a national custom to observe the anniversary of the adoption of the flag by public and private ceremonies in commemoration of the flag's inspiring history and in recognition of its present meaning:

Now, therefore, I, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, do hereby direct that the flag of the United States be displayed on all Government buildings on June 14, 1948, and I call upon the people of the Nation to observe that day as Flag Day by suitable ceremonies, and by the display of the flag at their homes and other appropriate places. I also urge all citizens to reflect upon the responsibilities which this banner enjoins, as well as the privileges it carries, remembering that the flag represents the Nation, and that our Nation and its citizens should uphold the concept of free government on all occasions, in order that the blessings of liberty may flourish among men.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed. Done at the city of Washington this 1st day of June, in the year of our Lord 1948, and of the independence of the United States of America one hundred and seventy-second.

By the President:

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

ROBERT A. LOVETT,
Acting Secretary of State.

In the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I deem it befitting that, in the publication of this stirring proclamation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, there should be included a poem written by James Patrick McGovern, of the District of Columbia bar, a former captain in our Army during the First World War, and the special Washington correspondent of the Arizona Daily Sun, which reads as follows:

EXEMPLAR FOR PEACE

America, more famed in war than peace,
With greater power the body's than the soul's,
Traditionally the pioneer whose goals
To conquer nature's forces never cease.
Let your virile manhood mellow now
By growth of mind and spirit linked with might;
Seek new truth and beauty, learn more light
Of peace, of happiness, and then know how
To live and reap the grain that brawn has sown.
Refine the crude, let substance be not all
For which strong hearts are set lest a deep pall
Of vain and selfish strife makes them disown
Their heritage of loved democracy
While communism spreads its leprosy.

—*James Patrick McGovern.*

Increase Railroad Pensions

REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, no one has a harder or more exacting life than a railroad man. This is particularly true in Minnesota where our severe climate imposes extra rigors and perils on the men who engage in this hazardous profession. I speak with personal knowledge on this subject for my father was one of the pioneer railroad men in Minnesota and the upper Midwest States. He railroaded for over 40 years, and I well remember the rigors and constant mental

strain to which he was continually subjected.

RAILROADING IS A HARD LIFE

Many of our citizens who could not tell the A end of a boxcar from the B end take our railroads too much for granted and are not acquainted with the exacting demands of railroad service. A railroad must be operated safely and practically with military efficiency. Their trains must run on time—day and night, winter and summer, in all kinds of weather—through rain, fog, snow, ice and blizzards. Constant watchfulness, alert eyes and a sound physique that does not tire and lose its efficiency are all necessary to the safe operation of our basic transportation system. Also needed are competent dispatchers, experienced maintenance-of-way men, roundhousemen and car men who can be relied upon to keep the rolling stock in safe operating condition. When wrecks occur many are routed out of bed to go out on the wrecker, most frequently in inclement weather, to open the road so that passengers and freight may reach their destination. Being subjected to such hazards and responsibilities, and also to the wear and tear of such work, causes many railroad men to grow old before their time and brings injury and sickness to many. The casualties of railroading far exceed many other lines of endeavor.

BASE PENSIONS ON PRESENT-DAY CONDITIONS

All of this adds up to the fact that our Railroad Retirement Act should be changed to more clearly recognize the realities of the hazards borne by our railroad men and to base the retirement benefits on present-day conditions. A good start was made when the Railroad Retirement Act was first adopted and the last Congress made desirable changes. But the cost of living recently has increased to such extent that many railroad men who have retired are not receiving the real benefits Congress originally intended. Other changes are needed to correct inequities which have come to light in the operation of the act.

SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS

It seems desirable to me that any change in the law should: First, grant a substantial increase in the retirement benefits; second, restore the lump-sum death benefit payments that were removed in 1946; third, make these added benefits available both to former railroad men who are presently retired on pensions and to railroad men and their beneficiaries who are presently receiving benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I realize it is late in the session, but I sincerely hope the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will see fit to report a bill to modernize the benefits of the Railroad Retirement Act and include the above suggestions. These remarks are made at this time as I understand the committee will hold their first hearing this afternoon on these proposals.

There are several bills before that committee which would give material help to railroad men and their dependents. The benefits provided by these proposals could be paid from the moneys presently being collected. No tax increase would be required. In particular I note many desirable provisions in the Wolverton bill, sponsored by the gentleman from New Jersey, Representative CHARLES WOLVERTON, the distinguished chairman of the committee. The bills introduced by the gentleman from Ohio, Representative CROSSER, an outstanding authority on railroad retirement, are also extremely beneficial and should be seriously considered. And there are others.

Mr. Speaker, now that these sound proposals have been made, let us enact them into law. The railroad men are entitled to this consideration, and the public are entitled to the security in the operation of their trains that such a law will bring about by making it possible for railroad men to retire when they should on an adequate pension.

ANALYSIS OF BENEFITS UNDER PENDING BILLS

I include the following analysis of the Wolverton bill and other pending proposals:

Case 1—Retirement in 1940 with 30 years of service (27 prior, 3 subsequent to date of act)

Assumed compensation per month during—		Monthly annuity		
Prior service	1937–39	Under present act	As proposed by Wolverton bill	Flat rates proposed by other bills
$80	$100	$50.00	$79.29	$60.00
$120	$150	62.85	104.04	75.42
$160	$200	79.20	127.71	95.04
$200	$250	91.50	132.00	109.80
$240	$300	103.80	132.00	124.56

Case 2—Retirement in 1950 with 30 years of service (17 prior, 13 subsequent to act)

ASSUMED COMPENSATION PER MONTH AS FOLLOWS

Years	Individual A	Individual B
Prior service	$100	$125
1937–39	125	170
1940–42	150	190
1943–45	175	210
1946	185	220
1947	195	230
1948–49	210	250

MONTHLY ANNUITIES ARE AS FOLLOWS

Present act	$65.25	$77.85
Proposal of Wolverton bill	97.52	113.28
Flat rate of other bills	78.62	93.42

Case 3—Retirement in 1967 with 30 years of service

ASSUMED COMPENSATION PER MONTH AS FOLLOWS

Years	Individual A	Individual B
1937–39	$100	$125
1940–42	115	150
1943–45	130	160
1946	150	180
1947	170	200
1948–49	190	225
1950–59	200	250
1960–66	225	300

MONTHLY ANNUITIES ARE AS FOLLOWS

Present act	$83.10	$97.35
Proposal of Wolverton bill	97.88	115.15
Flat rate of other bills	99.72	116.82

Case 4—Retirement in 1978 with 30 years of service (all subsequent and after 1947)

ASSUMED COMPENSATION PER MONTH AS FOLLOWS

Years	Individual A	Individual B
1948–49	$125	$150
1950–59	150	200
1960–69	175	225
1970–77	200	250

MONTHLY ANNUITIES ARE AS FOLLOWS

Present act	$81.00	$95.50
Proposal of Wolverton bill	89.10	105.05
Flat rate of other bills	97.20	114.60

Illustrative survivor annuities in respect to employee who died at the end of 1946 and who was continuously employed since 1937

Average monthly remuneration	Aged widow		Widow and 1 child		Widow and 3 children	
	Present	Proposed by Wolverton bill	Present	Proposed by Wolverton bill	Present	Proposed by Wolverton bill
$100	$26.81	$32.17	$44.69	$53.63	$71.50	$80.00
$150	30.94	37.13	51.57	61.88	82.50	99.00
$200	35.06	42.07	58.44	70.13	93.50	112.20
$250	39.19	47.03	65.32	78.38	104.50	120.00

Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks an editorial from the Chronicle-News, published in my home town of Trinidad, Colo., on the Voice of America. I feel that this editorial expresses the sentiments of a majority of American citizens who have become aroused over the type of programs being broadcast to foreign countries.

VOICE OF AMERICA

You certainly cannot blame the Congressmen in both Senate and House for exploding with righteous indignation over the low type of radio broadcast offered on the Voice of America program. If the lines of the script which have been quoted in the discussions of the subject of this work are fair samples of what the Voice of America has been saying to the multitudes which have been receiving the broadcast, surely it is high time that the elected Representatives of the American people called for an investigation. If persons assigned to the job of promulgating Americanism to peoples over the world can produce nothing better than that which is now reported on the floors of the two Houses of Congress, then the huge sums of taxpayers' money made available for these programs might just as well be dumped into a sewer.

Fellow citizen J. E. CHENOWETH, of Trinidad, had a hand in blowing the lid off the Voice of America broadcast, and has been assigned to the work of conducting an investigation to match the one in the Senate directed by FERGUSON, of Michigan. Enough

has already developed to put one of the top-ranking national radio hook-ups on the very hot spot. Again referring to the quotations, it is all too apparent that a program designed and intended to be intelligently educational and informative, has degenerated to become several notches below what is commonly known and described as "tripe."

According to the evidence now before these congressional committees, the principal purpose of this particular radio program seems to have been to satirize with vulgarisms, States and communities of the country, to stress trivialities of our conglomerate and complex American life, and to broadcast what raving and roaring critics now assert are downright libels. Certainly foreign peoples expecting to be told something about the virtues of our American democracy must, if they have any intelligence at all, be convinced that they have been listening to conversations between persons afflicted with some strange form of mental befuddlement that expert psychiatrists have no name for.

With a world distressed and hungry for enlightenment, the learned fellows who have been well paid to write the scripts for this nationally sponsored radio program have turned out such scintillating gems as this: "New England was founded by hypocrisy and Texas by sin." Another, "Nevada's two principal cities compete with each other because people get married in Las Vegas and divorced at Reno." Programs of this character have been broadcast to our good neighbors in South and Central America and elsewhere. One can imagine what sort of judgment any discriminating people will have formed of our cultural attainments after listening to this sort of stuff.

From what has been printed in the Washington reports, it would seem that a most important and influential medium for serving American aims, objectives, and policies in relation to national and world affairs has been left without organization and supervision. If our august lawmakers in Congress are flabbergasted by what they have now discovered, the bewilderment is no less obvious among their humbler constituents. The conclusion comes easy, that the ways by which the American taxpayers can be taken for an old-fashioned buggy ride are astonishing.

The Atomic Energy Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, on May 28, 1948 the Honorable MELVIN PRICE of Illinois set forth in the RECORD his views on H. R. 6402, a bill to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. PRICE views this proposed legislation with alarm, stating that it is politically motivated and will impair the efficiency of the atomic-energy program. We are warned to cease "fiddling with fission," to "support the President," and to "let the country know politics have no place in their great program." Lurking in the shadows of this fight the minority sees the fine hands of the power lobby.

It is not my intention to engage in a rebuttal of the emotional appeals of the minority but rather to state the facts of the case as I have observed them as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

It is extremely important in my opinion to differentiate between the atomic-energy program and the administration of that program. The program was instituted during the war and has continued ever since. On August 1, 1946, the atomic-energy program was incorporated into the law of the land by virtue of the Atomic Energy Act. This act sets forth the main programs to which this country is committed in maintaining our leadership in the field of nuclear research. All Members of this Congress and of the other branches of our Government are legally and morally bound to advance this program to the best of their ability. It should be clear then that the atomic-energy program is not in controversy at this time.

The Atomic Energy Act provides for a Commission to administer the act and it is with the administrative policies of this Commission with which we are now concerned.

Some members of the minority apparently have seen enough to convince them of the efficiency and judgment of the present Commission. Perhaps their perception and judgment is superior to the majority. The fact remains that this joint committee has been charged with the tremendous responsibility of observing the development of the administrative policies of the Commission and of reporting to the Congress its findings.

As vice chairman of the joint committee I submitted to the House a report which set forth the reasons why the majority were not yet ready to give approval to the administrative policies of the present Commission. In passing may I point out that when this legislation was considered by the joint committee all of its supporters were not Republicans. In order to keep the facts straight perhaps a summary of these reasons is in order.

Many of the staff members of the Commission have recently been employed because of the establishment of new policies and new administrative approaches. Many of the Commission's plans and policies are in the process of formulation. These are conditions to be reasonably expected, but, nevertheless, obviously additional time must be allowed for the policies and plans of the Commission to develop before any conclusions can be made as to the final direction of these policies.

Tests of atomic weapons have recently been announced. These tests are the culmination of research and plans begun some time ago. The effect of these developments cannot now be adequately or properly evaluated.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1946 provides for the establishment of a program for patent acquisition and compensation. The Commission has announced a tentative program, but this program has not as yet been finally established. This is a field which has hitherto been reserved to the individual, and the unprecedented action which we are now taking needs careful observation before any evaluation can be made.

The joint committee and the Commission have been seriously concerned about labor-management disputes at vital installations which have threatened continuity of operation. For the second time Oak Ridge is in the throes of a labor dispute and is operating as a result of injunction proceedings instituted under the Taft-Hartley Act. Less than a week remains for the effective period of that injunction.

Despite hearings by the joint committee and conferences with the Commission, no labor-management policy has been as yet reliably established so that continuity can be assured in these vital plants. The Commission is vitally interested in this problem and is endeavoring to find a solution, but has not as yet developed its specific proposals for a reliable solution.

A changing theory of sectional operation of the atomic-energy program, in the nature of decentralization, has recently been put into effect. It is too soon to evaluate whether or not this is a progressive move.

Many advisory groups have been set up by the law and by the Commission to survey and recommend on various phases of the atomic-energy program. The studies of these groups take time, and as yet the joint committee has not received many of the reports of these groups. Obviously, the extent of their recommendations or the action which the Commission has taken upon such recommendation cannot be made by the committee at this time.

In many pertinent phases of the program the joint committee has requested from the Commission and from other Government agencies information, conclusions and recommendations which would be of assistance to the joint committee in evaluating the policies of the Commission, as well as the operation of the basic law. These reports have not as yet been received. This in no way indicates a criticism of the Commission but merely strengthens the opinion that prolonged observation is needed before long-range policies can be justified.

One of the most controversial points in the entire Atomic Energy Act was the provision for the establishment of the Military Liaison Committee which is the vital link between the defense establishments and the Atomic Energy Commission.

It is to be noted that this committee has recently undergone a reorganization, the beneficial results of which cannot be presently evaluated.

The budgetary and accounting problems of the Commission are extensive and ramified. The problem is more complicated because of the fact that under previous wartime operation standardized accounting procedures were not in effect. Since the operation of this project involves an annual expenditure of close to a billion dollars, it is important that standardized accounting procedures be put into effect as rapidly as possible. The Commission is devoting considerable effort in this direction. However, a satisfactory system has not yet been set up, which fact is recognized by the Appropriation Committees of Congress, as well as by the Atomic Energy Commission.

Existing policies of the Commission involve the operation of cities and towns

within the project. Problems of jurisdiction, administrative authority, voting rights, residence, town management, court jurisdiction, subsidies, schooling, public utilities, and so forth, are complicated and demand careful and mature experience and examination before any final policies with respect thereto can be adopted.

A major program in the field of nuclear research, which is the reactor program, has recently undergone a major change in operation. Certain preliminary steps to effect this change have been undertaken. Any conclusions as to the efficacy of this policy at this time would be completely unwarranted.

The establishment of satisfactory and adequate personnel programs in the operation of this project is evident. The necessity for security cannot be disputed. The Commission is endeavoring to establish a policy which will assure the personnel security of the project under conditions of fairness to individuals and at the same time protect the rights of the public and the integrity of this national venture. The policies which have been adopted to date are interim policies and the search continues for a final formula to secure these ends.

The unsettled international situation has a direct effect upon the pattern of our atomic energy program. The Atomic Energy Act of 1946, provides for the transfer of many vital powers of the Commission to an international agency in the event that a satisfactory system of international control is established. After nearly 2 years of exhaustive effort in the United Nations, however, satisfactory universal agreement for reliable international control of atomic energy seems presently impossible. What effect this will have upon the permanent direction of our administrative policies in the atomic energy field cannot now be determined.

The report further points out that these matters do not indicate a lack of progress or a criticism of the Commission but rather reflect the inadvisability of any hasty conclusions based upon insufficient knowledge as to the permanent administrative pattern in this gigantic but infant national venture.

There is no crisis in our atomic-energy program today. The program will not collapse if the present Commissioners are not immediately confirmed. I am perfectly willing to admit that if this legislation is adopted a floor fight in the Senate over confirmation of appointees will be avoided. Frankly I believe that the avoidance of a fight on the personalities of the present Commissioners will benefit the program and will allow the program to develop without interruption. I am convinced that another prolonged and heated debate on the ability of the Commissioners would seriously impair the development of the atomic-energy program. I personally believe that those who are urging such a fight are motivated by politics and not by concern for the welfare of the program.

Be this as it may, the fact of a controversy or lack of controversy on confirmation played no part in my determination to study this tremendous administrative machinery more fully before reaching a final decision as to the permanent administrative pattern. The very scientists most concerned in the program would ridicule any person who came to a conclusion before all the evidence had been collected and evaluated. The administrative policies of this Commission, as the Commission itself testifies, are in a formative state and cannot be presently evaluated. In an unprecedented monopolistic enterprise of this nature a calm judicial approach must be adopted in the public interest. No breast-beating or crisis psychology will stampede me into a decision until the facts are in.

My remarks cannot be interpreted as an evaluation or disparagement of the present Commission. I reiterate that in order for the joint committee to discharge its responsibility to the American people and in fairness to the Commission, a longer period of time must be provided before any approval or disapproval of this particular administrative pattern can be made in good conscience.

United Air Lines Inaugurates Transcontinental Service to Baltimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, June 1, I was invited over to Baltimore by United Air Lines and the Baltimore Association of Commerce to be present when United inaugurated its transcontinental service into that city. Although I am not a resident of Baltimore, I have long been aware of the inadequacy of that city's air transportation facilities. I believe that this inaugural which I witnessed yesterday will go a long way toward correcting this situation.

United Air Lines will give Baltimore 4-hour service to Chicago, and 12- to 14-hour service to all Pacific coast points, such as Portland, Seattle, San Francisco, and Los Angeles, in addition to the seventy-odd other points on its Nation-wide system. It was revealing to me, also, that I can leave my home in Frostburg in the afternoon, drive to Baltimore, board a United plane after dinner in the evening, and be in Honolulu the following evening.

I was particularly happy to participate in the inaugural when I learned that one of the pilots of the first United plane to leave Baltimore was a boy from my home—Griffith Eisel, first officer on the Mainliner which inaugurated Baltimore service yesterday morning, is a Frostburg boy. He went to school there, and his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Leslie B. Eisel were well-known to me before they moved to Akron, Ohio. Griffith has a fine service record, having joined the Army Air Forces in 1941 and served until late in 1945. During that period he qualified as a pilot of four-engined equipment, and when he left the service he held the rank of captain. I understand that Griffith has been with United since August 1946, and is flying regularly scheduled routes day after day.

Last night, as a part of the inaugural ceremonies, I was a guest, along with three other Maryland Congressmen—Representatives MEADE, FALLON, and GARMATZ—at a dinner which United gave at one of Baltimore's hotels. The dinner was attended by the mayor of the city, and many of the leading figures in the government of the State and city, by Baltimore's outstanding civic leaders, and by officials of the Association of Commerce, without whose efforts Baltimore would still be as isolated in respect to air transportation as she was before the Wright brothers first flight more than 40 years ago.

It was indeed a pleasure to participate in this inaugural program, and to be on hand in the welcoming to Baltimore and to the State of Maryland the service and the citizenship which a great air line like United offers—and which we accept.

I have only one regret—Cumberland, Maryland's western metropolis, is inadequately served. We, in the western part of the State, still must go to Baltimore to avail ourselves of this new, transcontinental service. Perhaps some day—and it will be soon, if I can do anything about it—the people of Cumberland and western Maryland will get the air-line service they sorely need and must have to remain important factors in this air age.

Customs Appropriation for 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the customs appropriation for 1948, there arose considerable controversy. The National Customs Service Association spokesmen desire that the record be kept straight and in support of their contention the attached statement is being made a part of my remarks:

CUT IN CUSTOMS APPROPRIATION FOR 1948—COMPARISON OF 1947 AND 1948

There have been many heated arguments and honest differences of opinion on this subject. Let us look at the facts assembled from various sources for convenient reference. The following figures are based upon uncontroverted testimony before the House Committee on Appropriations, the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

Appropriated for salaries and expenses for 1947	$29,350,000
Budget estimates, salaries and expenses for 1948	36,000,000
H. R. 2436, as passed by House of Representatives for 1948	32,500,000
Apparent increase over 1947 appropriation	3,150,000
Decrease in 1948 budget estimates	3,500,000

FURTHER ANALYSIS, 1947 AND 1948

Appropriated for salaries and expenses for 1947 (supra)	$29,350,000
Pay increase, Public Law 390, 79th Cong. (separate appropriation)	3,797,000
Deficiency appropriation for 1947	850,000
Total appropriated for 1947	33,997,000
Mead-Ramspeck automatic increases in pay in 1948 (not occurring in 1947)	729,110
Total needed in 1948 to maintain Customs activities at their present level	34,726,110
H. R. 2436, as passed by the House of Representatives for 1948	32,500,000
Difference (or shortage in 1948)	2,226,110

The additional sum of $2,226,110 would not provide for any additional employees desperately needed to take care of the increased and increasing volume of imports, collections, and work load during 1948.

The total imports for the year 1946 exceeded the combined totals for 1938 and 1939. This increased volume of business cannot be handled without additional personnel, and increased personnel means increased appropriations, as over 93 percent of the money is for salaries. Based upon the continued increase in imports, conservative estimates would indicate that the imports for 1948 will exceed both 1946 and 1947. For this reason, an additional amount was estimated in the budget to take care of increased business and new business. The new business is largely the establishment of additional international airports, the increased volume of business by air (especially freight and express shipments), increases in imports of wool and sugar, etc. A survey made by the National Council of American Importers, with the cooperation of chambers of commerce, importers, and customs brokers, indicated that the budget should be $37,000,000 instead of $36,000,000, with 1,000 additional employees instead of 635, as recommended and approved in the budget estimates. The import business cannot sustain delays in the clearance of the merchandise and ascertainment of the duties. Importers, brokers, and carriers are complaining of delays at present, but admit that the Customs personnel is doing all it can to prevent delays—even carrying a heavier work load per man than heretofore and working longer hours without additional compensation to which they would be entitled under the law. If the Customs personnel is not increased, there will be further unavoidable delays and consequent complaints.

The above facts and figures may be readily verified, and large importers will confirm the annoyance and embarrassment to them of even unavoidable delays in receiving their goods and knowing how much they are to pay.

Prayer of Israel Reborn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 2 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I have received from Kate Selma Heyman a Prayer of Israel Reborn, which I think deserves the attention of the Members of the Congress. I shall not read it, but I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRAYER OF ISRAEL REBORN

Down through tireless ages we've devoutly prayed
We might come once more unto our land,
To the land made sacred by what the Lord hath said,
He, who promised freedom to our band.
Help us, Lord, Thy mercy to deserve.
Help us, Lord, Thy mandates to conserve.
Help us, Lord, grave dangers mount each day.
Help us, Lord! Forget us not, we pray!

We will cherish ever mandates sent by Thee:
That freedom and liberty never cease!
We will guard the land made holy by our blood
Given ever freely so right might live in peace!

Rise, O Israel, up and to our task!
Let us rise, all traitors to unmask!
Help us, Lord, Thy mercy to deserve.
Help us, Lord, Thy mandates to conserve.
Help us, Lord, for we are sore beset.
Help us, Lord, You promised—don't forget.

—*Kate Selma Heyman.*

Resolution on State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a resolution unanimously adopted at a recent meeting, May 24, 1948, in the city of Worcester, Mass. The meeting—called as a salute to the Palestinian armed forces and to the newly proclaimed state of Israel—was sponsored by Jewish organizations in Worcester and more than 1,500 members were present. The resolution follows:

Whereas after 19 centuries of national homelessness, the Jewish people has proclaimed and established the independent state of Israel; and

Whereas the Republic of Israel was created on the basis of a decision of the General Assembly of the United Nations, which, on November 29, 1947, called for the partition of Palestine into separate Jewish and Arab states; and

Whereas the Jewish displaced persons, still languishing in the camps of Europe, will at long last be enabled to emigrate to the new Jewish state and there rebuild their lives in a progressive and democratic community; and

Whereas the United States, the Soviet Union, and other nations have already given official recognition to the Republic of Israel; and

Whereas the new-born Republic of Israel is now engaged in a critical struggle for survival, since it has been ruthlessly invaded by the armies of neighboring Arab states, who are bent upon the destruction of the Jewish state; and

Whereas the Jews of Palestine are imbued with the highest ideals of democracy and are animated by the same high principles which guide Americans in their devotion to freedom and human rights: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we assembled at a mass demonstration at the Sheraton Hotel on May 24, 1948, representing all Jewish organizations in Worcester and in behalf of 10,000 members of these organizations extend our congratulations and heartfelt gratitude to the President of the United States for his immediate recognition of Israel, and we look forward to the early exchange of diplomatic representatives between the two countries; and be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully call upon the President to translate our country's recognition of Israel into the practical and logical steps which the present situation demands, and that the United States immediately revise its arms embargo, so that the embattled Jews of Israel may be given the opportunity to defend their lives—and their newly gained independence—against Arab aggression; and be it further

Resolved, That the United States withhold further financial assistance from Great Britain as long as that Government persists in providing monetary subsidies and military equipment to the Arab Legion and the other Arab forces now invading Israel; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the United States delegation to the United Nations.

Women Nominees Balked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARY T. NORTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Doris Fleeson, from the Washington Evening Star:

WOMEN NOMINEES BALKED—GOP STANDS IN WAY OF CONFIRMATION OF MISS HENNOCK, JUDGE MARION HARRON

(By Doris Fleeson)

The Republican Senate is refusing confirmation to two women nominated for high public office by President Truman.

Miss Freida Hennock, the excellent New York lawyer, who is the first woman nominee to the Federal Communications Commission, has been asked to submit her history to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Its chairman, Senator WHITE, and the other Maine member, Senator BREWSTER, strove manfully in 1947 to put a Maine woman, Marion Martin, on FCC after Chairman Reece fired her from the Republican National Committee. However, Miss Hennock is a Democrat.

As she is openly in politics and a lieutenant of Mayor O'Dwyer, it can in a sense be argued that she lives by the sword and cannot complain if she perishes by it. Republicans admittedly are saving as many jobs as possible for their hungry hordes, exactly as Democrats did in 1930, and they've got Miss Hennock on their list.

The second case is very different and involves an unappetizing collaboration between conservative Democrats and Republicans.

JUDGE HARRON'S CASE

Judge Marion Harron has served a full term with distinction on the United States Tax Court. Of 16 judges, she stands sixth in production, and the appeals record puts her first with fewer reversals and more confirmations than any of her colleagues.

But Senator MILLIKIN, of Finance, who is rapidly acquiring a considerable reputation

for pigeon-holing nominations, will not even give her friends a hearing. For months Senator MILLIKIN has also ignored Dr. James Boyd's nomination to head the Bureau of Mines—John L. Lewis doesn't like him. Dr. Boyd was former dean of the Colorado School of Mines, one of the country's best.

In the Harron case, Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, ranking Democrat, has collaborated with Senator MILLIKIN, to cold-shoulder the only woman judge and put over another 12-year term for a former Member of Congress, Judge Samuel B. Hill, who is 73, and has already served 25 years, 3 years beyond the mandatory retirement age.

Somehow, President Truman was persuaded to issue an Executive order permitting Judge Hill another 12 years—he will be 85 when his new term ends. Eleven judges on the court are over 60 and 4 over 70. Judge Harron is 44.

Four incumbent tax court judges were renominated actually: Judges Harron, Hill, Richard L. Disney, whose brother is a former Member of Congress, and Byron B. Harlan, who has served only 2 years. On 12 hours' notice a meeting of the Finance Committee was called to consider them. Senator MILLIKIN tossed out two names—Hill and Disney—and they were approved.

SHUSHED BY GEORGE

When a Senator asked about the others, Senator GEORGE shushed him. "We ought to be satisfied with two out of four," he said.

"Yes," Senator MILLIKIN said complacently, "we'll just keep the other two in the refrigerator."

Appointed in 1936, Judge Harron has worked through difficult years when a vigorous Treasury set out to correct the intricate system of tax evasions that developed with the income-tax amendment. The quality of her work shouts from the record—of her 516 cases only 2 percent have been reversed, which makes her the court valedictorian.

Judge Harron knew she was a pioneer, that she would be judged rigorously on her record. She has made her record; apparently it doesn't count. The only answer her friends can get is that she's a New Dealer.

Past custom has been to reappoint tax judges on a nonpartisan basis on their records. Since 1932, four Republicans were nominated and confirmed by a Democratic administration.

Development of the Columbia River Is Enriching the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include in the RECORD a radio address I made recently to the people of my district in the State of Washington:

COLUMBIA RIVER POWER

I will talk with you today about the greatest engineering project ever undertaken by man in all the history of the world. This greatest of all man's engineering undertakings is the Columbia River power and reclamation development.

Your Government already has expended more the $400,000,000 on Columbia River power and reclamation projects. Before the job is done, your Government will spend more than $2,000,000,000. No undertaking so vast, so costly, and of such great and far-reaching benefits has ever been attempted by man, anywhere in all the tens of thousands of years of his existence.

The over-all plan for developing the Columbia River calls for the building of 24 dams, 13 of which already have been authorized by Congress and 11 still are to be authorized.

Of the 24 dams proposed only 1—the Bonneville—has been fully completed as to power production. The Bonneville Dam is fully finished and all nine of the power generators it was built to carry are installed and in operation.

The second of the Columbia River's great power dams—Grand Coulee—in eastern Washington, is completed as far as the dam itself is concerned, but only 9, of the 18 generators this dam will ultimately carry, are installed. Nine others are still to be installed, and three of these are built and almost ready for installation.

In the special session of Congress last fall, I was one of those who worked for and was successful in obtaining from Congress sufficient funds to build three additional generators for the Grand Coulee Dam. These are now being built and will be installed during 1949 and 1950. We are now engaged in seeking funds from Congress to let a contract for the three additional generators that will be required to complete the Grand Coulee bank of 18. The last of these 18 should be installed by 1952.

In short, by 1952, as the result of installing these additional generators, we will be generating at Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams more than 50 percent more power than these two dams now produce.

Last year, $22,933,144 of power produced by these two dams was sold to Pacific Northwest consumers. The installation of the nine additional generators at Grand Coulee will make more than $35,000,000 of power available each year for sale by 1952.

But the Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams are not the only ones to be built on the Columbia River and its tributaries. There are 22 others still to be completed and of these two already are under construction.

At Umatilla, Oreg., near Walla Walla, Wash., a third great Columbia River dam, the McNary, is under construction. Work on it started last year when Congress appropriated $4,500,000 to start building it.

This year we asked for $30,000,000 for the McNary Dam. The House voted $20,000,000 and the Senate committee has increased this figure to $27,000,000. We do not know yet how much we will get for this dam except that the amount granted will not be less than $20,000,000 and probably closer to $27,000,000.

The McNary Dam will produce as much power as nine generators at the Grand Coulee. In other words, the McNary Dam, plus the installation of nine additional generators at Grand Coulee, will give us twice as much power as we now have. Bonneville power sales last year were about $23,000,000. With Grand Coulee and McNary Dams completed, these sales should run to about $50,000,000 a year.

I was present in the office of Secretary of Interior Krug the other day when he signed a $43,000,000 contract for construction of a power and reclamation dam at Hungry Horse in Montana. This fourth dam will be completed within less than 6 years and will add more power to the Northwest's available supply.

We are now asking that work be started on the Foster Creek Dam in eastern Washington, which, when undertaken, will become the fifth great dam of the 24 great power dams which eventually will line the Columbia River and its tributaries.

When, in 1954 or 1955, these first five of the proposed 24 dams are completed, we will have three to four times as much power as the Columbia River now produces. This means continued great industrial expansion for the Pacific Northwest.

Every factory requires energy to drive the wheels of its machinery. The energy to operate factories comes from four sources: coal, oil, gas, and electricity.

We have no developed supplies of coal in the Pacific Northwest in the vast commercial quantities needed by industry. We have no oil. We have no gas. But, while we have no great developed commercial deposits of coal or supplies of gas or oil, we do have a far more dependable and far cheaper energy producer than any of these in hydroelectricity.

Because of this abundant supply of cheap electricity, southwest Washington can, and I am convinced will, become in manufacturing to the west coast what coal deposits have made the Pittsburgh area to the eastern half of the United States and the Ruhr Valley, to Europe. We can and will, due to our abundant supply of cheap electricity, become one of the world's greatest industrial regions.

In many respects, the Columbia River is a remarkable stream. It is the second largest river in North America. It is unusually long. Its great length provides many natural sites for power dams—more power-dam sites than any other river in the world.

The Columbia throughout much of its great length flows through arid lands which now are of small value. The areas flooded by the great dams are of little value. This low-value land cuts the cost of dam building. Were the areas flooded heavily populated and economically valuable, the cost of the flooded land might make such dam projects too costly to be practical. Then, too, the Columbia River has many great gorges that provide natural reservoirs for the water the dams impound.

Also, fortunately, the Columbia flows swiftly. The volume of water passing any given place is enormous. This results in increased power productivity.

Most important of all, the volume of water in the Columbia River varies little summer or winter. In every season of the year, there is a large flow. This uniform large volume of water produces a uniform flow of power the year around—not an abundance of it in one season of the year and a scarcity in another season. Most industries need a constant year-round supply of power—not just abundant power 6, 7, or 8 months a year and then a scarcity of it during other months.

All of these factors make the Columbia River the world's richest power-developing stream.

But the whole job of developing the Columbia River is not just the production of power. Once power is developed, we must transport that power to the consuming population and manufacturing centers. This requires substations and power lines.

We have not been idle in seeking Federal funds for extending and improving distribution lines throughout southwest Washington. Last spring, I asked Congress for $7,350,000 to build and extend 26 power lines and to build substations in the 9 counties of my congressional district. Almost all of these projects have been approved by the House and I am sure will be approved by the Senate before June 18, when Congress adjourns.

These power lines and substations will provide every county of the area with more power and protect them against the costly interruptions in power service which sometimes, have occurred in the past.

The more available power these nine counties have, the more likely each of these counties are to obtain new power using industrial plants, thereby increasing the employment and prosperity of southwest Washington. Also this additional electricity will enable the electrification of many rural and farm homes, making it possible for

them to enjoy more of the comforts and conveniences provided by modern electrical appliances.

But low-cost public power is not the only benefit that the State of Washington people will obtain from these dams. The dams will impound behind them great reservoirs of water which will be employed to irrigate land on which today only sagebrush grows.

The lands of eastern Washington are for the most part arid. Nothing grows on them unless water is supplied. Irrigate these lands and they bloom like a garden. The Wenatchee and Yakima Valleys are examples of what water can do to arid eastern Washington lands.

Water from the Grand Coulee Dam, when put into irrigation ditches eventually, will turn 1,029,000 acres of now arid land into rich farms for 17,000 farm families. These farms will provide a living for 85,000 people, according to Reclamation Service estimates, and another 170,000 people, it is estimated by the Reclamation Service, will be required in nearby cities to service these new 17,000 farm families.

Altogether, this one great irrigation project at Grand Coulee will add 250,000 people to the population of eastern Washington. This is not something that will be achieved in the distant future. Irrigation of this land already has begun.

The first water flowed onto 5,400 acres near the Coulee Dam in May of this year converting desert waste into a garden. It is estimated that by 1952, only 4 years from now, 216,000 acres—or almost one-fourth of this great proposed million-acre project—will have water upon it and be in cultivation.

One of the fine features of this great Columbia River power and reclamation development is that it will not cost the Federal Government a cent. It will pay for itself.

The Government merely advances, as a loan, the money to build the initial dams, power facilities, and the reclamation projects. The irrigation district farm owners, water users, and the users of power in the rates they pay, will repay to the Government every cent that the Government invests in these projects plus interest at 2½ percent.

The Federal Government will get back all the money it spends on the projects and when the Federal Government has gotten back all its money with interest the Government will still own these projects and continue to derive revenues from them.

This is far more than we ever will get back from the billions we loan to Europe and Asia.

But the power and reclamation projects not only will pay for themselves out of the revenue from power and from reclamation water sales, the projects also will bring new industries and new farms into the region. This will mean more production of the goods American people need and in the using of which they will increase their living standards. Also, there will be more jobs for every classification of labor.

The new industries which cheap power will bring into the West will add to the taxable wealth of the Nation and the States. Since cheap power became available in the Columbia River Valley, private capital has invested $140,000,000 in establishing new power-using industries in that valley. These new industries now employ more than 7,000 people. These new industries last year paid more than $2,500,000 in new taxes to our Western States, counties, and cities. All of these benefits also can and should be placed on the profit side of the Columbia River development ledger.

The population of the State of Washington increased 28.6 percent between 1940 and 1948. It was the fourth fastest growing State in the Union. Only California, Oregon, and Arizona grew faster. Much of this growth was due to the industries the cheap power of the Columbia River brought into our State. As more dams are built and more generators installed, more factories and more people will come.

The sooner we develop the Columbia River the faster our Pacific Northwest States will grow and the greater the prosperity their people will enjoy. I, RUSSELL MACK, your Congressman, find it a great privilege to be in Congress and contribute my part toward hastening the development of Columbia River power and reclamation. I am certain that through these developments, western Washington and western Oregon will become one of the most populous and prosperous industrial regions of our Nation.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements Opposition a Republican Blind Spot Endangering Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Courier-Journal of May 17, 1948:

A REPUBLICAN BLIND SPOT IMPERILS FOREIGN POLICY

The prospects of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act have been gloomy since March when President Truman raised the issue and asked for a 3-year extension. Now the outlook is downright bleak. The President's request received a cool reception from the Republican majority in Congress. The question remained, however, just what form the Republican opposition would take. Now the answer has been given by the party's House leadership through the Ways and Means Committee. The answer is about as bad as could be. It could only have been worse if complete abandonment of the reciprocal trade policy had been proposed.

The plan is to extend the act not for 3 years but for only one. Worse, it would establish a congressional veto power over trade agreements. Under the bill, this power could be exercised only in case of disagreement between the President and a proposed tariff commission. But the existence of this power would obviously subject both the commission and Congress to tremendous special-interest pressures. All of the old scandals and iniquities of tariff-making as we once knew it would be with us again.

A majority of the Republicans in Congress have been against the program from the beginning. They opposed it originally. They opposed each extension, except in 1943 when the issue was in abeyance on account of the war. Also, they consistently attempted to assert some form of congressional veto power. The party's 1944 platform called for congressional approval of trade agreements. The authors of the platform could not have been unaware that this would simply sabotage the program which Cordell Hull had inaugurated 10 years before.

The only hope was that all this was just opposition for opposition's sake by a party in the minority. It was conceivable that, once given responsibility, the congressional Republicans would not be so reckless. But to date it has not turned out that way. This is in spite of the fact that hacking away at the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act requires a curious inconsistency on the part of the Republicans. By and large, they have been enlightened in foreign affairs. The year of the last previous renewal of the act, 1945, was a year of many important international decisions, including our taking membership in the United Nations. Most of the Republicans faithfully supported a bi-partisan policy, except for one thing. They were against extension of the Trade Agreements Act, something vital to international cooperation.

Today the inconsistency is even more appalling. The Republicans favored the European recovery program. But reciprocal trade is the very basis of that program. There could be no greater folly or ignorance than to favor ERP and at the same time oppose and hamper reciprocal trade. Nevertheless, the Republican leadership in the House, by limiting the extension to 1 year, is proposing to introduce vast uncertainty into the world concerning our future tariff policy. It is proposing also to rob our negotiators of the confidence of the negotiators of other nations. How could other countries like an agreement they knew was subject to being upset by Congress?

The whole thing is so utterly anomalous that it is impossible to imagine its happening. Yet there is nothing in the news from Washington to justify real hope that it won't happen.

Development of Minnesota's Taconite Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the development of Minnesota's enormous taconite resources to supplement the diminishing supply of high grade iron ore on the Mesabi Range has been one of my major interests, dating back to my service in the Minnesota State Senate where I sponsored the Minnesota taconite tax law of 1941. During last week's debate on the Interior appropriation bill, I reminded the House of the importance of taconite development to the future prosperity of Minnesota, and paid tribute to Prof. E. W. Davis, director of the mines experiment station of the University of Minnesota, to whom belongs the major share of the credit for the progress in making the utilization of taconite commercially feasible.

Further recognition of the great contributions of Professor Davis in the field of taconite research has just been forthcoming. Recently the mines experiment station of the University of Minnesota announced the manufacture of pig iron from taconite rock, and in a speech delivered before the Minnesota Newcomen Society, Dr. J. L. Morrill, president of the University of Minnesota, explored the effects of this development on the economic life of Minnesota. At that time, the president also paid tribute to Professor Davis for his untiring research work which made this process possible.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by President Morrill. This article is a condensation of his recent address to the Minnesota Newcomen Society, which appeared in the May 30 edition of the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune. I also include the Tribune's press story of May

30 containing President Morrill's remarks regarding Professor Davis's contributions in taconite research.

(By Dr. J. L. Morrill, president, University of Minnesota)

In Ojibway lore, there is the legend of a fabulous giant who once strode the ranges of our north country. Driven by the gnawing hunger of his insatiable appetite, he would seize great boulders of granite and hurl them as weapons to slay his game. The Indians called him Mesabi.

A time came when the giant Mesabi settled down into the contours of the earth and fell into a prolonged and silent sleep. Some day, the story ran, he would waken and rise again.

The Minnesota range country is a vast region in which for unnumbered centuries only the simple Indian roamed. Then came the white man to eke out a precarious existence, unaware for decades that there were riches beneath the ground on which he walked.

MINING DEPLETES RICHES

That wealth, eventually discovered, was feverishly scooped from the earth. But good red ore does not, like growing things, reproduce itself. Would it one day be gone? What then of the communities reared on the prosperous economy of easy mining, and of the State of which they were a part? Doubts and fears gripped men's hearts.

And then, as the legend had prophesied, there were once more giant stirrings. But these were of a new giant who had also slept in the long silence of passing years. Geologists speak of "taconite"—and taconite is the new giant of the Mesabi!

Ours is a civilization of iron and steel. The unprecedented industrial growth of this country and of all western Europe as well—stems back to two discoveries made in England in the early years of the tenth century.

The first was the use of coal in the blast furnace to replace charcoal in the manufacture of pig iron. The other was the open hearth, and Bessemer's process for converting pig iron into steel. The impact on society of these inventions ranks with the discovery of the wheel in the remote past, or with the splitting of the atom in our own generation.

These inventions of the early 1800's constituted the essential forward step in the production of cheap steel. To these add the discovery of the rich Ohio valley coal beds and the great iron-ore mines of the Lake Superior district, connected as they are by a magnificent deep inland water route, and an industrial development was assured that could not fail to change the pattern of civilization throughout the world. The age of handicrafts had ended; the age of iron and steel and technology had begun.

YARDSTICK OF POWER

The eminent American sociologist, Dr. William F. Ogburn of the University of Chicago, offers the intriguing idea that one of the best measures of the greatness of a modern nation is the number of blast furnaces that operate within its borders. The blast furnace is a symbol of power and civilization.

If coal and iron underlie our eminence as a nation, the extent of these resources is a vital matter. Our supply of rich iron ore, especially on the great Mesabi Range, is lessening. The answer is the awakening giant of the Mesabi: Taconite.

Taconite is the mother rock, about one-third iron ore and two thirds waste, of which the Mesabi range was formed. It stretched across northern Minnesota in an extended sheet, 100 miles long and several miles wide.

Sprinkled here and there in the taconite expanse, like raisins in a Christmas fruit cake, are high-grade ore pockets. From them come the rich ores that have accounted for more than half of the iron and steel ever produced in the whole United States.

These ores, earth-like in texture and readily handled in open pits with steam shovels, are of a purity that permits their use in blast furnaces without further processing. But, several of the large steel companies which have been dependent upon them are now literally scraping, if not the bottom of the barrel, at least the bottom of their high-grade ore deposits.

TACONITE UNLIMITED

That bottom, however, is solid taconite.

This solid taconite, for practical purposes, is unlimited. But its use presents new problems—industrial and economic.

In truth, the new iron ore will not be mined, but manufactured. To use the taconite, the companies must now learn complex techniques, and must invest many millions in new plants and equipment. The company manager must now think in terms of amines, retentivity and heat of formation. He will discard inches and speak of microns. He will forget gallons and calculate the parts per million.

The initial operation of blasting the taconite rock from the quarry faces requires a drilling process whereby tons of buried explosives may be detonated deep in the ground to shake the rock free and to break it into pieces that can be handled.

Taconite is so adamant that entirely new methods of drilling have had to be developed. Blast holes a foot in diameter and 35 feet deep will be burned out with fuel of liquid oxygen and oil. Where old methods drilled a hole a day, these new techniques can prepare a hole an hour.

Is that earth tremor an explosion of dynamite or is it the giant shaking himself?

The huge taconite blocks thus ripped from the quarry walls must then be taken to processing plants, where monster crushers and grinders will reduce them to a powder as fine as flour. From every 3 tons of this powder 1 ton of good, usable iron ore will be removed, also in fine-powder form. It must be reconstituted into lumps or pellets that can be smelted in the blast furnaces.

SIXTY-THREE PERCENT IRON

The taconite rock contains approximately 25 percent iron, but the pellet, ready for shipment to the blast furnaces, contains 63 percent iron. (The magnetic type of taconite will be processed first in the plants to be built, but there are other types.)

To avoid a shortage of steel, we must encourage and learn a new art of mining (or, more properly speaking, of mineral manufacturing) and establish a great, new industry through which the national needs can be met. A new industry of such magnitude as we are considering here means vastly increased employment and expanded activity which will permeate the entire economic fabric and enhance the business and industrial welfare.

The giant is stirring. We must help him to his feet. But has he the economic strength to stand? Let's look at a problem of comparative costs.

After a ton of taconite rock is mined, pulverized, processed into iron ore, smelted into pig iron, refined into steel, and, let us say, drawn into wire, the steel company will have from the original 2,000 pounds of taconite rock approximately 400 pounds of wire to sell. At present prices this would bring about $16.

Can this yield a profit? This is a crucial question.

Copper provides a parallel. Today, after a ton of western copper ore is mined, pulverized, processed, smelted, refined, and drawn into wire the copper producer, from his original ton of ore, has about 20 pounds of wire to sell, which currently brings him $6. From these $6 he must pay all of his costs and take his profit. His ore-processing methods are every bit as complicated as those for processing taconite, and his smelting and refining methods are, if anything, more elaborate and exacting.

PRICE STAYS SAME

What the western copper producer can do today for $6 the steel industry should be able to do for $16, with full allowance for added transportation and handling costs of steel. And this is the point to stress: Although the supply of high-grade copper ores ran out 30 years ago, copper is no more expensive now than it was then.

It was 30 years ago, too, that in this State the tangled tale of taconite had its beginnings: When the giant stirred slightly to indicate that his long sleep was near an end. An attempt was made to process taconite in a small plant on the Mesabi. Financially, this experiment was a failure behind which were technical failures. The silica content of the ore was far too high for blast-furnace use. So taconite went back into the laboratory—into the laboratory of the University of Minnesota, in fact—and the problems involved in its successful processing were attacked anew.

Funds for the support of this research were not readily available. The State of Minnesota gave some help.

Today the support is more adequate, and the program is advancing with acceleration. Its success will be one further demonstation that there is no more significant investment that a people can make in their own welfare than the appropriation of money to study the utilization of the unused resources from which new wealth can be created.

There was developed a complete beneficiation method by which the use of the magnetic taconite can be processed to produce a concentrate of any desired grade which can then be agglomerated to produce high grade ore—tailor-made, as it were, for blast furnace smeltering.

TAXES OBSTACLE

But this scientific achievement could not alone insure the commercial development of the new processes. No mining company could be interested in taconite until the Minnesota law was changed which, year after year, imposed a tax upon all unmined minerals remaining in the State. The ad valorem tax, 90 percent of which was retained by the local communities, had long been a source of dissension between the mining companies and the communities in which they operated. It constituted a heavy burden—$10,000,000 to $15,000,00 a year.

Locally these taxes gave the communities the resources to develop the splendid schools, park systems, and other welfare enterprises of the range. But at the same time they were forcing the mining companies to exploit as rapidly as possible the highest grade ore properties under their leased control. These companies fought shy of acquiring properties with low-grade ores, which could be developed later and more slowly, because such properties only meant more taxes, with no immediate prospect of realizable returns.

No simple change in tax laws would suffice, because as soon as a taconite industry developed, there would be nothing to prevent a reversal of tax policy.

Something drastic was called for. A constitutional amendment seemed out of the question. However, if the range people could be convinced of the long-term advantages that would accrue if they would themselves voluntarily petition the legislature to pass a law prohibiting the taxation of taconite, this might convince the mining industry of their good intentions, and of their willingness to abide by them. Only in some such way would the companies be persuaded that it was economically safe for them to invest the needed millions for the development of a taconite industry.

Developments in 1940 played into the hands of those who had argued for such a change in the ore tax laws. The United States Steel Corp., which previously had never released to anyone a pound of ore it had mined, suddenly advertised that it would start selling ore in the open market. Such a move would serve only to hasten the depletion of the high-grade ores, largely under their control, and the removal of the ore industry from the State.

Yet this move was natural under the terms of the existing ad valorem tax. The result of this startling announcement was the revised taconite law of 1941.

ASK TAX END

In effect, the range delegation—renouncing a rich present tax for a long-time future gain—did ask the legislature to enact a statute that would remove the authority of the county and local boards to tax taconite on the ad valorem basis. They proposed a substitute tax of six cents per ton on the product made from taconite when shipped, the income to be divided equally among the State, the county, the school district, and the local town, city, or village.

Admittedly, this new tax would not yield in any year the income of the ad valorem tax, but for the range communities it held a promise of higher employment that would continue over the years. It thus substituted pay rolls as a source of economic stability for the future uncertainties of the previous tax, applied to a declining high-grade ore supply.

Industrial interest in taconite dates almost from the hour that the new taconite law was signed by then Governor Stassen. Now, 7 years later, every major mining company has acquired vast areas of taconite land previously considered worthless, and much of it tax-forfeited.

These companies are spending millions annually in acquiring water rights, town sites, wastes disposal areas, and railroad rights-of-way.

The first commercial plant producing taconite pellets and using the processes developed at the University of Minnesota will be actually in production this summer. Built and operated by Pickands Mather & Co., it will be comparatively small, costing only $2,000,000 and capable of yielding a few hundred thousand tons of taconite pellets a year. But it is a forerunner of what is certainly to come on a larger scale. Definite announcement has been made that two taconite plants are to be built in northern Minnesota with an investment of approximately $100,000,000. I am told these plants will be financed entirely by the ore-consuming interests—each steel company to take its share of the ore produced at whatever the cost of production may be.

The so-called Reserve Mining Co. project is being designed to produce 5,000,000 tons of processed ore at Beaver Bay on Lake Superior. It includes a power-generating plant and a new harbor to be connected with the mine near Babbitt by a new company-owned railroad. This plant will employ 1,000 men the year around at Beaver Bay, and as many more at the Babbitt mines, with a yearly pay roll of $6,000,000. Eventually twice the original capacity is planned.

SECOND AT AURORA

The second project is scheduled for Aurora, on the Mesabi, with an initial capacity of 2,500,000 tons of pellets a year. This plant, too, will be doubled in size as plans mature.

The announcement of these two developments by four major steel companies, which together produce nearly one-third of all the iron and steel in the country, reveals the emerging trends. The decision has been made that taconite is now the cheapest long-run source of iron ore available.

This momentous decision eventually can mean a billon-dollar industry in the Minnesota north country. It means expansion of electric power requirements. It means more people, more jobs, new towns, new railroads—new markets to develop, new collateral; educational and social needs to be met. It likewise refutes the statement that our present great steel centers will gradually abandon the Minnesota region and retreat to the Atlantic seaboard where foreign ores are available.

It means, in short, an economic upsurge in our mining districts, with a stability based on continuing pay rolls in a year-round, rather than a seasonal, industry.

But there will be new problems also to face. In processing taconite two tons of waste are rejected for every ton of pellets produced. In disposing of this waste for one of these plants alone, in a period of 50 years, an area of 20 square miles will be covered to a depth of 30 feet. Research, supported by mining companies, is now under way at the hydraulics laboratory of the University of Minnesota, appraising methods of flowing the waste over the disposal areas. At our agricultural experiment station, university scientists seek to determine the best types of cover and forest crops to plant on these soon-to-be-created, man-made waste regions.

But larger than all else is the brightened outlook of the industry. Hitherto the mining industry in Minnesota has looked down, depressed by the magnitude of the gaping hole that represented the quickest possible utilization of the ores. Today, it can look up to face a hopeful future, secure in the knowledge that seemingly unlimited ore resources are available.

IMPORT FOREIGN ORE

It is true that high-grade foreign ores exist, and that they have been imported from Sweden, Cuba, Canada, and the Latin-American countries. The Bethlehem Steel Co. has long secured Central and South American ores for shipment to its plant at Sparrow's Point, Md. It is even now building 25,000-ton ore boats, boats twice as large as those on the Great Lakes. These will cost $5,000,000 each, and four of these will be necessary to bring in 1,000,000 tons a year. This means a capital expenditure of $20,000,000.

Taconite plants can be built cheaper than this. In the long run the economics of the situation would seem to favor the domestic ores.

But this is not my point. Recall that steel and iron underlie our national greatness. "Security," wrote Newton D. Baker in 1935, "is more and more a question of raw materials, and nations estimate their war strength, not by a census of their population, but by statistics of their unmined ores."

No nation can maintain international influence if dependent upon others for so vital a resource as iron ore. Within 3 weeks after this Nation entered World War II, the Germans sank three of Bethlehem's ore boats.

For the remainder of the war, Minnesota ore was shipped to the Sparrow's Point plant.

If national power, wealth, and cultural eminence are measured by the blast-furnace index, there must be blast furnaces from whose chimneys smoke is pouring. Even the possibilities of atomic energy do not affect this basic truth, for machines, if powered by the new energy, must still be built of iron and steel. The security of our Nation, then, is directly and inescapably entwined with taconite as a source of iron ore.

There are taconite ores in other parts of this country: elsewhere in the Lake Superior region, in Michigan, Wisconsin, and New York. But it is on our own Mesabi that their utilization has had its initial development. The Mesabi offers natural and traditional advantages.

EFFORT NEEDED

The expansion I have been picturing, and the social gains to be derived from it cannot come without continued effort on the part of scientists, industrialists, and statesmen working cooperatively for a common end. The fact that such cooperation has already manifested itself gives this State its great initial momentum. It is on this advantage that, working together, we must build for the future. It is not merely fanciful to say that destiny has pointed to this State—to our own Minnesota—to play the all-important role in advancing and maintaining the national greatness of our Nation. Ours is the magnificent opportunity.

Taconite, the new giant of the Mesabi, has arisen. He stands ready to stride forward.

MORRILL LAUDS WORK OF TACONITE PIONEER

Discussing development of taconite in Minnesota, President J. L. Morrill, of the University of Minnesota, paid tribute to one of his staff members in these words:

"Prof. E. W. Davis, director of the mines experiment station of the University of Minnesota, has had the vision to perceive what taconite developments might mean to Minnesota.

"He has had the energy to carry forward, sometimes in the face of crushing discouragement, the patient and persistent endeavor that all fundamental research involves. He has had the perseverance of a crusader."

Does the Republican Tariff Bill Confirm the Public Suspicion That Too Many Republican Leaders Take Orders From Selfish Business Interests Behind Closed Doors?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington News of May 15, 1948:

A ROAD TO DISASTER

When high-tariff Republicans in the House clamped down their own iron curtain, and behind it held secret hearings on the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, it became plain that they were up to no good.

Even so, they didn't quite dare condemn this wise and popular law to die next June 12, as it would if Congress failed to renew it.

But they intended to restrict the authority it gives the President to make two-way agreements with other countries for the lowering of barriers to international trade. And they meant to allow it only a brief new lease on life, hoping that after the elections a Republican President would help them to get rid of it altogether.

Their intentions have now taken open form in a bill, drafted behind that "iron curtain," to cripple the Reciprocal Trade Act with amendments and to renew it for 1 year instead of the three asked by President Truman. The bill has been approved by a strict party vote—15 Republicans to 9 Democrats—of the House Ways and Means Committee. And Speaker MARTIN and other Republican leaders in the House have given it their blessing.

Enactment of this bill would be a terrible, if not fatal, blow to the European Recovery Program, hitherto given bipartisan support in Congress. It would amount to notifying the world that America is turning back to economic isolation. Through ERP, America offers to help other nations toward prosperity and peace, one of the conditions being that they act to promote freer world trade. How can we expect the condition to be met if America herself starts retreating down the old, disastrous road of restrictive tariffs?

Perhaps the high-tariff Republicans don't care what happens to ERP and the world. Let them give thought, then, to what their bill could do to their own party and its hopes for winning control of the White House as well as Congress.

For many years one of the Republican Party's heaviest handicaps has been a public suspicion that too many of its leaders take orders from selfish business interests behind

closed doors. Can the Republican Congress now afford to confirm this suspicion? Can it afford to tell the American people that a Republican victory next November would be followed by a swift return to the evil log-rolling system of writing tariffs? We think not.

We know that the United States cannot afford the damage this Ways and Means Committee bill would do. It should be rejected. Congress should renew the Reciprocal Trade Act, without hamstringing amendments, for three full years.

Savings Banks and Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech delivered at the twenty-eighth annual conference of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks on May 26 by Mr. Robert M. Morgan, chairman of the committee on mortgage investments, and vice president of the Boston Five Cents Savings Bank:

SAVINGS BANKS AND HOUSING

Housing is the basic stuff on which the savings banks build their mortgage portfolios.

As you well know, in most of our banks 40 to 70 percent of the deposits have, until recent years, been invested in loans on houses. Even in our larger institutions, with their substantial portfolios of loans on commercial properties, mortgages on residential property have always been a major investment. Savings banks by their very nature, have been interested in promoting the ownership of homes in their communities, as well as in seeking stable mortgage income to advance the cause of thrift.

Whereas in the past 15 years we have witnessed one of the widest swings in general interest rates in a century, bringing mortgage rates to an all-time low and although we have experienced foreclosures and depression of realty values almost without precedent, it is rather significant that interest rates obtainable on mortgages are still attractive and that the loan troubles and losses of the thirties have not discouraged the investment in debt secured by real estate, either commercial or residential.

Perhaps at this point, a closer look at the actual supply of housing would be helpful, if we are to gage the home-construction possibilities of the immediate future.

Ten years of depression—1932–41—with values and rentals falling, vacancies prevalent, and foreclosures common; 4 years of war—1942 through 1945—with every effort being made to preserve materials for use in the war effort, and private construction almost prohibited; 2 years of restrictions—1946–47—with controls, priorities, allocations, ceiling prices, black- and gray-market prices, and construction shackled by the heavy hand of Government; and but 1 year of semi-normality since mid-1947, during which the industry has really started to produce—these are the conditions of the past 17 years, frequently and loosely cited as being largely responsible for the short supply of housing.

But in reality, despite the years of abnormally low production, it is not the supply which is actually so short but rather, the increase in the demand which is causing the trouble. Our case differs radically from that of the countries of Europe, where the ravages of war have actually resulted in the destruction of housing, where the total number of units available has decreased.

The Bureau of the Census figures indicate that in the United States, the number of nonfarm occupied dwelling units has been steadily increasing from 23,200,000 in 1930 to 27,700,000 in April 1940, to 32,300,000 in April 1947, and it is estimated that almost 1,000,000 more have been added since then. The increase, from 1940 to 1947, of about 4,600,000 occupied units is accounted for by about 4,000,000 units arising from conversions, major repairs and new construction, and the balance of 600,000 from a reduction in vacancy.

Not only have the actual number of units been increasing more rapidly than our population, but the condition of the units themselves is better. A few Census Bureau tests of occupied nonfarm buildings illustrate the point:

	Percent
In need of major repairs:	
1940	14
1947	7
No running water:	
1940	16
1947	10
No private bath and toilet:	
1940	33
1947	25

In 1940, the year before the war, there was no housing shortage in either the sale or rental markets. But immediately following the war, with the return of men from the service to civilian life and, with the shifting of war plant workers to other employment, the pinch in housing began to develop rapidly.

The factors in the growth in the demand for housing should be scrutinized closely by those in our industry, for, as they have brought on the shortage by outstripping the supply, so, too, might their subsidence or removal convert the shortage into a surplus—all without any appreciable change in the total population.

The principal factors on the demand side have been:

1. The imposition and retention of rent controls: As salaries and wages have risen and rents have remained stationary, people have not only been able to increase their expenditures for rent, but have been able to spread out, thereby reducing the number of persons per suite and likewise increasing the rooms per person. The lifting of rent control could rapidly change this picture.

2. The high marriage rate, or family formation: Since the war, the number of families has been increasing at the rate of about 1,000,000 a year, and in April 1947 there were about 3,000,000 families living doubled up—against 2,000,000 in 1940. Reduction in the marriage rate has already set in, but the desire to undouble will probably persist until the demand of perhaps 1,000,000 to 1,500,000 young families for separate quarters is answered. Since most of these are veterans and, since it is in this double-up group that the problem is most acute, there will be attempts to solve the problem without the solution being necessarily economically justifiable.

3. Higher personal incomes: Individual income currently running at the rate of over $200,000,000,000 a year, as compared with about $80,000,000,000 in 1940, is more widely distributed among the people than it was in 1940, with fewer in the lowest bracket and, in general, a more even distribution, with a larger group in the higher brackets. With any substantial shift in general business conditions, falling incomes could have a salutary effect on the phase of demand for housing arising out of current higher income.

4. Large wartime savings: A larger number and a more widely diversified group of individuals saved extensively during the war than ever before—saved an average of about 15 percent of the national income, as against a normal of 3 percent of income. A change in the outlook for business could easily shake the confidence of some of the holders of these funds, many of whom have been using these accumulations for down payments on housing.

5. Easy credit: During the past 3 years, mortgage money has been available in greater amounts, at higher ratios to value, for longer terms, and at lower rates than at any previous time. The wartime accumulation of savings coupled with the scarcity of other suitable media for investment, has increased the total supply of funds available for the mortgage field. Wartime liberalization of FHA and the introduction of the GI loan have made possible purchases with little or no need for equity money, and both have been responsible for steady liberalization of State laws on mortgage lending. The influences at work for higher rates need no comment.

In summary, these factors on the demand side for nonfarm homes have brought to an all-time high the volume of such debt, the percent of total home mortgages, the size of the individual mortgage, the ratio of mortgage to value, and probably the proportion of individual income required for debt service.

If these, then, are the current conditions, what are the prospects that the probable supply of new housing will be able to take care of the demand?

A first consideration in any such analysis is the matter of costs. In a period of inflationary adjustment following a great war, when the economy is trying to work out the relationship between various prices, it is always difficult to assess what the new levels will be. In general, it looks as though labor, material costs, and builders' profits in residential construction have increased about 100 percent.

This means that the minimum, 4½-room, 32-by-24, expandable house with stairway to the second unfinished floor, with fireplace and tile bath, speculatively built in quantity, typically selling in 1940 for $4,500 to $4,700, now sells at $9,300 to $9,700.

What are the elements of this high cost? The labor increase has been caused both by higher wage rates and by reduced productivity. It now appears that the labor-cost factor is being gradually and slowly cut through better scheduled deliveries of materials, through the elimination of overtime, through higher productivity, through increasing use of mechanical equipment, and through larger-scale operations. But there is little indication that wage rates themselves are going to be lowered.

The building-material-cost picture is slightly different. Deliveries are steadily improving and the use of substitutes is on the wane. As to prices—some are up, some are down, and most are firm. The possibility of a general lowering of material prices seems at this point to be dependent on a reduction in the total volume of construction—a reduction at least not in the offing.

There is, however, more likelihood of a reduction in the overhead and profit of the builder than in the other items of construction costs. Houses are now being completed in 4 to 5 months as compared with 9 to 12 months a year ago. The speed-up and lessening of delays are bound to cut overhead costs and may in turn induce the operative builder to trim his mark-up even before the narrowing of the gap between supply and demand forces a profit reduction as the first reduction as it inevitably will.

Any consideration of the various costs of building is incomplete without a survey of the outlook for physical construction itself. Regardless of what the immediate price levels may be, will the materials themselves be produced and reach the hands of the builders? Material production in 1947 broke all records.

In most categories we appear to be producing sufficient to fill the needs of any probable housing construction.

The real question centers on whether the competitive demands of nonresidential construction and of the export market under the Marshall plan may not cut into some of the supply of critical materials sufficiently to prevent any housing expansion beyond the present rate.

In 1946 about 650,000 housing units were built, in 1947 about 850,000, and current estimate for 1948 are for 950,000 units, with the strong possibility of over 1,000,000.

Month by month in 1948 the building industry is chalking up a record of accomplishment 10 to 15 percent ahead of last year and if starts alone were the test, 20 to 25 percent ahead, with the result that housing production now for the first time is running at a rate in excess of the number of new families being created. This spells but one thing, and it is safe to say, the back of the housing shortage is broken. From here out any excess production will be eating into and reducing the backlog of the current deficit of some 2,000,000 units, including those needed for normal vacancy. Provided there is no drastic change in general business cutting employment or reducing individual incomes, it would appear that a backlog of demand for housing may well be sustained for 2 to possibly 3 or 4 years. This might be the case even though the intensity of that demand could in the meantime be lessened by prospective purchasers becoming more cautious about high prices and more satisfied with their present quarters, by the stiffening of the mortgage market, by some turn-over of units by recent purchasers who find their carrying charges to be in excess of what they had estimated or beyond their ability to swing, and, of course, always by an increase in the elements of cost. Certain building costs and resulting prices are assuming greater importance and the buyers are already becoming more selective, taking more time before reaching a decision, and fewer houses are being built on sales arranged without some regard for cost. It is clear that the steadiness of the production of housing may well depend on whether the shortage backlog of about 2,000,000 units can be taken care of at prices within the reach of the great mass of potential buyers in the upper-, lower-, and middle-income brackets.

Now where do the savings banks and other mortgage lenders fit into this housing picture? What stake do they have in its handling and its solution? Why might they use their experience to help clarify the thinking of these matters?

For just one fundamental reason. Because housing due to the shortage has temporarily become one of the major political problems of the day. The economics of supply and demand involved are being brushed aside for panaceas which are most certain to have harmful effects for years to come on what is one of our largest basic industries. Starts are being made from which it may prove difficult or impossible to withdraw. Solutions are being offered which will not solve but only further complicate the picture. Certainly the institutions which serve as the depositories for the little fellow on the street, institutions whose primary objective is the furtherance of thrift among our working people have an interest in seeing that his current investment through them is kept sound, that his right in the future to similarly invest is preserved, and that individual ownership of homes with all that that means by way of responsible democratic government and citizenship is encouraged.

It would seem, therefore, to be appropriate for the savings banks as one of the housing lending groups who have had long experience in the field to point out that there has been no shortage of money, that mortgage funds are being loaned for the longest terms, in the largest proportion to value, and at the lowest rates in history, that private capital has and can supply the funds with which to correct the current emergency shortage of housing to the full extent to which materials and labor are available—and that government money, whether it be Federal, State, or local, is not needed. These facts ought to be taken into account by the Government before it blindly assumes that the housing shortage is due to lack of money and on that assumption proceeds to rush into the housing business with an open purse.

The savings banks have pointed out to the Joint Housing Committee that they have been among the leaders during and since the war in the making of mortgage loans. They have made these loans not only because of their obligation to their depositors, but because they have felt a responsibility to the veterans and to the community as a whole.

From figures compiled in January by Dr. Steiner and subsequent monthly reports which give no reason for any significant change, the mutual savings banks of the country should have (1) from an increase in assets; (2) from pay-offs and amortization of existing mortgages; and (3) from security redemption, about $1,600,000,000 directly available for mortgage lending in 1948. But this sum would be a minimum for our institutions should there be an effective demand for a greater amount. Our mortgage loan account stood at 54 percent of assets in 1932, at 41 percent in 1939, and then as a result of no construction during the war and investment of all mortgage amortization and pay-off funds in Government bonds, the account as of April 30, 1948, stood at an even 25 percent or $5,000,000,000, while the holdings of the Government amounted to 60 percent of assets, or $12,000,000,000.

Should there be an increase in local demand for mortgage funds from their communities, the savings banks might expect to realize on some of their securities and thereby increase the $1,600,000,000 they will have in any case. If they merely had the same percent of their assets in mortgages which they had in 1939, after 10 years of depression they would have available $3,000,000,000, and by returning to a mortgage portfolio of 50 percent of assets, some $5,000,000,000.

The savings banks not only have the necessary ready funds but their record of mortgage loaning for the full year shows they are using them. While the rate of growth of their assets declined from 15.1 percent in 1945 to 10 percent in 1946 and to 5.7 percent in 1947, the ratio of increase in the mortgage account stepped up from minus 2.2 percent in 1945 to 5.9 percent in 1946 and to 9.1 percent in 1947. The figures for April 1948 indicate the mortgage loans of the system rose $54,000,000, the greatest increase for any month since early 1947 and more than double the figure for April last year. For the first 4 months of 1948 the increase in the volume of mortgage loans held was 74 percent above the gain during the same period in 1947.

What is the constructive approach which the mortgage banking industry might pursue in the interests of a sane solution for the admittedly tight housing situation? There are a number of things.

First. The Federal Government should be urged to steadily support the FHA and to keep its mortgage-insuring agency abreast of developments. Currently there is urgent need for the extension of title VI both as to effective time and as to the total amount of authorization. The Commissioner of FHA should be authorized to permit higher interest rates in certain areas on 603 and 608 loans. Legislation is likewise needed to remove the present unreal cost limits now fixed on a per room basis to the proposed $8,100 per unit basis. No single course of action will be more instrumental in getting production to meet the shortage than in providing FHA guaranties for title VI rental housing.

Second. Efforts to saddle long-term public housing on the country should be vigorously opposed. Provision of adequate housing for the underprivileged should not be allowed to be gradually and surreptitiously converted into general public housing. Yet that is the exact nature of the problem we face at the very moment. The immediate problem can be easily isolated. It is the need for a separate dwelling for each of the presently involuntarily doubled-up families. When that job has been completed we can again review the need and requirements for housing for the underprivileged for those dependent on welfare aid. Certainly this is not the time to embark on a program of federally built, owned, and operated housing for indefinitely defined, vaguely described income groups.

Third. There is need for gradual relaxation of rent controls under a stated definite and final program of decontrol. Until such a course is established, it will be impossible to free up segments of the housing supply now being inadequately used and likewise it will not be until then that many renters now enjoying their rent as the cheapest commodity they buy, will be induced to become purchasers of new housing.

Fourth.—It is fair to say that our banks must assume the responsibility which is theirs in a private enterprise economy of providing funds and making mortgage loans if they are to have any chance of avoiding the introduction of unlimited Public Housing. To that end they may well investigate whether they are using the FHA to the extent which they might.

Surely they will be able to fully justify the granting of construction loans and permanent loans on new residential units, even against the criticism that by their actions they have contributed to the inflationary process. Perhaps they may have to explain to the administrative side of the Federal Government that the banks have made a choice between taking care of the business themselves or, in effect, asking the legislative side to provide that the Government do so. We can have no quarrel with those who are handling the Government's fiscal affairs and who are attempting to curtail the use of credit and thereby slow down and curb the force of inflation. But to them we must point out that it is not inflationary either for the country to build or for us to finance the 1,000,000 housing units we are short—even though there may be involved an expenditure of up to $10,000,000,000. Certainly it will be better that these 1,000,000 units be built and financed by private industry at a cost of $8,000 to $10,000 a unit, than that the one or more branches of the Government do the work at a cost of $12,000 to $13,000 a unit. And if from the present Congress the country is fortunate enough to receive a Housing bill without the Public Housing sections, the building industry and the mortgage lenders will indeed together have the responsibility of doing the job which Congress will have thereby delegated to them.

The Perfect Crime?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, St. Louis, Mo., of May 30, 1948, entitled "The Perfect Crime?"

THE PERFECT CRIME?

One year ago last night, thugs entered the vault of the Kansas City Election Board, blew a safe and stole ballots from 32 of the 84 precincts under grand jury investigation in the 1946 Axtell-Slaughter primary vote frauds. The crime bore every sign of being an inside job.

From that day to this, none of the stolen evidence has been found. Not a single culprit has been tracked down. Not so much as one arrest has been made in the safe blowing which compounded the crime of trying to steal the primary nomination.

Are we to conclude from this that the FBI regards the Kansas City safe blowing as the perfect crime? Is that celebrated detective force completely stumped? Are J. Edgar Hoover's professional investigators at dead end?

It is more likely that the FBI—which has solved far more perplexing crimes—has suffered interference from higher up.

Until this crime is solved, it stands as a heavy black mark on the administration of justice by Tom Clark as Attorney General and Harry S. Truman as President of the United States.

In this Presidential election year, Mr. Truman owes it to himself, his party, and the fundamental principle of honest elections in a free democracy to see that this crime is cleared up.

This is doubly Mr. Truman's duty since he intervened in the primary in which the frauds were committed. Not only did he take a stand for Axtell and against Slaughter but he dramatized his interest by returning to his home precinct on primary day.

Finally, he was in Kansas City at the very time the safe was blown. For so gross a crime against honest elections and grand jury investigations to occur with the President in the community was nothing less than a national humiliation.

It is ridiculous to think that the Federal Government could not have long since tracked down, arrested, tried, and in all probability convicted the safe blowers if it really wanted to do so. Mr. Truman's failure to put the power and prestige of his office into this case is something he will have to answer for in the campaign.

Tribute to Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem:

TRIBUTE BY LAUREATE—JOHN MASEFIELD'S POEM

LONDON, Monday.—The Times today publishes the following tribute to Franklin Delano Roosevelt by the poet laureate, John Masefield:

"Honour this man, so stricken in his prime,
So shattered in his life's most kindling years
That had his spirit not been strong as Time
He could have won no tribute more than tears.

"Honour a dauntless soul and golden voice;
None sweeter ever spoke in Christian lands.
Through him, the horror passed, and we rejoice.
Our countries are released, and freedom stands."

Cost of European Recovery Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the people of the First Congressional District of Iowa are entitled to know their per capita share of the cost of the European recovery program, and in response to my request the Library of Congress has compiled this information for the counties and towns of the First Iowa District based upon the population as shown by the 1940 census. I am including these figures herewith so that the people of my district will know what their share of the cost of this program is:

Cost of the European recovery program apportioned on a Nation-wide per capita basis as applied to the population of counties and towns in the First Congressional District of Iowa

Counties and towns	Population, 1940	Share of European recovery program (population ×$129.11) based on $17,000,000,000
I	II	III
Cedar County	16,884	$2,179,893
Tipton City	2,518	325,099
Clarence town	685	88,440
Durant town	810	104,579
Mechanicsville town	821	105,999
Stanwood town	569	73,464
Bennett town	352	45,447
West Branch town	719	92,830
Lowden town	645	83,276
Des Moines County	36,804	4,751,764
Burlington City	25,832	3,335,170
Danville town	309	39,895
Middletown town	134	17,301
West Burlington town	1,323	170,813
Mediapolis town	806	104,063
Henry County	17,994	2,323,205
Mount Union town	186	24,014
Coppock town	93	12,007
Wayland town	576	74,367
Mount Pleasant City	4,610	595,197
New London town	1,340	173,007
Hillsboro town	280	36,151
Salem town	457	59,003
Winfield town	864	111,551
Rome town	119	15,364
Olds town	203	26,209
Iowa County	17,016	2,196,936
Millersburg town	177	22,852
North English town	865	111,680
Parnell town	263	33,956
Ladora town	300	38,733
Victor town	763	98,511
Marengo City	2,260	291,789
Williamsburg town	1,308	168,876
Jefferson County	15,762	2,035,032
Fairfield City	6,773	874,462
Libertyville town	310	40,024
Lockridge town	279	36,022
Batavia town	474	61,198
Pleasant Plain town	171	22,078
Packwood town	256	33,052
Johnson County	3,191	4,285,290
Solon town	515	66,492
Tiffin town	240	30,986
Lone Tree town	651	84,051
Iowa City	17,182	2,218,368
Swisher town	93	12,007
Hills town	232	29,954
Oxford town	542	69,978
North Liberty town	282	36,409
Coralville town	433	55,905
University Heights town	261	33,698
Lee County	41,074	$5,303,064
Donnellson town	515	66,492
Franklin town	80	10,328
Keokuk city	15,076	1,946,462
Fort Madison city	14,063	1,815,674
St. Paul town	94	12,136
Montrose town	592	76,433
West Point town	543	70,107
Louisa County	11,384	1,469,788
Columbus City town	326	42,099
Columbus Junction town	975	125,882
Cotter town	72	9,296
Fredonia town	147	18,979
Oakville town	391	50,482
Grandview town	315	40,670
Letts town	362	46,738
Morning Sun town	861	111,164
Wapello city	1,603	206,963
Muscatine County	31,296	4,040,627
Stockton town	124	16,010
Atalissa town	181	23,369
Muscatine city	18,286	2,360,905
Conesville town	302	38,991
Nichols town	357	46,092
West Liberty town	1,802	232,656
Wilton town	1,146	147,960
Scott County	84,748	10,941,814
Dixon town	226	29,179
Donahue town	89	11,491
Bettendorf city	3,143	405,793
Blue Grass town	287	37,055
Walcott town	440	56,808
Buffalo town	588	75,917
McCausland town	115	14,848
Plain View town	36	4,648
Davenport city	66,039	8,526,295
Maysville town	44	5,681
Le Claire town	881	113,746
New Liberty town	125	16,139
Princeton town	414	53,452
Eldridge town	283	36,538
Long Grove town	139	17,946
Van Buren County	12,053	1,556,163
Bonaparte town	653	84,309
Stockport town	338	43,639
Cantril town	376	48,545
Farmington town	968	124,978
Milton town	809	104,450
Birmingham town	498	64,297
Keosauqua town	1,040	134,274
Mount Sterling town	134	17,301
Washington County	20,055	2,589,301
Brighton town	791	102,126
Crawfordsville town	316	40,799
Kalona town	765	98,769
West Chester town	213	27,500
Riverside town	633	81,727
Wellman town	1,129	145,765
Ainsworth town	415	53,581
Washington city	5,227	674,858
Total for First District	338,261	43,672,878

Source: Sixteenth Census of the United States, 1940, Population, vol. I, pp. 368-377, Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce.

Open the Door!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial by the Reverend Robert W. Searle, which appeared in Protestant Church Life, official publication of the Protestant

Council of the City of New York, on May 8, 1948:

OBSERVATION POST

Without a doubt, one of the factors which most greatly discredits our Nation in the eyes of the world is our failure to open our doors to receive and welcome our share of the displaced persons of Europe. Britain, with all of its burdens, has taken in 270,000 DP's. The United States, with half the wealth of the world, has admitted less than 30,000. Meantime, hundreds of thousands still languish in concentration camps.

Who are these DP's? Some of them are Jews who have suffered untold indignities since the early days of Hitlerism; more of them are Gentiles—many more. Protestants, they are, and Roman Catholics—people from Poland and the Baltic states, from Czechoslovakia and the Balkans—men and women and young people who left their native lands, rather than live under the slavery of the police state.

There is irony in the fact that as displaced persons in concentration camps, the expense of their food and clothing and maintenance is borne by us, whereas those admitted are and would be not only self-supporting, but would contribute to our national life.

Certainly these who left home, rather than live under communism, would be a moral asset in our ideological struggle—and it is logical, too, as those who know report, that these who refused to accept chains for bread are virile and honorable and talented.

And what shall be said of our tradition of haven and refuge? What shall we do with the Statue of Liberty? It is a rather hypocritical symbol in the face of our closed door.

Memorial Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a Memorial Day address which I made at the dedication by the American Legion of the new war memorial at Larchmont, N. Y., on Monday, May 31, 1948:

Mr. Chairman, Legionnaires, and my friends and neighbors, when Mr. McGrath asked me to join you today I was so glad to be able to be here. I was immediately reminded of a joint resolution just passed by the Congress of the United States regarding this 1948 Memorial Day. It requests the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe Memorial Day 1948 by praying for permanent peace, to unite in prayer for permanent peace. The American people believe in God. They believe in prayer. We are a Christian nation and as a nation we are doing those things which we think will avoid war. So here today we are carrying out the terms and principles of that resolution.

And so, standing here today as we dedicate this monument of World War II I can think of but one thing: "War must never come again" even though suffering brings experience, surely humanity has suffered enough.

Of all great nations in history, ours has had the fewest wars. Our first was physically to separate the new idea of freedom from the old. The second and third were to preserve that idea. The fourth was to purify it. The fifth was primarily to free a small segment of the Western Hemisphere and the fifth and sixth, were at least in theory to protect and encourage its new idea in the old nations of Europe and Asia.

The destiny of our country is inescapable. It is a spiritual destiny, and these young men and women to whom our honor is paid today, forwarded that destiny. Like ourselves they were from families out of all nations. It matters not at all to us what was their race, creed, color or their origin. They belonged to us here at home. They must know—as do we—what they fought and died for. It was to insure the freedom and to preserve rights and dignity of individual man from betrayal by personal dictator or pagan state.

In the giving of their lives these young men and women remind us that no human government is higher, nor can it long be lower, than the highest aspirations of its people. Human government will err, but the spiritual desire, as I have said, now more active among us than ever and acknowledged by us as inseparable from our constitutional principles, may be confidently depended on to bring government back to the proper course.

Because of the efforts, the sacrifices, the supreme sacrifice of these our relatives, our neighbors and our friends, all mankind has been helped onward. The men and women of World War II, whom we reverently honor today have passed on to us the responsibility for demonstrating that loyalty to an ideal, purity of motive, and sacrifice through true courage so necessary in the universal task that lies ahead. Their job is done; ours is but begun.

Britain's Stake in an Arab Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article written by Lillie Shultz, which appeared in the Nation on May 29, 1948:

BRITAIN'S STAKE IN AN ARAB VICTORY

(By Lillie Shultz)

LAKE SUCCESS, May 24.—The mask has finally disappeared and British intention in Palestine stands clearly revealed. If any doubt remained that the British are determined to achieve victory for the Arabs, the performance of Sir Alexander Cadogan last week in the Security Council dissipated the last shred. Not only did he make a successful effort to prevent the Council from branding as aggression the open invasion of Palestine by the Arab states, but he adopted the Arab line that the United Nations had no legal right to dispose of the Palestine question—although Britain brought the question to the UN—and joined the Arabs in a demand that "the present juridical status of Palestine" be determined. Indeed, Sir Alexander distorted the facts to the extent of charging that the Arab invasion was counterbalanced by Jewish action.

But even more important than this perversion of truth and morality is the open rift between the United Kingdom and the United States. In refusing to support the American demand that the Security Council invoke article 39 of the Charter and bring about collective action to restore peace in the Holy Land, Britain exposed the undercurrent of rivalry and antagonism which has been increasing since the end of the war. At no time since the issue became acute in 1945 have the United States and the United Kingdom really agreed on Palestine except for the brief interval when the State Department went into retreat and connived with the Foreign Office to destroy partition. What now emerges is the naked desire of Britain to maintain the lifeline of an empire that has largely vanished. To accomplish this the British Foreign Office has been engaged for the past 2 years in a campaign which would leave it in sole control of the Middle East and make the Indian Ocean the new Mare Nostrum. Iraq and Egypt have slipped away. The Palestine mandate, under compulsion of events, has had to be relinquished. But in a desperate effort to retain its title to empire, British strategy maneuvers to dominate the air, land, and sea lanes to the Far East.

Reviewing the record, one sees clearly that the bonds of former comradeship in war and present dependence in peace have not produced any fundamental concessions by Britain to American desires with respect to Palestine. It was the British who refused to accept the unanimous proposals of the Anglo-American Commission. It was the British who turned down President Truman's request in 1946 for the admission to Palestine of 100,000 Jewish refugees. Though the British submitted the Palestine question to the United Nations in 1947, the Foreign Office rejected the majority report of the United Nations' Special Commission on Palestine. In the General Assembly session last fall, despite a formal pledge of neutrality, the British used every device to prevent the adoption of the partition resolution. After the session it was the British who engineered the sabotage of partition: they planned the Arab revolt, supplied—and still supply—the Arab states with arms and guidance, exposed the Jewish community of Palestine to attack and Palestine itself to chaos. In the 4 months which followed the November 29 resolution they succeeded in convincing the State Department anew that partition would open the Middle East to Communist penetration, endanger oil leases, and threaten the security of the western world—arguments now exposed as false.

Even after partition had been all but formally abandoned by the State Department, the British refused to join the United States in an alternative plan. In the General Assembly they opposed the American suggestion of temporary trusteeship for the whole of Palestine. Behind the scenes they also worked against a temporary trusteeship for Jerusalem. And today they are engaged in a last-ditch fight to keep the Security Council from branding the Arab revolt as an act of aggression.

Obviously the British are trying to insure an Arab victory. The reasons for this become evident as one studies their tactics.

Some 10 days before the end of the recent special session of the General Assembly, and before the unexpected recognition of the state of Israel by the President of the United States, the British were making overtures to the Jews at Lake Success and in Palestine. They were prepared, so they said, to recognize that partition had taken place in exchange for an agreement by the Jews to accept Abdullah as the ruler of Arab Palestine. But at the same moment, Foreign Minister Bevin was telling the House of Commons that Britain would continue to arm the Arab states.

On April 28, after King Abdullah had announced his intention to invade Palestine, Bevin still insisted that Britain's treaty obligations, including the training and financing of the Transjordan Arab Legion, would be fulfilled. On May 14 units of the legion were not only still in Palestine, but the British delivered to them three shiploads of arms, ammunition, and gasoline. As late as May 18, when Abdullah himself announced to the Security Council that his legion was operating in Palestine, the British foreign and

colonial offices stated that Britain would not withdraw British officers, subsidies, or munitions unless the United Nations decided that the Arab Legion was in Palestine illegally (this despite the fact that on April 17 Sir Alexander Cadogan had promised the Security Council that the Arab Legion would be withdrawn from Palestine before the end of the mandate—a promise repeated by Bevin on April 28).

What is behind all this? During the 4 months between November 29 and April 16 the British Government hoped that the Jews would be defeated or suffer sufficient military reverses to make them ready to compromise. In negotiations with the Arab League half a dozen schemes were developed by the British, all of which gave Britain base rights in Haifa and the Negev. One scheme called for the taking over of all Palestine by Abdullah, with the Jews concentrated into a ghetto area extending from Tel Aviv to Athlit. Another would have parceled out Palestine among the Arab states. When rivalries among the Arab League states caused these schemes to collapse, Britain hoped through the special session of the General Assembly to destroy partition, not temporarily but forever, and pave the way for the establishment of a so-called federal state.

The coup de grace to this endeavor was given, ironically enough, by the small powers in the United Nations—led in the first instance by two British dominions, New Zealand and Australia. The brilliant tactics of the Polish delegate, Juliusz Katz-Suchy, who joined forces with the representatives of Guatemala, Uruguay, Australia, and New Zealand, defeated both trusteeship and British countermaneuvers and brought the special session to the very moment of the termination of the mandate—May 15—without supplanting the partition resolution. When, within 15 minutes after the formal end of the mandate, the President of the United States, reversing State Department policy, announced recognition of the provisional government of the state of Israel, the partition resolution remained the legal authority for the establishment of the Jewish state.

The President's action stripped the British of their pretended "neutrality" and was the signal for an all-out fight in support of the Arabs. Obviously, there was no longer any point in trying to negotiate a compromise with the Jews, who were now conceived to be in the orbit of the United States and whose rights under partition had been fully established.

Even before this the cracks in the Anglo-American alliance had become plainly visible. On May 12 the United States had called for the appointment of a high commissioner as the interim authority in Palestine. This proposal was based on a suggestion thrown out by Arthur Creech Jones, the British colonial secretary, who had said that setting up a "humble" authority might conserve the assets of Palestine and insure continuation of communal services. But the British were taking no chances. On April 28 a letter marked secret, dealing with the conservation of British assets in Palestine, had been addressed to Dr. Karel Lisicky, chairman of the United Nations Palestine Commission, by Sir Alexander Cadogan. A copy went to Washington and was circulated among officials of the United States Government. Nonetheless, when the United States offered its resolution to create a high commissioner it blandly ignored Britain's desire to have the protection of its assets specifically guaranteed in advance. And the British were furious.

How important these assets are can be gaged from the terms of the letter to Lisicky. Sir Alexander wanted the commission to know before the mandate ended that the British demanded the safeguarding of their oil supplies, their commercial interests, and their imports of potash and foodstuffs, mainly citrus and other fruits. Above all, they wanted British Government assets safeguarded.

In his communication Sir Alexander pointed out that His Majesty's Government had both movable and immovable assets in Palestine. Recognizing that it would be impossible to dispose of all immovable property before the mandate ended, he wanted it understood that his Government had clear title to dispose of such assets after the termination of the mandate in any way it saw fit. In the matter of movable assets, consisting especially of large quantities of military stores, he asked for assurance that they could ultimately be removed either to Haifa or disposed of locally after August 1, 1948, when the last British troops would be presumed to have left Palestine.

A considerable part of Sir Alexander's letter was devoted to the protection of British oil interests in Palestine, including the pipe line across Palestine to Haifa and other assets of the Iraq Petroleum Co., such as mining rights, water projects, occupation of land, and so on. So sure was it of future control that on April 28, the British Government was still talking about building a second pipe line to Haifa from Iraq, an agreement for which had been signed in March 1948, by the British without prior consultation with the United Nations Commission.

Sir Alexander revealed that the Consolidated Refineries Co. is owned entirely by the British, that British interests own 47½ percent of the Iraq Petroleum Co. He reported further that both companies operate in Palestine under agreements with the Government of Palestine which are not due to expire until January 2001 and October 2003. Sir Alexander wanted assurance that these agreements would not be affected by the termination of the mandate and that, in addition, the British oil companies would be free to expor their petroleum products to such destinations and in such quantities as they might choose, no matter what authority was ultimately established in Palestine. Just recently the British have stopped oil shipments through the Haifa pipe line in order to deprive the Jewish state and the Jewish armies of oil.

Another matter which concerned the British was the fact that at the end of the mandate they would have no treaty rights in Palestine with respect to commercial undertakings, shippings, or civil aviation. They asked the Palestine Commission to give them assurance in advance that the United Kingdom and Colonial Airlines would have operating permits for services to, from, and through Palestine.

A day earlier in another communication, also marked secret, Sir Alexander Cadogan stated that the British would not surrender the assets of the Palestine Government until there had been "the unqualified prior acceptance as a charge on the assets of Palestine of (1) all liabilities incurred by the government of Palestine prior to the termination of the mandate on May 15, 1948; (2) responsibility for all expenditures incurred by His Majesty's Government after that date for the account of Palestine; and (3) His Majesty's Government's liability in respect of the 3-percent guaranteed stock referred to in paragraph 2-b (1) of section II of the inclosed statement." Sir Alexander also said that the British Government would regard the "movable assets of the government of Palestine as available for disbursement by them to meet any expenditure incurred by His Majesty's Government for the account of Palestine after May 15, 1948."

Simultaneously the commission was told that May 15 the cash deficit of the Palestine government would be £7,001,858, to which the British added the sum of £1,995,000 for anticipated disbursements after May 15. Included in these charges were the maintenance costs of the Cyprus refugee camps and the severance pay of the British civil staff. Thus a surplus of some £50,000,000 in December 1947 was turned into a deficit of almost £9,000,000 in April 1948. To make sure they would have enough, the British impounded the funds of the Palestine Currency Board, totaling approximately £50,000,000.

But this secret attempt to nail down, in advance of its departure, all the assets and prerogatives of the control it was about to relinquish was only one aspect of Britain's plan to defend its strategic interests in the Middle East. Having failed to secure strategic control of Palestine by peaceful agreement, Britain is now preparing to advance its strategic aims by force, and the Arab Legion is in effect its ersatz army.

British grand strategy is directed to the following goals:

1. A corridor from Iraq and Transjordan to the Mediterranean coast at Gaza. This aim partially explains why units of the Arab Legion have been permitted to remain in Palestine, and why the legion, under the personal command of Glubb Pasha, still an officer of the British Army, entered the country at Jericho, and is now attempting to capture Jerusalem and establish an enclave stretching north to Ramallah and south to Hebron. With the Jerusalem enclave as the bridgehead, the legion hopes to open a corridor to Gaza through Hebron and Beersheba. The armies of Egypt have stolen a march on Abdullah and are occupying Gaza. What will happen if and when the Egyptians and the Arab Legion meet is another matter.

This corridor is meant to be a two-way street. It will give the two Hashimite kingdoms of Iraq and Transjordan their long-desired outlet to the Mediterranean. It will give the British an inland route to Transjordan and Iraq. The British are willing to throw the Holy City of Jerusalem to the Arabs partly because it is the bridgehead for this corridor, partly to enable their puppet, Abdullah, to make it the capital of Transjordan and thus enhance his prestige, and partly to restore Britain's waning popularity in the Arab world.

2. The second strategic line which Britain is gambling for includes the port of Haifa, the Haifa pipe line, and the Hejaz Railway, which runs southeast from Haifa to Transjordan, links with Syria, and continues southward through Transjordan to Maan. A 40-mile extension would link it also with Aqaba. Last week the press reported that King Abdullah with his nephew, the Regent of Iraq, led the attack on Gesher, a Jewish village just across the Transjordan border, in itself an unimportant objective. But a glance at the map shows that Gesher is the first village on the road to the port of Haifa. If the Arab Legion can reach Haifa, it will insure British-Arab control of the best seaport on the Mediterranean and of the pipe line extending from Haifa past Gesher to Transjordan; moreover, Haifa is only about 40 miles from Transjordan, less than half the distance from Gaza to Transjordan. The Hejaz Railway is already controlled by the British and Arabs; the pipe line was turned over to Transjordan a few weeks before the mandate's end.

3. Britain's third objective is control of the Negev. Today the largest British military encampment in Palestine is at Rafa on the Palestine-Egyptian border; 4,000 troops are stationed here, and there are extensive installations. Two months ago the British negotiated a contract with the Arab owners of the land for a 27-year lease renewable at 3-year intervals. The British have no intention of relinquishing Rafa, which is only a few miles from Gaza. A new British scheme calls for a Rafa-Gaza link through Beersheba to the port of Aqaba, and thus to the Red Sea; the Gulf of Aden, and the Indian Ocean. For this they need the Negeb.

4. Egyptian disaffection has compelled the British to concentrate their armed forces today in the Canal Zone, which is owned by

Egypt. In the rapidly developing situation the British can anticipate Egyptian pressure to leave even this area. They are, therefore, considering a new canal at Aqaba as a possible substitute for the Suez Canal. This would give them direct access to the Red Sea and control of the Indian Ocean.

5. Even if this scheme is not carried out, control of Aqaba means for the British control of a direct route from the new base in Kenya, East Africa, to Gaza and the Mediterranean or to their bases in Transjordan and Iraq. That is why last fall the State Department, at the instance of the British, put strong pressur on the Jewish Agency to yield the Negeb and the port of Aqaba. Other considerations were the possibility of establishing British bases in the Negeb near the Canal Zone, far from any areas now inhabited, and the belief that there is oil in the Negeb.

Britain's determination to control the Negev explains its opposition to any move in the Security Council to declare the Arab States aggressors and to any other action that would end hostilities. If it can bring about an Arab victory, it hopes to be cast in the role of mediator between the Jews and Arabs; in that case the Negev will be the price it will ask from the Jews for peace and protection within severely controlled boundaries.

Whether or not the British succeed will depend to an important degree on the vigor with which the United States now moves to protect the state it has recognized. Previous State Department connivance with the Foreign Office has given Britain reason to hope that American recognition of the State of Israel may be merely a political gesture. But it is hardly conceivable that the President of the United States will now permit the British Government or the states it influences to carry out a Machiavellian scheme which undermines not simply American interests in the Middle East but, much more important, peace, and morality.

Recognition must now be supported by (1) arming of Haganah; (2) a continued arms embargo against the Arab states; (3) a reprimand to the British, backed by appropriate penalties which Washington is in a position to impose; (4) an unrelenting effort to bring about action by the Security Council against the Arab States as aggressors. This is the kind of action that talks. And it would be talk that the British and Arabs would understand.

Toward a Trade-Pact Compromise—An Editorial From the New York Journal of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1948

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, in the face of the State Department's uncompromising demand that the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 be extended without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t," the editorial from the May 7 issue of the New York Journal of Commerce will be found very interesting and most timely by the membership.

The editorial to which I refer, an editrial entitled "Toward a Trade-Pact Compromise" is, Mr. Speaker, the following:

TOWARD A TRADE-PACT COMPROMISE

Current congressional deliberations over the extension of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 may be headed for a deadlock, spelling the end of the act by June 12, its present expiration date, unless a reasonable and workable compromise plan is worked out quickly.

The administration seeks a 3-year extension of the act. Counterproposals that have been made range from discontinuation of the reciprocal-trade policy to a stop-gap, 1-year extension without any immediate changes.

A 1-year extension without major changes in the act would seem the best way out of a tough situation even though it would give the Democratic Party an opportunity to make the foreign-trade policy an election issue, and even though such an action would merely postpone the necessary basic decision on our future trade policies.

But, with time working against a complete review of these policies now, a 1-year extension would be preferable to the possible alternative of expiration of the act next month or its extension with some amendments which, though designed to protect American industry against harm from tariff concessions, would actually throw the whole issue of trade agreements back into the lap of Congress with all the pitfalls of traditional tariff logrolling.

Most important point in favor of a 1-year extension is the consideration that such action would not reverse our foreign policy.

Our foreign friends should not interpret such a solution as willingness to relinquish our role of leadership in international affairs at this crucial juncture. This would be the reaction were we to drop the Trade Agreements Act completely or even if Congress would limit the authority of the administration in trade negotiations by insisting on congressional ratification.

The chief reason for the growing wave of criticism against the reciprocal trade agreement policy is the belief that, with economic conditions abroad being what they are, this country is giving away valuable concessions without immediate compensatory returns.

The over-all Geneva trade agreement is cited as the outstanding case in point.

It is true, of course, that at present the trade agreement policy abroad is being observed largely in its breach. Witness the trend toward the imposition of more and more import quotas and the continuing currency blocs. It is the height of something or other that, a few days ago, a spokesman of the three Benelux countries found it necessary to warn that foodstuffs were piling up in Holland and that imports of such items as steel, fertilizers, window glass and cement from Belgium and Luxemburg could be increased were it not for currency difficulties.

Current trade and currency restrictions, however, are largely a reflection of war dislocations and abnormally heavy reliance upon the United States for supplies to meet pent-up demand, reconstruction needs, and normal requirements. To point to the above shortcomings, thus, is not an argument against our foreign trade policy per se. Instead it is merely a reminder that reliance on this policy alone is not enough to build for a larger world trade in the future.

If a trade-agreement policy is to work in the future, there must be genuine reciprocity, instead of a mere Santa Claus attitude on our part which all too many foreign countries have come to take for granted.

This brings up the all-important problem of industrial safeguards under such a trade-agreement policy.

It is one of the most difficult problems in statesmanship to strike a proper balance between potential harm to individual industries and the potential benefits to the economy as a whole. If our foreign-trade policy is to be based on the necessity of a high level of export, the risk of at least temporary disadvantages for individual industries cannot be eliminated.

The problem then is to hold such risks within reasonable limits and to act quickly if, as a result of unforeseen contingencies, the future of a vital industry appears in jeopardy.

This is why escape clauses are necessary in all trade agreements and, even more important, why the recourse to these escape clauses, if this is called for, must not be dominated by the State Department, which has negotiated an agreement and therefore has a strong interest in keeping it intact.

There has been some criticism against the present safeguards. Congress, therefore, should look carefully into the question of how the present escape clause mechanism can be strengthened in order to increase industry's confidence in the reciprocal trade-agreement program so that it may be maintained as a long-term American policy.

Resolution of Logan County (Ill.) Bankers' Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a copy of a resolution passed by the Logan County (Ill.) Bankers' Federation under date of May 27, 1948, which is so pointed and so sound that I desire to incorporate such resolution with my remarks. The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas, as bankers in our local communities, we are quite conscious of the very large sums of money that have gone from our respective communities in recent months in payment of income taxes; and

Whereas we, the members of the Logan County Bankers' Federation, feel that the matter should be called to the attention of the Illinois State Bankers' Association at its meeting next week: Now, therefore, the Logan County Bankers' Federation, in meeting assembled this May 27, 1948—

Resolve, That this matter be called to the attention of the Illinois State Bankers' Association at its annual meeting; that said association be requested to formulate and adopt a resolution requesting that our Federal Government (1) abolish nonessential Government jobs; (2) reduce Government expenditures; (3) eliminate duplication of State functions; (4) reduce income taxes; be it further

Resolved, That we request that the Illinois State Bankers' Association present this matter to the American Bankers' Association, and request that the American Bankers' Association pass similar resolutions; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Illinois Bankers' Association.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the Logan County Bankers' Federation are thinking in the proper direction and toward the goals this Government must reach if we are to maintain economic stability in this country. Many of us in the Congress have been continuously fighting to reduce appropriations and to abolish nonessential Government jobs but must admit, with all frankness, that we have not been able to come as close

to doing this as we had hoped or desired because of the fact that the Chief Executive and all departments and agencies of Government have continuously worked against the best efforts of the legislative branch to reach such objectives. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it becomes clear in the minds of most of us that if we are to accomplish such purposes as this resolution sets forth, we must have an executive in the White House who will cooperate with the legislative branch. An opportunity to create such a situation will come in November of 1948 and it is then I trust that all good sound thinking Americans will work together toward the end that a Republican President may be elected who will work with and through a Republican Congress and thereby create a sound and practical business administration in Government affairs. Only through such a set-up can this country expect to remain economically strong.

The Yalta Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, on May 13, 1948, I misstated certain facts with respect to the Yalta agreement, having based my statement on what I believed to be correct information. However, I am now in receipt of a letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States which I am glad to insert here in order that the error of fact might be corrected:

THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 25, 1948.

Hon. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HERTER: My attention has been called to the following statement reported on page 5812 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 13, 1948, as having been made by you on the floor of the House of Representatives during the course of your remarks on an amendment offered by you to House Joint Resolution 342:

"No one has ever yet been able to get at the original [agreement signed at Yalta by President Roosevelt] because all the official papers were removed from the White House and are now in packing cases at Hyde Park and no one has access to them, because the trustees to whom they have been turned over feel that they are no longer public documents."

The original Yalta agreement is in the possession of the Department of State and could be made accessible, I am certain, to any responsible party. The question as to the ownership of President Roosevelt's papers was submitted to the surrogate's court of Duchess County by the executors of his estate. This court, on July 21, 1947, decided that President Roosevelt during his lifetime had made a valid and effective gift of his papers to the Government. These papers are now in the library at Hyde Park and are available for use subject to the regulations of the Archivist of the United States Governing the custody, protection, and use of historical material in the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, published in the Federal Register on September 19, 1947.

I have taken the liberty of calling your attention to these facts in the hope that there will be no misapprehensions concerning the status of the Roosevelt papers. A marked copy of the Eighth Annual Report of the Archivist of the United States as to the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library is enclosed for your information.

Sincerely yours,
WAYNE C. GROVER,
Acting Archivist of the United States.

Railroad Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at Portland, Maine, on May 16, 1948:

I have a very soft spot in my heart, and a very great deal of admiration, for railroaders, both working and retired. I admire the loyalty you have always shown to your job and your industry. I admire the splendid way in which you cooperate with one another. And I admire the quiet, efficient way in which you establish goals for yourself and then systematically achieve them.

One such goal, of course, has been good, sound retirement legislation. Please don't misunderstand me. I am not saying that the system you now have is the best of all possible systems. I am saying only that your generation of retired railroad workers is much better off than the generations which had to depend for their pensions on the generosity of individual railroads. And even if the railroad was truly generous, its pocketbook was not always as large as its heart. Consequently, many a man or woman reached retirement age only to find that there was no money left in the pension kitty and he was doomed to pass his declining years entirely without income. Even after you began to draw a pension sometimes, your road will fall on hard times and your pension would be cut down or taken away entirely.

It was all the men and women of the railroads, working together through their organizations, who brought an end to that kind of uncertainty. I don't have to remind anyone here, I think, of what a struggle it was. First you had to fight to get a bill passed to make your retirement system uniform, and reliable, and under Government supervision. That was in 1934, before there was such a thing as social security, so you were real pioneers. And you underwent all the hardships that are common to pioneers. That first act was thrown out by the Supreme Court and you had to start over. The next act, in 1935, was on its way to the same fate until your labor leaders got together with railroad management and effected a compromise. The result of their agreement, as you know, was the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937—a pretty good bill for its time. After it had been in force for a while, experience showed that it needed improvements here and there. One of its most serious shortcomings, as I recall, was that it was under-financed. That is, the money coming in for retirement taxes wasn't enough to go on indefinitely paying retirement and death benefits.

You might think that it would be a simple matter to go to Congress and say "This is wrong, and that could be improved, and besides that, the tax rate should be increased by so much." The railroad labor boys who come to Washington each year to protect your interests, however, could tell you different. It took literally years, and whole volumes of testimony and debate, to achieve the Crosser amendments of 1946. I know many of those men well. I see them often, and I know how hard they work. You are to be congratulated on having chosen people of their caliber, their earnestness and sincerity, to fight in your behalf.

Sometimes I wonder how much you hear of the results of their work. Of course, you know the so-called Crosser Act was passed in 1946. Many of you received increases in your annuities because of it. But acts of Congress must necessarily be drawn up in legal language that will cover every possible contingency or set of circumstances that could conceivably crop up. You have to sit down with a copy of an act like the railroad retirement amendments of 1946 and actually translate each line into simple English in order to get a clear picture of what it really means to the people it affects; in this case, what it means to you.

I went over the Crosser amendments that way before I voted for them in 1946. I have with me today the list I made then for my own guidance. Perhaps you would be interested to hear it. It is, in a sense, a record of accomplishments—yours and your labor-organization representatives. This, as I see it, is what the present Railroad Retirement Act boils down to:

1. A full annuity for any totally disabled railroader with 10 years' service. (Under the old act he had to have 30 years of service or be at least 60 years of age, in which event the annuity to which he would have been entitled on the basis of service and earnings was reduced a certain amount for every month he lacked of being 65.)

2. A full annuity for any railroader with 20 years' service who becomes too disabled to continue his regular job. (Under the old act you had to be totally and permanently disabled in order to get a disability annuity.)

3. A floor under annuities, which makes $50 the lowest amount that the average railroader, who has, say, 17 years of service, can get in retirement pay. (This is $10 a month higher than the minimum under the old act.)

4. Annuities for railroad widows aged 65 or over. (Under the old act, a railroader could provide an annuity for his widow only by agreeing to have his own annuity reduced.)

5. Annuities for railroad widows of any age who have in their care dependent children of the employee.

6. An annuity for each dependent child. Such an annuity continues until the child reaches 18 or ceases to be dependent. (The old act made no provision for surviving children.)

7. Annuities for the dependent parents of each deceased employee who leaves no widow or children. (The old act made no provision for annuities for parents.)

8. A lump-sum payment to survivors if there is no one to whom an annuity is immediately payable. (A widow less than 65 and with no children would get a lump-sum payment at the time of her husband's death and then get, in addition, an annuity beginning when she reached 65.) One especially important thing about the Crosser Act, it seems to me, was its effect on railroad widows. Under the old act, if a railroader retired, drew an annuity for a while, and then died, his widow was usually left with nothing, as far as the Retirement Act was concerned. This is the way it worked. A certain amount of money—4 percent of the railroader's average earnings from 1937 on—was earmarked as a death benefit. If he died before he retired that amount went to his widow. If he lived long enough to re-

tire, however, and most railroaders do, then every cent he drew as part of his annuity was deducted from that ear-marked amount. Just a few months of drawing annuities was enough to cancel out the death benefit entirely. The man went on drawing an annuity, of course, as long as he lived; but when he died his account was closed. There was nothing for his widow. The only way to get around that situation was for the railroader to agree to take a reduced annuity himself so, if he died first, the difference would be paid to his widow as an annuity. But very few railroaders had a large enough annuity coming in the first place to be able to afford a reduction. And even if they made that sacrifice, it didn't always work out well. Sometimes the wife died first. Then the man, having made a bargain, couldn't get out of it. He had to be content with his cut-down annuity for the rest of his life. That's not true any more. Under the present act, the widow of an annuitant gets an annuity in her own right, and without any sacrifice on the part of her husband during his lifetime.

Well, so much for counting our blessings. Let's look at the other side of the picture for a moment. It isn't pretty. Prices have gone sky high. Pensions have stayed where they were. Most of them haven't changed since 1937, when you could buy two sacks full of groceries with a $2 bill. What are we going to do about it?

The first thing to do, I think, is coordinate our forces. The last time I counted there were 22 separate and distinct bills before Congress for the amendment of the Railroad Retirement Act. Some of them are purely technical, but most of them would affect the amounts of annuities you receive or the time at which you would receive it.

Some of them sound wonderful, until you start figuring out how much they would cost. Then you discover that what would happen would be that a few people would get high annuities at an early age, then the fund would collapse from too much strain and thereafter nobody would get anything.

It has been my experience that the railroad labor organizations, because they pool their resources and work together, have excellent facilities for studying such things as the probable costs of certain types of legislation. When I talked to them about increasing retirement incomes for railroaders I found they had not been idle. But they had proceeded with sensible caution. Of course they want annuities increased. They are working for themselves as well as for you, and they'll be drawing retirement pay themselves some day. They realize what a hard time their retired fellow railroaders are having, and they are most eager to see some adjustments made that will bring pensions more in line with prices.

Remembering the days when private pension plans collapsed, and the tragic results to aged men and women, one of their first concerns is, how to protect the retirement fund. The obvious answer might seem to be "By raising taxes."

But raising taxes would place a great burden on the working railroaders, so great a burden that the proposal would probably never pass in Congress. Congressmen would be flooded with protests from railroad workers, and would, accordingly, vote against the bill.

The only alternative seemed to be to find out whether any more retirement money could possibly be squeezed out of the present fund without putting it on the rocks. The labor organizations went to the best actuaries they could find and set them to work on the problem. After much figuring, it was finally determined that annuities could be increased from 20 to 25 percent (with the greatest increase going to the lowest brackets) without raising taxes and without seriously endangering the fund. One bill now before Congress, H. R. 5993, proposes such an increase.

Everybody agrees, I think, that the increase isn't nearly as much as we'd like for you to have. But we must face the fact that such an increase is the most the retirement fund can afford. Congress is certainly not likely to approve an increase so great that there isn't enough money to pay for it. That being the case, H. R. 5993, is the bill with the best chance of passing; the bill that will be best for you in the long run because it will leave your retirement fund in sound condition; and the bill that has at least 22 of the national railway unions solidly behind it.

Just as Will Rogers used to know nothing except what he read in the papers, so a Congressman knows nothing about what you want except what he reads in your letters. If he gets a few letters from retired railroaders who want one bill, and a few advocating quite a different measure, and a few more who have still a different idea, naturally he concludes that the retired railroaders themselves aren't sure what they want and consequently he has very little guidance for his vote. That situation, repeated with 435 different Members of Congress, can have only one result. The session will end without any legislation to improve your income.

I don't want to see that happen, and I'm sure you don't either. I think we can avoid it, if we can just get together on one bill. It seems to me that the logical rallying point should be H. R. 5993 inthe House, and S. 2437, which is the Senate version of the same bill. Back up your labor organizations by letting Congress know you want those bills. If you do that, then I honestly believe you have a good chance of winning a pension increase with the next 2 months.

Increase of Annuities of Retired Railroad Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. LOVE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I should like to take this opportunity to speak to you in behalf of our retired railroad workers. I am appealing to the committee to report suitable legislation to the floor of the House of Representatives providing for a "cost of living" increase in retirement annuities.

Today the average monthly annuity for these retired employees is approximately $70. Due to the increased cost of living, $70 now buys what $40 bought when the annuities were granted.

Seventy dollars per month is certainly inadequate to purchase the necessities of life today. This amount should be substantially increased, in my opinion. It is apparent that necessary increases could be granted without additional assessments and without impairment of the retirement fund.

Gentlemen, we may expect the Congress to adjourn within the next few weeks. I respectfully urge the committee to forthwith report legislation for adequate increases in railroad retirement annuities so that the same may be enacted into law and provide a decent livelihood for our retired railroaders.

TVA Needs the New Johnsonville Steam Plant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WIRT COURTNEY

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include:

First. A statement by the department of electricity of the city of Clarksville, Tenn., and

Second. Resolutions adopted by the board of directors of the Clarksville Chamber of Commerce.

I invite the attention of the Members of the House to both of these messages from sources that well recognize the necessity for the proposed new Johnsonville steam plant for the Tennessee Valley Authority system.

TVA NEEDS THE JOHNSONVILLE STEAM PLANT

Pursell Smith, the $65,000 per annum power lobbyist, from his swanky Washington, D. C., office, in an effort to defeat this project, and to ultimately destroy TVA, makes many unwarranted and untrue charges.

The pet one is that TVA will always be a Government-subsidized operation.

The true facts, according to the records, are:

In the 14 years from the creation of TVA through June 30, 1947, TVA has received total power revenues amounting to $260,000,000. Operating expenses and provision for depreciation (on the conservative straight-line basis) have totaled $163,000,000, leaving a balance of $97,000,000 as the Government's return on its investment. The average annual rate of return on the total investment in TVA's power facilities over this 14-year period has been between 3½ and 4 percent. The cost of money to the United States during the same period has been about 2 percent, so the TVA power program has covered the cost of the Government's money with a good margin to spare.

Most of these earnings have been reinvested in new plants, but $23,500,000 has been paid in cash toward the reduction of the Government's investment in TVA, in addition to the amounts paid by TVA as interest on TVA bonds held by the Treasury and the RFC.

If TVA's development period—the 6 years from 1933 to 1939, when the numerous injunctions instigated by the utilities kept TVA's generators idle—is excluded, the average rate of return on the Treasury's investment is more than 4 percent, and in the last fiscal year, ended June 30, 1947, the rate of return was 5½ percent. The TVA power system is not a subsidized operation.

In addition, all plants throughout this Tennessee Valley using TVA current, without exception, pay a much larger tax equivalent into the city and county treasuries than was paid by the old power company owned and operated plants.

DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRICITY,
CITY OF CLARKSVILLE.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CLARKSVILLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Whereas it is a recognized fact that an adequate and uninterrupted supply of electrical power is essential to the welfare of our city and the security of our Nation; and

Whereas the United States Government (the Tennessee Valley Authority), through purchase of generating and transmission facilities throughout the Tennessee Valley area and through the construction of steam

plants and transmission lines, has become the sole source of power supply for this entire Tennessee Valley of over 80,000 square miles and more than 5,000,000 citizens; and

Whereas because of its rapid and continuous growth during the past few years and the extraordinary increase in the power requirements, the total available capacities of the Tennessee Valley Authority system is now only equal to the total demand; and

Whereas the valley area, due to the aforementioned condition, faces a critical power shortage in the immediate future, which will inevitably result in serious economic losses and the corresponding impairment of our national welfare and security; and

Whereas this very essential additional power can be secured in an economic and dependable manner only through a program of construction and hydro generating plants with supplementary steam plants; and

Whereas the Johnsonville steam plant, as proposed by TVA with its hydro development, is essential in providing a well-balanced and economic power supply reasonably adequate for the progress, welfare, and security of this Tennessee Valley; and

Whereas Clarksville, Tenn., is a thriving and progressive city, well located in the middle Tennessee section of the Tennessee Valley area; and

Whereas the continuous growth and welfare of its citizens who have invested heavily in their power development facilities are entirely dependent upon an adequate and uninterrupted supply of power; and

Whereas Camp Campbell, one of the largest defense projects in America, is located within less than 10 miles of our city is dependent upon TVA power; and

Whereas the great Oak Ridge defense project, located only 200 miles east of Clarksville, is dependent upon TVA power facilities; and

Whereas except for the uninterrupted flow of electricity from the Tennessee Valley distribution facilities to the various manufacturing plants producing implements of war, including the Aluminum Co. of America at Alcoa, Tenn., which produces 80 percent of all aluminum going into the construction of our war planes, the final story of World War II might have been written "Defeat" instead of "Victory"; and

Whereas adequate defense is essential to our security, well-being, and happiness: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Clarksville (Tenn.) Chamber of Commerce, on behalf of its members who represent the various activities of this area, petition the Congress of the United States to recognize the urgent need of the Johnsonville steam plant for the welfare of this community, this area and this Nation; be it further

Resolved, That the president of the chamber of commerce be authorized and hereby directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the Congress of the United States and that additional copies be provided for the press of the Nation.

By order of the board of directors of the Clarksville (Tenn.) Chamber of Commerce, this the 28th day of May 1948.

JOSEPH BAILLIN, *President*.

A Needed Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Horace C. Carlisle:

"Whatsoever thy hand findest to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, in the grave, whither thou goest." (Ecclesiastes 9: 10.)

A NEEDED CHANGE

When a new man comes to Congress,
For a year, or more,
He sits here, dumb as an oyster,
As a rule, before
He learns how to pull the ropes,
To attain his aims and hopes.

Just about the time he's ready
To begin to start
Working, his own reelection
Looms up in his heart,
Which becomes his chief concern,
If to Congress he'd return.

So, he must neglect his duties
Up here, or neglect
To keep satisfied the voters,
Or he can't expect
Their support, election day—
Both of these he can't obey.

Congressmen should be elected
For four years, not two—
Every Member could serve better
If he only knew
That he'd be saved the expense
Of a race, each two years hence.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Democracy Versus Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that our young people should be encouraged in every way possible to take an active part and interest in our democratic form of government and to realize the many benefits we all enjoy because of it. It is not enough merely to provide formal education for each generation, as too often a real appreciation of our democratic processes escape us unless we can participate in, and learn more about, this Government of the United States.

I sponsored a contest for the high-school students of the Sixth Texas District to encourage these young people to record their thoughts on important topics. I am proud to announce the winner of the essay contest in Brazos County, which was so ably conducted by County Superintendent W. D. Bunting. Miss Betty Jo Ross, of Bryan, Tex., has been declared the winner, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include her essay entitled "Democracy Versus Communism":

DEMOCRACY VERSUS COMMUNISM

(By Betty Jo Ross, Bryan, Tex.)

Democracy versus communism, light versus darkness, life versus death, freedom versus enslavement—yes; these actually compare in meaning. The term "democracy" is defined by Mr. Webster as "a government by the people collectively by elected representatives." To me, a high school junior, it within itself represents the American way of life and all that it has meant to a heart bursting with American pride. It is that particular something that has a prevailing spirit of existence in each little courthouse, in the classrooms of every American school, on the playgrounds of America, and down at the corner drug store, as well as being the ideal from which our very own Government was derived and is based upon.

Democracy is that indescribable substance which lined the hearts of such men as George Washington, Abe Lincoln, and Franklin D. Roosevelt. It is that which moves one to separate the right from the wrong—the good from the bad—and to respond with an unexcelled, energetic desire to conduct oneself in a democratic manner. Remember that democracy is an undivided affair—an unprejudiced one. It is meant to be shared and accepted with all the inhabitants of the earth and not just with your chosen associates. In order that old Ben J. Franklin might rise up and point at you, declaring, "There's a real American—an American who is kindling the spark of democracy into a blazing fire for the sake of all humanity," you must avoid such stumbling blocks as the fear and prejudices against race, color, and creed; you should have no thought of a selfish, personal gain, but that of a world-wide one.

Democracy could be justly defined as the power that made a Cordell Hull from a man who might have been a Goebbels, an America from a land that might have been a Russia. Yes; democracy is not merely a word, for it carries the influence and force behind it to insure the happiness, health, and prosperity of every citizen of this, our country.

Democracy and communism have no more similarities than black and white. Democracy is felt, seen, and individually believed in and supported constantly, while communism works underground, behind closed doors with hidden, disguised methods in order to arouse unrest and political grievances in hopes of achieving their one goal—that of a communistic world.

Communist ideas have won over some people, but their communistic methods have forced millions under their grasp. They recognize no boundaries and are eagerly anticipating a world communistic revolution—which must not be allowed to come:

There are too many advantages of democracy over communism to enumerate, but some of them are as follows:

1. Personal rights: Example: No American home may be entered without a warrant issued by a court; in a communistic country the police are never questioned about any actions.

2. Personal freedoms: Example: In America we have freedom of speech, worship, press, and from want and fear. Where there is no democracy, the only meetings allowed are those which carry out the aims and purposes of the government.

3. Political rights: Example: Americans may organize and support any political party; we have a choice of candidates and we may vote as we wish without thought of fear and punishment; we may criticize any official, even the President, and our people are free to run for office. In Russia, for instance, the Communist Party runs Russia and allows no other party existence; they are free to vote, but only for Communists; they are free to hold political discussions, but prohibited to speak against the Communists; and no person can run for office without communistic approval.

4. Cultural rights: Example: We may read literature, enjoy the music and art, and study the accomplishments of any nation, while a communistic government must approve movies, plays, books, and other cultural material before people may use it.

5. Economic rights: Example: Here in the United States we may own property and have Government protection, while a Russian may own nothing except of a personal nature.

Under each of these headings there are many more examples, but I am sure that

each of us, without further discussion, realizes the importance of combining our efforts in maintaining, and, yes, even furthering democracy. Democracy for ourselves, for our children, for our Nation, and for the world.

Light versus darkness—we will take the light; democracy versus communism—we demand a democracy.

Hon. Daniel A. Reed, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Ways and Means Committee, by unanimous vote, passed a resolution honoring a member of that committee. The gentleman so honored represents the Forty-fifth District of the great State of New York. I refer to the Honorable DANIEL A. REED, now serving his thirtieth year in this House.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure and great privilege to have served with this distinguished gentleman for 28 years and I speak advisedly when I say that he has served in this House with marked distinction during each of those years. That all Members of the House may know the type of service he has and is rendering for the people of his district, his State, and his country, and the confidence, respect, and affection with which he is regarded by the members of that great committee, I am proud to present the resolution for the RECORD:

Resolution of the membership of the Subcommittee on Social Security, Committee on Ways and Means, United States House of Representatives

Whereas the Subcommittee on Social Security of the House Committee on Ways and Means during the past 2 years has tried diligently to carry out the responsibilities entrusted to it to study the basic issues in social security and to prepare legislation on matters of first priority; and

Whereas the work of the subcommittee has been steadfastly advanced under the leadership of its distinguished and able chairman, the Honorable DANIEL A. REED of New York; and

Whereas the deliberations of the subcommittee have been conducted in the most friendly, fair, courteous, and nonpartisan manner, with concern only for the development and maintenance of a sound system of social security and the over-all welfare of the Nation; and

Whereas the aforesaid chairman of the Subcommittee on Social Security has throughout his 15 years of service on the Committee on Ways and Means ever fulfilled his duties so as to endear himself to his fellow committee members, regardless of party: Now, therefore be it,

Resolved, That the membership of the Subcommittee on Social Security, Committee on Ways and Means, United States House of Representative, hereby express our gratitude for the gracious, cogent, and statesman-like leadership of Hon. DANIEL A. REED as chairman of the Subcommittee on Social Security during the Eightieth Congress, and that a copy of this resolution be presented to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in executive session in order that the entire membership may join in this expression of esteem and affection.

The full committee unanimously approved the resolution.

Memorial Day Exercises at Longmeadow, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. CLASON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, May 30, 1948, the graves of men and women who have served in the armed services of the United States were decorated in cities and towns all over the Nation. Unusually impressive exercises were held in the beautiful town of Longmeadow, Mass. Thousands of its citizens and neighbors witnessed the military funeral of Corp. Edward G. Wilkin, a fellow townsman, who posthumously was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for bravery in battle above and beyond that required of him in the line of duty. Many of the residents had attended the exercises when the Congresional Medal of Honor was given to his little son several months ago.

A military funeral always stirs to the depths the hearts and minds of all who witness it. In this instance, the massed colors and the casket, draped with the American flag, on the caisson proceeded slowly behind the military band. Marching at the head of the honorary pall bearers was Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chief of Staff, United States Army, in whose group of armies Corporal Wilkin was serving when he performed his heroic exploits and later when he was killed in a subsequent action. Following the interment of the body in the graveyard behind the famous First Church of Longmeadow, one of the finest examples of churches of Colonial days, the Memorial Day exercises took place on the Longmeadow Green, from which American boys have drilled and gone away to French and Indian Wars, the Revolution, and all succeeding wars in which our country has been engaged.

General Bradley made a memorable speech on this occasion, one which has received high tribute from commentators and in newspaper editorials throughout the country. It was my high honor to introduce General Bradley on this occasion. I would like to close by including my remarks in introducing General Bradley as the guest speaker, the address of General Bradley, and a thoughful editorial upon his address as it appeared in the Washington Evening Star of June 1, 1948:

INTRODUCTION BY HON. CHARLES R. CLASON, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Chairman Landon, members of the clergy, and fellow citizens, millions of Americans are paying tribute today to the men and women, now departed, who served in the military forces of our country. Through their sacrifices, our Nation has steadily advanced from a weak confederation of former colonies of a great European power to the position of the outstanding leader among all the nations of the world. Our statesmen and our people are beginning to realize the extent of the obligations confronting us.

Throughout the 172 years of our independence, our people have steadfastly maintained the advantages of a true democracy within a republic. Here we enjoy the highest standards of living of any people on earth. Let those who would prefer a totalitarian form of government to our great heritage ponder well on what they are saying and doing. Here we have, among other great advantages, the freedom of opportunity for the individual citizen. President Truman has risen to the highest office in the United States from a background of a poor farm boy in Missouri. The man next in line of succession to the Presidency is Speaker MARTIN of Massachusetts, a former newsboy. No kinder gentlemen ever held high office anywhere. What a comparison they offer to the ruthless dictators of the Old World.

Our guest speaker today has been described in my presence by General Eisenhower as the greatest general of World War II. He successively commanded a division, a corps, an army, and a group of armies, totaling 1,300,000 men. He overwhelmed the greatest enemy military forces ever to confront either American or allied troops. He is a very distinguished product of the American way of life—a small-town lad who became America's outstanding combat general.

When the war was over in Europe, he accepted the most difficult civilian job in the whole United States—head of the Veterans' Administration during its most critical period of operation. Through his efforts, the Veterans' Administration is now functioning efficiently with its main object the best interests of the veterans. Last December, he returned to active Army service and, in due course, succeeded General Eisenhower in the highest office of our Army.

Today he is here to honor the memory of all of Longmeadow's war dead. One of them served so heroically under him that he received the Congressional Medal of Honor, the highest decoration for valor within the power of a grateful nation to bestow. It is particularly noteworthy that out of scores of invitations to participate in Memorial Day exercises, several of them from the largest cities in the country, our guest speaker selected the invitation from Longmeadow in order that he might, by his presence, pay his personal tribute here to the Nation's departed heroes.

It is a great honor and esteemed privilege to introduce to the citizens of Longmeadow and their friends Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chief of Staff, United States Army.

ADDRESS BY GEN. OMAR BRADLEY, CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES ARMY

Here, on the long green meadows of this tranquil New England town, we have come to do honor—not alone to one brave soldier—but to the generations of earnest young men who left their homes to defend them at Concord. Antietam, San Juan, the Argonne—and in the snows of the Ardennes.

For as long as free men have lived, worked, worshipped, and reared their families under these elms, so long have their sons been summoned to arms against those who would covet or destroy them. In generation after generation they have been forced to quit these quiet homes in your peaceful valley to fight—and sometimes to die—in conflicts visited upon them by issues that seemed remote from their everyday lives.

From the chancelleries of London, Paris, Berlin, Rome, Tokyo, and Moscow those bitter struggles that have scarred the progress of all mankind eventually spanned the seas to invade the snug parlors and warm kitchens

of these colonial homes. And as these world struggles have wasted the youth and resources of nations they have also left behind them sorrowing women and empty chairs in the houses on this green.

It is easy for us who are living to honor the sacrifices of those who are dead. For it helps us to assuage the guilt we should feel in their presence. Wars can be prevented just as surely as they are provoked, and, therefore, we who fail to prevent them must share in guilt for the dead.

I have not come here today to consecrate war and its evils for the sacrifices war has produced. For every man in whom war has inspired sacrifice, courage, and love there are many more whom it has degraded with brutality, callousness, and greed.

Rather we are gathered here to take comfort and strength from those of our dead who have already given this Nation so much. We have come to learn—if we can—how men might live as charitably together in peace as they died for each other in war.

We have come to ask why it is that our young men must spend their bodies against the Siegfried line—why it is men cannot live as bravely as they die.

In our hatred and renunciation of war, we must not forget that the roots of conflict flourish in the faults and failures of those who seek peace just as surely as they take shape from the diseases and designs of aggressors.

While the American people have within themselves the moral strength, the power, and wisdom to marshal their forces against aggression in whatever form it affects—we cannot feign innocence through indifference or neglect of struggles that bring on wars. We have suffered enough in two world wars to know that noninvolvement in peace means certain involvement in war.

Either we shall employ our strength, power, and conscience boldly and righteously in defense of human dignity and freedom or we shall waste those reserves for peace and default to the forces that breed new wars.

This lad we buried today is partly the victim of your folly. He is the victim of your folly and the folly of all the peace-loving peoples who turned their backs on the ills of the world. For at the very time those aggressors at whose hands he met his death conspired against the peace of the world, we blinded ourselves to their threats and by our shameful inaction countenanced their starting attack.

Secure in distant and peaceful towns like these, clinging to comforts, refusing risks, seeking safety in refuge and refuge in words, we recanted power and conscience to side with those who sought peace at any price. Too late we discovered the price was too high; and to keep our freedom we paid in the bodies of our young sons.

If the United States ever again stoops to expedients to avoid the difficult decisions that come with leadership, the heavy burdens that come with defense, we shall once more run the dangers of all halfway measures and waste our strength and conscience as a weather vane rather than a force.

If we cringe from the necessity of meeting issues boldly with principle, resolution, and strength, then we shall simply hurdle along from crisis to crisis, improvising with expedients, seeking inoffensive solutions, drugging the Nation with an illusion of security which under those conditions cannot exist. If we are to scamper from crisis to crisis, fixing principles and policies to the change of each day, we shall place ourselves supinely and helplessly at the mercy of any aggressor who might play on our public opinion and decimate our forces at will.

To live bravely by convictions from which the free peoples of this world can take heart, the American people must put their faith in stable, long-range policies—political, economic, and military—programs that will not be heated and cooled with the brightening and waning of tension.

The United States has matured to world leadership; it is time we steered by the stars, not by the lights of each passing ship.

On this Memorial Day, as we take leave of this brave soldier—Corp. Edward Wilkin, Army of the United States, Medal of Honor—we pay homage as he would have us do, to all his fallen comrades—to the strong, the weak, the leaders, the led, the brave, the fearful, to all who perished where only God could witness their charity to their fellow men.

Proudly but reverently, sadly, we honor them. We pray they will ever rest in peace.

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 1, 1948]

STEERING BY THE STARS

It is too bad that General Bradley did not feel free to talk more directly to the point in his Memorial Day address at Longmeadow, Mass., for he had something to say. As it was, in deference to considerations that are understandable, the Chief of Staff dealt in generalities. Even so, his remarks are deserving of more than casual notice.

General Bradley was using the occasion to appeal for an American policy that is consistent with the times in which we live. "If we cringe," he said, "from the necessity of meeting issues boldly with principle, resolution, and strength, then we shall simply hurdle along from crisis to crisis, improvising with expedients, seeking inoffensive solutions, drugging the Nation with an illusion of security which under those conditions cannot exist. If we are to scamper from crisis to crisis, fixing principles and policies to the change of each day, we shall place ourselves supinely and helplessly at the mercy of any agressor who might play on our public opinion and decimate our forces at will."

These words justify the inference that General Bradley feels—although he does not say it in so many words—that our policy today is one of scampering from crisis to crisis, that we have not yet put our faith in stable, long-range policies that "will not be heated and cooled with the brightening and waning of tension." Certainly, whether this is what he meant to say or not, the record supports the inference.

The Marshall plan, for example, is the key unit in a stable, long-range program designed to reinforce our own security by preventing the Russians and their Communist allies from enlarging their spheres of control. The plan is sound in conception and its success is vital to our own future. Having committed ourselves to this basic program, one would expect that our other policies would be consistent with it. But that is not the case.

Congress, for instance, is supposed to be building up our military strength to reinforce the economic and political undertakings of the Marshall plan. But in such vital areas as military training and the draft the military program is bogging down in election-year politics. The same thing is true of the administration's handling of the Palestine problem. There again our policy has been so extensively influenced by considerations of political expediency that the objectives of the basic policy—the Marshall program—are in jeopardy.

We cannot go on like this without inviting disaster. If we continue to permit expedient and inconsistent policy making to say our strength and dissipate our influence we will be playing into the hands of our potential enemies. General Bradley is indisputably right when he says: "The United States has matured to world leadership; it is time we steered by the stars, not by the light of each passing ship."

Memorial Day Address of Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Memorial Day address of Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., in the Gettysburg National Cemetery, reprinted from the Gettysburg Times of May 31, 1948:

CONGRESSMAN MARTIN ASSERTS UNITED STATES SEEKING PEACE

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Congressman from Massachusetts and Speaker of the House of Representatives, this afternoon declared that the United States seeks world peace in a Memorial Day address in the Gettysburg National cemetery. He addressed a large audience in front of the rostrum in the cemetery where veterans of many wars are buried. His address follows:

"We are gathered here on this field of sacrifice to again pay honor and to recall to the living the heroism of those who gave their last great measure of devotion in the defense of their country.

"Their mortal remains lie buried in many a clime. Some of them lie in lonely islands of the Pacific. Some lie in the countries of continental Europe. Some are in the Orient. But, wherever their mortal remains may be, their spirits go marching on.

"Not only do we pay homage here today to the memory of those who have fallen in the service of their Nation in all of the wars and struggles which have claimed the efforts of our people. We pay homage also to those who are living, and who are going through the rest of their lives, bearing the wounds, physical or mental, or carrying dreadful memories of those terrible days and nights in the trenches and in the foxholes and on the ships and in the submarines throughout the last war, the First World War, and the other wars in which our Nation has been compelled to engage.

"On this field of sacrifice, the most beautiful evaluation of the service rendered our Nation by those who have fought in her defense was uttered by the immortal Abraham Lincoln. None can hope to surpass, and only a rare few can hope to equal, the beautiful passages in which he appraised the sacrifices made by those who have fallen that their country might remain free.

"He was speaking of those who helped to preserve the Union. Of those who had helped to hold together the government and the Nation founded by our forebears. Of those who in their day gave their lives and their blood that we might know the great, rich, free country under the great, free government that constitutes our American way. Little did Lincoln realize in that day when he stood here and uttered his classic appraisal of human sacrifice for love of country that in holding the Union together they had done something which would have a tremendous—a decisive—effect upon civilization."

BULWARK OF LIBERTY

"The Union which was held together then has today become the hub of the world. The Union which was held together then has today become the pivot upon which turns the fate of civilization. The Union which they preserved then has become the Nation to which all of the war-stricken countries of the world have turned their eyes for hope

and help to get on their own feet and to again become self-sustaining.

"That Union which they preserved then has become the Nation which is the last bulwark of liberty in this world. It has become almost the last habitation of freedom on this globe. It has become the spearhead of an international cooperative movement which must save civilization, if civilization is to be saved.

"That Union which they preserved then, we in our generation must keep sound, solvent, safe, and free in order that we can lead the rest of the world back to enduring peace.

"Until we are assured that real and permanent peace, an enduring good will among men on this earth is certain, we must maintain a national defense fully adequate to meet any emergency which may arise in the future."

UNITED STATES IS BEING TESTED

"On this field of sacrifice we can truly say from the bottom of our hearts that this Nation under God is being tested. We are testing whether or not a Nation conceived in liberty as our Nation was conceived in liberty can go on to lead the world back to sanity and peace and progress and to see that freedom does not perish from the earth.

"We can, on this field of sacrifice, say in good conscience that we in America want to live in good will and amity with every people and every nation in the world. With our neighbors to the south of us in Mexico and in Central and South America, we want to live in friendship and cooperation for peace and progress. With the old worlds of Europe and the Orient, we want to live in peace and amity and progress.

"We can say truly and honestly that we do not desire any of the territory or any of the possessions of any other people or any other nation. We can say with honesty that we have contributed more in men and money to the cause of freedom and peace than any other nation or combination of nations in this modern day."

SEEK FREEDOM FOR ALL

"We earnestly and honestly desire for all peoples everywhere the freedom, the opportunity, the prosperity, the richness of life, the religious and political freedom and tolerance that we practice in the United States under our American way. There is nobody who knows the American people who can for a moment doubt that we are motivated by good will for all peoples everywhere. Why shouldn't we be? We have the richest, the freest, the most wonderful life of any people anywhere in the world. Our poorest, lowliest workmen, the poorest of our citizens live better, have more freedom, have greater opportunity to progress, than the people of any other country in the world.

"What a precious boon it is for each individual to be able to go where he pleases when he pleases.

"As we stand here today on this sacred battlefield, we look across the world at another power which is spreading over Europe, and which believes in another kind of government. We know that in our midst there are those who pay their first allegiance to the Kremlin and the despotism which rules Russia."

PRICELESS HERITAGE

"When we compare the kind of government they have in Russia with the kind of government we have here, when we compare the status of the citizen under the Russian system and the despotism of the Kremlin with the status of a free citizen in America, we can understand what a noble sacrifice and what a wonderful and priceless heritage has been made for us by those who have fallen or who have borne wounds in defense of the United States of America.

"A Russian citizen may not own land. He may not be tried by a jury. He may not choose his own job. He may not absent himself from work. He may not strike. He may not picket. He may not travel. He may not own jewelry. He may not own a refrigerator. He may not own an automobile. He may not ring a church bell. He may not be friends with a foreigner. He may not have freedom of speech. He may not have freedom of assembly. He may not have freedom of religion or freedom of soul.

"All he may hope to have is what some petty tyrant above him may be pleased to permit him to have only so long as that petty tyrant is willing for him to have it."

BENEFIT FROM SACRIFICES

"It is that we in our country may have all of these things; it is that we may have all of these rights and liberties and privileges that the men whose memory we honor here today and whose acts of devotion and defense of their country we honor that we are gathered here.

"It was due to their heroic sacrifices that we in our generation and of those who are to come after us may have the rights and privileges denied to so many millions of people in such a large section of the world.

"No one who knows the American people can for a moment doubt that we want to get along agreeably and amicably with Russia. Nobody knows that better than the rulers of Russia. The men of the Kremlin are not blind. They are not stupid. The know what goes on in the world. They know the mood of America. They know we do not seek war with them. But today I want to say to you in the name of those heroes who have fallen and who today sleep in their narrow graves that we do not intend to be overrun or to see the rest of the world overrun by the despots of the Kremlin."

PREPARE FOR CHALLENGE

"We are determined our Nation shall have a strong military establishment consistent with our increasing responsibility of world leadership. We want a mighty air force equipped with the most advanced models of fighters and bombers; we want a trained air-force personnel competent to meet, if necessary—and I pray it won't be necessary—any attack of the future. We are not saber rattling. We Americans love peace. We believe that to preserve it we must be adequately prepared to meet the challenge of any ruthless despots who would enslave the world. We must follow this motto: Prepare a strong defense for peace. Without preparedness there can be no peace.

"You may be assured that we shall create and maintain such a defense for peace and that we shall work unceasingly for that peace.

"America is beset today with maiy vital problems, both national and international. But America has had problems before. We have met them in our true American way and emerged each time stronger than ever. These problems have been met and will continue to be met by strong leadership and common unity among the people.

"There are all too many in our own country ready to betray the sacrifices which have been made by our hallowed dead, overthrow this country by stealth, if possible, and by force and violence, if necessary. Over the years they crept into high places in our Government."

FERRET OUT REDS

"The present Congress determined that the Communists and fellow travelers who infested the Government service must be driven out. We want no fifth colunists on the Government pay rolls. Our committees have exposed them whenever we have found them and we shall continue to ferret them out until the last of them have been removed. There is no room on the Federal pay rolls for anyone whose loyalty is to another nation.

"We shall hold up to the light of day any Communist activity in this Nation, whether it be inside or outside the Government. It is a strange paradox that when we seek to curb their seditious activities, the subversionists seek refuge under the protection of the same Constitution and the same Bill of Rights they are attempting to destroy. The Founding Fathers never intended that the Constitution should be a cloak over those who would overturn the Government of this Nation.

"We must constantly be on guard against those who from without would assail us or those who from within would betray us. So, too, we must be on guard that the stresses and the necessities of these times do not expose us to the loss of our freedom and to the sacrifice of all that our forebears fought and sacrificed for through the constant encroachments of our own Government upon the rights and privileges of the citizen."

PEOPLE HAVE POWER

"War always brings about a concentration of control in the hands of the Government. The whole tendency in times of stress is for the Government to reach out and take over the direction of lives of the citizens of the Nation. It undertakes to regulate and regiment them rather than to permit them to work out each his own destiny and his own salvation within the framework of orderly liberty under the law.

"All Government tends to grow bigger and bigger unless the people themselves prevent it. All Government tends to build up a crystallized structure of bureaucracy which in its turn seeks always to entrench itself deeper and deeper in the recesses of Government, farther and farther away from the gaze of the people and from their knowledge of what is going on. It is typical of all Governments, and has been so in all ages, that the people, and only the people, can prevent the Government from growing bigger and bigger. Only the people can restrain the Government from spending and wasting more and more of their money and imposing heavier and heavier taxes upon them."

GOVERN BY PEOPLE

"It was for that very reason that Lincoln, who saw so clearly that danger, always stressed Government of, by, and for the people. He knew the dangers of governmental encroachment. He knew the dangers of crystallized bureaucracy. He knew the dangers of the power to tax, which is a power to take, the power to destroy. He knew that unless the people carefully maintained those checks and balances between the three independent, coordinate branches of the Government as set up by the Founding Fathers under the Constitution that we could lose our liberties and that we could lose our republican system.

"We are just beginning to learn, even though only partially as yet, the tremendous extent to which secret diplomacy has been practiced upon the American people. We are beginning to get information about deals which were made that the American people had not the slightest knowledge of at the time they were made or for a year or 2 years or 3 years afterward."

OPPOSE SECRET STATECRAFT

"The founding fathers knew the danger of secret statecraft and diplomacy. Washington warned against this. Jefferson warned against this. Lincoln warned against this. Every statesman of the past has warned the American people against permitting their Government to conduct relations with other peoples and other governments in secrecy and away from the knowledge of the American people. We therefore have to guard assiduously against the danger that there will be other commitments of which we will know nothing until after they are accomplished facts.

"In any government of, by, and for the people, certainly the people themselves are entitled to know, and they should be told what commitments are being made on their behalf. They are entitled to know what actions are being taken that are going to increase the cost of their governmental operations and consequently increase their taxes.

"We must always keep in mind that if the Government conducts diplomacy in secret negotiations and can set up secret operations without the knowledge of the American people that the people's liberties can be whittled away one by one. Their freedoms can be reduced one by one. Their privileges can be stealthily taken from them one by one. Finally, they could find themselves literally the prisoners of their own government.

"There is no excuse for this. No people in the history of the world have ever demonstrated as fine a capacity for self-government as have the American people. It has always been a fact that if and when the people are given the truth and told the facts about any situation, the wisdom of the Nation has been greater than that of any group or clique or any individual at Washington. Therefore, there is not the slightest excuse in the world for conducting peacetime Government along secret lines and of concealing from the people what we aim to do.

"It behooves us as we stand on this field of sacrifice today to rededicate ourselves and for the citizens of this land to rededicate themselves to the proposition that Government of, by, and for the people shall be conducted by the consent of and with the knowledge of the people.

"As our citizens in hamlets and villages and cities clear across this broad, blessed land of ours on this day pay homage to those who have laid down their lives and those who have borne wounds in defense of their country, we must again rededicate ourselves to the proposition that by the help of God we will be vigilant in maintaining and retaining our liberties. We must keep in our own hands the powers of Government, so that we shall not meanly lose our liberties, or permit any Government of our own to whittle them away or deprive us of them. And let us by the help of God and our faith in Providence and in ourselves go forward to keep the faith of those who gave their all to their country and to preserve for posterity the land and the Government and the privileges and the freedom which they gave their lives to preserve and perpetuate. God give us the strength to meet the challenge and to meet it successfully."

Old-Age Insurance—An Intelligent Study of the Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER R. JONES

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, one of the bills introduced at this session of the Congress which deserves more than passing study by the Members of the House is H. R. 5751, a bill to amend old-age and survivors insurance, introduced by my friend and colleague, RUSSELL MACK. The bill is well thought out, reasonable, conservative, and constructive, and will, if enacted into law, greatly improve old-age and survivors insurance without endangering the long-term soundness of social-security reserves.

The constructive value of this bill is pointed by an editorial appearing in the Seattle (Wash.) Times on Sunday, May 30, 1948, one of the great daily newspapers of the Pacific coast. This endorsement of RUSSELL MACK's proposals reflects the opinion not of the editorial writer alone, but of thousands of persons who find in this bill an intelligent study of the question.

The editorial follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY PROPOSALS BASED ON CAREFUL STUDY

Among genuinely constructive measures introduced during the present session of Congress is the bill to reform the Nation's social security and survivors' insurance program sponsored by this State's Congressman RUSSELL V. MACK. Providing for substantial increases in the monthly pensions to all beneficiaries, present and future, broadening the scope of the program to include many classes of workers now excluded, and extending social security credits to members of the armed forces for the time they lost during the war, the Mack bill embraces and improves upon many of the revisions proposed by President Truman. It also accords closely with recommendations of an advisory committee set up by the Senate to study the question.

There is ample basis for the amendments Congressman MACK proposes. They would not endanger the financial soundness of the social-security program. The reserve fund for old-age and survivors' insurance on February 29, 1948, stood at more than $9,500,000. It has been growing at the rate of $119,000,000 a month. To this extent are its receipts exceeding disbursements. MACK figures that if his bill had been in effect last year, receipts still would have exceeded disbursements by almost a billion dollars.

The Nation is permanently in this social-security business. MACK's proposals have a solid background. They do not smack of impractical New Dealism. The Congress would not go wrong in accepting the results of his intelligent study of this question.

Stalin's Austrian Double-Cross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. M. (DON) WHEELER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of interest has been manifested lately with regard to the purported peace negotiations being carried on between Mr. Stalin and our misguided Mr. Wallace. This maneuver on the part of Mr. Wallace is evidently purely political in nature.

In the Washington News under date of May 26, 1948, there appears an editorial on the subject of Stalin's Austrian double cross which I think should be read by all those who have a tendency to be misled by Mr. Stalin's present alleged peace moves. I include this editorial for the benefit of the membership.

STALIN'S AUSTRIAN DOUBLE CROSS

The small American minority taken in by Stalin's phony peace offensive must find it increasingly difficult to make his fair words fit his foul acts. For he goes right on breaking past agreements while talking about negotiating a new one.

This is his current record in Korea, in Germany and in the United Nations. On Monday Russia in a double veto to prevent UN investigation of her rape of Czechoslovakia—her twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth vetoes—violated again her San Francisco pledge limiting use of the veto.

The latest proof that Stalin's word is worthless is Austria. Big Four treaty negotiations have been wrecked by Soviet insistence on getting reparations and on giving Austrian territory to Yugoslavia, a Russian satellite. In the Moscow agreement of 1943, Stalin promised unconditionally to restore Austria's 1937 frontiers and to exact no reparations.

Here is a clear case of the customary Communist double cross, of Stalin's cynical breach of faith.

Still there are a few Americans who think there's a chance of an American-Russian "settlement" if only the two disputants could be brought together to thresh out their differences face to face. It seems impossible to get across to these wishful thinkers the fact that the American and Soviet Governments have been carrying on almost incessant face-to-face negotiations since VE-day.

President Truman and Stalin talked Austria at Potsdam. Secretary of State Byrnes personally tried to get an Austrian settlement. Then Secretary of State Marshall went all the way to Moscow to talk with Stalin and Molotov. Over the past 3 years there have been literally hundreds of negotiating sessions on Austria. In the Big Four London conference on an Austrian treaty, which Russia has just wrecked, there were 110 meetings.

Even so, the United States has not slammed the door. It has named a special liaison officer and announced its willingness to resume negotiations at any time on the basis of the 1943 Moscow agreement on Austrian independence. But of course Stalin is not interested in that.

Memorial Day Tribute to Veterans of the Spanish-American War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 30, 1948, it was my privilege to participate in the annual Memorial Day program of the Dewey Camp, United Spanish-American War Veterans, at Altoona, Pa.

This program was the first event in the 2-day observance of Memorial Day in Altoona. My tribute to the heroes of the Spanish-American War is contained in the following speech which I delivered on the occasion:

This Memorial Day 1948 is of special significance to members of the United Spanish War Veterans because it is 50 years since we, as a Nation, united our forces with Cuban patriots and liberated Cuba from Spanish rule.

The occasion was fittingly observed by a joint session of Congress on April 19, which was attended by some of the members of Dewey Camp. I am only sorry that more of you did not have the opportunity to witness

the splendid program that included the President of the United States, both branches of Congress, and the appearance of representatives from official and diplomatic life in our Nation's Capital.

But the Spanish-American War was not only confined to Cuba and Puerto Rico. You boys of '98 fought in the Philippines and in China. Let no man underrate the soldier of the Spanish-American War. Faced with the perils of yellow fever, and with poor rations and contaminated water, his life was made more difficult by disease-carrying insects that, 50 years ago, were not under the control of man.

We should keep in mind that medical progress has made stupendous strides in the past 50 years. Yet you boys of '98 were forced to act as guinea pigs in the desperate attempts made to halt epidemics of every known variety. The soldier of the Spanish-American era was poorly equipped and fought in heavy clothing in hot weather that sapped the strength of the sturdiest men.

Yet the American spirit of love of freedom was the motivating influence that dominated the lives of the boys of '98, which you so proudly represent in this area.

You volunteers fought for love of country and in the good old American tradition of freedom for all mankind.

On such an occasion as this is is good to refresh our memories and briefly recall the incidents that led to our participation in the Spanish-American War.

It was 9:40 p. m. on February 15, 1898 that the battleship *Maine*, sent to Cuba on a friendly mission, was destroyed in Havana Harbor by an explosion that claimed the lives of two officers and 258 men.

"Remember the *Maine*" became the slogan in 1898, as President McKinley called for 125,000 volunteers and later for 75,000 additional men. At that time we had an Army and Navy of only 2,143 officers and 26,040 enlisted men. Yet Spain, at that very moment, had one of the largest navies in the world, and an army of 500,000 with over 192,000 in Cuba alone.

President McKinley's call for volunteers was responded to in typical American fashion and American manhood, to the number of 1,000,000, expressed readiness to defend the stars and stripes. Some 483,000 served, of which nearly 20,000 lost their lives either in action or through disease contracted in the steaming jungles. Many more thousands suffered permanent disability.

The feat of Admiral Dewey on May 1, 1898 in the bay of Manila, when the Spanish fleet was destroyed, is one of the glorious chapters in American history. It sounded the end of Spanish tyranny and opened the door through which the United States has traveled to become the greatest world power in all history.

While we are paying tribute to the splendid role played by the United States Navy in the Spanish-American War, let us not forget that the valiant foot soldiers and intrepid cavalrymen were fighting in the cruel heat of San Juan, and battling with pestilence and disease at Chickamauga.

The Spanish-American fighter has been affectionately termed "The Hiker" and he has earned this title by his relentless devotion to duty in not only Cuba and Puerto Rico but in the Philippines and China. He left his home and loved ones to fight America's first crusade for the liberation of mankind. It is interesting to observe that despite poor rations, lack of equipment, and being continually exposed to deadly disease, "The Hiker" received the monthly sum of $15.60.

You members of the United Spanish-American War veterans represent a portion of the 109,000 that remain from the war of 1898. Many of your leaders in that war fought gallantly in the war between the North and the South to preserve the unity of this great Nation.

Many of your number served with distinction in World War I and provided the leadership that enabled America to repel the forces that threatened the freedom of the peoples of the world. You have sent your sons and daughters and grandchildren into both World Wars and they have been able to duplicate your record of loyalty and devotion to country by the magnificent victory in World War II over the dictators that sought to extinguish the torch of freedom in a civilized world.

You men of the Spanish-American War had a great responsibility, which you met in an unflinching manner.

Today, 50 years after your glorious achievements, and despite the fact our Nation has fought two global conflicts, we are still engrossed in efforts to rescue humanity from evil forces who would deny freedom and liberty and substitute an alien philosophy for the American way of life.

The American Nation owes you a debt of everlasting gratitude for you were pioneers in the fight for liberty and freedom. I can think of no better way of perpetuating the ideals for which you fought than to proceed with our plans for building a strong national defense. For it is only by a strong and united America that we can hope to carry on the great principles you fought for in the disease-infested jungles in 1898.

I am confident that we Americans will continue our united efforts in the hope of restoring peace to a confused world by uniting all mankind in a spirit of true brotherhood. It is only on the basis of justice, love, and understanding that we can ever hope to fashion a lasting peace among all nations.

High Cost of Living Big Challenge to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt's column My Day, which appeared in many newspapers over the country.

This particular column appeared in the Cleveland Ohio Press on May 11, 1948. In it, the challenge to America of the high cost of living is very clearly stated:

NEW YORK.—Now and then I find the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD extraordinarily interesting reading. I won't quarrel with anyone who says that for the most part it is somewhat dull, but I was rather surprised that I had not seen more in the newspapers about a speech by Congresswoman HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS on the subject of the cost of living in 1948.

There is a great deal more involved in the cost of living in the United States than just whether you and I, as American housewives, can pay for the things we want. If that was all there was to it, we might be told that, for the sake of peace and in order to help world conditions, we must do without certain things at the present time.

We must do without as we did during the war and for the very same reason—that is, that certain things which were needed for the war are now needed to win the peace.

But, in addition, there is a balance that must be maintained. The rest of the world is depending on the economy of the United States. Even the U. S. S. R., which, for the moment, is highly suspicious of everything we do, would suffer greatly if our economy were to collapse. They might accept this with joy, because they would feel it vindicated their theories.

It is necessary, I believe, for us to be in a position of military strength, and we should so gear our economy that it would serve both our military and other needs. But if we go beyond a certain point in military strength, the rest of the world, including the U. S. S. R., has a right to wonder whether we are gearing for aggression rather than for peaceful purposes.

In the speech by Mrs. DOUGLAS, there is one little passage on the steel industry, which is basic to many other industries. When United States Steel announced recently that it would reduce prices in May by $25,000,000 annually, this was coupled with a refusal to raise wages for the workers.

I saw no mention, however, of the fact that since November 1946, 17 months ago, United States Steel has raised its prices by a total of $340,000,000 annually. That means that its customers will still pay $315,000,000 more for a year's output of steel than before Congress killed price control.

We Need an Emergency Radio System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, in these days when, very properly, we are giving considerable attention to the broad question of national defense and security, I believe we have, officially at least, overlooked one important matter.

The absence of any plan for the utilization of radio as an instrument of offense or defense in an emergency might well imperil the public safety and the national interest.

What I am saying is in no wise intended to create any scare, but rather to face very squarely a situation that should receive the attention of the Congress, the radio industry, and the Military Establishment.

It has been called to my attention again in a rather challenging manner by the concluding chapter of a book just published by the Ziff-Davis Publishing Co. under the title "Star Spangled Radio." This book, written by Edward M. Kirby and Jack W. Harris is an account of radio's part in World War II. Both of the authors are from my own district and during the war Colonel Kirby became radio chief for General Eisenhower, while Major Harris became chief of radio operations for General MacArthur.

On the basis of their experience in those key positions they have collaborated in the writing of a very readable and thrilling account of radio in the war, and in the final chapter entitled "Beamed Toward the Future," they present some conclusions and some recommendations which should receive official attention.

As they point out in that chapter, radio ad libbed its way through the last war but it cannot hope to ad lib its way through another war, if one should come.

When the substance of this final chapter, which I shall include with my remarks, was brought to the attention of the War Department, Colonel Kirby was recalled to active duty and given an assignment to make a study and report on a plan for a comprehensive M-day emergency communications system.

His study and report have been made, and it is my understanding that the Signal Corps of the armed services is ready to cooperate with the radio industry and other agencies in completing the plan.

The success of such a plan, however, would depend largely on the establishment of an alternate seat of government. And that is a matter which only the Congress can settle. A bombardment of Washington not only would result in a partial or complete destruction of the seat of government but it would result in a partial or complete destruction of telephone and telegraph lines to a great extent insofar as communications with the rest of the country is concerned.

Should such a thing happen, and without a bombproof communications center, the rest of the Nation would be completely cut off from the government.

It is therefore highly important, I believe, to give some attention to the development of an emergency system for broadcasting to all parts of the country.

The distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] has introduced a resolution to provide for an alternate seat of government. Sound judgment and proper precaution demand that some consideration be given to this proposal.

I hope the Congress will not too long delay taking the necessary step in that respect in order that the radio industry and the Signal Corps may proceed to develop an emergency communications plan.

I am including herewith the final chapter, which is a short but provocative one, of the book Star-Spangled Radio:

BEAMED TOWARD THE FUTURE

There is only one conclusion to be drawn from this summing up: American radio was lucky. It ad-libbed its way through its first war—and without Government control. Private management continued to operate on public franchise, and at a profit. The industry sent forth its young men and women and they made the American concept of radio under free enterprise work even during wartime.

There is scant comfort in the fact that when the Japs bombed Pearl Harbor no plan existed for the use of radio as an instrument of either defense or offense, or for anything else, for that matter. For that oversight both Government and the radio industry may be criticized. Furthermore, as long as no M-day plan for radio for the future exists, so long will the public welfare be imperiled.

Our age has been transformed from the electronic age to the atomic age. It is not warmongering to talk about war, any more than it is inviting fire to insist on fire-escapes. No one is eager for more bloodshed, but if the Nation learned anything from the recent conflict, it was the need for preparation. Yesterday's weapons are today's museum pieces. Our entire war machine has been outmoded by the development of atomic energy. Split seconds, as well as split atoms, are now in the calendar of Mars. Now, every human being on the face of the earth is exposed to the possibility of germ warfare, guided missiles, and atomic bombs. Without warning ruthless machines of destruction may descend through the night, and large sections of the population may be cut off and isolated. Then will rumor spread and multiply—and rumor, too, demoralizing as it is, must be reckoned a weapon of war.

What can be the role of radio in such a war? It is not too early to ask the question. American radio cannot permit its future during another war crisis to be left to improvised planning after the war is upon us. Neither war nor peace can be won merely with good intentions. By all means, let us endeavor to have radio speak the language of brotherhood and understanding between all peoples at home and abroad. But let us not overlook radio's responsibilities today, should men fail each other again tomorrow.

As a first step, regular liaison should be established between the armed forces, the State Department, the Federal Communications Commission, and the radio industry. The mechanism is at hand in Washington. The National Association of Broadcasters should be geared to handle such an important assignment. The armed forces should welcome an NAB committee composed, not only of management, but also of operations men as well: engineers, newsmen, and program people.

The work of this joint military-civilian committee would be of a fluid nature, changing from year to year as the political and technical picture developed. But always it would include a workable radio plan in every blueprint for the Nation's defenses. The industry may count on it—the military will have such a plan in a new emergency. Therefore, radio should help formulate it, with the best brains in the broadcasting business, for the mutual protection of an American free radio and of the Nation.

With Washington likely to be the No. 1 target in the next war, provision should be made for the broadcasting of communiqués and news from bombproof studios scattered throughout the Nation. Both Government and radio must be mobile. Provision must be made for the interconnecting of all network and nonnetwork stations. A means of transmission of network broadcasts, other than by telephone landlines, must be utilized. The United States is a big country, and no single radio transmitter can be heard from one end of the Nation to the other. No network broadcast can now be aired from one coast to the other without the use of landlines which, in a war, might quickly be bombed out. There must be alternate facilities which could be brought into use.

The plan should also include the revival of some Central Government information clearinghouse like the old OWI. Should this evoke cries of "censorship" or "Government control," set them down as irrelevant, immaterial, and irresponsbile. What we are talking about here is a sensible means of survival. The orderly flow of information from the Government to its people in time of war or emergency is vital. Should war come again, we will not be permitted the leisure to set up a war plan. Because the fighting front will be, immediately, in our own front yard, not on some far-off front in north Africa or Guadalcanal. We had better select our Elmer Davises and Byron Prices now.

Radio is naturally reluctant to relinquish its competitive practices. Yet, in some cases this can be—and was—carried to injudicious extremes. For example, during the last war, it became necessary for the Army to take over the railroads during a strike that threatened to cut off the supply of ammunition and food to our soldiers. It became desirable for the Secretary of War to make a public proclamation and statement to prevent possible riot or rebellion. The networks, when first approached, refused to carry the talk unless each could have it "exclusive." Later they reconsidered. In other cases, however, the networks did not always relent from their policy of exclusiveness. As a result, important war messages met the stiffest kind of entertainment competition.

Certainly the talk by the Secretary of War was not a radio "feature" in the usual sense of the word. It was a functional wartime use of broadcasting. Statements by the Eisenhowers or MacArthurs of the future can never be designated "exclusive" for any one network, nor should they be. With a war in our own front yard these questions become academic, and one more reason why the broadcasters and armed services should set up a pattern now.

Consideration must further be given to the use of new technical advances. For example, what is the place of television in a future war? What security problems are involved? What is to prevent the technical sabotage of the radio spectrum? References have been made to "jamming," a practice wherein one station's wave length is overwhelmed by another's, so that it cannot be heard. What civilian chaos could result, under the stress of war, if the entire spectrum became an unintelligible blur of sound while citizens groped desperately for information? These are questions requiring answers which can be found only in the closest cooperation of the armed services and the radio industry.

The armed services themselves should undertake serious self-examination with respect to their public-relations policies and procedures. These gradually improved during the course of the war, but little has yet been done to assure the elevation of public relations to a position of respectability at the war council table. In all fairness it may be said that the present system results inevitably in a defensive policy rather than an open, forward-looking policy.

Consider the difficulties of Army public-relations officers in Washington after Pearl Harbor. They had a world-wide war on their hands. Yet their jurisdiction ended at the shore line where their problems began. No direct chain of public-relations authority linked the Pentagon with the overseas theaters. Each commander set up his own public-relations organizations, and, to a large extent, formulated the policies he deemed most satisfactory. If the picture coverage was poor or unrepresentative, if radio facilities were inadequate, if censorship was too restrictive, all that Washington could or would do, was to inquire, request, or suggest. Only intervention by the Secretary of War or the Chief of Staff could change the picture, and these persons vere not always accessible.

Confusion in the public mind could be avoided by the issuance of communiques from a central authority, rather than by means of individual public-relations offices in different branches of the service.

Serious thought must also be given to plans for international coordination in time of war. The experience of the Army with the BBC in England is a striking example of a warped situation. It would have been far better if the coordination arrangements had been made on a high government level. International good will was lost, and effective propaganda was jeopardized because of the high-handedness of one powerful group.

A strong plan for radio should therefore contain certain provisions for the use of radio on an international basis, if the contingency arose.

Radio and the public welfare will benefit from a unity of control and purpose of the armed forces public relations. For example, in too many cases inexperienced Regular Army officers, rather than take a chance, played the old Army game of do-nothing. The movement of information to the public and to the troops cannot be accomplished by buck-passing. In other situations, officers trained in the ways of the daily newspaper were in control of media which they did not understand, or which they resented. Many times an alert enemy caught the ear of the American audience by resorting to short-

wave radio, thus scooping both our press and our radio. It is poor psychology to be forced to confirm later what one's enemy has stated first, for that builds confidence in enemy sources and undermines confidence in one's own.

The psychological block which seems to separate our armed forces from our citizens in time of peace, should be broken down once and for all. As General Richardson said repeatedly: "The American Army and the American people are one and the same." In radio, the armed forces have a medium through which this understanding may be brought about. The radio industry, in turn, has an opportunity to add to its service chevrons—if it undertakes in its own manner this peacetime mission to bring about better understanding of our military services. No nation ever owed more to those professional men of arms who carried on to keep this Nation strong. For they certainly got little reward save the satisfaction of serving honor, duty, and country.

In this atomic age the interests of the civilian are identical with those of the soldier. Now in our quest for peace and security the good soldier and the good citizen are one, as exemplified in the role of George C. Marshall as a soldier and statesman.

Certainly, as they work for peace, the good citizen and the good soldier must keep war in mind. For in another war, our enemy will have a plan before he strikes. We would have no time for conferences or compromises. The time for preparation is now. With the first radio-controlled missile, with the first germs to infest our reservoirs, with the first terrifying blast of atomic energy over some American target would come, simultaneously, the effort to seize or destroy our radio communication facilities. Destroy an army's lines of communications, and you destroy the army.

No country places such reliance on its radio system as does the United States. For it is a part of the daily lives of its citizens. We depend upon the American radio for information and news, as well as for entertainment.

Without a plan for radio's protection and utilization in time of emergency we might find our great resources transformed into a national liability, a perilously vulnerable point in the armor of national defense. Every radio transmitter in the country is now a potential target for the enemy, to seize or to destroy.

While we hope fervently that radio, henceforth, will bring only tidings of peace throughout the world, let American radio draw upon its great potential to fortify the peacemakers, that mankind may be spared another—possibly a last—fearful holocaust.

But let the broadcaster be realistic now in appraising the possibilities of war. For American radio cannot hope to ad lib its way through world war III.

Bill To Admit 5,000 European Refugees Now in Shanghai

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, none of the legislation which is now being considered for the relief of the DP's in Europe affects the plight of the 5,000 European refugees who have been stranded in Shanghai since 1938 and 1940. These 5,000 victims of persecution in Germany, Poland, and other areas of central and eastern Europe, still wait and hope that they will be given an opportunity to become citizens of the world again. Many countries have absorbed the major portion of the Shanghai refugee colony which originally numbered 16,000; 11,000 have been absorbed by Australia, South America, and the United States, as well as some European countries to which some went as repatriates.

For the 5,000 who still remain in Shanghai, no doors have been opened, and their situation becomes more desperate daily. For their relief I am today introducing a bill to admit these refugees to the United States. The text of the bill follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That as used in this act, the term "eligible displaced person" means any displaced person or refugee as defined in Annex I (except paragraph 1 (b) of section A of part I thereof) to the constitution of the International Refugee Organization who on or after January 1, 1938, entered the city of Shanghai, China, as a displaced person or refugee, and is residing in such city, as a displaced person or refugee, on the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. In addition to persons admissible under other laws to the United States for permanent residence, a number of eligible displaced persons not in excess of 5,000 shall be admitted to the United States for permanent residence as nonquota immigrants at any time prior to June 30, 1950. Such persons shall be permitted entry into the United States under this act irrespective of nationality. All provisions of the immigration laws shall be applicable, insofar as practicable, to eligible displaced persons admitted under this act to the United States for permanent residence.

SEC. 3. The Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, with the approval of the Attorney General, shall prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this act; but all such rules and regulations insofar as they relate to the administration of this act by consular officers, shall be prescribed by the Secretary of State upon the recommendation of the Attorney General.

Address by Hon. John L. McClellan, of Arkansas, Before Southern Cypress Association and Associated Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 2 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered at Jacksonville, Fla., on May 26 of this year, at a convention of the Southern Cypress Association and Associated Industries.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, abundant forests being one of the great natural resources of my State, and wood products being one of its principal industries, prompts me to have a very keen interest in all phases of timber and wood-products resources. Although I have never been closely identified or associated with any forestry or lumber enterprise except in a professional relation as an attorney, I have always recognized the importance of effective conservation measures, forestry protection, selective cutting, and other practices in the processing of timber into the finished product so as to increase values and eliminate waste. For those reasons, I have consistently favored measures and appropriations in Congress in support of State and National programs for such purposes.

It is with considerable gratification that I have observed much progress in this field not only in Arkansas but throughout the Nation. I shall continue to give my support to such programs and policies because an all-time adequate supply of timber is essential to the strength and striking power of our Nation in time of war and also to its economic prosperity and progress in time of peace.

Notwithstanding this personal and public interest that I have expressed, it would be presumptuous for me to discuss any particular subject peculiarly related to the Southern Cypress Association, which many of you represent. Your own knowledge and experience in that field of enterprise far surpass, I am sure, any information of which I may be possessed.

But there are higher and more important objectives for all of us than the immediate prosperity of any one particular industry, business, or profession in which we may be separately or collectively engaged. The overall welfare of our people, the security of our Nation, and the establishing of a peace that will endure, are of common and paramount concern to every loyal and patriotic American citizen.

On the broad subject and the intricate ramifications of national affairs, either foreign or domestic, I cannot qualify as an expert and I do not presume "to speak as one having authority." The profoundest statesman in American political life today could not possibly identify, much less thoroughly discuss, in a single speech, the many vital issues and perplexing problems now confronting us with respect to our international relations and obligations and those associated with our own domestic economy and fiscal policies. That perplexity and confusion exist is recognized and readily admitted. Our purpose and efforts to restore world order and tranquillity among nations and bring about economic recovery in many countries are vigorously opposed and obstructed and present one of the greatest—if not the greatest—peacetime challenge in the history of our Republic.

All freedom-loving peoples of the world look to the United States for positive and dynamic leadership. In their distress and destitution, they turn to us as their only hope for assistance and redemption. Many nations must now depend upon us for financial aid toward economic recovery, and, in some instances, for military support and protection against totalitarian aggression and invasion. Never before has America had such peacetime burdens thrust upon her. Never in our time has it been so difficult to formulate wise and effective policies and to determine just how far we can and should go in assuming obligations and in trying to meet these tremendous responsibilities in keeping with our own enlightened self-interest and security.

Disregarding all humanitarian considerations, the imperative necessity of preserving the sovereignty and independence of many countries for the sake of human freedom is the impelling reason for our interest in and efforts to assist them.

We cannot forget that within the present generation we have made a tremendous investment in freedom and in the peace of the world. At an initial cost of some $60,000,000,000 and the lives of 40,000 American soldiers, with our allies, we won the First World

War. At a further cost of some $350,000,000,000 and approximately 400,000 American lives, we won the Second World War. Winning the first war did not prevent the second, and winning the second may not prevent a third war. We cannot prevail in the present "cold war" or win the peace by appeasement, retreat, or surrender to aggressive forces of conquest. If our Government should now retreat and withdraw its moral, economic, and military support from Europe, our participation in both world wars and the great sacrifices we made in resources, materials, and human lives will have been expended in vain. The forces of totalitarianism we defeated and crushed would immediately be supplanted by another dictatorial regime, communism, which is more vicious, brutal, and iniquitous than the totalitarian aggression over which our military might prevailed in the two world wars.

We have made this investment in freedom, in world order and peace, and it must not be abandoned now. To do so would break faith with our war dead and render impotent and ineffective our influence in world affairs. This investment we have made at so great a cost of material resources and human lives, we must protect and defend. We have no other sensible and honorable alternative. To pursue any other course would invite disaster, and freedom could perish from the earth.

I do not subscribe to the philosophy of lavish spending, freewheeling New Dealing, and world-do-gooding. I have not supported a number of measures and appropriations enacted for foreign aid and assistance. I voted against UNRRA, against the British loan, and against one or two other relief bills, not that I was wholly opposed to their proposed objectives but primarily because the amounts involved appeared excessive and the machinery established for their administration and for the supervision and control of such expenditures was faulty and inadequate to insure the wise distribution and expenditure of the funds involved. Under the programs of assistance provided by those measures, I was convinced only a comparatively small percentage of benefits would accrue and that we were loosely spending $3 to $4 for every $1 in value of results that would be accomplished. Subsequent events, have, I believe, fully vindicated my position.

But I am strongly persuaded now that without our help many independent, sovereign governments of Europe—in fact, probably all of them—would be utterly helpless and defenseless against and at the abject mercy of the onrushing tide of atheistic, communistic aggression.

If all Europe should be encompassed by Red dictatorship, another world war would be certain and inevitable. These considerations were compelling reasons and factors in my decision and vote in support of the European recovery program.

The instability of international relations, which indicate the strong possibility—if not the positive danger—of another war, makes imperative large expenditures at home for national defense and preparedness. The present program of financial aid and assistance to foreign countries is in excess of $7,000,000,000 annually for the next fiscal year, and will be that amount or more possibly for the next four, and the increased cost of armaments and military preparedness superimposed on current heavy regular Federal obligations imposes an economic burden upon our peope unprecedented in the life of our Government.

This is unfortunate for us and tragic for the world. We will spend some $13,500,000,000 during the next fiscal year for national defense, and it is estimated by competent authorities that by 1951 this cost will rise to approximately $20,000,000,000—more likely to $25,000,000,000. These estimates are not mine, they have been made by competent authority and are regarded as conservative. The enactment of universal military training would add an addition $3,000,000,000 to $4,000,000,000 to the present or to any future military budget.

If we were not compelled to make these extraordinary expenditures for national defense we could easily reduce taxes by another $5,000,000,000 or more and continue to provide reasonable financial assistance abroad. We could also divert our productive capacity that is now turning out implements of war to the production of goods and commodities which the life, comfort, and happiness of millions of human beings will require.

When we hear or read the phrase "Keep America Strong" too often we think only in terms of military power. But strength and power of a democracy are not reposed alone in military armaments. Sound fiscal policies are essential. Continuous or prolonged deficit spending, adding billions annually to our unprecedented national debt, will not only weaken our solvency, but can lead to national bankruptcy. The three great bulwarks against the infiltration and invasion of foreign ideologies into our philosophy of life and government are our basic constitutional freedoms, the productive power of our free-enterprise system, and the solvency and financial might of our Government.

Based on present and estimated Federal revenues of forty to forty-two billion dollars annually, there is a definite prospect that in meeting these extraordinary expenditures we shall incur deficits of $5,000,000,000 or more for the next 3 or 4 years. That is on the basis of present cost of Government and current commitments and obligations and does not allow for the cost new laws will incur and of administering new laws and programs not related to foreign aid and national defense, which the President in special messages since the beginning of this session of Congress has recommended that the Congress enact.

If this Congress should take the President seriously and pass all the laws he has recommended at this session expanding existing social welfare programs and authorizing new ones, the annual cost of the Federal Government would be increased by $15,000,000,000 to $20,000,000,000. Just three of the laws he has asked Congress to pass at this session—a national health program, the expansion of the social-security program to include some 15,000,000 to 20,000,000 of citizens not now covered by present law, and a national housing program similar to the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill—will add $12,000,000,000 to $15,000,000,000 to Federal expenditures annually. If Congress should follow these recommendations, we would have more than a $60,000,000,000 budget by 1951 and an annual deficit of nearly $20,000,000,000.

How can we meet this recommended and anticipated additional cost of Government? Such Federal revenues must come from higher taxation—by taking more and more of the profits of business, by taking from the white collar worker a larger percentage of his salary, by taking a bigger cut in withholding taxes out of the laborer's wages. Can business, salaried employees, and labor stand another $20,000,000,000 a year in higher taxes? Can they pay that much more? Do they want to pay that much more? The only other alternatives are printing-press money and disastrous inflation, or, charging it against the lives, earnings, and industry of future generations. The latter would certainly lead ultimately to a dishonorable and impoverished heritage that we would leave to the next generation. Liberty and democracy cannot long survive in America if this is to be our standard and quality of stewardship and responsibility.

I simply leave with you this thought and admonition: When you write and urge your Congressman and Senators to vote for a new law that will increase the already staggering cost of government, in all fairness to them please add a postscript to your letter saying you are willing to have your own taxes correspondingly increased to help pay the bill. My own philosophy is that however much we may desire the benefits of any proposed social-welfare program, we have no moral right to take and enjoy such benefits and charge their cost to Americans yet unborn. As an American citizen and as a Member of Congress, I am unwilling to establish a standard of living for our Government and our people that we cannot afford and charge a huge deficit each year to my children and grandchildren and to yours.

Confronted with these colossal costs, the Congress is faced squarely with the imperative necessity of practicing the most rigid economy with respect to Federal expenditures. It must differentiate between proposed expenditures and objectives that may be desirable, even highly desirable, and those in the class of absolute essentials. If the membership of Congress is to possess and exercise that high order of statesmanship that will be required of it to do its full duty and discharge this important obligation to the country, it must have the moral and political support of the citizenship of this Nation. Each individual as a citizen and taxpayer must share some of the responsibility by supporting, upholding, and reelecting Members of Congress who have the moral and patriotic courage to disregard in many instances their own immediate political fortunes by serving their country first instead of yielding to the dictates of political expediency.

If the Congress of the United States and the people of this Nation are unwilling to make and if they do not make the necessary economic and political sacrifices to maintain sound fiscal policies and national solvency, we shall invite perils and dangers of a magnitude that will shake the very foundations of our liberties and our democracy.

There are other real dangers to our liberties and to the constitutional government that we must guard against and oppose with all of our might and strength. Many devious ways are employed—by legislation, by administrative fiat, and by court decisions—to circumvent and violate the letter, the spirit, and the plain mandates of the Federal Constitution, the fundamental law of the land. The most recent and one of the most vicious assaults on our constitutional liberties and State's rights was made by injecting into national legislation the issue of so-called and misnamed civil rights, as recommended in the report of the President's 15-member Commission on Civil Rights and by the President to the Congress in his civil-rights message of February 2, this year.

This proposal that the Federal Government usurp many of the powers and rights reserved to the States and to the people themselves by the tenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States is one of the most flagrant abuses of Federal authority ever attempted in the history of our Government. If this program is enacted into law, the power and authority of bureaucratic rule and domination over the social, economic, and political life of States and individual citizens will be established on a fashion that compares with the rule of totalitarian dictatorship.

Instead of preserving and implementing the Bill of Rights, this proposed legislation will destroy the very freedom that its proponents claim it will protect and defend.

The implications of this program are far-reaching and the full extent of their ultimate consequences and repercussions upon our form of government, our free-enterprise system, and our personal liberties can hardly be estimated or foreseen.

The imposition of Federal power over the States in the field of criminal law enforcement, the denying of States their constitutional right to determine and establish the qualifications of their electors, the establishing of a Federal bureau to tell the employer

whom he must employ and whom he may discharge in the conduct of his business, and the imposing of Federal sanctions and penalties against States and individuals that do not conform but who insist on their constitutional rights, is a form of national tyranny and oppression that if pursued will destroy the great heritage of freedom that we have so long cherished and enjoyed.

At a time when unity is the very essence of our national strength and security, it is a tragedy that this violent and bitter controversy should be injected into the social, political, and economic life of our people.

These are some of the many vital and perplexing problems and issues that your national lawmakers are called upon to solve and to resolve. They require the greatest wisdom and highest order of statesmanship and legislation of which we are capable. But I have an abiding faith and confidence in the final judgment and decision of the American people, and with their moral and political support, the Congress of the United States can and will preserve the sovereignty, the solvency, and the constitutional integrity of our Government and the liberties, happiness, and prosperity of our people.

A-Shopping She Did Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial from the May 13, 1948, issue of the Staff Press, published in Stafford Springs, Conn.

Stafford Springs is a small town, with a population of slightly over 3,000, but its problems of run-away prices and increasing cost of living are as great as those you will find in any large city, be it Los Angeles or Washington.

A-SHOPPING SHE DID GO

Mrs. DOUGLAS went shopping the other day.

Her shopping was done in Washington, D. C., and she learned that prices of food staples had leaped by astronomical percentages in the lowest-priced chain store there since the removal of OPA, roughly 2 years ago. In June 1946 to be precise.

Mrs. DOUGLAS is HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, Representative from the Fourteenth District of California. She was authorized by the House to go shopping on behalf of the American housewife to determine the price differential before and after. Before Mr. Bowles' department was discontinued by the drive of the National Association of Manufacturers. After greedy interests had had their way with prices for nearly 24 months.

What did Mrs. DOUGLAS find out? She found out plenty. She brought back a market basket filled with high-priced merchandise that cost about 50 percent (generally) more than the same basket full cost in 1946. That increase applies generally throughout the country—in Stafford as well as in the Capital of the Nation.

In her report to her fellow Representatives after she had filled her market basket, Mrs. DOUGLAS remarked:

"* * * a little over a year ago I reported to the House on what had happened to the cost of living in the first year of decontrol when we were asked to let prices seek their natural level in the open market. Remember the decontrol that the NAM promised would bring good for everybody at prices they could afford to pay and a better tomorrow?

"I reported on the NAM's 'better tomorrow' last year, and found it far short of the promises made. We were told then that the NAM 'tomorrow' had not been given enough time to dawn. Well, now we have given them another year, and where are prices?"

Mrs. DOUGLAS answers her own question by pointing a telescope away up there in the heavens to locate the prices, they have soared so high.

Here are some of the findings made by Mrs. DOUGLAS on her shopping tour:

Under OPA a pound of the best butter cost 65 cents. Last year that pound cost 82 cents. This year the pound costs 93 cents. (That is, of course, in Washington. There may be a price differential in Stafford—a lower differential.)

A dozen eggs cost 53 cents under OPA, 65 cents today.

Three pounds of round steak cost $1.35 under OPA, $2.76 today.

Two pounds of Maxwell House coffee cost 60 cents under OPA, $1.06 today. (The price in Stafford is higher: $1.16.)

To mention a few other increases:

Two pounds of pork chops cost 76 cents under OPA, $1.66 today.

One pound of a certain brand of margarine cost 18 cents under OPA, 40 cents today.

Two pounds of boneless stew beef 70 cents under OPA, $1.46 today.

Three pounds of Crisco 68 cents under OPA, $1.28 today.

One pound of Swift Premium bacon, 42 cents under OPA, 75 cents today.

Other food staple prices charged in filling Mrs. DOUGLAS' basket were equally high, prices which turn the average pocketbook into a limp, useless, drained thing.

Well, you did have to vote Republican in 1946.

To paraphrase the Republican slogan of that year: Paid Enough?

Western State College Commencement Address by Palmer Hoyt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on May 27 Palmer Hoyt, editor and publisher of the Denver Post, delivered an inspiring and timely commencement address at Western State College, Gunnison, Colo. In this address Mr. Hoyt dealt realistically with the Russian challenge, and presented a plan of action which, if followed, might bring peace with honor in our time. I deem this speech so important that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD for the benefit of students of present-day diplomacy, and especially for the benefit of interested Members of Congress.

I am informed that the printing of the address in the RECORD will require 2⅓ pages, at a cost of $165.67. However, I am very anxious to have the address published in the Appendix of the RECORD; and therefore I ask consent that it be published there, notwithstanding the cost.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF HOYT SPEECH AT WESTERN STATE COLLEGE

I

President Mickelson, the faculty, the graduating class of 1948, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a privilege to be here today to address myself to those of you who by graduating are entering more actively into the affairs of this brave new world of ours.

I congratulate you on completing this important step in your lives, but warn you from the experience of one who himself was graduated 25 years ago and has lived in a fast-changing world, your education has but started.

Today this most dangerous and interesting world places a high premium on the truly educated man or woman. It may well be that the price of our survival will be to be truly and adequately informed.

Far too many people of today take an overly pessimistic view of the shape of things to come. I grant that our existence in this year of our Lord 1948 is a perilous one, and I concede that the atomic bomb hangs like a futuristic Democlean sword threatening our very lives.

I will agree that man in his mad and successful search for the infinite has created a situation where for the first time civilization can by self-immolation end its very existence.

WORLD'S CHALLENGE

However, the world today also presents its greatest challenge in all history. Science has thrown down the gauntlet—man must control the forces he has set in motion if he is to survive. Perhaps from this Western State College graduating class of 1948 the thought patterns that will control these cataclysmic tides will be generated.

You who leave these cloistered halls today enter a world vibrant with troublous and serious problems—problems that demand immediate attention and solution, but you also enter a world of opportunity unequaled in the long and tortured history of mankind.

To paraphrase an old saying "The world is your oyster," I beseech you to open it.

II

Some 7 years ago I had the privilege of delivering the commencement address at Pacific University near Portland, Oreg. It was shortly after the German conquest of France. I referred in my talk to the dramatic and historic speech made by Paul Renaud to the French Senate on May 21, 1940. The Germans had just breached the French line on a 62-mile front. Arras and Amiens had fallen to the Teuton tidal wave.

FRENCH CRUSHED

It was on that day that the French first realized that their army of 5,000,000 men—the greatest army in the world—was hopelessly beaten. On the day that Premier Renaud rose to give the official word of their crushing defeat, a million and a half French soldiers—the finest troops in the world—were in hopeless flight.

It was the blackest day that France had known in her entire history. Premier Renaud's speech to the French Senate was the first official word to the French Nation that they were beaten.

His official pronouncement came like a death knell when he said:

"The truth, gentlemen, is that our classic conception of the conduct of war clashed with new conceptions. The bases of these new conceptions are not only mass uses of armored divisions, there is not only cooperation between armored divisions and fighting

planes • • • there is a determination to disorganize an enemy in the rear by deep thrusts, by parachutists, who in Holland almost took The Hague, and who in Belgium took the most powerful of the Liege forts by orders given on telephone lines which caused premature evacuation."

This was the first official admission that France was not prepared by equipment, by understanding, by tactics.

The hour was dark. It was defeat. The taste was bitter in the mouths of Frenchmen. In his brilliant address, the French Premier called on the United States for a cloud of planes. He said: "If I were told that a miracle was needed to save France, I would say, 'I am a believer in miracles.'" The cloud of planes and the miracle did come—finally—and France was saved. They did not come that day as Premier Renaud called on God and America to save his beloved fatherland—years went by before those planes came, but they came and still it was a miracle.

THE UNITED STATES MIRACLE

The miracle came, for America is itself a miracle. America is a living shrine of human freedom, America is God's pledge to civilization of the dignity and freedom of the human soul.

The United States of America was founded and a war was fought because our forefathers believed tremendously in freedom. And we have enjoyed that freedom—that great freedom. And today in this calm and peaceful spot in the center of one of the most beautiful areas in this America of ours, may I suggest that such freedom as we have enjoyed connotes and implies great responsibilities.

There are many reasons why America could not in 1940 and cannot today sit idly by and see freedom pass from the rest of the world. One of these reasons is very selfish, for if freedom passed from the rest of the world then it would surely pass from this, its greatest stronghold. And if freedom passed, so would pass the civilization that you and your fathers and your forefathers have known and worked and fought for.

But those freedoms will not pass—the freedom of religion—the freedom of assembly—the freedom of expression, of speech and of the press—freedom to be governed by designated representatives. These things will not pass, for there will be a miracle, and you are that miracle, you, and the countless millions like you.

Seven years ago as I spoke in Oregon, France, historic temple of human liberty, was in danger, the world itself was periled.

America, coming tardily to realization of the threat Hitler's police state held for civilization, armed herself and her allies and the superstate a madman had created was toppled in the mud. Civilization was saved; the whole world rejoiced.

But now, only 3 years after the fall of Hitler, totalitarianism is again on the march. Josef Stalin has replaced Adolf Hitler as a symbol of slavery.

Again freedom is threatened and America must assume and maintain her role as world leader and militant champion of democracy. This time there is a difference. America has been alerted before the battle is joined and if we can become strong and stay strong, there is good hope that war will not come. It is well that this is so because this time a strong fifth column marches within our borders.

III

I spoke to you of the problems that you face. They are legion. We need to activate our democracy; we need, as Drew Pearson says, to "make democracy live."

We have pressing puzzles in our economy that demand solution.

There is the whole field of broadening opportunity for our citizens which embraces housing, public and private; employment and unemployment; fair treatment, guaranteed under the law, for minority groups, both racial and religious; public health; adequate social security and education.

That outline but touches the over-all problem of domestic needs, needs that must be filled if our way of life is to become the enduring goal of the whole world.

PEACE CRUCIAL

There is, however, a problem, universal in scope, that is much more pressing than the ones I have cited. There is the problem of peace. For, without peace, there is no chance to solve any of our other problems.

It seems to me that there are four ways to look at peace.

1. Peace at any price. This is the peace of the pacifist, and I think we can all agree that any such consideration is not only stupid and silly, but criminal as well.

2. The Roman peace. That is peace enforced by our arms. We can't have another war which will result in the end of civilization. It would be suicide and too expensive to buy.

3. Peace at a price, but one we can't pay. This is the Wallace plan, as I see it. This is appeasement and blind belief and toadyism.

4. Peace at a price we can and must pay. As I see it, this is our best and only chance for survival in this troubled world. This means adequate and immediate armament to insure an armistice while we are approaching and achieving the broad base upon which peace must be built.

GUILT COMPLEX

Before we further discuss peace as such, I would like to bring to your attention one of the dangerous habits of too many American intellectuals. It is the active indulgence in the guilt complex.

If you listen to Henry Wallace or GLEN TAYLOR or a host of other prominent Americans, you would believe that America is entirely and solely responsible for the cold war now carried on between Russia and the United States.

Let's look at the record for a moment. Think back to the days following VE-day and VJ-day. To put it in the simplest terms possible, I would say it this way: You could have got your nose punched in August of 1945 if you had said anything on the street against the Russians. The Americans believed fully in the integrity and good intentions of their allies.

The situation now has almost completely reversed itself. You would find it much easier to get your nose punched today by saying something for the Russians rather than against them.

RUSSIAN FOLLY

In October 1946 I was in Berlin, and while there I had the pleasure of meeting a number of the faculty members of the University of Berlin. One of them I shall never forget; she was a wise old fraulein, a doctor and a professor at the University of Berlin.

This learned old woman said to me, "The Russians are such fools and such barbarians." I said to her, "Granted, but what of it?" and she replied.

"Well, it's like this. All the rolling stock in the Russian zone of Germany is loaded down with dismantled German factories. They are on sidings all the way to the Polish borders, probably these factories will never be reassembled. If they are, they will be inefficient and set up in such a manner as to make their productivity definitely uneconomical. Now, I want to show you what fools the Russians really are. If they would be nice to you Americans, and tell you that they were all for peace and prosperity and stop their expansive aggression for a few years, you would not only go in and build the factories they need, but loan them $10,000,000,000 as well."

The doctor made a tremendous point there. And if we look at the record, we will find that Russia has disagreed with the United States on virtually every issue and every point brought up that might insure or promote peace since the end of the war. This is not a matter of my opinion, but is a matter of documentable fact.

Which brings us pretty sharply to the recent exchange of letters between Mr. Wallace and Mr. Stalin. In the first place, this is an unfriendly act by a supposed friendly power. In the second place, the points made by Mr. Stalin are without merit for the simple reason that there is not a single issue suggested in the Wallace-Stalin correspondence that the Russians could not settle without a bilateral discussion.

REDS UNWILLING

Take for example the big point, arms reduction and prohibition of atomic weapons. This is in the United Nations committee, and Mr. Stalin could move into that tomorrow if he wished to. It is a matter of history that the Russians have not been willing to consider disarmament in the terms necessitated by this age of scientific mass killing.

Another point made in Mr. Stalin's answer to Mr. Wallace's letter is the resumption of the free movement of students, scientists, and the free exchange of scientific information. We have such an arrangement with all the nations on earth except the Russians and we have repeatedly tried to get them to make us a similar deal. In this connection it is interesting to note that Russia has refused to have anything to do with UNESCO.

Another one. Speedy peace treaties with Germany and Japan. These, of course, have to be written by the Allies, and to this Stalin objects. As a matter of fact, all Stalin has to do to achieve this end is to quit violating the treaties he has signed.

A further point: That is the evacuation of American and Russian troops from China and Korea. At the present time there are no combat troops in either country, and all Mr. Stalin has to do is to honor his treaties with China and cease to supply Red armies in both China and Korea.

Another point which might be worth mentioning in passing is that relating to the respect for the sovereignty of individual countries and noninterference in their domestic affairs. The Wallace-Stalin interchange is an excellent example of the way Russia enters the domestic affairs of other countries.

Actually, of course, the Russians don't want any firmer peace talks than they now have access to. They are committed to a continuance of their expansive aggressionism and are unlikely to desist until they are forced to do so by the strength of other countries banded together in a world network of freedom.

KREMLIN LOGIC

In view of all this, what should be our attitude toward Russia? In the first place, we should try to understand them. We should remember that from the standpoint of Russian political leaders, their course is very logical.

We should remember that one of the ways to get world peace is through world government, and that to the Russian mind means just one thing—a world of Communist government—a universal police state. Obviously, we cannot go along with that—it would mean slavery for all of us.

IV

One of the great problems of peace today is the fact that there are in this world two basic ideologies that are at complete variance with one another. One, communism, totalitarianism, the slave state, the police state; the other, democracy, liberty, and freedom.

There must, of course, be a sharp clash between these two ideologies. Mr. Wallace has

attempted to bridge the gap, but it cannot be bridged merely by the use of such idle terms as "economic democracy" with which Mr. Wallace describes the Russian system. That has no realism, and no weight.

REALISTIC VIEW

In this connection I would like to quote from the Freedom Train speech made by Mr. Justice Douglas in Denver last week:

"It is time that we were no longer misled by the Communist mirage of freedom, equality, and opportunity. As realists, we must look at communism, as it is practiced by Communists today. For communism in actual operation on the world scene is as destructive of democratic values as the tsarism that preceded it or the fascism whose mad march we stopped only recently."

In looking at peace, we certainly have to be realistic. Any other view is stupid and suicidal.

What is Russia's intent toward the world in general and us in particular? It has been written down many times.

Adolf Hitler wrote his pattern of conquest in Mein Kampf. In that book he painstakingly laid out the course of empire as he hoped it would be. Furthermore he gave in great detail the methods he planned to pursue. Later he followed Mein Kampf almost to the letter. And yet too few people in the high places read the book, or if they did, paid any attention to it. For example, I learned only the other day that Neville Chamberlain, the goat of Munich, had never bothered to read Mein Kampf. It is barely possible that had he read this fearful outline of planned destruction, history might have been different.

RUSSIAN DESIGN

If there are any who doubt the intent of the Russians in their world conquest, I recommend as outstanding three books, The October Revolution, The Problems of Leninism, and Foundations of Leninism. There one will learn beyond peradventure of the plan which the Russians have for all of us.

Specifically in this connection, I would like to quote from V. I. Lenin, the founding father of the Soviet Union who laid down the principal of world conquest to his followers:

I quote from Lenin:

"We repudiate all morality that proceeds from supernatural ideas or ideas that are outside class conceptions. In our opinion, morality is entirely subordinate to the interests of the class war; everything is moral that is necessary for the annihilation of the old exploiting social order and for the union of the proletariat. Our morality thus consists solely in close discipline and in conscious war against the exploiters. We do not believe in eternal principles of morality and we will expose this deception. Communist morality is identical with the fight for the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat."

"COOING" BEAR

Barnet Nover, distinguished columnist, in his Sunday article in the Denver Post, When the Bear Begins to Coo, followed the Lenin quotation with these observations:

"In view of this attitude, which the history of Soviet Russia has exemplified from the start, it would seem to be a matter of elementary prudence, in dealing with Russia, to be on the strictest guard when the Soviet Bear begins cooing like a dove of peace.

"This does not mean that we should not welcome and encourage every genuine manifestation of peace on the part of the Kremlin. Of course we should. But it would be the rankest folly on our part to let ourselves be fooled by calculatedly deceptive gestures of peace; accept the shadow for the substance.

"Once burned, twice shy. In their dealings with Soviet leaders, American statesmen from Roosevelt and Hull to Truman and Marshall have discovered, not once but innumerable times, that it is extremely difficult to pin the Russians down, that when they are pinned down there is no assurance that they will live up to the commitments they make, and that when they cynically violate those commitments they insist that they are actually living up to them.

"It is hardly surprising, then, that the Molotov-Stalin peace offensive has met with a decidedly cool reception in Washington. To enter into negotiations with Russia, as the Soviet leaders now suggest, would, administration and congressional leaders realize, serve no useful purpose unless there is full assurance that these negotiations will have a happier outcome than past negotiations have had."

FALSE PROPHETS

I would like to recommend to Mr. Henry Wallace and Senator GLEN TAYLOR that they read the books I have mentioned and that they read the above quotations from Lenin, father of the Soviet, and from Mr. Barnet Nover.

What are we to believe? It is certainly not the voices of false prophets, either those who advocate war as a means to peace or those who with equal stupidity advocate appeasement as a sure course to a sane world.

Rather, let us be calm and realistic. The fact is that one of the reasons for Stalin's gesture in waving the plastic olive branch was that communism hasn't been doing so well of late. The Communists lost the Italian election overwhelmingly. They are virtually out of the French Government. They have been kicked out of a majority of American labor unions because intelligent people are beginning to see behind the false front of false and dishonest peace claims which the Russians avow.

Another reason, of course, why the Russians are cooing like the Woolworth dove is because the Marshall plan is beginning to work, and with western Europe on its feet, the Politburo is realistic enough to know that the Russians will have a hard time spreading the seeds of disunion, disorder, and destruction.

NO SELL-OUT

Of course, we must continue to make every reasonable overture to the Russians within and without the frame work of the United Nations. However, I wish to point out at this juncture that bilateral peace conversations such as are proposed by Joseph Stalin and Henry Wallace are highly improper and would be supplying the Russians propaganda to use against us in Europe.

The effect of the United States joining Russia in peace talks would be incalculably bad on the countries that we are trying to help. They would immediately think that they were being sold out to the Russians just as the democracies, many of them, were sold out to the Nazis in the dark years preceding the Second World War.

No, rather we must be strong and calm and forceful. We must develop the strongest armament ever maintained by a democracy in peacetime. Russia respects strength, and there is little doubt in my mind but that the almost unanimous passage of the 70-group air force bill by the Congress, signed by the President, had a wholesome effect upon the Russians' attitude toward this country.

There are many reasons why we must be strong. Not the least of them is that to prevent the Russians from doing a foolish and untoward thing.

This Nation must be so strong that totalitarianism not only will be afraid to attack us openly, but will be on constant guard against incidents that might cause the world to stumble into war. We must not forget that inadvertent acts have caused great conflicts.

The Russians today are rearming at an incredible rate. Figures are not available, but we know they are building many times more airplanes than we are, and we know that they are maintaining a vast army numbering high in the millions.

Therefore, it behooves us to be strong enough so that the Russians will not attempt any silly invasion nor attempt to use the strength they say they are accumulating for peace in any ill-destined way.

SILLY CHARGE

One of the dangerous charges repeatedly hurled by Henry Wallace, Senator TAYLOR, and other irresponsible critics is that the administration, Wall Street, the military, and the newspapers want war. I do not believe this. I do not believe that any enlightened person today wants war.

All intelligent persons know that with the atomic bomb, bacteriological warfare, deadly rockets, superincendiaries can denude the surface of the earth and destroy all life. It would be silly to want war. I personally have talked to many of our national leaders. I do not believe they want war. I cannot believe that Wall Street and the military want war despite the claims of Mr. Stalin, Mr. Wallace, and Mr. Taylor.

Such an idiotic claim perils the imagination, and I will not subscribe to it. In fact, the greatest argument I have heard for peace in a long time was the argument presented before the Air Policy Commission by Dwight D. Eisenhower, former commander in chief of the Allied forces in Europe.

To me this is another bit of dust throwing typical of Mr. Wallace's shallow thinking and his complete infatuation with the Daily Worker's editorial page.

However, despite those who shout "Warmonger" at anyone who would preserve the peace of the world and the integrity of the United States, America is rearming not for war but for peace.

A reflection of the desperate world situation and the recognition which the country gives it, is the vote on the 70-group air force plan which was passed with only three negative votes in the House of Representatives and only two in the Senate. This remarkable and unprecedented support indicates that our political overlords have finally come to realize that the situation is serious. They reflect accurately the thinking of the people. We face many other defense problems, indeed, but we are moving toward rearming in the air, the major present medium of warfare.

V

What must we do to be secure?

First we should remember that no armament, no matter how great, can give us more than relative security. We must remember that absolute security can only come when this world decides to live under a world government of law. That is a long way off. However, it is something toward which we are working.

In this connection I would like to point out the most difficult obstacle. We cannot have a world government by law until the peoples of the earth are as well informed as the peoples of the United States. It is an unfortunate truth that more than half of the 2,000,000,000 people who inhabit the globe are still in darkness about most of the things that you and I know about so casually. For example, the Russians, as a people, are unaware of the frightful compulsion that the atomic bomb connotes. They know little about the deadly potential of bacteriological warfare. They do not know because it behooves their leaders to tell them only that they are safe as long as they have the huge Red army.

FAITH IN FACTS

Before this world government by law can come about, there must be an elimination of censorships. People must base their judgments on a common set of facts. As Thomas Jefferson said repeatedly in his writings, "I

have the greatest faith in the intelligence of the average man if only he is in possession of the facts."

It will be a long time before the average man is in possession of the facts, but we as a government, we as a people, and we as individuals should do everything in our power to press home the point that every possible treaty should be effected which eliminates peacetime censorship whether it be bilateral or multilateral. We should continuously urge action by the United Nations toward the establishment of the free flow of news and communications throughout the world.

True freedom in communications, in travel, and in freedom of expression—which, of course, includes the press and radio—can form the actual and permanent foundation of peace.

UNITED STATES POLICY

In the meantime, we must adopt, with all our heart and strength, a national policy which calls for full support of the United Nations. We must have adequate armament so that we are strong enough that none will dare attack us. We must have the Marshall plan which provides economic aid for other countries. We must develop our democracy into a living thing. We must have an international policy, a clear understanding with all the nations of the earth that we will come to the aid of any nation threatened with aggression.

And, in final closing, I would reemphasize that this world cannot long continue to exist half informed and half uninformed, and that we can have peace in our time if we will it, and if the free nations are strong enough to enforce it.

Shopping Trip Shows Grocery Dollar's Sharp Shrinkage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting article that was sent to me from Beaumont, Tex., which appeared in the Sunday Enterprise on May 30, 1948.

My speech before this House or April 28, 1948, on what is happening to the cost of living seems to have struck a responsive chord in that city. An Enterprise reporter decided to find out for herself how the rising cost of living was affecting Beaumont. A shopping tour convinced her that $10 today buys only a fraction of what it did a few years ago.

Unfortunately the photographs showing the decrease in the purchasing power of the dollar in terms of quantities of commodities cannot be reproduced here. But the article itself, with the revealing prices, can:

SHOPPING TRIP SHOWS GROCERY DOLLAR'S SHARP SHRINKAGE

To find out how far a dollar earmarked for groceries goes today in comparison with the good old days, an Enterprise reporter spent a few hours last week poring over food ads in the newspaper's bound files of yesteryear.

The results of the research only add more fuel to the fire set under Congress recently by beauteous but brainy HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, United States Representative from California. Marching indignantly down to the front, Mrs. DOUGLAS plunked a basketful of groceries on the Speaker's table and described its meager contents as all I could buy for $16.23 in the lowest-priced chain store in Washington.

Last year, she declared, the same assortment would have cost $15.02, and in 1946 under OPA, $10.08.

A $10 BILL IN BEAUMONT

"The housewife," further fumed the legislator, "cannot feed her family on speeches and declarations of Americanism. Although incomes have gone up, actual purchasing power has dropped $7,000,000,000 since OPA days."

How far can an average Beaumont housewife—one, say, with two children and a husband to feed—make a $10 bill stretch in today's market?

The reporter decided to find out. First of all a call was made on the county home demonstration agent, Mrs. Katie Pruitt. What, please, was the minimum good diet for the average person?

STANDARD DIET

Mrs. Pruitt consulted the chart issued by the Texas food standards bureau.

"Here's what they call a good diet * * * or what each individual should have every day," she said.

The diet: One pint to one quart milk (children under 16 should have three-fourths to one quart a day); one egg (dried beans, peas or nuts may be substituted); one serving of meat (poultry, cheese, beans or nuts may be substituted); one serving Irish or sweetpotatoes; one green or yellow vegetable; one other vegetable, such as dried beans or peas.

One serving of citrus, tomato, raw cabbage, strawberries, or melon; one other serving of fruit; one serving of whole grain product such as oatmeal, whole-wheat bread, rice; butter or margarine; some sweets for energy; six to eight glasses of water.

After multiplying these basic terms by four and shopping half-a-dozen stores, the reporter discovered that about the only thing the harried housewife can give her family in the prescribed proportions is the water.

HERE'S WHAT ONE GETS

By hurrying sternly past the luxury counters, and not always buying first quality brands, this Enterprise experimental shopper managed to purchase the following with the afore-mentioned $10 plus 4 cents:

Six quarts of milk, $1.44; 2 dozen eggs, 90 cents; 4 pounds veal roast, $2.36; two 1½-pound loaves bread, 36 cents; 4 pounds cabbage, 14 cents; 1 pound onions, 8 cents; two bunches carrots, 20 cents; 1 pound coffee, 36 cents; three tall cans condensed milk, 41 cents.

One pound bacon, 55 cents; 1 pound margarine, 41 cents; 2 pounds dried beans, 27 cents; 5 pounds sugar, 39 cents; 1 dozen oranges, 45 cents, 1 pound cheese, 59 cents; 5 pounds flour, 39 cents; 1 pound lard, 29 cents; one box oatmeal, 15 cents; 5 pounds potatoes, 28 cents.

To go into much detail about the prices of these opulent times and those of 1933, for instance, when the depression was at its blackest, might cause too many alligator tears. Those were the days, remember, when pork chops sold for 12 cents a pound, bacon for 15, butter for 22, liver for 8, hamburger and veal roast for 7½, eggs for 19, and chuck roast for 5 cents.

AND BACK IN 1928

But, comparatively speaking, it's fair enough to hark back to the halcyon days of 1928 when there was money enough for at least one or two chickens in every pot. Then $10 worth of groceries were almost more than two healthy stevedores could hoist, to wit:

Eight quarts milk, 96 cents; 10 pounds potatoes, 22 cents; 1 pound bacon, 16 cents; 2 pounds porkchops, 33 cents; 3 dozen eggs, 99 cents; 20 pounds flour, 80 cents; 3 pounds shortening, 57 cents; one large box soap powder, 21 cents; 6 pounds roast beef, $1.54; one 5-pound picnic ham, 95 cents.

One pound butter, 37 cents; eight 1-pound loaves bread, 56 cents; 1 pound cheese, 25 cents; 2 dozen oranges, 25 cents; 10 pounds sugar, 49 cents; 5 pounds prunes, 35 cents; 2 pounds stew meat, 25 cents; 5 pounds cream meal, 17 cents; two boxes oatmeal, 15 cents; 10 pounds rice, 44 cents.

That totals $10.01.

DON'T BLAME THE GROCER

One of the small independent grocers with whom the reporter talked got a hunted look in his eyes when he discovered the purpose of the research.

"Lady," he implored, "please, lady, for the love of Pete, make it plain that we little grocers aren't to blame. We don't set the prices, the times do. I'm not gettin' rich by a long shot. Just ask anybody who sells food for living. Our margin of profit is too small."

The manager of a large chain store dittoed his independent colleague's statements.

"Couple of years ago you could buy enough roundsteak for $1.35 to feed a big family. Now it costs at least $2.25. I don't know who's making the extra 95 cents. Not us."

So that's the way it is. The way Representative DOUGLAS puts it, "Excuses, party slogans, trumped-up charges, whipping boys, and accusations are not going to be accepted by the housewives of America whether they be Democratic or Republican. They want action."

One thing is quite clear, though: That Texas food standard "good diet" is certainly taking a beating.

Compulsions on the Twenty-seventh District of New York for World WPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, within a few days now, certainly before this session of Congress adjourns, we will have appropriated several billions of dollars to take care of the first year's cost to the American taxpayer of what has been called the Marshall plan, the European relief program, and the Economic Cooperation Administration. On the basis of information that has come to Members of Congress on this plan during recent weeks, it is clear that the Marshall plan for the relief of undernourished men, women, and children has turned into an Economic Cooperation Administration for the utilization of about 80 percent of its funds on a huge world-wide WPA socialist program to be financed at the expense of the men, women, and children of America.

Certainly the sending of coal, oil, steel, tobacco, coffee, and machinery is not to

satisfy starvation but rather, in many cases, to keep up trade and prices at home in this election year of 1948.

Aside from the relief of starvation abroad, I find it difficult to tell the citizens of Putnam County that they will be committed to an outlay of $2,137,416 as their share of this proposed economic cooperation. It is especially difficult when the Minister of Industry and Commerce for France says that "For the first time France has more coal at her disposal than she can transport"—referring to the rich Saar coal fields assigned to France. England and Poland are also offering to sell coal, which France refuses to buy because she expects the United States of America to give her 6,750,000 tons each quarter for the next three quarters. Can people whose emotions were whipped into a willingness to make sacrifices for the starving find justification in the questionable politics of this unique commerce in coal?

According to the 1940 census there are 281,253 men, women, and children in that part of Westchester County which is within the Twenty-seventh Congressional District. If the total program of the Economic Cooperation Administration is carried out, these people, according to figures prepared by the Library of Congress, will be charged the fantastic sum of $36,312,575. Will the people of Bronxville, Yonkers, Ossining, and Dobbs Ferry applaud or condemn the imposition upon them, respectively, of $889,310, $18,410,828, $2,065,244, and $759,554, if I find as their Representative that comparatively little of this money is going to feed the starving of Europe?

A most astonishing piece of information has just been uncovered by the House Select Committee on Foreign Aid working with the United States Tariff Commission. They find that instead of Norway and Denmark requiring several hundred thousand tons of fats and oil from the United States under the Marshall plan as requested by the Bevin committee's Paris report, those countries are expected to have large exportable surpluses. This of course reduces the need for food as represented to us by the Marshall plan experts. On behalf of my constituents in Bronxville, Yonkers, Ossining, and Dobbs Ferry I demand a revision of these figures to show the actual food needs that must be met before consenting to the imposition of further tax burdens.

It is right that we should know that the appropriations will serve the purposes which the Congress was originally told they would serve. Until these assurances are forthcoming, it behooves me to vote against appropriations for food and materials that seem to be needed more to consolidate a socialistic bureaucracy abroad and keep up prices on surpluses of many commodities at home than to feed the hungry.

Mr. Hoffman himself has said that he and his aides can see but a little way ahead. I believe that we should appropriate for needs of food only as far ahead as Messrs. Truman, Marshall, and Hoffman can see. In the face of the facts as we know them and our inability to see ahead, should the people of Peekskill be committed to a program that will force them to pay approximately $2,235,000, or those of Tuckahoe $847,349, into the Economic Cooperation Administration program? Should the citizens of Hastings-on-Hudson be committed blindly to a program, not to feed the starving, but to manage a world economy, by making a gift to ECA of $911,129?

It is proposed to burden Brewster with $240,532, Carmel with $169,780, Mahopac with $143,183. Even the little town of Nelsonville, with 457 people, is down on the list to contribute $59,003. Even if tobacco is regarded as an item for the relief of the hungry, is it likely that Tarrytown, with its 6,874 population, is so frightened by propaganda to stop communism with dollars that its citizens can read press dispatches telling of the rotting of great quantities of American cigarettes in the portion of Germany we control and be indifferent to the $887,502 burden on it?

I am sure that this is a problem of equal weight and seriousness for the consideration of my 434 colleagues whose towns, counties, and cities are expected to bear the same proportion of burdens and debts for their ECA contributions that apply to my district.

The detailed facts for the Twenty-seventh Congressional District of New York are as follows:

Counties, towns, and cities	Population, 1940	Share of foreign aid proposed under European recovery program 1948–52 (population ×$129.11) based on $17,000,000,000
	I	II
Putnam County	16,555	$2,137,416
Brewster	1,863	240,532
Carmel	1,315	169,780
Cold Spring	1,897	244,922
Garrison	594	76,691
Mahopac	1,109	143,183
Nelsonville	457	59,003
Patterson	538	69,461
Westchester County (Twenty-seventh District only)	281,253	36,312,575
Ardsley	1,423	183,724
Briarcliff Manor	1,830	236,271
Bronxville	6,888	889,310
Buchanan	1,600	206,576
Croton on Hudson	3,843	496,170
Dobbs Ferry	5,883	759,554
Elmsford	3,078	397,401
Hartsdale	2,664	343,949
Hastings on Hudson	7,057	911,129
Jefferson Valley	403	52,031
Irvington	3,272	422,448
North Tarrytown	8,804	1,136,684
Ossining	15,996	2,065,244
Peekskill	17,311	2,235,023
Pleasantville	4,454	575,056
Shrub Oak	640	82,630
Tarrytown	6,874	887,502
Thornwood	1,347	173,911
Tuckahoe	6,563	847,349
Valhalla	2,139	276,166
Verplanck	1,127	145,507
Yonkers	142,598	18,410,828

There is not a citizen in my district who wants to see human beings starve and who would not make personal sacrifices to see that the starving are fed. Nothing short of such a humanitarian purpose, however, should make us willing to commit our fellow citizens to the compulsions of taxation for such a program. I cannot and will not so commit them to a world WPA program without their consent.

Palestine Partition and the Displaced Persons Problem of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 2 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a radio address delivered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] on May 7, 1948, on the Pro and Con program of the National Broadcasting Co., Station WRC, Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PALESTINE PARTITION AND THE DISPLACED PERSONS PROBLEM OF EUROPE

INTRODUCTION BY LEIF EID

Two weeks ago on Pro and Con Representative ED GOSSETT, of Texas, denied that Zionist Jews have any claim on Palestine, economic, political, racial, or religious. He said all immigration to Palestine should stop. The Jews in Europe should stay where they are. Representative GOSSETT said that American activity to promote a Jewish national home would make the Moslem world our enemy, promote chaos in the Middle East, and open the door there to Soviet communism, might even start world war III, and he said we must repudiate definitely and finally the program and aspirations of world Zionism for the creation of a Jewish state in the Holy Land.

Pro and Con's guest tonight, Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, does not agree. Senator MURRAY also is a Democrat who has taken a deep interest in the affairs of Palestine. And here now speaking on the partition of Palestine and the displaced person's problem, is Senator JAMES E. MURRAY.

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES E. MURRAY, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM MONTANA

Mr. GOSSETT and I are both members of the Democratic Party, a party which stands for freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from fear, and freedom from want, a party which, above all, stands for tolerance and for the protection of racial minorities.

If democracy means respect for the dignity of the person, then I feel constrained to differ completely with the Congressman's views on the subject of Palestine and the helpless displaced persons of Europe. I cannot see how any Democrat, whether he spells it with a small "d" or a capital "D", can do otherwise. I can't see how any American can turn his back on the impassioned plea of the displaced persons of Europe for haven and refuge. To do so would be a repudiation of the glorious democratic tradition which helped to make our country great.

I think it is utterly un-American to insinuate suspicion against any of the minority groups which go to make up this great American Nation. I can't see how any fair-minded American can scoff at the proposal that we admit a fair share of the displaced persons of Europe to this country. To do so would be a complete negation of the leadership of the Democratic Party, which has consistently advocated the admission of 400,000 displaced persons into the United States. I don't know of anything that could be more hurtful to our country than the introduction of propaganda designed to create hatred, ill-will, and misunderstanding amongst the various groups that constitute America.

The America which the world envies and admires is not the creation or possession of any single group in our country. America was built by the blood and sweat, the creative energy, and the patriotic devotion of all the immigrants who have come to our shores—and we are all descendants of immigrants in this great land of immigrants. The secret of America's supremacy in the family of nations today lies in the fact that under our democratic form of government we are able—better than any other nation—to release the creative talents of our intermingled peoples so that all could make their highest contribution to the common national good.

If we undertake to distinguish the contributions made by the various groups that have come to this country—Scandinavians, Irish, French, Italians, or Protestants, Catholics, or Jews—we would have something different in America than we have today. Today all these groups are working in harmony—each making its contribution to the American way of life. Of all nations in the world, America should be free of racial suspicion or prejudice. Surely we can discuss the problems of displaced persons and Palestine in an American way without engendering ill will and suspicion toward any group of our citizens, particularly those whose coreligionists suffered so outrageously at the hands of Hitler. Surely we can discuss these problems without borrowing from Goebbels' bag of tricks the tactic of the Red smear.

The 800,000 men, women, and children—homeless, landless, displaced—who now live in camps in Germany and Austria, the victims of Nazi terror, have a claim on the world's conscience. America is making mighty contributions toward the reconstruction of war-torn Europe. Yet up to this point there has been a blind spot in the program of Congress for postwar reconstruction. Up to this point, we have done nothing for the displaced persons who managed to survive Hitler's death chambers. Congress has done nothing—despite the plea of the President, Secretary of State Marshall, virtually every Cabinet officer, and the leaders of every religious group and labor organization in the country.

Who are these displaced persons? Congressman GOSSETT would have you believe that the displaced persons are a Jewish problem. He should know better. General McNarney, commander-in-chief of our forces in postwar Europe, has pointed out that they are the remnants of the millions of slave laborers dragged into Germany and forced to work for the German war machine. By the end of the war many had perished; most were able to go back to their former homes; but there remained about 800,000 men, women, and children who have nowhere to go. Some of them cannot remain in Germany, the Germany which has been the graveyard of their families, their friends, their hopes. Some cannot go back to their countries which are now governed by hostile forces. More than 80 percent of the DP's are Christians; less than 20 percent are Jews. The bulk of the Jews would like to go to Palestine; but if some of our legislators would have their way, Palestine would be closed to them in the east, and the United States barred to them in the west.

The American Army chiefs who have carefully investigated the background and skills of the displaced persons have told the Congress that the men are capable farmers, mechanics, and technicians who could make a useful contribution to the American economy. Certainly, some of our underdeveloped States which have recently been losing population would benefit by a wise resettlement of DP's in their areas.

The best proposal pending in the Congress on the DP problem is the Stratton bill, which would admit 100,000 DP's a year for 4 years into the United States. America is now at the peak of her strength and prosperity. There is virtually no unemployment. These DP's could be absorbed today with great benefit to our economy and, more important, great benefit to our moral stature in the eyes of the world. I join with the President and the Cabinet, the leaders of our great churches, and our labor organizations, in urging the passage of the Stratton bill as the American answer to the DP problem.

One hundred and seventy-three years ago, the American colonies took up arms against the British King. In defense of that action, they issued a Declaration of Independence that has become one of the immortal documents of history. I wonder if those who oppose this program have ever read it. One paragraph may have had a very subversive sound. It is the paragraph in the Declaration wherein the Americans announce their reasons for breaking with the British King. It reads as follows:

"He has endeavored to prevent the growth of population of these States; for that purpose obstructing the laws of naturalization of foreigners; refusing to pass other laws to encourage migrations hither."

But, then, I suppose even the more vital sections of the declaration—the very watchword it announces, that all men were created equal—must have a disagreeable sound to those "bitter enders" who oppose this just and reasonable program.

Emblazoned on our Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor, facing the lands of the Old World, is this immortal verse: "Give us your poor, your tired, your huddled masses yearning to be free." That statue has been a beacon of light and hope to oppressed peoples all over the world. It has become a symbol of America's moral leadership in the family of nations.

If certain Congressmen could have their way, the Statue of Liberty would turn her back to the pleas of the hungry and the oppressed; her torch of hope and freedom would be blacked out.

Now, let us concede at once that the problem of Palestine is a difficult one, and that there are no easy, simple solutions that will please everyone. It would require more than the judgment of Solomon to develop a formula for the troubled Holy Land that would be greeted with hallelujahs by all its inhabitants. But there are some crucial facts that are undisputed; they must be the basis of any truly American program for Palestine.

The United Nations—the organized conscience of mankind—studied the Palestine problem for many months. By a vote of more than two-thirds the United Nations decided to partition Palestine in line with the proposal initiated and supported by the United States. Under that proposal Palestine was divided into three parts. The area in which the Jews are in the majority was to become a Jewish state. The area in which the Arabs are in the majority was to become an Arab state. The holy city of Jerusalem and the surrounding towns were to remain a religious shrine for all the great faiths under the protection and trusteeship of the United Nations itself. What could be more fair and reasonable?

The Palestine decision represented the first important occasion when the nations of the eastern bloc joined with the nations of the western bloc in the United Nations to work out a peaceful solution. Russia accepted the American program for Palestine. And now, because Russia is for partition, there are some who would create suspicion of the Zionist program.

The devious device of identifying a whole race as Communist is an old and discredited tactic. Every intelligent person knows that whatever communism may be, it is not the exclusive invention or possession of any people, race, or creed. You have only to recall what has been happening in Italy, Czechoslovakia, France, and China to find conclusive proof of that fact.

Efforts to indict a whole race have been tried before. The British tried it on the Irish when they sought to continue Ireland in political bondage to the British Empire. The British tried to tell the world that the Irish were a shiftless, worthless, quarrelling people, to be held in subjection. They failed in that effort. But others still go on using similar tactics. After all, of course, one cannot very well admit that a man is a scholar and a gentleman and at the same time despoil him of his property. If you want to confiscate his property, you must first attack him as a scoundrel of some kind before you proceed to rob him.

I cannot conceive how anyone can honestly discuss the Palestine problem and ignore the contributions that the Jews have made since the beginning of recorded history to the development of world democracy. The Old Testament is still the basic document of the democratic faith; and the people of the Book were among the very first to oppose all forms of dictatorship, all systems of government that violate the dignity of human beings, all efforts to impose tyranny over the minds and hearts of men. How could any honest discussion ignore the more than 6,000,000 lives they gave, and the sacrifices in blood and treasure they made, for the victory of democracy in the last war?

The crucial issue which the world faces today is the threat of foreign aggression against the new Palestine state. King Abdullah of Transjordan has brazenly announced to the world that his mechanized troops will march into Palestine on May 15. Anybody who knows the Middle East knows that these Arab chieftains can hardly call their souls their own; knows that Abdullah would not fly in the face of the United Nations decision unless he were getting secret support and encouragement.

I have no partisan position on Palestine. I speak only for peace and for the preservation of the dignity and integrity of the United Nations. I believe the genuine moral support of America can still bring peace to the Holy Land. I think it is our duty to bring every effort to bear to prevent a catastrophe in Palestine. Every American President since Wilson has pledged this country's support to the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine. Now, in furtherance of those pledges, the United Nations, backed by the United States and other freedom-loving nations, have adopted the American partition proposal. Let us stand by that pledge. Justice will surely prevail.

Thus, we can usher in an era of peace and prosperity in the Holy Land—for Jews, for Arabs, and for Christians—and strengthen the peace of the world itself.

Cost of Living Is Chief Issue, Mrs. Norton Insists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD at this time an article which appeared in the May 29 issue of Labor, published by the railroad labor unions in Washington, D. C.

It paid homage to one of the stanchest defenders of labor's rights, Congresswoman MARY T. NORTON, in her new role

as chairman of the credentials committee in the Democratic National Convention:

COST OF LIVING IS CHIEF ISSUE, MRS. NORTON INSISTS—"PEOPLE JUST CAN'T BUY ENOUGH FOOD FOR THEIR FAMILIES," SHE SAYS

MARY T. NORTON, who has served in Congress longer than any other woman and who has a labor record which is practically perfect, has achieved another distinction:

She will serve as chairman of the credentials committee in the Democratic National Convention. It's the first time any woman has ever done anything like that, but Mary is accustomed to doing unusual things. When she was notified of her selection she made a speech.

"The high cost of living will be and should be the leading issue in the coming campaign," Mary declared.

"Every man should have the experience of going to market. Then high prices wouldn't just be vague terms.

"Food has gone up 50 percent since the war ended. People just can not buy enough food for their families. Apparently this Republican Congress won't bring the cost of living down.

"I have a niece who buys milk for her four children and husband. They are not what you would call poor, but they have had to curtail the supply because of high prices.

"If they are forced to indulge in that kind of economy, in heaven's name what's happening to those who are in the very low-wage brackets?"

The Role of Oil in the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a speech which was made today by Mr. Eugene Holman, president of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, before the National Press Club. Mr. Holman's subject was The Role of Oil in the World Today. Of course, in the time at his disposal Mr. Holman did not have an opportunity to cover all phases of that subject.

Mr. President, the solution of our petroleum problems and the attitude of the Government toward the development and production of petroleum and international world trade in petroleum can be intelligently settled only on the basis of facts. In the statement which Mr. Holman made today there are many facts which I deem worthy of attention by all persons who are interested in this very vital problem. So I ask unanimous consent to have the speech printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF OIL IN THE WORLD TODAY

Today this Nation is using oil products at the greatest rate in its history. This year's consumption of oil in the United States will be half again as much as it was in 1941, some 20 percent above the wartime peak, and perhaps 7 to 8 percent above last year's record.

Naturally, then, the top question these days on oil is whether there is going to be enough of it. My answer to that is "yes." Putting it plainly, there is no crisis in oil. Barring emergencies, such as war, disasters, or serious strikes which would affect the supply of any commodity—or unless we have to assume an abnormal burden in supplying oil needs abroad, no one in this country is going to have to make any important change in his way of life because of a lack of oil products. The need of present consumers will be met, and there will be a margin available for a reasonable number of new users.

I say this while fully aware of the great amount of attention being given to supply difficulties. I also say this knowing that some people accuse me of being an optimist on the supply situation. As a matter of fact, I think there is a great deal to be optimistic about. Drilling activities are up some 18 percent over last year. The country's oil production rate is getting higher week by week. Already it is 7 percent above the average for last year. The tanker fleet tonnage in service is up sharply, and many new tankers are on the ways. Important pipe lines, such as those into the Middle West from west Texas, are coming into service. In view of the progress which has been made, it is my considered opinion that aggregate demands on the industry during the coming summer and winter will be no greater than aggregate supply. Of course, this assumes no interruptions due to the kind of emergencies I have mentioned.

This, however, does not answer the questions—"Will there be service stations out of gasoline this summer?" and "Will there be cold homes this winter for lack of oil?" My answer to the first of these must be "yes." Actually, there has never been a summer when some service stations have not on some occasions been out of gasoline. There will be more of such occasions this summer than usual, but they will result from local, temporary conditions, and will not involve whole communities.

As to this winter, supplies will be greater than they were last winter, and I feel safe in saying—again barring the type of emergencies I mentioned before—that home heating needs next winter will be met without serious inconvenience to oil users.

It may surprise you to know that in spite of the exceptionally cold winter, and the special transportation problems which were encountered, the record now shows that over the last year the industry came within less than 1 percent of meeting all consumer needs.

The industry is pressing forward on expansion programs to cost an estimated $4,000,000,000 in 2 years alone. The speed at which these expanded facilities come into operation is being determined largely right now by the availability of construction materials, yet the fact is that for some time to come the industry will be operating at near capacity in keeping up with rising demands. Occasional dry spots are almost certain to occur, due to local and temporary circumstances. Every effort is being made to minimize the occurrence of such difficulties and to be able to correct them promptly when they occur.

The next question logically asked is, How about supplies in the longer-range picture—beyond 1948? I feel this should cause no alarm, even though I expect to see demand for oil products continue to increase—not only in this country but abroad. Liquid fuels have many advantages over solid or gaseous fuels as a source of energy, and the means of transporting and distributing them have been worked out so that now they are available to almost everyone—everywhere. With further mechanization, with growing uses, with continuing increases in the standard of living world-wide, I see no reason to expect any other than a continuing rise in the consumption curve.

Will there be supplies to meet these increasing demands for oil? Again I say, "Yes." To understand why, it must be understood that there are many important sources for liquid fuels. Let me review what they are:

Our most important source of oil today, by far, is the domestic supply of crude oil. Next in importance are foreign sources of crude oil available to us. Third are the alternate sources of energy, such as natural gas, coal and oil shale, which can be converted into synthetic oil products. In total these sources represent an enormous potential supply, unquestionably able to carry us for many, many decades—certainly well into the age of atomic sources of power, where all estimates of energy supply and consumption become mere conjecture.

Regarding the domestic crude-oil supply, much confusion comes from failing to distinguish between proved reserves and potential—or what might be called expected but as yet undiscovered—reserves. The first of these—our proved reserves—are the known working stocks of crude oil. Discoveries are continually adding to them and production subtracting from them. Each year proved reserves are estimated by the American Petroleum Institute, and their latest figure, which is well accepted in the industry, is 21,500,000,000 barrels—a very large amount.

Where most of the argument on domestic supply begins is when we start talking about potential reserves—or the amount of oil remaining to be discovered. Here the pessimist and the optimist have a wide field in which to range. The fact remains, however, that each year when we take our inventory we have added to more than we have subtracted from our underground stocks of oil.

Actually, most of the arguments on domestic supply revolve more about the rate at which discoveries will be made than about what total the ultimate discoveries will reach. It is true, of course, that finding oil has become more difficult and expensive. And it is true that each oil field discovered means that one less remains to be found. But it is also true that the hunting grounds seem to expand with our knowledge and our activity. Our search for oil continually extends into areas previously barred by economic or technical limitations. An outstanding example today is the coastal tidelands, which through great engineering achievements are becoming an increasingly important potential source of oil.

Reserves of crude oil, both proved and potential, in foreign lands are also very large. Exclusive of Russia, the proved reserves outside of the United States of America totaled over 37,000,000,000 barrels in 1944, according to the information submitted to a Senate committee recently by 11 American companies operating abroad. Potential reserves abroad are, of course, much greater. Actually, the rest of the world has had nowhere near the intensive search for oil as has been the case here. A common estimate is that the United States contains some 15 percent of the world's land area in which oil could be found. Yet the United States has produced some 60 percent of all oil to date and has today about one-third of the world's proved reserves. Oil reserves outside of the United States must be developed rapidly if the world's needs for oil are to be met.

In estimating the development of oil resources in foreign lands, expert opinions differ, even as they do in the United States. Most of these differences again involve opinion as to the rate at which discoveries will be made. The rate of development abroad, however, involves an even wider range of conditions than here. After all, success in any undertaking depends upon the effort going into it. This effort is determined largely by the economic, social, and political conditions facing the enterprise.

Abroad, these conditions often differ widely from those at home. The scale of capital investment, at least in the early phases of

development, is usually very high. At the Barco Concession in Colombia, $60,000,000 was spent and 23 years elapsed before oil was first brought to market. Imperial Oil Ltd., invested over $23,000,000 in oil exploration in Canada before making its first major oil discovery in Canada last year. Yet such developments are of enormous value, not only to the countries themselves but to the whole world supply picture.

Social and political conditions, too, are matters of major concern abroad. Wherever the search for oil carries them, oil men have had to adapt themselves to the social conditions existing, improving them whenever possible. Politically, there is the fact to be faced that leases, concessions and practically all terms of operations and development are controlled by most of the governments involved. The conditions thus imposed and the nature of assurances as to the security of investments are the factors really determining the amount of effort going into developing the oil producing possibilities of other nations.

The third major source of oil supplies for future needs is synthesis. While it is technically possible to produce oil from almost any hydrocarbon source, the principal raw materials now thought of are natural gas, oil shale, and coal. The real problems here are in the economic field, for present costs of synthetic products are higher than of those derived from crude oil. Moreover, the investments required are very large, as are the needs of materials and construction time. Nevertheless, work is going on actively in efforts to bring the processes closer to economic reality. In the very long run, these synthetic processes assure us of an almost indefinite supply of liquid fuels. Natural gas reserves alone will add 50 to 100 percent to our natural petroleum supplies, and our known supplies of coal and oil shale could, literally, supply us with oil products for centuries.

Our ability to supply oil needs over the long run seems, therefore, assured. Why, then, the current concern and why the talk of imports from foreign sources? The answer lies in the very factors I have been discussing. However great are our proved reserves, there are physical limits to the rate at which we can draw on them without waste. Moreover, the rate at which proved reserves increase is dependent upon the success in finding oil. Together, these factors determine the total productive capacity of oil for the Nation. As productive capacity falls behind demand, the margin, we believe, will be made up largely by imports. The Nation's rate of consumption today is just about equal to its domestic productive capacity. In addition, imports now just about balance exports. The estimates are that the domestic demand will rise faster than the productive capacity, thus requiring an increasing margin of imports as time goes on. This does not visualize a waning domestic industry. On the contrary, the greatest production activities in history lie ahead.

Most of our imports now come—and are expected to continue to come—from Western Hemisphere sources. Last year the Western Hemisphere, outside the United States, produced some 1,600,000 barrels of oil a day. Of this, some 930,000 barrels per day were consumed in the Western Hemisphere outside the United States, while 430,000 barrels per day were imported into the United States. The balance, 240,000 barrels per day, plus much of the average of 450,000 barrels per day exported from the United States, went to the large Eastern Hemisphere markets.

But oil demand in this hemisphere is growing rapidly, and oil now exported out of the hemisphere is increasingly needed here. Oil resources in the Eastern Hemisphere must be developed to meet the growing needs there. With 86 percent of the world's population, the Eastern Hemisphere now produces only 19 percent of the world's oil. Fortunately, large sources of oil exist in the Eastern Hemisphere. The largest, and certainly the best known oil-producing areas there, are those in the Middle East, but there are other potentially important areas in western and central Europe, in the Far East, and certainly in the U. S. S. R.

Right now, and for the next few years, the most critical needs are those of western Europe. Oil needs totaling far above present supplies are among the most important requirements to be met under the European recovery plan. These are expected to come primarily from expanded production of the Middle East fields. Not only are these fields the most economic supply sources, but they are the only presently known large reserves which can be developed in time to meet Europe's needs. Lacking oil from the Middle East, our country and other Western Hemisphere nations would face the choice either of providing basic needs there, even though it were to mean rationing and restriction of oil consumption here, or of greatly weakening the recovery program and permitting western Europe to become hungry, cold, immobile, and industrially handicapped.

Oil developments in the Middle East have not been without some recent criticism and misunderstandings. In recognition of these I would like to make a few points clear.

First, Middle East oil resources are being developed independently of and not as an alternate to Western Hemisphere resources. The main need for Middle East oil is to supply Eastern Hemisphere markets.

Second, while Middle East oil resources are not counted upon to supply any important part of United States markets, they will have a very great effect on supplies of oil for this country, since their availability will reduce the necessity for the large present exports of oil from this hemisphere.

Third, the development of Middle East oil looks primarily toward supplying the peaceful needs of the great and growing Eastern Hemisphere populations. However important it would be to have American developed and operated sources of oil there in the event of war, I want to emphasize that our developments and interests there are based on peacetime commercial needs.

Fourth, oil development in the Middle East has not involved political activities on the part of Standard Oil Co. (N. J.). A few weeks ago our company issued a statement in this connection from which I would like to quote:

"We recognize that international-trade relations involve political considerations of the highest order. Policies governing such considerations are, of course, the responsibility of our Government acting in the best interests of all its citizens.

"We do not expect, and have never sought greater protection for our foreign interests than is normally afforded by the United States Government to any private citizen engaged in overseas trade.

"We inform interested agencies of Government regarding any contemplated foreign agreement or activity of ours that could in any way affect the policies or interests of this country.

"When we do business in other countries we try to be good citizens there. We do not make foreign commitments if we cannot do that and still be in harmony with the foreign policy of the United States."

Nothing I have said considers directly our national defense needs. If we should again be plunged into war, oil needs for our military forces could reach very large figures. Where such supplies would come from is a question that vitally concerns our security. The whole question of oil supplies in the event of war is under active study by a number of committees which include the best brains in the oil industry, and by military representatives, all working together. All angles of this question are being explored. I know that serious and highly capable consideration is being given to the supplies which could be obtained in an emergency. I am confident that military needs will be met if they arise.

In closing, I want to reaffirm my confidence that oil supplies of the world will continue to meet demands of people for them. The way in all cases is not clear, and many major problems will have to be solved. Some of the problems lie in the technical field, and in these I have the greatest confidence—for technology has always been the great multiplier. Others of these problems are in the fields of human, of international relationships. These, too, will be solved for, whatever its ups and downs, I am convinced that our civilization is moving forward. And oil will play an ever bigger part as more people everywhere live better.

What About Public Housing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1948

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, do we need public housing? Do we need more Federal subsidies and guaranties for housing, or can private enterprise produce sufficient housing? These are questions that occupy the minds of many Americans today. What about the answers to these questions?

Mr. Speaker, we are short of housing. No one can challenge that fact. But we are not as short of housing as the Public Housing propagandists assert. They say we lack 10,000,000 units. That is a gross exaggeration. The number of new housing units needed, according to careful housing surveys, is somewhere between one and two million units.

The demand for public housing, and for large-scale housing subsidies and guaranties, comes from those who say, "We must have low-cost housing. If private enterprise cannot give us low-cost houses, then the Government must." Private builders have always given us low-cost houses. Why can they not do it now? Why do new houses cost so much today?

Mr. Speaker, here are some of the reasons:

First. Because of the New Deal inflationary policies the dollar today has a purchasing power of only 50 cents, so a $5,000 house now costs $10,000.

Second. Building materials are in short supply as a result of war needs and large shipments abroad, therefore they command higher prices.

Third. Labor costs have risen even more than material costs, the result of increased wages coupled with decreased labor productivity.

Mr. Speaker, a Nation-wide survey that covered 64 cities in 28 States on the question of the decreased productivity of labor established the following facts:

In 1940 it required 2.2 man-hours to install a toilet; in 1946 it required 3.6 man-hours to do the same work—an increase of 64 percent. In 1940 built-in tubs and showers required 6 man-hours of labor; in 1946 they required 9 man-hours to install—an increase of 50 per-

cent. In 1940 an average of 7 radiators were installed per man-day; in 1946 an average of only 5 radiators were installed per man-day—a decrease of about 30 percent. These are just a few examples of slow-down practices that skyrocket the contractor's building costs and the ultimate costs to the consumer. Neither public-housing nor Federal-housing subsidies will cure this situation.

Mr. Speaker, as a further argument against the economic unsoundness of Federal housing authorities, in connection with their rental policies, I submit the following editorial from the May 18, 1948, edition of the Chicago Journal of Commerce, entitled "Fifteen-Dollar Rent":

FIFTEEN-DOLLAR RENT

The Chicago Housing Authority has just reduced the rent of 175 members of the CIO United Packinghouse Workers to $15 a month. The average normal rental is $35 a month.

The 175 tenants thus favored are striking against the Chicago meat packers.

"We don't care for the reason for loss of income," the CHA director says. "We are only interested in the ability to pay rent."

What this CHA policy amounts to is a $20-a-month subsidy to the strikers.

Whether this particular strike is right or wrong—and we think it's dead wrong—is beside the point. The question is: Should public funds be used to aid one of the parties to an industrial struggle?

Can you imagine the howl that would go up if Government money was used to make up some of the lost income of the many struck packing companies?

If strikers are offered $35 rental accommodations for $15, they should, consistently, be allowed to purchase a $1.75 steak for 75 cents and to ride on the streetcar for a nickel.

And if those lucky enough to live in CHA low-rental units have this privilege, then why shouldn't all victims of lowered income share in the gravy?

Nothing less is just. Yet such a policy would be a case of "To each according to his needs"—the very essence of classic communism.

Whence we must conclude that the whole concept of public housing clashes with American principles.

A Word in Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1948

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of June 3, 1948:

A WORD IN TIME

The Reverend Edmund A. Walsh, of Georgetown University, speaking on communism the other day at the annual meeting of the National Industrial Conference Board, made some telling points that ought to be pondered by the advocates of the Mundt bill. He said the best way to meet the Communist menace "is to wage war in terms of the economic and social needs of the moment, strengthen our domestic economy, assist other people to do the same" and to "expose the hollowness of the Communist claim that Soviet Russia is the champion of human freedom." At present, Congress appears to be following the opposite course. Essential reforms and progressive measures languish while the reactionary Mundt-Nixon bill is pushed. The inescapable effect is to give communism an attractive issue and democracy a shabby record.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1948

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, time is fleeting and the second session of the Eightieth Congress is nearing its end without action on S. 472, although the Senate passed this measure by a majority of 58 to 22.

The Eightieth Congress is about to miss the opportunity of enacting into law one big piece of social legislation. I congratulate the Republican leadership upon its splendid cooperation with the Democratic administration on foreign policy but it has failed utterly to enact the social legislation called for in its platform during the congressional campaigns of 1946.

I am including with my remarks urging that even yet the House be given the opportunity of voting on the Federal aid bill an editorial which appeared in the May 30 issue of the Atlanta Journal.

The editorial is a great one and sets forth in splendid fashion, unanswerable arguments for the adoption of this much-needed legislation. It follows:

AMERICA'S DEFENSE AND SECURITY DEMAND PROMPT FEDERAL AID FOR THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

It is now nearly 2 months since a federal-aid-to-education bill passed the Senate with a bipartisan majority of 58 to 22. Meanwhile, a companion measure in the House has been locked in committee. Speaker MARTIN, whose nod could release the House bill for debate and probable passage, professes to favor its purposes but has refused to give it right-of-way. He says that national defense comes first and that not until its demands on the budget are fully determined can the claims of Federal aid for schools be safely considered.

Does Speaker MARTIN remember how many young Americans were rejected for military service during the recent war because they could not read or write? According to official records there were at least 500,000 of them, enough to have filled 25 combat divisions. Evidently, a basic need in our national defense is more and better schools. Today there are some 5,000,000 children between the ages of 6 and 17 who are not in schools of any kind. How well will they be prepared for the duties of national defense and the responsibilities of citizenship? The worth of the billions we put into greater armaments will depend at last on skilled and intelligent manpower.

To contend that this country cannot afford Federal help to education on top of the new military outlays and the cost of the European recovery program is to ignore a key factor of the entire problem. The proposed $300,000,000 a year to meet urgent school deficiencies is well described as "an investment in America's human resources, making better producers and consumers of the people who ultimately must pay off the large expenditures for military preparedness and foreign aid. Thus the question of what expense can be afforded is, largely, a matter of the capacities of the people to maintain a sound economy through their productive skills and their faith in our American system. Unless we continue to build these underlying skills and faiths, we neglect a fundamental upon which the Nation's whole economy is based."

Not only its economy, but also the vigor and the very survival of its free institutions. Ignorance and the low standards of living that accompany it are the most fertile soil for demagogy, communism, and dictatorship. There are 10,000,000 American adults, according to the 1940 census, who, if not quite illiterate, have had so little schooling as to be unequal to the normal demands of modern life, let alone the higher civic responsibilities. Truly has it been said, "When we cheat our children of education we cheat our Government of the intelligent voter who makes democracy possible." Federal aid toward adequate public schools, far from being an extravagance or a mere burden, is the soundest sort of economy and an urgently needed measure of national security.

It is only through Federal aid that the deficiencies and inequalities in America's common schools can be remedied. The States with the poorest schools are, in the main the ones which are spending the highest proportion of their incomes for education. This seeming paradox is explained by the fact that the poorer States have the lower income per taxpayer and also the higher percentage of children per taxpayer. Thus Mississippi's expenditure of 1.67 percent of its people's income for schools provides only $44.80 per pupil, while Connecticut's expenditure of 1.36 percent provides $159.50 per pupil.

As Walter Lippmann has put it, "A poor family with five children cannot give each child as good an opportunity as a rich family with one child. But this does not mean that the poor family has not tried to do as well by its children as the richer one. The poorer States with the poorest schools actually make a greater effort, actually devote a larger part of their resources to educate their children. If we are talking of justice and self-reliance, then the comparisons are in their favor." Once their educational opportunities have been lifted and broadened, and their productive capacities thereby increased, their incomes will rise accordingly and they will be more and more self-sustaining.

Meanwhile, however the handicapped areas are not living unto themselves alone. They are part and parcel, bone and tissue, blood and brain of our common America. "All the youth of the country," says President James B. Conant, of Harvard, "are future citizens of the entire country; their activities as citizens and voters will determine the kind of Nation we are going to be living in in the next quarter of a century." Therefore, the general welfare and the vital interests of every part of the Union require that the economic strength of the Nation as a whole be drawn upon to help equalize educational opportunities and to insure a decent schooling for all our children.

Such are the common justice and common sense on which the program of Federal aid for schools stands. The bill which has passed the Senate and the companion measure awaiting action by the House would apportion $300,000,000 a year among all the States on a basis of their needs, abilities, and efforts to improve public-school standards and services. Georgia's allotment is estimated at $17,745,000, which would be a great help toward meeting her educational emergencies. Is $300,000,000 a year too much to ask for so imperative a national need? Sponsors of the bill reply that it would involve only pennies among the piles of dollars now being appropriated for other purposes. Speaker MARTIN is right in saying that national defense comes

first, but the measure which he is holding up lies at the heart of our Nation's defense and security.

The Greatest Failure of the Eightieth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. M. (DON) WHEELER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 3, 1948

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, when the Eightieth Congress convened on January 3, 1947, the country was in the throes of recovering from the impact of World War II. The American people were still beset on every hand with problems brought into being by the war. Shortages in every field caused inflation to take one upward spurt after another. Millions of American people were without adequate housing, proper medical attention, transportation was hard to get, millions of Americans had been cared for by the Government to the extent that they had lost much of the individual initiative which has made this country great, and, last but not least, millions of our American children were without adequate educational opportunity.

After one regular session, one special session, and with the second regular session fast coming to a close, we find that very little has been done to solve any of the problems with which we were faced when the Republicans took over control in January 1947. Much could be said about the failure evidenced by Congress in any of the fields I have mentioned, but today I would like to address myself to the one failure which is most important of all and the one problem which we still have time to solve before we adjourn. This problem has to do with our failure to provide adequate educational opportunity for all the children in America. We still have time to correct this greatest of all our failures by passing S. 472, which provides Federal aid for education.

There are those who use as an excuse for their opposition to Federal aid a specious argument to the effect that they do not want governmental control of education. The speciousness of this argument is readily seen by simply remembering that the education of children has always been a function of government in the field of public education. Of course, none of us want the rights of the several States of this Union invaded to the extent that a Federal bureau would administer the educational program of this country. There is no cause for the entertainment of a single fear in this regard if we will enact S. 472, for the rights of the States are well protected in this bill. If this were not true I would not support it. Our Government has become a Government of pressure groups to the extent that legislation which has the support of large, vociferous, and well financed groups is the legislation which gets the most consideration. In the case of Federal aid for education there is no well financed group which will benefit individually by the passage of this legislation, therefore, we find a lack of interest in it. The lack of this type of support does not hide the pressing fact that there is a large group of our people who will benefit immensely from this legislation. This group is composed of our millions of children whose education is being sadly neglected. We as Members of Congress must speak and work for these citizens of tomorrow if their needs are to be satisfied. If we as Members of Congress fail in this duty then we will not be held guiltless by future generations.

The problems of adequate financial support for elementary and secondary education in this country are perennial. A study of the history of education in the United States indicates that probably never before have these problems been so important or their solution so urgent as now. There are many things crying for governmental action which can wait and bide their time but we cannot afford to continue the neglect of our children.

The general problem of financing elementary and secondary education is national in character and scope. There is common agreement that the educational attainment of the population is important to the welfare and progress of the country as a whole. A fairly high minimum level of education for all the citizens is of fundamental importance in a modern democracy. The broad question at issue is: Has the Federal Government a responsibility in the maintenance of this minimum level of education for the Nation's citizens, and if so, what is the extent of this responsibility and how should it be discharged?

From the inception of our Republic the Federal Government has assumed a share of the responsibility for the financing of public education. In most of the States the public schools are still receiving considerable income from land grants initiated by the Congress of the Federation in 1875 and increased through many years to a total area 10 times as large as Maryland. Early Federal land grants for the support of public education were considered substantial when made. Generally the States sold these lands and used the proceeds to create trust funds yielding continuous income for the support of elementary and secondary schools. However, in most of the States the income from these trust funds is now so low that it furnishes less than 1 percent of the finance required to operate the schools. Grants initiated in 1862 for colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts were not intended to aid elementary and secondary education.

Federal aid to the States for vocational education at the secondary level began in 1917; and Federal aid for vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry began in 1920. Much larger Federal expenditures in aid to the States for educational purposes were made during the depression of the 1930's and during World War II. However, compared to the total cost of public education, Federal aid has been relatively small, averaging less than 2 percent of the cost over a period of many years. During the school year 1945–46, not counting aid for school lunches, Federal aid throughout the Nation averages $1.56 per child 5 to 17 years of age.

Although cities and metropolitan areas spend more money for education, rural areas must spend larger proportions of their income for this purpose. In 1944–45 the Southeastern States had a larger percentage of their population enrolled in public schools than other areas of the country. The lowest percentage of the entire population attending school was found in the Northeast and far West. Obviously to maintain 26.3 percent of the population in school, as in Mississippi, is a far greater financial burden than to maintain only 13.0 percent of the population in school, as in Rhode Island.

With respect to the number of persons affected, public education is the biggest business in the United States. Sometimes a great corporation announces that it serves a million customers, usually over a period of years. During the single school year 1944–45 the public schools of the United States served over 23,000,000 customers—the total number of pupils enrolled in that year. These customers were served by a professionally trained staff of over 800,000 men and women—the public-school teachers of America—composing about 1½ percent of the working force of the whole country.

During the school year 1944–45 the United States spent about $2,600,000,000 for the operation of its public elementary and secondary schools, including the payment of salaries of the instructional staff. The amount of money we spent on education was somewhat less than the $2,700,000,000 we spent for tobacco in the calendar year 1944. In the same year this Nation spent $7,100,000,000 for alcoholic beverages.

During the calendar year 1945 the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics spent 8 percent of the national income on education. According to George S. Counts, professor at Columbia University and author of a number of published studies on Soviet education, the Russians are spending a larger proportion of their income for education than any other people in history. In the current war of ideologies which we are waging with Russia it seems that we are placing ourselves at a great disadvantage by allowing them to outstrip us so greatly in the field of education. The proper place to really fight communism and other ideas that are foreign to the American way of life is in the schools of our country. We cannot do a good job of this as long as we allow our schools to remain in their present deplorable plight through failure to properly finance them.

The American Association of School Administrators has declared that appropriations for schools in the United States of America should be tripled and the number of teachers should be doubled to meet the present demand for elementary and secondary education. It is expected that these demands will greatly increase within the next decade. In the 5-year period from 1941 through 1946 about 13,000,000 babies were born in the United States, although population experts had predicted only 9,000,000. As a consequence of this unprecedented increase in

the birth rate elementary school enrollments will increase rapidly until 1950. By 1953 the high schools will feel the impact of this increase in birth rate and will continue to be overcrowded until 1960 After 1960 the school enrollments are unpredictable. Mr. Speaker, are we to sit idly by and allow our school system to deteriorate to the extent that we are to have many more millions of our children without the benefit of even elementary and secondary education? We cannot afford an uneducated population. The impact of mass ignorance will destroy any democracy.

One of the chief earmarks of a totalitarian state is the ignorance of the masses. An enlightened population will not long tolerate a dictatorship for as the shackles of ignorance are stricken from the minds of individual citizens freedom of the whole people is bound to accrue. Minds that have been freed from the bondage of ignorance is our best insurance against any ism which would destroy us. It is my sincere belief in this regard that, if real education is being attained in Russia as a result of their great educational effort, not many years will have passed before an enlightened populace will arise to overthrow the dictatorial powers of the Kremlin.

When the entire record of Federal activity in connection with education is considered, it is evident that throughout the years since our country has been in existence the Federal Government has been increasingly concerned with the development of educational opportunity. The ability of States and local communities has always been unequal. This inequality of ability has been magnified in recent years by the great changes that have taken place in our social and economic conditions. While the inequality of ability has been accentuated education has become increasingly important. This is not to say that local educational programs have not improved but merely to recognize the fact that their relative inadequacy has prevented them from improving fast enough to meet the increasing needs.

Mr. Speaker, when American men were being drafted into the service of their country they were not asked how much taxes their parents paid. They were called and served regardless of the geographical circumstances of birth. They were not rejected because they happened to have been born in any particular section of this country but they were rejected in large numbers because the country they were willing to serve on the field of battle had allowed them to reach an illiterate majority. In war or peace the contributions made by our people to the welfare of this country are not confined to the section where they live but adds to the whole wealth of our Nation. With a full realization of this fact it is impossible for me to understand why the elected representatives of a great people can fail to take legislative action which will admit the responsibility of the Federal Government and insure action on the part of the Federal Government which will result in equality of educational opportunity for all our people.

Mr. Speaker, there are a great many technical questions involved in the proposition that the Federal Government should subsidize education in this country. These questions can be answered in various ways but the most pertinent answer to these questions rests upon the premise that the education of our youth is of the highest importance to the maintenance of our democratic form of government, our national welfare, and the economic and social advancement of society.

I plead with the membership that we not allow this Congress to adjourn until we have passed S. 472 and thereby erased from the record an account of our greatest failure to date. We cannot allow it to be truthfully said that we have failed to provide equal educational opportunity to all the children of America.

Why I Am for Taft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 3, 1948

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, 8 years age I said Senator TAFT was the best-qualified man the Republican Party had to offer the Nation as a candidate for President of the United States. Senator TAFT has brains, courage, and convictions, three very desirable qualities in this day and age for a Presidential candidate on any ticket, qualities not always to be found in Presidential candidates.

Mr. Speaker, during the past 8 years Senator TAFT has demonstrated his great ability and his statesmanship. He has become the true leader of the Republican Party in Congress, and as such he would make an ideal Presidential candidate.

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the June 1, 1948, edition of the Chicago Tribune expresses my sentiments so well that I include it as a part of these remarks:

TAFT

On July 7 last year, the Tribune endorsed the candidacy of Senator TAFT in the following language:

"Aside from General MacArthur, who has yet to say whether he is in the running, there is only one man under consideration who measures up to the job. That one is Senator TAFT, beyond all doubt the leading Republican figure in the National Capital today.

"Mr. TAFT got that way by virtue of intelligence, character, hard work, courage, and belief in the principles of his country and his party. Whatever the party platform will say, the plain fact is that the Republican candidate, whoever he may be, is going to run on the record of the Republican Congress, which is to say the record of the TAFT leadership. No one is as well qualified to defend this record and interpret it as is Mr. TAFT himself. That would be true even if the other commonly discussed candidates were his equals in all other respects, which quite obviously they are not."

Nothing has happened since July 7 a year ago to require us to alter these judgments. At the time we did not share Mr. TAFT's belief in Federal subsidies for housing, education, and health and we still do not agree with him on these points; but in spite of these persistent differences of opinion we thought then and think now that he is by long odds the best qualified of the avowed candidates. If we cannot always agree with him, we cannot fail to admire the candor with which he sets forth his views, a candor that none of his rivals has come within miles of equaling.

Mr. TAFT had the courage to say in Nebraska, where farmers operating on marginal lands would be sure to hear him, that the floor under farm prices ought to be lowered. While Mr. Stassen and Mr. Dewey in Oregon were promising bigger raids on the Treasury for every chamber of commerce's pet river project, Mr. TAFT voted with a small minority in the Senate to cut the rivers and harbors appropriation by $200,000,000. He is on record against the punitive taxes on oleomargarine though no one knows better than he does the strength of the dairy lobby. He has been outspoken in opposition to the administration proposals regarding the draft though the measure has the indorsement of the American Legion and numerous other veterans' organizations and is supported by most of the influential newspapers of the country. He is the only candidate in either party with enough true liberalism in his marrow to denounce the Government's methods in the sedition conspiracy trial in Washington and in the ex post facto trials of the German leaders at Nuremberg.

Every one of these declarations of his was unpopular in the place and at the time he uttered them. No one knows better than Mr. TAFT the political power wielded by the pressure groups, but he has the kind of faith in popular Government that requires him to deal candidly with the people whose votes he is soliciting. Mr. TAFT doesn't say one thing "again and again and again" and mean another. He doesn't proclaim faith in the people only to conceal his real purposes from them and betray them. With Mr. TAFT in the Presidency, the country would know that there is a man of integrity in the White House, a quality which has been lacking there throughout the long years of New Deal occupancy.

Unlike his principal rivals, Mr. TAFT is not a phony. The promise he showed when he was graduated at the top of his class at Yale and again at the Harvard law school has been realized. He is senior partner in a leading law firm in Cincinnati. He is the acknowledged leader of the Senate and he got that way without patronage with which to reward the faithful and without punishments with which to threaten the recalcitrant.

Mr. TAFT dominates the Senate because he works hard, knows the facts, talks sense, and doesn't dodge responsibility. It should never be forgotten that when he had the choice between heading the committee that was going to do the popular job of cutting taxes and heading the other committee that was going to undertake the politically risky but necessary job of amending the Wagner labor law, he chose the latter; and he gave the country a temperate labor law despite majorities in both Houses clamoring for a vindictive one.

The managers of other candidates say that though their boys may lack TAFT's record of character and solid achievement, the process known in politics as the build-up will make them seem to be his equal by November. We doubt that press agentry, even the most skilled press agentry, can achieve so much in so short a time. At any rate, Mr. TAFT needs no artful build-up. If he is nominated he will campaign on his record. It is the record of an honest man, a man of courage, a man of high inteligence, a man who works hard and thrives on hard work, a sound Republican, and a true liberal. None of his rivals measures up to him in any of these respects and, of course, none of them

has anything like his intimate knowledge of the day to day functioning of the Federal Government.

The election next November is not to select the man best qualified for a job in Hollywood or as a salesman of patent medicines. We are going to choose a President of the United States and for that office Mr. TAFT is so much better qualified in mind, in heart, and in experience in Government that comparisons with his rivals for the nomination become ridiculous.

GOP Majority Should Get Busy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 3, 1948

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Miami Herald of May 26, 1948:

GOP MAJORITY SHOULD GET BUSY

The Republican majority will have to get a move on if it completes its program in time to adjourn for the party's national convention. GOP leaders have assured the Republicans that if they get together and down to business they can close up shop for the session before June 21 when the convention meets in Philadelphia.

The Legislative Reorganization Act fixes the time for ending the session as July 31: "Except in time of war or during a national emergency proclaimed by the President, the houses shall adjourn sine die not later than the last day (Sundays excepted) in the month of July each year unless otherwise provided by Congress."

At the present reading it looks as if the GOP majority will not be able to close up shop by convention time. It is quite possible that Congress will be forced to recess over the party conventions. It then will have to hie itself back to Washington's summer heat to wind up the session by July 31.

This session of the Eightieth Congress is not notable for the range of its accomplishments. To date it has but three major pieces of legislation to its credit:

The multi-billion-dollar Economic Cooperation Act (the Marshall plan), authorizing the European recovery program, along with military and economic aid to Greece, Turkey, and China. The President signed it on April 3.

Passage of the $4,800,000,000 income-tax reduction bill on April 2 over the President's veto.

Extension of Federal rent controls to March 31, 1949, signed by the President on March 30.

There the record stands. Not because no great domestic legislation is needed but because the Republican majority is bitten with the same bee that they say stings the Democrats—Presidential year politics.

With a speed that amazed the world, the Congress rushed to put over the Marshall plan. Europe must be saved by a dyke of American dollars thrown up with lavish prodigality to stem the westward rush of the Red tide.

There has been no such concern for the rehabilitation and care of our own people. The long-pending Federal aid to education bill passed the Senate. After a Nation-wide demand, the Senate sent the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill to the House. The lobby that has fought this welfare legislation over the years is lining up subservient opposition in the House to stifle it. Capital observers say that neither it nor the education measure will get by this Congress. Billions for Europe. Not a cent for our houseless and our children needing education.

The administration contributed its great share in gumming up legislative progress by its unrealistic military-requirements program. The brass-hats have obstructed things by internal envies and bickering between the heads of the Navy, Army, and the Air Force.

The people have been whipped into a very frenzy of fear by demands for preparedness against some future enemy. Yet the administration and Congress go round and round discussing a manpower measure that is nothing but universal military training under the name of draft.

Even so simple and obvious domestic legislation as the repeal of the oleomargarine tax is treated to the congressional runaround. After 62 years of discrimination in favor of the butter makers, the people thought that they were at last to be given relief, that this healthy food would not be priced out of their range. The House voted repeal on April 28. A month later the Senate still dallies with the measure.

The regional-education plan of the South was handed similar treatment. The House approved the resolution for a southern interstate compact to pool education resources. The Senate shelved the proposal for the session by sending it back to committee.

The reciprocal trade treaties, which should be judged solely on their merits and especially in relation to the Marshall-plan billions, is fast becoming a political football. Price supports for agriculture are running the political gamut. Revision of security and compulsory health insurance is also fogged in politics.

Springtime in Presidential year Washington has clouded visions with politics when the state of the Nation, which means the state of the world, calls for the highest order of statesmanship.

Memorial Day, 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 3, 1948

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege on May 30 and May 31 to address huge throngs of Americans in their observance of Memorial Day. My itinerary included the following cities in Pennsylvania: Altoona, Curwensville, Shippensburg, Carlisle, and Clarion.

I am inserting at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following speech that I delivered at the Memorial Day observance conducted on Sunday, May 30, 1948, by the Veterans' Memorial Association, Curwensville, Pa.:

We are assembled this Memorial Day, 1948, to pay silent tribute to those men and women whose great devotion to the ideals of free men are enshrined in our memories. They have given their all for the preservation of the inalienable rights of free people everywhere for which the world owes them an eternal debt of gratitude.

If it were not for these valiant dead, America, as a free and independent nation, long ago would have ceased to exist and human progress would have been shackled with the chains of slavery—and of despotism.

Today all of us should feel a spirit of humility as we pay reverence to this mute army which has passed to a land where there are no wars—no hate—no greed. May we all take courage from this great devotion to freedom everywhere.

It is ordained that all men must die in body—but in spirit they may be with us forever. These men died young—they died before their time that you and I and our children might continue to live as man was intended to live—free to work at his chosen trade, to pursue happiness, to worship his God as he may choose.

No one can say that these men have died in vain, for through their sacrifices they have handed to us, the living, those freedoms essential to carry on the struggle against the despoilers of the heritage of mankind.

The torch of freedom has been handed to us, and we cannot fail them—or we too may perish. Unless we triumph over those forces against which these heroic dead gave their lives, we will be forced to accept a mode of living that will mean nothing.

It has been less than 3 years since the last of our war heroes gave his life in battle; and already we are confronted with the ill winds of greed and hate, of dissension, and of fear. Such are the arch enemies of mankind—who are responsible for the deaths of those whom we honor today. Only when all peoples and all nations realize this simple truth can there be an everlasting freedom of speech, of worship, from want, and from fear.

We participated in the greatest and most costly war in history to gain those four freedoms—but they have not been achieved. Only when we have accomplished the objective of universal peace can these defenders of our flag truly rest in peace. The responsibility is heavily upon our shoulders, and to shirk it would be traitorous to those who met death in discharging their duty to their country.

History records that on land, on sea, and in the air our living and dead have won victory after victory. No challenge was too great for them and no goal too distant. From the holocaust at Verdun to the inferno that was Metz, from the bomb-shattered remains of Pearl Harbor to the devastation that is Tokyo, from the beachheads of Europe and Africa to the eternal city of Rome and the desolation called Berlin—our men in khaki marched, fought, and died.

Today, scattered throughout the world, many of our brave men lie buried in American cemeteries near where they fell in battle. Their last resting place is marked by a white cross or the Star of David, symbols of the unity of mankind against oppression.

Now the struggle must be carried on, or we shall be unfaithful to the trust we have inherited. It is our sacred obligation to renew our faith in the free institutions of America, and to live day by day the precepts of the Golden Rule, which are the foundation of our free society. We must reaffirm our faith in our constitutional government which has given us the highest standard of living ever attained by any nation in history. Surely, if there are any ideals in the world worth fighting for—even dying for—they are the ideals of this Nation, the most blessed country of free men on the face of the earth.

We are, today, faced with many grave problems, the greatest of which is to find the means to prevent another world catastrophe, which might destroy us all. How can we prevent wholesale slaughter and destruction from which the world might never arise? Every day we hear answers to this burning question ranging from one extreme to the other. Some advocate a policy of appeasement, while others urge more drastic measures. Surely within the two extremes there must be a method or combination of methods wherein we can place our greatest hope for survival of the remaining free nations on earth.

Under no circumstances do we want to purchase peace at the price of freedom, or to accept a false peace by meekly submitting to those who have no regard for individual rights or liberties. This is not the American way. It is the way of him who cares not for the dictates of his conscience or those of his fellow men. It is the way of the one who would sell the future of his country for glittering promises that lead only to national destruction.

America is a peace-loving Nation and has fought two world wars to rescue humanity from total destruction. It is difficult to understand why every generation is visited with war and bloodshed.

Why is it that man, who has learned so much about nature and put that knowledge to practical use for the benefit of all, still harbors a warlike spirit?

Why is it that he has failed to control his emotions of conquest, of killing, and of plunder? Perhaps no mortal can give the complete reason for this abnormal behavior of civilized man; but does it not seem that the answer lies in part in his failure to recognize the value of individual freedom and the rights that go with it?

Let me illustrate what I mean. I have said that such human emotions as greed and hate, dissension and fear, are the evil roots that bring about wars between nations. Such despoilers of peace may always be found in a totalitarian government that subjugates the freedoms of its people to further its own delusion of imperial power.

The illogical reasoning that the government is all-supreme is never confined to the boundaries of the country itself. Nations imbued with this false precept invariably extend it to include other countries, other races, and other religions. This fact is proved by the expansion of such nations as the Roman Empire, France under Napoleon, Nazi Germany, Imperial Japan, and currently communistic Russia.

In such nations individual freedom is almost totally suppressed. Freedom of speech, of press; yes, even of thought, scarcely exists.

There are no means by which a true evaluation may be made of the issues affecting the welfare of the people. Facts are distorted or embellished through the propaganda machine of the government and the people have no basis for making a sound judgment. Consequently they are easily led to believe that one nation is surrounding them economically and politically in preparation for attack; or that another nation is so decadent that it is likely to contaminate them. Thus wars are started.

A people who do not know the virtues of individual freedom cannot seek and find truth. It is denied them by the Government they have sworn to uphold and defend. Some of the greatest lies in history have led nations to near disaster. The government supreme cannot afford to let its subjects know the truth for it would weaken its power and eventually destroy it. Only in a country in which there exists a complete freedom of speech, and of thought, can there be recourse to truth.

The freedom of the individual as against the edicts of a dictator must be universally achieved before war can be permanently relegated to the past.

That is the one important reason why we must resist those who would destroy the freedom of the individual.

Today the remaining free people of the world are looking to the United States as the leader in the preservation of western civilization. Without it, much of the progress of the world would cease.

We are today eulogizing the brave men and women who died for our country, but words alone cannot discharge our obligations to them. We must carry on 24 hours a day throughout each year the task for which their blood was shed. We are their ambassadors. For them we must implore all men to adhere to the principles of our American way of life. We must teach them that they are the children of God who taught us to love, and not to hate our neighbors. In all that we read and all that we hear, we must always seek the truth. We must always strive to make ourselves worthy of those whose graves we visit this day, for they have proved themselves worthy of any sacrifice.

From the dawn of history, wars have been man's greatest plague. What kind of a world this would be had wars never existed—is not within our imagination. We do know that the time is drawing short when war must be outlawed, or else we must all perish with them. No longer do we live isolated from the rest of the world. Whether we like it or not, we now belong to the community of nations. We must go forward with them—or go down with them.

The unleashing of atomic energy, the development of guided missiles, of germ and mechanized warfare can easily destroy all of mankind. These developments have placed us in the most critical period the world has ever known.

We must face this perilous situation with the utmost faith, courage, and conviction. We must fight the fire of hate with understanding, ignorance with truth, and slavery with freedom. With the help of almighty God we can succeed.

We have visions of hope from the success of the Italian elections and our efforts through foreign aid to rehabilitate the prostrate nations of the world. We are rebuilding our national defenses only as a precaution in the event that our offer of friendship is rejected. But I warn you that our hope of universal peace may be only temporary.

On this eightieth anniversary of Memorial Day, many of you may feel disheartened that the peace for which your loved ones died is not yet realized. Your loss has already been great but I know those you mourn would beg of you not to give up—not to lose your hope—not to surrender.

Our honored dead are counting on all of us to carry through victoriously the struggle in which they made the supreme sacrifice. They played their parts to perfection—if we do less we shall defile their memory.

Only a strong and united America can meet the challenge to our way of life. God grant we will not falter in our efforts to preserve the America we love, thus proving that our honored dead shall not have died in vain.

Extension of Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 3, 1948

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I was particularly impressed by the theme of the attached editorial which appeared in the June 5, 1948, edition of the Saturday Evening Post, which is encompassed with these words:

The cause of free enterprise will not be advanced by refusal to extend its advantages beyond political barriers. To refrain from mutually profitable trading solely on ideological grounds would be about as sensible as the policy of the farmer who had a row with the circus, and "just to get even with the goldarned circus, bought six tickets and wouldn't go in."

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the article, entitled "Trade Agreements Will Benefit the United States, Too":

TRADE AGREEMENTS WILL BENEFIT THE UNITED STATES, TOO

On June 12, 1934, the United States Congress approved for a 3-year period an effective Trade Agreements Act. The bill amended the Tariff Act of 1930 to facilitate and extend our trade with a world rapidly succumbing to various forms of economic nationalism. The act has been renewed four times and will expire on June 12 of this year unless Congress renews it again.

Currently the Trade Agreements Act authorizes the President, upon the recommendation of the Department of State and certain other appropriate divisions of the Government, to reduce tariffs up to 50 percent of what they were on January 1, 1945. The act provides for reciprocal trade agreements such as will advance our sales abroad through tariff and other concessions from foreign countries in return for concessions by us. These adjustments are extended to all nations that do not discriminate against us.

We might suppose that, since the Congress has extended the validity of the act on previous occasions, voting on another renewal would be largely a matter of routine. But this is not so. Opposition is manifesting itself in various quarters. Yet it is difficult to see how we can hope to get back any appreciable portion of our advances abroad if we are unwilling to accept a greater quantity of imports.

Furthermore, our participation in the convention at Geneva last summer, where 23 nations conferred on the subject of tariffs and trade, and our further leadership in creating the charter for an international trade organization at Habana last March demand consistency of policy with reference to the Trade Agreements Act. The ITO charter is in spots rather too tolerant of the efforts of "managed economies" to maintain themselves by various interferences with control of foreign trade. But trade is a two-way process. It should be pointed out, however, that American opposition to the ITO comes more from those who want as little international trade as possible than from those who want more trade and fewer restrictions by governments.

If we were now to discard the Reciprocal Trade Act, we should deserve to be accused of failing to keep the faith. We should not only disrupt a trend among the nations toward the reduction of trade barriers but we should run counter to a widespread conviction in the business world that we must inevitably join other nations in bringing about improved trade relations. We have pledged nearly $6,000,000,000 to aid many nations to help themselves economically. Most of the nations are much smaller than we are and depend even more than we do upon international trade. They will not be able to help themselves adequately unless trade barriers are alleviated. We shall defeat our own ends and waste large portions of our financial assistance if we make it difficult or impossible for these nations to trade with us.

Nor should we give up all hope of restoring commercial relations with countries behind the iron curtain. The cause of free enterprise will not be advanced by refusal to extend its advantages beyond political barriers. To refrain from mutually profitable trading solely on ideological grounds would be about as sensible as the policy of the farmer who had a row with the circus, and "just to get even with the goldarned circus, bought six tickets and wouldn't go in."

Let's Settle Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, this House, last session, passed H. R. 4059, a bill to settle Alaska with veterans. This by giving them an enlarged homestead.

National defense demands that Alaska be settled. With proper inducement Alaska can, and will, within a short time, have a population of at least a million or two. I predict the day will come when Alaska will be settled by thriving Americans—not foreigners.

I have just received the following letter from a friend who knows Alaska. Read it and inform yourself on Alaska, our most valuable Territory:

KETCHIKAN, ALASKA.

Mr. WILLIAM LEMKE,
Representative to Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEMKE: A short time ago there happened to come to my hands a book on the hearings before the subcommittee in the House of Representatives on the Veterans Homestead Act of 1947. After reading the book the thought occurred to me that in some small way, because of my extensive travels in the Territory of Alaska, I may be of some help to you, and henceforth, the reason of this long letter.

First of all I would like to make my position clear. I have no axe to grind, and I am seeking nothing, otherwise than to help, if at all possible, to make this very complicated picture, such as exists in Alaska today more understandable and lucid. I am not a veteran, or a job seeker, or a well-to-do person. I am simply a person who lives on the land and makes my living on similar lines such as I judged you must have made your living years ago when you and your family settled in North Dakota; from the raw resources, such as any wild land must offer.

I have lived in Alaska 16 years. I am now 45 years old, married, with a family of two sons and one daughter. Since my family life began I have lived and raised my family in southeastern Alaska, this period being now near to 10 years. Before I was married I traveled and worked all over Alaska, wherever habitation or a means of living was to be found. I worked out in the Aleutians in the fur trade long before the war, or the thought of a war being there ever occurred to any of us, and few there were, who lived in this remote land. I have been to Point Barrow and along the Siberian shore, worked on gold dredges and mining claims, trapped furs in the Arctic and sub-Artic, travelled through the regions both north and south of the Alaskan Peninsula, the Matanuska, and most all other places where even just a few people were to be found.

Before coming to Alaska I had received a fair education and had the benefit of a sound body without which I could not have undergone the many hardships I encountered during my perigrinations. I had an adventurous and inquisitive disposition which made everything I saw, and worked at, interesting. Out of such things I gleaned experience and knowledge which has been most useful in enabling me to make a living in this land. I have worked at so many occupations that at times, even to me, it seems almost impossible that any person could acquire such diversity and do any one thing well enough to get along.

My work has been, and is, out of doors. I never have worked in the towns or cities such as there are in Alaska. I have always considered that if a person wants to work in an office, or at any service job, they would be far better in the States, where such employment is larger and more easily found. Alaskan cities are the same, only smaller than those found in the States. There is the same work, the same life, the same everything, only on a smaller scale.

I consider that I am a fair example of the average Alaskan. I think I know what it takes for the average man to get along in this country, because my life has followed a similar pattern.

When I first came to Alaska I had no friends in this country and the sum of only $35 in my whole possession. The States was in the agony of a Nation-wide depression. The thought that was uppermost in my mind was to get some place where I could be on my own, where there were raw resources, that somehow I could mill out a living with my hands. I chose Alaska, and in making this choice I found the land to be good.

It is not my desire to present the picture of a great success story on my behalf. I have not acquired wealth, nor have I been as successful as I might have been had things been different and I could have worked with a free hand. In Alaska there are so many restrictions imposed by the Federal Government agencies. There are bureaus for everything, all supposedly functioning to prevent the exploitation of the vast natural resources. But in spite of the watch-dog supervision it has been my observation, and this observation is shared by many, many Alaskans who live like I do, and by many who have lived longer in the country than I, that the country is being systematically exploited. It is not necessary for me to write of the salmon industry, for I feel sure that it would be an old story to you. But anyway, the salmon run in southeastern Alaska, which I am most familiar with, is in a pretty sordid state today.

I live out at a place called Clover Pass. There is a small community here that has grown steadily since I located here almost 10 years ago. My neighbors are all people who live about like I do. Their work is dependent on the salmon run, halibut fishing, what few logs they can pull out and sell, and what ever small employment comes their way. I can remember when I first came out here there were many more salmon in the waters than there are today. I have watched a steady decline even in this short period. None of my neighbors are big operators. They all have small boats which they troll with. The salmon fishing in the past usually starts in this area around about the middle of April and continues on until about the middle of September when the salmon run is over. It is necessary in this period of time to accumulate enough money to carry over the winter for the simple reason that the rest of the year provides rather slim picking. If the fish come everything is fine, but if they don't, we cannot meet our bills, and all we have to hope for is that the next year will be better.

For the past 2 years the fishing has been poor. Today is almost the middle of May, and as I write this letter, moored to the float in front of my home, there are at least a dozen trolling boats. None of them so far have caught enough fish to pay their fuel bills. They are all hoping, because of the late season, that the salmon will come. But deep in their hearts most of them know as I do that the day of the big salmon run is over. The fish are depleted and cannot be counted on to be a sure thing which will provide a living.

But despite such a condition, the life in the community goes on. Most of us have small gardens where vegetables grow very well. Berries are abundant and game is fairly easy to get. All and aroundabout the great forest grows providing us with a bountiful supply of fuel. We can always catch enough fish to eat, and shellfish are in great abundance. In these things the raw essentials of life is provided and it is entirely possible to live. But just to live seems hardly enough when we see all about us the chance of doing far better if we had the chance to do so.

Just as an example I will try to picture my situation. In 1939 I got a special use permit for a home site from the Forest Service. The land I wanted and got was well situated for a home. Seaward to the land was a well-sheltered bay, and although the forest was junglelike in density, the soil beneath was good. I knew once the land was cleared I could raise a good garden. The climate was mild with little or no snow in the winter months. The water supply was plentiful and good. Not too far (15 miles) by a fairly good road was the city of Ketchikan. Then there were only four families living out here, but the prospects for more people coming, which later proved correct, was good. I felt that some day a prosperous community would make the place a real place to live.

I had my wife and a small daughter, and between the time taken for making a living I worked clearing land by hand and building a house. In 1941 my home was completed. The place was substantial and well built, and best of all, we had built it entirely ourselves. Then came the job of making a garden and doing the dozens of other things to improve the place.

In 3 years' time our place was released from the forest and we were due to receive title. Everything had been done and the supervising by the Forest Service was over. We felt as soon as the necessary papers were filed as provided by law the land would be ours. But such to date has proved to be wishful thinking. We have only 4.30 acres, but somehow or other the Government does not give us title. Without the title we do not own the land. The house I have on the land is insured for $5,000, and this apparently is all we own. We do not pay any taxes, and whereas before, when we were under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service we paid to the Government $5 a year. Now we pay nothing.

I have written reams of paper to everyone I knew to write to, all with negative results. My papers and all records were finally turned over to an attorney in Ketchikan to see what he could do. He has filed the papers with the Anchorage land office in the effort to get me clear, but the results are still the same. No title to date.

Now, let's see how this has all worked out. This community since I came here has grown. At this last primary election the community cast 62 votes. Last year we had sufficient children of school age (14) to request the Government a Territorial school. Dr. Ryan, of the Territorial school board, came down here to look the situation over. He agreed with us that the distance to Ketchikan was too far to send our children in order to attend school. We needed a school in the community, but he was very embarrassed to tell us that, unfortunately, the Territory did not have enough funds to build us a school house and that we would have to wait until funds were available. No tax to provide funds, no money to build schools.

This seemed like a very odd set-up, since you must know that the Territory of Alaska has been a very profitable investment for the Federal Government. But, nevertheless, we had to have a school. Every man out here went to work. We borrowed money, and got credit, and built our own school. We paid for the supplies and gave our labor. Then the Territory came through and give a stove, books, and provided us with a teacher.

Such an example to me as this pictures the American tradition, which is very much alive in the pioneer Alaska today. Do with what you have to get along and you will get along. But in this day and age when the Govern-

ment is doing so much to help other people outside the United States we should first look at our own people to see how they are getting along.

Here is another thing. My place is ideally located and many tourists who visit Alaska would like to come out here if I had a place for them to stop. For a number of years I have been an Alaskan guide taking people out on fishing and hunting trips. I have made some good connections through this experience which I know I could use to an advantage if I had the proper place. If I had the title to my land I could borrow the necessary money to build a lodge and cabins. Without it I cannot borrow anything to finance a project of this kind. I haven't enough money of my own so the whole thing has to slide until the time comes when I can finance myself.

Each summer I contact people from the States who would like to come up here and live. Most of them have the wrong idea; they all think that land is easy to get in Alaska. When they learn the truth they are not willing to take the chance and they go back to the States. It is small wonder that the Territory of Alaska does not grow in population.

As I have pointed out, there are many people here in Alaska whose experience parallels mine. The whole thing retards development and the country cannot grow unless things are made easier for the people who now live here. Many wonder why people like myself live in the country at all; why don't we go some other place where things are easier. As near as I can discover, we stay here because we know the country is new and raw, our homes are here, we can always make some kind of a living, and very deep rooted there is a great love for this land that we feel no place on earth can fill. For these reasons we stay and hope for a better day that surely must sometime come if we as American people are not to perish from the earth.

Your arguments before the committee are to be applauded. You are on the right tract and it is my hope that nothing will deter you. This country must be settled by young strong people, and the young strong people today are the veterans. I am not saying that all veterans will fit into the picture out here, and neither am I saying that all of them will not. It is my belief that many of these people will come out here and do as I, and many people like myself, have done. We have had no Government assistance, and we are living here and raising our families in spite of the many obstacles thrown up against us. With some assistance, the repealing of many outdated laws, will be enough, and we will get along much faster.

Just recently I accompanied Commander O. D. Weed of the United States Coast Guard, who will on June 15 be in Washington on permanent duty, on a trip that took us over much of southeastern Alaska. Together we landed on many of the islands, all of which are familiar to me. The commander has had several years' duty in Alaska, and he appreciates our problems out here. He is not an office man, and when out on expeditions of such kind, lives like a frontiersman.

Reading the report was fresh in my mind. I pointed out to the commander many places where now, not a living soul lives. Great valleys or rich productive soil that could support communities such as you outlined in your plan. The surrounding land had thousands upon thousands of boardfeet of timber, good saw logs, now much over ripe, rotting as they stand.

What we want in this country is many, many, small saw and shingle mills. The timber is here for them, and it is our last untouched resource. Lumber is salable always in a country that is growing, and what is left over, if the way is paved to do so, can be shipped to the States.

Look at what is down on the Canadian side, east out of Prince Rupert. I do not know the actual count, but I am willing to bet that between Prince Rupert and Terrace, B. C., there are at least two dozen small mills. All of these mills are doing fine, providing something substantial out of what resources they have to work with.

What have we got here in southeastern Alaska. You can count the number of mills on one hand. The lumber mill in Juneau is closed down. The mill in Ketchikan cuts not near enough to supply even the immediate needs, hence the price of lumber in this area. Some time ago I wanted some shiplap. I was willing to pay the price, $67 per thousand, but I couldn't have any. The mill was far behind in their cut it was said, and I would just have to wait. It seems to be part of the Forest Service policy to discourage, or even prevent, a new mill coming into the area. Just recently this company bought up 85,000,000 feet over on Hecta Island. The company is a large company and have what it takes to handle a deal of this kind. But with the small operator it's a far different story.

Now the Forest Service seems to believe that only the big operators will be the ones that will be the salvation of Alaska. They want the pulp mills in and are willing to turn the entire forest reserve over to them, simply because, they say, only the big companies know how to log the country so there will be a sustained yield. This is a pretty hard one for me, and people like myself, to swallow. We simply do not believe it. All I have to remember is how the big operators handled the deal in Washington and Oregon and I know that is not the way to settle Alaska.

If the situation is made so that all of us will be able to get a timber show, and be able to sell our logs, the earnings will be spent in this country and the country will grow. On the logged-off lands, in the valleys where the soil is good, new communities will find a way of living that would be impossible under a big-company dictatorship.

Powell River and Ocean Falls on the Canadian side are run by big paper concerns. They own the business, the houses where the workers live, the stores, everything it seems, even including the employees lives. Alaska has enough absentee ownership. The salmon industry is an example of this kind of a deal, and such deals are not conducive to the growth of any country, let alone Alaska.

The transportation problem out here must be overhauled. As you know we have the highest freight rate in the world, while because of the water route, it should be one of the cheapest.

All of these things when summed up have a very definite retaring influence on the healthful growth of the country, and make small people like myself, poor, and very helpless individuals. If more people come, and the existing situation is not changed to the better, our burden will only be greater, and the newcomers will be defeated before they even start. But if things are changed for the better, and we as American people are allowed to share in the rich natural resources that are all around us, each and every one of us, according to our ability, will be able to prosper and support our families according to American standards. People will stay where they are doing well, and if people are allowed to do well, they will find that Alaska is a great hospitable country of mild, pleasant climate capable of supporting a population now undreamed of which in turn will achieve what your principal aim is: To secure the country from any possible invaders in the future. A land that is populated with a contented people is no push-over for any nation.

Yours very sincerely,

LAWRENCE (KIT) CARSON.

Promise and Performance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1948

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the column of Marquis Childs which appears in the Washington Post of June 3, 1948, entitled "Promise and Performance."

The coming political campaign will list the box-score of promises and performances. The record will speak for itself. It may be distorted by clever political propaganda.

The article follows:

PROMISE AND PERFORMANCE

The terrible floods in the Northwest are a kind of handwriting on the wall for anyone who cares to read. It is a warning, in words a mile high, of the cost of failure.

The tragedy in Oregon, so vividly described in the press and on the radio, comes in the immediate aftermath of another event that put Oregon in the headlines. That was the Republican primary fiercely contested by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, and Harold Stassen.

They talked about housing. They talked about the development of river basins and flood control. And then the rains came and the floods came, to show that promises are empty unless they are backed by more than words.

Under the pressure of high-priced lobbyists, the Republican Congress is chipping away at the Tennessee Valley Authority. TVA has demonstrated that it can control devastating floods and at the same time produce low-cost power to benefit a whole region. On at least three different occasions the TVA system has functioned to prevent damage from floodwaters.

It is fairly clear that only through such an over-all coordinated approach as TVA can the job on our river valleys be done. Only through such an all-out attack can the evils of erosion be checked and the damage done by man be overcome.

The Army engineers have spent hundreds of millions of dollars on flood control over many, many years, and yet year after year the headlines tell of mounting flood damage. The Army engineers are an efficient corps, but no amount of efficiency can compensate for the pick-and-choose tactics that result from the grab-bag of flood control held out by Congress.

Stassen, in his campaign in Oregon, flatly opposed regional authorities for river basins. Dewey at first said he favored "development on a regional basis for the drainage valleys of the Missouri, Columbia, and the Willamette Rivers." Two days later, however, he announced that a Missouri or a Columbia River Valley authority would be the equivalent of tyranny. In Oregon they explain this sudden shift by saying that Dewey got some pointed prompting from David B. Simpson, a Portland realtor, who was one of the New York Governor's principal backers.

A Columbia Valley Authority is one of the hot issues in Oregon politics. Ardent boosters for a CVA want a system of storage reservoirs near the headwaters of the river. These storage basins would back the surplus water and release it gradually. The possibility of a disaster like that at Vanport would be greatly reduced.

This is not merely a wordy argument among politicians. Behind the politicians'

promises are men, women, children fleeing for their lives before a wall of dirty water that sweeps down unchecked.

Housing is another issue which sometimes, in political speeches and before congressional committees, has an empty sound. But the refugees who fled from Vanport could tell us something about housing.

They were living in flimsy, barrackslike apartments built as temporary quarters for the thousands of war workers who came to Oregon's shipyards. Most of them were veterans with their families. They could find no other place to live.

Here in Washington the little band of men who rule the House have decided there shall be no housing legislation from this Congress. They are sabotaging a measure already passed by the Senate.

After long and patient effort, Senator ROBERT A. TAFT got a bill through the Senate providing for a modest minimum of houses to be built with a Government subsidy. Because of this provision in the bill, the oligarchy in the House means to kill it.

While the news dispatches said nothing about the schools at Vanport, it is a good guess that they were inadequate or worse. Many States, overwhelmed by the influx of war workers, have been unable to provide enough school rooms or enough teachers. The same little band in the House is holding up a bill to grant a minimum of Federal aid for education.

We are going to hear a lot more promises from the politicians. When the two parties gather in Philadelphia to nominate their candidates, they will put together platforms which are traditionally full of promises.

Some day people may begin to wonder a little about the relation between promise and performance. Perhaps even the political carpenters at Philadelphia will think about it a little as they promise and promise and promise.

A Friendly Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1948

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of the Appropriations Committee of this body a timely editorial appearing in the Denver Post, May 27, 1948.

It is unfortunate that the people of the West must continue to look to the Appropriations Committee of the other body for just and equitable treatment.

The editorial follows:

EASY WITH THAT AX—SOMEONE MAY GET HURT

Here we go again. The House Appropriations Committee has swung its "economy" ax to chop down 1949 Reclamation Bureau funds and three of the cuts, unless restored, will directly affect Colorado interests.

Actually the proposed cuts would save no money and one of them probably would cost the Federal Government extra expense.

Members of the committee seem to be obsessed with the idea that they can reduce costs by allocating to the Denver office of the chief engineer of the Reclamation Bureau less than the amount required to carry on necessary work.

They don't seem to realize that any reduction in the chief engineer's staff would have to be counterbalanced by increasing the engineering staff of the regional offices of the Bureau.

The regional offices do not receive specific budget allocations as the Denver office does, so the increases in the regional staffs would not show up as budget items to offset the "saving" made in the Denver office but the offset would be there just the same, although hidden from public view.

The same kind of phony economy was tried by Congress last year with the result that quite a number of engineers were transferred from Denver to other locations—at extra expense to the Government.

The House committee has voted to reduce the Denver office allocation to $6,000,000, $5,000,000 less than was requested and $1,800,000 less than the office received last year.

Equally specious is the "saving" which the committee seems to believe it has made by trimming more than $3,000,000 from the construction program of the Colorado-Big Thompson reclamation project.

The $3,000,000 is needed primarily for canals to get water out of reservoirs onto farm lands. The canals will have to be built eventually unless the reservoirs are going to be allowed to stand full of water which cannot possibly be used.

The third reduction ordered by the committee would leave the Bureau short of funds with which to make preliminary investigations on such pending projects as the Gunnison-Arkansas and the Blue River-South Platte. Funds for investigation were reduced last year and every reduction merely delays the time when all water resources of the State can be put to beneficial use.

If the House does not restore the more important budget cuts made by the Appropriations Committee, Colorado will have to look to the Senate—as it had to do last year—for relief from short-sighted and damaging "economy" which would not economize.

Federal Workers' Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO ISACSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1948

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Speaker, the immortal Benjamin Franklin, first Postmaster General of the American Nation and the founder of our post office system, blazed the way for our great postal network of today with the moral: "The mail must go through."

I say to this Congress today, Mr. Speaker, in the true spirit of that great founding father, Benjamin Franklin:

Just and adequate wages for our postal workers must go through.

Wage increases for all Federal workers—to assure them a real, American standard of living—must go through.

Mr. Speaker, Benjamin Franklin never envisaged, when he uttered the undying concept that underlies our vast postal service, that we might one day subject a whole class of American workers to economic penury and sacrifice of family life so that the mail may go through. He would indeed have opposed vigorously the principle of underpaying Government workers for the benefit of monopoly business. He would have fought ceaselessly and successfully against the principle of Government finance which reduces taxes for big business at the expense of the health, happiness, and indeed the very liberty of faithful, loyal servants of the public.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, this is the evil consequence which confronts us today, as the congressional session draws to a close with no provision for improving the economic condition of our Government workers who are at least 10 years behind the rest of the Nation in maintaining their standard of living.

Mr. Speaker, in the 3 months since I first entered this Chamber as a Member of Congress I have regarded with deep concern the appropriation of literally billions of dollars for warlike purposes and many more billions represented to the American people as relief for other nations of the world. I have challenged some of these expenditures as militaristic and the others as actually unmindful of the real needs of the stricken peoples of the rest of the world.

BILLIONS FOR MILITARISM

But while these unprecedented billions have been rushed through by the Congress so that our war machine may frown at an unhappy world and so that the merchants of other nations may have money to spend for the products of American business, a total of more than 50 bills have lain in committees of the House and the Senate for the relief of hundreds of thousands of patient, hard-working, loyal Americans, without whom our great Nation would be utterly helpless and unable to function, whether in war or peace.

Mr. Speaker, the standard of living of our post office workers and other Government workers by the hundreds of thousands has long since fallen far, far below any dignified, American level through the abysmal neglect of Congress and its outright failure to vote them a decent wage.

In the eyes of the Government worker, the Eightieth Congress has a strange record indeed. In its unseemly rush to line the pockets of the munitions profiteers and the great corporations of international monopoly, the Eightieth Congress has turned a deaf ear on one of the most deserving and most neglected groups of plain, faithful American workers.

BUT NOT ONE CENT FOR GOVERNMENT WORKERS

Billions for militarism, but not 1 cent for the underpaid mailman.

Billions for ERP, but not a thin dime has this Congress appropriated to bring the standard of living of American Government workers up to a point almost but not quite reached 10 whole years ago.

This is a callous record indeed, Mr. Speaker.

Ungrateful is too kind a word for it. The Eightieth Congress and its bipartisan coalition from the White House down has been not only neglectful and ungrateful but actually ruthless and inimical toward these indispensable workers.

They have been subjected to inquisitions into their loyalty. They are denied their political rights through perversion of the Hatch Act. They are faced with dismissal in some cases for joining the labor union of their choice. And they are forced to sign away their right to strike as a criminal act.

Yet these men and women who, to serve their Government, willingly bear all these indignities and deprivations of their rights as citizens are denied even a minimum American standard of living by the Congress of their country, which virtuously asserts that "defense" comes first.

DEFENSE BEGINS AT HOME

Mr. Speaker, the first line of defense of the American way of life is the health, happiness, and economic security of our citizens.

Yet the very first ranks of our citizenry—those who man the machinery of government and carry out its functions—are held in political subjection and burdened with incredible economic burdens in the midst of unparalleled prosperity for American business.

Let us consider some statistics about the plight of the American Government worker. Let us begin with the postal workers, a group of some 360,000 men and women employed in one of the most vital services our democratic system provides to assure the free and swift flow of information and exchange of commercial communication and commodities.

The post office people collect, transport, and deliver some 35 billion pieces of mail, newspapers, magazines, and parcels a year. They render thousands of special services daily and annually to virtually every one of the more than 140,000,000 people of America, individually and collectively.

The postal service is truly indispensable to the business, social, and cultural life of every American community.

THE PLIGHT OF THE POSTAL WORKER

Yet today the American postal worker is so far behind the rest of American workers in standard of living that even the $1,000 annual increase which postal workers and other government workers seek will actually not remedy this discrepancy. The fact is that even the $1,000 increase would not bring the postal worker and other Federal workers and their families back to their own 1939 level in economic security.

In spite of this fact, affirmed by our own Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of this body has pared down the original $1,000 request of most of these workers and the more moderate $800 request of others of them, to a mere $468, which would be automatically taken away again in June of next year unless the next Congress votes to extend it. For postal workers the committee proposes $585 yearly, thus acknowledging the extent to which this service has fallen behind the rest.

And now there is a real threat that the present Congress may not even act on so much as this inadequate $468–$585 proposal for the Federal workers.

I should like to offer some urgent arguments for an immediate and substantial increase for all Federal workers.

THEY CAN'T LIVE ON SLOGANS

Specifically referring to the postal worker, virtually every able-bodied employee of this essential public service has been forced to seek additional employment in private industry to make ends meet. Wives, too, are forced to seek employment in order to meet the demands of rising rents, prices, and cost of services.

Home, health, and children suffer. These people are forced to sacrifice the fundamental needs and satisfactions of American family life in order that the mail must go through.

The postal workers of our Nation have indeed exemplified the living truth that "Neither snow nor rain nor heat nor gloom of night stays these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds."

They and the hundreds of thousands of other loyal, long-serving workers who make our democratic public services an example to the world deserve to be first, not last, in the consideration of the Congress of this Nation.

GRANT THE $1,000 INCREASE

Mr. Speaker, I include with these remarks several documents which illuminate in specific detail the economic plight of postal and other Federal workers of which I have spoken today. I hope sincerely that this Congress will not fail in these closing weeks to elevate the standard of living of American Government workers to parity with that of the rest of the Nation.

HOME, HEALTH, CHILDREN SUFFER

(Statement of the Joint Conference of Affiliated Postal Employees of Greater New York and vicinity, representing over 18,000 post office employees affiliated with American Federation of Labor)

The post office function is collecting, transporting, and delivering over 35,000,000,000 pieces of mail yearly. It renders over 800,000,000 special services each year to the country's more than 140,000,000 people, individually and collectively. The postal service is essential to the business, social, and cultural life of every community. It is the Government service that is closest to the people, and the most taken for granted.

Appropriations, charges for service, and rates of expenditures are fixed by Congress. In determining postal rates, every consideration is given to the public welfare, and in many cases rates are deliberately set far below the cost of performance, to encourage the spread of news, knowledge, exchange of commodities, and communications.

Postal employees render efficient service and have a pride in their work, yet the salaries they receive are inadequate. With responsibilities, problems and duties to family, church, and community welfare, in the same measure as all other people, they have a right to expect adequate salaries, housing, and food, or conditions of employment, commensurate with American standards.

WIVES FORCED TO WORK

The Bureau of Labor Statistics figures on the increased cost of living show a rise of more than 60 percent in the cost of all commodities from 1940 to 1947. Costs are still rising; food having increased in cost more than 100 percent since 1940. The budget of all small salaried people, today, must allow about 70 percent of income for food. With rents about 25 percent to 30 percent of income, this leaves practically nothing for clothing, insurance, medical, or dental services, replenishing house furnishings, laundry, or entertainment. An accident or emergency would be impossible to cope with.

All postal employees pay State and Federal taxes. Their take-home pay is further reduced by payroll deductions of 5 percent for retirement; this will soon be raised to 6 percent.

About 85 percent of all postal workers are employed in cities, having a high cost of living and the present housing situation to contend with. A very high percentage of the employees are married and have families.

At present, practically every able bodied postal worker is either additionally employed in private industry or is seeking such work. Wives are forced to seek employment to supplement family income. Home, health, and children suffer.

ONE OVERCOAT EVERY 8 YEARS

The Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor states that a modest income for a family of four (two children, ages 8 and 13) to maintain a maximum standard of living should be at least $3,004 per year in New Orleans, $3,347 in New York City, and $3,458 in Washington, D. C.

A modest budget for a family of four (a point of resistance below which no family ought to fall, according to BLS) calls for the following:

Chicken, turkey, or high-priced cuts of meat, only at Thanksgiving, Christmas, or New Year's; 2 pounds of other meats per person each week; 12 quarts of milk, 20 eggs, 6 loaves of bread, for entire family per week (no mention of butter, bacon, jelly, or cake, with two growing children in the family).

For the breadwinner: Less than one pack of cigarettes per day, five newspapers per week, one letter and three phone calls per week, one haircut every 3 weeks and one movie in the same period; one pair of shoes per year, one suit every 3 years, one overcoat every 8 years.

For the wife: Cotton and rayon underwear, two house dresses, one rayon-silk dress, two pairs of shoes, annually; no mention of beauty parlor or hair dressers; one coat every 4 years, a movie every 3 weeks, four medical calls per year for herself and entire family; no dental allowance.

Two children: Five cotton undershirts and five shorts per year between them; two outer shirts and one pants apiece annually; a fraction of a hat for each and one coat each every 2 years; a movie every 2 weeks; no allowances.

CLOSE THE GAP

The gap between the fixed salaries of postal workers and the income needed to maintain a decent standard of living is continually widening. Working two jobs to try to make ends meet or wives working to help supplement the family income is a strain that is beginning to tell. It is making serious inroads on their health and their efficiency and family life. It is a public responsibility to prevent this by aiding to get an increase for these loyal and hard-working employees.

ILL-FED, ILL-HOUSED, ILL-CLOTHED

(Testimony of Roy Eldean for the United Public Workers of America on the need for a $1,000 increase for postal workers, before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service)

My name is Roy Eldean and I am testifying as a member of the executive board of the United Public Workers of America, CIO.

I am now employed in the post office in Chicago as a postal clerk, and having been in the postal service for 23 years, I believe I am in a position to speak of the immediate need of postal workers for an increase, not only as a representative of my union, but on the basis of my personal knowledge and experience.

The fact is that every postal worker is today in serious economic difficulties. He cannot make ends meet out of his income. And the situation is becoming worse each day, as

prices of food, clothing, rent, and other necessities continue to mount. According to the official figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the cost of living had gone up over 60 percent from 1939 to August 1947. It has probably increased another 5 percent since August.

SEVENTY PERCENT IN THE HOLE

But much more important to the families of people like postal clerks and carriers is that food has gone up 100 percent and clothing 90 percent, in the same 8-year period. Food and clothing have thus practically doubled in cost and those are the major necessities that we spend our incomes on.

During the same period it is true that we have received increases totaling on the average 30 percent. That leaves us a mere 70 percent in the hole on our food and clothing needs. And another thing has developed: Before the war a job as a postal clerk, letter carrier, or railway mail clerk was considered to be a good job, and workers in private industry were prone to envy the status of the postal employee; today the situation is reversed. Again, according to Government statistics, the average weekly earnings of factory workers have more than doubled since 1939. (They were $23.86 in 1939 and $49.21 as of last August.)

In other words, the postal employee has lagged far behind in the unequal race to keep up with the high cost of living. Year by year he has fallen farther behind. Even going by averages, I believe the postal worker takes home less pay today than the factory worker. He is no longer to be considered in the middle third of our American economy. He is definitely in the lowest third—the group that Franklin D. Roosevelt described as "ill-fed, ill-housed, and ill-clothed."

A large percentage of the wives of postal workers are forced to work so that they can pay their bills. Those having young children have to hire someone to take care of them so they are little money ahead. Those having older children face the problem of juvenile delinquency unless there is someone to watch over them.

WORKERS GO INTO DEBT

I believe that the Chicago post office has the largest credit union in the State of Illinois. In 1947 the credit union loaned out $200,000 more than in 1946 because of increased living costs.

A clerk or carrier starting to work in the post office as a regular substitute is paid by the hour at $1.04. By working long hours he earns $2,500 or more a year—in some instances, $2,800 or $3,000. When these substitutes are appointed as regulars they go to the lowest grade of $2,100 and sometimes $2,200. As a result, many clerks and carriers upon receiving a regular appointment quit the postal service rather than take a cut in pay. The turn-over is great among new postal workers. The Post Office Department loses thousands of dollars every year in the training of new men and the efficiency of the service is also impaired.

Now I am not just talking statistics. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has completed a study which says that a minimum budget, providing only bare necessities, for a family of four in my own city of Chicago called for $3,282 a year as of June 1947. The cost of food, clothing, rent, and other necessities has certainly gone up 10 percent since that time, which would add another $328, bringing the minimum budget to $3,610 a year. Very few postal employees in Chicago earn that much today; many thousands of them earn $1,000 a year less than that.

FAMILY OF FOUR NEEDS $4,500

And that is really a minimum budget. It doesn't permit the kind of living that most people associate with the postal employees. I could quote the budget of the Heller committee of the University of California, which as of now would show that to maintain a decent standard of living would require an income of about $4,500 a year.

In view of the facts and figures I have given, I wish to state that the United Public Workers of America is completely in accord with the proposal to increase salaries in the postal service by $1,000 a year. Such an increase is necessary to permit postal workers to make ends meet; it is necessary in order to maintain morale in the postal service; and it is necessary to maintain prosperity and avoid economic crisis.

I must confess that I cannot understand, nor do I think postal workers understand, why the President of the United States is unwilling to recommend that Congress raise postal salaries. The President's budget calls for spending $7,000,000,000 abroad this year. I am sure there is great need among the people of Europe, and that we should help them, but I am even more sure of the needs of my own people here at home; and I don't see why helping them has to be posed against helping us.

NO, MR. PRESIDENT, IT'S NOT INFLATIONARY

The failure of the President to recommend these sorely needed increases comes as a great shock to us. We see corporation profits at a level more than double the most prosperous prewar years, prices at unprecedented high levels, yet there is nothing that can be recommended to relieve the condition of the Government employee. No other group in the country is being called on to make such unwarranted sacrifices—why us?

We cannot see how giving us enough of an increase simply to restore our prewar purchasing power is going to cause inflation. We cannot believe that you can have a sound economy with millions of families pushed down below a decent living standard.

I know that all of our postal employees are looking to this Congress for action in this crucial year. They expect, and I think they have the right to expect, serious consideration of their problems and a serious answer in terms of a substantial wage increase. They will be gravely disappointed if this Congress talks a great deal about big raises but then finds it impossible to grant anything.

FEDERAL WORKERS IN EFFECT DEMOTED

(Statement of Nathan Cowan, legislative director of the Congress of Industrial Organizations)

The Congress of Industrial Organizations believes that the steadily rising cost of living has had the effect of demoting each Federal worker.

Although national and international commitments of the United States have placed increased responsibilities on the Federal Government and its employees, the present Federal pay scale provides inadequate compensation for the Government worker. The pay increases granted to these workers during the war years were primarily to compensate for the abolition of overtime work and did not increase the take-home pay. The last increase, on July 1, 1946, based on the rising cost of living, was before the abolition of price controls. Even on the date the increase went into effect, it was already outmoded and inadequate. Consequently, many lower-paid workers are forced to take part-time jobs in private industry to supplement their incomes; additional large numbers have been forced to forego basic necessities and medical care.

AT LEAST $1,000 BEHIND

Today, half of the Federal workers receive less than $2,500 a year. It should be noted that the Bureau of Labor Statistics has stated that an annual income of $3,500 is necessary for a family of four to maintain an adequate standard of living. Therefore, at the present cost of living, it will require an increase of $1,000 a year for most Federal workers to restore their purchasing power to prewar levels.

President Truman and his economic advisers have repeatedly stated that where inequities in pay exist, they should be corrected. Where workers are underpaid, they should not be penalized for the inflation that exists by an argument that their pay increase will cause inflation.

CUTTING STAFFS NO REMEDY

The CIO supports the proposed legislation granting an annual increase of $1,000 to Federal workers. Such an increase is now provided in the Langer-Chavez bill. Furthermore, the CIO urges the appropriation of additional funds for such an increase. Services now being provided to the people of the United States by the Federal Government should not be impaired to provide funds for a pay increase. Finally, in view of the pressing need, this measure should be enacted into law by Congress immediately.

Text of Pope Pius XII's Address to Cardinals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1948

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I think it fitting and timely to include in the RECORD the text of the address to the College of Cardinals of His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, on June 2, 1948.

During this period of world upheaval and the search for a lasting peace it behooves each and every one of us to digest well the statements of the holy father and make them applicable in our every day life. The address follows:

The shining figure of Pope St. Eugene.

For the tenth time, divine providence allows us to receive, venerable brothers, your greetings on the feast of our holy patron and to express to you our appreciation for your close and loyal collaboration as well as our reliance on the aid of your prayers. But today, for the first time, we enjoy the consolation of accepting your earnest good wishes as expressed with such delicate feeling by the revered and most worthy new dean of your sacred college.

It was only a few months ago at Christmas time that we listened to the voice of the venerated and lamented Cardinal Gennaro Granito Pignatelli di Belmonte. The Lord has called him to Himself in the evening of a long and fruitful lifetime. To serve for his eulogy and to put into words our gratitude in his regard there springs immediately to our mind a phrase that fits him perfectly and describes him completely: He was "the good and faithful servant" of the church of Christ and of his apostolic see.

Today we naturally turn our thoughts to the holy pontiff whose name our deeply devout parents gave us and whose patronage they assured us when we were born, never guessing its hidden meaning for us. And we, who for a goodly 10 years have been steering the barque of Peter through the squalls of the tempest and the furious buffeting of the storm, tossed about without rest

or respite amid the reefs, find it heartening now to recall the story of him who was really here below the "sacerdos magnus, qui in diebus suis placuit Deo et inventus est justus" and who today from Heaven's glorious and eternal rest sends down upon the latest of his successors a gentle and brilliant ray of light which fills our heart with comfort, courage, and confidence.

Terrena non metuit! He feared nothing on earth!

CHARACTERISTIC TRAIT

The sacred liturgy depicts, in the forceful final words of a brief antiphon, the figure of a sovereign pontiff according to the mind and heart of the Divine Master, wholly wrapped up in the gravity of his mission and his responsibilities: "Dum esset fummus pontifex, terrena non metuit": "While he was sovereign pontiff he was afraid of nothing on earth!"

Terrena non metuit! He feared nothing on earth!" There is the characteristic trait which sums up the life and activity of all the great popes; there is the feature which the church has seen fit to make the title of honor for all the popes who are saints. From the very first moment when, in spite of our unworthiness, we were called to follow in their footsteps we have considered this as a constant directive for our conduct. We have made this the ideals toward which we ought to advance with all our feeble forces. In excited and exciting days like ours, at a time when truth and error, faith in God and denial of God, the primacy of the spirit and the predominance of matter, human dignity and its abandonment, the order born of reason and the chaos following its misuse, confront each other everywhere over the face of the world in a decisive struggle, the mission of the church and of her visible head cannot develop and mature with Heaven's blessing except beneath the motto: "Terrena non metuit."

To be afraid? Of what? Are we then, not strong? Is the clash between the followers and the foes of Christ after all insuperable?

The church suffers to think of the harm that her enemies are doing to themselves, of the evil they bring to so many little, frail, ignorant souls to whom they are a cause of scandal and of ruin. For herself she rekindles the ardor of Christ's disciples, and to burn into them a keener and deeper realization of their strength.

HEALTHY REAWAKENING

In the shadowy half-light the line of division between the two camps would seem almost shifting to the superficial eye. The full light of truth has marked it clearly at the very points where it appeared most uncertain. Now is the moment when every one who still treasures in the depths of his soul a spark of Christian spirit must wake up. This awakening may painfully disturb the smug tranquillity of those to whom the daylight of reality points inexorably to sacrifices and changes to which, in their slumbers, they had not given a thought, and from which they can no longer escape. But it is a healthy reawakening, too, because it releases energies hitherto pent up and, as it were, benumbed with grevious harm to individuals and to all mankind.

The attitudes, the resolutions, and the acts which are the fruit of this awakening are not confined, as an erroneous slogan would have it, within the sphere called purely religious, meaning by the phrase exclusion from any penetration into public life. The contrary is true. On the civic, national, international plane they are involved in every question where moral interests are at stake, in every question where the issue is to form ranks for God or against Him, in every question, briefly, which explicitly or implicitly touches religion.

In these attitudes, in these resolutions, in these acts, Catholic forces, while reserving their freedom of action in face of political currents and alinements, may sometimes follow a road parallel to theirs, insofar as it may be suggested by common interests; parallel, but no more, without merging or subordination.

SOLID FRONT FORMED

These attitudes, these resolutions, and these acts form the solid front of the Christian conscience which is determined, at the proper time and place, to put a stop to the advancement of religious nihilism to the violence of brute force, to the profanation of the person and dignity of man, to the assaults against society or to society's misdeeds.

Hence, in the name of God-made man, we address our paternal gratitude to each and every one of our beloved sons and daughters spread over the world who is enrolled in the army of Christ and sworn to battle for the coming of His kingdom of peace; while at the same time we express our most ardent hopes that, preservering faithful unto death, they may be found on the great day of eternal recompense among the number of the conquerors for whom are reserved the magnificent and inscrutable promises of the revelation full of mystery.

We are sure they will not feel offended if, to the expression of gratitude which rises from the depths of our heart, we add a new and urgent "vigilant"—watch.

In the brief pauses between two battles this unflinching vigilance is more than ever needed, because great is the danger then of resting on one's laurels, of becoming unnerved and allowing the enemy to retake the ground so laboriously conquered. The days of truce are often no less important than those of battle. They should not be days of empty and idle interruption, but of useful work; work of rescue, constructive work which will give substance and form to the glorious hopes inspired by victory.

WORK OF RESCUE

The work of rescue should be extended also to those many wayward souls who, although remaining—as they think, at least—united to our devoted children in the faith, have parted company with them to join in movements which actually tend to laicize and de-Christianize every phase of private and public life. Even though the divine word "Father forgive them for they know not what they do" should be valid for them also, this would not change at all the objective wickedness of their conduct. They provide themselves with a double conscience; for while they pretend to remain members of the Christian community, at the same time they fight as auxiliary troops in the ranks of those who deny God. This very double dealing or this cleavage threatens to make of them, sooner or later, a poisonous tumor in the very bosom of Christianity. These people remind us of those of whom the Apostle Paul spoke "weeping, flens"; they draw tears from our eyes also, because they are acting like enemies of the Cross of Christ, "inimicos Crucis Christi."

THE MATERNAL WARNING OF THE CHURCH

As long as it is possible we seek, with kindness and patience to open their eyes, to lead them back to Him who alone is the way, the truth, the life. Also to the just and salutary solutions of temporal problems—in conformity with divine and eternal principles—the prayer of the church contributes its aid: "* * * Grant to all those who profess themselves Christians to reject those things which are contrary to that name and follow such things as are agreeable to the same" (Collect, third Sunday after Easter).

While we thus pray for those in danger, we beseech them at the same time to heed the warnings of the church which still today exhorts and prays like a loving mother, that she may not be obliged to apply to them the severe judgment of the Divine Master: "And if he will not hear the church: let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican." (Matthew 18: 17.)

SOCIAL REFORMS

But the reconquest of so many wayward and embittered hearts, who have lost the true concepts and sound ideas about the world and God and themselves, will depend essentially on the earnestness, loyalty, energy and fairness which all men of right principle will bring to the solution of the fundamental problems growing out of the ruin and revolution of the war and its aftermath. As everybody knows, at the heart of these issues and controlling them entirely, lie the just and necessary social reforms, and particularly the urgent need to provide the poorer classes with housing, bread, and work.

Yet, it would be dangerous, since it might lead to bitter disappointment, if fantastic hopes and expectations of a fully satisfactory and speedy solution were to be based on these reforms. It is not a question today of merely distributing the products of social economy more equitably in closer correspondence with the labor and the needs of individuals. Important as this requirement may be, still under present conditions, especially in view of the enormous destruction and fluctuation caused by the war, every social reform is strictly bound up with the question of a prudent organization of production.

The relations between agriculture and industry within the singe national economies, and of those later with the economy of other nations, the manner and extent that each nation is to share in the world market; all these difficult problems present themselves today afresh and under aspects different from those of previous times. Upon their rational solution depends the productivity of the several nations, and consequently the welfare of individuals as well; for it is clear that there can never be sufficient distribution where there is not sufficient production.

EXPLOITATION WARNING

There are nations, of course, who can boast today of a productive capacity, which, they point out, is constantly increasing from year to year. But if this productivity is attained as a result of unbridled competition and of an unprincipled expenditure of wealth, or by oppression and despotic exploitation of labor and the needs of individuals on the part of the State, it cannot be sound and natural, because social economy is an organizing of workers, and every worker is endowed with human dignity and freedom. The immoderate exploitation of genuine human values usually keeps step with that of nature's treasures, especially of the land, and leads sooner or later to decadence.

Only on the principles of Christianity and in accord with its spirit can the social reforms, called for imperatively by the necessities and aspirations of our times, be carried out. They demand from some the spirit of renunciation and sacrifice, from others the sense of responsibility and endurance, from everybody hard and strenuous work.

Wherefore, we turn to the Catholics of the whole world exhorting them not to be satisfied with good intentions and fine projects but to proceed courageously to put them into practice. Neither should they hesitate to join forces with those who, remaining outside their ranks, are none the less in agreement with the social teaching of the Catholic Church and are disposed to follow the road that she has marked out, which is not the road of violent revolution but of experience, that has stood the test, and of energetic resolution.

THE WAR IN PALESTINE

Among the political problems which still await an adequate solution, it is unnecessary to say that world peace takes first place. And behold instead, to the profound consternation of all Christendom, the flames of war which were already smoldering in noble Greece and China's ancient land, have been rekindled in the very places where nearly 2,000 years ago the divine message of peace had resounded, ushering in the work of salvation.

The truce, however temporary, announced this very night, must be hailed with a sigh of relief, as a dawn of hope. How could the Christian world look on unconcernedly or in fruitless indignation, as that sacred ground which everyone approached with reverence most profound to kiss it with warmest affection, was being trampled by troops of war and bombed from the air? Allow the holy places to be completely devastated? Reduce the great sepulchre of Christ to a mass of rubble? God grant that the danger of so terrible a scourge may be finally dispelled.

THE WORK FOR PEACE

Since in this fashion the world has been languishing for 3 years under a strange uneasiness and is wandering along divergent paths, faltering between peace and war, far-seeing and courageous men are searching unceasingly for new avenues that open the way to safety. Through repeated attempts at reconciliation, they are devoting themselves to set on her feet again a Europe shaken to her very foundations and to make of this source of recurring upheavals a bulwark of peace and the providential champion of a general calm over the whole face of the world.

Hence, though without wanting to involve the church in the tangle of purely temporal interests, we deemed it opportune to appoint our special representative to the Congress of Europe recently held at The Hague, in order to show the solicitude and to offer the encouragement of this apostolic see for the union of nations. Neither have we any doubt that our faithful children will realize that their position is always at the side of those generous souls who are preparing the way for mutual understanding and for the reestablishment of a sincere spirit of peace among nations.

THE COMING HOLY YEAR

The more the world of today exhibits the disheartening spectacle of its dissensions and contradictions, the more compelling is the duty of Catholics to give a shining example of unity and cohesion without distinction of language, nationality, or race.

In the light of this ideal of concord, we welcome with gratitude to God and with confidence in His assistance, the approach of the Holy Year. There was a moment when it might have been doubted whether the Eternal City would be materially and spiritually in a position to guarantee a worthy setting for an event of such far-reaching import. But the vigor, the high-mindedness and the strong feeling for order, justice, and peace of the people of Rome and of Italy have made such a profound impression on the Catholic world as to dispel all doubt and to remove the basis of any fear whatever.

With deep joy and tender emotion then, venerable brothers, do we give notice to you and to the whole Catholic universe that in the year 1950 the twenty-fifth Holy Year in the history of the church will be celebrated, if so pleases the Lord, according to the prescriptions santioned by sacred tradition.

After the sad times that have just passed, filled to the cup's brim with sorrow and anguish, may this really Holy Year, by the grace of the Most High, and through the intercession of the august Mother of God, of the princes of the Apostles and of all the saints, be for the human family a harbinger of a new era of peace, prosperity, and progress.

That is our most dear wish, the object of our most fervent prayers.

May the days of the Holy Year bring the answer from heaven to the prayer which, with a single heart, pastor and flock, Rome and the Catholic world, address to God: "Laetifica nos pro diebus quibus nos affixisti, pro annis quibus vidimus mala" (Ps. 29, 15).

"Give us joy for the days in which Thou hast humbled us, for the years in which we have suffered misfortune."

Looking forward to this consolation, venerable brothers, upon you and upon all our beloved sons and daughters who have listened to this message of ours, we bestow with particular affection our apostolic benediction.

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 3, 1948

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by my colleague, Hon. SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, JR.:

JUNE 2, 1948.

Mr. and Mrs. ——— ———,
———, *Pa.*

DEAR MR. AND MRS. ———: Your telegram of May 20 is acknowledged.

Last week the House voted to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for 1 year with modifications. I voted for it.

There has been agitation from various sources since this action. Criticism has been focused mainly on the 1-year rather than a 3-year extension, and on the changes in the act.

I cannot understand the significance of a 3-year continuation. A 1-year extension would enable the new or present incumbent of the White House to determine his trade policies shortly after a new term begins; it would enable this country to observe the good faith of other countries in fulfilling their reciprocal obligations; and it would coincide with the approximate date when the report on the European recovery program is made, and when new appropriations for another year of the program are considered. A 2-year extension would span a congressional term, and 4 years would span a Presidential term, but what does a 3-year extension signify?

The modification of the act which would require the Tariff Commission, an independent body appointed by the President, to set limits below and above which he could not go without bringing the matter before Congress represents an effort to remove tariff changes from political manipulation by the executive branch. Our system of government is one of checks and balances, and it does seem correct that the President, regardless of party affiliations, should have some check on his actions by some means when he decides to act contrary to the advice of a nonpolitical expert commission.

I realize there may be circumstances which make it desirable to act beyond the set limits. If that should be the case, the President would bring it before Congress, and if they approve or fail to act within 60 legislative days, he could then proceed as he planned. Usually the President and the Congress are of the same political party, so that approval should not constitute an insuperable barrier.

I wish to see a sound revival of foreign trade, and if an equitable system can be evolved, there would be slight reason, once it is established to require a renewal at certain stated periods. It could run along indefinitely on such a basis.

It does not seem fair to condemn the measure on a supposition of what might be done by some group in the future. The reciprocal idea is a good one, provided adequate protection from hasty political action is assured.

Yours sincerely,

SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, JR.

From the North to the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the great tragedies of our life as a nation is the political cleavage caused by the Civil War nearly a hundred years ago, which has divided the people of the North and the South into two political parties, although, in political thought, the vast majority are on common ground. This has become increasingly evident in recent years, and no serious effort has been made to reform our political parties in such a way as to heal this ancient breach and make possible the unity of the people of the North and the South who think alike in matters of politics and government so that they can assert their attitudes by action under a single political banner.

Recently some very substantial citizens who are known personally to me, from the town of Lansing, a small community of rural New York, have initiated a movement toward establishing some pattern of cooperative understanding and action between the conservative Republicans of the North and the real Democrats of the South. They have adopted a resolution which speaks for itself but, in essence, contains the idea which, if carried to fruition, will pave the way toward a stronger, safer, and more united America. I commend it for your serious consideration and the sober reflection of all people of the North and the South.

FROM THE NORTH TO THE SOUTH

We, the undersigned, from the rock-ribbed Republican town of Lansing, and Tompkins County, in up-State New York, which has never voted Democratic, extend the hand of friendship to the southern Democrats, our fellow Americans. We agree with Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence, who said:

"I see with the deepest affliction the rapid strides with which the Federal branch of our Government is advancing towards the usurpation of all the rights reserved to the States, and the consolidation in itself of all powers, foreign and domestic; and that, too, by constructions which, if legitimate, leaves no limits to its power. * * * When all government, domestic and foreign, in little as in great things, shall be drawn to Washington as the center of all power, it will render

powerless the checks provided by one branch of government on another, and will become as venal and oppressive as the government from which we separated. * * * What an augmentation of the field for jobbing, speculating, plundering, office-building, and office-hunting would be produced by the assumption of all the State powers into the hands of the General Government. * * * It is not by the consolidation or concentration of powers, but by their distribution, that good government is effected. The way to have good and safe government is not to trust it all to one, but to divide it among the many, distributing to every one exactly the functions he is competent to do. Let the National Government be entrusted with the defense of the Nation and its foreign and Federal relations; the State governments with the civil rights, laws and police, and the administration of what concerns the State generally; and the counties with the local concerns of the counties; until it ends in the administration of every man's farm by himself. * * * What has destroyed liberty and the rights of man in every government which has ever existed under the sun? The generalizing and concentrating all cares and powers in one body."

So spoke Thomas Jefferson.

We believe, as did the founders of our Nation, in a Federal republic of limited constitutional powers; and in the system of checks and balances between the legislative, executive, and judicial departments—no one supreme; no packed court or rubber-stamp Congress.

We resent the swarms of bureaucrats who suck their living from honest industry, swelling their functions to fatten their pockets. The essence of liberty is the right of every man to retain the fruit of his toil; and we resent the fact that the average man must work 2 days of every week to support such parasites.

We abhor the demagogues who inflame strife to prey on the ignorant. We commend the law-enforcement officers of your Southern States who have so courageously reduced mob violence almost to the vanishing point, even when aroused by vicious crimes; we wish that an honest workman in the North could be equally protected against mob violence when going to work.

We deplore the lack of mutual understanding between the good people of the North and South, which by dividing our strength has played into the hands of groups who would weaken and destroy our Nation. Foreign intrigue has no place in our political system, and our public servants should cease to be sensitive to special pressure groups if and when the great body of our Nation speaks its mind without the division of traditional parties, a division which so exaggerates the influence of pressure groups in certain States.

We know that people a thousand miles away cannot always understand each other's problems. We realize that local conditions, traditions, and memories may make it as difficult for your good people to vote Republican as for us to vote Democratic. We do not ask you to do so. While the amalgamation of the two great parties may be impractical, and even undesirable as leading to the totalitarian dictator, we hope that your people and ours will so vote that our Nation as a whole will emerge stronger to face the problems which now confront us.

Robert V. Morse, Ithaca, N. Y. (writer of above); John W. Shannon, Ithaca, N. Y.; Charles H. Scofield, Supervisor, Town of Lansing, Groton; Louise Rankin, Ludlowville, N. Y., Republican State Committeewoman; Everett H. Rankin, Farmer, Ludlowville, N. Y.; Otis F. Curtis, Teacher, Ithaca, N. Y.; Lucy W. Curtis, Republican State Committeewoman, 1928–38, Ithaca, N. Y.; Charlotte Bush, Ithaca, N. Y., County Treasurer, 1925–46; W. Glenn Norris, Ithaca, N. Y., Tompkins County Clerk; Norman G. Stagg, Tompkins County Judge; James R. Robinson, Ithaca, N. Y., 14 years member New York State Assembly; Edward Ozmun, Justice of the Peace, Town of Lansing; John Howland, Highway Superintendent, Town of Lansing; Clay C. Tarbell, Justice of Peace, Town of Lansing, N. Y.; A. B. Genung, Economist, Northeast Farm Foundation, Freeville, N. Y.; H. N. Bliss, Ithaca, Engineer; C. F. Morse, Past Chairman Selective Service Board, Ithaca, N. Y.; Douglas Hewitt, Candidate for State Legislature, Ithaca; Merritt A. Vining, Industrial Executive, former Republican Precinct Committeeman, Ithaca; Carl W. Vail, Engineer, Supervisor Ithaca Fourth Ward, Ithaca, N. Y.; Bristow Adams, Alderman, City of Ithaca; Ray Ashbery, Attorney, Trumansburg, N. Y.; Joseph S. Barr, Ithaca, N. Y., Commissioner of Public Works; Fitch Stephens, former Tompkins County Surrogate, Republican State Committeeman from Tompkins County since 1937.

The Mundt Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 3, 1948

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to direct the attention of the Members of the House to the following editorial published Tuesday, May 25, in the San Francisco Chronicle, which for many years has been recognized as the leading organ of the Republican Party in northern California:

MUNDT BILL EMPLOYS BACK-HANDED APPROACH TO SUBVERSION

The Mundt bill undertakes to combat subversion in two ways:

It defines as a crime any attempt to establish for the United States a totalitarian form of government under domination or control of any foreign government, and sets up severe penalties for such effort. This is unobjectionable except on the ground of redundancy. We agree with Governor Dewey that crimes of sedition are already covered rather adequately by existing statutes.

The Mundt bill also deals with membership in the Communist Party and Communist-front organizations (as defined by the Attorney General) by requiring all members of the party and all officers of Communist-front organizations to register with the Attorney General such lists of names to be kept and maintained in such manner as to be open to public inspection.

Advocates of the Mundt bill approve this latter provision as a relatively gentle and probably effective regulation—it subjects these presumably wayward citizens, they say, to nothing more than publicity.

As professional dealers in publicity in the broad sense, we cannot dismiss this instrument so lightly. It is at once a weapon of great constructive potential—a part of the mechanism for the preservation of a people's freedom—and a weapon of great destructive potential, capable of ruining a man, and certainly of contributing to the ruin of a nation. Much depends upon with what intent and responsibility it is used.

The circumstances surrounding the injection of publicity into the Mundt bill offer no assurance that it will in this case be used as a constructive weapon. They indicate, rather, that the device was incorporated in lieu of any sound legal manner of getting at the Communist fronters, without intelligent regard for the device's possible abuse.

The framers of the bill recognize the endless complications that would surround any attempt to outlaw a group on the ground that it was deemed sympathetic to the Communist Party, which itself is quite lawful. Among other things, such an attempt would run afoul of the first amendment of the Constitution. So the proposition was come at from the rear, so to speak, with stiff physical penalties assessed for failure to register, but "nothing more than publicity" attaching to the acknowledgment of membership.

What was the purpose of this backhanded procedure? Clearly, to hold the members of such organizations up to public scorn, and in so doing, to impose a degree of punishment by a means other than those ordinarily prescribed by law—i. e., fine, imprisonment or death.

When a Congressman on the Un-American Activities Committee, or the Attorney General as a prosecutor denounces an individual as a Communist or as a fellow traveler, that is one thing. It is quite another when Congress puts all Communists and all officers of Communist-front organizations under the duty, on pain of imprisonment, of denouncing themselves. And for what? Not for acts of subversion, but for the mere act of membership in political organizations, the mother organization being a recognized political party.

The distinction is important and vital. We support the right and duty of the legislative and executive branches to name individuals and organizations whose activities they may consider dangerous to American society. This must be done—always responsibility—for that society's protection. But such denunciation does not establish any crime on the part of the ones denounced, is subject to open refutation, and there is no penal sanction involved.

But the requirement that citizens come forward and denounce themselves on pain of fine or imprisonment for the ideas they hold is new, different, and dangerously in conflict with the spirit of our laws and our freedoms.

Firmness Begets Respect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 3, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I think we should all commend the State Department for its strong stand against the Lebanese Government with regard to the detention of Americans taken from the steamship *Marine Carp*. Our State Department informed the Lebanese Government that our Government considered the grounds for the detention unsatisfactory, and that, so far as the United States Government had been advised, Lebanese authorities did not purport to have acted under the authority of any law or legal process of Lebanon. It was further stated that the Lebanese Government made no showing that those detained were charged with any offense

against Lebanese law, or that the Government's action was in conformance with basic processes of law recognized throughout the world relating to arrest, charge of commission of a crime, hearing, and trial. Our Government viewed the action of the Lebanese Government as in disregard of the established principles of international law relating to the rights and duties of a state with respect to aliens. Therefore, the note stated:

The United States Government protests the continued detention of these American citizens and requests their immediate release.

Mr. Speaker, the same determined action by our State Department to Britain and all the Arab aggressors will go far toward restoring peace in the Middle East.

Memorial Day Address of Hon. George W. Gillie, of Indiana, at Valley Forge, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1948

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. GEORGE W. GILLIE, of Indiana, at the twenty-fifth annual Indiana State Sunday service on May 30, 1948, at the Washington Memorial Chapel, Valley Forge, Pa.:

Dr. Hart, fellow Hoosiers, ladies, and gentlemen, let me say at the outset that I am deeply grateful for the opportunity to be at this Indiana State Sunday service in this magnificent memorial building which has been dedicated to posterity in honor of our first President.

This occasion calls to mind a statement made by Gen. Lewis Cass in the course of an address at the canal celebration at Fort Wayne in July 1843, when he said:

"We have come to rejoice together.

"Memorable deeds make memorable days. There is the power of association given to man, which binds together the past with the present and connects both with the future. Great events hallow the sites where they pass. Their returning anniversaries, so long as they are remembered, are kept with sorrow or joy as they are prosperous or adverse."

These words were spoken by General Cass more than 100 years ago in Indiana. They are as appropriate today—at this service—as they were then.

We Hoosiers take pride in the fact that Indiana has contributed to the building of this most beautiful memorial—through donations and through the erection of a beautiful Bedford sandstone altar. The Indiana Daughters of the American Revolution have contributed a bell for the carillon tower, which the national society of the DAR is adding to this great structure, a panel in the roof of the Republic, and an Indiana State flag.

In this connection, Indiana also takes pride in the fact that Mrs. Roscoe O'Byrnes, of Brookville, Ind., is the present president general of the DAR. Her splendid leadership and active participation has brought Indiana to the fore in DAR activities.

I hope it will not be amiss in these sacred precincts to recall an ancient pagan tale. You remember the legend of Antaeus: How, so long as he was in contact with his holy Mother Earth, he could never be vanquished, but destruction was certain should he for a moment lose touch with her. Standing today on soil so hallowed in every American heart, I am reminded of that ancient story. And I would fain point out that—like all the myths and folklore which have been handed down through the ages—this old story holds a moral for us today. So long as you and I and every group of Americans, their sons and their daughters and the generations which shall succeed them, keep in close and loving touch with this soil of ours—so dearly bought, so heroically defended—we shall continue to draw that strength and nourishment which sustains the national vigor and cut off from which the roots of our national being shall wither away and die.

"Land where my fathers died,
Land of the Pilgrims' pride—"

can never be an idle sentiment for us.

I should like to take this occasion to remark that I wish that that time-honored song were more frequently sung in our schools and other public places. To be sure, our official national anthem is The Star-Spangled Banner—and should be—but the other is equally dear to us and is, moreover, bound up with the lives of generations of American school children. All of us here today were certainly brought up on it. How many Friday afternoon exercises, commencement ceremonies, and Fourth of July celebrations it has adorned and beautified. I wonder whether the school children—the small, grade-school children—of today know it as well as we did. There are words in that song which should never be forgotten. They should be part of the warp and woof of all future generations of young American thought, as they were of ours.

"Let music swell the breeze,
And ring from all the trees
Sweet Freedom's song;
Let mortal tongues awake,
Let all that breathe partake,
Let rocks their silence break,
The sound prolong."

A gathering such as ours today inevitably recalls the past. I am not one of those who regard an excursion into history as a waste of time. A backward glance does not, in my judgment, at all imperil or impede a forward movement. Time-honored memories do not alter progressive views. Rather, by pausing for a brief space to reflect upon the deeds of our forefathers—their hopes, their fears, their ambitions, and (let us be perfectly honest) their entirely human mistakes; above all, the genesis and source of their inspiration—we renew our courage and increase our faith and return to our own modern problems refreshed in mind and spirit. This quiet gathering in this holy shrine this Sabbath afternoon reminds us of the Master's saying on one occasion to his perplexed and wearied disciples: "Come ye yourselves into a desert place apart and rest awhile."

It is good for us to be here; it is good to look back as we sit here in quietness and peace. History has many lessons to teach us. On the pediment of one of the heroic statues in front of the beautiful Archives Building in Washington is an inscription which reads as follows: "What is past is prologue."

If we can think of what has gone before as merely a prelude, more or less distant, to the actual living present in which we find ourselves and hence part of an immense panorama—never ceasing, continuously unfolding to the day of judgment—we gain what is at once the historian's most precious tool and the practical man of affairs' most invaluable asset: Perspective—a knowledge of the true and relative importance of things.

Make no mistake. We belong to the past no less than to the present. If the present seems peculiarly our own, it is because it is the living hour in which we have work to do and our especial duties to perform. But in a little while—a very little space—we, too, shall join the great majority as will our children and our children's children. But—

"A thousand years in Thy sight are but as yesterday when it is past, and as a watch in the night."

If an accurate perspective of the true importance of things is essential to clear thinking and right living, how greatly we are reminded of the fact today. Look around you. Here on this ground, forever hallowed, forever dear, lived and suffered through one dreadful winter that valiant patriot army to whose sublime fortitude we owe, under God, our national being. As we sit here today in this beautiful memorial chapel, as we wander around these beautiful grounds so lovingly kept in order by a grateful posterity, does it not seem as if the very air itself were impregnated with the spirit of that deathless sacrifice? But let us turn back. An eminent American novelist once thus described that dreadful—yet awe-inspiring—scene:

"Valley Forge—and starving soldiers moaning through the icy night. Washington rarely slept; he sat there planning, planning, in the cold, by the dim light. There was a war—and there were brave men—and there was a patriot soul."

Those moaning soldiers, those bloody tracks in the snow, the icy wind, the pitiful rations and towering over all that, strong, stern, silent, sorrowful but inflexibly determined commander in chief. Who amongst us has not seen at least a copy of that famous painting of the great leader standing on a snow-swept hillside, his cloak blowing around him, gazing into the distance as if he would fathom the future, and in the background those pitiful, ragged figures striving to warm themselves by the fire? This is history, fellow Americans. Who shall dare to say it conveys no lesson? No wonder that Mr. Lincoln, who was not given to outbursts, once exclaimed, "Washington is the mightiest name on earth."

And we fellow citizens of Indiana, we, too, have our particular share in that great conflict.

While the outbreak of the Revolution found no British garrison in Indiana, throughout the Northwest there was a deadly struggle between British and Americans to gain the friendship and adherence of the Indian tribes. The British in large measure succeeded in their design on inflaming the savages on the border. In the year 1777, long remembered throughout the Northwest as the "Bloody Year," the border was in a parlous state. While Washington was struggling in the East, George Rogers Clark and his little band of scouts and sharpshooters, only about 175 strong, were commencing to write an epic which will endure with American history. No citizen of Indiana need be reminded of Vincennes, Fort Sackville, Fort Wayne, and many another site so valiantly defended by Clark and his stalwarts throughout the Revolution. By the surrender of Vincennes February 25, 1779, a most glorious date in Indiana history and one of the most glorious dates in all American history—the great Northwest Territory was sealed to the patriot cause and the Union which was to be, assured of an opportunity to advance on its march of destiny.

Another great saga in the history of the Northwest Territory revolved around the establishment of Fort Wayne by that great soldier, Gen. Mad Anthony Wayne.

Few cities in America have a more colorful history than Fort Wayne. The present site of the city, because of its location "where three rivers meet," was, before the coming of white men, an important center of early American Indian life. Chief Little Turtle described the place as "that glorious gate through which all the good words of our chiefs had to pass from the north to the south and from the east to the west." Later, toward the close of the seventeenth century, the adventurous French succeeded in establishing a post there, and held it until 1760, when it was surrendered to the English as one of their prizes at the close of the French and Indian War.

The English had little success in holding the post, losing it back to the Indians under Chief Pontiac in the year 1763. Beginning at that time and continuing for a period of 30 years, the spot was the scene of continuous strife, turmoil, and bloodshed. Even after the Revolutionary War, it was still held by the savages, now with the aid of the English.

President George Washington dispatched three armies to the West to establish there what he said would be "an important post for the Union." Two of the armies were defeated, but the third, under General Wayne, overwhelmed the Indians and their English abettors, and established a stockade which became known as "Fort Wayne" and which was dedicated on October 22, 1794.

Other times, other problems. Today, we, the spiritual descendants of those patriots of early days face, in our turn, issues on an even vaster and more perplexing scale. "What is past is prologue." If our forefathers, those stern, valiant, and irrepressible men, met and solved in their day the mighty problems which confronted them, shall we despair of ourselves, their descendants? If, out of pitiful resources in the face of what seemed literally overwhelming odds, George Washington, George Roberts Clay, and Mad Anthony Wayne triumphantly vindicated the right of the freeborn to remain free and, together with their fellow patriots, established out of many scattered communities a Union which yet endures and shall, please God, endure for generations yet unborn, shall not we Americans, now grown so mighty, resolve to succeed on a yet larger stage, namely, the world? There are many proposals in this fearful latter day for world union. Some are for one type of federation, some for another. We need not quarrel in this place, this Sabbath afternoon, as to precisely how or when this great consummation shall take place. For surely we are all agreed on the principle—that the nations of the earth shall draw ever closer together in peace, commerce, and friendship until the brotherhood of man—so often foreseen by the prophets, so often sung by the poets—shall be a brotherhood in deed and "there shall be no wars any more." This is our great responsibility; this is our great vocation. Dare we refuse to answer that call?

I conclude with the words of one of the greatest of the sons of men, Abraham Lincoln—sometime a resident of Indiana, nigh unto Gentryville: "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. * * * No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down to honor or dishonor to the latest generation. * * * We, even we here, hold the power and the responsibility. * * * We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope of earth. * * * The way is plain, peaceful, generous, just—a way which if followed, the world will forever applaud and God must forever bless."

Antimonopoly Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, for roughly a year and a half there have been pending before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary two bills dealing with antimonopoly legislation. A short time ago a subcommittee reported favorably on Senate bill 104 by a vote of 2 to 1.

In connection with the consideration of that bill I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "FTC on Monopolies," from the Times-Picayune of New Orleans, La.; an editorial entitled "What Congress May Do About Monopoly," from the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times; an editorial entitled "For Competitive Enterprise" from the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune, and another editorial entitled "Monopoly Trend," from the Asheville Citizen, of Asheville, N. C.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune of March 13, 1947]

FTC ON MONOPOLIES

In a special report the Federal Trade Commission has presented Congress with the factual basis for action in case it decides to cooperate with the Truman administration in staying the monopolistic trend in the Nation's industry.

As evidence of the unhealthy trend, the Commission reports that about 1,800 substantial manufacturing and processing companies have been passed out through merger or purchase since 1940, and that 242 of them have fallen into the hands of 18 of the biggest national corporations. Indubitably the mergers have done injury to the system of free competitive enterprise.

The point about the mergers or purchases that seems most to concern the Commission is that they have achieved largely through the sale of the assets of one company to a larger one—a device by which the intent of the Clayton antitrust law is nullified. The FTC is empowered to prevent mergers through capital stock acquisitions if the result would promote monopoly, but the merger of physical properties through sales of assets bypasses the law. The Commission, of course, advocates the passage of the Kefauver bill to plug the loophole.

Reenforcement of the antitrust laws probably is the first essential in any program to slow down or stop the march of a comparatively few corporations toward mastery of the Nation's industrial production facilities and resources. But it is not the only requirement. Many of the impositions of the Government, including the mass of required reports and taxes which discourage the investment of risk capital, fall harder on the small or medium-sized independent business than they do on the great corporations. The imbalance in the labor laws places the small, more competitive business in a relatively more vulnerable position than the dominant corporations which can withstand periods of idleness and can recover their markets.

Unquestionably the Kefauver bill—and any legislation looking to the more vigorous prosecution of monopolies and collusive practices—will meet stiff opposition in Congress. Aside from the objections of groups that might come under scrutiny, there is a school which sees no menace in the growth of the giant corporations. For instance, the chairman of the board of Westinghouse recently argued that there are automatic limits on the size of the big business concerns because sooner or later "the expanding corporation becomes too unwieldy to cope with its competition." Contending that after a certain point the big organization begins to bog down in red tape and bureaucracy, he maintained that when a company attempts to dominate more than 40 percent of a given market it begins to lose a portion of its business to competitors.

Obviously, however, if one company can take 40 percent of the national market, that doesn't leave room for many corporations of a similar size. Domination of two or three national corporations in any field of endeavor is hardly the American idea of free competitive enterprise. But the trend is in that direction.

The Commission makes one pertinent point, frequently overlooked by those who find no menace in the concentration and size of industries: That if we have a private supergovernment of industry it will have to be regulated or controlled by a political supergovernment. Our alternative to this development is the maintenance not merely of free enterprise but of "free competitive enterprise" which requires a minimum of regulation.

[From the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times of February 24, 1947]

WHAT CONGRESS MAY DO ABOUT MONOPOLY

Congress is becoming monopoly-conscious again. The problem is raised by small-business men complaining about the encroachments of big business, by big-business men complaining about unrealistic provisions of the antitrust laws, and by business in general complaining about labor unions, which are exempt from antitrust prosecution.

The issue is not anti- or pro-monopoly. As Congressional Quarterly points out, monopoly, like sin, has no avowed friends on Capitol Hill. Everybody is against it. But, like sin, it is hard to regulate. Democratic governments have been struggling with the problem ever since an English court in 1604 handed down an opinion condemning a conspiracy to monopolize London's supply of playing cards. In the United States, congressional interest dates from the 1880's, when it became apparent that the common law no longer was sufficient to cope with expanding industrial empires. Today more than 60 laws on the subject are in effect.

Now in the aftermath of war, which resulted in an increased concentration of economic power, the question of preserving free, private, competitive enterprise in a democratic society arises at almost every turn. Ramifications of the problems are almost endless so, also, are the lines of attack proposed to meet it. Every constituent of every Congressman has a stake in what Congress does about monopoly, because a monopolized industry sends ripples through the economy to touch consumers, workers, farmers and businessmen—all of us.

A round-up by Congressional Quarterly of specific issues and proposals illustrates that impact. There is, for instance, the issue of small versus big business, of which the fight between independent and chain stores is a phase known in every community. Competition between them favors the consumer while it lasts, but some Members of Congress fear it will mean ultimately the disappearance of small business, leaving the consumer at the mercy of the winner. Representative

PATMAN, of Texas, Democrat, has two proposals to curb unfair practices that make competition too one-sided.

As another example, food prices are directly affected by the cost of keeping overworked soil productive, in the South and elsewhere. Increasing farm use of fertilizer in the face of a world-wide shortage has directed congressional attention to that industry. The question of monopoly has arisen over the operations of the Florida Hardrock Phosphate Export Association, which the Federal Trade Commission has found to control most phosphate exports through a cartel arrangement with French-African producers.

Other specific industries currently in the foreground of discussions about monopoly include railroads and air lines, oil and gas, electric power, newspapers and news services, insurance, and atomic energy. While each is the subject of separate recommendations, the active antimonopolists are generally agreed upon several broad lines of attack. Foremost among these are proposals to:

1. Provide for Federal charter of corporations with strict standards of corporate conduct.

2. Prohibit corporate mergers through acquisition of assets, or require FTC approval of such mergers.

3. Revise the patent laws to prohibit attaching restrictive conditions of manufacture, sale, or price to patent licenses.

4. Make corporation officers and directors civilly liable for stiff penalities for violation of antitrust laws.

Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, Democrat, and probably the best informed man in Congress on business practices, holds that Federal charter is the basic remedy. As he explained recently, the big, modern corporation is in a sort of no-man's land, responsible to nobody, too big to be controlled by the States, insufficiently regulated by the Federal Government. Corporations chartered by States frequently grow to a size larger than the State which chartered them. They are beyond the control even of their hundreds of thousands of widely dispersed stockholders.

But whether the current Congress enacts few or many regulatory measures, the problem of policing business and industry steadily grows bigger, even under existing laws. Much of this responsibility falls on the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, which has a modest $1,900,000 appropriation for the current year and is tentatively allocated $2,500,000 in the new budget. The latter figure represents only $1 out of every $15,000 which President Truman proposes to spend on the Federal Government as a whole.

The cost of enforcing antitrust regulations through this agency is peanuts in a nation which is approaching a $200,000,000,000 economy. Yet some economy-minded Members of Congress would slash this minor appropriation at the same time that it is proposed to pile more responsibility on the Antitrust Division. While many other forms of economy can be justified, it does not make sense to handcuff the cop on the corner who is faced with a bigger job of guarding the welfare of all of us—consumers, workers, farmers, and businessmen.

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune of March 17, 1947]

FOR COMPETITIVE ENTERPRISE

We suspect that many Americans, with their attention riveted of late on other domestic and foreign affairs, have overlooked the important report released he other day by the Federal Trade Commission. They ought to think about it, however, for what is revealed is not comforting to the believers in competitive enterprise.

The FTC study paints a stop-and-think picture of business in showing the increasing concentration of power in the hands of a small number of giant organizations. It informed Congress that 1,800 companies have been swallowed up by purchase and merger since 1940. It reported that 18 of the country's largest corporations have bought up 242 smaller firms, or an average of 13 companies each.

This is not to say that the outlook for small business is wholly black. It is revealed that the total assets of small manufacturing firms, increased during the war by almost 150 percent, those of medium manufacturing firms by just under 100 percent, and those of large concerns by about 35 percent. Furthermore, a study made in the Department of Commerce shows that there were by the middle of 1946 more individual firms in the business population than before the war, more even than in 1929, and that of the new businesses well over 95 percent were in the bracket of those having less than 50 employees.

But the fact that small business still finds opportunities in the American economy does not argue against the steady and persistent vigilance which the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice alone can supply.

One of the most devastating things their critics have said of the Republicans is that they are monopolists at heart, giving only lip service to the true ideal of free enterprise. The way they act on the modest budget request of the Antitrust Division and upon the Kefauver bill, which would amend the Antitrust Act to block the purchase of a company's assets if the transaction would tend to promote monopoly, will go far to prove that accusation—or to refute it.

Hearings are being held on the antitrust appropriation for 1948. President Truman has asked for $2,500,000 as against the $1,900,000 being spent this year. The 1948 figure is modest however, as is shown by the fact that the highest antitrust appropriation in history was the $2,325,000 allowed in 1942, and the cost inflations since then make the 1948 request less in actual purchasing power than the 1942 sum. Yet, as the FTC report and other figures show, the need for antitrust enforcement and vital changes in the law is greater in 1948 than it was in 1942.

[From the Asheville (N. C.) Citizen of March 18, 1947]

MONOPOLY TREND

A high level of industrial activity and expanding capital assets during and after the war encouraged some large companies to practice a business policy of integration. One example is provided by a drug firm which acquired 38 smaller companies by outright purchase from 1940 to 1946. The purchases included manufacturers of baby foods, floor waxes, and insecticides as well as other drug manufacturers and wholesalers. Thus, the purchasing company was able to establish effective control over manufacture, distribution, and sale of many allied products, thus integrating its operation.

Does this sort of practice constitute a dangerous tendency toward monopoly? The Federal Trade Commission, which has made a special report to Congress on business trends, warns that the "rapid growth of private supergovernment in industry must be halted" or it will result in "political supergovernment." The record of the last 6 years shows that 1,800 companies have been swallowed up by purchase and merger, 242 of them by 18 of the country's very largest corporations."

Of course, merger and separation are accepted facts of economic life. A successful concern often progresses by absorbing an unsuccessful business which may be on the brink of failure because of inefficiency. In this case the whole economy is strengthened rather than weakened. But excessive growth can be harmful. The FTC cites one instance where the giant steel corporations have bought up so many steel drum companies that they now produce 87 percent of the country's output as against 10 percent before the war.

The remedy, if any is needed, may lie in laws to forbid purchase of a company's assets if the transaction would promote monopoly. The present antitrust regulations apparently are inadequate to prevent such transactions.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Should Know Better," by M. A. Hubbard, executive secretary, Virginia Farm Bureau Federation, appearing in the Virginia Farm Bureau News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE SHOULD KNOW BETTER

(By M. A. Hubbard, executive secretary, Virginia Farm Bureau Federation)

The reciprocal trade agreements program under which the United States is attempting to work out with other nations some sensible and constructive adjustments in international tariff barriers is getting a little more than its share of unjust and ill-founded criticism from people who, judging from their pronouncements, have taken a very narrow view of the situation.

We are generally unanimous in our opinions that in order to have continued prosperity in this country we must maintain our export markets for the surpluses which we produce. However, we are by no means in agreement on the subject of imports—we want to sell but generally we balk like a sick mule when other nations wish to sell us something—too many of us think that international trade should be a one-way street. Those of us who think of international trade in this manner are guilty of muddled thinking, to say the least.

The standard of living of any nation may be measured by a very simple formula: Total production plus imports minus exports equals the total of goods and services available for domestic consumption. Whenever exports consistently exceed imports our standard of living is lowered—not raised. Under the reciprocal trade agreements program we are attempting to bring about a proper balance between our exports and imports.

At the present time we are solving the problem of dollar shortage in foreign countries by gifts and loans of such size as to all but stagger the imagination, and some of us are so foolish as to consider this a sound basis for long-term prosperity. Have we so soon forgotten the fool's paradise in which we lived prior to the collapse in 1929?

We must help other nations get back on their feet, yes, but except from a humanitarian standpoint our expenditures will be a very poor investment unless we can work out with other nations a sensible program which will return to our people in the way of imports, material benefits equivalent in

value to the goods and services made available through exports to peoples in foreign lands. While our present policy of permitting our exports to vastly exceed the amount and value of imports may be fully justified by existing emergency conditions, if followed for any considerable period such a policy can only lead to the early exhaustion of our natural resources and the impoverishment of our people. It is high time we stopped thinking of our supplies of such things as iron, copper, and petroleum as inexhaustible and give some thought to the conservation of these materials along with our vital soil.

Even here in the South there are those who would gladly consign the reciprocal trade agreements program to the ashcan. What disposition, may we ask, do these people propose to make of the South's enormous surpluses of tobacco and cotton? Rather than let these commodities rot in our warehouses, might it not be better to exchange them for some of the potash, nickel, tin, chrome, manganese, ore, rubber, and drug ingredients along with a great many additional items in short supply which our friends across the seas can furnish us to the mutual advantage of all parties concerned?

Let us not again shut ourselves up like a clam behind tariff walls reaching to the sky or stick our heads in the sand like an ostrich and try to fool ourselves into thinking that we can get along and let the rest of the world go hang. If we do this, eventually we will learn to our sorrow that the immortal query, "Am I my brother's keeper?", has economic as well as spiritual implications.

We should know by now that excessively high tariffs not only lead to economic stagnation here and abroad—worse still, they lead to war!

School Lunches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "School Lunches," which appeared in the Fairmont (W. Va.) Times of June 2, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHOOL LUNCHES

West Virginia has been almost the guinea pig State in the operation of the national school-lunch program. How it has worked in this State has been carefully examined by authorities of the United States Department of Agriculture. In the current edition of the publication Food Supplies and Markets appears the following summary. It should be of interest to all who are interested in the schools and in the way West Virginians have responded to the school-lunch program.

It reads:

The aim is simple enough. School-lunch workers want to feed children well—consistently—because good nutrition is an important element in good health. Good health is precious not only to the child, but to the community and the Nation.

In operation, diverse elements compose the program, and hundreds of different individuals have a part in running it. Sometimes essentials of one kind or another are missing.

Money itself was missing in a West Virginia mining community in late April. Miners had been out on strike. With savings gone and debts at the store, they were unable to find the few pennies per meal that are the parents' share of school-lunch expense. So it was up to the teacher to save the program. With money from her own purse, she bought food and served lunch as usual.

Callers came through the woods to see this school early in May. Outside it was raining and the pathway up to the plain frame building was coated with mud. Inside in pleasant, warm surroundings children sat down to a nutritious meal; delicious lima-bean soup, salad of diced apple and raisins, whole-wheat bread and margarine, and half pints of fresh milk. There were second helpings for children who finished what was on their plates. Everyone had seconds, and some had thirds.

What's missing may vary from place to place, and so may major obstacles. In most cases, though, all the essentials are available, and the programs move in accustomed channels. The point is that, when obstacles do exist, they are generally overcome; and that the national school-lunch program is in busy, effective operation in hundreds of American communities. The individual programs are keyed to a common problem; that of contributing a nourishing, well balanced meal, or at least milk, to youngsters' daily diets.

At one end of the school-lunch operation are the Nation's farmers. To them the program frequently means a bigger market—frequently a market for foods that might not otherwise be absorbed in normal channels. At the other end are the children—from city flats, village cottages, rural farms. The school-lunch program is to bring these two together. Solving it is a vast cooperative enterprise in which Federal and State governments participate with the community.

Congress has enacted school-lunch legislation and appropriates large amounts of money to help pay school-lunch costs. The United States Department of Agriculture helps to administer the program, working both with farmers and the States. The States underwrite their substantial share of school-lunch costs. State legislators and executive staffs turn over to local authorities most of the job of feeding the children. And these local officials enlist many more in the program. They turn to parent groups, to teachers, to paid workers, to many others to see that the children eat well.

In some programs, adults call on the children themselves to do part of the work. Out in Laurel Fork, W. Va., the principal believes there is valuable experience for students who help with lunch services.

Though money is available for a paid cook, this principal daily supervises a team of two pupils who prepare the meals for 16 and a second pair who clean up. Work teams take turns. The principal got his food preparation experience working in restaurants when he was a college student.

In other places, cooking is done by volunteers, and in still others by a professional staff. Eating arrangements, too, vary. Children may eat at long play tables, at cafeteria tables, or at their own desks. One school may meet the fruit requirement, for example, by serving peaches, another pears, and a third apples. But the meals are constant in one respect: they must meet five rigid dietary requirements of the United States Department of Agriculture.

Variations in the school lunch pattern do not change its essential nature. In hundreds of communities all over the Nation, children have at least one good meal a day because they eat the lunches provided under the national school-lunch program. The operations described in this piece were all observed in West Virginia. But they are typical of the hundreds of other programs in other places.

The teacher's resourcefulness enriches the program in many places. Take, for example, the 2-room, rural school in a mining community in Boone County, W. Va.

Many of these pupils had never heard of figs. Since one object of the school-lunch program is to teach good eating habits, the teacher worked carefully as she introduced these pupils to their unfamiliar food. First she aroused curiosity by announcing she had a food new to all of them. Then she displayed specimens and explained what they were. With this introduction, she developed a lesson on figs that led the children to geography and nature study. By lunch time, when each child held a fig in his own hand, the fruits signified new facts and distant places. They were eaten with interest and enjoyment.

Though the children might not care, their parents might have been interested in the source of this mineral-rich fruit. It came to the West Virgnia school because the Federal Government had bought a portion of the large 1947 crop from Pacific coast growers to relieve a distressed market.

Out in Barboursville (also in West Virginia), the junior high school has no lunch room, though 300 children must be served daily. The principal has organized feeding facilities in four classrooms. In two, students each day set up extra chairs so that 120 may be served in each. The other two rooms seat the remaining children. Trays are filled in an assembly-line system and picked up by the students. They return their own dishes after they have eaten. Cooks clean off the tables, the 1 o'clock class removes the extra chairs, and the students go back to book learning. The entire lunch operation is completed in 40 minutes.

These random experiences in West Virginia are typical examples of courage, ingenuity, resourcefulness, and leadership.

South Carolina Again Exceeds Army Quota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "South Carolina 'Again Exceeds Army Quota," published in the Anderson Independent, of Anderson, S. C.

The Senate is now discussing the draft measure and although I do not entirely agree with the editorial, I wish to point out that on every occassion the volunteers from South Carolina have exceeded the quota for our State. I understand that the bill provides that recognition shall be given in cases where the quotas are exceeded, and, of course, my thought is to have my State receive that recognition.

So I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH CAROLINA AGAIN EXCEEDS ARMY QUOTA

While the brass hats in Washington are wailing to Congress that volunteers aren't keeping the ranks of the Army filled, South Carolina has again exceeded its monthly recruitment quota.

The tears of the generals, of course, are being shed on behalf of the draft. If some of them had their way they would slap everyone in the Army, put us all under the boot and have a high old time running the country.

But in Anderson and in South Carolina and in many another Southern State the volunteers outstrip the quotas each month. Still, the Army says the volunteer quotas are not being filled.

That brings up the question as to what is happening in the other States.

Northern and Eastern States—or their minority blocs—have been the most vociferous of all in demanding this or that international action.

At the same time they have, apparently, been falling down on the job of volunteering for Army service and providing the country with power to take action.

South Carolina is doing its part to keep the Army's strength up to peacetime standards.

Draft-minded Senators from other States should be reminded of this fact.

Pro-Marshall Plan Press, Films To Get Fifteen Millions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in yesterday's Washington Times-Herald entitled "Pro-Marshall Plan Press, Films To Get Fifteen Millions."

It would be interesting to know how much of the enthusiasm displayed by these publications for the Marshall plan was generated by this promise of a fifteen-million subsidy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRO-MARSHALL PLAN PRESS, FILMS TO GET FIFTEEN MILLIONS

(By Willard Edwards)

A selected few American newspapers and magazines which shouted the loudest for the $6,000,000,000 Marshall plan are to share approximately $5,000,000 a year under the project, it was learned yesterday.

Another $10,000,000 annually is to be divided between book publishers and motion-picture producers who similarly were active in the propoganda campaign for the foreign spending experiment.

The $15,000,000 fund, contributed by American taxpayers, will be used to subsidize and boost the foreign circulation of those publications which earned the State Department's favor by zealous advocacy of the Marshall program.

The House Appropriations Committee heard the details, at a recent closed-door session. Members caustically commented that the money obviously was a reward for services rendered.

A million-dollar-a-year subsidy for the Paris edition of the New York Herald Tribune, one of the most vociferous exponents of the foreign spending scheme, topped the list of benefits.

The Paris Herald would receive $827,000 yearly for a proposed sale of 75,000 copies daily in the occupied zone in Germany. The blocked German marks it receives for such sales would be turned over to the Government. Another $150,000 a year would be paid the Herald Tribune for circulation of its Paris edition in the occupied zone in Austria.

ONE HUNDRED AND TEN THOUSAND DOLLARS FOR TIMES

The New York Times would receive $110,000 a year which was its estimated cost of selling 20,000 copies in the German occupied zone of its Sunday weekly overseas edition.

The principal magazine beneficiaries and the yearly sums they would receive for circulation are as follows:

Life magazine, $853,000 of which $663,000 would be for publication in England, $100,000 for publication in France, and $90,000 in Italy.

Time magazine, $360,000, of which $330,000 would be for publication in England and $30,000 for publication in Italy.

Newsweek magazine, $200,000, of which $129,000 would be for publication in England and $71,000 in Italy.

Reader's Digest, $305,000, of which $200,000 would be for a French edition and $105,000 for an Italian edition.

CIRCULATION BOOSTER

J. Noel Macy, assistant director of the office of international information of the State Department, who explained the secret plan to the committee, said these magazines could boost their foreign circulation by two-thirds with aid of the Government subsidy.

The yearly subsidy for publishing the magazines in Great Britain alone would be $1,168,454, under the plan. Another annual contribution of $6,018,422 would be provided for circulation of books in Britain.

"I supposed this is advanced as a part of the 'stop communism' theory of the Marshall plan," Representative WIGGLESWORTH, Republican of Massachusetts, noted at the hearing. "I should think England would be the last place where we would need this program."

KEEFE CAN'T UNDERSTAND

"Don't understand the philosophy of this program at all," commented Representative KEEFE, Republican of Wisconsin. "Don't these magazines get paid in dollars for advertisements? They can use the foreign currency they receive for services, material, and rent in foreign countries."

"It's a way of telling the American story, supporting the work of the Voice of America," said Macy.

"It appears to be only a scheme to bail these people out," remarked Keefe.

The European recovery program authorizes the $15,000,000 subsidy, Macy said, as a guarantee of investments in enterprises producing or distributing informational media.

"These newspapers, magazines, motion pictures and books now going into Europe receive foreign currencies which they are unable to convert into dollars," he told the committee, "the fund would enable them to convert these foreign currencies into dollars."

All motion picture companies which distribute films abroad would be eligible for this purpose, Macy added. These include Loews, Paramount, Fox, RKO, Universal, Warner Bros., Columbia, Monogram, Republic, United Artists, and Selznick.

Macy asserted that the payments would cover only the actual dollar cost of production. No profits would be involved but present losses would be eliminated, he remarked.

Match-Box Advertising of Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1948

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, apropos my remarks on the floor of the House on May 24, 1948, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that date, page 6343, on the captioned subject.

Inquiry of the Advertising Council, Inc., elicited the statement that the council had not placed the match-box advertisement. I was referred by the Council to Advertising Liaison, Office of Government Reports, Executive Offices of the President, which reported that the match-box advertisement had been placed in this way:

A Social Security official in the New York-New Jersey area contacted the Jersey Match Co. of New York and requested it to, and it did, carry the advertisement as a public service.

It has been definitely established that many commercial concerns have been, and still are, running extensive advertising campaigns, and, in connection with their ads they print the statement, "Presented as a Public Service." During the war, the Advertising Council, Inc., was created, consisting of private concerns allegedly to place advertising matter in furtherance of governmental programs, such as recruiting, bond sales, nurse recruiting, and many others. The Council has been continued since the war and still operates.

In September 1942 the Bureau of Internal Revenue ruled that commercial concerns may deduct, as business expense, the costs of such advertising when computing their income taxes. A copy of the Bureau's ruling is attached hereto.

It seems a certainty that the Jersey Match Co. of New York either has deducted, or will deduct, the cost of this matchbox advertising in computing its income taxes.

Manifestly, such expense is not a reasonable or necessary expense incident to a business, as required by the Internal Revenue Code; and some Bureau attorneys have said privately the Bureau should not have made this ruling.

This brand of advertising, along with so-called institutional advertising, is costing the taxpayers unknown and untold millions, perhaps billions, annually in lost revenue.

[Treasury Department, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Washington. Press Service No. 37-47. For immediate release Tuesday, September 29, 1942]

Commissioner Guy T. Helvering today issued an official statement of the policy of the Bureau of Internal Revenue regarding the deduction of advertising expenses for tax purposes. The Commissioner amplified public statements on the same subject previously made by Secretary Morgenthau before the Joint Congressional Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation on May 28, 1942, and by the Bureau itself in correspondence with the Association of National Advertisers, Inc.

Commissioner Helvering's statement follows:

"To be deductible, advertising expenditures must be ordinary and necessary and bear a reasonable relation to the business activities in which the enterprise is engaged. The Bureau recognizes that advertising is a necessary and legitimate business expense so long as it is not carried to an unreasonable extent or does not become an attempt to avoid proper tax payments.

"The Bureau realizes that it may be necessary for taxpayers now engaged in war production to maintain, through advertising, their trade names and the knowledge of the quality of their products and good will built up over past years, so that when they return to peacetime production their names and the quality of their products will be known to the public.

"In determining whether such expenditures are allowable, cognizance will be taken of (1) the size of the business, (2) the amount of prior advertising budgets, (3) the public patronage reasonably to be expected in the future, (4) the increased cost of the elements entering into the total of advertising expenditures, (5) the introduction of new products and added lines, and (6) buying habits necessitated by war restrictions, by priorities, and by the unavailability of many of the raw materials formerly fabricated into the advertised products.

"Reasonable expenses incurred by companies in advertising and advertising techniques to speed the war effort among their own employees, and to cut down accidents and unnecessary absences and inefficiency, will be allowed as deductions. Also reasonable expenditures for advertisements, including the promotion of Government objectives in wartime, such as conservation, salvage, of the sale of war bonds, which are signed by the advertiser, will be deductible provided they are reasonable and are not made in an attempt to void proper taxation.

"It is the statutory responsibility of the Bureau to determine and collect Federal taxes, among which are the income and excess-profits taxes, and to prevent abuses and attempts to avoid the high tax rates to which business will be subjected under the proposed tax bill now before Congress.

"No definite rule for determining what is reasonable in the case of expenditures for advertising can be laid down in advance so as to fit all situations and all classes of taxpayers. In determining whether the amounts are reasonable it is necessary to take into consideration all the facts and circumstances in each particular case.

"The Bureau will consider applications for individual rulings. It is, however, busy with an annual volume of work, and it is believed that if taxpayers will keep in mind the foregoing general rules, individual rulings will not be necessary except under most unusual circumstances."

Mundt-Nixon Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1948

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, probably no one in the field of Catholicism has had more practical experience with communism than the Reverend Edmund A. Walsh. His views are important, especially on the Mundt-Nixon bill, and I wish to include in my remarks the following editorial appearing in the Washington Post of June 3, 1948, the article entitled "A Word in Time":

A WORD IN TIME

The Reverend Edmund A. Walsh, of Georgetown University, speaking on communism the other day at the annual meeting of the National Industrial Conference Board, made some telling points that ought to be pondered by the advocates of the Mundt bill. He said the best way to meet the Communist menace is to wage war in terms of the economic and social needs of the moment, strengthen our domestic economy, assist other people to do the same and to expose the hollowness of the Communist claim that Soviet Russia is the champion of human freedom. At present, Congress appears to be following the opposite course. Essential reforms and progressive measures languish while the reactionary Mundt-Nixon bill is pushed. The inescapable effect is to give communism an attractive issue and democracy a shabby record.

Stalin's Rural Serfdom No Goal for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAT ARNOLD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1948

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Saturday Evening Post of May 29, 1948, entitled "Stalin's Rural Serfdom No Goal for Farmers," should be of interest to the American farmer and all others who look upon farming as one of the most essential industries to our national well-being. Under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include this editorial in the RECORD:

STALIN'S RURAL SERFDOM NO GOAL FOR FARMERS

Any American farmer who knows what has happened to the Russian peasantry since 1917 will be no customer for communism. Yet at a recent convention of a pretty big farm group in Denver an anti-Communist resolution was rejected.

The convention was that of the Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, which is said to have a membership of nearly 250,000 in thirty-odd States. The union is pledged to the preservation of the family farm, which is one Russian institution that Stalin and company have eliminated with savage efficiency. The resolution was submitted as an amendment to the union's 1948 program and read: "We oppose imperialism, dictatorship, and aggression in all forms, be it communism or economic royalism which breeds fascism." The argument raised against this was that the union's approval of democracy was on record. Maybe the reason cited for the rejection of this resolution is good enough, but in view of the fact that the noisiest proponents of democracy are supporters of the regime in Moscow, a little information about the Communist attitude toward the family farm may be in order.

In the year 1850 Marx and Engels told the Communist League that successful revolutionists should never "give the land to the peasants as free property" because they would become a reactionary bourgeois class. The land, they said, should be worked by "labor colonies, cultivated by the associated rural proletariat." This prescription for dealing with "the land-hungry peasant" was not followed by Lenin after the 1917 revolution. He needed the peasantry to liquidate communism's most powerful enemy, the landowning aristocracy, and to fight for him against counterrevolutionary armies. He gave the peasants the lands they seized from the aristocracy as "free property"; and the great mass of them supported the Communist regime. Russia became a land of tens of thousands of "family farms." But now, 30 years later, the land is the state's; it is worked by "labor colonies" as Marx said it should be, so strictly policed that no farm laborer may leave the soil except when the dictatorship decrees. Similar evolutions are in progress in the Communist satellite countries.

The beginning of this change came in the early thirties, when Stalin felt firmly enough established to deal with the prosperous peasants, or kulaks, who were developing into a defiant bourgeois class, as Marx had predicted. With the help of the poor peasants, the kulaks were liquidated, as Lenin had liquidated the landowning aristocracy. In the course of that liquidation—which included many poor but "politically unreliable" peasants and scattered millions of farm families through Siberian labor camps, the land was brought under close police surveillance. The poor peasantry could then be reduced to docility through grain confiscations and man-made famine. Then came the great collective state farms.

There is the Communist formula for reducing all free farm families to state serfdom in a generation. A positive attitude toward "democracy" is fine, but it takes a negative attitude toward communism to make it clear that we exclude from democracy the thing which has brought millions to serfdom.

Law and Courts In China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Roscoe Pound, from the American Bar Association Journal for April 1948:

LAW AND COURTS IN CHINA: PROGRESS IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

(By Roscoe Pound, adviser to the Ministry of Justice (China))

Development of a modern system of administering justice according to law has gone on in China under many difficulties. Under the old regime, a traditional body of ethical custom had been applied by magisterial discretion, which sought reconciliation of the parties to a controversy by bringing them to an amicable settlement. In 1905 the Imperial Government sent a commission to Europe to study plans of national reconstruction. Edicts followed purporting to do away with the autocratic regime and promising constitutional monarchy. But there was no intention of a real change, and a general public demand for a new order led to a revolution which broke out in October of 1911 and culminated in proclamation of the Republic at Nanking on New Year's Day of 1912.

There was little on which to build a constitution or a body of modern legal and political institutions. But in Dr. Sun Yat-sen, the leader of the revolutionary movement and first President of the Republic, China found a wise, farsighted, and constructive builder of a modern policy. His writings stand to Chinese constitutional law much as the Federalist has stood toward our own.

When the Federal Constitution was drawn up in America, we had the great advantage of strong, well-established governments in each State, all but one of which had already adopted a constitution on a common model going back to ideas of the puritan revolution and otherwise much in the fashion of the later colonial charters. Also, in the framing of our Constitution there were men of common training, learned in the history of English legal and political institutions, and possessed of practical experience of government under the colonial charters and the State constitutions. If they were learned also in the writings of the seventeenth and eighteenth century publicists, they had a background of practical political experience and of English legal and political writing on which to project it.

In China there was a good statement of certain fundamentals in the writings of Sun Yat-sen, who appreciated the importance of building where possible on what was usable in Chinese tradition and institutions. But in the actual framing of the Chinese constitution men well trained, some in England, some in France, some in the United States, some in Germany, and some in Japan, approached the problems of a constitution with different ideas which were often far from reconcilable. The basis had to be comparative politics and comparative public law, not Chinese experience. Considering the difficulty of the task, the framers of the Chinese constitution did their work wisely and well.

SLOW PROGRESS OF CODIFICATION PRODUCED EXCELLENT CODES

Codification on modern lines in China had begun under the old regime. In 1904 the Imperial Government appointed a commission to draft a commercial code. In a few months the commission submitted to the Emperor a draft law on traders, in 9 articles, and a draft law on commercial companies, in 131 articles. In 1906 a commission on codification was set up with a staff of law students trained in Japan, Europe, and America, and a Japanese adviser. This commission borrowed chiefly from Japan, which had drafted a civil code on the German model between 1893 and 1896. Japan had then succeeded notably in modernization; hundreds of Chinese students had gone to Japan to study law; and the Japanese had created a juristic vocabulary and produced a notable legal literature. Thus the Chinese could find near at hand in Japan the most advanced codification of the time, in a language they could readily master. The result was a draft civil code for China which followed closely the Japanese and consequently the German code.

After the proclamation of the Republic in 1912, this draft was felt to be inadequate, and a committee was set up to prepare a new draft. It was reorganized in 1916; in 1918 it was changed to a law codification commission. The work of that commission went on slowly; in 1928 five commissions took over the whole work of codification and legislation, and carried it on with much energy, so that the civil code was complete in 1930 to take effect in 1931, the code of civil procedure in 1931 to take effect in 1932 but revised and promulgated in 1935, the criminal code in 1935, and the organic law of the judiciary in the same year.

These codes, especially the civil code, were very well done. Twentieth-century codes follow the lines of the German civil code which took effect in 1900 and was the result of 23 years of careful preparation. This code was further developed in the Swiss civil code which took effect in 1912. The Chinese civil code was chiefly influenced by the Swiss, which thus far is the high-water mark of continental codification. But the Chinese civil code made some notable improvements, especially in incorporating commercial law, doing away with an artificial historical separation in continental law, and some borrowings from Anglo-American law. The Chinese code of civil procedure also is very well done. The Chinese codes will rank easily with the best examples of modern legislation.

ORGANIZATION, STRUCTURE, AND POWERS OF THE JUDICIARY

Legislation as to organization of the judiciary goes back to the last years of the Empire, when in 1907 a law of organization of the supreme court was promulgated, providing for a supreme court, high court, district courts, and local court of Peking, the Imperial capital. This was followed in 1908 by the provisional regulations relating to courts and in 1910 by the law of organization of courts. This remained in force under the Republic until in 1932 it was superseded by the organic law of the judiciary, which took effect in 1935. The latter has been revised more than once and has been supplemented by later legislation.

Under the constitution the highest judicial organ is the judicial yuan, with general jurisdiction over civil, criminal, and administrative cases and matters of disciplinary punishment of government officers. It is one of the five coordinate departments of the government. It is the interpreter of the constitution, and the grand justices are entrusted with enforcement of the provisions that laws and ordinances in conflict with the constitution are null and void. The organization in a supreme court, provincial high courts, district courts, and local courts, in the main follows continental lines. The draft constitution, on which the constitution adopted in December 1946 to take effect a year later is based, was complete in 1936.

REMARKABLE ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE REPUBLIC UNDER MANY DIFFICULTIES

Thus in 24 years from the overthrow of the empire and setting up of the republic, the work of providing a modern constitution, modern codes, and a modern organization of courts was done, and well done. This would have been a remarkable achievement in any case, seeing that it had to be done with little to build on, by study of foreign institutions and laws and adaptation of new ideas to an old country in a time of profound changes, even if there had been propitious conditions of peace and stability. To do it under the actual conditions is an achievement without parallel.

The republic had not much more than been set up when formidable attempts were made to restore the autocratic imperial regime. One in 1915–16 sought to found a new dynasty. Another in 1917 sought to restore the Manchus. After these had been put down, there followed a decade of internal warfare as military provincial governors sought to set up local independent autocracies. In the end a strong central government was established, but only to meet with persistent aggression by Japan. This led to occupation of three eastern provinces, to the setting up of a puppet state in Manchuria, to compelling the withdrawal of Chinese national forces from the territory between the Great Wall and the Peiping area, to attempt to detach five northern provinces, and to setting up of an autonomous regime in other provinces.

JAPANESE INVASION AND COMMUNIST REBELLION HAVE BEEN OBSTACLES

In spite of this, the process of unification and development of a strong central government had gone on under the able and vigorous leadership of Chiang Kai-shek, when in 1937 Japan began an offensive which compelled removal of the seat of government to Chungking and brought about hostile occupation of the greater and more important part of the country. The systems of transportation and communication was disrupted. The administrative systems, the system of administering justice, and the system of education were disorganized; 8 years of warfare on Chinese soil ensued. It was not until midsummer of 1946 that the Government was fully reestablished in Nanking. The puppet regimes set up by the Japanese were not fully put an end to until the last of 1945. A long process of reconstruction of administration, courts, education, finance, transportation, and industry, as well as of general rebuilding and repairing the destruction wrought by war and enemy occupation, was now required. But Communist rebellion, fomented and promoted from the outside, followed, and has had to absorb much of the energy and resources of the Government.

STEADY PROGRESS IN RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT HAS BEEN ACHIEVED

Notwithstanding this, steady progress has been made. The constitution, held in abeyance for 8 years during which the National Assembly could not be brought together, has been adopted. A general election, the first in Chinese history, has been held. The machinery of government has been working with increasing regularity and precision. Restoration of the judicial machinery over the occupied area has been quickly and effectually achieved. The Ministry of Justice had kept up the work of planning development of law and its administration and keeping the organization of justice functioning during the hard years at Chungking. The Ministry of Education, realizing the great importance of legal education, did a great work in keeping it in operation and proceeding with measures of improvement during 8 years of war at its very doors.

During the war the educational system was disrupted. Legal education suffered especially. Over 80 institutions of higher learning had to evacuate to unoccupied regions, having to move 7 or 8 times, often great distances on foot, as the Japanese continued to advance. The Government was confronted with a herculean task of housing and feeding hundreds of thousands of refugee students and teachers and maintaining standards of education. Since the end of the war the restoration of legal education by the Ministry of Education has gone forward rapidly and well.

MUCH REMAINS TO BE DONE TO OVERCOME PROBLEMS OF DIFFERENT SYSTEMS AND TECHNIQUES

Yet much remains to be done. Codes, however well drawn, do not interpret and apply themselves. They require a technique of interpretation and application which results from a taught tradition. The significant modern codes have each had behind them a long development of writing and teaching. They have been framed from materials well known by reason of a common teaching to those who drafted them. They have been the culmination of a continuous growth for centuries. On the other hand, the Chinese codes have been the work of jurists of diverse training, working on materials which have grown up in other lands, taken sometimes from systems with different techniques of development, interpretation and application. Some of the most difficult problems of Chinese law at the moment arise from incorporation of borrowings from Anglo-American law in essentially Continental codes and of American constitutional provisions in a constitution which is largely on continental lines and will be interpreted and applied by lawyers with a continental training.

Chinese law teachers and writers will have a real task in finding how to adapt such provisions to their surroundings and fit the technique of applying them to that of applying other parts of the same instrument. This would not be easy if all those who interpret and apply, and all the teachers of those who interpret and apply, had had a common training in a uniform system. But they have not. China has many well-trained, learned, able jurists, some of them of world-wide repute. As a class, however, there has been little in the way of uniform or unified training. Of judges and law teachers, most have been trained in the law of continental

Europe, some in France, primarily on the basis of the French Civil Code, some in Germany on the basis of the German Civil Code, many in Japan, where there was a very good law school before the war, on the basis of the Japanese version of the German Civil Code. But some have been trained in Anglo-American law, some in English universities, some at the Inns of Court, and some in the United States, getting a primarily English or primarily American view of the common-law system. Those trained in China have been taught by teachers with a corresponding variety of training. It is evident that a unified doctrinal and judicial development of the codes must be greatly retarded under such circumstances.

FIVE-PART PROGRAM TO IMPROVE THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

Accordingly, I have recommended to the Ministry of Justice a program with five parts:

First. I put surveys of the administration of justice in certain typical cities and provinces, in which to discover and point out the difficulties under which the courts are operating and the way to meet them; to discover the source of abuses, if any, and find ways of obviating them; to ascertain the deficiencies of organization and equipment under which the judges are working, the facilities they need in order to carry on their work effectively, the deficiencies in the law they have to apply, the deficiencies in the training of those who practice in the courts, and the specific problems with which the courts are confronted. The first of these surveys is about to begin.

Second. The program calls for conferences, conducted both locally and nationally, directed to what works well in judicial administration and what not, to what is used in practice and what not and why, to gaps in the law, and to matters which need the attention of the ministry or need legislation, seeking to treat concrete situations rather than to work out abstract solutions for hypothetical situations in other parts of the world, or to canvass abstract legal institutions in other parts of the world with reference to some abstract country.

Third. I am recommending an organization similar to the American Law Institute, a cooperative undertaking of officials, judges, law teachers, and practicing lawyers, to bring out a series of institutes of Chinese law, a unified series of books to furnish the needed doctrinal writing to aid in interpretation and application of the codes and their development by judicial decision.

Fourth. As the work proceeds I plan a thorough survey of and report on legal education.

Fifth. I hope for a final report on the organization of the legal profession and on recommendations for putting it on a sound basis while it is still in a measure formative.

But the first three items have the right-of-way.

Responsibility of the National Science Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The National Science Foundation," which appears in the June 1948 edition of the excellent publication, the Scientific American.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

(By Alfred Winslow Jones)

On May 5 the Senate passed, by a unanimous voice vote, the long-awaited legislation in behalf of basic science. By the time this article appears in print the House may have acted and the President may have signed the bill. If so, there will be set up in Washington a National Science Foundation with unique responsibilities and powers. Almost everyone concerned will be happy about the outcome of a long, irksome debate, and reasonably satisfied with the compromises reached on the many issues that had to be resolved to bring the Foundation into being.

The Foundation will do its job mainly by making research grants and loans to nonprofit institutions and by giving scholarships and fellowships to individuals. It will support research for the armed services after consulting with the Secretary of Defense. It may set up commissions for special jobs and may establish divisions for dealing permanently with particular branches of science. The chief emphasis is on the natural sciences, but "other sciences" also may be assisted, which is as near as the present legislation comes to including the social sciences. Here, almost surely, is a realm for ardent future discussion within the Foundation.

The spacious powers given to the Foundation are to be further defined and exercised by a 24-man board of persons "eminent in the fields of the basic sciences, medical science, engineering, education, or public affairs," serving part-time and appointed by the President. To execute the policies and decisions of the board, the Foundation will have a full-time $15,000-a-year director, also appointed by the President. According to the present budget figures, the Foundation will have $20,000,000 to spend during its first year. As it learns how to spend money, its appropriations should grow from year to year, reaching a figure that Presidential adviser, John R. Steelman projects as $100,000,000 after 10 years.

United States scientists are almost unanimous about the need for large-scale Federal aid to basic research. Without it American scientific work would move more and more toward the periphery of application, leaving a less and less adequate ratio of basic work going on at the center—except, for a time, under military auspices. The ultimate result might be a hollow shell of mere technology, followed by the decline of technology itself.

The reasons are familiar enough. The practical Yankee genius has always tended toward the making of tools and the mass production of goods, at the expense of the essentially speculative enterprise of basic or pure science. The main sponsors of American science have been industry, the Government, the universities, and the foundations. Industry, by and large, wants practical results for the money it spends. The people in charge of Government agencies and the legislators who make the appropriations have followed the bent of industry. All of the agencies listed on the next page have sponsored chiefly applied science. This leaves the universities and foundations as the main traditional promoters of basic research. They have done the best they could, but their funds have been limited and the pull upon them by industry for applied studies has been strong.

As a consequence we have been notoriously dependent on European science for basic findings and even for development work, since Europeans, supported by their governments, have been by far the more adventurous pioneers at the frontier of knowledge. To cite one of many illustrations: Of the 149 Nobel prize winners in physics, chemistry, and medicine since 1901, 123 were born and received all their early training in Europe, and only 22 were United States born and trained. (Two awards went to Canada, and one each to India and Argentina.) As between Europe and the United States, this is out of all proportion to national wealth and the application of scientific findings.

The war has obviously left Europe unable to maintain its old contributions to the international fund of pure science. If private American efforts could fill the gap, there would be no problem, but actually they are failing to maintain even the traditional insecure position of pure science in this country. In 1929 the funds laid out for scientific research by universities and foundations (the most accurate measure we have for the support of basic research) amounted to only 15 percent of a national research budget of about $170,000,000. By 1939 the ratio had shrunk to 10 percent and, although the dollar total of university and foundation research funds had increased to $35,000,000, a substantial part of this outlay included income from research contracts with industrial concerns, which represented a diversion from pure to applied science.

More recently universities and foundations have suffered from lower yields on their investments and from higher costs of research, and the universities have had more students and hence greater deficits. During the war the Nation's proportion of development expenditures, other than those of industry and the Federal Government, shrank to 4 percent; it now stands at about 8 percent. Of the $2,500,000 which Columbia University, for example, had this year for physical research, only $16,000 was from university funds, the rest coming from the Government, most of it from the Atomic Energy Commission.

Just as critical is the manpower shortage. Curtailment of education during the war cut the maturation of new scientists by half. The grevious loss may be estimated as some 20,000 graduates, including 3,000 doctors of science. Those who have been graduated are under an almost irresistible pull from industry. If it were not for a new interest in basic science on the part of the armed services, the plight of fundamental research would be cause for even greater alarm.

The war itself brought an almost total inhibition of basic research in the United States. Virtually to a man, the scientists of the United States were brigaded under the command of the Office of Scientific Research and Development for the most massive campaign of applied research ever organized. The more than 2,000 projects to which they were assigned spent $300,000,000 directly and guided the spending of hundreds of millions more. Two of the projects, the atomic bomb and radar, began as hopes and developed into billion-dollar enterprises by the end of the war.

The stupendous achievements of the OSRD shortened the war and saved countless lives, but its after effects must now be reckoned with. During the war the armed services received from the scientists imaginative and efficient new devices and techniques useful in almost every branch of operations. The war, therefore, endeared science to the military mind and even won it over to the need for basic research. The military is now determined that there shall be no postwar divorce. Under military auspices, science in general, and even some branches of pure science, are now being maintained in a style to which they have never before been accustomed.

The best measure of the Government's and the military's present involvement in scientific work is the Federal budget estimate for research for the fiscal year beginning July 1. The grand total is likely to be about $825,000,000, an increase of almost 25 percent over this year and 15 times as much as was spent

in any year before the war. Of this staggering sum, over $650,000,000 is for the Army, Navy, Air Force, and for the military work of the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

A rough indication of the proportion of Government funds which is being allocated to pure and applied research, respectively, was given in the so-called Steelman report, issued by the President's Scientific Research Board, John R. Steelman, chairman. Analyzing research expenditures in the fiscal year that ended in mid-1947, the report estimated that some $570,000,000 out of a total of $625,000,000 went for applied and developmental studies. For the armed services the figures were $465,000,000 out of $500,000,000. Of the $100,000,000 spent by the four civilian agencies with the largest research budgets—Agriculture, Commerce, Interior, and the NACA—about $85,000,000 was spent on nonbasic work, chiefly background research, that is, fact-gathering, compiling, surveying, and the like.

Since the end of the war scientists have been actively debating the role of the military in the scientific affairs of the country. Some are contented enough, and see no serious threat to the integrity of their work. Others are extremely unhappy—alarmed about the fatal blight of secrecy, about dismissals on mere suspicion of unreliability, about the inevitably limited objectives of the Army and Navy. They are afraid of the intrusion of others into their work and afraid that military-sponsored basic science will be cut off in favor of applied efforts when the now copious funds may be curtailed—at a time when the universities will have become dependent on military contracts.

Most scientists are grateful for the stopgap aid they have had, but many are now eager for other sponsorship. The body of scientific opinion appears to be opposed to an entire new department with a Secretary of Science—as was once proposed—but in favor of a civilian, independent agency. Specifically, through the National Science Foundation they look for a good, solid compromise between the old days of freedom and poverty and the wartime binge of regimentation and inexhaustible funds.

The new agency has been at least 3 years in the making. The New Deal, the war and the work of the OSRD under Vannevar Bush provided the impulse. Then developed a serious struggle over important details. In July of 1945, the creation of a National Research Foundation was urged by Bush in his report, Science, the Endless Frontier, written in answer to the request of Franklin Roosevelt. The following October, Senate committee hearings began on three bills. One of the two important ones, the Magnuson bill, followed faithfully the recommendations of the Bush report and put control of the Foundation in the hands of a part-time board appointed by the President. The Kilgore bill incorporated additional ideas by providing for strict patent controls in the interest of the Government and in giving control and responsibility to a Presidentially appointed director, advised by a board of scientists. This matter of administration became the most hotly contested point in the subsequent debate. In July of 1946, a compromise Kilgore-Magnuson bill (S. 1850) passed the Senate, but was killed in the House. The compromise, which seemed to represent a majority view among scientists, leaned too far toward the Kilgore position to be acceptable to the Bush people.

Last year Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH of New Jersey introduced S. 526, which passed both the Senate and the House. This bill leaned just as far toward the Bush position, but was supported by many scientists who had come to feel that it was about the best they could get. The Smith bill was regretfully vetoed by the President on the ground that it set up an impractical type of administration with the power in the hands of a board rather than a single director.

The 1948 Smith bill (S. 2385), which will pass in the closing days of the Eightieth Congress—or, failing that, the similar bill that clearly should be made a law in 1949—is a reasonable enough compromise, though it is still administratively not what the President hoped to get. The chief executive officer of the National Science Foundation will be appointed by the President, to be sure, but he will be fully governed and guided by the Foundation's legislative body, its 24-man board of eminent scientists and others. To this board is left the final decision on most of the controversial matters that have been fought over for the last 3 years.

The Foundation will decide just how wide a geographical distribution to give its grants and contracts. It will decide to what extent it can hold as public property patents resulting from work in which it takes part, and how far it will have to go in allowing patent rights to those with whom it makes contracts. It will decide whether or not to set up its own executive committee. It will prescribe its own rules and regulations. It may acquire real and personal property. It may receive funds donated by others. It may publish freely in the field of science.

The Foundation must clear security matters with the Secretary of Defense, and it may not go into atomic research without the permission of the Atomic Energy Commission. It is authorized to cooperate in international scientific research but any such activity "shall be exercised in such a manner as is consistent with the foreign policy objectives of the United States as determined by the Secretary of State, after consultation with the Director."

The greatest of the Foundation's considerable powers is that of deciding just what jobs to tackle. Certain obvious divisions—(1) medical research, (2) mathematical, physical, and engineering sciences, (3) biological sciences, and (4) scientific personnel and education—are suggested by Congress, but even these are not insisted upon.

With the probable passage of this legislation, the scene shifts. The Foundation itself now becomes the focus of arguments as to what it should do and how it should do it. The most vital and difficult single issue will be whether or not the Foundation shall undertake work in the field of social science.

Such a venture is admittedly fraught with difficulties. The social sciences differ from the physical and biological sciences more than the latter differ from each other. By the accepted standards of scientific work, the social sciences are less mature. Experimentation in them is usually impossible. Those who operate with social data are forced into more complex and higher abstractions and into many areas where measurement is impossible. Social science has ill-defined limits. At the end of its spectrum farthest from the biological sciences, its lines tend to blur into an area (from the scientific point of view) of mere heat—the warm, disorderly, ethically supercharged humanities.

A more serious difficulty stems from the deep and stubborn cleavage between pure and applied effort in social science. As James Bryant Conant has pointed out, there was a time when such a condition did not constitute a detriment to any branch of science. Until perhaps 100 years ago, science was almost entirely pure, and technology was in another realm. But now, the sphere of science has become so completely integrated that a scientific effort which remains endlessly pure, with no eventual application, is not thought of as science at all but as some sort of recondite, priestly discourse.

To a degree, this is what has happened to social science. Frightened away from the periphery of application by the fierce heat of controversy that is engendered there by conflict of interests, some social scientists take refuge in pure effort that is not, nor ever will be, called into practical play. Many an able social scientist spends his time endlessly gathering facts which are not really gathered to be used, because their use would get the user into trouble.

Pure and applied social science can serve special interests admirably, but the National Science Foundation is being set up to serve the general interest. Can it do so in the field of social science? The difficulties will loom so large that it will take a board of 24 (or at least a majority of 13) brave men to make the effort.

Yet none of this is to deny the scientific and human potential of social science, nor its great and urgent need. True, the direction of effort in the social sciences must differ sharply from that taken in the natural sciences. In the latter, the emphasis will rightly be on pure or basic work, since the spontaneous drift is away from it. In the social sciences, more attention will have to be given to practical problem solving.

Some things the Foundation can do easily. It can help develop the tools of social science, such as statistics and semantics. It can go into certain fields that seem relatively factual and remote from the battle, such as anthropology and demography. It could look at such problems as labor mobility, which would have to be gone into simultaneously in all parts of the country and would cost some $800,000. It could study the adjustment of individuals to handicaps and illness. It could look at the procedures of that big and influential industry, public-opinion polling—its sampling methods, panel studies, interviewer bias, and the like.

Since none of this promises to solve basic social and economic problems, the Foundation could, once its formula is worked out and once it has the necessary experience, go after the things that really matter.

Science is increasingly becoming a part of our culture, and general Federal aid is hardly more than a recognition of that fact. Science has given us much of what we have of material wealth, and is certain to give us more. But it is now generally recognized that material progress brings the exaggeration of social and economic problems, while at the same time it makes their solution possible. Will the coming National Science Foundation try to realize that potential, or will it be satisfied to act merely as one more vitally needed agency for still more material progress? Here the President, who appoints the board of the Foundation, and the board itself will face a major decision.

What Is Communism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by George E. Sokolsky, entitled "What Is Communism?" It appeared in the New York Evening Sun of May 25, 1948:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

WHAT IS COMMUNISM?

I listened recently to some definitions of communism which failed to include many characteristics of the Marxian philosophy. After all, more than 200,000,000 persons live under this way of life and we need to understand it. Definitions are most difficult when they are short, for the more we generalize the less specific is the description. After all, Karl Marx wrote three enormous volumes, Das Kapital, to explain a few phases of his program.

Yet, I venture to give here a fairly short definition which is not so generalized as to be out of focus nor so involved as to be difficult to understand. Here it is:

Communism is a social, political, and economic creed, originally devised by Karl Marx, since amended by Lenin and Stalin and by actual practice, which holds that a single political party shall control not only the government but the means of production and distribution, the fixed and liquid capital, and with it the lives and activities of all the inhabitants in the interest of the state. The oligarchy in control of that one party therefore controls the persons, minds, and actions of all under them who virtually live in slavery. The objective of this system is its self-destruction at such a time as the oligarchs believe it is safe to eliminate all forms of force from human society.

This definition, however, fails to explain why this creed persists and why it has such a fanatical driving appeal for so many persons, particularly among intellectuals. To understand that it is necessary to move away from the economic and political sides of communism, which are inevitable results of the "theology" of Marxism. And that "theology" is, like Christianity, based upon the primary question of how man came into existence.

Judaism, Christianity, and Islam accept the doctrine that man is a special creation of God, differing from all else in nature by the possession of will and choice and the dignity of personality. Because of that, man enjoys inalienable rights which are his at birth—as the grace of God. Out of this concept of man, he evolved a series of ideals of living which run through the Old and New Testaments.

In Genesis, this concept of man is stated: "So God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them."

This concept of man has often been opposed by other ideas, particularly in recent years by the scientifically minded, who regard man as a biologic creature, who, by chance, happened to turn out to be different from other creatures.

Once it is accepted that life is purposeless, that man has no existence except as he is controlled by his environment, then it is correct to assume that those who make and control the environment establish the nature of man. This concept eliminates all morals, substituting for them only the law of necessity—that is, that whatever is necessary is right. And who determines what is necessary? Under any moral system, each individual decides that for himself, assuming responsibility for his personal choice and conduct. Under communism, it is the oligarchs, operating a monopolistic political party, who decide what is, at a given moment, necessary, and changing their decisions as necessity dictates.

Lecomte du Noüy, in his magnificent study, makes this observation:

"The old-fashioned materialist who is honestly convinced that human life is without a cause and without a goal, that man is an irresponsible particle of matter engulfed in a maelstrom of purposeless forces, reminds us of the delightful remark made by a brilliant philosopher, Whitehead: 'Scientists who spend their life with the purpose of proving that it is purposeless constitute an interesting subject of study.'"

Once we accept the purely materialistic concept of man, everything else fits into place. Slavery becomes acceptable if the oligarchs regard that as temporarily (how long in history is temporary?) necessary. Even the destruction of human beings becomes valid as the smashing of roaches in a kitchen is valid because of necessity.

To understand communism and its forces, it is wise to understand the struggle between God and the devil, discussed so immortally in Job and in Goethe's Faust.

Congress Shouldn't Forget Postal Pay Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Press of May 28, 1948:

CONGRESS SHOULDN'T FORGET POSTAL PAY INCREASE

There are persuasive arguments for raising the pay of the Federal Government's employees, and we think the 375,000 post office workers have the best case of all.

They're getting in 1948 only about 20 percent more than they did in 1925. Their average wage is only $2,600 a year—$50 a week—and many of them get much less. In the race with the cost of living, they have fallen behind other Federal employees, and further behind most workers in manufacturing industries.

The postal workers don't strike to enforce demands. They look to Congress for fair treatment. Leaders of Congress have given them to understand that they will get a raise this year. A bill before the House would give them a $585 temporary increase; one before the Senate, an $800 permanent boost.

But Congress, swamped with other unfinished business, is rushing toward adjournment. Unless there is quick agreement on a single measure acceptable to both branches the postal workers' hope for better pay seems doomed to die when the Senators and Representatives take off for the political conventions.

Senator TAFT and Speaker MARTIN have promised to get together and work out an agreement on a postal pay bill that can be pushed to passage. However, they haven't done it yet and time is running out. We think these two powerful gentlemen should keep their promise without more delay.

There's another promise about which Republicans talked a lot before they got control of Congress—namely, that they would cut down and keep down the number of people on the Federal civilian pay roll. That number is above 2,000,000 (it was less than 1,000,000 before the war) and it has been growing lately. We think this promise also should be kept.

H. R. 6712 Takes Benefits From Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 3, 1948

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I think that the membership of the House should be advised that the tax revision bill reported out of the Committee on Ways and Means on May 28, 1948, carries provisions harmful to disabled veterans now drawing compensation from the Federal Government. In this connection, I include with my remarks a telegram which I have received from Mr. Francis M. Sullivan, director of national legislation, Disabled American Veterans.

As one Member of Congress, I suggest that serious consideration be given to the statement made herein by Mr. Sullivan. I whole-heartedly concur in his remarks, and I sincerely hope that this Congress will not take any steps to penalize our disabled veterans.

WASHINGTON, *D. C., June 1, 1948.*

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Consideration given service connected disabled during Eightieth Congress is deplorable. But when Congress intends to take away established rights from service connected seriously disabled, disabled American veterans wonder why the preference for foreigners through ERP and other foreign relief over men disabled in fighting such foreigners. Section 106 of H. R. 6712 will take away benefits from service connected seriously disabled so as to put premium on laziness. Congress should not consider discontinuing tax exemption of disability compensation of former servicemen who are totally and permanently disabled, amputees, paraplegics, and other similar cases. Seriously disabled veterans who lift themselves by their own bootstraps should be commended instead of penalized. Section 106 of bill would eliminate any benefit of disability compensation for employed seriously disabled.

FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
Director of National Legislation, Disabled American Veterans.

An Attainder of Blood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following editorial from the Dayton (Ohio) News of May 30, 1948:

AN ATTAINDER OF BLOOD

"In the second year of Joash son of Jehoahaz King of Israel reigned Amaziah the son of Joash king of Judah * * * And it came to pass, as soon as the kingdom was confirmed in his hand, that he slew his servants which had slain the king his father. But the children of the murderers he slew not: according unto that which is written in the book of the law of Moses, wherein the Lord commanded, saying, The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, nor the children be put to death for the fathers; but every man shall be put to death for his own sin."—The Bible, Second Book of the Kings, 14.

The daughter of John C. Virden, an Ohio industrialist, serving in a Government post, became a teletype operator in the Russian news agency, Tass, in Washington. Presumably she sympathizes with the Communists. Her father, well known as a hater of communism, broke with his daughter when she took this employment, and has not seen or heard from her since.

Nevertheless, in view of the current purge in the Government departments, Mr. Virden, himself a Republican, decided he must resign his post. Thereupon Congressman CRAWFORD, of Michigan, comments:

"It may well open up a new field for consideration as to whether there are others in

the high Government service who similarly have members of their families on the pay rolls of the Moscow government, or one of its fronts here. * * * Federal officials having known Red relatives * * * will save themselves and their Government embarrassment by removing themselves."

The problem of rooting Communists, virtual agents of Russia as they are, out of posts in the Government and posts of power, as to that, anywhere, is important and difficult. If that operation leads to the rule laid down by the Michigan Congressman, the problem is not only an important but an alarming one. This thing of hanging the father because his son, all unknown to the father, steals a horse, is a new thing in the jurisprudence of America.

It is not, of course, a new thing in the world. The extermination of a family or tribe by reason of an act of one member thereof was and still is a staple mode in barbarian societies. Very ancient is the rule of "visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children and upon the children's children, unto the third and the fourth generation." We had supposed we had outgrown that rule.

Here the iniquities of the daughter are visited upon the parents. How far, far back we go.

This attainder of blood has its modern example in that recent revival of ancient barbarism, the totalitarian society. The Nazis set out, with a great measure of success, to destroy, on this ancient theory, the whole body of the Jews. The crime of Lidice extended the doctrine of blood attainder to an entire community, a matter of geography. Wherever there is tyranny, itself a relic of barbarism, there is this assigning of guilt by relationship. The guilt of one member of a family is the guilt of all.

The Virden case, it happens, is not the only or even the most extreme case here of this new-old doctrine of guilt by tribe or family.

At Oak Ridge, atomic energy laboratory, it is most essential to exclude all Communist disloyalty. Here a scientist has been brought in question on the folowing remarkable presentation:

"Information available indicates that ——— (a close relative) may have been a member of the ——— Democratic club and the Russian War Relief."

Not what the scientist is, or even what his relative is, but what the latter "may be."

An official of the Government in Washington was blasted by the "Dies" committee lately because a second cousin was allegedly a Communist sympathizer. So far the suspicion of the suspicious can go.

Has Congressman CRAWFORD considered whither the rule which he suggests for "others in the high government service" inevitably leads?

Among those in "the high Government service" is Congressman CRAWFORD himself. Should it transpire that a second cousin of Congressman CRAWFORD'S mother was seen reading the Communist Manifesto, would it not be up to Congressman CRAWFORD to "remove" himself forthwith? The harm a Communist-controlled Congressman can do is surely no less than the harm a mere employee of a department of the Government is capable of. And remote control by relatives, as the Congressman suggests, can be most menacing.

Congressman CRAWFORD is not a Communist. Neither is Mr. Virden, whom CRAWFORD commends for resigning because of the communism of a relative. Surely the rule for the one must be the rule for the two.

Congress has passed a bill under which five Senators could order the FBI, an administrative agency, to investigate the freedom from taint of appointees of the President. This, under the new rule proposed by CRAWFORD, would go, not only to the character of the appointee, but to the character of all his relatives "unto the third and fourth generations."

Has it occurred to Congressman CRAWFORD that this policing of relatives would, with equal reason, involve the most remote relatives of every candidate for Congress and of every Congressman? Where, short of a total Ogpu, could this thing stop?

Who can know the whole heart of all his wide-flung relatives? The only man who, as an employee of the Government, can be safe from the Congressmen Crawfords would need to be a bachelor, an only child, and an orphan too. Even at that, some far-off unknown collateral relative might turn up as an employee of Moscow or "one of its fronts." We need to remember here that some folks even fear that the Council of Churches is a Communist front. In that case even the bachelor must resign.

What self-respecting American, with this sword suspended over him, would consent to serve in the Government?

The proposal of Congressman CRAWFORD, a general extension of the ancient barbarian attainder of blood, would demoralize and could destroy the Government by wrecking its personnel. Since that is an object dear to all Kremlin activity, must we suspiciously suppose that Congressman CRAWFORD, influenced even without his knowledge by some second-cousin Communist, is himself a Communist front? Where can this police state thing stop?

Surely there is a less ruinous way to ward off the Communist totalitarian conspirators than by this adoption ourselves of the totalitarian weapon of attainder of blood and total censorship. This is in truth not a way of escape, but a sure way of bringing upon ourselves the evil from which we flee.

To the credit of the administration at Washington, Mr. Virden's resignation has not been accepted and it has been withdrawn. America is still America.

Westchester's Young Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the attached clipping from the Daily Times, published in Mamaroneck, N. Y., May 25, 1948, entitled "Westchester's Young Republicans":

WESTCHESTER'S YOUNG REPUBLICANS

Westchester as a whole and the Westchester GOP in particular may pride itself upon the election last week end at the State convention in Schroon Lake of Police Justice Morrie Slifkin, of Tarrytown, as the State head of the Young Republican Clubs.

It is a tribute to the enthusiastic work of Young Republicans in this county, one of the first to get the movement under way.

This activity, it might be noted in passing, has been recognized heretofore, in advancement of two other young GOP leaders of Westchester to the State chairmanship. One was Ralph E. Becker, of Port Chester, who went on to becor the chairman of the National Federation of Young Republican Clubs, wherein he is now completing his second year, and the other was Joel Mencher, of Tuckahoe. Both young men performed creditably in the interests of their party.

In Judge Slifkin, the Young Republicans of the State have an able leader. Highly respected in his home community, he has shown capacities not only of a partisan nature but also has been a leader in civic enterprises of moment. He will make, we predict, a strong president of the Young GOP of the Empire State in an important year. And the influence of these Young Republicans throughout the Nation, as well as of the Young Democrats, cannot be discounted. National Young GOP Chairman Becker, along this line, said at Schroon Lake last Saturday:

"As a result of our growth and activity we have produced leaders who have now become Senators, Congressmen, Governors, delegates to the national convention, and even candidates for the Presidency. These men have risen from the bottom up. They know virtually every phase of political work, and it is their practical experience which has qualified them for a higher post.

"Hence, there is a significance to the extraordinary growth which we Young Republicans have had during these last 2 years, and that is that today the Young Republican movement is producing a greater number of future political leaders of this country than has perhaps ever been produced by any group in any other period of history."

We recommend membership within the Young Republican and Young Democratic Clubs to all Westchester youth, both men and women. It is the ideal way to learn the science of politics and the administration of government. It teaches the language of the trade which runs our Nation. And we hope that before long there will be a Westchester president of the State and national Young Democratic Clubs to balance the honor which has come to Judge Slifkin, of Tarrytown.

Action Long Overdue on Star-Route Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. MAHON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I request to have inserted in the RECORD excerpts from the hearing by the Appropriations Committee on the first deficiency appropriation bill for 1948, relating to star routes.

These excerpts will give evidence of the long battle which has been waged by the friends of the star-route carriers. I am glad that today favorable action has been taken on star-route carrier legislation. I am most hopeful that the differences between the House and Senate bills may be composed and final legislation enacted at this session.

The following excerpts from testimony before the Committee on Appropriations are typical of the attitude of Members of Congress who know the problems of the star-route service and who are convinced that action on the subject is long overdue:

[Excerpt from hearing by Appropriations Committee on the first deficiency appropriation bill, 1948, February 23, 1948]

Mr. MAHON. * * * I believe the majority of the Members of Congress who are familiar with the star-route situation feel that when a star route is somewhat comparable in its operation to a rural route, in giving people service through the country, that the carrier should in some way be insured of a living wage.

Mr. CASE. I feel as Congressman MAHON does, that the star-route carrier is the forgotten man in the carrier system of the Post Office Department. The star-route carriers

whom I know have to go over all kinds of roads, and they fight those roads in all kinds of weather. The rates paid to the regular rural carrier—whenever there is an increase in pay for Federal employees there is generally an increase to him. But the star-route carrier goes ahead, tied down to whatever is the weight of his economic circumstance at the time that he made the bid.

During the depression you had competition in seeing who would agree to taking the most depreciation out of the old car that the carrier had, to try to get enough money to keep his family going.

I have never been satisfied that the Department as a whole has given recognition to the star carrier comparable to that which is given to other carriers in the service.

Mr. HARDY. As I stated before, the Department has taken the position that if Congress feels that they would like to change the basic law the Department would endeavor to administer it in accordance with the letter and spirit of the law.

Mr. CASE. Have you made favorable reports on the various bills that have been proposed for revising the star-route contract-letting system?

Mr. HARDY. The Department has made a report on all of the bills. * * *

Mr. CASE. Have they been favorable reports?

Mr. HARDY. Not altogether; no sir. * * *

Mr. CASE. Have you ever proposed an alternative bill that would work out some method of compensating star-route carriers on any basis comparable to that of the rural carriers?

Mr. HARDY. No, sir; not the Department.

Mr. KERR. May I make a suggestion?

Mr. CASE. Yes.

Mr. KERR. I want to go on record as saying that I think you should cooperate with the Congress in order to give justice to these men who have been star-route carriers for so long and who are helpless when some other man comes in and underbids them $5. In many cases they have been carrying mail on that route for 20 years and have practically worn out their lives in the service.

Mr. CASE. I happened to have been present at a meeting of the Rules Committee just a short time ago when a bill was proposed to increase the rates of pay for regular route carriers. The meeting turned more or less into a discussion of star-route carriers. I was surprised at the number of men on the Rules Committee who got to talking about star-route carriers. Without exception they all spoke of the star-route carrier as being the one person in the postal service who was not compensated in accordance with what he was asked to do.

I did not know that this was going to be discussed here this afternoon, but both Mr. MAHON and Mr. KERR have expressed themselves generally on the situation, and that is the situation when Members of Congress get to talking about star-route carriers. And it seems to me strange that that situation cannot be corrected.

I am not anxious to add to the postal deficit, but I do believe that there is a widespread feeling among Members of Congress that the star-route carriers are improperly treated.

Effect of High Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very constructive and instructive address delivered by Col. Robert R. McCormick at the Edgewater Beach Hotel on January 27, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The other day the Canadian Pacific railroad reported that it would take over $800,000,000 to replace rolling stock that had cost $400,000,000. Then the Inland Steel Co. observed that to replace the blast furnaces rapidly wearing out would take three times as much money as they had cost.

Marshall Field reports that it is delaying plans for expansion because of high costs.

Montgomery, Ward & Co. is not rebuilding stores that have burned down for the same reason.

Sears, Roebuck & Co. is selling its buildings to get working capital, and then renting them back from the buyers on long-term leases.

BORROW HEAVILY FROM BANKS

All the paper mills in Canada have borrowed heavily from the banks because of the great increase in the cost of their inventories.

Many industries are finding trouble in financing themselves by stock sales and have had to take to bond and preferred stock issues.

The amounts set aside for depreciation will only provide half the money needed for replacements. To stay in business, even without expansion, large amounts of earnings must be withheld from stockholders, which must pay corporation profits taxes under the existing law.

Failure to replace obsolete machinery had much to do with the ruin of British industry.

Another set of reports which has come to me show that where institutions have doubled the volume of their business, the net profits have increased little, if at all.

In addition to my old time benefactions and charities, I find myself importuned by a host of strangers who cannot make ends meet. Only recently old Yale came out with a plan and a plea to raise enough money to keep it in the education field. The money is not in sight, after taxation, to maintain private education.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY NEEDS

The director of the humanities development of the University of Chicago writes:

"The university's library problem, without Government aid, which we do not desire, is insupportable. As you know from your interest in the atomic instruments we develop, the research staff requires unusual facilities; the library today cannot supply the required facilities. It is a most serious condition we face."

The once wealthy St. Luke's Hospital, now seeking to raise $3,500,000, has raised only $500,000. Mercy Hospital, wishing to put up a six-million-dollar building near the Northwestern University campus, has only raised $2,000,000 to date. St. Francis Hospital in Evanston has only obtained $460,000 of a desired four million.

In all, it is desired to raise $30,000,000, but if this should be obtained there still would not be enough beds for Chicago's sick.

The money is going to build power plants and buy intoxicants for Europeans.

Deprived of their customary gift money, hospitals are compelled to raise their rates to a point that patients cannot afford to pay.

AMERICAN LIFE DISAPPEARS

It is rapidly becoming obvious that our much vaunted American way of life is rapidly flowing down the sewer. It is dying because there is hardly a man in or out of public life with the courage to denounce the appropriations and the taxes raised for them which are rapidly destroying us.

We seemed to be on the road to recovery when the last election sent men fresh from their communities to Washington. There they fell into the toils of the bureaucrats and have become little better than New Dealers.

The entire vast bureaucracy is utterly indifferent to the welfare of the country and is interested only in itself. The commanders of our vast Army, Navy, and Air Forces were taken from their homes while still boys, and immersed in occupations which cannot be productive and must be destructive.

They are trained to command, that is, to rule. No harm came from that when the forces were small. Now they are ruling a substantial part of the population, which is acquiring the habit of being ruled and abandoning self-government. The commanders are deep in politics and, as rulers, looking upon the people as their privates. Their attitude is that they tell Congress how much money they want and it is up to Congress to find it. The members of the military committees grovel before them and do not criticize or investigate them.

LIVE AT EXPENSE OF PEOPLE

The civil servants consider themselves Washingtonians, not Americans, Washingtonians to live at the expense of the Americans they rule.

Our State Department is composed of men who joined it to get out of America. If they can win the patronage and approval of the foreigners they consider their superiors, they little reck what happens to the common Americans they despise. Their whole life is bound up with the countries beyond our shores.

There are various factions among them, of which the pro-British and pro-Russian factions are the strongest. The small pro-American faction is neither influential nor vocal. These dangerous organizations are abetted by banks and businesses whose sight is so short that they can only see the immediate profit, without the vision of the ruin ahead.

Many of us here can remember when the budget first touched $1,000,000,000. According to Senator BYRD, plans promulgated by the bureaucrats and accepted by our feeble-minded Congressmen envison a budget of $50,000,000,000. Local expenditures are $13,000,000,000.

THIRTY PERCENT OF INCOME

Sixty-three billion dollars is 30 percent of the total national income. When this is drawn away, with all costs doubled in the last 7 years, with all earnings facing extinction, through the cost of replacement, we are shooting into the abyss into which England has already fallen and to which she is drawing us.

Your own books tell you the same story that I have just repeated. Your taxes are ruining you. Two years ago, when conditions were not as bad as they are today, I made a very similar speech in Los Angeles. It received much acclaim but nobody did anything about it. I wonder whether you will do anything about it or will you futilely glide to your ruin.

Gamble Report Sets Goal for New Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the attached

clipping from the Daily Times, published in Mamaroneck, N. Y., May 25, 1948, entitled "Gamble Report Sets Goal for New Homes":

GAMBLE REPORT SETS GOAL FOR NEW HOMES

WASHINGTON.—Representative RALPH A. GAMBLE, Larchmont, N. Y. (Twenty-eighth New York District), has turned author. He is now sending to real-estate editors of newspapers throughout the Nation "Housing in America—Its present status and future implications."

The volume contains a factual analysis of testimony and studies, together with suggestions by members of the Joint Committee on Housing, of which the Westchester Congressman is chairman. Hearings were held in 33 cities.

"The housing goal I visualize," said Representative GAMBLE, "is a million and a half newly constructed or reconstructed dwelling units a year for the next 2 years. The builders and the building-trades workers, from both of whom the committee is receiving the fullest cooperation, assure me that they will do their utmost to reach this goal."

Ease Restrictions on Relief Packages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I have for a long time advocated and encouraged the extension of voluntary relief in Europe. From personal experience I became aware of the many difficulties encountered in mailing such packages, much along the line outlined in an article by Dorothy Thompson, which I am pleased to note was inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (p. A3433) by my colleague Mr. KEATING, of New York. I have urged that many of the restrictions be removed and that every possible assistance be extended to encourage the sending of such packages abroad.

To the extent by which we encourage individual shipments of food and clothing we reduce the tax burden for European relief.

A Democratic Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Alexandria Gazette, which is said to be the oldest daily newspaper in the United States, has published a very interesting and provocative formula for the solution of the dilemma which confronts the Democratic Party at this time. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DEMOCRATIC FORMULA

The following formula is suggested for the Democratic Party to be employed in the approaching national election for the purpose of bridging the recently developed differences between its southern and northern wings, and which could and should result in the success of a Democratic candidate.

The formula involves a return in part to the method devised by the framers of the Constitution for the election of a President by electors chosen by the several States and followed before any national conventions were held for the nomination of a Presidential candidate. National party conventions are extra-constitutional bodies and there is no legal requirement obliging an elector to vote for a particular candidate even though his name may appear as a nominee upon the ballot cast by the electorate and by which electors are chosen. The electors are quite free to vote in the electoral college for whomsoever they wish. Eight of them upon one occasion voted for the late Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler for vice president although he had not been nominated by any party. They could in the circumstances have voted for anyone else.

Let the national convention be held as usual, adopt the party's platform and proceed with the customary transaction of the business for which it is called, except that it should not nominate a candidate for President. This would be neither an approval or a rejection of the candidacy of President Truman against which the southern contingent now vehemently protests, and which would probably lead, if he were to be nominated, to the withdrawal of some of the southern delegates and doubtless the refusal of some Southern States to support his nomination. Instead, let the convention direct the Democratic organizations in the several States each to nominate a candiate of their choice whose name would be entered upon the ballot together with the names of the electors, the same as has been done heretofore when the party's national convention nominated a candidate, the object being the election of democratic electors.

A list of such possible candidates could include:

For the New England States: Hon. J. HOWARD MCGRATH, of Rhode Island, or Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts.

For the Middle Central States: Hon. James A. Farley, of New York. The two most popular New York Democrats are Senator ROBERT WAGNER and Mayor O'Dwyer, but both, because they were not born in this country, are ineligible. Mr. Farley would seem to be the next most popular Democrat and perhaps equal in popularity with either of them in the matter of vote-getting ability.

For the Middle West States: Ex-Governor Frank J. Lausche, of Ohio, or Senator SCOTT LUCAS, of Illinois.

For the States immediately west of the Mississippi River: President Harry S. Truman.

For the Mountain States: Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming.

For the Pacific Coast States: Senator SHERIDAN DOWNEY, of California, or Gov. M. C. Wallgren, of Washington.

For the Southern States: Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, or Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia.

For the border States: Senator ALBEN BARKLEY, of Kentucky.

Or any other Democrat whom the Democrats of any particular State believe could win the electors of that particular State.

When and if a majority of Democratic electors should be chosen in the several States let the chairman of the Democratic National Committee be empowered to call a meeting of such electors with directions to them to select the candidate for whom all of them would vote in the electoral college—always remembering that it is the electors who actually elect the President—and that no elector is bound to vote for any indicated candidate. Formulating their own rules, each would indicate his first preference, and then by the process of successively eliminating the name lowest on the list, would arrive at a majority choice, or, in deference to the old two-thirds rule, they could make their selection by that requirement. Having entered such a meeting and agreeing to abide by its decision, they would return to their States and cast their votes in the electoral college for the candidate agreed upon. Conceding that the method would be unusual, it would nevertheless be thoroughly democratic. The electors would select their candidate and vote for him.

If this method were followed it would be helpful to local candidates in the various States.

With the Democratic Party divided into three different elements, it would seem futile to attempt a head-on fight against a united Republican Party. The Democrats must resort to strategy, and such strategy as is here suggested, although not according to recent custom and practice, is entirely honorable and legal.

The People Lose a Fighter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very touching and appropriate article on the passing of the late Jim McGill, a grand and great soldier for great democratic causes, written by Charles W. Ervin, editor of the Advance, and published in the National Union Farmer, issue of May 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PEOPLE LOSE A FIGHTER

(By Charles W. Ervin, editor, the Advance)

This country lost a truly great man when Jim McGill passed on. It is true that this Indiana farm boy "made good" in the eyes of the business world. It is also true, however, that this fact interested him not at all.

For over a third of a century his interests were for the common good; not only did he give generously of his money to various movements, seeking to bring to the people truths, which if translated into action would realize the promise of the Declaration of Independence—"life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," but by constant contact with those in the front ranks of the army for the common good he helped to inspire them to renewed effort and encouraged them to keep on with the fight. And this was true even in the darkest days of reaction.

RANKS THINNING

Many of these fellow fighters for the common good passed on before Jim was cut down by the scythe of time. Senator George W. Norris, whom Jim supported in all of his political moves looking to the widening of the democratic process, would tell me how Jim had been to see him in Washington and what an inspiration he had been when the Senator felt discouraged as he waged his battle in Congress.

Then there was Judson King, who battled for so many years against the utility monopoly and for public ownership, and who is still battling in Washington against perhaps the most powerful lobby of the big interests. Jim kept in constant touch with his work and helped support the organization which, with meager means, has done a magnificent job.

There was Tom Amlie, who came to Washington as a Congressman and a truth-teller. Tom told so many truths that he told himself out of a job. He went on telling the truth in other fields and was able to do so mainly because of the encouragement and help of Jim McGill.

And Oscar Ameringer, that doughty fighter who wielded his pen and sounded his voice until death struck him down in his early seventies, found in Jim a steady support for his American Guardian weekly. This fearless sheet, under Ameringer's leadership, reached into every State of the Union. It had several financial crises which Jim helped to overcome.

During the depression and the entrance of Franklin Delano Roosevelt onto the political scene with the New Deal, Jim was much in Washington, as was this writer. There I had a chance to watch Jim at close range. He was an inspiration not only to progressives of his own generation but to many younger men who had come to Washington to take part in the New Deal.

When the Political Action Committee, headed by Sidney Hillman, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, was formed, Jim became comptroller and threw great energy, in spite of ill health into the battle of 1944 when Franklin Roosevelt was reelected.

The services which Jim gave to the common good would make a long, long list. In his own life he realized the dream of Ulysses: "How dull a thing it is to pause, to make an end, to rust unburnished, not to shine in use; as if to breathe were life."

Dear Jim shone in use until the end. It is difficult to grasp that physically we will not see him again, but his spirit will march with all of us until we, too, are summoned to the great beyond.

(Editor's note: Two things should be added to this story. The first, Charles Ervin's name should be placed on his list of fighters. He has been on the firing line longer than most people live, it seems, and Charlie is still in there slugging it out though he is well past 80. The other point is that Jim McGill was one of the stanchest friends the Farmers Union had. He was the friend of any group that fought for people.)

A Positive Program for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the prepared text of an interview which Mr. Charles Parmer, of Station WEAM, Arlington, and WDEL, of Wilmington, conducted with me last Sunday.

The subject of this interview over Mr. Parmer's fine program was a positive program for peace.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A POSITIVE PROGRAM FOR PEACE

Mr. PARMER. Ladies and gentlemen, we are happy to have in our studio this afternoon one of the distinguished statesmen of the United States Senate, the Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY, senior United States Senator from Wisconsin. Senator WILEY is chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee and a high-ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He is no new participant in this program, for he has spoken to us on several previous occasions, discussing matters of national and international importance to our country. Many of our listeners will know Senator WILEY as the author of the book of humor of, by, and about Congress entitled, "Laughing with Congress." But it is no joking matter about which Senator WILEY will speak with us this afternoon. Senator, won't you tell us just what this subject is?

Senator WILEY. Well, Charley, the subject of our little talk this afternoon is the most important subject pending in the world today—the preservation of peace among nations. Every mail to me from the State of Wisconsin brings deeply distressed letters from mothers and fathers, from war veterans, from ministers asking the Members of the Senate to do everything possible in order to preserve the peace. I would like to discuss with you, Charley, ways and means of securing this objective, ways that are both general and very specific.

Mr. PARMER. Senator WILEY, I can think of few Members of your distinguished body, the United States Senate, who are better able to give expert judgment on this topic of peace. Over your 9 years in the Senate, you have a long and impressive record of suggestions calculated to achieve world peace and harmony.

IMPORTANCE OF PEACE

Senator WILEY. Thanks, Charley. I have only sought to do my duty along this line. Surely, there is nothing more important than preventing atomic destruction, germ warfare, and a virtual end to our civilization because of war. It was the Master who told us: "Blessed are the peacemakers." It is in the New Testament, too, that we read the words which are familiar to all of us, "Glory to God in the highest and peace on earth, good will toward men." How strange it is that in spite of these words, there is more talk in the world today of war than perhaps at any other time in the world's history. Men speak of war as though it were a certainty rather than just a possibility.

Mr. PARMER. Senator, do you think it important that we should just think about peace and forget a military emergency which might confront our Nation?

Senator WILEY. Definitely not. We dare not close our eyes to the realities that exist in the world today. We cannot simply assume that all men are brothers and that we can abandon all arms and armament, and by some miracle, have everlasting peace. The history of mankind shows wars occurring intermittently. However much we are going to try to prevent another war from occurring, there is no use in kidding ourselves. War is always possible, and we must be eternally prepared and vigilant against it. But I want to state a positive program for peace.

1. ADEQUATE MILITARY PREPAREDNESS

Mr. PARMER. All right, sir, what is No. 1 on your program?

Senator WILEY. First off, Charley, paradoxical though it may be, item number 1 is complete preparedness for war. It was George Washington who said, "To be prepared for war is the surest guaranty of peace." This means preparedness with modern weapons (I emphasize modern) for the Army, Navy and Air Forces, (and not with "squads right, squads left" hocus pocus). It may seem strange that we must talk of armaments in the same breath that we talk of peace, but I believe that there would be no greater danger to world peace than if America were to lag in her armaments as she did after World War I.

There is also a danger, however, that we will become infatuated with armaments, that we will think that armaments alone will be enough to preserve peace. That definitely is not the case, for mere preparedness against war is no final guaranty of itself against war. We must have a positive program in order to prevent our sons from ever becoming involved in another terrible holocaust. While we have modern preparedness, while we decentralize our cities, our Government, our industry, we must take other steps—affirmative steps. A 70-group air force, however worth while, isn't enough to assure peace all by itself any more than any other armaments are.

2. PREPAREDNESS AGAINST COMMUNISM

Mr. PARMER. What is point 2, Senator?

Senator WILEY. Point No. 2 of the positive program for peace is internal preparedness against the menace of communism here at home. If the Russians think that they can paralyze us by termiting our institutions here at home, if they think that they can weaken America by encouraging class warfare and strife, then they will feel that much more arrogant in their foreign policy and will feel that much more confident that they can risk war. Right now we in the Senate Judiciary Committee are considering the Mundt-Nixon bill to control subversive activities. We are analyzing every angle of this bill in order to make sure that we do not violate the Constitution in any particular in the very legitimate purpose and the worthy purpose of combating communism in our midst. We are definitely going to report out constructive legislation along this line.

Mr. PARMER. External preparedness and internal preparedness, then Senator WILEY, are points one and two. What are your further points?

3. STRENGTHEN UN

Senator WILEY. Well, Charley, I think that point No. 3 should be the definite strengthening of the United Nations in order to make sure that it fulfills the prayers of the world for true cooperation. According to the latest Gallup poll, the UN has sunk to its lowest esteem in the minds of the American people. We in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee have unanimously reported out what is called the Vandenberg resolution, a declaration of United States policy for the strengthening of the UN and for the support of like-minded nations abroad. While we must pass this or similar legislation to strengthen the UN, we must never forget that the UN itself cannot be our sole guaranty for peace. Rather, it is the will and intent and the purpose for peace on the part of the peoples of the world which will make for enduring peace. Now, the next item in the positive program for peace is the setting up of a definite peace establishment.

4. NEED FOR DIVISION OF PEACE

Mr. PARMER. Senator WILEY, as I recall, right along that line you introduced a bill to establish a Cabinet Department of Peace with a Secretary of Peace in the President's Cabinet.

Senator WILEY. That is true, Charley; I have introduced a Department of Peace bill in this Congress, but, unfortunately, action has not been taken upon it. The State Department says that it believes that such a Department would duplicate the Department's own activities, although I do not believe that this would be the result. If we cannot get up a separate Department of Peace, let us at least establish a Division of Peace in the State Department. Such a Division would be exclusively responsible for the mobilizing of the spiritual forces of mankind for the maintenance of world peace. It could cooperate with the great religious organizations of America, fraternal organizations, veterans' organizations and others, in order

to secure true cooperation between the peoples of the world.

5. COOPERATION BETWEEN PEOPLES

Mr. PARMER. Senator WILEY: What would you say is item five of your positive program for peace?

Senator WILEY. Charley, I believe that the people of the United States should continue to send messages abroad to their friends, their relatives, and organizations with which they are familiar, in order to impress upon them the truths about America and about our way of life It should be the responsibility of our churches, our schools, our great civic organizations, service clubs and others to be in continuous contact with comparable organizations abroad in order to solidify America's bonds with mankind.

Right now, for example, the people of my own State of Wisconsin are celebrating the hundredth anniversary of their admission into the Union. As a symbol of that celebration, they have arranged for a Centennial Friendship Fleet which will carry the gifts of the people of Wisconsin, of various nationality groups, industries, and other segments to the peoples of the Scandinavian and the Low Countries.

We should not, however, only give of our material resources. We should give of our spiritual resources.

6. SENDING PAPERS AND MAGAZINES

Mr. PARMER. Senator WILEY, you also have suggested that Americans send newspapers and magazines abroad.

Senator WILEY. Yes, Charley; that is the next item on the positive program for peace. I believe that our foreign-language groups should take out subscriptions to worthy American-minded periodicals, published in foreign languages in our land, and that these subscriptions should be sent abroad to organizations which are hungry for the "light." We should encourage those foreign organizations, in turn, to send us their periodicals wherever possible in order that they can feel a sense of contribution and participation instead of being only on the receiving end of American gifts.

7. PEACE CONFERENCE WITH STALIN

Mr. PARMER. The world, Senator, has heard recently of the Russians' so-called "peace offer" to President Truman. Is that a part of your positive program for peace?

Senator WILEY. Yes, Charley; but not conferences merely for Red propaganda purposes. I have urged that there be multilateral conferences with the Russians in order to iron out the differences between us. Those conferences should not be between the United States and Russia alone. Mr. Stalin seems to think that our two countries can make decisions regarding other countries and affecting their destinies, such as was made for Czechoslovakia at Munich without its consent. We cannot and will not do that. We must emphasize that these conferences must not be conferences of appeasement and that we are not trying to circumvent the United Nations. Rather, Russia must change her policy in the UN if she is to indicate her true peaceful intentions.

But, Charley, I do not want the United States State Department to be adopting a "holier-than-thou" attitude. I do not want the State Department to be rejecting peace offers, as if America were not interested in talking at all with the Russians. We have got to put ourselves in the Russians' shoes. We have got to understand their centuries of background, their long series of invasions suffered at the hands of foreign foes, their isolation behind the iron curtain, their being deluged with propaganda. We have to stretch out our hands to the Russian people and say "You are entitled to the kind of Government that you want, just as other peoples are entitled to the Government that they want. We want no war. We want only peace, just as the rank and file of the Russian people are hungering for peace. We do not intend to stand idly by and watch aggression precipitated by your leaders."

This is the message we must send in our radio broadcasts and in the newspaper and magazine articles to the Russian people.

8. SOUND FOREIGN BROADCASTS

Mr. PARMER. Senator, right along this line, you've undoubtedly heard about the kind of inane broadcasts that have been going abroad in the Voice of America program?

Senator WILEY. Yes, Charley, these Voice of America broadcasts have in many instances, been shockingly inept, stupid, and downright un-American. We've got to straighten out this whole foreign information program and make sure that it fulfills its important purpose in a sensible, American, economical way. Many of our previous broadcasts sound as if they were beamed from Moscow instead of from Washington.

9. RECIPROCAL PRIVILEGES WITH RUSSIA

Mr. PARMER. That brings us, Senator, to Item No. 9.

Senator WILEY. This next item in the positive program for peace that I am suggesting is that America must seek reciprocal cooperation on the part of Russia for all the courtesies that we extend to the Soviet emissaries in our own land. We allow Russians to move virtually freely in our country. We allow them to circulate their propaganda. We must impress upon the Russians that we desire reciprocal courtesies in their land and in the other lands behind the iron curtain.

Mr. PARMER. Senator Wiley, is there any concluding item in your positive program for peace?

10. PRAYER FOR PEACE

Senator WILEY. Yes; Charley, I believe that it is up to every last American citizen to pray for peace and to pray that the leaders of America will be adequate to their responsibilities for peace. You may recall that I met on shipboard, during my recent trip to Europe, Mr. Vishinsky, the Soviet representative at the United Nations. I clasped his hand in a handshake and said, "Mr. Vishinsky, I pray every night that the United States and Russia and their leaders will be adequate to consummate their desire for peace." Mr. Vishinsky said, through an interpreter, "I do not pray." Well, Charley, Mr. Vishinsky may not pray and Stalin may not pray, but I believe that the overwhelming mass of the Russian people who have not forgotten God and who have not forgotten the Holy Scriptures, are praying for peace. Let us, too, pray for peace and let us pray that we will become vehicles and channels for the Light through which peace can be established

Mr. PARMER. Well, Senator Wiley, I want to thank you for being with us and for presenting your outstanding positive program for peace. It is but one of the numerous outstanding contributions for peace that you have made throughout your distinguished service in the United States Senate.

This is Charles Parmer signing off.

Reduction in Veterans' Administration Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on the reduction in Veterans' Administration expenditures made by George E. Ijams before the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives on April 1, 1948.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF GEORGE E. IJAMS BEFORE THE VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE ON CUT IN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION EXPENDITURES

The recent announcement of a reduction in personnel in the VA caused little surprise to the officials of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, who have for many months been cognizant of the fact that the Veterans' Administration has been far overstaffed for the past 2½ years in some of its activities.

Not only have we realized that overstaffing in nonessential jobs has taken place, but we have repeatedly called this fact to the attention of the then Administrator of Veterans Affairs, and requested a correction of the situation. Unfortunately, our repeated efforts to reduce unnecessary administrative overhead have met with little success. As far back as January 1947, the then commander in chief of the VFW, Mr. Louis E. Starr, expressed apprehension to Government officials and employees engaged in administering the huge appropriations for veteran welfare and benefits, that "if too large a slice of total appropriations goes into overhead and administrative costs the Nation's veterans may suffer an economic wave in the future." Mr. Starr stated, "We all know something of the cycles in which history repeats itself. The economy wave of 1933 haunts those who are thoroughly acquainted with veteran problems and justice. The appropriations of a grateful Congress earmarked for veteran rehabilitation, claims, pensions, and related problems are a credit to the Congress, and the citizens of the Nation. Nevertheless, taxpayers, which include all of us, are entitled to the highest degree of efficiency and financial economy in the administration of the appropriations."

Mr. Starr then called attention to the fact that overhead and administrative costs of the public outlays of cash are always a target under the most perfect conditions, and he added, "We want to be sure that administrative costs and overhead by those responsible for veteran welfare and benefits are at a minimum required for appropriate functioning."

He concluded his remarks with the statement, "It might be well that we take heed now and lock the barn door while the horse is still with us rather than clean up and lock the stable after he has disappeared. Perhaps some agency of Government, like Congress, should conduct a survey into the costs of administering veterans' affairs with the purpose of making sure that veterans receive every penny possible out of the appropriations. As an organization devoted to the welfare of all veterans, let me stress the fact that the VFW is opposed to any slashes in essential welfare measures and benefits for veterans. But we know that waste and extravagance, if present, must be eliminated, or our years of effort and accomplishment will meet certain defeat."

Last September, when the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States assembled in national encampment in Cleveland, Ohio, resolutions demanding economy of administration in the VA were presented from many States, notably from Oregon, California, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, Florida, and Massachusetts. These resolutions indicated a widespread belief that waste and extravagance of operations existed. All of these resolutions suggested a reorganization of the VA to bring about a better utilization of its personnel. They cited definite waste of manpower throughout the VA, and the use

of personnel in work not essential to the proper administration of veterans' benefits.

These resolutions requested the organization to go on record in recommending the elimination of certain units of organization and practices, and the consolidation of other departments within the VA, and they specifically called for the elimination of many of the nonessential high-bracket positions, as well as the cancellation of many reports and "voluminous publications now being promulgated."

Last October, after making a Nation-wide survey of the situation in the VA which resulted from the much publicized overpayment of $50,000,000 to young men receiving vocational training, the results of this survey were presented to General Bradley, and he was informed we had discovered the need for additional clerks and messengers in some of the operating services of the Regional offices. As a means of securing this essential personnel without going to Congress for a deficiency appropriation, it was suggested that certain high-salaried positions involving no direct service to veterans be eliminated, and the moneys paid to these persons be set aside for the employment of the needed low salaried personnel.

This suggestion like many similar ones we had made, met with no success.

Last October the National Council of Administration of the VFW met in Kansas City, Mo. Among the important problems considered was that of economy of administration in the VA. There were many World War I veterans present at this meeting who remembered the effects of the infamous Economy Act of 1933 which resulted in the reduction of compensation to battle casualty cases of World War I and to the widows and orphans of those who had made the supreme sacrifice in that war. The members of the National Council of Administration were fully cognizant of the fact that unless waste and extravagance of administration were eliminated from the VA, the veterans of World War II soon will be confronted with demands for an Economy Act similar to the one which played havoc with the war casualties of World War I.

The members of the Council realized that the officials of the VFW had been doing their utmost to bring about a reduction of the many high-salaried positions recently created in the VA which were not essential to the granting of benefits to the disabled men. They also appreciated the fact that our continued efforts and demands for economy of operation had borne little fruit. Therefore, the National Council of Administration unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"ECONOMY OF ADMINISTRATION IN THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

"Whereas the appropriations currently granted to the Veterans' Administration represent one of the largest single items of Federal expenditures; and

"Whereas most of our citizens are under the mistaken impression that all of this money is dispersed to our disabled veterans and their dependents; and

"Whereas a large part of these funds is used to pay the salaries, traveling and other expenses of high-salaried staff, coordinating and planning, and supervisory personnel, whose duties have little or no bearing on direct benefits to veterans; and

"Whereas the preparation of forms, flow charts, reports, news releases, and other nonessential issues of the Veterans' Administration is very costly, time-consuming, and requires the services of hundreds of employees in their preparation, printing, distribution, and reading; and

"Whereas certain divisions of the branch and regional offices of the Veterans' Administration are nonoperating administrative offices, which consume the services of highly paid staff personnel while contributing little direct benefit to the rehabilitation of veterans; and

"Whereas the operation of branch offices as now constituted makes it necessary for adjudicating work to be performed in certain instances, both in the regional office and in the controlling branch office, at considerable expense and with a great loss of time; and

"Whereas millions of dollars have been obligated for the benefit of private architects for hospital plans and specifications which are now found to be impractical and useless; and

"Whereas all of these activities and others add to the cost of administering direct benefits to veterans without adding appreciably to the service, and in fact in some instances retarding the service to disabled men; and

"Whereas it is our studied opinion that unless the action contemplated in this resolution is taken immediately our veterans will be confronted with legislation similar to the infamous Economy Act of 1933, which reduced the meager benefits that were paid to the veterans of World War I who suffered disabilities in that war, and to the widows and orphans of those who made the supreme sacrifice: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the National Council of Administration of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, at its meeting in Kansas City, Mo., October 16, 17, and 18, requests the Administrator of Veterans Affairs to immediately eliminate those positions and units of organization which are not contributing to direct benefits to our veterans and their beneficiaries, thereby eliminating millions of dollars of unnecessary overhead now charged against veteran benefits."

It is because of our belief that there has been waste and extravagance in the administration of the VA through the creation of unnecessary individual jobs and units of organization, that we welcome this opportunity to present our opinions to the members of the Veterans' Committee of the House of Representatives.

In presenting a solution for the difficulties which General Gray was unfortunate enough to inherit when he assumed the office of Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, we wish to state most emphatically that it is our first objective to see that the benefits granted to the veterans of our wars are retained, and that the veterans of World War II may be spared the experiences which confronted the veterans of World War I in 1933 when the infamous Economy Act was enacted into law.

We realize that many of the regional offices of the Veterans' Administration which deal with direct benefits to our disabled men are laboring under extreme difficulties because of the shortage of clerks, typists, messengers, and other personnel. We also realize that there are 13 branch offices of the Veterans' Administration set up under the old Army system of "corps areas" or "service commands," to quote the recent officials of the Veterans' Administration, which employ a great number of high-salaried officials whose duties have little or no effect upon benefits paid to veterans except in some instances to retard the work of the regional offices.

We are aware of the fact that when reductions of personnel have been ordered many of the deputy administrators have ordered the dismissal of essential clerical personnel in the operating services of their regional offices while making very few cuts in the personnel of their branch offices.

Just recently, one deputy administrator reduced by 13 percent the personnel in one of his regional offices, and 9 percent in another; at the same time he cut his own force by 0.04 percent, and this in spite of the fact that his branch office employed many high-salaried persons whose duties have little bearing on benefits to veterans.

The veteran organizations are not alone in their belief that many of the positions and units of organization in the branch offices are not only very costly, but are serving no useful purpose to the disabled veterans.

This same thought has been expressed repeatedly by managers of regional offices of the VA in all sections of America, and by other officials of that organization.

Today we are confronted with the absolute need for clerical employees in certain regional offices where most of the direct benefits are handled. We are also confronted with the demand of the American people, including our veterans, that all governmental agencies be operated at an absolute minimum of overhead expense.

It is the belief of the officials of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, that the money for the salaries of additional personnel in the regional offices can be provided through the elimination of unnecessary positions and units of organization in the branch offices, and that a saving to the taxpayer will result if this action is taken.

We also believe such action will avoid the necessity for breaking down career service in Government with a resultant lowering of morale of all career employees.

Were it not for the fact that the national service life insurance for World War II veterans is now housing in the 13 branch offices we would have recommended the abolishment of these offices long ago. We realize, however, that before any change takes place in the handling of national service life insurance, a decision must be made that this insurance either be recentralized in one city, or that it be further decentralized from the branch offices to the regional offices serving the veterans in the various States. Either move would present difficult space and personnel problems, and we appreciate the fact that it will take some months to solve those problems. We, therefore, feel that for the time being at least the insurance work should remain in the present 13 locations in which it is housed, under insurance directors who would report directly to the Assistant Administrator for Insurance in Washington, thus giving that official direct responsibility over all insurance activities, which authority he has not had since the insurance was decentralized to the branch offices and placed under the jurisdiction of the deputy administrators. This action would at last place direct responsibility for the operation of the insurance activity of the VA upon one official, which is so essential if this work is to be maintained on a businesslike basis.

We feel that the dependency claims work now being handled in the branch offices could be decentralized to the regional offices and that all other activities of the branch offices except a very small supervisory force could be entirely eliminated, part of the money thus saved could be used for the employment of much-needed low-salaried personnel in the regional offices, and the rest of it could be returned to the Treasury of the United States.

So far our comment has been directed to the field activities of the VA. A great deal of money could be saved in Central Office as well. This saving could be effected in such a manner as to materially improve the morale of the large number of splendid career employees in Central Office. The overexpansion of the VA was not confined to the field. Unfortunately, much of the expansion of central office took place through the employment of persons in high grades and for nonessential work. We now find in certain activities so many positions graded from CAF–13 up, that the employees in the lower grades, who are called upon to do the major part of the actual work, find few opportunities open to them for promotion.

Logically, this situation has had a tendency to destroy the morale of a large number of essential career employees of the VA.

There have, of course, been other very large expenditures which in the public minds, are chargeable to veterans benefits but which

have produced no benefits to the disabled veterans, such as the great sum of money paid through the corps of engineers of the Army to outside architects for plans and specifications for hospitals which could not be used and had to be completely revised by the VA's very able staff of architects, engineers and draftsmen before these plans could be advertised for bids.

Many other instances of extravagance and absolute waste of taxpayers' money could be cited, but the committee can ascertain the true facts through means open to them.

The principal problem confronting us today is the need for low salaried essential personnel in the regional offices of the VA, and the means of providing this personnel without requesting additional funds from the Congress of the United States.

We submit that this problem can be solved by abolishing the branch offices as they are now constituted, leaving the national service life insurance in the present 13 locations, under directors of insurance who will report directly to the Assistant Administrator for Insurance in Washington, by decentralizing the dependency claims work from the branch offices to the regional offices, and by leaving in certain selected branch offices very small and well trained supervisory forces for the supervision work in their areas.

We are convinced that such action would not only materially improve the service to the disabled veterans, but would also result in savings to the taxpayers over and above the money needed for the employment of essential personnel in the regional offices.

The VFW has been instrumental in securing much beneficial legislation for the veterans who have defended our country. We intend to do our utmost to see that those benefits are maintained. We are determined that there shall be efficient operation of the vast agency established by a grateful people and our Congress to administer those benefits and that wasteful extravagancies shall be eliminated.

To this end we pledge our full cooperation to the Congress and to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

We conclude our testimony with the reminder that nothing in this statement should be construed as being critical of the present Administrator of Veterans' Affairs who assumed office on January 1, 1948. As a matter of fact, General Gray has the respect, the confidence, and the heartfelt sympathy of all informed veterans who know of the problems he inherited.

Housing Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the attached clipping from the Daily Times, published in Mamaroneck, N. Y., May 28, 1948, entitled "Housing Outlook":

HOUSING OUTLOOK

In an analysis of the hearings held in 33 cities by the Joint Committee on Housing which he heads, Representative RALPH A. GAMBLE, of Larchmont, says he visualizes 1,500,000 newly constructed or reconstructed dwelling units a year for the next 2 years.

"The builders and the building trades workers, from both of whom the committee is receiving the fullest cooperation, assure me that they will do their utmost to reach this goal," announces the Westchester Congressman.

We trust that Mr. GAMBLE is correct in his visualization. For there is no greater need at this time not only in Westchester, where home building has long been our principal industry, but elsewhere throughout the entire Nation, for modern, comfortable, medium-priced homes. Not only does such building improve housing conditions, now badly warped from normalcy, but it also creates tax-producing wealth through private enterprise, points out Mr. GAMBLE. All the more reason, then, for a steady, determined push on the part of all concerned—builders, workers, investors, and the like—until we reach the goal.

A nation is composed of homes, and when we don't have enough homes we don't have enough Nation.

One Hundred and Fortieth Anniversary of Birth of Jefferson Davis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 3, 1948

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith the following address delivered by me before the United Daughters of the Confederacy, at Washington, D. C., on the occasion of the one hundred and fortieth anniversary of the birth of Jefferson Davis:

In the hearts of all who love and cherish the institutions, traditions, and principles of the glorious South, the name of Jefferson Davis finds itself conspicuously engraved.

Great men have lived and died, each striving for a cause rooted in the conscientious belief that it inured to the betterment of humanity. Thus lived and died the greatest of all Mississippians—Jefferson Davis—loved, honored, respected, and revered by those who knew and understood him; maligned, despised, and pitied by those whose minds were so saturated with sectional hatred that they neither understood nor cared to understand him.

Jefferson Davis, the greatest of all Mississippians, was thrown by the unpredictable hand of fate into the leading role of the greatest tragedy ever to befall a nation of free men.

Placing incontrovertible truth and undying principle above the security of his person and the emoluments of high national position, he led his proud and unrelenting comrades in an exhibition of courage and stamina which continues 75 years later to amaze practical historians and to baffle military minds.

And yet out of the stigma of the inevitable defeat which the valiant southern defenders were to suffer came a better and more lasting America. For the South, along with her unconquerable leaders, accepted her fate with head unbowed, and concentrated her efforts toward a more perfect union. Many years after that dreadful conflict it was Davis—still clinging to his cherished ideals, but realizing the hopelessness of further struggle—who said:

"No one is the arbiter of his own fate. The people of the Confederate States did more in proportion to their numbers and means than was ever achieved by any people in the world's history. Fate decreed that they should be unsuccessful in the effort to maintain their claims to resume the grants made to the Federal Government. Our people have accepted the decree; it, therefore, behooves them, as they may, to promote the welfare of the Union, to show to the world that hereafter, as heretofore, the patriotism of our people is not measured by lines of latitude and longitude, but is as broad as the obligations they have assumed and embraced the whole of our ocean-bound domain. Let them leave to their children and children's children the grand example of never swerving from the path of duty and preferring to return good for evil rather than to cherish the unmanly feeling of revenge."

In these words, Davis expressed the spirit which pervaded the South even in the dark days of reconstruction following the war for southern independence.

The principles in defense of which Davis lived, fought, and died—the right of men to local self-government and the right of freemen to determine, insofar as it is consistent with general public welfare, the course of their own lives—are just as vital to our people today as they were in his time. These principles the South continues to hold as inalienable to the best of interest of orderly government, despite continued attacks from those who would destroy our liberty.

It has become a highly popular and politically profitable pastime for those in certain other sections to point the finger of scorn at our people.

While it is impossible for the South to forget the humiliation to which she was subjected following her great crisis, she has cast aside the sectional hatred which prevailed in those dark days and has tried to join hands with her sister States to promote national homogeneity. There are those in other and less-damaged sections of our Nation though, who are attempting to rekindle those old fires of hatred. Thus today, as in the days of Jefferson Davis, we see the South again placed on the altar of political expediency. We are again faced with the problem of preserving our time-honored institutions, our cherished traditions, as well as the integrity of our people. We will not, we cannot, submit to those, who merely to gratify their insatiable lusts for political power, would ravish our beautiful Southland, and would render valueless the sacrifices of our forefathers.

As we pause to honor the memory of this great southern leader, let us not be unmindful of the sacrifices which he and his beloved comrades suffered in order that the sovereignty of our States might be preserved.

We believe, as they did, that the only course which can produce harmony among our people is that which permits the people of the South to go their way in peace and which gives self-determination as well to those of other sections. We are, and have always been, tolerant and understanding in our dealings with our sister States. Is it too much to ask that they accord us like consideration?

The South bears a burden which no other people bears today. This burden belongs to the South and is one of which she will never be completely relieved. But it must be said to her everlasting credit that she has borne her burden with fortitude, dignity, and understanding, and has proven herself capable of self-management.

The South today needs the understanding and tolerance of her sister States rather than their scorn. She asks no assistance other than the right and opportunity to help herself. Since the war for southern independence, through no fault of her own, she has been kept in economic bondage by her conquerors. But through the normal processes of evolution, she is today emerging as America's Garden of Eden, and through constant tugging at her own bootstraps she has lifted herself above the shame and degradation of

reconstruction days. This she has done alone, and under tremendous handicap. Likewise, she can handle the racial problem on her own, and without the uninvited assistance of misguided humanitarians from other sections of the country.

It is particularly significant that the land of Jefferson Davis finds itself today inhabited by the most wholesomely patriotic people in our Nation. Our sons, fathers, and brothers have died that our Nation might continue to extol the principles of freedom on which it was created. We are not infested with Communists and their ilk; our only ism is Americanism.

If Davis could but live today, I am confident that he would just as steadfastly cling to the tenets of today's South as he did to principles of the Confederacy.

At no time in the turbulent history of our great Nation have we needed more than we need today the type of leadership that Davis exemplified. We need, in the South as well as in the North, to apply the temperance, understanding, and courage with which he was so abundantly endowed.

Many years have passed since his remains were interred in the fertile soil of his beloved Southland; and long since has the physical being of Jefferson Davis returned to its original dust. But the life which he lived and the principles for which he fought shall live among us forever, presenting themselves in our memories as rays of hope to give light to our darkest hours. The fight which he fought was lost, but the cause for which he lived and fought will accompany mankind to the day of eternal judgment, and will continue itself as a goal to be attained by all who love and cherish the traditions of liberty and freedom which are so characteristically American.

As we depart from these Halls this afternoon I know that the spirit of Jefferson Davis will be with us, affording us a greater enjoyment of the things for which he strived and which were denied him, that we might reap their benefits.

God grant that in these trying days we may cast aside sectional differences and join together as one in common understanding and brotherhood; and with the help of Almighty God march on together toward a greater and invincible America.

British Role in Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 3, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, considering the invasion of Jerusalem by the Arab legion, and that Jerusalem was to be administered as an international enclave by the United Nations, Mr. Bevin's excuses fall flat. British participation in direct aggression against Israel is clear. There follows the UP news story from the New York Herald Tribune of June 3, 1948:

BEVIN REFUSES TO HALT AID TO TRANSJORDAN—DENIES TROOPS OF ABDULLAH INVADED PALESTINE; SAYS ARABS INVITED THEM IN

LONDON, June 2.—Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin flatly rejected today left-wing Labor demands that Britain end its $9,000,000-a-year military subsidy to Transjordan.

Mr. Bevin, in a peppery exchange in Commons, also denied that King Abdullah's Transjordan forces had invaded Palestine. What happened, he held, was that Palestine Arabs had invited them into territory earmarked for Arabs under the United Nations partition plan.

In the course of his remarks Mr. Bevin disclosed that Brig. John Bagot Glubb, called "Glubb Pasha," had resigned his post in the British Colonial Service so he could retain his command of the Arab Legion.

Though he refused to stop the Transjordan subsidy and defended King Abdullah's activities in Palestine, Mr. Bevin said that he hoped conditions would not prevent a truce.

It would be premature, he said, to give an opinion on the eventual settlement of the Palestine crisis. "It is the task of the UN mediator to talk to both sides," he said. "We shall give him our utmost assistance in this task."

The American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that our young people should be encouraged in every way possible to take an active part and interest in our democratic form of government and to realize the many benefits we all enjoy because of it. It is not enough merely to provide formal education for each generation, as too often a real appreciation of our democratic processes escapes us unless we can participate in, and learn more about, this Government of the United States.

I sponsored a contest for the high-school students of the Sixth Texas District to encourage these young people to record their thoughts on important topics. I am proud to announce the winner of the essay contest in Leon County, which was so ably conducted by County Superintendent Jay S. Winn. Miss Lucille Mullenax, Oakwood High School, Oakwood, Tex., has been declared the winner, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include her essay entitled "The American Way of Life":

THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

(By Lucille Mullenax, Oakwood, Tex.)

The American way of life was founded upon the belief that man is a son of God and has God-given rights. This is clearly presaged in that oft-quoted sentence from the Declaration of Independence, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." That was the ideal of the people who settled America and today continues to be the ideal of the average American.

Terrible wars have been fought to preserve the rights that should be every man's by birth. The first of these great wars was fought in 1776 when the colonists rebelled against the tyrannical laws imposed upon them by the mother country, England. The last war fought to make the world safe for democracy was World War II, brought on by Hitler's fanatical desire to destroy everything democratic.

One of the principal institutions of the American way of life is our democratic Government. Bills of rights have been adopted to protect the individual against governmental aggressions. These bills deny to the Government the right to exercise any powers except those that the people have specifically granted to it. We are convinced that there are activities that the Government should not undertake. That makes clear the political meaning of democracy. Politically, it means the right of a whole people to determine its own fate. However, in private life, democracy means the right to advance as far as one is capable of advancing without encroaching upon the rights of others. In America, we are free to exercise ingenuity, incentive, competition, and thrift because we are not subject to tyranny or despotism from Government.

An institution that helps make possible our democratic system of Government is our public schools. In public schools is found the opportunity for every person in America to do four things well:

1. To become a separate, distinct individual without being a mere chattel of some state bureau.

2. To take part in our Government with patriotic, intelligent motives.

3. To become a self-determined individual, able and willing to carry his own economic load. To vote intelligently is part of that load.

4. To become a cooperative individual; cooperation implies equality. Without equal rights for all, government and civilization remain backward and one group of people dominates the other group.

Recognizing the needs of free people, the American public schools are attempting to develop well-trained minds whose depth of knowledge will enable individuals to think clearly; to weigh the opinions of others; to put away personal prejudices and passions; to accept the responsibilities by respecting the rights of others, by obeying the laws of their government, by voting at all elections with intelligence, and by accepting the will of the majority as expressed by our system of free ballot with a cooperative spirit. The American school surrounds its pupil with a cultural environment, emphasizes the development of a strong body, and encourages participation in physical activities; thus, preparing each child to make wholesome and satisfactory use of leisure time in childhood and throughout adulthood.

Because of the apparent soundness and security of our present way of living, many people have come to take it for granted. But we must wake up to the fact that it has enemies, both within our Nation and in foreign countries, that are seeking to destroy it. One of our most serious faults is our feeling of complacency. If we do not become active citizens, working continually for the welfare of our country, we may be forced to work for the welfare of a less desired form of government.

The second enemy that should be seriously considered is the above mentioned less desired form of government, such as communism. Though it is true that few Americans even sympathize with communism, it is also true that few Russians were Communists in 1917 when that nation's government was overcome by the Communist party. Since we do not wish to live in the turmoil, confusion, and poverty brought on by dictatorships we must work in cooperation with those who are ever trying to improve our system of government for surely there are shortcomings in the American method.

In spite of the fact that more money is expended per capita for education in our public-school system than any nation on earth, certain changes must be effected which will enable our education system to meet the challenge brought about by a rapidly changing world. Fields of training must be enlarged and broadened. More emphasis must be placed upon social, political, and economic studies. The youth of America

must be enlightened in the field of international relations. To accomplish this, better trained teachers are needed. They will be available when the teacher's position is elevated to the same plane as that of other professions requiring the equivalent of preparation and training, and when salaries commensurate with such training are provided. Actually, the amount of money appropriated for the support of our public, free schools, is relatively small when one considers expenditures for other purposes. It is the considered judgment of our leading thinkers that the surest method of combating those influences that seek to tear down our democratic institutions and ideals is through a broadened and enriched educational program.

One of the most sacred and cherished rights guaranteed to every citizen of the United States by the Constitution is freedom of religion.

In its broadest sense the ideal of free religion means the right of every man to worship according to his own belief. In the United States there is a complete separation of church and state. The Government is allowed no part of the religious affairs of the people and no man is persecuted by the Government because of his religion. The ideal of the American way of life is that no man be persecuted by his neighbor for religious beliefs.

The Constitution also guarantees to all the right to vote. Not only is this a privilege but also a duty. The ballot is the main way of allowing everyone to participate in the Government, which is essential in a democracy.

The American way of life must be preserved. If you are an American citizen, you must indeed be thankful that you live in America. Where else is there a country, whether socialized, or partly socialized, or even communistic, that has given its people nearly so much? A capitalistic America has enabled even common laborers to live like kings were accustomed to live not many years ago. We produce and enjoy the fruits of production. We must never forget that the American way of life has made this possible.

By working together in cooperation for the good of all, Lincoln's dream that "government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth" might be realized.

Address by Hon. Paul E. Fitzpatrick, Chairman, Democratic State Committee, at the Annual Dinner of the Nassau County Democratic Committee, Wednesday, May 26, 1948, Garden City Hotel, Garden City, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 3, 1948

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I take pleasure in including a speech made by Hon. Paul E. Fitzpatrick, the chairman of the Democratic State committee of New York. The occasion was the annual dinner of Nassau County Democratic committee, which was held at the Garden City Hotel, Garden City, on May 26, 1948, last.

The address of Mr. Fitzpatrick follows:

It is always a privilege and an honor to come to Nassau County, and it is a particular privilege and honor for me to be with you tonight. For in this year of decision, this large and enthusiastic gathering before me is living proof of the basic strength and vitality of the Democratic Party. I base that not only on the enthusiastic turn-out you have here tonight, but on the real accomplishments made by all of you and Chairman Carreau and the members of his committee. For the first time in many years you have elected a Democratic mayor in Glen Cove; you have elected a Democratic administration in Long Beach; you have tripled the vote in North Hempstead—to mention but a few of your victories. These great strides are the direct result of organization, and your many new Democratic clubs give promise of greater accomplishments to come. I can see that your able publication, the Nassau Democrat, will have triumph after triumph to report, for your work here in Nassau is an inspiration to the rest of the State and the Nation for victory in November.

For success in New York State and in the Nation does not begin in Philadelphia in July. It gets a new start here, to be sure, but it has its roots in the year-in and year-out hard and painstaking work so essential to a local political organization. Only in this way can a State or national party function as it should in the continuing formulation of issues, and in the presentation of these issues and candidates to the voters, so that our Government remains truly responsive to the people.

A national campaign is a test of issues, but it is also a test of strength, a test of the strength of our local organizations. So, on your local work and organization depend the future of events as remote from your precinct as the Dardanelles or Korea. Therefore, I propose to face some facts right here tonight in Nassau County.

What are the issues? Well, one big fact is certainly not an issue, and that is that the worst and the greatest conflict of all time left unparalleled economic and political consequences and problems in the lap of President Harry S. Truman, and that President Truman and his Democratic administration have led the country valiantly toward their solution, at home and abroad.

At home, in spite of Republican scuttling of price controls, and antilabor laws, President Truman has led the country through the maze of reconversion to a prosperity unequaled in our history. Never have the American people enjoyed greater national production and employment, higher wages or business profits.

And abroad it was President Truman and his great Secretary of State, George C. Marshall, who had the vision and the practical program to rescue the freedom-loving nations of Europe, by helping them to help themselves, and to stop the march of totalitarianism by making possible its alternative—the democratic way of life. Politics, as President Truman has said, must always stop at the water line, but bipartisan policy that has given the United States postwar world leadership was initiated and conceived by the President.

Moreover, it was President Truman who led the world in recognizing the new state of Israel, helping to fulfill the humanitarian dream of the long-suffering Jewish people for a homeland in Palestine. That dream, we can now be certain, will soon come true. I am sure that when the full story of our Palestine policy is unfolded, all of us will understand the President's wise handling of a difficult problem, reconciling the aspirations of the Jewish people, our own national interests, and the realities of world politics.

After the 1946 elections, it was President Truman who patriotically offered to cooperate with the Republican-dominated Congress. It was these same Republicans, flushed with victory, who paid lip service to cooperation, and then blocked it in practice. They paid lip service in the bipartisan Economic Cooperation Act, authorizing $5,300,000,000, but so far the Republican Congress has kept the strings on all but $1,000,000,000.

The Republicans have paid lip service to the bipartisan Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, and to bipartisan Federal aid to education, and then bottled both in committee. For over 2 years they have delayed action on an adequate medical-care program, the Wagner-Murray-Dingell measure. For an adequate minimum wage increase, they substituted a meaningless wages and hours bill, and for a humanitarian and workable plan for displaced persons, they have substituted unworkable restrictions and discrimination.

The Republicans have done us the signal honor of taking over, lock, stock, and barrel, but with far different motives, a program for which President Truman deserves full credit, and that is his statesmanlike civil-rights program, to make democracy real for all people here in the United States, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin. Needless to say, President Truman is acting in the finest tradition of the Democratic Party and of the American dream.

The Republicans even violate their own election pledges, for instance to extend social security, to enlarge the Labor Department. Having cut the staff of the Labor Department almost in half, they go on and attempt to whittle away its appropriations double or triple that of other department cuts. But this is merely part and parcel of their antilabor bias, such as the Taft-Hartley law, for which they claim, and may have, exclusive credit. It was President Truman, however, whose devotion to duty made him enforce that Taft-Hartley law not so long ago while Republican leaders made an out-of-court, outside-the-law, political settlement.

The Republicans promised to extend social security, but what is the performance? They have frozen contributions again, are attempting to slash appropriations 80 percent, and by misleading and unnecessary measures to preserve the status quo, have actually threatened to remove millions from the rolls, and thus reduce the entire program to nothing. Not content with these attacks on our human resources, the Republicans are making a concerted drive against conservation of our natural resources—neglecting establishment of a Missouri Valley Authority on the one hand, and on the other undermining the TVA by restrictions aimed for the benefit of private utilities. And finally, determined on Republican control of atomic energy, they play political football with President Truman's nonpolitical and statesmanlike appointments, thus brazenly placing again votes ahead of defense.

In short, the Republicans are doing their level best, or their level worst, to undo the Democratic progress of 16 years. It is up to workers of the Democratic Party, here in Nassau County and everywhere, to present these issues to the voters. Faced with the choice, I am sure the American people next November will not abandon and abdicate to an untried Republicanism the leadership given the Nation by President Harry S. Truman and a Democratic administration.

Congressional Left-Overs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 2, 1948

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the CONGESSIONAL RECORD the attached clipping from the Daily Times, published

in Mamaroneck, N. Y., May 29, 1948, entitled "Congressional Left-Overs":

CONGRESSIONAL LEFT-OVERS

When the Joint Legislative Committee drew up the Reorganization Act of 1946, the committee recommended that Congress take a recess each year from June 30 to October 1. The reason advanced by the committee read:

"Representative democracy cannot remain truly representative if elected members are required to remain away from their constituencies for long periods of time. In recent years * * * the Senators and Representatives have been denied the interchange of ideas so necessary to our system of government. Proper functioning of the Congress as a representative body demands * * * intimate first-hand knowledge of the problems of the places they represent. Their return is not required for fence building or vacations, but is in fact the essence of representative democracy."

And, it might be added, although the committee was not so frank, Washington is a very hot place during the summer.

At any rate, whatever may be the reasons normally put forward, Congress has two legitimate excuses for a 1948 summer recess, namely, the Republican and Democratic national conventions in Philadelphia in June and July. Plans now are for Congress to take a recess 2 days in advance of each convention, or a recess for the GOP convention and adjournment of the regular session just preceding the Democratic convention. In such case, it is pertinent to note what legislation might be affected, either by delay or pigeonholing.

There is, for example, the bill to give statehood to Hawaii. Passed by the House, the Senate earlier this month refused to discharge the bill from the committee and thereby bring it upon the floor for a vote. It is doubtful if this session will see Senate action thereon. Remaining items include possible revision of the Taft-Hartley labor reform law, enactment of the draft and, possibly but not probably, some form of universal military training; housing legislation, expansion of social security privileges as requested by President Truman; the latter's civil rights program, or substitutes therefor; UN revision; increase of the minimum wage; health insurance; expansion of crop insurance; and emergency jobless benefits.

Some of this may be enacted before expected adjournment early in July; other items will be left-overs for fall action; while still others will be quietly interred in congressional pigeonholes. All in all, the remaining days of the Eightieth Congress should be of public interest.

Social Security—Older People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 3, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from one of my constituents which simply and admirably describes the dilemma that a large number of older people find themselves in today because of the high price level and the stringent restrictions of the present social security system which limits earned income to $15 a month if benefits under the social-security system are to be paid. Many people, like my constituent, have contributed to the social security system for years and justifiably feel that they should avail themselves of the benefits to which they are entitled. On the other hand, many of them, especially living in big cities, cannot afford to accept the benefits if they have to pay the price of limiting their supplementary earnings to $15 a month, since the high cost of living today makes it almost impossible to even subsist on the benefits now authorized. I hope that the Congress will make equitable changes in the law on this point as well as on the others which are up for consideration, so that the purposes and spirit of the social security system will not be defeated at this critical period, especially for those who have faithfully abided by the rules and made their contributions since the inception of the program:

NEW YORK, *May 25, 1948.*

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
Congressman, Twenty-first District, New York.

DEAR MR. JAVITS: As you are the Congressman from this district in which I live I am writing to you as regards the social-security law, in which so many are involved. I think the amount one gets from it is insufficient at the present-day prices. I have been drawing social security now since last March 1947. I get a small pension from the union that I did belong to, but the both of them put together is insufficient at the rate of the buying power today. The buying power today and the day this law was passed is as different as day is from night.

You, as Congressman in our Government, are in a position to do much good in the way of getting some relief, so that we can cope with any situation that arises today.

At the present rate of the union scale (Typographical Union No. 6, and I paid in plenty toward this pension while I was working, and now I am deprived of those benefits, due to the social security not allowing me to make more than $14.99 in any one month, which to me is all wrong) I could not work even one day; in so doing I would go over the $14.99 rate allowed by the Social Security. I am not working now at all, relying entirely on social security and my small pension.

That is one reason why the "old timers" don't want to take social security, even though they are entitled to it. They would lose out. So you see the inconvenient situation one is placed in as at present. A man would be better off to accept the 2 weeks which the union allows, and drop the social security, but for over 10 years has paid in on social security.

It certainly is a handicap to hold a person down to $14.99 a month and no more. There are billions of dollars involved in this law, and there is no reason why a person has to be held down to such a low figure. Where is all the money going? Give a man a chance—at least so that he can do something, and still belong to the human race, and keep his head above water.

You see, our union allows us to work 2 days a week, providing, of course, we could get it, and that is not too bad, along with social security, but the social security comes along and puts a damper on things, by not allowing us to make more than $14.99 a month. It seems to be the most unfair law that I ever heard about. I think it is about time a change was taking place, so that a man can be able to hold his head up, and look the next man straight in the face. After all, we are not being unreasonable or taking anything from anybody, only what belongs to us, and that we are entitled to.

I notice they are working on the social-security law now, but just expanding it to take in others. How about working on the basis of giving to those that are already in an increase? That is why I am writing. It seems as though everything is increasing, why not the pensioners? They sure could use it very nicely. It would seem as though some in our Government are accusing others of wrongdoing in order to further their own interests, and the pensioners can get along the best they know how. What an attitude. To think it is the public that pays their salary.

Having no lobbyists or pressure group working in our behalf, we are alone in the fact that there has been no increase, no upward revision, no adjustment to and in keeping pace with the increased cost of living, and I think a change in the law is long overdue toward an upper revision.

I know that you will give this matter your most undivided attention.

For your careful consideration, I am,
Respectfully yours,
CLAUDE A. BRANDT.

Confederate Memorial Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 3, 1948

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by the House, I insert in the RECORD a speech delivered by Hon. Warren S. Reese, Jr., on the 26th day of April 1948, Confederate Memorial Day, at Oakwood Cemetery in the city of Montgomery, Ala. This address was delivered under the auspices of the United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Ladies Confederate Memorial Association, and is as follows:

This day is one of memories, a day when we meet in the hallowed past and hold communion with our holy dead. Each year it is consecrated in the South to the memory of those sons of Dixie whose noble souls still march along the broad corridors of American history—the Confederate soldiers. For though these heroes have slept through the long years their deeds, indelibly written in blood, still live in verse and story. Around this sacred day cluster precious memories of our fallen brave. Over the silent chambers of our sleeping Confederate dead we have today wreathed garlands of flowers, symbols of our love and gratitude. Oh, let no stinted grief profane their bed. Let tears bedew each wreath that decks the lawn of every grave; for as we cover the graves of these heroic soldiers with flowers, the past rises before us like a dream and we recall anew their deeds of heroism—their sacrifices, their suffering, their giving of their all in defense of those ideals for which their founding fathers fought and which they felt were the right. This is a sacred heritage purchased by their valor and sealed by their blood. History is their encomium. Battlefields bear witness to their bravery.

"No gay battlefield of earth to the muse's pen,
Displays a parallel in arms to these heroic men,
Who perished in battle their blood to match their banner's crimson bar,
Nor sought the fame of those who plucked the glory of the star."

We come today not to mourn for those who slumber here. Their epitaphs are written in the grandest history of the ages. How truly immortal are those who give their lives in defense of their ideals. To have lived long, purposeless neutral years is nothing—to have lived a few glorious hours, to have

bravely faced the infinite, to have calmly met the Master in humanity's cause with the fog in one's throat and the mist in one's eyes is sublime.

Nor do we come to praise these departed ones, for in a sense the Confederate soldier needs no monument; his fame is a thing of the ages. There is no granite in all the hills firm enough to bespeak his principles, no snow upon cedared summits white enough to match his loyalty or to furnish him a winding sheet in the temple of fame. But though he needs no monumental shaft, we owe it to ourselves to tell posterity of his fame; and if we fail to do this the wrong done is not to him but to ourselves. Recognition, it is true, embalms the virtues of the dead; but it also bespeaks the gratitude and voices the ideals of the living.

"The sound of musketry has ceased, the pulse
of war is still,
No bugle sound in echo stirs the sleep of
those on yonder hill,
No wail of agony breathes forth in battle's
fevered cry,
To name the hallowed wish that fills the
soldier's parting sigh,
Beyond the warfare of the world, the battle's
glare and gloom,
Where in the crystal light above, life's fade-
less laurels bloom,
Where comrades meet to part no more, be-
side the mystic river,
Where truth is diademed of God and right is
right forever."

It is fitting, however—as we come to this consecrated hill to pay solemn tribute with flowers, tears, and words to Dixie's noble sons lying on the gentle slopes of yon green hillsides—that we call to mind the words written over the entrance to the home of Jefferson Davis in Beauvoir, Miss.: "Stranger, tread lightly here for this is hallowed ground." Ground made hallowed by the bodies of those heroes buried here—heroes whose wounds made the streams of the South run red through four long years of blood, sweat, and tears. These graves here are more than a local shrine; they are the shrine of all Dixieland, the Mecca to which those patriots of the South who are worthy of the glorious legacy handed down to them by their ancestors journey to renew their devotion to the noble cause for which these patriots died. For it was here, within a few blocks of where I stand, that the Confederacy was born 87 years ago; that the Ordinance of Secession was passed, and that Jefferson Davis was inaugurated as the first President of the Confederate States. From near Court Square in this historic city was given the order that brought about the firing on Fort Sumter—a shot that marked the commencement of the War Between the States. Thereafter, as the years passed on Montgomery became, it is said, the largest hospital center south of Richmond, having seven hospitals. So here were brought the flower of southern manhood, oftentimes to die, from every battlefield of the Army of Tennessee and from many of the battlefields of the Army of Virginia.

On yon hillock beneath the greensward in the cool shadows of the magnolia trees and the embracing vines is the last bivouac of those sons who rode with "Fighting" Joe Wheeler, as he so often struck the northern foe from the rear or turned his flank by his lightning raids; of others who rode with Nathan Bedford Forrest, the wizard of the saddle, as he "got there fustest with the mostest men," as he said, and turned defeat into victory, of those native sons of Alabama, too, that stormed Little Round Top at Cemetery Ridge under Gen. George Pickett in a charge that has no equal in American history for daring and bravery and is as storied as the Charge of the Light Brigade, made famous by Tennyson; and of those who saw the gallant Confederate leader, Gen. Albert Sidney Johnston, mounted on Fire-Eater, lead his last charge at Shiloh. A little farther over on the reverse slope of the rolling grass-covered hill lie those who wore the gray with Pemberton at Corinth and Vicksburg and saw their lines hold against overwhelming odds, finally to succumb to the blockade only after their food and water completely ran out and the gunboats in the Mississippi leveled their forts; and those that bore arms with Johnston and Hood during the Atlanta campaign and saw service at Chickamauga and Kenesaw Mountain in the dark and closing hours of the Confederacy, when General Thomas, the Rock of Chickamauga, saved the day for the Yankees.

Then last but by no means least are those noble Alabamians of the Fourth Alabama Regiment (now the One Hundred Sixty-seventh Infantry) who saved the day at the Battle of Rull Run by refusing to yield ground, though their officers were all killed and the Southern forces were in confusion and rout, enabled the Confederates to reorganize and drive the Northerners back across the Potomac. This regiment more than any other one was responsible for the decisive Northern defeat in this battle.

"Sleep heroes, sleep,
Your deeds shall never die."

Also resting here within the sound of my voice are William Lowndes Yancey, known as the Silver-Tongued Orator of Secession and as the Firebrand of the South; Thomas H. Watts, Attorney General of the Confederacy and wartime Governor of Alabama; and many other giants of the Confederacy. So here we may aptly say:

"Soldier rest, thy warfare o'er,
Dream of fighting fields no more,
Sleep the sleep that knows no breaking,
Morn of toil or night of waking."

And it has well been said that:

"When these historic graves shall crumbling
lie,
In ages hence in woman's heart will be,
A folded flag, a thrilling page unrolled,
A deathless song of southern chivalry."

I know of nothing more appropriate on this occasion than to inquire what brought these noble sons of the Confederacy here; what high motive led them to condense life into an hour and to crown that hour by cheerfully welcoming death. Let us consider this.

As late as 1860 this was the most unwarlike Nation on earth. For nearly 50 years no spot in any of these States had been the scene of battle. Thirty million people had an army of less than 10,000 men. In the minds and hearts of the men of the South there was not any desire for war. They simply wanted to be allowed to go their way in peace. For many years the abolitionists of the North had been viciously attacking the South and its institutions. These misguided men in bitter assaults denounced the Constitution as a "covenant with death and an agreement with hell," all because it permitted slavery. These men were the real secessionists, ones of the ilk of William Lloyd Garrison, Henry Ward Beecher, Wendell Phillips, Harriet Beecher Stowe, and John Brown, whose every utterance was filled with vituperation and hate of the South and stirred up the sparks of dissension and strife.

It had been taught throughout the length and breadth of the land that the Union was a voluntary one and that secession of a State from the Union was optional with the people of that State and depended upon their will. No one before 1860 had ever questioned this right. On numerous occasions before then New England threatened secession and seriously advocated and considered it over the causes leading up to the War of 1812. Thus it is seen secession was no new doctrine; rather it was a time-honored one laid down by States of the North.

In 1861 all that the South did was to retreat to the ancient citadel erected by their founding fathers—that of States rights. This permitted of no other course but nullification when the North endeavored to deprive the South of these rights and force upon it odious legislation. The men of Dixie, in withdrawing from the Union, did not rebel; they merely announced the end of a political compact that could not continue to live in the face of Northern assault. The North denied them this right and stated that their denial would be enforced by arms. The firing on Sumter followed and then the War Between the States.

Let no one tell you the South fought for a lost cause. It is true the men of Dixie did not win the war, but their noble struggle for what they felt was the right has been a beacon to other brave people over the world. The heroism of the southern soldier has become a part of the priceless tradition of courage that the human race will always cherish as an invaluable possession.

Now those heroes are dead. They sleep under the solemn pines, the sad hemlocks, the tearful willows, and the embracing vines. They sleep beneath the shadows of the clouds, careless alike of sunshine or of storm, each in his windowless place of rest.

The earth may run red with other wars, but they are at peace. In the midst of battle, in the roar of the conflict, they found the serenity of death.

And now, my friends, the sun is sinking and evening draws nigh and the time has come when we must quit this hallowed ground and return to our homes. Let us never cease to remember:

"No rumor of the foes advance,
Now swells upon the wind,
No troubled thought at midnight haunts,
Of loved ones left behind:
No vision of the morrow's strife,
The warrior's dream alarms,
No braying horn nor screaming fife,
At dawn shall call to arms.
The muffled drum's sad roll has beat,
The soldier's last tattoo,
No more on Life's parade shall meet,
That brave and fallen few.
On Fame's eternal camping ground,
Their silent tents are spread,
And Glory guards, with solemn round,
The bivouac of the dead."

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement on the reciprocal trade agreements bill made by William P. Jacobs, president of the American Cotton Manufacturers' Association, before the Committee on Finance, on June 3, 1948.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My name is William P. Jacobs. I am appearing as president of the American Cotton Manufacturers Association, which includes among its members approximately 86 percent of the cotton mills of the United States. Most of these mills are located in the South.

We are appearing to support the objectives of H. R. 6556.

While we cannot deny the idealistic principles underlying the purposes of reciprocal

trade agreements and the International Trade Organization as they tend to encourage an elimination or reduction of trade barriers, it is our belief that conditions in other countries, under postwar rehabilitation, are such as to make a continued increase in reduction in tariff barriers extremely hazardous.

Under present chaotic world conditions it would of course be unthinkable for the United States to assume a position of selfish isolationism. We can neither relish nor afford steps in the United States which would have the effect of preventing the restoration of industry and agriculture in foreign countries for such a short-sighted policy would sooner or later backfire on our own economy and upon our own strong democratic ideals.

However, for the sake of the solvency of the world, we must retain the solvency of our domestic industry and we should take no steps toward the elimination or lowering of trade barriers which will force a more rapid readjustment upon any of our domestic industries than they can afford.

Take American textiles for instance. The records of the United States Tariff Commission show that in 1891 the tariff rate on countable cotton cloths imported into the United States on an equivalent ad valorem rate basis was 46.35 percent. By 1934, when the new Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act was passed by Congress, the percentage had decreased to 37.41 percent. Thus in 43 years the percentage had decreased approximately 19 percent. However, under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act the percentage ad valorem rate had decreased in 1946 to 17.85 percent, which means that under this new one-world philosophy and under the administration of the United States Department of State, the decrease in the relatively short space of 12 years had precipitated to approximately 52 percent as compared with a percentage rate of decrease in the previous 43 years of only 19 percent.

Now this reflects a dangerously rapid decrease in trade barriers. Since 1934 when the Trade Agreements Act became law most of the years since then have been war years when most of our industries including textiles were hard pressed to supply sufficient cloth for our allies as well as for our domestic consumption. The question of the rate of the tariff, of course, had little or no effect, therefore, upon the exporting or importing of textiles. We were operating under emergency conditions which were entirely abnormal and tariffs had little effect upon the increase or decrease of foreign trade.

As we return to more normal conditions, however, it seems quite clear that the intent of our reciprocity in trade agreements supported by the proposed international trade organization and apparently sponsored by our own Department of State is to so adjust trade barriers as to encourage the rehabilitation of foreign textile industries by enabling them to make use of American capital in the manufacture of increasing quantities of textiles which they can sell in the United States over lowered tariff walls to obtain the dollars with which to buy other American products which they cannot themselves make.

Now it is granted that international trade agreements must be based upon the good of the whole and if ultimately the United States increases its exports of other heavier products we must not be too critical if the step happens to work against the interests of the American textile industry; and we are not. We recognize the inescapable facts that:

1. We in the United States have most of the dollars.

2. That other nations need our type of manufactured and raw products which they do not themselves produce.

3. That textiles happen to be the one type of product in which the United States leads but which can be made by all people everywhere.

4. That unless foreign countries can sell us something they can't find the dollars with which to buy from us.

Furthermore we recognize the inescapable conclusion that in the future we cannot under new world conditions expect to permanently hold a position of world leadership in any product in which we are dependent upon the protection of high tariff barriers alone.

Hence we do not insist upon a law which will afford higher tariffs on the imports of textiles into the United States.

Furthermore, we do not depend entirely on tariff walls to build and hold a position of world supremacy in textiles. This in spite of the fact that there is, due to foreign currency collapse and other effects of a world war, a greater disparity between the high American textile wage and the low textile wages in foreign countries than ever before.

Our position is rather one of sympathetic understanding of the problems of our international competitors, combined with a desire to be helpful and constructive.

We do not know whether a continued lowering of barriers against world trade is necessary or inevitable as some of our leaders seem to think it is. However, if that be true we do maintain that the process of lowering should be subject to such limitations in speed and in amounts as will give our domestic industries which are to be most affected the time to adjust themselves to the new circumstances and thus minimize the injury.

This is particularly advisable in the case of American textiles.

As stated, we shall not depend upon tariff walls alone. We must and shall produce a better fabric at a lower unit cost to meet the severe competition of the world market in which low foreign wages play an active part. In short we must and will, with the cooperation of farsighted American workers and automatic machinery through mass production methods, produce yarn and cloth at lower unit costs and with higher individual productive capacity and larger individual earnings, so that our yarn and cloth may be sold at lower prices that more may afford to consume them and more may be employed in their manufacture.

The development of this process under this modern conception of the American way has been under operation for years. That is why we will lead tomorrow even if tariff barriers are lowered.

However, the development of such a process takes time and money and much new equipment which we do not now have.

It will come in time. Meanwhile we must not forget that American textiles are particularly vulnerable today against world competition. We have not yet successfully completed the change. We still use more manual labor in the manufacture of a unit of cloth in proportion than is true of any other major industry in America.

Compare the manufacture of a unit of cotton cloth with its nearest cousin, a unit of paper. I believe it takes about five sets of human hands to guide a log into the hopper, grind it into pulp, test the chemical content, and operate the hoist to lift a roll of craft paper from the paper machine. In the case of cotton cloth it takes from 16 to 25 pairs of human hands. As long as there is that high percentage of manual labor involved in the production of a unit of cotton cloth, our industry is necessarily and unusually vulnerable to low wage world competition and particularly so if tariff walls are lowered more rapidly than the speed of adoption of new processes by the industry.

Hence our position on reciprocal trade agreements is that the values of the entire system should be reappraised in the light of the long-pull world readjustments under conditions more nearly approximating normal than in the case of war years.

There is clearly not time left to this Congress before adjournment to carefully analyze the full effect of tariff changes under modern conditions.

We believe, therefore, that it is smart and sound to continue the present system for a year, and only 1 year, to give Congress time to fully inform itself on such an intricate subject which means so much to hundreds of thousands of American workers and to millions of Americans who directly or indirectly depend upon the American textile industry for a livelihood.

We have within recent months noted a decided tendency of some foreign countries to undertake to make their own domestic textile industries self-sufficient by raising tariff walls or setting embargoes against the importation of foreign textiles; this while our Government is endeavoring directly or indirectly to aid them.

We should carefully watch this tendency for a year and be prepared to adjust our own tariff policies more practically in the light of the extreme nationalistic spirit of some of our fellow nations before we go into a one-world philosophy of reduction of trade barriers.

Furthermore it is our firm conviction that this entire matter will be more soundly adjusted at the hands of Congress and our Tariff Commission than when left to the world beneficence of the United States Department of State which seems at times to be more concerned with the plight of our foreign competitors than with the welfare of the American workers.

And so, Mr. Chairman, we recommend the adoption of H. R. 6556, not because we believe in reciprocal trade agreements, or in the charter of the International Trade Organization, but because we believe that Congress should give a much more intensive study to this intricate subject before conclusions are reached.

Oil and Steel Supply and Distribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an opening statement which was given by the chairman of the Small Business Committee the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] on Friday, May 28; when the Oil and Steel Subcommittees met and conferred with a score of representatives of the steel industry on the subject of oil and steel supply and distribution. In this vigorous statement, the Senator from Nebraska challenged the steel industry to so equitably and fairly distribute their product, through industry cooperation, that the threat and necessity for Federal controls might be minimized and avoided. I was impressed by the approach taken by the Senator from Nebraska to one of our prevailing and more difficult national problems. Other Senators may well benefit from the point of view which is so clearly advanced in the statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, this meeting will come to order.

The steel committee and the oil subcommittee of the Senate in joint hearing today have called together representatives of the steel industry to discuss with them, in round-table fashion, the problem of getting more steel, particularly sheet and steel pipe into areas which are suffering from lack of distribution.

For the most part this involves the interest of the smaller fabricator and the smaller producer, because the areas that are steel-starved are those in which small business predominates.

As most of you know, the Steel Subcommittee, under the able direction of my colleague Senator MARTIN of Pennsylvania, had been investigating steel shortages and maldistribution for over a year.

The Oil Subcommittee began its investigations last summer. At several points these subcommittees have merged their interests particularly on the problems of securing steel pipe for the independent oil producer, and in general, surveillance of the steel export picture.

In September of last year all of the leading steel producing companies—most of them—many of which are represented here today, came before this committee.

At that time we told the industry what committee investigations had revealed up to that time. Since then a gray market—it was then and since then—has been flourishing. Historical patterns of distribution had little meaning. Distribution was withdrawn and has been withdrawn by certain companies from areas formerly served.

Larger exports were going out of the country than could be supported by the domestic economy and there was not enough steel to meet greatly increased demands at home.

The committee records show that those conditions exist to the same extent if not greater today than they did almost a year ago. They certainly have not been solved.

I do not wish to minimize the efforts of the steel industry to combat some of these problems, in fact, I want to compliment those that have helped to solve some of them. But the committee is fully aware that the steel industry is more alert to the diversions of its steel from normal channels of trade—and we appreciate that. Cases have been revealed and properly prosecuted.

However, the fact remains that steel is selling on the gray market today for three and four times the mill price.

We had a man come in from Nebraska to testify, who fabricates steel into disk harrows, that the price that he had to pay—and the only place in the world he can get it is in the gray market—has increased from 4 cents a pound to 11 cents a pound.

That has been within the past 2 days. Those costs are prohibitive and it means that he cannot stay in the fabricating picture and continue to buy that steel on that kind of a market. And that is just one case of hundreds of cases in complaints here, within the past few weeks, that are contained right in these files, of these fabricators that have no place to go.

The steel industry is producing more steel today than at any time in its history, for which we are thankful.

The industry announced a billion dollar expansion program last fall which would bring forth more steel and would result in improved facilities.

You gentlemen can tell us better than anyone else just how well that expansion program is progressing.

Sixty-five million tons of finished steel products were produced in 1947. It is our understanding that the industry hopes to produce at least 67,500,000 tons of finished products in 1948. This is higher than peak production reached during the war and a great increase over the 49,000,000 tons produced in 1946 and the 46,000,000 tons produced in the prewar year of 1940.

That had been accomplished in spite of work stoppages and in spite of shortages of such basic components as scrap.

Allowing 10 percent of this production for normal exports, or to meet the needs of the European recovery program, we would still have over 60,000,000 tons of steel—should have over 60,000,000 tons of steel for domestic consumption.

That may not mean sufficient steel productwise to meet demand, but in over-all the domestic demand is being currently estimated in the neighborhood of about 60,000,000 tons of steel.

The problem before this committee—and it is an acute problem today—is where is that production going—that is, this 60,000,000 tons—and to what extent does the steel industry intend to cooperate to see that more steel reaches the hands of the independent oil producer and steel fabricator at what I would call a regular price and not a gray-market price?

Testimony here brought out this week in different areas in the Middle West were as much as a third to up to 80 percent of the steel furnished these fabricators has to be purchased through the gray market; that they cannot get more than 25 percent to one-third of their requirements through the normal channels at a normal price.

In the past 2 months both the oil subcommittee and the steel subcommittee have continued hearings in the field in an area covering 10 Midwestern States, in the Northwest, and on the west coast.

We have first-hand information that the situation with respect to steel distribution has not improved from last year, and it is even growing worse today than at any time since the war.

In the last day or so we have continued these hearings, and we have had some of those complaints before the committee. They are fresh in our minds.

State delegations sent down here by the Governors of six Midwestern States have testified.

Witnesses have come from the far West and have told us the facts and the figures in their own areas. Not only the facts show, but the oral testimony is convincing. The information they have gathered, not only in their area but in their respective States, is unanimous that the situation is worse now than it was a year ago.

It was the policy of the Government during the war years to decentralize industry and to sponsor the development of industry in lesser industrialized areas.

As a result, over the past 8 years many industries have sprung up and communities have been built around them. The contribution which these new industries made to the war effort cannot be estimated.

The contribution they are now making to the health and to the welfare of our economic life is immeasurable. This committee has no idea of sitting idly by and seeing them wiped out because they did not obtain steel at a regular price rather than a gray-market price.

Since controls on steel were lifted in the fall of 1945, distribution of steel to those areas has been shrinking.

I know from testimony that only dribs and drabs of steel are being distributed in certain Middle Western States by major steel companies. Fabricators who formerly have depended, through regular channels, through the warehouses to the steel mills, for their monthly requirements, have been deprived of that. Their market has just been taken away from them.

And the answer given to them is that they just do not have it.

We have evidence that major companies have stated that they will not continue to ship into more remote areas for the very obvious reason that it is uneconomic to them.

Warehousers in the Midwest and the far West and all parts of the country have testified that they are receiving in some cases as low as 30 to 40 percent of what they received in 1947. The warehouse is the principal source of supply for the smaller producer who buys in small lots and cannot afford to get in on the mill schedules.

So, this committee is asking you gentlemen: where is the steel going? It must be going in larger quantities to larger users of steel.

Steel companies have testified that they are supplying smaller industries and they have many smaller business customers on their books, but the smaller customers tell us they are not getting the steel.

Those are the facts. That is the evidence here. They are just not getting it. Not on the evidence of these consumers and fabricators, not on the testimony of the Government officials from six Middle Western States which has been adduced here in the past 3 days.

So we have invited you in here. We want to look at this problem broadly and fairly. Ninety-five percent of the manufacture in the United States depends upon steel. It is the lifeblood of our economy. It is the lifeblood of the Nation.

In the hands of a relatively few producers the welfare of our economic life now depends.

It boils down to these simple facts: Whether the steel industry wants to be free, a competitive economy in which all segments may have a chance for survival, or whether you want a regimented economy here in the United States. That is how serious I think this problem is.

I am one who wants a free economy. No one in the world has worked harder than I have worked to see that we have a free economy in this country on a voluntary basis. But I tell you this situation is so serious that it is going to take a superhuman effort, I think, on a voluntary basis to allocate this steel where it belongs.

There just cannot be any by passing, there just cannot be hiding behind the cloaks of a free economy to those of us who fought for it. We have to have equitable distribution now. We just simply have got to have it. The time is here.

And I make this prediction: If you do not get it, you are going to get something else. And it will not be a distribution under voluntary methods. It means Government controls.

This committee has within the past week explored the operations of the Office of Industry Cooperation.

Under Public Law 395 it has been made possible for the Government to seek the cooperation of industry on a voluntary basis to supply certain strategic materials.

As far as I can understand it, these programs are progressing very slowly. I think much too slowly. Their ultimate effectiveness will depend on the extent the industry itself cooperates with the voluntary programs.

At present the general impression of the program is that of bringing the horse to the trough and then trying to persuade him to drink. That is about what it amounts to.

This committee has suggested the possibility that under voluntary industry agreements it is possible to provide the allocation of materials to certain areas and for certain segments of industry, particularly small business. This is not being contemplated under present thinking.

Now, we have asked you gentlemen, you who represent the steel industry, you who represent, I think, the success or the failure of the voluntary system, to sit here this morning with the committee in a round-table discussion to see whether or not this situation can be solved in what I call the American free-enterprise way.

The committee has some further thoughts that will be presented later. But that is the problem that is before us.

We want to say as we start into this meeting today that the committee simply wants the facts. We are not a legislative committee. We simply make recomemndations. But you will find that if you examine our files that daily the complaints have increased to such an extent that to my mind this is a major problem, not only for the industry itself, but it has become a major problem for the Congress.

If we cannot get it done on a voluntary basis it seems to me there is no other recourse, but that legislation will be recommended and passed by individual Senators, and by those who feel that this thing is broken down, bogged down, and we are not getting the steel out where it belongs at a regular price that will help these small fabricators to continue to do business.

I want to give you just one case. Out here at Blair, Nebr., my own State, there is a firm that started up to manufacture farm implements. That little firm has grown to 110 employees in size. Eighty percent of its personnel are veterans—returned veterans who ought to be given some consideration in this free-enterprise system of ours. They cannot possibly buy steel now except through the gray market. They have no source of supply.

It is not only a question of the historical base of distribution; it is a question of whether or not the individual today can get into business. Many of them are veterans that ought to be entitled to get into business.

Regardless of the historical base, they are entitled to some steel. The question involved is that if they have to buy the steel on the gray market they are put at a competitive disadvantage whereby they just cannot exist.

Gentlemen, that is not the American way. Thank God this is the land of opportunity. If we are to have a free economy, the small man, the individual, has a right to have his day in court and success just as you men have had the same chance. And it is your job to keep the opportunity free and open in this country on a free competitive basis.

Personally, I do not object to big business. I have taken off my coat and said that regardless of whether you are big business or small business, what we want in this country is a continuance of the great production we have had.

But big business comes out of little business, and little business today is having a tough time getting the steel allocations that they need on a voluntary basis.

We are making this final appeal to you, you the industry, to see if you cannot help us solve this problem.

I have been over in Europe several times. I have always thought that if after the war instead of putting in the Morgenthau plan, they could have opened up the Ruhr under some limitation and establish the heart of European steel production again, it would have been the solution to our European problems and the world peace. That hasn't been done.

I think that the steel industry here is just as important to the lifeblood of America as the Ruhr is to the peace in Europe, and if we are going to stop the expansion of communism abroad, yes, we have to do it, but we also have to stop it right here. And one of the ways to stop it is to see that the individual has free opportunity in this country.

This is not just a speech for the record, and this is not publicity. Never was a man more sincere than I am in continuing the free enterprise system, both big business and little business. But I am convinced from the facts that we have gathered in these investigations that this volunteer system that we hoped would work has bogged down. I think the situation is worse than it was a year ago.

The last place we have to go is to the industry itself.

We want to be fair about it. We want to feel free to lay it right out on the table, tell us what you think is wrong. You are big men. You are the thinking men of the country. You ought to be able to tell Congress what will solve their situation. So far it has not been solved. We welcome the opportunity and want to thank every one of you for coming and hope you will stay long enough to give us some constructive ideas and constructive help of how we can continue to allocate steel on a voluntary basis rather than have to go to Government controls.

The Mundt-Nixon Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at a luncheon given by the Committee of One Thousand on the Mundt-Nixon bill at the Hotel Biltmore, New York City, Thursday, June 3, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MUNDT-NIXON BILL

A leader in the field of the art of government or the science of politics must come to the conclusion that society and nations, like individuals, suffer from ill health. Disease, poverty, and ignorance seem to be with us always. Perhaps they are with us to induce the incentive necessary to overcome in order to become strong. History shows that a victorious nation sometimes adopts in a more virulent form the very ideas and practices which it fought to destroy. If history is repeating itself again, we must strengthen that eternal vigilance which is the price of liberty.

In my lifetime and in your lifetime we have passed through revolutions—social, political, and economic—so great that when we compare them with periods in the past we marvel at the momentum for change modern man has developed. Let us take an illustration. When the Manchus conquered China, they imposed upon all Chinese men the custom of wearing a Chinese queue. It was a sign of servitude, but it became so universal that some people said that George Washington's wig, with its little queue in the back, was an adaptation of John Chinaman's sign of servitude. Washington, who gave us liberty, wore, while he did it, the sign of slavery. I am not giving you that as absolute fact, I am giving it to you as a deduction and as a point I should like to make about society, nations, and people.

The serious minded among us, who feel and know that there are great values in our way of life which must be preserved, think we should study the crises in the history of nations because we then could keep our heads a bit better above the hysteria of the day. I heard a great British Ambassador, who spent his life in foreign service and who is now retiring, say that that which is considered today's crisis turned out to be merely yesterday's wind. We are living in chaotic times, but I have full faith that that which is attempted through the Mundt-Nixon bill will not happen, and the next generation will be forever grateful to the even-tempered minds of this generation for refusing to take on the ills of single-will ideas.

The great principle of my life has been absolute faith in democracy. I have always sought to live up to the precept of that greatest of American democrats, Thomas Jefferson, who said: "I have sworn upon the altar of God, eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

The letter and the spirit of our Constitution and its Bill of Rights is directed to guaranteeing our people certain fundamental freedoms. It is not intended to impose tyrannical proscriptions. Our country has grown great and strong, despite the fact that throughout its history, there have been periods in which reaction, dictated by fear, burned witches, drove men further into the wilderness, threw men into prison, and chased them from public life and office. The spirit of democracy as embodied in our Constitution always triumphed in the end. Peoples all over the world seeking freedom, have looked to our democracy as a beacon light, have looked to our Constitution as a model for their own charters of freedom. These people have not looked upon our country as the land that burned witches, but as the land whose Constitution proclaims; "Congress shall make no law respecting establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; of abridging the freedom of speech or of the press or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

It is for these reasons that I am unalterably opposed to the Mundt-Nixon bill. In my opinion, this bill, and the vagueness of its language, threaten the fundamental constitutional American right to openly and freely discuss and criticize political and social ideas and institutions.

The great discussion and the debate which have been developed around this bill, are, in my opinion, in the best American tradition. The bill itself is not.

In this discussion, much has been said about the alien and sedition laws of 1798. Many parallels have been drawn between the purpose of those laws and the victorious struggle against them—and the situation we are facing today. In the days of the alien and sedition laws, Thomas Jefferson was called subversive, an infidel, a Jacobin, since it was the French Revolution that the conservatives of those days feared. His supporters were also accused of being Jacobins, engaged in international conspiracies directed against the Government of the United States. In the hysteria whipped up against the supporters of Jeffersonian democracy, it was wildly stated that they—and I quote: "Had applied the torch, and having commenced to burn cities, they would soon begin to murder the citizens." Anyone bold enough in those days to suggest that fires might have been started by natural causes, would have been dubbed a Jacobin. "A Frenchman was a natural enemy to America," and all should be wiped out.

Think of our feelings when we were suffering from an attempt to crush something we did not like in the first third of the last century, when the anti-Masonic party came into existence. Read your history and see how much you loved the Americans during the drive against the "know-nothings," or see how you cherished the idea of the "know-nothings" in their particular days. Read the Copperhead philosophy during the Civil War and after, and then concerning the zeal of the followers of that element in Congress who were set upon crushing, punishing, and even impeaching our President. Go back and read the period after the First World War. Think of the things that happened when somebody suggested there was a Bolsheviki present. Then come down to the present and analyze the Mundt-Nixon bill.

In 1919 Jefferson would have been labeled a Bolsheviki. In 1948—in the spirit of the Mundt-Nixon bill—he would be denounced as a Communist.

Such thinking was the product of fear in 1798. Such thinking is the product of fear

in 1948. For a long time now, I have been combating fear as an instrument of national policy. In 1944, I wrote a little book called the Four Fears, and with your indulgence, I will quote a few words from it, because I feel that they apply to the problem of the Mundt bill that we are facing today. I said: "If we are so terrified of communism, it must be because we have lost confidence in ourselves, it must be that we have a very uneasy feeling about the living reality of our own democracy. I have no uneasy feeling about the reality of our democracy. It will be here stronger than ever, after communistic and fascistic adjustments have been made."

It is probably true what Jefferson said—"that the rule of the majority is the natural law of society"—but the rule of the majority can become a single will and crush the best thought there is in society. The genius of America is not that the majority rule, but that we have set up institutions to see that the minority is protected. There can be no majority rule for thought, for art, for aspiration, for expression. There can be no freedom if any element in society becomes a single will and by force directs all elements.

The reality of our democracy will be here stronger than ever, if we reject all efforts to legislate thought—to legislate conformity. The warning words of the Supreme Court in the Barnette case are worth pondering. The Court declares: "Those who begin coercive elimination of dissent soon find themselves exterminating dissenters. Compulsory unification of opinion achieves only the unanimity of the graveyard."

The American Constitution was set up under the theory that the people should rule. That of necessity means deliberation, freedom of discussion, substitution of ballots for bullets. Let us go back and read Milton's ideas and see how plain he made it: "That man could not be free in a proscribed society; that freedom to print was essential in a free government." The whole world has had to face this problem probably more often than any other problem.

Think through those things that are facing us today by answering to yourselves where you think you would have been in your sentiments and feeling when Socrates drank the hemlock. Would you like the actions of the proscribers during the period of the triumvirate, where one of the three had to allow his friend to be killed if another of the three considered that friend his enemy? Oh, of course, you will all say conditions are different; the evils that face our democracy must be crushed. But the techniques of crushing are not different. If we become a single-will state, there will be a technique of a single-will idea that is working and democracy will be destroyed. We cannot kill ideas by force or by outlawing them.

May I cite a case—one I like best when I am discussing these questions? It is far enough away from us so that no one can get particularly mad, nor can they say our conditions are different. The greatest of all of the Chinese—Confucius—became completely rejected after he was dead and all of his books were ordered burned throughout the whole nation. They were preserved by zealots who knew their worth. But Confucius thought he knew what was right for his people so well that he wrote a book, The Spring and Autumn Annals of Lu, to hold a nation to his thinking "for 2,000 years." He almost did it. Now, compare that idea with John Marshall's words: "Gentlemen, it is a Constitution we are expounding—a Constitution set up to endure through the ages."

Shall we be ruled by fear or shall we accept Marshall's theory about the Constitution and be ruled by reason. If the Constitution is to endure through the ages and is to meet changing conditions it must meet them on the basis of its own experience. One hundred and fifty years of American constitutional history shows us that the founding fathers knew the worth of freedom and knew the meaning of liberty. They knew that we could have no government of the people unless the people could aspire and think new thoughts. They knew that we could have no government by the people unless the people had a chance to express themselves, to deliberate, to discuss, and feel free in their discussion. And they knew that we could have no government for the people unless we acted in accordance with the fundamental theory that man is a rational, reasonable being; and that if he is free to use his head his decisions will be good. Shall we respond to the emotions to hit against something we do not like, or shall we say to ourselves—John Marshall grasped the meaning of America and the place of the Constitution of the United States in the development of man. I know that if the Mundt bill were left to the people of the United States and considered by them it would never become a law.

Now what does our American constitutional theory say to the individual? It says to him: Believe as you wish, worship as you choose. This is the essence of man's right to think for himself. This is the essence of the state's duty to restrain itself. American constitutional guarantees of freedom depend on the restraint placed upon the state through fundamental law. That is to say, the state puts a limit on its own power so that the individual may have freedom. It is a poor state that cannot leave a man his own soul. And once again in the words of Thomas Jefferson: "It behooves every man who values liberty of conscience for himself, to resist invasions on it, in the case of others; or their case may —by change of circumstances—become his own."

It seemed to me that our country had learned that lesson in the long years of the Second World War. Our boys died in far-flung corners of the world resisting invasion of liberty in the case of others, as well as defending our own liberties as Americans. They went willingly into battle against Hitler and his attempt to impose tyranny over the minds of men—as well as over their bodies. The ultimate lengths to which the enemies of human freedom went in World War II were brought home to me with particular sharpness, when, in company with a number of my colleagues from the United States Senate, I stood in the Nordhausen concentration camp in the summer of 1945. It began with persecuting men's religion, men's social and political rights and it ended by throwing even women and little children into death ovens.

We went to war against dictatorship. Our Constitution, our Bill of Rights, our American way of life rejects dictatorship. Why, then, should we in any manner imitate any of its methods? I say we have better methods than Mundt bills for protecting our liberties. I say we must not destroy the freedoms we hold dear under the guise of safeguarding them.

It was very gratifying to me to find support for my position in such a citadel of conservatism as the Wall Street Journal, whose editorial on May 20, 1948, said the Mundt bill was of doubtful usefulness. What impressed me most about that editorial was the reasoning on which it based that opinion. It said: "If we sincerely believe, as we profess to, that freedom under law is incomparably better than any species of dictatorship, that the individual has rights of which the State cannot deprive him, we should not begin to betray the political ideals we honor by risking any infringement of that freedom or those rights. Our Constitution permits the people to change it as they see fit; that is part of the freedom which the Constitution was established to protect. As for attempts to change the nature of our Government by other than lawful constitutional means, we already have enough laws to punish and defeat them."

I leave to the practicing lawyers the task of analyzing the legal weaknesses and faults of the Mundt-Nixon bill. Many eminent legal minds have said that this bill violates not only the first amendment to the Constitution—but also the fifth amendment which guarantees American due process of law; the sixth amendment which protects citizens from compulsory self-incrimination; and article 1 of the Constitution itself, which prohibits bills of attainder.

I have studied this bill carefully and also the debate upon it in the House of Representatives. I am much impressed by many of the arguments presented by the Congressmen who opposed the bill.

I agree with those who said that this bill represents a grave danger to the working men and women of our country. I especially agree with those who asked why we don't spend as much time praising our form of government as we do denouncing communism—and those who said why don't we do something about the things that may cause the spread of communism. I agree with those who said this is not a good bill because it is the same kind of legislation that drove Roger Williams out of Massachusetts into Rhode Island 300 years ago.

It is the kind of law that not only seeks to legislate how men shall think, but it also places inordinate power into the hands of nonelective officials. It even condemns in advance people who, for example, may wish to band together to work for the repeal of the bill should it become law. Under its broad and general terms about persons who in any manner do one thing or another—what is to prevent administrators of this law to declare an organization called Committee to Repeal the Mundt-Nixon Law a Communist-front organization and require it to register with the Department of Justice.

But I wish to state here that the arguments that most impressed me with regard to the Mundt-Nixon bill were those advanced by a great patriot and an able lawyer—Mayor William O'Dwyer, of New York City. They were sober and intelligent arguments. They were good American arguments. O'Dwyer said he considers this bill a "dangerous short-cut to thought control and police-state regulation" because it would establish the undemocratic and dangerous principal of guilt by association without proof of actual guilt. He pointed out that it empowers a Government officer to determine the subversiveness or disloyalty of any political, civic, or religious organization.

Mayor O'Dwyer went still further and courageously touched upon a subject that needs courageous discussion. He disagreed with his fellow Catholic War Veterans who criticized him for opposing the Mundt bill. He reminded them of some of the anti-Catholic intolerance that has existed and still exists in our country. To them he said: "It is not impossible to imagine a situation where a Ku Klux administrator in some local community that is hostile to the Catholic minority, might declare a Catholic organization subversive, disloyal, or subservient to a foreign domination. This may sound impossible, but the proposed bill opens the door and opens the door wide, to just such fantastic possibilities."

As a member of a church which has known persecution even in this free country, I understand something of what O'Dwyer warned against.

In conclusion, I would like to call attention to another fact that has been made very well known in the discussion for and against the Mundt bill. There are already some 27 laws on our statute books directed against the evils which the supporters of the Mundt bill say we must be protected. It would seem to me that there is nothing to be gained from passing a twenty-eighth law. On the contrary, it seems to me that there is danger of losing a great deal, if we do pass the law.

We shall be losing much of our proud heritage as free men, dedicated to building and strengthening a country based on the fundamental political rights and freedoms embodied in our Declaration of Independence. Our country must never fear ideas—new or old. Our country must not fear the idealism of our own great revolution. We don't need restrictive laws directed against political opponents, if we do not lose the conviction that here in the United States—with political and economic democracy for all, with absolute faith in democracy—with complete freedom from fear—we can keep ours the greatest and freest country in the world.

Redeem Lincoln's Faith in the Wisdom of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 4, 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Times-Herald of June 4:

Gen. Douglas MacArthur last week politely turned down a formal request from the Senate appropriations committee to come to Washington this week and give Congress the benefit of his views on how much money should and should not be giver to the armed forces.

The supreme allied commander in Japan said in his note of refusal that if he should return to the United States before the Presidential nominating conventions he would inevitably get mixed up in political demonstrations of one kind or another, and he wanted none of that.

Now, the Senate committee has virtually decided to respect General MacArthur's wishes in the matter, and not try to turn its previous request into an Army order which the hero of the Japanese war would have to obey.

What we've been getting around to is the fact that in his statement of last week MacArthur wound up with this sentence:

"Indeed, were I permitted to give but one word of advice toward the safeguard of national interest, I should elect to urge that we reaffirm the basic concepts which safely guarded our past, and above all else redeem some of Lincoln's faith in the wisdom of the people."

To which we'd reply: "General, you never made a wiser remark."

This country was founded on the proposition that the people, within certain limitations on their passions and impulses, have a right to make their own mistakes. Inherent in that idea is the belief that the people will eventually arrive at sound decisions.

When the Democrats took over the White House in 1933, they proceeded to give this ancient American principle a kick in the teeth, and they have been kicking it consistently ever since. Their four administrations have been keynoted by Harry L. Hopkins' blat, early in the first, to the effect that the people are too damn dumb to know what is good for them.

This idea is Communist in origin, and it is practiced consistently by the Kremlin.

President Truman, for 1948 election purposes, is frantically trying to disown the Communists and fellow travelers who have been lousing up Washington since 1933. But he can't get all or nearly all of them out of positions of power, because they have had a long time to dig in and camouflage themselves.

It follows that we'll never beat back to the Lincoln idea of "trust the people" with the present gang in charge of the executive branch of the Government. Only a changeover to a Republican President, backed up by a Republican Senate and House, can make that reform possible.

And—aside to the GOP—how about hammering on the Lincoln-MacArthur idea during the campaign, boys, and practicing this "trust the people" preachment if and after you win?

Administration of Greek-Turkish Relief Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 4, 1948

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, the Economic Cooperation Administration, which is administering the European recovery plan, has heretofore taken over the Greek-Turkish program and it is being handled by them.

As one of their first acts, they have called for bids on hospital equipment for Greece and Turkey and specified, in the main, only the very best of equipment. In almost every case where they could and should use equipment similar to that in general use in hospitals and doctors' offices in the United States, they have instead asked for "luxury" items which cost four and five times the price of the normal, substantial, usable type.

The bid requirements for much of this equipment are all in stainless steel instead of the galvanized steel used generally in medical institutions in this country. Stainless steel is currently selling at about 39 cents a pound, while galvanized steel is selling at about 3 to 4 cents a pound.

Let us take the case of the conventional treatment chair which is found in every hospital, dispensary, or doctor's office and is used mainly for eye, ear, nose, and throat examinations and treatments. The usual enameled type made from galvanized steel and found in almost all American offices is listed at $63.50. The stainless steel chair being purchased by the ECA for shipment to Greece and Turkey is listed at $315.

Another example is that of a kitchen utility truck. This is a small cart used to carry garbage cans, pots, pans, and other containers around the kitchen. ECA asks for this truck in stainless steel which lists at about $300, while the list price on the galvanized steel truck in common American hospital use is $57.85.

ECA says it needs stainless steel dish trucks which are used to carry soiled dishes and which are listed at $225.00 while we here generally use the galvanized variety quoted at $47.50. The shining stainless steel truck, which transports trays in hospitals, is listed at about $545.00 and is required by ECA, whereas the ordinary variety used by us lists at $100.00.

ECA says that its dirty clothes hampers must be in stainless steel at a list price of $61.60, while our hospitals use the same thing in galvanized steel at $14.00.

Our hospitals and doctors would be delighted to have this fine, expensive equipment, but they cannot afford it. Certainly my doctor at home gets along very well with an examination chair of ordinary enameled steel and seems to be able to treat his patients as well as if he had one of the luxurious variety costing four times as much.

Examination of the hospital equipment catalogs show that the ECA is purchasing the most expensive equipment on the market.

Congress has approved of the aid program and I am certainly not trying to hamper it, but surely the durable, substantial type of equipment that we use should be very satisfactory rather than that found in a Park Avenue doctor's office. On a comparable basis, if the Turkish-Greek authorities, or those of any of the other European countries, ask for transportation, they will probably get all Cadillacs and not a single Chevrolet.

Our own veterans' hospitals have very little of this type of equipment as theirs is almost wholly made of galvanized steel. I believe that the Army hospitals are the only ones buying this more expensive equipment, and the only reason I can ascribe for the action of ECA is that they must be following the easy road of making copies of their specifications.

It is of interest to note that in making stainless steel, chrome and nickel are required. About 18 percent of chrome is used and about 8 percent of nickel in the type of stainless steel called for by the ECA. Both metals are produced almost wholly outside of the United States and about 30 percent of our supply of chrome is coming from Russia. Neither metal is needed to make the commonly used galvanized steel.

I call your attention to a letter which I this week directed to Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, head of the ECA. The letter follows:

MAY 31, 1948.

Mr. PAUL HOFFMAN,
Administrator, Economic Cooperation Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: A shocking situation in connection with the Greek-Turkish relief program has just been brought to my attention, and, in my opinion, it should be immediately corrected. I refer to the bids recently closed on ECA specifications for the most expensive equipment listed in hospital supply catalogs. I am informed bids were not requested for the usual type of equipment found in almost all United States hospitals and physicians' offices, but specified only the very best.

On a number of items which I examined, the cost of those on your specifications were four to five times as high as the ordinary, serviceable, conventional types.

It is my sincere hope that there has been an error made by your administration in this regard, and that this was not intentionally done. Otherwise, the pattern set will certainly make the cost of the recovery program far in excess of anything contemplated and will be a huge waste of the taxpayers' dollar.

Your personal examination of this matter will be appreciated not only by myself, but I am sure, by all of our citizens who are responsible for the payment of this bill.

Very truly,

WALTER NORBLAD.

Greater care must be used in obtaining supplies under such appropriations as we shall vote for the ECA. Such careless procedures as has obtained under this hospital bid, cannot continue. The American public will not stand for it.

Hon. Richard J. Welch, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 4, 1948

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the primary elections of California have just been held. It is good news to all of our colleagues to know that the Honorable RICHARD J. WELCH, of San Francisco, has again received the endorsement of both the Republican and Democratic Parties of that State. Mr. WELCH has an unbroken service in this House which is now rounding out some 22 years. What he has done here in behalf of his constituency and the people of this country constitutes a record of which any Member might well be proud. To give some idea of what his local people think of Mr. WELCH and his record, I now wish to introduce in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following two editorials—one from the San Francisco Chronicle and one from the San Francisco Call-Bulletin:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle]
REPRESENTATIVE DICK WELCH

Too busy with congressional affairs to return to his home town and campaign for renomination, RICHARD J. WELCH decided this time to let his record speak for him. It does so, eloquently.

As Representative from the fifth district, DICK WELCH has been one of the prime builders of San Francisco and the bay area.

It was WELCH who sparked the campaign to bring the Sunnyvale Air Base to Santa Clara County, Hamilton Field to Marin. The naval shipyard at Hunters Point, which has brought millions of dollars of business into the city, came into being through a bill originally introduced in Congress by WELCH. The Federal building at Civic Center, the new marine hospital and the veterans' hospital at Fort Miley were DICK WELCH's projects in Congress. He has played a leading part in the development of San Francisco's harbor and its bridges; he was instrumental in getting the two existing bridges and is in the thick of the fight to get a third crossing under way.

To list all of the projects WELCH has espoused for the betterment of the bay area and California would be impossible in this space, for he's been at it in Congress for 22 years, and was fighting for the same principles as a supervisor and State senator before that. The recent authorization of a foreign-trade zone on the Pacific coast was the fruition of a decades-long struggle by DICK WELCH.

At present, WELCH is occupied with a long roster of projects in this same vein. He is in the midst of a campaign to revitalize the shipbuilding industry on the west coast; as chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, he is striving for the maximum Federal assistance for completion of the vast Central Valley project.

In brief, DICK WELCH is one of those rather rare public figures who construe their whole duty as the safeguarding and implementing the best interests of the people they represent, and of the Nation at large. Probably that is why San Franciscans have kept DICK WELCH in Congress for so long. Certainly it is a compelling reason to send him back again.

The Chronicle considers that San Francisco has been lucky to have a man like WELCH fighting the city's battles in the Nation's Capital, and urges his renomination next Tuesday by a sweeping majority, both as a matter of civic self-interest and as a token of appreciation for the kind of job WELCH has always done.

[From the San Francisco Call-Bulletin of May 31, 1948]

WELCH'S RECORD—LONG LIST OF ACHIEVEMENTS IN PUBLIC SERVICE MERIT VOTE OF CONFIDENCE

The long and constructive public-service record of Representative RICHARD J. WELCH, of San Francisco's Fifth Congressional District is one of which all San Franciscans can well be proud.

Although Congressman WELCH's list of accomplishments in the legislative field is far too long to record here, it is fitting to review a few of the highlights of his career.

As a State senator, WELCH was author of the constitutional amendment providing for workmen's compensation, approved by employers and employees alike, and of the constitutional amendment for rigid inspection of weights and measures, which has saved millions of dollars annually to the consuming public.

He also sponsored laws providing safety measures in construction projects; the 8-hour law for women, equal rights for women, and pensions for widows and orphans.

As a supervisor he initiated movement for construction of the Golden Gate Bridge, and actively worked for the San Francisco-Oakland Bridge; he led the fight for building Bayshore Highway and numerous other road and highway improvements of great value to San Francisco.

As a Representative in Congress his record of accomplishment for San Francisco and California is equally impressive. He led in the fight to establish the Sunnyvale dirigible base—and Hamilton Field. He introduced the original bill which made Hunters Point naval shipyard a reality and he played an important part in bringing other shipbuilding yards to the bay area.

He led the fight for the Federal building in Civic Center, for construction of the new Marine Hospital at the Presidio, and for the veterans hospital at Fort Miley. He fought for adequate hospitalization and other benefits for disabled war veterans.

His record in support of an adequate American merchant marine and in bringing shipbuilding to the Pacific coast is outstanding. He led the fight that secured a differential for West coast construction which restored shipbuilding to this area.

More recently he has been instrumental in making the Central Valley project possible; in obtaining authorization for a foreign-trade zone in San Francisco; in obtaining joint Army and Navy approval of a second bay crossing, and in securing numerous other advantages for San Francisco and the bay area.

Representative WELCH now holds a position in Congress vital to the development of California and the entire West—chairman of the important Public Lands Committee which handles such projects as reclamation, parks, insular affairs, Indian affairs, flood control and hydroelectric developments, all of great moment to California and the West.

Because of the importance of legislation pending before his committee, Representative WELCH has been unable to leave Washington in order to return to San Francisco to make a personal campaign for reelection.

This devotion to duty bespeaks the high type of service he has rendered the people of the fifth district and San Francisco throughout his long public service.

Such devotion to duty and such outstanding service merits wholehearted response on the part of the people of San Francisco. It is to be hoped and expected that this response will be recorded in an overwhelming vote of confidence by citizens of both the Republican and Democratic Parties at tomorrow's election.

Voters of the fifth district can do no less for the man who has done so much for them and for our city.

Story of Nisei Who Sat on Trieste Powder Keg Has a Human Sequel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, recently we have spent a good deal of time trying to determine the best method of meeting the menace of world communism.

A recent news story recalls an incident when a handful of Americans stopped an arm of world communism cold. I refer to the incident in Trieste when the Yugoslav Army attempted to move beyond the American positions in violation of agreement.

There is a touch of both irony and prophecy in the fact that the American commanding that road block was Second Lt. Harry Konishi, a man whose father was and still is ineligible to American citizenship.

In this incident, as in the entire military history of Japanese-Americans in our armed forces, there is abundant proof that the American ideal has towering strength, and that the Americanism of these men does not falter, even though we at home may discriminate against their parents.

Enactment of H. R. 6809, which is a subcommittee approved version of my original bill, H. R. 5004, will give notice to the world that we intend to keep faith with Lieutenant Konishi; that loyalty and faithfulness and devotion to high ideals are not related to the mere accident of birth. Therein lies the prophetic quality of his gallant and courageous action. The future belongs to all Americans; this is his faith, and we can do no less than prove it justified.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the story from the Washington Daily News of June 1, 1948:

STORY OF NISEI WHO SAT ON TRIESTE POWDER KEG HAS A HUMAN SEQUEL

(By Oland D. Russell)

Last September Yugoslav troops tried to force their way into the Free Territory of Trieste by bluff and intimidation. They chose a point guarded by an American platoon commander and a half dozen GI's.

The Americans stood firm, even though the Yugoslavs brought up reinforcements and deployed as if they were going to give battle. For 3 hours ranking Allied officers waited tensely to see whether the Yugoslavs would carry out their threat to break through. It

might have touched off the Trieste powder keg and started a war.

Finally the commander of the Yugoslav detachment backed down, announcing at the roadblock that he would refer the incident to higher authority.

Commander of the American unit, who later was commended for his firmness and tact, was a second lieutenant named Harry Konishi—5 feet 2 and wearing glasses.

Folks around Platteville, Colo., near Denver, weren't surprised when they heard Harry Konishi had told the Yugoslav Army how far it could go. They'd been used to this wiry wisp of a boy accomplishing feats beyond his pounds. For 3 years he was a star on the Platteville High School basketball team, and was football captain in his senior year when he weighed 115.

Konishi volunteered for Army service in 1945 when he was 17. He was accepted on his eighteenth birthday, was chosen for officer candidate school, and went overseas in September 1946 as a second lieutenant.

EMERGENCY LEAVE

This month Konishi came home on an emergency leave because of the illness of his father. His father, George H. Konishi, operates a 160-acre ranch near Platteville and has lived in the United States since 1911.

Konishi, senior, came to this country when he was 9 years old with his parents. He has lived here ever since. He cannot become a citizen because he was born in Japan. His son is an American citizen because he was born in this country—and no one will question Lieutenant Konishi's worthiness. But it is a source of humiliation—and in some cases hardship—to both parents and children that the parents may not gain citizenship.

Said Lieutenant Konishi: "Ever since he came to this country, my father has had his heart set on becoming an American citizen. It seems to me that if I'm good enough to serve as an American Army officer, he deserves the chance to become naturalized."

There is a bill before Congress which would permit the elder Koshini to become a citizen—if he is spared from death in his present illness.

Originally, legislation was introduced last year by Representative ED GOSSETT (Democrat, of Texas) providing that all parents, irrespective of race, whose sons were killed in action should be made eligible for citizenship. This was of particular benefit to parents of the Japanese-Americans who made up the Four Hundred and Forty-second Regimental Combat Team and the One Hundredth Infantry Battalion, the two most-decorated units in the American Army in World War II.

On the House floor it was amended to include all parents of soldiers who had received the Purple Heart. In that amended form it was passed by the House last July 7—unanimously.

It has been pigeonholed in the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration since that time.

ANOTHER BILL

In the meantime Representative WALTER H. JUDD (Republican, of Minnesota) has introduced another bill. It provides naturalization privileges to all aliens who have been lawfully admitted to the United States and also provides limited immigration quotas to all Asiatic and Pacific peoples.

What Representative JUDD's bill actually does is to grant the same privileges to the Japanese, Koreans, Siamese, and a few other presently excluded Pacific peoples that Congress extended—in a burst of fraternal war fervor—to the Chinese, Filipinos, and East Indians in special legislation passed in 1943 and 1946.

Under the Judd bill, Colorado Rancher George Konishi could become a citizen.

The bill has had hearings before the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization last month. It has not been reported out.

Testifying for the bill, Joseph C. Grew, former Under Secretary of State and Ambassador to Japan, said: "It seems to me there can be little room for disagreement that any immigrant who is allowed to remain permanently in the United States should not only be permitted to seek citizenship but should be encouraged to do so."

CONCLUSIVE ANSWER

"If, before the war, there were any doubts concerning the deportment in time of crisis of the Japanese, Koreans, and other Far Eastern people living in America, we have now had a conclusive answer. It is wholly in keeping with American tradition that in so deeply important a matter as citizenship, admission or denial be made only on grounds of individual behavior and qualification."

There is a quality of loyalty that lies very deep in people of Japanese ancestry. In these times we have need for the Harry Konishis who can stand firm when our outposts of democracy are threatened anywhere in the world—and need for their parents who taught them firmness, and Americanism.

Murder of George Polk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a script which was sent to me by Mr. Theodore Koop, of the Columbia Broadcasting System, which deals with the murder of George Polk, and the general question of the handling of the news in Greece.

There being no objection, the script was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CBS VIEWS THE PRESS

(By Don Hollenbeck)

One of the last jobs CBS Correspondent George Polk did in Greece before he was murdered was another phase of an assignment to which he had devoted the nearly 15 years of his career as a newsman: the search for truth. The truth about George Polk's death is not yet established; the evidence is incomplete, and we will have more to say on that point in a few minutes. What George Polk was trying to do before he went to Salonika to die with a bullet in the back of his head concerned criticism of another reporter in Greece, a reporter who along with George Polk (and a lot of other reporters) has always tried to report not only the fact, but the truth about the fact. That reporter is Homer Bigart, of the New York Herald Tribune, whose correspondence to his newspaper has displeased the Greek Government.

Now the correspondence of many reporters from Greece has displeased the Greek Government—George Polk himself had reason to know this—but the Greek Government's displeasure with Homer Bigart of the Herald Tribune had an unusual sequel: Dwight Griswold, the head of the American Mission for Aid to Greece wrote a long letter of complaint to the editor of the Herald Tribune about Mr. Bigart's reporting, which he said was not factual. Now this is bad business for a reporter, this writing letters to his boss about something he has done, or is accused of having done; it tends to discredit the reporter, and even if the letter writer is wrong, it starts a fuss; the complaint has to be answered. If the criticism of the reporter is justified, of course, the public airing of it is healthy; the reporter must say, "I take it back"; he must face up to his responsibility to tell the truth. But if the criticism is not justified, the original impression is never quite eradicated; it's the old story of the denial never quite catching up with the original statement, and the reporter, although he has satisfactorily answered his accuser, still wears a scar. In this case there can be no attempt to judge the merits of the criticism; Mr. Bigart's answer is not yet on the record—he hasn't yet said, "I take it back," or "I won't take it back."

Mr. Griswold's complaint about Mr. Bigart's reporting appeared in the Herald Tribune on May 2. It seemed pretty serious; Mr. Griswold took issue with Mr. Bigart's findings about Greece on a number of points, and the conclusion of his letter was particularly serious, since Mr. Griswold said the case reminded him of the recent visit to America of Ilya Ehrenburg, the Russian propagandist who had presented a distorted picture of our country. Mr. Griswold's point was that the Russian had reported—factually enough—only on the less attractive features of American life, and this was what Mr. Bigart seemed to be doing in Greece, yet the over-all effect was to make a damaging allusion; Homer Bigart and Ilya Ehrenburg coupled in a reference which would seem to imply that they were birds of a feather, and the implication for the casual or thoughtless reader is that it's a red feather.

Mr. Bigart is preparing his own answer to Mr. Griswold's letter, but he is not preparing it in Greece. Mr. Bigart has been transferred temporarily to Belgrade; at his own suggestion, the Herald Tribune says, with the intention of going back to Greece later and resuming his job there. A month ago, the Herald Tribune says, Mr. Bigart expressed the opinion that there might be a better story to be gotten in Yugoslavia than there was in Greece at the moment. Mr. Bigart's judgment of news sources and possibilities is respected by his editors; he has been with the Herald Tribune since 1929, and in 1946, he won a Pulitzer price for his wartime reporting from the Pacific. In absenting himself from Greece at this particular time, Mr. Bigart has lost touch with one of the most important stories to come out of that country recently: Who killed George Polk, and why? Knowing Homer Bigart's devotion to the truth, one misses his reports on a story where the truth is so difficult to isolate. But to return to Mr. Bigart's own case.

Pending Mr. Bigart's answer to Mr. Griswold's letter, we asked George Polk for a comment, and a few days before he left Athens for Salonika, we had a cable from him, and later a telephone conversation with him. In his cabled reply, Mr. Polk said that the Griswold-Bigart controversy was such as almost to preclude his taking sides. Both were his friends, Mr. Polk said; both are honest and sincere. But he went right to the heart of the matter when he made this observation: that the trouble seems to be a clash between the diplomatic versus the reporting aspects of the Greek situation, plus the entanglement of the official versus the unofficials attitude. And Mr. Polk's cable went on to point out that because of his important position, Mr. Griswold couldn't know about all the goings-on, whereas Mr. Bigart's nondiplomatic status enabled him to see the situation from the bottom up. And now to quote directly from George Polk's last cable to us: "Lacking guts to attack us openly, the Greek officials are working behind the scenes to get certain American reporters transferred or fired. For instance, while I've never been reproached by the numerous Greek press ministry officials whom I see constantly, yet the Greek press ministry has been actively seeking to discredit me for some time."

CBS had heard that there had been high-level attempts to get Homer Bigart trans-

ferred, and to this question Mr. Polk said he could confirm that a number of persons—Greeks and non-Greeks—had tried to do so, that the Greek Ambassador to Washington had pulled wires vigorously, that an American Embassy official in Athens had protested Mr. Bigart's stories to a visiting Herald Tribune business executive. When the executive asked, "Is Mr. Bigart factually incorrect?" the reply was, "No; but the tone of the writing is unfriendly." Simultaneously, Mr. Polk's cable continued, top-level Greek Government officials had sought to influence American mission press attachés to arrange for Mr. Bigart's recall, and he went on to say that in his opinion, Homer Bigart might occasionally have overwritten or sensationalized a situation that needs thorough ventilation. "Essentially," Mr. Polk said, "Bigart has only been trying to tear down the gobbledygook about the facade called Greek democracy."

One thing is clear from the Griswold-Bigart exchange, Mr. Polk went on, and that is, where there's so much smoke, fanned by so many reporters, there's hot fire. The meaning of that is plain. Too many reporters have had run-ins with the Greek Government for there not to be any fire. Seymour Freidden of the Herald Tribune, Robert Vermillion of the United Press, Constantine Poulos of the Overseas News Agency, Dana Adams Schmidt of the New York Times, Ray Daniell of the New York Times, Constantine Argyris of the Christian Science Monitor, John O'Donovan of the London Observer, Stephen Barber of the London News Chronicle, his wife Mary Barber of Time magazine, Fred Sparks of the Chicago Daily News—quite a roll call of correspondents who have felt the displeasure of the Greek Government. They have felt it in various ways—assignments have been made difficult, slander has been spread about them, open or covert efforts have been made to get them removed from the scene. Homer Bigart's apartment was ransacked, his assistant arrested.

Or there will appear in an Athens newspaper a comment such as the following, for the translation of which I am indebted to Constantine Poulos: "How long," the newspaper asks, "must Greece continue to suffer the lies of these American correspondents who get their money from Moscow and their information from Red wenches?" These correspondents of course, including those named above, some of the best in the business, and others. The Red wenches would seem to be in pretty select company.

Now as for the Griswold letter; Mr. Polk's cable added that it was being released for publication in Athens, and that he would advise us later as to its reception in Greece. He did so by telephone 2 days later. He told this reporter that naturally enough, the Greek extreme right-wing elements had received the letter with whoops of joy, and were busy turning it into a testimonial for themselves, also that its publication was going to make honest reporting just that much more difficult in Greece. He added that he was going up north, and that he'd have more when he got back to Athens.

George Polk did not get back to Athens and the reasons for his not getting back are, as said before, not yet entirely clear. Who murdered George Polk, and why, are two unanswered questions to which truthful answers must be found. First, of course, as a matter of justice, and second, because all reporters everywhere are vitally concerned—the bell tolls for them. Both extreme left and extreme right are using George Polk's death for propaganda purposes, and Radio Athens, the voice of Greek Government of which George Polk was often critical, has gone on the air with the assertion that George Polk had always worked for the recognition of Greece's rights, that he held anti-Communist views, and therefore he must have been murdered by the Communists. For their part, the Communists say that Mr. Polk was murdered by the Greek Government as a warning to reporters not to try to get in touch with the free Greek forces.

It is quite true that George Polk had been critical of the Greek Government; it is just as true that he had been critical of the other side; as Edward R. Murrow put it the other night, "he spared neither the corruption, inefficiency, and petty political maneuvering of the Greek Government, nor the vacillation of American policy, nor the excesses, the foreign support, the atrocities committed by the Communists. What happened, he reported without fear and in language that all could understand. To accuse George Polk of bias on one side or the other of the Greek question is to ignore the record of the work he left behind him. For either side to use him as a martyr or as an apologist is ghastly."

The Columbia Broadcasting System does not intend to be swayed by the propaganda of the Greek right, center, or left. It will be convinced only by hard facts; facts developed through an honest and intensive investigation into who is responsible for the death of George Polk.

George Polk told us long ago that there was a systematic campaign on the part of the Greek Government against correspondents who try to report the facts as they found them; in the Bigart case, the new factor is the entry of American officialdom into the matter. We've reported a number of times on this program the difficulties of American newsmen, and the situation will bear some recapitulation. The campaign against the reporters is part of a larger one, and is complicated by the fact that the Communists are attacking American policy in Greece too; both right and left are charging us with the interference in internal Greek affairs. Both left and right want control—they don't like American reporters who send stories which threaten to upset their plans for assuming complete control of the country when the proper moment arrives.

To quote again from George Polk's last cable to us: "Although there is ostensibly no censorship or press restriction in Greece, it's my opinion that this is not because the Greek Government stoutly believes in providing such working conditions for reporters. Rather, it is because the Greek Government does not want trouble with an American whose country supplies the money that keeps Greece going. As an example of how the Greek Government really feels about freedom of the press, there is the case of a Dutch correspondent whose legation in Athens recently applied for a visa for him. The Greek press ministry granted the visa, but bluntly informed the Dutch legation that one unfriendly story from the Dutch reporter would mean the loss of his visitor's permit."

The Netherlands, of course, are not supplying cash to Greece, and one may speak in firm tones to Dutch reporters.

Costantine Poulos in an article written for the Overseas News Agency, puts it this way: The Polk case * * * "draws into sharper focus the difficulties and dangers facing American correspondents overseas, as well as the responsibilities of governments toward foreign reporters. As the United States rose to a preeminent position in world affairs after the war, so did the value of American public opinion, and, naturally, the importance of American correspondents abroad.

Thus, the men and women who reported to the American people on events and developments overseas came to be considered by the various European governments as very important persons. Accordingly, these correspondents were either pampered or threatened, depending on whether they reported favorably or unfavorably about any particular government. Mr. Poulos' observations would seem to point up the conscientious correspondent's problem of accurate reporting and interpretation in a country where he is expected either to be a press agent and apologist for the existing authority, or, as he is expected to be in Soviet-dominated areas, an outright enemy and more than probably a capitalist spy. Objectivity in reporting is increasingly difficult; the record is full of cases where reporters attempting to tell the truth have been threatened, mistreated, slandered and thrown out, or lavishly adulated as salesmen for a particular ideology.

George Polk did not die to become a martyr or a rallying cry for any politician of whatever complexion; George Polk died because he was trying to find out the truth. In this case, he had indicated he wanted to get an interview with the leader of the Greek guerrilla forces; as he had told a friend, "We've had lots of second-hand reports about what those people are doing, and he'd like to get the facts for himself." If the facts had been critical of the Communists, George Polk would have so reported them. If the facts had been critical of the Greek Government, George Polk would have so reported them. He was an apologist for nobody.

But to repeat, all reporters everywhere are vitally concerned in finding the answer to the death of George Polk; the survival of truth and the free flow of news are at stake. In these days when more and more obstacles are put in the paths of reporters who are trying to learn the truth, and to communicate that truth to readers and to listeners, the murder of a good reporter is more than the death of one man; it is the murder of truth, and truth is having enough trouble surviving these days.

The Imprisoned Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Imprisoned Housing Bill," published in the New York Herald Tribune of June 4, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE IMPRISONED HOUSING BILL

The House Banking Committee continues to imprison the Taft-Ellender-Wagner general housing bill. For the last 3 days the committee has droned along, beguiled by one solitary witness of negligible importance. In considering a well-threshed bill like this one, that has been before Congress for nearly 4 years, such behavior appears designed more to obstruct than to illuminate the House. No good reason has been given why the committee should not report the bill. On the contrary, assurances have been given that the bill, in some form, will come out of committee although specifications of when, how, and in what form are lacking.

Support for the housing bill continues to grow. In the House signatures on the discharge petition that would force the committee to act have continued to accumulate. And in stating that the Senate will stand firm for a comprehensive bill, Senator FLANDERS expresses not only the views of the

upper House but those of millions of veterans and American families in the throes of the housing crisis.

Save in the remote chance that Congress will reconvene after the conventions, today is the last day signatures on the discharge petition can influence the House Banking Committee, and liberate the housing bill. Those who support the measure in the House should grasp this opportunity to stand up and be counted.

Life and Activities of J. N. Thelan, of Great Falls, Mont.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very dramatic, human interest story relating to the life and activities of a distinguished citizen of my State, Mr. J. N. Thelan of Great Falls. The article exemplifies the difficulties which are besetting the independent oil producers of Montana in their efforts to survive under the black-market conditions which have developed in the steel industry.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of May 27, 1948]

GREELEY DISCIPLE RETURNS

(By Fred Othman)

"Forty years ago, after graduating from the University of Minnesota," said J. N. Thelan, "I took Horace Greeley's good advice and went west to seek my fortune."

He set up shop as a lawyer in Great Falls, Mont., married, bought a house, and mortgage, became the father of a daughter and, in a somewhat complicated legal deal, proprietor of a tract of sagebrush.

"Mostly sand," he told the fascinated Senators on the Small Business Committee. "Good for nothing much. And then they began to find oil all around. The geologist told me there was more oil under my land than any lawyer ought to have."

He leased the oil rights, the drillers sunk the holes and snaked down the pipe, and the royalties began to pour in—or maybe dribble—on Thelan. The wells were shallow, and each only produced 4 or 5 barrels a day. But the pumps kept chug-chugging year after year.

His daughter grew up, became an Army nurse during the war, married a young man who'd been wounded in the Battle of the Bulge and had twins. Thelan thanked the good Lord for that oil. All during the war it kept things going. When the shooting was over he made a deal for his son-in-law, whose health was shaky, to build a little house at the oilfield and supervise the operations.

This story the elderly Thelan told the Senators with a good deal of eloquence. With the war's end the pipe supply seemed to get tighter and tighter. No new oil wells were drilled in the field; no old ones were repaired. No steel.

Then the black marketers in steel invaded Montana and began offering fabulous prices for the ancient pipe inside producing oil wells.

"Every time the pipe was pulled from one of our wells, the oil beneath it was lost forever," Thelan continued. "The good Lord put that oil there for our use and for us to abandon it I don't think is right at all."

A couple of weeks ago the fellows who'd paid the royalties all these years notified Thelan they were pulling up all the pipe they'd sunk on his land 40 years ago and selling it at outlandish prices.

Thelan is president of the Montana Association of Stripper (low production) Oil Well Owners and he's down here demanding—not asking—that the Government put a stop to this loss of oil. Quit shipping pipe to Saudi Arabia, he says. Don't let the big oil firms have more than their fair share. Crack down on the gray marketers.

Not that it matters much to him personally. He made his fortune as per Horace Greeley's formula. But he is worried about the young fellows in the business and, for that matter, about his country. The time has come, he told the committee of Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY, of Nebraska, for the Nation to quit wasting the things the good Lord gave it.

Mergers Through a Loophole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, for roughly a year and a half there has been pending before the Committee on the Judiciary two bills, both dealing with antimonopoly—Senate bill 72 and Senate bill 104. A short time ago a subcommittee reported favorably on Senate bill 104. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Mergers Through a Loophole," written by Richard L. Strout and published in the Christian Science Monitor of March 26, 1947.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MERGERS THROUGH A LOOPHOLE

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—The United States was built by men who believed in individualism and competitive enterprise. For that reason, the concentration of economic power into great corporations has always caused concern. Big business almost inevitably means big labor unions and big government. Where the competition of free enterprise does not police an economic system, it is inevitable that Government should step in to preserve a democracy.

The Federal Trade Commission recently issued a special report showing that since 1940 18,000 companies were swallowed up by big corporations through purchase and merger. One big drug concern, for example, absorbed 38 smaller companies, the companies swallowed including manufacturers of baby food, floor wax, paint, spaghetti, and insecticides. A loophole in the Clayton Antitrust Act permits such a process which Congress intended to make illegal.

The Clayton Act passed in 1914. It was hailed as the doom of trusts. But trusts haven't been doomed. In fact, the process of building bigger and bigger corporations has gone on. This is because of a convenient loophole in the act. Congress believed that monopolistic corporate mergers would be accomplished by one corporation purchasing the capital stock of another. Section 7 prohibited this. But this section was bypassed, and the plain intent of Congress defeated by another corporate device: the purchase of the physical assets of competitors, rather than their capital stock.

Company B sells its plant, machines, and facilities to Company A, and it then doesn't matter much whether it sells its stock certificates or not. The whole thing was legalized by a Supreme Court decision in 1926, in the Western Meat Co. case. It was a 5-to-4 decision, with Justice Brandeis, Taft, Holmes, and Stone all dissenting. Later the loophole was further widened by another decision, also 5 to 4.

The bipartisan Federal Trade Commission has unanimously recommended, every year since 1927, that this loophole be plugged. Congress hasn't acted. And the process of corporate expansion by merger has gone on. On March 4, the Federal Trade Commission, in a special report, pointed out with all the urgency at its command, the tremendous growth of corporate agglutination. President Truman in his economic report to Congress made a specific recommendation for this amendment to section 7. Congress hasn't acted. The temporary National Economic Commission studied the matter carefully and made the same recommendation: Congress didn't act then either.

Now two Congressmen, Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming, and Representative ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, have again introduced a bill to plug the loophole. Only a sense of the way the old American tradition of free competition, free enterprise, and individual initiative is being endangered will make Congress act now.

Here is how the system works. A Chicago grocery corporation has just become the largest wholesale grocer in the United States, with total assets of $20,000,000, and annual sales of $100,000,000. It did so by acquiring the assets of three competing corporations.

The Federal Trade Commission brought suit under the Clayton Act. It wanted to protect the small grocers of the Nation. But it was shown that the big corporation had surrendered to the three competing corporations all of the capital stock which it has acquired from them, and received in lieu thereof an unconditional transfer of all their assets. After that, there was nothing for the FTC to do. It was all perfectly legal. It dismissed the complaint.

There is little chance of permanently reducing the size of the Federal Government in Washington, its bureaucracy and its police powers, so long as competition is reduced and corporations get bigger and bigger. For example, if there is one big interstate grocery wholesaler instead of several local ones, the pressure for comparable Federal control is almost inevitable, and so it goes. There is danger, too, for any democracy which allows economic concentration of power to spread at the expense of small business.

What Is Kentucky?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, from time to time there appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tributes, in various forms, to the States and communities of the Nation. This is not, I believe, inap-

propriate, for we have, indeed, a great country, with manifold features of historic, patriotic, and scenic interest, and such contributions tend to bring about an increased interest in, and a better understanding and appreciation of, our country's various regions and communities. A few days ago there was carried in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting and informative story, in verse, of the beginnings of the Lone Star State, describing much of the historical background of that imperial domain.

Kentucky is another great Commonwealth of the Union. It was the first State formed west of the Eastern Mountains, and it and the Kentucky region, have played a large part in the Republic's history. I ask that there be inserted in the RECORD a poem entitled "What Is Kentucky?" It is from the pen of a loyal Kentuckian, Maurice H. Thatcher, who has served his State and Nation faithfully and well, and in various capacities. His last public service was rendered as a Member of the House of Representatives from the Louisville district. Before that, during the construction of the Panama Canal, he was a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission and Governor of the Canal Zone. The treatment of his subject is historical, descriptive, and interpretive in character, and constitutes an interesting and unique contribution to Kentuckiana. Recently it was published in the Register, the official magazine of the Kentucky Historical Society, an organization which through the years, has performed invaluable service in unfolding the story of the exploration, settlement, and life of the Kentucky region.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS KENTUCKY?

(By Maurice H. Thatcher)

What is Kentucky? Mem'ry, hope, and faith:
Mem'ry of things that were, and faith and hope
Of things to be, with past as base and prelude.

What is Kentucky? Boone, Kenton, and Clark;
Shelby, "Old Rough and Ready," Clay, Lincoln,
Davis, and a-many others, great and
Near-great, together with the endless train
Of sons and daughters who, throughout the years,
In this most favored land, have lived, and in
Such manner wrought, as to impress it with
A sense and air distinctive and unique.
It's Cumberland Gap and Walker's Cabin;
The Wilderness Road, Boonesborough, Harrodstown,
And Harrodsburg, the Falls of the Ohio,
Corn Island and Louisville; the Blue Licks
And beleaguered Bryan's Station (where was
Written by Kentucky pioneer women,
An epic story of courage and daring);
Limestone, Leestown, and Frankfort; Lexington
And Danville, Bardstown, and scores of other
Historic places; the Northwest Conquest,
And the Wedge of Civilization westward
Thrust from the older East. It is the Thames
And Tippecanoe, the River Raisin,
Lake Erie, and New Orleans; also, 'tis
Buena Vista, Shiloh, Chickamauga;
Fratricidal strife and reconciliation;
The war with Spain and the Panama Canal;
And it is World War One and World War Two.

What is Kentucky? Behold her virgin state.
'Tis part and parcel of her patterned worth:
The habitat of birds, beasts, and wild game
Of every kind and species; paradise of
Primordial beauty; a magnet for
The savage and the paleface: fated thus
To be the field of sanguinary strife.
Move closer to that magic scene and note:
Hygeian springs, great cataracts, cascades,
Flowers, plumage, bird song; the cardinal
And goldenrod, dogwood, and giant oak;
The laurel, rhododendron, and wild rose;
Canebrake, wild grape, and wood pigeons flying
In masses thick enough to hide the sun;
Meads, forests, "barrens," and stupendous caverns;
Salt-licks and the outcrops of hidden wealth;
The long and winding "trace" of buffalo;
And all things else that held in wonder's grasp,
And delighted thrall, the hardy pioneer!
What is Kentucky? War-whoop and scalping knife;
The deadly arrow and the tomahawk;
The terror of a fate far worse than death;
The blazed trail, camp fire, and slow caravan;
The crack of rifle and the curling wood smoke;
The crude cabin in the westernmost wilds;
The wee settlement in the heart of nowhere,
Lone and unprotected save for the strength
Of desperation and the woodsman's craft;
The liquidation of white and savage foes,
With peace, security, and government;
And growth unparalleled in early times!
What is Kentucky? Innumerable
Brave women who have toiled and sacrificed,
With Kentucky's sons, to found and build and keep
A noble commonwealth; a blood whose main
Ascends to Virginia, the Keystone State,
And Carolina, thence to the British Isles;
Staunch homes and families; loyal citizens
Regardless of race, creed, or extraction.
It is a region famed for its frontiersmen,
Soldiers, sailors, statesmen, churchmen, authors,
Artists, and those of the skilled professions.
Kentucky, through and from Virginia derived,
And as Virginia's daughter ever known
Kentucky, the Mother of Governors,
And other civic leaders and builders
Of the sister States, and of the Nation's
Territories and wide-flung Possessions!
What is Kentucky? Region of marked contours!
Like ancient Gaul, into three parts divided:
The Mountains, Blue Grass, and the Pennyrile,
Each one distinct in aspect and appeal,
But holding, all, a single loyalty.
The domain of tragedy and romance;
Of legends rich, and traditions old; and
Of vital hist'ry, unmarred by dullness!
Dearest abode of fair women and strong men!
Kentucky, rarest among the Forty-eight;
The natal spot of the opposing leaders
Of the great civil strife and crucial years;
The seat of old and honored institutions
Of learning; and variant churches, faiths, and
Fraternities, thriving in amity.
A country of farms, factories, and mines.
A clime where nature lavishes her gifts,
And yields rich bounties at the harvest time.
The strong and deathless fabric of the dreams,
And blood, and sweat, and toil of dauntless souls.
What is Kentucky? The "Ken-tah-teh" of
The Wyandots, signifying "The Land
Of Tomorrow"; by the Whites corrupted
To the final, sturdy name we know today;
Or, as others say, an original
Appellation in Cherokee for "Prairie,"
Or the "Barrens." Whatever be the fact,
Kentucky is, today, the "Blue Grass" State—
A land of paradoxes and contrasts.
What is Kentucky? Transylvania
And Jackson Purchase, the Father of Waters,
Marking the Commonwealth's most western limit;
Old cities, towns, and villages, deep-rooted
In the past. Kentucky, home of Man-o'-War,
And many another brave and winged
Champion of track and ring. Kentucky,
Of many things well proud; although, as some
May think, ofttimes placing an emphasis,
Undue, on certain of her worths and skills.
What is Kentucky? Look again, and see.
The broad Ohio (the "Great River" of
The Indian tongue; and to the early French
Known as "La Belle Riviere," or the
"Beautiful River"), whose tremendous sweep—
Made up of endless loops and bends, for full
Six-hundred-fifty miles, from Catlettsburg
To Cairo—forms Kentucky's northern rim
And bastion, and lies wholly in her bounds.
The vast Ohio, fed by the waters
Of many Kentucky and border streams,
Mostly navigable; and all of them
Lusty and picturesque—among them, these:
The Big Sandy and its twin confluents;
The Licking, Kentucky, and Salt River
(Of facetious fame); Green and Barren Rivers;
The Cumberland and the Tennessee; all
Of them flowing through the State, except that
The first, with its Tug Fork, defines, in part,
Kentucky's eastern verge; and all of them
(Save and except the Big Sandy's major streams,
And the lengthened and harnessed Tennessee),
Rising withi the State's own hallowed soil.
Truly, the Ohio is the "Great River,"
Bearing, as it does, upon its mighty breast,
The unmatched fleets of an inland commerce;
And threading—from Pittsburgh's Golden Triangle
To the distant, yawning mouth—the richest
Valley region in all the blessed Earth.
What is Kentucky? A wealth of mountains,
Rivers, hills and valleys, and blue-grass tracts;
Great caverns—with Mammoth Cave as chief—vast
Min'ral treasures, rich soils, and many waters;
With lovely terrains and lordly vistas
Accenting the great stretch from Sandy's tide
And the Cumberlands, to the Mississippi;
A place of parks, local and national;
A playground realm, filled with historic shrines;
Prospects of beauty and grandeur without
A limit: the Breaks of Sandy, Cumberland
Falls, Natural Bridge, the High Bridges, and
Dix River Development; the great cliffs
And mighty clefts of the Nolin, Green, Barren,
Kentucky, and Cumberland Rivers; old
Federal Hill, the Lincoln Birthplace Farm,
Davis Memorial, Reelfoot Lake, and the
Kentucky Dam on the Lower Tennessee.
A State where but the few are very rich, and
There be, always, the patriotic poor.
A region of varieties infinite,
Once the Indian Hunting and Trading Ground.
Kentucky, the fifteenth State of the Union,
And the fifteenth star in Old Glory's blue.
Kentucky, during the era of her
Exploration and settlement, as well
As thru the internecine conflict of
The Fateful Sixties—the stage and setting
For the most tragic and ensanguined strife,
Whereby she came to be o'er-qualified
To bear the name so long ascribed to her—
And known to all—"The Dark and Bloody Ground."
Kentucky, with her wealth of waterways,
In mileages of navigable streams,
Standing as first among and in the States.
The scene of feuds, historic, but outworn.
A land, with lonely trails to highways grown,
And famed for letters and the gracious arts.
And tho she hath her lacks and lags, all these,
Under the lamps of progress, must needs yield.

Again, what is Kentucky? Changing scenes,
Kentucky, in her seasonal cycles,
Presents a host of pleasing variations:
Among the many a few may be observed.
In the bright hour of Spring the tender greens,
And blossomings of red-bud, wild flower,
And fruit tree; and all the wealths of dogwood bloom,
That seem as falling flakes of purest snow
Poised in the air a-near the waking earth,—
Are pageantries of beauty to inspire.
Wild geese are flying northward to escape
The waxing heat of the loved southern climes:
In perfect V-formations flying, flying—
As if the lone and lofty emblems of
Our country's victories in war and peace.
Then summer, closely trailing, treads the path
Of the vernal season; and is, in fact,
Only the spring now grown to adult life.
The summer scatters wide, in jades and golds,
The growing and maturing crops; and woodlands,
With leafages that hold the sun at bay.
Next, crimson deeps of dogwood and sumac,
And gum and ash, in autumn's prime, unite
With wondrous tints and hues of maple, beech,
And chestnut, poplar, sassafras, and other
Deciduous trees and shrubs (accented by
Dark emeralds of pine and cedar growths),
To fashion and create flaming mosaics,
And tapestries, and oriental rugs,
Of richness and variety unmatched:
Glorifying thus, the grove and forest.
Wild geese are flying southward, now, to seek
The warmer zones in which to play and feed:
Again in perfect V's, honking, flying,
On tireless wings, high o'er the cooling lands.
At last comes winter with its beautiful
Austerities of naked hill and vale,
And mountains climbing skyward in the cold;
And streams, uncounted, flowing to the sea:
The whole oft robed in white; and the grim northwind
Singing the dirges of the dying year.
These are some features of the seasons four
In their Kentucky wont and countenance.

What is Kentucky? An aggregation
Of men and women of unstudied and
Emotional faults and robust virtues;
And of sentiment all compact; a race
Of glorious heritages and grave
Responsibilities, and which is not
Too good—nor, yet, too bad—but a fair mean
That makes for sympathy, and light and charm.
Kentucky! a place where there is reverence
For womanhood, and womanhood is worthy
Of reverence; where courage, skill, and daring
Are manly traits which are idealized,
And always there have been those to bear them
In the most certain and pronounced degree.
Beloved Kentucky! the land of Yesterday
And Tomorrow; erstwhile the enchanted realm
Of Foster and "My Old Kentucky Home";
Demesne of sunshine and shadow; of joy
And sorrow; of song and revelry; of
Laughter and tears; of travail and sacrifice,
With Gethsemanes sprinkled here and there;
The haunt of pleasure and the thorobred;
The stage of eloquence, valor, and zeal;
The rare product of a freedom-loving folk;
A mother whose children, at home and abroad,
Love her in strength and manner unsurpassed!

What is Kentucky? A bloom and fragrance;
A name, a song, an idea and symbol;
A pray'r, a vision, and a revelation;
A dream, an epitome and pageant;
An appeal, a torch in time of darkness;
A lode-star, and a pillar and a cloud;
A fount of faith and hope, and a rainbow;
A prophecy and a benediction!

What is Kentucky? Ah, let the answer be:
A strange and proud, intangible spirit,
Born of the soul and soil, and all that went
Before; a brave and hospitable people,
Tolerant in all things save politics,
Whose hot and gusty breath oft blows away
Discretion's light, and leaves the State awry;
A breed whose members find that their mutual
Regards, affections, and esteems increase
With the proportioned distance from their homes!

Indeed, what is Kentucky, but a rich
Composite of all of these? Her past is sure,
Her present worthy, and her future shall
Be whatsoe'er her own may will it to be!

Air Shipment of United States Periodicals Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in recent months I have made numerous suggestions for shipment by plane of American newspapers and magazines abroad. In this connection there has come to my attention a letter to the editor of the New York Times from Mr. Langdon P. Marvin, Jr., which is right along the lines of my own recommendation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Marvin's letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPREADING THE PRINTED WORD—LOW POSTAL RATES, AIRPLANE DELIVERY ASKED TO SEND PUBLICATIONS ABROAD

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

A long time ago Benjamin Franklin, with the authority of long experience in both publishing and government, wrote: "When truth and error have fair play, the former is always an overmatch for the latter." Our Government is applying the wisdom of this statement in its current programs for spreading American ideas abroad. This next year our Government may be spending over $50,000,000 for international information and educational programs, including the much-discussed Voice of America.

I am in favor of having the Government enlist the further support of private citizens, especially American writers and publishers. Let's add the private pen to the Government's voice.

Years ago Congress gave publishers very low (second class) mail rates within this country, in order that the greater circulation of printed matter would create bigger business and greater unity. Why wouldn't it now be an excellent thing to spread the printed word at low rates still further—by airplane throughout the world?

VALUE OF PLAN

Such a plan would have a double value: It would give individuals everywhere the opportunity to read, cheaply and readily, the products of the American free press, and these private publications would be less suspected abroad of being propaganda than would Government materials.

It would give our hard-pressed air line flying abroad a new source of revenue, which they badly need if they are to become both a sound business and a sound reserve for our military forces in event of war.

The outline of such a plan would be as follows:

The Post Office Department would adhere to the newspaper subscription agreement of the Universal Postal Union or would make somewhat similar agreements with certain other countries which are not members of this general agreement whereby an individual citizen of, say, Italy might go to his local post office and enter there a subscription to the New York Times, Christian Science Monitor, Reader's Digest, Time, Life, Harpers, or some technical or scientific journal, or whatever he or she might want.

The basic subscription price of the magazine, plus a low air-mail charge of, say, 15 cents for each 4 ounces, would be paid in by the Italian citizen to his local post office, whence the money would be forwarded or balanced, through long-established postal channels, to the United States Post Office, which in turn would contact the publisher and arrange to receive from him regularly the desired periodical, which would then be handled by the United States Post Office on board an airplane flown abroad, unloaded by the Italian post office, and finally delivered through the regular mail channels to the Italian citizen.

The difference between the air-transport rate charged to the subscribers by the United States Post Office and what the latter would actually have to pay the air lines to carry those periodicals would have to be paid by the Government.

The procedure would simply be reversed in the case of Americans wishing to subscribe to foreign publications.

NEW BUSINESS SEEN

I am sure this plan would create a lot of new business. At present the foreign air rates are just as high for publications as for individual letters. An internationally minded citizen of, for example, Italy now would have to pay $1.20 for air-mail postage alone for a single issue of an American magazine or paper weighing 4 ounces, and I think he would more likely become a subscriber if he had to pay only 15 cents. And these rates should be reduced still further when the cargo builds up.

The Government would be building up the foreign sale of our publications not only by its low air rates but also by the convenience of having each local post office abroad become a subscription center for any American publisher, and of having the international postal channels become a reliable distribution agency. This arrangement would certainly help, since few American publishers have agents abroad.

It is difficult to estimate how much business would be generated by this system, but a glance at the current flow of publications by surface ships prompts me to hazard a guess that, if all major countries were served, several million ton-miles a year of new air traffic might be built up. This approaches the present volume of all international air mail and would be a significant addition to publishers' circulation and to air-line revenue. Further, it would be a good investment for the Government in (a) spreading the gospel of freedom and democracy abroad, and (b) helping to build up a fleet of overseas air transports which would be a good reserve for the military.

The Post Office Department has just started an international air parcel post service to expedite the shipment of relief parcels and personal effects overseas, and I believe the above plan relating to newspapers and periodicals would be another constructive step for our Government to take. While this idea is not now an official plan of the Post Office Department, it is in the back of the mind of Paul Aiken, the Assistant Postmaster General, who would, I am sure, ap-

preciate any advice or suggestions from the readers of this article.

The more that countries understand one another, the better they will get along with one another. I can think of no better way to promote real understanding, particularly in countries where the fundamental freedoms are being threatened, than to make possible the speedy and cheap exchange of newspapers and magazines between America and other nations.

LANGDON P. MARVIN, Jr.,
Formerly Chairman, Interdepartmental Air Cargo Priorities Committee, Washington.

WASHINGTON, *April 6, 1948.*

Congress Must Not Let the Housing Bill Die

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Congress must not let the Housing bill die," published in The Philadelphia Inquirer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS MUST NOT LET THE HOUSING BILL DIE

Omission of any provision for alleviating the housing shortage is by far the worst feature of the whittled-down "must" list of legislation to be passed by Congress before it adjourns.

The Nation's need for housing speaks for itself, through high prices, the virtual disappearance of rental space, doubling up of families and the existence of trailer camps near many cities. All the arguments and pressures of the real estate lobby cannot dispel the unpleasant fact that there is a shortage.

Congress had it in its power—and still has—to do something toward solving the problem. More than 6 weeks ago, the Senate passed the Taft-Ellender-Wagner long range housing bill, which aimed at spurring the construction of 15,000,000 new housing units over the next 10 years.

That the House has done nothing about the measure since then is a tribute to its stubbornness, but not to its willingness to come to grips with a national need. Because of their opposition to the public housing feature, a relatively few men have blocked the legislation, even though it contains many necessary inducements for continuing private building.

Attacks on the modest public housing provision gloss over the fact that present high prices of homes put them out of reach of large numbers of families, including those of veterans. Opponents of any Federal low-cost housing program refuse to acknowledge the effects of the wartime halt in construction on the Nation's housing requirements.

It would take but a few hours of Congress' remaining time to complete action on a housing program. All that is needed is a decision to face the problem. The leaders of Congress should decide without further delay that they, and the Nation, cannot afford to let the housing bill die.

Growth of Industrial Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Growth of Industrial Monopoly," written by Marquis Childs and published in the Journal of Commerce of May 1, 1947.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON CALLING

(By Marquis Childs)

GROWTH OF INDUSTRIAL MONOPOLY

The visitor from Mars—and if we accept the word of our more romantic scientists, he may be here any day now—is bound to find many puzzling contradictions on our troubled planet. Here in the United States, he is certain to be confused by the way in which the word "monopoly" is bandied back and forth.

It figures largely in the drive for restrictive labor legislation. The National Association of Manufacturers is spending a great deal of money on advertisements hitting at industry-wide bargaining. The public is being told that this is a monopoly of a little clique of labor leaders.

But, curiously enough, at the same time we find the NAM growing red in the face with anger at anyone who dares to say that monopoly in the ownership of business is growing at a new and accelerated pace. It is only left-wingers and collectivists who would dare to say such a thing.

Specifically, Earl Bunting, head of NAM, attacks a report issued by the Federal Trade Commission. Now the Federal Trade Commission is a respectable old-line agency that existed long before the New Deal was ever heard of. Yet Bunting interprets the report as sinister evidence that the FTC has been captured by left-wingers.

The NAM president has chosen an odd way to refute the FTC report on the growth of monopoly. He, or his economists for him, takes the number of corporations that have been absorbed by merger since 1940 and compares it with the total number of business firms. Thus he reaches the conclusion that, at this rate, it would take a thousand years to monopolize American industry and therefore we are perfectly safe.

In so doing, he ignores the major conclusion of the report. That was the fact that the 1,800 companies which were merged with larger companies represented 5 percent of the total value of all manufacturing corporations. Most of those mergers took place in the last 2 or 3 years.

The total number of companies is not the important point. The important point is that 5 percent, which is not to be derided as the bogey of left-wingers and collectivists. Five percent is a sizable chunk of our economy. The threat of merger and absorption is a very real one to thousands of smaller businesses throughout the country.

Name-calling is so silly and futile. It is always the last resort of a man with a bad case or a bad conscience.

Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, is no left-winger. He has been fighting for the past 10 years to keep the free enterprise system free by keeping it competitive. He has had the courage to say that the giant corporations are in reality collectivism—a kind of private socialism. And being wise in the ways of politics and human behavior, he knows that private socialism will sooner or later in a democracy become public socialism.

O'MAHONEY and Representative ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, have a bill before Congress which would stop one of the loopholes in our antitrust laws. The law, as it stands today, says that one corporation may not acquire the stock of another where that would help to create a monopoly. It says nothing about acquiring the physical assets—plants and machines—of another corporation.

Most of the mergers in recent years have been by the latter method. The O'Mahoney-Kefauver bill would close that gap.

If Congress is going to attack the labor monopoly by law, as the NAM wants, then Congress cannot very well ignore the monopoly that exists in many fields of business. There seems to me to be little point in arguing which monopoly came first. Industry-wide bargaining may have grown up because of the existence of industry-wide trade associations and industry-wide price-fixing. But like the argument over which came first, the chicken or the egg, this is irrelevant.

"Now is the time," said NAM President Bunting, "to clean out the system-changers from the temple of government." As Senator O'MAHONEY sees it, the system-changers are those who would monopolize all business and thereby prepare the way for the all-dominant state.

Federal Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Federal Science," published in the New York Times of June 4, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL SCIENCE

Last year the President vetoed a National Science Foundation bill because it would have set up a Government-supported autonomous research organization responsible to no one but itself. Heeding his objection, Senator SMITH, of New Jersey, introduced in this Congress a new bill which, though not all that it should be, was approved by the Senate on May 5. Will it be passed by the House? The prospect is not bright.

With the example of what Dr. Vannevar Bush's Office of Scientific Research and Development accomplished during the war, the demand for a National Science Foundation acquired strength. The Army, the Navy, scientists as a class were all for Government-financed research, and the statistics supported them. From 1938 to 1948 the amount of money spent or appropriated by the Federal Government for research increased from $68,000,000 to $825,000,000. Industry also increased its expenditures for research during this period. Though the distinction between theoretical and applied research is no longer sharp, much of our engineering has come out of theoretical research that had no practical end in view. For all the progress we have

made in theoretical science, it is still true that up to the outbreak of the war we were dependent on Europe for those searching inquiries that gave us the atomic bomb, jet propulsion, supersonic planes, synthetic vitamins and hormones. We have scraped the bottom of the barrel for unutilized principles. Europe is scientifically paralyzed. The time has come for us to invent our own theories if we are to retain the leadership that we have won in technology, if we are to exploit science and engineering even more assiduously than we did through the Office of Scientific Research and Development. This would be the primary function of a National Science Foundation.

The Taft-Hartley Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Taft-Hartley Law," published in today's New York Times. It is an excellent résumé of the way in which the Taft-Hartley Act has operated up to the present time. The editorial is brief and concise in every sense of the word. I hope it will be read by every Member of Congress who is interested in the Taft-Hartley Act and the manner in which it is working.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW

The Joint Congressional Committee on Labor-Management Relations, which has been conducting hearings for the past week or more on proposed amendments to the Taft-Hartley law, has voted not to recommend any changes at the present session. That means that in all probability it will not be reopened before 1949.

This seems like a reasonable and intelligent decision. The Labor-Management Relations Act was passed over the President's veto on June 22, 1947, but its provisions did not become fully effective until August 22. It has thus been in existence less than 10 months, which is a very short time for adjustment to a new pattern of labor-management relationships. Only one change with a reasonable chance of adoption had actually reached the point of being introduced in the form of a bill. This is the proposal, sponsored by Representative LANDIS and Senator IVES, to abolish the polls now required before an employer and a union may enforce the clause requiring union membership of all employees with more than 30 days' service.

No legislation as far-reaching, as controversial, and containing so many clauses requiring interpretation at the hands of its administrative agency and the courts as the Taft-Hartley Act could avoid running into a few snags and raising questions as to the practical applicability of some of its provisions. But the Labor Relations Act has one advantage over previous legislation of its kind even in that respect. This is to be found in the fact that it provided for the setting up of the joint committee of Congress, sometimes referred to as the "watchdog committee," as a continuing body charged with following the progress of the measure and considering at regular intervals proposals for correcting weaknesses that might reveal themselves in operation. The provision for union-shop elections is a typical example.

This section has shown signs of being unworkable as it stands, and it seems probable that, whether the Ives-Landis proposal is ultimately accepted or not, it will be modified. Other questions that have arisen are: Does the slowness of Labor Board procedure indicate that enforcement of labor law should be shifted to the courts? What is to be done to eliminate present strife over welfare funds? Should the "national emergency" sections be extended to cover the railroads as well as other industries? The section most likely to go overboard first when the streamlining of the legislation begins is the one banning expenditures by unions in connection with election campaigns. A Federal court has turned thumbs down on this provision. The issue of industry-wide bargaining and industry-wide strikes shows signs of being still very much alive, as does that of the non-Communist affidavit. Most of the important union leaders have now complied with the provision of the law that such affidavits must be submitted. Like the expenditure section, this provision has yet to be passed upon by the Supreme Court, but on April 13 a special Federal court ruled that the Government was not exceeding its authority in requiring union officers to swear that they are not Communists as a condition to using the facilities of the NLRB.

One thing, at least, about the Taft-Hartley Act is clear even now beyond question. There is nothing in its record after 10 months of operation, actual or indicated, to justify even faintly the dire prophecies of its extreme critics, outside or inside the Government. The favorite plaint of union leaders was that the measure represented slave-labor legislation. Union membership has not fallen off, but has increased, since enactment of the law, and if the latter has curtailed "the right to strike" this is not evident in the statistics on labor disputes or the number of man-days idle resulting therefrom. At the present time there is some reason to think that both these totals will be at least as high for 1948 as for 1947, if not higher. And, as every newspaper reader is aware, it has not militated against the success of the big unions in obtaining further wage increases.

The performance of this act is equally a rebuff to President Truman, who professed to see no good, and great harm, in its enactment. Among the sections which the President raked fore and aft in his veto message a year ago were those covering strikes in key industries—strikes threatening the health and safety of the community. Yet it was these sections that he called into use with such success when John L. Lewis took his men out of the coal mines and started once more the grim business of starving the Nation's economy into submission to his demands. They also strengthened the President's hand in dealing with the three railroad brotherhoods that sought to emulate Mr. Lewis last month. The achievement of the measure in this vital sphere alone would be sufficient, in our opinion, far more than to outweigh the comparatively few and minor shortcomings that it has revealed to date.

Counterattack Attacks Misrepresentations of Mundt-Nixon Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks an analysis of the Mundt-Nixon bill and a reference to some of the misrepresentations that are made about it.

Following is the article:

(From special supplement with May 28 issue of Counterattack—Facts To Combat Communism)

WHAT'S TRUE AND WHAT'S FALSE ABOUT THE MUNDT-NIXON BILL

There's such a profusion of Communist lying about the Mundt-Nixon bill that Counterattack herewith gives its subscribers the plain facts.

Part 1, below, summarizes main features of bill in form in which it was amended on floor of House, passed, and sent to Senate, where it is now.

Part 2 deals with some lies about the bill.

PART 1. WHAT'S TRUE

Section 1 consists of one sentence: "This act may be cited as the 'Subversive Activities Control Act, 1948.'"

Section 2 presents the findings of Congress regarding the nature of totalitarian dictatorships, the existence of "a world Communist movement" that is directed "by the Communist dictatorship of a foreign country," the fact that this dictatorship has set up in various countries "political organizations" that conspire to overhrow existing governments, and the fact that "the recent successes of Communist methods in other countries present a clear and present danger to the security of the United States and make it necessary that Congress enact appropriate legislation."

This finding of Congress isn't binding on the courts, but it does create a presumption, to which the courts will give weight.

Section 3 defines terms used in bill, mainly "Communist political organization" and "Communist-front organization" (spelled without capitals).

A "Communist political organization" is one which has some of the usual characteristics of a political party and which is controlled by "the foreign government or foreign governmental or political organization" that directs the "world Communist movement," as stated in section 2. In order to decide whether an organization is so controlled, the Attorney General and the courts are to bear some or all of 10 considerations in mind.

One of these considerations is "the extent to which its policies" are based on those "of the foreign government or foreign governmental or political organization." Another consideration is "the extent to which it receives financial or other aid" from the same government or organization. Still another, "the extent to which it sends members or representatives to any foreign country for instruction or training in the principles, policies, strategy, or tactics of such world Communist movement."

Eight of the 10 "considerations" are so framed that they can't possibly apply to any party except one controlled by Moscow. The remaining two "considerations" (stated in subsections D and I) might also apply to one or more small leftist parties, which have only a few hundred or a few thousand members. But such parties are entirely safe, because they don't come under any of the eight other considerations, such as getting directives from Moscow, getting aid from there, or sending members there for training. So it's obvious that they are not controlled by "the foreign government or foreign governmental or political organization" that directs the "world Communist movement." And they couldn't be so adjudged in court.

Only a party controlled by Moscow has anything to fear from the definition of a "Communist political organization."

A "Comumnist-front organization" is any organization, except a political party, of which this is true: "It is under the control of a Communist political organization." Or

"it is primarily operated for the purpose of giving aid and support to a Communist political organization, a Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement referred to in section 2," or "its views and policies are in general adopted and advanced because such views or policies are those of a Communist political organzation, a Communist foreign government, or such world Communist movement."

Section 4 prohibits any action to promote the establishment in the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship that is to be controlled by "any foreign government, foreign organization, or foreign individual." Violators may be fined up to $10,000, or imprisoned for up to 10 years, or both.

There's no statute of limitations for offenses under this section. A violator may be punished at any time, no matter how remote. Reason for this provision is that crimes of some Communist leaders have been discovered by the House Committee on Un-American Activities too late for punishment.

Still this provision ought to be eliminated in Senate. A person shouldn't be prosecuted in 1958 for a crime committed in 1948. Moreover, such a never-ending threat, instead of encouraging people to quit the Communist movement, will encourage them to stay in. Why should they quit, if they can never escape the peril of punishment?

Section 5 provides that any person who has been convicted in Federal court of violating section 4 (by promoting establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship under foreign control) shall lose his citizenship.

One of the main witnesses who testified before Nixon subcommittee in February was Louis Waldman, noted labor lawyer. His analysis of the Communist movement, and his proposals for legislation, were more comprehensive than those of any other witness. A number of his suggestions were adopted. Waldman urges elimination of the provision for revocation of citizenship. His reason is simple. As all lawyers know, juries hesitate to convict if punishement is very severe. Under the present bill, a violator of section 4 may be imprisoned up to 10 years. If the jury knows that in addition to this, he is sure to lose his citizenship, many jurors will be reluctant to convict. This provision should therefore be dropped.

Section 6 forbids "any member of a Communist political organization" (but not someone who is only a member of a front) to seek or accept any Federal office or employment without revealing that he is a member of such organization. This applies not only to appointive but to elective office. If he already holds an appointive Government job, he must resign within 30 days after enactment of the bill. But if he holds an elective office he can keep it.

Also, every Government officer or employee is forbidden to employ anyone whom he knows to be "a member of a Communist political organization."

Section 7 deals with passports. Communist agents move from country to country. To impede them, the bill forbids "any member of a Commuist political organization" (but not a mere front member) to apply for a passport or for renewal of one. If he already has one, he can use it for 60 days after enactment of the bill * * * but not later. Every Government officer or employee is forbidden to give such a person a passport or a renewal of one.

Section 8 requires "each Communist political organization" and "each Communist-front organization" to register with the Attorney General, giving name and address of every officer during the preceding 12 months, and also making an accounting of all money received and spent during that period.

A "Communist political organization" is moreover required to register names and addresses of all its members during the preceding 12 months.

But a Communist front is not required to do this. However, it must keep records of names and addresses of all members, for Government inspection.

Section 9 provides that all registration statements in the Attorney General's office shall be open to public inspection.

Section 10 makes it unlawful for anybody to remain a member of an organization which the Attorney General has found to be a "Communist political organization" but which has not registered.

Section 11 provides for "labeling" the publications and broadcasts of Communist organizations. It requires that no "Communist political organization" and no "Communist-front orgnization" shall send through the mails or through any other means of interstate or foreign commerce "any publication * * * which is intended to be * * * circulated * * * among two or more persons, unless such publication and any envelope, wrapper, or other container in which it is mailed or otherwise circulated or transmitted bears the following, * * * with the name of the organization appearing in lieu of the blank: 'Disseminated by , a Communist organization'."

Similarly, any radio broadcast must be preceded with this: "The following program is sponsored by , a Communist organization."

Section 12 says that if you give money to a registered organization, or to one which the Attorney General has ordered to register, you cannot deduct the gift for Federal income-tax purposes. Also that no such organization shall be exempt from Federal income tax.

Section 13 provides for investigation by the Attorney General to decide whether or not an organization is "a Communist political organization" or a "Communist-front organization." It must get a public hearing and it "shall have the right to present its case by oral or documentary evidence, to submit rebuttal evidence, and to conduct * * * cross-examination."

Section 14: If the Attorney General finds that the organization is of a Communist character, it may appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. The court may overrule the Attorney General if his findings aren't supported by the preponderance of the evidence. The decree of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court.

But it has been objected that the Attorney General shouldn't have the double power of making the original finding and of prosecuting violators. It would be better if the finding were made by an independent board. But best of all would be to have it made by Federal courts. In order to prevent delay, cases of this sort should get priority over other types of cases.

Section 15 prescribes penalties. If an officer of a Communist political organization or a front doesn't file a registration statement, or falsifies it, he shall be fined $2,000 to $5,000, or/and imprisoned 2 to 5 years. Anybody who commits any other violation of the act for which no penalty is provided in this section or in section 4, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or/and imprisoned not more than 2 years.

The final sections, 16 and 17, are routine legal provisions.

PART 2. WHAT ISN'T TRUE

Suppose you owned a grocery or a drug store, and you were required by the city or the State to get a license, or perhaps to register your firm name and the names of officers, etc. And suppose you disobeyed this law, and as a result you were punished. Could you then say that the law outlawed your grocery or drug store? And that it was driving you underground?

Yet this is exactly the contention of the Communist Party. William Z. Foster says: "The national board of the Communist Party has definitely stated that it will not register, should the Mundt bill become law. So the general effect of the Mundt bill, if finally enacted into law, would be to outlaw our party." In other words, anybody is outlawed if he is punished for violating a law. This assertion is fantastic, but it has been picked up by many non-Communists, some because they haven't read the Mundt-Nixon bill, others for devious reasons of their own.

The fact is plain that the Mundt-Nixon bill doesn't outlaw the Communist Party, as a reading of the above summary of the bill will show.

Another Foster lie is that the bill "outlaws (a) the disruption of trade and commerce; (b) the incitation of economic, social, and racial strife and conflict; (c) the dissemination of propaganda calculated to undermine established government and institutions." And Henry Wallace, echoing Foster, says the bill is aimed against strikes. There's nothing like this in the bill.

In order to scare unionists and liberals, the Communist Party has invented dozens of lies. It says the bill is an attempt "to rob you of your right to disagree with Government policies, your right to advocate social-welfare legislation or any other reforms. * * * It is * * * an attempt to silence everyone who advocates peace, fights for civil rights, works for a new party, strikes for higher wages, opposes lynching and the poll tax." It would "prevent strikes for higher wages and better conditions." It would "prevent action to lower prices, to control rents, to wipe out Jim Crow and anti-Semitism."

And it would "destroy any organization engaging in political action which the Attorney General disapproves." It would destroy your freedom to cooperate with others "for any reform the Attorney General doesn't approve."

Perhaps the biggest, slickest lie of all is that if you support "anything the Communists say they support you can go to jail." This is a falsification of what the bill says about Communist fronts (see the summary of sec. 3 of the bill). And there isn't even anything in the bill that would put people in jail for joining Communist fronts.

When Communists use the Stalin-Hitler technique of the big lie, the way to fight them is by telling the truth. Read the summary of the bill again. Show it to others. Ask Senate Judiciary Committee for copies of the bill. See for yourself how the Communists have lied about it.

As a public service, Counterattack waives its usual rule and authorizes reproduction in whole or part of this special supplement.

Yours faithfully,

COUNTERATTACK.

MAY 28, 1948.

The Cost of Segregation in Lives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from an article entitled "The Cost of Segregation in Lives," from the Southern Patriot, which is published at New Orleans.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COST OF SEGREGATION IN LIVES

The human victims, certain primitive peoples sacrificed to their gods, were few

indeed compared with the number our Christian democratic society sacrifices to maintain the color line.

CASE HISTORY

Three thousand seven hundred and twenty-two Mississippi citizens died without medical care in 1937. Five hundred and thirty-one of them had white skins; 3,191 had black.

Of every 100 Negro children born in Mississippi, only 17 are given their first spank by a doctor; 83 are delivered by midwives or without any assistance.

There is 1 Negro doctor to every 18,527 Negro persons in Mississippi; the acceptable standard is 1 doctor to every 1,500 persons.

In Mississippi, some of these problems are exaggerated, perhaps, but they are exactly the problem facing Negroes all over the South, and to some degree, all over the Nation: and they are the same problems faced by all the people in the South. Briefly summed up, here is the case history:

Those 10 extra years

1. The Negro death rate is more than 33 percent higher than the white death rate. The mortality rate for Negro babies is even higher, and for Negro mothers, higher still. Thus the life expectancy of Negroes is 10 to 12 years shorter than that of whites.

* * * * *

3. There is a serious shortage of hospital beds of all types for the Negro population. In 15 States requiring segregation only Maryland and Missouri, both strictly speaking outside the South, provide as many as two beds per thousand Negro population—and that is less than half the accepted standard. Many States provide less than one-third the standard, and in widespread areas less than one-tenth the necessary beds are available. That means people are dying—because hospital beds say, "For white only."

In the South 10,000 to 11,000 Negroes die of tuberculosis yearly, yet there are less than 6,000 beds for their care. The American Public Health Association says that at least two beds for every death from TB are necessary to care adequately for this disease. That means 20 to 25,000 are needed. The situation is similar in regard to facilities for convalescent care and the mentally ill.

Even where hospital facilities for Negroes are available they are usually of inferior quality. A private room, for example, is virtually unobtainable. Furthermore, in many hospitals where a Negro is admitted as a patient, the doctor of his choice, if he is a Negro, is not allowed to treat him. In Mississippi, for example, in 1940 there were no modern hospitals where a Negro physician could take his patients, and as far as we know that is the case today. A corresponding situation prevails in many of the other Southern States. Even in cities like Atlanta and Richmond, where medical colleges have control over large public wards of local hospitals, Negro physicians are not permitted to participate in their programs.

4. There is a critical shortage of Negro doctors, dentists, nurses, medical social workers, and laboratory technicians, which contributes heavily to the high rate of Negro mortality. This results largely from the policy of virtually every medical school in the United States which bar Negroes from admission.

The sad and shocking state of health in the South is not limited to its Negro citizens.

In seven Southern States—Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Arkansas, and Louisiana—more than half of their young people—in the prime of life—were unable to meet the minimum physical and mental requirements for military service. In every Southern State at least 40 percent of the men examined for the draft were rejected.

But those who knew the health conditions in the South need not have been surprised at those results. For every other measurement of death rates and medical facilities show the same unhealthy condition, when North and South are compared.

The infant mortality rate, for example, shows 48.6 deaths per 1,000 births in the South; and 40.6 deaths in the rest of the United States. This higher rate in the South is not due exclusively to the soaring death rate among Negro babies. The death rate among white babies in many Southern States exceeds that for Negro babies in many Northern States.

Some figures just compiled by an official State body in South Carolina indicate the tremendous problem facing the whole South, Negro and white alike. The report showed that:

Only 29 percent of the hospitals in South Carolina were approved by the American College of Surgeons in 1946.

Twice as many beds are needed in the State's six tuberculosis hospitals.

Dental service is altogether lacking for indigent and near-indigent groups. South Carolina needs two and one-half times as many dentists as it has at present.

Only 33 percent of the State's hospital beds are available to Negroes, although they constitute 43 percent of the State's population and their need is more acute.

DIAGNOSIS

However you look at it, it's mainly a question of money. The Negro is not healthy because he cannot purchase health.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics, an official Government agency, estimated at the end of 1947 that the necessary annual income for a decent living for a family of four was $3,500. But according to a survey of annual family incomes conducted by Fortune magazine in December 1947, only 4 percent of the Negro families in the Nation had an income of $3,500 or higher. Twenty-one percent had an income from $1,000 to $3,000 and 75 percent had an income below $1,000. Figures for white families were: 27 percent over $3,500, 51 percent $1,000 to $3,500, 22 percent below $1,000.

The 96 percent of America's Negro families with substandard income are not able to afford healthful diets, or housing conducive to healthful living, and can't afford to call the doctor when they get sick. For example, 70 percent of Negro homes in the South in 1940 were without running water or electricity.

This economic picture can't be separated from the segregation picture. For it is the Jim Crow system that is largely responsible for the Negro's low income. It is Jim Crow that robs him of adequate educational opportunity; it is Jim Crow that keeps him from higher paying jobs.

In 1940, 70 percent of the Negro wage earners in the country were unskilled workers, 24 percent were skilled workers, and only 6 percent were nonmanual workers. The defense program was in full swing at the time; the percentage of unskilled workers is probably higher today, as a result of the Jim Crow employment policy, last to to hired, first to be fired.

The Jim Crow ghettos in southern cities crowd Negroes into unsanitary, disease-breeding slums discriminated against even in such matters as garbage collection. In the rural areas, the situation is worse, rather than better. For example, 26 percent of Negro farm families have no water supply within 50 feet of their homes.

Education is important to health—in breaking down superstition, and old-fashioned practices, in spreading facts about nutrition and preventive health measures. Yet here again segregation robs the Negro child of an equal educational opportunity. His schools have shorter terms, poorer buildings, and equipment, larger classes, poorly paid and trained teachers, poorer bus service than the schools of the southern white child, inadequate as they are.

Finally, disparity in health and medical care available helps explain the disparity in disease.

DOCTOR'S DILEMMA

Discrimination in hospitals

5. Yet in spite of these difficulties, about 140 graduate each year. Their big problem then is to find a hospital in which to intern. There are only 14 Negro hospitals approved for internship, just barely enough—and offering no choice to the student.

6. In order to specialize in any field in medicine, a young doctor after he completes his internship of 1 year in a hospital, must spend another year or two as a resident in a hospital. Yet residences are terribly difficult for the Negro doctor to find, almost impossible. Thus he is usually forced to become and stay a general practitioner, however great his talents may be in a particular field, such as surgery.

7. Upon starting his practice, the young doctor will find that in most of the South, there are no modern hospitals whose facilities he may use, and in which he may treat his patients. In the whole State of Mississippi there is none, and that is true of other Southern States as well. It goes without saying that when hospital staff appointments are made, he is not considered.

Discrimination in medical schools

Of the 77 medical schools in the Nation, only two freely admit Negro applicants, and those two are Negro institutions: Howard University Medical School in Washington, and Meharry Medical School in Nashville, Tenn. Only 85 Negro students are now enrolled in 20 other northern and western schools, whose enrollment includes 25,000 white students.

8. That he cannot treat his patients when they must be hospitalized, brings on a bread-and-butter problem; he often loses his patient to a white doctor, who can use hospital facilities.

9. A very serious problem for the doctor is that his patients generally have a low-income level, particularly in the South—and where the need is greatest, he is unable to practice, because he cannot make a living.

AMA color line

10. The Negro doctor is barred in the South and in the District of Columbia from membership in the American Medical Association, or more exactly from the county and State medical associations which are affiliates of the AMA.

11. The Negro doctor because of the AMA bar and the hospital problem has special difficulties trying to keep up to date on developments in medicine. For example, some years ago the Atlanta Medical Society was requested to admit Negro doctors just to hear the discussions of current medical problems, and refused.

12. Public health service clinics and facilities and public health service jobs are not often open to Negro doctors.

13. Finally, the Negro doctor in the South must find it particularly difficult to endure the southern segregation pattern. The disregard for his professional status, the day-to-day problems of life for the southern Negro—housing his family in slum conditions, sending his children to inferior schools, being subjected to constant indignities—drives most good doctors North, and leaves the areas most in need without adequate medical care.

These same problems are faced by the Negro dentist, and the Negro nurse. Less than 3 percent of the registered nurses in the United States are Negroes. Of the 1,300 nursing schools in the country, well over 1,200 are "for white only." The Negro nurse cannot count heavily on private practice, and the public-health system offers few opportunities because of discrimination.

CONTRAINDICATED

It seems plain that no honest person can advocate two standards for health, one white

and one black. Yet whenever separate segregated facilities are set up, that is the inevitable result.

Too many civic minded groups, feeling the need for Negro hospital facilities, for example, put their energies and money into an effort to establish a new hospital for Negroes only. A campaign is launched, the money is raised with difficulty, a new hospital is built—but virtually never with the equipment and facilities equal to the already existing public, tax-supported institution for whites only. The net result is to extend and perpetuate the Jim Crow system which leads to further inequalities. The same money and energy put into enlarging and extending the public hospital and making it really public would produce far greater and more beneficial results for all concerned.

A similar issue has been raised with respect to the problem of medical schools for Negroes in the South. Under pressure from the United States Supreme Court, which has insisted upon equal educational facilities for Negroes, the southern governors are much concerned. For there are no State medical schools open to Negroes in the Southern States, it is too expensive to open 17 separate schools and the governors are not willing to open the doors of the State university medical schools to Negro students. In their effort to escape demands of the Constitution, the governors propose a regional school, and are negotiating with Meharry Medical School, proposing that the Southern States purchase and operate it jointly. Meharry, unfortunately, has its own financial problems, and its trustees have offered the school to the governors conference.

Again, this would be a backward step perpetuating discrimination—an endorsement of educational segregation. Justice demands the opening of all professional schools now to all qualified students.

PRESCRIPTION

What can we do about it all?

Obviously, a many-pronged program is necessary—

An all-out attack on segregation, to end Jim Crow in hospitals, and professional schools, in housing and education, and in the expenditure of public funds.

A national health program, which will provide medical care to all our citizens, without regard to ability to pay.

A community health program to meet the specific needs of each area.

An over-all program to raise the living standards of the Southern people, Negro and white alike.

Jim Crow must go

Young Negroes must have the opportunity to secure training in medicine, dentistry, nursing, and allied fields. Negro doctors must be allowed to treat their patients in any institution for the care of the sick. How can it be complacently said that we "have made wonderful progress" when thousands die needlessly?

An attack on segregation is not enough however, for thousands will continue to die needlessly because they can't afford medical care. Authoritative and conservative estimates show that the average cost of good medical care today is more than $150 per family per year. We have seen that 75 percent of the Negro families in the South earn less than $1,000 per year, which is not enough for minimum food and shelter needs. Most of the white families in the South cannot afford minimum medical expenditures either. Even if we leave out of consideration entirely the fact that many families have need of medical services costing much more than the average figure of $150 a year, it is evident that a majority of the population cannot meet the costs of proper medical attention.

Compulsory health insurance

Clearly, the only solution of this problem is a method of payment by which the risks may be distributed among a substantial proportion of the people, and the cost of illness over a long period of time. That is the approach of the Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill, which extends social-security benefits to include complete medical care. It is financed by an employee pay roll tax—in other words a compulsory health insurance plan which would ease the impact of illness on all individuals.

The bill has been endorsed by all the labor organizations, by a great many civic groups, and by many groups in the medical field. Opinion polls show it is favored by 68 percent of the American people. But the bill has been bottled up in committee, opposed by vested interests in the medical profession, and strangled by a coalition of Democrats and Republicans.

The American Medical Association, bitter foe of this legislation, has introduced a bill to divert support from the Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill. Their proposal does little else than preserve the existing system of paying for such services and make a new demand upon the Federal Treasury for a totally inadequate lump sum to provide medical care for the indigent.

It is not just the indigent, of course, who cannot afford proper medical care. A majority of the population is unprepared to meet a medical emergency. The AMA tactics parallel those of the opponents of the public-school system used over a century ago, attempting to substitute poor schools for indigent children for a free public-school system.

The antidiscrimination clause in the bill is full of loopholes, and the National Medical Association has stated they have "no confidence in the equitable administration of a program which could be controlled by an organization with the record of the AMA with respect to the Negro."

PTA plan for preventive medicine

Preventive medicine—another phase of the problem—is attacked by a bill initiated by the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, which would put Federal money for the first time into the creation and expansion of local public-health centers for basic services. The PTA's object is to blanket the country with disease-control measures, maternal-child health clinics, and other preventive-medicine activities. It would supply public health services for 135,000,000 Americans who today either have none at all or are serviced by substandard staffs.

This would materially assist the communities in waging a battle for health. In shaping a community-health program, it should be remembered that the problems of Negro health are merely exaggerations of the picture of the community as a whole. Thus, any program which meets the requirements of the community needs only to be intensified or extended to meet the problems of Negro health.

The Alaska Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter on the subject of the rights of the Alaskan Indians, written by Jonathan M. Steere and Isaac Sutton, of Philadelphia. The letter was published in the New York Times of March 28, 1948.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ALASKA INDIANS—BILLS BEFORE CONGRESS SAID TO DEPRIVE THEM OF RIGHTS

(The writers of the following letter are, respectively, president and vice president and counsel of the Indian Rights Association.)

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The Indian Rights Association, with which we are associated, wishes to call attention to the organized efforts of selfish interests to deprive the Alaska Indians of their title to their lands and their fishing and timber rights. Several bills to that effect have been introduced in Congress and hearings have been and are being held on them. Senate Joint Resolution No. 162 states that whereas any aboriginal titles which may be claimed to have existed with respect to lands in Alaska were extinguished under the terms of the treaty with Russia and that the United States never recognized the rights of the natives based on use and occupancy of such lands, the action of the Interior Department establishing the boundaries of certain Indian towns is thereby rescinded.

The Alaska Indians have lived in their villages for many generations and have fished for salmon in the adjacent waters. The treaty with Russia in 1876 provided that the Alaska natives should enjoy "all rights, advantages, and immunities of the citizens of the United States and shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their rights, property, and religion." Congress, in 1884, recognized the Indian rights to the possession of "lands for their use and occupancy" and provided that the terms under which they may acquire title were reserved for further legislation. These terms were provided by the act of May 1936, which permitted the Secretary of the Interior to fix the boundaries of Indian villages.

A commission was appointed by Secretary Ickes for this purpose which was headed by Judge Hanna, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of New Mexico, and was composed of citizens of high standing. After many months of study the boundaries of the important towns were determined and reported back to the Secretary. It is this action which the Senate resolution undertakes to rescind.

SALMON TRAPS

There is also before Congress Senate bill No. 1446 authorizing the Department of the Interior to grant salmon traps in Alaska for the period of 15 years. These traps are set at the mouth of the rivers and many locations have been used by the Indians from time immemorial and are included in the areas determined by Judge Hanna's commission. The result of this bill would be an infringement on the Indians' title. It would result in placing the most valuable traps in the hands of the salmon fishing industries. These industries maintain one of the largest and highest paid lobbies in Washington and back both bills.

The question of the use of traps for catching salmon is a debatable question. A plebisite has been planned in Alaska to occur sometime during the year as to whether the traps should be allowed. Many Indians and white natives are opposed to them on the ground that they are ruining the fishing and gradually exhausting the salmon. Many rich salmon streams have already been destroyed as food producers by commercial traps. In the case of 11 traps under the management of P. E. Harrison Co., the number of salmon was materially reduced each year from 3,639,000 in 1941 to 162,000 in 1947. The bill originally authorized the Secretary of Interior to grant the use of traps for only 2 years. For some mysterious reason the bill was amended to provide for a term of 15 years.

SUPREME COURT BACKING

The United States Supreme Court (in the case of *United States for the Haulapai Indians* v. *the Santa Fe Railroad*) recognizes the right of occupancy by the Indians "as sacred as the fee simple of the whites" irrespective of whether there were a treaty or not. This was confirmed in 1946 in the case of the *United States* v. *Alcea Band of Tillamooks*. The Supreme Court says: "* * * Whether this tract * * * was properly called a reservation * * * or unceded Indian country, * * * is a matter of little moment * * * the Indians' right of occupancy has always been held to be sacred; something not to be taken from him except by his consent, and then only upon such consideration as should be agreed upon."

The Senate Joint Resolution 162 also states in its preamble that the Indians have available for the adjudication of their claims, the Indian Claims Commission, created by the last Congress to adjudicate all outstanding claims of the Indians, but the bill creating the Commission restricts its jurisdiction to claims arising prior to its effective date of organization. They are therefore relegated to the Federal Court of Claims for remedy.

Indians cannot use the Court of Claims, however, without a special act of Congress giving them jurisdiction and past experience has shown that it takes many years before Indian claims can be adjudicated by this court and the expense is great, indeed more than most of the Alaska Indian villages can pay.

Irrespective of the remedy, however, the taking of these Indian lands would be a dishonorable act by the United States and the violation of good faith by our Nation and contrary to the principles of the morality upon which our Christian civilization stands.

JONATHAN M. STEERE.
ISAAC C. SUTTON.

PHILADELPHIA, *March 19, 1948.*

Poll on Relations With Russia and Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1948

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I should like to include an article which appeared in the Pittsburgh Press of Friday, May 28, 1948, by Robert Taylor, the Pittsburgh Press Washington correspondent, on the results of a poll of voters in my congressional district, the Third-third Pennsylvania.

The questionnaire submitted to the voters asked them to check their views on the following three questions:

First. Should the United States be tough [ ] or conciliatory [ ] in dealing with Russia? Have events since hostilities ceased 3 years ago convinced you that we should continue further a policy of appeasement with Russia, or are you unduly alarmed over the expansion of communism?

Second. Do you favor reviving selective service on a limited basis for the present world crisis? Yes. [ ]. No. [ ]. President Truman has told us that our armed services are 300,000 below authorized strength. UMT would not add to the size of the Regular forces. It has been proposed that the draft be put into operation to bring the forces up to strength. Those who have served at least 90 days would be exempt from this draft.

Third. Do you favor universal military training? Yes. [ ]. No. [ ]. UMT would give 1 year of military training to 18-year-olds, with the trainees becoming part of our Reserve force for emergency call.

The questionnaire required no signature although if they wanted to sign they were pleased to do so. Eighty-five percent of the returns were signed.

The article follows as well as an editorial in the Sunday, May 30, Pittsburgh Press, a Scripps-Howard newspaper.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press of May 30, 1948]

BUCHANAN GETS THE TRUTH

Congressman FRANK BUCHANAN, of the Thirty-third Pennsylvania District, serves a big and heavily populated territory in which there is great labor-union strength.

It is a home district of the United Electrical Workers, and therefore was selected by President Thomas Fitzpatrick, of the great Westinghouse local, as the one in which he would run for Congressman on the Wallace ticket.

To judge by what Mr. Fitzpatrick and other leaders of the electrical workers have been saying, that particular district is violently opposed to such things as the European recovery program, a tough policy toward Russia, the draft, and universal military training.

To test the actual sentiment of his constituents, Congressman BUCHANAN sent out 50,000 printed questionnaires to them. As a special means of getting the so-called left-wing sentiment, he also mailed questionnaires to signers of Henry Wallace's election petitions, whose names were printed in this paper.

After deducting questionnaires which could not be delivered because of faulty addresses, Mr. BUCHANAN had a total poll of 45,000 letters. He received more than 10,000 replies, to which more than 85 percent signed their names and addresses.

That is a remarkably high response.

In view of all these conditions, the results justify Mr. BUCHANAN's description of them as amazing.

To the question whether the United States should be tough or conciliatory with Russia, 92.8 percent favored a tough policy.

Limited selective service was supported by 90.1 percent.

Universal military training was backed by 86.2 percent.

There isn't any doubt about the overwhelming sentiment shown by these returns.

They are reassuring, particularly in view of the pro-Communist policies of the leadership of the United Electrical Workers. They prove that the membership of that union is made up of sound Americans who are being misrepresented by the union officials.

In no other congressional district have Communists and fellow travelers been more vocal than in the Thirty-third. This poll shows the falsity of their claim that they speak for a large following.

Congressman BUCHANAN performed a valuable service by making so complete and decisive a poll on questions of the utmost importance to America.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press of May 30, 1948]

DRAFT, TOUGH RED POLICY WIN 9 TO 1 IN BUCHANAN POLL—CONGRESSMAN SENDS 50,000 QUESTIONNAIRES; MANY VOTERS ADD COMMENTS OR WRITE LETTERS

(By Robert Taylor, Press correspondent, Washington)

WASHINGTON, May 28.—A house-to-house poll of voters in Representative FRANK BUCHANAN'S Thirty-third Congressional District shows 9 out of 10 voters favoring a tough policy toward Russia, revival of selective service, and universal military training.

Mr. BUCHANAN said today he considered the results of the poll as amazing.

Many of the voters in Mr. BUCHANAN'S district are members of Local 601, United Electrical Workers, CIO, and are employed at Westinghouse plants.

Tom Fitzpatrick, president of Local 601, is running as an independent candidate against Mr. BUCHANAN, whom he once supported. Mr. Fitzpatrick has consistently opposed the things which the voters favor in Mr. BUCHANAN'S poll.

Mr. BUCHANAN sent out 50,000 questionnaires, covering every household in his district. While he was doing this, the Press published the lists of Wallace petition signers, and questionnaires were mailed to each signer.

Despite this special effort to cover left-wing sentiment, the poll results were overwhelmingly in favor of a tough policy and preparedness.

That's one reason why Mr. BUCHANAN, a Democrat running for reelection against both a Republican and a Wallace Progressive, considers the poll results amazing.

He advised the constituents who replied to the poll of the results. The questions and answers were:

"Should the United States be tough or conciliatory with Russia?"

Tough, 92.8 percent.

"Do you favor reviving selective service on a limited basis for the present world crisis?"

Yes, 90.1 percent.

"Do you favor universal military training?"

Yes, 86.2 percent.

Mr. BUCHANAN sent out 50,000 questionnaires. Five thousand letters came back because of faulty addresses. Of the 45,000 that were delivered he got 10,000 replies, which he considered a high rate of return. Of the 10,000 who replied, 85 percent signed their names and addresses.

MANY ADD COMMENTS

Many of the voters added their own comments and even wrote letters to the Congressman to air their views.

A few of them denounced the Congressman. One woman wrote that she never supported him and never would. Most of the voters, however, devoted serious attention to the problem mentioned by Mr. BUCHANAN.

Mr. BUCHANAN said each community in his densely-populated district has its veterans' organizations and that all show a high degree of patriotism.

Wallace supporters entered Tom Fitzpatrick, president of local 601, United Electrical Workers, CIO, as a candidate against Mr. BUCHANAN and his Republican opponent, Albert G. Brown, Duquesne.

Mr. Fitzpatrick doesn't live in the district. He lives in Wilkinsburg, which is in the Twenty-ninth Congressional District.

Mr. BUCHANAN said he spent $2,500 of his own money on the poll-taking, and that he considered the expenditure well worth while.

The Thirty-third District includes the thrity-first ward of Pittsburgh, the cities of Duquesne, Clairton and McKeesport, the boroughs of Braddock, Dravosburg, East Pittsburgh, East McKeesport, Elizabeth,

Glassport, Homestead, Liberty, Munhall, North Braddock, Port Vue, Rankin; the first district of Trafford, Turtle Creek, Versailles, Wall, Whitaker, West Homestead, West Elizabeth and Wilmerding; and the townships of Elizabeth, Fordward, Jefferson, Lincoln, Mifflin, North Versailles, Snowden, South Versailles, and Versailles.

We Must Raise the Railroad Retirement Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1948

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, this Congress should not adjourn before we amend the Railroad Retirement Act so as to increase the retirement benefits for railroad workers. Many bills are now in the hopper to accomplish this purpose and I urge that we take expeditious action to consider them and pass an appropriate bill before adjournment.

I live in a railroad town. The city of St. Paul, which it is my privilege to represent, is a major railroad center of the United States. Several major railroads, including the Great Northern, Northern Pacific, and the Omaha maintain their home offices there and all three of the northern continental railroads serve the city. A dozen lines maintain shops, round houses, and supply facilities there. Thousands of railroaders live in my district.

I think I know the railroad man very well. I come from a family of "rails." As a young man, I worked as a coach cleaner on the Great Northern Railroad. My brother was a yard clerk on the same line. My father learned the machinist trade on the Chicago-Great Western Railroad. He worked at his trade on the Santa Fe and Southern Pacific systems. For many years he was a machinist with the Omaha Railroad and at the time of his death several years ago, was round house foreman at the old East St. Paul shops of that line. Many of my relatives and hundreds of my friends are railroad employees. I spent much of my free time as a boy hanging around the railroad yards, shops, and depots. Since childhood, I have known the railroad man and his problems. I know his problems today. The greatest problem facing the retired railroader is trying to get along on the small pension he now receives under the present provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act. Many of them get only $40.00 or $50.00 a month, and the average retired man receives less than $70.00 a month. How is it possible for a man to support himself and family on that much money? We all know that the ravages of inflation have played havoc with the budgetary problems of many of our citizens. This is especially true of the retired railroad worker.

Normally a railroad man knows only one business and that is railroading, so that when he retires he is not able to devote his special talent to any other gainful occupation even if he were physically able to do so. Still, in the city of St. Paul I know well a retired engineer who, at the age of 72 years, is obliged to supplement his meager retirement compensation by working as a janitor in a downtown department store. A retired switchman is obligated to run a truck garden. There are many such examples. The normal family financial obligations of these men usually far exceed their retirement pension. Very few of them have been able, during the course of their normal working life, to save up a nest egg because of the large drains upon their monthly pay check raising and educating their families.

The cost of living has gone up more than 60 percent since before the war. The present retirement rates are based on the kind of dollar that was earned by these men in the normal period before 1940. If the railroader received a retirement dollar that was of the same value as the 1937 dollar, he would not have as much to worry about. But the dollar today is worth less than half of the dollar 10 years ago.

This Congress must recognize the patent injustice of permitting so many of these men to struggle along on the small retirement pension now afforded them. The railroad retirement fund is in sound financial shape. The fund will permit raising the pensions by some 20 percent without the need for additional assessments on either the railroads or the workers. The Railroad Retirement Board has so advised the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Such an increase in benefits is provided for in many of the bills before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Some of these bills, especially the one introduced by Chairman WOLVERTON of that committee, H. R. 6766, also restores the provision for lump-sum death-benefit payments. This provision, formerly in the law, was stricken by the 1946 amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act. I think it is most necessary that this benefit be restored.

There are other changes that should be made in the Railroad Retirement Act, but an increase in the pension benefits and the restoration of the lump-sum payment provision are two of the most pressing. I believe it essential that this Congress take action in this field before adjournment on June 19.

The railroad man has long been a stalwart of the great American laboring class. He is a high-grade citizen. He owns his own home, pays his taxes, raises his family, contributes unselfishly to the upbuilding of his community and his country, and makes a tremendous contribution, through his labor, to the successful operation and management of the great transportation systems of the country. Such an individual must be adequately provided for in his old age. We have an opportunity here and now to materially contribute to the present financial welfare of retired men and to make better provision for those who will retire in the future by the favorable consideration and enactment of these changes in the law.

This week I testified before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce urging that this legislation be favorably reported out for House consideration. I am advised that it is very probable that the bill will reach the floor next week.

I strongly urge that we take expeditious action to bring about these very desirable, laudable, sound, and needful amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act.

Destroying Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Destroying Free Enterprise," published in the News and Observer, of Raleigh, N. C., on April 19, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DESTROYING FREE ENTERPRISE

The mails are full of pamphlets from the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers extolling the American system of free enterprise. It is the only sound system in peacetimes. But neither of those big business organizations points out or even admits the existence of the one foe that is doing more than all else to undermine or shut the door to men who would like a chance to build up a business of their own. Not all the cries of the believers in free enterprise of "Open the Door to Free Enterprise, Richard" is heard in the citadels of monopoly.

The Federal Trade Commission recently issued a special report showing that, since 1940, 18,000 companies were swallowed up by big corporations through purchase and merger. One big drug concern, for example, absorbed 38 smaller companies, the companies swallowed including manufacturers of baby food, floor wax, paint, spaghetti, and insecticides. A loophole in the Clayton Antitrust Act permits such a process which Congress intended to make illegal.

The Commission's recommendation to plug this loophole has been ignored by Congress while it seeks to exempt insurance and railroads which violate the antitrust law.

The Washington correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor points out the situation as it now exists:

"There is little chance of permanently reducing the size of the Federal Government in Washington, its bureaucracy, and its police powers so long as competition is reduced and corporations get bigger and bigger. For example, if there is one big interstate grocery wholesaler instead of several local ones, the pressure for comparable Federal control is almost inevitable, and so it goes. There is danger, too, for any democracy which allows economic concentration of power to spread at the expense of small business."

Sandy Point and the Labrot Offer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 4, 1948

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

SANDY POINT AND THE LABROT OFFER

The offer to the State of a mile of bay-front property, which has just been made by Mr. William H. Labrot, has a direct bearing on two important issues: that of establishing a public tidewater park, and the fate of Sandy Point.

For years, the State's lack of a large tidewater park has been a subject of fitful study and discussion. All the feasible sites have been investigated and reinvestigated. But such obstacles as cost, inaccessibility, inappropriateness of terrain, and local opposition have balked every effort at decision.

The Sandy Point area is by common agreement the ideal location for a tidewater park. It offers a diversified terrain. It offers superb beaches for public recreation. Of all the sites which have been considered at one time or another, it is the most accessible to the Baltimore and Washington metropolitan areas—both in terms of distance and in terms of highways. In fact, it is the sole remaining tidewater site, within easy reach of these centers of population, which can be developed on a large scale for recreation. Cost, up until now, has ruled it out. Mr. Labrot's offer makes possible, then, the establishment of the long-wished-for tidewater park in its ideal location.

But we all know that the fate of Sandy Point is much at issue just now. The Naval Academy wants to take 2,400 acres of it for an airfield. The Navy public works bill, including the appropriation for developing this project, was passed by the House of Representatives on Wednesday. It is now before the Senate. If the Senate approves this bill without eliminating the Sandy Point project, then we may as well say good-bye to the dream of a tidewater park on Sandy Point.

At no time has the Navy made out a wholly convincing case for the location of its airfield on Sandy Point. It has not shown beyond all reasonable doubt that the reasons for locating an airfield on the Sandy Point Peninsula outweigh the substantial objections to doing so. Mr. Labrot's offer makes the Navy's case weaker than ever—indeed, demolishes it. Maryland's Senators should do their utmost to remove the Sandy Point project from the Navy public works bill. By removing it, the Senate can pass the bill without further controversy and thus enable the Navy to proceed with its pressing construction plans. Then the question of the future of Sandy Point, so important to the State of Maryland, can be dealt with separately and on its merits—as it should be.

North Carolina, State of Hospitality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 4, 1948

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the National Editorial Association recently met in Pinehurst, N. C., where outstanding editors from all over the United States assembled and exchanged ideas and renewed acquaintances. In the Chariton (Iowa) Leader, Mr. Will D. Allender, a well-known Iowa newspaperman, describes his visit to the Tar Heel State by characterizing North Carolina as a State of hospitality, as well as a great agricultural and industrial State. The South has long been noted for its spirit of hospitality. On this occasion traditional southern hospitality was manifested at its very best. Many folks in Congress will be interested to know the impression gathered by this newspaperman from Iowa, concerning one of the great Southern States. I take this occasion to extend my remarks in the Appendix, and include the editorial from the Chariton (Iowa) Leader of May 25, 1948:

NORTH CAROLINA, STATE OF HOSPITALITY

For the fourth time in our lives we have attended a national editorial convention and postconvention conducted tour. If we should attend many more we cannot conceivably understand how any of them can even equal the hospitable reception given us by the people of North Carolina in the period from May 6 to 15.

Besides being long on hospitality, North Carolina is a State of vast forests with a variety of industries using those huge acreages of trees as the processing base for innumerable materials. Nor does the State rely too heavily on its timber for support. Its people raise corn, tobacco, apples, and many other products. One huge mill we visited turns flax grown in Minnesota and California into cigarette paper under a process unknown until shortly before World War II.

We were shown through a large blanket and other mills whose products were not suitable as gifts, but they overcame that by giving the ladies pairs of nylon hosiery. We spent an hour in the R. J. Reynolds plant at Winston-Salem where one machine was packaging Camel cigarettes at the rate of 86 packages per minute. How many of those machines they have would be hard to estimate.

We spent an afternoon on the sky-line mill at Elkin, owned by the Chatham company, and upon returning home found they had mailed us one of their blankets as a memento of our visit. We were shown through en route to Asheville were our party was housed for 3 nights in two hotels. From there we were taken from the Blue Ridge Mountains into the Smokies, visited the Cherokee Indian Reservation. One forenoon was spent visiting Biltmore mansion on a 15,000-acre estate.

We dined at the cook's school at Camp Lejeune and from there were driven to the beach on the Atlantic Ocean and were there given the privilege rare to civilians, of witnessing a simulated landing invasion by 1,200 troops carrying rifles, flame-throwers, 105 cannon, supplies, etc. In that performance everything clicked on split-second schedule according to the mimeographed sheets given the guests and supplemented by announcements over a loud speaker.

In fact we saw so much that the "You're in Print" column on this page from now until fall may be used as a diary to tell our readers who care to follow it the story of our visit in detail.

Besides hospitality North Carolina is long on many other things. If there is anything they are short of following our visit it must be fried and/or broiled chicken. It wasn't a bit unusual to be served a half chicken twice a day.

Brash War Slogans Cost Too Many Lives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 4, 1948

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial in the Saturday Evening Post of May 29, 1948, entitled "Brash War Slogans Cost Too Many Lives":

BRASH WAR SLOGANS COST TOO MANY LIVES

The controversy over how we got into the late war, and whether or not we ought to have got in, receives considerable impetus from Dr. Charles A. Beard's exhaustive analysis of the available evidence, President Roosevelt and the Coming of the War, 1941 (Yale University Press). Doctor Beard goes into the facts found in the Pearl Harbor report and other official sources, and concludes that the picture given to the public by President Roosevelt and his associates at the time was very different from what was actually going on. Roosevelt did make commitments to Churchill at the Atlantic conference of 1941; we were participating in offensive naval warfare against German submarines, despite the fact that Roosevelt denied it; in late November 1941 our demands—whatever their justification—upon Japan could have had no other effect than to "maneuver her into firing the first shot," which Mr. Roosevelt indicated was his objective.

All this establishes the extraconstitutional nature of Mr. Roosevelt's exercise of power in conducting foreign policy. It doesn't dispose of the argument that the safety of the country and the apathy of its citizens in the face of danger justified the President in proceeding as he did. It seems to us that Roosevelt, who usually preferred "complicated moves" to the simple and direct course, might have relied more on frankness and less on the Harry Hopkins formula that most of us were "too damn dumb to understand." It would be rash to concede—at any rate out loud—that a President is ever justified in deceiving his fellow citizens in such circumstances, however lofty the ultimate motivation may be. Nevertheless, the issue cannot be finally settled without reference to the question: "What would have happened if we had remained out of the war?" If the answer is that Hitler would have won the war, probably discovered the atomic bomb first and thereby been able to hold the world for ransom, then the Roosevelt policy, or at any rate its results, stands one test of history.

As Dr. Beard points out, this argument would be stronger if Roosevelt, still pursuing his policy of secrecy, had not surrendered to Stalin in the late stages of the war many of the advantages gained by assisting in the defeat of Hitler. The frivolous stipulation of "unconditional surrender" as a war aim ended the possibility of serious internal resistance to Hitler and, in the view of some Army authorities, prolonged the war by at least a year. At Yalta and Tehran, Roosevelt cheerfully and secretly handed over Chinese territory to Stalin, consigned thousands of innocent people to slavery, set up the background for the communist coup in Czechoslovakia and the schmozzle in Berlin, and double-crossed patriots like Mihailovitch who resisted Stalinism equally with Hitlerism. By 1945 we had lost untold moral prestige throughout the world, not to mention mortgaging our

physical security. Roosevelt's luck had run out. Failing health, says one set of critics. The consequence of acting without principle, says another.

Today, with too many people talking about war without thinking very much about its reality, it becomes vitally important for Americans to understand more about the essentials of foreign policy and the relation of "war aims" to the nature of modern war. If "unconditional surrender" cost the world some millions of men, not to mention the destruction of the means of livelihood of central Europe, what would be the result of some equally idiotic slogan for the "next war," if any? In our view, American statesmanship seems bogged down through acceptance of war as "inevitable" when its clear duty is to explore every basis for even an uneasy peace. Should a new war occur, the first impulse of our leaders would be to emit statements as grandiloquent as Mr. Roosevelt's promise that "we will accept only a consecrated world." The temptation would be to promise the total destruction of communism in Russia, the trial of Stalin, et al., as war criminals, and a lot of other things that stir the blood of armchair warriors, but have little relation to our actual national interests.

Instead, the duty of statesmen in such circumstances would be to announce immediately, before we get too mad, what we would settle for, bearing in mind that the debonair words of politicians must be written in the blood of soldiers. One Army officer, thinking in terms of a possible war with Russia, suggests that at the outset we limit our objectives to the evacuation of the satellite countries and settlement of their final status by a United Nations shorn of the veto power. In his view, civilian leaders who contrive fantastic and impossible war aims show the need of a course in political logistics. Before burning down the barn, they should show that the pig is worth roasting.

Flood Control Act of 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK A. MUHLENBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1948

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in order not to reiterate things that have already been said on H. R. 6419, I will confine my remarks to sections 205 and 206. I must say first, however, that the smallness of the total of the bill before you is due to careful guardianship of recommendations by the committee, Mr. ANGELL, chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors; Mr. WILSON, chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control; together with the chairman of the full Committee on Public Works, Mr. DONDERO, in culling out and selecting only the most important projects for recommendation. It is a pleasure for me, a new Member of Congress, to sit on such a distinguished committee and to receive the wise guidance and to benefit by the firm knowledge of the older Members. I desire to call your attention specifically to sections 205 and 206, both of which propose changes in procedure of the existing law. As a former district engineer, United States Army, I found that there were many times when I wished for authority not allowed under the present law to construct small flood-control projects not specifically authorized by Congress, but which were indicated by immediate necessities of the situation. The delay in taking these up through necessary military and legislative channels, that is the Division Engineer's Office and the Chief of Engineers, and then through the Committee on Public Works with first approval for a survey and later, in another legislative year after approval of all authorities, for approval of construction, plus the necessity for appropriations, made many of these projects impractical of accomplishment within time limits necessary for proper protection. It is recommended now in the bill before you that projects under $100,000 in total cost may be erected if consistent with a general plan for neighborhood or community protection, after approval by the Chief of Engineers, with the limitation that the total cost of all such projects shall not exceed $2,000,000 within any one fiscal year.

I think this is an extremely important new provision—one well warranted by the necessity for protection of small works.

The second section I desire to discuss, 206, brings up another problem that again as district engineer I have seen as requiring appropriate attention by the Congress. Under the existing authority which limits work on existing flood-control jobs, work has been limited to actual repair of existing work. Very often it is obvious that the thing to do is not to repair the existing work but to do some parallel work at possibly a nearby place or to extend the limits of the existing protections. Section 206 would give authority similar to that I have just described to district engineers to proceed with work of this nature that may be a wiser expenditure of money that would be the case were the existing flood-control work merely to be repaired.

I specifically recommend both of these amendments as constructive changes in the present law. I may add that I am in agreement with the other sections of the bill. Being on both subcommittees, I have had opportunity to investigate each of the projects and individually, in my opinion, they are worthy and warranted by the necessities of the situation. I particularly recommend section 208, too, which is a change from the present law that requires special measures to be passed from time to time to cover specific flood relief due to sudden and unanticipated disaster. The usual amount, if there is any such thing as a usual annual amount, has been from ten to fifteen million dollars during each session. We have now changed this to a definite amount of twenty-five million for a fiscal year, which is made available without special legislation for special relief work. The former method of handling this was proven inadequate in amount year after year and limited the work that could be done by the Corps of Engineers in relieving immediate situations such as have occurred annually in flood disasters.

Award to a Country School Teacher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. STANLEY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1948

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a newspaper account and editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch, relative to the selection of Mr. Roy Fisher, of Nathalie, Va., as the "best teacher" of 1948, in a Nation-wide radio contest.

Mr. Fisher, an English teacher in Volens High School, Halifax County, Va., richly deserves this special recognition. His record is an outstanding example of the noble and unselfish service rendered by our school teachers.

PERSISTENCE OF STUDENT WINS BEST-TEACHER AWARD FOR 22-YEAR-OLD HALIFAX COUNTY MAN

CHICAGO, May 29.—A man today was named the best teacher of 1948—reversing the trend of female encroachment in fields usually dominated by men.

What's more, he is only 22 years old, and had been at his job less than 2 years.

He is Roy Fisher, an English teacher in Volens High School at Nathalie, Halifax County, Va. He won first prize of $2,500 in a Nation-wide contest sponsored by the Quiz Kids radio program. Previous winners have been middle-aged women.

Mr. Fisher won a special recognition award in the 1947 contest. A letter from one of his pupils declaring, "Mr. Fisher just can't take third place," played a part in his first place selection this year, the sponsors said.

Miss Blanche Ferre, for 20 years a teacher in the elementary grades at Central School, Brigham, Utah, won $1,000 as the best elementary teacher, and Miss Nellie Hitt, 48, fifth grade teacher in Verner Elementary School, Tuscaloosa, Ala., won the $1,000 best intermediate grade teacher award.

The awards were based on investigations of nominations made by school children. Some 35,000 letters were read and judged by this committee: Dr. Paul A. Witty, of Northwestern University; Dr. Willard Olson, of the University of Michigan, and the Rev. Philip S. Moore, of Notre Dame University.

Prizes of $1,500 went to 560 students submitting the best letters.

TO BE QUIZ KIDS' GUEST

Mr. Fisher will fly to Chicago for a week's visit as special guest of the radio program and will appear on the Quiz Kids' show for the presentation of his award on Sunday, June 6. Of the $2,500 award, about $1,500 is to be used for advanced study at any university of his choice.

The award announcement stated that "Mr. Fisher owes much of his good fortune to the persistence of one of his pupils, 16-year-old Falcon Guthrie. Falcon had written a fine letter about his favorite teacher in last year's contest and had won for Mr. Fisher a special recognition award of $500. But that wasn't good enough. When this year's contest opened, back came another letter to the

judges, entitled "Not Defeated," and saying "Mr. Fisher just can't take third place." And he didn't.

"This year the contest judges were so impressed with the outstanding record that Mr. Fisher has made in only his second year of teaching that they have found him to be the Nation's best. Falcon Guthrie will receive $50 for his letter nominating Mr. Fisher."

Receiving his bachelor of arts degree in English at the University of North Carolina in August 1946, Roy Fisher first began teaching the following month at the Volens School, a rural high school with an enrollment of approximately 300 students. Mr. Fisher teaches English to around 150 students a day.

At the close of his first year of teaching, after receiving the special award in the Quiz Kids' 1947 Best Teacher Contest, Mr. Fisher was asked to take a number of teaching positions, with better salary offers. Because he felt he was needed where he was, he stayed.

DISCUSSES JOB

Says Mr. Fisher about this job:

"It is an experience to which I look forward each day and enjoy every minute. Each time I enter the classroom, I consider it a challenge to impart some of the little information I possess to those I face in a manner that will catch and hold their interest and thereby instill in them a curiosity and a thirst for learning which will extend beyond the classroom. I love my job, despite the many oftentimes discouraging situations and distressing problems that can arise only in a school."

The youngsters' social activities in the Halifax County community are centered around the Volens School, the Chicago announcement points out. "Under Mr. Fisher's direction, they play and work together in a spirit of wholehearted enthusiasm, and it is a common sight to see teacher and students singing together, playing baseball, square dancing, pitching horseshoes, or taking part in a serious discussion," it added.

"Often during the school years, Mr. Fisher takes a class of students to Richmond or Washington to see a play or a concert, organizing a school dance to raise funds."

Says tall, lanky, dark-eyed Falcon Guthrie, who nominated Mr. Fisher: "His classroom has the friendliest atmosphere in our school. I feel pounds lighter when I enter that door."

AWARD TO A COUNTRY TEACHER

Selection of Roy Fisher, 22-year-old English teacher in a Halifax County high school as the best teacher of 1948 should help to give many other teachers of Virginia a sense of accomplishment. For the fact that young Mr. Fisher was chosen for this conspicuous honor is evidence that important work in the field of education is not always done in the wealthy or thickly populated regions, and that such work in a country high school in a small town, such as Nathalie, can be of the utmost significance.

Roy Fisher is evidently a man with a special talent for inspiring his pupils, but he has other excellent qualities as well. For example, after he had won a special award in the same Quiz Kids contest a year ago, he received various offers of a more lucrative nature from other schools. He turned them all down, with the comment that he felt that he was needed where he was.

He was right about that; he was needed. Furthermore, his subsequent service at that same post in Halifax County brought him an even greater prize than the one he had got in 1947. He was chosen first among all the teachers of the Nation.

There is no particular mystery about this, when one considers Roy Fisher's dedication to his task, and his statement as to why he loves his work. Said he:

"It is an experience to which I look forward each day and enjoy every minute. Each time I enter the classroom I consider it a challenge to impart some of the little information I possess to those I face in a manner that will catch and hold their interest, and thereby instill in them a curiosity and a thirst for learning which will extend beyond the classroom. I love my job, despite the many oftentimes discouraging situations and distressing problems that can arise only in a school."

Could there be a better recipe than the foregoing for success in the field of teaching? Roy Fisher is a worthy recipient of the high honor that has been accorded him.

Reds Show Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1948

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "Reds Show Hand" which appeared in the New Hampshire Morning Union, published in Manchester, N. H., June 3, 1948:

REDS SHOW HAND

If any doubt has existed anywhere that communism in the United States is not a subversive conspiracy directed from Moscow, it has been removed by the testimony of William Z. Foster, chairman of the Communist Party in this country, at the Senate hearings on the Mundt-Nixon bill.

Pressed by questions from members of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee, Foster made some very revealing admissions. First, he declared that Communists would not support the United States in any conceivable war with the Soviet Union, and that in the event of such a war, their one determination would be to find means to end that war on democratic terms.

Asked to define those terms more closely, Mr. Foster admitted that they could only be Soviet terms, since such a clash could be only an imperialistic war in which the United States necessarily would be the aggressor.

Mr. Foster declared further that he was unable to say at this time whether he and his followers would disobey military orders from the United States. That, he said, must be decided by time and events. But in this connection, he emphasized that Communists were not going to fight against the Soviet Union, which was definite enough.

When Mr. Foster's partner at the hearings, John Gates, editor of the Daily Worker, was asked if he would then betray the United States to the Russians, he made a most significant answer. "I would direct myself," he said, "toward the American people to put pressure on the Government or to change the Government to one that would bring about peace."

Both Foster and Gates declared that under no circumstances would they obey pending legislation restricting communism. When one member of the committee interjected: "No matter if the Supreme Court tells you to?" the reply was: "No matter who tell us to."

No searchlight is needed to grasp the full meaning of these statements. They are crystal clear. They mean that Communists in the United States, even those that are citizens, owe primary allegiance to Soviet Russia and their main purpose is to promote Soviet designs. If in doing this it becomes necessary to conspire and work against the United States, they do not hesitate to do so.

These things throw a side light on the importance of protective measures, such as the Mundt-Nixon bill, to see that these people are labeled and their purposes disclosed. Such masures are not a matter of sentiment or prejudice. They are essential to American security. We must not allow them to go by default.

Development of Undeveloped Areas Under American and British Flags

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1948

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the people of England and the United States should give serious consideration to the proposition of going into the vast, undeveloped areas under the American and British flags for the specific purpose of developing those areas industrially and economically and thus providing for the production of goods which the world is crying for, and giving the people of those areas a chance to produce and earn their way and enjoy the fruits of their labor, as the people of the United States did in the early days, during the formation of this country, and letting that be the genuine and only answer to the idea of the communistic philosophy. Communism is in every country on earth today. If we have the idea that we can destroy it with guns and bullets, I, for one, feel that we will miserably fail in that objective.

I think that the answer to communism is to give the people of the world a chance to make for themselves a place in the sun. I think the countries of the world to which I have referred, namely, those under the British and American flags, and that means our territories and insular possessions and the areas under the British flag similarly situated under the control of London, should make whatever concessions are necessary to induce capital to come into those areas and develop them, provided the local people have a chance to participate in the genuine production which they contribute to organized society. I hope the British and American people will not fail to go into these areas and do that very thing, because it seems to me that sometime during the next 10 years the United States will have to recover as best it can and operate as best it can under a Communist-controlled world, or it will as a victorious country have to salvage the world as best it can after the radioactivity has done its terrible work, or we shall have to proceed to do the very thing I have here recommended.

Democracies Destroyed by Inability To Deal Swiftly With Fifth Columns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 4, 1948

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Star of June 4, 1948:

DEMOCRACIES DESTROYED BY INABILITY TO DEAL SWIFTLY WITH FIFTH COLUMNS

(By Dorothy Thompson)

When, on April 27, on the Town Meeting of the Air, I said that the Wallace movement had been initiated by the Communists in the first place, that the attempt to split the Democratic Party and merge its left wing with the Communists exactly followed the pattern successfully employed abroad, and that all such alliances had ended without exception in total Communist control, Senator TAYLOR dismissed these charges with the usual cry of "Red baiting."

A serious problem demands truth in dealing with it. The term "Red baiting" has meaning only as it characterizes attempts to injure by untruthful accusations. I am, therefore, glad to be acquitted of Red baiting by the Communist Party itself. In a draft resolution to be submitted to the national convention early in August, the Communist Party declares:

"The Communist Party was the only force in American political life which instantly grasped the reactionary * * * essence of the Marshall plan * * * and undertook the struggle for its exposure.

"The Communist Party, from the earliest days after the end of the war, understood that its traditional fight for a new people's party directed against the two-party system * * * had once more been placed by events as an immediate, practical question."

CENTRAL, IMMEDIATE TASK

The resolution then orders American Communists to help the Wallace forces as their "central, immediate task," but to work to transform it into a counterpart of the Communist Party.

This confirms the substance of my accusation.

The immediate task of the third party is not to get Henry Wallace elected but to protect the Communists. The Wallaceites are rallying the lobby against the Mundt bill. At Mr. Wallace's meeting when he launched his letter to Stalin, "defeat the Mundt bill" was the main theme of the speakers who told the crowd the most preposterous untruths—that any one who struck for a raise or worked for rent control could be prosecuted under it. To applause from a by-no-means Communist audience VITO MARCANTONIO declared that the day the bill was passed we should have taken the last step to fascism. Only the Communist Party, he said, could protect this country against fascism.

One wonders why the Communist Parties in Germany and Italy, the two strongest on the Continent, did not protect those democracies from fascism, and why Switzerland, where communism was illegal, avoided fascism and war.

Mr. Wallace calls the Mundt bill warmongering. So we may no longer be masters in our own house without being accused of planning to attack the Soviets. That testimony disqualifies the Communist claim to be an independent American party because, if it were, why should the Soviets consider it a warlike act to subject it to stricter control? But when Mr. Wallace was asked to accept or reject as accurate a section of the bill attributing to the Communists a worldwide conspiracy, he replied he was "no expert" on such matters.

KNOWS WHAT HE IS DOING

There is a disposition on the part of Wallace's followers to believe he is an innocent idealist. I, however, do not believe that Henry Wallace is feeble-minded. He knows what he is doing, and he is not controlling his Communists. They are controlling him. They nominated him; he is their man.

The Wallace party illustrates how difficult it is to get after communism as an organization, since the organization—being in its central core secret and governed from the top down—can reorganize itself under another name at any time.

Yet here we have a body of some tens of thousands of American Communists, now commanding through Henry Wallace and other stooges a mass following of several millions, who—as William Z. Foster's testimony clearly demonstrated—acknowledged only one fatherland: the Soviet Union.

That fact has nothing to do with peace, war, or constitutional liberties. If American democracy is unable to suppress fifth columns, this Nation will perish, or the people will move toward fascism by taking the law into their own hands. It has been incompetence to deal with fifth columns, not failure to tolerate them, which has destroyed democracies.

Housing Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. CLASON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 4, 1948

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, during the years which have followed the cessation of hostilities in World War II, one of the great problems of our Nation has been the critical shortage in housing units. When the war ended, there were many restrictions upon the use of materials required for the war effort. There was practically no home building after the attack on Pearl Harbor.

In order to increase the number of homes built in communities where the shortage has been acute, several of the States, including Massachusetts, have provided funds or authorized the issue of bonds by a municipality or State which would result in carrying out home projects. During this period, the Federal Government has aided financially both builders and purchasers of homes, particularly veterans. Restrictions have been lifted and the effect of these various acts on the part of the Federal and State Governments has been most beneficial. Bills have been introduced before Congress which would undoubtedly help further. In order to bring the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, which has already passed the Senate, before the House for consideration, I signed the discharge petition. It now appears that the House Committee on Banking and Currency will report a housing bill for action shortly.

However, there has been considerable misinformation about the rate of building of housing units in the United States since the close of the war. Recently, Ewan Clague, Commissioner of Labor Statistics, reported that 90,000 new homes were started in April 1948—only 4,000 less than the 1947 monthly peak which was not reached until September last year. After I had read a brief summary of his report, I asked Mr. Clague to furnish me with information about house building in the United States since January 1, 1945. Mr. Clague has been kind enough to give me a table which indicates the rapid expansion in the construction of houses during the past 40 months.

In 1945, the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated that 209,300 new permanent nonfarm dwelling units were started. The number of completions during that year is not available.

In 1946, 670,500 units were started and 437,800 were completed.

In 1947, 849,000 units were started and 831,700 were completed.

During the first 4 months of 1948, 257,200 dwelling units have been started. The Bureau has not in its possession at this time the figures on the number completed. It is interesting to note that during the first 4 months of 1947, 205,200 units were started and the increase during the first 4 months of 1948 is more than 25 percent. On that basis of increase, the number of new dwelling units started outside of farm areas in 1948 will be well over the million mark. Since 387,500 homes were under construction on December 31, 1947, there will undoubtedly be completed and occupied during the calendar year 1948 well over 1,000,000 new housing units, furnishing shelter to more than 3,000,000 persons. Many of these units are being purchased or rented by veterans. This year, 1948, will bring to a peak of 1,000,000 housing units the efforts of our building trades. The previous peak is about 925,000 units in 1925. We are told that all available materials will be needed to make this new American record.

While the demand for dwellings continues heavy, activities in the construction field have now assumed large proportions. This is evidenced by the high prices which now have to be paid for construction materials which are in very heavy demand. I believe that the figures for 1948 will show for the first time since the close of the war that the number of new houses will have decreased in some measure the backlog of demands for new houses as it existed on December 31, 1947. This will be a very favorable development nationally since housing still is one of our most serious problems. I believe that the Federal legislation which has been and will be enacted on this subject will serve to overcome the shortage of housing within the next 2 or 3 years. None of us can expect that the problems raised by the cessation of house construction for a period of more than 4 years can be solved immediately in the face of the return of our veterans and the natural increase in our population. However, great strides have been made

and it is particularly interesting to note that under the Republican program of 1947 and 1948 the postwar housing activity has reached its highest level.

The following table furnished to me by Mr. Clague shows in detail the accomplishments of the building trades in furnishing new permanent nonfarm dwelling units:

Estimated number of new permanent nonfarm dwelling units started and completed, 1945–47

Year and month	Starts	Completions	Under construction
1945	209,300	(1)	(1)
January	7,000	(1)	(1)
February	7,900	(1)	(1)
March	10,600	(1)	(1)
April	12,400	(1)	(1)
May	14,600	(1)	(1)
June	18,600	(1)	(1)
July	17,000	(1)	(1)
August	17,100	(1)	(1)
September	20,100	(1)	(1)
October	25,600	(1)	(1)
November	29,300	(1)	(1)
December	29,100	(1)	(1)
1946	670,500	437,800	
January	37,500	15,900	159,100
February	42,400	17,300	184,200
March	62,000	18,700	227,500
April	67,000	21,000	273,500
May	67,100	25,100	315,500
June	64,100	30,600	349,000
July	62,600	36,700	374,900
August	65,400	43,400	396,900
September	57,600	49,700	404,800
October	57,800	55,500	407,100
November	47,700	61,200	393,600
December	39,300	62,700	370,200
1947	849,000	831,700	
January	39,300	62,600	346,900
February	42,800	60,300	329,400
March	56,000	57,600	327,800
April	67,100	59,200	335,700
May	72,900	59,400	349,200
June	77,200	62,300	364,100
July	81,100	64,800	380,400
August	86,300	69,600	397,100
September	93,800	76,700	414,200
October	94,000	82,700	425,500
November	79,700	86,500	418,700
December	58,800	90,000	387,500
1948:			
January	50,000		
February	47,200		
March	70,000		
April	[2] 90,000		

[1] Not available.
[2] Preliminary.

Housing Starts Soar to 90,000 in April

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 4, 1948

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the attached releases by the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, D. C., entitled "Housing Starts Soar to 90,000 in April" and "Contractors Employ 164,000 More Workers in April":

HOUSING STARTS SOAR 90,000 IN APRIL

Home-building activity soared to a high in April, when builders started 90,000 new permanent nonfarm dwelling units, according to preliminary estimates of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor. This is an increase of 29 percent above the revised estimate of 70,000 for March and 34 percent above the 67,000 units started in April 1947. Nearly all of the new units started this April were privately financed.

Home building for the first 4 months of 1948 showed an increase of 51,800 units, or 25 percent, over the same period of 1947. So far this year, 257,000 units have been put under construction.

Early indications from local building-permit reports are that the high April level of housing activity prevailed in all regions of the country, particularly in the Middle Atlantic States, the East North Central and the West North Central States.

Among the larger cities reporting exceptional gains were Washington, D. C., and Arlington, Va.; Chicago, Ill.; New Orleans, La.; New York City, N. Y.; and Houston and San Antonio, Tex. A substantial drop occurred in San Francisco, Calif.; Portland, Oreg.; and in Dallas, Tex.

CONTRACTORS EMPLOY 164,000 MORE WORKERS IN APRIL

EXPENDITURES FOR ALL NEW CONSTRUCTION UP 9 PERCENT

The value of new construction put in place during April amounted to $1,269,000,000, an increase of 9 percent over the revised estimate for March, and 37 percent over April 1947, according to preliminary estimates of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor. Construction activity showed moderate gains in the month for all classes of work except privately financed nonresidential building.

Employment by construction contractors rose by 163,000 workers during April to 1,790,000, the highest level for any April since 1942. Compared with April 1947, employment in the industry was higher by 171,000 (11 percent). Privately financed new construction claimed four out of every five workers employed by contractors in April, and about two workers in five were employed on new nonfarm housing.

The most important gains in privately financed construction during April were for new homebuilding and public utilities. The $500,000,000 spent for housing was $25,000,000 over March expenditures. Privately owned public utilities spent $190,000,000 this April for new construction, a $14,000,000 increase over March.

More than half the advance in publicly financed construction last month occurred on highway work, for which the dollar volume totaled $80,000,000, $28,000,000 more than in the previous month. Expenditures for all publicly financed new construction in April, at $279,000,000, amounted to only a little over a fourth of the money spent for private work.

For the first 4 months of 1948, total expenditures for new construction amounted to $4,600,000,000 against $3,500,000,000 for the corresponding period of last year. Privately financed construction registered a 35-percent increase this year over last in the dollar volume of work put in place, resulting mostly from a $700,000,000, or 60 percent, rise in expenditures for new homes. Private work on new nonresidential building, at $1,000,000,000, was 5 percent higher this year than last for the first 4 months, in spite of a substantial decline in construction of new factories.

Secret Opposition to Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 4, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, many people have written me, expressing their opposition to the pending measure which seeks to afford Federal aid to our public schools.

Of course, many of the members of the teaching profession have written me, expressing their hearty approval of the bill. Likewise, many have been inspired to write me and other Members of Congress, where the inspiration was directly traceable to certain teachers' organizations and through parent-teacher associations of the country. Most of those who have written me in favor of the measure are prejudiced witnesses. They have a more or less selfish motive in favoring the bill. They want their own salaries increased, or that of their friends. This is not an argument in favor of Federal aid to education.

Everyone knows that, generally speaking, our teachers are underpaid. I am from a family of teachers. My mother, her sister, and their mother were all teachers. Several of my sisters-in-law have been, and are, teachers. My wife has been a teacher. All of these taught in the grade and junior and senior high schools. A brother of mine was a teacher in one of the leading universities of this country. I served many years as a member of the board of education where I lived. My daughter has a life certificate and did some teaching. I think I know the problem of the teacher, and particularly the economic situation which prevails in the teaching profession. I know they are not adequately paid. But this alone is not sufficient argument to justify Federal aid to education.

There is much secret opposition to Federal aid to education. Those who have written me most convincingly are generally opposed to the principle of Federal aid to education. In many instances these are school teachers who admit that they need the relief badly, but express themselves in opposition to the proposed plan. In some instances they belong to organizations which have gone on record as favoring the proposal, and have told me confidentially they could not afford to let their names be used as witnesses in opposition to the proposal, for they were afraid of the consequences. Even some superintendents and high school principals have written me expressing their sincere opposition to the program, but requesting that their names be not revealed.

In a list of questions which I submitted during the month of March this year to 35,000 boxholders in my district, without having addressed a single one personally, I asked if they favored or opposed Federal aid to education with any Government control. Thirty-nine percent of those who answered expressed themselves as in favor, while 61 percent answered in the negative. In each instance the ones who answered gave me their names and businesses or professions, and their addresses. It might be interesting to note that more than one-third of those who said they were teachers, expressed themselves in opposition to the pending measure. If any group of people should be expected to be in favor of Federal aid to education, we would naturally assume that it would be the people in the rural districts and in the smaller cities and towns, where the

weaker schools are located and where the lower salaries are being paid to teachers. These are the people to whom I sent the questions, the 35,000 boxholders of my district.

As an example of how some of these individuals who do not want their names used, express themselves frankly but confidentially, I quote from a highly respected businessman and citizen of one of the larger towns of my district. This letter was addressed to one of my colleagues, with a carbon copy sent to me. The letter is dated May 18, 1948. The author stated he preferred that his name not be revealed for the reason that his "daughter is a school teacher, and although she feels the same as I do, she has already encountered some personal animosity among her coworkers by reason of her views." The letter, which my constituent wrote to one of my colleagues of the House of Representatives, states, in part:

As a common, ordinary citizen and taxpayer, I am opposed to Federal aid for this purpose. In my judgment, our common schools should be managed by the school districts themselves without any Federal aid or interference. Frankly, I distrust Federal aid. We want our schools to remain purely local institutions, which would cease to be the fact if a paternalistic, bureaucratic department of education of the Federal Government attempted to dictate curriculum, policies, and so forth. Wouldn't that be a fine place for the infiltration of the subversive element? The only people I have found who strongly favor Federal aid to education are the school teachers and the politicians. The former want more money (which they should get by other means), and the latter want more political fields to exploit. I hope you will continue to resist the pressure.

It is inconceivable that people of the type of the author above quoted can be said to be prejudiced witnesses. They certainly must be admitted to be speaking their sincere convictions, even at the peril of possible repercussions and adverse criticisms. They speak against their own selfish interests, and ordinarily the testimony of such witnesses should be given the highest credence.

It is my humble opinion that many do not understand the program thoroughly, but that, generally speaking, the American people and the American taxpayers are inclined to be against further extensions of Federal grants-in-aid, subsidies, and other programs which they know or fear may result in the destruction of local self-government and the establishment of further bureaucratic domination from Washington.

Knights of Columbus Periodical, Columbia, Supports the Mundt-Nixon Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 4, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the June 1948 number of Columbia, a magazine published by the Knights of Columbus, supports the Mundt-Nixon bill. The article is as follows:

WHY YOU SHOULD SUPPORT H. R. 5852

In dealing with the Communist conspiracy against our Government and our people, there is the danger of falling into a state of mind in which we (1) automatically support anything the Commies oppose or, (2) automatically oppose anything they support. Such a habit of judgment, obviously, can lead us into absurd and untenable positions. The architects of the "party line" might conceivably, in a moment of savage hatred toward their own kind, denounce the man-eating shark: we could hardly endorse the monster on that account. Nor could we hold that it is good for the poor to starve simply because the Communists cry that the poor should have bread. Still, when the comrades give out with exceptionally loud cries of anguish, it is the part of prudence to look into what ails them and it is natural to entertain the hope that the affliction may be fatal, or thereabouts, to their plans for our future. What ails them at the moment is the Subversive Activities Control Act, 1948, which is also known as the Mundt-Nixon bill.

The purpose of the bill is to control the activities of the American Communist Party and its subsidiary organizations; the bill is based upon the conviction that our country can be better protected against the Communist conspirators in our midst by exposing them rather than by attempting to repress them. The principal provisions of the bill, which has, of course, been recklessly misrepresented by the Communist press, are as follows:

1. It makes unlawful, and punishable by heavy fine or imprisonment, or both, activities (including conspiracies) to establish, or looking toward the establishment of, a totalitarian dictatorship in the United States to be under foreign control.

2. It provides for loss of citizenship upon conviction for the offenses mentioned above.

3. It denies Federal employment and passports to members of Communist political organizations, which term it defines so as to include the Communist Party of the United States, or any other organization, existing or hereafter established, having essentially the same characteristics.

4. It requires registration with the Attorney General of Communist political organizations and Communist-front organizations. Such registration is to be accompanied by a statement, and annual reports thereafter, giving names and addresses of officers of the organizations; an accounting of receipts and expenditures; and, in the case of a Communist political organization (but not in the case of a Communist-front organzation), names and addresses of members.

5. It makes it unlawful for any individual to become or remain a member of a Communist political organization if the organization is not registered within the time prescribed.

6. It denies to any organization which is registered, or which has been ordered by the Attorney General to register, the use of the mails for circulating publications unless marked with the name of the organization and the fact that it is a Communist organization; it also denies to such organizations the privilege of broadcasting any matter over any broadcasting station unless it is preceded by a statement giving the name of the organization and the fact that it is a Communist organization.

7. It removes the so-called charitable-contributions deduction for Federal income tax purposes, of contributions to, or for the use of, an organization which at the time of making the contribution is registered or has been ordered by the Attorney General to register; it takes away the Federal income tax exemption of such organizations.

Reporting, from the Committee on Un-American Activities, on the need for legislation to control Communist activities in the United States, Congressman MUNDT has this to say:

"Ten years of investigation by the Committee on Un-American Activities, and by its predecessors, have established: (1) that the Communist movement in the United States is foreign-controlled; (2) that its ultimate objective with respect to the United States is to overthrow our free American institutions in favor of a Communist totalitarian dictatorship to be controlled from abroad; (3) that its activities are carried on by secret and conspiratorial methods; and (4) that its activities, both because of the alarming march of Communist forces abroad and because of the scope and nature of Communist activities here in the United States, constitute an immediate and powerful threat to the security of the United States and to the American way of life.

"The conclusion that the Communist movement constitutes a threat to the security of the United States and to the American way of life is not the cry of alarmists.

"The Communist program of conquest through treachery, deceit, infiltration, espionage, sabotage, corruption, and terrorism has been carried out in country after country and is an evergrowing threat in other countries. There is ample evidence that one of the primary objectives of the world Communist movement, directed from within the most powerful existing Communist totalitarian dictatorship, is to repeat this pattern in the United States.

"There is incontrovertible evidence of the fact that the Communist Party of the United States is dominated by such totalitarian dictatorship and that it is one of the principal instrumentalities used by the world Communist movement, directed from within that totalitarian dictatorship, in its ruthless and tireless endeavor to advance the world march of communism.

"Concern over this threat is not limited to the legislative branch of our Government. On March 17, 1948, the President asked the Congress to appropriate several billions of dollars to build up American defenses against the potential threat of the world Communist conspiracy, of which the Communist movement in the United States is a constituent element. Previously, on February 5 the Attorney General, in testifying before the Legislative Subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities, had stated that present laws were inadequate to deal with the subversive activities of the Communist threat in the United States. To resist Communist aggression abroad and ignore it at home would be an utterly inconceivable pattern of procedure.

"Concern over the Communist threat is not limited to the United States. It is mounting throughout that part of the world which still remains free. For confirmation we have only to look at the recent unprecedented steps taken by the leading nations of western Europe toward banding together in a union, political as well as economic, which will be powerful enough to resist the Communist onslaught. In this hemisphere the nations assembled at Bogota, on April 22, 1948, unanimously adopted a resolution declaring that the 'present world situation demands urgent measures to safeguard peace and defend mutual respect among States' and recommending that each participating nation 'adopt within their respective territories, and in accord with their constitutional precepts, necessary measures to prevent and uproot activities directed, assisted, or instigated by foreign governments, organizations, or individuals.'

"The Congress of the United States, by adopting the legislation here proposed, can set the pattern for controlling in each country the foreign-directed Communist conspir-

atorial activities which threaten the existence of free institutions, not only here, but throughout the world."

As expected, the Communists and their sympathizers and stooges are yelling bloody murder about the measures proposed in the Mundt-Nixon bill, officially known as H. R. 5852. Hating the light of day as the devil hates holy water, they are flooding Senators and Congressmen with their protests. It violates, they say, their tender democratic sensibilities; what they really fear is that it will force them out from under their rock.

Competent students of the legal angles involved concede that the proposed legislation departs from the traditional requirement that criminal guilt be personal and that it establishes the precedent of dividing our citizens into groups, more favored or less favored before the law because of their political associations. Some are of the opinion that some of the language of the bill should be tightened and clarified. But they are agreed that it is necessary legislation and that it is unobjectionable under our existing legal concepts.

That the framers of the bill were conscious of the delicacy of their task is clear from the remarks of Congressman MUNDT: "The committee approached the problem with care and restraint because it is believed essential that any legislation recommended be strictly in accordance with our constitutional traditions. How to protect freedom from those who would destroy it without infringing upon the freedom of all our people presents a question fraught with constitutional and practical difficulties. We must not mortally wound our democratic framework in attempting to protect it from those who threaten to destroy it."

The Subversive Activities Control Act, 1948, (H. R. 5852) is poison to the Communist conspirators against the people of the United States. Citizens should be prompted by their own self-interest, if by no other consideration, to let their Senators and Representatives know that they want this long-needed medicine compounded and administered.—J. D.

American Auto Workers Compete With European Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the bill for European economic recovery—Marshall plan—I pointed out that the 16 European countries aimed to achieve recovery to a degree comparable to the economy that prevailed in this country for the period 1940–44. That was a period when our industrial and agricultural production was in high gear to meet the demands of a wartime economy. Nevertheless the CEEC Report submitted by those countries was very frank in stating its objectives. At that time I raised the question as to what would happen to our own economy if these objectives were attained. Obviously this meant competition with our business and industrial concerns and this would affect the jobs of our workers and their standards of living. Now we have positive proof that such a situation is developing.

Two weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, the Ford Motor Co. of Detroit asked its workers to take a pay cut. The company said that such action would stabilize working conditions in the auto industry. The workers countered by demanding a rollback in prices. Last week the Ford Motor Co., Ltd., of England, announced that the British-made Ford is now available to the public at American dealers. In other words, while Ford at Detroit was asking its workers to take a cut in pay, its English company is competing for the same market in this country. Notwithstanding extra shipping costs, that company can still meet American competition because there is a considerable difference in the standards of living between the two groups of workers.

Mr. Speaker, on last Wednesday the Austin Motor Co. of England claimed a new record for selling imported automobiles in the United States. The managing director of that company announced that nearly 6,000 British-made Austins had been sold in this country in the past 6 months. In any previous year, not more than 1,000 Austins were sold here.

Mr. Speaker, American dollars under the European recovery program should not be used to undercut our own auto workers and thereby reduce their standards of living. If American firms with European branches resort to such practices it might easily wreck our economy, cause unemployment, and a depression. Our first duty is to the workers of this country.

To End an Injustice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, there is steadily accumulating evidence of widespread support for the principle embodied in H. R. 5004, now replaced by H. R. 6809, which will eliminate racial discrimination in American nationality and immigration law. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial recently published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

TO END AN INJUSTICE

The Judd bill is one which Congress ought to pass, if only to discharge a moral obligation incurred during the war. This measure, on which hear ag- were held the other day, would provide the privilege of becoming naturalized citizens to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence in the United States. It also would make immigration quotas available to Asiatic and Pacific peoples.

As Representative JUDD of Minnesota said in introducing the bill, it would admit only a few hundred more Asiatics a year. The important thing about it is that it would confer the right to vote and the full protection of the law on persons to many of whom the Nation is deeply indebted.

As an example, Mr. JUDD cited the case of Mrs. Munemori. Her son Sadao, was a member of the famous four hundred and forty-second regimental combat team which so brilliantly distinguished itself in Italy. He was one of its heroes who did not come back. Yet his mother, though qualified in every other way, is denied citizenship.

Similar examples were cited by President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights which urged the modification of the Federal naturalization laws to permit the granting of citizenship without regard to the race, color, or national origin of applicants. In the past, barriers against Chinese, Filipinos, natives of India and other peoples were pulled down. So it is hard to understand why the bars are kept up against those of Japanese origin.

And they are the chief victims of this form of discrimination just now. According to the latest figures—those of June 30, 1943—there are 90,251 of them out of only 96,485 persons living in the United States but ineligible for citizenship. The next largest group is made up of 3,521 Koreans. The other groups—Afghans, Malalyans, Siamese, British and French Pacific Islanders, Guanamanians, Javanese, Sumatrans and Netherlands Indians—number only between 111 and 288 each.

Unfortunately, there has been an increase of racist legislation in some of the States since VJ-day. But if individual States have forgotten why the war was fought, there is all the more reason for the Federal Government by its example to remind them. Not to pass the Judd bill would be a denial of the American tradition of equality of opportunity, and a sad blot on a Nation whose representatives in foreign parts are preaching democracy morning, noon, and night.

Indian Office Abuses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Tulsa Daily World of Tulsa, Okla., under date of May 28, 1948:

INDIAN OFFICE ABUSES

Effective treatment for the ailing Indian Service of the United States seem about to be adopted. The principal remedy will be abolition by sections.

It appears that a frontal attack on the Bureau will come about through ostensibly local matters. The Indian office at Oklahoma City is now under attack in Congress, and Representative STIGLER, of the east side, an Indian himself, seems to be making a hot fight. The branch office may be worse than useless. It is not located where the Indians are; it is apparently not giving Indians adequate service. Certainly, it is costing the Government a lot of money, and it should be required to justify, if possible, its existence.

Troubles have been building up for many years. The Indian Bureau was long overloaded with personnel, and it has become one of the big job-holding establishments of the Nation. It is big and costly beyond ordinary understanding. The useless branches are manifestations of the whole topheaviness and uselessness.

John Collier started much of the troubles we now experience. Collier was a glowing New Dealer, an industrious do-gooder. He

went in with grandiloquent ideas and rigged up a gorgeous set of rules for the Indians and black denunciations for the white people. He undertook, in effect, to prolong the tribal and reservation status. The policy ostensibly had been, before this time, to make the Indian a full-time citizen. The Collier administration was a throw-back.

It is well known to all who have any particular acquaintance with the race that Indians distinctly want to be left alone. They resent excessive herding and catering and bossing and rounding-up. The feeling of the country toward the Indians is generally benevolent; we acknowledge obligations and want to see the Indian people prosperous and contented. The spreading opinion is that officialdom is throwing the whole movement in reverse, and that the officiousness we now see is anachronistic, hobbling, and parasitic.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Interior Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee appointed me as chairman of appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Indian activities to recommend appropriations for the fiscal year 1949. As such chairman, I was called upon to draft the portion of the report applicable to appropriations for Indian activities. In the report, among other things, I state:

As a result of the actual inspection by the committee last fall of numerous Indian agencies, schools, hospitals, and other installations, and as a result of numerous hearings on Indian affairs, out in the field and here in Washington, it is believed that the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and its operations in the central office, the district offices, and the reservation offices, are subject to severe criticism.

The report then deals with the paternalistic control exercised by the Bureau of Indian Affairs over Indians, which may be charged up largely to Mr. Collier, former Commissioner of Indian Affairs, as pointed out in the above editorial.

Then the report deals with Indian activities, particularly education, vocational training, law and order, health, welfare, overlapping governmental functions, and maladministration.

Under the subject of overlapping governmental functions, the report recites:

Certainly money can be saved, and it is believed efficiency promoted and more desirable results obtained, by the elimination of these overlapping activities, which will result in the placing of our Indian citizens on the level with all other citizens, the elimination of class distinction, and the encouragement of the Indian to assume his full citizenship responsibilities.

In the lists of conclusions and recommendations in the report, the committee states:

There are many other instances of what seemed to the committee to be intolerable delays and inexcusable cases of procrastination in the processing and handling of the affairs of Indians in the agency, district, and central offices. More efficient service is expected at the central office and at the reservation or agency offices. It is believed that the district offices are unnecessary and that the functions and expeditious handling of the affairs of Indians can be improved and will be improved with the elimination of the district offices. More authority should be extended to the superintendents and others at the reservation or service level, which will enable the central offices to supervise and determine policies and expedite formal approvals required by law of the central office.

Air Service to Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 4, 1948

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Aeronautics Board for more than 4 long years has had under consideration the question of granting an air-line franchise for the operation of air passenger and express service between the Pacific Northwest and Hawaii.

The people of Hawaii want this air service. The people of Seattle, Tacoma, Portland, and the entire Pacific Northwest repeatedly had plead for establishment of it. This air service would benefit both the Islands and the Pacific Northwest.

Eight hundred miles south of the Pacific Northwest there is air service between San Francisco and Hawaii. Also there is an air line operating farther south from Los Angeles to the islands.

While the Civil Aeronautics Board has fiddled away time in indecision and procrastination, a British-financed air service has been inaugurated from Vancouver, B. C., to Hawaii via California.

Four years is long enough to consider this problem. There is no sense in further delay. CAB should act and act at once on the application for a Pacific Northwest to Hawaii air service.

I include in the RECORD an editorial from the Honolulu Star Bulletin published May 20, 1948, and reprinted May 27, 1948, in the Seattle Post Intelligencer, indicating that these two great newspapers favor the establishment of this air service. I believe the views of these two great newspapers are the views of almost everyone in both the Islands and the Pacific Northwest. The editorial follows:

NERO IN THE AIR AGE

This long delay in settling the Pacific-Northwest-Hawaii air route issue reminds us of Nero and his famous fiddle.

According to the story, Rome started to burn. Instead of calling out his fire department and turning on the water from the Tiber, Nero put on a fresh nightshirt (they called it a toga in those days), crowned himself with another wreath of laurel, climbed puffily up to his palatial housetop with his fiddle, and settled down happily with the fiddle and a jug of good old Falernian wine.

Five-sixths of Rome flamed and flared and burned to the ground, and Nero went blissfully on, fiddling and sipping, sipping and fiddling.

Later biographers and historians say that the story is incorrect. Some say that Nero was not that kind of gent and others that long before the fire started, he was already under the covers, blooey and blotto, the Falernian jug quite empty.

Whatever the facts, Nero gets credit in persistent legend for fiddling while a great city perished.

For more than 4 years, we have been trying to get direct air service between the Pacific Northwest and Hawaii.

For the past 2 years they've been playing the fiddle in Washington.

Meanwhile other air services have been established, and are flourishing.

One of these almost parallels the proposed route from Seattle and Portland to Honolulu.

It runs from Vancouver, B. C., right down the coast to California, then off to the southwest to Honolulu, then south to Australia.

This is a British-backed company. And while it is under some restrictions about picking up passengers and freight in United States territory, its service is quite well recognized as a threat to any United States company which takes the Northwest-Hawaii certificate.

Month after month, year after year, the Civil Aeronautics Board has been considering and cogitating, discussing and delaying.

Finally it got around to making a recommendation to the President.

After awhile the recommendation was back in its lap, sent by Mr. Truman for further study.

Further study! Ye gods and little fins and propellers! How much more study is needed before the CAB can act!

Every day that drags along without decision serves to emphasize the discrimination against the trade interests of the Pacific Northwest and Hawaii that ought now to be served by direct air facilities.

President Truman is to be in Seattle, June 10.

The business groups of Seattle, Portland, Tacoma, and Spokane hope to meet with him there, and impress on him the need for action. Hawaii should reinforce those groups with another, the latest of many, requests for immediate and final decision on the route and the carrier.

This fiddling has gone on long enough.

If We Ask for War We Will Get It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 4, 1948

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, John Jay, the most brilliant strategist of Revolutionary War days in the field of foreign affairs, wrote in the Federalist as follows:

The number of wars which have happened or will happen in the world will always be found to be in proportion to the number and weight of the causes, whether real or pretended, which provoke or invite them.

In the modern vernacular, this would be expressed in a sentence on this order: "If you keep asking for it, you are going to get it."

The Democratic Party kept asking for war and finally got it in 1941. Three months ago, through one of those causes—whether real or pretended—the Democratic President virtually asked for war again. He called Russia by name and branded it an aggressor, although, as postwar history plainly proves, Russia has taken not 1 square inch of territory President Roosevelt at Yalta and President Truman at Potsdam did not virtually invite Russia to take.

A week or so ago, the President of the Polish-American Congress declared that President Roosevelt sold Poland down the Volga. Every person who could—and did—read carefully the signs of the times after Yalta knew that to be true 3 years ago. Republican Congressmen—

and your Congressman was among them—pointed out that this Nation had virtually invited Russia to take over middle Europe, thus leaving the way clear for the Red tide of conquest to sweep the entire continent.

Since that time, the United States has spent billions upon billions of dollars on so-called plans to stop communism. All that was needed was one ounce of foresight.

At Potsdam, President Truman had one last chance to stop that red tide of conquest let loose at Yalta. But did he take great diplomats, great historians, or great foreign affairs strategists along to help him? No. He took along Clark Clifford, who resembles Van Johnson but has less chance of success in government than Johnson has in the movies. He took along Jake Vardaman. He took along Ed Pawley. That was the Missouri crowd. Well versed in ward heeling, they were tragically inept at the intricacies of global planning. They allowed Stalin to trade them out of our victory—and then drank vodka with him.

The results of Potsdam now are clear. The United States was given the poorest portion of Germany—and even agreed to dismantle that portion, the machinery either to be shipped to Russia or destroyed. We are paying more billions to correct that blunder.

Now, months after he tried to promote another war, President Truman has read the public-opinion polls and has decided that the American people do not want war. They want peace. He is talking peace at every stop on his so-called "nonpolitical" tour of the country. This is the same Truman who was talking war only a short while ago.

John Jay, the long-dead seer, was right. Wars are brought on by the causes, real or pretended, which provoke them. We Americans had better be careful about the kind of President we get next time, even about the kind of Vice President. We might get into a war by a pretended cause. That kind serves the purpose of a certain kind of politician as well as a real cause.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 4, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under consent, I am inserting in the RECORD an extremely able article from one of New York's most influential Yiddish-language newspapers, the Day, as published in the June 1 issue.

This editorial was written by the capable and widely known editor of the Day, Mr. S. Dingol. I want to endorse what he says, most emphatically, and to express the hope that all Members, and especially the members of the Committees on Foreign Affairs and on Appropriations, will read this cogent article:

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OUR FOREIGN POLICY?

(By S. Dingol, editor, the Day, New York)

The actions of our Diplomatic Representative at the Security Council of the United Nations during the debate of the Palestine resolution last week is so incomprehensible that it justly merits a congressional investigation.

What happened at the Security Council Saturday, May 29, is not only an insult to the United States, but it also contains an element of danger for the future of our country. The danger is that instead of the respect we enjoy in other countries, and their looking to us for leadership, we might be turned into the laughingstock of the world, and even the high value of our currency may not help in the deflation of our poor diplomacy.

I shall not dwell again on our major diplomatic error in calling for a special session of the United Nations Assembly for the purpose of voiding a decision which we urged other nations to vote for just a few months previously. We called for the United Nations Special Assembly ostensibly for two purposes;

(a) to urge the UN Assembly to withdraw its resolution on the partition of Palestine, voted on November 29, last, and

(b) to place Palestine under a United Nations trusteeship.

After weeks of debate, it turned out that the United States had no specific plan for trusteeship, but only "a working paper" fit for a high-school debate, and the United Nations Assembly rightly refused to change its vote on partition.

And so the whole purpose of calling the special session of the United Nations Assembly failed.

Our private appeals to the Jews to refrain from proclaiming a Jewish state, to the neighboring Arab states not to invade Palestine, met with no greater success. The Jews of Palestine realized, after 5 months of fighting, that if they would not proclaim their own state at the time the British will give up the mandate, Palestine would become either an Arab state or a British colony. Again our policy of appeasement to the British and the Arabs suffered a major defeat.

To retrieve the fortunes of American diplomacy, President Truman acted quickly and decisively by giving de facto recognition to the Jewish state of Israel 20 minutes after it was founded.

There is evidence that the State Department was not consulted by the President on this move. Our United Nations representative, Mr. Warren Austin, was surprised when he learned about our recognition of Israel while he was addressing UN Security Council.

The President's timely and courageous act as well as his invitation to the newly elected President of Israel, Dr. Chaim Weitzmann, to the White House, bore fruit also in England.

Almost simultaneously with the introduction of Mr. Austin's resolution in the UN Security Council, naming the Arab states as aggressors, and calling upon both sides in Palestine for a truce, within 36 hours, the two most influential papers in London, the London Times and the Daily Mail, as well as the Manchester Guardian, called on the British Government to revise its Palestine policy and recognize the Jewish provisional government.

For some strange reason our representative at the UN turned this major United States diplomatic victory into an ignominious defeat.

It began with an objection by Sir Alexander Cadogan, British representative to the UN, to the term "provisional Jewish Government," which Mr. Austin named in his resolution. Sir Alexander was not sure that such a government is in existence; he wasn't sure that the Arab States who invaded Palestine were aggressors. In fact, he wasn't sure of anything, except that the resolution submitted by Mr. Austin was not the right kind of a resolution.

Instead of our representative insisting that there is a Jewish Government in Palestine, which is proven by the fact that the President of the United States recognized it, Mr. Austin immediately succumbed to the suggestion that the term "Jewish Government" be eliminated and "the Jewish and Arab authorities" be substituted.

The United States resolution, watered down pretty much to suit the British, was finally adopted by the Security Council, and both sides to the conflict in Palestine were called upon to lay down their arms, or else.

The Jews accepted the UN Security Council's call for a true and the Arabs rejected it. But, instead of the United States delegate now pressing for action against the aggressors, he failed to call for anything.

Mr. Austin permitted the Soviet delegate, Mr. Gromyko, to introduce a resolution calling upon the Security Council to take action against the aggressor party, in conformity with the UN Charter. That was on Thursday, May 27. Simultaneously with the Russian, the British delegate introduced a resolution calling once more for a truce, this time for a week.

Friday morning, May 28, our representative, Mr. Warren Austin, announced the United States support of the Russian resolution. Seven votes were needed for its passage. We were sure of five—our own vote and that of Soviet Russia and of the Soviet Ukraine, as well as the votes of France and Colombia, who previously announced their support of stronger action.

But, strange to say, our representative did nothing to acquire the additional two votes needed for the passage of the resolution which we supported. Furthermore, on that fatal Saturday morning, Mr. Austin did not say a single word in support of the resolution. He merely let it go down to defeat, and immediately switched his support to the British resolution.

And so the British again scored a diplomatic victory over the United States of America.

No one who watched the session of the Security Council would believe that it was impossible for the United States of America to gain two more votes in support of the United States of America-Soviet Russia resolution. No one could understand why Mr. Austin did not call for an immediate adjournment of the meeting after the U. S. S. R. resolution failed so as to realine his forces and review his strategy. It was not the defeat of a resolution; it was the defeat of American diplomacy, talking high and acting low, which hurt.

Nation Wants Action on Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 4, 1948

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out in a recent speech, Congress ought to go into the whole subject of excise taxes before adjournment, for it is obvious to all tax authorities that many of these excises are grossly unfair to the affected industries and to the consumers of the United States.

I pointed out that the stove manufacturers in my district were complaining because the excise taxes fall heaviest upon them in a time of declining demand for their product. I pointed out that

many other types of business are being penalized, and, in effect, being held back by the Government itself from rendering the best possible service at the most reasonable possible price.

Within a week of my speech, Mr. Speaker, I had received letters from all sections of the United States commending me upon my stand. As every member of the House Committee on Ways and Means knows, the interest in these excise taxes is extremely great, particularly among the industries primarily effected. But there are plenty of consumers also interested in these excises, for such a tax as this falls heaviest upon the poor man who must buy his commodities, or services, now, while the luckier and richer portion of the populace may have obtained its stove, or other needs subjected to heavy excises, long before the higher 20 percent rate went into effect.

Among those writing to me were many hotel men, including several from my own State of Michigan. These hotel men are interested especially in the excise tax that applies to dine and dance rooms in their establishments. They have seen revenue fall steadily since 1946 and they attribute this declining revenue to the fact that a lot of citizens have taken to eating elsewhere to dodge the excise tax, which is 20 percent.

Like other Members of the House, I have received some very interesting supplementary information about the excise tax that affects hotel dining rooms and night clubs operated in connection with established hostelries. This information comes from hotel men themselves and from officials of the various labor unions whose members have been effected seriously by the operations of this particular excise tax.

We are told, for instance, that revenues to the Federal Government from roof garden and cabaret tax returns for August 1947, were $1,761,852.40 under revenues from the same source for the same month in 1946. According to hotel men, who should know if anybody does, the revenue is still falling on this phase of their operations, and the tax collected is bound to get lower and lower. One hotel man has told me that it is his considered opinion that the Federal Government, in the long haul, would obtain more revenue from a smaller excise tax rate on service in hotel dining rooms and night clubs than the Government will obtain from the present tax.

Mr. Speaker, as we all realize, there were excise taxes before World War II, but the rates then in effect were trivial compared to those we enacted to help finance our gigantic war effort. What we in Congress did at that time, hastily, proved to be useful for a period. But many of the excise taxes have outlived their usefulness, and I know that I express the belief of many thoughtful tax students when I state that excise taxes must be made to fit better into the general tax picture. They must be lowered in some instances and repealed entirely in others.

The hotel men of the United States cannot afford to converge on Washington to impress us with their demands. They are dignified, hard-working executives, busy with their own large enterprises. Yet, they have written to us and they have made their story clear to each of us. We in Congress ought to give them some action on this excise-tax situation as soon as we can, and I know I speak for many of my colleagues when I say the sooner the better.

The statistics which have been furnished me—and I have no reason to dispute them—reveal pretty conclusively that hotels are suffering a great injustice by the excise tax as it applies today. Hotels are big business and must keep records for all parties to see—their stockholders, the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and representatives of other Government agencies and taxing authorities. They have been collecting and remitting the vast majority of the funds collected by the Government from this tax. With all due regards to the owners of night clubs and other eating places which have music and dancing, we all are familiar with the fact that many of these places open and close intermittently, likely keep no adequat- records, and fail to remit to Uncle Sam plenty of money due him in taxes.

This process causes unfair competition for the established, tax-paying, public-spirited hotel men of the United States. It makes them wonder if honesty and integrity pay off, or whether the Government itself is not trying to encourage poor service at the expense of men who want to give the best possible service. Thousands of musicians, chefs, waiters, and other hotel dining-room employees either have lost their jobs already or face the loss of their jobs through the workings of the so-called cabaret-excise tax.

Some hotels have lost as much as 85 percent of the patronage in their dine and dance rooms, when 1946 totals are compared with 1948 totals. We all realize that some of this drop in patronage can be attributed to the ending of the war emergency, but most of us know that hotel men are probably right when they maintain that much of this loss of patronage is due to the workings of the excise tax.

This tax, in effect, adds an extra $1 cover charge for every $5 a customer spends in one of these dining rooms. You and I know that there are many times in a person's life when he must entertain his friends, constituents, or members of his family in a hotel dining room or cabaret. Why should such persons be penalized by their own Government on the food they eat? Other Americans, eating elsewhere, do not have to pay this 20-percent supercover charge. It is palpably unfair and I am sure that most Americans agree with me that it is unfair.

Public Housing—Disastrous Here and Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 4, 1948

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise again in support of freedom as the source of housing for the low-income group. I am in unqualified opposition to the Taft-Ellender-Wagner public housing bill which forsakes freedom and resorts to the compulsions of the authoritarian governments to house the people. I propose to show that such public-housing schemes are fraudulent in their promises to the poor and ruinous to our free economy that alone can build houses and cure society of its slums. Besides, government housing brings political corruption by the exchange of tenants' votes for low rents. It leads in the nature of things to government bribery of investors and must lead, as the sad experience of a lost Europe now proves, to a firmly entrenched state socialism, totally contradictory to everything which we think of as American freedom and American self-government. We believe that if the American edifice of constitutional liberty is good at all it must be good all the way through. It cannot stand part good and part bad as a source of housing.

I thought the Members might want to hear the following news story from Socialist England and her public-housing bureaucracy. On May 5, 1948, the New York Times carried the following news release:

BRACKNELL, ENGLAND, May 4.—The Government called off today the crews that were wrecking the 4-room cottage built by Leslie Kirby without a local permit.

The Ministry of Town and Country Planning stopped the demolition after neighbors had petitioned Prime Minister Attlee and had considered appealing to King George. Local authorities were instructed by the Ministry to wait until Mr. Kirby could tell his side of the story.

Mr. Kirby, a carpenter, had used his life savings and his own hands to build the dwelling, in which he lived with his wife, son, and an ailing mother-in-law. However, the Easthampstead Rural Council, ordering its demolition, said he should have had a permit.

Thus, if Mr. Kirby's story proves satisfactory to the Minister of Town and Country Planning of the British Socialists, he may be allowed to live in the house he built with his own hands out of his own savings. Liberty may be in this one case exempted from the workings of arbitrary compulsory socialism now fastened on all the land and housing of England.

For centuries the Englishman's home was his castle. Even the King could not enter, nor the whole of Scotland Yard, without a court order. But three short decades of Government housing and rehabilitation have broken down the benefit of centuries of English liberty.

This bill proposes that we as a people travel down the same road of shackled personal liberties. We are already far down that road.

THE PROPOSED U. S. A. HOUSING BILL

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill provides for a public expenditure by the Federal Government of $7,000,000,000. This is on top of the present United States Government commitments in housing that have already reached the appalling total of $20,000,000,000 in subsidies, loans, and guaranties.

The bill permits the United States Public Housing Administration to keep as a revolving fund $800,000,000 which

was to have been repaid to the United States Treasury. Aside from this, the bill creates new loans of three-quarters of a billion dollars. And what is worse, to induce private capital to quit private investments and become investors in government public housing, the Government guarantees interest and amortization and assures the return of 90 percent of the investment.

The bill promises investors in Government housing exemption from all Federal income taxes. The Government will also force the local municipalities to exempt the housing projects themselves from all municipal taxation. The Government promises further that taxpayers who get no benefit from the housing shall be compelled to pay the additional taxes necessary to make all these promises good and pay besides the expenses for the schools, fire protection, street lights, police, and other municipal services for the benefit of the Government housing tenants and their children, and for the benefit of the investors in their projects.

Thus the investors are neatly relieved from all risk and all need of exercising any judgment or responsibility for the future. They can just leave everything to Government. They get interest guaranteed on certificates of participation in state socialism, not investments in a free economy. The Government assumes all the risk and exercises all the power over their property.

So, tenants are housed and their housing is financed and the taxpayers are compelled by Washington to pay the bill in exactly the same way it has all been done in socialized Berlin, Vienna, London, and Moscow. House building always slows down under government. In some countries it stops entirely. So the government merely appropriates and redistributes what has already been built. For example, in France there is no new building at all. Tenants vote for the kind of rents they like to pay under government control, sometimes as low as 2 percent of their income. They sue for damages to their furniture from leaky roofs. So owners abandon their property as a liability.

FREE ECONOMY PUT TO DEATH

Many proponents of this legislation openly admit that this bill puts our Government permanently into the business of housing and that hereafter all housing will be affected if not controlled by it.

When government goes into housing freedom must go out the door. There can be no competition with government because it can finance itself by robbing the people and calling it power of taxation. The free market in building material and labor disappears because government pays prices private investors cannot meet.

Government fixes rents at a fraction of what they should be and pays the deficits in operation by more taxation.

Obviously private investors cannot compete with such government rents and they enjoy no privileges to make good their losses through "legal" robbery to get finances. Nor can they be kept in business by votes of people who get in return the favors of housing.

Besides private investors cannot make plans or take chances for the future in competition with government because it is impossible to predict what arbitrary government will do next year and the next. Housing requires long-time financing for 10 or 20 years or more. They must try to foresee what the free market will be. When government comes in, there is no free market. A private investor cannot plan when a government corrupts the people by giving them favors in financing building contracts, high wages in government projects, and low rents all in return for votes. What such a government will do is unpredictable. It may decide at any time to rob owners of houses privately financed in favor of tenants and call the business rent control. It imposes rent control on its competitors, the private investors, but imposes none for itself. Then it accuses private industry of falling down.

When government goes out of its proper sphere of protecting and maintaining freedom it becomes an absolute monopoly free of any limitations or legal responsibility. It manipulates its business safe in the knowledge that it is a law to itself.

It has been the culprit that has created the shortage in houses that has accumulated since 1933. It has itself hamstrung private enterprise.

It now proposes to put to death all free competitive effort by removing all incentive or opportunity of the investor or builder in competition with the all powerful, corrupt, monopolistic government.

The investor tries to save what he can by liquidating and quitting the business on the best terms he can get. As a result the government compulsions and ownership of European statism are substituted for private enterprise which is charged with failure to build for the poor.

Now, who are the low-income or poor families involved? Which political party will select them and vote them and their dependents in on the deal is not disclosed. In fact, one of the neatest deceptions used to build public emotional support for this $7,000,000,000 burden is to advertise that it is a gift to the poor or the low-income families. The latter phrase turns out to be a totally vague if not meaningless expression, when we recall how a judge of the supreme court in New York recently ruled that $4,500 is low income and that tenants cannot be put out of public housing merely because they have annual incomes of that size. These $4,500 income families are being supported through taxation of millions of families having very much lower incomes and not favored by Government housing. Thus the low-income families become exploited by the Government itself. Government is no longer the protector of equal rights and opportunities. It ignores with impunity the constitutional limitations protecting the individual from the compulsions of government to house whosoever the party in power selects to house.

To innocent worshipers of the goodness of Government's management of us, the phrase "low-income group" suggests the very needy, those who are making the hardest struggle, under the greatest handicaps. But the casual workers, the unskilled and the unemployable, the sick, the aged, and low-paid workers do not get into public housing because, even with tax exemption and subsidies, Government housing rents are too high for them. The Government refuses them shelter and turns out to be a tough landlord.

Gen. John Thomas Taylor, representative of the American Legion, told a joint committee of the House and Senate that veterans, particularly disabled veterans, were receiving less consideration than was extended to other "low-income families." He said many of the 2,000,000 disabled veterans who had really low incomes, could not get into public-housing projects. In my district in the city of Yonkers, N. Y., is Mulford Gardens, a 550-family unit Government house. A family of four earning more than $1,700 cannot qualify for an apartment. That is what the law says. But 275 families, half of the 550 families, have incomes running above this legal minimum and up to $8,000.

The Fred F. French Co., managers of Knickerbocker Village, built with RFC aid, says that they have many apartments in this low-rent building occupied by tenants with very large incomes. When they tried to make the over-income tenants move, so the space could be rented to low-income veterans, the tenants went to court, and the court upheld them.

It should not surprise us, therefore, to learn that the joint committee actually brought out that relief families are turned away from public housing. The proportion of truly destitute families that get into public-housing projects is very low in every city, less than 15 percent on the average.

In many localities with relief families, there is not one of them in the housing projects which ostensibly were built for them.

I am well aware—

Said Senator McCARTHY, vice chairman—

of the reasons why it is not desirable to segregate relief families in a few areas, but the proponents of public housing do not seem to realize how logically that proves there should not be any publicly subsidized housing at all.

The public housers, most of whom are on the Government pay rolls or creatures of Government favors themselves, claim they are especially concerned that all children shall have a fair chance, including a decent place in which to live. But they do not mean the children of the unemployed, the sick, and the disabled veterans because such unfortunate citizens cannot pay operating and maintenance costs which are too high in Government housing. If public housing could give us additional houses above the rate now being built, which it cannot, or if it could give us cheaper housing, which it cannot, or if it could build and operate houses at a profit which it never does, even then the only justification for it would be to help the really poor and needy. Instead they are turned away and favored tenants who can pay higher rents to the Government landlord are chosen.

It should be noted, also, that the preponderance of tenants in Government housing who are not poor or needy is no accident of the war, nor is it in any sense

a temporary phenomenon. It is a characteristic and an inevitable byproduct of public housing in every country. The available facts prove that skilled workers, small tradesmen, professional people, and especially Government officials and party voters always manage to get a large share of the Government dwellings when this form of political patronage is handed out. Besides that, at the core of many of these projects are the Socialists and Communists nicely bedded down with low rents and compensated besides in Government jobs while they agitate, organize, and lead the other tenants in the agitation for more plunder and corruption of government.

The Harness committee on the use of propaganda by Government found that the tenants of Government housing were organized in San Diego and Oakland, Calif., by their inner cores so thoroughly that the vote was as high as 100 to 1 in favor of the candidates for Congress belonging to the political party that had built the houses.

Both in this country and abroad the cruel fact is that the very low-income families must continue to pay rent and pay their share of the local municipal taxes as well as their share of the annual central government's evergrowing budget. It is precisely this budget which actually contributes the subsidies enjoyed by their more fortunate neighbors, the government tenants. So government itself becomes, as it always tends to become, the one over-all exploiter and plunderer of the people. It pretends to but never relieves the poor. Instead government management increases the number and miseries of the poor.

PUBLIC HOUSING—A DISASTROUS FAILURE IN EUROPE

The governments of Europe finally gave up the idea of government subsidies for housing, because their experiences after 1918 were uniformly disastrous. Subsidies did not produce more houses. They did not produce houses for the poor, remove slums, or dry up disease. But they were a dangerous drain on the treasury. New subsidies were abandoned after 1925, but treasury payments for the old subsidies will continue unabated until 1980. Only the English tried subsidies on a large scale. Their failure has been the more disastrous. The real English housing boom came in the thirties, after the government had been taken out of the housing picture, and it was entirely the product of private construction, and private financing.

The famous Swedish housing program involved no government subsidies. Swedish housing is the best in the world because it is the freest in the world. Credit goes to the Swedish cooperatives but not to government as is so widely and so falsely represented by socialist writers in America. The German and Austrian housing schemes did not benefit the very poor. They seriously upset the public finances.

The glamorous pictures of European public housing have been painted by paid American propagandists for public housing. The whole literature in America on this subject is so false and misleading as to be incredible. It can be explained only by the uniformity of illusion and deception that comes to men and women whose hopes are in promises of the false gods known as communism and socialism. Europeans are now under no illusion that government has solved—or even partly solved—the housing problem. Their misery, however, is not relieved by disillusion. There is no hope in government housing. It is common practice for the French people to visit daily the funeral parlors to ascertain were vacant space may be. France suffered very little from bombing. Decades of socialism have destroyed the capacity and incentive to build. She suffers from 33 years of rent control.

Public housing was used as the central highway on which Socialist cabinets and parliaments and dictators rode to power in Europe. Votes of the tenants organized by the Socialists and Communists, always in goodly numbers in the public-housing projects, were delivered to the candidates who promised more public housing, more papering and painting and landscaping, and lower rents than opposition candidates could honestly promise.

The story of public housing in Europe is so juicy, so total in failure, so full of corruption and misery and yet so effective a vehicle for the Socialist and Communist technique of grabbing control of political power in nation after nation, that our Senate and House must send a joint commission to study it and tell our people about it instead of imitating the disaster in Europe. We ought to observe in Vienna the remains of the grand experiment in building the great tiers of Marxhoffs and Englehofls. They were heralded around the world 25 years ago as the last word in enlightened public housing for the underprivileged. When the Nazis came over from Germany, they looked around to count the strength of the Socialist Party. They found them nicely housed in the government housing. So in the middle of the night the Nazis turned their artillery on the Marx and Engel houses and thus disposed of the Socialist Party.

We should study public housing abroad to enable us to decide at home which of our political parties shall occupy the houses and which shall use the artillery if that madness is to come upon us too.

THE LONG-TERM ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED GOVERNMENT HOUSING MEASURE

Under the proposed bill, the Government promises to build 500,000 new homes for low-income families. We are told there are 11,000,000 low-income families but the bill does not tell us which low-income families will be selected. The bill promises to clear some slums but does not state which slums in which States or cities. All this is to be done by taxation—the payment of which forces many families with incomes just above the low-income group to fall into that group, thus increasing rather than decreasing the low-income groups and the slums. Incomes barely sufficient for the support of millions are reduced by taxation in order to benefit Government tenants. All of the present 11,000,000 low-income families will be taxed to support the 500,000 selected tenants. Thus 10,500,000 families will find themselves with still lower incomes and no better housing to show for it.

Appropriations of seven billions or more out of the taxpayer's money for the USPHA, means vast immediate deductions from the private funds which taxpaying workers, contractors, and owners are now using to meet the housing need by voluntary building. The money merely changes owners. Loaded down with prohibitive taxation fewer citizens can afford to become home owners. But the worst feature is that Government by taking over 10 percent of the Nation's housing does not leave 90 percent for the improvement of private industry. On the contrary, the Government's power over 10 percent covers and smothers the whole economy. Individuals, private firms, corporations without the Government's power of exempting some from taxation and compelling others to pay interest, amortization, and carrying charges are unable to build and rent houses that must themselves pay taxes, amortization, interest, and carrying charges. Such houses simply cannot rent or sell in competition with a Government housing system. The two kinds of business cannot mix.

The logic of things demands that a national economy must either be all government or all free. That is the great tragic lesson which Americans should learn from the socialist experiment which has now turned the whole British economy into one bureaucratic nightmare of control over land, building, import, export, wages, prices, and persons. Will we learn or will we march into that kind of economic slavery with both eyes open?

As Congressman GAMBLE, the chairman of the joint committee, so ably points out, this bill with all its billions cannot add one extra carpenter or plasterer or apprentice, not one additional nail, 2 by 4, or a piece of plumbing, above what is now being provided for and used by private builders. As more men and material become available, they too will be used, without any housing bill.

When a political party which runs the Government controls 10 percent of the house construction, as this bill contemplates, it bids up the price of carpenters, bricklayers, nails, lumber, plumbing, and land, and all materials and workers and credit beyond the reach of private persons. Even now we are witnessing how 70 percent of all house building in this country is controlled and dependent upon Government insurance and GI loans.

If some lenders are insured by government, all others want to be. This is true in spite of the fact that there is four times more money in circulation than ever before. Since government must treat all alike or at least pretend to do so, it cannot leave any lender or builder to take his own risk.

On the other side, the unions complain that the trade is full of "brush men" or men who learned a smattering of their trade on Government war work or on WPA. Why should skilled men do a better job? So all production is slowed down to the level of the mediocre. Reward according to production is taken away. Contractors can no longer figure costs with any certainty and therefore cannot agree to any contract. They work on the

basis of cost-plus. Whatever, the cost is, the taxpayer is lashed into paying it.

The price of land is pushed up. Prices have already been pushed unreasonably high by the demand from competitive private builders. The Federal Government coming into the market on top of all that can only drive the prices still higher, and out of reach of most people. It muddies the water and adds no new houses. Confusion, its sole product, raises the cost of the mortgage burden which will hang over the whole people for the next 45 years.

All these proposed Government expenditures merely take away the capital which the citizens would use to build themselves houses or for other plans of their own. The joint committee report says:

> Enterprisers who might undertake the provision of large numbers of dweling units are restricted * * * by the appropriation of such a large part of their annual earnings for Federal taxes. Moreover, taxation impairs their credit. They confront extraordinary difficulties in procuring working capital.

The proposed bill enormously adds to those difficulties, because the Government itself makes the lenders believe it is the soundest borrower. All other borrowers are made to appear not so sound. So lenders insist on Government guarantees which private borrowers cannot give.

We, who oppose this or any other Federal public-housing bill, defy anyone to gainsay the fact that this is the true picture of our national credit market. And since this is true, it automatically becomes clear that the whole housing cry is cheap politics and outright demagoguery. It is a pet scheme of irresponsible politicians who do not shrink from playing havoc with our whole national economy at a time when we have already put our children and children's children in the chains of a national indebtedness out of which this Nation may not emerge for generations ahead.

Government has two hands. With one hand it takes and with the other it gives away only a part of what it takes. What is more, it gives houses to some and withholds from others. For obviously it cannot build for all who want houses. It robs some of the fruits of their sweat and toil while it exempts others from responsibility and self-reliance. This kind of duality is neither justice nor government. By that tyrannical process the Government destroys those uncounted houses which the free citizens can never build. They would have built so many more and so much better homes than the Government ever can.

Some people point to the building of national roads as an argument that government can do business better than a voluntary free society. But, post roads, harbors, and rivers are specifically listed as a proper enterprise of a constitutional government. Houses are not. Roads, for example, are all taxed by the consent of the governed, because all citizens use the roads. All benefit. All pay the same price for stamps at the post office. All are treated alike, an impossibility in Government housing. That is one reason why the Constitution did not include housing as a proper function of our Government.

GOVERNMENT'S POWER OVER MARKETS AND ITS CORRUPTING INFLUENCE

When the Government enters the markets of materials and labor, it controls that market. It raises prices just as it does when it buys wheat for Europe. What the Government wants, it gets, whatever the price. No competition in the marketplace stops its arbitrary power.

The threat of Government buying or selling is enough to change the price that anyone can get for his product. The free market disappears. An arbitrary and artificial market takes its place. There is no longer a dependable or predictable value on any work or product when the Government begins to manipulate prices.

Now, then, if we give the Federal Government the vast funds with which to control say 10 percent of the market in housing, we are really giving it unchecked power over the market for everything that enters into the business of housing.

Builders, suppliers, workers, lenders, and prospective owners are quick to give up personal responsibility for political promises, pressures, and finally controls. So all hands try at once to get on the Government band wagon to get their cut, sell their land, materials, or services to the Government, live in Government houses, on Government pay rolls and buy Government guaranteed certificates of financing. Government becomes the big customer and the source of security, the source of temporary prosperity. It is so easy to go socialist.

The Government takes all the risks, and pays all the losses. The free economy is killed off before the poor unorganized taxpayer knows what is happening. When he wakes up, he sees no private lending or building. The value of money is changing and uncertain. The value of contracts is destroyed by rent control. No one knows what the Government may decide to do next. No one trusts it. All fear it, and bow down for its favors and concessions which are secured by offering the party in control the largest group of voters possible in exchange for appropriations. The taxpayers are too weak, scattered, and confused to organize and do anything about it. Besides, under the socialist scheme of things, those with property to tax are in the minority.

Private industry retreats at once. It tries to escape but there are few places to escape. So it liquidates the invention and production of future goods in favor of the immediate needs of Government planning. As old private building is liquidated, new independent building stops. The public housers cry out all the more that what is needed to fill the gap is more of the same thing that couses scarcity, viz., more Government housing. The final proof of the Government-created failure of private industry is indeed at hand. The propaganda machine, well oiled by Government funds, operated by housing officials and tenants, rushes in to establish the failure of private industry in the minds of the people. Complete control of the mind and faith of the voters in Government itself is achieved. The socialist magic though utterly false, fools the people again, even in America.

THE SOCIALIST GOVERNMENT TAKES OVER THE CAPITALISTS TOO

The public-housing advocates employ an old trick. They have learned from Europe how to induce private investors to finance their Socialist schemes. The Government offers to guarantee income and capital if it is loaned to public housing. It exempts such income from taxes and increases taxes on private investment income. This bait lures the lenders and private investment declines. The lenders no longer have to exercise their judgment and responsibility in finding secure investments. Instead they take certificates of participation in Government housing. They quit working, planning, inventing, producing.

With the Government guaranteeing their interest and principal, they have achieved Government security for their capital and joined a continuous WPA for investors. Capital goes on the dole.

In this manner, no bloody revolution is necessary to take over private property. The most powerful forces in the free economy meekly surrender without a struggle.

When Government is the borrower, lenders are made to feel that if Government is not safe, nothing is. There is no risk under the sun which the taxpayers will not be compelled to make good. Finally, investors have no place to go but to the Government. It then makes its own terms for capital. The end is always the same. Germany proved how it was political and economic suicide for free investors to make themselves dependent on government doles. They were as foolish as the tenants who trust government promises about housing only to find themselves in the street. In brief, lenders and tenants alike are offered a degree of security that exists nowhere on this earth.

GOVERNMENT'S EVIL POWER SPREADS INTO BUSINESS AND LABOR GENERALLY

The FPHA will determine building wages, working rules, apprenticeship, materials, operating, maintenance, and finally the price of all houses.

If we give the public-housing agency the billions it asks for, we will be giving to government the small block of "stock" through which it can get control of the whole company. This Government capital will be like the late Mr. Insull's purchases of a small part of the stock in many businesses in order to get control, through a holding company, of a large number of underlying companies.

The FPHA will be a huge holding company which grants the cities their own money, and lets the political party in power there grant the taxpayers' money to local landowners, builders, unions, suppliers of fuel and paint, maintenance men, tenants, and investors. In return for past favors and future prospects they gratefully deliver their votes. And thus their political party power is maintained and expanded. Public hous-

ing is the greatest known build-up of political patronage.

PUBLIC HOUSING AS A TRANSMISSION BELT FOR POLITICAL AND BUREAUCRATIC PROPAGANDA

The joint committee found that the FPHA itself had 6,571 employees, under its present "dormant" program, with a budget of over $11,000,000 a year for administration—and propaganda. In addition, there are 18,700 employed locally on the Federal Government projects.

Interesting confirmation of the impact of this propaganda machine is found in the report on slum clearance submitted by Senator WAGNER. The Senator reported that 9 out of 10 answers to his questionnaire were in favor of Federal public housing, but then it must be remembered that he sent his inquiries to mayors and other officials, most of whom are hoping to add patronage to their pay rolls and votes for their party.

The FPHA is, in fact, an ever-increasing propaganda machine. Out of a budget of eleven millions it has kept up a constant stream of releases slanted to favor Government housing and to depreciate private building by free citizens. Free citizens, builders who know how, are called the "special selfish interests," whereas Government itself has become our biggest special interest, our most powerful lobbyist. What is worse it is free from prosecution because it controls the prosecutor. Staff members writing reports, speaking to meetings, traveling by plane and train, taking part in committee meetings—can all be lightly turned into agents of a Government mass propaganda, to remind people of the slums and the low-income families and of the failure of private enterprise, while preaching rosy sermons on the Government's fostering care of the common man.

In San Diego, for example, propaganda for the election of Government officials was carried on boldly on the very premises of the housing projects. Their speeches and literature, prepared at taxpayer expense, included misrepresentations of the statements made by opposition candidates.

The techniques employed were described under oath by Mr. Hinton A. Miller, an assistant housing manager in Los Angeles. He testified that he was told to attend a Jackson Day dinner, where Government employees and tenants were "soaked" $25 each. Collections were made by the office of the housing project.

At a luncheon the FPHA officials turned out en mass.

Mr. Arvin—

Mr. Miller said—

told us that the purpose of this meeting was to organize us as a machine to swing the primaries * * * by organizing the tenants in our projects and getting out their vote on primary-election day.

The Government workers were told that they had the approval of the regional director, Mr. Langdon Post, to take part in political activity although it was illegal under the Hatch Act.

Another technique was described by Mr. Dillon Myer, Public Housing Authority Administrator, as quoted by Congressman HARNESS.

The great bulk of the American people—

Said Mr. Myer—

do not understand how vitally the outcome of this struggle can affect their welfare.

He went on to point out that the whole future of housing was the basis for a life-and-death battle between a small group of power-hungry men and the larger interests of the world as a whole.

The following letter was sent to building contractors and others, telling them what financial contributions they were expected to make to the campaign of the National Public Housing Conference to help carry on the propaganda for Senator WAGNER's bill. It was written on the letterhead of the Housing Authority of the city of Tacoma, Wash., by an official named John Schlarb, Jr., and dated October 1945.

The letter reads:

GENTLEMEN: Some time ago I wrote to you asking for a contribution in support of the National Public Housing Conference. The letter was written at a time when we were all very busy with war work and it might be that you have overlooked it.

I am taking the liberty of writing again now because under the leadership of the National Public Housing Conference the postwar public housing program is rapidly assuming its final form and it is, therefore, urgently necessary to draw together the people in our region who want to participate in the program.

The omnibus housing bill sponsored by Senators WAGNER and ELLENDER providing for postwar housing developments on a large scale, both public and private, is now under consideration in the United States Senate. The material for the bill was prepared by the National Public Housing Conference and that is why I, as the northwest regional committee member of the conference, ask you now for your support.

The postwar program of the 32 housing authorities in this region will be affected by the bill now in Congress and these local authorities are all anxious to see it pass.

Contributions in support of the conference have already been received from a number of firms which constructed the Nation's public war housing. Those firms whose total contracts were less than $500,000 gave from $250 to $500 while those whose contracts were more than $500,000 made $500 contributions. These contributions are deductible for income-tax purposes. A copy of the program of the National Public Housing Conference is enclosed.

I would very much appreciate it if you would reply to my letter because we are forming a regional organization and it would be most helpful to know how you feel about the problem.

Cordially yours,

JOHN SCHLARB, JR.,
Executive Director, Housing Authority of the City of Tacoma, Legislative Committee Member, National Public Housing Conference.

Another exhibit is a letter from David L. Krooth, cochairman of the Housing Legislative Information Service. For a time he was general counsel and Acting Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration.

I am informed this letter was sent to all employees of the Federal Public Housing Administration, and is a request, if not an order, that they contribute funds for an emergency drive of the National Public Housing Conference.

We have already seen that the NPHC works through Government employees and those in receipt of Federal funds, to recruit members and funds for its regular drives for support of public housing.

The Krooth letter follows:

FIGHT FOR HOUSING DAY, JUNE 25, 1947

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 24, 1947.*

DEAR FELLOW HOUSER: Now is the time for all good men (and women) to come to the aid of the program.

Forty-three national organizations are cooperating in the Housing Legislation Information Service by supplying blow-by-blow information about the congressional prospects of pending legislation on housing. These organizations are being invited to sponsor a national demonstration to urge the passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill (S. 866) b the Senate before the July adjournment.

Fight-for-housing day: To do this, June 25 is being designated as National Fight for Housing Day. Meetings will be held in difference parts of the country simultaneously, culminating in a national legislative conference in Washington. Extensive press coverage and radio publicity are to be arranged. The plan, and such a plan takes money, you know, will be financial by a special fight-for-housing fund.

This letter is written to you because you work in the housing program and, I am sure, believe in it. Because you have seen what housing is, why it is needed, and what it can do for our cities, and our people, you are invited to make your support tangible and effective. Some funds have been pledged on condition that additional money is raised from other sources. That's you.

What to do: If you want a national housing policy, and national housing program, use the enclosed envelope and mail your check, money order, or cash to the Fight-for-Housing Fund. Since commitments must be made at once, send your contribution by return mail, please.

We need privates and generals both in this fight. Make your contribution as large as you can or as small as you must, but send it now. This is an emergency drive for immediate help. It has no relationship to the continuing work of the National Public Housing Conference.

Yours sincerely,

DAVID L. KROOTH,
Cochairman, Housing Legislation Information Service.

These are only two of the thousands of Government commissars who are continually spending taxpayers' money to tell the people how unfit they are for freedom. They speak of the selfishness and greed of the people that makes it necessary for the Schlarbs and Krooths to to compel them by taxation to do what they should.

This is typical Socialist propaganda technique. It makes the lesser lights of the bureaucracy feel that they are engaged in a great crusade, that they are on the side of the angels. It is the identical method used on a national scale by Socialist and Communist governments which tell their people that they are fighting a defensive war against the wicked men who would destroy them.

Another propaganda device is the "exclusive meeting" technique. Selected representatives from "cooperative agencies" are invited to preliminary meetings to orient them on Government housing. These representatives are carefully

screened. No one is invited or gets in who is not already committed to socialized housing and who would not be disconcerted by crude admissions of how best to fool the people. If the handpicked "representatives" include the executive secretary or the editor of the group's paper, so much the better. The representative's duty is to go back to his community or his association and spread the propaganda. This makes a pretty network. Here is the process by which so many editors, students, women, and religious leaders have been persuaded that the T-E-W bill gives benefits to low-income families and clears slums.

PROPAGANDA WORKS IN CONCENTRIC CIRCLES

The really important decisions taken by the inner circle are, of course, never seen and never heard by the groups of good citizens taken in to give respectability to the transfer of property to Government. They are kept in the outer circle to get and spread the body of "factual" reports, which are issued ostensibly to give the facts—usually all on one side. Beyond that are the less formal speeches in which suggestions can be planted even more easily.

Beyond that comes the rings of satellite private agencies, which pick up the statements of public-housing advocates, and transmit them to millions of innocent members of private associations, who never suspect that the resolutions they pass in favor of help for the poor were formulated by some Socialists in some Government office here or abroad.

We cannot assume that the inner circle are all in Government employment. Sometimes they are and sometimes they are not, and very frequently they flit back and forth, coming into Government agencies to familiarize themselves with the mechanics and to help shape policies, and then going out again to one of the private agencies which forms a link in the series of concentric circles revolving about the public-housing program.

Our colleague, Mr. HARNESS of Indiana, has suggested that the higher strategy of this public-housing scheme has been worked out in Government bureaus. But who planted this Marxism there? What political influences are at work crossing the lines of this huge unmanageable bureaucracy of ours? How far are these plans for public housing worked out by Communist government agents here or by their enthusiastic fellow travelers?

BUILDING OF A POLITICAL MACHINE

The power held by the public-housing group is skillfully used as bait to draw more satellites into their net. The purpose is violently political. The various groups become parts of a political machine, dedicated to the idea of state socialism.

The guaranteed annual payments of interest and capital can be used to draw in one group of satellites, the investors. Businessmen, builders, unions, and tenants follow. The employees in the public-housing agencies are the local headquarters staff of the machine. The tenants are the infantry who deliver the votes.

The Government housing law gives PHA almost unlimited choice of where to put its projects. It can find its "low-income families" anywhere, under the broad definition it uses. So practical politics is free to decide to put the Government houses where they will "do the most good"—that is, where a critical vote for Senator or Congressman or the electoral college is in doubt.

The well-known pattern of political patronage was worked out by WPA. Since it could find needy families anywhere, it simply became a matter to find them exactly where they would be most helpful to the party vote. Thus, when the agricultural vote was in doubt, relief funds were spent in farm states. When city votes became important, the "needy" in the city increased in numbers very rapidly. When a few critical states with a large bloc of electoral votes were hanging in the balance "relief needs" went up in those areas.

Just as Government WPA was used in hard times, so Government housing is used in good times, when credit is lush and labor and material scarce, to achieve our particular brand of state capitalism.

Government housing, however, doubles or trebles the corruption of the voters beyond anything ever dreamed of under the old WPA. It will become the crucial but permanent governmental spending fund for propaganda, for votes, for reelection. It is the speeded-up version of the slogan "spend and spend, tax and tax, elect and elect."

Most of the voters in areas with public housing would of course naturally vote for the public-housing party. It is easy to fill the houses with people who see eye to eye with the party in power, the spending party. It is easy to move tenants out who vote against the party building their houses. In the big cities the tenants in some districts vote above 90 percent for that party. We used to wonder how Hitler and Stalin got 90 percent of the people's vote. We thought that was awful cruelty. We understand now how it is done.

Langdon Post, who was regional director for San Francisco, for the PHA, said the following in his book, Challenge of Housing:

> Danger signals flash from the political thinking and opportunities inherent in a vast public-housing program. This last plum is a new brand of political fruit which has enormous possibilities of exploitation. Imagine the golden opportunities latent in a $500,000,000 housing program in New York City. Commissions, profits, fees, jobs, and finally apartments for at least 200,000 voters. It is a bonanza beyond the wildest dreams of the most optimistic politician.

When the Federal Government puts a $500,000,000 expenditure into the budget of a city government, the officials of that city look to Washington, and not to the little taxpayers, who pay only hundreds or thousands.

Here again we see the development from WPA. WPA was an outright political subsidy paid to cities to meet part of their budget expenses and bring the mayors and other local leaders into line behind the spending administration.

WPA repaired streets. It repaired public buildings. It paid a good part of the cost of municipal housekeeping. In return the mayors were required only to speak well in public of the needs for WPA and to get out the vote in the districts where WPA funds were spent. Mayor LaGuardia, of New York, got the largest slice of WPA money. He headed the mayors' conference, which urged on Congress the need for even larger appropriations for WPA.

It is strange that so little attention has been paid to Federal subordination of our cities, Federal bribery of city officials with gifts disguised as welfare for the poor, Federal intervention in local government policies, Federal punishment for refusal to follow a centralized policy, Federal impoverishment that makes cities weak and dependent on the taxing powers of the central government.

A great deal of attention has been paid to the way the central government took over control of cities and Federal states in Germany. The same thing is happening in England and it is happening here. Here we need no violence and no pressure. It is all being done with money. And it was no less authority than Mr. James A. Farley who just recently reminded us that the New Deal, above all else, depended upon "the boughten vote" to remain in power.

Where the cities of a nation come to depend more on the central government for their revenue than they do on their own taxpayers, the cities are no longer self-governed. They are driven and managed, by silken reins or by crude pressure, from Washington.

When the cities of this Nation all have their policy dictated by the Federal Government and can be punished if they fail to go along, the constitutional foundation of our Federal system is gone. The cities are being coordinated into one huge monolith central state apparatus designed in and directed by Washington.

The Government dispenses according to its judgment what is good for all groups, capitalists, tenants, workers, material men. It controls the credits and the housing of the people—two of the necessary elements prescribed by Marx to achieve socialism. The T-E-W bill is socialism—American plan. It is the main road prescribed by Marx by which complete socialization is to be realized. The others are easily taken.

BETTER HOUSING FOR ALL IN A FREE UNCONTROLLED SOCIETY

A free economy is the only source of housing—the only way of shelter and food for the poor, the only means of clearing slums. A good illustration is found in the 1920's. Slums well-nigh disappeared in one of the greatest building eras of our country. In New York City, for example, according to the report of the Children's Federation, the slums were 70 percent vacated. That was when free enterprise was unrestrained. Between 1933 and 1940 under a Government-manipulated economy the number of new houses built was disastrously reduced and the slums filled up again. Under rent controls and Government housing as we now have it, slums have returned as they always do under Government management of an economy. Such Government interference destroys all freedom and initiative.

Only a free society can ever house or feed itself adequately. This is because only the free are creative, productive, and cooperative. The managed, controlled, dictated, and enslaved people have always lived in slums.

Perhaps the issue becomes clearer if we transfer the reasoning of public housers to automobiles. They would tell us that 11,000,000 low-income families cannot afford to buy new automobiles at present high prices. Therefore the Government should tax everyone in order to go into the automobile business. The autos themselves would be financed with Government-borrowed money, guaranteed as to principal and interest—such interest income to be tax exempt. When ready the new cars would be sold at subsidized prices to 500,000 politically selected families who might or might not have low incomes. The absurdity of this is apparent.

At best, very few people can build new houses. Only the most productive can do so. That is the only economic thing possible. Likewise comparatively few people can buy new automobiles. When they buy a new one they sell their old one. The purchaser of that sells his old one. The next purchaser sells still an older automobile but they all run and we nearly all ride—including the poorest of the people.

We must encourage those who are productive to build new houses and move out of their old ones. Many old houses are built with solid material and good workmanship. They can easily be reconditioned at low cost by such an undertaking as the Baltimore plan of improvement. Most of us live in reconditioned houses. The President of the United States lives in a fairly good second-hand house. If the most productive move into new houses the values of the old ones will fall within the reach of low-income families, but still be good houses. That is the economical way to do it. That is the way to vacate slums with better housing for all. That is the American way of freedom.

CONCLUSIONS

To sum up, the Federal housing bill must be defeated for moral, economic, and constitutional reasons. The sordid past of public-housing schemes here at home and abroad prove beyond a doubt that the fraudulent promises are not met. The really poor and truly deserving people are simply cheated.

The impact upon our free economy of a public-housing scheme is devastating. Even if the Federal Government initially limits itself to 10 percent of housing, its wastefulness and corruption must crush any free-building enterprise and drive it out of business.

Finally, but above all, the constitutional integrity and political self-government of this Nation demand that a drastic stop be put to any further expansion of a system of legalized party tyranny by spoils which is socialism—American plan. Give the corrupt politicians in Washington and elsewhere these billions of housing dollars and you can bid farewell to the limited, constitutional government under which this country grew into the productive, inventive, and humanitarian giant of all time. Let us not cross the bridge of public bribery into the alien world of state socialist compulsion. Let us stay on this side of that bridge and here remain free, guarding our constitutional government, that our children and children's children may know everlasting meaning of the American life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. Let us keep our Government solely in the business of protecting, maintaining, and expanding our liberties as the only sure source of houses, food, and the good life.

General Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 4, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, with only a few legislative days left before the political conventions begin, I believe the hearings on the general housing bill being conducted by the House Banking and Currency Committee should be terminated. To some people this may raise the question whether or not Congress has given full and adequate hearing to both sides of this important question. I believe it has, and I believe that anyone who will study the record of events leading to the present situation will also agree that Congress has adequately heard all parties while considering the general housing legislation.

According to Mr. TAFT's testimony before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on April 1, this bill was first considered in 1944. Since 1944 there have been extensive hearings before various committees of the Congress on general housing legislation. The Senate Banking and Currency Committee held hearings on the General Housing Act in 1945. The record consists of 1,394 pages. Later that year, discussing credit for housing, they held additional hearings to the extent of 569 pages. In 1947 hearings and bills pertaining to national housing extend to 647 pages, and this year hearings on the perfecting amendments add an additional 216 pages.

The House committee held hearings on housing in 1947 to the extent of 608 pages, and the Joint Committee on Housing, traveling throughout the United States, held hearings in 30 centers to the extent of 6,148 pages. These come to a grand total of 9,582 pages of hearings over 4½ years in 30 cities throughout the United States, with hundreds of witnesses on both sides.

I believe the Congress has listened and talked enough about this bill. The time has come to act. Mr. Speaker, I urge that the hearings be terminated and this body be given an early opportunity to vote on this legislation.

Palestine: Jewish Homeland or Jewish State—Dr. Hannah Arendt, Prominent Zionist, States the Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 3, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, less than 6 months after the United Nation Assembly's recommendation for partition of Palestine the Jewish homeland is witnessing a first-class war. Is there no other alternative? Dr. Hannah Arendt, Zionist of many years' standing, has written a challenging article in the current issue of Commentary on this question.

Mr. Speaker, I am including excerpts of that article as part of my own remarks:

THERE STILL IS TIME TO SAVE THE JEWISH HOMELAND

(By Hannah Arendt)

When, on November 29, 1947, the partition of Palestine and the establishment of a Jewish state were accepted by the United Nations, it was assumed that no outside force would be necessary to implement this decision.

It took the Arabs less than 2 months to destroy this illusion and it took the United States less than 3 months to reverse its stand on partition, withdraw its support in the United Nations, and propose a trusteeship for Palestine. Of all the member states of the United Nations, only Soviet Russia and her satellites made it unequivocally clear that they still favored partition and the immediate proclamation of a Jewish state.

Trusteeship was at once rejected by both the Jewish Agency and the Arab Higher Committee. The Jews claimed the moral right to adhere to the original United Nations decision; the Arabs claimed an equally moral right to adhere to the League of Nations principle of self-determination, according to which Palestine would be ruled by its present Arab majority and the Jews be granted minority rights. The Jewish Agency, on its part, announced the proclamation of a Jewish state for May 16, regardless of any United Nations decision. It remains a fact, meanwhile, that trusteeship, like partition, would have to be enforced by an outside power.

* * * * *

The past few weeks of guerrilla warfare should have shown both Arabs and Jews how costly and destructive the war upon which they have embarked promises to be. In recent days, the Jews have won a few initial successes that prove their relative superiority over present Arab forces in Palestine. The Arabs, however, instead of concluding at least local truce agreements, have decided to evacuate whole cities and towns rather than stay in Jewish-dominated territory. This behavior declares more effectively than all proclamations the Arab refusal of any compromise; it is obvious that they have decided to expend in time and numbers whatever it may take to win a decisive victory. The Jews, on the other hand, living on a small island in an Arab sea, might well be expected to jump at the chance to exploit their present advantage by offering a negotiated peace. Their military situation is such that time and numbers necessarily work against them. If one takes into account the objective vital interests of the Arab and the Jewish peoples, especially in terms of the present situation and future well-being of the Near East—where a full-fledged war will inevitably invite all kinds of international interventions—the present desire of both peoples to fight it out at any price is nothing less than sheer irrationality.

One of the reasons for this unnatural and, as far as the Jewish people are concerned, tragic development is a decisive change in Jewish public opinion that has accompanied the confusing political decisions of the great powers.

The fact is that zionism has won its most significant victory among the Jewish people at the very moment when its achievements in Palestine are in gravest danger. This may not seem extraordinary to those who have

always believed that the building of a Jewish homeland was the most important—perhaps the only real—achievement of Jews in our century, and that ultimately no individual who wanted to stay a Jew could remain aloof from events in Palestine. Nevertheless, zionism had in actuality always been a partisan and controversial issue; the Jewish Agency, though claiming to speak for the Jewish people as a whole, was still well aware that it represented only a fraction of them. This situation has changed overnight. With the exception of a few anti-Zionist die-hards, whom nobody can take very seriously, there is now no organization and almost no individual Jew that doesn't privately or publicly support partition and the establishment of a Jewish state.

* * * * *

Something very similar to this growing unanimity among American Jews has arisen in Palestine itself. Just as zionism had been a partisan issue among American Jews, so the Arab question and the state issue had been controversial issues within the Zionist movement and in Palestine. Political opinion was sharply divided there between the chauvinism of the Revisionists, the middle-of-the-road nationalism of the majority party, and the vehemently antinationalist, antistate sentiments of a large part of the kibbutz movement, particularly the Hashomer Hatzair. Very little is now left of these differences of opinion.

* * * * *

The general mood of the country, moreover, has been such that terrorism and the growth of totalitarian methods are silently tolerated and secretly applauded; and the general, underlying public opinion with which anybody desiring to appeal to the Yishuv has to reckon shows no notable divisions at all.

* * * * *

It would be frivolous to deny the intimate connection between this mood on the part of Jews everywhere and the recent European catastrophe, with the subsequent fantastic injustice and callousness toward the surviving remnant that were thereby so ruthlessly transformed into displaced persons. The result has been an amazing and rapid change in what we call national character. After 2,000 years of "Galut mentality," the Jewish people have suddenly ceased to believe in survival as an ultimate good in itself and have gone over in a few years to the opposite extreme. Now Jews believe in fighting at any price and feel that "going down" is a sensible method of politics.

* * * * *

Thus Jewish unanimity on the Palestine issue has already prompted a somewhat vague and inarticulate shift of Jewish public opinion in the direction of pro-Soviet sympathies, a shift that even affects people who for more than 25 years have consistently denounced Bolshevik policies. Even more significant than such changes of mood and general attitude have been the attempts to establish an antiwestern and pro-Soviet orientation inside the Zionist movement. The resignation of Moshe Sneh, the organizer of illegal immigration and formerly prominent in the Haganah, is important in this respect; and occasional utterances by almost every one of the Palestine delegates in America point even more strongly in this direction. The program, finally, of the new left-wing Palestinian party formed by the merger of the Hashomer Hatzair and the Ahdut Avodah has put plainly on record as its chief reason for not joining the majority party the desire to have Zionist foreign policy rely on Russia more than on the western democracies.

The mentality behind this unrealistic understanding of Russian policy and the consequences of subjecting oneself to it has a long tradition in Zionism. As is understandable enough among people without political experience, a childlike hope has always been present that some big brother would come along to befriend the Jewish people, solve their problems, protect them from the Arabs, and present them eventually with a beautiful Jewish state with all the trimmings. This role was filled in Jewish imagination by Great Britain—until the issuance of the white paper; and because of this naive trust, and an equally naive underestimation of Arab forces, for decades Jewish leaders let slip one opportunity after another to come to an understanding with the Arabs. After the outbreak of the Second World War, and particularly since the Biltmore program, the imaginary role of the big brother of the Jews fell to the United States. But it has very quickly become clear that America is no more in a position to fill the bill than the British, and so Soviet Russia is now left as the only power upon which foolish hopes can be pinned. It is remarkable, however, that Russia is the first big brother whom even Jews do not quite trust. For the first time a note of cynicism has entered Jewish hopes.

* * * * *

Every believer in a democratic government knows the importance of a loyal opposition. The tragedy of Jewish politics at this moment is that it is wholly determined by the Jewish Agency and that no opposition to it of any significance exists either in Palestine or America.

From the time of the Balfour Declaration the loyal opposition in Zionist politics was constituted by the non-Zionists (certainly this was the case after 1929, when the enlarged Jewish Agency elected half of the executive from the non-Zionists). But for all practical purposes the non-Zionist opposition no longer exists today. This unfortunate development was encouraged, if not caused, by the fact that the United States and the United Nations finally endorsed an extremist Jewish demand that non-Zionists had always held to be totally unrealistic. With the support of a Jewish state by the Great Powers, the non-Zionists believed themselves refuted by reality itself. Their sudden loss of significance, and their helplessness in the face of what they felt justified in thinking an accomplished fact, were the result of an attitude that has always identified reality with the sum of those facts created by the powers-that-be—and by them only. They had believed in the Balfour Declaration rather than in the wish of the Jewish people to build its homeland; they had reckoned with the British or American Governments rather than with the people living in the Near East. They had refused to go along with the Biltmore program—but they accepted it once it was recognized by the United States and the United Nations.

Now, if the non-Zionists had wanted to act as genuine realists in Jewish politics, they should have insisted and continued to insist that the only permanent reality in the whole constellation was the presence of Arabs in Palestine, a reality no decision could alter—except, perhaps, the decision of a totalitarian state, implemented by its particular brand of ruthless force. Instead, they mistook decisions of Great Powers for the ultimate realities and lacked the courage to warn, not only their fellow-Jews, but also their respective governments of the possible consequences of partition and the declaration of a Jewish state. It was ominous enough that no significant Zionist Party was left to oppose the decision of November 29, the majority being committed to the Jewish state, and the others (the minority under Weizmann) to partition; but it was downright tragic that at this most crucial of all moments the loyal opposition of the non-Zionists simply disappeared.

In the face of the despair and resoluteness of the Yishuv (as a Palestinian delegate recently put it) and the suicide threats of the Jewish leaders, it might be useful to remind the Jews and the world what it is that will go down if the final tragedy should come in Palestine.

Palestine and the building of a Jewish homeland constitute today the great hope and the great pride of Jews all over the world. What would happen to Jews, individually and collectively, if this hope and this pride were to be extinguished in another catastrophe is almost beyond imagining. But it is certain that this would become the central fact of Jewish history and it is possible that it might become the beginning of the self-dissolution of the Jewish people. There is no Jew in the world whose whole outlook on life and the world would not be radically changed by such a tragedy.

If the Yishuv went down, it would drag along in its fall the collective settlements, the kibbutzim—which constitute perhaps the most promising of all social experiments made in the twentieth centry, as well as the most magnificent part of the Jewish homeland.

Here, in complete freedom and unhampered by any government, a new form of ownership, a new type of farmer, a new way of family life and child education, and new approaches to the troublesome conflicts between city and country, between rural and industrial labor have been created.

The people of the kibbutzim have been too absorbed in their quiet and effective revolution to make their voices sufficiently heard in Zionist politics. If it is true that the members of the Irgun and the Stern group are not recruited from the kibbutzim, it is also true that the kibbutzim have offered no serious obstacle to terrorism.

It is this very abstention from politics, this enthusiastic concentration on immediate problems, that has enabled the kibbutz pioneers to go ahead with their work, undisturbed by the more noxious ideologies of our times, realizing new laws and new behavior patterns, establishing new customs and new values, and translating and integrating them in new institutions. The loss of the kibbutzim, the ruin of the new type of man they have produced, the destruction of their institutions, and the oblivion that would swallow the fruit of their experiences—this would be one of the severest of blows to the hopes of all those, Jewish and non-Jewish, who have not and never will make their peace with present-day society and its standards. For this Jewish experiment in Palestine holds out hope of solutions that will be acceptable and applicable, not only in individual cases, but also for the large mass of men everywhere whose dignity and very humanity are in our time so seriously threatened by the pressures of modern life and its unsolved problems.

Still another precedent, or at least its possibility, would go down with the Yishuv—that of close cooperation between two peoples, one embodying the most advanced ways of European civilization, the other an erstwhile victim of colonial oppression and backwardness. The idea of Arab-Jewish cooperation, thought never realized on any scale and today seemingly further off than ever, is not an idealistic day dream but a sober statement of the fact that without it the whole Jewish venture in Palestine is doomed. Jews and Arabs could be forced by circumstances to show the world that there are no differences between two people that cannot be bridged. Indeed, the working out of such a modus vivendi might in the end serve as a model of how to counteract the dangerous tendencies of formerly oppressed peoples to shut themselves off from the rest of the world and develop nationalist superiority complexes of their own.

Many opportunities for Jewish-Arab friendship have already been lost, but none of these failures can alter the basic fact that the existence of the Jews in Palestine depends on achieving it. Moreover, the Jews have one advantage in the fact that, excluded as they were from official history for

centuries, they have no imperialist past to live down. They can still act as a vanguard in international relations on a small but valid scale—as in the kibbutzim they have already acted as a vanguard in social relations despite the relatively insignificant numbers of the people involved.

There is very little doubt about the final outcome of an all-out war between Arabs and Jews. One can win many battles without winning a war. And up to now, no real battle has yet taken place in Palestine.

And even if the Jews were to win the war, its end would find the unique possibilities and the unique achievements of Zionism in Palestine destroyed. The land that would come into being would be something quite other than the dream of world Jewry, Zionist and non-Zionist. The "victorious" Jews would live surrounded by an entirely hostile Arab population, secluded inside ever-threatened borders, absorbed with physical self-defense to a degree that would submerge all other interests and activities. The growth of a Jewish culture would cease to be the concern of the whole people; social experiments would have to be discarded as impractical luxuries; political thought would center around military strategy; economic development would be determined exclusively by the needs of war. And all this would be the fate of a nation that—no matter how many immigrants it could still absorb and how far it extended its boundaries (the whole of Palestine and Transjordan is the insane Revisionist demand)—would still remain a very small people greatly outnumbered by hostile neighbors.

Under such circumstances (as Ernst Simon has pointed out) the Palestinian Jews would degenerate into one of those small warrior tribes about whose possibilities and importance history has amply informed us since the days of Sparta. Their relations with world Jewry would become problematical, since their defense interests might clash at any moment with those of other countries where large numbers of Jews lived. Palestine Jewry would eventually separate itself from the larger body of world Jewry and in its isolation develop into an entirely new people. Thus, it becomes plain that at this moment and under present circumstances a Jewish state can only be erected at the price of the Jewish homeland.

Fortunately, there are still some Jews left who have shown in these bitter days that they have too much wisdom and too great a sense of responsibility to follow blindly where desperate, fanaticized masses would lead them. There are still, despite all appearances, a few Arabs who are unhappy about the increasingly Fascist coloration of their national movements.

Until very recently, moreover, Palestinian Arabs were relatively unconcerned in the conflict with the Jews and the actual fighting against them is even now left to so-called volunteers from neighboring countries. But now even this situation has begun to change. The evacuations of Haifa and Tiberias by their Arab populations are the most ominous occurrences of the whole Arab-Jewish war so far. These evacuations could not have been carried out without careful preparation, and it is hardly likely that they are spontaneous. Nevertheless, it is very doubtful that Arab leadership, which by creating homelessness among Palestinian Arabs aims to arouse the Moslem world, would have succeeded in persuading tens of thousands of city dwellers to desert all their earthly possessions at a moment's notice, had not the massacre of Deir Yassin struck fear of the Jews in to the Arab population. And another crime that played into the hands of the Arab leadership had been committed only a few months back in Haifa itself when the Irgun had thrown a bomb into a line of Arab workers outside the Haifa Refinery, one of the few places where Jews and Arabs had for years worked side by side.

The political implications of these acts, neither of which had any military objective whatsoever, are all too clear in both instances: they were aimed at those places where neighborly relations between Arabs and Jews had not yet been completely destroyed; they were intended to arouse the wrath of the Arab people in order to cut off the Jewish leadership from all temptations to negotiate; they created that atmosphere of factual complicity which is always one of the main prerequisites for the rise to power of terrorist groups. And, indeed, no Jewish leadership did come forward to stop the Irgun from taking political matters into its own hands and declaring war on all Arabs in the name of the Jewish community. The lukewarm protests of the Jewish agency and the Haganah, forever limping behind, were followed two days later by an announcement from Tel Aviv that Irgun and Haganah were about to conclude an agreement. The Irgun attack on Jaffa, first denounced by Haganah, was followed by an agreement for joint action and the dispatch of Haganah units to Jaffa. This shows to what extent political initiative is already in terrorist hands.

The present executive of the Jewish agency and the Vaad Leumi have by now amply demonstrated that they are either unwilling or incapable of preventing the terrorists from making political decision for the whole Yishuv. It is even questionable whether the Jewish Agency is still in a position to negotiate for a temporary truce, since its enforcement would largely depend upon the consent of the extremist groups. It is quite possible that this was one of the reasons why representatives of the agency, though they must know the desperate needs of their people, allowed the recent negotiations for a truce to break down. They may have been reluctant to reveal to the whole world their lack of effective power and authority.

The United Nations and the United States have up to now simply accepted the elected delegates of the Jewish and the Arab peoples, which was, of course, the proper thing to do. After the break-down of truce negotiations, however, it would seem that there are now only two alternatives left for the great powers: either to leave the country (with the possible exception of the holy places) to a war that not only may mean another extermination of Jews but may also develop into a large-scale international conflict, or else to occupy the country with foreign troops and rule it without giving much consideration to either Jews or Arabs. The second alternative is clearly an imperialist one and would very likely end in failure if not carried out by a totalitarian government with all the paraphernalia of police terror.

However, a way out of this predicament may be found if the United Nations could summon up the courage in this unprecedented situation to take an unprecedented step by going to those Jewish and Arab individuals who at present are isolated because of their records as sincere believers in Arab-Jewish cooperation, and asking them to negotiate a truce. On the Jewish side, the so-called Ihud group among the Zionists, as well as certain outstanding non-Zionists, are clearly the people most eligible for this purpose at the moment.

Such a truce, or better, such a preliminary understanding—even negotiated between nonaccredited parties—would show the Jews and the Arabs that it could be done. We know the proverbial fickleness of masses; there is a serious chance for a rapid and radical change of mood, which is the prerequisite for any real solution.

Such a move, however, could be effective only if concessions are made at once on both sides. The white paper has been an enormous obstacle, in view of the terrible needs of Jewish DP's. Without the solution of their problem, no improvement in the mood of the Jewish people can be expected. Immediate admission of Jewish DP's to Palestine, though limited in terms of time and number, as well as immediate admission of Jewish and other DP's to the United States outside the quota system, are prerequisites for a sensible solution. On the other hand, the Palestinian Arabs should be guaranteed a well-defined share in the Jewish development of the country, which under any circumstances will still continue to be their common homeland. This would not be impossible if the huge amounts now expended in defense and rebuilding could be used instead for the realization of the Jordan Valley Authority project.

There can be no doubt that a trusteeship as proposed by President Truman and endorsed by Dr. Magnes is the best temporary solution. It would have the advantage of preventing the establishment of a sovereignty whose only sovereign right would be to commit suicide. It would provide a cooling-off period. It could initiate the Jordan Valley Authority project as a government enterprise and it could establish for its realization local Arab-Jewish committees under the supervision and the auspices of an international authority. It could appoint members of the Jewish and the Arab intelligentsia to posts in local and municipal offices. Last but not least, trusteeship over the whole of Palestine would postpone and possibly prevent partition of the country.

It is true that many nonfanatical Jews of sincere good will have believed in partition as a possible means of solving the Arab-Jewish conflict. In the light of political, military, and geographic realities, however, this was always a piece of wishful thinking. The partition of so small a country could at best mean the petrifaction of the conflict, which would result in arrested development for both peoples; at worst it would signify a temporary stage during which both parties would prepare for further war. The alternative proposition of a federated state, also recently endorsed by Dr. Magnes, is much more realistic, despite the fact that it establishes a common government for two different peoples, it avoids the troublesome majority-minority constellation, which is insoluble by definition. A federated structure, moreover, would have to rest on Jewish-Arab community councils, which would mean that the Jewish-Arab conflict would be resolved on the lowest and most promising level of proximity and neighborliness. A federated state, finally, could be the natural stepping stone for any later, greater federated structure in the Near East and the Mediterranean area.

A federated state, however, such as is proposed by the Morrison plan, is outside the actual political possibilities of the day. As matters now stand, it would be almost as unwise to proclaim a federated state over the heads and against the opposition of both peoples as it has already been to proclaim partition. This is, certainly, no time for final solutions; every single possible and practicable step is today a tentative effort whose chief aim is pacification and nothing more.

Trusteeship is not an ideal and not an eternal solution. But politics seldom offers ideal or eternal solutions. A United Nations trusteeship could be effectively carried through only if the United States and Great Britain were ready to back it up, no matter what happened. This does not necessarily mean great military commitments. There is still a good chance of recruiting police forces on the spot if the present memberships of the Arab higher committee and the Jewish agency were to be denied authority in the country. Small local units composed of Jews and Arabs under the command of higher officers from countries that are members of the United Nations could become an important school for future cooperative self-government.

Unfortunately, in a hysterical atmosphere such proposals are only too liable to be dismissed as "stabs in the back" or unrealistic.

They are neither; they are, on the contrary, the only way of saving the reality of the Jewish homeland.

No matter what the outcome of the present deadlock, the following objective factors should be axiomatic criteria for the good and the bad, the right and the wrong:

1. The real goal of the Jews in Palestine is the building up of a Jewish homeland. This goal must never be sacrificed to the pseudo sovereignty of a Jewish state.

2. The independence of Palestine can be achieved only on a solid basis of Jewish-Arab cooperation. As long as Jewish and Arab leaders both claim that there is no bridge between Jews and Arabs (as Moshe Shertok has just put it), the territory cannot be left to the political wisdom of its own inhabitants.

3. Elimination of all terrorist groups (and not agreements with them) and swift punishment of all terrorist deeds (and not merely protests against them) will be the only valid proof that the Jewish people in Palestine has recovered its sense of political reality and that Zionist leadership is again responsible enough to be trusted with the destinies of the Yishuv.

4. Immigration to Palestine, limited in numbers and in time, is the only irreducible minimum in Jewish politics.

5. Local self-government and mixed Jewish-Arab municipal and rural councils, on a small scale and as numerous as possible, are the only realistic political measures that can eventually lead to the political emancipation of Palestine.

It is still not too late.

Will Rogers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 4, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a distinct honor to represent the First Congressional District of Oklahoma, in which the late Will Rogers was born and reared, and where his and his wife's remains are buried.

Will Rogers was born near Oologah in Rogers County, Okla. At Claremore, the county seat of Rogers County, there has been erected a beautiful memorial, and a spacious and most interesting museum, in which are housed many of the earthly possessions of Will Rogers. It is on the brow of the hill on which the museum is located, that Will Rogers and his wife are buried, overlooking the little city of Claremore.

There are few shrines visited by more people annually than is this memorial and museum erected by the people of Oklahoma in honor of the memory of Will Rogers and the life he lived.

Many books and articles have been written about Will Rogers. Most of them have been written by his associates, friends, and admirers. Will Rogers was a Cherokee Indian by blood, and was always proud of that fact. So far as I know, there has been only one poem written by a Cherokee Indian to commemorate the laudable characteristics of our distinguished friend. It was first written in the Cherokee Indian language, employing the Sequoyah characters, for it was Sequoyah who invented and gave to the Cherokee Indians their alphabet. The author of this poem is Levi B. Gritts, a full-blood Cherokee Indian whose name appears opposite Cherokee Roll No. 17924, on the final rolls of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma. Mr. Gritts now lives in Muskogee, Okla. Mr. Gritts has translated his poem into English; Mr. Gritts was present at the Memorial Day services conducted by the Oklahoma State Society in Washington, D. C., last Sunday, May 30, 1948. These services were conducted at the foot of the statues of Sequoyah and Will Rogers in the Hall of Fame in the National Capitol at Washington. Mr. Gritts is president of the Keetoowah Society, Inc. This is an organization authorized by special enactment of Congress as the official spokesman for the Cherokee Indians of Oklahoma. Mr. Gritts' poem on Will Rogers follows:

WILL ROGERS

(By Levi B. Gritts, Full-blood Cherokee, Roll No. 17924)

God gifted Cherokee, humorous born,
His heritage the land of the free;
His genius discovered on foreign strand,
His greatness shown throughout the world.

Intelligence and humor recognized;
His mind alert to express;
His people ready to listen and laugh;
His popularity ever unsurpassed.

Will Rogers, beloved universally;
His country as carefree as he;
His achievement admired by all
His memory revered forever.

Letter From Walter J. Donnelly, Legislative Chairman, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Local No. 549, Bridgeport, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 4, 1948

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include in the RECORD a letter just received by me from Mr. Walter J. Donnelly, legislative chairman of Local No. 549, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Bridgeport, Conn. This letter is so different from the many form letters that are received in our offices daily, and contains so much good sense and food for thought that I recommend its reading to my colleagues. I further recommend the reading, at your earliest convenience, of the reports that are mentioned herein because the contents will provide much useful information to the Members about post offices that will be applicable to a greater or lesser extent to post offices in your particular districts. The Trundle Engineering Co. report is House Report 1656, issued on April 2, 1948. These reports, emanating from the House Post Office and Civil Service Committees, have been prepared after careful surveys and inspections under provisions of House Resolution 176. Evidently, they are being read carefully by Uncle Sam's postal employees, who not only can benefit by reading these but can make suggestions that will effectively improve their working conditions and help modernize the Government agency that has the largest number of employees.

This letter manifests a new interest has been created among the postal employees as a result of the committee's reports, an interest that further substantiates the loyalty and devotion of such governmental employees, and is one more reason for us to provide an increase in their wages which not only is richly deserved but is urgently needed, and as soon as possible.

The letter follows:

LOCAL NO. 549,
NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
POST OFFICE CLERKS,
Bridgeport, Conn., June 2, 1948.

Hon. ANTONI N. SADLAK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The RECORD tells me that on Friday, May 28, 1948, Mr. REES delivered a report on a survey and study of the postal system, House Report No. 2076. If it is possible for you to do so, I would appreciate your sending me one or two copies.

My interest in these reports is twofold. They form a base for future legislation in which I am always interested. They also are a splendid means to raise the level of interest of our members from trivial personal grievances to a consideration of the operation of the whole post office.

Since the report of the Trundle Engineering Co. on the carrier service in the Cleveland Post Office was issued, some clerk in our office has been studying it each evening. Our lone copy is rather tattered now but the men who are interested in improving the service have a better idea of the necessary reforms and many men who have never given the whole service much thought are looking at it with new eyes.

This is as it should be. For too many years our local was busy trying to correct injustices in local procedures. Lately, we have been able to convince the supervisory force that our interests were mutual. The new manual of instructions which has been issued in lieu of the Postal Guide gives such clear interpretations of the personnel rules it will save all of us many a dispute.

If these purely local matters are adjusted easily, and our pay bill is out of the way, we will be able to devote the proper amount of time to improving the efficiency of the service and straightening out some of the kinks in the present postal and civil-service laws.

Senate bill 1486 on persons improperly removed from the service is one of the kinks I referred to. I was pleased to read that you were one of the conference committee. Pleased too, that the bill has now passed both Houses. Not many men are suspended unjustly but it is only proper to give equity to those who are.

I know that you are interested in developing a Research and Development Division in the Post Office Department. My ambitions do not reach quite that high. I merely want to stimulate our members to ponder on possible and projected improvements. Reading and discussing congressional reports is an excellent means to this end.

Sincerely,

WALTER J. DONNELLY.

International Trade Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Dr. Elvin H. Killheffer at the Third National Textile Seminar, Shawnee-on-Delaware, Pa., May 12, 1948, on the subject, International Trade Organization.

Dr. Killheffer attended the Havana Conference for an extended period as an observer and adviser approved by the State Department at the request of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

In my opinion, it is vitally important for every Member of each House of the Congress to know something about the relation between the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and the proposed International Trade Organization. When more normal times return to this great Nation of ours and to the world, then the mistakes we may make in this field of trade agreements and joining world organizations will become apparent to the people of the United States through the effects they will have upon our economic welfare and happiness.

It is said that if these things work to our detriment, they can be cured by the Congress, but that is not the way things happen. World-wide problems cannot be cured in a moment; and if we make serious blunders in reducing too far or eliminating altogether proper protective tariffs, it may be too late for us to preserve our great system when the effects become apparent to our people. We cannot wave a magic wand and stop an improper flow of foreign goods into this country without incurring ill will and defeating the very purpose we have had in mind in our efforts in the field of foreign relationships.

All Senators may be called upon in the near future to vote on H. R. 6556, and they also may be called upon to approve or disapprove the actions of our State Department in connection with the International Trade Organization taken at Geneva early last fall and again at Havana, Cuba, this spring.

I urge every Senator to read Dr. Killheffer's speech so that he may better form his own opinion as to the wisdom of the course we are following.

I have an estimate from the Government Printing Office that the manuscript will make approximately 2¾ pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $195.25. I think it would be well worth any reasonable expense to have this speech printed, because I am sure it will help every Senator who will read it to understand what is going on in connection with international trade organizations. I therefore repeat my request that the speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL TRADE ORGANIZATION

The idea behind this proposal has a twofold origin. It is a natural and perhaps inevitable outgrowth of the trade-agreement policy followed since 1934, and is also related to the creation of the International Bank and the Monetary Fund. At the time of Bretton Woods, it was said that bank and fund should have a trade counterpart.

My justification for using the expression, "natural and inevitable outgrowth," is that most governmental bureaus grow in exactly this way. The first mistake usually leads to others. So, when the political trick of transferring tariff policy from the legislative to the executive branch of government was pulled off, the stage was set for the growth of a typical bureau. That the bureau wanted to make the transfer a permanent one, despite the contrary provisions of the United States Constitution, seems self-evident.

Bretton Woods enlarged the concept, for if a trade organization parallel to the bank and fund could be created and made a part of the United Nations, then not only would the bureau retain its powers but it would actually extend its philosophy and field of operation to take in the whole world and under international auspices. So, with the enthusiastic help of a handful of extreme internationalists, the Department of State issued its first pamphlet on world trade and employment at the conclusion of the negotiation of the British loan. Some of you will recall how it was said at that time that a part of the quid pro quo was the agreement of the British to go along with ideas put forward in the Department of State publication including, importantly, the elimination of imperial preference. The British interpretation as to what was agreed did not check with what the American public was told.

Then followed the Department of State's more specific proposals for an international trade organization and the call, through the United Nations, for the first conference at London, and subsequently a second at Geneva. During preparation for Geneva, the Finance Committee of the Senate held hearings in which the authors of the draft charter were interrogated at considerable length about many points in it. Almost at the same time the Department of State held hearings in seven cities to give the public an opportunity to give their views on a document of which most of them had never heard and few had seen.

Parenthetically, you can expect the same sort of maneuver in respect to the Havana Charter.

The document drafted at London was redrafted at Lake Success, the so-called New York draft, and this became the basis of discussion at Geneva, April to September 1947, where two things were done. First, the charter for ITO was negotiated and adopted for submission to a world conference already arranged for Havana; and, second, the general agreement on tariffs and trade was negotiated and signed. Participation in the latter was under the authority of the Trade Agreements Act and it was claimed the same authority covered the first also.

This brief outline brings us to the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment, which began in Havana on November 21 last, and concluded on March 24, 1948, when it was signed ad referendum by almost all the nations attending the conference.

I attended as a member of the United States delegation in the capacity of an adviser and it is to tell you of my impressions that I am here. Perhaps the greatest is one of keen disappointment that so great an opportunity for leadership was not employed to better purpose. Two-thirds of the nations at Havana were attending such a conference for the first time, and their eyes and ears were open for enlightenment. Either they would be influenced toward greater acceptance of the practices of statism and planned and controlled economies or toward the opposite concept of private enterprise. Many, if not most of them, were either getting help from the United States or were expecting to get it. Certainly, they knew that something accounts for our ability to extend economic help such as has never been known before in the history of the world. Surely it is difficult to imagine any more favorable auspices to impress them with a concept which has meant so much to the material prosperity of the United States. What they got was a thorough indoctrination in the ideas of preferences, special discriminations, planned and controlled economies.

It is true that the Geneva draft, which was the basis of discussion at Havana, contained much to which objection had been voiced by such organizations as the National Association of Manufacturers, the National Foreign Trade Council, the American Tariff League, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and others, in addition to the searching criticisms and suggestions of the Senate Finance Committee. And it was expected that considerable improvement would be made at Havana. Actually, on balance, the Charter suffered deterioration instead. Moreover, the main criticisms of the earlier draft have not been corrected. These briefly were:

Good principles are stated only to be followed by multitudinous exceptions permitting continuance of almost every practice the good principles were to do away with;

Termination of exceptions left vague in many instances;

Rules applicable to United States will be avoided by other nations through exceptional authorizations;

Language which is necessarily complex is also unnecessarily ambiguous, spelling later trouble when the bureaucracy interprets it;

A good chapter regulating monopolies and cartels in private hands, followed by a longer chapter for their creation under intergovernmental auspices;

Obligations perhaps more normal for planned economies but which the United States has always opposed.

While not a complete list, all of these were pointed out in reports by the associations previously mentioned or the Senate Finance Committee, the latter also questioning the authority of the Department of State to agree to some of them.

At Havana more exceptions were made. A good illustration is the provision for the creation of new preferential arrangements. Nations listening to the debates pro and con on preferences decided that these were just what they wanted. Pointing to the continued existence of British preferences they used that as a lever to gain the privilege for themselves. And the United States situation on all the matters to which objection has been made is not helped any by the proposal by the United States that in ITO there shall be one vote for each country.

You will ask why the charter was not improved at Havana. The direct answer is that what we in industry wanted as improvements would have meant rejection or drastically altering provisions by the men who were the original authors. That was a good deal to expect.

And on the next question of whether substantial improvements could have been made, I can only say that it is my conviction that they could, if we had had aggressive negotiators who themselves believed in the ideas. The new handling of foreign investment is a case in point. The handling of it was such that Australia, a country with little, if any, intention of making such investments

itself, wrote the provisions. Obviously, they are written from the viewpoint of the receiving country. Yet, if such investments are made the United States must make most of them.

Another question will be as to the amount of change from the earlier Geneva draft. That does not lend itself to a mathematical answer that means anything. Geneva had 100 articles, whereas Havana has 106. And the greater part of Havana Charter is either identically the same or the same in substance. The more meaningful comparison is one which attempts an evaluation which shows:

(a) Number of instances of improvement;

(b) Number of instances of retention of matter criticized in the earlier draft;

(c) Number of instances of deterioration from Geneva.

Obviously, the points selected, as well as their classification, would vary with the analyst. However, in examinations of earlier drafts my criticisms have not differed materially from those of any of the groups previously mentioned.

I find 6 improvements, 34 retentions of undesirable matter formerly criticized, and 57 further deteriorations from Geneva. In addition, there are a number of matters that are questionable.

In the time at my disposal it is impossible to cover all of these fully. Therefore, I will try to give you some of the important points and will, in addition, try to answer such questions as you may wish to ask. For those of you who wish to pursue the matter further, and I hope that includes all of you, I shall be glad to make available copies of my comparison of Havana and Geneva drafts in detail. This includes many comments, as well as a reference to guide you to the particular points criticized. And you should have a copy of the Havana Charter, which can be obtained from United Nations headquarters.

The charter consists of nine chapters and a number of annexes.

CHAPTER I. STATES THE PURPOSES AND OBJECTIVES

There is little criticism from any quarter of the objectives of such an international organization, particularly if it adheres more closely to the original idea of a consultative and advisory body. In fact, it seems that much study, consultation, and advice should precede the setting up of a formal organization, which is another way of saying that the present attempt may be premature. Certainly, that is one of the conclusions to be drawn when one examines the extraordinary number of exceptions to the rules which are thought necessary.

Thus, I think the last objective stated should really be the first. This reads: "To facilitate through the promotion of mutual understanding, consultation and cooperation the solution of problems relating to international trade in the fields of employment, economic development, commercial policy, business practices, and commodity policy."

The third objective is one of the ambiguities in which the Charter abounds. It reads: "To further the enjoyment by all countries, on equal terms, of access to the markets, products, and productive facilities which are needed for their economic prosperity and development."

Interpreted literally it may mean things to which we in the United States do not agree at all.

CHAPTER II. EMPLOYMENT AND ECONOMIC ACTIVITY

In this chapter an effort was made by the adviser furnished by the American Federation of Labor, to include a principle declaring against directed or forced labor of any kind. This was successfully opposed by the United Kingdom, who themselves use such measures.

CHAPTER III. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND RECONSTRUCTION

This is expanded tremendously over what it was and my guess is that it will be productive of headaches in the future. The ITO is to arrange for surveys of natural resources and the economic potentialities of members and assist in plans for their development. Moreover, there are obligations that members shall cooperate in providing such facilities within the limit of their power. And the so-called undeveloped countries think the power of the United States is limitless.

In this chapter there is a provision that ITO may make recommendations and promote agreements to facilitate equitable distribution of skills, arts, technology, materials, and equipment with due regard to the needs of members. Members are governments. What is an equitable distribution? ITO apparently will decide and the United States has one vote against the field.

Investment provisions have been referred to previously. They will not encourage but rather discourage it. The charter speaks of "public and private investment." When it was suggested that most investment will come from private sources and that "public and private" might be deleted, speaking only of investment, there was great protest that the word "public" certainly must be retained because private investment might not be forthcoming. They did not need to mention that perhaps the obtaining of so-called public money might be easier and the requirements for servicing and repayment less burdensome. Moreover, lending of what are called public funds can quickly become political lending. In essence, it is foreign investments or loans forced on our own citizens through the Government's power to tax.

When we consider these provisions of the charter, it must be remembered that while originally written to provide such investments for economic development, Havana extended this to cover reconstruction also. In fact, while ITO originally contemplated establishing fair rules of trade, it is now said that reconstruction is an essential condition for the realization of the purposes.

In the same chapter, article 15 provides for an increase in preferential tariff systems. British preferential tariffs provided an object lesson for other countries seeking new and permissible methods of discrimination. Their demands were met, at least partially, in article 15.

CHAPTER IV. COMMERCIAL POLICY

The longest chapter, sometimes called the heart of the charter. It is based on the idea that multilateralism in trade is all good and bilateralism is bad. It stems directly from Mr. Hull's belief that reducing United States tariffs was a panacea for the world's ills.

One of the great purposes of the trade-agreement obsession was to restore a balance between United States imports and the constantly increasing volume and value of exports. But apparently two important points were overlooked. First, the fact that exports only have value to the extent they pay for imports and that exports beyond the value of imports are gifts instead of trade; and, second, the fact that the United States could easily produce and export a much greater value than it could possibly import.

We can only import commodities or services. Increasing imports of the latter would help to balance the accounts. Curiously, it is the purveyors of services that seem to shout the loudest for low or no tariffs on commodities.

But in the main, the United States exports manufactures and imports raw materials. Obviously, the values do not balance. So we find a curious function added in the ITO charter. You can speculate for yourselves what this may mean. It reads: "in such collaboration with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations and with other intergovernmental organizations as may be appropriate to undertake studies on the relationship between world prices of primary commodities and manufactured products, to consider and, where appropriate, to recommend international agreement on, measures designed to reduce progressively an unwarranted disparity in those prices."

I shall merely mention several other provisions of this chapter which should interest you.

One provides that if a member fails to join the group, known as contracting parties, within 2 years from the coming into force of ITO, member shall cease to enjoy the tariff concessions made at Geneva by the 23 nations known as contracting parties. But if they enjoy them for 2 years, it will be exceedingly difficult and perhaps politically impossible to withdraw them. They will then look for new concessions in return for any they make.

Another provides that binding a low tariff shall be considered a concession equivalent to the substantial reduction of a high tariff.

Still another provides that in negotiations a member may, in granting concessions, undertake not to raise a tariff above a specified higher level.

CHAPTER V. RESTRICTIVE BUSINESS PRACTICES

This is a condemnation and a series of articles for the control or regulation of private monopolies. Unfortunately, we find the inevitable provisions excepting State trading and intergovernmental cartels.

Under the requirements of the charter for judging whether a monopoly is harmful, it is an interesting speculation whether many will be so adjudged—remembering again that the United States has one vote and that monopolies are looked on with more favor in other countries than in the United States.

CHAPTER VI. INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMODITY AGREEMENTS

Starting with the creation of complete cartels controlling production, price, markets, etc., on primary commodities in burdensome surplus, this chapter is a foundation for the extension of Government planning and control. Provision is made for including other than primary commodities. Obviously, international controls will require domestic controls, for one without the other will not work. And, one product like cotton, under such control can soon lead to controls on other fibers which, if free, would upset the cotton controls. Moreover, it introduces a socialistic concept that consumers shall have a voice equal to that of producers in establishing prices and other terms of the cartel.

Whatever may be objectionable in monopolies in private hands will inevitably be worse in the hands of Government bureaus. And, in the hands of an international bureaucracy, worse still. I do not accept the idea that some chosen few in such a group will be endowed with integrity and wisdom of a superior order. It has been suggested that absence of any selfish profit urge would enable the agency to plan and administer with even-handed justice. I wonder.

These planners and administrators could be men of little or no practical experience. Yet included in the provisions of the charter is the idea of shifting resources, both of materials and manpower, from one line of production to another where the resources could be employed more efficiently.

In the limited number of cases where international agreements of some sort are really required, it would seem that, besides using every effort to limit their number, only the governments concerned should negotiate a treaty. Setting up a permanent bureaucracy means expansion in the whole field of planned economy.

CHAPTER VII. THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE ORGANIZATION

This sets up the structure and functions, voting procedure, and powers and duties.

Here are found the provisions granting one vote to each member.

Contributions are to be apportioned from time to time, following the principles applied in United Nations. An attempt to limit the contribution of the United States to one-third of the budget was defeated.

And in case someone thinks the development provisions of article 10 are simply entertaining words, the function of carrying those functions is specifically included.

CHAPTER VIII. SETTLEMENT OF DIFFERENCES

This contains the provisions for consultation, arbitration, review, or reference to the International Court of Justice.

CHAPTER IX. GENERAL PROVISIONS

Here provision is made for a general review of the charter in 5 years. This is an improvement over the 10 years prescribed in the Geneva draft.

The charter is to come into force 60 days after a majority of the signers at Habana have accepted it, or if at the end of a year after the final act of Habana it has not so come into force, then when it has been accepted by 20. Otherwise there are provisions to bring it into force by other means.

Meantime, by resolution, an Interim Commission of ITO has been created without benefit of legislative approval. This interim body has been given certain duties to perform during the period before formal ratification of the charter.

Moreover, it must be remembered that many of the charter provisions are reproduced in the general agreement on tariffs and trade concluded at Geneva. Parts I and III of this have been proclaimed by the President as in effect as of January 1 last, and part II to the extent its provisions are not inconsistent with our laws. That means that until successfully challenged, someone may interpret it as not being in conflict. Some of the provisions of part III tie in very closely with ITO also.

It is a situation that bears watching.

CONCLUSIONS

Major criticisms and suggestions made in connection with the Geneva draft were largely ignored at Havana. Further deterioration far outweighed the few improvements made. Language susceptible of several interpretations is continued. One delegate said in reference to this that he was beginning to understand that the references to full employment probably meant full employment for lawyers.

The charter may be premature for, despite the many exceptions in the Geneva draft, delegates at Havana were seeking new ones. Hence bad practices were not eliminated, but are preserved by exceptions designed for that purpose. Principles binding on the United States are not applicable for the present to many other countries.

My conclusion is that the Habana charter is unacceptable to the United States and should be rejected by Congress and a renegotiation demanded. Moreover I firmly believe that a greatly superior charter could be negotiated if we made an aggressive effort.

When that proposal is made the objections are: (a) that the group of countries could not be brought together again; (b) that failure to agree now would result in chaotic conditions in international trade and finance.

As to (a), experience of the past denies its validity. A smaller group of countries met in London and again in Geneva for 6 months last summer on the same subject. These same nations, plus a much larger number, met again in Havana only a couple of months after the conference at Geneva was ended. Moreover, Habana was the first time most nations had studied and debated the subject.

But there is a more important point involved. Is ITO more important to the United States than to the other nations? I think exactly the opposite is the case. If I am correct, then the United States should not exhibit such anxiety to get a charter.

As to (b), it is nonsense to say we would have chaos. That is what we have and it is what the charter recognizes. The multiplicity of exceptions provide for indefinite continuance of the conditions the ITO was supposed to rid us.

I think the effect would be salutary if the United States would take the action I have already indicated. I think the other nations would be the ones to take second thought. They would be the ones to ask for a new conference and a new attempt. In that way, perhaps, a good charter, but certainly a better one, could be written, with rules in it that would have more general application. Wherever there had to be exceptions, they could be limited in number and provided with a definite date of termination.

It is my belief that an entirely new group of negotiators would be necessary, for there is presently far too much acceptance of the philosophy of government-planned economy and controls by the state.

There is no noticeable appreciation of the fundamental weaknesses of government versus private enterprise but rather a belief that government bureaucracy can do everything better, with even the idea that private enterprise, being selfish, is necessarily on a lower moral plane. Very importantly, business and industry in the United States should be invited to help write a preliminary draft before it is submitted to other nations. It is an empty gesture to consult them after the fact.

In the interest of amity and to forestall misunderstanding or misinterpretation by the other nations, it would be well if the Congress, in rejecting the Havana Charter, would at the same time declare the pattern of what it would accept.

Intelligently handled, this could be an act of constructive leadership by the United States, in which other nations could be clearly informed as to the direction in which the United States would cooperate with them, as well as the direction in which it would be less interested.

It would not mean trying to force our system on them. It would mean that, in so far as the conduct of international trade and financial relations is concerned, the United States wants to create an organization in which:

1. Sound principles would be clearly and unequivocally stated.

2. These would apply in international trade, regardless of the particular internal systems used by individual nations.

3. Rules which would apply to all uniformly would be clearly stated, without exceptions.

4. Rules regarded by all as future desirable goals not immediately attainable could be stated and a date set when nations would agree to comply with them.

5. Recognizing a transition period, a separate section could set out the steps toward achievement of the desired goal, again including date of termination of any necessary transitional measures.

With no assertion of completeness, this listing is an attempt to indicate a constructive approach rather than write a complete program, aiming always at gradual reaching of a declared goal, contrasted with the present more negative approach in which the chief anxiety is to provide for indefinite continuance of every possible device for avoiding the rules.

Without laboring this point further, it remains to say that if this is thought to be a better approach, there is a possible way in which it can be brought about. It will be done if the weight of informed opinion in the United States is clearly and firmly put before the Congress by the appropriate organizations of industry, agriculture, business, and finance and by interested individual citizens, not neglecting maximum publicity through all available channels.

It is extremely dangerous and most unlikely to increase international amity, for the United States to accept the charter as it emerged from Havana, on the fuzzy notion that the mere fact of having an organization will progressively lead to better relations with our neighbors.

Your chances for altering the terms of an important contract are best before you sign it.

The Economic Cooperation Administration will have a dominant influence in world economic relations for the next several years. Through its aid it may be possible to develop more universally acceptable standards with fewer exceptions.

A present propaganda line is to the effect that rejection of ITO or failure to renew the Trade Agreements Act will be interpreted abroad as a renewed intention of the United States to return to isolationism. Perhaps the best answer to this is to quote from the London Economist of April 10, 1948, as follows:

"Search back as one may * * * there is no record of a comparable act of inspired and generous diplomacy. * * * It will be difficult, after this demonstration of international solidarity, to go on repeating the old gibes about American isolationism, the old complacent references to American political immaturity. In recent months, the American public * * * is rapidly qualifying for the title of the least isolationist and self-absorbed of peoples."

Open Letter From Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, to Editors of the Daily Worker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter on the subject Your Party, Your Paper and Its Tactics, written by me to the editors of the Daily Worker.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE EDITORS OF THE DAILY WORKER

Re your party, your paper, and its tactics.

DEAR SIRS: I am presenting below some comments regarding the recent activities of the Communist Party and of your publication, the Daily Worker, in particular, in connection with the Mundt bill. Ordinarily I would not even consider writing to you or making these comments. Your sheet has, however, undoubtedly relied upon the fact that very rarely do public officials even bother to honor it by commenting upon its nefarious activities. I do, however, feel that your publication and your party have been so vicious in your entire approach to the Mundt bill that I would not be fulfilling my duty if I did not call public attention to your debased approach.

I am not presenting any specific comments on the Mundt bill as such, because I have arrived at no final conclusion on it. Contrary to all that the Daily Worker has said and implied, the Senate Judiciary Committee has conscientiously approached the Mundt bill with a fair and open mind, seeking real light on the subject. We are in the position of judges—we do not decide cases until all the

evidence is in. We are about to proceed on an intensive and cautious line by line, clause by clause analysis of the bill, in order to determine its necessity or advisability, its legality, its possible constitutionality, any possible violation of civil liberties, etc. We will give due and earnest consideration to all the statements we have received, both pro and con and we will make all changes in the bill that are deemed necessary.

Completely irrespective of the bill, therefore, I should like to make the following points:

COMMUNIST CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS

1. The Communist Party stands accused, on the basis of its record, of insolence and insult to the American people and, in particular, to the United State Senate before whose committee, Communist witnesses behaved in a most evasive and outrageous manner. We extended to your representatives the privilege of testimony in fair public hearings in a truly American manner. We bent over backwards to give the opposition to the Mundt bill the overwhelming proportion of available time. You acknowledge our courtesy by contempt of all of the processes or republican government. Not only did your witnesses (and I refer to your front outfits, too) not shed any light on the subject, but you sought to capitalize on the public forum possibilities of the committee hearings by issuing long, windy, and useless statements of generalities actually unrelated to the Mundt bill and merely echoing the Communist Party line on all phases of foreign and domestic affairs. You sought, moreover, to sabotage the bill by extending hearings indefinitely, but we would not tolerate your stalling tactics.

DEVIOUS RED PROPAGANDA

2. In its propaganda campaign against the Mundt bill, the Communist Party stands accused before the American people of utilizing every shady trick in its dishonorable repertoire in order to inflame public opinion and emotion against a measure without actually presenting any facts about that measure—in order to encourage synthetic thinking and rash actions. You sought to dupe liberals, progressives, and all other individuals who are not personally Communists into believing that the United States Congress was secretly attempting to foist some type of totalitarian regime upon our country. You ruthlessly utilized every Hitlerian propagandistic device, and in particular, wholesale name calling, denouncing every member of the committee who even dared to ask you or your representatives a question as Fascists, warmongers, and every other poison name you could muster.

EXPLOITATION OF MINORITY FEELINGS

3. Your party stands accused on its record of seeking to inflame minority groups against the Congress and against our American way of life, seeking to exploit grievances—real or imagined—of some minorities so as to aline these minorities with your revolutionary program rather than actually to achieve any constructive solutions to minority problems. For years, you have relied upon the gullibility of some elements in certain minorities and have sought to pose as their champions and defenders, when actually you have only been interested in utilizing them, as you utilize everyone, for your own secret, revolutionary ends.

PROVOCATION OF INCIDENTS

4. The Communist Party stands accused on its record of seeking to provoke mob incidents for publicity value in connection with the Mundt bill even to the point perhaps of leading to some bloodshed, so as to continue your sham pose as martyrs and as the victims of capitalist political persecution. We have, however, been careful to prevent your provocation of such incidents.

LOW COMMUNIST JOURNALISM

5. The Daily Worker, in particular, stands accused on the record of its alleged news reporting and its editorial comment of the cheapest, foulest sort of gutter journalism. You who have so long criticized the American press (which is the freest and the finest in the world) are guilty of the worst sins of any press in the world.

NAME CALLING AGAINST OPPONENTS OF REDS

6. The Communist Party stands accused on its record of hurling unjustified charges at all those who recognize its menace—hurling the very charges of which you yourselves are guilty. You have called the enemies of communism war mongers, although you yourselves are the greatest contributing factors to ill will between the American and the Russian peoples, and therefore a contributing factor toward the terrible possibility of a horrible third world war. You yourselves are guilty of the very charge of seeking dictatorship and totalitarianism which you tried to pin on your opponents. You yourselves are guilty of the very charge of stymieing the forces of progress because you seek not constructive solutions to America's problems at home and abroad but rather chaos and confusion—the conditions in which you believe you can best operate and rise to power.

7. The Communist Party stands accused on its record of seeking to convert individuals with humanitarian impulses to your antihumanitarian creed—seeking to make them "chumps for communism" or "suckers for Stalin."

THE MENACE OF COMMUNISM

I cannot predict the outcome of the Mundt bill in the United States Senate, particularly because of the short amount of time left for us for conscientious consideration of this controversial bill. But I can predict that the Communist Party's behavior during these last few weeks will constitute forever a case history—a prime example, so to speak—of the very worst sins against our Nation, of which you have so long been guilty. You yourselves have torn off the mask which hides your vicious aims. You yourselves have shown to the American people the danger of communism in our midst; the danger of a fanatic, atheistic "religion," whose objectives are the objectives of a foreign nation, whose processes are the alien procedures of a foreign way of life, whose approach is a dogmatic approach in which reason and logic have no place, whose tactics are based upon provocation of violence and bloodshed.

FAIR PROCEDURE OF JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Even though we of the committee despise your philosophy, we will not allow emotion to sway us. There will be no hysteria in committee action, no Red-baiting, no witch hunting—as you have tried to accuse us. We have sworn to protect and defend the Constitution—and we will do so, preserving the civil liberties of all our people—yes; even of despicable Communists.

Sincerely,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

More Than 1,000,000 Persons of Polish Descent Fought in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1948

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, a most interesting article entitled "More Than 1,000,000 Persons of Polish Descent Fought in War" appeared in the Polish-American Journal, Scranton, Pa., on Sunday, June 6, 1948.

Because of the interesting statistics contained therein which has bearing on my proposal, a measure which I introduced on May 24, 1948, namely, H. R. 6680, to authorize the incorporation of the Polish Legion of American Veterans of the United States of America, I include it herewith:

MORE THAN 1,000,000 PERSONS OF POLISH DESCENT FOUGHT IN WAR

A study of various records shows the great contributions Polish Americans made in the winning of World War II

More than 1,000,000 persons of Polish extraction served in the armed forces of their country during the conflict. Although they constitute only 4 percent of the population of the United States, Polish Americans made up at least 8½ percent of the entire military forces of their country.

The most accurate statistics available so far show that in April 1944, while about 5 percent of all armed forces made the supreme sacrifice, 8 percent of the number of Polish Americans in the service were officially listed as killed in line of duty.

When World War II began, about 20 percent of the personnel in uniform was made up of persons of Polish ancestry. Once America took active part in the encounter Polish Americans flocked to the colors.

One naval officer in charge of the recruiting station in New Haven, Conn., reported that in 1940 and 1941 at least 50 percent of all enlistees were of Polish descent. Other recruiting centers in Polish American areas issued similar reports.

Statistics of the Roman Catholic Diocese at Scranton show that of 43 Polish parishes with 86,111 individuals, 18,083 entered the armed forces, or 21 percent of the membership. Of these, 456 lost their lives, according to the June 29, 1945, issue of Republika-Gornik, now the Polish American Journal.

The November 6, 1945, edition of Nowiny Polskie declares that of 11,000 soldiers of Polish descent in Milwaukee, 900 died in the service of their country.

The Polish National Alliance of Chicago with about 285,000 members, had 20,450 men and 429 women members in the armed forces as of September 1944. Of these, 429 were killed in action.

The Polish Roman Catholic Union of America with 141,615 on its roles shows 5,377 members in the service as of November 1945. Of these, 453 lost their lives in line of duty.

According to figures compiled in the summer of 1943, 2 years before the war ended, the Polish Women's Alliance with 60,000 members had approximately 1,500 of its membership in the various women's military services. Husbands and sons in the service at that time numbered 16,418.

The American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that our young people should be encouraged in every way possible to take an active part and interest in our democratic form of government and to realize the many benefits we all enjoy because of it. It is not enough merely to provide formal education for each generation, as too often a real appreciation of our democratic processes escapes us unless we can

participate in, and learn more about, this Government of the United States.

I sponsored a contest for the high-school students of the Sixth Texas District to encourage these young people to record their thoughts on important topics. I am proud to announce the winner of the essay contest in Ellis County, which was so ably conducted by County Superintendent J. E. Wakeland. Miss Leta Barkley, Midlothian High School, Midlothian, Tex., has been declared the winner, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include her essay entitled "The American Way of Life":

THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

(By Leta Barkley, Midlothian, Tex.)

One of the most striking things about the United States is its unity. From New York to San Francisco most Americans speak the same language, read the same magazines, have about the same standards of living and the same philosophy of life.

In Europe, if you cross a mountain range like the Pyrenees or a river like the Rhine, suddenly everything is different; language, ideas, and food. Some parts of that country live in the thirteenth century, some in the eighteenth century, and some in the twentieth.

In some of the countries in Europe almost every inch of the soil is cultivated, while America is still practically an empty country. Maybe because of this there is less bitterness between the people.

Society in America is not exactly classless, but here privileges are kept down. If you attempt to bypass the man who is in line before you, you will soon be called down with "Who do you think you are?" Everyone expects you to be a citizen, nothing more, nothing less; to stand on your own rights, but to claim no immunities. One of the great facts of America is that democracy works very well. It is possible to have both democracy and discipline. In wartime, elections took place without disturbances. To criticize the President, the Government, and the conduct of the war was a right everyone had. Such freedom played a great part in the final victory; it kept the leaders, civil and military, on their toes.

In the American Army discipline is very different from what it used to be in the Old World. But it is perfect in combat. Outside military activities, the young American resents any privileges granted to officers. The best American young men are rebels at heart; it is their strength.

In America the people who appeal most strongly to the public are not the long-faced ones but those who have a sense of humor. The cheerfulness and good humor of individuals and crowds add much to the charm of life in America. That the Nation is seldom angry is one of the reasons for its success.

Some people believe the United States to be a country of luxurious comfort and not a country of intellectual culture. Both ideas are wrong. Until recently several countries have been much more comfortable than the United States. It is no longer true that American civilization is a dollar civilization. The Americans love industrial organization, not greedily but for pleasure of achievement. They take a delight in discovering new ways of harnessing nature, in inventing more ingenious contrivances, and in producing bigger and better things. There is a close association between industry and culture.

In America, education is practically a religion. A greater percentage of American people go through universities than do Europeans. Some have said that the universities in America give too much place to sports and social life. It used to be true in some of them; it is getting less so. The admixture of veterans has produced excellent effects. Veterans put into their work a seriousness, a knowledge of life that the prewar student did not possess.

One cannot find such fine public libraries, such beautiful art museums, or such excellent symphony orchestras as in America. In the last 25 years familiarity with good literature, painting, and music has increased incredibly.

America is now a postwar world, dominant in the production field and successful in the culture field. This strength puts tremendous responsibilities on the United States. To maintain peace the world must have active American support; there will be no war as long as the United States remains strong and determined to put its tremendous strength at the service of justice. Contrary to what happened after the Versailles Treaty, Americans are ready to join in any reasonable scheme for international organization.

There are many ways of life, but to me the American way of life is the only way of life.

Blood Can Lift the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, blood can lift the iron curtain. By that I do not mean bloodletting but I do mean the affinity of blood for blood. There are 90,000,000 people of the Soviet satellite countries caught in the police-state net. There are seven to ten million people in the United States with the same racial background as the unfortunate people held in the Soviet orbit in eastern Europe. There are millions of ties of relationship between the two. These ties can be woven into a mighty cable to lift the heavy curtain that shuts off the eastern European people from truth and civilization. While the curtain is down the Titos, the Beiruts, the Paukers, the Dimitrovs, the Gottwalds, the Rakosis, and the rest proceed to weld the chains for these formerly independent states.

One of the coldest facts in the cold war is that sowers of Soviet propaganda are reforesting the world with a new kind of tree, a tree that grows taller than the Sequoias of California; it is the Tree of the Tremendous Lie. Samples of the fruit of this tree plucked from broadcasts from the Soviet and satellite radios for just one day, June 1, Tuesday of this week, are as follows:

From Moscow such phrases as: "The imperialist groups of the United States"; "the antidemocratic measures of the United States"; "the superiority of Soviet culture over American culture." From the Polish radio on June 1 was a long broadcast about "the two-faced policy of the United States." From Hungary it was stated on the same day, "We Hungarians are defending freedom and aggression from the west and from America." From Yugoslavia on Tuesday came the broadcast about "American imperialism unleashing its attack." And so the Soviet radios all over the world are vilifying the United States and its people each day. They must have an ultimate effect. The natural feeling of friendship of these people behind the iron curtain for the United States must ultimately give way if they are no longer to live in the foliage of falsehood.

We must find ways and means to develop a real Voice of America, a chorus of millions of voices that can speak the truth about America from those that live in this land of liberty. That voice must reach the satellite nations.

We have a most potent factor in this country that no other country in the world possesses. It is part of our heritage as a land of asylum for the oppressed peoples of this world. That was this country's historic role since its discovery. From our country there extend strong ties of affection for every country in the world. Each of the whole 140,000,000 of us can trace his ancestry to a foreign soil. This is true of no other country in the world. It is a great dynamic factor for world peace. We must keep warm these natural embers of affection against the cold hate that is being broadcast against us throughout the world by the mendacious Soviet propagandists.

There are approximately 90,000,000 people in the Soviet satellite countries. In the United States there are at least from seven to ten million people of the same racial background. There are over 4,000,000 people of Polish extraction; nearly 2,000,000 of Czechoslovakian; nearly three-quarters of a million Hungarian; nearly half a million Yugoslavian; over a quarter million Rumanian; over 300,000 Finnish; tens of thousands of Bulgarian and Albanian extraction, as well as Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian. All of these people of iron-curtain country racial origin have a real understanding of the hearts of those behind the iron curtain. They know that there are millions of people enslaved there.

What the Italian people of the United States did to persuade the people of Italy to vote for liberty, these people can do by informing the people behind the iron curtain what the real facts are concerning America.

The people behind the iron curtain are being deluged with Soviet lies about conditions in the United States. They are being conditioned for conflict with the West. While the 90,000,000 behind the iron curtain know that the United States is being misrepresented, the day-in-and-day-out repetition of these lies is bound to have its effect.

However, if American people of the same racial origin in the United States began to communicate with their friends and relatives overseas it will be far more potent than Soviet Government propaganda.

If a present-day citizen of Poland is having dinned into his ears a hate-America program, you can see how a letter from a relative or friend in the United States would be far stronger propaganda because it would be based on truth. The Polish citizen would rely on the veracity of his American friend or relative. He would not rely on the official Soviet broadcast.

When the Cominform was set up last year to wreck the American plan to aid Europe, it was set up in the satellite

countries as the springboard of economic attack. The American people of iron-curtain-country background can throw a counterpunch that will set the Cominform on its heels.

Some might say that the satellite governments would immediately ban the mails if communications began to swell in numbers causing disturbances behind the iron curtain. But if the satellite governments tried that, there could be broadcast to the people behind the iron curtain that millions of letters were awaiting delivery to them from their friends and relatives overseas but that their governments were holding them back.

The societies in the United States of people of the same racial background as iron-curtain peoples should formulate a counterplan to that of the Cominform. They should call upon all of their people to organize a tremendous campaign of communications by letter and otherwise to their friends and relatives overseas. Communications should be sent by the millions. The natural ties of affection, relationship, and friendship should be kept alive. These are the ties that the Soviets are trying to cut. This could be a most effective Voice of America, a voice that the people overseas would heed. I would give them heart. It would let them know that there are people in the United States of the same blood, who live in freedom.

Address by Hon. James A. Farley Before Chamber of Commerce of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, in a recent address delivered before the Chamber of Commerce of the United States here in Washington, Mr. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and one of America's foremost citizens, urged that businessmen participate more actively in the affairs of the Government, a reminder that I believe is most timely in the days of mounting Government problems.

Because Mr. Farley's experience and sound judgment are so well recognized, I believe his message is one which should be given general publicity and therefore ask unanimous consent that the address be published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESS AND CONGRESS

It has been said by one of its more successful, if stern practitioners, that politics is not an exact science. If Otto von Bismarck is correct, it is because the true science and study of politics is man, and man is an unpredictable animal. Perhaps he is at his most unpredictable when he is predicting elections as Senator WHERRY and his fellow Nebraskans demonstrated so conclusively 2 weeks ago.

I used to be a political prophet myself and must acknowledge, in all modesty, that I was not without honor. Of course, it was a little easier to prophesy when the States were all out of step except Maine and Vermont. I have no intention of dwelling on my surrender, voluntarily, of the prophet's mantle. Some thought I left too soon and others felt I did not leave soon enough.

Suffice it to say, I have no intention of playing a return engagement. I have no political ambition. Lest there be any misapprehension over occasional mention of my name, I want it clearly understood I am not a candidate for any office.

I am now an American businessman. I say that with pride. I have been in party politics for 35 years. If there be any in the sound of my voice who do not know it, I was identified with the Democratic Party. I am a Democrat still—not very still at the moment—and I expect to die in the party.

However, the 8 years I have devoted exclusively to business have taught me one can serve his country in commerce no less faithfully than in public office. I think the decisive factor in the war—American production—an enduring testimonial of that fact.

This does not mean, however, that businessmen should be content to stand and wait while others assume the task of running the Government. While I do not intend to preach politics—in fact I have no commission to preach politics—I am convinced that businessmen have neglected the cause of better government. Indeed, I feel that they have seriously damaged their own interests by failure to play a greater part in local and national affairs.

In my years in politics I have seen organized pressure by minority groups rattle our Nation like a dice box. I have seen the best interests of our national economy scuttled by the inactivity of men of the ability and performance of you who sit before me today. Like you I have experienced in one way or another all the pressures from what we call, "the administration." And I know something of the pressures that are exerted on "the administration" in the executive and legislative branches.

Men of business take their governmental responsibilities all too lightly. Few take the time to learn how our Constitution operates. Not many have taken the trouble to know how Congress operates, what role it plays in the Republic or anything of the men in it. Likewise few take the trouble to study the functions of the executive branch of the Government, to study its role and the nature of its personnel.

Let me say here and now Congress is the bulwark of our democracy. With all its faults it is, because of its many virtues, the greatest assembly in the history of the world. Every one of our 531 Senators and Representatives needs, and, believe you me, welcomes our support. And if they do not get it our last bulwark is gone and the deluge of communism will pour in to overwhelm freedom.

I am anything but an alarmist. Throughout my life—and I have had my share of reverses as well as my triumphs—I have firmly believed that everything happens for the best. In passing I might add that while the darker hours are reportedly great for building character, I would prefer not to linger over them. It is difficult to find anything comforting in the present state of the world. Everywhere except in our own fortunate land there is misery and want.

Fear hangs over the world. The fear of war. One nation, unhappily, holds the key to the stable of the four horsemen of the apocalypse. War, famine, pestilence, and death cannot run their terrible course unless that nation wills it. Unfortunately, that nation is not governed by a representative assembly, but by the most powerful despot the world has ever known and a cold clique of zealots to tyranny.

If culture and civilization, as we know them, are to survive, we must support our Congress. It is to be regretted that in attempting to give that support many of us are inept and all too few of us are effective. I have no wish to burden you with examples. I am sure all recognize that the situation could be improved, that the relationship of business and the Government could be bettered.

Much could be done if businessmen would employ the same directness and dispatch they use in running their businesses in their dealings with Congress. More important, perhaps, is that we men of business pull together with our lawmakers and with labor and agriculture. At no time in histor, perhaps has there been a greater need for national unity. We cannot win abroad unless we are united at home.

Let us be confirmed followers of the great American doctrine of give and take. Let there be no division in our ranks. The devious characters, whose badge is appropriately enough the color of blood, are not torn by internal dissension. But let us not surrender our sacred right to dissent. Not for one minute would any of us suggest we achieve harmony by the route of Siberia or the firing squad.

Silence is not always golden. It can be cowardice or suicide. One of the inalienable rights of every American is the right to complain. If anyone has a grievance, it is his privilege to give it tongue. If we as businessmen fear that our prize ox is being gored, by all means let us stand up on our hind legs and bellow. But first let us be sure that we are not merely baying at the moon, but that we have a grievance interwoven with the interests of our fellow citizens. And let us make ourselves quickly and easily understood.

Not long ago a nationally known businessman wrote a five-page single space letter to one of our congressional leaders in an attempt to make a point relating to inflation controls. The recipient turned it over to his staff for analysis and, failing in that, tried to figure it out himself. In disgust he tossed the communication into a waste basket after telling his secretary to send a routine acknowledgment. No one can blame the congressional leader for exclaiming, "My God, if that is the best a supposedly intelligent businessman can do, he might as well save his time and mine."

I can hear some of you say: "Why should I write a letter to my Senator or Congressman? Who am I among hundreds of thousands?" To tell you the truth, if the kind of letter is like thousands I have received, I could agree with that philosophy. However, the greater proportion of the letters I have received in public office have been genuinely helpful and influenced my course of action perhaps more than any of the writers suspected. To the politician the voice of the people should be the voice of God, except when he thinks solely in the terms of the next election. The good politician graduates to statesmanship when he begins thinking in terms of the next generation.

Believe me, Members of Congress should hear from you pillars of strength in their own community. They are anxious to do so, if they are worthy of the seats, and let me say to you the unworthy is the exception rather than the rule. Of course, any opinion you send should be worthy of the name, a product of study based upon experience and information. It should not be tossed off in anger, indignation, or contempt, nor should it be forged in self-interest or bias.

In other words, I would caution you to deal with Congress as you would deal with your business associates. Congress is a responsive and a responsible body. With all the solemnity at my command, I say that as

a class businessmen have erred in pondering to whom is Congress responsible.

Sometimes it is forgotten that to carry his share of the load each Member of Congress must be reelected. That means the fulfillment of obligations and promises. The politician has nothing to sell but his word and its performance. Too frequently businessmen are not aware that they have an obligation. As I see it, business has an obligation to do something to help the Congressman's constituency. We can do that by improving our communities and the lot of our workers. Also we should engage in hard, productive work on governmental and international affairs in our cities and towns. Before it is too late we should engage in political educational programs on public issues.

Too many times I have heard businessmen declare themselves for a certain measure or program because their favorite columnist or commentator had written a supporting appeal to which they subscribed. Too many times I have heard them complain that it is futile to combat a measure or program because they cannot win. To these I can only say that no one ever won a fight without throwing a punch.

Without any intention to lecture or scold I ask you, as businessmen, whether you have given as much time and effort to correcting things that affect your businesses as you have in complaining about them? Would we, by default, let our businesses take their own course, as we surrender the helm on the direction of domestic and international issues?

To return to Congress, I wonder how many understand that it operates largely on a committee basis and that when a committee holds a hearing it is seeking enlightenment for Congress as a whole. Committees are searching for facts rather than propaganda. If they get the latter, can we honestly say that it is not in any way our responsibility? Despite prejudices, which are inherent in all men, no Congressman would wittingly vote for a measure that would stifle production and curtail employment.

I wonder how many of you realize that a Member of Congress often votes against a measure or for a measure, contrary to your position, because he has not heard from businessmen in his district or State. Too frequently the silence of businessmen is as deafening before a vote as their howls of anguish after it has been cast.

Let me here interject a partisan note. I want to appeal to you businessmen to participate directly in every phase of party politics. By all means exercise your right to ballot. I have known of districts where men regarded as left of left were elected because the partisan vote of businessmen dropped off to an extremely low level. We have a two-party system. The very vigor of our form of government depends upon it. Businessmen ought to take a hand in the working of that system. You ought to take a hand in the development of party platforms and in the selection of party candidates.

Participation in politics is participation in government. Businessmen have a capacity for government as the war demonstrated. Many of you dropped private activities at a sacrifice to perform splendidly in Government service. No small part of our victory in war was due to your efforts within the Government as well as your productive genius. Unfortunately with the end of the war, too many businessmen forgot their obligations of public service. We cannot win the peace without more of that full measure of unselfish cooperation.

To their own detriment businessmen hesitate to appear before our representative of Congress and lay their problems on the line, I can understand, although I do not condone, reluctance to travel to Washington. I can only condemn passing up of golden opportunities to present the business point of view when committees hold hearings outside of Washington in the home towns of industries most interested.

Business must have closer personal relationships with Congress. It should engage in the right kind of correspondence. As one of you I say we must be sympathetic and patient. We must be quick to acknowledge a job well done. At every opportunity we should take our Members of Congress behind the scenes of business and do a selling job on the effect of pertinent legislation. We should do what our Congressmen do for us on our visits to Washington, when they give us a glimpse behind the scenes.

I want labor and agriculture to do the same. Our Government is one of checks and balances between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. It is the best government in the world. Our economy is one of our checks and balances between business, labor, and agriculture. And it is the best economy in the world. Let us keep it so.

Socialized Medicine and Dentistry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1948

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, during the past number of years those directing the course of our Government have adopted many Socialist policies and have taken this country much further toward a Socialist form of government than most people realize. The trend has been definitely in that direction. Many worn-out policies of European socialism that have failed miserably have been copied here by those high in government. It must be the policy of this Government in the immediate future to change the trend away from socialistic policies, because socialism is only a modified form, the twilight zone, or the vestibule leading into a Communist or totalitarian state.

For many years bills have been introduced in Congress that if enacted would finally fasten socialized medicine and dentistry upon the American public. The Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill having received the most study, consideration, and publicity is a long step in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, they offer these socialistic schemes notwithstanding that our voluntary system of medical care has given to the American people the best medical treatments and the greatest safeguard against the spread of disease in the history of the world. Due to the progress made in medical science, treatment and medical care of the people of the United States, the average life span of our people has been increased in the past 40 years from 48 to 68 years of age. A more adequate hospital service has continued to develop throughout the Nation. In fact, through the development of medical science and surgery under our present system as reflected in the past world war, almost countless thousands of wounded American soldiers who would have died of such wounds during the First World War are living today and are sustaining themselves in American industry and the professions. Never before in our history have the American people from the poor to the rich had medical and hospital care brought to them in such great numbers as at the present time.

If those misguided people in our government who advocate health insurance and Federal Government control are successful in persuading the Nation to embark on the first steps of socialized medicine, socialized dentistry will follow in its wake. No step could be taken in this field which would strike a more effective and dangerous blow against the future health of the people of this Nation. We would rapidly begin to lose the great gains we have made in medical research and surgery. The expense would be enormous and the liberty of our people to choose their doctors and dentists would be infringed upon, and to a large extent abolished in the future. Further progress in medical and dental care would be impeded to the detriment of all the people of the Nation.

The chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in considering legislation I have referred to, in May 1947 called upon the Brookings Institution a nonpolitical institution of the highest standing to make a study of bills introduced before the Congress and asked them to make a report to this Senate Committee as early as available in 1948.

Drs. Lewis Meriam and George W. Bachman headed the staff making the study. Dr. Bachman has had a very wide experience in medical research and public health, both in this country and abroad. He has served on the faculties of Johns Hopkins and Columbia and is regarded along with Dr. Meriam as outstanding in the medical profession in this country and the world.

In signing the report H. G. Moulton, president, the Brookings Institution, says:

> It is our hope that the study may prove of genuine service to your committee.

Mr. Speaker, I herewith submit brief excerpts from the study made and recommendations of the Brookings Institution, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM BROOKINGS REPORT

It is apparent that the United States under its voluntary system of medical care has made greater progress in the application of medical and sanitary science than any other country. This progress is now reflected in low mortality and morbidity rates of infectious diseases and in increased life expectancy. There is every reason to believe that these trends will continue unabated under our present system of medical care.

The United States has some individuals and families not possessed of the resources to enable them to pay for adequate medical care. In the future, as in the past, provision must be made for them through public funds or philanthropy. The evidence suggests that many of them are elderly, impaired, or underemployed or are widows or deserted women or their dependents. It is doubtful if they could be effectively covered by compulsory insurance because they would lack the means to attain and maintain an insured status. The large majority of American families have the resources to pay for adequate medical care if they elect to give it a high priority among the several objects of expenditure. The issue is not whether they can afford medical care but

whether they should be compelled by law to pool their risks and to give payment for medical care a top priority. The major alternative for people with ability to pay is to leave them free to determine for themselves what medical care they desire and whether they will pool their risks through voluntary arrangements.

Compulsory health insurance would necessitate a high degree of governmental regulation and control over the personnel and the agencies engaged in providing medical care. This field of regulation and control would be far more difficult than any other large field previously entered by the Government, and past experience with governmental regulations and control in the United States causes doubt as to whether it encourages initiative and development.

The problem of eliminating politics from Government administration is extremely difficult. It does not seem probable that politics could be eliminated from medical care supplied under a governmental system.

Compulsory insurance would inject the Government into the relationship between practitioner and patient. A real danger exists that Government actions would impair that relationship and hence the quality of medical care.

The administration of compulsory insurance would require thousands of Government employees for accounting, auditing, and inspection, and investigation.

The cost of medical care presumably would increase because of (a) administrative expenses; (b) the tendency of insured persons to make unnecessary and often unreasonable demands upon the medical-care services; and (c) the tendency of some practitioners and agencies to take advantage of the system for their own financial advantage.

The adoption of compulsory insurance would not immediately make available adequate service for all, because there are not at present the facilities nor a sufficient number of trained and experienced physicians, dentists, and nurses to meet the demand which would result from compulsory insurance.

Proposals for compulsory insurance provide for payment of practitioners under one or all of three methods: (a) Fee for service, (b) per capita, or (c) salary. Use of the fee-for-service device represents the minimum degree of socialization, but it is administratively difficult. Administrative difficulties would probably result in the adoption of the per capita system which represents a higher degree of socialization or even in the salary system which represents practically complete socialization. It seems questionable whether a country which once embarks on compulsory insurance can turn back but must attempt to remedy defects by more complete Government control and administration.

RECOMMENDATIONS

For the present, in our judgment, the National Government would be wise to leave to the individual States the question of whether compulsory health insurance is to be adopted or whether the provision of professional services is to be left in the realm of free enterprise. It seems highly probable that in many communities the intelligent cooperation of consumers and practitioners will develop satisfactory arrangements that remain subject to their own control without National Government administration.

From the standpoint of public relations, governments might be well advised to leave adult educational campaigns for the control and prevention of disease to the National, State, and local voluntary organizations which have been able to enlist the active cooperation of leading laymen in most sections of the country.

The years since 1932 have witnessed—

1. A great growth in voluntary insurance both for hospitalization and for medical services.

2. A growing willingness on the part of practitioners to cooperate in the development of prepayment plans and other devices to enable patients who so desire to regularize their payments for medical care.

3. A profound change in the amount and distribution of the earnings of the American people. This change greatly reduces the number who cannot afford adequate medical care if they desire to purchase it.

The experience of the United States since 1932 seems to have demonstrated the wisdom of these recommendations of the majority of the members of the committee on the costs of medical care. It would seem unwise at this time to substitute for these developments a system of compulsory health insurance by national law which would have the unfortunate tendency to freeze policies and eventually retard medical progress.

HOW IT HAS FAILED IN OTHER COUNTRIES

Mr. Speaker, New Zealand reported some years after the inauguration of its system a great increase in the annual cost of its medical-care program. While many of the doctors were still in the armed forces, payments to those who were at home for services rendered had surpassed by 50 percent the $5,000,000 annual Government appropriation. The increased cost was not due entirely to an increase in fees collected by the physicians, but to a number of abuses including overconsultation and the speedy examination of patients, some at rates of 12 an hour.

In Germany it was a common abuse for a workman unhappy at his job to declare himself ill and apply to the doctor for treatment. Any doctor who was meticulously honest and refused the man the benefit soon became unpopular and lost his practice. Another abuse which was found difficult to control was the refusal on the part of the patient to go back to work when the physician was ready to discharge him. On one occasion the Government required all who were on sick leave to appear before a physician other than their own for examination. About one-fourth returned to work immediately without being examined. Industrial strikes, it is reported, helped to fill the consulting rooms of sickness insurance doctors. Thus sickness insurance often becomes a refuge in economic difficulty more than a means of medical care. This material on Germany I am taking from a study made by Sir Arthur Newsholme, Health Commissioner of England. He made the study in 1930 at the request of an American foundation.

Under health insurance absenteeism because of sickness doubled in both Germany and England, and in both countries is almost twice as high at the present as in America. Experienced German doctors report that two-thirds of the applications for treatment are unnecessary. The allowance to the physicians for their services is so small that the only opportunity they have of making a living is by mass treatment and in this way many deep-seated diseases are overlooked. One doctor reports:

Apart from the excessive clerical work, there is "eternal writing," most of it unnecessary.

Dr. Howard H. Ochsner, Chicago Medical Society, in testifying before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, May 1946, told of experiences he had in practicing medicine in Germany in 1896. A prominent German surgeon with whom he collaborated confided in him that after he had worked in the public clinics from 9 a. m. to 2.30 p. m. he was "going home to my private practice in order to supplement my meager income from the clinic with a little private practice income so that I can support my wife and baby decently. I have to waste one-fourth of my time ferreting out malingerers." In approximately the same time, 9 a. m. to 2 p. m. with a half hour for lunch, his assistant with the aid of a Ford car made 23 calls, averaging a little less than 12 minutes per call. One can imagine how much medical service was rendered.

Mr. Speaker, here in the United States, the medical profession is cooperating with the public in providing a program of sickness insurance superior to that provided by any government. Generally speaking, it is a voluntary prepaying medical-care program. There are many variations of the general idea. In most instances the plans are devised by groups of physicians and citizens, controlled by a common board elected by the subscribers under which each person for himself or his famiy makes a stated annual contribution in return for which he will receive certain medical benefits. The first of these plans to be organized and sold throughout the United States was a hospitalization plan. Now there are similar medical-care plans, and in many instances the two are combined. Other groups that may inaugurate a system of this kind are cooperatives, industrial workers, and Government employees. All of these are likely to be non-profit, but the commercial companies are not overlooking an opportunity and are providing a similar service in a way that they can make a profit.

The plans providing medical care alone are increasing rapidly. In 1942 there were 18 plans with an enrollment of 700,000. In 1947 there were 72 plans with an enrollment of 7,264,462. The figures for 1948 are not readily available, but the plans are growing very rapidly. It is estimated that more than 30,000,000 people at the present time are insured in some one of the voluntary plans.

Mr. Speaker, lack of time confines me to only a few reasons why socialized medicine that has helped to wreck other countries should not be seriously considered in free America.

Honolulu Law-Abiding City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1948

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I present herewith an analysis of crime rates in Honolulu, prepared by the Hawaiian Economic Foundation, as follows:

A study of crime statistics for Honolulu and mainland cities reveal these facts:

1. Honolulu is comparatively a law-abiding community, which can be proud of its rec-

ord—a record at which Pacific coast cities should look with envy.

2. At the same time, there has been a tendency for crime to increase in some respects, since the lifting of military government.

3. This necessarily calls forth the most vigorous and well-considered remedial measures by law-enforcement and community agencies, because the very nature of our outdoor life here makes crime far more disturbing than in most mainland areas.

These were the main points made today in a survey issued by the Hawaiian Economic Foundation. Commenting on the study, Claude A. Jagger, president of the foundation, said:

"In connection with renewed interest in crime prevention in Honolulu, the foundation was requested to compare available statistics, so that we may judge the magnitude of our problem. Preliminarily, we have collected statistics for Honolulu, Seattle, Portland, Oakland, San Francisco, and Los Angeles.

"These statistics are encouraging. We can tell visitors and prospective visitors that Honolulu's record as a friendly, law-abiding city is probably far better than the record of their own city, and that compared with prewar years Honolulu is even more friendly and law abiding than it used to be.

"At the same time," he continued, "this is nothing to be complacent about. Honolulu has been through a period of full employment. There is less crime in such periods. The Territorial employment service reports a decrease in job opportunities. We hope this will be temporary, but cannot bank on it.

"Furthermore, with our form of out-door living, with our inability to close off and lock lanais, for instance, any volume of crime, even close to what some mainland cities experience, would be intolerable here.

"Crime prevention is a long-range project. It begins with avoidance of juvenile delinquency. It is encouraging that parent-teacher and other community groups are increasingly active in this field, and that studies of the over-all problem are progressing, by the chamber of commerce, the bar association, the governor's conference on youth, and others."

The record of major offenses in all categories known to the police increased slightly in Honolulu in 1947, to 1,319 per 100,000 population, from 1,253 in 1946. Comparisons with war years are not meaningful, because the situation was abnormal in several respects. Nevertheless, the 1947 figure of 1,319 is well under any of the five prewar years, when the highest was at 1,727 in 1939.

There are many reasons why Hawaii has kept and should keep its crime rate lower than on the mainland, Jagger said. Principal reason is the ocean barrier. Criminals cannot have the mobility they have on the mainland.

The Hawaiian Economic Foundation analyzed statistics dealing with major crimes as outlined by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. These are murder, rape, manslaughter, robbery, assault, burglary, larceny, and auto theft. Offenses such as forgery, disorderly conduct, vagrancy, and gambling were not included in this study.

The number of criminal offenses known to police in Honolulu is compared here with the national average and the average for cities with populations over 250,000 as reported by the FBI. The population of the city and county of Honolulu is 360,274.

Criminal offenses known

	Rate per 100,000 population
National average	1,687.92
Cities over 250,000	1,854.67
Honolulu	1,318.60

The 1947 crime rate in the city and county of Honolulu is compared here with the five West coast cities.

Offenses known to police

	Rate per 100,000 population
Honolulu	1,318.60
Seattle	2,434.7
Portland	2,516.7
Oakland	2,522.9
San Francisco	2,673.8
Los Angeles	2,792.6

The only category of major crime in which Honolulu exceeded the national average in 1947 was burglary, although in that category, it was better than any of the five coast cities except San Francisco. The figures follow:

Offenses known to police

	Rate per 100,000 population
Honolulu	402.7
National average	389.8
Cities over 250,000	450.6
Seattle	662.0
Portland	710.0
Oakland	660.0
San Francisco	360.0
Los Angeles	609.0

Rates for certain other categories follow:

	Murder	Rape	Robbery	Assault	Auto theft	Larceny
Honolulu	4.4	4.7	17.5	25.5	91.9	767.5
National average	6.1	12.6	59.6	72.2	182.1	961.2
Cities over 250,000	7.1	16.0	85.7	85.8	197.1	1,007.1
Seattle	4.0	8.7	124.0	17.0	365.0	1,254.0
Portland	2.7	14.0	99.0	94.0	256.0	1,341.0
Oakland	6.1	26.4	133.3	130.1	276.0	1,291.0
San Francisco	7.8	30.0	182.0	76.0	380.0	1,638.0
Los Angeles	6.3	24.1	195.3	117.9	347.0	1,483.0

It will be noted that in all of the foregoing six groups, Honolulu had a better rate than the national average, and better than the average for all large cities, in 1947. In murder alone, Portland and Seattle alone made a better showing. In assault, Seattle alone had a better record than Honolulu.

Comparable statistics on juvenile delinquency have thus far been unavailable because of different methods of keeping records in different cities. It is notable, however, that Honolulu records for juveniles charged with major crimes showed improvement in 1947, compared with 1946. The record, furthermore, was better than in some prewar years.

Juveniles charged for major crimes in Honolulu, per 100,000 population, for each of the past 11 years, follow:

1947	268.1
1946	299.5
1945	250.5
1944	209.6
1943	193.0
1942	183.5
1941	238.6
1940	320.9
1939	298.8
1938	262.8
1937	298.0

In connection with the foregoing, it should be remembered that unusual factors, such as curfew and blackouts, prevailed in the war years.

Recognition of Rights of Filipino Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. HESS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1948

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Manila Times:

[From the Manila (Philippine Islands) Times of May 24, 1948]

LITTLE TIME LEFT

Something less than a month remains of the current session of the United States Congress. That much time is left to secure congressional approval of the Rogers bill providing for long-delayed recognition of the rights of the Filipino veterans of the Great War.

It is heartening to note that two members of the Philippine Congress now in Washington on a mission to secure passage of this bill are confident that they will get results.

And it is certainly encouraging to note that, by all reports, this is one piece of legislation, involving appropriation of American funds for spending abroad, that has no elements of controversy.

Not, of course, that it should have. The Filipino veteran has no trade to offer, no deal to make. He is in a bad way because he fought for the United States. When he was called on to fight, he asked no questions. And if it is said that he fought for his own land as well, the answer is that because he fought and suffered, a great many American boys are now alive who might otherwise have died.

We repeat, when he was called he asked no questions. Now that the appeal is made in his behalf, he offers no trade. He does not say, "Help me, or I will go Communist." In fact, he says nothing.

But loyal men speak for him, in a language which every American will understand.

It is well that he has spokesmen like Representatives Cinco and Magsaysay. It is well that they have an audience that will listen to an honest, factual statement of the case.

It will be well if in the few remaining days left to it, the Congress of the United States will so act as to vindicate, among Filipinos and Americans, the faith in the innate justice of the American people which reigns here.

[From the Manila (Philippine Islands) Times of May 29, 1948]

MR. O'NEAL SPEAKS

It is as well for the prospects of the Rogers bill that Ambassador O'Neal was on the spot to give the congressional committee which considers it a true picture of the situation here.

Mr. O'Neal gave the gentlemen of the committee the works. He pulled no punches. He told them exactly what the Filipino veteran, called and unquestioningly marching into a hopeless fight on orders from American officers, who had their orders from sphere of high policy, faces today, when the war had been won and when this veteran finds himself stranded as wreckage after a tidal wave sweeps over the land.

Mr. O'Neal emphasized what, it appears, has never been emphasized before in the right quarters in the United States—the destruction this war left behind it in the Philippines.

Above all, he emphasized that the need now is for speed in payment of a just obligation.

A skilled and efficient lobby has been needling the Congress of the United States into appropriating sums in the astronomic figures to aid nations that have not contributed one-tenth of the Philippine effort to the victory, that have not heard the echo of the suffering which the Filipino people have suffered, that cannot show an infinitesimal fraction of the contribution which the Filipino veteran made to the American cause in the last war.

Nobody lobbied for the Rogers bill. No striped-pants diplomat, well-fed and well-wined, appeared for the Filipino veteran with a tin cup in one hand and a red flag in the other.

The Filipino veteran rested his case on the evidence of his service.

Now that Mr. O'Neal has presented that case, the rest is up to the innate American sense of justice.

For awakening that somewhat dormant sense of justice, Mr. O'Neal is to be thanked.

You Can Have It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that "murder will out." This applies to ERP which, when the facts are disclosed, and the greedy perfidy behind it, there will be a tidal wave of resentment against those who have promoted this international fraud. Examined from every point of view it is anything but a relief measure. Day by day, more and more is being learned about this raid on the United States Treasury, and in due time those who have so skillfully planned to profit by exporting goods to foreign nations to be paid for by our taxpayers will come to light.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting an article by Frank C. Waldrop which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of June 5, 1948:

YOU CAN HAVE IT

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

The dizziest and most mysterious tale now circulating in Washington is the story that was told to the House Appropriations Committee by Paul G. Hoffman and his merry men of the "European Cooperation Commission," in the hearings on how much money is to be dumped into international politics this coming fiscal year.

The $15,000,000 deal to subsidize the New York Herald Tribune, Times, and other book and magazine servants of the ECA program is just one small item in a circus that surpasses anything Washington has ever seen before.

Not even the WPA in the balmiest days of Harry Hopkins' boondoggles can match this one. And if the American taxpayers are not by now so numb and disgusted that they just can't feel any more the consequences at the polls in November will be noticeable.

As everybody knows, the biggest propaganda weapon in this ECA sell has been the specter of starvation. Whenever anybody raises the question of how much United States money should be spent in European politics, it is standard business to picture skeletons and whitened skulls and make horrifying suggestions of starved babies, to crush even the feeblest doubts.

This is to notify anybody looking for detailed proofs and evidence in that regard to steer clear of the hearings above-mentioned, though ordinarily such would be the place to look.

Appropriations hearings are supposed to be the occasion for justifying requests for money. But these hearings are likely to make any sensible-minded taxpayer howl with anguish and fury that somebody has been doing a job on him with a dull knife.

For instance, have a look at facts of prewar production and 1948 forecasts (as of May), as to selected and significant items in the 17 ERP beneficiary countries.

The happy 17, for the record, are Austria, Belgium, Luxemburg, Denmark, France, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom, and western Germany.

Before the war these 17 ERP countries produced 60,300,000 metric tons of potatoes.

The May forecast for 1948 is that this year's harvest will be 63,500,000 metric tons.

That's more than prewar. But that's not the whole story.

Chairman JOHN TABER of the Appropriations Committee has lifted the lid a little further to show that—

1. The Socialist Government in Britain still rations potatoes, even while it has so many in storage that they are rotting, and also continues to import potatoes from Denmark.

2. Yet when the Danish potatoes arrive Britain turns around and exports them to Germany. If anybody can make sense out of that kind of "planned economy," please do so. More potatoes than prewar. Potatoes rationed. Potatoes hoarded and rotting. Potatoes imported. Then the imports exported back next door to the nation from which they had been bought.

That's just a sample. Have another, on wheat. Before the war the ERP area produced 34,055,000 metric tons of bread grains. The 1948 yield will be, on the basis of May forecasts, 33,369,000 metric tons. That's really a very small cut below normal.

As a matter of fact, some countries will have a better wheat position this year than we will.

France, to be exact, will have about 7 bushels of wheat per person as against about 4 bushels per head in the United States of America for domestic consumption. Even Italy, supposed to be starving at death's door, figures a 4.9-bushel per capita crop this year, better than ours. And Britain has a better than prewar prospect.

Anywhere you look, the picture is so fantastic that the ordinary beholder feels like the farmer who saw his first giraffe and said there ain't no such animal. But look again and it is still there.

Take the case of fertilizer. Don't joke. It's a serious matter.

The American farm land is being mined these days at a terrific rate. Our farms are being pushed beyond their natural limits in the political attempt to raise living standards around the world up and beyond natural levels.

Artificial fertilizers are absolutely essential to bring in the yields and protect the basic assets of soil. Yet here's what the record on ECA hearings reveals:

1. The ERP area is getting more fertilizer than it did before the war.

2. The United States is furnishing so much of it that the need of American farmers in 1948 will fall short by 20 percent, one pound out of every five. The testimony of the witnesses is flat, unmistakable, and plain, thus:

"Question. Will that be sufficient for his (the United States farmer) requirements?"

"Answer. No, sir."

Flip the pages a little further until the very fascinating subject of gold is being discussed. This matters, because the United States is pumping dollars into Europe on the theory that we have to give the Europeans the money to buy our goods.

You would think that in all common sense, rule 1 of the ECA would be "you get nothing from us until we see what you've got." That's what any ordinary prudent principle of backing somebody else with your goods and money would require.

But here's the testimony in the official hearings:

"There is undoubtedly a very considerable amount of gold and maybe a certain amount of dollar currency hoarded in France and hoarded in all the other countries. * * * It is tantalizing to think it is there but I do not know how to get it out."

Such is the approach of Uncle Sam in this biggest and wildest of all the boondoggles in the history of the world.

Transfusing Your Own Blood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 7, 1948

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following press release by Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill, former Representative from Indiana:

TRANSFUSING YOUR OWN BLOOD

Something of the real scope of the saving made possible by the tax reduction bill has just been revealed. The figures are startling. They show how false is the booby-bait of Federal aid.

Mississippi, one of the poorer States of the Union benefits by keeping within its borders the tidy sum of $17,000,000. Throughout the Nation, in the pocketbooks of all of us, there is left $4,500,000,000 that except for the tax reduction measure would have vanished in the maw of Washington.

Senator MILLIKIN, of Colorado, put the figures into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Too few of us see them there. They show, for instance, that in Indiana $108,000,000 are saved to that State; $164,000,000 to Texas; $273,000,000 to Ohio; $37,000,000 to Oklahoma; $81,000,000 to Maryland; and $474,000,000 to California.

The money left in the States is now available for local and State taxation. In nearly every one of the 48 States the Federal tax cut equals the cost of their schools and libraries. When too much money is siphoned off to Washington, the taxpayers and the States feel poor. They then go to the Nation's Capital to beg for Federal aid—the return of their own money, less the political brokerage collected by the politicians on the Potomac.

For every dollar the average American taxpayer has been paying for the support of his State government, he has been paying five to seven dollars to Washington, D. C.

It is said that the States need more schools, hospitals, etc., and don't have the money to finance them. But why? Because Washington drains their money away.

Federal taxes should have been reduced more than they were. The managers of the tax cut, however, were threatened with a veto. They wanted a bill that would be sure of enough votes to override Mr. Truman's desire to keep the money flowing into Washington for the 2,040,000 Federal bureaucrats to get a slice of. Other Federal spending should now be cut by whatever the Marshall plan costs us.

The New Dealers say that the tax cut was nothing but a political gesture; that when the election is over, the taxes must be re-

imposed. They should be told that if the administration can't run national affairs with $38,000,000,000, we will get an administration that can—and indeed for even much less.

The endless appetite of the Federal Government for the people's money must be resisted, and that calls for organization. It is tragic how poorly supported are the organizations which carry on the fight year after year for economy in public spending. Every person who has paid income taxes has benefited from the cut. The cut would not have been made without the organized support of various taxpayers' associations and citizens' groups. What a grand thing it would be if every person should now resolve to contribute 10 percent of the money saved for him by this tax cut to the support of these groups which made his savings possible. Then the fight could go on successfully.

Year after year, businessmen and homemakers pay for insurance against fire and burglary. The losses from these hazards are infinitesimal compared to the losses from wasteful public spending—the loss of money and the loss of liberty.

In short, the Federal Government causes economic malnutrition and anemia in the States, and then gives them a blood transfusion from their own veins—charging a fee for doing so!

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

Communism in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1948

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a communication from the American Wage Earners Foundation relating to the distribution of House Document No. 754, which bears the title "Communism in Action" and which was prepared under my direction by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

It will be recalled by the Members that the printing of this document in quantities was authorized in 1946 and 1947 and has found great favor throughout the country as a documented study and analysis of communism in operation in the Soviet Union.

One of the organizations which has done an extraordinary amount of work in the distribution of this document is the American Wage Earners Foundation of Chicago, which was founded by Mr. Erwin R. Wright, of Galesburg, Ill., who was a former president of the Illinois Federation of Labor.

I believe it will be informative to the members of the House to include at this point a letter from the American Wage Earners Foundation, dated May 28, 1948, and signed by Mr. Ralph Pohek, the senior consultant for the organization. The letter is self-explanatory and indicates the work done by this organization.

The number of colleges using this document indicates the interest in this matter in the institutions of learning of the United States.

This distribution of the document is substantially in addition to the hundreds of thousands of copies which were made available to the membership of the House for distribution in their respective districts. Another interesting aspect of the matter is the number of labor unions and labor publications which have manifested a sustained interest and endeavored to secure the facts concerning this ideology which seeks to destroy our system of free enterprise.

How the matter was handled in bringing it to the attention of men and women identified with the American labor movement is best evidenced by the reprint which follows and which is taken from the Illinois Tradesman, the official organ of the Springfield Federation of Labor.

From all this it must appear that this document has exercised a persuasive influence in all sections of the country, and it occurs to me that the Congress could do nothing better than to authorize the publication of a million copies for general distribution throughout the land. When all is said and done, education is one of the greatest weapons at our command in bringing light to the people on this very timely subject.

AMERICAN WAGE EARNERS FOUNDATION,
Chicago, Ill., May 28, 1948.

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DIRKSEN: The attached report on the distribution of Communism in Action, House Document 754, which you sponsored, should be interesting to you and also to those who have criticized our colleges for being "red."

Two hundred and seventy-nine colleges have requested Communism in Action, the total number of copies being 37,070 as indicated on the report. The original letters requesting these copies for use in class work or as required reading are on file in my office and I believe full publicity should be given the fact that not all of our American colleges are passive about the menace of communism, and also to the fact that not all labor groups are communistic.

The list of labor papers donating good-sized advertising space to create requests for Communism in Action is impressive. Several of the ads are attached also a partial list of the unions, national, international, and locals which have requested large numbers of copies for distribution directly to the members is evidence that labor is interested in educating the so-called rank and file as to just what has happened under communism in the only country that has tried it for 30 years.

The interest evidenced by the Polish-American groups is proven by the two donated ads in the two largest Polish-American publications, Zgoda, the official organ of the Polish National Alliance and Everybody's Daily, the largest Polish daily in the United States, and the cooperation given by local chapters of the Polish-American Congress which distributed copies at their mass meeting against communism in New York last fall, should be convincing evidence that the Polish Americans are not for communism.

I purchased 50,000 copies of Communism in Action in 1947 and after testing various methods of distribution, found that the most effective was to create interest in the document and to get people to ask for it. This was accomplished through the ads outlining questions that could be answered in the book, giving the page number where the answer could be found, and through the use of the attached statement of J. Edgar Hoover which I had run in several labor papers and then reproduced in circular form with a page devoted to Communism in Action, offering a copy free upon receipt of the coupon. By outlining 32 questions and giving the page numbers on which the answers could be found, a very solid interest was created. The reason for using that method was founded on the belief that a person who became interested by reading the outline with the questions and then went to the trouble to write for the book, would read it.

So far I have purchased 65,000 copies of the reprints of J. Edgar Hoover's statement and have given them away in any quantity requested and the response from the coupons has been most gratifying.

Before the 50,000 copies of Communism in Action were distributed, the indications were that a larger quantity would be required and I purchased 25,000 in February 1948 and another 25,000 in April 1948. At the present time the distribution by direct request has amounted to over 70,000 copies. Twelve thousand were sent to the libraries in the United States which in turn resulted in hundreds of requests which I cannot trace. I had the documents overprinted as you can see by the attached cover, making extra copies available free. This has worked similar to a chain letter. All indications are that purchases of larger quantities will be required in order to keep up with the demand.

We intend contacting all of the colleges in the United States which have not availed themselves of the free offer in an endeavor to get the book adopted for use in the fall and winter terms. Due to the fact that we made our offer to the colleges late in March we missed a good part of the school year. It looks as if I would be supplying Communism in Action to schools and colleges for some time to come and, in addition, taking care of the individual requests.

It has been a great pleasure to have the privilege of distributing this important document and I want to compliment you upon the work you did in connection with it and your cooperative attitude at all times while I was carrying on this work.

I have been told, and I myself feel, that this distribution has been a significant contribution to understanding among two very important groups—the wage earners who are on the front line, producing the things which make up our economy, and the students who will be wage earners in 1, 2, 3, or 4 years. As one professor wrote: "The more students know about communism and how it works in actual practice, the better able they will be to defend themselves against the insidious arguments by the most superbly trained and best organized group that the world has ever seen, or ever will see, all determined to plunge the entire world into communism.

We must make no mistake about it. They are on the march and are determined, ably led, financed beyond the dreams of Midas or Croesus, and driving ahead for the one goal—world communism. Imbued with a zealots fanatical belief, everything is subordinated to the main objective. Long hours, weather conditions, hardship; none of these things deter them. The weak fall out and the strong rise to positions of power after proving themselves over a period of years. They are planted in every organization in the country, many of them holding key jobs in American industry, key positions in all kinds of organizations, even in our legislative groups they can be found.

It is no easy job to overcome the influence that they wield, because they have just one objective in mind and are not allowed to deviate from it. Excuses do not go under communism.

One of the main things that makes the progress of communism easy is the apathetic, indifferent attitude of many people in America who should be concerned. They are concerned about the same way as a fellow is concerned about the general well-being of the entire world. It is remote and not something to which he must pay immediate attention so it gets shelved and the Communists take full advantage of that attitude. In fact, they

say that "America will drop in our lap like a ripe apple when the time comes." I am quoting Stalin.

If communism does come to America, Congressman, you are one man who can say that you did all that was humanly possible on your part to oppose it and I am grateful for the privilege of having aided in that opposition in a very, very small way.

For political and security reasons it is not advisable to publish the names of the schools and colleges and many labor publications and organizations which have cooperated with me in the distribution of this document, to protect them from the criticism, active opposition, and smear that I have had to endure. This operation has been carried on on a rather confidential basis as regards just who is working with me and I have refused any information to outside agencies or to parties unknown to me or my associates.

With sincere personal regards and all good wishes, I am,

Cordially and sincerely,

RALPH POHEK,
Senior Consultant.

[From the Illinois Tradesman, official organ, Springfield Federation of Labor, Springfield, Ill.]

HAS LABOR BENEFITED UNDER COMMUNISM?

CAN YOU ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS ABOUT LABOR UNDER COMMUNISM IN SOVIET RUSSIA?

Communism in Action, known also as House Document No. 754, which was prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, under the direction of Ernest S. Griffiths, at the instance of Representative DIRKSEN, of Illinois, and printed by the United States Government Printing Office, answers all these questions and hundreds more. One hundred and forty pages of facts, not propaganda.

We are not selling this book. All you have to do is to ask for it. It is free, postage paid. After you learn the facts about the actual workings of communism in practice, you can form your own opinion. Send the coupon now.

Do workers have freedom of movement? Page 51.

Freedom of choice of occupation? Pages 50–53.

What is labor discipline in the Soviet? Page 52.

What are "speed kings"? Page 46.

What are "heroes of socialist toil."? Page 47.

Can labor leaders lead in Russia? Page 52.

Do unions have an independent treasury? Page 42.

Who decides what workers get? Page 42.

Are the unions independent of the state? Page 41.

How much collective bargaining is permitted? Page 40.

Are Soviet unions permitted to strike. Page 40.

What are labor camps? Pages 34, 54, 58.

What is forced labor? Pages 33–36, 54–58.

Who fixes wages? Pages 35–36, 40.

AMERICAN WAGE EARNERS FOUNDATION.

(Founded by Edwin R. Wright, formerly president Illinois State Federation of Labor, Suite 605, 30 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.)

AMERICAN WAGE EARNERS FOUNDATION,
Suite 605, 30 North LaSalle St.,
Chicago, Ill.:

Please send me a free copy of Communism in Action.

Write for free copies of How To Fight Communism, by J. Edgar Hoover.

Korean Immigration and Naturalization Committee's Views Outlined by Walter Jhung

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1948

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, extension of the privileges of naturalization to the Asiatic and Pacific peoples legally resident in the United States of America and also to permit nationals of those countries to enter the United States upon a reasonable quota system is strongly supported by the Korean Immigration and Naturalization Committee, of which Walter Jhung is the executive secretary. For almost 2 years Mr. Jhung, an American citizen of Korean ancestry of Hawaii, has ably represented this committee in Washington. His representations both to committees and to Members of Congress individually have been of great value in bringing about an understanding of this question. The recent statement by Mr. Jhung on this subject follows:

Our committee acknowledges that there is a definite need of an over-all revision of the present laws on immigration and naturalization, insofar as they may pertain to the countries and nationals bordering the Asia-Pacific area.

In 1943 Congress saw fit to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act. While doing so, United States rightly placed China upon a quota system for immigration, and qualified Chinese nationals legally resident in this country were extended the honor and privileges of becoming a naturalized citizen thereto. And hundreds have since become citizens thereof.

Then, in 1946, the Filipinos and East Indians (Hindus and Moslems alike) were accorded similar international courtesies. However, our Korean Immigration and Naturalization Committee honestly and sincerely believes and adheres to the principle that the United States Congress ought to extend similar benefits to other countries bordering the Asia-Pacific area, including Korea and her nationals.

Extension of such friendly courtesies are long overdue. Our committee hopes that the lawmakers of this Eightieth Congress will have the honor and opportunity of forever eliminating the present discriminatory and unjust statute pertaining to quota immigration and naturalization in reference to the peoples situated in the Asia-Pacific area. Especially at this juncture when there is much turmoil, political, social, and economic unrest all over this world between two distinctly extremist ideologies. Even at this very hour, out in Korea, ominous nerve-war set by Communist Soviet Russia may turn into an actual fighting war between the forces for world domination by Communist Soviets and those who believe in world peace through democratic processes, as we do in these United States of America.

The United States of America is like a surgeon confronted with a patient in primary stage of cancer. Only quick and clean surgery removing the tumor will relieve pain and save the life of the patient. That malignant tumor must be speedily eliminated without loss of time. Present ill-adapted and time-worn-out immigration and naturalization laws pertaining to the nations and people of Asia-Pacific area should be immediately repealed and amended. The Congress of the United States as that surgeon, in removing the present injustices and inequalities of the immigration and naturalization laws, will earn the high regard of all the Asiatic countries for the United States and her people. In saying this I speak for Korea and her people everywhere.

At this time, out in Hawaii, there are many deserving alien Koreans who would like to become naturalized citizens of the United States but for the present cumbersome laws specifically defined against their favor. Majority of them arrived into the United States as mere children. Except for having been born in Korea, they are in every respect worthy of being considered as natural-born citizens. But because of being a member of the Korean race and therefore ineligible to become naturalized citizens they are today men with no country.

At present, under consideration by the Senate Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization is S. 152, to extend the privileges of naturalization and a quota to Koreans. This Senate bill was introduced by the Honorable Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, from Florida last January 1947. Also at present under consideration by the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization is a similar measure, H. R. 860. This House bill was superseded by a like bill, H. R. 2932, also introduced by the Honorable JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, Hawaii, a Delegate to the United States Congress. Back in 1944, Mr. FARRINGTON first introduced our Korean immigration and naturalization bill, H. R. 4940. Congressman EMANUEL CELLER from New York also introduced a similar bill in the first session of this Congress last year. His bill, H. R. 1437, as well as Mr. FARRINGTON'S, are awaiting for some over-all legislation, such as the legislation now before the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, to extend these privileges to all Pacific and Asiatic people.

In view of these circumstances aforementioned, we of the Korean immigration and naturalization committee earnestly hope that the bill to remove all racial restrictions in the laws for naturalization and immigration will be passed by this session of Congress.

Msgr. Joachim Vilallonga

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, Msgr. Joachim Vilallonga, who offered the opening prayer in this House today, is one of the most eminent members of the Society of Jesus. During his long career in the Roman Catholic Church he has served with distinction in far-flung parts of the world. I first met Father Vilallonga when he visited the island of Guam, of which I was then Governor, as the apostolic visitor of His Holiness Pope Pius XI. The broad mindedness and the clear vision with which he counseled the utmost loyalty to the stars and stripes on the part of the Chamorro people impressed me greatly, and I became then, and have remained, his sincere friend. I have no doubt but that the recollection of Father Vilallonga's advice played its part in the intense American patriotism of the people of Guam and while they suffered under military domination of

Japan for some years during the recent war.

Father Vilallonga is now the ecclesiastical superior of the Ahmedabad Mission in India and is in this country in furtherance of his work at that post.

I am, indeed, happy that we in this House of Representatives have been privileged to have Father Vilallonga with us today.

Slash in ERP Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 7, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by James Reston, from the New York Times of June 5, 1948:

SLASH OF 24 PERCENT IN ERP FUNDS CAUSES A WIDE SPLIT IN GOP—HOUSE ACTION JARS REPUBLICAN LIBERALS BACKING THE BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, June 4.—It has been a long time since the Republican Party has been so divided over any issue as it was today over th House Appropriations Committee's 24-percent cut of the European recovery program funds which the House supported tonight.

The party split over the Nation's economic foreign policy has existed ever since the end of the war, but never on such an important issue as the ERP have the so-called liberal and conservative wings been so far apart.

FOUR POINTS MADE PRIVATELY

Outwardly, those Republicans on Capitol Hill who have been leading the fight for a bipartisan foreign policy have had little to say, but privately, they were making these points tonight:

1. The basic issue in the bipartisan experiment of the last few years has been whether the United States could really develop a consistent, reliable foreign policy which would reassure our friends and confound our potential enemies.

2. We were making real progress toward this goal, especially through the adoption of the ERP, but the action of the House, like its action in inviting Spain into the ERP several weeks ago, was a serious psychological blow, even if, as in the case of Spain, the Congress reverses the committee.

3. This is especially true after the attempts of this same group in the House to make basic changes in the reciprocal trade program. These two drives, following on the administration's inconsistent and subjective approach to the Palestine issue, have shaken world confidence in our leadership, just at a time when that leadership appeared to be impressing the Russians.

4. For the Republican Party, too, the action is unfortunate at this time. This party has been out of power for 16 years; its chances of coming to power now are excellent; but the split on the tariff and on the ERP raise the question whether it can get together on economic foreign policy and command the confidence of the country and the world.

CASE OF FRANCE IS CITED

Those Republicans who feel this way illustrate their views by pointing to the current foreign policy controversy in France. There, Foreign Secretary Bidault, after months of negotiation, has finally agreed to go along with the United States, Great Britain, and the Benelux countries on a plan for unifying and strengthening western Germany, and internationalizing the Ruhr.

In France, there is no more fundamental issue than the revival of German power, and nothing on which a politician can take greater risks. Nevertheless, Bidault went along with the western German policy primarily on the ground that the United States had given vital aid to France under the Marshall plan and was determined to bolster the German economy.

Already, however, the Communists in France are pointing to the action of the Appropriations Committee as evidence that the ERP is not a reliable basis for a policy, and at the beginning of next week, Mr. Bidault must go before the Chamber of Deputies to answer charges that he has traded the revival of Germany for an American appropriation which is already being cut by 25 percent.

The Taber-Knutson bloc in the House, of course, represents the views of only one section of the party, and those who differ with them are now organizing to keep Mr. TABER's views from prevailing.

But as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the veteran New York legislator is in a powerful position. During this critical period of postwar economic reconstruction, the decisive questions in the realm of foreign policy are economic. They require appropriations which originate in the House and usually require the personal assent of Mr. TABER.

Some members of the House are conscious of the new responsibilities placed on the lower chamber by the need of the United States economic assistance to the rest of the world. The original effort to place the Congress behind a bipartisan policy on the political organization of the world came from the House.

SEEK OVER-ALL APPROACH

Since the Republicans captured control of the legislature in 1946, Chairman CHARLES EATON, on the Foreign Affairs Committee, and Representative JOHN M. VORYS, of Ohio, have worked unremittingly with other members of the Foreign Affairs Committee to encourage an over-all approach to our foreign policy.

In line with this objective, Mr. EATON and Mr. VORYS yesterday reported a bill designed to strengthen western Europe and the United Nations, and in commenting on it Mr. EATON had this to say:

"What we have been working night and day in this committee to do is to develop a responsible congressional foreign policy that would relate all these various problems to one another, and give the House and the country an over-all picture of our problems. We think we are making progress toward this goal, and we ask the press to cooperate with us in trying to explain our objective."

But this is precisely the complaint that men like Mr. EATON are now making against the action of the Appropriations Committee: That it does not see the foreign problem whole at all; that it approaches it from a narrow mathematical point of view, and does not take into account the over-all role of America, the fears of our friends, the objectives of the Russians, or even the prestige of the Republican Party.

Law in a Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 7, 1948

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, on Friday evening, June 4, it was my privilege to speak at the commencement exercises of the National University School of Law, this city, of which Chief Judge George P. Barse is the chancelor and Charles E. Wainwright is the dean. I was especially impressed with the outstanding records made by members of the graduating class, many of whom were veterans. Under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD my address:

LAW IN A CHANGING WORLD

Chancelor Barse, Dean Wainwright, faculty members, graduates, and guests, I am honored to have the privilege of speaking to you on the occasion of the seventy-ninth convocation of National University School of Law. It has been said that an educational institution endures in proportion as it contributes to the clear thinking and mental advancement of its students. This university may look back with pride over its 79 years of distinct contribution to the progress of our legal profession.

National University's School of Law has a splendid reputation, gleaned through its more than three-quarters of a century of service. It has indeed become what Professor Wedgewod intended it should—a truly national university.

The accomplishments of this institution are due to the excellence of its faculty and official family, and to the caliber of students it has always attracted. I know personally what it means to attend night school after a day of arduous work. It is not an easy task, but there is in the process a mental and moral discipline that is in a great measure its own reward. Easy victories are lightly prized, but the victory that is the product of sweat and anxiety and strain is the victory that gives the greatest satisfaction. Each of you graduates has achieved such a victory.

It is especially gratifying to note the well earned recognition given to the accomplishments of your charming valedictorian. She typifies the firmness of ambition, the spirit of sacrifice, and the courage that actuate the members of this class, and every class that leaves this historic institution.

You graduates may start upon your careers in the full consciousness that you belong to a group to which the Nation and the world owe a heavy debt. America was founded on the principle of government by law and not by men, and where there is codified law there must be lawyers to expound it, to frame it, and to judge the merits of controversies.

It appears to me that the golden age for lawyers is just ahead, for if war is to be abolished there must be some other way found to settle differences, and what better way can there be than the way of law? Benjamin Franklin once said a countryman caught between two lawyers is like a fish between two cats. Perhaps that might be the kind of lawyers they had in Franklin's time, but that is not the kind who graduate from this institution.

The history of the human race is the history of man's relations to the mandates of his society and his God. Man is ever within the embrace of law—"Thus far shalt thou go and no further." It is an old saying, "Where there is no law there is no sin." Our forefathers held that "obedience to law is liberty." It is imperative that we find a true and happy balance between liberty and authority in the modern state. The grave issue of our time is, whether civilized peoples can maintain and develop a free society. The process is impossible without law.

So also thought Judge Story, who said, "No one appreciates more fully than myself the general importance of the study of the law. No one places a higher value upon that science as the great instrument by which society is held together and the cause of

public justice is maintained and vindicated. Without it neither liberty, nor property, nor life, nor that which is even dearer than life—a good reputation—is for a moment secure. It is, in short, the great elastic power which pervades and embraces every human relation. It links man to man by so many mutual ties and duties and dependencies that, though often silent and unseen in its operations, it becomes at once the minister to his social necessities and the guardian of his social virtues."

Centuries ago, the Greek philosopher Heraclitus remarked, "You can never step into the same river twice." Thus he meant to illustrate the fact that change is in everything about us and in ourselves. Neither the individual, nor society, nor the world itself, stands still. Life manifests itself always in movement.

There is need for continued emphasis of the fact that society is a constantly changing thing—that changes take place through the agencies by which society expresses itself. Therefore, as we study these institutions and agencies, we need continually to revaluate them and to reform the underlying concept which first of all brought these agencies into being, and which are still underlying. The special agencies of society to which we might refer are those of government, education, church, and industry. It is quite apparent to even the most casual observer that the greatest changes in our history have taken place during the past two decades. Therefore while we seek to revaluate these agencies and to give consideration to their continued progress, we need to revaluate more fully our legal objectives in the light of the changes that have taken place; or, putting it in other words, we need religiously to clarify and redefine the mission of law and the responsibility of the lawyer in our changing society and changing world.

Our concern respecting all of these changes is not that changes are taking place, but rather for the effect the changes may have upon the lives of individuals. Society exists to render service to the individual, and it is for such a purpose that the legal profession is organized as well.

While we emphasize the fact that there is much that is changing, there are some things we need to recognize as being permanent. It was Richard Hooker who said, "Of law there can be no less acknowledged than that her seat is in the bosom of God, her voice the harmony of the world. All things in heaven and earth do her homage—the very least as feeling her care, the greatest as not exempt from her power; both angels and men, and creatures of what condition soever, though each in different sort and manner, yet all with uniform consent, admiring her as the mother of their peace and joy."

The unchanging principle that we must recognize is, that law is an instrument of God's will. Man's world is changing, and the mission of law and the responsibility of the lawyer is to see that whatever changes take place have the sanction of that Divinity that shapes our ends. No higher compliment can be paid to law than this, that it applies always to intelligent creatures and not to inanimate things. Here we have recognition of the Supreme Intelligence, an implication of the resident power of obedience and disobedience.

In point of fact, all law is from God and is to the same end—the uplift and welfare of humanity. The first system of laws was delivered to God's chosen nation in its infancy, when it was incapable of making laws. The first government was a theocracy. God led His people, teaching them that He was the leader of nations, the source of all things and the author of all laws.

This is a fundamental truth which men and societies neglect to their own undoing. We cannot look at the world as it is today, a scene of vast and universal conflict, without concluding that the world has been purposely constructed, where effort and struggle, trouble and sorrow, are appointed as the necessary educators of the race—and this, not through the malevolence, but the benignity of the Creator.

There can be no solution to human problems that does not accept the fundamental fact that governments are provided for in the great economy of God, and that God intended that man should be free to rule himself. I press this point because our political and economic structure will not much longer stand the strain of the conflict between the theories and policies of men and the laws of God which govern the economic and political systems of the world.

Dr. Robert Hutchins has said, "Until there can be some semblance of agreement upon the aims of human life and the ends of organized society, humanity must fumble on from catastrophe to catastrophe, learning little as it goes." Certainly we must recognize that while the present world crisis is challenging society as a whole, it is preeminently a challenge to our legal profession. For it has always been the privilege and the responsibility of lawyers to lead in time of crisis. Self-government has supplanted tyranny largely as a result of the unremitting efforts of lawyers who brought about the provenience of common law. A free people have always required social and political leadership to assure the proper functioning of self-government. Lawyers have helped—and must continue to help—to bring about great social changes and readjustments.

From the historical view, we may cite the long Colonial period of America—almost half the life span of our people on this continent—when there were no laws in force which were not imposed from foreign sources and administered by functionaries and judges who were primarily self-serving. For a century there was scarcely a lawyer in the Colonies.

When, as the 18th century advanced and the Revolution was approaching, a legal profession native to America had begun to arise, it was the bane of the existence of the Colonial administrators appointed by the British crown. The insistence was placed upon government by law and not by men, and we find General Thomas Gage writing to an English correspondent:

"The lawyers are the source from whence the clamors have flowed in every province. In this province nothing publick is transacted without them and it is to be wished that even the bench was free from blame."

Lawyers, rather than planters or merchants, were the ones who clamored for liberty under laws. It is significant that half the Members of the first Continental Congress were lawyers, while in the second Continental Congress more than two-thirds were of our profession. The Declaration of Independence was largely the work of one lawyer, but of the 56 signers, 25 were lawyers. The Constitution, which was the joint work of many men representing many shades of opinion, was framed by some 55 men, 32 of whom were lawyers.

In the further development of America, lawyers have played a leading role. Two-thirds of our Presidents have been lawyers, and approximately 75 percent of the Members of each Congress have been members of our profession.

I cite this history to show that in these tumultous times, lawyers, by reason of their training, their opportunities, and the prerogatives which they traditionally enjoy, have the responsibility above all others to lead in discovering and giving expression to America's social and political ideals. It may well be that the progress of our people and the peace of the world lies in the hands of a legal profession in which the security of our democratic institutions remains the dominant sentiment.

I do not need to call to the attention of this audience the surge of radical philosophy that threatens to erase the achievements of eight centuries of progress under common law. You are alert, I am sure, to the threat of communism both at home and abroad. We must believe that we can deal with communism and still maintain our essential American liberties. Self-preservation is always sound law. We cannot permit civil liberty to become the sanctuary of subversion, the tinderbox of treason. No system of law is just, no concept of liberty is safe, that breeds the instruments of its own violent overthrow. We must deal positively with the threat of communism, but more important we must develop a new fervor, a new enthusiasm, a new appreciation for the democratic process. For as Lord Bryce aptly observed, "No government demands so much from the citizen as democracy, and none gives back so much." In this respect, today's problems make great demands upon the wisdom, self-sacrifice, and courage of American lawyers.

I would exhort this class to regard the privilege of practicing law as a public trust. It is the duty of the lawyer, of course, to represent his client loyally, to the best of his ability. A paramount obligation, however, is to the public and to the court of which he is an officer. The law is a noble profession, and a lawyer is potentially capable of attaining the highest position of respect in his community and Nation. All that is needed is a deep feeling of responsibility and an abiding sense of integrity.

On this important occasion, therefore, may we be privileged to receive the benediction of the psalmist: "Blessed is the man whose delight is in the law of the Lord; and in his law doth he meditate day and night. And he shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season; his leaf also shall not wither; and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper."

Taconite Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1948

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the May 31 edition of the Minneapolis Star relating to the development of Minnesota's taconite as a source of iron ore:

TACONITE MOVES AHEAD

Successful smelting of pig iron from taconite (low grade) ore is important news for this State. It means another definite step forward in the great project to retain Minnesota's first place as supplier of civilization's most important metal.

Prof. E. W. Davis and his assocaites at the university mines experiment station have produced pig iron on a pilot plant scale. Next step is to use a similar process in a big commercial plant. That is bound to come soon as an outgrowth of all the taconite research now going on.

Minnesota's easily accessible high-grade iron ore will be largely gone in a few decades. But there is taconite enough on the northern ranges to last the world for centuries. The big problem has been to extract the relatively smaller amounts of iron from taconite and keep costs down. Gradually that problem is being licked.

For years observers have been predicting the imminent death of Minnesota's iron ore industry. Mining companies have looked elsewhere for the raw material for steel.

One or two have moved from the State entirely as their mines declined.

But lately there has been a growing feeling that our taconite is probably the best bet after all. Rich deposits in the Quebec-Labrador fields may become available in 10 or 15 years. Yet mining engineers now believe that such high-grade ore will be shipped in limited amounts and will be used chiefly to mix with Minnesota ore.

South American and other foreign ore involves long shipment. Minnesota and the big smelters are all on the Great Lakes. Even if the St. Lawrence seaway is completed, this State will enjoy a big advantage in distance. And its ore supply is much safer during war.

Minnesota has adopted a sensible tax policy to encourage taconite development. With its use, direct revenue from taxes may drop, but taconite processing promises to employ three times as many workers per ton of shipped ore as did the more simple mining of high-grade ore. That makes the future of northern Minnesota promising indeed.

Announcement of the smelting of taconite ore should remind Minnesotans of the valuable research center they have at the State university. And it should make them grateful for the work of Professor Davis and his staff. When taconite utilization becomes a full-scale commercial operation the credit in large part will belong to Davis and the mines experiment station he heads.

Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 7, 1948

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by John E. Thompson, chief of Newsweek's Berlin bureau, who recently returned from a tour of Poland, reporting on the anti-Marshall plan reconstruction behind the iron curtain. It is very enlightening as to the progress made in the last 4 years.

POLAND: THE SICKLE AND THE CROSS

In the most Catholic country in Europe a kid-glove brand of Russian communism is staging a bloodless industrial revolution to convert Poland from a backward, largely agricultural land into a key postion in eastern Europe's anti-Marshall-plan economy. A new Russian technique—persuasion by political pressure rather than overt tyranny—was much in evidence during a 6-day trip through the agricultural and industrial heart of Poland—700 miles by auto from Poznan to Warsaw, Cracow, Katowice, and Wroclaw (Breslau). The impression was that Russia is succeeding where many another conqueror (or liberator) has failed.

On the western side of a shaky wooden bridge over the Oder River at Kostryn, one of several town on the border between Poland and the Soviet-occupied zone of Germany, we were warmly greeted by a grinning, gold-toothed Russian soldier just out of his teens, a tommy gun slung over his shoulder and a bunch of lilacs in his hand. While a captain laboriously completed a long record of our passports, visas, and other documents, the soldier and two comrades asked us questions about America—mostly about the climate.

From then on—from Kostryzn through Poznan across the equator of Poland to Warsaw—we saw only scattered pairs of Russian soldiers maintaining the Soviet communication lines from Berlin to Moscow. In 24 hours in Warsaw we glimpsed just three Red soldiers, and none between Warsaw and Cracow. Last year there were Polish checkpoints almost every 20 miles ostensibly to protect travelers against marauding bands. This year there were checkpoints only at Kostryzn and Warsaw.

EXPENSIVE FUN

The trip from Poznan to Warsaw and Cracow brought out the tremendous vitality of a people who suffered perhaps more than any other Europeans during the war. In Poznan night clubs and cafes like the Moulin Rouge, Warsawski, Bagatelle, and Cafe George, crowds siped vodka or pivo (beer), swung through lively Polish dances, or sang rollicking folk songs until 3 or 4 a. m. Often, when the orchestra took a rest, everyone joined in singing until the band returned. Then they kept it up during the dancing.

Businessmen, industrial workers, and shopkeepers mingled with civil servants, students, and professional men. Where they got the money to pay the stiff prices was the mystery. The average monthly wage of working men in Poland is 10,000 zlotys ($25). A good restaurant meal, including two or three vodkas and a glass of beer, costs about $5, or almost a week's wages. At the Casanova night club in Cracow we paid $37.50 for a bottle of Red Hackle scotch.

There is an abundance of fine food in restaurants and of clothing, furs, and jewelry in shops. A set of bedroom furniture at the Poznan fair was priced at 213,000 zlotys ($532) 21 months' average wages. Women's good-quality shoes in Warsaw cost from $45 to $50.

Most Poles, of course, simply do not buy luxury goods. They live on their daily food ration and queue up for clothing. Those who buy luxuries occasionally or spend a night dancing, singing, and drinking in cafes and bars acquire their zlotys in a typical Polish way: by hard work. The traditional Polish working day is from 8 a. m. to 3 p. m., without a break for a meal. Then comes the main meal. The balance of the day is free. Many Poles use this time to earn extra money doing odd jobs or handicraft for unregulated wages usually higher than their regular pay. A factory manager in Warsaw told me this practice had reduced the general productivity of workers, who were either too tired during their regular hours or preferred to save their energy for better pay in off-time hours.

For the first time since the war the Poles are now receiving their full bread ration regularly and on time. With 80 percent of the arable land planted this spring and more than 90 percent expected to be planted next fall, the Poles hope to export grain in 1949 and take bread off the ration. But as a Polish cabinet minister explained: "The Marshall plan obviously means a lower standard of living for us. It will hurt us. But we can live on what food we have and do without machinery for a while. I don't think western Europe can do without food, and I wonder how long the United States will be prepared to feed western Europe."

MARCH SLAV

Poland will play a key role in the Russian scheme to give eastern Europe the industrial strength to survive without western Europe and the Marshall plan. Polish industry is to be completely integrated with Czechoslovak industry and with the Russian economy. Poland, for instance, will concentrate on production of steam coal, Czechoslovakia on production of coking coal. Heavy industry is already being shipped to Poland from Russia to help the transition of some light industries to heavy-machinery production. The ports of Gdynia (fully restored) and Gdansk (not yet restored) have been assigned to handle Poland's domestic trade, while Stettin is to be the port for trans-Poland trade to Czechoslovakia, via the Oder River.

The plan is much more than a customs-union type of integration. Entire industries in Poland and Czechoslovakia will operate under a single board, some plants and equipment will be interchanged, and even skilled workers and managers moved.

To a casual visitor from the West, it seems incredible that a Catholic and independent people like the Poles could accept wholesale Soviet domination. One consul in Warsaw explained it this way: "The Poles fear the Russians almost more than they hate the Germans. They do not want another reign of terror like the 6 years they suffered under the Germans. They are quiescent and acquiescent."

In cafes, bars, and night clubs the people will talk to Americans of their hopes for freedom, but always furtively, in whispers or in secluded corners.

Meanwhile, they cling to the faith of their fathers. Every hamlet and village in Poland has a wayside crucifix or shrine, festooned with flowers or evergreen braids. In the cities thousands of workers and clerks and shop girls spend a few moments in church on their way to work. In Cracow I saw more than 100 hearing mass in one church at 6 a. m. Under the rubbled ruins of the Alexander Church in Warsaw, mass is celebrated at a cellar altar. At Czestochowa, the Lourdes of eastern Europe, thousands of pilgrims walked up broad avenues to the hilltop shrine of the black madonna on May 1, while thousands of union workers carrying Red banners marched through the town below in a different parade. School children are now taught religion only with the written consent of their parents, but 90 percent of them are learning their catechism in school.

Success: American Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 7, 1948

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, the following story which appeared in the Kansas City Star of June 2 is the story, not merely of Fred Theden, but also of millions like him who have helped make America—and make it great:

SWEDISH IMMIGRANT IS FAR PAST HIS GOAL OF $1 A DAY FARM PAY—60 YEARS AGO FRED THEDEN SAW THE STATUE OF LIBERTY—NOW THE PROSPEROUS KAW VALLEY FARMER CREDITS SUCCESS TO GOD AND AMERICA

Sixty years ago yesterday an immigrant boy from Sweden had his first, and last, look at the Statute of Liberty, a symbol to him of his highest aspirations—5 acres of farm land all his own.

Forty-five years ago yesterday, while well on the way toward exceeding his fondest hope, Fred Theden, by then making a name for himself by the thoroughness of his farming methods, saw the Kaw River rise over its banks to carry away his home and the $450 he and his wife had invested in furniture.

By yesterday those reminiscences had become pleasant in the memory of Fred Theden, now 77 years old and too advanced in years to "do more than milk my 25 cows and tend the garden." He stood shading his eyes and looking out over his 500 acres of Johnson County land near Bonner Springs. The farm is well improved and debt-free, and provides an ample livelihood for himself, a foster son, Carl Theden, and a nephew, Everett Anderson.

FLAG PAINTING IN HOME

Before sitting down in the kitchen to help Mrs. Carl Theden stem the last of the straw-

berries from their patch, Fred Theden turned to an oil painting of Old Glory which he had framed in gilded wood.

"I owe all that I have been able to do here to God and that flag," Theden said with emotion. "The Lord and the United States have been very kind to me. When I left Sweden I was being paid $22 a year for farm work from sunup to sundown, and sundown didn't come until 9:30 o'clock at night. I thought if I could only get to America where they paid a dollar a day I might some day own a 5-acre farm and die a millionaire."

Theden admitted his ideas had changed some, but added smilingly that he had obtained everything from life in this country he had wanted. And he doesn't want to go back to Sweden, although he is sure living has progressed there, too.

Theden's mother died when he was a child. His father, the late Henry Theden, and his brother, Herman Theden, another well-known farmer near Bonner Springs, had gone to the United States 3 years earlier. Fred Theden at the age of 17 had been able to scrape together $52 for his passage steerage on the ship *Heckla* and fare through to Kansas City. He joined his relatives on an island in the Kaw River they were farming at that time. Those days of struggling against high water, weeds, and willow sprouts no longer seem harrowing to Theden.

TO SAFETY IN NIGHT

"But the darkest day of my life, or so it seemed at the time," the farmer recalled, "was that flood of 1903. We reached safety in the night. The next morning we watched the water carry away our home."

Theden and his wife, the late Mrs. Anna Anderson Theden, were able to salvage more than many of those hit by the flood. Their house was floated into a depression and left standing in 27 feet of water. They were able to tow it back and reclaim much of the furniture, including a cuckoo clock which still is a prized possession.

Mechanical gadgets were slow to make an impression upon Theden. He was a 6-mule farmer who firmly believed in his own farming methods and a large dairy herd to give him a continuous and dependable income. He never resisted the tractors his son and nephew moved onto the farm, however. He welcomed electricity but has never had a motorcar.

"The roads just aren't wide enough for me," he laughingly explained.

Mr. Speaker, these accomplishments were not obtained by waiting for Government aid—not by blaming fate for ill fortune. They came about because of individual initiative, sweat, thrift, honesty, and faith in God and country—old-fashioned virtues too often forgotten in our present-day life.

Publications Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 7, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of June 5, 1948:

PUBLICATIONS ABROAD

How groundless is the charge that currency convertibility provisions in the European recovery program are a pay-off for newspaper and magazine support may be seen from the number of disavowals of such assistance that already have been issued. The purpose of the $10,000,000 sum approved by the House Appropriations Committee is, purely and simply, to facilitate the distribution of American books, magazines, newspapers, and motion pictures in European countries where currency restrictions now make such distribution difficult or impossible. The appropriation cannot be considered a subsidy, for the only thing it does is to enable cooperating institutions to convert foreign currencies received for their products into dollars. All the hullabaloo about subsidy and pay-off could very easily serve, however, to discredit the project in the eyes of the Europeans it is intended to benefit.

That there is a great need for fresh American publications in Europe has been recognized by practically every committee that surveyed the ground for ERP. Even Representative JOHN TABER, no friend of the recovery program, asserted that some American newspapers distributed abroad are accomplishing more in France, Germany, and Italy than the Voice of America. The need is twofold. Some countries have seen virtually no new American books, especially textbooks and technical books, since before the war. Beyond that, the American newspapers sent abroad are often badly outdated in comparison with the up-to-the-minute publications from Moscow available on newsstands.

The ideal solution, as this newspaper has observed before, would be a multiplication of European editions of American publications, printed abroad for rapid distribution. As a matter of fact, the original language in the ERP authorization act was intended to facilitate such enterprise not only with respect to media of information but also in connection with the stimulation of other productive activity. The fact that such expansion now must be undertaken at a loss serves, of course, to discourage it. In most cases the loss itself is largely artificial. Dollars must be spent for publication costs, but the money received in the sale of such services is in currency blocked in individual countries.

There is always the possibility that any sort of governmental assistance in currency conversion will be stigmatized as governmental control over policy, even though such is decidedly not the intention or the fact. It is this possibility, no doubt, which has led news services and certain publications to reject the suggestion. Perhaps the answer to such objections lies in a broader provision made applicable generally to American businesses in Europe until currencies are restored to interchangeability. In any event the captious criticis of the proposal are under an obligation to suggest some workable substitute that will make use of the tremendous potential of publications and motion pictures in telling the American story abroad.

Roadless Area Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 7, 1948

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Agriculture has approved S. 1090, a bill to preserve 500,000 acres of primitive lake and forest land in the Superior National Forest of Minnesota as a permanent canoe and vacation area, and this measure is now pending in the House. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "Quetico-Superior Challenge," by Sig Olson, which appeared in the May 1948 issue of Sports Afield. This editorial summarizes the issues involved and explains the reasons for prompt action on S. 1090.

QUETICO-SUPERIOR CHALLENGE

(Guest editorial by Sig Olson)

America is in danger of losing one of its most cherished and valuable assets, the famous wilderness canoe country known as the Quetico-Superior. What makes the threat so appalling is the fact that within a 750-mile radius live more than 43,000,000 people.

The brutal fact is that the immense populations of the Midwest, not to mention the millions from other States beyond, are in immediate danger of being robbed of one of the finest recreational opportunities on the continent today, the privilege of breaking away from civilization and cruising by canoe through the primitive lakes of the Minnesota-Ontario border.

This unique and interesting area belongs to the people of America. It is the only remaining lake region in the entire Midwest that can be called true wilderness. It can be ours for all time if we are willing to fight for it now. And it must be fought for, or it will soon be just another resort country, and the wilderness which now gives it distinction and charm will be an old, forgotten dream. Threatening resort developments within the roadless area of the Superior National Forest can be stopped in only one way—by the swift acquisition by the United States Forest Service of the 120,000 acres of privately held land within its borders. Failure to accomplish this at once will mean the doom not only of the wilderness of the Superior but of Quetico Provincial Park, lying immediately to the north.

What makes the Quetico-Superior country so immensely important to the Midwest? Because in addition to its accessibility it has the rare combination of qualities that makes it an ideal wilderness canoe country. First of all, the lakes are close together and the portages shore, which makes travel from one body of water to another easy. Even though some of the lakes are 20 to 30 miles in length, they are so broken by islands, peninsulas, and channels that there are few open sheets of dangerous wind-swept water. The waterways are intricate and closely woven.

Then, too, the camp sites of the Quetico-Superior country seem especially created for enjoyment. Smooth shelves of rock invite landings everywhere and the needle-covered carpets of duff beneath the pines are ideal for pitching of tents. Only in this strip of lake country along the international border do you find the great red and white pines. Their shade and protection and their shoreline beauty are frequently missing farther to the north.

To the fisherman, this wilderness lake country is something to dream about and, because canoe parties take only what they need for food, primitive fishing is as good today as it ever was. Bass, trout, walleyes, and northern pike are plentiful on all the routes where airplanes, resorts, and the heavy fishing they entail, have not disturbed the old setting.

Seeing wildlife such as deer, bear, and moose is a rare experience today. Here in the Minnesota-Ontario border country is one of the last stands of the moose, and one of the few places this side of the Rockies where it is still possible to see the great timber wolves, the otter, the pine marten, and the fisher.

One of the greatest charms of the canoe country is the constant realization that it was the country of the voyageurs of the old fur-trading days.

The country is still wilderness, much of it as undeveloped as when the voyageurs trav-

ersed it several hundred years ago. Wilderness is rare today. We do not have enough of it. All of the reservations in the entire United States represent only three quarters of 1 percent of our total land area.

Opponents of the Quetico-Superior program say: "Suppose the country is settled; suppose there are resorts on all of these beautiful lakes with roads leading to them or air harbors at their docks; suppose planes bring in fishing parties to every body of water; will that change the country so terribly?"

The answer is that, in addition to the physical changes that become inevitable, it will destroy a far more valuable asset, the country's wilderness character. The roadless areas of the Superior National Forest and the Quetico Provincial Park to the north are more than just good camping and paddling country. They are wilderness canoe country. Divorce the element of wilderness from these ancient water trails and you ruin them as surely as though you had wiped them off the map. Paddling, portaging, or pitching camp can be done anywhere. It is the doing of those things in a wilderness setting that makes a Quetico-Superior cruise a memorable experience.

When the enemies of the canoe country say "Why save this area for the selfish enjoyment of a privileged few, those who can afford guides and go in de luxe?" just remember that 90 percent of all those who take canoe trips are young people of modest means and well under 25 years of age. Actual counts by the Forest Service indicate a big and growing use each year. To thousands of Boy Scouts, organized groups from boys and girls camps, as well as to uncounted private canoe parties, the Quetico-Superior country means the highest recreational experience they know. To them this area is worth fighting for; its preservation is a challenge that must not be ignored.

What can be done to save the Quetico-Superior canoe country? We can contribute personally to the revolving fund of the Izaak Walton League of America, which was set up for the express purpose of aiding the Forest Service, with its limited funds, in acquiring strategic private lands within the roadless areas. We can enlist the aid of Congressmen and all groups or organizations who should be interested in preserving the wilderness character of this superlative lakeland. We can talk and write and plead through every medium at our command and rally Nation-wide support for the two Superior National Forest bills now before Congress, H. R. 2642 and S. 1090, which will make it possible for the Forest Service to speed up its acquisition of the 120,000 acres along the canoe trails. If we fail to get immediate action, the development of airplane fishing camps will spell the doom of our cherished canoe country within a year.

The Quetico Provincial Park right across the border, a region as large as our own roadless area, is still without commercial developments of any kind. If we fail to protect our own side of the border, there will be no reason for Canada to continue preserving the wilderness on her side any longer. Planes will swarm across and the commercial developments will swiftly destroy her own dream of wilderness.

This is the challenge to the men and women of the Midwest, to the 43,000,000 who live within a radius of 750 miles. This is their playground, this their hope of future wilderness enjoyment. Unless they accept the challenge and recognize the fact that swift action is imperative, they will be robbed of one of their most precious assets.

If the millions of the Midwest lend their support to the program now, success will be assured. Then the voyageurs of the future can look back and say, "Our people were wise. They planned well for our happiness. The wilderness canoe country of the Quetico-Superior is a monument to their foresight and vision."

More Power in Furtherance of the Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1948

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the most important law on our statute books faces the supreme test of survival. Attacked as it has been from all sides by the rapacious interests, the law has been vigorously championed not only by those of us who helped to bring about its adoption 14 years ago, but is being most ably defended on sound grounds by such outstanding and seasoned reporters as Blair Moody in his article treating the subject in the Detroit News under date of May 30, and previously under date of May 28 in the same newspaper by his colleague and brilliant commentator, W. K. Kelsey.

There is enough substance in these two articles in themselves to decimate all the selfish opposition of the affiliated plunderbund, the grundyites, and the High Tariff League. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include these comments in the RECORD:

THE COMMENTATOR

(By W. K. Kelsey)

TRUMAN BUILDS UP THE PARTY

President Truman continues to build up, for the record, the Democratic case as it must and will be presented in the platform, whether he is the party's nominee or not. And the Republicans in Congress continue to give him all the help they can.

Almost daily the President either asks Congress to enact some measure he favors, knowing that it will not, or prods Democratic leaders to try to get action on bills that the Republicans in control of both Houses are blocking.

So far this week, Mr. Truman has asked Congress to expand the social-security system, which it will not do, and has summoned his own party leaders to demand passage of a 75-cent minimum wage, and the Federal-aid-to-education measure. Before Congress adjourns for the convention, he will have thought of other matters to be written into the Democratic platform, along with denunciation of the Republican Party for failure to put them through.

It is to be noted that in his appeals this week, the President has had his eyes on a multitude of voters.

His social-security program alone would add an estimated 20,000,000 persons to the rolls, and increase benefits to several millions more. The 75-cent minimum wage would affect still more millions, especially in the South, where Mr. Truman's championship of that measure may undercut the opposition of politicians to his renomination.

Similarly, Federal school aid is popular with southerners who, though heavily taxed for education, are still unable to bring their school systems up to the average national level.

Thus bit by bit Mr. Truman strengthens his own cause by taking advantage of Republican failure to grasp these issues and do something about them.

GIVING THE DEMOCRATS A FAT ISSUE

The House Republicans have now come to the President's aid in fine style, by voting to renew the reciprocal tariff bill for only 1 year instead of 3, with what Secretary of State Marshall has characterized as "crippling amendments."

On the plea that haste is necessary, because the present law expires June 12, the Rules Committee forbade all amendments on the floor, despite Democratic promises to hold debate on them to a minimum to save time.

Wednesday, the Republican majority jammed the bill through, even Members who denounced the tactics of the Rules Committee voting for it. These included Representative COFFIN, of Detroit, a city vitally interested in foreign trade as free as it can reasonably be made; he sacrificed his principles for party regularity. So did Representative EATON, of New Jersey, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, knowing and admitting that the bill was wrong.

The measure now goes to the Senate, where it faces the same necessity for haste. That body is expected to pass it, if for no other reason than to put President Truman on a hot spot. For the President will then have the choice of vetoing the measure and thus killing it, for there are not enough votes in Congress to pass the bill over his veto, or of signing it unwillingly despite the fact that Secretary Marshall has said it would be better to let the present law die than to enact the House bill.

Thus the Republicans are playing fast and loose with a fundamental Government policy, for purely political purposes.

They are rewriting themselves the party of high protective tariffs at a time when both the political and economic future, not of this country alone but of the world, demands freer trade.

How can we continue to point out to the nations of Europe the advantage of lowering or removing all barriers to international trading, while at the same time denying that in our case there are such advantages?

NEW LIMITS ON BARGAINING POWER

Under the present law, the President negotiates, through the State Department, lower-tariff reciprocal arrangements with foreign countries. That is, we agree to lower our tariffs on certain goods exported by those countries, and they agree to lower their tariffs on certain American goods.

By Executive order the President in 1934 set up a Committee for Reciprocity Information, composed of representatives of seven Government agencies interested in trade and tariffs. Its present chairman is the Vice Chairman of the Tariff Commission, and it contains one other member of that body. The committee goes extensively into every question of reciprocal tariff reduction, and holds hearings on them. It then makes recommendations to the President.

Moreover, by an Executive order of 1947, the Tariff Commission is directed to investigate alleged injuries to American producers, arising out of reciprocal tariffs, and to recommend remedial action.

It would appear that the American producer is well enough protected by the Committee for Reciprocity Information and the Tariff Commission. But the Republicans don't think so.

The new bill takes away the powers of the committee. It turns investigations over to the Tariff Commission, and authorizes it to fix limits to which tariffs may be lowered—or raised. If the President declines to follow the advice of the Tariff Commission in negotiating a reciprocal trade agreement, Congress will have power to approve or disapprove his proposals.

VOTING AGAINST NATIONAL INTEREST

What the bill passed by the House does is to nullify the Committee for Reciprocity Information, which is concerned with building up our foreign trade, without the sacrifice of any important American interest, and to exalt the Tariff Commission, which is interested only in the fairness of customs schedules fixed by Congress.

At a time when the Government is trying to promote foreign trade, the sale of American goods abroad and the receipt of foreign

goods in payment for them (which is the only way in which trade can be conducted), Congress has decided to impede and limit the President's power to make reciprocity treaties in order to give political protection to American producers who already have under present law and Executive order, all the protection to which they are reasonably entitled.

This is the partisan political view, opposed to the best interests of the Nation and of the world.

It is noteworthy that many Republican Congressmen see the matter in that light, even though only five of them had courage enough to vote against the bill. The six Representatives of Detroit were evenly divided, Republicans against Democrats. Of the Republicans, one knew better, and the other two are faithful rubber stamps.

THE LOW-DOWN ON WASHINGTON—HOUSE TARIFF WALL LOADS TRUMAN GUNS—CYNICAL ATTITUDE TOWARD WORLD TRADE MAY BECOME PRESIDENT'S NO. 1 ISSUE

(By Blair Moody)

WASHINGTON, May 29.—President Truman takes off for the west coast next week on his first 1948 campaign trip, armed with a new and potent set of political weapons forged by the Republican House of Representatives.

For an election year, the performance of the Halleck machine for the last fortnight has been all but incredible.

Over in the Senate, where the influence of special interests is not so effective, Democrats universally and some troubled Republican Senators privately assert there can be only one explanation: A belief that the Republicans cannot lose this year's election no matter what they can do.

With the South in revolt, Wallace cutting in from the left, and a growing demand that Eisenhower replace Truman, this may not be overconfidence. But the hope is rising once more at the White House that the GOP will yet snatch defeat from the jaws of victory.

READY-MADE ISSUES

Mr. Truman's No. 1 issue may thus be made not by him, but for him. The question could become, as some GOP Senators gravely admit, whether the country's safety could be trusted to the cynical (or ignorant) attitude already being translated into action.

A collateral issue, assuming a Republican sweep of the congressional elections, would be what an enlightened, propublic Republican President could do in the face of a legislative machine of his own party which crassly disregards the public interest.

A judgment typical of the opinion of close and impartial observers came this week in an explosion by the usually sedate New York Times.

Commenting on the action of House leaders in jamming through under a strict gag rule an extension of the reciprocal trade law so crippled that Secretary of State Marshall and conservative Senator GEORGE, Democrat, of Georgia, both called it "worse than nothing," the Times said:

"If the Republican leadership of the House of Representatives had stayed up nights for a month, trying to think up ways of giving the country a stunning exhibition of provincialism and partisanship at their unexampled worst, it could not possibly have hit upon a more successful means of doing so than in the position it has taken on renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act."

BLOW AT WORLD TRADE

"Here, in [this] act sponsored and developed under the wise statesmanship of Cordell Hull, is the most constructive contribution made by the United States in the last generation to the cause of sound international economics.

"[It] recognizes that international trade, like any other trade, is necessarily a two-way process. It recognizes that the Hull program is the indispensable other half of the Marshall plan.

"It recognizes that the American consumer is entitled, particularly in a time of inflation that is playing hob with living costs, to go to foreign markets for the goods he needs if they are offered to him at more reasonable prices, and that it is an outrage to force him to pay on such goods a tariff which is designed to protect a domestic monopoly."

After pointing out that under the House bill "no foreign country would know whether the President's word would tick," the Times added:

"Nor is this all. Having contrived this scheme to knife the Hull trade program while appearing to befriend it, the Republican leaders have brought their plan into the House under a closed rule actually forbidding any attempt whatever to change it on the floor.

"The House may talk—for a limit of 3 hours. It may vote. But it may vote only for or against this ingenious bit of sabotage. It is either this or nothing. No change permitted. No revision possible. No amendment from the floor. This is gag rule at its worst."

HOPE IN THE SENATE

"The House leaders are making a mockery of the legislative process. The Senate leaders may have better judgment. They may have a more realistic understanding of what is happening in the world today. They may also have a better guess as to just how many thousands of independent votes this combination of high-tariff provincialism and partisan gag rule will cost the next Republican Presidential candidate if this is to be the program."

This denotes the spirit of the current House, and not on the trade issue alone. It has buried UMT in committee and stalled on the draft. As soon as the Kremlin makes a few transparent maneuvers of "friendship," brought on by the very fact that we were all-out to build our strength, the urgency to become strong sags—just as "Uncle Joe" hoped it would.

To thousands of families, in all parts of the country, there is just one really important issue today—housing. That's because they can find nowhere to live. In many cases, including some World War II veterans, they cannot pay rents high enough to amortize high construction costs—which have risen, like the price of food, largely because the GOP Congress prematurely ripped off price controls. As basically conservative a man as Senator TAFT sees clearly that the Government must move in this field, and move quickly.

LOBBYISTS IN SADDLE

Must? The odds are heavy that it won't. Why not? Because lobbyists like Herbert U. Nelson and Morton Bodfish, representing the real estate and construction interests, who want houses built only if they can make an uncontrolled profit thereon, have more influence with the men who run the House than the President of the United States or Senator TAFT.

As a matter of fact, the Nelsons, Bodfishes, and the Grundy high-tariff boys, who speak through the Republican chairman of Ways and Means, Representative KNUTSON, have more to say about what goes on in the House today than the Members of the House themselves.

Why should there have been a gag rule on reciprocal trade, unless the House leaders were afraid their own GOP rank and file would break away and put their country before petty politics?

Why are they planning to bottle up the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill in committee—unless they can find a way to bring it out without permitting a vote on slum clearance and public housing?

Why should not the elected representatives of the people be allowed to represent them?

What sort of perversion is this of the powers of the branch of our democratic system that is supposed to be the most democratic?

Foreign Aid Appropriation Bill, 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to authorize the expenditure of the $5,300,000,000 appropriated in this bill for the European recovery program in a 12-month period instead of spreading it over 15 months, as recommended by the Committee on Appropriations.

Under usual circumstances I would follow the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee. Today the situation is unusual. A large sum of money is involved in the proposed reduction, but important as that saving might be the really important thing is to see that those who must administer the European recovery program are given every possible tool with which to work. This agency has already made large commitments for purely relief purposes—food, clothing, medicine, and shelter. Every dollar we reduce this appropriation below the amount authorized by Congress 60 days ago will be a dollar taken from the rehabilitation phase of the European recovery program. Necessary as relief funds may be, the really important part of the program should be the rehabilitation of the economy of Europe. The next 12 months are bound to be critical months. The success or failure of the program may well depend on the interpretation European capitols make of our action here today.

The only possible justification for supporting the European recovery program is that if the program succeeds, we can look forward to living in a peaceful world for some years to come. That being true, I don't think we should jeopardize the success of the program by attempting to save even a billion dollars.

Those who favor reducing this appropriation often refer to the overburdened taxpayer of the United States. If the European recovery program fails and we have to arm to the teeth, the amount carried in this bill will be comparatively small in comparison to what we will have to appropriate for our own national defense.

Interior Department Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1948

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Hon. J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior, before the Senate Appropriations Committee:

STATEMENT OF HON. J. A. KRUG, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, so far as I know there has never before been, in the 99 years of existence of the Department of the Interior, an appropriation bill which would as seriously cripple the Department's effectiveness in the administration of the Nation's resources for the public good as the appropriation bill passed last week by the House of Representatives. Never before—to my knowledge—has there been an appropriation bill which repealed so many substantive provisions of law of long years' standing, and so interfered with the prerogatives of executive management, as this appropriation bill. In the latter respect, the significance of this bill transcends the interests of the Department of the Interior and becomes a matter of national concern.

As a member of the President's Cabinet, which is responsible for the executive operations of our national Government, I say that this legislative development is one which seriously threatens our representative legislative system. I say this because this bill marks a growing trend toward, and could establish a dangerous precedent for, the usurpation by a handful of Representatives on the Appropriations Committees of the functions of the legislative committees comprising a large majority of the Congress.

The seriousness of this development is even more apparent when it is realized that the most damaging of the legislative limitations prescribed in this bill, without the benefit of public hearing, are limitations which would have the effect of accomplishing the purposes long sought by special interest groups through the legislative committees and rejected by those committees after full and open hearings. The same is true also of many of the appropriation and administrative limitations under the bill.

These violations of the public interest and our democratic process are in no way minimized by the fact that the reduction in the Department's total appropriations under this bill is less than the reduction effected last year.

The total effect of the bill would be to so weaken the Department's management of the Nation's resources as to impair the national security as well as the future economic well-being of this country. The husbanding of our natural resources is today a matter of urgent necessity. The last war took an unbelievable toll upon our resources, from which the Nation is already suffering. Another war would require even greater expenditures of raw materials. Independently of the security factor, the demands of the civilian economy upon our natural resources are far greater than ever before and will continue to increase if we are to improve—even to maintain—the American standard of living. At this time and in these circumstances, to render ineffective the public management of the resources so long protected by the Federal Government in the public interest would be a reckless and irresponsible act. A glaring example is the amendment which had been rejected by the House committee and was adopted by the House by vote of only 12 percent of its membership, which is designed to require me to discharge two Reclamation men, Mike Straus and Dick Boke, both of whom have been doing well in the big jobs assigned them. This amendment is the handiwork of Messrs. ELLIOTT and DOWNEY and a group seeking first to nullify and then reverse congressionally established land and power policy.

I sincerely urge this committee to give full and thoughtful consideration to these broad implications of the House bill.

I want to discuss now the more direct effects of the legislative and administrative limitations in the bill upon the Department, in terms of: (1) limitations on departmental management; (2) limitations on personnel; and (3) legislative limitations.

LIMITATION OF DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

The Congress has criticized this Department for inadequacies of management. Frequently the criticisms have been justified. However, the Congress has repeatedly denied our requests to strengthen our management staff. The bill passed by the House not only provides the latest example of such a refusal, but includes directly and indirectly the elimination of vital staff facilities which I now have. It is unreasonable to expect me to carry out the great work programs without the essential tools needed to do the job well. I feel that our requests for management staff facilities have been modest and reasonable.

I have the responsibility for the administration of the program of the Department, the total cost of which in 1949 will approximate $400,000,000. This responsibility includes the fitting together of the programs of many operating agencies of the Department so that the total result is meaningful, so that the programs do not overlap, and so that they adequately cover the needs at which they are directed.

I requested funds for a small program staff in my office which would have no administrative responsibility, which would not in any way come between the operating agencies and the Secretary, but which would assist me in defining more clearly the problems of resource development. This staff was thus expected to assist the Secretary in developing improved integration of the natural resources policy and problems within the Department. I was able to allocate only the small amount of $80,000 for this purpose in 1948. I requested an increase of about $100,000 for 1949. The House not only refused my request for increased funds, but, in addition, struck out the amount allocated for this purpose in 1948, and the House committee said that, in its judgment, the staff would serve no useful purpose. Who is fairly to be held responsible for the failure of the administration of the program of the Department under such circumstances as these? In every other administrative position which I have occupied it has been my executive prerogative to determine the staff facilities needed to accomplish my task.

In connection with my request for increased funds for the program staff, I proposed to extend to three other regions, the California Central Valley, the Colorado, and the Rio Grande and related basins, the experience we have recently gained in the Pacific Northwest. This experience has demonstrated that substantial values in improved perspective can be gained through the device of a committee of regional representatives of the various agencies of the Department, even though the committee is not charged with any administrative duties. The Pacific Northwest Coordination Committee has provided useful advice on the needs of that great region and their relationship to the Interior program. It has provided the field people with an excellent opportunity to learn about each other's programs and how their efforts can effectively be related. Our stakes in these regions are too great to forego the benefits of coordination. The House bill eliminates the funds for a one-man staff for these committees. The elimination is not limited to the three new committees but applies to the Pacific Northwest as well.

I am responsible for the businesslike administration of the power program of the Department of the Interior. The total investment in power facilities for which the Department of the Interior has the pay-out responsibility is over $500,000,000. Construction under way by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Army will add materially to this amount within the next few years. The capacity of those plants from which the Department markets the power was 3,130,770 kilowatts as of May 24, 1948. This is the largest aggregation of hydroelectric power in the world. During the 1947 fiscal year, over 15½ billion kilowatt hours of electric energy were generated, bringing in a revenue to the Federal Treasury of approximately $40,000,000. I cannot review personally all such matters as rate determinations, cost allocations, pay-out studies, construction and operating programs and practices, or sales contracts, for which I am responsible. It is necessary that I have expert assistance in the fields of administration, electrical, hydraulic and civil engineering, finance and accounting, power construction and operation, power utilization, and marketing. The division of power is the organization in the office of the secretary which assists me in supervising and coordinating these power activities. The Division of Power has operated under a wholly inadequate appropriation limitation of $50,000 during this year, and the budget request for 1949 is $104,610.

Again the House not only refused our request for a modest increase to bring the power staff to the minimum levels which existed prior to 1948 but denied the whole amount. This would leave me in the position of being responsible for one of the biggest power businesses in the country, divided between three entirely independent operating agencies, without any staff to assure the accomplishment of the objectives laid down for me by the Congress. Perhaps the most graphic example in the power field is the action taken by the House in also eliminating the $21,500 request for eastern power marketing as a part of the activities of the Division of Power. I have the responsibility under the Flood Control Act of 1944 for marketing the power from flood-control projects built by the Corps of Engineers. Several of those projects are under construction in the Southeastern States. I requested these funds to provide the minimum staff necessary to permit me to discharge this responsibility. Its elimination leaves me a job to do without staff resources with which to do it. Millions of dollars of annual revenue to the United States which should result from the provision of these projects are jeopardized by this action.

In similar fashion, but to a lesser degree, the House has failed to recognize our urgent need for departmental level staff in the field of administrative management by denying our request for small increases for the Division of Personnel Supervision and Management and the Division of Budget and Administrative Management. The House bill proposes to eliminate the regional offices of the Bureau of Land Management and the Office of Indian Affairs. The House committee charged that the regional offices were an extra and unnecessary administrative layer. Regional administration has proved very effective in other agencies of the Department. These facilities are needed to supervise work at the local levels and to see that the programs are conducted within the region in the most efficient, economical, and expeditious

manner. They provided the medium for coordinating the work of the bureau with the programs of other bureaus of the Department which operate in the area. They also provide a level for final decision upon matters which can be decentralized from Washington to a regional level but which could not effectively be discharged by a much larger number of local offices acting independently.

LIMITATION OF PERSONAL SERVICES

The bill is replete with arbitrary and capricious limitations on the use of personal services. These are not the "multitude of small items * * * where reductions could be effected without seriously curtailing current activities" that they are represented to be by the House committee. They are not economy measures. In the aggregate these limitations will destroy the efficiency of the Department. Numerous examples could be cited.

For example, the bill carries the limitation of $750,000 for total personnel engaged in personnel management functions. This limitation compares with the limitation of $1,000,000 during the current year. Even that limitation necessitated a dispersal of the personnel work to the operating staffs, and a corresponding reduction in the time spent on operating matters. It did not eliminate any personnel work. It did not save any money. It did successfully interfere, however, with the effective operation of the Department. The further limitation approved by the House would no more successfully accomplish the purported purpose than the limitation of the current year..

The bill also limits the total amount of the appropriation which can be used for personal services in given bureaus and for given segments of the work of the bureaus, with total disregard for the changing size, scope, and character of the bureaus' programs, year to year. In some circumstances, these limitations may be too liberal, but in others they could strangle the bureaus. These are no more economy limitations than the limitations on personnel for personnel management work. They are instead limitations designed to subvert the operations of the Department.

The most glaring example of all is that which requires that the Commissioner and Assistant Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, and all regional directors of that Bureau, shall have at least 10 years of engineering and administrative experience. This provision has the proclaimed purpose of removing specifically the Commissioner and the regional director for California, neither of whom has an academic engineering degree. In that regard, it is as insidious as the provisions of earlier appropriation acts, since declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, which prohibited the payment of salaries to named individuals. This is particularly so since the declared fight against these two men stems from their support of the existing 160-acre law and the public power policy of the Congress. The implications of this feature of the bill are clear: Unless a Federal officer disregards a clear mandate from the Congress and administers the law in accordance with the dictates of those who would, if they could, have it amended or rescinded, he risks being legislated out of office. Yet, if he were to follow such dictates, rather than the congressional mandate, he would be in personal jeopardy or violation of his oath of office to uphold the law of the land. I can think of no situation more patently unfair to public officials or more potentially dangerous to the public interest.

Moreover, I consider this limitation to be the rankest sort of intrusion upon the prerogatives of executive management, the effect of which is to impugn my judgment as to the ability and qualifications of the officials serving under me and to seriously limit my discretion in the selection of such officials. There is nothing in the record to support this limitation other than the vendetta inspired by a group which, having failed to change the law, now seeks to change the management.

This committee has heard at hearings which closed 2 months ago both sides of this controversy over the two men concerned. The attempt to legislate them out of office originated with the Subcommittee on Publicity and Propaganda of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department, which has refused to hear me or the accused.

LEGISLATIVE LIMITATIONS

The legislative limitations of the bill, which I have already referred to, are accompanied by numerous gratuitous statements in the accompanying report which are intended to have the effect of legislation without being enacted into law. Together, this legislation and these statements would add untold confusion to the Department's administration of the laws for which it is responsible.

To clarify this statement, I will quote a number of provisions of the bill. On page 38 of the bill is the following provision:

"*Provided further*, That no part of any appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this act shall be used for the salaries and expenses of personnel whose activities include efforts to obtain power contracts with customers who already have an existing adequate source of power supply."

Does this provision rescind the existing legislation which provides for preference in the sale of power to public bodies and cooperatives? Who shall say whether the current supply is adequate? Is that determination to be made by the Secretary, the customers, or the present supplier of power? If a customer approaches us on the assumption that his supply is inadequate, do we endanger the salary of the employee who is approached if later examination reveals that the customer's current supply is adequate? These things could reverse and nullify our public-power policy, which has been written into law in numerous statutes and reaffirmed by action of the Congress time and time again. I do not question the right of Congress to change the public power policy of the Nation, but I suggest that such action should be taken only after full and detailed legislative consideration and not through this kind of vague and ambiguous rider upon an appropriation act.

In two places on the last proviso, on page 7 and beginning at line 18 through line 23 on page 52, the House bill attempts to modify basic reclamation law by prohibiting the use of funds collected on account of interest on the power investment in reclamation projects for the purpose of paying off a portion of the costs of reclamation projects allocated to irrigation. The modification proposed would, if their intent were realized, result in increased power rates to the public and water rates to farmers. Many projects now under construction and many projects which could be authorized under existing law would be rendered infeasible. This is a matter which has been the subject of extensive hearings before legislative committees and is in a comprehensive piece of legislation which, after passage in the House, is before a committee of the Senate. It is my understanding that the legislative committees were not even consulted when the language was proposed for inclusion in this bill. It should be stricken.

These are but a few of the dangerous legislative provisions contained in the bill. Time does not permit a discussion of the balance of these provisions. I request, however, that all such provisions be deleted from this bill. We will submit amendments necessary to accomplish this propose.

Time does not permit either full coverage of the effect of the cuts in appropriations for the department's various programs. I have already mentioned the seriousness of the elimination of the power division, the program staff and southeastern power marketing facilities. I am submitting a separate summary for inclusion in the RECORD of some of the more critical effects of cuts in other specific programs of the department.

I ask that all of the President's budget estimates be restored. Amendments needed to restore these funds will be submitted. I specifically urge that these amendments together with other amendments being submitted, be given your thorough consideration.

The chairman of the House committee stated to me during my closing testimony: "We do not want to do anything, Mr. Krug, that will cripple you in any way. That is one thing above all else that this committee does not want to do, anything that will hurt your operation in any way, shape or form."

The House bill, as recommended by the committee, provides funds in the amount of $965,842 for salaries in the office of the Secretary as compared with our request for $1,368,350. This is a reduction of almost 30 percent. The reduction results in funds being made available for immediate office in a lower amount than in 1948, after the drastic slash of last year.

Management responsibility is a heavy burden under the most favorable conditions. Despite the statement of the chairman, the House action, if supported by the Senate, would seriously cripple our ability to do a reasonably good job for the people of the United States.

The Four Chaplains Need Never Have Died

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1948

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, as this session of Congress draws to a close, we still have not enacted legislation which provides the needed manpower for our military services. We cannot overemphasize the necessity of having trained, disciplined men ready to meet any eventuality.

I wish to call attention to an article by Marshall Andrews which appeared in the Washington Post, and herewith inserted into the RECORD, dramatically emphasizing the tragedy which was caused by lack of training. These four chaplains lost their lives on the *Dorchester*, February 3, 1944, because four soldiers were hastily trained and were not disciplined to meet an emergency.

The article follows:

FOUR SOLDIERS DIDN'T OBEY ORDERS—THE FOUR CHAPLAINS NEED NEVER HAVE DIED

(By Marshall Andrews)

Behind the story of one of the most gallant acts of the recent war lies another story which never has been told.

All the world knows how four Army chaplains, a Catholic, a Jew, and two Protestants, stood on the deck of the sinking transport *Dorchester* February 3, 1944, and went down with the ship because they had given their life belts to four men. All four were awarded the Distinguished Service Cross posthumously; and last Friday a special postage stamp was issued in their honor.

All that has been said about them and all that has been done in their memory could never match the magnificence of what they

did. The deed that ended their lives was their final dedication to all men and to the God of all men.

Yet this tragedy is infinitely more tragic because it need never have happened.

What has been overlooked in this story of matchless heroism is the fact that four fine, useful young Americans died because four soldiers had never learned to obey orders. And the blame for that is upon all of us.

Go back for a moment to the crowded *Dorchester* steaming through icy seas near Greenland that bleak February day 4 years ago. When the ship was torpedoed, something like panic followed. Men rushed on deck, milled helplessly about, many frantic with terror, afraid to remain aboard the stricken ship but even more afraid to enter the bitterly cold water.

The four chaplains moved among the men, quieting them, encouraging them, and persuading them to go overboard. They opened a chest filled with life belts and passed them to men who had none. Then, when the box was empty, they tore off their own life belts and gave them to four soldiers.

When the ship plunged under the sea, the four heroic chaplains were seen standing on the forecastle, their arms linked and their voices joined in prayer.

It has not been revealed whether the men aboard the *Dorchester* were casuals or members of organized units. It is not known, if they were in units, whether those were destined for combat or for service behind the lines.

Nothing is known about them except that they did not obey orders.

On every transport one supposedly inflexible requirement was that every man must wear his lifebelt at all times unless asleep and then it was to be with him in his bunk. It was an order which always required unceasing vigilance in enforcement among the hastily and inadequately trained officers and men of the wartime Army.

Had it been carried out aboard the *Dorchester*, the men would have had their lifebelts on, panic or no panic, and four young men of the kind the country needs so badly might have been alive today.

A distressing and hopeless gap in this story is its sequel. What became of the four soldiers who were saved by the chaplains' lifebelts? Did they go on into combat or to jobs behind the lines upon which the welfare of the combat troops depended?

If they went on to battle, how many other men died because they could not obey orders? Or did they themselves, having been saved at the cost of four fine lives, die in battle for lack of the discipline they had not learned to accept?

If they were service troops, how many fighting soldiers died because of their carelessness? If those questions could be answered, the object lesson of unreadiness would be written clear.

America has fought all of its wars with untrained or half-trained soldiers. And in every war thousands of these young men have needlessly died because they could not be taught how to live.

Mothers have lost sons forever because they were unwilling to spare them for a few months of rudimentary training in peacetime. Politicians have condemned thousands of young men to death on the battlefield because compulsory peacetime training was politically inexpedient.

America's unwillingness to prepare itself for war has always resulted in its soldiers being required to learn to fight by fighting. And always the primary essential to survival in battle, discipline which is accepted because it is understood, has been neglected for lack of time to teach it.

Even now, with peace never so precarious, Congress is smothering for political reasons the chance to save lives by adequate training in advance. For in training lies the soldier's highest hope of survival.

If only this can be understood, the *Dorchester* chaplains will have saved by their valiant deaths not four but uncounted thousands of American soldiers.

Old-Age Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 7, 1948

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remind the House that our National Capital was honored last week by the presence of 2,000 delegates representing the Nation's 12,000 Townsend clubs at the ninth annual convention of the Townsend Clubs of America. These delegates did not come to Washington as pleasure seekers but came as representatives of economically insecure persons—the aged, the blind, and the disabled. They were also here to remind the Congress of the unpleasant truth that our Government has shirked its duty to the fathers and mothers of America and ignored their welfare during both sessions of the Eightieth Congress.

I had the privilege of addressing the Townsend convention and was forced to inform these old folks that the old-age pension bill—H. R. 16—has been gathering dust in the House Ways and Means Committee for 17 months, and that there were not 218 Members of this body who were willing to sign a discharge petition to bring it to the floor for debate. My participation in the convention made me increasingly aware of the gross miscarriage of social justice implicit in the situation: although these aged people have labored all their lives in the service of society, and now, after their life's work is done, the Republican majority refuses to place any kind of old-age security legislation on the agenda for this session.

I want to go on record before the House as saying that it is necessary and urgent that Congress adopt some kind of legislation for the welfare of our senior citizens before we adjourn this year. I believe that it is high time that our Government recognize that one of the great problems of the twentieth century is that of providing economic security for our fathers and mothers during their declining years. I might say that it is a problem that is becoming increasingly important because an ever-greater proportion is surviving to a ripe old age. Due to improved medical science, increased control over disease, lower infant mortality rates, and better living conditions, the national average age is moving steadily upward.

The following statistics emphasize this trend toward greater longevity in America. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, America was a nation of youngsters—people married young and usually died young. Even as late as 1850 over 87 percent of our population was under 45 years of age and only 2.7 percent ever reached the age of 65 years. However, the pattern is much different today. At the present time over 25 percent of our total population is over 45 years, and there are 10.6 million persons, or about 7.3 percent of the total population, who are 65 years or older. It has been estimated that by 1980, there will be over 22,000,000 Americans who will be 65 years of age or more.

This ever-increasing number of persons above the now-defined retirement age of 65 poses a serious economic problem to our Government planners. It is a problem resulting from the social and economic contradiction whereby medical science allows more people to survive middle age than ever before, but society has failed to answer the question of their survival. It grows out of the fact that the economic consequences of old age is that the individual is no longer able to work and thus is cut off from his normal source of revenue, but his wants continue as long as life itself regardless of whether the means of satisfying these wants are available.

The solution of the problem resolves itself into methods of providing purchasing power to our old people in adequate amounts to permit them to buy the necessities of life after their days of labor are over. The only way that this can be done is through a liberal and all-embracing Federal pension system for the benefit of our senior citizens. No fair-minded person can dispute this proposition; its proof is found in our recent political history.

One of the lessons of the 1929 depression, and our experiences of the 1933–40 period, is that the average person cannot achieve old-age security through personal savings and private insurance annuities. As the Federal Security Board estimated in 1938, some 5,000,000 of the 7,800,000 old folks, about two-thirds of them, were dependent at the time upon public, private, or family aid as a means of support. Some 70 percent of these 5,000,000 dependent fathers and mothers were relying upon their children or other relatives for their livelihood.

The lessons of this period showed that social action, rather than individual savings, was necessary to cope with the problem of old-age security, and that the Federal Government must assume the responsibility of providing this security. It was upon this premise that the Social Security Act and the old-age assistance program was adopted. It was this premise which was expressed as a working principle of government by our late President—the immortal Franklin D. Roosevelt, when he said on January 11, 1944:

> In our day these economic truths have become accepted as self-evident. We have accepted, so to speak, a second economic bill of rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all—regardless of station, race, or creed.

Among these economic rights outlined by Mr. Roosevelt were:

> The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve good health;
>
> The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment.

As a supporter of the Roosevelt program for full employment and national prosperity, I say that we must extend his

program of social security for all the people. I look upon the Social Security Act of 1935, which established the old-age pension and assistance programs, as an important milestone on the road to old-age security. The act is important, not that it alone is adequate to meet the needs of our senior citizens, but rather because it was a beginning—a step in the right direction.

It is important that we recognize that the Social Security Act was only a start—that this law is wholly inadequate to meet the economic needs of our old folks today. In the first place, its coverage is far from complete. Less than 2,000,000 people are entitled to old-age and survivors, benefits, with another 2,000,000 now eligible for old-age assistance. After taking into account the civil service, railroad retirement, the armed forces, and private pension systems, it is safe to say that no more than 50 percent of our retired citizens are covered by pension systems.

In the second place, the pension system established by the Social Security Act lacks uniformity, and is therefore inequitable. Old-age pension payments now range from $10 to $85 per month, and old-age assistance payments range from $15 per month in Georgia to $60 per month in Washington. Finally, the monthly payments are so low that recipients cannot maintain a decent standard of living. The national average for old-age pensions is $25 per month, and old-age assistance payments average only $35 per month. In my State of Minnesota, for example, the average monthly assistance payment is only $41. It is obvious that no person can exist on a health and decency level on such miserable pittances.

In the final analysis, the only logical solution to the old-age-pension problem is Federal legislation to establish a comprehensive, uniform, and liberal old-age-pension system. By a comprehensive pension system, I mean a pension set-up which makes pensions available—as a matter of legal right—to every person reaching the retirement age of 60 years. Such a system would mean that such discriminatory laws, such as the Minnesota lien law, which deny assistance to many persons, must be abolished. Such a system would also cover those persons under 60 years who are unable to work because of physical disability or mental deficiencies. By a uniform pension system, I mean one which will provide uniform monthly pension payments to every person regardless of their State residence, or other race, color, or creed. I maintain that the citizens of one State deserve the same treatment as those in another State—that pension payments should be the same for all people in all States.

By a liberal pension system is meant one which provides monthly payments which are sufficient to maintain the pensioner on the health and decency level, thus enabling him to live out his last years with a satisfactory standard of living. The minimum monthly payment, under today's inflated price structure, should be at least $100 per month.

Mr. Speaker, legislation to give security to our senior citizens is must legislation during the present session. Millions of our old folks are today living under conditions of dire poverty, and are suffering from slow starvation. The Congress has recently appropriated $14,000,000,000 for national defense, and we have authorized over $6,000,000,000 for European recovery, of which a goodly part is going to our former German enemies. If we can afford to pour out our billions for Germany and Japan, we can surely afford to appropriate funds for the fathers and mothers of America. I maintain that Congress has a Christian duty to provide for our senior citizens, and I appeal to the House leadership to bring H. R. 16 to the floor and enact it into law before the end of this session.

H. R. 6823

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 7, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced House bill 6823, which, if enacted, will exempt admissions to religious, educational, and charitable entertainments, and to certain concerts conducted by civic or community membership associations from the tax on admission which is now collected by the Federal Government.

This tax, as now collected, amounts to 1 cent for each 5 cents or major fraction thereof on the amount paid for admission. It amounts to a 20-percent tax on such activities and entertainments as high school football and basketball games, and voluntary civic efforts which support recreational, cultural, and other community projects. Such activities, prior to the war, were exempted by the provisions of Section 1701 subsections (a) and (c) of the Internal Revenue Code. However, during the war, in order to make our all-out effort, and throw every resource of this country behind the war effort, these exemptions were eliminated.

Surely our Government no longer needs to take its toll from funds raised through activities of this kind, and these exemptions should be restored at the earliest possible moment.

Recently a resolution urging the reinstatement of these exemptions was adopted by the Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs. This resolution is as follows:

Whereas the Federal admission tax of 1 cent for each 5 cents or major fraction thereof on the amount paid for admission to any place, including admission by season ticket or subscription, was raised during the war and made to include these organizations previously exempted under section 1701, subsections (a) and (c) of the Internal Revenue Code; and

Whereas this admission tax as raised during the war was to have terminated "on the first day of the first month which begins 6 months or more after the day on which the war ends," and its continuance penalizes volunteer civic efforts which support recreational, cultural, and other community projects, with a consequent lessening of such efforts in communities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs seek reinstatement of the Internal Revenue Code of section 1701, subsections (a) and (c), by urging clubs and individuals to request Representatives in Congress to make the reinstatement: And, further

Resolved, That an additional section be added in respect to the exemptions listed under (a) and (c) of the Code to read:

"In lieu of such tax each organization as listed under subsections (a) and (c) shall furnish an affidavit for each entertainment to their respective collector of internal revenue, stating the nature, time, and place of such entertainment and for what purpose the proceeds will be used": And further

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs at its convention in June 1947, be requested to approve this resolution and to urge other State federations to support the resolution.

I am informed that a similar resolution was adopted by the General Federation of Women's Clubs of the United States at its convention which has just been concluded.

I urge that prompt action be taken to enact House bill 6823 into law, so that these exemptions may be speedily reinstated, and these worth-while activities not be penalized further under this wartime measure.

Hon. Carl Albert, of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOBY MORRIS
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 7, 1948

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a resolution adopted by the board of trustees for the Goodland Indian Orphanage, located in Choctaw County, Okla., commending my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma, Hon. CARL ALBERT, for his efforts in behalf of the educational program for Indians. The resolution follows:

Whereas Hon. CARL ALBERT, Congressman from the Third District of the State of Oklahoma, labored valiantly for appropriations for the educational program for Indians of Oklahoma and the Nation, his work coming at a crucial period in the legislation; and as we feel, he, by his tireless efforts, has brought success to said program: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Board of Trustees of Goodland Indian Orphanage, at Goodland, Okla., now in annual session, That we hereby express our sincere thanks to Hon. CARL ALBERT, Congressman from the Third District, for his interest and labor in bringing about success in the appropriation for further education among the Indians of Oklahoma and the Nation; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread on the minutes of our meeting and a copy sent to Mr. ALBERT.

Done at Goodland Indian Orphanage, Goodland, Okla., on this the 21st day of May 1948.

W. E. SCHOOLER,
FRANK M. TAYLOR,
J. L. IMOTICHEY,
Committee on Resolutions.

Attested by:

HUGH E. BRADSHAW,
Secretary, Board of Trustees,
Goodland Indian Orphanage.

Columbia River Floods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 7, 1948

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call the attention of the Congress to new developments in the tragic flood disaster in the Columbia River Valley.

Reports of this morning placed the known dead at 26 with more than 50 persons still missing; the property loss at $140,000,000 and the number of people made homeless by the floods at about 48,000.

Of the 12,000 families—48,000 people—made homeless by the Columbian floods, the homes of approximately 6,000 families have been completely and utterly demolished.

This is, in short, one of the greatest flood tragedies in our Nation's history and may, when final estimates are possible, equal or almost equal the great Mississippi Valley flood disaster of 1937 when damage estimated at $210,000,000 was done by flood waters.

The Columbia River floods have not only demolished 6,000 homes and damaged 6,000 others, but also have done great damage to State and county roads, city streets in many towns and settlements, dike and drainage districts, and to city sewer and water systems, power and telephone lines.

A check-up of Federal disaster relief aid available shows:

First. That $6,000,000 is available as grants to the State for the rehabilitation of State primary and secondary roads, but no funds are available for roads and highways of a lower rating than secondary;

Second. That $22,000,000 is available for loans at 3 percent to aid farmers and other individuals and firms in the purchase of seed, livestock, in rebuilding homes, and reestablishing businesses;

Third. That the United States Engineers have about $1,500,000 for rebuilding damaged dikes in disaster areas with efforts now being made to obtain an additional $6,000,000 from Congress for use by the United States Engineers for such purposes; and

Fourth. That sufficient funds are available for demolition and cleaning up of the wreckage in Vanport and other areas where severest flood damage has occurred.

Greatest emergency needs at the present time in the Columbia River Valley disaster area are:

First. The providing of funds as grants to cities and counties for the restoration of public facilities, such as county roads, city streets, water systems, sewage system, public power facilities, repair of schools and public buildings, and other similar public services which have been damaged by the floods; and

Second. The providing of funds which can be used immediately to provide temporary housing to shelter the 6,000 families whose homes were demolished and also later to replace these temporary homes with permanent structures for occupancy by the 6,000 families whose homes were total losses in the flood.

The housing shortage situation created by the Columbia River floods is most unusual.

Oregon, between the years 1940 and 1947, increased 39 percent in population and the population of Washington, during the same 7 years, increased 28.6 percent.

In short, Oregon showed the second largest population increase for any State in the union, being exceeded only by California, while Washington ranked fourth among the States in population growth.

Peculiarly, the greatest growth in population in both Oregon and Washington occurred in those areas hit hardest by the floods. There were practically no vacant houses in these areas before the floods and now with 6,000 homes destroyed and 6,000 others damaged the housing shortage situation in this area is most tragic and intolerable.

By act of December 22, 1921, the Congress approved a grant of $20,000,000 to Russia for famine victims in that country and followed this grant January 20, 1922, with an additional grant of $4,000,000 in medical supplies to Russia.

On February 1925 the Congress gave $6,017,069.03 in a credit to Army accounts for the issue of supplies to earthquake victims in Japan.

Throughout our history, Congress has on scores of occasions supplied cash, goods, and services to disaster areas in our country which have suffered from floods, tornadoes, fires, and droughts.

I am certain this Congress will deal generously with the Columbia River Valley flood victims of Oregon, Washington, Montana, and Idaho and that we will act before adjournment.

Which Shall It Be—Generous Old-Age Security or Starvation and the Haunting Fear of Old Age and Disability?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 7, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission heretofore granted, I include as part of my remarks my address to the National Townsend Convention on June 2, 1948, in Washington, D. C.:

WHICH SHALL IT BE—GENEROUS OLD-AGE SECURITY OR STARVATION AND THE HAUNTING FEAR OF OLD AGE AND DISABILITY?

Mr. Chairman, Dr. Townsend, and my friends of the Townsend convention, I am indeed happy to have again the privilege of addressing this great gathering of men and women from all over the United States, devoted to the great cause of bringing about adequate care and protection for the elderly and disabled people of America. Recently there appeared in the local newspaper in my home town of Portland, Oreg., the following brief statement:

"OLD-AGE PENSIONER FOUND CRITICALLY ILL

"Leonard Dow, 79, Lind Hotel, old-age pensioner who was found seriously ill in his room Friday, was taken to the emergency hospital. Attendants said he is suffering from pneumonia and malnutrition.

"He later was admitted to Permanente Hospital, where his condition is reported critical. Dow is the third elderly person found this week in need."

I am chagrined and horrified that in my own beautiful State of Oregon, where prosperity reigns and where an Infinite Father has been most kind in providing a wealth of natural resources, a stable climate, and a productive countryside, any old person in this, the greatest Nation on earth, should meet the sad end of malnutrition and starvation. A great nation is indeed derelict in its duty when it will permit such a situation of exist, so inhumane and negligent, in the care of the aged. We attempted, in a way, to meet this problem several years ago when the Congress enacted legislation providing first, for old-age and survivors' insurance, and secondly, for public assistance to the aged who could not qualify under the insurance program. However, the average check received each month by a retired worker and his wife, under the old-age and survivors' insurance law, is $39.20, and the average check received each month for old-age assistance for each individual is $37.71. The committee appointed by the Senate to investigate this whole problem, recently rendered a severe indictment against it, showing its complete inadequacy to meet the old-age problem facing us. The only solution, in my judgment, is the enactment of a Federal old-age annuity program, Nationwide in scope, toward which all contribute during their productive years, and in which all will participate in their old age. I am proud to be the author of H. R. 16, the Townsend program, which embodies this solution.

We in America can be justly proud of our achievements in the development of our industrial enterprise system under mass machine production which enables us to stand in the forefront of all nations in the ability to produce food, clothing, shelter, and other necessities of life in abundance, not only for our own people but to help other nations in need. This was a major factor in winning the war. However, with machine labor and mass production, we have found that the elderly people of America, by reason of the very success we have achieved in production, are outcasts and have been deprived of remunerative employment in their declining years.

Existing social and economic conditions force upon us the complex question of security for the individual in our modern, industrial civilization. Since 1919 the number of self-employed individuals in the United States, including farmers, has remained fairly constant at about nine or ten million. During the same period, the number of employees in the American labor force has risen from 32,600,000 to 50,700,000, an increase of 18,000,000, or about 60 percent. Since population has been increasing during this entire period, the percentage of self-employed persons in the United States has declined from about 22 percent in 1919 to about 16.6 percent in 1946. In other words, we are facing an age-old problem under rapidly changing conditions.

The young and vigorous are on the pay rolls of this machine age and the elderly citizens are relegated to the sidelines. As a result of this maladjustment, we find the aged unemployed increasing in numbers and in want, and we are faced with the problem of social security to meet the needs for livelihood of this large group.

To meet this problem the Congress passed Public Law 271 in the Seventy-fourth Congress, setting up a social-security program not only for the aged but for the blind, dependent, crippled children, and with certain assistance to maternal and child welfare and public health. The Seventy-sixth

Congress made extensive amendments to the law, and as a result we now have two major programs governing old-age security—title I providing grants to States for old-age assistance, and title II setting up a program for Federal old-age and survivors' insurance benefits. For almost 10 years now these laws have been in operation and we find that they fail, in many important particulars, to meet the problems we are seeking to solve in providing adequate social security for the aged and disabled.

The advisory council on social security to the Senate Committee on Finance has just made its report and recommendations. This council consists of 18 outstanding leaders representing practically all segments of our industrial and social life. Their recommendations are significant in that they point out the deficiencies of the existing program for social insurance. The council finds three major deficiencies in this old-age and survivors' insurance program which I quote verbatim:

"1. Inadequate coverage—only about three out of every five jobs are covered by the program.

"2. Unduly restrictive eligibility requirements for older workers—largely because of these restrictions, only about 20 percent of those aged 65 or over are either insured or receiving benefits under the program.

"3. Inadequate benefits—retirement benefits at the end of 1947 averaged $25 a month for a single person."

In order to remedy these deficiencies, this advisory council recommends that the coverage be extended to include the self-employed, farm workers, household workers, employees of nonprofit institutions, Federal civilian employees, railroad employees, members of the armed services and employees of State and local governments, all of which are now excluded from the benefits of the act. The council further recommends extending greater liberality in eligibility and increased benefits and survivors' protection. The findings of this council clearly disclose that the present social-security program is basically inadequate and must be completely overhauled or supplanted by a more effective program.

The old-age and survivors' insurance program is a contributory plan based upon contributions by both employers and employees, each paying a tax of 1 percent of the first $3,000 of wages, to be increased to 1½ percent in 1950–51 and 2 percent thereafter. This, in effect, is a tax on production and a burden on all citizens. These taxes go into what is called a trust fund which, on December 31, 1947, amounted to $9,360,000,000. The Government spends the trust funds as received for the regular expenses of Government, and replaces the funds with Government securities bearing interest paid by the Government, which encourages deficit spending. It follows that when these funds are needed, in lieu of the bonds, the Government will be obliged to levy another tax on all taxpayers to meet the demands on the fund. Notwithstanding this huge balance in the trust fund on December 31, 1947, there had been paid to beneficiaries under the program up to that date only a little over $3,000,000,000. The cost of administering this program is now running approximately $42,000,000 a year. The total costs to date have been about 15 percent of the benefits paid out and a little more than 2 percent of the total receipts. For the fiscal year 1947 administrative costs were 2½ percent of the receipts and 9.6 percent of the benefit payments. A major part of the heavy administrative work is in keeping the wage records of 75,500,000 living people and determining the amount of benefits each (including his family) is entitled to if and when he becomes eligible for benefit payments. To be fully insured for life a worker must have 40 calendar quarters of covered employment. Minimum benefits for a worker are $10 a month, and for a worker and his wife, $15. Maximum benefits currently paid are $44.40 for a worker and $66.60 for a worker and his wife. The average payments as of June 1947 were $24.10 for a worker and $39.20 for a man and his wife. This old-age and survivors' insurance plan contemplates these actuarial calculations would become effective for a boy 16 years of age in a covered occupation and that for 50 years or until he is 65 years of age, the Social Security Board will keep track of his employers' and his tax payments made from his wages and other essential data covering the case and based thereon will determine what he will receive in benefits 50 years from now which, according to present average payments, would be about $24 a month. With the ups and downs in the economic condition of our Nation and the fluctuation in the value of the dollar, it is at once apparent that the whole scheme is unworkable and, in fact, offers little social security to our workers. These workers who, with their employers, have been taxed through the years, and who are now receiving only an average payment of $24 a month, are receiving less than many of the old-age beneficiaries who pay no tax to the fund. In the meantime, the Federal Government is piling up a huge so-called reserve fund which, in reality, is only a paper fund as the actual moneys are expended as received by Government bureaus and only IOU's are left in the fund.

All of these difficulties would be avoided by the enactment of legislation of the type we propose in H. R. 16 which, as I have said, is a pay-as-you-go plan and is financed from current receipts to which all contribute who come within the tax formula. Particularly, it would eliminate the unsound reserve fund, the bureaucratic spenders' paradise for inflation and deficit spending. Furthermore, our proposal would be elastic so that the monthly annuities necessary to enable the recipient to maintain himself in decency and health would be determined currently, based on existing conditions and tax revenues collected, and which would be adequate to meet necessary living expenses.

The old-age assistance program under the present social-security law is also wholly inadequate to provide a decent annuity to the old people of our Nation who come within its provisions. This program is financed through congressional and State appropriations without any contributions from the annuitants. No special Federal levy is made to finance the Federal share. The distributions are made by the States which receive direct grants from the Federal Government. Federal contribution for payment to the aged and blind is two-thirds of the first $15 plus one-half of the next $30. There is a similar graduated payment for children eligible for assistance. The maximum Federal contribution, however, is $25 for the aged and blind and $13.50 for the first dependent child and $9 for each additional child. Assistance payments to the aged under this program, as of December 1947, average $37.42 per month each. It is a starvation allowance. Many old-age annuitants are suffering from malnutrition, which means starvation. There is little uniformity, however, in the payments made in the several States. For example, in December 1947, they ranged from a high of $87.42 in Colorado to a low of $15.87 in Mississippi. When we consider that the average payment of old-age assistance under this program is only $37.42, and running as low as $16, it is evident that the program is wholly insufficient to provide even a minimum for these elderly people to maintain themselves in decency and health, in view of the high prices prevailing at this time.

If we are to preserve the American way of life and our economic and democratic processes under free enterprise, we must find a solution not only for our unemployment problems but also for the problem of providing adequate care for the aged and disabled. With an accelerating advance in technology in the postwar era, and with the discovery of atomic energy presaging more rapid transitions in mass production, the social risks and hazards of unemployment and old age are increased. Rather than see workers pushed from the active labor force, hit or miss, the logical policy to follow is one of selection. The older group has earned retirement. Many of them are now covered by the Social Security Act. By covering the entire group, the whole process of business activity will be stabilized. Retirement payments will provide continuous buying power, will provide the needed balance in market demand and will help to provide mass consumption without which our mass-production economy cannot function successfully. It will lead the way to greater prosperity in our Nation.

It was by reason of these deficiencies in the old age security program that those of us in the Congress interested in the problem, introduced the Townsend legislation which is embodied in my bill H. R. 16. The aged, through no fault of their own, through the fiat of industry are denied a part of production. They toiled the longest in production and should not, when old, be deprived of taking part in consumption. They are the victims of an industrial system for which they are not responsible. Society owes a duty to these old folks, and it can only perform this duty by establishing a national annuity system providing against the hazards of old age and disability. There are now millions among us, 60 years of age and over, who are not now being cared for in an honorable and just way by the present system of social security, and are receiving no support or hopelessly inadequate support. Our plan would replace the complicated, arbitrary and inequitable provisions of the existing law. It is financed by a transaction tax in which all participate. It is a pay-as-you-go system, and annuities will be paid currently each month out of currently raised revenues, and the sums so received by annuitants must be spent within 30 days. Under the plan, the existing system of old-age and survivors' insurance and old-age assistance will be abolished and a new program substituted therefor. This proposal gives recognition to the past labors of the aged and would offer them dividends from the wealth of American industry which they helped to create. These annuities are provided for these self-respecting American citizens, as a matter of right, without reference to need or prior contribution, and with neither the stigma of charity nor the aroma of poverty.

We in the Eightieth Congress plead with the Ways and Means Committee to report this bill for a vote. Failing in this, I filed a petition to discharge the committee and there are now 172 out of the 218 names required signed to it. All of us in the House, with the welfare of our old folks in our hearts, have appealed to our colleagues on every occasion to sign this petition and bring the bill to the floor for enactment before the Eightieth Congress adjourns.

My good American friends of this great organization, I know it is not necessary to plead with you for justice to our old people, but may we heed the admonition of the Good Book where it is said—

"But if any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel."

"Honor they father and thy mother that it may go well with thee in the land the Lord thy God giveth thee."

We have spent, and are spending, billions of American dollars for war and for preparation for war in the Old World and for aid and succor to the derelict there, but we have

been niggardly in providing a pittance to our old people here at home to keep body and soul together and the wolf from the door.

"God of our fathers, known of old
Lord of our far flung battle line,
Beneath whose awful hand we hold
Dominion over palm and pine;
Lord God of hosts, be with us yet
Lest we forget! Lest we forget!"

Hidden Clauses Peril Vast Power Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 7, 1948

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I now wish to introduce in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared on the front page of the Washington Post of June 6, 1948:

RAMMED THROUGH HOUSE—HIDDEN CLAUSES PERIL VAST POWER PROJECTS

(By Robert Bruskin)

Obscure legislation buried under a misleading title and rammed through the House by its Appropriations Committee yesterday threatened the Government's vast power-irrigation projects.

Interior Department sources said it would cause power-rate increases to consumers ranging from 15 to 38 percent. Six of its largest projects, said the source, would become "infeasible."

Minority Whip JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, declared the legislation gives off a strange odor. * * * It is the odor of the power lobby.

The House Public Lands Committee, which handles reclamation, was not told of the concealed clauses by the Appropriations Committee or the Rules Committee, Chairman RICHARD J. WELCH, Republican, of California, declared it "strikes at the very heart of western reclamation and irrigation."

He called it "the worst blow the projects have had since they were started in the days of Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot at the turn of the century."

The damaging clause was contained in the appropriations bill for the Interior Department, a chronic target for Appropriations Chairman JOHN TABER, Republican, of New York.

Although it was clearly legislation which the committee had no authority to originate, it sailed through the 'House under a rule which prevented Members from taking exception to it.

The clause was buried under the title, "Alaskan Investigations." It stated that the 3-percent interest collected by the Government on its power and municipal water projects could no longer be used to extend irrigation and cheap electricity to consumers. The interest must go back into the Treasury.

This provision would have the automatic effect, if sustained by the Senate, to bring the cost of power and irrigation closer to prices charged by commercial firms, Interior sources said.

The intent is similar to a bill introduced by Representative ROBERT F. ROCKWELL, Republican, of Colorado. It was approved after a bitter fight in rigorously amended form which took the sting out. This bill is now pigeonholed in the Senate.

So rapidly was the appropriations bill pushed through the House last week, and so little warning was given of its contents, that debate was almost negligible on the hidden provisions.

A Senate appropriations subcommittee completed its public hearings yesterday without any indication what might happen.

Interior Secretary Krug, in his testimony, declared the bill would have the effect of accomplishing the purposes long sought by special interest groups through the legislative committees and rejected by those committees after full and open hearings.

He pointed out that clauses would require the dismissal of Reclamation Commissioner Michael W. Straus and Richard Boke, regional director in the Central Valley project.

"This amendment," said Krug, "is the handiwork of Messrs. Representative ALFRED J. ELLIOTT, Democrat, of California, and Senator SHERIDAN DOWNEY, Democrat, of California, and a group seeking first to nullify and then reverse congressionally established land and power policy."

Another clause prohibited the use of funds for persons employed to get power contracts with customers who already have an existing adequate source of power supply.

Asked Krug:

"Does this provision rescind existing legislation which provides for preference in the sale of power to public bodies and cooperatives? Who shall say whether the current supply is adequate?"

R. K. Lane, president of the Public Service Co. of Oklahoma, and J. E. Corrette, Jr., vice president of the Montana Power Co., who said he represented all private power companies in the Rocky Mountain area, opposed any more construction of Government power facilities in the area.

Corrette told the Senate subcommittee yesterday a surplus of privately controlled power exists. He said the Rocky Mountain group of private utilities was organized to tell Congress we would build all the transmission lines and generating plants.

Inquiry by House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce Concerning Ability of National Transportation System To Meet Future Emergencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 7, 1948

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to call to the attention of the House the important inquiry being inaugurated by the Committee on Inerstate and Foreign Commerce with reference to the present status of all forms of transportation and their ability to meet any emergency that may arise in the future. This national transportation inquiry starting today, is to be carried on by hearings on June 8 and 9, 1948, and it is arranged to continue the study during the recess of Congress.

The hearing starting this morning is a continuation of the series dealing with the national transportation inquiry. Our transportation policy calls for the developing, coordinating, and preserving of a national transportation system by rail, highway, air, and water adequate to meet not only the needs of commerce and the postal service but of the national defense. It is the committee's hope that it may arrive at and constantly thereafter be apprised of the transportation industry's ability to meet any emergency situation.

Testimony at this hearing on our defense transportation system is to come from the various carriers and the industries supply them with maintenance materials and equipment. Involved are air, railroad, coastwise, and inland water carriers as well as private and common carrier automotive transportation; automotive manufacturers and parts industry, railroad locomotive and car builders, and their material and component suppliers. Pipeline transportation will not be covered by this hearing since it is a part of the committee's concurrent fuel study which covers the petroleum, gas, coal, and electric-power industries.

The committee hopes to hear from the carriers on their present financial and manpower resources, condition of physical plant and equipment, and their ability to handle any increased demands for service. It also wishes to learn of any existing restrictions on capacities of operations, bottlenecks in physical facilities, material, manpower, or finances, and suggestions as to means for improvement.

In recent years there have been economic and technological changes and trends within and without the transportation industry affecting its ability to provide service, such as the availability of fuel, especially of petroleum; adequacy in normal and emergency times of the supply of specific products like jet fuel, gasoline, Diesel, and fuel oils; the alteration of types of power or efficiencies of engines to conform to or best utilize such petroleum products; the retention of stand-by railroad coal and water facilities for alternate type of power utilization, and the like. In all of these matters, the committee is concerned.

From the industries engaged in supplying transportation maintenance supplies and equipment, the committee wishes to hear as to their present ability to provide supplies and equipment, such as railroad rolling stock and rail, ships, aircraft and parts, motor vehicles, and the like. There may exist restrictions on capacities and operations, bottlenecks in physical facilities, material, components, manpower, or finances, and the committee desires suggestions as to means for removal.

In this examination into the status of our national transportation system from the point of view of national defense, we are conscious of the experience we had preceding and during the last war.

At that time military needs largely preempted aviation equipment and personnel. Our shipping needs and the submarine warfare largely eliminated coastal water-borne traffic. Stringencies of rubber and to some extent of gasoline supply deeply affected our highway and motor vehicle freight and passenger carriage. This meant that the wartime transport burdens fell largely upon the railroads, and to lesser extent upon pipe lines, inland waterways, and our existing motor vehicle fleet.

At the same time wartime demands for manpower, facilities, and materials affected the usual relationship between

the equipment and maintenance supply industries and the carriers.

Of the excellence of the job done we are all aware. Our pipe lines and internal water facilities were used to the utmost. Our highway equipment was more or less pooled, and with restricted gasoline and tire replacements, performed magnificently. Our local transit facilities carried a tremendous number of war workers. Our railroads without exception met every wartime test placed upon them.

Concurrently related supply industries contributed invaluably to the Nation: The aircraft industries to our preeminent air position; the automotive industry to tanks, military trucks, aircraft, and ordnance; the locomotive and car builders to domestic and military railroad equipment, tanks, ships, and ordnance; and similarly across the field. In no other endeavor was the transportation supply industry surpassed in the amount of conversion to direct munitions work.

Not once during the war was there ever any breakdown of our national transportation system.

This is a credit to all who participated in these operations: To the men and management of the carriers, to their supplying industries, and to the governmental authorities who had to plan the balance between the preservation and maintenance of an adequate transportation system and the use of men, materials, and facilities in the direct munitions production for the prosecution of the war.

This committee is concerned at this time with what this performance may have meant, and left to us in the way of a vital transportation system; of our ability again to meet such an emergency demand; of the changes which have taken place or may be occurring.

We well appreciate that the last war's record was possible in some measure owing to the large transportation resources and facilities which were available when we entered the conflict. We were able successfully to carry on because of the accumulated production of trucks, automobiles, and buses; and with a substantial increase in railroad motive power, largely to operate with rolling stock then available. It was clear that the railroads possessed substantial unused capacity—to a great extent paid for during the preceding two decades at the expense of their security holders—which with excellent shipper cooperation, and elimination of some plant bottlenecks, more than doubled the transportation service they had been rendering.

What is the situation today?

Would our various transportation agencies be able to repeat such performance? While there have been substantial postwar increases in motor vehicles and the railroads have expended vast sums in plant improvements and new equipment, could the same record be repeated?

How far is the situation different? It would not appear that this country again would be faced with the same dire straits as to rubber. There also is indication that the present change in our petroleum economy from gasoline to kerosene and distillates would not mean the repetition of the same limited gasoline supply. Would these things mean that we might expect a much different load to be carried by motor vehicles? Could it be so carried? What is the condition of our highways, our important highway bridges, of the age of the vehicles? Would or could we again devote automotive production facilities entirely to munitions?

Similarly, what is the condition of our rail facilities? Have the postwar improvements, the acquisition of new power and equipment, the installations of centralized traffic control, the technological advances such as controlled-cooled rail, and so on, increased our railroad plant capacity? Or on the average has it so aged that it could not again assume such load? Is a body of competent trained individuals still available for extra loads? Do we have adequate reserve equipment manufacturing facilities or have they been converted to other uses?

These are only indicative of the line of examination which the committee desires to make into each transportation field. The entire subject will, however, be pursued this summer and fall by the committee and the committee's staff, so that to some extent the questioning which the committee would otherwise conduct at this time will be deferred.

Builders of the Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1948

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD the June 7 column of Mr. George E. Sokolsky, whose comments appear daily in the Washington Times-Herald. The column is devoted to some comments concerning State Senator Ole Fallon of Wilsall, Mont., who is a good friend and neighbor of our colleague, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Ole Fallon is an outstanding example of fine citizenship. He is one of the many persons of Scandinavian origin who has done so much to build the Northwest. As such, the tribute by Mr. Sokolsky is well deserved.

And we who know of the fine work the gentleman from Montana has done in the House, know that the tribute to him is equally well deserved.

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

We drove through Monmouth out of Yellowstone National Park for another hundred miles, more or less, through snow-capped mountains, past herds of antelope, by multihued pheasants until we reached the ranch of Ole Fallon, member of the Montana legislature.

His wife, Christina, had prepared a glorious dinner for us, cooked as no fancy restaurant would even know how to prepare food for fastidious farmers.

And table was set in the kitchen where the aroma of home-made rolls, of cream gravy, and braised chicken added zest to the appetites of hungry tourists.

It was more like a harvesttime table, heavy-laden with good things to eat, with home-made pot cheese, and home-made grape jelly, and preserved cranberries.

Ole is a typical Montana rancher who owns about 1,200 acres, considered not too large in those parts. He has paid for his land, for his cattle, for his sheep. He owes no one anything. He, like most ranchers in these parts, has learned much from the years of drought.

He has learned not to owe anybody anything; therefore, there will be no one to take from him the fruits of his labor, his land, and his cattle.

That he learned from the bad years of the Dust Bowl, when rain did not fall and the grass did not grow, and the cattle died on the range and the banks foreclosed the mortgages.

He also learned something in the New Deal days. He learned that the Government talks bigger than it does; that so-called experts often do not understand more than books can tell them; that Government aid is no substitute for experience, hard work, and common sense.

I came upon Ole while he was engaged preparing his irrigation ditches, and discovered that a good farmer does his own irrigating and does not depend upon Government and all its rules and regulations.

I also learned from Ole that a man who is not a good rancher is not liked as a candidate for public office. We were discussing candidates and he made the point that a man who does not winter his cattle properly and does not protect his neighbors by mending his fences cannot be relied upon.

And, of course, that is logical. If a man does not know how to live, how can he do the Nation's business?

Now, Ole is a Norwegian immigrant, as is his wife, Christina. They came to this country seeking work and opportunity, which they found here.

They did not settle in crowded cities, in the strange ghettoes where European tongues are retained and professionals earn their livings by keeping alive ancient grudges.

They went to live among Americans in distant places, near tiny villages, where the dignity of person is maintained as an individual right and where the center of society is not some complex social organism artificially created in the maelstroms of big cities but is in the family—husband, wife, and children laboring and living together.

That is the American tradition. It is the tradition of western civilization.

Ole and his family were Americanized neither by the synthesis of artificial pressures nor are they a product of the melting pot. They have been fused into American life until they have become as much American as the snow-capped Rockies in whose shadows their cattle and sheep roam.

They are not peasants, nor driven nomads who range from State to State looking for seasonal work and better relief laws.

They have the dignity of landowners and land workers who can look into the rising sun and be unafraid. And they rear their children that way in American colleges.

And so Ole works his land and his neighbors send him to the State legislature, as they have sent his close friends, ZALES ECTON, to the United States Senate, and WESLEY A. D'EWART, to the House of Representatives.

Working farmers and ranchmen, these, who having lived by the soil of America, love it—and understand it. It is their soil.

It is their opportunity and their hope for their children. They have no affiliations with what they left behind them in Europe because they have sunk their roots deep in our land which they have made their own by work.

Knights of Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 7, 1948

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include therein a speech made by the Honorable ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE, Members of Congress, Third District of Connecticut, at the sixtieth anniversary of the founding of the Rodrigo Council, No. 44, Knights of Columbus, last night at the Lawn Club in New Haven, Conn.:

Mr. Toastmaster, members of the clergy, distinguished guests, members of the council, ladies and gentlemen. It is perhaps historic and indeed an honor for a member of the Congregational Church of North Branford to be asked to join with you on the occasion of the sixtieth anniversary of your founding.

However, it is typically American, for here we can all join together without fear, criticism, restriction, or hindrance, so long as we keep within the bounds of propriety in our celebration.

My only fraternal affiliation, if you wish to call it such, is membership in Totoket Grange, P. of H., and my duties in Washington have played havoc with my attendance record with that organization, although I have maintained my membership by payment of dues.

I was also once a member of Troop A, Cavalry, Connecticut National Guard, but as Major McQuade can testify, I did not fit well on a horse. They always gave me one of the wrong size.

My association with men of your faith started many years ago and I was privileged to attend and graduate from the law department of one of your great universities, Georgetown.

One cannot of course actively practice law in New Haven without constant contact with members of the Knights of Columbus who compose a large segment of the legal profession.

When I went to Congress I found that many of my constituents and colleagues were also members of your order, so it is pleasant to return here, especially in this election year, to greet not only constituents but friends and associates of many years.

Representing a district which houses your supreme council headquarters, is no mean honor. I have tried to represent all the people regardless of their creed, race, color, or political affiliation.

I learned early in life that you cannot satisfy everybody, and the best one can do is stick to principles and chart his course on the basis that one first of all must be true to himself if he is going to do a good job in any field of activity he may enter. It is not always easy to adhere to principles and issues of the moment can and often do becloud one's ability to think clearly and decide sanely. There is so much hysteria connected with every problem presented. Being an extremist in anything is never sensible and usually disastrous. Excess never goes with success.

We all believe in moral values, in moral obligations, in the basic tenents of Americanism that were taught us as boys and which we have seen demonstrated in our history since 1776. We are all agreed that America has a responsibility to perform, a mission of mercy if you will, in this postwar world. The Congress has embarked upon a program of assistance the like of which our forefathers would never have dreamed of. We have been able to build a great country where each man may call his soul his own, because we have reared our national edifice on a foundation that defines the rights of each individual. We do not believe in the master state, but in the right of the people to rule. We believe that each man should choose his own course in life without hindrance, that he should worship in his own way without interference or persecution. We call that respecting the individual. So many nations have forgotten the individual and so many others are willing to forget him in their desire for totalitarian government.

I have always felt that true democracy in America is never better exemplified than in the New England town meeting. Out in North Branford we have had many sessions that might be mildly termed invigorating. Each has his say. I remember one fellow who signed a petition for a special town meeting. Some of his friends said they were surprised to learn that he had signed the petition, as they didn't believe he was in favor of the subject to be advocated that night. "I ain't in favor of it," he told them. "I signed that petition so I could go to the meeting and tell 'em what I thought about the matter and get a chance to vote against it." But it's a good thing for neighbors to get together and talk things over. We have too little of it in our larger communities, and that is perhaps why so many of our citizens in this country lose personal interest in the Government. They don't feel that they are a part of it, and the only date they seem to feel it is March 15. It is good for individuals to band themselves together in worthy organizations such as the Knights of Columbus.

Let us go back for a moment to the beginning of your order, which was born only a few blocks from where we are meeting tonight. On January 16, 1882, nine New Haven gentlemen met with Father Michael Joseph McGivney, assistant pastor of St. Marys Church, in the parish house. Their names have become part of the Catholic history of Connecticut and of the world. James T. Mullen, Daniel Solwell, John Tracy, Michael Tracy, William M. Geary, Cornelius T. Driscoll, John T. Kerrigan, James T. McMahon, and William H. Sellwood. That was the beginning of the Knights of Columbus officially incorporated 2 months later on March 29, as the greatest Catholic fraternal order in the history of the church. The Knights first met in Smith's Hall on Chapel Street. Applications for membership deluged the organization, and in May the same year the first meeting of the supreme council was held. The first grand knight was Connie Driscoll, a Yale man, mayor of New Haven, and representative in the general assembly. The basis of the organization was that a man had to be a good Catholic and a good American. Your order has never swerved from that original maxim. In war and in peace it has demonstrated amply that it is one of the greatest forces for good ever developed under our system of government. On June 6, 1888, Rodrigo Council was founded, with John Q. Quinn, uncle of my good friend Joe McQuade, as one of the charter members. Through the threescore years, many famous men from New Haven have been counted on your rolls. The father of Tom FitzSimmons, your toastmaster, Chief Philip Smith, Dr. Stephen Mayer, renowned authority on tuberculosis, and my own associate in the law, the late David E. FitzGerald, Sr., and many others.

In 1892 Rodrigo Council was held part of the celebration here in New Haven on the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America by your patron, Christopher Columbus. Over 4,000 Knights took part in the parade and religious observances. The growth of the Knights of Columbus is well portrayed in the activities and responsibilities of your own supreme council headquarters on Wall Street here in New Haven. From there during the First World War went out the directives which won for the Knights of Columbus undying fame in the motto which hung at the door of every Kacey war hut: "Everybody welcome, everything free." They asked nothing more than to be permitted to serve our fighting men, and they followed our fighting men into European battle lines for two long years. Veterans of the First World War still tell of the good work done by you without restriction to color, creed, or class.

After that conflict the Knights went ahead with rehabilitation work, fostering education and relief, assisting in the many problems which any international unheaval always causes.

In World War II the Knights of Columbus did historic work in the USO, war-bond drives and other measures to ease the lot of the men and women in uniform. But the real work of your order has not been in war alone. Through the years of peace when it grew from a small parish society into an international brotherhood of Christian warriors, the Knights of Columbus has lent the full strength of its power to moral stabilization both at home and abroad. Believing in the basic rights of man as expressed by our Constitution, and rallying to defend the ancient institutions of the family and the home, your order has been a mighty bulwark against those who would undermine these foundations of government and of a decent way of life. That record is particularly notable in view of what America faces today.

We need organizations such as yours. We need the courage of honest conviction, the devotion to ideals, the firmness of purpose, the respect for authority, the belief in freedom under law which your order possesses and exemplifies to such a high degree.

Gen. Ray Hufft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 7, 1948

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I believe it will be of more than passing interest for the Congress to know that today Louisiana has not only the youngest adjutant general in the United States but the youngest adjutant general in the history of this country.

Gov. Earl K. Long has named Louisiana's outstanding war hero, Gen. Ray Hufft, to be adjutant general of Louisiana. General Hufft is only 33 years of age, but crowded in those few years is a life which could well be the envy of a man who has lived three times as long.

In naming General Hufft adjutant general of Louisiana, Governor Long has demonstrated a keen desire to give to Louisiana the best men available for service to the State.

In naming General Hufft, Governor Long has selected a typical American soldier to head the National Guard in Louisiana, an American soldier who wears on his chest 11 citations for gallantry in action. In naming General Hufft, Governor Long has certainly gone beyond the pale of politics and clearly demonstrated that in his administration he is determined to name the best individuals fitted for the job which he wants them to do. In doing this, Governor

Long outlines the pattern for an administration of progress and accomplishment during the next 4 years. He is to be complimented not only on this appointment but on the many wise selections which he has made to date in surrounding himself with men and women who are determined to give Louisiana 4 years of matchless progress and prosperity.

Governor Long has recognized the part which youth must play in public life if this country is to continue on its course of destiny.

General Hufft is just one of many such splendid appointments which Governor Long has made. Only recently he named to the Court of Appeals of Louisiana, the second highest tribunal in the State, another young man, Godfrey Z. Regan. Judge Regan is only 40 years of age but he has brought to the Louisiana Appellate Court not only dignity and integrity but a fervent desire to continue to build on a well-founded background of study and scholarly attainment.

I cannot help but feel a pardonable degree of pride in these appointments by Governor Long because both these young men have been close personal friends of mine and have contributed in great measure to my own success in public life through their association with me. General Hufft managed my last campaign and Judge Regan headed my speakers committee.

America has nothing to fear as long as we have young men of the stature of General Hufft and Judge Regan to carry on our ideals and our way of life.

Hear not only from me. I want you to read an article which recently appeared in one of New Orleans' newspapers, the New Orleans Item, about the career of General Hufft and his elevation to adjutant general of the State of Louisiana. Read it and determine for yourself the caliber of men Governor Long has called to service in Louisiana and you will agree with me that the future of Louisiana is in good hands.

Here is the newspaper story to which I have referred and which was written by Bender Scarpero under the caption: "New guard chief succeeds in war, peace—Ray Hufft's exploits growing into legend":

(By Bender Scarpero)

You sit down to tell the story of the new adjutant general of Louisiana, and immediately you have a problem:

How can you properly describe this man who refuses to stay put in your mind?

You ask yourself: Which is the real Raymond Frederick Hufft?

Is it the business executive who made good at 23 and was an outstanding success 10 years later?

Is it the paratrooper colonel who at 27 became a legendary figure on the battlefields of Europe?

Is it the gentle husband and father, a quick-smiling, mild sort of fellow who finds keen excitement in just drifting along a bayou in his boat, dangling a fishing rod over the side?

You struggle a while trying to reconcile these seeming inconsistencies. Then you have the answer.

Ray Hufft symbolizes that once underrated America which surprised and then destroyed Hitler, Mussolini, and the Japanese masters.

SHOT FOUR

He is the decadent democrat who was not taught in childhood to kill his brother or to love war, but who, nevertheless, stood over four dead enemy soldiers in the German woods one spring day in 1945 calmly reloading his pistol.

The uniformed representatives of the Third Reich had tried to sneak up on him while he was on patrol.

A citizen-soldier who never sought a professional military career, he is only doing another job in taking over as chief of the State's armed forces under the Governor.

At 33 he is the youngest adjutant general in the country. He succeeds Maj. Gen. Raymond H. Fleming, adjutant general for the past 20 years.

"And you can say I'm taking over from the best in the United States," Colonel Hufft says while recalling the first time he ever saw General Fleming.

Hufft was only 14 but crazy about horses and cavalry, and spent much time at Jackson Barracks watching the polo games.

One day he was invited to ride one of the horses. As he was mounting, an officer asked him in a kindly voice, "Can I help you up, sonny?"

Hufft says he was so excited at getting on the horse that he is not sure whether he thanked the general properly for his offer of assistance.

General Fleming says of the new adjutant general:

"Ray Hufft is a fine soldier with a long and efficient record of service in the National Guard, and I wish him the best of success in his new duties."

Colonel Hufft had always wanted to be a cavalryman, and so, in 1934, he enlisted in Troop I, One Hundred and Eighth Cavalry, Louisiana National Guard.

HELPED BY PATTON

One of his earliest heroes was Gen. George S. Patton, idol of all cavalrymen everywhere. Years later General Patton was to assist Colonel Hufft in getting an overseas assignment to Europe after he had returned from the Pacific.

In 1938, after attending Louisiana State University and working for the Federal land bank, he became associated with James A. Noe in the latter's radio enterprises, becoming vice president and general manager of Station WNOE here.

In January 1941 he entered Federal service as a first lieutenant with his outfit, which had been converted into an antiaircraft unit. He had earned his commission from the ranks.

When he returned home almost 5 years later he had risen to full colonel and had been awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, the Silver Star with two clusters, the Bronze Star with two clusters, and the Purple Heart with two clusters.

His brilliant combat record has been told many times.

SIXTEEN MONTHS IN PACIFIC

He spent 16 months in the Pacific, then returned to the States in 1943. Subsequently, as a major, he joined the First Special Service Force in Italy. This was a hard-hitting outfit highly traned in sabotage, demolitions, and hand-to-hand combat.

He fought in the Battles of Cassino, Anzio, Rome, and Arno. On D-day minus 1 he went into southern France, leading in the capture of two small islands to secure the port of Toulon.

On March 16, 1945, a hand grenade exploded near him. In the hospital he heard that his men were about to cross the Rhine. He promptly went a. w. o. l. from the hospital and rejoined his outfit.

He says this "was only what was expected of you. Gen. Robert Fredericks, our commander, set the pattern. He was hit eight times and was a. w. o. l. from the hospital during the Rome assault."

Hufft, by now a lieutenant colonel, led his men on a night mission across the Rhine in a rubber boat to pick out a suitable landing spot. Enemy patrols were all around, but the job was carried out.

He was the first Allied officer to cross the Rhine and received the DSC.

But his luck couldn't last indefinitely. Some months later he was leading his regimental combat team against Nuremberg. At 1 p. m. he was hit in the arm but continued to fight after getting first aid.

Three hours later he was hit in the chest by a burst of machine-gun fire and for 2 days was reported dead. When he awoke he was in the hospital. He lost his right lung and several ribs and today still carries several pieces of shrapnel in his chest.

Since his return to civilian life, he has continued his association with the Noe interests and is also vice president of the Bayou Broadcasting Co.

Nothing he has ever done has surprised those who have known him. Col. John Barkley, his first commanding officer and a constant hunting and fishing companion, says:

"He is the most remarkable personality I have ever known. He was outstanding from the day he enlisted in Troop I. Later, as an officer, he took the unit to the Pacific.

"After that, I didn't see him again until we met at Cassino. He came over one night to my headquarters and insisted on going up right then and there to see what was going on. He found things dull there, though, so he got a transfer to Anzio Beach, where it was more active.

"His versatility is astounding and I believe he'll be an outstanding adjutant general."

CURED MEN

Tech. Sgt. Joseph Di Giovanni served with him for a number of years.

"What kind of Joe is he? Well, in the 1940 maneuvers 15 or 20 of us in his battery were on our backs, coming down with flu. There wasn't much medical aid around. Old Hufft went out and brought us a couple gallons of whisky and wrapped us up in blankets. We all got well.

"It was on Friday the 13th that we landed on Canton Island in the Pacific. And it was really a black Friday. There was a hell of a storm blowing around, and before we could land, the ship was beached on the rocks.

"Colonel Hufft got us off and then made us form a human life line from ship to shore. We made it O. K., thanks to his leadership.

"After we settled down he was always around bulling with the fellows and talking to those who got homesick on that God-forsaken piece of sand. And he was always able to get us stuff like decent chow which the other outfits never had.

"It got pretty lonesome and there was never any entertainment, but he went down to Australia once and pretty soon along came a ship with some Hawaiian girls. They put on some dances for us, and it really helped our morale.

"I've still got a picture of him, crouched in a foxhole with a Thompson in his hands, a .45 on his hip, and a rifle on his shoulder."

STORIES SPREAD

"Months later, when I was in Germany, I was always hearing stories about him—and from guys who didn't even know I knew him."

Colonel Hufft, his pretty brunette wife and their 15-month-old daughter, Rayme, live at 77 Jackson Barracks. Their pleasant living room is filled with the colonel's souvenirs.

The most striking of these is a huge wall cabinet containing German rifles of every description. Probably his most prized battle trophy is a beautiful saber surrendered to him by a German general.

(The general at first refused to give up to the colonel, insisting that the latter was only "a mere boy," and couldn't possibly be the American troop commander. He changed his mind in about 10 minutes.)

As he talks to you, Colonel Hufft will probably be biting gently on his pipe. He learned to smoke it in a French fox hole. He has never smoked cigarettes.

Appointment as adjutant general carries with it the rank of brigadier general. But Colonel Hufft will quickly assure you he has no desire to be "a big shot or big timer or big operator—whatever you want to call it."

CARRYING ON

His ideas and plans for the future?

"The same policies will be carried out which are already in effect.

"There will be no politics in the National Guard while I am adjutant general. I am proud of the guard and its traditions, and the morale and efficiency of the troops will be my first concern.

"One of the outstanding needs of the guard at present is additional armories. A bill has been introduced in the legislature to appropriate $500,000 for their construction and maintenance to which Federal funds will be added.

"I feel selective service and universal military training are the only means to check Russia. I believe Russia will have the atomic bomb by 1951 and will be hard to handle.

"I believe that a man should always take some kind of action when faced with a situation. As they say in the Army, 'do something, don't just stand there.'

"Efficiency is prior planning and reconnaissance is perpetual.

"I do not believe the people of America realize the seriousness of the world situation. I am firmly convinced that we must take steps to be in a position to fight, if fight we must—though God grant that this may never happen again."

Germany: A Warning—Here Is a Prophecy That if We Allow German Unity She Will Again Be a Threat to the World's Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article by Eugene V. Rostow that appeared in the New York Times Magazine of Sunday, June 6, 1948. Mr. Rostow, a professor at Yale law school, served as wartime assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State, and he has written previously in several publications on the topic presented in the following article:

GERMANY: A WARNING—HERE IS A PROPHECY THAT IF WE ALLOW GERMAN UNITY SHE WILL AGAIN BE A THREAT TO THE WORLD'S PEACE

(By Eugene V. Rostow)

We seem to be on the verge of repeating and compounding all the catastrophes of Allied policy toward Germany after 1919. We and the British, openly irritated with the French, are pressing to organize a unitary German state in the western parts of Germany and to woo German nationalism to our side in an ideological war with the Russians. Before we take the final plunge in this direction it is worth recalling that in the period between the wars, when we and the British were also generally irritated with the French, the French were right and we were wrong. If we had followed French advice in the 20 years of armistice, there would have been no Second World War. We had better consider whether American policy toward Germany would not be safer if it followed the lines proposed by France, Belgium, and the Netherlands, rather than the program developed by our military leaders in Germany.

The passage of the European recovery program and the accelerating pace of the drive to unite western Europe put the German question in a new perspective. It is increasingly plain that the Soviet Union will not evacuate eastern Germany, but rather proposes to make of it another satellite state on the familiar model of OGPU "democracy." Indeed, they have already begun to cultivate fraternal relations between Polish and German Communists. Equally we are determined not to tolerate the continued expense of an unproductive western Germany. We are therefore driving ahead to harness German economic resources for European recovery.

The central issue for our decision is whether this recovery drive in Germany should be coupled with the organization of a single German state, embracing the three western zones, or, alternatively, whether the separate German states should be allowed as such to participate in the recovery program and the organization of a European federation. We seem doggedly committed to the idea of a unitary German state. Part of our attitude is a response to Russia's propaganda insistence on German unity. We are afraid to allow the Russians to outbid us for German support. Part of our position, however, arises from blind irritability with the French and other Europeans who persist in thinking that they know as much about Europe as our generals in Germany, many of whom, consciously or unconsciously, are impregnated with a German view of European and world politics.

The course Britain and the United States have been pursuing in Germany for more than 2 years has been a disaster. Unless its political aspects are changed, it threatens the success of the Marshall plan, and of our entire program in Europe. The failure of the London Conference, and the break-down of four-power rule in Berlin, give us a chance to start anew. By reorienting the politics of our German policy, we can eliminate the major weakness of our political position on the Continent. For many of our best friends in Europe fear that we are determined to repeat the great error of Anglo-American diplomacy after 1919—the re-creation of a dynamic and powerful Germany, capable of creating endless confusion, and even of starting another war.

Certain ideas have become accepted during the last 6 months as fundamental to American policy in Europe. The first is that we should try, in the deepest interests of American security, to help Europeans save Europe for western civilization. The second is that the problem of Germany cannot be considered except as part of the problem of Europe as a whole. The third is that in the Marshall plan we have put forward the most powerful, appealing, and promising conception we have sponsored in Europe since the war ended: the idea of European union. The response of the Europeans, and of the Russians, has been electric. Both the Europeans and the Russians see in the concept of European union a force of great importance—the basis, in fact, on which Europe may become a stable and independent political body, capable of maintaining a life of its own despite the proximity and present ambitions of the Soviet Union. The first step in the process of freeing Europe from fear is the establishment in Europe not only of a viable economy but of a political structure strong enough to sustain its own notion of social living against the pull of disruptive political attack from any quarter.

If these are the fundamental axioms of our foreign policy, the danger of Anglo-American policy in Germany becomes plain. For we have been trying as hard as we can to unify Germany politically. But a unified German state reestablished in the center of Europe will inevitably dominate any European Union we can hope to see organized. In population and in industry a new Reich would be the strongest state in Europe. When raw materials are made available, the recovery in German production will seem magical, because Germany's basic productive equipment has been little touched by the war or by reparations.

The Germans will be obsessed with the dream of nationalist revenge for many years to come. A unified German state would have the will and the resources to destroy any modus vivendi we could anticipate creating with the Russians, in order to profit from our divisions. In the event that we have to spend the next generation in a state of restless near-war with the Russians, the Germans will do everything in their considerable power to strengthen themselves by weakening us, and, as in the twenties and thirties, trying to separate us from our western allies.

An episode reported by Sumner Welles typical of the period between wars, would be our daily diet. In 1924, when under Stresemann the Germans were everywhere being praised and accepted as cooperative and peace-loving democrats, Stresemann secretly approached Herriot and proposed a military treaty between France and Germany from which England would be excluded. "How," asked Herriot, one of the mildest and most conciliatory of men, "could any nation have faith in Germany when a German leader, who was above all others identified as the prophet of German regeneration, was willing to stoop to treachery of so low and grotesque a character?" Germany's endless efforts to divide France and Britain finally produced the Anglo-German Naval Treaty of 1935, which embittered French and British relations and helped to make Vichy possible.

We have been politically confused by the economics of the German question. It is by now almost universally agreed that German economic resources must be used in the desperate struggle for recovery and for the improvement of living standards in Europe. German productive resources cannot be used economically if managed by small states, divided by tariffs, separate currencies and other barriers to trade. From these facts, presently undisputed, we have drawn the entirely unjustified inference that we favor the restoration of a German Reich.

All too faintly recalling the two German wars we almost lost, we comfort ourselves by talking about a federalized rather than a centralized German state. Such constitutional details are of no consequence. The thrust of our effort has been to restore a single German state capable of a unified foreign policy. Both the British Commonwealth and the United States are political bodies more federal than anything we are likely to get in Germany. Yet both have proved altogether capable of united action in war and diplomacy.

The first premise of our German policy should be that as Germany is strengthened economically, it must be weakened politically. The economic interpretation of everything has been so popular recently that we have almost forgotten to give separate consideration to factors of political organization. Yet the politics of the German question are far more important than its economics.

We have been trying to unify Germany, and have recently begun to think about unifying Europe. The emphasis should be shifted. Our policy should be to unify Eu-

rope, and to allow the historically separate German states to participate individually in the common affairs of the European commonwealth.

Secretary Byrnes is authority for the report that at Tehran, while they were still face to face with the terrible force of the German war effort, the big three agreed on a policy of dividing Germany into a number of separate states. The wisdom of that decision should guide us in handling the problems of Trizonia. In their propaganda to the Germans, the Russians are appealing to German nationalism in its crudest form. We must not be tempted into further competition along that line. We should offer the German people hope of their equal and prosperous participation in the affairs of Europe and the world. We can do that easily if the momentum of the Marshall plan results in the formation of a continental economy in Europe, in which the separate German states of the western zones could soon be allowed full equality of participation. We should support an international control of the Ruhr, and the complete political division of the Germanic nations within the wider framework of an all European organization.

On such a basis, we should at last have reasonable hope for peace and stability in Europe. Under such circumstances the Russians could hardly accuse us of seeking to use Germany as a buffer or a fighting cock against her. And our policy in Europe would have a far less threatening aspect than it has today. Secretary Byrnes' plan for a treaty of alliance, through which we would undertake to join in a third German war, while desirable, would not reassure the people of western Europe. The promise of American help would be cold comfort if they had to live with a Germany capable of trampling them down before the Americans could arrive.

As for the Germans, they would regret the glories of the Reich, if they were organized again into separate states. They would even meet in dark places and talk about rebuilding Germany. But let us make no mistake about German nationalism. The Germans will regret having lost the war in any event. If there is a German Reich, it will spend its efforts in the destructive struggle to become a great power again. Such efforts would be beyond the dreams of separate German countries. Bavaria could not plot for the recovery of Silesia, nor could Hanover seek to redeem the lost provinces of Austria or Czechoslovakia.

We shall stand on a far safer footing in trying to build ultimate friendship with the Germans if we say to them frankly: "You are not to be trusted as masters of a great state. We shall welcome you as members of small nations within the concert of Europe. But we base our policy on Goethe's statement, that the unification of Germany means the destruction of all the positive values of German culture." Germany, Professor Jaspers has said, can recover her soul only by accepting guilt and penance. Let us start by offering to undo the work of Bismarck as the first step in Germany's penance.

Adequate Appropriations for ERP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 7, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the country is speaking out with shock and surprise against the sweeping cut made in the appropriations for the European recovery program—a program on which the American people based great expectations as one of the principal elements in winning the peace. The following editorial is a sample. The House will have a chance to record its vote on a conference report. Let us hope that this time its decision will sustain the appropriations needed to make the ERP work, and that the cuts will be restored:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of June 7, 1948]

LET THE REPUBLICANS SPEAK

The most shocking aspect of the effort by the little men in the House of Representatives to emasculate the European recovery program is that this blow to American honor was administered by taking advantage of every parliamentary device to confuse counsel and to evade responsibility. For this the Democrats must bear their share of the shame. On a measure which originated with a Democratic administration they might at least have forced each Representative to stand and be counted in a record vote. But the primary blame rests with the Republican leadership in the House, which failed its party, its country and all that the United States stands for in a world that is perilously near the edge of an abyss.

It is, therefore, the urgent duty of every Republican to see to it that the House's fall from grace be retrieved, and that the country be told the party insists that every pledge of American faith be made good. The first burden of this task falls upon Senator BRIDGES and his colleagues of the Senate Appropriations Committee. The Nation is confident they will meet the test. There is no doubt what position Senator VANDENBERG will take. But this is not a question involving a single man, or a single committee. All Republican leaders, all of the Republican rank and file, must make their influence felt. The candidates for the Presidency must speak out. On this issue the interests of the Nation demand a record vote, so that the world may know the Republican Party repudiates, overwhelmingly, the stealthy attempt to rob the country of moral authority and power for good.

An Appeal to the House Leadership To Afford Members an Opportunity To Vote on the Pending Resolution To Submit to the States a Constitutional Amendment To Modernize Our Presidential Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE F. LEA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 3, 1948

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago the Judiciary Committees of the two Houses of Congress favorably reported identical resolutions proposing to submit to the States a constitutional amendment for the modernization of our Presidential election. The proposal has met with widespread approval over the Nation.

This is an appeal to the leaders of the majority party in the House—the Speaker, the majority leader, members of the steering committee and the Rules Committee—to afford the House a vote on the submission of this resolution; and to give the people of the Nation their opportunity to remove the objectionable features of the present method of electing the President.

Let us take another look at the proposal. The fundamental issues involved are few and simple.

The resolution proposes to leave the voting power of each State exactly as now provided in the Constitution. Each State would retain voting power by electoral votes in proportion to its population, plus two votes to each State regardless of population. That means each State would continue to have the same number of electoral votes in electing the President as it now has Senators and Representatives in Congress. It means each State would still have the same voting power in electing the President as it has in managing the affairs of the Nation in Congress.

The resolution proposes only two main changes:

First. As to the method of voting; and

Second. As to the method of counting electoral votes.

METHOD OF VOTING

Under the present method of voting we have an electoral college. We vote for electors who in turn cast the whole electoral vote of their State for the candidate whose electors secure a plurality of the popular votes in the State.

No credit is given in the electoral college to the votes for minority candidates in the State, no difference how large their votes may be. The plurality candidate gets the whole vote of the State, even though his vote may be only 40 percent or less of the total vote of the State.

In a good many instances Presidential candidates have received more credit in the electoral college for the votes of their opponents in the State than for their own votes.

The pending resolutions propose that we do away with the electoral college, the election for Presidential electors, the Presidential electors themselves, and the election of the President by the electors. These resolutions provide that we elect the President by direct vote of the people.

The abolition of the electoral college simply removes a useless incumbrance on our election machinery. Its function to register the public will can be better accomplished by a direct vote of the people as proposed.

Certainly no considerate person will object to this simplification of our election procedure.

It is further proposed that the electoral votes of the State shall automatically be counted for the candidates in the State according to their proportion of the popular vote. There would be no disfranchisement: all votes would be credited to the candidates as cast.

METHOD OF COUNTING VOTES

The fundamental feature of this proposal is that the unit system of counting votes be abolished; that the electoral votes to which each State is entitled be credited to candidates within each State in exact proportion to the popular votes of the candidates within that State.

In this way the electoral vote would become a true common unit for counting the votes between the States. It would faithfully represent the will of the peo-

ple of each State and provide a common measure of vote values between the States. That is something the unit vote cannot do.

By the unit-voting system of counting, all logical relation of votes within each State and between the different States is destroyed. The unit-voting system confiscates all minority votes in the State and gives the whole voting power to the plurality candidate, regardless of how great or how small his plurality may be. A plurality of only 10 votes in our greatest State can, by the unit vote in the electoral college, take 23 electoral votes away from the candidate for whom cast and credit them to the candidate against whom they were voted. Such a method of counting votes is incapable of intelligent defense.

The unit vote is a system of wholesale disfranchisement of minority voters and legalized larceny of their votes by transferring them to the credit of the plurality candidate, without rhyme or reason.

With the large voting population we now have, in an average Presidential election for the future, if the present method be retained, the number of voters whose votes will be counted contrary to the way cast, will exceed 15,000,000 at each such election.

That means 15,000,000 voters disfranchised; 15,000,000 votes credited to candidates against whom those votes were cast.

What, if any, reason can anyone suggest to justify Congress for assuming responsibility for the perpetuation of this electoral monstrosity?

The number of votes so appropriated in each State depends on chance. The unit vote is without logical relation to the number of States carried; without logical relation to the population of any State, or to the plurality votes of any State. It is an unblushing legalized larceny system of counting votes. Such a system is neither fair, reasonable, nor honest.

Where is there a man in public life, by virtue of popular votes, who would want to stand up and defend such a method of counting the votes?

Under the proposed constitutional provisions the unit voting system of counting votes would be abolished; no votes would be disfranchised; no votes would be counted other than for the candidates for whom they were cast?

DUTY AND OPPORTUNITY OF CONGRESS

As I view the matter, this Congress has an outstanding opportunity to distinguish itself and perform a fine service for the Nation by simply giving to the States, in a constitutional way, an opportunity to remedy this situation.

Some may ask the question: "What effect does my party get from the present system that would be taken away under the proposed plan?" The simplest answer would be that the party which succeeds in securing credit for the largest number of votes cast in favor of its opponents would be the chief beneficiary. A candidate whose votes were counted in favor of his opponent would be the victim. We trust that no normal American is so constituted as to desire that his party win by a legalized larceny of votes. Where is there a party man so zealous that he would want such a practice to be the policy of this Nation, or for his party to win by such a perversion of votes?

Why should a man in public life commit himself to an unjust policy, hoping that it may operate to his advantage? So long as such a policy remains it is equally certain that sooner or later it can engulf him as well as his opponent.

We now face a jam of legislation more or less common to the closing days of a Congress; yet I trust our leadership, worthy and effective in so many things, will give the American people the opportunity which I think they desire, to vote directly for President and to have their votes counted in each State in proportion to the votes of its people.

HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

It is seldom that Congress proposes legislation that is of particular significance from the long-time viewpoint of history. Ordinary current legislation has an exaggeration of importance that is soon lost in the multiplicity of routine affairs. Out of many, this Congress has passed one or two pieces of legislation that may justly have a place of relative importance in the long course of years.

The correction of our inept system of electing the President, yearned for by millions of our citizens for a century and a quarter, would be a service to the country that would gain historical recognition and importance as long as our political system of government remains.

I do not pose as a prophet, but I feel secure in saying that by submitting to the legislatures of the Nation either House Joint Resolution 9 or Senate Joint Resolution 200, which are identical, this Congress can justly gain a distinctive and commendable recognition in the future history of our country.

Address by Hon. William F. Knowland, of California, to the Young Republicans of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks I made last Saturday night, June 5, at the State convention of the Young Republicans of West Virginia.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests and delegates, alternates and visitors to the West Virginia Young Republican Convention, we meet in Bluefield tonight just 2 weeks before the Republican National Convention assembles in Philadelphia to nominate the next President of the United States.

We have many able men who are available for our selection. No one at this time can predict with certainty who the nominee for President will be. We should be building all of them up and tearing none of them down.

As Americans and as Republicans we have a heavy responsibility; 1948 will determine not only our own policies but will also play a vital part in the course of events elsewhere in the world.

From the Republicans of California I bring a symbolic "hands across the continent" greeting. It is, I believe, indicative of the type of transcontinental unity that will spell success in November.

You are representative of the youth of the party who are taking an increasingly active part in governmental and party affairs in all sections of our Nation. This is as it should be. Men and women who served their country during war have no less an obligation to serve it in peacetime.

We cannot discharge the obligation of citizenship by merely going to the polls on election day. This is like a son who remembers his mother on Mother's Day and forgets her the other 364 days of the year.

The proper functioning of our governmental machinery requires active and responsible political parties. It is clear from reading history that two major political parties have become a part of our political system. From time to time, as in 1948, third parties spring into being. In time they either disappear or they take the place of one of the major parties which passes into oblivion. Hence, neither Republicans nor Democrats should view their ascendancy in Government as anything but temporary. Political parties come and go, but our constitutional Government continues. The Federalist and Whig Parties played their part and passed from the political scene. But their demise did not leave a permanent void. Other more vigorous groups took their places. Political parties must justify their existence or make way for others that will.

It has been my privilege to serve on the county committee and the State central committee, in addition to my service on the Republican National Committee. Political campaigns cannot be won by last-minute efforts. To the contrary, it requires work throughout the year. Organizations such as yours have played and will continue to play an important part in mobilizing for the job confronting us.

This is no time for Republicans to consider that they have the election "in the bag." Any such misconceptions would, in my opinion, be a serious mistake in judgment. While I recognize that the Wallace candidacy will be beneficial to our cause in a number of key States, I wish to point out that this alone is no guaranty of Republican success in November. It is certainly no substitute for a strong ticket and an active campaign.

Each single vote is important. In 1916 a change of less than 2,000 votes in California would have elected Charles Evans Hughes President of the United States.

As young men and women you have much work to do both for your Nation and your party. You must constantly be on the alert against complacency and inertia.

Our country grew from a weak colony of 3,000,000 people on the Atlantic seaboard to a great Nation of 140,000,000 people occupying the vast continental area between the Atlantic and the Pacific because Americans from colonial days to now have refused to be wedded to the status quo or ruled by the dead hand of the past. We are a dynamic and not a static people.

In the long history of nations, ours is a young nation. In the history of parties, ours is a young party. Republicans have a great contribution they can make to the Nation. They can bring a constructive and vigorous administration in place of one that has remained so long in power that it has lost its grip on segments of its own party and has lost its bearings in dealing with national and international affairs.

Who more than younger generation Americans has a greater stake in the policies we

pursue? In the normal course of events we will have to live under them longer or because of them die sooner.

I make no claim that all the virtues are to be found in our party. I make no charge that all the faults are to be found in the opposition party. We both have a share of each.

To our party and the opposition I express a hope that in the national platforms they will say what they mean and mean what they say. I would rather have them write it on a post card and do it than to write a volume and file it.

Let us take great care that nothing goes into the platform unless the national well being will be best served by its being there. When it goes into the platform as a plank let it be carried out with vigor. As young men and women let us battle against the cynics who hold to the view that platforms are written to catch as many votes as possible with the least offense.

The national interest must in all cases override any partisan advantage. The test should be, Will our country be best served by this action? rather than, Will we get a minority bloc of votes that may assure our election?

If we approach the great national and international problems that will confront our Government in the years ahead with the same devotion to duty that motivated those who drafted the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, we will be best serving this and future generations of our countrymen. It is certainly not the time, if indeed it ever is, for the national parties to use the Tammany or Pendergast approach to issues.

The Nation requires a type of leadership we can give but which it cannot get from either the Democratic Party as presently constituted or from the third party. Certainly this Nation will not follow the type of leadership being offered by Henry Wallace. His program for the appeasement of Russia would lead the world down the same blind alley it followed at Munich. Apeasement of aggressors has never brought real peace. It merely whets the appetites of such nations. They are enabled to digest their easy victories while preparing for increased demands.

It is well that we recall where the apologist for Russia, Mr. Wallace, received his build-up so that he might later use it in an endeavor to destroy our bipartisan American foreign policy.

He was appointed by a Democratic President as Secretary of Agriculture, nominated by a Democratic national convention as the Vice Presidential candidate in 1940, and fortunately was dumped by the convention of 1944. However, he was appeased with an appointment by the Democratic administration as Secretary of Commerce. The same administration that gave full recognition to Russia in 1933 is responsible for building up this man.

Now let us take a look at the administration presently in power. Can it furnish the leadership we so desperately need in the years ahead? It can hardly furnish the focal point for leadership of the Nation when it can't even lead the Democratic Party. The left wing is off following Henry Wallace. The big city machines whose loyalty rested on patronage rather than support of the high ideals or lofty principles of Jefferson are deserting the administration like rats leaving a sinking ship. From their point of view almost any candidate will do if he can salvage the State and county machine sponsored tickets.

Feeling secure that the South was "in the bag" the administration for 16 years followed whatever course of action would give them votes in the big cities. They seemed to lose sight of the fact that you can even ride a good horse to death. While the New Deal insiders were riding high, wide, and handsome in the saddle, the southern Jeffersonian Democrats were under the saddle furnishing the horsepower and getting spurred to boot. In 1946 the Nation found that it had enough and elected a Republican Congress. By 1947 the Jeffersonian Democrats found that they too have had more than enough.

Our party has only been in control of the Congress for 18 months. Legislation of great importance to the Nation and to the world has been enacted during that period.

There are some critics who complain that to legislate takes time. Of course it does. The system of representative government is meant to take a reasonable amount of time for committee hearings in the House and Senate, for debate on the floor, for conference action to bring the views of the two bodies into agreement and for final congressional action which may also necessitate action on a Presidential veto.

For the previous 14 years the Government was under the domination of a strong executive branch. So-called "must legislation" was rushed up to Capitol Hill and many times passed without adequate consideration or debate. Then the critics were complaining, with justification, about the "rubber stamp" action of the lawmakers. The Eightieth Congress has been no "rubber stamp"! As believers of the constitutional balance of powers in our Republic all Americans should take pride in this fact.

In spite of the fact that some of us may be disappointed that some particular bill has not been passed by both House and Senate and approved by the President, the fact remains that much constructive legislation has been enacted into law.

When the Eightieth Congress met in January 1947 it was necessary to completely reorganize under the La Follette-Monroney Reorganization Act. In the Senate, for example, this reduced the number of standing committees from 33 to 15. This major readjustment took place at the same time that the control of Congress changed which put in a new chairman and majority in control of each of the committees.

During the first session, Congress passed two tax-reduction bills, both of which were vetoed by the President. The Labor-Management Relations Act was passed over a Presidential veto. The following are among the more important pieces of legislation passed at that session: unification of the armed services, Presidential Succession Act, Greek-Turkish aid, termination of a vast number of wartime controls, Portal-to-Portal Act, payment of terminal-leave bonds, constitutional amendment limiting a President to two terms, ratification of the Bulgarian, Italian, Hungarian and Rumanian Peace Treaties, and ratification of the inter-American treaty of reciprocal assistance.

During the second session Congress passed the European Recovery Act, the income-tax reduction bill was passed over a Presidential veto, and increased subsistence allowance to veterans was provided. In addition, the Congress insisted upon the 70-air-group program and the modernization of our national defense, and passed the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1948. A number of other important bills have passed either the House or the Senate and will be acted on before the Congress adjourns for the two national conventions. Passage of a number of additional bills will depend upon the possibility of Congress coming back into another session prior to the time the Eighty-first Congress will meet in January.

There is no doubt that the great economic and political problems that confront us can be solved, in one way or another. The challenge we face is to solve them under our constitutional form of government and within the framework of the American system of personal liberty and free enterprise.

On all the great questions of the day there are bound to be honest differences of opinion among the members of both parties. Unless there is to be an irreconcilable split, somewhere along the way, a common meeting ground must be found. As a general rule, but not always, the Republican Party seems better able to compose its differences than is our opposition.

The American system of profitable business and well-paid labor go hand in hand. Destroy one and you destroy both. We can, I firmly believe, do more under our American system for our people than the new socialism of Britain or the communism of Russia can do for their respective peoples. We don't need their methods but we can use some of their crusading zeal.

In American industry it is highly desirable that employees who are helping to build such industries or businesses have ever-increasing opportunities to improve their economic position through contributions to increased productivity. In maintaining the profit system it is vital that an ever-increasing number of our people have a personal interest in its continued existence.

Labor and management need to pull together and not apart. Business must be able to operate with profit and efficiency. There is no constructive future for workers or investors in closed factories or bankrupt firms.

The world needs peace in the international field and America needs domestic tranquility if full production is to continue to raise our standards of living and permit us to help other nations to help themselves.

In our complex economic life we are dependent upon each other. Those who exercise great power must assume great responsibility. No person or group has the right to strangle the economic life of 140,000,000 Americans.

The Republican Party believes that the taxpayers should have some tax reduction. Three times the Congress passed a tax-reduction bill, and thrice the President used his veto. This session, by an overwhelming vote, the final bill was passed over the Presidential objections. This should help reinvigorate the free-enterprise system and make it better able to carry the heavy worldwide responsibilities now upon it.

After the Republican administration takes office in January 1949 and the full cooperation of the executive branch of the Government is secured in cutting out nonessential fat from the Federal budget, there will be excellent prospects for additional tax relief legislation next year.

At times I find it most difficult to comprehend the inconsistent policies this administration pursues both at home and abroad. The President has sought to reestablish a controlled economy in the United States. While the stated purpose was to check the inflationary pressures, we find that Government agencies were following commodity purchasing policies that encouraged high prices in grains at a time when they were far above parity support levels.

A major contribution that can be made to meeting the inflationary problem is to increase and assure the continued productivity of this Nation. In traveling through Europe last year I had the opportunity of getting behind the iron curtain. Neither in Poland nor in any other country outside of the iron curtain did I see anything that encouraged me to believe that controls during peacetime would increase American productivity. To the contrary, I came back with the strong belief that such peacetime controls would stifle it.

You cannot, in my judgment, go part way down the road to a controlled economy with regard to manufactured goods or agricultural products. If you control prices you must be prepared to control wages, profits, the allocation of raw materials and ultimately (as in Britain) the allocation of labor.

If we permit this Nation to undergo that type of rigid control in peacetime, I have grave doubts whether we can come out from

under them in the foreseeable future. Speaking as one Member of the Senate, I shall oppose their reimposition.

One of the greatest troubles with this administration is that associated with it are those who have worked with controls so long they have apparently lost confidence in the free-enterprise system. While they give it lip service, they have no confidence in its ability to do the job.

Recognizing the great difficulty confronted by a Congress attempting to reduce Federal expenditures which have grown to astronomical proportions when it does not have the cooperation of the executive branch, the Eightieth Congress established the commission on organization of the executive branch of the Government. This is a bipartisan commission to study the executive branch and the methods of operating in Government bureaus, agencies, and boards. After making a thorough study the Commission is to report its findings and recommendations to Congress for action in January of next year. The 12-member Commission is composed of 6 members from private life, 2 from the Senate, 2 from the House, and 2 from the executive branch.

Based on the assumption that the President in conformity with his 1946 post-election statement would cooperate with the new Congress, some of our Members were too optimistic on their estimates of savings.

The original budget request for the 1948 fiscal year, the permanent appropriations, and the supplemental requests sent up to Congress by the President amounted to $38,171,091,538.

Congress after intensive hearings in both Houses provided $34,928,813,516 (including permanent appropriations) which was a reduction of $3,242,278,022. When one considers that in 1848, just 100 years ago, the total cost of the Federal Government was $54,195,275.06, the congressional saving was substantial. As late as 1916 the total cost of the Federal Government was $734,056,202. We did not become a billion-dollar Government until the war year of 1917.

This year the President presented a budget of approximately $40,000,000,000 and since has added a number of supplemental requests. The two Houses of Congress are now working on the various appropriation bills. Substantial savings will be made under the President's requests without handicap to the national defense, our foreign policy, or essential domestic activities. As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I am personally convinced that with the cooperation of executive departments and bureaus, substantial additional economies could be made that would result in better service and would assure the people that the Government was getting a dollar's worth of value for each dollar spent.

Twice in the past quarter of a century, world wars were fought. One reason they came was that the aggressors thought that our Nation could not or would not fight. In their own minds they pictured us as a decadent democracy. Are such miscalculations again being made?

It is more likely that peace can be preserved if America remains strong. Already there has been too much delay in bringing our defense establishment up to authorized strength. Congress must not allow committee or floor filibuster tactics to jeopardize national defense.

Certainly up to now the United Nations as an organization has not shown that it has either the moral or military force to preserve international law and order As long as the veto exists, a potential aggressor nation is able to block effective action even if the United Nations were prepared to act. It should be apparent by now that some future Hitler, Tojo, or Mussolini will not be stopped by debating society tactics.

We must face up to the question as to whether or not we believe it is in the best interest of world peace and our own national security to have a rehabilitated western Europe. Congress, under bipartisan leadership, has determined that it is not only desirable but is essential to our own national security as well as to the peace of the world.

A necessary corollary is that we must provide this Nation with an adequate national defense on the sea, on land, and in the air, and I lay special emphasis upon our air program. This will require an effective, constantly modern, striking air force in being and not on blueprints.

The peace today cannot be saved by appeasement any more than it could be at Munich. The sacrifice of Austria, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, and Manchuria, did not buy peace but rather made certain that power-hungry aggressors would be encouraged to raise the ante.

Let us make it crystal clear that the politburo in Moscow can gain no satisfaction from the Republican victory on November 2.

Our Nation has assumed obligations under the United Nations Charter. The Republican victory will not weaken but should strengthen the system of collective security.

I firmly believe this for two reasons: First, because a sound national economy and a solvent Federal Government is a prerequisite to a strong America and only under those conditions can we help to rehabilitate the war-torn free world; secondly, a Republican victory will mean a more consistent foreign policy.

It just did not make sense to ask the American people for billions of much-needed help to save western Europe from going behind the iron curtain, while we allowed large shipments from our resources to the one nation that is a threat to human freedom. This was not stopped until Members of Congress took action.

It certainly is not consistent to make mighty efforts to prevent 200,000,000 Europeans from being enslaved by the Communist terror while showing complacency about communistic activity which seeks to engulf 400,000,000 of our traditional friends, the Chinese.

It most emphatically does not make sense to send numerous strong notes as in the Petkov case and then to have our Government give full recognition to the Soviet satellite Government of Bulgaria 10 days after they have murdered the leader of the democratic opposition.

We should constantly keep in mind that we live in the age of the airplane and the atom.

The world must recognize the fact that only in an adequate system of international control can the world be safeguarded from the devastating effects of this new instrument of destruction. I have seen a considerable amount of war damage in Europe and Asia. Two years ago I had the opportunity of seeing Nagasaki where the second atomic bomb was dropped. The community looked as though it had been put through a coffee grinder and the remains scattered out over the landscape.

Every constructive proposal that has been made for the international control of atomic energy has been blocked by the Soviet Government. As long as an unlimited veto exists in the Security Council there cannot, in my opinion, be a satisfactory international control of atomic power. How is mankind to be protected if the potential aggressor nation itself can veto collective security action by the law-abiding nations of the world?

No man can say with certainty how long it will be until other nations are able to manufacture the atomic bomb. Sometime in the not too distant future they will do so. Any nation which has in mind a full scale "Pearl Harbor" attack upon the industrial and communication centers of America must be made to understand that no such blow will prevent this Nation from launching a swift, sure, and inevitable retaliation on a far greater scale.

This is not a happy prospect but it is a realistic one. To do less than be fully prepared in these uncertain times would be worse than folly, it would be treason.

The Government would not be dealing with candor if it did not make clear that the policies we follow in Greece and Turkey involve risks. If Greece, Italy, Turkey, or Iran should succumb to overt outside pressure and lose their independence or have their territorial integrity violated without swift action to support them by all the law-abiding nations of the world, then the whole fabric of collective security will distintegrate, and the United Nations would join the League of Nations in oblivion.

We are not going to leave Germany until our occupation job is completed. Should we depart from Berlin under Russian pressure we would do irreparable harm to our prestige in Europe. It would undermine our friends and give aid and comfort to the one nation that is a threat to human freedom.

I feel certain that our people have a growing realization based on the experience of two world wars that peace, in this day and age, is indivisible.

The time has passed when debating-society methods can save the peace. If the present situation in Palestine continues unchecked, the principal victim will not be Israel or the Arab states. It will be the United Nations itself, the only existing international organization around which the forces of international law and order can rally. To date I have not been impressed by the record.

The issue raised by open warfare, invading armies, and bombing of open cities, far transcends in importance the issue of partition boundary lines or the ultimate de jure recognition of a de facto state.

Aggression cannot be camouflaged by any technicality. Supplying arms to one side or the other by the nonbelligerent members of the United Nations is no solution. That course of action, in effect, merely says "sic 'em." A fire department does not squirt gasoline on a fire. That is the technique of the arsonist.

Now is the time for the United Nations and its members to say in clear and unmistakable language: "Fighting must cease at once. Opposing armies will stand in place."

If this mandate for peace is ignored, full economic sanction should be applied forthwith; if necessary, they should be supported by a naval and an air blockade.

Article 33 of the United Nations Charter states: "The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiations, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice."

It is obvious that the nations now at war are not using this section, which is not permissive but is mandatory upon them. The Charter has been openly and flagrantly violated.

There are various steps then outlined in the Charter to be taken by the nations concerned and/or by the Security Council under the provisions of articles 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, and 40.

Article 41 states:

"The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the members of the United Nations to apply such measures. These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations, and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations."

This is followed by article 42, which supplies the necessary language to enforce the above-mentioned article. Had the League of

Nations followed a similar course of action against Fascist Italy in 1935, Ethiopia would not have been overwhelmed and World War II might well have been prevented. Instead, only half-hearted "slap on the wrist" tactics were used, which angered Mussolini but caused him no basic discomfort.

Seeing such impotence on the part of the League of Nations, ruthless men in Germany and Japan licked their chops and picked out their own victims for future aggression. That is the basic danger in procrastination, now or in the future. History has a way of repeating itself.

Article 42 states:

"Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of members of the United Nations."

Either these articles mean something or they do not. Now is the time to find out. We can no longer permit the people of the world to rest under the impression that there exists a system of international law and order and collective security, if, indeed, such means are not in existence. These words in the various articles either mean something or they are but pleasant platitudes and the United Nations Charter itself but a scrap of paper.

The sands of time are rapidly running out. Delay will not only be fatal to the people of Israel and the Arab world, who will continue to die in the battles now being fought and yet to come, but it will also be fatal to the plans and aspirations for peace by men and women everywhere in the world. If ever intelligence and leadership were needed in the world, they are needed today. If ever a people had an opportunity for leadership the United States occupies that position. The whole course of history will hinge on how we measure up to our responsibilities.

Yes; the young men and women of America have a vital stake in the establishment of international law and order. Until the peace is secured for ourselves and our children we cannot devote our full energies to the opening of the new frontiers in science, industry, agriculture, government, and in the cultural life of America and the world.

Yet we cannot and dare not permit progress to stop in these and other fields because the danger of aggression still exists in the world.

For we know full well that the new techniques of warfare plan to make use of quisling leaders and fifth columnists. Subversive forces thrive on poverty and ignorance. While we strengthen our outer defenses of military power, so must we continue to strengthen our inner defenses of greater educational opportunities, decent housing for rural and urban America, a constructive approach to adequate medical care without state medicine, and a constant effort to develop and improve sound social security legislation for old age and unemployment.

At the same time we must keep constantly in mind that security alone is not the answer. The most secure man in the world is the one with his food, clothing, shelter, and medical care provided for life—as an inmate of the state prison.

Americans must never surrender liberty for security. Our job as young men and women is to help develop and improve the American system of free enterprise and constitutional government. As a dynamic people we must not lose interest in people or nations less fortunate than we. A strong and vigorous America is still the last best hope of men and women who love freedom. Not even the iron curtain has been able to dim the love of liberty.

It was Lincoln who said: "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. * * * The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation. * * * We, even we here, have the power and bear the responsibility. * * * In giving freedom to the slave we assure freedom to the free. * * * We shall nobly save or meanly lose this last best hope on earth."

Housing—Taft-Ellender-Wagner Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 7, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, it is sometimes thought that the big northern industrial cities are the focal point for the demands to get the Taft-Ellender-Wagner general housing bill passed at this session of Congress. The following article by the distinguished editor of the Atlanta Constitution, Ralph McGill, shows that the demand is not sectional but is deeply rooted in the convictions of public-spirited men dismayed by the catastrophic housing shortage who see the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill as the one measure flexible enough to meet the demands of the years and the Nation:

THE HOUSING CHALLENGE—MAY 1948

(By Ralph McGill)

Housing, as a word, has many meanings.

It means the trees in the forest being felled, trimmed, loaded, and sent to the whirring blades of the saw; the whining scrape of the planing mills.

It means trainloads and truckloads of manufactured lumber, all in movement toward some building site.

It means the juncture there of other materials, bricks, stone, tile, bags of cement, kegs of nails, frames, windows, doors.

It means, too, the putting together of these materials; the sound of hammering, sawing, of grunting bulldozers moving earth; of men at work as the apartment building or house takes shape and becomes a place to live.

But, away from the site itself, there are other meanings to the word "housing." Back of housing are deeds, permits, loans, mortgages, interest rates, attorneys' fees, taxes, contracts as to rents, and so on.

Thousands of men have worked in mines for iron ore; dug in pits of clay; fired kilns, moved trains, assembled motors and truck bodies; cut down trees, floated them down streams or dragged them out to be loaded on flat cars; toiled in sawmills and finishing mills; handled the red-hot flow of a snakey, seemingly endless pencil of steel that goes clattering into a machine to emerge as nails; fabricated angle iron and beams.

Housing has many meanings. These are the material meanings.

But history has shown us that every time we have tried to separate the meaning of things and follow only the dictates of the material we have come upon grief and failure.

There must also be given full consideration to the spiritual or human meaning of our way of life. It is especially true of housing. It is possible to say that the meaning of housing is the meaning of our civilization and culture; or, as the phrasing of today has it, our way of life.

HOME AND COUNTRY

When a man thinks of his country he thinks of his home, the place where he lives; his home city and his house, or home, in it. He does not think in the greater terms of its economy or its politics, but in terms of his own home. His whole attitude toward his Government, city or nation, is conditioned by his home.

A great many persons have written of this in philosophy, in prose, and poetry.

One of the world's great men, with a feeling for humanity, was Britain's great Prime Minister, Benjamin Disraeli. In a speech made a good many years ago, in 1874, he said:

"The best security for civilization is the dwelling, and upon proper and becoming dwelling depends more than anything else the improvement of mankind. Such dwellings are the nursery of all domestic virtues, and without a becoming home the exercise of these virtues is impossible."

One of our own great poets, Walt Whitman, wrote in his Notes, as early as 1888:

"The final culmination of this vast and varied Republic will be the production and perennial establishment of millions of comfortable city homesteads and moderate-sized farms * * * healthy and independent * * * life in them complete but cheap, within reach of all."

Discussion of housing, now so much a part of our lives because of the great shortage and the inequitable distribution of new housing, is not itself new. There long has been discussion and study of housing, but, as always, those who saw the human and spiritual side of it have been in advance of the dominant thinking and the economic integrity of their time.

It is fair and conservative to say at this time, with much of the world destroyed by a world revolution of which the Second World War was a part, that we who have been relatively less touched by its forces nevertheless have not escaped them and must continue to contend with them.

A people expect services from their government. And they think of services chiefly in terms of their health and their housing. We who believe in a concept of individual opportunity, and who have built our Government on that concept, must see that to maintain it our system must be resilient and flexible. Among the world powers, capitalism, which has shown the world that it is the most efficient productve system ever devised, must become an even more intelligent capitalism to bring its people along with it and conquer the great and hostile forces loosed in the world.

That being so, as thoughtful men will not deny, we must agree with Disraeli and Whitman, and with many others of the past and of our own day, that "the best security for civilization is the dwelling, and upon proper and becoming dwellings depends more than anything else, the improvement of mankind."

Neither housing nor houses can remain static.

Architects continually improve and change the concept of the house or the multiunit dwelling. We laugh today at the old gingerbread horrors of the eighties and nineties. We revere the purity of line left us by the Greeks and Romans. And we try, in our modern dwellings to give them both beauty and utility. There always is change, to meet new developments in heating, cooking, living, and custom.

Neither may the philosophy, the legal, nor the spiritual status of housing become static. As a weapon of intelligent capitalism it can be the bulwark against which the hostile forces loose in the world will break. It can be the house built on a rock. Or, if greed induced blindness and a refusal to consider housing in terms of national security have their way, we will live to see the hostile waves undermine much of what we want to keep.

THE ROAD WE FOLLOW

We have come a long way in our thinking and action, when one considers that it was

in 1933, a mere 15 years ago, that the first action was taken. In those years the opposition contained some of the arguments still to be found today against public assistance in housing the one-third of the Nation which is ill housed. But, in 15 years many of the old arguments have been proved false and some proved ridiculous, as time will prove those remaining to be ill founded and conceived largely, in lack of understanding, not wholly in hostility.

Fortune magazine, of, for, and by big business, is intelligent and factual, and conservative within the true meaning of that word, now one of many words greatly abused and distorted. In the depression of the thirties, the first approach to housing was that of make-work, as Fortune magazine reports. The idea was to encourage the building of homes. Fortune says:

"What happened was this—and it is not without its irony. The purpose of Congress had been to make work by encouraging the construction of houses. That purpose had been blocked by the protests of invested capital which claimed that if new houses were constructed its investment would be destroyed. It was therefore capitalism which gave the program (of public housing) its first shove in the new direction. Complying with these protests, the Housing Division had turned its face toward the housing of the poorer one-third of the population of the country. Down to the summer of 1933 there did not exist in the United States one single instance of the replacement of a slum with new housing capable of occupancy by the families which had occupied the old quarters. But all those having to do with the Housing Division knew, as Great Britain had already discovered before them, that the clearance of slums and the provision of decent housing was more important to the maintenance of a stable social order than any other gesture."

So concluded Fortune. It is worth noting that when the Conservative government was replaced with a Labor government in Britain, the chief weapon used by the Labor candidates was the failure of the Conservative government to meet the housing problem of Great Britain before the war, and the belief that it could not meet the greatly exaggerate problem of war-destroying housing by the methods of the past. It was chiefly on the basis of its housing failure that the Conservatives fell, and this fact explains why a government which had won the war, nonetheless failed of relection.

This country may well be disturbed by the present problem. Behind us are the foolish babblings of 15 years ago—that slum people like slums; that they will ruin new housing; that they will keep coal in the bathtubs; that rents will be defaulted; that only the middle-income groups will benefit, and so on.

But, there remain the objections of the greedy and stupid, who would call even Senator ROBERT TAFT a Communist because of his advocacy of a public housing bill. And there remains the even greater hurdle of the apathetic opposition of those who are not informed and who do not take the trouble to inform themselves about their local conditions and needs.

NEEDS—LOCAL AND NATIONAL

Housing needs differ regionally.

Before World War II, an approximate ten and a half million people live in the South. In every region there are people in poor housing. But the Federal Bureau of Census reports show more persons in the South living in poor housing than in any other region.

In the rest of the Nation, one of every three dwelling units falls short of minimum standards. In the South two out of every three are so designated.

That was the situation in 1940 as compiled by the Bureau of Census reports for that year.

They are made every year. So we find that the 1947 reports show a slight improvement nationally. Housing has improved least in the South and especially in the South's cities and towns.

There is a reason for this.

We have been, and are, predominately a rural region. Since 1880 our country has been witnessing a shift of farm population from farms to the cities and towns. Now the Nation has a majority of its people in cities, called urban regions.

That movement has been slowest in the South. World War I stepped it up. The depression slowed it down. World War II greatly accelerated it. Now we are witnessing the movement of industry into the South and at least 50 percent of it, on the average, is moving into cities with less than 50,000 population, some of it into cities with populations of 1,500 and 2,000. More and more people will move to our cities and towns where the housing is not merely inadequate but below standard. The larger industries, which demand thousands of employees, still must move to the larger cities or on their outskirts.

Let us go back to the census reports.

They tell us that in 1930 about 30 percent of the South's total number of dwelling units were in urban centers of population from 2,500 on up to the largest cities.

By 1940, just 10 years, 40 percent of the South's dwelling units were in these urban centers.

By 1947 this had grown to 45 percent.

Is an urban, or city house, a big one?

No; the census shows that even in big cities in the South, like Atlanta, Memphis, and New Orleans, most of the houses and apartments are of three or four rooms.

MINIMUM STANDARDS

Now, what are these minimum standards?

According to the listings a dweling unit of minimum standards meets these requirements:

1. It is not in need of major repair work.

2. It has an adequate supply of water, piped into the house if in town or city, or within 50 feet of the house on a farm. (These are minimum. Farm houses with piped water are desirable.)

3. A flush toilet in a town or city, and on a farm an outside privy properly kept. (Keep in mind these are minimum standards.)

4. Electricity.

5. As many rooms as people living in it. This does not mean as many bedrooms as people living in it, but simply as many rooms.

Many more things are desirable. These are the minimum for health and decent living.

Now, what are some of the conditions in our South, including Atlanta, Ga., where within the city limits there are hundreds of houses with outdoor toilets, not too well kept, and even schools without indoor flush toilets?

In 1940 almost half the dwellings in the urban South fell short of the minimum standards. (The same was true for farm houses.)

One out of six of every urban house had no running water piped into the houses. Sixteen percent of the city houses had no electricity. Seventeen percent were so in need of major repairs as to be considered dangerous to live in.

The census for 1947 shows little change. Indeed, in some phases it was worse. Our contrast with the rest of the country is bad. Our southern housing picture shows us to be below the national average on running water, toilets, crowded conditions, repairs, and other standards.

The South has the most Negroes. But, wherever the Negro is in America, he is the worst housed.

Here in the South we need to know the facts. We need to know what our actual needs are. Then we need to apply the remedies. We must face the fact of national planning to do something about housing for the millions for whom the system of competitive enterprise cannot act. And we need to learn not to be afraid of that fact or to be deceived by shibboleths. The lesson of history is pretty clear, even to modern history in Britain where failure to solve the housing problem, before war came, had created a great dissatisfaction with the existing government.

The regional picture is part of the national picture. Let us examine that.

NATIONAL HOUSING PROBLEM

In 1948 we are using more building material, in all forms of construction, than ever before in our peacetime history, but the bald and paradoxical fact is that we are a long way from any startling change for the better in housing for those who need it most.

How far we are from real improvement may be seen by the fact that in 1947 the Government estimated 1,000,000 new homes were begun. These included temporary quarters, much of it on campuses of colleges.

An approximate 850,000 permanent new homes were started.

There were, in 1947, about 900,000 new marriages which, with few exceptions, do, and should, create demands for new housing. We hardly held our own in potential demand.

The President and the building industry have envisioned 1,000,000 new homes this year. This is a tremendous figure because, if our inflation should break, construction would halt for a substantial period of time.

But, if we get them, we will get almost that many new marriages and we will also not take care of the accumulated backlog demand for housing from persons who long have been living "doubled up" or "quadrupled up," or who are living in houses badly in need of repair and unsuited for habitation.

There are thousands of veterans still living in temporary barracks. Millions of Americans, living in crowded rooms, weary of the inevitable friction between relatives and in-laws, compelled by lack of housing to seek cover under the same roof, want housing. They have been pretty patient about it. And there are those millions who cannot be rescued from slums unless there is a program of public housing. There also are several million thrifty, hard-working people of low income who want low-cost housing and low-rent housing which meets at least minimum standards and who cannot pay for it unless there is some governmental participation.

THE TWO PHASES

Out of the problem seem to emerge two phases of the problem which will be apparent to all.

1. There is an immediate and urgent problem of overcoming the pressing lack of room caused by the lack of building during the war which was precipitated into extremely abnormal shortage of space by the slow rate of building in the years before the war.

2. There is also a long-range problem which will replace old dwellings which have become, and others which soon will become, unsanitary and even unsafe. The minimum such as old buildings already in need of replacement is set at about 5,000,000. Estimates have gone as high as 12,000,000.

As millions of veterans and others know, problem No. 1 has not been solved. In 1946 the Administrator of the National Housing Agency announced that it was believed possible to build a maximum number of 2,700,000 temporary and permanent homes. This was not set as the number needed, but as the number that might be built. With these built it was estimated there would still be 2,000,000 families—families, not persons—still "doubled" or "tripled up" when these were completed by January 1948. The goal was not nearly reached.

As a result the census figures for 1946 showed about 2,500,000 married families crowded in with other families, in addition to the other housing needs. This was a 50-percent increase over the figures for 1940. The census figures for April 1947 showed 2,754,000 married couples sharing rooms with other families. And everyone knows that even a large house is crowded with two families in it. Indeed, the Chinese have a saying that no house can be large enough for two families.

The present state of affairs in which we are using more building materials than ever before, serves only to emphasize the failure. A proper use of building materials should provide the kinds of housing people need in ratio to these various needs. It should include rental units as well as units for sale. It should provide dwelling units, in apartments or houses, for low and middle income needs as well as for the higher income groups. It should be proportioned in city and suburb.

Every person who goes about his community knows there are houses standing empty—for sale. We all know the emphasis has been on homes for sale, largely in suburbs or even beyond them, instead of rental units in the cities and suburbs—they being the most badly needed.

In our country about 60 percent of the population normally rent their dwellings. In 1947 only about 10 percent of the permanent new construction was built as rental property.

Another failure, and one which has a long-range danger, is that most of the new dwelling units, apartments and homes, are the "birth control units," in doll-house effect, with no necessary space to take care of the arrival of children.

President Truman, in his housing message to Congress, touched on three reasons for our housing failure. Chief among them was cost.

The majority of our population—the conservative persons in the low and middle income ranges, make up the greater part of our population. They are our great bulwark against radical change. Yet it is they whom we have punished by our housing failure. The inflated costs have put new housing out of the reach of most of these people.

Costs also have "scared" both builder and buyer.

A second factor is scarcity. We are producing most building material in greater quantities than we believed likely by this time. Yet scarcities still are reported in some materials: nails, millwork, soil pipe, some fixtures, gypsum-lath, and steel. The result has been a slow, sort of piece-by-piece building.

The third factor is fear of a collapse in the economy which would catch both purchasers, renters, and builders.

But anyone who studies the problem comes also upon other factors. There are conflicting, and often obsolete, building codes which delay building, and often prevent it.

Building goes on furiously, but there still is lack of building to meet the needs of various groups.

Actually, there is very little free enterprise, or competitive building in the mass construction going on. It is somewhat ironic that many builders furiously oppose any Federal housing subsidy, yet eagerly avail themselves of title VI of FHA by insuring 90-percent mortgage loans and thereby providing themselves more liberal financing. Almost no rental property is being constructed today in urban centers save under this form of Federal subsidy in which the taxpayer is the final owner of any property which might not pay out. And also the final loser. Nevertheless, this is an excellent plan and its facts merely illustrate the hypocrisy of opposing other ventures by the Government in providing housing for those who cannot be reached by this subsidy to private builders.

Whatever the plan, it is folly to exclude from it a permanent public-housing provision of flexible provisions. The builder with 90 percent of his mortgage guaranteed by the taxpayers cannot with good face refuse to agree that for persons of low income decent minimum housing can be provided only by some form of subsidy. The veterans who were promised so much are by no means the only ones who need this sort of aid or subsidy to make up for the difference between present costs and rentals and what they can afford to pay.

What we must face, honestly and without hypocrisy, is that the program proposed under the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is flexible enough to meet the demands of the years and the Nation. It should be passed by the Congress if we are to do the job of intelligently sustaining our capitalistic system by maintaining its tap root—the domesticity of our culture and our traditions. Public housing for low-income families is the keystone to the arch.

"As the homes, so the state."

Maj. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley

REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD remarks prepared by me with respect to the life of Maj. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I had the pleasure on May 24 of hearing a fitting eulogy to a great American who has served his country long and well. I am referring to the appropriate words that were given on this floor on behalf of Maj. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley by the senior Senator from New Hampshire, STYLES BRIDGES.

The occasion for Senator BRIDGES' remarks was the insertion in the RECORD of the "New Mexico Plan," which General Hurley has devised to build business careers for veterans and others in his State and to benefit all the people. This plan will be implemented through the enactment of the Veterans Economic Development Corporation Act (popularly known as the "Little Man's RFC"), a bill which 30 distinguished Senators and I have initiated in this 80th Congress.

My purpose in commenting at this time on my colleague's talk and on the "New Mexico Plan", which Pat Hurley has evolved for his State, is in the hope of emphasizing the past and continued efforts of this great man to be a benefactor to the country for which he has fought so long and valiantly. When I say fought, I mean in peacetime as well as during our periods of war.

Quoting briefly from the April, 1947, issue of the American Legion magazine:

"There's not much to report on Patrick J. Hurley. Not much, that is, except that he has been a coal miner and a cowboy in the Southwest. He has served in every grade in the Army from private to major general. He has been Secretary of War, Ambassador to China, and during World War II was the personal representative of President Roosevelt in 21 different nations."

Here I might end General Hurley's biographical sketch, but in view of his economic-development plan for raising the standard of living of the citizens of New Mexico, I would like to call attention to the background that has equipped him for this service. For Pat Hurley is an outstanding example of what a person may achieve in this country through our traditional advantages of free enterprise and equality of economic opportunity. What he has accomplished, he now wants to help others accomplish.

A self-made man, Patrick Hurley knew hardship and poverty as a child of hard-working Irish parents. His mother died when he was 11. That same year Pat went to work in the coal mines at 75 cents a day. Later he was a mule driver and while yet a youth, became a cowboy. He worked his way through college and law school, driving a grocery delivery wagon, caring for horses at the university and later, driving a taxicab. While he was still in school he became a private in the Indian Territory Volunteer Cavalry. After finishing school, he became a clerk in the office of the Indian agent to the Five Civilized Tribes at Muskogee, Indian Territory.

He became national attorney for the Choctaw Indian Nation and Assistant to the Attorney General of the United States in the filing of 30,000 Indian land suits in Indian Territory. He entered World War I as a captain, received the Distinguished Service Medal, was cited for gallantry in action and rose to the grade of lieutenant colonel. He became Secretary of War under President Hoover in 1929 and served to the close of Hoover's term, March 4, 1933.

During his term, Hurley supported and the Congress passed a resolution authorizing the appointment of a Commission to make a report on war plans and industrial mobilization. Hurley became the Chairman of that Commission. The Commission not only prepared a plan that has not been excelled, it also recommended that a similar Commission be appointed every 2 years under congressional authority to keep the plan current and to hold public hearings so that the people could be advised on the nature of our industrial preparation for war. At that time he was severely criticized for intimating that there would be another war. This is another instance showing he had foresight and the courage of his convictions.

He answered his critics with this statement:

"I agree with those who contend that there is something rotten in a civilization that must periodically wet itself down in the blood of the best specimens of the race. But I call the attention of my fellow citizens to the unalterable fact that it is in that civilization that we must be prepared to exist. We must change the basic elements of our civilization or be prepared to live in the civilization as we find it."

Hurley has been called an idealist. This statement certainly shows him as a realist whose services are now needed by the Nation.

In 1940, as a practicing lawyer, he arranged a settlement between the Mexican Government and five oil companies whose properties had been expropriated by Mexico. For this service the Mexican Government, which was paying for the property, conferred upon Hurley its highest decoration, the Order of the Aztec Eagle.

In 1941, Hurley came out for the repeal of the Neutrality Act, which he called a cowardly surrender of the freedom of the seas.

In November, 1941, he reentered the service for training as a colonel of infantry in the Reserve Corps. After the Japs struck at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, President Roosevelt sent for Colonel Hurley and assigned him a hazardous war task: that of running the Japanese blockade with supplies for our troops in the Philippine Islands. Hurley accepted the assignment and immediately left for Australia.

The American fleet had been sunk at Pearl Harbor; the British fleet was sunk at Singapore and in Macassar Straits. Hurley and his associates had to procure civilian ships and crews to run the Japanese block-

ade with supplies for MacArthur's command in the Philippine Islands. After he had landed in Australia, Hurley was made a brigadier general and was given ample financial credit, which he spent for ships and crews through the Army finance officers. It is only fair to say that while Hurley made the only real effort to supply and reinforce MacArthur, his mission failed. To use his own words: "We were out-shipped, out-planed, out-gunned and out-manned by the Japanese". Only three of the blockade-running ships ever reached the Philippine Islands. Hurley himself was wounded at Darwin, Australia, on February 19, 1942, for which he was awarded the Purple Heart.

After his blockade-running experience, General Hurley was sent as President Roosevelt's personal representative to Russia. He was with the Russian Army in the battle for the encirclement of Stalingrad. For his services in Russia and in the Southwest Pacific, he received another Oak Leaf Cluster for his Distinguished Service Medal.

In 1943, Hurley was President Roosevelt's representative in the Near East; in that same year he went to Afghanistan, India, and China as Roosevelt's emissary. Following this, he attended the Cairo Conference and, at Tehran, he prepared for President Roosevelt what is now known as the Iran Declaration, which reaffirmed the principles of the Atlantic Charter as the objectives for which the United Nations were fighting and established the territorial integrity and political independence of Iran. The Iran Declaration was signed by Franklin Roosevelt for the United States, Winston Churchill for the United Kingdom, and Joseph Stalin for Russia. The Atlantic Charter, which Hurley's Iran Declaration had reaffirmed at Tehran, provided that the nations will * * * "seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other." This provision, of course would have prevented Russian expansion. The Atlantic Charter provided that "* * * all people shall have the right to choose the form of Government under which they will live". The Atlantic Charter had many other provisions, but the principles are enough to show basis for Hurley's contentions at a later date. Hurley contended that every principle to which we agreed in the Atlantic Charter and which were reaffirmed by the Big Three at Tehran and then officially approved by 45 nations, were secretly surrendered by our diplomats at Yalta.

Hurley contended at that time that, in a Government by the people, there is no place for secret diplomacy. He said later at a congressional hearing that the people cannot form correct conclusions or take logical action if they are not given all the facts. This was the basis of Hurley's fight with the State Department.

When Hurley went to China, he went as a military officer—a major general—and as personal representative of the President. At that time it was generally conceded that the Government of the Republic of China was about to collapse. Hurley's mission to China was to:

1. Prevent the collapse of the National Government of the Republic of China;

2. Keep the Chinese Army in the war;

3. Sustain the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek;

4. Harmonize the relations between the American and Chinese military establishments and between the American Embassy and the Chinese Government;

5. Prevent the economic collapse of China;

6. Unify all anti-Japanese military forces of China;

7. Support the aspirations of the Chinese people to establish for themselves a free, united, democratic government.

During the war especially, it was his duty to prevent the collapse of the Chinese Government and keep the Chinese Army in the field. Hurley succeeded in doing that. His achievement has gone far to retard Communist military imperialism and war.

There were, at that time, many Americans in China who believed that the Chinese Government must fail, and they favored arming the Chinese belligerent Communist armed party in China. Hurley opposed arming the Communists. He clearly stated that his mission was to prevent the collapse of the Chinese Government and that it would be folly to arm the party whose purpose it was to overthrow the Government. President Roosevelt sustained Hurley and approved his action in relieving those who did not go along with the American policy in China.

Then Roosevelt appointed Hurley Ambassador to China. In February, 1945, Hurley was called to Washington to report to the President and, while he was away, the Chargé d'Affaires sent a cable to the State Department asking that Hurley be reversed and that the Chinese belligerent Communist Party be armed with American lend-lease supplies. The Chargé d'Affaires stated that every official in the Embassy agreed with his recommendation. Hurley immediately stated that he would not return to China as Ambassador unless those who opposed the American policy and favored the arming of the Communists against the National Government be relieved from duty in China. These officials were relieved but were placed in administrative positions in the Chinese and Far Eastern Divisions in the State Department at Washington. Hurley charged that the American policy in China was being sabotaged by people in the State Department. He also charged that there were persons in the State Department and other departments of the Government whose purpose was the overthrow of the United States Government. At this time Hurley was literally covered by an avalanche of tax-paid propaganda, which tried to make frivolous his charge that all American principles had been surrendered at Yalta and that there were subversive persons in the United States Government. The fact remains that since the time Hurley made his charge, to the present, according to most recent tabulations in the press, 833 persons have been discharged from the Government for subversive conduct. Not one of these people was discharged before Hurley made his charges. Furthermore, after his demand for open diplomacy and a publication of all secret agreements, the Yalta secret agreements were published and showed in Hurley's own words, "a degree of cowardice, appeasement, and failure unequaled in the history of American diplomacy." Hurley said he could not go along with our foreign policy and resigned as Ambassador in November, 1945. Developments since that time have revealed his foresight and wisdom.

This is only a sketchy outline of Hurley's career. His record on military preparedness and industrial mobilization, his reports on the military effects of American oil reserves in the Middle East, the fact that his mission did prevent the collapse of the Chinese Government, did keep the Chinese Army in the field, and did enable the Chinese Army to continue to contain more than a million well-trained, well-equipped Japanese soldiers (thus preventing them from meeting our own soldiers on the beachheads)—all these things stand as a monument to Hurley's ability. His good reputation endures.

His mission in China did succeed in its first two objectives. Others have tried with much more elaborate forces than Hurley commanded to unite China, but they have failed. Noteworthy is that the Chinese National Government recently conferred on Pat Hurley the Decoration of the Order of Yun Hwei (Cloud Banner) with Special Grand Cordon in recognition of his services in the promotion of the friendly relations between China and the United States.

Hurley's record as a private citizen is emphasized by outstanding success. He is recognized as a formidable factor in our efforts toward stabilization of our domestic affairs and our world relations for the maintenance of peace.

His latest contribution toward reaching this national objective is his "New Mexico Plan". The plan will help us develop our economy to solve the problems of shortage of food, supplies, and housing in this country; enable us to supply some of the needs of other countries; promote our good relations with our great neighbor, Mexico; and finally give the citizens, especially the veterans, an opportunity to develop the great resources of the State of New Mexico under the American system of free enterprise and equality of opportunity. I think that we of the Congress have an obligation to give General Hurley our cooperation in promoting the welfare of the citizens of New Mexico.

"LITTLE MAN'S RFC" TO IMPLEMENT HURLEY'S NEW MEXICO PLAN

As one of the Members of this Congress sponsoring the Veterans Economic Development Act, which will implement the "New Mexico Plan", it is a pleasure to welcome the endorsement of that Act by such a man as Pat Hurley.

This "Little Man's RFC" would go far toward giving this Nation the increased production so badly needed to meet the demands now being made upon us and to provide the stabilization of economy that would eliminate the economic spirals which plague us from time to time.

The very backbone of our economy has always been little business.

This legislation is the path to greater prosperity, greater production, greater wealth in spirit and materials, and greater strength for the part we are now being called upon to play in world affairs.

The Freedom to Disagree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on June 4, I delivered an address on the subject of The Freedom to Disagree, before the convention of the Young Democrats of Colorado, at Pueblo. I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am grateful to you, President Scheunemann, for giving me this opportunity to break bread with the Young Democrats of Colorado.

Day before yesterday I was present at an impressive ceremony when our own Charles Brannan was inducted into office as Secretary of Agriculture. It was a great day for Colorado, and a great day for the farmers of America. You Young Democrats have every right to take special pride in your former president's high appointment.

May I remind you, President Scheunemann, that it is only one step from the presidency of this organization to the Cabinet of the President of the United States. This is America.

Speaking of the President, most Americans realize that Harry Truman has had the most difficult role of any President in history. Not only did fate decree that he step into the shoes of the most popular President the

United States has ever had, but fate gave to him the job of reconverting our economy from war to peace. Not only that, but fate has called upon him to furnish the world the leadership it sorely needed in getting back on its feet after the most destructive war of all history. His task has been and is far beyond human comprehension. Harry Truman has not shirked, and he has not faltered, and he has not side-stepped. With simple faith, deep humility, and boyish optimism, he has met the challenge. In the coming general election he is prepared to make the fight of his life for the causes he believes to be right. There is no question whatever about his nomination in Philadelphia on the first ballot. Before November the people are going to like this earnest man and his hard-hitting, straight-from-the-shoulder campaign. They are going to believe in him and respect him and love him.

It is good to be with you tonight. As I rub shoulders with some of you silver-haired Young Democrats I feel almost youthful myself. I am encouraged with your active concern and intelligent interest in the second most important thing in our existence—politics. First comes religion—the relationship between man and his Creator. Next in importance is politics—the relationship between man and man.

The phenomenon of the art and science of politics is interesting. Humans cannot live together any place in this old world until someone has established at least some degree of order. A mighty chieftain assumes leadership. In due time another would-be leader springs up, and trouble begins. Thereupon the rival leaders organize gangs, and as these gangs grow in membership they evolve into political parties. It is wise for persons of like mind to work and plan together for common objectives.

Most countries are bedeviled with too many political parties. But the modern tyrants, the Nazis, Fascists, and Communists, are not troubled by anything like that. For they have created and made infamous the one-party system. With the aid of an obedient and brutal state police, they converted this one-party system into democracy's greatest menace. One party, the early dawn, the march of death, the stone wall, the firing squad; or perchance, the salt mines of Siberia.

These despots arranged a very simple ballot, too. Their ballot isn't cluttered up with a lot of names. It might well be called the short ballot. Hitler and Mussolini got bumped off because of it, but Stalin still uses it. It is not quite a coincidence that the only name on his short ballot is Joseph Stalin. In fact, everything in his system is made easy. An enterprising member of the Ogpu points out with his bayonet the exact spot to mark the X on the ballot, and then he remains in the neighborhood until the ballot is finished. Oh, of course, the Russian voter has the freedom of choice—that is, the freedom of one of two choices. He doesn't have to follow the bayonet; he can start on that one-way trip toward the North Pole with the bayonet prodding him. It is as simple as that.

Many of the European democracies go to the other extreme with their political-party systems. In the recent world-shaking and historic election in Italy, 99 political parties appeared on the ballot.

Some call that system the "splinter party" system. The boys and girls in sunny Italy are still trying to find out what the splinter election really accomplished. After the people's votes were counted, the victorious candidates had to start balloting until some politician could gather enough splinters to form a coalition government. This system manages to keep the winner in perpetual hot water. He never knows when one or more of the splinter parties will disaffiliate, as John L. Lewis would say. It is harder for the victor to keep the election won than it was to win it originally.

In the United States for 160 years we have achieved fairly satisfactory results with the two-party system. However, occasionally we have had splinter parties of our own. Theodore Roosevelt elected Woodrow Wilson with his splinter party. Henry Wallace did not like the way Harry Truman ran his ball club, so he gathered up his boomerangs and started a protest party of his own. It is lucky for Wallace that he was not playing on Joe Stalin's ball club when he got the urge to open a rival camp. Wallace might not like mining salt.

While perhaps no one in Colorado finds all that he wants in either of our two parties, yet most of us are content. That is, those of us who are not perfectionists are content. We get a big kick out of party politics. We point with pride and we view with alarm with all the fervor of an evangelist. Truly an election in the United States exhilarates and stirs the soul, but the real test of the strength of our democracy comes in the sportsmanlike finality with which we accept the election verdict.

The United States is the great melting-pot of races and peoples. Including sun worship, all the religions of mankind thrive here. We are a country of all colors and all shades of color. We have every industry known to man, and our professionals and artists reach the maximum in quantity and quality. Any major political party attempting to serve such a constituency must be buoyant and imbued with a broad and tolerant spirit.

The party in which you and I hold membership is a rather large tent capable of extending itself over a wide range of political philosophy. Many doctrines and many shades of opinion are to be found beneath its expansive canvas.

When one contemplates a cross-section of any great American political party, "shades of opinion" does not seem to be quite the right expression. Strange bedfellows would seem more apt. A cross-section of either side of the Senate reveals what I mean. A LANGER and a VANDENBERG, and a MORSE and a TAFT, a BALDWIN and a MALONE laboring together under one tent is something that you should see. And, crossing the aisle to the Democratic side, a BYRD and a PEPPER, an O'DANIEL and a KILGORE, a GEORGE and a TAYLOR, also strain at the guy wires. Truly, in both parties, the lambs and the lions lie down together in the green meadows of their respective parties.

The merger of six Republican Presidential hopefuls into one candidate seems to be a challenge to a skilled magician. In June the Republican problem is how to blend together the slashing, clashing, and snarling big six into one candidate. But wait. By July, all except one of them will have taken his beating with a gulp, and will have started whooping it up for the choice of the smoke-filled room. They will exhaust all the adjectives of commendation in the English language, and sound as though they meant every word. That is American politics.

Other strange things are happening. Two States in the deep South, Alabama and South Carolina, have already acted officially to reserve to themselves the right to vote in the electoral college for whomsoever they please for President, regardless of the election returns in November, and, furthermore, the Democrats in these two States are pledged specifically to not vote for the son of a Confederate soldier, Harry S. Truman.

The United States has not seen a political revolt of such intensity and magnitude since the Civil War. It is more than likely that Georgia and Mississippi also will not vote in the electoral college for the candidate nominated by the Democratic Party at Philadelphia. Should the election be close, it is their purpose to throw it into the House of Representatives and out of the control of the electoral college.

The Democratic Party is not alone in this business of splitting wide open. If the Republican Party should win the election this fall, it is safe to predict that within 4 years it will be torn to shreds by the crusaders of destruction now operating so successfully on the Democratic Party. The seeds of impending splits are being sown in the Congress right now. Small groups of Republican Senators are forming private blocs bent on rule or mischief. Strange enough, New England, traditionally conservative and overwhelmingly Republican, is the cradle of this new insurgency.

Colorado is puzzled by the violence of these political eruptions in the two sections of the country where party labels traditionally have decided all election contests. Out here, where we ignore party labels and vote for the man, we can hardly grasp or appreciate the extent or the intensity of these political revolutions. Perhaps independent voting has spared Colorado from the frustration sweeping the solid South and rock-ribbed New England.

Governments and governments' right-hand bower, the political parties, exist primarily to serve the people. Political parties being competitive, serve best when the rivalry between them is fiercest. The people, if they are wise, will keep them a nip-and-tuck affair. The two-party system is the people's safeguard against laxity, corruption and arbitrariness.

Regardless of what may happen in the Nation, Colorado voters will do well to not let either party gain a strangle hold in the Centennial State.

It is in the interest of good government that the Democratic Party does not disintegrate in Colorado, and it will not disintegrate if we send in our first team. The crisis facing us as a party is too great for us to experiment with men lacking proven vote appeal. In this Republican-landslide year our party has about all the handicap it can stand without nominating men who lack the confidence of the voters. The Democratic Party in Colorado will not disintegrate if it sponsors the kind of program the people want, and if it nominates the kind of men the people want. That is putting it cold turkey, but that is the way it is.

It is said in derision, there are Republicans who act like Democrats, and Democrats who act like Republicans, and Democrats and Republicans, too, who act like they don't know what they were, or why. Precise party classifications are hard to make in a complex economy. Borderline cases might well be anticipated. Today certain candidates for office are screaming in high tenor for a purge of the Democratic Party of all members who do not see eye to eye with them. They want to banish out of the Democratic tent everyone who dares to disagree in the slightest degree with their own narrow convictions. Either they lack balance and stability, or they are not motivated by lofty ideals. Perhaps they hope to enhance their own political position by such endeavors. Perhaps they desire high office. But rivalry is wholesome, political ambitions should be encouraged and not stifled, and criticism is good medicine for the soul. The Democratic Party, therefore, will be strengthened, not weakened, by such demands.

No two normal persons, if honest, can possibly agree on every point. Neither can a separate political party be provided for each voter.

To insist that all party members think alike and react alike to every issue is only one step removed from totalitarianism. To that doctrine I cannot and will not subscribe. In my own family each member has the liberty to agree or disagree on every issue. I reserve that liberty within my party. The alternative is party slavery, and I refuse to be a party slave.

For 10 years now the Democratic Party has been the minority party in Colorado. During that period no Democrat has been elected to State office without the aid of thousands

of Republican votes. Right today the Republican majority in this State is probably fifty or sixty thousand. As Democrats, we are not in a very good position to advocate strict party adherence. Certainly the Democratic Party wants to do more than merely nominate men for public office. It hopes to elect them. Our party is compelled, if it wants to win, to nominate men with enough vote appeal to attract Republican support.

Recently a statistician analyzed the vote of all of the Senators. He found during the present Congress that only 75 percent of the time had I voted with my party. I do not know as to the accuracy of his report and neither does it concern me. I have tried with all my might to vote right all of the time, which to me is far more important than casting a party vote. Why should I be expected to vote slavishly with my party on the very issues which have made it the minority party in the State of Colorado? I have no obligation to anyone to vote against the best interests of my State. My first and only duty is to vote right. Without such freedom I want no part of Congress. I refuse to be a rubber stamp or a political slave to anyone, and especially do I refuse to be the slave of a small group of zealots with loud voices who could not be elected dog catcher in shanty town, yet who profess to speak exclusively for the Democratic Party. I refuse to accept their canned doctrines. There are dozens of issues before the Congress, and before voting I must weigh the merit and demerit of each, with what has gone before and what may come afterward. A freeman, a sincere man, and an honest man cannot do otherwise.

Here are a few important issues which in recent weeks I have had to consider. I think my batting average on them from a Colorado point of view has been pretty high.

They are:

Slum clearance; FEPC; anti-poll-tax; anti-lynch; segregation; universal military training; Federal aid to education; labor-management problems; the school-lunch program; repeal of Federal excise taxes; the Italian treaty; the proposed treaty with Germany, Austria, and Japan; increased Federal and postal pay; the 70-air-group issue; reenactment of selective service; the Marshall plan; revision of the United Nations Charter; Taft-Hartley bill; railroad retirement; reclamation; flood control; Federal housing; compulsory labor disputes; reciprocal trade agreements; GI benefits; disabled-veteran care; the Federal hospital program; rearmament; Palestine; displaced persons; foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico; soil conservation; admission of Alaska and Hawaii as States; the proposed mining subsidy; the wool bill; the sugar bill; the fur bill; the Townsend plan; the seaboard oil reserves; regulation of civil aeronautics; the Bulwinkle bill; the radio clear-channel issue; the Rizley gas bill; the Mundt-Nixon anti-Communist bill; the Greek-Turkish loan; and many, many others of far-reaching interest and concern. Never in our history has Congress been confronted with more or greater problems.

According to the keynoter at the recent Colorado Republican Convention, the Democratic battle for the nomination of United States Senator is to be a public display of Senator JOHNSON'S mistakes. That should be fun for everyone except JOHNSON. The other fellow's mistakes are always good fun. The Republican keynote orator said, "When the Senator gets through with this primary he will be a very humble man." I hope he is correct. No man anywhere has more reason to be humble.

And as for mistakes, doubtless I have made many. I have been around a long time and have had lots of chances. John Flynn has written a big volume on the alleged mistakes of former President Franklin D. Roosevelt. All men who do things make mistakes. It isn't the bat boy who makes the errors. It is the shortstop, with hopping grounders and sizzling line drives heading his way, who muffs one now and then. Sure, men who never served in high office can scream and criticize and flail their arms. Andrew Carnegie once said, "To avoid criticism, do nothing, say nothing, be nothing."

The Saviour put it this way, "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone."

Two weeks ago a great preacher in a great church in Boston asked that only sinners attend a certain church service. He didn't want one person who was free from sin. He didn't want one saint in his audience. Result: No standing room in the great temple.

I want to tell you about a weird assortment of blunders which occurred in Washington 2 years ago. If you think public men cannot make mistakes, listen to this one. It had to do with the railroad strike. I blundered into the middle of that one, too. The trainmen and enginemen, after months of negotiations, were unable to reach an agreement with railroad management, and after due notice to the public, called a strike. The whole country was tied up. Passengers were milling around frantically in all the railroad terminals of the Nation. Livestock was languishing on sidetracks, millions of tons of perishable freight was rotting, and pandemonium reigned supreme. The President, under the War Powers Act, took over the railroads and hoisted the American flag, but President Alvanley Johnston, of the Engineers, and President A. F. Whitney, of the Trainmen, refused to call off the strike. Since no one ever has the right to strike against the Stars and Stripes, that was mistake No. 1.

In desperation President Truman appeared before a joint session of Congress and asked for additional powers to deal with the frightening situation, which rapidly was pitching the Nation into the abyss of chaos. In a belligerent message to Congress and in an angry tone the President advocated, among many other drastic things, to—

"Deprive workers of their seniority rights who without good cause persist in striking against the Government."

One minute after the President had uttered that hard-boiled doctrine, a messenger stepped up to the rostrum in the House of Representatives where he was speaking, and handed him a slip of paper. The President, greatly relieved, said: "Word has just been received that the rail strike has been settled on terms proposed by the President." The Congress burst into wild applause.

The President made a very bad mistake when he suggested such unconstitutional provisions. As I say, while he was delivering this speech, the strike was called off, but he did not withdraw the demand for a law. The House, under the tense emotional spirit prevailing in the country, thereupon enacted the President's three-page strike-breaking proposal, word-for-word, by an overwhelming vote. That was another terrible mistake. I cannot believe that such a bill would receive one vote in either House of Congress today. The measure then went to the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, where many of its drastic provisions were eliminated, but the committee reported the bill out with the provision intact about forfeiting seniority. That was a bad mistake, too.

And who do you think led the fight against this vicious provision? It was my colleague, our own Republican Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN. He covered himself with glory in his passionate plea to preserve to railroad labor their vested right of seniority. When the bill came up on the floor, Senator BARKLEY and 60 other Senators, including "Yours Truly," voted for it. That was another time I should have been voting with the Republicans.

Alvanley Johnston and A. F. Whitney were furious, as well they might be. Whitney vowed he would spend $4,000,000 to defeat the President. But this story has a happy ending—an American ending. A few months ago, A. F. Whitney, big man that he is, called at the White House, shook hands with the President, and good-naturedly called the whole thing off. That was not a mistake. The President shook Whitney's hand warmly, and that was not a mistake either.

Twenty-five years ago northwestern Colorado was represented in the State Senate by the late Bob Norvell, of Hayden. He was a good Democrat, endowed with a keen mind, a jovial disposition, a judicious temperament, and he was a man of solid integrity. But he had a cynical political philosophy. Often have I heard him say in public addresses and private conversation that the only real difference between the Republican and Democratic Parties is patronage. I was very fond of Bob, but never could go along with him on that conclusion. I am afraid he was thinking of Tammany Hall and other big city political machines. If Senator Norvell was only halfway correct, then politics is indeed a black art, and most politicians scoundrels, and you folks are wasting your time and talents in such gatherings as this. But it isn't true. Way down deep, all political parties have a far nobler purpose than patronage.

Speaking for myself, I am a Democrat primarily because I love independence and freedom passionately, and despise regimentation with all my heart. Police-state methods, such as price controls and conscription in peacetime, are repugnant to me. I want more and more democracy, and less and less dictatorship.

In the Halls of Congress I have tried mighty hard to represent all the people of Colorado. I have no foes to punish, no friends to serve. I am as near to being without strings and private obligations as a public servant can be. My only master is the best interests of Colorado. Through the year, the Democratic Party has been more than good to me, and I owe it the most effective public service of which I am capable; nothing more; nothing less. I have tried to show my gratitude by close attention to duty and by diligence in protecting the people's interest. I know of no better way to serve my party than faithfully to serve my people. There is little of the spectacular in the office of Senator these days. It is just plain hard work. I was reared on hard work, but never since the day I was born has my workload been heavier than during my 12 years in the Senate. And each year the burden grows. It is fortunate for me that it is that kind of a job, for glamour is not my line.

In their approach to public questions political parties are either positive or they are negative. They are either dynamic, or they are static. I want the Democratic Party to be both positive and dynamic. I don't want my party to be listless and unconcerned. It must not mark time when time is the essence. It must not dissipate its golden opportunities which may never return. It must not fail to move forward when inertia means a lost cause. A bicycle not in motion will fall flat. Likewise, a political party. There is much to be done in every field of endeavor, and it should be done now. The Democratic Party must accept the challenge of these times. It must provide leadership in the area of international understanding and peace; it must speed up overseas rehabilitation; it must encourage domestic programs of health, housing, research, education, social security, and public welfare generally; and it must sponsor better agricultural practices and badly needed internal improvements such as flood control and highway construction.

The people will rally and support such a program. If perchance they stray and worship at the feet of false gods in 1948, we must fight on for constructive action in public affairs. They will return. For this is the program they want. This is no time for quibbling, petty bickering, acrimonious debate, character assassination, vicious misrepresentation and hashing over and over the mistakes of yesterday. This is the time for

positive and dynamic political action. This is the time for stability and rational thinking. This is the time for young Democrats and old Democrats, and Democrats of all shades of opinion to come to the aid of their party. Let us shout with Admiral Farragut; "Damn the torpedoes. Full speed ahead."

Commencement Address by Frank P. Graham at the Woman's College, Greensboro, N. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a commencement address delivered by Frank P. Graham, president, University of North Carolina, at the Woman's College, Greensboro, N. C., on May 31, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In a little while, you will receive your diplomas and be gone. In these last minutes when the ties of class and the sense of place are about to give way for many of you to the pull of the gas engine, let us think together as you sit together for the last time. What are the thoughts that come to us now?

We of the faculty remember again and again that you were the seniors and leaders of the student body in this dark year in the history of the world. You have stood four square to all the winds that blow, ready for whatever call of duty and service may come in behalf of that freedom and democracy for which your Nation and your university stand.

I take it, you are mindful of your mother and father who denied themselves that you might stay here; of an older brother and sister who stood aside that you might pass up these steps to your triumph today; of a teacher here and there along the way who cheered you on; of your professors who gave up larger salaries to teach you here; of the people of North Carolina who for over 50 years, and often out of their poverty, have builded here this college of the people. In the quiet dedication of this hour you remember and you are grateful.

You are also mindful of the freedom of this place which put upon you the moral responsibility to develop in your own way the most and best that is in you.

In the free air of this place you have learned that what you do is more important than what you say, and what you are is more significant than what you do; that personality is paramount to all mechanisms, that the pecuniary interest should be subordinate to the industrial, and the industrial subordinate to the human and spiritual; that there is a moral process in the evolution of human personality which cannot be defied and there is a spiritual presence about every human being which cannot be denied without damage to one's own personality, that the greatest teaching of Jesus is the spiritual worth of every human being. You are mindful of and you will stand by the intellectual independence, the moral autonomy, and the spiritual power of this democratic college.

But this freedom of the college should not be mistaken for approval of those who are merely sophisticated or who superficially exploit either the passing currents of great human causes or who fundamentally, debase the deep human passions or poison the springs from which flow the waters of life. Such an abuse of freedom has the scorn of scholars whose intellectual integrity and wholesome life are a source of freedom. True freedom of self-expression leads neither to self-exploitation nor to self-deterioration, but leads rather to the self-realization of the whole personality for the good life. No abuse of freedom should cause us to strike down freedom of assembly, speech, and publication which are the fresh resources of a free religion and a free state.

This is the essence of Americanism. Grown on this soil, Americanism is not a frail plant that must be falsely protected with intolerance or terrorism by those without faith in the depth of its rootage or the robustness of its timber. Its roots are deep in the teachings of our religion, the traditions of our country, and the ideals of our university. Jesus said, "Know the truth and the truth shall make you free." He met fallacy with understanding and hate with His great love. The wise Gamaliel sought to calm his fearful-minded colleagues in the Sanhedrin who feared the subversive power of new and fervent agitators, in these wise and reassuring words, "If this counsel or this work be of men it will come to naught but if it be of God, you cannot overthrow it." John Milton, in the midst of a bitter public controversy over the threatened suppression of free speech and free opinion, said, "Give me the liberty to know, to utter, and argue freely according to conscience above all liberties." Thomas Jefferson said, "Truth is the proper and sufficient antagonist to error and has nothing to fear from the conflict."

The heroic souls who have fought and even given their lives for the freedom of the human mind made no reservation against the free conscience of those whose ideas might be hateful to them. In the cause of freedom of opinion and freedom of assembly, spiritual heroism shines out all along the way of the human pilgrimage. The cross, the stake, the Bastille, the Carlsbad decrees, demolished presses and all other symbols of repression but emphasize the unconquerable aspiration of the human spirit for a freer and better world. Idealism does not cringe before power. Repression is the way of frightened power, freedom is the way of enlightened faith. History teaches beyond the denial of bigotry or the sneer of cynicism that the answer to a difference of opinion is not denunciation, is not a concentration camp, is not the Mundt-Nixon bill now pending in the Senate, or any new and vicious form of the long discredited alien and sedition laws; the answer to error is not terror, but the cleansing power of light and liberty under the Bill of Rights and the Constitution of the United States.

To be truly American in the great American tradition is sometimes miscalled un-American. To stand by our historic American Bill of Rights is not a subversive activity. It is unfair to our religion and our Americans to call the most decent, humane, and spiritual hopes communistic. The more Americans who understandingly and sincerely subscribe to the Constitution and its Bill of Rights, the better for the university, America, and the world.

As a part of an ancient heritage and a living profession of faith, the woman's college of the University of North Carolina stands unafraid and looks forward in the strength of her past in the hopes of the youth soon to leave these halls.

Beyond these halls and groves is a hard-surfaced road all astir with the traffic, the noise and calls of a stricken world. Here it is quiet and sheltered.

In a little while you move out from the walks of the college upon the roads of North Carolina which shall turn to your courage and lead far up the highways of the world. However far you may go upon those roads and ways critical with the issues of human freedom, social justice, dictatorships, and the organization of peace in the world, you young women of the class of 1948 will resource yourselves in the freedom and hopes of this place. Sometimes you will think yourselves back in these halls and groves and the spirit of Alma Mater will reach across a continent and across all the years to hold you tight to her great heart.

Nationalization of Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "It Never Has Worked," published in the Indianapolis Star of May 27, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT NEVER HAS WORKED

In a fit of pique, 21 American railway unions have demanded nationalization of the Nation's railroads. They should know better. While on the one hand they accuse the Government of strikebreaking, on the other they demand that the strikebreaker take them over and permanently fasten the power of the Federal Government over them. They just overlook the fact that the Federal Government does not tolerate strikes against itself.

The rail unions say top management of the railroads is of low caliber. So they in effect ask the Government to replace $50,000-a-year executives with Government bureaucrats making $10,000. If this would bring about improvement in railway operation, the experiences of Great Britain, France, and Russia have yet to prove it.

During the First World War the United States Government took over the railroads. This turned out to be a national disaster. The roads lost $2,000,000 a day during the entire period of operation, and American taxpayers are still paying the bill for that mistake in judgment. On top of that, today's privately managed railroads are paying $3,000,000 a day to the Government in taxes.

Sure, railroad management can improve its service. But that service is still better than the nationalized trains in Britain, in Russia, and in France. And see what happened when Britain and France nationalized coal. In the first year of nationalization Britain lost $80,000,000 in the coal fields where private industry made $60,000,000 profit the year before. Prices of coal increased $1.30 a ton. In France production slumped from 112,000 tons a day to 98,000 tons, with 49,000 more miners. And the Government has subsidized the industry to the tune of 80,000,000,000 francs.

If improvement is needed in American railroads the first place to make it is in providing less regulation, not more of it. The Federal Government now regulates profits, wages, rates, taxes, and bookkeeping for the railroads, and all by separate and uncoordinated agencies. No wonder the companies are all balled up and making a mere 3-percent profit in their investment. Intelligent Government action would be congressional passage of Senator Capehart's bill to coordinate the Nation's transportation system under a single Cabinet office so that the Government's right hand will know what its left hand is doing.

Meanwhile, the rail unions ought to think more deeply about their angry proposal for nationalization. If it really materialized, they would find themselves far worse off than they could ever be under the present system.

The Disabled American Veterans' Service Foundation — This Vital Institution Needs America's Financial Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, nearly 3 years ago, on July 2, 1945, it was my pleasure and privilege to deliver a statement on the Senate floor about the problems of America's disabled defenders and their dependents.

At that time I related various facts about the only congressionally chartered organization composed exclusively of wounded and handicapped veterans of our Nation's wars, the Disabled American Veterans. It is this organization which, since its inception in 1920, has been dedicated to the program of rendering needed service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans—the men to whom the Nation owes a debt beyond payment.

Today, Mr. President, I should like to supplement my previous summary. In so doing, I should like to call attention to the fact that the month of June is for the second time being commemorated as Remember Disabled Veterans' Month, as sponsored by the Disabled Veterans' Service Foundation, the incorporated trustee of the DAV. In inviting the attention of my colleagues and of the Senate to this patriotic observance, I want to present some further facts on the need for financial support of the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation.

Ordinarily, I would not consider mentioning in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or on the Senate floor any organization's plea for financial contributions. I have, however, made an exception in the case of the DAV Service Foundation, because I know that my colleagues will agree with me that here is an organization which is fulfilling an indispensable function with true integrity, dignity, and efficiency, and that without financial aid this organization could not continue its work.

My brother Senators will recall that as Calvin Coolidge stated:

> The nation which forgets its defenders will itself be forgotten.

And it was another great American, President Abraham Lincoln, who told us of our responsibility—

> To care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and for his orphans.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the text of my remarks on the subject of the DAV Service Foundation be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE IS "REMEMBER DISABLED VETERANS' MONTH"

It is certainly fitting that the month of June, perhaps the most significant among all the months as to the joys of living, should have been designated as the month during which to remember our surviving disabled veterans. During this month, particularly, it is up to every American, (especially those who did not serve beneath the Nation's colors, as well as those who served but fortunately do not bear the scars of battle), to rededicate themselves toward the solution of the problems of living of the disabled veterans.

As I have stated on the Senate floor and elsewhere, it is up to us to enable these gallant heroes to live in a true American way, for the preservation of which they offered their bodies and their lives if need be, and for which, as a consequence, they sacrificed their youth, parts of their bodies, their health, and a part of their joy of living. In the Nation's veterans' hospitals and in many homes throughout the Nation, these faithful ex-servicemen bear with them now, as they will in many cases for the duration of their lives, the scars, the wounds, the pain of shot and shell and the hell that is modern war.

It is not enough for us to pay homage to our deceased war veterans on Memorial Day. You and I know that we can best honor our war dead by living memorials, by remembering the surviving disabled, by helping them to help themselves. For this purpose it has, for example, been my pleasure to appear before Congressional committees on behalf of adequate funds for vocational rehabilitation of the Nation's veterans, and to work with many of my brother Senators on legislation urged by the DAV for the Nation's disabled veterans.

What are needed are actions, not mere words, however sincere and noble the words may be. Our soldiers, sailors, and marines did not offer mere words at Iwo Jima, or Anzio, or Normandy, or Okinawa. They made sacrifices. We can only be equal to our debt to them if we make sacrifices ourselves wherever and whenever necessary—gladly, devotedly, gratefully.

One of the particular ways by which we can fulfill our responsibility is to make donations to the DAV Service Foundation, especially during "Remember Disabled Veterans' Month," and thus we will help the DAV to be adequate to its vast responsibility of helping veterans to help themselves.

OUR GOVERNMENT'S LIMITATIONS

Most Americans believe that one of the primary obligations of the Government should be to see to it that all of our country's disabled war veterans, and their dependents, should be adequately provided for. But many Americans have ipso facto assumed that such obligation must therefore have been fulfilled.

Much as our Government has done for veterans, it has not, cannot, and really should not be expected to provide for an automatic solution for all of the problems of all disabled veterans and their dependents.

This responsibility should be shared equally by our Government, our States, our municipalities, our Nation's employers, other American citizens, and last, but by no means least, by the disabled veterans themselves—a task to be undertaken both individually and collectively.

It is neither practicable nor desirable that the Government should solve all of the problems of all disabled veterans; such an easy method would be detrimental both for the disabled veterans themselves and for America's taxpayers.

The Government could not, and should not, provide sufficient compensation to every disabled veteran to obviate the necessity for receiving income from other sources.

As our Government's Administrators of Veterans' Affairs during the past 28 years have clearly, emphatically, and repeatedly stated, the task of rendering adequate service to America's large numbers of disabled veterans is a job far greater than can be done merely by the Veterans' Administration, greater than the Government—it is the responsibility of every individual and community in America. That is why the services of a nongovernmental congressionally chartered, volunteer organization, such as the Disabled American Veterans, are essential if our disabled veterans are to become and to remain adjusted to useful civilian life, through suitable, gainful employment. Only in that way can our disabled veterans be saved from dependency upon Government compensation, and be enabled to live as happy, self-supporting Americans.

ASSURING GAINFUL JOBS—OUR RESPONSIBILITY

If American citizens, as employers, should fail to provide ample opportunities for the suitable employment of partially disabled veterans, then obviously such disabled veterans would have no other alternative than to seek to become completely dependent upon doles.

In this connection, we should all remember that less than 7 percent of the some 2,200,000 service-connected compensated disabled veterans are rated by the Veterans' Administration as being totally disabled. The remaining 93 percent are considered as only partially disabled and therefore receive lesser rates of compensation for their partial disabilities. Their inadequate income from disability compensation must obviously be supplemented from some other source, preferably from suitable, useful, gainful employment.

WHY GOVERNMENT NEEDS DAV HELP

In accordance with its congressional charter, the DAV cooperates with the United States Veterans' Administration and all other public and private agencies devoted to the cause of improving and advancing the condition, health, and interests of wounded, injured, or disabled veterans. The fact that America's war-disabled veterans saw fit to form their own organization—the Disabled American Veterans—should not, therefore, be regarded as an implied criticism against any Federal agency.

The DAV has, during the last 28 years, been extending free of any charge, pertinent counsel and assistance to scores of thousands of disabled veterans, much needed by them, in technically establishing their legal entitlement to governmental benefits to which, under certain legal limitations, restrictions, requirements, and provisions, they may be lawfully, equitably, and factually entitled.

Acting as the defendant, the Government is called upon to pay the damages, in the form of disability compensation for service-connected disabilities, medical treatment, hospitalization, vocational training, and other benefits provided by law.

Acting as judge and jury, the Government decides whether, under the law and the circumstances (the official records and factual evidence), the veteran is lawfully entitled to the benefits to which he thinks himself equitably entitled.

It would be very inconsistent to expect the Government also to act as the prosecutor, as it were, or to furnish the attorney for the claimant.

COMPLICATIONS UNAVOIDABLE

The officials and employees in governmental bureaus must necessarily operate under complicated, technical regulations, legal interpretations, precedents, schedules of disability ratings, service letters, and other guiding policies and procedures, in their administration and application of the some 800 laws pertaining to veterans and their dependents.

The jurisdiction of any one governmental official or employee must, naturally, be narrowly circumscribed, lest he encroach upon the jurisdiction of some other governmental official within his own section, division, or agency or with the policies and procedures of some other Federal agency.

My colleagues have all had sufficient contacts with governmental officials to be well aware of the full significance of this division of responsibility. No matter how much we might simplify government—as constantly advocated here in the two Houses of Congress and outside of Congress—such division of authority is, in the final analysis, to some extent unavoidable.

BAFFLING TO VETERAN CLAIMANTS

It just is not, and never will be, feasible for any veteran to go to one governmental official, or even to one Government office, to find out what he may be entitled to under any one or more of the numerous laws which might be pertinent any more so than such an ideal situation can ever prevail as to any corporation which conducts business operations in more than one State.

Our Federal Government is exceedingly complicated and its requirements are oftentimes utterly baffling to the average disabled veteran. He needs expert counsel as to the proper preparation, presentation, and prosecution of his claim for any benefits, privilege, or preference, to which he may be potentially entitled under any appropriate Federal law.

WHY A DAV

It was because of the realization of this "core of the problem"—that the Government could not, and should not, be expected to take care of all of the complex, varied problems of America's disabled war veterans and their dependents—that the DAV was founded originally by distressed, disappointed, disillusioned, disabled veterans of World War I.

Distressed disabled veterans need the helping hand of their own organization, the Disabled American Veterans, formed in 1920, congressionally chartered in 1932, and in several Federal laws, specifically designated as a spokesman for America's war-disabled veterans.

DAV NEED FOR FUNDS—THE IDENT-O-TAG PROJECT

Inasmuch as the Disabled American Veterans—composed exclusively of America's war-wounded and disabled veterans—has never been able to finance its essential service activities merely out of membership dues, it has had to rely upon the financial support of sympathetic, understanding, civic-minded fellow Americans. This it has been doing, with more or less success, during the last 28 years, through the annual Forget-Me-Not drives of its local chapters, and, during the last 7 years, through its Ident-O-Tag project, under which individualized miniature license tags are sent out each year to most automobile owners, in response to which about 30 percent of them send in donations of 25 cents or more.

Incidentally, it is interesting to note that, by reason of this Nation-wide key insurance, about 4,000 sets of keys are returned each month to their owners—an excellent service to America's automobile owners.

Most of the manufacturing, assembling, and operational processing of this Ident-O-Tag project is handled by handicapped veterans and their dependents.

If 100 percent of the recipients of these neat little key-ring Ident-O-Tags were to return 25 cents or more, the DAV would have no financial problem in continuing its staff of some 350 full-time national service officers, located in all of the regional and branch offices and hospitals of the Veterans' Administration.

DAV SERVICE SET-UP

Some 400 handicapped veterans of World War II were trained to become national DAV service officers by the Veterans' Administration under the provisions of Public Law No. 16. This included 6 months of academic training in the American University in Washington, D. C., with 6 months of on-the-job training under each of three experienced old-time national service officers in three different locations, at a considerable expense to the Veterans' Administration and to the Disabled American Veterans. The first class started on October 16, 1944. On May 17, 1947, it was my privilege to deliver an address before a proud group of graduate national service officers at the American University here in Washington. The tenth class of such trainees will have been rehabilitated in February 1949, whereupon the full salaries of all 10 classes of such trained national service officers will have become the direct obligation of the DAV.

INCORPORATED TRUSTEE FOR DAV

As related in my statement concerning the same question 3 years ago, the DAV decided, back in 1931, that the potential donors who support its service program should have the assurance of a continuity of policy as to the expenditure, by the DAV, of all funds contributed. Therefore, the DAV formed a trusteeship, under the laws of the State of Ohio, known as the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation.

The primary purpose of the DAV Service Foundation is to receive donations from interested social-minded Americans, and then periodically to make allocations, from its accumulated trust funds, to the national headquarters of the DAV—as the operating congressionally chartered membership organization of America's disabled defenders—to enable it to continue to maintain and further to expand its Nation-wide set-up of full-time, expert national service officers, national civil-service officers, and national employment officers.

In order to be enabled to carry on this service activity on a basis commensurate with the responsibilities assumed, the DAV, it has been estimated, should be enabled to expand its service budget up to $2,500,000 per year. Therefore, the 12 trustees of the DAV Service Foundation—consisting of prominent civic-minded citizens—feel that it should build up a trust fund of at least $25,000,000.

Every social-minded individual and corporation has the opportunity to support this important work through generous donations to the DAV Service Foundation of money, real or personal property, shares of corporation common stock, preferred stock, bonds and debentures, assignment of Government bonds, designation in insurance policies and wills, and by other methods, including premieres and benefits, as well as participation in the foundation's puzzle contest.

SERVICE FOUNDATION PUZZLE CONTEST

In order to supplement the inadequate income so far derived from such sources, the DAV Service Foundation recently dramatized its appeal for financial support from the general public by full-page advertisements in many leading newspapers and magazines, inviting contributions in three different groups, $2, $5, and $10. Each such contestant contributor has been extended the opportunity of winning one of the 270 cash prizes, totaling $51,265.00, for the highest solutions, in an interesting intriguing word puzzle, with relative standing among the top-scorers, if tied, to be determined on the basis of from one to three sets of tie-breaker puzzles. The original entries must have been submitted before midnight of May 31, 1948 and substitute solutions are submittable by mail prior to midnight of June 30, 1948.

Solution of this word puzzle has no doubt proven to be very interesting and educational to those who have entered into the spirit of it. I am glad to learn that this dramatic method of arousing the interest of potential contributors to the DAV Service Foundation has resulted in scores of thousands of contributing contestants.

Other constructive plans of raising funds are now being considered by the DAV Service Foundation and if the public is fully informed of the purpose of such funds, I am sure an enthusiastic response will follow.

Inasmuch as the month of June is, for the second time, being commemorated as "Remember-Disabled-Veterans Month," it would be very appropriate for hundreds of thousands of other citizens, in addition to such contestant contributors, also to make substantial donations to the DAV Service Foundation, and thus enable the foundation to help the DAV to help disabled veterans to help themselves. Social-minded Americans can easily do so by sending their contributions addressed simply to: DAV, Box 100, New York City.

Funds received by the foundation are allocable to the Disabled American Veterans—which I repeat is the congressionally chartered operating organization of American's war-disabled—to enable it to carry on its expert, personalized services for disabled veterans. Through these services, the DAV assists disabled veterans in the solution of their varied rehabilitation problems, to prove up their claims for disability compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization and vocational training, followed up by useful, suitable, gainful employment.

As Maj. Gen. Irving J. Phillipson, chairman of the foundation's finance committee, has aptly stated: "To assist in this work is not only a moral obligation and a patriotic duty—it is a privilege."

The peak service load will probably not be reached until 1960. Moreover, inasmuch as sharp curtailments in its budget have caused the VA to trim its staff of contact men, a heavier load has been assumed by the volunteer service organizations, of which, as I have pointed out, the DAV is one of the most outstanding.

ENDORSEMENT OF DAV BY OSCAR EWING

The following statement by Oscar R. Ewing, eminent attorney, now Federal Security Administrator, helps to explain this situation. He said:

"I want to express to you my admiration of the services which the Disabled American Veterans is giving to disabled veterans. Being a World War I veteran and also a lawyer, I can appreciate what your organization is doing.

"It stands to reason that if such disabled veterans are to obtain the full protection that Congress intended, many of them will need the advice and help of persons fully familiar with the laws governing the rights of veterans. I do not believe that this is the type of service that usually could be rendered by the ordinary practicing lawyer. Too often the time spent by the lawyer would be out of all proportion to the amount involved and either the lawyer would be underpaid or the veteran overcharged.

"It has been suggested, I know, that the Government might employ persons to act as counsel for the disabled veterans. This would, I am sure, be impracticable. Such employees of the Government almost inevitably develop a psychology which causes them to try to save the Government money instead of seeing that absolute justice is done to the veteran.

"Your organization's method for solving this problem is admirable, namely, the training of war-handicapped men as specialists in veterans' legislation who can advise and help a disabled veteran in securing the benefits that Congress and a grateful America want the veteran to have. Your program deserves the support of all."

GENERAL BRADLEY'S REASONS FOR SUPPORT OF DAV

Testimony of Gen. Omar N. Bradley, during his tenure as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, gave further reasons why the DAV, through its national service officers, is most

effective in solving the many rehabilitation problems of handicapped ex-servicemen. General Bradley said:

"The Disabled American Veterans represents in its name, in its purpose and its accomplishments those veterans who have been disabled in the service of their country. They—more than any others—deserve first call on all we can do.

"The DAV has been a great help to us in this important work. We welcomed this help in the past. We count confidently on it for the future.

"I am pleased to add my endorsement of the national service fund of the Disabled American Veterans. Certainly, this program, which has for its objective the rendering of service to those who served, is a worthy one. It merits the support of all who are interested in the welfare of our disabled ex-servicemen. Your efforts are commendable and I wish for your program the success it deserves."

Among additional commendations and endorsements which have been received by the Disabled American Veterans, and its incorporated trustee, the Disabled American Veterans' Service Foundation, are:

President Harry Truman: "The Disabled American Veterans are performing a most useful function in helping disabled comrades to help themselves. As I told you during your visit to the White House, our disabled veterans deserve every assistance within the power of the American people.

"Surely, in this postwar reconversion period there is no more important and timely work to be done than that of assisting disabled veterans. All Americans should cooperate in the great task of helping these veterans to make as complete a transition as possible to productive civilian life.

"I feel certain that all organizations and individuals who are interested in the welfare of our country will assist you."

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower: "I am delighted to learn that you are taking effective steps to raise substantial sums for this purpose. Your efforts will be fully rewarded in the lasting appreciation of veterans who will have sacrificed so much for the cause for which we are fighting."

GENERAL MAC ARTHUR'S COMMENDATION

Gen. Douglas MacArthur: "I accept life membership in the Disabled American Veterans with a sense of distinction. Membership in no group in the world carries greater honor than does membership in the Disabled American Veterans."

Former President Herbert Hoover: "Please express for me to the Disabled American Veterans my continued appreciation of their services to the country and my sympathy with their efforts to meet the practical needs for rehabilitation and restoration."

Gen. John J. Pershing: "I sympathize fully with the worthy purposes of the foundation. The welfare of our disabled veterans is, and always shall be, close to my heart, and the activities of this trusteeship in their behalf have my hearty endorsement. No other body of our citizens commands my interest to the same extent as does that peculiarly distinguished group of Americans, the disabled war veterans, whose welfare shall always be very close to my heart.

"It is, therefore, particularly gratifying to me to learn of the plans of the Disabled American Veterans to expand its already extensive service program so as to make available to the handicapped servicemen of World War II, who are coming out of the present conflict in ever-increasing numbers, the valuable advice and assistance it has long rendered their fathers of World War I.

"These new veterans and their dependents also will need a helping hand, and I hope that the organization will meet with complete success in its campaign to provide now for the extension to them of its worthy activities."

The late President Franklin D. Roosevelt: "The purpose of your Nation-wide rehabilitation program * * * to extend needed assistance to members of our armed forces and who become disabled, as well as to disabled veterans of the World War and their dependents, is indeed a worthy one and merits the full support of our citizens."

LABOR ENDORSES DAV

William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor:

"Be assured that we of the American Federation of Labor who have long relied upon the principle that unity develops strength look with favor upon the valuable service-giving activities of the Disabled American Veterans' organization.

"I cannot help believe that every thoughtful American would be sympathetic toward the work and service of your organization. I am willing to help and serve in the promotion of the aims and purposes of the Disabled American Veterans in every possible way."

Philip Murray, president of the CIO: "This is to express my appreciation for the important work undertaken by the DAV, on behalf of those who have given more to their country than can ever be fully repaid. Labor's heart goes out to the disabled veterans, many of whom come from its own ranks, and we are eager to do everything we can to help these handicapped veterans and their dependents to secure the fair and generous treatment to which they are entitled."

James V. Forrestal, Secretary of Defense: "I feel very keenly the necessity for our proving to the lads who have really taken the rap in this war that the American people do not intend to forget them. I want to congratulate you on your willingness to take leadership in the drive on behalf of the Disabled American Veterans. The way in which we respond to the needs of our returning soldiers and sailors, and particularly the proof of our enduring recollections of their sacrifices, will provide one of the great tests of this Republic."

Robert R. Wason, former president, National Association of Manufacturers: "The DAV is not appealing for your sympathy nor to your patriotism, but is presenting a practical plan for making useful, independent citizens of our disabled veterans. It is to be commended for its excellent work."

Congressman WALTER G. ANDREWS, of New York: "The DAV is helping to protect and to promote the best interest of disabled veterans, and of the general public, by maintaining and further expanding its national service bureau in Washington, D. C., and its Nation-wide set-up of national service officers. To do the job properly, however, the DAV needs to have at least three or four times as many full-time national service officers as it now has."

The New York Times stated editorially: "The Nation's first obligation surely is to stand by its fighting men disabled in the line of duty. The DAV's success in this drive should be desired by all citizens, for an adequate DAV staff will mean that those who have bravely fought and bled for us all will not be disinherited and forgotten. Many pleas are made to the American public. This is one campaign that surely merits the generous support of every one of us."

DAV OFFICERS

The Disabled American Veterans' Service Foundation maintains an office at the national service headquarters of the DAV, at 1701 Eighteenth Street, Washington, D. C. Its president is William E. Tate, who is also the national director for claims for the DAV. The chairman of its finance and budget committee is Gen. Irving J. Phillipson, of New York City, a disabled veteran of three wars, under whose direction Army emergency relief raised several million dollars during World War II. General Phillipson is director of industrial relations of Botany Mills in Passaic, N. J. A long-time friend of mine, Millard W. Rice, former national commander and national service director for the DAV, recently became the full-time executive secretary for the DAV service foundation.

Having 12 trustees, 10 of whom each serve for 5-year periods, with the other two automatically consisting of the national commander and the chairman of the national finance committee of the DAV, I am convinced that the DAV service foundation is in good hands and meets a real need on behalf of America's disabled war veterans.

Americans who are grateful for the sacrifices of our disabled veterans will, I feel sure, generously support the service program of the Disabled American Veterans' Service Foundation.

Palestine: Dr. Charles Malik Addresses the Security Council of the United Nations on the Question of Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a timely address by Dr. Charles Malik, Minister to Lebanon, who addressed the Security Council on the Palestine question on May 28, 1948. His remarks are of interest to all who are interested in the critical situation which prevails in the Middle East area.

The address follows:

The debate concerning claims and counterclaims; concerning legalities and illegalities; concerning the endless juridical aspects of this problem; the debate concerning truce and cease fire; accusations and recriminations; counteraccusations and counterrecriminations; proposals and counterproposals—all this—can go on indefinitely.

I believe, of course, that this frame of reference within which the question is being debated has its proper validity, which I respect. But this politico-legalistic validity has also its own limitations. It cannot be overstretched, for if it is, the wider, larger, deeper bearings of the question will be lost. I propose in my brief intervention to put aside all legalism and cleverness. I propose to focus on the simple realities of the situation.

A fresh immersion in the utterly simple, the really true, the unchanging and abiding, might yield some useful insight.

It is true that the Security Council has the responsibility under the Charter of maintaining and restoring international peace and security. But everything depends on the way in which this is done. It is possible that, with the best intentions in the world, and with the sincerest legalistic correctness and fulfillment of one's obligations, the way in which a thing is done spoils the end in view.

My first simple submission is that it is not the way of peace to keep pointing the finger of accusation at the Arab world, to keep spiting that world in the Council's decisions, to keep disregarding its deepest feelings. If the Arabs completely despair of international justice, and if the Council succeeds in putting them in the mood of what I might term an international persecution complex, do the honorable members think that real peace will ever be established in the Near East?

I am not entering now into the question of whether we can properly speak, in this in-

stance, of a disturbance of international peace. This is a politico-juridical question, and I put aside that type of approach. I am only saying that this august Council, which is charged with the supreme task of watching over the peace and security of the world, is actually seized of this problem and that it is trying its best to do something about it. I am also making a distinction between an improvised patched-up solution, and the solution of real statesmanship; between a forced and unnatural peace and an abiding peace of nature and truth. A dictated peace—I repeat, a dictated peace—held by international pressure and by force of arms, and leaving the Arabs of the Middle East—and behind them, in varying degrees, the entire Muslim world—permahently disaffected, is obviously not a real peace and one which, in my opinion, the Security Council should be altogether above considering and effecting.

The distinguished representative of Colombia, not long ago, spoke of what he called hard and stubborn facts. It was the great American philosopher, William James, who described facts as being stubborn and irreducible. I believe the Security Council must face this stubborn and irreducible fact, namely, that it is not conducive to real peace for the outside world—the non-Near East world, the non-Arab world, and the non-Muslim world—to always keep taking decisions apart from and in opposition to the Near East and the Arab and Muslim worlds. To always take decisions against those worlds is, from a long-range point of view, not calculated to produce real, enduring peace.

The Security Council might recognize, or, with sufficient force, even establish a Jewish state in Palestine. I assure the Council that nothing is easier than for the United States and the U. S. S. R., if they agree between themselves, to surround and support the Jewish state with their force of arms. The Arabs, obviously, cannot withstand this combined military might. But is that a real solution of the problem of Palestine? Will the United States and the U. S. S. R. then be really serving the Jews?

In my opinion, the real task of world statesmanship at the present time is not to do just that—a very easy thing indeed—but to help the Jews and the Arabs not to be permanently alienated from one another. The Jews must come to terms with the Arabs sooner or later. They must do so before they come to terms with the Americans, or the Russians, or the Guatemalans. They cannot keep on estranging the Arab world indefinitely, and rejoicing in the comfortable feeling that they have gained, in return, the blessing of the outside world. Such a state of affairs is wholly unnatural, unreal and unstable.

It must follow from this that the function of this Council is not only the mere mechanical restoration of peace and security in Palestine—that is a relatively easy matter—but the more difficult task, the statesmanlike task of creating the necessary objective and psychological conditions of trust and intercourse, a positive encounter between Jew and Arab in Palestine whereby this unnatural estrangement of the Jewish community from its immediate world is canceled and overcome.

The Arabs constitute the immediate world of the Jews and it is with them that they are going to live for the next 10, for the next 60 or for the next 100 years. Their friendship is more important to them than all the friendship of the rest of the world

The immediate present concentration of the Jews upon winning the support and ensuring the friendship of the rest of the world, caring nothing about the Arab world except to call it all sorts of names, is not helpful either to the accomplishment of the task of the Security Council or to the Jews' own permanent interests. Suppose that the Jews have the closest possible association with the rest of the world—with the United States, with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, with Guatemala and with everybody else—but find themselves in a state of political, economic, existential enmity with their immediate world, with their whole hinterland. If that is the case, then I ask: Have you, the Security Council, charged with the supreme task of maintaining peace and security in the world, really succeeded in establishing and maintaining a state of peace in the Near East? What does it really advantage the Jews if they win the friendship of the entire world and gain the enmity, the antagonism of their own immediate Arab world?

I affirm, then, a second simple, because stubborn and irreducible, fact: The real task of those who would establish real peace in Palestine and the Near East is to refrain from giving the Jews a false sense of international security, and therefore from encouraging them to defy and flout the Arab world. Nothing is easier for an international body than to generate this false sense of distant security when the real task, the hard task, is to face the Jews with courage and love and to tell them that their duty, their permanent interest, does not consist in the exaggerated manipulation of international machinery, but in the exertion of supreme efforts by everybody to come to a reasonable, workable, just, abiding understanding with the Arabs.

One victory of real understanding with the Arabs—no matter how modest, no matter how rudimentary—is worth a hundred hollow international engagements. Every victory won by the Jews in the international field at the expense of understanding and concord with the Arabs is profoundly illusory; for real victories are always victories of understanding.

I believe that Jew and Arab must, sooner or later, live together in peace in Palestine. This is another inescapable, another stubborn and irreducible, fact. You who sit on the Security Council can either help them to do that in peace and justice soon, or you can employ such high political procedures as to delay that day and to litter the path leading thereto with much blood and suffering and bitterness.

This leads me to another inescapable fact: There can be absolutely no peace in this situation if the Security Council approaches its task, first, in a punitive spirit, and, second, on the basis of a fait accompli. If the motive is to punish the Arabs and, as a distinguished representative said not long ago in speaking of one of the Arab princes, to put them in their place, then there can be no peace. If the presupposition is to confront the Arabs with a fait accompli, to force a Jewish State upon them by sheer fiat, again there can be no real peace. Real and honest understanding, far-sighted conciliation—not on the basis of a fait accompli and not in a punitive and vengeful spirit—is the only way out of this terrible problem.

I must therefore ask: What is being done to bring the two peoples together? Who is doing it, and where is it being done? Should you gentlemen not be concerned also with attempting this more basic conciliatory task of peace? Is this not the real task of the United Nations—the task of conciliation and understanding?

I shall doubtless be told: "But the mediator has been appointed for just that purpose. What you are asking us to do is something we have already done. But the answer to this somewhat complacent position is this: What can the mediator really do? What conditions can he single-handedly bring about which will help in this fundamental task of peace? His helplessness has not escaped the honorable members of the Security Council, who have, on various recent occasions, refused to expect of him magical powers. Nor, indeed, has it escaped the mediator himself. Did not he himself say a few days ago that his chance of success was of the order of only 1 percent?

No, the responsibility is clearly not the mediator's. The responsibility rests upon our sovereign governments. The will to conciliation and peace must first be generated in our respective capitals.

The other day the distinguished representative of the United States submitted a proposal which was swiftly supported by the U. S. S. R. Today, the roles are reversed: the U. S. S. R. submits a proposal which is swiftly seconded by the United States. This rapid alternation of role between leader and follower in this problem is interesting. It raises far-reaching problems which, if only I had the time, I would elaborate in full.

The fundamental theme of all these problems, however, is the destiny of the Arab world. How is it going to form itself? What are going to be the elements of its new strength? Where will it turn for friends in the international field? What will be the character and structure of its development? What role is it going to play in the economy of peace?

As I have said, this alternation of roles between the United States and the U. S. S. R. is interesting, but I will not now dwell on its deeper significance. I do not know enough about the U. S. S. R.; I know more about the United States. So I must now ask: What have we done to the United States to deserve this mode of treatment? Have we not always been their friends? It is true that the United States is also the friend of the Jews, but when has the United States not also been the friend of the Arabs? Have we not had American schools and universities for a century in our lands? Have not American missionaries—for a century now—lived, suffered, and served in the Near East? Has not the modern social, political, literary, and intellectual awakening in the Arab world been partly, if not primarily, caused by this century-old fermentation of American liberal ideas? Have not American enterprises enjoyed an open-door policy in the Arab world? Has not America enjoyed, until lately, the finest reputation in Arab hearts as a land of justice, nobility, freedom, fairness, real concern for the people, real sympathy with the weak and helpless, real respect for the dignity and work of the individual, and a largeness of heart embracing the entire world? Has not the name of America—by comparison with the European countries with whom we have had our serious differences—occupied the highest rank in our esteem?

Am I now to be persuaded that all this fund of interest, good will, and friendship, built up across the years by so much toil, care, and even tears, is to be cast to the winds, a heap of desolation and regret? What has happened now? What have we done to the United States to merit this treatment at their hands? It is true, as I said earlier, that the Jews are also the friends of the United States, but the Arabs have been also. If you have two friends you do not place the one at the expense of the other; you do not scheme with the one against the other. For, apart from the deeper question of principle, how do you know that the one who is your favorite today, knowing that you have turned with him against the other, will not begin to fear that one day you might turn against him? If you have two friends then surely, as the distinguished representative of China said the other day, you maintain their friendship in detachment and equality and truth. A true friend never allows a situation to arise in which he is forced to sacrifice one friend for another.

The prize in this problem will not go in the end to efficient political improvisation but to stability of character, foresight, wisdom and understanding.

Death Blow to Private Pensions?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Death Blow to Private Pensions?" by David Lawrence, from the United States News and World Report for April 23, 1948.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEATH BLOW TO PRIVATE PENSIONS?
(By David Lawrence)

Systems whereby pensions and retirement benefits have been set up for employees in private companies are in peril as a result of a decision last week by the National Labor Relations Board.

Establishment of such systems, which hitherto has been regarded as primarily a management function, has now been brought within the purview of compulsory collective bargaining.

Pension plans are usually based on actuarial studies—minute calculations designed to yield certain payments at later dates. The Treasury Department requires that all plans must be uniform within a company or tax deductions will not be allowed for the sums contributed by the company. Retroactive changes, therefore, present difficulties.

Rather than embark on the uncertain adventures of pension-plan negotiations with a half-dozen unions and possible strikes, many companies will fight shy altogether of any such controversies. In the end a public demand could arise for the abolition of all private pension plans so that the Government may add them to its social-security system to which employers and employees already contribute substantial sums.

The issue came to a climax last week when the National Labor Relations Board, after many months of mysterious delay, finally handed down a decision in the case of the Inland Steel Co. and the CIO Steelworkers' Union.

It was a purely legalistic decision without consideration either for realism or practicality. If the Board is to construe every phrase in existing labor laws literally, there is no end to the mischief that can be wrought in labor-management relations.

CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT

The original Wagner Act and its amended version in the form of the Taft-Hartley law both define collective bargaining as covering conditions of employment.

It is easy enough to enlarge that phrase literally to embrace the kind of management the union will accept and even the identity of its personnel. Certainly it can be argued legalistically that a union has a right to discuss with an employer as "conditions of employment" whether it will accept one or another form of supervision of the work, one or another system of accounting of the company's income, one or another method by which costs are determined and, last but not least, what the company does with its profits and surplus.

EXTENDING COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Up to now it had been considered that not everything was subject to collective bargaining and that certain matters could not be required by law to go on the negotiation table. Thus the Senate Labor and Education Committee, when reporting favorably to the Senate in May 1935 the original Wagner bill, said:

"Nor does anything in the bill interfere with the freedom of employers to establish pension benefits, outing clubs, recreational societies, and the like, so long as such organizations do not extend their functions to the field of collective bargaining, and so long as they are not used as a covert means of discriminating against or in favor of membership in any labor organization."

Certainly if an employer attempted to play one unit in his plant against another by offering or withholding pension benefits from some and not others, there would be a discrimination case under the law. But the Treasury Department regulates that phase anyway by refusing tax deductions to employers for payments unless the pension plan is uniformly applied.

The National Labor Relations Board now disregards the custom and practice existing when the Wagner law was passed and pension plans were not involved in labor-management negotiations. Instead the Board upholds a curious distortion of the phrase "collective bargaining" as set forth by the trial examiner:

"It is well known that over the years of negotiations between unions and employers, the accepted subject matter of collective bargaining has expanded, so that presently various subjects which were formerly deemed to be reserved as 'management prerogatives' are bargained about. * * *

"In the ladies' garment industry agreements with the union 'specify the conditions under which an employer may reorganize his business, or enter into another partnership, or send materials to other firms for fabrication, or introduce a work week as opposed to a piece-work basis of wage payments'."

Here we have a flagrant example of what happens when economic power first is abused so as to force employers to surrender their management prerogatives and is next recognized by a governmental board as a precedent designed to prove the existence of a custom or a practice.

Actually the Inland Steel decision is the first pension case to be brought before the Board since it was established in 1935. That hardly confirms the prevalence of a practice to negotiate pension or retirement plans through collective bargaining.

It is true the Board, with tongue in cheek, concedes that an employer doesn't have to agree to a union's demands if he doesn't care to do so. The report says:

"It is not beyond the realm of possibility, that all of the collective-bargaining agencies with whom the respondent (employer) has contracts would be willing to meet at a general meeting to discuss jointly the provisions of its pension plan with the respondent, since all of the workers represented by collective-bargaining agents are similarly affected by its terms and provisions. Furthermore, as heretofore noted, nothing in the act compels a respondent to reach an agreement with any of the collective-bargaining agents on this issue. The requirement is that the respondent discuss the issue and explore in good faith the possibility of reaching an agreement."

LEGALISTIC REASONING

This is tantamount to saying that an employer must bargain in good faith on pensions but, if he takes the position that on this subject he cannot change the existing plan, he is liable just the same to a charge of an unfair labor practice.

It is optimistic reasoning indeed, to expect CIO and A. F. of L. unions to agree on pension plans when they cannot agree on the fundamental question of whether the craft or the industrial union which embraces all employees of a plant or company, is the appropriate unit for collective bargaining.

The Inland Steel case arose on narrow ground. Its pension plan fixing a uniform retirement age of 65 has been in force for many years. It applies to all employees alike. But when the company began to discharge employees reaching the age of 65, as provided in the plan, the union insisted that this became a grievance subject to bargaining and negotiation. The Labor Board closed its eyes to the right to hire and fire or to determine a minimum- or maximum-age level, which is inherent in management's prerogatives, and ordered the company to bargain on whether or when employees should be retired and how they should be selected for retirement.

Out of the four votes cast for the decision, three members of the Board are New Dealers. The fourth doubtless was misled by the legalisms involved in the phrase "conditions of employment." The fifth member saw the realities and dissented vigorously.

THE CANCER OF SOCIALISM

The decision is a grave mistake and will rise to plague American industry and its employees until Congress corrects the situation by new legislation. For it may be expected that the New Deal Supreme Court, anxious also to break down the prerogatives of management on hiring and firing, will go along with the Labor Board. The remedy lies in Congress and not in the courts.

Little by little, the cancer of socialism seems to be eating into the American system, bringing nearer the day of government control of everything and the state as master of us all.

Little by little, the prerogatives of management are whittled down so that labor unions, local and national, forming a kind of supergovernment, eat into the foundations of successful enterprise. Thus is economic anarchy fostered so that state socialism may some day ride triumphantly into power.

It would seem that the Nation's recent experience with a labor-union monopoly in control of production in the coal mines would open the eyes of Congress to the gradual enlargement of a supergovernment by private groups. The whole structure of representative government is threatened by the economic power of national unions, encouraged by legalized doctrines of collectivism.

Charges Confirmed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein a letter appearing in the Washington Post of June 4, 1948.

This letter was written by one who spent some time overseas and had the opportunity of first-hand information.

It corroborates the position I have taken regarding our American military occupation of Europe. It also confirms the charge I have made that very questionable people have been sent by our Government to serve in foreign fields, who either have no proper conception of our Government or who are radical left wingers. The Post is to be commended for printing the letter. It follows:

BLIND OCCUPATION

Reference is made to the Washington Post report of May 31 stating that substantial

gains were made by the German Communist Party in Bavaria, a fact that astounded American officials. Such remarks appear routine in both State Department and Army experience overseas. Everyone, save the responsible United States agency, appears well aware of developments, becomes apprehensive, and places the information at the disposal of the United States authorities only to receive naive replies or none at all.

This trend toward communism in Bavaria first became apparent in late 1945 and was incorporated in Counter Intelligence Corps, reports emanating from Augsburg. The undersigned, legal officer in that city for over a year, also detected a sharp reaction in quietly expressed public opinion due to the inefficiency and incompetence of many military government officers, to their devil-may-care attitude toward pressing problems, to the nonorientation as to the long-range mission of commanding military government officers and illegalities committed by Criminal Investigation Division operatives and some military police officers.

Although many of the factors causing this state of affairs have now been largely done away with, it is sadly apparent that highly placed officials are still astounded by circumstances it is their sole duty to be informed about and on which to take corrective measures. Drastic and heavy should be the hand falling upon the inept and those who refuse to concern themselves with matters involving what is clearly in the national interest.

JAY MARTIN SMITH.

SILVER SPRING.

Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report which I have received from Fanny May Baldridge in regard to some of her experiences in Europe as a member of our Army. I discussed with her, when I made my trip to Europe, some of the problems that confronted her in operating some of our USO institutions in connection with the Army. This report to me presents a point of view which is deserving of the reading and careful consideration of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *April 5, 1948.*

In the mind of every loyal and unloyal citizen, every known and unknown alien—and there are many—are the subjects being so seriously and vitally weighed by our State and legislative departments today. On the right decision of these subjects will rest the security of our people, our way of life, and the hopes of freedom-loving peoples everywhere. Therefore, it seems there has to be sane and careful consideration, passage, and action on the subjects dealing with our own physical and mental rearmament for defense here at home, defense aid to others, and protection in vital spots against the aggressive and infiltrating Communist action and ideals. Universal military training, selective service, European relief, what to do about Palestine now that Russia remains adamant with the Zionists on the too hastily recommended partition plan, Federal education, are so interrelated they form a confusing pattern.

In the consideration of these things I can no longer restrain from expressing myself and setting down my suggestions and summations arrived at through personal contact with the subjects in question. Much thought and prayer has gone into these problems confronting us as regards universal military training and selective service, and the part each can play in stamping out Communist infiltration. My reactions and suggestions are based on what I saw, heard, and experienced for 5 years serving as an Army Service Club director in a camp that embarked 2,500,000 combat soldiers into Europe and Africa, and in the redeployment area of France prior to VJ-day, and in the occupational armies in France and Germany (Camp Kilmer, Oise Intermediate, Western Base, Third Army). What I was cognizant of in our States—in the New York schools, unions, street corners, and even in our Federal Government—has grown with leaps and bounds, infiltrating unknowingly into churches, universities, wielding an alarming influence by taking advantage of the freedom of our principles. I am amazed at its inroads since returning home.

Military training can be the most powerful and beneficial program ever adopted provided it is the adoption of the proved experimental program developed at Fort Knox and recommended by the Civilian Advisory Committee. A strong part of that program is the promotion and understanding of our type of democracy, our Constitution, its ideals and the protecting of these ideals. The universal military program is one designed to improve physically, morally, spiritually, mentally the youth of America, to make of him a bulwark of defense in time of mental violence and physical aggression. The need of defense and loyalty is more necessary today than ever before, and this time it is girding to protect our way of life at home, at the very same time we assist others to protect their desired way of life when it is threatened. Through this training program can come our leaders of the future, which heaven knows we are in need of. Two world wars have deprived us of many destined leaders. Through it can come the rebirth of understanding of our system of government. Through the educational program of UMT the thousands and thousands of 18-year-old boys who have been indoctrinated in the schools with the rudiments of communism and the doubt of the efficacy of our laws, can learn the countless benefits of our system and the way to encounter, without gun, the onslaught of propaganda.

The draft and training program in both our wars, especially World War II, was necessarily terrifically hurried, therefore costly in money and men, the individual rights of men, even children in the sight of law, were completely overlooked as they became "Government issue." Officer material, guiding and commanding these young draftees were also hurriedly chosen, often with political pressure with the result that these unfortunate companies were impeded with depressingly low morale. Due to this being caught unprepared, 18-year-olds with 5 to 7 weeks' training were sent overseas, and into the Bulge. Many never saw the sunset of their first day in battle. Many crumpled and died from dysentery and accidents simply because they had not had time to learn discipline, prevention, and the first rudiments of defense; an essential part of UMT. In our great haste, physically and mentally deficient men were sent overseas, no training period evolved to prove their condition, and medical officers did not have the time to make the proper tests. Countless young trainees of 18 years confessed their fear because of inadequate training, they had to speak but where no officer or buddy could hear. Through hurried and sometimes inefficiently chosen draft boards, soldiers were so often classified wrong; technical experts, specialized men, engineers, were placed in the wrong outfits, with no chance for reclassification even when the Army needed their skills and had to train men in those skills. It was called selective service with no time to select.

A strong, efficient military training program for every young man in America could overcome this liability, could make a stronger, finer, better classified, and more democratic and respected civilian army and Regular Army in peace and in time of war.

Every Congressman, every voter, should acquaint himself with the proved experimental training at Fort Knox, Ky., under the leadership of Major General Devine and the Civilian Advisory Commission. This program should be accepted, without political fumbling, and without its protecting measures, moral fitness, cultural and religious influence, educational advantage program being tampered with by clever propagandists. Juvenile delinquency was never as great as today, the type of military training proved at Fort Knox could go far in stamping out the confusion which is causing this condition. If this system is not forced too rapidly by necessity there can be found definitely in the Army and in civilian ranks officers and leaders who are well trained to be the instructors and workers in these training centers, which should be conducted by a personnel which has been combed with the fine-tooth comb of loyalty. The Fort Knox program and its goal, is "the turning out of well-trained and well-disciplined basic soldiers to fill the ranks of the National Guard and organized reserve; to send to ROTC boys who are well grounded in the basic military virtues; to teach obedience, loyalty, and a sense of responsibility to the young man of the Nation so that any future emergency will find a well-trained, disciplined citizenry ready to meet it" (General Lewis, Courier-Journal). The Citizen's Religious Committee cooperating with the experimental training made this report: "To put it succinctly, as this committee saw UMT in action, preparedness and not combat was the dominant motive, the principals of morals and ethics that it stresses are sound, highly desirable, and should become a part of the training and conduct of the American Armed Forces." The Parents Committee reported, "it offered discipline not regimentation, respect for authority, and the rights of others, training for leadership, spiritual values, and educational opportunities."

Many church groups and particularly women's groups are basing their objections to UMT on the loose discipline and widespread use of alcoholic beverages in the occupational and now standing Army in the United States. There is no argument about this fact. I understand since coming home that this widespread use of liquor, a result of monthly liquor rations, was forced on the Army by political pressure. These women are justified in their condemnation but, in UMT, liquor is positively prohibited. Keep these safeguards in UMT if it is adopted. I am no member of any group favoring abstinence, but for the sake of our young men and the prestige of our citizenry and the United States Army here and abroad, allow the Army to place restrictions once again on the use of liquor. Overseas it has produced much that is irreparable. In 1946 18-year-old soldiers, who would not have been served probably in a bar at home, were given a monthly liquor ration with a bottle of green cognac thrown in as a gift. The results were disastrous. My club in the western base's largest billet was on the edge of Pigalle in Paris—I speak from experience. Now the fearful cut of budgets for the army of occupation has cut entertainment and forced the sale of beer and wines—even hard liquor—in clubs so as to make them self-supporting. Even the salary of the Army hostess and librarian, who until 1917 was on appropriated

funds, now is remunerated by this method. Our liquor manufacturers will not like the idea, but they would not like the loss of prestige and efficiency produced overseas, either, if they are true Americans. Communist sympathizers will voice for the Reds that this is an infringement on individual rights—as they will also fight any inclusion of religious services if UMT is being favored to the voting point. But today the Communists fight UMT—as they fought ERP, as they will fight the draft, as they preach for civil rights and put class against class. They favor the Federal aid bill to education—but if that bill is safeguarded so they do not see a way to use education for further infiltration we will be accused of being violators of freedom of thought. But if we wish a fine disciplined citizenry in a time of urgency UMT can provide that discipline even in this trouble spot. Truly, I trust our country will never again send 18-year-old boys overseas in war or peace, and certainly they should send no one overseas without adequate training—in war or peace. Had there been adequate training there would not today be so many white crosses overseas, so many flag-draped caskets coming home. But the training we plead for now, through UMT, is training to defend us here at home should the time come we need defending, as well it may be.

Russia realizing how little our masses know of our system of Government except that we are what we are because we are what we are, have been and are undermining and confusing our young people—and their olders—in public, private, specialized, cultural, and trade schools, colleges and GI veterans' schools, as to the value of our system, teaching everything but loyalty to America. Universal military training could and should be the school to combat this foreign, alien propaganda aimed at the adolescent mind. If our boys are trained to defend their bodies, minds, and rights against foreign ideals that are far from ideal, if they are trained in an atmosphere of loyalty and appreciation of our type of government, they will probably never be called on to defend America in war. But should they be summoned in a minute's notice because of action by a misguided nation, they would not be in confusion, but in command, cool, calculating, disciplined, capable of defending themselves, you, and me. Russia nor any other country will strike a strong, prepared united citizenry and country. Universal military training will raise our boys above the Army category of Government issue.

FANNY MAY BALDRIDGE.

Nineteen Hundred and Forty-eight Is the Year To Vote American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD V. ROBERTSON
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "1948 Is the Year To Vote American," published in a recent issue of Collier's magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1948 IS THE YEAR TO VOTE AMERICAN

The big national political conventions are almost here; and, as always at such a time, excitement and speculation are growing hotter by the hour. How about Mr. Truman's chances? What will the southern revolt achieve, if anything? Will the 1948 Republican convention run into a stalemate as in 1924; and if so, how will it be settled? And several dozen other questions like these.

Collier's doesn't endorse candidates for public office. We would, however, like to offer a thought for all voters to ponder as the Presidential election approaches.

This thought is that 1948 is preeminently a year for all United States voters to vote for America—for its best interests as they see them, and for the candidates they think will most vigorously push those interests if elected.

Of course, no Presidential year is a year to vote against America. But in 1948 we are on an unusually hot spot. We came out on the winning side in the late war. Also, we came out free of any bombing damage, and with our productive apparatus in better shape than ever before.

Accordingly, we are cordially detested, even by some of the people we are trying to help via the Marshall plan; and the Government of Communist Russia quite frankly hates our capitalistic innards and seems determined to do us in somehow sometime.

In such a position, we cannot afford to take chances on having a lightweight in the White House for the term of 1949–53. So when you step into your polling place next November 2 how about shoving aside all your personal hates and inherited prejudices, and voting for the candidate whom you consider the best qualified to lead the Nation through the next 4 years? If we'll all vote American we'll most likely elect the best available man.

A Settlement With Russia—Its Necessity for World Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, the most stimulating address I have read on the subject of the United Nations—and I have read scores, containing hundreds of thousands of words—is an address delivered by Grenville Clark before the Association of the Bar of the City of New York on February 7, 1948. I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SETTLEMENT WITH RUSSIA—ITS NECESSITY FOR WORLD FEDERATION

The title of our discussion—"The United Nations and World Federation"—may possibly mislead. It might imply that advocacy of world federal government means abandonment of the United Nations.

Therefore, I make it clear that I do not advocate either discarding or by-passing the United Nations. What I do advocate is the radical amendment of the Charter, so as to transform the United Nations into a limited world government. By this, I mean a federal world government. I mean a government with strictly defined and limited powers which shall, nevertheless, be fully adequate to enforce disarmament and achieve peace.

I take it that no one can now seriously claim that in its present form the United Nations can fulfill its basic purpose of preventing war. The rule of one vote for each member country, irrespective of population or power, has made it impossible to confer sufficient powers upon the General Assembly. The veto in the Security Council makes that body subject to paralysis. Thus the combination of an inherently weak Assembly, with a Council that cannot be relied upon for action, makes it clear that, until radically changed, the United Nations is no more capable of preventing major war than was the League of Nations.

But it does not follow that the United Nations is useless as a foundation. It is capable of being changed. It should be utilized, built upon and transformed.

I make it plain also that I do not advocate a federal union of the so-called free peoples only, thereby excluding Russia and many other countries. I fear that a union so restricted would be as likely to precipitate as to forestall the catastrophe of a third world war. Rather I agree with Henry L. Stimson that "we cannot have world government * * * in any meaningful sense, without Russia." Consequently I believe that every determined, persistent effort should be made to achieve, by Charter amendment, a limited federal world government that will include the Soviet Union.

It has long been obvious that to attain so great a result an over-all settlement with Russia is essential. This means an agreement not only on Charter amendment but on all the other major issues between the Soviet world and the West. And now at last the necessity for a general settlement is being faced.

On January 23, Mr. Churchill made the all-important statement that "the best chance of preventing war is to bring matters to a head and come to a settlement with the Soviet Government before it is too late."

Mr. Churchill spoke of a "lasting settlement" through "formal diplomatic processes, with all their privacy and gravity." If this means discussions in private, instead of in a goldfish bowl like Flushing Meadow, all will agree. Yet we all know that decisions of such import cannot and should not be kept under cover. The possible terms must go before the bar of public opinion. Our whole people must know what is proposed; and now is the time to begin a public discussion of the definite terms upon which a "lasting settlement" can be reached.

So I come directly to my main theme and ask: How can we settle with Russia? More definitely, upon what specific terms is there a prospect of obtaining Russian consent to Charter amendments that will make the United Nations really effective?

What shall we ask of Russia? The indispensable things are, I submit: (1) her consent to explicit Charter amendments abolishing all military forces and armaments, except such as are actually required for internal order; and (2) her consent to further amendments that will make the United Nations a genuine world federal government authorized to function effectively in the limited but vital field of war prevention.

These amendments must confer power on the United Nations to enforce without question the disarmament provisions of the rewritten Charter. This means power to maintain effective world inspection and "peace forces" (to use Ambassador Austin's phrase) of sufficient strength to enforce disarmament promptly and decisively as against any nation or combination of nations, just as effectively as our Federal Government can now enforce peace between our States. It means that the world law in its limited sphere shall be enforceable against the individual. It means United Nations' authority to tax, although the taxing power can and should be carefully restricted. It means United Nations' federal courts with jurisdiction to interpret and apply the amended world constitution and the world laws enacted thereunder. It means

a world legislature organized on a fair basis of weighted representation, in which neither Russia nor the United States or any other country would have a veto. It means a world executive whose authority, like that of the world legislature, would be strictly limited and yet adequate to the task.

It is needless to say that, from Russian standpoint, these would be immense concessions. They are so great, indeed, that it is hopeless to expect her consent except through reasonable and fair recognition of her stature in world affairs and of her legitimate vital interests.

What are those interests and how can they be fairly met? Although less is said of them than of some other questions, the two greatest issues are, I believe, the problems of the Dardanelles and Middle East oil.

In respect of the Dardanelles, we all know that control of this access to warm water has been a vital Russian interest for two centuries. Now, with our military mission in Turkey and the current proposals for new 70,000-ton carriers capable of launching V-2's and 25- to 50-ton bombers, it has become not merely a matter of Russia engress to the Mediterranean. It is also a matter of preventing access to the Black Sea that would threaten destruction of her cities and oil centers. If the position were reversed and we assume a Russian mission in Mexico and absolute Russian control of the seas, we can, by imagining our own fears, see that the present Russian apprehension is hardly groundless.

I believe that this situation is by itself an ultimate cause of war, and that its solution must be a prime feature of any agreement.

But, most emphatically, I do not advocate allotting control of the Straits to Russia alone. While in the Russian view this would do no more than place Russia on a parity with the United States and Britain in view of their control of Panama, Suez, and Gibraltar, exclusive Russian control of the Straits would merely accentuate nationalism and would be a step in the wrong direction.

The solution must be a broader one. It calls for placing all the great passages between seas and oceans under a reformed United Nations, possessed, by Charter amendment, of clear authority to own and manage key points in the world. This would mean that not only the Straits, but also Panama, Suez, and Gibraltar would pass to the United Nations. They would be administered impartially for the benefit of all countries. They would be guarded by the armed forces of the United Nations.

While Russia would be denied exclusive control of the Straits, she would suffer no discrimination because the previous exclusive control of Panama, Suez, and Gibraltar would have been simultaneously abandoned. All four passages would be on the same basis of United Nations' control for the impartial benefit of all peoples.

If it be said that this plan would involve impairment of the sovereignty of Turkey, Panama, and Egypt, I reply that the relinquishment of their rights over these truly world assets would be no more than a reasonable contribution to world peace. It would be a contribution shared also by Britain and America in their surrender of control at Suez, Gibraltar, and Panama.

I believe that this Straits problem can be met by no less extensive a solution than this. Halfway measures such as some modification of the Montreux Treaty, while not disturbing the Anglo-American control of the other great passages, will not remove the sore spot.

The proposal is radical if you wish. But it is time we understood that if we want peace we must pay the price by modifying the nineteenth century nationalism so typically embodied in nationalistic control of Suez, Gibraltar, and Panama, and by the Russian claim for corresponding rights of the Straits.

In respect of Middle East oil, the assumption of a reversed position will readily show why British-American control of these vast reserves must be a cause of severe tension. If we imagine ourselves as a relatively undeveloped country and if we imagine joint Russian-British control of all Latin-American oil and a refusal by them to give us any fair share, we can envisage the Russian feeling on the existing status of Middle East oil.

It is estimated that by 1970, the Soviet Union and the other countries in her sphere will have a population of over 300,000,000. This whole area aspires to a great development of industry and of motor and rail transport. We are hardly in a position to deny the legitimacy of these aspirations. But they largely depend upon ample oil supplies; and, even though these countries cover one-sixth of the world's land surface, there is no assurance that the requisite oil can be found within their borders. It is in the Middle East that a great part of the world's oil reserves are known to lie.

Can the British and ourselves expect to continue in virtually exclusive control of those reserves, denying any share to the Soviet area, without continued friction and imminent risk of ultimate war? Plainly not.

Here, too, the remedy lies in an imaginative, cooperative outlook whereby the Soviet sphere is allotted a fair share on fair terms. Preferably, this should be done by a direct world ownership of this oil, through the reformed United Nations, as in the case of the great sea and ocean passages. But, at the least, it requires a fair division that is supervised and guaranteed by the United Nations.

I am, of course, not unaware of other important questions. There is the problem of Germany, including the Ruhr. There are Korea and Japan. There is China; and there are still others, including the question of access for travelers, students, and teachers, both to Russia and the western world. But what I stress is that even if all those other issues were settled, a failure to resolve the Straits and Middle East oil problems would still leave open crucial issues that would block any "lasting settlement."

My proposition is also that the problem of rewriting the Charter and all these other questions must be faced as a coordinated whole. They are so interrelated as to be inseparable.

Why must disarmament and the transmuting of the United Nations into a limited world government be included? Why will not a great treaty settling the main issues be sufficient? It is because a mere agreement by treaty, even on all the outstanding questions, would be insufficient unless a regime of enforceable world law is simultaneously established. This is essential for the simple reason that neither side would trust the other to observe any treaties. It is clear as crystal that no mere treaties will prevent a continuance of the armed truce. There must exist a dominant institution to enforce the treaties beyond any question. Mr. Baruch knew this when he advanced his atomic control plan on June 14, 1946, a plan that called for nothing less than world government in a considerable sphere.

In local, State, and national affairs, we do not trust to mere agreements for the maintenance of order. We rely only on law enacted and enforced by government. Now all thoughtful men know at last that to achieve world order, government under law is no less requisite.

On the other hand, no such regime of enforceable world law can be established unless and until the basic specific issues are settled. One depends upon the other. And this is why the negotiation of agreed-to amendments of the Charter must proceed side by side with negotiations regarding the Straits, Middle East oil, Germany, Japan, China, and the other issues.

But someone will say, "This might secure peace, but it can't be done." I reply: "Consider the alternative, a war to the death with Russia, and you will say it must be done."

Have we even now sufficiently envisaged the consequences of a United States-Soviet war? I doubt it, for there are many who still like to think that with the bomb and our air and naval power, we might easily crush the Soviets. Perhaps so, but let us consider.

Let us assume that we could destroy every city in Russia and kill or maim tens of millions. Let us assume that this could be done without any damage at all to our home territory. Would even this unprecedented destruction compel submission? That is, I believe, a matter of doubt. It seems possible that even under these conditions, Soviet ground forces could surge over much of western Europe, occupying many cities and dispersing themselves.

One can even imagine that, with their country virtually uninhabitable, there might occur a great trek westward of Russian civilian masses, perhaps 100,000,000 souls, displacing the western populations and occupying their homes. If such a migration would be without precedent, so also would be the conditions produced by atomic war. One must remember also that with millions of their women and children killed or maimed, such a war, as Justice Robert H. Jackson has said, would be a war of unprecedented fanaticism and fury.

Nothing stirs hatred so deeply as the slaughter of innocent civilians. We would have accomplished this on the greatest scale in history. Since a stalemate might result unless we drove the Red army back into Russia, the problem would exist as to whether to bomb western Europe also, even at the cost of more millions of innocent lives, including some of the most advanced peoples of the world.

The dilemma would be shocking. But who can guarantee that, even if we lost our souls doing it, we would refrain from that slaughter? Even if, however, we did cover western Europe with atom bombs, we might even so need to invade its devastated territory with larger forces than in the last war. We might still have to fight our way eastward against stubborn infantry imbued with as strong a hatred as ever existed toward any enemy.

No doubt we would win even such a war, but only at the cost of centuries of infamy and with a loss of American life that would cripple our future for generations. And when our hegemony was established, what then? As Mr. Stimson has said: "Americans as conquerors would be tragically miscast."

I wonder if all this prospect has been sufficiently grasped by the average American. Should it not influence us to attempt what may on the surface seem next to impossible? Should it not induce even the pessimist to remember James Russell Lowell's saying, "Not failure but low aim is the crime"?

Despite all this, I doubt whether we are even now ready to enlarge our minds to a point that will enable us to undertake what is necessary. Under our present policy of containment, with our military missions in Greece, Turkey, and Persia, with a fleet in the Mediterranean, air bases in the Azores, north Africa, and Okinawa and all the rest, we will doubtless march farther down the road to war and approach still closer to the abyss. We are now close to it, but have not yet quite peered into its depths. When we do so, may we not recoil and summon ourselves to an unprecedented effort of will and resource, directed not to war but to a settlement of which effective world institutions shall be the keystone?

The result will depend primarily upon the intelligence of our people, especially of the leading citizens who should be the leaders of opinion. In talking and corresponding with hundreds of them since 1944, I have observed, broadly speaking, three views: Firstly, the extreme view that a Soviet-American struggle to the death is inevitable and that

it is simply not worth while to do anything about stopping it, however horrible the prospect. Secondly, that we ought to try for an over-all settlement and the rule of world law but that the prospect for success is slim until the world is still further chastened. This view is illustrated by the recent remark of a United Nations delegate: "The atomic war first. Then world government." Thirdly, the view that, however hard the task, it is far from hopeless, and that, when we really face the abyss, there may be a sudden change of heart and a willingness to venture into new paths. This is typified by the recent statement of President Conant of Harvard: "What seems inevitable suddenly changes, and it is just as likely that, instead of war, people will find within 10 years an effective world government in action."

It is this view of tempered optimism which I encourage you to adhere to, since without some hope the disaster is truly inevitable.

But more than a reasonable hope is required. On our part, we must shed much of our massive self-righteousness. On the Russian side, they must discard much of their obduracy and rigidity. On both sides, the drum fire of mutual recrimination must abate. There must be with us, as with them, at least some spirit of give and take.

With us, it is too commonly assumed that it is Russian perversity alone which stands in the way of world order. I do not minimize their obduracy, born of many elements, including deep fears and suspicions. I do not even know—no one does—that the Russian rulers will not try for world domination. How foolish to deny that this may be so. But how foolish and also irresponsible to assert that it must be so and that the cause of peace is hopeless until after the atomic war.

In any case, however grimly we choose to view the Russian attitude, we ought to recognize that it is not merely the Russians but also ourselves whom we have to persuade. Thomas K. Finletter spoke true words recently, when he said, "We must make haste with our politics for peace, for we cannot long endure a world bristling with atomic and biological weapons"; and that we need "a show-down with ourselves, as well as with Russia" since "we, ourselves, have not made up our minds that we want peace so badly that we will give up our tradition of strict nationalism."

John Foster Dulles also spoke truly when he said that for peace: "We must plan and act on a grand scale. We must do mighty deeds, such as are usually inspired only by war itself."

You will agree that the program I have outlined does call for mighty deeds. It is a radical program in the sense of going to the root of things. But it is almost conservative in the true sense of safeguarding civilization and creating order instead of anarchy.

What of Free Enterprise?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an interesting and thoughtful address entitled "What of Free Enterprise?" delivered by Mr. T. Coleman Andrews, C. P. A., to the members of group IV of the Virginia Bankers Association at Lynchburg, Va., on May 8, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT OF FREE ENTERPRISE?

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, as bankers you are engaged in a business that is vital to the privilege of free enterprise that is inherent in our form of government, for you are the gatherers, custodians, and dispensers of the capital that is the lifeblood of the free-enterprise system. Through this system we have attained the highest level of production and the highest standard of living that any people has ever enjoyed. A large portion of the responsibility for accomplishing these very tangible gains in the advance toward fulfillment of our destiny as a people and as a Nation has rested upon you, and you have discharged this responsibility with great credit to your profession and immense benefit to the Nation and its people. You have contributed greatly, therefore, to your country's remarkable attainments.

These gains have not been accomplished without occasional set-backs; there have been times when we have gone too fast and been forced to draw back, make corrections, and start over again. But over the years we seem to have been able to return to fundamentals and make a fresh start before anything too serious happened; that is, we did until the last time, a decade and a half ago, when we let ourselves be talked into the old and invariably disastrous idea that we could spend our way to prosperity and stability; and we have gone so far down this road that it is hardly probable that fiscal collapse and political upheaval, the inevitable consequences of unrestrained spending, can be avoided except by resort to drastic measures.

I do not wish to be understood as predicting that these dire calamities are certain to overtake us, for, as precarious as our situation is, I do not believe that it is too late for us to save ourselves from catastrophe. Nor do I wish to be understood as holding the view that we either can or should attempt to return to the level of public spending of any period of the so-called "good old days," for I am fully aware that the world of today is a very different world from that of 15 years ago and that we must expect the expenditures of all levels of government to be higher. Nor am I one who fears either the political or the military power of any other government; the only serious threat to the continuity of our present system that I can see is our inexplicable unwillingness to face the old but presently intensified challenge of the economic facts of life.

What I do wish to be understood as saying, and very sincerely believing, is that, after 15 years of the clearest possible evidence of the unhappy consequences of so doing, we are still pursuing a policy of profligate improvidence in the management—I suppose it would be more accurate to say mismanagement—of our public affairs; that this is the way to bankruptcy and fiscal collapse; that these consequences will befall us if we do not soon come down to earth and adjust our public expenditures to the capacities of our pocketbooks; and, I might add, that the enemies of our system, publicly committed to the conviction that our form of government is not capable of sustained stability, and confident that we are too far gone to save ourselves, are fairly drooling with anticipation that this last stronghold of democracy and the free-enterprise system soon will fall and the stage will be set for them to move in and impose their system upon us without firing a shot.

I do not presume to be aware of all the mistakes that account for the unhappy situation with which we now find ourselves confronted; and the time at my disposal would not permit statement and discussion of all of them even if I had such knowledge. But I believe that I can identify the basic mistake. I also believe that understanding and forthright correction of this one would correct all the rest. The key to identification of what I believe to be the root of our troubles is to be found in the definition of democracy. The fifth edition of Webster's Collegiate Dictionary defines democracy as "government by the people; government in which the supreme power is retained by the people."

It seems to me that we have not wanted to be bothered with exercising our power, that we have come to prefer to devote ourselves exclusively to pursuit of the privilege of private enterprise and leave the management of our public affairs entirely to our legislative representatives and public officials—as if we could surrender our power and shed our responsibilities as citizens without becoming victims of the inevitable assumption that the Government is better able to spend our money than we are, of the selfish aims of organized pressure groups, and of politico-economic philosophies aimed at governmental control of production or worse.

In Lydia Bailey, the latest of Kenneth Roberts' long list of delightful and instructive historical novels, the author has one Albion Hamlin saying that those who brought our country into being "held * * * inert people to be the greatest menace to a country's freedom." It is not necessary for the purpose of this address to go into the question whether our country's freedom is menaced, except to remind you of the extent to which the country that is the center of opposition to our system has fastened its grasping tentacles upon those countries that have embraced its ideology, and to at least caution that it would be foolhardy for us to believe that we are immune to this fate. But, if we are to be realistic, we must admit that we have become an inert people and that the unhappy consequences of our inertia plague us on every hand. We also must take notice of the struggle that is going on, not only elsewhere in the world but also here, between state control and the voluntary society. Further, we must recognize that the present trend of this struggle, here in our country as well as elsewhere, is toward victory for the advocates of state control, and that the adoption of state control here will deprive us of much of the right of self-determination that we now enjoy. If free enterprise is to be saved, one of our first and most important jobs is to reverse this trend.

This won't be easy after 15 years of effort to destroy the free-enterprise system; but there is nothing fundamentally wrong with this system; it is just as appropriate to our needs today as it ever was; in fact, it is more so. Private enterprise made us great, and private enterprise alone can keep us great and carry us on to greater and greater accomplishments and higher and higher standards of living. Every right-minded person must admit that improper advantage has been taken of the free-enterprise system, but to condemn the system and all the employers of this country because a handful of employers have taken advantage of it would be as absurd as condemning an entire community as thieves and scoundrels because an occasional thief and scoundrel is caught in the meshes of the law and brought to justice. I think the people will see this, once the advantages of the system are intelligently disclosed to them, its disadvantages honestly admitted, and honest effort is made to correct abuses and make the system work for the good of all. It is utterly absurd even to talk about the systems of other countries when it is a demonstrable fact that there is no system in the world under which the necessities and luxuries of life can be purchased with as few hours of labor as they can in this country. No people, past or present, ever has attained

under any system such a standard of living as we have under democracy and the free-enterprise system; and no people ever has enjoyed the freedoms that we enjoy.

Our difficulties, therefore, are of our own making, and, having made them, we can unmake them, if only we will. The trouble with us is that we let ourselves be taken in by a lot of plausible but false prophets. Once in power, these people soon had the Government's nose in everybody's business and most of the people believing that there was no problem that the Government could not solve. Worst of all, they denounced the country's employers on every possible occasion as robbers of their employees. Most of these people have gone from the Government now, but not all of them; as late as last December the President's Council of Economic Advisers said in its second annual report that "the accumulations of capital over the years have in fact involved deprivation of the rank-and-file worker." Moreover, the Government still has its nose in everybody's business, and the Government's expenditures continue to mount, although we are on the threshold of the fourth year since VJ-day.

Enormous indeed is the mess we have to clean up. It is sickening just to think of the billions that have been borrowed, spent, and piled up as a mortgage against our earnings and those of our children and children's children during the past 15 years of experimentation with our freedoms, and it will be a great deal more of a job to correct the evil done by the architects of this disgraceful experiment than it will to correct any abuses that have grown up under our system. But if we do the pruning that will be necessary in order to correct these evils, we will get the cost of Government down to a tolerable basis. Internal conditions alone are enough to command our utmost exertions toward this end without further delay; our undertakings abroad make immediate action imperative, for the purpose of these undertakings is not only to render aid but also to preserve democracy in those countries to whom aid is to be extended.

These people know only too well that we are over-extended financially and that this over-extension jeopardizes our poliitcal stability as well as our fiscal stability; our enemies have made sure that they know this. It would be foolish, therefore, to expect these people to line up on our side while looking into the muzzles of our enemies' guns, unless and until we make a showing of stability that will convince them beyond all doubt that alliance with us will afford them greater assurance of the peace and security they seek than they could expect if they allied themselves with our enemies. This showing has to be doubly convincing, considering the fact that our enemies are right next door to these people and might overrun them, if they became so disposed, before we could get aid to them. Senator BYRD has cautioned us with compelling logic against failure to put our affairs in good order, in these words:

"The most sacred responsibility of every representative of the people in the Halls of * * * Congress * * * is to keep * * * our Government sound and solid. Neither our own people nor those who seek our aid should ever forget that the might of America lies in this strength here at home—our fiscal solvency, our productive capacity under the free enterprise system, and our ability to finance our obligations without crushing taxation. Our financial stability is far more urgent for freedom in the world than any program of international subsidies that would severely strain our economy. Financial instability in the United States would serve the enemies of democracy far more than any weapon that could be devised. By the same token, our financial soundness is the only hope for those who seek our help. Without it there would be no bulwark against communism, and freedom could not survive here or elsewhere. If the fiscal stability of America weakens the whole civilized world will follow."

This word of caution was prompted by faithful subscription to the old-fashioned but eminently sound proposition that "those who are least governed are best governed," which is but another way of saying that the way to make our country sound and solid is to put more business into Government and keep the Government out of business, or to give private enterprise its head, under reasonable regulation, and hold the cost of Government down to the point where it will not throttle private initiative. This is the surest way to freedom and the enjoyment of a superior standard of living that has ever been conceived by the mind of man, and its wisdom is proven by the record, which has shown over and over again that this country has been made great by exercise of the right of self-determination, not by governmental edicts and control. Here's the way a man puts it who lived under one of the best systems that Europe had to offer; I quote from Planned Chaos, that fearless exposition of the philosophy of interventionism by Dr. Ludwig von Mises, the noted Austrian economist:

"Business deserves credit for the fact that most of the families in the United States own a motor car and a radio set. The increase in per capita consumption in America as compared with conditions a quarter of a century ago is not an achievement of laws and executive orders; it is an accomplishment of businessmen who enlarged the size of their factories and built new ones."

We have not remained true to this unchallengeable concept of the root of our remarkable achievements; we have yielded to false doctrines whose ill-advised application threaten not only the continuity of the accomplishments cited by Dr. von Mises but also the system of government under which these accomplishments were achieved.

The growth of the Federal budget has been one of the most amazing and one of the most alarming phenomena of our times. In 1929 Federal expenditures were less than two-thirds of the total income payments to the people of California. By 1938 they had been increased to the point where they were equal to the total income payments to all the people in 11 of the 22 States west of the Mississippi River. By 1946 they had been increased to the point where they were equal to the total income payments to all the people in 19½ of the 22 States west of the Mississippi River, and the total tax bill had become equal to one-half of the aggregate income of all those who made $5,000 or more per year. This trend must be halted, for it is taking so much of the fruits of our labors that nothing is left for savings and investment, and the well-springs of the capital that makes free enterprise possible are being dried up.

The aggregate cost of all levels of Government amounts to between fifty and fifty-five billion dollars per year. The Federal Budget now under consideration alone amounts to forty billions, with every prospect that it will be substantially more than this when it is adopted. Moreover, it is clear, as Senator BYRD points out in another recent statement, that we are on the threshold of a Federal budget of at least fifty billions, which means that we soon will be facing total annual expenditures of from sixty to sixty-five billions for all levels of Government. We simply cannot afford any such level of public spending. The Prussian serfs of centuries ago were allowed to work 2 days out of each week for themselves. We are only twice as well off as they at the present level of our public spending.

Moreover, as a result of our inordinate cost of Government and the Government's abortive attempts to control the country's economy, our buying power has been cut to the point where in some cases it is only a third of what it was less than 10 years ago. According to the United States News, a net income of $10,000 in 1939 had a buying power of $9,657, whereas in 1947 it had a buying power of only $5,050; the buying power of an income of $25,000 dropped from $22,673 to $10,235; that of an income of $50,000 dropped from $41,379 to $16,080 and that of an income of $100,000 dropped from $68,003 to $23,416.

Putting it another way, Dr. G. Rowland Collins, dean of the Graduate School of Business Administration of New York University, said: "Statistically speaking, * * * it is entirely possible to establish the fact that the $2,500-per-year income earner in 1939 needs today an income of $4,511 to match his 1939 position in the market and that the $10,000-a-year man in 1939 needs today $22,483 to match his earlier position in the market place." Then he reveals the astounding fact that the $100,000-a-year executive of 1939 needs today $618,708, or six times his 1939 scale of compensation.

Aside from the fact that whenever we add another person to the Government's payroll we reduce the Nation's potential production, there are two very serious consequences of the inordinate expansion of the Government's bureaucracy that deserve our most serious consideration.

First, there has developed in the minds of the people a low regard for public officials and employees generally. This is a situation that we cannot afford to regard lightly, for it is only a short step from this attitude to one of distrust, and distrust is the soil in which the seeds of political unrest germinate and grow. The enemies of our system are striving with all their might to create such unrest. A most serious aspect of the people's thinking about public officials and employees is the attitude of many persons of distinguished accomplishment toward the holding of public office; there are few such people who do not regard the holding of such office with disdain—as something to be studiously avoided rather than as a coveted medium for expression of a high sense of public duty that it should be. These attitudes undoubtedly have been induced by the familiar sight of multitudinous Government officials and employees milling around in each other's way, obviously not properly organized and directed except here and there in the numerous departments and establishments—all too often inept and inefficient—and consequently confused and frustrated, not to mention their amazing and unconstructively critical interference with the management of private enterprise, with whose problems few of them have even remote familiarity.

Second, incentive for distinguished accomplishment is being destroyed, and competition for outstanding talent and performance is being stifled. All over the country men who have contributed mightily to our unparalleled economic accomplishments are withdrawing themselves in the prime of their usefulness from the pool of ingenuity that has made us great, because the net benefit of continuing gets proportionately less and less the further a person goes toward full attainment of the potentialities of his talents. Those who are continuing are becoming less and less inclined to yield to competition for their services; there is little incentive to move on to a larger field of opportunity when the net reward will be relatively insignificant in proportion to the enlarged responsibilites that the greater opportunity will impose; and so, the turn-over of managerial talent of the type that has been so largely responsible for the success of private enterprise is being slowed down, and business establishments are finding it more and more difficult to keep on their toes by occasional introduction of new blood.

The cost of government is high for two reasons: First, because the Government is engaged in a lot of activities in which it has

no business being engaged in; second, because it spends far more than is necessary for practically everything that it does. This has been pointed out over and over again by the Comptroller General of the United States. He said it in the following clear and unmistakable terms at an appearance at a hearing on the congressional reorganization bill of 1946:

"Our Government is in a mess," * * * a mess that "has been accumulating through administration after administration, Republican and Democratic alike, for years. * * * The trouble is that we have developed an extravagant hodge-podge of duplication, inefficiency and inconsistencies. It is an ideal system for the tax eaters and those who wish to keep their snouts in the public trough, but it is bad for those who have to pay the bill. * * * The Government is full of zealous workers, but the fact remains that many of them are working in bureaus or agencies that have no earthly reason for further existence."

I realize full well that a good argument can be made for almost every item of present expenditure on the ground of necessity; but we cannot make decisions as to expenditures solely on this basis. We must make such decisions on the basis of what we can afford. When people get up against hard times, they usually find that they can get along without a lot of things that they think they need. The Government is up against hard times, and it could do the same thing, and it should do it; there is no difference between it and the people who compose it. If the people can't afford to pay the cost of an activity, the Government can't afford to carry on that activity. The time has come for the Government to stop yielding to unbridled desire and to discipline itself in the matter of expenditures just as the people have to pay the bill would discipline themselves under the same circumstances.

The only possible way to forestall the dreadful eventualities that are implicit in our present policy of undisciplined spending is to get the cost of Government down to a reasonable basis. Anything more than one-sixth of our national production or national income, whichever way you choose to put it, is unreasonable and beyond our means. Referring again to the Comptroller General of the United States, this great champion of economy told, in another statement to the Congress, how this might be done. He said that the way to do it would be to get out the grubbing tools, the bush axes and the pruning shears, and go to work on the activities, excessive personnel, and other items of wasteful expenditure that account for the tax gatherer's inordinate exactions.

Unless we do this, we may not hope to escape becoming the greatest menace to our country's freedom and, I fear, the architects of our own destruction.

Foreign-Aid Appropriation Bill, 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I did not support the ERP bill when it was before the House some weeks ago. There is an abundance of evidence today to support that position. Consequently, I shall oppose this appropriation bill.

The Appropriations Committee is to be congratulated upon its decision to reduce the amount of money for foreign relief by some $2,000,000,000. If this reduction is found advisable after 2 months of investigation and study, it is quite likely that further study and more time would make much greater reductions advisable.

While the Administrator has been able to spend only $208,000,000 in 2 months out of the $1,000,000,000 advanced, yet they keep yelling for more billions. The committee hearings established beyond doubt that the original estimates for the Marshall plan money were made recklessly and without any factual basis whatsoever.

During these 2 months some very pertinent facts have come to light. For example, France is expected to produce this year 300,000,000 bushels of wheat, or 7 bushels per person. Our consumption of wheat as estimated by the Department of Agriculture is 3.9 bushels per person.

Yet, under the Marshall plan, France is scheduled to receive 60,000,000 bushels of wheat. Italy this year will produce 4.9 bushels of wheat per person, and we ship wheat to Italy.

The Marshall plan proposes $114,000,000 for relief in Ireland, $295,000,000 for Belgium, $130,000,000 for Denmark, and $10,000,000 for Iceland at a time when all these countries are prosperous and able to secure a bank loan if they need money.

We see in the press that Holland is forced to destroy food surpluses. While Polish coal is going unsold and British coal producers are finding it difficult to recover the French market, France is planning to receive 6,750,000 tons of coal from the United States free of charge.

How can European industry recover as long as we keep the people on a dole?

The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] tells us that out of the $704,000,000 Italy is to receive out of the Marshall-plan money, $100,000,000 goes to Russia in reparation. These revealing facts should make us all the more cautious about this foreign-relief problem.

We cannot continue giving away billions of dollars in supplies without weakening our own structure; without neglecting or foregoing our domestic obligations. Our Government is giving away billions while our old-age pensions and social-security payments remain pitifully low.

Our first duty is to make our own country secure and maintain the high living standards of our people. All these things are threatened by continuous wild spending.

Since the beginning of the lend-lease program to foreign countries and through to the completion of the Marshall plan proposal, this country will have given away $85,000,000,000 in supplies out of the American market. That is why prices are out of all reason and that is why we do not have houses, farm machinery, and many other commodities we need very much indeed.

We have been shipping overseas billions in bread grains, fats and oils, sugar, meats, dairy products, fruits, cotton, fertilizer, coal, petroleum, timber, steel, trucks, and freight cars.

When we go down the street and have to pay $1.30 a pound for steak, we can say to ourselves, "As long as this Government continues to export $8,000,000,000 annually in supplies and getting nothing in return we will pay higher prices and goods will continue scarce."

Our people who are in the lower-income brackets will pay more and more and have less and less. We must not be lulled into a state of complacency because the Government is buying huge quantities of our merchandise to ship abroad. All this is paid for out of the United States Treasury which in turn must get it from the taxpayer. Consequently, our people must pay for these foreign loans and gifts through higher and higher taxes, and higher and higher prices.

To give you an idea what the Marshall plan will cost the American people, I have had the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress break down the cost as it affects the counties in the Fourth Congressional District:

Cost of the European recovery program apportioned on a Nation-wide per capita basis as applied to the population of counties in the Fourth Congressional District of West Virginia

County	Population, 1940	Cost of ERP on national per capita basis (population × $129.11) based on $17,000,000,000
Cabell	97,459	$12,582,931
Jackson	16,598	2,142,968
Lincoln	22,886	2,954,811
Mason	22,270	2,875,280
Pleasants	6,692	864,004
Putnam	19,511	2,519,065
Roane	20,787	2,683,810
Tyler	12,559	1,621,492
Wayne	35,566	4,591,926
Wirt	6,475	835,987
Wood	62,399	8,056,335
Total for Fourth Congressional District	323,202	41,728,609
Total for West Virginia	1,901,974	245,563,863

This assessment upon the people of West Virginia and the Fourth Congressional District will be reflected in our tax bill and the cost of living for years to come.

We cannot have housing and many other scarce items and prices will not be materially reduced as long as this spending continues. The American standard of living is seriously threatened by the high cost of government.

Senator BYRD says that we are again moving into deficit spending which means the Government is spending more money that it raises by taxes. He predicts that by 1951 the deficit will be running as high as $10,000,000,000, if we continue on our present course.

If this condition comes about, and considering the staggering national debt, we will be approaching the realm of financial collapse.

While I am opposed to the bill, if it does pass the House, I hope the upper body will approve the committee's recommendations.

Save the Reciprocal-Trade-Treaty Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the recent action taken by the House of Representatives, in failing to pass legislation to extend the life of the reciprocal-trade-treaty acts for an additional customary period of 3 years, is most regrettable. Moreover, the inclusion of the amendments to the law which was passed is designed to cripple and kill the reciprocal-trade-treaty program. The changes proposed in the recent action sounds the death knell to the reciprocal-trade program. During the 14 years of the life of the reciprocal-trade-treaty acts, this program has been most successful. Certainly this mutually satisfactory two-way program should not be scuttled and killed, but to the contrary it should be fostered and extended. It is hoped that the Members of the other body will save the reciprocal-trade-treaty program by eliminating the crippling amendments which the House unwisely adopted and extend the life of this legislation.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that two editorials be printed in the RECORD, which editorials I commend to the reading of all Members of the Congress, but especially the membership of the majority.

The editorials are as follows:

[From the Nashville Tennesseean of May 28, 1948]

STAB IN THE BACK

Fourteen years ago the first reciprocal trade agreement, inaugurating a policy which was born of Cordell Hull's broad statesmanship, was entered into with Cuba. That was a turning point in American tariff history, leading to economic reciprocity which has been a boon to this country and the most important trading nations of the world.

Protection, which was the cornerstone of Republican tariff policy, had been thrown overboard—it was to be hoped, forever.

But now the GOP, feeling its strength once again, has begun its hatchet work by a brazen act of sabotage as it stabs the Hull program in the back under the pretense of extending a hand of friendship. On a strictly party basis the House has voted to extend the program for but 1 year, instead of 3 years as sought by the Truman administration, and in doing so it has reduced it to impotence.

Secretary Marshall is correct in saying that the presence of many crippling amendments has robbed the Reciprocal Trade Act of its substance. And his view is supported by a citizenship which knows the benefits that have sprung from the Hull program as well as it remembers the paralyzing effect of Republican high protective tariff in the era which culminated in the great depression nearly 20 years ago.

Are Republican memories so short that they have forgotten the lessons so bitterly learned? Do they still hold to the proposition that international trade can be a one-way proposition, in which the United States can perform the miracle of flooding other countries with goods without payment in kind?

This country does not desire to erect another tariff wall when trade is recognized as the lifeblood of nations, and this attitude will become increasingly clear in the coming elections unless the Senate, with more show of reason, undoes the work of the House.

For an issue of vital national importance has been raised and Representative DOUGHTON, of North Carolina, assays the situation properly when he declares that if the reciprocal trade program were the only issue between the two parties in the next election, the Republicans wouldn't carry a single county in the United States.

Repudiation of Mr. Hull's good work, which stands as a monument to his wisdom, will all but be complete if the House Republicans have their way. For the measure they sponsor not only would limit the period of extension to 1 year but it would set up the Tariff Commission as a censor over the President's exercise of powers now delegated to him. The veto is provided for any act of the President which does not conform to the Commission's views. The result would be that no foreign country could know whether executive action on tariff negotiations would have any meaning at all.

The majority party professes to be confident of victory in the November elections, but on the tariff issue alone it has already raised the question of whether, having learned nothing by experience, it has any right to expect favor at the hands of thinking voters.

This country has turned its back on economic isolation once and for all. It wants no return to the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, nor anything which approaches that memorable instrument of ruin. It is too well educated on tariff matters to be fooled by a protection which really constitutes a national danger.

Having raised the issue, let the GOP be not mistaken on one fact—it will be held accountable.

[From the Washington News of June 7, 1948]

KEEP THE CORNERSTONE

There is another thing this country cannot afford to do to the European recovery program. That is to withdraw or weaken its cornerstone, the principle of reciprocal-trade agreements.

Congress would make a tragic mistake if, while voting billions to help other nations, it served notice on them that America is turning backward to economic isolation. For no expenditure of money can assure continued progress toward prosperity and peace, here or abroad, if this and other countries start building up barriers to international trade.

Fourteen years ago, with passage of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, America assumed leadership of a world movement for the progressive lowering of such barriers. The present term of that act will expire next Saturday. Many months ago President Truman began urging Congress to renew it for 3 years.

Instead, Republican leaders in the House waited a long while. Then, after secret hearings, they drafted a bill to renew the act for a single year and to cripple it with amendments restricting the President's authority to make tariff-reducing agreements with other nations. And then they jammed this bill through the House under a gag rule. At each step, we believe, they signaled their plain intention to kill the reciprocal-trade principle next year and to return to the evil old system of log-rolled high protective tariffs.

The time left for the Senate to correct the blunder made in the House is brief. But it can be enough if Republican leaders in the Senate are wise and resolute.

They should insist on renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, without crippling amendments, for three full years. This would notify the world that America will continue to recognize the fundamental fact that trade is a two-way business.

It would assure other countries that we intend to buy as well as sell. It would let them know that we expect repayment of our loans to them in the only way they ever can be repaid—namely, in goods produced by those countries. It would allay fears that a world-wide trade war, such as we started with the Smoot-Hawley tariff, will lead to another shooting war. And it would tell the American people that they are not going to be robbed by high tariffs written to protect monopoly and inefficiency in our own industries.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following petition:

CLINTON, TENN., *June 1, 1948.*

Hon. JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JENNINGS: We, the undersigned, urge you to do all you can to bring H. R. 2953, Federal aid to education, to the floor of the House for vote this session of Congress.

T. L. Seeber, county judge; Harland La Rue, county trustee; Mattie Hollingsworth, county court clerk; Mrs. E. A. Hollingsworth; Ben Singleton, register of deeds; Eloise H. Leeqnue, clerk, circuit and trial justice courts; H. C. Scruggs, clerk and master; J. Fred Cournharl; J. R. Sharp; Ervin Queener; Freddie Queener; Mrs. J. M. Underwood, secretary, Clinton PTA; Mrs. Herbert Smith; Flora Bradshaw; J. R. Dougherty; J. M. Burkhart; Mrs. W. K. Ghormley; J. F. Hall; Myrtice Burkhart; Wilma Haynes; C. H. Vogelle; Calvin N. Scruggs; L. B. Parker; Mrs. W. A. Offutt; Mrs. J. B. Richardson; Mrs. J. H. Scruggs; Richard K. Eager; W. O. Paul; James A. Paul; Elbert Mulkey; Glenn Shrader; Catherine Driskill; Clyde E. Campbell; Jas. H. Gamble; E. T. Lomax; Mr. W. K. Ghormley; Lee L. Wallace; E. O. Lewis; P. H. Worthington; R. F. Worthington; Mrs. P. H. Halley; P. Holley; J. H. Wallace; Sallie Wallace; Fred Bacon; James Silvey; W. F. Silvey; Savannah Silvey; Mrs. W. F. Silvey; Ruth B. Dover; Sam A. Pieser; F. J. Hobbs, D. D. S.; Worth Miller; Arletla Horton; Oakleah Marten; Beulah Appleby; Mrs. R. L. Gooldy; Mrs. J. R. Brooks; Nelle Irwin; Hilda McCoy; M. M. Mapers; F. M. Giles; O. A. Lawson; H. L. Lewallen; B. W. Fita; Thos. M. Rollins: H. F. Miller; H. L. Owen; Mrs. Chas Kincaid; Mrs. E. L. Young; Cummie Kincaid; Mrs. J. Frank Underwood; Mrs. C. C. Dennison; Floyd H. Ryne; Alvin Duncan; Mrs. Frank Martin; Mrs. C. L. Greene; Mrs. O. R. Stansberry; Mrs. T. J. Kesterson; C. F. Minis; Mrs. H. C. Scruggs; Mrs. Inez S. Moore; Mrs. D. J. Brittain, Jr.; Mrs. Robert Sanders; Mrs. Lillie Gaylor; Frank Bernard, Maxie Shanlever; Carlton Wilson; Muriel Jarnagin; Greta Beets; Anna Ruth DeFoe; H. I. Wells, Jr.; Henry C. Scruggs, Jr.; Vivien Shoopman; Mary Scruggs; Mrs. Beatrice Daugherty.

Mossie King; Mrs. Clyde Sharp, PTA president, Lake City, Tenn.; Luther Wheeler; R. B. Scott, M. D.; N. Scott, R. N.; C. J. Murray; C. York; Fred J. Paeper; H. M. Stuckey; G. G. Webb; G. W. Faust; Loyd Riggs; James Welton; John E. Cox; J. M. Cox, M. D.; Mrs. J. M. Cox; Van M. Alley; Hubert Heath-

erly; Leland F. Cardens; R. L. Henrickson; G. W. Miller; Grace Leach; Lois Greene; Mary Beene; Beatrice McDonald; Carl Dew; Roy B. Adkins; Kenneth Pelley; Sherwood Viles; J. K. Hutson; Kyle McKamey; R. C. Adkins; Russ Martin; Raymond Adkins; Mrs. G. L. Alderson; C. J. Watts; Bill Martin; C. B. Sharpe; Mrs. Clay Russell; J. V. Ford; D. W. Disney; Mrs. Helen Disney; F. D. Gray; Charles Sweet; Mrs. D. F. Page; R. M. Alley; Nancy Curnutt; Cletha Pfoff; Mrs. Catharine Shaw; William Richards; Mrs. George Rector; Enos Herrin; John Watts; H. L. Hackmaker; Luther C. Luallen; Delos H. Sharp; Will H. Hodges; Oda Smith; Bonnie Johnson; Carl Reed; H. T. Jayne; Edna Mae Vowell; Carl Prince; Edward C. Dail; R. B. McGill; J. E. Webb; Mrs. J. E. Webb; Mrs. J. E. Lawson; C. F. Bennett; Loari Massingle; Mrs. Harry L. Bennett; Mrs. Ralph H. Weatherford; Mrs. R. W. Graham; Anthony M. Martinez; Mrs. Anna Martinez; Mrs. S. M. McCluney; Eddis V. Johnson; Omar L. Parks; Mrs. E. L. Finley; Mrs. R. B. Sharpe; J. O. Tyler, Jr.; Rolien Rhea; Nell Ranes; W. B. Yates; Mrs. Mary A. Rhea; John B. Rhea; Mrs. Maude Horner; Hubert R. Melton; H. F. Gilbert; Mrs. S. A. Wender, Jr.; Mrs. Howard Jackson; Howard Jackson; Carl Duncan, Sr.; M. C. Newport; Helen Hyder; Carl Duncan, Jr.; Charles B. Dabney; J. Will Disney; Floyd Parks; Mrs. Jeanette Golloway; H. E. Boccia; Alvin Hill; C. P. Wortham; W. H. Lee; Mrs. Paul Martin; Paul Martin; Paul H. Murphy; Isham Greeley; B. O Stanford; E. R. Murphy; R. H. Smith; Bedford Hatmaker; Don O'Dell; Chester Hicks, president Lions Club; D. F. Page; Sarah Hendrickson; Robert D. Lindsay, ex-senator; Rubye Paeper, O. E. S. worthy matron; O. K. Leach, banker; W. H. Winden, merchant; H. R. Easterly; Hugh M. Stokes; C. D. Sparks; Ed Duncan; W. N. Luallen; Otis F. Weaver; Arthur Nier; Mrs. Arthur Nier; B. H. Luallen.

Mrs. C. J. Butcher, Jr., Mrs. Wallace Cantrell, Wallace Cantrell, Mrs. C. E. Dabney, Mrs. Elmer Nebaley, Mrs. C. L. King, C. L. King, Mrs. M. C. Coker, Goldie B. Dalziel, R. E. Olinger, Mrs. Paul Rhea, T. E. Pemberton, D. K. Hendren, Mrs. D. K. Hendren, Mrs. Bill Alderson, Gussie Lou Weaver, S. E. Garrett, Mrs. D. K. Roberts, Mrs. Phoebe Salvage, Anna Moore, Mrs. Ennie Hendresen, Henry Hendresen, Mrs. Mabel S. Cannon, Mrs. H. L. Winfrey, Sr., Mrs. H. L. Winfrey, Jr., H. L. Winfrey, Mrs. Stanley Tribble, Mrs. B. Crowley, H. S. Duckett, Mrs. W. E. Eaton, Mrs. J. L. Dooley, Thos. A. Presnell, Mrs. Thos. A. Presnell, Mrs. Cora Hatmaker, Mrs. Lucy Russell, Mrs. D. A. Clinton, Mrs. A. T. Chase, Mrs. T. J. Steele, T. J. Steele, Tommy Steele, Mrs. C. D. Sparks, Mattie Baker, Mrs. Hobart White, Mrs. Clyde Nance, Mary Alice Pruett, Mary Andrews, Mrs. J. E. Andrews, D. N. Finchman.

J. W. Jackson; Mrs. Galen Chambers; Mrs. Troy Taylor; Mrs. Henry Converse; Mr. J. H. Gaum; Mrs. R. E. Brown; Mrs. Don Fryer; Mrs. W. C. Gray; Mrs. Murray Kanes; Mrs. Sam L. Davis; Mrs. J. U. Goans; Mrs. C. M. Miller; Mr. W. H. Ellison; Mr. John S. Martin, Jr.; Mrs. K. G. McGuire, Jr.; Mrs. Ray Robinson; Mrs. E. G. Kiser; Mrs. Milton Green; Milton Green; Joe H. Wall; Mrs. Pauline Wall; Mrs. Ralph Duval; Mrs. Marvin E. Short; Mrs. Ralph Greener; Mrs. Joe Jackson; Mrs. R. C. Cooper; O. O. Wright; Glenn I. Tuttle; Stella Phillips; Mrs. Eddis V. Johnson; Mrs. J. O. Elliott; Mrs. R. M. Gamble; Mrs. Claude Pickrell; D. J. Brittain; Mrs. Mary W. Coffey; Mrs. Bill Stiner; Massie Jones; Nora Phillips; Belle B. Shultz; Fletcher Dail; Reba Fulier; Mamie Aakins; Minnie Jones; Mrs. Ralph Finchum; Mrs. H. C. Pierce; Mr. Whitman Slover; W. A. Offutt; John A. Offutt; James E. Cox; Mrs. Thomas B. Brown; W. L. Cooper; Grace Ellis; Virginia Holt; Elizabeth Long; Willie Turpen; Luther Turpen; Cleo Meredith; Ruth Pyatt; Mrs. A. N. McGill; Mrs. A. N. McGill, Jr.; Burns & Douglass Gro.; Mabel Cooper; W. C. Murphy; Ola G. Hutchison; W. Lloyd Hutchison; Alta B. Hendren; Dardeen Miller; Mrs. Katheryn Cooper; Elizabeth Holt; Mrs. J. S. Holt; Irene Wallace; Rubye A. Wallace; Reba Gentry; Lucille Hill; Lena Stooksbury; Grace Ellenburg; Ida Gamble; Leroy Talley.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM C. COLE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by Jack Beall:

Good evening. One of the bitter truths about this whole Soviet situation is that the Communist world leadership, by concentrating on propaganda points and scoring propaganda victories over us, can make the worse cause appear the better. In the past month, by seizing on a blunder at the State Department, the Soviet Union quickly dons the halo of the peace-loving nation and makes it appear to the world that this country—the United States—is opposed to peace because it doesn't want to confer anew with the Soviet Union. Our position is, of course, that we cannot meet the Soviets in a two-power conference, leaving out the other nations of the earth, and try to carve up the world between us.

More basic, perhaps, than this is the unspoken but implicit point that even if we could afford to do this sort of thing—which we can't—we could never have any confidence that the Soviet Union would honor its commitments in any respect that was disagreeable to the Communists later. We started off rather hopefully, after the end of the war, to deal with Russia on the basis that she, too, wanted to make peace, that it was to her interest to see the world recover from its wounds. That was our fundamental error. In every possible way the Russians have driven it home to us that they did not want the world to recover, that they would do everything in their power to keep peace from being made. The rulers of Russia have shown that what they prefer is chaos and unrest. They evidently figure they can gain more by fishing in troubled waters, so it is to their advantage to keep the waters stirred up.

I do not think the Soviet Union wants war, actual war, at the present time, any more than we do. But they very evidently do not want peace, either. Apparently the present situation—half way between war and peace—suits them infinitely better. This may have something to do with their domestic situation. Stalin's technique of terror, to get production at home, has begun to show diminishing returns. It requires the looming, dangerous presence of capitalist encirclement and capitalist imperialism to get more work out of the Russian people.

In a recent letter to the New York Times, Louis Fischer, one of the best-informed anti-Stalinists in this country, says that Stalin can neither afford war nor peace. He goes a step further and says that "If we examine the records of the numerous four-power and three-power conferences since 1942, we find that agreement resulted when the western powers granted all or part of Russia's demands for territory and extended influence; that disagreement resulted when the western powers rejected Russia's demands, but that no agreement, at any international conference * * * was ever the result of Moscow's readiness to diminish or withdraw its power abroad."

From the first, very great concessions were made to Russia, in the way of territory and power, but as time went along and we saw that the promises which Russia had made in return—at Yalta, at Tehran, and at Potsdam—were not honored, then we began to slow down on concessions. We are now in the position of saying to the rulers of Russia: "Until you make good on your previous promises, we see no point in talking any more. Actions speak louder than words. If you really mean what you say about wanting to confer with us, you can show it in a dozen ways. You can show it by your actions in existing international bodies like the United Nations and the Allied Control Council in Berlin."

This may seem very churlish of us, after 3 years of doing all the conceding, to begin telling the Soviet Union that our reservoirs of patience and "trying to understand" have begun to be exhausted. After these 3 years of buying dead horses from the Soviet Union, we mildly suggest that we don't intend to buy any more dead horses. Furthermore, we see no reason for buying the same dead horses, over, for the second time. We would like very much to see the Soviets replace their dead horses with live horses. Then we might get to trading with her again. But dead horses are now a drug on the market. We are not interested.

That, in effect, was what we have just told the Soviet Union within the past month. But the Soviet Union has spread it far and wide that the United States is not interested in horse trading—for peace—at all. What we want is war, they are telling their own people and all whom they can reach by their propaganda.

Well, I think it may be a bit helpful to review the record and see which side has tried to be cooperative and has striven for a peaceful settlement and which side has dragged its feet and sabotaged the making of peace.

When you consider just one point of Henry Wallace's "peace plan," in his open letter to Premier Stalin and which Stalin said he accepted "as a basis," and then see how Stalin has acted, right on top of that pious declaration, the whole shabby subterfuge is shown up.

One of the Wallace points was that neither the United States nor the Soviet Union "should interfere in the internal affairs of other nations."

What possible good would come of a new discussion of that, across the table from a Soviet representative, when, several times, at the United Nations, that very thing has been up for discussion and quashed, every time, by the Soviet Union. The latest example of it was this past week. The United Nations had a proposal before it to hear charges that the Soviet Union had threatened the use of military force, to back up the Communist coup in Czechoslovakia. Mr. Gromyko, promptly and unabashedly, hit this proposal over the head with a double veto—numbers 24 and 25—and completely stopped the conference on one of the main points on which Mr. Wallace thought we ought to sit down and confer with the Russians. That shows the wide gulf between talk and action. That shows, rather conclusively, how much good it would do to have "just one more conference." There are plenty of regular, established forums for the discussion of these very things, if the Russians really want to talk—or, rather, really want to do more than talk, but agree on active steps toward peace.

And speaking of the use of the veto by the Soviet Union. That is not the only way it has sabotaged the will of the overwhelming majority of nations. It has boycotted the "Little Assembly" by staying away from its sessions or by Mr. Gromyko and party "taking a walk." It has boycotted the United Nations Temporary Commission for

Korea, also the special Balkan Commission and the proposed discussions about modifying the veto power, itself.

As a result of Soviet blocking, UN has reached an impasse, on the most important armament, or rather, disarmament problem before the world today—the control of atomic energy. Never before in the history of nations has a country which possessed a weapon so decisive in warfare, offered to share it with other nations or to outlaw it. We have offered to do this, insisting only that if we turned our secret and even our stock pile of bombs over to an international authority, on which Russia would be represented and from which Russia would draw the benefit, the international body would have the right of inspection so that some nation could not secretly be making the bombs, unbeknownst to other countries.

The Russians, on the other hand, insisted on the outlawing of the bomb and the destruction of stock piles before any control system be established. Gromyko said that there could be no international inspection. Nations should be only on their honor to live up to a control agreement. You can imagine how gladly we would take the word of Russia—atheistic Russia—on a thing of this sort. On a stack of Bibles, I suppose.

Fourteen out of seventeen nations on the Atomic Commission are agreed on the need for an international control plan, including inspection. But the Soviet Union, and her two satellities—Poland and the Ukraine—block the others and block all hope of outlawing the bomb in future wars. In other words "everybody's out of step but Jim." It has got so bad, after 2 years, that the Commission says that it sees no useful purpose in trying to continue the talks. But the Soviet Union and the Ukraine say they want to continue them.

If the talks were transferred to some other forum, do you think it would make any difference? Wouldn't they still maintain the same intransigent attitude? I wonder, too, if the roles were reversed and the Soviet Union had the bomb and we did not if they would offer, in the first place, to share it with us? And in the second place, would they offer to destroy their stock pile of bombs without any guaranties, whatever, that we or some other nation wouldn't try to make them on the sly? You can imagine Stalin or Molotoff making such a gesture!

Mr. Wallace said in his open letter that both the United States and the Soviet Union should join certain international bodies and commissions. One might gather from this that we, like the Soviet Union, had refused to join them. But look at the record. We have joined all of the following international organizations and the Soviet Union has refused to join them. They decline to cooperate in the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, and the organizations for civil aeronautics, for international labor, for trade and for international refugees. When they joined the Telecommunications Union, the Universal Postage Union, and the World Health Organization, their attitude was distinguished either by obstructionism or disinterest.

Most of the world's outstanding problems are taken up by these bodies which I have listed. If the Soviet Union had any serious interest in settling problems it would naturally find its opportunity in the regular organizations and along the regular channels already set up. When Russia either blocks action or won't even sit down in these organizations and try to negotiate, does it seem very likely that it would be any more willing to come to agreement in some other forum?

In the realm of peace treaties, the United States offered the Soviet Union a 25-year mutual guaranty pact against the Japanese and German aggression. Later, we made it on the basis of a 40-year guaranty. The Soviet Union has rejected our offer.

Here are some of the territorial concessions which the United States and Britain, principally, have made to the Soviet Union, at the various conferences. We agreed to cede the Kurile Islands and southern Sakhalin; we agreed to the Soviet annexation of the northern portion of East Prussia; to fixing the Curzon line as the western border of the Soviet Union, thereby giving them a sizable chunk of prewar Poland. We agreed to recognize paramount Soviet interest in Dairen, Port Arthur, and the Manchurian railways.

At these conferences, such as Yalta, we asked, in return, that the Soviet Union assist liberated countries to solve their problems by democratic means and to permit free elections in Poland, Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria. The Soviet part of the bargain has been most cynically breached.

About the only territorial concession which the Soviets made was that Britain should be regarded as having a special interest in Greece. You can judge for yourself whether this has been observed. As you will remember, the Soviet satellites, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Albania, began a course of conduct which permitted armed bands being raised, trained and outfitted on their territory to conduct guerrilla warfare against Greece, on their borders, and that warfare still goes on. I suppose we ought to confer about this, when all along, the Soviet Union denies responsibility for anything that her satellites do. She does this in spite of the fact that the Cominform, which takes in these very satellites, has announced as its No. 1 objective the defeat of the Marshall plan. And I don't suppose that anybody is so dumb as to think that the Cominform is not a specialized arm of the Comintern, and run strictly from Moscow, for the benefit of the foreign policy of the Seviet Union. But try and pin them down. Oh no, Yugoslavia, Albania, and Bulgaria are all sovereign independent nations—they say. But we poor, dumb Americans may be permitted to wonder why it is that the official heads of all of these countries today were members of the Comintern, all of them Communists, and all received their training in the Moscow school.

I say that the left hand does know what the right hand is doing and that, even in this small territorial concession about Greece, the Soviet Union has shown its utter faithlessness. If they want seriously to start peace talks they can start right there, by acting on their word, and giving some visible evidence that they mean what they say. Talk is very, very cheap and sometimes is used only to conceal thought and to delay action.

I am reminded of the words of the old preacher who said: "What you do talks so loud I can't hear what you say."

This is Jack Beall saying good night from Washington.

The Good Samaritan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of the House the following beautiful poem, written by James Patrick McGovern, of Washington, D. C., entitled "The Good Samaritan":

Christ was a Jew, yet many gentiles scorn
The race from which their own religion's born;
Charity in thought, alive with deed,
Their Saviour taught to be the soul's prime seed;
Still charity seems more of hand than heart,
A gesture rather than of them a part,
While Jews once more are homeless on the earth—
No Palestine, no Promised Land, no hearth.

The Hebrews bravely fought for every land
Where freedom marched for footholds in the strand;
Now freedom won, where is their sacred sod
On which they may like others worship God?
Once more they wander, flying refugees,
Persecuted, across the seven seas;
And sometimes hearts turned bitter in dire stress
Rise to violent passions of lawlessness.

What tragedy of suffering compares
In years and poignancy to turn gray hairs,
With that which trial has graven on this race?
The gentiles' scorn has marked the Jewish face
With thought-worn brow, grave eyes, and mystic fire,
Brands of survival and the heart's desire.
And so the Jew by long tradition tried
By grace as well as strength is fortified.

Do gentiles in their proud majority
Fear to set this dwindled people free
That they may grow in all their scope and power?
Was not an Einstein born in happy hour?
Did not a Heine in his suffering
Voice lyrics which with deathless beauty sing?
Has a Baruch accumulated gold
Save that he might serve mankind, growing old?

The Jew is man, no ism mars his name;
Just human nature, as you and me the same;
Scion of Moses and of Solomon,
With good and evil of the father's son;
A small minority, which seared by time,
Scales the ridiculous to the sublime.
Should gentiles, then, ignore their fellow man,
Forget Christ and the good Samaritan?

—*James Patrick McGovern.*

Are We Restoring Japan's Economic Supremacy in Asia While the Philippines and China Are Being Rehabilitated Haltingly?—A Filipino Economist Advocates an All-Asia American Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, much of our attention these days concerns Europe. We must not forget Asia and the Pacific, where over half of the world's population lives. Theodore Roosevelt said that our future as a Nation would be affected, not by Europe, but by Asia.

Under the grand direction of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, pursuant to a plan, the rehabilitation of Japan is being worked out efficiently. But voices are being heard that Japan might be rebuilt and rehabilitated while those countries like the Philippines and China that took

part in the war against her are having difficulties in their reconstruction.

An illuminating and timely discussion of this matter is made by Mr. Vicente Villamin, well-known Filipino lawyer and economist, in an article in the Manila Bulletin. I wish to make it a part of my remarks.

Mr. Villamin advocates an over-all American policy for Asia based on a correlated study of the whole situation so that Japan may not become relatively the strongest nation in Asia again. He says that she should be kept on the same general economic level of the countries surrounding here.

Mr. Speaker, press dispatches from China are to the effect that the Chinese are protesting against the greater attention paid by us to the recovery of Japan. Our Ambassador in China, according to those dispatches, has taken notice of the situation. The subject matter of Mr. Villamin's article is the same, but he is calm and constructive in his handling of the question.

Mr. Villamin's article follows:

OVER-ALL ECONOMIC PLAN FOR ASIA

(By Vicente Villamin)

Japan in defeat is being rehabilitated more methodically, speedily, and solidly than either the Philippines or China in victory. This means recapturing for Japan her prewar position of economic primacy in the Orient, which gave the Japanese a sense of supremacy over her neighbors and the assumed role of regional leader before the world.

Before the war, the 75,000,000 Japanese were able to overimpress and overawe the 1,000,000,000 around them with their superior economic apparatus and the efficient organizations which they supported. Japan was formidable, ambitious, and aggressive. That gave birth to her militarists, imperialists, and supernationalists who were intoxicated with the idea of conquest by force of arms.

The war, which Japan precipitated and lost, should logically have the result of bringing her down to the same general economic level of the other countries in the Orient, particularly those that took part in whipping her in war, so that she could never again be the terror that she was. But, instead of that, if America's plans for her economic and organizational recovery are carried out, her relative position of supremacy in the Orient will be restored with all its dangerous potentialities. Does America with all her good intentions realize that?

Under the direction of the American Government, the different phases of Japan's rehabilitation have been investigated by several American technical groups which made an almost identical recommendation. These recommendations with their implementations would give Japan a solid, stable reconstructed economy that could comfortably support a standard of living higher than that which could be expected in the neighboring countries. The Japanese nation in the next 20 years will number more than 100,000,000 strong.

Among those that made studies and recommendations on Japan are the Pauley committee, the General MacArthur organization, the National Engineers Council, the State Department, the Far Eastern Commission, the Overseas Consultants, Inc., and the Johnston committee.

The technical investigations considered Japan as a unit separate and distinct from the area of which she is a part. The only connection, weighed between Japan and her neighbors was that Japan would import raw materials from them and sell the manufactured goods to them. Her neighbors would do the primary producing and she would do the processing and marketing and, incidentally, receive the lion's share of the benefits and profits. Japan would be the apex of the economic set-up in the Orient. The vanquished would be the economic lord of the victorious.

The study of Japan's recovery should have been made in the light of and in relation with the recovery of the surrounding areas. This is the time, the only time, when Japan is under control and beginning a new life, to bring about a reasonable equalization and a rational equilibration of economic conditions, standards and opportunities in the Orient. That would not be penalizing or retarding progress, but merely bringing progress to all by decentralization.

To give more symmetry to its plans, it would seem wise for the American Government to invite high-minded and long-sighted orientals to give their ideas upon that country's rehabilitation. These men must, on the one hand, have a practical conception of the reconstruction of their respective countries and, on the other, have the common sense to accept without cavil the fundamental fact that Japan is a permanent neighbor with whom the rest of the Orient will have to deal on the basis of equality.

From these oriental leaders—they should be private citizens who would act and speak forthrightly—would come intimations that would be enlightening. One of them is whether they would propose a reasonable plan or an unreasonable one, which would sooner or later lead to a struggle in which America would inevitably be involved. It would be well for America to know that now.

An American over-all blueprint for the Orient is most desirable. The relocation of the new Japan in the oriental lay-out is especially vital. Is she going to be the industrial leader again? America is aiding the countries of the Orient separately and without regard to each other's relationships. She considers that each has its own peculiar problems. That is true as to their internal affairs. But they have relations and problems with each other which America at this precise time could help place on a sound basis, so collisions, conflicts and rivalries could be avoided.

Today Japan spends nothing for national defense and thus is enabled to devote all her resources to social betterment. But China uses four-fifths of her government budget to stop her civil war and the Philippines one-third of her budget for military preparedness and for the reestablishment of law and order. Under America's tutelage and protection as a vanquished power, Japan is extremely lucky and many of them know it and have the good sense to take advantage of it, while other Oriental peoples, especially the victors, are worrying themselves to distraction.

Japan's spiritual rehabilitation is all but complete. In her defeat, through her enemy's essential decency and humanitarianism, she has been humbled but not humiliated. Her national spirit, in silence, is marching on. The Japanese, from the Emperor down, are happy and satisfied—and why not? Their great spiritual triumph will come when the countries that whipped their country in war fight each other with atomic bombs or when they defeat themselves through their inability to recover and rebuild from the ravages of the war that they inflicted upon them.

The Japanese are a smart and proud people and they know the limitations of their neighbors. They do not want to think that the Chinese, the Filipinos, and other orientals beat them, but to the Americans and to other occidentals to a lesser degree, they bow in humility, saying to themselves that it was their scientific apparatus and greater material weight and not their courage or spiritual superiority that reduced them. It would take at least a century of indoctrination under pressure and sanction to wipe out the Japanese genius for intrigue, duplicity, and cruelty. The veneer of democracy and Americanism covers Japan today like the morning dew that melts as it receives the life-giving warmth of the sun.

The provision in the Japanese constitution saying that the Japanese Government and people have no sovereign right to engage in war is a declaration written on water. It repeals the unrepealable law of life, the law of self-preservation. Japan will fight wars and call them crusades or some other euphonious designations. She will fight wars of self-defense, civil wars and other types of wars. It would be poor policy for other nations to build their security on the basis of the Japanese no-war provision, for sometime she will be free from control and supervision by the victorious powers.

America has the golden opportunity to bring about a situation in the Orient that would make for peace and plenty in and between the countries that compose it. To translate that opportunity to a reality she will have to have an integrated, over-all plan for the entire Orient as a unit.

Ninety Billion Dollars to Foreigners Since 1941 but No Real Increase in Benefits to Elderly American Citizens Under the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest blunders that could be charged against the Eightieth Congress would be that of adjournment without truly liberalizing benefits under the Social Security Act.

Ever since this Congress convened many of us have introduced amendments to benefit the millions of Americans who are in the twilight of life and dependent upon old-age assistance or other forms of social-security benefits.

Time and time again statements have been made on this floor and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has been full of impassioned pleas for action by the House leadership with respect to improving benefits under the Social Security Act. The present plight of elderly citizens is a national disgrace and has existed for the past several years. The bill passed by Congress last week enabling the individual States to increase old-age assistance $5 monthly is woefully inadequate in view of the high cost of living.

Despite the fact that the present administration, while in control of Congress, has failed to take action the past several years in obtaining an increase in social-security benefits, the Republican leadership should meet this problem in a realistic manner without further delay. It is true that the Republican Party gained control of Congress the past several months, yet if we fail to remedy the present situation we will be as guilty as the Democratic administration that neglected this problem when they had clear-cut majorities in both branches of Congress.

It is a known fact that social security is here to stay and that it is intended to

provide elderly citizens with a means of livelihood in their declining years. Yet we seem to forget, in viewing earned social-security benefits, that the formula used in computing them has never been changed since the law was first passed. Meanwhile, the cost of living has soared to the point where it has doubled itself. Since 1933 the cost of living index has increased from 89.7 to 169.3 percent. It is common knowledge that persons gainfully employed are having a difficult time in making both ends meet.

The Congress of the United States has ignored the elderly citizens of America, who, by their labor and taxes, built this great Nation. Yes, we have forgotten them in turning our attention to world problems. Hardly a day passes that we have not heard on this floor of the poor unfortunate people abroad. When you pick up your daily newspaper it is not uncommon to find full page advertisements directing your attention to the needs of millions of persons abroad. But there is not one word said in defense of millions of our own American citizens who are on starvation diets and restricted in many instances to one scanty meal a day.

Let us examine, for a moment, the amount of financial assistance we have given to the peoples of the world. According to the United States Department of Commerce, from March 11, 1941 to December 31, 1946, in the form of lend-lease aid alone, the American taxpayers contributed $50,243,996,159. In addition, we have contributed toward world recovery since May 1, 1945, the sum of $23,076,995,818, which has been allocated as follows:

Contributions to:	
United Nations	$29,289,349
UNRRA	2,700,000,000
World Bank	3,175,000,000
Lease-lend	2,163,000,000
Advances to foreign nations:	
Surplus property	1,148,000,000
Loans to Great Britain and the Philippines	4,390,000,000
War Departments grants	1,771,926,293
Export-Import Bank	2,931,209,176
Greek-Turkish loan	400,000,000
Liquidation of lease-lend	500,000
Relief, war-devastated areas	350,000,000
International Relief Organization	71,073,000
Military relief in occupied areas	600,000,000
Interim-aid bill, 1947	597,000,000
Total	23,076,995,818

With the recent passage of the European recovery program, we have obligated ourselves to expend $17,000,000,000 more as a starter in bailing out Europe from its financial mess. When you add together all of these sums for foreign aid, you have the almost unbelievable total of $90,000,000,000, which includes ERP, which is estimated to cost $17,000,000,000, but which may well exceed that sum.

In other words, since this Nation was founded in 1776 until 1933—a period of 157 years—we spent, in conducting the affairs of government, less than $90,000,000,000. Yet, in 7 years we have sent abroad over $90,000,000,000, which should not be such a bad record in the eyes of foreigners for a Nation that has been called repeatedly a "race of Shylocks."

Let us recognize the fact that all groups in America have received some recognition with respect to the increased cost of living. Virtually all employees in Government and industry have received wage increases. Yet, little attention has been given to the plight of our elderly citizens receiving old-age assistance and no attention has been given to those who earned retirement benefits under the Social Security Act.

For example, in the State of Pennsylvania in 1947 the minimum figures for bare existence of an individual amounted to $20 for food, $4 for clothing, shelter maintenance, $25, and incidentals, $4, or a total of $54.

The cost of living in Pennsylvania is typical of conditions in the United States. Yet in Pennsylvania in 1947 the average old-age assistance paid was $23.52 per month. At the same time, retired employees under social security received an average monthly benefit of $25 with $13 additional if married or a total of $38 monthly.

In 1946 old-age assistance payments in the United States on an over-all average amounted to $32.15 monthly for each recipient. This figure includes Federal and State aid, but it is only an average figure. In some States many recipients of old-age assistance received $10 to $15 a month and are told to live on such an allowance. According to statistics recently compiled, there were 3,140,819 old-age pensioners, dependent children, and the blind, who, in 1946, received an average payment each month of $12.75.

Yet, at the same time, Great Britain has been paying, by comparison, $33.00 monthly to each needy person. Our gifts to the British Socialist government in recent years have averaged $1,500,000,000 annually; and, in dispensing money under the European recovery program, Great Britain will receive approximately one-third of the money that American taxpayers are contributing to support the so-called Marshall plan. It is a ridiculous situation to realize that American taxpayers are doling out billions of dollars to foreign nations and permitting them to pay to the needy nearly three times the amount we expend for our own elderly citizens.

Even though we approved legislation to enable States to increase old-age assistance $5 monthly, is there anyone in the United States that when he reaches age 65 can be expected to live on $12.75 monthly, $25 monthly, or $38 if married? The answer is so apparent that it is an insult to question one's intelligence to even ask such a ridiculous question. Yet, that is exactly what we have been asking the elderly citizens to do the past several years.

Let me quote from some of the letters I have received from elderly citizens in my congressional district as to the tragic plight of the millions of patriotic Americans who in their declining years, are faced with anxiety and a close approach to starvation.

The excerpts from these letters of residents in Blair, Centre, and Clearfield counties are as follows:

FEBRUARY 18, 1948.

DEAR MR. VAN ZANDT: * * * I am living in an apartment house. On the floor below me live two people on old-age assistance. I know that they do not get enough money to buy sufficient food to eat, therefore they have not been able to buy clothes or shoes for 4 years.

If this money comes through the old-age assistance I am afraid they will not get all they are entitled to, as they seem to have had trouble getting the little they do receive; they have not been allowed even a dollar extra since the cost of living went so high.

JUNE 19, 1947.

DEAR SIR: In regard to the old-age pension bill, if you pass an old-age pension bill, for God's sake give it to us plus our homes. Don't make it like the one we have in Pennsylvania at present. It is rotten. It is not just and fair to give it to the bums and foreigners for nothing. I worked 40 years to get a home and raised nine children and had two in service to fight for our country and now if I want an old-age pension I have to sign my home over, which my children helped to get. They have already got $600 in my home—a judgment I mean—which is rotten. The bums get it free. * * *

Yours truly.

FEBRUARY 16, 1948.

DEAR SIR: * * * Hoping and praying we get increase. God knows we need more; us old folks are not able to live on what we receive now. Eating crackers without the soup is about all we can get. I do hope our Congressmen will do something about us old folks in the United States. Fuel, light, water, very little if any clothing, without household supplies.

Our Congressmen have never had to sign over their small homes to get a pension nor have we heard them working for the old folks. You know half of our pension goes for food.

MARCH 4, 1948.

DEAR SIR: * * * I am 80 years old and they allow me $26.69 per month and they won't allow you to work to amount to anything and at a person at 80 years old no one wants him to work for them because he is not able to do much work.

I see the Senate wanted $10 a day extra for expense money and the Government expects me to live on ninety cents per day. That is a small amount to keep up a home with at the price everything is today.

DEAR SIR: * * * One of my greatest desires is to have the old people of our own country taken care of properly. Not a measly loan that shortens their lives worrying because they have to sign away, or give to the Government everything they have striven a lifetime to obtain but an honest to goodness pension adequate to take care of them without want or worry.

We have several cases in our community receiving their so-called old-age assistance loan I'd say. It is heartbreaking to know how they worry about having to sign all their earthly possessions away, only to receive a few paltry dollars to exist on.

Surely a rich and glorious land like ours can do better for the old folks, who have made our country what it is, than that. Also, at an age when they still have some time left to enjoy it.

If they have worked and saved to have a home they should be rewarded for that not penalized. * * *

Respectfully.

JULY 12, 1947.

DEAR SIR: * * * We had to go back on the pension. We are only getting $20 a month and we can't live on it. We can only

afford one meal a day. If you know anything about us getting a little more, for there are some people that are getting more.

Yours truly.

APRIL 16, 1947.

DEAR JIMMIE: * * * I am now 70 years old and nothing to look forward to and there is thousands more just like me.

There are some of the high officials in Washington that are looking ahead for pensions for themselves and I understand that the highest paid official of Pennsylvania is also set for a nice fat pension for the rest of his life. Do you think this right when the older working people get nothing?

Very truly yours.

FEBRUARY 17, 1948.

DEAR JIMMY: Now I don't want you to throw this in the waste basket before you read it. I just want to tell you how the public assistance is treating me in your State.

I was taken sick last year. The hospitals were filled and had to be taken to another place; before I went away was getting $41 per month; when I got back they cut me down to $19.50 per month. They should be ashamed to offer anyone so little as that. Am not being treated right at all. * * *

You people in Congress are sending large sums to Europe to feed those people, when there are lots of peoples in your own country that are hungry. Keep some of these billions over here to feed us. This is the opinion of 70 percent of the people in your own district. There are people living within a mile and a half of * * * that are living the same as those of 60 years ago and there has been nothing done to better their condition. Just wanted to let you know how the public assistance is treating the old people.

JUNE 21, 1947.

DEAR FRIEND JIMMY: I am glad you are taking an active and personal interest in getting a national old-age pension. Must be mandatory on the States to pay every one who needs it and who is 65 or over. A lot of us have been unable to work at all for 10 years since social security started hence have spent all our savings and can't get Pennsylvania old-age pension because of our statute law and executive policies. * * *

I guess I should be a foreigner, European preferably, then I could get national assistance without any effort. I wrote to a public official in Pennsylvania three times about my case and I never even got a reply from him. But when his term expired one day and the next he applied for his pension and started drawing $470 per month. Then he wonders what is making Communists so fast.

Very sincerely.

FEBRUARY 10, 1948.

DEAR SIR: I hope that we will soon be given more money as this cold spell took our money for food and had to buy coal.

I only get $5.40 a week for food, light, water, and coal.

I will be 61 years on July 18 and I cannot get a job and am hardly able to work. * * *

Yours truly.

JANUARY 28, 1948.

DEAR SIR: * * * I am going to tell you who is the forgotten man, the man that never worked for a company that gave pensions when they got too old to work and also the man that never worked under Social Security Act. These men have no income at all except the old-age slavery pension, that is the new name we have for it. That is $39 a month, here we pay $7 a week for a room. What have they got left to live on. They are under the slave thumb. If you could hear some of the things them smart investigators asks the old people you would think it was a slavery pension. They are not allowed to make an extra dollar to help them out.

* * * I was talking to an old man the other day. He said he only ate two meals a day. It cost him $1.25 and he said he didn't get much to eat at that. How would you like that? Yes, Mr. Congressman, make laws to grease your own pockets.

Yours truly.

JULY 28, 1947.

DEAR MR. VAN ZANDT: * * * I am the mother of 11 children, reared 9, lost a son 28 and a daughter 24, just 7 months apart. The other 5 daughters and 2 sons all have families of their own and therefore cannot help us any. Mr. ——— always worked for Mr. ——— at the wholesale-produce house till he went out of business and they didn't pay any social security at that time. Mr. ——— will be 69 his next birthday and has a heart condition which there is no cure for. Dr. ———, here in ———, is his doctor and he says he will never be able to work again. So if there is anything you can do for us in the way of a pension I will thank you with all my heart.

Mr. ——— was a man that always worked and supported his family. This is the first time in our lives this ever happened. As you are one of our home-town boys, I thought you may be able to do something for us.

Yours truly.

JULY 21, 1947.

DEAR MR. VAN ZANDT: * * * I have lived on State assistance and our State pays a single man here in ——— County as low as $23. I receive $29.90 to pay for food, rent, light, and clothing. None of us should receive less than $45 to $50 per month. Pennsylvania pays a maximum of not over $45. But its minimum is where the trouble lays. Too much local discrimination in our county board set-ups. There should be a minimum all alike.

There should be a minimum all alike. To stop this local discrimination by such persons as county board investigators. They are indirectly handled by local small storekeepers and a lot of petty personality used. The minimum would stop this. Federal pension plan is the most practical way out of this question. I have referred to the State as well as to Federal plan to give you this matter as I find it. So that you may use your own judgment on the bill. We have States like Washington, Missouri, Colorado, and Arizona, all small States. They pay a minimum of $45 to $50 to all old agers. That should be the case in Pennsylvania. But it is not. I know plenty of old men here in this county who get as low as $23 to under $30. The only thing to stop it is a Federal law by Congress, giving some minimum payment along the lines I have indicated.

Sincerely yours.

Mr. Speaker, the excerpts I have just read are from honest, God-fearing American citizens, whom I know personally and whose homes I have visited when discussing economic conditions with them. These people are the victims of poverty and the roofs over their heads are mortgaged to the State because of the small pittance they receive in the form of old-age assistance.

We are speaking of adjourning here this month. How in the name of common sense can we adjourn this Congress without providing adequate relief to the senior citizens of America. I am wholeheartedly opposed to adjourning the Eightieth Congress until we discharge our obligations to these elderly citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I may be criticized and held up to ridicule for making this statement but I am determined to refrain from voting for any more appropriations designed to aid the peoples of foreign nations until we take care of our own American people. I refuse to be a hypocrite and shed tears over people in other lands while our own American people are victims of poverty at the hands of a Congress that has turned a deaf ear to their pleadings.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. COLE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by Jack Beall:

Good evening. As I watched the Communist-inspired and Communist-led march on Washington this past week, I couldn't help thinking what a wonderful propaganda against communism it would make if only the films of it could be exhibited throughout the world—especially in Moscow.

Here were a thousand or so people—professional proletarians, let's call them—able to leave their jobs, able to pay train and bus fare from fairly distant points, in some cases, converging on Washington in protest against the Mundt-Nixon bill. Some were dressed in the height of fashion. The women wore the new-look skirts and dresses. The men were mostly garbed in contrasting sports coats and slacks. They were well fed, prosperous-looking people, who from their appearance, would never be mistaken for down-trodden workers in any country of the world—especially Russia. If the Russian people could only see the films of those ground-down American proletarians demonstrating against the slave-driving capitalists, I think they would wonder what in the world those people had to complain of. Of course, the Soviet theaters are not likely to show such a film. They would be certain to realize it would backfire against them. I was talking recently to Ed Angly, former Associated Press, and later Chicago Sun correspondent in Russia for many years. He told me of a movie he went to in Moscow, which was put on, primarily, to show episodes of American police brutality toward strikers. The big violence scene was where some cops were carrying a kicking and protesting picket to the police wagon. As he kicked, the sun glinted on his shoes.

The point which the Soviet propagandists wished to bring home was lost after all. People around Ed were not exclaiming about the police brutality. He heard them whisper "What shoes—what fine shoes—on a worker."

It is somewhat ironic to think that, in the United States you can't look at a so-called proletarian, a Communist, or a fellow traveler, in revolt against the system and distinguish him, by the clothes he wears, from the people he has learned to call the bourgeoisie, or the middle class. That is getting pretty close to a classless society, itself, I would say.

But that's more or less by the way. What I really want to talk about tonight is another phase of the protest by Communist and their fellow travelers against the Mundt-Nixon bill. William Z. Foster, the head of the Communist Party in this country, appeared last week before the Senate Judiciary Committee and some very interesting things came out. Editor-in-chief Gates, of the Communist Daily Worker, also testified alongside Mr. Foster.

Several things are self-evident from their testimony. One is that they are no longer as bold as they used to be about stating their position on the subjects of religion, dictatorship of the proletariat, and revolution by force and violence. They have toned these things down in the 16 years since Mr. Foster published his book called Toward a Soviet America. Mr. Foster says he has changed his ideas somewhat, he is more mature now. The committee suggested that maybe the passage of the Smith Act, making it a crime to advocate overthrow of the Government by force and violence has had something to do with it.

Also, the American Communists now strive to make it appear that they are no longer connected with Moscow. Mr. Foster even told the committee that he couldn't remember when his party had communicated with the Russian party, by letter or by messenger. He said the Communist Party of the United States of America is an independent party, without any connections or strings whatever to any other Communist Party, anywhere in the world.

It makes its own program and the fact that the program is the same all over the world—the defense of the Soviet Union—is by a spontaneous process of thought, because all Marxist think alike. I would say that this was close to mental telepathy, if true. I wonder how they explain the notable zigzag of the party line all over the world, from being anti-Hitler to being pro-Hitler, at the time of the Stalin-Hitler pact. That could hardly be explained on the ground of Marxist thought, all over the world. That really stunned the true Marxists.

It takes a little more than spontaneous similarity of thought to explain how it is that if you read the Communist organ of France, for a certain date, you will find the same policies plugged, with even the same expressions used, as in the Communist organs of New York or Rome, for that same date.

It is quite evident why the spokesmen for the Communist Party, United States of America, seek to disown any connection with Moscow now, although the connection, at one time, was openly avowed and admitted. The reason now is that the Mundt-Nixon bill would proscribe and make criminal any attempt to set up a dictatorship, in this country, under the influence of a foreign power. But even after the supposed dissolution of the Comintern we find, from perusal of the Canadian spy cases, where Moscow kept in touch with every move being made and even controlled the assignments of Canadians to do certain jobs that they wanted done. It had a complete card index of everybody in the Canadian apparatus and communicated its orders through the embassy, or through special messengers who are constantly being used for the most secret work.

Back in 1939, Mr. Foster appeared before another committee of Congress. At that time, he made some rather damaging admissions about the loyalty or lack of loyalty which the comrades felt for the American flag. Mr. Foster told that committee then: "All capitalist flags are flags of the capitalist class and we owe no allegiance to them." He added that the flag which Communists do owe allegiance to is the red flag. Incidentally, the flag of Soviet Russia is a red flag, ornamented with the hammer and sickle.

But now, Mr. Foster, after having had this statement used against him for 9 years, has had a second thought. He now says that Communists are willing to salute the American flag as the flag of our country that has been carried through two revolutions.

But when the committee, last week, got around to the implications of Communist loyalty to our American flag, the going got rather tough.

The general question which the committee members asked over and over, pressing it home in many ways, was this one simple question: "In the event of war between this country and Soviet Russia, which country and which flag would the Communists defend?"

The general line taken by Mr. Foster and Mr. Gates was that any war which would be fought would be an imperialist war, begun by this country, and that Communists are against imperialist war.

"We would fight to terminate the war, at the earliest possible moment, with a democratic peace," said Mr. Foster.

Here is a little of the back and forth:

Question. Would you fight on America's side?

FOSTER. That is ridiculous. We are not going to fight at all. We are going to fight to bring it to an end.

Question. Would your heart be on America's side if you had to serve just to keep out of jail * * * in other words, would you willingly or unwillingly serve in the Army or Navy, under such circumstances?

FOSTER. I have stated that we are not going to fight against the Soviet Union. We are not going to fight any imperialist war.

Then came a welter of semantics and logical, illogic, and double talk about what would happen if the Soviet Union declared war on this country. The position taken by Mr. Foster and Mr. Gates was that this was a physical impossibility, which could not even be imagined as the basis of a hypothetical question. It is impossible for the Soviet Union to attack another country, one of them said, because no capitalists live in the Soviet Union and only capitalists make wars—Q. E. D.

Asked if Russia had not attack Finland, back in 1939, the witness flatly denied it. Asked about Poland, the other witness said that the Russians were just taking back land which belonged to Russia.

Mr. Foster denied that his party would recommend mutiny or revolution to the members of the armed services, in the event of war with Russia, but his previous answers, that the Communists would fight for termination of the war at the earliest possible moment, certainly has overtones of the established and historic policy of the Communist Party, as laid down by the Comintern hundreds of times. The maxim, the slogan which they have urged on all Communists, is that their duty, once within the armed services of capitalist countries, is to "turn the imperialist, or capitalist, war into a civil war." They are urged, in every way, to foment strikes by soldiers and sailors killing or supplanting officers, and open fraternization with the enemy, at the front. I have devoted one entire broadcast, previously, to a documentation of this and can now only state it as a fact, which I will undertake to stand by against all comers.

Mr. Gates was a bit more specific, as to the methods which we would use if he were drafted into a war against the Soviet Union. He said that, even if he were drafted, he would direct his efforts toward the American people, to put pressure on the government, to change that government to one which would bring about peace. All while he was in the Army, mind you.

Asked if he would betray the United States, he said certainly not, that he would betray the United States only if he participated in a war against the best interests of the American people.

I have observed that Communists everywhere use this same gambit. They are defending the interests of the American people, even if they oppose the government, in a war which that government may be involved for its very life. The Communist say they know what is for the best interest of the American people, even though the American people, themselves, do not know what that interest is. They propose to set their own judgment up as superior to the combined judgment of the American people, as defined by their elected representatives.

I don't think you will have much trouble in figuring out whether this is a loyal attitude, although it is covered over with a lot of double talk, which is calculated to fool the American people. It doesn't fool the rank-and-file Communist, because he recognizes what his leaders mean when they say "fight for the early termination of the imperialist, capitalist war." They already have their marching orders, way back, for just such a thing.

It is all part and parcel with the attitude the Communists take of setting themselves up as being above the law, when they are required to do something they don't want to do.

Take this very eloquent passage from the questioning of Mr. Foster. He said the Communists would refuse to register, under the terms of the Mundt-Nixon bill, even if the courts held it constitutional.

"Any law," he said, "which makes our Party register—that law we cannot abide by."

"And will not?" asked Senator DONNELL.

"And will not," answered Foster.

"No matter whether the Supreme Court orders it or not?"

"No matter who tells us, we are not going to register," says Foster flatly.

It has always been known that the Communists were not a democratic group. As a minority in many countries, they overrule the majority by force and fear. That happened in Finland, last week, when Finnish Communists refused to abide by a government decision. They called a general strike and sabotaged the government.

It has always been recognized among Communists that they go in for legal work and illegal work, but their pretense here has been that they are a legal party, that they are even a democratic party. Any anybody who believes in the principles of democracy, must believe in majority rule. But even, if, by majority rule, the Mundt bill is passed, and signed by the President, the Communists now say that they will openly disobey one of its main provisions and not only that—they go farther than any group I have ever heard of which claimed legality—they are determined to defy the Supreme Court. Even if the Supreme Court decides against them, they say, they are not going to register. They set themselves up, not only against the legislative and executive branches of the Government but against the judicial branch, as well. They are the ones to decide. Not Congress, not the President, not the courts. The Communist Party is the supreme law unto itself in this country. That is what they are claiming. That is the logic of the utterances of William Z. Foster, head of the Communist Party, United States of America.

It is good to have this testimony from such a source, out of their own mouths, that the Communist Party stands for illegality, for subversion of the law, as determined by Congress, the President and the courts. They won't fight against the Soviet Union because they set themselves up as a higher court, in determining what is to the interest of the American public. They won't register—period.

Their words change from time to time, because of tactics or pressures, but their meaning can only be that they stand against the laws and the constituted authorities of this country and will so stand in time of war, as in time of peace.

So, it is good to have it from William Z. Foster, himself, just what sort of outfit we are dealing with. It is an important warning to this country.

This is Jack Beall saying good night from Washington.

America and the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Stephen B. L. Penrose, Jr., is an expert of Middle East affairs. He is the president-elect of the American University at Beirut and International College, Beirut, Lebanon, and on May 26, 1948, addressed the General Federation of Women's Clubs in Portland, Oreg., on this subject. He has presented in his address several points of view which are important to Americans, as it involves our national security.

In view of the tense situation now existing in the Middle East and especially Palestine the address of Dr. Penrose is extremely pertinent. Under leave to extend my remarks I am including his address verbatim:

AMERICA AND THE MIDDLE EAST

As recently as the beginning of the last war, I wrote a chapter on the Middle East in a book which I am quite sure no one ever read. The book was entitled "The Asian Legacy and American Life." In my contribution to it I attempted to analyze the opinions which Americans had of the Middle East and I was able to say, with my tongue only half in my cheek, that the general impression most Americans had of the Middle East was that it was largely composed of sand and camels.

This was only 7 years ago. Developments during the war have markedly altered our views. The early concentration of military operations in Egypt, the establishment of a large American supply command in Iran, the air operations of the British and Americans from Egypt and Palestine, and the use of various Mediterranean bases by our Office of Strategic Services for behind-the-lines penetration into German occupied Greece and the Balkans have familiarized a great many Americans with the area far more than was previously the case.

Important inter-Allied conferences were held in Cairo and Tehran, serving to focus our interest on this part of the world. Recently the protracted struggle over Zionism in Palestine has brought that small country and the parts of the Arab world adjacent to it very much to the forefront of our attention. There are few subjects which have in recent months so consistently and for so long a period been a matter of front-page interest in the American press.

In spite of this markedly increased publicity, the American people are by no means as well-informed as they should be concerning the importance of the area to America itself. We have not yet come to understand that the Middle East is an important key to our own security both of the present time and in the foreseeable future. It is on this relationship between America and the Middle East that I wish to speak to you today.

There are four major reasons for the importance of the Middle East to the United States. First, it is a vast and populous area whose political orientation is still uncrystallized. The decision which it will make in this time of world dichotomy will be momentous to us for good or ill. Second, Americans have traditionally played an important, if unofficial, role in the development of the various countries at the eastern end of the Mediterranean. Third, the area possesses certain great natural resources which are essential to our civil economy, to the support of our established foreign policies, and to our military preparedness. Fourth, by its geographic location alone, the Middle East is of vital strategic importance in an air age. I would like to expand somewhat on each of these four points.

With the exception of Turkey and Iran, the area which we are considering is almost entirely Arab, and, including the two exceptions mentioned, it is preponderantly Moslem in its religious faith. The vital influences which caused the amazing development and spread of Islamic empires in the seventh and eighth centuries have lain dormant for the past several hundred years, just as for centuries prior to the awakening caused by the Arab expansion Europe itself had slumbered in its Dark Ages.

Since the First World War there has been marked evidence of a renaissance in the Arab world, and this new spirit is finding expression in the development of a number of new states, recently independent and struggling to establish themselves in the family of nations. Turkey got an early start under her remarkable leader, Ataturk, but to Turkey's surprising rebirth from decadence have now been added Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Iran, Transjordan, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia. In this latter country there is a ruler whose strength and vision are comparable to those of Ataturk, although to most Americans King Ibn-Saud is nothing more than an Oriental despot, an absolute monarch of nomadic tribesmen.

Most of these countries have only recently broken away from foreign control or from shackling social and governmental conditions. They are striving with much the same enthusiasm and under at least as great handicaps as characterized the efforts of our Thirteen Original States to establish themselves as free and independent nations. Their efforts affect a territory nearly 2,000,000 square miles in area with a population of some 76,000,000 people.

This great area and its people are the spiritual nucleus of the entire Moslem world stretching from Pakistan on the east to Morocco on the west. What happens in it is of vital importance to 300,000,000 Moslems, who feel together even if at the moment they do not always act together. It is potentially a mighty factor in the development of future world affairs.

By long tradition the Middle East is predisposed to be friendly to the United States. This is due in part to the fact that since the late nineteenth century a large number of Arabic speaking people have settled in the United States and have sent back to their friends and relatives in the Arab world glowing reports of the idealism, the wealth, and opportunity which America embodies. Furthermore, their reports have been consistent with what personal experience the Middle Easterners have had with Americans in their midst.

American missionary activities have been constant ever since the establishement of the first American Board mission in Turkey in 1820. These missionaries were for the most part remarkable people whose influence in cultural, scientific, and educational fields has only been matched by their humanitarian and religious works. You are probably not aware that the type now in use for printing the Arabic language was designed by an American missionary, Eli Smith, and is even today universally known as American Arabic.

Many of you will recall the Near East Relief Organization which sought after 1915 to bring aid and comfort to minorities in the Ottoman Empire, people whom we would now, with our penchant for alphabetical soup, call the DP's of World War I. Our record for humanity then was perhaps better than it has been recently, for Americans then contributed privately some $116,000,000 for the relief and resettlement of displaced Armenians and Greeks. The modern successor to the Near East Relief, the Near East Foundation, is still doing a remarkable work in improving and developing agriculture and social welfare in the villages of Syria, Lebanon, Greece, Iraq, and Cyprus.

The most permanent, far-reaching, and effective of the American influences in the Middle East have been those which had their source in the large group of colleges and universities which were founded and are operated by American initiative and vision. Springing originally from the characteristic missionary desire to raise the cultural level of the peoples with whom they worked there have now been for more than 80 years American educational institutions of high quality operating in the Middle East.

In the training which they have given to thousands of their graduates they have exerted a profound influence over the entire area, and at the same time have unwittingly cultivated in the minds of many more thousands an admiring and admirable conception of the ideals and energies of the American people.

Of the 12 or 15 excellent institutions of higher learning in the area, a group of eight American colleges and universities are united in the Near East College Association. They have made and are making an outstanding contribution to the educational development of the Middle East.

It is possible to make an interesting comparison between these institutions and the early colleges and universities in the American colonies which aided so markedly in forming the ideas of our founding fathers. The American colleges in the Middle East are inspired with traditions of education identical with those of our own early institutions, such as William and Mary, Harvard, Princeton, and Yale. Just as those colleges trained many of the leaders of our newborn Union, so the graduates of these institutions have provided, and we hope will continue to provide a significant part of the leadership upon which the new nations of the Middle East must rely for their guidance.

It is not without significance that 29 alumni of the Near East colleges represented their respective countries in the San Francisco Charter Conference. The present Chairman of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations is a graduate of the American University of Beirut. In addition to that task he is Minister of Lebanon to the United States and is professor of philosophy on leave from the university. Other graduates of this and other colleges also represent their countries with distinction abroad and a great many more assist in guiding their governments at home.

Robert College in Turkey has provided effective leadership in the field of engineering in Turkey and in the Near East. The work of the American University of Beirut has resulted in the founding of the nursing profession in the Middle East and has set standards for the professions of medicine, dentistry, and pharmacy throughout the entire area. But, in addition, these colleges and others like them have affected the habits of thought of their graduates, inspiring them with the same ideas and ideals which made this country great.

In large measure as a result of this American training, students in the Middle East have come in ever-increasing numbers to the United States for graduate work. During this year 1947–48 there have been 1,870 graduates from the various middle eastern countries studying in the universities here. It is fervently to be hoped that they will not return home disillusioned with what they have found during their study abroad.

I wish to emphasize that in spite of this background it is by no means impossible to undermine these long-established influences. Action by the American Government which is inconsistent with the ideals which these people have come to think of as being distinctively American can only too easily affect

their faith in us and turn the sweetness of friendship to the bitterness of enmity. I am sorry to say that during the past few years and particularly the past few months the American Government's attitude with regard to Zionism has done much to turn opinion against us.

Rightly or wrongly, our friends in the Middle East have come to believe that America stands for justice in international relations and brotherhood among peoples. Rightly or wrongly, our strong support of political zionism, our original pressure on behalf of the partition of Palestine, and our recent frantic haste to extend de facto recognition to Israel, have led them to believe that the principle of self-determination of peoples, the foundation of international justice, is just a phrase to which America pays lip service only.

They find it difficult to understand how by any other interpretation the United States can support the establishment in a limited area of the sovereignty and independence of a minority group with half the population which the Arabs have in the same area. They cannot see the connection between brotherhood and the divisive influence of an intensified and exclusive nationalism.

They recognize the fact that for reasons of local political expediency American politicians may deem it advisable to give their support to Zionism. However, they would say, and they have said it to me, "this is what we might expect from our own politicians but not from those of a country whose ideals have always been held up to us as exemplary and whose wise leadership in the world of today is the one hope upon which may be built the structure of a permanent peace."

Parenthetically, may I say, that such a view is typical of a great part of the world. We Americans must realize that whether we want it or not, we have a responsibility for world leadership such as has never before fallen upon any nation. Woe be unto us if we are measured and found wanting.

I have mentioned the fact that the Middle East possesses natural resources which are essential to us. This of course means oil, of which the proved reserves in Arabia, Iraq, and Iran are more than 40 percent of the total oil reserves of the entire world. The United States has but 31 percent of the world's reserves, and we have heretofore always considered America to be the richest source of oil on the globe.

It has become fashionable of late to criticize American interest in the Middle East as the result of "oil diplomacy," an opprobious and slippery term implying that the Government is controlled by oil companies and their bankers who are fearful for their investments in the Arabian oil installations and for their profits from Arabian oil. The true picture is rarely, if ever, presented, for it is far more alarming than titillating to the American reader.

Something far more serious is at stake than profits of private companies, to whom incidentally we can be sincerely grateful for their original development of the middle eastern oil fields and for the exemplary way in which they have carried out their relations with the Arab Governments. They typify an entirely new conception of the "economic exploiter," for they have done much to strengthen and confirm the excellent relations between Arabs and Americans which have existed in the past.

The plain facts on oil are that the United States is in 1948 consuming more oil than it produces, even without taking into consideration the new commitments for its use which we have undertaken. I am referring to the program of European recovery and to our plans for increased national defense.

It does not seem to be generally known that petroleum products are second only to food among the major items of material aid to be provided under the Marshall plan. The program envisages shipment of a quantity of oil in 1949 amounting to 1,000,000 barrels a day. Under the plan, 91 percent of this is to be provided from non-United States production, more than half of it from the Middle East. This oil aid is scheduled on an increasing scale with more than one and one-third million barrels of oil a day required by 1952. Of this latter amount, 97 percent is expected to come from non-United States production, and by that time it is scheduled to come chiefly from the Middle East.

Since America is already consuming more oil than it produces, it is apparent that such vast supplies cannot come from this country under present conditions. During the war, we were able to make available for military use an equivalent amount of oil but only by practicing strict rationing, strict control of nonessential industry, and by the conversion of many war industries to coal. At that time, too, we had a large reserve productive capacity which is no longer available because of our greatly increased consumption.

If Middle East oil were to be denied to us, we would either have to return to such a wartime program, if that were now possible, or else radically curtail and reschedule that part of the Marshall plan which is devoted to economic recovery. The former alternative, involving rationing, would in all probability be unacceptable to the American people in time of peace, yet the latter would perfectly fit the avowed Russian aim of preventing the successful carrying out of the Marshall plan.

To put it bluntly, if we can get sufficient supplies of oil from the Middle East we have a chance of making the European recovery program succeed. Without it we can almost certainly expect it to fail or to be greatly retarded in its effect. Since it is such a vital factor in the European recovery program, we may confidently expect that Russia will do everything in her power to see to it that we are denied access to Middle East oil.

You should be clearly aware that in order to accomplish such a purpose it is not necessary for Russia to strike at the oil fields themselves or even to stop the operations of American oil companies on the Persian Gulf. If Russia can insure the development of chaotic political conditions in the Middle East, she can retard our production and at the same time prevent the development of those facilities for distribution which are essential in order to get the oil to Europe. Without any question, this aim is behind Russian support of partition for Palestine, behind her efforts to prevent the successful accomplishment of a peaceful solution in Palestine through trusteeship or effective truce, behind her recognition of the Zionist state. Our own recognition, calculated in part to get the jump on the Russians, was actually like beating them to a punch on our own jaw.

Russia knows that with the Middle East in a turmoil it will be almost impossible and certainly unlikely that the oil companies can go ahead with the construction of the pipe line to the Mediterranean or the refineries on that coast, or that they can expand their production on the Persian Gulf to the point needed to produce the volume of oil necessary to support European economic recovery.

On the 6th of May the Petroleum Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee reported that in case of war the United States military services would require petroleum products at a rate of 3,000,000 barrels daily above any foreseeable United States production. Common sense would indicate that under such circumstances a rational program of preparedness should be started at once involving the conservation of Western Hemisphere oil resources together with an immediate stock piling of petroleum products as critical materials.

Such a program inevitably means much larger dependence immediately upon distant sources of petroleum in order to prevent the too rapid use of supplies nearer at hand. The only known area possessing sufficient potential productive capacity for these purposes is the Middle East. I need not emphasize again the value in this connection which Russia would attach to denying us access to Middle East oil. It is certainly an end to be sought by Russia of an importance equally as great as relates to undermining the Marshall plan.

Looking at the matter from a different point of view, the development of oil production in the Middle East can be of tremendous economic importance to all the countries of the area. Not only would Saudi Arabia benefit hugely from royalties on the oil, but the countries through which the pipe line would pass and in which facilities for storage and refining would be built would be the beneficiaries of large nongovernmental American expenditures and of newly developed industrial operations providing employment for large numbers of their citizens. Associated with such developments would be the benefits of technical training and the acquisition of skills and business experience which would inevitably accrue from such extensive operations as have been planned.

I have no hesitation in saying that the program of oil production and distribution, if carried out as planned, would do far more to raise the standards of living in the Middle East and to improve its economy than could ever be expected from the full implementation of Zionist plans for an exemplary, but inevitably, hated state. This latter effect is often advanced as one of the major reasons for supporting Zionism.

In sum, therefore, Americans have no reason at all to be ashamed of their natural and essential interest in the oil of the Middle East. Far more important than the question of profits is the fact that in acquiring resources essential to our civilian economy, to our European recovery program, and to our military preparedness, we would be largely benefiting all the countries of the area without, at the same time, limiting their sovereignty in any sense, or increasing the burden on the American taxpayer.

Unless we are willing to go so far as to say that any commercial enterprise seeking a profit is by that fact evil, and this of course is the Communist line, we will cease to pay serious attention to the unenlightened or carefully calculated bleats of propagandists concerning America's oil diplomacy.

I would like to point out very briefly the importance which attaches strategically to the geographic location of the Middle East. If you were in charge of the planning for an international air police force capable of controlling political disturbances in any part of the Eastern Hemisphere, where would you look for a major operating base? You would certainly wish to find an area well adapted for the construction of air fields, situated in a position from which within short flying time you would be able to reach all parts of the area to be controlled, and located in a territory which is governed by some power unlikely to be immediately and primarily involved in a clash of major political interests. I submit that the countries of the Middle East possess all these qualifications.

In short, the area which in ancient times was the essential land bridge between Asia and Europe, the only feasible land route for commerce between East and West is still, in an air age, of equal strategic importance. It would be folly to overlook this fact and to allow ourselves to come to the easy but unenlightened conclusion that since the Middle East has been undeveloped for some centuries it can play no important

part in the future organization and control of the world. To counteract such a view I suggest that you study a map of the Eastern Hemisphere and note the central position of Arabia or Iran, for example, relative to the various centers of national government in Europe and Asia.

It is obvious on the basis of what I have said that American policy with regard to the Middle East is of very great importance to our own security as well as to the support of our foreign policy in other areas. What can we do in rectifying the errors of some of our past performance to develop the type of relationship which will be of greatest benefit both to the United States and to the future peace of the world?

I believe that there are three major lines of endeavor upon which we need to embark. First, it is incumbent upon us to support and strengthen the institutions in the Middle East which are capable of spreading the influence of a true democracy throughout the area. This does not necessarily mean providing them exclusively with the funds necessary to carry on their work more successfully. Even more important is the strengthening of their hands by demonstrating that American policy is not inconsistent with the ideals which these institutions have long upheld. We must continually seek to develop our national policy in domestic and international affairs on the basis of fundamental principles rather than of temporary expediency.

The ideals of human justice, of enlightened humanitarianism, of real brotherhood, exemplified in our official as well as our unofficial and personal life, will receive not only admiration but duplication in practice by those who understand them and have confidence in them. At the present moment unfortunately our policy with regard to the Arab world has been based upon so many contradictory ideas and aims that no one can truly say what that policy is. Even though presumably and most unfortunately we have now stated it, almost everyone will have reason to doubt whether we meant what we said or said what we meant. Unlike Horton the elephant, we have given the world little reason for believing that the United States is "faithful 100 percent." We need to bear in mind that we will always be better known by our works rather than by our words.

In the second place, it is essential that we familiarize ourselves with the history and the political background of those nations with which we must deal, upon whom our policy will impinge. Only through the development of a proper respect for and understanding of peoples hitherto considered foreign can we expect to develop relations with them which are likely to be mutually satisfactory. In many cases this will mean discarding the old stereotypes which too frequently condition our ideas. It would be far better, for example, if we could think of Arab national leaders as graduates of American universities, trained as our sons are trained, than it would be to continue to think of them as colorful savages dressed in flowing robes, dashing wildly over the desert on camels or sleek horses, seeking to run off with some beautiful maiden in distress, real or feigned. Our foreign policy should not be formulated by Rudolph Valentino, or its effectiveness will be as defunct as its author.

Finally, may I say that if we are to deal properly with other nations wherever they may be located, we need to have a clear understanding of our own ideals and aims. How can we expect others to understand us if we do not understand ourselves?

One of the words which has achieved most common currency in recent international debates is the term "democracy." Everyone uses it, and yet obviously everyone has a different meaning for it. We are frequently puzzled, annoyed, and frustrated by the claim of the Soviet Union, for example, that it is more truly democratic than are we. Our frustration derives from the fact that we and they fail clearly to understand what each of us means by the term. We can only penetrate the difficulty if we realize that by democracy we mean the ideals which inspire it rather than simply the framework by which it operates. I cannot emphasize too strongly that a governmental structure is itself unimportant unless one takes into consideration the foundation of ideas and ideals which give it life.

Not unless we understand this essential fact and are able to make it clear by example as well as by precept to the peoples with whom we deal can we expect them to understand and to appreciate our aims. Not until we realize that democracy implies the equal value of all men as children of God, owning the rights and bearing the responsibilities derived from that heritage, can we reap the fruits of confidence in the United States among the peoples of other lands. On the practical application of such ideas this Nation was built, and only by their universal practice can permanent peace be assured. In the words of Norman Corwin in his famous broadcast, On a Note of Triumph, we must, ourselves, with work as well as prayer, "post proofs that brotherhood is not so wild a dream as they who profit by postponing it pretend."

Aid for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George S. Benson, president of Harding College:

LOOKING AHEAD

(By George S. Benson, president Harding College, Searcy, Ark.)

Already, party leaders are inclined to use the Federal-aid issue in the forthcoming political struggle. This issue ought to be above mere party politics. Federal aid simply means, if passed, the Federal Government will have a finger in the affairs of every public grade school and high school in the Nation. If we nationalize education, pretty soon we'll be nationalizing everything else.

ONLY THE BEGINNING

Some of the people supporting proposed Federal aid to education bill admit frankly that these represent only a beginning. Once the principle has been adopted, they say, increasing amounts could be expected. Those acquainted with the way Federal projects grow and grow and grow would naturally expect this to happen. Within a decade the Federal Government would be carrying the chief burden of public education.

Is this bad? Just to suggest the idea is to show the danger. Decisions of policy for public education would be made on the national level. After such nationalization of the public schools, it would be easy to obtain legislation requiring all students to attend public schools for national indoctrination purposes. This is exactly the type of thing we decry in Russia.

These were the methods that made millions of school children just like Hitler and Mussolini wanted them. To favor Federal aid is to argue for the exchange of our present public-school system, with locally controlled public schools operating alongside many private and church related schools, for a nationally financed and nationally controlled educational system. No two ways about it, Federal aid would mean undesirable Federal controls.

Controls do go along with financial assistance, and our Federal Government has no record to the contrary. In fact, the Supreme Court of the United States has already declared, in the case of farm subsidies, that the Federal Government may control that which it subsidizes. When one Federal-aid bill was debated in the Senate, amendments to control not only the aid but also that which it supplements, were offered and accepted.

When we recall powerful influences within our own generation to get political influence into nearly every American institution, it doesn't take much imagination to see Federal control of the American school system following any general Federal-aid program. We can all remember when, at election time, WPA workers were told, "Remember who your friends are when you vote."

Dependence upon Washington sets up a political system, super de luxe model. I would look upon the nationalization of American education, which could be expected to follow Federal-aid bills, as a decisive step in the development of a totalitarian state. Should America nationalize her education, it is my conviction that full nationalization of industry, distribution and agriculture would follow within a generation.

We must remember that the one Nation in the recent war which was able to arm itself against the Axis Powers was not a socialized state. The one nation that was able to lend arms to its allies was not a socialized state. The one country now being called upon to help all the rest of the world is not a socialized nation. The one nation now providing the greatest educational system the world has ever seen (more higher education for more young people than the rest of the world put together) is America.

I am not one of those who believe that in order to remain great we must discard suddenly the methods and principles by which we became great. Two years after England started nationalizing her industries she was forced to vote power to the Government to tell her citizens where to work and what to do. We want none of this. But, if we nationalize education through so-called Federal aid, we will get all of these ills and more.

AID OR WASTE

Suppose your doctor should say, after having drained off about 3 quarts of your blood: "Why, my poor man, you look anemic. I'm sorry for you. Out of my well-known generosity I am going to give you a half-pint of blood." You wouldn't consider his reasoning to make good sense. Yet, the backers of Federal aid to education, arguing that "poorer" States are not able to support adequate educational programs within their borders, fall back on that sort of thinking.

For the Federal Government to take from Arkansas $98,000,000 a year in income taxes and then offer back $6,000,000 in "aid" because of Arkansas' poverty, just doesn't make sense. If the Federal Government would eliminate its present wasteful spending and reduce income taxes by only 10 percent, that alone would be worth more to the "poorer" States than passing back to them this proposed "aid."

It must be remembered that Washington has no money to give anybody. The Federal Government can hand out only that which it collects. It can only tax the States to get money with which to "aid" the States. We should remember, moreover, that such aid will always be weighted with bureaucrats and political hangers-on, to be paid for by the same States that get the "aid." The local way is not only the responsible way, it is also the economical way.

The Federal Government has no record for the economical operation of anything. Should our public-school system become federally controlled, I would definitely expect it to become a very wasteful operation. (Most

of our Indians are educated in Federal schools. The cost per student is several times greater than in our regular public schools.) A federally operated school system would show the same waste and inefficiency that is typical of Federal operations in general.

We have a national debt so monstrous already that there is mounting concern whether we shall be able to meet present obligations and maintain economic stability. Therefore, I look upon Federal economy and efficiency as an issue of prime importance. The same thinking that begs for Federal aid to education can be allowed to wreck the Government by adding financial burden upon financial burden, when the Treasury has more debt than anything else.

As an Arkansas citizen, I am fully aware of our own educational problems, in one of these "poorest" States. Yet, we have tripled our per capita income since 1939. Scores of new industries have been started in the State, and our agriculture is prosperous. We can support an adequate school system. What Arkansas needs most is a suitable reorganization of an outmoded system, not Federal aid as a crutch for all present weaknesses.

As a citizen, you surely know that the day will never come when the dreamers cannot dream up more plans calling for more money on social projects and on education than this Nation, or any other, can afford. Yet, in comparison, America is spending far more for education and is providing more higher education for more people than any socialized State has yet done. Contrary to all the scare talk, there is no crisis in education that requires Federal action.

What America actually needs today is deep moral purpose in her education, rather than a more extravagant system. Our educational advantages have increased greatly in the last 40 years, but the juvenile crime rate has increased just as fast. There are those who would make Federal aid the answer to juvenile delinquency, a problem which goes back largely to home and parents. Yet, the moral purpose that America needs so much suffers a real set-back every time we hand individual freedom to Federal bureaucrats.

WAY TO SOCIALISM

When President Charles Seymour, of Yale University, declared recently that his university wants no part of Federal grants for educational purposes, it seemed to me high time that educators in general should wake up to the dangers inherent in Federal aid to education. The public, too, seems entirely too complacent regarding this let-Washington-do-it attitude, an attitude far too many educators have been fooled into accepting.

It was President Seymour's idea that direct Federal grants to his institution would imperil the independence of the university. Indeed, sooner or later they would. Public school educators could tear a leaf out of President Seymour's notebook. If Federal aid would bring interference and control at Yale, so also would Federal grants to public education bring control by Washington over local educational functions.

As far as I know, nobody has ever argued that control over the finances of an undertaking fails to bring with it full control of that project. Surely where the pocketbook is, there goes the authority. None of those arguing for Federal aid will admit they would welcome Federal control of education. Everybody wants to avoid Federal control (except the Communists).

Yet, it amazes me that folks would accept measures that lead to control, as surely as dawn precedes day. We work hard and spend tax money to promote decentralization, local responsibility, and local self-government in Germany. We still believe that Hitler and his Nazis built a dictatorship by concentrating political and economic power into hands that no one dared oppose.

Why, then, should America ever take a step in the same direction? Federal aid to public education is socialized education. All the dangers attendant to the centralized government would be magnified under any plan that would permit Federal control of the education of children. Must America go in the same direction that Czechoslovakia has gone? Freedom of the local community in educational affairs must be maintained.

No sane educator or good citizen would argue against more and better education. Everybody agrees on the necessity for improving our schools constantly. Not only the children but the Nation as a whole suffers when we neglect to provide funds for school buildings and equipment. Our public school teachers need better pay and better training. Although we have already made the best record of any nation in the realm of education, we can do still better.

The answer to this problem is: educate the adults. Educate the grown folks to have the same appreciation for good education that they have for good highways, and you will find splendid schools in every place. State finances are greatly improved. Our States can, and will, spend more and more for education. Why run to a Federal Government already in debt hundreds of billions of dollars?

Federal aid to schools in this Nation is neither necessary nor desirable. Yet, Federal aid, which is a strong step toward socialization, has received strong support in educational circles. Every informed citizen should keep alert to the danger of Federal aid to education. Then tell your Congressman.

THE SAFE WAY

(NOTE.—The subject of Federal aid to education is not new to these columns. The comments below were written in 1944 and apply to events and measures of the past. However, the principles remain the same. Federal aid is still being pushed, and the same political uses are being made of the Federal-aid issue today.)

School teachers are influential people. They choose their calling as a rule because they love children, and love influences children. Youngsters, in turn, control their homes and parents more than they realize; in ways they don't know about. Thus a good teacher is a power in the community. Any politician could cut quite a splash if only he could line up all the teachers behind him.

The idea is not new. Starts are made in that direction often. Plans to halter the public schools of America in a bureaucratic treadmill have come before Congress four times since 1937. They have failed every time but each new attempt shows more strength. The most recent one, discussed in this column exactly a year ago, gained enough momentum to get talked about from Bangor to Burbank.

This latest sally on the public school system was led by Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, helping Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, of Utah. The bill (S. 367) as finally rejected by the Seventy-eighth Congress is dead but the Senators' ambitions can still wiggle. HILL is campaigning now for reelection on a platform of "Federal aid to education," and that's been a hobby of THOMAS' for a long time.

The issue will be revived. Political problems have a way of coming to life repeatedly until they are cured, and this one is not cured. Teachers have a right to earn as much in the classroom as they might get for manual labor in a factory and, until teachers' pay is adjusted, State school authorities will have their troubles born of somebody's mistakes; maybe their own.

Federal aid to education, if it comes, will be Federal control of schools eventually, whether the author of the bill wants it or not. Whoever signs the checks can compel obedience to orders, even from teachers. Obviously most public school systems need, not Federal support, but better State support. There are at least six good reasons. Three are plain and practical, the others basic.

(1) Federal control would cost taxpayers more for the same results than State control; an extra handling charge. (2) Federal control of schools would make one more huge bureau with an army of henchmen in a maze of pyramiding salaries. (3) Federal control will ride down traditions. How the South will fester at the first successful effort to seat white and colored children together at school. It might easily result in widespread violence.

The foregoing objections are practical ones. But it is wrong in principle to rob parents of their influence in public schools. (4) Concentrating school funds in the hands of far-away strangers is saying to all parents, "hands off school." (5) It is also fruitful of racketeering. (6) Worst yet, it violates the principle of State sovereignty which is the backbone of American freedom.

Any time tax "rich" Washington sets up a WPA for teachers, local school revenue will start drying up. Soon the United States Treasury will be footing all bills and that suggested $200,000,000 a year increase in pay for teachers will not be a drop in the bucket. In many States teachers need and deserve more pay. If they get it, the people will pay it and they'd better handle it locally. A local solution to the problem is possible anywhere. It is the only safe way.

Some Questions About Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, there are a few questions concerning Federal aid to education that should be answered. The chief questions are:

First. What good will it do your State?

Second. Can the budget stand it?

Third. Are all States doing their part?

Fourth. What about big surpluses in State treasuries?

Fifth. Are flat grants to all States desirable?

Sixth. What will it cost to administer Federal aid?

WHAT GOOD WILL IT DO YOUR STATE?

A recent study by the United States Chamber of Commerce showed the tie-up between education and economic levels. Where there are better schools, there also are better homes, greater retail sales, more automobiles, greater average incomes. It is obvious that raising living standards in a number of States—through better schools—will help every State. In America sales markets cross State boundaries into every village and city.

But consider a few other points:

Your State gets a substantial number of new residents every year. The 1940 census shows that in that year only four States obtained less than 10 percent of their population from other States. On the other hand, in California 57 percent of the residents were from outside the State; in Illinois, 22 percent, even before the World War II industrial boom, and in Missouri, 24 percent. The States whose schools stand to be improved most

by H. R. 2953, are generally the ones which provide large numbers of new residents to many other States and get few in return.

During World War II, 12 States contributed significantly greater percentages of their selective service registrants to the armed forces than other States. These States, with generally good school systems, were Massachusetts, Oregon, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, Nevada, New York, New Jersey, Washington, Pennsylvania, Utah, California, and Maine. During the war 12 States—all with poorer schools—contributed significantly smaller percentages of men. One commentator summed up:

"Wealthier States paid for educational deficiencies of poorer States with the blood of their young people."

While the country was drafting 1,050,000 fathers, it turned back 659,000 men for educational deficiencies. The need for men was even so great that the Army drafted over 300,000 men whom it had to train in special schools and units at a tremendous cost. Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey said: "I think we could say that had we been able to take 50 percent of the group at the bottom—rejections due to physical, mental, and educational deficiencies—the whole problem of taking fathers and even of taking scientists and medical students and a dozen other essential occupations would not have been an issue because we wouldn't have gotten as close to the bottom of the barrel."

The other day an admiral who favors universal military training said that he felt the country would not need it so badly if public schools were able to do a more thorough educational job.

CAN THE BUDGET STAND IT?

The Federal-aid measure represents three-fourths of 1 percent of the next national budget. When approved it would mean that the Federal Government would be contributing about 10 percent of the total spent by State, local, and National Governments for public schools; 90 percent of school support would still come from State and local sources. The amount involved—$300,000,000—compares with $265,000,000 appropriated in ERP for tobacco. (Incidentally, the American people spend as much for cosmetics each year as they do for education and two and one-half times as much for liquor.)

Can the budget stand this $300,000,000? A Gallup poll just completed shows that a majority of the people want an education measure passed by the Eightieth Congress. Only one in three voters believes that the cost of education should be financed entirely by the individual States.

Mrs. Eugene Meyer, of the Washington Post, put the problem of H. R. 2953 this way in a speech on May 13:

Federal aid to education is the only measure by which the Republican leadership in the House can demonstrate its interest in the public welfare.

ARE OTHER STATES DOING THEIR PART?

Some people say that the States getting the most benefits are not helping themselves. Facts refute that statement. A 1944–45 study showed that the national average of income payments going to public schools was 1.59 percent. Half of the Northern States were either at this level or better, but so also were nearly half of the Southern States.

The fact is that the income which supports schools varies greatly in different parts of the country. The Department of Commerce estimates for 1946 for per capita income were: Far Western States, $1,465; Northwest, $1,162; Central, $1,264; Southwest, $927; Southeast, $801; Mideast, $1,432; and New England, $1,320. Southeastern States would have to tax proportionately nearly twice as much per capita as far Western States to do an equal job.

Senator TAFT said:

Because of the way wealth is distributed in the United States, I think we have a responsibility to see if we cannot eliminate hardship, poverty, and inequality of opportunity to the best of our ability. I do not believe we are able to do it without a Federal-aid system.

What about big surpluses in State treasuries?

These, like the news of Mark Twain's death, are greatly exaggerated. Eleven out of nineteen States which are below average in per-pupil expenditures for schools would still be below the national average even if every bit of their surpluses were spent on public education. Obviously, these States could not spend all of their surpluses for schools and forget about roads, public health, and other programs. As a matter of fact, in 6 out of the 11 States, the surpluses make up less than 10 percent of the amount required to lift the State concerned to the national average for school expenditures. Surpluses sound like the solution until they are examined.

ARE FLAT GRANTS TO ALL STATES DESIRABLE?

The principle of H. R. 2953 giving every one of the 48 States a flat grant of funds was ably defended in the Senate. Senator IVES said he knew of no State which cannot use the funds to good advantage. Senator TAFT said that even the wealthier States are not able to do all the things the people want because their power to tax is limited in comparison with the National Government. But Senator IVES summed up the philosophy when he said:

It is very unsound governmental policy to have a system of aid established whereby certain States would contribute to it and receive nothing, and other States would contribute little, or almost nothing, and receive everything that is contributed to the fund.

WHAT WILL IT COST TO ADMINISTER FEDERAL AID?

Cost will be small, smaller proportionately than with many other Federal-aid bills. No new office organization will be required; disbursements wil be handled through the United States Office of Education.

WHAT DOES H. R. 2953 PROVIDE?

Briefly, the act helps States and Territories to finance a minimum public school program. It calls for $200,000,000 for the first fiscal year, $250,000,000 for the second and, after this, $300,000,000 per year.

The act safeguards State control and prohibits Federal interference. No State authority is taken over by the National Government. Section 2 of H. R. 2953 prohibits any Federal instrumentality from interfering with personnel, administration, curriculum, and textbooks or equipment of State or local school systems.

The formula for apportioning funds is similar to the one in S. 472, approved by the Senate. Although some witnesses opposed the act, not one of more than 100 before the Senate criticized the formula. H. R. 2953 allots funds in direct proportion to needs of the State, as indicated by the number of children to be educated; in indirect proportion to the relative ability of the State to finance its schools; and in direct proportion to State effort to finance public schools.

ERP Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article appearing in the Washington Evening Star of Monday, June 7, 1948, by Constantine Brown, entitled "This Changing World":

THIS CHANGING WORLD—HOUSE SEEN JUSTIFIED IN CUTTING ERP TO PREVENT WASTE OF UNITED STATES FUNDS ABROAD

(By Constantine Brown)

America's security must be based not only on military strength and the proper support of the remaining democratic nations, but also on American economic stability.

It is this consideration which prompted Chairman TABER, of the House Appropriations Committee, to insist on a deep cut in funds for the European recovery program. The House vote approving the reduction in foreign aid indicates that the majority of the legislators are of the same mind.

The administration's pressure to restore the original $6,500,000,000 total has already begun in the Senate and is unlikely to make more than a passing impression on the Members of the upper House's Appropriations Committee.

According to a preliminary survey, the members of that committee probably will restore 50 percent of the money cut from the bill by the House. But it is expected that when the conferees of both Houses meet the Senate's total will be cut again, so that the ERP reduction finally will amount to about 75 percent of the amount cut out by the House.

CONTRADICTIONS ARE CITED

Mr. TABER's strongest point was that American officials, who are presenting recommendations for Europe's economic revival, were careless and acted like amateurs rather than political economists. For instance, they wanted Congress to appropriate a large sum to supply wheat for the 16 nations which are to benefit from ERP, although experts of the Agriculture Department had advised, after careful study of European conditions, that this year's crop in continental Europe would be the best and largest since 1935.

Some of these countries, like France, will have even an exportable surplus. Yet, the Economic Cooperation Administration insisted that we comply with European demands as they were estimated last fall, when nobody knew what the wheat yield would be

in those countries. A similar situation is believed to exist with respect to cattle, sheep, and hogs.

The House of Representatives is poorly impressed with the administrative abilities of our special ERP ambassador, W. Averell Harriman. They say that the former Secretary of Commerce still is imbued with what is described as the "wartime Harry Hopkins philosophy."

When Mr. Harriman was our lend-lease representative in Britain during the war and later as Ambassador to Moscow he had a good deal to do with supplying lend-lease goods to both those countries. He followed White House instructions to "Give them all they want, and don't bother about the cost."

OTHERS DEAL WITH SPAIN

Some doubt about the consistency and wisdom of our economic policy is raised by the fact that on May 15 Britain and France signed trade agreements with Spain, in which the latter country is to get $450,000,000 worth of heavy industrial machinery, and railroad and electrical equipment over a period of a year. This was done at the same time that we were refusing to have direct governmental economic relations with Spain.

Our special representative in Greece, Dwight Griswold, testified before a congressional committee that Greece has such a surplus of olive oil—which we are supposed to send from this country—that she doesn't know what to do with it.

Many Members of Congress believe that mere military preparedness and political alinements with foreign countries are not sufficient to provide for the security of the American people.

During and since the war we disposed of a large quantity of our national resources. Since VJ-day we have spent in the neighborhood of $18,000,000,000 in good Samaritan work. It is not the amount of money spent, however, which is harmful, but the fact that American substance in many cases has been wasted abroad.

Members of Congress are mindful of the fact that if we go on spending recklessly we may be confronted with a domestic crisis of the first magnitude. Such a crisis could be utilized as readily by the U. S. S. R. as a weapon against American security as could troubled political conditions in Europe.

Congress has approved the ERP and is determined to make good the pledges of the American Government. But it sees a strong need to strike some kind of balance, in our expenditures for world economic recovery, between what is actually needed and what is being asked for without much thought by our Government officials.

Need of Fisheries Research in Gulf of Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation today to provide necessary research work in behalf of the fisheries industry of the Gulf coast. This measure authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior, through the Fish and Wildlife Service, to take such steps as may be necessary under the provisions of an act of August 14, 1946, to assure the best possible utilization of these great resources. It would provide in this connection that two surplus vessels suitable for oceanographic and biological research and exploratory fishing be transferred to the Fish and Wildlife Service and that an appropriation of $500,000 be granted for the reconversion and operation of such vessels, with additional grants as may be necessary from time to time to permit the carrying out of this act.

Due to wartime activities and shortage of personnel, it was not possible to collect fisheries statistics in the Gulf area during the war, and therefore, after almost 12 years of continuous effort in this connection, a 5-year lapse was necessitated. The program was resumed for the year 1945, only to be discontinued when Congress reduced appropriations for the fiscal year now drawing to a close. It is vitally important that operations of this nature be resumed as quickly as possible. The Government and the industry cannot afford to be without this information.

NEEDS FOR FISHERIES RESEARCH IN THE GULF OF MEXICO—THESE NEEDS LISTED BELOW PARTICULARLY CONCERN LOUISIANA WATERS

SHRIMP

This may well be a critical period in the shrimp fishery. A large number of new fishing boats were added to the fleet during World War II and in the years since. The older boats have been repowered with new and better engines so that the effort being put into catching shrimp is greater than at any time in the past. But, despite these changes the shrimp catch for Louisiana has remained at about 100,000,000 pounds a year, which has been the approximate level of production for the last 8 or 9 years.

Records for the offshore fishery of the Morgan City-Berwick-Patterson area show a marked decline in production in recent years. In 1945 the vessel with the highest production for the year captured a total of 1,500 barrels of shrimp; in 1946 the top catch was about 800 barrels and, in 1947, 660 barrels. The average catch per landing, for this area, has declined from 13.2 pounds in 1945, and 15.8 pounds in 1946, to 9.8 pounds in 1947.

The present high prices make it possible for each vessel to catch less and still remain in operation. If, however, prices were to return to a more normal level, the industry might lose considerably on its investment.

It is not the belief of either the State or Federal biologists that the shrimp resources will be seriously depleted through overfishing. There is a greater danger to the species through unfavorable changes in its environment, especially in the brackish water marshes, bayous, and bays which serve as nursery grounds for the young shrimp.

The oil and sulfur industries and the States of Louisiana and Texas are spending considerable money to determine if any relationship exists between the rapid expansion of the oil industry into coastal waters and the heavy oyster mortalities which have recently occurred in these areas. These same waters are the shrimp nursery grounds and at present no investigation whatsoever is being made by either State or Federal biologists to determine if this industrialization is having an effect on shrimp and other valuable sport and commercial species, such as speckled trout, red fish, sheephead, and so forth, which occupy these waters at some time during their life history.

OYSTERS

At present, the Federal Government is doing no research on oysters in the Gulf. The States of Louisiana and Texas, however, are making such studies.

The Louisiana oyster industry has experienced in the past few years mass mortality of oysters which has seriously threatened the continued existence of that industry. The sudden death of oysters on extensive planted beds has brought financial ruin to many oyster growers and seriously reduced the shellfish production of the State. These losses, except in a few cases, have never been satisfactorily explained. Among the possible factors concerned with such mortalities are pollution, particularly from oil exploitation, which has developed rapidly in recent years in the tidal bottoms of the State, drainage from the extensive marshes of the area, and sudden changes in the salinity of the waters. Information as to causes of the severe oyster mortalities, followed by the development of remedial measures, is the most urgent problem in shellfisheries in Louisiana.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE TIDAL BOTTOMS OF LOUISIANA NOT USED AT PRESENT FOR THE CULTIVATION OF SHELLFISH

Few people realize the extent of undeveloped oyster bottoms in Louisiana. If properly utilized, these areas could boost shellfish production of the State manyfold. One need only to cover the low tidal areas west of the Mississippi River by air to appreciate the extent of these bodies of brackish water that may be effectively utilized in oyster production. Some progress has been made in developing these bottoms, but, by the application of proper oyster-cultural practices, production may be further increased. Stiffening of the bottom in many instances would allow the cultivation of many acres not now utilized. Development of the particular oyster-farming techniques needed in this area and demonstration of the benefits of oyster farming are urgently needed.

CONTROL OF CONCHS AND OTHER OYSTER ENEMIES

Depredations by oyster enemies have resulted in the loss of a very great number of oysters in Louisiana. The conch, Thias, is particularly damaging in certain areas. Some concept of the abundance of this oyster enemy can be obtained when, as has been seen on a particular oyster bed, each scraping of the oyster tong brings up 1 or 2 live oysters and from 20 to 30 conchs. It can be readily realized that the few live oysters on this bed would not be alive long. The oystermen have developed some methods of control of this and other enemies, but further studies of the biology of these animals are needed to more efficiently combat the loss in oyster production resulting from the activities of oyster enemies.

CRABS

Louisiana could potentially produce more crab meat than any other State. At present she ranks much below Maryland and Virginia in this respect, not because they have more crabs but be-

cause they are making more intensive use of this resource. Practically nothing is known of the biology of the crab in southern waters.

MENHADEN

No studies of a biological nature have been made of the menhaden; still there was a greater poundage of menhaden produced in the United States in 1946 and 1947 than any other species of fish. Only a small percentage of this came from the Gulf, although it is well known that menhaden are abundant in these waters. In view of the great demand for fish meal and oil, encouragement should be given the development of this industry, and there should be more information determined about the life history and habits of the fish. At present only one menhaden plant is operating in Louisiana, and this is at Cameron.

MISCELLANEOUS FISH

Very little is known of the life histories of such valuable sport and commercial fishes as speckled trout, redfish, croakers, sheephead, mullet, and tarpon. To intelligently regulate the taking of these species requires, among other things, a knowledge of where they spawn, where the young develop, size of fish at maturity, and rate of growth. Much of this needed information is not available at the present time.

Practically nothing is known of what fishery resources might be present in the open Gulf waters, at depths beyond the range of the shrimp vessels. In these offshore waters we know that there are spanish and king mackerel, sharks, snappers, and groupers, and perhaps other species which are not at present being fully utilized.

PRESENT FACILITIES OF THE FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE TO CARRY ON FISHERIES RESEARCH IN THE GULF

At the present time there are two fisheries biologists stationed at New Orleans. These are the only fishery biologists of the Fish and Wildlife Service south of Chesapeake Bay. Their allotment of funds for all activities in the present fiscal year (1948) was $3,000. They are quartered in an office building with no facilities such as boats and other equipment for conducting marine studies.

WHAT IS NEEDED IN ORDER FOR THE FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE TO PERFORM ITS NECESSARY FUNCTIONS IN SAFEGUARDING THESE FISHERY RESOURCES OF THE GULF?

There is immediate need for a shallow-draft vessel of perhaps 40 feet over-all length for use in surveying the effects of recent industrialization on the shrimp nursery grounds. This vessel could be used also for all coastal fisheries problems which might later be undertaken.

As soon as possible it would appear advisable to conduct additional surveys in offshore waters to determine the present abundance of shrimp in these areas and the possible locations of new fishing grounds. This work would require the use of a seagoing vessel of approximately 80-foot length which would serve as a floating laboratory. The staff of the present Fish and Wildlife Service of the Gulf investigation should be enlarged to at least three members, or better four, and provided with sufficient facilities so that they can begin work immediately on the many problems that are now in critical need of study in the Gulf and encourage the development of new branches of the industry when it is biologically and economically sound.

At the present time it seems that such facilities are being provided for work in other sections of the coast where the fishery resources are of no greater value.

The Gulf of Mexico offers the people of that area an inexhaustible means of wealth. No one knows how great the possibilities are. I am confident, however, that the income of our citizens can be increased many millions of dollars a year through a scientific and intelligent approach to the various problems confronting the fisheries industry. We must determine with accuracy just what these resources are and how best to utilize them. The legislation I propose will do this.

We in Louisiana should remember that the Gulf of Mexico is our best friend, upon which we can always depend. One of these days our oil reserves and some of our other natural resources may be exhausted. No matter what happens we will still have the riches of the Gulf. That does not mean we can leave everything to chance. The Gulf will reward us in proportion to the extent that we do our part. Let us give the same study and attention to this opportunity that we have devoted to the development of sugar and rice and cotton and oil and all the many other factors that have made our great State.

Just as this measure means so much to Louisiana, it offers untold possibilities to other Gulf sections. It is a matter of vast importance to the entire Gulf area. I cannot emphasize too strongly the necessity of this legislation, and it is my hope and belief that Congress will speedily grant its approval in order that this vital program can be initiated without further delay.

Observations of an American Businessman in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER R. JONES

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include a letter from a friend whose experience and business acumen qualify him to make certain important comments on the way in which our Government's relations with countries of Europe are being handled by ERP and the military government in Germany. I am sure that my colleagues in the Congress who are on committees which must deal with the economics of these relations will welcome Mr. Oles' comments and observations:

COPENHAGEN, DENMARK, *June 2, 1948.*

Hon. HOMER R. JONES,

Member of Congress From the State of Washington, House Office Building, Washington, D. C., U. S. A.

DEAR HOMER: It has been my recent numerous and rather extended visits to the western zones of Germany which prompts me to write this letter to you. I am inclined to the belief that our people in executive positions and on some of the committees of the Congress which have to do with our relations with Europe, the Western European Union, and our economic policies in Germany are a bit confused in their thinking, and I feel it important to send along the impressions of an objective observer, and of a businessman—for I am no longer in the Army actively, and am primarily concerned with business, some of which I am doing with the Bizonia agencies.

First, let me ask a favor. I would much like to have a copy of each of the reports connected with the ERP legislation which outline the economic situation and needs of the western European countries to receive Marshall plan aid, as applied to western Germany and to Denmark. I have had a brief privilege of looking over the one as to western Germany, but would like very much to have a chance to study it in detail. I imagine these documents, the formal name of which I do not know, should be readily available to you, and I will deeply appreciate your courtesy in sending me copies.

Second, and another favor, I should like a copy, if it is public property, of the document which has aroused so much Communist noise in Europe—the House Foreign Affairs Committee's "Who's Who" amongst Communist leaders in Europe.

Finally, I refer back to my first comment, European economics as affected by congressional action. That there is a muddled objective seems clear, if anything is clear in United States policy about Europe. First, we have the ERP program which seems to aim at making western Europe self-sustaining as soon as possible, by enabling it (primarily through raw materials and equipment) to return to a normal condition of internal trade and economic relationships. Then, we have current United States military government policy, aimed apparently at assuming Germany to be a permanent pauper living off the United States taxpayer, hence trying to make that inevitable burden as cheap as possible. This laudable aim military government tries to accomplish by spending as little in dollars as possible, and by recovering as many dollars from German current production as possible—in other words, doing by indirection that which we have long damned the Russians for doing, namely, taking reparations out of current German production. The two aims are contradictory, and cannot live together. I do wish that simple, arithmetically demonstrable fact could get across to those who make United States policy in Europe.

I think all will agree that, Germany being traditionally as big as she is, and as important in western European economy, she must be restored to solvency if Europe is to be so, and thus be taken off the necks of United States taxpayers. But German, hence European, solvency, depends upon restoration of normal trade relations and normal exchange of goods between Germany and her neighbors. That cannot be done so long as we attempt to operate Germany as a dollar area, and so long as we keep her currency a worthless lot of paper, for which no German workingman will work more than enough to secure his weekly rations for his earnings—savings, buying of additional wants, he will not attempt, for his pay envelope is filled with worthless paper. So why not establish a new and useful and defen-

sible currency in Germany, making it worth a fixed value (no great matter what that value is in dollars, so long as it is fixed and then maintained) and thus give German workmen an incentive to work. However much our socialistic idealists may prate, only something of value in return for one's labor will produce results. So long as we hold German currency to be worthless, not much can be expected in the way of productiveness of labor. What are we waiting for? Russian kindhearted support? It's about time we quit kidding ourselves and set out to make a German mark that has value.

And how can we expect German trade to become a self-supporting thing while we make Germany's neighbors pay dollars for German products, and then try to sell their wares to a British- or United States-operated German-buying agency for dollars? Both operations are as silly as trying to make Connecticut or Oklahoma operate on Congo francs or Portuguese escudos. Germans need Dutch vegetables and Scandinavian fish and eggs and bacon and butter, but to issue, as military government has done, a ukase that these shall be bought for dollars, from the lowest bidder, and as little as possible, is too fantastically insane even for intelligent discussion.

Traditionally, for generations, Germany has bought food from the rest of Europe and sold its technical and manufactured products in exchange. No question ever arose in this intra-European trade as to whether or not it was translatable into dollar values—dollars had nothing to do with it. It may well have been, at any given time, that Germany might have bought cheese cheaper (in dollars) in Wisconsin than she could buy in Denmark—but Wisconsin, unfortunately perhaps, had no use for German chemicals, coal, cameras, and binoculars. So Germany sold her products to those who could pay for them, in effect, with raw materials and foods. If ERP is to restore normalcy in Europe, it must be by aiding in the restoration of that kind of trade.

Right now, Joint Export-Import Agency in Frankfurt (called JEIA) buys slaughterhouse offal, used for German sausages, in Chicago because Chicago, with its huge capacity, its ability for prompt and dependable delivery, its production machine uninterrupted and unaffected by war, bombing, and economic dislocations, can beat the price at which JEIA can buy similar products in Europe. Frankly, I would ask, what the heck has that to do with the question? Chicago is not buying German cameras, etc., and will not, because we have plenty of our own, and we have a prohibitive tariff besides. And we don't want a lot of German products flooding our markets, anyway. But Europe wants them—and cannot have them because in its weakened and in any case less efficient and extensive production machine, it cannot compete for the moment in price and delivery terms, with Chicago. And so we take American dollars out of American taxpayers' pockets in Washington, D. C., and put it back in at Chicago, via Frankfurt, and up we run American shortages and inflation, and down we push Europe's opportunity to work out its salvation.

There are some logical and absolutely unavoidable steps to be taken if we are to put a stop to all this economic adolescence, and if we are to look forward to a time when we can take Germany, and Europe, off our collective taxpaying necks.

1. We will establish in Germany a stable currency, with a fixed value in world trade, and we will defend that value.

2. We will remove western Germany from the dollar area, at once, and permit Germany and her neighbors to return to trading in their natural currencies, thus enabling each to buy from the other their mutual needs, regardless of what may be the relationships of the values involved to American dollars.

3. And, as a corollary, we will terminate the current military government view that Germany is a permanent pauper, to be maintained as cheaply as possible in dollars, and from whom is to be wrung as much dollar return as possible, regardless of long-range effects on the economy of western Europe.

4. Finally, and again as a necessary corollary, we will adhere to the expressed and oft-repeated purpose of ERP, as distinct and opposed to the military government policy, of looking to the long-range up-building of Western Europe, by the restoration of normal intra-European trade relations.

Till the above policy is substituted for the current anti-ERP policy of military government in Germany, any ERP money spent in Germany is just as good as dumped off a dock.

And, Homer, let me ask another question, the answer to which, it seems to me, is urgently important. Just what is Congress doing to make sure that its laudable and thoroughly defensible aims, as outlined in the Recovery Act, are not defeated by the short-range policies of those still, sad to say, in control of economic policy in western Germany? You can't just lay an egg and leave it—you have to stick around and see it hatched * * *.

Yours sincerely,

FLOYD.

Bringing Prohibition Back Through the Back Door

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, in February of this year I made several speeches exposing the attempt to bring back prohibition to our Nation through the back door. I wish to place a summary of my speeches in the RECORD for future reference and reprint. These remarks were made by myself on January 29, 1948.

The recent arbitrary and discriminatory action of the Federal Government through Secretary of Agriculture Anderson in rationing grain to the distillers smacks strongly of police-state control methods. Worse than that, it shows absolute disregard for the integrity of Government itself.

When the distillers voluntarily agreed to shut down production of alcohol for a 60-day period, they were promised that "no effort will be made to extend the shut-down."

Then Secretary Anderson, using section 4b of the Taft antiinflation law, disregarded the Government's promise—dictatorially interpreted the law as being retroactive—and arbitrarily forced a discriminatory and unfair ration system on the distillers.

The stated purposes of the Government was to save wheat, but a statistical analysis of the distilling industry's wheat consumption makes this stated purpose ridiculous.

The actual purpose would appear to be a combination of politics and an effort to achieve some form of prohibition through subterfuge.

There is nothing new in the tactics adopted. Dictators have used them for years—first to make a promise and later to break it, at will—and second, to achieve police-state control over the desired objective.

It is rather depressing to see such a spectacle in our own Government.

Of course, most of you who read this probably won't bother to do anything about it. Dictators know this and that is how they achieve their power.

Encroachment on the rights of the people is usually subtle—but gradually expands until the population wakes up and finds out it can happen here and they are powerless to do anything about it.

Today it discriminates against the liquor industry. Tomorrow it may discriminate against the paper industry. And the next day perhaps against your industry.

TIME FOR COMMON SENSE

In the next few days the Congress will be asked to consider legislation to extend the shut-down of American distillers. Since this involves an industry which pays annually more than two and a half billion dollars in taxes, and employs directly and indirectly more than two million American workers, we think it might be useful for you and for the public to have some of the facts about the recent voluntary 60-day shut-down.

The Canadian distillers did not shut down.

The British distillers did not shut down.

No other country in the world closed its distilleries.

For the announced purpose of providing food for hungry people in Europe, the shut-down has been an absolute, costly, and utter failure.

The government of every country in the world, except our own, has adopted the principle that distilling takes nothing away from the food economy. This is proved by the fact that none of these governments have shut down their distilleries. Surely they are not purposely taking food out of the mouths of starving people.

England is running at capacity; Canada is running at capacity; 11 countries which have submitted their needs under the Marshall plan have asked for grain for distilling and brewing.

Even assuming that the shut-down saved a few million dollars' worth of corn, let's see what it cost:

It completely dislocated an industry which pays to the Federal and State governments more than $2,500,000,000 a year in taxes.

It threw thousands of American workers out of work.

It increased the price of the neutral grain spirits now in storage in the United States more than 150 percent.

It opened the door wide for foreign distillers and foreign workers to take over the business of American distillers and the jobs of American workers.

I admit that these are strong statements, but I will prove every one of them right up to the hilt.

There is one other fact that ought to be clarified. The public was told that the stocks of whisky in the United States were adequate—that we have over 550,000,000 gallons of whisky. What we

have, actually, is about 65,000,000 gallons of whisky in this country which is 4 years old or older. This is about 1 year's supply. The rest is green whisky not yet fit to drink. Government figures show what is put away—not what is there after evaporation and outage.

This is less aged whisky per capita than in any distilling country on the whole face of the globe.

No other American industry was asked to make any comparable sacrifice.

No other country asked its distillers to make any sacrifice.

I think it is time for a little common sense.

I think this whole question of the shut-down of distillers and the allocation of grain for restriction of production should be investigated by the Congress of the United States. Not in an hour, not in a day, but in a full-dress hearing with opportunity for all to be heard. Not just distillers, but the communities that are being ruined, the workers who are being thrown out of work, and the farmers who have an interest in the feeding of their stock and the disposition of their products.

I believe that the public interest would be best served by full disclosure of all the facts in the full light of day.

Today we will be asked to vote to give the Secretary of Agriculture another blank check to restrict the use of grain by the United States distilleries in the following 25 States: California, Colorado, Connecticut, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, New Hampshire, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

The industry was shut down completely for 60 days—October 25 to December 25. It is being restricted throughout January.

We are being asked to rush through an act to restrict it through February.

In November and December, when the United States distilleries were shut down, 1,109,000 bushels of United States corn were shipped into Canada. Since the Canadian tariff has just been reduced, we will probable get most of this back in the form of Canadian whisky.

In 1946 Canada imported practically no United States rye—8,591 bushels.

But in 1947 Canada's imports of United States rye were 1,433,356 bushels.

They imported 710,000 bushels of this, or almost exactly one-half, in the single month of November, when United States distilleries were shut down to save grain.

After the Canadian distillers had imported enough United States grain to run at capacity—and they are still running at capacity—rye was embargoed.

But they can still use all of the United States corn that they care to use, while United States distillers are restricted.

Canada has suddenly become an enormous producer of corn pone and rye bread, or could it be corn and rye whisky?

If we want to know where the United States grain went that was alleged to have been saved by restriction on United States industry, read the following:

Exports of United States corn to Canada

	1946	1947
	Bushels	*Bushels*
August	255,338	816,687
September	63,418	542,046
October	23,095	592,476
November	261,745	573,658
December	379,246	730,611
Total year	2,378,858	8,085,768

Exports of United States rye to Canada

	1946	1947
	Bushels	*Bushels*
August	666	1,977
September	0	194,259
October	0	744,096
November	0	436,815
December	0	Embargo
Total year	666	1,433,356

The "Trails" Must Not Be Forgotten

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I urge this Congress to take immediate action to amend the Railroad Retirement Act so as to increase the benefits of the railroad workers.

Many bills have been introduced to take care of this but not one of them has been brought to the floor of the House for consideration and debate. I know hundreds of "rails" and their families in my district and I know what they are up against. I know how difficult they are finding it to maintain their homes and to live on the present small pensions which they receive. Many of the old timers who have retired find their pensions will not go very far and despite their age and years of loyal service, they have to seek other employment to make both ends meet. The cost of living has gone up more than 60 percent since the beginning of the war and the present retirement rates are based on the cost of living before the war. The Congress should recognize the injustice that is being done to the railroader today and I urge that before we adjourn, we consider legislation to take care of these people who have been so loyal; who have worked so hard and who are entitled to this consideration. The time is short and the need for action is imperative if we are to do our part in seeing that justice is meted out to the "rails" before the Congress adjourns on June 19.

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over Station WNBF on May 29, 1948:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, Memorial Day will soon dawn and Old Glory will be flown, draped, and displayed by every American family.

I know you will be interested, then, in receiving a patriotic book about our flag.

This is a handy little volume, in colors, and contains history of the Stars and Stripes from early days on down to the present.

Every citizen ought to know something about his flag. You can find the story in this book I have and it's yours for the asking.

Write me if you want to learn more about the Star-Spangled Banner.

And I still have a few of those cook books which many housewives have already acknowledged to me as the best they've seen.

Up to the moment, no word has been received in my office of the progress made by the Army engineers with their interim report of flood control for Endicott, Vestal, Johnson City, and the Conklin area.

I am reminding General Wheeler, Engineer chief, of this in the following letter:

"DEAR GENERAL: Two months have elapsed since Broome County suffered one of the most devastating floods in history.

"You will recall your men were on the spot a few days thereafter and, at your order, made an interim report, which you promised would be made public soon.

"I urge you to release your report immediately because the people of my section are anxiously awaiting your aid and assistance in solving our No. 1 problem in the Triple Cities.

"Anticipating early and favorable reaction, I remain with best wishes.

"Most sincerely."

In connection with this timely matter, I understand Vestal had another flood. I sincerely hope it did no serious damage.

How many more times will Endicott and Vestal, Conklin, yes, and Windsor suffer. That's a $64 question, but I think I can answer it.

The blind opposition to the Hall flood-wall bill, probably louder from a few saboteurs back home than from anywhere else, will continue to block all suggestions I make to build dikes and walls for Endicott and Vestal.

They will continue to justify their asinine reaction to all local flood works as long as they can kid some people into believing that the seven proposed dams above Binghamton on the Chenango and Susequehanna Rivers will totally eliminate floods down our way.

Even the engineers said the dams wouldn't lower flood heights more than 1 foot per dam. That means Endicott and Vestal will have to take it on the chin until these obstructionists give up, and it looks as though they'd like to stall the program indefinitely.

Of course, they're dividing the home front and that renders assistance from Washington impossible. They want to rule or ruin. Naturally, neither Congress nor the engineers are going to help us if they see a divided camp.

The people themselves want local flood control. They don't give a hoot for dams a hundred miles up the river which may take 30 more years to build.

The folks in Vestal and Endicott don't want to be flooded out 30 times in the meantime, but they're going to be if these fellows continue to stand in the way.

Several weeks ago a few soldiers of fortune tried to make your Congressman the scrapegoat, as usual, and put him in the middle of the oleo-butter fight, a rather slippery situation.

They filled the newspapers with poison and told the farmers, whose solid support

I have always had, that I had sold out to the oleo barons.

It was the worst smear yet to besmirch me during the nigh 10 years I've fought for our farmers in Congress and that's saying a lot. It was also the biggest lie they've ever told.

The only way I could counteract the tremendous newspaper circulation, blown up with huge headlines of this sordid story, was to reach every farmer in my district with my own side of the case, the truthful side.

Years ago, Congress set aside for its Members the privilege of the frank. When persecuted by public smears, and character assassination at the hands of ruthless, powerful individuals, filled with personal spite, Congressmen often had no defense.

They were not accorded the same space as their attackers. They could not fight back therefore below-the-belt jabs.

So they took upon themselves the privilege of the frank for sheer self-preservation.

Your own Congressman, being a poor man financially, has no newspaper of his own to fight off the smear boys. He has been compelled, on several occasions, to send you a history of the truth, telling his side of the story, through speeches and letters direct to you.

His story, sent to you by direct letter, cannot be twisted, distorted, or shot full of holes. He can, thereby, defend himself with his farmer friends, with the workers of the Triple Cities, who have always been in his corner, with the great rank and file of patriotic American voters, whom the poison-peddlers try so hard to upset every day in the year.

With these shields and shibboleths, a man can ward off the darts and thrusts of the sinister forces he is compelled to grapple with, and tell you friends listening in what George F. Johnson used to say, "We never know anything until we know the truth."

Behind the Navy-Air Force Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor, entitled "Behind the Navy-Air Force Controversy":

STATE OF THE NATION—BEHIND THE NAVY-AIR FORCE CONTROVERSY

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Two significant developments took place in Washington this week which bear upon but in no way dissolve the jealousy and strife between the United States Army Air Force and the United States Navy.

One development is the approval which the Senate Armed Services Committee voted to give the Navy to proceed with its planned 65,000-ton super aircraft carrier.

The other is the official disclosure that this project has not been approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff as a part of any integrated program of strategy or preparedness. This fact was made clear to the committee after a Navy spokesman unintentionally had made the mistake of informing Congress that the giant flush-deck carrier had been endorsed by the Joint Chiefs.

Now, no layman will casually argue that the development of a fleet of 65,000-ton or larger aircraft carriers is not desirable. It may be very desirable. But the project was unable to win the united approval of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the reason why the Joint Chiefs stand disagreed on this issue is the key to the disunity between the two services.

The reason is that the Air Force sees the development of the massive carriers as an action calculated to remove from it the primary role of air offensive, and the Navy sees the development of massive carriers as an action to retain its role as the Nation's first line of defense.

The Senate committee's approval of the big carrier and the disclosure of the division within the Joint Chiefs bring these facts more into the open:

1. The military leaders of the armed services, specifically the Joint Chiefs, are unable or, because of interservice rivalry, unwilling to agree on the over-all strategy of American defense on the basis of which it would be established deliberately by pooled strategic judgment, not accidentally by the congressional Appropriation Committees, whether the Navy is to be the prime instrument of air offensive or whether the Air Force is to be the prime instrument of air offensive.

2. Since the Joint Chiefs have been unable to agree on over-all strategy, they have been unable thus far to produce for congressional approval an integrated program of military preparedness. Each has been arguing before Congress for all it can hope to get, and high officials in each service are arguing to some extent against the other's program.

3. Under such a situation, interwoven as it is with service rivalry, it is not the military leaders who are determining military startegy; it is the Congressmen who control the purse strings who, because of the failure of unification to unify, are being called upon to determine military strategy by choosing between the competing appropriation requests of the Navy and the Air Force.

4. Finally, while the Joint Chiefs thus far have failed to discharge a unified responsibility under unification and while thus a vital military decision falls haplessly into the hands of congressional laymen, the decision itself isn't being made deliberately by anybody. Congress, which should not have to make the decision, is, in fact, itself evading it by giving both services part of what they want and by giving neither service really what it wants.

The issue is not whether there should or should not be a strong Navy air arm. Obviously there should be. The issue is whether the Nation should have—indeed, can afford—two offensive, striking air forces, the Army Air Force and the Navy air arm.

It is not the purpose of this column to assume lightly to judge whether the Navy or the Air Force should be built into the prime offensive force of the Nation's defense. But what needs to be seen is that if the United States doesn't look out, instead of making the mistake of trying to have two adequate air forces, it will end up by so dividing its funds and production that it won't have one adequate air force.

Cracked Voice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a timely editorial on the subject of the Voice of America which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of June 4, 1948:

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK—CRACKED VOICE

In its rightful indignation about the silly antics of the "Voice of America" foreign radio broadcasts, Congress is centering its fire on personalities. We suggest that is the wrong target.

The trouble with this "Voice" business is that it has no place in American policy. The proper corrective is to "reform it altogether," which Congress can do by cutting off the funds that support it.

Contrary claims notwithstanding the foreign broadcasts are an excursion into government propaganda. Propaganda is the weapon of dictators and it is such men as Hitler and Stalin with no regard for the truth who have developed and used the weapon. When this country copies them it is doing the foolish thing of trying to beat another at the game which he invented. Bad performance is inevitable.

Mr. Parker LaMoore, a Scripps-Howard writer, recently has returned from abroad where he had opportunity to hear the American broadcasts and judge their effect. He believes that very few foreigners listen to them. And after reading his description of the contents of the programs, one is forced to believe the neglect to listen is the best thing about them.

However, we can be sure that the leftist dominated radio stations over the world listen and we may be equally sure that they take full advantage of each slip which goes out over the air from Washington.

The most harmful aspect of this whole situation probably is not generally realized outside the ranks of those who gather and disseminate information.

American press services such as the United Press and the Associated Press have a very high reputation throughout the world for accuracy and for disinterested reporting. Go where you will and newspaper editors prefer the American news services to those of any other country. This is partly because of their energy and resourcefulness. But the greater factor is that they are known to be free of any official connection or domination; they are not subsidized as some of their counterparts in other countries, and their representatives are not suspected of being secret agents of some government.

It is questionable, we think, if this reputation of the private American agencies can be preserved if the United States Government itself is going into the business of news purveying. They might stay perfectly free of the governmental project, as they have to date. But will editors over the world continue to believe that? An editor's source of news must not only be right, but it must seem to be right; in small as well as large things it must be above suspicion.

We think that in the long run the high regard for news emanating from American sources is a much more powerful influence than propaganda. Not only is it more powerful but more befitting to the American character.

Way to Voters' Hearts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN ALBERT WHITAKER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. WHITAKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "Way to Voters' Hearts," which appeared in the June 3, 1948, edition of the Park City Daily News, Bowling Green, Ky., together with an article by Mr. Lowell

Mellett, under the heading, "When something constructive must be done, Congress takes longer," which appeared in the May 29 edition of the Evening Star, Washington, D. C.:

[From the Park City Daily News, Bowling Green, Ky., of June 3, 1948]

WAY TO VOTERS' HEARTS

The second session of the Eightieth Congress has encompassed five of the most crucial months in our peacetime history. It has made some crucial decisions, too, such as passage of the ERP bill. There are several other notable accomplishments to its credit.

Now Congress is scheduled to adjourn shortly, in time for the national political conventions. As usual, when adjournment time approaches, there is a big backlog of work piled up. But this time the backlog includes legislation which is vitally concerned with national and world history in the not distant future.

Action on some of these bills has been delayed because there are just so many hours in a day for Congressmen to work. But the delay on others results from partisan division and individual obstructionism. And these tactics have happened to affect some of the most important business before the two houses.

There is the draft bill. Its fate will determine whether the rebuilding of our defense is to be a program of positive action or simply a stepping-up of production in our airplane factories.

There is the Reciprocal Trade Act. On this must be shaped the whole pattern of European trade recovery so hopefully laid out in the Marshall plan.

There is also the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill. This promising answer to our chronic housing problem has been kicked around for 4 years now.

And there are such things as bills to admit displaced persons, to revise the United Nations, to control communism, and so on.

The draft bill delay is chiefly the responsibility of the House Rules Committee. Considering the urgency of the measure, the delay is inexcusable. The extension of the reciprocal trade program is being balked and temporized with by a group which seems to think that high tariffs will fit in nicely with the world dollar shortage which is holding European recovery to a paralyzingly slow pace.

The housing bill finds many Members shying away, even though its bipartisan sponsorship gives little cause for political jitters.

Further stalling on these and other matters can do the country tremendous harm. It does not seem likely that Congress can railroad them through before June 19, for its schedule also calls for the enactment of 10 large appropriation bills before the fiscal year ends.

It seems necessary, then, that Congress should recess rather than adjourn, and come back to work when the conventions are over. Such a decision would be popular with few on Capitol Hill. The House and a third of the Senate are to be chosen in November, and this is a Presidential year. Quite naturally the Members would like the whole summer for campaigning.

But we can't see how any congressional candidate now in office could build himself more prestige with his constituents than by sticking to his job until it is finished.

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 29, 1948]

ON THE OTHER HAND—WHEN SOMETHING CONSTRUCTIVE MUST BE DONE, CONGRESS TAKES LONGER

(By Lowell Mellett)

The President has outraged the finer sensibilities of Republican leaders in Congress. He has played politics.

First, the President sent up to Congress a message proposing the expansion of the social-security program to cover some millions of citizens who do not enjoy its benefits now. This is the third time the President has made this request which happens to be in line with the 1944 platform pledges of both parties.

Then the President asked Congress to stop delaying action on legislation to increase the present minimum wage and legislation to check the rapid collapse of the public-school system.

Just politics on the President's part, says House Leader CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana. Representative HALLECK didn't deny the necessity of doing something about social security, minimum wages, and education. He simply called attention to the fact that Congress is due to adjourn in a few weeks and wouldn't have time to enact the desired legislation. Therefore, the President knowing this, was playing politics when he asked Congress to act.

WHY IT WAS POLITICS

The inference, of course, is that the President was proposing something that would be popular. That's why it was politics. If you should suggest to Mr. HALLECK that it might be even better politics to enact those bills, you would know his answer in advance. There isn't time, he'd say.

How much time does it take to do something the Republican leaders really want to do? Very little time, indeed. They have a tight, smoothly functioning machine for that purpose and have just given it a public workout. Having decided to destroy the effectiveness of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act—the measure whereby the great damage done to world trade by the Smoot-Hawley Act is slowly being repaired—they were able to carry out their decision in practically no time. Without interfering with any other work of the House, the Ways and Means Committee met a few times in closed sessions, heard a few witnesses, drafted the bill, voted down its opponents among committee members, and took the matter up with the Rules Committee. The Rules Committee prepared a rule that limited debate to 3 hours and forbade any amendment from the floor. Thus gagged, the House passed the bill in one afternoon.

That's what the House can do, and how fast it can do it, when it sets out to do damage. When it undertakes to do something constructive, it takes a little more time.

EDUCATION BILL IS EXAMPLE

The education bill, for example, has been in the hands of the House leaders for more than a year. Very extensive hearings were held by the Committee on Education and Labor last summer. Since then the Senate has acted, passing the bill sponsored by Senator TAFT by a vote of 58 to 22 and doing it without a gag rule. But the House committee hasn't moved.

Nobody among the House leaders has offered any argument against the bill, aside from the suggestion that perhaps the country cannot afford to save the school system just now. Speaker MARTIN has expressed the opinion that the bill will pass overwhelmingly if it is brought to a vote. More people seem concerned about it than anything else before Congress, he said. But he is waiting, he explained, to see how expenditures for defense will affect the budget. Those expenditures for defense, incidentally, contain a certain amount of direct and indirect aid to education in Germany, Italy, Greece, and China. The Voice of America, for instance.

Time passes. The House leaders wait. They probably will until it is too late. And if the President tries to prod them, he's "playing politics."

The Postal Employees Must Not Be Forgotten

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as the time for adjournment draws close, I am again appealing to the House to give immediate consideration to S. 1949 which would provide for a permanent increase of $800 a year in the postal employees' salaries. It is imperative that this group receive this consideration in view of the fact that the cost of living is increasing all the time and the need for this measure is, therefore, all the more pressing.

I had hoped, and had testified to that extent, that the Dingell bill would be considered by the House but it seems the only possibility we have left is to get consideration of the Flanders measure. I urge that we take expeditious action to consider this measure before adjournment. I know many of the postal workers in my district and I know how loyal they are; how hard they work and what a difficult time they have to make both ends meet. It is hard for me to understand why legislation covering this proposed increase has not been brought to the floor of the House before this. The longer we delay the more difficult we make it for those who work in the postal service. Furthermore, if legislation like this is not passed, it means a great number of postal employees are going to leave the service of the Government and seek employment elsewhere. We all have been proud of the efficiency and courtesy which has marked the service of postal employees. It is only fitting in these times of high prices and devalued dollars, that we give to these workers the increase which they must have if they are to maintain a livelihood.

I urge therefore that the House give immediate consideration to S. 1949 so that we can put into effect all or part of the action already taken by the Senate. I have no doubt but that if this House will pass this measure the President will sign the bill. The need for action is now and I urge the House not to let the postal employees down.

World Peace and its Relationship to World Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert K. Ball, a prominent lawyer in my district and one with considerable business interests, recently addressed the Soroptomist Club of Atlantic City on the sub-

ject World Peace and Its Relationship to World Trade.

Mr. Bell is a well-qualified student on reciprocal trade, and his speech is a careful and well-considered statement, which I think will be of interest and benefit to the membership. It is particularly timely since the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act is now having the consideration of the Congress. The speech follows:

All through history wars have been mainly fought to gain control of trade. In the recent World War each move made by Japan into Manchuria and China was to improve their sphere of trade. It was the reason Italy moved into Abyssinia, and the controlling factor that made Germany try to control all of western Europe. Since it is generally understood that trade and war are closely related as a battle between the "haves" and the "have nots," it would appear that the first move toward peace would be to adopt a method of conducting world trade which is least likely to breed war.

The present foreign economic policy of the United States is based on the trade-agreement program and freer trade. The people responsible for the policy claim that free trade promotes peace and that tariffs and barriers breed war. However, if we judge from the action taken at the Geneva and Habana Conferences by the other nations of the world, the opposite is true. The South American countries, particularly at the Habana Conference, stated that they were determined to industrialize just as this country had done after the American Revolution, and whether the United States liked it or not, they were not going to subject their countries to a lower tariff until after their new industries had been stabilized.

Since there are so many conflicts and international tensions in the world today, our country must adopt policies which reconcile rather than inflame the differences which arise between nations. Our country today is one of the leading nations in world trade and with this position goes great responsibility. We know that isolation is both impossible and undesirable and that expanding world trade involves conflicting national interests. It is, therefore, best to develop a program for expanding world trade with a minimum risk to world peace.

Our foreign trade is based on a dynamic economy and should expand at a normal pace in keeping with the expansion of normal productivity and, therefore, contribute to the prosperity of all nations. Such a process is a natural growth and not something that is inspired by artificial means. Domestic and foreign economic policies should be determined in their interdependent relationship and not independently, the one from the other. We must never forget that our home market is the main basis for American industrial efficiency. Without a market of such size, our assembly line technique would not be nearly so efficient in terms of low unit costs. If our imports impair this productivity, our own prosperity is impaired.

Our policy in this country under the trade-agreement program has been to change the natural channels of trade. This policy should be modified, or changed, as it has developed into many misunderstandings in our present foreign relations. Changes in the natural channels of trade must grow through the actual conduct of natural trade and not through international agreements in anticipation of trade which is unnatural. We must seek to remove the threats, fears, and misgivings which have been caused by our policy and have prevented many of the nations from cooperating with us up to the present time.

Under the trade-agreements program, it is not only possible for a country that has a trade agreement with the United States to not have any trade with us but it is entirely possible for the country to stop the trade that is already in actual progress. That is exactly what has happened since the Geneva Conference, both in the case of Canada and Mexico, our nearest neighbors, with which countries mutual trade should be most natural. Canada found their trade with the United States to be so short in dollar credits that they placed a virtual embargo on much of our goods on the date that the Geneva agreement was announced. Mexico has raised duties on the commodities in the trade agreement and on many others in addition to the items in the agreement. Mexico has also withdrawn all of her concessions to the United States. Cuba, the host of the Habana Conference, has raised its tariffs on various items. France has devalued the franc, which has the effect of lowering the level of our rates in respect to their goods, and which is contrary to the theory of both the trade agreement and the ITO.

True, trade agreements usually overcome the barriers of trade and accomplish the purpose for which they are made. Trade agreements of the Geneva type act only as trade barriers; that is to say, if a country does not want to or cannot trade with the United States, it gives us what we might insist on in the form of a signed agreement, but it replaces the concession made in one barrier by adopting another. If there is a real need for goods, it is dangerous for any government to bar trade. If there is not a real need for the goods, it is practically impossible to trade under any conditions that do not create confusion and ill will.

The United States spent 7 months at Geneva and more than 4 months at Havana wrangling with the world over theory and policy, while other nations had negotiated true reciprocal trade treaties which produce trade. Great Britain has concluded agreements with Argentina in recent months specifying commodities in terms of trade. She has also concluded a treaty with Sweden; another with Russia and there have been scores of other treaties fostering the current trade of the world, while the United States has been fighting for theory.

It has been advocated that an international trade organization be established, in which nations, without jeopardizing sovereignty, may confer, study, advise, and cooperate on conditions for improving and fostering the flow of mutually profitable international trade. If such an organiaztion could be established on sound principles, applicable alike to all countries, it would be a strong incentive to eliminate economic strife. This organization could help establish treaties between nations to prevent unfair practices against foreign investors and traders, and eliminate barriers against mutually profitable trade, and also provide facts, figures, and information useful to fostering foreign trade. The treaties would be the result of work of the international trade organization. The United Nations affords the basic charter under which this work could be done, leading to the proposed treaties.

The Trade Agreements Act, which has been in effect since 1934, was enacted as one of several extraordinary powers transferred from Congress to the Executive in the depression emergency. The recent book, Memoirs of Cordell Hull, who was Secretary of State at that time, confirms that the moving was planned as a drive toward freer trade unhampered by Congress or the courts.

There is ample proof in recent and current history that freedom is curtailed as a balance of power if transferred from the legislative and judicial to the executive branch of the Government. If there is a complete transfer, a dictatorship has been created. In the United States, we still maintain freedom only so long as there is a balance of power among the three branches of Government, and the people have a voice through their elected representatives.

The transfer of power by the Trade Act of 1934 was intended to be temporary to cure the depression, but it was extended to prevent war, then to stop the war it did not prevent, and then to prevent the next war. The continuation of this emergency power is prolonging the sequence of emergencies, interfering with the conduct of foreign trade and curbing the freedom which is its stated goal.

Some advocates would have you believe that "part of every dollar you get comes from foreign trade." The truth is under today's program every dollar you get goes to pay for foreign trade. Over 60 percent of all goods coming into the United States are duty-free. The United States has the ability to produce more than half the manufactured goods needed by the world. The home market uses about 90 percent of our manufactured goods, exports represent the other 10 percent. We must be careful not to ruin the 90 percent to help the 10 percent. So long as the standard of living of other countries is so far below ours, our economy must be protected; otherwise, our standard will be lowered without helping the other nations.

World peace has been the hope of Christian people for many generations, and today appears to be as hard to obtain as at any time in the past. Mankind is visibly splitting into two worlds separated by a curtain of fear. The United States is acknowledged as the leader of the West and the free peoples, while Russia appears as the leader of the East under communism. Communism boiled down is nothing more than dictatorship with high-sounding ideals.

The west is anxious for unity, while the Soviet policy calls for division. Many plans have been suggested for world peace, including one which has many prominent sponsors in this country. It is a so-called World Government. This World Government, if formed, would mean that all nations would have to give up their sovereign rights, at least to the extent of protecting themselves from aggression insofar as their relationship with other nations is concerned. This World Government would police the world and compel all nations to behave themselves.

Another plan has been suggested—that of disarmament. It is advocated now, as it was advocated after the First World War. Disarmament works fine as long as all nations do as they agree, but when you have a Hitler or a Mussolini, who won't conform to the general plan, the whole program fails, and chaos is the result.

Marshal Smuts, of South Africa, has suggested a Western Commonwealth, including the United States. Many other suggestions have been made, but it appears that the United Nation, if properly constituted and organized, is the most logical and the most likely to succeed. The United Nations in due time should take in Germany, Italy, and Japan, and the countries that are now strong should give aid through the United Nations to the other countries that are weak. If the organization is kept alive and active it can come nearer bringing about world peace, in my opinion, than any other plan so far suggested. In the United Nations the small countries have a right to speak and to be heard.

It is unfortunate that the veto power of the Security Council was included in the United Nations' Charter. It is more unfortunate that Russia has used the veto power so frequently, but Russia is ever playing politics. It first sought to restrict world authority to the big powers and to demand discipline from the rest of the nations. Since the war it has now striven to restrict the number of nations participating. It first excluded China, then France, and it is now attempting to exclude Britain through its latest suggestion that the Soviet Union and United States meet to settle their differences in order to promote peace. The United States properly rejected the Soviet offer, and should continue to do so, until Russia is willing to submit the differences to be handled by the United Nations through the channels set up in that organization.

There is much confusion and frustration in Europe today because many Europeans are still haunted by the specter of the return of the United States to isolation and the withdrawal of its troops from Europe. This would expose the Europeans to Russian vengeance after we encouraged them to stand up in opposition to Russia. The United States cannot let these countries down. We must shoulder our responsibilities and adopt a strong foreign policy which can be depended upon by the small nations of the world.

If the United Nations is to succeed and bring about peace between the nations of the world, the United States must have patience. We must not be disheartened by controversies. The deeper the gulf between Russia and ourselves, the greater the need for United Nations, for it is one bridge that may span the gulf. The problems today of China, India, Palestine, Germany, and Japan are all so complicated and difficult that if they can be solved in several years, it will be a wonderful achievement. We cannot solve these problems over night and they will never be settled except with the help of all nations, large and small.

We must be prepared and vigilant. Our Congress has just granted large sums of money for additions to our armed forces, especially the Air Force. This, everyone seems to agree, is wise for if we are to maintain our position as a world leader, we must be strong from a military viewpoint. It has been said that vigilance is the only way freedom can be maintained.

A month or two ago Russia was carrying on a campaign that made war seem inevitable. Now Russia has asked for a peace conference and the public interest has subsided rapidly and war seems far away. We must not be lulled into a false sense of security as we were in the period prior to World War II.

We must be generous by giving money and goods to the other countries in the world that need our help to rehabilitate themselves. This aid should be given with adequate safeguards, first to see that the gifts are not wasted and secondly, the gifts should be made systematically over a period of time so that we ourselves do not become bankrupt or economically unsound. All of our aid and assistance, or as much as possible, should go through United Nations so that body will grow strong and win the respect of the world. In our trade relations we must be fair with other nations and fair with ourselves.

The strength of our Nation lies more in the fine character of our people than in any other one single thing. We must fight to preserve that character.

Lastly, we must remember that as desirable as world peace may be, there is nothing that can take the place of the freedom that our ancestors fought for in 1776. Let us work, hope, and pray that world peace will be achieved and that our country, so long known as the land of the free and the home of the brave, will continue as the leader in the fight for peace and freedom for all peoples.

Address by Hon. Paul V. McNutt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by Hon. Paul V. McNutt, at the annual dinner of the Nassau County (N. Y.) Democratic dinner, on Wednesday, May 26, 1948:

While it is a great pleasure to be in this company I have not come to talk of pleasant things.

Today all of us together face a great crisis. We face a crisis as members of the Democratic party, as Americans, and as a portion of mankind.

It has been a long crisis. For those of us who are now in middle age, virtually the whole of our adult lives has been spent amidst the disturbances, the threats and the dangers of crisis. There were a few years, say from 1924 to 1929, when it seemed as if the earthquake of 1914 was over, that the ground beneath our feet had ceased to tremble, and that in our western world at least the destruction was being repaired the wounds were healing, and men had resumed the works of peace. We now know that this was an illusion, that there was only a temporary lull, and that then there came upon us convulsions greater than any for which we were prepared.

Thus for more than 30 years, with only short intervals of comparative calm in which to catch our breath and compose our spirits, we have lived in the storm and stress of immense and incalculable events. Not every generation goes through an ordeal of this kind. Our fathers had their troubles. In the nineties they had to work their way through panics and acute economic disorders. But only two other generations of Americans, those who made the Republic between 1776 and say 1810, and those who held it together between 1861 and 1880, have really known what it meant to have to defend the very foundations of civilized living against a breakdown into the anarchy of separated, quarrelling groups. It is difficult, I think, to overestimate the nervous strain to which responsible men and women, those who, as the Quakers say, have had a concern of mankind, have been subjected in these 30 years. Think back to 1914 and then realize how tremendous have been the demands upon human energy, the constant peril and the terrible anxiety first of World War I and its huge miseries, then of the peacemaking and the enormous complication of high ambitions and violent passions, then of the revolutions which overthrew all the empires of continental Europe, then of the first reconstruction in the twenties, in which men had to fight every foot of the way for small installments of reason against the fierce resistance of terrorized and shell-shocked masses of people, then the breakdown in 1929 and all the panics, and the revolutions which have swept mankind. Then this was to be followed by catastrophic World War II, which all but destroyed civilization. Its implications we do not realize, its consequences we cannot know. Any man who has lived through these tremendous years and has tried as a responsible leader or as a conscientious citizen to do his part, to rise to the occasion, to contribute what he had in him, has endured anxieties, has drawn upon his reserves of moral force, to a point where at times it seems inhuman to ask any more of him. We need not be astonished that statesmen have become confused, that the peoples have again and again acted as if they were more than a little mad. The generation which has been passing through the ordeal of this crisis is shocked, weary and nervously spent. It has been frightened by blow after blow for which it was unprepared, bewildered by events which it could not understand, disappointed as one fair hope and one fair promise after another have been dashed to pieces. Obviously, in the short space of time allotted me, I cannot even begin to describe all the complexities of the situation in which we find ourselves in politics, in national affairs, and in international relations. I can tell you, however, that in the considered opinion of many students of contemporary history, we face today a greater test of our devotion to American and Democratic party principles than we have at any time in the recent past.

The great war through which we have just passed was a challenge to everything we believed in—to all our principles and even to our national survival. Today we face a challenge not only to our survival as a Nation but to the very existence of mankind in the state we now know. It is not only the challenge of resurgent totalitarianism. It is a challenge to the basic truths of modern civilization. We thought we had firmly established those truths by our recent victory. We know today that we have not. What we accomplished was merely the defeat of one particular group of forces which arose to threaten modern civilization. We find today that there are other challenges, not only in foreign lands but also in our own country.

We thought we had established beyond all question, and doubt the concept of one world, the concept of the indivisibility of peace and of the brotherhood of man. We thought we had fixed beyond challenge the truth of the statement that human, individual rights and the dignity of the human spirit were to be recognized above all other values. We thought we had firmly established the fact that governments are instituted among men to protect and preserve their inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that governments exist only by the consent of the governed, under justice and law.

Today, almost 3 years after the end of hostilities, we find these truths again challenged. We find the spokesmen for supernationalism, for isolation, and for economic privilege again taking the center of the stage. We find one nation arrogating to itself the right to determine the fate of others and the right to rule others. Again we hear voices from many lands and from within our own land speaking of encirclement, of balance of power, setting up one nation as a check against another, of letting Europe and Asia settle their own problems, of drawing a line around the Western Hemisphere and daring any foreign power to cross it.

In our own country we hear the voices of reaction, long hesitant, now speaking again in bold, loud voices about the necessity of destroying the power of labor, of freeing business from all regulations whatsoever, of decreasing taxes on the rich and increasing them on the poor, and of the danger of meddling with private enterprise. Spokesmen for selfish privilege, for vested economic interests, no longer speak in whispers in Washington. Openly they make their demands before congressional committees—and the public be damned. Lobbyists for the big monopolies are given respectful attention. It was only a hastily aroused public opinion that frustrated some of these monopolists in their open efforts during these last two meetings of Congress to secure enactment of legislation which would have taken us back into the dark economic ages of the 1920's.

It is true that organized labor, protected and given new rights and privileges under the Democratic administration, has, in some cases, abused its newly gotten power. It is true that in some instances, there has been too much Government regulation and interference with the details of private enterprise. It is true that businessmen have been befuddled and confused by endless red tape in Government, especially during the war, and that controls of excessive severity and complexity were exercised from Washington. The people reacted against those controls and those abuses in the last election and followed the good American tradition of expressing at the polls general resentment against long-continued regimentation.

Americans love freedom with such a passion that they resent even the suspicion that controls are exercised for the sake of discipline and not because they are absolutely necessary. But the American people have now gotten a taste of the Republican Party's

philosophy of government. In my judgment the American people have gotten their bellies full of the political medievalism into which the Republican Party is attempting to lead this country. We now see the outlines of the promised land into which the Republicans are trying to lead us. It is a land of sky-high prices, of unchecked and unconscionable profits, of inflated credit, of false values, of boom and bust, of unlimited privileges for the few and of the fewest possible privileges for the many. The Republican Party spokesmen denounce Government planning as socialism and even worse, yet what do the Republicans propose in its place? They propose planning, too, but planning by monopolists, government by the few, and high prices by organized scarcity.

The Republicans rail and rant against dictatorship and against the power of labor leaders, but what they want is merely less power for labor and more power for themselves. I do not think that the American people will stand for that sort of philosophy. I think we have long passed the point where this great Nation will tolerate that kind of rule from any kind of private business headquarters.

The Democratic Party's philosophy of government cannot be reconciled with that of the party now in power in Congress. I do not think that we will win any votes or regain the unquestioned leadership of the Nation by moving in that direction. The Democratic Party has always been the party of liberalism. If it expects to survive as a major party in this country, if it expects to win the unquestioned mandate of the people, it must remain the party of liberalism.

If the American people decide to move in a conservative direction they will choose the Republican Party as they did in the last congressional elections. I do not think that the vote in November 1946 was an indication that the American people have permanently gone conservative or have abandoned those principles of government which resulted in four unprecedented and consecutive national victories for the Democratic Party over the last 16 years.

I think we have now been sufficiently warned by the brand of government which the Republicans are offering to know that we cannot compromise on domestic issues with that philosophy. We also know that although there are some Republican leaders who are aware of our international responsibilities, the Republican Party, as such, is not capable of discharging those responsibilities. Most Republicans in Congress have proceeded unwillingly with the fulfillment of our obligations abroad. Although lip service was given to a bipartisan foreign policy, support was given to that policy only grudgingly by some and not at all by others. A Republican victory in 1948 would be an unmitigated world disaster. The forces of democracy and freedom throughout the world would feel that they had suffered a tragic loss. On the other hand, the forces of totalitarianism and antiliberalism would rejoice. They know that a victory for the Republican Party would be a victory for isolationism, and for the early withdrawal of the great moral power that has been exercised by America in behalf of world order, law, and justice. How else would you explain the fact that American Communists find common cause today with die-hard Old Guard Republican isolationists? Today the Chicago Tribune and the Communist Daily Worker make the same arguments and support the same program. Those two newspapers have exactly the same attitude toward the Truman doctrine and toward the Economic Cooperation Administration. Both newspapers and their partisans are taking the same joy and delight in the political prospects of a third-party movement, with its subsequent threat to a Democratic Party victory in 1948.

It is true that many shades of opinion are to be found in the Democratic Party. But I think that if we examine our party closely, we will find that in the broad questions of policy, we all agree. We are for liberalism, and against reaction; for the common man, and against selfish privilege; for assisting small business, and against monopoly; for upholding the rights of the common man and against the selfishly used power of the few; for sound business and against big business excesses; for enlightened leadership in world affairs, and against blind isolationism. Certainly no Democrat will disagree with those principles. Certainly that is a broad enough tent to cover all of us. All other differences can be resolved. There are elements among us who are violently prolabor, there are other elements which are alarmed at some of the excesses of organized labor. There are those who want to achieve the millennium tomorrow, and others who urge a more graduated pace; there are those who wish to vest unlimited power in the Central Government, and others who favor a greater emphasis on States' rights. These are differences which can be reconciled in the inner councils of the party. But the Democratic Party must never be false to its basic principles, to its history, to its traditions, to its championship of the people's rights above all others, of democracy with a small "d", of liberalism, and of equal justice for all men. Leaders of labor are perfectly at home in the Democratic Party, and must always be; the Democratic Party is the party of labor and the middle class of enlightened and unselfish business of every size, of the intellectuals—the school teachers and students—of the veterans, and of the young in mind and heart. The Democratic Party is the party of progress and venture, of intelligent experimentalism, vision, and courage. It is the party of the people.

In foreign affairs, the Democratic Party is the party of democracy and brotherhood. It is the party which has given leadership to the world during the past 16 years. It is the party looked to by the masses of mankind of every race and nationality. It is the party which knows that genuine economy in international affairs depends upon maintaining peaceful relations with our neighbors, relations built on the free access of all peoples to the world's riches and resources, and the progressive reduction of trade barriers and trade restrictions which are the consequences of imperialism, nationalism, hatred, and suspicion. It is the party which is anti-imperialist, which wishes for all peoples to share the blessings of liberty and prosperity, and which is willing to have America take the lead and show the way to a world of peace and plenty.

The Democratic Party stands for unlimited cooperation with all freedom-loving nations and peoples in the efforts to achieve peace and security. We are ready to support and befriend our allies and to cooperate with movements designed to isolate totalitarianism and tyranny. We acknowledge our responsibilities. We accept them. We realize that our national wealth and power give us the obligation to befriend the less fortunate, and to take whatever steps are necessary to maintain peace in this troubled world.

Today the Democratic Party needs the unstinted efforts of all men and women who acknowledge these principles.

For in a world crisis of such magnitude, such violence and such complexity, the statistics alone are not reliable enough, the economic theories are not certain enough, technical procedure is not clear enough to lead us out. We have to work our way out because we are indomitable, having fixed it clearly in our minds that in a country so richly endowed, with a Nation so full of vital energy, there can be no harm through any cause except the demoralization of the people and their failure to accept these principles.

It is not by diplomatic formula and by conventions and by treaties that such crises can be overcome. It is only by the moral unity of all these nations—I hope the United Nations—which wish to keep the peace and to preserve for themselves and for their children the standards of liberty and human decency. The forces of order in the world are still more powerful than the forces of chaos.

I believe that among the peoples of the world who have lived under the heritage of liberalism for a century or more, the systems of ordered liberty remain. I believe that upon this soil we shall prove that to separate themselves from the disorders of this age, men need not surrender their birthright.

We shall also watch with eager sympathy and with what help we can give, the efforts of the democratic nations to carry through. They are our fellows in one of the great adventures of man's history. Never fear. If we stand firm the day will come when the democracies of America, of Europe and of the Far East will be able to say as Pitt said of England in the crisis of the Revolution and the wars of his day: "We have saved ourselves by our own exertions, and the world by our example."

Much of what I have said has had to do necessarily with the abstract. The concrete thing I want to say is this: The Democratic Party is the one tried and true political vehicle for putting these liberal principles into action and for achieving the ends to be desired. Before it can reach its maximum effectiveness as such a vehicle it must assemble its constituent parts into a unified whole. The affair in November 1946 bore a tragic resemblance to the one in 1928. The one good thing about it was to bring home to all thinking Democrats that interparty bickerings and jealousies serve no good purpose. The party is greater than any single member or group of members within it.

It was demonstrated that we could take an overwhelming defeat in 1928, reorganize our forces from the precinct up and win in 1930, and in 1932, and in 1934, and in 1936, and in 1938, and in 1940, and in 1944. Nineteen thirty-two sets the pattern for 1948—if you are willing to forget your differences and unselfishly go to work at the important business of winning the election. The Republicans are doing everything they know how to make this possible. Their internal affairs are an open secret. They cannot stand prosperity.

This is the time for the Democrats to make the high resolution and go to work. You owe it to yourselves, you owe it to your State, you owe it to the man in the White House, who carries upon his shoulders staggering burdens. I have known Harry Truman for more than a quarter of a century. To me he is Mr. America—the man who has reached the Nation's highest plane and has not lost the common touch. I have known many chiefs of state, both here and abroad. None of them has or had a higher sense of public service. No man more earnestly desires to do the right thing for his people than President Truman. Courageous, experienced, inspired, he is the acknowledged leader of those who would save our way of life for ourselves and for the world. Uphold his hands. Join those who march behind him in unbroken ranks.

This is the time. It is later than you think. God give us the vision to see the path and the courage to follow. We dare not, we will not fail.

Mundt-Nixon Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I enclose two editorials from the Washington Star, both dealing with the attempt made by the Mundt-Nixon bill to prevent the violent overthrow of our Government and the establishment of a totalitarian rule by those under the domination and direction of a foreign power. This is a difficult problem upon which to legislate effectively and with due regard to the complete protection of all civil rights. The Mundt-Nixon bill represents a careful and painstaking approach to what is admittedly a central problem of our modern Nation. The Star's editorials call attention both to the difficulties involved and to the need for a law of this general nature.

The first editorial, Critics Without Facts, appeared on June 1. The second one, Dealing With Communists, appeared on June 6. They follow:

CRITICS WITHOUT FACTS

The self-styled liberals who have been attacking the Mundt-Nixon bill have at least succeeded in demonstrating that they are masters of the art of misrepresentation.

Henry Wallace is one of these. In his formal statement to a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee he said that the bill could be made applicable to his third part. But when he was pinned down in cross-examination, he admitted he did not know whether it would apply to his party or not. He has yet to point to anything in the bill which would apply to his group or any similar group, and he cannot do so for the simple reason that his contention is a misrepresentation of the fact.

Other self-appointed liberals have charged that the bill would create a Fascist state, that it would penalize a man for his thoughts, that it would destroy the Constitution and especially the Bill of Rights.

The American people should not be taken in by this brand of humbug. For while these critics have a right to their opinions and a right to express them, it is important to remember that they are stating opinions and not facts.

This bill is aimed at the Communists and it is undoubtedly true that the Communists will find their wings clipped somewhat if it becomes law. But we should not forget that the bill, in the first instance, has been drafted with care to extend the protection of the Federal courts to every person accused under it. Nor should we forget that, beyond this, the constitutionality of the measure, if it is enacted, will be subject to the judgment of the Supreme Court.

Most of the critics who have been shouting that it is unconstitutional are hardly competent to pass on this question. Instead of swallowing their propaganda, we might well keep in mind the point made by spokesmen for the District Bar Association, who, in the course of stating their belief that the bill is constitutional, declared: "Critics have assailed the bill as illegal and unconstitutional, but none of them has shown exactly how or why."

DEALING WITH COMMUNISTS

President Truman's Chicago speech clears up one point by destroying the "pleasant fiction" that his western tour is a nonpolitical trip. If anyone had any doubt about the matter, it is plain enough now that this trip is as political as free cigars and a torchlight parade. But if the speech clears the air in this respect, it serves to muddy the waters in the debate now going on with respect to the Communists and how to deal with them.

Mr. Truman, drawing upon such ancient cliches as "you cannot stop the spread of an idea by passing a law against it," seems to put himself on record as being opposed to the Mundt bill. Perhaps this is not too important, for it does not look as though the Mundt bill is going to emerge from the Senate Judiciary Committee at this session of Congress. And if it is not acted upon, we still need not lie awake nights in fear that the American Communists are going to rise up and take us over before Congress meets again.

It is important, however, to have a clear idea of what it is we want to do in this matter of dealing with Communists. Mr. Truman evidently wants to go about it by improving the the lot of the people, and that undeniably is one effective approach. But he is wrong when he says that communism succeeds only where there is misery, weakness, or despair, as is witnessed by what happened in Czechoslovakia, and he is also wrong in suggesting, as he seems to do, that nothing can be accomplished through restrictive legislation.

Legislation cannot do the whole job. But the lesson which is taught by the success of communism and other isms is not that legislation failed, but rather that suitable legislation was not tried.

The basic question to be decided in our own case is whether we want to try any legislation. If the answer to that is no, then the matter ends. If the answer is yes, however, then it is worth while to look critically at some of the attacks being made on the Mundt bill.

It is said, for example, that the Mundt bill, if passed, would give the Communists an issue, a talking point, which they do not have now. That is true. But the same thing will be true of any restrictive legislation which might be passed. It is also said that passage of the Mundt bill would make martyrs out of the Communists. In whose minds, other than their own, would they be martyrs? It is said that the Mundt bill is unconstitutional; that it entails a grave threat to our basic liberties and our way of life. Some employers said the same thing about the Wagner Act. Labor leaders cried out in warning against the clanking chains of slavery when the Taft-Hartley law was passed. But our basic liberties are still intact and no one is in chains. The thing to be remembered about this is that the constitutionality of many laws is open to question. As long as we have an independent judiciary, however, and as long as our laws are subject to its review, as is the case with the Mundt bill, we should not let ourselves become too frightened by the outcries of the special pleaders.

No one can deny the reasonableness of the proposition that our democracy has the inherent right to protect itself against the Communists or against any group which, working in the interest of some foreign government, is trying to accomplish the destruction of our system. There is room for difference of opinion as to how this protection can best be established. But it is wrong to contend that nothing can be accomplished toward this end through properly drawn legislation, and it is foolish to take seriously some of the complaints that are being aimed at the Mundt bill. This country is not going to impose, a dictatorship upon itself unless and until that becomes clearly necessary as a matter of sheer survival.

Edward Lamb and the FCC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago I brought to the attention of this body the remarkable and somewhat unusual cooperation which one Edward Lamb had received from the Federal Communications Commission. Mr. Lamb received five radio permits within the short space of 2 weeks. This action by the Federal Communications Commission is the exception and certainly not the rule. I know of several instances in which reputable individuals have had applications on file for radio station permits with the Federal Communications Commission for more than a year, and all they have gotten thus far is a lot of conversation, buck-passing, excuses, double-talk, meaningless chatter, but no permits.

These men, of course, have never been linked with any Communist activities or Communist-front organizations in this country. They are successful, average, every-day Americans who believe in the American way of life. I do not know whether they have been prejudiced in the eyes of the Federal Communications Commission because they are Americans of unimpeachable attitude to the American way of life, and outspoken foes of communism and all that obnoxious ideology stands for. Comparing their failure with Mr. Lamb's success I can come to only one conclusion.

In Mr. Lamb's case it would appear that association and connection with Communists and Communist-front organizations was the real open sesame to favor by the Federal Communications Commission. Mr. Lamb has a record of Communist activities which sends its malodorous odor to the gates of heaven itself. And nobody can deny that the Federal Communications Commission is not cognizant of Mr. Lamb's record because it was brought to their attention when Mr. Lamb applied for one of his numerous licenses. It was brought to their attention in a formal petition for reversal of one of the unusual grants given this individual. It was brought to their attention by me on the floor of this House. It was brought to their attention by a letter written to them by the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of this House who asked for an explanation of the Commission's apparent eagerness to give Mr. Lamb anything he wanted. It was again brought to their attention on the floor of this House by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] only recently, and I am bringing it to their attention again today by reading an editorial from the Mansfield News-Journal of Mansfield, Ohio, which raises some new questions in connection with Mr. Lamb's activity.

The silence of the Sphinx is a deafening bedlam of noise compared to the silence of the Federal Communications Commission in explaining its obvious preference and remarkable cooperation for Mr. Lamb when he appears before that august body seeking permission to build a radio station. For Mr. Lamb they roll out the red carpet. For Americans who have stood the test of loyalty to the Government they keep the door closed.

Just what is the weird and unusual connection between Mr. Lamb and the Federal Communications Commission?

I am going to keep on asking that question until I get a satisfactory answer.

Here is the editorial from the Mansfield News-Journal to which I have referred:

RADIO INTERESTS BEING JUGGLED BY LAMB

A new twist has appeared in the Alice in Wonderland story of Edward Lamb and the Federal Communications Commission.

Lamb is the Red-tinged Toledo lawyer who procured five radio broadcasting licenses within 2 weeks in an unprecedented burst of generosity by the FCC. He is the same Toledoan accused in Congress as a "man saturated and drenched in Communist writings, associations, and affiliations." He is the same Edward Lamb who holds an FM radio broadcasting license for Mansfield; the same man Congressman F. EDWARD HÉBERT charges has "one of the most expansive records of associations with the Communist Party in America, front organizations and fellow travelers" of anyone to come to the attention of the House un-American Activities Committee.

Lamb's latest radio deal is the sale of a corporation he formed and controlled and through which he had sought to obtain television rights in Youngstown.

Besides selling his interest in Youngstown, Lamb also stepped out as secretary of another of his corporations, Heart of Ohio, Inc., which is an applicant before the FCC for another Columbus broadcasting license. The pending license is for AM or standard broadcasting. He already has a television license for Columbus. Although relinquishing his office in the corporation, the Toledo lawyer retained, with his wife and law partner, control of the firm's stock.

Further, Lamb announces that he is pulling out of Springfield, where he was granted another radio station license,

What does it all mean?

Lamb said he is abandoning his Springfield and Youngstown interests in order to devote more time to interests in Toledo, Columbus, and Erie, Pa. He made no mention of his intentions in Mansfield.

If his statement about concentrating his interest in other cities is true, why did Lamb go to all the trouble and expense of organizing, financing, and operating a half dozen corporations? What does he really have in mind for the broadcasting licenses which he seemed to have gained with such ease, despite his leftist leanings, red sympathies, and Communist associations?

Does his action at Youngstown indicate that through his uncanny ability to get cooperation from the FCC, Lamb is going into business as a wholesaler of radio stations or companies? Could it be that he seeks to become the vendor of tickets for riding his "inside track" to get radio broadcasting licenses from the FCC? Has the control of radio in the United States swerved so far left that legitimate businessmen may soon find that it is only through such questionable characters as Lamb that radio licenses will be available?

Or do these things mean that Lamb, once more following the familiar Communist pattern, is going "underground" to operate his radio enterprises from behind the scenes? His relinquishing of office in the "Heart of Ohio" corporation, while still retaining majority stock control, might well give rise to speculation on underground tactics.

It is inconceivable that Lamb and the FCC will be allowed to go forward with any such operations, inasmuch as a part of the story now has been forcibly placed before Congress. It is high time that some more responsible division of government should take a hand.

Preservation of World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following letter received by me from the First Congregational Church of Guilford, Conn., containing a resolution adopted by its members:

THE FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH
OF GUILFORD, CONN.,
May 25, 1948.

HON. ELLSWORTH FOOTE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of members of the First Congregational Church of Guilford held on Sunday, May 23, the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas the people of all nations of the world are tired of war and are desirous of the establishment of a real peace; and

"Whereas the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America has urged the President of the United States and the Government of the United States to seek world peace primarily through the use of economic, social, and moral means instead of by weapons and war measures; and

"Whereas the council of the church has proposed a constructive plan to the Government and people of the United States looking toward an over-all solution of the world crisis to the great benefit of the people of all countries: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the First Congregational Church of Guilford, Conn., That we heartily endorse the program of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America for immediate and constructive steps toward world peace instead of toward war, by combatting the present hysteria and urging talks between the United States and Russia in an attempt to clarify the issues of the world crisis with the purpose of finding an over-all and just solution for the good of all peoples."

This copy is being sent to you by order of the church.

Very truly yours,
JAMES E. ROLSTON,
Clerk.

The British Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Dr. Alvin Johnson, that appeared in the New York Post on Sunday, June 6, 1948:

THE BRITISH ROLE—IMPERIALISM RAMPANT MOTIVATES THE EFFORT TO EXTERMINATE ISRAEL IN BLOOD

(By Alvin Johnson)

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Dr. Alvin Johnson, noted economist, editor, and educator, director of the New School for Social Research, sent the following article as a letter to the New York Times on May 27. The letter appeared in that publication on June 1. Dr. Johnson's views were so carefully expressed and his conclusions so direct and sound, that we sought, and obtained, permission to reproduce it here for our readers.)

The New York Times editorial of May 27, The Arab Answer, put the case as every real American would put it. The Republic of Israel is a fact It is an officially recognized fact. And America, mother of republics, cannot stand by while this newest republic is being murdered by Arab fanatics financed and armed and trained by the British for the specific purpose of extinguishing in blood the aspirations for liberty of the Jewish community, now the state of Israel.

It does not sweeten our reflections that these Spitfires murdering women and children in Tel Aviv, these mortars making rubble of the Holy City, have been paid for with American money, not yet ERP funds, but the $4,500,000,000 we loaned Britain with no expectation on either side of its ever being paid back. We are blood-bespattered, but through no fault of our own unless stupidity be a fault.

The British Government holds up its red hands in high-toned disgust over the crudity of American policy. Doesn't a gentleman look the other way when mass murder is being perpetrated? Our misrepresentative diplomats in Europe are said to feel very sad over the rift between British and American policy. It is more than a rift. It is a chasm.

The Britanni, as Virgil saw, "separated from all mankind," have always been wrong in their judgments of America, but never so wrong as now. They imagine that the American policy of recognition of Israel is dictated by concern over the Jewish vote. It is not. It is dictated by concern over the American vote. Israel has ceased to be a Jewish issue. It is an American issue, the issue of republicanism against imperialism backing barbaric kings and emirs. I do not find half the bitterness against England among Jews that I find among my solid Declaration of Independence Yankees of the Middle West.

We naive Americans were outraged when at the behest of Cecil Rhodes and the De Beers syndicate the British Empire proceeded to stamp out the Boer Republics in South Africa. Britain was mighty and we were weak, and Britain could safely thumb her nose at us. We were outraged by British oppression of Ireland. Down to the First World War, Britain thumbed her nose at us. We are outraged by the British war upon the Republic of Israel. Is this a good time for Britain to thumb her nose at us?

We bailed Britain out in two world wars; we are bailing her out in the present crisis of production and trade. We are doing our best to set her up again as a competitor of ours, knowing well that we can never expect fair competition from the British. But do the British imagine that the American taxpayer, giving one-third or one-half or three-fourths of his income in taxes, never reflects wryly, "20 percent for education, social security, roads, pork barrels, and 80 percent for getting Britain out of the messes her imperialist diplomacy got her into?"

We have assumed the total cost of defending ourselves—and Britain. We are throwing money by the billion into the British lap. Do we have to do it? We are morally committed for 3 years more. But it rests with Congress to decide how far a moral commitment holds in favor of a nation up to its neck in the blood of a republic.

Sure, we are sentimentalists, and sentimentalism is the pasture of the cynical imperialist. But sentimentalism sometimes goes sour. Ours has kept sweet about as long as it can, in the matter of the Republic of Israel and Britain's unholy war.

The Colorado River Issue Climax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1948

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege recently given me, of extending my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared May 11 in the Los Angeles Times. The fact that it is now a month old makes it no less pertinent. It refers to the desire of several Western States to have the continuing controversy over the allotment of the water from the Colorado River settled in the Supreme Court of the United States. This is the American way of settling controversies, by arbitration or by mutual agreement, or, as in this case, when legal problems are involved, in the courts of the country, and eventually, if necessary, in the highest court. California and Nevada are willing to take their chances before the Supreme Court; Arizona, the other party to the controversy, has as yet seemed unwilling to agree to this constitutional method of settlement. The editorial follows:

THE COLORADO RIVER ISSUE CLIMAX

In Washington yesterday began the momentous hearings which should end a 25-year controversy and decide the explosive Colorado River water allocation question for all time.

But there may be shilly-shallying and indecisive action unless California citizens ask—in letters and telegrams to Members of Congress from other States—that the issue be submitted to the Supreme Court for final adjudication. The submission of the matter to the Supreme Court, in fact, is the subject of the hearings begun yesterday before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Californians will urge such a course; Arizonans will oppose it.

Why has it become necessary as a last resort to go to the Supreme Court?

Many events during the last few years have combined to render a lasting determination vital and imperative. For one thing it has become increasingly apparent that the differences between California and Arizona over the amount each is to receive from the Colorado River, and the formula for deciding that amount, never can be decided at a conference table. On the basic issues the two States are irreconcilably divided.

Additionally, the increasingly acute need of California for more power and for guaranties concerning its water contracts and of Arizona for additional irrigation water have made the starting of new Colorado River projects necessary. But until certain fundamentals have been decided, it is impossible to embark upon any of these matters because each State claims that the proposals of the other would constitute an unfair drain upon the Colorado's resources.

The Times, following a detailed investigation in 1946, expressed the opinion which it still holds that a Supreme Court action, even with all the uncertainties and delays involved, would be preferable to the futile bickering which was going on then and still is going on. Certainly there are drawbacks to a Supreme Court decision on the matter. Both California and Arizona may get less than they claim. But at least the needed developments then can go forward on the basis of known factors, rather than in the blind atmosphere of hostility and passion.

Nature, incidentally, has played a part this season in the great drama of the contested water. The drought which has scourged Arizona for several years has been broken, particularly in the northern portion, by the best rains and snowpack in a long time. It is quite possible that the cycle of dry years may have been ended, and that the plight of Central Arizona will be remedied by natural sources such as the filling of Roosevelt and Coolidge Dam basins. In such an event, the plea of Arizona that it cannot wait for a Supreme Court decision would be invalidated.

It is quite possible, in fact, that if Arizona were to join wholeheartedly with California and other States of the Colorado River Basin in supporting the move for a Supreme Court decision, the matter could be decided within a year to 18 month. The procedure will be for the Attorney General of the United States to instigate such action to determine the legal validity of the contracts of the United States with the States, involving Colorado River water, and thus get it directly before the supreme tribunal.

This is the purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 145 being considered this week before the Senate group and of House Joint Resolution 226 which will come up before a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee next week. It is support for these measures which should be written or wired to Representatives and Senators; not California's delegation, because they already are for the Supreme Court test. It also is being urged that friends in other States be asked to write their Congressmen in favor of the two resolutions.

Never has a more important issue confronted this section of the country. Both California and Arizona are dependent for their civilizations upon Colorado River water. At this time, millions of acre-feet of Colorado water are going to waste in the Gulf of California each year because there is no need for it on existing projects. But in the future when increasing populations and possibly dry years make every drop precious, the matter of the legal division of the water will be of vital importance.

The only orderly way to handle the matter is to make the division now, under sanction of the Supreme Court, so both California and Arizona can go forward in the sure knowledge of what the future holds for them.

Labor-Management Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address which I delivered over Station WWJ in Detroit, Mich., on Monday, June 7, 1948:

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

Ladies and gentlemen, on April 26, I described the inequities—or perhaps iniquities is a better word—inherent in the Taft-Hartley Act. This is the act which all leaders of American labor have condemned as destructive of the aspirations of working men and women. It was passed over the emphatic veto of President Truman by a Republican-dominated Congress, aided and abetted by the powerful lobby maintained in Washington by the National Association of Manufacturers.

There has been no change in the situation since last I addressed you. Though this pernicious legislation will not have been in effect a year until August 22, every day brings fresh evidence of the intent of those who wrote or inspired it. That intent is to hamstring and defeat the legitimate aspirations of American working men and women. Those aspirations are security in employment, a rising standard of living, and the right to live as free American citizens.

The Republican majority has done nothing to improve conditions of living either for the workers who are members of labor organizations or the other masses which go to make up our great country. They have refused, for instance, to pass a housing bill—opposed by the real-estate lobby—which would make it posible for millions of Americans to have better homes. Conversely, however, they have passed—in the House—an emasculated version of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act which in effect, as President Truman and Secretary Marshall have said, is more of a repudiation of this basic principle of American foreign trade, than an extension. As Marquis Childs, one of the most distinguished Washington correspondents wrote only recently, Senate approval of the House-passed measure would take our country back to the McKinley era. By voting to extend this act for only 1 year, in contrast to the 3 years requested by the Democratic administration, the House of Representatives has jeopardized our foreign economic program and threatened the good-neighbor policy. It also carries a potential threat against continuous employment of many of you in this audience.

Now all of these things are part of a general plan. It is a plan to put back into complete power over the lives and destiny of American workers that element of our population termed "economic royalists" by the late President Roosevelt. It is the same group which stage-managed the boom-and-bust era of the 1920's and left in its wake more than 10,000,000 unemployed, and hunger, worry, and insecurity in every household.

Let me describe to you some of the signs that already are apparent. All of you already are feeling the effects of the boom part of this cycle. It is inflation. Workers are getting less in real wages, less in purchasing power, more in debt and worry—than they were 2 years ago when the OPA was abolished through the power and influence of the National Association of Manufacturers and other lobbyists over the Members of the Republican majority in Congress. They are receiving much less than they were 3 years ago when overtime work was added to their pay checks.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics figures, covering manufacturing wages only, which are higher and more responsive to price changes than many other industries, show that average real earnings in March, 1948, were nearly 4 percent under those of June, 1946—the last month of OPA control. "Real" earnings mean dollar earnings discounted by the price increases since that time.

The reduction in wartime overtime pay, averaging around 4 hours a week, occurred mostly in the first year after VJ-day, so the figures show that since June 1945, purchasing-power wages of factory workers, on the average, have dropped about 11 percent.

In July 1945, average weekly earnings in dollars totaled $45.45. In June 1946, they averaged $43.31. In March 1948, they averaged $52.25.

But the BLS Consumer Price Index, measuring the cost of essential living items, including food, rent, furnishings and utilities, was only 30 percent above the prewar average in 1945, and rose only 4 points in the first postwar year under OPA. But in the two

years since OPA was abolished, the index has shot up to 67 percent over prewar, more than nullifying all the wage increases that have occurred.

That is what 2 years of a Republican-controlled Congress has accomplished for the American worker. It is what President Truman and numerous of us in Congress predicted would happen during debate on the bill which killed OPA.

Now the Republicans are predicting that what has gone before is only a taste of what will happen if American voters, misguided by propaganda, return them to control of both Houses of Congress as well as the administration of the Nation's welfare. And I have no doubt that if such an event should occur, their predictions will come true.

Many of you remember that when Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected President of the United States in 1932 it was after 12 years of Republican control. The same philosophy dominates those in control of the Republican Party machinery today. Instead of such great social advances as the Social Security Act, the original Wagner Act—and not the emasculated version of that act as included in the Taft-Hartley atrocity of 1947—the Fair Labor Standards Act, the regulation of the Nation's stock exchanges by the Securities and Exchange Commission—the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, to mention a few—what may American working men and women reasonably expect?

1. The effort has already begun during the present session of Congress to remove millions of workers from the protection of the Social Security System.

2. More stringent amendments will be added to the Taft-Hartley Act.

3. An under-cover drive already begun through an anonymous report to a subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee of the House will seek the outright repeal of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

There is something peculiar about that report. Though I am the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, only a limited number of copies of this report, printed at the expense of the entire committee, were distributed. I was not among those selected to receive a copy. However, I did obtain one. It is 31 printed pages long. When a Washington newspaper correspondent obtained a copy—not mine incidentally—the Republican chairman of Subcommittee No. 4 of the Education and Labor Committee, denied any knowledge as to the source of the so-called study. Yet in a letter of transmittal to other members of his committee he declared: "This study has been prepared in order to present to members of this subcommittee an up-to-date composite analysis of current proposals which involve Federal regulation of employer-employee relationships. As such, this should prove of value to the subcommittee in arriving at definite conclusions in regard to proposed legislation which has been submitted for the consideration of this Congress."

Now I want to read you a single paragraph contained in this report on the Wage and Hour Act. "Demands for the revision of the act"—and I quote—"have become increasingly insistent, and many believe that the act, despite its commendable objectives, has actually created more problems than it has solved. Ten years' experience with the act buttresses the arguments of those who claim the cure has been more damaging than the disease."

Now the Fair Labor Standards Act has as its main objective the placing of a floor below which wages could not descend and a ceiling over hours without the payment of overtime. It was a protection for legitimate employers as well as workers. The first year of the act's operation called for a minimum wage of 25 cents an hour. The maximum of 40 cents an hour did not become statutory until October 24, 1945, though industry committees, composed of an equal number of persons representing labor, management, and the public, could increase the minimum wage to the 40-cent limit in advance of the stautory date. That was so done.

It must seem amazing to you, as it did to me, that since the act became effective violations of those simple regulations have been found in 149,885 inspected establishments. Proprietors of these establishments have paid voluntarily, or by court order, $110,891,340 to 2,959,545 employees. Yet the movement I have described would remove this protective statute from those most in need of protection from selfish, unethical employers, many of them, proprietors of sweatshops.

The figures include not only those low-paid workers at the bottom level of our economic structure. They cover overtime payments, perhaps to some of you, certainly to many who enjoy your level of income. Yet the repeal of this law is already in the works unless American workers join together to send to the next Congress men who believe that the unorganized workers are entitled to the protection of Government from those unethical employers who for so many years exploited them and compelled them to exist at a substandard level of living.

President Truman has repeatedly asked the present Congress, rather than to take this protection away from the poorly paid, to increase the minimum wage to 75 cents an hour. Secretary of Labor Lewis B. Schwellenbach in repeated appearances before the Education and Labor Committee has urged the same increase in the basic minimum wage.

If such a tragedy should befall America's lowest income group, then the wage-structure at all income levels will be endangered. It will be fodder in the campaign of hate now being waged against the institutions of our country by those who would destroy all freedom and make slaves of all workers.

I hate communism and all that it stands for. I hate it with the venom that men have for a rattlesnake. Conversely, I love America. I am convinced that we live here under the greatest concept of government ever conceived in the mind of man. I am not one of those who believes that set-backs in progress, such as the Nation is now experiencing under a reactionary Congress, will destroy our form of government or permit such un-American principles as the Communists propose to prevail. The American democracy is here to stay as the guiding beacon to the troubled souls of men everywhere. The forces of progress, which have carried us so far in the past 16 years of Democratic control of our national Government shall again prevail. Those who would halt that progress can only delay it. They can never return us to the days of Harding and Coolidge and Hoover.

I thank you.

Britain's Anti-Jewish Bias

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Harold J. Laski that appeared in the New York Post on Sunday, June 6, 1948:

BRITAIN'S ANTI-JEWISH BIAS AND DISHONESTY BARED BY LASKI

(By Harold J. Laski)

LONDON.—The British government has done more damage to the honor and prestige of Britain in the past week than our enemies have been able to inflict upon us since the evil days of Munich.

It is beyond doubt that the attitude of the British government is responsible for the invasion of Palestine by the Arab states.

When the Security Council moved to act against their aggression Sir Alexander Cadogan attempted first to pretend that there was no aggression, and then to secure for the Arabs an extension of time in which to answer.

When they refused a truce, Sir Alexander again proposed a form of standstill so obviously like nonintervention in Spain that no serious observer could fail to draw the conclusion that he was about as anxious for fair play for Israel as he was for fair play for republican Spain when he was in Chamberlain's government.

The humbug of our relations with members of the Arab League is bad enough, but it is almost trifling beside the dishonesty about our relations with Transjordan. Foreign Secretary Bevin made it an independent state in 1946 when the Anglo-American Commission on Palestine was acting. Bevin insisted the Anglo-Transjordan Treaty state that King Abdullah was not to engage in military action without consulting Britain.

Yet with or without Bevin's leave, Transjordan's Army is the main invader of Palestine.

The bias of the British Government against the Jews has been demonstrated over and over in the UN and the House of Commons. A typical example was the allegation that many Jewish immigrants into Palestine were Russian agents. This was denied both by Sir Godfrey Collins in Cyprus and for all effective purposes by the officer in charge of disembarkation.

The Government did nothing to assure continuity of service on the Palestine railway. It permitted the land-settlement department to sell lands in the state domain, as in Haifa Harbor, to the Arabs.

It sent the documents concerning irrigation and land registration to England, which is bound gravely to complicate future disposition of land.

It paid more than $1,000,000 to the Supreme Moslem Council, though this was a direct subsidy to the exiled Mufti of Jerusalem.

It has unilaterally excluded Palestine from the sterling area and blocked the sterling balances in London.

The Palestine Government has sold the two main railroad lines in Palestine to Transjordan and Egypt, with the result that they have virtually sealed off Israel.

Nor must one omit to note that in March 1948, 4 months after the UN Assembly had voted for partition, and once more as a unilateral act, the British Government gave the Iraq Petroleum Co. the right to build a new pipe line terminating at Haifa. Perhaps it was symbolic that the end of the British regime in Palestine should be written in oil.

Unnecessary Flood Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I remember well a year ago the warning that

was given the Members of the House when we had before us the appropriation bill for the Interior Department by the ranking Democratic member of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio, MIKE KIRWAN. The following editorial that appeared in the Youngstown Vindicator on June 6, 1948, bears out the statements made by the gentleman from Ohio, MIKE KIRWAN, 1 year ago in this House:

UNNECESSARY FLOOD DISASTER

If a lawsuit should arise from the Columbia River floods, no doubt the court would class them as "an act of God." It is true that the excessive snow-melting and rainfall were unpreventable, but the damage from the resultant floods could have been averted.

The lives and property lost in the last few days could have been saved by a Columbia River Authority, similar to the Tennessee Valley Authority. President Roosevelt urged a CVA, and President Truman has repeated the request. But, like the proposal for a Missouri Authority, the Columbia project was blocked by conservatives (untrue to their name in this case) who cried "socialism," and by those who were influenced by the private power lobby.

Even without a CVA, the Army engineers and the Reclamation Bureau could have lessened the flood disaster. True, they could not have set up the broad, integrated program of dams, reforesting, wise farming methods, and other measures which have controlled floods in the Tennessee Valley. They could, however, have knocked the peaks off the floods. But Congress has a piecemeal policy in flood control, a bit here and a bit there; and it recently cut $50,000,000 out of the Reclamation funds for the Columbia area.

This was called economy. It did save $50,000,000. But the loss in the Oregon disaster is estimated at more than $100,000,000. The contrast confirms Congressman MICHAEL J. KIRWAN'S warning that penny-pinching in conservation wastes money. And as we have seen in Oregon, it throws away lives.

The Present Mundt Bill Compares With the Alien Sedition Law of 1798—Statement of Representative A. J. Sabath on the Occasion of Laying a Wreath at the Statue of John Marshall at the United States Capitol on Wednesday, June 2, 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1948

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave given me, I insert the following address I made on the occasion of the laying of a wreath at the statue of John Marshall, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States:

Mr. SABATH. Friends and fellow Americans, it gives me great pride to lay a wreath at the statue of a great American.

There are special reasons why I, a Democrat, join today in honoring John Marshall, a conservative Federalist, originally a party opponent of the Jeffersonian Democrats.

It is because John Marshall set us an example when he was a Congressman, before his appointment as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court—a patriot who placed his country above his party.

The occasion was the debate on the Mundt bill of 1798—the so-called alien and sedition laws.

John Marshall, a leading Federalist, refused to follow his party on its course of repression. He publicly spoke and fought against the alien and sedition laws.

We honor such nonpartisan defense of the Bill of Rights. America needs more of it today—more Democrats and more Republicans who will join the fight against the Mundt bill, against the Committee on Un-American Activities—in defense of the basic human rights set forth in the Constitution and Bill of Rights.

Congress should remember that the Mundt bill cannot succeed, any more than the alien and sedition laws did 150 years ago.

The American people will never give up the fight to make their voice heard—to speak up for their rights.

When Congressman Matthew Lyon was jailed and fined under the 1798 Mundt bill, the people of Vermont showed their contempt and defiance of that law by reelecting Lyon to Congress, while still in jail, by a better than 2 to 1 vote.

When the Federalists persisted on their course of threatening critics and opponents with jail, the American people replied in 1800 with the election of a new party, the Democratic Party, to control of Congress and a Democratic President, Thomas Jefferson.

Our history also shows us that Mundt bills are always two-edged swords, threatening all the people, not only the so-called radicals.

William Cobbett, one of the most vigorous supporters of the alien and sedition laws, found himself, 1 year after its passage, disagreeing with President Adams and in danger of prosecution under the very law he had advocated.

The parallels between today and 1798 are many. Then reaction tried to frighten people about the "Irish Jacobins" instead of the foreign Reds—Jefferson was supposedly paid by French money instead of Moscow—France supposedly threatened our peace and security and all who opposed the administration were secret agents of France.

But the people fought back and won, as they will fight back not only today but will continue in the future to preserve their freedom and liberties granted by our Constitution and Bill of Rights.

We can do no better than adopt as our own, the courageous words of Congressman Edward Livingston, in closing the House debate on the alien and sedition laws:

"If we are ready to violate the Constitution, will the people submit to our unauthorized acts? Sir, they ought not to submit—for then, they would deserve the chains that these measures are forging for them."

Review of Book, A National Policy for the Oil Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. H. MOORE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Here Is Danger." This is contained in the Economic Council Review of Books. The book referred to is entitled "A National Policy for the Oil Industry," by Eugene V. Rostow, professor and a member of the graduate faculty of economics at Yale University. This book is being used now to justify the Federal seizure of tidelands oil. It is being used by the departments which would nationalize one of the largest American private enterprise industries. It is being used as an authority that this can be done under existing law or judicial decree.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HERE IS DANGER

Books are always shock troops in the battle of ideas for the dominance over human minds that causes historical action. In a time of mortal conflict, such as this, some books are decisive. These are usually obscure books, hardly noticed at first. When Marx's Capital was a year old 200 copies had been bought. You and I would not have heard of it. Mein Kampf had done its work before we knew its name. Have you heard of A National Policy for the Oil Industry, by Eugene V. Rostow, professor of law and member of the graduate faculty of economics at Yale University?

This book purports to justify (I quote it) "the disintegration, dissolution, and reorganization" of the American oil industry by Supreme Court decree, and proposes that the fragments of the industry be made Federal corporations. This is the first product of a larger inquiry into the functioning of our system of public law for the control and direction of the national economy, the first of a series of books designed to present the result of studies made in the course of an interdepartmental program of research in national policy, organized at Yale University in 1946, under the auspices of members of the Department of Economics and Political Science and the School of Law. Funds for this project are supplied by the Carnegie Corp. and the Ganson Goodyear Depew Memorial Fund of Yale University.

These men are Profs. Percy Elwood Corbett, Kent T. Healy, John P. Miller, and Harold D. Lasswell, the widely known propagandist and founder of the weighted-average system. Professor Lasswell worked for the Department of Justice during the war and was appointed by the then Assistant Secretary of State, William Benton, as one of a committee of eight to appraise the notorious Voice of America broadcasts. In addition to his activities listed in Who's Who, Professor Lasswell has been national committee member of the League for Industrial Democracy, the American Civil Liberties Union, and the Association for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis, which advocates the psychoanalysis of all public officials. Professor Rostow has been employed in the State Department as advisor on lend-lease in the Office of Wartime Economic Affairs.

Justifying the nationalization of a vital American industry, however, is not this book's main purpose nor its probable total effect. It is not written for the general reader; it is addressed to its authors' colleagues in Washington who need no persuasion to nationalize the whole American economy. It tells them, with the presumably disinterested authority and prestige of the School of Law of Yale, how to use the existing legal means of doing this.

A QUESTION OF SELF-DEFENSE

A national policy for the oil industry is not primarily an attack upon the oil industry. Its essential meaning is this: Legal means exist, now, to dismember and nationalize any American industry, to destroy any American business however small, and to demolish the political structure of the Union by utilizing the existing Federal power over the States.

The oil industry is especially vulnerable at this moment. Ever since the first antitrust action under the Sherman Act in 1911 against Standard Oil, many Americans have

been made to feel vaguely that "the oil interests" are evil and dangerous. Obviously the industry is essential to national defense; this is a time when the treacherous trick, "Shall we draft men, and not property?" will easily work on it. The Supreme Court's decision in the tidelands oil case authorized the Federal seizure of citizens' leases and States' property in under-water oil wells (not only within the 3-mile limit at sea, but in rivers and lakes as well) and took this property out of the States' jurisdiction; there is a bill in Congress to restore the States' sovereignty over the areas within their borders, and this is a crucial point upon which the existence of the American Constitution depends.

The oil industry's very genius in overcoming the peculiar difficulties of petroleum production puts it into the center of this struggle. Crude oils in the earth are mixtures of oils and gases lying in sand, under enormous pressures. (Professor Rostow says that the gas exerts the pressure, but back in 1911, when I was selling California farmland to drillers on the rigs in the Coalinga fields, any eye could see that underground water exerted the pressure, certainly on the Katy leases.) A drill pierces into that compression as a pin into a toy balloon, and a terrific explosion roars up through the 6-inch hole: a gusher. The hole is so small that oil will flow up through many wells, until the pressure is relieved; then, at greater cost, you pump it up.

Now the rapidity and brilliance of the discoveries made by the oil industry's scientific research—in physics, mechanics, chemistry, geophysics, and nuclear physics—are a marvel for all time, one of the stupendous ignored achievements of free enterprise. (The "oil interests" pay the bills. And lease all patents to all comers, at a cash loss, for the general progress of the industry.) Researchers discovered that the natural forces wasted oil; they learned how to harness that terrific energy deep in the earth, and use it to bring up the oils economically. This meant controlling the free-flowing wells; and many men and companies owned every oil field, each one naturally wanting to get the most oil, most rapidly, for himself. The solution was an agreement among them to control the oil flow scientifically and divide it equitably; but this would be an agreement to control production, legally to control trade; and such an agreement is illegal under the Sherman Act.

At the same time, in the early 1920's, Socialist thinkers went into one of their recurrent panics about exhaustion of natural resources. Babblers who did not recognize an oil well when they saw it were yammering that "we" had only 5,000,000,000 barrels of oil, that it would all be gone in 1925, that "our" economy was doomed. Then the Seminole field came in, and suddenly the terror was overproduction of oil. "We have solved the problem of production; we have not solved the problem of distribution." States passed laws, President Coolidge appointed the Federal Oil Conservation Board. The oilmen's free trade association, the American Petroleum Institute, offered a plan for the industry's self-regulation; the Federal Attorney General in effect vetoed it, presumably because of the Sherman Act. The Conservation Board then offered to aid the oil-producing States in setting up controls of oil production.

STATE VERSUS FEDERAL POWER

These controls, called prorationing, are operating now. State engineers are supposed to regulate the drilling and the flow of wells according to the principles discovered by the industry and in accordance with best conservation practices.

Then arose the problem of rivalry between the oil-producing States. All the States are represented in the conference of governors; and (with permission from Congress) the oil-producing States are also represented in a permanent Interstate Oil Compact Commission.

Obviously, this institution and the prorationing State commissions are new political organs, adding to the States' powers, and tending rather to maintain the balance between State and Federal powers than to destroy it. Obviously, their function and power would cease to exist with the dissolution and reorganization of the oil industry by Federal action.

Professor Rostow makes his view clear immediately. On page 4 he refers to the "weakness of our divided system for controlling business." He condemns the States' prorationing commissions as inefficient, costly, wasteful, a burden on interstate commerce, and a tax on society. He advocates, instead, the compulsory operation of each oil field as a unit, but not "within the present structure of the industry." There must be "a fair allocation of power and control within the corporations or cooperatives set up to operate the fields on a unitized basis. They might all be made Federal corporations from the outset to assure simple and uniform corporate policy."

The publication of this book at this precise time is so strategic that if it is merely a coincidence, it is, indeed, a remarkable one.

Now, I am not concerned for the gentlemen who are vaguely villified as the oil interests. If this were merely an attack upon them, my view would be that it is no attack upon me. My concern, as it must be yours if you want to save your neck, is self-defense. I am concerned to defend my liberty, my ownership of a tiny but to me essential bit of property, and, above all, my country, my country's constitutional law, which is the security of my life.

These are the target of this attack. This book is being used now by the little group in Washington which, if citizens do not stop it, will carry out its program; for such destruction is always done by a small, unnoticed group. Senator DONNELL, a most violent champion of the Federal seizure of tidelands oil, was using this book as an authority in congressional committee hearings in March.

Think, even, of the immediate effects of the disorganization and nationalization of the American oil industry, at this juncture in world affairs.

A GREAT AMERICAN ACHIEVEMENT

The American oil industry is one of the greatest of all human achievements. Oil was seeping from the ground in ancient Sumeria 5,000 years ago; no one knew any use for it. Ninety years ago, no one made any use of it. Fifty years ago Americans were making kerosene for lamps (women put salt in it to keep it from exploding) and axle grease for wagon wheels. Today the American oil industry embraces the planet. A million American workers are cooperating in this activity, so complex and so dynamic that no human mind can encompass it.

These men cannot even know each other's names. Yet they work together, each for his own immediate purpose, and together they achieve a result beyond imagination. With invisible waves they explore deep into solid earth; they pierced the earth for miles, actually miles, with small tools suspended on thin steel wires, and they bring up from the depths a variety of fluids. They sort out, by size and shape, the invisible molecules in each of these fluids, some molecules (which men believe would look like cockleburs, if any instrument could make them visible) they crack, and crack again, into their separate atoms; with these atoms, they make new molecules, a new fluid, unstable, explosive, risky to handle. So they invent and make new ways of safely transporting and handling it. And within 30 years they have wholly transformed the American way of living.

Among American industries, the oil industry is large. It supplies the fuel for the motorcars, the airplanes, the trucks and tractors, threshers, and wheat elevators, Diesel engines and locomotives, the fuel that heats the blast furnaces and warms skyscrapers and homes; the asphalt for city streets and roofs and asphalt shingles, the cheap, pretty, fire-resisting roofs of America; its oil smothers the dust from country roads; it supplies the base for cosmetics, the candles in churches and on birthday cakes, the sanitary waxed paper, a thousand such small things. And without the oil industry, not a wheel can go on turning in America, not a wheel in any factory, not an elevator, not a lawn mower. The oil industry lubricates every wheel that turns.

These million Americans, called the oil industry, simply keep my country operating. They keep the wheels turning in America, every peaceful hour; and in war theirs is the power that wins the war. Russia has the natural resource—the Baku field is one of the world's richest. The Communist International has had its control and direction by public law during these same past 30 years, and has had at its disposal all the American techniques, too. The German drive for Baku's oil failed to reach it by hundreds of miles. But these Americans supplied the gasoline and oiled the wheels of the Soviet's motorized divisions. The Russian armies followed those divisions on foot and in ox-carts.

WHERE YOUR GASOLINE DOLLAR GOES

So what is wrong with the American oil industry? It works all rights. Then does it prey on you and me, who are the consumers, the public, the society? I can remember paying 40 cents a gallon for poor gasoline, and carrying a reserve supply in a 5-gallon can on the running board beside the tool chest. Today you pull in to the next filling station and say "Fill 'er up. And check the oil, will you?" A young man polishes your windshield and windows, while a pump measures into your gas tank a gallon of fine chemical, made from muck found 3 miles underground, 2,000 miles away; the pump rings pleasantly. For that gallon, you pay politicians as much as 7 or 8 cents; about 4 cents to the filling station operator; a couple of cents to the local wholesaler; you pay workers' wages all the way back to the well, and half a cent or less to the oil interests. With this, they go on expanding and improving the service to you.

A national policy for the oil industry does not mention this fraction of a cent, it merely refers to "excess selling costs incurred as a consequence of monopolistic organization of gasoline marketing." Professor Rostow would save money by eliminating many filling stations, abolishing advertising and brand names, dumping all kinds and grades of gasoline into one standard kind, and selling it at one flat price.

Nor does this book refer to the United States Department of Labor price index. As of December 31, 1947, this index shows that since 1926 the average wholesale price of all commodities has risen 62.3 percent; the price of petroleum products has risen 12 percent. Since 1920 the oil industry has cut its price to you from 30 cents to less than 20. If politicians had not increased their take some 1,400 percent since 1920, last year you would have paid about 19 cents a gallon for gasoline. The price would be higher now because demand is increasing faster than supply, although the industry today is producing more than it did at the peak of its gigantic war effort.

Then are the oil interests exploiting labor? When have you heard of a strike in the oil industry?

Before the Wagner Act and the NLRB outlawed organizations of the cooperation natural in a free economy, Americans were creating a totally new thing in human industry: Social organization within industries. Thousands of different experiments were tried, throughout this country; hundreds were

working marvelously. The various oil companies had in operation a wealth of these new social forms; employee representation in management, mutual benefit associations for education, medical care, housing, pensions, sickness and accident and old-age and life insurance. You'd expect sociologists and economists to study eagerly this new phenomenon; so far as I know, none of them saw it. The brain trust in Washington wrecked it.

The victims salvaged what they could. Wage-earners in the oil industry reorganized their outlawed forms of cooperation with employers, and escaped the Federal edicts by renaming them independent unions. The CIO and A. F. of L. are in the industry, too. But no labor troubles to speak of. Through the depression the oil companies, in the red, reduced working hours, spread work, improved techniques, and by 1937 were paying higher wage-totals than at the top of the 1921 boom.

So what charge do the professors make against the oil industry? It is difficult to tell businessmen, who cannot believe it. The charges are two: 1, An indefinite number of oil companies, called majors, are larger than companies called independents that are smaller; 2, the majors eliminate the middleman's profit.

WHAT IS A MONOPOLY?

I am translating Professor Rostow's words. He uses, a technical vocabulary, which turns the meaning of words upside down. He says that the oil industry is monopolistic, that it must be dissolved to make it competitive.

"Competitive markets," he writes, "are those of many sellers, no one of whom sells an appreciable fraction of the total supply of the commodity or service in the market, and no one of whom has any discretion as to the price he receives."

"Monopoly power is a matter of degree. The extent of the monopolist's control over the prices he charges depends on the availability of substitutes, the nature and elasticity of the demand for his product, and * * * other factors. Nonetheless, he has a measure of discretion as to the price he charges."

The oil industry must be shattered because it is monopolistic, he explains. It is monopolistic because, 1. The "majors" handle petroleum products from their source to the consumer—for that fraction of a cent which this book does not mention. Oilmen invented, build, and own tankers, tank cars, tank trucks and pipelines, though they operate the pipelines as common carriers regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission. (This is true, not only of "majors" but of more than a hundred companies, large and small.) They eliminate the middleman's profit. 2. As you know, oil companies state their selling prices, and change them to meet competitors' prices. Of course, in this country all businessmen do that, but to the Yale committee, only a monopolist can do it. Do you own anything on which you put a selling price? Then you are a monopolist.

And, like the oil industry, your business can be dissolved, reorganized, nationalized, today, under the present interpretation of the Sherman Antitrust Act. Do not think I am exaggerating. This is the truth.

Far too little attention has been given, as Professor Rostow points out, to the possibilities suggested by the first antitrust proceeding under the Sherman Act, in 1911. "This was a case in which the Court decreed not an injunction against offensive trade practices, but far-reaching divestments of stock by an offending holding company. It is true that the decree was inexpertly drawn, and rests on a totally inadequate analysis of the economic problems of controlling the market for petroleum products. Nonetheless it was a start, and a most promising start, in the use of the most promising of all the remedies available for accomplishing the competitive reorganization of particular industries."

Today the promising start is being expanded rapidly. "In the Aluminum case Judge Hand finally interred and reversed the old dictum that size is not an offense under the Sherman Act. Size * * * was the essence of the offense. * * * All other aspects of the case were subordinated to the central and decisive fact that the Aluminum Co. of America, many years after its patents had expired, made, and then fabricated or sold over 90 percent of the virgin aluminum used in the United States * * *. No predatory or illegal tactics need be shown, and no specific evidence of 'intent.' * * * Judge Hand's opinion is a practical and feasible restatement of the conception of monopoly, giving the law new and far-reaching scope."

Judge Hand said that he doubted whether selling 60 or 64 percent of a product constitutes a monopoly, "certainly 33 percent does not." Yet in the Tobacco case, three companies were charged with selling, together, 75 percent of the cigarettes bought in the United States, or 25 percent each. Their sales were not increasing as fast as total sales, and six smaller companies were gaining on them in the market. The three companies were found guilty on a criminal charge of monopoly and restraint of trade. The Supreme Court rules that "the power to exclude actual or potential competition, not the actual exclusion of actual competitors, is a hallmark of the offense prohibited by section 3 [of the Sherman Act] * * *. Parallel action based on acknowledged self-interest within a defined market structure [i. e., meeting a competitor's price] is sufficient evidence of illegal action."

CAN YOU BELIEVE THIS?

Professor Rostow comments, "What emerges from the tobacco case is a new, vital and most promising doctrine—a doctrine which provides the Department of Justice with its best opportunity since the Sherman Act was passed to seek the enforcement of the law on a grand scale, and in ways which might produce not piddling changes in the detail of trade practice, but long strides toward the great social purposes of the statute."

"The actual elimination of small competitors is unnecessary. * * * Parallel action, price leadership, a reliance on advertising rather than price competition * * * and, above all, size—the market position of a small number of sellers or buyers—these are now key points to be proved in a case of monopoly, or of combination in restraint of trade * * *.

"Against the background of these cases, an action against the major oil companies * * * should not face insuperable obstacles. * * * The 20 major oil companies together refine and sell at wholesale 80 percent or more of the gasoline. * * * Actually, all the major oil companies do not operate in any one market. They appear in different combinations, and in much smaller numbers, in different regional markets. In all those markets, the policy of price and output which prevails * * * is effectively monopolistic in pattern—certainly every bit as monopolistic as the policy declared illegal in the tobacco case. This result, and not a mechanical rule of thumb as to how many sellers can be a monopoly, should be the decisive factor in applying the principle of the tobacco case."

Twenty separate companies, operating in different markets are a monopoly under the present legal interpretation of the word in section 2 of the Sherman Act, because all of them do 80 percent of the business in their field, or 4 percent each. I repeat, this is legal; and this book, A National Policy for the Oil Industry, is in the hands of men in Washington who regard it as an authority and a pattern of action.

Americans have a totally false idea of the Sherman Act. I have yet to meet a businessman, big or little, who would listen to any criticism of the Sherman Act. You have a fatuous belief that it protects you from "monopolies" and "concentration of economic power." Had Alcoa, making an unpatented product from a material everywhere, a monopoly, in your meaning of the word? Is a dwindling 25 percent of the cigarette market, a monopoly? Has any oil company a monopoly in your town? Did you say a word in defense of the Aluminum Co.'s right to own property? Did you say a word in protest against the criminal conviction of the tobacco companies? What will you do to defend the oil industry of America, upon which American life and American military strength depend? When will you begin to defend yourself?

Sherman Act, section 2: "Every person who shall monopolize, or attempt to monopolize * * * any part of the trade or commerce among the several States * * * shall be deemed guilty."

Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a statement which I made before the Senate Appropriations Committee on the subject of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway.

Funds to begin the construction of this great project have been recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and inserted in the bill in the Senate.

I am appealing to the House conferees to accept the Senate amendment, and let us proceed with the construction of this the greatest inland waterways project ever proposed, and one that will mean more to our national defense than any other that could possibly be constructed at this time.

It may mean the saving of America in case of an atomic war with a foreign power.

My statement before the Senate committee, as it appears in the hearings, follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN E. RANKIN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

TENNESSEE-TROMBIGBEE INLAND WATERWAY

Representative RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, this is the most important inland navigation project ever proposed in the United States. It is not altogether new for the simple reason that we already have it developed from Mobile up to the mouth of the Warrior River.

It will provide a slack-water route for returning traffic from the Gulf of Mexico to Pittsburgh, Pa., and also provide what will amount to a slack-water route from the Gulf of Mexico to Chicago, Ill., on the Great Lakes.

It will provide what will amount to a slack-water route from the Gulf of Mexico to Minneapolis and St. Paul on the Mississippi River.

It will provide what will amount to a slack-water route for all the traffic coming down the Missouri River that has to return;

that is, it will provide what will amount to a slack-water route all the way back to St. Louis.

It will provide a slack-water route from the Gulf of Mexico at Mobile, Ala., up to the greatest defense plant, the world ever knew; that is, Oak Ridge, on the Tennessee River. At the same time it will cut the water distance from Oak Ridge to the Gulf of Mexico by approximately 800 miles, or 786 miles to be exact.

At the same time, it will save the swift current of the Mississippi River for downstream traffic.

For downstream traffic, the Mississippi River is the greatest highway of water commerce, inland water commerce, on earth. I dare say there is not another inland stream on earth that furnishes the great facilities for downstream traffic the Mississippi River does.

However, when you start back, if the river is flowing at the rate it is today a barge would eat up all the gasoline in Louisiana and probably not move a peg.

"NATCHEZ" DISASTER

They have just experienced the great disaster of the steamboat *Natchez*. The *Natchez* was attempting to navigate against the current of that monarch stream with a number of loaded barges. It reached the vicinity of Greenville; it cut half its barges loose, anchored them, and undertook to take the other half. The swift current threw that boat against the piers of the Greenville Bridge and destroyed it, with a considerable loss of human lives.

Senator GURNEY. Is there some indication regarding that accident, Congressman, that possibly the man at the helm did not turn the wheel in the right direction at the right moment?

Representative RANKIN. I doubt that. I should like to make this statement, and I would like for Colonel Jewett to correct me if I make a misstatement, because this is a most vital issue, and I do not want to mislead the committee.

A barge can only travel about 5½ miles an hour in slack water. I believe that is the testimony that the engineers supplied to the committee. This river now is flowing probably 6 or 7 miles an hour, and this tow with the large number of barges was attempting to return upstream. The tow is similar to one of these tows that you see on this map here that came down from the Ohio River or from the Great Lakes or the upper Mississippi or the Missouri.

In this case they left part of the barges and undertook to take the others, but the current was so swift that it overcame the force of the vessel, and threw the boat with these barges against this bridge and destroyed it, with the loss of life to which Senator EASTLAND has referred.

This project will provide what will amount to a slack-water route from the Gulf of Mexico to the Great Lakes. You have a slack-water route now along the Tombigbee to the Warrior River. This project will give us a slack-water route of 481 miles along the Tombigbee to the Tennessee River.

It is 215 miles downstream from where this project reaches the Tennessee River there to Paducah, Ky., on the Ohio.

FLOW OF TENNESSEE RIVER

The average American does not realize that the Tennessee River flows north. When De Soto went through that area, he came down the Tennessee River to Gunthersville, went across to Tuscaloosa, turned northwestward and struck the Mississippi River about Memphis. He thought it was the same stream. I have a copy of his map showing the Tennessee curving southward and making the Mississippi.

Do not forget that De Soto's expedition was filled with the most intelligent men in Europe, and it never occurred to them that the Tennessee River would turn north as it does.

Probably in prehistoric times there was an upheaval that turned that river north. Probably at one time it flowed down the Tombigbee River.

This is a lime country, and in it we find shark's teeth and other evidences of marine life. That river not only flows 215 miles north to Paducah, on the Ohio, but the Ohio takes its water down 47 miles to Cairo; so you have 262 miles downstream from where this project intersects the Tennessee River to Cairo, Ill.

The Army engineers have been trying for probably 150 years to find a way to even connect these two streams. It never could be done until the Pickwick Dam was built just below the mouth of Yellow Creek, where this projects intersects the Tennessee River. Up to that time they would have had to have locks going both ways, with no water supply at the summit.

You cannot operate locks without a water supply at your summit. Those of you who have been to the Panama Canal will remember that the Panama Canal is supplied by the water that comes from the Chagres River down the Isthmus and is turned into Gatun Lake, 85 feet above the sea, and with that water we lift those boats up to that level and carry them through the canal.

When this Pickwick Dam was built, it raised that water 55 feet high, and the Army engineers found that they could cut through this sand ridge and put the summit of the project in the Tennessee River; so that problem is entirely solved.

EXISTING SLACK-WATER ROUTES

On the Ohio River they have 46 locks and dams between Cairo and Pittsburgh; that gives them a slack-water route all the way up the Ohio River. The traffic on the Ohio would move down the Mississippi in order to take advantage of the swift current, and come back up this slack-water route to Paducah on the Ohio River.

It is true you have an upstream route from Cairo to the mouth of the Illinois River, which is 218 miles, but that is offset, you might say, by the 262 miles downstream from the mouth of Yellow Creek to Cairo, and when you get to the Illinois River you have a slack-water route entirely into the Great Lakes at Chicago.

You also have a slack-water route all the way up to Minneapolis and St. Paul; I believe there are 26 locks and dams on the Mississippi River between Cairo and St. Paul and Minneapolis.

We get our grain from the northwestern section of the country, as a rule. It comes down the Missouri River and down the Mississippi River. However, when those barges start back and they want to take back the things they need, they are punished by having to navigate against that swift current that at times is destructive, as Colonel Jewett says, averaging around 2½ miles an hour the year around, and sometimes running 6 or 7 miles an hour.

Therefore, by cutting through this sand ridge and putting in these locks and dams, you give us a slack-water route up to the Tennessee River and a downstream route to Paducah and Cairo, which solves the problem the people in that area are struggling with.

You have been told that the St. Lawrence would be blocked with snow and ice. This project will not be blocked with snow and ice. It will be open the year around.

OAK RIDGE PROJECT

Before I go further, let me show you what it means, and I am quoting the figures of the Army engineers. Let us take the Oak Ridge project, the greatest defense project the world has ever seen. I do not know the material we have to have at Oak Ridge, but I do know that we have to supply an enormous population there.

We have a plant covering 70 square miles. In that area there are some aluminum plants that bring their bauxite from South America, just as there are in the Pittsburgh area. Let us see what this would mean.

TRANSPORTATION SAVINGS

Here are these great barges, as you can see on this picture. There is one coming down from the Great Lakes, and you see it is loaded with automobiles, evidently produced in Michigan. Here is one coming from Pittsburgh; and each one of those barges carries 14,000 tons of freight. The average barge until recently had a capacity of 3,500 tons, or one-fourth the amount of this one in this picture. These big barges are being used today. Here is one coming down the Mississippi or the Missouri.

If that barge were returning from Houston, Tex., to Cairo, Ill., it would save $5,600 on its fuel bill alone on just one trip.

If it were going to Paducah on the Ohio River, $7,560 would be saved.

If it were going to Oak Ridge, Tenn., it would save $15,960 just on its fuel bill alone.

If it were going from New Orleans back to Cairo, it would save $9,800 on its fuel bill alone.

If it were going to Paducah, it would save $11,760, and if it were going to Oak Ridge, it would save $20,020.

That is on the price of fuel 3 years ago. It would probably save a great deal more than that today.

I might say to you at this point that a large portion of the material that is used in this area and manufactured there comes from South America, and it comes through Mobile. Going from Mobile to Cairo, a 14,000-ton barge would save $20,160; going to Paducah, it would save $22,160; going into the Tennessee River, whether it went to Knoxville, or to Oak Ridge, the saving would be $30,380 on its fuel bill alone.

Senator GURNEY. Are you giving credit there, Congressman, to the toll for the difference between going in slack water and against the current of the Mississippi?

Representative RANKIN. Yes, sir.

With reference to Birmingham and Demopolis, the savings from Birmingham would be just the same as they would from Demopolis, because all the water traffic from Birmingham has to come through Demopolis; so I will just refer to Demopolis, and remember that this applies to Birmingham. By the way, we already have a 9-foot channel up to Demopolis.

That 14,000-ton barge going from Demopolis to Cairo, Ill., would save $28,140 on its fuel bill alone.

If it went into the Ohio River at Paducah, it would save $30,100.

If it were going to Oak Ridge it would save $38,360, on its fuel bill alone.

I will not go farther up the river but will refer you to the table I am inserting. In my time, I have known boats to go as far up as this point here, which is the confluence of Browns and Mackys Creeks where this project intersects the Tombigbee River. It is about 25 miles from the Tennessee to the Tombigbee River. The Tennessee is on a plateau about a hundred feet above the Tombigbee.

I say that sand ridge has precluded us from making this connection up to the present time, but now that has been solved and it seems to me that the necessity for facilitating the traffic, not only from the Ohio River, not only from Chicago and the Great Lakes area, not only from the Mississippi, but from the Missouri and the Tennessee, the entire area, more than justifies us in speeding up the construction of this project.

Senator HAYDEN. Do you have the figures showing the total annual savings on the average traffic flow of the Mississippi River?

Representative RANKIN. No; I do not. The Army engineers may have, Senator, but I do not. I will say this much, that a great deal of traffic is kept off the Mississippi River now because of the tremendous cost of taking these barges back, of ascending the river.

Now, I wrote to Secretary Forrestal, and I am sure that he would not object to my reading his letter to you here. He said:

LETTER FROM SECRETARY FORRESTAL

"DEAR JOHN: I have your letter of the 17th of February with reference to the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway. The civil-functions estimate for the fiscal year 1949 submitted by the Bureau of the Budget, Department of the Army, included an amount to initiate this project. This item was eliminated from the appropriation requested, the request contained in the budget message, but upon appeal by the Department, it was submitted for $1,500,000 as a supplementary request.

"The civil functions appropriation bill as passed by the House does not contain this item. However, the Department of the Army expects to request restoration of the amount when their bill is considered in the Senate.

"Sincerely yours,

"JAMES FORRESTAL."

All we are asking for is for that amount, in order to start the project. As time goes on, it is going to be necessary, of course, to speed the work up in order to complete this project. It is the only place on the face of the earth where you can transfer the traffic from one major watershed to another with so little expense, so much ease, and such tremendous savings in transportation costs and distances.

It will put Oak Ridge about 800 miles nearer the Gulf of Mexico, and the savings on the materials will be tremendous. I understand some of the railroads have kicked on this, and they did the same thing when we developed the Warrior River. There never has been a railroad man thrown out of work by this kind of development. The railroads have simply readjusted their rates, and today they employ more railroad men in the Birmingham area than they did when the Warrior River was developed years ago.

Gentlemen, that is the statement that I have to make to you. I appeal to you to put this item back in the bill. We did not call the roll on it in the House because we thought it advisable to bring it over to the Senate; but when you investigate it carefully and consult the Army engineers, and examine the facts, I do not see how any man in America can oppose it at this time. As I said, this slack-water route will be open all the year. You will not have it frozen up. It will bring tremendous savings to this entire area.

If we had had this route opened up so that we could bring oil into this area, they could have had their oil stored within 300 miles of Boston. Today they are freezing in that country, I am sorry to say, because their oil supply has been shut off, and there is a great deal of suffering in some of the areas along the Great Lakes. That could be relieved in the future by the construction of this project.

I will be glad to answer any questions that any of you Senators care to ask.

BENEFIT-COST RATIO

Senator KNOWLAND. What is the benefit to cost ratio on the project?

Colonel JEWETT. The benefit-cost ratio is now 1.13. We recomputed the savings on diversion of up-bound Mississippi River traffic, about 2,500,000 tons each year, and now place those savings at $1,500,000 annually, the combined annual direct saving being $7,883,000.

Senator RUSSELL. Is that based on the annual traffic or the estimate of the traffic that would flow if the route were available?

Colonel JEWETT. This is based on the estimate of the traffic that would flow, appraising the entire area, including not only the traffic that would flow directly on the route, but the traffic that would be diverted from the Mississippi River to take advantage of the slack-water route in lieu of fighting upstream through the Mississippi.

NUMBER OF LOCKS AND DAMS CONTEMPLATED

Senator RUSSELL. How many locks and dams are contemplated?

Colonel JEWETT. The project plan contemplates 18 locks and dams.

Senator GURNEY. Senator RUSSELL asked you a while ago, or asked Congressman RANKIN, if he had any estimate of savings based on the present flow of traffic down the Mississippi River. Do you have that information readily available there?

Senator RUSSELL. He just gave that; your attention was diverted. It was $1,500,000 a year.

WHERE WORK WOULD BE STARTED

Senator GURNEY. Where would this initial work be started?

Colonel JEWETT. It would be begun at the north end by dredging the divide cut.

Senator GURNEY. That is south of where the Tennesse enters into the proposed system?

Colonel JEWETT. Yes, sir; it would cut out from the Pickwick Pool down Yellow Creek to connect with Mackeys Creek.

Representative RANKIN. This would give us two outlets to the sea from Oak Ridge that we may need in case of trouble in the years to come.

I ask that this table and this letter be inserted in the record as a part of my remarks.

Senator GURNEY. You have read the letter, Mr. RANKIN, and we will insert the table in the record at this point.

Representative RANKIN. Here is the table showing the savings in transportation costs which this project will provide:

From—	To—	Via Mississippi, per ton	Via Mississippi, per tow of 3,500 tons	Via Tombigbee-Tennessee, per ton	Via Tombigbee-Tennessee, per tow of 3,500 tons	Average savings per ton	Average savings per tow of 3,500 tons	Average savings per tow of 14,000 tons
Houston, Tex	Cairo	$2.34	$8,190	$1.94	$6,790	$0.40	$1,400	$5,600
	Paducah	2.42	8,470	1.88	6,580	.54	1,890	7,560
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction.	2.74	9,590	1.00	3,500	1.14	3,990	15,960
New Orleans, La	Cairo	2.02	7,070	1.32	4,620	.70	2,450	9,800
	Paducah	2.10	7,350	1.26	4,410	.84	2,940	11,760
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction.	2.42	8,470	.99	3,465	1.43	5,005	20,020
Mobile, Ala	Cairo	2.39	8,365	.95	3,325	1.44	5,040	20,160
	Paducah	2.47	8,645	.89	3,115	1.58	5,530	22,160
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction.	2.79	9,765	.62	2,170	2.17	7,595	30,380
Fort Birmingham, Ala.	Cairo	2.96	10,360	.95	3,325	2.01	7,035	28,140
	Paducah	3.04	10,640	.89	3,115	2.15	7,525	30,100
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction.	3.36	11,760	.62	2,170	2.74	9,590	38,360
Demopolis, Ala	Cairo	2.68	9,380	.67	2,345	2.01	7,035	28,140
	Paducah	2.76	9,660	.61	2,135	2.15	7,525	30,100
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction.	3.08	10,780	.34	1,190	2.74	9,590	38,360
Columbus, Miss	Cairo	2.83	9,905	.51	1,785	2.32	8,120	32,480
	Paducah	2.91	10,185	.45	1,575	2.46	8,610	34,440
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction.	3.23	11,305	.17	595	3.06	10,710	42,940
Aberdeen, Miss	Cairo	2.88	10,080	.46	1,610	2.42	8,470	33,880
	Paducah	2.96	10,300	.40	1,400	2.56	8,960	35,840
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction.	3.23	11,480	.13	455	3.15	11,025	44,100
Fulton, Miss	Cairo	2.93	10,255	.41	1,435	2.52	8,820	35,280
	Paducah	3.01	10,535	.35	1,225	2.66	9,310	37,240
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction.	3.33	11,655	.08	280	3.25	11,375	45,500

Senator RUSSELL. Is there any question about these large barges going down that river?

Colonel JEWETT. No, sir.

SIZE OF LOCKS

Representative RANKIN. All of the locks on the Ohio River and the Mississippi and the Illinois are 110 by 600 feet. The Pickwick Dam and also the Gilbertsville Dam locks on the Tennessee River are 110 by 600; so that every vessel that comes from one of these streams can go back that way.

Senator GURNEY. You passed over the locks and the dam that might be on the Warrier River. What size are those locks south from the Tennessee?

Representative RANKIN. The Warrior River locks are smaller.

Senator GURNEY. Would they have to be increased in size?

Representative RANKIN. These big barges cannot go into the Warrior River now, but they change their cargo at the mouth of the river at Demopolis, and the smaller barges take them into Birmingham.

Senator GURNEY. I do not seem to know my geography down there, but I am trying to find out on the return route going north, I presume the locks in the south are the large-sized locks. From Demopolis, north, what is the size of the lock?

Representative RANKIN. You mean up the Tombigbee River? That is what we propose here, that they be built.

Colonel JEWETT. Locks 110 by 600 feet are included in our plan.

Representative RANKIN. They turned it down in the House one time because the bill provided for small locks and the people in the other parts of the country contended that they could not return with their barges through those small locks; so the engineers went back and made a resurvey, and the last report provides for locks 110 by 600 feet, which is the standard lock on the Mississippi, the Ohio, the Illinois, and the Missouri Rivers.

I thank the committee for their attention. We have some other members here who would like to be heard.

Mr. Speaker, as has been said by the Army engineers time and time again, this is one of the most important projects of its kind that has ever been proposed.

This is the only place on earth where the traffic can be transferred from one major watershed to another with so much ease, so little expense, and such

tremendous savings in transportation costs and distances.

In addition to that, it is most vitally important to our national defense, and might mean the difference between victory and destruction in case of an atomic war.

Our Need for Moral Rearmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an address delivered by Ralph T. Harbo, Assistant Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation before the National Conference on Community Improvement, Hall of Flags, United States Chamber of Commerce, Washington, D. C., on May 25, 1948.

This is really a challenge to those who may be indifferent to the necessity for taking a greater interest in the youth of this country who, in the final analysis, will be the sovereign citizens of tomorrow. I believe that the citizens will very rapidly lose their liberties, not only for themselves, but for future generations, unless they meet their responsibility in the handling of this great problem of juvenile crime. Not only this, but the fundamentals of our Government are in the balance and will be destroyed unless our schools and colleges teach the fundamentals of free government as embodied in our Constitution and Bill of Rights. The churches have a tremendous responsibility to meet in combatting communism which, after all is said and done, seeks to overthrow our free institutions, and with this overthrow will go the churches.

This speech of Mr. Ralph T. Harbo ought to be read and acted upon by every person in the United States who wishes to preserve sound American doctrine and freedom.

I recall only last year of reading on the tombstone of William Bradford at Plymouth, Mass., these words: "Do not basely relinquish what the fathers with difficulty attained."

Under unanimous consent previously obtained, I am inserting the address of Ralph T. Harbo:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, my pleasure in meeting with you this morning is somewhat diluted by my knowledge of the regrets of Mr. Hoover that he was unable to accept your kind invitation to be here, due to the pressure of official duties which has made it impossible for him to be here. However, he asked me to convey to you his greetings and best wishes.

In considering the problem of crime control it may be well for us at the outset to examine briefly the general crime situation in the United States at this time. When we do so we see substantial increases in major crimes since the end of the war, a large amount of juvenile crime, undermanned law enforcement agencies, and unsettled economic and social conditions as an aftermath of the war. On the other side of the ledger we find on the average, better-trained law enforcement officers than 10 years ago, resulting from increased emphasis on effective training programs, and a greater appreciation for and fuller use of scientific aids in criminal investigations.

To be more specific regarding recent crime trends in the United States, the 1947 murder figure is 15.4 percent above the prewar average. For other crimes, the increased rate is 48 percent for aggravated assault, 59 percent for robbery, 14 percent for burglary, 15 percent for larceny, and 2.6 percent for auto theft.

Fingerprint arrest records reveal that arrests of males under 21 years of age increased 10 percent in 1945, 1.6 percent in 1946, and 10.5 percent in 1947. And arrests of girls under 21 were 30 percent in excess of the figures in 1941. One further statistic on this particular point: Over half of the persons arrested and finger-printed last year already had fingerprint arrest records on file in the identification division of the FBI. This situation is certainly not one to induce a feeling of complacency.

May I next point out one additional illustration of the unsatisfactory conditions with reference to crime and law enforcement in the United States. I have to go back to 1938 to get prewar English figures. They are the most recent available. They indicate that in the United States the murder rate was 12 times the murder rate in England, in proportion to population. With reference to other serious crimes such as robbery and felonious assault, the average rate in the United States is at least nine times as great as in England. I cite those figures because crime is one of those things that we have with us, from day to day and year to year. We have in this country a grossly excessive crime rate. There's a danger that we will become so accustomed to it so that we will barely be aware of it.

The home is the basic unit of our community life and our existence as a democratic nation. Whatever is strong in our community is directly traceable to the home. Likewise whatever is weak and undesirable in our community is the result of the failure of the family unit. The home is responsible for, and has much to do with, the quality of our schools and churches as well as our local government. Hence we see that the home has the broad underlying responsibility for all phases of our community life.

The home is receptive, responsive, very sensitive to leadership furnished by the school and the church. One thing the home must inculcate is respect for authority. As American citizens, liberty under law is our priceless heritage. Obedience to the law is our obligation. This is a very simple truth. It is fundamental but it cannot be overemphasized. Proper home training will necessarily inculcate a respect for the authority of teachers, police officers, judicial officials, and all others who are in places of rightful authority.

Respect for the personal rights and property rights of others is an additional item which needs increased emphasis in the development of youth. The shameful acts of vandalism to private dwellings, public buildings, schools, and other establishments, which we read of in the daily press, resulting in thousands of dollars of property damage are an obvious indication of the failure of those responsible for the rearing of the children of the Nation properly. Adults frequently place temptation in the path of youth by their carelessness in making it easy for them to commit thefts.

An illustration of this is the parking of an automobile in a public place with the ignition keys in the switch. Obviously, it is the obligation of adults to avoid contributing to delinquency either directly or indirectly. One of the essential elements in the control of crime is the deterrent influence of the certainty of detection and punishment.

We of the FBI have no quarrel with those who seek to improve the environmental factors which influence youth. We are heartily in favor of all such constructive measures. But we do disagree with the views expressed by some overly sentimental people, who apparently feel that the individual offender is relatively blameless and that society should receive the major portion of the blame for delinquent or criminal acts.

The doctrine of individual responsibility for the consequences of one's own conduct needs reemphasis. Human frailties make it appropriate to teach the fact that sooner or later those who transgress will be detected and punished. The extent to which some offenders go in an effort to conceal their guilt, is illustrated by the following case which occurred in a southwestern State some months ago.

Several pedestrians on a country highway were struck by a motorist who fled the scene, leaving two of the victims to die. After caring for the remaining injured persons, the State police made a thorough search of the scene, but the only evidence which they found consisted of a few small pieces of metal which had been broken from the automobile involved. Upon examination of these metal fragments in the FBI laboratory, it was possible for our experts to advise the State police that the automobile involved was a 1936 Buick.

This information was their only clue, and for weeks, they sought to locate such an automobile, which bore some indication it had recently been in a collision. But their search was fruitless, until one day an alert officer noted that a 1936 Buick had been reported stolen some distance away. Upon being questioned, the owner denied being involved in an accident. His story was that he and some friends had been drinking in a tavern, that he never drove his auto after heavy drinking, and accordingly he and his companions stayed overnight at the tavern.

He claimed his auto was stolen that night. Further investigation disclosed that the owner of the car actually was driving the car at the time of the fatal collision, and after giving his confession, he took the officers to the spot, where he had concealed the car. He was a construction foreman, and after running over the auto with a bulldozer several times, he had buried it under 6 feet of dirt.

He thought he had eliminated all evidence which could possibly connect him with the crime, but a careful search for physical evidence at the crime scene, coupled with the services of the laboratory experts, yielded the essential clue which ultimately lead to the detection and punishment of the hit-and-run driver.

Our times have been characterized by a lack of restraint and, undoubtedly, to some extent, by a lack of proper discipline in the home. It would not be fair to assume that as a general proposition the whole burden of character training should be placed upon the schools. But we have seen that a large portion of present-day crime is committed by youth. A majority of persons committing crimes are repeaters. It is particularly important that teachers be keenly aware of this situation, for the schools have contact with the youth of the land during a large part of their waking hours.

Crime conditions in this country indicate that we are in need of moral rearmament. The vicious philosophy that anything is all right if you can get by with it, must be definitely rejected and thrown out of American thinking and living. Likewise we must guard against the existence of conditions that might lead our youth to believe that they can get by with performance that is less than their best. We need to set higher standards for youth and give them more encouragement in striving to attain those standards.

Certainly we need to do everything possible to discourage the notion, entertained by some of our youth, that they can get away with murder and other serious crimes. One

of the best ways for reducing the amount of crime in the United States is by vigorous and efficient enforcement of the laws. To accomplish this it is essential that the police have the full support and active cooperation of the public, and that police organizations throughout the country be administered efficiently.

One of the greatest draw-backs to efficient police administration is the domination of police organizations by corrupt outside influences. Another draw-back is the short term of office of the average police administrator. It is important that the police administrator have capable officers under his direction, that he be allowed to administer the law without fear or favor, and that there be continuity of administrative policy.

Law enforcement must be bulwarked in every community in the land. Once the criminal or would-be criminal realizes that he cannot get away with it, he will be less likely to rob and plunder. He can be taught this only by superior mentality, superior weapons, and equipment. But good law enforcement is not the final answer. The problem goes much further.

Every resource in our land must be mobilized on the front of crime prevention. The modern view of progressive law enforcement was expressed by Mr. Hoover some time ago when he said, "We of the FBI are constantly working toward not only the capture of the enemies of society, but toward a new viewpoint which we hope will result in fewer violations of the law. We have no desire to be known solely as hunters of men. We would much rather be looked upon as preventers of crime. We have no happier days in the FBI than when vast throngs of boys, under the guidance of friendly special agents, are taken through our building and shown how we operate. We hope to see the day when every law-enforcement officer in America will realize that the best weapon against crime is a feeling of confidence and friendship upon the part of every boy and girl in his neighborhood."

I have been particularly impressed during the past few years by the large number of activities sponsored by local police agencies, the specific objectives of which are to aid unfortunate youth, such as Junior Police Corps, Boys Clubs, Boy Scout Troops, and other similar activities. I would like to suggest that those activities sponsored by the law-enforcement agencies are deserving of wholehearted community support, and certainly I bring to your attention an obvious fact that the police are on the front line with reference to boys and girls who are most likely to get in trouble—those who are on the border line, as it were. They know which ones need the helping hand, the chance for a redirection of their activities so that they will develop into worth-while citizens.

Crime can be controlled. But it is no easy task. The two basic approaches are, first, crime prevention, and second, effective enforcement of the law. This includes the functioning of judges, jurors, probation and parole officers, and penal authorities, as well as police.

Some of the essential ingredients of a successful prevention program are as follows:

1. Coordination of the programs and activities of the several official and private agencies which seek to direct the activities of youth in worth-while channels.

2. Ascertain the high-delinquency areas, and then check to determine whether the recreation facilities are adequate.

3. Work for the strengthening and possible expansion of the programs of agencies which provide wholesome spare-time activities for youth, such as schools, recreational departments of the local government, churches, and other private agencies.

4. Seek to reemphasize the character-building function of schools and churches.

5. Return to the moral law embodied in the Ten Commandments.

6. Encourage church groups to intensify their efforts to increase the number of boys and girls brought into the Sunday School and emphasize the importance of reaching those most in need of such influences.

7. Check on the problem of truancy.

8. Impress on parents the importance of home discipline, guidance, and control of youth, regardless of their natural confidence in their children. Parents should analyze the problem as it pertains to their own home, taking inventory of the amount of unsupervised time of their children and making sure it is spent in wholesome activity.

9. Strive to develop a tradition of law observance. Adults in this respect should remind themselves that they teach by example as well as by precept.

10. Emphasize that our form of Government not only bequeaths rights and privileges upon its citizens, but also duties and obligations.

Some of the essential elements of a successful enforcement program are:

1. High standards in the selection and training of law enforcement personnel, coupled with adequate salaries.

2. A well disciplined organization, free of any corrupting influences.

3. Adequate modern equipment.

4. Full use of all scientific aids to crime detection.

5. A strong public opinion, demanding strict enforcement of the laws, and appropriate restrictive measures against habitual offenders who have demonstrated their unwillingness to live within the laws of organized society.

A public opinion of this nature is diametrically opposed to the too often observed tendency of many people to express exaggerated sympathy for the defendant and to make excuses for his unlawful conduct. We must be more realistic and substitute consideration for the victim and the victim's family for the often overly sentimental inclination to find excuses for the offender. Such a shift in our thinking concerning the problem of law enforcement is essential, if we are to put in first place the general welfare of society and preservation of our internal strength as a Nation.

The tremendous volume of crime in this country, a problem aggravated by abnormal postwar conditions, requires the utmost diligence. The facilities of the FBI are available to assist local law enforcement officials in the field of training, fingerprint identification, and scientific laboratory examinations. Speaking in broad general terms, building better law enforcement involves improving the physical equipment of the community, the physical environment in which our people live. In addition, and more important, it involves the building of citizens who will earnestly endeavor to live up to high ideals of law observance and cooperate in the enforcement of laws adopted through the will of the majority. In brief, then, the extent to which we plan and conduct community life, determines the kind of people we have in our communities and their desirability as places in which to live and work.

Politics as a Field of Professional Activity for Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an article which I wrote for the Woman's Manual, to be published by the Social Sciences Publisher, Pauline V. Young and Fay B. Karpf, editors:

POLITICS AS A FIELD OF PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY FOR WOMEN

Politics as a field of professional activity is no different from any other field where ability and training are required.

One might say that the chief physical prerequisites for a good politician is a head that can think problems through, a heart that can feel with one's fellow men, and a skin seven spans thick to make one impervious to unwarranted and unjustified criticism. A skin seven spans thick was essential to any lawmaker under the old Iroquois Indian confederacy and was explicitly recorded in their constitution some 500 years ago. Perhaps it should be one of the requirements for a Member of our Congress.

To the extent that women satisfy the initial requirements for politics, it is a field open to them as it is to men. I find myself resenting the implication that women are peculiar creatures, fit only for certain types of work. I also resent the constant comparison with men as the ultimate yardstick. If women are good, they're good on their own. If men are good, they also must be judged in terms of their own achievements. But spare me those inevitable and invidicus comparisons.

There is practically no field of activity closed to women, per se, except perhaps some types of manual work. Even in that respect, World War II made notable changes. Women were employed as truck drivers, as conductors and motormen, as engineers, firemen, and repairmen in railroad yards, in aircraft and automobile factories. They were used as welders, lathe operators, riveters, blast furnace topmen, and section hands. Even today in the typically masculine heavy industries, women total 13 percent of all production workers.

It is true that men have replaced women to some extent in many of the heavy occupations, with the ending of the war. But women have beyond a doubt proven their ability and their worth.

As a matter of fact, the head of the Women's Bureau, Frieda S. Miller, made the observation recently, during the centennial celebration of the founding of the Women's Bureau, that of the 451 occupational classifications used in the 1940 census, women were employed in all but 9. That is a far cry from the situation in 1836, 12 years before the Women's Bureau was founded, when women were employed in only seven occupations, and those humble ones. And it was not until the Census of 1870 that official notice was taken of the employment of women. In that year, 2,000,000 women were recorded as being gainfully employed. Today about 17,000,000 women are so employed or seeking employment, 28 percent of the total working force.

During the war, the employment of women reached an all-time peak of 20,500,000 in July 1944. The drop in the employment of women since the war has been much slighter than even their champions had anticipated. That means that there are more jobs to go around, and that women have proven their worth beyond all doubt.

The Women's Bureau is shortly to publish a study of the changing occupations of women in the last seven decades that should prove of great interest.

Although women in large numbers are comparatively new in many professional fields of activity outside the home and school, they have proven able, given the training and the opportunity. They have become judges, doctors, lawyers, physicists, and chemists, engineers, and mathematicians, educators, politicians, and even outstanding world citizens. In the field of public relations and in

the business world they have proven themselves able executives and administrators.

Women have made good judges, even in so abstruse a field as tax law, as for example Marion Harron, of my own State of California.

In law, in medicine, in physics (particularly Lisa Meissner in atomic physics), in chemistry, in world affairs, women have left their indelible mark.

Very few men have spoken as simply, as briefly and to the point on international matters as Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt has in meetings in which I have been a participant.

Now that the air has been cleared of fuzzy talk about the type of occupations open to women, what about politics? What have women to contribute that is distinctive?

From the time she is born woman is a politician. At home she must be housekeeper, mother, teacher, judge, and sometimes even jury. What is government but housekeeping on a large scale?

Family life and children are a very important part of a woman's life and must not be belittled. She has much to contribute there and to learn that fits her to go on to community responsibility. If a woman's home life is organized she can find time to do all sorts of things that are essential to her community and to her nation. If a woman can't organize her home, she won't be much good on organization elsewhere.

In her home she meets problems of civil rights, of fair play, of discrimination. In her community she meets problems of housing, of delinquency, of playgrounds, and nurseries. She meets these problems and must deal with them in concrete terms. Consequently, women come to public life, not as raw recruits, but as seasoned politicians. They're not apt to make quite the same mistakes the male lawmakers do.

Years ago, women's training was such that only after her children grew up, and only if she had the inner drive and the encouragement of her husband and friends, and only if she had the opportunity did she seek farther horizons in politics or medicine or law.

Now, fortunately, young people, both girls and boys, are getting good basic training, many of them going on to college and professional schools. They marry, have children, so organize their time that they are able to continue their work. Veterans in particular and their wives have shown what can be done with budgeted time. No longer does woman have to choose exclusively between marriage and a career. Her choice now is marriage, a career, or a combination of both according to her inclinations, her finances, her ability, etc.

Women are in a very real sense the housekeepers of the Nation. It is at home that women first learn the value of the dollar—how much it will buy. The end of all the erudite talk of "economic spirals" is in the market basket. Just what happens to a consumer's dollar when it no longer buys 100 cents worth of commodities, but only 60 cents worth, as is the situation today?

It is in seeking the answer to that problem—the devaluation of the dollar—that women enter the field of national economics. Our national economy, and even our international economy is only the extension of the home economy.

In knowing the value of the dollar, what makes it change, the plans to stabilize currency on a national and international scale, how effective they are, what obstacles are placed in the way of effectuation, the special interests at work—in knowing these basic economic facts, women become specially fitted to be housekeepers in our national economy.

That title is in no sense derogatory. It is a recognition of special training for a special kind of job.

As members of the community women find that laws and their making are not abstract problems, but are a necessary outgrowth of having to face problems of housing, delinquency, playgrounds, nurseries, discrimination, directly, not merely in debating societies or in the halls of government.

Women in the home who grow up with their children, who follow their problems and take an active part in the problems of the community (through Parent-Teacher Associations and through local civic groups) shortly find themselves, in trying to solve those problems, appearing before school boards, before local governmental bodies, etc.

They find that to intelligently solve their local problems they must know and understand something of the wider problems that face the community and the Nation. Almost before they realize it, they have been caught up in politics in the wider sense, in the sense of statecraft and civil government.

Such a situation is an inevitable one for women to find themselves in, and it is a good one. It enables them to use their experience, their practical training, their instincts and their hearts for the greater good.

And that, it seems to me, is the real goal of politics.

Danger Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Steel magazine, issue of June 7, 1948:

DANGER AHEAD

It is no accident that discussion of steel pricing dominated the annual meeting of the American Iron and Steel Institute 2 weeks ago and the annual convention of the National Association of Purchasing Agents last week. The subject is vitally important to sellers and buyers alike.

The pertinent question is whether or not pricing on an f. o. b. mill basis would be preferable to the present multiple basing point system. Government spokesmen say that f. o. b. mill will prevent monopoly, tend to decentralize industry and benefit a majority of customers. Most producers and consumers contend that the reverse is true on all three counts.

The weight of experience is on the side of the latter group. There is nothing in basing-point pricing that affords the opportunity for monopoly that would not be presented to favorably located sellers under an f. o. b. mill system.

As for decentralization, f. o. b. mill—instead of dispersing fabricating and manufacturing plants, as predicted by Government spokesmen—actually would tend to concentrate these consumers in the vicinity of their sources of supply. If one doubts this, let him remember that while there are about 30,000 direct customers of steel mills and about 300,000 customers of steel warehouses there are only a few dozen mill suppliers of most steel products, and only a few thousand warehouses. The initial effect of f. o. b. mill would be to tempt customers to cluster about existing mills. Later a few new mills might gravitate toward centers of heavy consumption, but the net result would be more concentration than dispersal.

To change from basing points to f. o. b. mill would favor some customers at the expense of others. Any realistic appraisal of this aspect would prove conclusively that more customers would be harmed than would be benefited. If anyone doubts this statement, he is advised to study the list of mill customers by States and compare it with steel mill capacities of nearby steel-producing centers. More buyers are distant from mills than are conveniently near them.

All in all, change to f. o. b. mill would impose drastic and dangerous adjustments upon industry. If the Federal Trade Commission persists in its drive for f. o. b. mill, Congress will be fully justified in acting to protect the public interest.

Fiftieth Anniversary of Dewey's Victory at Manila Bay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 9, 1948

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I am including in the RECORD the following address of the Honorable Ernest W. Gibson, Governor of Vermont, delivered at Montpelier, Vt., on May 16 upon the occasion of the unveiling of a diorama depicting Admiral George Dewey's victory at Manila Bay:

Just 50 years ago this month the morning stillness of a quiet tropical bay halfway across the world was broken by the crash of naval guns. Before the sun set on the same scene, one of the great navies of the world lay broken and burning. But most important, though none of the participants realized it, was the historic fact that a new world power strode onto the world's stage.

The United States in 1898 had been an introvert among nations—and no wonder, for she still suffered the wounds of a cruel and devastating civil war. But as the nineteenth century passed into the twentieth century, she found herself with an empire—and all the responsibilities of a world power, as well.

There were many who did not want this—who battled honestly and sincerely to keep this Nation out of the maelstrom of European power politics, now rapidly entangling the whole world in a battle of rival imperialisms.

And so the struggle continued for nearly 50 years—"isolationism" versus "internationalism"—until 1941. There again, as the quiet of a tropical harbor was broken by the reverberations of bursting bombs, the United States was again thrust reluctantly upon the international stage. Yet by the time the conflict ended theer was no longer any real quarrel of "isolationist" versus "internationalist"; the discussion had become purely academic. The seas had shrunk with the naval carrier and the long-rang bomber. And as the battleship carried a doubtful America onto the world stage, the B–29 made certain her permanent lodging there. There was no retreat—the only door open led to more rather than less participation in international affairs.

Our early ventures into world politics bore many of the traces of imperialism then widely current, and sowed the seeds of world suspicion of American motives—in Europe, in Latin America, and in the Far East. Our enlightened policy in the Philippines has provided the world proof of our willingness to apply principles of justice and equality in international relations. Yet the world is not yet convinced. If they have ceased to fear political imperialism, they now fear economic

imperialism, the domination not of guns and ships but of steel and oil.

Thus the great necessity for America today is to pursue a course calculated to overcome this suspicion—a course of enlightened and unselfish internationalism. Even today there are interests who would bend American foreign policy to their own ends. In a democracy such as ours we can and will defeat any such efforts.

Yet the real danger is much more subtle. It is that we shall—in an excess of concern for our national security—neglect international security. We are today forced by the actions of nations who propose to extend their rule by force, to remain a strong military power—especially in a world where international influence seems still—regretably—proportionate to the caliber of the gun in your holster.

But surely there can be no permanent national security in a world where peace among nations is not secure. New armaments only stimulate the same in our opponents. Arms may produce a temporary security against possible attack—at least during that fleeting moment when you are at the top of the eternal see-saw. But they can never purchase permanent peace.

We have created at least the beginnings of agencies to promote and preserve world peace. Yet in the pursuit of national security, there is a strong tendency in this country today to utilize these agencies to the ends of national foreign policy, instead of the purpose of international peace. The temptation is great, because other nations do the same. But who will lead, if we do not?

Some years ago, in San Francisco, we gathered with high hopes to build a new international structure. We did not realize all these hopes, but we got an organization which constituted a community of all nations. And the wise men who framed it incorporated a provision for its revision, when sentiment should favor those further objectives they could not then achieve. In fact, they specified that a conference to revise must be called within at least 10 years.

It is up to us to take up where these men left off—to put our shoulder to the wheel. We must utilize the existing machinery to wipe out the underlying causes of strife among nations, and we must strengthen its organizational structure to enable it to meet and solve the problems involved in the clash of major as well as minor powers.

This we did, as Americans, once before, in 1789. We tried the experiment of loose cooperation of wholly independent sovereignties, and found we could not solve the major problems. We then revised our structure of government to provide for a Federal organization of States which had surrendered part of their independence to the new Government.

And we instituted a rule of uniform law as amongst the people of those States.

It is a similar path we must follow today—toward a world-wide government based on law. If the task seems more difficult as among scattered nations of the world today, let us remember that we are no further removed from India now than was Vermont from Georgia 150 years ago. And those founding fathers started from scratch; they did not have their own example, as have we today.

Law is the cement of orderly relationship within society. Lack of law amongst nations is the reason why we do not live together in pacific disagreement, as we do at home. We do not seem to find it possible to agree to disagree.

Our job then is to extend this rule of law from a national to an international plane. That is, we must build a bridge between the type of peaceful society in which we as citizens of this Nation live—because of law—and the society in which the peoples of the world must come to live—if they are to dwell in peace with one another.

Yet there is today no world law because there is no law-making body. And there is no policeman to enforce it, once made. The two imperatives of our time are, therefore, an international legislature, meeting as men gather in these rooms, and an international police force with power to carry out that law.

Yet these will not come merely because we wish them, but because we have acted to make them possible. We must begin building bridges—many bridges—out of the past and into the future—bridges to international understanding.

There is the vast and promising work of the many agencies of the United Nations, international bridges all too little known to most of us. This obscure but significant work has been overlooked by the newspapers, who concentrate on the more spectacular disagreements on major issues. It is a work which must be pressed forward and expanded.

But we cannot rely on this deliberate, painstaking process alone. Much social and economic progress is delayed for the lack of a political framework within which to carry it out.

It was this vital fact which was recognized by the founding fathers in 1789. Discovering that the little sovereignties which had joined hands in a confederacy—were falling apart instead of together, they built a political framework—our Federal Constitution—within which they could work out their social and economic problems. We need to study more closely their example, if we are to build this bridge into the future.

The way is open—the framers of the United Nations Charter were aware it was not perfect; they incorporated into its Charter a provision for its amendment. It is now time for us to test the waters, take every step possible to strengthen its hand. For, in the face of the agents of destruction we ourselves have created, there is very little time left. However, there is an equally significant bridge which must be built at the same time—a bridge of international amity through international citizenship. While our statesmen build mightier mansions in which to dwell, the peoples of the world must be offered the chance to grasp hands across the oceans and the boundary lines that divide them.

Across the Atlantic today the leaders of the Western World are gathering to lay the foundations for a new United States of Europe. And at the same time the peoples of those countries have gathered at The Hague to explore a wider citizenship, and to lay the foundations of friendship and understanding necessary to make any government work.

Let us of the New World, take up the challenge and lead not only the countries of Europe, but all nations of the world toward this broader horizon. Idealistic? Yes, but I suspect that many of our practical idealists today are actually our realists. Realism is not pessimism, not reaction. The methods of power politics have failed, historically, to bring us peace despite centuries of trial. Is it not time we tried a new road? The men who gave their lives in the late war gave them that men might live—not that they might shift sides and start fighting again. They were the great idealists—shall we be less?

No one can look back on the 50 years since a relatively unknown naval officer from the capital city of Vermont set a Nation on the path of international destiny, without a feeling of great awe at the magnitude of the events through which we have passed. Yet there lies before us an opportunity which has been presented mankind for not 50, but 150 years—since 1789 when George Washington, James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, and the other "greats" of this Nation's fathers built the world's first Federal Republic.

This is indeed our hour of destiny.

GOP Record Discouraging as Congress Approaches End

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of Monday, June 7, 1948, fairly describes the discouraging record of the majority party and its leadership of the Eightieth Congress insofar as doing something for the benefit of the average citizen of our Nation:

GOP RECORD DISCOURAGING AS CONGRESS APPROACHES END

Republican leaders of Congress are firm in their determination to adjourn on June 19, the even of the Republican National Convention, and with a view to giving some semblance of impressiveness to their record they have agreed that three pieces of major legislation shall be enacted.

They include the selective service bill, reciprocal trade agreements and a measure providing for entry of displaced persons. This program of legislation is vital but even though the three measures are enacted the record of Congress will not be one reflecting any substantial measure of credit upon the Republican majority.

Presumably, the selective service bill will be passed in acceptable form, but this cannot be said for either of the other measures. Provision for 200,000 displaced persons does not represent an adequate fulfillment of this Nation's humanitarian and moral obligations in this matter. Other nations, with infinitely less in the way of resources, have been far more generous in their attitude toward the needs of these stricken people.

If passed by the Senate in the form in which it has come from the House, the reciprocal trades agreement bill will represent nothing more important than the first step toward abandonment of an enlightened trade policy which is essential to our own economic interests and to world recovery. Hope of an improved bill lies with the Senate, where Senator VANDENBERG has taken the initiative in an effort to deny to Congress the power to veto schedules approved by the President.

Assuming the must legislation is passed, the Republican record in Congress will still be without distinction. Here, for example, is what the Republican platform of 1944 promised on the subject of housing: "The stimulation of State and local plans to provide decent low-cost housing, properly financed by the Federal Housing Administration or otherwise, when such housing cannot be supplied or financed by private enterprise."

Yet, in spite of this promise, Congress will go home leaving the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill dead at the hands of selfish lobbies and without having provided any alternative to this measure. The record on housing in itself is sufficient to discredit the majority. And what is happening to the bill to repeal the Federal tax on oleomargarine and to the reappointment of David E. Lilienthal and the other four members of the Atomic Energy Commission?

The record is discouraging. Inspired efforts will be required if it is to be saved from becoming a source of embarrassment in the coming campaign.

Mr. Justice Douglas Speaks on Democracy in China and in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. KLEIN Mr. Speaker, regardless of party, the Nation and its representatives here have a deep and honest respect for the integrity of Mr. Justice William O. Douglas, of the United States Supreme Court.

In a recent address before the East and West Association he made one of his characteristically succinct and yet comprehensive speeches in which he outlined the function of the modern democratic state and took as his examples the progress of the common man in China and in Palestine. It gives me honor and pleasure to insert this address in the RECORD under consent:

The acceptance of the first annual award of the East and West Association on behalf of Dr. James Yen is for me a real privilege. I am happy, of course, because the honor goes to a friend—a friend in whom a great many of us have a life investment of affection and confidence. But the importance and significance of this occasion are for all of us more important than a celebration of a friend's work and achievement. When we honor Dr. Yen and his mass education program we honor a point of view, a philosophy, an idea that can give directive power to the explosive forces of unrest and discontent that are at work in the world. The occasion, therefore, seems to me an appropriate one to examine these forces and to ascertain the requirements which they exact from us.

Ideologically this is not one world. It is a world torn asunder by competing ideas that are hostile to each other and between which there can be at many points no compromise or reconciliation. The dictatorship of the Communists on the left like the dictatorship of the Fascists on the right takes its cue from ancient tyrannies and is intolerant of tolerance. Both use political instruments that are beyond the law in the democracies. They employ murder and terror in their politics, making fear rather than reason the dominant influence. They try to make man into a standardized article—one political faith, one economic and social theory, one road to salvation. Those who do not conform pay the price of banishment or death. The values of our Bill of Rights are tossed into the discard.

Ideologically the world is, therefore, divided into hostile camps. But in other respects the world is more of one world than ever before. There are no isolated compartments in the world. What happens in Tel Aviv implicates the fate of men thousands of miles away. An educational program formulated in Szechuen, China, has as its beneficiaries white-skinned, yellow-skinned, and black-skinned men the world around. A slogan of freedom uttered in this hall tonight can tomorrow be on the lips of men the world over. We are neighbors—East and West. We cannot run away from the inexorable forces that sweep the world. We are part of them. It is the interaction of ideas throughout the farthest reaches of the globe that today determines the destiny of men of all races. We have a tremendously important role to play in shaping that destiny.

CLIMATE OF FEAR

The explosive forces that rock the world have produced in this country the beginning of a climate of fear. A few years ago that fear was the march of fascism; today it is the spread of communism. But if we realize the strength of our own free institutions and the inherent weakness of totalitarianism, there will be no real internal threat to us. Totalitarianism does not take hold where freedom and justice flourish, where a nation is dedicated to increasing the standard of living of its people. Our real internal security depends on our resourcefulness in making our economic system work and on our willingness to make our ideals of justice not mere preachments but part of the fabric of our living.

But most of the areas of the world cannot be judged by the conditions which prevail here. In most of them there are the extremes of wealth and poverty. Opportunity is afforded only a few. And the design of that opportunity is for the exploitation of the man underneath. There is no middle group. The bourgeosie are missing or in the minority. Those at the top have the wealth, the means of production, and the political power. Those at the bottom are illiterate. They can do the work of their masters but they cannot sit at their tables. Their opportunity to escape by self-help the slavery into which they were born is slight. Science cannot be their hand-maiden in providing a more abundant life, for they have no way of knowing how to use the keys to knowledge. Disease is their all-powerful enemy, and they do not yet know how to wage the war of public health. Superstitions, illiteracy, fears, traditions make them easy victims of those who hold both economic and political power over them.

This condition is not a new one. It is age-old. For centuries the outstanding characteristic of most societies has been the wide and impassable gulf between the ruler and the subjects, between the master and the servants. Since it is an ancient problem, not a new one, people are often unconcerned with it. They are apt to say: "The laborers of Africa and South America, the coolies of China—they have always been the same—if they do not have the gumption to help themselves, it is their concern not ours."

HOLDING OPERATION

To say nothing of the narrow provincialism of this attitude, one consequence of it—for the democracies the most dangerous consequence of all—is the foreign policy which flows from it. Foreign policy is then designed to effect a holding operation—to preserve the position of the democracies by keeping things as they are, to protect the future of the democracies by making a bastion of the status quo the world around.

This might be done—and done effectively—under the conditions that prevailed in the last century. Certainly England built an empire under those conditions. The British fleet sailed the seas and kept democracy safe at home. Continents were then exploited under a colonial policy that was dependent on the continued subjugation of other nations. But what England did then none could do now, even if the desire were present. There are powerful ideas loose in the world—ideas that fire men's imaginations, that kindle their hearts; ideas that show men the paths for escape from their misery; ideas that are explosive in their consequences.

One of those ideas is democracy, another is communism. Both of them are contagious. They have been carried to the farthest outposts of the world by ships and planes, by radio, by agents, by armies. All over the world men and women have seen the vision of a richer life. All over the world the yearning for a better life has produced ferment. At times this ferment moves toward the great freedoms as we know them. Too often it falls victim to the false promises of the totalitarians. Nor can this danger be dealt with by military means.

The important fact is that whatever course they may take, the peoples of the world are in great ferment.

All the armies and navies in the world cannot stop that ferment. Bullets can kill men; but ideas survive military defeat. Ideals infiltrate behind the lines and continue to stir men uneasily even under an occupation army.

EXAMPLE IN CHINA

A good illustration is China. For years the Nationalists have been fighting Communists with vastly superior forces. Twenty years ago the Communists were a small straggling military group located at Kiangse in central China. The Nationalist army, with modern military equipment, moved in to annihilate them. The Communists made a march of 1,600 miles to Yenan in North China. There they established themselves, made new recruits, and settled down to guerrilla warfare. Since that time they have faced and survived greatly superior armies. In spite of that, their ranks have swollen and they have waxed strong in their opposition.

Why is that so? The answer is simple. They have addressed themselves to the needs of the common man in China. The Nationalists have not. The Communists have a comprehensive social program for China. The Nationalists do not. It is easy to criticize the Communists, to say that they betray freedom, and to point to the fact that they are rank opportunists and will seize on any chance to exploit the weakness of an opponent. That is all true. It is also true that they will take any road that leads to power. But whatever their motives, whatever their strategy, the stark reality is that in China they have been winning the battle of the masses, even in the face of great military odds. If we are tempted with the idea that armies and navies can defeat the ideas of communism, China should convince us of our folly.

No, a holding operation will not be enough. If that were our strategy, we would in a very short time find ourselves an island in a hostile world with only the dubious comfort of our armed fortress to sustain us.

What we must conceive and execute is a positive, aggressive political program designed to win the masses of people of the world to our banner. They will be won to some cause. And there is no reason why that cause cannot be ours. The important thing is to conceive of the program as a political one on a world scale. Only then can we fashion political instruments adequate for the necessities of the world's problem. The democracies of western Europe are, of course, the starting point of our world-wide political program, as the European recovery program rightly recognizes. But we know that the world's security cannot be safeguarded within the confines of Europe. No local solution alone can deal with a global crisis.

FOR THE COMMON MAN

Congress recognized that in the China Aid Act of 1948. And the step it took in that legislation may well be epoch-making in the history of our foreign policy. I refer to the part of the act which the conference report calls the "Jimmy Yen provision." It authorizes the use of 10 percent of the funds appropriated for China in furtherance of the mass education and rural reconstruction program which Dr. Yen has headed for the last quarter century. By that means this nation told the masses of China that their welfare was its concern. No stronger measure could be designed to knit together the destinies of two races. America by that step makes more than a gesture to the common

man of China. It endorses a tried-and-true program which in operation has proven to be practical and effective. It is a program which strikes at the very heart of all social disorder. For it is designed to help rid the coolies of China of the four cruel masters that have exploited them for centuries—illiteracy, poverty, disease, and misgovernment.

This tribute by our Government to Dr. Yen and his program makes 1948 a year of great achievement both for him and for us. It can mark the beginning of a new era in democratic influence among the masses of the people of the world. What can be done in China can be done in Java and in India, too.

In the global crisis that confronts us, mass education is a political instrument. It should be employed as such. It is a powerful political weapon. It can be utilized to free people from their bondage and to grant them a legacy of democratic values.

Dr. Yen has often said that what his people needed was not relief but release—release from the misery and suffering which illiteracy, poverty, disease, and misgovernment have brought them. It is magnanimous of America or any other nation to feed and clothe the starving and freezing people of other lands. But it is the greater part of wisdom to promote and encourage programs for those people which will enable them to feed and clothe themselves. At times all they will need is encouragement and advice and the export of American technicians to show them how. At other times they will need funds, physical equipment and other forms of capital. If the program entailed no more than industrialization, the construction of public works such as power projects, highways and the like, it would involve great risks of new exploitations. Industrialization without a genuine program of social reconstruction to accompany it would create horrible sweat shops. For the poverty level is so low in vast areas of the world that human life could be made an extremely cheap commodity by machine-age standards. In China the average annual income of the agricultural family is $100 a year. Think how oppressively cheap labor could be made when a whole family makes less than $10 a month.

EDUCATION IS PRAGMATIC

Mass education is a method by which the evils of industrialization can be avoided. It can do more than teach people to read and write, to exercise the franchise intelligently, to inaugurate sanitation programs and the like. Dr. Yen brought science to the farms of China—seed selection, cross-breeding, new methods of irrigation, the use of fertilizers. He also showed the farmers how to become businessmen—how to use credit cooperatives and marketing cooperatives, how to keep for themselves the profits of their toil. One ultimate objective, of course, is to fulfill the dream of Sun Yat-sen and make the tillers of the soil the owners of the soil.

The mass education program is experimental in some of its phases, and in all respects is adaptable to the changing conditions which any society produces. One illustration drawn from the recent activities of Dr. Yen's staff will illustrate what I mean. A year or so ago the staff organized weaving cooperatives in one province which had been famous for its weaving. This was in response to the difficulty the weavers had in finding capital after the war to buy yarn. The movement raised money to finance the purchase of the yarn. Cloth was standardized by quality, length, width, and thread count. As a result the cooperatives have been able to operate at a profit. They decided to give 20 percent of their profits to educational programs in the community and 10 percent for health clinics, and to retain the remainder for capital investment.

This has set a pattern. There has been a widespread desire for establishment of weaving cooperatives in many villages. The movement has undertaken to organize them, on condition that the cooperatives establish a school for the unschooled children in their community and organize literacy relay stations for the illiterates. The Government has now advanced sums to finance these cooperatives. As a result a great impetus has been given to self-help. More cooperatives mean more schools. More schools mean more cooperatives. The common people of China have seen the future filled with hope and promise by reason of Dr. Yen's program. They are embracing it as their cause. They are contributing a share of the profits of their new enlightenment so that others also may enjoy the benefits of this education. It is safe to say that once the program is launched on a national scale, it will have tremendous influence. It will release in a democratic cause the energies of hundreds of millions of people. There can then be no force in Asia to stop it.

There is bound to be great diversity in the form of social and economic organization in the areas of the world where programs of reconstruction are launched. It would be folly to think of them solely in terms familiar to our own experiences. Some may be socialistic rather than capitalistic. The important thing is that they serve the needs of the people involved. The crucial test by which we should measure them is not the form they take but whether they preserve the democratic values.

GLORIOUS EXPERIMENT IN PALESTINE

Palestine is a case in point. It was Justice Brandeis who first showed me what a glorious experiment was taking place there. It was a wasteland, seemingly lacking in potentials of productivity. Through centuries of abuse, the land had wasted away. Several feet of precious topsoil had been carried into the Mediterranean. But discerning eyes saw bright prospects. Science was put to work. Sand[illegible] places became fertile gardens. Even barren ledges were made to grow plants and shrubs and trees. The wasteland became an oasis. Lowdermilk's account of the transformation is thrilling to read. But Palestine represents more than a tour de force by modern agricultural science and irrigation engineering. Palestine is also more than an expression of nationalism. Palestine is a democratic star in the Middle East. The people who conceived it and built it preserved democratic values in the process. The ideas of Thomas Paine and Thomas Jefferson are at home there. Democratic ideas have been carried into a region that for centuries has held man in the tyranny of feudal systems, in the slavery of poverty and illiteracy. Palestine is therefore a dramatic illustration of the powerful force which a democratic program of social and economic reconstruction can generate.

In the details of its operation, the Palestinian program shows how versatile the democratic processes can become, how adaptable they are to the needs of different communities and races. The agricultural program developed there illustrates the point. The land seemed to offer few prospects for successful colonization and development. Due to the short supply of water and the absence of fuel and power, there seemed little chance for more than the most primitive types of social arrangements. And yet there exist in Palestine today, in the fields of agriculture and industry, the most varied kinds of economic establishments.

COOPERATIVES ENCOURAGED

You can, for example, become a farmer, own your own land, raise your own produce, sell your products in the market, and pocket your profits to do with as you will.

If you prefer, you can voluntarily get together with other farmers, each of whom owns his own land and raises his own crops, and agree to market your products in combination, achieving the savings incident to joint distribution. The profits from your crop would be yours alone. You can go further and voluntarily agree with other farmers not only to market your products in common but to till your lands in common, each still owning his own land and each keeping his own profits.

On the other hand, you may prefer voluntarily to join a communal farm group, where there is no individual ownership of property. The land is owned in common, tasks are assigned to the members, marketing is done by the group, and the profits belong to the community. The profits buy the necessaries that the group does not itself raise and these are distributed in accordance with need. But any time you tire of the arrangement, you are fee to leave and conduct your business as you prefer.

An almost infinite variety of economic patterns exist and are in actual operation in industry as well as in agriculture.

WOVEN INTO HARMONIOUS WHOLE

The remarkable thing is that all of these apparently discordant arrangements have been woven together into a harmonious structure. They coexist without seeming conflict and with mutual benefits. Maximum production has been achieved so that the people of Palestine, greatly dependent on the fruits of their own labors, are amply supplied with the products the country can produce. And they still have enough of many products for export.

This pluralism in combination achieved in a land that cannot afford the luxuries of lavish experimentation is an inspiring, and, I think, unique example of the potentialities of the democratic process.

This program in Palestine and Dr. Yen's program in China, though unrelated in origin, are closely related in function. They show that we need not lose by default to the totalitarianism of either the left or the right. They show that democratic programs can, indeed, fill the void that has followed two world wars and can bring the promise of a more abundant life even to the desolate and poverty-ridden areas of the world where hope for the common man had well nigh perished.

Those programs for Palestine and China give us the key to the political formula that is the only possible antidote to either communism or fascism. They show how in various parts of the globe the great extremes between the top and the bottom of society can be bridged, how the standards of living of the masses can be raised, how the land and other material resources of a nation can be put to use for all the people, not for one select group. They show that all these things can be done without regimenting man, as the totalitarians do, to one political faith or to one economic theory.

FAITH MORE THAN DOLLARS

We can use this formula to help shape the world in the democratic pattern. To do it will take more of our faith than our dollars. We cannot treat the problem as we do charity or relief at Christmas time. This is a program that requires constant planning and attention. It will condition all phases of our foreign policy, determine our alliances abroad, and dictate our position in the councils of the nations. Results cannot be expected quickly. They will take time and patience. We must have faith. We must have faith of the kind that has kept the Jews of Palestine and now of Israel true to their ideals in the face of great adversities. We must have the kind of faith that Dr. Yen had when he slept in the mud huts of China's villages for 8 years so that he might understand the actual conditions with which mass education would have to deal. We must have his faith that this is part of God's work in which we are the servants.

If we dedicate ourselves to this undertaking, as we would to a Holy Grail, we cannot fail. For never have so many been so eager for a leadership that would take them to the

highlands where men can find both food and freedom.

The opportunity is therefore unique. The results can be staggering. They will show that east and west men of different colors, different races, different creeds can join hands to wage war on man's most ancient enemies—illiteracy, poverty, disease, and misgovernment.

Portland's Industrial Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on Portland's industrial future, by Chester K. Sterrett, manager of the industries department, Portland Chamber of Commerce, delivered by him on May 24 before the joint meeting of the East Side Commercial Club and the Portland Chamber of Commerce Member's Forum, in Portland, Oreg. I present this for printing because it has an important bearing, it seems to me, on the industrial problem which confronts my section of the country, particularly in view of the flood conditions now prevailing there.

The Printing Office informs me that the address will make approximately 2½ pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $177.50.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND'S INDUSTRIAL FUTURE

Today I want to tell you people about the workings of our industries department—to let you know what we are doing, what we hope to do, and some of the obstacles in our way. We have here at our head table representatives from four of the largest new industries that have been attracted to this area in the last 2 years. Naturally, the Portland Chamber of Commerce can take a great deal of the credit for the location of these industries in this community, but it would be foolish for us to take all of the credit, because we are just one cog in the whole machine that is working toward the development of this area.

On the National Biscuit Co. negotiations for the original site near the Rose City golf course we had the excellent support of the East Side Commercial Club on the zone change necessary to accommodate this industry in that location. I wish to publicly acknowledge your support and to say that you are 100 percent behind us in all of our industrial activity. In addition, on that project alone, we had the support of the city planning commission, a majority of the city council, the central labor council, and many others. It wasn't easy to find another suitable site for the National Biscuit Co. in Portland, but fortunately we were able to do so.

On the negotiations for the site which they have just purchased, we had assistance from the Union Pacific Railroad who assembled the site; the Portland Gas & Coke Co., who moved a gas line so this site could be used; and the Portland General Electric Co., who moved a power line so we could get this industry. In addition, we had splendid cooperation from many other business leaders in Portland. This one negotiation illustrates to a degree the community spirit that is necessary to bring about the development of an area. In addition, the banks, railroads, and industrial realtors have also been very helpful to us in our program.

Then, there is the matter of time. We just don't go out and make one trip and get an industry to come back and locate here in Portland. It takes plenty of time and plenty of effort. With respect to the National Biscuit Co., I find that the chamber has been working on this company for the past 10 years. About 18 months ago, we finally convinced them that they should come here rather than go to Seattle. It has taken us 18 months to work out all the difficulties on a site for them, but fortunately, they are coming here, and we are glad of it. We appreciate their patience and friendly spirit of cooperation throughout the long period of negotiations necessary to get them a suitable site.

Now, a few background figures to illustrate our growth here. Portland, as you know, grew tremendously during the war, and has kept this growth. The city of Portland had a population in 1940, of a little over 305,000. Today, it is variously estimated as between 410,000 and 425,000. The metropolitan area, which is the true gage of our growth, increased from 406,406, to about 600,000. Now, when I first came here in 1944, a few pessimists in the area were wondering what we were going to do when the shipyards closed down. At the peak, the shipyards, as you know, employed 120,000 people. They are now down to around 2,000 employees. We have absorbed this labor force by the growth of old industries, attraction of new industries, and by expansions in other types of business. And, believe it or not, we have less unemployment in this area now, than we had in 1940. In 1940, we had unemployment of about 30,000. Today, we have about 23,000 unemployed. And during this period, too—from 1939 up to date, we have doubled the number of industries here. The Census of Manufactures shows that the Portland area had 888 industries in 1939. We estimate at the present time that we have about 1,600 manufacturing plants. Manufacturing employment in the 4 counties comprising the Portland industrial area—Multnomah, Clackamas, and Washington counties in Oregon, and Clark County, Washington—increased from 35,000 in 1940, up to 53,000 at the present time.

Nonmanufacturing employment, that is, employment in utilities, wholesale trade, retail trade, service industries, banks, etc., has had a still further increase; 99,500 in 1940, up to 150,900 at the present time. To give you a picture of some of the industries that have expanded in this area, I have worked up some figures. The food industry has expanded from an employment of 5,000 in 1940, up to about 7,000 now. The lumber products industry, in spite of the fact that we have lost several large lumber mills here in Portland, has gone up from 8,300 to 11,500 at present. The machinery industry has increased from 1,700 to 4,300 employees.

Last year we were pleased to announce that Portland obtained 173 new industries. In the last 3 years, we have obtained 368 new industries, and those 368 industries employ about 6,000 people. Of the 173 new industries that we recorded last year, only a dozen of these were branch plants, such as the Carborundum Co., Continental Can Co., etc. The balance were local concerns, started by local individuals, producing items, for the most part, that were never made here before. Such new articles as aluminum shingles, perlite insulation products, plastics, cement tile, house trailers, etc. The whole Pacific coast is growing and we feel that Portland is more than getting its share of the growth. But to bring the matter of our future growth close to home, I will now touch on some of the most pressing problems facing us.

There is no question that we have plenty of potential industrial sites in the Portland area to support a still larger industrial economy. However, due to circumstances beyond our control, we are restricted in the number of sites which we can show an individual looking for a location right now. This comes about because some of our best potential sites are being used for temporary Government housing developments. For instance, we have the Guilds Lake area, the Vanport area, St. Johns Woods, and Kellogg Park Homes—all very fine potential industrial property. Eventually, we will be able to clear these sites and replace these homes with industries. We can't do it over night—in fact, we don't want to do it too rapidly because we have about 15,000 families living in these temporary houses, and over 50 percent of these families are returned GI's. The Portland Housing Authority is cooperating with us very nicely, and through their efforts we are gradually removing some of the temporary houses in the Guilds Lake area, and we hope to be able to remove additional units there within the next year or two.

Now, what is a good industrial site? Most people have the mistaken impression that a good industrial site is a nice, flat piece of land with perhaps a railroad track adjoining it. Well, those are two of the first requisites, but there are a number of other items that must be taken into consideration to fit a site to a particular prospect. First, we must know whether a site has adequate sewer facilities, gas lines, electric lines, and other utilities. Whether a site is located where the plant in question can obtain an adequate labor supply. Also, a very important problem, and one that is often overlooked, is the question of the foundation conditions of the site. For instance, out in the Vanport area, which we feel is a good potential area for certain light industries, you have to go down 75 feet before you hit load-bearing gravel. An industry having heavy load requirements, or using heavy machinery, would have to put down extensive piling to make use of a site there, but it is all right for light, one-story buildings.

Last, but not least, there is the question of the zoning of a site. In Portland, we now have four types of zones. In zone 3 and zone 4 we can put industrial concerns. You are more or less familiar with the problem we had on the National Biscuit Co. negotiations with respect to zoning, but to go back just a year or two previous to that, the Canada Dry Ginger Ale Co. wanted to put a plant out on Halsey Street. Part of the property which they wanted to purchase, was zoned for industrial, the balance was in zone 2, or limited residential use. Well, the real-estate people and the others interested in locating Canada Dry here, went to the city council and asked for a zone change, so Portland could get this industry. Unfortunately, some of the people in the neighborhood objected to this zone change, but to the credit of the city council, the zone was changed and we were able to get this industry here. A sequel to this story illustrates an interesting point. When the Canada Dry officials had their open house, several of the neighbors who had been the most vehement in their opposition to the plant, came to the manager and said, "If we had known what type of structure you were going to build, we would never have objected to it." Now, that is just one of the things that we have to work out here in Portland, the feeling that industries always bring smokestacks, dirt, and noise, and things like that. New, modern industry does not always create nuisances. Take, for instance, the new Willard Storage Battery plant, it would be a credit to any neighborhood; and the proposed National Biscuit structure will be a fine improvement to this city or any city. I think we can guarantee that in the development of Portland, the Portland Chamber of Commerce is not trying to ruin any good residential areas. We feel that there is need for adequate residential areas so that we can

have enough places for the workers to live, but unless we have sites for our industries, we will have no basic pay roll for the community. Without industrial pay rolls, no community can thrive or prosper.

Now, another one of the pressing local problems at the present time is the question of power supply. Most of you have read considerable in the press on the impending power shortage in the area. Ladies and gentlemen, that impending shortage is real, not imaginary, but is nothing that we should get alarmed about. The utilities of this area, private utilities, Bonneville Power Administration, the cities of Seattle and Tacoma, are all integrated into one vast "Northwest power pool." These people in the power business realize the situation, and are all working together to correct it. They are all telling the same story back in Congress of the need for the McNary Dam, and it depends on how large an appropriation we can get for the McNary Dam project, just how soon that project can be completed. Until that time, unfortunately, we will not be able to solicit any industry that takes large blocks of power, such as an aluminum company or other electro-chemical industries. Still, in analyzing our industrial growth here, it is interesting to note that from 1940 up to the present date, only 10 percent of our increased industrial employment has come in those industries which came out here to take advantage of our cheap power. The other 90 percent of our industrial pay-roll growth has come from concerns which use very little power, but came here to take advantage of our central location, our distribution facilities, or to serve the expanded market here, due to our increase in population.

While I am on the subject of power, it seems to me that sooner or later the Federal Government, which has taken the lead in the power development of the Columbia River—due to the fact that the dams are multipurpose projects, combining power, navigation, and irrigation—should change its policy on appropriations for such developments. Such projects as the McNary Dam which are self-liquidating should be put in a different category than the actual expenses of running the Government, such as the cost of operating the Post Office Department or some other bureau which is actually an out-of-pocket expense. Any industry which tried to charge off capital expenditures on an income-tax return as an expense item, would soon be taken to task by the Bureau of Internal Revenue. It seems to me that the whole accounting procedure of the Federal Government itself should be changed, and appropriations be separated into appropriations which represent capital expenditures, and appropriations which are straight out-of-pocket government expenses. Then the Government could operate on a businesslike basis and needed Federal developments would not be judged on the basis of how much money they cost, but what they will do for the development of the country.

The next problem is one of labor costs. We are very proud here in Portland of our admirable record of labor-management accord in recent years. Much credit for this situation lies in the splendid work of the Portland Labor-Management Committee and its predecessors. Also, our good labor relations are due to the caliber of the leadership of our labor unions here. We also can take considerable pride in the high level of wage scales that exist here in the Portland area and throughout the whole Pacific coast.

But—in trying to interest new industries to come into this area, our high level of wages sometimes creates a selling problem for us. The manufacturer back in the East looks at our wage rates out here, compares it with his present wage rates, and says: "You're higher than we are." Well—there is another part to this story. We have to tell him that we feel that labor productivity is higher out here. The average worker will turn out more goods. We have good reason for making that statement and believe it or not, one of the best reasons is our climate. We have no cold, severe winters that hamper production, and we have no hot, oppressive summers which decrease the worker's efficiency. So, from this standpoint, we can make out a fairly good case for Portland. However, in many instances, the level of our wage scales here still is a deterrent. For instance, in our logging and lumber industry, the wage scales in effect here in the Pacific Northwest, are just about double those in effect in the southern lumber industry. In our paper industry, we are about 20 percent above Middle West and the East. Now, in these times when there is a shortage of lumber and a shortage of paper, those wage differentials do not hurt our business, but if we ever do have a depression, then perhaps this area might be hurt more than other parts of the country. This problem of wage scales has another effect here in the Portland area. It is not only a problem of wage scales—but in certain industries, high material costs, together with wage scales and other costs, makes it hard for local industries to compete with eastern manufacturers. I am thinking now of some of our tool manufacturers—some of our machinery manufacturers, and some of our structural steel people. Eastern manufacturers in many cases can ship their products into Portland and undersell our local people in these fields.

On the whole, I think that most every employer in Portland does not hesitate to pay good wages if he can get corresponding production. Now, there is one bright spot in our whole labor cost picture, and it is one method which some of our industries are adopting. It is a new type of wage scale that is being put into effect. It is an incentive system and the worker will be paid according to the amount that he produces, and not just for being on the job. I think an increased use of this system here in the Portland area will help us to solve the problem of high labor costs.

When I came to Portland, several well-meaning people told me that we would never have any real industrial development in Oregon until we changed our tax structure. I asked them what was wrong with the Oregon tax system, and they knowingly replied, "You'll find out." After I had made a thorough study of the tax laws here, I came to the conclusion that on the whole, Oregon's tax system was not bad at all—that it had several good features, and only a few items that should be corrected. It is unfortunate that the general public has the wrong impression about our tax system, because only one person in a hundred really knows the details of the tax statutes.

Prior to 1947, one of our disadvantages was the fact that Oregon was surrounded by community-property States, and this allowed individuals in the upper salary brackets to pay less Federal income tax than similar people in the State of Oregon. This situation was corrected by the passage of the community-property law by the 1947 session of the Oregon Legislature, and as everyone knows, the recently passed Federal tax law permits the splitting of income between husband and wife and the filing of separate returns, giving everyone in the United States the tax benefits that accrue under a community-property law.

We have no sales-tax law in Oregon. This is a feature of our tax system which we can use to good advantage in talking to industrial prospects. In the State of Washington, for instance, which has a 3-percent sales tax and a compensating or use tax, the manufacturer must pay 3 percent on all the building materials used in his new plant and must pay 3 percent on the value of every piece of machinery and equipment going into his plant. This situation gives a company locating in Oregon a saving on building materials, machinery, and equipment over one going into business in Washington.

Oregon has an excellent workmen's compensation law, with rates that are equitable, and an experience-rating feature which is based on the accident frequency of the company alone. Also, our unemployment compensation law permits an industry with a low labor turn-over to earn a rate as low as one-half of 1 percent on its pay roll, whereas in many States the manufacturer must pay the straight 2.7-percent rate, and does not receive any benefits by keeping his labor turnover down.

One of the features in the Oregon tax structure that might be corrected is our excise tax on corporations. Only incorporated companies pay this tax, and other types of business enterprises, such as individual proprietorships, partnerships, and cooperatives, do not pay it. Perhaps some new method of equitably dividing the tax burden can be worked out. This present method of taxation has some advantages, however, for if a corporation does not make a profit it does not have to pay the excise tax. This contrasts to the situation that applies in our neighboring State of Washington, for all types of enterprises must pay a tax on the gross amount of business done in good years as well as bad. For manufacturing concerns this is one-quarter of 1 percent of the value of all products produced.

The whole subject of taxation is a complicated matter, and in our industrial program we attempt to figure out the exact tax burden a prospective industry will pay in our State. To date, I can truthfully say that since I have been here our tax system has not prevented any new industry from locating in the Portland area. In one instance it actually aided us in getting a large pay roll.

Another deterrent to present development of the area is construction costs. While back East recently, I talked to the executives of one large industry that is thinking about coming out here. Before the war they built a plant in the South. This plant cost them $5,000,000. They had planned to build a similar-sized plant here in the Northwest, but their estimates on the cost of the plant and machinery, believe it or not, at the present time is $15,000,000, or three times the cost of the prewar plant built in the South. Consequently they can't go ahead with this expansion program and make the thing pay off. Now this concern together with several other large concerns with whom I have talked in the East, are figuring that sooner or later the upward spiral of inflation is going to be broken, and these companies being large, well-managed organizations, can afford to wait for 5 or 10 years to take advantage of better construction costs. I think that we will get some of these industries in Oregon eventually, but we won't get them in the next few years.

Then there is the problem of raw materials. Most people think that we have raw materials galore here in the Pacific Northwest. We do have some. One of the most important that is often overlooked is our abundant supply of soft water. Water is the life blood of many industries, particularly the chemical industry. We have plenty of power potential in the Columbia River and its tributaries, we have adequate supplies of timber and wood pulp. We have such certain raw materials as diatomaceous earth, clays, laterites, and other things. We don't have any oil and we don't have any gas. Our supply of iron is limited and believe it or not, we don't have any large supply of certain types of limestone. We do have plenty of limestone in southern Oregon and plenty of limestone in eastern Oregon, but to supply our carbide plants that need a limestone without any phosphorous is a problem. Our carbide manuafcturers have to scramble to get lime that just barely meets their requirements. Eventually we hope to bring high-quality limestone in from Alaska and solve this problem.

Our problem on raw materials is the problem of making the best use of what we have

here in the Pacific Northwest, and in bringing in from off-shore sources those things that we cannot get locally. It is for this reason that there was set up about a year ago, the Raw Materials Survey here in Portland. This organization is sponsored by the chambers of commerce in Oregon and southern Washington, the banks in Oregon, the private utility companies, the port of Portland, and the dock commission. The object of this organization is not to duplicate any of the efforts of the Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industry—or the Washington Department of Geology—or the United States Bureau of Mines—but to take the information which these organizations have, separate the chaff from the wheat, and focus it toward the economic utilization end. A manufacturer seeking a location out here isn't interested in knowing that there is a little vein of asbestos in eastern Oregon, if there is not a commercial deposit there.

To give you an example of how the Raw Materials Survey will help us bring in new industries, one of the first surveys to be made by us was on the silica resources of the area. This silica report, and the advice of our managing engineer of the Raw Materials Survey, were two things that helped us get the large Carborundum Co. plant which is now being built across the river at Vancouver, Wash. True, there were other reasons why the Carborundum Co. came out here, but the assistance of the Raw Materials Survey was a valuable one to them. This plant will take silica in the form of silica sand or quartzite, and fuse it in an electric furnace with carbon. But this one plant alone, a $2,000,000 plant, is a feather in our cap, and shows what can be done by a study of making the best use of the raw materials that we do have.

The location of the carborundum plant in Vancouver also illustrates the regional attitude of our industrial development program. We try to give prospects looking over this area all the best information possible as to sites, labor supply, water supply, and raw materials, and then we let the industry itself make up its mind which is the best location to suit its needs. On the carborundum plant—due to the fact that they wanted to be on deep water and had to be close to the Bonneville Power Administration power lines—there were just two sites that they considered. These were the area at Vancouver which they purchased, and the area at Oregon Ship. With respect to the Oregon Shipyard location, the Carborundum Co. officials realized that it would take them at least 2 or 3 years to unsnarl the Government red tape necessary to get this property, and they couldn't wait that long. Also, they received a very good proposition from the Port of Vancouver for the site over there, so decided to locate there. Even though their plant is in Vancouver, we consider them in the Portland metropolitan area, and I think they will do the merchants of Portland as much good as if they were located down here in the business district right next to Meier & Frank's.

I'll have to move along here now. I have spent too long in discussing the problems of the area.

What are the possibilities?

With the freight rates increasing, there is going to be an ever-increasing program of decentralization of industry. Also, the growth of our population will bring in industries producing consumer goods, such as bakeries, soft drinks, dairy products, etc. Now, there is another interesting trend developing. Certain large eastern companies come out to the coast with a branch plant producing consumer goods, and they will naturally gravitate toward California with its nine or ten million people. It is only logical that they put a plant down there. But when they grow and expand and get ready for their second Pacific coast plant, that is when Portland should step in and try to interest them. We have had two examples of this situation recently, and executive of two such companies are sitting at the head table today. The Willard Storage Battery Co. has a plant in Los Angeles, and their second Pacific coast plant is now in operation here. The Pioneer Division of the Flintkote Co. has a plant in Los Angeles, and we now have a new plant of this company up here.

In our industrial program we also are not overlooking the development of small industries here in Portland. We have one man on our staff at the chamber who devotes most of his time to looking after our local industries—the little fellow. We are trying to help them find new products, new materials, or other ways to make a profitable enterprise.

From the basic industries standpoint we have unlimited possibilities. We have possibilities for the expansion of our food industries, in the fields of canning and preserving. I can't go into detail now. I wish I could. We have possibilities for further wood fabrication—for production of plywood specialties and other products which would take raw lumber and turn out more finished products. A particular item for which we have a crying local need is the production of office furniture. We are due for expansion in our machinery industry, especially agricultural implements. Although the major implement companies have warehouses and distribute from here, we have only a few minor implements made here. With our growing agriculture and a million and a half acres to be opened up in the Columbia Basin, I think we can look forward to increased production of agricultural tools here. The chemical industry, which is close to my heart, within the next 5 or 10 years, I think will be represented by such new industries as rayon, cellophane, ammonia, further production of fertilizers, sulfuric acid, phenol, plastics, matches, etc.

I see that my time is just about up. I wish I had a little longer to go into these opportunities further. You can see that we have our problems and we have our opportunities. It is up to us all to work together, and by such cooperation we can solve our problems and make Portland the biggest city in the whole Pacific Northwest. I thank you.

European Recovery Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 9, 1948

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me by the House I include in these remarks the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of June 7, 1948, with regard to the action of the majority of this Congress in slashing the funds for the European recovery program. It is a shame that there was not a roll call vote on this measure last Friday night when the Republican leadership steered the bill through the House. I am sure most of the Members who voted to cut the European recovery program appropriation felt ashamed when they learned of the comfort their vote gave Stalin and the Red Fascists. The editorial I refer to reads as follows:

THE COMMUNISTS MAKE HAY

With a kind of sheepishness, the House followers of Representative JOHN TABER should find it at once interesting and instructive to read the reactions of Europe's Communist press to their deep slash in funds authorized for the European recovery program. With gleeful irony, the organs of the Kremlin in France, Italy, Germany, and elsewhere have lost no time in capitalizing on the event as evidence of how foolish it is for any country to depend on the promises of the United States.

Thus, in Rome, the Communist newspaper has headlined the story as "The Marshall Plan Cheat." Another Red headline asks, "Who Can Trust Washington?" similarly, in Vienna, the "satellites" of the United States have been lectured for failing to follow the Soviet lead in refusing to take part in the ERP. Simultaneously, in Berlin, the Germans have been told that "this is the end of an illusion" and that western Europe must doubt "the wisdom of trusting America." And in Paris French leaders have been described as discovering now that "they sold France for a slice of bread."

All this was to have been expected, of course. The Kremlin and its Communists International have been waging a relentless propaganda war against the ERP for months past, and the House action has supplied them with potent new ammunition. For that action can easily be presented in the worst possible light. The funds for the program have been cut approximately 25 percent. It is as if the United States first offered western Europe a whole loaf of bread to regain its strength, and then sliced off a quarter of it—a decision leaving the Marshall plan nations with considerably less than the minimum they must have to get back on their feet and become self-sustaining.

Although they should have anticipated the thing, Mr. TABER and his House followers apparently gave little or no thought to how the Kremlin and its agents would delight in the loaf-slicing and make propagandistic hay out of it. Nor do they seem to have given much thought to the fac that the great promises of the Marshall plan played a major role in effecting a Communist defeat in the Italian elections, and in strengthening the middle-of-the-road French Government, and in serving as the economic basis of the Western Union recently worked out by Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg.

In short, economically, politically, propagandistically, and otherwise, the House has committed a grave blunder in its reckless pruning of the funds previously authorized by Congress for the first year of the ERP. In terms of the cold war being waged between east and west, nothing could have given greater aid and comfort to the Soviet Union. In the circumstances, it must be hoped that Senator VANDENBERG will succeed in having the cuts restored in the Senate and that Mr. TABER and his followers in the House, reflecting soberly on what they have done, will then see the error of their ways and reverse themselves.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1948

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that our young people should be encouraged in every way possible to make an active part and interest in our democratic form of government and to realize the many benefits we all enjoy because of it. It is not enough merely to pro-

vide formal education for each generation, as too often a real appreciation of our democratic processes escapes us unless we can participate in, and learn more about, this Government of the United States and its relationships with other governments.

I sponsored a contest for the high-school students of the Sixth Texas District to encourage these young people to record their thoughts on important topics. I am proud to announce the winner of the essay contest in Freestone County, which was so ably conducted by County Superintendent Shelma Carlile. Miss Clara Allison, Teague High School, Teague, Tex., has been declared the winner, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include her essay entitled "The Marshall Plan":

THE MARSHALL PLAN

(By Clara Allison, Teague, Tex.)

Secretary of State George C. Marshall, speaking at the commencement exercise at Harvard in June of 1947, first mentioned the necessity of the United States aid in the rebuilding of Europe. This proposal was not in the completed form of a plan; but Marshall's proposal was so warmly accepted that he completed a plan known as the European recovery program, or the ERP.

There are several reasons other than merely war destruction that makes Europe need American aid. Some of the reasons are: Failure of imports from the countries under Russian control, the lack of sustenance from the troubled areas of East India and Southeast Asia, and ruined crops caused by weather conditions. During the winter of 1946–47 Europeans saw the worst weather in recent history. The heavy winter exhausted coal reserves, crops did not grow because of the extreme cold, and floods washed away the rich topsoil and drowned livestock in the valleys. The following summer the weather was good—too good. Lack of rain caused a drought. The wheat yield was very low. Because of lack of coal the electricity was shut off, the factories had to stop operations, and cold-storage plants warmed up and ruined the precious food reserves. Lack of food brought about other shortages. When the miners did not have enough food, they could not dig as much coal. When there is a lack of coal, there is also a lack of steel. A lack of steel brings about a lack of farm equipment to produce food; and the cycle starts over.

"The Marshall plan in simple language is a humanitarian program which would be backed by the United States Government and paid for by the American taxpayer." This plan is a serious problem which concerns some 270,000,000 people. The Marshall plan has a deeper meaning than merely giving money, food, and raw materials. The United States must help Europe to recover socially and morally and to obtain democratic government. This plan is merely a proposal that America help western Europe to help herself—to save herself from economic, moral, social, and political collapse.

Marshall summed up the purposes of his plan in five statements, but his main purpose is "the revival of working economy in the world so as to permit the emergence of political and social conditions in which free social institutions can exist." Marshall's five points were: "to make real economic recovery possible in a definite period of time, to make sure that the goods and funds that we furnish will be used effectively, to keep costs to us within manageable bounds, to give adequate aid while protecting our economy and resources, to fit this program into our long range economic interests and foreign policy."

The estimated cost of the Marshall plan cannot be made without first considering the needs of Europe. The list below is an estimated need of Europe in 1948. Europe will need $1,500,000,000 of food and fertilizer; $300,000,000 of coal; $500,000,000 of petroleum; $400,000,000 of iron and steel; $1,100,000,000 of electrical equipment, freight cars, and equipment for petroleum refining and steel plants; and $7,200,000,000 of other imports.

Marshall's first proposal for the ERP did not give an estimated cost. It is a wise thing that he did not give this estimate of his plan, because more than likely the plan would not have been greeted with such warm enthusiasm if people had thought it would amount to such a vast sum. When Marshall went before Congress on July 12, 1947, he asked for, or rather demanded, $6,800,000,000 for the first year.

Benjamin V. Cohen, who is a former State Department counselor, has stated that Europe's needs will probably reach the sum of five or six billion dollars a year for a period of 5 or 6 years. VANDENBERG estimated that Marshall's proposed cost could be reduced almost a billion dollars. TAFT thought that $4,500,000,000 for the first year should be sufficient. Newsweek's Washington Trends stated that "Estimates range from $8,000,000,000 to $12,000,000,000 for 4 years or a maximum average of $3,000,000,000 a year."

Most of the world anxiously awaited the reaction on Europe to Secretary Marshall's plan. Russia was dictating to the east, therefore the east was openly suspicious. Western Europe's reaction was one of warm relief. Europe's only alternative to raise funds if the Marshall plan fails is to sell her holdings and industrial enterprises in the United States. Europe does not want to sell these holdings; therefore she must favor the plan.

Britain and France readily led the United States to believe that they were in favor of the plan. Britain's loan that was expected to last until 1951 was already exhausted when the Marshall plan was introduced. Britain felt that the Marshall plan was "a good deed in a bad world." British Foreign Secretary Bevin stated that even if Russia did not accept the plan, Britain would go ahead without Russia. Bevin, French Foreign Secretary Bidault, and Molotov met in Paris, France, on June 27, 1947, to discuss the plan.

The Benelux countries—Belgium, Netherlands, and Luxemburg—were short on funds; and the Marshall plan was their only solution for obtaining a loan. Italy needed a loan to spur industrial construction and reconstruction; therefore Italy approved of the plan because there was a shortage of money in these three countries.

Russia reacted in an entirely different manner from the actions of the other countries. Russia threatened that the United States was merely offering this plan in order to get on the good side of all the nations. Russia wished to depict the United States to the other nations as a country with imperialistic aims, and the Marshall plan was the chief weapon.

Since the break between the east and west in Europe, recovery has been hindered. Russian diplomatic pressure forced the weaker countries of Hungary, Rumania, Poland, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Finland to refuse discussion of the plan or to attend the July 12, 1947, meeting in Paris to discuss the needs of the different countries. Russia is making an effort to stir up the Communists in European countries to prevent rehabilitation and recovery. One American diplomat led the United States to believe that the countries of Europe were afraid to accept the Marshall plan because Russia would sabotage the efforts of the other countries who tried to make the plan work. Some people think that Russia wants the rest of the world to believe that the United States can be of no help to Europe without the aid of Russia.

The main difference of opinion about the Marshall plan was how much money it would require. Another point of disagreement was who would supervise the funds provided by the ERP. The third measure for conflict was the general belief that the United States had enough financial troubles without worrying about the financial troubles and the hard times in Europe.

Secretary Marshall went before Congress on January 12 to demand that he should be given complete authority and adequate funds to make the European recovery program workable. He demanded that Congress should accept his plan wholeheartedly and give him adequate means, or reject his plan entirely. Marshall received several criticisms because of his hasty methods.

VANDENBERG believed that the Marshall plan could be a compromise rather than meeting specific demands. VANDENBERG criticized Marshall because of his demand to either accept or reject—not compromise. VANDENBERG suggested that Marshall's $6,800,000,000 proposal could be cut down to $6,000,000,000 at least.

"The first week's hearings did not mean that the ERP was in danger of being junked. But they did mean this: Congress, aware of its responsibilities and prerogatives, was in no mood for take-it-or-leave-it attitudes; ERP would have to be the product of a compromise."

The Marshall plan will help the United States as well as Europe. The United States is taking out insurance against future wars when she shows the European countries that she is willing to share her blessings with the less-fortunate countries. If the European countries are depending on the United States for food, raw materials, and clothing, they will not likely take up arms against the country from which they receive their sustenance. "The Marshall plan is admittedly a gamble. But it is a gamble on peace and the billions of dollars that must be expended will seem small if we obtain that peace for which we are planning."

Mother of Exiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial printed in the Washington Post on Friday, June 4, 1948, dealing with the problem of Europe's displaced persons:

MOTHER OF EXILES

The displaced persons bill passed by the United States Senate is a fraud, a pious fraud which masks meanness, bigotry, and callousness behind a pretense of Christian charity. To the world's outcast who asked for bread, the Senate has decided to give a stone. The tired, the poor, the "huddled masses yearning to breathe free" to whom the great figure of Liberty astride the harbor of New York pledges the sanctuary of this land are not going to be admitted to the United States under the conditions the Senate has laid down. As Senator PEPPER said of what the Senate did, "This is a bill for the fortunate." It is extremely doubtful that there are enough of these, enough, that is to say, who can qualify under the complicated, frustrating, overlapping restrictions of the bill to permit the actual admission here of anything like the promised 200,000 in 2 years.

There are some shocking implications to the conditions imposed by the Senate. Scrutiny reveals them to be designedly anti-Semitic. The stipulation that half of the people benefiting from the bill must have had agricultural background, experience, and training in the country from which they come patently and purposefully discriminates against Jews who, precisely because persecution confined them to urban ghettos, lack this background yet who, as their performance in Palestine has shown, are entirely capable of acquiring it. The provision that not less than 50 percent of the visas issued under the act shall be "available exclusively to eligible displaced persons and eligible displaced orphans whose place of origin or country of nationality has been annexed by a foreign power" seems similarly a weasel way of discriminating against Jews. Insofar as this relates, as it is obviously intended to do, to the Baltic states, it amounts, incidentally, to a strange acknowledgment by the Senate of a Soviet extension of authority which the Government of the United States has never been willing to recognize.

When the preference for Balts and the preference for agricultural workers are joined together, the result is an administrative monstrosity. Add to this complexity the requirements that everyone admitted have a sponsor to guarantee he will not become a public charge, that he will not displace an American worker and that he will have a home in which to reside before a visa can be granted to him, and you have in the final analysis a bill to exclude DP's rather than to admit them. We hope fervently that the House will ignore this obstructive hodgepodge and act instead on the Fellows bill favorably reported by its own Judiciary Committee. Congress needs to do a great deal better than the Senate has done in meeting the tragic problem of the world's homeless if it is to adjourn this month with any ease of conscience.

A National Leprosy Bill To Stamp Out That Dread Disease in the United States; Some of Our Veterans Who Fought in the Pacific Theater Were Exposed to This Disease and It is Possible It Could Develop in Certain Areas of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 6653, entitled "The National Leprosy Act." Study of the facts show that we have in this country a potential group from those who served in the armed forces in the Far East, in World War II, who were exposed to, and later may develop, Hansen's disease, hitherto known as leprosy.

Further, it is clear that if they, and our other citizens so affected, are to be accorded the treatment and services which effective handling of this problem require, the proposed act offers the best means to do it.

I am sure that most Members of Congress and, certainly, the vast majority of the public, do not realize that we have a serious Hansen's disease (leprosy) condition in this country, and neither are they aware that some 40 States have sent patients to the Federal Leprosarium at Carville, La.

It is a truly tragic situation that those so afflicted confront, and I have no doubt but that we are dealing here with one of the most serious problems in the field of medical treatment and hospitalization, and, surely, means should be provided whereby these innocent people might be accorded opportunity to be properly rehabilitated, and, through a program of public education, bring about recognition of the grave needs for accepting into society the arrested cases, so that they may be reunited with their families and loved ones, and have opportunity to secure employment, without stigma being attached to them, in any way.

In view of the importance of this matter, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix an explanatory statement by Col. George H. Rarey, United States Army, retired, a national vice president of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, who has spent many years of study in this field, and, also a brief statement by Mr. Paul A. Strachan, president, American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, which organization has its national headquarters at 1376 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. I also ask consent to include in these remarks a copy of H. R. 6653.

The matter referred to follows:

A STATEMENT OF IMPORTANT FACTORS IN THE LEPROSY SITUATION IN THE UNITED STATES

(By Col. G. H. Rarey, U. S. Army (retired), national vice president, American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc.)

An investigation of the leprosy situation in the United States reveals:

(a) (1) That the ancient disease known as leprosy, and designated by some authorities as "Hansen's disease," has always had an unjustified and shameful stigma attached to it which has been, and still is, harmful to its victims, and detrimental in the extreme to past and present efforts to control, reduce, and eliminate the disease.

(2) That, due to the ignorance of the general public concerning the communicability of the disease, and the availability of modern treatment methods and medicine of unusual value in arresting cases of leprosy, there still exists a widespread fear of leprosy among the American people. This unjustified fear perpetuates the leprosy stigma and influences society to use the debasing weapon of ostracism against American leprosy victims and their families.

(3) That the unjustified weapon of ostracism is not confined to the victim while he is undergoing treatment, but extends to discharged patients whose cases have been arrested. In many instances, discharged patients, although physically able to work, are unable to get employment if they admit that they have taken treatment for leprosy. If employed without having given this information, they are immediately discharged when the employer learns the facts. The basis of this tragic example of man's inhumanity to man is an unjustified lepraphobia, or public fear of leprosy, and this fear, in turn, is based upon the unjustified stigma previously mentioned.

(4) That it is in the interests of the American public, including the present and future victims of this disease, to direct the Public Health Service to disseminate pertinent authentic information upon this subject, designed to dissipate the erroneous conceptions concerning leprosy, eliminate the harmful stigma, and banish leprophobia from the public mind.

(5) That throughout recorded history and down to and including the present time, the word "leper" has been wrongfully and unjustly used as an approbrious term to describe the ultimate in human degradation. Since it still connotes opprobrium and disgrace that follows evil or wrong conduct, infamy and sin, it is in the interests of the Nation, and in accord with a decent regard for the feelings, opinions, and desires of American citizens afflicted with leprosy to discontinue the use of the word "leper" in all information releases, statements, lectures, data, and reports prepared by the Public Health Service subsequent to the passage of this act.

(6) That evidence exists of numerous cases of leprosy having been diagnosed by members of the United States medical profession as syphilis, tuberculosis, etc., and since certain remedies used to treat syphilis are harmful to leprosy patients, and since the failure of physicians to recognize leprosy is detrimental to the patient in that it prevents him from receiving proper treatment for his disease, it is evident that there is an urgent need for the Public Health Service to disseminate correct information upon the diagnosis and treatment of this disease to the United States medical profession, including registered nurses, medical colleges, State government and private health agencies.

(b) (1) That the segregation of leprosy patients, as practiced in the United States for the past 51 years, has been proved ineffective as a means of controlling and eliminating the disease in this country; that it has defeated its purpose since it has discouraged voluntary application for treatment, on the part of many persons afflicted with the disease, due to its lack of flexibility and rigid application to all types of leprosy whether communicable or noncommunicable. Another factor in the failure of the present segregation policy has been the fact that it has taken no account of the serious family problems involved when a member thereof is found to have contracted the disease.

(2) That, because of the leprosy stigma and the lepraphobia in the public mind, its adult victims, in most cases, when arranging to enter the leprosarium for treatment under the present segregation policy, have found it necessary to break up their home life, sever all social relationships, business connections and life plans, and drop out of the home and community life to which they were accustomed by adopting a different name upon entering the leprosarium in order to avoid, if possible, having the remaining members of their family subjected to ostracism by an ignorant public.

(3) That, in many cases where the patient is a parent, the disruption of the home leaves the family without proper parental care and supervision, and if the patient is the breadwinner without adequate financial support.

(4) That the above-mentioned problems are among the factors which induce persons afflicted with leprosy to remain in seclusion, and prefer to endure the ravages of the disease rather than apply for treatment and accept separation from their families for years, if not for life, during their long isolation in the single treatment center heretofore available at Carville, La.

(5) That leprosy is now classified by medical science as a "feebly communicable" disease, and only about 50 percent of leprosy cases are of a communicable type. In view of this classification and the percentage of noncommunicable cases reported, it is apparent that many leprosy cases may, without danger to the public or detriment to the patient, be adequately treated by a qualified physician in the patient's home, or as outpatients by qualified members of hospital staffs, or in any hospital (not established and endowed for other specific purposes)

near the patient's home, while other patients with far-advanced cases may, in their own best interests, require continuous hospitalization over an indefinite period.

(6) That the present segregation and leprosy-treatment policies of the United States should be changed to conform with the modern appraisal of the communicability factor of this disease, and that each case should be judged upon its own merits and treated in accordance with the type of the disease contracted and the status of the disease when discovered.

(c) (1) That the Louisiana institution for treating persons afflicted with leprosy, now the National Leprosarium, was established in reclaimed swamp land at Carville, La., in a hot, moist, and endemic section of the State where leprosy thrives, about 16 miles south of Baton Rouge, La.

(2) That due to the isolation of the leprosarium, the debilitating climate of this section, and due to the understandable disinclination of many potential patients to enter this institution for extended treatment periods, the maintenance of a single leprosy-treatment center, so located, for all patients, regardless of the type or degree of communicability of their disease, and regardless of whether they come from endemic or nonendemic State, has been shown to be an erroneous and ineffective policy. This has been demonstrated by leprosarium records, which show that about 384, or less, of an estimated 3,000 to 5,000 persons in the United States afflicted with leprosy, have taken treatment in any one year at this institution and that there were but 1,517 admissions in the period of 50 years from December 1, 1894, to January 1, 1946.

(3) In view of the above it is apparent that the present plan which provides for a single treatment center in Louisiana is not successful; that a different approach must be made to this health problem, and that it is necessary to make leprosy treatment facilities more accessible to those who have contracted the disease, by establishing certain additional treatment centers in endemic States, and one such center in a nonendemic State.

(4) That leprosy is mainly a tropical disease and thrives in areas having hot, moist climates. Although a small number of cases exist in a few localities having extremely low temperatures, such as Iceland, where a total of 26 cases were reported in 1939, these cases were rapidly diminishing at that time, according to the report, and leprosy records show that this disease has maintained itself year after year in the United States and throughout the world, in tropical and subtropical climates, while it has been unable to survive in the more stimulating regions of the temperate zone. This fact has been demonstrated by the Norway example where the disease was widely prevalent in 1856, there being at that time in Norway, 2,850 known cases which, according to some students of the leprosy problem, were brought into Norway by sailors engaged in the shipping and whaling trade with tropical countries. But leprosy, even with this good start, did not thrive in Norway. By 1938 the 2,850 cases had been reduced to a total of 18.

Another impressive instance of leprosy's failure to thrive and spread in the cooler portions of the temperate zone is that furnished by the States of Minnesota, Iowa, and Wisconsin. From 160 to 200 persons afflicted with leprosy were brought into these States as Norwegian and Swedish settlers in the middle of the nineteenth century. No new cases developed in these settlements during the first 50 years, but 7 new cases were reported between 1895 and 1916. None have occurred since then, showing that, although the disease spread temporarily in those States, it did not thrive there and soon was extinguished.

(5) That, in view of the facts listed in subparagraph (c) (4) above, it is essential to the plan to control, reduce, and eventually to eliminate the ability of leprosy to survive in this country, to establish one leprosy treatment center in a north, or north-central, nonendemic State, where leprosy does not thrive, as a test of the value of a cool, dry climate in treating and eliminating this disease.

(d) (1) That, due to the length of time required to halt arrestable cases of leprosy, and especially those existing over a period of years before proper treatment is started, many patients now hospitalized, and many of those who will be hospitalized in the future may be expected to be away from their normal occupation a sufficient length of time to suffer material loss of skill and ability to maintain themselves and families. Discharged patients are frequently so situated that they cannot, by their own efforts alone, regain the skills and abilities essential to their economic security.

(2) That it is in the interests of the Nation to establish a bona fide rehabilitation and reemployment program for those hospitalized leprosy patients who may, without interfering with their treatment requirements, take educational or vocational training as a form of occupational therapy, to give them an objective, a new life plan upon which they can work during the long period of hospitalization and thus prepare themselves to become self-supporting members of society when discharged.

(3) That it should be a function of the rehabilitation and reemployment activity to obtain the cooperation of Federal, State, and selected private employment agencies in providing remunerative employment for all discharged leprosy patients who are physically able to take such employment.

(e) (1) That in certain cases, due in part to delay in starting treatment, and in others to having taken treatment over a long period, the patient is found to have suffered injuries, or loss of physical ability which may make it necessary after the disease has been arrested for the individual to adopt an occupation requiring less physical activity than that previously followed. In other cases, the patient when discharged may be physically disabled to a point where he or she is unable to work.

(2) That those discharged with a physical disability sufficient to affect materially their ability to support themselves, or if they have family responsibilities to support their family, should, if they have no adequate means of support, receive a suitable remuneration from the Federal Government for this purpose, similar to that provided for disabled veterans for varying degrees of disability.

(f) That one reason for the failure of parents and other adults afflicted with leprosy to report their illness, and enter the hospital for treatment, being the lack of funds to support their dependents during the long period the patient will be isolated for such treatment, it is in the interest of the national effort to control this disease, to provide financial assistance, when needed, to the families of patients who enter the national leprosarium, or other treatment center, and take leprosy treatment in cooperation with this national effort.

(g) That, since the manner in which leprosy is contracted is still unknown, it is in the national interest to provide for a suitable expansion of leprosy research by the Public Health Service, and by grants-in-aid to selected research agencies under the supervision of that Service, for the advancement of knowledge concerning the method, or methods by which leprosy is contracted, and for the discovery of improved medicines and techniques for its treatment.

(h) That it is essential to the national plan to eliminate this disease, to establish a national advisory council on leprosy, for the purpose of assisting the Surgeon General, Public Health Service, in planning, putting into effect, and aiding in the operation of the provisions of titles one to nine, inclusive of the proposed National Leprosy Act.

STATEMENT OF PAUL A. STRACHAN, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED, INC.

There has never been a proposal laid before the American public in such thorough, scientific, and practical way as that in H. R. 6653, a bill to establish the National Leprosy Act.

Here is a great problem, which, unless drastic steps are taken, may, soon, conceivably, become much worse. Those mothers and fathers whose sons fought in the Pacific, perhaps, have not thought of the possibility of later development of Hansen's disease amongst them.

Those who have not personally come into contact with the patients at Carville (La.) Leprosarium, cannot realize what such incarceration, complete severance of family ties, and lack of income, or any means of livelihood, means to these people.

We speak most sympathetically of the displaced persons of Europe, and it may be fair to say that we have, right here in America, many who would fall into the same category.

The real purpose of this act is to stamp out leprosy. We believe, by the methods and treatment suggested, that is possible, within the next two decades.

Therefore, we urge that all organizations and individuals lend their full support to this measure.

[H. R. 6653, 80th Cong., 2d sess.]

A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the leprosy situation in the United States, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "National Leprosy Act."

TITLE I—DISSEMINATION OF PERTINENT FACTS CONCERNING LEPROSY

SEC. 101. (a) It shall be one of the purposes of this act to promote an enlightened public opinion, a new and more accurate understanding on the part of the American public upon the subject of leprosy, as one of the major essential requirements in the national plan to effect control and the elimination of leprosy in the United States, by disseminating to Federal and State health agencies, including Federal and State medical colleges; private medical colleges and nurse-training schools, and other private agencies that are in any way concerned with the diagnosis and/or treatment of communicable disease; to the medical profession of the United States, and to the general public, the pertinent facts essential to each group and agency listed above concerning leprosy, including information upon the latest improved medicine and methods for treating this disease, and including a statement of the procedure to be followed to obtain proper treatment.

(b) The leprosy health problem in the United States being a national responsibility, the Public Health Service, as an agency of the Federal Government, is hereby charged with the duty of preparing and disseminating the information outlined in section 101 (a) of this title.

(c) In carrying out the provisions of this title, it shall be the duty of the Public Health Service to promote the welfare of the people of the United States by aiding and fostering a spirit of tolerance and understanding upon the part of the public, in the interests of persons who have, or who may in the future contract leprosy, as an initial step in the national fight against this disease, by showing the injustice of the leprosy stigma, for the purpose of allaying the unreasonable fear of this disease in the public mind.

(d) The word "leper" shall not be used in any statement, lecture, data, report, or other

material prepared by the Public Health Service subsequent to the passage of this act.

SEC. 102. In carrying out the provision of this title, the Public Health Service shall—

(a) advise and cooperate with other agencies and departments of the Federal Government, with State governments and agencies, and with private agencies functioning in the field of health;

(b) collect and analyze statistics and make studies, investigations, and reports on conditions, problems, and needs in the leprosy field in the United States and in other countries, and disseminate to the people of the United States pertinent information thus obtained.

SEC. 103. The Surgeon General, Public Health Service, is authorized to make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services and rent at the seat of the government and elsewhere, for books of reference and periodicals, and for printing and binding) as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title and as may be provided by the Congress from time to time.

SEC. 104. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury, not otherwise obligated, for such additional administration expenses of the Public Health Service as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, including such expenses as are described in section 103 of this title, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and each year thereafter, the sum necessary for such purposes.

SEC. 105. This title shall take effect 90 days after passage of this act.

TITLE II—TREATMENT OF LEPROSY PATIENTS

SEC. 201. In order to encourage persons afflicted with leprosy to apply for treatment, the Public Health Service is hereby authorized and directed to provide suitable methods and facilities for treatment purposes generally more accessible to leprosy patients, as outlined in this title, and to establish leprosy-treatment principles, methods, and regulations for administering leprosy treatments more in harmony with the customs of society as applied to the care and treatment of persons afflicted with other diseases.

SEC. 202. In carrying out the provisions of this title the Surgeon Genera' is authorized and directed to—

(a) arrange and provide for administering treatment to certain veteran patients in Veterans' Administration hospitals; certain other patients in State, county, and city hospitals; and in leprosy-treatment centers other than and in addition to the present national leprosarium; certain others as out-patients, and to have treatment administered to certain patients in their homes;

(b) to supply or pay for the medical treatment which, in his opinion, is most suitable for use in each case treated outside of Public Health Service hospitals, and to supply printed instructions covering the use of such treatment: *Provided,* That payment for medicines administered to veteran patients by the Veterans' Administration hospitals will be made by the Veterans' Administration;

(c) base the decision, as to the locality at which treatment is to be administered, upon the type of the disease contracted in each case, the degree of communicability of the disease when the case is examined by the Public Health Service; the proximity of the patient's home or place of residence to the nearest available hospital or treatment center, and the feasibility of treating the patient as an out-patient, or of administering treatment in the patient's home;

(d) establish such regulations governing treatment of leprosy patients at leprosy-treatment centers, at other hospitals, as out-patients treated at such centers and hospitals, or as home patients, as will be conducive to and encourage the voluntary application for treatment upon the part of persons afflicted with leprosy.

(e) utilize the services and facilities of any executive department or agency of the Federal Government, as needed to carry out the provisions of this act, in accordance with an agreement with the head thereof. Payment for such services and for the use of such facilities shall be made as may be agreed upon between the Surgeon General and the head of the department or agency furnishing them.

SEC. 203. In carrying out the provisions of sections 201 and 202 of this title the Surgeon General is authorized and directed to arrange with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for the admission and treatment of veterans of the armed forces afflicted with a noncommunicable type of leprosy, for hospitalization or out-patient treatment; and for admission and treatment of veterans with a communicable type of the disease who have made sufficient progress toward its arrestment to justify their transfer to a Veterans' Administration hospital for the remainder of the treatment; and for the admission and treatment of such other veteran patients as may be approved by the Surgeon General for treatment in a Veterans' Administration hospital.

SEC. 204. The Surgeon General will arrange with the director of State health departments, in appropriate cases, or with the responsible head of State, county, and city hospitals for the admission and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy of a noncommunicable type as hospitalized, or as out-patient cases; and persons with a communicable type of the disease who, in the opinion of the Surgeon General, have made sufficient progress toward its arrestment to justify receiving the remainder of the treatment in or from an approved hospital other than the national leprosarium.

SEC. 205. The Surgeon General is hereby authorized to arrange with any qualified physician in the United States to treat persons afflicted with a noncommunicable type of leprosy in the patient's home.

SEC. 206. As a prerequisite to a patient being authorized to receive treatment for leprosy other than as a hospitalized patient in a United States Marine hospital, or other treatment center operated by the Public Health Service, the Surgeon General is authorized to require a written agreement that the patient will follow the treatment instructions specified by the Public Health Service, until the disease is arrested and the official discharge from treatment requirements is received by the patient; and that, thereafter, the patient will regularly and promptly present himself for periodical physical check-up over the period designated by the Surgeon General. Failure upon the part of the patient to comply with such agreement will authorize the Surgeon General to transfer the patient to a suitable Public Health Service hospital for treatment.

SEC. 207. The Public Health Service shall receive into any hospital or treatment center operated by that service, and not set aside and reserved for treating mental patients, or designated as a tuberculosis hospital, any person afflicted with leprosy who presents himself for care and treatment; and to send for any person reported by the proper health authority of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia to be afflicted with leprosy, and to convey such person to the nearest suitable hospital or treatment center, if necessary, for an examination to determine the type of the disease contracted, and the place where the patient is to receive treatment in accordance with the provisions of this title.

SEC. 208. All cases determined by the Public Health Service to be of a communicable type of leprosy which, in the opinion of the examining officer, cannot be satisfactorily treated except at a Marine hospital or other treatment center operated by the Public Health Service, will be transferred by the Surgeon General to the United States Marine hospital, not set aside for mental, or tuberculosis patients, nearest the patient's home, or to such hospital in a nonendemic State as may be desired by the patient concerned, or by the parents, or guardian, if the patient is a minor: *Provided,* That patients having a communicable type of the disease who reside in a nonendemic State will be sent to a United States Marine hospital in a nonendemic State for treatment.

SEC. 209. Release of patients from treatment requirements, regardless of where the treatment is administered, will be by the authority of the Surgeon General or his designated representative in each case.

SEC. 210. Transportation of patients, except those being treated as out-patients, from their place of residence to hospitals and treatment centers and return to their homes within the United States and its Territories, when discharged, shall be met with funds available for the maintenance of hospitals of the Public Health Service, except in those cases where another Federal agency is authorized or required to pay for such transportation.

SEC. 211. The Surgeon General is authorized to make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services) as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, and as may be provided by Congress from time to time.

SEC. 212. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise obligated, for such additional administration expenses of the Public Health Service in carrying out the provisions of sections 201 to 211, inclusive, of this title, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and each year thereafter, the sum necessary for such purposes.

SEC. 213. Except as specifically provided herein, nothing in this title shall be construed as conferring on any Federal officer or employee, or any other person, the right to exercise supervision or control over the leprosy-treatment methods and policies established by the Public Health Service.

SEC. 214. In order to carry out the provisions of this title with respect to the establishment of such additional leprosy-treatment centers as may be found necessary, the Administrator, Federal Security Administration, is authorized to acquire by purchase, condemnation, donation, or otherwise, a site in each of the four endemic States of California, Florida, Louisiana, and Texas, and one site in a nonendemic State having a climate approximately described as cool and dry and not subject to extremely low temperatures in winter, and to erect thereon, furnish and equip such buildings and facilities, or to acquire by purchase or donation such site and installations as may be available and suitable, and to provide such personnel as are needed to establish and operate leprosy-treatment centers, as funds are made available therefor. When established, these treatment centers are to be known as "United States marine hospitals."

SEC. 215. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise obligated, a sum not to exceed $1,500,000 for the acquisition of a site and the establishment thereon of a leprosy-treatment center in a nonendemic State having a suitable climate as described in section 214 of this title, to provide facilities for administering leprosy treatment to approximately 200 patients at a time, in such a climate in comparison with the same treatment administered at the present national leprosarium.

(b) The amount authorized in this section to be appropriated shall include the cost of preparation of drawings and specifications, and supervision of construction, and other administrative expenses incident to the work.

SEC. 216. This title shall take effect 90 days after date of passage of this act.

TITLE III—THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON LEPROSY

SEC. 301. (a) There is hereby created the National Advisory Council on Leprosy, to consist of the Surgeon General ex officio, who shall be Chairman, and nine additional mem-

bers to be appointed without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, by the Surgeon General with the approval of the Administrator, Federal Security Administration.

(b) Six of the appointed members shall be selected from leading medical authorities not otherwise in the employ of the Federal Government, who are outstanding in the study, diagnosis, or treatment of leprosy and thoroughly familiar with leprosy conditions and problems in the United States. One of the appointed members shall be selected from a national press organization, and one from a national veteran organization. One of the appointed members shall be a discharged leprosy patient whose disease has been arrested by treatment administered at the Carville (La.) National Leprosarium.

(c) The three nonmedical members of the Council are authorized to vote on all matters considered by the Council except purely medical or technical matters pertaining to leprosy research and medical treatment administered to leprosy patients.

(d) Each appointed member shall be appointed for a term of 3 years, except that any person appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and except that the first term for the originally appointed members shall expire, as designated by the Surgeon General at the time of the appointment, three at the end of 1 year, three at the end of 2 years, and three at the end of 3 years after the date of appointment. All appointed members shall be eligible for reappointment at the discretion of the Surgeon General.

SEC. 302. Each appointed member of the Council while attending conference or meetings of such Council, or while otherwise serving at the request of the Surgeon General pursuant to this title, shall be entitled to receive compensation at the rate fixed by the Surgeon General, the rate of compensation to be the same for all members of the Council, but not to exceed $25 per diem, and shall also be entitled to receive an allowance for actual and necessary traveling expenses, including subsistence expenses, while so serving away from his place of residence.

SEC. 303. The Council shall meet as frequently as the Surgeon General deems necessary, but not less than once every 6 months. Upon the request by three or more members, it shall be the duty of the Surgeon General to call a meeting of the Council.

SEC. 304. It shall be the duty of the members of the Council to advise and consult with the Surgeon General upon any and all matters relating to the titles of this act, and upon other matters pertaining to leprosy conditions and problems in the United States, at the request of the Surgeon General, and to initiate recommendations as a council, or as individual members thereof, which they jointly or individually deem advisable and necessary to bring to the attention of the Surgeon General in order to accomplish the purposes of this act, and otherwise to improve the leprosy situation in the United States. The recommendations and reports of the National Advisory Council on Leprosy shall be printed as public documents.

SEC. 305. The Surgeon General is authorized to make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services and for printing and binding) as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, and as may be provided for by Congress from time to time.

SEC. 306. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise obligated, for administration expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, including such expenses as are described in section 305 of this title, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and each year thereafter, the sum necessary for such purposes.

SEC. 307. This title shall take effect 90 days after date of passage of this act.

TITLE IV—REHABILITATION AND REEMPLOYMENT OF LEPROSY PATIENTS

SEC. 401. In order to assist leprosy patients to prepare themselves for remunerative employment following the arrestment of the disease, the Surgeon General shall establish a rehabilitation and reemployment program for such patients who are treated at the national leprosarium or other leprosy-treatment center. This program shall—

(a) be designed to restore by education and training the skills and abilities in the patient's previous occupation, or provide in another more suitable occupation the requisite skills and abilities for self-support, and a reasonable degree of economic security for himself and family;

(b) be available for such patients as, in the opinion of the Surgeon General, or his representative, are physically able to study or take training, and who are expected to be employable, or capable of self-employment, at the termination of their treatment period;

(c) be available for any employable discharged leprosy patient treated by the Public Health Service or by the authority of that Service;

(d) include plans to obtain the cooperation of Federal, State, and other employment agencies, corporations, and businesses in placement of employable discharged leprosy patients.

SEC. 402. Educational and/or vocational training as may be needed and desired by the patient will be made available for hospitalized patients at any time during their treatment period when, in the opinion of the Surgeon General or his representative, such activities will not retard their recovery or interfere materially with their treatment. Such instruction and/or training will be continued during their stay at the hospital or treatment center as needed to complete the training objective.

SEC. 403. Employable discharged patients shall be given preference, without regard to the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, in filling employee vacancies in the Public Health Service hospitals and treatment centers for which they are, or can be qualified by on-the-job training.

SEC. 404. On-the-job training at the leprosarium and treatment centers will be used as fully as practicable for vocational training purposes under such supervision and methodical step-by-step guidance as will fit the patient, when discharged, to enter and satisfactorily fill the job for which he or she is being trained.

SEC. 405. Educational and vocational training will not be limited to that necessary to engage in the occupations available at the Public Health Service hospitals and treatment centers, but will be based as fully as practicable upon the needs and desires of the individual patient.

SEC. 406. The rehabilitation and reemployment program will be under the general supervision and control of the medical officer in charge of the hospital or treatment center. The active supervision of educational and training activities will be conducted by a licensed occupational therapist and such assistants as, in the opinion of the medical officer in charge, are necessary. The employment of this supervisory personnel, and the purchase of the minimum requirements in training equipment and supplies for the actual and exclusive use of this program, are hereby authorized.

SEC. 407. Work satisfactorily performed, including scholastic and training programs satisfactorily carried out by patients, or by discharged patients, shall be compensated at such hourly, daily, or monthly rates as, in the opinion of the Surgeon General or his representative, are most suitable for the kind of work or scholastic effort concerned, but which shall not exceed $50 per month while the patient or discharged patient is in training.

SEC. 408. Upon the completion of the training period, or periods, patients who have qualified for regular employment and who, in the opinion of the Surgeon General or his representative, are physically able to carry on the work in the leprosarium or treatment center for which they have been trained, and in which occupation a vacancy exists to which the patient can be and is appointed, the compensation for such patient will be 75 percent of the rate paid by the Public Health Service to nonpatient employees engaged in such work.

SEC. 409. Employable discharged patients who return to the leprosarium or treatment center for reasons other than for additional treatment, when employed at these institutions, shall be compensated at the same rates, and be employed under the same conditions as are applicable to other nonpatient employees.

SEC. 410. The Surgeon General is authorized to make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services and for printing and binding, training equipment, and supplies) as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, and as may be provided by Congress from time to time.

SEC. 411. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise obligated, for the administration expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, including such expenses as are described in section 410 of this title, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and each year hereafter the sum necessary for such purposes.

SEC. 412. The Surgeon General shall establish the necessary regulations for carrying out the provisions of this title.

SEC. 413. This title shall take effect 90 days after date of passage of this act.

TITLE V—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR LEPROSY PATIENTS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

SEC. 501. There shall be included in the annual appropriations for the administration of the National Leprosarium and leprosy-treatment centers, provision for a fund to be known as the "Patient's Welfare Fund," from which patients taking treatment in these institutions who do not have an income equal in amount to $10 per month, who are not physically able to engage in such compensated tasks as are available, or for whom no such task is available for which they are qualified, or who are physically unable to take educational or vocational training, shall receive the sum of $10 per month to defray incidental expense common to the needs of all patients undergoing treatment over an extended period away from home.

SEC. 502. In order to carry out the provisions of section 501 of this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise obligated, a sum not to exceed $20,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and such sums thereafter as Congress may provide.

SEC. 503. The dependent or dependents of leprosy patients who are hospitalized for leprosy treatment shall be entitled to receive a monthly family allowance for the period during which the patient continues to take such treatment, plus 1 month following the patient's discharge from treatment requirements.

SEC. 504. (a) The dependents of hospitalized leprosy patients authorized to receive the family allowance shall include the wife; child or children under 18 years of age and unmarried, including stepchildren and adopted children; the patient's father, mother, father-in-law, and mother-in-law who have received their chief support from the patient for a period of 6 months before the patient entered the hospital for treatment; the patient's brother and sister under 18 years of age and unmarried, or who are physically or mentally unable to support themselves and unmarried, who have received their chief support from the patient for a period of 6 months prior to the date

the patient entered the hospital for leprosy treatment.

(b) Monthly family allowances authorized in this title shall apply to those cases where the patient is a parent or guardian who is the breadwinner or provider for the family. In cases where the patient is a wife who is not the family provider but who is living with her husband and children immediately prior to her entry into the hospital for leprosy treatment under the supervision of the Public Health Service, the monthly family allowances will be 75 percent of the amount authorized in section 505 of this title.

(c) Dependents of such leprosy patients as are authorized by the Surgeon General to take treatment outside of Public Health Service hospitals shall be entitled to receive such portion of the family monthly allowances as are approved by the Surgeon General, based upon the actual need in each case for such family assistance, and the inability of the patient to continue to provide for his dependents without interfering with the leprosy treatment requirements, or his chances for recovery.

(d) Application for monthly family allowance shall be initiated by the patient. The medical officer or physician responsible for the patient's treatment will certify as to the correctness of the information furnished by the patient and forward the application to the Surgeon General who, upon his approval of same, will forward the application to the Bureau of Public Assistance, Federal Security Agency, for payment.

SEC. 505. The monthly family allowance authorized for dependents of leprosy patients taking treatment under the supervision of, or by the authority of, the Public Health Service, are as follows:

(a) To a wife without children, $60; a wife and one child, $80, and an additional $20 for each additional child.

(b) To a child but no wife, $42; with an additional $20 for each additional child.

(c) To one parent but no brother or sister, $50.

(d) To two parents but no brother or sister, $68.

(e) To one parent and one brother or sister, $68, with an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister.

(f) To two parents and one brother or sister, $79, with an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister.

(g) To a brother or sister but no parent, $42, with an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister.

SEC. 506. In the case of a wife living separate and apart from the patient under any temporary or permanent court order, or decree in a divorce allowance, or legal-separation proceeding, or written agreement, the amount of the family allowance payable to such wife will not exceed the amount provided in such order, or decree in a divorce allowance, or legal-separation proceedings or written agreement to be paid to such wife, and if such order, decree, separation proceeding, or agreement provides no amount to be paid such wife, no family allowance will be paid to her.

SEC. 507. In the case of a former wife divorced, the amount of the family allowance payable to such former wife divorced will not exceed the amount fixed in the court order or decree as the amount to be paid to such former wife divorced, and will not in any event exceed the amount of $60 per month authorized in subparagraph (a) section 505, of this title.

SEC. 508. Changes in the status of a dependent which will terminate entitlement to a monthly family allowance include—

(a) death of the dependent;

(b) attainment of the age of 18 years by a brother, sister, or child, except when such dependent is physically or mentally incapable of self-support;

(c) the marriage of a brother, sister, or child;

(d) marriage of a former wife divorced;

(e) cessation of required degree of dependency of dependent fathers, mothers, brothers, or sisters;

(f) divorce of wife without alimony, or a termination of alimony;

(g) divorce of a husband from the patient will terminate entitlement of his dependents to any part of the family allowance paid under the provision for 75 percent of the total amount authorized, as provided in subparagraph (b) of section 504 of this title.

SEC. 509. Changes in the status of the patient which will terminate entitlement to monthly family allowance include—

(a) death of patient;

(b) discharge of the patient from treatment requirements: *Provided*, That one additional monthly allowance shall be paid in case of the death or discharge of the patient;

(c) unauthorized absence of the patient from the place of treatment designated by the Surgeon General, or unauthorized discontinuance by the patient of the treatment provided by, or by the authority of the Surgeon General will authorize that authority to terminate entitlement to family allowances.

SEC. 510. The Surgeon General is authorized to make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services and for printing and binding) as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, and as may be provided by Congress from time to time.

SEC. 511. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise obligated, for administration expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, including such expenses as are described in section 510 of this title, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and each year thereafter, the sum necessary for such purposes.

SEC. 512. The Surgeon General will establish the necessary regulations for carrying out the provisions of this title.

SEC. 513. This title shall take effect 90 days after date of passage of this act.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION FOR DISABILITY INCIDENT TO LEPROSY

SEC. 601. (a) Prior to the discharge of leprosy patients from treatment requirements, the medical board authorizing or recommending their discharge from Public Health Service hospitals shall determine the degree of physical disability, if any, sustained by the patient due to leprosy and/or treatment therefor. Such disabilities sustained by patients treated in other hospitals, or as out-patients, or as home patients, will be determined by the physicians responsible for their treatment, who will forward their recommendations thereon to the Surgeon General.

(b) The Surgeon General or his designated representative will review the findings and recommendations in each case, and if they are approved, they will be certified and forwarded to the Bureau of Public Assistance, Federal Security Agency, for payment of the following compensation for physical disability incident to leprosy.

(c) To discharged patients who are classified as totally and permanently disabled, there shall be paid a sum, starting immediately following their discharge, in the amount of $125 per month.

(d) To discharged patients who have suffered total blindness incident to leprosy the compensation paid shall be $150 per month.

(e) Patients who are found to be physically disabled incident to leprosy in a degree less than total shall receive a portion of the compensation authorized in this title, the amount of which shall be graduated in accordance with the percentage of their physical disability. Disabilities determined to be less than 10 percent will not be certified for compensation payments.

SEC. 602. Compensation received under the provisions of this title shall not bar the discharged patients from further improving their economic situation.

SEC. 603. Unauthorized departure of the patient from hospitals and treatment centers, or unauthorized discontinuance by the patient of treatment provided or authorized by the Public Health Service under the provisions of this act, will authorize the Surgeon General to cancel the right of such patient to receive the benefits provided by this title.

SEC. 604. The Surgean General is authorized to make such expenditure (including expenditures for personal services and for printing and binding) as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, and as may be provided by the Congress from time to time.

SEC. 605. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise obligated, for administration expenses, including such expenses as are described in section 604 of this title, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for each year thereafter, the sum necessary for such purposes.

SEC. 606. This title shall take effect 90 days after date of passage of this act.

TITLE VII—EXPANSION OF LEPROSY RESEARCH

SEC. 701. (a) It shall be one of the purposes of this act to provide for an immediate expansion of research to discover—

(1) the method or methods by which leprosy is contracted and transmitted;

(2) a method or means for detecting the leprosy bacillus during its incubation period;

(3) more effective and faster-acting remedies and techniques for the arrestment of all types of leprosy; and

(4) the possibilities of developing preventive medicines and techniques for combating this disease.

(b) The Public Health Service is hereby charged with the duty of conducting and supervising the national research effort as outlined in section 701 of this title.

SEC. 702. (a) In carrying out the purposes of this title, the Surgeon General will conduct, assist, and foster research, experiments, demonstrations, and studies relating to the cause, method of transmitting, treatment, prevention, control, and elimination of leprosy's ability to survive and spread in the United States.

(b) The Surgeon General will coordinate research activities in the leprosy field conducted by the Public Health Service and similar research conducted by private research agencies, organizations, and institutions, and make grants-in-aid to public and private agencies, organizations, and institutions for conducting leprosy research as authorized in this title.

SEC. 703. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise obligated, to carry out research in the field of leprosy the following sums for the years and purposes indicated: For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, for leprosy research activities of the Public Health Service, or for grants-in-aid for leprosy research at the discretion of the Surgeon General, a sum not to exceed $100,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, for leprosy research activities of the Public Health Service not to exceed $100,000, and for grants-in-aid for leprosy research not to exceed $100,000; and thereafter, such sums as may be provided by Congress from time to time.

SEC. 704. Sums authorized for leprosy research for a fiscal year and remaining unencumbered at the end of such year shall remain available to the Public Health Service for such purpose for the next fiscal year (and for such year only), in addition to the sums authorized for such next fiscal year.

SEC. 705. This title shall become effective 90 days after date of passage of this act.

TITLE VIII—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 801. If any provisions of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder

of the act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 802. It shall be the duty of the Surgeon General to insure that all laws passed by Congress and regulations established by the Public Health Service pertaining to the care, treatment, rehabilitation, and reemployment of leprosy patients are brought to the attention of patients undergoing treatment.

TITLE IX—AMENDMENTS

SEC. 901. Title III of the Public Health Service Act (Public Law 410, 78th Cong.) is amended by eliminating sections 331 and 332, part D of that act, and by substituting therefor the provisions of title II, Treatment of Leprosy Patients, of this, the National Leprosy Education and Treatment Act.

SEC. 902. The provisions of this act supersede and invalidate the provisions of other national acts and instructions which are contrary to this act as applicable to the national plan for the control and elimination of leprosy in the United States.

Housing—The Taft-Ellender-Wagner Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, one of the types of opposition which the T-E-W bill has had to face is the charge that its public housing title is socialistic. Those who make this argument have conveniently shut their eyes to the time-honored rivers and harbors and soil-conservation programs which are exactly similar in their import. These programs are designed to help individuals who need the help of the Federal Government because it directly contributes t· the health and well-being of the Nation and because if they are not benefited, not they alone but the whole Nation suffers. No one would accuse the distinguished president of the Motion Picture Industry of America, Mr. Eric Johnston, former chairman of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, of favoring socialistic legislation. His letter of endorsement of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill urging it as a must bill is very impressive. It is appended hereto.

It has also been stated that real estate interests are against this bill. Selfish real estate interests are, but realtors who have the interest of all the people at heart realize that a general housing program is best for their own businesses too are not. I append a letter from William Reinhardt, a realtor himself, urging passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill:

MOTION PICTURE ASSOCIATION
OF AMERICA, INC.,
Washington, D. C., June 4, 1948.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JAVITS: I appreciated very much your comments on my remarks on housing to the National Conference on Family Life.

The conference recognized and pointed up the urgent need for adequate housing as a bulwark of American family life.

You are doing something positive and effective about it by sponsoring the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill in the House, and I congratulate you and all those associated with you in this splendid effort.

If there ever was a "must" bill, this is it. It has been a "must" bill for a long time. It is a "must" bill today. It should be taken up and passed by the House with all possible expedition.

It would be tragedy, in my judgment, if the bill were to be sidetracked or defeated at this session.

The bill fills a need which must be met in the interest of all the people of America.

Sincerely yours,

ERIC JOHNSTON.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *June 3, 1948.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have been a Philadelphia realtor for more than 40 years; I am conveyancer and director of one of the largest Federal savings and loan associations in Philadelphia, a director of the Federal Home Loan Board for the Third District, a former president of the Pennsylvania Savings and Loan League, and chairman of the Philadelphia housing authority.

As a conveyancer for more than 30 savings and loan associations, I have handled the financing of 70,000 small homes in the Philadelphia area, and with this varied background of experience in the housing field, I wish to say to you that I believe the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill provides the best method of meeting our present housing shortage.

As a private realtor I am shocked and disappointed at the apparent apathy of Members of the Congress toward enacting suitable legislation to meet our housing needs. As a public official, charged with the duty of providing decent housing for those families for whom private industry cannot provide shelter, I am convinced of the necessity of Federal aid to provide a minimum of public housing for our lowest income groups.

As a private realtor and as chairman of the Philadelphia housing authority, I urge you if you have not already done so, to sign discharge petition No. 6, and bring the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill to a vote on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I believe it to be a shameful disgrace and abuse of democratic process that a small handful of men representing special interests can thwart the will of the American people by keeping this legislation bottled up in the House Banking and Currency Committee.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM REINHARDT.

The Taft-Hartley Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD W. LANDIS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following digest of the Taft-Hartley law which I have prepared:

THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW
(By the Honorable GERALD W. LANDIS)

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

Section 1, findings and policies This section merely relates certain findings in the field of labor relations and sets forth the policy of the United States with reference to such findings.

Section 2, definitions: Certain terms, phrases, and statements are defined herein.

Section 3, the National Labor Relations Board: This section sets up the new NLRB, separating its prosecutive and judicial functions and setting forth its duties, powers, etc.

Sections 4, 5, and 6: Has reference to section 3 inasmuch as it prescribes certain matters relative to the NLRB operations.

Section 7, rights of employees: This part gives the workers a right to organize, join, or assist labor organizations or not to.

Section 8, unfair labor practices:

Subsection 8 (a): Unfair labor practices by employers.

Subsection 8 (a) (1) makes it illegal for an employer to interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of their rights to organize, join, or assist labor organization or not to.

Subsection 8 (a) (2) outlaws company dominated or financed unions.

Subsection 8 (a) (3) prevents discrimination against any person because he is or is not a union member, and makes it unlawful for an employer to discourage or encourage membership in a union by discrimination in hire or conditions of employment. This subsection bans the closed shop. It is legal to require as a condition of employment, membership in a union, after the 30th day, if the union has conformed to other sections of the law. This is that part permitting the union shop.

Subsection 8 (a) (4): An employer cannot discharge or otherwise discriminate against an employee because he has filed charges or given testimony under this act.

Subsection 8 (a) (5): An employer is required to bargain collectively with the union if it has complied with other provisions of this act.

Subsection 8 (b) is a new subsection, listing unfair labor practices by unions.

Subsection 8 (b) (1) makes it unlawful to restrain or coerce a worker to join or not join a union.

Subsection 8 (b) (2). Discrimination: An employee can be expelled from the union, but the union cannot get the worker discharged from his employment, except for nonpayment of dues.

Subsection 8 (b) (3): This subsection requires unions to bargain with employers.

Subsection 8 (b) (4) (A) bans secondary boycotts.

Subsection 8 (b) (4) (B) makes it an unfair labor practice for one union to engage in strike activity to force some other employer to recognize some other union which has not been certified.

Subsection 8 (b) (4) (C) makes it an unfair labor practice for a union to force any employer to recognize or bargain with it if another union has been certified by the NLRB.

Subsection 8 (b) (4) (D) outlaws jurisdictional strikes. A violation of 8 (b) (4) can be restrained. (See section 10.)

Subsection 8 (b) (5) provides that the NLRB has the right to prevent high initiation fees if they are excessive or discriminatory, and this applies only in case of a union shop. Some crafts have high initiation fees, but they are not out of line with the skill required and the benefits received.

Subsection 8 (b) (6) makes so-called featherbedding unlawful; that is, the union cannot force an employer to pay 10 workers to do a job when only 6 or 7 actually work on that job.

Subsection 8 (c) is the free-speech subsection. It says that anybody can say anything he wants to about any matter, so long as there is no threat of reprisal or force or promise of benefit.

Subsection 8 (d) is bargaining procedure. It requires a 60-day notice to the other party, a 30-day notice to the Federal Mediation Service, and the continuation of work till the end of the contract or the 60-day notice, whichever occurs later. It requires the status quo of the present contract during this

interim period. It further requires both the employers and the unions to bargain collectively in good faith. Both must attempt to work out an agreement; and if that is done, they are required to put it in writing so that everyone clearly understands what was agreed to.

Section 9, representatives and elections: Subsection 9 (a) says, if a union wins the bargaining rights by a majority vote, it shall represent all employees in that unit; however, any worker can present and have adjusted any grievance of his own without going through the union, if he so wishes, provided, it does not conflict with the contract but—the union has to be given an opportunity to be present at such adjustment.

Subsection 9 (b), appropriate unit: The NLRB still determines the appropriate unit with the following limitations: 1. It cannot force professional employees in a unit with nonprofessional unless a majority of the former so desire. 2. It cannot deny a craft unit separate bargaining rights just because of prior Board decisions against it. 3. It cannot include guards in a unit with rank and file workers.

Subsection 9 (c), filing petitions: Some new changes have been made in this procedure; first, an employer can now petition the NLRB for an election to find out who represents his employees, after a labor organization has presented a claim to be organized. Second, the Board now has to treat independent unions the same as affiliated ones. Third, it defines voting eligibility, denying that privilege to employees who strike without giving the 60-day notice (8 (d)); or if they are not eligible for reinstatement. Fourth, only one election can be held in any 12-month period.

Subsection 9 (d) outlines the procedure for review of certification.

Subsection 9 (e), voting on the union shop: Only a union that has been certified can ask for union-shop election and it has to show 30 percent of those in the unit desire it before an election will be held. The union must get a majority vote of all employees eligible to vote.

Subsection 9 (f) and (g) requires unions to make known to the members the financial condition of the union, and further, the officers are required to file with the United States Department of Labor, certain information such as bylaws, officers and compensation, election procedures, financial statements, etc. The penalty for not doing this is the denial of the use of NLRB facilities.

Subsection 9 (h), non-Communist affidavit: Officers of unions are now required to file an affidavit that they are not a member of the Communist Party or do not support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the Government by force or illegal methods.

Section 10, prevention of unfair-labor practices: Subsections 10 (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), and (i) outline the methods and procedure by which the NLRB prevents unfair-labor practices by having and determining charges and if necessary applying to the courts for enforcement).

Subsection 10 (j) gives the Board power to petition for a restraining order in any case where an unfair-labor practice has been or is being engaged in whether it be by a labor organization or an employer, if a charge has been filed and a complaint has been issued on the charge.

Subsection 10 (k) gives the Board power to settle a jurisdictional dispute (8 (b) (4) (D)), if the parties concerned cannot agree within 10 days after notice that such charge has been filed.

Subsection 10 (l) makes it mandatory for the Board to petition for a restraining order to stop a secondary boycott; to stop unions from engaging in strike activity to force some other employer to recognize some other union which has not been certified; and to stop a union from forcing any employer to recognize or bargain with it if another union has been certified by the Board (8 (b) (4) (A), (B), and (C)).

Section 11, investigatory powers: This section sets forth procedure and conditions for NLRB investigations.

Section 12 prescribes penalties for interference with the performance of duties of the NLRB members or its agents.

Section 13, limitations: The right to strike is herein protected.

Section 14, supervisors: Subsection 14 (a) does not prohibit supervisors, as individuals, from belonging to a labor organization but their employer is not compelled by law to bargain collectively with them. They may still strike to gain recognition.

Subsection 14 (b) states that the union-shop provision shall not apply in any States where such form of union security is outlawed.

Section 15, reference to Bankruptcy Act: Provides for conflict between this act and provisions of the Bankruptcy Act.

Section 16, separability: States that in the event any section or sections of this act are held invalid, the remainder of the act shall not be affected.

Section 17, title: States a title for the law.

Sections 102, 103, 104.—Effective date of certain changes: Inasmuch as these three sections deal with a related subject, they are combined for convenience. Under these sections provisions are made that any act classed herein as an unfair labor practice, but was not described as such prior to this law shall not be affected until the end of the contract or 1 year from the effective date of this act, whichever occurs first. In other words, for example, if the union signed a closed-shop contract prior to June 23, 1947, it will be effective until its expiration date, whether it be for 1, 2, or 5 years. However, if the same type of contract was signed after June 23, 1947, and before August 21, 1947, it is legal only for 1 year or until July 1, 1948, which ever date occurs first. After August 21, 1947, any contract signed has to conform with the law.

TITLE II—CONCILIATION OF LABOR DISPUTES IN INDUSTRIES AFFECTING COMMERCE

Sections 201 through 205 set up the new Federal Mediation Service; provides for a national labor-management panel and defines their duties and authority.

Section 206 through 210 are sections pertaining to disputes of national emergency. They provide for a fact-finding board, appointed by the President, and a restraining order to prevent work stoppages for 80 days while attempts are being made to effect a settlement. At the end of this period the employees are given an opportunity to secretly vote to accept or reject, the employers' last offer. It is mandatory that the restraining order be dissolved. After this the employees may strike if they wish. This limitation on the right to strike can only be invoked where the threatened strike would imperil national health and safety.

Section 211 (a) and (b) provide for the compilation of data on collective agreements, etc.

Section 212 says this law does not affect any workers subject to the provisions of the Railway Labor Act.

TITLE III—SUITS BY AND AGAINST LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

Section 301 provides that an employer or a union can be sued for damages if either effects a breach of their contract. However, members themselves cannot be sued or held liable for actions or violations by the union.

Section 302, check-off and welfare funds: With reference to the check-off—formerly—if the company granted the check-off—that was it. Now under this section, nothing can be checked out of employees' wages unless they sign an authorization allowing such to be done. The law provides that only dues can be checked off; however, the Attorney General recently gave an opinion that the check-off of initiation fees and assessments were also permissible, but a court ruling will be necessary to establish the real fact. The welfare fund part of this section provides that any fund to which the employer contributes cannot be administered solely by the union; the employer also is granted representation on the welfare-fund board. Your rights to share in benefits from the fund must be clearly stated in writing. The NLRB recently ruled that employers are required to bargain on welfare plans with the unions, provided the unions have complied with the Taft-Hartley law. The welfare-fund provisions are not applicable to trust funds established by collective agreement prior to January 1, 1946.

Section 303 provides that a union can be sued for damages for a secondary boycott. However, as stated in section 301, members themselves cannot be sued for such actions.

Section 304, restrictions on political contributions: With reference to unions, it is illegal to use union dues or assessments, to campaign for or against any candidate for a Federal office. Members can make voluntary contributions to a fund for political activity, but their union dues cannot be used out of the union treasury. (A United States district court recently ruled this section unconstitutional, and it was appealed to the Supreme Court. The High Court has not as yet ruled on the matter, so, therefore, this section still remains in effect.)

Section 305 makes it illegal for Government employees to strike.

TITLE IV—CREATION OF THE JOINT STUDY COMMITTEE

Sections 401–406: Create the Joint Congressional Committee on Labor-Management Relations to study labor relations and observe the operations of the Taft-Hartley Act and other existing Federal labor laws.

TITLE V

Section 501 consists of definitions.

Section 502, saving provision: This section protects the rights of individual employees against involuntary servitude. In other words, employees can individually quit work if they wish, also it will not be deemed a strike under this act if an employee or employees quit work, in good faith, because of abnormally dangerous conditions for work at the place of employment.

Section 503, separability: If any provision of this act is held invalid, the rest of the act shall not be affected.

NOTE.—Bear in mind that this law applies only to businesses engaged in or affecting commerce that is interstate. It is difficult to determine what firms are engaged in or affect interstate commerce, but clearly the Board's jurisdiction is very broad.

Did You Know the New Deal Has Provided Over Three-quarters of a Million Dollars in Subsidy to One Big Cotton Farm?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the New Deal administration has two characteristics. One is, they talk loud and long about the "little fel-

low" and their great friendship for him and interest in him. The second is, that while they are shedding tears for the "little fellow" they are lining the pockets of the "big fellow."

Just read this official letter:

MAY 19, 1948.

HON. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: This is in reply to your letter of May 3, 1948, requesting the amount of money received by the Delta Pine Co. each year since 1933 under the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program.

It was necessary to secure most of the information from the State office at Jackson, Miss., and this accounts for the delay in sending you the information. We now have the information, which is as follows:

Year	Adjustment payments	ACP payments	Parity payments
1933	[1]$114,840.00		
1934	[1] 102,408.35		
935	[1] 101,039.52		$33,972.61
1936		$67,794.66	
1937		64,168.47	58,788.26
1938		67,941.79	
1939		9,830.00	45,116.04
1940		9,839.49	46,235.35
1941		9,732.07	40,409.32
1942		9,930.00	
1943		9,856.00	
1944		7,114.65	
1945		7,041.56	
1946		3,592.26	
1947		9,999.88	
Total [2]	318,287.87	276,834.77	224,521.58
Grand total			819,644.22

[1] S. Doc. No. 274, 74th Cong.
[2] Total and grand total added in office of REID F. MURRAY

Sincerely yours,

N. E. DODD,
Acting Secretary.

Here is one farm, the Oscar Johnson Delta Pine Co., that had had a total subsidy of $819,964.22 under the New Deal when the great percentage of farmers were receiving $20 to $40 each. Mr. Johnson is one of the head operators of the National Cotton Council. This outfit is a great oleo promoter.

While the New Deal reached down and exacted a Federal tax from people making $500 per year, it used the money to give the landed aristocracy of one farm of the South over $750,000 in subsidies.

There southern crops have had special-privilege legislation all during the years. The livestock has been asked to take it on the legislative chin time after time, so that Federal funds could be provided to subsidize soil-depleting crops like cotton.

Although the Marshall plan was started as a European relief program, even this program may well end up as a southern relief program for cotton and tobacco. Mr. William Clayton, who has demonstrated that if one has money enough evidently he does not have to register as a lobbyist, is another one of the big cotton operators that appears very successful in making millions on the cotton crop by exporting and dealing even after the other big operations have been paid huge sums for growing it, not growing it, or because it did not bring enough in the market place.

President Truman is making plenty of political agricultural speeches about a long-range program, and yet his New Deal has not been able to administer a short-range one.

Let's Dignify Public Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Let's Dignify Public Office," which I broadcast over the facilities of radio station KSL on June 1, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S DIGNIFY PUBLIC OFFICE

World War I was fought to "make the world safe for democracy." The Second World War was fought against dictatorship, totalitarianism, fascism, and single-willism. We hear rumblings of a third world war because communism and democracy are not compatible in one world. In our fear of communism we are trying to sell democracy to the world through the Voice of America. To preserve our way of life in the world we have instituted the Marshall plan for Europe and China. But what of democracy for "inside United States of America."

In one part of our country the problem is how to extend the voting franchise to all of the people, while in that part where all men and women with established residence and over 21 years of age enjoy that franchise the problem is how to get them to the polls on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November. In 1944 Utah had 351,000 persons of voting age. Two hundred forty-eight thousand of these went to the polls to exercise that franchise, for which America has fought, lost her sons, and paid billions of dollars. But in November 1946 only 197,399 exercised that right.

When the signers of the Constitution of the United States affixed their signatures to that document on September 17, 1787, which provided for the setting up of a way of life here in America which would "establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity," they did not dream that public offices set up under that constitution would be belittled, degraded, and ridiculed as seems to be the vogue in some quarters today. I have even heard it preached from the pulpit in Washington that people should leave Government service and establish themselves in private industry, inferring that the Government of the United States is something to be feared, something to be ashamed of, and that men should not seek a career in Government. Can it be that we are losing faith in democracy to such an extent that we are afraid to practice it, as men seem to have lost faith in Christianity on the score that it does not work in everyday life? My plea tonight is—if people are going to have a voice in government, if democracy is to live in America the time is here for all of us to take an active part in government and to dignify public office so that the best men in America will be proud to hold public office.

How can we maintain, as Jefferson said, "the will of the majority—the natural law of every society" when we have in some States only 16 percent of the potential voters participating in elections. True, in 1944 71 percent of the potential voters in Utah expressed their wishes, but there was a decline in that percentage in the 1946 election. To complete a working democracy, every member of society must feel duty bound to assume responsibility in government in case his fellow citizens wish to call him to service. Our first responsibility in government is to participate in every election to keep them free elections. We only vote every 2 years for a Congressman, once every 4 years for a President and governor, and every 6 years for a Senator. But these days have been ignored by many, more often than they have been observed.

The permanence of American democracy rests in our two-party system. We have only to look to France and Italy to see what a many-party system does to a country. A labor party would not be good for the United States nor for labor itself. The reason is simple. In America, political parties are not professional. They are sentimental. They are not economic. They are traditional. We do not want our political parties built upon economic lines. Such parties emphasize class distinction. The glory of America is that the employee can still marry the boss' daughter, and members of different political parties can meet together in their churches, in their business, in their homes, and husbands and wives can go separately to the Democratic and Republican primaries or rallies without serious clashings. That is a more glorious characteristic of our American democracy than most of us appreciate. Professional or economic division would be as disastrous to American democratic fundamentals as a party built upon church affiliation. The formation of a labor party would invite the formation of a party made up wholly of employers or management. Victory for either group would destroy unity in America.

What are the elements of our economic and social life which should be fundamental in the thought of every true American who believes that the public welfare should be the first consideration of every citizen? First, it is education; second, it is health; third, it is conservation; fourth, it is the continued production of wealth, not its exploitation and its wastage. As the individual citizen moves forward economically as a result of the rising standards of living, not only does he benefit but all benefit. Health is a matter which in its final analysis becomes of benefit to all. A well-trained citizenry is the only sure guaranty of a democracy. A healthy, vigorous citizenry is the only sure guaranty of a continued expanding economy. The three evils of man are still illness, ignorance, and poverty. Therefore, if the general welfare should be advance above that which is enjoyed today, the time for the American people to speak is on those 2-, 4-, and 6-year days.

In one of our committee meetings, a man who had been appointed by the President to a great public office, an office which gave him the right to administer on behalf of the people one of the greatest information distributing agencies man has yet invented, was asked what he thought was the first fundamental connected with the administration of this office. He could not answer. When a Senator suggested that his office should be administered for the benefit of the people, he smiled as if he had never heard of that.

I wonder if it has dawned on any owner of our newspapers, radio stations, heads of our medical associations, or lawyer organizations, that, through licenses granted by the public, through the guaranty of freedom of the press, freedom of speech, freedom of thought, the Government sets up these various people in their occupations and guarantees them a sort of monopolistic right because it is deemed good for the public welfare that the press should be unhampered in its thought, that radio should be free, that those in the professions should be well

trained. That being the case, should not their first consideration be the public interest.

When the Government guarantees the right to organize, to associate with one's fellows, it has been deemed that that freedom is in the public interest. Thus the laboring man should have the same respect for the public interest that the doctor should have, the lawyer, newspaper publisher, or the radio station owner. But in all of these branches of our economic life we hear more of the rights coming from these governmental guaranties than we do of the duties or responsibilities accompanying these great guaranties and privileges.

If "the price of liberty is eternal vigilance," the American people must adopt a positive program; and I mean it for all branches in our economic life which are so necessary in bringing freedom and general welfare. I mean by a positive program that all of these people must accept those privileges not so much as rights or guaranties but as opportunities to serve, to make better conditions in our land, and to help the Government in providing for the general welfare. The American people in their fight for the preservation of democracy and liberty, must become united in regard to certain fundamentals. Those fundamentals must be so much a part of the life and thought of every man and woman in America that when those all-important days come on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November every 2, 4, and 6 years, every potential voter will respond in the selection of the type of men who, by their lives, have proved that they understand what is meant by providing for the general welfare.

When democracy in America comes to mean individualism with a social conscience we shall have a 100 percent response of potential voters on those 2, 4, and 6-year days; public office will be dignified, and the American Government, and Government men will receive the proper respect from the body politic.

To all officeholders I should like to remind you of Ben Franklin's wisdom when he said, "We must not in the course of public life expect immediate approbation and immediate grateful acknowledgment of our services. But let us persevere through abuse and even injury. The internal satisfaction of a good conscience is always present, and time will do us justice in the minds of the people even of those at present the most prejudiced against us."

Control of Subversive Influences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting discussion of the Mundt-Nixon bill by Prof. Zechariah Chafee, Jr., of the Law School of Harvard University. The discussion is in the form of a letter addressed to the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. I think it is of such general interest that the public should have the benefit of it.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAW SCHOOL OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
Cambridge, Mass., May 28, 1948.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Judiciary Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: It is very gratifying that your committee is holding hearings on H. R. 5852, the so-called Mundt-Nixon bill. I am sorry that I have to go to the hospital this afternoon for an operation, or I would send you a much more extensive memorandum on this bill. As it is, I can only ask leave to file with you a few reasons why I feel strongly that the bill should be dropped.

My main reason is that I see no evidence whatever for the necessity of such an unprecedented conglomeration of elaborate regulations of the opinions of private citizens and exceedingly drastic penalties for entirely novel offenses. We already have on the statute books the Smith Act of 1940, with severe penalties for membership in any organization which urges the overthrow of the Government by violence. There are no reported convictions of Stalinite Communists under this act, and so far as I know no such Communist has been thought deserving of prosecution. (The sole reported case involved a Trotskyite labor union; *Dunne v. United States* (138 Fed. (2d) 137).) Second, I know of no reported case of a Communist spy, and the paper has reported no prosecutions or arrests of such spies. (Since Gorin was arrested in December 1938; 312 U. S. 429.) Although the activities of such spies in Canada show that they can take place, there is no indication that such activities have occurred or are occurring in the United States. In the third place the Un-American Committee of the House of Representatives spent many thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money investigating the motion-picture industry. The results of this long investigation were presented by the committee at its hearings last winter. Although I followed these hearings carefully, I did not see a statement that a single person in the United States was doing anything dangerous to our Government. It is true that three or four writers have since been convicted for refusing to say whether they were Communists. This may go to show that the committee unearthed a few Communists in the motion-picture industry. It wholly fails to show that they or anybody else "present a great and present danger to the security of the United States and to the existence of free American institutions," as section 2 (11) of the bill avers. If there were really a great danger to our Government and our freedom from Communists in the United States, surely there would have been somewhere or other an outburst of unlawful acts or at least tangible evidence of an unlawful conspiracy.

I fully recognize that the Communist Party in Czechoslovakia was a danger to the freedom of Czechoslovakia, and the same is probably true of Italy and other countries. It does not follow that the inclusion of less than one-tenth of 1 percent of our population in a Communist Party here is a real danger to our institutions and our freedom under the very different conditions in this country. We have a very strong Government equipped with existing legislation and efficient Federal police. Our Government does not need any such novel bill as this in order to deal effectively with any actual conspiracy against its existence or any actual effort toward violent revolution. Where inside this country are the facts which justify the establishment of unheard-of regulatory machinery, the expenditure of large sums of money in its operation, and the severe punishment of American citizens because somebody or other has not filled out a piece of paper?

It is now nearly 30 years since my work as a student of freedom of speech led me to pay considerable attention to the activities of Communists in this country. Although I still dislike them very much, it is my considered opinion that they are far less dangerous today than they were in 1919–20, soon after the Russian Revolution. During those early years that revolution was to many Americans the symbol of a better world. It was assumed to be a heaven on earth. To many idealists it at last appeared possible that men might build a fruitful society without having to seek their own profit. Few of those who now dream of a city of God can ignore the ugly facts in Moscow. Radicals of my acquaintance who used to speak of Russia as a land of hope are now reduced to saying that it is no worse than any other country. Also social and economic conditions in this country have vastly improved since 1919. The reasons for revolutionary discontent which then existed have greatly been lessened by the legislation under Mr. Roosevelt, the high wages paid during the war and since, the realization that Americans of every sort fought and suffered side by side during the war. The national health is far better than in 1919. We have an immunity to revolutionary radicalism far greater. After the First World War drastic Federal legislation was proposed but not passed. The years that followed proved that we did not need it. In some States there were outbursts of suppression which are now regretted. Yet at that time there were tangible evidences like the bomb exploded near the Attorney General's house. If we could get along safely without anything like the present bill in 1919–20, we certainly have no cause for such legislation today.

Turning to the bill itself, I find it has two aspects. First, it sets up an administrative machinery for registration. It does not, however, require all political organizations, or all organizations which are somehow associated with politics to register. It practically allows one man, the Attorney General, to single out particular organizations that must register. Although there is an eventual judicial review, the obligation to register is apparently not suspended in the event of an appeal from a ruling of the Attorney General. In view of the serious consequences to an organization from his ruling that it must register, it is important to notice that he does not have to decide that the organization is controlled by a foreign government or is an instrumentality of the world Communist movement. It is enough under section 3 that he thinks it reasonable to conclude that the forbidden conditions exist. He does not have to conclude that they do exist.

In connection with the requirement of registration, it is important to observe that we now have two statutes which require anybody who acts as the agent of a foreign government and any organization subject to foreign control which is engaging in political activity to register (22 U. S. C. A., secs. 233–233G; 18 U. S. C. A., secs. 14–17). If Communist organizations are now so closely affiliated with the U. S. S. R as the advocates of this bill seem to urge, then the Attorney General should invoke the two statutes I have cited. The fact that these two statutes have not been used against American Communists indicates that the connection with the foreign government is much more tenuous. The new bill is capable of reaching organizations where this connection is very conjectural. The willingness of certain governmental people to condemn a desirable organization on the basis of very thin evidence is shown by Professor Gellhorn of Columbia in his article in 60 Harvard Law Review 1193 (October 1947), relating the wholly unfounded condemnation of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare by the Un-American Committee of the House of Representatives. This is the sort of organization which might very well be forced to terminate very useful activities by being required to register as a Communist-front organization under section 3 (4) of the bill.

The bill is much more than a registration measure, although it is sometimes represented to be merely that. It imposes many serious penalties upon the expression of opinions and upon membership in organizations which are stigmatized because of their opinions. First, section 4 has no connection with the registration requirements. It punishes any sort of participation in the novel and very vague crime of establishing a totalitarian dictatorship in the United States. Whatever this crime means, it goes far beyond the speech which is punishable under the Smith Act. The statute of limitations does not apply, so that a mature man can be punished for what he did as a college student. Furthermore, in view of the definition of a Communist political organization in section 3 (3), it seems very possible that any active participant in such an organization is guilty of the vague crime which is punishable under section 4. If the organization does not register, its officials can be sent to prison for 5 years under section 15. If it does register, then they may very well make themselves liable to 10 years in prison under section 4. In other words, the registration provisions virtually compel them to confess their own guilt of attempting to establish a totalitarian dictatorship.

The second penalty is exclusion from Federal employment. This includes teaching in the Washington public schools. Employees and prospective employees who are open to any possible suspicion will be penalized without any trial. They will be deprived of employment because the official responsible for their employment will want to be on the safe side in order to avoid going to prison themselves, under section 6 (b). Observe that he does not have to know that a prospective employee belongs to a forbidden organization. It is enough that he believes it even though his belief is wrong and unreasonable.

The third penalty is that the member of a forbidden organization cannot get a passport, under section 7.

The fourth penalty is that the use of the mails and interstate commerce is subject to a burdensome limitation under section 10. For example, if the Attorney General should be persuaded by the Un-American Activities Committee to share its views about the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, that organization would have to describe itself on all its publications as a Communist organization. This novel stigma recalls the practice of medieval princes to require Jews to wear special marks on their coats.

Therefore in view of these penalties, the question is not merely whether American Communists should be obliged to register. The question is whether American citizens who have not been proved to be dangerous individuals should be made liable to heavy fines and long prison sentences, in large measure because of the activities of other people. A good deal of the bill creates guilt by association. See the article on this subject by Lord John O'Brian in 61 Harvard Law Review 592 (1948).

In this statement I have not gone into questions of constitutionality. The main question before your committee is the wisdom of this bill and not its validity. Such an extraordinary measure can be justified only by a tremendous danger within our Nation. Are these novel penalties, is this novel machinery, required to save the country? It is not enough that Communists are pestiferous people or indulge in big talk about taking over our Government. The question is whether they are within a million miles of doing so. Jefferson said in 1801: "I believe this the strongest Government on earth." Because I confidently share his belief, I hope very much that your committee will reject this unheard-of bill.

Sincerely yours,

Z. CHAFEE, Jr.

Selection of Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., of Massachusetts, as Chairman of Republican Resolutions Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, today's New York Herald Tribune carries an editorial paying tribute to a Member of the Senate who has just received very appropriate recognition in that he has been named as chairman of the resolutions committee at the Republican National Convention. I speak of our distinguished colleague the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who is sitting beside me.

I think this editorial is so well framed and so appropriate that it should appear in the Appendix of the RECORD. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed there.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN EXCELLENT CHOICE

The Republican leadership did a good day's work in picking Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., for chairman of the resolutions committee at Philadelphia. The man from Massachusetts is one of our ablest Senators. There is nothing narrow in him; he is not given to partisanship for party gain. Placed on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at Senator VANDENBERG's urging, he can be counted on to promote vigorously a continuing bipartisan American unity before the world as the Republicans sit down to write their platform.

Senator LODGE has no strings on him, no commitments among candidates. The rivals hold him in respect, which is a tribute to his character and capacity. At a mere 45, he has had an unusually rich background of experience in newspaper work, the Army, and public life. His career throughout has been one of activity, and his knowledge of men and affairs at home and abroad is thoroughly firsthand. Senator LODGE will exert himself seriously in guiding the platform writers. The Republican statement of belief and objective is to be awaited as an important document, both for what it says to the American voter and its message across the seas. Senator LODGE, we are confident, will give the 1948 platform something extra, the distinguishing Lodge touch.

The American People Are Betrayed by Failure To Enact Adequate Housing Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 9, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the final and ultimate betrayal of the millions of Americans who risked their lives and future to fight for America took place behind the closed doors of the House Committee on Banking and Currency when the Republican leadership sold out completely to the real-estate lobby.

For 4 years the Congress of the United States has had pending before it a long-range housing bill, drawn up by experts, and introduced and endorsed by the outstanding leaders of both parties. That measure bears the name of a Senator who may be the nominee of the Republican Party for President. It has gained the support of an overwhelming majority of the American people.

Enactment of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner National Housing Act would do more to discredit and discourage communism than all the repressive thought-control measures that can be dreamed up. This bill is dynamic American democracy in action—or it would be as law.

The supporters of the T-E-W bill forgot the invisible government which pulls the strings of the Republican marionettes who sit out in front for show only.

The real-estate lobby knows only one goal—unlimited profits and to hades with the public interest.

Although the T-E-W bill would make it practically impossible for any private builder, no matter how inefficient, to lose money, that is not enough for these profit-mad real-estate gamblers living in a dream world of their own.

Because, along with the utmost generosity to private builders and financiers, this bill timidly proposes a half million low-cost housing units for the underprivileged—only a driblet of the total needs, the shadow government of the real-estate lobby has voted the bill.

This is gross betrayal of the American people and of democratic representative government.

Thousands for the Few and $20 to $40 for the Many

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 9, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the New Deal has constantly tried to convince the American people that it was for the little fellow. They have provided a few hundred farms with 100-percent valuation loans at 3 percent interest, but they foreclosed on thousands of them because this group could not pay 75-percent valuation loans at a 5 percent interest rate. The New Deal talks about the family sized farm but it subsidizes the big land operator and the landed aristocracy.

As one example I include at this point an official letter showing the subsidies paid to one big wheat operating outfit, the Campbell Farming Corp. of Montana and New Mexico:

HON. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: This is in reply to your letter of May 3, 1948 in which you request the amounts of payments made to Mr. Tom Campbell under the agricultural programs.

Following is a list, by years, from 1933 through 1946 of the payments made to the Campbell Farming Corp., in Montana, and to Mr. Tom Campbell as an individual in New Mexico. The payments are divided into agricultural adjustment, agricultural conservation, and parity payments.

Year	Agricultural adjustment payments, Campbell Farming Corp.	Agricultural conservation payments		Parity payments, Campbell Farming Corp.
		Campbell Farming Corp.	Thomas D. Campbell	
1933	$23,159.52			
1934	27,431.19			
1935	31,613.94			
1936		$11,019.65		
1937		11,798.72		
1938		13,563.48	$8,699.81	
1939		9,700.40	8,946.83	$7,640.19
1940		8,129.99	8,033.34	8,906.36
1941		7,940.36	7,182.50	9,660.02
1942		90.12		24,346.64
1943		9,846.10		
1944		1,894.30		
1945		9,836.61		
1946		163.40		
Total	82,204.65	83,983.13	32,862.48	50,553.21
Grand total				[1]249,603.47

[1] Addition showing grand total in office of REID F. MURRAY.

Sincerely yours,

N. E. DODD,
Acting Secretary.

Last year Mr. Tom Campbell visited President Truman and demanded $3.50 per bushel for his wheat. In 1934, 1935, 1936, and 1943 we imported more wheat than we exported, even though Mr. Campbell and other wheat men were being paid for not growing wheat and additional thousands because the wheat did not bring enough in the market place. The great percentage of farmers received $20 to $40 per year subsidy while the big-time operators obtained thousands. The more one checks the New Deal in operation, the more one finds thousands and millions for the few and $20 to $40 for the many.

Think of giving practically a quarter of a million dollars to one outfit in a wheat program when 4 years of the first 12 years or one-third of the time the United States was on an import basis for wheat. If it had not been for the quota on imports—put on in 1940—no doubt, the United States would have been on a wheat-import basis all of the 12 years.

Letter of Robert H. Williams, of Los Angeles, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST K. BRAMBLETT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 9, 1948

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter from Mr. Robert H. Williams, Los Angeles, Calif.:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *May 5, 1948.*

Hon. ERNEST K. BRAMBLETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A letter dated May 28, 1947, from the then Secretary of War, Robert P. Patterson, to Mr. Meier Steinbrink, honorary chairman of the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith, contained false statements concerning my war service in the Army. These statements were entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD July 26, 1947, and published in the Appendix of the RECORD, page A4149 and A4150. They have subsequently been used to discredit me and a book I wrote in 1947, The Anti-Defamation League and Its Use in the World Communist Offensive.

Mr. Patterson's letter stated that while overseas in the Army during the Second World War, I was in no way "concerned with the investigation of Communists or any subversives" but had been only a weather and air intelligence officer. The letter implied that I had not at any time been engaged in the investigation of subversives. It further stated that I was no longer connected with the military service in any way.

All statements were false. Throughout all but 14 of my 42 months of service in the Second World War my primary duty was counterintelligence (having to do with the investigation and disposition of subversive personnel). Beginning April 10, 1942, at S–2 on the staff of Col. Mert Proctor, commanding Basic Training Center No. 4 at Miami Beach, Fla., I organized, trained, and directed one of the largest counterintelligence forces in the Army Air Forces. From that asisgnment I became executive officer for the Intelligence Staff Section, Headquarters, Miami Beach Schools, on the staff of Maj. Gen. (then Brig. Gen.) Ralph H. Wooten. While overseas I was both combat (air) and counterintelligence, but my primary duty was that of wing counterintelligence officer.

My record as an intelligence officer was at all times either excellent or superior.

I have been connected with the Army at all times since April 4, 1942, and am now a major in the Military Intelligence Reserve (Army Serial No. O901911), and a member of the Six Hundred and Second Composite Training Group (Reserve), Los Angeles, Calif. At the time Mr. Patterson wrote the Anti-Defamation League that I was no longer connected with the military service I was a major, inactive, subject to immediate call to active duty.

Original copies of orders and papers in my files confirm the above statements in full. Papers in my file in the office of the Adjutant General, Department of the Army, likewise will confirm these statements in full, unless those papers have been tampered with.

Yours very truly,

ROBERT H. WILLIAMS.

Radio Address to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 9, 1948

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over Station WNBF on June 5, 1948:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, my visit home Memorial Day week end was most successful. I had the chance to shake hands with many old friends as well as to deliver a message of hope and good will to the large crowd assembled at the Broome County courthouse in Binghamton.

I also enjoyed listening to the inspiring speech delivered by Barney Chernin, one of the best I ever heard.

The enemies of flood control for the Triple Cities shot another broadside at me over the week end. Their course has now taken on a belittling technique.

Not being able to sell you people against adequate protection of your homes and property which I've been advocating, they now poke fun at my efforts to help you.

Their current trick now is to call some influential person, who has nothing to do with the question, either at home or in Washington and ask if I have spoken to him about flood control or any other subject, for that matter.

Then, they jump to their typewriters and scream to the world that I am laying down on the job and haven't got around yet to take the action I should.

On the other hand, whatever action I had taken would receive punishment and ridicule from them, as has been so well demonstrated for the past few months.

By their continually throwing monkey wrenches into the works, flood control for Endicott, Vestal, Johnson City, Conklin, Windsor, and everywhere else is jeopardized.

I hereby announce my candidacy for the Republican nomination to Congress from this district for a sixth term.

Once again, I am stating that I have kept every promise I ever made to the people who elected me.

If I go back to Congress, I will continue the program of direct representation I have given you folks during the nearly 10 years I have served as your Congressman.

If you decide that I am to stay in Washington, I pledge to you:

1. That I will keep up the fight I have conducted for a national bonus for World War II veterans.

2. I will continue my fight for a pension for the vets of the First World War.

3. I will keep up my opposition to those who are trying to wreck our American system of government.

4. I will continue to advocate a minimum of $100 a month retirement for all our citizens 60 years of age and over.

5. I will keep faith with our postal employees and vote them the highest possible salary raise, preferably the maximum amount they want and need.

6. I will keep on representing all the people, regardless of race, creed or color, or station in life and will not be the tool of powerful interests or persons of influence.

7. Neither the moneyed magnate nor the whip-cracking labor leader can be my master, but I look upon the workers and farmers and Americans I represent as final authority.

8. The first to introduce legislative action to conduct war against the high cost of living, I remain as anxious as ever to see prices on food, clothing, and all other life's necessities come down within the reach of the rank and file.

9. I will continue to strive for peace at home and throughout the world, and to insist that America remain strong in the face of all possible enemies.

10. I will keep on voting in Congress for measures to strengthen the United States in all ways and to increase our friends abroad and to develop the sincere friendship of other nations.

11. I will continue the uphill battle for flood control in our section in the face of tremendous opposition.

In presenting myself to the voters within our Republican Party, I call their attention to my record, which is as loyal a Republican record as any in the entire Eightieth Congress.

No one within the party can have honest complaint of the votes I cast on the national issues the Republicans have espoused.

No person in the counties of Broome, Chenango, and Madison can truthfully say I have failed to try to comply with their written requests, no matter how large or small

whether they be Republican, Democrat, or any other American.

The people of my district can count on my continued action upon their individual requests. They know a 3-cent stamp or a penny postcard is the only letter of introduction they need to obtain a hearing from me.

They know all they have to do to get me to act for them in our Nation's Capital is to write me. They can write me in pencil if they want to and they will receive the same treatment as though their message were written on engraved bond.

Once more, I ask the support of my fellow Republicans and assure them of the same steadfast devotion to duty in the months to come that I have tried to manifest in the past.

British Hated by Both Sides

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1948

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Robert Kennedy, from the Boston Post:

BRITISH HATED BY BOTH SIDES—ROBERT KENNEDY, SPECIAL WRITER FOR POST, STRUCK BY ANTIPATHY SHOWN BY ARABS AND JEWS

(This is the first of a series of stories on the Palestine situation written for the Post by Robert Kennedy, Harvard senior and son of the former Ambassador to Great Britain. Young Kennedy has been traveling through the Middle East, and his first-hand observations, appearing exclusively in the Post, will be of considerable interest in view of the current crisis.)

(By Robert Kennedy)

Certainly, if Arthur Balfour, Britain's Foreign Minister during the First World War, had realized the conflicting interpretations which were to be placed on his famous "declaration" calling for a homeland for the Jews, he probably would have drawn it with its meaning clearer and saved the world the bloodshed that its double promises have caused. In his attempt to conciliate both Jews and Arabs in a time of distress for the British Empire, he conciliated neither.

No great thought was given it at the time, for Palestine was then a relatively unimportant country. There were then not the great numbers of homeless Jews that we have now, and no one believed then that the permission granted for Jewish immigration would lead 30 years later to world turmoil on whether a national home should mean an autonomous national state.

First, let us consider the viewpoint of the Arabs in regard to the national homeland promised to the Jews in the Balfour declaration

The Arabs by word and deed leave no question in anyone's mind how they feel. They argue that the Balfour declaration supports their point that no national state was promised, pointing to the clause in the declaration that says the national home shall be set up subject to the civil rights of the people living in Palestine at this time. In recent years they have pointed to the United Nations Charter and the article dealing with the self-determination of nations. Let us adhere to that, the Arabs say, and let the people, that is the Arabs who are involved, decide the question by the democratic processes. If this policy of partition was truly adhered to, they say, then why couldn't there be a partition within the partition set aside for the Arab minorities?

TOEHOLD

Jemal Heusenni, the Arab leader, suggested to me, during my recent visit to Palestine, that we Americans, who had been so solicitous of the rights of the Jewish people, take the Jews into the United States and set up a national State for them in California. The Arab world, he claimed, had certainly taken in more than their share of the Jewish race and it has been this policy that has led to today's troubles. If the United States feels so philanthropic about this minority question, he asked, why not be really good fellows about the whole problem and give the colored people the State of Georgia.

If the people of the world, Jemal Heusenni added, are selecting Palestine because of the lengthy sojourn there by the Jewish people, then the Arabs say give us back Spain where we were for 800 years.

The Arabs are most concerned about the great increase in the Jews in Palestine: 80,000 in 1918 to 800,000 in 1948. The Arabs have always feared this encroachment and maintain that the Jews will never be satisfied with just their section of Palestine, but will gradually move to overpower the rest of the country and will eventually move onto the enormously wealthy oil lands. They are determined that the Jews will never get the toehold that would be necessary for the fulfillment of that policy.

ALWAYS WILL ATTACK

They are willing to let the Jews remain as peaceful citizens subject to the rule of the Arab majority just as the Arabs are doing in such great numbers in Egypt and the Levant States, but they are determined that a separate Jewish state will be attacked and attacked until it is finally cut out like an unhealthy abscess.

The Arabs believe they contributed greatly to making the Allied victory possible in the First World War. At the Paris peace conference they felt that they received nothing comparable to what they were promised for their fight under Lawrence against the Turks. Rather, due to power politics, British and French domination replaced that of the Ottoman Empire. The Arab leaders attribute their country's backwardness to these 400 uninterrupted years as subservients to the Ottoman Empire.

The Jewish people on the other hand believe that if it were not for the wars and invasions that racked Palestine and which sent them scattered and persecuted throughout the world, Palestine would today be theirs. It would be theirs just as when Moses led them from Egypt into the Palestinian plains which they point out were inoccupied except for a few Bedouin tribes.

SET UP LABORATORIES

They wish no other country, and in 1870, when Uganda was offered to them as a homeland, they were unanimous in their refusal. The Balfour declaration, when it was made, however, they felt was the answer to their prayers.

Under the supposition that, at the finish of the mandate, this was to be their national state, they went to work. They set up laboratories where world-famous scientists could study and analyze soils and crops. The combination of arduous labor and almost unlimited funds from the United States changed what was once arid desert into flourishing orange groves. Soils had to be washed of salt, day after day, year after year, before crops could even be planted. One can see this work going on in lesser or more advanced stages wherever there are Jewish settlements in Palestine. From a small village of a few thousand inhabitants, Tel Aviv has grown into a most impressive modern metropolis of over 200,000. They have truly done much with what all agree was very little.

The Jews point with pride to the fact that over 500,000 Arabs, in the 12 years between 1932–44, came into Palestine to take advantage of living conditions existing in no other Arab state. This is the only country in the Near and Middle East where an Arab middle class is in existence.

The Jews point out that they have always taken a passive part in the frequent revolutions that have racked the country, because of the understanding that they would eventually be set free from British mandateship. They wished to do nothing to impair this expected action. During the Second World War they sent numerous volunteer Jewish brigades which fought commendably with the British in Italy. In addition to that, many Palestinian Jews fought as volunteers with Allied troops throughout the world and still others were dropped by parachute into German-held territory as espionage agents. They were perhaps doing no more than their duty, but they did their duty well.

The Jews feel that promise after promise to them has been broken. They can quote freely, for example, from speech after speech of labor party leaders in the election campaign prior to the victory of the Labor Party in England, to attest to the fact that one need not even refer back to the controversial Balfour Declaration to learn Britain's attitude and promises toward a Jewish state. The machinery for the setting up of an autonomous Jewish state was to be one of the first acts of the labor government if it were put into power. The Jews, remembering this, have rather bitterly named the block bombed out in the Ben Yehudia disaster Bevin Square.

It is an unfortunate fact that because there are such well-founded arguments on either side each grows more bitter toward the other. Confidence in their right increases in direct proportion to the hatred and mistrust for the other side for not acknowledging it.

NEVER SEARCHED

When I landed at Lydda Airport I became immediately aware of it. I carried letters of introduction to both Arabs and Jews and at the airport where both sides intermingle, it was explained to me by first one and then the other that I was taking a great risk. The Jew said it was all right for me to carry Arab papers in Jewish territory for I wouldn't be molested, but when I entered Arab territory I had better be rid of all letters to Jews for I would immediately be searched and, if they found anything, would be quickly shot. The Arab said exactly the opposite and I found both to be half right, in that I was never searched by either side.

Another fact I became immediately aware of was a basic violent hatred of the British by both sides. I talked to a British Army sergeant who had been in Palestine for 2 years, and he placed the blame with the Palestine Colonial Police. Later I found many to be in agreement. He called them the "underpaid uneducated dregs of society." They were evidently the most corrupt group of police in the world, firstly because they were so underpaid, and, secondly, because when colonial police were sent to their posts the worst of the lot were invariably sent to Palestine.

The Arab bitterness and also fear toward the British had as its starting point the 1936–38 revolution, which was crushed most ruthlessly by the British.

INCREASING BITTERNESS

Leading Arabs in the higher committee speak in all sincerity of the Indian brought by the British into the country because of the great skill and knowledge that he possessed in being able to torture with fire while leaving no scar tissue. Many claim to have suffered by having their nails pulled out from their fingers and toes and others of having burning matches thrust beneath their nails.

I found little evidence that these stories were true.

The Jewish attitude toward the British has been one of increasing bitterness. The Jews have looked upon the British civil administration, which some years ago took over from the army, as most unfriendly and uncooperative and which has therefore led to much mutual distrust. Jews received virtually no financial help for building of schools and hospitals in Jewish settlements, and the post office which was set up to serve Tel Aviv wasn't suitable for a village of several thousand inhabitants. I was forced to wait well over an hour in line in order to purchase stamps.

When told if they wanted a port, they would have to build it themselves, the result was the port of Tel Aviv, which was constructed entirely through Jewish capital and labor. Nevertheless, it is taxed as high as the Arab port of Jaffa, which was built and maintained by funds raised by taxing both Arabs and Jews. These arguments are infinitesimal compared with the larger issues that have swept both sides during the last year, but they are mentioned to show that the hate that exists now is not something newly born and has a substantial background.

Additional Honors for Hon. John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1948

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, no Member of the House of Representatives, I venture to say, is held in higher respect and esteem by its membership than the distinguished former majority leader, presently the minority whip, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts. His unfailing courtesy and his consideration and respectful regard for all of his colleagues and the invaluable contributions he has made to his country during the long period of his membership in the House have made him truly a man of renown among his contemporaries.

All of us, I am sure, are most pleased to learn that on June 3, 1948, an additional honor was conferred upon our statesmanlike friend and colleague by the presentation to him of a citation and testimonial by the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews. The presentation was made at the eleventh annual dinner of the committee. Participating in the event were the Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the Lieutenant Governor, the mayor of Boston, the editors of the six daily newspapers of the Boston metropolitan area, and the presidents of the leading colleges in that region, justices of the supreme judicial courts and the superior court of the Commonwealth, his excellency the auxiliary bishop of Boston, Most Rev. John J. Wright, and approximately 1,200 others.

The presentation on behalf of the committee was made by Hon. John P. Higgins, chief justice of the superior court, a former Member of the House and colleague of the recipient, who, in his preliminary remarks, stated that although he had had many pleasant assignments at public functions in years passed, none was comparable to the pleasant assignment of presenting to his friend of many years, Congressman MCCORMACK, the annual citation of the committee. The citation itself reads as follows:

CITATION

The Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, at its eleventh annual dinner, presents this citation and testimonial to a distinguished son of Massachusetts, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, the coleader of a great party in the Congress of the United States whose exemplary public service should be a genuine inspiration for every man in public life. His wide human sympathies, his faith in the capacities of ordinary men and women are deep and his clear and commanding voice has always been raised with a sympathetic understanding of their needs. Through the qualities of his heart and his mind he has made men aware of their brotherhood. A credit to his church, to his State, and to his country, he richly deserves the acclaim of Americans of good will of every race and creed.

Dated at Boston, Mass., this 3d day of June 1948.

On this significant occasion our respected and honored colleague, after the presentation of the citation, delivered the following excellent address:

Of the many satisfying rewards which can come to anyone, particularly one who endeavors to make a career of public service, I can think of no tribute which is more pleasing or more gratifying than that which has been so graciously paid to me tonight by your organization.

Your citation is one I shall always treasure. In all humility, I can state that I seriously doubted whether the person described in the citation was really myself, and while I labor under no misapprehension as to my personal worthiness of it, it is nevertheless appreciated as one of the highest honors to which I could aspire.

I am profoundly grateful for the badge of brotherhood which it carries with it, and I assure you I shall cherish it always.

While I do not think I merit it, I am touched by the fact that my fellow men think that I do. I can assure you, however, that the citation represents what I want to be in the journey of life.

The significance of tonight's occasion, however, is far more important than those of us you have chosen to honor, and far more remarkable than the achievements of any of us.

For this fathering, as I view it, typifies the spirit of good will and the ideal of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

Contrasted with the atmosphere in the world around us, the congenial sense of brotherhood prevalent here tonight is indeed more than remarkable, for today there is abroad in the world a foreboding of evil which is both alien to that spirit and destructive to that ideal.

We yearn for peace—and we have no peace. China, Greece, Israel—these three examples alone make mockery of our yearning, with uncertainty, confusion, fear, internal division in other lands.

We seek international amity and concord—and barriers of fear, of distrust, and of vindictive and unwarranted selfishness block the hand extended in brotherly friendship.

We cry out for understanding, freedom of association, and brotherly love—and our cries seem to be answered with stony silence of suspicion, isolation, and open and smouldering hatred.

And constantly the question is asked: Why?

Why is it that man, whose intellect is just a little less pure (when exercised properly) than that of the angels, cannot surmount a level above the animal nature?

Why is it that our combined will, the driving force of our personality, seems to be ever thwarted in its yearning for peace, mutual good will, and personal and universal brotherhood?

The answer, I think, lies in the negation of all that this gathering here tonight represents and stands for.

It is because man has become intolerant of his brother.

I think it can be safely asserted that every crisis in the world today has its sole or main origin in man's intolerance for man.

In India, antipathy between Hindu and Moslem, between Brahmin and the untouchables, caused a nation to be born in a bath of blood.

The intensity of feeling makes the border between Greek and Bulgarian and their countries a perpetual armed camp, backed by the determination of a powerful nation, the Soviet Union, to destroy the independence of Greece and the liberties of its people.

Arabs attacking the Palestinian Jews, determined to deny them a homeland with sovereignty and with freedom, not because Palestine lacks living space for both, but because of lack of charity, because of prejudice and of hatred.

Even in our own country, disregard for the rights of minority groups has infected the social body with the virus of intolerance, and deep-rooted prejudices rob us of the unity of true brotherhood.

Whether these antagonisms stem from national social, racial, or religious sources, they have one common characteristic. They exist not in nations, not in the doctrines of religion, not in the canons of social ethics, not in any scientific racial theories, but solely in the perversions of the mind of man.

The intolerance which inhibits reason, the bigotry which beclouds that reason, and the prejudice which perverts it—all warping the mind of man—are the root causes which have led mankind from the path of righteousness into the wilderness of fear, distrust, and of hatred, with the distressing and destructive results that follow.

In this era, they have made too many forfeit their inheritance as common children of God.

They have set brother against brother, class against class, nation against nation.

They have made our world a house of discord instead of a dwelling place of peace.

And most tragically of all, they have made fertile the field for the sowing and ripening of the seeds of atheistic and materialistic communism.

This, however, is only one part of the whole picture.

But the happy augury of assemblies like this and organizations like yours is graphic evidence that we have not reached the point of despair.

Fortunately, men and women of good will, like you who are gathered here tonight, have helped to and can stem the tide of intolerance, and through your nobility of character reverse the tide of intolerance and the disintegrating results that flow from evil minds. It is and will be a hard fight, but noble-minded and determined men and women will never give it up, until ultimate victory comes.

Our gravest problem results from the godless, materialistic ideology of the age in which we live.

Modern atheistic materialism, for example, has gradually dulled in the minds of many the realization that man has a spiritual nature, and in the dulling process, the importance and necessity of God in our lives

and in the lives of nations, as well as the dignity of the human individual, have been overlooked to the extent that many have

Why is it that the only one of God's creatures endowed with the faculty of reason persists in being unreasonable?

lost their reverence for God and forgotten their duty or respect, understanding and charity towards their neighbors.

Our generation is the inheritor of the glorious traditions of a magnificent Judeo-Christian culture which is the very fabric of our civilization. We would be worse than fools if we continued our course of departure from that culture, and abandoned it for a mess of materialistic pottage.

Our duty seems to me to be clear.

We must return to the practice of these virtues by which our Nation and our people have grown great: A return to our spiritual values.

Belief in the Creator and manifestation of that belief must replace the callous indifference of atheism and of materialism.

The tolerance of brotherly love must drive out from our hearts the cancer of intolerance and of bigotry and of hate.

The poison of prejudice must be neutralized by the antidote of logic and reason applied with conformity to objective truth.

And, above all, we must recapture the spirit of unity which inevitably flows from the realization that we are a family of brothers with a common Divine Father who has given to us a priceless legacy of spiritual treasures to be shared for mutual benefit.

Return to, and belief in, and practice of the principles of the natural law would be a unifying program where in all of us, regardless of creed, race, or color, could assert the moral forces which are vital to the cure of the maladies which beset our national and international society. For that law is the final arbiter to which men can appeal when bewildered by confusion or chaos and scourged with intolerance. Through it we participate in the eternal law of God, recognizing His overlordship, and finding therein the common basis for our brotherhood.

No more sublime example of its unifying strength can be cited than that of the death prayer of the four chaplains who went to meet their God, our God, from the deck of the transport *Dorchester* when it was torpedoed in February of 1943.

In the face of eternal realities, these brave and noble representatives of the three faiths—Catholic, Protestant, and Jew—gave up their places in the life boats so that others might live and that we and future generations of free men and women might live.

But far more noble and inspiring than that sacrifice was the magnificent spectacle of their union in prayer. In that, their last few moments, four servants of the Lord locked their arms around each other in brotherhood to acknowledge and beseech their common Father.

What prayers they offered to God on that occasion, their last act on earth, went to their watery graves with them. But with arms locked together they intoned their prayers as the waves swallowed their bodies. But the waters did not swallow their spirit.

In the few fleeting moments they had left, with the power of the mind to think rapidly, they thought of their loved ones past and present, but their overshadowing thoughts were of God. And their prayers offered to Him were for the benefit of mankind.

In their deaths they gave to mankind one of the greatest sermons of all time.

They died, it is true, that others might live. But their spirit survives, and with it, the hope and aspiration of all men of good will that their spirits may become universal throughout the world commonweath of man.

It is through decent minded men and women: Through such splendid organizations as yours, that the curse of mankind, prejudice, bigotry, hate, can be checked, gradually rolled back, and the spirit of these chaplain heroes to God and country will become universal in our own beloved country as well as throughout the world commonwealth of man.

Need We Lose the "Black War" by Default?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1948

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article by M. Edmond Demaitre which appears in the Saturday Evening Post of June 12, 1948.

NEED WE LOSE THE "BLACK WAR" BY DEFAULT?

(By Edmond Demaitre)

"Could you tell me, monsieur, why Americans hate us?"

I looked, astonished, at the waiter who had served me for many years in a little restaurant near the charming Church of St. Germain des Prés, near the Latin Quarter in Paris.

"Why on earth do you think that Americans hate Frenchmen?" I asked.

"Well," he said, "look what they did to poor Lucien Coedel."

From the pocket of his frayed white jacket he fished out a battered copy of L'Humanité, the official organ of the French Communist Party. He put his finger on an article splashed across the back page. The article suggested that American secret agents were responsible for the death of Lucien Coedel, a popular French actor who had died 2 days previously, after falling from a train. Coedel was just on the point of finishing a film. Because of the actor's death, explained L'Humanité, the film could not be finished, the money invested in it was lost, and French industrial recovery delayed. "All this suited admirably the interests of the American film industry."

This happened last autumn, two weeks after the setting up of the Cominform, which was founded in order to facilitate the exchange of information between the Communist Parties in Eastern and Western Europe. When, a few days later, the four-page L'Humanité found space for seven anti-American stories, it became obvious that the canard about the death of the French actor was part of a well-thought-out campaign. This campaign is known in Europe as the Black War.

The Black War—so-called because it is being fought with ink—is aimed at discrediting the United States. To this end the leaders of the Black War use a technique that varies according to the specific objectives. These are, first, to persuade their readers that the United States is planning to dominate the world; second, that its intention is to impose a system based on monopoly capitalism on all countries; and third, that economic aid given to Europe and American efforts to foster cultural and other relations with foreign countries are a camouflage of American penetration which aims at enslavement of all European nations.

Since the foundation of the Cominform, L'Humanité has carried a special anti-American page for women, children and intellectuals. The special page for women was launched with an appeal to French mothers: "Fight the offensive of the dollar against the minds of your children. Mothers! Beware of American picture magazines." Another special page was published under the headline: "America degrades the mind."

Two weeks after accusing the American film industry of murdering Lucien Coedel, L'Humanité reported the death of a certain Henri Moisset, whose body was found near the viaduct of Auteuil. "Is it a crime camouflaged as an accident?" asked L'Humanité. "Or is it a new murder perpetrated by the American Secret Service, which is now multiplying its executions and acts of sabotage on our territory?" The paper also accused the American Secret Service of having smuggled a group of former SS (Nazi Elite Guard) officers, disguised as French workmen, into the Citroën factory in Paris with instructions to destroy it in order to ruin the chances of French industrial recovery.

An obvious way to counteract this vicious anti-American propaganda would be to compel the Communist papers themselves to publish denials of unfounded reports such as those about the death of Coedel or the smuggling of SS officers into the Citroën factory. This can be done because the French law requires newspapers to publish a statement by individuals or organizations attacked in their pages. These denials must appear on the same page and in the same type as the original story. Were the Communist newspapers compelled to print a denial every time they launched a mendacious attack against an American official or organization, they would undoubtedly revise their application of Hitler's doctrine that "the bigger the lie the greater the chance that it will be believed." That the Americans have not done this is a constant surprise to Europeans.

The tactical superiority of the Communist press over its pro-American opponents is increased by the fact that, while all Communist papers in western Europe have their own correspondents in Moscow who supply them with abundant material about the achievements of the Soviet Union, very few European papers have their own correspondents in the United States. Since the war, not a single French or Italian morning paper has maintained a permanent correspondent in the United States. Readers of these papers seldom have the opportunity to get acquainted with the working of the world's greatest democracy through the eyes of their own journalists.

The fact that the leading morning papers of western Europe—except Great Britain—have no special correspondents here is due to financial difficulties. The Communist papers seem to have no difficulty in securing foreign currency to pay their correspondents in Moscow and elsewhere. But the non-Communist and pro-American newspapers in western Europe have failed to obtain from their respective governments the necessary dollars to keep special correspondents in this country. Perhaps it is not presumptuous for a foreigner to suggest that a profitable use of some of the large amounts being spent on propaganda abroad would be to provide some adjustment in exchange to permit foreign journalists to work in the United States. Surely such use of propaganda funds would be more effective than the Voice of America radio programs, which the Communists take measures to counteract.

As the Italian elections suggest, the picture may change completely, once the economic recovery of Europe has been completed. In the meantime, however, it would be a serious mistake to belittle or to disregard the effects of the Communist-led, anti-American propaganda. In judging the effect of these puerile falsehoods on disappointed, impoverished and hungry Europeans, one must bear in mind that similar campaigns contributed greatly to the formation of Nazi fifth columns in almost every country in the world.

Central Arizona Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1948

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona: Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following:

ARIZONA'S FIGHT FOR WATER AND POWER

Efforts have been under way for more than 25 years and are being continued vigorously for the State of Arizona to obtain her rightful and seriously needed share of Colorado River resources. With the desert State experiencing the most severe droughts in her history, her citizens are awaiting the action of Congress in approving the development known as the Central Arizona Project, an investment that not only would add to the wealth of Arizona but to the Nation as well.

The lack of water and the shortage of power, both of which now are being permitted to drain into the Gulf of California, compel the immediate attention of the Congress.

Various proposals were advanced, and during the early development, these proposals were characterized by sharp differences of opinion within the State as to what plan should be adopted. At the same time that Arizona was studying its plight, certain interests in southern California had gone forward with their own program of development, which consumed much of the water of the Colorado River.

In recent years, the extensive growth of Arizona, coupled with unusual droughts, has emphasized the necessity of a unified front within Arizona. There were honest differences of opinion during the early consideration of the problem of providing Arizona with water from the Colorado. One faction believed a dam could be placed in the Colorado River near Lee's Ferry and a tunnel could be dug from that dam for a distance of more than a hundred miles, eventually emptying into the river below Flagstaff. In this manner, a large portion of the river would be funneled by gravity into the central part of the State. Also proposed was the construction of several power dams on the Verde River, with the view that such a project would create more wealth for Arizona than any other development, because it would not consume power by operating pumps in bringing water into the State. It was contended that this plan would actually produce power at the proposed dams on the Verde River. From a theoretical point of view, this project seemed ideal for our State. However, before any project could be constructed on the Colorado River, it was necessary to obtain the approval and aid of the Federal Government, since the Supreme Court of the United States has ruled that the Colorado River is a navigable stream, and once the Supreme Court has declared a stream to be navigable, in accordance with the Constitution of the United States, the stream belongs to the Federal Government. Thus, all projects on the Colorado River must be constructed with the prior approval of Congress.

The late Governor Osborn recognized this legal point and urged the State legislature to approve the one instrumentality provided by Congress, namely, the Colorado River Compact. This approval was given by the Arizona Legislature several years ago, and the compact thus made it possible for the Governor of Arizona to negotiate with the Secretary of the Interior for water allocations from the flow of the Colorado River and for the presentation to Congress of projects bringing water from the Colorado River into central Arizona.

After the Arizona Legislature approved the Colorado River compact, it was decided that the engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation be asked to recommend the most feasible and desirable project on the Colorado River for the benefit of Arizona. At the conclusion of extensive surveys, the Bureau of Reclamation submitted a report to Congress and to the governors of the various States in the Colorado River Basin recommending that the project for the benefit of central Arizona be constructed as follows:

First. A dam to be built at Bridge Canyon in the proximity of Peach Springs, Ariz. Due to the high cost of construction, the Bureau engineers suggested that the construction of the tunnel from the Bridge Canyon Dam to the Bill Williams River be postponed indefinitely. In lieu thereof, a pump lift would be erected at the Parker Dam site for the purpose of bringing water into central Arizona. By this means, waters from the Parker Lake would be pumped by a series of lifts into a canal, originating north of Bouse. This canal would flow by gravity into the Salt River Valley and thereby deliver water into the Salt River just north of the Granite Reef Dam, some 20 miles from Phoenix.

Second. A gravity flow tunnel to be completed—when the cost of construction levels off—and thus bring water from the Bridge Canyon Dam into this same canal, thereby doing away with the necessity of having the pump lifts.

In the meantime, Arizona could have the benefit of the use of its share of the water from the Colorado River. The power used in pumping the water from Parker Dam to the canal would be produced at the Bridge Canyon Dam site. The cost of this power would be so cheap that it would be feasible to lift the water from Parker Lake to the canal, which would be approximately 1,000 feet.

The Bureau of Reclamation has submitted estimates on the dam and the Parker pump lift, together with the canal. It is estimated that these projects would cost approximately $600,000,000 and would require 70 years for the repayment to the Federal Government. It is a self-liquidating project.

When I, with the other members of the Arizona delegation, introduced legislation in Congress to authorize this undertaking, to be known as the central Arizona Project, certain California interests immediately began sabotaging Arizona's chances for favorable action by Congress on these projects. Every known tactic has been used by Southern California people to delay and prevent the due consideration by the United States Congress of these projects. California's latest maneuver is in the presentation of a resolution in Congress, requiring Congress to direct the Attorney General of the United States to bring all the States in the Colorado River Basin into one lawsuit before the United States Supreme Court and thereby adjudicate their water rights. In opposing this resolution, Arizona has been joined by Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico. The California resolution is supported only by Nevada. So far hearings have been held, and the disposal of these resolutions is presently being considered by the House and Senate Judiciary Committees. If either of these committees tables this resolution, then Arizona will be in a position to present to both the House and Senate its plans for the central Arizona project.

It is pertinent to note that the central Arizona project will render benefits to many sections of Arizona. By bringing water into the Salt River Valley area, a certain portion of the water of the Salt River Valley system can be delivered in turn by canal into the Florence-Coolidge-Casa Grande area. Successively, the farmers of the Upper Gila, Safford, and Duncan area will also be benefited. By releasing additional water into the Gila River system, it would be possible for the San Pedro River to be dammed for the benefit of the Tucson area. It is generally understood that the benefits from the Colorado River will be distributed to all irrigated sections in the central and eastern parts of the State.

Not only have the droughts caused serious inroads into Arizona's economy, because of the lack of water, but the shortage of power is of prime concern. The Colorado can provide the State with more than enough electrical energy, but this potential is unavailable under present conditions.

This shortage has become so acute that central Arizona business faces the prospect of power rationing. Lacking power, stores, farms, and other industry will be forced to curtail their activities, and the populace will be subjected to discomforts that well could lead to a health problem and the limitation on the growth of our State.

The central Arizona project would not only alleviate the water shortage, but would also be the means of supplying cheap electric power to our people and thus avert a setback of the State's business and physical welfare.

It has been necessary for the Bureau of Reclamation to make an extensive and detailed study of the plan to bring water into central Arizona. Before this plan could be presented to committees in Congress, estimates of cost had to be computed; surveys of the territory and plans of the dams, pumping plants and the canal had to be made. All of these surveys and plans have been completed. The necessary details have been worked out, and we are now in a position to submit the proposals and estimated cost to the committees in Congress. Some testimony has been taken on this project. However, it is impossible to complete all

the hearings and have a final consideration in the House and Senate before the close of the Eightieth Congress. Because of the seriousness of this entire problem, it is urgent to call to the attention of the Eighty-first Congress, even at this early date, the important role it will play for Arizona in her quest for a rightful share of the Colorado river resources. If the California interests succeed in delaying the Arizona project, they will continue to usurp large portions of the Colorado river water, and Arizona may find it too late to obtain her heritage from the Colorado.

We are not alone in this demand and many of our neighbors understand and support our position. Although much has been accomplished in Congress towards Arizona's goal, there is considerably more work to be done. Arizona must and will continue the efforts initiated by the late Governor Osborn.

During the next 2 years, I have every confidence that the people of Arizona will continue this fight under vigorous leadership and bring it to a successful conclusion in the Eighty-first Congress by approval of the central Arizona Project.

Taft-Hartley Law Handcuffs Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 9, 1948

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, during last year's congressional debate on the Taft-Hartley law, members of the Republican majority stated time and again that this measure is not antilabor but is designed to protect the interests of the workingman. GOP spokesmen even went so far as to claim that most workers were actually in favor of this NAM-sponsored legislation.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an analysis of the Taft-Hartley law which was prepared recently under the direction of Thomas W. Walsh, attorney for the Operative Plasterers and Cement Finishers Local 20, St. Paul, Minn., and issued by Frank J. Thill, president of the Minnesota State Building and Construction Trades Council. This analysis, entitled "The Handcuffs," gives labor's side of the Taft-Hartley law, and reflects the opinion of the overwhelming majority of organized workers regarding this vicious antilabor legislation.

THE HANDCUFFS

Labor unions, in their long battle to win decent hours, living wages, and fair working conditions, have had to create and develop their own fighting implements.

Among the weapons so developed have been compact memberships, organization solidarity, the closed shop, use of the strike, and the boycott, and other protective devices.

Labor would be in a sorry condition today without these implements. Sweatshop conditions, starvation pay, and long hours would be the rule. American living standards would be as low as in many foreign countries—on a black bread and cabbage soup diet.

The Taft-Hartley law takes away from labor many of these implements of defense. Hard-won rights, American rights, and human rights, which labor built up over a long period of serious effort, have all been sharply curtailed by the Taft-Hartley law.

Until 1842, workers who joined together for the purpose of collective bargaining to raise wages or improve working conditions could be prosecuted and imprisoned for "criminal conspiracy."

It took many years of hard work—decade after decade—to win a fight so that Americans learned to know that it was neither unfair nor wicked nor criminal to bargain collectively for the rights of labor.

The Taft-Hartley law is an opening wedge aimed at breaking down the gains labor has won. In many of its provisions it makes it a criminal offense once again to fight for labor. This law makes it legally wrong to do certain things on behalf of labor, but it does not, and it cannot, make it morally wrong to carry on such a campaign for labor.

The Taft-Hartley law takes away from labor many implements needed in fighting for better conditions, and in their place clamps handcuffs on the union man and organized labor.

It puts these handcuffs on the union man and the union in several ways. The outstanding examples are in section 8 of the law, where certain union unfair labor practices are created. In the following paragraphs, only a few flagrant examples are cited to show how this law affects the laboring man and the union to which he belongs.

Section 8 (b) (1): It's unfair for a union to restrain or coerce any worker from exercising his right not to a join a union.

What is meant by "restrain or coerce"? Before anyone knows exactly, these terms must be interpreted by the courts. Senator TAFT has said that mass picketing to keep a scab out of a plant would violate the Taft-Hartley law.

This provision takes away the cornerstone of collective bargaining and union security.

Section 8 (b) 2: It's unfair for a union to discrimiate against a worker or to have him discharged because he is not a union member.

Under this section of the law, union men cannot refuse to work with a man who ignores good workmanship methods, nor with a union spy, a scab, or the like.

If a man's work is sloppy or not up to union standards of workmanship, union members would be unfair if they refused to work alongside such a person.

It is also unfair for a union to take action on the job against a man who was constantly inciting union quarrels and jurisdictional disputes, or even if he agitated communistic ideas or was in fact a subversive agent.

Section 8 (b) 3: It's unfair for a union to refuse to bargain collectively with an employer.

Suppose a union has all of its industry in a city organized. It negotiates a new contract with new pay scales which is signed by all employers except one. The union refuses to bargain further with this one employer, because to negotiate for anything less than the scale signed in the general contract will tear down the entire wage structure.

Such a refusal to negotiate is "unfair." This provision of the law seriously hampers a union in its collective-bargaining strength.

Section 8 (b) 4: It's "unfair" to stage certain types of strikes and boycotts.

It is unfair for a union to use the strike or boycott to stop chiseling, cut-throat price-cutting, or other acts by an employer who seeks to break union solidarity by putting out of business any competitors hiring union men.

It is even unfair to seek to induce, by boycott, a chiseling or irresponsible employer to join an employers' association so as to stabilize labor conditions.

It is unfair for a union to help the entire organized labor movement by refusing to work on nonunion goods. This practice is a practical right which labor has established and nurtured as a practical way of stabilizing wages and working conditions.

Section 8 (b) 5: It's "unfair" to have "excessive or discriminatory" initiation fees.

No union can protect its membership against "fair weather Charlies" or union-busters by establishing initiation fees high enough to discourage the boomer. This provision of the law tends to discourage unions from maintaining a high type of apprenticeship or journeyman qualifications.

Section 8 (b) 6: It's "unfair" to compel payment for work not actually done.

This section of the Taft-Hartley Act is aimed at "featherbedding," a practice generally frowned upon by good union members. The law is so written, however, that employers can attempt to abolish such well-established practices as rest periods, "call in" pay for workers ordered to report and who are then not put to work, portal-to-portal pay, and other like measures.

Such openings for employers tend to discourage efforts at winning further improvements in working conditions.

Section 8 (d): It's "unfair" to strike at the end of a contract unless four preliminary steps, outlined in the law, are first taken.

The four preliminary steps serve to delay action and to tie a union up in red tape. Yet, if a union calls a strike at the end of a contract, and if there was a slip somewhere in the steps required to be taken, the workers would be penalized by automatically losing their status as employees and would be barred from legally returning to their jobs. They also would not be eligible to vote in labor elections conducted by the National Labor Relations Board on questions dealing with their jobs.

This is an example of rank and file union members facing penalties because of possible acts, or nonacts, by union officials.

MORE HANDCUFFS

There are many additional handcuffs in the Taft-Hartley law. The preceding list of "unfair" practices is only a part of the story.

Some of the sections are aimed at breaking down union security.

Section 8 (a) 3. The closed shop is made completely illegal.

A closed shop is one in which a person cannot be hired unless he is a union member when hired. The closed shop has been one of organized labor's best methods for improving working conditions.

The outlawing of the closed shop takes away from organized labor its most potent means for collective bargaining and union security.

Section 8 (a) 3: A "union shop" is permitted, but only under a number of special conditions.

In a "union shop," nonunion workers can be hired and do not have to join a union for some specified period of time—often 30 to 60 days—after starting work. Many jobs (especially in the construction field) are completed before this required time expires.

Under this section of the Taft-Hartley law, even the union shop is hard to establish. The union must first have, and prove that it has, a majority status, after which an election must be held to determine if the employees want a union shop. In such an election, all employees who fail to vote are in fact counted on as voting "no."

Section 9 (c) 3: Labor elections are restricted to one a year.

After one election is held, a second may not be held within a year. If a union loses that first election, and even if the employee rolls change materially—with many men hired or fired—the union can do no collective bargaining there for a year.

STILL MORE HANDCUFFS

There are still more handcuffs in the Taft-Hartley law, involving free speech, political action, and other matters.

Section 8 (c): Certain curbs are placed on free speech.

The Taft-Hartley law says that workers can retain their constitutional right of free speech, but it adds, provided there are no threats of reprisal or force or promise of benefit. Just what does that mean? Does it mean that a union member is making threats of reprisal or force if he urges a strike? This is another section of the law which must be interpreted by the courts before workers will know what it means.

Section 304: It is unlawful for any labor organization to make any contribution or expenditure in connection with any election for President, United States Congressman, or Senator.

Senator TAFT has said this law forbids a union newspaper or magazine from commenting on political issues, if the publication is financed from regular union dues. This section goes so far as to prohibit even the holding of a political meeting in a union hall, if the union pays the rent or printing costs, or distributes handbills, pamphlets, cards, and election material.

Section 9 (f) (g): Every union, local, national, and international, must file with the United States Secretary of Labor a great many documents, reports, and declarations.

These reports and records which must be filed include: Copies of constitutions and bylaws; names, titles, salaries, and expense allowances of officers; how the officers were appointed or elected; the amount of initiation fees and dues; full details regarding qualifications for membership, fines, expulsions; an annual financial statement, in detail—all these must be filed with the Secretary of Labor.

Copies of the union's financial statement must also be given each member of the union; failure to do so is a serious offense; some antagonistic union member or an employer's spy, by denying that he received a financial statement, could cause long and serious delays and difficulties for the union.

It is not enough for a local to file every figure and report, with every semicolon and comma neatly in place; if the international union should fail to file every bit of data required, the local will be deprived of any action on its behalf by the National Labor Relations Board. It is another case where union members can be penalized by the acts or nonacts of union officers.

In addition to all of the foregoing, there are still other serious objections to the Taft-Hartley act. They include these points:

1. It shackles the Wagner act, which is the American Magna Carta for labor.

2. It degrades and discriminates against all union officers by subjecting them to a question as to their loyalty as United States citizens; it does this by forcing them to swear, under oath, that they are not Communists but it does not require that officers of employer organizations must take any such oath.

3. It puts dictatorship powers into the hands of the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, by providing that he has the sole decision as to prosecutions.

4. It puts in the hands of the Government the right of injunction (with all its abuses) against unions but not against employers in labor disputes.

5. It sets up red tape and complications which will tend to cause unwarranted delays in reaching decisions by the National Labor Relations board in industrial disputes. This will encourage strikes and industrial strife, instead of reducing them.

The Taft-Hartley law puts handcuffs on all labor unions.

It creates an unjust situation when it declares the moral right to fight for justice is, in many cases, illegal.

When labor sees clearly the handcuffs in this act, it will act vigorously to have it repealed.

The Supreme Court's Decision Against the Champaign Plan of Released Time for Religious Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 9, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Charles H. Tuttle, which appeared in the Protestant Church Life, official publication of the Protestant Council of the City of New York on April 10, 1948:

THE SUPREME COURT'S DECISION AGAINST THE CHAMPAIGN PLAN OF RELEASED TIME FOR RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

On March 8, 1948, a majority of the Justices of the United States Supreme Court held that the plan of released time for religious education, adopted by the school board of Champaign, Ill., was violative of the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States. That amendment declares that "the Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The Court ruled that by the fourteenth amendment this prohibition was made applicable to the States.

Four separate opinions were rendered. The majority concurred in saying that they were not condemning released time as such, but only the particular plan then before the Court.

The Champaign plan had back of it no enabling State statute. The religious education was given in the public school itself during school time by religious teachers approved and supervised by the superintendent of schools. The number of available schoolrooms limited the number of religious classes. Scholars who did not wish to attend were moved into a separate room for further secular education. The public-school teachers distributed cards in the school building for the solicitation of signatures by parents.

A majority of the Justices held that this plan constituted an unconstitutional "integration" or "fusing" of church and state in the school building for the dissemination of religious doctrines, and helped provide pupils for the religious classes through the use of the State's compulsory public school machinery.

The New York plan of released time is altogether different. It has back of it a State statute which modifies both the compulsion and the study period of the public school law by adding an additional permissable excuse whenever a parent requests. This additional excuse is for attendance at religious instruction off the school grounds at some center designated by the parent and conducted by teachers over whom the public school authorities have no power of approval or supervision. No cards are distributed and no solicitation is conducted in the school building. Nonattending pupils are not required to move from their regular classroom. No credit is given for attendance upon the religious classes. The school authorities exert no compulsion as to attendance or truancy.

At the time of the argument of the Champaign case, The Protestant Council of the City of New York, through the writer as its counsel, submitted to the Supreme Court a brief amicus curiae. This brief was devoted exclusively to an exposition of the New York plan and of its statutory and constitutional bases. The opinions of a majority of the Justices reflect recognition of these differences between the New York and the Champaign plan.

On March 17, 1948, the corporation counsel of the city of New York rendered to the Board of Education of the City of New York an opinion that the decision of the Supreme Court in the Champaign case did not require the Board "to modify or discontinue the procedure now being followed." On the following day the Board issued a statement that "there will be no change in the way in which matters connected with released time are conducted."

The Greater New York Coordinating Committee on Released Time of Jews, Protestants and Roman Catholics issued a statement on March 23, 1948, that it was continuing its function in the matter of released time in the city of New York.

The writer agrees with the Corporation Counsel of the city of New York, and believes that the New York State Commissioner of Education also agrees.

CHARLES H. TUTTLE.

Soil Conservation That Really Conserves the Soil—Why Not Try the Wisconsin Way and Save the Soils and Save the Taxpayers Many Millions of Dollars Spent in Subsidizing Soil-Depleting Crops?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 9, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, millions upon millions of dollars of Federal money have been spent and are being spent in the name of agriculture and in the name of conserving the fertility of our soils.

The New Deal program has been to erect quotas and embargoes on imports of soil-depleting products produced in the South by special privilege legislation. The next step has been to weaken the system of agriculture or livestock farming that tends to conserve the fertility of soil.

The result has been to subsidize the soil-depleting crops and to jeopardize the natural soil-conservation practices incident to maintaining or increasing soil fertility.

A recent publication from the University of Wisconsin portrays some of the experiences of this great State in connection with livestock farming as a means of maintaining soil fertility.

It is as follows:

[From the University of Wisconsin on Review]

FOODS AND FARMS

America's dairyland—How did it get that way? Why did the dairyman replace the lumberjack? What kept Wisconsin out of the Gulf of Mexico?

A FRIEND INDEED—TO EVERYONE WHO GROWS FOOD, OR PROCESSES IT, OR EATS IT

Better farms and better food—for healthier, happier Americans.

That, in brief, is a large part of the story of the University of Wisconsin's College of Agriculture, a great institution which has had a big influence on the prosperity of the farmer and the welfare of his customers.

This folder, published by the University of Wisconsin Foundation, will outline the work of the college of agriculture. It will attempt to show why the college is important, and how it serves the growers, processors, and consumers of food.

His university is as close to the average Wisconsin farmer as his telephone, his radio, his mail box, or his county agent. Wisconsin farmers perhaps receive more direct benefits from their university than does any other group except students actually attending classes on the campus.

It didn't just happen this way; it's the result of planning to fill a need. The farmer cannot do his own experimenting; he must provide food, shelter, clothing for himself, his family, and the rest of the population. He cannot jeopardize this supply by taking unnecessary chances. The weather insects, disease furnish enough risk, without his growing hundreds of new crops on the offchance that one may be better than any he grew before.

Thus the university has done the experimenting, and taken the results back to the farmer, that he may provide more and better food and fiber for himself and others—with a minimum of soil depletion.

It is difficult to realize the extent to which agricultural research, carried on by the University of Wisconsin and other institutions, has affected not only farming, but the health and welfare of the entire country. Most of the modern methods and equipment which today we take for granted are the products of such research.

As you read through this folder, you'll learn of specific jobs the college of agriculture has tackled. Naturally, the stories told here are of tasks completed—objectives attained. But there are many more problems to be solved. With their solution will come greater prosperity, health and welfare for millions of people. To help in this work, the University of Wisconsin Foundation has been organized.

BALANCED RATIONS

The Wisconsin farmer today feeds his livestock balanced rations which include protein, carbohydrate, fat, vitamins and minerals. Why?

Among other things it was a generation ago that Dr. Stephen M. Babcock, working with other scientists at the university, proved that protein, carbohydrate and fat alone cannot make a good ration. This experiment led to the discovery of vitamins which today are so important in the diets of animals and of human beings.

Years of subsequent research on rations for livestock by scientists at the university proved that alfalfa or clover hay, corn silage, farm-grown grains and a minimum of high-cost protein supplement can make good rations.

Thus, when the Wisconsin farmer feeds his stock he is making a direct and practical use of agricultural research to produce animal products efficiently—to his benefit, and the benefit of the consumer.

VICLAND OATS

The Wisconsin farmer, the past 3 years, has sown more than 2,000,000 acres of Vicland and Forvic oats each year. Why?

Plant breeders developed these new strains because superior oats were needed. Experimenters at the university found that in Wisconsin these oats yielded from 15 to 25 bushels more an acre than varieties previously grown. That means an extra 30,000,000 bushels a year. At 65 cents a bushel (and oats have cost more than that during most of the past 3 years), that would mean $20,000,000 a year to the farmers of Wisconsin and more feed and food for Wisconsin and the world.

IN THE FIELDS AND ON THE AIR

Demonstrations by crews from the university's college of agriculture draw big crowds of farmers—men who know their jobs, and want to do them better. For the smart farmer knows that the "cow college" men—in the fields, as in classrooms and laboratories—are working out new methods that mean money in his pocket.

And in many Wisconsin farmhouses, the radio shares the work of the farm papers and magazines. For over the air, Wisconsin's professors explain and discuss the work they're doing—work that pays dividends in the form of better crops and better stock.

Thousands of Wisconsin farm youth, of course, attend the university, where they are trained to be better citizens, to have a broader view of life, and to enjoy a fuller life. They are trained for their life work—perhaps to become better farmers and homemakers, perhaps to teach others, or perhaps to become research workers and delve into the basic facts of better farming and homemaking. Or the sons and daughters of rural Wisconsin may elect to become doctors, physicists, lawyers, musicians, or to follow any of the livelihoods outside agriculture. The university offers the opportunity, guidance, and training.

And when the farmer's sons and daughters do go to the university they're not suddenly projected into entirely strange surroundings. Many of Wisconsin's rural children have "attended" the university through the Wisconsin School of the Air. It has brought them education not available in one-room, one teacher—or even elaborate schools. If they do not attend college, or even if they must drop formal education during their high-school years or before, the School of the Air has brought them a broadened outlook.

The Wisconsin farmer knows that the university is dedicated to a better life for him and his family. It has brought him, and all people, more and better food, a better life. The Wisconsin farmer knows it is his college of agriculture, his university, that its purpose is to serve him and his family.

BETTER FARMERS FOR BETTER FARMS

The university, in its short course, offers a special service to the farm people of Wisconsin—college education geared to the farming year, taught during the mid-November to March slack season.

The university inaugurated the short course in 1885, and since then thousands of farmers have attended. The short-course students are in dead earnest about their schooling—they know it's training for their life work. The percentage of short-course graduates among the State's top farmers is high.

Although technical agriculture is the primary aim of the short course, it serves other important functions. Farmers and farm boys attending the short course learn something about music, literature, business, the management of farm cooperatives, and other things that make for a broader and more useful existence in their rural communities.

The university has served agriculture not alone by evolving and teaching improved methods of farming, but by improvement of the family farm as a mode of life.

Just as the agronomists have inquired into the ways of producing better crops, so have the social scientists and economists at the College of Agriculture inquired into the ways of producing a more abundant and satisfying rural life in Wisconsin. The university has long been a leader among the institutions of the Nation studying the organization and operation of farmer cooperatives.

Three and four decades ago the College of Agriculture at the university pioneered in the study of Wisconsin's rural people and their mode of living. Subsequent and continuing studies have been an important source of material in such State and local activities as land zoning, planning, reforestation, and the encouragement of industries.

Thus the farmer knows that the university offers him more than technical improvements in agriculture, more than methods which can reduce his workweek and increase his profits, while saving his soil.

Through its extension service the university offers the farmer a broader view of life, just as it does his urban brother, right at home on his farm. Through State-owned radio stations the university brings him the best in literature, music, and programing, as well as the latest information on farming.

WHERE THE COW IS QUEEN—AND WHY

Wisconsin is known throughout the Nation—and the world—as America's Dairyland. Her reputation for high-quality dairy products and breeding stock is unparalleled Why?

Wisconsin started as a lumbering, and then a grain-producing State. But Wisconsin's soil and climate were not suited to grain production—it could not compete profitably in wheat and corn production with other States. The attempt was undermining Wisconsin's major resource at an alarming rate.

Thus it was that the State's agricultural leaders turned to grassland farming. With the progressive farmers and other leaders in this move was the University of Wisconsin. The university could not, and did not, try to force a system of farming upon the farmers of the State. But it could, and did, experiment to find what type of farming best suited the soil and climate of Wisconsin, and how that type of farming could profit farmer and consumer most.

Beginning with the soil, the scientists determined that grassland farming was the answer. Grass, with its permanent or semipermanent cover, could do much toward keeping the top 6 inches of Wisconsin out of the Gulf of Mexico.

New methods of caring for the soil—liming and fertilizing—as well as new pastures and pasture crops were discovered and fostered by the university. A mixture of alfalfa, bromegrass, and ladino clover, the research men found, would make a high-yielding, drought-resistant crop high in protein.

Grassland farming was only the beginning. Wisconsin had not only to save her soil, but live from it. Grass is saving the soil; dairying is furnishing the means for living.

There again the university was called upon to foster and originate better methods. Geneticists, animal husbandrymen, veterinarians, and dairy industry specialists * * * they all work with dairymen and manufacturers to improve dairy products.

While dairying is Wisconsin's major industry, there are many other farm enterprises which are important and which are not being neglected by the university. Research projects in agriculture range from the control of leaf blight on the sour cherries of Door county * * * through methods for the fur farmer to determine a muskrat's age * * * to how the farm housewife can remodel her kitchen—and what it will cost to do the job.

RESEARCH FOR HEALTH

While most of the benefits of the experiment station are of foremost interest to agriculture, they extend to every walk of life.

Wisconsin research discovered vitamins A and B, and showed that yellow corn has a higher feeding value than white corn because it contains vitamin A. The value of that discovery to stockmen can hardly be overestimated. Its value in human health and nutrition is even greater.

Along with the discoveries of vitamins A and B Wisconsin developed the method of irradiating foods to prevent rickets in children. College of agriculture scientists discovered nicotinic acid—which prevents pellagra, one of the most destructive of all human diseases.

It was college of agriculture scientists who discovered a method of doubling American penicillin production. Increased, economical production of the miracle drug brought the price down, and the supply up—even to the point where it can be used in treating animal diseases.

Wisconsin scientists found dicumarol in sweetclover while searching for the cause of cattle deaths from bleeding. They discovered, too, that vitamin K restored blood coagulation. Result, dicumarol can be used in treating human patients to prevent postoperative blood clots, since an effective and safe antidote is available.

Whether it's a new corn hybrid, a scab-resistant potato, better dairy-cattle housing, or the control of undulant fever—the university's research has as its aim the improvement of human life.

PEAS AND TOMATOES

Wisconsin leads the Nation in canning crops. Why?

The soil, climate, and growers of Wisconsin are responsible—with help from scientists, who have developed higher quality, better yielding, and more trouble-free varieties. Wisconsin is particularly well known for the high quality of her canning peas. The cooperation between the Wisconsin grower and the university scientist is in large measure responsible.

The reputation the university has built over the years is indicated by such things as the Wisconsin No. 55 tomato. A few years ago it was nonexistent. As soon as the new tomato variety was bred and released by the experiment station, it was accepted by growers and its popularity is snowballing remarkably.

Back of this situation is the confidence of the grower in his university. He knows the university's interests are his interests, and that the college of agriculture has nothing to sell him except better farming and better rural living.

FORWARD INTO THE UNIVERSITY'S SECOND CENTURY OF SERVICE

As the University of Wisconsin approaches its one hundredth anniversary the State and Nation are praising its past and predicting an even finer future.

We people of Wisconsin are increasingly seeing our State university for what it really is—a friend and neighbor who is wise and unselfish and ready to lend a helping hand whenever we need it.

We have always taken for granted that our University is and should be one of the world's truly great educational institutions, foremost in teaching and research.

We have always taken for granted that this university gives service of many kinds to people in their homes, farms, shops, offices, and stores. But we have not realized the full extent of this service, nor that the University of Wisconsin blazed a new trail which has come to be known as the Wisconsin idea.

Service to the people

The university originated and developed a unique idea of usefulness. Not content to help only the students who could attend its classes, the university began long ago to take useful information and new ideas to all the people in their homes and at their places of work. This was called the Wisconsin idea. There have been a thousand definitions of it, all boiling down to service to the people.

As President Edwin Broun Fred has often said, a university reflects the character of the people whom it serves. That statement can be well proved in Wisconsin. The people of this State were and are forward looking. They believed in free speech, a free press, and the opportunity of education for everyone who wanted and would work for it. From these guiding principles their State university took its shape. Out of Wisconsin's spirit of independence came another important belief, expressed in the words now known as the Wisconsin creed:

"We feel that we would be unworthy the position we hold if we did not believe in progress in all departments of knowledge. In all lines of academic investigation, it is of the utmost importance that the investigator should be absolutely free to follow the indications of the truth wherever they may lead. Whatever may be the limitations which trammel inquiry elsewhere, we believe the great State University of Wisconsin should ever encourage that continual and fearless sifting and winnowing by which alone the truth can be found." (From a report of the board of regents, 1894.)

Among the men of vision who have helped shape the University of Wisconsin's policies was Charles R. Van Hise, who served as president from 1903 to 1918. It was President Van Hise who said that State universities needed and deserved gifts and endowments as much as privately endowed institutions. No doubt he foresaw that the people would demand more and more services from the University of Wisconsin, all of which would add greatly to the cost of maintenance and operation. In 1905, President Van Hise said:

"In addition to the certain support by the State of productive scholarship, the State universities in the future have at least an equal right with private institutions to expect assistance from their alumni. Finally, the State university may reasonably expect funds from wealthy men, not alumni, inspired by ethical and educational motives. * * * It can be made clear that a State is at least as safe a trustee as any individual or corporation. The wealth of the people of an entire State is surety for such funds."

For many years the university has been receiving gifts from those who realize the good that it does. We quote from a recent report titled "Living Memorials":

"Including grants from groups and organizations, there have been hundreds of gifts and bequests given to the University by public-spirited citizens since James T. Lewis, a former Governor of the State, gave the university its first gift, a $100 Government bond, back in 1865. The gifts range from a few dollars upwards to the two and a half million mark."

University needs gifts

Notwithstanding the gifts and bequests made voluntarily, Wisconsin lags far behind other State universities in this respect. It has become clear, however, that if the University is to keep pace with the calls for its services it needs gifts from its friends.

Accordingly, the University of Wisconsin Foundation was organized to inform the people about conditions facing the university and to ask for their help in supporting its public service and cultural activities. It plans to raise funds for purposes other than purely academic. In brief, it intends to foster the Wisconsin idea of service to the people and to help Wisconsin maintain its high rating among other universities.

Regarding the foundation, F. J. Sensenbrenner of Neenah, president of the board of regents, says: "Legislative appropriations, substantial as they have been, liberal as they undoubtedly will become, can provide little more than the bare essentials of education. That is why the University of Wisconsin Foundation was organized. The foundation does not seek gifts and bequests for the ordinary operational expenditures of the university, nor for academic buildings and equipment which the legislature may be expected to provide. Its purpose is to provide special educational facilities to supplement those which the legislature may be expected to provide."

President Fred, formerly dean of the college of agriculture, says: "The University of Wisconsin Foundation was organized to help satisfy public service and cultural needs to carry on the activities implicit in the Wisconsin idea and to strengthen the university by increasing the basis of its financial support."

Howard T. Greene, a leading dairyman of Genesee depot, says, "The foundation has made a survey of what Wisconsin is doing and what it needs to carry on its services. It now solicits and invites the support of all those who appreciate the university and who will contribute to its further progress in the second century of its service to the people of the State and Nation."

Gifts are tax-exempt

The centennial campaign of the foundation, now in progress, is receiving gifts for the university. The immediate objective of the centennial campaign is to raise a minimum of $5,000,000 for the university. Suggested forms of gifts are outright immediate gifts, life-insurance policies, bequests, and gifts in trust.

Looking into the second century of the university's career, the foundation hopes to raise funds to supplement (but never supplant) legislative appropriations.

Gifts made to the University of Wisconsin foundation for the benefit of the university are tax-exempt.

The headquarters of the centennial campaign is at Kohler, Wis.; Herbert V. Kohler is general chairman, and L. L. Smith is executive secretary.

For further information, address: University of Wisconsin Foundation, 905 University Avenue, Madison, Wis.

Columbia River Flood Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, as we have seen in the press for the last 2 weeks, the Columbia River area in the great Northwest has been visited by the most devastating flood in its history in which many lives have been lost. Over $100,000,000 in property has been wiped out, thousands of people have been flooded from their homes, millions of acres of fertile farm land have been inundated and the crops destroyed, farm homes, barns, and equipment have been demolished, and many thousands of veterans, as well as other citizens, have been completely deprived of their homes.

It is a tragedy which should engage our attention and legislation is pending for that purpose. I most sincerely hope that every Member of the Congress will give consideration to the needed legislation which will help to restore these citizens to a normal condition in which they may again be enabled to carry on their normal activities. Many thousands of people have been deprived of all their possessions. Local communities, the Red Cross, the Army, the Navy, all the Government agencies with authority, have been cooperating to bring temporary relief and provide stop-gap shelter and subsistence. The Federal Government, which has been so generous with distressed peoples in all areas throughout our history and which in recent years has provided billions of dollars for peoples of foreign lands, certainly will not

hesitate to provide adequately for our own citizens who are in great distress.

I realize that owing to the short time remaining before adjournment, it will be necessary to take short cuts in securing approval of the necessary legislation to provide first for the immediate care and protection of citizens who otherwise will suffer and secondly to provide stop-gap shelter for them during the next several months and third, to provide permanent housing, particularly for the veterans who were living in Government structures when this disaster struck them. In my own district in the Vanport project alone there were 18,700 flood victims, 60 percent of whom are veterans, who have been deprived of their homes which were owned by the Government and who have lost all of their worldly possessions. We should, before we adjourn, enact legislation providing not merely stopgap or makeshift houses for these worthy veterans and others in a similar situation but the Government should provide permanent housing on conditions within their ability to meet.

I include as a part of these remarks certain excerpts which portray the great distress in which these people now are and their dire need for our assistance.

[From the Oregon Daily Journal of May 24, 1948]

HUNDREDS DESERT HOMES BEFORE RISING STREAMS; MORE INDUSTRIES CLOSE

Hundreds more persons were driven from their homes and thousands from their jobs Friday as the still-rising Columbia cut or overflowed additional dikes and the Willamette threatened to invade downtown Portland and the west side industrial district. The day saw these new developments.

1. Evacuation of 355 families, totaling 1,400 persons, from the fruit valley project in Vancouver to McLoughlin Heights and Vancouver Barracks.

2. Complete evacuation of about 250 families from Oak Park, between Camas and Washougal.

3. Cutting of the Columbia River highway in two places, while the Evergreen Highway on the Washington side remained open "subject to closure any minute."

4. A power shortage in the Northwest network with the possibility of further shortage foreseen.

5. Scores of additional industries shut down while others prepared to retreat from advancing water.

6. Engineers prepared for a flood crest that is expected to flood the Union station, part of downtown Portland and the industrial district along the west side of the river, north of Hoyt Street.

7. A crest no higher than 29.5 feet in Portland Tuesday predicted as the upper Snake River gave indications of leveling off.

8. Columbia poured over dikes on lower Sauvie Island, flooding thousands of additional acres, while the Woodland dike weakened but continued to hold.

PROBABLE CRESTS ESTIMATED

Elmer Fisher, weather bureau river forecaster, Friday again predicted a 30-foot crest at Vancouver Tuesday and a 29.5 crest at Portland. The river will go no higher, if the upper Snake River levels off, Fisher explained.

Cooler weather at the headwaters of the Snake may check that river's steady rise and hold down the rise in the Columbia, Fisher explained. Hotter weather, however, might mean a crest higher than 29.5 feet here. The Willamette stood at 25.5 feet Friday, the Columbia 26 feet at Vancouver.

A crest of 29.5 feet will flood the Union station with more than 6 inches of water, Ben Morrow, Portland city engineer, announced. To protect the downtown business district itself, city employees Friday night began preparations to construct a dike with sandbags from the north or down stream end of the seawall on Hoyt Street to Northwest Ninth Street.

Approaches to the Broadway bridge will be safe. Traffic to and from downtown Portland will not be affected, Morrow said. But the area north of Hoyt Street downstream on the west side will be flooded to 6 inches or deeper for several blocks back from the river bank.

The dike will not be thrown up until late Saturday or early Sunday, to avoid impeding traffic as long as possible, Morrow explained.

INTERSTATE CLOSURE NOT CONTEMPLATED

A similar dike about 150 feet long will be built at the south end of the seawall, just south of the Hawthorne Street Bridge to prevent water from flowing around the south end of the seawall.

The Interstate Bridge will not be closed now or at any time so long as cars can get through the foot or more of water expected at the Vancouver approach to the bridge at the crest, officials emphatically announced in an effort to spike persistent rumors of imminent closure.

Neither is Vanport City in any foreseeable danger from a 30-foot flood crest, Harry D. Jaeger, general manager, declared Friday in an effort to quiet fears for that locality.

Preparations are being made to care for Vanport's 25,000 inhabitants if the situation should change, however, Red Cross officials announced.

Possibility of a power shortage throughout the Northwest was seen by power engineers Friday as the output of Grand Coulee and Bonneville dams was reduced by the high water—which cut down the "head" or distance the water falls through the penstocks.

Voltage dropped in Portland Friday for a few hours as the power supply sagged. A meeting of the northwest emergency power committee was called and the Portland General Electric Co. prepared to put another steam plant at Salem into operation to help the demand.

HIGHWAY CUT IN TWO PLACES

The Columbia River highway was cut 2 miles east of Viento and near Beufert. Cars were being routed around Mount Hood to Maupin, or else over the Evergreen highway to the Mary Hill ferry, thence back to the Oregon side at Biggs. The Mount Hood loop highway will be opened at 8 a. m. Saturday, State police said. The Evergreen remained open, but water licked at the approaches to the Wind River Bridge and at the grade itself between Cooks and Underwood and State patrolmen said "the road may be closed at any minute."

The American Red Cross disaster committee, headed by E. A. Valentine, chairman, announced the Portland armory was available for central shelter, redistribution point, and base operations. The Red Cross had a representative flying from San Francisco to Vancouver to assist in handling displaced persons.

Gov. Mon C. Wallgren, of Washington, called out the National Guard to aid in the flood emergency while Gov. C. A. Robins, of Idaho, said he will proclaim a state of emergency Saturday in 10 flooded northern Idaho counties.

RED CROSS OFFICIAL FLIES HERE

Richard F. Gordon, director of the Pacific area Red Cross, left San Francisco for Portland Friday to direct relief work, and the local Red Cross chapter worked around the clock.

Vancouver city mobilized 100 auxiliary policemen, selected from the ranks of the junior chamber of commerce, industries, and city and State governments, to assist 50 Fort Lewis soldiers in patrol of flooded areas.

The United States Coast Guard commissioned six radio-equipped Portland yachts to stand by as Coast Guard cutters with Coast Guard auxiliary crews and opened headquarters at McCuddy's Columbia Marina, on Northwest Marine Drive. A 38-foot picket boat, a surfboat, and a sound truck were ordered to Portland from Point Adams lifesaving station, and a surfboat and sound truck were sent to Longview and Kelso to assist in rescue and relief work.

The Morrison Street Bridge went out of service at 6 p. m. Friday, and the drawspan was left open for river craft. The rising water was expected to short circuit electric cables under the bridge.

AUTHORITIES FORECAST RIVER STAGES

River stages forecast by the weather bureau and the Corps of Army Engineers, in feet, at locations on the Columbia River and tributaries were given Friday as shown below. The readings actually taken Friday are noted, with predictions for other days based on upriver readings. Final figure after each reading point is expected maximum crest.

	Friday	Saturday	Sunday	Monday	Tuesday
Portland	24.8	26.3	27.5	28.8	29.5
Umatilla	26.1	27.4	28.7	29.2	.....
Celilo	29.3	30.5	31.7	32.5	.....
Vancouver	25.6	26.8	28.0	29.0	30.0
Lewiston	20.5	21.5	.....	.....	.....
The Dalles	48.8	49.5	50.7	51.7	.....
Kelso Wash	18.9	20.7	21.5	22.3	23.0

[From the Portland Oregonian of June 4, 1948]

TEN DORMITORIES AT SWAN ISLAND TAKEN OVER TO HOUSE VANPORT FLOOD REFUGEES

The Housing Authority of Portland Thursday took over from War Assets Administration 10 domitories at Swan Island, with the announcement that within several days approximately 1,200 Vanport refugees can be installed there by the Red Cross.

At the same time, telegrams were sent by Mayor Earl Riley, Jesse Epstein, regional director of the Federal Public Housing Authority at San Francisco, and Chairman Herbert Dahlke of the Portland authority to President Harry S. Truman and members of Oregon's congressional delegation, urging an immediate appropriation of $10,000,000 to provide emergency living accommodations for flood victims of this area.

It was asked that the money be made available to the local authority through some Federal agency, probably the PHA.

PLAN TEMPORARY ONE

The Swan Island dormitories, which have cafeteria facilities, will be operated as a revolving shelter, from which families will be removed as fast as other stopgap family units, primarily trailers and small prefab houses, are set up to receive them. The Red Cross agreed to furnish food through the cafeterias.

Of the 5,300 displaced families in Vanport, 45 have been established at University Homes, 350 at Guilds Lake, and 90 more can go into Guilds Lake when the waters recede enough to open sewers there, Harry Freeman, executive director of the Portland authority, revealed.

Emergency housing of Vanport college students and their families has been taken over by a separate bureau established by the college, Dr. Stephen Epler, director, announced Thursday night. Telephone AT 6747 has been established as a clearance for housing offers.

HOSPITAL SHIPS READY

Stopgap housing which could take care of approximately 1,500 persons was being readied at Astoria Thursday, where two large hospital ships, the *Louis Milne* and the

Ernestine Koranda, were being taken out of mothballs in the Maritime Commission reserve fleet anchorage for use in Portland.

They will be brought to Portland as soon as the Army engineers permit river traffic, possibly not before Saturday.

Mayor Hugh Bowman, of Pendleton, has announced a number of Pendleton air-base buildings would be suitable to house flood refugees. He said that many of the buildings could be made livable with minor repairs.

O. L. Thoreson, San Francisco, deputy administrator of medical services, Pacific area office, Red Cross, said such temporary shelters as churches and lodge halls cannot, by their nature, be used for more than another 2 weeks, and that refugees who were taken into private homes, often by strangers, are beginning to report back to the Red Cross asking for other accommodations. The Red Cross reported 300 had already come back to the shelters from private homes.

Trailers rather than a more permanent type of housing, were fixed on as the most satisfactory form of stopgap. Epstein reported 440 Government-owned trailers have been lined up in the Pacific coast area, and added that "with money available, we could pick up another 4,000 tomorrow."

TRAILER SITES EYED

Epstein said he had asked a Nation-wide survey of the number of trailers available from manufacturers and dealers, where located, and approximate price. Inquiries in the Los Angeles sector indicated an average price of $1,000, he said.

Probable sites for the trailers were mentioned in Guilds Lake, where 22 acres cleared for but not yet used by private industry are available as well as spaces between existing houses. McLoughlin heights and Ogden meadows, at Vancouver; Fairview homes trailer camp, and several properties acquired but not developed by the city park bureau. All of these have sewer and water utilities installed.

Members of the Portland housing authority said they hoped some of the $10,000,000 asked for could be used in salvage work at Vanport.

Looking ahead to permanent homes for the displaced families, Loyd O. Carter, president of Portland Realty Board, said the builders concur that the best solution would be a $40,000,000 or $50,000,000 appropriation to RFC or some other Government agency, to be loaned directly to property owners for building purposes at low interest over 25 to 30 years.

"These homes should be primarily single-family units; all on one site, available for rent or purchase," said Carter. "Let the terms be 5 percent down, 4½ percent interest. At that rate the Government could unload its mortgages to private bankers in a few years." A 6-percent net return to the builder was suggested.

First, however, a survey should be made among the Vanport homeless to learn how many intend to stay in this area, and how many want to rent or buy homes, said Carter.

Several other committees are also at work on housing plans.

One, named by the Portland Chamber of Commerce, is composed of a number of builders and contracting interests. Harry Mittleman is chairman. Its goal is homes and permanent homes.

A third committee has been called by the Portland League of Women Voters. The league has asked approximately 30 representatives of veterans, church and women's organizations, the city club, the special committee appointed by Dahlke, the chamber of commerce retail trade bureau, the YWCA, the Portland Council of Churches, and others to meet Friday at 7:45 p. m. in room 511 of the Education Center Building.

SLUM IDEA OPPOSED

The chamber of commerce committee—for housing and construction—which also met Thursday morning, was told by Harry Mittleman, chairman.

"We do not wish to start another project which bears even the seeds of a future slum area. Portland can no longer think in terms of emergency or defense housing.

"Instead of creating a great potential slum area, let us build small apartment units, houses, courts, duplexes. * * * We can give them an opportunity to eventually buy the homes which are going to be set up, and we can keep Portland the city of homes, not of gigantic defense housing projects."

The committee made these recommendations:

1. That several vacant dwellings around Portland be listed as a permanent accommodation quarters.

2. That a committee of four or five persons should be selected to investigate emergency dwellings, and that it should be ready to report within 7 days on places that could be converted to bivouac dwellings. Suggested places were the Army barracks at Vancouver and portions of the city parks for tent cities.

Israel in Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 9, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, a desperate war rages in Palestine—a war of annihilation by the feudal and medieval Arab nations there, backed by the might of the British Empire and filled with a horrible religious fervor toward fratricide—against the new nation of Israel.

The world asks, "Why?"

Why does not the United States make its instantaneous and statesmanlike recognition of Israel effective by lifting the embargo against arms to Palestine, or by implementing the truce orders of the United Nations?

Why does Great Britain, suing for economic aid, defy the United Nations and the United States by continuing to back the Arab aggression morally, if not now by military assistance?

We do not know all the answers. Most sincerely, I hope that we can get them.

We can only hope and pray and urge for Israel the blessing of this well-established democratic Nation for its new sister country, modeled on our own democratic way of life, and for economic aid in the form of credits, loans, and supplies, for support in the family of nations, and, if necessary, for military supplies to defend its life from aggression.

It may help us to understand the problems in the Middle East by reading what others have said.

Under consent, I am inserting in the RECORD several excerpts from the Nation and one from the New Republic.

From the June 5 issue of the Nation I have selected an editorial which is part of a column of comment under the general head, "The shape of things."

THE SHAPE OF THINGS

The replacement of Loy Henderson and his clique in the State Department is a move President Truman can no longer avoid making if he has any regard for his own prestige and that of his high office. The post of Special Adviser on Palestine to the Secretary of State is more necessary today than it was when General Hilldring was appointed. Now that illness has prevented Hilldring from assuming his duties, another appointment should be made at once. The name which first comes to mind is that of Sumner Welles, who not only is one of our most experienced diplomats and a former Under Secretary of State, but has the added qualification of understanding that the survival of Israel is essential to the security and democratic development of the Middle East. Unless Welles or an equally trustworthy person is chosen promptly, we may expect continued collusion between the British Foreign Office and the State Department, repeated sabotage of Presidential decisions, and increasing strife in Palestine which may well involve the rest of the world.

When President Truman recognized the state of Israel, it was generally assumed that the move would be backed with action, in and out of the United Nations. The assumption was a dream that lasted for exactly a week. Then the real and unaltered attitude of the State Department asserted itself, and the sapping operations began. After the Arab rejection of the Security Council's appeal to cease fire, the United States, instead of reintroducing its resolution invoking article 39, left it to the Soviet Union to do so, knowing full well the prejudice against any Russian-sponsored resolution. We neither backed the Soviet Union when it charged the Arab states with responsibility for the failure of the cease-fire appeal, nor challenged the British on their failure to carry out their pledge of April 17 to withdraw the Arab Legion from Palestine before the mandate ended. We did not vote down, as we should have done, the original British truce resolution, which was aimed directly at the Jews; we did not propose a single decent amendment to the British text; we did not answer the inquiry of Belgium and Canada as to what action we were prepared to take if article 39 were invoked. It was France which prevented the Security Council from banning Jewish immigration into Palestine during the 4-week truce. It was Colombia which asked the British whether they would continue to arm the Arabs even if they should refuse to cease fire. It was Canada which restricted the role of the mediator to the functions assigned to him under the resolution of the General Assembly of May 14. It was we who introduced an amendment under which the British and the Arabs alike could justify blockade of Palestine territorial waters, hemming in the Jewish state.

Had the Russian resolution passed, the Arab states would have been named as aggressors and exposed to political and military defeat. This the British prevented. Under the truce resolution as adopted, the Jews have been stopped in their tracks by an international arms embargo, while at the same time the Arab Legion, said to have an 8 months' reserve supply of British arms, and the other forces of the Arab states remain in position inside Palestine as a continuing threat to the Jewish state. It was for this that the United States eventually voted. Obviously, the intention of the British is to destroy Jewish resistance and force a negotiated peace with a weakened Israel, reduced in size and prepared to accept terms that will insure Britain's firm control of strategic bases, with the Negev as one certain prize of war. Thus, British maneuvering has again succeeded, with State Department help, in undermining the decision of the President of the United States and the last fragment of United Nations authority. It is up to Mr. Truman now to show whether he or Mr. Bevin determines American foreign policy. The President can approve an immediate loan to Israel; announce that the United States will help arm Haganah once the truce period is over; and, equally important, can tell the British people that this

country will not continue to support Mr. Bevin's policy in Palestine.

From the May 22 issue of the Nation I have chosen the following editorial article by Freda Kichwey, editor of this well-known journal of liberal comment:

AMERICA AND ISRAEL

(By Freda Kichwey)

The abrupt reversal of policy that produced de facto American recognition of the state of Israel within minutes after the end of the British mandate was undoubtedly a maneuver hastily devised to get in ahead of the Russians. Later administration claims that the decision had been made soberly, some time in advance, are amply disqualified by the confessed astonishment and dismay of the American delegates in the UN Assembly when they heard the news; in any case, to have decided earlier and then deliberately withheld the decision from its own representatives would have been even more fantastic than a mere improvisation.

But questions of method and motive fade in the light of the fact: American recognition if followed by its logical consequences offers the new Jewish state—born fighting and baptized with Arab bombs—its one good hope of peace and survival. For this reason friends of Israel, and of a decent policy in the Middle East generally, will temper their criticism with thankfulness.

Until the United States acted, the omens were almost all bad. The Jews issued their declaration of independence—a solemn and lofty document—at Tel Aviv, while the Haganah fought desperately to recapture the road to Jerusalem. On three frontiers the Arab states were waiting to attack the moment the mandate should end. At Lake Success the Americans were arguing the lost case for trusteeship and attempting to secure the appointment of a high commissioner who would supersede the UN Commission and seek agreement on the "future government" of Palestine; in other words, our delegation was still trying to rescind partition when, like a bomb exploding in the Assembly, word came of American recognition.

The total effect of this latest and most sensational about-face is yet to be measured. The first reaction in London and Moscow and even less sensitive areas was understandably one of irritation. How can a nation that reverses its position without warning expect to be taken seriously? How absurd to go back on everything our delegates were solemnly advocating. In view of its own undeviating support of partition, Russia in particular must have looked upon our performance as a rather bare-faced bit of sharp practice. But the fact remains that, by returning to our original position, we have again alined ourselves with Russia on the Palestine issue and opened the way, however slightly, for a new effort at agreement in the Middle East. As for Britain, its chief emotion for the moment will be one of mingled bitterness and relief. With its mission in Palestine ended in bloody failure, its best earlier endeavors buried under the hatred of the past 3 years, official Britain feels abused, and America's action is regarded as final evidence of our well-known irresponsibility. "All right, it's up to Washington now; let them try to make peace in Palestine for a change; as for us, we'll wait and see." Such is London's present mood.

And in fact it is up to Washington. The United States sponsored partition and then abandoned it. Now that the Jews, with unbelievable courage and persistence, have established partition by force of arms, the least this Government can do is to provide the help that will give substance to its hasty gesture. To recognize the de facto Jewish state and leave the matter there would be a brazen admission that the action was nothing more than a tactical trick.

Most Americans will realize that it was something more than that. The haste may have been tactics; recognition itself represented strong opinion in and out of the White House. The truth is, as this journal has reported week after week, President Truman and some of his close advisers favored partition right along but were overborne by the military-financial interests on the other side. In the presence of those interests, Mr. Truman loses confidence in his own convictions. He is afraid of being charged with putting sentiment—or politics—ahead of security. But he has come to understand, slowly, that these people are not infallible; he has learned a great deal in recent weeks about British maneuvers in Palestine against partition (the documents published by the Nation 2 weeks ago are known to have opened the eyes of several important administration officials); in addition to everything else, he has learned the full measure of the political penalty he would have to pay for his own vacillation. The steady pressure of liberal opinion was a heavy factor in bringing him around. And when the Jews showed that they were able to launch their new state without benefit of UN or United States, recognition became certain.

But recognition of the new state will have to be filled in with concrete acts before it becomes a policy. Our Government should sponsor the early admission of Israel to the United Nations. We should urge immediate action by the Security Council to check the open aggression of the Arab states. On the pretext of moving into the "vacuum" left by the British in order to prevent chaos and end Jewish "terror," Egyptian planes are bombing Tel Aviv. Their army has crossed the border. Contingents of the Arab Legion have occupied prepared positions under the direct orders of King Abdullah. The Arab League, whose members with the exception of Transjordan are all members of the United Nations, has declared war on Israel.

For this hateful consequence the United Nations and the United States are largely responsible. Certainly, no duty could be plainer than the duty to declare the Arab states aggressors and apply sanctions against them if they refuse to withdraw and give up the fight. It will be said that, lacking a police force, the United Nations cannot act effectively. This is not a fact. Economic sanctions applied firmly to the Arab states would probably be enough to end their aggression. Their dependence on the West for arms and financial support is almost complete. At the very least, the Security Council could direct members of the United Nations to embargo shipments of arms to the offending states and supply them to Israel. If military sanctions should be necessary to check actual aggression, a token force could be assembled rapidly from forces available in Europe and the Mediterranean. All that is needed is the will to act.

But again, as in December, the initiative will have to come from the United States. Our recognition of the Jewish state scuttled our own futile efforts to find some other solution; it is up to us to move with equal energy to stop the Arab invasion and give Israel a chance to bring peace and progress to the old land of Palestine.

The Central Utah Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1948

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, bills have been introduced in at least the last three sessions of the Congress to construct a reclamation project to be known as the Central Utah project. Many Members have asked, and many other people have asked, When will we get through with the building of reclamation projects? The answer to that question is: We probably never will finish the job until all the available land suitable for agriculture is brought under cultivation. We will go on building projects and reclaiming land to meet the ever-increasing demand for food and fiber. At the present rate more farm land is going out of production as a result of the loss of plant food and soil erosion than we are reclaiming. It is therefore very likely that as time goes on these projects will become more expensive.

In addition to the problem of irrigation we also have the question of power. As the use of electricity becomes more general there will be an increasing demand for these multiple projects for the development of irrigation, water, and power.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time to inform my colleagues of the necessity for this great Central Utah project. I want you to know what the project is and what it proposes to accomplish.

The Central Utah project is the enlargement of the present Strawberry project now in operation for over 40 years. This project has one of the best water rights in the State of Utah and almost pays for its operation by power revenues.

This project will consist of the following construction:

1. The enlargement of the present Strawberry Reservoir to about 2,000,000 acre-feet capacity, the earth filled dam being about 300 feet high. The elevation of the Strawberry Reservoir is now 7,600 feet.

2. A feeder canal to the Strawberry Reservoir along the south flank of the Uintah Mountains about 100 miles long and comprising 90 miles of tunnel, no single unit of which will be more than 10 miles in length. This is due to the fact that the east-west feeder canal referred to intercepts the north-south streams of the Uintah Mountains.

3. Collecting reservoirs in each canyon intercepted by feeder canal. This is made necessary in order to control water entering the feeder canal from the Uintah Mountain canyons.

4. The Flaming Gorge Dam—350 feet high—on the main stream of the Green River in Utah for the purpose of diverting the waters of the Green River through a tunnel 22 miles long which will convey water in a southerly direction to the Strawberry aqueduct or the feeder canal on the south flank of the Uintah Mountains. The Flaming Gorge Reservoir on the Green River will have a capacity of 3,000,000 acre-feet.

5. Echo Park Dam on the Green River for storage and the development of hydro-electric power, 529 feet high with a reservoir capacity of 6,400,000 acre-feet. The power plant at the dam will have the capacity of 145,000 kilowatts installed and will furnish firm power for the Central Utah project.

6. Echo Park aqueduct to replace water taken from the streams of the Uintah Mountains that was used on farms in the Uintah Basin.

7. Four hydro-electric power plants on Diamond Fork where the water flows through from Strawberry Reservoir, a vertical distance of 2,900 feet, which will generate 240,000 kilowatts installed capacity. This power will not be firm.

8. Bates Reservoir on upper Provo River having 75,000-acre-feet capacity. The medium of this reservoir water can be shifted to the north.

9. Midway-Little Cottonwood Tunnel, 14 miles in length, which will drain Park City-Alta Mining District and make available extra water for Salt Lake County.

10. A distributing system for the Central Utah project will include the Wasatch aqueduct, 73 miles long, and Sevier County canal, 97 miles long.

It is estimated the Central Utah project will supplementally irrigate 150,000 acres of what is now partially irrigated land and will fully irrigate 300,000 acres of first-class new land. Available water obtained from the Central Utah project (600,000 acre-feet) will double the agricultural area in Utah which is suitable for the growing of peaches, cherries, truck-garden products, and other high-income-producing crops.

The power development on the Central Utah project will furnish an equivalent of about one-third the hydroelectric power developed at Hoover Dam and will be used for agricultural and industrial purposes in the great basin and particularly along the Wasatch front.

The storage developed at Echo Park on the main stream of the Green River will assist the States of the upper basin to use their portion of the Colorado River water and will also make possible the fulfillment of the guaranty made by the upper basin States to deliver an average annual flow at Lee Ferry of 7,500,000 acre-feet.

Through its mineral wealth, its growth in manufacturing, and its substantial agriculture, Utah will be able to pay for the Central Utah project. This, of course, will be made possible by the cheap electricity developed by the project and new industries that will naturally follow.

By exchange of water the Central Utah project will benefit the entire Sevier River drainage area by storing central Utah water in the Sevier Bridge Reservoir and making it available to lower users. Water of the Sevier River which would otherwise go to the lower users may be made available at the headwaters.

Small, expensive projects in the State of Utah that will not pay out can be tied to the revenues from a pooling arrangement of earnings from power generated on the Colorado River.

The Central Utah project will stabilize Utah's economy. Utah's great deposits of coal, iron, phosphate, salt, potassium, and magnesium will furnish the needed foundation for substantial and permanent industrial growth. Already a great steel plant and copper-producing center have the necessary base for a wide use of electricity in new industrial plants that will naturally follow. Fabricating plants to process steel products and a new copper refinery are already under way.

Excise Taxes on Radio Tubes and Light Bulbs Is a Hardship on Every American Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 9, 1948

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, recently the House passed a bill modifying excise taxes on cosmetics. When this legislation was under consideration we were told it was necessary because the excise tax was having a punitive effect on the cosmetic industry. Furthermore, it was pointed out cosmetics could no longer be considered a luxury.

I supported the legislation because it was the first effort by this Congress to repeal the punitive excise tax that is cutting the very heart out of several industries located in my congressional district and providing employment for thousands of my constituents.

Some weeks ago I called to the attention of the House that the fur industry was suffering and that a particular furrier in my congressional district had to reduce his personnel by one-third, and unless some relief was forthcoming immediately, additional employees would lose their jobs because of the punitive excise tax of 20 percent on furs.

Another industry in my district, the Sylvania Electric Products, Inc., Altoona, Pa., manufacturers of radio tubes and light bulbs, is also suffering because of the 20 percent excise tax on radio tubes and 10-cent light bulbs. Beyond food, clothing, and shelter, I can think of no other items so necessary to the American way of life than light bulbs and radio tubes.

When one considers the illumination provided by a 10-cent light bulb and the part that a radio plays in the life of the average American, it is ridiculous to classify these necessities as luxury items. Frankly, I feel there is no sound reason for a 20 percent excise levy on these necessities of life. Instead of being a luxury tax it is a hardship tax.

Let me point out, as I did several weeks ago when speaking of the fur industry, the effect of this excise tax on the light bulb and radio tube operations of the Sylvania Plant at Altoona, Pa.

In February 1945 employment at the Altoona plant was 2,480. In March 1948 the number of persons employed dropped to 750. From the pay-roll standpoint, the peak pay roll was $3,262,000 in 1944, while the annual pay roll this year approximates $1,600,000.

In a city of approximately 100,000, such as Altoona, Pa., when you reduce the pay roll of a firm at least 50 percent you seriously disturb the economy of the community and encourage unemployment.

In my opinion, any Federal tax should not be a punitive or hardship tax. It is my hope, before the Eightieth Congress adjourns, that some consideration will be given to the many small companies suffering from excise taxes such as is imposed on furs, radio tubes, and light bulbs.

We have given a lot of consideration to rehabilitating industry abroad. It is time that we devoted some attention to preserving American industry.

Peace, Isn't it Wonderful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 9, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Rabbi Harry Halpern, which appeared in a recent issue of the bulletin of the East Midwood Jewish Center. It speaks for itself:

PEACE, ISN'T IT WONDERFUL

It is a consoling thought to know that we live in a peaceful world. We have all hoped for the day when peace would reign on earth and according to some distinguished statesmen, we are at peace. Hundreds of human beings are losing their lives in Palestine but this does not constitute a breach of the peace or even a threat to it. The Arabs and the British are agreed that Arab armies are merely taking a hike in the state of Israel in order to improve their health.

Mr. Bevin has declared that Britain would not stop its shipment of arms to the Arab states unless and until the Security Council declares such action illegal. Then Britain's representative comes to the Security Council and does everything in his power to prevent the action being called illegal. Thus the British have learned to talk out of both sides of their mouth simultaneously.

We can understand Mr. Bevin's determination to continue the shipment of arms to the Near East. After all, Britain has a contract to supply these arms and the British respect their promises. Such a recognition of the pledged word is admirable. But evidently, Mr. Bevin has forgotten that England also made a promise to the Jewish people of a national home in Palestine in 1917. How does this promise differ from the contract to supply arms to Arabs? As a matter of fact, a promise to the Jews did not involve bloodshed whereas the other contract does.

Our brothers and sisters in Israel are fighting a desperate war for existence at the present moment. Britain chooses to be neutral. Does neutrality explain Britain's request to France not to recognize the new Jewish state? Does neutrality mean to give material assistance to those who are aggressors and who brazenly violate the orders of the United Nations?

While we are grateful to our own Government for the assistance which it has rendered us in its prompt recognition of the new state, yet such recognition will be meaningless unless it is implemented by some decisive action which will serve notice on Arab aggressors that the United States means to stand behind those who observe international law. We must make Britain

understand that no supposed community of interests of our two countries will stand in the way of our doing what is an act of simple justice. A valiant soldier of the last war, an American citizen, who was a Jewish boy from the Bronx, lost his life fighting with Haganah. It is too bad that the bullet which killed him was not extracted from his body and sent to Mr. Bevin as a souvenir with the words "We send you a striking symbol of British neutrality."

Looking at the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 9, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by David J. Dallin that appeared in the New Leader on May 29, 1948:

LOOKING AT THE WORLD—MOSCOW AND TEL AVIV
(By David J. Dallin)

During the last few months, the support given to the partition plan for Palestine by the Soviet Government has been more consistent than the position of any other power. Throughout the world, the Communist Parties and the Communist press have been unequivocally enthusiastic about the creation of an independent Jewish state; Communist rallies have demanded action in favor of Israel and in this country, the pictures of Gilda Meyerson, Moshe Shertok, and David Ben-Gurion have frequently adorned the pages of the Daily Worker. It would appear that Moscow has thus succeeded in creating one more illusion and in generating a misconception about its stand concerning a Jewish state.

For more than a quarter of a century, down to 1946–47, the Soviet Government, as well as the Comintern, was violently opposed to Zionism and a "Jewish national home" in the Holy Land. To them, Zionism was sheer hypocrisy, a weapon of British imperialism—"the most vicious and reactionary" of all imperialisms. The Arabs were treated as the victims, the Jews as aggressors.

"The Palestinian enterprise of the Zionists," the second congress of the Comintern announced, "actually yields to British exploitation the Arab population of Palestine under the pretext of establishing a Jewish state." Two years later the Comintern promised support to the Arabs "against British-Zionist occupation."

It softened during the last war, but only for a short time. The alliance with Britain against Germany made a temporary rapprochement with Zionism possible. When Ivan Maisky, the Soviet Ambassador to Britain, passed through Palestine in 1943, he received a Jewish delegation, made advances to them, and even dropped some disparaging remarks about the "backward Arabs controlled by feudal cliques."

When the war was over, Soviet opposition to the Anglo-Saxon powers became the substance of all Soviet policy. The Zionists again became the vanguard of British imperialism and the Arabs, with their feudal cliques, potential allies of Moscow. "The British must be ousted from Palestine!" was the Communist slogan against England and Zionism as late as 1946. In July of that year Victor Lutsky, the Soviet expert on Palestine, in a public lecture in Moscow, strongly assailed the Zionists for their endeavors to make a Jewish-capitalist state out of Palestine. He declared that the Arabs, having lived there for many centuries, were entitled to Palestine.

The leader of Palestinian communism, Meier Vilner, testified before the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry in March, 1946, and denounced the plan for partition of Palestine; according to him, it is an imperialist program for the continuation of the old British rule.

The Soviet courting of the Arabs was resumed, and the feudal lords were again potential leaders in the fight against imperialism. A few voices in the Arab world showed themselves to be responsive to Moscow's wooing. A spokesman for the Arab office, in April 1946, threatened the British and Americans with a possible Soviet-Arab rapproachment: "We will grab at any straw—Russia and anyone else who will help us." Another leading Arab, Auni Bey Abdul Hadi, the former aide to an Arab king, said that the entire Middle East would be forced by Anglo-American policy into the bosom of Soviet Russia.

Not until early in 1947 did Stalin reverse his policy. At the risk of antagonizing the Arab world, he embraced the partition plan. He suddenly realized that his chief aim of ousting the British from an important foothold could be accomplished by supporting a rapidly rising Jewish movement for national independence.

The Middle East, as a whole, has proved to be a rather arid field for Stalin's political activity. Soviet acquisitions were extensive in Europe and tremendous in the Far East; in the Middle East, however, there has been no Soviet expansion. Turkey and Iran have consistently barred the road. Among other reasons, of all religions the Moslem world turned out to be the most unfertile ground for communism. The partition of Palestine thus pesented a welcome new opportunity.

Denied bases anywhere in the Mediterranean from Greece to Tripoli, Stalin and Molotov now began to pay attention to the disputed Holy Land. If the British would quit, why could not the Soviet Union be her heir as it was elsewhere? Now immigration from eastern Europe to Palestine was facilitated, contrary to previous Soviet policy. With the help of the Soviet satellites, thousands of Jews have migrated from Europe to Palestine in the last years.

Soviet policy was primarily concerned with the establishment of an independent Jewish Palestine. A transformation of Israel into a "friendly nation" remains scheduled for some future date. At present even a semi-Socialist government in Palestine, even Jewish parties of the despised Second International, win Moscow's support. The Communist program for Palestine is to be played down for the time being. Only when the first stage is successfully weathered are the borders of Israel to become part of the demarcation line between the two worlds.

Communism has made no compromise with Zionism as a philosophy, or with the Jewish goal of creating their own state. In Soviet Russia Zionism remains severely persecuted, and no change in this policy has taken place in 30 years. The Zionists in Palestine are convinced that, in their endeavors in and outside of the United Nations, they have ably made use of the Soviet stand for their own benefit. Moscow, on the other hand, is convinced that it has succeeded in taking advantage of Zionism for the furtherance of its own ends in the Middle East.

The two goals are far apart. The interests of Moscow and Tel Aviv are divergent, indeed. For Moscow, Zionism and Israel are but pawns in a great diplomatic game. They will be dropped or abandoned as soon as circumstances make such a new switch advisable from the viewpoint of over-all Soviet strategy.

Behind the Tariff Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 9, 1948

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following editorial from the New York Times of June 9, 1948:

BEHIND THE TARIFF FIGHT

The Senate Finance Committee yesterday adopted the House tariff bill in modified form. The Senate version carries an amendment which throws out a House provision giving Congress veto power over tariff rates negotiated by the President. However, it contains, in lieu of this, a provision under which he would have to notify Congress within 30 days if he should approve tariffs going beyond "peril points" that may have been established by the Tariff Commission. Moreover, like the House measure, it calls for only a single year's extension of the RTA program at this time.

If the House authors of the watered-down version of the Hull program believed they were improving upon the original, why, many persons will want to know, have they restricted its life to a single year? The answer to this, unfortunately, would seem to be all too clear. The protectionist-isolationist element in the party apparently has no intention of stopping here. But it wants to be sure the Republicans will be in control in Congress for the next 4 years before it really shows its hand. If the Republican Party should be returned by a heavy majority in November, it is a safe prediction that a year from now we may expect this same group to launch a genuine all-out attack on the reciprocal tariff policy.

A preview of what is in the back of the minds of the members of this group is afforded in a measure designated H. R. 6379, introduced "by request" April 28 by Representative GEARHART, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. This bill, which follows more or less closely the ideology of the protectionist American Tariff League, would convert the Tariff Commission into a Foreign Trade Authority empowered to terminate all trade agreements at the earliest possible moment. This body would be authorized to proceed from there to adjust import duties on a basis of domestic valuation, these readjusted duties to be submitted to Congress for its approval or disapproval. In short, the present modification of the law would be merely a stop-gap pending the time when the Republican high tariff forces can be mobilized for a major assault on the reciprocal trade program.

Marshall Plan—1 Year Old

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 9, 1948

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the New Orleans States:

MARSHALL PLAN: 1 YEAR OLD

Four years ago this past week end was D-day; Americans, British, and Canadians

swarmed over Normandy beaches. One year ago this past week end, Secretary of State George C. Marshall announced at Harvard University a plan for American aid to European democracies.

One was a beachhead against nazism; the other, a beachhead against a more virulent ideology, communism.

Now, just at a time when even the hard to convince are ready to agree the tide of the cold war is in our favor, the House voted to lop 26 percent off the foreign-aid program, spreading less money over a longer period of time.

This country, in enacting the Marshall plan, accomplished a phenomenal feat for a reputedly slow-moving democracy. Within about 6 months American resources had been surveyed, 16 European nations had worked out their programs for self-help with United States assistance, our funds started pouring overseas to countries needing stop-gap aid, and $17,000,000,000 was set as the target for the European recovery program. It took international communism 4 months to get together to organize against the ERP.

Senate and House composed their differences and by April, 3 not quite 10 months after the Harvard speech, President Truman signed the 4-year plan of economic action providing a bulwark against communism. Subsequently, ERP organization has been completed and supplies are cascading into continental ports.

Vote of the House to curtail our spending abroad is naturally a shock both at home and abroad at this late hour. The planning has been predicated on about $2,000,000,000 more than the House voted. Basis of the estimated need in the first place was assertedly an irreducible minimum.

From all accounts the nations participating in the ERP are mystified by the action of the lower house—which is quite natural considering that Americans, too, are puzzled. The confusion and despair coming as an outgrowth should wreathe the sleepless Communists in smiles.

Our burst of speed in establishing a beachhead against communism under the Marshall plan will not amount to much if we do not advance quickly. Hope of rectification of the Representatives' mistake rests with the Senate and Internationalist ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG. Observance of the first anniversary of the Marshall plan is as grim as spending a birthday in a hospital.

Foreign Aid Appropriation Bill, 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1948

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most far-reaching appropriation bills ever considered by Congress or any other parliamentary body. It carries with it a total of some $6,000,000,000 for financial aid to 21 foreign countries. The Committee on Appropriations, after many weeks of exhaustive study, has recommended a cut of approximately one and a half billion dollars. I believe it is necessary to aid in the recovery and rehabilitation of war-torn nations. We are willing to supply them with necessities, but we are not willing to finance a lot of foolish projects just for the sake of spending money. After examining all the testimony, I am convinced that this reduced appropriation, if properly administered, will be ample to take care of all essential items under the Marshall plan. I shall therefore support the committee in its recommendations.

The supporters of this vast foreign aid and rehabilitation project can be divided, roughly, into three categories: First, those level-headed, solid citizens who sincerely believe that we have a moral obligation to help reestablish war-stricken nations so that they, in turn, can do their part in stemming the tide of world communism; second, those who are inveterate "do-gooders" and support any missionary project that comes their way. They will reconvert and reconstruct, whether the reliefee likes it or not. With them it is an obsession. Third, the parasites and opportunists who live off the distress of others. In this last category we have some business enterprises and so-called charitable organizations who are out to get their cut, come what may.

Let me say that the great majority of individual Americans fall into the first category. On the other hand, the organized minorities—those who have access to powerful promotion and publicity media—are heavily concentrated in the second and third groups. More than once in the past decade have these traders in special privileges deceived a Congress into believing they voice the sentiments of a majority of the American public. Let me warn you against their smooth representations.

When you walk up and down the streets of America and your laboring man tells you he is paying too much for his shirts, or somebody says he is paying too much for cotton or wool hose, and when you go into the butcher shop and meat prices are too high, you may then wonder whether an appropriation committee should give a request for an appropriation the once over in order that the speculators of America and the speculators of the world do not take advantage of the American taxpayers' dollars which represent these huge appropriations.

We have heard a great deal said about the peoples of China and the rest of the earth, and heard a great deal of proper concern expressed about raising their standard of living and starting them on their way to a peaceful, happy, prosperous world. That is all magnificent. It is a splendid objective upon which we are all agreed. It is the objective the world has pursued for 2,000 years not entirely successfully. But is it not about time we said a word about the poor people who are going to carry the burden for this and all other expenses we are improvidently loading on their shoulders, and I refer to the working man who labors 8 hours a day from one end of the United States to the other and pays for this expenditure in the form of hidden taxes on everything he buys.

Many Members on this floor have raised their voices against inflation and the high cost of living, but most of these same Members are among the first to vote for increased spending whenever an opportunity presents itself. The chief cause today of high prices is reckless governmental expenditures which directly result in inflation. When you return home to your constituents you will be called to account when the prices rise, when the effect of this appropriation and the $5,000,000,000 additional Army, Navy, and other appropriations make themselves felt in the price level and in the scarcities. All that the Committee on Appropriations has done has been to try and spare the country to a small extent from the inescapable storm of inflation that is going to fall upon the Members of Congress who have no regard for the taxpayer and the workingman—the ultimate burden-bearer of this and similar appropriations.

Time will not permit me to discuss more than one item which will be affected by this reduced appropriation. I refer to tobacco. I don't believe there is any one Member on the floor of this House who can really justify the expenditure of $110,000,000 to buy tobacco to be sent abroad. There is no justification or excuse for it except to get rid of surplus tobacco now in the hands of the Government. We are only spending $83,000,000 for meat, $12,000,000 for eggs, and $6,000,000 for dried fruits. We have millions of cases of surplus canned foods in this country, but none of this is to be sent. The starving call for bread and we send them tobacco. Nearly $1 out of every seventeen will be spent on the American tobacco market for tobacco to be delivered to starving Europeans—tobacco to keep the peace. And you might be interested in knowing that if the original request of ECA is granted, Great Britain will receive 218,260,000 pounds of tobacco, or about 5 pounds per person. This tobacco costs around $119,000,000, most of which is sent as a free gift by the taxpayers of America. The British Government takes this tobacco and imposes an import tax of $11.74 per pound.

All of a sudden the $119,000,000 worth of United States tobacco becomes the equivalent of $2,500,000,000 to the British Government for budget-balancing purposes. The tobacco given by the United States is sold to the processor by the British Government at the Government's price plus the import duty. The processor, in turn, sells to the distributor, who sells to the public and, eventually, a Briton wanting a smoke pays the equivalent of 70 cents for a package of cigarettes that costs 15 cents in the United States.

If the cut is adopted as proposed by the Appropriations Committee tobacco will be one of the items affected. When this proposed cut was first suggested by the head of the British Food Commission, Maurice I. Hutton, on April 7, 1948, wrote to Mr. Charles E. Gage, who is Director of the Tobacco Branch in our United States Department of Agriculture, as follows:

A reduction in the total programs would necessarily involve a reduction in our request for certain individual commodities. Much as we should wish to obtain our needed requirements of tobacco, I have little doubt that in

such circumstances tobacco would be one of the items which we would have to reduce.

The record disclosed that Mr. Gage, representing our Department of Agriculture, had been very active in urging the British to take more American tobacco as a gift under the ECA Act. Back in January of this year, when it appeared Congress might not approve of the tobacco gift, Mr. Gage wrote a letter to Mr. Harry Jefferson, president of Waitt & Bond, Ltd., saying:

It has been exceedingly thoughtful and nice of you to keep on sending me cigars week after week, but I could not possibly feel comfortable in accepting them longer with the way the business outlook has changed and the way it is affecting the fortunes of W. & B.

I am informed that Waitt & Bond are tobacco exporters—apparently a British corporation.

Another significant fact is that Ireland, which was not even in the war, nor devastated by the war, nor threatened with communism, is urged to receive a huge allotment of tobacco, simply because the planners of this program decided that 88,000,000 pounds sterling out of the recovery program should be allocated to Eire.

An Irish newspaper, the Cork Examiner, in January of this year, carried an interesting editorial. Bear in mind that this is an Irish newspaper:

Many citizens of Eire must have opened their eyes in wonder when they learned that Eire stands to be allocated almost eighty-eight million pounds out of the United States contribution toward the recovery of Europe.

It is, of course, inadvisable to look a gift horse in the mouth, and the general feeling will be to thank America for her thoughful generosity, which is all the more noteworthy when we remember that when she asked us to expel Nazi representatives in Dublin we refused.

That is, Ireland refused our request for a little cooperation in ending use of the country as an enemy spy base. I read on:

We also turned down a suggestion that we might allow her facilities in certain ports. We were neutral during the war, and we emphasized our neutrality on many occasions.

Now, of course, we cannot blame Ireland or any other country for accepting our gifts if we insist on it, but the American people are entitled to know these facts.

The report of the Appropriations Committee conclusively shows that many of the countries abroad are actually exporting surpluses of some of the very items we are shipping to them. These countries, of course, will find tobacco, coffee, cotton, steel, wheat, and oil acceptable in any amounts as gifts, but the committee has found that they are no longer needed in such quantities originally proposed and recommend that we save $1,500,000,000 of Uncle Sam's money.

My colleagues, I appeal to you to exercise discretion—to use the taxpayers' dollars wisely, in order that the needy humanity the world over can get some relief, and that the American people are not impoverished as a result of the action we take here. Above all, let us put Americanism at the head of the priority list.

Palestine Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from Mr. Paul Ginsberg, of Atlanta, Ga., my personal friend of many years standing, a man who served with distinction during World War II, winning several awards, including the Purple Heart and Cluster, who is permanently disabled from injuries received in combat, who is now serving as Georgia Department Commander of the Disabled American Veterans. In this letter Mr. Ginsberg has discussed the position of American Jews with reference to the Palestine situation.

Mr. Ginsberg is active in all veterans' organizations, being national vice commander of the Disabled American Veterans, commander of Betty Harrison Jones Chapter, No. 1, DAV, and department commander of the Jewish War Veterans of Georgia. In addition to holding these offices in veterans organizations, he is active in the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars, as well as in local community civic organizations in Atlanta, and a man of outstanding integrity and a capable attorney.

I think it is worth while to present these views for the consideration of Congress, and under leave previously granted, I insert herewith Mr. Ginsberg's letter to me:

Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: When I was in your office some few days ago, we discussed the conflicting accounts of the implications of Jewry in the partition of Palestine. I deemed it advisable to relate my clear understanding of the philosophy and attitude of the American Jew in this matter, which is hereafter set forth.

Certain groups, through malice, are endeavoring to create a confusion seeking to leave some stigma of possible inconsistency between the obligations of the Jews as Americans. There is no such problem. This has been a proven fact by the wonderful war records of the Jews in World War II as well as in every war in which this great country has participated.

It is clear to me that there will be no political identification of Jews outside of Palestine with whatever government that may be instituted there. Politically the Jews are not split personalities, and they have demonstrated their loyalty to this country by the death rolls of every battlefield in which this great country has participated.

What should be the attitude of Jews toward a new state of Palestine? They have merely affirmed their sympathy with those who wish to settle in Palestine, just as the Irish did, in demanding a free state in Ireland, as the Greeks did with reference to the situation in Greece, and as humanitarians who, like all Americans, believe in freedom, the very sinew and tissue of this great country. Is not that the true American and Christian humanitarian attitude? At present this land is beset with the horrows of violence and bloodshed and its shores closed to that suffering remnant of downtrodden European Jewry which yearns to go there. Should not we Americans lend our outstretched arms to aid those suffering peoples who seek a land where they can be a free people? We Americans who love freedom, the very basis and the reason for the creation of this great country, should recall the old welcome to the oppressed of which we were so proud to shout many years ago. Let us recall the inscription on our Statue of Liberty, which stands so proud as the beacon of American idealism, which is:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses, yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore,
Send these, the homeless, tempest tossed to me:
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

Do not those words set forth an American policy, the American way of life? Is not that idealism, the same as expressed by the American Jewry with reference to Palestine? Surely, the position is the same.

In helping Palestine the Jews will do nothing which in any degree will constitute a violation of the laws of the executive action of the United States. True, they are insistent upon the enforcement of the mandate of the United Nations, but is that unreasonable? The United Nations Assembly did not merely decide a dispute between two peoples—it prescribed a course of international conduct, a measure to insure world peace. The world must abide by the decisions of the United Nations. Responsible Jewish leaders ask only that the Security Council of the United Nations create a sufficient constabulary to preserve peace and order in Palestine and to make clear to the world that the decision of the United Nations Organization is not to be treated as a mere scrap of paper. It is vital, not only to the Jews in Palestine, not only to the preservation of the holy shrines, but to the peace of the world, that the dignity and integrity of a resolution of the Assembly of the United Nations be defended against bloodthirsty attempts to thwart it, as have appeared thus far.

The Jewish people in Palestine, in sharp contrast to the Arabs, who have avowed their intentions to flout by force the decision of the United Nations, were prompt to give of their youth and labor and did organize the Jewish brigade to support the British forces in the Middle East to hurl back Nazi forces, while the record of the Arabs and the Grand Mufti in that hour of peril was one of aid and comfort to our enemies, the Nazi armies, who had sworn to ravage and subjugate our own country and our allies.

An embargo has been placed on the importation of munitions into Palestine, yet this same Grand Mufti, can draw arms from Arab States, who in turn receive these arms from Great Britain, while the small group of defenseless people in Palestine must depend on the Haganah force, a defense force which is a band of Jewish men and women claiming no objective other than the defense of their lives, their hearths, and their homes. The conduct of the Arabs in Palestine is a threat to international peace. The state of Israel should have the right to purchase arms and munitions to defend themselves.

This position is not merely a pro-Jewish position. This is a pro-American position and a pro-United Nations position. We are a peace-loving people and the American Jews cannot conceive that our country, the outstanding champion of a peaceful and democratic world, will see fit to view with indifference the ready collaboration of any other nation to challenge security.

From North to South, from East to West
They faced the foe, they met the test!
What more could Jew and Gentile give
Than die for us, that we might live!

My kindest regards to you.
Sincerely yours,

PAUL GINSBERG.

Address by Hon. John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 9, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made before the Third Annual Convention of the Amphibian Engineer Association at Boston, Mass., on Saturday, June 5, 1948:

Gentlemen, it is always a good feeling to be with a great outfit, a feeling second only to being part of a great outfit.

I envy you your membership in the Amphibian Engineer Association and all that it stands for.

I want to join in welcoming you to Massachusetts—the mother State of America's amphibian glory.

In establishing your Boston beachhead, you have moved in, I must say, by all manner and means unbecoming true amphibians; by rail, by air and by smooth auto highway. But Boston does not begrudge you these luxuries.

Within a few hours the entire Nation will be looking back 4 years to one of the most tense moments in world history—D-day—June 6, 1944. Many of you were there as you were everywhere that the going was toughest.

At Oran, Omaha, and Okinawa. At Salerno, Samar, and Sansapor; Leyte, Luzon, and the Lingayen Gulf. At Bohol and Balikpapen. As I chant them now, these names have a sort of musical ring, but you know the kind of music that was played there.

It was the same monotonous music which one engineer special brigade listened to during 82 combat landings. Eighty-two combat landings. The longest list of combat operations of any unit in the entire United States armed forces. And, as I don't have to tell you, every one of these 82 combat landings stuck. During its campaign, this same brigade brought down 42 Jap planes, mainly with small-arms fire, and killed over 1,000 Japs.

On one occasion, a boat company met and repelled an attack which the enemy launched as the boat company hit the beach.

Swinging to the logistics side of the amphibian engineer saga, it is now proud history that two amphibian engineer brigades handled a cargo tonnage across Omaha Beach which was the equivalent for a like period handled by the combined port facilities of the cities of Philadelphia and Baltimore. This was on an open beach with only a breakwater of sunken ships.

And when Patton's Third Army was coming back to the beach for its supplies—when it was slowed down due to the lack of essential supplies—these brigades responded by adding to its around-the-clock shift every man in the entire organization—clerks, cooks, colonels, and corporals. The cargo moved off the boats and onto the roads, and Patton moved again with his usual speed, like lightning.

The back-breaking toil on Omaha Beach went forward in the face of heavy casualties. The supplies and equipment that were not barged ashore or dukw'd ashore were brought ashore in small boats, or the boats were landed and unloaded by hand.

A brigade quartermaster platoon—apparently figuring that it had some time on its hands during the landing—managed to muscle its way into a ranger battalion and slug it out with the Germans.

Just let it be said that in the early fighting the entire rate of advance of our armies across France was entirely dependent upon the logistical support from Omaha Beach.

Yours is a very rich tradition indeed; one filled with courage, teamwork, efficiency, skill, speed; with contempt for danger, and with a tremendous capacity for sacrifice.

I cannot attempt tonight to recount the brilliant successes of each of the various engineer special brigades. Nor would it be possible for me to single out your Noces (like Close), Trudeaus (Trew-Doe), Wolfes, Hoges (Hoag), Thompsons, Ogdens, Heaveys (Hee-vee), Houstons, Quinns, and Mulligans, without running the list down the line and through the ranks until I had named every last amphibian soldier.

I'll just name one amphibian soldier tonight. But in naming him I want to read again the citation which accompanied his Congressional Medal of Honor:

"Private Junior N. Van Noy, Five Hundred and Thirty-second Engineer Boat and Shore Regiment: For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action with the enemy near Finschafen, New Guinea, on October 17, 1943. When wounded late in September Private Van Noy declined evacuation and continued on duty. On October 17, 1943, he was gunner in charge of a machinegun post only 5 yards from the water's edge when the alarm was given that three enemy barges loaded with troops were approaching the beach in the early morning darkness. One landing barge was sunk by allied fire but the other two beached 10 yards from Private Van Noy's emplacement. Despite his exposed position, he poured a withering hail of fire into the debarking enemy troops. His loader was wounded by a grenade and evacuated. Private Van Noy, also grievously wounded, remained at his post, ignoring calls of nearby soldiers urging him to withdraw, and continued alone to fire with deadly accuracy. He expended every round and was found covered with wounds, dead beside his gun. In this action Private Van Noy killed at least half of the 39 enemy taking part in the landing. His heroic tenacity at the price of his life not only saved the lives of many of his comrades but enabled them to annihilate the attacking detachment."

Your association has for its purpose the perpetuation and strengthening of the amphibian comradeship and ideals to which I pay tribute. It is to all of you that I say "well done." And it is to those men who never came back from their beachheads that you and I tonight silently promise that their job will remain well done.

In its present state of affairs, the world should be taking a lesson from the amphibian scorebook—not only from its magnificent combat pages, but also from the chapter concerned with the formative and development stages, where it would find a pattern of determination and clear thinking for surmounting most all of the man-made obstacles to unity, cohesion and cooperation.

It is not by chance that the engineer amphibian command can claim to be the first truly unified fighting force to have pulled in and carried with it not only the American Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Air Force, but the British Army and Navy as well. (If the amphibian engineers had had the notion that they could have made use of them whatsoever, I'm certain they would have swept into their fold not only the Democrats but also the Republicans. I still think the amphibian command could have found room for the Republicans at Carabelle.)

Unification on the amphibian scale was no easier upon its elements than has been over-all unification of the Armed Services on the grand scale of total defense. There were bound to be differences of opinion, tradition and ambition. The important fact is that when these differences were encountered by the men charged with organizing our amphibian force they were analyzed intelligently—and vigorously attacked. These differences were dissolved in an air of sober understanding, not detoured or left to widen the gap between give and take.

In its original training the engineer amphibian command had a Coast Guard detachment administering boat training. Shore training and doctrine came under a Marine Corps officer; Coast and Geodetic Survey officers were used in their specialty. And goodness only knows the range of techniques contributed to amphibian training by the Mississippi River gang, and the New England fishermen and motorboat men.

The amphibian planners performed in true American character. It is the only way we really know how to behave, but we are being put to extreme ends in our efforts to go on expecting the same behavior by others.

Yours was a fighting and a logistical mission and you accomplished it exceedingly well. Now, instead of sitting back on your laurels, you are eagerly promoting the peacetime development of the wartime weapon you called your own. You are aware of the unpleasant fact that victory is slow, almost vengefully so, in producing the peace that it promised. You are self-alerted to this realization. You trained for and fought for objectives in terms of proper preparation. These are still terms which you understand full well, and that is a natural and a very fortunate development.

You now constitute a spearhead of thinking which must lead the way to national thinking about the necessity and virtues of preparedness—preparedness to join with other nations in a common front of understanding, preparedness to defend the democratic tradition against those who would bring about its downfall, and, just as important preparedness to strengthen and improve our Nation in the ways of peace, so that American tradition and American intelligence and strength can work constructively, not only for our own good, but for that of all mankind.

Appointment of Thomas C. Buchanan to the Federal Power Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette on June 7.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUCHANAN'S DEFEAT

The public utility lobbyists who appeared before a Senate subcommittee in opposition to the appointment of Thomas C. Buchanan to the Federal Power Commission couldn't prove that he was socialistic or that he had a bad record. So the talk turned to "judicial temperament," whatever that is, and it was on that obscure characteristic that Mr. Buchanan's nomination was defeated.

Actually, the hearings were just so much political window-dressing. The Republican majority was prepared to vote against him whatever his temperament or other qualifications. The fact is that Mr. Buchanan, a Beaver, Pa., lawyer and former member of

the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, was up against the decision of the Republican Policy Committee to hold up confirmation of presidential appointees for the remainder of this session, with certain exceptions.

The thinking behind this decision is that the Republicans will soon have their own man in the White House and he can appoint party stalwarts to long-term commission positions like that to which President Truman had named Mr. Buchanan.

Of course, this is nothing new. In 1932, when the Democrats had come into control of the Senate, they failed to confirm nearly 1,200 of President Hoover's appointments. But by whatever group this procedure is followed, it is bad. It results (as it will in the Federal Power Commission where the four members are divided evenly on policy) in delay and inefficiency in important Government agencies.

The spoils system has long been an accepted part of American political life. We doubt that the merit system will ever replace it fully. Still, the merit system is progressing while the spoils system becomes increasingly objectionable to an enlightened electorate. Some day, perhaps, one of the major parties will raise above the spoils system and put the public welfare first.

We should live so long!

I'd Rather Be Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Samuel Grafton which appeared in the New York Post on June 8, 1948:

I'D RATHER BE RIGHT

(By Samuel Grafton)

The western powers are planning to set up a new German state. One wonders if they would let the Arabs invade it, and, if the Arabs did, whether the western powers would be satisfied with suggesting a meek little truce, to take effect someday or other.

One wonders, too, if the British are going to delay recognizing the new German state, as they have refused to recognize Israel, on the ground that there is no telling how long it is going to last, or what its precise boundaries are going to be.

(Flash: Late cable—the last question has been answered. The British Cabinet has met and approved the plan for a federated state in western Germany. This makes the British in effect, the first to recognize the new Germany. It is just 3 weeks since they sneered at us for being the first to recognize Israel.)

AS COMPARED WITH ISRAEL

It seems to me inevitable that these comparisons should be made between the fortunes of the new state of Israel and the forthcoming new state of western Germany. (What shall it be called? Germania? How about Westmania?) If I were the Arabs, I would be very careful about laying a hand on the new German state. The western German federation is going to be well protected. It will, in some ways, be the best protected state in the world; a strange country, without a popular hero, without a program, without any clearly articulated political development, yet one summoned majestically unto life by six Western Powers. It will, in fact, be a country which has a guaranty of life even before it exists, as contrasted with Israel, which indisputably exists, but has no guaranties of any kind.

THE ARTIFICIAL STATE

There is something artificial about the new German state; it will come into existence only because certain other nations want a new state, with certain functions, to exist in a certain place. The new state will come alive without even the issuance of a single handbill on a single street, which is as strange a thing as the birth of a baby without a cry.

It is strange, too, that what purports to be a birth should seem so much like a death; the death of hope, perhaps, for a really remade, reborn, really democraticized Germany. Nobody would think of applying these words to the patching job the western nations are doing. The German people do not need a state, but the miracle that makes one has not yet happened, the dream has not been dreamed in the lonely ruined rooms; and there is no cry because this is not a birth. This is the attempted making of a new creature out of bits and left-over pieces.

IF IT'S LIFE WE SEEK

And it seems to me that we of the West are hurting ourselves; that it would be safer, on every level, if we were to surround with our tender care a genuinely new state, like Israel, and let Germany wait to be born until its turn. For what we of the West seek is, after all, a continuance of life on this planet; and there is life in Israel, the real thing, the fire and the music. When I think of what we are trying to do in Germany, I think, for some reason, of a cinema alchemist, working on some impossible construction in his cellar, while the unnoticed spring rolls unseen by his window.

Centennial of the University of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on May 29, 1948, the State of Wisconsin celebrated its one hundredth anniversary of admission into the Union as our thirtieth State. Wisconsin rejoices, too, in another of its forthcoming anniversaries—the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the University of Wisconsin.

Within these short 10 decades this great institution of higher learning has written itself into the dynamic history of every phase of life in the Badger State. Within every field it has made constructive contributions. It has sent its graduates far and wide to the Nation and to the world as bringers of the light of truth in all the fields of learning and human activity.

Today, under the able leadership of President E. B. Fred, the university and all its devoted alumni are laying plans worthy of this dramatic and inspiring centennial observance. The celebrations will include a world-wide network of founders' day dinners on February 5, 1949, and an anniversary commencement week in June 1949. Among the many memorial projects will be preparation of a two-volume history of the university.

The plans for the observance call for four separate projects—special celebrations, memorials, academic conferences, and fine arts performances. I might note that in connection with the academic conferences invitations have been sent out to some of the leading universities of the land. Each day more events are being arranged for in connection with the centennial.

I ask unanimous consent at this time that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a list of some of the events that will be held, because I know that the broad scope of these events will be of tremendous interest to folks in all lines of human endeavor.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

The tentative schedule of university centennial events follows. Events will be held at Madison unless otherwise noted.

June 4: Symposium on pulverized coal burning and high-pressure steam generation, Milwaukee.

June 20–22: Meeting of Cornbelt section of American Society of Agronomy.

June 21–23: Meeting of American Physical Society.

August 7–29: Exhibit at State centennial exposition, Milwaukee.

August 29 to September 4: Meeting of chemical engineering division of American Society for Engineering Eduction.

September 2–4: Symposium on housing research.

September 5–10: Meeting of American Mathematical Society, Mathematical Association of America, Institute of Mathematical Statistics, and Econometric Society.

September 6–8: Symposium on steroid hormones.

September 7–11: Symposium on combustion and flame and exposition phenomena.

September 25: Concert, New York Philharmonic Orchestra, Leopold Stokowski conducting.

Art exhibit, A Survey of Art Techniques.

Historical exhibit set up at historical library.

Broadcasts of special centennial programs to begin.

Production of university moving picture to begin.

October 8–10: National educational conference.

October 11–13: Symposium on humanities in American society.

October 25–30: Drama performances at Memorial Union Theater.

SHAKESPEAREAN PLAYS

November 2 to December 6: Symposium on significant history: 1848–1948.

November 5–6: Concert, Fritz Kreisler, violinist.

November 18–19: Margaret Webster's Hamlet and Macbeth, Wisconsin Union Theater.

Art exhibit, State centennial exhibition of contemporary Wisconsin art.

December 6–11: Drama performance, Wisconsin players.

December 14–15: Concert, Florence Quartararo, soprano.

December 28–31: Meeting of Association of American Geographers and American Society for Professional Geographers.

January 7–8, 1949: Concert, Todd Duncan, baritone.

January 12: Ballet Theater performance.

January 13–14: Symposium on science and civilization.

Art exhibit, Decorative Art in Wisconsin.

Art exhibit, Growth of a Building.

February 1–12: Alfred Lunt and Lynn Fontanne (tentative).

February 5: Founders' Day dinners at alumni centers throughout the world with national radio hookup from Madison.

February 5: Publication of the History of the University of Wisconsin, by Professors Curti and Carstensen.

February 12–13: Concert, Gregor Piatigorsky, cellist.

Concert, university centennial composition by Prof. Gunnar Johansen.

Art exhibit, $1,000,000 loan of old masters from the New York Metropolitan Museum of Art.

FOLK MUSIC FESTIVAL

March 3–5: Concert, Vladimir Horowitz, pianist.

March 7–12: Drama performance, Wisconsin players.

March 25: Concert, Burl Ives, ballad singer.

Campus folk music festival.

Visiting drama performance.

April 4–9: Drama performance, Wisconsin players.

April 14–16: Meeting of Misissippi Valley Historical Society.

April 14–16: Symposium on American regionalism

April 18–20: Meeting of Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts and Letters.

April 21–23: Meeting of Midwest Economic Association.

April 21–24: Meeting of Wilson Ornithological Society and Wisconson Society of Ornithology.

Symposium on cocurricular education.

Art exhibit, annual student art show.

May 7–8: Symposium on interrelation of law and American economy.

May 9–14: Drama performance, Wisconsin players.

May 15: Music festival concert, "Artists of the Future."

May 18: Music festival concert, Pro Arte Quartet.

May 20: Music festival concert, massed performance of university choruses, orchestras, and bands.

May 30: Requiem for Wisconsin war dead.

Symposium on labor legislation and social security.

Art exhibit, annual rural art show.

CHEMISTRY SYMPOSIUM

June 19–22: Symposium on organic chemistry.

Symposium on conservation of Wisconsin's natural resources.

Centennial commencement

Centennial dinner, "The University of Wisconsin in the century ahead."

Alumni reunion

Dedication of centennial memorials contributed through the University of Wisconsin foundation.

Art exhibit.

September 5–7: Meeting of council of National Society of Phi Beta Kappa.

September 8–10: Symposium on plant growth substances.

French Strip German Zone and British Take It Easy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include two news items from the current press. Inasmuch as the appropriation bill to provide money for the ECA or the Marshall plan, is now before the Congress, the membership, no doubt will be interested in the results of the administration of our affairs in Europe:

The items follow:

FRENCH STRIP GERMAN ZONE AS UNITED STATES FEEDS IT—PARIS TAKES CATTLE AND WINE

(By Larry Rue)

FRANKFURT, GERMANY, June 7.—Although the food situation in the French zone is improving, especially since the United States donated $100,000,000 to feed Germans there, the over-all economic situation is getting worse, a recent visit disclosed.

From the Luxemburg frontier to Coblenz, the Mosel River meanders between steep banks where vineyards dating back to Roman days produce wine famous for its deep golden color, delicate bouquet, and rich flavor.

On the more gentle slopes and in the surrounding valleys agriculture, dairying, and fruit growing are the main industries.

FORESTS DENUDED

On top of the hills the Germans for centuries had cultivated extensive forests which contributed to the general wealth of the population. Now large areas of the forests have been denuded by the French. Unscientific cutting has ruined many more.

Dairy herds have been depleted by requisitions. Lack of machinery is crippling agriculture, and the wine growers so far have been forced to deliver to the French military government 92 percent of their wine crops and stocks so there is not even enough left to fill the monthly ration of one bottle for each adult.

BRITISH TAKE IT EASY NOW THAT THERE'S UNITED STATES AID

(By William Fulton)

LONDON, June 7.—With Marshall aid in the bag, British workers are taking it easier these days, according to official Government figures published in the current Ministry of Labor Gazette. The Gazette discloses two ways the country was slacking up, as follows:

1. During the first 4 months of 1948, the number of working days lost through work stoppages reached the staggering total of 1,216,000. From January to April 1947, the contrasting figure was 927,000.

2. During the first 4 months of 1948, 235,000 men and women workers succeeded in obtaining reductions in hours of work.

COAL MINERS LEAD

The coal-mining industry, which is in the second year of socialization under Government control, was the bellwether for other industries in strikes and wage disp During the 4-month period this year, 109,900 miners quit work and the calculated loss in working days was 289,000.

By contrast, 70,900 miners threw down their picks for a loss of 132,000 working days during the same period of 1947.

Service in the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, in my book service in the armed forces in peace or in war is honorable. I believe in the career soldier. His services are vital to the Nation and it is not right for the Nation to neglect him when physical misfortune overtakes him.

Last week William M. Floyd, national commander, Regular Veterans' Association, appeared before the Senate Finance Committee and made a statement along this line, which I ask go into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where it would be available to the Congress and the country.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am the national commander of the Regular Veterans' Association of the United States. Our organization consists of members who have honorably served their country in time of war and peace, and those who are still serving. The Regular Veterans' Association is Nation-wide in scope, and is the only veterans' organization which includes in its proposed tenets the protection of the rights and privileges of all veterans.

The bill under consideration by this committee today, S. 2160, was introduced by Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama. A companion bill, H. R. 5402, was introduced by J. HARRY MCGREGOR, Congressman from Ohio, and is essentially a bill to improve the status of the disabled peacetime veteran and his dependents, and to place him on the same plane of recognition as a war veteran.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, the purpose of this bill is to stimulate recruiting and to offer security to the members of the Regular Establishment in case they become disabled while serving their country in line of duty. Do you know, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that a man serving today receives 75 percent of the war rates? Is this fair? Don't you think that the man or woman serving today is just as valuable to his country as those who were drafted, or entered by way of selective service?

In all instances, the peacetime veterans have formed the backbone of our national defense and security. I think there can be no disputing that fact. They have constituted the first line of defense in all wars into which this country has been forced and with their experience have saved many months in the training of a citizen Army and Navy in time of war. These peacetime veterans have been in the past, and are now, the guinea pigs in testing new equipment in its development, such as airplanes, parachutes, gliders, submarines of more or less effectiveness in the beginning, the tests of ammunition, tanks, guns of all kinds and types, demolition apparatus, and many others, and in developing numberless theories and scientific experimen.s both in the Army and Navy.

Mr. Chairman, it is the opinion of the Regular Veterans' Association that a man who has served his country honorably, whether in so-called peacetime or in wartime, is entitled to the maximum protection the Government can give him. We can see no difference between a man or woman being disabled in peacetime and one disabled in wartime. In both cases the veteran receiving such disability was actively serving the country in time of need. The members of the Regular Establishment are Americans, too.

However, the Veterans' Administration has never agreed to any benefits for the members of the Regular Establishment. You ask me why. I don't know. Don't they feel that they should have this Nation well guarded by members of the Regular Estab-

lishment? These men are on duty 365 days of the year, and they should be given every consideration while serving.

A member of the armed forces who is mustered out of the service with a CDD with less than 20 years' service has to abide by the decision shown on his medical record, and ordinarily his remuneration is less than 50 percent, which would entitle him to $51.75 a month; but if this man served 20 years, he could retire on half pay. May I point out to you that there are 22,996 men who are drawing less than 50 percent, and half of them are drawing only 10 percent, or $10.35 a month.

These men should be entitled to the same security as war veterans. They may not be able to return to the same type of work they were engaged in before entering the service. They are required to call regularly at the Veterans' Administration to see if they have recuperated from their disability. Who knows but what this small compensation that we offer these veterans of 19 years or less may be taken away from them overnight.

We cannot agree with the Veterans' Administration and its recommendations. Previously the War Department made the same recommendation, but may I point out to you and members of this committee of the Seventy-ninth Congress, I was able to break this barrier by talking and writing to the legislative branch of G–1. At this time I would like to submit a copy dated Tuesday, May 7, 1946, a statement made by Col. William H. Woods, chief of legislative branch, G–1, of the War Department.

STATEMENT OF COL. WILLIAM H. WOOD, CHIEF OF LEGISLATIVE BRANCH, G–1, WAR DEPARTMENT

"Mr. Chairman, over the week end I learned you were to have an early hearing on H. R. 3908. On turning back to the report the War Department submitted on this bill, I was surprised to learn that we had submitted an opposition report. I went into the matter, going back through the files of the Department, beginning in 1933, and I observed therein that up until approximately 1943 the War Department had always held that pension benefits for disabilities incurred in time of peace and those incurred in time of war should be on the same basis.

"The War Department had not sponsored or testified on that point before any congressional committee, due, primarily, to the fact that the Veterans' Administration is charged with the administration and direction of policies as regards pensions for military personnel; but the Department always stressed in reports to the various congressional committees that it favored the establishment of pensions on a basis of equality.

"I took the matter up with an Assistant Chief of Staff, Maj. Gen. Willard S. Paul, and pointed out to him that this report was in contradiction to a long-established War Department policy, and I asked him if there was any reason why I should not appear here and correct that statement. Before coming here it was necessary to communicate with the Bureau of the Budget that we were changing our stand on this matter.

"The Bureau of the Budget informed us that we should tell this committee that this proposed legislation is not in acocrd with the program of the President. I want to make that point.

"It seems that the background of the War Department's old policy of equality of benefits for those injured either in wartime or peacetime was based upon the theory that the veterans' pension is provided in order to furnish them sufficient funds to live in a satisfactory manner. It did not seem that there was any reason to believe that a veteran who was disabled during peacetime could exist on any less than one who was injured in wartime.

"From my experience in the service I know that the older noncommissioned officers and enlisted men, particularly those who have dependents, go through a great many periods of apprehension concerning what is going to happen to them if they are disabled. And all of those men, particularly those in the combatant forces, are engaged in hazardous occupations from time to time. If they are disabled they are not allowed to reenlist. They lose their means of acquiring a livelihood. In many cases they return to civil life handicapped physically and professionally, in that they have devoted so much of their lives to the Army that they are not in position to step out and demand a livable salary for whatever trade they might work at.

"I think it very sound that pensions for disabled veterans, regardless of when they acquired disability, in wartime or peacetime, should be on a basis of equality. There should not, in my opinion, be any differentiation.

"Mr. McGregor. I want to congratulate the colonel on his splendid statement, and especially for his taking the initiative in bringing this matter of error to the attention of his superiors in the War Department with a view to rectifying it. He has told us that the original policy of the Department was different than the report on the pending bill.

"It is a matter of regret that the statement has been made that this proposal is not in accord with the financial program of the President. Some of us find it pretty near impossible to understand the financial program as recommended by the President, when he wants to lend or give great sums to one nation and then refuses to recommend that further financial assistance be given to our own veterans. I certainly criticize and disagree with such a policy."

It appears to us that very little consideration has been given the issue of increasing pensions or recommendations for enlisted personnel of the Regular Establishment with a view to increasing our ranks by offering inducement to get these veterans to reenlist in their grade. Haven't we, Mr. Chairman, tried everything to build up our armed forces—but so far we do not have the enlistments pouring in to give us the strengtn which you gentlemen authorized in the first session of this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I hear many gripes as to the benefits that are being given to World War II veterans, and the difference being shown those young lads who reenlist and who are on our beachheads today, and who will be on our beachheads tomorrow. This same veteran receives few of the benefits conceded to the World War veteran and returns to civilian life without sufficient reimbursement. However, he takes advantage of the so-called GI bill of rights; but if he becomes disabled 6 months or 6 years from today he must pay the same costs as others for a subsistence, a very bare subsistence is all that the Government provides for its most important servants, the enlisted personnel of the armed forces.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I would like to point out to you that a bill was passed giving the members of the Regular Establishment 90 percent of the war rates. You will recall that, and we are grateful to all the Members of the Seventy-ninth Congress who placed themselves on record to see that such legislation was consummated in Public Law 659, which was approved by the President on August 8, 1946.

Mr. Chairman, I also had the privilege of appearing before the House and Senate committees in conjunction with bills pertaining to increasing war veterans' compensation, and consequently the war veterans' compensation was increased 20 percent. It became Public Law 662, and became effective the first day of the first month following the passage of the act.

At this time I invite your attention to the report of the Veterans' Administration and its recommendation on the above * * * to the committee that "if favorable action is given to the bill, section 2, page 4 of the bill, near the bottom of the page, be changed to read: 'The increased rates provided by this act shall be effective from the first day of the second month following the passage of this act.'"

I point this out, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, merely to indicate the apparent discrimination advocated by the capitalistic Veterans' Administration against members of the regular armed forces who are protecting them today. Do you think that this is a fair recommendation? Weren't all members of the armed forces supposed to be treated alike—they were up to 1924—they received the same physical disability benefits acquired in line of duty as the war veterans.

Mr. Chairman, if this country is to have an efficient standing Army, Navy, and Air Force strong enough to stave off enemy attacks from without, the service must be made sufficiently attractive to invite young men and women to make a career of the service. The profession of arms has always been an honorable one throughout the history of the world. Let's keep it that way for the future security of this country of ours by providing a decent security for those who select active service in the armed forces of the United States as a career with all its attendant dangers both actual and potential, especially with the small return received for such service. I say that the best basic Army, Navy, and Air Force we can muster for the protection of this country must be professional and those who give their years to developing this armed security must be assured of individual security when their time and efforts are spent.

S. 2160 is sound. The necessity for increasing pensions or disability compensation for peacetime veterans as well as those of wartime veterans is imperative. No great amount of argument should be required to insure its enactment. As a matter of fact, no argument at all should be necessary.

In general, pensions are awarded to wartime veterans on the basis of the earning capacity lost by them because of their disabilities. It appears to us that the same viewpoint should be taken in the case of pensions for service-connected disabilities of peacetime veterans. Their earning capacity is reduced to the same extent as war veterans with similar disabilities. The man who loses a leg in line of duty in peacetime is not less disabled than one who loses his leg in time of war. The Government is, in our opinion, obligated to guarantee decent and adequate security for both, and increases to meet the cost of living.

During both World War I and World War II there were many veterans who never served outside the continental limits of the United States. Nevertheless, those who were disabled while training or in any manner connected with the service, received wartime pensions. This is true whether they served 30 minutes or 30 months. The peacetime veteran, however, may have served 19 years and 11 months for his country, then become disabled due to his service, and he must accept a pension or compensation of 25 percent less than the man who just happened to serve under the same or safer conditions in wartime without ever being overseas and in many instances never operating anything more dangerous than a typewriter or a mimeograph machine. Difference in disability compensations look like this:

Members of the Regular Establishment with service-connected disability on the Veterans' Administration rolls as of June 30, 1947, and an estimated average by the Veterans' Administration report that will be on the rolls in 1949

On rolls, June 30, 1947	Estimated average on the VA report for 1949	Disability percentage estimated VA report of 1949	Present rating under Public Law 639	Proposed rates of S. 2160	Monthly increase for each individual as proposed of S. 2160	Daily increase proposed, S. 2160	Additional monthly increases	
12,278	12,058	10	$10.35	$13.80	$3.45	$0.11½	$41,600.10	
4,233	4,157	20	20.70	27.60	6.90	.23	28,683.30	
8,625	8,471	30	31.05	41.40	10.35	.34½	87,674.85	
2,860	2,809	40	41.40	55.20	13.80	.46	38,764.20	
3,238	3,180	50	51.75	69.00	17.25	.57½	54,855.00	
1,862	1,829	60	62.10	82.80	20.70	.69	37,860.30	
948	931	70	72.45	96.60	24.15	.80½	22,483.65	
709	696	80	82.80	110.40	27.60	.90	19,209.60	
69	68	90	93.15	124.20	31.05	1.03½	2,111.40	
7,418	7,285	100	103.50	138.00	34.50	1.15	251,332.50	
								$584,574.90
SPECIAL COMPENSATION CASES								
(1,914)	(1,880)	K	$31.50	$42.00	$10.50	$0.35	$19,740.00	
OTHER SPECIAL CASES INCLUDED IN THE REPORT ON S. 2160								
249	245	L	$180.00	$240.00	$60.00	$2.00	$14,700.00	
38	37	M	211.50	282.00	70.50	2.35	2,608.50	
8	8	N	238.50	318.00	79.50	2.65	636.00	
28	27	O	270.00	360.00	90.00	3.00	2,430.00	$40,114.50
24	24	(1)	1,113.75	1,485.00	371.25		1,703.25	1,703.25
								626,392.65
								×12
42,587	41,825							7,516,711.80

[1] Code 61 through 71.
Average age, 44 years.

Special allowances for wartime veterans, under Public Laws 182 and 662, Seventy-ninth Congress, range, for the same disabilities, from $42 to $360.

Is one veteran more disabled than the other if he proves his entitlement to a service-connected disability? Can one veteran, whether peacetime or wartime, maintain his family more inexpensively than the other? In the long run, is the peacetime veteran less important to the country and its security than the wartime veteran? In the case of the peacetime veteran, he enlists, he volunteers his service perhaps for a career regardless of what happens. In case of war, the citizen soldier is drafted and is trained and instructed by the peacetime soldier who fights shoulder to shoulder with him. Is one more important than the other?

If the peacetime veteran was assured of a fairly decent security in the way of pension for disabilities incurred in line of duty, the service would be more attractive to younger men and women who could make it their profession, thereby keeping the Regular Establishment up to the necessary strength. There would be some measure of equality, then, in the economic condition of the men and women who serve years in the Regular Establishment and the average civilian worker.

Modern military science requires training enlisted specialists of many kinds. We of the Regular Veterans' Association believe that one of the best ways to attract these specialists and other capable men and women is to offer them future economic security in the event their careers are cut short by injury and disabilities contracted in line of duty; and that means increased peacetime pensions for the Regulars.

Mr. Chairman, again I refer to the Seventy-ninth Congress, which gave the Regular Establishment 90 percent of the war rates in effect at that time. Of course, Public Law 662 overshadowed this. I strongly urge that amends be made—regardless of the Veterans' Administration recommendation—in view of the exorbitant increase in the cost of living, as evidenced by the President of the United States in his speech on April 21. These veterans are disabled. They have used all their war bonds—if they had any—in order to put a crust of bread in the mouths of their families. This is one way in which we can show the members of the Regular Establishment that we are behind them—and we want an Army, Navy, and Air Force that will stave off the enemy.

As I have previously stated, S. 2160 is sound. We urge that favorable consideration be given the pending bill today.

Address by Hon. Ralph A. Gamble, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 9, 1948

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a speech by my colleague, RALPH A. GAMBLE, before the twenty-eighth annual conference of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks at Atlantic City on May 26, 1948:

Mr. Chairman, it is a privilege to address the mutual savings banks of America on the subject of Housing. Those institutions which specialize in encouraging our citizens to save a part of what they earn, constitute the real reserve strength of our country.

Democracy and the capitalist system are inseparable. Many with whom I have talked believe that the United States was never in a more critical position that it is today, and that it can endure in its present form only through personal thrift, and the continued expansion of individual enterprise.

For 16 years we have witnessed a continuous, deliberate attempt by the New Deal government to hamper the accumulation of surplus capital by the individual. Although the attacks were directed mostly on corporate business, the ultimate effect on the individual has been the same. High taxes and high expenditures by Government encourage and abet each other. The capital gains, excess profits, the graduated income taxes, and the attempt to enact the so-called basket tax are but a few examples. Great as are the people's resources today, as represented in savings accounts, home ownership and business investment, they are relatively limited in comparison with the vast amounts of capital accumulated by Government. Government stands today as a paternal, but nonetheless deadly competitor of the earned savings of the people.

You savings bankers are familiar with the cycles which mark the expansion and contraction of real estate. Let alone, these cycles take care of themselves. But in these past 16 years they have not been let alone. This tinkering with economic law, together with World War II, left us on VJ-day with an undetermined but undoubtedly tremendous shortage of dwellings.

The Joint Housing Committee, of which I have been chairman, was created to ascertain the facts, so that, on these facts, Congress could devise a new and a real national housing policy. Our work fell naturally into six categories:

First. How extensive is the shortage, and where is it the worst?

Second. What can be done to increase the supply and decrease the cost of all building materials?

Third. What can be done to increase the productivity of labor in the building trades?

Fourth. How can construction management be roused to greater responsibility and efficiency?

Fifth. What incentives can be provided to risk capital to enter the home-building field?

Sixth. What can be done to improve housing for the welfare and lowest-income groups?

Along with the trend during the last 16 years toward a greater and greater centralization of power in the Federal Government, there has been much agitation for Government ownership and operation of housing. From propaganda promoting the latter, the impression may have been gained by some that there is a shortage of some 15,000,000 homes. This estimate is based, not on the

premise that each family needs a separate dwelling, but that the slums must be cleared, and substandard dwellings, wherever located, replaced by federally owned and operated housing. The recipients of such benefaction, these proponents argue, are to be, not the welfare classes, but a vaguely defined income group, ranging now upward even to the $6,000 and $7,950 classes.

I am in favor of improved housing conditions for the welfare of lower income groups, but surely these groups do not include the $6,000 to $7,950 income groups. I feel also that local and State responsibility, financially, administratively, as well as legally, must be made a requirement for any further Federal grants or subsidies. The public-housing question is not one of emergency but one of social desire, with which I am in sympathy, but which I do not believe should be confused with the immediate housing problem confronting those centers of population to which millions were drawn by war manufacturing plants and where they have since remained, and to educational centers to which our returning ex-servicemen went (with their families) to complete their education.

With the assistance of the Census Bureau and other agencies, I reached the conclusion that at the beginning of 1947 there was an actual accrued shortage of between one and two million homes, that is, homes to house families now doubled up. The figure was probably much nearer to one million than to two. I learned that from 700,000 to 800,000 units are required yearly for the next 3 or 4 years to care for families newly formed. After that the number is expected to decrease. The realistic problem, then, is to keep up with the demand and whittle down the deficit as quickly as possible.

What is the record? In 1947, 835,000 new units were completed, and an estimated 175,000 more units were made available through conversion of existing buildings, a total addition of over 1,000,000, and many more conversions could have been made available if many of the cities had done their job—enforced their building codes.

This year we are surging ahead even faster. In the first 4 months of 1948 we started 257,000 new units, as contrasted with 205,000 units in the same period of 1947, an increase of 25 percent. A projected total for the entire year 1948, including conversions, would, therefore, be in the neighborhood of one and one-quarter million additional homes—a record-breaking figure.

The conclusion is that if this rate can be maintained we will have overcome the real shortage in a maximum of 4 years, perhaps a minimum of 2.

I should like to invite your attention to a printed report entitled "Housing in America—Its Present Status and Future Implications," prepared for the use of the Joint Committee on Housing. It is a factual analysis of the testimony presented to and the studies of the Joint Committee on Housing. It is available to you as a public document if you will write me at the House of Representatives.

In this factual analysis of testimony and studies you will readily understand one of our housing troubles. Since VJ-day certain key lines, like lumber, nails, soil pipe, gypsum products, and plumbing equipment, have either been in short supply, have been maldistributed, or have been so fantastically high priced, as to be prohibitive.

Our Joint Housing Committee activity, I believe, has been very instrumental in vastly increasing the supply and thereby, to a fractional degree, in bringing down the price of housing materials. The most disturbing of all factors, in my opinion, is that of European relief. I voted for such relief, but as chairman of the Joint Housing Committee, I have insisted that the administration must show more firmness and wisdom than it has in the recent past in allocating scarce housing materials for shipment abroad. We dare not permit the dollars we lend to prostrate nations unrestrainably to reenter this country to compete with the domestic building materials market. To do so will be to add to inflation, disappoint the homeless, and stimulate the demand that the Government take over all housing.

The Department of Justice, I feel, is remiss in not acting to free the great lumber industry from decrees which prevent agreements to reduce prices, as well as to raise them. Ineptitude on the part of War Assets Administration and the Navy Department continue soil pipe in a critical state. What appears to be selfishness among the integrated steel producers undoubtedly prevents larger output of nails by the nonintegrated plants. Americans were penalized to the extent of millions of dollars by black-market distribution in gypsum, traceable, in my opinion, to basic conditions described in the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. The situation in plumbing and other housing materials in scarce supply demands further vigorous attention by the Congress. But notwithstanding all the above, materials are reaching the market in steadily increasing volume.

Our Housing Committee was unified in one very important respect: It felt that a solution in the public interest could be attained only through seeking cooperation. This led to the appointment of cooperating committees from the building trades-unions, builders, building-supply manufacturers and distributors, industrialized housing manufacturers, real-estate operators, insurance interests, and mortgage and investment bankers. We held many informal hearings with these groups, and I believe every member of our committee agrees with me that the results were constructive and in the public interest.

This was particularly true among the builders and labor unions. The former agreed to our suggestion to explore grievances locally before reaching the breaking point. They also agreed to stand back of the buyer in cases of proven faulty construction. Considering the possibilities for misunderstanding, the cooperation achieved with the organized building-trades workers was remarkable, and is a testimonial to the leadership of the gentleman with whom I closely worked, Mr. Gray, president of the building trades department of the American Federation of Labor; Mr. Bates, chairman of the housing committee, AFL; Mr. Crow, of Houston; Mr. Haggerty, of San Francisco; Mr. Keenan, of Chicago; and Mr. McSpedon, of New York.

The three or four outstanding results of our successful enlistment of labor cooperation include increased productivity, accelerated apprentice training, reduction of on-site stoppages, and the elimination of some questionable practices, such as reglazing. It was my privilege on a number of occasions to meet with such international presidents as Messrs. Hutcheson, of the carpenters; Tracy, of the electrical workers; Maloney, of the operating engineers; McSorley, of the lathers; Lindelof, of the painters; Durkin, of the plumbers and steamfitters; Byron, of the sheet metal workers; Tobin, of the teamsters; and MacGowan, of the boilermakers. I am hopeful that any congressional committee on housing which may be active in the future will avail itself of the cooperation of these gentlemen. Faults in labor exist, as they most certainly do among the manufacturers, builders, and others, but many of these deficiencies are being corrected, and the way stands open for further progress along this line, as for instance, support of Mr. Gray's set-up for the prevention of work stoppages through jurisdictional strikes, and Mr. McSpedon's plan for wage stabilization. Furthermore, my contact with the building trades convinces me that housing construction can be greatly accelerated in 1948.

In our desperate efforts to free private enterprise from strangulation through regulations, rent control remains a dangerous factor. It is so because of its implications, and the basic nature of the construction industry. The Eightieth Congress was successful, during the life of our committee, in improving the situation. Whereas, previously local autonomy was largely a theory, with the Federal Housing Expediter speaking the last word, final decision now rests with local boards of appeals, the Housing Expediter and finally the emergency court of appeals.

This gives point to pending legislation growing out of the activities of our housing committee. In brief, the solution of housing must eventually be a State and local responsibility. It is a question of economics, and no matter how amiable our intentions may be, the fact remains that to build houses we need dollars, to get dollars we must save them out of earnings or profits, and to retain these dollars they must bear some interest.

The principal housing bills now before the Congress are four in number but the number of housing bills introduced in Senate and House are legion:

H. R. 5854, the Wolcott bill, which the House of Representatives passed on March 23;

S. 886, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, which passed the Senate on April 22;

S. 2317 and H. R. 5862, the McCarthy-Fletcher companion bills, still before Banking and Currency Committees of both the House and Senate; and

H. R. 4488, the American Legion Veterans' Homestead Act, favorably reported by the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

On the first 14 pages of Housing in America will be found a summary of conclusions. It was on recommendations similar to some of these conclusions that the Wolcott bill was based. The Wolcott bill confines itself strictly to the housing emergency: Title VI of FHA. In brief, it provides:

"Section 603 and 608 loans may bear interest rates up to 5 percent if Commissioner of FHA 'finds that in certain areas or under special circumstances the mortgage market demands it.'

"Title VI extended to March 31, 1949, with $2,000,000,000 ($1,000,000,000 of which is discretionary in President); 'necessary current cost' for 603 changed to 'value'; 'cost' in 608 is 'cost as of December 31, 1947'; $800,000,000 must be for 608 loans. (Cost limit under 608 changed to $8,100 per unit; 603 and 608 loans may bear interest rates up to 5 percent as noted above.)

"Provides a new section in National Housing Act under which FHA could insure a 90-percent construction loan to on-site construction plant builders of a project of 25 or more houses provided there was some modernized techniques involved.

"Expands section 609 on prefabricated housing to provide that payment of 80 percent of purchase price of house may be deferred for 180 days after delivery of house to site if purchaser executes 180-day promissory note for said 80 percent (at 4 percent, or 5 percent if Commissioner finds necessary); FHA authorized to insure lender against loss on these notes; can also insure loan to cover cost of manufacturing house."

Since the passage of the Wolcott bill by the House, and of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill by the Senate, indications are noted that additional points, not now embraced in either bill, are being called to the attention of the Congress, either as separate bills, or as amendments to some bill already introduced. These include:

Authorization of the Census Bureau to conduct a continuing housing census.

Authorization of the Office of Domestic Commerce of the Department of Commerce to carry out specific projects on building regulations: the production and distribution of building materials; uniform heating code; voluntary industrial agreements, and cost reduction.

Adequate support for the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor

Adequate financial support for the apprenticeship training service, Department of Labor;

Authorization for H and HFA to gather and report all facts relative to the financing of housing;

Adequate system of appraisal and inspection where Veterans' Administration or other Government-insured loans are concerned;

Accelerated depreciation;

Limited dividend corporations.

The American Legion has asked the House Committee on Banking and Currency to incorporate the Veterans' Homstead Act, H. R 4488, as a part of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, S. 866.

Generally speaking, the emergency, or private-enterprise features of S. 866 are similar to the Wolcott and McCarthy-Fletcher bills. S. 866 remains, however, substantially a proposal to extend Government ownership and operation of housing. It would add, presumably, 100,000 new public housing units a year for the next 5 years, for the use of low-income families, but not for welfare cases, and would involve Federal commitments, direct and contingent, of approximately $10,000,000,000 over a period of 40 years.

This whole subject of more and more Federal aid for housing for certain classes of our population is dealt with extensively on a factual basis in our committee hearings. The facts disclose that present Federal commitments, direct and contingent, for public housing, wartime housing, FHA mortgage insurance, veterans' insurance, etc., came to a grand total of $20,000,000,000.

There seems to be no escape at the moment from further commitments under title VI of the National Housing Act if we are to maintain the present rate of construction, particularly in the rental field, and that is the hope of breakng the back of the present housing shortage. The amount earmarked for such insurance in S. 866 is $800,000,000 and $1,000,000,000 in the Wolcott bill.

So, no matter how we split it up, pending legislation should further inflate the Federal Government's housing commitment, direct and contingent, by a minimum of two billions, and a possible maximum of a second twenty billions—two billions for private mortgage insurance, ten billions for public and rural housing and slum clearance, and nine billions for veterans. Added to the twenty billion commitment already referred to, we may be confronted with the possibility of a 100-percent increase of the Government's fiscal position in housing, to $40,000,000,000.

We must, and I think we can, find a better road to our housing objective than the road that leads through bankruptcy.

Now, for this (to me) senseless paternalism, business is much to blame. In the late fall of 1932 many delegations of special business interests called in great fear upon President Hoover. It was the time, you will remember, when that courageous and misunderstood man was refused the cooperation which he sought of his successor in the White House—a successor who promised to lighten the tax burden on the people and to keep us out of war. To one group of industrialists, who logically reasoned that their business was in the public interest and therefore entitled to special consideration by the Treasury, Mr. Hoover said: "Gentlemen, this thing cannot go on forever."

Well, it has gone on for 16 years. Part truths are always dangerous. There is an element of justice in the demand for better housing for the lowest income group. There is an element of justification in the demand to quiet the fears of uneasy risk capital (made uneasy by government itself) through insurance commitments. But, like President Hoover, I would say, "Gentlemen, this thing cannot go on forever." That is, we cannot continue to follow the easiest way without endangering our democratic capitalist system, which rests upon the productivity of the people and upon their savings deposited in your banks, invested in homes and in business enterprises.

In savings institutions of all kinds there must be tens of millions of depositors, with billions of dollars to their credit. They are labor unionists, stenographers, clerks, professional people, men, women, children. They are the true "little people" about whom so much is spoken when another emotional appeal is made for Federal money. They are the kind of people that made this country possible. They are the only kind of people that can preserve our country through their productivity and their thrift. Why don't you tell your depositors the facts? They constitute the most powerful element in our electorate. Because they represent no particular interest, they are representatives of the public interest. Their judgment will be respected and, I believe, obeyed.

I do not know what the outcome will be, but I can close with this positive assertion:

The sooner we return financial responsibility to the localities and the States, the sooner will we solve, not only our housing problem, but all our problems.

The Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio discussion of the Taft-Hartley Act by Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY, United States Senator from Montana, and Mr. J. Albert Woll, general counsel for the American Federation of Labor, on the program Labor Speaks, sponsored by the American Federation of Labor, broadcast from Station WOR, Newark, N. J., May 26, 1948.

There being no objection, the discussion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

ANNOUNCER. Our guests are the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, United States Senator from Montana, and J. Albert Woll, general counsel for the American Federation of Labor. Senator MURRAY is a member of the Joint Legislative Committee on Labor Management and recently authored the committee's minority report to Congress. The report was sharply opposed to the views expressed by Senator JOSEPH BALL, the chairman of the committee. Senator MURRAY, would you review for us some of the statements you made in that report?

Senator MURRAY. Well, hearings opened last Monday before the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations to consider the effect of the operations of the Taft-Hartley Act and the need of corrective amendments thereto. That amendments to this law should be found necessary so soon after its enactment creates no surprise to those of us who understood its purpose and foresaw its certain evil effects.

In the short 8 months of its operation, it has now become apparent that this is one of the most unwise pieces of legislation ever enacted in the field of labor-management relations. Its punitive purpose and certain effect is so injurious to our economy that no amendments can cure it. Its total rejection is the only remedy for a law which is causing such disastrous consequences in the field of labor-management relations.

While this act has been in effect too brief a time to reveal its full potential impact on the American economy, the testimony so far presented clearly confirms the major objections presented against it during the debate in Congress. Conflicts between labor and management traceable to this law have become widespread, and picket lines across the country are being organized to protect labor's reasonable standards of living. During March a total of 6,000,000 man-days were lost because of work stoppages. This represents an increase of over 700 percent over the preceding month of February, and an increase of 500 percent over the month of March 1947, prior to the Taft-Hartley Act.

Reports of violence in labor disputes, reminiscent of the pre-Wagner Act days, are frequently seen in the daily press. These are only some of the symptoms bred by this restrictive legislation, which was condemned on the eve of its enactment by leading economists and experts in the field of labor relations.

In the brief time available to me, I should like to review the basic considerations which prompted the fight which I made against the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act and which have prompted me to join with several of my colleagues in introducing a bill seeking its repeal.

Two years ago I joined with Senators O'MAHONEY, WAGNER, and THOMAS of Utah in a measure known as the full employment bill. The enactment of that legislation, now known as the Employment Act of 1946, reflected the great need for coordinated and continual attention by the President and the Congress to the varying trends in our economy as a whole in order to obtain maximum production, employment, and purchasing power.

The enactment of that legislation constituted another recognition of the interdependence of industry, labor, and farming. It is obviously essential to the development of a healthy domestic economy that Congress should fully appreciate the importance of this interdependence, and that the integrity of each group be preserved. Over-indulgence of the selfish desire of one group at the expense of the others, while it may secure temporary advantages, can only harm the economy of the whole Nation, and eventually injure the interests of the very group which seeks to exploit the others.

This economic fact is not new. The Wagner Act, which became law in 1935, was based on the same underlying theory—that it is essential to our free economy that wage earners possess sufficient purchasing power to obtain a fair share of the products of industry and agriculture. Since the individual wage earner possesses insufficient bargaining power to achieve this result, collective bargaining was the only alternative. The right to engage in such bargaining, therefore, was not only protected, but encouraged under the New Deal through the Wagner Act.

I should like to emphasize that this keystone of the national labor policy under the New Deal was not only intended to benefit the American wage earner, but also designed to strengthen the whole economy. An important factor which contributed to the 1929 depression was the failure of mass purchasing power to keep pace with productive capacity. This in large measure resulted from the antiunion drive after the First World War which seriously undermined the American trade-union movement and drastically reduced the bargaining power of the American wage earner.

Over 90 percent of our farm products are sold in this country. The bulk of the products of industry are likewise disposed of in domestic markets. Lack of purchasing power cause by inadequate wages thus means a

reduced market for products of American industry and farms.

It was because I recognized these considerations that I opposed the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act. I opposed the act because it was designed to reduce the bargaining strength of labor at a time when, according to Justice Department statistics, concentration of economic power in American industry was at the highest point in our history. I opposed the act because it was designed to weaken labor's bargaining power at a time when American industry was making the largest peacetime profits in its history and when millions of American families were obliged to subsist on an average annual income far below that recognized as necessary to maintain an adequate standard of living.

In 1946, just before the Congress began its consideration of the Taft-Hartley Act, 20 percent, or approximately 7,000,000 American families, had an average annual income of only $835, and 20 percent received an average income of $2,023. Do these figures indicate that wage earners had become too powerful in collective bargaining?

During 1947, the year the Taft-Hartley Act became law, corporate profits before taxes reached the peacetime high of $28,000,000,000 as compared to twenty-one billions in 1946. Do these profits indicate that wage earners had become so powerful that American business dared not deny their demands?

Yet the claim that labor had become too powerful was the main justification advanced for the Taft-Hartley Act.

The propaganda drive to sell the provisions of the act to the American public and the American wage earner has been of tremendous proportions. This drive has been aided by the fact that operation of the act was slow to start and that its full economic effect will probably not be felt until we enter another era of business recession. It is important, therefore, that the correct facts concerning the act's operations be brought to the American people.

In conclusion, I quote from the Minority Report of the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations:

"A free collective bargaining system requires that labor be able to deal with management on equal terms. It requires that labor be able to obtain a fair share of industries' profits in order to maintain a decent and adequate standard of living. * * *

"We are convinced that the Taft-Hartley Act will defeat the attainment of this objective and is, therefore, harmful to the national welfare. We, therefore, recommend that the act be repealed."

Leaders in management and in the ranks of labor are coming more and more to recognize the need of a better understanding of all these problems. If we are to make the democratic system work, there must be a better spirit of cooperation and understanding between labor and management. The Taft-Hartley expansion of bureaucratic control in this field will never take the place of intelligent understanding, sound judgment, and cooperation between labor and capital. This is the only road to increased production in our cities, continued prosperity on our farms, and the preservation of high standards of living in America.

ANNOUNCER. Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana has told us of his views on the Taft-Hartley bill.

Our other guest is J. Albert Woll, general counsel for the American Federation of Labor. Mr. Woll, what is your position with regard to the current legislative committee hearings on the Taft-Hartley bill and the possible amendments to that bill?

Mr. WOLL. Senator MURRAY has just told you that the Taft-Hartley Act is so injurious to the national welfare that no amendments can cure it and that the only remedy is outright appeal. I am certain that any person who takes the trouble to examine the facts and who, like the Senator, is truly interested in the welfare of this country will agree with him.

Eleven months have elapsed since this law was passed by Congress and what do we see in the way of results?

The sponsors of the Taft-Hartley Act claimed it would reduce or eliminate strikes and labor-management disputes, Has it done so? The official records, cited by Senator MURRAY, prove just the contrary.

The basic theory of those who drafted the Taft-Hartley Act was that labor unions had grown too powerful for the good of the country. They even went so far as to assert that labor unions were oppressing their own members. So they set out to destroy the power of the unions by a multitude of restrictive provisions. Two of these sought to abolish the closed shop and to encourage union members to desert their organizations by requiring approval in secret ballot elections of a majority of all eligible employees in a collective-bargaining unit before a union-shop contract could be put into effect by labor and mangement. It was assumed, of course, that the workers of this country would vote against the union shop if given the opportunity to do so.

That was 11 months ago. Today we find the very same people who insisted upon the requirement for union-shop elections now demanding that Congress eliminate it as a waste of Government money. The reasons for this abrupt about face are clear and potent. In the thousands of union-shop elections conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to date under the Taft-Hartley Act, the unions have won more than 99 percent. The records of the board show that more than 85 percent of the total number of workers eligible to vote, cast their ballots in favor of the union shop.

Paced by this mass of expression of an overwhelming desire for the union shop by the workers themselves, the opponents of labor in Congress now want to eliminate the elections entirely. Their new attitude is not surprising.

Aside from the huge waste of Government funds, the requirement for these elections has swamped the machinery of the National Labor Relations Board. Its backlog of cases, arising from the confusing and unjust provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, has become so great that prompt settlement of labor-management disputes can no longer be obtained through recourse to the board. The resulting delays in obtaining justice will aggravate the original conflicts and cause widespread unrest and industrial disturbance.

To sum up, labor indicts the Taft-Hartley Act on these major counts:

1. It has restricted and denied freedom of speech and freedom of political action to American workers organized into trade-unions.

2. It has hampered the organization of unorganized workers who are left at the mercy of unfair employers.

3. It has impeded true collective bargaining, given employers unfair advantages, increased their resistance to legitimate union requests, and stirred up suspicion and mistrust at the bargaining table.

4. It has disrupted long standing and peaceful collective-bargaining relationships between labor and management in many industries.

5. It has limited the opportunity of wage earners to obtain welfare funds, pensions, hospitalization, and insurance during illness, when the need for continuing pay is most urgent.

6. It has denied labor its traditional right to stand together in common cause against working conditions that endanger the American standard of living.

7. It has placed agencies of the Federal Government and the courts, through complaints and injunctions, in the false position of fighting on the side of employers against workers seeking to protect their rights and to improve their conditions.

For these major reasons, the Taft-Hartley Act stands condemned by the workers of this country and should be repealed at the first opportunity.

Bataan Editor Makes Out Case for Filipino Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, by leave granted me, I include a newspaper article from the June 3, 1948 issue of the Stars and Stripes:

(By Diosdado M. Yap, editor and publisher, Bataan magazine)

On July 26, 1941, the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States, by Executive order integrated the Philippine Army and the Philippine Constabulary into the armed forces of the United States.

When the Japanese Imperial Forces invaded the Philippines, the Filipino soldiers fought the enemy side by side with their American comrades not as a Philippine armed unit but as American soldiers under American commanders. In subsequent pronouncements by its highest commanding general in the Pacific, the Government of the United States promised to reward and grant to the Filipino soldiers the rights and benefits accorded to all soldiers in the service of the United States. The Filipino soldiers creditably fulfilled their part of the war. Their response to duty in the defense of the American flag is written in blood on the beaches of Lingayen, in plains of Luzon, in the foxholes of Bataan, and in the island fortress of Corregidor.

When their American commanders surrendered to the Japanese forces, the Filipino soldiers continued the fight in guerrilla warfare, gathering valuable intelligence information for General MacArthur in Australia, and at the same time harassing the enemy, thus relieving to a great degree enemy pressure on the American forces of Liberation in New Guinea and the Netherlands East Indies.

By the valor and loyalty of the Filipino soldiers, hundreds of thousands of American lives as well as the civilian population of the country and billions worth of supplies and equipments have been saved. The war was certainly shortened. However, on the part of the Filipino people, thousands of Filipino lives and incalculable worth of property were lost and destroyed as a price of their courage and loyalty to American and American ideals.

The morale and faith of the civilian population of the Philippines were kept high in spite of difficulties and adverse propaganda of the enemy.

When the American Forces of Liberation landed on Leyte, the Filipino people, guerrillas as well as civilians, renewed their determined attack against the Japanese throughout the archipelago. In most instances, these guerrillas' and citizens' army annihilated their common foes. The American people showered them with glowing tributes and expressions of gratitude and praises in superlative terms. "No other country in the world besides the Philippines has shown to America the highest degree of loyalty to her flag and ideals," the American people stated.

The war ended in the middle of 1945. The Filipino veterans, thousands of them sick and wounded, maimed and disabled, sought hospitalization and medical care. But, unfortunately, to their dismay, the United States Congress denied them the medical care and attention promised them and also the other benefits accorded them as American soldiers, by passing the Recession Act of February 18, 1946.

Certainly, the Filipino veterans could not understand such action on the part of the United States Congress in denying them the benefits as stipulated under the GI bill of rights. The Filipino veterans know that their own country in the midst of reconstruction from the ravages of war, is not in a position to adequately extend to them the benefits promised and long overdue to them.

In this connection, it should be stated that the very inadequate assistance that the Philippine Government is actually giving them through the Philippine veterans' board is very limited due to lack of funds. Consequently, their hopes hinge on the American benevolence and sense of justice. They have not lost faith in the ultimate recognition by the Congress of the United States of their heroism, courage, and loyalty.

To urge the prompt consideration of the pending measure known as the Rogers bill, the Philippine Veterans' Legion commissioned two of its members to come to Washington. The members of this mission who are all former army and guerrilla officers are Representative Ramon Magsaysay who is also chairman of the House Committee on National Defense of the Congress of the Philippines, and Representative Atilano R. Cinco, member of the Commission on Appointment and guerrilla leader in Leyte. They have travelled 10,000 miles and left their own Congress still in session to work and intercede in behalf of their poor and suffering fellow veterans of the Philippines.

Again this same people and the same government have committed themselves to fight on the side of the United States whenever and wherever another emergency should come. The tie of understanding that binds these two peoples is easily understood. This is true not only in the field of battle but also in the fields of business, commerce, and trade.

We are confident that the American Congress fully understands the seriousness of the problems confronting the Filipino veterans. We have every reason to believe that the very limited benefits provided in the Rogers bill will soon be acted upon in the best interest of the Filipino veterans. They are in dire need of this help now. Any delay means prolonging their sufferings and agonies. The financial stipulation contained in the Rogers bill is very insignificent, but certainly such an amount, however meager it is, means a great deal to the Filipino veterans whose friendship and loyalty to the American people is such that America cannot turn a deaf ear to them in this critical hour of their lives.

Section 32 Funds Used for National School-Lunch Program—Why Is This Skim Milk Not Fortified With Vitamins A and D?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following table shows the amount of dried skim milk used by the school-lunch program, and the amounts used in certain States:

Nonfat dry milk solids distribution, 1947–48

State:	*Pounds*
Alabama	280,017
Arizona	54,000
Arkansas	324,000
California	583,200
Colorado	54,000
Florida	54,000
Georgia	216,000
Idaho	54,000
Illinois	54,000
Iowa	54,000
Kansas	108,000
Kentucky	140,103
Louisiana	378,000
Maryland	54,000
Massachusetts	108,000
Michigan	162,000
Minnesota	216,000
Mississippi	162,000
Montana	14,985
Nevada	10,800
New Hampshire	27,000
New Mexico	21,600
North Carolina	175,500
Ohio	756,000
Oklahoma	356,400
Oregon	76,815
Rhode Island	27,000
South Carolina	189,000
Tennessee	119,880
Texas	648,000
Utah	54,000
Virginia	121,500
Washington	162,000
West Virginia	162,000
Wyoming	16,200
Hawaii	156,900
Puerto Rico	1,207,100
Total	7,358,000

The United States Department of Agriculture has hundreds of scientists, and since President Truman is trying to make political capital out of the program it is only fair to ask a couple of questions.

One is, Why this dried skim milk has not had an acceptable support price, in conformity to the Steagall support program?

Two is, Why are American school children in the national school program provided skim milk that is not fortified with vitamin A and vitamin D?

If the scientists find the scientific answers in the United States Department of Agriculture, why does not the Secretary of Agriculture make use of the results of the experiments?

The Presidential propaganda about the school-lunch program, a program with bipartisan support, indicates he has more interest in politics than in the welfare of the children of America. Too much politics, too little adaptation of scientific facts.

The Marshall Plan on Inter-European Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, on March 29, 1948, on page 3659 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under special order, I made a statement on the then proposed Marshall plan.

I would like very much to call your attention to this statement by presenting a few excerpts. These quotations have a bearing on a current news item which I shall bring to your attention in a moment.

The quotations follow:

The economic crisis in Europe is brought about by its social, political, and spiritual crises and will not be corrected by economic aid.

* * * * *

The war has been over nearly 3 years. Something must be radically wrong with the way we have been aiding Europe, otherwise they would have shown some marked degree of recovery and we should have made friends. Our world-recovery donations, totaling $22,000,000,000, have utterly failed to achieve their pronounced objectives.

* * * * *

Parenthetically, I might observe that it might be a good thing for this country, if instead of supporting workmen who will not work to the utmost in England, we let the socialistic experiment, which is now going on there, demonstrate its utter incapacity to succeed.

* * * * *

There is an abundance of evidence to support the belief that the alien-minded Socialists who infiltrated into our Government during the past 15 years are seriously and objectively aiding and abetting their brothers under the skin in Europe to establish, firmly, socialism there and, in turn, bring about socialism here through national collapse and bankruptcy, thereby creating a socialistic world which, apparently, has been their objective since the beginning.

* * * * *

The main obstacles to European recovery are the present economic policies followed by their governments. Help from outside to any country goes eventually to relieve its least urgent needs. Aid from the United States will be futile unless the country aided discontinues restrictionist policies.

* * * * *

Intergovernmental loans increase and prolong governmental restrictions on the economy, both in the borrowing and in the lending countries, and delay the return to a free economy.

* * * * *

Remove all control of exchange rates by the International Monetary Fund and permit honest valuation of foreign currencies, thus making trade possible between European countries.

Now, I read an AP news item from Washington, dated June 7:

A steady drop in trade among western European nations has caused considerable alarm among government officials directing the Marshall plan.

At least two key American financial experts have gone to Paris to help devise some means of checking this unexpected reduction in intra-European commerce. The United States Government through these representaives has made it plain this trend must be reversed in the quickest possible time lest the success of the Marshall plan be endangered.

Large-scale trading among the 16 participating countries has been counted upon as one of the most important of the self-help features of the Marshall plan. Officials said today that unless a remedy is forthcoming soon, surpluses of vegetables and fruits may rot in countries like Italy and Holland while neighboring nations with other products to sell want them.

The situation recently has reached the point, they said, where even Britain is having difficulty making adequate payment arrangements for exports of her coal.

The downturn in intra-European trade, these officials said, stems from these basic causes:

1. Each country is drastically curtailing imports to conserve its scarce dollar supply.

2. Countries like Belgium, Sweden, and Switzerland are no longer extending credit to needy countries wanting to buy their goods because they are not getting the type of goods they want in return.

3. The jumped currency situation in Europe has caused most countries to overprice their goods.

Mr. Speaker, the inevitable has come to pass.

It is indeed remarkable that the managers of our Government have learned nothing from experience and that simple economical facts are wholly disregarded.

As I have related time and again on this floor, the vacillating foreign policy of this administration is costing the American taxpayer billions upon billions of dollars and has created international problems too grave to be exaggerated.

How can you revive trade in Europe as long as we keep the people on a dole?

How can England and Poland sell their coal as long as Europe can get it from us for nothing?

How can Holland, Belgium, and the Scandinavian countries sell surplus agricultural commodities, which they have, as long as their prospective customers can get it from us for nothing?

Where is the justification of spending good American dollars to support incompetent, nonproductive, socialistic governments who are tightening the noose of socialism about the necks of the people we profess to want to save?

These governments would not stand 24 hours without support from the United States Treasury.

Why not give the European people a chance to establish the government they want and put their own house in order?

The false value on their currencies prevents inter-European trading. The whole scheme is breaking down and we are on the road to wasting another $17,000,000.

Program of the Catholic War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks the program of the Catholic War Veterans, as follows:

STATEMENT OF CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS

FOR GOD, COUNTRY, AND HOME—ACTION

During the past year, Communist strength in the United States has been growing rapidly. It has now attained alarming proportions. The Communist Party member—and his more dangerous satellite, the fellow traveler—has succeeded in building a springboard for disaster.

It does not require any great feat of mental gymnastics to arrive at the conclusion that the United States is in danger of destruction from within. There is a greater percentage of Communists in the United States today than there was in Russia at the time of the revolution.

Propaganda, some of it brazen, most of it subtle, bombards the eyes and ears of America through the media of fellow traveling information agencies.

A combination of fool and genius, traitor and zealot, is working feverishly to welcome chaos to America.

The American people have become increasingly cognizant of the immediate and grave danger of the world Communist movement. Today, Americans are looking for leadership, for guidance, for protection from within.

Basing its activities on the solid moral and spiritual rock of the Catholic Church, the Catholic War Veterans, in cooperation with all loyal Americans, have been able to provide some of the leadership and guidance so urgently needed.

The Catholic War Veterans have fought, and will continue to fight, for our American heritage. It was not mere expediency that motivated our founding fathers when they set the principles of freedom and justice so clearly stated in our Constitution. Inalienable rights are not expediencies. They are granted to all mankind, not by changling rulers, but by God himself.

AN AMERICANISM SCHOOL

In its report on the Mundt-Nixon bill, the House Committee on Un-American Activities stated, "The committee wishes to emphasize that this legislation alone is not the complete answer to the Communist problem in the United States. An attack must be made upon the Communist problem on all fronts if we are to meet it successfully. It is imperative that the American people understand the true character, aims, and techniques of the Communist conspiracy."

In complete agreement with this report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the Catholic War Veterans of America will conduct in the city of Washington quarterly school sessions of 1-week duration in order "that the American people understand the true character, aims, and techniques of the Communist conspiracy."

Realizing that the final battle between communism and democracy is being waged on Main Street, United States of America, one member of the Catholic War Veterans of America will be selected by each Catholic War Veteran State department to represent that State at the school sessions. The member selected for attendance at the Americanism school should be experienced in public speaking, have some legal training, and be willing to return to his home State and cooperate with all civic groups on matters pertaining to the combatting of communism.

The Americanism school has been fortunate in securing the services of the coauthor of the Mundt-Nixon bill, the Honorable RICHARD NIXON, of California, chairman of the Legislative Subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and the Reverend John F. Cronin, S. S., department of social action, National Catholic Welfare Conference, as advisory directors for the school. Leading American authorities on communism and subversive activities will conduct the school sessions.

THE ROSARY PROGRAM

As a pathway to success in the all-out anticommunism drive of the Catholic War Veterans, we are undertaking a phase of spiritual activity known as the rosary program.

The Catholic War Veterans of America is a Catholic organization and it is fitting and proper that religious devotion should be fostered among our members before all other activities.

We know, as Catholics, that in praying and requesting divine guidance, we can receive no greater assistance than that proffered by our Blessed Mother. We know from her lips as she spoke at Fatima that one of the greatest keys to happiness, to victory, and to peace is the saying of the rosary.

To this end—peace, victory, and happiness—through the Queen of Peace, the Catholic War Veterans will assist in the task of spreading the rosary devotion among our comrades in the veterans' hospitals, on active service, and within our own organization. Approximately 100,000 rosaries will be distributed in honor of the Lady of Fatima.

The Reverend Patrick Peyton, C. S. C., director of radio's nationally famed Family Hour and head of the family-rosary program in the United States, has agreed to write a special devotional pamphlet for the veteran ill in the hospital, for the Catholic now in active service, and for members of the Catholic War Veterans of America.

The rosary and pamphlet will be a gift of the Catholic War Veterans of America. It is firmly believed that through requesting the assistance and guidance of Mary, our program of attack against communism and its disastrous consequences will be successful. In defeating communism and fulfilling the very purpose of our organization, we must enlist the aid of our Divine Lord. We must work—but we must also pray.

FILM-EDUCATION PROGRAM

A program for the production, presentation and distribution of 16-millimeter sound, color motion pictures exposing the techniques of the Communist and presenting methods and means of combating communistic activities has been formulated by national headquarters, Catholic War Veterans of America. The films will be distributed throughout the United States through the various Catholic War Veteran posts and will be shown on a community-use basis—presented not only to Catholic War Veteran posts but to all civic groups interested in the destruction of communism.

America at the Crossroads: Presented in association with the Research Institute of America, this film explains techniques and purpose of the Communist in his infiltration into a labor union, the fomenting and prolonging of strikes and the methods used in the development of the fellow traveler. It further illustrates the effective means which the loyal American labor man may use in defeating the Communist and in retaining control of his union.

Parliamentary Procedure: This film will offer instruction in the basic principles of parliamentary procedure as outlined in Roberts Rules of Order. It will be directed toward the American meeting-goer and will instruct the loyal American in the techniques of meeting conduct so that he is not driven from the union hall, town meeting or other civic assemblage by the technical parliamentary maneuverings of the trained Communist.

Too Lazy To Live: This film will be directed toward that particular type of American who, in his selfish complacency, fails to appreciate the responsibilities of hard-won freedoms. It will illustrate the communistic system of creating doubt, fear, and confusion among those who fail to work at being Americans.

Eternal Conflict: This film will treat the basic differences between Communist and American philosophies of life as contained in the Thesis and Statutes of the Communist International and the Constitution of the United States of America. The film will show why and how a Communist thinks and will explain in detail the absolute incompatibility of communism and democracy. It will also illustrate the techniques which the loyal American must employ in defeating the communistic world movement.

A Proposal for Financing of Federal Water-Power Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement prepared for presentation to the fifth annual convention, American Public Power Association, Colorado Springs, Colo., May 18, 1948, by Samuel B. Morris, general manager and chief engineer, department of water and power, city of Los Angeles:

For a long time I have been observing, with concern, the delays and inadequate appropriations by Congress for vitally needed hydroelectric projects for which the United States has assumed the role of planner, designer, financier, builder, and owner; and so I am delighted to have the opportunity of crystallizing my views on this subject for presentation to the American Public Power Association, which is a proper forum for discussion of these ideas.

Additional generating capacity is of essential and paramount importance to meet the increased power demands of our rapidly expanding production of manufactured goods. This is particularly true at the present time of critically low electric power reserves. This shortage of power reserve capacity is Nation wide and has resulted in actual curtailment of power in several regions, especially in portions of the Pacific coast which have experienced such a great increase in population and industrial production.

The primary purpose of this paper is to create an awareness of the public utility responsibility for furnishing adequate sources of electric power at low and reasonable rates. Government, by its assumption of complete authority over the richest and most economic main stream hydro sources, must accept responsibility for their development. The Government must share with the utilities in the responsibility for anticipating not only growing production requirements of our expanding civilian economy, but for possible war production needs as well.

It is helpful to review briefly major events in the history of the assumption by the United States of a continuously increasing responsibility for river control and the production of hydroelectric power. In such review I shall not have time to examine and report the full record which is of impelling interest to me as a proponent of public power.

The national interest in development of our inland waters has progressed from navigation only to irrigation through the Reclamation Act of 1902. Then began an era of small hydroelectric plants at dams and at drops in canals in connection with early irrigation works such as at Elephant Butte, Roosevelt, and Arrowrock dams. These hydro plants were truly incidental to irrigation and were financed out of the Reclamation fund, the capital cost to be returned without interest. Power from these early plants was generally sold to private power companies at maximum competitive rates. It was soon discovered that the electric revenue was an important factor in the irrigation economy and of great assistance to the irrigation districts in meeting their repayments to the Reclamation fund. Electric service also contributed greatly to the convenience of farm living.

Soon the irrigation districts discovered that there was better service and greater profits from distributing the power themselves to their own farms, communities, and small industries. A new and better balanced economy was the result—but with this development came competition with, and opposition from, the privately-owned power companies.

It was into such a frame of precedents and pressures that the Boulder Canyon project came into being on the Lower Colorado River. Here was the first great multiple purpose water project planned, financed and constructed by the United States to meet the pressing needs and demands of many agencies in Southern California for protection from the vagaries of this uncontrolled river. Here was the Imperial Valley, below sea level, with the Colorado River above, in time of flood, threatening destruction of the entire valley and, in dry years, furnishing inadequate unregulated flow by canal through Mexico for irrigation of desert lands in the United States. And there was crying need for silt control. These demands were developing as we emerged from World War I.

The Fall-Davis report of 1922 recommended a high dam at Boulder Canyon and the All-American Canal. In keeping with tradition, navigation was named with irrigation as the paramount purposes of the project. There was yet no national policy on flood control and other items which are now considered nonreimbursable, such as recreation, fish and wildlife, and silt control. This report brought to the fore the fact that, although production of power was merely an incidental purpose, such a dam would develop great quantities of hydro power; in fact, the revenues from the sale of this power would be sufficient to pay for the dam and power plant. The fact that this would be low-cost power stimulated interest from both public and privately owned power utilities in southern California. In fact, the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power and also the private power companies proposed, themselves, to build a high dam on the Colorado River and promised similar benefits. These proposals were rejected and the United States built the project.

The point I wish to emphasize is that the United States asserted and has maintained the position that it alone can build dams and regulate the flow of the Colorado River, an interstate and an international stream. In spite of this assumption of sole jurisdiction and responsibility, it took California agencies 8 years to secure passage of the Swing-Johnson bill, known as the Boulder Canyon Project Act. This delay was encountered in spite of the fact that the cost of the Hoover Dam was to be completely repaid with interest to the United States from power revenues supplemented by a 25-cents-per-acre-foot charge for storage of domestic water supply; and the cost of the All-American Canal is to be returned without interest in 40 years under the reclamation law.

The act provided that Hoover Dam should not be built until the Secretary of the Interior should have in hand executed firm contracts sufficient, in his judgment, to provide revenues to retire the cost with interest at 4 percent in 50 years and at such prices for power "as the Secretary of the Interior may find to be justified by competitive conditions at distributing points or competitive centers." I shall not take time here to discuss the various attacks made before Congress which delayed this favorable legislation under which the United States taxpayer makes no financial contribution to the cost of the dam and power plant, all of which cost is returned with interest.

The Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of 1940 changed the interest rate from 4 percent to 3 percent. Power was first produced in 1936, and in the first 10 years Hoover Dam furnished 34,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, the equivalent of 68,000,000 barrels of fuel oil at 500 kilowatt-hours per barrel. The Department of Water and Power used approximately 53 percent of this total power output. While authorized during a period of prosperity, Hoover Dam was actually constructed in a period of depression. It has made an outstanding record and reputation as a self-liquidating project.

Almost immediately after authorization of the Hoover project in 1928 came the depression years, and the idea and policy conceived with this project, of the Government's carrying out as part of its utility function great multipurpose river developments on a self-supporting basis, were lost sight of. In its stead, beginning in 1933, a new motive and purpose for such public-works projects was exemplified by the "make work" programs which were invoked during that period.

Next came the national flood-control policy of 1936 and 1938 under which the United States pays on a nonreimbursable basis the total construction cost of flood-control projects, and, in some cases, also the costs of lands and rights-of-way. However, such projects must show a benefit-to-cost ratio exceeding unity. This has enabled the War Department to more than compete with the Bureau of Reclamation in using the United States taxpayers' money for the benefit of local areas for the reason that irrigation investment must be returned without interest while flood-control expenditures require no return to the United States Treasury.

During the depression years, a number of great multiple purpose water projects were constructed by the United States with provision for large production of hydroelectric power coming more and more to the foreground. In fact, in the case of the Tennesseee Valley Authority, power was the prime purpose, although technically included as incidental to river regulation, navigation, and flood control. And, it is interesting to note, the Authority was created in part as a social-economic experiment to improve conditions of living for the people of the Tennessee Valley. Now nearly everyone recognized that TVA has been a great success. The people of the valley have prospered. Low-cost electricity has brought industries and improved living conditions; and improved forestry and forming under TVA have made their contributions to its success.

Bonneville Dam and Grand Coulee Dam were constructed on the Columbia River, an interstate and international stream, and the Bonneville Power Administration in the Interior Department was created to transmit and market the power from these War Department and Bureau of Reclamation constructed and operated projects. The Bureau of Reclamation took over the California Central Valley project, planned and authorized by the people of California as a State project. The Bureau constructed the Shasta and Friant Dams. In Texas the Bureau built the Marshall Ford Dam on the Colorado River of Texas. The War Department built the Fort Peck Dam on the upper Missouri River for river regulation and incidental power. In provisions for power on these major projects there was a lack of uniformity in policy which, perhaps inadvertently, gave competitive advantage to some areas over the Boulder Canyon project service area.

There had been many a cry that these Federal power projects would not pay out; that there would never be a market for the millions of kilowatts of hydroelectric power capacity thus created. True it was that these projects added great reserves of low-cost electric power and, during the depression thirties it did appear that it might take quite a number of years before the output of such plants would be fully used. When and if depression years return again, the old policies of useful water and power projects constructed at a time of surpluses and low

costs may again be inaugurated to help smooth the business cycle and give employment with confidence of their later full use.

It was upon this scene that war broke out in Europe in 1939. As our participation in World War II progressed from "arsenal of the democracies" to "all aid short of war" and, finally, to declaration of war by the United States on December 8, 1941, our magnificant production of arms and facilities with which to wage war depended in no small part upon these reserve public power projects which had been constructed so well in advance of need during the depression thirties.

Now, in this postwar period of prosperity, I have a feeling that the atmosphere in Washington, the thinking which goes on in the Halls of Congress and, in part, even in the administrative departments in Washington, is that appropriations should be cut; multiple purpose water projects, especially hydroelectric projects should be delayed; prices are too high, materials and skilled labor are too scarce. There is all too much thinking in terms of ironing out business cycles by delay until there are surpluses of labor and materials and the construction of such works would become again an important factor in improving employment and economic conditions during the next depression. All of this might be true if we had, at the present time, excess power reserves instead of critical power shortages.

Somehow, some way, we must awaken the people to the fact that there is a general shortage of reserve-power capacity and, in many cases, a critical power shortage which cannot be alleviated for several years; that it now requires 3 years to obtain delivery of generating equipment and many other items required to construct steam or hydroelectric generation plants. Recently, in Los Angeles, the low bidder on insulators for a 300-mile, 220-kilovolt transmission line, offered delivery in 1,500 days, or more than 4 years.

A word should be said about our declining fuel-oil and gas reserves upon which we depend, on the Pacific coast, to such a high degree. California is now importing gas from Texas. Fuel oil has more than doubled in price in the past 3 years as California has nearly ceased to be an export State and may soon become an import State with even higher fuel-oil costs.

In southern California since the war there is three-quarters of a million kilowatts of steam capacity constructed or under construction. In northern California the 400,000-kilowatt capacity presently under construction is to be supplemented by 600,000 kilowatts recently placed on order. We have already experienced much difficulty and uncertainty in the purchase of sufficient fuel oil. What will our condition be in California when we have to purchase oil for this addition of 1,700,000 kilowatts? As a matter of fact, possible oil shortages may require substitution of coal for oil.

While each and all of the publicly and privately owned utilities must proceed to construct adequate power capacity, the United States continues to hold back in its responsibility for immediate appropriations adequate to construct hydroelectric works which will provide needed reserve capacity. Of course, there are many areas of the United States where hydroelectric power is not an important factor, but there are regions where it is the controlling factor, regions within the influence of interstate rivers such as the Colorado and Columbia and the Tennessee Valley, in which the United States has assumed the sole responsibility for developing hydroelectric power. On these streams there remain millions of kilowatts of hydroelectric capacity which can be developed at costs lower than steam power and also lower than the smaller hydroelectric plants which local public and privately owned utilities are permitted to construct on minor streams.

We who operate these utilities cannot wait for depression years in which to build. We must and are building now, whatever the cost. The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power has under construction 290,000 kilowatts of steam and 112,500 kilowatts of hydro. We are investigating another 250,000 kilowatts of hydro on the middle and south forks of the Kings River in the Sierra Nevadas, where we have made filings, and are looking for new sites for additional steam plants. These are probably higher-cost projects than hydro projects possible of development on the Colorado River.

On the lower Colorado River at Glen and Bridge Canyon Dam sites there is the opportunity to develop power the equivalent to the burning in steam plants of nearly 15,000,000 barrels of oil per year. On the lower river as a whole, new projects the equivalent of more than 25,000,000 barrels may be developed. During the past year we received word from the Bureau of Reclamation that they were running out of funds to core drill and test the Glen Canyon Dam site. In the absence of Federal funds we contributed to the Bureau $60,000 to continue this work. We would like to see all pertinent agencies of the United States recognize the pressing need for these plants on the lower Colorado River.

On the Columbia River, it is the same story. The Federal plants on the Columbia River in 1946–47 produced 50 percent of the electric power consumed in the Pacific Northwest, but here again, appropriations are inadequate to provide the power capacity required and only the United States may build the great dams and power plants on the Columbia River. It is noteworthy that both public and privately owned utilities in the Pacific Northwest have joined in presenting their appeal to the United States to generate sufficient power to avert critical shortages. The forecast and request is for 300,000 kilowatts of additional capacity per year for the next 10 years. I shall not continue this review of pressing demands on the Government for additional Federal hydroelectric projects on main streams which it has assumed the sole right to construct.

May I inject one fundamental thought here? I believe all will agree that this country must be prepared for war in order, if possible, to avert war and, if necessary, to wage war successfully. We are inferior to our adversaries in manpower. Our great superiority is in productive capacity. Among the basic requirements to maintain this superiority are adequate water, electric power, and fuel. Before World War II we had surpluses of power capacity and fuel oil. Here in the West this was in large measure due to Federal water-power projects constructed during the depression thirties. Now we have only inadequate power reserves and actual shortages. Is it not time to again rush construction of Federal water-power projects to meet utility needs and to be ready for manufacture of war goods? And on the Pacific coast it is further important, in case of war, to release great quantities of fuel for the Navy, which is now in competition with new steam plants being authorized from month to month to meet utility demands which cannot await action by an apathetic Congress in providing necessary funds for Federal hydroelectric projects.

How should we differentiate in treatment between self-supporting and self-sustaining water and power projects constructed with funds from the Federal Treasury which will be repaid with interest within prescribed periods of time and other forms of Federal projects, the costs of which are generally recognized as being nonreimbursable? I believe the answer is that the Government should abandon the policy of holding up the former type of self-sustaining works until periods of depression in order that they might be used as a means of curing such depressions and ironing out the business cycle. We should go back to the period before the thirties and look again at the policy adopted in 1928 when the Boulder Canyon Project Act was adopted. You will recall that this act provided that the Secretary of the Interior must have firm contracts for repayment of all costs with interest in 50 years of the Hoover Dam and power plant with the exception of $25,000,000 allocated to flood control without interest which, under the Boulder Canyon Project Act, need not be returned until after the 50-year period. The Secretary obtained such firm repayment contracts with both public and privately owned electric-power utilities and with the metropolitan water district of southern California. When this had been done, the work was authorized, funds made available, and the works were constructed and have been in successful operation for 12 years.

Why not adopt such a policy as to feasible water-power projects susceptible of development by the United States? Why should any legislator or taxpayer hesitate to put this water power to work turning out the products of our manufacture for peace or, if need be, for material for defense or for waging war to preserve us as a Nation and as a free people?

Perhaps thought should be given to an additional factor of evident protection to the United States taxpayer to distinguish the form of financing of these projects. This might be done by the issuance of United States water power revenue bonds. There is a great deal to be said for issuing such revenue bonds on a callable basis. The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, which I have the honor to represent, has some hundred million dollars of revenue bonds outstanding. During the recent years of low interest rates, prior issues were called and new bonds averaging an interest rate of less than 2 percent were issued, bringing a total interest saving in the life of these bonds to nearly $30,000,000.

This callable feature has a very important advantage in revenue bond financing of utility works as we must, in a utility, build works to meet demands even when costs and interest rates are high. At a later date, under lower interest rate markets, the power utility, either public or private, may refinance by calling high interest rate bonds and issuing low interest rate bonds in their stead, thus enabling the utility to gain the benefit of favorable money markets.

"Revenue bonds," as the term is discussed here, means bonds payable exclusively out of the revenues of a self-liquidating publicly owned utility. They are dealt in exclusively in reliance upon the adequacy of such revenues to meet service charges upon the bonds, in addition to paying the costs of operating and maintaining such utility and all other charges against the revenues.

The idea of the financing of Federal reclamation projects through the issuing and sale of bonds did not originate with the preparation of this paper nor are we in Los Angeles the only ones yet to explore its possibilities. It may be of some surprise to you to be informed that at the time we were seeking the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act a plan was proposed by the Government for issuing United States bonds in the principal amount approximately equal to the aggregate of the advances from the Treasury to the project, the bonds to bear interest at not exceeding 3½ percent and maturing at such times, not later than 1987 (the expiration of the 50-year power contracts) and in such amounts as would conform, as nearly as could be determined, to the schedule of repayments of such advances by the power users through rates. I am informed that officials high enough in the Government to control the fate of the Adjustment Act insisted that this funding plan be made part of the act. Such insistence

was subsequently abandoned when it developed that the inclusion of the funding provision in the act would preclude the adoption of it before the Seventy-sixth Congress adjourned.

Senator CAIN, of Washington, is reported to be currently considering the introduction of a bill in Congress to provide for the financing of present and future self-liquidating reclamation projects, as well as such portions of broad multipurpose projects as are determined to be self-liquidating.

Some suggestion has been made for consolidation of all such self-liquidating projects into one revenue-bond fund. This would have the effect of stronger projects supporting the weak ones and only requiring that the total of all projects should pay out successfully. In such a proposal some very weak and uneconomic projects may be carried along.

I am presently more impressed by each project standing by itself. If repayment with interest is guaranteed by contracts as was required at Hoover Dam and revenue bonds issued on each such project, it would appear that it would be possible to bring into the picture new elements to judge the economic soundness and worth of new Federal water-power and domestic-water projects. This new element would be the investing public. The confidence of these investors in sound projects should give confidence to the general public and in the Halls of Congress. If this be accomplished, the features inherent in such projects differentiating them from other forms of public work will have been more clearly defined to the point that everyone can recognize them and adequate funds should, by reason of their soundness, become available for such self-liquidating projects.

A proposal of power-revenue bonds for financing Federal hydroelectric projects which have been guaranteed by contracts with publicly owned and privately owned utilities, with preference to the publicly owned utilities, should afford a means of securing authorizations and financial approval of Congress. It would make possible construction of needed economically sound water-power projects to meet the needs of utility service and to restore the power reserves required to protect peacetime demands with some added reserve for possible wartime production. It should be given serious study, and the complex legal, political, and financial problems should be attacked without delay. For certain it is that authorizations and appropriations for these self-liquidating water-power projects are at the present lagging in an altogether unfortunate and critical manner, which may prove of great danger should war come.

At the beginning of World War II, at the close of 1941, according to the Federal Power Commission, the Nation had a total dependable central-station generating capacity of some 37,500,000 kilowatts. Of this, slightly more than 15½ percent was reserve above peak demand. This, augmented by savings through brown-outs, black-outs, daylight saving, and completion of limited new construction, with industry working around the clock, was sufficient to supply the tremendous production machine that made our victory in the war possible.

In December 1947 the country had slightly over 48,000,000 kilowatts of dependable capacity, and less than 1¼ percent of this was reserve over the peak demand of that year. In the southern California area, one of the most important production centers of the last war, our reserve above peak in 1941 was more than 30 percent. At the end of 1947 it was slightly over 1½ percent.

Today the United States is launching a multi-billion-dollar European-aid program that will call for increased production. Military forces are being expanded, air forces enlarged, and naval craft brought from storage and reactivated. All this calls for still more production and tremendous consumption of already scarce fuel. More than $7,000,000,000 worth of Government-built industrial plants, most of them originally scheduled for sale through the War Assets Corporation, are now preserved for emergency use. Supplies of coal, most widely used fuel in steam production of electric energy, are in the usual state of uncertainty. Secretary of Defense Forrestal's estimate of a 2,000,000-barrel per day shortage of petroleum for war requirements has been raised to 3,000,000 barrels per day in a report this month by the House Armed Services Committee.

Summarizing construction of generating facilities from 1947 through 1952, the technical press lists slightly more than 23 millions of new capacity as under way or contemplated, including only a relatively small amount of Federal construction on main streams. The total covers 12,500,000 kilowatts of steam, and 10,500,000 kilowatts of hydro. This program is the answer of the electric utilities to current shortage of energy. It is a tremendous expansion in generation, but it will provide no appreciable reserve as a margin of safety. In most industrial centers it will just about keep up with the normal growth of demand developing through the period of construction.

Federal agencies, in complete control of the country's great rivers, have mapped large programs but national policy and the Congress have not implemented these programs with necessary authorizations and appropriations. Generation of vitally needed hydroelectric energy has become involved in political maneuvering, and, in many instances, is threatened with the burden of uneconomic irrigation projects which cannot carry their own costs.

This is no time for argument of private versus public power. The needs are so great and so imperative that all persons and parties should pull together to secure the necessary additions to hydroelectric capacity to protect the economy and security of our country.

The Federal Government has absolute control over the Nation's mighty streams, down which flow waters carrying energy equivalent to millions upon millions of barrels of precious fuel. Until harnessed and set to work at generation of vitally needed electric power, that energy continues to flow on, wasted forever, a complete and irrevocable loss to the Nation's economy. Government, having assumed complete authority, cannot escape responsibility for this waste, or for our failure if we are found with too little, too late, in a sudden emergency.

America Is the Victim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Chicago Tribune of June 7.

All too frequently nowadays we hear that America is the victim at the hands of the people who are getting billions of the American taxpayers' money.

The State Department and the army of occupation will force the American public to shoulder these burdens until public opinion compels a stop.

The editorial follows:

WRECKING GERMAN PLANTS

British and American military governments have decreed the end of synthetic-rubber production in the west German bizonal area after June 30. The reasons given are that coal is being consumed uneconomically and that natural rubber is now available. The amount of coal used is negligible, as the surviving synthetic plants produce only 500 to 600 tons of rubber a month. On appearances, this is a move to get another market for Britain's Malayan rubber, with the American taxpayer, of course, paying for German imports.

The closing of the synthetic plants is in line with the policy pursued ever since the adoption of the Morgenthau plan to wreck German industry and reduce the country to a potato patch. Primarily this is a policy of vengeance, but it has the added virtue in British eyes of putting a trade competitor out of business.

Morally, this program is indefensible. Economically, it is lunatic. The refusal to permit Germany to get on its feet not only has disrupted whatever chance there was for the recovery of all of Europe, but fastens on American taxpayers a charge of about a billion dollars a year to keep Germans on a marginal subsistence level. The shut-down of the synthetic-rubber plants is especially criminal, as its effect is to decrease German employment and prevent Germans from meeting some small part of their own needs, while compelling the United States to pay the bill for British natural rubber required as a replacement.

Dr. Albert B. Newman, president of the American Institute of Chemical Engineers, was correct recently in asserting that America was the victim in Germany of British and French avarice. Referring to 682 plants in western Germany marked for dismantling as reparations, Dr. Newman said, "The British and French were more interested in the long-range competitive aspects of German industry than they were in getting up a balanced economy for Germany."

It is obvious that unnecessary burdens will continue to be inflicted upon American taxpayers as long as the dismantling of nonwar plants continues. The State Department and the army of occupation will force the American public to shoulder these burdens until public opinion compels a stop.

The Country Has Lost a Leader, But the Pattern Will Not Fade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it was my high privilege to be seated not long ago at a luncheon, next to the Right Reverend Monsignor Edward J. Flannagan, known throughout the length and breadth of the land simply and devotedly as Father Flannagan.

It was a moving experience to have the opportunity for a visit with this man of God whose life has been devoted to the redemption and rebuilding of young boys into useful citizens.

As I remarked afterward on several occasions, one could not look into his inspiring face and hear his stories about his work without the feeling that here was a man whose contribution to the age in which he lived was almost impos

sible to calculate. In his modest simplicity he typified unselfish service at its best. Any man, of high or low estate, was a better man after contact with this consecrated personality.

His untimely passing at a comparatively early age, in the full vigor of his active and useful life, has saddened the hearts of all those upon whom he has left the indelible imprint of his presence.

The tribute to his memory which he would cherish is unquestionably the one suggested by the editor of the Brighton-Pittsford Post in the accompanying editorial honoring the memory of this great American, which, under leave to extend my remarks, follows:

THE COUNTRY HAS LOST A LEADER, BUT THE PATTERN WILL NOT FADE

With honors far beyond the average person's accumulation during a lifetime, the Right Reverend Monsignor Edward J. Flannagan, better known as Father Flannagan, who died last week on foreign soil, will love best the knowledge that during his mortal being he contributed to making so many true Americans out of earlier imperfect boys.

No better monuments exist than those in the hearts of people we have helped. No monuments can be erected which will have such lasting worth as though cast in the hearts of other men. Out of the readjustments made in these lives of boys, there will come clean, wholesome citizens who will have made such a start in life that generations far beyond those days may continue to increase in useful lives.

It can be supposed that people will flock to put stone upon stone until dizzy heights and architectural beauty will draw people from all over the countryside to see for themselves the spectacle. Regardless of its cost, its creative work, probably the man who liked to be known as just a fellow priest, will feel such ornamentation a hollow mockery of his objectives, and would far better like to see any such memorial moved along the lines he has already set the pattern for, and more buildings and equipment for needy boys be the object of any testimonial to his great career.

The country has lost a great leader, but the work which he started will have such a strong pattern that competent men will be found to continue the saving of boys.

Our Foreign Agricultural Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 9, 1948

WHY CONTINUE TO DECEIVE THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ABOUT RECIPROCITY WHEN THE FOLLOWING IS THE PROGRAM?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that more severe trade barriers have been erected under the New Deal than were ever erected in the history of our country. The most vicious trade barrier, of course, has been a law passed in 1940 when Cordell Hull was Secretary of the State and Henry Wallace was Secretary of Agriculture. This law prohibits the export of tobacco seed. The office of the Secretary of Agriculture states that this was enacted to prevent other countries from growing tobacco to compete with tobacco grown in the United States. The only other similar embargoes in the world are: First, the embargo on sable from Russia; second, the embargo on shipment of certain types of sheep in Australia.

The list of trade barriers erected since 1933 while the State Department was preaching good-neighborliness and reciprocity have been:

First. The tobacco seed embargo.

Second. The embargo on cotton imports—both short staple and long staple.

Third. The paying of export subsidies on cotton which has now amounted to many, many millions of dollars, and even paid where cotton is parity in price or above parity in price.

Fourth. The export subsidies paid on wheat of 25 to 30 cents per bushel even when wheat was bringing the American farmer less than 60 cents per bushel.

Fifth. The export subsidies paid on corn exports.

Sixth. The near embargo on wheat imports.

Seventh. The embargo on flaxseed imports, which is the latest one.

These actions took place at the very time that the State Department was turning out tons of propaganda about the wonders of reciprocity and a good-neighbor policy.

There is one significant fact and that is that there has been no duty reduction on a crop grown or product produced south of the Mason and Dixon's line when the crop or product was more than a small percentage of the national production of the crop or product.

The duties on peanuts at 7 cents per pound and on tobacco, some over $1 a pound have been well maintained, even though the duty was over 100 percent ad valorem. While this has taken place, the duty on livestock products has been reduced in a dozen or more instances. There is not much more to be done to the dairy industry as at Geneva they went so far as to reduce the duty to three-sixteenths of a cent a pound on skim milk.

The FAO, which is a part of the UN, and is the world agricultural set-up, together with the activities of the leading farm organizations of our country, offers some hope of a world agricultural trade adjustment that will make the tariff and the misnamed reciprocity approach appear to be obsolete.

The present set-up may appeal to the millers of Minneapolis since they have a monopoly on the American market for their flour; it may be acceptable to the special protective crops like cotton, peanuts and tobacco, but it is not based on fairness nor is it based on justice.

The soil-depleting crops are enjoying special privilege legislation and are also enjoying huge expenditures of public funds, while the system of agriculture that will conserve the soil has been subjected to a tariff policy and a domestic set-up that is most unfair as well as unwise.

Yes, I again repeat, that the New Deal foreign agricultural policy is honeycombed with deceit and dripping with deception.

Income-Tax-Reduction Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the sole purpose of correcting the RECORD of February 2, 1948, the concluding day of the debate on H. R. 4790, the income-tax-reduction bill.

At page 894 of the RECORD the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. REEVES], claims credit for having introduced the first bill in the Congress to authorize income splitting by married taxpayers as a remedy for the community-property problem. Said the gentleman from Missouri, and I quote:

During all the years the New Deal Democrats controlled the Congress and increased surtaxes to unprecedented and confiscatory levels, they permitted this vicious and inequitable discrimination to develop. They did absolutely nothing to correct it, except to make an ineffectual attempt to deny married persons in community-property States the privilege of making separate returns. The idea of permitting all married couples to make tax returns on the divided-income basis never occurred to them; if it did, they neither said nor did anything about it. As a matter of fact it was not proposed by anyone, so far as I have been able to learn, until a tax legislative counsel for the Treasury Department mentioned it late last year as a possibility, but obviously without the sanction of the Department.

Simply to keep the record straight, and to refute the claim made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] that he and other Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committe originated legislation on the subject, I desire to relate the facts.

The first bill introduced either in the House or in the other body to authorize "income splitting" by all married taxpayers was H. R. 1759, which I introduced on February 6, 1947, and discussed under a special order a few days later.

* * * * * *

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan did not get around to originating the income-splitting measure until he embodied it in the tax bill which he introduced last month and which is not before the House.

* * * * * *

No, Mr. Chairman, the bill to equalize the Federal income-tax burden through universal income splitting was not an "item of Democratic origin which we proposed in the consideration of H. R. 1," as the gentleman from Michigan so blandly said on Thursday. He knows better. The origin was H. R. 1759, and it was of Republican origin.

Members of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. Speaker, and the more seasoned Members of the House, will recall that attempts have been made over the years to provide equal treatment under the income-tax laws for married persons in whatever State they may reside. In the Revenue bill of 1941 the attempted solution was to require husbands and wives to file joint returns. When the mandatory joint returns provision appeared to be threatened with defeat, on August 2, 1941, I wrote the

chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means as follows:

AUGUST 2, 1941.

ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DOUGHTON: In accordance with the proposal I made before the committee this morning to consider a substitute for the compulsory joint return provision under section 111 in the event it is stricken, I submit that it is both wise and proper that the committee be prepared to lay before the Hou my substitute which is intended to attain the same objective as section 111 but allowing married couples for tax purposes to report their total income on a split or divided basis. In other words, to report it separately and on the self-same basis with taxpayers similarly situated in community property States. The amendment should likewise contain the necessary hike in rates to accomplish the objective of section 111.

I feel that the committee should have such an amendment ready in order that the membership of the House will understand that in the event section 111 is stricken they will have an opportunity to impose a greater load upon the 94 percent of their taxpayers in order to perpetuate the 6 percent class who have enjoyed a privileged status.

Therefore, I request that the Committee on Ways and Means be called together Monday morning, August 4 at 10 o'clock in order that this question might be considered. I should like very much that Mr. Stamm, Mr. Beeman, and Mr. O'Brien be notified to be present in order that they may properly draft such an amendment.

I subscribe myself, with best wishes,
Cordially and sincerely yours,
JOHN D. DINGELL.

In response to that letter, according to the minutes of the Committee on Ways and Means, a meeting of the committee was held on August 4, 1941, which the chairman announced was called as a result of my letter. At that meeting I proposed an amendment to be offered by the committee in the event the section relating to joint returns was stricken out. Although the motion was defeated in the committee, in view of the fact that no final decision had yet been reached by the House on mandatory joint returns, that same day I introduced H. R. 5488, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, which reads as follows:

H. R. 5488

A bill to equalize the tax burdens of husbands and wives in non-community-property States with those living in community-property States

Be it enacted, etc., That section 51 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) Income of husband and wife: If a husband and wife living together during the entire taxable year make separate returns, the income of each may be divided equally between them. In such case, each shall alone be entitled to one-half of the deductions and credits allowed under this chapter which are properly allocable to such income. This subsection shall apply only to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1940."

It is readily apparent, Mr. Speaker, that the idea of splitting income between husband and wife, which I proposed on August 4, 1941, probably before the gentleman from Missouri ever thought of coming to Congress, is essentially the same and antedates by five and a half years the idea contained in the Reeves bill, H. R. 1759, which he introduced on February 6, 1947.

Now, it is quite all right for a freshman Member of Congress to take an interest in important legislation and to seek all the credit due him; but when a new Member seeks publicity at the expense of another or tries to discredit other Members of Congress who have long labored over such matters, I believe it is only fair to have the record made clear. In fairness to all, he may well acknowledge his error and disavow the intemperate, though hasty, diatribe leveled without provocation against another Member.

Effects of High Corporate Tax Rate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Pathfinder there appeared a very interesting and informative article which should be read by every student of taxation. The article shows how the present high corporate rates discourage the formation of new businesses and as a result encourage the expansion of present monopolies and the creation of new ones.

Clearly, these dangerous trends, described in the Pathfinder article, will in a few years result in American industry passing to the absolute control of large and monopolistic concerns.

For years I have attempted to point out that the wasteful spending on the part of the Federal Government was rapidly closing the door of opportunity to the youth of America because of the excessively high tax rates such spending makes necessary. In the Pathfinder article, which follows, we have a clear case of how it works:

HOW TO MAKE MONEY

Quiet, dark-haired, 35-year-old Henry James Rand this week gave the United States an ominous lesson in 1948 money making.

His father, James H. Rand, president of Remington Rand, office-equipment makers, had made his pile by going into business. Son Jim discovered he could get ahead faster by staying out.

After college, Jim turned down a front-office job in favor of diddling—inventing—in the family's Cleveland, Ohio, basement. During World War II he diddled for the Government—designing guided missiles. Then, with his twin brother, Marcel, he developed a new washer. It is automatic, noiseless, vibrationless, weighs 100 pounds, handles 9 pounds of wash, and dries it in a flash by a new vacuum method.

Bonanza? Tests of 100 sample machines in homes and apartments proved successful. Jim and Marcel had $10,000,000 worth of orders in sight.

"Then," said Jim, "everybody we approached agreed our venture was sure-fire, but they wouldn't buy stock because taxes would take about all they got back."

Deciding that with the Government taking up to 82 percent of individual incomes it wasn't worth while to become manufacturers, Jim and Marcel offered their stock for sale. Bendix Home Appliances, Inc., at South Bend, Ind., snapped it up—put down $350,000 for an option which runs to July 8. On that date the company will pay $150,000 more—a total of $500,000. Completing payments on the stock, Bendix will pay annual installments each March 10 between 1950 and 1968, based on the number of Rand-type washers sold in each preceding year.

Meanwhile, Jim Rand is sitting pretty with no business worries, but with a tidy sum in pocket and plenty more to come. Because he was smart enough not to go into business the Federal tax will be 25 percent (the top rate for capital gains) instead of at sky-high rates imposed on individual incomes.

In the financial world the deal created a small sensation because it graphically illustrates today's venture capital situation: The risk-taker has no chance to win. If he succeeds, the Government collects his reward—if he fails, he alone absorbs the loss.

Son Supports Father

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article entitled "Son Supports Father" that appeared in the New York Post on June 9, 1948:

SON SUPPORTS FATHER—ISRAEL DEFENDS JERUSALEM FOR UNITED NATIONS, BUT GETS NO HELP FOR OWN STATE

(By Observer)

Jerusalem is the City of Peace, according to the meaning of its name, but a city of war as its fate at the present is. Why is Jerusalem a city of war? The Israelis agreed that it should be an international city as decided by the United Nations on November 29. But the British scheme with Abdullah is to make it the capital of this puppet King. Thus, it turns out that the British and Abdullah are trying, by war and by siege, to take for themselves the city which is declared by the family of nations to belong to all nations.

Instead of all the nations defending Jerusalem against the British and the Arabs, the Israelis, who already have the task of defending their state against the onslaught of the armies of seven Arab states, now bear the additional burden of defending Jerusalem and thus of fighting for all the nations.

The invasion of Palestine by the Arab States and their war against Israel should be met with international force, but the Security Council hesitates to follow this path; and so, instead of receiving help, the Israelis give help to all the nations that assigned Jerusalem as an international city. Nor do the Israelis merely provide help; they actually carry the entire burden of defending Jerusalem from those who strive to make this international city their possession.

Strange as it seems, fifty-odd nations do not come to the assistance of Israel, but Israel, in addition to its own war, wages war on behalf of the fifty-odd nations.

On November 29, 1947, the General Assembly voted:

"To place the city of Jerusalem under international trusteeship" with "the United Nations as the administrative authority."

"The city of Jerusalem shall be demilitarized, its neutrality shall be declared and preserved, and no paramilitary formations, exercises, or activities shall be permitted within its borders."

"A Governor of the city of Jerusalem shall be appointed by the Trusteeship Council. He shall be neither Arab nor Jew nor a citizen of the Palestinian States, nor, at the time of appointment, a resident of the city of Jerusalem."

"The city of Jerusalem shall guarantee free transit and visit to residents of the Arab and Jewish States in Palestine."

"The protection of the holy places, religious buildings, and sites in the city of Jerusalem shall be entrusted to a special police force, the members of which shall be recruited outside of Palestine and shall be neither Arab nor Jew."

Thus the United Nations decided about the city that is holy to a major part of humankind. It did nothing to implement its decision. The Governor was not appointed, a police force was not sent to Jerusalem, the city was not demilitarized, its neutrality was not assured, and access to holy places was not guaranteed.

Instead of this, and even for many weeks before Great Britain surrendered the mandate, the British did not object to Jerusalem being put under siege; the mandatory made no effort to help keep the roads to Jerusalem open for the transport of food to its inhabitants.

Jerusalem being under siege, the field guns of the British-Arab Legion shell the residential sections of the city, and its hospital and university in the suburbs. It has been under incessant fire for many weeks. Before hostilities began and afterwards, the Israelites repeatedly offered to remove Jerusalem from the conflict. The United Nations, however, have done nothing, great or small, to bring order to the Holy City or to establish its neutrality.

When the Vandals sacked Rome in the year 455, they erected a memorial to themselves; their very name became a word for wanton destroyers. The Vandals, however, did not profess any spiritual affinity or religious feeling for Rome. But both the British and the Arabs declare that Jerusalem is a holy city, and express pious sentiment for the city of peace. The waging of war in the city of peace is sacrilegious and wanton, and it is all the more so when the vandals who bombard it do so with pious words on their lips.

If the nations of the world are an honest family and their representatives in the United Nations act with integrity, then Jerusalem can be saved from further destruction. Let a governor be appointed immediately for Jerusalem, whether it be Count Bernadotte or Harold Evans from Philadelphia (both are already in Palestine) or Sir Carl Berendsen of New Zealand or Evatt of Australia or Smuts of South Africa; let an international police force be dispatched to Jerusalem and placed at the disposal of the governor; and let it be proclaimed that the family of nations does not intend to allow Jerusalem out of its charge.

Were all the resolutions on Jerusalem written and accepted only as a sham? You put your hand on the Bible when you swear. When you put your name to a resolution on Jerusalem, it is a kind of oath. Should this oath be broken, the United Nations will stand before the generations to come as a company of welshers. Wars will never cease.

For if all the nations together cannot make peace in Jerusalem, which is their common trust, then there will be no peace anywhere on earth either for you or for your children.

Open Letter to Generalissimo Stalin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARTER MANASCO
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following open letter from the Boston Post of May 19, 1948:

To GENERALISSIMO STALIN, KREMLIN, MOSCOW, U. S. S. R.

SIR: Henry A. Wallace, your candidate for President, having the presumption to pretend to speak for the American people, started this custom. You in turn, by your open letter, approved it, even though in bypassing the President of the United States you offered an unnecessary insult. Therefore, you will pardon us if we adopt that method of replying.

We believe that, to keep the record straight and maintain a semblance of order, government communications should be between the heads of governments. However, there is one thing we strongly approve. The wisest thing one of the wisest of Americans once said comes to mind. As a way to peace, Woodrow Wilson, a sincere soldier for concord in the world, advocated open covenants openly arrived at.

We are for that. It is the American way. We drop no iron curtains. Your supporters have free rein in America. Even at this late moment, after all the intransigence displayed at peace conferences here and abroad by your envoys, we cannot decide whether to allow or outlaw the Communist party. Only Monday night last, two leading contenders for Presidency who—unlike Mr. Wallace—have a chance to win, debated the propriety of giving William Z. Foster and his rabble-rousing zealots enough rope or shutting them up entirely.

That must amuse you. It must also amuse you to see Henry Wallace step in and pretend to speak for his Government and all the American people. He doesn't and you know it. But what we know is that Mr. Wallace, Mr. Stassen or Mr. Dewey would not be allowed to say two words aloud in the U. S. S. R. We likewise know that if they ever sent an open letter to the President of the United States from Moscow or Stalingrad, no one would ever hear of them again.

And that brings us to the most important point of the seven points in your letter on which you want us to think we could find agreement with you and dissipate the current cold war. Evidently, you want us to believe that you advocate—because you brought it up—"The defense of democracy and the ensuring of civil rights in all countries."

Do you believe that? If you do, why don't you practice it in Poland, Latvia, Estonia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Northern Korea and other places in the world where your Moscow-trained native leaders cock an ear to the Kremlin before they even say "Boo."

Now don't say you have nothing to do with those places. We are very gullible. But we are not that gullible. Communism opened our eyes far wider than deceitful men like the Kaiser, Mussolini, Hitler or Hirohito. And they didn't pretend to like us. Suddenly you do—even after Vishinsky's blasts, Gromyko's stubbornness and those roaring diatribes against us from Pravda.

Yes, our State Department, it is true, has found your latest note encouraging. In a sense it is—if it is not propaganda. But we, to tell the truth, were rather expecting it. After set-backs in Italy, Greece, and France, we figured that communism would try a new tack. Doesn't it always when up against it?

Please understand us, we want peace. But we are not going to take it on your terms. We appeased you to the point of humiliation and will never do it again. We would rather die on our feet than live on our knees. That's an old saying. We give you another, a proverb. Yours is a land of proverbs. Here is one of ours: "Actions speak louder than words." In your open letter you gave us words. We heard them all before. Prove now that you mean them by deeds.

Very truly yours,

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

Christianity's Critical Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Charlotte Observer:

CHRISTIANITY'S CRITICAL CHALLENGE

The tall and vast minds of Christendom are intimating, if not actually, in some occasional cases, asserting that Christianity's most critical day is immediately ahead.

They have abundant reason for such prediction and possibility.

It is aside the point to try to take hard-and-fast facts and present-day conditions and fitting them into the symbols of prophecy to prove the point.

Nor need one measure such possibilities on the basis of the world-wide wreck that has occurred in the moral standards of the human race nor in the pestilences of passion which everywhere rage on every front nor in any of the visible and spectacular departures of society from proper religious attitudes and conduct.

These times are distressing and terrifying. One who studiously looks out upon human society today has a reason for furrows of fear on his face and deep anxieties in his heart.

It's a mirror that makes for melancholy, and unending panorama of the lusts and lecheries of men, of governments snarling and growling and gnashing their teeth in the faces of one another, of fierce international angers and hates, of appalling crime and degeneracy—a world of social muck and defilement and pollution and extravaganzas of all manner of evil.

It may be for all we know or can learn from the written epics of all the ages of all the evils of men that sin has never been more spectacular nor streamlined, not even in the days of Sodom and Gomorrah or Tyre and Sidon than at this hour.

But it is not for this, as horrible and challenging as this may be and ought to be, that the hosts of Christian righteousness and truth have reason for new fears.

After all, for whatever comfort it may be, there are no new immoralities. Neither before nor since the corrupt King of England offered the half of his kingdom to whosoever would invent for him a new sin has a new sin been discovered.

Evil today is the evil with which man first was born, only it has more speed, more alluring blandishments, more defiance, more effrontery, and more theatrics.

Christianity's threat today arises not so much from immoral conduct as from unmoral concepts.

It's the whole philosophy of life which the Galilean came to propose and to expound which is coming under the deadly fire of new conceptions and philosophies.

There is spiritual poison in the political potions that are being poured down the throats of the free peoples of the earth today, even of our own people if so it be that they are drinking of this cup.

Men of Christ dare not stand mute and immobile when they see democracy on the run.

For may we not agree that insofar as the human content is concerned democracy and Christianity are interchangeable terms. Democracy is nothing but the political name for the ideals in social relationships which Christianity brought into the world as a religion.

At any rate, we certainly can unitedly assent that the birth of democracy is coincident to the birth of Christianity and that many of the more important moral and religious principles of Christianity flower out in democracy.

So it must be that any social or political concept that collides with the concept of democracy collides also with the concept of Christianity and, if left unchecked and unresisted will leave human society not only without its common liberties but without its Christian faith.

That explains why Russia, when it enthroned the state, dethroned Christianity and held a mock funeral of God in a processional through the streets of Moscow. Russia could not keep God as sovereign when it made government its god.

That explains, also, why Germany silenced the voice of its Christian evangelists, closed the doors of their Christian churches, shackled their feet and silenced their tongues. The religion of Christ has always been compelled to decrease in proportion as the religion of the state has increased.

Look where you will in ancient history or this morning's newspaper and you will find that in every case in which the state is deified, the deity of Christ is denatured and denied.

Churchmen of the Christian order of society and of an ancient faith should be alive to this subtle and sinister device that is moving out today from the pagan minds of social reformers and lustful politicians.

Against their mischief-making philosophy, the cause of Christ has bared its breast since the day that Jesus himself dared imperial Rome to battle for the allegiance of the world.

Against his challenge Savonarola thundered from the pulpit in Florence and Calvin at Geneva and Luther nailing his immortal theses to the cathedral door at Wittenberg.

We marvel that the American pulpit has been so soft spoken in the presence of this monster that clearly seems to be threatening an invasion of our liberties and of our faith, call it by whatsoever name you please.

Equally we marvel that citizens of the state who profess first loyalties to their Christian citizenship are unterrified, even often unimpressed, by the obvious evidences of this onrushing menace and challenge to the heritage of their religion.

Our Slums

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial that appeared in the Miami Herald on June 7, 1948:

THIS TIME LET'S CLEAR OUR SLUMS

The newly organized slum-clearance committee has started preliminary work in practical fashion. It will make a census survey of the Negro downtown area to determine actually and factually what existing housing conditions and overcrowding of living accommodations are.

If the people generally understood what is meant by slum clearance, the committee would immediately command the powerful and articulate support needed to bring to reality a vital community project of which we have talked much and loudly during the years but about which we have done nothing definite and complete.

Unfortunately from a public realization standpoint, the great majority of our people never have the occasion to visit these areas. In a general way they understand that they are not quite "pretty," that the buildings are on the ramshackle side, that things are what might be expected on the "wrong side of the tracks."

Our Negro section is all these things. But that's only surface.

We have crammed thousands of human beings—variously estimated from 30,000 to 50,000—into a few city blocks. There are no towering apartment houses, multiple dwelling units to take care of this congested mass of humanity. Houses are tiny, as a rule, hardly large enough for a small family. Yet rents are so high, places to rest one's head so scarce that our colored citizens are actually compelled to house up in inadequate space, much as bees in a hive. Only bees can migrate to colonize elsewhere when they take the notion. Our colored population cannot. They are not free to locate where they will.

During the war we heard of hot beds in industrial cities turning out war materials.

A hot bed is a sleeping place which, when a man on the day shift leaves to go to work, is immediately occupied by a night worker tumbling in after a night's labor. Such sleeping facilities are reported in Miami's colored section.

This inhuman crowding, this cramming of humanity together in subdecent surroundings can have only the worst possible effect on the life, the living, and the morals of those compelled to submit to them.

The white population is affected profoundly by these intolerable conditions. Committee member Rev. John P. Culmer, of St. Agnes Episcopal Negro parish, spoke realistically at the interracial organization meeting.

"Although we have segregation here, it is a thin line. We will have to show these folks where their washing is done, where the workers who come into their homes are living, and in what circumstances."

It is a thin line. The public health, for instance, is not divided into the white and Negro compartments. The over-all health of our colored people is involved with ours. Contagious disease, for example, does not stop at a segregation boundary. Enlightened white self-interest should dictate a not-to-be-denied drive for slum clearance.

But our white population, which holds the key to solving of the problem, should be motivated by something nobler and spiritually finer than self-interest. Our Negroes are the creatures of God's handiwork, as we all are. Common humanity should shake Miami out of the lethargy or whatever untoward reasons have kept us from providing decent living conditions for our Negro population.

Past efforts to provide new Negro housing have smashed up on opposition to the locations selected.

Executive Director Jesse T. Knight of the Miami Housing Authority is right in the light of past practice in stressing the importance of designation of another Negro Housing development before actual slum clearance starts. Given the right kind of public support and the required official courage, that angle can be firmly and finally solved.

Where will the money come from? There are the usual Government agencies as well as private financing groups to undertake such projects. They are good business.

Last week the Institute of Life Insurance sent out a report on rental housing financed by life insurance companies that should interest the committee. It showed nearly 100,000 persons are living in their projects and company-built facilities are now under construction planned to take care of 100,000 more. The insurance companies have invested more than $400,000,000 in these housing programs. They are located in 11 States and in Canada. Why not in Miami?

The need is pressing. All it requires is the will to meet it.

The Shadow of High Tariff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I append an editorial from the Northern Virginia Daily, Strasburg, Va., of June 1, 1948, entitled "The Shadow of High Tariff":

THE SHADOW OF HIGH TARIFF

Senator VANDENBERG once more has demonstrated his sincere bipartisan approach to matters that enter into foreign affairs. He told the Senate flatly that he is against the House-approved bill which would give Congress a veto over future tariff agreements. And he also showed the plain common sense so conspicuously lacking in the utterances of some other Republican Senators who voted for the measure when he pointed out the danger in overthrowing the present reciprocal tariff arrangements.

Congressmen are continually the center of pressure brought by special interests to influence legislation. They should know full well that this sort of activity would be the rule in connection with tariffs if the veto provision becomes law. The situation carries the dark suggestion that many of them would not be so ardently for the veto right if they didn't see in it a chance to do something special for certain interests among their constituents. We hope this suggestion is ill-founded in most cases. But the old-time tariff controversy plainly is with us again.

As for the proposed measure's being practical, there are now before Congress dozens of measures that have been the subject of interminable hearings and any amount of wrangling without any decisions—right or wrong—having been reached. Is there any reason for thinking that things would be any different in connection with matters so highly controversial as tariff policies? The unavoidable conclusion as to the motive of the House in passing the bill is that members want to undo the work of recent years by building higher tariff walls.

Other countries recognize that motive and they may be counted upon to try to protect themselves. The result would be tariff rivalry of the sort that contributed so largely to the depression of the 1930's. It is to be hoped that the Senate will follow Senator VANDENBERG's initiative by rejecting the bill. But while the Senate frequently corrects the House's impulsive errors, that outcome can't be counted upon with certainty. Citizens who recognize the immense stake this country has in world trade will watch the Senate's action with more than a casual interest.

Support of H. R. 5277 To Repeal the Embargo on Exports of Tobacco Seed by the Agriculture and State Departments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there was considerable com-

ment recently in the press and on the radio to the effect that H. R. 5277, a bill to repeal the embargo on tobacco seed exports, was introduced as a retaliatory measure. This is not in keeping with the facts.

The embargo on tobacco seed exports is the most vicious trade barrier ever erected in our country. This embargo, together with the import quota and near embargo on cotton imports, and the export subsidies being paid on tobacco and cotton exports makes all claims of the New Dealers that they are for reciprocity and a good neighbor policy look ridiculous. It is just one more example of the fact that the foreign agriculture trade policy of the New Dealers is honeycombed with deceit—yes, dripping with deception. The tobacco seed embargo is similar to the Russian embargo on sable and the Australian embargo on certain types of sheep. Why talk about reciprocity as long as this tobacco seed embargo is on our statute books?

So long as the New Dealers insist on keeping this embargo on tobacco seed exports, just so long will their vociferous position on reciprocal trade treaties and good neighbor policy be truly deceitful.

The public has already been deceived too long about the foreign agricultural policy. In short it has been to supplant embargoes and quotas for tariffs on the crops of the South and to reduce the duties on the livestock and livestock products of the North.

The Food and Agriculture Organization as a part of the United Nations is the proper approach to this problem. It has the cooperation of the farm organizations, of the United States and many other countries. This approach will make the tariff and reciprocal trade treaties become obsolete.

Following are letters received from the Departments of State and Agriculture respectively in support of H. R. 5277:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 21, 1948.

Hon. CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. HOPE: I refer again to your letter of April 21, 1948, requesting the Department's views with respect to H. R. 5277, a bill to repeal the act of June 5, 1940, entitled "An act to prohibit the exportation of tobacco seed and plants, except for experimental purposes."

The Department is heartily in accord with this bill to repeal an embargo which was enacted against the advice of the Departments of State and Agriculture and without the approval of the President. The Department of Agriculture, in a report to your committee in 1937, pointed out that foreign production of tobacco was not necessarily dependent upon continuation of supplies of American seed, and that in view of conclusively established principles of genetics, the seed could be produced in foreign countries if adequate safeguards were adopted to prevent cross-fertilization. Consequently, the Department concluded that an export prohibition on seed could have no material effect upon production of American types of tobacco in foreign countries, except perhaps of a very temporary nature. The Department of Agriculture also emphasized the impossibility of effecting sufficient control to assure that small quantities were not taken from the country, since 1,000,000 tobacco seeds weighed but three ounces.

At the time this report was made, the Department of State concurred in the views expressed by the Department of Agriculture that the proposed embargo would be ineffective in accomplishing the purposes for which it was intended, and this Department considers that the appraisal furnished by the Department of Agriculture is still valid. Furthermore, the Department considers it is now more important than ever that arbitrary restrictions of this sort should be removed. I need hardly remind you how important foreign markets are to American tobacco growers, and how necessary it is that their position in those markets be protected against the imposition of arbitrary or discriminatory controls. The tobacco industry is at present seriously hampered by foreign trade controls, both temporary wartime ones which can be justified on economic grounds, and others which are not so clearly defensible. There is every reason to expect that the former will disappear as reconstruction abroad progresses and as expanding production and exports enable foreign countries to increase their import trade.

It is against the other and more serious type of restriction that this Government is now concentrating its efforts, and in the proposed Charter for an International Trade Organization far-reaching provisions have been agreed upon which should prove to be of great long-run benefit to American tobacco producers. These include provisions for the general elimination of quantitative import restrictions, except under clearly defined circumstances and subject to careful safeguards; the establishment of a rule of nondiscrimination with respect to trading activities of state enterprises; and a general prohibition on new or increased tariff preferences. Furthermore, the charter, by establishing for the first time a code of fair conduct for the world's trade, should contribute to a general improvement in trading conditions and a general expansion of world trade which will be of no small importance to the tobacco industry. These and many other important benefits cannot be obtained, however, unless the United States is willing for its part to eliminate restrictions which are unjustified on economic grounds and which are harmful to other countries. Article 20 of the proposed Charter in fact calls for the elimination of any prohibition on the exportation or sale for export of any product destined for any other country a member of the International Trade Organization. It would therefore require the elimination of the existing embargo on tobacco-seed exports, an embargo which is, in the Department's opinion, not only an unnecessary and harmful restriction but one which is not in the best interests of the tobacco industry itself.

For these reasons, the Department recommends the enactment of H. R. 5277.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report to the Committee for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. BOHLEN,
Counselor
(For the Secretary of State).

MAY 21, 1948.

Hon. CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HOPE: This is in reply to your request for a report on H. R. 5277, a bill to repeal the act of June 5, 1940, entitled "An act to prohibit the exportation of tobacco seed and plants except for experimental purposes."

In a report to the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, dated July 20, 1937 (on H. R. 6830, 75th Cong.), the Department of Agriculture set forth its reasons for opposing the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of tobacco seed and plants except for experimental purposes. Those reasons were (1) difficulty of enforcement because of the possibility of illegal exportation of small quantities of tobacco seeds which would be sufficient to maintain extensive production; (2) recognition of the fact that propagation of American types of tobacco abroad would not be prevented even with adequate enforcement of an embargo on exportation of American tobacco seed; and (3) possibility of retaliatory action of countries affected by the prohibition of exportation of seeds and plants.

As a matter of principle, for the same reasons as those set forth in 1937, the Department considers prohibition of exportation of tobacco seeds and plants, except for experimental purposes, to be unwise. However, in all fairness it must be admitted that the administration of the act has not been difficult and the prohibition may have been a factor in retarding the development in certain foreign countries of tobacco which would compete successfully with certain American types of tobacco. Further, we are not aware of any serious instance of retaliatory action on the part of any country affected by the prohibition against exportation of tobacco seeds and plants.

This Department favors enactment of H. R. 5277.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

N. E. DODD,
Acting Secretary.

Speaking of Armaments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on June 8, 1948:

SPEAKING OF ARMAMENTS

This is a time of great concern over arms. The war fastened attention on weapons. The atomic bomb shadows popular imagination. And today, facing a new expansion of totalitarian tyranny, the western democracies, led by the United States, are picking up again the arms so recently laid aside, and adding others.

In the present state of the world this step appears necessary. There is reason to hope that it will be a deterrent to war. If lack of evidence that aggression would be resisted contributed to the miscalculations which led to the recent war then it is well now to make the position unmistakably clear. The American arms program may serve that end.

Even so, this turning so soon again to arms is deeply troubling. It is a mistake to consider arms and war synonymous. But renewed concern with armaments does reflect a failure to achieve settlements by the more ideal means of reason and justice. And unfortunately this sign that the world is not ready for unarmed diplomacy may tempt us to turn too much away from peaceful persuasion and rely too exclusively on material power.

In this situation we believe it would be highly practical and helpful to remind ourselves of another arms program enunciated by the Apostle Paul in writing to the Christians at Ephesus:

"Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil.

"For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places.

"Wherefore take unto you the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand.

"Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness;

"And your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace;

"Above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked.

"And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God."

This is, of course, first of all a program for individuals. But we are told that one wise man saved a city. Surely if enough citizens adopted this arms program their nation would soon be strengthened more than any accumulation of weapons can empower it.

Particularly when it is so plain that the basic struggle today is not "against flesh and blood" but "against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world" and its materialism is it wise to begin with moral and mental preparedness. Tyranny and aggression have succeeded largely because of moral cowardice, of political corruption, of cynicism, of economic injustice, of internal strife caused by selfish interests and lack of faith in good.

Communism is only one of the spearheads of "spiritual wickedness in high places." It succeeds quickest where rank materialism builds a Trojan horse. Defenses must be raised against all "the wiles of the devil," which by filling even our own thinking with hate, fear, greed, or dishonesty, would defeat us no matter how strong our physical armaments.

Republican Keynoter and Civil Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the June 2, 1948, St. Louis Post-Dispatch. The editorial follows:

GOVERNOR GREEN TRAMPLES CIVIL SERVICE

The degradation, not to say prostitution, of civil service in Illinois under Dwight H. Green is enough in itself to disqualify him from any consideration whatever for a place on the national Republican ticket. It is enough to disqualify him, for that matter, for reelection for a third term as Governor, an office which he nominally seeks.

The whole sordid, ugly story is told in the report of the Civil Service Protective Association, composed of civil-service employees throughout the State. What may be called a key to this report is the statement in the two Green administration there has been "utter contempt for the merit system and a total disregard of the rights of civil-service employees."

The widespread application of the lug, the use of State employees to collect campaign funds, systematic efforts to force out civil-service employees to make room for party henchmen, designation of "personnel officers," actually politicians, at State institutions for the express purpose of taking the hiring and discharging of civil-service employees away from the managing officer—these are only a few of the items in the bill of indictments which the civil-service organization files against the man whom the GOP National Convention will hear as its keynoter.

What makes the Green record all the worse is his betrayal of his special message to civil-service employees in his 1941 inaugural address. Here is what he said on that occasion:

"Since the power and prestige of a political machine is maintained by jobs, every extension of civil service is a blow to bossism. The merit system is no longer a subject for controversy. The new administration will comply with the civil-service statute, and expects the same conduct from the beneficiaries of that law."

Yet the sound of that pledge had hardly quieted before the raids were on, before plans for the disruption of the civil service over the years were in progress, before the lug was under way as never before applied in Illinois. In little more than it takes to tell its morale was broken in State institutions. The full flower of Greenism came when the State mine inspection service was so compromised through the shake-down of mine operators that the Centralia mine disaster could take 111 lives notwithstanding repeated warnings that an explosion was imminent.

One thing we can be sure the GOP keynote speech will not contain. It will not contain a true account of the way the civil service has been ignored, trampled on, kicked in the face under Dwight Green in Illinois.

Rejections for Military Service Because of Illiteracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the South Carolina Weekly:

WHY DON'T WE DO SOMETHING ABOUT IT?

You have heard these statistics before. Perhaps you might have even been impressed by them. But what have we done about it? We are talking about the young men who were rejected by the draft boards in South Carolina and all over America because they could neither read nor write.

Are these men destined to go through life begging someone to write their name by the little "X" mark every time they have to sign a document?

Are these men never to be given the honor and privilege of serving in the armed services of their country in time of peace or war?

Why do we continue to punish them? They may even be disfranchised because of their educational deficiency. Perhaps up to now it has been rather convenient for the demagogs to keep these men in the dark.

But what of the future?

* * * * *

Altogether more than 600,000 Americans were rejected all over the United States. The largest portion, however, came from the South. And the southern soldier is a valiant individual. He is unsurpassed for gallantry in action in this world. He is unsurpassed for valor and cool thinking. He is known to make the best paratrooper. He has courage.

In Congress we are now enacting legislation to provide the manpower the services need in order to be adequately prepared for any eventuality that might rise.

The 600,000 Americans who were rejected the first time will be rejected again, if they still come within the age limits of the new draft bill. Nothing has been done to give this sector of the American population a chance to serve their country. What is more pitiful is the fact that a new crop of illiterates will be rejected. They will be the boys who are just becoming of age.

The revised Senate bill now being considered provides for 2 years of duty for young men between 19 and 25.

To our way of thinking that bill should be amended so as to provide ways and means to accept the illiterates within that age group.

Service schools should be established to teach these young men to read and write while they are being put in physical condition and being trained in the modern art of warfare. It could be done easily. And if it were done these unfortunate young men who are illiterates because their parents were illiterates would be given a new light—a light to discover our rich traditions and valiant history, the history of democracy.

Essay on Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I append an essay by Arlene Showalter, of the senior class of the Lovingston, Va., High School, on the subject of conservation.

"To be an American citizen is one of earth's greatest blessings," someone has said. Would he say the same thing if America were an impoverished land, resources depleted, the people poor and undernourished? Fortunately, this is not true. America is rich, powerful, and influential. But if riches are to remain, if our citizens are to be strong and healthy, if the leadership to which we are accustomed is to continue, we must look well to one of the internal problems of our Nation.

We have been taught that food getting is the most important problem facing man. It is secondary only when there is an abundant food supply and man's faculties may be turned aside to other pursuits. Without sufficient food, man's will to advance is impaired, his vision is dimmed, and his animal nature begins to assert itself. Selfishness and greed supplant the higher qualities of kindness and good will, and soon the very foundation of a working social order is undermined.

Is America in danger? Are we headed toward this end? Scientists tell us that a carpet of top soil less than a foot thick is all that keeps man on earth. In a period of 300 years we have thrown away a third of our rich heritage. We have thrown it away because it could have been used and at the same time preserved. It has fallen prey to one of our Nation's most insidious foes—erosion.

Erosion is a tireless worker, ever alert, never satisfied. It takes advantage of man's thoughtlessness, his every careless act, his greed. So well has man cooperated with erosion that it has been able to undo in 300 years what it will take nature 1,500 years to repair—if given a chance.

Erosion has an ally in the ever-increasing demands for food. Our land can adequately support 184,000,000 people. Our present population is about 145,000,000 and it is increasing rapidly. In a few more years, our population will absorb all the produce we can possibly raise. At present most of our surplus food is being shipped abroad. But it is not enough. The world has land to adequately feed 700,000,000 fewer people than live on it. If all the nations were under normal production, the present population could not be properly fed. What a temptation to strain the land to the utmost? What a wonderful opportunity for erosion to feed upon the very lifeblood of our Nation?

America is proud of its heritage. It is spending billions to keep the enemy away from our shores. But our enemy within is so close to us that we overlook its very existence. It is stealing a half million of our acres a year and yet many of us make no protest. We read of dust storms that sweep farms into the sky and manifest little interest. Floods, droughts, poverty of soil and health we accept as our fate and not as the outcome of our own carelessness.

In Algeria there stands a ghost town named Timgad. There are no people there, for they disappeared 1,350 years ago when the desert sands took over. It is a silent testimonial of a people who forgot that towns are kept alive by good soil. It serves as a warning for us whose maps show that our deserts are growing.

It is late but not too late to keep the gloom and desolation of Timgad from descending upon our future generations. The work of erosion can be halted and some of the damage repaired. Organizations such as Friends of the Soil, Audubon societies, the National Federation for Wildlife Conservation, Boy and Girl Scouts, Campfire Girls, and 4–H Clubs are turned toward training boys and girls to accept responsibility for conservation. Every tree planted, every gully patched, every bird house built, and every mineral wisely used will help to keep our cities from turning into Timgads.

What is the test of the worthwhileness of our generation? It is that we leave our Nation a better place than we found it. Otherwise our existence is not justified and we deserve no credit. Can we afford to squander what we merely hold in trust? Can we afford to be less magnanimous than those who have done before? The answer is up to us. Let us arise to the need of the hour as America has always arisen when enlightened. Let us continue to make it a blessing to be an American citizen.

Theodore G. Bilbo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a tribute I have prepared to the memory of the late Senator THEODORE G. BILBO, of Mississippi, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and that it then take its place in the bound copy of the memorial services.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

The eulogy is as follows:

Mr. President, THEODORE G. BILBO, late a Member of this body, was honored with high public office by the people of Mississippi more than any other man in the history of our great State. Born of humble parents, he never lost the common touch, and never lost a keen sense of understanding of the problems of the average man. Because he fought with unyielding courage to better the lot of the common man, and because he reflected the attitudes and opinions of the average citizen on the major problems of the day, his fellow citizens elected him State senator, lieutenant governor, twice governor, and three tim s United States Senator.

THEODORE GILMORE BILBO was born October 13, 1877, at Juniper Grove, 5 miles south of Poplarville, in Pearl River County, Miss. The humble circumstances of his birth merely fired his determination and ambition to achieve an education that would fit him for a career of public service. Not until he reached the age of 15 was he able to enter public school at Poplarville, where he was enrolled in the third grade, but in 4 years he completed the grammar and high school course.

Young BILBO then enrolled in the University of Nashville, Peabody College, paying his expenses by serving as a newsbutch on a train, and running a laundry agency in the college dormitory.

Leaving Peabody in 1900, he taught for 5 years in the public school of southwest Mississippi, accumulating savings to enter the study of law. After studying for 3 years at Vanderbilt University and the University of Michigan, he was admitted to the Mississippi bar in 1908.

His promising political career was already under way at this time. He was elected to the State senate in 1907, representing Pearl River, Lamar, and Hancock Counties. Senator BILBO's career in the upper house of the Mississippi Legislature gained favorable attention throughout the State. In 1911 he was elected Lieutenant Governor in his first State-wide campaign.

In 1915 the progressive forces of the State rallied to the banner of the young Lieutenant Governor, and he was swept into the governorship on a platform of service to the common people.

The record of the first administration of Governor BILBO is one of accomplishments that rank among the important achievements in the recent history of Mississippi. Measures for the improvement of the health and welfare of the people gained first attention. A tubercular sanatorium was established at Magee, and this institution today ranks as one of the finest of its kind in the United States. A charity hospital, home for the feeble-minded, and a campaign against adult illiteracy were part of the welfare program.

The State's financial structure was reorganized, a State tax commission established, and the State highway commission created to systematize road building.

The people were given a broader voice in government through the establishment of an initiative and referendum system, a reapportionment of representation in the legislature, and restrictions upon the activities of lobbyists. An education commission reorganized and codified education laws, and a distribution system for school funds designed to benefit the poorer counties was adopted.

The Governor's record during this period gained for him a name among the people as "BILBO the builder." He was very proud of this name and the record that it implied, and delighted to hear himself so referred to in later years.

Governor BILBO was Mississippi's chief executive throughout the period of World War I. His enthusiastic and complete cooperation with the national defense effort attracted the favorable attention of President Woodrow Wilson, and set a pattern followed by all Southern States in World War II.

Returning to the practice of law at Poplarville after the completion of his term as Governor (constitutional provisions prevented a second term in succession), BILBO still remained active in the Mississippi political arena.

As Governor, he had taken the lead in fighting the cattle tick in Mississippi by promoting a dipping-vat program to rid livestock of this pestilence. Uninformed people feared this new innovation of dipping, and it became the chief political issue in the south Mississippi area in which Governor BILBO lived. The people were greatly aroused, and passion took the place of reason in many quarters. But even though he knew that his position was unpopular, BILBO entered the race for Congress with a firm stand in favor of a dipping program as one of the chief planks of his platform. He went down to defeat on that issue, but he had helped sow the seeds of calm thinking about the cattle-tick issue. Eventually a tick-eradication program prevailed, and Governor BILBO deserves a large share of the credit for the development of the great livestock industry which we have in Mississippi today.

In 1923 the former Governor sought to return to that high office, but was defeated after a hard campaign of the type that gained BILBO the sobriquet, "Stormy petrel of Mississippi politics." The scene had changed in 1927, however, and he was nominated for the governorship by one of the largest majorities ever attained by a candidate for that office.

The bitterness of the two preceding gubernatorial campaigns marred the success of Governor BILBO's second term as Governor. A strong opposition faction gained enough strength to block enactment of most of his legislative program, but many of his recommendations have been adopted in modified form by succeeding legislatures. Chief among these was a gigantic State highway building program. The road program which was eventually adopted has made Mississippi's arterial highway system one of the best in the Nation.

Always a loyal supporter of the Democratic Party, Governor BILBO had taken the lead in active campaigning for the party's nominee even in dark days of the 1928 election year. He enthusiastically supported Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1932, and welcomed the chance for a post with the new Department of Agriculture farm

program in 1933. A still broader horizon opened for him in 1934, when he asked for the nomination to the United States Senate.

The first years of the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt were a time of great inspiration and hope to the people of Mississippi. For the first time the Federal Government was turning its attention to the economic problems of the Southland, offering a chance to improve the lot of the average citizens to whom Governor BILBO has been a faithful friend. Pledging himself to support the efforts of the Roosevelt administration to bring the Nation out of the depression, to aid the farmer and the laboring man, BILBO was elected to the United States Senate.

In the Senate he worked for those measures designed to benefit the great mass of citizens of the United States, and not a privileged few. He made a great record as one of the supporters of much of the legislation to provide economic and social benefits to the Nation that today stands as a landmark of the progress of our country.

Senator BILBO was author and one of the chief sponsors of a measure that today is recognized as one of the major achievements in the long fight to promote adequate agricultural research. Under this bill four great agricultural research laboratories were established at Philadelphia, Pa.; Peoria, Ill.; San Francisco, Calif.; and New Orleans, La. In the short time of their existence these laboratories have provided the knowledge that has meant millions of dollars in additional income to the farmers of America, and they are continuing to contribute to the sound development of our national economy. Senator BILBO was particularly proud of the fact that scientists working at the Peoria laboratory perfected improved methods for the wholesale manufacture of penicillin, thus making this drug available for general medical use.

The problem of peaceful relations between the races received more and more of the Senator's attention as tensions mounted with the peace of World War II. He determined upon one possible solution as the establishment of a Negro colony in the home continent of Africa. This idea was not one that Senator BILBO claimed to have originated—Jefferson, Monroe, and Lincoln were among those who gave serious consideration to this possibility during the days of actual slavery.

When measures were brought before the Congress affecting the established customs and traditions of Mississippi and other southern States, Senator BILBO fought back with all the vigor of the rough-and-tumble political fights that had enlivened his public career in Mississippi. He asked no quarter and gave none.

Senator BILBO was fiercely loyal to his friends throughout his long career, in both private and public life. He had a natural liking for people and was happiest when with a group of friends or speaking to audiences of his supporters.

He learned to love people as he found them. Once during a hectic campaign an associate expressed displeasure at a group of constituents, but the Senator came to their defense: "You must learn to like people as you find them; life is too short to make people over to suit your taste."

Never forgetting the periods during his own life when he had to battle material hardships, Senator BILBO was never known to refuse a request for aid to the needy. The poor and the downtrodden of Mississippi, regardless of race or creed, knew of this warm, human characteristic, and provided him with many opportunities to be of service.

A close friend of the Senator has made this estimation of his career:

Thus, with resolute determination, THEODORE GILMORE BILBO, from 1908 to August 1947, with vision and clear thinking of almost prophetic foresight, has fought the battles for the progress, welfare, and happiness of the average man of this State and Nation.

His determination was effectuated by prompt attention to every request. He answered friend or foe with some kind of response. He believed in the political principle that "while the light holds out to burn, the vilest sinner might return." He did not give, and he did not ask any quarter, in political fights. He enjoyed publicity and often said to newspaper reporters that he cared not what they wrote about him, but he did not want to be ignored.

His labor of love was the building of Juniper Grove Baptist Church and parsonage and his own last residence nearby, the Dream House. He was always dreaming and building not so much for his own enjoyment but that others might have greater opportunities in his home community in his State, and throughout the Nation.

On our last trip together from Washington, in January 1947, when his seating was wrongfully delayed, at his suggestion we drove by a cemetery at Cleveland, Tenn. He pointed out a stately and beautiful marble mausoleum. It is the pattern for the one that is to contain his ashes until that great getting-up morning, when the trumpets shall sound. Even in the face of death he dreamed and built for the future.

He enjoyed perhaps more close, faithful, and loyal friends from every walk and station in life than any other in our time. On the other extreme, he had as many bitter personal and political enemies as any public official of Mississippi in the last 75 years. This resulted very greatly from the fact that he always took a positive stand on every public issue that was presented. He was no fence straddler and he was never afraid to speak his convictions on any subject.

In the many political campaigns in which "The Man" BILBO participated he spoke for more than an hour, from four to eight times a day, and to as many different audiences. He was proud of his strength and endurance and never failed to meet and fill every speaking engagement, whether the crowd was large or small.

Senator BILBO's turbulent career in the Senate in many ways followed the same pattern of his political career in Mississippi. He did not thrive on placidity, and it is probable that he would not have cared for any career other than a stormy one.

The people of Mississippi twice reelected him to the Senate. Despite the formidable opposition of a distinguished former Governor of the State, he was renominated by a large majority in 1940. In 1946 four outstanding Mississippians opposed him in a hard-fought primary, but he gained a majority over the entire group in the first primary balloting.

Following this nomination, Senator BILBO was reelected without opposition in the general election of November 1946. When his proper credentials as the duly elected Senator from Mississippi were presented to the President of the Senate, opposition developed to his being sworn in. This opposition had sprung from the same partisan, sectional politics that has contributed to certain ill-advised attempts to legislate customs and traditions in recent years in the Halls of Congress.

Senator BILBO fought back at this effort to thwart the will of the people of Mississippi who had elected him, but his health was such that it would not have withstood the strain of the contest before the Senate. Accordingly, a compromise was reached whereby he was allowed to return to his home in Mississippi in an effort to regain his health, while his credentials remained on the table, subject to further call when the contest was brought to a climax.

Unfortunately, the illness which weakened Senator BILBO was the dread malady of cancer. Despite his heroic attempts to fight back, making use of all the medical resources known to man, death came to him on August 27, 1947. Thousands of people from over the State and Nation joined in expressions of sympathy. Many thousands of his faithful friends were present to pay a final homage when he was laid to rest in Juniper Grove Cemetery near his beautiful dream house and his well-loved Juniper Grove Baptist Church.

A Mississippi statesman bespoke a befitting final eulogy at the memorial services in his honor conducted by a joint session of the Mississippi legislature:

In death all men must cast aside the burden of their honors and their griefs. Man takes with him only that which he has freely given away. Measured by this standard, Senator BILBO bears a legacy so rare that even envy is compelled to pay tribute of admiration. Upon his country's altar he placed his wonderful natural talent. With tireless brain he wrought to promote the general good. He faced each task with heroic courage of those who do not count the cost. As time runs on and the historians survey the picture of these troubled days, there will arise in it no figure more courageous than Senator THEODORE G. BILBO.

Excerpts From Article by Bernard Baruch in Saturday Evening Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, America today is accused by enemies abroad and at home of many things. As a result our generous efforts to assist other countries, instead of bringing us appreciation, quite frequently brings exactly the reverse.

Most pertinent to this situation, I believe, is an article which appears in the

latest issue of the Saturday Evening Post by Bernard M. Baruch, of whose abilities and services to his country the Members of this body, I am sure, are fully aware. Mr. Baruch details in most convincing fashion the extraordinary part America played in achieving victory in World War II. It is a story that every American should know, and upon which even many in Washington, who were closest to the picture, might well wish to have their memories refreshed.

For this reason and because I think the facts presented deserve the widest of publicity, I ask unanimous consent to have the pertinent excerpts from the article published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FEW KIND WORDS FOR UNCLE SAM

(Excerpts from an article in the Saturday Evening Post, June 12, 1948, by Bernard M. Baruch)

Shortly after we entered World War I, President Wilson invited me to a White House discussion of a critical oil shortage which threatened to disrupt our military plans. One official proposed we seize the Mexican oil fields at Tampico. Squadrons of marines had already been alerted. The President had only to give the word for them to push off.

President Wilson hardly waited for the finish of the argument.

"What you are asking me to do is exactly what we protested against when committed by Germany," he reprimanded. "You say this oil in Mexico is necessary for us. That is what the Germans said when they invaded Belgium, 'it was necessary' to get to France."

"Gentlemen," he concluded, "you will have to fight the war with what oil you have."

This incident * * * flashed into my memory recently while I was thinking of how widely and unjustly this country has come to be besplattered as a "money grabber" and "imperialist," concerned only with profit-getting and national aggrandizement.

Contrasting their own devastation and misery with our untouched cities and prosperity, many Europeans feel the United States somehow profited while engaged in the recent war, and greatly since. Some go so far as to regard our generous postwar aid as an obligation we owe to "balance the burdens" others suffered. Exploiting these resentments, Soviet propagandists have been belittling what we did to defeat Hitler and Japan, and besmearing our motives in the peacemaking as seeking a "new war in lust for profits from the blood of millions."

It may help avert future embitterments of "Uncle Shylock" to set forth now just what America's contribution to the war and peacemaking has been.

These facts are marshaled in hopes of inspiring a better appreciation of both the spirit and the magnitude of our endeavor, in which we hazarded everything with no impulse of reward, other than to gain peace for all.

It is a record for which no American need feel anything but pride. It is particularly worth examining now, when everything this country symbolizes is under assault by enemies, abroad and at home, who would destroy our faith in ourselves. The role thrust upon us by today's peace-waging is remarkably like the one we performed so magnificently during the recent war. Once again, demands beyond our resources tug at us from all over the world—western Europe, China, Turkey, Greece, Korea, South America. We again face the necessity of developing that global leadership and decisiveness of internal unity—this time in peaceful equivalents—which enabled us to achieve global victory in the war. Knowing what we did before, and therefore can do again, may hearten and comfort this greatest stronghold of righteous power left in the world.

Probably the one caricature of America circulated most persistently abroad is that of Uncle Sam as a walking fistful of dollars using his wealth to buy other peoples as "cannon fodder" to do his fighting.

In actual fact, more than one-half of all munitions produced by all the Allies were stamped "made in America." Our war expenditures of $330,000,000,000, through the fiscal year of 1946, exceeded those of Great Britain and Soviet Russia combined.* * *

Although the United States was forced into the war 27 months later, American military casualties exceeded those of the entire British Empire in both dead and wounded. Of the 90 divisions which stormed through western Europe, 61 were American. The initial landing waves of all but a few of the beachhead assaults on the many Pacific islands were American. * * * The World Almanac totals the casualties for England, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa, and the colonies, together at 353,652 military dead, 475,070 wounded, 90,844 missing, and 60,595 civilians killed, or 980,161 casualties in all. American dead numbered more than 400,000 and there were nearly 670,000 wounded. Our toll of dead would have been higher but for the remarkable care given the wounded.

During both—producing the implements of war and using them on fighting fronts across two oceans—was a deliberate choice. * * * We did not keep, for our own protection, weapons which could have been employed on fighting fronts. To the contrary, we deliberately exposed our defenses—not without protests from some Americans—so that everything possible could be shipped overseas. To Britain alone, more than 45,000 antiaircraft guns were sent.

DISPROVING OUR WAR-GAIN MOTIVES

The wartime aid contributed to our allies soared to $50,000,000,000, from which $10,000,000,000 should be deducted for reverse lend-lease and other settlements. For a nation which, according to its detractors, is motivated by selfish ends, we were remarkably insensible to opportunities for exacting materialistic gains as the price of this astronomical assistance. * * *

To meet the Allies' needs, America's industrial capacity was vastly expanded. Some may point to that as a war gain. Any idea that the war swelled America's net physical wealth evaporates if one compares our wartime imports and exports. * * * The difference is one measure of the physical resources expended as part of our war contribution. The 5,800,000,000 barrels of oil pumped from the American earth would keep all the automobiles in the country running for 12 years.

For what went abroad, we were paid virtually nothing, the bulk going to American forces or as gifts to Allies. For what we imported, we paid dollars, which represent claims upon our future production still to be made good. Our public debt jumped five times. In 1939 taxes took as tribute one of $13 of our national income; today they exact one of every $4 Americans earn. Still the American people have continued their giving into the war's aftermath with additional loans and gifts, so far, of $21,000,000,000—not including our contribution to the World Bank and Montetary Fund—in UNRRA grants, the British loan, surplus-property credits and, most recently, the European recovery program. To Europe alone, last year, individual Americans sent more than 23,000,000 parcels through the mails and CARE, plus an estimated $120,000,000 in remittances to relatives and friends, and another $250,000,000 of relief in cash and goods through private organizations.

One could search vainly mankind's whole history for comparable generosity. Yet, to some critics abroad and apologists at home, this is the record of a nation scheming to exploit and enslave the world.

Two-thirds of our lend-lease aid went to the United Kingdom, about a fourth—$11,000,000,000—to the Soviet Union. Such sums speak their own importance. Still, since the Soviet Government has chosen to dismiss this assistance as incidental, these additional facts might be brought forth.

Our aid was concentrated upon filling Russia's most critical needs, like night-fighter airplanes which the Soviets could not produce, or aviation gasoline, in which Russian output was woefully deficient. The 1,931 locomotives and 3,786,000 tires we shipped the U. S. S. R. were more locomotives and tires than the Soviets produced in any full prewar year. Soviet truck production, before the war, ran around 200,000 units a year. We sent the Soviet Union 375,000 trucks. Being vastly superior to those made in Russia, these trucks probably equaled 2 years' normal Russian output.

Without American trucks, tires, and locomotives and such items as 52,000 jeeps, 35,000 motorcycles, 415,000 telephone sets, 15,000,000 pairs of soldiers' boots, and 4,000,000 tons of food, the Red army never could have achieved the superior mobility which was one of its principal military advantages over the Germans. Being able to shift their troops more rapidly, the Soviets could choose Germany's weakest salients for their attacks.

Out of her own resources, Russia could not have supplied the 22,000,000 men the Red army is estimated to have mobilized. Workers and peasants would have had to be kept back on factories and farms. Russian munitions production would have been curtailed to fill the gaps we plugged. Nor should it be forgotten that we stimulated Russia's own productivity through nearly $500,000,000 of American machine tools and another $2,500,000,000 of industrial materials, like armor plate, aluminum, copper, and zinc.

Soviet military operations profited from American and British bombing of German industry and lines of communication. Our unceasing pressure upon the Japanese after the Battle of Midway was certainly a powerful restraint against the Japs attacking Russia and forcing her to fight on two fronts.

In as much as the Soviets have taken to boasting they beat Hitler virtually single-handed, it must be said that without the United States, the German Army would not have been driven from Russia's soil. Our offensives had to leap two distant oceans. Nine days after General Eisenhower landed in Normandy, more than 3,000 miles from the United States, General MacArthur was assaulting the Marianas, 6,000 miles from home.

That we could undertake two such operations, at opposite ends of the world, at the same time has never ceased being a source of marvel to me. No other nation in the world could have done it. Of all the belligerents, only the United States really fought a global war. While Russia and Britain as well as Germany and Japan, participated on a few fronts at most, there was not a battlefield or staging area which did not see American food, weapons, and, in most cases, American men. The tentacles of our communications stretched more than 56,000 miles.

In every field we set new production records. With fewer farmers, our output of food was lifted one-third. Off the assembly lines of our "arsenal of democracy" during the five war years rolled nearly 300,000 airplanes, more than 15,000,000 rifles and carbines, 319,000 pieces of field artillery, 41,000,000,000 rounds of ammunition, 4,200,000 tons of artillery shells, 86,000 tanks, 64,500 landing craft, 52,000,000 tons of merchant shipping—three ships a day—quadrupling

our own merchant fleet. The Navy grew from 1,900,000 tons to 13,800,000 tons, greater than all the other fleets of the world combined.

Twice in my lifetime I have seen the American Nation transform itself from a peaceful, war-hating people into the most terrible instrumentality for destruction the world has ever seen, and, even more swiftly, revert to its easy-going, antimilitaristic normalcy. It is not accidental that Americans behave in this fashion; that we avoid war as long as possible, accepting it only as a last alternative; then, once in the struggle, fight with the fury of one possessed; and, the shooting over, scuttle and run back home.

The mainspring behind these actions is the American passion for freedom—that and the fact that war is the complete opposite of our normal ways, as night unto day. For 100 years, students of Marxism have parroted the libel that the capitalistic system is driven to war by its very nature, in its hunger for markets and profits. The truth is that modern warfare has developed so that no economic system is more conducive to peace than one based on private initiative, where a multitude of individuals pursue their happiness and profit, independent of the state.

The American system hasn't produced perfection. It has brought the people further along in their pursuit of happiness than any other system. More important than material benefits, the people still hold the power to change anything and everything. Nothing anyone would propose cannot be done by the people, if persuaded of its wisdom. They can revoke any law, fire any official, tax the rich, succor the poor. Under a police state, once imposed, the people lose all ability to determine their future. Why change our form of government when we can use that government to make whatever changes we desire?

Benefits for the Aged—Dependent Children and Needy Blind

REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 9, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure a day or two ago in behalf of the Committee on Ways and Means to remove the last obstacle as far as the Congress is concerned, to enactment of House Joint Resolution 296. Under this resolution, which is now on the President's desk awaiting his signature, individuals in all States, in need of financial assistance, or who are now obtaining such assistance, will obtain increased benefits if the States find such increases are justified in individual cases.

The resolution authorizes an increase of approximately $185,000,000 in expenditures from the Federal Treasury to be paid to the several States on account of benefits to needy aged individuals under the State-operated old-age-assistance program established in title I of the Social Security Act and to dependent children and the needy blind under similar assistance programs. This does not mean the increases in benefit will be limited to a distribution of the $185,000,000 among the three-million-three-hundred-and-sixty-four-thousand-odd beneficiaries now receiving such assistance, but that the Federal participation will be increased by this amount and probably supplemented by increased State contributions to such beneficiaries.

Under the matching formula provided for in the resolution the Federal Government will contribute three-fourths of the first $20 paid to any individual recipient of assistance, under titles I and X of the act, and 50 percent of amounts in excess of $20 up to a maximum Federal contribution of $30 in any given case.

The following table shows how Federal contributions in these programs will be increased above the existing level of Federal payments:

Federal participation in old-age assistance and aid to the blind programs under titles I and II, Social Security Act

Total benefit paid by State	Federal share under existing law	Federal share under H. J. Res. 296
$15	$10.00	$11.25
20	12.50	15.00
25	15.00	17.50
30	17.50	20.00
35	20.00	22.50
40	22.50	25.00
45	25.00	27.50
50	25.00	30.00

Federal contributions to benefits to dependent children will also be increased, under the resolution as shown in the following table:

Federal participation in aid to dependent children program under title IV, Social Security Act

Total benefit paid by State	Federal share under existing law	Federal share under H. J. Res. 296
$6.00	$4.00	$4.50
9.00	6.00	6.75
10.00	6.50	7.50
12.00	7.00	9.00
15.00	9.00	10.50
20.00	12.50	13.00
24.00	13.50	15.00
27.00	[1] 15.00	16.50
30.00	16.50	[1] 18.00
40.00	21.50	23.00
45.00	[2] 24.00	24.50
48.00	24.00	[2] 27.00

[1] Maximum contributed by the Federal Government with respect to the second and each successive dependent child.
[2] Maximum contributed by the Federal Government with respect to 1 dependent child.

The general effect of enactment of House Joint Resolution 296 will be the direct encouragement of the States either to increase their monthly benefits under all these grant-in-aid programs or more recipients to the rolls.

In 1946 Congress increased the authorization for Federal participation in these three grant-in-aid programs from a 50–50 matching formula to two-thirds of the first $15 of any benefit and 50 percent of amounts paid to any recipient in excess of $15, with a maximum Federal share in any case of $25. The matching formula with respect to aid to dependent children was proportionately increased. This resulted in an increase in the average payments for old-age assistance beneficiaries of $5.56 per month; blind-aid recipients, $10.43 per month; aid to dependent children, $5.99 per month—average increase per family. There is no reason to believe that the increases authorized in House Joint Resolution 296 will not result in a similar increase in the average benefits under these programs. As of March 1948, the national average benefit payments under the three programs were as follows: Old-age assistance, $37.71 per month per recipient; aid to the blind, $40.63 per month per recipient; aid to dependent children, $65.85 per month per family.

A. F. of L.'s Report on Slave Labor in Soviet Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks the very excellent article in Labor's Monthly Survey published by the American Federation of Labor concerning the slave-labor camp in Soviet Russia, as follows:

SLAVE LABOR IN SOVIET RUSSIA [1]

Many Americans do not realize that communism in Soviet Russia depends upon a vast system of slave labor. This system comprises over a hundred concentration camps where millions of prisoners live behind barbed wire and are driven to work 10 to 12 or more hours each day by armed guards. With this slave manpower Russia operates huge industries. The slave empire, made up chiefly of Russia's own citizens who are "degraded to the level of beasts of burden," [2] is an organic part of the Soviet system. It is essential for two reasons: (1) To enforce the will of the dictator. The concentration camps are controlled by the police under the MVD. Persons suspected of opposition to the Government may be seized by the MVD and without trial sent to a concentration camp. The country is covered by a network of spies and informers [3] who watch everyone and report to the MVD any conversations or acts which seem to indicate opposition to the Government or failure to carry out its orders. From such persons the MVD recruits its manpower for the camps. (2) To carry out hard and particularly disagreeable kinds of work and to make a profit for the state. This slave labor is used for mining, roadbuilding, lumbering, etc., in Arctic regions where free labor will not go because of the bitter cold and inhuman conditions. In these and many

[1] Information in this section is taken from two authentic books: Forced Labor in Soviet Russia by Dallin and Nicolaevsky, Yale University Press, 1947, and I Chose Freedom, by Victor Kravchenko, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1946. Where page references are specifically given, they are referred to by "D" to indicate Dallin and "K" to indicate Kravchenko. An excellent article on this subject, entitled "GULAG Slavery," also appeared in the magazine Plain Talk for May 1947. Mr. Kravchenko reports his own experiences. Other information is compiled from official Russian sources and from thousands of reports, either from prisoners who have escaped from concentration camps and forced labor colonies or from Poles who were released when Russia needed Poland's help in the war against Germany.
[2] D, preface, p. x.
[3] D, p. 15–16.

other projects, the prisoners are given barely enough food and housing to keep them alive. This can be done at about one-third the cost of a free worker's wage in U. S. S. R., and the state thus makes a large profit from their work. This profit is used to provide wealth and luxury for top Soviet officials and to meet other expenses. Because of the inefficiency of the police state system, exploitation of this submerged class of workers is necessary to cover costs.

The work of prisoners from concentration camps is supplemented by that of exiles—great masses of people forcibly banished from their homes and assigned to distant, unsettled regions.[4] These so-called special or voluntary settlers are not confined behind barbed wire but live in isolated communities built by themselves and supervised by a representative of the MVD. This system serves the double purpose of removing from their communities any persons suspected of opposing the regime, and of populating the vast unsettled regions and building new industries. These settlers are paid wages, but their food is rationed according to the amount of work they do. Few ever return.

HOW MANY SLAVE LABORERS?

Some have estimated the number in concentration camps as high as 20 million. Mr. Dallin uses a conservative figure of 8 to 12 million in 1947, after careful examination of all evidence. Mr. Kravchenko states that during the war "in official circles 20 million became the accepted estimate" not including the boys and girls from 14 to 16 forcibly torn away from their parents and assigned to regions where manpower shortages were sharpest. The war industries of the U. S. S. R., like those of Germany, rested primarily on slave labor.[5]

In any case it is conservative to estimate that today at least one in every six men over 18 in U. S. S. R., and possibly one in every four men, is in a concentration camp.[6] Every man knows that he may at any time be seized for forced labor, even if he is innocent of the alleged misdeed for which he is condemned. About 10 percent of the inmates of the camps are women, some of whom were sentenced because they failed to report to the MVD the alleged counterrevolutionary activities of their husbands, fathers, or brothers.[7] At least one of the camps has a considerable number of children.[8] The system represents a degree of coercion of labor never heretofore attained and is based on absolute contempt for human life.[9]

In addition to those in concentration camps, the number of exiles required to do forced labor runs into millions; even their approximate number has not been estimated.

Forced labor in Soviet Russia is a class more numerous and economically no less important than that of free workers in industry.[10] The development of great industries in the northeast, pointed to as a major Soviet achievement, has been accomplished almost entirely with forced labor, with immense human suffering, brutality, and loss of life.

REASON FOR THE IRON CURTAIN

The Soviet Government shrouds this huge slave system in the utmost secrecy. This is one of the main reasons for the iron curtain, for the Soviet could not afford to let foreign correspondents go about the country freely, observe, talk to the people, and report. Even the Soviet citizen is kept in ignorance, as far as possible, of conditions in the camps and the extent of the system. He knows that his friends and relatives disappear if they offend officials, and that few ever return. The state-controlled press never mentions the compulsory migration of millions of men to the east and north.[11] Letters from the camps, if the inmates are physically able to write after their exhausting work, are so severely censored that they may not tell the facts.

WORKING AND LIVING CONDITIONS IN CONCENTRATION CAMPS

At each corner of the barbed wire enclosure which surrounds the camp is a watch tower equipped with revolving searchlight and machine gun and manned constantly by a guard. The prisoners sleep in barracks, on bare board shelves arranged in two or three tiers, with no bedding. An iron trough supplies water for washing and buckets are furnished for refuse—the only toilet facilities available for some 300 persons in each barracks. Cracks between boards in the walls let in the cold in winter, and the iron stoves heat only a radius of 5 or 6 yards, leaving the rest of the building frigid. This causes acute suffering in northern winters.[12]

The general food policy is to keep prisoners in a state of semistarvation and "by holding out hopes of slightly better food give them an incentive for doing more work."[13] A norm is set for the amount of work to be done during the day, and prisoners are fed according to their accomplishments. Rations differ from camp to camp. In European camps in the summer of 1941–42 the following is reported: First cauldron (those who failed to achieve the norm, day laborers around the camp, second class invalids): Thin soup twice a day, and 400 grams (14 oz.) of bread. Second cauldron (full norm and office workers): Thin soup twice a day, 700 grams (1.54 lbs.) of bread, buckwheat in the evening. Third cauldron (those achieving 15 to 25 percent above the norm): Soup twice a day, 900 grams (2 lbs.) of bread, buckwheat and a small piece of meat or fish in the evening. Governing staff: 750 grams (1.65 lbs.) of bread, and a meal twice a day containing some meat or fats. Sick persons received a meal three times a day containing fats, and 700 grams (1.5 lbs.) of bread.[14] Those achieving more than 25 percent above the norm may buy an extra half to three-fourths of a pound of bread.

Their work is often located several miles from camp; they must sometimes walk for 1 or more hours besides working 10 to 12 hours. The prisoners are organized in brigades of 20 to 30 men under military guards, and if a brigade fails to accomplish its norm the entire group may be forced to work 36 hours continually to make up the loss. About 5 a. m. the foreman "starts to drive the prisoners to the gates, pulling them off their bunks if necessary. Naturally this does not occur without blows."[15] If a prisoner refuses to work, his food is cut and he is put in a confinement cell or dungeon. Their work consists of building canals, roads and railroads, lumbering, mining, quarrying, farming, construction, metal industries, and many other types of work.

The death rate is very high, due to undernourishment, disease, and exhaustion. The personnel of the camps must therefore be constantly replaced, a reason for ruthless seizure of persons believed to be "socially dangerous." Among those considered socially dangerous and sent to concentration camps are those Russians who have seen the higher living standards enjoyed by workers in capitalist countries outside Russia's borders.

Mr. Kravchenko describes groups of laborers from concentration camps he saw working: "Four or five hundred haggard men and women were working under armed guard. They were as tragic looking a group of human creatures as I had ever seen. Their unsmiling silence was more terrible than their raggedness, filth, and physical degradation. They went about their work like people doomed. * * *"[16] "The ragged workers, knee-deep in mud and water, seemed scarcely human. Clouds of swamp mosquitoes hovered over them. * * * My eyes rested on a young woman with cadaverous features; her hands and face were black with mosquitoes but she plied her shovel listlessly."[17]

[4] D, p. 40 ff.
[5] K, p. 404.
[6] D, p. 87.
[7] D, pp. 17 and 87.
[8] D, pp. 84 and 256.
[9] D, preface, p. xiv and p. 19.
[10] D, p. 87.
[11] D, preface, p. xi.
[12] D, p. 12; K, p. 338.
[13] D, p. 9.
[14] D, p. 10.
[15] D, pp. 7 and 9.
[16] K, p. 198.
[17] K, p. 199.

The Lord Reigneth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, those who have suffered and permitted the key positions of our Government to be filled with Communists will some day return in humiliation and repentance to God.

While the subversive interests are deliberately undermining our Government, the racketeering internationalists are aiding and abetting the communistic sabouteurs by giving financial support to a foreign socialistic government as well as to communistic Russia and her satellites.

I believe that the godless cult of communism will eventually meet defeat at the hands of an outraged God, but not until a free people realize that "the most urgent need of the day is a return in humiliation and repentance to God."

Under leave to extend, I am inserting an article distributed by Evengelical Publishers:

"THE LORD REIGNETH"

The Second World War, with its colossal tragedies and unpredictable developments was causing the whole world to writhe in an agony of anxiety when a united war prayer meeting in the Central Hall, Westminster, London, England, unanimously passed this resolution on May 15, 1940:

"Believing that until a call to national prayer has been approved and recommended by the Prime Minister on behalf of the Government, it cannot be said that the Nation itself has made a corporate acknowledgment of its dependence and reliance upon God in this the greatest crisis in its history, this meeting of representatives of our national Christianity held under the auspices of the World's Evangelical Alliance, appeals to the Prime Minister, the Right Honorable Winston Churchill, to request His Majesty the King, by royal proclamation to call the nation and Empire to a day of prayer."

On May 18 it was announced throughout the world that King George VI wished Sunday, May 26, to be observed as an Empire Day of Prayer. On this day, therefore, the Prime Minister and other members of the Government, and endless rows of statesmen, soldiers, ambassadors and leaders of the nation could be seen at prayer in Westminster Abbey, and innumerable plain people gathered in their churches in cities and villages all over the Empire pleading for divine mercy and intervention. Within 48 hours light began to pierce the dark clouds, and

on June 4, in the British House of Commons, the Right Honorable Winston Churchill said: "When a week ago I asked the House to fix this afternoon as the occasion for a statement, I feared it would be my hard lot to announce the greatest military disaster in our whole history. I had thought the twenty or thirty thousand men might be saved from Flanders, but certainly it seemed that the whole French First Army and the whole British Expeditionary Force north of Amiens and Abbeville would be broken up in the open field or else have to capitulate for lack of food and ammunition." But actually, while he went on to announce "a colossal military disaster", yet 335,000 Allied troops were miraculously saved by way of Dunkerque. Ninety percent of the British Expeditionary Force was rescued after Hitler had announced that it was surrounded, trapped, doomed to immediate annihilation. A fog did its helpful work in screening from the innumerable German aircraft the motley mass of vessels sent to rescue the men; and the English Channel was more calm than it had been for years. The stars in their courses fought against Hitler—in answer to prayer. The New York Times, in a memorable article said, "So long as the English tongue survives, the word Dunkerque will be spoken with reverence."

"A day of really national prayer can be extraordinarily effective the moment it is officially decided upon by a nation," wrote Dr. D. M. Panton, of England, recently. In World War I on July 17, 1918, the then Prime Minister, Mr. Lloyd George, announced in the House of Commons that August 4 would be a day of national intercession. Count Hertling, ex-Chancellor of Germany, stated just before he died that, "On the 18th of July 1918, the most optimistic of us became convinced that all was lost." God says, "While they are yet speaking, I will hear" (Isaiah 65:24).

THE FOOL HATH SAID, "NO GOD"

In those early days of the First World War, Germany could easily have cut through to the Channel ports and had England at her mercy. But the Germans struck for Paris. They did not reach Paris or the Channel ports. Six weeks after Germany began the war she might have possessed every foot of the Channel, but mad and blinded she plunged Parisward, for the Kaiser must have his "Christmas dinner in Paris." The only possible explanation is—Germany was mad. "Let them alone," said the Lord. "They are the blind leading the blind, and if the blind lead the blind they shall both fall in the ditch." Mad and blinded, she struck for Paris, and that gave England time to get between the Channel and the enemy, and there she stood for four long years while the battle ebbed and flowed and Germany lost.

Through the Battle of Marathon, 490 B. C., God settled that Grecian civilization should not go under the heel of barbaric Persia. Through the Battle of Tours, A. D. 732, God settled that Europe should be Christian rather than Saracen. Through the Battle of Hastings, 1066, God settled that the Anglo-Saxon civilization should not perish from the earth. Through the Battle of Waterloo, 1815, God settled that Europe should not become the slave of a military despot. Through the Battle of Gettysburg, 1863, God settled that America should no longer continue half-slave and half-free—but all free. Through the Great War, 1914–18, God settled that the hands on the clock of civilization should not be turned back a thousand years by the hand of the Hun.

PARIS SAVED IN 1914—HOW?

"The First Battle of the Marne—second to none in the war for its decisive importance in the course of the world conflict" as Lloyd George says (War Memoirs, p. 832) was fought on September 6, 1914—one month after the war began. The Germans were in sight of Paris. The Kaiser, from yon hill, through his glass, could plainly see the Eiffel Tower. The French had but 8 hours' ammunition. The orders were already given: "When the last round is fired, every man take to his heels." The archives of the Government had been removed from Paris southward, and the women and children had been taken out by the thousands. Eight hours and the war would be done and the world won—only 8 hours—when, all of a sudden the Germans ceased firing and did not begin again for 47 hours. General Galienni commandeered every taxicab, automobile, carriage, cart, wheelbarrow—everything that had wheels—in Paris, and rushed munitions and men to the front. After 47 hours the Germans began firing again, but met with such fury that they were pounded back, and never in 4 years were the Germans so near Paris again. Generals Von Kluck, Hausen, and Beulow—German generals in charge—in their official report said they did not know why they ceased firing. Only 8 hours and the battle would have been Germany's—and the Germans ceased firing and did not know why. The Bible answers that: "So far shalt thou come, and no farther."

Conrad von Hoetzendorf, chief of staff of the Austro-Hungarian Army, asked Field Marshal von Moltke how long it would be till a decision in the west was achieved, and von Moltke replied: "The thirty-sixth to the fortieth day of mobilization." As war began on August 2, the fatal date came between the 6th and 10th of September. And just before this, on the 26th of August, the Allies did begin a huge retreat, but the Battle of the Marne was the decisive battle of the war against the Huns.—(Fisher, History of Europe, p. 1125.)

HATH THE WIND A FATHER?

Of the spring of 1915, the Times History of the War says, "Never had the position in Flanders been more critical" (vol. 5, p. 60). The Germans had long planned to use asphyxiating gas, but as the official German Archives (Reichsarchiv) tell us, "the date had to be continually postponed as the required wind did not blow * * * no wind from the right direction." And then, late on the lovely spring day of April 22, 1915, at 5 p. m. during the second battle of Ypres, in Belgium, the wind suited their nefarious purpose, and "two curious greenish-yellow clouds * * * moving before a light wind" startled the Allied troops—180,000 kilograms of chlorine gas had been released by the Germans. Five thousand Canadians, among others, gasped and died. It was so unexpected, and the Allied soldiers, all unprotected, fell in windrows. They were piled up like bloated cord wood. All that Germany now needed to do was to march through, take the English Channel, and the world was hers. Then, why didn't she do it? And why was this particular time selected to turn loose the gas? It was not the military but the meteorological department which announced to the German general in charge that the direction of the winds was fixed and settled for 36 hours to come, and that they would carry the gas far out over the Allied lines. So the gas was turned loose—when, all of a sudden, it whirled and flung itself back on the German Army. And the Germans, gasping, strangling, staggered by the thousands to their death. Dr. Schmaus, in his official report, said, "In 40 years of meteorological records of the German Government the wind never acted so peculiarly before." And the doubly strange and striking thing was that the wind whirled in only that small area. The British, Official History of the War (based on official documents, by the direction of the historical section of the Committee of Imperial Defense, Military Operations, France and Belgium, 1915 (vol. 1, p. 188)), says: "The German meteorologists were strangely mistaken."

WHO SENT THE BEETLE? "HE GIVETH SEEDTIME AND HARVEST"

By the spring of 1917 the German scientists had solved the problem of growing food and grain, and perfected it as it had never before been perfected in the history of the world. They announced that Germany would have the potato crop of all time; that they had put in each potato hill that which would kill every enemy of the potato under ground and above ground. And how the potato of Germany grew. When those uncounted acres and miles were in blossom, lo, a blight (the Colorado beetle), till then unknown, swept over the potato fields of Germany, and in a day they were scorched, scabbed, shriveled as though fire-swept, and hungry Germany learned the truth uttered by Napoleon—"An army travels on its belly, and will not travel when the belly is empty." Ludendorff, in his history of the war, says that it was the failure of the potato crop of 1917 that lost Germany the war.

That same spring, though the British started with the coldest and wettest spring for years, nevertheless they raised such a bumper crop of potatoes, and wheat, and everything, that they were able to feed themselves and the Allies. Verily "He giveth seedtime and harvest." "He sendeth the early and the latter rains," and also the blight.

And Germany cried in the very words of the Scripture, "The harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved." The Book speaks of God as a God who forgetteth not. "He is the same yesterday, and today and for ever."

HATH THE SEA A FATHER?

Late in 1917 the German submarine strength was at its peak. Night and day they had been turning them out. They had enough submarines to sweep the seas of Allied ships and soldiers and they said: "The war is won." The Berlin papers of those weeks gloated over the winning of the war by the submarine, when lo, the seas roared and raged and would not cease, and many submarines, unable to return to their bases because of the fury of the seas, were forced to come to the surface and were captured or sunk. The back of the German submarine warfare was broken, and Germany lost.

In 1588 the Spanish Armada sailed forth from Spain—129 great ships and thousands of sailors and soldiers, to swallow England and wipe Anglo-Saxon civilization out of the world. The Armada lay just off the coast of England, waiting for the dawn of the morrow and a great victory, when such a storm as never struck those shores before or since seized the 129 ships and shivered them to splinters, and the next morning the proud Spanish Armada was but floating wreckage and dead men.

"The sea rose by reason of a great wind that blew." "The Lord God hath His way in the whirlwind." Two hundred and nineteen times the Bible tells of God's doings and dealings with His storms at sea.

"HE MAKETH THE CLOUDS HIS CHARIOT"

The world recognized that Germany was superior in the air, and yet the world knows, and Germany conceded, that she was worsted in the air the last few months of the war. The head of the aerial service explained this by saying: "The Allies did not have superior airships nor fighters, but it was the accursed clouds that defeated us. Nearly every time when we had a bevy of the enemy's ships in a pocket ready to take them, one of those accursed clouds would be hanging handy by and would envelop them as thick as a blanket, and the devil himself couldn't find them, and they would escape at their leisure. It was the accursed clouds that did it." He spoke by the records. "My clouds shall curse them in that day, saith the Lord." Many of our boys who were in the air serv-

ice report the same thing—"that just when they were in a tight corner a cloud, coming from nobody knew where, canopied them, cloaked them as a tent."

"He commandeth the clouds." "The clouds are the dust of His feet." One hundred and sixty-two times the Bible speaks of God's doings and dealings with the clouds.

HATH THE RAIN A FATHER?

June 1918, was one of the darkest months of the First World War. The Austrians had swept down the Alps to swallow Italy. Just before them lay Venice, the heart of Italy. To have taken Venice at the time would not only have broken the heart of Italy, but the Central Powers would easily have taken Florence, Rome, Naples, Milan. If at that crucial hour, Italy had fallen, the Allies might have lost. "Italy was profoundly shaken, her existence was at stake, and the whole Allied cause was in peril." (Italy and the War, by Ambassador T. N. Page, p. 315.) All there was between the Central Powers and victory was the Piave River. The Piave is a slow, sluggish stream that sleeps itself away 125 miles into the sea. The banks are so flat that it is easy to fling over bridges or cross by boats. The Austrians poured over by the tens of thousands. They took no food, for the granaries of Italy were just ahead. Every soldier carried an empty chest. There were automobile trucks by the score to bring back the loot. They got to within six and a half miles of Venice. The sky was red with the flame of their victory and the air rent with their shouts, when, all of a sudden, out of what had been a dead and dry sky an hour ago, there burst a Niagara. And in an hour the Piave was a racing, roaring, mad, wide sea, sweeping before it boats, bridges, trees, soldiers. Whole battalions of Austrian soldiers were cut off without supplies, a great terror seized them, and the Italians captured or killed more than 40,000 of them. General Foch said, "General Diaz did his best." What would his best have amounted to without God's best? General Diaz recognized this and sobbing, he said, "Deus fecit"—God did it.

Napoleon planned to fight the battle at Waterloo at 6 in the morning, and by 2 o'clock all would be over. And it would have been, for Wellington could not win without Blucher, and Blucher could not arrive until 5 o'clock. But Napoleon did not fight the Battle of Waterloo at 6 o'clock, nor 7, nor 8, nor 9, nor 10, nor 11. All that night God sifted His rain down through the sieve of the trees and the ground was so soft Napoleon could not use his artillery, and he could not win the battle without his artillery. And Blucher came at 5 o'clock, and Napoleon lost. Who sent the rain at Waterloo? Who sent the rain at the Piave?

Job asks a very interesting question: "Hath the rain a father?" And the book says, "Jehovah caused it to rain grievously upon the earth." One hundred and two times the Bible speaks of God's dealing and doings with the rain.

Napoleon was right, "God is on the side of the heaviest battalions." Only Napoleon forgot that God stables His battalions in the skies. Napoleon, with half a million picked soldiers of France, started for Moscow. He would have Russia and the world. All of a sudden a snowflake kissed Napoleon's cheek. He laughed and brushed it off. And then a dozen snowflakes. Napoleon laughed again, but not so loud. And then handfuls of snowflakes, armfuls—avalanches of snowflakes. And the men and horses floundered and plunged and sank and died, beneath a mountain of snowflakes, and half a million French soldiers lay frozen on the plains of Russia—and Napoleon lost. Who sent that snow?

Hath the snow a father? "God sayeth to the snow, fall thou upon the earth."

The Air-Power Squabble Is Dynamite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Argonaut, of San Francisco, is one of California's oldest and most famous publications. Quite naturally, the people of California are extremely interested in the protection of the coasts and in the mobility and efficiency of our armed forces. Regardless of all the talk about attacks on inland communities, the people of the coasts expect to be the first targets for attacks on the continental United States. In view of this, the following article, from the issue of the Argonaut of May 28, 1948, should prove very interesting to the Members of this Congress:

THE AIR-POWER SQUABBLE IS DYNAMITE

The explosive subject of air power has been so cunningly distorted by feuding military experts since war's end that today the American people and its Congress are being forced into the most perilous and costly blunder in the history of armament—the equipment of a mammoth land-based air force at the direct expense of sea-air strength. The gag rule imposed on the Navy by the Army and the Air Force as a result of "unification" has blinded the Nation to the true function and composition of superiority in the air, in defiance of the well-documented lessons we learned at so much cost in World War II. Warned Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE: "The (air) controversy is passed on to Congress and we are thus required to pass judgment on a technical dispute between professionals. It is utterly preposterous and would be comical if the consequences were not so dangerous." What's behind this dispute he refers to? Why isn't a 70-group Air Force all the Army claims for it? And what happened to the Navy's voice?

The story is told, piece by piece, in the official releases which have disclosed comparative accomplishments of Army and Navy air groups in the Pacific war. Here are the figures:

1. Army aircraft destroyed 10,343 Japanese planes in the Pacific. Naval (and Marine Corps) aircraft destroyed 15,401, or 49 percent more than the Army.

2. Of the Navy's total score, 80 percent were destroyed by carrier-based American aircraft, or 19 percent more than the entire total of the Army Air Force.

3. Fourteen Japanese planes were shot down for every one carrier-based American Navy plane, but only five enemy aircraft were shot down for every Army plane.

4. United States carrier planes destroyed 5,649 Japanese aircraft on the ground. The Army Air Forces destroyed only 2,981, or almost half as many.

Because the unification program demands that the services compose their differences, and because both Army ground forces and Army fliers have an equal stake in land-based aviation, the Navy has been out-voted and actually silenced—in the face of these telling figures. The record, except in a few scattered articles (notably in the Buffalo (N. Y.) Evening News), has not provoked any more profound discussion than an editorial pat on the back for "our fighting carriers."

The superiority of naval air strength to land-based aviation is proved, moreover, in every analysis of air strategy to weather the battles of World War II. Early, the British and then we found out that air superiority was simply the power to push enemy aviation back to its own territory, to make it fight where and when we chose, and on our own terms, and finally to destroy it in the air and on the ground. Then the bombers could crowd in and bring the enemy to his knees—and lower. Land-based aircraft could never do this alone, for a bomber's effective range is determined by that of the fighters which must escort it. Only the mobile, far-ranging, and, above all, unpredictable carriers can clear the air for the final devastation of the bombing missions. This, also, is eloquently shown by the Pacific record. The Army Air Force moved only 700 miles in 2 years, from Fort Moresby to Hollandia. It was almost a year and a half before land-based aircraft on Guadalcanal mastered the air above Raul, 700 miles away. But the brand-new carrier air force, in the 10 months from the start of its westward offensive against Tarawa, had cleared the skies above the Philippines, 3,600 miles distant. And its losses, by comparison with the planes and the abandoned fields lost by the Army, were phenomenally light.

All this the Army dismisses as "controversial." In fact, it was as controversial as a straight left to the heart, and the Army knows it. With a costly screen of propaganda designed to establish the word "air power" as the trade-mark of a 70-group, land-based Air Force, the Army is successfully building the United States an air weapon as balanced as a bicycle with one wheel. Funds for aircraft this year will probably be divided up at a ratio of 70–30, the lion's share going, of course, to the Army, which is even opposing the construction of an 80,000-ton carrier for the Navy. That's what "unification" has done for us.

It is the duty of Congress, and of the citizens it represents, to examine the purpose of air power and to adjust this unbalanced program while there is still time. World peace is too big to be the vehicle for feuding cliques. Because effective strength in the air is America's only hope of peace and survival in the atomic age, we believe this situation to be the most shocking and the most discouraging story in the world today—or, for that matter, tomorrow, for this sort of blundering can only be paid for by Providence, time, and American blood.

The Rough Riders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the fiftieth anniversary of the organization of the Rough Riders—the first volunteer United States Cavalry—will be observed on the 24th and 25th of this month of June 1948, at Prescott, Ariz., the home city of the famed William Owen "Bucky" O'Neill, its mayor and captain of Troop A of that glorious regiment of the Spanish-American War, who was killed in action while gallantly leading his men at the Battle of San Juan Hill on July 1, 1898. A magnificent equestrian statue, by the celebrated sculptor, Gutzon Borglum, to the memory of that hero, stands in Court House Square, in the city of Prescott, and on

January 21, 1948, I introduced in the Congress House Joint Resolution 305, authorizing the issuance of a special series of 3-cent postage stamps, commemorative of that fiftieth anniversary, and which shall bear a picture of that statue. The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to whom such joint resolution was referred, reported favorably thereon May 27, 1948, without amendment, and recommended that it do pass. That joint resolution passed the House by unanimous vote on June 8, and I hope that it may be enacted into law promptly.

James Patrick McGovern, of the District of Columbia bar, a captain in the American Expeditionary Forces during the First World War, and the special Washington correspondent of the Arizona Daily Sun, of Flagstaff, Ariz., where he lived as a youth, has written a fitting tribute, in verse, to the Rough Riders, which I now submit for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and elsewhere throughout the Nation, as follows:

THE ROUGH RIDERS

Charge, charge of San Juan Hill, charge, charge again,
Resounds as half a century enshrines
The memory of deeds by supermen,
Whose dauntless valor swept the Spanish lines.
Roosevelt and Wood, for whom life's peak was fame,
O'Neill and Capron, for whom scorn mocked at death,
Men white and red, of every rank and name—
All thrilled with a devotion dear as breath.
True warriors they were, first volunteers.
From mountains and from plains of the broad West,
Virile, bold, and peerless pioneers,
Exploring in a new horizon's quest.
They stormed the heights of glory with white fire;
Forever shall their vibrant hearts inspire.

—*James Patrick McGovern.*

The Mundt-Nixon Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the convictions which I expressed in the debate on the Mundt-Nixon bill, it is gratifying to note, are shared by those of progressive thought in many fields. Appended is the resolution on this subject of the human relations commission of the Protestant Council of the city of New York transmitted to me by Dr. Allen E. Claxton, pastor of the Broadway Temple, one of the great Protestant congregations in my district. Our opposition to this legislation is based not upon the exposure of Communists, which we favor, but upon the subversion of civil rights which we are duty bound to protect:

RESOLUTION ON THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT, 1948 (MUNDT-NIXON BILL)

The Human Relations Commission of the Protestant Council of the City of New York has considered the Mundt-Nixon bill entitled the "Subversive Activities Control Act, 1948."

We agree with the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights in its statement that "to expect people to reject totalitarians, when we do not provide mechanisms to guarantee that essential information is available, is foolhardy."

We believe that it is necessary to make provision for enabling citizens to identify totalitarian movements whether Communist or Fascist and that there is need to throw light on organizations which are directed for purposes adverse to the interests of our democracy but we think that the Mundt-Nixon bill has important defects and we are convinced that it should be defeated.

This commission believes that an undue amount of hysteria has been stirred up in the United States. We do not believe that effective action on this or any other issue can be properly planned or wisely considered in an atmosphere of hysteria. Nor do we see valid reasons which would justify the existence of a spirit of hysteria in our country. The United States is strong and resourceful. While our patterns of social relationship—political, economic, and otherwise—fall far short of realizing the American dream, nevertheless we have faith in American democracy and in the American people. We believe that our human problems can be solved within our political pattern. We believe that Americans observing what has gone on and is going on in the world will never surrender their liberties to a police State. We believe that the most effective way in which we can protect our democracy is to press steadily for the fulfillment of its promises to all our people.

The Mundt-Nixon bill as it stands seems to us to accept the principle of the imposition of guilt by association. Under it individuals may be subjected to disability because of affiliation with organizations when no personal illegal acts are alleged to have been committed by them. The default of an organization, it is indicated, would be considered to involve a separate crime by each member of the organization (section 10).

In addition, the bill seems to us in section 13 to place an undue and possibly arbitrary authority in the hands of one man—the Attorney General. While appeal to the courts from the findings of the Attorney General is granted, yet it is held in section 14 that the findings of the Attorney General "as to facts, if supported by substantial evidence shall be conclusive." Thus it seems to us that an individual may be held guilty of crime without trial by jury.

It is the feeling of the commission that the definitions in the bill because of lack of precision constitute a threat and would contribute to widespread uncertainty.

We therefore reiterate that the Mundt-Nixon bill should be defeated and urge that the whole subject of Communist and Communist Front activity be referred to a more judicially minded committee than the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Reduced Postal Charges on Overseas Relief Packages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the campaign of Miss Dorothy Thompson for reduced postal charges on relief packages, referred to in my remarks on June 1, has elicited response from far and wide, furnishing eloquent support to the desirability of early administrative action to put into effect the will of Congress as expressed in the European Recovery Act.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a further article on this subject in her syndicated column.

Informal advice is to the effect that action will be forthcoming this month to cut the postage on these packages to about one-fourth of the present rates. I hope this information is correct. Such relief is urgently needed. It cannot come too soon.

ON THE RECORD—READERS CONFIRM HIGH COST OF MAILING PACKAGES; HOFFMAN IS URGED TO ACT

(By Dorothy Thompson)

Under the terms of the European Recovery Act, "Funds made available shall be used, insofar as practical by the Administrator, under rules and regulations prescribed by him, to pay ocean freight charges from a United States port to a designated foreign port of entry of * * * relief packages conforming to such specified size, weight, and contents as the Administrator may prescribe, originating in the United States and consigned to an individual residing in a participating country * * *."

The high postal rates, making a 22-pound relief package addressed to Europe cost $3.08 postage, need not, therefore, under the law, continue. If ERP Administrator Paul Hoffman takes advantage of this section in the act, it will cost the sender of such a relief package only 77 cents.

I am informed that such a reduction is contemplated for the middle of this month. It is essential that it should not be postponed. For my mail informs me that many people, anticipating a change in the rates, are holding groceries and food for shipment. If the new rates do not come into operation within a fortnight, regular senders of relief packages to Europe should write their Congressmen.

LETTERS ARE QUOTED

The column I wrote on May 28, calling attention to the difficulties and expense in sending parcels to Europe, received a volume of confirmatory testimony and also showed the generosity and ingenuity of American volunteer assistance.

One woman writes: "Our family is assisting 14 German families. Since May 3, we have sent 49 packages. Our postage was exactly $130.28. Our cellar now is full of clothing and groceries. We go to rummage sales and buy seconds of hosiery and underwear from local mills. But we must hold up sending more now because we cannot afford the postage."

Another: "My housemaid has close relatives in Austria. Every month she spends her entire wages on food and necessities for them. But the postage often costs as much as the contents of the packages."

Another: "Our family has no relatives or friends in Europe, but we send to a church group we heard about. We get such grateful letters. We could do more if the postage were cheaper."

Another: "We have so very little money we can't buy much, but I do sort out and mend the children's outworn clothing. Sometimes I wondered whether anyone would care for the scuffed shoes even when they were whole and the soles sound, but the letters are so grateful. You also can get great bargains in thrift shops. It's only the postage that prevents us from sending more."

HELP FROM POST OFFICE ASKED

A correspondent also makes a suggestion to the post office. "I recognize that for shipping purposes the post office must set a limit on the size and weight of parcels. I do wish, though, that the post offices could pro-

vide sheets of brown paper and cord, which we could purchase right there to rewrap our parcels when the weight has been misestimated. Household scales are hardly ever accurate, and it is discouraging to have to carry a heavy bundle back home, rewrap it, and then carry it back to the post office.

Recently the Voice of America has got itself into hot water requiring embarrassing investigation and change of policy. But there is one voice of America a million times more effective than any words put out over the air possibly can be. That is the voice of hundreds of thousands of conscientious, warmhearted American families expressing mute human sympathy in soap fats, sugar, coffee, underwear, and shoes.

Every package that arrives from America in a European home undoes volumes of Moscow-inspired propaganda against this country. Out of this giving, correspondence arises and contacts are established, not between governments but between people. The Government has it in its power to encourage this communication; it should delay no longer but put into practice the powers allowed it in the European Recovery Act.

The Armenian General Benevolent Union and the Armenian Refugee Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1948

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege and very great honor to accept the kindly invitation of the Armenian General Benevolent Union, to appear before and deliver the principal address at the closing session of its thirty-fourth annual convention which convened at Washington, D. C., on May 27, 1948.

Over 700 delegates, a most credible cross-section of American life, civic leaders from all corners of our country, both religious and lay, were in attendance upon its several sessions which were held in the palatial banquet halls of Washington's famed Statler Hotel. It was a most impressive gathering.

Urged to do so by the president of the union, Mr. H. Norair of Washington, D. C., I am handing a copy of my address to the Public Printer for inclusion, in accordance with the unanimous consent of the membership of this body, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a memento of this historic conclave. The text of my address is, Mr. Speaker, the following:

ARMENIANS IN THE UNITED STATES AND ABROAD

The Armenian communities in America have contributed greatly to the development of this country; to the enrichment of its national life, this in many, many ways. Those that compose them, have worked hard for their own well-being, but they have never withheld the hand of helpfulness to those who had stumbled or fallen under the weight of unkind fate's heavy burdens.

From the very beginning of their residence in this county, these sturdy representatives of an ancient race have taken an active interest in humanitarian and philanthropic work. As one who has observed their benefactions at close range, watched them in their work, evaluated their fervent activity in behalf of their unfortuniate brothers and sisters abroad, my admiration grows with each additional demonstration of their generous public service. Such a fine spirit and unselfish service in the cause of suffering humanity must and does command the respect of all.

To me such work is but an exemplification of one of the noblest virtues of Christianity—that of charity. As I understand it, the aim of this organization is not only to do charity but to promote and encourage such work among others. By bringing relief to the tens of thousands of needy Armenians, this that they may enjoy in full measure the good things which this world so abundantly makes available, this worthy organization demonstrates again and again that we are, indeed, our brother's keeper

You are all well aware that during the First World War and the years immediately following, this country was, officially and unofficially very much interested in Armenian affairs. The Near East Relief Foundation collected and distributed about $100,000,000 in food and clothing; and most of this was expended to save the lives of Armenians in great numbers. At one time the United States Government was asked officially to consider accepting a mandate over the recreated Armenia. As you know, that step was not taken. Unofficially and most willingly, we continued to do relief work among Armenians abroad, but officially this Government hesitated to permit itself to become involved in the complicated politics, diplomatic maneuverings of the Near East.

Since then great events have overtaken us everywhere. A large majority of Amenians, including many survivors of World War I, founded a new Armenia in a corner of their historic homeland which became a part of the Soviet Union. Several hundred thousand others, who had fled their homes in order to save their lives, settled as refugees in all parts of the Near East (excepting that part of it which is under the heel of the unspeakable Turk) and in many European countries.

During the last 28 years these refugees have been leading a precarious existence. Finding themselves in this condition it was inevitable that they should wish to be repatriated to that part of Armenia that had been swept into the Soviet Union. I am informed that several thousand of these refugees had gained admission into Soviet Armenia long before World War II, and even a larger number have done so within the last 3 years.

In this work of repatriation, I am told, the Armenians of this country have contributed considerable sums of money, and thereby have taken upon themselves almost the entire cost of this repatriation program. This commendable work of rescuing Armenian refugees from war-torn countries like Greece and elsewhere in the Middle East is being carried out, I am reliably informed, under the guidance and direction of this benevolent union.

It is gratifying for me to learn that this union has been able to secure some basis of cooperation with the Soviet Government in Moscow, and, through it, with the Government of Soviet Armenia, whereby its program of repatriation is already partly carried out. This is a refreshing deviation from our American experiences in relation to other international problems for which we can be grateful.

As far as it is ascertainable, there are between 225,000 and 250,000 Armenians in this country. And the number of Armenians in need of aid, including the victims of World War I and World War II, in the Middle East and the Balkan countries exceeds the total number of Armenians in this country. This means a great responsibility has resolved itself upon the Armenians already here; a moral responsibility imposed upon you by the unenviable lot of your less fortunate brothers and sisters abroad. As by divine edict, you are commanded by the highest authority to play well the role of your brother's keeper.

And I know you will not shirk this solemn responsibility. You will, within the limits of your ability, continue your care of them; to aid and assist them in every way within your power. Of course, a similar responsibility is imposed, in varying degrees and in accordance with their peculiar circumstances, on Armenian communities in other countries of this hemisphere and elsewhere in the world. And let it be said in their praise that their response to this call of distress has left nothing to be desired.

In this great humanitarian work your organization deserves the aid and assistance of others. In the service of a cause so noble, aid and assistance should be forthcoming from all corners of the world. Humanitarians of whatever nationality who know of the unhappy plight of these refugees, have always been anxious to ease their suffering in every possible way, short of direct political involvement. The history of the Near East relief stands as an eloquent testimonial of American generosity towards the Armenian cause.

It is true that in recent years the attitude of the United States Government has created an impression of unconcern over the sad condition of your blood relatives residing abroad.

If, in that appearance, there is reality, it is to be accounted for by certain catastrophic events which took place during World War II, and especially by the postwar policies of a certain great power. In other words, the present foreign policy of this Government in the Middle East areas is conditioned by the Soviet Government's attitude and behavior toward the United States. Whether wise or unwise, that policy is calculated to serve our country's best interests and, in the end, it is to be hoped, Armenia's as well. Though international politics may intrude and influence badly our political thinking, be assured, my fellow Americans of Armenian antecedent, the heart of America beats in harmony with yours.

As far as I am able to ascertain that policy was neither foreseen nor planned; it was forced upon this country by the postwar policy of the Soviet Union. In the course of 1946 and 1947 it was made clear to us that the Soviet Union's foreign policy in the Middle East was nothing short of complete Soviet domination over the whole area. Because we became firmly convinced of this more than a year ago, the preservation of American policy required the extension of material aid to Greece and Turkey.

I need not try to interpret the immediate and long-range motives behind such a policy. I would only say that if it were at all possible for us to get on with the Soviet Union on a give-and-take basis, that is, on the basis of mutual understanding arrived at through compromises, another American policy less prejudicial to the Armenian cause would have evolved as a matter of course. Improving relations with the Soviets may yet redeem the situation.

America has been the promised land for all who have come here in search of political, religious, and spiritual freedom. The first Armenian who arrived here in 1618, as well as all others arriving since, came to our hospitable shores to find and enjoy these freedoms. In the land of your ancestors, often referred to as the "cradle of mankind," your forebears have not always enjoyed these freedoms. At different periods of history, under conditions that tried men's souls, when prejudice became persecution and massacre the weapon, they kept their heads up, clung tenaciously to their Christian religion, refused to yield their most cherished national traditions. "All misfortunes and all maltreatment notwithstanding," said the late Dr. Nansen, "the soul of Armenia's people could not be crushed, and the dream of liberty revived whenever there appeared any gleam of hope."

Having arrived in this country and having learned through experience the blessings that flow from freedom and liberty, the Armenians quickly embraced and took to their hearts all the opportunities which life under the Stars and Stripes afforded.

In this great land of freedom the Armenians learned well and quickly the democratic principles upon which their adopted country is founded to become an integral part of this, the greatest democratic community on the face of the earth.

They have given a good and honorable account of themselves in all phases of our national life. Their devotion to the cause of democratic freedom and their unwavering loyalty to the land of their adoption has been demonstrated over and over again. In peace, as in war, they have served.

In the world of business and trade, and in manufacturing enterprises, the names of Armenians have become household words throughout the country. In the learned professions of medicine and law they are full and well represented. They are represented with distribution on college and university faculties. In some fields of activity the Armenians are newcomers, but, even as newcomers, they need defer to none.

To mention only a few by name—the Armenians of this country have at last their idol in literature in the person of William Saroyan of my own California; in sculpture there is Haig Patigian; in grand opera there was Madame Bassian, and in the field of commerce there is K. Arakelian. Names beyond the numbering could be listed, all of which have added luster to the glory that is America's.

The United States, aptly called the natural home of self-made men, has offered a great field to the Armenians for the full and free development of all their gifts and talents. In America they are accepted as blood brothers, for, indeed, they have been true to the best traditions of free men. They have honored in practice the highest ideals of democracy, as understood and exemplified in this country. And, of course, they are always true to the ennobling tenets of Christianity—faith, hope, and charity.

If the sons and daughters of Armenia had not faith in the great charitable cause they have embraced, they could not have accomplished the near-miraculous results for which they are acclaimed.

It must be that hope that ever dwells in the hearts of Armenians which caused the late James Bryce, a great admirer of the Armenians, to write of them—"Through the course of history every winter of despondency has been followed by a joyous springtime of hope. Hope is the mainspring of faith, and without faith nothing is accomplished."

With faith, hope, and charity, you have rendered great services to the heavily laden—not only to your less fortunate brethren but to all mankind. And well may you take pride in the fruits of your endeavors.

The writers of history will do you honor!

Navajo Rehabilitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned today from my home State, after arguing before the Supreme Court of Arizona a lawsuit which I instituted last year to provide the right of the ballot for the Indians of Arizona.

Despite the importance of national legislation as we attempt to close the current session of Congress, I felt that this lawsuit was of such vital interest that I took the time to fly to Phoenix and return, spending but 1 day away from Washington. After appealing to the Arizona Supreme Court for this right, it was with regret that I learned after my return to the capital that the Bureau of Indian Affairs had made an adverse report on the Navajo rehabilitation.

The Committee on Public Lands, after extensive study and work on this legislation, has reported a bill which emphasizes the education of the Navajos. Education is not only a part of our obligation to all children, but to the Indian as well. If the State of Arizona wishes to grant the right of the ballot to the Indians, then they must have the knowledge to vote with responsibility.

Delay on the Navajo rehabilitation bill should not be countenanced merely because the full $90,000,000 requested by the Bureau of Indian Affairs is not to be provided at this time. While the Nation as a whole progresses, so must we permit the Indians to march forward in stride. It is the duty of the Eightieth Congress to see to it that the Navajo receives the full advantages and is enlightened to the fullest extent of our power. Postponement can only mean ignorance, but our wisdom with speedy action can mean wisdom for the Navajo.

Education is the basic step we must take to aid the Navajo Indians. The features of the plan for Navajo rehabilitation which make this step possible are provided for in the bill reported out of committee, and it is my hope that this Congress will not delay this legislation because of objections of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, who at this time are apparently more interested in appropriations to perpetuate activities of questionable value than to face the basic problems of education and improvements in health and sanitation on the Navajo reservation.

Crushing the Frugal and Thrifty—Is There Any Surer Road to Communism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1948

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, Nicolai Lenin is reported to have said, "The surest way to overturn the existing social order is to debauch the currency." When the Bolsheviks seized power in Russia, they soon printed enough paper rubles to get that job of debauchery done.

Is the current ballyhoo against communism in this country plunging us irrevocably into the currency debauchery that will bring victory to the Communists?

Let's look at some of the evidence.

The United States News, in its issue of January 17, 1947, reported:

These things seem most probable now that the cards are on the table:

Budget of $37,500,000,000 offered by Mr. Truman will be cut by Congress. * * *

In year starting next July (1947) Mr. Truman's $37,500,000,000 budget is likely to be whittled by Congress to $34,000,000,000. That's the plan.

In year starting July 1, 1948, a cut to $28,000,000,000 may be made.

In year starting July 1, 1949, a cut may be made to $25,000,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, those United States News estimates make sad reading now.

Do they demonstrate that Government spending is out of control? Or is further evidence needed.

If further evidence is needed, has not the Federal Reserve Bank of New York provided it? Mr. Sproul, its president, recently declared:

Without our support (the Federal Reserve System), under present conditions, almost any sale of Government bonds, undertaken for whatever purpose, laudable or otherwise, would be likely to find an almost bottomless market on the first day support was withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to respect the thinking of my colleagues who are continually promoting schemes to raid the Treasury. However, I am beginning to wonder who is doing the most to bring on communism in this country—the Kremlin or the politicians promoting new raids on the Federal Treasury.

These spenders are steadily undermining the value of every savings bond, bank deposit, mortgage, and pension in America.

Mr. Speaker, when the thrifty, humble people of this country are legally despoiled of their savings they will be ready for communism. And those who will have destroyed America will be those who shouted for Federal spending.

Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, we in America today enjoy the enviable distinction of being citizens of the greatest, richest, and most powerful Nation of freemen. This should cause us to feel a sense of humility, of gratitude, and—most important—of responsibility.

America has long been the refuge of those who dared to think differently than the tyrants who ruled them. We welcomed them to our shores, and in return they gave their substance to the life stream of our national inheritance. The blood, the language, the traditions, the hopes, the aspirations, the ideals, and the labor of each individual and each group were pooled and blended to make a nation and a people. Our debt to those pioneers is incalculable. Our responsibility to their present-day contemporaries is no less.

Today, as never before in the span of living men, there are those who are weary

and haunted, persecuted and harried because they were unable to select their ancestors, or because they ventured to believe that men should be free to think as they choose and not as they are told. Can we refuse them a haven? Dare we break faith with those of earlier generations who gave us a nation, a civilization, and a heritage?

Mr. Speaker, the response of Americans to suffering in other parts of the world has always been prompt and gratifying. Already, in anticipation of the passage of this bill, plans have been made in many communities for the reception of displaced persons. In my home city, the St. Louis Resettlement Committee for Displaced Persons of the Archdiocese of St. Louis has listed in their files the names of 392 families who are anxious to give shelter and employment to displaced persons. It is estimated by this organization that through them arrangements can be made for handling 500 displaced persons. There are many other similar organizations which are making comparable arrangements.

This commendable charitable work by American citizens will insure the orderly absorption into our economy and into our civilization of the 200,000 DP's who will be admitted under the terms of this bill.

The eyes of the world are on us here today. The hopes and aspirations of thousands now living and multitudes yet unborn hang in the balance. Mr. Speaker, we cannot, we must not fail them. Let us therefore expeditiously pass H. R. 6396, and in the words of the Goddess of Liberty say once again:

Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses,
Yearning to breathe free, the wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest tossed to me
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

Claim of Alfred Bergman Against the French Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that the following communication which I have received be published in the RECORD. I am distressed that American citizens find it necessary to resort to such ends, in pursuit of their avowed claims against foreign governments which have benefited so greatly at the generosity of our taxpayers.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 18, 1948.*

Hon. NORRIS POULSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POULSON: Your attention is called to the claim of Mr. Alfred Bergman, of New York City against the Government of France, the nature of which is set out in a petition which has been filed on his behalf with the International Bank (World Bank), with the Export-Import Bank, and with various agencies of the Federal Government which may be considering or contemplating the advancement of loans or credits to France.

A copy of this petition is enclosed herewith.

The French Government refuses to recognize the necessity of settling its obligation to Mr. Bergman and has refused negotiations looking to such a settlement. In view of this fact, it seems inconsistent that our Government should advance funds or credits to the Republic of France unless and until this obligation is satisfied.

In justice to Mr. Bergman and all other American citizens who are taxpayers and investors in the securities of the International Bank, no further loans or credits should be advanced for the account of the French Government until it has shown a disposition in good faith to settle its obligations to American citizens, including Mr. Bergman's claim.

For these reasons, you are respectfully urged to oppose any action on the part of the United States Government, and all agencies thereof having responsibility with reference to French applications for loans or credits, and on the part of the International Bank and the Export-Import Bank, to extend any further credits or make any loans to the French Government unless and until Mr. Bergman's claim is satisfied.

In my opinion, the citizens of the United States would feel outraged if they knew the Government of France was receiving hundreds of millions of dollars of credits and loans while at the same time refusing to honor its contractual obligations to citizens of the United States.

Very truly yours,

ELMER W. PRATT,
Attorney for Alfred Bergman.

PETITION OF ALFRED BERGMAN TO INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT, ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION, STATE DEPARTMENT, EXPORT-IMPORT BANK, FEDERAL RESERVE BANK, TREASURY DEPARTMENT, RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

PETITION ASKING THAT ANY APPLICATION OR APPLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF FRANCE FOR LOANS OR CREDITS BE DENIED

This petition is filed by Alfred Bergman of 80 Broad Street, New York City, on his own behalf, in the matter of his claim against the French Government in a total sum exceeding $250,000,000 arising out of a contract entered into by the petitioner and representatives of the French Government in 1941.

This petition is also presented on behalf of the people of the United States who, through Congressional appropriations and the purchase of the International Bank's debentures, have contributed the Bank's dollar capital which could be dissipated through ill-advised loans that might be made to the Government of France.

The bad faith of France in the matter of Bergman's claim to date should be of particular interest to every member of the International Bank, the Economic Cooperation Administration, the State Department, the Export-Import Bank, the Federal Reserve Bank, the Treasury Department, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and any other agency having any responsibility with respect to France's loan applications.

The Government of France for approximately 7 years has continually ignored all requests for payment and has used every devious and contemptible method and trick to avoid payment and has continually hidden behind diplomatic immunity in the most shameful manner. It refused even to discuss the matter with petitioner and his duly authorized representatives and, using its diplomatic and legal immunity, has attempted to discredit petitioner and his representatives. Present indications are that France will continue to refuse to settle this outstanding obligation, and, accordingly, it is hereby requested that France's application for loans in any amount be viewed in the light of this record, and any further loans to France be denied unless and until such time as petitioner's claim is satisfied.

Petitioner finds justification in filing this petition in the charter creating the International Bank and because of repeated public expressions of policy that the debt record of would-be borrowers is a material consideration in determining the business risk in any loan that might be made to such borrowers. In this connection, particular reference is made to the stated policy of the International Bank with respect to the fitness of a country to receive a loan, i. e.:

"The first step is the improvement of the credit position of many of the countries concerned. There are several things which those under-developed nations with a poor credit standing can do to improve their position. Perhaps the most effective would be for them to clear up their external debt records. * * * It is important for the countries concerned to give clear evidence of their desire to do their utmost to reach fair and equitable agreements with their creditors."

The International Bank's statement regarding loan procedure to the effect that: "The debt record of the prospective borrower is also studied and, if it has defaulted on their obligations, investigation is made of the causes of default, of the efforts made to reach a settlement with creditors, and of the borrowers' attitude" is indicative of the policy of our Government in determining the fitness of foreign governments to receive loans from the United States.

The responsibility of the International Bank is such that it must justify the confidence American investors have shown by the purchase of its debentures. If the Government of France is able to repudiate, ignore, neglect, and avoid its contractual obligations to American citizens, what assurance has the American public that France will not repudiate, ignore, neglect, and avoid repayment of its loans obtained through the International Bank, through the Economic Cooperation Administration, or some other agency or agencies of the United States? According to a statement made by the President of the International Bank, Mr. McCloy, recently:

"The Bank must justify the confidence American investors have shown. The Bank must demonstrate that the funds entrusted to it are not wasted or used for political purposes, but are used for sound projects of economical reconstruction and development * * *."

To advance further funds or credits to France in the light of her evasions of existing contractual obligations to American citizens would appear to be a dangerous and wasteful use of the funds entrusted to the International Bank or other agencies of the United States considering or proposing to lend money to France.

The petitioner is also requesting the State Department to make representations to the Government of France on his behalf, to the end that the French Government may be induced to pay and satisfy petitioner's justified claim as set forth herein and in the exhibits attached hereto. Complete documentation is available to support the validity of the debt owed by the Government of France to petitioner, and such documentation is well-known to the French Ambassador, the Honorable Henri Bonnet, and other representatives of the French Government; and though often importuned to settle this claim, said Ambassador and other representatives, and through them, the French Government, have refused to discuss settlement of this claim although frequently requested to

do so by petitioner and by certain members of the United States Senate.

The basis of petitioner's claim is set forth in a statement attached hereto marked "Exhibit A," which includes exchanges of correspondence between M. Girard de St. Andre and petitioner, dated respectively, April 3, April 7, and April 14, 1941, which concern the agreement between the French Government and the petitioner, which agreement was fully authorized by General deGaulle as head of the Provisional French Government. All agreements made by General de Gaulle in his capacity as head of the French Provisional Government were later ratified and approved by the French Assembly, as binding upon all succeeding French Governments.

M. de St. Andre who signed the agreement referred to and set forth in Exhibit A was sent to Syria by the French Government and was mysteriously shot and killed, presumably because of his stated position that the petitioner's claim was valid while M. Jacques de Sieyes, who was a party to the negotiations and agreement relied upon by petitioner, but who participated in an attempted disavowal of the petitioner's claim, was made French Minister to Bolivia. M. de Sieyes, when sued by petitioner in the United States courts, claimed diplomatic immunity, thereby making it impossible for petitioner to enforce the said claim.

Wherefore, the premises considered, petitioner prays that any applications of the French Government for loans or credits or grants of any kind whatsoever, be denied unless and until petitioner's rightful claim has been satisfied.

Respectfully submitted,

ELMER W. PRATT,
Attorney for Petitioner.

United Nations Building Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the following is text of telegram sent by some of the most distinguished citizens of the city of New York urging action at this session on the loan for the construction of the United Nations headquarters. This legislation was in the bill which I sponsored, House Joint Resolution 386, at the request of the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and introduced on April 26, 1948. It has since been reported out favorably by the committee as part of H. R. 6802. The United States invited the United Nations here. Congress wants a strong and effective United Nations; the action which will make these words meaningful is the approval of the loan. It has security similar to a first mortgage and it does make possible a suitable home for the United Nations which would otherwise be impossible.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of June 10, 1948]

CITY COMMITTEE WIRES MARTIN TO RUSH UN SITE LOAN BILL

The Mayor's Committee on the United Nations Headquarters, headed by Park Commissioner Robert Moses, has urged Congress, it was learned yesterday, to approve the $65,000,000 United States loan for construction of the UN headquarters on Franklin D. Roosevelt Drive.

A bill, including authorization of the loan and a $25,000,000 advance from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, was approved yesterday by the House Foreign Affairs Committee but still must be expedited by the Rules Committee to be passed at this session of Congress.

The mayor's committee, apparently fearful that in the rush for adjournment the bill may be shelved, telegraphed Speaker JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Republican of Massachusetts, that unless Congress acts on the bill the UN will almost surely move to Europe.

The signers of the telegram are Mr. Moses, Winthrop W. Aldrich, John W. Davis, Frederick H. Ecker, Charles G. Meyer, Nelson Rockefeller, Thomas J. Watson, and Grover A. Whalen.

The text follows:

"Members of Mayor's Committee hear UN building loan requires favorable action by the Rules Committee. Refusal of this Congress to advance this fund will almost surely result in removal of headquarters to Europe.

"Detailed plans for building completed and New York City has pledged $20,000,000 for site improvements. Surrounding site presented to UN with full approval of United States Government.

"Abandonment of the present huge open excavation in heart of Manhattan will create an eyesore, a subject of ridicule and a reproach to all of us.

"If loan is made United States will lose nothing in the event of ultimate removal by failure of the UN because the site with all improvements reverts to the lending agency. The enhanced value of the site and the usefulness of the proposed building for business purposes insure adequate security.

"We are certain proper terms for the loan can be arranged without further delay. We urge you to exert your great influence to carry out our country's responsibility toward this UN program."

Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARION T. BENNETT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast:

RADIO BROADCAST BY CONGRESSMAN MARION T. BENNETT, OF MISSOURI, AND DR. HUGH H. BENNETT, CHIEF, UNITED STATES SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE, KWTO, KGBX, KDRO, JUNE 1948

Congressman BENNETT. Fellow citizens, I must caution you that you are listening to two Bennetts on today's program—and we spell our names alike. But we'll try not to confuse you. Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, I'll just call you "Chief," as you are so widely known, because you are Chief of the United States Soil Conservation Service.

Dr. BENNETT. That's perfectly all right with me, Congressman.

Congressman BENNETT. It wasn't just because of your good last name, Chief, that I asked you to take part in this broadcast. The real, serious reason is that I am convinced a lot more people in my part of Missouri—and all over Missouri—need to know and to do more about soil conservation. To my mind, it is one of the most important matters before us today, in the United States and in the world.

I have supported soil conservation in every way I could, in Missouri and in Congress. But you were starting to preach soil conservation before I was ever born. So I think it will help us in our conservation thinking to get some pointers from you as recognized world authority on this vital matter.

Dr. BENNETT. I am glad, Congressman Bennett, to have this opportunity to discuss soil conservation. We have done a lot of conservation work, but I think I should point out that the big job is still ahead of us. It will take our combined best efforts for a good while yet before that task is anywhere near completed.

Congressman BENNETT. As I recall, you have made some first-hand studies of our land conditions in Missouri.

Dr. BENNETT. Yes, I have. In the last 38 years, I have either worked in or have been in every county in Missouri, including general field supervision of soil survey work in Barton, Cass, Greene, and Polk Counties, in your district. Only recently I enjoyed a fine fried-chicken dinner on a farm in your own county.

Congressman BENNETT. Your activities in soil conservation have covered quite a period, all right; and in that time many millions of tons of once good, rich topsoil have washed away down the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. That's why 4 years ago, on August 22, 1944, I declared in a speech in the House of Representatives my support of soil conservation as a constructive program to help Missouri farmers. I have not changed my mind, especially with continuing world food needs, plus record domestic demands for the products of our land, still placing a tremendous strain on our productive land capacity. How do you figure we stand now, Chief, as far as our good productive land is concerned?

Dr. BENNETT. Congressman BENNETT, we find ourselves today all too close to the danger line with respect to our supply of agricultural land. That is because, in only a few short generations, we have allowed around half of our cropland here in the United States to be damaged in some degree by erosion. Millions of acres have been ruined for further practical crop production, and other millions of acres have been seriously damaged. Still other millions of acres of grazing land have been damaged by this same wasteful and unnecessary process.

We are still losing the equivalent of at least 500,000 acres of cropland every year, with a still larger area damaged in some degree. And about 85 percent of that part of our crop and grazing land which is still subject to impoverishing erosion is yet lacking the protection of effective soil conservation treatment.

Congressman BENNETT. Missouri has her share of that damaged land and the erosion loss you speak of, doesn't she, Chief?

Dr. BENNETT. Yes, erosion surveys show that about 85 percent of Missouri's land has been affected by erosion in moderate to severe degree. Much of the topsoil, the cream of the land, has been skimmed off several million acres of your productive Missouri land. Nearly 2,000,000 acres have been practically ruined by gullying and deep erosion for any further immediate cultivation, and a much larger acreage has been damaged in lesser degree.

The tragic part of it is that all of this damage and waste actually is unnecessary. It can be stopped in a very practical way with sound soil conservation and proper land use. Moreover, it would pay us to do this conservation work as quickly as possible. That is because the cost of uncontrolled erosion throughout the country adds up to more than a billion dollars a year. That is just in such measurable items as direct cost to farmers, contributions to flood damage, silting of reservoirs and ditches, highway damage, and so on. This figure does not take into account such other costs as reduced income and purchasing power of farmers and ranchers, a narrowed tax base, and poorer living. Moreover, the longer we delay, the more difficult and expensive the job be-

comes—and the more good soil goes to waste down the hungry gutters of our streams.

Congressman BENNETT. All these facts you have just stated, Dr. Bennett, should leave little doubt in the mind of any thinking person that we can't afford, on any account, to delay the job of soil conservation. I, for one, feel that we have not been moving ahead nearly fast enough in Missouri with the soil-conservation-districts program.

I know we got started a little late with it, in 1943; but we have now had enough sound experience in soil conservation that we certainly can't plead that nobody told us about these things. We have had our own pioneers in the study of erosion and related subjects, in men like Dr. William A. Albrecht, Dean M. F. Miller, and W. C. Etheridge at the university. Early research studies and demonstration work under direction of your Soil Conservation Service at Bethany and other Missouri centers represented pioneering undertakings on their own part.

I wish you would tell us how the soil conservation program is coming along for the country as a whole.

Dr. BENNETT. As you say, Congressman, we still aren't moving nearly fast enough—in Missouri and a lot of other places. But we have made wonderful progress in a comparatively few years. We now have a vigorous and successful soil-and-water-conservation program actively under way throughout the United States. That is the farmers' own truly local soil-conservation-districts program.

The Soil Conservation Service is helping the districts get the job done, at their request, mainly by supplying technical help. You understand, of course, that as a technical agency specifically directed by Congress to make our facilities available to farmers in this way, we cooperate through the districts in any bona fide conservation program—State or Federal.

Congressman BENNETT. I know you do, Chief, within the limits of your personnel and funds available to you. And the work these soil-conservation districts are doing with your technical help, plus the educational assistance of the State agricultural college people, and the support of various other public and private groups is one of the most important accomplishments ever made in American agriculture.

I hope that before too long a time every county in my part of the State, at least, will be within soil-conservation district boundaries and in position to take advantage of this assistance. I personally have seen some of the fine work the farmers are doing in our Johnson County District, and can recommend it highly to all their Missouri neighbors.

Dr. BENNETT. Well, I hope you get your wish, Congressman; because farmers everywhere are finding their soil-conservation districts to be the best means ever devised for getting this important job done that we have to do. There are now about 2,000 districts. They cover more than a billion acres, and three-fourths of all the farms in the country. Missouri farmers already have voted 20 of these districts, embracing six and three-fourths million acres. That is a worth-while start.

The real measure of our progress in soil conservation, of course, lies in the complete, acre-by-acre planning and treatment of our farmland. Up to the first of this year, in soil conservation districts alone, the Soil Conservation Service had helped the districts prepare more than half a million complete farm-and ranch-conservation plans, covering nearly 150,000,000 acres. And considerably more than 75,000,000 acres already have had the planned work applied on them. Those figures do not include many additional millions of acres planned and treated under other programs in which our Service has taken part.

Congressman BENNETT. Those are real achievements, Dr. Bennett, for the United States Soil Conservation Service of which you are Chief. They indicate better than anything else could that the amount of money we've appropriated for this soil conservation assistance has been spent to good purpose. By the way, the House for the 1949 fiscal year has appropriated $44,000,000 for your agency, which is $6,000,000 above budget requests.

Dr. BENNETT. That's right. And practical, scientific soil conservation benefits the people on the land, benefits business and professional people in town—from Springfield to Sedalia, from St. Louis to Kansas City. It benefits our schools and churches, and benefits the State and Nation. If we had time, I could cite any number of examples of this, many of them from Missouri.

Congressman BENNETT. I've also been interested in some of the wider public benefits you have referred to, especially flood control.

Dr. BENNETT. That is a very important part of the whole soil conservation undertaking, Congressman BENNETT. As you know, a flood-control survey has been made by the Soil Conservation Service in cooperation with other interested Federal and State agencies in the Osage Basin, including a considerable part of your district. In addition, southern Barton County in this Missouri area is in the Grand Neosho River watershed, on which the field work of a similar flood-control survey also has been completed.

Congressman BENNETT. Well, Dr. Bennett, I don't think there is any question anymore about the effectiveness and the value of the kind of soil-conservation work you have been telling us about. In recent years, we have seen many crackpot schemes advanced to solve the woes of the farm. Soil conservation is not a crackpot idea, any more than it is a cure-all for our farm problems. But it is a practical, proved, and necessary approach to a sounder agriculture for Missouri—the Nation, and the world.

There are many kinds of Federal soil conservation programs. I have always especially liked the program of the United States Soil Conservation Service for two reasons. First, it is solely devoted to soil conservation. And, second, under it the average farmer benefits.

Congress has authorized some programs, such as the PMA or AAA program, under which the average farmer does not benefit. The President, in a message to Congress January 10, 1947, said, "More than 60 percent of total payments have been going to only 20 percent of the Nation's farmers." He urged Congress to shift its emphasis to the type of program represented by the Soil Conservation Service and the Extension Service. Under the PMA or AAA program, for instance, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD disclosed yesterday, payments totaling $819,644.22—think of it, over a quarter of a million dollars—were paid to one big farm operator in Mississippi, from 1933 to this year. At the same time, the great percentage of farmers were receiving around $20 under the same program. A quarter of a million dollars was paid to one big wheat farmer in Montana during the same period.

It is not my purpose here today to criticize these other programs, most of which serve a very useful purpose in their own way, and could increasingly do so, with modifications. These programs are referred to by the general term, "Soil conservation." They include the PMA or AAA program, the work of the agricultural experiment stations, the Extension Service, the Forest Service, the TVA distribution of fertilizer, and many other activities. But, I must repeat, I like the United States soil conservation program which is wholly a soil conservation program and by which the average farmer benefits. There is a lot of unnecessary rivalry between these groups in government. What I am interested in is not this rivalry but an integrated permanent, long range, well-supported soil conservation program working in cooperation and harmony and I feel that is your sentiment, too, Dr. Bennett, although I do not seek to speak for you

I hope there are not many—if any—people in my part of Missouri who don't appreciate the importance of soil conservation as such and want to see it put into effect 100 percent on our farm lands. The big job now is for us all to pull together in working for that goal.

In conclusion, Dr. Bennett, permit me to express for myself and our listeners in Missouri, our appreciation for your taking the time today to leave your post as Chief of the United States Soil Conservation Service to come over to the Capitol and make this educational broadcast on a topic vital to all Americans. Finally, we wish to invite you back to the Sixth Congressional District of Missouri for another of those fried chicken dinners you said you enjoyed there so recently.

That's all we have time for today, folks. This is Congressman MARION T. BENNETT speaking and returning you to your local station announcer. Thanks for listening.

Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Press of June 5, 1948:

THAT CANAL AGAIN

Plans for the long-proposed Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal were approved the other day by the United States Army Engineers in Cincinnati.

That doesn't necessarily mean that the canal will be built. Its advocates still have several tough hurdles before them, including the all-important one of getting Congress to approve spending about $416,000,000 to build the project.

If or when such an appropriation comes before Congress, it is likely to run into active opposition from (1) taxpayers in other parts of the country, and (2) Pittsburgh industrial interests.

At first glance, it might seem that the canal would be of great benefit to Pittsburgh. It would give the city water transportation to and from the Great Lakes. Ore might be brought here cheaper, and coal shipped to the Lakes at lower rates than at present.

That's the way leading Pittsburghers thought a few decades back. Now, however, they're not so enthusiastic. When a hearing on the matter was held here last year, almost all Pittsburgh organizations that were represented were opposed to the canal.

Pittsburgh, they reason, would be placed in a bad competitive position by the canal. Especially the steel industry.

The canal would go through Youngstown, Warren, and other steel-making centers of eastern Ohio. These centers already have two advantages over Pittsburgh. Their freight rates on ore are lower, and they are closer to the big steel-consuming markets along the Great Lakes.

Pittsburgh now has the advantage of cheaper coal. If the canal were built it would lose this advantage, for Pittsburgh district coal could be floated right into Youngstown.

What Pittsburghers fear most is that, in the end the canal will be built only from the

Ohio River to Youngstown. This would give the Ohio city the cheap coal it is seeking, and give Pittsburgh no benefit at all.

The fears are well founded. Most of the engineering difficulties involved in the canal project are between Youngstown and Lake Erie.

Pittsburgh opposition to the canal may be selfish. But there are other arguments against it.

There is reason to doubt that the canal actually would save very much on shipments. Materials on the larger lake boats would have to be transferred to boats that could use the canal, which would be expensive and time-consuming.

With benefits to Pittsburgh very doubtful, the major beneficiaries would be a few steel companies around Youngstown. For them, the American public would be asked to put up nearly half a billion dollars for construction of the canal, and about two billions a year to operate it.

From where we sit, the canal project looks like a gigantic boondoggle.

European Recovery Program Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the avalanche of public opinion is beginning to impress upon the Congress the need for making good on the ERP by adequate appropriations and by restoring the amounts in the drastic cuts made by the House. Our people believe in the ERP as a truly American policy to help attain world peace. They will not be let down. I append a resolution favoring the full ERP appropriation adopted by the executive committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America on June 8, 1948, and transmitted to me by the secretary, Rev. Walter W. Van Kirk:

RESOLUTION ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR EUROPEAN RECOVERY

We strongly urge the Congress to appropriate, without enfeebling reductions, the funds authorized in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948. To cut now the initial funds for the European recovery program would jeopardize the constructive potentialities of this cooperative undertaking, and endanger the security and stability of the free societies. As this committee has warned before, less than an adequate effort at the start might change the program from one of recovery into one of costly relief.

Moreover, the good faith of this country is at stake. The original action of the Congress in adopting the ERP legislation was taken after consideration of careful estimates of the resources and needs and after full and democratic debate. That legislation committed this Nation to a constructive course of action, on the basis of which the other cooperating peoples have assumed new duties. It would be morally irresponsible for the Congress of the United States now to violate its own solemn engagement for economic assistance. For the welfare of our people and of the world, America's commitment must be honored.

Address of Fleet Adm. William F. Halsey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a ringing American speech made by Fleet Adm. William F. Halsey, United States Navy, a great American, at the annual dinner of the Massachusetts committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, held in Boston, on the evening of June 3, 1948.

This committee is a splendid group of Americans of all religious faiths to further tolerance and understanding, and to constructively combat bigotry in the United States.

ADDRESS BY FLEET ADM. WILLIAM F. HALSEY, UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. Toastmaster, it is a privilege for me to be here tonight. For more than 40 years I have sought to serve this country of ours as a member of its naval service. I have seen much of America, and I have met many Americans. I have come to admire true Americanism as God's greatest blessing to the dignity of mankind.

The true American thinks of his neighbor as an American without thought of his religious beliefs. So long as a single one of us thinks of another as a modified American of any sort, we are all in danger of losing our heritage of freedom.

Our Constitution leaves no room for intolerance or condescension. No one religious group can seek to demean another. The dignity of the American people cannot rise above the least common denominator of any of its component parts.

Less than three short years ago we concluded a great war in which we, as Americans, fought for the preservation of the democratic principles we cherish. We fought then as we should live now, as a team, without regard for religion or social background. We fought then as a free people, fighting to defend their freedom. We fought to overthrow those who championed the theory of a master race. We fought to assure that all men might live in peace and dignity.

In that war many Americans lost their lives. Those men were not chosen from any specific groups. There are no restrictive covenants on death in the battlefield. The exploding shell does not stop to select its victims on the manner in which they worship their God, nor require that you attend any certain church before you can be worthy of dying for your country.

The men who fought these battles know, perhaps better than most, that there is really little difference among us. They know that their fears and their hopes were shared by all their fellows. They know that the color of blood streaming from a wound is the same, regardless of the religion of the man whose life blood is ebbing. They know no creed makes a man less fearful of death, or better equipped to withstand pain.

Even now, 3 years after the roar of battle, there are thousands of Americans—true Americans—under treatment in veterans' hospitals throughout the Nation. For them the past is not a closed book. The horror of war is all too clearly etched upon their souls and bodies. And they have not forgotten the great lessons of equality which war teaches.

Perhaps among the hospitalized veterans there are some who remember the sinking of the Army transport *Dorchester* in the North Atlantic. Perhaps they remember the four Army chaplains who gave their life jackets to soldiers who had lost their own, and who were last seen standing with locked arms, each murmuring his own prayer, as the ship sank beneath the surface. Perhaps they recall, too, that these four chaplains were a Catholic priest, a Jewish rabbi, and ministers of two Protestant denominations.

Where is the difference in religion which makes any one of these men more heroic than the other three?

Or perhaps some of you remember the day that a Navy plane crashed at San Juan, P. R., on December 31, 1942, killing its pilot and crew. Those who died were Lt. Edward Vogel, of Erwin, Tenn.; Aviation Ordnanceman Isidore Goldberg, of the Bronx, N. Y., and Aviation Machinist's Mate Edwin Sipowsky, of Waukegan, Ill. These three men were buried side by side in the service cemetery at Santurce. Officers and members of their squadron carried their caskets, and the entire squadron was present to do them honor. Funeral services for Edward Vogel were read by a Protestant chaplain, those for Edwin Sipowski by a Catholic chaplain and for Isidore Goldberg by a Jewish chaplain. The caskets of each were draped by the flag for which they had mutually died—the Stars and Stripes.

Where is the difference in religion which made any one of these men a better American than either of his fellow victims?

The many well-tended cemeteries which dot the islands of the Pacific are filled with rows of white crosses and Stars of David. Here lie men who loved America because generations ago their ancestors had a hand in her founding. Interspersed with them are men who loved America because they themselves, or their parents, came to her shores in recent years to escape oppression abroad. Here are interred, side by side, officers and men, the wealthy and the poor. Here lie Protestants, Catholics, Jews, and atheists. In this hallowed ground no man is hated because of his faith.

The dead do not practice discrimination. There is no religious intolerance in the cemeteries. There is only democracy in its highest and purest form.

But what of the living? Must Americans die before they achieve that equality which our Government promises them? Are the words, "all men are created equal" fulfilled only in death?

The world which our hospitalized veterans read about in their daily newspapers is a far cry from the world for which they fought and for which their comrades died. Each edition of the press carries new examples of man's inability to live in peace with his fellow men, of man's inhumanity to man. In some sections of the world, armed conflict is the order of the day. Throughout the rest of the world fear and unrest prevent the realization of the peace and tranquillity for which these men fought.

Even here in our own country there is no real peace, there is no real brotherhood of man. There are still those who hate the Jews, those who abhor the Protestants and those who ridicule the Catholics.

These men, who have not learned the lessons of tolerance—these men who deny the rights of an American citizen to another man because of religion—are, by their very acts of intolerance, dishonoring our wounded and disgracing our dead. They are negating the principles for which our sons and brothers fought. They are spreading the germs of the only disease which can stifle the life of this country.

Our American way of life was built on the premise of freedom and equality for all men. Every time an American acts to restrict that freedom, or violate that equality, he is striking a blow at the very foundations of our country. It is true that it may be only a small blow, but nevertheless it weakens the

structural whole. A succession of these small blows, repeated in ever-increasing numbers, will eventually shatter the cornerstone and bring the whole structure of democracy tumbling down about our heads.

It is to help to prevent the spread of intolerance that we are here tonight. The Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews has waged a continuing battle since its organization, 12 years ago, against this deadly disease of prejudice and hate. The committee has grown in size and effectiveness until today its influence is felt among hundreds of thousands of Americans.

True, there is still prejudice, intolerance, and discrimination. But they are not as widespread as they were last year, and, because of the work of this committee, they will be even less apparent in the years to come. That is the principle to which the Massachusetts committee is dedicated, and it is the principle to which every American should be dedicated—it is the basic tenet of Americanism.

It is my sincere hope that the fine work you are doing here in Massachusetts will eventually be felt throughout the entire Nation, and, ultimately, throughout the world. When the day finally arrives when there is no need to observe brotherhood day anywhere in the world, because all men are brothers every day—then and only then, your efforts will have achieved their fullest measure of success.

Between Two Worlds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, on June 7 the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] delivered a very interesting and able address on the subject Between Two Worlds at the centennial celebration of Muhlenberg College in my State. I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BETWEEN TWO WORLDS

Today is but tomorrow's page in history. You and I are the authors of what will be written on that page.

Because we are living that history in the making—because we are so close to our immediate problems, it is often difficult for us to distinguish between truth and propaganda, between constructive or destructive forces, between half truths and the eternal verities.

The problems are made more difficult because all propaganda is not evil, just as it cannot all be good. The problem is made vital because each of us in his daily living becomes a propagandist, adding in our own way our bit to the page of history.

An example of this unconscious propaganda is demonstrated in a story concerning Senator Chandler and the Pasha of Makarech. (Story told.)

Senator Chandler's bit of propaganda was innocent fun. But it did create a lasting impression with the Pasha, and it illustrates the weight of deep and lasting impressions which individual actions create. Those of you who saw service abroad during the war will appreciate the influence of personal contacts with other people.

It is a power for good or evil that is inherent in each of us. It emphasizes the far-reaching and fundamental importance of individual responsibility and integrity.

Individual responsibility is the cornerstone upon which nations rise or fall.

Muhlenberg College, as an institution of the Lutheran Church, aims to foster in each of its students a Christian personality, an awareness of individual responsibility; as a college of liberal arts it upholds the ideals of a liberal education.

Specifically, it seeks to develop and to relate properly in each student:

First. A religious interest—because it believes religion to be the integrating force that gives purpose and direction to personality. My own concern for such a sense of purpose and direction last month led me to introduce a resolution which called upon the President to designate Memorial Day as an occasion for Nation-wide prayer by the people, to seek permanent peace for the world. These are the words used in introducing that resolution: "There are two ways to arm for defense, one materially, the other spiritually. The Government itself can arm only materially, but the people, who compose the Government, must arm spiritually if we are to defend America."

Second. Your college seeks to develop—

"Intellectual curiosity and the improvement of critical thinking—to develop the attitude of the open mind and suspended judgment, and to enable the student in any situation requiring action, to arrive at conclusions dependable and satisfying."

In other words, a habit and determination to find all the facts, to relate them on the bases of truth and knowledge, and thus to attain the moral and intellectual security that is the end-product of conclusions independently arrived at.

Third. "A knowledge of social usages and values." In knowing the proper thing to do we are at ease and we do our best; a sense of moral values enables one to determine the spiritual value against the material.

Fourth. "A wholesome regard for physical well-being." Education's traditional devotion to the principle of a sound mind in a sound body has its roots in the scriptural injunction: "Your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost, therefore glorify God in your body."

Fifth. "Vocational guidance in harmony with the Christian concept of the value and dignity of work." I repeat—the value and dignity of work. That is a concept whose full meaning was known to our forefathers, but it is an inheritance which has been sadly neglected in its passing down.

What do these aims of education mean in terms of real values in life? Are they mere words or do they have living meaning? Why do they offer the tools with which to equip yourselves for these times?

The crisis of these times is not a material one. It is a spiritual and a moral crisis. We have developed materially and technologically to an unprecedented degree. But we have not developed the intellect and the soul to solve the elementary problems of life which are those of human relations. It is a failure as between nations as it is between men.

The test of education in such times must be its ability to inspire the student to develop himself at the same time that he is made aware of the responsibilities he owes to his fellow men.

The failure or lack in education proves itself in suspicion, hatred, and intolerance.

The essence of education must be the building of qualities of self-mastery which mark the good men and women in any society. Foremost among these qualities are those of understanding, moderation, fortitude, trustworthiness, fairness, kindliness, and creative ability. Above all else is the ability to use the tools of intelligence and the force of conscience to distinguish between the true and the false, the wise and the foolish.

These are the precise consequences of the aims to which I have referred.

They involve a recognition by your college that the way to make a better world or to make the best of an imperfect world is to make better men and women.

That is the spirit of your college. It is a spirit desperately needed throughout the whole range of human affairs. Never in history has mankind had so much to live for and so little will to grasp the promise of the future.

There is great significance in the occasion of the centennial celebration of the founding of this college. It signifies a maturing not only of the institution but of the Nation. It is indicative of a history that has brought our Nation of age.

There is real purpose in looking back to 1848, the year this school was founded.

In Europe that was a year of trouble and strife. It was the year of the potato famine in Ireland, which sent thousands of our antecedents fleeing to these shores. It was a year of revolutions in France, Hungary, Sicily, Austria, Poland, and Denmark.

An impoverished young German named Karl Marx and his associate, Friedrich Engels, had just published a pamphlet called the Communist Manifesto. Not unlike 1948, it was a year of ferment. New ideas were on the march.

In America the march was to our frontiers. The war with Mexico was completed, settling our destiny as a continental power. The trails of the pioneers had already cut across the prairies and the mountains to link a people from one ocean to another. Gold was discovered in California, a dramatic impetus to full exploitation of the West.

The habit and expectation of thought had realized an empire. Think of that—the habit and expectation of thought of a people had realized an empire from a wilderness. The mills of Lowell were linked to the docks of San Francisco. And further untold changes were in the making. The dreamers of railroads, telegraphs, and turbines were already translating their dreams into realities. That was the year the railroad between New York and Boston was opened. A low-energy economy was at the point of ignition. The lusty young giant's preoccupation with a continental growth was best expressed in a policy for external affairs that was to prevail for three-quarters of a century—to leave alone and be left alone; to work out our own destiny alone.

Now, let us contrast that with a look at the position in which we find ourselves here in the United States today.

The measure of the continent's span in time has been translated from months to hours. Our economy is the most productive ever known to man. Through the impelling forces of trade our destinies have been linked not between two oceans but across the oceans and the lands of the earth. We are a world power, not merely a continental power. We have fought two wars which demonstrate, if they have not fixed, our global relationships.

Never before in history has a nation enjoyed such a preeminent position as ours. That preeminence is history's tribute to the unique experiment that was America—a system of a free people in a free society. The accomplishments of that system, measured in the highest standards of living known to man, are our great heritage.

That preeminence is a testament of youth. We are, after all, only 170 years old. Yet, in our vigor we seek to solve evils accumulated over 3,000 years. In our impatience there is the danger of losing the gains already made.

We have every reason to exult in our estate. We can be proud of our technical progress. We can find satisfaction in our generosity to other countries. We should be able to look to the future with a confidence that we possess the means to lift the well-being of our people far beyond the fondest dreams of the past.

And yet, as a nation, we are seriously sick. We have drawn no uplift of spirit from the material miracles we have won.

In scores of technical achievements we have opened the storehouses of the universe. We literally can reverse the old maxim and make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. But instead of exulting in the promise of a better world, we are full of misgivings over the consequences of making use of our knowledge.

The mutual suspicions of labor and management aggravate unrest. Their rivalry threatens the most essential public services. The urgent necessity of full production, as the certain and reliable balance wheel in our economy, goes unheeded. In the charges and countercharges between labor and management there is no hint of the harmony and mutual dependence that is so elementary it escapes attention. In their separate lusts there are forebodings that strike panic for the consumer.

On the one hand we fear inflation in our economy, and take measures to avoid it. The consequences generate a fear of deflation, and we take measures to prevent it.

We know that Government controls over our lives have to be lifted if freedoms are to be preserved. But we are susceptible to the seducing comforts promised by artificial brakes upon our excesses.

We know the movement has gone too far in centralizing so much of affairs in Federal Government, but we hesitate to return the problems to the localities and to the people, where the burdens will be more directly felt, for fear that nothing will be done about them.

We fought the cruelest war in history to end the intolerable pressure of aggressor nations. We fought it to make the world's peace secure. We fought it in the name of the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter. We fought it to make sure that an international organization would be created for the purpose of making future war impossible through the combined moral and material force of the world community.

That war is behind us, ended in presumed victory for our purposes.

But now we are engaged in a cold war; so named, without doubt, because it is so cold-blooded.

We were told that the end of the shooting war would mean an escape from huge armies and the enormous cost of armaments for national defense. There is something deeply ironic in the fact that we now offer our tithe—upwards of a tenth of our national income—not to the Lord but to the monster goddess of war.

In the haste and hysteria of arming we close our eyes and by-pass the elaborate machinery for peace created in the United Nations. We seek to substitute our dollars for the moral force of united action. In the grasp of political expediency we actually repudiate its meaning.

Frightened by our own lack of moral force we would slam the door shut on our adversaries in the cold war. To the people of the world, and to ourselves, we admit our failure to win the peace. The world, like ourselves, is in a mania of fear.

The dilemma of the intellectual symbolizes the paucity of spiritual strength in the world. He finds that Jeffersonian democracy or Lincolnian republicanism are little more than campaign slogans. He seeks expression for the spirit of emancipation with which he is imbued. He may readily be swept into the orbit of Marxian communism.

If you would read the stages of disillusion that have come from that course, I recommend Freda Utley's splendid book on the literature of disenchantment, Lost Illusion. There she describes the inevitable experience of sensitive and generous spirits attracted to communism; their journey from enthusiastic acceptance to bewilderment, to shock, to the agonies of doubt, and then, under the hammer blows of history, to the bitter truth that the system originally hailed as a glorious hope for all mankind is the cruelest form of despotism in human experience.

There is a brutality in that experience that fortunately cannot be paralleled by any disillusion with our own scene. But we do have confusion and frustration, and it is no wonder that the atmosphere sometimes approaches sheer panic.

Literally we are caught between two worlds—the magnificent promise of tomorrow and the unreasoning fear of what tomorrow may bring. We seem to hang suspended between the blessed and the damned.

Our fears for the future do not lie in any want or failure in our material world. It is now a commonplace, because it is so self-evident, to say that we have the resources, we have the men, the plant capacity, and the skill to produce security and a high standard of living for all. It is likewise true that we have a United Nations Organization, within the framework of which lies the machinery by which justice and peace can be guaranteed to the world.

The lack is the human will to make these instruments in the material world work for us.

The fault lies not in our stars but in ourselves. Our physical maturity is real but our spiritual maturity is retarded. It is characteristic of a child, when hurt or faced with something he should not have done, to blame his troubles on every cause outside himself. In like immaturity, we put the cause of our fears on science, on the Communists, or the capitalists, on the Republicans or the Democrats, on the depression or on the war; on anyone and everything except ourselves as individuals. And we find the most convincing reasons to show that the cause of our troubles is the other fellow, not ourselves.

How does this avoidance of individual responsibility manifest itself?

First. We see everywhere the naked struggle for power. We see it on the part of labor leaders, the owners and managers of industry, political personalities, leaders, and heads of States. I am not talking about those impersonal generalities called labor, management, Democrats or Republicans, the United States or the Soviet Union. These struggles for power and pelf are waged by people, individuals like ourselves, who avoid the true responsibilities connected with the positions in which they find themselves. Everywhere men are overreaching themselves in a grasp for power, to control the lives of other people. In that grasping there is no pause, to discharge the responsibilities which other people have a right to expect from them.

Second. We find a widespread distortion and misuse of the fundamental tools of progress—an unwillingness to pursue or to face fundamental facts and to apply plain reason, logic, and common sense to them. I could give a dozen examples, the trick uses of statistics to prove a point, the colored or partially told story, the use of sugar-coated phrases that say one thing when the fact is something different.

It is a problem which does not stem from government alone, but cuts through every facet of our lives, whether called by the velvet name of public relations, the license of an age of advertising, or anything else. We have become slaves to slogans and to the emotional appeal. Trick phrases and ready tabs are the substitute for reason. One newspaper headline citing a "slave labor law" defeats weeks of reasoned exposition in debate. Tabs of "reactionary," "red," "Fascist," or "economic royalist" condemn without hearing an old-fashioned liberal who puts liberty before reform, a genuine progressive one who abhors communism, or one who has been successful in business.

This simplicity, we can say with Henry Adams, is the most deceitful mistress that ever betrayed man. And the people are responsible. We simply do not face facts squarely or use plain reasons and common sense. We have too many leaders with a flexible conscience. What is more, we seem to have lost the power of moral indignation which in the past compelled our leaders to speak and act with sincerity.

Third. Closely associated with this is the shocking indifference to the simplest and most elementary virtues of the good life and the good society, self-reliance, the dignity of work, honor of the pledged word, plain speaking, insistence upon the elementary standards of justice, willingness to demonstrate good faith, and inspiration to confidence by action. Again, this is the fault of people, not of government, of labor, of technology, of philosophy, or some other vague impersonality.

Fourth. There is the universal trend toward paternalism, to let someone else guarantee our rights or our security. This is the most evident form of an avoidance of responsibility on the part of people wherever they should be exercising it. It is most evident in a reliance upon Government.

Our people rightly fear the interference of Government in their enterprises and in their lives. It is not a good thing and it may eventually destroy our liberties. But Government interference has come about and continues to increase because we have either not recognized our personal responsibilities or have not met them when they arose as a State, as a community, or as an individual.

It is positively amazing to see how everybody and every interest comes to Washington for a solution to problems that ought to be settled back home. Federal aid has become a gigantic grab bag, and each interest feels that there is no price to pay.

I am reminded of a lettter from a woman to a Senator stating she was amazed that he was so concerned about the cost of the bill to provide for Federal aid to education. "It would not cost the taxpayers one cent," she said; "the Government would pay for it."

Pare a Government bureau today and you cut to the quick a hundred thousand outraged citizens back home. Everyone wants someone else regulated or taxed. But each one wants to borrow the Government club to help him solve his own problems, and usually to his own selfish advantage. The private interests come to Washington in their self-seeking; counties, cities, and States are already there.

Few seem to realize that the price for this avoidance of one's clear responsibilities is increasing taxation, a red-taped bureaucracy, increasing regulation. And what is worse than all the price is a growing helplessness of an entire people to do anything for themselves. In the awareness of that growing helplessness there is a constant fear of the future. If those closest to the problems, whether individuals or community, would accept their responsibility for a solution, there would be less uncertainty and less fear about the future.

We clamor for privileges, and rights, and we avoid our clear responsibilities, the responsibilities of each one to meet the problems in his own sphere squarely and fully. When each brick of the house does not hold up its share of the weight, the whole house is endangered.

And so we come back to the point where I started this discourse—to the fundamental importance of individual responsibility in

the solution of the basic problems of human relations, and to the precepts of your college.

The problems of our times are real and they cut deep.

But they are by no means insoluble. An awareness of the problems is in fact one step toward their solution.

I am reminded of Ralph Waldo Emerson's observation, written more than a century ago:

"This time, like all other times, is a very good one if we but know what to do with it."

This is an enduring solace. There is the challenge.

There is your individual responsibility.

Your college education equips you to meet that challenge, unless you are the one of whom Sir Joshua Reynolds was speaking when he wrote, "There is no expedient to which a man will not resort to avoid the real labor of thinking."

Thomas Edison made good use of that thought by having it printed on cards. When workmen in his laboratory at Orange, N. J., came to him and asked for advice or insisted a thing could not be done, he would silently hand his worker that bit of philosophy.

It is not new for youth who are graduating from college to face problems at home and in the world.

It has been civilization's loss that many of our problems in human relationships have not been solved.

You will find real satisfaction in grappling with these problems and in their solution.

In these problems and their solution you will find life itself.

As a nation we have conquered our geographical frontiers, but we have failed miserably in solving the all-important problems of human relationship.

Herein lies the future of the world, individual understanding of each other, employer and employee cooperation, racial tolerance, nations and individuals understanding the problems of each other, and sitting down at a table with sympathy and a determination to make an enduring peace both internationally and in their daily internal problems.

A bright new world equal to the glorious opportunities offered to us, as new frontiers of science and achievement unfold.

Yours the individual responsibility.

Yours the touchstone for the future.

Conditions in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the Appendix of the RECORD the London letter of Harold J. Laski regarding British policy in Palestine.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LASKI—LONDON'S POLICY IN PALESTINE HAS PUT BLACK STAIN ON BRITISH NAME

(By Harold J. Laski)

LONDON.—The British Government has done more damage to the honor and prestige of Britain in the past week than our enemies have been able to inflict upon us since the evil days of Munich. Every step it has taken over the situation in Palestine has been marked by evasion, a narrow legalism, and an unmistakable anxiety to do the utmost damage it could do the nascent Jewish state.

That it should have been necessary for Secretary-General Trygve Lie of the United Nations to send a special emissary to Ernest Bevin to warn him of the disastrous effects of British policy upon the organization we are pledged to support is the measure of the degree to which we have forfeited international confidence in our good faith.

The contrast between the spirit of Herbert Morrison's words about Palestine at the Scarborough Labor Party conference and the policy of the Government in London is one it is difficult not to describe as shameful.

It is beyond doubt that the attitude of the British Government is responsible for the invasion of Palestine by the Arab states. Whatever formal warnings the foreign office may have given, its attitude has been one from which those states were bound to infer that Britain would not be seriously perturbed if they acted. When the Security Council moved to act against their aggression, it was Sir Alexander Cadogan who attempted first to pretend that there was no aggression at all, and then to secure for them an extension of time in which they could answer.

When they refused a truce, it was Sir Alexander again who proposed a form of standstill so obviously like nonintervention in Spain that no serious observer could fail to draw the conclusion that he was about as anxious for fair play for Israel as he was for fair play for republican Spain when he was permanent Secretary of the Foreign Office when Neville Chamberlain's government was helping to put Franco in power.

The humbug of our relations with members of the Arab league is bad enough, but it is almost trifling beside the pretense and dishonesty about our relations with Transjordan. Foreign Secretary Bevin made it an independent state as recently as 1946 when the Anglo-American Commission on Palestine was acting. It was at Bevin's instance that the Anglo-Transjordan Treaty stated that King Abdullah was not to engage in military action without consulting Britain. British officers trained his army and are the main source of its strategic capacity. It has been armed wholly by Britain, and the $8,000,000 it receives as an annual subsidy from Britain are the very basis of its existence.

Yet with or without Bevin's leave, Transjordan's army is the main invader of Palestine; it is the Transjordan army which is shelling Jerusalem; and though Bevin tells us that no British officers are in charge of operations in Palestine, correspondents report a completely different story.

It is difficult for anyone to believe that Abdullah acted in all this without the full knowledge of the Foreign Office. And it is still more difficult not to believe that the Foreign Office was from the start fully aware that Abdullah's invasion was the most serious threat the Jews would have to face.

The bias of the British Government against the Jews has been demonstrated over and over in statements to the UN and in the House of Commons. A typical example was the allegation that many of the Jewish immigrants into Palestine were Russian agents. This was denied both by Sir Godfrey Collins in Cyprus and for all effective purposes by the officer in charge of disembarkation.

The Government did nothing to assure continuity of service on the Palestine railway. It permitted the land settlement department to sell lands in the state domain, as in Haifa harbor, to the Arabs.

It sent the documents concerning irrigation and land registration to England, a policy which is bound gravely to complicate the future disposition of land. It paid out more than a million dollars to the Supreme Moslem Council, though it must have been fully aware that this was the same as a direct subsidy to the exiled Mufti of Jerusalem, who has always been in sole control of this fund.

It has unilaterally excluded Palestine from the sterling area and blocked the sterling balances in London, though the grave difficulties involved have been pointed out by the Palestine Commission of the UN, which the authorities in London lacked even the courtesy to consult. The Palestine Government has sold the two main railroad lines in Palestine to Transjordan and Egypt, with the result that they have virtually sealed off Israel from access to the rest of the world.

Nor must one omit to note that in March 1948, 4 months after the UN Assembly had voted for partition, and once more as a unilateral act, the British Government gave the Iraq Petroleum Co. the right to build a new pipe line terminating at the port of Haifa. Perhaps it was symbolic that the end of the British regime in Palestine should be written in oil.

What I have set down here is only a small part of British policy in Palestine in recent months. There is far more of a similar kind; and though most of it is fully known to Americans, little of it has appeared in the British press.

Labor supporters ought to be aware that there are few non-Arab countries in the world today in which British policy in Palestine is not regarded as a black stain on our good name. It has been a deliberate and conscious attempt to help the Arabs against the Jews. It has been accompanied by persistent calumny and misrepresentation. Not merely the most eminent of European Socialists—men like Leon Blum in France and Camille Huismans in Belgium—have been shocked at its cynicism. It has dismayed many of the best friends we have in the United States and has been of great help to every source of anti-British sentiment there.

It is not often that a Socialist government has fallen so low or displayed so ungenerous a spirit. It is not merely the Foreign Secretary who is responsible. This is the policy of the Government and of a party in the House of Commons. It is the signal proof of the evil men do when they desert the straight path in their search for power by means it has always been the aim of Socialists to condemn and to destroy.

Address by Mr. Barney Balaban, President of Paramount Pictures, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include an inspiring speech made by Barney Balaban, president of the Paramount Pictures, Inc., at the annual dinner held in Boston the evening of June 3, 1948, of the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews; a splendid organization of Americans of all religious faiths organized to further tolerance and understanding, and to combat bigotry in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, Admiral Halsey, Congressman McCORMACK, and friends, I am keenly conscious of the honor being bestowed upon me today by your committee. The prestige of your organization, its record of accomplishment in the field of human relations, and the caliber of the other two men who

share in these honors make this award a treasured event.

I shall not mar this happy occasion by questioning the wisdom of your choice in selecting me as one of the honored guests. I am sure that there are many outstanding citizens of my faith who are more deserving of such a distinction. However, I am grateful to you for your kindness, and trust that—in the years ahead—I may hope to merit the generous comments made about me this evening.

In honoring me tonight for such contribution as I may have made to the Freedom Train, I am sure that you intend to honor all those who participated in the development of this highly successful program. I therefore accept your recognition of my participation in its organization as a symbolic tribute to everyone who has played a part in its accomplishment.

This meeting is in keeping with the finest spirit of the Freedom Train. All of the historic documents carried on that traveling shrine bespeak the ideals which motivate your organization. You have translated the musty documents of yesterday into a living credo for today. As free men and women you have found the noblest expression of your freedom in the practice of brotherhood. It is fitting that such a gathering be held in the Cradle of Liberty, where our American freedom was born and nurtured.

The good works of the Massachusetts committee, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, have been known to me for some time. Anyone who has been interested in the development of better group relations knows about the program of your organization and its beneficial impact upon your community. Here you have an instrumentality through which men of good will can work together for the purpose of creating harmony in your communal family. You not only have contributed to the well-being of your native Commonwealth, but have set an inspiring example for others to follow.

As Americans, each of us—regardless of religious persuasion—has a stake in the attainment of your worthy objectives. We who belong to the Hebrew faith perhaps have more reason to be ardent in these endeavors than others. The history of our people has given us an intimate and personal understanding of the evils of bigotry and prejudice. There are other minorities who can bear equally valid testimony in this regard. Yet the problem is not one which is of special concern to any particular minority. I believe, with all my heart, that the objectives of the Massachusetts committee are the aspirations of decent people everywhere.

Respect for the human personality is inherent in all religious faiths. It springs from the deep wells of every religious inspiration. It is the foundation upon which we have built our democratic structure in America.

In seeking the elimination of group prejudice, we must strive inevitably for the universal acceptance of this basic concept of our democratic society—respect for the human personality. This doctrine is the soul of our American way of life. It is the basis upon which all human rights and liberties rest.

The greatness and the glory—all the splendid achievement of our country—has been made possible under a system of government founded upon the belief that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights. This was the Christian-Judao ethic translated into the law of the land by its founding fathers.

Freedom of enterprise, protection of minorities, rights of labor—all the rights and liberties which we enjoy under the Constitution and Bill of Rights—derive their validity from this doctrine. Reject any part of it and you strike at the whole structure.

For democracy is indivisible, bestowing its blessings with equal favor to all. Again and again this doctrine has been sanctified by the blood of our countrymen, Protestants, Catholics, and Jews. And when a bigot stands on the free soil of America and preaches hatred against any group of his fellow Americans, he sins against the American spirit.

My friends, unfortunately there have been many such sinners in the history of our country. Human beings, being human, do not always practice the principles to which our country is committed. Neither the moral compulsions of religion nor the dictates of a democratic society have been able to eliminate man's suspicions and prejudices against those of a different race, creed, or national origin. Respect for differences still remains as one of the objectives in perfecting our way of life.

There have been many minorities in our history who have felt the bitter impact of prejudice and persecution. Predominant among these is the colored race. We are only beginning to make good for them the guaranties given to all citizens under our Constitution and Bill of Rights. We have a long way to go before the conscience of America can rest easily on this score.

The Quakers and the Mormons have known what it means to be victims of unreasoning bigotry.

Our good citizens of the Roman Catholic faith well remember the ignoble records of the Know-Nothings and the APA. They marked a cruel injustice against a loyal minority—a flagrant violation of the American ideal.

In our own day, we witnessed the poison of anti-Semitism being transplanted from Nazi Germany to the free land of America. The German-American Bund and the alleged "Christian Front" became modern successors to the "know nothings" and the APA. They spoke the same language of hate, although the objects of their bigotry differed. Tomorrow it may be some other group singled out as the victim of prejudice—or the scapegoat for political ambition.

If we have learned any lesson from our history, it should be that no group is safe unless every group is safe. We remain secure in our individual freedoms only as long as we secure them for every American.

Any challenge to the integrity of the individual is a threat to everything we stand for. In this respect, group prejudice and communism have something basic in common. Both are inherently contemptuous of the sanctity of the individuals human personality. Both succeed in their objectives only when they have destroyed human rights. I submit to you that you cannot honestly fight one without fighting the other.

The greatest threat of communism lies not on a military battleground but in the hearts of our people. As long as we have faith in ourselves and cling to our heritage of freedom, then no power on earth can destroy our way of life. Give us hearts that are sound, hearts that beat to the traditional rhythm of America—and we'll take Stalin in stride as we've taken Hitler and Hirohito.

It was because of this need to rededicate ourselves to American ideals and principles that the Freedom Train was born. We sought to create a dramatic symbol of our freedom. We hoped to develop a greater awareness of the privileges we enjoy as Americans. If the response to the Freedom Train is any criterion, I tell you that the heart of America is sound.

In every city visited by the train, overwhelming crowds thronged to see the exhibit. In your own city of Boston, five to ten times as many people as could get on the train in one day tried to get into the exhibit every day it was here. It has been the same everywhere—old and young, rich and poor, men of all colors and creeds made the pilgrimage to this shrine of their freedom. They waited in line three to eight hours to see the heirlooms of their heritage. These were just documents, fading ink on aging parchment. But they knew what these papers meant. The hushed whispers, the reverence, the awe with which they viewed the exhibit, left no doubt about that. They knew that these documents were their credentials as free men.

Forgive me if I conclude on a personal note.

My parents came to these shores about 70 years ago. They left behind them an old world filled with bitter hatreds and ruled by despotism. Here they found a new world filled with wonderous things—freedom, opportunity, kindliness. Not things you could touch or eat but—when you've never had them before—things more real than a pair of shoes or a loaf of bread. As long as they lived they never stopped wondering at the glory of America. They were two of the best Americans I've ever known.

Seventy years ago, they came here with nothing but the clothes on their backs and an awful lot of courage. Tonight their son is being honored by more than a thousand of New England's finest citizens. Barney Balaban, a son of immigrants, is being given a citation from a distinguished committee headed by a man who bears one of the most illustrious names in American history. Goldie and Israel Balaban's boy is sharing the honors with JOHN MCCORMACK, majority leader of the Congress of the United States during the most critical years of its existence and Admiral Halsey, one of our greatest naval heroes of all times.

It's a wonderful country, my friends. Let's keep it that way!

Military May Get the Atomic Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Military May Get the Atomic Bomb," by Hanson W. Baldwin, from the New York Times of this morning.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILITARY MAY GET THE ATOMIC BOMB—PRESIDENT'S APPROVAL COULD END CIVILIAN CONTROL, BUT MOVE BEFORE 1949 IS DOUBTED—POLITICS DELAYING FACTOR—WITH EFFORTS FOR WORLD CURBS ON ATOMIC ENERGY BLOCKED, WEAPON ISSUE IS ALTERED

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

WASHINGTON, June 9.—Custody and control of the atomic bomb may be transferred from the Atomic Energy Commission to the armed services if military recommendations to that end are approved by the President.

An issue of some magnitude—essentially the same issue fought out in Congress 2 years ago, the issue of civilian versus military control of atomic energy—has arisen between the Atomic Energy Commission and the military services in the past few weeks. The question immediately at debate is custody of atomic bombs already manufactured, but both the military services and the Commission believe that the ultimate issue is modification of the present Atomic Energy Act to give the military branches greater responsibility than they now possess in the policy-making field.

The resurrection in considerably milder and more reasoned form of the bitter debate of 2 years ago when the Atomic Energy Act was passed is in part the result of a change in attitude toward atomic energy in that period, in part due to recent reorganization—incident to the so-called unification of the armed services—of the military liaison committee to the Atomic Energy Commission.

CONTROL EFFORTS FUTILE

Two years ago, when atomic energy was new, there was much hope for a brave new world and fantastic estimates of the atomic bamb's destructive capacities and of the possibilities of the quick utilization of atomic energy for power were commonplace. Today the negotiations for the international control of atomic energy have been virtually abandoned; the bomb has been reduced to finite proportions, and, indeed, is regarded by some of the military as "just another weapon," and the hopes for cheap and plentiful power have vanished into the future. As one estimate put it recently, within our lifetime there will be no atomic power plants producing substantial amounts of power, except in very rare instances.

Possibly in the not too distant future we may have a few units powering naval vessels, perhaps submarines. Power for very large aircraft is necessarily much further removed, and as for automobiles and individual home requirements, we and our children's children can pretty much forget about it.

Atomic energy today and in the foreseeable future means primarily, therefore, military weapons, and the military arms feel they should have a greater share in its control and development.

NEW MILITARY BODY POWERFUL

This feeling, always latent, has been crystallized following the reorganization of the military liaison committee to the Atomic Energy Commission. The act creating the five-man Commission, all civilians, also created a military liaison committee to "advise and consult" on atomic-energy matters related to military applications. This group, as its name implied, was originally chiefly a go-between or liaison group between the civilian commission and the Secretaries of War and Navy. If there was disagreement between the Commission and the committee, the latter could refer the matter at issue to the Secretaries of War and Navy, either of whom could then carry the issue to the President for his final decision.

With the passage of the so-called unification legislation and the setting up of the National Military Establishment last fall, the military liaison committee was reorganized and became in fact a far more powerful and more integrated unit. Effective last April 12, the committee obtained a chairman and two members from each of the three services, appointed with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense.

The chairman, Donald F. Carpenter, vice president of the Remington Arms Co., appointed recently by Secretary of Defense Forrestal, acts with full power as Mr. Forrestal's deputy for atomic-energy matters. The new committee is, in reality, representative of the whole Military Establishment, and authority covering a broad range of functions has been delegated to it by the Secretary of Defense.

Partly as a result of the evolution of this new military liaison committee, with its better integration and greater power, the armed forces' policy toward custody of the atomic bomb has now been crystallized. An exact statement of that policy is impossible to give, partly because it probably has not received in all elements final approval from Mr. Forrestal, largely because the whole matter is shrouded in much secrecy.

But as far as could be learned the Military Liaison Committee has recommended or will shortly recommend, apparently with unanimity, that custody of and maintenance of all completed atomic bombs be transferred from the Atomic Energy Commission to the military services.

This would not necessarily mean, contrary to popular impression, distribution of the bombs to various airfields and their storage and maintenance by the Air Force. The services' technicians—chiefly Army engineers and Navy and Air Force technicians—would probably be in charge of the completed bombs if the transfer should be decided upon.

Under the Atomic Energy Act, the President could, if he desired, order the change.

The arguments that are being brought to him will inevitably have two facets—the political and the technical. The technical arguments advanced by the armed services are that the atomic bomb is a weapon, that the users of the bomb in war should have custody of the bomb in peace, that the problems of maintenance, storage and security must be solved by the armed services now in peace—and not, with difficulties, after war comes. The Atomic Energy Commission's obvious retort is that the skilled scientists and technicians who make the bomb are best equipped to maintain it. Impartial observers admit that the armed forces can make a pretty good technical case for actual custody of the bomb.

CONTROVERSY IN PROSPECT

The political considerations of a transfer of completed bombs to the armed services outweigh, however, the technical considerations. Such a proposal is certain to create controversy in this country, where scientists already are complaining about unnecessary secrecy, overzealous security "checks" and the increasing subsidization of science by the military. The switch also might have international repercussions and could be viewed as preparations for war.

In the longer view, however, the basic issue is somewhat oversimplified—the degree of control or influence that the military should have, vis-à-vis the civilian, in the whole atomic energy picture. For it is clear that a transfer of the custody of completed bombs may be only a step—indeed, is viewed by some military men as the first step—in transition to what appears from the military point of view to be a more desirable atomic energy organization.

The desirable organization, the military leaders believe, would probably eliminate the military liaison committee altogether and, instead would include a number of military men in the membership of the Atomic Energy Commission.

RESTRICTED COMMISSION SUGGESTED

An alternative suggestion is the elimination in entirety of the Atomic Energy Commission and return of the whole project to the National Military Establishment. Still a third suggestion, more likely to receive broader support than the others, would restrict the Atomic Energy Commission to the production of fissionable materials and peacetime experimentation and development in medical, biological, and research fields.

No changes of this nature, and indeed no change in the custody of the bomb, are likely to be made in the near future, however. The issue of custody either already has been, or shortly will be, carried to the President, who under the law, can decide it.

It seems improbable, however, that Mr. Truman, already at odds with Congress about the reappointment of David E. Lilienthal and other members of the Atomic Energy Commission, will make any ruling of such broad implications in an election year. The chances are that this issue, like so many others, will be laid in the laps of the next President and the next Congress.

The Draft and the Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Draft and the Guard," from the Chicago Tribune of June 8, last.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DRAFT AND THE GUARD

The strength of the National Guard throughout the Nation passed its prewar peak in mid-May with 245,157 volunteer citizen soldiers enrolled. Illinois led all of the States in recruiting during the first half of the month, adding 1,774 men to bring the strength of the State militia to 14,774, the largest in its peacetime history. With another 300 men, we shall have the strongest guard unit in the country.

This record is the more noteworthy in that the Regular Army, as Representative BARDEN, of North Carolina, has asserted, has deliberately attempted to keep the National Guard and Reserve components weak because of resentment against them. The Regulars have long had the ambition of destroying the guard in order to leave themselves unchallenged bosses of the Military Establishment. They have pursued these tactics with special zeal of late because of their ambition to put over universal training and a revived selective service, which would place hundreds of thousands of new men under their command.

The guard's success in voluntary recruitment effectively shows up the Army plaint that it cannot get volunteers and therefore requires conscription. The guard has been getting its men with very little more as an inducement than an appeal to patriotism. The Army, according to Mr. BARDEN, has spent $10 propagandizing the draft to every dollar it has spent recruiting. It is scaring off recruits by terms of enlistment and standards of required attainment, and may be expected to continue doing so as long as there is a chance of putting across conscription.

The fact that the professionals realize that the National Guard is queering the show was clearly shown in Defense Secretary Forrestal's demand that Congress approve a less ambitious retirement plan for guard and other Reserve members than the House has voted. Until now, there has been no pension provision for guard members even though they may conscientiously have served their country for 20 or 30 years and probably have seen action in one or two wars.

The House attempted to enhance the attractions of a volunteer career in the guard or Reserve by passing a bill providing retirement benefits which, at a maximum, would amount to $400,000,000 a year. To qualify, guardsmen would have to serve 20 years, reach the age of 60, and accumulate credits for at least 50 days of active service in 16 of the 20 years. It is doubtful whether any very considerable amount of the four hundred million fund would be paid out, and, even if it were, the Nation would have had the protection of a cohesive defense organization at a fraction of the $3,000,000,000 estimated annual cost of UMT.

Forrestal, upon hearing of this plan, sent the Army personnel director, Maj. Gen. John

E. Dahlquist, before the Senate Armed Services Committee to voice his objections, demanding that the pension fund be trimmed down to eighteen or twenty million dollars annually, about 5 percent of the sum authorized by the House.

Obviously, the Army felt that it would never do to encourage citizen soldiers to adopt guard and Reserve careers when such service would jeopardize the professionals' case for conscription as vastly greater cost. The only appropriate retort is for the Senate to pay no attention to Mr. Forrestal and his messenger boy. The guard and Reserve, with a little inducement to offer, can show just how fraudulent the pretense is that this country cannot muster an adequate defense force by voluntary means.

Republican Promises Versus Performance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago this November, the people of these United States voted to entrust control of our Government to the Republican Party. In these past 2 years, the Republican Party has been in control of the two legislative bodies of our country; the House and the Senate, and the committees of the two Houses have been controlled by the Republican majority, under the leadership of Republican chairmen.

Two years ago, the Republican Party promised the people of our country, in return for control of the Government, that they would lower prices (within 60 days), provide housing, lower taxes (for rich and poor alike), raise the living standards, the educational standards, and the health standards of the United States.

Those were promises. But what have they accomplished? What is the record of their legislation in these 2 years?

Prices of food, rent, commodities of all kinds, from clothing to automobiles, have spiraled steadily upward. And housing, what about it? The picture is the same here. Little housing, if any, is within the reach of the average citizen of our country. Our veterans, contrary to the rosy picture painted by the Republicans, are without the homes they so desperately need.

What young veteran, just beginning his adult life, with a new family, and his schooling not yet completed, can afford to buy a home—if he can find one—at today's exorbitant prices? With the high prices of food, clothing, furniture, and other necessities, what has become of this promised improvement in living conditions? The very phrase is a mockery.

Young children are going without milk and other health-giving foods. Why? In this country? Milk today costs 21.2 cents a quart. Two years ago it cost 17.6 cents.

While the Republican-controlled House quibbled over changing the name of a dam, legislation that means whether this country shall long survive, legislation that would provide a decent education for all of our young people, legislation that would keep our citizens healthy and strong, and legislation that would provide adequate and decent housing for our veterans, is allowed to languish and die, because it is not important enough to merit the attention of the mighty Republican chairmen of the committees of this Republican-controlled Congress.

Taxes for rich and poor alike? Poppycock. The Republicans said in their tax bill, "The poor can get along with a tax reduction equal to 5 days's pay. It is the rich who need the help of the Republicans, we will give them a tax reduction equal to 5½ months' salary." This reduction in their tax bill is the comparative relief given the earner of $3,000 per year and the earner of $100,000 per year.

I could continue, but you all know the promises made by the Republican Party 2 years ago, what they promised to do in return for control of our country. You all know how these promises to the people have been disregarded, how a chosen few—the wealthy few—have been singled out for the favor of the Republicans. Bills permitted to reach this floor by the Republican leadership, have been bills to benefit those who need no benefit—the wealthy, who are already well housed, well fed, well clothed, and well educated.

And what about the great body of our citizens who have not benefited from this Congress? The veterans, the children, the aged—who strive to live on $39 a month, when hamburger costs from 59 cents to 79 cents per pound—what are they to do now, after two long years of ever-increasing prices? Milk costs more, bread costs more, potatoes cost more, meat costs more?

Ask the housewives of this country. Ask about their heart-breaking job of stretching inadequate salaries to cover the cost of food for their families, provide a decent roof over the heads of their babies, provide adequate medical attention. Ask them, the housewives, and their husbands, the breadwinners of the families of this country. Ask them, "What are they going to do now after these past 2 years of Republican control of the country?"

Ask them, Have they "had enough"? Have they "had enough" of high prices, growing steadily higher? Have they "had enough" of inadequate housing, growing ever more inadequate? And the answer will be a mighty, "Yes, we have had enough."

"We have had enough of Republican-caused high prices, low incomes, inadequate housing. We want a change—a change to the Democratic Party which is concerned for the welfare of all the people."

"We want a change to Democratic leadership and control in the Congress once again. We are going to the polls on November 2 and vote to elect a Democratic Congress and a Democratic President because we know that the Democrats are close to the common people, and that they will protect us from Republican 'boom and bust' inflation and depression."

Freedom of Speech for the Labor Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, this morning, through the courtesy of the Joint Committee on Labor Relations, I had the privilege of appearing and testifying in favor of my bill, H. R. 4369, which has for its purpose the clarification of the complete right of the labor press, or any other press, to support or oppose any candidate for office or any principle with which they are concerned. I have been concerned with the possibility that the Taft-Hartley Act would throw some doubt on this right, and on the complete freedom of the press and freedom of expression. I introduced my bill 10 days after Philip Murray participated in the Maryland election through the CIO News and many months before he was indicted for doing so. Regardless of any decision that the court may make, I think Congress should clarify its intent in this respect.

I argued accordingly before the Joint Committee on Labor Relations this morning and my statement, in part, follows:

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity given me by the joint committee to appear before you this morning. The section of the National Labor Relations Act which provides for a continuing study of the law is of the utmost importance. No legislation is perfect, and the imperfections and injustices must gradually be adjusted.

Of course, the criticisms directed against the Taft-Hartley Act have, for the most part, been grossly exaggerated. Nevertheless, there is certainly room for improvement, and that is the reason this committee is sitting; to determine how it can be improved.

There are a number of items that concern me, but they have been or will be discussed by other witnesses, and I would like to confine myself to one particular phase of the law; that is section 304, prohibiting business corporations and labor organizations from making contributions or expenditures in connection with certain Federal elections.

I think that the motive of Congress was to apply the same law to labor organizations as it has already applied under the Corrupt Practices Act to business corporations; and that motive is a proper one. The purity and fairness of elections must be protected against enormous campaign contributions from any source, for or against any candidate. The American people don't expect elections to be put on the auction block, and to be struck off to the highest bidder. However, Congress did not intend, or in any event should not have intended, to infringe in the slightest degree upon the rights of a free press. To guard against any such possibility, I introduced H. R. 4369 on July 24, 1947. Both the language and purpose of that bill are very simple. It provides:

"A bill to clarify and make certain freedom of expression

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 304 of title III of Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, and notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, a bona fide newspaper published by any labor union or labor or other organization shall not in any way be restricted in

its right to advocate the election or the defeat of any candidate for public office.

"SEC. 2. 'Bona fide newspaper' for the purpose of this act is any publication published not less often than once a month and which shall have been so published for at least 1 year."

It will be noted that this bill simply makes clear that the prohibition of the act cannot apply to a bona fide newspaper and then defines what a bona fide newspaper is.

You will observe that this bill antedates by several months the indictment against Philip Murray and the CIO for entering into a Maryland election with the CIO News. This indictment was found on February 11, 1948. The issue of the CIO News complained of was published on July 14, 1947, and 10 days after its publication my bill was introduced. I wanted to make sure that no interpretation by any court could be used to hamper freedom of expression and freedom of the press.

Since that time, the United States district court has found that the act is an unconstitutional abridgement of this freedom and the case is presently pending before the Supreme Court.

It is not my intention to burden the committee or the record with a legal discussion. It is my belief that the act, if it prevents support or opposition to political candidates by regularly issued newspapers, is unconstitutional. It is my belief that it is extremely unwise to make any attempt to prevent the right of any regular newspaper fully to participate in an election campaign. Moreover, it is doubtful if such a result was intended. Representative HARTLEY, chairman of the House Committee on Labor, and a cosponsor of the law, is quoted as having said that any union newspaper, no matter how it is supported, can legally take a stand upon any political candidate. The design in my bill is to make this perfectly sure.

I don't think we ought to await a judicial determination; I think we ought to say now that we don't want to prevent a complete freedom of expression and a complete freedom of the press. In the long run, the purity and fairness of elections can be better guarded if we do zealously guard these freedoms.

Mr. Chairman, I am a candidate for reelection to the House of Representatives, but I certainly would not lift a finger to prevent any group from freely expressing their opposition to my reelection. I want no one to buy the election in my district either for me or against me; but at the same time, I want no one to be prevented from advocating either my election or my defeat. That is so essential to the American system of government that no excuse, no matter how plausible, is sufficient to justify restraint.

Ethiopia Shall Stretch Forth Her Hands to God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered at the gigantic mass meeting of the Ethiopian World Federation, Inc., held at its headquarters in New York, N. Y., on Sunday, May 9, 1948, in commemoration of the seventh anniversary of the liberation of Ethiopia, by Robert T. Bess, founder and executive director of the Anti Job Discrimination League, Inc.:

ETHIOPIA SHALL STRETCH FORTH HER HANDS TO GOD

Mr. Chairman, members and friends, ladies and gentlemen, I deeply appreciate the honor which has been conferred upon me by the Ethiopian World Federation, Inc., to deliver the principal address to this great audience bringing to a climax the seventh anniversary celebration of the glorious return of Emperor Haile Selassie and his conquering heroes to Addis Ababa, the capital of Ethiopia, on May 5, 1941.

My subject, Ethiopia Shall Stretch Forth Her Hands to God, makes me a very unworthy individual to deliver this address, because it takes us back thousand of years ago when one of the great prophets made this statement which is now fulfilled in our time with its national and international implications. So that I may not become lost in its various ramifications, I will deal with it as it affects certain countries and the United Nations in particular. Before doing so, however, I would like to make my position clear and that is, "I swear allegiance to no other country in the world but this country of which I am a citizen." As a matter of fact, I am very proud of this privilege and hope and pray that other countries would adopt the principles of our liberal Constitution and fight to put it in operation as we are fighting to do now.

The countries through which I will prove my subject are: Italy, Spain, Germany, Great Britain, France, India and Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, South Africa, Liberia, Haiti, Indonesia, Palestine, United States, and Ethiopia. The United Nations will summarize all.

Italy: When Italy set out in 1935 to conquer Ethiopia, she camouflaged her objective by saying that she was out to civilize the Ethiopians. She was aided and abetted by Great Britain and France and was thus able to kill defenseless women and children with poison gas. The success of that conquest precipitated World War II with the result that Italy was brought to her knees and her leader, Mussolini, lynched after death by the hands of his own people. You will remember that Emperor Haile Selassie (after pleading the case of Ethiopia before the League of Nations and was convinced that justice would not be rendered) stretched Ethiopia's hand to God when he said, "God and history will remember." As a result, the strife in Italy today is rocking the civilization of the whole world and she still bears the mark of conquest to the extent that she has no place among the United Nations.

Spain: Spain followed Italy's example and a bloody ideological civil war ensued. The result was, that thousands of her own citizens were slaughtered and she is still not a member of the United Nations.

Germany: Germany quickly followed Italy and Spain; but she was more ambitious, because she set out to conquer the world. The result was that around 6,000,000 Jews were slaughtered and millions of others in the world. Ethiopia's hand is still stretched out and she is self-supporting while practically nearly all the nations of Europe are begging bread.

Great Britain: Great Britain is at the crossroads of life today. A once proud empire with over a quarter of the people on earth under her domination, she has had to shed India, Ceylon, Burma, and almost everything she had; but she still holds on to the Province of Ogaden in Ethiopia. She is indebted to us to the extent of billions of dollars and needs more and more money every day not only to support her people at home but to hold on to what's left of their tottered empire abroad. We are sounding this warning here and now—"If she does not get out of Ethiopia as quickly as possible, the god of Ethiopia's outstretched arm, will not only break her to pieces abroad but will turn her own people against her at home. The handwriting is already on the wall and those who read, will learn.

France: France has had so much upon her that she fell prostrate on her face. Ethiopia's outstretched hand caught up with her very heavily and but for our liberation, she would have remained in defeat. Today she is economically lost without us.

India and Pakistan: India and Pakistan came into their own through Ethiopia's outstretched hand. But for the injustice done to Ethiopia precipitating World War II, their opportunity for freedom may have been long delayed. We hope, however, that the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi might also precipitate a union of the two Dominions under the old and historic name—India.

Burma: Burma emerged as a republic through Ethiopia's outstretched hand and can today say: "Thank God, I am free."

Ceylon: Ceylon emerged as a self-governing dominion while Ethiopia's hand was still stretched out.

South Africa: The dominion of South Africa was cracked wide open through Ethiopia's outstretched hand. The world realizes today that the greatest oppression by a minority on a majority, exists there. What is the United Nations doing about it? The exposure of this situation has been so pronounced that it is surprising that the United Nations has not taken definite steps to correct it as yet. Africa, first and last, is for the Africans; and when they are not only exploited but maltreated by the people whom they are benefiting, something should be done about it.

Liberia: Liberia came into her own from Ethiopia's outstretched hand. Her dominant position was recognized as a key spot in Africa in World War II and today she is rapidly progressing under very splendid leadership.

Haiti: Haiti received the blessings of fair play and justice through Ethiopia's outstretched hand when she was recognized as a desirable base in the West Indies in World War II and is forging ahead today.

Indonesia: Indonesia took advantage of Ethiopia's outstretched hand and cracked the chains with which the Dutch held her, after World War II. She is still having a desperate struggle; but the God of Ethiopia will bring her out victorious, as world sentiment is already crystallized in her favor. The principle of self-determination will prevail.

Palestine: Palestine is now the powder keg of the world. Through Ethiopia's outstretched hand precipitating World War II, millions of Jews were made homeless and the United Nations was therefore forced to agree to partition it to give them a home. That decision is also prophetic. Not until partition is effected will fighting cease there. Palestine was given by God to the Jews as a home, long before they were in slavery in Africa in the country of Egypt under the Pharaohs. At that time, Africa ruled the world through Egypt, and Ethiopia shared the spotlight; so the prophecy on Ethiopia and Palestine was made about the same period. No trusteeship will settle the question, as God's word must come to pass.

United States: The United States today is the leader of the world. God brought it into being as a haven from dissatisfaction and unrest. People of every race, creed, color, and national origin are among its inhabitants. It is the capital of the United Nations. Its leadership is only as effectual as its treatment is to all of its citizens. I must express here and now that its treatment to its citizens of African descent is a laughing stock to the world. How can we preach democracy abroad when we discriminate, segregate, and Jim Crow 15,000,000 of our citizens at home, automatically making them second-class citizens? How can we have taxation without representation in any part of our country and call it a free country? Isn't it a fact that our citizens whose foreparents were slaves for nearly 250 years have a greater right to be first-class citizens because of the free labor given during all those years?

The civil-rights program sponsored by the President, and now in the hands of Republican leaders in Congress, is a "must" program, because on it depends the peace of the world. Unless America cleans her house, her followers will rebel and there will be no peace. As a matter of fact, believe it or not, the peace of the world depends on giving Negroes their civil rights and the Jews their homeland. Ethiopia's hand is still stretched out, and the god of Ethiopia will prevail.

United Nations: The United Nations has the responsibility for its 58 member nations, in its hands. We must call its attention to Ethiopia. According to its Charter which contains the principle of self-determination for all its members, Great Britain should be told to get out of any part of Ethiopia at once. She is not wanted there, does not belong there and must get out of there. Eritrea and the Somalilands were stolen from Ethiopia and should be given back to her. Is it fair that she should be hemmed in by other nations and not have an outlet to the sea? Why should black people always suffer at the hands of white people? The answers to these questions are not political. They are simply questions of righteousness and justice and require just answers. Remember, Ethiopia's hand is still stretched out to God; and having denied her justice has already cracked up the League of Nations. Do you want Ethiopia's God to crack up the United Nations? We do not. We therefore plead with you to set your machinery in motion without delay to give justice to Ethiopia.

Ethiopia: Ethiopia now brings us to the conclusion of this address. Every African and every descendant of Africa among the sum total of over 400,000,000 in every part of the world, joins with us, at this moment, in joy and gladness on this seventh anniversary celebration in memory of the tumultuous reception which greeted His Majesty, Emperor Haile Selassie on his return to his capital, Addis Ababa.

Due to the fact that Ethiopia is the oldest empire on earth, and, according to biblical history, was able to put over a million men in the field to fight her battles thousands of years ago, we therefore recognize her as a symbol of the fighting spirit of all the black peoples of the world. We look forward to her return to her former greatness when her queen, Candace, visited King Solomon and was hailed as the greatest and richest visitor (accompanied by a tremendous retinue) to grace that Hebrew court. We wholeheartedly congratulate Emperor Haile Selassie on his democratic and intelligent leadership in striving to bring about and institute reforms which will improve the education, health, and culture of his people. We ask the sympathetic cooperation of the peoples of the world and of the Negro people in particular, to go to Ethiopia as professional, mechanical, industrial, and businessmen and women to help to push the spirit of progress which is evidenced throughout Ethiopia. Last, but not least, we give our warmest felicitations to the Emperor and wish him long life, health, and happiness in the years ahead and pray that Ethiopia's hand continue to be stretched out to God.

Congress Must Not Let the Housing Bill Die

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I include an article by Malvina Lindsay in the Washington Post of June 9, 1948; a letter from William Reinhardt, a realtor in Philadelphia; and an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of June 3, 1948, endorsing the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill:

FACING THE HOME FOLK

(By Malvina Lindsay)

VERDICT ON CONGRESS

Many a Member of Congress no doubt wishes he could pull down an iron curtain in his glass house during these present hectic days of bill passing and buck passing. For the mood of the voters back home, whom he must face sooner or later, is uncertain. If some politically embarrassing bills get lost in the last-minute jam, will many people notice it? Will they care?

The general feeling among politicians seems to be that they won't, that they are as politically apathetic as in 1946 when they made a comparatively small showing at the polls. They have jobs and they are eating fairly well, it is argued, and they are still engrossed in their personal postwar affairs. What's more, they've had their taxes reduced—at least the more vocal of them. Why should they bother watching Congress or its lobbyist? Why should not legislative obstructionists expect to get away with any amount of high-handed sabotage?

Yet some warning signs are beginning to show up. These indicate there may be more voters looking into candidates' voting records than have been counted on.

Most significant is the recent action of a great church body, the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, in censuring Congress for repudiating its pledge to provide housing for veterans. The church's general assembly also took a definite stand on other social legislation, some of which is likely to remain bottled up, and called on its Division of Social Education and Action to provide voting records of Members of Congress to be studied in individual churches prior to the November elections.

Another group likely to look into housing legislation, or more likely the lack of it, will come from the approximately 6,500,000 families, including many veterans, that are living doubled up and from the millions of others living in inadequate quarters.

Also failure to pass the Federal aid-to-education bill would set a great many people, parents as well as educators, to thinking, especially in September when 2,570,000 new first-graders, as estimated by the Census Bureau, will be ready for school. The number of beginners will be 300,000 above last year as the wartime baby crop is now turning into a school tide that is expected to reach its peak in 1953. Yet poorer communities are not prepared to educate these children without Federal aid.

Voters on fixed incomes who are bearing the brunt of inflation, and the many white-collar workers who have not profited by union wage increases also might be expected to be more politically curious this year than usual.

Another unpleasant prospect for the legislator who has contributed to congressional delay and inaction is that of facing the large nonpartisan organized women's groups which are aggressively backing international cooperation and social-welfare advance. Never before has there been such an army of these. Women's National News Service, which recently made a survey of the strength of these groups, found a groundswell of membership had taken place in the last few years.

Among the groups with substantial gains are the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the American Association of University Women, the National Federation of Business and Professional Women, the League of Women Voters, the Women's Action Committee for Lasting Peace—all committed to definite legislative programs.

Most of the big national women's groups have been working vigorously for international legislation, such as ERP and the reciprocal trade agreements. Many have also backed Federal aid to education and housing and health measures. Among these women there is less straight party voting, more tendency to judge a candidate on his personal voting record.

It will not, of course, be possible to run down all the villains in the plot, should Congress end with a record of obstructionism toward foreign policy and domestic social legislation. But there may be more amateur sleuthing for them than is generally expected.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *June 3, 1948.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have been a Philadelphia realtor for more than 40 years; I am conveyancer and director of one of the largest Federal savings and loan associations in Philadelphia, a director of the Federal Home Loan Board for the third district, a former president of the Pennsylvania Savings and Loan League, and chairman of the Philadelphia Housing Authority.

As a conveyancer for more than 30 savings and loan associations, I have handled the financing of 70,000 small homes in the Philadelphia area, and with this varied background of experience in the housing field, I wish to say to you that I believe the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill provides the best method of meeting our present housing shortage.

As a private realtor I am shocked and disappointed at the apparent apathy of Members of the Congress toward enacting suitable legislation to meet our housing needs. As a public official charged with the duty of providing decent housing for those families for whom private industry cannot provide shelter, I am convinced of the necessity of Federal aid to provide a minimum of public housing for our lowest income groups.

As a private realtor and as chairman of the Philadelphia Housing Authority, I urge you if you have not already done so, to sign discharge petition No. 6, and bring the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill to a vote on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I believe it to be a shameful disgrace and abuse of democratic process that a small handful of men representing special interests can thwart the will of the American people by keeping this legislation bottled up in the House Banking and Currency Committee.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM REINHARDT.

CONGRESS MUST NOT LET THE HOUSING BILL DIE

Omission of any provision for alleviating the housing shortage is by far the worst feature of the whittled-down must list of legislation to be passed by Congress before it adjourns.

The Nation's need for housing speaks for itself, through high prices, the virtual disappearance of rental space, doubling up of families, and the existence of trailer camps near many cities. All the arguments and pressures of the real-estate lobby cannot dispel the unpleasant fact that there is a shortage.

Congress had it in its power—and still has—to do something toward solving the problem. More than 6 weeks ago, the Senate passed the Taft-Ellender-Wagner long-range housing bill, which aimed at spurring the construction of 15,000,000 new housing units over the next 10 years.

That the House has done nothing about the measure since then is a tribute to its stubbornness, but not to its willingness to come to grips with a national need. Because of their opposition to the public-housing feature, a relatively few men have blocked the legislation, even though it contains many necessary inducements for continuing private building.

Attacks on the modest public-housing provision gloss over the fact that present high

prices of homes put them out of reach of large numbers of families, including those of veterans. Opponents of any Federal low-cost housing program refuse to acknowledge the effects of the wartime halt in construction on the Nation's housing requirements.

It would take but a few hours of Congress' remaining time to complete action on a housing program. All that is needed is a decision to face the problem. The leaders of Congress should decide without further delay that they, and the Nation, cannot afford to let the housing bill die.

How Are Things? Not Bad!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, as is always the case there is a criticism of the accomplishments of the Congress from groups who are not wholly satisfied, and some of those criticisms are unquestionably justified. Nevertheless, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. The Republican Congress has been in session since January 3, 1947, until now, and what is the state of the Union?

As of June 7, 1948, Time, in its section on business and finance, reported as follows:

Wall Street's baby bull market grew a bit more last week. The Dow-Jones industrial average moved up 1.06 points to 191.06, the highest in 19 months. By week's end the market had slipped back a bit, to 190.74. But there was no hesitation in the rest of the economy.

In April, said the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 90,000 new houses were started, 20,500 more than in the same month last year. Civilian employment, said BLS, is also headed for a new peacetime high of 62,000,000 jobs by September. Industrial production, which had dropped in April for the second consecutive month because of the coal strike, was on the rise again. After the disappointing Easter season, department store sales, reported the Federal Reserve Board, were at exceptionally high levels in April and the first half of May.

Say when. How long would it last? A firm answer was given this week in the Federal Reserve Board's third annual survey of durable goods spending. With minor reservations, it was what businessmen wanted to hear: for at least the rest of this year there will be no let-up in the demand for durable goods (autos, refrigerators, etc.), the backbone of the boom About 20,000,000 spending units (families) bought autos, radios, washing machines in 1947.

The cash was there for spending. Though consumers saved less in 1947 than in 1946 and more of them went into debt, they still had enough cash in their pockets to keep demand at its peak. Up to 4,100,000 planned to buy cars, as many as at the beginning of 1947. "There is no change," the survey noted, "in the prospective demand for other selected durable goods."

In housing, the number planning to buy this year—more than 1,000,000—was larger than the estimated number of houses that might be completed. Equally promising to the building industry was the fact that prospective buyers were prepared to pay prices in line with the high ones last year.

More to come. An increasing amount of such buying would be on credit, said the survey. But consumers were making more (total money income had risen 10 percent), and the added income was well enough distributed among all income groups to support this financing. Of the 48,400,000 spending units, about 2,500,000 more had incomes above $5,000 in 1947 than in 1946.

"The outlook," the survey concluded rosily, "Is that consumer expenditure * * * will continue in expanding volume. * * * It is possible that immediate consumer demand for certain types of durable goods has increased further since the survey, which was taken before the proposed increase in military expenditures."

It is pretty difficult to show that the Republican Congress has not been good for the country

Mr. Speaker, how are things? Not bad.

Canada Kept Controls on the Market Basket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I should like to report the results of a brief survey I made of Canada's cost of living.

My concern about what has been happening to the cost of living in this country during the last 2 years since complete decontrol—which was to bring a better tomorrow according to the NAM—led me to wonder about our good neighbor, Canada.

Canada is a country whose natural wealth and economic standards very nearly parallel ours. It is a large food-producing country which in recent years—during the war and since—has done much to share its abundant larder with that part of the world which so sorely needed its food. It too, like the United States, has been exporting large quantities of food. In some commodities it has exported a much larger proportion of its total production than has our country. Its food resources and natural wealth, its position in international trade as a large exporter of wheat and products that depend on wheat, make its economy very similar to our own.

In addition, the statistical records on wages, prices, and cost of living, which its Dominion Bureau of Statistics keeps, closely parallel ours in the techniques and extent.

For those reasons, I feel a comparison of the general cost of living in the two countries and the specific cost of living in terms of foods, in terms of rent, clothing, and so forth, is proper and should throw light on the present economic state of our own country.

Just one month ago I brought onto the floor of this House a marketbasket of groceries. They had been purchased in the cheapest chain store in Washington. They covered the cheapest cuts of meat and the staple groceries that every family uses—flour, bread, coffee, milk, soap flakes, and so forth. At that time food costs had increased 41 percent since June 1946 when price control was arbitrarily ended.

As every housewife knows from bitter experience, during this last month, despite the end of the meat strike, meat prices have soared even higher and they are not expected to decrease preceptibly in the near or distant future.

In the April 28, 1948, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page 5011, you will find a list of grocery items with their prices for the United States. Below, you will find a list of similar grocery items for Canada—the average for the Dominion and the average for Montreal. The dates on which the articles were priced vary from February to May 1948.

TABLE 1.—*Canadian food prices for specific commodities as of February 1948*

Commodity	Dominion average	Montreal average
10 pounds of flour, first grade	$0.62	$0.60
1 pound of butter	.72	.72
2 quarts of milk	.34	.35
1 dozen eggs grade A, large	----------	[1].49
2 pounds medium prunes, bulk	.41	.43
3 pounds of round steak	1.50	1.51
1 pound of bacon, fancy sliced	.70	.69
3 pounds of vetegable shortening	.94	.96
2 pounds of coffee, Early Morning	----------	[1].98
1 pound of pork sausage	----------	[1].39
2 pounds of stew beef (boneless)	.63	.57
2 cans cut wax beans (20-ounce tin), C. C. Q	----------	[1].25
3 cans peas, Banquet	----------	[1].45
2 loaves plain wrapped bread, white	.19	.17
1-pound package Super Suds soap chips	----------	[1].31

[1] Advertised prices for May 12, 1948, in Montreal; all other prices are average for February 1948.

Sources: Labour Gazette, Department of Labour, Ottawa, and the Montreal Daily Star. Also the Office of Foreign Labor Conditions, U. S. Department of Labor.

In February 1948 the official exchange rate for the United States dollar in Canada was at par; however, the free exchange rates for the Canadian dollar in New York averaged about 89 United States cents during that month. At present (May 28, 1948) the free exchange rate is about 92 cents.

NOTE.—All prices are in Canadian cents.

I think you will find illuminating the fact that, whereas the cheapest store in Washington sold 10 pounds of flour for 89 cents, in Canada the average price for the best grade of flour in Montreal was 60 cents. This same average price held throughout the Dominion.

Butter was 72 cents in Canada; in the United States it was 93 cents a month ago. Grade A large eggs were 49 cents a dozen in Montreal on May 12, 1948. In Washington a month ago they were 65 cents a dozen in the cheapest store. Three pounds of round steak were $1.50 in the Dominion—$1.51 in Montreal. In Washington they were $2.76. And so on through every item for which we have comparable figures.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House may remember a chart I brought before this House showing price of the better grades of meat in 3 types of stores in Washington. The meats included leg of lamb, steaks, chops, and so forth, the kind of meat too many people in the United States cannot afford at present prices. For those who wanted to study the problem further, I asked and was granted permission to place the charts in the Members' corridor. I am sure, therefore, that all the Members are now familiar with the comparative United States prices.

Below is a table showing May 12, 1948 advertised prices for the same or similar

grades of meat in Montreal under reimposed price control:

TABLE 2.—*Current prices for better grades of meat in the United States and Canada*

PRICES IN 3 TYPES OF STORES IN WASHINGTON, D. C., ON APR. 26, 1948

	Price per pound		
	Cheapest	Medium	Deluxe
Leg of lamb	$0.69	$0.73	$0.79
Lamb chops:			
Loin	.98	1.19	1.25
Rib	.89	.89	1.00
Shoulder	.69	.79	.75
Steak:			
Sirloin	.89	.98	1.15
Porterhouse	.89	.98	1.25
Round	.92	.98	.89
Rib roast:			
Standing	.69	.79	.75
Boned and rolled	.85	.89	.75
Chicken:			
Fryers	.47	.55	.65
Stewers	.43	.59	.55
Bakers		.59	.75
Chuck beef	.79		
Bacon	.75	.77	.85

ADVERTISED PRICES IN MONTREAL, CANADA, ON MAY 12, 1948 [1]

	Per pound
Lamb fores (shoulder) roast	$0.29
Lamb chops (shoulder)	.39
Steak:	
Sirloin	.53
T-bone	.59
Round (choice boneless or roast)	.55
Rib roast, prime rolled	.53
Chicken:	
Roasting, grade A	.52
Roasting, grade B	.49
Boiling fowl, choice grade A	.41
Chuck roast, beef	.29
Bacon, sliced, grade No. 1	.62

[1] After price control was reimposed.

Members of this House will be particularly interested to note that in a large city in Canada, where prices are generally higher than in rural areas, lamb fores shoulder roasts were selling for 29 cents a pound. In Washington, D. C., the price of leg-of-lamb roasts on April 26, 1948, varied from 69 to 79 cents a pound. Shoulder roasts were approximately 59 cents a pound. Shoulder lamb chops were 39 cents a pound in Canada; in Washington shoulder chops varied from 69 to 79 cents a pound, and loin and rib chops from 89 cents to $1.25 a pound. Steak in Montreal was under 60 cents. In Washington it varied from 89 cents to $1.25.

Of course, some may say, what of the exchange rate? Actually the official exchange rate for the United States dollar in Canada is at par; that is, $1 in Canada exchanging for one United States dollar. However, the free exchange rates for the Canadian dollar have averaged about 90 cents.

In other words, if a tourist from the United States were to exchange his United States currency for Canadian currency and go across the border to make his food purchases 90 United States cents would buy $1 worth of Canadian goods. To put it another way, Canadian prices as listed above, in terms of the free United States dollar, are 10 percent less for the United States purchaser in Canada. That is, Canadian prices are even lower in terms of free exchange rates.

You may remember that in my cost-of-living speech of a month ago I included a table from Business Week on the cost of living in the United States since 1939. Canada has similar figures on the cost of living, using the same years—1935–39—as a base. Below is a table with official figures published by the Canadian Department of Labor.

TABLE 3.—*Index numbers of the cost of living in Canada*

	Percentage increase since Aug. 1, 1939	On basis of average prices in 1935-39=100						
		Total	Food	Rent	Fuel and light	Clothing	Home furnishings and services	Miscellaneous
1939		101.5	100.6	103.8	101.2	100.7	101.4	101.4
1940	4.8	105.6	105.6	106.3	107.1	109.2	107.2	102.3
1941	10.8	111.7	116.1	109.4	110.3	116.1	113.8	105.1
1942	16.1	117.0	127.2	111.3	112.8	120.0	117.9	107.1
1943	17.5	118.4	130.7	111.5	112.9	120.5	118.0	108.0
1944	18.0	118.9	131.3	111.9	110.6	121.5	118.4	108.9
1945	18.6	119.5	133.0	112.1	107.0	122.1	119.0	109.4
1946	22.6	123.6	140.4	112.7	107.4	126.3	124.5	112.6
1947—January	26.0	127.0	145.5	113.4	109.0	131.5	129.8	114.7
February	26.8	127.8	147.0	113.4	109.1	131.9	130.9	115.5
March	27.9	128.9	148.7	113.4	109.1	133.1	133.6	116.0
April	29.6	130.6	151.6	113.4	109.1	136.9	137.2	116.3
May	32.0	133.1	154.9	115.4	116.2	140.0	138.6	116.8
June	33.8	134.9	157.7	117.8	116.7	142.4	139.8	117.1
July	34.8	135.9	159.8	117.8	117.3	143.2	142.5	117.2
August	35.5	136.6	160.6	117.8	118.6	145.5	143.7	117.2
September	38.3	139.4	165.3	117.8	121.1	152.0	147.4	117.5
October	41.1	142.2	171.3	119.9	121.9	154.2	149.9	117.6
November	42.5	143.6	173.6	119.9	122.6	157.0	151.4	118.2
December	44.8	146.0	178.7	119.9	120.3	159.3	154.9	119.8
1948—January	47.1	148.3	182.2	119.9	120.4	161.2	158.4	122.6
February	48.9	150.1	186.1	119.9	120.1	165.1	159.9	122.8

Source: Labour Gazette, Department of Labour, April 1948, p. 389, Table F-1.

There have been increases in the cost of living in Canada, just as there has been in practically the whole world in its attempt to pay off the debts of the recent war and adjust itself to normal living. But whereas the increase in the general cost-of-living index in February 1948 reached 167.5, or 70 percent above 1939, in the United States, in Canada it was up only to 150.1, or 49 percent above 1939.

Most of the increase in Canada's cost of living in recent months was due to the increase in food and clothing prices when controls were lifted temporarily. Even here, however, if we compare the food price index in Canada with that of the United States we find that in Canada in February 1948 food was 186.1 as compared with 204.7 in the United States.

Canada very wisely retained its machinery for controls—the wartime prices and trade board—while experimenting with lifting controls. At the beginning of 1946 first steps were taken in the gradual removal of wartime price controls. In September 1947 controls were lifted from practically all goods and services except sugar and rent. Careful instructions were issued by the Minister of Finance to the Price Board to watch the behavior of prices. When in late 1947 and early 1948 it was noted that prices, particularly in food, were increasing out of hand, controls were reimposed immediately over certain items, including meat and butter.

Mr. Speaker, it is only fair then to conclude that the cost of living in Canada, where conditions are very much the same as they are here, has not increased as rapidly as it has in this country, because Canada has kept controls. It has not been in as great a hurry to "let prices seek their natural level in the open market."

What increase in cost of living has occurred in Canada is due largely to world wide pressures, particularly to the increase in prices in the United States where controls were lifted without regard for the economic future of ourselves and our neighbors.

I again plead with this House, Mr. Speaker, to take prompt action now to stop these runaway prices. The bill which I introduced on April 28, 1948, H. R. 6832, will go a long way toward alleviating the problem of rising prices now facing the harassed housewife. It should be acted upon at once.

It is our duty to do something before this Congress adjourns.

Unpopular Savers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the widespread criticism, via the press and the radio, that has been directed at members of the House Appropriations Committee, and those Members in the House, who voted to cut appropriations for the European relief program, I wish to extend my remarks to include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of June 10 entitled "Unpopular Savers":

UNPOPULAR SAVERS

The other day the House Appropriations Committee recommended curtailments in appropriations for the European relief program. The House accepted the recommendations.

The committee found that certain things which the United States was to do for Europe could be done, in whole or in part, by Europeans. It found that some phases of the aid project called for appropriations which seemed excessive. It questioned whether certain things should be done at all.

Very well, the committee may be wrong. But those who oppose its action ought to prove that it is wrong as to the various points it made in behalf of economy. The dispatches from Washington may do these critics an injustice, but, so far as we have observed, they do not say the committee is wrong. What they seem to say is that unless a certain amount of money is set aside and spent, even though it may be spent unnecessarily and wastefully, the whole project will be injured. What they seem to say is that unless this country agrees to spend money up to a certain sum, then the countries to be benefited will be very mad at the United States and the Russians will have scored a diplomatic victory.

It seems to us very much as though the carpenter who said that the job which he thought would cost $100 could be done for $90 should be denounced as a penny-pinching tradesman trying to cheat his helpers and his suppliers; and in addition trying to put his patron before the neighbors in the light of a miserly scalawag.

Now, what we have here, in the first place, is a case where men have become so interested in the means of doing something that they have forgotten what it was they set out to do.

What they set out to do was to assist Europe to revive. The means of doing that was financial assistance. Now they say that unless a certain amount of money is spent—the amount was a guess in the beginning—then the whole project is killed; it is wrong to do the job as cheaply as possible.

When ERP was under discussion the State Department made certain estimates and Secretary Marshall said those must not be cut. Senator VANDENBERG differed. Now Senator VANDENBERG says about the sum to which he is committed the same things that Secretary Marshall said about the sum to which he was committed.

In the second—and more important—place, what we see is another exhibition of that strange mood that any problem can be met by spending money; that the probabilities of a successful solution are in direct ratio to the amount spent and that anyone who proposes to spend less is a traitor to the whole project. Thus anyone who questions whether European recovery depends on an inordinate supply of tobacco is, ipso facto, an isolationist.

Officeholders act this way because they think the country wants them to act this way. Two candidates for President made haste to say that they were on the side of large appropriations. They said that in face of the fact that a majority of their party in the House agreed to the lower appropriations. The reasons given for their stand take little or no notice of the arguments for lower appropriations which were made by responsible members of their party after long and careful analysis of how the money asked was to be spent.

In brief we have apparently reached a stage where it is unpopular to question the necessity of an expenditure.

Or are a number of gentlemen bedazzled out of their common sense by the prospect of living in the White House?

UNESCO—An Investment in Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I am including herewith a copy of an interesting address that was delivered recently by Mr. Rees H. Hughes, president of the Kansas State Teachers College, of Pittsburg, Kans., before a meeting of the Western Kansas Science, Industry, Agriculture Conference at Hays, Kans.

Mr. Hughes is one of the outstanding educators in the Middle West. I commend the reading of this informative address:

UNESCO—AN INVESTMENT IN PEACE

Approximately 3 years ago the leaders of most of the nations of the world met in San Francisco for the purpose of laying a foundation for permanent international peace. The conference resulted in the formation of the United Nations Organization. The new Organization aimed to accomplish its purpose through international cooperation on the basis of international acquaintance and understanding. It was the expressed belief of the delegates that through understanding and cooperation it would be possible to settle international disputes without reverting to war; to rebuild the countries devastated by war; to expand employment and international trade; to increase respect for freedom and human welfare; and to raise living standards and to advance the development of self-government throughout the world. The basic idea of the Organization was to secure peace by removing the causes of war.

Now, after 3 years, despite highly publicized controversies and differences, those most closely associated with the United Nations Organization and, hence, most familiar with its work, say that substantial progress is being made both in perfecting its organizations and in developing its program. It appears to be the most successful sample of international cooperation the world has yet experienced.

The fact that such a difficult organization was accomplished is noteworthy. Evidence of success can be sighted in its part in the removal of Russian troops from Iran, in the aid that has been given Greece, in assistance in the organization of separate governments of India and Pakistan, and in the steps taken to avert war in Indonesia. The survival of the United Nations for nearly 3 years, despite the difficult obstacles that have confronted it, represents a notable achievement.

Further evidence of success is to be found where the specialized agencies of the United Nations are at work on their problems, such as that done by the World Health Organization in dealing with the cholera epidemic in Egypt; by the food and agriculture agency in distributing food to many needy countries; by the International Bank in providing funds for equipment and production essentials in war-devastated countries, and by the International Trade Organization in expanding trade agreements and removal of barriers between countries.

It is of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, one of the specialized agencies of the United Nations Organization, and its work that I wish to speak particularly. Generally it is referred to as UNESCO. It is looked upon as the people's agency of the United Nations Organization. Its purpose is clearly stated in the constitution: "To contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science, and culture, in order to further universal respect for justice, for the rule of law, for the human rights and fundamental freedoms which are affirmed for the peace of the world without distinction of race, sex, language, or religion."

UNESCO's target is the individual mind—to effect clear thinking on the issues of peace and war. UNESCO has assumed the job of helping the individual citizens everywhere to better understand the problems of building peace and the ways in which his own personal energies may become most effective in solving them. UNESCO hopes "to unite the energies of all educational, scientific, and cultural agencies in the effort to solve the problems of peace. It proposes to use the tools of education, science, and culture to build peace."

The membershp of UNESCO at the present time consists of 40 nations whose total population represents nearly two-thirds of the people of the earth.

The organization for UNESCO is clearly defined. General headquarters are in Paris. The governing body is the International Conference composed of official delegates appointed by the state departments of the member countries. They meet once a year to formulate the working program. The first meeting of the International Conference was held in Paris in 1946. The second meeting was in Mexico City in October and November 1947. The International Conference designates 18 of its members to serve as its executive board. Duties of the executive board are to further direct the program and the policies established by the International Conference. It also selects and indirectly supervises the Secretariat, the paid staff for UNESCO.

The 1948 program of UNESCO, as set up by the International Conference in Mexico City provides for projects in six areas:

1. Reconstruction of the educational, scientific, and cultural agencies of the member nations devastated by war.

2. Communication projects in this area will seek to increase understanding across national frontiers by the various means of communication.

(1) Through visits and exchange of persons.

(2) Through radio, film, and press.

(3) Through libraries, books, and periodicals.

It is believed that through the full use of facilities of mass communication there is a chance to cultivate world unity and world citizenship needed to insure civilization against war.

3. Education: Much of UNESCO's most concrete activities in 1948 will be in the area of education for international understanding. There will be an endeavor to extend the educational opportunities as a means of raising the standards of living throughout the world. Text books and teaching materials will be studied in order that children in the schools may be given more accurate information of other nations. During the past ysar a seminar on education for international understanding was held in Paris. The program this year provides for three seminars. The projects in education will endeavor to extend international understanding not only in the schools but generally through adult groups.

4. Cultural exchange: There will be an endeavor to "promote interchange between cultures and aid in interpreting one culture to another through arts and letters, philosophy, social science, and the natural sciences."

5. Human and social relationships: Provides for a study of national tensions and will endeavor to remove the barriers of suspicion, jealousy, and misunderstanding which tend to divide people.

6. Natural science: UNESCO hopes to serve as a coordinating agency and stimulate scientific development in order that all the peoples of the world may have the advantages that may come from it.

UNESCO has been described as "a people to people" agency that will enable "people to speak to people," and the projects in the six working areas are described as follows:

1. Reconstruction represents people helping people to recover from war.

2. Communication represents people talking to people to get acquainted.

3. Education represents people growing together in knowledge.

4. Cultural exchange represents people sharing with people their heritage.

5. Human and social relationships represents people seeking to understand people.

6. Natural science represents people sharing with people the truths of science, the knowledge of nature and the control of environment.

Since UNESCO is a "people's program," it is necessary for it to reach the people, and for this there is a plan. First, the International Conference encourages the formation and organization of national councils within all of the member nations. The membership of the national councils is to be composed of representatives of the leading educational, scientific and cultural organizations within the Nation. The duties of the national council are twofold—first, to serve in an advisory capacity to delegates to the International Conference; second, it is responsible for interpreting the program adopted by the International Conference back to the organizations represented by its membership. In turn those organizations will be expected to reach out through the regional and State and local organizations until the entire individual membership will be made aware of and encouraged to participate in UNESCO'S program for maintaining peace.

A second plan for enabling the program of UNESCO to reach the people is through formation of State councils. In turn State councils will encourage formation of county and local councils, which will reach the people of every community.

The success of UNESCO will depend on the extent of people's participation. The public generally must take hold of the idea of UNESCO if it is to become an effective working program. UNESCO, in addition to sponsorship of its own projects, serves as a coordinating agency. Opportunity is given for masses of people to participate in building a foundation of understanding upon which it is hoped there may be constructed a structure for permanent peace. When the people are opposed to war it is doubtful if their governments will engage in wars.

I should like to point out some of the areas in which your organization and you can have an effective part in advancing UNESCO's program. No organization or person can be expected to participate in all the projects. However, it can be safely assumed that in the complete program everyone can find some place in which he can participate effectively.

You and your organization can have a part in the reconstruction of the educational, scientific, and cultural facilities that were devastated by war. You can help people recover from war. Destruction is beyond comprehension in many of the countries. A large percentage of the schools were destroyed by war and many have not been reopened School equipment was destroyed and little is being manufactured. Laboratories, museums, libraries were pillaged and wrecked. There are literally millions of undernourished, emotionally unstable children without schools and teachers and facilities for education. We can share from our supply of pencils and notebooks and text books and laboratory equipment. They are desperately needed.

While UNESCO does not operate as a direct relief organization in itself, it does serve as a coordinating agency and provides information that will enable organizations to participate in extending aid to countries where it is needed. The committee on international education reconstruction has prepared bulletins which describe ways for aiding in reconstruction.

Your organization can have a part in the communication project. UNESCO hopes that modern facilities for communication such as the press, radio and film, commonly in use for residents in the United States, can be made available to more people throughout the world. Your organization can distribute periodicals and books. One scientific society during the past year has distributed 18,000 scientific reports to leaders in other countries. Educational bulletins are being sent to school leaders in other countries. Literally thousands are engaging in letter exchange. One of the leading news commentators stated a few days ago that the letter exchange from people in democratic countries to people in Italy may have been one of the decisive influences in the recent general election there.

Your organization can participate in the educational projects. They propose eventually to eliminate illiteracy throughout the world. It is reported now that more than 50 percent of the people of the world can neither read nor write. A structure for permanent peace cannot be built on the basis of illiteracy and ignorance. Projects in the area of education hope to raise the minimum standards of education and living for the people everywhere. Life expectancy in the United States is more than twice as many years as that to be found in some other nations. It is not because natural living conditions are better in this country, nor are the people inherently stronger. Rather, the span of life expectation has been increased as a result of the general benefits people of the United States have gained from health education. UNESCO hopes to extend those advantages to all the people of the world. We are very proud of the fact that food surpluses have enabled us to ship large quantities to others in need throughout the world. Here again, large food production in the United States is not because our natural resources exceed those to be found in many other areas throughout the world. Rather it is because through scientific agricultural education we have learned to improve varieties, to increase soil fertility, and expand cultivation practices. UNESCO hopes to extend these advantages to all the other peoples of the world.

UNESCO hopes also that people who have had the educational opportunities can be encouraged to become better acquainted with factors that cause troubled situations to prevail in many places throughout the world. You can read to become informed and acquainted with people of other nations. People who know each other do not resort to war to resolve their differences. Too generally opinions are based on lack of information or misinformation. . This leads to prejudices. Prejudices generate tensions and fear. These lead to hate and hate leads to war. This is as true for nations as for individuals. Every or anization can encourage its membership to become better informed of the issues of war and peace. Encourage reading and discussion of vital issues, and become acquainted with the facts of areas in the world where trouble is brewing, such as Palestine, China, Germany, etc. Education leads to information—information to understanding—understanding to tolerance and cooperation and peace.

Your organization can assist and encourage the exchange of persons. For instance, there are 125 exchange teachers from the United States in the British Isles this year and a like number from the British Isles teaching in the schools of the United States. You can make contacts with those who may be near your community. Become acquainted with them and let them become acquainted with you. Last summer 450 United States teachers went to Mexico, Cuba, and Canada for foreign study. It is reported that there are 14,000 students from other parts of the world in the universities and colleges in the United States this year. Four hundred dollars will pay the round-trip fare for a student or teacher from Europe. You can encourage the plans for exchange of personnel by raising funds for scholarships and by sending your representatives.

Your organization can take advantage of the opportunity to become acquainted with the visitors from foreign nations. You also can interpret to them a clear and accurate picture of us and of our country. Your organization can encourage the attendance at international conferences and meetings. For instance, there were 40,000 Boy Scouts from literally all over the world who attended the International Jamboree in France last summer. It was a great adventure in international understanding. Your organization can help send suitable delegates.

Organizations are at work in UNESCO's program. The San Francisco Museum of Art is sponsoring UNESCO meetings. Universities and colleges are organizing workshops. The National Education Association has included UNESCO in its program. It is being sponsored by the American Library Association. Last year 128 schools used UNESCO for the commencement theme, and the graduating class gifts were contributed to the UNESCO fund. Eight States have perfected UNESCO State organizations. UNESCO councils have been organized in many colleges and high schools. Boards of education are providing travel funds for teachers who wish to gain experience in foreign travel. The National Association of Parent-Teachers is providing teachers' kits for schools in war-devastated areas. The World Student Service Organization is sponsoring a campaign to raise $1,000,000 to aid needy students and professors throughout the world. Scientific associations are contributing professional journals to foreign libraries. Last year it was reported that the children of Greece were unable to secure lead pencils and could learn to write only by marking in the sand. The Campfire Girls of San Francisco sent them 80,000 pencils. The Kansas State Teachers College in Pittsburg is bringing a Danish professor with his family to the faculty for a year, and is employing for part-time teaching a former teacher in the schools of England, who is now a local resident.

You can help by becoming acquainted with people. Begin at home—your home, your office, your school—and develop with your own children and your associates and for yourself clear and accurate ideas about other people and about our world relationships. Develop attitudes based on better understanding and greater appreciation of the people of other lands. Someone has said that "you can tip the scales a dozen times a day in your personal life by a tolerant phrase, an accurate statement, an intelligent suggestion, and a gesture of friendship that will demonstrate your attitude and practice in dealing with every-day racial, cultural, and national barriers."

UNESCO appears to be ideal in its approach, but political and economic arrangements between governments apparently are not enough. I think no one believes that we can continue to fight a war every 25 years. A statement by Congressman JUDD recently is typical of the thinking of many—that "a third world war will destroy all that we hold dear." I think no one believes either that the United States can continue to buy peace through continuous financial arrangements. Our resources will not hold out at the rate we are now using them. There may be now no structure that will guarantee peace, but some agency—it may be UNESCO—will encourage men to gain knowledge and appreciation of what is happening in the world, and on that basis it is hoped that the structure of peace will be built. UNESCO provides a central focus enabling individuals, groups, societies, and countries to combine their effort in the greatest creative task in this age. The UNESCO program can provide the world a chain reaction leading to peace.

I close by quoting again from the preamble to UNESCO's constitution. "Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be reconstructed."

UNESCO's plan, then, is to build peace through the activities of people who under-

stand the issues of peace and war. The idea is not without precedent nor does it lack evidence of success. You will recall the newly appointed King Solomon's unparalleled petition, "Give therefore thy servant an understanding heart, to judge the people that I may discern between good and bad." It is recorded that during his reign of 40 years the people of Israel enjoyed one of the truly great periods in their long history. May it be that in 1948 the people, enough people, of the world will petition as did King Solomon, "Give therefore thy servants understanding hearts to judge the people, that we may discern between good and bad, war and peace." UNESCO offers to you and me the opportunity to make an investment in permanent peace.

Federal Aid for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials and statements:

[From the Pittsburgh Courier of June 5, 1948]

WHY THE DELAY ON EDUCATION AID?

Most citizens will applaud the letter sent last week to Speaker JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of the House of Representatives by the President, in which Mr. Truman expressed the hope that the House would pass the Federal aid-to-education bill, which has already won the approval of the Senate under the effective sponsorship of Senator ROBERT A. TAFT.

It is difficult to recall a piece of legislation which has had such wholehearted and Nation-wide approval, and yet the bill snoozes in a House committee, with every likelihood that it will be necessary to get the signatures of 218 Representatives before the measure can get to the floor.

One wonders why the delay.

Can there be any intelligent and informed Congressman who does not know that this bill, appropriating $300,000,000 to lift the standard of national education, is a must?

Is it possible that there are Representatives who do not know at this late date that many States simply do not have sufficient funds to give every child the sort of education it should have, and that the Federal Government is the only source to which they can look for aid?

Those who delay action upon this bill are being penny-wise and pound-foolish because America, in order to survive in the dangerous world of today, must be educated, and even then the task will be difficult.

They do not understand how truthfully the President speaks when he says:

"I regard the proper education of our youths as a matter of paramount importance to the welfare and security of the United States * * * It is necessary and proper that the Federal Government should furnish financial assistance which will make it possible for the States to provide educational facilities more nearly adequate to meet the pressing needs of our Nation."

Our people especially stand to profit from the passage of this bill because it is notorious that they have suffered the most from the inability of the States in which the majority of them reside to bring Negro educational facilities up to the minimum standard.

Those Congressmen who persist in blockading the highway of progress may find it extremely difficult to explain their stand to their constituents in the coming campaign.

[From the Pittsburgh Courier of May 29, 1948]

ONLY AN EDUCATED AMERICA CAN SURVIVE

The United States is the most powerful nation on earth today, but it can only maintain its preeminence by continuing to surpass the rest of the world in technological and cultural advancement.

Regardless of class, color, or creed, Americans are united in their desire to achieve this goal, but this can never be done unless the Nation proceeds immediately to lift its educational level.

According to the 1940 census, some 10,000,000 American adults were practically illiterate, and there has been little change in this situation.

According to a 1946–47 report of the United States Census Bureau, more than 3,000,000 children between the ages of 6 and 17 were not even in school.

According to reliable estimates, there will be a 30-percent increase in the number of children of elementary-school age for the decade between 1942 and 1951.

During the last war it was shocking to learn that 1,750,000 men called for military service fell short of the Army's minimum standard of a fourth-grade education.

It is equally shocking to learn today that 100,000 teachers are employed on emergency substandard certificates.

In short, while the United States can only remain the greatest nation in the world by keeping up educationally with the demands of her world position, we are lagging lamentably behind.

While some of the States are able to keep step with the demands of the new day, many other States are incapable of doing so because of inadequate funds, and the hardest hit are those States in which there are large Negro populations.

There seems to be only one immediate solution to this national problem: Federal aid to education, which will enable even the poorest States to offer to each child the educational opportunities necessary to keep this Nation great.

Realizing this imperative need, Senator TAFT, of Ohio, and a bipartisan group of his associates sponsored a Federal-aid-to-education bill (S. 472), which was passed by the Senate on April 1 by a vote of 58 to 22.

The bill calls for an annual expenditure of $300,000,000, which allots a flat distribution of $5 annually to each State for each public-school child between the ages of 5 and 17 years or a minimum of $50 yearly for each.

The House bill allots $3 for each school child between these ages with a guaranty of a minimum of $40 yearly for each child, and calls for an expenditure of $200,000,000 the first year, $250,000,000 the second year, and $300,000,000 the third year, with an equal sum annually thereafter.

If the House would pass its bill, undoubtedly the conferees from both bodies could iron out the differences, but unfortunately this needed legislation is now sleeping in the House Committee on Education and Labor, although a subcommittee has approved the measure (6 to 2).

Both bills stipulate that where separate racial systems of public education are maintained there must be fair and equitable apportionment of the Federal funds.

The fact that 25 leading Negro organizations representing 3,500,000 adults who are all potential voters have endorsed this legislation evidences a conviction on their part that the Federal funds will be properly expended without any discrimination because of color, creed, or race.

Unless this vitally needed legislation is passed within the next 2 weeks, Congress will adjourn around June 18, the bill will be killed and we shall have to wait until next year before anything can be done.

But America is too far behind to permit of any delay when the world situation is taken into account.

This Federal aid to education must be made a reality now or we shall regret it on some near tomorrow.

It is hard to see how patriotic Congressmen can permit this must legislation to die but in order to make certain that they do not, every American, regardless of class, creed, or color, must let his Representatives know at once that Federal aid to education must become the law of the land, now.

It must never be said that Congress voted $250,000,000 for cigarettes for Europeans under the Marshall plan and would not vote an equal sum to lift the educational level of the greatest national resource the United States has—its youth.

PUBLIC FORUM ON FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

The following are statements by 11 leading Negroes supporting Federal aid to education which were solicited by the Pittsburgh Courier:

Mrs. Mary McLeod Bethune, founder-president, National Council of Negro Women:

"Ten million adult illiterates! Almost 2,000,000 children between the ages of 5 and 17 out of school. America's tremendous debit—a debit in human resources that this great Nation of ours can least afford. As founder and for 43 years president of an institution devoted to the higher education of boys and girls, particularly of the South, I have witnessed the ill effects of the substandard training afforded through the elementary and secondary schools of certain areas of our Nation. The debit is great, but it can be directed toward a balance if our Congress enacts Federal aid to education during its current session. Will our Congress fail us? It must not."

John W. Davis, president, West Virginia State College:

"Education is defense. Five million youngsters are not now in school, and millions more are in substandard schools. During World War II the Army had to teach many to read and write well enough to perform elemental war duties. More than half a million more could not serve their country in this war because of educational deficiencies apparently beyond correction.

"America needs to wake up. An aroused public opinion can cause the leadership in our national House of Representatives to send the Federal aid to education legislation (H. R. 2953) to the floor of the House for immediate passage.

"Wake up, America. Education is defense."

Thurman L. Dodson, president, National Bar Association:

"The National Bar Association has repeatedly gone on record in support of Federal aid to education. The present stalemate of this legislation in the House of Representatives is a keen disappointment to those who have worked and struggled for an informed citizenry through adequate educational facilities. It is a false economy which would perpetuate the present proven inequality in educational opportunity."

James C. Evans, adviser to the Secretary of Defense:

"National strength, safety, and security demand Federal aid to education. Since we cannot match populations, America must develop in every individual the maximum potential for peace or for war. Such development must begin at an early age. We cannot win another war with a million illiterates, half of them Negro, in the armed forces. Neither will there be time to teach adults in uniforms reading, writing, and arithmetic after a conflict starts. Come the enemy, he will proceed against the Nation

as a whole. Thus this is a national problem and Federal aid to education is an immediate imperative."

Perry W. Howard, Republican national committeeman, from Mississippi:

"American defense against the foes of democracy, without and within, is a highly literate American people. I feel, and history confirms my belief, that prosperity and general welfare are measured, to no small extent, in terms of the level of literacy of a people. Prosperity and general welfare cannot be protected in a nation where any section of the country or any segment of the population is denied those minimum educational opportunities that are so necessary in the type of society in which we live. To me, a chief duty of the Federal Government is that of assuming responsibility for minimum educational opportunities that are so necessary in the type of society in which we live. * * * To me, a chief duty of the Federal Government is that of assuming responsibility for a minimum educational opportunity for all boys and girls of the Nation. Legislation, H. R. 2953, now pending action in the House, proposes an acceptable assumption of this responsibility."

Dr. W. H. Jernagin, director, National Fraternal Council of Negro Churches:

"Religious expression and educational opportunity represent important bulwarks of the American way of life. Religious freedom cannot be protected and advanced while a vast number of our people are denied the right to basic educational achievement. The church, over the years, has lent its full support to the educational interest of the Nation and its children. It is not surprising, therefore, that this American institution would urge our Congress to enact laws proposing aid to education, and that I, as director of the National Fraternal Council of Negro Churches, would take this opportunity to solicit the full support of members of our House of Representatives in the passage of H. R. 2953. Were I a Member of Congress, I would not wish to be guilty of deserting millions of American boys and girls by my negligence to make Federal aid to education law during the current Congress."

Col. Campbell C. Johnson, assistant to the Director of the Office of Selective Service Records:

"The high rate of rejection of selectees, both white and Negro, for educational deficiency, or failure to meet minimum intelligence standards, calls attention to a problem which affects our Nation in time of peace, as well as in time of war. In time of peace, it prevents effective participation of large numbers of our citizens in our national life at a productive level. In time of war, it is impossible for these same people to make their full contribution to the military security of the Nation.

"A study of this problem leads to the conclusion that the inability of large numbers of our citizens to meet a minimum standard of education or intelligence has national significance. The failure of one State to be able to make its proportionate share of manpower available for national defense causes other States to assume a disproportionate share of this responsibility. The question as to whether or not one community, county, or State provides adequate educational opportunities for its citizens has national implications.

"Communities, counties, and States with higher educational standards are compelled to absorb the manpower procurement deficiencies of States with poor educational systems. In the final analysis, they actually pay in the blood and suffering of their own young men for the educational deficiencies of their sister States.

"It would seem to be desirable, therefore, for the Federal Government, where necessary, to assist States in maintaining schools with acceptable standards since the safety of the Nation depends, in a large measure, upon citizens in every State and section having a reasonable minimum of education."

Rayford W. Logan, chairman, department of history, Howard University:

"I urge the passage of H. R. 2953 because it will provide for all school children, especially in the Southern States, the foundation upon which equal educational opportunities can be built.

"Frederick Douglass and other prominent leaders, without respect to party, urged Federal aid to public education nearly 70 years ago. It is high time, therefore, that this preliminary step be taken."

Howard H. Long, American Teachers Association:

"I am for Federal aid to education, as proposed by S. 472, passed April 1, this year, and supported by H. R. 2953, now pending action in the House, because it provides an equalizing tendency, since the poorest States draw most heavily though every State draws something; equitable distribution of funds based on population ratios for minority races for whom separate schools are maintained by law; that no school district within the benefiting State shall spend for operating expenses less than $50 per child by races; for a thorough system of accounting and reporting through the Commissioner of Education to the Congress of the United States."

Leslie S. Perry, Washington representative, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People:

"Just as we believe that no child should be limited in educational opportunity on the basis of race or color, so we do not believe that a child should have less opportunity because of the accident of having been born in one of the poorer States.

"The only answer is Federal aid to education in such amounts and on such conditions as to eliminate both of these evils."

ADAM C. POWELL, Member, House of Representatives:

"I can think of no better application of democracy than for the Federal Government to invest in education of all the people. Federal aid to education will provide a better-informed citizenship throughout the Nation, and will strengthen democratic government, assuring better understanding among ourselves and other nations.

"As a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, it is my sincere hope that this committee will report the Federal-aid bill favorably and promptly, and that the entire House will proceed to complete the enactment of the legislation without delay."

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION (NEGRO)

(Based upon an exclusive Pittsburgh Courier survey conducted during the week of May 16, 1948)

Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority.
Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, Inc.
American Teachers Association.
Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges.
Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.
Conference of Land Grant Colleges for Negroes.
Delta Sigma Theta Sorority.
Federation of Colored Women's Clubs.
IBP Order Elks of the World.
Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity.
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.
National Association of Colored Women.
National Alliance of Postal Employees.
National Association of Registrars and Deans.
National Bar Association.
National Congress of Colored Parents and Teachers.
National Council of Negro Women, Inc.
National Dental Association.
National Fraternal Council of Negro Churches, USA.
National Medical Association.
National Negro Business League.
National Negro Domestic Workers Association.
National Negro Insurance Association.
National Pan-Hellenic Council.
Omega Psi Phi Fraternity.
Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc.
Phi Delta Kappa Sorority.
Sigma Gamma Rho Sorority.
Zeta Phi Beta Sorority.

"B. G.," Keyman of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times magazine section of June 6, 1948.

"B. G.," KEYMAN OF ISRAEL

(By Gene Currivan)

TEL AVIV.—David Ben-Gurion, Israel's first Prime Minister, decided about 40 years ago that there was going to be a Jewish state in Palestine some time and that he was going to be one of its leaders. He has come to the realization of that dream, but it has meant 40 years of toil, hardships, discouragement, imprisonment and even exile.

He was a chubby, pink-cheeked lad of 19 when he first came to Palestine from Poland in 1906. He was still pink-cheeked, but with a great shock of unruly white hair, when on May 14 this year he stood before heads of the Provisional Government and solemnly read the proclamation establishing the Jewish state.

It was a historic moment for him and his people. They were realizing a hope that had been in their hearts for 2,000 years. Here was one of the leaders of Zion they could thank. He had been instrumental in crystallizing all their efforts and was the architect of the formula for a "viable Jewish state in an adequate part of Palestine," which was accepted by the United Nations as the basis for discussion and actually became the nucleus of partition.

It is not going far afield to describe Ben-Gurion as Israel's wartime Churchill. Whether he will be a good and efficient peacetime Prime Minister remains to be seen, but at present there is no one in all of Palestine who could fill his shoes. There is not a commander or even Minister who would turn a wheel unless he first consulted "B. G." That is why his day is full to the saturation point. His decisions are made not just on the spur of the moment but usually after a few telephone calls or swift conferences. He doesn't consider himself infallible and will not give a word of advice that may bring havoc to Israel without first considering every phase of every problem. His lieutenants, whether civil or military, realize this and therefore have complete confidence in his decisions.

He has an overwhelming personality and indomitable strength, and he knows personally everyone in high-level posts. He knows how to approach them, how to treat them, and he has an age-old intuition that tells him how they will react—an invaluable attribute, especially when decisions have to be made on the spur of the moment.

He is just as much a commander in chief of the Israel Army today as President Roosevelt was during the war. He has his chiefs of staff and is constantly in touch with them. He doesn't pretend to be a military expert, but he does know that a common sense and calm, ordinary perspective sometimes have greater effectiveness than all the last-minute plans made by generals. He offers a sane viewpoint backed by years of experience.

Ben-Gurion starts his official day at about 9 o'clock, when he is at his desk in his capacity of Minister of Defense. He does not begin his other duties as Prime Minister until 5, and he travels to a different part of Tel Aviv to carry on this second part of his dual existence. Sometimes his day is not finished until midnight.

His day starts with meeting his chiefs of staff and other heads of supply, defense, and security. He generally has several of these military conferences before a quick lunch at midday. He no longer goes home for lunch, but, after eating in a nearby cafe, either takes a short siesta or spends an hour reading Greek, his favorite language. He plods through more office detail, and then, after dinner at home with his wife, he goes to his other office, where he starts functioning as Prime Minister. His day also includes late meetings with the provisional government of 13 minister and the provisional council of state.

He is everywhere. When we had our first air raid on the morning of May 15, just 5 hours and 14 minutes after the State was proclaimed, the first one on the scene of the bombing was Ben-Gurion. He arrived in his shirt sleeves, jumped out of his jeep and surveyed the damage, much to the amazement and consolation of the terror-stricken residents of the district.

Ben-Gurion has few personal friends and no one who is really close to him. This is not because of any lack of personal charm but because he lacks the desire for personal contact. He has worked hard all his life, avoided social activities as much as possible, and concerned himself entirely with matters at hand.

He is meek, humble, and shy, but only to a point. That point is reached when, for example, in a political debate he comes up against a disagreement not based on fact, or a disagreement put forth merely for the sake of argument.

Then he is apt to explode. He has been known to walk out of meetings in a rage after delivering a scathing indictment of his opponent. But a little while later, after a cooling-off period, he may saunter back, calm, unruffled, smiling, as though he was putting in the first appearance of the day.

He has a keen sense of humor, but is serious-minded and can't stand having his trend of thought interrupted. He knows precisely what he wants at all times and states it in most simple, direct terms. He speaks English well and is meticulous in his selection of words.

In his office he keeps his own files, and just the way he wants them. His desk is neat, clean, and contains only those papers needed at the moment. His speeches and other documents are always handwritten by himself in Hebrew. He hardly ever dictates, which is just as well because his secretaries are a little afraid of him. They say he is so unpredictable.

If he were so inclined he could dictate in English, German, Hebrew, Yiddish, Russian, Greek, Turkish, and under pressure, could contribute a bit of French. English-speaking correspondents have a difficult time of it when he makes important addresses because they are always in Hebrew and generally delivered extemporaneously from scribbled notes. But this doesn't bother him; he is not concerned about feelings of newspaper men or whether they like or dislike him, and he shuns personal publicity.

He dislikes one of his principal duties—the signing of decrees. Under the present provisional government and its emergency laws these decrees can be issued by various ministers without the consent of Parliament. Ben-Gurion has to sign them all, but he resents it because he thinks in terms of democratic government and democratic elections, and it is on this foundation that he hopes to build the state.

He has a tremendous amount of will power, which he demonstrated in an unusual fashion about 5 years ago when he decided he was smoking too much—about four packs of cigarettes a day. Using his son Amos, who is now an important factor in Haganah, as the foil, he decided both of them were smoking too much and should cease. He hasn't smoked since.

Most of the time he speaks softly, almost in conversational tone, and you get the impression he is tired. He has the appearance of a poet or of one whose thoughts transcend the material. He has a powerful, intelligent face that sometimes seems pugnacious. He has very small blue eyes that radiate friendliness, a healthy pinkish skin, and great masses of white hair, sparse in the middle. He is now 61 and carries his years well.

Ben-Gurion was born December 16, 1886, in what his wife described was the nicest house in Plonsk. Plonsk was then in Russia, but it is now in Poland. It had a Jewish population of 5,000 and most of these, including Ben-Gurion's father, were ardent Zionists. Ben-Gurion was born with zionism in his blood and before he was 14 he was preaching the doctrine in public halls of nearby Warsaw.

His Zionist and Socialist activities eventually landed him in a Warsaw jail. At the end of his term, he boarded a ship and sailed for Palestine in 1906 as an illegal immigrant. Palestine then was part of the Ottoman Empire and the Turks gave him only a 3-months visa, but like many settlers in those days, he ignored the time limit and stayed 9 years.

During his first years in Palestine he worked as a wine presser in the Rothschild vineyards at Rishon, just a few miles above here. He began to think then that Jews could not go on forever being stateless and that they would some day have a nation of their own. If this came to pass, he reasoned, they must have leaders, and those leaders will come from among the people here now.

He was never one to waste a moment once he had an idea to be carried out. Palestine and its settlements were left to those who could best handle them and Ben-Gurion took off for Constantinople in 1913, where he matriculated in a law school to prepare himself as a future leader.

At the start of his third year of law he came back to Palestine on a holiday and arrived just in time to be present at the outbreak of World War I. After hearing a few of his public utterances on socialism and Zionism, the Turks decided he was a dangerous element and put him in prison. He managed to buy his way out, before long he was back in again, and this time it was the considered judgment of the Turkish authorities that the country would be much better off if Ben-Gurion were in some other country.

That was in 1915. The Turks considered him dangerous not because of his zionism but because of his activities in the field of labor. In fact, at that time it was the pioneer labor movement for Palestine rather than either zionism or socialism in which he was interested. It was then that he was laying the foundation for powerful Histadruth, the General Federation of Jewish Labor, which he helped to found in December 1920.

So Ben-Gurion left for the United States. When he got to New York he started planting seeds of zionism, socialism, and socialized labor. He became a popular figure in Zionist politics and went into the publishing field. He edited and published Yazior, a magazine, and founded the Hechalutz movement in America.

In 1917 he met, wooed, and married Paula Moonvess, who was a student nurse at a Jewish training school in Brooklyn. She had arrived in the States from Minsk at the age of 13, and, like Ben-Gurion, had been scheduled to stay only 3 months on a temporary visa. When she was due to go back, widespread pogroms developed in Russia, and her father, a wealthy Minsk merchant, arranged for her to remain.

She had intended to become a doctor of medicine, but meanwhile her father died and there were no more funds forthcoming from Russia. She settled for a nursing career and it was while she was working for the board of health in Brooklyn during the infantile paralysis epidemic that she met "B. G.," as she calls him. As usual, he was busy furthering the cause of labor, plus laying the foundation for what later became the Jewish Legion, a volunteer group of Americans and Canadians who fought alongside the Allies in Palestine. In his spare time he was writing the Palestine Historical, Geographical, and Economical Survey in collaboration with I. Ben Zevie.

Paula and "B. G." were married after she had agreed to go with him to Palestine. In the spring of 1918 he formed and joined a unit of the Jewish Legion in Windsor, Canada, and sailed with it for Palestine. She remained behind until their first child was born and then joined him in Tel Aviv. (There are now three children, two daughters and a son.)

About 8 months later he was "demobbed" from the Jewish legion and went to Europe with his wife and child on a mission for Paole Zion (Zionist Labor Party). They went to London, Vienna, Warsaw, and it was the first time that Paula, who until then was not a Zionist, realized the necessity of providing a homeland somewhere for Jews. She saw the result of widespread pogroms and was to see more when they returned to Palestine in 1921.

During those early years and in fact until fairly recently Ben-Gurion did not concern himself with general Zionist politics but concentrated more on developing the labor party and trade unions. He was laying a foundation for the future State while others were trying to mold the structure itself. At the same time he was also preparing himself for leadership. He remembered those early days in the settlements when he tilled the soil and crushed the grapes of the land, all the while dreaming of the day when he could lead his people into this land that was promised them and tell them it was theirs.

Apparently his dreams didn't impress the more practical-minded settlers, who were satisfied with their lot. Recently one of his former bosses, who is now a very old man, was informed that his youthful protégé was about to become Prime Minister of a new state.

"I knew nothing would ever come of him," he replied.

When he had worked as an agricultural laborer in the little settlement called Sejera, southwest of Tiberias, in the direction of Nazareth, he had become a watchman, or shomer, in the settlement. It was during this interlude in his life that he became interested in Haganah, which was an offshoot of Hashomer, the Jewish watchmen's organization guarding settlements against Arabs and Turks. He was one of the original supporters of Haganah, which now comprises the official army of Israel and then was a vigilante group protecting settlements.

Today, as Prime Minister, Ben-Gurion hopes that Israel will have peaceful relations with all nations based on mutual interests and that the new state will not become part of any power bloc. He believes firmly in the principles guiding the United Nations and is determined that those same

precepts will constitute the rock upon which Israel shall be built.

After more than twoscore years he has ended an odyssey, with two of his fondest dreams realized—there is a Jewish state in Palestine and he is one of its leaders.

The Delaware Plan for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. DOUGLASS BUCK
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

MAY 24, 1948.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD certain statements, letters, and other material relating to the Delaware plan for veterans.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR C. DOUGLASS BUCK, OF DELAWARE

My purpose in sponsoring the "Delaware plan" is to increase the prosperity of the citizens of my State. I shall exert my best efforts to the end that each individual—veteran and nonveteran—benefits from the wealth of new economic opportunities that are waiting to be developed through our traditional private initiative and private enterprise. To accomplish that purpose, the plan was developed. I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to insert an outline of the plan in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, following my remarks.

The Delaware plan also affords new teamwork for our small businessmen, our veterans, our farmers, our community fathers, and our legislators. The veterans tell me that they look upon our plan as a new opportunity for them to help develop a new leadership in the economic development of the community, the State and the Nation. To enable our veterans and small businessmen to prosper and to attain that new leadership for the benefit of all our people, we have sponsored in the United States Congress the bipartisan bill S. 1652, the Veterans Economic Development Corporation Act, popularly called the "Little Man's RFC." This act, which will implement the Delaware plan, is designed to enable the little man and the veteran in each community to develop gainful careers and businesses under our free-enterprise system—the system that has made us the greatest Nation in all human history.

There is another objective in our sponsoring this "Little Man's RFC." The Russian strategy of world Communist imperialism and conquest is based upon the expectancy that the economy of the United States will fail in recessions or depressions. It is the opinion of those of us who sponsor this legislation that the surest way to stop Communism is to increase prosperity for all our people by spreading the base of our economy and, especially, to strengthen the economic position of the little businessman, the farmer, the merchant, the professional person and particularly our veterans. Moreover, in developing increased trade with other countries under the provisions of this bill, "thereby cultivating those countries to become increasingly our friends and customers," we have the best argument in favor of Americanism and economic democracy against Communist imperialism. For such trading will enable the free individual in friendly countries to deal with the free individual in the United States. When a Russian citizen does business in a foreign country, that means the Russian Government and Communist imperialism are doing business in that country. But, under the provisions of the "Little Man's RFC," an American citizen who engages in an enterprise or trade in other countries will be there to bring profit to the people of that country and not to represent imperialism.

George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, and our other founding fathers were good businessmen. The grass roots of our economy have been given strength by such men. Today, more than ever, we need men of their caliber. I can think of no greater new source of ability, resourcefulness and new leadership than our veterans, who were selected as the finest specimens of American manhood and womanhood. Through this bill and the Delaware State plan, we hope to enable our veterans to take the leadership in making all our people more prosperous and reducing the threat of communism and war.

The eyes of the country are upon the progressive action we have initiated in our Delaware plan. We are proud that we already have imitators in other States. For 300 years our inhabitants of the Diamond State have played a significant part in the development of the Nation. Thomas Jefferson referred to Delaware as a "jewel among the States" because of its compact area and rich soil and in tribute to the brilliance of its people in his day. One of the Original Thirteen Colonies and the first State by adoption of the Constitution in 1787, Delaware is destined now to go forth to greater glory and the enrichment of all our people.

Before going further into detail, I wish to insert in the RECORD three important letters that concern our legislation and our State plan to help the little businessman.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., May 25, 1948.

Hon. C. D. BUCK,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUCK: I am glad to learn you have prepared a Delaware plan of projects which could be implemented under provisions of S. 1652—the Veterans Economic Development Corporation Act. Such State plans will aid the people of many communities, including veterans, by bringing new industries to the communities, expanding present businesses, modernizing agriculture, and by creating new industrial uses for agricultural products and other raw materials.

Representatives of friendly nations are interested in developing programs similar to your Delaware plan to enable their people to prosper and to hold the line against communism and war. It is not an overstatement to say that if applied here at home and abroad, such a plan would help win a bloodless victory.

Your championship in Congress of small business in the United States and the establishment of veterans in businesses and profitable careers has our strong support. The bill that you are sponsoring in the Senate, S. 1652, entitled "The Veterans' Economic Development Corporation Act," will enable millions of veterans to catch up with the economic parade at home and abroad. This bill will interest the taxpayers particularly, as no appropriation of taxpayers' money is contemplated. In addition, it is estimated that it will reduce taxes as it will save our taxpayers a billion dollars a year in the present cost of Government.

The bipartisan support of this bill and its early passage is indicated by the companion bills introduced in the House by ESTES KEFAUVER of Tennessee, a champion of small business; Representative EDITH ROGERS of Massachusetts, Chairman of the important Veterans Committee; Representative JESSE WOLCOTT of Michigan, an authority on finance and Chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee; the past Chairman, Congressman SPENCE of Kentucky; by Congressmen KEARNEY of New York, and VAN ZANDT of Pennsylvania, both former Commanders-in-Chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The unusual support of the bill in the Senate is shown in the cosponsorship of S. 1652 by Senator BRIDGES of New Hampshire, Chairman of the important Appropriations Committee; Senator REVERCOMB of West Virginia, Chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee; Senator BARKLEY of Kentucky, Senator BUTLER of Nebraska, Chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; and 30 other distinguished Senators.

As the Veterans Economic Development Corporation bill is not limited to veterans, your Delaware plan will help to implement this program in an orderly manner, marking a new milestone in the illustrious history of Delaware and of the Nation.

Sincerely,

RAY H. BRANNAMAN,
Commander-in-Chief.

I want to take this opportunity to introduce in the RECORD a letter from a great American and public servant, a man whom all veterans and fellow citizens honor—James F. O'Neil, the present National Commander of the American Legion. This letter was written to Senator STYLES BRIDGES, the Chairman of the important Senate Appropriations Committee, one of the many distinguished cosponsors of our Veterans Economic Development Corporation bill.

Hon. STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman, Appropriations Committee,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BRIDGES: I wish to compliment you on your statesmanship, especially your economic statesmanship in formulating an American doctrine to build mutual prosperity between our communities in America and the communities in friendly countries that are trying to hold the line against communism.

In their stand on Americanism, 20,000,000 living American veterans can't be wrong. From what I know of veterans, I can say that we have one more good fight left in us, and this is it. As you gentlemen in Congress have challenged us, I believe we can meet the challenge in peace with as much vigor and determination as we have met the challenge in war.

Furthermore, as all veterans alike have served their neighbors and our Nation, I am confident that the legionnaires in our State will invite the cooperation of the members of other veterans' organizations to meet this new challenge to champion Americanism against Communism through your economic-development plan.

The Army and the Navy were charged with being prepared to defend Pearl Harbor but obviously their lack of coordination paid its toll. I, for one, wish to prevent a Pearl Harbor in veterans' affairs. To that end I am confident that the Legion will cooperate with other veterans' organizations in our communities and in our States to help unify our people for the best interest of all.

I am impressed by the number of legionnaires in the Eightieth Congress who are cosponsoring with you your veterans RFC bill, which appears to be a good basis to afford veterans economic opportunities and housing and to complete an over-all veterans' program for the benefit of the veterans and of the Nation.

With my best wishes for your success in your plan to fight Communism with prosperity, I am

Sincerely,

JAMES F. O'NEIL.

Delaware once more demonstrates its leadership. This time we have set the pace for the various State plans that the veterans and other citizens of other States have developed. For this progressive action, great credit is due to the man who has helped bring together veterans of all organizations and public-spirited citizens in cooperative teamwork toward benefiting the people of our State. That man is Lloyd W. Ricards of Wilmington, and I take pleasure in introducing in the RECORD his letter on a subject that is so important to all of us.

DEPARTMENT OF DELAWARE,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Wilmington, Del., May 18, 1948.

Hon. C. DOUGLASS BUCK,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUCK: I want to thank you on behalf of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the Department of Delaware for your interest and cosponsorship of S. 1652, the Veterans Economic Development Corporation Act, which is called by veterans' organizations "one of the most constructive pieces of veterans' legislation ever to be introduced."

Your sponsorship of this bill, popularly labeled the "Little Man's RFC," is of particular significance to the veterans and other public-spirited people of Delaware, as the bill will implement the Delaware plan. This plan has captured the imagination of the veterans of Delaware and of the community fathers who have studied it because it will benefit enterprising people in each community, as well as veterans, by affording them new economic opportunities in careers, businesses and projects. Since our early public meetings in Milford and Wilmington, in which other veterans' organizations and public bodies participated, the ideas underlying the Delaware plan have steadily taken root.

In fact, the veterans and other public-spirited people in many States have copied our Delaware plan, devised for us by Col. Richmond Harris, the technical consultant to those of you in Congress who sponsor the "Little Man's RFC" bill which will implement the various State plans. We are proud that the Delaware plan was the first of the many State plans to be devised, and that it has since served as the model for other States in the Union and as a model for friendly countries seeking United States economic aid.

Once again our people of Delaware have taken the lead as they have often taken it since they first led in helping to frame the Constitution of the United States. Following in the tradition of our Constitution and Bill of Rights, which afforded the little man new human rights and opportunities, this "Little Man's RFC" now opens to our people new economic opportunities in careers and businesses. The "Little Man's RFC" bill, therefore, should prove to be another milestone in the chain of human rights and economic opportunities.

We believe that your continued support of our objectives in the United States Senate will enable us to coordinate Federal, State, community, and private-agency functions to open opportunities for the little man in our communities. As our plan builds a bulwark against Communism by eliminating its causes at the source in the communities, we believe that as the Delaware plan is further developed in other States and other countries, it will go far toward reducing the threat of Communism and war.

We compliment you and thank you for your interest in the veterans of Delaware and of our country.

Sincerely,

LLOYD W. RICARDS,
Department Commander.

Before I list some of the specific new opportunities provided by our bill, I will describe its functions in a few words.

HOW WILL THE "LITTLE MAN'S RFC" OPERATE?

The act will create a Government Corporation vested with broad powers to provide long-range credit and technical advisory services to: (a) Private business—individuals, firms, and corporations, and (b) State and municipal self-liquidating public projects, with the condition that preference in new career opportunities would be afforded veterans, if available.

When our "Little Man's RFC" bill was introduced concurrently in the Senate and House, one of our cosponsors, a national authority on finance, Chairman JESSE P. WOLCOTT of the important House Banking and Currency Committee, wrote an illuminating opinion on our bill to Chairman STYLES BRIDGES of the Senate Appropriations Committee, who introduced the bill in the Senate on his behalf and that of 20 other Senators. I quote from Chairman WOLCOTT's interesting statements as follows:

"At home and abroad the Veterans Corporation, popularly called the 'Little Man's RFC,' would create economic opportunities for veterans and others through broad powers along the lines of the present RFC. But in addition, the Veterans Corporation would afford skilled technical advisory service to self-liquidating projects that will employ veterans and to qualified veterans themselves. It would be a move toward matching veterans' skills against the unused production capacities of the Nation and our untapped abundant national resources to meet the phenomenal demand for American goods and services throughout the world.

"Although the proposed Veterans Corporation is charged specifically with solving veterans' short-range and long-range economic problems, at the same time it is designed to produce an economic profit to the Nation. It is estimated that it will reduce the cost of veterans' affairs by $1,000,000,000 per year by creating gainful employment; also, it may make it possible to save taxpayers other billions of dollars in direct expense. The Veterans Corporation is so designed that it should operate without cost to the taxpayers, as the spread between the rate of interest the Treasury pays the public for the bonds, and the interest rates charged on loans made by the Veterans Corporation will more than cover administration, losses from loans, and operating costs. The present RFC reports that, under similar conditions, it has returned more than $500,000,000 profit to the Treasury. It is estimated that with the wider distribution of loans made by the Veterans Corporation and with its skilled technical advisory and research services to protect the Government against loss, the Veterans Corporation should return a still greater profit to the Treasury than the present RFC.

"For the first time in American history, we have a specific foreign policy. Consequently, it is possible for the State Department, with the help of the Senate, to put teeth in our new foreign policy. We believe that the Veterans Corporation provides the most immediate approach to this objective and in support of what Senator VANDENBERG, the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, says, this approach will help 'peace-living' countries rather than 'peace-loving' countries to bring lasting peace to the world. At a time when we no longer have a powerful army to reinforce our foreign policy, it is significant that 20,000,000 living American veterans, who with their families represent 60 percent of the people of the United States, consitute a potential new moral and economic force in the world. More than 13,000,000 of these living veterans are veterans of foreign wars. Our veterans were selected from the cream of 140,000,000 people for their physical, mental, and educational superiority and are now the finest essence of our people. Many of them are experienced and capable and, if properly utilized, are a source of a new domestic economic power. They are also a source of vast new power to reinforce our foreign relations, as many experienced veterans are eager to go as business and technical missionaries to countries that we have helped to liberate, including Korea, China, India, the Philippines, Iraq, Iran, Arabia, Italy, France, Turkey, and Greece. Our veterans are, potentially, the greatest army of goodwill missionaries in all human history. Under the provisions of this legislation our veterans could help to tip the scales now between war and peace.

"The passage of this act is immediately necessary and urgent as no other Government or private agency can perform the functions to meet the emergency.

"The Veterans Corporation would strengthen the hand of the Congress for several reasons:

"(a) It appeals to the taxpayers as it will save an estimated $1,000,000,000 per year in veterans' unemployment compensation and obviate the abuses of the '52-20 Club.'

"(b) Banking approves of the Veterans Corporation because, like the present RFC, it will make only loans that do not compete with private banks. It will help to balance the Federal budget. The American Bankers Association in their Journal of January 15 said: 'During a term of office in which economy and tax reduction will offer no new plums for veterans, the proposed Veterans' RFC (sponsored by Chairman WOLCOTT, of the House Banking and Currency Committee, and several Senators) will provide something which Members of Congress can loudly endorse.' The Veterans Corporation should cost the taxpayers nothing, as all projects and enterprises will be self-liquidating and will show a profit to the Nation. It will utilize all existing facilities of Government without duplicaion and simplify veterans' affairs. (The veteran had nine agencies of Government to give him the runaround after World War I, and now after World War II has 29 agencies of Government to confuse him.)

"(c) A good cross section of labor leaders—in fact, all we have contacted—favor this bill. They recognize that it means the halfway mark in permanent full employment because veterans would otherwise compose half the unemployed labor force during depressions. It would prevent the inevitable conflict between the veterans' organizations and organized labor by opening new opportunities for fuller employment where both will profit.

"(d) The veterans' organizations are supporting this bill because it will enable veterans to recoup their losses in economic opportunities in competition with those who remained at home and it will provide self-supporting careers for disabled veterans. For example, veterans' organizations are urging the enactment of this legislation as it will immediately help to break the bottlenecks in veterans' housing and provide careers for veterans. The veterans' organizations also like the features that will enable capable veterans to trade abroad, to return as technical and business experts to help modernize many of the very countries they helped to liberate such a short time ago. They believe, also, that the program provided by the Veterans Corporation will be a powerful factor in strengthening our ties with other countries in the United Nations, thus helping to prevent war.

"This legislation will also enable us to plan ahead for the 2,700,000 now in training. Domestically the Veterans Corporation should spread the base of our economy, which has already suffered by the alarming loss of many small industries and businesses which, heretofore, have given America its phenomenal economic strength. Unless we act quickly, there is the recognized danger that our economy will become top-heavy, as big business

must feed largely on small business. We believe, furthermore, that this legislation will be insurance against a recession, in fact, the best insurance now in sight.

"A statement, prepared by the experts of the Department of Commerce over the signature of Under Secretary Alfred Schindler, to Senator WAYNE MORSE of Oregon, concerning the Veterans' Corporation said: 'It is a well recognized fundamental of business economics that expanded commercial activity creates employment, and your bill, designed to incorporate the existing reservoir of young veterans in such expansion, offers the most intriguing possibilities of any piece of current legislation which has come to my attention * * *. America, in the years ahead, needs alert young men in business and the men released by the armed forces are the natural source of this necessary manpower potential. It seems to me that your bill strikes a new and intelligent chord. Government support in a business expansion program of the type you visualize is simply common sense.'

"The Commerce Department tells us that we now have hundreds of thousands of captured enemy trade secrets, patents and secret processes, many of which are immediately commercially profitable and suited to this program. The Interior Department tells us that millions of acres of good land are ready to be opened. There is a vast new opportunity in the further mechanization of agriculture and in industrial uses of agricultural products that they themselves can manufacture—establishing a better balanced economy.

"General Bradley said: 'We must have an agency such as this "Veterans' RFC," as the Veterans Administration, with its 200 hospitals and enormous load, has all that it can handle with hospitalization, pensions, claims, and insurance. We cannot handle the creation of employment opportunities for veterans; yet we receive thousands of letters blaming us for veterans being obliged to work at substandard wages or not finding a job at all.'

"In sponsoring this bill, we propose to nominate for appointment to the Board of Directors and to the Advisory Council of the Veterans Corporation (with the advice and consent of the Senate) outstanding leaders, such as Herbert Hoover, who can direct and counsel this important agency to serve its new high purpose for the Nation. The Board of Directors would establish standards for loans. Under it, a staff of the best technical experts would have two primary responsibilities: to enforce the standards, both before and after the establishment of the projects or enterprises; and, to provide technical service to the organizations or individuals to protect the Government against loss by protecting the organizations or individuals against failure.

"After other American wars, new frontiers were developed with the help of veterans. From the days of the Cumberland Road, which George Washington and other veterans helped to build and which speeded the development of our rich Midwest after the Revolutionary War, veterans have engineered and worked to stimulate our Nation's growth. Veterans helped to open the plains beyond St. Louis after the War of 1812. After the War Between the States, veterans helped to engineer and build our railroads to the west coast and to develop the valleys along the Pacific seaboard. The Federal Government helped develop these frontiers. Now vast new frontiers—the greatest frontiers in all American history—are ripe for development: the new technological frontier at home and the vast new frontier where we can help modernize other friendly countries (quoting from the bill) 'thereby cultivating those countries to become increasingly our friends and customers,' thus preventing war and strengthening the United Nations. There is also Alaska, the most strategic world area in this atomic age of over-the-pole flying. Our study of 'Veterans Opportunities in the Development of Alaska', that was made by Colonel Harris at President Roosevelt's direction, reveals that the Veterans Corporation now offers us a great opportunity to guide the rapid development of that vast rich Territory through veterans and others who are loyal to our form of Government. This program will offer protection against Communism to us in that strategic Territory.

"Secretary of Commerce Harriman states: 'Without expanding world trade, our own economy must shrink.' The program provided by the Veterans Corporation should make possible the peaceful, mutually profitable penetration of many foreign countries by American experts and capable veterans who are interested in setting up projects and business enterprises or developing natural resources. This will strengthen our foreign policy as it will demonstrate how on-the-scene democratic business can succeed in economic democracy. This would be particularly significant in those areas where our system of democracy must compete for survival with totalitarian and despotic systems. In this connection, it is important again to note that there should be little or no concern about the loyalties of the men selected and approved for such penetration. The War and Navy Departments already have their complete case histories, and our veterans have been screened as to their loyalties to our American form of Government. Furthermore, this overseas economic development program would be accomplished without the drain on our Treasury that additional foreign loans would impose.

"The experts in the State Department are giving us their hearty cooperation in making plans for the modernization of certain countries where the Veterans Corporation legislation will meet the emergency, as it is acknowledged that this Veterans Corporation bill has prospects of earlier enactment than any other legislation for accomplishing those objectives of economic development on the ground level in other countries.

"This legislation will undoubtedly stimulate an ever-expanding economy in industry, agriculture, unused natural resources, and overseas trade sufficient to assure full employment in the United States for the decades covered by the term of this legislation."

SMALL BUSINESS SPREADS ITS WINGS—TECHNICAL ADVISORY SERVICE UNDER THE LITTLE MAN'S RFC

The advisory service to be provided under our "little man's RFC" will afford the small-business men and the ambitious veteran the latest technical and trade information recently developed at an expense of many billions of dollars in research by the United States Government, other friendly governments, and private agencies. In addition, the great wealth of scientific information captured in enemy countries will be made available.

Our advisory service will save time and money for small-business men and veterans, as it will afford them the specific information they wish, at the time they need it. As it is now, the little fellows in business must wait months and even years before the information they desire can be cleared through the many ramifications of Government and private agencies.

The surest way to avoid the danger of the encroachment of monopoly in the United States is to spread the base of our economy by aiding small business and veterans in domestic trade and in overseas trade.

The big industrial corporations, having large expert staffs, can acquire information from Government and private agencies more easily than small business, because they know exactly where to go and what to look for. Our advisory service will give the little operator similar advantages.

Following is a brief presentation of the kind of information that is being coordinated and the services that will be made available to small-business men and ambitious veterans:

1. Technical information:

a. United States Government research, which includes the research carried on in all Government departments, including nonsecret developments in the Department of Defense. Several billion dollars have already been spent on this research, and much of the technical information can now be put to profitable commercial use.

b. Captured German and Japanese research documents, of which there are 1,600,000 German patents and processes. Many of them are unknown to the American market and are commercially practicable and profitable. It is estimated that the commercial value now of this material to American businessmen exceeds $25,000,000,000.

c. Exchange information with other countries. Under this plan, friendly countries provide the United States with their research information in exchange for American information.

d. Nonsecret atomic information applicable in industry, medicine, and science.

e. New techniques to produce better or cheaper products.

2. New markets and trade outlets:

a. Opportunities in the United States

(1) The surveys we are currently making reveal new oportunities at home for small business to help fill the requirements under the European recovery program.

b. Opportunities overseas

(1) Sales outlets—new opportunities for exporting goods

(2) Manufacturing abroad

(a) Licensees

(b) Mutually owned stock companies

(c) Branch plants

(d) Advisory service to foreign firms on a royalty basis

(3) The selection of commercial representatives abroad

c. Opportunities in importing

3. Large share for small business and veterans in the exploitation of our natural resources:

a. The Government-controlled lands in the United States and in our possessions exceeds 36 percent of the total land area. Our plan offers the small-business man new opportunities to expand his business or to start a new business.

(1) Mining: We have many known and unknown mineral deposits that have been exploited almost entirely by big business, as Government red tape and leasing laws have usually made it unprofitable for the little fellow to operate.

(2) Reclamation: In the reclamation areas, a wealth of new businesses can be started as new settlements are made or old settlements expand.

(3) Timber and forestry: Many small businesses can benefit from the new research in wood products and the derivatives of wood.

(4) New industrial uses for agricultural products.

4. Stockpiling critical items for peacetime purposes and for the present national emergency. Under our plan small business at home and abroad can have an equitable share in stock piling.

Only a fraction of German and Japanese material has been made available to American industry. Our service will speed the dissemination of this valuable research information, through which America has already profited in large measure.

Among the many successful small businesses that have been started as a result of obtaining the new technology, we find: the manufacture of dry ice; tanning hides and skins into leather; molding compounds, using

sawdust, wood-flour, etc.; paper match-book manufacturer; making potato chips; metalizing baby shoes; tinning by hot-dipped methods; establishing a small ferrous-metal foundry; mirror manufacture; hot-dip galvanizing; electroplating; precision or investment-mold casting; silver plating; porcelain enameling; the manufacturing of candy, Christmas-tree ornaments, envelope and stamp adhesives, and straw-hat cleaners.

In addition to the developments listed above, there are many other new developments. Following are a few examples:

1. Ointment preventing the sterility of cattle
2. Vaccine against foot-and-mouth disease, which has been tested in Mexico and the United States
3. Dental development in which new substances have been introduced as an alloy substitute
4. Seed virility agent used for a quick test of germination and also as a diagnostic dye for living tissue
5. Pesticides as a more effective substitute for DDT
6. A nicotine substitute
7. Food fat from synthetic fatty acids prepared in Germany especially for use in submarines, on account of its stability against rancidity
8. Successful preparation of highly concentrated proteins from fish and shell fish

The following machines and equipment were brought over from Germany to advance the technology of American industry:

1. Lathe and thread-rolling attachment
2. Cylindrical grinding machine
3. Ultra-precision form grinder
4. Pavement breaker
5. Expansion circuit breaker
6. Measuring machine
7. Double-twist cord twister
8. Atmosphere compressor
9. Metalized paper condensing machine
10. Motorcycles
11. Electric balance machine

OTHER EXAMPLES OF BUSINESS OPPORTUNITIES

Synthetic fuel: The synthetic fuel process is estimated to be worth $20,000,000,000 to the United States, as it will supplement our peacetime diminishing fuel supplies and reinforce our national security.

Ceramics: In the past ceramics were made by the wet process, in which shrinkage always occurred, and in an amount which could not be predicted accurately. A German machine has been found that stamps dry ceramic parts rather than wet parts, as has previously been done. This type of machine is now available to the American market and is being utilized to the advantage of the ceramic industry.

Vacuum-type techniques: More improvements have been made by the Germans in vacuum tube designs than in any other branch of electronics. At the end of hostilities many vacuum tubes were brought to this country and disseminated to our vacuum-tube manufacturers. As a result new and improved tubes are already available.

X-ray tube developments: German scientists also greatly improved X-ray tubes and techniques. New materials were developed and new techniques evolved which have extended the power and application of X-rays and, at the same time, reduced the size and voltages required. Numerous complete X-ray installations have been made available to X-ray manufacturers in this country.

Metalized condenser process: The metalized condenser process is one of the most revolutionary finds brought over from Germany. A company in the United States has a contract with the military for supplying 8,000,000 small condensers for the proximity fuse. The condensers are 50 percent smaller and 40 percent cheaper. This new process alone will save the condenser industry of the Nation millions of dollars per year.

Another large company has already built five machines to be used in manufacturing 25,000,000 condensers for desk telephones similar to those in everyday office use. The reduction in size of the condensers has brought about a complete redesign of the desk telephone. The new telephone will soon be found in common use.

Hormones: Considerable progress has been made in the synthesis of hormones, especially of sex hormones from animal and vegetable material, such as certain species of soybeans, etc. This new research will be profitable to the medical profession.

Insulin: In Germany, insulin—an important corrective agent in diabetes—was prepared from the pancreas of codfish. Its production from the whale might be a new, economical source opening up an entirely new field of insulin production.

Sand casting: In the field of metals and minerals, one of the important items to come to light was a new method of sand molding. This process was developed late in the war years in Germany, but its use had not obtained widespread practice. Some of the claims for it, verified by a Government agency, were that castings made by this process had a much cleaner and smoother surface than ordinary sand castings, and that the process was applicable to the casting of unusually thin sections of steel. As a foundry process, it can be equally useful to both large and small industries. Present interest in its use in this country stems mostly from small business, as the capital investment it requires is unusually low. Other evidence of its importance appears in the interest shown in the process by one of our largest chemical companies.

Batteries: Another item which is likely to assume importance in military as well as in commercial use is the nickel cadmium storage battery, which can be used in such products as walkie-talkie sets and for other applications where lightweight batteries are essential.

Steel: The process of the cold extrusion of steel found its chief use in Germany in the mass production of military items such as shell cases and cylinders used in the landing gear of airplanes. We can now extend that application of this technology to our own production.

Magnesium die casting: The Germans developed pressure die casting of magnesium. Since the use of high pressure in casting has never been undertaken in this country, a complete die-casting machine was brought to the United States. Work with this machine is under way at this time in various fields where die casting can be used, and it has great promise for the future.

New optical devices: Due to the requirements of war, many new optical instruments were produced in Germany with improvements in associated techniques. New methods of grinding lenses and of coating them were found. The information was made available to the American optical companies. Likewise, numerous novel optical instruments were brought to this country and circulated among the optical manufacturers and any others who might desire them.

We found during the war that it facilitated production to have small companies make optical lenses. The new German methods can also be used to advantage by small companies.

Color photography: A new and less complicated method for prc ucing color photography was developed in wartime Germany. This process has been analyzed with great precision and excellent reports covering every phase of the new technique are available now to the American market. "Climbing the Matterhorn," the first moving picture in which the process was used, was recently released. Feature films will be issued shortly.

Drugs—morphine substitutes: The Germans discovered morphine substitutes, which they synthesized to furnish medical agents that remove pain or spasms. The substitutes are much less poisonous and less habit-forming than morphine. Further improvement led to a product which is now being marketed by at least three American firms and by one English firm under different names.

Blood substitute: The Germans developed a blood substitute which assists in restoring blood pressure and which is useful in heavy blood losses and also for sustaining effects in medication. This process is now being studied for use in the United States.

Oxo compounds: Oxo compounds made by the Fisher-Tropsch reaction: Through use of this reaction, synthetic fats, which are a direct substitute for the increasingly scarce edible fats, may prove to be a major article of commerce. In addition, the lower molecular weight compounds offer a wide range of raw materials of the aldehyde and acid type, the use of which may open up entirely new types of chemical raw materials for American industry.

While the Fisher-Tropsch reaction was originally intended for use in the development of synthetic liquid fuels of the gasoline and fuel-oil type, the development of oxo compounds may very probably develop into a major industry in this country. The use of these acids in the preparation of soaps and textile auxiliaries and wetting agents may well provide the solution of our present soap shortage. It is understood that at least one major chemical company is working on this type of reaction at the present time.

Toys: A toy company in the United States is producing a plastic toy automobile for children that is entirely new. This toy will meander across a desk or table top, but will not fall over the edge; it simply turns around and starts back in the other direction. The device which makes the toy automobile turn is a fifth wheel which is set in the middle of the frame at a right angle to the other wheels. The manufacturer states that bright plastics are used both because of their color appeal to children and because plastics will stand any amount of rugged handling by eager hands. Further advantages of plastics, according to the manufacturer, are the low number of handling and finishing operations necessary; the lightness of weight, which cuts transportation costs, and the smooth finish of the plastic sharp edges.

Infrared ray as detector: The Germans developed techniques for detecting enemy men and machines in total darkness with invisible infrared rays. The United States Army engineers also conducted valuable research in this field. The infrared searchlights send out their invisible rays, and the image of the target is reflected and transformed into a visible image on a viewing apparatus. A report of American experts discloses that the Nazis effectively used searchlights of invisible light on rifles of infantrymen, enabling a Nazi sniper to spot and shoot enemy soldiers in "complete darkness up to a distance of about 100 yards". Apart from its wartime use, the infrared apparatus could be used on rifles for night hunting and for many commercial purposes.

Selenium rectifiers: The Germans invented the selenium rectifier. Rectifiers are used in many branches of the electronics industry, in radio and radar sets, in battery-charging devices, and whenever it is necessary to convert alternating voltage into direct voltage. Such devices normally make use of the rectifying qualities of copper oxide. The use of selenium renders them cheaper and more reliable. This, of course, advances the art and benefits the public.

One United States company manufacturing selenium rectifiers has remodeled and expanded its factory to incorporate the layout and methods of German plants.

Torpedoes and bombs: The Germans developed a missile which was controlled in flight by electric impulses through very fine steel wires connecting plane and missile. As much as 50,000 feet of wire was used, even with bomb or torpedo traveling at high speeds. Another amazing discovery was a torpedo that could not miss; it was guided

by the sound of the target's propeller and was effective at 10 miles. It traveled 30 feet below the surface at 40 miles an hour, leaving no wake, and exploded either on contact with the ship or when directly under it. This information has certain commercial applications.

Wired radio broadcasting: The Germans developed a system of wired radio broadcasting. The programs enter the telephone central offices on wires (modulating carriers frequencies between 100,000 and 200,000 cycles), then are distributed over local telephone circuits and selected by the subscribers, who use their ordinary radio receivers. By this method, the programs are received entirely by metallic circuits, no radio being involved. In this way, static and other interferences are eliminated completely. The research and development carried out to produce these results can be used to the advantage of American industry.

Ionization of the air: A German made a study of the effects of ionization of the air upon the health and sensations of human beings. In general, he found that positively ionized air has undesirable effects upon the feelings and health, producing discomfort, ill temper, depression, and fear. In sensitive or allergic persons, positive ionization is found to be the cause of, or condition for, attacks of asthma, hay fever, high blood pressure, nervous tension, and similar symptoms. On the other hand, negatively ionized air tends to create a feeling of well-being, buoyancy, and optimism, similar to the effects of mountain air.

After much study and research, the conclusion was that negative ionized air is very beneficial to human beings, whereas, positively ionized air is detrimental. It is easy to see, therefore, that it is desirable to maintain air negatively ionized wherever possible. Herein lies great possibilities for creating an entirely new industry for manufacturing and installing industrial and home machines for negatively ionizing air. Such an industry would become as important as the air-conditioning industry.

Typed speech: The German invention of a device for transmitting speech directly into typed words is most ingenious. It is evident that the machines and apparatus resulting from the research can be of great new value to American businessmen and manufacturers.

Canes: An ingenious modification of a cane for cripples without a leg was perfected during the war by a professor in Germany. This cane is now manufactured in this country and is being used by large American hospitals.

Oil: A fluid known as R fluid, obtained in Germany, is at present being studied as ignition oil for internal combustion engines. This oil will be used to replace electric ignition.

Springs: Specifications taken from Germany on independent springing of automobile wheels has been furnished to a large motor company in the United States.

Diesel engines: A company in America has been working on small two-cycle Diesel engines for the past few years. They expect the German data to be of material assistance to this new design.

Engines: A professor of one of our large State universities has been working with various Diesel manufacturers in the United States on the development of light, two-cycle loop scavenging engines. The Germans developed an air-cooled, two-stroke-cycle, valveless loop scavenging engine with a turned exhaust pipe which weighs approximately 7½ pounds per horsepower. This engine could be used as a portable generator for Signal Corps radio stations or light plants.

Metallurgy: The field of powdered metallurgy products presents new industrial opportunities to both large and small business.

Blasting: Soft grit blasting and cleaning of metal surfaces has been promoted by one of our Government offices as a new business field. It is believed that there are great possibilities here.

Hemp industry: The hemp industry has been thoroughly studied by the Government. It is believed that the development of a "poor man's linen" industry, as well as of a domestic cordage business, could successfully be carried out.

X-ray: A large company in the United States recently announced it had developed an X-ray thickness gage, which enables continuous production of accurate sheet and strip. This gage will be used in measuring the thickness of all types of material, including steel, glass, plastics, and nonferrous metals. Off-gage material is automatically rejected. Basic advantages of an X-ray thickness gage are the following: there is no contact with material, the surface will not be marred, thin foil will not be torn, and no part of the gage will be worn; there is instant response to changes, and easy access to areas difficult to gage by other methods. The design can be changed for inspection of complicated shapes, which, it is expected, will make the gage applicable to the production of bottles and similar objects with internal voids.

Plywood boats: Government research enabled two veterans in Minneapolis to go into the production of plywood round-bottom rowboats. In this case the information was about the proper adhesive to use and problems of pressure and temperature. A detailed report was submitted to the two veterans, who now employ 150 people and are publicizing their boats and enjoying a good business.

Wool plant: During the war a firm engaged in war production considered entering the woolen mill business after the war. They owned a large building with rail, truck, and water shipping facilities. Plenty of good water and wool was available.

These people had sufficient capital, but knew nothing of the woolen busniess. They obtained Government technical advice, and all of the problems were worked out. The plant now employs 140 persons making woolen sports clothing of the California type.

Recording machine: A company in New Jersey, employing two dozen men, is now in the business of manufacturing the German magnetic recording machine called the Magnetophone. This is a sound-recording device using a metalized plastic tape instead of the usual disk. This machine is one of several now being produced in the United States as copied from German developments. This particular machine is a high fidelity model for radio station transcriptions and sells for $3,000. The machines manufactured by several other companies are less expensive models for home use.

Fertilizer: Nitrogenous fertilizer is in critical short supply both here and abroad. Great new opportunities exist in the manufacture and separate distribution of these products.

Fertilizer made from fish and sea-food byproducts has also been the subject of thorough study by the Government. A few trial plants have already entered this field.

Fish: Shark fishing is an industry which is greatly underdeveloped. In addition to the meal, skin, oil, and fins, which are now the principal products of shark fishing, the basic elements for vitamins and insulin can be secured for profitable commerce.

A grocery clerk in Morehead City, N. C., was advised by his physician to give up his job as grocery clerk after he had undergone a mastoid operation. He turned to shark fishing and last year was recommended to the Saudi Arabian Government as a qualified shark-fishing instructor by the United States Bureau of Fisheries. He went to Jedda, where he spent 4 months before returning to the United States to obtain modern gear for his work. The Government of Saudi Arabia has given him a contract to teach Red Sea fishermen how to catch sharks. He expects to teach the Arabian fishermen how to use modern nets and set lines and how to prepare and cure the liver and skin of the captured sharks. In this country, the liver of the soup fin shark, found in west-coast waters, sells for as high as $7 a pound because of its high vitamin content. The selling price of the liver of other species ranges as low as 12 cents a pound. He expects that the skin of the Red Sea sharks, like that of sharks in domestic waters, will be suitable for processing for eventual use in the manufacture of women's shoes and other leather goods. Since 1937, when this former grocery clerk started shark fishing, he has caught 6,500 sharks and has made money.

In the fall of 1943, the president of a precision metal-working plant went on a duck hunting trip. On this hunting trip, baked carp was served and it tasted surprisingly good. In fact, it was so good that the businessman wondered if there might not be a commercial market for canned carp. He gave much thought to the idea and devised an attractive trade name and sales plan. After preliminary work had been done, a trial run took place in the research and experimental laboratory of a large canning company.

The tests were entirely satisfactory, both to civilian and military personnel, and the first carp cannery in the United States was erected. This plant now employs 100 people and, in 1946, 200,000 14-ounce cans of canned carp were furnished to the Army alone. Since the fillet only is canned, nearly two-thirds of each fish would be waste. Now a subsidiary plant for the utilization of the waste fish to produce fish meal has been established.

Heretofore, our experience with loan programs, such as our proposed Veterans Economic Development Corporation, has been profitable to the taxpayers. To illustrate this point, I quote another cosponsor of our "Little Man's RFC," Senator HUGH BUTLER, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which committee is concerned with the natural resources in the vast domain of the United States and our possessions:

"As Chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and as a cosponsor of the bill to establish a Veterans Economic Development Corporation, I would like to let you know some of the tremendous potentialities that I hope can be realized through enactment of this bill. I refer to the almost unlimited opportunities for development of the economic resources of our great West, and of our last and greatest frontier in Alaska.

"Responsible economists are authority for the statement that our 11 Western States, with a present population of only about 16,000,000 could easily support a population of 60,000,000 people at a high level of prosperity if the resources of those States were adequately developed. If this statement seems amazing, it is only because too many of our people do not realize the tremendous possibilities of growth in the West. These resources include vast mineral deposits not yet surveyed in many cases, tremendous quantities of potential hydroelectric power, millions of acres of dry land to be brought under irrigation, and many others.

"To give only one example of the wealth that is waiting there to be opened up for productive use, the full development of irrigation in the 17 western reclamation States can bring into cultivation 20,000,000 additional acres of highly productive land.

"Irrigated land of this type has a high value per acre and a high productive capacity, and can be conservatively valued, on the average, at $200 per acre. It is evident that such a program would involve the ultimate development of agricultural wealth to the extent of a $4,000,000,000 increase in the value of the land alone. That should give some idea of the size of the program, without even mentioning the possibilities of mineral and industrial development.

"The other great undeveloped region that seems to offer tremendous hope for the future is Alaska. This vast territory is more than one-sixth of the entire area of the United States. Alaska is now the key to our national security. It will never be safe until it is more densely populated. The economic potentialities are equally important. Alaska has abundant natural resources and an equable climate. Its area is far greater than that of Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, yet the population of Alaska is only 100,000, compared to 13,000,000 in Scandinavia. To mention only one important resource, Alaska has enough good timber to supply one-fourth of the newsprint pulp requirements of the United States in perpetuity, taking into account the regrowth of the trees. This means that thousands of new industries based on wood, wood pulp, and their byproducts and chemical derivatives could provide a tremendous basis for employment.

"All of this development means opportunities for expanded prosperity to thousands of our people. I am thinking particularly of our millions of veterans, many of whom are looking for an opportunity to help carve out a new economic empire. This bill is particularly designed to provide such an opportunity.

"What our Western States and Alaska need is capital that would stay in the country and develop it, plus the energy of our veterans. This bill provides for both, plus the adequate technical advice that is necessary for sound development and assurance of success.

"I believe this bill would serve as a spearhead to get this development going. Section 2a (6) of the bill provides for the stimulation of profitable activity so as to attract the investment of private risk capital within areas which at present still need such capital. The following subsection provides for assisting State, community, and private agencies in financing self-liquidating projects which will utilize profitably the services of our veterans. I believe these two subsections fit precisely the needs of our undeveloped territories in the West and Alaska.

"In many fields the Federal Government has found it necessary to stimulate economic expansion and pioneering development by self-liquidating loans. It is worth mentioning that our experience with such loan programs has been profitable to the Government and the taxpayers. To illustrate this point, I only need mention such programs as Rural Electrification, Home Owners Loan, and Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, all of which are distinct financial successes. I am confident that the Veterans Economic Development Corporation would be at least as successful from a financial standpoint.

"In short, I believe that veterans need and deserve some such program as this, and I believe that the Nation will benefit from mobilizing their talents in a program of economic expansion. I am glad to join with you in pushing for early consideration of the proposal.

"Sincerely,

"HUGH BUTLER,
"United States Senator."

When Senator BRIDGES made his tour of Europe and the Mediterranean as head of an 11-member investigating committee of the Senate Appropriations Committee which evaluated the needs of the European recovery program, he was invited by the National Broadcasting Co. to make a coast-to-coast speech on the situation as he saw it. As Senator BRIDGES spoke of the need for our "Little Man's RFC" and of the saving it would mean to our taxpayers, I ask that his very interesting speech be inserted in the RECORD, for I am sure our taxpayers will be interested in reading it.

"Over 2 years ago * * * the guns of World War II were thought to be silenced. We can never forget the spontaneous rejoicing that spread around the world when the news of the peace was announced. It was universally believed then that this time peace had come to the world to stay. The war had left the world so badly ravaged that free men just could not perceive 2 years ago anything but a lasting peace on earth. We could not imagine that any man or any group of men could have the suicidal attitude it would take to block any effort toward lasting peace. The world had been shaken by the atom bomb. All the world knew that man had created an instrument which could mean his own destruction.

"In that charged atmosphere, America was called upon to assume a great twofold task. We were called to build here at home a sound peacetime economy. We were called to help build the world into a citadel of peace, progress, and freedom. We knew then and we know now that to fail in this work will mean the end of civilization as we know it. That is a strong statement. But it is the truth.

"There are more shocking truths. Over 2 years after the ending of World War II there is no real peace: There has been little progress; except in America the world has no real freedom; nowhere on earth is there a sound peacetime economy. Shocking as these truths are neither the people of America nor the people of the world are really alert to them.

"The situation is such today that we cannot tell how close the world may be to another armed conflict; we cannot tell how nearly humankind may be to economic chaos.

"Today's terrific struggle is for the possession of the minds of men. Upon the outcome of the struggle depends the bondage or freedom of mankind. World War II was born of world economic instability. The seeds of bitterness were sown in areas of the world where poverty was a byword. Leaders without scruples took advantage of hungry nations to harrangue them into a complete surrender of every liberty, and then into a war which has left them prostrate before the world. The same conditions which gave rise to Hitler in Germany, Mussolini in Italy, the Communists in Russia, and the war lords in Japan haunt Europe and Asia today. Europe and Asia are covered with a topsoil of hunger and economic distress which has invited the spread of cancerous communism.

"If we fail to sustain the distressed, and fail to teach them to help themselves, then they and perhaps all the world will be plunged into communistic darkness.

"That is why a sound peacetime economy is vital to America. That is why a sound peacetime economy here at home is vital to the world. It is a shocking fact that America has allowed much of this American relief work to be done in Communist-dominated areas under Communist direction. The result has been that we have placed a drain on our own uncertain national economy without getting at the roots of the economic problems of the "have not" countries. That means that the distressed people and some Americans have been dipping into our National Treasury as if it were a bottomless pit. It would be a great thing if the National Treasury were the bottomless pit so many think it is. Then we could sponsor any nation no matter what the cost. But our resources are a limited reservoir. They must be used with their definite limitations in mind. The cost of what we are asked to do must be counted. Ways must be devised to replace that cost to America, which is the last great hope on earth for those who like to help themselves, and be free to do it, and to survive.

"There can be no economic progress on earth if America is not economically strong.

"AMERICA MUST PLAN FOR THE FUTURE

"America cannot long be economically sound at the rate we are going today. Here we are at a time when the need for our money, our resources, and our production is greater than ever before in our history and we find ourselves with less money, poorer in resources, and relatively lower in production than we have ever been. We could discuss at length some of the inexcusable reasons for our national condition. We could talk about the reckless spending of your money on nonproductive programs during the prewar years. We could talk about the constant refusal of some men in the Government to cooperate in saving your money today. We could discuss the careless use of the Nation's resources without any planning for their replacement. We could talk about the "don't care" attitude of many toward greater production at this time when greater production could do so much to assist the American people and other peoples of the world. On the other hand, we could refer to proposals which are being put forward by sound thinking, loyal Americans to improve conditions at home and to help America to improve the conditions of the world. That is what I choose to do tonight.

"THE VETERANS ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION ACT INTRODUCED

"Eighteen other Members of the United States Senate joined with me to introduce a bill which we believe could help solve America's and the world's economic problems. A companion bill was introduced in the House of Representatives. That bill is called the Veterans Economic Development Corporation Act. That is the formal name. It is becoming known as the Veterans' RFC or the "Little Man's RFC.' Let me quote from the bill itself so that you can understand its purpose. It is designed, and I quote: 'to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers for veterans in a free competitive economy.'

"This so-called 'Veterans' RFC' places emphasis on opportunities and careers for veterans. The basic aim, however, is to urge the development of America's untapped natural resources and untapped productive capacity to the personal and group welfare of all the American people. This so-called 'Veterans 'RFC,' by urging such a development of our resources and productive capacity, would take advantage of the staggering demand for American goods and services throughout the world. That would spell economic progress for our people and our country.

"Most of you are familiar with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, commonly referred to as the RFC. Stated simply, the Veterans Economic Development Corporation, or the 'Veterans' RFC' would work for individuals and small business in much the same way as the original RFC works for big business and big industry.

"Perhaps the outstanding feature of this proposed 'Veterans' RFC' is that no appropriations of public money would be required for its operation. The agency is not designed to compete and would not compete with private banking. It would aid private banking and other private agencies in fields where they do not and cannot operate. The original RFC which today operates mostly as an aid to big business and big industry has turned back into the Federal Treasury a profit of more than $500,000,000. Those who have been studying the possibilities of the proposed 'Veterans' RFC' believe that, in addition to direct help to the national economy, it would return to our Federal Treasury a profit greater than that realized by the existing RFC.

"THE COST OF WAR

"The cost of war does not end when the guns are silenced. The cost goes on almost without end. This means that as generations come of age they assume whatever burden of debt and taxes is upon the country. This means that the millions of men and women who sacrificed years of their lives in fighting for America must sacrifice as long as they live to pay for the war they fought. It means that their children and their children's children must also sacrifice to pay the cost of war. That is why any program which would help veterans to help themselves or help the people generally to help themselves would be such a service to

them because it would lower the debt and tax load which they must bear.

"Last spring when General Bradley came before the Senate Appropriations Committee, of which I am Chairman, I asked him what percentage of America's total population is made up of veterans and their dependents. The answer which he gave to us should interest every American citizen and especially the veterans of our country. It should interest the veterans especially because it shows the great burden they and their families have upon their shoulders in spite of the great service they have already rendered America. General Bradley told us that really almost every person in the United States is either directly related to a veteran or has some interest in a veteran's welfare. He told us that 'the number of living veterans, their wives, their children under 18, and other relatives in homes of which living veterans are heads was 46 million on January 1, 1947.' He told us further that it is estimated that by 1957 that number will increase to 62,500,000. That means that by 1957 40 percent of the total American population will either be veterans themselves or dependent upon veterans. I mention these figures in my discussion of the 'Veterans' RFC' because this proposed agency would help this great segment of our population to make sound plans for the future and make their lives less burdensome than they will be if constructive action is not taken to assure them the opportunity to be in a position to always help themselves and their families. I want to emphasize that the figures and percentages I have given to you, large as they are, include only living veterans. They do not include those who are receiving benefits as the dependents of veterans who have passed on.

"THE VETERANS' RFC IS NOT A CURE-ALL

"We who proposed the 'Veterans' RFC' do not claim that it will do all things for all men. We stated when it was introduced that we wanted it studied by our colleagues and the American people with a view to its improvement. What we do claim is that the bill provides a basis on which a program can be built which will set in motion in the American way machinery which would help build a sound America and help build a lasting peace. The bill provides a basis upon which can be built a program that would go far in meeting America's most pressing problems today. The best protection against inflation and economic chaos is lower taxes and increased production at fair prices. Such a 'Veterans' RFC' as we proposed would help lower the cost of government and thereby help lower taxes. It would promote production and greater production would help bring fair prices. The plan has down-to-earth common sense that every American can understand. It has the common-sense objectives which all loyal Americans share. Almost everywhere in this country and the world there is work to be done that is not being done now. The people who want the work done and the workers who would like to do it have under present conditions no way of meeting one another. We see in such a plan as the 'Veterans' RFC' a way to help bring the jobless man to the manless job. It would help provide a place to work for those veterans who are today receiving a college education or on-the-job training. It is a fact that, although the country has gone to great lengths to provide education and training for veterans, no sound steps have yet been taken to provide in the traditional American free-enterprise system, a place for them to apply what they learn. If such a place is not provided, then the veterans' investment in time, and his neighbors' investment in money, will both have been lost.

"THE FUTURE OF AMERICAN BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY

"You sometimes hear some Americans say that there is no future for American farming or business or industry under our present system. That is the bunk. Those who make such statements are the people in our midst who just don't want to see our system work. There are still Americans with vision; there are still Americans with ambition; there are still Americans with initiative. They outnumber overwhelmingly those who lack vision—those who, in lacking vision, ambition, and initiative, would like under some other system of government to be in a position to tell the rest of us what to do and how to do it. These sound Americans can always be in the great majority if we remain alert in this time of economic stress and strain. Our country is still young. So is American business and industry. We have now the greatest demand ever for American production in every field. We are not going to train men or employ men to meet that demand if we are going to leave everything to Government direction and Government edict. The country is going to be supplied with the right kind of manpower if we have the right kind of program with the right kind of men directing it. Under a sound program, directed by sound men, the men and women who fought to preserve America are going to have the opportunities they deserve to work to preserve America and to better themselves.

"SURVEY OF THE COUNTRY

"Some of the veterans' organizations which are supporting the 'Veterans' RFC' are already at work in local communities across the country surveying needs and planning where this program could be applied. In my own State of New Hampshire little groups in the cities and towns called know-how committees are being formed. They will consist of representatives of the veterans, the fields of science, agriculture, education, labor, business, industry, and religion. The functions of these committees will be to recommend out of their knowledge and experience the possible projects which could be devised and profitably undertaken by the individuals and small businesses within their communities. At home we are calling this the New Hampshire plan, and we have already discovered many worthy self-liquidating projects which could be sponsored under the 'Veterans' RFC.' We know individuals with initiative and ambition who under the 'Veterans' RFC' could improve themselves and their communities without cost to the Government.

"The veterans' organizations which have cooperated in the study and introduction of this 'Veterans' RFC' tell me that they expect this community interest, these know-how committees to spread across the country. They tell me what I have found to be true that what most Americans want, and especially American veterans, is a sound chance to help themselves and thereby further help their country.

"WHAT OTHERS THINK ABOUT THE VETERANS' RFC

"Senator REVERCOMB of West Virginia who is the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works tells me that he sees the 'Veterans' RFC' as a help in developing self-liquidating public projects like parking areas, auditoriums, toll roads, toll bridges, public markets, airports, and irrigation projects. He believes that under this proposed legislation, communities would be able to rehabilitate their public works and educational institutions after the necessary neglect of the war years.

"Owen C. Holleran, the Commander of the American Legion of the department of Washington, D. C., states that under the provisions of the veterans' corporation bill, housing for veterans can be speeded. With its long-term-credit facilities, private banks and private builders can break the bottlenecks in housing developments for rental units and single dwellings at prices veterans can afford to pay. The provisions of the veterans' corporation make unnecessary any Federal, State, or municipal subsidies. In this way, roads can be put in and engineering work performed to develop immediately the areas suitable for housing. The provisions of this bill would enable builders and veterans, under our free-enterprise system, to break the housing bottlenecks all the way from raw materials to finished houses with the same speed that they met our building requirements during the war.

"In an inventory being taken by Col. George Ijams, Director of Rehabilitation of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, he reports that in the 48 States, housing for veterans tops the list of self-liquidating projects that could be served under this bill.

"When I spoke at the recent VFW Forty-eighth National Encampment in Cleveland, Commander-in-Chief Brannaman told me their inventory revealed that there is hardly a community in the Nation that would not profit by the passage of this bill.

"Omar Ketchum, the VFW Legislative Director, termed it, 'one of the most constructive pieces of veterans' legislation ever to be introduced in the Congress.'

"Congressman KEFAUVER of Tennessee, in whose State atomic energy is being created, says that our veterans can be trained and utilized to give us a head start in peacetime uses of atomic energy in industry, commerce, medicine, and in the development of useful power from nuclear fuels. Atomic energy will create a demand for entirely new types of equipment and open new fields in engineering. Under the provisions of the Veterans Corporation, the United States can help to set the pace in peacetime uses of atomic power.

"BILL WOULD REDUCE FOREIGN AID

"Let me give you a bird's-eye view of how the 'Veterans' RFC' would reduce our financial aid. Many countries such as France, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Egypt, Arabia, Iraq, Iran, China, India, Korea, the Philippines, and our Latin-American neighbors plead with us for American technicians and the know-how to show their people how our free enterprise operates in the United States. Many of our veterans, sensing the vast new opportunities for economic development in other countries, wish to join with American technical experts and engineers to take advantage of these world-wide opportunities. American veterans, teamed up with American experts, would constitute the greatest army of good-will missionaries the world has ever known. Under the provisions of the Veterans Economic Development Corporation Act they would demonstrate the advantage of our American free-enterprise system. These manufacturing, scientific, and agricultural pilot operations in friendly countries would be particularly significant in those areas of Europe and Asia where our way of life must compete for survival with such despotic systems as fascism and communism.

"Ray Brannaman, Commander-in-Chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, writes: 'While this bipartisan measure is designed primarily to strengthen our domestic economy, it would also reinforce our foreign relations. * * * Never before in history have we had so many potential good-will missionaries as we have in our veterans, 12,000,000 of whom are veterans with foreign service. They understand foreign relations as American veterans who have had first-hand experience in serving in every quarter of the globe. The program provided by the 'Veterans' RFC' will be a powerful new factor in preventing war by strengthening our ties with other countries in the United Nations.'

"Ray Sawyer, National Commander of the AMVETS of World War II, writes: 'Whether American postwar history repeats itself, with resurgent waves of veteran discontent and angry bonus marchers, depends on what the leaders of our country do to help veterans help themselves. * * * Your bill expresses the hopes of millions of World War II veterans by encouraging them to seek productive careers, and by restoring opportunities lost while in the service of the Nation. It

will not only help veterans, but will reinforce democracy at home and contribute to peace throughout the world.'

"I should like to quote from a letter I received from James F. O'Neil of New Hampshire, the newly elected National Commander of the American Legion, concerning the Veterans Economic Development Corporation bill. In recognizing our national emergency he said: 'I believe it is possible that your doctrine may go far to assure prosperity and peace for the United States and for the United Nations by integrating the economy of other countries with ours. By utilizing the manpower and the skills of the veterans, you put your finger on what I believe is the spearhead to prosperity and Americanism against depression and Communism.' "

CONCLUSION

"In closing I want to repeat that if there is to be freedom anywhere we must preserve freedom in America. We must preserve our free institutions and our free economic system. To do that we must devise sound ways to employ our men and resources, and to improve our national economy. That is why this proposed 'Veterans' RFC' was conceived. That is why we invite the people to study it. America and the world have never known a more challenging period and it is for our very survival that we must meet the challenge if we can.

"As I talk with you tonight, I am thinking of the decisions some of us will have to make tomorrow—decisions which will help to shape America's and the world's future. As I talk with you tonight, I am thinking ahead of the investigation some of us have been called upon to make in the devastated areas of Europe. I am thinking of the decisions we must make upon the basis of the facts we find—other decisions which must help shape the course of America and the world in this uncertain hour. That is why those of us who propose such a program as the 'Veterans' RFC' are anxious that every sound opportunity be accepted to improve America and keep her forever strong. Most of the world leans upon us today. The hope of the world for peace rests in us. The hope of the world for justice is in us. The hope for world progress lies in our welfare, security, and ability to move forward."

Here is another message that I am confident will interest every progressive small-business man and farmer. We are fortunate to have in the Senate a man who is both a successful manufacturer and farmer, Senator HOMER CAPEHART of Indiana, a member of our Banking and Currency Committee and of the Special Committee to Study Problems of American Small Business. After Senator CAPEHART had completed his important mission to Alaska, he also was invited to address the Nation over the NBC network. As copies of his timely speech have been requested, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to insert it in the RECORD:

"PROSPERITY THROUGH PRODUCTION

"I have just returned from heading a Senate Investigating Committee to investigate our national defense in the Territory of Alaska and to determine the fastest way of developing the economy of that vast rich Territory for the benefit of our people in the United States.

"I made this trip because I view Alaska as the one most pivotal point on the earth's surface today. The shortest route by bomber from Asia to important production centers of the United States lies directly over Alaska. In this sense Alaska is the key to world control. Where we had a protective moat of water 3,000 miles wide in the Atlantic and another moat 5,000 miles wide in the Pacific during World War I and II, we now have only 3 miles between our Territory and Russian territory in Alaska.

"I say all this to draw your attention to the fact that when—or if—we are drawn into world war III, Alaska will be a pivotal point of contest. But it is my firm belief and the belief of many authorities that we can prevent world war III before the shooting starts. As other wars of recent history have been allowed to breed through economic causes, the United States must take action promptly.

"The United States of America stands at the crossroads of all human history. The action we take now will determine the immediate course of human history as we are today in a position to determine that course. We are either going to have war or permanent peace, and it is just as simple as that. The choice is ours.

"All authorities agree that World War I and World War II were brought about basically through economic maladjustments throughout the world, rather than by the imperialism of warlike nations. Hindsight is easier than foresight. Had we had the knowledge before both world wars that we have today, we surely could have prevented those two horrible and devastating catastrophes that engulfed all mankind.

"All evidence through our diplomatic sources and military intelligence reveals that Russia is positively preparing for war against the United States. Her action in the United Nations to split the world into two parts makes this obvious. Russia's refusal to cooperate in controlling the atomic bomb against its use in warfare makes it conclusive that she is bent on only one course And that course is war. Although Russia has thousands of her representatives in this country gathering our industrial and scientific secrets, Russia has denied Senator BRIDGES and his 11 members of the Senate Appropriations Committee the courtesy of visiting American property—our own United States Embassy in Moscow.

"As we all know, through Russian imperialism, democracy has died in all of eastern Europe. Within two years after Hitler's fall and without firing a shot Russia has already consumed nearly all the gains which Hitler acquired through years of warfare and political conquests.

"The only peaceful solution to the threat of world aggression on the part of Russia is through the rehabilitation of friendly European countries. Obviously, they cannot do this solely by themselves. We can aid them not only by providing food to keep them alive, but by supplying them with the machinery necessary to enable them to help themselves. The only way that we can supply these demands is through production.

"Production is not only the principal peaceful means by which we can check the influx of communism abroad, it is also the main method by which we can combat the surge of our main enemy at home—inflation In the Communist strategy of world conquest, Russia is counting most on the breakdown of the economy of the United States They know that if our economy is drained we cannot aid other democratic countries that seek our help.

"Let us look to the causes of this inflation which imperils our economy. Up until 193 I doubt if anyone had ever given thought to the philosophy of scarcity as a means of creating prosperity. Always we had prospered through the medium of plenty.

"However, this Nation through its Government at that time adopted the philosophy of scarcity—our Government tried to teach us the way to prosperity was by working fewer hours per day, fewer days per week, and reducing farm production—actually paying the farmer for not producing.

"By Government order farmers plowed under crops and the Government killed and disposed of thousands of pigs while hungry people looked on. This was the beginning of planned shortages. Then came the philosophy of working shorter hours in our factories.

"The general philosophy was that there was overproduction throughout the world and the way to prosperity was to produce less, work less—with the silly idea by so doing you could have more.

"The war, of necessity, changed all that overnight. Production was again the keyword to the success of our ideals and goals. But as soon as the war was over, and despite the rapid change-over from war production to peacetime production, the philosophy has been one of scarcity—in effect if not in word.

"Now any 10-year-old child should have known that we should have completely abandoned our philosophy of scarcity—less work, less production—because wars always require tremendous quantities of food and materials, and anyone knows who has studied the aftermath of war that for many years after a destructive war (and World War II was our most destructive) it requires tremendous quantities of food and production of all kinds and all types of goods.

"What we need, then, to discourage inflation at home and to aid friendly countries abroad in the fight for life and against communism is production, not at a prewar level, not at the wartime level, but at a new high postwar level. This is our only chance of success.

"At the request of many countries, we have loaned or made outright gifts of many billions of dollars to help them hold the line against the imperialism of Communist Russia. This outpouring of the funds of American taxpayers has already increased our cost of living and is one reason for holding our taxes high.

"Prosperity or wars are made by people. People themselves can either win or lose their freedom. If we are going to win the peace and win world war III before the shooting starts, we must do it through our people and with other people. We must build a stronger United States and a stronger United Nations. Individually, you and I are like drops of water in the ocean. But collectively, we have great power. It is only through organization and organized groups that we make our individual power effective. There is a similarity between our position in the world today and that of our forefathers in their efforts to build the United States on this continent. In the early days of the Republic, our forefathers as individuals were also unorganized and weak. It was only through the organization of individuals into groups and the organization of our various colonies into a United States that our forefathers began to show their strength.

"Today, we ourselves can again demonstrate our strength through organization and build a still greater United States of America and a strong United Nations of the world. We must increase our strength if we choose to stop Russian imperialism and prevent war. A few American diplomats negotiating in foreign capitals holding out American dollars is not strong enough. Now, we need the organized power of millions of our people and groups of people to give this new world purpose its motive force.

"I can think of no greater power in the world today than the moral and physical force of the 20,000,000 living veterans of America's wars. They have a greater moral power than any other segment of our people as they cut across all political, religious, racial, and geographic lines. Our veterans have served the Nation in its critical hour. They are truly the finest essence of our people. In our two World Wars, most of them were chosen by scientific methods for their physical and mental superiority. Many of them are now our leaders in important walks of life. Our younger veterans offer us a great new source of power to become leaders and form the backbone of a still greater nation.

"If we afford our veterans the economic opportunities they seek, they will help us achieve our national objectives in reducing

the high cost of living, in reducing taxes, and in preventing war.

"I wish to stress this evening the importance of this Veterans' Corporation bill when enacted, because I can foresee how it will combat our three big problems facing us today, namely, the high cost of living, the spread of Communism, and veterans' unemployment.

"One of the main features of this legislation is that it will be of no cost to our taxpayers, but will in turn reduce the heavy burden now being thrust upon our citizens. Our veterans do not want compensation. They want jobs and careers and the opportunity to enable them to become self-sufficient. The same applies to those needy countries of Europe. In the long run American dollars will not solve their problem. What they need is increased economic development. But only through American assistance can they acquire prosperity through production. This means that we must continue the types of assistance we are at present rendering, at the same time augmenting this increasingly with machinery and technical assistance necessary to restore their economic stability. We must inject some of our fighting and aggressive American spirit into the hearts and minds of these people before they allow themselves to be caught in the web of Russian imperialism which has spread over Europe.

"What better way can we help solve the problems of these unfortunate countries than by enforcing them with American experts in the field of production and the necessary equipment and machinery to enable them to once again become prosperous and self-sufficient? Under the Veterans' Corporation bill, there would be new opportunities for Americans with modern equipment and methods of soil and moisture conservation to help increase the grain production in the undeveloped areas of Canada, Mexico, Australia, Tehran, South Africa, and North Africa. With the present food shortages facing the world this would not only afford opportunities for American agricultural experts and enterprising veterans but it would also help to feed a hungry world and avoid an abnormal drain on our own supplies. For example, in the Peace River country in Canada along the Alaskan Highway, built by American funds, lies the greatest wheat-producing area left undeveloped on this continent. Americans and Canadians, being close friends, could together develop this rich area to the profit of both countries as an example of how this plan would work with cooperating democracies.

"We must act quickly. Friendly nations abroad are only temporarily helped by gifts, subsidies, and charity. That is why our foreign policy has failed.

"Our domestic policy has failed because we have adopted a philosophy of scarcity, less work, less production—dog-eat-dog—everyone seeing how much he can get and how little he can give.

"This piece of legislation, about which I have been talking tonight, if enacted into law, will place into the hands of thousands of veterans the tools with which to work, place them in a position to be self-supporting, start a new business or expand an old one, explore new fields at home and abroad.

"May I plead with every person listening to me tonight to adopt a philosophy of plenty, a philosophy of big production, a philosophy of working harder and longer, a philosophy of seeing how much he or she can give; and may I further plead with you to sell the philosophy to members of your family, your friends, and those with whom you come in contact because the philosophy of bigger production, both in our factories and on our farms is the only philosophy that will reduce prices, help us feed and clothe the world, and help us place in the hands of the people in other parts of the world tools with which to work so they may become self-supporting.

"Therefore, let's work toward greater prosperity through greater production at home and abroad to prevent war and secure the peace."

NEW ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES UNDER THE DELAWARE PLAN

Among the many projects already being planned in Delaware are radio and electrical appliance repair units, each of which could employ approximately 50 veterans. In these units, the repair of an article would start at one end of the shop and the article would come out fully repaired and inspected at the other end of the building. For example, one such shop could serve the merchants in the small towns of lower Delaware within a radius of 10 miles or more. At the present time these merchants do not have the adequate means for repairing the appliances they sell. A recent survey in Delaware reveals that several such projects could be set up and operated successfully.

A number of dry-cleaning units and wet-wash laundries also have been proposed. These projects would each employ from 10 to 20 people.

We find that veterans are interested in the mechanization of farms and that many want to farm on an intensive scale rather than on an extensive scale. In other words, they wish to grow vegetables on truck farms or raise chickens on chicken farms rather than to grow wheat and corn, which is a less profitable undertaking. Under the provisions of the Veterans Corporation, veterans would be assisted in developing this type of farming and in buying mechanical farm equipment which, in many cases, could be used cooperatively by a group of veterans.

Apple growing and peach growing offer the veteran other possibilities to profit. Delaware is one of the most extensive early-apple producing States in the Union, and is one of the few sections that can put this fruit on the market before the first of August. The State's late apples have a wide distribution through eastern United States, and during the season they are shipped in large quantities to Canada, South America, and Europe. Peaches, once a bonanza crop when "the Delaware peach" ruled the eastern markets, are again being grown with profit. New orchards could be planted with the help of funds from the "Little Man's RFC."

In one community in the southern part of the State, a group of colored veterans is very much interested in a slum clearance project. Other such projects would be highly beneficial to other communities.

The building and staffing of a veterinary hospital is another project that is considered. It is entirely possible that there may be a need for at least two others of these hospitals.

In two communities we have had interest shown in a community building for social activities, the rental of which, along with the stores established therein, would liquidate the loan for its construction. An auditorium and athletic field in the central southern part of the State would be of great benefit to all of the surrounding communities.

These are only a few of the many projects that have been suggested and are desirable for the southern part of the State. But, let us look now into the needs of the northern part of the State, where the heavy industry is located and where most of the population is concentrated. Wilmington is the center of a customs district in which New Castle and Lewes are included. One project here would be the building of additional piers and warehouses. The management of these new constructions would provide additional career opportunities for veterans and others.

As we all know, housing is one of the crucial problems facing us today. One of the greatest handicaps which would be overcome through the "Little Man's RFC" bill is the securing of funds for the basic engineering work, which must be done prior to the laying of the first brick and the hammering of the first nail. If we are to plan large-scale housing projects and solve the problems involved—the purchase of the land, road building, engineering work, and the installation of utilities—we can have sufficient financing under the provisions of the bill. Indeed, the housing problem would be speeded through enactment of our bill. Further, a large-scale housing project would provide many opportunities for veterans to engage in such services as plumbing, electrical wiring, heating, carpentry, bricklaying, road building, architecture and engineering work, bookkeeping, maintenance, and all the other services that are brought into play in such large-scale projects. The Wilmington Housing Authority has listed several projects for low-rent construction.

One such project near Wilmington, that is now being considered, would provide approximately 4,500 living units and carry with it a business center, golf course, country club, swimming pool, and recreational center for the people of that community. Along with such a project, there would be a sewage-disposal plant and a water-purification plant. The maintenance of these as well as the supplying of water to several small adjacent communities would provide profitable employment for the local residents.

OPPORTUNITIES IN PUBLIC HEALTH

Through self-liquidating projects, much of Delaware's public-health program in the schools and in other areas could be improved. For example, more physicians and nurses who devote their whole time to school health should be employed.

Mental-hygiene work should be increased. The present number of clinics are unable to care for those needing mental-hygiene advice. New clinics are needed, and present clinical facilities should be increased to render services to more people.

A better mosquito-control program is another essential for good public health in Delaware.

Approximately 49,000 people visited the clinic services of the State Board of Health of Delaware in 1944. Services are usually housed in buildings that were originally residences, where, instead of finding facilities being adapted to services, we find services being adapted to facilities. Under the provisions of our Delaware plan, adequate and efficient facilities could be provided.

More quarters are necessary for tuberculosis care. Adequate personnel is needed to suppress communicable diseases and to provide maternity, infant, pre-school, and school health services, which include dental health. There is also a lack of personnel in the Division of Sanitary Engineering. This is serious as this Division renders services in the field of community sanitation, industrial hygiene, chicken-dressing plants, milk control, and food-handling establishments.

Finally, more public-health nurses, physicians, dentists, dental hygienists and physiotherapists are needed to give proper service to youngsters and adults alike.

EDUCATION

Thousands of adults desire an extension of their education. Under the provisions of the Delaware plan adult education could be expanded for natives and aliens alike and could include opportunity for parent education. Better opportunities should be afforded subnormal children, who are either physically or mentally handicapped. There is an additional need for traveling teachers for home-bound children.

Guidance programs in schools are inadequate. Trained personnel are necessary to carry out satisfactorily this important service to grade-school, high-school, and college students.

Another important field to be considered is in-service training. Teachers and professional workers, as well as maintenance and operational staffs, sometimes need help and training in order that their efficiency and happiness may be increased.

This last war has shown the importance of physical education. The physical and health education program should be accelerated.

Adequate educational opportunities for the children of migrant workers are needed. State scholarships for outstanding students who are unable to receive higher education because of lack of finances should be provided. Many of the public school buildings in Delaware are in need of repairs and paint. Many schools, especially some colored schools, need modern and safe shops, gymnasiums, cafeterias, auditoriums, and libraries.

THE DELAWARE PLAN

This State plan is designed to develop, under the provisions of the Veterans Economic Development Corp. (the Little Man's RFC), the resources of Delaware to promote the prosperity, welfare and health of all our people. Career opportunities for veterans as well as continued full employment for others would be fostered through the development of needed new businesses, the modernized productivity of agriculture, the utilization of unused natural resources, and the implementation of needed self-liquidating public projects.

The Veterans Corporation, with authority to extend credit totaling $5,000,000,000, will direct its loans toward supplementing the loans of banks and other existing private lending agencies, and the capital needed will derive from existing public money. No appropriations from Congress will be necessary, as only profitable self-liquidating projects will be considered.

Planning activities would be on a State, county, regional, or community level. The State planning board, with the assistance of a know-how committee, composed of technical experts, would plan for the physical development of the State, cooperating with other State agencies in the preparation of programs. It would also assist regional and county committees (which would plan for county and regional projects) and community planning boards, giving technical advice and assisting in the coordination of State, county, and community plans. It would further extend technical assistance to individuals, new businesses, and projects.

Since the "Little Man's RFC" program is essentially a grass-roots program—designed to serve small business and industry and agriculture in the community—emphasis on planning would be on a community level. Thus, while the State planning board and know-how committee would engage in planning on a State-wide basis, their primary function would be to serve the interests of the communities and to bring to bear the cooperation of the Federal Government on local projects whenever advisable and necessary.

Because of this emphasis on local planning, the following outline on State and community planning will list specific opportunities for development and expansion under the section on community planning.

Foreign aid to stop Communism and war

Ambassadors, ministers, and technical experts of friendly nations seeking our help under the Economic Cooperation Administration and other forms of foreign aid have shown great interest in applying this State plan to their own countries. In their opinion, the plan will speed modernization of their economy and enable the people in their communities to become increasingly self-sufficient. This economic development plan will increase two-way trade between the people in the communities of the United States and of other countries for the increasing profit and security of both our peoples.

It is the belief of American authorities that the application of this plan in the communities of friendly countries will help provide a firmer foundation upon which our financial aid at Government level to these countries will rest. Further, this grass-roots plan may be put into effect abroad without cost to the American taxpayers as no appropriations of public moneys are required. This is considered to be the method most economical to the American taxpayer to stop Communist imperialism and war.

Community planning

1. Local planning board is established, representing industry, finance, business, labor, sciences, the professions, veterans, religious groups, agriculture.

2. Planning board sets up a know-how committee.

3. Planning board outlines program of activity, receiving assistance in organizing and formulating programs from State planning commission or State know-how committee.

a. Inventory to determine present and future economic needs, including preparation of town and agricultural maps on the following:

(1) Population distribution and trends
(2) Property-tax surveys
(3) Land use
(4) Zoning ordinances
(5) Traffic studies
(6) Recreational facilay requirements
(7) Health and welfare survey
(8) Community center redevelopments
(9) Highway maintenance
(10) Fire protection
(11) Water supply
(12) Housing
(13) School system
(14) Farming, acreages, crop production, livestock
(15) Utility service
(16) Transportation service—airport, etc.

(a) Uses facilities of Federal, State, and regional agencies for fact-finding and making projective studies.

4. Opportunities for development and expansion:

a. Local industries
(1) Needed expansion of existing industries
(2) Needed new industries
(a) Research for new products
(b) Use of captured enemy patents and new processes
(c) Use of natural resources
(d) New industrial uses for agricultural products
(3) Processing plants for local products
(4) Assembling plants for local markets
(5) Service industries
(6) Retail trade

b. Land use
(1) Land conservation
(a) Irrigation—surface- and underground-water resources
(b) Reforestation
(c) Erosion control
(d) Soil treatment
(e) Fertilizers
(2) Water-power development
(a) Utilities
(b) Industrial uses
(c) Agricultural purposes
(d) Home
(3) Agricultural practices
(a) New methods of farming and livestock improvement
(b) New farm enterprises and better use of land resources

c. Commerce
(1) Sales development—new market centers in growing communities
(2) Farm cooperatives
(3) Export-development opportunities
(4) Shipping
(a) Assembly, processing, and warehousing facilities
(b) Harbor improvements; feeder lines
(5) Air transport
(6) Trucking
(7) Freight

d. Mining
(1) Geological surveys
(2) Development of mineral resources
(3) New uses for mineral products

e. Tourist and recreational areas
(1) Beaches and artificial ponds and lakes
(2) Wood trails and roads, camping areas
(3) Sports, fish and game stocking
(4) Restoration of historical areas, scenic improvement
(5) Hotels, cabins, and restaurants
(6) Stream- and pond-pollution control
(7) Handicrafts

f. Public service (self-liquidating)
(1) Utilities and power development
(2) Transportation of passengers
(a) Bus
(b) Streetcar
(c) Train
(d) Air travel
(e) Boat

g. Public health and welfare (self-liquidating)
(1) Medical clinics
(2) Fire prevention
(3) Sanitation
(a) Stream pollution abatement
(b) Sewage disposal
(c) Garbage disposal
(4) Hospitals (improvement and/or expansion)

h. Public works and public improvements (self-liquidating)
(1) Housing
(a) Multiple low-rental units
(b) Prefabricated and industrial housing
(2) Toll bridges
(3) Parking areas and buildings
(4) Municipal projects

i. Education (self-liquidating)
(1) Colleges, professional and trade schools (improvement and/or expansion)
(2) Housing to accommodate veteran students
(3) Community recreation centers
(4) Vocational and social guidance
(5) Rural school program, consolidation and transportation.

State and regional planning

1. State planning board is established, representing industry, finance, business, labor, sciences, the professions, veterans, religious groups:

a. The board supplements and implements work of existing State planning agencies.

b. The board cooperates with and serves community planning boards.

2. Planning boards sets up a State know-how committee composed of technical experts in various fields:

a. Know-how committee gives technical advice to planning board, to community know-how committees, to county or regional committees, to individuals, to new businesses and projects.

3. Planning board outlines program of activity, receiving assistance in organizing and formulating programs from State know-how committee (or State planning commission):

a. Takes inventory to determine present and future economic needs of State and geographic area, preparing State, regional, and county maps and statistical studies.

(1) Uses facilities of Federal, State, and regional departments and agencies for fact-finding and making projective studies.

4. Planning board relates county, community, and intrastate regional plans to one another, thereby eliminating overlapping, confusion, and unprofitable enterprises and projects.

5. Planning board cooperates with other States on regional projects in same geographic area, such as power developments, land conservation, etc.

(Specific opportunities for development and expansion outlined in detail in section on community planning.)

In closing my remarks, I cite the experience most governors of States, Members of Congress, and other public servants have had with people. We can lead our people just so fast and just so far. Beyond that a gap usually occurs. However, it has been my experience with the people of Delaware that

they are exceedingly alert to and abreast of the opportunities of our time. A clear demonstration of this is the active cooperation of small businessmen, veterans, farmers, and community fathers in initiating our "Delaware Plan." Through the implementation of this plan and that of similar plans in other States in the United States and in other countries, our people can help to check Communist imperialism and war.

Under these State plans, provided for by the enactment of our proposed "Veterans Economic Development Corporation Act" or "Little Man's RFC," we can help inaugurate the greatest era of individual prosperity and personal security in our dynamic American history.

European Recovery Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of June 8, concerning the publicity given to the cut made by the House, in money appropriated for European recovery:

ERP WITHOUT HYSTERICS

It should be possible for the friends of the European recovery plan, in Congress and in the press, to discuss the cut made by the House in the money appropriation without getting hysterical about it. Anyone may consider the House action unwise, but such outbursts as "crippling recovery in Europe" are nonsense. So are the quoted extracts from the Communist press of Europe to the effect that the United States cannot be trusted to keep its word.

If the House had voted to appropriate more instead of less than the administration had asked, the Communist press would have been just as violent. It would then have harped on its other favorite theme, a vicious American imperialism bent on subjugating mankind to our greedy profiteers.

Admittedly, the cut in ERP funds voted by the House is a rather drastic one. Whereas the administration had asked Congress to provide $4,245,000,000 for ERP expenditure in 12 months, the lower Chamber marked the fund down to $4,000,000,000 and directed that the smaller amount should cover ERP's outlay during the first 15 months. The total of appropriations for all foreign aid carried in the same House bill was $5,980,000,000, whereas the administration had asked for a total of $6,533,000,000.

But it cannot yet be determined whether even the smaller ERP appropriation voted by the House can be expended in 12 months or in 15 months wthout throwing it around. Before either time period has passed Congress will again be sitting. If ERP shows any indications of being crippled solely by lack of American funds 7 or 8 months hence, Congress can loosen the purse strings as much as then seems necessary and wise.

We think it is quite possible and even probable that a smaller appropriation at this time than the administration calls for will actually contribute to the success of ERP. Rapid, large-scale purchases of commodities and industrial equipment for Europe in this country will inevitably work to raise our price level. That means that the faster the Administrator of ERP spends his money the less goods he can get for it. In the main, the same rule will apply to his buying outside the United States.

There is another aspect of our foreign-aid spending to be considered. Last week the cables reported that France and Italy were refusing to buy coal from Poland, the obvious reason being that they hoped to get their fuel for nothing through ERP. No doubt Administrator Hoffman will seek to correct situations like that. How? Only by withholding ERP funds in similar cases. It is silly, then, to say that reducing the rate at which ERP money can be laid out risks disaster for the program.

Some little consideration, too, is due our own people. They will pay for what we give to Europe, not only through taxation but through living costs. They have a right to ask that the giving be held within their means and that it be regulated according to the degree in which the peoples of western Europe help themselves and one another.

Appropriation for Institute of Inter-American Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of June 10, 1948:

IS THIS THE GOOD NEIGHBOR?

The Senate Committee on Appropriations has an opportunity this week in considering the appropriation for the Institute of Inter-American Affairs to undo a House blunder that could seriously undermine our relations with Latin America. It should restore the money cut from the Institute's requests for the fiscal year 1949 and give it authorization to enter into contracts with Latin-American countries for the following year. If it does not, about the last tangible vestige of the good neighbor policy that has done so much to unite this hemisphere over the last 16 years will have gone down the drain.

It is a fairly modest sum as appropriations go these days—$1,348,500—but the evil effects of its deletion can be great. Editorial comment in Latin-American newspapers since the report of the House Appropriations Committee on May 7 has been bitter.

The Institute of Inter-American Affairs is a chartered Government corporation that was set up under the old Office of Inter-American Affairs to carry on with Latin-American countries cooperative programs in health, sanitation, education, and food supply. Currently 22 such programs are in existence in 14 Latin-American countries. For every dollar this Government now puts into the programs the Latin Americans put in two—$10,800,000 against our $5,800,000 for 1948-49. Yet for our one-third interest we get an equal voice.

The Institute's program can be shown by figures to be a worth-while one merely in the area of foreign trade, in increased imports by participating countries of American pharmaceuticals, farm machinery, textbooks, and so on. Beyond that there are hardly calculable benefits in eradication of diseases that might otherwise be carried to this country to start epidemics, and incalculable benefits in good will toward us.

Values of Various Crops in 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, with so much talk about basic and Steagall commodities, I submit the following information from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture:

Value of 1947 crops sold by farmers

Basic commodities:	
Wheat	$3,155,000,000
Corn	5,432,000,000
Cotton [1] (lint and seed)	2,291,000,000
Tobacco	912,000,000
Peanuts	228,000,000
Rice	219,000,000
Fruit	896,000,000
Total meat animals	10,039,000,000
Dairy products	4,845,000,000
Poultry and eggs	3,069,000,000
Potatoes	627,000,000
Dried beans [2]	188,786,000
Peas, dried	32,003,000

[1] Lint, $1,889,000,000; seed, $402,000,000.
[2] Navy beans, $43,250,000 estimate.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

In the first place, there are not any legal basic commodities. Certain crops as corn, cotton, wheat, tobacco, peanuts, and rice are called basic because they are under the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration Act. By submitting to certain acreage controls they automatically come under the protection of the loan and support provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration Act. I will not attempt to try to explain why a $2,291,000,000 cotton crop has special-privilege legislation. Millions secured from customs receipts on wool and other livestock products have been used to subsidize cotton exports.

The New Deal agricultural approach has been, first, to give special-privilege legislation to the crops of the South; second, to subsidize domestic production of soil-depleting crops; third, to subsidize exports of these soil-depleting crops; and, fourth, to continually jeopardize livestock farming, the best-known system of conserving soil fertility.

I ask you in all fairness, does it make economic sense to you to support prices for a $228,000,000 peanut crop, a $219,000,000 rice crop, or a $900,000,000 tobacco crop and not support a $3,000,000,000 poultry and egg crop, a $10,000,000,000 meat crop, and a $4,800,000,000 milk crop? Cotton at this hour is enjoying export subsidies even when cotton is above parity at the market place.

All crops and all agricultural commodities are deserving of equal legislative consideration. A study of the logrolling machination and power politics that have been practiced in connection with domestic and foreign agricultural products would convince anyone that the logrolling on the tariff question never equaled the logrolling incident to the New Deal agricultural program.

A Challenge to Educators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from remarks delivered by the Honorable M. Vashti Burr, deputy attorney general of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to the alumni of the State Teachers College at Indiana, Pa., May 22, 1948:

There are complaints that the young people of today are losing confidence in their elders who, they are inclined to say, can no longer help to point the way to success. If that be true, is it because we did not build strongly enough, or is it because we forgot the paths by which we ourselves came? Have we, for example, taken our freedom too much for granted and valued too lightly those fundamental precepts of intellectual development and moral courage which our forebears valued so highly? Have we been inclined to forget the true function of the teacher in our concentration upon turning out a standardized, streamlined, assembly-line intellectual product without adequate consideration for character building?

We prize of our free system of government in America. No system of government based upon the freedom, dignity, and integrity of the individual can endure unless the citizens are adequately educated. An enlightened public opinion is required in any free government. Of all the groups in the Nation having an influence upon, and the opportunity to mold, public opinion, the teachers, especially those in the elementary and secondary schools, have probably the greatest responsibility. They have the task of educating youth in the formative, most impressionable years. Hence the immense importance of adequate education of the teachers themselves, so that the teachers may fully appreciate the principles of our American system and the social and economic basis of American life. Our American heritage is the realization that life is an adventure which obliges us to place spiritual integrity above material security if we are to solve problems which confront us in perpetuating liberty for all.

The charters of the privately owned Colonial colleges stressed the need of educating youth for public service in church and civil state. The Revolution stimulated patriotic fervor, leading to the study of our national history and civics, the foundation of political education. As stated by Stephen Pierce Duggan, formerly professor of education at the College of the City of New York:

"In no country is education so active and vital an element in the life of the people as in the United States. Nowhere else do teachers show so strong a desire for self-improvement, parents so great a determination that their children shall take advantage of the opportunities offered, or citizens so great a willingness to bear the necessary expense * * *. In other words, real progress is being made toward the realization of the American educational ideal, viz, so to organize education that the capacities of every child shall be discovered and the necessary training given to develop those capacities to the utmost, to the end that every individual shall be doing that in life for which his native abilities fit him."

The same Professor Duggan states, very significantly:

"The theory upon which education is organized in the United States is the very opposite of that which holds in Europe."

We may feel justly proud of our American system of education, even with all its faults. Let us be on guard against the importation into our American system of those foreign ideas which, for example, would make the educational system a pawn in the hands of a centralized National Government. As the president of the University of Notre Dame recently remarked:

"There is no denying that our schools need greater support, but we cannot strengthen them by sloughing off local and State responsibility and lodging control in the hands of a remote commissar of education. Rather, we must reassume our individual responsibilities, for education like good government begins at home."

The incontrovertible fact is, as stated by Gov. James H. Duff:

"The people back home know better than anybody else what their problems are and how able and willing they are to pay to solve them."

It is good common sense to conclude that if the people are willing to pay for better schools and adequately paid teachers, they would rather tax themselves in their own communities where they will have the use of approximately 94 cents out of each tax dollar, than pay taxes to the Federal Government for the same purpose, knowing full well that every dollar the Federal Government gets from the people by direct or indirect tax and hands back to them in grants, has lost as much as 40 or 50 percent of its value in transit. (See Inaugural Address of Gov. William M. Tuck, of Virginia, January 16, 1946 (Vital Speeches, March 15, 1946).)

The 1947 general assembly enlarged the tax base for local government (including school districts. It is now for the citizens to understand that they can guarantee home rule by raising the needed funds at home. Likewise, Pennsylvania's Representatives in the Congress are supporting proposals relating to coordination of Federal and State taxation. Hon. RICHARD M. SIMPSON, chairman of the Pennsylvania delegation, is sponsor of one of these proposals. United States Senator EDWARD MARTIN was a member of the joint conference of congressional and governors' representatives which issued a statement to the effect that our States must cease relying upon the Federal Government to do things for them and their citizens which they can do for themselves as well as, or better than, the Federal Government, and that the Congress should withdraw to some extent from the field of taxation so that the States may have more tax sources in order to finance State programs, such as education.

In the Federal-State system of government like the United States, there must of necessity be Federal-State tax coordination. There is a clear duty, therefore, upon every citizen who desires the American system of government to endure, to support the united effort of the Congress and the State legislatures in effecting such a program.

Again I quote the president of the university of Notre Dame, who has so well said:

"The best investment that America can make today is in the youth that will be the leaders of tomorrow. And no agency can produce the leadership our country needs except the colleges and universities that will take their stand on the educational legacy that is ours from colonial times."

There is the challenge to our educators today. There is the challenge to the State teachers colleges in Pennsylvania—how best to preserve and extend the educational ideals of those who designed and established this great Nation, so that the need of youth in this country not only for knowledge, but also for a keen understanding of the basic concepts of our American system and of the art of living well and wisely, may best be served.

Confusion Concerning Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the people in my district are intensely interested in soil conservation. I regret to see that a division is taking place concerning two agricultural bills which are now pending in the Congress, both having to do in some measure with soil conservation. One is Senator AIKEN's bill, S. 2318, and as a part of my remarks, I wish to insert the following recommendations which have come to me concerning this bill:

At a community meeting of farmers from Spring Valley, Goshen, Elm Springs, Springdale, Prairie Grove, Tontitown, Farmington, Rhea's Mill, Cane Hill, Morrow, Cincinnati, Lincoln, Elkins, and West Fork in Washington County, Ark., we reviewed bill H. R. 6054 by Representative HOPE. We farmers and committeemen do not see fit to recommend this bill, as it is our opinion that it does not represent the best interest of the farmers of the Nation. This bill does not give all farmers an equal opportunity in conserving and rebuilding soil fertility. The administering of the program is on a centralized set-up coming from Federal workers, which eliminates the State, county, and community farmer-elected committeemen and farmers in having any authority to administer, recommend, or certify practices qualifying for assistance. We feel and recommend that farmer-elected State, county, and community committeemen should have a responsibility in whatever long-range program is set up, to the same extent that they have in the present PMA agricultural conservation program.

Farmers have become concerned over the numerous bills relative to coordination of various agricultural agencies into a long-range agricultural program. We farmers and PMA agricultural conservation committeemen reviewed the bill, S. 2318, by Senator AIKEN. After our review, we recommend it, since we feel this bill serves the best interests of the consumer, agriculture, and farmers in our community and the Nation.

We are well pleased with the accomplishments and results of the PMA agricultural conservation program and do not feel there is any need for any radical changes in the present farmer-administered agricultural conservation program, since the ultimate objective of the program is to achieve a permanent and prosperous agriculture, capable of producing efficien ly the expanding food and fiber requirements of our growing population, to maintain our soil fertility and rebuild our eroded soils. However, should a long-range agricultural program be set up, we endorse bill S. 2318 with the following recommended changes: That title 1, section 101 (a) and (b), be changed to read as follows:

"(a) The educational information and demonstrational features of such functions shall be exercised through the Extension Service, in coordination with the agency to be established as the 'Bureau of Agricultural Conservation and Improvement,' since that agency will be charged with many responsibilities of the 'Agricultural Act of 1948.'

"(b) The research and investigation features of such functions shall be exercised through the agricultural experiment stations in coordination with the Division of Soil Conservation and Improvement."

We further recommend that if a long-range, coordinated agricultural program is set up, farmer-elected committeemen should have a part in its administration—similar to the part they now have in the PMA agricultural conservation program.

After reviewing bill S. 2318 and our recommended changes, we solicit your consideration of our recommendations and your support of the Agricultural Act of 1948.

At a community meeting of farmers from Washington County farmers unanimously adopted the following resolutions:

1. That an annual appropriation of not less than $300,000,000 be made available, with sufficient administration funds, so that a stable conservation can be formulated. If the program and funds are stabilized, with administrative funds of not less than $37,000,000, a more effective job of agricultural conservation can be had, since elected farmer-committeemen could be better trained to administer the program. Present funds do not permit efficient training and informing farmers in the need for conservation practices and the guidance and assistance in putting the practice on the land.

2. That the limitation of $500 payments should be eliminated. Conservation needs are based on cropland and not on individual farmers. The present limitation limits the conservation that can be accomplished on large acreage, and does not increase conservation on small farms. Assistance should be placed on the needs of the land, and not on the total amount to an individual farmer.

3. That the increases in small payments be continued as at present.

4. That assistance for conservation for 1948–49 fiscal years be increased to $300,000,000 for each year. Conservation still could be put into practice on Washington County farms, since farming operations have just started in this area. Due to this and weather conditions many conservation practices are put into effect in the late spring, summer, and fall months. Farming plans are flexible to the extent that changes in plans would permit more conservation, should more funds be made available in 1948.

5. That services now available through PMA agricultural-conservation program should be maintained, since they are vitally needed by farmers in producing farm products and rebuilding soil fertility. However, should there be any need for consolidation of programs and agencies, farmer-elected State, county, and community committeemen should administer the program as the present PMA agricultural-conservation program is administered. Farmers and committees should make recommendations, and this should remain the basis for setting up agricultural-conservation programs. Information necessary to the administration of the program should be handled by committees. Extension service should provide educational material on subject matter and experiment station results of practices in coordination with the committees.

6. That at least $65,000,000 be set up annually for the school-lunch program.

Powell C. Williams, Joe P. Reed, Frank Swift, Vol Pullen, J. W. Thompson, Lee L. Williams, Floyd Hays, J. B. McCuistion, Jack Taldo, George Holcomb, W. Shannon Pharr, Lincoln E. Maupin, Roe D. Stokenbury, E. W. Price, G. S. Smith.

Similar resolutions were received from C. R. Broadhurst, Scott Evans, and D. B. Blair, members of the Benton County Triple-A Committee; also letters from George W. Reeves, W. J. Ledford, James M. Parker, D. W. Alderson, W. P. Robert, Adry Gaskill, Ewell E. Boyd, P. V. Blankenship, Everett V. Watson, Lavon V. Watson, Clay McBroom, Paul Smith, Lawrence H. Smith, D. C. Parrott, Tom Hargis, Fred Berry, Hood G. Lough, and J. W. Parrish.

Also, Mr. Speaker, another group in the district are highly in favor of the Hope bill (H. R. 6054), including soil-conservation districts throughout my 10 counties. Among those who have written are C. M. Ellington, John Jenkins, Jack Corley, D. F. Wright, Dale E. Harper, J. E. Ferguson, Tom Battershell, Ralph Guthrie, Gus McCracken, Frank H. Love, James M. Parker, Walter D. Ramey, Sterlin Hurley, Carl H. Brown, Noah Dearing, Tom Millard, H. R. Koen, Reece Caudle, Kenneth Sager, and M. A. Hathcoat.

I think perhaps their attitude can best be summarized through an editorial written by E. H. Taylor, associate editor of the Country Gentleman, which appeared in the April 1948 issue of the Journal of Soil and Water Conservation. I ask to insert it as part of my remarks:

An actual land policy is now in sight. The act introduced in Congress by Chairman CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of the House Committee on Agriculture, bears the title and meets the full requirements of such a policy. Its passage would be one of the memorable turning points in our history, insuring the foundation of natural resources upon which all national stability rests.

The Hope Act has two decisive merits. It establishes conservation and the orderly development of our land and water resources as a basic policy of the United States. This will focus both public and legislative attention on conservation and will give it a priority it has heretofore lacked.

The act coordinates and unifies all the forces now engaged in a divided struggle to protect and conserve our land and water and their dependent resources. To realize how important such a step is one has only to read this passage in Fairfield Osborn's Our Plundered Planet: "All the component parts in the machinery of nature are dependent one upon the other. Remove any essential part and the machine breaks down. This is a primary fact and there is no other comparable to it in importance. * * * This interdependence of elements is, in truth, the basic law of nature. Therefore, unless man respects it, nature will not work for him."

Every conservationist has realized this unity of nature. It is brought out by Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson in the recent report of the Iowa Conservation Study Committee, it is voiced in the annual report of Chief Lyle F. Watts of the Forest Service. The men wrestling with flood control in the great watersheds are coming to recognize it. Good land use, soil and water conservation, forestation, flood control, siltation prevention, fish and wildlife propagation are all parts of one proposition. Under the Hope Act we will be able to deal with them as such, coordinating our efforts to correspond with the integrated processes of nature.

The act fairly recognizes and apportions the responsibility for the work among all the various interested agencies. It is especially commendable for the long overdue encouragement it gives to research. And it provides, as it should, for an active and responsible participation by farmers themselves. In fact, its very excellence is a tribute to its author, one of the fairest and ablest men in public life who, by virtue of this act, if nothing else, takes rank among the great statesmen of agriculture.

In the Hope Act we have as good and workable a national land policy as we are ever likely to get. It represents the only ultimate answer to the needs of the situation. But it is, as yet, simply a proposal. What it requires is such a groundswell of support that its passage cannot be stayed either by apathy or oppostion.

The Mundt Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Anoka Herald of June 3, 1948:

THE MUNDT BILL

There is danger now that the Mundt bill, which would go a long way toward outlawing the communistic party, will be lost. It has passed in the House, but there is controversy over its feasibility in the Senate. We would like to take some of our flag-waving, freedom-extolling Senators where we have been. Twenty-eight years ago we visited schools on the west coast supported by Russian money where communism was being taught to little children. In those days they were allowed this type of democratic freedom. The philosophy of Karl Marx and the ungodly doctrine in which they clothe themselves was being instilled into the youth of America. The editor of this paper at that time raised the alarm of this menace to our form of government and was thought a little "cracked" on the subject.

When we read that smart men like Senator BALL has his doubts over the Mundt bill, because he thinks it would drive them entirely underground, we wonder what his doubts are about our laws that forbid crimes that undermine our form of government. The Mundt bill is designed to outlaw foreign-inspired conspiracies in America, and that is what the Communist Party is busy doing. They can go right ahead believing the doctrine of Karl Marx. What the law intends to do is to forbid the union of Marxists into subversive-action groups.

The Communist Party is very busy opposing the bill, so it leaves the question, Why are they against the bill if it is going to be helpful to them? The answer definitely is that they are afraid of mass opinion, and that is what the law amounts to.

It takes years for what some of our greatest writers and statesmen have stood for to show that they were right. People like to hear sophistry; they like to hear high-sounding democratic phrases; but the far-seeing man who sets the alarm and says the only way to curb communism is to outlaw it is thought a little too drastic. They need to take heed of what happened in Czechoslovakia and the protest the people made there in their recent election. The Czechs have an uphill battle to fight, but when over 25 percent of the people brave dire threats to voice their denunciation of communism they will win in the final analysis.

Taconite of Iron Range Promises New Era of Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two news stories relating to the development of taconite as a source of

iron, and the meaning of this development to the future prosperity of Minnesota. The first one appeared in the June 3, 1948, edition of the Chisholm Tribune-Herald of Chisholm, Minn. The second article was published in the June 3, 1948, edition of the Chisholm Free Press. They follow:

[From the Chisholm (Minn.) Tribune-Herald]

MINES SCHOOL CROWNS YEARS OF RESEARCH—NEW PROCESS ASSURES FUTURE INDUSTRY OF RANGE

After years of experimentation, the University of Minnesota has announced that it has made real pig iron out of that common product of the Mesabi Range—taconite.

Headed by Prof. E. W. Davis, the experimental work on taconite has been going on for many years to prove that even with the range's high-grade ore running low or depleted the low-grade taconite, of which there is a great abundance available, will be valuable in taking over.

Professor Davis last Friday described the tests at the mines experiment station at the University of Minnesota as completely satisfactory, as the long years of experimentation begin to pay off.

The State university researchers announced that they have proved they are able to convert the metallic powder they extract from the stone into real pig iron and to prove it they have 160 tons of iron stacked up behind the station on the campus.

For many years and particularly following the huge demand during World War II, authorities have wondered what would happen to the iron industry when the high grade ores obtained from range mines are exhausted and have tried to visualize the situation within the next few years when these ores are gone.

Now the problem is licked, the university announced, and Professor Davis, who along with his associates who pioneered the experiments was given high praise by J. L. Morrill, university president, has indicated that the new process is financially feasible.

"In my judgment," Professor Davis said, "use of taconite in place of high grade ore will not materially increase the price of steel to the consumer. There is no reason why cost of the finished products should be any higher."

In a story from Minneapolis last week end the statement was made that since Minnesota's iron ore is the heart of America's steel industry, taconite—which contains about 30 percent iron ore—must supply the Nation's needs in years to come. Otherwise, the United States will have to look to foreign sources of supply.

On this ground range governmental and civic leaders hail the university announcement on the new process announced by Dr. Davis. The university will have two plants for extracting the iron from taconite in operation by the end of summer.

A test plant, on about the same scale as at the university laboratory, is now in service in Hibbing. The second, now being built at Aurora, is a "preliminary" plant, anticipating expansion into commercial operation, scheduled to be completed in August.

University authorities call attention to the fact that the Aurora plant is not to be confused with a iron powder plant set up by the Range Resources and Rehabilitation Commission 4 miles away. The iron powder plant uses an entirely different material—carbonate rock, which is far less abundant than taconite, it was said.

University authorities went on to indicate that the process is different and the end result is different. Iron powder is 99.7 percent pure iron and can be used in direct manufacture of die tools and other hard steel items.

Iron ore, which is what taconite yields, is only 72 percent iron at its best and averages 51.5 percent iron.

The pig iron which came from the university blast furnace was called a personal triumph for Professor Davis and his associates. Mr. Davis has been with the mines station since 1914; for much of which he has been a leading advocate of taconite development.

Discussing development of taconite, President Morrill paid tribute to one of his staff members in these words:

"Prof. E. W. Davis, director of the mines experiment station, has had the vision to perceive what taconite developments might mean to Minnesota.

"He has had the energy to carry forward, sometimes in the face of crushing discouragement, the patient and persistent endeavor that all fundamental research involves. He has the perseverance of a crusader."

Civic leaders of Chisholm now feel that the future of the iron range is assured as here are unlimited supplies of taconite.

[From the Chisholm (Minn.) Free Press]

RED GOLD OF THE IRON RANGE PROMISES A NEW ERA OF PROSPERITY

Taconite, the siliceous and iron-bearing rock which generations of miners have rejected for richer ore bodies in the Lake Superior region, is destined to become a keystone ore source for the steel-making furnaces of America.

For millions of years nature has been leaching iron ore from taconites by the slow, percolating action of water. Scientists of United States Steel Corp. now propose to transmute the 25 to 35 percent iron content of taconites into thousands of tons of valuable ore concentrates per hour by developing processes for grinding the same hard rock to powder, separating the iron compounds from the mixture, and then concentrating it so that it can be used in the production of iron and steel.

With the objective of conducting a long-range study to develop commercially useful concentrating methods, Oliver Iron Mining Co., United States Steel's ore-producing subsidiary, has established a new research laboratory here. This latest addition to its research facilities still further extends the studies of ore beneficiation sponsored by the Oliver Co. through its more than half a century of existence.

"In the past," said Walter L. Maxson, Oliver's vice president in charge of research, "the ore supply available from the Lake Superior district has consisted of high-grade underground and open-pit direct-shipping ores, provided in concentrated form by nature and supplemented by varying amounts of concentrates produced by relatively simple processes. This type of ore supply can be expected to continue, although in gradually reducing volume, for a long time to come. The exact length of time depends upon the demand for and the industrial absorption of iron and steel products."

Concurrently, Maxson added, the future supply from this region will contain increasing proportions of high-cost underground ores and high-cost concentrates while the proportion of direct-shipping open pit ores will decline. Ultimately the Lake Superior ore supply will consist largely of concentrates, together with a moderate proportion of underground direct-shipping ores.

A review of past years' mining activity shows that more than 2¼ billion gross tons of iron ore have been shipped from Lake Superior mines since iron ore was first discovered in this part of the country almost 100 years ago. Of this amount 1,619,000,000 tons came from Minnesota's three ranges, almost 72 percent of the total for the entire Lake Superior district.

Considering only Minnesota's ranges, it was found that in the prosperous twenties about 30,000,000 tons of direct-shipping ores (highest grade) left the ranges each year. This pace slowed somewhat during depression years, but by 1940 was up to almost 40,000,000 tons. Peak war demands reached more than 57,000,000 tons in 1942, while the war years 1940–1945 took almost 300,000,000 tons—one-fifth of the total high-grade direct-shipping ore mined in both underground and open pit properties since these Minnesota deposits were discovered!

In future years the supply of underground and open pit direct-shipping ores will be gradually augmented by a steadily increasing amount of concentrates and specially treated low grade ores. Consequently, the future demand against all reserves of high grade ores will gradually diminish to a point, perhaps only one-half of what it is today, according to some estimates.

Thus, as Maxson asserted, one era in iron mining is gradually drawing to a close, and another, challenging all the ingenuity and knowledge that raw materials and engineering can muster, is dawning. Since there are billions of tons of taconite, he said, the perfection of an economic method of extracting iron values from it should solve the problem of American iron ore reserves for years to come.

As to the quality of the future ore, Maxson has asked furnace operators to share in the problems of the ore dresser. He cited 158 separate grades of ore specified in 1944 which included many overlapping duplications, and warned that the period of multiple grades of high quality ore, blended to exact specifications, is ending.

Blast furnace operators, he suggested, may well project their thinking forward to the time when, the proportions of fine-structure concentrates will arrive in agglomerated form, either nodulized or sintered. The great advantage of the coming ores, Mr. Maxson concluded, will lie in the fact that they will be more uniform in grade both chemically and structually, than Nature provides.

Stigma To Be Removed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times of May 3, 1948, in support of my bill, reintroduced as H. R. 6809, to remove any stigma on the basis of race from our immigration and naturalization laws:

STIGMA TO BE REMOVED

The argument for passage of Representative WALTER H. JUDD's bill to remove racial discrimination from the naturalization laws is best summed up by the case of one woman, the mother of Sadao Munemori, a Japanese-American who was posthumously awarded a Congressional Medal of Honor for gallantry in Italy.

Mrs. Munemori sought citizenship in the country for which her son died and in which she has resided many years. But it was denied her, as it is denied some 90,000 persons who were born in Japan but have lived in the United States 20, 30, or 40 years.

These men and women, thousands of them parents of Nisei who bore arms in the late conflict, are denied a privilege that has been extended to Chinese, Filipinos, and natives of India. As established members of American communities, they have accepted the responsibilities of citizenship but are barred by law from naturalization.

Representative JUDD's bill would make citizenship available to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence. It would be a small token of appreciation to persons like Mrs. Munemori. More than that, it

would be notice to the Far East and all the world that the United States makes its bid for international friendship on a platform free from any belief that racial origin establishes inferiority.

The Jugglers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

THE JUGGLERS

An acquaintance of ours was born and raised in the Kaiser's Germany. His youth was spent under the shadow of "papa's annuity." To gain this anchor against the future the whole family scrimped and saved. It was for papa's annuity that the family forewent vacations, that mama passed up new dresses, and that the children did with makeshift toys.

In the spring of 1922 papa's policy matured. The policy was paid all right, at full face value. But mama took the whole of it, a lifetime of savings, and the family celebrated with one good Sunday dinner.

We have a neighbor who was born here and has lived his life in one neighborhood. In the dark and uncertain days of the depression he, too, bought an annuity. In 15 years, if he was frugal, he was to retire on $150 a month.

Last Christmas he began to receive the fruits of his sacrifices, His checks come regularly and are helpful, but the dream of retirement is gone. He no longer talks about the cottage in Florida.

These two men, unknown to one another, have a common bond. With both of them their community, that is to say their government, failed to keep faith. They sacrificed something of value and got back a thing which bore the same label but which had cheapened. Both of these men feel cheated.

There is a difference between what happened to the German mark and to the United States dollar. But the difference is quantitative, not qualitative. The same thing happened to the dollar as happened to the mark, and for some of the same reasons. It did happen here; just not so badly.

Cheapening money is an age-old device to get currency for armament programs and other nonproductive governmental projects. The people who pay for it are all those who are frugal, all those who have savings, who buy insurance policies, or who participate in pension plans.

There are many ways to cheapen money, Kings used to shave the edges of their gold pieces. Later governments simply whirled the tempo of the printing presses. A more progressive method is to pump up the currency and credit supply through the government controlled central banking system. That has the advantage of being too subtle to alarm the populace.

Under the impelling necessity of war this country used the up-to-date method. The results require no commentary.

Now we are embarking once more on a great armament program to be piled atop an already huge Government budget. And in Washington they are again talking dangerous language.

In the past few weeks there have been a series of news stories with all the earmarks of road dredgers for an about-face in Government fiscal policy. In one case an "authoritative Government spokesman," who addressed a formal press conference but who refused to let his name be used, said the administration "might" have to drop all credit curbing programs. On the contrary, the Government "might" deliberately encourage more credit expansion to pay for the huge spending.

Stripped of the economist's jargon, this means that the administration is toying with the idea of inflation again.

Everybody knows what inflation does to daily prices. We are prone to forget too easily that it also cheapens—and can compdetely destroy—the accomplishments of a lifetime.

That's not an academic evil to the man in the street. It is a threat to avery laborer who looks forward to a pension, to every man who buys savings bonds or puts away a dollar for the proverbial rainy day, to every man who scrimps for an insurance policy. And 73,000,000 individuals in this country hold private life-insurance policies, not counting social security. These policies affect three out of every four American families.

The wartime inflation has already stolen half the savings of many of these. Further inflation, so glibly talked about, can only dissolve most of the remainder.

We think it's about time irresponsible officials stopped playing ducks and drakes with a people's future.

Does a Duty of 1 Cent Per Pound on Hogs, 3 Cents Per Pound on Lard, and 25 Cents Per Bushel on Corn Make Economic Sense to You?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following official information is from the United States Tariff Commission:

Duties on swine, pork, and corn

Description	Tariff rate in—		
	Act of 1930	1945	1948
Swine	2 cents per pound	1 cent per pound [1]	1 cent per pound.[2]
Pork:			
Fresh or chilled	2½ cents per pound	1¼ cents per pound [1]	1¼ cents per pound.[2]
Frozen	do	2½ cents per pound	Do.[2]
Bacon, hams, and shoulders, and other pork, prepared or preserved:			
Cooked, boned, packed in airtight containers or made into sausages of any kind.	3¼ cents per pound	3¼ cents per pound	3¼ cents per pound
Other	do	2 cents per pound [1]	2 cents per pound.[3]
Corn or maize, including cracked corn	25 cents per bushel of 56 pounds.	25 cents per bushel of 56 pounds.	25 cents per bushel of 56 pounds.
Lard	3 cents per pound	3 cents per pound	3 cents per pound.

[1] Trade agreement with Canada, effective January 1939.
[2] Bound, Geneva, 1948.
[3] Geneva, 1948.

Source: U. S. Tariff Commission, May 11, 1948.

If it takes 12 bushels of corn to produce 100 pounds of hog, it would be necessary to pay $3 in duty—12 times 25 cents—to import sufficient corn to produce 100 pounds of hog. The 100-pound hog can be imported for 1 cent per pound, or for $1. This is just one more example of, first, the antilivestock position taken by the present administration; and second, it is just one of the many examples of the uneconomic approach that has been made by the infantile group which has lacked factual, scientific, nutritional training, and which has been selected to make reciprocal trade treaties.

Hogs and lard have for years had equal prices in the market place. The duty of 1 cent per pound on hogs and 3 cents per pound down do not make economic sense. Apparently, the reason why the duty on lard is 3 cents per pound is because the duty on cottonseed and soybean oil is 3 cents per pound and a reduction in the duty on lard below the duty on vegetable oils would be too apparently ridiculous.

Do you now really believe in the New Deal brand of reciprocity? Would you, if I ask, subscribe to it if livestock products had three times the protection that the corn had?

Lincoln Day Address by Val J. Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT L. REEVES, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, I include in the remarks excerpts from an address delivered before the Kansas City Negro Republican Club on the occasion of a dinner commemorating the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, by Mr. Val J. Washington:

Mr. Chairman, honored guest, and friends, this is an unusual night in my life, because I have been asked here to address the Kansas City Republicans on Abraham Lincoln. This is one of my favorite subjects, and I am, therefore, going to ask you to bear with me as I talk about this great human. The subject of my address this evening will be Lincoln Was No Phony, and I repeat, Lincoln was no phony.

Most of us know the general biographical sketch of Abraham Lincoln's life. We know that he was our sixteenth President, born in the most humble walk of life; that his birthplace was a log cabin; that his father,

Thomas Lincoln, had grown up literally without an education; and that his mother, Nancy Hanks, was illiterate.

In 1830 Abraham Lincoln was then 20 years old and remained with his family in Illinois only long enough to help with the building of a new cabin and to assist in the rough tasks of the following winter. Upon leaving home he navigated a flatboat from a point near Springfield down to New Orleans under the guidance of his personal friend, John Hanks. In New Orleans, for the first time, Lincoln beheld the true horrors of human slavery. He saw Negroes in chains—whipped and scourged.

One morning in his ramblings over the city Lincoln and John Hanks passed a slave auction. A vigorous and comely mulatto girl was being sold. She underwent a thorough examination at the hands of the bidders. They pinched her flesh and made her trot up and down the room like a horse so that, as the auctioneer said, the bidders might satisfy themselves as to whether the article being offered for sale was sound. The whole thing was so revolting that Lincoln moved away from the scene with a deep feeling of unconquerable hate. Bidding his companions to follow him, he said, "By God, boys, let us get away from this. If ever I get a chance to hit that thing, I will hit it hard." For several days after that, in the words of John Hanks, "Lincoln's heart bled. He said nothing much, was silent from feeling, was sad, looked bad, felt bad, was thoughtful and abstracted. I can say, knowing him, that it was on this trip that he formed his opinion of slavery. I have heard him say so often and often."

In 1834 he was elected to the Illinois Legislature where he served four successive terms. In 1847, he served one term in Congress where he had the distinction of being the only Whig from Illinois, and on January 10, 1849, he read a proposal to abolish slavery in the National Capital. In 1855 he became identified with the new Republican Party and at the State convention in Bloomington, in what some have called his greatest speech, he became the leading Republican in Illinois.

Two years later he was successful in getting the Republican senatorial nomination. In Springfield in 1858 he delivered a carefully prepared speech revealing his position on the slavery question and denouncing the Dred Scot decision as part of the proslavery conspiracy to recognize slavery even in the free States. Then, followed a series of debates with the leading Democrat, Douglas, in the senatorial campaign in which he showed his strength as a leader and politician. He was nominated in the national convention at Chicago, because he was a candidate who was not too radical nor too conservative. The result, of course, was his election as the sixteenth President of the United States.

Lincoln received a sweep of the electoral votes for reelection in 1864 in spite of opposition within his own party. He did not experience the ensuing struggle for reconstruction for he was assassinated on the night of April 16, 1865, in the Ford Theater by John Wilkes Booth.

I wish to say right here and now that Lincoln's real interest in slavery, and his program for the abolition of it actually started in 1830 at the age of 20 when he saw slaves sold on the block in New Orleans. I want you people to keep that date firmly entrenched in your minds during this dissertation. Remember, at that time, Lincoln was not a politician; he had taken no part in politics, nor had he ever made a speech. But at 20 years of age, as I mentioned earlier, he said, "Some day I am going to hit that thing and hit it hard." That is all one needs to know about what was on Abraham Lincoln's mind regarding slavery. That happened 118 years ago—at that time every ounce of brain power and every type of diplomacy imaginable was necessary to accomplish his aim—the ultimate freedom of the slaves. You have often heard, in recent years since the Democrats came to power, brazen remarks from some of our Negroes such as "Forget Lincoln," "You can't eat Lincoln," "It's time to turn his picture to the wall," "Lincoln did not fight the war to free the slaves," and many other such ridiculous statements. I again wish to call your attention to 118 years ago and to his statement at that time, "Some day I'll hit that thing and hit it hard."

Lincoln, in answer to Horace Greeley on his criticism of Lincoln for the way he handled slavery had this to say: "If I could save the Union without freeing any slave, I would do it; and if I could do it by freeing all the slaves, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would also do that. This is my official duty as I see it, but does not in any way change my personal views, that all men should be free."

Lincoln's ability never to let his personal feeling interfere with what he thought was his official duty was what made all who knew and studied his acts respect and love him. Other remarks of Lincoln on slavery, which leave no doubt as to where he stood are as follows:

"As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master. This expressed my idea of democracy. Whatever differs from this, to the extent of the difference is no democracy."

"Familiarize yourself with the chains of bondage and you prepare your own limbs to wear them. Accustomed to trample on the rights of others, you have lost the genius of your own independence and become the fit subject of the first cunning tyrant who rises among you."

"The same spirit says, 'You toil and work and earn bread, and I'll eat it.' No matter in what shape it comes, whether from the mouth of a king who seeks to bestride the people of his own nation and live by the fruits of their labor, or from one race of men as an apology for enslaving another race, it is the same tyrannical principle."

"I like the system which lets a man quit when he wants to and wish it might prevail everywhere. One of the reasons why I am opposed to slavery is just here."

"I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free."

"In giving freedom to the slaves we assure freedom to the free."

You must keep in mind that Lincoln served but one full term as President of the United States, and within that one term had accomplished his long-sought dream of making all men free.

Ladies and gentlemen, Lincoln was no phony.

Now let us compare him with the present-day activities of the Democrats. All of you know that for the last 15 years we have heard many of our so-called leaders running up and down the country telling of this great liberal administration which has had control of our Government for the last 15 years. In the hands of this administration was placed more power and confidence than in any other administration in the history of these United States. From now on in this address I will deal with the general dishonesty of these so-called leaders.

Let us see just what this Democratic Party has really done. There are in this country today two major parties—the Democratic and the Republican. I do not intend in this discussion to let the Democrats take credit for all of the good things they claim to have done and side-step the true issues of interest to us. I am willing, in this comparison, to take all of the venom which can be heaped upon the Republican Party by its opponents, if the Democrats will take credit for all of their failures and shortcomings.

One of the tricks of the Democratic propagandists in the past has been to try to convince you that the Democrats of the North are not in favor of the Democrats of the South. In the North, where Negroes can vote, they have sought their support; in the South, where they would have real power, if they could vote, they have done everything to keep them from doing so.

I do not think it is necessary to call your attention to the Rankins and the Bilbos—we all know of them; but right here and now I am going to ask you why, after 15 years of rule by these great liberal Democrats, we, as Negroes, are still fighting for the anti-lynch, anti-poll-tax, and fair-employment practice bills. They have hurled at you the fact that some few Republicans did not vote for these bills, but there has never been a time when racial legislation was brought before the Congress of these United States that the majority of the Republicans (and a large majority) in both the House and the Senate did not vote favorably for this legislation. That, most assuredly, is untrue of the Democrats. Let us examine their record a little more closely. At the height of the New Deal, in the Seventy-fifth Congress, out of 435 Congressmen, only 89 were Republicans; there were 333 Democrats and 13 who belonged to minor parties; the whole of these 13 minor-party members supported the New Deal in all of its theories. Out of 96 Senators there were 17 Republicans, 75 Democrats, and 4 minor-party members. If all of the Republicans, and all of the Democrats from the South and all of their minor-party members had voted against racial legislation, the northern Democrats would have had 243 Congressmen to pass anything they wanted, with plenty of votes to spare. In the Senate, if the same situation had taken place, they would have had 75 Senators or a clear majority. Did they pass any of the racial legislation? The answer is most evident, for we are still fighting for them. And when it is acted on favorably, Republicans will do it. FEPC has been passed in seven States: New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Wisconsin, Oregon, and Indiana—all of them States with Republican Governors and Republican legislatures. But what are the Democratic-controlled States doing? In the North they have not passed FEPC in a single State; while in the South, just let me read you exactly what they are doing to keep us from our citizenship rights.

Wrightsville, Ga., January 20, 1948: "Voters and candidates in Johnson County Democrat primary, scheduled for March 3, must sign pledges saying that they favor the white primary, segregation of races, and the county unit system of voting." Candidates qualifying for the primary must make similar written vows. The following seven rules must be followed: (1) Favor the county unit system now existing in the State of Georgia; (2) favor the white primary; (3) favor preservation of segregation for the races as now exists in Georgia; (4) oppose communism; (5) oppose any organization that seeks to destroy the Constitution of the United States and the constitution of Georgia; (6) oppose enactment into law of the rules and regulations promulgated by the Fair Employment Practice Committee; (7) will support the nominees of this primary in the general election.

Jackson, Miss., January 24, 1948: A bill requiring that the State constitution be taught in all schools is being criticized hotly in the Mississippi Legislature on the grounds it might make it easier for Negroes to vote. The measure would insert in the curriculum of all Mississippi high schools the teaching of the State constitution. Senator John Culkin, Democrat, of Jacksonville, Miss., asserted that if a Negro presented a circuit clerk with a diploma showing he had been taught the State constitution the clerk might find it difficult not to register him.

South Carolina: The Democratic Party sought to bar Negroes from its elections by divorcing primary from State control. It

made the Democratic Party an exclusive club opened to white persons only. A court of appeals ruled against this saying, "No election machinery can be upheld if its purpose or effect is to deny the Negro, on account of his race, or color, an effective voice in the government of his county, of his State, or community wherein he lives." Democrats have chosen, however, to ignore this law, and are going on with their plan to exclude the Negroes from voting.

New Orleans, La.: Five-dollar fines were levied against three Negro school teachers in Recorder's Court on charges of refusing to obey police orders to move on during the visit here of the Freedom Train.

Memphis, Tenn.: "I do not know when the Freedom Train will get to Memphis; I thought it had run out of gas"—quotation by E. H. Crump, Democratic political boss of Memphis. This statement was made after he had refused to let Negroes and whites visit the Freedom Train at the same time.

Macon County, Ala.: In Macon County, Ala., the seat of famed Tuskegee Institute, no registration board for voters has functioned in almost 2 years. It is impossible for residents of Macon County, white or black, to qualify as voters. Governor Folsom, Democrat, of Alabama, has admitted it is almost impossible to find three white citizens who will serve as registrars, the former registrars resigned after having denied a Negro, William P. Mitchell, of Tuskegee, the right to vote. Macon County has over 8,500 colored as against 5,000 white residents. The white Democratic citizenry solved their dilemma by abolishing the board. A great many Democrats seem to feel that if democracy does not work in the interest of white supremacy it shouldn't work at all.

Lincoln, in less than 6 years, under more trying conditions, gave us our complete freedom, and had he not been killed by an assassin's bullet, would have worked out our destiny.

Can you imagine Lincoln ignoring these injustices for 16 years? He would have remedied them long ago. Ladies and gentlemen, Lincoln was no phoney.

Now let us see about some of the great liberals and what they stand for.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, Democrat, of Florida, who has paraded over the country as one of the greatest liberals of all times, and who at one time compared Henry Wallace with Christ at a public meeting, has refused to leave the Democrat Party to support Wallace.

Let us look a little more closely at the record of Senator PEPPER, this great Florida Democrat. According to the Saturday Evening Post of August 31, 1946, PEPPER'S ultra liberal policy, "is a blend of political expediency and deep conviction." PEPPER meets the easier tests of liberalism. He is firmly opposed to poverty. But the acid test of all-out liberalism, racial equality, is to much for him. He campaigned in 1938 with promises to do something for the "poor white man in the South," not the poor black man. He filibustered against the antilynch bill, twice voting against cloture. Bilbo could have done no more against this liberal measure. In 1944 when he was running for reelection, he shouted for white supremacy; he loudly proclaimed that Florida primaries would be kept white; no votes for Negroes. "The South will allow nothing to impair white supremacy."

Do you think that Lincoln would have been caught in the company with men so demagogic in their thinking and in their acts? I say that Lincoln would have had nothing whatsoever to do with them, because, ladies and gentlemen, Lincoln was no phony.

Now let us talk a little bit about the present economics of the Nation and the reason for the high cost of living. Very few of us realize that we pay much more to be governed than we do to eat. These high Government costs are the greatest contributing factors to the high cost of food, shelter, and practically everything we buy. The New Jersey Taxpayers Association issued a report recently in which it estimated that each and every person in the United States averaged paying $325 per year for food, while the cost to each individual of supporting our Federal Government is $341 per year. Think of that $16 more per year to the Federal Government for taxes than we spend for food, and keep this in mind, this does not include taxes paid to State and local governments.

It is natural when you talk about cutting budgets that Government job holders would put pressure on Congress to block these economies because they do not want to lose their jobs. When Attorney General Clark, Democrat, was testifying before the Senate Civil Service Commission Committee he said, "In the Government it seems like the more people you have working for you the more money you make (meaning the boss makes more money) so nobody ever wants to get rid of any of the staff." Abraham Lincoln would never had stood for the wrecking of our country's security. He would have, however, found a sensible way to solve our problems.

Ladies and gentlemen, Lincoln was no phony.

Lincoln, who believed in the principle of the Constitution, had this to say:

"The people of these United States are the rightful master of both Congress and courts, not to overthrow the Constitution but to overthrow the men who pervert the Constitution."

Lincoln further said, "If you once forfeit the confidence of your fellow citizens, you can never regain their respect and esteem. It is true that you may fool all the people some of the time; you can even fool some of the people all of the time; but you can't fool all the people all the time."

And so the Democratic Party is now at the end of the road and cannot any longer "fool any of the people any of the time." Real leaders, as Lincoln, never try to fool the people. Ladies and gentlemen, Lincoln was no phony.

Our Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, no man in northwest Arkansas is doing more for the develpoment of our State than is C. F. Byrns, editor of the Southwest American. Mr. Byrns is in the forefront of any fight for the development of Arkansas, and especially with reference to the conservation of our natural resources.

It is a little late, but I believe the Congress needs to read his editorial which appeared in the December 8, 1947, issue of the Southwest American, published at Fort Smith. Under leave to extend I insert the editorial as part of my remarks:

OFF THE RECORD
(By C. F. Byrns)

Congress saved some dimes and lost some dollars with its economy cuts last spring in expenses of Federal agencies which deal with natural resources.

A graphic demonstration of expensive economy is the sale of timber from the national forests.

Funds to finance Federal costs in sale of national forest timber should have been increased. Instead, they were cut. It wasn't much of a cut in dollars or in percentage—only $15,271 trimmed off the previous year's allotment of $593,349. It made a showing of saving in the record. But it didn't make a showing of saving in Government receipts, in available lumber or in more houses to meet the critical shortage.

The value of lumber is high. The demand for it is unprecedented. Obviously, now is the time to cut and sell all the timber which logically should be taken out of the forests. But the economy policy of Congress will force an expensive slow-down in timber cutting in the first half of 1948 unless additional funds are made available quickly.

Here's what has happened in the Ozark National Forest of Arkansas: The timber cut and sold in the 1947 fiscal year, ending last June 30, was 19,425,000 board feet. The quota for the year beginning July 1, 1947, was set at 20,000,000 board feet. The money provided to pay Federal costs was $28,240. By the end of this month, the timber cut will total 13,000,000 board feet, which is 65 percent of the year's quota, and the money spent will likewise be 65 percent of the year's allowance. For the next 6 months, it will be necessary to slow down the sale of timber to stay within the money allotted. The only apparent way to avoid a slow-down is a deficiency appropriation by Congress.

The value of timber cut since July 1 has averaged $18.70 for each 1,000 board feet. The cost to the Forest Service for marking, scaling, and other expenses connected with the sales, has averaged $1.41 per 1,000 board feet. So every 1,000 board feet cut has produced a net return of $17.29. It is logical to assume that these values and expenses will be maintained at about the same rate during the remainder of the fiscal year.

The Ozark Forest can cut only about 7,000,000 board feet between January 1 and June 30, if no more money is made available. It could cut 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 more feet if the funds were available. Five million feet would produce a net yield of at least $85,000. Six million would produce more than $100,000. One-fourth of that would go to the counties in which the forest is located, to be spent for roads and schools. The other three-fourths would go into the Federal Treasury.

For every $1.41 Congress saved by cutting timber sales funds, it sacrificed $17.29 of revenue for the Federal Government and the counties.

The country needs all the timber it can get now. The forests need cutting of mature trees and thinning of young trees to maintain their maximum production. It would be wise now to provide funds to keep the timber sale program going at full tilt. It will always be wise to look beyond the end of the week when cuts are proposed for natural resource agencies.

Public Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the full text of President Truman's Seattle address of June 10 as printed in the June 11 edition of the New York Times. As a member of the House Committee on Public Works I visited this Pacific Northwest area last sum-

mer on a committee inspection trip, and I am convinced that Mr. Truman's proposal for a vast program of public power development and flood control is a sound and constructive one.

The address follows:

Yesterday I visited the Grand Coulee Dam for the third time.

The sight of that great project moved me deeply, as it has moved me in the past. For Grand Coulee has a significance far beyond the direct contribution it makes to the prosperity of the Pacific Northwest, vital as that is. To me that magnificent structure stands for many things to which I am deeply devoted, and stands for many things for which I stand and for which I have always voted in the Senate.

It stands for the wise use of the natural resources with which God has endowed us for the benefit of all the people.

It stands for the use of water for two purposes essential to the growth of the West—irrigation and power.

It stands for the industrial development of the West, which is so vital for the growth of this whole Nation.

It stands for the courage and determination of far-sighted citizens, who kept up the fight for the construction of this dam until that fight was won.

It stands for the use of the powers of the Federal Goverment to promote the welfare of its citizens.

And, finally, it stands for the great heart and the great vision of one who did so much to make it possible—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

When I saw Grand Coulee Dam yesterday it was pounded by the waters of the worst flood that has visited the Columbia River in 54 years. Mr. Banks, who is in charge out there, told me that a million acre-feet of water per 24 hours was going over that dam. That's almost incomprehensible. This flood has taken precious human lives. It has done tremendous damage to towns and farms. I cannot express too strongly the concern that this disaster has brought to me. But it is an experience from which we can learn a lesson, or rather get added proof for a lesson that many of us learned a long time ago.

FLOODS MUST BE CONTROLLED

The Federal Government must press forward vigorously with projects to control the waters of our rivers and direct them to useful purposes.

The waters of the Columbia River can be controlled. The shock of this tragedy should reinforce our determination to build the dams and other structures needed to bring about such control.

Nothing can ever completely repair the damage caused by this flood, or replace the lives that have been lost. But we can do something to see that it does not happen again.

We know what must be done to achieve this. We have already proved it in the Tennessee Valley. The Tennessee River used to flood every year or so. But that doesn't happen any more. The waters have been checked by dams. Now they are used for electric power and for navigation and recreation. Now those waters that used to rush down to the sea in floods are held and put to work. Every year in the Tennessee Valley millions of dollars—and probably human lives as well—are saved because the floods have been stopped.

What we have done in the Tennessee Valley we can do elsewhere. We have already been moving in that direction in other great river basins—such as the Missouri, the Colorado, the Central Valley in California, and the Columbia. Our purpose is the same in all of them—to conserve and use water, instead of wasting it. But to achieve that simple purpose we must follow a great concept of unified development of all the resources of each area. And that is no easy job, for a number of reasons. Let me use the Columbia River basin as an example.

The Columbia and its tributaries comprise a mighty river system draining parts of seven States and Canada. It discharges the second largest flow of water of any river in the United States. To harness this vast flow will take many dams and years of effort.

Furthermore, the Columbia Basin is rich in other resources besides water. It has fertile land, vast bodies of timber, valuable minerals, and a multi-million-dollar fishing industry.

We cannot plan in terms of water alone. The water and the land must be considered together. They must be studied in relation to fisheries and forests. The hydroelectric power must be considered in relation to the processing of minerals. All natural resources must be related to the industrial development of the region.

There must be, in short, a great vision of what the resources of a region can achieve if they are wisely conserved and developed together, and we must have the faith and the courage to carry out that vision.

It will take the toughest kind of fight to put over these great projects for western development. For there are people in this country who will not support the adequate development of western resources. A few of them, unfortunately, hold influential positions. They are opposed, or indifferent, to the development of these western regions for the benefit of the people here and of the whole Nation. They still seem to look on the West as some sort of wilderness in which the Nation should invest as little as possible.

I think the record is conclusive on this point. It was only 15 years ago that the tremendous waters of the great Columbia River rushed unused to the sea. At the same time, good farm lands in the Columbia Basin lay barren and dry. Industries which needed huge volumes of low-cost power stayed elsewhere. The same story was true throughout the West. In those days too many of the West's raw products were shipped to the East for processing; and the people here got neither the jobs nor the profits involved in their manufacture into finished goods.

Prior to 1933 the Reclamation Act had been on the books for 30 years. In all that time water for reclamation had been extended to less than 3,000,000 acres throughout the West; and the hydroelectric power capacity installed on these projects was only 35,000 kilowatts. Compare that with the present situation. The Grand Coulee project alone will produce nearly 2,000,000 kilowatts of power, and water for nearly 1,000,000 acres of land, and there are projects on a similar scale under way all through the West.

It is easy to accept conditions as they are today, and to forget the bitter struggles we went through to bring about this progress. But I am sure most of you can recall those days. When the Bonneville and Grand Coulee projects were before the Congress, they were bitterly opposed by the private power lobby. The lobby pointed out that there was not much industry in the Northwest. They claimed that these projects would turn out to be white elephants because there would be no use for their power. And a lot of people believed them.

DAM PROJECTS MADE GOOD

But the projects were put through and the cries of the private power lobby were proved to be absurd. The low-cost power produced at Bonneville and Grand Coulee attracted new industries to the Northwest at a rapid rate.

During the war this power was of tremendous importance. I am sure that Bonneville and the Grand Coulee speeded up victory to such an extent that they more than paid for themselves in money and in men.

Since the war the growth of the Northwest has continued. The demand for power, instead of decreasing with the decline of war production, has greatly increased. I wish those Congressmen—and there are a lot of them—who are still listening to the private power lobby, would look at these projects now. They are turning out every last kilowatt of power they can, and new generators are being installed as fast as they can be obtained.

Moreover, the rapid industrial development of the Pacific Northwest is going to require a great deal more power in the years ahead. Let's look at some of the facts about this industrial development. In less than a decade, the power from the Bonneville and Grand Coulee projects has led to the establishment in the Northwest of electric-process industries turning out $140,000,000 worth of products each year. Many other new industries have sprung up in the Northwest. The indirect effects of industrial growth here have been felt across the Nation in higher employment, higher income, and greater wealth.

For example, the new aluminum rolling mill at Spokane is selling its products to 600 plants throughout the Nation which employ 350,000 workers. This shows that industrial development here in the West does not detract from the prosperity of any other region. Instead, it adds to the prosperity of the whole Nation. The United States is still growing, and growing fast. The growth of the West means a better life for people here, and better markets and sources of supply for the rest of the country as well.

POWER LOBBIES HAVEN'T LEARNED

You might think that the private power interests and others who have fought against the development of the West would have learned by now that western growth means increased national prosperity. But they still haven't learned. Again the record is clear.

Last year I asked the Congress, in my annual budget, for an appropriation of $146,000,000 to carry forward the reclamation program for the development of water resources. There was a powerful move in the Congress to cut this back to less than $50,000,000. Even in the face of protests from all the Western States, the House of Representatives voted to cut my figure by more than half.

This year the Congress doesn't seem to be quite so interested in holding back the development of the West. But I have a suspicion that this might have something to do with the fact that this is 1948. I do not believe that the people of the West will go along with a system that appropriates enough money for western development only 1 year out of 4. And even this year, the appropriation of adequate funds is in doubt.

Some of the people who oppose western development represent selfish interests who are more concerned with present profits than with future growth. They refuse to admit that funds spent for reclamation projects and power plants and navigation locks and fish ladders are investments which will pay huge dividends as the years go by to the people of the United States.

This administration is determined that it will continue to move ahead with a constructive, practical program against the delaying tactics of ignorance and selfishness. It will fight in the future with the same vigor as it has fought in the past.

POWER LOBBYISTS STILL FIGHT

The private power lobbyists are still fighting. Where they can't block the production of public power, they're trying to block its distribution at low cost. For example, down in California, Shasta Dam has been completed and has begun to turn out power. If that power is to be used for the people's benefit, it must be moved over the transmission lines to the areas where it's needed.

But the Congress has blocked the building of the necessary transmission lines year after

year. This has been at the expense of the public, and to the benefit of a private company. This is the same company which has so little faith in the future of the West that it failed this spring to be ready to furnish vitally needed power. As a result, the whole of northern California had to resort to a brown-out.

There is no reason why the public should be forced to suffer in this manner. Utility companies must not be allowed to block publicly owned transmission lines which will bring public power to the people at low cost.

As more and more public power becomes available from the great dams all through the West, we can see the time when all the great systems will be connected together. From the Colorado through the Central Valley and up to the Columbia Basin, there should be a vast network of high voltage transmission lines. I suppose when that time comes we'll still have to battle with the men of little faith.

The fight over whether or not publicly produced power shall be used for the public benefit is only a part of the larger battle concerning the development of the basic resources of our great river valleys. One important lesson we have learned from the Tennessee Valley experience is that the resources of a watershed area must be developed jointly and in relation to each other, if they are to contribute everything possible to the development of the region. A second great lesson we have learned from the Tennessee Valley is that the local, State, and Federal Governments must work together in regional development, if that development is to be in fact for the benefit of the people.

TVA USED AS EXAMPLE

I have urged time and time again that the experience of the TVA shows the way in which we should move in other great river basins.

We are only a small distance along the road we want to travel. Water that can be used for power, for irrigation, for navigation, is going to waste all over our country. Millions of acres of land that are now dry or swampy can be put to work in productive agriculture. Soil, water, and forest conservation is just beginning to be understood and put into practice on the scale needed.

In the Columbia Basin, Bonneville and Grand Coulee mark a fine beginning. But we must have more dams if that mighty stream is to be effectively harnessed for useful purposes. I believe the present flood shows that we should try to make progress even faster than we had planned—not slower. Last year the Congress threw us backward when it cut the appropriations for this work. The cuts that are threatened this year will throw us back again if they are made. Such cuts as this are the worst kind of false economy.

All of us should take to heart the tragic events that have happened here in the Northwest in the last few weeks. If we don't conserve our resource wisely we shall pay a terrible price. We cannot afford that price, if we are to remain strong and to enjoy a better life in years to come. We must keep before us the goal of using all our natural resources fully, for the benefit of our children as well as ourselves.

But we shall have to battle every step of the way. There will still be men of little faith who are afraid to trust to the people the development of the resources of the Nation.

I believe we have the courage and the will and the vision to carry the program through in spite of these men. I believe the people here in the Northwest, and in every other part of the country, understand the issue clearly and will choose the path of growth and progress.

We know what must be done and we know how it can be done.

But in order to get it done, you must make your voices so plainly heard in the Congress that there will be no mistaking your will and your faith in the future of America.

The State of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a magazine article by Felix Morley, entitled "The State of the Nation":

THE STATE OF THE NATION

During the war there was a great deal of thoughtless adulation of Soviet Russia, as the gallant ally which, at terrible cost to itself, wore down the strength of the Nazis.

At present there is a great deal of equally thoughtless hostility toward Soviet Russia, as the source and fountainhead of a spreading revolutionary system which aims to destroy the American way of life.

Many people have been disturbed by the rapidity with which our group thinking has passed from one emotional extreme to the other. Many people realize that the character and objectives of the Russian Government are exactly the same today as during the heroic defense of Stalingrad.

The present change in attitude does not result from any change in the character of communism, but from a general revaluation in our own thinking.

The political effects of that revaluation are now about to be demonstrated, in the nomination of candidates for the responsibility of directing the policy of the United States during the next four years. During that period the relations between Washington and Moscow will be a matter of supreme importance to the entire world.

The shadow of war oppressed the nominating conventions in 1940. The condition of war affected all political considerations in 1944. This year the picture is even more perplexing. There is the condition of what is aptly called "cold war" with Soviet Russia, and there is the constant fear that thinly veiled hostility may, through some unwelcome incident, be quickly developed into a cataclysm of conflict.

No wonder that Americans are now urgently seeking to understand what lies behind this appalling picture. No wonder that they are asking what went wrong, and how, from the present welter of disillusionment, we can climb back.

On Lenin's birthday, April 22, there was published a biography of this extraordinary man, which is distinctly helpful in the effort of unemotional understanding now so insistently demanded. The author is David Shub, a Russian who was a colleague of Lenin in the proscribed Social Democratic party during the early years of this century.

After exile to Siberia, as a revolutionist, Mr. Shub emigrated to the United States, where he has lived for 40 years. He is now an editorial writer on the Jewish Daily Forward in New York. The value of his careful biography of Lenin lies in its objectivity. Mr. Shub neither condemns nor condones. In clear, straightforward writing he gives us the best picture available in English of the founder of modern communism.

All men are molded by circumstance. In 1887, when Lenin was 17, his older brother was hanged for a leading part in a conspiracy to assassinate the Czar, Alexander III. A generation later, the son of that Czar, his wife, his son, four daughters, and their attendants were coldly butchered by the Bolsheviks, with Lenin's approval. This was only one of many instances in which Lenin showed his disdain of the text which says: "Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord."

In that there was nothing illogical, because Lenin vigorously denied God. Religion was to him the opiate of the people. Deeming the Creator a mere abstraction, he worshiped instead this other abstraction which he called the people. By official Communist admission at least 5,000,000 of these same Russian people were either starved to death or executed under Lenin's personal orders.

But the irony goes even deeper than that. Lenin was personally perhaps the most modest and unassuming dictator who ever lived. Completely Spartan in his habits, he often complained sadly of the fulsome praise lavished upon him by the Soviet press. "This completely un-Marxist emphasis on an individual," he said, "is extremely harmful. It is bad, entirely inadmissible, and unnecessary."

Now, nearly a quarter of a century after Lenin's death, his embalmed body still rests in pomp within the permanent mausoleum by the Kremlin wall. Daily the shrunken corpse is worshiped, and all the writings of this mortal man are revered, studied, and expounded by the Communist faithful as though they were Holy Scripture.

A PROBLEM OF THE SPIRIT

The issue which this biography of Lenin helps to point runs very deep. It has so many historical antecedents, so many economic and moral ramifications, that it seems difficult to think the problem through. We feel the emergency of a dreadful predicament, but do not know how to solve it. So we fall back on material measures, like putting together atom bombs and building airplanes and conscripting men. Few would deny the need for such material defense. But military preparation is in itself no solution of any problem which is fundamentally spiritual in nature.

Behind the obscurity which baffles us, certain simple elements are clearly discernible. There is a quality which we call good, and there is a quality which we call evil. Take one letter from good, and we have God. Add one letter to evil, and we have Devil. The two sets of words are associated, and the principles which each set represents are continuously and eternally in conflict. From the time when men first learned to chronicle their thoughts, the greatest minds have struggled with this issue of good and evil. Ability to distinguish this issue separates men from monkeys.

Unlike the monkeys, men cannot escape philosophy; Americans least of all, because our system of government is a philosophic system, demanding at every turn that we choose and distinguish and determine for ourselves as individuals. The power of government is limited under our Constitution, so that men must face up to life, under that divine authority which we consider superior to the state.

This faith in a Supreme Authority is now challenged, as never before in our national history, by a doctrine which aggressively denies that God has any place in human thought. Communism is not without a distorted morality and ethics of its own. Lenin himself put this clearly. "We repudiate all morality," he wrote, "that is taken outside of human class concepts. * * * Our morality is derived from the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat. * * * We do not believe in God."

GOD—OR THE DEVIL

But to repudiate God is to give allegiance to the Devil. To narrow and limit the field

of what is good is to widen and enlarge the sphere of what is evil. And this tremendous enlargement of evil was the fruit of Lenin's brilliant but completely amoral mind. It is always so when intelligence is divorced from conscience, the literal meaning of which is "knowing with" God.

The challenge posed for America by Stalin, as the disciple, heir, and apostle of Lenin, is different from, and much more subtle than, that posed by Hitler. The threat of the Axis Powers was essentially that of one group of governments to another national group. A victory for the Axis would have been intolerable but, for that very reason, would probably not have been permanent. Throughout history men have risen to overthrow tyrannical government. An evil government does not necessarily corrode individuals.

The triumph of an evil idea is worse than the triumph of an evil government, because ideas enslave the mind and soul of man, not merely his body. Moreover, an evil idea, as opposed to a corrupt regime, cannot be overthrown by physical heroism or by the mobilized power of physical force. Indeed, we must realize that the moral and material ruin spread by modern war provides a tragic fertilization of the seed of evil.

The First World War gave Lenin his opportunity. The Second World War has strengthened the grip and power of his doctrines. A third world war would likely efface God from the minds of men. That was Lenin's primary objective.

Often man fumbles by failing to see the simple essence of a complicated problem. In the small decencies which make life happier for everyone is the one sure antidote to communism. The doctrines of Christ—if we believe in them—are stronger far than those of anti-Christ.

FELIX MORLEY.

Appropriation for Triple A

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most enterprising farmers of the Third Congressional District of Arkansas is Ralph Hudspeth, who lives near St. Joe in Searcy County. I have known him many years. He is the type of farmer we in the Congress can take great pride in having supported in the past. I do hope that we continue to support far-sighted, active young men like Ralph. He was here a week or so ago and testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee. I ask permission to insert a copy of that testimony in the RECORD as a part of my remarks:

I am Ralph Hudspeth, livestock farmer in Searcy County, Ark. I am here today speaking for myself as a farmer who operates a livestock farm and for thousands of other farmers in my section of the State. At a meeting of farmers in our part of the State not long ago, I was selected to come up here and tell you gentlemen what we farmers think of the appropriation you are now considering for the agricultural conservation program which you call conservation and land use, but which is known by farmers all over the country as the triple-A program.

As I said before, I am speaking for thousands of farmers. In the 10 counties in the Third Congressional District of Arkansas there are 25,000 farmers. I feel sure that if any or all of these farmers were here today they would give you about the same information and express about the same opinions that I am going to give you.

In the first place I would like to mention the appropriation for this year's triple-A farm program, the 1948 program year. As approved by the House, the appropriation for this most necessary work would be only $150,000,000 which isn't anywhere near enough to do the conservation job that needs to be done. I have heard that you have been getting reports that any increase in triple-A appropriations could not be effectively used this year in increasing conservation because it is too late in the year. This report is that farm plans have been made and operations are under way and any increase in assistance will not get any increase in conservation. This is far from the truth in Arkansas and I feel sure it is far from the truth in much of the Nation. If you will recall, last year there was a period of about 5 or 6 weeks before the appropriations was finally approved when farmers didn't know whether there would be any assistance or not and what a lull there was in conservation work. When the appropriation was finally approved, farmers redoubled their efforts in conservation work and in Arkansas carried out conservation practices in excess of the amount for which assistance was available.

Farmers in Arkansas are just now starting their farming operations and farming plans and operations are sufficiently flexible to permit changes to permit more conservation if assistance is available. In our State many of the conservation practices are executed in the summer and fall months.

We believe that the appropriations should be not less than $300,000,000 with sufficient funds of not less than $37,000,000 for administration.

In the event additional funds are not made available farmers will not carry out needed conservation practices because they are not financially able to do so. Too, it has a tendency to cause farmers to lose faith in the Government in that the Government is failing to do its part of the soil-saving job. If such funds are made available, they will be used. Terraces, ponds, and application of minerals such as limestone, phosphate, and potash as well as other pasture practices will be carried out. These practices are the major practices in our section and are carried out after September 1 as a rule.

Reasons for stabilizing appropriations:

1. It will give State, county, and community committees a definite goal whereby they can plan better conservation practices.

2. The program will be more effective if the committees and farmers have something definite to work toward. The farmers are at a loss to know how to plan future conservation practices not knowing what amount he will get as aid from his Government. Therefore, he is limited to what cash he has on hand.

3. With a stabilized program we can train and hold personnel and thereby make a more effective and efficient program. As it now is we cannot hold trained personnel because: (1) The appropriations are too uncertain; (2) Other agencies offer our help more money about the time we get them trained to do the job.

4. With a stabilized program the committees will be more interested because a long range program can be planned and the farmers and committees can work toward that end.

5. By stabilizing the appropriation there will be better trained committees because they will be used more in contacting the farmers which will cause more interest to be shown in the conservation program.

The community committeemen serve as the backbone of the conservation program. It is the duty of the community committeeman to carry the program out to his farmer neighbors thereby laying the foundation for the educational phase of the program. We sincerely feel that the community committeeman is the proper one to carry on the informational work of the program. He should, therefore, be given the experiment station's findings for this purpose.

The farmers of my area ask that the $500 limitation in payments be removed from the bill because:

1. Conservation needs are not based on individuals but on needs of land.

2. Big farms as well as small need assistance.

3. Big operator is in little better position to pay all cost.

4. Tenants on big farms benefit from conservation as well as operators.

In the past years the farmers have overearned the appropriation of money. You might say they are just now getting sold on the needs of conservation. For instance, in 1947 our district had $594,707 allocated for conservation assistance, but actually carried out conservation practices to a total program value of $826,583.49; that is, they overearned the allocation by $231,876.49. If we figure on the same basis in 1948, the farmers of northwest Arkansas under the $150,000,000 program will overearn a half million dollars. This is less than 50 percent of the amount of conservation needed in our district. Now, I understand in setting up the money for conservation practices the plan is for the Government to pay approximately one-half the actual cost of carrying out practices. If that is right, in 1947 the Government paid less than 36 percent of the cost of the conservation that was carried out in northwest Arkansas. Assuming that the same amount of conservation is carried out in 1948 under a $150,000,000 appropriation, the Government will be paying less than 17 percent of the actual cost of all conservation carried out in the Third Congressional District of Arkansas.

Now, gentlemen, we feel that soil conservation is a public responsibility. The farmers are not financially able to do the job alone. Furthermore, the present generation is not responsible for the present conditions of our soil. In order to elevate the health and wealth of the Nation, the farmers must have something more than technical assistance. Technical assistance is fine, yes, but if technical advice is all the farmer can get from his Government, there will be very little conservation carried out, as was demonstrated before the triple-A was started. With the fine service offered by the Soil Conservation Service, they are able to get only a very small amount of conservation carried out without PMA payments.

I know this is true on my own farm. I need more conservation, but I am forced to limit the amount of conservation carried out in keeping with the amount of assistance I can get from the Government. When my farm allowance was built up at $1 per acre of cropland, I was able to carry out more conservation than I will be able to carry out this year where my farm allowance is built up at $0.25 an acre. I know that if I could carry out more conservation this year, you could eat better beef and your children would be healthier, but it would not increase my profits sufficiently that I could afford to do it. Therefore, it will not be done. I am sure there are thousands of other farmers that figure the same as I do.

We farmers in northwest Arkansas are eager to cooperate with you in your future action on programs. I wish to thank you for the privilege of coming before your committee this morning.

Humor as a Weapon Against Dictators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we have all heard much about the ineptness of some of the Voice of America programs. Funds have been used in many radio broadcasts overseas which have been not only stupid and vicious, but un-American. Many of the broadcasts have been completely ineffective because they were completely over the heads of the listeners. I believe that we have got to straighten out this overseas information program so that it will fulfill the actual intentions of the Congress in the war of ideas against communism.

Recently, at the invitation of the Overseas News Agency, I released a statement which has been published in many American newspapers on the matter of using humor as a weapon against dictators—humor which can be universally understood, which is simple, direct, and appealing. Humor can be overused, obviously, and can boomerang, so precautions must be taken.

I ask unanimous consent that my statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY SEES HUMOR AS "SECRET WEAPON"—WISCONSIN SENATOR WANTS IT USED IN WAR OF IDEAS AGAINST TYRANTS

(By ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

WASHINGTON.—You may have heard the joke about the Yugoslav peasant who was formerly known as a great admirer of the deposed king and who was seen by a Communist to be praying. The Communist asked, "For whom are you praying?" The peasant answered, "For Tito." The Communist sneered, "You used to pray for the king, didn't you?" "Positively," the peasant answered, "and now look where he is."

The length and breadth of Europe, wherever men and women were once free and are now beneath the dictators' heel, jokes are whispered behind closed doors as people seek to satisfy their hunger for liberty. Proof that humor is regarded as a real menace to tyrants is the fact that "offensive" humor is strictly prohibited.

America, however, should recognize that humor can be a secret weapon and an important one in winning the war of ideas against Russia and the Communist ideology. We should be experts at humor because in American politics, there is nothing sacred about any man, public official, or private citizen.

Humor does a lot for the deliverer as well as the listener, for it helps to release tensions and anxieties. Humor, in fact, is so universal that it must exist even in dictatorships. There, however, it is carefully channelized and can never be directed against the top tyrants. For example, a Russian newspaper may joke about an inefficient local distribution system, remarking that a sure sign of summer is the appearance of ski-wax for sale in sports stores.

There was humor in Germany, too, during the era of Hitler. Always, however it was designed as a puny gesture at what is called "constructive self-criticism" of the inevitable corruption and red tape in dictatorial administration.

I believe that humor should be utilized in the United States overseas information program, in our radio broadcasts, in our overseas magazines and newspapers, in our overseas business advertising and in every medium in the Voice of America program. Of course, humor has been used, particularly in overseas issues of some of the leading magazines. But I believe we should plan carefully in using humor as a "secret weapon."

Several safeguards are necessary.

1. There is no weapon like humor which can puncture the inflated balloons, the stuffed-shirts that always make up a dictator's hierarchy.

2. The humor of each people is in some sense unique and is based upon that people's culture, history and folk lore. Therefore humor must be tailored to each people.

3. Humor can't be too involved if it is to be successful. It must get down to brass tacks.

There has been no great forward movement in history which was not advanced by men's sardonic humor, by poking fun at existing institutions and removing them from the sacred atmosphere of infallability. In fact, Benjamin D. Casseres once said, "Progress is nothing but victory of laughter over dogma."

Obviously, humor can backfire if it is handled improperly or to excess. It is no panacea. We can't make our overseas information program a gag parade or it really will gag in the throats of the American and foreign peoples.

Our basic weapon in the war of words must be facts—hard, cold, memorable facts. But we must never forget that humor can often penetrate where a million high-principled words may not.

Here in this political year of 1948 we will get another fine illustration of the constructive and perhaps the destructive value of humor in politics. Perhaps we will take the constructive lesson to heart and begin to use humor as I believe it should be used as a weapon in the war of ideas.

Why Does Not the Department of Agriculture Follow the Provisions of the Steagall Amendment?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we are supposed to have a support program for potatoes, but the following information which I have just received from my district, and which I have directed to the Secretary of Agriculture, is further evidence of the fact that it has not been efficiently or effectively operated:

STEVENS POINT, WIS., *June 8, 1948.*
REID MURRAY,
Washington, D. C.:

Farmers in Portage County have 80 cars of potatoes which are spoiling fast. Government loans on them. What happened to diversion program for feed in Wisconsin? Would like investigation of price-support program. State and county officials can do nothing, could not get support price of $2.23 at any time. All have loans of $1.15. Today State officials said loans must be paid back. Leaving producer with nothing for 1947 crop. Please answer collect at once.

MAX HAVILAND AND ELI SCRIBNER.

BANCROFT SUPPLY CO.,
Bancroft, Wis., June 10, 1948.
Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: Farmers around here have several thousand bushels of potatoes stored in our warehouse on which they secured Government loans, and should be disposed of at once as they are spoiling.

If action is not taken soon in removing them from our warehouse great damage will result to our building.

We have taken this matter up with our renters, and they inform us that they cannot do anything about it until the Government releases them.

Can you do anything to help this situation? Anything that you may be able to do will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,
BANCROFT, SUPPLY CO.,
By E. O. ERICKSON,
Manager.

JUNE 11, 1948.

MR. CHARLES F. BRANNON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SECRETARY: Yesterday I received the following telegram from Stevens Point, Wis., concerning the potato situation there:

"Farmers in Portage County have 80 cars of potatoes which are spoiling fast. Government loans on them. What happened to diversion program for feed in Wisconsin? Would like investigation of price-support program. State and county officials can do nothing; could not get support price of $2.23 at any time. All have loans of $1.15. Today State officials said loans must be paid back. Leaving producer with nothing for 1947 crop. Please answer collect at once."

I have been advised that your potato branch is working on this problem and I sincerely trust that they will work it out in such a manner that it will be fair to all of the potato growers in Wisconsin.

The way the potato program has been administered these past years has disturbed me very much. I have felt that it was not properly administered and that it has jeopardized the whole support program. In the first place I never could understand why the Department continues to support potato prices on an acreage basis when they have had so many examples of the futility of using this yardstick in controlling production. In my opinion the support should have been on a bushel basis and much of the difficulty could have been averted. Under the program up to this time it appears that southern crops are taken over by the USDA without question of the losses sustained. Potato growers in the southern portions of the northern regions where potatoes are planted earlier, have been able to get them fairly well marketed before the loan set-up went into operation. However, other northern potato growers have been subjected to the loan program, which is not working out satisfactorily.

If the potato producers of the South and certain early potato growers of the North are provided means of obtaining cash for their crops as produced, why is not the same privilege accorded other potato growers?

According to the report of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the 1947 potato crop was only 384,000,000 bushels and in former years when the crop was 400,000,000 bushels, the program was handled without any large losses. I realize the Department has contended that it did not have the authority to control production, but they had only to ask for such auhority as I do not believe that anyone would want to be in the position of subsidizing excessive surpluses.

When situations exist, as they apparently do in Wisconsin and particularly in Portage County at this time, I think you appreciate that the whole support program is jeopardized, and it makes it difficult for the county

agricultural agents and the AAA committeemen to carry on their work and endeavor to explain a support program that turns out not to be a support program.

During the past several years the present Administration has been able to provide $816,000 for one cotton farmer of Mississippi and another $249,000 for Mr. Tom Campbell's wheat-farming operations. This money was paid for either raising the crops or not raising them or was given to the producers because the crop did not bring enough in the market place.

The point which I wish to make is that the approach to the potato program does not appear to be a very desirable one when potato growers do not receive just consideration for the crops which they have actually produced.

As previously stated, I trust that this entire problem will receive serious consideration and some action be taken at once to alleviate it.

Sincerely yours,

REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress.

Sometimes I am of the opinion that the potato program has been planned that way. There seems to be money available for southern crops and some early potato crops of the North, but when it comes to the product of the average potato farmer of the North, we find that he is not extended just consideration.

The senseless burning of potatoes by the Government and the support program of this product has jeopardized the entire support program. There is little use of talking about a long-range agricultural program when the already existing law providing for support prices—namely, the Steagall amendment—is not followed.

Could the objective of the Secretary of Agriculture be a desire for more power so that he may have the whip hand over the farmers of America? Does it not appear that he wants the power to tell the poultryman he is to receive 24 to 36 cents per dozen for his eggs, or whether the pork producer is to have 12 to 18 cents per pound for his hogs, or the dairymen to have $2 or $3 per hundredweight for his milk, or 20 to 30 cents per pound for his cheese, and 50 or 75 cents per pound for his butter?

The ultimate result of the Secretary's proposal would be to make the Secretary of Agriculture the economic dictator of this country.

The farmers of America are entitled to equal legislative support for their particular crop, regardless of North or South and regardless of the Mason and Dixon's line.

A Favorite Phrase of Mr. Truman's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Krock, from today's New York Times:

A FAVORITE PHRASE OF MR. TRUMAN'S

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, June 10.—The President has now uttered publicly a view he has often privately expressed—that the Congress he was dealing with is the "worst." At Spokane, in a colloquy with a reporter, he expanded this theme by saying that the Eightieth, or current, Congress, holds the low record in the history of the Republic, modifying this later to give that description to the Congress that impeached Andrew Johnson and then deciding to stand on his original rating of the Eightieth.

There are obvious reasons why the President, who is a candidate for nomination on the Democratic ticket, did not refer to an estimate he used to make of the Congress that was in session when he succeeded. Of that Congress, the Seventy-ninth, he was wont to say in the spring of 1946 that it was the "worst since Andrew Johnson's" meaning the National Legislature elected in 1866 and not the one chosen in 1864 when Lincoln won a second term on the same ballot and Johnson became Vice President.

Mr. Truman's experiences with the Eightieth Congress may have upped his rating of the Seventy-ninth. But another explanation may be that this Congress was organized by the Republicans, while the President's own party, from which he is seeking nomination, organized the Seventy-ninth, of which once he expressed the same unflattering opinion after his unsuccessful struggles with it over the Office of Price Administration and other controversial issues.

In any event, the President has put the current Congress in a historical category which he finds discreditable and to which he would consider admitting only Andrew Johnson's second legislative body. Those who are familiar with the record of that, the Fortieth, Congress will not wonder that Mr. Truman's remarks, as originally made or as modified, has angered Members of the current body on both sides of the party aisle; and, as a political tactic, has distressed and alarmed leading Democrats. For nothing in the record or conduct of the Eightieth Congress, as of the Seventy-ninth, justifies the scathing comparison.

IN 1867–68

There has been criticism in Congress of Mr. Truman, but none that approaches the vituperation and coarseness of the attacks on Johnson in the Fortieth that were climaxed by the unique attempt at presidential impeachment. On the great issues of that day, the Reconstruction bill and the Tenure of Office bill, Congress, though its fierce leader, Thaddeus Stevens, was dying, balked the President at every turn; while the Eightieth has accepted and in large measure sustained the foreign policy on which Mr. Truman expects, if nominated, to base his chief claim for election. It passed the Taft-Hartley Act, which he vetoed and still denounces, but this law gave him the effective legal weapons with which he prevented a railroad strike and broke the strike called by John L. Lewis. And if the Executive power to make trade agreements with other countries is preserved in any of its essentials, the President will owe that to Senators VANDENBERG, TAFT, and MILLIKIN, all Republicans.

To Senator VANDENBERG in particular Mr. Truman is beholden for the championship of the so-called Truman Doctrine and the European recovery plan, without which both might have been emasculated or even rejected. And in the hour that the President was flaying this Congress as the worst or second worst, Mr. VANDENBERG, aided by Mr. Stassen and Governors Dewey and Warren, all Republicans, was staking a much more promising political future than Mr. Truman's on an intra-party battle to finance the ERP with the sum which the Democratic Administration has set down as absolutely essential to its success.

SOURCE OF THE NAME-CALLING

The President began the name-calling, which he expanded in Spokane yesterday. He began it with personal attacks on Senator TAFT over price control. But no one in the Eightieth Congress has come near referring to him, as Parson Brownlow did to Johnson in the Fortieth, as "that dead dog in the White House," and Representative CLEVENGER's efforts in that direction today were instantly rebuked by a fellow-Republican, who admonished his party not to sink to Mr. Truman's level.

This is hot stuff in the political pot, but the fire that burns beneath it was lit by the President himself. And, like the record of the Eightieth Congress as contrasted with the Fortieth, it is not faintly comparable to the Executive-legislative exchanges of 1867 and 1868.

Dip almost anywhere in the first 200 pages of Bowers' The Tragic Era (Houghton Mifflin, Cambridge, Mass., 1929), and this difference between the White House-Capitol relations of that time and the present is plain. On January 7, 1867, Loan, of Missouri, introduced impeachment resolutions "charging Johnson with every imaginable crime"; and a week later Loan, in a House speech which was ruled "unexceptionable" by the Chair, whose ruling the House Republicans sustained, insinuated that Johnson had instigated the assassination of Lincoln and was "influenced by the grosser animal instincts."

Very naturally, a Congress put by the President in the same category with the Fortieth burns with indignation and the spirit of reprisal. Even if Mr. Truman has not depressed his own low political stock by his words, he has to this extent injured the national interest.

Labor Monopolies and Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following statement by Dr. Willford I. King, chairman of the Committee for Constitutional Government:

Not long ago our railway employees threatened to strike. By so doing they could paralyze many of our great industries. Therefore the Government stepped in and seized the railroads. Now the union leaders ask that the Government take over the ownership of the railroads and continue to operate them.

The probabilities are that a little later the coal miners will threaten another strike. Suppose that, at the behest of Government, the miners cool off for 80 days and then reiterate their intentions to strike. Will not the Government proceed to seize the coal mines? It certainly cannot allow the Nation's industries to be closed down by lack of coal. If the mine owners refuse to yield to the demands of the United Mine Workers, will not the latter then insist that the Government purchase and operate the coal mines?

If past experience is any criterion, some time within the next 2 or 3 years there will be a widespread collapse in the demands for most kinds of durable goods. When this happens, unless wage rates are reduced, large-scale unemployment will be inevitable. But can we imagine the union leaders gracefully agreeing to wage cuts? Will not threatened strikes in all of our great essential industries lead to their seizure by Government? Will not the steelworkers, the petroleum workers, the telephone workers, the electrical workers all demand permanent Government ownership and operation in their respective fields?

Those who are familiar with the course of events in Europe during the last 40 years

know that the unions have repeatedly forced governmental intervention in the industries of that continent and that their persistent endeavors to ecure government ownership and operation of the principal European industries have now been crowned with success.

Most American union leaders loudly proclaim their devotion to the principle of free enterprise. How, then, does it happen that they, like their European counterparts, now ask for government ownership of our railroads? The answer is simple. Only government can pay in wages amounts not justified by what the industry in question can collect from its customers. Government can saddle the unwarranted wage load upon the taxpayers and propertied classes. Private owners do not have this recourse.

This point is well illustrated by what has happened in France. When the government there took over the leading French industries, it anticipated that the profits of these industries would pay a large part of governmental expense. However, the workers in these fields demanded sharp wage advances. The unions control so many votes that the French Government has been afraid to defy them. Wages have gone up and up. As a result, the anticipated profits have been replaced by huge operating deficits. The French Government, fearful of popular opposition, has not dared to raise taxes sufficiently to balance the budget. Hence it has resorted to inflation. Next, it has attempted, by using rationing and price controls, to counter the inevitable increase in the price level. Thus, industrial recovery has been greatly hampered, and the United States Government is asked to make up the deficit.

France's experience has been largely duplicated in England, Germany, Belgium, Holland, and Italy. All of these nations have adopted government ownership—in other words, state socialism. All are bogged down in the "Slough of Despond." And now our labor leaders are urging us to follow these nations down into the morass. Fortunately, Americans do not seem to be stupid enough to yield to such advice.

But such refusal does not indicate that we are willing to go after the root of the difficulty. Clearly, governmental seizure of industry is not a scientific method of dealing with wage disputes Just what is to be done if workers and employers both remain adamant? No one has offered a good answer.

What the Nation really needs is to eliminate the source of the trouble. That source is obviously our acquiescence in the development of privileged labor monopolies so huge that they have it in their power to shut down whole industries. As long as we allow these ruthless organizations to exist, a sword of Damocles will hang over our heads. That year after year, freedom-loving, red-blooded Americans should tolerate this situation is almost incomprehensible. But facts are stranger than fiction.

The Mundt-Nixon Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter on the Mundt-Nixon bill, written by Raymond L. Wise, and published in the New York Times on June 6, 1948.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MUNDT-NIXON BILL—UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF PENDING LEGISLATION IS CHARGED

(The writer of the following letter has been special assistant to the United States attorney and assistant attorney general of the State of New York.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In view of the many statements made about the Mundt-Nixon bill by those who have never actually read it, I thought you might like a letter from one who has studied it carefully because of a deep interest in civil liberties.

The bill starts with a finding of fact describing the nature, extent, and methods of the world Communist movement. This finding is followed by definitions. A "Communist political organization" is defined as one which is controlled by the foreign Communist dictatorship. A "Communist front" is one which is controlled by a Communist political organization or aids one or holds its views.

The bill develops its two main aspects:

First it creates the specific crime of attempting to establish by any means a totalitarian dictatorship in the United States under the control of any foreign government. The penalty is a fine of not more than $10,000 or not more than 10 years, or both. There is no statute of limitations. Loss of citizenship is an additional penalty.

RESTRICTIVE PROVISIONS

Second, the bill establishes a pattern of special treatment for Communist organizations or what the Attorney General finds "on substantial evidence" to be such. They must file registration and annual statements and keep records as to officers, lists of members, nonmembers who are active, funds, and contributors. This information must be kept on public file by the Attorney General. They cannot use the mails or radio or other means of communication without disclosing their name and nature. They and their contributors are not to enjoy tax exemption or deduction.

A number of new criminal offenses are created in respect to conduct of their members. Their members cannot seek or hold elective Federal office without disclosure of the fact they are members, and cannot be employed at all in any Federal nonelective job. They are denied the use of passports. They cannot become or remain members of an unregistered organization knowing it to be such. The Attorney General must make a full investigation of any organization he has reason to believe ought to register. He must also investigate any organization when requested to do so by either branch of Congress.

All organizations are entitled to hearings after timely notice. The hearings may be reviewed by the Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, but the findings of the Attorney General as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive. Further appeal may be taken to the Supreme Court.

Penalties vary from fines up to $10,000 and imprisonment up to 10 years, or both. There is the usual saving clause which saves the rest of the act if any part is held invalid.

The bill is clearly unconstitutional.

PROCESS CLAUSE VIOLATED

Section 4 prohibits any attempt to establish a Communist state here. There are laws which now prohibit such an end by unlawful means. But section 4 goes further and proscribes any means, even a proposal to amend our Constitution. It thereby clearly violates the due process clause of the fifth amendment in that it prohibits an act which the Constitution protects.

Section 6, prohibiting the holding of elective office, section 7, regarding passports, and section 10, regarding membership in a nonregistered organization, all violate the sixth amendment, giving to each defendant the right to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation against him. Each of these sections is based on the definitions of Communist organizations in section 3. These definitions are so vague, complex, and susceptible of varying interpretations as to make them lacking in that certainty with which the sixth amendment requires that a criminal offense be described. A man of common understanding must know what is prohibited. This is not possible under section 3.

Section 8, dealing with registration, and section 9, providing for the keeping of a public register, violate the first amendment, which provides that Congress shall make no law * * * abridging the freedom of speech or * * * the right of the people peaceably to assemble * * *. The requirement of registration and the making public of the registration statements would impose an undue and unnecessary restriction or free speech and on the holding of meetings. Such a restriction on speech or assembly is permitted only when the words used are used in such circumstances and are of such a nature as to create a clear and present danger that they will bring about the substantive evils that Congress has a right to prevent (that is, when a crime will be committed as an immediate result of the utterance of the words).

DANGER TO SECURITY

The quotation is from the case of *Schenck* v. *The United States* (249 U. S. 47), and the words were written by Mr. Justice Holmes. The bill, in section 2, speaks of a clear and present danger to the security of the United States.

This may be true in the broad international sense, but there is no clear and present danger that our Government will be overthrown if Communists are not compelled to register and there is no finding to that effect in the bill. That must be the test, not the fact that the interests of two nations are in conflict. Section 10, regarding membership in a nonregistered organization, violates the first amendment for the same reason.

Section 10 and section 11 as to the use of the mails, etc., and section 12 as to tax exemptions all violate the fifth amendment. They constitute discriminatory legislation which is directed against a class and is held to violate the prohibition against deprivation of liberty "without due process of law" unless the public welfare requires the legislation. In such cases there must be a "real and substantial relation" between the public welfare and the object sought. Here again, unless there is clear proof that our Government will not be overthrown by force and violence unless Communists are compelled to register, there would be no "real and substantial" relation between public welfare and registration.

PRINCIPLE OF SEPARATION

Section 13, giving the Attorney General the right to determine who must register, and section 14, making his findings binding on the circuit court of appeals if they are "supported by substantial evidence" are violative of the principle of separation of powers set forth in the Constitution in article I, section 1, vesting legislative powers in Congress; article II, section 1, vesting the executive power in the President; and article III, section 1, vesting the judicial power in the courts.

In sections 13 and 14 of the bill Congress delegates a legislative power to an Executive and makes such power binding on the judiciary. Delegation by Congress to the Executive is lawful only when clear and unequivocal standards are set up by Congress to guide the Executive in making a determination. Here again, the definitions set up in section 3 of the bill are so vague, complex,

and indefinite as to render the delegation of power unlawful. This defect is aggravated by the fact that the court of appeals cannot upset the findings if they are based on substantial evidence.

It is contrary to our fundamental theories of government to penalize or put pressure on expression of opinion or on free association in advance of personal criminal guilt, established after trial by due process of law. No political groups are singled out for special criminal laws. We do not recognize "guilt by association."

Edmund Burke said in his speech on the Conciliation of America, "I do not know the method of drawing up an indictment against a whole people." Today, in this country we are not yet so sorely pressed that we must undermine our own liberties by drawing up an indictment against a whole party.

RAYMOND L. WISE.

NEW YORK, *June 1, 1948.*

Canadian Hotels Find Excise Relief Pays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, hotel men of the United States have received graphic proof of their contention that the present 20-percent excise tax is a positive deterrent to their dine-and-dance rooms.

This news came by way of the Billboard, a magazine of news about the amusement and related industries. In the May 29, 1948, issue of Billboard, there is a lengthy news story relating how the Canadian Government has lifted its 25-percent excise tax which formerly was levied on all business in cabarets and in hotel dine-and-dance rooms. Most significant is the fact that lifting of this tax caused an immediate pick-up in business in hotel rooms where there is music and food is served.

One hotel, the Mount Royal Hotel in Montreal, proved by its records that its Normandie roof business was 25 percent better in the 6 days following May 19, date of the lifting of the tax, than it had been on the same roof garden in the 6 days preceding the lifting of the tax. In short, this is specific proof that a high excise tax actually is a deterrent to business in this specific field.

As we all realize, the tax in the United States on such dining rooms—which have music—in hotels is 20 percent. Many hotel men tell me they feel sure this tax is causing regular dining-room business that normally would come to them to go elsewhere. It is apparent that this would be true. We in Congress ought to act—and act as quickly as possible—to keep up with Canada in its far-sighted lifting of this burdensome excise tax.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the May 29 issue of the Billboard, relating to the lifting of excise taxes in Canada:

CANADA BIZ GETS HYPO AS 25 PERCENT TAX ENDS—LEGIT, NITERIES, PARKS AIDED

MONTREAL, May 22.—Show business in Quebec was given a new lease on life this week with the announcement in Ottawa that the 20 percent Federal tax on theaters and the 25 percent amusement tax on other amusement places would now be a thing of the past.

The lifting of the stiff levy was announced in the annual budget revealed by Finance Minister Abbott in the House of Commons. It still is hard to say what the general effect of the tax removal will be, but coming at the birth of a new tourist season it is certain to benefit all branches of showbiz.

Although the tax removal is applicable throughout Canada, the effect will be felt only in certain provinces. During the war the Federal Government, by order-in-council, forced the provinces to vacate certain fields of taxation, the amusement tax income being lost by the provinces.

ONLY QUEBEC AND ALBERTA?

After the war the tax issue became a hot political potato, with provinces trying to reclaim the vacated tax fields. Now that the Federal Government has left the amusement tax field and the Provinces are again in, the benefits are certain to be felt by only two provinces—Quebec and Alberta—which have announced that they will pass on the benefits of the federal action intact to their citizens.

In Ontario the provincial government will levy the 20 percent tax let go by Ottawa, and in Manitoba the Government will not only take over the amusement taxation field but will hike all amusement taxes to the 25-percent level. British Columbia is ready to proclaim its own amusement tax. What the other provinces will do is unannounced as yet.

While the removal of the tax is encouraging, the amusement industry, along with other industries, are disappointed that the government could not see its way clear to reduce income taxes. On the whole, however, the average citizen will feel much more like going to amusement places now that the heavy tax has been removed. Here's the situation:

NITERIES

In the nitery field removal of the tax will be especially beneficial (see full story in night club department). Loss of business because of the tax has been big, and the end of the bite may mean a complete realignment in show policies on the part of clubs.

LEGIT

Lifting of the levy from legit ducats probably will mean a hypoing in Canada of legit b. o. and an increase in Montreal in the number of road companies that want to show their stuff. It has been well known that many a road company has decided to by-pass Canada because of the heavy amusement bite. (The O'Dyly Carte Gilbert and Sullivan troupe didn't show up here for that reason.) With the reduction in ticket prices, road companies will now be encouraged to come to Montreal more often.

CONCERTS, BAND ONE-NIGHTERS

Sponsors of long-hair and band personal appearances are particularly overjoyed. Here also it was necessary until now to set tickets at a high price in order to take care of the tax. However, the end of the levy means that the impresarios will not be afraid to go out and book the bigger stars, since with the tickets reduced in price the chances of getting off the nut will be that much easier.

UNIT SHOWS, SPORTS, PARKS

Removal of the tax will also have a beneficial effect on circuses, roller and ice shows, baseball and hockey games, wrestling and boxing matches, amusement parks, etc. In general, it means that promoters are now anticipating larger crowds (with ticket prices down) and with the increased revenue they will be able to provide more stellar attractions.

For example, the top movie houses have already cut their top ducat price from 67 cents to 57. When the same principle is carried right through the amusement industry the effect will be an over-all boost in box-office receipts, which will, in turn, result in better quality entertainment.

The budget generally, aside from removal of the admission tax, had no special good news for the amusement industries. Such imports as are still permitted into Canada after the embargo on many items to reserve Canada's dwindling United States dollar supply, will still retain their present prices, if not go higher, since there has been no pronounced change in the tariff scale.

Home Construction in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much misinformation on housing in the United States since the close of the war that I believe it proper to examine the facts. The United States Government keeps accurate data on this problem in the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Reports from this Bureau show that in 1945, 209,300 new permanent nonfarmed dwelling units were started.

In 1946, 670,500 dwelling units were started and 437,800 were completed.

In 1947, 849,000 were started and 831,700 were completed.

In the first 4 months of this year, 257,200 dwelling units have been started.

It is interesting to note that the dwellings started in the first 4 months of 1948 exceeds by more than 25 percent those started during the first 4 months of 1947. This will give us over a million new homes in 1948 and thus furnish new shelter to more than 3,000,000 persons. The previous top figure was 925,000 units in 1925.

I include the following complete report from the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics:

Estimated number of new permanent nonfarm dwelling units started and completed, 1945–47

Year and month	Starts	Completions	Under construction
1945	209,300	(1)	(1)
January	7,000	(1)	(1)
February	7,900	(1)	(1)
March	10,600	(1)	(1)
April	12,400	(1)	(1)
May	14,600	(1)	(1)
June	18,600	(1)	(1)
July	17,000	(1)	(1)
August	17,100	(1)	(1)
September	20,100	(1)	(1)
October	25,600	(1)	(1)
November	29,300	(1)	(1)
December	29,100	(1)	(1)
1946	670,500	437,800	
January	37,700	15,900	159,100
February	42,400	17,300	184,200
March	62,000	18,700	227,500
April	67,000	21,000	273,500
May	67,100	25,100	315,500
June	64,100	30,600	349,000
July	62,600	36,700	374,900
August	65,400	43,400	396,900
September	57,600	49,700	404,800
October	57,800	55,500	407,100
November	47,700	61,200	393,600
December	59,300	62,700	370,200

[1] Not available.

Estimated number of new permanent nonfarm dwelling units started and completed, 1945–47—Continued

Year and month	Starts	Completions	Under construction
1947	849,000	831,700	
January	39,300	62,600	346,900
February	42,800	60,300	329,400
March	56,000	57,600	327,800
April	67,100	59,200	335,700
May	72,900	59,400	349,200
June	77,200	62,300	364,100
July	81,100	64,800	380,400
August	86,300	69,600	397,100
September	93,800	76,700	414,200
October	94,000	82,700	425,500
November	79,700	86,500	418,700
December	58,800	90,000	387,500
1948:			
January	50,000		
February	47,200		
March	70,000		
April	[2] 90,400		

[2] Preliminary.

Also included is the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics release entitled "Housing Starts Soar 90,000 in April."

HOUSING STARTS SOAR 90,000 IN APRIL

Home-building activity soared to a high in April, when builders started 90,000 new permanent nonfarm dwelling units, according to preliminary estimates of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor. This is an increase of 29 percent above the revised estimate of 70,000 for March and 34 percent above the 67,000 units started in April 1947. Nearly all of the new units started this April were privately financed.

Home building for the first 4 months of 1948 showed an increase of 51,800 units, or 25 percent, over the same period of 1947. So far this year, 257,000 units have been put under construction.

Early indications from local building-permit reports are that the high April level of housing activity prevailed in all regions of the country, particularly in the Middle Atlantic States, the East North Central and the West North Central States.

Among the larger cities reporting exceptional gains were Washington, D. C., and Arlington, Va.; Chicago, Ill.; New Orleans, La.; New York City, N. Y.; and Houston and San Antonio, Tex. A substantial drop occurred in San Francisco, Calif.; Portland, Oreg.; and in Dallas, Tex.

Reciprocal Trade Sabotage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Reciprocal Trade Sabotage" published in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of June 10, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECIPROCAL TRADE SABOTAGE

The Hull Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is not sacrosanct. It is reasonable to suppose that it, like any other legislation, could be improved. But there is no evidence that improvements have been made by either the House or the Senate Finance Committee.

On the contrary, there is evidence that they have crippled a program that in the 14 years of its operations has brought tangible improvement to world trade.

If the Republican majority has improved the act, as it contends, then why does it plan to extend it for only a year, rather than for the customary 3 years asked by the administration?

It is easy to conclude from Republican handling of this issue that a year's extension of the revised act is simply a stopgap measure. It will give the Republicans an opportunity to put their own man in the White House and to strengthen their hold on Congress.

If successful in November, then the all-out assault on the Hull program can come when the stopgap bill expires next June. That reasoning is implicit in the history of the legislation this spring, starting with secret hearings and a gag rule in the House and coming now to the Senate Finance Committee's vote, which followed a strict party line.

The only thing that can be said in mitigation of the Senate committee's action is that it substituted for the House measure a bill that omitted a congressional veto of future trade pacts negotiated by the President.

At the same time, it strengthened the hand of the Tariff Commission at the expense of the present interdepartmental committee, on which the Commission now has only one vote. Under the proposed change, limits for concession in proposed trade agreements will be recommended by the Tariff Commission rather than the interdepartmental committee, from which the Commission would be divorced. Democrats have good cause to fear that this will lead to emphasis upon protectionism to the subordination of such interests as national defense, export requirements, and foreign policy.

The Mundt Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a paid advertisement, by the Communist Party of the United States and the Communist Party of Georgia, dealing with the Mundt bill, together with an editorial published in the Atlanta Journal of June 2, 1948—the same issue of that newspaper in which appears the advertisement I have just mentioned. The editorial discusses the Communist movement and their misrepresentations of this proposed legislation.

There being no objection, the advertisement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUNDT BILL IS AIMED AT YOUR FREEDOM

The Mundt bill, now in the United States Senate, uses the big lie that American Communists are foreign agents. Hitler used this same type of lie to confuse and murder millions of Europeans.

American Communists have nothing in common with the Mundt bill's distortion of our program and aims. American Communists have helped advance every gain made by Negro and white workers in the past 30 years.

Wall Street corporation lawyers, now pushing the Mundt bill in Congress, will use this bill, if passed, to establish "thought control"—to turn our country into a 100-percent police state.

The Mundt bill means:

If you're a union member and strike for better wages;

If you're for antilynch and antipoll tax legislation;

If you're against the Taft-Hartley law; against the draft;

If you're for the partition of Palestine; for public housing;

If you're for peace, you will be called Communist.

Under the Mundt bill, if it becomes law, you would be in danger of 10 years in jail and $10,000 fine.

Speak out now before it's too late.

Wire or write Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee, Washington, D. C. Urge him to keep the Mundt bill off Senate floor.

This message is from southern leaders of the Communist Party, United States of America, Communist Party of Georgia.

Paid political advertisement by Homer B. Chase, State organizer, Post Office Box 4836, Atlanta 2, Ga.

COMMUNIST ADVERTISEMENT IS FULL OF LIES ABOUT MUNDT-NIXON SUBVERSIVE CONTROL BILL

Elsewhere in today's issue of the Atlanta Journal appears an advertisement of the Communist Party opposing the Mundt-Nixon subversive-activities control bill, now before Congress.

This advertisement was submitted personally by Homer B. Chase, State organizer of the Communist Party, who paid in currency for the display space it occupies.

The Journal accepted the advertisement only after thoughtful consideration of the issues involved. Our first inclination was to refuse publication, as we would have been well within our private and, we think, public rights in doing.

A newspaper has a public obligation to keep its columns open as a forum for every shade of opinion that seeks to exert itself through lawful means. A newspaper has no right to reject legitimate political advertising because it disagrees with the opinions expressed therein.

There is sound basis to believe, however, that statements of the Communist Party on affairs of the United States are not legitimate expressions of American opinion.

Everyone with eyes to see and ears to hear knows that the line of the Communist Party is not determined by its American members but is dictated from Moscow and is changed at will to suit the purposes of the Kremlin.

Communists scream more loudly than anyone else about freedom of speech in countries that preserve such liberties; but the historical record shows that freedom of speech ceases to exist in countries where Communists seize control.

Communists use freedom of speech for themselves in a never-ceasing struggle to destroy the freedoms of others.

Democracies need to realize these facts, and to guard against the dangers they represent. Some method must be found, within the framework of our constitutional liberties, to protect the Republic against those who would destroy it.

Bearing all these considerations in mind, the Journal decided it would be a public service to publish the Communist Party advertisement, and to expose its fallacies.

Publication of the advertisement demonstrates clearly the source and nature of much of the opposition to the Mundt-Nixon bill. It brings Communist opinion on this measure into the open, where it can be answered forthrightly.

II

The Communist advertisement has the audacity to use the word "lie" about the opinions of others when that advertisement itself is full of lies.

The first paragraph says: "The Mundt-Nixon bill, now in the United States Senate, uses the big lie that American Communists are foreign agents."

That statement itself is a lie.

Section 2 of the bill recognizes the existence of "a world Communist movement," directed and controlled "by the Communist dictatorship of a foreign country." The bill declares this movement "a clear and present danger to the security of the United States and to the existence of free American institutions."

Those statements in the bill are true.

The Communist Party advertisement says: "The Mundt bill means:

"If you're a union member and strike for better wages;

"If you're for antilynch and anti-poll-tax legislation;

"If you're against the Taft-Hartley law; against the draft;

"If you're for the partition of Palestine; for public housing;

"If you're for peace, you will be called Communist;

"Under the Mundt bill, if it becomes law, you would be in danger of 10 years in jail and $10,000 fine."

Those statements are lies.

The Mundt-Nixon bill concerns none of the subjects alluded to, and can have no effect upon them.

III

Up to now the Journal has neither indorsed nor opposed the Mundt-Nixon bill. The Journal does not now indorse the measure in all its details.

The Journal does indorse the objectives of the bill and expresses the opinion that most of its provisions are reasonable and temperate, as well as urgently necessary.

The Journal does urge upon Congress the necessity for positive action, after every effort has been made to perfect the bill by remedying whatever defects it may have.

IV

By no means all opposition to the Mundt-Nixon bill comes from the same sources as the Communist Party advertisement.

Many intelligent, sincere, and patriotic Americans contend that the bill would endanger the liberties of all citizens, while striving to control subversive activities of the few.

Such opposition, when it comes from reputable citizens, as much of it does, merits the careful study of Congress. It should be utilized, not as an excuse to block action, but to test each section and each sentence of the bill in the light of how it would affect the people of the United States and their freedom.

At the same time it should be recognized that much of the opposition from well-meaning people is based on misinformation about the bill, deliberately fostered by Communists and their sympathizers.

V

The bill does not seek to outlaw the Communist Party or any other organization. The bill does provide for the registration of Communist and Communist-front organizations.

It requires the clear labeling of Communist publications and radio broadcasts—just as the Communist Party advertisement is clearly labeled in today's Journal.

The bill denies Federal employment to members of Communist political organizations.

The bill makes it a crime, punishable by $10,000 fine or not more than 10 years' imprisonment, or both, "to attempt in any manner to establish in the United States a totalitarian dictatorship to be under the direction and control of any foreign government, foreign organization, or foreign individual."

The section of the bill most open to legitimate question is that which places in the hands of the Attorney General the power and the duty of determining what organizations are Communist and what organizations are Communist fronts.

This is a great responsibility for any public official. It is this phrase of the bill which leads to charges of "thought control."

It probably would be better if the determination of what organizations are Communist and Communist-front were placed in the hands of an independent board.

Wherever the power is placed, it is—and must be under our Constitution—subject to review by the courts. So long as we have our system of judicial review there is little danger that any provision of the bill could be used to destroy liberty instead of protecting it.

The bill specifically provides that any organization may appeal from the finding of the Attorney General to the United States Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

Beyond that the entire machinery of the courts is open to any individual or organization who believes that he is falsely accused.

VI

Some of the opposition to the Mundt-Nixon bill cannot be considered in the same light as that discussed above.

Some of the opposition comes from individuals and organizations concerned, not with protecting American rights, but with fostering a dictatorship in which they would hope to belong to the ruling oligarchy.

Opposition from the Communist Party of Georgia, as expressed in today's advertisement, and from the Communist Party of the United States, as expressed to a Senate Committee last week, constitutes to most citizens an argument in behalf of the bill.

William Z. Foster, chairman of the Communist Party of the United States, told the Senate judiciary committee last week that members of the party would not support the United States in any conceivable war with the Soviet Union.

In other words, their first loyalty is not to this country but to another.

Mr. Foster said his party would not obey the Mundt-Nixon law, even if the Supreme Court told it to do so.

Such defiance would deserve whatever punishment it might receive from the courts of the United States.

VII

The world had a fresh demonstration last week of how Communist dictatorships treat democratic institutions.

Czechoslovakia held what it called an election.

Until a few months ago Czechoslovakia was a self-governing republic. It was the one country of central Europe which had ever understood and practiced democracy in the western sense.

Then the Communists took charge. There was one slate of candidates in the election; the Communist ticket. There was only one way to vote. Opposition had been silenced, murdered, or exiled.

That is how Communists treat the most fundamental of liberties when they come into power.

VIII

The Mundt-Nixon bill has been passed by the House of Representatives. It is now before the Senate, where committee hearings are in progress.

This newspaper believes, with the New York Times, that:

"The country does not want, nor would the Constitution sanction, a law which attempted to control the political beliefs of American citizens. But the country can properly seek, and the Constitution surely would not deny, proper and adequate safeguards against intervention in American politics by agents of a foreign power."

The Communist Party advertisement suggests writing to Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

It would be well for citizens who oppose communism to adopt that suggestion, writing their own views to Senator WILEY and to the Senators who represent their State.

Housing Bill a Fraud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the House Banking and Currency Committee has reported the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, by a vote of 14 to 13.

The provisions of this bill are about as New Dealish and as fallacious as it is possible for them to be considered against the back drop of our free-enterprise economy, conditions as they exist today, and the hopes and dreams of millions of Americans.

This so-called wet bill is fallacious because it holds out false hopes to millions of Americans who need and desperately want new and cheaper homes. It promises to deliver these homes faster than they are being delivered under the efforts of freemen, working for a profit, in a free economy. The bill itself actually will not construct a single house or apartment any faster than these would have been constructed anyway, and it will not save any American, in the long run, a single dime on the cost of the housing he must have.

Any money "saved" by the thousands who will be able to rent or buy the homes which would be constructed after the bill takes effect will have to be paid out in taxes to make up the Government's loss in thus ostensibly "saving" a few persons a little money.

The bill will not make a single carpenter, bricklayer, electrician, contractor, or lather work any faster than he is working today. It will not help produce a single new stick of lumber a bit faster than this is being produced today.

As a matter of fact, the bill is written on the assumption that not enough Americans have enough money to buy houses. Every survey made in recent months and years proves that the demand for houses, by people who have money, is greater than it has been in our lifetime. This bill, by making more money available for public construction, actually will cause wilder competition for existing building materials and push the price of existing homes, or homes to be built by private contractors, higher and higher.

In short, it is not a bill to cut the price of homes for the average American, it is a bill that will increase the cost of homes to every American, in ways which many an average citizen may not consider.

It is difficult to obtain labor to help build, remodel, or renovate a structure right now. What will be the condition when the Government starts hiring these laborers and takes them out of the free market into the controlled market? Will labor get cheaper or more costly? That question answers itself.

Nobody can give the American people cheaper housing except the laborers who work on every stick of wood and every piece of equipment that goes into the construction of a home, plus the laborers who build the house. If they lay 400 bricks in a day when they could lay 1,400, the cost of the house is going to be out of sight—as it admittedly is. But this housing bill doesn't mention bricklayers and would not cause a single one to work harder. The same applies to all segments of labor—and, indeed, to every man who loafs today when he should be working to produce all that he can.

This housing bill has been used by men who should know better to attempt to make political hay with the element of our society that prefers smooth, honeyed, demagogic words to cold, hard, economic facts. It should be defeated.

The laboring men of America—all those who work in plants producing building materials; all those working in the forests, the sawmills, the planing mills, and the lumber yards of America; all those who lay brick, tailor wood, or install electrical equipment and wiring—have a definite responsibility to their fellow men and they face a great challenge to meet that responsibility. No housing bill, regardless of its provisions, can give us better houses, cheaper houses, or more houses. The men who work on every house—from its raw beginnings to the last drain pipe to be installed—can give us the housing we need, if they will.

This bill, if passed, will cause more inflation in housing. It will cause the further socialization of our economy. It will bring inevitable disappointments to the veterans who mistakenly believe it will furnish them housing—for it will not because it cannot. The bureaucrats are great propagandists, Mr. Speaker, but by the record they are poor producers.

Petroleum Needs for Our Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include the following correspondence and editorials:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D. C., May 11, 1948.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am taking the liberty of enclosing a report on the national defense aspects of petroleum, which report has just been rendered, by unanimous vote, by the Special Subcommittee on Petroleum of the House Committee on Armed Services, of which subcommittee I have had the honor to be chairman.

The enclosed report is as frank, as accurate, as nonpartisan, as unbiased an appraisal as we can make of the nationl defense situtation as affected by the present and long-range petroleum potentialities of this Nation. It is our view, after receiving and studying over 2,500 pages of detailed testimony from industry and Government leaders, that the Nation must move more forthrightly and vigorously in dealing with this serious question of petroleum than it has in the past, if our armed forces and the Nation as a whole are to have adequate supplies for a time of national emergency.

In the report you will find a number of recommendations directed to this very basic, very vital subject affecting our national security. May I invite your attention specifically to these recommendations, and ask, on behalf of the subcommittee, that you seek their implementation as promptly as possible:

(1) That the present program attempting the allocation of steel by voluntary means be continued; but if this program gives evidence of failure, if the international situation deteriorates or is not improved, and if within 6 months the armed forces are still without adequate supplies of petroleum to meet an emergency, the voluntary program not be permitted to continue, and at the end of that 6-month period Government controls should be imposed, by recommendation from you to the Congress, to allocate steel to the petroleum industry.

(2) That the same procedure be followed, as proposed in (1) above, in respect to rationing of petroleum products.

(3) That the National Security Resources Board be directed by you immediately to establish a Commission on Petroleum composed of major and independent oil industry leaders, the consuming public, and appropriate officials representing the Government, to study thoroughly all aspects of the short- and long-range petroleum problem facing the Nation, the Commission being directed to submit to the Congress, with Presidential approval, a legislative proposal designed to establish an integrated, inclusive petroleum policy for the Nation to follow consistently in the years ahead.

Within the enclosed report of investigation, Mr. President, there are also numerous recommendations as to what the Commission suggested in (3) above could profitably consider. I earnestly hope that your staff will make these recommendations known to you and the National Security Resources Board, so that we may all be confident of their inclusion in the complete coverage of this tremendously vital subject by the Commission.

We bring these matters to your personal attention at this time, because we are genuinely concerned over what the Nation's petroleum situation is now, and what it is to become, from the standpoint of national defense, in the event the Government fails to move promptly now. We sincerely hope you will find your way clear to support our views and that you will take early steps to meet the problem by implementing the actions indicated above.

Respectfully,
DEWEY SHORT,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Petroleum.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 15, 1948.

Hon. DEWEY SHORT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DEWEY: I read your letter of May 11, with which you enclosed a report of the investigation of the petroleum situation as related to national defense, with a lot of interest.

I hope you will read my message to the special session of the Congress in November 1947 and also my message of March 17, 1948, on the same subject.

You will remember, that I proposed 10 points in the message to the special session for the necessary controls to meet the very situation to which you refer.

I am most happy that you are at last coming around to my viewpoint, although, I am afraid, it is a little late.

Sincerely yours,
HARRY.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D. C., June 8, 1948.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I read with concern and regret your reply of May 15 to my letter of May 11, which related exclusively to the present and future petroleum needs of the armed forces.

The report on petroleum, which was enclosed in my letter, suggested means by which the Nation may insure, insofar as possible today, a sufficient supply of petroleum to meet Army, Navy, and Air Force needs in time of emergency. This report was rendered by the Special Subcommittee on Petroleum of the House Armed Services Committee, which subcommittee consists of six Republicans and five Democrats. The subcommittee report was unanimous.

The report deals with a subject in which we felt confident you would be as deeply interested as we have been—that is, a secure national defense in respect to petroleum. Your reply, however, deals only quite indirectly with this problem, much to the regret of the subcommittee on whose behalf my letter of May 11 was written, and also on whose behalf this letter comes to you.

Only the three most urgent recommendations of the subcommittee were set forth specifically in my letter of May 11. But you will recall that many other recommendations were indicated as being in the report which we hoped your staff would also bring to your attention. It was suggested in my letter of May 11 that your staff do this, since these other recommendations are likewise important elements of this very basic question today. They include:

1. The stock-piling of petroleum for the armed forces.
2. Creation of additional petroleum reserves.
3. Increased personnel and appropriations for the Oil and Gas Division of the Department of the Interior.
4. Possible further centralization of Government activities relating to petroleum.
5. Further exploration and development of public lands.
6. Government aid to secondary recovery projects.
7. Full develpment of the naval petroleum reserves.
8. A resurvey of the Nation's coal reserves.
9. A Government policy on the development of synthetic fuels.
10. Stimulation of State Department activities in relation to petroleum.
11. A study of the impediments to petroleum imports.

And the report contains numerous other recommendations of equal importance.

As you know, the subjects mentioned above were not included in your recent messages to Congress, although your letter of May 15 would indicate to the contrary. Surely you do not wish us to understand from your reply that none of these matters are important, or that none of them will be supported or implemented by the executive branch of the Government.

Of the three recommendations of the subcommittee that were singled out in my letter of May 11, two referred to allocation of steel and petroleum products. These alone seem to be the subject of your reply of May 15, although it is not so stated. And yet, you seem to have given no consideration to the conditions which the subcommittee unanimously agreed should be met before Government controls are reimposed. These conditions were contained in my letter of May 11. Your messages to Congress did not contain them, as you know. Your reply of May 15 would indicate otherwise.

The other recommendation singled out in my letter of May 11 was that the National Security Resources Board be directed by you to establish a Commission on Petroleum

which would delineate a present and long-range petroleum policy for the Nation, the Commission to be composed of oil men and representatives of the consuming public and the Government. This was not mentioned in your messages to Congress, as you know. Neither was it mentioned in any respect in your letter of May 15 to me. Surely, by omitting reference to this recommendation, you do not mean to indicate that you have no interest in it, or that the present and foreseeable petroleum situation does not warrant such a commission. If the recommendation is unsound, we would welcome knowing why. If it is sound, we would, of course, appreciate knowing what plans you are formulating to implement it.

Again, let me say on behalf of the subcommittee that at no time during its extended hearings on this subject did it seek any publicity or any political gain whatsoever. The goal was, throughout, to seek some answer to this critical problem underlying our national defense. The goal is the same now, as I, on behalf of the subcommittee, and with its approbation, pursue the subject with you. Somehow I am certain that you must have misconstrued my previous letter, for your failure to deal with this important subject at all in your reply still does not lead me, or the subcommittee, to the belief that you are distinterested either in the petroleum needs of the armed forces or in our studied views as to what the meeting of those needs requires on the part of the Government.

Mr. President, the subcommittee again asks, with sincerity, and with the same concern as have the armed forces themselves, that you have some member of your staff examine the results of our studies at least briefly, so that you may be advised before you conclude, if you must, that all of our views, most of them, or any of them, should be lightly considered.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

DEWEY SHORT,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Petroleum.

[From the Washington Post of May 26, 1948]

OIL FOR THE FUTURE

Anyone who has been content to regard America's oil supplies as a problem for someone else to worry about will get a rude shock from the report of the special subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee. The report is so cogent and so rational that it ought to be required reading for every informed citizen. And it pulls no punches in stating that an immediate, comprehensive oil policy is vital to security, even though the policy may make necessary such restraints as oil rationing and steel allocations. As the committee phrases it:

"We want to give expression, frankly and without equivocation, to our view that the Nation is already guilty of half-hearted action in dealing with petroleum; that as a nation we are living profligately today in our use of petroleum products; that we are providing inadequately for national defense at a time of great international tension; that early action is imperative, on a national scale, unless we wish to continue to jeopardize the national safety and render future generations in this great country hostage to our own profligacy."

The blunt fact is that as a nation we have become oil-happy. We are consuming now more oil than the entire world used in 1938, and last year we used 9 percent more oil than at the peak of the war. The great upturn in demand, the committee asserts, is due to two factors: The instruments for burning oil are increasing more rapidly than the facilities for producing oil, and there is a growing public preference for oil over coal for a variety of reasons, "not excluding the gyrations of the leader of the United Mine Workers."

It should be obvious that the United States is particularly vulnerable to a curtailment of its oil supplies, even for civilian use. This is even more true with respect to military use, for oil is the food of war. Yet, according to estimates, demand will outstrip domestic production by a million barrels a day in 1948 and 2,000,000 barrels a day in 1954. The committee suggests on the basis of precedent that we would be nearly 3,000,000 barrels a day short of war requirements. At the same time domestic oil discoveries are declining and excess production capacity no longer exists. The critical implications of this situation cannot be stressed too strongly as world tension forces us to augment our military strength.

The report shows clearly the vital relationship of steel to petroleum, for the present oil shortage is primarily caused by a bottleneck in steel. The committee is not overly sanguine about the voluntary steel allocation program. This program, the committee emphasizes, must "not be permitted to rock along if it gives evidence of being ineffective." The alternative is, of course, a mandatory allocation program directed at attaining so far as possible self-sufficiency in this country, and beyond that at developing sources in the Western Hemisphere and other areas. In this connection the committee also observes forthrightly: "Within the next 6 months the Government must determine whether present efforts * * * to persuade the consumer to conserve oil will be adequate." If the voluntary program gives evidence of failure, rationing must be imposed.

[From the National Petroleum News of May 12, 1948]

SHORT COMMITTEE REPORT ON SUPPLY DESERVES IMMEDIATE, CAREFUL CONSIDERATION BY INDUSTRY

The highly pessimistic view of the scarce supply of oil taken by the Special Subcommittee (Short) on Petroleum of the House Armed Services Committee should not be too greatly discounted even by the oil industry's most ardent optimists. When the military look at war they must figure things as safely as possible, with an added margin if they can find it. That seems to be the case of the military and this House committee in this report.

The report warns Congress and the Nation in the following words—words which were repeated many times throughout the long report:

"We want to make it as plain as words can—we want to emphasize—we want each of you (the main committee members) to carry this thought away with you above all others in this report—the Nation is in a grave situation in respect to its petroleum; the national defense is in a precarious position in respect to its petroleum; the Congress is confronted by decisions on this subject that are as basic, we believe, as any matters that have arisen in recent years."

"Make no mistake about it," the report says again, "the Nation is in a critical oil situation. * * *

"We know that the next war will impose fantastic demands. * * *

"In the face of these conditions, we cannot, in good conscience, rely on optimism.

"We cannot fly jet air fleets on undiscovered oil. Nor can we, in time of war, turn off civilian requirements fostered in an oil economy to supply our war needs. * * *

"Again we say that we are gravely concerned over the future availability of oil. It is high time the Nation did something about it."

The report contains the same facts and figures of supply and demand that the industry has been publishing with the added estimate that military needs alone—in event of another war—would mount to at least four and one-half million barrels per day, with the Nation's total needs in that period, including highly restricted civilian consumption of some seven to eight milion barrels per day, while today's consumption and supply is well under six million barrels per day.

The report says the oil supply must come from the ground in this country, Mexico, South America, Canada, and Alaska rather than from the Middle East, though the committee favors continued development of the Middle East for as long as our military can defend it, but using tankers instead of pipe lines. A big synthetic industry, the report dismisses as calling for too much steel and manpower when they are in most demand. Synthetics, the report says, should be allowed to develop only in due time.

The report recommends the appointment of a presidential commission, like that headed by Baruch on rubber, and consisting of men from independents and major oil companies, from the consumers and the interested Government agencies to make a thorough study of oil supplies and to recommend a national policy.

The report suggests that this commission will have to consider stock piling of oil, its rationing, the procurement of steel for it—which means steel rationing to all industries—possible subsidies for more drilling and refining, and concentrating and developing all Government agencies that have to do with oil. While the committee favors private enterprise, it says the oil situation is so serious that undoubtedly Government will have to take hold and direct the industry to insure enough oil for war.

Any reading of the 22 printed pages of the report should convince most anyone of the need for immediate and thorough study of the oil situation from a military standpoint. Whether that study should be by another group, as suggested, is a fair question. The National Petroleum Council, the Oil and Gas Division of the Interior Department, the Armed Services Petroleum Board, and the Interstate Oil Compact might well appoint a joint committee to study the report of this House committee and recommend the best procedure. All of the foregoing groups are, by their positions, the best informed about oil in the country. They have been reporting the facts and figures that the House committee wants studied. These oil and military men can make the quickest and most accurate summary of the situation and the best way to meet it. To bring in strangers to the industry would delay a plan that much longer and perhaps add complications from the lay mind.

This is something the oil industry should have been well organized to handle since World War I, and especially World War II. If the industry had acted promptly and with due foresight, the confusion over supply and demand this past year should have been avoided, the complaints of the military at inability to get sufficient oil, in its estimation, would have been avoided, and it is entirely possible the Short committee would not have written the kind of a report it has. The Short committee severely criticizes the military, both Army and Navy, and the Government generally for lack of sound planning on oil supplies. The committee praises the oil industry for fulfillment of plans when made but perhaps the committee might have been justified in criticizing the oil industry also for not looking ahead and contemplating what it would do if another war comes over the horizon.

Whether one is a pessimist or an optimist on oil supply, this report should be studied in the light of the rumblings of the Great Bear out of the Eastern Hemisphere, and then help to try and stir the industry to more study and action through whatever facilities may be available to him, whether API or his own industry association.

And furthermore mobilization for war—in whole or in part—will call for much more than rationing of steel to the oil industry and rationing of product to the consumer. It will call for fitting one's business into the war scheme.

The questions every oilman should ask himself and do his best to get answered are:

Just what will mobilization mean to me and my business?

What will I be allowed to do and what will I be made to do to defend the country?

You cannot get the answers to those questions too soon.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
STATE MINERAL BOARD,
Baton Rouge, May 15, 1948.

Hon. DEWEY SHORT,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Petroleum, Committee on Armed Services, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SHORT: I thank you very much for your courtesy in sending me a copy of the report of the Special Subcommittee on Petroleum, which was made to the Armed Services Committee.

While I do not concur entirely with all of the recommendations made, I do wish to compliment the subcommittee on this very fine report. The report reflects the fine thinking of its membership and thoroughness of the hearings held by the committee.

With best regards, I am,

Cordially yours,

B. A. HARDEY.

DALLAS, TEX., *May 26, 1948.*

Hon. DEWEY SHORT,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Petroleum, Committee on Armed Services, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SHORT: Please accept my thanks for your kindness in sending me a copy of the report of the Special Subcommittee on Petroleum of the Committee on Armed Services. I have read it with a great deal of interest and it seems to be an excellent report.

With best regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

E. DEGOLYER.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
GENERAL STAFF, USA,
LOGISTICS DIVISION,
Washington, D. C., May 21, 1948.

Hon. DEWEY SHORT,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SHORT: I have received the copy of the report of the Special Subcommittee on Petroleum which you forwarded. I feel that the report will be invaluable in furthering efforts toward a sound national petroleum policy.

Sincerely yours,

H. S. AURAND,
Lieutenant General, General Staff Corp., Director of Logistics.

FORT WORTH STAR-TELEGRAM,
Fort Worth, Tex.

Hon. DEWEY SHORT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations on your report (No. 263) of Investigation of Petroleum in Relation to National Defense.

This report contains a wealth of facts and common sense conclusions which should be required reading for every American citizen. I think it is particularly important that it be made available to as many newspaper editors as possible.

I mentioned the report at a meeting of the program committee of the National Conference of Editorial Writers in Louisville, Ky., last week, and several of those present expressed a desire for a copy of it.

The conference is composed of about 125 editorial writers on many of the Nation's leading newspapers. Would it be possible to have a copy of the report mailed to the entire membership of the conference? If so, a list of the members can be supplied by Mr. John H. Cline, of the Washington Evening Star, Secretary of the Conference.

Your cooperation in this will be greatly appreciated.

Yours very truly,

ROBERT E. HICKS,
Chief Editorial Writer.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, May 27, 1948.

Hon. DEWEY SHORT,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SHORT: Thanks for your letter of May 11 enclosing the report of the Special Subcommittee on Petroleum of which you are chairman, and for your generous expression of appreciation of the help of the Department of the Interior in the conduct of the investigation. We shall at all times be ready to help in any further way that we can.

The report presents clearly and forcibly the results of one of the ablest and most comprehensive studies of the relationship between petroleum supply and national defense that, within my knowledge, has been made by a congressional committee.

Based on such study as we have so far been able to give them, we are well prepared to implement promptly a number of the recommendations in the report whenever the requisite funds are provided. Because the staff of our Oil and Gas Division is so small and so burdened with work, a detailed analysis of the report and a report to you thereon may take some time. It is already being started, however, and will come to you as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Acting Secretary of the Interior.

STANDARD OIL CO. OF CALIFORNIA,
San Francisco, Calif., May 13, 1948.

Hon. DEWEY SHORT,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Petroleum, Committee on Armed Services, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SHORT: I sincerely appreciated your courtesy in sending me a copy of the report of your committee as a result of the exhaustive review made by your committee during the past few months with respect to all phases of the petroleum situation, particularly as it affected the armed services. There is no doubt but that your committee has highlighted in this report the pertinent problems with relation to our present and future petroleum supplies.

You and your committee are to be congratulated on your diligence and your comprehension of the subject. As an oilman it was, of course, of considerable interest to me to note your primary recommendation that a commission composed of competent oilmen be appointed to develop further the problems outlined in your report.

In conclusion, and more personally, I shall always remember with gratitude the courtesies extended to me during my brief appearances before your committee, as well as your own kindly interest and patience.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

FLOYD S. BRYANT.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, May 17, 1948.

Hon. DEWEY SHORT,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Petroleum, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives.

DEAR DEWEY: Prior to receiving your letter of May 11 I had instructed the Armed Services Petroleum Board to report to me in detail on the steps which the National Military Establishment should take in the light of your excellent report on petroleum.

In a listing of "Significant Actions of the Meeting of the Committee of Four Secretaries (Defense, Army, Navy, and Air Force) on May 11, 1948," the discussion of this subject is summarized as follows:

"6. Report on Petroleum in Relation to National Defense by the Special Subcommittee on Petroleum of the House Committee on Armed Services. (Unclassified.)

"It was agreed that the foregoing report should be referred to the Armed Services Petroleum Board for study, and for the preparation of recommendations to be submitted to the Committee of Four Secretaries, and, thereafter, to the National Security Resources Board. It was the sense of the meeting that the National Security Resources Board, in connnection with its current study of petroleum and related matters, should likewise consider this report and prepare recommendations with respect thereto. It was also the sense of the meeting that the National Security Resources Board should forward the conclusions of its study, together with those of the Armed Services Petroleum Board, to the National Security Council so that these conclusions may be considered in relation to issues of foreign policy which fall within the cognizance of the Council."

I shall submit my comments to you as soon as possible, but I wanted to write you at this time in order to let you know the work we are doing in connection with your report.

Sincerely,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

GULF RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT CO.,
Pittsburgh, Pa., May 17, 1948.

Hon. DEWEY SHORT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your letter of May 6 to which you attached the report of the Special Subcommittee on Petroleum. I want to congratulate you on the excellence of your report. It was a delight to read it.

I would like very much to have twelve additional copies if they are available.

Sincerely yours,

EUGENE AYRES.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 2, 1948.

Hon. DEWEY SHORT,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Petroleum,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SHORT: I have received your letter of May 11, 1948, and enclosed report of investigation of the Special Subcommittee on Petroleum of the Committee on Armed Services. In your letter you invited my views concerning the recommendations in the report pertaining to the Department of State, and the action if any the Department proposes to take to implement them.

I regret that I was not able to participate in the hearings of your subcommittee on the national defense aspects of petroleum. It is apparent from the report, however, that the subcommittee has covered this subject with thoroughness, and that it has rendered a report that deserves full and prompt consideration by the agencies of Government, as well as by the petroleum industry.

The report contains two recommendations relative to matters of direct concern to the Department of State—steel for the Trans-Arabian pipe line and provision of information to other American Republics concerning the petroleum security problem of the Western Hemisphere.

The question of steel for the Trans-Arabian pipe line has been considered periodically with other Government agencies each time a quarterly export quota of steel for the pipe line has been approved. The Department also reviewed its position after

the hearings of your subcommittee on February 5 and March 8, at which officers of the Department testified. At that time it was concluded that the risks involved in continuing to provide steel for its construction, balanced against its advantages and the imperative need for its completion, had not become such as to warrant the Department in withdrawing its support of the project. I agree, however, with the recommendation that the problem should be completely reexamined in the light of present strategic and world conditions. The Department of State again is giving this matter special study and will participate in such a reexamination with other Government agencies.

I also concur in the recommendation that representatives of the United States Government in the other American Republics be fully informed on the subject, and that they present at every opportunity the overriding importance of petroleum as a hemisphere defense item. The Department has endeavored to keep the American embassies and the other American Republics informed concerning petroleum, both with respect to its peacetime and its security aspects. These efforts have not been limited to the normal conduct of our relations with Latin America. At the meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council on March 8, 1948, the American representative presented a memorandum on the petroleum situation. This memorandum brought to the attention of the American Republics the desirability of facilitating the development of their petroleum resources. At meetings of the Inter-American Defense Board on February 24 and March 16, 1948, the Western Hemisphere petroleum problem and its defense aspects were presented to the members of the board, on which high-ranking officers of all the American Republics serve as members. It is believed that through these actions progress already is being made in implementing the recommendations of your subcommittee. These efforts will be continued, and any other appropriate measures taken, to bring about full recognition by all of the American Republics of the importance of, and the need for action in regard to, petroleum.

I wish to express my satisfaction that this important problem is receiving the consideration of your subcommittee and to assure you that the Department of State desires to cooperate with you in further work by your subcommittee on this problem.

Faithfully yours,

ROBERT A. LOVETT,
Acting Secretary.

AUTOMOBILE CLUB OF NEW YORK, INC.,
New York, N. Y., May 24, 1948.

Hon. WALTER G. ANDREWS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDREWS: We are greatly interested in the recommendation contained in the report on petroleum made by a Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of which you are a member.

Our national headquarters has urged President Truman to direct the National Security Resources Board to set up a commission to investigate and report on the Nation's oil problem and to present to Congress a rounded-out national aid policy.

While the Commission suggested by your subcommittee would differ somewhat from the type of committee recommended by the AAA, we feel that the important and urgent thing is to get the study under way now and, we, therefore, heartily endorse your subcommittee's recommendation.

Under the recommendation, there would be included on the Commission representatives of the public, and, in this connection, we submit that it is of the utmost importance that highway transportation is represented.

Yours respectfully,

WILLIAM J. GOTTLIEB, *President.*

NATIONAL MINERALS CONSERVATION COUNCIL,
Madison, Wis., May 24, 1948.

Hon. DEWEY SHORT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHORT: I want to thank you for the copies of your report on the Investigation of Petroleum in Relation to the National Defense. As you know, I had had no chance to read it while in Washington. I merely heard the laudatory remarks of the young reporter whom I encountered in your office. Having read it here, my only regret is that it can't be published verbatim in some of our more popular weeklies in order that the real urgency of the situation may be brought home to everyone.

Of course, that's out of the question with a report of this kind, but I do want to compliment you and the committee on the masterly way in which this job was done.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

EDWIN R. SHORY,
President.

What Price Glory?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT TRIPP ROSS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, last December I introduced a bill to provide for a $200 allowance for private interment of repatriated war dead of World War II. The following editorial which appeared in the New York State Catholic War Veterans' paper, the Catholic Veteran, emphasizes the great need for increasing the burial allowance for our repatriated war dead:

WHAT PRICE GLORY?

We of the United States of America have had drawn for us by masters' hands many times the pictures of our returning armed forces. We have been told how they came marching back to us, rightly proud and victorious, reading their glory in this Nation's eyes. But what of those who did not come back? What of those who died in Flanders fields where poppies bloom; in the densest forests and jungles of New Guinea or Guadalcanal; on the lava beachheads of Iwo Jima or Okinawa, or the sand of Utah and Omaha beachheads; in the bosom of the deep blue Atlantic or Pacific? What of the wives and children, the mothers and fathers, sisters and brothers, and all their loved ones of those who did not come back? What price was their glory, and was that price paid in vain?

A grateful Nation and that Nation's lawmakers have given generously to those who did come back. They have given terminal-leave pay, mustering-out pay; they have given them educational benefits and on-the-job training benefits; and to the wounded they have also given the best of hospital care and treatment, all of the foregoing at great cost to this Nation. And the grateful people of that Nation were, in the main, quite willing to stand such cost.

But what of those who did not come back? What have those former members of the same armed forces received from this Nation? If they had come back, each of them would have been entitled to the very same benefits. Mustering-out pay alone would have amounted to $300 in almost every instance, to say nothing of the cost of the educational benefits, or of on-the-job training, or even of the 52-20 Club? What did they receive from that same grateful Nation? One of them received the honor of a huge funeral procession across Twenty-third Street and up Fifth Avenue, with many public servants of the Nation, State, and city marching ahead of the very men with whom those fallen heroes had fought and been killed. And he was then arrayed before the multitude in Central Park and had many words tossed over his flag-draped coffin. Such ceremony must have cost considerable, if only in the time of those public servants thus participating. But after that pomp and ceremony had been concluded, what was that dead hero, and the others, given? Aside from the fact that this Nation had brought back to this country the earthly remains of such of them as could be reasonably identified, this Nation gave to the families and loved ones of those returning heroes the huge sum of $75, but only if they asked for it, for their reburial.

It goes without saying that practically every one of those families and loved ones wanted the solace and comfort of the proximity of those earthly remains, and also wanted to rebury them with some religious service. And it is so fitting and proper to think this month of such reburial services. We all think of them especially this month. And it is also fitting and proper to know what the Department of the Army and the Department of the Navy think of the "nerve" of those families of those returning war dead in asking through us, the Catholic War Veterans, that Congressman Ross have the Congress tell those Departments of the Army and the Navy that $75 is not enough even for the cheapest reburial service, without any religious service even considered. Those Departments of the Army and of the Navy have each decided that they alone know what proper amount they will allot for such reburials; and they alone have decided that in their wisdom the sum of $75 is sufficient—just as it has been sufficient for many, many years. This decision, mind you, is stated in writing by those Departments after they were shown facts and figures of the cost of even the cheapest funeral today in this area, which was more than twice their present allowance of $75. Despite any insurance such family may have received—and incidentally, such insurance was paid for by such dead hero, and not given by the Nation—the least, the very least this Nation could do for the returning war dead is to give him a decent burial as a final tribute and mark of gratitude for what that boy had given to this Nation. In these days of contemplated donations of so many billions of dollars to those who had given nothing but insult to this Nation, does it not seem strange to a reasonably patriotic citizen that this same Nation should deem 75 measly dollars enough for a grateful tribute by that same Nation to those who gave their all for that Nation? Truly, one cannot help but say—What price glory?

Speech of the Honorable Will M. Whittington, of Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, on June 7, last, my colleague, the Honorable WILL M. WHITTINGTON, from the State of Mississippi, one of the veteran legislators of this body, delivered a challenging address to the graduating class and the assembled audience at Mississippi College,

one of the outstanding institutions of higher learning in Mississippi. The occasion also marked the fiftieth anniversary of the graduation of our distinguished colleague at that institution. Moreover, on that occasion our able colleague was further honored by being awarded the honorary degree of LL. D., an honor most worthily and appropriately bestowed by this institution upon one of its outstanding sons.

Because of the depth and wisdom of the subject matter of that address I submit it herewith as a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of the thousands of thoughtful persons throughout the land. The address follows:

THE MOVING CHALLENGE TO EDUCATION AND DEMOCRACY

The moving finger is never still in history. It records the development or the deterioration, the commendation or the condemnation, the success or the failure, and the victory or the defeat alike of individuals, education, and democracy.

I

EDUCATION

During the 50 years since the graduation of the class of 1898, great progress has been made in education, educational facilities, buildings, and equipment. The raising of standards, and the improvement in scholastic requirements in colleges have been notable. Endowments have been enlarged. There has been an unusual increase in the enrollment in the colleges, universities, and technical schools. In 1898 the enrollment was 222,827. In 1948 it is estimated to be 2,750,000. The percentage of increase in colleges is more than 10 times the percentage of increase in public and elementary schools. This increase is partially accounted for by the large numbers of veterans in the colleges. Advantage has been taken of the opportunities afforded by a grateful and generous Government. The veterans are giving a good account of themselves, as they have determined to prepare to live for the country for which they volunteered to die.

Mississippi College has kept pace with the progress of other higher institutions of learning. The faculty is better prepared. The standards are higher. The buildings are modern. The equipment is excellent. The endowment has been greatly increased. Of the buildings on the campus in 1898, only the chapel with its distinctive architecture remains. It should always remain as a shrine and as the central building on the campus. Nothing could better serve as a connecting link between the hallowed memories of the past and the dreams and aspirations of the future of a greater Mississippi College.

I do not underestimate in either education or college the material. It is the basis. It is always important. The superstructure is teaching. The ethical and the cultural are more important than the material.

While there has been unprecedented growth in methods of teaching, in standards of scholarship, and in attendance, the fundamentals of education are constant and unchangeable.

Religion

It is the province of the home to teach religion and to mold character. The college can never supplant, but it can supplement the home, for now, as always, education has as its foundation belief in God. Our forefathers came to Plymouth and to Jamestown in search of freedom to worship and freedom to live. Religion always put granite into their character. The guidance of the Almighty in peace and war, in public assemblies and on the battlefronts has always been invoked in our country. Our colleges and our Congress are opened with prayer. Religion is fundamental in education. The Christian ideal is emphasized in Mississippi College. The Christian influence of the teachers, their personal interest, and the personal contacts between the teachers and the students are a part of Mississippi College.

The scholastic opportunities of Mississippi College should always be as good as the best. The more I see of education and of colleges and universities, the more I believe in the mission of the smaller colleges, and of the liberal arts colleges.

Primary Aim to Think

The primary aim of the college is to teach students to think, to reach, and to form conclusions for themselves. It is better to think erroneously than not to think at all. The distinction between democracy and communism is nowhere more pronounced than in education. In a democracy students are taught how to think and not what to think; in communism the student is taught what to think and not how to think. In a democracy individual excellence, and individual achievement are the goal. In communism there is mass instruction. Teaching smacks of the assembly line. The model does not change. It is of a familiar pattern. It was the boast of the German youth under Hitler, as a young German said to an American friend of mine who was travelling in Germany before World War II, "We Germans are so happy. We are free from freedom." What the young German meant was that the Führer made his decisions for him. He did not think his own thoughts. He did not dream his own dreams. The individual was submerged. The state was supreme. I am sure that youth today, if he survives, has paid a thousandfold for his delusion.

Hard Work

In college, as in life, it is not the person with a brilliant mind who always succeeds. More often it is the person or individual with average mind who is industrious, who works hard. An important aim of education is the discipline of hard work. On one occasion when asked what one thing helped him over his greatest obstacle, Henry Ford replied, "the preceding one." There is nothing comparable to the discipline of hard work. I recall an incident in Mississippi College during the presidency of the venerable Dr. W. S. Webb. Fathers often accompanied their sons to be enrolled in the college. A wealthy father came with his son. He said to Dr. Webb that he had worked hard, that he did not have the advantage of education, that he spent his youth in hard work, that he was determined that his son should not have so many difficulties as he had. He was anxious for him to have the education that was denied to him. He said to Dr. Webb that he wanted his son to have all of the money that he desired. He insisted that he was anxious for his son to be congenial with his associates. He said that money was not to be spared. Dr. Webb promptly said, as he stopped the father, "I am sorry, but we cannot take your son. What you propose would ruin him and if he enrolled on those terms he would ruin the college. Whether you know it or not," continued Dr. Webb to the father, "you are seeking to deprive your boy of the very discipline that enabled you to succeed." I am convinced that after all the discipline of hard work is more important than a brilliant mind. The industrious man is never lonely, and the hard-working person is generally successful. We cannot produce unless we work. We cannot have more unless we work more. We can never get something for nothing either in college or in life.

Tolerance

An essential aim of true education is tolerance. The educated person, always tolerant in thought and in deed, accords to others the tolerance which he demands for himself. Mississippi College has always stood for the freedom of the teaching that is essential to tolerance. I do not agree with much of Voltaire, but I do agree when he said, "I wholly disapprove of what you say, but will defend to the death your right to say it." Tolerance is the flower and the fruit of mental growth and culture. There is no place for bigotry in education. It dwarfs the mind. It is inconsistent with tolerance.

Character

Mastery of the arts and sciences without the integrity of character is a fatal defect in education. Reliability and dependability are essential to character. The improvement of the mind, and the cultivation of the soul in the years of study should culminate in character, which is among the supreme aims of education.

Zeal

No person can be well educated, as no citizen can be faithful, unless that person is devoted to a good cause, unless that person is militant in the advocacy of the cause he espouses or the ideal that he pursues. There can be no zeal unless a person is positive and not negative. It is impossible to defeat something with nothing. In education there must be a militant zeal and a devotion to conviction. I know of nothing that is more conducive to a successful and satisfying life than conviction, than a militant devotion to a good cause. After all, a few militant souls have been responsible for the great advances in civilization. There will never be a final sunset for any person who is zealous and militant for his ideals in society and in government. It does not take so many people after all to accomplish things. Less than 12 disciples with the greatest teacher of all times have changed the course of civilization and of history. They have influenced the destiny of man for 2,000 years. Less than 100 people were responsible for the Renaissance and the Reformation of Europe. Less than 10 men were responsible for the formation of the federal union.

Civic Responsibility

In college there must be preparation for civic responsibility. The educated person should be familiar with the history of governments. Walter Bagehot was right when he said, "The secret of free government is in men living together." I know of nothing more difficult than government. A well-educated person, while interested in success in his chosen field or profession, and while devoted to his home and to his church, should always contribute a part of his time and his talents to his community and to his country. Public opinion is potent in democracy. Citizens have the high privilege of shaping and molding the opinion that supports and promotes good government. Civic responsibility is by no means synonymous with seeking or holding public office. It contemplates training in the college for leadership in life. It contemplates loyalty and service to the government that protects the life and property of the citizens. We are inclined to take our heritage of liberty and our freedom for granted, but patriotism and love of country should be emphasized in the classroom as well as on the forum.

Recently, an Italian professor on an assignment on the faculty of Princeton University journeyed to Washington for a call at my office to thank me personally for a kindness that he felt that I had done him through the intervention of a mutual friend. He was a graduate of the University of Rome. He had received his academic degree, as well as his degree of doctor of philosophy, in the leading university of Italy. He had served in the Italian army in the Libyan campaign in World War II. I have seldom come in contact with a more cultured person or with a keener mind. During the course of our conversation I asked him about political conditions in Italy. I was anxious to know about the

interest of the educated people in Italy in public affairs. I referred to the death of Mussolini. I said that he had met the fate he so richly deserved. I was interested, however, to ascertain the reaction of the educated and the better class of people in Italy to the brutal, beastly, and barbarous exposure and treatment of the dead body of Mussolini in the public square in Milan. I was astounded when he replied: "The educated people in Italy take no part in political matters. They leave that to the politicians." What the learned professor was saying was that the educated people of Italy had no feeling of civic responsibility. They took no interest in public affairs. They neglected to support and promote the country that protected their lives and their property. I understood then better than ever before how it was that Mussolini became the dictator of Italy and how it was that the dictator and his fascism led Italy to defeat and to destruction. It was because of the indifference of the people. The Italian elections have occurred since the conversation. I am more hopeful over the future of Italy. I now believe that the country of Cavour and Garibaldi in the world-wide conflict between the forces of freedom and despotism will redeem herself. That redemption, however, in Italy and in any other European country, cannot come unless the educated people of Italy and the educated people of other European countries discharge their civic responsibilities and meet their civic obligations. The fate of free government in all lands today will be largely determined by the zeal and by the devotion of the educated people to the service of the countries in which they live.

I have spoken of a few aims of education. The list is not inclusive, but I have mentioned these aims because the Christian ideal, the ability to think, the discipline of hard work, the integrity of character, tolerance for the views of others, devotion to good causes, and civic responsibility are essential for the full and abundant life that finds its fruition in service to home, country, and God. As I emphasize the tasks of the college, these words come to me from the King's message:

"And I said to the man who stood at the gate of the year:
Give me a light that I may tread safely into the unknown!
And he replied: Go out into the darkness and put thine hand into the hand of God.
That shall be to thee better than light and safer than a known way."

Education is more essential in democracy than any other form of government. In democracy the citizen is free to think, free to speak, and free to act, subject to the rights of others. The enjoyment of the freedom is dependent upon training. Education affords the training that is essential to democracy. Ignorance and democracy are incompatible. Public opinion cannot be formed without enlightenment.

George Washington said, "In proportion as the structure of government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened."

Thomas Jefferson never uttered a more profound truth than when he said, "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and what never will be."

The challenge then is that education shall promote the aims and provide the training essential to democracy.

II

DEMOCRACY

The moving finger has not been still in democracy. Fifty years ago the sun never set on English possessions. The Englishman proudly boasted, "I am a British subject." Today it is the proud boast of a citizen of the United States as he thinks of the power and influence of his country in world affairs, "I am an American."

Great wars affect individuals and nations. There emerged from World War II, as had been prophesied by students of history, two great powers, the United States and Russia.

The United States

Democracy in the United States has demonstrated that it is the most successful form of government ever devised by man, in peace and war. We have surpassed the world in education, commerce, finance, manufacturing, agriculture, and production. We enjoy the highest level of living of any nation in the world. Today we are conscious that the United States has reached the highest pinnacle of power and majesty ever attained by any nation in civilized history. As citizens we have amazing and unparalleled opportunities. We know that these opportunities mean responsibilities. When we contemplate the desperate plight of the vanquished nations with their physical destruction and with their far worse mental and spiritual damage, and when we think of the unhappy conditions of the other countries of the world, we are fortunate to be citizens of the United States. Freedom has always been our goal. We have insisted upon our right to be free to think and be free to speak. We have encouraged freedom among the nations. When the class of 1898 left Mississippi College to find their places as citizens, the United States was fighting, to a successful conclusion, the Spanish-American War. The battle cry was freedom for Cuba. We were victorious in the World War. The slogan was to make the world safe for democracy. We won the war, but we lost the peace by failing to cooperate to enforce peace. We turned aside from the high ideals of Woodrow Wilson. We rejected the League of Nations. We went back to normalcy. The nations traveled again the road to war. After the surrender of Germany and Japan in World War II, we determined to profit by the mistakes of World War I.

Russia

More than a century ago Alexis de Tocqueville, a brilliant French student of the American Republic, made a prophetic statement when he wrote:

"There are at the present time two great nations in the world. * * * I allude to the Russians and the Americans. * * * The Anglo-American relies upon personal interest to accomplish his ends and gives free scope to the unguided strength and common sense of the people. The Russian centers all the authority of society in a single arm. The principal instrument of the former is freedom, of the latter, servitude. Their starting points are different and their courses are not the same. Yet each of them seems marked out by the will of heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe."

That statement would have been an excellent analysis in 1948, but it was actually written in 1835, 12 years before the communistic manifesto of Karl Marx. There was a great gulf between the American and Russian ways of life then and that gulf has recently widened. The irony is that Russia's power today is largely due to the implements of war furnished during the war to Russia by the United States. Without American aid victory for Russia would have been difficult if not impossible. The American and the Russian civilizations are totally different. One system is democratic. The other is communistic. The name matters not. Fascism, nazism, and communism all alike are totalitarian. Under the democratic philosophy the individual is supreme. The government is made for the citizen. Under the communistic philosophy the individual is the slave. The government is supreme. The choice today in all countries is whether the people will control the government or the government control the people. Democracy is dedicated to freedom. Communism is dedicated to the destruction of freedom. Communism as an economic or political theory is one thing, but communism as a secret conspiracy to overthrow by force the Government of the United States is quite another thing.

Permanent Peace

The United States undertook to meet the responsibilities of leadership for permanent peace. We took the initiative in promoting the United Nations Organization. We took the initiative in peace conferences. The world was hungry for peace. The United States insisted that the greatest war of history should be followed by the greatest peace of all time with adequate means to enforce that peace. Russia, while agreeing to peace, in reality has obstructed peace. One peace conference after another has been used by Russians for communistic propaganda, for poisoning the international atmosphere with suspicion, and for the expansion of communism among all nations and on all continents. Thus far Russia has wrecked every peace conference. The program of Russia was twofold. It was first to consolidate the gains of war in the countries where Russia was in control at the close of the war. That objective has been largely reached, but the militant progress of expansion to rule the world has been halted and it has been stopped by the United States and by the United States alone. The purpose of the United Nations and of the United States was that all countries, great and small, should work out their own destiny and determine for themselves the system of government under which they would live.

Guidance

The small nations look to the United States for leadership and for guidance. They know, as the world knows, that the tree of liberty can never grow in communistic soil. The United States has not disappointed them. The United States has determined not to let liberty-loving nations down.

Two Ways of Life

The conflict between the United States and Russia is between the minds of men. It is a contest of ideologies. The United States accords to Russia the type of government under which Russia shall live, and America demands for herself the same rights she accords to Russia. The conflict between Russia and the United States involves two entirely different ways of life. The supreme issue is the free or democratic system versus the communistic or police state. While the czar has been succeeded by Stalin, Soviet Russia is running true to form. The Russians know despotism only. They have never known any government except government from above. Russia has always been suspicious, in its domestic and in its foreign relations. From the days of Ivan the Terrible and of Peter the Great to the rule of Stalin, Russians have been suspicious of one another, and Russia has been suspicious of other countries. Communism is run by a few men. It is supported by a secret police. There is but one party. Under the democratic system there is majority rule. Two major parties are encouraged, for they are essential.

Despotism and Communism

The despotism of the czars was denounced by Karl Marx a century ago. The czar was condemned for absorbing the Balkan states to promote militarism. Although the czar proclaimed that his purpose was to protect the Balkan states, as history shows, the purpose was to infiltrate and control. Such is the purpose of Stalin today. Communism to be combatted must be understood. While it thrives on suffering and hunger, it is a mistake to assume that communism can spread only in countries where there is poverty. It thrives on propaganda. It encourages and

enlists the disappointed and the discontented. It professes concern for the underprivileged. It repeatedly uses the term democracy. While advocating democracy in name, communism only proclaims democracy in order to secure control. Under the philosophy of the Communist, any means justifies the end. The purpose is to secure the control of strategic offices and particularly those in charge of the police. To attain control the Communist stops at nothing. After he is in control, force is used to maintain that control. Freedom disappears. The firing squad and concentration camp follow control. It is difficult for those who do not live in Communist-dominated countries to realize the desperation of those who live under the rule of the despot. Freedom of speech is denied. The mother knows that milk will not be available for her baby if she or her husband opposes, and only she knows the meaning of the knock on the door in the dead hours of night. Jan Masaryk knew what it meant, when the Communists took over in Czechoslovakia.

Only 3 Percent of Population

The Communists of Russia today are not more than 3 percent of the population, but they rule the Russian empire. Only a few were responsible for fascism in Italy or for nazism in Germany, but those few ruled. We must not underestimate Russia. While piously speaking for peace, Russia is maintaining the largest standing army in the world. Without war, Russia is enjoying the fruits of war as she concentrates and undertakes to expand.

Powerful Force

While democracy has been tried and tested in the United States, and while communism, as defined by Lenin and practiced by Stalin, is still an experiment in government, the fact remains that communism in Russia is one of the most powerful forces the world has ever known. What makes it formidable? What makes Russia powerful? It is not necessarily numbers. It is not necessarily resources. It is certainly not wealth. It is certainly not production. I believe that the primary reason is the zeal and the fanaticism of the ruling classes. In World War II the Russians demonstrated that they could fight. They were zealous for their country. They stopped Hitler in his tracks at Stalingrad. They drove the Germans back to Berlin. While misguided, the Russian is fanatical. There is a fanatical belief in the Soviet system. The party members, the top officials, both civilian and military, believe profoundly in the Marxist doctrine as taught by Karl Marx and Fredrich Engel in the latter part of the nineteenth century, and as practiced by Lenin and Stalin. The soul is overlooked. The heart is disregarded. God is ignored. But the party members are militant in their advocacy and practice of the communism upon which the institutions of Russia are being erected today.

Militant Propaganda

I have heard of one instance after another where Russians take advantage of their associations with Americans to proclaim the alleged virtues of communism with zeal and militancy. I have thought about the zeal of Communists a great deal. I believe that we Americans can profit from our experiences with Russia. I believe that American soldiers and American civilians whenever and wherever they contact the Russians, and wherever they are, can best promote democracy and freedom by showing zeal for American ideals and by a militant proclamation of the benefits of freedom and democracy. If Americans at home and abroad are as zealous for democracy as the Russians are for communism, the future of the world will be secure. We must substitute zeal for complacency. Americanism must meet the challenge of totalitarianism by demonstrating at home and abroad devotion to the ideals of freedom.

Stable and Strong America

The United States has determined to have a program that will lead to peace. It may be that years will elapse. We are determined to guard against unemployment and depressions. We know that the best way to promote peace is to be prepared for war. We know that Russia knows no language except the language of force. We also know that Russia will continue to bluff and continue to expand unless checked. The door to peace between Russia and the United States must be kept open, not for communistic propaganda, but for good will among the nations of the earth. A stable and strong America is essential to permanent peace.

Marshall Plan

In a memorable address at Harvard University on June 5, 1947, Gen. George C. Marshall, Secretary of State, announced that the United States was profoundly interested in the rehabilitation of Europe. He stated that we intended to force no program upon European countries. He announced that if those countries desired the aid of the United States and if the European countries submitted a request for assistance, the United States would give thoughtful consideration to the plans to enable the countries of Europe to help themselves. The Paris Conference took the initiative. Congress passed the European recovery program. The primary purpose is to aid Europe and to aid China to help themselves. It is not to force these countries against their will. It is not to undertake to maintain oppressive governments in power. It is to encourage the liberal forces for better governments. We are not undertaking to buy European help. They know that we are opposed to communism. The purpose of the plan is to tell them what we stand for, that we believe that all classes should have a voice in their government, and that each nation should determine its destiny without outside infiltration or control and that recovery to promote peace is essential to the security of the world. We proclaim, over and over again, that our purpose is not to fight communism with bullets or with dollars, but our program is to answer the philosophy of communism by the better philosophy of democracy. We combat communistic ideas by democratic ideas. The recovery program is offered at the request of those whom we would aid. It is designed to help people help themselves. They know we are against communism, but we are determined they shall know we are for self-determination and freedom for all peoples.

Spiritual Plan

The need in our domestic policy and in our foreign policy is not only a Marshall plan, but a spiritual plan. Economic plans alone will not overcome communistic propaganda. The mind of man must be encouraged. The soul of man must be enlightened. The world needs a spiritual plan to supplement the material plan. After all, the best way that America can aid Europe is for America to demonstrate at home that democracy is functioning in the United States. The best way to defeat communism is for America to demonstrate that free enterprise continues to promote the highest standard of living for the common man and for the average man of all classes, races, and creeds, in all history, with freedom to speak, with freedom to worship, and with freedom to work. Arms are essential to repel force, but ideas can only be conquered by better ideas. There must be a spiritual satisfaction for the downtrodden and for the oppressed, for the hungry and for the distressed, threatened by exploitation by the rich and selfish few in Europe and China, if the Marshall plan is to be successful. It is still true, "Man shall not live by bread alone." The world cannot be saved politically and economically unless it is saved spiritually. God's moral order must be put above man's economic order.

War Can Be Averted

Does the conflict between communism and democracy mean war? It does not. War would not solve the social problems. The opposing ideologies would remain. War would destroy civilization itself. The Russians not only do not want war, but they are not prepared for war. They have not recovered from the last war. They have not the resources or the production. But there is no need for war. The United States is preparing, not for war but for peace. The United States, strong and powerful, should continue to tell Russians and Russia that America has no designs on the right of Russia to determine her form of government. If war comes, it will be because the United States falters in power, because Russia believes we are not prepared, and because we do not prepare to match our words with our deeds. Police are essential in the city. Army, Navy, and Air Forces are essential in the Nation. The objective is not war but a permanent peace. It has its dangers. The goal is not peace at any price but a just and lasting peace. If the United States maintains its strength and leadership, there will be no war.

The challenge to democracy is moving. The great challenge is that democracy will not only survive and expand in the United States but grow and develop among all the nations of the world. It is either the rule of democracy or the reign of communism, in western Europe and China. The aim of the United States is to promote the freedom of choice to all nations, great and small, to determine their form of government.

The Moving Finger of Destiny

We live in an unusual day. We live in an epic era. We live in an era of danger and of crisis. Heroism is always born of danger. England was never more unhappy than following the appeasement at Munich, but England was never finer or braver than following Dunkerque. Education and democracy are imperative to improve the lot of the average man in all the world.

The individual can only be free in a free government. Our fathers fought for their freedom. To remain free we must pay the price that our fathers paid. We must achieve our freedom. Every generation must win its liberty. The Greeks said, "Know yourself," the Romans said, "Be yourself." The Christians said, "Give yourself." They have been called the swords of the spirit. The founders and the defenders of the Republic knew human history. They were familiar with the rise and fall of governments. They welded together the best in the philosophy of the Greeks and the Romans, under the influence of the Christian ideal when they adopted the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights.

We must keep the lamps of liberty burning and the fires of democracy lighted. We must put none but Americans on guard in our foreign and domestic programs. We must purge Government pay rolls of all Communists. We must prohibit Communists from holding public office. We must profit by the tragedy of Czechoslovakia and by the recent lesson of Bogota. We must purge our political parties of those who would destroy by force our form of government. I paraphrase the words of Mississippi's most illustrious statesman since the War between the States, L. Q. C. Lamar, when I say, "Subversive Communists are people in the United States today whom no good political party deserves and whom no brave political party will bear." We must preserve and defend the freedom for which our fathers died.

"For what avail the plow or soil,
Or land or life, if freedom fails."

The moving finger is writing today in education and democracy. The challenge to both is the most commanding in history. The response will determine the destiny of the world.

Benjamin Franklin, writing in 1799, said: "God grant that not only the love of liberty, but a thorough knowledge of the rights of man may pervade all the nations of the earth, so that a philosopher may set his foot anywhere on its surface, and say, 'This is my country.'"

We must support the ideal of Benjamin Franklin. We must strengthen the foundations upon which the Republic was built. We must keep faith with the brave and chivalrous lads who never came back and died in World War II that America might still be free. We must not let the song of hope for a fairer land, a better world, and for universal peace die on our lips.

The challenge to youth is to achieve in the great adventure of life.

"The moving finger writes; and having writ,
Moves on; nor all your piety nor wit
Shall lure it back to cancel half a line,
Nor all your tears wash out a word of it."

Members of the graduating class, the moving finger will continue to write. The needs of humanity were never greater. This means that the opportunities of youth were never more challenging. There will always be a way. It is for you to choose the way, as John Oxenham has so well said:

"To every man there openeth
A Way, and Ways, and a Way,
And the High Soul climbs the High Way,
And the Low Soul gropes the Low,
And in between, on the misty flats,
The rest drift to and fro.
But to every man there openeth
A High Way and a Low,
And every man decideth
The Way his soul shall go."

I wish for each of you the full and abundant life which each of you alone for yourself can achieve. As you go, I bid you remember that the future of America is not dependent upon the college or the Government alone, but depends upon you and me and the other millions of men and women like you and me in the United States. The individual is the cornerstone and the crowning glory of the American way of life. As the moving finger writes, may it never be written of you as it is written of Belshazzar 2,500 years ago, "Weighed in the balance and found wanting," but as you live, may you realize the good life and grow to the full stature of noble womanhood and splendid manhood, and may the moving finger always write, "Well done."

A Few Kind Words for Uncle Sam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Bernard M. Baruch from the Saturday Evening Post of June 12, 1948:

A FEW KIND WORDS FOR UNCLE SAM
(By Bernard M. Baruch)

Shortly after we entered World War I, President Wilson invited me to a White House discussion of a critical oil shortage which threatened to disrupt our military plans. One official proposed we seize the Mexican oil fields at Tampico. Squadrons of Marines had already been alerted. The President had only to give the word for them to push off.

President Wilson hardly waited for the finish of the argument. When aroused, he would speak in firm, measured tones, which left no doubt what was in his mind.

"What you are asking me to do is exactly what we protested against when committed by Germany," he reprimanded. "You say this oil in Mexico is necessary for us. That is what the Germans said when they invaded Belgium, it was necessary to get to France. Gentlemen," he concluded, "you will have to fight the war with what oil you have."

This incident, in which the President of the United States refused to bend to the totalitarian dictum that necessity knows no law, has never been related publicly before, to my recollection. It flashed into my memory recently while I was thinking of how widely and unjustly this country has come to be besplattered as a money grabber and imperialist, concerned only with profit getting and national aggrandizement.

Contrasting their own devastation and misery with our untouched cities and prosperity, many Europeans feel the United States somehow profited while engaged in the recent war, and greatly since. Some go so far as to regard our generous postwar aid as an obligation we owe to balance the burdens others suffered. Exploiting these resentments, Soviet propagandists have been belittling what we did to defeat Hitler and Japan, and besmearing our motives in the peacemaking as seeking a new war in lust for profits from the blood of millions.

I have favored assisting Europe and the rest of the world to help themselves. For Europeans or others to adopt a posture of reliance upon us, in the mistaken illusion that the war has enriched America, is to invite a tragic future disillusionment which could readily wreck any hopes of the free nations holding together. It may help avert future embitterments of "Uncle Shylock" to set forth now just what America's contribution to the war and peacemaking has been.

That record, never brought together before, is presented here, not to detract from what others did—the Chinese, who resisted longest of all; the Russians, who lost the most lives and whose villages were rubbled under the conqueror's heel; the English who braved Hitler's bombings alone for so long; or of others who joined against the common enemy. These facts are marshaled in hopes of inspiring a better appreciation of both the spirit and the magnitude of our endeavor, in which we hazarded everything with no impulse of reward, other than to gain peace for all.

It is a record for which no American need feel anything but pride. It is particularly worth examining now, when everything this country symbolizes is under assault by enemies, abroad and at home, who would destroy our faith in ourselves. The role thrust upon us by today's peace-waging is remarkably like the one we performed so magnificently during the recent war. Once again, demands beyond our resources tug at us from all over the world—western Europe, China, Turkey, Greece, Korea, South America. We again face the necessity of developing that global leadership and decisiveness of internal unity—this time in peaceful equivalents—which enabled us to achieve global victory in the war. Knowing what we did before, and therefore can do again, may hearten and comfort this greatest stronghold of righteous power left in the world.

Probably the one caricature of America circulated most persistently abroad is that of Uncle Sam as a walking fistful of dollars using his wealth to buy other peoples as "cannon fodder" to do his fighting.

In actual fact, more than one-half of all munitions produced by all the Allies were stamped "made in America." Our war expenditures of $330,000,000,000, through the fiscal year of 1946, exceeded those of Great Britain and Soviet Russia combined. However, this astonishing outpouring of production and dollars came in addition to bearing our full share of fighting.

Although the United States was forced into the war 27 months later, American military casualties exceeded those of the entire British Empire in both dead and wounded. Of the 90 divisions which stormed through western Europe 61 were American. The initial landing waves of all but a few of the beachhead assaults on the many Pacific islands were American, aided by gallant, yet small, Australian, New Zealand, and Filipino forces, and by China's dogged, holding attrition. The World Almanac totals the casualties for England, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa, and the colonies, together at 353,652 military dead, 475,070 wounded, 90,844 missing and 60,595 civilians killed, or 980,161 casualties in all. American dead numbered more than 400,000 and there were nearly 670,000 wounded. Our toll of dead would have been higher but for the remarkable care given the wounded.

Doing both—producing the implements of war and using them on fighting fronts across two oceans—was a deliberate choice. Let me stress that. Early in 1943 what Washington correspondents like to term a "revolt" developed in Congress, with a fairly strong group demanding a reduction in the size of the Army, then projected at 10,800,000 men. Some Government statisticians undertook to prove it would be impossible to draft the 4,400,000 additional men needed and still leave enough workers to produce all the ships, guns, and airplanes scheduled.

President Roosevelt named a special War Mobilization Committee to review the problem. No announcement was made of the committee's creation. James F. Byrnes, then serving as "assistant President," was its chairman. The other members were Admiral William D. Leahy, Roosevelt's Chief of Staff; Harry Hopkins, Samuel I. Rosenman, the President's counsel; and myself, the only member without official position.

Broadly, the decision before us was which should get preference, our fighting or our production? To cut the Army would have meant fewer men in uniform, more in overalls. The committee decided that the armed forces had to be given all the manpower needed to carry through the military offenses pledged our allies. If anything was to be held back, it would be production.

Most of the committee felt we could do both, and so it worked out. With 14,000,000 men and women mobilized, we still produced 60 percent of all Allied munitions. When the committee made its recommendation, President Roosevelt agreed, remarking, "We'll take everything that is necessary to carry out the fighting program."

That was the spirit which governed our total conduct of the war. If American cities escaped destruction, it was because of geographical good luck in being so distant from the lanes of bomb flight. We did not keep, for our own protection, weapons which could have been employed on fighting fronts. To the contrary, we deliberately exposed our defenses—not without protests from some Americans—so that everything possible could be shipped overseas. To Britain alone, more than 45,000 antiaircraft guns were sent.

DISPROVING OUR "WAR-GAIN" MOTIVES

The wartime aid contributed to our allies soared to $50,000,000,000, from which $10,000,000,000 should be deducted for reverse lend-lease and other settlements. For a Nation

which, according to its detractors, is motivated by selfish ends, we were remarkably insensible to opportunities for exacting materialistic gains as the price of this astronomical assistance. Perhaps it would have been wiser had we done so, as some who believe we were taken for Uncle Sap today contend. Instead, we drove no bargains, not even when the British and Russian plights seemed most despairing. Literally opening our Treasury, we pooled all our resources without limit, thought of repayment, or haggling for postwar advantage.

To meet the Allies' needs, America's industrial capacity was vastly expanded. Some may point to that as a "war gain." Any idea that the war swelled America's net physical wealth evaporates if one compares our wartime imports and exports. Into the United States after Pearl Harbor were brought 106,000,000 tons of cargo of every type; shipped out were 268,000,000 tons. The difference is one measure of the physical resources expended as part of our war contribution. The 5,800,000,000 barrels of oil pumped from the American earth would keep all the automobiles in the country running for 12 years.

For what went abroad, we were paid virtually nothing, the bulk going to American forces or as gifts to allies. For what we imported, we paid dollars, which represent claims upon our future production still to be made good. Our public debt jumped five times. In 1939, taxes took as tribute $1 of $13 of our national income; today they exact $1 of every $4 Americans earn. Still, the American people have continued their giving into the war's aftermath with additional loans and gifts, so far, of $21,000,000,000—not including our contribution to the World Bank and Monetary Fund—in UNRRA grants, the British loan, surplus-property credits and, most recently, the European recovery program. To Europe alone, last year, individual Americans sent more than 23,000,000 parcels through the mails and CARE, plus an estimated $120,000,000 in remittances to relatives and friends, and another $250,000,000 of relief in cash and goods through private organizations.

One could search vainly mankind's whole history for comparable generosity. Yet, to some critics abroad and apologies at home, this is the record of a nation scheming to "exploit" and "enslave the world."

Applying the principle of complete good faith to the Soviets always was a thorny problem. With the British, military operations were fully coordinated through the Joint Chiefs of Staff. A side light will illustrate how intimate this cooperation was. President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Winston Churchill were frequently in direct cable and telephone communication, the President often neglecting to inform the American Chiefs of Staff. The Joint Chiefs of Staff, though, had arranged for each to show the other all military messages. In several instances our top military people learned what President Roosevelt was thinking from the British.

The Soviets insisted on conducting all operations on their own. They afforded us no access to their activities, although Roosevelt and Stalin did communicate directly. Stalin's cables followed what Roosevelt once described as "the darndest" pattern. There would be one, two, three messages of fatherly commendation; then "a blisterer." At first, Roosevelt would telephone Churchill and the two would compose a reply to these "blisterers." That didn't prove satisfactory and Roosevelt hit a new stratagem. "I save up the good cables until a bad one comes along," he explained, "then I acknowledged the good and bad ones together."

Roosevelt strove constantly to prevent suspicion from interfering with the prosecution of the war. "We must treat Russia as an equal and give her our full confidence," he often remarked. Only with difficulty was he able to convince Churchill this was the course to follow. The President asked me to "speak to Winston about his attitude toward the Russians." This I did, in Roosevelt's presence, shortly after the Quebec Conference.

"The Russians are killing more Germans than the rest of us put together," I started out. "We should be glad of it and help them all we can. As long as they go along with us 100 percent we should go along with them 100 percent."

Roosevelt nodded his approval.

"But what will happen when Germany is beaten?" demanded Churchill. "What are we going to do about Russia afterward?"

"We have to win the war first. In the meantime let us be guided by their actions," was my reply. "When the war is over, Russia will be sorely devastated. We must impress upon the Soviets the importance of a just peace or no assistance for Russia's reconstruction can be forthcoming from the American people. Whether we will be able to come to an understanding with Russia, no one can know now," I ended. "Let us give them no grounds for suspicion, keeping all our promises, while insisting they fulfill their pledges meticulously."

This episode is related solely to show the complete good faith we sought with the Soviets. It is beyond the scope of this article to determine what caused the present impasse or to weigh the wisdom of what was done or not done at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. To do so, one would have to consider the strategic situation at the time of these Big Three meetings, the choice of actions open to us, the commitments the American people could be counted on to support, what might have happened had all Russian demands been refused, whether any agreements which might have been reached would have been kept.

Whatever suspicions may have crept through the Kremlin corridors were of Russian imaginings. The last time I saw President Roosevelt was about 3 weeks before his death. He had asked me to fly to London to see Churchill, and I had come to Washington for final instructions before leaving. Admiral Leahy joined us, and he and the President talked of a surrender "feeler" from Marshal Kesselring, then commanding the German forces in Italy.

Informed of the surrender bid, Stalin had cabled back, virtually accusing the President of attempting to negotiate a separate peace with Germany and insisting that Soviet officials be present at the first contact with any Germans or negotiations be broken off. Roosevelt was plainly hurt. He was not one to whimper or make excuses when things went wrong. His disappointment was evident, as he explained how carefully we had tried to avoid any action which might be construed as seeking a separate peace. He did not object to the Soviets taking part in surrender negotiations, but didn't want to delay until Russian officials could be brought to the Italian front. If Hitler's Gestapo got wind that Kesselring was trying to surrender his army, Roosevelt feared Kesselring would be shifted and the fighting in Italy needlessly prolonged.

The President and Admiral Leahy were still discussing what reply should be sent Stalin when I left. While in England, I learned Kesselring's "surrender" had fallen through; also that Roosevelt had cabled Stalin, expressing sharp resentment over any implications we might not be keeping our agreements. At almost the same time Roosevelt assured Churchill he intended that the Soviets should live up to their part of all agreements. So much for the spirit with which we dealt with our allies.

Two-thirds of our lend-lease aid went to the United Kingdom, about a fourth—$11,000,000,000—to the Soviet Union. Such sums speak their own importance. Still, since the Soviet Government has chosen to dismiss this assistance as "incidental," these additional facts might be brought forth.

Our aid was concentrated upon filling Russia's most critical needs, like night-fighter airplanes which the Soviets could not produce, or aviation gasoline, in which Russian output was woefully deficient. The 1,981 locomotives and 3,786,000 tires we shipped the USSR were more locomotives and tires than the Soviets produced in any full prewar year. Soviet truck production before the war ran around 200,000 units a year. We sent the Soviet Union 375,000 trucks. Being vastly superior to those made in Russia, these trucks probably equaled 2 years' normal Russian output.

Without American trucks, tires, and locomotives and such items as 52,000 jeeps, 35,000 motorcycles, 415,000 telephone sets, 15,000,000 pairs of soldiers' boots, and 4,000,000 tons of food, the Red Army never could have achieved the superior mobility which was one of its principal military advantages over the Germans. Being able to shift their troops more rapidly, the Soviets could choose Germany's weakest salients for their attacks.

Out of her own resources, Russia could not have supplied the 22,000,000 men the Red Army is estimated to have mobilized. Workers and peasants would have had to be kept back on factories and farms. Russian munitions production would have been curtailed to fill the gaps we plugged. Nor should it be forgotten that we stimulated Russia's own productivity through nearly $500,000,000 of American machine tools and another $2,500,000,000 of industrial materials, like armor plate, aluminum, copper, and zinc.

Soviet military operations profited from American and British bombing of German industry and lines of communication. Our unceasing pressure upon the Japanese after the Battle of Midway was certainly a powerful restraint against the Japs attacking Russia and forcing her to fight on two fronts.

"Who won the war?" is a futile speculation. Inasmuch as the Soviets have taken to boasting they beat Hitler virtually singlehanded, it must be said that without the United States, the German Army would not have been driven from Russia's soil.

Russia not being a maritime nation, it is doubtful whether Soviet leaders ever really appreciated the difficulties we had to hurdle. I recall General Marshall's account of the second-front discussion at Tehran. Why did amphibious operations require such enormous preparations, Marshall Stalin wanted to know.

"The Red Army has had to cross many rivers," Stalin pointed out. "What is so difficult about crossing a body of water?"

Marshall Voroshilov added, "When we come to a river, we send several small parties across to feel out the enemy. Then we throw our full force at the weakest points. Why can't you do that?"

"That's the last thing to do in an amphibious landing," General Marshall exclaimed. "When it comes to ground operations, I will sit and listen at your feet, for you have defeated the greatest ground army in the world. But of amphibious operations you know nothing. When you land amphibiously, you must hit with everything. A failure on a river crossing is a reverse. A failure in an amphibious operation would be a catastrophe. All our operations are conducted at the end of a steamship line," General Marshall went on. "Everything must be planned 6 months ahead of time."

That summed up the difference in the kinds of war we and the Russians were fighting. The Red Army had rivers to cross; we had oceans to cross. It does not lessen our appreciation of the incomparable courage and stamina of the Russian people in defense of their homeland to say they fought with one foot on home base. Our offensives had to leap two distant oceans. Nine days after General Eisenhower landed

in Normandy, more than 3,000 miles from the United States, General MacArthur was assaulting the Marianas, 6,000 miles from home.

That we could undertake two such operations, at opposite ends of the world, at the same time has never ceased being a source of marvel to me. No other nation in the world could have done it. Of all the belligerants, only the United States really fought a global war. While Russia and Britain, as well as Germany and Japan, participated on a few fronts at most, there was not a battlefield or staging area which did not see American food, weapons, and, in most cases, American men. The tentacles of our communications stretched more than 56,000 miles.

If we are to win a global peace, we must recapture the three elements which enabled us to win the global war.

First, there was our production. One afternoon Harry Hopkins showed me a map which pinheaded the numerous outposts and battlefronts where American soldiers were stationed or which we were supplying. Using a school-teacher's pointer, he skipped from the Arctic to the desert, from mountains to jungles.

When Hopkins was through, I remarked, "Let me add one point. All those pins on that map depend on one thing—America's production. Each of those pins is a commitment. The bank that must make them all good is America's production, with its millions of branches in farms and factories."

In every field we set new production records. With fewer farmers, our output of food was lifted one third. Off the assembly lines of our arsenal of democracy during the five war years rolled nearly 300,000 airplanes, more than 15,000,000 rifles and carbines, 319,000 pieces of field artillery, 41,000,000,000 rounds of ammunition, 4,200,000 tons of artillery shells, 86,000 tanks, 64,500 landing craft, 52,000,000 tons of merchant shipping—three ships a day—quadrupling our own merchant fleet. The Navy grew from 1,900,000 tons to 13,600,000 tons, greater than all the other fleets of the world combined.

How all the more remarkable those figures look when stacked against what we had when the war began. In 1940, for example, the Army's total air force was under 3,000 airplanes. It is my belief that if America produced for peace as it did for war, all-out, without strikes or stoppages, inside of two years the foundations of economic stability in the world could be established.

The second ingredient of global victory was the fact that we had a global strategy—something still missing from the peace-waging. In addition to equipping our own armed forces, we supplied food or munitions to 43 different nations. At no time was there enough for everyone. Still, we managed to divide our not-enough so that our most distant allies were heartened to continue in the struggle until America's own military machine was built up to score the decisive knock-outs.

This global vision never fogged. In the blackest days immediately after Pearl Harbor, Roosevelt insisted something be sent to Australia, even if only a trickle. Later, Herbert Vere Evatt recalled, "Nothing heartened us so much in those dark days as that trickle of supplies which came to us through the long, Jap-infested sea and which told us we were not forgotten."

Whatever is written about Franklin Roosevelt, one tribute all historians will have to pay him and his aides, like General Marshall, Admiral Ernest King, Gen. "Hap" Arnold and others—they saw the struggle in its global dimensions and developed the necessary world-embracing strategy.

For the "cold war" attrition with the Soviets, the essence of any global strategy, I believe, lies in pacing ourselves. It will do no good to sprint like mad for a year or two when the race is a marathon. We must learn to distinguish between those areas where we can achieve a quick decision and "holding actions," where our plans must be shaped to a long, gruelling contest. Let us remember the moral of the tortoise and the hare and be sure it is we who break the tape at the finish, so peace will be the pay-off.

Too many commitments we have taken on tend to weaken us. The strategic concepts and economic policies must be developed to turn many of these into sources of strength. Peace cannot be attained by dispersing or even sharing America's strength. We and our allies must grow stronger together, mobilizing not only America's resources but those of free peoples everywhere. Otherwise, the democracies will waste the advantage of strength they now hold.

The third factor which made possible our wartime global adventure was what Woodrow Wilson described as "the highest form of efficiency * * * the spontaneous cooperation of a free people."

Twice in my lifetime I have seen the American Nation transform itself from a peaceful, war-hating people into the most terrible instrumentality for destruction the world has ever seen and, even more swiftly, revert to its easy-going, antimilitaristic "normalcy." It is not accidental that Americans behave in this fashion; that we avoid war as long as possible, accepting it only as a last alternative; then, once in the struggle, fight with the fury of one possessed; and, the shooting over, scuttle and run back home.

The mainspring behind these actions is the American passion for freedom—that and the fact that war is the complete opposite of our normal ways, as night unto day. For 100 years, students of Marxism have parroted the libel that the capitalistic system is driven to war by its very nature, in its hunger for markets and profits. The truth is that modern warfare has developed so that no economic system is more conducive to peace than one based on private initiative, where a multitude of individuals pursue their happiness and profit, independent of the state.

What is the essence of modern warfare? Its indispensable requirement is dictatorship, with the government controlling every feature of economic activity. Communism and fascism both have molded themselves to fit this totalitarian image of war. Both are systems of perpetual wartime mobilization. Both put guns above butter, the state's exactions for war ahead of improving the living standards of the people.

Before a modern capitalistic nation can go to war, it literally must turn itself inside out. Only great provocations justify such a transformation. This explains why America's strength has the quality of a storm, which, before it bursts, must gather unity from darkened, threatening skies. Only the clouding of great dangers will cause us to accept the restraints on our freedom which mobilization entails.

Even when we do, the spur remains our determination to preserve our system. We fight to banish the danger which forced us to band together, so we can go back to our normally free, individualistic habits. Often, Americans are accused of not knowing for what we fight. Yet, ours has been a consistent—though perhaps inadequate—war aim. We fight not to implant ourselves on foreign shores, but to come home; not to remain warlike, but to return to war hating; not to impose our will upon others, but so we can continue governing ourselves as we wish.

Considering this behavior, faithfully followed through two wars and their aftermaths, it is strange to have America accused of being imperialistic. Such charges can spring only from malice or a failure to understand the American system. It is worth noting that the propaganda of imperialistic grabbing spread against us is always couched in the future tense. It is what we allegedly are going to do for which we are smeared, not what we have done. From neither the First nor the Second World War did we take anything from some other people for our own enrichment.

The few islands in the Pacific under our control serve as part of a system of defense on which the security of all freedom-loving people rests. Economically these islands are liabilities.

In his final report as Chief of Staff Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower wrote of the American proposals on atomic energy, "In truth, it demands nothing of others which the United States is not willing to give to the others, and it would give to all our knowledge of the application of atomic energy."

That can be repeated as a generalization about our conduct through the war and peacemaking—we have asked nothing we were not willing to give to others—namely, peace.

Not that I claim perfection for America. There have been lapses in the past, and more recently over Palestine we reversed our pledged word—an act which will plague us until corrected. But through the years, more often than not, the spirit guiding us has been that of Woodrow Wilson, in refusing to seize the oil fields of a friendly Mexican neighbor simply because "it was necessary." In this same spirit we and Britain respected Ireland's neutrality during the recent war, although the inability to use Irish bases cost dearly in lives and shipping. One can also point to our freeing Cuba and the Philippines; our long championing of the territorial integrity of China, even when every other power in the world seemed bent upon partitioning it; our attempts to make the doctrine of self-determination of peoples a cornerstone of peace.

That the United States should do these things is not surprising. Rarely do the waters of foreign policy rise above their domestic sources. No nation, over any sustained period of time, acts differently in its foreign relations than at home. Perhaps, if we have been overly generous in assisting foreign nations, it reflects how much this country has done and is still doing for its own people.

Recently, at dinner, a young woman exclaimed, "What I worry about is whether America's sun has not set! There was a time when democracy was the idea of the age and everything toppled before it. Isn't communism that sort of irresistible idea now?"

"I do not think so," was my reply. The challenge of the American adventure seems as fresh today as when this country was founded. What does the American adventure symbolize? It is the belief that the ordinary man and woman can govern themselves. To contradict the theory of the divine right of kings, America brought forth its doctrine of the divine right of man—that "all men are created equal * * * with certain unalienable rights." Today we still champion this cause of popular government against that oldest of dogmas, that government cannot be left to the people, but must be entrusted to the benevolence or tyranny of an enthroned elite.

The American system hasn't produced perfection. It has brought the people further along in their pursuit of happiness than any other system. More important than material benefits, the people still hold the power to change anything and everything. Nothing anyone would propose cannot be done by the people, if persuaded of its wisdom. They can revoke any law, fire any official, tax the rich, succor the poor. Under a police state, once imposed, the people lose all ability to determine their future. Why change our form of government when we can use that government to make whatever changes we desire?

Equality before the law and change through the law are the two sides of the American coin. Americans can make no

greater contribution to mankind than to demonstrate that these qualities will survive as the "last best hope on earth." How wonderful that we held presidential elections in 1944, with the war at its climax—something no other nation did! Now, we again face what has been the test of survival for freedom at all times—that free men know when to unite and discipline themselves to preserve their freedoms. To make peace, we must achieve a new unity. Of all the kind words that could be said for Uncle Sam, the kindest are these, "He did it again."

Having Done This, Let Us Match It With Benefits for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the vote on the bill today to admit 200,000 displaced persons into our country was a vote requiring serious thought and some difficult choices. If I had viewed this entirely from the standpoint of immigration policy, as based on conditions 10 years ago, my vote would have been against this bill, but based on postwar conditions involving humanitarian considerations along with immigration policy, as I view it, it is an entirely different thing. Time and again I have declared that I am inclined toward a highly selective policy toward all immigrants, and I am also inclined toward a restrictive policy. If I could have had my way on immigration policy alone, I should have preferred closing the door somewhat, for a period at least, until there is better adjustment here at home. That is why I favored the Vorys amendment.

Not only is all legislation a matter of compromise, where controversy is involved, but resulting policy is also a compromise, and it was so in this case. Of course, I want to do the right thing by our friends in the old world, but I should much prefer to do the right thing by them in rehabilitating them in their old home rather than by inviting them to come here. During the war, and since the war, America has been very generous toward supplying the needs of our friends abroad, and in that I have been glad to have a part.

However, the immigration laws do provide for quotas, and if we had not passed this law we would have had the former law in effect, and thus would have received as many immigrants under those regulations as will be admitted under the act passed today.

I think, however, that the act passed today will do two things. It will give us a better safeguard in the selection of those who are to come in than existed under previous law, and it will do another thing in that it will help America to do the humane thing following the war. I do not regard the argument that we can save money by shipping these people into America rather than supporting them abroad. The money-saving angle does not appeal to me. Rather am I thinking of the sociological and economic phases. The conditions and terms contained in the measure passed today will make it possible for us to do the humane thing and also make a better selection of the same number of immigrants which we would have admitted under previous enactment anyway.

This is an act of generosity and grace on the part of America, and I do not regard it at all as a measure of special benefit to our country, either sociologically or economically. We hope we can get worth while and worthy individuals under this new enactment even though we will get no greater total of immigrants than we would have without the enactment. However, this same Government that has passed this generous enactment owes a far greater obligation to its veterans and others whose inconvenience and inevitable maladjustment will be continued and prolonged because of this enactment and our other generous immigration policies. All the more reason why this Government should be ashamed to have done so little toward veterans' housing and toward farm homes for veterans. In a sense we regard this as necessary legislation. How much more necessary that it should be accompanied by needed and favorable legislation for our own people who have paid a price in this war.

How We Earned His Hate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune of June 11, 1948:

HOW WE EARNED HIS HATE

We are printing this editorial on the front page because that is where we published Mr. Truman's attack on us.

Mr. Truman has added his name to the long list of political crooks and incompetents who have regarded the Tribune as first among their foes. This would please us a great deal if we didn't deserve the distinction and it pleases us even more because we do.

Mr. Truman's tactics are, of course, transparent. He is desperate. He started his trip fearing that he was unpopular. Now he knows that he is. The tour has been a flop. The people are not interested in him or anything he has to say.

We do not wonder that, having no defense to offer, he feels he must attack. We do not wonder that he has turned his fire on us. Thanks in no small measure to the Tribune, the people of the Nation know Mr. Truman for the nincompoop he is and for the vote-stealing, graft-protecting, gangster-paroling Pendergast man that he is.

Mr. Truman is not the first discredited politician to employ these tactics. Among Republicans, Lorimer, a Senator, Thompson, a mayor, and Small, a governor, played the same game and lost. Neither is Mr. Truman the first President nor the first Democratic President nor the first New Deal President who sought to make the Tribune rather than himself the issue in a campaign. Sometimes these tactics have succeeded for a time. They will not do Mr. Truman any good because his position is already hopeless.

Mr. Truman regards us as first among his foes, and he is right in both senses of the word "first." He is right in thinking we have been foremost in the attack on him. It is no accident that Mr. Arvey, the Democratic leader here, is determined to defeat Mr. Truman's nomination, for Mr. Arvey knows that the Democratic voters of Chicago can have no illusions about the man. Mr. Truman is right, also, in recognizing that we saw through him when others still believed there was something to him.

Mr. Truman came to power on April 12, 1945. Like everybody else, we hoped for the best. We hoped that the dignity and traditions of the office would wean him from his political habits and criminal associates. We know that he was a creation of the corrupt Pendergast machine in Kansas City; we hoped that he would not remain the creature of this vote-stealing, criminal-protecting gang. Pendergast and many of his chore boys had been sent to the penitentiary for graft and vote stealing. We had told all this, in detail, during the 1944 campaign, including the fact that Mr. Truman himself was the direct beneficiary of the ballot-box stuffing, but we hoped all that was behind him.

We had few illusions about Mr. Truman's competence and none about his political record on April 12, 1945, but, like everybody else, we continued to hope for some months. We gave him the benefit of the doubt. Mr. Truman journeyed to Potsdam in July. On August 3 the unconscionable deal he had made with Stalin was announced to the world.

Most of the leaders of opinion in the country failed to recognize what he had done there for the damnable thing it was. We did. We said on August 4:

"It must now be recorded with regret that Mr. Truman is as devoid of diplomatic skill as he is without understanding of the problems he has been dealing with."

We were a lone voice then, but everybody now knows that we spoke the sober truth. Everybody now knows more than that. They know that Mr. Truman is not only a catastrophic failure as the director of foreign policy, but also is as closely bound to his corruptionists as he ever was.

He could not rest until he had pardoned his Missouri vote thieves. He carried in his heart an undying grudge against Maurice Milligan, the prosecutor who had sent Pendergast and his boys over the road. By 1946 Mr. Truman was back in Kansas City leading the machine in its fight to unseat an anti-Pendergast Congressman. Votes were stolen in wholesale quantities in that election, too. The prosecution was hampered by the burning of the ballots. The gang was on the march. It knew that it had a protector in the White House.

Mr. Truman's devotion to gangsters was not confined to the Missouri brand. Pretty soon his parole board had released four of the leaders of the Capone mob. They had already received distinguished consideration at the hands of Mr. Truman's administration, having been transferred to the penitentiary of their choice where they would suffer the least interference with their comfort and the conduct of their lawless business. They were now at liberty, released almost on the first day that the criminal code permits, with the Government's claims against their accumulated fortunes compromised favorably to them.

The Tribune suspected that the release was brought about by corruption and the suspicion was deepened by the egregious size of the Democratic vote in the gangster-ridden wards of Chicago. We started out to investigate and soon had enlisted the aid of a congressional committee. The findings

confirmed the worst of our suspicions. The trail led first into the office of Tom Clark, Mr. Truman's Attorney General. The gangsters were from Chicago but they had as their lawyer Maury Hughes of Dallas, an old friend of Mr. Clark. Mr. Hughes' fee was $15,000. From Mr. Clark's office, the trail led to the White House. Another mouthpiece for the gangsters was Paul Dillon of St. Louis, a long time associate of Mr. Truman in the Pendergast machine, who has entree to the White House.

For bringing all this to light, Mr. Truman can properly regard the Tribune as first among his enemies. He has still another reason for his rage against us. A man of his quality expects that anybody can be bought off provided the price is set high enough. He devised a scheme for corrupting the press with Government funds obtained through the Marshall plan. We exposed that one, too. We showed that the New York Herald Tribune, for example, was promised a million dollars from the fund to expand its business. The Herald Tribune is shouting louder today than ever for Mr. Truman's foreign policy and for the maximum Marshall plan appropriation.

It shocks Mr. Truman to discover that the methods he learned at Pendergast's knee don't always work. There are some newspapers, it seems, that don't sell out for any price. We know we are not the only one in this category, but it fills us with satisfaction that Mr. Truman has placed us first among them. Certainly we have done all that lay in our power to earn the distinction.

A Real Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of June 10, 1948:

A REAL VOICE OF AMERICA

The finest presentation of the American side we've ever seen is Bernard M. Baruch's article in this week's Saturday Evening Post. Title: "A Few Kind Words for Uncle Sam."

It is a devastating answer to critics abroad and apologists at home who call the United States a money-grabbing, imperialist nation, concerned only with profit getting and its own aggrandizement.

In it Mr. Baruch demolishes both the mistaken illusion that America, enriched by war, can afford to support a dependent Europe and the pro-Soviet falsehood that America now schemes to exploit and enslave the world.

He does that by a simple marshaling of facts about the American record in war and after—a record which amply supports his statement that this country has asked only what it was willing to give others, namely, peace. We fought, he writes—"not to implant ourselves on foreign shores, but to come home; not to remain warlike, but to return to war-hating; not to impose our will upon others, but so we can continue governing ourselves as we wish."

Of all the belligerents, Mr. Baruch asserts, only the United States really fought a global war across two oceans. Far from enriching ourselves, we poured out to other peoples our irreplacable resources, "without limit, thought of repayment, or haggling for postwar advantage."

We not only equipped our own vast forces but supplied weapons or food to 43 other nations. Sixty percent of all Allied munitions were made in America. Our military casualties, in dead and wounded, exceeded those of the entire British Empire. Two-thirds of the divisions which stormed through western Europe were American. Without the aid given by the United States the German Army would not have been driven from Russian soil.

Our war expenditures of $330,000,000,000 were greater than those of Britain and Russia combined. We sent $40,000,000,000 net in lend-lease aid, and since the war $21,000,000 more in loans and gifts. Our public debt was multiplied fivefold and our tax burden grew from one in every $13 of national income to one in every four.

Mr. Baruch sets forth these facts in no spirit of boastfulness, but in the earnest belief that a wider understanding of America's contribution to war and peace is needed to avert future tragic disillusionment and bitterness against Uncle Shylock. We should and can assist the people of Europe, he contends, but unless they help themselves—unless not only America's resources but those of free peoples everywhere are mobilized to win the peace—the democracies will waste their present advantage of strength.

Of all Mr. Baruch's services to his country, we think this article is one of the greatest. Americans will read it with a thrill of pride. Broadcast to other countries, it would be the most effective Voice of America this world has heard in many a month.

Welcome to Connecticut, Mr. Tisdale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose the column by Westbrook Pegler appearing in the Tuesday, June 8, edition of the Waterbury (Conn.) Republican.

Mr. Pegler notes that Mr. Frederick Tisdale has become the publisher of the New Milford (Conn.) Times, an outstanding weekly newspaper published in the Fifth District.

I wish to take this opportunity to welcome Mr. Tisdale to our midst and to wish him every success in his new endeavor. The New Milford Times has a lengthy history of responsible public service, which, I am sure, will be continued under Mr. Tisdale's direction.

The article follows:

MR. TISDALE, OF NEW MILFORD, WILL SURELY SPEAK HIS PIECE

(By Westbrook Pegler)

NEW YORK, June 8.—Fred Tisdale has bought an interest in the Times, a weekly published at New Milford, Conn. In a comfortable old phrase with rockers on it, he is settling down in the beautiful Yankee country to spend the rest of his life as a small-town editor. Mr. T. is a real professional journalist in the finest sense of the word. He was born in west Tennessee, at a time when the "hants" of Gen. Nathan Bedford Forrest still rode in the moonlight in the shrouds of the original Ku Klux Klan, landed in Kansas City "busted," at a tender age, wrote and drew pictures for the Kansas City Star, and played the grand tour of the tramp newspaperman. This included the New Orleans States, the Evening Sun in Baltimore, something called the Telegram in Portland, Oreg., that I can't say I ever heard of, and the China Press in Shanghai.

On the China Press he covered the police court and drew pictures to go with his copy. One of his stories dealt with a Chinese fellow charged with attempting to commit suicide with a brick. The charge was not elaborated on the blotter and Mr. T. nearly drove himself and his readers crazy speculating whether he tossed the brick in the air and tried to get under it, or put it on the ground and dived or dove (vote for one) on it. They had to go to press before the court got around to the defendant and Mr. Tisdale lost interest next day and therefore never did find out in what manner the defendant had tried to end it all by means of a brick. Does it matter now?

The grand tour was variable, like the route of an inveterate ballplayer some years ago. Newspaper reporters, including a few spectacular alcoholics, wandered from town to town in the way of that class of cavalry soldiers called snowbirds, who enlisted for the winter when the cavalry was snowed in and went over the hill in the spring. They must have been quaint. The memories of an old soldier named Hand which run endlessly in the Star in Tucson casually tell of the execution of one of the boys by a firing squad of his own comrades because he refused duty. The captain pleaded with him to yield and do the duty, but he had a stubborn streak so it was necessary to shoot him, but Mr. Hand added that they buried him with honors. That seemed to relieve the episode of meanness.

In those days—my youngling days, too—if a man could truthfully say that he had worked on the Kansas City Star he could hang his hat in any shop in the country. Chicago, Minneapolis, and St. Paul were on the grand tour, Omaha, St. Louis, Denver, San Francisco, Seattle, New Orleans, and for some reason, St. Joe, Mo.

Des Moines, Memphis, Dallas, Los Angeles, and Fort Worth were not and there was practically no such place as Oklahoma City or Tulsa in the newspaper sense, or any other for that matter. The pay ranged from $15 a week for cubs, mostly runaway big-city office boys who would pitch in as busboys at the Baltimore Lunch for their hamburgers and coffee when they couldn't catch on in the local newspaper shops, up to $35 a week for older hands of 23 or 30, with a knack and competence of seasoned men.

There were lots of papers then. We had four in Des Moines when I was a cub there in 1913 as against two today, and in St. Louis we had five as against three now. That is about the ratio of survival and in baseball it is about the same. There are fewer leagues and the young ballplayers, like the young reporters, take a strangely unromantic view. The money doesn't go far enough and I find myself wondering why reporters, rewrite men and telegraphers enjoyed, as they certainly did, their almost penniless condition and their life in sooty little rooms in hotels down by the Union Depot.

Mr. Tisdale's clarion call in his first editorial says he isn't going to try to make a "smart" city newspaper of the New Milford Times and would leave global problems to the editorial writers of the great metropolitan dailies.

"We do not presume to believe," said he, "that any ponderous pronouncement in the New Milford paper is going to soften the attitude of Joseph Stalin or put an end to lynchings in the South."

Well, excusing that word "ponderous" and noting an exception to that phrase "in the South," the voice of the New Milford Times could be as influential in its own circulation field as that of any daily. After all, these

metropolitan editorials are written, mostly, by the likes of Mr. Tisdale, hired for their ability to express the policy of the person or the soulless corporation who owns the paper. There is a tradition that practically all of them have one of two ambitions. The first is to settle down to country journalism and the second is to raise chickens.

If we get any honest discussion of the questions which will settle the fate of the United States in the next few years—say 4 years—and may do for us as a free people, we will get it from the nonmetropolitan papers. The deep-South papers are much franker today. I am afraid they would flinch, too, in the same circumstances which have made most of our metropolitan press tiptoe around the vital questions of our foreign policy. They are not subject to the boycotts of a new Ku Klux Klan conceived in the darkness of Europe and set loose among us crying "bigot," "hatemonger," and "minority rights" at Americans whenever we resent some monstrous impudence or put in a word for our rights as the patriotic law-abiding majority.

There aren't any hicks in the United States now. After two wars we are a far-traveled people and higher education is as common as the common cold. An item right under Tisdale's clarion call or outline of purpose on the editorial page says that James Allared, who makes his home up Long Mountain, "was with Jimmy Doolittle on that famed flight over Japan."

Long ago the Daily Gate City, of Keokuk, Iowa, carried an almost endless rhapsody entitled "Keokuk Will Be a Town Like a Jewel," a vision of the future of Keokuk after the completion of the great Mississippi Dam. This was rough-hewn poetry, but as literature it was certainly much better than the illiterate prattle of night clubs, politics, and pregnancies for which the metropolitan press regularly pays more money than any poet, essayist, or great editorial journalist ever got. About the same time the late Bert Leston Taylor reprinted in the Line O' Type in Chicago a saga of a runaway clipped from a weekly somewhere over behind Ottumwa. It was full of power and passion.

I remember—"as down the street that mare she dashed around and around her tail she lashed."

Mr. Tisdale says "after traveling all over the world we settled in New Milford because we like it better," but that his editorial view is bound by the township line. I expect to see him breaking out all over nevertheless. New Milford fought at Omaha Beach after all.

Portland Veterans' Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a portion of a letter which I received from a World War II veteran residing in Salem, Oreg. In view of the fact that there has been so much controversy over the Veterans' Administration hospital program, it is a pleasure to make public this commendation of the operation of the veterans' hospital at Portland, Oreg.:

Another matter, I have just spent a week at the veterans' hospital in Portland undergoing an operation on both legs. Please be advised that it was a pleasant experience. The staff is excellent, courteous, and professional. I talked to many patients and there were no gripes; morale was very high. I can certainly commend the VA on that hospital.

Sincerely yours.

Human Rights, the Key to World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a clipping from the Naugatuck (Conn.) Daily News giving the text of the prize essay contributed to the Connecticut VFW Auxiliary contest by Miss Lois Hermonat, a high-school student at Naugatuck.

This essay demonstrates the provocative thought being given our system of government by the youngsters of America, and is entitled "Human Rights, the Key to World Peace."

The article follows:

PRIZE ESSAY HOLDS WORLD DEMOCRACY KEY TO PEACE—PRINCIPLES OF HUMAN RIGHTS EMBODIED IN DEMOCRACY, NAUGATUCK HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT, WINNER OF STATE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS AUXILIARY CONTEST, WRITES

(Following is the text of the essay written by Lois Hermonat, Curtiss Street, awarded first prize of $150 in the annual Connecticut VFW Auxiliary essay contest. The essay will be judged in the national contest for top prize of $1,000.)

(By Lois Hermonat)

Human rights, the key to world peace—what does this imply?

In the first place, the key to human rights must be considered, and that, I firmly believe, can be thought of only in the terms of democracy, for democracy embodies the principles of human rights, namely, the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Democracy has the high aim of considering and advancing the personality of all individuals—the idea of respect for integrity of the person and of the value of developing persons as worthy and worthful individuals in themselves. To me, this includes the discovering and use of unique talents, the fullest possible expression of creative powers, and a share in shaping the conditions which are found to make the achievement of an individual possible. Human rights, as the key to world peace, can be achieved only through a world democracy.

The first condition of the democratic principle is that human rights are of ultimate good and that each individual has a certain unique worthfulness.

Democracy is a process of personal achievement, and it is at the same time an ideal of a community, working for the economic and spiritual welfare of all its members. A truly democratic world would thus seek through every department of life to protect and give expression to betterment of individual living. There is only one way to have a better world, and that is to have better individuals in it.

Wherever sharing of power, of knowledge, and of respect is in process, wherever sharing on all these fronts goes forward, where responsibility for achieving these aims is being equally shared—there is democracy.

The whole idea of democracy has been the result of long human experience with efforts at the preservation of individual rights and fuller self-expression. Slowly and painfully people have had to learn that royal families, feudal barons, landed aristocracies, priestly overlords, and dictators necessarily served their own interests—not those of the community as a whole.

It is for us Americans today, by understanding and friendship for the people of all parts of the world to revere, uphold, and put into practice the ideal of our forefathers; to make a perfect union. We seek not only our own betterment, but the betterment of all; the good not only of our own group, our own section, our own State, our own country, but of the entire world.

The purpose of government in a democracy is the assurance that conditions of life are such that would serve in the development and enrichment of the rights of every citizen.

All of this is neither a new nor strange doctrine in America. It is all a part of America's traditional faith. In our vast trials we have sought liberty, equal opportunity and a fraternal attitude.

Never before in history has the phrase, the human family, had such a precise meaning. This much all of us—American, European, African, Asiatic, and Australian—have in common. We have been brought together or thrust together as members of a world unit, an unorganized world unit, whether we like it or not.

The American faith professes that its structure is built on the sanction of all the people and for all the people, in order that life and happiness may be assured. Americans are convinced that there must be organized activity and that organized effort should be put forth to provide for human needs.

Yet, despite the splendor and unparalleled fineness of America's hold upon these aims and ideas, has she developed them to her fullest extent? We uphold that all men are created equal, regardless of who or what they are, but the problem of racial discrimination still keeps rising. We must come to this simple but essential truth—that human beings are of primary value in life. We must relentlessly strive to live in mutual respect and comradeship with other races and nations of the earth.

Though the idea of bestowing democracy on all other peoples throughout the world seems both magnanimous and attractive, the fact remains that democracy is not to be had just for the giving or the taking. It depends not only on love of freedom, but on the ability to carry out the responsibilities of freedom.

The aims of education in a democracy must be the same for all people. Thus freedom depends upon a liberal education. As a liberal education helps to establish a free community, so it helps to preserve it.

We proudly call the United States the land of liberty, for it has taught the world how liberty may be a blessing to all. Our American democracy, the ground work for a world democracy, is already laid. It is for us, as Americans, with the people of all other nations of the world, to complete the construction by bettering ourselves and remembering the rights of others.

There are opposing forces in the world still engaged in an endeavor to make us resign from the human race, to make us suspect and detest other peoples—our allies no less than our enemies. Surely we realize that this course is a death-beset highway that we formerly traveled until we collided with a large object labeled World War II, and surely we are aware of how it betrayed democracy and human rights.

The world is now facing a serious crisis. Human rights are being disregarded, and world peace seems to be unattainable. Thomas Jefferson recognized the key to human rights and advocated democracy. Let

us progress further and work for a world democracy, so that we may achieve a world peace. As we plan to initiate the peace, may we be able to say with Walt Whitman:

"I salute all the inhabitants of the earth,
You, whoever you are!
Health to you! Good will to you all—
From me and America sent."

A New Fifth Column or the Refugee Racket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, the House has just passed the so-called Fellows bill to admit into this country 200,000 persons from the DP camps of Europe. I am most unhappy with this action and was opposed to the bill.

While political postmortems are rarely of any benefit, I nevertheless want to insert for the record a speech which I made on this subject, under the above title, on July 2 of last year.

The speech is still apropos of this issue although it was made against the then-pending Stratton bill. The only major difference between the Stratton bill and the so-called Fellows bill is in the numbers to be admitted.

My speech of last year is as follows:

Mr. Speaker, every issue decided by this Congress, should be decided solely on the ground of what is best for America. On this basis of what is best for America, I am bitterly opposed to the Stratton bill. This bill proposes to bring to this country over and above present immigration, 400,000 refugees from the DP camps of Europe. On this issure, I wish to speak for millions of Americans who are unable to speak for themselves, and for many thousands of others who are afraid to speak.

The statements to be made in this discussion are based upon careful study and research, and upon information furnished me by reliable persons, many of whom would suffer reprisals should their names be used. What happens to me personally or politically is of no consequence if what I have to say here helps to awaken this country to the danger that lurks in such legislation as the so-called refugee bill.

One of the largest, best-paid lobbies in the city of Washington at this time is the so-called displaced-persons lobby. They are backed up by a Nation-wide organization that has spent and is spending millions of dollars on propaganda. These organizations have filled the press and the radio of the Nation, a large part of which they control, with canned editorials, syndicated columns, sentimental appeals, feature stories, and a vast array of misleading information. They have lined up many politicians in both parties who seek to acquire or retain the foreign-bloc votes in the pivotal States.

EXISTING IMMIGRATION LAWS

Before taking up the Stratton bill specifically, let us consider briefly existing immigration laws and policy. Those of us opposed to this refugee bill are not unfriendly to immigrants. Most of us are proud of the strong immigrant blood that went into the building of this country. When there were frontiers to conquer and jobs to fill, immigrant blood meant strength. The blood now offered means weakness and pollution. The Germans, the Irish, the Norwegians, the immigrants from northern and western Europe who came here in the last century are among our best citizens. They settled in and helped develop all sections of this great Nation. Today there are no jobs to fill. We do not need workers nor nonworkers. Not only have times and conditions changed, but so have the immigrants. Of the immigrants coming here last year, not over 1 percent went to the farms. At least 95 percent poured into our big and overcrowded cities. Unemployment, housing, slum clearance, crime, education, health, and all of our many social, political, and economic problems are further complicated and aggravated by today's immigration. Following the First World War we passed our basic immigration laws setting up certain quotas and restrictions through which we sought to protect the American way of life. American institutions, and American standards of living. These laws are exceedingly liberal. They should be strengthened, not weakened. From Europe generally, we permit the entry of 154,000 a year under quotas. We impose no quotas whatsoever on countries of the Western Hemisphere. Even from quota countries we permit many to come over and above the 154,000. Wives and minor children of American citizens, ministers, and professors, and certain classes of merchant seamen, may come in outside of the quotas. We place no limit upon visitors, or students, or treaty merchants. Furthermore, during the World War we naturalized 110,000 aliens serving in the American Army, under legislation which I helped to pass. We brought in around 100,000 war brides; we removed certain other discriminations and inequities, all under legislation sponsored or supported by me. Under existing laws, we will probably receive into this country through various channels not less than two or three hundred thousand immigrants per year—more than we can adequately assimilate.

FOREIGN-BORN POPULATION

According to official figures, around 35,000,000 of our 140,000,000 inhabitants are of recent immigrant origin. The 1940 census listed 11,500,000 people in this country of foreign birth, and over 23,000,000 who had at least one foreign-born parent. The 1940 census listed six cities of more than 500,000 population in this country where less than 40 percent of the white population is of native parentage. There were 11 cities between 100,000 and 500,000 where less than 40 percent of the white people were of native parentage. In 1940, 1,047 newspapers in this country were published in 38 foreign languages and were read by more than 10,000,000 people. In 1920, one out of every five persons of voting age in this country were foreigners. In many of our northeastern cities the ratio of foreign-born to native-born voters is approximately 1 to 3. No other nation in the world has so large a percentage of foreign-born folks.

NATIONAL POLICY

Mr. Speaker, our very survival in a mad world depends upon internal strength and unity. Furthermore, we cannot teach democracy abroad unless we preserve it at home. The President's expert commission recently reporting on national defense, specified as the first requirement for our security that we must have a strong, educated, united population. It takes time for roots to grow deeply. To say that 400,000 refugees from the displaced persons camps of Europe would add to our strength, our health, our unity, or our influence abroad, or would promote our welfare in any way is absurdly false. Unquestionably, the exact reverse is true.

Dr. Henry Pratt Fairchild, professor of sociology in New York University, in a 1943 discussion of the Implication of Population Trends for Postwar Policies, concludes that immigration should be restricted. He expresses the danger of new immigration in these words: "We are fighting this war for the sake of democracy, the rights of the common man, the eradication of race prejudice, and the general recognition of human equality. If the findings of science were in accordance with unenlightened, liberal sentiment, there might be no particular danger. Since this is not the case, it is essential that the peace negotiators be prepared to recognize, and to make clear to the world, that what may seem like a narrow or illiberal policy is really a liberal policy because it promises the greatest welfare for the greatest number of people over the longest stretch of time."

Many statesmen, including Woodrow Wilson, expressed the same convictions and fears. No other intelligent conclusion is possible. Out of such philosophy our present inadequate laws have grown. Common ideals, common heritage, real Americanism is more essential today than ever before. We should now patch the holes in the fence through which illegal immigrants pour. We should now raise, not lower, immigration barriers. Now, of all times, we should promote internal strength and unity or we shall lose democracy at home, forfeit the sacrifices of two great wars, and end up by being ourselves destroyed.

Two years ago many of those now wanting to dump the refugees of Europe into America were before Congress pleading for a guaranteed full-employment bill. They predicted inevitable mass unemployment and depression. We set up at that time an Economic Planning Board, seeking to forestall inevitable recession. We are still working at that job. Although our prosperity has confounded the pessimists, we even now have 2,500,000 people out of work. We have millions on some sort of relief. About 50 percent of our families still live on incomes of less than $2,400 per year. Some 10 percent live on less than $500 annually. Approximately 40 percent of our veterans are still living doubled up with relatives and friends, while nearly 25 percent of our married veterans are without homes of their own. Thousands of veterans are still trying to get into overcrowded schools, while at least 2,000,000 will soon flow from these institutions seeking useful jobs in a land that owes them first consideration.

To the problem of normal immigration, we have added an increasing influx of Puerto Ricans. When we acquired Puerto Rico it had around 800,000 inhabitants. It now has 2,500,000 people living on a tiny island that will not adequately support one-third of that number. A New York newspaper complains that 100,000 Pureto Ricans a year are pouring into the slums of that city. A million of these folks will doubtless migrate to the States within the next few years. Among other things, the next Congress will be called upon to appropriate billions for slum clearance, billions for health, and millions to combat an ever-increasing crime wave. Mr. Speaker, we will do well to absorb the poison already flowing in the bloodstream of this country without the injection of more foreign virus.

THE DISPLACED PERSONS

Mr. Speaker, this brings me to a brief discussion of our displaced-persons camps from which we are urged to take an original installment of 400,000 refugees. These camps could and should have been closed and abolished a year ago. Their administration has not been good, and their continued maintenance is disgraceful. To solve the problem by dumping any part of them into this country is the worst and most dangerous of many alternatives. Since the war Allied military authorities have repatriated—returned to their homes or places of their choice—more than 7,000,000 of these persons. Ninety percent of some 800,000 persons in some 300 DP camps still under our supervision could and

should have been repatriated. Such could and would have been done but for the selfish, vicious, political, and misguided humanitarian pressures in this country. To be a displaced person in an American camp has long been a preferred status in Europe. Bear in mind probably not more than 30 percent of these so-called displaced persons were in fact displaced persons at the time the war ended. For various reasons, they have displaced themselves and have flocked into these camps from all over Europe. Many of them have come from Russia and countries under Russian domination. While a few good people remain in these camps, they are by and large the refuse of Europe. The camps are filled with bums, criminals, black-marketeers, subversives, revolutionists, and crackpots of all colors and hues. Contrary to reports, we have maintained no confines around these camps as other countries have done. Many people have come in, acquired blankets, food, and clothes, gone out and sold them on the black market, changed their names, gone to other camps, and repeated the performance. We have outfitted the whole caboodle at least twice.

Mr. George Meader, appointed special investigator by the Mead committee in the last session of Congress, in a nonpartisan report on displaced-persons camps states: "These persons are, for the most part, penniless and do not desire to work, but expect to be cared for, and complain when things are not as well done as they think they should be. Mr. Goldman, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation director of the camp, said that he had not been able to get more than 400 of the 3,000 to do any work, even fixing up their own dwelling space. When he did get any work out of them, it was because of offering special inducements, such as extra cigarettes."

Mr. Meader points out that at least 120,000 Jews have flocked into these camps since January 1946, and others continue to come. Bear in mind these are not German Jews, of whom there are less than 30,000 left, but they come from other parts of Europe.

Mr. Meader further describes an incident where 3,000 newly arrived Jews pulled a sit-down strike and refused to leave the train at the Babenhausen camp which had been opened only 2 weeks at that time. The train was turned around by American authorities and these folks taken to another camp.

Of course these reports have been given little publicity in this country.

Now self-styled humanitarians, some real, some phony, say these people will get killed if they go home. This is false. Maj. Gen. Lowell W. Rooks, Director General of UNRRA, in a statement on June 4 appearing in the Christian Science Monitor stated that of the 7,000,000 persons repatriated since the end of the war, not one substantiated instance of persecution or reprisal had come to his attention. Of many witnesses appearing before our committee in support of the Stratton bill, not one has produced a substantiated instance of persecution after repatriation.

Last year, according to General Clay, as reported by AP from Berlin on April 14, we offered a 60-day supply of food as a sort of bonus to DP's in the American zone if they would go home. In response to this offer, 48,000 Poles returned to their homeland. Again this year we instituted this bribe seeking to induce these people to leave. We got down on our knees and said to our guests of 2 or 3 years, "Won't you please go home?" The best of them have gone. Many have come to this country. Now we are asked to open our doors and admit the worst of them into our very homes.

These people are living in a land that is devastated. There are cities that need rebuilding, lands that need cultivation, and isms that need fighting. Still they do none of these things. If they shirk responsibility abroad they will certainly assume none here. If they are worth anything to us, they would be worth a great deal more to the countries from whence they come. Again, if they refuse to go home, there are many other places to which they could go instead of coming into the already overcrowded cities of America. Australia has a population of 2.5 persons per square mile; Africa 14.7; Canada 3.1; South America 14.1; while in the United States we have 43.7 persons per square mile. An article in last Sunday's New York Times is headed: "Australia seeks citizens." Australian immigration commissioner, Arthur Calwell, is quoted as saying:

"If we could bring 200,000 adult and junior workers here tomorrow, Australia would give them all work within a week."

Another newspaper headline declares, "South America wants 7,000,000 immigrants in 10 years." Some time ago Robert Prigent, while Minister of Population in France, stated:

"Unless we import 3,000,000 workers within the next 10 years France cannot survive."

Vast areas of the earth are in need of workers and artisans of all kinds. The fact that these people will not go home, will assume no risks or responsibilities in their homelands, will not go where workers are needed, is abundant proof of their liability to us. But there are other reasons for caution.

MANY SUBVERSIVES AMONG REFUGEES

Mr. Speaker, the majority of these folks are not the material out of which good citizens could be made, even if we had the time, money, and facilities for doing such a job. Some of these camps are little more than training schools for revolutionary activities. Doubtless many persons have been planted in these camps to infiltrate this country and to serve alien causes. Doubtless many of our foreign enemies would be happy to see the refugee camps emptied into this Nation. Trojan horses are offered us on every hand. On January 26, 1947, the New York Herald Tribune carried a wireless dispatch from Frankfurt, as follows:

"Army headquarters, meanwhile, is warily watching the actions of approximately 40,000 Polish Jews now temporarily located along the Polish-Czech frontier. While this group probably will not migrate in the severe winter months, it is known here that the Russian, Polish, and Czech Government facilitate the movement of Polish Jews from east to west. This strategy is based on the belief that the more of the Jews who become the responsibility of the western powers, the more embarrassed the western powers will become, in view of the tense Palestine situation."

Mr. Speaker, nations are destroyed from within before they are destroyed from without. Infiltration is a deadly form of attack. Hundreds of dangerous persons have entered this country in recent years, and many are still coming. Other hundreds of potential fifth columnists sit in the DP camps and await passage to America.

WHY PREFERENCE FOR DISPLACED PERSONS?

Assuming, however, for the sake of argument, that all the good things said about the displaced persons were true, there is still no reason to give them preference over even better folks. There are at least 100,000,000 who fought and sacrificed in the war on our side who are just as desperate as they; there are at least 100,000,000 of our friends who are hungrier than those in the DP camps; there are at least 100,000,000 who wish to come to America just as badly as do they; and there are hundreds of millions who dislike just as much the governments under which they live.

SCREENING IS BAD

When well-grounded objections are raised to the character of the DP's who would come under this bill, proponents always answer that we will screen them carefully. Our screening to date has been a joke—a joke for which we may pay dearly. We have no reason to suppose a better job would be done in the future. In this connection I would point out that thousands of refugees are now coming in under a Strattonized Executive order issued by the President on December 22, 1945. This order was purportedly written by Judge Samuel Rosenman. No member of Congress was consulted, and the order was severely and properly criticized by the House Committee on Immigration in the last session. The order sets aside 90 percent of our nonpreference quotas for the DP's in Europe. This order violates both the spirit and the letter of our immigration laws and should be revoked. Upon its promulgation the State Department enlarged its consulates abroad and instructed them to waive the usual requirements of immigration laws; that is, first, a birth certificate to establish one's country of origin; second, a police record showing one not to be of bad character; and, third, evidence that one will not become a public charge. As a substitute for the usual showing that one will not become a public charge the State Department accepts the assurance of charitable corporations, organized in this country, to facilitate refugee immigration. These organizations and affiliates have conspired in the wholesale violation of our immigration laws. Thus, the back-office boys in the State Department have, in effect, eliminated even the superficial screening that we have heretofore given prospective immigrants. Under the President's Executive order, which gives a small preview of proposed operations under the Stratton bill, many dangerous persons have entered this country. Under the Stratton bill, injury and insult to our national well-being would be multiplied manyfold.

DISCRIMINATION PRACTICED

In the President's directive, which seeks to facilitate DP immigration, appears this stipulation:

"Visas should be distributed fairly among persons of all faiths, creeds, and nationalities. I desire that special attention be devoted to orphaned children to whom it is hoped the majority of visas will be issued."

This provision has been totally ignored. According to officials of the State Department, about 20 percent of the persons in the DP camps were Jews. However, State Department officials before an Immigration Committee last fall admitted that 75 percent of all visas issued had been issued to persons of Jewish faith. Thus rank discrimination is practiced against Protestants, Catholics, orphaned children, and others. In fact, gentiles in our zone of Europe have been known to masquerade as Jews in search of preferred treatment.

OUR FAIR SHARE

Proponents of the Stratton bill all cry out we must do our "fair share," that we have a "moral obligation" to find acceptable homes for these DP's. We suffered a million casualties and spent more than $350,000,000,000, including more than fifty billions in lend-lease, in liberating the peoples of Europe, including these refugees for whom we are asked to furnish perpetual care. Since the shooting stopped, we have spent or obligated ourselves to spend in cold cash, more than $20,000,000,000 in tax money in their rehabilitation and relief, to say nothing of many millions of dollars that we have spent and continue to spend through private charity and individual contributions in food, clothing, and materials. The chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations estimates that we will spend approximately $6,000,000,000 in 1948 for the relief of the peoples of Europe. In blood and in treasure, has any country at any time ever done one-tenth so much for the peoples of other lands? To say that we

are further morally bound to open our country to this great additional number of refugees is to insult our patriotism, our intelligence, and our Christianity.

APPEASEMENT OFFERED

Again, proponents try to appeal to our pride and self-interest by saying that we will make friends and will set an example for other nations to follow. Can we buy friendship? Do we make friends by allowing ourselves to be pushed around? Should we thus practice appeasement? We cite all of history, both sacred and profane, in refutation.

WHAT'S BACK OF THE STRATTON BILL?

Mr. Speaker, after long and serious thought and deliberation, I have decided that it is my duty to make a charge and issue a warning. I charge that the Strattton bill originated with, and has been largely sustained by a number of prominent Jewish organizations. These powerful and influential organizations have shrewdly and cleverly enlisted the support and influence of many prominent non-Jewish citizens, non-Jewish organizations, and non-Jewish religious groups. Most informed persons in this country, however, know that the sustaining force back of this movement is our Jewish friends.

Mr. Speaker, we must avoid anti-Semitism in this country as though it were the plague. When anti-Semitism becomes pronounced or rampant, it destroys both Semitic and anti-Semitic, both Christian and Jew. The blackest page in the history of our civilization is the Fascist and Nazi persecution of the Jews. It was anti-Semitism that gave a perverted madman a sordid vehicle on which to ride to power in Germany. It has cursed and brought unspeakable sorrow to an entire world.

Anti-Semitism in American could furnish fertile soil for some fanatical Hitler to repeat sadistic history in this country. It would lay us open to pillage and destruction and turn civilization back to the Dark Ages. Thus far anti-Semitism cannot be charged to the American people. We have received the Jewish people with open arms and have accorded them places of honor and responsibility. They have contributed much to American wealth and culture. There is no better judge on the United States Supreme Court than Felix Frankfurter, himself a Jewish immigrant. Many of the finest and ablest Members of Congress are Jews. A few years ago I made a speech entitled, "Distinguished Citizens of Foreign Birth," and paid especial tribute to the dean of the House of Representatives, the Honorable ADOLPH SABATH, of Chicago, who was himself a Jewish immigrant. At least two of the five members of our all-important Atomic Commission are persons of Jewish faith. We have never sought to impose any restrictions of any kind upon Jewish immigration. According to the American Jewish Yearbook for 1946–47, published by the American Jewish Committee, we had in this country in 1907 only 1,776,885 Jews. In 1927 this number had grown to 4,228,029; in 1946, to 5,000,000, or approximately one-half of all the Jews left in the world. According to this same authority, from 1937 to 1943, by yearly averages, more than 60 percent of all immigration into this country was Jewish. In 1943, by Executive order, the word "Jew" or "Hebrew" was eliminated from immigration papers. In 1944, Jewish authorities claimed more than 400,000 Jewish aliens in this country. No one denies our generosity toward this persecuted race. But they should not insist upon our opening our doors to the ends of the earth.

Here, Mr. Speaker, is what I want to say to our good Jewish citizens. When they band themselves together in Jewish organizations, when they use their power and influence for obviously selfish purposes, when they seek to control the press and radio for selfish ends, when they conspire to destroy immigration barriers, they stimulate and promote anti-Semitism within this country to the serious detriment of all. Unless they desist and refrain from such activity they will bring great sorrow upon this Nation. For the sake of all the Jews, as well as the rest of us, they must not become a minority pressure group in this country.

THE CHURCH GROUP

Mr. Speaker, a good many ministers in this country, including some prominent in my own denomination, have alined themselves with those who seek to break down our immigration laws. Most of them have been deceived by these cries for help. Acting on wrong information, they have allowed their hearts to overcome their better judgment. They have either wittingly or unwittingly alined themselves with those who would do this country a great disservice. A few of our prominent ministers have so confused religion and politics that they no longer render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, nor unto God the things that are God's. In restrictive and selective immigration we seek to protect the spiritual as well as the material values of this country. To my preacher friends I wish to say that in your support of the Stratton bill you have gone far beyond the bounds of Christian charity. The good Samaritan stopped on the road to Jericho to minister to the man who had fallen among thieves. He dressed his wounds and he carried him to an inn, and he paid for his lodging. This we have done, and more. The good Samaritan did not, however, take the stranger home with him or open up his household to the stranger's family for permanent abode. If the Federal Council of Churches and other religious groups who have been beating the drums for the Stratton bill should succeed in their campaign of dumping the refugees of Europe into this country they will simply add to the long line of crimes that have been committed in the name of the church and of the holy religion.

ARGUMENTS SUMMARIZED

Mr. Speaker, the arguments of those who seek to open our doors to the refugees of Europe may be summarized as follows: They have no place to go; they will make useful citizens; they will be carefully screened; we need their talents and abilities; we have not done our fair share; we have a moral responsibility to take them. We have shown all these arguments to be without any foundation whatsoever. We hope, Mr. Speaker, this country will not be misled by any false appeals to our generosity.

ON OUR SIDE

I am happy to report that a vast majority of the great patriotic societies and organizations of this country, including the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, have not been misled by the volume of propaganda in behalf of the Stratton bill. They realize its folly and its dangers; they recognize it as a major attempt to break down our immigration laws. Like most of the members of our committee, they believe that immigration bars should be raised, not lowered; that we should select immigrants with greater, not less, care.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, those of us who speak out against the Stratton bill will be ridiculed by that certain type of intellectual who has contempt for all established institutions; by those ultra liberals who would equalize everybody by reducing all to the lowest common denominator; by the crackpots who think anything foreign is better than anything American; and by those misguided humanitarians who would throw their doors open to any and all who knock.

Mr. Speaker, if loving one's own folks just a little better than one loves strangers is bigotry, then I am a bigot. If seeking to defend American ideals and institutions is intolerance, then I am intolerant. If thinking this country of ours is the best in the world and wanting it to remain so is chauvinism, then I am chauvinistic.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, our country has not and will not shirk her many responsibilities. She will serve humanity most through the preservation of her integrity and her institutions. Not through weakness and compromise, but through strength and justness, will she lead a fear-crazed, hate-ridden world along the paths of peace. And in these efforts, I am sure all of us will join the immortal Stephen Decatur in saying:

"Our country! In her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be right; but our country, right or wrong."

Water Pollution Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I would like to include in the RECORD my remarks on the Water Pollution Control Act, S. 418:

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

The Merrimack River, which forms in New Hampshire and courses through northeastern Massachusetts to the Atlantic Ocean, is described as being the dirtiest open sewer in the Nation.

In my home city of Lawrence, Mass., the population of 85,000 people drink this water after it has passed through a filtration plant. There is no other supply.

The volume of waste discharged into this river from many industrial communities above Lawrence is making the problem increasingly dangerous. At this very moment the people are complaining about the taste of the water which has to be saturated with chlorine to kill the bacteria.

The menace to public health is real and immediate not only to Lawrence but to many other cities and towns along this waterway.

S. 418 has been favorably reported out of the Committee on Public Works of this House. It is imperative that this Water Pollution Control Act be passed with a minimum of delay.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts is aware of this need, but it cannot do the job alone. It empowered a commission to study conditions, and here are the warning facts in its report. At the city of Lowell, 10 miles up river from Lawrence, the Merrimack receives pollution amounting to 21,000,000 gallons daily. At Lawrence the rate is 47,000,000 gallons every day, and at Haverhill it is 12,000,000. All shellfish areas in Newburyport Harbor have had to be condemned. The commission advised that a Merrimack River Valley sewerage district be established. This project would call for the construction of interception sewers and chlorination plants at Lowell, Lawrence, Haverhill, and Newburyport at a cost of $27,500,000.

Such an expensive and unilateral approach to the problem would merely alleviate conditions, not solve them.

The Merrimack River runs through two States.

No matter how much Massachusetts might do to clean up the situation, its efforts would be fruitless without corresponding action on the part of New Hampshire. The river would be filthy and dangerous before it reached Massachusetts from the thousands of tons of human and industrial waste flowing down from the cities and towns of New Hampshire.

The Merrimack once abounded with fish life. Now pollution has become so dense that just below Lawrence the oxygen content of the water has been reduced to a minimum, and the fish have disappeared.

There was a time when this river afforded recreational opportunities to the hundreds of thousands of people in this basin, but those days are gone. Civic and industrial carelessness is responsible.

You can see the varicolored chemical dyes, waste products of textile manufacturing, pouring from large drains into the river. When a dry spell comes and the river is sluggish, the stench from it is unbearable.

We do not wish to put an unnecessary burden upon our industries. At the same time we cannot afford to endanger the public health. No one questions the fact that river pollution is a grave problem. The only issue at stake is our approach to it.

Being an interstate river, the Merrimack, for instance, is properly the subject for Federal assistance. During the Senate hearings, held last year, the following letter was introduced:

CAMP, DRESSER & MCKEE,
Boston, Mass., April 30, 1947.

Miss ELOISE PORTER,
Assistant Clerk, Senate Committee on Public Works, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MISS PORTER: I am informed that the Barkley-Taft bill (S. 418) relating to anti-pollution legislation is now being considered by a subcommittee of the Senate Public Works Committee. I have for some time followed the efforts of the Congress to pass legislation relating to water-pollution control and am familiar with the various bills which have been considered. It is my opinion that the Barkley-Taft bill (S. 418) embodies the most desirable features of all bills which have been submitted and that this bill should be enacted into law.

I believe that a provision for grants-in-aid to municipalities is a desirable feature and is essential in some cases to provide the spark required to initiate action. Federal participation in the cost of abatement is particularly appropriate on inter-State streams and on streams which are used for recreational purposes by persons who are not residents of the State in which the stream is located.

Please record me in favor of the Barkley-Taft bill (S. 418).

Yours very truly,

THOMAS R. CAMP,
Consulting Engineer and President, New England Sewage Works Association.

During the testimony offered at the hearings, Arthur D. Weston, chief sanitary engineer for the Massachusetts Department of Public Health, representing Conference of State Sanitary Engineers, stated that: "Stream-pollution control is impossible without Federal control.

The committee agrees that the responsibility for the diagnoses of the causes of stream pollution, the development of remedies, and the justification of expenditures are properly entrusted to the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service. The execution of the remedies, however, involves the design and construction of sewage-treatment works by non-Federal public bodies and industries to be financed, in part, by loans from the Federal Government. The committee is convinced that the agency presently organized on a Nation-wide basis and best qualified to supervise this type of non-Federal construction program is the Federal Works Agency.

The Federal Works Agency, together with its constituent units, has constructed or financed over 1,500 sewer projects throughout the United States, and has made advances for the planning of more than 1,300 additional sewage disposal and treatment works. Its engineers, finance personnel, and lawyers are skilled in the preparation and review of detailed plans and specifications, the making of construction estimates, the inspection of work, and the issuance of municipal bonds, particularly revenue bonds, by means of which bonds it is expected a considerable portion of the program will be financed.

The committee considers that the designation of the Federal Works Agency to perform these functions will permit the program to go ahead with a maximum of speed and efficiency and a minimum of administrative expense. The Public Health Service and the Federal Works Agency, each contributing its special skills and working together cooperatively, can accomplish more than either of them working alone. Both of these agencies agree with this point of view.

The bill as amended leaves the initial responsibility for enforcement with the States. Federal enforcement is to be exercised only after the efforts of the State have been exhausted, and then only with the consent of the State. The committee is deeply impressed with the serious effects of polluted waters upon the public health and welfare and is firmly convinced that failure to accomplish adequate progress in pollution abatement under the terms of this bill, through the cooperative efforts of the Federal and State agencies, will undoubtedly call for much stronger and more direct Federal enforcement measures at some subsequent session of the Congress.

The House of Representatives has made the following major changes in S. 418:

1. Loans limited to States, municipalities, and interstate agencies for treatment works.

2. Loans limited to one-third of estimated cost of treatment works or $200,000 whichever amount is smaller.

3. Authority to make loans limited to $20,000,000 for each of five fiscal years (July 1, 1948, to June 30, 1953).

4. Funds authorized up to $1,000,000 for each of five fiscal years (July 1, 1948, to June 30, 1953) to be allocated to States on an equitable basis for investigation, research, surveys, and studies.

5. Grants authorized up to $1,000,000 for each of 5 years (July 1, 1948 to June 30, 1953) to be allocated to States on an equitable basis for investigation, research, surveys, and studies.

6. Grants authorized up to $1,000,000 for each of 5 years (July 1, 1948 to June 30, 1953) to States, municipalities, or interstate agencies, for engineering and planning.

7. Research in water-pollution control is encouraged by provisions above-mentioned and authorization of a laboratory at Cincinnati, Ohio, to house the work there established in 1913.

8. Language of bill more definitely confines provisions to interstate streams.

9. All authorizations of loans, grants, and administrative funds are limited to five fiscal years (July 1, 1948 to June 30, 1953).

10. No loans or grants authorized to private industries.

I have given you the cautious and factual language of the legislators from the reports of committees representing the Senate and House.

We in northeastern Massachusetts know from first-hand experience, that polluted waters spell danger.

We expect that the Federal Government will join with us in a common effort to safeguard the health of our communities before the end of this session.

Negligence invites disease.

Why Are We Rebuilding German War Potential?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, there are millions of Americans shocked by the spectacle of the United States of America repeating every mistake made following the First World War, but on a more cosmic scale.

We are restoring to power the shrewdest of the Hitlerian brain men—not necessarily members of the Nazi party, but frequently the masters to whom the Nazis were mere robots until the Nazi party, like the Frankenstein monster, became unmanageable to its creators.

As one example, Herman Abs, financial genius of the Hitler regime in stripping Europe of its wealth even before war broke out, in subjecting a whole continent to the bitter economic subjugation which existed before a shot was fired, has been appointed by American and British authorities to new offices of power in continental banking from which he can again spin the golden web of intrigue which can end only in a new war.

Using funds provided by the American taxpayers through the Economic Administration, Abs now will sit in a chair of absolute financial authority as banking director for three occupational zones.

FEW ALIVE TO DANGERS

One of the few publications of general circulation in this whole great Nation which seems alive to the dangers is the New York Post.

In its news columns, in its editorial columns, and its by-line columns of comment and correspondence, the Post has warned this country, and our Government, of danger ahead.

Under leave I am inserting in the RECORD three recent columns from this newspaper.

The first is the daily column of Dr. Frank Kingdon, as published June 10.

TO BE FRANK

(By Dr. Frank Kingdon)

With fanfare and solemn self-congratulation we have announced a program for western Germany. It amounts to one thing only. We are now set to repeat the mistakes we made following World War I.

The central idiocy is that we are going to subordinate all European industry once again to German industry. Germany comes back as the industrial master of the Continent. The other European nations presented plans for redistributing industrial plants so that production would not be concentrated in Germany. We have ignored these to rebuild German industrial supremacy.

Into this we have thrown the mockery of so-called international control of the Ruhr. This will not work politically because of the rivalry of the powers concerned and because the controlling nations will grow less and less vigilant as time goes by. Behind the screen of internationalization the Germans will take back control of the Ruhr within 10 years.

Meanwhile, no matter who controls it, the rehabilitation of the Ruhr will operate every day to reestablish German dominance of Europe economically and industrially. As long as it is within Germany and managed by German industrialists it will enable these unreconstructed Germans to rebuild their beloved cartel systems, in the mazes of which their neighbors will be entrapped.

One immediate result of this German program will be to weaken France. Any mildly rational approach to the reconstruction of Europe would have begun with the strengthening of France. Instead we proceed to do the one thing most calculated to weaken it.

We shall feel the repercussions of this at once in French politics. They have been unstable ever since the end of the war. In recent months signs of stability have appeared. These are now dissipated. Fear of Germany and suspicion of the West once more appear to inflame emotions and tempt the French to desperate decisions.

As for ourselves in the United States this program commits us to the traditional British policy of balance of power in Europe. Britain wants to sit in the driver's seat of any western European team that may emerge. Its only possible present rival is France. By raising Germany to strength France is kept weak. It is an old British trick to encourage the ambitions of one people against another so as to keep Britain the permanent master of the situation.

British guile is reinforced by Americans who will make money out of German industry. Peoples all too easily forget the lessons of a war. Profiteers never forget the road to profits.

Our intervention in Europe brings little hope for finding new ways to peace. Up to this point we are merely repeating and reinforcing policies often tried and always tragic with catastrophe.

From the same issue I take the column of comment by Edgar Ansel Mowrer.

WORLD AFFAIRS

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Around the six-power plan of western Germany—as around Huckleberry Finn's pap—float two angels, one black and one white.

The observer is struck by the similarity of the German situation after the last war and now. Then as now, the French were protesting, the Germans were alternately whining and shouting for immediate equality of status with the victors, the Americans and British were irritably defending the Germans in the name of Europe.

Events proved conclusively that the French were then right and the Anglo-Americans wrong.

1. The first and greatest defect of the present plan is that it does not insist on the destruction of German industrial supremacy in Europe, once and for all.

2. Another blemish: the Germans are to contribute to and participate in European recovery. But in what capacity? Many people think that now, hardly 3 years since the last Jews were murdered in the gas ovens, they are not ready to accept the Germans as allies. They are still wondering through what perverted sense of justice these defeated sadists are already being given such precious guerdons of freedom as the right to strike, etc. Five years of absolute obedience would have been none too much to exact from beaten Herren-menschen.

3. A third defect is, in my judgment, that while the six powers are to control the distribution of Ruhr coke, coal, and steel, the production is not under the control of the six. Neither the Anglo-Americans nor the Germans can be trusted to see that the Germans produce, not what they choose, but what continental Europe needs.

4. The greatest defect—to me—is that the Allies apparently indicate to the Germans the hope of their achieving a united Germany. This is unnecessary and most undesirable. German unity would prevent European unity. A united Germany would so dominate a European federation that the other European peoples would fight to prevent it.

Unlike General Clay and Ambassador Murphy, they still fear the Germans as much as they fear the Russians.

If the German federal states (Laender) joined a united Europe, German unity would not be necessary.

To this extent, the new agreement looks like a victory for the Germanophiles in the American and British Governments.

There is fortunately a white side.

1. The first benefit is the admission of Benelux—Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg—to "close association" with the three larger occupying powers in shaping German affairs. The little states—the more the better—should have been urged to take part in the military occupation from the beginning and to have a voice in all decisions affecting the future of Europe. They know more about Europe than Americans or Britishers.

2. Another good point—as mentioned above—is the projected control of the distribution of Ruhr products. If this had been offered 2 years ago, there would have been less squabbling about recovery. European and German reconstruction would be further along.

3. A third benefit is leaving a way open for minor annexations of German territories by the Netherlands, Belgium and France if these countries so decide.

4. A fourth useful provision is that which gives the Germans the possibility of one day securing the withdrawal of all forces of occupation. No country—not even Germany—can be expected to make much of an effort unless an ultimate goal is indicated. A mean policy with a clear way to end it is less depressing than milder treatment with no time limit.

5. A final virtue of the plan is the fact that it looks forward to new talks among the six powers. The continental Europeans will have other chances of convincing the powerful but uncomprehending Anglo-Americans that German industrial preponderance must be destroyed once and for all and the German division would be attractive and beneficial to a world twice ruined by German unity.

REPREHENSIBLE ROLE OF STANDARD OIL EXPOSED

Finally, I am inserting the June 1 column from the Washington bureau of the Post, which exposes the reprehensible war record of Standard Oil of New Jersey:

WASHINGTON MEMO

(Editor, Charles Van Devander; associates, Oliver Pilat, James A. Wechsler, and William O. Player, Jr.)

OIL DIPLOMACY SIDELIGHT: STANDARD GUILTY OF WARTIME DECEIT IN FARBEN PATENTS

WASHINGTON, June 1.—In view of the present oil-company coloration of American foreign policy, it is interesting to look back briefly at wartime relations between Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) and Germany's I. G. Farbenindustrie, an important and integral part of Hitler's Nazi war machine.

The United States Supreme Court, in a little-noted decision, recently upheld lower court findings that Standard Oil's wartime actions were marked by illegality, sham, concealment, and furtiveness, intended to deceive the United States Government for the benefit of and on behalf of an enemy.

By upholding the lower courts, the Supreme Court avoided passing on the further grave question raised by the Department of Justice, of whether Standard Oil (New Jersey) was not itself an enemy of the United States under terms of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

That may have been a break for Standard Oil, because the Supreme Court has previously stated that the "category of enemies" does not exclude "those who act with, or aid or abet and give comfort to enemies * * * though they may not be residents of enemy's territory."

The story of Standard-I. G. relations goes back to 1926–29 when Vice-President Frank Howard, for Standard Oil, negotiated a super-cartel agreement with August von Knierien, general counsel for I. G. and one of its 17 officials now on trial as war criminals. The courts, however, have interested themselves chiefly in relations of the two industrial giants subsequent to September 1, 1939, when Hitler invaded Poland and touched off World War II.

Most spectacular incident, though not the only one, was a formal Standard Oil-I. G. Farben conference at The Hague September 24–25, 1939. Howard and Dr. Fritz Ringer (as deputy for von Knierien) headed the respective delegations.

On October 12, 1939, Howard reported to Standard Oil President W. S. Farish:

"They delivered to me assignments of some 2,000 foreign patents and we did our best to work out a modus vivendi which would operate through the term of the war, whether or not the United States came in."

As Federal Judge Wyzansky (backed by the Supreme Court) observed, these two "private commercial empires" were making and executing plans for "continuance of cooperation under the stress of developing friction and approaching war between the countries of which they were, after all, respectively nationals."

Chief purpose of the "sham," "furtiveness," and "deceit of their government" in which Standard Oil officials engaged during the war was to prevent government seizure of Farben patents by concealing their enemy ownership.

Despite these efforts the patents were seized by the Alien Property Custodian in March 1942, about the same time that Standard Oil and its officers, facing criminal charges under the antitrust laws, avoided trial by paying $50,000 in fines and agreeing to the royalty-free licensing of all German patents during the war.

Standard Oil (New Jersey) being the world's largest corporation, that probably would have been the end of the matter if Standard, in its arrogance, hadn't sued to recover the German patents. The suit was tried in the Federal Court for the Southern District of New York in 1945. Standard was represented by John W. Davis, one-time Democratic candidate for President. The Government was represented by Max Isenberg, a 32-year-old assistant to the Attorney General.

An important part of Standard Oil's plan to deceive the United States during a war for survival was the pretended sale by Farben to Standard of its half interest in the Joint American Study Co. (JASCO), in which Farben and Standard both placed some of their more important patents.

After the United States had seized a half interest in JASCO Davis contended "in a tone of injured innocence" that Standard should be entitled to withdraw those patents which it had developed independently of Farben. Isenberg argued that since Standard did not come into court with clean hands it was not entitled to any such help from the Government. The Supreme Court agreed with him.

As a result, the United States is now half owner with Standard Oil of JASCO, which owns patented processes developed by Standard as well as by Farben. One is left wondering what would have happened to John Smith, citizen, if he had done what the Standard Oil Co. has been adjudged guilty of doing.

WHAT DOES FUTURE PORTEND?

These are grim reminders that we have had to fight Germany to her knees twice already to preserve our own freedom.

Will we have to do it again?

Or do our economic imperialists plan to make the United States the master nation, with Germany as a willing vassal?

Is the current hysteria—the repression, the thought-control measures, the character assassination—all part of some future of horror in which the cartel system has conquered all the libertarianism which animates our democracy, and reduced this Nation to the Hitler pattern?

I do not pretend to prophesy. I raise the questions only because the fear in the air seems more than can be accounted for by any rational thesis. It could well be a smoke screen to hide new nefarious plots against our freedom and our peace.

Displaced Persons Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following article by Edward E. Jaffee, assistant news editor, Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass., which appeared in that newspaper under date of Thursday, June 3, 1948:

MELTING POT PAY-OFF—FAMILY SHINING EXAMPLE OF WISDOM OF DP BILL—SAGA OF RABBI AND CONGRESSMAN ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PASSAGE

(By Ed E. Jaffee)

All the fuss 'n feathers being scared up to obscure, delay, and defeat the displaced persons bill currently in the congressional hopper are refuted today by the story behind a short paragraph elsewhere in this issue of the Item, under the heading, 25 Years Ago Today.

That paragraph, culled from the Item files by Paul A. Haley, Item expert on historical data, reads: "Chief Rabbi Liber Marvit, of Lynn, today asked Congressman William F. Connery, Jr., to have the United States aid in getting his family out of Russia. He said he fears that his wife, four sons, and a daughter are in peril of their lives at the hands of the Reds."

What happened after Rabbi Marvit made his appeal to the Lynn Congressman, on June 3, 1923, should be an object lesson to those who are continuing their dilatory tactics to hamstring the "DP" bill in Congress, despite approval of the measure from virtually every religious group in the country.

POINT WITH PRIDE

Likewise, the story that developed after the rabbi sought the aid of the popular Lynn Congressman can give heart to such current supporters of the "DP" bill as Congressman THOMAS J. LANE, of Lawrence, successor to the late Congressmen "Billy" and "Larry" Connery. Just as Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL won his fight for passage of this humanitarian bill, in the face of one disheartening delay after another, Congressman LANE has indicated that he will fight to save the measure from further emasculation in the House. The bill passed the Senate last night, 63 to 13, but in a version greatly watered down from the original.

The late "Billy" Connery came quickly to the aid of Rabbi Marvit in 1923. Through the Congressman's intervention, the rabbi's wife and five young children received special exemption from the immigration quotas of that year and they were permitted quick passage to the United States.

Upon their arrival here, the Marvits were welcomed with a home on Shepard Street, equipped and furnished for them by an expanding local Jewish community. And from the date of their arrival in Lynn, in September 1923, the Marvit family has been a decided asset to their adopted country.

Two of the sons served in the armed forces for Uncle Sam in World War II. A third son is chief of staff of a large New York City hospital. The daughter is wed to a dentist, while the other two sons are each leaders in their respective communities, one as a prominent educator.

The rabbi himself remained in Lynn until 1926, ending a 6-year stay here, to become spiritual leader of the One Hundred and Ninth Street Synagogue in New York City. Not since his departure has there been another here to be designated as "chief rabbi."

A few years later the One Hundred and Ninth Street congregation moved to a new location in the Bronx and took the name of Kahal Adath Yeshuren Synagogue. Rabbi Marvit was honored by being elected spiritual leader of the congregation for life, a position he has filled with distinction.

His visits to Lynn since 1926 have been infrequent, and on his last trip here several months ago with his wife, many old friends came for miles to greet him.

The eldest son, Julius Marvit, is an insurance executive in Lynn today. Long interested in promoting Hebrew education among children, he was elected superintendent of the Lynn Hebrew School earlier this year. He is a past president of the Anshai Sfard Synagogue and has been active for years in the affairs of the local Jewish community.

Sol Marvit, the second son, served with distinction in the Armed Forces in World War II and is now residing in New York.

A NOTED DOCTOR

A third son, Dr. Irving Marvit, resides in Pelham Bay Park, N. Y., and is chief of staff at Mount Sinai Hospital, in New York City.

Son No. 4, Harry Marvit, also saw action in in the Army in World War II. He makes his home in Hartford and is currently attached to the Internal Revenue Department in Connecticut.

The youngest of the five children, Mrs. Goldie (Marvit) Leff, is the wife of a prominent dentist in the Bronx, N. Y.

Through their readiness to serve their adopted homeland in peace as well as in war, the Marvit family has repaid the 1923 kindness of the late "Billy" Connery and the ready hospitality of a big-hearted America.

They stand today as an eloquent argument for passage of the DP bill—for admission of long-suffering displaced persons of all races and creeds—and quickly.

We Can't Defend American Democracy by Abandoning It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, this vast country came through the most horrible war in history without having sacrificed any essential individual rights; on the contrary, we preserved meticulously the forms of our civilian democracy, and the spirit of it, in our crusade against fascism, the negation of democracy. We came out of that war stronger materially and spiritually than we had ever been before, a country so mighty and so wealthy not a single power of this earth would dare challenge our supremacy.

But now that all danger is past, we are caught up in a wave of fear which expresses itself in attempts at repression of thought, at rigid controls, at wild statements from even sober statesmen. We are as hysterical as a group of old maids.

Under leave, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial from the June 10 issue of the New York Post which pursues this thought; and furthermore I endorse fully the views expressed:

ABANDONING DEMOCRACY

There is a curious and false theory being expounded both in the United States Senate and the House that the way to defend democracy is to abandon it.

This is the essence of the warped arguments advanced both for the draft bill and for the Mundt-Nixon bill.

The argument for the draft bill runs something like this: Too few men are volunteering for service in the Army for us to keep our peacetime Army on a war basis.

The argument for keeping the peacetime Army on a war basis is that we face imminent war with Russia everywhere in the world.

The theory is that Russia is determined to make war on the United States and that we must have an Army trained and big enough to meet that challenge.

The truth is that this is another step in the effort to overstress both the military menace of Soviet Russia and to oversimplify the means of meeting such a menace if it existed.

What is really means is that the Department of Defense is determined to frighten us sufficiently to make certain of extending its control over the lives of the current generation of high-school graduates and early college students for a 2-year course of military training which would take them out of civilian life.

The military influence is already so dominant in our administration that every policy, both domestic and foreign, is being determined in a way to place our entire peacetime economy in the hands of Secretary Forrestal and his associates, and cripple the civilian authority correspondingly.

That power has been used to sabotage support of democracy abroad—witness Israel—and to justify outrageous overpayments for Saudi Arabian oil for the benefit of private tax-free corporations and individuals. It has caused us to divert well over 50 percent of our tax revenues for a war machine controlled by men who are reckless of all values except destructive force.

Under a weak President these forces threaten to dictate our entire economy—and to do so on a wartime basis. The cost, in tax dollars alone, which should be going into public housing, social security, inflation controls, public medicine and the like at home, and for impartial relief abroad, is enormous. The cost to democracy is even greater than the dollar cost.

These are not the men to entrust with a peacetime mobilization on a war basis; certainly not the men to entrust with the enforced induction of our most vigorous youth into a 2-year military regime.

The Mundt-Nixon bill is also presented as an anti-Red measure on the theory that it would cripple communism on the home front. Actually it would cripple democracy instead.

By placing the power to determine what citizen, or what group of citizens, holds thoughts dangerous to the United States in the hands of the Attorney General, it would effectively suspend the Bill of Rights and open the door to wholesale imprisonment of critics and dissenters, whether from the far right, the center, or the far left.

It would throttle free speech and dam expression of minority thought. It creates the very kind of dangers it pretends to oppose. It is vicious, and its provisions would threaten every citizen.

Each of these measures should be killed. Only your protests will kill them. Write or telegraph your own Congressman and Senator. In addition, with respect to the Mundt-Nixon bill, write or telegraph your views at once to Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, which is still debating the bill.

LETTER FROM CONSTITUENTS

Along this same line, I am inserting also a letter from two of my constituents, Mr. and Mrs. John C. Wooddy, of 16 Stuyvesant Circle, New York, who, under date of June 10, wrote to me on a number of subjects expressing views so close to my own I might well have written the letter.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 10, 1948.*

Hon. ARTHUR KLEIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. KLEIN: We wish to tell you that we have been following the current session—and your efforts—very closely, and for the most part, though the action in the House has been discouraging, have been happy to see the line your own efforts have followed.

Certainly, superhuman efforts should be put forth to see that the embargo on arms to Palestine is removed without loss of time—and that the lip-service given to Israel by President Truman is given impetus by concrete action and assistance. Mrs. Wooddy and I both feel that so long as Loy Henderson and his ilk, with the backing of Mr. Forrestal, continue to dictate to our State Department—just so long shall the powder keg of Palestine continue to menace world peace.

So you may know our views on some of the other matters currently under consideration by Congress, I want to express my disappointment at passage of the tax-reduction bill. If we are not to reduce our national debt now, when money is cheap and plentiful, when are we to pay it off?

I certainly hope you will get around to acting on the President's recommendations for increasing the social-security taxes and benefits. At present price levels the benefits are pitifully inadequate and they should be increased. A further advantage of increasing both taxes and benefits now is that the cost effect of higher benefits will not be felt much until sometime in the future, whereas increased taxes will drain off some inflationary money right now.

I am unutterably opposed to the Mundt bill or any revised version of it. By all means let us expose and prosecute traitors and spies, but let us not destroy our liberty in the process. Our Nation was built by nonconformists, by people with new ideas. If we condemn everyone who has fault to find with things as they are, we deny the possibility of progress.

I am in favor of American assistance to Europe in accordance with the act setting up the ECA. I feel that it should be supported with appropriations for the full amount authorized in the original act. However, British perfidy in Palestine has reached such heights of savagery that we must exert every pressure at our command to bring about a just settlement. Do we need yet another world war to teach us that if we acquiesce in this international brigandage we not only condemn to death the Jews of Palestine, but we also take one long step nearer to our own demise. And every man who failed to exert the last ounce of his strength, who failed to seize every possible chance of international peace and justice and mortality must carry the blame for the debacle which such failure will surely bring.

At the present time there are proposals before Congress designed to make the American people more secure in their civil rights. I refer to bills abolishing the poll tax, protecting people from lynching, setting up a permanent FEPC, forbidding segregation in the draft, and other similar bills. If these measures fail to pass this session there will be no escape from the conclusion that campaign promises and party platforms are meaningless.

The Reciprocal Trade Act is about to expire. What becomes of free enterprise if the House of Representatives foists a vicious substitute upon the United States and upon the world and we abolish freedom of trade? What kind of private enterprise system is it under which the Government picks dimes out of the pockets of the many in order to pour dollars into the hands of the few? We decry Russia's iron curtain, yet the House of Representatives seeks to divide the world even further. When will we learn that the world cannot live that way? The choice is cooperation—free cooperation—or death. And in the death of the world no one, not America—not New York—not ARTHUR KLEIN, is exempt.

There is another matter before Congress. The decision either way will not have earth-shaking consequences in a material sense. We have the opportunity to blacken our country's name and conscience or to make it shine more brightly before the world. It is proposed to admit 200,000 displaced persons, refugees, to the United States in the next 2 years. Surely the number is pitifully small compared to the number waiting and compared to the wealth and spaciousness of our country. Surely we cannot deny them and still call ourselves human. And in the name of God, when you let them in don't ask if they are Jew or Christian; farmer or shopkeeper or artisan; Pole or Czech or Balt; just ask if they need and want a place to live and work in freedom and in peace and loyalty to the land that gives them bread.

In New York Harbor, in the doorway to our home, there is a statue that holds aloft a torch. Through her we have told the world "Send them, the homeless, tempest-toss'd to me."

If now we are to tell these sufferers "No" or if we are to hedge our "Yes" about with "if's" and "but's" and "maybe's" then let us not add hypocrisy to stupid selfishness. Tear down the Statue of Liberty! Slam the door that so many have hoped to enter and let no pious tribute to our vanished magnanimity remind us that we were once the hope and the dream of all humanity.

Yours very truly,

JOHN C. WOODDY.
LUCY S. WOODDY.

Reduced Postage on Gift Packages Soon To Be a Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to announce to the Members of the House today that beginning on June 21 a program for reduced postage on gift and relief packages to the devastated countries of Europe will go into effect. The immediate program calls for a reduction of 4 cents from the normal rate of 14 cents a pound which is now charged.

It will be recalled that in the course of consideration in the House of the European recovery program, we adopted an amendment to that bill providing that the Administrator of the program should furnish ocean-free transportation on relief and gift packages and should negotiate with the foreign countries receiving aid under the act for the free transportation of such packages from the place of arrival in Europe to the place of destination inland. The same amendment directed the Relief Administrator to make agreements with the 16 participating foreign countries for the waiving of import duties on such packages.

I derive appreciable personal satisfaction from the fact that I sponsored these amendments on the floor of the House and that they will result in a tremendous increase in the number of packages sent overseas for the relief of the needy peoples.

Since the passage of the act, Administrator Paul Hoffman and Postmaster General Donaldson have been working on the details to effectuate the mandate of the Congress. These officials have now completed arrangements under which the over-the-water cost may now be paid from European relief funds. This amounts to 4 cents a pound. Arrangements have not yet been concluded with the participating foreign countries by the terms of which those countries, using moneys in the so-called revolving fund set up under the act, will pay the cost of transportation from the place of arrival in Europe to the point of destination. When these arrangements are concluded, it is hoped within the next 6 weeks there will be an additional saving of about 3 cents; so that when the whole program becomes effective, the reduction in postage on relief packages will amount to about 50 percent of the present cost.

At the present time Administrator Hoffman is negotiating agreements with the recipient countries under the European Recovery Act under the terms of which these countries will waive their import duties and charges. It will be recalled that many of the foreign countries now impose such import duties on relief packages containing even the necessaries and essentials of life. The whole idea of encouraging American citizens to send more relief packages to needful Europeans will, therefore, not be fully realized until the additional 3 cents postage reduction is effective and the import duties are waived.

I am a strong believer in the "person to person" as distinguished from the "country to country" kind of relief. The emphasis under the European recovery program should be on reconstruction as distinguished from relief. The discharge of relief obligations should primarily be a humanitarian and a personal one, resting on the individual shoulders of the people of this country. These provisions of the European Corporation Act of 1948

will encourage our American people to send thousands more packages to many more people every month. The sending of such packages is now building up thousands of little cells of good will in the devastated countries of western Europe. This undoubtedly is of great assistance to us in our long-range objective of building a firm world peace.

I encourage my fellow citizens to do all within their financial means to discharge our humanitarian obligation of helping the thousands of needful people in the devastated countries of Europe. It would be most appropriate if communities throughout the land, through individual drives and community-sponsored appeals, would concentrate their efforts on the sending of individual relief packages overseas. Such a movement, in addition to giving great personal satisfaction and pleasure to the givers on this side of the water, would perform a very useful service in the upbuilding of international good will.

Betrayal of ERP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a splendid editorial from the St. Paul Pioneer Press for Thursday, June 10, 1948. The editorial succinctly marshals the arguments in opposition to the ECA appropriation cut.

BETRAYAL OF ERP

Last Friday Chairman TABER of the House Appropriations Committee issued a statement to explain the reduction by 25 percent of the European aid program by his committee and the House.

Senator VANDENBERG found that the explanation did not really explain the action and yesterday he went before the Senate Appropriations Committee to accuse the House leadership of using the appropriating functions to veto the declared policy of Congress. He warned the Senate that such conduct will brand these policies before the world as capricious, unreliable, and impotent."

It must have embarrassed Senator VANDENBERG to take issue in this manner with his colleagues of the House, but he would not deserve the high reputation as a statesman which he now enjoys if he had failed to put patriotism and conviction ahead of party.

The extent of the mistake made by the House can be appreciated from the propaganda use which the Russian Government has already begun to make of the situation and the dismay which it has caused in the House of our friends who have braved the enmity of Russia to join with us in this venture. The United States is being represented to the rest of the world as a weak and unreliable reed, and its policies as shifting, insincere, and uncertain.

It is to be hoped that Senator VANDENBERG's courageous action will result in such repair of the damage as may be possible. The United States cannot afford to create distrust of its steadfastness in world affairs. Senator VANDENBERG warned correctly when he said that leadership for peace cannot be built on shifting sands.

Chairman TABER contends that his cut of the appropriation was based on a factual analysis of the need of ERP. His statement fails to bear him out. So far as it presents an analysis, it mainly is based on the argument that such articles as tractors are badly needed at home, not that they are unnecessary abroad. It makes a senseless comparison between wheat consumption abroad and in this country, which has the most varied diet on earth. But even these items account for only a small part of the cut. The major reduction was achieved by the purely arbitrary method of ordering that the appropriation cover 15 months instead of 12.

There is nothing sacred about any particular amount, but Congress after careful and prolonged study by the appropriate committees settled on $6,500,000,000 for European and Asiatic reconstruction and relief for next year. For the appropriations committee to overrule that decision is indefensible. Recheck of those needs is the proper task of the Administrator, and on basis of that performance Congress next year would be in position to make an informed judgment of further needs.

Such economy as Mr. TABER proposes is a repudiation of the policy. There may be a political temptation in such tactics, but those who succumb to it will discover that playing politics with issues of peace and security, though in the name of economy, will boomerang.

Protection of Labor's Rights Is the Basic Foundation for Prosperity in Our Modern Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln, one of our wisest Presidents, said:

Labor is independent of and prior to capital. Capital is but the fruit of labor and could never have existed had labor not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital and deserves much the higher consideration.

I am proud to say that I labored physically for many years before I was elected to Congress. I know from experience what it means to "earn ones bread by the sweat of his brow." My workweek for many years averaged 60 hours per week. It has been only natural and right for me to understand the problems of people who work for their daily bread and I have been diligent in my opposition to Federal legislation whose purpose was to harm the worker and reduce their wages.

During my 6 years service in Congress, many bills have been introduced which, in my opinion, were harmful to labor. Among these were the Smith-Connally bill, the Gwynne portal-to-portal bill, the Case bill, and finally the most harmful bill of all, the Taft-Hartley bill. I opposed all of these bills. Under the Republican-controlled Congress, the Gwynne bill and the Taft-Hartley bill have been passed.

These bills contain many sections which have not as yet been used against labor. The Republicans are holding these punitive sections in abeyance until after the forthcoming Presidential election in November. If they are successful in electing a Republican President and maintaining their present majority in the House of Representatives and the Senate, they will be in a position to take away from the workers, most of their hard-won gains of the last 14 years. Under the Democratic administration from 1932 to 1946, labor was protected and their protective unions grew from a membership of approximately 3,000,000 to almost 16,000,000. Their working hours were shortened and their wages became greater.

The standard of living was bettered and our society as a whole has been benefitted more in the past 16 years than in any similar period in our history. This proves that high wages for the workers means prosperity for all. If the Republican philosophy, as expressed in the Taft-Hartley bill which they fathered and passed, is enforced, I fear we are headed again for another Hoover depression era.

Let us consider briefly the simple but true economic facts which are so important to the welfare of the workers and also to all of the people in our modern machine production society.

America has been builded by the bone, flesh, sinew, and lives of her workers. Without the expenditure of untold manhours of physical energy, we could not have attained the position we hold as the most advanced nation in the world. Our people could not enjoy as they do, the highest standard of living of any people in the world.

Our continuance as the foremost Nation with the highest standard of living depends primarily on an ever-increasing consumption of goods of all kinds. To put it in another way, the average citizen must be fed, clothed, and housed better in the future than in the past. Must have better health service during his lifetime and he must be protected in his old age against the hazards of poverty, disease, and want.

Why do I make the foregoing statement? We have multiplied our productive capacity of all kinds of goods by labor-saving machinery. Every year brings new and better machinery which multiplies the productive capacity of man manyfold. It also decreases the the burden of physical effort. The people of our society become more interdependent on each others production, and the distribution and exchange of goods becomes more important. Unless the average citizen can purchase the goods produced by our machines, it is evident that our machines must become idle. This means unemployment for the tenders of the machines, and a breakdown in our modern way of life. When this occurs, we say we are having a depression.

In our modern machine-production society, the great problem which faces us is the division of the profit of the machine. We must decide what percentage of goods shall go to the tenders of the machines in the form of wages and what percentage of goods shall go to the owners of the machines in the form of profits.

That division of goods in a free society such as ours, depends on negotiation or bargaining between workers and owners. The owners have the advantage of determination as to operation of the machinery and the workers have the advantage of determining whether they work or not. The owner can shut down his plant and lock out the workers. The workers can refuse to tend or operate the plant machinery, and this is the strike.

These interruptions of production are detrimental to the smooth functioning of our modern society but it is important for us to realize that no alternative solution has been found, as yet, which has proven better. Compulsion from government on either the owner or the worker endangers the function of our free-enterprise economy. Such compulsion is a step toward the police state.

Pending therefore the gradual evolution of a more equitable division of goods through the present methods of collective bargaining or negotiation between owner and worker, what should the function of government be?

It seems to me that government's obligation is a joint obligation to owner, worker, and last but not least, to society as a whole. We must see that the owner and the worker are given the same fair treatment. Our legislation must not penalize either the labor unions, which represent the worker in collective bargaining, nor the owner group.

It is for this reason that I have tried to protect the workers in my opposition to anti-labor legislation, such as the Smith-Connally Act, the Case bill, the Gwynne bill, and the Taft-Hartley Act. I voted against all of these anti-labor bills because I sincerely believed that they would weaken labor on its side of the collective-bargaining table.

It is popularly believed, due to newspaper and radio propaganda, that labor unions have achieved a position of undue strength over the owners or management group. I do not believe this concept is supported by facts. Certain labor leaders have been extreme in their demands, but the over-all position of 15,000,000 workers who are members of organized labor unions has not been too strong. Their standard of living is the proof of my statement; it is not too high in the light of our modern capacity to produce. Most of the workers in America could easily consume more food and clothes and should have better health services and better houses to live in. If the consumption of goods was increased it would also mean better business for the professional and service trades and more profits for the owners of land and machinery.

This important fact should never be forgotten: Where the workers are employed at good wages the modern mass production and consumption of goods of all kinds increases, our standard of living advances, and the profits of the professional group, the service-trade group, the business group, and the owner group increases in direct proportion to the gross wages paid the workers.

I conclude my remarks, therefore, with a repetition of Abraham Lincoln's remarks, "Labor is independent of and prior to capital. Capital is but the fruit of labor and could never have existed had labor not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital and deserves much the higher consideration."

In defending the rights of the workers, through continued opposition to unfair and punitive labor legislation, I am defending the basic foundation of our American free-enterprise system.

I am helping to maintain the maximum purchasing power of the consumer for more and more goods. If this consumption of goods is protected and increased we need have no fear of a depression.

Salary Increases for Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Annapolis, Md., June 10, 1948.

Hon. GEORGE H. FALLON,
Congress of the United States,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FALLON: By direction of the Maryland Legislature I am enclosing herewith copy of Senate Joint Resolution No. 4, of the special session of 1948, urging salary increases for postal employees.

Very truly yours,
B. L. BOONE II,
Secretary of State.

Senate Joint Resolution 4

Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for salary increases for postal employees

Whereas the price of all commodities and services has been continuously rising since 1939, with every indication that the advance in prices will continue; and

Whereas this condition of high prices has lowered the standards of living for all postal employees, increased indebtedness, threatened ownership of homes, and dissipated savings; and

Whereas, this lowered standard of living for postal employees seriously threatens the efficiency of the postal services by the loss of employees, resigning from the service, so that no permanent, efficient force can be built up: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby requested to enact legislation at the earliest possible date, granting to postal employees an annual increase compatible with present living conditions, and that such increases be retroactive to January 1, 1948; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he is hereby requested to send a copy of this resolution under the great seal of the State of Maryland to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the chairman of the House Committee on Civil Service and Post Office, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and to each Member in the United States Congress from the State of Maryland.

Approved June 1, 1948.

WM. PRESTON LANE, JR.,
Governor.
JOSEPH R. BYRNES,
President of the Senate.
C. FERDINAND SYBERT,
Speaker of the House of Delegates.

Yugoslavia Freer Under Tito Than Greece Under Griswold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Omaha World-Herald of June 9, 1948:

HOW GREECE GOES

Dwight Griswold is back in Athens for 90 days.

If the phrase sounds a little like a jail sentence, the inference is understandable. The former Nebraska Governor has had one of the toughest jobs in the world.

As head of the American mission in Greece he has been charged with rebuilding the Greek economy so that democratic government can survive in that country.

It is essential, of course, that communism be kept out of Greece. To that end the United States is up to its neck in the Greek Civil War, having expended some $172,000,000 on the Greek Army in the past year. The prospect is that this military expenditure is only the beginning.

To keep communism out of Greece, Mr. Griswold has also found it necessary to intervene in the internal affairs of the Greek Government. It is generally conceded that he has (1) had a hand in reshuffling the Cabinet, (2) helped to increase its importance at the expense of the Greek Parliament.

His job has been complicated by the undemocratic nature of the present Greek Government, by the waste and inefficiency of the UNRRA administration that preceded him, by the ineptitude of the Greek Army in its war on the Communist guerrillas, by the division of American authority between him and the United States Ambassador, and by the tradition that Balkan messes are never solved but merely palliated.

Nevertheless, Mr. Griswold was able to report to Congress during his brief trip to Washington a few days ago that "Communism is stopped in Greece."

Mr. Griswold's critics, like the difficulties of his job, have been increasing in number and intensity. From the beginning Mr. Griswold has had Pravda and the Chicago Tribune calling him a gauletier. However, the middle-of-the-road American press in Athens has on the whole been favorable to him.

Comes now the New York Herald Tribune's correspondent, Homer Bigart, to voice a vigorous dissent. In reply to a letter of protest Mr. Griswold sent to Mr. Bigart's editor, the correspondent denies a charge of consorting with Greek leftists and giving his dispatches a leftist slant.

He counter-charges that basic liberties have been suppressed in Greece, that the Griswold mission has condoned mass arrests, mass executions, and mass exile of so-called bandits, that Greece is, in fact, a police state.

Mr. Bigart writes from Yugoslavia, which he says is freer under Tito than is Greece under Griswold and under a corrupt Greek Government.

The Herald Tribune, a liberal Republican newspaper, remarks pointedly that it has "complete confidence in Mr. Bigart's observation and fidelity to the truth."

If the price of stopping communism in Greece has been the establishment of a police state, grave questions now arise about the wisdom of our Greek intervention.

In the attempt to keep communism out has the American mission let totalitarianism in by another door? And in this attempt have American newsmen been "under wraps" imposed by Mr. Griswold? Is there a subtle censorship in Greece that has hidden the true nature of the many-sided conflict there? And if so, what has America gained except a temporary, fragile barrier against communism?

There is more involved here than the Greek adventure. America is about to embark on other aid missions under the Marshall plan. Greek aid has been a sort of pilot plant to demonstrate how an economic rescue job could build a strong democratic state that could some day stand alone.

Any accomplishment less than that may well be futile. If, after a year of American aid, Greece is less free than Tito's domain, civil war is still unresolved and the call is for further expenditure, there is reason to wonder whether the Greek adventure is going our way.

Peru Must Treat Our People Fairly If They Expect Any Assistance From Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker there has come to my attention a matter affecting an air line which was certificated by our Civil Aeronautics Board to provide direct service between the western half of the United States and South America. I refer to Braniff International Airways, which has its headquarters at Dallas, Tex., in my State, and which serves Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Tennessee, Colorado, and Texas.

After exhaustive hearings and study, the Civil Aeronautics Board, with the approval of the President of the United States, awarded Braniff International Airways a route into South America on May 22, 1946. Before South American service could be started, the State Department had to negotiate bilateral air transport agreements, or assist Braniff to obtain operating permits with nine sovereign countries. Among the countries of South America to be served is Peru.

PERU SIGNED AGREEMENT WITH UNITED STATES

On December 27, 1946, the Government of Peru signed a joint air transport agreement with the Government of the United States of America, providing for reciprocal rights for air lines operating between the two countries. This air transport agreement is similar to others negotiated by the State Department with other Republics in South America. It contains ample provisions for consultation, negotiation, and even arbitration, in the event of disagreement or dispute.

In accordance with the terms of this bilateral air transport agreement, the Ministry of Aeronautics of Peru issued to Braniff Airways an operating permit providing Braniff with the right to operate between the United States and Peru via intermediate points and to points beyond.

On July 24, 1947, the Civil Aeronautics Board of the United States, reciprocally, granted a foreign air carrier permit to Peruvian International Airways, giving them the right to fly into the United States and serve Washington, New York City, and points beyond. On page 14 of this foreign air carrier permit, the Civil Aeronautics Board stated that Braniff was authorized by our Government to provide service on a route—

From Houston, Tex., through Havana, Canal Zone, and along the west coast of South America, via points including Lima, to the terminal points Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, and Buenos Aires, Argentina.

PERU SUSPENDED PERMIT UNDER FLIMSY PRETENSE

In preparation for this service, Braniff purchased DC-6 aircraft, constructed radio stations, employed and trained personnel, investing some $4,000,000. Yet, only a few days before Braniff Airways was ready to initiate its first scheduled service as far as Lima, Peru, the Government of Peru suspended the Braniff permit, under the pretense, so they stated, that they had no previous knowledge that Braniff Airways was going to serve Havana, Cuba, enroute to Lima, and that it would thus compete with their own air line, Peruvian International Airways. The record is clear that Peru had full knowledge of the exact route to be operated by Braniff.

This unilateral action on the part of the Government of Peru, in violation of their Bilateral Air Transport Agreement with the United States, prevents our United States Flag Air Carrier, Braniff, from flying into Lima, Peru and forces them to turn around at Guayaquil, Ecuador.

This will not block the extension of the Braniff route on to Bolivia, Brazil, and Argentina, but it will, naturally, delay it.

What is behind this arbitrary action, I do not pretend to know or to guess. But this much I wish to state very frankly: The Republic of Peru has failed to live up to its solemn agreement. There are ample provisions in the Bilateral Air Transport Agreement for discussion in connection with all matters contained in the agreement. There is absolutely no justification and no legal right, in my judgment, for Peru to act unilaterally.

Thus, unless these differences can be adjusted at once, Braniff, an air line of the United States, acting in full faith and confidence in its United States certificate, and upon this agreement between Peru and our country, and upon the permit issued by Peru thereunder, has now invested some $4,000,000 and may face tremendous losses which indirectly may have to be borne by the taxpayers of the United States.

PERU AFFRONTED UNITED STATES

In my judgment, the Government of Peru has affronted the United States in a high-handed and unfriendly manner, yet I am informed that this same Government plans to apply to the Export-Import Bank for a loan of some $50,000,000 for their development projects. I am sure you are aware of the fact that an amendment to the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended (S. 2549), has passed the Senate and is now awaiting study and hearing in the House Banking and Currency Committee. The purpose of this amendment is to expand the loaning capacity of the Export-Import Bank, primarily, to provide further financial aid to the countries of Latin America. Unless this amendment is passed, the Export-Import Bank will be unable to make any further advances to many of these countries, especially Peru.

WHY SHOULD UNITED STATES HELP PERU UNDER CIRCUMSTANCES?

I raise the question as to why the United States of America should continue to act in a liberal and open-handed manner with countries who repeatedly ignore their obligations to the United States, and who repeatedly and contemptuously kick us on the shins. If the Government of Peru does not lift the Braniff suspension at once and conduct itself in accordance with the terms of the bilateral agreement, I intend to introduce an amendment to the Export-Import Bank Act to the effect that: No part of the funds of the Export-Import Bank will be made available for loan purposes to any country which has failed to live up to its agreements with the United States of America.

GOLDEN RULE SHOULD APPLY TO OUR GOOD-NEIGHBOR POLICY

I think that only by such firm and resolute action can the United States make some of its neighbors realize that we, too, are a sovereign country; that we, too, like fair treatment, and that we will be good neighbors only to those countries who are good neighbors to us.

[From American Aviation Daily of June 8, 1948]

THE BRANIFF ENTRANCE INTO SOUTH AMERICA

(Background analysis by W. W. P.)

Inauguration of service to South America by Braniff International Airways has more than the usual ramifications of opening up a new route. It is the first challenge by a United States certificated carrier to the continent dominated up to now by Pan American World Airways and Pan American-Grace Airways. It is a new chapter in United States international air transport.

It has already become a hectic battle. The opening shots were fired when Braniff was certificated 2 years ago.

Up to now the inroads into Latin America by United States certificated carriers have been of relatively minor importance. American Airlines first penetrated the scene with service to Mexico City. Then National was certificated into Havana, Eastern into Puerto Rico, and Chicago & Southern into Habana and Venezuela. But these are fringe opera-

tions. The Braniff route extends all the way to Buenos Aires.

It is no secret that PAA and Pangra have left no stone unturned to block Braniff's entry into South America. Officials of both companies have freely admitted as much to Braniff officials and to all others within hearing. In view of the 20 years of freedom and exclusivity which both companies have had in the Southern Hemisphere, the opposition to a newcomer is understandable. There is no other part of the world, and certainly no part of the United States, where the competitive battle is fought with so few holds barred as in South America.

BRANIFF MANAGEMENT ACCEPTS CHALLENGE

There is probably no other air-line management in the United States that would undertake the South American challenge in the face of both known and unknown obstacles from the firmly entrenched incumbents. But Thomas E. Braniff has faced obstacles before which others believed insurmountable. He took a beating with his Aerovias Braniff in Mexico when he tried to invade that field without benefit of a United States certificate. He learned many lessons. He has gone about the development of his new service with calm and calculated determination.

The set-back which he received in the midst of the preinaugural tour, when the Government of Peru suspended his permit a week before regular commercial service was to begin, was sufficient to discourage the most hardy air-line management. Yet Mr. Braniff took this set-back in his stride as just another anticipated skirmish. Others might have postponed inauguration of service indefinitely. But Braniff Airways began operating last Friday as far as it could—to Guayaquil, Ecuador, and will begin service to Lima as soon as the present difficulties are overcome.

WELL-PLANNED PREINAUGURAL TOUR

It would probably be unwise to underestimate Braniff's penetration of Latin America. He will have many more difficulties before his line terminates at Buernos Aires and Rio de Janeiro.

No air line has ever staged a better-planned or more diplomatic preinaugural tour. On board the Braniff special were powerful banking, publishing, and political interests. State receptions by foreign governments and United States embassies were the high lights. The receptions accorded Braniff and his party at all points, including Peru, were of the highest order. Not the least vital features of the tour was the poise and diplomacy of Mr. Braniff himself. His executive vice president, Charles E. Beard, performed equally well.

Without a United States certificate and the firm backing of the United States Government, no American company could hope to invade the PAA field in South America. And this is the keystone to the entire Braniff program—that Braniff Airways is an authorized instrumentality of the United States. Thus on all questions of operating rights, Braniff passes the responsibility to the State Department. In Washington the State Department has backed him up 100 percent.

Braniff has had to install its own ground facilities everywhere except in Peru where the Government itself handles airways communications through a subsidiary called Corpac. As a result, Braniff has installed the most powerful airways communications setup in South America; so powerful, in fact, that when a Braniff survey plane taxied to the end of the runway at Lima and radioed its take-off report, Braniff stations in the United States as far as Chicago acknowledged the pilot's report. It seems clear that other airlines (except PAA and Panagra, of course) will be utilizing Braniff facilities in due course.

Panagra has refused to provide any facilities to Braniff whatsoever. This necessitated Braniff's building its own terminal at Guayaquil. PAA finally agreed to leasing space in its Havana terminal only at the last minute. The Braniff preinaugural flight to La Paz, Bolivia, was serviced by Panagra only at the specific request of the Bolivian Government and the American embassy in La Paz, though Panagra objected to having to carry out the request.

PAA-PANAGRA OPPOSITION

Braniff officials cites scores of instances where PAA and Panagra have endeavored to block their path, but PAA and Panagra have made no secret of these efforts, beyond saying there would be no more locking of toilet doors, blocking of planes, and so forth, such as happened with Aerovias Braniff in Mexico. One Panagra official made it quite clear that his company would not be ungentlemanly or stoop to trivialities. But broad opposition policy will remain and there apparently is in existence a letter from Panagra management requesting its employees not to have any contact, social or business, with Braniff people.

The PAA-Panagra opposition is based on two counts. One is that these two companies pioneered South America and hence feel they have no obligation whatever to help Braniff with any ground or airway facilities. The second is that the traffic potential does not justify a competing American company and that the net result will be losses for all concerned. (Another sore point is Braniff's 95-cents-a-mile mail rate against the temporary Panagra rate of 32 cents.)

Traffic-wise, it is difficult to predict. The Braniff plan for a weekly DC–4 tourist-cargo combination plane with 25-percent reduction in fares will undoubtedly appeal to many who balk at the relatively high standard airline fares in Latin America. Braniff has made a strong appeal that it is going after traffic west of the Mississippi, that Braniff serves a new territory, and that much new business should result. There is no doubt that Braniff will capture business from those who have not been satisfied with existing service, those who have grievances real and imagined.

BRANIFF GETS GENUINE WELCOME

Even in Peru, where the permit suspension caused embarrassment, Braniff Airways was given a genuine welcome. The Latin countries are all short of dollars; all have hopes that the new service will bring more dollars south of the equator. But over and beyond the traffic potential (and Braniff officials think they will be doing good business) is the national defense angle which unquestionably played a vital part in the Government's certifying Braniff for South America.

Summarizing: (1) No United States air line has ever undertaken a more difficult task of developing a new service, for neither PAA nor Panagra in Latin America recognize in Braniff anything but an enemy to be fought with whatever weapons can be obtained and utilized. Yet of all the potential threats to the PAA empire in Latin America, Braniff looms as the one most likely to succeed in establishing itself and offering a type of competition which Latin America has never known in the air. As one of the leading Catholic laymen of the Western Hemisphere, Mr. Braniff's strength in Catholic Latin America cannot be underestimated. As a leading and lifelong Republican, Mr. Braniff is not likely to be upset by a new administration, and the present Democratic administration has gone all-out for him.

(2) The CAB and the State Department will have to determine the full meaning of an international United States operating certificate, i. e., will it permit other certificate holders to go beyond mere competition and challenge the validity of United States certificates to foreign governments. There seems to be no doubt in the minds of Braniff officials that Panagra, and PAA, have exerted and will continue to exert unless halted, pressures on foreign governments in matters pertaining to operating permits. This, then, becomes a governmental matter and it will be interesting to see how firm a stand the United States Government takes, and to what extent an international air carrier certificate is supported by the Government. There is no question of the right of any certificated air line to utilize full legal resources at its command in the country of origin, i. e., Washington. Whether a right exists to attempt to block that certificate by working through foreign governments or foreign interests, is a matter to be settled. It is a rather important point which affects all bilateral and other international air agreements and, consequently, all air-line operating certificates. PAA and Panagra have had a wide latitude of freedom in Latin America, operating their own State Department, and are not likely to relinquish this freedom without a struggle.

The new chapter now being written on United States international air transport will not make for dull reading.

The Shameful Failure of Our New Deal and Military Government Policies in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement by O. K. Armstrong, of Springfield, Mo., a writer for Reader's Digest and other magazines, who recently visited the occupied areas of Europe and, who, on yesterday, gave this testimony before the Senate Committee on Appropriations:

Members of the committee, I greatly appreciate the honor of appearing before this Senate committee to discuss the proposed appropriations for expenses of the occupied areas. My remarks shall be addressed particularly to the situation in the American zone of Germany.

I speak as an American citizen and taxpayer, and not officially for any group. However, I feel certain that the vast majority of those who have studied objectively conditions in the western zones of Germany will heartily agree with my conclusions and opinions.

Last fall I toured many of the countries of western Europe, spending several weeks in all the zones of Germany, making a survey of relief needs and conditions generally in preparation for magazine articles and newspaper reports. I state frankly that I think our occupation policies are a betrayal of the interests of the American people, and a failure, economically, socially, and morally.

Unless this Congress can assure the citizens of our country that our policies are to be radically altered to conform to both common sense and the practical needs of the situation in western Europe, then the money requested for the civilian activities of the Office of Military Government should be flatly denied.

In the limits of the brief time I have before this committee let me draw on my actual experiences and personal observations.

I shall then be glad to try to answer any specific questions you of this distinguished committee may care to ask.

I believe that the American people have understood that the purpose of the occupation of the conquered areas was (1) to restore order and peaceful production, and (2) to protect the interests of the United States and of all friendly nations in the areas. In both categories, military government has failed. This is no fault of military men. It is because military government was, and is, out of its sphere. In the American concept, the military fights and wins wars. To ask military authority to govern a people or territory is a tragic mistake.

No power, military or civilian, could have brought order and peaceful production to Germany under the two major policies that have set the pattern for occupation activities. They are: First, the Morgenthau plan of reducing Germany permanently to a low-income, pastoral nation, with economy based upon a bare subsistence level. Second, close collaboration with representatives of Soviet Russia, and until quite recently, close compliance with their desires in all major matters.

The American taxpayers may think their money is being spent to protect our interests and preserve strict order in Germany with a military force. They would be shocked to know that at least $300,000,000 are spent annually to maintain a vast sprawling bureaucracy, implanted upon the civilian government of Germany. It is made up of many sincere and capable men and women, who honestly would like to render service; and also a host of misfits and incompetents, entirely happy in their new power. In typical bureaucratic fashion, they have spread into every avenue of German life.

Anyone who observes the civilian personnel and their activities closely in the occupied areas must come to the conclusion that about half are engaged in imposing intolerable restrictions upon the German population while the other half run around trying to cheer the population up with free advice on health, education, and welfare. Why should the American taxpayers have to support this needless bureaucracy?

Here are a few examples: One of the top administrators of the welfare program told me that there was not a single function of military government that could not be done better by intelligent and capable members of the indigenous population. Thousands are engaged in dictating, typing, and filing copies of useless information. One officer told me his job was to lecture on economics to German businessmen, everyone of whom he said, knew more economics than he will ever learn. Wacs, wearing their "fruit salad" uniforms, may talk to German youth on the evils of military life. One occupation bureau has broken up a burial society for veterans of World War I and their families on the ground it is a military organization, and has arbitrarily frozen its funds. Instances of such petty business could be multiplied thousands of times. In my opinion, our taxpayers would prefer that money spent on such boondoggling be put into real military protection in Europe.

THE DENAZIFICATION PROGRAM

An integral part of the Morgenthau plan was the "denazification" program. Just how many of our personnel are engaged in this Soviet-flavored process, I do not know, but it is considerable. Let me make it clear that I believe that the Nazi leaders should have been punished for their inexcusable crimes. The guilty who remain should be given speedy justice. But the denazification program is un-American in its concept and execution. It has done more to prevent peaceful recovery in Germany than any other one factor.

I talked to at least a score of officials connected with the denazification program, some of whom had sat as judges. The great majority vigorously denounced the whole scheme as violating every principle of American justice. Particularly does it violate the cherished American principle that outlaws forever in our Bill of Rights the ex post facto law, for denazification presumes great masses of German people are guilty of the crimes of their leaders and places them under automatic arrest. It ignores the bar against double jeopardy. I gathered data on dozens of persons who were tried two or more times for the same "offense."

A young man who joined military government training while in college in 1943, shortly after becoming an American citizen, now high in the denazification program, admitted to me that he knew no law, but explained that in bringing about mass punishment for people guilty of "supporting" a dictator, it is best to discard American legal procedures. That such men could be making policies affecting the very life of a whole defeated nation is a sad thing.

I talked to some victims of the denazification people's courts who were actively opposing Hitler while some of their American persecutors were supporting him before his attack on Russia in June 1941. Church people of Germany recently protested against the denazification program, whereupon Gen. Lusius D. Clay, American commander, sternly scolded them for opposing constituted authority. From this program, millions of Germans have received their major impressions of American democracy.

I respectfully refer you to an article by Louis P. Lochner, former chief of the Berlin Bureau of the Associated Press, entitled "The Idiocy of Our Denazification Policy," in the current (June) issue of the Reader's Digest, in which he declares: "The greatest single damage to faith in American purposes in Germany has been done by this policy as hitherto administered."

If this program cannot be administered in any other way, I earnestly suggest that this committee cut off the money for it.

DESTRUCTION OF OUR MILITARY EQUIPMENT

I ask you gentlemen of this Senate committee, who authorized the destruction of so much of our military strength in the American zone of Germany?

I refer first to all the great numbers of aircraft that were blown up, fighting planes and bombers that could now be used to strengthen our military protection in western Europe. I learned of this destruction from enlisted personnel, who were dumbfounded to find that thousands of our splendid airplanes, some of which had never seen service, were being systematically destroyed.

I was told of numerous fields where this destruction has been carried out. So I went to see for myself. In a field in Bavaria I saw hundreds of B–17's, 4-engine bombers, that had been flown in and lined up wing to wing, in a huge pasture. Small demolition bombs had been placed in each engine or fusilage and set off.

In a field near Nuremberg, the planes destroyed were mostly P–47's, the fast fighter planes. Here an Army detail spent 3 months conditioning the craft, so that, according to their commanding officer, they could be flown back to the United States. Enlisted men told me that their CO informed them that the Presidential citation might be received for their good work in getting the planes ready to be flown back for future use. But soon some civilians, representatives of the State Department, arrived and demolished each plane with individual bombs. Some of these men, our soldiers said, spoke a foreign tongue.

Similar destruction of military equipment went on all over Germany. I tried hard to find out who authorized it. I was told repeatedly that it was part of the Potsdam agreement. In Frankfurt I was informed at the OMGUS office that the program of destruction was insisted upon by Soviet authorities to reduce our military strength down to an agreed level. Perhaps the State Department can give a better answer. As one American, indignant at this sabotaging of our strength at the insistence of a potential enemy, I would like to know.

ACTIVITIES OF LEFT-WING PERSONNEL

A glaring example of the waste of American taxpayers' money on personnel who do not represent American policies or ideals may be found at Nuremberg. Here we followed a course of procedure set up by approval of the four major powers, including representatives of Soviet Russia. We did this after our Government had possession of documents recently made public by the State Department, showing that the Hitler-Stalin, or Ribbentrop-Molotov pact of August 1939, perhaps the most notoriously criminal pact ever made, touched off the recent great war and proved the guilt of the very Communist leaders who sat in judgment of their former fellow criminals.

Surely the interests of justice would have better served if the guilty Nazi leaders had been promptly tried and sentenced. Instead, a huge force of so-called legal experts was employed. I was astonished to hear many of them branded as open Communist fellow travelers or sympathizers by their more American-minded colleagues. That many of them had, or still have, close liaison with Soviet authorities is certain. If these trials are to drag on, I challenge this committee to call upon the FBI for a record of all the United States personnel enjoying employment in this procedure.

As a sample of the radical type of activities carried on—perhaps without the knowledge and consent of the United States Congress, I cite the program of so-called land reform for the farmers of the American zone. I hold in my hand a collection of documents, received from OMGUS officials, which spell out the policy enforced to break up farms if they were more than 100 hectares in size. Here again the policy closely parallels that of the Soviet Government in the eastern zone of Germany.

Farm settlements were set up, similar to those in the Soviet zone. With all the trappings of totalitarian bureaucracy, candidates for the farms were allotted their land. Permit me to read one paragraph to illustrate the flavor of this process. I quote: "A person who can be proven to have been a poor farmer in the past or who has failed to meet his duties to deliver his products may be rejected as a candidate for settlement."

From personal observation, I declare that personnel administering such programs are for the most part those who would have enjoyed putting their social and economic schemes into effect in the United States. Failing in that, they landed excellent jobs with the military government, where their decrees have the full effect of law and they work apparently unhindered.

DESTRUCTION OF INDUSTRIAL PLANTS

I do not know how much of this proposed appropriation is earmarked for use in the destruction and dismantling of German war and industrial plants, nor how many of our personnel are engaged in this work, but from observation I would say it is considerable. This program stems from the Potsdam Agreement, implemented by later executive decisions, whereby facilities of German economy were to be removed as reparations to Allied countries. During weeks of close inspection of German life in the destroyed cities, towns, and rural areas, it seemed to me to be a ghastly thing to continue to destroy resources that could be used for peaceful reconstruction, to say nothing of taking some of the burden of their support from off the backs of the American taxpayers. Yet

occupation authorities were still destroying and dismantling plants up until a few weeks ago, and shipping most of the material to Soviet Russia.

I hold in my hand a report showing the plants in category 1 and 2, dismantled or still to be dismantled in the American zone of Germany, with notations as to where this dismantled equipment has gone. It is an astounding thing that so much of it, particularly that which can be used in war, has been shipped to Russia or to her satellite countries.

General Clay announced last April that Soviet Russia and four of her satellite nations had received 63 percent of all reparations from the United States zone of Germany, nearly twice as much as was delivered to the 12 western allies. Russia alone, Clay said, collected about 30 percent of the total. Of major interest to American taxpayers is the fact that 42 percent of all this material was sent to Russia and her stooges after June 1947, when opposition to Soviet expansion became official United States policy.

This program is indefensible from an economic standpoint, for it destroys the very means of peaceful European recovery. More than 40,000 German workmen have been engaged in the destruction, while they should have been working to produce goods to rebuild countries who were victims of Nazi aggression.

This program is indefensible from a legal point of view, for it is in direct violation of international law. The United States is signatory, with all other major nations, to the Hague Treaty of 1907 which forbids the taking of private property from a defeated country for reparations except as agreed to in a peace settlement.

The dismantling program is politically disastrous, for it is pushing the German people further toward the waiting arms of communism. In Munich, as elsewhere in our zone of Germany, I observed Russian officers in uniform circulating freely. They were in our installations, barracks, and eating places. I was told that four of the Russians, working in the area in cooperation with American officials, were going about indicating to our authorities which plants and equipment they desired dismantled and shipped to Russia.

An American businessman, whose name I shall be glad to give to this committee if you desire to question him, tried to get permission to import a certain product from a Bavarian plant, but was denied by our occupation authorities because, he was told, the Russians had asked that the plant be destroyed. This was long after the announcement of the Marshall plan.

A NEW POLICY NEEDED

Gentlemen of this committee, it is my opinion that Congress long ago should have written a new policy for our occupation officials, military and civilian. The policy of vengeance has failed to accomplish anything good. Such a policy can only lay the basis for new conflicts, and never the foundations for a lasting peace.

I should like very much to see an amendment to this act which would provide that no funds made available under the authority of this act shall be used for the destruction or dismantling of property except as may be provided in a peace treaty; and that no funds could be used for any activities which, if so declared by the Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, are, in his opinion, detrimental to the recovery of any nation participating in the funds appropriated, including areas occupied by military forces of the United States.

Gentlemen of the Senate, we are late with these reforms, but not too late for this Congress to control the matter by the most convenient method so wisely provided by the Constitution to check rampant bureaucratic power—a cutting off of the funds for policies so detrimental to the interests of our country. I thank you.

Pulajanes and Moro War Veterans Being Treated Unfairly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed at the indifference exhibited by some Government officials toward the plight of the veterans who fought in the Pulajanes and Moro Wars of the Philippines. These veterans, who lived under extreme physical hardship and danger, have been deprived of the same kind of treatment accorded veterans of other wars.

There is a bill pending before this Congress which should have the support of every Member of this House.

The Regular Veterans Association of the United States also is interested in this bill. The national commander of the association, Commander William M. Floyd, is a tireless worker for the veterans who gave honorable wartime service between July 4, 1902 and January 1, 1914. Commander Floyd originally sponsored and supported a bill, H. R. 4099, in the Seventy-eighth Congress, which was introduced by Representative LESINSKI.

My present bill, H. R. 451, is somewhat similar. Its title is to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended to certain persons who served with the United State military and naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child or children. This bill on May 5, 1948, was favorably reported by a subcommittee of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Because I feel that some interesting history should be more comprehensively presented to the Members, I am reprinting here an article written by Mr. James A. Hilliard, National Historian of the Philippine-Pacific War Veterans. It follows:

H. R. 451, in its present form, was drafted in a manner that would eliminate previous objections raised by either the War Department or Veterans' Administration. A similar bill has passed the House twice and the Senate once. A near-accurate estimate of surviving veterans affected place the number under 2,000, with around 200 unremarried widows still living. The average age of these veterans is now 67.

Referring to but one battle, more men were killed and wounded in the so-called peacetime battle of Bud-Dajo, April 1906, than met a similar fate in August 1898 during the wartime bombardment and capture of Manila.

Comparing the small number of men engaged in the peacetime Pulajanes and Moro Wars with an equal number engaged in the Spanish-American War, Boxer Rebellion, or Philippine Insurrection proper, we find the percent of battle casualties were greater in the Pulajanes and Moro Wars of 1902 to 1913.

Casualties up to noon on July 4, 1902, are classed as wartime incident to the Philippine insurrection, surviving veterans now being entitled to a wartime disability and service pension. Casualties occurring after noon on July 4, 1902, are classed as peacetime casualties incident to military operations against hostile Pulajanes and savage Moros, surviving veterans being denied the same disability pension, and no service pension at all, as now enjoyed by their comrades who served prior to noon on July 4, 1902.

After July 4, 1902, we had hundreds of combats with Pulajanes and Moros; 26 major uprisings of sufficient seriousness to be listed as campaigns by the War Department. A few of them are: 3-day battle in May 1903; 3-day battle in March 1906; 5-day battle in December 1911; and a 5-day battle in June 1913. December 16, 1913, the first civil governor of the new department of Mindanao and Sulu, Hon. Frank W. Carpenter, relieved Gen. John J. Pershing. Mopping up and moving followed and by December 31, 1913, we had the last 45,760 square miles of peace in territory occupied by Moros and non-Christian tribes.

Had there been no Spanish-American War, there would have been no Philippine Insurrection. Had there been no insurrection, there would not have followed, without a break in military operations, the so-called peacetime Pulajane and Moro wars. No other peacetime campaign, expedition, or occupation compares with, or was of a similar nature, as the Pulajane and Moro wars, for the simple reason that the Pulajane and Moro wars were but the natural continuation of the original Philippine Insurrection, due to the President's ill-timed proclamation of peace, effective July 4, 1902, which did not, by any means, bring about a true or actual peace. Changes in military operations after this date were in name only; that is, prior to July 4, 1902, we were engaged in a war against Filipino insurgents, but after that date it was peacetime activities against hostile Pulajanes and savage Moros who were still in open rebellion against the authority of the United States Government—they did not appreciate the fact that the war was supposed to be over.

My conclusions are:

1. That those killed in action or dying as a result of wounds or injuries while engaged in peacetime combat with hostile Pulajanes or savage Moros between July 4, 1902, and December 31, 1913, were just as dead, and had suffered the same agony, as those who met a like fate in the official Philippine Insurrection prior to July 4, 1902. Further, that the Pulajanes and Moro war veterans actually served in the same war, under same conditions, same enlistment contract and tropical-disease hazards, and subject to the same inadequate medical attention as those who served prior to July 4, 1902.

2. That the War Department, many years ago, recognized combat service against the Pulajanes and Moros as wartime service when it issued the same identical Philippine War Medal, same Purple Heart, same Medal of Honor, and same Distinguished Service Cross to these veterans as it had issued those who had served in the Philippine Insurrection prior to July 4, 1902. War medals, medals for valor displayed on the field of battle, and purple hearts are not, and never have been, issued to commemorate peacetime or parade-ground home service. Hence, a state of war must have existed on the islands of Samar and Leyte until June 30, 1907, and on the island of Mindanao, including the Moro Province, to December 31, 1913. Consequently, the veterans covered by H. R. 451 are, and by legal rights should be, entitled to the same pension privileges as those with like service who served in the same war prior to July 4, 1902.

The Republican Party—Have You "Had Enough" of Republican Misrule?—If You Have, Vote Democratic!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, the Republican Party was swept into power by the American people. During the past 2 years, the lawmaking power has been in the control of a large Republican majority. In matters of policy, they have been able to override even the President's veto, as indicated by the overriding of his veto on the Taft-Hartley labor bill and on the Knutson tax bill. The Taft-Hartley bill took away important rights of the American workingmen, and notwithstanding the President's veto of this vicious bill, it became a law of the land. The Knutson tax bill, one of the most iniquitous tax bills ever passed in America for the benefit of the rich and greedy, and to the detriment of the poor and needy, was also passed by the Republican majority over the President's veto.

The Republicans were swept into power on a wave of propaganda, which, through the radio and newspapers, deceived the American people regarding the shortages which occurred because of the greatest war in our history. The people were not told the truth. They were told that the fault of the shortages rested on the OPA. They were not told that the shortages were the result of the most destructive and costly war in our history.

Capitalizing on this war weariness, and the confusion of the people, the Republicans adopted the slogan of "had enough?" They asked the people if they had "had enough" of gas rationing, high food prices, clothing prices, and of rent control. The people, confused by the propaganda of the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and all of the newspaper mouthpieces of big business, were stampeded into defeating the liberal Democrats who had tried to protect them against inflation, and to electing the Republican representatives of big business and the wealthy interests of our country. The Republican Party and the big-business interests promised the people that if the Republicans were elected they would do away with price control and rationing and priority allocations of building materials. When this was accomplished, they promised the people that production would increase to the point where there would be a surplus of food, clothing, and building materials, and the surplus of a free market would drive the "temporary high prices" down and the prices for food, clothing, rents, and building materials would be cheaper than they were under the OPA price controls.

What has happened? Have the Republicans made good on their campaign promises of 1946? I challenge the Republican candidates for Congress to justify the program which the Republican Party has enforced during the past 2 years. The Republicans killed the OPA. Price controls were removed from food, clothing, automobiles, gasoline, and building supplies. What has been the result during the 2 years of Republican control of our economy?

I present at this point the Government statistics from the Bureau of Labor which no Republican dares to deny. In the first column on the left, I give the prices of some of the necessities of life under price control as of June 1946. In the second column, I give you the prices as of April 1948, the last available figure to date.

Prices

FOOD

	OPA, June 1946	April 1948	Percentage increase
	Cents	*Cents*	
Milk	13½	19	40
Bread	11	14	27
Butter	65	99	52
Margarine	18	47	160
Bacon	42	77	83
Eggs	53	69	30
Over-all average increase			42.8

CLOTHING

1 unit	$1.00	$1.25	25

	Percent increase
Rent	7.2
Utilities	18.3

Over-all cost-of-living index

OPA June 1946	133.3
Apr. 15, 1948	169.3
Increase in 22 months (percent)	27

We see that under Republican misrule and contrary to Republican promises, food costs have advanced 42.8 percent. We see that the cost of clothing has advanced 24.9 percent. The price of automobiles has advanced 13.4 percent, and it is impossible to buy an automobile today even at the advanced list price. It is common knowledge that most automobile purchasers are being charged extortionate prices because of under-the-counter black-market bonuses, or through being gouged by a reduced and unfair trade-in on his old-model automobile. Remember, automobiles were also under price control 2 years ago.

So, we see the Republican Party has deceived the people of the United States and has reduced their purchasing power, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 27 percent. In other words, if you are making the same salary today that you were making in June 1946, you still have received an actual wage reduction in the purchasing power of your dollar of 27 percent. In other words, if your annual salary is $3,000, you can now buy only $2,190 worth of the necessities of life. This is the record, and the Republican Party cannot deny a single statement that I have made.

They come now before the American people in another great election and they ask the American people to elect more Republican Congressmen and a Republican President. They do not face the issues which they have created—the issues of inflation, of higher food prices, of higher living costs, of higher building costs. The ordinary workingman and the GI veteran has been priced out of the market for automobiles and houses. He must spend every dollar he makes for food, clothing, and his children. The miracle of surplus and lower prices which the Republicans promised to give the American people by eliminating price control, allocations, and rationing has not occurred. The questions before the American people in the November election are as follows:

"Have you had enough" of Republican misrule?

"Have you had enough" of high food and other cost of living prices?

"Have you had enough" of the reduced take-home pay as a result of the elimination of overtime?

"Have you had enough" of inflationary prices?

"Have you had enough" of the promises of the Republican Party, the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce?

If you have had enough, go to the polls in November and vote Democratic. Remember that your Democratic Congressman, CHET HOLIFIELD voted to retain price controls during the postwar period. Remember that he voted to retain priority allocations on building materials so that veterans and other low income people could buy their homes at reasonable prices. Remember that he voted against the tax bill which gave to the $3,000 per year man only 5 days additional take-home pay, but gave to the $100,000 annual income earners, 5⅔ months additional take-home pay. Remember that inflation has already wiped out the wage earners' small reduction in taxes.

Remember that he voted for the best interests of the majority of the people of his district and the Nation, and against the Republican program of high prices, tax relief to the high income brackets and their inflationary "boom and bust" program which will inevitably bring on another great Hoover depression.

Admitting the DP's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. STRATTON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Illinois State Journal of June 8, 1948:

ADMITTING THE DP'S

Whereas the United States of America has lived up to its role of world leadership in most respects since VJ-day, our Government has been slow to admit displaced persons from among the hundreds of thousands rendered homeless and politically exiled by the tides of World War II.

Great Britain has led the list of countries taking in the homeless. She has admitted during the last year alone 48,685 refugees.

Belgium admitted 17,678; France, 16,528; Canada, 13,287; United States, 13,594; Argentina, 6,699; Palestine, 5,824; Australia, 3,636; Netherlands, 3,166 and Brazil, 2,784.

Now before Congress at the insistence of Republican leadership, and amended by Senator C. WAYLAND BROOKS of Illinois to include recognition for Polish comrades-at-arms pressured from their homeland by Soviet rule, is legislation to admit 200,000 displaced persons within the next 2 years. It will probably be adopted.

First among Congressmen to author a significant DP bill in the postwar era was WILLIAM G. STRATTON, who is now Republican candidate for Illinois secretary of state in the fall elections. The Stratton bill established the idea of using up immigration quotas not filled during the war, to absorb the DP's.

Speaker JOSEPH MARTIN and Majority Leader CHARLES HALLECK are to be commended for speeding the DP legislation to the floor of Congress before it adjourns on June 19. In this idealistic action is proof that the GOP leadership is concerned with the problems of suffering humanity which exist in the wake of war, and is taking concerted action to alleviate such conditions.

America was built by immigrants from Europe. Through the successful assimilation of many cultures into an aggregate personality which we know as American, we have set an example which today is the hope and the pattern of the world.

Letter of Carl I. Collins, President, Superior Steel Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

SUPERIOR STEEL CORP.,
Pittsburgh, Pa., June 9, 1948.

Hon. JAMES G. FULTON,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FULTON: On Thursday of last week I was called to testify before Trial Examiner Frank Hier, in the complaint by the Federal Trade Commission against the American Iron and Steel Institute and against 105 steel companies.

The avowed purpose of this action is to force upon industry and upon all member companies a requirement for each producing unit to quote and to sell its steel products only upon the basis f. o. b. point of manufacture. In my judgment and in the judgment of many others who would be similarly affected, this would be a most serious blow to the free-enterprise system in the United States, and in particular, a serious blow to the smaller independent producers of iron and steel products.

If the Federal Trade Commission were to be successful in this action it could very well result in the death knell of the smaller nonintegrated steel companies in the industry. It would constrict the market of all single plant producers largely to the local consumers. It would violate the rights of a free American citizen to quote whatever price he deems necessary or desirable for him to quote. It would favor the large steel companies which have multiple plants located in or near various consuming centers, and discriminate against the smaller companies with only one plant.

I do not need to tell you that it was most heartening to me to see a Representative of Congress attending the hearing last week, and it was most encouraging to realize that you and other Members of Congress are interested in such serious problems of small industry.

I appeal to you and to your colleagues not to let this thing happen to us or to the customers whom we serve.

Sincerely yours,

CARL I. COLLINS,
President.

Everything But Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the St. Paul Pioneer Press for June 10, 1948, dealing with the postal employees pay-raise proposals. Everyone agrees that these good public servants are deserving of adequate pay increases. Let us terminate our procrastination and legislate accordingly.

EVERYTHING BUT ACTION

Postal employees have found no lack of cordial response to messages they have addressed Congressmen and Senators urging support of the pending bill that would raise their pay. They have been told, promptly and without exception, that they deserve the pay increases which the bill would provide. In fact, the only thing lacking in the situation is the one essential—action.

Whether Congress adjourns June 19 or merely recesses to a date following the party conventions, the danger is that the bill granting postal employees badly needed salary adjustments will die in the last-minute rush, along with many other good measures.

There have been only three small increases in the pay of postal employees in the last 25 years. Beginning pay now is $175 a month, or $2,100 a year. After 17 years' service, the employee has worked himself up to only $3,100 a year. There is no question whatever that this large but neglected group of employees deserves the pay increase contemplated.

Minnesota's congressional delegation, both in House and Senate, have pledged support of the pending bill. With all the backing assured it from every part of the country, one concerted push should put it over, despite the last-minute rush. It is to be hoped that the favorable position held by Minnesota's Senator THYE as member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee can be turned to advantage in translating the general support which definitely does exist into the final action necessary in making the pay adjustments a reality.

The Late Honorable Peter J. McGuinness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article appearing in the New York Times of Friday, June 11, on the death of the Honorable Peter J. McGuinness, a distinguished Democratic leader of Brooklyn, N. Y.:

PETER MCGUINNESS DIES IN BROOKLYN—ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF BOROUGH WORKS, EX-ALDERMAN, WAS GREENPOINT BOOSTER

Peter J. McGuinness, veteran Brooklyn politician and ardent champion of the beauties of Greenpoint, died last night in St. Catherine's Hospital in his home borough. He would have been 60 years old on the 29th of June.

Mr. McGuinness spent his life proving that politicians can be colorful and still be honest. He was the New York City equivalent of Chicago's "Hinky-Dink" Kenna and "Bathhouse" John Coughlin—a throwback to the Stone Age in politics—except that no one ever traced to his wallet a crooked dollar, and no one who knew him even expected to find anything wrong with Pete.

He was born and raised in "Greenpernt," he was Greenpernt to the rest of the world. "When history is wrote and rewrote," he once said, "Greenpernt is going to have its share of the credit." In the same speech, he added: "Greenpernt has not only given and given to the Nation, but she has given good."

Many of the "quotes" attributed to McGuinness were the creations of imaginative reporters, but that was only because they hadn't been able to reach Pete to get a real McGuinness special. He was as good as any of his ghost writers, with a flair for publicity that kept his name in the newspapers from the time he entered politics, via the board of aldermen, in 1919, until his death.

GAVE ALL TO POLITICS

He talked, lived, and ate politics, and he worked at it. He knew his district, his pet "garden spot of the universe," better than all the cops on the beat put together. He knew which factory was pouring out smoke that was dirtying Mrs. McCann's Monday wash, and whether the gas works were ready to put on or lay off men. It paid off in political dividends. Pete was proud of Greenpoint, and Greenpoint was proud of him, until neither Mr. McGuinness nor his candidates ever had to fear defeat.

It was not always that way. When he entered politics, in 1919, James A. McQuade—later to be known for the "34 starving McQuades" who ate up his income, he said—was leader of the district. Pete started by running for alderman, defeating Mr. McQuade's candidate, and 5 years later he took on Mr. McQuade himself, and won.

He was elected member of the Democratic State committee from the Old Fifteenth A. D. in Brooklyn, the Greenpoint district, over Mr. McQuade despite the fact that John H. McCooey, then at the height of his power as county boss, favored Mr. McQuade's reelection. He fought Mr. McQuade year after year, until Mr. McCooey recognized him as leader, and Mr. McQuade, in 1932, gave up the ghost.

Mr. McGuinness had started with a club at Meserole and Manhattan Avenues, but as he and his organization prospered in the district, the Greepoint People's Regular Democratic Organization, as it was known, moved into a new clubhouse on Norman Avenue. It remained the center of politics in Greenpoint from that time on.

TESTIFIED IN SEABURY INQUIRY

When Pete testified in the Seabury investigation and then stepped down off the witness stand, Mr. Seabury stepped forward and shook his hand. Pete had acquitted himself well. He admitted, all right, that he had once had a gambling game going in his club, and gave a spirited description of the scene when the place was raided by the police, but he convinced Mr. Seabury that he ran the game only to keep all the boys from going over to Mr. McQuade's place. And when it

came to finances, Pete put his bankbooks on the table, and even funds left over from a primary campaign, which might have been used for the leader's private purposes, were in special accounts, ready for inspection.

He never missed an opportunity to make an entrance, make a remark, or make something for Greenpoint. He fought for years to save its ferry, and when that was gone, he fought just as hard to get built the Meeker Avenue bridge connecting his section of Brooklyn with Queens.

It was his sense of publicity which led him to invite Frederick McMonnies' and much-disputed "Fat Boy," the statue of Civic Virtue, to be transported from City Hall Park to McCarren Park. That was in Mayor Fiorello H. LaGuardia's time. Years before, in his first term as member of the Board of Aldermen, he had actually proposed a city ordinance which would have prevented women from smoking in public. The ordinance never actually got out of committee, but somehow the police department thought it had passed and began enforcement of the drive.

Pete later centered his fire on prohibition, demanding that Police Commissioner Enright's special squad enforcing prohibition turn its talents elsewhere, to crime and accident prevention.

Pete went up the political ladder rapidly, after he left the old board of aldermen, to sheriff and register of Kings County, and, after the register's office was abolished, he became assistant commission of borough works, a job which did not take much of Pete's time, but preserved his official dignity. He never lost that dignity, either.

He was a powerfully built man, just short of 6 feet, weighing close to 240 pounds, with big blue eyes, and hair that turned white while he was in his early fifties.

Born in Greenpoint, June 29, 1888, he had worked since he was 6 years old, running errands and rushing the growler, so that he was known to all long before he ran for office or was old enough to vote. He quit school when he was 14, and never went back. R. H. Hoe & Co. knew him as a press worker when he was still in his teens. After that he was a bouncer in a bar on a steamboat, a middleweight fighter, and, finally, a boss of the longshoremen, before he entered politics.

Americans All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Dr. Daniel A. Poling that appeared in the New York Post on June 10, 1948:

AMERICANS ALL
(By Dr. Daniel Poling)

"Am I intolerant just because I stick to my convictions?" A fair question it is, and the answer should be direct, and here is my answer.

The man who does not stick to his convictions is not capable of true tolerance. Intolerance is first of all disloyalty to the "royal" in yourself. It is a sin against your own integrity before it is a wrong against another. You are never intolerant merely because you are true to your own convictions—not unless you disregard the convictions of others who wish to stick to theirs.

Voltaire stated an eternal truth when he said, "I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it."

As to sticking to your convictions: If you are really going to stick when your convictions are challenged, then you must be intelligent in your loyalty, you must have the reason for your belief and you must justify your faith. I have discovered that I cannot be intelligently loyal to what I hold dear unless I understand in some measure at least my neighbor's loyalties—why he believes what he believes.

I am at least a better man today than I otherwise would have been because of the lives I have touched in every race and faith. My heart has been strengthened and my mind enriched by the loyalties of my friends. Fundamentally, intolerance is ignorance, ignorance not only of the mind put of the world. We are only free when we know truth.

But I do not like the word "tolerance." The longer I live the more intolerant I become of mere tolerance. In the field of human relations I want more than tolerance and I would give more. I want friendship and mutual high regard and to have these I must give them.

The Evolving Role of Congress in Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as we all recall, Mr. Benjamin V. Cohen was the counsel of the State Department when the Honorable James F. Byrnes was Secretary of State. Mr. Cohen was a close adviser of Secretary Byrnes, and accompanied Secretary Byrnes on many of his important missions to international conferences.

On April 22 last Mr. Cohen addressed the American Philosophical Society at Philadelphia on the subject of the evolving role of Congress in foreign affairs. It is a most interesting address emphasizing the fact that Congress should have a larger measure in our foreign policy, and in carrying out our foreign affairs.

I find that the address exceeds by one-half page the space allowed for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have had an estimate of cost made of printing the address, which is $177.50. So I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the additional cost the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EVOLVING ROLE OF CONGRESS IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

I

In considering the evolving role of Congress in foreign affairs, it is natural to think of that role in the light of the grave responsibility cast upon our country by the changes resulting from the recent World War. Even before the last cataclysmic war, however, serious thinkers, in this country as in other democratic countries, were giving their attention to the growing need not only of democratic control of foreign policy but also of democratic participation in the shaping of foreign policy which in the modern world affects the well-being of the people as much as or even more than the domestic program of government.

In his stimulating little book on Diplomacy, published in 1939, the eminent British publicist, Mr. Harold Nicolson, writes:

"Before the war of 1914–1918 the ordinary elector in Great Britain, in the Dominions and in the United States took but a spasmodic interest in international relations. * * * There was a feeling that foreign affairs was a specialized and esoteric study, the secrets of which lay beyond the scope of the ordinary layman's experience or judgment. And there was a tendency to leave the conduct of foreign policy to the Cabinet and its attendant experts * * *.

"The war of 1914–1918 did much to change this negative or acquiescent attitude. On the one hand it was realized that a country might be committed (without its full knowledge, deliberation and approval) to policies involving definite pledges to foreign powers. And that if a major crisis arose, the people might be faced overnight by the alternative of having to repudiate promises which had been made in their name or else to plunge into hostilities. On the other hand it was known that modern warfare is not confined in its effects to those professional soldiers and sailors who of their own free will have selected the profession of arms; but that it entails upon every individual citizen anxious ordeals, heavy anxieties and appalling dangers."

The recent war has greatly increased, in democratic countries, the demand of the people who bear the brunt and agony of modern warfare for a more direct and more compelling voice in the determination of policies upon which the issue of war or peace may depend.

II

Under the Constitution the President has power to make treaties, "by and with the advice and consent of" two-thirds of the Senate. But our national commitments in the field of international relations are by no means limited to treaties. Since the beginning of the Republic, policies of vital importance have been promulgated by the President with the concurrence of a majority of both Houses of Congress, and significant international commitments have been made by Executive agreement or declaration without express congressional agreement. (See John Sloane Dickey, Our Treaty Procedure Versus Our Foreign Policies (25 Foreign Affairs, 357; April 1947).) Indeed, it has been noted that while this country has in its history, been party to some 850 treaties, it has effectuated more than 1,400 international agreements by Executive agreement with or without legislative action. (See McClure, International Exective Agreements (New York, 1941), pp. 3–4; MacDougall and Lans, Treaties and Executive Agreements, 54 Yale Law Journal 181, 262 (1945); Borchard, Executive Agreements, a Reply, 54 Yale Law Journal 616, 626–627 (1945).)

Principle and precedent would seem to indicate that the authority of Congress, within the broad sweep of its legislative powers, to direct or sanction international arrangements is virtually coextensive with the authority of the Senate by two-thirds vote to ratify such arrangements (Cf. *U. S.* v. *Curtiss Wright Export Corporation*, 299 U. S. 304). Certainly, in the rapidly moving modern world, where governmental action must be prompt to be effective, and positive significance is often attached to nonaction, the formal procedure for treaty ratification by two-thirds of the Senate has become anachronistic. Besides being less democratic and representative, that cumbersome procedure tends to strengthen intransigent minorities rather than to unite the country and to assure the broadest possible support for a truly national foreign policy. In fact, with

a few notable exceptions, such as the Charter of the United Nations, the Treaty of Versailles, and the recent peace treaties, legislative authorization or approval by a majority of both Houses of Congress has become the more normal procedure for making effective the most important arrangements with other countries. This more flexible procedure for the democratic control of our foreign policy has been used, for example, in the case of the reciprocal trade agreements, the Bretton Woods agreements for the International Bank and the International Monetary Fund, the lend-lease agreements, the Greek and Turkish aid agreements, and more recently Secretary Marshall's European recovery program.

The requirement that treaties be ratified by two-thirds of the Senate has, in practice, been largely frittered away. What if anything remains of it is likely to prove an obstacle to, rather than a safeguard of, the effective democratic control of our foreign policy. It is noteworthy that Secretary Hull in his memoirs reaffirms his belief in a constitutional amendment that would scrap the two-thirds rule in favor of a simple majority. Such an amendment would eliminate any lingering doubt as to the plenitude of congressional power in the conduct of foreign relations, and would allay misgivings as to the propriety and effectiveness of less formal agreements, which might, in a critical emergency, create serious embarrassment for our country.

There are, of course, occasions when the President must act on his own responsibility. From Jefferson's purchase of Louisiana and President Monroe's enunciation of the important doctrine which bears his name to President Roosevelt's transfer of destroyers for bases and his agreements for the defense of Greenland and Iceland, there have been numerous instances, even when the country was formally at peace, when the President, without awaiting formal congressional action, entered into important international agreements necessary to protect the national interests in a pressing emergency. Compare, also, *U. S.* v. *Belmont* (301 U. S. 324), *U. S.* v. *Pink* (315 U. S. 203). In making a vitally significant declaration or entering into an important executive engagement, the President must, however, be very conscious of the fact that unless a majority of the Congress is willing to accept or acquiesce in his action, the accomplishment of the purposes of his declaration or engagement is likely to be thwarted.

Similarly, moral and sometimes legal commitments will arise from votes cast on the instruction of the President or Secretary of State in various organs of the United Nations or of other international organizations of which we have recently become a member. But most if not all of these commitments will involve congressional action at some stage for their full honoring or effective fulfilment.

III

But more important than the formal procedures for legislative control of foreign policy is the need for democratic cooperation in the shaping of the substance of that foreign policy. The power to restrain is not sufficient when action, often prompt action over a wide field, is imperative. The Executive may by its unilateral action put Congress and the country on the spot, and Congress and the country may not, simply by refusing to go along, be able readily to get off the spot. Congress can embarrass the Executive by ill-advised action or by the withholding of appropriations. But deadlocks do not create policy and splitting differences can frequently result in a policy which is difficult of any rational defense. Doubts as to how our Government will act or whether it will act at all can gravely imperil not only our leadership and influence but our own security in this dangerously interdependent world. As former Secretary of State Byrnes has said: "Twice in our generation doubt as to American foreign policy has led other nations to miscalculate the consequences of their actions. Twice in our generation that doubt as to American foreign policy has not brought peace, but war." (Address before American Club, Paris, October 3, 1946.)

With our abandonment of the policy of isolationism, the executive branch requires the constant and continuing support of Congress to carry out its responsibilities in foreign affairs. This support can be obtained only by constant and continuing cooperation between the two great branches of our Government.

It is one thing, of course, to recognize the need of cooperation between the executive and legislative branches and quite another thing to devise the means of effectuating that cooperation. The latter task is particularly difficult for us under a constitution framed on the principle of the separation of powers. In countries having a cabinet form of government, where executive leadership and legislative leadership are merged, the task, generally speaking, is much easier. If the cabinet cannot maintain its support in the parliament, it ceases to be the cabinet. With us the leadership of the executive branch is not only distinct from the leadership of Congress, but even the authority of congressional leaders to speak for the Congress is amorphous and uncertain. Individual Members of Congress are very jealous of their own independence and often are lacking in any appreciation of their collective responsibility. There is rivalry at times between the two Houses, between committees of the two Houses, and between committees of the same House. The weight given to seniority in committee assignments and advancements does not always bring to committee leadership those best able to give or to secure cooperation. Members of the Congress are inclined to forget at times that the actual administration of foreign affairs subject to the law of the land is the constitutional function of the executive branch. Congress at times is not content to lay down sensible standards and rules to guide the executive branch, but tries to control the minutiae of administration. A hamstrung administration is seldom an effective administration. Effective liaison between the executive branch and Congress is not easy. It was commonly remarked during the last war that some of our very important war leaders had to spend so much time with congressional committees that they had scarcely time to take care of their own executive work.

But these difficulties—real as they are, and dangerously obstructive to the realization of an effective foreign policy as they at times are—must not be exaggerated. The Members of Congress, as well as the members of the executive branch, want to serve the best interests of their country. Recalcitrance in the Congress may represent recalcitrance of important segments of public opinion. Democratic cooperation in foreign affairs cannot be secured by mere formal observance of congressional etiquette. It can be achieved only on the basis of an informed understanding, with adequate opportunity for informed and constructive criticism.

No one will deny that in the difficult problems of foreign affairs and national security we must to an increasing degree rely upon the expert opinion and on the professional knowledge of the trained civil servant and the military specialist. But, as "A. E." (George William Russell), the Irish publicist, has said, "the expert should be on tap, but not on top." While some politicians in their ignorance may be scornful of the knowledge of the expert, some experts, with their specialized knowledge, may be ignorant of the human forces and considerations which give democracy its strength. Experts and specialists in the field of international relations can learn much from Congress. It must be remembered that many Members of the Congress in questioning the opinion of the expert are trying not to obstruct constructive action, but rather to find ways and means to make constructive action acceptable and understandable to the people they represent.

In addition to a general recognition of the need for receptiveness to cooperation and joint action, I would note several specific practices which, in my opinion, are conducive to effective democratic action on foreign policy. I would note first that cooperation between the Executive and Congress must take into account the facts of our political life. One such fact is the two-party system. And it is fortunate that in recent years there has been a growing recognition of the need for a bipartisan foreign policy.

A bipartisan foreign policy in fact fits in more readily with our two-party system than might be apparent on first impression. It is the splinter-party systems that foster the sharpest divisions on party lines. Under our two-party system, neither party can afford to take extreme positions on highly controversial issues. Both parties are under compulsion to strive for the support of people of differing views on important issues. Consequently, the competition between our two major parties is not to sharpen divisions among our people but to develop programs that will have the greatest common appeal.

Democratic support of foreign policy necessarily involves democratic control of foreign policy. The purpose of bipartisan collaboration in foreign policy is not and should not be to circumvent democratic control of foreign policy, but to promote effective democratic participation in shaping that policy. Its purpose is not to eliminate public discussion or criticism, but, rather, to render our foreign policy less vulnerable to criticism in democratic debate. A bipartisan international policy can, and will, succeed only if there is genuine bipartisan collaboration in the development of that policy. So far as is practicable, therefore, the leaders of both parties should be consulted before, and not after, important decisions and declarations are made, just as there should be consultation on important congressional programs before, and not after, they are submitted. Of course, in event of genuine difference on basic principles, political leaders must accept the responsibilities of leadership. There must be no bipartisan deals to deprive the people in a democracy of their right to control the foreign policy of the Nation.

While the actual conduct of foreign relations must be the responsibility of the President, the inclusion of congressional leaders in delegations to major international conferences is of the greatest importance. Working with the Executive on such delegations, congressional leaders learn at first hand the problems of the other branch, and State Department officials and experts learn that congressional leaders are not prima donnas or rubber stamps; that they, too, know how to work and share responsibility. Certainly the active participation of Senator VANDENBERG and Senator CONNALLY in the United Nations Assembly and the Council of Foreign Ministers has been most helpful in forging powerful bonds of cooperation between the executive branch and the Congress. I regret that in the last year there has been a tendency to omit congressional leaders from our delegations to the United Nations Assembly and to other important conferences.

Of course, it should not be necessary to note, cooperation in this respect is a two-way street. While it is important that the President and Secretary of State should not take important action in the field of foreign policy without consultation with congressional leaders, it is equally important that congressional leaders and congressional committees should not take a stand on important questions without consultation with the executive branch. It is not always easy for

public men to recede from positions publicly taken, and the policy of prior consultation should be adhered to by the legislative as well as the executive branch of our Government.

In addition to a cooperative attitude and sympathetic understanding of their joint task in the formulation of foreign policy, both Congress and the Executive can take steps to improve their respective roles, and to increase their awareness and sensitivity to considered, intelligent, and disinterested opinion. No branch of government, and no professional or specialized service thereof, can assume to have a monopoly of wisdom or of virtue. Congress has very materially helped itself to become more effective in its increasingly important role in foreign affairs by the enactment of the LaFollette-Monroney Congressional Reorganization Act. That act makes it possible for the standing committees to have efficient and competent staffs. These trained staffs of the important committees should, of course, concentrate upon the sifting and elucidation of the important issues that the committees must pass upon, and avoid the temptation of trying to function as a competing State Department or National Defense Department. That does not mean that the staffs should not be in a position to make available to Members of Congress ideas and views other than those originating in the executive departments. But it is their task to be expositors rather than advocates.

Congress can also on occasion be greatly helped by seeking disinterested advice from those in private life who are specially qualified to give it. Thus, for example, Senator VANDENBERG requested the Brookings Institution to make a special report to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the administrative provisions of the European recovery program and this report greatly facilitated agreement on these provisions by the committee and later by the Congress.

The importance of expert congressional staffs, and expert independent advice, cannot be exaggerated. Democratic cooperation in foreign affairs can and should be something more than the rubber stamping of departmental recommendations and something more than a compromise between the shallow amateurism of uninformed minds and the combined professionalism of the specialized services. A truly informed congressional viewpoint frequently can constructively revise a departmental viewpoint so as to make the latter less vulnerable to popular attack and less offensive to deeply rooted feelings of important segments of public opinion. Departmental specialists not familiar with the working of Congress are often inclined to believe that Congress gives excessive weight to minority opinion; Members of Congress sometimes feel, not without reason, that the departmental specialists, when they cannot fully meet a minority viewpoint, are inclined to ignore it completely. Few Members of Congress would consciously support a minority viewpoint against what they conceive to be the best interests of the country. But most Members of Congress realize, what specialists, in their zeal to defend their own programs, sometimes forget, that democratic majorities are usually aggregations of minorities. The success of democratic cooperation in foreign affairs in the long run rests not upon our ability to get a majority vote on this measure or that measure, but on keeping our people as united as possible on the basic principles of our foreign policy. Congress can make its greatest contribution to this end with the assistance of independent experts who can understand and explain the position of the departmental specialists without being committed to support that position as if it were holy writ.

Of course, to make foreign policy more responsive to democratic forces requires a conscious striving to that end by the executive departments as well. It would probably facilitate constructive democratic cooperation in our foreign policy if more deliberate effort was made to fill the important political or policy-making offices in the State Department and National Defense Department such as the Under Secretaryship, and Assistant Secretaryship with men of wide and active experience in public affairs rather than those with technical administrative experience or men from the career service. This is not to say that there should not be places of equal rank, dignity, and compensation for trained administrators and permanent public servants.

Indeed, there might well be an office of Permanent Under Secretary of State which should be held only by a ranking Foreign Service officer. But it seems to me a doubtful practice to have career men, at least while they are in the career service, in high political office. It accentuates the tendency, however unjustified, of the public and of some Members of the Congress, to think of the State Department or the National Defense Department as a collection of specialists out of touch with the average American's feeling and thinking. Our career Foreign Service, like the armed services, includes men of real ability, devotion, and character. They have great knowledge and they give their views, as is their duty, honestly and fearlessly. But as permanent public servants they should not be charged with the final determination of policy. When career men become the final arbiters of policy, their ability to give disinterested and objective advice may be seriously affected; at least, their ability to do so will be subject to serious question. Members of any specialized service have to work as a team, and their promotion depends upon their cooperativeness. It is a healthy safeguard for the Foreign Service and the armed services that they should test their thinking against that of men brough up closer to the thinking of the people.

During the war a great number of specialists, mainly with academic background but not trained in the Foreign Service, were brought into the State Department on special assignments. Tenseness would at times be evident in the relation between these men and the career officers, but their cooperation was, I am convinced, of great help to both groups. Many of the academic group have now returned to their universities and colleges, but their experience in the State Department will not only have marked effect on their own work, but will aid them in fostering a better understanding of our international problems in their respective communities. And that understanding in turn will affect the attitudes of Congressmen from those communities. It would, I think, be advantageous both for our universities and the State Department if exchange arrangements could be worked out so that some of our Foreign Service men could give our universities the benefit of their experience, and some of the academic specialists could give the State Department the benefit of their learning.

As with Congress, the executive branch can effectively advance democratic cooperation in the shaping of our foreign policy by enlisting the assistance of groups of representative and specially qualified citizens outside the regular Government services. In the making of special studies on the problems of the peace and world organization, Secretary Hull and Under Secretary Welles had the benefit of weekly meetings with a committee composed of important Senators and Representatives, prominent and informed leaders of public opinion, and State Department officials. Close liaison with numerous public groups interested in the formation of the United Nations at the San Francisco Conference undoubtedly faciliated the ratification of the Charter.

The constructive proposals for the control of atomic energy submitted by Mr. Baruch to the Security Council were based in large part on the work of the Acheson-Lilienthal committee which had the assistance of a panel of specially qualified industrialists and scientists. Likewise the work of the Harriman committee composed of important industrialists and economists contributed much to the acceptance of the European recovery program by Congress and the public. The Compton Commission appointed by the President to consider universal military training and the Finletter committee appointed to consider a national air policy have likewise contributed toward a better public understanding of these difficult and important problems. While these committees have given great weight to the work done by the departmental staffs, they have in no sense been mere window dressing. Their effectiveness has come from reviewing and reshaping the recommendations of the specialists so that they would have a better chance of public acceptance.

If we are to have democratic cooperation in international affairs, both Congress and the executive branch should be in a position to tap a deep reservoir of disciplined thinking outside the governmental services. There is a saying, attributed at times to Lloyd George and at times to Clemenceau, that the waging of war is too important to be left to the generals. Certainly in a democracy matters of international policy and national security are too important to be left exclusively to the thinking of any one group of civil servants or military specialists. Under the most favorable circumstances the scope for individuality and the development of new ideas and procedures in the specialized services is subject to severe limitations. With the future of the civilized world at stake we need to draw upon all our resources of independent scholarship and research to make sure that we have not overlooked and neglected lines of thought of inestimable value.

The extent to which access to matters genuinely of top secrecy is necessary to informed thinking on problems of international affairs and national security can easily be exaggerated.

There is an urgent and pressing call for independent thinking and inquiry into these matters upon which the fate of mankind depends. We must not be afraid to examine and reexamine the premises and the strategy of our struggle for peace, freedom, and human dignity. We must not be content with but one plan or strategy. We must have alternative plans and strategies available in case of need. We must not only constantly test the soundness and worthiness of our objectives but the effectiveness of the means chosen to achieve those objectives.

We need independent thinking and research not with a view to supporting or rejecting particular policies, but with a view to hewing to the line of truth and letting the chips fall where they may. For this sort of independent thinking and research we need the full-time, not the merely casual, efforts of our best thinkers and researchers. This is a challenge to our universities and research foundations not to enter into politics and propaganda, but to increase and fructify our knowledge.

If we acquire the necessary knowledge, I do not doubt the ability of our people to absorb that knowledge, or the willingness of Congress to utilize that knowledge in the effective fullfilment of its evolving role in international affairs. The public and the Congress have indeed responded with surprising alacrity to such revolutionary ideas as lend-lease and the European recovery program. An informed public opinion probably has a greater appreciation of the significance of the United Nations than, unfortunately, have powerful elements in the executive and legislative branches. But every new day raises again the terrifying question, whether we have out of our accumulated wisdom developed the ideas necessary for our salvation. Congress needs not propaganda or pressure but full information

as to the facts and the best thought that our richly endowed democracy can provide.

BENJAMIN V. COHEN.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 22, 1948.*

Carter Glass

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 21 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. CARTER GLASS, late a Senator from the State of Virginia

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, books have been written on the life and career of CARTER GLASS, of Virginia. They may be found in virtually every library in this broad country. His deed of public service are documented in the archives of his State and Nation. His great achievements already have taken their position in our history.

His record as an American and a statesman speaks for itself, and I do not presume that anything I could say would add to its brilliance. At this time and place I would prefer to think of Senator GLASS as a man who was my friend. Memory of my friendship with him is among my most cherished possessions, and I shall be eternally grateful for the privilege of fellowship with this wonderful man in whom nature truly succeeded.

We who knew him are better citizens for the acquaintance, for he surely was one of the great Americans of his time—a copy of none, but the personification of the dignity of the individual.

He was the freest man I ever knew. His fine talents sprang from a great soul, and his tender heart was the only limitation upon his independence. Without exaggeration he was the most beloved Member of the Senate of the United States.

He was a man whose work in Congress brought from President Wilson an expression of hope that the whole country appreciates the work you have done at something like its real value. He was always a leader among his friends, and none respected him more than his adversaries.

He was a man to whom family, home, church, State, country, and democracy were words of magnificent virtue. In millions of homes throughout America his name stood for the highest type of political official—a gentleman unafraid; a statesman whose life and character inspired those who still believed a man could be elected and reelected to public office and remain true to his character, convictions, and patriotic impulses in the discharge of public duty.

He was a man of capacity and perseverance characteristic of those who have made this Nation great. With little formal education, he was described by a great educator at an ancient college as a man who had reached a position of distinction and eminence which placed him above the powers of others either to add to his honor or detract from his fame.

He was a man of great and varied achievements and yet, in the words of a colleague in the Senate, his greatest contribution probably was his example to youth—his example of idealism, devotion to duty, and mental and spiritual morality. His character, I know, was carved out of the unblemished granite of truth and loyalty and sincerity. His were a private life and a public career which we may proudly hold up for emulation and tribute by our children for generations to come.

These are some of the characteristics which stimulated my admiration for my friend CARTER GLASS. My admiration was exceeded only by my love and devotion for him. I can think of my close and intimate association with him only with deep emotion. I cannot recall even a short period in his presence which was not an inspiration.

Virginia—his State, and mine—has committed many great men to the service of their country, and CARTER GLASS has a high place among them. His stature will grow even greater with the passing of time.

His State honored him time and again with public office; President Wilson honored him with appointment to his Cabinet as Secretary of the Treasury; the Senate of the United States honored him with election as its President pro tempore; his home district honored him with repeated election to Congress; his city honored him with local office; his State senatorial district honored him with election to the Virginia General Assembly; he was honored as a leader in the State's constitutional convention of 1901; the Democratic Party in Virginia twice honored him with endorsement as its choice for President of the United States. And, he honored all of them by his unfailing discharge of public trust.

Yet, with all of the honor won by his high accomplishments and distinguished service to State and Nation, I am sure that the source of his greatest satisfaction was the love and confidence of his own people in Virginia, and especially his neighbors in Lynchburg where he was born in 1858, and his associates on the newspapers which he published there. He knew the fiber of these Virginians for he had known the hardships of their families. He had seen his beloved Virginia recover from the ravages of civil war which had been fought over its fertile lands, and he worked with his neighbors and constituents in the reconstruction of their lives and homes.

From his experiences of the reconstruction era, in some respects more terrible than war itself, I believe, came the capacity for straight thinking and progressive and fearless leadership for which Senator GLASS became known in every quarter of the country.

He had his critics, but even when they disagreed they never accused him of serving any motive save that which he thought was best for his country and his countrymen. And, while his forthrightness frequently caused criticism to be concentrated, he was never long without vindicaiton. This was true in his flight for the Federal Reserve Act. It was true in his advocacy of Wilson's new freedom. It was true with his demand for stock control, the predecessor of the Securities and Exchange Act. It was true throughout his long and useful career.

In many cases costly national mistakes would have been averted if his judgment had been followed in the first instance, for he possessed insight which made him rebel against those things detrimental to his Nation and its citizens. He proved the paradox that one can be a great liberal and a great conservative at the same time.

He was a liberal who always favored improvement of the Nation's economic and political life, yet he was a conservative who was unwilling to advocate impracticable measures having political expediency as their primary objective and waste and extravagance as their inherent characteristics. He was a liberal who opposed concentration of power. He was a conservative who fought to conserve for the States those powers and rights which are properly theirs. He was a liberal who demanded freedom of speech, freedom of press, and freedom of religion for all regardless of their political or religious views. He was a conservative who did not hesitate to defend fundamental rights of individuals when they were endangered by packed courts, who did not hesitate to denounce every effort to reduce the legislative body to dependency upon the executive.

Some of his more recent critics called him reactionary, but they were indulging merely in name-calling, for Senator GLASS was fighting entrenched privilege and greed almost before they were born. Those who knew him best knew he was always fighting for constructive progress consistent with his philosophy that true liberalism worthy of the name must be based upon conservative fiscal policies.

As chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee he worked heroically toward this end. That his efforts for economy were largely unsuccessful was no fault of his, but here again vindication is forthcoming.

As his friend and colleague, I rededicate myself today to the great principles for which he stood so valiantly at all times. He was surely a great patriot who, with his eloquent wisdom, fought a full lifetime to preserve the doctrine laid down by his Virginia predecessors:

> That no free government, or the blessings of liberty, can be preserved to any people but by a firm adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, frugality, and virtue and by frequent recurrence to fundamental principles.

Such a man indeed was CARTER GLASS—worthy of all veneration by the Senate of the United States assembled, and by his fellow countrymen everywhere. Yet, if he were here he would be genuinely embarrassed by our praise of his integrity, independence, and courage. With typical humility he said he regarded these traits as virtues of the common man. "In all my life, day in and day out," he said on one occasion, "I have never done anything but what I would expect and what should be expected of the average man of good sense and good character."

That is the challenge he has left with us and, as we pause here in his memory, I know he would have us reflect upon it.

We who would serve our country best would truly serve his memory most.

John Thomas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a tribute to the late Senator John Thomas, of Idaho, by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As a freshman Senator in January 1941, I first met our late friend, Senator John Thomas of Idaho. He was then serving his third term, having been first appointed to complete the term of the late Senator Borah, and then having been twice elected by the people of Idaho. We became fast friends, and when he was called in death, I was glad to be among those who accompanied the funeral party to his home State and to pay my respects to a man who had done noble service to his State and the Nation.

John Thomas was a real man. He was always kindly and most gracious, a gentleman of the old school. He spoke only when he was speaking from the heart. He was a pioneer of the West, and felt most sincerely that our Nation needed the development of western resources to sustain its strength for future trials. As an ardent supporter of the development of western resources he envisioned far better than most of us the opportunities and the responsibilities of the great Northwest in the growth of our Nation.

Senator John Thomas was a man of the very highest integrity. He was one with whom it was a genuine pleasure to be associated, whether as a Member of the Senate, as a neighbor and business associate, or as a member of the week-end golf foursome.

His first thoughts were always of his family, of whom he was always most proud. His approach to proposed measures was truly statesmanlike. He arrived at his decisions through an analysis of their effect on the everyday life of his friends and acquaintances. He knew then what effect they would have on his country.

Our Nation needs more men in our Congress whose courage, capacity and quality of service and character can compare to that of our departed friend, John Thomas of Idaho.

Address by Hon. Scott W. Lucas, of Illinois, at Connecticut Democratic State Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered last evening by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] at the Democratic State Convention at Hartford, Conn.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It was gratifying to receive your gracious invitation to come here tonight to say a few words to this convention of the representatives of the Democratic Party in the State of Connecticut. Let me assure you that it is a great pleasure to be here—and not only because I feel a deep sense of kinship with fellow Democrats everywhere but also because it gives me the opportunity to escape for a little while from the hectic atmosphere of a negative Congress which is driving hard to adjourn.

I stand before you tonight with a keen sense of the wonders and glories of your great State. Connecticut, like my native Illinois, is today composed of people of nearly every racial origin and every kind of religious creed—people who migrated from Europe to add their strength to the strength of the pioneer stock which came here to create out of the American Revolution our beloved country. The great spiritual lesson which the United States has taught the world is that people of every kind from all corners of the earth can live together in harmony and can prosper together providing only that they love democracy enough to practice real democracy. Nowhere is this lesson more easily learned than in your State of Connecticut and in my Illinois. We all fervently hope that the nations of the world will profit from our experience and that they will learn to live together free of the shadow of war.

It has been said that Connecticut has sent out more people than it has kept at home. Connecticut blood is the basis of much that is held dear in many of our States. Connecticut pioneer stock can be found in families all over the country.

No State was more vigorous in its support of the American Revolution. Every schoolboy is thrilled to learn of the glorious exploits of your Revolutionary hero, Nathan Hale. The Declaration of Independence bears the signatures of four of Connecticut's great men. It was here that Yankee ingenuity and inventiveness laid the foundation of a prosperous industrial State and the enormous contribution to the war effort which you made during the last war. Yes; this is, in truth, a State which represents all that is fine in America.

Connecticut has produced remarkable statesmen, many of whom have now gone to their reward. When I think of those who are now carrying on for God and county, I am immediately reminded of the former national chairman of the Democratic Party and former great Attorney General of the United States, the honorable Homer Cummings. Before leaving Washington, I talked with him about this convention. He regrets, of course, that he cannot be here, but requested that I convey to his many friends in this great State his greetings and good wishes for a successful convention. The Honorable BRIEN MCMAHON who now serves in the United States Senate with me, I count among my dearest friends. It has been my great pleasure to have been associated with him in many legislative battles. No State could want a more devoted or a more far-sighted representative. I hope the whole country understands the debt it owes to him for his untiring efforts in connection with the legislation dealing with the use and control of atomic energy. At a crucial time, he stepped in to lead the battle for wise and sound legislation, so that America and the world might profit to the utmost from this amazing scientific discovery.

We meet here today in the shadow of the most important national election to be held in this country since 1932. That was the year which gave us a leader who carried us out of a Republican depression. I wonder if we will ever forget that year. Who can forget the breadlines, the apple sellers, the closed banks, the misery and distress of the whole American people? Our free-enterprise system was staggering. By a series of carefully planned reforms and emergency measures, the Democratic administration gradually brought this country out of the depression. The man who saved the free-enterprise system for America and who may well have saved free enterprise throughout the world was that man of iron courage and deep humanitarianism, the immortal President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

How does 1948 compare with 1932?

During the years since the close of the war, we have enjoyed the greatest prosperity in the history of the United States. More people are employed than ever before. More goods are pouring from our factories to satisfy the needs of our people. More profits are being earned than at any time since the beginning of the Republic. That, my friends, is the record made under the administration of the man chosen by Franklin D. Roosevelt as his running mate, the President of the United States, the Honorable Harry S. Truman.

President Truman has been confronted with problems on the domestic scene and on the international front which would tax the wisdom of a Solomon. Again and again he has shown the courage to meet the country's problems with calm deliberation and sound judgment.

Our country has become the leader of nations. We did not seek leadership. Our greatness and our power gave it to us. Our standard of living is the envy of every country in the world. This country needs the kind of leadership that will give us continued prosperity at home and peace for all time in the world. That is what the American people want, stated in the simplest terms. That is what they will get when they choose the candidates of the Democratic Party to lead them during the years which lie ahead.

My friends, this country must realize what I am sure all of us here realize, that America today faces the greatest challenge in its history.

Communist aggression threatens to dominate the whole European Continent and aspires to dominate the world. With lying slogans calling for revolutionary justice for the oppressed, the Communist movement seeks to exploit all of the forces of social discontent and frustration in every place in which it proposes to spread itself. When a man has not enough to eat, he will believe and follow any leader who promises him bread, although the Communist leader can only give him slavery.

How can we meet this terrible challenge to all we hold dear? The Marshall plan, if it is permitted to become fully effective, contains the answer to that question. We propose to rebuild Europe, west of the Soviet Union, into an economic and political force, independent of the Soviet Union, as well as ourselves. For it is the simple and unchallengeable truth that the recovery and reconstruction of Europe means the end of the Communist dream for dominating the whole of Europe. We have it within our grasp as a nation to achieve this result—to restore to health the whole European Continent and thus by peaceful and humanitarian means, to make the Russian bear harmless. That is the road to peace—that permanent peace so longed for by every American.

I wish I could report to you that Americans of all political views understand the importance of the Marshall plan to the future security of our country. As you know, the European recovery program is under deadly attack in spite of the fact that the Congress voted for it overwhelmingly. The Republican Party has never purged itself of those die-hard isolationists who have consistently

failed to understand that in the modern world American security is tightly bound with the security of the whole world.

In spite of Congress' expressed intention to support vigorously the President's program for European recovery, the House Appropriations Committee, under the leadership of Representative JOHN TABER, has driven a dagger into the heart of the program. That committee has mercilessly slashed the funds requested by the President for the operation of the program. In order to understand what Mr. TABER and his committee are up to, it is only necessary to read the reactions of the Communist press of Europe. Those newspapers have lost no time in capitalizing on the action of the Appropriations Committee as evidence of how foolish it is for any country to depend upon the promises of the United States. Communist newspaper headlines read: "The Marshall plan cheap"—"Who can trust Washington?"

My friends, I cannot imagine any single action which Congress could take which would do more to advance the cause of world communism. The isolationists in Congress once more find themselves in the position of being bedfellows of the Communists, as they once found themselves the bedfellows of the Fascists. An aroused America must root out this terribly mistaken idea of isolationism before it is too late.

It is not only the isolationists who menace the success of the European recovery program. The dreamy-eyed followers of Henry Wallace—the willing stooges of the International Communist movements—have expressed their unalterable opposition to the Marshall plan. My friends, how any true liberal in this country could support Henry Wallace is beyond understanding. A vote for Henry Wallace is a vote thrown away. A vote for Henry Wallace is a vote for the Kremlin. A vote for Henry Wallace is a vote for the reactionaries of America. The time has come for true liberals and independents to cast aside their emotions, resist demagogic appeals, and become realists by voting the Democratic ticket in November.

Tied up closely with the whole European recovery program is the foreign policy of this country as it affects the question of tariffs. The same isolationist Republican leadership which is bent on destroying the European recovery program is working to destroy the reciprocal trade agreements program. President Truman asked for renewal of legislation authorizing a continuance of this program as it has been in existence since 1934 for a period of 3 years. Republican leaders are trying to cut this extension down to 1 year, with crippling amendments which would cut the heart out of the program. However, the Democrats in the Senate will fight this move with all of the strength at their command. European recovery depends upon an enlightened policy with regard to tariffs. Every intelligent American understands that the trade agreements program is one of the cornerstones of our program to accomplish a lasting peace.

Within less than 5 short months, we will hold our national election. In one respect, that election will be different from any we have held since 1932. Ever since 1932, the Republican Party has run on the basis of promises. But this year that party will have to run on the basis of the record—the record which the Republican-dominated Congress has made in the last 2 years. The days of rosy promises are over. The voters are going to have a chance to take a long, hard look at that record before making up their minds. It does not seem too long ago that the statement was made, when the Republican Congress began its work, that they expected to open with a prayer and close with a probe. Well, they have probed and probed and probed. These great advocates of economy spent a huge sum of the taxpayers' money poking about into every nook and cranny of the Democratic administration and of the war years, hoping to find that one earth-shaking scandal on which they could ride to victory.

As a member of the Committee To Investigate the Pearl Harbor Disaster, I was a close witness to this Republican search for scandal. For week after tedious week, my duties on that committee required me to listen while high officials of our Government were subjected to merciless cross-examination. The same questions were repeated over and over again. A mountain of testimony was compiled. Anyone who has the patience and the time to wade through that testimony will come to the same conclusion to which the American people came; namely, that it was the Japs who bombed Pearl Harbor, not General Marshall.

Looking for greener pastures, the Republicans next looked westward to California and Mr. Howard Hughes. They thought they had a perfect opportunity, through Mr. Hughes, to smear not only our late President, but his family as well. The fur flew for awhile; but when the battle was over, the prosecuting attorney, Senator BREWSTER, wound up as the defendant, appealing to the people to believe his word instead of Mr. Hughes.

The Republican Party would have been more successful, I am sure, if they had done less probing and more praying.

The President called upon the Congress to take action to provide this country with decent and adequate housing for all the people. If you will look into the 1944 platform of the Republican Party, you will find that they promised the country adequate and decent housing. But, where is the housing legislation after 2 years of Republican control of the Congress? Well, it's in the same place that so much other progressive social legislation can be found. It is bottled up in the Republican-controlled House of Representatives.

What has happened to the program of Federal aid to education? Under this program, the Federal Government would assist the States in seeing to it that every American boy and girl gets a minimum education. Everyone agrees that this legislation is absolutely essential if we are to have an intelligent and enlightened people who are fit to choose their own leaders. We can be sure, however, that this bill, like the housing bill, will never see the light of day. It, too, is lying in a pigeonhole somewhere in the House of Representatives.

President Truman asked for a minimum wage of 75 cents an hour and for further expansion of the social security program, but the Republican leaders have made no move toward enacting these important humanitarian measures.

The President has again and again urged the Congress to do something about the high cost of living. Every time a housewife goes into the local grocery store, she is confronted with the problem of trying to make the dollar, which is daily shrinking in value, stretch over the mounting cost of feeding her family. This cannot go on indefinitely. Yet the leadership of the Republican Party has consistently refused to do anything about these soaring prices. They maintain a strange silence about the whole question. They hope that such silence can wish the problem out of existence.

Make no mistake about it, my friends. Inflation is creeping higher and higher every day. So far as it appears now, it will continue to mount unless the Congress is prepared to take action. The dollar which you spend today buys only 59 cents worth of what it would have bought 10 years ago. The savings of our people are shrinking fast under the impact of inflation.

The Federal Reserve Board made a study of the spending of American families and discovered that one-fourth of all American families are spending more than they are earning. This, my friends, is a fact which should shock the Congress into action. Of course, we can hardly expect action from the Republican leaders who destroyed the Government controls which kept the cost of living in check so well during the war.

My friends, this is a decisive year in the political and economic life of this Nation. It is a decisive year for the laboring man and his family. It was a Democratic administration which gave to labor its rightful place in the economic sun. Whether the laboring man continues to enjoy his hard-won economic blessings depends upon the interest he takes in the coming Presidential election. Every voter in the ranks of labor should exercise his right of franchise for the liberal candidates the Democratic Party will nominate.

It is the duty of not only the laboring man and woman, but of every good citizen to exercise his sacred franchise and to choose as the leaders of this country those who are pledged to carry out the principles of the Democratic Party—principles which will lead to security against war and the continuance of a high standard of living for every group in our population.

We know that as we move into this campaign, we will be under attack both from the right and from the left, but, remember this: the Democratic Party has the leadership, and we have the issues.

We have the solution for the do-nothing obstructionist attitude of the Republican leaders. Elect our liberal candidates to carry out the Roosevelt-Truman program, a program which places human rights above property rights. A vote for the Democratic Party is a vote for a strong, workable program at home and abroad—a program that can and will go into effect in the Eighty-first Congress.

We will not win our victory without hard work and good organization. We must not be diverted from our goal by the snipings of the reactionary forces on the one side and the attacks of the dreamy-eyed followers of Henry Wallace on the other. The only program of practical liberalism is the program of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman. To insure peace throughout the world and continued prosperity at home, we must have a Democratic Congress and a Democratic President.

John Thomas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a transcript of the memorial service of Senator John Thomas, at Gooding, Idaho, November 15, 1945.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MEMORIAL SERVICE OF SENATOR JOHN THOMAS, GOODING, IDAHO, NOVEMBER 15, 1945

Quartet, Lead Kindly Light (Charles Gee, Earl Whipkey, Bert Bowler, Leland Fleischman).

Scripture, Dr. J. Wesley Miller, Gooding, Idaho: "Death is a divine appointment—the door opens, and we enter immortality."

"And Jesus said, 'I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die.'

"The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms.

"The Lord is my light and salvation: whom shall I fear? The Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid?

"The righteous live forever, and the care of them is with the Most High: with His right hand He shall cover them, and with His arm shall He shield them.

"For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens."

Prayer of invocation, Rev. Irvin S. Motz, minister, First Methodist Church, Gooding, Idaho:

"Almighty God, fount of all life, Thou art our refuge and strength, Thou art our help in trouble. Enable us, we pray Thee, to put our trust in Thee, that we may obtain comfort, and find grace to help in this and every time of need. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

"Almighty God, our Father, from whom we come and unto whom our spirits return, Thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations. Thou art our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. Grant us Thy blessing in this hour and enable us to put our trust in Thee, so that our spirits may grow calm, and our hearts be comforted. Lift our eyes beyond the shadows of earth, and help us to see the light of eternity. So may we find grace and strength for this and every time of need; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Scripture, Psalm 90:

"Lord, Thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations. Before the mountains were brought forth, or even Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God. Thou turnest man to destruction; and sayest, Return, ye children of men. For a 1,000 years in Thy sight are but as yesterday when it is past, and as a watch in the night. Thou carriest them away as with a flood; they are as asleep: in the morning they are like grass which groweth up. In the morning it flourisheth, and groweth up; in the evening it is cut down, and withereth. For we are consumed by Thine anger, and by Thy wrath we are troubled. Thou hast set our iniquities before Thee, our secret sins in the light of Thy countenance.

"For all our days are passed away in Thy wrath: we spend our years as a tale that is told. The days of our years are threescore years and 10; and if by reason of strength they be fourscore years, yet is their strength labor and sorrow; for it is soon cut off, and we fly away.

"Who knoweth the power of Thine anger? even according to Thy fear, so is Thy wrath. So teach us to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom. Return, O Lord, how long? and let it repent Thee concerning Thy servants. O satisfy us early with Thy mercy; that we may rejoice and be glad all our days. Make us glad according to the days wherein Thou hast afflicted us, and the years wherein we have seen evil.

"Let thy work appear unto Thy servants, and Thy glory unto their children. And let the beauty of the Lord our God be upon us: and establish Thou the work of our hands upon us: yea, the work of our hands establish Thou it."

First Corinthians 15: 41–58:

"There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars; for one star differeth from another star in glory. So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption: it is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power: it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body.

"There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body. And so it is written: The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from Heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy: and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly.

"Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption. Behold, I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written.

"Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin: and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.

"And John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of Heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband.

"And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, 'Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them, and they shall be His people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God.

" 'And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes: and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away.'

'Jesus said: 'Let not your heart be troubled; ye believe in God, believe also in Me.

" 'In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you.

" 'I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also.' "

Eulogy, Dr. J. Wesley Miller, retired minister, and member of the Genesee Conference of the Methodist Church; a close friend of Senator John Thomas:

"Honorable Members of the Congress of the United States of America, His Excellency, the Governor of Idaho, other distinguished guests and friends here present:

"It is with conflicting emotions that I attempt to speak at this time a few words of tribute to the memory of our dear friend and honored statesman, John Thomas.

"Deeply do I feel the loss that has come to the Nation, to the State of Idaho, and to this immediate community, where he lived, and for which he did so much to promote its advancement in every way.

"However, in his going, it is a matter of great satisfaction to know that he has been called from his strenuous labors so faithfully performed, to his well-earned immortal reward.

"In an intimate personal acquaintanceship covering more than 30 years, I found Mr. Thomas to be affable, genial, candid, and at the same time, an earnest and intelligent man.

"Toward all great questions involving the interests of his fellow citizens, his attitude was easily ascertainable.

"He concealed nothing, and expressed his opinions with utmost candor, and with a force, which can come only as the result of an intense earnestness. He was reliable beyond all question, and as a public servant, he approximated the ideal.

"In politics Mr. Thomas was a Republican, and yet I feel it can safely be said of him that he was never a partisan in the offensive meaning of that word.

"Mr. Thomas was conservative in his judgments, a financier of oustanding ability, and in a very real sense an economist. His counsel was sought by many leaders in the State of Idaho and elsewhere on questions involving the better interests of agriculture, particularly the beet-sugar industry, irrigation, conservation, and finance.

"Mr. Thomas was in no sense an egotist and very seldom spoke of his own achievements. He possessed a well-poised enthusiasm for the interest of his community, his State, and the Nation. Nothing seemed too hard a task for him to undertake to better these several interests.

"We shall not soon forget the earnestness, the vigor, the persistency, and the tenacity which marked his efforts in behalf of the farmer, the stockman, and the furtherance of reclamation throughout Idaho. He never seemed to be discouraged, and nothing seemed to daunt him.

"Mr. Thomas was a firm believer that 'righteousness exalteth a nation.' I always found him ringing true in outstanding and challenging moral issues, though he was in no sense an extremist. While he did not affiliate himself with any particular church, he could always be depended upon to support the church in its aggressiveness for the betterment of mankind.

"During the lifetime of Gooding College he was a trustee of that institution and its treasurer for many years.

"Mr. Thomas was in principle opposed to war, and on more than one occasion prior to our entering upon World War II he discussed foreign issues with me, and told me how he earnestly hoped we would not have to enter the struggle because of its devastating results, both materially and physically.

"Nevertheless, once our Nation declared war it became his war, and he supported the Government in all its movements which he considered to be economically and efficiently sane.

"Mr. Thomas loved his home. It was there he could be found almost every evening when he was in the city. He was a consistent student and read very widely. He was a most affectionate husband and father.

"He was democratic in his attitudes, and at no time did his success in business or politics turn him aside from men in the more humble walks of life.

"As a friend I always found him understanding, kindly sympathetic, and ready to go the second mile in any time of need. I count his passing a distinct and irreparable personal loss. What Mr. Thomas was to me as a friend I am very confident he was to others of you, many of whom are here to pay tribute in memory of his long and distinguished public service.

"To summarize, the late Senator John Thomas was loyal to his friends, liberal in his views, independent in his opinions, courageous in his convictions, an aggressive fighter, an eloquent advocate, an earnest worker, a wise legislator.

"To all of this, I am confident, you, his colleagues here present, can, and do affectionately attest.

"Mr. Thomas was the embodiment of all the elements essential to the highest type of American citizenship, and the bright example of his life and work, may well serve as a guide-star for those of us he has left behind."

Senator C. WAYLAND BROOKS, of Illinois, spoke in behalf of the congressional delegation in his tribute.

"If you want to see a monument to John Thomas look around Idaho.

"He was rich in his devotion to duty, in his friendship, in idealism, in his courage, and the mark he has left on the educational, agricultural, commercial, and financial institutions of Idaho will carry on through all time as a living monument to a great man.

"We merely came to bring his earthly remains to his old home town and be present and participate in his burial as he would want it to be, among friends he loved so dearly, and the soil he loved so well—the friends and soil of Idaho.

"In honoring him, we of Congress truly honor ourselves. In the building of the rugged and fruitful west and its glorious story studded by bright lights of achievement of men of sterling character and iron courage, none will shine brighter than the life and accomplishments of John Thomas, who literally died in the active service of the people of Idaho."

Quartet, Rock of Ages: (Members of the male quartet previously mentioned. Mrs. Helen L. Smith, accompanist).

GRAVESIDE SERVICE AT ELMWOOD CEMETERY, GOODING, IDAHO

Scripture:

Rev. Irvin S. Motz, minister, First Methodist Church, Gooding, Idaho:

"Man that is born of a woman hath but a short time to live, and is full of misery. He cometh up, and is cut down like a flower; he fleeth as it were a shadow, and never continueth in one stay.

"In the midst of life we are in death: of whom may we seek for succor, but of Thee, O Lord, who for our sins art justly displeased?

"Yet, O Lord God most holy, O Lord most mighty, O holy and most merciful Saviour, deliver us not into the bitter pains of eternal death.

"Thou knowest, Lord, the secrets of our hearts; shut not Thy merciful ears to our prayers, but spare us, Lord most holy; O God most mighty, O holy and merciful Saviour, Thou most worthy judge eternal, suffer us not at our last hour for any pains of death to fall from Thee."

Dr. J. Wesley Miller, Gooding, Idaho:

"For as much as it hath pleased Almighty God, in His wise providence, to take out of the world the soul of the departed, we therefore commit his body to the ground, earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust; looking for the general resurrection in the last day, and the life of the world to come, through our Lord Jesus Christ; at whose second coming in glorious majesty to judge the world, the earth and the sea shall give up their dead; and the corruptible bodies of those who sleep in Him shall be changed and made like unto His own glorious body; according to the mighty working whereby He is able to subdue all things unto Himself.

"I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, 'Write, from henceforth blessed are the dead who die in the Lord: Even so, saith the Spirit; for they rest from their labors'."

Prayer:

"Almighty God, with whom do live the spirits of those who depart hence in the Lord, and with whom the souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity: We give Thee hearty thanks for the good examples of all those Thy servants, who, having finished their course in faith, do now rest from their labors. And we beseech Thee, that we, with all those who are departed in the true faith of Thy holy name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in Thy eternal and everlasting glory, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

"The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, be with us all ever more. Amen."

Josiah W. Bailey

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 21 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JOSIAH WILLIAM BAILEY, late a Senator from the State of North Carolina

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I shall always think of JOSIAH WILLIAM BAILEY as a man who had faith in truth, who sought the truth and tried always to spread it.

His judgment was unswervingly based upon righteousness and in righteousness he performed his duty.

He was a master of self-judgment and self-control. He possessed special qualities of mind and heart—qualities that were both natural and acquired.

He combined these traits with a manly bearing, a genial and winning grace, impressive dignity, and admirable character.

Those who served with him in the Senate of the United States were keenly aware of his ability to transform these attributes into effective, useful energy in the best interest of his country.

Like others among his host of friends I miss his sound counsel terribly, for with cold calculation he had a way of cutting straight into a problem and facing it head on.

It was with such calm and fearless deliberateness that he reversed his deeply rooted views on foreign policy in 1941 when he told the Senate that he had changed his mind; that he was advocating "intervention with all its implications." He had seen the specter of Hitler across Europe, and he said "all my life I have looked a thing straight in the face and argued it as it is."

He followed through by urging postwar participation in the maintenance of peace, and in his last statement to the people of North Carolina, whom he had served in the Senate since 1931, he counseled that even should the United Nations organization fail, it did not necessarily mean war. "It does mean," he said, "that it will be necessary for us to get along in a world not fully organized for peace—which will be most difficult."

With the same high-minded vigor he opposed and denounced other measures advocated by the leadership of his political party, such as packing the Supreme Court, Federal anti-poll-tax legislation, and Federal antilynch legislation.

He could not support these measures, he said, because it was plain that they were unsound, and in the long run the consequences would be bad for the people he served.

No man could have been more faithful to his principles, for when he was first elected to the Senate he resolved to preserve the Republic in the true character in which it had served our people so well for 150 years.

Time and time again I marveled at his courage—the kind of courage that brought him into open opposition to the appointment of a former Vice President of the United States to a Cabinet position.

My own devotion for Senator BAILEY came from two sources. One was pure admiration for the man, his great ability and his highly governed mind, which found pleasure in nothing but the true and the just. The other was his friendship for me, which he evidenced in so many ways. I have never known a sweeter character or a friend I loved more. I shall always treasure the numerous letters he wrote me in his own hand, in which he discussed some of the great issues of the day. To be closely associated with JOE BAILEY was one of the greatest privileges that has ever come to me. As long as I live I shall treasure his memory. He was born of parents who were Virginians, and that made our friendship even closer.

From these parents he inherited the religious background which so richly influenced his philosophy. With this background he went on to equip himself thoroughly for his remarkable service in this great legislative body by furthering his study of law, serving his party as a Presidential elector at large, by serving his State as a member of its constitutional convention, and by serving his country as a collector of the revenue.

No State has been better served in Congress than was North Carolina by its Senator BAILEY, and he was never unmindful of the trust his people reposed in him. The nobility of the man was demonstrated in his message to the people of the State which was written during his last illness.

In this statement he gave his constituents the benefit of his views and the reasons for them, and he concluded the message with characteristic humility:

"These are my views, honestly expressed," he wrote, "and I express them in part discharge of the great debt I owe the people of our State."

To me, at least, it was significant indeed that one of the last bits of advice from his wealth of judgment was that no man should be elected to Congress until he pledged that he would reduce expenditures and balance our budget and keep it balanced.

Senator BAILEY took this occasion to remind his people that—

An eminent historian prophesied early in the nineteenth century that our Republic would be plundered in the twentieth century, not by a foreign invader but by its own people.

That plundering is now and has been for several years going on.

It was well, indeed, that JOE BAILEY was a man who, at once, could be both serious and cheerful. This was another reason why his advice was sought and followed. He never departed from the belief that much could be retrieved that seemed to be lost. He was never the cynic. He was never the pessimist. He was never the critic save constructively. He was a benefactor of humanity.

I know that other Senators miss him as I do, but we take comfort in the fact that he is still helping us think, for he has left for us, here in the Hall of the Senate, marks of his refined culture and a great fund of facts and anecdotes

which were the products of his keen thought and intellect.

His shrine is in the hearts of all of us who knew him.

Constitutional Liberalism and the Taft-Hartley Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Constitutional Liberalism and the Taft-Hartley Law, delivered by me yesterday at Asbury Park, N. J., at the convention of the American Federation of Musicians.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the convention, it is a pleasure to address you and in so doing to respond to the kind introduction I just received from your president. However, I didn't think that good musicians ever missed a cue—and you sure missed one when you applauded a statement your president just made while introducing me.

I believe I quote him accurately when I say he just expressed this opinion to you, namely, that "our speaker is one of the very few liberals left in Congress;" whereupon you enthusiastically applauded. Your President's comment really called for tears instead of applause. It calls for something more, namely, a determination upon the part of you and millions of other voters in this country to go to the polls in the elections during the next few years and do something about the political complexion of Congress.

There is only one way to assure the election of more men who will place human rights above a materialistic approach to democracy, and that is for the American people to make clear to the two major parties that if they do not support the nomination of constitutional liberals within their party conventions, on both a national and State basis, the overwhelming majority of the American people will elect to political office—irrespective of party affiliation—men who can be counted upon to work and fight for constitutional liberalism.

Your President introduced me as a Republican and I am very pleased to tell you I am proud of the fact that I am a progressive Republican.

It is true that we have our share of reactionaries in the Republican Party but if I were to offer your President a wager on the question as to whether his party—the Democratic Party—or my party—the Republican Party—has the greater number of reactionaries, I'm far from convinced that I should lose the bet.

However, I think both parties should recognize that more and more people in this country are crossing party lines in both State and national elections and voting for those men—irrespective of party affiliation—who, they are satisfied on the record, are devoted to the cause of advancing within the rights and guaranties of the Constitution the welfare of all the people, in contrast to serving the selfish interests of the privileged few.

In discussing constitutional liberalism and the Taft-Hartley law with you today, I don't want to appear under any false colors. I think you are entitled to know at the outset the branch of the Republican Party from which I come. My severest critics charge me with being a Jeffersonian Republican, and I plead guilty. I not only plead guilty to that charge but I recommend to the Republican Party that Jeffersonian Republicanism is good and sound Republicanism and should be followed by my party, because if we follow it we shall return to the basic principles of Republicanism enunciated by Lincoln.

One cannot study the political philosophy of Lincoln without recognizing that he accepted as basically sound the human-rights doctrines of Jefferson. The same conflict between the views of those who believed in an aristocracy of government, devoted to advancing the selfish interests of powerful economic groups, and those who believed in the superiority of human rights over economic rights—as represented by the conflict between Hamilton and Jefferson—existed also at the time of Lincoln.

It exists again today. It is a conflict between a notion of government from the top trickling down to the masses of the people, and a view of representative government by the mass of the people vesting in elected officials at the top certain specific governmental obligations. It is a conflict between two schools of political philosophy, one of which following the Hamiltonian view will lead inevitably to an aristocracy of government in which the state is the master and not the servant of the people—in contrast with the Jeffersonian view that the people must always make certain that politically they are their own masters and the government their servant.

I would point out to you that each era or period of our history has brought forth that same old conflict in one degree or another. It has brought forth a conflict between a materialistic approach to democracy and an approach based upon the spiritual values of democracy.

In my discussion of constitutional liberalism and the Taft-Hartley law today I shall endeavor to focus attention on some of the differences between a materialistic conception of democracy and a human-rights approach to the problems of representative government.

However, before turning to my formal remarks, I wish to thank you for this invitation to appear before you. I understand from your president that this is the first time a United States Senator ever has addressed one of your conventions. I hope it will not be the last time.

When my very good friend, Herman Kenin, of Portland, Oreg. (a member of your executive board), invited me to give a speech on the Taft-Hartley law at this convention, I was greatly pleased to accept his invitation. I have known Herman Kenin for a good many years, and I'm sure I need not tell the delegates at this convention what a fine citizen and kindly man he is. I am pleased to note that you have continued at this convention to recognize his qualities of leadership.

In fact, my visit here today is similar to a short visit home because of the number of Oregonians who are here. It has been a great delight for me to see again so many friends from Oregon, including my very close friend, S. Stephenson Smith, formerly on the faculty of the University of Oregon and now holding a responsible position with your organization on your public-relations and editorial staff. Steve and I taught together at the University of Oregon for 13 or 14 years, and we were always very close associates in faculty affairs.

Actually Steve helped give me some valuable experience in the field of practical politics. I say that because if you don't know it, serving on a faculty of a modern university these days is an excellent training ground for political experience. Speaking in New Jersey today recalls to my mind a comment which Woodrow Wilson once made when during his campaign for the governorship of New Jersey he was criticized as lacking practical political experience. As you know, he had been a college professor and president of Princeton prior to his entrance into politics, and he replied to his critics by saying in effect that as president of Princeton he had received a postgraduate course in practical politics.

Since I came to the convention hall, Mr Kenin has informed me that yesterday you passed a resolution authorizing the executive board of your union to contribute a substantial sum to the relief of flood victims in my State of Oregon and in other sections of the Pacific Northwest. I wish to express my deep appreciation to you for this generous act of deserved relief.

The flood waters now raging along the Columbia have brought havoc, terrific economic loss, and tragic human suffering to a great many thousands of citizens of my State of Oregon, as well as to many people in Washington and Idaho. Fortunately the loss of life apparently is not going to be as great as we first feared, but it is still expected that when the waters finally recede they will leave behind a record of death to a considerable number of people.

It has been reported to me that more than 30,000 people are homeless in the Portland-Vancouver area, and the city of Vanport has been completed demolished by the flood waters. The humanitarianism which has characterized the people of Oregon and Washington—and for that matter, the entire Nation—in meeting the emergency needs of these people is another example of that reassuring faith we have, as a people, in the spiritual values of democracy.

I now turn to a discussion of the subject which Mr. Kenin asked me to speak to you about, namely, constitutional liberalism and the Taft-Hartley law. I desire to discuss it from the standpoint of certain problems of politics which I think cannot be separated from the passage of the Taft-Hartley bill in the first instance.

Political pots are boiling, not only in our country but practically in all of the countries of the world today. Political pots also are being concocted as the conflicts of political ideologies intensify.

Being an optimist I am satisfied that the stage of political turmoil through which we are now passing at home and abroad will eventually result in an advancement in the cause of human rights, but I recognize that that will not necessarily happen unless we hold fast to the basic tenets and values of a constitutional liberalism.

We in America have a solemn historical obligation to fulfill by way of demonstrating to the peoples of the world that the liberalism of our Constitution not only can be put into practice but when practiced offers the best governmental framework for the protection and advancement of human rights.

Our politicians, both Democratic and Republican, need to remember that a great majority of the American people are not impressed with the political platform of sophistry and hypocrisy which has characterized the convention platforms of both major parties for a long time past. Although many people joke about it, nevertheless, the fact that millions of Americans have come to believe that party platforms are nothing but political buncombe is no laughing matter.

The general public's lack of confidence in party platforms should be recognized before it is too late as being a symptom of political ill health in our body politic. It could lead to disintegration of our party system.

The two political conventions at Philadelphia this year would do much by way of restoring political health to our two major

parties if our political leaders would recognize the fact that the people of America do not want the political parties to take on the characteristics of circus side shows under whose tents they know they are going to be fooled even at the time they pay their admissions.

Our politicians need to remember that the forces of political education, the impact upon our people of world events with all their implications for the future, the strains and stresses of our complex living problems and the fears and sense of insecurity that gnaw at the hearts of most Americans these days, leave little patience for political platitudes.

It is solutions to specific problems and issues which the American people want from their politicians. It is less politics and more statesmanship which the people want. It is an exercise of honest independence of judgment on the merits of issues in accordance with the facts as they present themselves on specific issues that the American people want from their politicians. It is cause to effect reasoning rather than buck-passing ability and rationalization which the people want.

They are sick and tired of being told that depressions are part of the price we pay for liberty because they know it need not be so if more politicians would represent the people rather than have so many represent special interests which are still powerful enough in America to elect many men to office. The people know that there is no excuse for so many millions of our homeless being priced out of owning a home or being forced to pay triple prices for shacks that frequently are not so well constructed as chicken houses on a modern poultry farm. They know that the inflation boom which has turned the American dollar into a 50-cent piece, based on 1939 values, could have been and still could be checked in part by a Congress willing to recognize that free enterprise does not mean license for the owners of capital and sources of production to profiteer at the expense of the many as the result of a short supply created by an unbalanced war economy.

The people are disturbed by the encroachments upon inalienable rights set forth in the Constitution by powerful economic interests which are able to force through the Congress laws which transgress those rights. The Taft-Hartley law contains many encroachments upon inalienable rights. The people are beginning to see that many politicians are rationalizing legislation which invades the realm of inalienable rights by trying to convince the American people that the economic welfare of the country, the complex industrial system of the country, the material comforts of the country, the uninterrupted production of the country justify and make reasonable a limiting of inalienable rights.

This materialistic approach to democracy is creating great tensions in our body politic. Many people are disturbed. Resentment is growing. All is not well in our democracy. Politicians and our political parties need to take heed of the fact that as the American people have risen in defense of inalienable human rights embodied in the spiritual values of democracy as epitomized in our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution when those rights were endangered by totalitarianism abroad, so, too, will they in due course of time repudiate any attempt to transgress those rights through government by the privileged few at home.

We are witnessing in America today a resurgence of Hamiltonianism and a suppression of Jeffersonianism. It is not surprising that economic dislocations, inflationary prices, failure as yet to win the peace, labor excesses, monopolistic profiteering, inequitable taxes, Russian aggression, growing class-conscious conflicts at home and abroad, the danger of another war, and the on-every-hand manifestations of greed and selfishness have left the average voter perplexed, disillusioned, and sick at heart over politics and politicians.

It is to be expected that in such a period of social and political flux our people generally should be routed a bit from holding fast to an abiding faith in the spiritual values of democracy. However, the politicians and our political parties will make a grievous mistake if they interpret the hysteria of the moment for crystallized public opinion on the basic issues of the day. In due course of time they will be repudiated at the polls if so many of our politicians continue to look upon democracy as a form of government motivated by values of materialism rather than by human rights.

They will discover that the American people will never endure any form of economic fascism or any form of communism, because the people know that economic fascism, even by big business, and any form of communism, even by a class-conscious third party in America, will mean the end to personal liberty. The Lincoln view of the superiority of human rights over property rights is no political cliche in our American ideology of representative self-government. Any sacrifice of individual freedom to the economic advantage of the owners of property or to the economic comfort of the general public strikes at the roots of the inalienable personal rights set forth in our Constitution.

We cannot have those rights and eat them, too. We cannot respect them only when it is economically advantageous to do so and still preserve them. Lip service of praise for individual liberty, followed by legislation which sets forth procedures so restrictive in nature as to make effective exercise of individual liberty impossible, will never check encroachments upon the democratic way of life.

I think that in America today there is being renewed a struggle between Hamiltonian theories of political aristocracy and Jeffersonian theories of human rights; between the static Constitution of John Marshall and the dynamic Constitution of Holmes and Brandeis; between the exploitation of our people by a laissez faire economy and the paramount duty of a representative government to promote the general welfare by protecting the weak from the exploitation of the strong.

I like to put my view as to the trend in American politics, as I see that trend, in terms of a fight being waged by constitutional liberals on the one hand and political reactionaries and leftists on the other side. My definition of a constitutional liberal is a person who believes in applying the guarantees and legal principles of the Constitution to human rights and property rights in America. He is a person who believes in the good old Lincoln doctrine that we can best protect property rights by first protecting human rights. In politics he is one who believes that one of the primary objectives of our representative form of government should be to protect the economic and political weak from the exploitation of the economic and political strong but do it within the framework of a private property economy and in accordance with the guaranties and legal principles of the Constitution, including its precious bill of human rights.

A constitutional liberal recognizes that the ideology of communism cannot be reconciled with the liberalism of our Constitution because the dignity of the individual; the inalienable rights guaranteed to the individual by our Constitution; and the right to exercise a freedom of choice through a free ballot box in determining one's political destiny are all foreign to the ideology of communism.

The constitutional liberal asks the American people these days never to forget that the police state methods of communism, the totalitarianism of communism, and the principle of master rule by the state, on which communism is based, cannot be reconciled with the liberalism of our American Constitution.

The constitutional liberal in America asks not only the American people but the two major political parties to recognize that we have no need to fear communism, fascism, or any other police-state ideology if we will only put into practice the liberalism of our Constitution. However, that calls for political courage, for progressive thinking and for a willingness to rise above pressure politics. It calls for a clear demonstration to all the peoples of the world that we are a government in which the people are the masters and not the servants; a government in which human rights are recognized as more important than a materialistic approach to our problems.

In essence it calls for a rededication to the spiritual values of democracy based upon a recognition of the dignity of the individual from which principles stems both our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution. If we do not give the same vitality of meaning today to those two historic documents that they were given by the men who wrote them, then we will never be able to meet the challenge of police states.

The Taft-Hartley law is the product of government by propaganda and pressure. It relates to a subject of labor excesses, in which field some legislation was needed. Too many in labor had forgotten or were willing to trample on the democratic principle that one's individual rights are relative in that they must bear a nontransgressing relationship to equal individual rights of other persons. However, as time passes more and more people will see that what was needed was not punitive legislation but legislation which sought to balance the interests and rights of labor and employers and thereby protect the best interests of the public. Legislation which was fitted into the framework of voluntarism in recognition of the fact that the economic and social problems of wages, hours, conditions of employment, pensions, job security, production output, and the many other facets of free collective bargaining are not basically legal issues at all. What was needed was a Congress which recognized that any law which attempts by the punitive force of government to force either free workers or free employers into a governmentally dictated economic mold is more than likely to endanger the inalienable rights of the individual.

Is it any wonder then that concern is growing throughout the Nation over the problems and methods which government must use to enforce the Taft-Hartley law? Is it any wonder that those employers of the country, in increasing numbers, who recognize that collective bargaining is here to stay, are becoming more uneasy month by month over the implications of the Taft-Hartley law? It will take time, much time, possibly too much time for people generally to comprehend fully the limitations upon individual liberty not only of the worker but of the employer, too, which are encompassed in the Taft-Hartley law. It will probably take a decade, but during that decade an old historical pattern will be woven once again in the tapestry of our national life. It will be the pattern of resentment. It will depict again that freemen will struggle even against odds to prevent the Government from becoming the master instead of the servant of the people's freedom.

We are yet too close to this new struggle to appreciate the costly price we have paid for the Taft-Hartley bill. If we should suffer a depression, if unemployment should stalk our streets again, if the civil war within the house of labor should end, if a chain of events such as those which crystallized labor unity after the Haymarket riots, and which eventually

led to the Norris-LaGuardia Act, should repeat themselves, the public would soon understand that the Taft-Hartley law is based upon a principle of government by force in a field of economic and social relations where voluntarism is the essence of government by law. Industrial peace is much to be desired. Uninterrupted production should be the goal of management and labor. They should recognize that it is their mutual obligation to maintain uninterrutped production, and maximum production at that, through good faith collective bargaining based upon the give-and-take of fair play voluntarism, conscionable compromise, and peaceful procedures free of compulsory dictates of government. They should not ignore the fact that excesses of either labor or management or both always give rise to the danger of extreme legislation.

However, the public has responsibilities in the field of industrial controversy, too. The public's elected representatives should give voice to those responsibilities and stand up against waves of public indignation which seek to express themselves in demands for legislation that encroach upon constitutional guaranties or is so extreme in nature as to intensify class-conscious feelings. Congress did not counsel calmness and reasonableness when it passed the Taft-Hartley law. It did not think through its proposals for enforcement and administration. It did not weigh the implications of throwing upon the common-law courts of the country, in the last analysis, the burden of attempting to settle, as though they were questions of law, the highly social and econimic problems of industrial relations.

I find it rather amusing to note the growing irritation in Congress among those who voted for the Taft-Hartley law when their attention is called to criticisms of the law by increasing numbers of employers who are beginning to see that they were sold a pig in a poke. In recent weeks I have noted that an increasing number of Members of Congress are hedging a little on the Taft-Hartley law and are beginning to suggest that maybe it needs not some slight but some basic revisions. They are concerned about the increasing number of scholarly analyses of the Taft-Hartley law which are pointing out the danger of the law's reestablishing government by injunction in this country.

They have no satisfactory answer to the criticism that it is irreconcilable with the principle of freedom of choice, so basic to individual rights in a democracy, for the Government to say to supposedly free workers in America, either work in the mines for 80 days under court order or go to jail for contempt. They, too, are becoming fearful that if it is proper by law to force workings to exercise that choice for 80 days, nothing would prevent a wave for congressional hysteria from making it 160 days or twice that figure.

Thus we find a wave of reflection sweeping public opinion these days. That innate sense of American fair play plus our ingrained love for individual liberty is causing increasing numbers of Americans to see the unfairness, injustice, and transgression upon individual freedom in any law which in part forces men to work for private employers for 80 days or go to jail. This resentment is likely to injure the prestige of our courts just as government by injunction before the Norris-LaGuardia law kept our courts under political attack. This principle of freedom from economic dictates by our courts, this right not to be directed to work for another man for his profit for any period of time, this struggle against the Hamiltonian theory of making the courts the strong arm of capital, is nothing new in American industrial history. The Taft-Hartley law only presents it in a little different form. I have no doubt that, to the extent that the administration and enforcement of the Taft-Hartley law jeopardizes individual rights so that they cannot be enjoyed in their full measure by freemen, the law will in due course of time be changed by the Congress. In the meantime, I have confidence that the courts of the land, with final appeal to the Supreme Court, will eliminate from the law those sections which I believe will and should be found to be unconstitutional. However, the sections which place within the jurisdiction of common-law courts the power to settle labor disputes by injunction in my opinion are not unconstitutional. Rather, they are administratively unsound and in the long run unworkable.

In closing this speech I should like to summarize my entire approach to constitutional liberalism by giving you a poetic definition of a liberal. Such a definition that is to be found in those inspiring lines of Louis Untermeyer when he wrote:

"Ever insurgent let me be,
Make me more daring than devout;
From sleek contentment keep me free,
And fill me with a buoyant doubt.

"Open my eyes to visions girt
With beauty, and with wonder lit—
But let me always see the dirt,
And all that spawn and die in it.

"Open my ears to music; let
Me thrill with Spring's first flutes and drums—
But never let me dare forget
The bitter ballads of the slums.

"From compromise and things half done
Keep me with stern and stubborn pride—
And when, at last, the fight is won,
God keep me still unsatisfied."

The Foundation of the Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Foundation of the Republic," delivered by me at the annual convention of the Treasurers' Association of Virginia, at Lynchburg, Va., on June 11, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FOUNDATION OF THE REPUBLIC

It is a coveted honor and privilege to address this group of county and city treasurers, not only because I can call so many of you my personal friends, but also because of the important position you occupy in the life of Virginia. I desire to take advantage of this occasion to discuss briefly that position and the responsibilities which it entails.

Each of us is prone to become absorbed in the daily routine and to lose sight of the over-all significance of what we are doing. Thus, when I have been engaged in studying the content of the thousands of bills which are offered at each session of the Congress or handling the numerous problems which our citizens now bring to their representatives in Washington, I welcome the occasional letter or personal conversation with someone who reminds me that there is more to being a Senator than merely standing up under the exhausting daily grind. It is inspiring to realize that I am one of those honored with the responsibility for helping to direct the course of the most powerful Nation on the face of the earth. Yet the grave responsibility of doing my part to prevent another war or a depression comparable to that following World War I is a thought ever foremost in my mind and heart.

But there can be no safe superstructure without a firm foundation. The destiny of the Nation does not depend alone on what the Congress does or on what the President and his administration do. Nor does it depend on what the legislatures and the governors of the States do.

I truly believe that the future welfare of the people of the United States is firmly linked with the preservation of our republican form of government. But that government, representing what Daniel Webster appropriately called constitutional American liberty, can be maintained only through the efforts of the people as a whole. And, as officials of the basic local units of the Republic, you have contacts with what we term the grass roots which enable you to keep alive in your respective communities the zeal for local self-government which is the foundation of our personal liberty.

That statement is made by one who has had varied experience in the affairs of State government, including 6 years as a Commonwealth's attorney and advisor to a board of supervisors, 6 years in the State senate, and 6 years as a members of the cabinets of Governors BYRD and Pollard, followed by 16 years of experience in the Congress.

On the basis of that experience I can say also, without hesitation, that Virginia for the past quarter of a century has had as efficient government at the local as well as the State level as any State I know, and better than the average.

A spirit of criticism seems to be synonymous with the spirit of our times. Crowds will pack a hall and pay $2 to $5 each for the privilege of hearing Henry Wallace say what a fine country Russia is and what a lousy country ours is. And the Old Dominion is not without those who are free in their criticism of our public officials and of our alleged lack of progress. Other counties may have had treasurers as good as my late friend, William A. Adair, of Rockbridge, but I never knew a better one. Other States may have legislatures as good as our general assembly, but I never knew a better one. And when I served in the cabinet of Gov. HARRY F. BYRD other States may have had chief executives as good as he but he was the best Governor I have ever known.

I believe in progress and would be the last to say that we should live in the past and seek to attribute to ourselves the virtues of previous decades, but it should certainly be possible for us to work for progress in essential governmental activities without ignoring the contribution made during the past 25 years to schools, roads, public health and allied services by those who have been responsible for State and local government during that period. The charge of courthouse and machine may be just the shibboleth of the man who is out and trying to get in.

As I drove down from Washington today and passed the home built by the Sage of Monticello, and the university which he founded, I was reminded of how important Thomas Jefferson considered the local units of our Government and the officials who conducted their affairs.

After Jefferson had drafted his bill for diffusion of knowledge, which proposed a general system of public education in Virginia for the first time, he wrote a letter to John Adams in which he confessed he had placed a joker in the bill for an ulterior purpose. Jefferson's school system would require small local subdivisions of the Government, and he told Adams his purpose in this was to be sure the county was divided into wards or towns, "confiding in them," he said, "the care of their poor, their roads, police, elections, the nomination of jurors * * * in short,

to have made them little republics, with a warden at the head of each, for all those concerns which, being under their eye, they would manage better than the larger republics of the county or State."

And again, in his autobiography, Jefferson said: "It is not by consolidation, or concentration of powers, but by their distribution, that good government is effected. Were not this great country already divided into States, that division must be made, that each might do for itself what concerns itself directly, and what it can so much better do than a distant authority. Every State again is divided into counties, each to take care of what lies within its local bounds; each county again into townships or wards, to manage minuter details; and every ward into farms, to be governed each by its individual proprietor.

"Were we directed from Washington when to sow, and when to reap, we should soon want bread," Jefferson said. "It is by this partition of cares, descending in graduation from general to particular, that the mass of human affairs may be best managed, for the good and prosperity of all."

We all realize, of course, that conditions have changed since Jefferson's day and that technological progress has created situations which he hardly could have imagined. Modern transportation and communication have brought us so much closer together that it has been natural to consolidate some of the functions of government and it has been necessary to enlarge the field within which public agencies will protect the welfare and advance the interests of the individual.

Thus, we have seen the old county road districts disappear, giving way to countrywide highway systems, and they in turn have been absorbed into the State system. Local schools of one and two rooms have been replaced by more efficient consolidated schools and smaller counties have found it economical to join each other in supporting almshouses or other projects.

The most striking changes, however, have been in the extent to which the Federal Government—originally founded with the idea that it would handle only foreign affairs and a limited number of matters affecting national defense and commerce between the States—has extended its operations into matters close to every citizen.

Aside from the direct functions of the national government its penetration of local affairs is evidenced by the fact that Federal grants in aid to the States, which amounted to only about $5,500,000 in 1915 reached a peak of $2,161,000,000 in the depression year of 1935 and, after dropping to a little less than $1,000,000,000 in 1939, climbed back to $1,200,000,000 in 1947.

About half of the total grants now being distributed are for old age assistance and aid to dependent children. I am not criticizing this program, and, as a matter of fact, only last week I voted in the Senate to increase the Federal contribution for this purpose to $15 out of the first 20 instead of the present $10 out of the first $15 with the Federal Government continuing to match State and local funds above that amount up to a maximum payment of $50 a month.

For a long time the Southern States have been raising more than their share of children who have gone off to other States to spend their most productive years where economic opportunities were greater. The new balance of agriculture and industry which is being achieved by the South and in which Virginia has made notable progress will correct this situation in time. But, meanwhile, it is no more than fair that as long as we contribute our proportionate share of Federal taxes we should receive our proportionate share of grants in aid.

But, as the States and the counties accept these funds and become dependent on them to carry on essential programs, they must not lose sight of the fact that this is not manna from heaven.

The Federal tax dollar comes out of the same pockets, generally speaking, as the State tax dollar and the county tax dollar, and is less efficiently handled. Strings are always tied to so-called grants in aid, and at times take on the nature of a bribe offered in return for the surrender of local rights to the Central Government.

Already we have seen attempts in the Congress to penalize States for failure to conform to particular patterns of procedure prescribed in Washington in behalf of certain social theories.

We would do well to recall that in his farewell address Washington said: "The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them."

We should consider also the statement of Andrew Jackson who said: "In a country so extensive as the United States, and with pursuits so varied, the internal regulations of the several States must frequently differ from one another in important particulars; and this difference is unavoidably increased by the varying principles upon which the American Colonies were originally planted; principles which had taken deep root in their social relations before the Revolution, and therefore, of necessity, influencing their policy since they became free and independent States.

"But each State," said Andrew Jackson, "has the unquestionable right to regulate its own internal concerns according to its own pleasure; and while it does not interfere with the rights of the people of other States, or the rights of the Union, every State must be the sole judge of the measures proper to secure the safety of its citizens and promote their happiness and all efforts on the part of the people of other States to cast odium upon their institutions, and all measures calculated to disturb their rights of property or put in jeopardy their peace and internal tranquillity are in direct opposition to the spirit in which the Union was formed and must endanger its safety."

In view of some of the current efforts to force upon one section of the Nation social changes for which it is not prepared and to disrupt for purely political reasons a program in which individual States have been making fine progress, the words of Andrew Jackson seem highly applicable to our time when he made this statement:

"Motives of philanthropy may be assigned for this unwarrantable interference, and weak men may persuade themselves for a moment that they are laboring in the cause of humanity and asserting the rights of the human race, but everyone, upon sober reflection, will see that nothing but mischief can come from these improper assaults upon the feelings and rights of others. Rest assured that the men found busy in this work of discord are not worthy of your confidence and deserve your strongest reprobation."

Andrew Jackson called a spade a spade, and I continue his words:

"It is well known that there have been those amongst us who wish to enlarge the powers of the general Government and experience would seem to indicate that there is a tendency on the part of the Government to overstep the boundaries marked for it by the Constitution. Its legitimate authority is abundantly sufficient for all the purposes for which it was created, and its powers being expressly enumerated, there can be no justification for claiming anything beyond them. Every attempt to exercise power beyond these limits should be promptly and firmly opposed. For one evil example will lead to other measures still more mischievous, and if the principle of constructive powers, or supposed advantages, or temporary circumstances shall ever be permitted to justify the assumption of a power not given by the Constitution, the General Government will before long absorb all the powers of legislation, and you will have, in effect, but one consolidated government.

"From the extent of our country, its diversified interest, different pursuits, and different habits, it is too obvious for argument that a single consolidated government would be wholly inadequate to watch over and protect its interests, and every friend of our free institutions should be always prepared to maintain unimpaired and in full vigor the rights and sovereignty of the States, and to confine the action of the General Government strictly to the sphere of its appropriate duties."

At a later time we find Woodrow Wilson proclaiming that our American political system "would be an impossibility without its division of powers."

America, Wilson said, "has come to maturity by the stimulation of no central force or guidance, but by an aboundingly self-helping, self-sufficing energy in its parts, which severally brought themselves into existence and added themselves to the Union, pleasing first of all themselves in the framing of their laws and constitutions, not asking leave to exist and constitute themselves, but existing first and asking leave afterward, self-originated, self-constituted, self-sustaining, veritable communities, demanding only recognition. Communities develop not by external but by internal forces. Else they do not live at all. Our comonwealths have not come into existence by invitation, like plants in a tended garden; they have sprung up of themselves, irrepressible, a sturdy, spontaneous product of the nature of men nurtured in a free air."

In the same lecture from which I have been quoting Wilson also said: "We are certified by all political history of the fact that centralization is not vitalization. Moralization is by life, not by statute; by the interior impulse and experience of communities, not by fostering legislation which is merely the abstraction of an experience which may belong to a nation as a whole or to many parts of it without having yet touched the thought of the rest anywhere to the quick.

"The object of our Federal system is to bring the understandings of constitutional government home to the people of every part of the Nation, to make them part of their consciousness as they go about their daily tasks."

And so I hope that you, as officials of our county and city governments in Virginia, will go about your daily tasks, conscious of the obligations of our constitutional government and of the necessity for bringing an understanding of it home to the people.

I hope you will keep deep in your own hearts and convey as best you can to those with whom you come in contact the sober fact stated by Daniel Webster when, speaking on the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of George Washington, he said:

"If disastrous wars should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhaust our treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolate and lay waste our fields, still, under a new cultivation, they will grow green again and ripen to future harvests. It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these may be rebuilt.

"But," said Webster, "who will reconstruct the fabric of demolished government? Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty? Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with States rights, individual security and public prosperity? No, if these columns fall, they will be raised not again. Like the Coliseum and

the Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful, a melancholy immortality. Bitterer tears, however, will flow over them than were ever shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art; for they will be the monuments of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw, the edifice of constitutional American liberty."

I love Virginia and all that the name means to us and the people of the Nation. I am a joint heir with you in the rich heritage of Virginia's traditions and shall be a colaborer with you in the preservation of Jeffersonian democratic institutions.

Extension of Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "It Is Up to the Senate To Enact a Sound Trade Bill," published in the Baltimore Sun of June 12, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT IS UP TO THE SENATE TO ENACT A SOUND TRADE BILL

The Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as extended several times, will expire at midnight tonight unless extended again. The House of Representatives has already passed an extender bill. It is an unsatisfactory bill, however, because it lops off some of the most admirable provisions of the present act. The Senate is scheduled to pass an extender bill today. People who understand about trade will hope the Senate version moves back toward the present law and toward a reasonable compromise with the House.

Already the worst thing about the House bill seems to have been abandoned. This was the provision that certain tariff agreements negotiated by the President would be subject to Congress' veto, once he had negotiated them. This would have opened the way to the old-fashioned tariff logrolling in the lobby and on the floor which has darkened so much tariff history. This provision has been voted down in the Senate Finance Committee.

But the Senate committee seems disposed to go part way with the House version in the matter of the Tariff Commission. Under the present law the Tariff Commission is a fact-finding body. It has membership with other Government agencies on the interdepartmental committees which counsel the President in his tariff negotiations. The present act gives the Tariff Commission no special weight in this counsel. It leaves the President free to balance the technical economic facts found by the Commission against the considerations urged by the other department representatives. In this way a rounded judgment on the requirements of the national interest as a whole is secured by the President.

The House bill, however, goes back to the Smoot-Hawley Act of 1930 to lift the Tariff Commission into special authority in the program. It would empower the Commission to make recommendations to the President which he could reject in the service of the wider all-department view only at the risk of the congressional veto mentioned above. The Senate committee plan, while it knocks out the congressional veto, continues the special place for the narrowly technical counsel of the Tariff Commission in the tariff-making set-up. Nothing has yet been offered by the critics of the present law to justify this belittlement of the diplomatic, military and other considerations that must go into trade negotiations.

Finally, there is the interval of extension. The extended bills of the past have always been for 3 years. This time the House has voted to extend for only a year. But the next 3 years will cover crucial phases of the foreign-aid and reconstruction program which the Congress is also enacting just now. It is a commonplace that our trade policy is a central consideration in the aid program. This means that trade policy and foreign aid ought to be planned together and projected into the future together. A 3-year extender would serve this need. On this and the other points—though time is short—the Senate should move back toward the provisions of the present act.

The Housing Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 12, 1948

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the June 12, 1948, edition of the Washington Post relating to the housing issue:

GOOD WORK IN HOUSE

The housing bill has been sent on its way to enactment by the House Banking and Currency Committee, it is said, because a Congressman from Philadelphia switched his vote in favor of crucial amendments, after "catching hell" from his constituents. Legislators from other slum-ridden communities with thousands of overcrowded families may well take note of the incident. Apparently the people, especially those living in the larger cities, are intensely interested in this measure. Votes against it are likely to be a heavy liability to any legislator in November.

The Banking and Currency Committee is to be especially congratulated for saving the bill from the emasculation it had suffered at the hands of the committee's own chairman, JESSE P. WOLCOTT. With crass disregard for the efforts of his fellow Republican, Senator TAFT, Mr. WOLCOTT had transformed the comprehensive housing policy approved by the Senate to a narrow device for aiding the private housing industry. Now the committee has added to Mr. WOLCOTT's measure those sections of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill dealing with public housing, slum clearance, urban redevelopment, farm housing and housing research. It becomes once more a well-rounded policy worthy of support from every Member of the House who is genuinely interested in the welfare of the people. The approval of such a bill in the face of Mr. WOLCOTT's opposition is a truly remarkable achievement.

The bill still has to clear the hurdles of the Rules Committee and a vote in the House itself, but the outlook is encouraging. Rules Chairman ALLEN has asked the Republican steering committee for guidance. That should scarcely have been necessary, in view of Speaker MARTIN's promise that action on the bill will be taken before June 19. But at least it shows a proper deference on the part of the Rules chieftain to a higher leadership council. Only a colossal double-cross could now keep the House from voting on the measure, and there is no reason to believe that such a betrayal of the public interest is in the making. Once the measure gets to the floor, we doubt that the pressure of the real-estate lobby against it can equal the pressure from a wide variety of citizen groups in its favor.

Free American Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 12, 1948

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein a most challenging editorial just mailed me by a constituent. We should indeed reflect on it now. I quote the most outstanding sentence, "Government never creates, but only takes from the creators." Government must never be a master—it can only last and be respected as it serves. One great philosopher said, "We do not think; we merely rearrange our prejudices." Let us hope that we have not sat by and merely allowed the Government propaganda of the past 20 years to seep in because we have been too lazy to think.

The editorial follows:

ANYHOW, LIFE IS EASIER

There was one Monday morning away back there which was about as bad as it could be for Mother. Tom had got up late, after a Sunday date with his girl, and rushed off to school without starting the kitchen fire or filling the reservoir to heat the water for washing. Fred neglected to lower the milk into the well and it was in a fair way to sour. Topping it all, Bess had gone to stay overnight with a girl friend and hadn't come home to clean the lamps and fill them with coal oil. Besides that, Dad had gone to work without watering or feeding the horse. Blue Monday was really blue those days, with the washboard to operate, the beans to cook—and nobody helping.

For most American families these tribulations have not annoyed for many years. Remembering them, the older generation is able to appreciate some of the things we have since acquired. The kitchen fire starts with turning on the gas or electricity—or in some cases the gasoline. The milk is safely stored in an electric or gas refrigerator. The smoky lamps have given way to electric lights, and the old corrugated washboard is replaced by the mechanical washer, with an automatic heater supplying hot water.

It's a long, long stride in comfort and convenience, which the younger folks probably can never appreciate or understand. Whether life is happier or not depends upon the individual. But certainly it is easier, with more time for leisure. The automobile may be less romantic than the horse, but it is faster and more comfortable. Mother—and Tom and Fred and Bess and Dad—in spite of all the glamour of the good old days, wouldn't turn back the clock.

The thing about it worth remembering is that the things which have taken all this care and drudgery out of life haven't just happened or been handed down from on high in the form of sudden miracles. They are the products of American ingenuity, genius, perseverance, research, and study—backed up by the faith and courage of men and women who dared to take the financial risks of making these products available to the millions. They were not the gifts of government or philanthropy, but the fruits of the American spirit of enterprise. Government never drilled an oil well, developed

a cubic foot of gas, evolved a motor or light bulb, or built a washing machine or a motorcar. Government never creates, but only takes from the creators.

It would be wholesome if the harebrained clamorers for paternalism, collectivism, socialism, and communism could be translated backward a couple of generations to gain some appreciation of what free American enterprise has wrought.

Segregation in Nature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 12, 1948

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, every 4 years for the past two or three generations we have had a new crop of insincere reformers and do-gooders crop out. For proof of the folly of these do-gooders, we have only to let our minds drift back to our boyhood days and there take a lesson from Mother Nature herself.

To pass laws to try to force social equality can no more change our way of life in the South than would laws requesting that the beasts of the fields and the birds of the air change their way of life against the intent of nature. Back on my dad's old farm, there are many large trees. In these trees live many birds. In our loft live others, and still more birds come and go in season. It has been going on for innumerable bird generations.

The regulars are mockingbirds and bluejays. In the spring comes a world of robins to visit with us for a time, as is the way with robins, their red breasts pleasant to the sight. All these birds live harmoniously, each breed and species pursuing its own way, its own devices, its own living habits. For generation after generation they live that way without interference from the so-called do-gooders.

Yet, I have never seen any of the different breeds of birds have anything to do with the others. The robins never mix with the jays. The jays never mix with the mockingbirds or the mockingbirds with the robins. They mind their own business as apparently God put it in their hearts to do. In the same field and in the same trees they remain in their groups as Providence saw fit to create.

In our loft there are many pigeons of many colors. They, too, have been there for generations. They have never mixed with the robins, mockingbirds or the jays. Seldom do you walk the fields without seeing sparrows flying about. If the sparrows have any truck with any of those other birds, it has never caught my eye or attention.

Out near our barn in the horse lot you will see the goats herded in one corner and the sheep over in another. I have never known of them mingling and interbreeding, but yet they live together in peace and harmony. Drive out into the country and you will find great grain fields. These fields in fall and winter abound with birds. The ricebirds fly in huge swarms and settle to rest and eat in their way. In other places there are vast flocks of blackbirds seeking the grain that the threshers drop. They, too, herd by themselves.

All these birds live with their own kind strictly and live at peace with the other species. Are these birds and animals all wrong about this thing—about their way of living? Are they guilty of wrongful segregation? Does the fact that they live and do as Mother Nature teaches them mean nothing? Should they mix with these other species and interbreed? Are there no "do-gooders" among the birds and animals to criticize them for their way of life? Are they wrong in staying aloof and apart socially from these other birds of other breeds and other colors and other characteristics? Are these birds who do only that which Providence taught them guilty of intolerance? Should they have a Civil Rights Act imposed upon them to make them live otherwise?

Is it not true the human "do-gooders" would have us believe that what is true of the birds and the beasts is not true of man, as though the same God who made one did not make the others. Is there reason to believe that Providence intended the races of humanity to remain less pure than the races of birds and beasts?

That we should mix the races of mankind socially is a horrid thought. It can have no backing in the eyes of a Providence who taught the birds and the bees and the beasts how to live. A black-and-tan civilization such as the do-gooders would create is abhorrent to men and birds and beasts alike. The robins, the jays, the mockingbirds, the sparrows and the pigeons in our yard and fields never make that mistake. Mother Nature does not teach them such infamy, for there is no socialism in Mother Nature. There is no group of "do-gooders" to tell them they must live otherwise than God so plainly intended they would.

Mr. Speaker, I was born and reared in the South, where peace and harmony usually prevail among all of its citizens. Experience has taught us how to best handle our own affairs. Every 4 years the so-called "do-gooders" with their selfish political views create disturbances in the South which require much of the next 4 years for the South's citizens to straighten out. I reiterate, if these so-called "do-gooders" would only take their cues from the so-called less intelligent animals and the birds, this would be a better world in which to live and much more happiness and contentment would prevail.

Public Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 12, 1948

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 11, 1948.*
Hon. ROBERT F. RICH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Public housing, under the Taft-Wagner-Ellender bill, is coming up for debate in the House on Tuesday, June 15, unless the Rules Committee refuses to give it a rule. It provides for more than $7,000,000,000 to put Government into housing permanently, in addition to the appaling sum of $20,000,000,000 loans or subsidies already made.

The Public Housing brigades and propagandists misrepresent the facts and confuse the people. Our investigations show that Government housing never goes to the really poor, and it has never cleared slums.

Public housing, by offering exemptions from taxation, induces purchase of Government certificates of participation in Government housing and makes impossible credit for private building in competition. It destroys free economy which in the United States has provided housing unparalleled elsewhere in the world. It overburdens the general taxpayers, exempts capital from taxation, and grants low rents to political party workers and voters to keep corrupt Government in power. It makes immediate the prospect of a million or more votes that will be cast, and in some districts 100 percent, for the local political party that builds the houses, whether that party is Republican or Democrat. It violates the fundamental principle of Government treating all citizens alike and sets up a mechanism of political favoritism.

Socializing activity in housing, by suppressing private initiative, causes scarcity. That has already proved disastrous in every socialized country in Europe. It can be stopped here only by the most vigorous leadership of those who want to save our form of Government. To rush to enactment in the closing days of Congress such vote-buying politically motivated legislation is a perversion of the functions of Congress. This destructive bill should be held until it can be fully and calmly discussed on its merits next year.

WILLFORD I. KING,
Chairman, Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc.

The Land Without Prejudice—Anti-Semitism in Soviet Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 12, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Jacob Pat, executive secretary of the Jewish Labor Committee, which appeared in the New Leader on June 5, 1948:

THE LAND WITHOUT PREJUDICE—ANTI-SEMITISM IN SOVIET RUSSIA

(By Jacob Pat, executive secretary of the Jewish Labor Committee)

The Russian-Jewish paper, the Einigkeit, reported that the free Jewish communities of Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Poland sent enthusiastic telegrams to the great father of the free nations on the occasion of the celebration of the Bolshevik Revolution last November. The Jewish World Congress sent its congratulation from London. The League of Friendship wired its blessings from Palestine. These Jews telegraphed to Moscow that the Bolshevik coup

was a turning point in the history of mankind, that the Soviet Revolution is the motive power behind all the nations striving for peace and the U. S. S. R. is the citadel of freedom and democracy.

The cables said that Soviet Russia is the country where all national minorities have been given freedom, where anti-Semitism has been uprooted. The Central Consistory of Bulgaria sent greetings to the famous Leninist-Stalinist Party, which is defending the freedom and the culture of all progressive mankind.

B. Z. Goldberg's group of American-Jewish writers and artists informed Russia, in a message signed by Sh. Almasof, Menasha Unger, and the editor of the Protestant, Joseph Breinin, of the enthusiasm inspired in American Jewry by the cultural freedom granted to all peoples in Russia, in general, and by the building of a Jewish state in Biro-Bidjan, in particular.

Have 30 Novembers cured the common man in the Soviet Union of the anti-Semitic disease?

During the war hundreds of thousands of Jews from eastern Europe found refuge in or were deported to the Soviet Union. When the war ended, they returned westward; but instead of remaining in Poland, Rumania, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, they kept on moving westward to the displaced-persons camps in Germany, Austria, and Italy. Among them there were a number of Russian Jews who preferred the uncertainties of the West to life in the Soviet Union.

It is virtually impossible for Soviet citizens to leave their country, but, thanks to the war, a few thousand of them managed to get out. For the most part, they were born and raised in Russia and occupied important positions. They were military leaders, doctors, teachers, high-ranking naval officers, as well as plain soldiers, sailors, and workers.

A former captain of a Soviet ship writes: "If the captain of the ship is a Jew, he is blamed for everything. Anti-Semitism among the sailors is very powerful. No one under my command knew that I was a Jew. I was very careful to keep it secret. During the war I commanded a number of Soviet ships, but the story was the same everywhere. After the war, in 1946, I was in port and went to have a drink with two 'responsible' Russians and one Lettish Communist. After we had had a few, one of the Russians opened up and said: 'Those Yids, no matter how many of them you kill, there are still too many left.' I couldn't stand it any longer, so I asked him: 'What have you got against the Jews? Six millions of them have been murdered.' To that the Lett replied: 'As a Communist I am opposed to what the Germans have done. But as a human being I must say, they didn't do enough. There are still too many Jews.'"

Here is a letter from a former Komsomol, a young man born and bred in Russia:

"I suffered because of the anti-Semitism all about me. Anti-Semitism became much stronger during the war. I was never a Jewish nationalist. I was a good Komsomol. But no matter what happened, every discussion eventually led to the Jewish problems. Why? Why? It is a disease which penetrated everywhere."

There is another letter from a 24-year-old boy from Rostov, in the Ukraine. His mother and sister were killed by the Nazis in Kiev, together with all the other Jews in that city. His father died in the war:

"You know better than I do what happened to the Jews when the Nazis penetrated into the Soviet Union. Unfortunately, a great part of the Russian population approved of the German behavior against the Jews. It is a bitter truth to hear, but is actually the truth. The Soviet Government fights against anti-Semitism, but the true spirit of the people became evident when the German bandits arrived. This is a difficult question for me, personally. How can such a thing be true of people who have been raised and educated in Soviet Russia? Who is responsible for it? How can anyone tell who is a Jew and who isn't? There is no mention in a Soviet passport of religion or national origin."

In the big pile of letters there are some from high Russian officers. One of them tells us that he is signing his letter with a Russian name because he doesn't want anyone to find out that he is a Jew.

A Russian anthology, Evreiski Mir (The Jewish World) which appeared in New York in 1944, fell into the hands of a 35-year-old Russian-Jewish expatriate in a camp. He read the whole volume and then wrote us a lengthy letter. He writes about his pleasure and surprise at reading it. "For the first time in my life," he writes, "here, on this German soil, in a Jewish DP camp, I read such courageous and free thoughts. You, Jews of America can't conceive of what it means. How happy you are that you have such an opportunity to think out loud without having to look fearfully about you. * * *"

But the anthology contains one article by a Communist, Stalinsky, on the Jews in the Red army. This is the comment of my Russian-Jewish correspondent:

"I know the Soviet Union very well, but unfortunately no one there knows that the heroes you, in America, mention as being Jewish, are actually Jewish. They are never advertised as Jews, because that would inflame the anti-Semitism in the country, which is already very great without it. You need nothing more than to say that such-and-such a general is a Jew. * * * These things are whispered in private, in a narrow circle of friends.

Here is another letter: "Poverty, slavery, fear, and, on top of that, anti-Semitism. * * * If I should ever be dragged back there I have a bullet left to kill myself.

We have no reason and no right to accuse the Soviet Government of anti-Semitism. We know of the prohibitions and penalties that have been imposed on anti-Semitism in Soviet Russia. It would be nice to believe that these letters are exaggerations, that in reality the Soviet people have been freed from anti-Semitism. But we can't fool ourselves. The mountainous wave of letters from the Russian Jews says something else.

Anti-Semitism is an ancient evil. For generation upon generation, economic, religious, and political forces have fanned the flames of hatred. Changed economic circumstances, heightened morality, purified culture, more humanity, more knowledge, more understanding, more real freedom, more equality, more justice, are the historical remedies for hatred between nation and nation, man and man. This cannot be achieved merely by decrees.

The people of Soviet Russia are poor, they live in darkness, their hearts are frozen, their minds imprisoned. The great world is closed to them. They know that they are not allowed to use the word "Yid." They know that it is forbidden to be an anti-Semite, and they are afraid of punishment. But when they are not afraid, when they are alone among themselves and a few glasses of vodka have loosened their tongues, they put into words that which they have in their hearts. When three men sit together, of whom one is secretly a Jew, they talk about it: "There are still too many Jews."

The Soviet writer Ilya Ehrenburg, who on his trip to America about a year ago is reported to have bought some 20 suits at $150 each, recently gave a lecture before a group of Jewish writers in Lodz, Poland. He spoke about anti-Semitism. He said that, just because some Ukrainian, Lithuanian, or Polish murders killed Jews during the war one couldn't condemn the whole people.

But where does the worst anti-Semitism exist? In America. He said: "I went to a hotel in America that didn't admit Jews. The Jew who accompanied me was indifferent to it. He said to me, 'So what? Is there a shortage of hotels that do admit Jews? And they are just as good, or even better than the others'."

Ilya Ehrenburg was quite wrought up about it. He told the Jews of Lodz: "The Jews over there, in America, don't understand the tragedy of the Jewish people. They have to be reminded. They have to be taught."

And in order to teach the American Jews he, the new interpreter of the Jewish tragedy, recently wrote that Americans are cannibals.

Hundreds of books, pamphlets, leaflets, appear in America that preach against race hatred, intolerance, anti-Semitism. The fight against discrimination in America is conducted by public hearings in the Government, publication of documents, dissemination of information through the radio, the press, the movies. The most successful film playing around the country now is Gentleman's Agreement, which is an indictment of anti-Semitism in its subterranean form.

It is my duty to read carefully the Soviet press and other literature. I have not found there, in many years, a single word of explanation or discussion of the problem, or a word of propaganda against anti-Semitism.

And here on my desk is the great pile of letters from Russian Jews telling about the concealed, but deep-rooted disease of anti-Semitism gnawing at the heart of the Soviet Union. These letters are profoundly shocking.

Much "Bunk" About Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES K. FLETCHER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 12, 1948

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union for June 8, 1948:

MUCH "BUNK" ABOUT HOUSING

By some peculiar quirk of American mentality, probably prompted by the paternalistic doctrines of the New Deal, there seems to prevail an idea that the Federal Government, the State governments, and the local governments have an obligation to furnish housing to everybody who may need or desire it. Common sense says that there is no more obligation on any unit of government to supply living quarters for an individual and his family than there is to provide food, clothing, and other necessities of life.

There is a logical exception, of course, in the case of the veteran who gave his service and risked his life in our armed services. His country owes him shelter and comfort and security for his wife and children. We have heard no objections from any quarter against decent housing for veterans and their families, and we feel certain that the people will support any measure designed to do them justice.

But there has grown into public thinking, thanks to New Dealism, the notion that there is an obligation on the governments, Federal, State, and local to provide housing for everybody, without regard to their status. The blunt truth is that the United States, or the State of California, or the city of San Diego, has no obligation whatever to furnish homes for nonveterans.

During the war, with production imperative, the Federal Government felt it necessary to provide housing for employees of war factories. This was done—in most cases at an extravagant price. With the end of the war emergency, however, there persisted a demand from millions of former war workers that they remain the beneficiaries of wartime conditions. Hundreds of thousands of workers had migrated to war industry centers, enjoying unparalleled wages and cheap living quarters at the expense of the Government. At the end of the war, manufacturers took their losses, if any, and set their sights on postwar conditions.

But millions of workers failed to reconcile themselves to peace conditions. They expected the same munificent compensation and the same Federal housing provisions prevailing during the war. As a result of this attitude, there is hardly an industrial community, or former industrial community, which has not been besieged with demands that the Government, State or National, continue to guarantee cheap housing for former employees of war industry.

Old standards have been overturned or abolished. There was a time before the war when a worker contemplating a change of employment or locality first inquired as to the prospects of employment and the opportunities for desirable living quarters. That time has passed. Southern California, for example, is crowded with individuals and families who have migrated to this area without assurance either of jobs or places to live. Many of the migrants have become patrons of the Red Cross, many of the county relief funds. But a large percentage of them, as the employment agencies will verify, have come to Southern California without assurance of jobs, without prospects of living quarters, and without means of sustenance beyond a brief period.

These, in major, account for what we have come to term "southern California's housing problem." They are the main subjects of tearful tirades against the negligence of government which fails to provide them with housing and adequate medical care. They have been responsible for a situation in which southern California cannot guarantee jobs and cannot guarantee housing.

The result of this shortsighted policy has been an accumulation of dependents, moved by radical agitators to place the blame on official indifference and to demand drafts on the taxpayers to pay for their shortsightedness and indifference to ordinary business sense.

The real housing problem in southern California is not a local problem for which local government is in any way responsible. It is the logical result of wholesale immigration of families and individuals, ignoring the dictates of common sense, and depending on the generosity of taxpayers to bail them out. If anyone doubts the truth of this statement, let him look at records of the Red Cross or the Federal employment agencies.

Taft-Ellender-Wagner Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD F. YOUNGBLOOD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 12, 1948

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Rolland E. Fisher before Eastern Detroit Realty Association, Tuesday, June 8, 1948:

I have been asked to discuss with you the highly publicized Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill (S. 866). I am very happy to do this because it is so important to the welfare of our industry and profession.

The T-E-W bill is an omnibus piece of legislation of over 100 pages. It is obscure, complicated and difficult to comprehend, even by experts. It is dished up as offering: (a) A way to end the housing shortage; (b) a way to help the veterans' housing situation; and (c) a way to consolidate Federal housing affairs and policies.

Actually, it is none of these things, except the latter, plus the launching of public housing on a scale never before attempted. It is full of long-range social planning; abounding in visionary schemes and idealistic devices.

The T-E-W bill is one of the most dangerous pieces of legislation ever proposed. It consists of nine titles, of which two only are directed toward the immediate supply of housing through private enterprise. They are titles I and II providing for extension of titles I, II, and VI of the National Housing Act. Title II provides for a secondary market in a most dangerous way. It creates a national mortgage corporation as an instrumentality of the United States; provides that there shall be a president of the corporation with all powers vested in him. It then provides that the Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall be the president of the corporation. This gives full and complete authority to the H and HFA Administrator and a blank check for $505,000,000 with no restrictions except a $10,000 limit on mortgages. This means that he can purchase these mortgages any place he chooses and for whatever reasons he chooses.

Title III covers housing research and the same man, the H and HFA Administrator, is directed by Congress to undertake and conduct a program of technical research on new and improved techniques, materials, building codes, standard dimensions, appraisal, credit, housing needs, demands and supply, finance and investment, other laws and codes, cost of housing, and related technical and economic research.

Mr. Foley is then directed to correlate as the result of this research his findings and recommend executive action on legislation necessary. He is also to encourage localities to make studies of their housing needs and markets, urban land use and related community development. To do this job he is confined to undertake research cooperatively only with agencies of State or local governments, educational institutions, and other nonprofit organizations. By the law he is deprived of conferring with or using the research facilities of private industry—such great companies as General Electric, Westinghouse, Libby-Owens-Ford, Johns-Manville, etc. These companies spend millions every year in research; yet the law specifically prohibits the Administrator from conferring and coordinating with these facilities.

Title V presumably provides for slum clearance and urban redevelopment. Actually it's a club over the localities to undertake a program which the previous title in research has outlined. This title by-passes the Appropriations Committee to the tune of $1,010,000,000 by providing funds directly through the Secretary of the Treasury. Instead of clearing slums, it actually gets into the details of public housing by stating that the residential slum areas may not be demolished before July 1950 because of the housing shortage and, at the same time stating that the plan for slum clearance in the locality must provide for families displaced in other areas not less desirable. This means that you would have to build public housing units into which you would move these displaced people before you could clear the slums. But to do so, another provision in the same title says that it is not necessary for the Administrator to remove the slums on the basis of one public housing unit for one slum unit unless he feels that he should.

This section not only provides that you clear slums, but that you can set up slum projects in open urban land and open suburban land adjoining a project area.

Title VI covers public housing. The high light is that even though the local community presribes that they do or do not want public housing, the final determination lies in Washington. This in so many words says that public housing locally is actually public housing out of Washington. This section also raises by 1 percent the amount of contributions which can be paid by the Federal Government to local communities as subsidies, so that now as much as 4½ percent would be paid by the Government for public housing money.

Title VII covers farm housing and reduces the farmer's status to serfdom. The Secretary of Agriculture holds full and complete control over every farm applicant to insure productivity of the land as the Secretary may direct. The joker in this section is that the bill states that an applicant must show (1) that he is the owner of a farm which does not have a decent, safe, and sanitary dwelling; (2) that he is without sufficient resources to provide the necessary housing on his own account; and (3) that he is unable to secure the credit necessary for such housing.

In other words, the farmer must be a deadbeat without credit before the Secretary of Agriculture will recognize him as an applicant for this housing—and that is considered as the best risk farmer. There are three other classifications that are equally as ridiculous. The joker is that a provision authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to compromise, adjust, or cancel subsidies and direct loans made to the farmer.

Now, with your permission, I would like to go back and take a look at title VI of the T-E-W bill. As I stated before, title VI of the T-E-W bill deals with public housing. In order to fully evaluate public housing, we should know the reasons for its beginning in the United States, completely understand its underlying philosophy, be cognizant of its objects, and calmly aware of its socialistic and damaging effects.

During World War I the United States Housing Corporation was established to deal with certain specialized war housing problems. Some of the unemployment relief PWA construction projects of the depression years took the form of housing projects. But public housing as a social policy of Government began with the United States Housing Act of 1937.

History of this movement for socialized housing is the story of constantly changing official purpose. The primary purpose of the 1937 act was to alleviate present and recurring unemployment. The goal has since shifted to housing for the needy, slum clearance, then housing for adequately paid war workers, later housing for veterans, and finally housing for typical tenant families.

While the Federal agency that promotes socialized housing has been changing its name from United States Housing Authority, to Federal Public Housing Authority, to Public Housing Administration, it has worked toward objectives that seek an increasing proportion of the Nation's tenants as its clients. In a radio debate over CBS on April 14, 1946, the first Administrator of the United States Housing Authority urged that two-thirds of our home production take the form of public housing.

If we have a socialized housing program on a scale to meet these publicly proclaimed goals, there is no reason to think we can avoid the results that England got by going the same route—an expansion in the number of dependent citizens, weakened private ownership of housing as more of the tax load for the increasing extent to socialized housing is

shifted to it, the elimination of private home production, and the kind of legislation that is now undermining private property ownership in England.

Since hearings began May 3 before the House Banking and Currency Committee, the proponents of S. 866, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner socialized housing bill, have held full sway. Their case can be summed up in one brief sentence—that the philosophy of the T-E-W bill is desirable and that many people are presently living in undesirable homes. There has been no documented evidence to show that this bill will alleviate the condition which they claim exists. There is no evidence to show that this bill will build one house for these people until at least 1950. The only emergency portion of the bill is contained in title I, which extends title VI, FHA, until March 31, 1949, and amends titles I and II, FHA, to bring them up to date.

Since Tuesday, June 1, the House Banking and Currency Committee has heard proponents to S. 866. Facts and figures have been given to show the absolute lack of need for the bill.

One of the first to be heard was Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, arch enemy of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill provisions for subsidized homes. Senator MCCARTHY charged that Federal housing projects in Detroit are country clubs for middle-income families and that Councilman Edgecomb, when Public Housing Administrator, was negligent in his duties. The Wisconsin Senator told the committee Detroit offered the Nation's worst example of public-housing occupancy by overincome families.

Another to be heard was George D. Lyle, Detroit, chairman of the Michigan veterans' housing committee. Accompanied by five other veterans, Mr. Lyle condemned S. 866, urged extension of FHA title VI, and called public housing a national experiment in state socialism.

Douglas Whitlock, chairman of the Building Products Institute, called the bill a hodgepodge of ambiguity and the most flagrant collection of political pork ever assembled under one tent. In referring to the 22,000 words of the bill, he said: "Not more than a handful of people, including the Members of the Senate, understand what it means. And yet, because of clever propaganda and tremendous political pressure from high places, many large and well-meaning organizations have been induced to support a bill which they accept entirely on faith. And that faith has been broken, whether intentionally or otherwise."

In writing about the housing emergency, in the May issue of the Civic Searchlight, Mr. James Inglis, Director of the Detroit Housing Commission, said:

"The private home-building industry is seriously sick today and in desperate need of a good stiff blood transfusion.

"That the home-building industry is sick hardly needs amplification here.

"It is sick as any industry is sick when it fails in its primary purpose."

Let's see how sick the home-building industry really is.

In spite of weeks and months of congressional dispute, official statistics from various agencies of Government prove conclusively the industry's ability to produce under the favorable financial conditions which have existed until recently. Preliminary estimates indicate that new construction started in the month of May will exceed 100,000 units. April's 90,000 starts were record breaking, but May will exceed anything in history.

In 1947, 840,000 new units were completed even though starts during the first 4 months were 25 percent less than new starts this year. It is quite clear that if Congress follows Mr. WOLCOTT's suggestion that "we do these other things which are necessary to keep up the momentum of home construction," we shall exceed the million mark in this country for the first time.

A NEW ALL-TIME FHA RECORD

In April a total of 35,555 units were started under FHA inspection, beating March by 18 percent. During the first 4 months a total of 104,698 units was considerably more than twice the 42,032 units started during the first 4 months of 1947. April applications for mortgage insurance included 27,379 units under title II, of which 10,130 were for new construction at an average mortgage valuation of approximately $7,500. This represents a dollar volume of approximately $75,975,000.

Now let's see how well public housing has done their job.

It took Government 32 months to build 2,150 units at Herman Gardens, 25 months to build 240 units of the Brewster Addition, and 27 months to build 355 units of the Parkside Addition. And there was no shortage of labor or materials in 1938.

Going back to Mr. Inglis' article, he says: "They"—and here he refers to "selfish pressure groups"—"They are afraid to risk an honest democratic vote on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill in the House of Representatives."

Here again Mr. Inglis is very mistaken.

The home builders and realtors of the Nation want an "honest democratic vote on public housing," but the public housers are afraid to risk it. Public housers are afraid to risk a vote on the socialized public housing feature of the T-E-W bill and so tack it onto other housing features such as FHA, title VI, etc. We would welcome a vote on public housing alone, but I doubt if Mr. Inglis, or any other public houser, would.

Let's see what else Mr. Inglis says in his article. He states further, "For two long years a stubborn minority in the Lower House of Congress has stood in the way."

I declare that is a false statement. For weeks now Congresswoman HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS has been attempting to get 218 signatures to a petition to take the T-E-W bill away from the House and bring it onto the floor for action. To date she has been able to get only 161. This should prove conclusively that a majority of the House are not in favor of public housing and instead of being a "stubborn minority" are a "thoughtful majority."

The most persistent plea for Government production, ownership, and operation of housing is that private enterprise and private ownership can't produce decent housing for families of modest rent-paying ability, so Government must do the job. The fact is private enterprise and private ownership are now providing half of the country's urban and rural nonfarm housing at monthly rentals of $29.33 or less. More than 7,000,000 dwellings are in this low-rent range.

The recent Bureau of the Census report showing that average rent in the United States was only $29.33 in 1947, completely shatters the case of the proponents of public housing who plead for a huge Federal building program on the premise that private enterprise is not taking care of the low-income people.

A further study of the report disclosed, moreover, that 90 percent of the ordinary dwelling units in the country were in good condition or in need of only minor repairs, destroying another of the favorite lines of the public housers that the country is overrun with what they term "substandard housing."

That average rent of $29.33 means that half of the tenants in this great Nation, or more than 8,830,000 of them, paid $29.33 or less a month. In fact, the figures show that 4,100,000 tenants paid rents of less than $20 a month.

Although section 2 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, which established the public-housing program, defines the low-income families presumed to be its beneficiaries as "families who are in the lowest-income group," the housing provided by the act goes to other families.

As of April 23, 1948, out of 4,877 permanent units of public housing under direct control of the Detroit Housing Commission, 2,276 units, or 47 percent of the total, were occupied by overincome families. Of a total of 11,421 units of temporary and permanent public housing in Detroit, only 10 percent are being occupied by families of welfare status.

The public-housing program is responsible for the building of 155,000 dwellings, according to testimony in hearings on S. 1592 (pt. I, p. 187). The total number of dwellings demolished on the sites of these projects is 54,000, according to Public Housing, a booklet published by the Federal Public Housing Authority. Thus, about two-thirds of the public housing stands on sites that were never slum sites.

FPHA claims credit for demolition of another 43,000 dwellings on sites other than sites of new housing projects. This simply underscores the distinction between slum clearance and housing and makes clear the fact that they are not identical.

The truth of the matter is that housing does not create slums. Slums are created by people. The best housing in the world will not cause certain types of individuals to change their living conditions or habits.

Because certain strata of our society will not sacrifice a few pleasures in order to purchase used homes and convert them to their use is no reason for asking the taxpayers of the Nation to expend billions of dollars for new public housing to take care of them. It is as foolish and uneconomical as asking taxpayers to buy 1949 Chevrolets and Fords for everyone because they cannot afford to purchase them and will not buy used cars of older vintage.

Public housing is subsidized housing—housing which rents for less than its market price. If the socialistic demands of the public housers are satisfied by passing such legislation as the T-E-W bill, their next goal can be a clamor for nationalized automobile production, for public food growing, or for governmental clothing manufacturers. The same arguments can be used for cars, or steaks, or winter overcoats; that poor people cannot afford enough of them, or not decent ones; therefore, the Government should start auto plants, cattle ranches, and what have you, the output to be sold at a discount to the selected poor.

Even the thoughtful supporters of public housing have seen its dangers as a political bear trap. Langdon W. Post, a regional director of the Federal Public Housing Authority, referred to public housing as a "new brand of political fruit which has enormous possibilities for exploitation."

Charles Abrams, while consultant to the United States Housing Authority, admitted that "public housing is a great field for political intrigue and offers many opportunities of personal advantage to the unscrupulous."

In Detroit the results of the last councilmanic election show that, while Council President Edwards garnered 59.2 percent of the votes, city-wide, and former Public Housing Commissioner Edgecomb received 50.5 percent, a tabulation of the votes in districts 84A and 84B, in which the Parkside project is located, showed Edgecomb got an average of 85.8 percent of the vote, while Edwards got 69.9 percent; yet in two adjoining districts, 84 and 83, Edwards' average was 64.7 percent, while Edgecomb dropped to 54.1 percent. In districts 16, 17, 18, and 19, in which the Herman Gardens project is located, Public Houser Edgecomb received an average of 86.2 percent of the vote, while Edwards received 72.3 percent of the vote. Again, we see that in districts 14, 15, 20, and 21, adjacent to Herman Gardens, Edgecomb received 57.9 percent, while Edwards received 65 percent. These figures point conclusively to the colonization of votes feature of public housing.

I would like to read to you a statement on public housing by the Bildor, official publication of the Builders' Association of Metro-

politan Detroit. The Bildor says in the May issue, and again I quote:

"It is claimed by professional public housers, a substantial number of uninformed do-gooders, and some local editorial writers, that passage of the public-housing features of the T-E-W bill will relieve the current housing emergency.

"There is nothing in the 15-year record of public housing which gives any weight to this assumption. On the contrary, the evidence on the record, positively indicates that public housing would contribute practically zero to the current housing shortage.

"Let us examine some facts; assuming that the public-housing features of the T-E-W bill were enacted into law by July 1.

"The only local projects ready for immediate approval are the Douglas and Jeffries projects—2,440 units.

"If work started promptly July 1, it would take at least 6 months—probably a year—to demolish existing buildings and clear the sites. Assuming that the site was cleared in 6 months and contract awards approved by January 1, covering both projects; the projects would be completed by August 1949—if everything proceeded with prewar speed.

"We arrive at this estimate by checking the records on Herman Gardens—2,150 units. The construction time was 32 months from date of contract awards to completion.

"Here is the record on two small prewar projects, Brewster addition, 240 units; and Parkside addition, 355 units. Brewster was completed 25 months after project approval. Parkside 27 months after project approval.

"There were no shortage of labor or materials in 1938. So on the record, if the T-E-W bill were immediately enacted into law, it would be approximately 3 years before a public housing project would be completed.

"Records of recent events substantiate this conclusion. Local and national public-housing authorities have been struggling for 2 years to build 1,200 so-called reuse units. (These are the little architectural gems, such as you see decorating factory front yards along Connor Avenue.)

"As of this date, this great 1,200 temporary housing project is still uncompleted.

"And the cost?

"We are reliably informed that these dinky, little two-by-four apartments, exclusive of land or site improvements, are costing $7,800 each.

"'And,' says a Detroit editorial writer, 'the T-E-W bill will reduce construction costs. Some adults still believe in Santa Claus.

"In the same 2-year period, Detroit metropolitan area builders have moved thousands of veterans into new single homes, selling from $6,900 to $8,800. And these selling prices include land costs, site improvements, and taxes.

"The veterans who bought these private enterprise houses, with 10 percent or less down, are getting their housing for from $36 to $48 per month, including principal payments, interest, and insurance. On the basis of comparative earnings and income, those payments compare with $18 and $24 in 1938. Is this high-cost housing?

"The record indicates that private builders were making substantial progress in solving the veterans' housing program, until Government cut off veteran credit terms."

And now just a word about the cost of the T-E-W bill.

It is hard to estimate the exact total costs of the T-E-W bill. Actually, it is full of financial booby traps. But even if we take conservative estimates and put our finger on those costs we can identify, they add up to $9,075,000,000. This does not include the contingent liabilities the people might have to assume under the indefinite commitments in this measure.

Let's think about that $9,075,000,000 for a moment. How much does that mean the taxpayer will have to pay out in Federal taxes to finance the public housing this bill would put up?

With 145,000,000 people in the United States, according to Bureau of the Census estimates, it means that every man, woman, and child would have to pay $62 in Federal taxes for this bill alone—at the very minimum.

Public housing can build housing, but it cannot accomplish the social objectives of clearing slums and providing housing for families in the low-income classes. Public housing is not veterans' housing. The American Legion at the 1947 national convention voted 2,796 to 722 against the T-E-W bill and public housing. Organized veterans of Michigan are on record as against public housing in any form. Public housing is an alien philosophy which brought loss of freedom and ruin to so many European countries. Public housing is one thing and one only—it is a gateway to further nationalization and socialization of American industry and regimentation of our people—it is a big step toward communism.

State Department Business Transaction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 12, 1948

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Senate Majority News for June 11, 1948:

GOOD BUSINESS TRANSACTION

News item: "Iranian Government wants surplus United States military equipment 'to maintain internal security.' However, it doesn't have the dollars to pay either the purchase price of the equipment, $10,000,000, or the $15,675,000 for repairing, packaging, and shipping. The State Department asks Congress for an appropriation so it can extend credit to Iran to cover both sums."

The above sounds like this kind of a "business transaction":

Jones: I desire to purchase your piano.

Smith: Fine. It cost me $1,000, but I'll sell it to you for $100.

Jones: But I don't have $100.

Smith: Oh, that's all right. Just give me your I O U.

Jones: The piano is in bad shape. It needs repairing. Also it'll have to be packed and shipped to my home. How much will that cost?

Smith: $150.

Jones: But I don't have $150.

Smith: Just give me an I O U for that, too.

Jones: You're a nice guy to do business with.

Smith: I aim to please—that's my motto.

Mr. Speaker, this is the way our State Department does business. Oh, how silly, how unbusinesslike.

Polish Soldiers Who Fought for Liberty Should Not Be Forgotten

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the first to resist the advance of the Nazi hordes in Europe was the Army of Poland.

Today, thousands of the brave heroes of Poland's Army are among the displaced persons of Europe because they remain as strongly opposed to the Russian form of dictatorship as they were to the Hitler style.

When victory came to the United Nations these fighting men of Poland, the most liberty-loving nation of Europe looked to a triumphant return to their homeland. Instead they find their country an unsafe place for them because of their refusal to bow to Soviet domination.

I favor this pending amendment which would allow 18,000 Polish soldiers admission to the United States in addition to the authorized number of displaced persons under terms of H. R. 6396. Granting that the majority of these soldiers are now in England does not, in my opinion, take them out of the status of displaced persons.

These first champions of freedom in Europe are the type of men who will make fine Americans. They will make splendid citizens and add to the glory of their homeland as have the thousands of Polish birth and of Polish ancestry who through our entire American history have contributed so much to the building of a great Nation in the New World.

Wedgwood's Curse—The Darkest Hour in British Ethics Came When His Faith Was Betrayed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 12, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Wedgwood's Curse," which appeared in the New York Post on June 1, 1948:

WEDGWOOD'S CURSE—THE DARKEST HOUR IN BRITISH ETHICS CAME WHEN HIS FAITH WAS BETRAYED

(By Observer)

When, during World War II, the late Josiah Wedgwood, a much respected member of the British Parliament, came to the United States to seek lend-lease for his country, he appealed in a pamphlet to the American Nation with these words:

"We shall not convert a crusade into imperialism by a mean use of your help. May the Lord do so to us, and more also, if once we break that faith."

Lend-lease was granted. Soon thereafter Josiah Wedgwood died. And the British converted the crusade into imperialism by a mean use of American help.

Josiah Wedgwood was the greatest champion of the cause of Zionism, and every just cause, in Great Britain. Winston Churchill, in his preface to Wedgwood's autobiography, a Fighting Life, wrote: "The distressed of the whole world learned to look to him and through him to Parliament for the redress of wrongs." At his death there was none to take up the mantle of the champion of unselfish courage and constancy in the support of what he deemed honor. Had Josiah

Wedgwood lived, Great Britain would not have fallen so low in political morality. Today is the darkest hour in British ethics.

Great Britain, for some reason inexplicable from the viewpoint of self-interest, placed Palestine at the top of her politics, although a quarter of the world is still in British hands.

There she heaped mistake upon blunder, blunder upon injustice, until she became so enmeshed in colonial intrigue at the expense of the Jewish people that she lost face and moral stature. Violating the decisions of the old League of Nations, misinterpreting the mandate and the Balfour Declaration, she actually became coculprit with Nazi Germany in the annihilation of the Jews in Europe.

The wrecking work of Great Britain is causing the break-down of the new world organization, the United Nations. Great Britain, more than any other nation, should be interested in the existence of this organization, for Great Britain endures not only by her own strength but by the charity of the United States, and not financial charity alone, but also military and political charity.

But in the calculating mind of Ernest Bevin, Great Britain could escape the obviously humiliating role of international beggar by increasing the differences between Russia and America, by infecting both countries with suspicion.

Bevin tries to use the Palestinian problem as an apple of discord between Russia and America, applying the old Hitlerian slogans of "the Jews and the Communists." From the day when the chancellery building in Berlin collapsed over the bodies of Hitler and Goebbels, Great Britain has taken over Hitler's works.

Today Great Britain is the main protagonist of anti-Semitism in the world. Therefore it is futile to argue that Great Britain is a socialist country with a socialist government.

A socialist country that supports Franco in Spain, King George in Greece, and Chiang Kai-shek in China, the Mufti in Palestine, and great cartels in Germany, and that spreads anti-Semitism in the world, is a national-socialist government, and Nazi is an abbreviation for this.

The Nazis in Germany also introduced a number of social reforms. But the attitude of the Nazis toward peoples of other nationalities made them diverge from the socialist movement, and it is the same with the British Labor Government. This is the criterion: As long as an anti-Semitic policy motivates a government it is not socialist but national-socialist. As a logical result, such government will side with Franco, the Mufti, etc.

Teamwork Between Labor and Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. CROW

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 12, 1948

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Maurice R. Franks from Partners for May–June 1948:

TEAMWORK

Speaking over a Nation-wide radio hookup recently, William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, brought out a fact that needed to be presented to the attention of a great many Americans. He stressed the importance of teamwork between labor and management.

"Such teamwork," said Mr. Green, "would be impossible under a Communist philosophy, which preaches class warfare. But with labor-management teamwork, we can attain full employment, maximum production, and widespread industrial peace."

Wise words, Mr. Green. For what you are saying is that unless the partners of industry settle down and pull together as a team, our American system of free enterprise is headed for oblivion. In the light of this hideous possibility, it will be still wiser for you, as president of the American Federation of Labor, to bend every effort to make the obvious truth of your statements sink into the minds of the rank and file of American workers as a whole. Fancy words and fancy speeches on formal occasions are not enough—it is faithful and continuous action that really counts. And you, as the mouthpiece of a great and potent labor organization, are in an excellent position to perform a public service of supreme importance, by setting an example of sincere, intense, and constructive action. Your organization, from top to bottom, must be made to feel the impact of your leadership in a program as vital as this.

In order to achieve the ideal of labor-management teamwork in industry, the workers, as well as the manager, must at all times shoulder his responsibility to the team. He must not balk at giving an honest day's work for an honest day's pay. This much is obviously implied in any discussion of industrial teamwork.

But to listen to such a sane discourse over the radio and immediately afterward to learn another broadcast over the same ether that strikes of great magnitude are again becoming prevalent throughout the Nation, is to make the listener wonder just what on earth Mr. Green really means when he speaks of teamwork as applied to labor and management.

In the city of Chicago the printers are out on strike, and with them, the packing-house workers. In Detroit, thousands of automobile workers, and in Buffalo the entire building and construction trades are likewise striking. And we could go on and on, citing strikes of every kind and description—some justifiable and some just defiable. All of which sums up to the fact that the team of production is doing a lot of plowing—but mostly plowing under.

PHONY WAGES NOT COLLECTIBLE

With the demands for higher and higher wages comes the command of higher and higher prices. And mainly because not enough leaders have taken it upon themselves to analyze the basic requirements of teamwork. Bigger real wages and really better working conditions arise out of bigger and better production, possible only as a result of the cooperative efforts of labor and management when pulling as a team. Union bargaining strategy alone can result only in bigger strikes, bigger wages and bigger prices—and therefore headaches all around. Higher wages inscribed on contract paper and secured by the brass of animosity can become as unreliable as so much Chinese cash. Unless there is the gold of harmony and the silver of production behind the paper working agreement, higher wages become just tokens of a lower standard of living.

Speaking of a lower standard of living brings to mind the question of overtime—and particularly double-time. On quick glance, this phony looks genuine. But when presented for redemption, it is disclosed to be quite brazen. Work 1 day, get paid for 2? 'Tain't bad, brother. But when you go to collect on that one, you soon find out that this kind of money is tainted—because of the inability of the employer to pay 2 days' wages for 1 day's work. And that is why very little overtime work today is called for, and scarcely any double-time at all. With the result that the worker actually gets just 5 days' pay to cover 7 days' obligations—and brother, 'taint enough.

In short, double-time in essence has turned out to be nothing more than double talk.

SELFISH PROMOTION OF A FALLACY

Now, what is behind all this nonsense? Have all our labor leaders gone beserk? Are they all just a bunch of Communists and racketeers? Definitely not. By and large, most of them are good conscientious individuals and sincerely believe that higher wages for less production are the basis for a sound economy—especially the union economy. Selfishly, such a leader believes that the minimum number of hours produce the maximum number of members—and thereby maximum financial security for the leader. Such a philosophy, however, is not only shortsighted, it is likewise utterly fallacious. And what is more, it presents a dangerous hazard to our total economy.

America, as we know it, did not become the greatest productive Nation in the world as a result of minimum production at maximum cost. It attained to its present position through the application of a wholly opposite formula: maximum production at minimum cost, thereby making available the most of the best for the least to the most. Only through the application of this principle was our unusually high standard of living created, and only through our unswerving application of it can that standard be maintained. Any other theory is sheer poppycock—inspired either by ignorance or by the Communist plot to destroy our American way of life.

Behind this vicious plot of economic murder lie jealousy and a lust for power. Jealousy and hatred between labor and management? Oh, hardly that. The trouble lies with those who, in their fits of jealous rage, would tear the entire body of free enterprise apart. Make no mistake, the Communists also have a program, not of producing, but of getting, the most of the best for the least. And to them, as to us, the most of the best is America—and they intend to get it for the least. Which means by hook or by crook. Their crooks are in our labor movement and their hooks are in our press—particularly in our labor press.

Oh, why don't more of our labor leaders have the courage—and I may add—the intelligence, to acquaint their memberships with these all-important facts! Why don't they lead their followers, instead of following the lead of the enemies of their followers?

THE ISSUE IS COMMUNISM

This is no time to pussyfoot the issue of communism. The hour is late, too late to indulge in starry-eyed liberalism—liberal to the extent of urging us to give up everything we now possess in exchange for the nothing which lies in the storehouse of a bogus ideology. We have no time left to pamper the kind of liberalism which would have us accept a bad egg in exchange for a good hen.

For communism at its best is, in fact, a bad egg—and when opened up, sends off an odor nauseating to every sensible American. And yet, in spite of all this, we are letting go unchallenged the propaganda dispensed by the leftist press of this Nation—voluminous propaganda, if you please—which tells the American worker stories that distort these facts and, at the same time, paints Soviet Russia as a modern economic Utopia, where nobody works very hard and everyone gets lots and lots of nice soft money.

Looming large among the purveyors of this kind of propaganda is The Daily Worker, the official organ of the Communist Party of the United States and a publication whose pages serve only to desecrate all phases of our American way of life. The very name of worker is blasphemed by its inclusion in the title of this radical journal, whose scurrilous news items and editorials are a disgrace to the principle of the free press as

sanctified by the Constitution of our United States.

It's about time that we acquaint the American worker with these left-handed would-be overthrowers of our Government, these unconscionable distorters of fact.

THE CASE OF AN "AGAINSTER"

And speaking of fact, another publication comes to mind—one which also deserves a public airing, so that the American people will come to know it for what it really is: A perverter of the very facts it purports to expose. In Fact is a misnamed pulpy four-page pamphlet published each week in New York and edited by one George Seldes, a notorious "againster" who, in book and article, for the past 20 years has been snapping and snarling at everything to the right or left. By means of malicious innuendo and uncompromising perversion of evidence—plus no end of silly guesswork—he has carried on a relentless and arrogant campaign of hatred, the final purpose of which would seem to be the pitting of Protestant against Catholic, of worker against his employer, of each and every American against his natural teammates.

Seldes' weekly "news" letter, In Fact, personifying everything but what its name implies, may not be, like the Daily Worker, an out-and-out Communist publication, but certainly it is doing a marvelous job, through its columns of hate and hysteria, to abet the strategy of communism, by dividing the American people and thereby leaving them wide open for conquest.

DISTORTERS OF FACT

The editors of every decent publication in America should not hesitate in going all out to expose such papers as the Daily Worker and In Fact for what they really are—distorters of fact. We who are charged with the responsibility of forming public opinion through the press, if we value our American heritage, must spare no effort to identify its enemies. Our job at this crucial moment is to unmask the crackpots and willful revolutionaries who, from the sidelines, are doing their utmost to frighten our American production team and prevent them from realizing the fullest possibilities of teamwork.

Frankly yours,

MAURICE R. FRANKS, *Editor.*

America and the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABE McGREGOR GOFF

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 12, 1948

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix to the RECORD, I include a major portion of an address given by Dr. Stephen B. L. Penrose, Jr., president-elect of the American University, of Beirut and International College, Beirut, Lebanon, before the national convention of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, in Portland, Oreg., May 26, 1948.

During the late war, more than 16 months of my overseas service was in the Middle East.

Dr. Penrose, with whom I am acquainted, offers a challenging summary of American problems and interests in that area. He served with American Military Intelligence in the Middle East during the last war, and later was in charge of planning OSS intelligence activities in the European theater. In offering his informed lecture to you, I call your attention to the very real dangers which threaten our vital position at the main crossroads between troubled Europe and seething Asia. I regret that limitations on the printing of extensions will not permit inclusion of the speech in full. Some excerpts follow:

AMERICA AND THE MIDDLE EAST

As recently as the beginning of the last war, I wrote a chapter on the Middle East, in a book which I am quite sure no one ever read. The book was entitled "The Asian Legacy and American Life." In my contribution to it, I attempted to analyze the opinions which Americans had of the Middle East, and I was able to say, with my tongue only half in my cheek, that the general impression most Americans had of the Middle East was that it was largely composed of sand and camels.

This was only 7 years ago. Developments during the war have markedly altered our views. The early concentration of military operations in Egypt, the establishment of a large American supply command in Iran, the air operations of the British and Americans from Egypt and Palestine, and the use of various Mediterranean bases by our Office of Strategic Services for behind-the-lines penetration into German-occupied Greece and the Balkans have familiarized a great many Americans with the area far more than was previously the case.

Important interallied conferences were held in Cairo and Tehran, serving to focus our interest on this part of the world. Recently the protracted struggle over Zionism in Palestine has brought that small country and the parts of the Arab world adjacent to it very much to the forefront of our attention. There are few subjects which have in recent months so consistently and for so long a period been a matter of front-page interest in the American press.

In spite of this markedly increased publicity, the American people are by no means as well informed as they should be concerning the importance of the area to America itself. We have not yet come to understand that the Middle East is an important key to our own security both of the present time and in the foreseeable future. It is on this relationship between America and the Middle East that I wish to speak to you today.

There are four major reasons for the importance of the Middle East to the United States. First it is a vast and populous area whose political orientation is still uncrystallized. The decision which it will make in this time of world dichotomy will be momentous for us for good or ill. Second, Americans have traditionally played an important, if unofficial, role in the development of the various countries at the eastern end of the Mediterranean. Third, the area possesses certain great natural resources which are essential to our civil economy, to the support of our established foreign policies, and to our military preparedness. Fourth, by its geographic location alone, the Middle East is of vital strategic importance in an air age. I would like to expand somewhat on each of these four points.

With the exception of Turkey and Iran, the area which we are considering is almost entirely Arab and, including the two exceptions mentioned, it is preponderantly Moslem in its religious faith. The vital influences which caused the amazing development and spread of Islamic empires in the seventh and eighth centuries have lain dormant for the past several hundred years just as for centuries prior to the awakening caused by the Arab expansion, Europe itself had slumbered in its dark ages.

Since the First World War, however, there has been marked evidence of a renaissance in the Arab world, and this new spirit is finding expression in the development of a number of new states, recently independent and struggling to establish themselves in the family of nations. Turkey got an early start under her remarkable leader Ataturk, but to Turkey's surprising rebirth from decadence have now been added Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Iran, Transjordan, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia. In this latter country there is a ruler whose strength and vision are comparable to those of Ataturk, although to most Americans King Ibn Saud is nothing more than an oriental despot, an absolute monarch of nomadic tribesmen.

Most of these countries have only recently broken away from foreign control or from shackling social and governmental conditions. They are striving with much the same enthusiasm and under at least as great handicaps as characterized the efforts of our Thirteen Original States to establish themselves as free and independent nations. Their efforts affect a territory nearly 2,000,000 square miles in area with a population of some 76,000,000 people.

This great area and its people are the spiritual nucleus of the entire Moslem world stretching from Pakistan on the east to Morocco on the west. What happens in it is of vital importance to 300,000,000 Moslems, who feel together, even if at the moment they do not always act together. It is potentially a mighty factor in the development of future world affairs.

By long tradition the Middle East is predisposed to be friendly to the United States. This is due in part to the fact that since the late nineteenth century a large number of Arabic-speaking people have settled in the United States and have sent back to their friends and relative in the Arab world glowing reports of the idealism, the wealth and opportunity which America embodies. Furthermore, their reports have been consistent with what personal experience the Middle Easterners have had with Americans in their midst.

* * * * *

The most permanent, far-reaching and effective of the American influences in the Middle East have been those which had their source in the large group of colleges and universities which were founded and are operated by American initiative and vision. Springing originally from the characteristic missionary desire to raise the cultural level of the peoples with whom they worked there have now been for more than 80 years American educational institutions of high quality operating in the Middle East.

In the training which they have given to thousands of their graduates they have exerted a profound influence over the entire area, and at the same time have unwittingly cultivated in the minds of many more thousands an admiring and admirable conception of the ideals and energies of the American people.

* * * * *

I wish to emphasize that in spite of this background it is by no means impossible to undermine these long-established influences. Action by the American Government which is inconsistent with the ideals which these people have come to think of as being distinctively American can only too easily affect their faith in us and turn the sweetness of friendship to the bitterness of enmity. I am sorry to say that during the past few years and particularly the past few months the American Government's attitude with regard to Zionism has done much to turn opinion against us.

Rightly or wrongly, our friends in the Middle East have come to believe that America stands for justice in international relations and brotherhood among peoples. Rightly or wrongly, our strong support of political Zionism, our original pressure on behalf of the partition of Palestine, and our recent frantic haste to extend de facto recognition to Israel, have led them to believe that the principle of self-determination of peoples, the foundation of international

justice, is just a phrase to which America pays lip service only.

They find it difficult to understand, how by any other interpretation the United States can support the establishment in a limited area of the sovereignty and independence of a minority group with half the population which the Arabs have in the same area. They cannot see the connection between brotherhood and the divisive influence of an intensified and exclusive nationalism.

They recognize the fact that for reasons of local political expediency American politicians may deem it advisable to give their support to Zionism. However, they would say, and they have said it to me, "this is what we might expect from our own politicians but not from those of a country whose ideals have always been held up to us as exemplary and whose wise leadership in the world of today is the one hope upon which may be built the structure of a permanent peace."

Parenthetically may I say that such a view is typical of a great part of the world. We Americans must realize that whether we want it or not, we have a responsibility for world leadership such as has never before fallen upon any nation. Woe be unto us if we are measured and found wanting.

I have mentioned the fact that the Middle East possesses natural resources which are essential to us. This of course means oil, of which the proved reserves in Arabia, Iraq, and Iran are more than 40 percent of the total oil reserves of the entire world. The United States has but 31 percent of the world's reserves, and we have heretofore always considered America to be the richest source of oil on the globe.

It has become fashionable of late to criticize American interest in the Middle East as the result of "oil diplomacy," an opprobious and slippery term implying that the Government is controlled by oil companies and their bankers who are fearful for their investments in the Arabian oil installations and for their profits from Arabian oil. The true picture is rarely if ever presented, for it is far more alarming than titillating to the American reader.

Something far more serious is at stake than profits of private companies, to whom incidentally we can be sincerely grateful for their original development of the middle-eastern oil fields and for the exemplary way in which they have carried out their relations with the Arab governments. They typify an entirely new conception of the "economic exploiter," for they have done much to strengthen and confirm the excellent relations between Arabs and Americans which have existed in the past.

The plain facts on oil are that the United States is in 1948 consuming more oil than it produces, even without taking into consideration the new commitments for its use which we have undertaken. I am referring to the program of European recovery and to our plans for increased national defense.

It does not seem to be generally known that petroleum products are second only to food among the major items of material aid to be provided under the Marshall plan. The program envisages shipment of a quantity of oil in 1949 amounting to 1,000,000 barrels a day. Under the plan, 91 percent of this is to be provided from non-United States production, more than half of it from the Middle East. This oil aid is scheduled on an increasing scale with more than one and one-third million barrels of oil a day required by 1952. Of this latter amount, 97 percent is expected to come from non-United States production, and by that time it is scheduled to come chiefly from the Middle East.

Since America is already consuming more oil than it produces, it is apparent that such vast supplies cannot come from this country under present conditions. During the war, we were able to make available for military use an equivalent amount of oil but only by practicing strict rationing, strict control of nonessential industry, and by the conversion of many war industries to coal. At that time, too, we had a large reserve of productive capacity which is no longer available because of our greatly increased consumption.

If Middle East oil were to be denied to us, we would either have to return to such a wartime program, if that were now possible, or else radically curtail and reschedule that part of the Marshall plan which is devoted to economic recovery. The former alternative, involving rationing, would in all probability be unacceptable to the American people in time of peace, yet the latter would perfectly fit the avowed Russian aim of preventing the successful carrying out of the Marshall plan.

To put it bluntly, if we can get sufficient supplies of oil from the Middle East, we have a chance of making the European recovery program succeed. Without it, we can almost certainly expect it to fail or to be greatly retarded in its effect. Since it is such a vital factor in the European recovery program, we may confidently expect that Russia will do everything in her power to see to it that we are denied access to Middle East oil.

You should be clearly aware that in order to accomplish such a purpose it is not necessary for Russia to strike at the oil fields themselves or even to stop the operations of American oil companies on the Persian Gulf. If Russia can insure the development of chaotic political conditions in the Middle East, she can retard our production and at the same time prevent the development of those facilities for distribution which are essential in order to get the oil to Europe. Without any question, this aim is behind Russian support of partition for Palestine, behind her efforts to prevent the successful accomplishment of a peaceful solution in Palestine through trusteeship or effective truce, behind her recognition of the Zionist state. Our own recognition, calculated in part to get the jump on the Russians, was actually like beating them to a punch on our own jaw.

Greater Than Pyramids

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 12, 1948

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes appearing in the Washington Daily News for June 12, 1948:

GREATER THAN PYRAMIDS

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

WITH PRESIDENT TRUMAN.—Looking upon Grand Coulee Dam in Washington for the third time, as President Truman saw it again for the third time, here came back a declamation we boys used to deliver in high school—Napoleon's speech to his army at the Pyramids, beginning:

"Forty centuries look down upon you."

Standing on top of the great dam, watching the waters hurtle down from one side and from the other, looking up the lake formed by the dam which extends 151 miles to the Canadian border, you are gazing into the future—a future of boundless promise created by man in his engineering and scientific role, and not the dead bricks of the Pyramids raised to satisfy the vanity of an Egyptian potentate by the labor of a myriad of slaves which Napoleon celebrated in his oration.

The centuries instead open up before you. This is the future.

The late President Roosevelt, with his vision, saw it and initiated the Grand Coulee project in Washington and the Bonneville project in Oregon, also on the Columbia River.

He urged a series of dams to control and utilize this great river in the development of the Northwest. Had that been done the disastrous floods which wiped out the whole town of Vanport, Oreg., and devastated vast areas over which President Truman flew in a trip of inspection, would not have happened.

They could have been controlled, just as floods have been controlled by unified development of the Tennessee River by TVA.

President Truman's gospel, as was that of Franklin D. Roosevelt, is an expanding America. But, as he pointed out, there are "men of little faith" who bitterly fought this development which has meant so much for the Northwest, and who are now bitterly fighting its expansion.

The private utilities and their agents in Congress not only choke off appropriations in Congress in this sabotage attempt, but they also are seeking to prevent the Government from building transmission lines from its public power projects to provide electricity cheaply to householders and industry.

The President cited the case of the great Shasta Dam in California. It has been completed, but the utilities, through their agents in Congress, have blocked the building of transmission lines.

Campaign Comments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Gladewater Daily Times-Herald May 19, 1948, and some comments which appeared in the Kilgore News-Herald May 23, 1948:

[From the Gladewater Daily Times-Tribune of May 19, 1948]

GLADEWATER CONGRESSMAN ASSURED OF REELECTION WITHOUT AN OPPONENT

Ten years ago a young representative of Upshur County in the legislature announced himself a candidate for Congress against a veteran Member of the National Legislative Body. His winning personality, his sincerity, and his forthright manner won for him the Democratic Party's nomination and election to the post of Representative of the Third District in the National Congress.

LINDLEY BECKWORTH, of Gladewater, Tex., has had a hard fight to win renomination in every election since. But hard as the fight has been, he has won handily in every race. Two years ago two distinguished attorneys, one a district judge and the other a former district judge, opposed him. As able as were his opponents, LINDLEY BECKWORTH won in the first primary. The people believed in the young Congressman.

This time, although there have been conferences of political leaders who desire the political scalp of the Gladewater man, none saw a possibility of defeating BECKWORTH, and for the first time Congressman BECKWORTH goes back to Congress without opposition.

It is more of a tribute to the common people than to any individual that BECKWORTH gets by without opposition. BECKWORTH did not vote with anybody except his own conscience. He even believed himself right in voting for the trouble-making Taft-Hartley law. And political courage, conscientious effort, and a heart that beats for the com-

mon man have combined to make BECKWORTH an able Representative of the Third District of Texas.

Congratulations are in order both to the people of the district and to LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

[From the Kilgore News-Herald of May 23, 1948]

SCRATCH PAD

Orchids today to Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH. The popular young Representative will be renominated and reelected this year without an opponent. That fact is a tribute to Mr. BECKWORTH and to the people of the district. It might also be said to be recognition that this outstanding public official is looked upon by politicians with considerable awe and respect. This is the first time Mr. BECKWORTH has not had strong opposition. Two years ago when he roundly defeated two formidable opponents it was generally conceded that a comfortable majority of the people had come to know and like and appreciate their Congressman, and had no desire to make a change.

Mr. BECKWORTH has proved another often discussed political theory. He has never indulged in mud-slinging or in personalities. He runs on his own merits. And he has turned the other cheek and ignored his critics. The people seem to like that type of campaign.

The energetic young Congressman has worked his way up to a position of considerable and steadily growing influence in Washington. He is in position to render an ever-growing type of public service to his constituents. And his election without an opponent will be pleasing to the so-called common man—the ordinary working man and woman who has no particular interest in politics.

Mr. BECKWORTH, known to thousands simply as Lindley, serves no man or group of men above another, bows down to no pressure group, accepts no favors which would place him under obligations, votes and works as his own conscience dictates. * * * He truly represents all of the people to the very limit of his ability.

Today, Lindley, SP salutes you and congratulates you for the fine record you have made. * * * Only in America could a poor farm boy achieve your success, without money or influence, and without compromising high principles.

Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 12, 1948

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks an editorial from the Pueblo Chieftain, published at Pueblo, Colo. on the Voice of America. As indicated in this editorial, the material contained in our international broadcasts over the so-called Voice of America has aroused our people in every section of the country. It is difficult for them to believe that taxpayers money could be used for such purposes. The editorial follows:

VOICE OF AMERICA HAS BEEN BADLY MISUSED

There now appears to be well-founded support for the uproar that has gone up about the Voice of America broadcast.

The State Department beams the short-wave program abroad and it is supported out of public funds. The original purpose of the program was to report the news of the day, which in some parts of the world is suppressed, and further to tell the world how we live in America.

There can be no doubt that its purpose was propaganda. It was to propagate the ideas of personal liberty, of political democracy and economic freedom. It was not to paint the United States as a paradise. But neither was its purpose to vilify and slander our institutions or our people.

The Wall Street Journal does an eloquent job of reviewing it.

Truth is an evasive thing. We can pile fact upon fact and build a mountainous lie. We could fill a book upon the assault, murder, and pillage that occurs in the United States each day, and make an unknowing reader think us a nation of fiends and murderers.

Someone has done this sort of thing with the Voice of America. Senators reviewing transcripts of its programs read, among other things, that our Southland is a place of prejudice and oppression for racial minorities; that New England is founded upon hypocrisy and Texas upon sin.

We could not argue that there is no prejudice in the South, no hypocrisy in New England, nor any sinning in Texas. But what sort of truth is this? We who live here can see incidents and conditions in perspective. But what of those who must form their images of our living from a few minutes at a radio?

We are dubious of the value of the Voice of America programs anyway, for there is a taint to the best-intentioned official propaganda.

Certainly that kind of a voice ought to be silenced. We can trust our enemies to perform distortions. These particular broadcasts were either deliberate maliciousness or the worst sort of stupidity.

A Sorry Spectacle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 12, 1948

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a sorry sight when the statesmen of a great and powerful Nation—the greatest and the most powerful in the world—think they find it necessary, in peacetime to conscript the youth of the land for military service.

It needs no recital of facts to show that from a productive, financial, and resourceful standpoint, no nation is the equal of the United States—no combination of nations has the slightest chance, at this time, of invading our land or destroying our national supremacy. However, a few indisputable statements should call to the minds of all that we have no justifiable fear of aggression.

We have the only worth-while Navy in the world. We have the atomic bomb—the most powerful single weapon known to man. We have the most powerful air, under-sea and on-the-land weapons yet produced. We have the greatest productive capacity of any three other nations.

Two wars have demonstrated that our fighting men, trained or untrained, are the superiors in courage, in endurance, and, above all, in initiative, in effective action of any, anywhere. We are told we must help the whole world because it is prostrate. Without our aid, people everywhere will starve or freeze. In the same breath we are told that the starving, the freezing, and the helpless will suddenly, overnight, arise, smite, and destroy us.

Proof that our people have the greatest degree of freedom, of prosperity, and the widest opportunity for physical, material, educational, and spiritual advancement in all the world is shown by the fact that people everywhere, when they desire to leave their native land, choose America as the promised land.

It is a sorry commentary on the statesmen and the leaders of any administration when, after directing the policy of our Nation for 14 years, upon which, we are told, the whole world depends for the preservation of civilization, that they find themselves in such a state of fear, so lacking in confidence in the ability and the integrity of our own people, that they deem it necessary to enact legislation to force the youth of our land into the armed services to fight for its preservation.

One of two things is certain. Either our young men are so lacking in courage, in loyalty, or civilian awards are so superior to those of a military career, that they will not enter the service to defend themselves, their kin, their homes, their fatherland; or the need for such service is not, in their opinion, necessary for the preservation of the Nation. The former, I do not believe. The indisputable facts justify the conclusion that all the propaganda, all the publicity put out by Wall Street, the war profiteers, those of a militaristic mind, the internationalists who would surrender a part of our sovereignty by entering into a one-world organization or a military alliance with a part of Europe, has not been able to undermine the good, hard common sense of our youth; otherwise they would flock to the colors and enlist by the thousands.

This country does not need, and cannot survive, a continued draining of its essential and necessary national resources through granting largess to other nations which are controlled and guided by world politicians.

What this country needs above all things are a President, Senators, and Representatives who have the knowledge and the good sense to so guide our Nation that we will not become involved in every squabble, wherever in the world it may occur; that we will not be forever a party in every war, no matter what the cause—no matter how remotely it may affect our national interest. What we need, above all, is a party with a policy designed to first advance our own national interests, preserve the liberty, the prosperity and the opportunities of our own people.

A President and a political party which cannot, guiding the destinies of the most powerful Nation in the world, keep it free from bankrupting itself, regimenting its people, destroying its foundation—the Constitution—and drafting its young men for foreign war, is a failure. President Roosevelt made one true statement when he said, "We have nothing to fear but fear itself." He might have added "fear generated by those who profit out of war through the shedding of American blood on foreign soil."

Get the Facts on the White House Handling of the Railway Wage Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 12, 1948

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there has been a great deal of doubt and haze hanging over the White House because of the handling of the wage dispute between the railroads and certain brotherhoods.

The Railway Labor Act is intrinsically good and well designed, but if the White House must handle the disputes every time and as in the present instance take over the railroads, then I think it is time that Congress reexamine this whole situation.

In this connection it was my intention to introduce a resolution calling for such a study. However, this morning I was glad to read in the papers that a committee of the United States Senate will undertake to look into this matter and get the facts.

If the Railway Labor Act is not meeting the situation, then it is the duty of the Congress to know why and to adopt such legislation as will be necessary and appropriate. The American people are entitled to have their affairs administered according to law rather than by White House determinations.

I am hopeful a careful examination of the facts will lead to a proper and workable solution.

Stabilization of Agricultural Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 12, 1948

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this measure to continue the agriculture price stabilization program for another 2 years, with the adjustments and improvements recommended by the committee.

The practice of supporting farm prices near parity as a method of encouraging maximum production of badly needed food and fiber has been invaluable during the years of the war and the chaotic postwar period. Although the war is finished, we find ourselves still involved in international affairs of great complexity. We are far from any semblance of a normal, peacetime economy as we have known it. Food has become a weapon in international conflicts, and our farmers still must be called upon to produce all they can. With the future still uncertain, the world still unsettled, it is necessary and proper that the successful farm price support program should be continued. It is easy to understand the difficulties the committee has met in its efforts to work out a long-term program which would serve the present unusual period as well as the future peacetime needs of our country. This bill is an admirable bridge between our war program and the long-term program we can expect to work out in 1949.

I am glad that the support of wool has been included in this bill. The effect of government policy on wool during the war was to shake our domestic wool industry to its foundations. It has not yet fully recovered. This support is essential to it and to the economy of many Western States where wool is produced.

College and University Building Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 12, 1948

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a report following a survey made by Drs. Ernest V. Hollis and J. Harold Goldthorpe, specialists in higher education in the United States Office of Education, on the building needs of colleges and universities in the United States:

COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY BUILDING NEEDS

(By Ernest V. Hollis and J. Harold Goldthorpe, specialists in higher education, U. S. Office of Education)

American colleges and universities now have 341,550,000 square feet of building space and need an additional 265,000,000 square feet in order to accommodate enrollments anticipated by 1950. This proposed increase of 78 percent in the present college plant is approximately equivalent to 133 Empire State or 76 Pentagon Buildings. At 1948 prices the additional space would cost approximately $2,650,000,000. With land, equipment, and miscellaneous costs added, the total would exceed $3,500,000,000. In addition, provision must be made for obsolescence cumulated during the war, for the customary loss of buildings by calamities, for higher educational standards, and for the plant needs of new institutions. These capital costs added to the preceding estimates would bring the total to $5,000,000,000.

The demand for more educational and residential housing has been brought about by the enrollment of nearly a million more students than the prewar plants accommodated. The shortage has been intensified by the inability to replace obsolescence or losses of buildings during the war, and by the necessity for housing new programs required in providing education for veterans. College plants built for a prewar peak gross enrollment of 1,500,000 students, were in the fall of 1947 accommodating in some fashion a total of 2,340,000 students, and college officials expect a gross enrollment of 2,675,000 students by 1950.

SPACE PER STUDENT

Gross figures on building space in relation to enrollment are more easily comprehended when they are shown as the number of square feet of space per student. This ratio is more accurate, for the country as a whole and, with a dozen or so exceptions, for individual institutions, if it is expressed in terms of full-time enrollment at a given period instead of by cumulative annual enrollment which does not reflect the number of students enrolled at any one time and which also usually includes part-time and extension students. Buildings and equipment obviously are needed only for the largest number of students present at any one time. Such ratios are also made more meaningful by separating residential from educational space because institutional responsibility for the two types of housing is determined by different general and local factors.

In 1947, colleges had approximately 40 percent less educational and residential space per full-time student than they had in 1940, the prewar peak of enrollment. The 210 square feet per student for the year 1940 is not based upon actual census of building space but is estimated upon the assumption that the colleges in 1940 had substantially the same amount of building space reported in March 1947. If the increase in gross space needed is erected by 1950, institutions of higher education will then have 14 percent less space per full-time student than it is estimated they had in 1940. Full-time student figures of 210 square feet for educational space and 100 square feet for residential space indicate estimated prewar status rather than standards or norms that are recommended for judging the quantitative adequacy of future buildings.

PLAN OF SURVEY

Summary figures in the preceding paragraphs and the more detailed analysis which follows were made possible through a survey of existing and needed building space conducted by the veterans' educational facilities program. The VEFP, administered jointly by the Bureau of Community Facilities of the Federal Works Agency and the Division of Higher Education of the Office of Education, has responsibility for obtaining war surplus buildings, equipment, and supplies for schools and colleges which require them in providing programs of education for veterans.

The VEFP asked 1,386 participating colleges, which enrolled 96 percent of the Nation's 1947 college population, to list their present and needed (by 1950) building space by uses (classrooms, laboratories, storage, etc.) and to relate the total to actual and expected enrollments up to 1960. Institutions which enrolled the unreported 4 percent of college students are estimated to have 16,000,000 square feet of space and probably will not need additional buildings for expansion.

RESIDENTIAL SPACE

According to the 1947 VEFP survey, approximately one-third of the total building space was in the form of residential housing for students and staff members. One-fourth of the colleges and universities do not maintain any form of residential housing. Among colleges which provide such facilities, the character and amount of living quarters seem to be determined by size and character of the community, location, institutional resources, institutional policy, and type of institution.

Due to the factors mentioned above, the space per full-time student is not nearly so meaningful an index for residential space as it is for educational space. Nevertheless, there may be some normative value in knowing that in 1947 there was 67 square feet of residential housing per full-time student enrolled (not per student housed). Additional space needed, together with present space, brings the total of residential space in 1950 to approximately 100 square feet per full-time student.

In table 1 are presented for the four major groups of persons housed, present residential space, additional space needed, and the total of the two categories. If the colleges succeed in constructing the additional residential space needed to accommodate their enlarged student bodies, the proportion

of space available to the different groups housed will vary only slightly from the 1947 pattern of distribution. It must be remembered that the 1947 pattern of housing differed markedly from the 1940 pattern because of the large volume of temporary housing provided by the Government for married veterans.

TABLE 1.—*Combined present and additional residential housing space needed by 1950*

[Gross space in thousands of square feet]

Type of residence	Combined present and needed		Present		Additional needed	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Total	$214,629	100.0	$119,060	100.0	$95,569	100.0
Single students	138,627	64.6	80,677	67.7	57,950	60.6
Married students	43,364	20.2	20,182	17.0	23,182	24.3
Faculty members	27,317	12.7	14,784	12.4	12,533	13.1
Miscellaneous	5,321	2.5	3,417	2.9	1,904	2.0

In order to get an estimate of the change in outlook and building activities of college officials between March and October 1947, and to sample the effect of inflation in building costs on the actual expenditure of available funds, the Veterans' Educational Facilities program made a spot check on the situation in 106 colleges and universities located in 43 States. These institutions, evidently in better circumstances than the average had approximately one-fourth of all educational space available in 1947 and enrolled one-fifth of the students then attending college.

Data from this resurvey indicated that the 106 colleges had added 4,130,000 square feet of their residential facilities. Moreover, they also added 5,500,000 square feet to the March 1947 estimate of needed residential housing. Thirty of these institutions reported that they had been authorized to issue revenue bonds for self-liquidating projects, mostly dormitories. These colleges, which are not waiting for gifts or appropriations to finance their needed residential housing, have obtained authorization to issue $42,300,000 of such bonds. During the calendar year 1947, they sold $18,500,000 of the total amount authorized.

EDUCATIONAL SPACE

Educational space is used, in the absence of more exact nomenclature, to include all college structures other than residential housing for students and staff members. The 222,500,000 square feet of present educational space, for example, includes maintenance, service, and other auxiliary space as well as that used for instruction, research, and administration.

Architects and contractors, as well as college administrators, plan buildings and estimate costs primarily in terms of the use of the building space. In projecting building needs for a specific institution it is important, therefore, to know the amount of space per student commonly allocated for classrooms, laboratories, offices, libraries, and for similar facilities. It is therefore valuable for normative purposes to know the prevailing national pattern of building space according to major functions.

In table 2 are shown, by 12 common categories of space use, the distribution of gross space and space per full-time student for the present buildings, and needed additional space. The publicly controlled institutions at present have 54 percent of the total space, and a predominant proportion of the instructional shop and miscellaneous space, while the privately controlled colleges have 55 percent of the library and study hall space. In the distribution of the present total educational space among the 12 categories, about one-fourth is in the form of classrooms, about one-fifth in laboratories and instructional shops, and about one-tenth in gymnasiums. No other category shows so much as 10 percent.

Of the additional educational space needed by the institutions by 1950, approximately three-fifths is required by the publicly controlled institutions. Table 2 shows the most pressing needs are for classrooms, laboratory, gymnasium, library, and student center purposes, in the order named. The privately controlled institutions report the need for similar facilities. Columns 8 and 9 show combined present and needed space in gross figures and on a per student basis. The pattern of combined present and needed space distribution is not markedly different from that of the present educational space.

TABLE 2.—*Present, needed, and combined educational space according to use*

[Gross space in thousands of square feet]

Use of space	Present building space				Needed additional space		Combined present and needed space	
	All institutions		Publicly controlled institutions	Privately controlled institutions	Publicly controlled institutions	Privately controlled institutions	Total	Per student
	Total	Per student						
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
All facilities	222,489	126	119,738	102,751	100,044	69,221	391,764	182
Classroom	52,740	30	26,267	26,473	22,212	14,044	88,996	41
Laboratory	35,563	20	19,330	16,234	19,164	11,396	66,123	31
Instructional shop	7,025	4	5,297	1,728	5,929	1,677	14,631	7
Administrative and faculty office	19,165	11	10,155	9,010	6,072	4,249	29,486	14
Library and study hall	17,054	10	7,701	9,353	7,416	6,730	31,200	14
Cafeteria and food service	11,851	7	5,848	6,003	4,083	3,357	19,291	9
Gymnasium	24,868	14	13,401	11,467	11,076	10,725	46,669	22
Auditorium	10,102	6	4,935	5,168	4,485	4,330	18,917	9
Student center	7,059	4	4,131	2,927	7,182	4,412	18,653	9
Infirmary	7,418	4	3,673	3,744	3,263	2,634	13,315	6
Service and maintenance	12,539	7	7,074	5,465	4,879	3,014	20,432	9
Miscellaneous	17,105	9	11,926	5,179	4,284	2,663	24,052	11

SPACE PROVIDED BY THE COLLEGE

College officials, in March 1947, had no assurance of funds to provide three-fourths of the educational buildings they reported as needed. The 16,500,000 square feet of temporary space provided by the Government was admittedly a costly stopgap measure. Even though it is generally acknowledged that some of the temporary buildings will be in use 25 years hence, it is equally clear that most of them must be replaced in from 5 to 8 years. Therefore, unless funds for permanent construction become available at an accelerated rate, colleges will be able to do little more by 1950 than replace temporary buildings, buildings obsolescent when we entered the Second World War, and buildings normally lost by fire and other major calamities.

Subsequent events indicate that college officials were both timid and conservative in estimating the additional funds taxpayers and philanthropists were willing to provide. The February 1948 issue of Fortune estimated that the privately controlled colleges of the country alone are attempting to raise $2,000,000,000 for endowment and capital-outlay purposes. Moreover, since the close of the war State legislatures and other tax-appropriating bodies have been asked to appropriate an equal amount for capital-outlay purposes. California, for example, made capital-outlay appropriations of $91,700,000 for the 8 units of its university and $22,250,000 for the 12 State colleges. Data from the partial survey showing changes between March and October 1947 indicated that the 106 institutions reported $240,300,000 available for capital-outlay purposes and that $80,250,000 of this amount was under contract or in actual construction. Nevertheless, in March 1947 the college leaders of the 1,386 institutions reported available resources which would provide only $275,000,000 worth of educational buildings.

Shifts in the building activities and intentions of the 106 institutions between March and October 1947 are indicated by the fact that approximately 3,000,000 square feet of additional educational space had been completed. This represented an increase of 5.3 percent over the educational space available in March. Moreover, within this 6-month period these institutions added 5,280,000 square feet to the space for which they had assurance of funds for early construction. Furthermore, the sights of their leaders had been raised to the point of adding 17,663,000 square feet of needed space for which at the time they had no plans for financing.

CONCLUDING STATEMENT

A composite picture of college and university building needs by 1950 has been made from the generally conservative reports of presidents and business officers. It is not the picture of an ideal plant required to provide suitable college programs for all qualified individuals. It is the amount of space practical administrators believe is required to provide educational and residential housing for prevailing programs of higher education for the 2,675,000 students expected to be in attendance in 1950.

The $64 question, which the VEFP survey does not attempt to answer, is how will colleges get the $3,500,000,000 required to complete and equip the additional buildings needed or the $1,500,000,000 likely to be required for replacements, for meeting higher standards, for colleges not covered by the survey, and for new college ventures. Since two-thirds of the educational and residential building space is sought by tax-supported institutions, presumably that proportion of the cost will be sought from taxpayers.

National Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Republican Governor Warren of California on the need of a program of national health insurance.

Legislation pending in Congress designed to make medical care more accessible to the people through a national health-insurance program has been labelled as socialistic. Other progressive legislation helpful to the people has been similarly attacked. A bill sponsored by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], to provide a national housing program, has been labelled socialistic because it attempts to do something effective to meet the distressing situation in the field of housing.

Now the Republican Governor of California is being attacked for the same reason. Governor Warren, however, in his illuminating article which appears in the current issue of Look, has set forth with great courage and vigor the reasons why he feels compelled to advocate a system of health insurance for his people, and why he believes that this practice of name calling as a method for obstructing the welfare of our people, should be ended.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY PLAN FOR HEALTH INSURANCE

(By Gov. Earl Warren, of California, as told to Nat S. Finney, 1948 Pulitzer prize winner)

For the past 5 years I have been trying to find a way for ordinary California families to keep themselves from going broke when serious illness strikes someone in their homes. I have had a lot of encouragement from husbands and wives who know from their own human experience how a huge wad of unexpected doctor and hospital bills can wreck a lifetime of frugal planning. I have also had a lot of discouragement from groups that push aside the simple, human catastrophe of serious illness and see only the reasons why nothing much can be done about it.

I am convinced the people of my State want a plan that will protect ordinary families from being wrecked by the costs of serious illness. Any plan that is fair and that will do the job will be accepted.

PLAN TO GUARD FAMILY NEST EGG

Any change that will improve a plan either before or after it is adopted will be welcomed. I would not object if the date on which a plan goes into effect is set far enough ahead to give the medical and hospital facilities of California time to make fully ready for it. My mind is open as to the details. It will not be closed until the ordinary family can look at the family nest egg without fear that serious sickness may gobble it up next day or week or month.

I often wonder just how many people even in California are clear in their own minds about what I have proposed to do. A blizzard of propaganda has hidden the simple facts about my proposal, about what the plan is and what it is not. Certainly the American people as a whole do not know how we propose in California to become the Nation's first State to solve this problem.

It seems important to me that both Californians and people in other States understand how we hope to have this State, standing on its own feet, help its citizens to help themselves to keep serious illness from wrecking homes. Sudden, serious illness is as much a wrecker of homes in other States as it is in California. The threat is national. But there are very strong reasons why this particular social problem can be better solved by States than by the Federal Government. Some assistance to the States from the Federal Government may prove to be needed. But the closer the solution is tailored to each State's needs, the better it is likely to work. Our experience can be of help to other States.

I doubt whether many citizens really know the whole problem of human sickness and health in their own State. California is a fairly typical, progressive State in handling these problems, so, first, let's look at the whole picture there.

In California, as in most other States, we have accepted the broad humanitarian principle that no one will be left to sicken and die for lack of help because they cannot afford treatment. No one questions this principle. Questions arise only about how it should be applied. Many of these questions have been settled by common-sense agreement, and are no longer debated in public and legislative forums.

THE STATE HELPS DISEASE VICTIMS

For instance, we have agreed that the State and its subdivisions will help individuals and families that have been hit by tuberculosis if they are not able to help themselves. We tax people who have fortunately escaped this universal scourge to aid its victims. That is the decent, humane thing to do, we all agree.

We take much the same view of mental diseases. They are a human misfortune that springs from the strenuous pattern of our social life. We recognize the humanitarian common sense of mutual cooperation through our State and local governments in sharing the burdens of the misfortune of mental illness.

We accept the idea that people who fall sick with any one of dozens of ailments, and have no money to pay for treatment, shall be treated free at city and county and State hospitals and their out-patient clinics. We sometimes call these people the medically indigent, and use the disagreeable word "pauper" regarding them. The learned and disagreeable words do not change the human facts. These people are our own, and we take care of them, all of us willingly paying taxes to carry a human burden we humanly acknowledge. But we go a step further.

STATE INSURANCE ISN'T NEW

Not many years ago, after a debate that reminds me of the one now going on in California, we accepted the simple principle that a breadwinner who is injured while he labors shall be treated for his injuries and paid during his days of enforced idleness. The cost of this assistance—we call it workmen's compensation—is met by a levy on employers through an insurance system. But the simple fact is that we all help pay for it in the purchase prices of the goods and services we buy. Although workmen's compensation was bitterly fought with all the mustn't-do-this-or-that slogans, it is now taken as a matter of course.

Recently, almost without dissent, we broadened our unemployment-insurance law to provide benefits for workers who lose wages because they are sick, not because they are laid off or dismissed. This extension of the unemployment-insurance principle to cover wage losses due to illness made simple sense to the people of my State.

The principle that no one shall lack medical care because they can't afford it has a partner principle. It is that people who can afford to pay for their own medical care shall pay for it themselves, without burdening other citizens. So we have two principles: 1. Mutual sharing of responsibility for the unfortunate; 2. self-reliance for the fortunate.

These two simple principles are as old as America, and likely much older. To me they are basic ideas about the ways and means by which human beings live together in good fortune and bad luck.

SLOGANS CONFUSE ISSUE

Certainly, they are a lot older than the ideas behind the mustn't-do-this-or-that slogans used to postpone their application. They were accepted as good human principles long before anyone heard of socialism or Fascist regimentation. I confess it disturbs me deeply to hear these ideological blackjack slogans used to frighten forthright citizens out of responding to their American instinct to do something about misfortune when they see it.

What I have said so far is the background to my own thinking about a plan that will keep serious illness from wrecking homes. We have solved the problems of mutual sharing of the costs of sickness and injury on a wide scale and in a variety of ways. Yet there is one important part of the problem we have not solved. We have not found a way to put the principle of mutual sharing to work to help families of such moderate incomes that the costs of serious illness are likely to push them down into a lower social group.

Economic disaster is always close enough to these families, which are the great middle bulk of our society that does most of the hard work. Both the welfare and the outlook of this great middle bulk are profoundly important. Society loses part of its stability when one of these families is compelled to give up its self-reliance. It loses something almost as important when the parents in such a family are forced to abandon reasonable ambitions for their children. I can show you what I mean in a personal way.

WARREN TELLS OWN STORY

I was born and raised in a small California town. My father worked for the railroad, and his pay was never much more than he had to have to pay the family bills for a healthy family. But he and mother squeezed enough out of that pay to send me to college.

I was older before I realized that if my father's health hadn't been perfect during those years, I would have been like most of the other boys in my town. I would never have got to college at all. That means a lot to me, but it isn't the whole story, either. My father had his heart set on sending me to college, so I could have a better chance than he had. If his health had failed, I think he might have been a heartsick man, too.

My parents had the good luck to have good health. As Governor of California, I have learned a lot about families that had bad luck, and about what the bad luck of serious illness does to ordinary families. Not the well-off or the poor families. They are always taken care of by themselves or society. But the families in between, whose self-reliant efforts make the wheels of society go round; the families that just naturally want a peaceful, productive community with no nonsense about "isms" or get-rich-quick schemes.

Let's look at a family I was told about recently. They lived in San Mateo County, which is just south of San Francisco, and had been doing very well. They'd bought a small home, and got a good loan from the bank on it because they had savings of their own

to put into it, and the husband had a fine record. They have one son and one daughter, and the children were doing excellent work at school.

Then the mother came down with a very serious heart ailment. It was curable, but the kind of thing that means months of hospital care and expensive treatment. By the time she was well enough to care for her family again, they'd lost the home and he had borrowed every cent he could. The strain was too much for the husband and he did what you know a lot of perfectly good human beings do, if you're honest with yourself about it. He drank too much. He lost his job, and along with it a fine chance for promotion that he'd earned by being a good, responsible workman.

I don't know what is going to happen to that fine family, but my experience with human problems has long since convinced me that four whole lifetimes have been seriously damaged. And that's just one case out of hundreds in California, and out of thousands in America. That kind of tragedy is as familiar as apple pie.

Right now I can hear one of my musn't-do-this-or-that critics saying: "Yes, but if they had shown the foresight to subscribe to a voluntary health insurance plan they would have been all right."

Of course they would have been all right if they had done any one of several things they did not do, and perhaps could not do. I can see that if every ordinary family always had the foresight and the means to do what hindsight says they should have done, then they wouldn't get into much trouble. The hard fact is they don't have such foresight.

What I cannot comprehend is why some of our best people do not understand the real question society must answer in this problem: How can we help families of moderate income to have the means and the foresight to protect themselves against the tragic consequences of unexpected, serious illness

The plan I have recommended in California requires that all employees already covered by our unemployment insurance act and all public employees pay 1 percent of their salary or wages up to $3,000 a year into a health-service fund. This means that the worker making $200 a month would pay $2 a month. The worker making $250 a month or more would pay $2.50 a month. These contributions would be matched by the employers. Provision is made to include others who may wish to join the system. It is my hope that eventually we can work out methods by which all families of moderate income can participate.

Contributing members of the fund, and their dependents, will be assured payment in full of the costs of hospital and laboratory services, with certain reasonable restrictions, and the costs of medical care in hospital cases. The plan is designed to protect families against the more costly kinds of serious illness, not to provide for sickness involving only home visits by the doctor or office visits by the patient. The very important relationship between doctor and patient in the home and in the physician's own office is not disturbed.

M. D.'S TO WORK AS NOW

Furthermore, my plan does not call for any change in the traditional relationship between the doctor, the patient, and the hospital. My belief in the virtue of these traditional relationships is so deep that the plan expressly provides they are not to be changed. Patients are free to choose their own doctor and hospital, just as they do now. Doctors and hospitals are left free to select the patients they want to care for.

There is nothing in the plan to compel employees to use the benefits of the system if they prefer not to. It is carefully provided that the well-to-do can take their benefits in money indemnities to pay their own doctor bills if they wish to do so.

The bill I am sponsoring to put the plan into effect expressly provides that no system shall be created for dispensing medical or hospital care by the State through doctors employed by the State. So, far from regimenting or socializing medicine, the plan expressly prohibits State medicine.

The method for payment of doctors and hospitals is borrowed from the successful experience of private hospitals and medicine. It is the fee-for-service system used by voluntary medical and hospital service plans. I emphasize this because I want it understood that the California proposal is anything but a revolutionary scheme. It represents the minimum change that must be made to make sure people in moderate circumstances will not be bankrupted by serious illness.

The plan supports the highest standards and ethics of the medical profession in a practical way. The California Health Service Authority it establishes is directed to offer needed scholarships for post-graduate medical study when funds are available. I hope that in this way we will be able to improve medical standards in communities where surveys have shown they are too low. There are no hidden strings tied to these scholarships.

One further point. The plan will not disturb existing group voluntary plans or insurance policies that provide equal or superior protection to the limited number of families that can be covered by them. Voluntary action has made a splendid contribution toward the solution of this problem. I have watched its growth with warm feeling. Yet, as Governor of all the people of my State, I have had to say that voluntary action is not enough. Tragic facts made known to me in the day-to-day administration of my office have forced me to the reluctant conclusion that it will never be enough.

I think I have said enough about the plan and its background to convince Look's readers that it is designed to solve the very real problem of payment for the unexpected costs of serious illness, and not to interfere with the methods of professional treatment. Now I would like to say why I think there has been so much opposition to my proposals, and how I feel about this opposition.

I'd like to have you sit down in my chair in the Governor's office for a little while so you will get my point of view.

Let's take a fairly typical day. On my appointment list for 11 in the morning is Doctor So-and-So. He's an old friend. I am proud to have many old friends in the medical profession. Doctor So-and-So is a sincere man who holds the humanitarian ethics of his profession close to his heart. He is the Good Samaritan if I have ever known one. The respect and admiration of his professional colleagues has made him their spokesman, and he is genuinely troubled as he takes a chair across my desk.

DOCTOR'S FEARS UNFOUNDED

Doctor So-and-So is fearful of what my prepaid medical service plan will lead to for his profession. He has no very specific objection to the bill I have offered to put the plan into effect. I have yielded to every reasonable objection. But the plan, he says, may be the basis on which some later, less responsive governor will adopt the kind of system of state medicine that proved a destructive failure in Germany and New Zealand. I am, he says, letting the camel of socialization get his head inside the tent of free enterprise. It is socialism, regimentation, compulsion that he fears.

As Doctor So-and-So explains his objections to my plan, my hand reaches for a letter that came to me that same morning. I try to explain to Doctor So-and-So that his fears are probably not well grounded. But what I say is not convincing to the good doctor. That is understandable. There is really no bone of contention between us. I believe as deeply in free enterprise as he does. There is no flaw in my admiration for his profession, and he knows it.

Finally I fished out the letter I have been thumbing and hand it across the table to him. It's a very ordinary letter, carefully written in pencil on paper from a ruled tablet. The erasures that show on the coarse paper bear witness to the soul-searching that went into writing it. It tells again the same old tragic tale of serious illness and wrecked lives, and pleads with me not to drop my health service plan. Doctor So-and-So reads it carefully, then looks up at me questioningly.

"Which argument would weigh more with you?" I ask. "The argument in that letter or the argument you have given me?"

Take another day. A delegation of insurance men call to impress upon me that my plan is not exactly insurance in the actuarial sense. They bring along an expert to make a learned, mathematical argument. I explain to them as carefully as I can that we can't make a start on the basis of exact insurance principles because no one has had enough experience with exactly this problem. We've got to start the plan with equal percentage contributions to get the experience. If we waited until after we got the experience, we'd never start the plan.

The argument drones on, and again I find myself reaching for a letter. I get them almost every day. They aren't the sort of thing actuaries deal with—they're human stories, not dry figures. This time I read the letter aloud. "Which argument would weigh the most with you gentlemen?" I ask.

WE CANNOT NEGLECT PROBLEM

There it is as I see it from the Governor's chair in California. Tragic human need versus long-reaching fear of foreign ideologies, and the knife-sharp theories of experts. I do not discount the fears, and the experts are of great service in their special fields.

But I am wholeheartedly convinced that in our struggle to prevent our democratic processes from being infected with foreign ideologies we cannot afford to run away from any of the basic problems of American life.

We must prove to the world that the American system can solve these problems through the application of democratic procedures. But first of all we must prove it to ourselves. To prove it to ourselves we must have faith that our institutions are so practical, so adjustable, and so responsive to every situation that we can make them fully serve our needs, whatever they may be. After that we must have the will to do whatever should be done.

With such determination, we will be willing to face human facts, even unpleasant human facts. We will not hide behind slogans that are easy to repeat but have no real application to the facts. Such slogans are dangerous to progress.

It is, in my opinion, the misfortune of our times that too many men in public life use slogans to promote or oppose ideas, as if ideas were commodities. Ideas are not commodities. They should not be built up or torn down by slogans, as if they were a new brand of breakfast food. Ideas can be tested only with facts.

SLOGANS DON'T TEST FACTS

My attempts to do something practical about the fact that serious illness wrecks homes have taught me that slogans are the lazy man's way of slaughtering an idea he is unwilling to test against the facts. And that slogans are the designing man's way of defeating an idea he knows he cannot successfully meet on the facts. The experience has increased my determination to solve this problem despite the slogancers.

I think it is very important that something be done now about the catastrophe of sudden, serious illness in ordinary homes. We have, now, a period of good times and moderate social tensions. We have time to cut and fit and alter and improve a solution to the problem, learning as we go along. We have an opportunity to do this in the States, close to the people who are affected. We can have the advantages of flexibility and intimate contact that the Federal Government can never hope to have.

I do not like to sound alarms about the future. But I would be less than honest about this matter if I did not caution my mustn't-do-this-or-that critics. If times change, we may all be compelled to accept hasty and radical measures that can be avoided if we act now.

The Anti-Communist Bill—Will It Be Approved by This Session of Congress or Will the Communist Attacks Upon It and Their Inspired Marches on Washington Be Rewarded by Inaction and Indecision by Congress?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 12, 1948

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I am herewith inserting in the RECORD a highly informative editorial analyzing the so-called Mundt-Nixon anti-Communist bill and calling attention to very valid reasons for its early approval by the United States Senate.

While the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and many other patriotic, service, and community organizations have endorsed this legislation, the Communist leaders in America have frantically been resorting to every available device to delay action by the Senate or to defeat the legislation outright.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report to the House that the Senate Judiciary Committee has been working diligently on this bill (H. R. 5852) and that a wide area of agreement has now been reached among Senators on this legislation. It is hoped the Senate Committee will act favorably on the bill next Monday and that the Senate itself will then be given an opportunity to vote its approval of this legislation before the anticipated recess of Congress.

The following editorial provides an excellent summary of what is really included in the Mundt-Nixon bill. It is a typical editorial selected from the many which have come in praising this legislation and urging Congress to complete action on it during the current session of Congress.

[From the Paris (Ill.) Daily Beacon-News]

THE ANTI-COMMUNIST BILL

Action of the House of Representatives in passing last week by an overwhelming 319–58 vote a bill to protect the United States against un-American and subversive activities is an accurate reflection of the Nation's sentiment.

Fury of the opposition has seldom been equaled. The Congress was flooded with hysterical outbursts but with few exceptions they emanated from a common source—the agencies and influences against whom the legislation is directed. They are forces of communism and Communist sympathizers, shouting loudly for the protection of the very agencies of free government they would destroy if they could. To the credit of the House of Representatives it must be said that neither the propaganda nor the pressure had any effect.

There is a good deal of confusion over just what the bill proposes to do. There is a good deal of misunderstanding as to its terms. Communist propaganda saw to that. Since the measure still must pass the Senate, and since it may very well concern the future of every man, woman, and child in America, it is deserving of the study of every thinking citizen. Such thoughtful study can lead only to the conclusion reached by the House Un-American Activities Committee. That conclusion was: The need for legislation to control Communist activities in the United States cannot be questioned.

Ten years of investigation by the committee and its predecessors in the Congress have established:

1. That the Communist movement in the United States is foreign controlled.

2. That its ultimate objective with respect to the United States is to overthrow our free American institutions in favor of a Communist totalitarian dictatorship to be controlled from abroad.

3. That its activities are carried on by secret and conspiratorial methods.

4. That its activities, both because of the alarming march of Communist forces abroad and because of the scope and nature of Communist activities here in the United States, constitute an immediate and powerful threat to the security of the United States and to the American way of life.

The conclusion that the Communist movement constitutes a threat to the security of the United States and to the American way of life is not the cry of alarmists. The co-authors of the bill represent the highest type of American citizenship. Representative KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, is a veteran, though youthful, legislator whose career has been marked with such success that he is expected to be elevated to the Senate this fall. Representative RICHARD M. NIXON, of California, a new member, was chosen as one of the ten outstanding young men of the year by the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce. On the committee with them is Representative RICHARD B. VAIL, of Illinois, a successful and patriotic Chicago manufacturer, widely recognized as one of the most able new Members of the Congress. These men are not alarmists. Nor are they fanatics. Rather they are determined and courageous Americans conscious of their responsibility to frame constructive legislation calculated to protect this Nation and harm none but its avowed enemies. The overwhelming margin of the vote in the House, representing a majority of both parties, indicates their colleagues have full confidence in their course.

The bill is a constructive attempt to control the universally recognized dangers of Communist infiltration without violation of the principles of democratic due process. Many reactionaries have been willing to say that due process does not matter; the Communists should be exterminated by any convenient method. Many liberals have thrown up their hands, saying that communism cannot be controlled without resort to the police state and therefore should not be controlled at all. The bill denies both of these counsels of despair and makes a real effort to bring the peculiar problem which Communist conspiracy has presented to western democratic society within the legal and social controls which our society has developed.

This is what the bill does:

Makes it unlawful for any person to attempt in any manner to establish in the United States a totalitarian dictatorship to be under the direction and control of any foreign government, foreign organization or foreign individual.

Makes it unlawful actively to participate in the management, direction or supervision of such a movement, or to conspire to do so.

Fine or imprisonment or both would follow conviction, and those so convicted would be deprived of their United States citizenship.

Employment in the Federal Government is denied any member of a Communist organization. Passports also are denied such persons.

Each Communist organization and each organization found to be a Communist-front organization by the Attorney General must register with the Attorney General, furnish an accounting of funds received and the source, funds expended and for what purpose.

Each Communist political organization (but not Communist-front organizations) must register the name and address of each member annually. Each member so listed is to be notified by the Attorney General that he is so listed.

Use of the mails is denied registered Communist organizations unless the envelope or wrapper bears a prominent designation, "Disseminated by ———, a Communist organization." Any material broadcast must be preceded by a similar verbal designation, "the following program is sponsored by ———, a Communist organization."

Tax deductions and exemptions are denied in the case of contributions to or for Communist organizations.

Judicial review is provided for organizations and individuals, with convictions and penalties the result of established court procedure.

The basic principle of the act is a deliberate attempt to single out and define allegiance to communism or any other foreign-inspired and foreign-controlled allegiance. The weapon is to compel publicity for those who accept such allegiance and to make it a crime for those who follow it to the professed Communist aim to overthrow the Government by "other than democratic means." That's just so much language meaning force and violence.

Authors of the bill properly warn that this legislation alone is not a complete answer to the Communist problem in the United States. To quote their conclusion: "An attack must be made upon the Communist problem on all fronts if we are to meet it successfully. It is imperative that the American people understand the true character, aims, and techniques of the Communist conspiracy. The many patriotic and fraternal organizations in the United States can be of tremendous service in developing a program of education which will inform the people of this threat. In the words of one of the outstanding witnesses before our committee:

"The people should be informed, accurately and fully and continuously, about the nature, activities, strategy, and tactics of communism. This educational task can be in part accomplished by qualified and concerned private citizens."

The bill sincerely tries to do, within the framework of our democracy, what the overwhelming majority of patriotic, thinking Americans want done. The House has acted with courage and wisdom. It is to be hoped the Senate will act similarly and promptly. There is no time to lose in the continuing battle to preserve the freedom of our people.

Governor Driscoll of New Jersey Has the Qualifications for An Acceptable Candidate for Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 12, 1948

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll, of New Jersey, is outstanding in his qualifications as a candidate for the Republican nomination for Vice President. He is young, vigorous, and able. He has progressive ideas. His accomplishments as a State senator, as Administrator of Beverage Controls in the State of New Jersey, and as Governor have been not only acceptable, but of such a high order that they have attracted the favorable consideration of not only the citizens of New Jersey, but likewise throughout the Nation. The skill and leadership that he displayed in providing for New Jersey a new constitution that is up to date and progressive in character has stamped him as a man of rare ability. His administration as Governor of the State of New Jersey before and after the adoption of the new constitution has likewise given unmistakable evidence of his outstanding qualifications as an able and conscientious administrator. He is the type of man that would be readily acceptable to the people of this Nation as Vice President.

In this connection, under the unanimous consent granted, I include the following editorial of the Courier-Post newspapers, Camden, N. J., in the issue of Tuesday, June 8, 1948:

DRISCOLL IS BOOMED FOR VICE PRESIDENCY

While a hands-off attitude is being displayed by Governor Driscoll himself, his friends are organizing a full-fledged drive to obtain the Republican Vice Presidential nomination for him.

Its success will naturally depend in large degree on the outcome of the Presidential race. All the prominent Republican candidates for the Presidency outside of Governor Dewey and Speaker of the House MARTIN come from western States and would probably welcome a running mate from some pivotal eastern State. Should either Dewey or MARTIN be nominated for President, the Philadelphia convention logically would select a westerner for second place on the ticket.

In recent weeks there has been some discussion of a Vandenberg-Dewey slate, but the New York Governor said flatly in Boston last Friday that if he fails in his quest for the big prize he would not accept the Vice Presidential nomination under any circumstances.

Harold E. Stassen has also been mentioned as a good compromise choice for Vice President, assuming, as in Dewey's case, that he loses out in his bid for the top spot. But Stassen has repeatedly issued disclaimers of any aspiration for the minor role, and additionally has aroused considerable resentment among other candidates, including TAFT and Dewey, by his vigorous, free-swinging campaign methods so that it is doubtful if he would be acceptable to the convention for the secondary prize if he is unable to swing it for President.

Driscoll's backers believe that strategic considerations make him as logical a choice for Vice President as any other man that has been mentioned. He controls a 35-man delegation which is uncommitted for a Presidential candidate once it casts a first-ballot favorite-son vote for Driscoll, and which may play a leading role in the bargaining if a deadlock develops.

The New Jersey Governor is on friendly terms with all the leading hopefuls, including Governor Warren of California, with whom he has had relatively minor disagreements in the past at governors' conferences on issues involving States' rights. Now it is rumored, however, that Warren will follow Stassen, Taft, and Dewey in making a courtesy call at Trenton with the aim of furthering his chances at Philadelphia, which might lead to at least an informal understanding between the two Governors involving the Vice Presidency, should Warren be a compromise choice for President.

Geographically, Driscoll would team up equally well with Taft, Stassen, Vandenberg, or Warren. State Republican Chairman Marsh and others are trying to line up a bloc of delegates from Pennsylvania, California, Connecticut, Maine, and Texas who would give nominal support to Driscoll's favorite son candidacy on the early ballots and furnish the nucleus of a really formidable vote for him for Vice President.

Through numerous trips about the country and through his leadership at governors' conferences, Driscoll is well and favorably known to Republicans nationally. In addition he is regarded as an extremely able and successful governor, who has achieved a constitutional reform which even Woodrow Wilson was unable to effect.

Driscoll reportedly will make no personal effort to obtain the Vice Presidential nomination but would accept it if offered, although preferring to complete his term at Trenton and see his legislative program brought to full fruition.

It is quite within the realm of possibility, as things stand today, that the efforts of his well-wishers will be successful and that the next Vice President of the United States will hail from the charming and historic borough of Haddonfield, N. J.

Back to Harding?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 12, 1948

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the brilliant and trustworthy commentator, Marquis Childs in the Washington Post of June 12, 1948, contributes a column of factual matter which should arouse every thinking citizen to action in his own defense.

The article bears out my protestations on the lamentable and unfair tax bills and other legislation slanted to favor privileged classes and which discriminate against the average citizen. The reference to the official Republican News, "Don't Throw Peanuts to the Elphant" is a bold and brazen confession of the considerations behind some legislation. Is it to be construed as the pay-off? If not, what else does it mean?

WASHINGTON CALLING
(By Marquis Childs)

BACK TO HARDING?

Five months before the Republicans met for their convention in 1920 a political prophecy came from one of the party's shrewd political fixers. He said:

"We are not bothering about primaries and delegations. At 2 in the morning before the nomination, half a dozen men will meet in a room, go over the candidates who have been eliminated, and then and there Senator Harding will be nominated."

It happened in just that way in a smoke-filled room in Chicago's Blackstone Hotel, and that has become the prototype of all smoke-filled hotel rooms. The prophet was Harry M. Daugherty, who was to become Attorney General in the Cabinet of Warren G. Harding and go down to disgrace with the spoilsmen and corruptionists of that tragic era.

The parallels between 1920 and 1948 are too striking to be ignored. Then, too, the Nation was weary in the wake of a great war. Then, too, prices were soaring and the average American had little time for politics as he struggled to pay the rent and the grocery bill.

In 1920, as in 1948, the GOP had able men who had campaigned intensively for the Presidency. These men had impressed their views and their personalities on the public. The three leading contenders in that other June were Gen. Leonard Wood, Gov. Frank O. Lowden, and Senator Hiram Johnson, of California.

These three contestants were deadlocked on the first ballot. The vote was: Wood, 287½; Lowden, 211½; and Johnson, 133½. The deadlock went on for 3 days until half a dozen men met to agree on Harding. The compact was signed and sealed shortly after midnight and the following morning Harding was nominated.

This time, at Philadelphia, the leading contenders are Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, Senator Robert A. Taft, and Harold Stassen. On the first ballot Dewey's strength is estimated at 300 to 325, TAFT's at 250 to 275, and Stassen's at 150 to 175.

Thus the same kind of deadlock will develop as developed 28 years ago. In Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG the party has a compromise candidate of stature and great national prestige.

But also within the party are powerful forces seeking to install in the White House another Harding. There was nothing wicked or sinister about the bland, pleasure-loving Senator from Ohio. He was merely a willing party hack, ready to be pushed around by stronger men who knew what they wanted out of the Federal Government. He had little understanding of his country or its place in the world. In the Republican stable today are dark horses on the Harding model.

The atmosphere of 1920, as described by Karl Schriftgiesser in his just-published This Was Normalcy, was one of grab-while-the-grabbing-is-good. At the Chicago convention in 1920 a swarm of favorseekers, many of them representing great wealth, pressed down on the delegates.

Something like that atmosphere has oppressed the Republican Congress as greedy lobbyists push for the benefits they seem to feel are certain to come from the GOP. And at times Republican officialdom encourages that attitude.

In the current issue of the Republican News, official paper of the Republican National Committee, is a remarkable appeal captioned, "Don't throw peanuts to the elephant." It gives a table showing tax savings under the tax cut put through the GOP Congress, with the taxpayer who earns $2,500 saving $78.40, and the taxpayer who earns $50,000 saving $7,533. The appeal says:

"Take a look at the table below. Many of our friends feel that, entirely apart from other important considerations, the least they can do to express their appreciation is to contribute a substantial part of their tax savings for this year to insure the reelection of the Congress which made this possible."

In the same issue the chairman of the GOP finance committee says, "The stakes are too high to take any chance on not winning."

The stakes are certainly too high to take a chance on another Harding. Harding led the Nation back to isolationism, and the short-sighted policies of the men around him prepared the way for boom and bust. The evil consequences came in a terrible depression and a more terrible war.

Succeeding columns will be devoted to an appraisal of the men and the issues at Philadelphia. The choice to be made there may well be as momentous as that which was made in the same city in 1787.

Can America Defend Itself Against the Communists Within Our Gates?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 12, 1948

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5852, the so-called Mundt-Nixon bill to control Communist activities in the United States, is now before the United States Senate. Its final fate will be determined by that body within the next week unless Congress continues beyond the anticipated recess date. Millions of Americans are hoping that the Senate will not approach its recess without acting favorably on this legislation to do something at home about the Communist threat against which we are presently spending billions of dollars abroad.

The enclosed editorial from the Brooklyn Tablet, published in Brooklyn, N. Y., is one of a great host of editorials supporting this legislation and urging action on it before adjournment.

[From the Brooklyn (N. Y.) Tablet]

CAN IT BE DONE?

As this is written the destiny of the Mundt-Nixon bill to halt the aggression of communism is uncertain. If it is passed by the Senate and if it is signed by President Truman and if its enforcement is not sabotaged by agents of communism in the Government, the measure will rank as one of the greatest achievements in the history of American freedom from foreign domination. Up to the present, the Communists have successfully wrecked or rendered ineffective every attempt on a major scale to hamper their program.

The Reds realize better than anyone else the threat to their anti-American activities in the Mundt-Nixon bill. No other single object has drawn out so many of their pressure devices. Over 30,000 telegrams alone deluged members of the Senate Judiciary Committee in opposition during its hearings on the measure (about 300 telegrams and letters supported the bill). Thousands of prominent but misinformed dupes, self-labeled "liberals," and others whose positions make them sensitive to Communist disapproval, have been enlisted to fight the measure. Tons of paper have been put into pamphlets, leaflets, and throw-aways to sway the public by outright lies about the bill. All other matters of moment to the Communist Party have been thrust into the background until the Mundt-Nixon bill is killed.

Obviously, the reason for the all-out job to prevent the enactment of the measure is that the House Committee on Un-American Activities has produced a weapon capable of stopping communism in America. Denunciations of communism in resolutions, speeches, and editorials cause little annoyance to the Reds, for words without action don't harm them. Opposition to their influence and leadership in particular projects, such as unions, tenants' and consumers' groups, and so on, call for strong action in a limited field, but the techniques of handling that form of opposition are well mastered by the Communists. Exposure through the publicizing of what they want kept secret, such as is being done in Counterattack, the World-Telegram, and in these columns, is a real obstacle to the Moscow-dictated program. But none of these is the threat to all Communists everywhere in the country that the Mundt-Nixon bill is. They will, therefore, kill the bill, if they can, before the public wakes up and realizes that the measure is the most effective means yet discovered to save America from foreign rule.

Stabilization of Agricultural Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 12, 1948

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill and to pay my compliments to the Agriculture Committee of the House who wrote the bill. I am sure that if everybody would take the time to study the good effects which the 90 percent of parity on basic farm crops has brought about for not only the farmers of America but also for all the people there would be no opposition to this legislation.

We must bear in mind that to have national prosperity the farmer of America must receive a good American price for his products, for the very simple reason that our research into the records of the past 25 years has proven without a question of doubt that the annual national income is always just about exactly seven times the farm income. This is due to the fact that the farmer produces new wealth each year, because the things he produces are consumed either in the same year they are produced or the year after which is not true of manufactured products known as durable goods.

For example, the gross farm income for 1947 was around $30,000,000,000 and the national income was around $210,000,000,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you will recall that from the years 1920 to 1940 the American farmers received a little less than 80 percent of parity for his products, so it is little wonder that not only the farmer but also the entire Nation was in a constant depression during those years, and that until we began preparing and producing armaments of war in 1940 our unemployed numbered from seven to twelve millions. That must not happen again, and it cannot happen, if prices on farm commodities are kept on a fair price level which this bill will provide.

I, like many other Members of Congress from farm States, have been severely criticized year after year by Members of Congress who represent large industrial cities for our support of this sort of legislation because it raises the cost of living, but let me remind them once again that good wages are wholly dependent on good farm prices as a study of the past has proven. Consequently, I certainly do not apologize to anyone for supporting this bill, just as I have supported without exception the full amount of funds requested by the Agriculture Subcommittee on Appropriation for REA, soil conservation payments, soil conservation service, and commodity loans to farmers all during my 8 years in Congress while the Democrats were in control and the last 2 years under Republican control for the reasons earlier stated in my remarks today and on many previous occasions, due to my constant interest and study of our economic problem over the past decade and more.

I am sure that anyone who has even a fair conception of what is required to support a $40,000,000,000 annual Federal administration expense knows that we must do everything possible to insure a national income of at least $200,000,000,000 in order to collect enough revenue to keep our United States Treasury solvent and to avoid taxing the American people into bankruptcy.

While at the same time, as all my colleagues well know, I have vigorously opposed all unnecessary, wasteful spending of the taxpayers' dollars, this bill which guarantees 90 percent of parity for basic farm crops must be extended in order to insure our national solvency.

The GOP (Grand Old Politics) Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 12, 1948

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article on taxes which I wrote and which was published in the March 1948 issue of the Democratic Digest. The article follows:

THE GOP (GRAND OLD POLITICS) TAX BILL

(By AIME J. FORAND, Member of Congress)

The Republicans had a "field day" in the House of Representatives on February 2, 1948.

Operating under a gag rule, they steamrollered to passage the iniquitous Knutson tax bill by a vote of 297 to 120.

The bill provides a tax cut of $7,000,000,000 of which nearly 46 percent would go to less than 5 percent of the taxpayers.

It is the GOP's third tax bill during the Eightieth Congress. President Truman vetoed the first two, on the ground that they were "the wrong kind of a tax bill at the wrong time," and Congress sustained him. The question now is: What will the Senate do with the bill?

The GOP Rules Committee brought the bill to the House under a rule that waived all points of order against the bill, or any part of it, waived the reading of the bill, and prohibited the offering of any amendment from the floor, except amendments offered

by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

This rule prevented the Democrats from changing the bill in any way. It allowed only a motion to recommit the bill with instructions. The Republicans made sure that such a move would not succeed.

At a conference on January 23, every GOP Member of the House was put on the spot by their leaders.

After proclaiming the "virtues" of the Knutson bill, any Member who did not agree to support the bill was asked to stand. Failure to stand meant one was for the bill. For any Member to rise at that time would have invited pressure from the leaders to whip him into line.

All, naturally, adopted the line of least resistance and agreed to vote against the motion to recommit, and in favor of the bill. Only one Republican voted against the bill, a bill to which could well be applied the caustic phrase used by the late President Roosevelt, when he vetoed a tax bill a few years ago, calling it: "A tax bill for the greedy and not for the needy."

Congressman JERE COOPER (Democrat, Tennessee) suggested that the title of the bill should be changed to read: "An act to borrow money and reduce taxes."

Secretary of the Treasurer John W. Snyder said of it: "It is unbelievable that any tax proposal would be seriously promoted that would produce a budget deficit and increase in the public debt of $2,100,000,000 in the fiscal year of 1949."

His warning, like that of others who place the welfare of the country ahead of the redemption of rash GOP campaign promises, went to naught.

Republicans, in the 1946 campaign, sought votes on the promise that they would cut taxes 20 percent across the board.

The plan was that they would pass rash tax-cut bills in the Republican House and that a Democratic Senate would kill them. They did not expect to control the Senate. The result they thought would redound to their political advantage.

But, in typical Republican fashion, they figured wrong. The voters gave them full responsibility in the Congress.

I was shocked when I heard Republican leaders of the House admit, privately, that they realized that the Knutson bill, in its present form, would never be reported by the Senate, but that they thought it was good politics to pass it anyway.

This confirmed the statement made by former Speaker SAM RAYBURN, that the House GOP were not sincere; that they were trying to fool the people; that they were playing politics.

The GOP are on the spot. They must either repudiate their rash campaign promises, or cut taxes, forfeit their claim of standing for sound finance, and repudiate the Republican platform of 1944, which reads:

"We shall maintain the value of the American dollar and regard the payment of the Government debt as an obligation of honor which prohibits any policy leading to the depreciation of the currency. We shall reduce that debt as soon as economic conditions make such reduction possible."

Elections are only a few months away. So, regardless of the damage this bill may cause to our national economy and the financial structure of the Federal Government, the GOP seeks to make good its vote-getting promises.

Tax cuts made in the higher income brackets means money in their campaign chest. And, corporations must be allowed to make excessive profits because it is corporate dividends that make possible the large contributions from individuals.

These considerations get priority over the fact that our national debt, now at $256,000,000,000 is costing us $5,200,000,000 a year in interest.

The GOP overlook the fact that at the rate of $2,500,000,000 a year it would take more than 100 years to liquidate that debt.

They give no hought to the fact that a $7,000,000,000 tax cut might well mean deficit financing, or to the effect this would have on Government bonds now held by 85,000,000 American citizens, insurance companies, banking institutions, etc.

They argue that to continue our economy at its present rate it is necessary that taxes be cut so as to provide incentive for risk capital.

Is this necessary at the present time? As Al Smith used to say: "Let us look at the record."

Treasury Department figures show that in 1939, the last prewar year, there were 3,316,700 operating businesses in this country.

During the war that dropped, in 1943, to a low of 2,860,600. In 1945 the number of operating businesses increased to 3,134,100. In 1946 it jumped to 3,503,900, and in 1947 the number rose to 3,783,600, an increase of about 280,000. Does this indicate that people are scared or that they need tax incentives?

Proponents of the Knutson tax bill oppose reinstatement of the excess-profits tax upon corporations. They don't agree that corporate profits are excessive,

Yet the record shows that corporate profits for 1947, after taxes, were $17,000,000,000. In 1946, they were $12,500,000. In 1939, they were $5,000,000,000. In 1932, the last year under a Republican President, corporate profits, after taxes, were zero. In fact, corporate losses that year were $3,400,000,000.

A survey of profit figures, made in November 1947 by Guernsey-Montgomery, from published reports of 50 companies, show these companies to have increased their profits, after taxes, in 1947, over their profits for 1946, by 25.9 percent for William Wrigley, Jr., 107.1 percent for Worthington Pump & Machine, 130.6 percent for Johns-Manville Corp., 192.8 percent for St. Regis Paper Co., 233.5 percent for Libby-Owens-Ford Glass Co., and 246.9 percent for General Cable Corp. I emphasize, there are profits for 1947 over 1946 profits, after taxes, in each year.

I want business to make a reasonable profit, but I am opposed to corporations making excessive profits that come from the pocketbook of those who can hardly keep body and soul together.

The Democratic proposal is for a limited excess-profits tax on corporations. Small corporations would be exempt by a specific exemption of $50,000. The excess-profits tax would apply only to those profits over and above a net exemption of $50,000, plus an exemption of 135 percent of the credits allowed each corporation during the war. In other words, a corporation with a base of $1,000,000 would add to that $350,000, plus the exemption of $50,000, making a net of $1,400,000 free of the excess-profits tax. Only about 22,000 corporations would be affected by this tax, and this only because their profits are excessive.

A tax cut is necessary now because there is a lack of investment capital for the expansion of business at this time, representatives of business argue.

Well, again, let us look at the record: A Securities and Exchange Commission press release of January 13 reveals that expenditures for new plants and equipment of business in the United States in 1947 (for manufacturing, mining, railroading, other transportation, gas and electric utilities and other businesses), amounted to $15,680,000,000. This compares with $5,200,000,000 in 1939. In other words, expenditures on plants and equipment in 1947 were more than three times that expended in 1939, the last prewar year.

Secretary of Commerce Averell Harriman, when he was before the Ways and Means Committee on January 19, commenting on the question of availability of funds, said: "We have two sets of data which bear on this point.

"The first set shows the sources of saving and their use for investment purposes in 1947. Total investments amounted to $39,000,000,000, of which $30,000,000,000 was domestic investment, and the remaining $9,000,000,000 represented our net foreign investment. The foreign investment includes, it should be noted, $5,000,000,000 of goods financed by Government loans.

"In 1947, corporations expended $14,500,000,000 on plant and equipment, $7,000,000,000 on enlarging their inventories, and added roughly $5,000,000,000 to their trade receivables. This aggregate of $26,000,000,000 was financed by approximately $15,000,000,000 of retained profits and depreciation reserves, $4,000,000,000 of net capital issues—that is, new issues in excess of pay-offs—and $3,500,000,000 of bank loans, as well as by a $1,000,000,000 increase in trade payables, a $2,000,000,000 increase in other payables, and a $1,000,000,000 reduction in liquid assets.

"It appears, therefore, that to finance $26,000,000,000 in capital requirements, corporations needed to raise not much over $7,000,000,000 through new issues and bank loans, nor were they compelled to reduce their liquid assets to a significant extent, as had been the case in the previous year."

High taxes retard business advancement, the Republicans say. But the New York Herald Tribune (Republican) on January 2, last, published a review of 1947 which refutes the GOP argument.

It reported: That farm income in 1947 was $18,000,000,000; in 1946 it was $15,200,000,000, and in 1939 it was $4,500,000,000; that the gross national production for 1947 was $235,000,000,000; and that the national income for 1947 was two hundred to two hundred and twenty-five billion dollars; that approximately 60,000,000 workers are gainfully employed, and that their present wages is at the rate of $130,000,000,000. In 1946 it was $116,800,000,000 and in 1939 it was only $47,800,000,000.

The Republicans argue, rightly, that savings—the real source of investment capital—has dropped considerably.

The New York Herald Tribune of January 2 reveals that the 131 savings banks of New York grew from $5,500,000,000 in 1941 to $9,700,000,000 on November 30, 1947 (an increase of 76.5 percent). The peak rate of increase for net savings deposits was reached in 1945, when increases amounted to $1,100,000,000. In 1947 the gain was only $470,000,000, or 48 percent below the gain in 1946.

The fact is that people with low incomes have to withdraw their savings to supplement their current income to meet the high cost of living, while those with high incomes continue to pile up savings.

How does business look upon the future? Here are a few examples:

General Electric, in 1947, exceeded all peacetime production records. Its sales in 1947 exceeded the estimated goal of $1,000,000,000 by 20 percent. Charles E. Wilson, the president, estimates 1948 will exceed 1947 production by another 20 percent.

Westinghouse Electric production reached a rate of $800,000,000 in 1947 and expects greater gains in 1948.

The machine tool industry had a volume of $300,000,000 in 1947 and expects to pass this mark in 1948.

Freight-car builders have set a target of 10,000 cars a month during 1948. On December 1, 1947, they had orders for 125,395.

Business is doing well, but as President Truman said in his state-of-the-Union message, "Certain adjustments should be made within our existing tax structure that will

not affect total receipts, yet will adjust the tax burden so that those least able to pay will have their tax burden lessened by a transfer of it to those best able to pay."

The President suggested a plan by which taxes could be reduced without impairing the revenue of the Government.

The bill, H. R. 4968, introduced in the House by Congressman JOHN DINGELL (Democrat, Michigan) shows the way. It provides for a cost-of-living tax credit of $40 for each individual taxpayer and an additional $40 for each dependent. A man with a wife and two children would thus have his taxes reduced by $160. The credit would extend to all taxpayers, but would be particularly helpful to those with low incomes. The Dingell bill would also impose a modified excess-profits tax on corporations. This would yield approximately $3,200,000,000, the amount of revenue that would be lost through the cost-of-living credit.

Other Democratic proposals to cut taxes were offered during the Eightieth Congress. Among them were: (1) The bill, H. R. 2577, which I introduced early in 1947, to increase exemptions for each taxpayer, and each of his dependents, from $500 to $700; (2) my motion to recommit the second Knutson bill provided a way to reduce taxes in a fair and equitable manner. This motion would have raised exemptions from $500 to $600 per capita and reduced each surtax bracket by three percentage points. (3) Last July, in the names of Congressmen JOHN DINGELL (Democrat, Michigan), HERMAN P. EBERHARTER (Democrat, Pennsylvania), and myself, I introduced a bill providing for (a) the elimination of wartime excise taxes on such articles as toilet preparations, ladies' handbags, low-priced jewelry, electric-light bulbs, telephone and telegraph rates, etc.; (b) the repeal of the tax on transportation of property; (c) raising of exemptions from $500 to $600 per capita; (d) the reduction of surtax rates by 1 percent in each bracket; and (e) the extension to married persons in the common-law States of the same advantage of splitting their incomes for tax purposes as is now enjoyed by the residents of community-property States.

In considering the question of income-tax reduction we should bear in mind the inflationary spiral now prevalent in this country. The over-all effect of a tax cut on prices people will have to pay for the things they purchase merits our most serious consideration.

Such a tax reduction at this time would mean billions of dollars added to the purchasing power of the people. It would mean billions of dollars in the stream of commerce. This at a time when people with money are bidding against one another for goods that are in short supply.

Where is the bidding coming from? Not from the 29,000,000 taxpayers whose weekly pay is less than $20, nor from the 14,000,000 whose wages are from $20 to $27 a week. And very little of this bidding up of prices comes from the 9,000,000 who earn from $27 to $77 a week. They don't have the money to bid with after they purchase the bare necessities of life for their families.

The bidding comes from the 1,700,000 whose income is above the $4,000 mark.

Let us not forget that out of approximately 55,000,000 individual income-tax payers, more than 38,000,000 have incomes under $3,000. These are the people who cannot meet a minimum budget.

The report of a survey recently made public by the Bureau of Labor Statistics confirms this. The survey covered 34 major cities. It was ordered by Congress in 1945 "to find out what it costs a worker's family to live in the large cities of the United States."

This 2½-year study shows that modest living for a family of four in the city of Washington costs $3,562. In New Orleans (the least expensive city in which to live) the minimum budget for a family of four is $3,100.

No one likes to pay taxes. But the needs of government must be met. While people with low incomes need tax relief, those in the high-income brackets can afford to and should pay their just share of the expenses of our Government. A table prepared on March 17, 1947, by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation shows that in 1939 there were 2,553 income-tax returns filed by individuals with incomes of from $100,000 to $300,000. In 1947 there were 8,096 in that bracket, an increase of 5,543. In 1939 there were 111 returns on incomes of from $500,000 to $1,000,000. In 1947 there were 287 filing returns in this class, an increase of 176. Incomes of $1,000,000, or over, numbered 45 in 1939. In 1947 this class jumped to 80.

Treasury Department estimates are that 45.7 percent of the $7,000,000,000 relief provided by the Knutson bill would go to 4.4 percent of the taxpayers—the less than 3,000,000 taxpayers with incomes of $5,000 or more. Only 54.3 percent of the $7,000,000,000 would go to 95.6 percent of the taxpayers—the more than 50,000,000 taxpayers whose income is under $5,000.

The Democrats on the Ways and Means Committee unanimously condemned the Knutson bill. Their minority report says:

"On the basis of a predicated level of personal income of $200,000,000,000 for calendar year 1948, * * * enactment of H. R. 4790 in its present form would convert the anticipated budget surplus of $4,800,000,000 in fiscal year 1949 to a deficit of $2,100,000,000.

"* * * The GOP resolves all doubts in its favor. It is argued that receipts will exceed the $44,500,000,000 budget estimate for 1949. Assuming personal income of $209,000,000,000 in calendar year 1948, receipts for fiscal year 1949 of $47,300,000,000 are forecast. Even under these assumptions the enactment of H. R. 4790 would, without reduction in the President's budget, leave a surplus of only $500,000,000 for fiscal year 1949. * * * This figure would be further reduced by any revenue loss from the prospective 30 percent reduction in estate and gift-tax liabilities resulting from amendments to H. R. 4790 now being prepared under the sponsorship of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and means. (The amendment is now part of the bill.)

"The majority is proceeding in reckless disregard of the congressional experience in attempting to reduce expenditures below the President's budget for 1948. The departmental requests presented initially * * * in preparation of the 1949 budget were reduced by the President by approximately $7,000,000,000. Further economies may be possible, but substantial reductions would have to be made by weakening the national defense or a drastic curtailment in effective assistance in international relief and rehabilitation."

The Knutson estimates are predicated upon a personal income of $209,000,000,000 and a budget cut of $2,000,000,000.

But, during consideration of the bill by the Ways and Means Committee, the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, when questioned, said that for the first half of 1948 they estimated personal income would be at an annual rate of $212,000,000,000. During the second half of 1948 that this will drop to $205,000,000,000, and for the first half of 1949 personal income will run at an annual rate of only $195,000,000,000. The first half of 1948 is the anticipated high-water mark.

Congressman LYNCH, (Democrat, New York) inquired whether this $212,000,000,000 personal income for the first half of 1948 was due in part to inflation and not to real productivity. The economist for the joint committee admitted that it was.

Prices on the commodity exchanges have tumbled sharply since then. If prices continue to fall the personal income will of necessity show a drop from the $209,000,000,000 figure upon which the Republicans base the revenue yield. This is serious, because it is an accepted principle that for every $3,000,000,000 drop in personal income there is a drop of $1,000,000,000 in Federal revenue.

That is the reason why the Treasury Department bases its estimates of revenue receipts on the $200,000,000,000 figure.

"Enactment of the Knutson bill into law means the wrecking of the Marshall plan for foreign aid and rehabilitation, and the certain weakening of our national defenses," Congressman LYNCH told the House. A vote for this bill, he said "* * * is a vote either for the sabotage of the Marshall plan and the crippling of national defense or for an uncontrolled inflation that will pay off our Government bonds with 50-cent dollars or less. * * * Those who vote for this bill will go down in history as the hatchet men of the Marshall plan."

Something To Paste in Your Hat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 12, 1948

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times Herald:

SOMETHING TO PASTE IN YOUR HAT

Bernard M. Baruch got fed to the teeth recently with the talk that comes from Russian, British, and a few American sources about how the United States really didn't do such a whale of a job in World War II after all, aside from paying others to fight.

The result of Mr. Baruch's annoyance appears in the current Saturday Evening Post, in the shape of an article entitled "A Few Kind Words for Uncle Sam." In this piece, the famous nonpolitical statesman presents the first complete fact-and-figure roundup that we've seen of just what this Nation did pour into World War II, along with some succinct information on what we contributed to World War I.

Here are the high lights. It is suggested that patriots paste them in their hats.

BLOOD

United States military casualties were greater than those of the entire British Empire in World War II, though we came into the conflict 27 months after Great Britain declared war on Germany. Ninety western allied divisions rescued western Europe from Hitler following D-day in June of 1944; and of these, 61 were American divisions.

We fought the Pacific war almost singlehanded.

Our World War II casualties were more than 400,000 dead and almost 670,000 wounded; total, 1,070,000. Over-all British Empire losses were 353,652 military dead, 475,070 wounded, 90,844 missing, 60,595 civilians killed—total, 980,161.

These casualties of ours were exceeded on the allied side only by the Russians, who are estimated to have lost perhaps 7,000,000 dead, largely because of the Kremlin's contempt for human life. Russia's casualties would have been much heavier had it not been for our lend-lease help—which leads to the next item on this list.

MATERIAL

We produced 60 percent of all the munitions used by all the allied powers in World War II. Endangering our own cities, we sent Great Britain alone more than 45,000 antiaircraft guns.

United States oil burned up in the war—5,800,000,000 barrels—would have yielded enough gasoline to keep every automobile in this country running for 12 years.

We put out some $44,000,000,000 worth of lend-lease materials of every description. Of this, about 66 percent went to Britain and 25 percent to Russia. Reverse lend-lease amounted to little. We are now being cursed in Russia and scolded in Great Britain (except by Winston Churchill and a few other men of like vision) as rascals of assorted kinds.

During World War II we rolled up new production records of all varieties—food output hiked one-third, with fewer farmers than usual; nearly 300,000 airplanes built; also 15,000,000 rifles and carbines, 319,000 pieces of field artillery, 41,000,000 rounds of ammunition, 4,200,000 tons of artillery shells, 86,000 tanks, 52,000,000 tons of merchant ships, almost 12,000,000 tons of war vessels.

MONEY

Our over-all expenditure on World War II was three hundred and thirty billions—much of it probably wasted—but it's down the drain now. This total was more than Britain and Russia combined spent on the war.

One result: Our national debt increased by 500 percent, and now stands at the appalling figure of two hundred and fifty-four billions. Another: Whereas in 1939 taxes took $1 out of every $13 of our national income, in 1948 they take $1 out of every $4.

Since the war we've shoveled out twenty-one billions in foreign aid of various kinds and are now setting forth blithely to spend around seventeen billions more on the Marshall plan.

From all this it follows that just one word applies to anybody who belittles the United States effort in World War II. That word is the short, simple "liar."

Address by Hon. Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, Before the Union League Club of Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER FERGUSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] delivered an excellent and spirited address yesterday in Philadelphia in defense of the record and integrity of this Congress. I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the address, as published in the New York Times of June 12 inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President Truman has opened his campaign for nomination and election. He is traveling through the country with a 15-car train at the expense of the voters. He is blackguarding Congress at every whistle station in the West for the simple reason that Congress happens to differ with him in his whole philosophy of government.

I have repeatedly set forth the constructive accomplishments of this first Republican Congress in 16 years in reducing expenses, reducing taxes, eliminating war regulations, establishing equality and justice in labor relations, reorganizing the armed forces, and reversing the foreign policy of the administration toward communism.

But today I want you to look at the program of President Truman. I want you to consider where we would be today if we did not have the Eightieth Congress prepared to resist the feeble spurs which our gallivanting President says he would like to apply. I want you to consider what this country would be like if Congress followed his advice, or if he should be reelected in November with a Congress of his own choosing.

The President's program would create a nation completely regimented, choked by taxation, under the complete domination of centralized bureaucracy and arbitrary union leadership.

PAST REGULATIONS RECALLED

In 1946 the people became so indignant with Government regulation that President Truman himself, prior to the election, abolished rationing and meat control, and abolished most price controls before the Republican Congress could take office. Yet, within a year, he demanded from Congress, and still demands on his western trip, complete authority to reestablish OPA, to reestablish WPB, to reestablish the War Labor Board, to ration every housewife.

He wants power to fix prices and wages and regulate all phases of industry in his own arbitrary selection and discretion. He says he wants selective controls to be selected by him, but experience has shown that once any important commodity is placed under regulation, the regulation must extend to every related commodity. We have the greatest production and the highest standard of living of any country in the world without controls.

The President would destroy our free economy and adopt those controls which in every country in Europe have so reduced production that our taxpayers are paying $7,000,000,000 a year today to help support them. If such controls were effective they would decrease production, but they would be no more effective than they were after the war. They would fail because vast shortages and black markets would develop in every city and on every farm.

Federal bureaus would be regulating every one of a billion transactions a day in the United States. They would tell the farmer how to run his farm, the businessman how to run his business, and the housewife how to run her kitchen.

The President would not stop there. He has repeatedly recommended the socialization and the nationalization of medicine. He wants $5,000,000,000 more taxes to be paid into Washington so that a Federal bureau may employ all the doctors in the United States to give free medical care to all the people of the United States. He would destroy the freedom of the medical profession and make every doctor an employee of the Federal Government.

BRITISH SYSTEM IS CITED

Federal bureaus with thousands of employees would have to keep track of millions of medical services, make regulations telling every family when it could have a doctor, what kind of medicine it could have, and every detail of medical care for children. In Great Britain the book of regulations is an inch thick.

What does the President want in labor relations? He has told the unions in the West that he is opposed to the Taft-Hartley law and that the unions' only remedy lies in November 1948. In vetoing the law, he attacked every feature which tended to impose any responsibility on unions or restore equality in the administration of the law by the National Labor Relations Board.

We can only conclude that he would repeal the law and restore labor union officers to their former position, where there was no recourse against their arbitrary actions either by the employer, by the public, or by the labor union members themselves.

In the passage of that law, we deprived labor of no rights. We require the employer to recognize the union and bargain only with a representative of a majority of the employees on an equal basis across the table. We base our law on free collective bargaining with the right to strike for better hours, wages, or working conditions.

The President would restore the days when every small employer was at the mercy of a labor-union officer, no matter how arbitrary. He would restore the days of secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes. The number of strikes has been cut in half under the present law, and millions of workmen and their wives bless the day when they are no longer forced to quit their jobs in the arbitrary discretion of unreasonable men.

SPENDING PLEAS ASSAILED

The President's program does not stop at this point. He is in favor of vastly increased spending by the Federal Government. I have never heard of a spending project which has invoked his opposition. No matter how wild the proposal, he will endorse it. He is traveling through the country, promising every group and every State and every community money from the Federal Treasury to support its favorite projects.

Here in Washington, he and the Democratic minority in Congress have opposed every effort of the Republican Congress to cut the expenditures of the Federal Government. Today he is deriding Congress because it has some sense of responsibility to the taxpayers, which he entirely lacks.

Here in Washington we are still fighting the New Deal. While there is a Republican Congress, the President still appoints more than a million employees. Hundreds of Federal bureaus and thousands of press agents are busy propagandizing for their own pet spending, and against every effort of Congress to hold them in restraint.

If any bureau is cut, word goes out through the country to cut off that project or those employees who have the most popular appeal in order that Congress may be subjected to popular pressure to restore the cut which has been made. But the personnel sitting at the desks in Washington continues to increase.

The President favors every project for spending money abroad. He favors every recommendation of the defense department. If Congress carried out the recommendations of his famous New Deal message of January 1948, the Federal budget would be $60,000,000,000 in stead of $40,000,000,000.

PRESIDENT HIT OVER TAXES

If the President had his way there would be an immediate increase in taxes in every category. Since the wealthy already pay a greater part of their income in taxes, most of the new burden would fall on the middle and lower incomes. Thus, socialized medicine is to be financed by a 3- or 4-percent pay-roll tax, tough on the lower-income employees.

The President vetoed three tax-reduction bills, although the money was not necessary for the current expenses of the Government. Like every true New Dealer, he wants a lot of extra money in the Treasury, because he expects to find a way to spend it.

On top of all the other control and taxation, he would impose on the American people universal compulsory military training. There can hardly be a greater limitation of individual liberty than it is to take a million boys a year—and perhaps a million girls—for an entire year from their homes and families, their education, or their occupation, upset their normal approach to life at an im-

pressionable age, and subject them to the training and indoctrination considered advisable by some military bureau in Washington.

We can be sure that under President Truman that bureau would be infected with New Deal doctrines as it was during the war, and the youth of this country would be trained to a military approach to all questions. It would be literally the regimentation of our children.

Furthermore, there is every sign that the President would return to the same soft policy toward communism which was followed by his predecessor, the policy which placed Russia in the powerful position it occupies today, and introduced Communist influence into every labor union and Government department.

MISCONCEPTIONS ARE ALLEGED

In the President's speech at Chicago he showed a complete misconception of the dangers of communism. He opposed all legislation to check the spread of communism in the United States. The only remedy he can think of is the passage of social-welfare laws, price-control laws, and a planned economy. He doesn't seem to realize that communism is an organized, world-wide conspiracy directed from Russia and using every means, legal and illegal, to extend its influence and power in the United States.

Certainly, we cannot make it a crime to be a Communist, but we can legislate against every activity which goes beyond the constitutional protection.

We are all in favor of social-welfare legislation. I have drafted and supported proposals for Federal aid to education, to housing and to health. I am for these measures because I want constantly to improve the condition of the American people.

But this program is a pretty slow method of meeting the crusading campaign of communism today. This is the kind of talk which the New Dealers engaged in while they encouraged the spread of communism throughout the world and in the American Government itself.

For 14 years the New Deal has been apologizing for conditions in this country and advocating the adoption of socialist and social-welfare measures invented in Europe where they have usually failed.

We want a government which will tell the world what our system has accomplished, not what it has failed to accomplish. That kind of government can prove to the world that American principles have already produced a higher standard of living and a greater production than any socialistic country has ever seen.

REPUBLICAN STUDIES STRESSED

The President attacks the Republican Congress because it has not enacted as much legislation relating to civil rights and housing and education and health as he recommends. The Republicans have been in power a little over a year and they have made extensive studies and progress in every one of these fields even if the exact remedies advocated by the President have not been adopted.

It hardly lies in the mouth of the President to accuse them of failure. The New Deal has been in power for 14 years. It has boasted of its interest in social-welfare legislation. It has promised the people social security and free lunches, and yet today the President admits that it has utterly failed in its much vaunted programs to improve housing, education, and health.

Every one of these subjects is complicated and difficult and requires careful study to work out the proper relationship between the Federal Government and local communities. The New Dealer always tries to give complete power to some Washington bureau to tell the States and localities how to run their programs and direct the lives of the people who may get the benefit of Federal assistance.

Look at their program for nationalized medicine. We Republicans are working out constructive programs which retain local control and responsibility, retain the freedom of the medical profession, retain the freedom of the people themselves to live their own lives.

HOME RULE PROGRAM UPHELD

It is to the credit of Congress that we are determined to develop the right method of working out these programs in a manner consistent with liberty and equal justice, and local home rule.

The President talks of his farm program. The Senate created a committee which studied and developed a farm program before we ever heard from the President. He never had a farm program until we wrote one, and he has none now. It is easy enough to state general principles of dealing with agriculture, but hard indeed to get general agreement on details. Our program is contained in a bill to be considered by the Senate next week.

If the President had his way, we would return to a regimented agriculture with full power to the Government to limit production and tell every farmer what he can plant and what he can't plant. Here again we are trying to work out stability for farm prices with little Federal control or limitations on production.

If the President were reelected with a Congress of his own choosing, that would be indeed a rubber-stamp Congress. In his blanket condemnation of Congress, we see his determination to write the congressional program. It is an effort not only to condemn this Congress, but to discredit the institution of Congress. It is an attack on the principle of representative government itself.

As such, it gives aid and comfort to all those who want to destroy representative government as do the Communists, Fascists, and every believer in a totalitarian state. The institution of Congress, the direct representatives of the people, is the great bulwark of liberty. Where legislatures have been suppressed by a strong executive, freedom has died.

There would be little left to that bulwark of liberty under a President whose attitude toward the people's representatives is that exhibited in the recent performance on the west coast.

PRESIDENT'S VETOES ASSAILED

The President has chosen to veto the most constructive measures adopted by this Congress in labor legislation, and taxation, and scientific research. Many are urging that Congress stay here to deal with those important problems which are still before the American people. There is little use in our working day and night to complete constructive programs when we have a President whose attitude toward Congress and its philosophy is that of President Truman.

There is little use remaining here to face the vetoes of a man who does not understand the difference between American principles of free government and communism, who does not understand the threat of totalitarian control. We had better adjourn now and appeal to the people in November for a vote of confidence in the election of a President who will cooperate in our programs.

Our only hope of winning the great ideological war today is to elect an administration which abhors regulation and spending and Federal power, which believes in liberty, equality, and justice, which believes in the success of the American system, which is prepared to spread American philosophy throughout the world, to meet the Communist crusade with an American faith.

We did it after 1776, and we can do it again. Under such an administration alone can we hope for continued progress in the United States; under such an administration alone can we hope for peace and security throughout the world.

Mundt-Nixon Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Mr. Al Fisher, secretary of the Washington State CIO Council, 84 Union Street, Seattle, Wash., with reference to the Mundt-Nixon bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The State CIO Council of the State of Washington represents an important section of the workers in basic industries of the Northwest. Our membership, speaking individually and through its organizations including the State council, have become extremely alarmed at the dangers inherent in the Mundt-Nixon bill, H. R. 5852, which is presently being considered by your committee.

The trade-union movement, built through many years of toil and sacrifice on the part of millions of deserving workers, is an extremely important part of the democratic structure and institutions in the United States. We have built this trade-union movement for the purpose of gaining a semblance of equality of bargaining power with our employers with respect to wages, hours, and working conditions; therefore, our study of the measure which you are now considering leads us to believe that the purposes and objectives of the measure include the destruction of legitimate trade unions.

Such a result could only place the workers in an extremely unfavorable bargaining position with the employers in industries which are combined together in tremendous monopolies.

It is our firm conviction that the necessity for such legislation as proposed in this act is nonexistent. It is our conviction that the laws already on the books are extensive enough to take care of any really subversive activities affecting the welfare and security of our Nation.

The workers of this Nation will in the future, as they have in the past, resist with everything they have any efforts to destroy the democratic institutions of our country as established in the Constitution and Bill of Rights enacted by our forefathers from the very beginning of our Nation. We will further fight to extend that democracy so that we can become an even greater Nation, serving the interests and welfare of all the people regardless of race, color, or creed.

We are greatly concerned with the attempts of proponents of this measure to enact legislation which would classify legitimate activities of our trade union movement as treasonable acts carried on in the interests of foreign "totalitarian dictatorship". It is clear to us that the real meat of this measure is the destruction of free, democratic institutions and organizations in this country. False fears of some nebulous outside conspiracy, are being used as the excuse for repealing constitutionally guaranteed civil rights of the American people. The bill itself is a conspiracy which seeks "the estab-

lishment of a totalitarian dictatorship" which could destroy "free, democratic institutions", ruthlessly repress "all opposition to the party in power", and completely subordinate the "rights of individuals to the state". It would deny "fundamental rights and liberties, characteristic of a democratic and representative form of government", such as freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly and religious worship".

We cannot have both the Mundt bill and the Bill of Rights. Let's keep the Bill of Rights. Nothing in the bill limits the power of the attorney general to issue a decree that any organization is a "communist political organization" or a "communist front organization". This could very conceivably be used to outlaw such legitimate trade union activities as striking, fighting against discrimination in employment, wages, hours, and conditions, or of carrying on educational campaigns designed to acquaint the membership of the unions with voting records of legislators and with the contents of various proposed legislative acts.

It is our opinion that the so-called threats to our democratic institutions comes from the proponents of this legislation who are seeking to cover up their pro-fascist leanings and real purposes by carrying out a hysterical campaign to divert the attention of the people.

Definitions in section 3 of the act of what constitutes a Communist political organization or Communist-front organization and the nature of its activities makes a virtual dragnet of the measure which could conceivably include all trade unions, fraternal orders, churches, political parties, and any other organization of the people in this country.

Paragraph (I) of this section could be particularly aimed at trade unions. This paragraph would outlaw long-established procedures to protect the members of the union by requiring information as to membership and any other business or records of the union which would be made public. Anti-labor employers would utilize such information for the purpose of discrimination. In effect, the proposed bill would make of the Attorney General a stool pigeon for the employers.

Section 13 of the Mundt bill places undue power in the Attorney General by making him the final trier of the facts relative to whether or not an organization is, in fact, a Communist political association, or a Communist-front organization. The bill provides: "The findings of the Attorney General as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive"; though provision is made for appeal from his determination to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and thence on certiorari to the Supreme Court of the United States. Such an appeal is, in fact, an empty one by reason of the restrictions placed upon the courts of appeal. Under this bill, organizations are deprived of a fair, full, open hearing in court and of trial by jury in proceedings wherein criminal liability may result. The courts are restricted to the reading of a cold record prepared by the Attorney General of the United States, and are bound by his findings of fact as to whether or not an organization is Communist. The limited powers of the court are confined merely to examining the record to determine whether there is any testimony or other evidence to support the Attorney General's finding. The courts cannot be concerned with preponderance of evidence, or the question of which side of the case should have been believed by the Attorney General in fairness to the parties concerned. The testimony of one solitary witness is, therefore, sufficient to support the Attorney General in his findings relative to an organization comprising thousands of men.

The role played by the Attorney General under the Mundt bill is almost identical to that of a Deputy Commissioner under the Federal Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. This act provides for a similar hearing to be conducted by a Deputy Commissioner for the deciding of claims of injured workmen; and the Mundt bill appears to have borrowed greatly from this act in the matter of the finality of such administrative determinations. In interpreting these similar powers of the Deputy Commissioner's, the Court stated, in the case of *Calabrese* v. *Locke* (56 Fed. 2d, 458):

"The part played by the courts in such proceedings is a narrow one. They cannot try the case de novo. They cannot weigh the evidence laid before the Deputy Commissioner and decide which adversary brought in the stronger proof."

The Mundt bill further allows the Attorney General to believe perjury, if he so desires, and a determination founded on his belief in perjured testimony cannot be upset on appeal to the courts. This precedent was laid down in the case of *Wilson & Company, Inc.* v. *Locke* (5 Fed. 2d, 81), in which the Court held:

"That it is clear that the creditability of witnesses in proceedings to recover compensation under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act is solely for the Deputy Commissioner."

Other cases evidencing the limitations of the powers of the courts after determinations of fact by Deputy Commissioners are as follows: *Crowell* v. *Benson* (285 U. S. 22, 76 L. ed. 598 (1932)); *Del Vecchio* v. *Bowers* (296 U. S. 280, 80 L. ed. 229 (1935)); *Voehl* v. *Indemnity Ins. Co.*, (288 U. S. 162, 77 L. ed. 676 (1933)); *Salmon Bay Sand & Gravel Co.* v. *Marshall, Deputy Commissioner* (93 F. (2d) 1 (C. C. A. 9, 1937)); *Wheeler Shipyard* v. *Lowe* (13 F. Supp. 836 (D. C. N. Y., 1935), Affirmed 82 F. (2d) 1022 (C. C. A. 2, 1936)); *Hoage* v. *Royal Indemnity Co.* (67 App. D. C. 142, 90 F. (2d) 387 (1937), Certiorari denied); *Royal Indemnity Co.* v. *Cardillo* (302 U. S. 736, 82 L. ed. 569); *Speaks* v. *Hoage* (64 App. D. C. 324, 78 F. (2d) 208 (1935), Certiorari denied, 296, U. S. 574, 80 L. ed. 405 (1935); *Wood Towing Corp.* v. *Parker* (76 F. (2d) 770 (C. C. A. 4, 1935); *Employers Liability Corp.* v. *Hoage* (67 App. D. C. 245, 91 F. (2d) 318 (1937)).

The distinction to be remembered in comparing the similar powers of the Deputy Commissioners under the Federal Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act and the Attorney General under the Mundt bill, is that the Deputy Commissioners are dealing only in civil matters relative to money claims, whereas the Mundt bill contains within it serious criminal penalties. In connection herewith is to be noted the view of many authorities, that the Deputy Commissioners wield too broad a power, even though they deal only in civil claims.

The United States is a young nation—but a Nation that has many beloved and honored heroes and leaders. Here is a statement made by one of the greatest of these—Abraham Lincoln. He said:

"All that harms labor is treason to America. No line can be drawn between these two. If any man tells you he loves America, yet he hates labor, he is a liar. If any man tells you he trusts America, yet fears labor, he is a fool. There is no America without labor."

Our great trade-union movement in this country, developed through years of struggle and sacrifice on the part of millions of hard working men and women, are organizations, of, by, and for working people everywhere.

As there is no America without labor, so also there is no freedom or security for workers without free, democratic trade-unions. The unrestricted right to organize and bargain collectively, through our unions, is absolutely essential to the welfare of the people of this Nation. Equally essential is the free right of workers to participate as they may choose in the poliitical life of our country, all the way from the presidency of the United States to the smallest community office. To participate without fear of economic or political reprisal from the foes of organized labor from whatever source.

These rights spell security for working people. With these rights intact, labor will contribute to the well-being of all the people—farmers, professional people, small business, by securing a higher standard of living and a greater purchasing power which is essential to full production in our economy. The State CIO condemns the Taft-Hartley Act, loyalty purges of Government employees, and all other measures which take away these rights. We pledge unceasing opposition to any backward steps toward loss of freedom.

We demand the complete defeat of the Mundt-Nixon bill, H. R. 5852, or anything that resembles it.

British Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 12, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by T. O. Thackrey which appeared in the New York Post on June 1, 1948:

ON GUARD

(By T. O. Thackrey)

Bitter, bloodthirsty, bungling Bevin, His Majesty's Minister for Foreign Affairs, has made it clear that as long as he directs British policy its objectives will be:

1. To foster enmity between the United States of America and the Soviet Union in the hope that, by such a division, Britain may again reconquer domination of world trade and hold the balance of power.

2. To re-create British domination of the Middle East, by driving out not merely Soviet but American influence, including oil concessions, in the hope of exploiting and expanding British income, while persuading the United States that it is worth while for us to pay the bills.

3. Destruction of Jewish life in Palestine; not merely the extermination of Israel, but the exclusion of Jews as such, both by preventing immigration and by the more direct method of encouraging mass murder.

4. To persuade the United States that British military and naval alliances are so vital to our national security, in view of our hysteria over communism, that we will place all our resources and our political power at Britain's disposal.

In those objectives, Mr. Bevin has been ably assisted by certain citizens and Government officials of the United States who have had their own axes to grind, even some whose ambitions for public power and private profit would be irrevocably destroyed in the process.

The hysteria over communism, for example, suits the book of our Defense Secretary at the moment, quite as much as it does Mr. Bevin's, but for different reasons.

Mr. Forrestal, a careful, able, and patient man, has succeeded in becoming the Nation's first chief of all armed forces and not only rivals but often exceeds in power the office of the Presidency itself.

In private life, as in public office, Mr. Forrestal is an expansionist. It is perhaps natural that he should wish to see the military establishment over which he rules double and triple its size, power, and capacity for

absorbing money, while he remains its guardian.

But the money—enormous amounts of money—must come from the public convinced that it is for a useful, necessary purpose—much as Mr. Forrestal's firm of Dillon, Read & Co. must persuade the public to invest in a stock or bond on the basis of its productive value.

Expansion of the military establishment means preparation for war—but if there is no urgently desperate menace of war, the public will revolt at carrying a double tax load. Q. E. D.—The usefulness of magnifying the Russian threat far beyond its real proportions.

The security fear is useful not only to Mr. Forrestal but to a vast number of its friends and acquaintances—and to many who are not—such as the beneficiaries, for example, of the American-Arabian Oil Co., which won out over British competition for the right to exploit Saudi Arabia's oil resources.

This company was cozily organized on a basis whereby profits would be tax-free, but American tax dollars would carry almost all of the burden of development and exploitation. There was an added advantage of being able to outrageously overcharge the United States Navy for the oil itself; but the deal was so raw, so clearly involving the use of public money for private gain, that an excuse palatable to the taxpayers is vital.

Here, again, the advantage of war hysteria.

Russia seeks a warm water port in the Dardanelles. Rush money, military supplies, and advisers to Turkey and to Greece in the name of stopping the communism menace. Concentrate the United States Fleet in the Mediterranean to guard against the Communist menace. The fleet needs oil, and where better than from Saudi Arabia?

Q. E. D.—Anything that could be construed as a menace to the continued cozy Saudi-Arabian deal—might be explained on the grounds of vital national defense needs and to question it unpatriotic.

This point of view has many friends in and out of the administration, but nowhere does it have any more stanch defender than in the person of bloody Bevin.

It fits his hope—and plan—so neatly. If accepted, his arrangements with Egypt, Transjordan, Iraq, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, and Yemen to invade Palestine, destroy Israel—and in turn pay off that grisly debt in oil, military bases, and political subservience—just might proceed.

The next planned step, of course, will be to revive the cry that a free Israel might be as friendly to the Soviet Union as to the United States—but has many more valid reasons than Ireland for hating British rule-or-ruin tactics.

The hope is to further weaken the President in his half-awakened efforts in Washington and in the United Nations to extend the friendship we have so long pledged and which the common people of this country cry out for. The hope is to appeal to his fear of Russia, and so blind him both to justice and to the British scheme for division—and conquest.

Despite these pressures—we have branded the Arab aggressors for what they are, before the United Nations Security Council, and pleaded for enforcement of that body's authority to outlaw aggressive war.

We need more—and rapidly.

If we know the meaning of aggression at Lake Success, we must know it also in Washington.

But if we do not use that knowledge to lift the arms embargo to Israel at once—the evidence that Mr. Bevin has succeeded in reducing the United States to a political colony of the British Empire will be complete.

How about it, Mr. President?

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 12, 1948

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, many a parent, wishing to save a child from the hardships the parent endured, to make the child's pathway easy, has lived to learn that the trials and the tasks from which he saved his offspring deprived that child of an opportunity to develop his character, dulled his ambition, made him a softie, a waster, and a spender. Too much money too easily acquired and foolishly spent has ruined many a promising youth.

What has been done to the individual can be, and is being, done for the first time in history to the people of a nation, the British Empire—more specifically, England and her people. The morale of the people of other nations, in a lesser degree, is being destroyed.

For centuries the English have been a courageous, a hard-working, an enduring people. Living on an island which, other than coal, possesses few, if any, natural resources, almost dependent upon other nations for raw materials necessary for their existence and expansion, by a bulldog courage, surpassing ability, and perserverance, they welded together an empire, the proud boast of which was that the sun never sets on the British flag. Until World War II, truthfully they asserted that Britain was the mistress of the seas. They even convinced some Americans that we were dependent upon the British Navy for our national security.

Today the Stars and Stripes rules the seas. It may be said that as today the earth turns on its axis, the sun ever shines upon land and ocean where American youth has fought, won, sometimes died.

As so clearly pointed out in the June 5 issue of the Saturday Evening Post, at the end of World War II, England was in better physical condition than her neighbors. The damage inflicted by war upon her was less than that suffered by others. True, some help could be used to advantage—in priming her economic pump, as it were—and the same was true of other countries devastated by the war.

And it was right and proper that we should lend her, as we did, a helping hand. Unfortunately we went far beyond that and poured out our money and resources to such an extent that, as set forth by the author of the Post article, we have destroyed the self-reliance and the initiative of the people of England and of other nations. Using our dollars to tide them over, the English have permitted the Socialists—and it is but a short step from socialism to communism—with their promises of an easy living, to sap their national strength and integrity of character. The world will be lucky if those we have aided so generously do not get the habit of expecting Uncle Sam, at the cost of hardship to his own people, to forever ease out the hard spots, make easy the path, and broaden the way—dependence upon others—which leads to national oblivion.

On June 4, the House, without a record vote, gave $5,980,710,228, to be spent in 15 months, for aid to foreign nations—since 1940 we have given more than $80,000,000,000 to foreign governments—and a large part of that goes to Great Britain. To aid other countries during the war, we used or gave to others 5,800,000,000 barrels of oil, enough to keep every automobile in this country running for 12 years.

We are being foolishly, needlessly, and injuriously sympathetic, charitably generous and wasteful with our taxpayers' money.

Another result of our folly is that we are draining our own country of its natural resources, its ability to defend itself. By giving billions abroad, we have brought the recipients of those billions into our own markets where they bid against our own taxpayers, our own people, for the necessities of life—and the cost of living here goes ever higher.

Yesterday, I paid $1.15 for a pound of butter and 98 cents for a pound of meat, 23 cents for a quart of milk, $18.95 for a pair of shoes. How long will our own people be able to buy food, clothing, and shelter if we continue our present policy and measure of giving?

If it is available, read the Post article, look around you, do a little thinking—then answer the question: "Is it not time we not only begin to think of America, but that we elect a President, Senators, and Representatives who will take some thought of the policy we are pursuing, consider seriously how much we can afford to give, the effect of our gifts upon others, and, above all, upon our own future welfare?

Long, long ago we were admonished: "For what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"

Modernized, it can be said: "For what shall it profit a people if they save the whole world but lose their own liberty?"

To Right an Inequity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "To Right an Inequity" from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of Friday, May 14, 1948:

TO RIGHT AN INEQUITY

It may seem strange that the end of a bitter Pacific war finds Congress debating the proposed Judd bill to extend naturalization to all legal immigrants. Practically, this is a grant of citizenship to 90,000, mostly elderly, Japanese who entered the United States prior to the Exclusion Act of 1924.

The fact is this is an overdue justice, postponed by hostilities. As the immigration bars

have gone up, citizenship restrictions have been gradually eased. Chinese and natives of India gained the right during the war. Only Japanese, Koreans, Siamese, Indonesians, and Pacific islanders remain ineligible to citizenship—an arbitrary and, in view of America's new status in the western Pacific, impolitic exception.

Congressman JUDD would also substitute the quota system for the exclusion act. Former Ambassador Grew supports him, regarding exclusion as an irritant which fallowed Japanese opinion for Tojo's hate mongering. After the warm debate of 25 years ago, such a repealer faces hard going in an election year. Yet, again, with China and India on small quotas, a specific Japanese bar is indefensible and its eventual repeal seems assured.

In the matter of granting naturalization to resident Japanese, only the most race-conscious can protest. These lifelong aliens entered legally many years ago. Here in St. Louis they are known as valued residents, debarred from the citizenship which is their children's at the instant of birth; some have clinched their claim by sending a child into the armed services.

At a time when Congress and the courts must keep the privileges of citizenship from subversive individuals, their keen vision is not helped by the blinker of an archaic law discriminating against one small group of aliens for reasons which, if once cogent, are no longer so.

Views of Americans for Democratic Action on Mundt-Nixon Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Mr. Leon Henderson setting forth the views of Americans for Democratic Action with reference to the Mundt-Nixon bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am making this statement for Americans for Democratic Action, a Nationwide organization of liberals and progressives dedicated to freedom and economic security through education and democratic political action. This organization is profoundly opposed to communism. In working toward our goals we repudiate Communist support and accept as members only those whose devotion to the principles of political freedom is unqualified.

We oppose communism because it would, in the end, deprive us of political freedom. We oppose the Mundt bill for exactly the same reason.

The liberal and labor movement is the special target of communism. The Communists direct their indefatigable and ceaseless efforts against exactly those groups which seek social justice and increased prosperity for all. They have, for example, a fanatical preoccupation with the conquest of organized labor. These are the groups which they most desire to infiltrate and lead. Liberals and members of organized labor are, therefore, better acquainted with the strategy and tactics of communism than other groups. We speak out of long experience when we speak of the techniques of communism and of ways to defeat it.

We do not want this Mundt-Nixon bill.

We do not want it because it is a threat to our system of liberty, which is our greatest safeguard against communism. The provisions of this bill constitute an attempt to stifle and repress communism—to silence it. We say let it be heard and combated in the open; it will be convicted through its own contradictions, vacillations, and absurdities. Our aim is to fight it by democratic methods, not to suppress it through the criminal prosecution and administrative regulations.

One of the great labor unions, whose leaders are affiliated with ADA, has recently emerged from a victorious struggle within its ranks against communism. Walter Reuther, a member of the board of ADA, and president of the UAW, has this to say about his union's victory over Communist infiltration:

"We have beaten them. The story of how we did it reads almost like the report of an experiment in creative democracy, and provides a demonstration of techniques which can be applied in the larger struggle to save democracy in the world.

"Communists cannot seize power in a nation or a union if the people are on their toes, if they know the issues and are offered democratic leadership built around a positive program of action. The inertia and indifference of the average citizen or union member are the most valuable assets the Communists have. Working as a well-disciplined minority, they cultivate this passivity and thereby seek to immobilize the democratic majority—especially those individuals and groups capable of providing leadership and direction in the fight against both Red and black totalitarianism.

"The momentum of a positive democratic program is the only final answer to both the commisar and the storm trooper."

ADA can point to its own brief history as an organization as proof of the success of open democratic methods against Communist influence. All we ask is a clear field and no favors. The tide in this country is turning against communism, and we shall soon see a reinvigorated liberal movement from which Communists will be excluded. Legislation of the repressive type proposed here will only serve to confuse the issues which are now being drawn on the battle ground of public opinion.

Let me give one brief example. The Communist Party in this country is today engaged in a laborious defense of the Communist regimes established in certain eastern European countries. In spite of all the Communist Party can say, however, it now seems clear that civil liberty, the right of political opposition, has been extirpated in these countries. Few people, on the evidence provided by the stream of political refugees from these countries, can doubt that communism is synonymous with repression. Now, however, the Mundt bill offers the Communist Party in this country a golden opportunity to pose as the champions of civil liberty. They are already using this opportunity to the utmost. They have invoked all our cherished ideas of democracy; they have appealed to the first amendment, in which they do not believe. If the bill is enacted, they will be its willing victims in the courts, and they will in all probability enjoy the victory of invalidating its unconstitutional provisions on appeal.

And one obvious result of this will be to mislead and confuse the public, yet another time, with regard to the true objectives of communism and its attitude toward civil liberty.

You may also expect, once this bill is enacted, to hear Radio Moscow on the air 24 hours a day, telling the world that democracy has ended in the United States—that we too have become a police state—and that our vaunted faith in individual freedom is so much claptrap.

The bill is unconstitutional because it attempts to do an unconstitutional thing; a thing which is repugnant not only to the express clauses of the Constitution, but to the general principles of fair play and free debate on which we have founded our political life.

The thing which the bill attempts to do, in my opinion, is to extirpate the Communist Party, through the infliction of penalties upon its members without reference to their individual responsibility for criminal or illegal acts. There has been a lot of inconclusive debate as to whether the bill outlaws communism or not. It is possible to demonstrate from the structure of the bill itself that it does.

Section 1 of the bill describes the world Communist movement and says that its aim is to establish a totalitarian dictatorship in all the countries of the world. It says further that these dicatorships are to be under the control of a world Communist movement which has its headquarters in a country which we know to be the Soviet Union. I do not disagree with these findings.

Section 3 then goes on to describe a Communist political organization, which is an organization under the control of the world Communist movement and having the same objectives, namely to establish totalitarian dictatorships. The bill then lays down rules requiring Communist political organizations to register with the Attorney General. When they register they must list the names of all their members and leaders.

Up to this point, I agree that the Communist Party is not outlawed. But then comes the stinger: Section 4 of the bill makes it a crime, punishable by $10,000 fine and 10 years in jail and loss of United States citizenship, to act in any manner with intent to establish a totalitarian dictatorship under Communist control in the United States. By definition the establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship is the aim of the Communist Party. Registration under the bill is prima facie evidence of guilt of the crime established by section 4.

Notice the words "any manner"; that means writing, or speaking, or offering a constitutional amendment, or running for Congress, on a Communist platform. Now, the leaders and members of the Communist Party do these things. Their names are disclosed under the registration provision of the bill. And the inescapable conclusion is that the Department of Justice must prosecute every single one of them for a crime.

This is not all. If the Communist Party does not register with the Attorney General, as required by the act, and the leaders of the Communist Party have already announced that they will not register, then section 10 of the act provides that they all must be prosecuted in the courts for remaining members of the Communist Party. Thus the bill exposes all Communists to criminal prosecution either way—if the Communist Party registers and if it does not register. Once this bill becomes law, it will be a crime in the United States to be a member of the Communist Party.

To my mind, this is outlawing the Community Party, and I do not see why the proponents of the bill try to gloss over this fact. It is there in plain unmistakable language.

Such outlawry of a group is unconstitutional. The freedom of expression which is the foundation stone of democracy, laid down in the first amendment, means freedom to express ideas, even if they are unpopular, dangerous, or even subversive. We cannot forbid the advocacy of ideas by legitimate and lawful means, without turning our backs on our whole constitutional development. We can draw the line at acts which threaten our security, or words which present a clear and

present danger to the community, but beyond that we cannot go. We have statutes on the books which protect us against any clear and present danger from communism. Among these are the Espionage Act, operative only in time of war (50 U. S. C. A.), the Peacetime Sedition Act (18 U. S. C. A., secs. 9 to 13). Subversive Organizations Registration Act (18 U. S. C. A., secs. 14 to 17), and the Foreign Agents Registration Act (22 U. S. C. A., secs. 611 to 621).

These should suffice, or if we need more statutes they should be drafted along the same lines, and not in such a way as to scoop up a whole school of political theory and make it criminal.

Chief Justice Hughes declared a decade ago: "The greater the importance of safeguarding the country from incitements to the overthrow of our institutions by force and violence, the more imperative is the need to preserve inviolate the constitutional rights of free speech, free press, and free assembly in order to maintain the opportunity for free political discussion, to the end that government may be responsive to the will of the people and that changes, if desired, may be obtained by peaceful means. Therein lies the security of the Republic, the very foundation of constitutional government." *De Jonge v. Oregon* (299 U. S. 353, 365).

A bill of this nature contains unforseen dangers for innocent persons and groups. The results of a statute which interferes with freedom of speech are unpredictable. Professor Chaffee of Harvard University has pointed this out in his great study of the repressive legislation passed during World War I. (Free Speech in the United States, Harvard, 1941.) Once you cut loose in a criminal statute from clearly defined rules of evidence or standards of guilt, and try to prosecute people because of their membership in a group or their espousal of certain political ideas, you sweep innocent people into the net of the law. District attorneys and juries, under local pressures, and in a hysterical atmosphere, are likely to turn the force of the law on local crackpots and public nuisances. The very existence of such a law intimidates innocent people and dampens public discussion. Even if the law is ultimately held to be unconstitutional, its effect is to stifle debate and to inflict prosecution and penalities on innocent people before the Supreme Court can catch up with the situation.

These dangers are quite apparent in this bill. The definitions which the Attorney General has to guide him in determining what are Communist political organizations and Communist-front organizations are loose and vague. In the first place, an organization can be proscribed under either of these categories if it is reasonable to conclude that it has certain characteristics on the basis of some or all of certain considerations. There is no requirement that the weight of the evidence show that the organization is Communist controlled; there is no requirement that reasonable doubt be eliminated with respect to the guilt of the organization accused.

In the case of front organizations, the standards are wide open. An organization may be branded if the Attorney General finds it reasonable to conclude that its views and policies are adopted or advanced because they are the views and policies of a Communist political organization, a Communist government, or the world Communist movement. In reaching this conclusion, the Attorney General need only look at the position the organization takes from time to time on matters of policy, or the use it makes of its funds, or the identity of the persons engaged in its management.

What I would like to ask here is, what about the people who are opposed to the management of the organization—what about the majority who may be fighting the control of a Communist clique? Are they to be branded because of the activities of persons whom they are desperately trying to unseat?

The House Un-American Activities Committee has constantly confused and muddled the whole problem of Communist-front organizations. I think they have done it deliberately. They have failed to distinguish between organizations which are infiltrated and those which are set up by the Communist Party purely as fronts. They have damned respectable people for participation in organizations in which a few Communists have wormed their way to influence. I believe that any Attorney General would do a better job in this field than the House Un-American Activities Committee, but I am perfectly aware that the House committee will be breathing down his neck insisting that he follow their own policy of wholesale smear and confusion, and I am not sure how long he can resist such pressure. This bill is an attempt to put the Attorney General in the clutches of the Un-American Activities Committee and control his operations with respect to Communist fronts.

Nor are all the criminal sections of the bill more accurate or precise than those sections dealing with the powers of the Attorney General. Section 4, which I have already mentioned, is so vague and so sweeping in the criminal offense which it creates, that it is certain to injure innocent people. The bill nowhere defines a totalitarian political dictatorship, and yet, section 4 makes it a crime to advocate one. This is no way to write a criminal statute, particularly since the penalties established for the commission of this undefined crime are the most barbarous in the bill, namely, the fine of up to $10,000 and a prison sentence of up to 10 years and loss of United States citizenship.

The proponents of the bill say that it is designed to bring the Communist Party out into the open. Clearly its effect is just the opposite. No organization is going to expose itself through registration to the wholesale prosecution awaiting it under this bill.

I would like to see the Communists out in the open. I think they can be driven out into the open. The way to do it is to lay down a positive democratic program in the unions, in political organizations, and among the other groups in which Communists operate, and to follow up this program with militant democratic action, challenging the Communists openly and showing them up as the dishonest frauds they really are.

But you can't beat communism by throwing embarrassing questions at witnesses in a congressional hearing. You can't slug it to death with a club or a slogan. You can't burn it at the stake. You can't catch it in an unconstitutional bear trap of a statute like the Mundt-Nixon bill. You have to show it up in the market place of ideas, and expose it by honest dealing.

Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the June 19, 1948, issue of the Journal of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia, entitled "Behind the Iron Curtain," written by Heber H. Rice, of Huntington, W. Va., who is a past national president of the Federal Bar Association and the former secretary-general and honorary president of the United Nations League of Lawyers.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

(By Heber H. Rice)

Pertinent existing facts relative to the Government and political operations of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will explain many of the reasons for the difficulties of the United States and of the United Nations in their efforts to obtain tangible cooperation from Russia in world peace settlements up to this time. These facts as presented herein are obtained from encyclopedias, biographies, articles by those who are recognized as having certain first hand information and from other authentic sources.

THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT

The basic governmental authority in Russia is vested in the Supreme Soviet of U. S. S. R., consisting of two superlegislative chambers with equal power, elected for a period of 4 years and which meet twice a year at the Kremlin in Moscow. The two chambers are: (1) The Soviet of the Union (consisting of 647 deputies, one elected for each 300,000 population) and (2) the Council of Nationalities (713 delegates), selected by the Supreme Soviet of each of the 16 Union Republics (25 each) and by each of the 19 autonomous Republics (11 each) and autonomous Provinces (5 each).

These two chambers jointly elect the Presidium, a body consisting of 1 President, 16 Vice Presidents and 24 other members, which has wide administrative powers between sessions of the Supreme Soviet—such as ratifying treaties and declaring war. Nicolai M. Shvernik is its president.

The Supreme Soviet selects also the Council of People's Commissars of 10 members which acts as the executive and administrative organ of state. The Council is, in effect, the controlling power of Russia. It consists of:

Chairman: Joseph V. Stalin, who is also Premier of Russia.

Vice Chairman: V. M. Molotov, who is also Foreign Minister.

Five of the other eight members appear to include:

Andrei Vyshinsky, who is also Deputy Foreign Minister.

M. A. Bulganin, whom Stalin has recently appointed as commander in chief of the Soviet armed forces.

L. M. Kagonovich.

Rosalie A. Zemlyachka.

A. I. Benediktov.

Additional biographical points of interest relative to the first three members of the People's Commissar are:

1. Stalin (born 1879) and Lenin led the Russian Revolution of October 1917 which overthrew Kerensky's authority, whereupon Lenin headed the government as president of the People's Commissars at the Kremlin in Moscow until his death in 1924 and was then succeeded by Stalin.

2. V. M. Molotov (born 1890) was a member of the Petrograd Military Revolutionary Committee of October 1917 and became secretary of the Communist Party and member of its political bureau in 1921. He became president of the People's Commissars in 1930 and chairman of the state committee of defense in 1941, and has been chairman of the Russian delegation to the United Nations since the San Francisco Conference, 1945.

3. Andrei Vyshinsky (born 1883) Soviet political leader and member of the Commu-

nist Party since 1920 was formerly Attorney General of Russia and a vice chairman of the People's Commissars.

Another name prominent in Soviet affairs (though possibly not a Commissar—is Andrei A. Gromyko, former Soviet Ambassador to the United States, and now Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister on the UN Security Council, but is being superseded by Jacob A. Malik, another deputy foreign minister who formerly conducted Russian foreign policy in the Far East.

SOVIET CONTROL IN THE HANDS OF A FEW

The foregoing insight into the personnel of the all-powerful Council of People's Commissars and the significant background and interwoven political relationships outlined as to three of its members disclose that this council is strongly entrenched and, for all practical purposes is the same group as the Communist Party's Political Bureau of nine members which (as explained in the next paragraph) controls the elections of the members of the two chambers of the supreme Soviet, which, in turn, choose the members of the Council of the People's Commissars.

The only legalized and organized political party in Russia is the Communist Party which controls the whole governmental machinery for the exercise of its dictatorship, though a few nonparty candidates are permitted to be elected to office. This party had, in 1927, a membership in Russia of 774,000, and today the membership there is estimated at 6,000,000, out of the total population of 200,000,000. Joseph V. Stalin has been the Secretary General of the Communist Party since 1922. The party is controlled by a central committee of 71 members which selects a small executive committee of 9 members, called the Political Bureau which, by virtue of its position of party leadership, makes all decisions on policy, which are followed by the government. This bureau has set up the United State Political Department (OGPU) to suppress any counterrevolution—political or economical—espionage and banditism, and which serves as Russia's gestapo. It works for the stability of the Communist regime.

From the foregoing facts it is observed that Stalin, with three or four of his select staff, controls the elections, he being the directive force of the Communist Party (which is the sole political party in Russia).

THE MAINTENANCE OF DICTATORIAL POWER

The paramount problem confronting Stalin and Molotov today is how to maintain that power, held by such a small handful of officials, over 200,000,000 Russians. In order to accomplish this the commissars deem it necessary to keep from the people all favorable information as to the freedom, prosperity and contentment of people living under other forms of government, to make it appear that the condition or plight of those nations is much worse than that of the people of Russia. An important part of the program is to keep up quarrels with capitalist or democratic nations (particularly the United States), in order to direct and stimulate the Rusisan people's animosities against those nations as a means of diverting or minimizing their resentment against their own dictators. Thus the Soviet people are made to believe that their own dictators are protecting them from other nations and thereby mechanically persuaded to give their continued support and allegiance. The fear of uprisings of the people is possibly one reason for the Soviet's recent manifesto which cut off from the Russian people all communication with foreign nations, except such as is cleared directly through Foreign Minister Molotov at Moscow under a complete censorship. Another reason for this action was obviously to conceal Russia's prearrangements for taking over the reins of government of Czechoslovakia in February 1948. The Russian gestapo has been able thus far to suppress uprisings and persons restive under the Soviet yoke, but the number of their executions, slaughters, and prison victims in Siberia resulting from the efforts to keep the people under complete subjugation, may never be known to the outside world. Also it should be borne in mind that Stalin holds effective control over the Soviet Army of an estimated 1,500,000 soldiers. As the age of Stalin gradually mounts, his mantle may one day possibly fall upon Molotov (11 years his junior) who is now performing many of the heavy responsibilities of government—provided the people do not decide to discard their despotic yoke and overthrow the government.

THE REASONS FOR SOVIET LEADERS' NONCOOPERATION WITH OTHER NATIONS

It appears to be a necessary part of the machinery of totalitarian governments (such as Russia is and Germany was) to maintain a constant aggressive action against foreign governments in the form of quarrels, or cold war, actual hostilities, or similar turmoil, in order to keep the minds of the people upon improvised or make-believe foreign foes and away from the thought of internal rebellion and outbreaks. It is quite clear, that Russia's external aggression will continue until there is sufficient show of external force from other nations to stop it. It is now obvious that force alone will command the respect of Russia. Stalin succeeded to Lenin's pinnacle of preeminence in the Communist movement, after 12 years had been required by Lenin to transfer the power and consolidate, it at the cost of millions of lives and after shaking the nation to its foundations. Stalin is reported to approve the following quotation of Lenin: "It is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist for a long period side by side with imperalist states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states are inevitable." (U. S. A. would be doubtlessly first of all.) Lenin has also said: "It is necessary * * * to use any ruse, cunning, unlawful method, evasion, and concealment of truth," to serve Communist ends.

The Communists claim 12,000,000 members outside the Soviet frontiers. Their network of advance agents and organized Communist parties are extended to every important country in the world. They take their instructions from Moscow. Russia publishes daily fake reports regarding the United States in her program to keep her people hostile towards America or believing that the United States is a common foe to them or to their ideals. Stalin and his party leaders must keep their people misinformed or uninformed and under rigid policy control and surveillance in order to hold their power; hence there is apparently no definite way at present to reach any tangible agreement with Russia for completing the war treaties which might interfere with her control over her so-called satellite nations of Europe, i. e., in Poland, eastern Germany, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, etc. Such, they obviously believe, would give too much democratic information to the Russian dominated portion of eastern Europe and endanger Stalin's power. It is obvious, too, that Russia expects to retain the territory now within its custody and to add new countries to it until checked and thwarted by determined power and force. Stalin, Molotov, and Vyshinsky are fully aware of the good faith of the United States and its desire for peace, but fear the extension of our democratic doctrine and influence to the Russian people. Hence, they must not permit American radio service and the true facts about the United States to reach the Russian people. The dictators will not even admit to the people that the United States gave vital aid, and shipped free of cost, to the Soviet army tremendous quantities of munitions, planes, supplies and equipment which saved Russia from Hitler's dynamic drive during World War II. The Soviet people as a whole are good wholesome people, but, being under the yoke of the dictators, they do not possess individual freedom or civil rights and are greatly restricted in their religious devotions. The Soviet dictators are atheists and have little respect for religious activities. Recently, as mentioned above, their international restrictions and censorship were tightened. It may be mentioned also in passing that the former Soviet Ambassador, Novikov, while in Washington in 1945 and 1946, was personally pleasant and cooperative with the American people so far as his restrictions from Moscow would permit.

The article in October 1947 in the Reader's Digest, The Only Way to Deal With Russia, expresses the situation in these words: "We are going to continue for a long time to find the Russians difficult to deal with. The outstanding circumstance concerning the Soviet regime is that down to the present day the men in the Kremlin (Soviet Administrative quarters in Moscow) have continued to be predominantly absorbed with the struggle to secure and make absolute the power they seized in 1917. They have endeavored to secure it permanently at home but they have also endeavored to secure it against the outside world. For their ideology taught them that the outside world was hostile and that their duty was eventually to overthrow the political forces beyond their borders. It means that there can never be on Moscow's side any sincere aims with capitalistic powers. If the Soviet Government occasionally sets its signature to documents which would indicate the contrary, this is to be regarded as a tactical maneuver permissible in dealing with the enemy (who is without honor) and should be taken in the spirit of let the buyer beware."

Russia knows that the United States and the other allies will tolerate a considerable amount of back talk and caustic criticism without thinking of going to war, but Russia's continuation in the United Nations Assembly shows her desire not to be completely insolated in world affairs.

Stalin and his associates act upon the theory that communism thrives best where there is chaos and turmoil. Stalin is like Shakespeare's Othello who said: "Rude am I in speech and little blessed with the soft phrase of peace." He does not believe that peace is conducive to the stability of the totalitarian Soviet Government, and hence he cares but little for complete peace with other nations. Likewise he appears to have but little interest in peaceful arbitrations. Therefore, Russia will be very slow in yielding any of the control it has once gained over middle Europe, by allowing democratic nations to share and spread in it their democratic ideas.

COMPARISON WITH DEMOCRACIES

The officials of the United States—the typical democracy—have no fears for an uprising of the people to overthrow them or the Government. The people elect their officials in orderly, fair, and free public elections, as prescribed in our Constitution, and by permitting, and always having, competitive political parties, wherein the candidates for office scrupulously abide by the results of those elections. Our people's freedom of speech, of religion, of the press, and of those privileges contained in the Bill of Rights give them contentment, domestic tranquility, and confidence in our Government and in the officials whom they elect.

The Soviet people live without civil rights and are under subjugation through police force and fear; while the handful of officials in Moscow who govern the nation appear to live in a fear of the people's revolt under such oppression. Such a government will not consider other strong independent nations upon a friendly basis. Unless the nations

are under Russia's communistic domination, they are regarded primarily as her enemies, and dealt with only at arms length. Such a government, afraid of itself or of its people, and unwilling to live as a friendly neighbor with other nations, will give us its cooperation only to the extent of our show of a powerful and mobile striking force.

AMERICA'S ONLY ALTERNATIVE

The Soviet dictators believe in government by force and have respect only for force. Having served in both World Wars, which wars were invited, in each instance, largely by our weak national defense, it is the writer's strong belief that, with other procedure now in progress, a third world war can be averted by taking the initial basic measures of building speedily a strong national defense, and by an early and effective preparation to meet any war emergency, including provision of the prompt and powerful mobilization of the Nation's forces and war equipment, for use if and whenever necessary.

Memorial Day Address by Hon. Claude Pepper, of Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD a Memorial Day address which I made at Richmond, Va., on May 31, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As the proud grandson of 2 Confederate soldier grandfathers, and 2 no less loyal grandmothers, I proudly come today to this capital of the Confederacy. This great city which will ever be the capital of Southern sentiment. Together we pay humble homage and heart-felt tribute to the valorous Army of the Confederacy, living and dead, and the kindred Army of the Independence of Cuba. I feel peculiarly at home here on the soil on which many of my ancestors lived and fought and now many sleep. How fitting it is that we should gather here today in this solemn place to speak again of the valorous deeds of those who lie here. How fitting that we stand together again in another memorial exercise to reconsecrate and to rededicate our lives and our sacred honor to a cause so worthy of their great sacrifices

Men, in the perspective of history, are judged by their fidelity to their faith,. We ask not today if the Englishman wore a red rose or a white rose for we know that both built a greater England. And, we know today that in the epoch struggle of the sixties that both they wno wore the gray and they who wore the blue, contributed their own craftman's stone to the edifice of a more perfect Union. Who today would withhold honor and dutiful regard from an army of men and women, the greatness of whose lives and grandeur of whose dying, has not been surpassed since the age of chivalry? Who can say that theirs was a "lost cause" which has had such strength and enduring vitality that it lives today in veneration, and in the hearts of men with no less magnificence than when the Sir Lancelot of the Confederacy, Gen. Robert Edward Lee, sheathed his shining sword, and handed it to his worthy adversary at Appomattox.

To try now to draw aside the veil of more than four-score years, and bring back even from vivid memory, the soldierly men, the saintly women, of the Confederacy, and make them live in all their natural glory is no more possible than to bring back to this day King Arthur and his knightly court, or the crucified Christ upon His cross at Calvary.

Yet we who see in its longer perspective American history, whether its starting point be St. Augustine, Jamestown, or Plymouth Rock, can see what an immeasurable part the South has played in every essential respect of American life. We can imagine no American thinking of America today without George Washington, Patrick Henry, Thomas Jefferson, George Mason, James Monroe, Robert E. Lee, Jeb Stuart, Stonewall Jackson, and their comrades upon the land and the sea, upon farm and in factory, in home and in hovel, who gave their utmost to the imperishable American tradition. From the vantage point of time, we can now see that conflict of forces, that clashing of ways of life, that produced this inevitable frightful strife. As we see the scene now with the calmer view of time, we, who do not bear upon our own bodies the scars of the conflict, may no more judge as cruel those who strove to abolish our peculiar institutions than their descendants may rightly charge with callousness those who fought for their preservation. We were both a part of the sweeping and converging forces of history which rushed together like two mighty rivers and after the first tumultuous junction emerged with a new unity and power toward the illimitable sea of the future.

We might both for a time have prayed like the Saviour in Gethesemane in the shadow of the Cross that "this cup might pass from us," yet with the omniscience of history, we know that it could not be; that our ordeal, like the Saviour's sacrifice, was part of the plan of Providence for the emancipation and salvation of a Nation in a new spiritual birth. From the greatest casualty list of any war in history, the War Between the States, fought between a divided Nation, there emerged the strongest Nation in all recorded time with the greatest unity of any people on earth.

Hardly three decades had passed from Appomattox before Fittzhugh Lee and Joseph Wheeler beside their erstwhile foes were leading their old comrades and their sons from both North and South in a common crusade for Cuban liberation. And this was but a prelude to a struggle from Belleau Wood and Chateau Thierry to Berlin and Tokyo, raging over the whole face of the earth to strike down new tyrannies, to liberate new victims, and to proclaim and to assure new dignity and security to human beings everywhere in the world when we were all indistinguishably Americans.

The path of progress has been a tortuous one. Nowhere has it been free of its rugged rocks, its bitter thorns, nor its onerous burdens. No part of the world is without its pressing problems of the moment, without its challenges, and without its imponderables. We of the South are not free of our own yokes, nor our own barriers, nor of our dilemmas. We have not yet escaped economic discrimination, even by our own country and countrymen. We have not yet freed ourselves from the shackles of poverty and handicaps, many of which have been forged by our fellow citizens.

We have not yet been permitted to rise from our ruins to our full majesty and glory and strength in the fraternity of American States. We have been strangled instead of strengthened in removing the cause of many of the conditions which the short-sighted or the prejudiced so often condemn.

We still struggle for a great new emancipation—the emancipation of the small southern farmer, the small southern businessman, the small southern banker, the small southern workman and workwoman. We still seek the means to give to every southern-born babe and its mother the chance to live every American should have and favored Americans now have. We still strive to reach for southern boys and girls the opportunities of education and training, for health, for open doors of opportunity which every American should have, and favored Americans now enjoy.

We still search for that mastery of our own resources and the capacity to bring them forth and to strengthen them which a more favored section of the country now possesses.

We know we of the South need America and America needs the South. We are flesh of the same flesh, bone of the same bone. The strength of the whole body lies in the strength of its parts. If a nation could not live half slave and half free, it cannot live today in its destined strength, divided by any kind of barrier.

As Jefferson said in his inaugural address, "We are all Federalists, we are all Republicans," we know today that we are all southerners. We are all westerners. We are all northerners. We are all Americans. As we have a common destiny, we have a common duty. Failure anywhere will mean failure for us all.

Never did a nation bear such frightful responsibility as is ours. Never did decency, democracy, and dignity live under the security of a single hand as they today under American protection endure.

The world knows little really about democracy. We will never be able to explain it to them by telling them about it. We must show it to them. If we convert them to the American way of life, it must be more by example than by precept.

Whatever our difficulties here at home, however sharp the horns of our many dilemmas, whatever awesome tasks we face, we must find our way forward in the democratic way of life, being to each other what Franklin D. Roosevelt called the good neighbor, "one who resolutely respects himself and therefore respects his neighbor."

The South is no stranger to this democratic way of life. No spokesman for human dignity and development ever reached higher than the words of Jefferson, for whose principles and practices the South must ever be the champion. If there be wrongs, let us right them and spare the necessity of any accusing finger, and give sympathetic aid to others as they struggle with theirs. Surely in no part of America does human liberty, human freedom, flourish more naturally than in that part of the country which saw and still reveres the planting of the roots and traditions of English civilization.

As we here in America have achieved peace over a vast area among vast hosts of people and pursue a common aim and end, let mankind and peoples everywhere follow our example. Let it be a people's world and a peaceful world. Do not those who have died deserve it? Can we discharge our trust to those whose dying made us what we are, better than by Christian fraternity with one another and by the propagation of those principles to people everywhere?

Those dead, whom we honor today, have no earthly immortality except through us and those who shall come after us. They are dead upon earth if they do not live in us They will be forgotten here unless we who live daily see them in our deeds and in our dreams. In these tender moments, in the presence of the dead and the living, as in our memories, we walk softly among their bedecked graves and reach out for an embrace which can be consummated only in the imagination or the world beyond. Let us bow our heads and bend our shoulders to receive upon our backs the sword of this commission to a knightly service to those high principles and purposes for which they lived, fought, and died.

Let all Americans, yes, all the world, see these soldiers of the South, of the Cuban war of liberation—yes, all who died for their faith as Harry Romaine saw the worshipers of their many faiths:

"At the muezzin's call for prayer,
The kneeling faithful thronged the square,
And on Pushkara's lofty height
The dark priest chanted Brahma's might.
Amid a monastery's weeds
An old Franciscan told his beads;
While to the synagogue there came
A Jew, to praise Jehovah's name.
The one great God looked down and smiled
And counted each His loving child;
For Turk and Brahmin, Monk and Jew
Had reached Him through the gods they knew."

Josiah William Bailey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD my tribute to the late Senator JOSIAH W. BAILEY, in accordance with Senate Resolution 212, adopted at this session. In addition to this address, I wish the remarks which I made in the Senate on January 3, 1947, in announcing the death of Senator BAILEY to be included and printed in the volume dedicated to his memory.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, JOSIAH WILLIAM BAILEY was elected to the United States Senate from North Carolina in November 1930, and entered upon the discharge of his duties in the Senate on March 4, 1931. He was reelected for another term of 6 years in November 1936, and for another similar term in November 1942, and served until his death at his home in Raleigh, N. C., on December 15, 1946. While he was elected for a total of 18 years, he served nearly 16 years before his useful career ended in death.

Senator BAILEY was wholly a North Carolina product. He was born in the State, educated in her public schools and at Wake Forest College; studied law under Dr. Samuel F. Mordecai and at Wake Forest Law School, licensed to practice law by the supreme court of North Carolina in 1908; and filled many positions of prominence and importance in the State, and spent his whole life in North Carolina, with the exception of the years when he was temporarily away from the State serving in the Senate in Washington.

Senator BAILEY was born at Warrenton, N. C., on September 14, 1873. After completing his high school course and graduating from Wake Forest College, he succeeded his distinguished father as editor of the Biblical Recorder, the official organ of the great Baptist denomination in North Carolina and served in this capacity from 1893 to 1907, and achieved distinction and fame as a brilliant writer and publicist. In the meantime he served as a member of the State board of agriculture from 1896 to 1900, and was Democratic Presidential elector-at-large in 1908. He began the practice of law after obtaining his license in 1908 and readily established a large practice. In 1913 he was appointed collector of internal revenue for the eastern district of North Carolina by President Woodrow Wilson and served until 1921. In 1915 he was a member of a State constitutional commission and rendered valuable service to the State in that capacity.

After retiring from the office of collector of internal revenue in 1921, Senator BAILEY formed a law partnership with his distinguished father-in-law, Hon. James H. Pou, of Raleigh, who was one of the outstanding lawyers in the State, and this firm enjoyed an extensive and lucrative practice. Upon his election to the Senate in 1930, Senator BAILEY withdrew from active participation in the firm.

Senator BAILEY was married in 1916 to Edith Walker Pou, a young woman of rare charm and grace and the brilliant daughter of distinguished parents, Hon. James H. Pou and Mrs. Pou. Five children were born to this marriage, to wit: James H. Pou Bailey, Mrs. William J. Primm, Josiah W. Bailey, Jr., Edith Pou Bailey, and Sally Bailey. In all the relations of life Senator BAILEY was faithful and loyal, thoroughly devoted to his family, happy in his home, and strong in his faith in God and his fellow man.

Senator BAILEY was a student, a thinker, a logician, an orator, and a master of debate. He was well informed on all subjects and could discourse intelligently and entertainingly on any question of domestic policy or international concern. He was eminent as editor, lawyer, executive, legislator, and advocate, and throughout his whole career a real crusader for causes which he espoused and to which he gave his militant leadership. He was a born fighter. He never ran away from any sort of fight and his courage matched his great ability. The famous debates in which he was engaged during his service in the Senate demonstrated his outstanding ability and his unsurpassed power of analysis, as well as his logical and powerful presentation of his views and arguments. The speech delivered by him in the Senate during the famous court bill fight takes first rank as one of the great deliverances of all time in the Senate and is often referred to in connection with the memorable addresses of Daniel Webster, John C. Calhoun, Henry Clay, and other great orators and advocates of other years.

Senator BAILEY was chairman of the powerful Commerce Committee of the Senate at the time of his death. He had served on many important committees and had an influential part in shaping legislation during his whole period of service. He was known for his clear thinking, his independence of action, and his courageous leadership. He never sought the popular side nor chose the easy way. He was guided by a high sense of duty and moved majestically toward the goal which he set for himself without regard to consequences to his political fortunes or his future successes. As a result, he alienated some support and aroused some criticism, but he never failed to bare his breast to the enemy and fight boldly in the open, neither giving nor asking quarters.

This phase of the life of Senator BAILEY is most effectively presented in an article from the Houston (Tex.) Post, which reads as follows:

THE HARD WAY

Back in 1937, a friend of the late Senator JOSIAH BAILEY, of North Carolina, asked him why he deliberately bucked the New Deal when it would be so much easier and profitable to go along with the tide. Jack Dionne, of Houston, has sent the Post a copy of BAILEY's reply, with a note saying, "I think the first page of this letter is the grandest thing in the way of a political declaration I have ever read in all my life."

The Senator's political declaration follows:

"I remember one Pontius Pilate. He pleased his crowd and let them slay their best friend. He went the easy way. So he held the governorship. I do not admire him, but he was a smart politician.

"I remember one Peter—a fisherman, who declared to the people demanding that he agree: We ought to please God rather than men. He went the hard way. They tell me he lost his life on a cross. But I admire him.

"I remember Christopher Columbus, the majority of whose sailors demanded that he turn back, but who nevertheless pressed on. He went the hard way. But he was most unpopular with his crew. But he discovered America.

"I remember Robert E. Lee, who refused the command of the Union Army, and all the rewards of the national gratitude, to do his duty to his State. He went the hard way. There were some who called him a traitor. And there are those to whom he is an inspiration.

"I remember Moses, who chose to dwell in the tents of the wandering tribes of Israel rather than the palaces of the Pharaohs. He went the hard way. He died in the wilderness, but God gave him a mountaintop to die on—and he is still on the mountain.

"I remember Him who said to the Pharisees, 'Your fathers stoned the prophets and you build monuments to them.' He knew the hard way. He died on the instrument of the slave's torture. But all men look to Him on that cross.

"None of these were popular men. They, unlike Pilate, went against the tide of public opinion. None of them was ever governor.

"So if I have made my choice, you must say that I choose the hard way; that I did not choose it because I was a fool, or wilfully; that I chose it unselfishly, but for the people who have trusted me and honored me."

There was another side to Senator BAILEY, which was revealed only to his family and intimates. He not only wrote fine prose, but he had the imagination and the soul of a poet. Just for pastime or in moments of meditation, he would write a poem occasionally. Following are two which reveal his deep and fervent sentiment. One is entitled "Dusk" and the other "Evening Prayer," giving some insight into his strong religious faith:

DUSK

Lo, tranquil dusk, in purple robe and gray,
Hath come to shrive Apollo's latest son,
And sings sweet requiem for dying day
As swift he fades into oblivion!

Yon evening star a lonely candle burns
Above bright paths of gold to gates ajar—
In longing dear the homing heart returns
From daily quest or alien lands afar.
The tide of light ebbs out and shadows fall—
The spirit's hour is come, the soul breaks free
Of earthly bond, and, answering the call
Of home, doth hearken to eternity.

EVENING PRAYER

Now shadows deep have barred the gate of day
And Vesper leads his shining hosts on high,
Enfolding night with quiet touch and sway
Doth still the world—alone with God am I.
Dear God, Thou art the pillow of my soul,
My pilot Thou upon life's pathless sea,
My refuge sure and my eternal goal,
In storm and calm hold Thou my way to Thee.
For faith I pray, in Thee to find repose,
Assured that Thou Thine own in love wilt keep
By grace of Him, Thy Son, fair Sharon's rose,
And lay me down in holy peace to sleep.

I would not close this brief tribute to Senator BAILEY without expressing my own sense of personal loss in his passing. He was my friend for over a half century. He measured up to all the standards by which men determine greatness, and in the loyalty of his life and the whiteness of his soul he won and held the esteem and affection of all who were permitted to enter into the charmed circle of his intimate friends. God bless his memory.

Mr. President, I wish to have inserted, following my remarks, an address to the people of North Carolina, prepared by Senator BAILEY a short time before his death in December 1946, and which he had intended to release for publication upon the convening of the Eightieth Congress in January 1947, announcing his retirement from Congress upon the expiration of the term to which he had been previously elected. This is a very able and thoughtful address and may well be regarded as his last will and testament on public questions and governmental policies. The address follows:

To the People of North Carolina:

I shall not be a candidate in 1948. Physicians advise that I may recover fully from my recent illness and be able to perform the duties of a Senator through the remainder of my present term. This I hope to do. I would be unwilling to attempt more. It will be better to elect in 1948 to the Senate some one in the full vigor of the prime of of life.

GRATEFUL TO PEOPLE

In making this decision I have been moved to issue a statement which follows:

I shall always be grateful to the people of North Carolina for the great honor they gave me and the trust they reposed in me. It seemed to me from the outset that the least I could do by way of appreciation was to be honest with them. This I have done.

I could not support a considerable number of measures put forward by President Roosevelt because upon reading them it was plain to me that they were unsound and the long-run consequences would be bad for the people. I voted against the Wagner Act, for example. It was and is a plain piece of political class legislation. We now see its consequences. Purporting to avoid strikes, it is an inducement to strike. Proposing to free the workingmen, it has placed them under the power of labor bosses.

The question in America today is whether the country shall be run by the people or by the labor leaders not responsible to the people. This question must be settled and be settled right. No man should be elected to the Senate from North Carolina who does not ring clear on this issue.

PREDICTED REFORMING OF ACT

The act can be reformed and I think it will be. It would have been reformed long ago but for the power of the labor organizations in the Senate. The workingmen ought to be free. They ought to be free to join a union or not to join one. Employers ought also to be free. The labor unions can be made to do bargaining and prevented from dictating. They are now not bargaining, but dictating. Certain of the railroad unions went so far as to vote for a strike against this Government in the midst of the war. It was a plain and shameful threat to deliver the country over to our enemies unless the labor leaders should have their way. They would have deprived our fighting men of food and munitions on the fields of battle. Recently they and others have been inflicting untold injury upon the entire population. They were paralyzing the American economy. Their demands are demands upon every person. They should not have this power. Regardless of the merits of their demands they ought not have power to injure the people of this country. None may be trusted with such power.

NO REASON FOR CONFUSION

They are not putting forward any argument for these demands, but saying in plain language we must have our way or the American people must pay the price of suffering and ruin. There is no right to do this or anything like it. Any individual has a right not to work at any given task, but no group of people has a right to injure and punish others in order to dictate terms to their employer. Woodrow Wilson was clear enough on this subject in 1916, and there is no reason for confusion. There is no moral right for a group of men to strike and hold up the people of this country, preventing others from working, and inflicting untold injury upon millions.

A government that will not put an end to this sort of thing is not worthy to be called a government. The fact is that the American people have never failed to respond appropriately to such a challenge; whenever any group has assumed power to subordinate the general welfare to its special interest, people, President, and Congress have taught it the necessary lesson; and so long as this shall be their way, this Republic is secure as a Government of and for the people. This is precisely what has just happened, and it is most heartening.

LOSE GOOD WILL THROUGH LEADERS

The workingmen ought to bear in mind that they always have the sympathetic good will of their fellow men, and that they lose it only when they permit unwise leaders to put them in the position of ignoring the public interest.

We can apply our antitrust laws to monopolistic practices in labor relations just as we can apply them to any other relations affecting commerce among the States—and we should do it. We ought to restore the remedy of injunction to prevent irreparable injury. The labor leaders have repudiated collective bargaining and undertaken to substitute dictatorial demand for it.

Labor has no more right to interfere with commerce than anyone else, and it is the duty of the Congress to protect commerce and to preserve its freedom. Only the Congress may regulate interstate and foreign commerce. It has plenary power to do so. Employers have a right to present their case to their employees and they also have a right to select their employees. Granted a man has a personal right to strike, he has no right to a job he has left. As matters now stand a man has to belong to a union and obey its boss in order to get a job. There can be no right to prevent others from working. This is not freedom, it is coercion. Nor do men have right to join in a mutual movement to stop production and thereby paralyze commerce.

UNIONS MUST BE HELD LIABLE

If collective bargaining shall be preserved, the labor unions must be required to perform their contracts or be held liable in damages.

Controversies ought to be settled in our courts of justice, and not by boards, commissioners, or panels.

The CIO and the PAC are now invading the Southern States and in particular they are invading the Democratic primaries. They have captured the Democratic Party in the North and propose to capture it in the South. The CIO and PAC are political parties and they are united in the American Labor Party—confessedly a radical class party.

The American people will be well advised to realize that the professional Communist proceeds by way of deceit. He will profess to be a Democrat in order to carry his point. He intends that the American Labor Party shall take our party over. The people of North Carolina will do well to suspect any candidate who is supported by the CIO or PAC, whether in the primary or the general election. They have drawn the issue and we must meet it. It is an issue we must meet squarely and in the open, and any man who runs for office without frankly stating his position ought to be voted against. Amongst other things they propose to overthrow white supremacy in the South, and vote great masses of the ignorant for their foul purposes.

GRAVE PARTY DANGER SEEN

If this movement by the CIO–PAC shall succeed there is grave danger that the Democratic Party will go the way of the Liberal Party in England; that is, be absorbed by the Labor Party.

I have been greatly disturbed by the international situation. So far Russia has made a policy of dissent and obstruction. There are those who think that Russia does not intend to destroy the United Nations Organization. It is my opinion that Russia does not intend to go along with it unless Russia can have her way. She means to dominate Europe and Asia, and then the whole world. There is evidence that Russia is operating in this country now by way of propaganda and infiltration. Her partisans are everywhere professing on some occasions to be Republicans, and professing on others of being Democrats, but being at heart Communists loyal to Russia and not to the United States. This issue is drawn in this country and in the world.

If the United Nations organization fails, this does not necessarily mean war. It does mean that it will be necessary for us to get along in a world not fully organized for peace, which will be most difficult. We must avoid war, engaging therein only when the independence of this country and the security of our people are plainly at stake. Isolation is obsolete. But internationalism does not predicate that our country must have a hand in every controversy or that we should assume responsibility everywhere. Let us press in all events for a world organization to preserve peace throughout the earth.

NEED MIGHTY ARMY AND NAVY

This country can get along in the existing circumstances only by way of being armed to the teeth. We must have a mighty Army and a mighty Navy and a mighty Air Force, and a mighty industrial and agricultural capacity, and everything in armaments that will give us superiority. The way to peace for America in such a world is by way of being so strong

that we will be able to beat down into the dust or ruin any nation that attacks us—just as we beat Japan down and Germany down. They will not attack us again. They attacked us because they thought we were weak. If they had known we were strong they would not have dared lift a hand against us. If they had known 5 years ago what they know now there would have been no world war, and we would have been delivered from the ordeal through which we passed in great tribulation. We must not run the risk of being attacked again. We must avoid war and establish our peace. And in order that we may, we must be so strong that every nation will know that we have the power to crush and to destroy any who rise against us. This is hard doctrine, but it is necessary. We may hope for a time when the nations disarm in the interest of peace, but we must not be the first to disarm. We must not disarm until we know that every other nation is disarming. This is why I am for the selective service and compulsory military training. I am for the peace and security of our country.

SHOULD ACT IN SELF-INTEREST

I do not think we should tie ourselves up with the destiny of the United Kingdom of Great Britain. We should be as friendly as possible with every nation, but should act only in our own self-interest. I voted for the lend-lease bill in order to get time in which to prepare this country for the war which was surely coming. Mr. Roosevelt felt that he could head off the war.

I followed Mr. Roosevelt in his measures of foreign policy prior to and throughout the war. This was because I was persuaded that he was doing everything to keep this country out of the war, and once in he was doing all possible to win. He was mistaken because he did not give Japan credit for the ignorance under which that country was laboring.

There is no reason why we should attach our fate to the United Kingdom of Great Britain. We cannot fight her battles, nor can we afford to make her foreign policy ours. We must have our own foreign policy—the policy of being strong, firm, and peaceful, and of getting into no controversy except in clear defense of our own country.

DIRECT LOANS NOT WISE POLICY

I am not opposed to the loans to foreign nations, except through the International Bank authorized by the Bretton Woods agreement. I was paired against the loan to Great Britain. I shall not support a direct loan for Russia nor for France nor for any other country. It is not wise policy. I question whether we have the right in time of peace to tax the American people for the sake of the economy of any other nation. Other nations will depend upon us and call upon us again and again as long as they find we can be persuaded to borrow money and send it to them. We owe too much now. We have enough here at home to take care of our own people and their security without undertaking to fight either the domestic or foreign battles of other nations. Our true course is to play the role of umpire in the United Nations organization in matters of no import to us, undertaking to see that justice is done and that the American security is protected. We cannot be a disinterested umpire in all cases. We must resolve every doubt in favor of the security of our country. I do not think we should be involved in the small quarrels of the little nations of Europe and other portions of the earth. Their interests and ideas are entirely different from ours. We should protect the Western Hemisphere and we will have our hands full doing that. It is no concern of ours what sort of government Spain may have, or whether Russia is communistic or not, or whether France is communistic or not. Let them have such a government as they please. Let us preserve the American Republic as received from our fathers and proved by experience.

WAS FOLLOWER OF WILSON

When I took the oath of Senator I was resolved to preserve this Republic in the true character in which it had served our people so well for 150 years. I was more a follower of Woodrow Wilson than of any other person. It seemed to me he understood the character of our Government and was determined to preserve it. I read all of his works in the interim between my nomination and the time I took my oath as Senator. I do not regret the fight I made, but I do not think it was won. I did my best. We will never know what was averted. I do not think the fight has been lost, although I realize our Republic has been changed to a great degree and very much to its injury. Much may be retrieved that now seems lost.

Let me conclude with one remark: Before the war our country had run a deficit of about $3,000,000,000 every year since 1932. No country has ever spent the earnings and the substance of its people as this country has without ruining itself and its inhabitants. The war expenditures were necessary, but there is absolutely no excuse for the extravagant civilian expenditure during the period in which I have been Senator. We must have an end of it and without further delay. We must stabilize our currency and our economy at the earliest moment possible if we are to avoid disaster and chaos. No man should be elected to the House or Senate until he has pledged that he will reduce expenditures and balance our budget and keep it balanced. An eminent historian prophesied early in the nineteenth century that our Republic would be plundered in the twentieth century not by a foreign invader but by its own people. That plundering is now and has been for several years going on.

It seems to me to be appropriate that at this time I should lay this statement before our people. These are my views, honestly expressed, and I express them in part discharge of the great debt I owe the people of our State.

JOSIAH W. BAILEY.

Air-Transport Agreements With Peru

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINGATE H. LUCAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, about a year and one-half ago, the government of the Republic of Peru signed a joint air-transport agreement with the Government of the United States providing for reciprocal rights for air lines operating between the two countries. This treaty was negotiated by the State Department, and was similar to other air-transport agreements made with republics in South America. In it there were ample provisions for consultation, negotiation, and arbitration, in the event of disagreement or dispute.

Shortly after the signing of this bilateral agreement, Peru issued to Braniff International Airways an operating permit with the right to fly into Peru and to points beyond. A few months later, the Civil Aeronautics Board of the United States granted a foreign air-carrier permit to Peruvian International Airways, giving them the right to fly into the United States, and to points beyond.

This foreign air-carrier permit, issued by our Civil Aeronautics Board to the Peruvian International air line, stated that Braniff Airways was authorized by our Government to provide service on a route from "Houston, Tex., through Habana, Cuba, the Canal Zone, and along the west coast of South America, via points including Lima, Peru, to the terminal points Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, and Buenos Aires, Argentine." And I now come to the point which I wish to raise at this time.

Braniff International Airways was granted a certificate into South America by the Civil Aeronautics Board after exhaustive hearings and studies lasting almost 2 years. They have now invested some $4,000 000 in purchasing DC-6 aircraft, constructing radio stations, employing and training personnel to inaugurate this service. They announced scheduled service on the first leg of their new route as far as Lima, Peru, to start on June 4. Only a few days before this new service was started, the Government of Peru suspended the Braniff operating permit, on the pretext that they had no previous knowledge that Braniff Airways was going to serve Habana, Cuba, in competition with their own air line, Peruvian International Airways. This, in spite of the fact that numerous documents clearly point out that Habana, Cuba, was to be served by Braniff Airways on their South American route.

Braniff is now forced to turn around, temporarily, at Guayaquil, Ecuador, and is prevented from flying into Peru. Unless the Government of Peru lifts this suspension, the extension of the Braniff route on to Rio de Janeiro and to Buenos Aires may be effectively blocked.

I am now informed that the Government of Peru plans to apply to the Export-Import Bank for a loan of some $50,000,000. At the same time, they are effectively blocking the extension of Braniff Airways into South America, after this air line has made an investment of some $4,000,000.

I am informed, furthermore, that Peru has not agreed to remove this suspension during the conference period on the subject, which is resulting in tremendous loss daily to Braniff Airways, and, indirectly, to the taxpayers of the United States.

I believe that this body should take cognizance of the arbitrary and unilateral action taken by the Republic of Peru, and that it should give serious thought to measures which will prevent the Export-Import Bank from loaning money to countries who fail to live up to their contractual obligations with the United States of America.

It is very well to be good neighbors, and I feel that we should assist the Republics of Latin America in every way consistent with our national policy. But I also wish to point out that we are a sovereign country, that we have certain rights, and that the good-neighbor policy is not a one-way street.

An amendment to the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, is now under consideration by the House Banking and Currency Committee. I think that this body should give serious consideration to a further amendment to the Export-Import Bank Act to strengthen the hand of the State Department in

dealing with countries who act in an arbitrary and illegal manner in their relations with the United States.

The Late Honorable David I. Walsh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a fitting tribute to the memory and great public service of the late United States Senator David I. Walsh, of Massachusetts:

Whereas Massachusetts voters of the Democratic Party at the Presidential primaries held on April 27, elected delegates and alternate delegates-at-large; and delegates and alternate delegates from each congressional district to attend the Democratic National Convention beholden at Philadelphia on the 12th day of July in the current year; and

Whereas a specific function of said delegates will be the nominating of candidates for President and Vice President of these United States, and defining, forming, and adopting a party platform, wherein shall be set forth and declared issues and argumentation in support of the lofty principles of the Democratic Party, which is dedicated to the proposition that all just power is derived from the consent of the governed; and

Whereas the aforesaid delegates and alternate delegates are assembled in the Hawthorne Room of the Parker House, Boston, on this 5th day of June 1948, to organize, prepare, and perfect preliminary details in preparation for participation in said Democratic National Convention; and

Whereas the members of the Democratic Party in this State and Nation have been blessed with the inspiration, guidance, hope, courage, and fortitude bequeathed by the founder of the Democratic Party, the immortal Thomas Jefferson, whose torch of human rights illumining our course through the nineteenth and twentieth centuries has been elevated to heights of glory by his illustrious successors, James Madison, Andrew Jackson, Grover Cleveland, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Harry S. Truman, who, each in turn have precisely interpreted the tenets of democracy and beneficently translated them into affirmative action in behalf of the struggling masses of humanity in our Nation, and the liberty-loving peoples throughout the world, so that all might be freed of oppressors, possess ample opportunity to live in peace and harmony, and enjoy of their own choice the pursuit of happiness; and

Whereas Massachusetts is the historic home of patriotic shines—Concord, Lexington, Bunker Hill, and the Old North Church, from the belfry of which flashed "One if by land, and two if by sea," emblems of hope, dauntless courage, and liberty that blazed the trail of Paul Revere as he led those pioneers who were heralding to the world that democracy was on the march. From those thrilling days of that early era, echoing down to the present, the voices of Massachusetts' sons have ever resounded militantly to democracy's plea; and in our day there stood among and endeared to us, one lofty in the eminence of our exaulted torchbearers, an outstanding Governor, our own beloved Hon. David I. Walsh, distinguished Senator who served numerous terms during the past three turbulent epochal decades in the upper body of our National Congress: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, duly elected delegates and alternate delegates acting in behalf of the members of the Democratic Party, hereby record our deepest grief and sorrow over Senator David I. Walsh's untimely demise, and the irreparable loss to his relations and his legion of close friends in this State and in the Nation; and in eulogium we give heartfelt expression to our sentiments of devotion, profound affection, love, and fealty to him; and we will cherish him long in our memory for the example of nobility he set for us to follow; and for the countless sacrifices he made that his fellow beings might be the beneficiaries of the brotherly love he manifested and exerted in behalf of humankind.

What's Happening in World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a portion of an address by a school chum of mine—namely, Henry C. Wolfe—who has really made a name nationally and internationally for himself. This address was delivered at the annual meeting of the National Institute of Social Sciences on February 5, 1948, at the Union Club, New York. His subject is entitled "What's Happening in World Affairs":

Unfortunately, the Czech public has forgotten that when Stalin and Hitler made their deal the year after Munich, the Soviet Government withdrew recognition from the Czechoslovak legation in Moscow, thereby putting the Kremlin's stamp of approval on the Nazi conquest of Czechoslovakia. Moreover, Stalin joined Hitler in recognizing the Nazi puppet regime in Slovakia. Yet today, thanks to skillful Soviet propaganda—and lack of a strong rebuttal from the west—the Kremlin's story is almost universally accepted in Czechoslovakia. Of course there is an informed minority in Czechoslovakia. The members of this group fear both Germany and the Soviet Union. The uninformed majority fear that Britain and America will rearm Germany and that the Munich formula will be repeated.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, that is not what the informed minority think will happen. What the informed minority fear is the old Bismarckian idea of an alliance between Germany and Russia. They talk about a Third Rapallo. The First Rapallo took place in Italy during the Genoa Conference in the spring of 1922. It was an understanding between Weimar Germany and the Soviet Union. What may be called the Second Rapallo was the Nazis-Soviet pact of 1939.

Is a Third Rapallo on the way? Some highly informed people in Czechoslovakia think so. This is how they analyze the situation: militarists of Germany and Russia have long dreamed of an Anschluss that would combine the manpower, raw materials and great space of the Russian domain with the manpower, technological know-how, industry and organizing ability of Germany. German and Russian empire builders have long believed such a combination could dominate the world.

Twelve years ago, it may be worth pointing out, I heard this Anschluss outlined by one of the Nazi leaders. He was Erich Koch, gauleiter of East Prussia, a friend of Hitler, Goering, Goebbels, and the other members of the Nazi hierarchy. The plan was unfolded to me in Koenigsberg, the capital of Koch's Gau. On my way from Danzig to Lithuania I stopped off for 3 days at Koenigsberg. It was a beautiful city, but off the beaten track not only for tourists but also for foreign correspondents. That was probably why Koch sent for me and offered me an interview. Unlike the Nazi leaders in Berlin who were on their guard, Koch talked bluntly. Square-jawed, pugnacious Erich Koch was not subtle. What he said, therefore, had unusual significance.

Here was the sensational forecast Koch made to me. He said that by one means or another Germany would one day get control of the Soviet empire. In the course of our 3-hour talk Koch made no effort to deny that the Reich's policies were leading to war. He admitted that Germany might suffer military defeat. He and his Nazi colleagues, he told me, recognized the risks involved. They might all go down in a flaming Goetterdaemmerung.

Then how, in that case, would Germany get control of Russia? Might not a defeated Reich turn Communist? Koch said a Red Reich might be part of the program, if Germany met military disaster. In that event would not Germany be ruled by Russia?

"For a few years," Koch told me, "the Russians would dominate the Germans. But perhaps after a decade or so, German cohesion, organizing ability and deeper political and national consciousness would begin to assert themselves." The German tail, Koch maintained, would start to wag the Russian dog.

"By one means or another," Koch boasted, "we Germans shall rule the combined manpower, raw materials and industry of Germany and Russia. With such a combination we shall dominate the world and make it over as we wish."

Ladies and gentlemen, the activities of Marshal von Paulus and his German Army in Russia give terrible meaning to the words of Erich Koch. The unfolding of the third Rapallo is, I believe, the most sensational, the most crucial train of events in the world today. It has a sinister potential for disaster.

And now to return to the subject Czechoslovakia and the informed Czech minority of whom I was speaking. They never heard of Koch's statements to me. But they see the trend of affairs in central and eastern Europe. They know about von Paulus and his German divisions under Kremlin orders. They know that Russian and German militarists share the ambition of a Third Rapallo. They are frightened. Not only the informed minority in Czechoslovakia, but also the informed minority in Austria, Finland, and the democratic, anti-Nazi remnants in Germany share these fears of Russo-German Anschluss. These people know that if the necessity arises, the Kremlin will sacrifice the Czechs and Poles.

The German frontiers have moved westward hundreds of miles. The Germans have lost all of East Prussia, Silesia, much of Pomerania and some of Brandenburg. They have lost their bread basket. The only power in the world which can restore these lost provinces to the Germans is the Soviet Union. The British, French, Americans cannot return those lands to the Germans, because those territories are occupied by Russian or Russian satellite troops. These German lost provinces are the great bribe the Kremlin can offer the Germans.

Informed observers in central Europe realize that the Pan-Germans and German militarists will not accept the loss of the eastern provinces. They see in the von Paulus movement the early maneuvering of the Ger-

man militarists to return to power. They suspect that one of the first definite warnings of the Third Rapallo will be the entry of the von Paulus army into the Soviet occupied zone of Germany.

There were rumors circulating among the Germans in Berlin, when I was there last August, that the von Paulus troops would occupy the former German capital and force the western democracies out. This was propaganda, at least for the time, but it made the democratic Germans in Berlin—who have been resisting Soviet pressure to join the Kremlin-sponsored Unity Party—extremely uneasy.

A factor of increasing importance in our relations with the German people is the fear in many German minds that we are going to pull our forces out of the Reich and let the Russians take over. Soviet propaganda naturally spreads this fear. It increases the difficulties of American military government in getting cooperation from the Germans in the western zones. And it discourages Germans who would otherwise be willing to assume some leadership in an effort to influence a democratic orientation of Germany. The Soviet propaganda offensive warns Germans that every one of them who cooperates in any way with the Western powers will be a marked man and will suffer when the Soviets take over all Germany.

Old-Age Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARDIN PETERSON
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1948

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, we should take action on the Angell bill, which is generally known as the Townsend plan, before we adjourn. Regardless of personal policies of Dr. Townsend, we should not let this waver us in the support of good legislation.

The problem of the aged and our older citizens will increase by reason of high cost of living.

Under permission granted, I include herewith a letter from Mr. Buddy Hays, president of the Orlando Townsend Club, of Orlando, Fla., which will give some interesting information:

ORLANDO TOWNSEND CLUB, NO. 2., INC.,
Orlando, Fla., May 6, 1948.

Hon. J. HARDIN PETERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PETERSON: I want to thank you from the bottom of my heart for your untiring efforts in behalf of the Townsend Plan, which would provide for America's senior citizens by giving them a direct, honorable annuity as a right of citizenship, thereby enabling them to become real assets to their communities, instead of liabilities.

As you know, many of our senior citizens, now over 60 years of age, gave their sons for the First World War, and gave their grandsons for the Second World War. But many of their sons and grandsons never returned to help support their parents, the citizens who helped to build everything that America holds dear. Many of these aged citizens not only gave their children but helped finance the wars; and many of them, former diemakers, toolmakers, and machinists, were called back to active duty and again did a wonderful job. Why not now retire these senior citizens with a decent, dignified annuity, and give the younger men a chance to get a good start in life?

There is nothing wrong with the younger generation. They should have an opportunity to secure good jobs at decent salaries and be relieved of the necessity of supporting their aged parents. Many young couples are unable to get married, are unable to make a home and rear a family because of their obligations to their parents. Why not relieve them of this obstacle and set them free to build America's future?

There are over 8,000 senior citizens over 60 years of age in Orlando, Orange County, Fla., who would be eligible for this annuity, who are incapacitated by old age, blindness, or some physical disability or who are widows with children under 18 years of age. With 8,000 citizens receiving $100 per month, the sum of $800,000 would be put into circulation every 30 days in Orange County, and a proportionate sum would be spent in all the other 3,000 counties in the United States of America. With such sums of money in circulation, who could talk of depressions? The Townsend plan would provide necessary purchasing power to insure prosperity to all businessmen: merchants, doctors, dentists, druggists, realtors, home owners, farmers, etc.

The Townsend bill provides for the repeal of the social security old-age tax on employer and employees. It is not a new tax but a substitute for a bad tax. It would be a very short-sighted businessman who would not want to pay a 3-percent tax to secure his share of resulting prosperity which would manifest from such a continual monthly circulation of money. The tax under the Townsend plan would be 3 percent each month on the gross intake of all business corporations and partnerships; hence, a corporation whose gross sales total $100,000 per month would pay a $3,000 tax. An individual whose earnings total $150 per month would pay 3 percent only, on that portion of his income above $100 per month, or 3 percent of $50, amounting to $1.50.

The Townsend plan provides a method for mass distribution and mass consumption of goods to match America's vast productive capacity. It would achieve this end within the framework of the American tradition of economic and political systems.

The Townsend plan does not confiscate; it does not pauperize; it is a compensation, an honorable annuity as a right of citizenship. Husbands and wives would receive the same amount. They can have other sources of income but must retire from gainful occupation or employment and put this money back into circulation within a period of 30 days, making a regular, steady supply of business for the merchants and other businessmen. Thus, the senior citizens of America would become a real asset to their communities. When enough dollars go to work, many more of the younger men and women can go to work. Capital, management, and labor all have a stake in the American system of enterprise. It would also help remove the necessity for strikes which may be brought about through the workers' fear of insecurity in their old age.

The senior, civil veterans of America have done a good job in the past and are certainly entitled to a rest, entitled to some comfort and security in their declining years. Quoting from the Honorable Jerry Carter, of Florida: "Any person in business in Florida, who does not favor the Townsend plan, should have his head examined for soft spots." The Honorable J. HARDIN PETERSON, United States Representative from Florida, says, "Take the time and trouble to read and understand the Townsend plan and you will approve it."

Help us make democracy work in the United States of America, and there will never be any room for fascism, communism, or any other "ism" but Americanism in this country.

Sincerely,

BUDDY HAYS.

The Bipartisan Sham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. MATHEWS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial which will be found at the end of them.

The article is from the Pathfinder and is written by a constitutent of mine who is one of the finest and ablest Americans it has been by pleasure to know. He is Mr. Wheeler McMillen, a noted farm authority, who has not only been editor-in-chief of the Pathfinder but also editor of the Farm Journal, Mr. McMillen is well known and admired by many Members of this House and by other persons of national importance. Anything that Mr. McMillen says or writes can be well commended to the careful consideration of anyone interested in the United States of America and the principles upon which it is founded, but particularly pertinent is the editorial in the June 2 issue of the Pathfinder, to which I have already referred entitled "The Bipartisan Sham."

This editorial follows:

THE BIPARTISAN SHAM

People have always approved the long-prevailing practice that "politics ceases at the water's edge." Now, unhappily, partisanship does not cease at the water's edge. We do not have a united foreign policy, nor a bipartisan foreign policy. Because so many hopeful people believe this myth, the facts should be made known.

The first steps regarding measures that involve international matters are necessarily for the President and State Department to take. When they require legislative action, they go to Congress. Bills, after introduction, are referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the House and to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Because only the Senate has authority to ratify treaties, the chairman holds a key position.

Since the Senate, in theory, has a Republican majority, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations is a Republican, Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG.

If the administration worked with Senator VANDENBERG and with his colleagues, a truthful claim might be raised that a bipartisan foreign policy exists.

But instead of working with him, the administration has merely used Senator VANDENBERG; has, indeed, used him almost contemptuously.

Senator VANDENBERG publicly complained lately that he had not been consulted last fall when the United States took one side of the Palestine muddle, nor this spring when we backed around to the other side. He was not consulted regarding important actions relating to China and South America, nor during the recent exchanges with Russia.

The White House, instead of consulting in advance with Senator VANDENBERG and the Republican leaders, calls the Senator in to tell him that another crisis has busted loose and that a bill must be rushed.

The Republicans on this committee with VANDENBERG include the octogenarian CAPPER, of Kansas, the ill and retiring WHITE, of Maine, the amiable WILEY, of Wisconsin, the New Dealish SMITH, of New Jersey, HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, and LODGE, of Massachusetts.

One of the Democrats among the 13 members is WAGNER, of New York, whom illness has kept out of the Senate for more than a year.

Time after time, the administration's bills have been reported as approved 13 to 0 by the committee.

Republicans on the floor who question the measures find extraordinary difficulty in getting information. If the party members on the committee support the administration measure on the floor, they wipe out the slender party majority.

Ideally, the President would invite leaders of both parties to discuss with him their views on foreign problems. He would report to them, confidentially if necessary, the facts on each problem. Such discussion normally brings out points of agreement. From such points a truly united course usually could be charted. The leaders, with information at their command, would be in a position to present the policy intelligently to their colleagues. Both parties would share in responsibility, understanding, and support.

Nothing of this kind now takes place. The administration proposals are tossed ready-made to Senator VANDENBERG, who obediently whips them through his weak committee and occasionally utters a lame complaint about not having been consulted. His reward comes in the form of lavish praise from the New Deal and international do-gooder press which warmly recommends that Republicans nominate him for President.

Without a really cooperative foreign policy America and freedom will stand constantly in needless danger. Nor can foreign policy stand apart from domestic matters when every foreign grant affects living costs, and any treaty may involve what might once have been purely domestic policy.

"Bipartisan" foreign policy, as now exemplified, is a sham, both poor and dangerous.

Tony Zale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the city of Gary and the Calumet region of Indiana are justly proud of Tony Zale, twice-crowned middleweight champion of the world.

Only the immortal Stanley Ketchel, classified by some sport experts as the greatest boxer of his weight in the history of the prize ring, accomplished the same feat as Tony Zale.

Tony is not only a great athlete, but an outstanding example of a clean-living, high-type American boy who is a credit to his profession.

The following editorial by H. B. Snyder, editor of the Gary Post-Tribune, reveals how his neighbors and friends regard the twice-crowned middleweight champion:

STEEL CITY'S CHAMPION

As an ambassador for the Steel City, Tony Zale does a mighty fine job.

There are a lot of queer characters in the professional fight business, and sports writers usually like to have someone around like Rocky Graziano on whom they can lavish a weird assortment of adjectives.

But to a man, they find a refreshing tonic in a man like Tony Zale, late of Uncle Sam's Navy. Gene Tunney was a nice guy and all of that, but there never was much affection for him among the experts in cauliflower culture. Tony is a different sort, and outstanding because his sort is so unusual in his trade. He's a real guy, and a clean guy all the way.

Tony Zale didn't have to regain his middleweight title from Graziano to convince Gary, or fight experts over the Nation, of that. He has given sufficient proof of that before, both in winning and losing.

But Gary is mighty thrilled at Zale's comeback triumph over Rocky, at the dispatch with which he accomplished his goal of regaining the world's championship. He proved again the truth of all the nice things that have been said about him.

And Gary should appreciate the very splendid job he is doing as a representative of the city on the national sport scene—"Gary's man of steel." Thanks for the advertising for the Steel City, Tony Zale.

Britain's Labor Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Don Cook that appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Sunday, June 13, 1948:

CHURCHILL SAYS LABOR PROGRAM IS TOTAL FAILURE—DECLARES SOCIALISTS MADE BRITAIN DEPENDENT UPON THE GENEROSITY OF UNITED STATES

(By Don Cook)

LONDON, June 12.—Winston Churchill charged today that Great Britain's Labor government "has become dependent on the generosity of the capitalist system of America."

Nationalization of British industry has been a "complete failure," Mr. Churchill charged, and "nothing less than the complete discrediting and abandonment of the socialist conceptions about industry can restore our country."

It was the Conservative party leader's first out-and-out political speech in several months. His characteristic broadside against the paralyzing and stifling theories and conditions of socialism drew from his audience of 7,000 young conservatives a prolonged ovation.

"In my long experience," he said, "I have never seen such an exhibition of squalid party malice and intrigue or one more cynically divorced from the revival and well-being of our country.

"How the Socialist Ministers can go about bragging on their Socialist program and of the nationalization of industry on party lines, how they can deride the system of free enterprise and capitalism which makes America great and wealthy and then, at the same time, eagerly seek the aid which has hitherto been so generously granted from across the Atlantic—that is a grimace which baffles the limitations of our language to explain."

The Conservatives, if elected to power, he said, "would curtail the failure and waste of state planning and state trading," would reduce government expenditure, would eradicate an inevitable conflict between the interests of employers and the employed, would clear the way for promotion for talent, merit, and fidelity and would bring all firms up to the standard of the best.

Mr. Churchill declared that British youth is in revolt against the folly that it is better that every one should have half-rations rather than that any, by their exertions or ability, should earn a second helping.

The need of the British nation, he concluded, is a new Parliament in which the experience of age will be refreshed by the new impulse of youth and the majority of the nation united in an inflexible resolve that our country shall remain a great power in the world—earnest, masterful, vital, self-supporting, valiant, and free.

Pacific Coast Conference on UNESCO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Prof. Ben M. Cherrington, general director, Social Science Foundation, of the University of Denver, in which he gives a brief summary of the Pacific Coast Conference on UNESCO, held at San Francisco from May 13 to May 15. In closing his letter Professor Cherrington uses this significant language:

This was the first meeting of its kind to be held in the San Francisco Opera House since the nations gathered there 3 years before to draw up a United Nations Charter. It was heartening indeed to sense in this group of representative citizens in the Far West a resolute determination to advance understanding among the peoples of the world through all appropriate means of cooperation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF DENVER,
SOCIAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION,
Denver, Colo., June 8, 1948.

Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: Having in mind your deep interest in international cultural relations and your clear perception of the distinctive roles of information and education respectively in serving our Nation's interests, I know you will be pleased to learn of the Pacific Coast Conference on UNESCO at San Francisco, May 13–15. Well over 2,000 delegates from Idaho, Montana, Washington, Oregon, California, Nevada, Arizona, Hawaii, and Alaska were in attendance. Industry, labor, agriculture, the major religious bodies, schools, universities, the press, radio, motion pictures, and scores of civic organizations were well represented. The conference was sponsored by the United States National Commission for UNESCO in fulfillment of its responsibility under the law to perform the function of liaison between UNESCO and the

organizations in this country interested in its program. I was privileged to take part in the program as a member of the National Commission. One was impressed by the down-to-earth realism evidenced in formal addresses and in general discussions. There was no observable tendency to regard UNESCO as an escape from the sobering facts of current world affairs. On the contrary, the conference began with an examination of the issues confronting our Nation in our attempt to establish and maintain international peace, then turned to UNESCO to inquire what contribution it might make to this objective. There was general recognition that the goals of UNESCO will not be accomplished in a day, and that it must be recognized as a long-range undertaking. Primary attention was given to ways of incorporating the principles and projects of UNESCO as permanent parts of the programs of the many organizations represented in the conference. Plans were laid for the formation of State and sectional councils to facilitate the activities of the cooperating groups.

This was the first meeting of its kind to be held in the San Francisco Opera House since the nations gathered there 3 years before to draw up a United Nations Charter. It was heartening indeed to sense in this group of representative citizens in the far West a resolute determination to advance understanding among the peoples of the world through all appropriate means of cooperation.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

BEN M. CHERRINGTON.

The Pick-Sloan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. ROBERTSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article printed in the section of the New York Times of June 13, 1948, headed Report From Nation, under the title "Midwest States. Pick-Sloan Plan Transforms Missouri River Area."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIDWEST STATES—PICK-SLOAN PLAN TRANSFORMS MISSOURI RIVER AREA

OMAHA, June 12.—There is surprising and heartening progress to report in the program aimed at changing the face and the character of one-sixth of the Nation's area.

This program is encompassed in the Pick-Sloan plan, which is not to be confused with the continuing academic discussion of a Missouri Valley Authority. The Pick-Sloan plan is a going concern, a bustling reality. The MVA plan, a rival of sorts to Pick-Sloan, is still a matter for debate in Congress and elsewhere.

Under the Pick-Sloan plan, which finds the Federal Government and 10 Missouri River Basin States in partnership, tremendous things are already happening along the 2,500 miles of the Missouri River and along its scores of tributaries.

The Pick-Sloan plan was authorized by Congress in the historic Flood Control Act of 1944. The program is a combination of plans prepared by Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, of the Army Corps of Engineers, and by W. G. Sloan, of the Bureau of Reclamation.

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Some of the objectives are:

1. Construction of 105 reservoirs on the Missouri and its tributaries. These will store 100,000,000 acre-feet of water, enough to irrigate more than 5,000,000 acres of land that is now only partially useful.

2. Construction of 43 hydroelectric plants that will eventually generate more than 11,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year.

3. Construction of a series of dams and reservoirs to regulate the flow of water in the Missouri River and its tributaries for flood control and navigation. A levee system from Sioux City, Iowa, to St. Louis is already well under way. One result will be a 9-foot navigation channel up-river as far as Sioux City.

4. Better agricultural practices through soil conservation, vast recreational areas, and better wildlife care.

BIG DAMS ARE BUILT

Army engineers are now supervising the work of private contractors on 21 projects scattered from Montana to central Missouri.

The Bureau of Reclamation of the Interior Department is equally busy. It has let contracts on five major dams and is rushing preliminary work on many other projects, all in coordination with the engineers' efforts and with the State governments involved.

The Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee is impatient to step into an even faster tempo. This group is composed of representatives of the interested Federal agencies plus five of the basin-State governors. The committee has adopted a 6-year program calling for the expenditure of $2,415,541,831.

Pacific Coast Oyster Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, the Pure Food and Drug Administration only recently has issued an order that threatens to destroy our Pacific coast oyster industry. This industry, in the State of Washington alone, employs approximately 1,500 year-around workers and, at some seasons of the year, as many as 6,000 to 7,000 persons. Private capital has invested millions and these millions of dollars of invested capital and thousands of jobs will be lost if the stringent directives of the Bureau are enforced. The oystermen now are appealing to the courts for relief and if relief is not obtained there it may be necessary for Congress to take some action to prevent the destruction of this industry.

So that Members may be informed of the serious threat to this industry, I include an editorial on the plight of the oyster industry from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, one of the leading daily newspapers of the Pacific coast. The editorial follows:

OYSTER INDUSTRY MUST BE SAVED

Regardless of the outcome of pending litigation, the Food and Drug Administration should reconsider the order which threatens the destruction of the Pacific coast oyster industry.

At first glance, the position of the Food and Drug Administration seems logical enough—that all canned oysters should be prepared in the same way, with the same minimum weight of solid matter in every can.

Such a ruling would be unassailable if the oysters involved were all of the same variety.

But, as the Pacific Coast Oyster Growers' Association pointed out in the brief which it filed in the case, there is as much difference between its product and that of its competitors on the Gulf coast as there is between a tiger and a house cat. The Pacific oyster, grown from the seed of the Japanese giant oyster (Ostrea gigas), has practically nothing in common with the eastern oyster (Ostrea virginica). In addition to being much larger in size the Pacific oyster requires far less precooking than the Gulf variety. As a result it exudes nectar after being placed in the can, a nectar which housewives find valuable for use in stews and other purposes, while the eastern oyster requiring a longer steaming which causes the loss of its natural juices, absorbs moisture after being packed. In consequence there is a greater solid content in a can of eastern oysters than there is in a can of Pacific oysters.

What is more, comprehensive experimentation demonstrated that the Pacific oysters suffered marked deterioration if packed too tightly in the cans.

Instead of bearing a marked resemblance to fresh oysters, they are twisted and distorted in shape when taken from the can and many of them are discolored. They have lost their special adaptibility to use in the preparation of fried oysters. Thus if the Pacific oyster canners are compelled to comply with the order of the Food and Drug Administration they will be forced to turn out an inferior product which cannot compete with the eastern variety.

Their only alternative would be to misbrand the cans as containing a substandard pack that does not comply with food and drug regulations—which would make it impossible for them to market their wares.

Therefore, if the Food and Drug Administration insists on putting its edict into effect next month, the Pacific oyster packers will be put out of business. And this would be a death knell for the entire oyster industry on the Pacific coast. As the growers explained in their brief:

"At one time, before the canned oyster becomes recognized for its qualities extensively, the production of oysters greatly exceeded the fresh oyster market. This resulted in sharply declining prices until fresh oysters were sold far below the cost of production. This resulted in over half of the fresh oyster plants going into liquidation, and more than half of the growers of Pacific oysters went out of business."

This can and will happen again unless the Food and Drug Administration adopts a more reasonable attitude.

That would bring disaster to an industry which, in this State alone, has a permanent pay roll of 1,200 to 1,500 persons, which is quadrupled in size at the height of the season. The 1946–47 pack came to nearly 600,000 gallons of fresh oysters and 88,000 cases (or 270,000 gallons) of canned oysters. Should a business of such magnitude be sacrificed to a bureaucratic whim?

Soil and Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to

have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the prize-winning essay, at high school level, in the 1948 school-essay program of Lord Fairfax Soil Conservation District of Virginia. This splendid essay by Gene Dicks, of Middletown High School, was the winner of the contest in which some 1,200 boys and girls participated. This was more than double the number who competed in 1947.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOIL AND LIFE

(By Gene Dicks, Middletown High School, Middletown, Va.)

When first the white man settled on this soil he found it inhabited by a race of people whose needs were very small. These people had no need for the lumber of the forest, his house was of skins. In this forest and fertile land he found his food and protection. His farming was done on a small scale—life was simple. He farmed in the open spaces nature had provided and when this land wore out he packed up his house and moved to another productive site. This gave nature time to rebuild his devastated fields. In this way these people had plenty of new farm land, also food in the forest and streams. When a heavy rain came, the forest and the ground cover didn't allow it to run wild over the lands. A large part soaked into the soil to trickle out in clear, life-giving springs and streams.

When the white man started to settle on the land, he cut the forest for lumber to build homes and cleared the land to farm. His needs couldn't be satisfied as easily as the Indians. He needed a stationary home, a fort for protection, land to farm on and fences to keep his cattle home. Much of this took away the forest and the cover and left a barren land for the rainwater to wash away. Along with the forest went the animals and his chief supply of food. As time passed rains washed away much of the fertile topsoil so he, too, was compelled to move on and on to new lands. This developed an endless chain of moving from eroded lands to new lands which was thought endless.

From the Old World came the demand for timber and timber products and grain. Great tracts of forest were cut. Mountains were cleared of their covering of forest and let lay in burden waste to be eroded and blown away. Because of this destruction of forest, field, and stream, wildlife was deprived of food and cover. It decreased in numbers. Many forms became extinct.

As far as the people were concerned, at least, to most of them, there wasn't such a word as conservation in the English language, certainly not in farming practices. Why should there be? There was plenty of land not settled and timber not cut. In Michigan alone it was said there was enough timber to supply the world's needs for a hundred years. When cutting was started in a big way, the timber supply lasted for about 10 years.

At last they came to the end of the chain of moving to virgin lands. For the first time in our history we were confronted with the problem of unfertile farm land as an individual and national problem—now a world problem.

Today more than 50,000,000 acres of once-fertile American soil can no longer be used for the production of cultivated crops. From another 50,000,000 acres we have lost more than 50 percent of the original topsoil. In fact, erosion has taken at least 25 percent of the topsoil from half of the farm land of the United States. Even today about 500,000 acres go down in ruin each year. Some of this destruction can be seen on our way to and from school.

There is little wonder that Dr. H. H. Bennett, Chief of the United States Soil Conservation Service, has declared:

"The plain truth is that Americans, as a people, have never learned to love the land and to regard it as an enduring resource. They have seen it only as a field for exploitation and a source of immediate financial return."

Now 140,000,000 Americans are dependent upon 460,000,000 acres of cropland. This is about 3½ acres of cropland per person. We all have a stake in those acres though we may never see them. Too many farmers are now working poor land that should be turned back to grass or woodland. Scientists tell us that about 3 acres of productive cropland are required per person for an adequate standard of living, so we have no more good land to lose.

Pioneers of the future will not go west to new and fertile lands but will have to apply conservation measures to much land that was once farmed out and discarded. This is not pleasant. It is well for us that a good beginning has been made in soil and water conservation and is being vigorously pursued here in our own Lord Fairfax Soil Conservation District which is one of 22 in Virginia and one of some 2,000 in the Nation.

Farmers use some 16,000,000 tons of commercial fertilizer every year in an effort to maintain and improve the fertility of their soil along with large amounts of lime and manure. This tonnage is puny in comparison with the soil nutrients erosion removes each. Soil erosion removes 60 times that amount annually. Even the volume of the soil nutrients taken from our lands in the form of crops is small when compared with losses due to soil erosion, which is from 10 to 21 times larger on sloping cropland.

Not only does uncontrolled water destroy soil and soil nutrients but too it also must be charged the direct loss of human lives, houses, roads, bridges, and farm crops and wildlife.

America was built by men and women seeking independence and security. Our food, our clothing, our shelter all come from the soil—plant and animal life can be no better than the soil that supports it. The same is true of our way of life. As the soil is lost, all is lost.

There is great rural and urban poverty here and in the world where erosion has been serious. Poor lands mean poor crops and low incomes. As incomes drop the standard of living falls, taxes go unpaid, trade is reduced, school facilities decline and fail, malnutrition becomes common, and people migrate in search of security and freedom from want. All this the world knows too well today. And history records all too many classic examples.

Serious as is erosion in many area, the situation in most sections can and is being controlled by prompt and conserted action and full cooperation and participation on the part of many in a democratic way. Thomas Jefferson taught and practiced the art of contour farming. And Patrick Henry said soon after the Revolution: "He is the greatest patriot who stops the most gullies." The correct use and conservation of soil and natural resources is an obligation of every American interested in the preservation of freedom and security and the American way of life today and tomorrow.

However, the men who would gain nature's rewards must first learn her laws and obey them. Our 1948-essay program—Soil and Life—in our schools will help in building correct conservation attitude and further study and participation. It is good to see much of the following conservation measures unfolding on farms along highways to and from school—and our school is glad to have a part.

I quote now from the 1947 annual report of our Lord Fairfax Soil Conservation District made available to all schools and others:

"For good erosion control and larger yields of better crops for better living apply "good land use, adequate vegetative cover, conservation practices and patterns: Good crop rotations; cover crops; crop rotation in alternate contour strips; contour tillage-farming on the level; vegetative galls, gullies, cuts, and fills; productive meadows and pastures of grasses and legumes; adequate use of lime, fertilizer, manure, and crop residues; farm ponds—storage of rainfall on the farm; woodland conservation and management; wildlife conservation and management on all land."

Would not the application of these simple yet effective measures of soil and water conservation have more as well as economic values when we are told: "Possibly three-fourths of the human race today are undernourished, and taken the world over, the average output per unit area of land is falling."

State Department Rules as Top Policy Dictator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present herewith an article from the Washington Star of June 13, 1948, written by Mr. Constantine Brown. I believe that this is one of the most truthful and illuminating articles which has appeared regarding State Department policies in a long time. I commend it to the public for most careful consideration.

STATE DEPARTMENT RULES AS TOP POLICY DICTATOR—FREQUENTLY OVERRIDES MILITARY MINDS AND SWAYS WHITE HOUSE IN INSISTING ON PEACE PURCHASING ABROAD

(By Constantine Brown)

The State Department has become the paramount Government agency since the end of the war.

In contrast to prewar days, it now has an important voice in the making and execution of policy on national defense. The Secretary of State is a member of the National Security Council and as such, frequently is in a position to block measures recommended by our naval, military, and air strategists.

For instance, last April when the Russian high command decided—in contravention of existing agreements—to subject all rail traffic between Berlin and the western occupation zones to strict control, the State Department induced the White House to cancel the decision of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Defense Department to instruct Gen. Lucius D. Clay to run American trains through the Russian lines with a strong military guard.

This plan had been recommended by the American commander in Germany and had been approved by all responsible military officials in Washington.

BLOCKS NAVAL OPERATIONS

For a long time before President Truman made his statement, March 12, 1947, of America's vital interest in stopping Soviet encroachments in Greece and Turkey, the State Department had blocked the sending

of strong naval forces to the Mediterranean. A few weeks before the Italians voted, April 18, the State Department also caused the Navy to withdraw all of its units from Italian waters.

Army, Navy, and Air Force chiefs find it difficult in the present strained international situation to decide what steps should be taken for the country's defense because of the lack of a definite policy by the State Department.

For instance, the National Security Council—whose estimates of the international situation, according to the President himself, are superior to those of the State Department—pointed out clearly the dangers of our policy in the Middle East and the peril of alienating the Arab world at a time when we lack oil resources. The Council's evaluation of the Middle East situation was overruled, however, by the White House with the consent of the State Department.

During President Roosevelt's administration, the foreign policy of the United States was controlled directly by the White House. Since President Truman came to office, however, he has followed, by and large, the advice of the Secretary of State and there is no question if he took a strong position he could prevail over Mr. Truman's White House advisers.

This is illustrated in our policy toward China. It is well known to all those in the President's inner circle that he favored strong military support for the Nanking government. Secretary of State Marshall, however, does not like Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and the Kuomintang.

ADVISES PRESIDENT

General Marshall was able to prevail over the President's own inclinations in the matter and to persuade him to back his policy of withholding military help from the Chiang regime, although most of the military men who do our war planning were strongly in favor of such support.

The advice of the military was ignored until a few months ago, when Congress, despite General Marshall's opposition, voted some $300,000,000 to assist the Chinese Government. However, between September 1946 and the fall of 1947, the State Department refused to license the export of vital military supplies to the Nanking government and as a result the situation has become so bad that it is doubtful whether anything can save the Chiang government in its fight against the Moscow-sponsored Communists.

The State Department also plays a predominant role in America's economic policies. Our diplomacy, as practiced in recent years, has been predicated on heavy use of the country's economic resources. Any attempt on the part of the legislative branch to put a stop to the rash spending of American substance is severely denounced by the State Department through its powerful propaganda mediums in the country.

The only consistency shown by our foreign-policy framers has been in dispensing a large share of the country's wealth to European countries in the belief that peace can be bought with goods and cash.

ELECTION VICTORIES HAILED

The Communists' set-backs in French and Italian elections have been presented as great victories for the State Department's thesis that we can buy peace in Europe and stave off another war by spending billions of dollars.

This also was the theme of President Roosevelt's appeals in 1941 when he asked Congress to approve his lend-lease programs and assured the country that, by becoming the arsenal of democracy, America would not have to send its sons to foreign wars.

The cost would be so small, it was stated, only about $6,000,000,000, and Congress considered the price not too great. By the end of 1945 we had spent some $265,000,000,000 in fighting a global war. In the so-called peace years since VJ-day we spent another $20,000,000,000 to aid our wartime allies, and the European recovery program provides for expenditure of a similar amount during the next 4 years.

Despite all our spending, the international situation has not improved. On the contrary, we seem to be closer, despite Moscow's peace offensive, to a major upheaval than the State Department likes to admit.

Our foreign policy framers and the advisers at their elbows are supposed to be conversant only with the details of the internotional situation. They know little about domestic conditions and the implications of overspending.

While the military spenders had a concrete objective before them—to defeat the enemy by using all available national resources, regardless of cost—our policy-framers now have to deal with the subleties of intergovernmental relations and with unpredictable foreign governments and peoples whose ways of thinking and objectives frequently are different from our own.

Despite the heavy sacrifices made by American taxpayers for Britain during and after the war, the London Government may be led away from its tight ties with the United States and directed closer to the U. S. S. R. because of American policies in the Middle East.

INFLUENCE IS DOUBTFUL

A coalition of heterogeneous nations hangs together in wartime because they all have a single purpose, to avoid defeat at the hands of a common enemy. But when the emergency disappears, their interests often head in completely opposite directions. No amount of money can influence the national policies of another country for any length of time.

The State Department, by the use of cliches about international harmony, persuaded Congress to vote billions for UNRRA. Its lamentable failure to achieve international good will now is admitted even by its proponents.

The $3,750,000,000 loan to assist Britain's economic recovery also was forced down the throats of legislators, who were told in executive sessions that unless the money was provided Britain would go Communist. The loan has been exhausted and the results have been negligible. Britain's economic predicament is about as serious as it was at the end of the war.

SPENDING STILL ADVOCATED

Although the $20,000,000,000 worth of sedatives administered to Europe have shown no tangible results, the State Department continues to advocate huge spending, leaving to other branches of the Government the task of devising means of preventing such expenditures from impairing our whole economic and social structure.

It is within the province of the State Department, our foreign-policy framers say, to spend money, but it is not their job even to inquire where and how the money and materials are to be obtained from the 145,000,000 Americans who are called on now to support the rest of the world.

Any objection to this dance of the billions is decried immediately as "isolationism." The sad part of the story is that after the expenditure of billions of dollars the "peace" which the public was told would ensue has become so unstable that it was necessary to provide the Military Establishment with not less than $14,000,000,000 for the current fiscal year. And that is only the beginning.

If Moscow's soft words cease in the next few months and the cold war threatens to become hot, the country will be called on to put up many more billions. We will have to strengthen a National Defense Establishment which was pulverized after the war ended because our policy-framers considered that appeasement of the U. S. S. R. would bring peace in our time.

Pertinent Observations Concerning Communism, Socialism, and Capitalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, communism and socialism are first cousins. They stem from the same family tree. They are both enemies of free enterprise. These two isms are very much in the news today, and because they constitute a real menace to our American way of life, I feel constrained to make some remarks concerning them for the edification of my colleagues.

This year marks the one hundredth anniversary of the Communist manifesto, issued by Karl Marx in 1848; therefore, a discussion of these isms is peculiarly fitting at this time. Marx was the father of both communism and socialism. Spawned by Marx, communism and socialism have won control in most of the countries of Europe, with tragic consequences to the humble people of those countries.

WHAT IS COMMUNISM?

Mr. Speaker, communism is an idea—a collectivist idea—that when put into effect insists the individual has no rights as an individual, but that he must subject himself to the state. State ownership of the means of production is the core of the system. Under it a person of ability is deprived of what he produces, so all incentives to produce are lost.

Communism and socialism are basically alike; each rests upon government ownership and control of the means of production. Either communism or socialism as a philosophy of government is to be feared and despised. They can be explained away, but not shot away. Ideas are not killed off with bullets; they are only destroyed by the substitution of other ideas. Communism claims "the State is all-important." Christ taught "the individual is all-important." These claims are contradictory; both cannot be right. That is why Christianity and communism do not and cannot mix.

COMMUNISM IN ACTION

Mr. Speaker, in 1917, after the downfall of the Kerensky government, capitalism in Russia was replaced by communism. At that time all property—both public and private—was placed under government control. We are told that in a few instances even the family was communized, meaning that all women of marriageable age were considered "the property of the State."

From the beginning communism in Russia has been a brutal affair, a despotism operated by certain men of power; first Lenin, then Trotsky, now Stalin. These men subjugated the common people, taking away all individual freedom.

Russia has now had a Communist regime for 31 years. A look at the record shows that some 17,000,000 Russians have been killed, starved, or slave-labored to

death during that time. This is a conservative estimate. That number equals the number killed in all the warring nations during both World War I and World War II. Today untold millions of war prisoners and political prisoners are being slave-labored to death in various slave-labor camps all over Russia. These facts and figures give one a clear picture of how cheap Russia's Communist dictator considers man created in the image of God. Communism in action does not make an attractive picture.

IT CAN HAPPEN HERE

In 1850 Karl Marx told the Communist League that no Communist government could afford to give the land to the peasants because the peasants would then become bourgeois landowners. He said all land should belong to the government and be worked by labor colonies or associated rural proletariat. In other words, by farm slaves or farm serfs.

After the Russian revolution of 1917, Lenin liquidated the land-owning aristocracy, but disregarding the advice of Marx, gave the land-hungry peasant free land. Russia under Lenin established hundreds of thousands of family farms. When Stalin seized power in 1930 he upset the family-farm arrangement, dispossessed the prosperous peasants, or Kulaks, and banished millions of them to the Siberian labor camps. The family farms were then turned into great collective state farms that are now worked by "farm slaves" or "farm serfs." Today the collective state farms of Russia are so strictly policed that no farm laborer may leave the farm unless he first gets permission from the dictator, Stalin. Thus in one generation Stalin has changed family farms—owned by happy farm families—into collective state farms operated by compulsory farm serfs. It can happen here.

COMMUNISTS IN EUROPE

Mr. Speaker, 5 percent of the people of France are Communists—2,000,000 out of 40,000,000; where only one one-hundredth of 1 percent of the people of Spain are Communists—2,700 out of 27,000,000. Why this difference?

Eleven percent of the people of Yugoslavia are Communists—1,700,000 out of 15,450,000; while only 3 percent of the people of Austria are Communists—175,000 out of 5,800,000. Why this difference?

Eleven percent of the people of Czechoslovakia are Communist—1,500,000 out of 13,636,000; while only 2 percent of the people of Poland are Communists—600,000 out of 30,000,000. Why this difference?

Could these differences be the direct result of the difference in the emphasis these people place upon religion? Why do such small Communist minorities in the various countries exert such an undue and unholy influence upon those European governments?

CAPITALISM VERSUS COMMUNISM

Mr. Speaker, in the United States we have our own democratic way of deciding things; we do so by majority vote, through the ballot box. Some people call this way of doing things democracy, and same call it capitalism.

Capitalism, reduced to its lowest terms, is simply the right to own property, the right to own a home, a farm, a business. When one accumulates property or owns property he becomes a capitalist.

Along with the right to own property—under our democratic way of doing things—goes the right to think as we want to think, the right to talk as we want to talk, the right to worship as we want to worship. These fundamental rights are as much a part of democracy as the right to own property. They are all a part of the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness that Thomas Jefferson talked about.

Communism takes away these individual rights, takes away all human liberty, and makes the individual a puppet of the state. Under communism the state is all powerful. It forces the individuals that make up the state to obey the order, the will, or the whim of its dictator ruler without question.

A Russian citizen may not own land, may not choose his own job, may not absent himself from work, may not strike, may not picket, may not travel, may not ring a church bell—and he is forbidden freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of religion, and freedom of soul. Yet we have some so-called Americans who would adopt the Communist program here.

The world today is divided into two armed camps—capitalism and communism. Capitalism is the American way of doing things; communism is the Russian way. "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve."

EVOLUTIONARY DEMOCRACY VS. REVOLUTIONARY AUTOCRACY

Mr. Speaker, history is a record of the struggles of man to better himself—economically, socially, physically, and politically. It's also a record of the struggles of man to make government his servant instead of his master. It required centuries to change the serfs of the Middle Ages into the freemen of the nineteenth century, and another 100-year period to change the absolute monarchies of the nineteenth century into the democracies of the twentieth century. During the last two decades—largely as an aftermath of World War I and World War II—we have witnessed a violent swing-back in Europe to totalitarianism, with the consequent loss of individual freedom that took centuries of struggle to acquire.

Today Communists tell us that the American way of life is a false dream, an illusive mirage; that equality of opportunity is a shibboleth that should be discarded; and that revolutionary overthrow of the American Government is the only way to bring about the Communist millennium. The question therefore is, Shall we have progress through evolution (the American way) or progress—so-called—through revolution (the Russian way)? Well, "let's look at the record."

In 1912, just 36 years ago, the Socialist Party of America adopted, among others, the following planks in its national platform:

1. The 8-hour day.

2. Old-age pensions, accident insurance, and sick benefits for public employees.

3. Abolition of child labor (in factories).

4. Rigid inspection of factories—for the improvement of lighting, heating, ventilating, sanitary conditions, safety appliances and the like.

5. Free employment bureaus to be established in cities.

6. Home rule for cities, including the right of cities to own and operate public utilities.

7. Child welfare departments.

8. Special attention to eradication of tuberculosis and other contagious diseases.

9. An adequate system of public baths, parks, playgrounds, and gymnasiums.

10. Free textbooks and proper school equipment; free school lunches, where necessary; free medical inspection in schools; vacation schools and night schools for adults.

11. Socialization of the liquor traffic (already adopted by 17 States).

In our impatience for social progress some of us overlook the fact that in the short span of 36 years all these "socialistic planks" have been adopted by a "capitalistic society," and this progress has been accomplished in the American way—by evolution, not by revolution. This record justifies our faith in the American way and proves conclusively to our mind that evolutionary democracy is preferable to revolutionary autocracy.

CONCLUSION

Now, Mr. Speaker, what has private capital and free labor done for the American people during the century that has elapsed since Marx issued his manifesto? In that 100-year period breathtaking advances have been made having to do with the well-being and living standards of the American people—advances not duplicated anywhere else in the world. This progress is the result largely of the economic system we call capitalism.

In 1848 when Karl Marx issued his Communist manifesto, the richest ruler in Europe did not possess a single electric-light bulb; did not have modern plumbing with running hot water in his palace; did not have a self-propelled vehicle to dash him hither and yon at 60 miles per hour; did not have a radio to bring the voices of the world to his ears; and did not have modern medical science to save him from pestilence and early death. The average humble American home of today has all these blessings and conveniences, and hundreds of others. Capitalism created them and made them available. Yet we have self-styled liberals who lambast and smear the capitalistic system and demand in lieu thereof some form of socialism. Experiments in socialism have always paid off in despotism and poverty. The English people are experiencing these very things today.

Mr. Speaker, before we decide to make any change in our American way of life we should count our many blessings under capitalism—blessings no other people on earth enjoy—then compare our lot with the lot of any other people on earth. If the American people will do this, I have no doubt what the decision will be.

Truman Gives Notice He's in Fight to Finish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD V. ROBERTSON
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Truman Gives Notice He's in Fight to Finish," written by Arthur Krock and published in the New York Times of June 13, 1948.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN GIVES NOTICE HE'S IN FIGHT TO FINISH—PRESIDENT'S WESTERN SPEECHES INDICATE CLEARLY THAT HE HAS NO INTENTION OF GIVING WAY TO ANOTHER CANDIDATE—HE CHOOSES THE OFFENSIVE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, June 12.—The President's campaign trip to the Pacific Coast has further depressed those Democrats and independents affiliated with the party, who have been hoping that at some point he would abandon his effort to be nominated by the national convention to succeed himself. Mr. Truman's belligerent speeches and remarks on tour, however much they may have embittered his already hostile relations with Congress and with several groups in his own party, proclaim a man who, as he wrote to a fellow-citizen of Missouri, "was not brought up to run away from a fight." And they reveal him also as a man who went West to start one.

When Democratic Members of Congress have gathered in the cloakrooms recently, or when they have conferred with their State leaders, something like the following has invariably been said:

"Before the balloting for President begins at Philadelphia Truman will conclude to withdraw. He is a party man and he just won't insist on leading his party to certain defeat. The Republican nomination and platform will in the meantime have made this certainty more obvious, even to him. He will give his blessing to some other Democrat—Chief Justice Vinson, for instance, who could unite the party—or to General Eisenhower. Harry won't sacrifice his party to his personal ambition."

That talk began to die down as visitors came away from the White House with the word that the President's mood was wholly to the contrary. They represented him as believing that: he owes to the country an appraisal of his record, particularly with respect to his program for world peace, and the Democratic Party owes to him the opportunity to obtain that appraisal. The national convention may reject him if it chooses, thus repudiating his record and casting away its last chance for victory: but he will never eliminate himself.

WORRY AMONG BIG BOSSES

Certainly this report is being borne out by the events of the President's trip. He has repelled all counsel of conciliation. He has singled out for attack individuals and newspapers. He has launched a broadside at Congress regardless of the risks involved to legislation which he has advocated, to the bipartisan foreign policy that has been generally successful, and to the situation within the Democratic Party itself. For in his assault on the Eightieth Congress as the worst, or perhaps just the second worst, in the history of the United States, he condemned a record to important parts of which Democrats have contributed.

This goad he administered to a mule that was already angry and had kicked hard several times at the White House traces. The big-city bosses, with some exceptions, have been frightened over the President's shifting policy on Palestine and over the threat they see in the appeals of Henry Wallace to urban groups who have supported Democratic candidates for years. The southern wing of the party, in its protest against Mr. Truman's civil-rights legislative program, has gone further toward insurrection than it ever has before. For the first time in years, after a Democratic incumbent of the Presidency made known his wish to continue in office, Senators, Representatives, and State leaders publicly have endorsed other citizens—in this instance General Eisenhower.

HIS FIGHTING STRATEGY

Mr. Truman is fully aware of what he is doing, and this has persuaded all but a few incurable optimists in the party that he intends to go through with his political plans as stated. It has persuaded them furthermore that, realizing well what he is doing, the President has decided to fight every inch of the way to November, having definitely concluded that his only hope of election lies in this strategy.

But actually, though the President is a kindly, sociable man, and a very practical politician who knows that compromise is the usual channel of political success, he is aggressive in a controversy. This he has proved on many occasions—in Missouri, in the Senate and in the White House. His quick temper, impelling him to say blunt things at delicate junctures, has been one of the chief worries of his devoted personal staff. He never forgives what he conceives to be a reflection on his standards of duty or his motives: thus, the Democrats who urged him to resign after the Republicans carried Congress in the 1946 elections will always be in his bad books.

CRITICISMS OF TRUMAN

But even if the President were endowed with a different set of reactions, some of his experiences in the White House might have sealed him in this fighting mood. He has been blamed by many New Dealers and panegyrists of his predecessor, even by members of the Roosevelt family, for unsuccessful dealings with official and political problems which he feels were passed on to him in a condition that defied solution. He has been attacked and deserted by many old-line Democrats in the South for asking for civil-rights laws which Mr. Roosevelt also endorsed, but presented merely as worthy and desirable principles and did not press at the Capitol. He was criticized for dealing with the Palestine problem from what his critics said was the viewpoint of domestic politics; and then, when he altered policy in response to warnings that he was trifling with national security, he was criticized for changing front and for injuring his party politically.

He tried to compromise with Henry Wallace, was virtually forced by James F. Byrnes and the Democrats in Congress to dismiss Mr. Wallace from the Cabinet, and when the result was the third-party movement, he was charged with ineptness in allowing this to happen. Mr. Truman may also feel that the split in his party over his palpable efforts to counter Mr. Wallace and his group promises politically is an unfair return for the dismissal on which these insurgents insisted.

A PRESIDENT'S POSITION

In general the President may have concluded that he cannot please enough people to get elected by conciliation and compromise, and that by being himself—which means to hit back harder than he is hit—he may arrive at a winning formula. But, though the President's attacks on Congress have been intemperate, unwise, and to a large degree unfair, and though the language he has employed is likely to make rather more than less trouble for him in that quarter, nearly all occupants of the White House eventually move toward this position. When the opposite party controls at the Capitol, and the President's own party rejects his legislative proposals and makes possible the overriding of important vetoes, Congress in Presidential eyes becomes even more definitely the chief villain of the play.

That Mr. Truman will fight to the end of his political adventure, whether this comes at Philadelphia or at the November polls, is the message his party is reading in the dispatches from the special train.

The Republican Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of June 10, 1948:

THE REPUBLICAN FAILURE

Republican leaders have been hoping to bring about the adjournment of this Congress by June 19, 10 days away, but realize there is a large amount of unfinished business which should be done. Therefore they are now tentatively suggesting a recess on June 19 and coming back in session again between the two national conventions, or even resuming after both conventions.

The Republicans can hardly be proud of their achievement since they took over a majority of both Houses in the 1946 election sweep. After the 14 years of New Deal they were going to do great things. They were going to cut taxes across the board. They were going to cut the high cost of living and the big New Deal spendthrift budgets. They were going to put through a housing program so that there would be homes for everyone.

It is true they put through a tax cut over the President's two vetoes. But they realize now that this tax cut is only a temporary affair to last until after the Presidential election. By next spring they know that the projected budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1949, will require a new tax bill, probably with higher rates for everyone than they were before the recent reduction.

The national budget is still at a record peacetime level, some 10 times as large as it was 20 years ago. For this the Republicans are not wholly to blame. The cost of the war and the postwar foreign policies, largely bipartisan, have made necessary huge budgets. But the Republicans with any foresight of what had to be done to preserve peace in the world and bring about European recovery must have known this and therefore their promises of great reductions were false, as the Republican promises of economy proved to be here in Massachusetts.

Now, after wrangling for the past 6 months, they have made some last-minute changes in the European recovery bill which their great leader in foreign affairs, Senator VANDENBERG, has declared to be a terrible blunder, and Secretary of State Marshall has said that by paring this sum for recovery down it may be a case of another too little and too late.

Again they have emasculated the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, under which for 14 years the able Cordell Hull worked to bring the various nations to agree on breaking down the international trade barriers. After our State Department had worked so hard to promote the great meeting of nations at Geneva, Switzerland, last fall, at which 23 nations agreed to come into the general plan for freer trade among the nations, this Republican Congress, again in a last-minute drive, put through a bill which practically wrecks the whole effort of the world for a saner economy.

The housing bill has been deliberately held up in committee, and Members who were considering signing the petition to get it before the Congress have been threatened with party discipline. The long-debated civil rights bill, the Federal highway construction bill, and the Mundt-Nixon anti-Communist bill are all still dragging, with probably little chance that they will be put through this year.

If the Republican spellbinders can go forth in the Presidential campaign and point with pride to that record they must think the American people are pretty gullible.

Foot-and-Mouth Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered before the Nebraska Stock Growers Association on June 12, 1948:

It is well to review, briefly, what has led up to the threat of foot-and-mouth disease to our country. This threat came about because the existing treaty between the United States and Mexico was violated in 1945 and 1946 when there arrived at the port of Vera Cruz, Mexico, several hundred Brahma bulls from Brazil. They were distributed under circumstances which indicate conspiracy between American and Mexican individuals and our State Department to violate existing agreements relative to the importation of bulls from countries having foot-and-mouth disease. The evidence will show that Mr. Messersmith, the then Ambassador to Mexico, and our State Department knew that there was an existing treaty between Mexico and the United States by which both countries decided to keep out of their respective countries, animals from countries in which foot-and-mouth disease existed. Both countries, by official proclamation, had found that foot-and-mouth disease existed in Brazil. The treaty did not permit the importation of cattle from this country. There are letters in the files of the State Department, of a confidential nature, which would be highly illuminating as to the attitude of the State Department on its importation of these bulls into Mexico from Brazil. These letters have been denied the official committees of Congress.

The evidence further shows that some of these bulls were advertised in the Excelsior, a leading daily newspaper in Mexico on September 3, 1946. It will show on page 12, that the Association of Cattle Growers pointed out that these bulls were being brought in at a great risk to Mexico and the United States. I am sure there was a definite connivance to violate the law between the Brazilian cattle growers and the Departments of Agriculture and State in both Mexico and the United States. Some of these bulls simply were enroute to the United States since they were sold to North American cattlemen before they were shipped out of Brazil. The evidence shows that North American cattlemen were in Brazil and had their pictures taken with the bulls in Brazil before they were bought. An examination of the Brahma Feeders Bulletin, issued in January 1946, discloses on page 3, a picture of a man and a woman standing by a Brahma bull with the following caption, "Mr. and Mrs. Raymond B. Guerra, of McAllen, Tex., standing by 22-month-old Mellore bull." This picture was taken on November 20, 1945, on the Indian ranch near Piral, in the state of Rio de Janeiro. The committee has other evidence of these bulls coming into the United States across the river at Matamoros. The Brazilian merchants obtained more than a million pesos in these illegal imports. They have apparently sold more than a hundred bulls in the United States at an average price of $3,000 each. They cost less than $300 in Brazil. One cannot escape the fact that there was definite evidence of criminal responsibility on the part of American citizens for the violation of our customs laws. Indeed there is definite evidence of a conspiracy on the part of our own Government. It should be remembered that the Tariff Act of 1930 provided that the Secretary of Agriculture must prohibit the importation of livestock and meat from countries having foot-and-mouth disease. The law provides a penalty of $10,000 fine or a 2-year imprisonment, for fraudulently or knowingly importing into the United States such animal or meat. As far as I know the Justice Department has taken no steps to punish those who have openly violated the law.

Now foot-and-mouth disease is an acute, highly communicable disease, chiefly confined to cloven-hoofed animals and characterized by eruptions of the vesicles or blisters on the mucous membranes of the animals and on the skin between the toes and above the hoofs. Mortality from the disease is not generally very high as in the case of some of the other infectious diseases. The death rate is higher among the young animals. The damaging effects of the disease on the affected animals is serious. It has the ability to spread rapidly from animal to animal and from one community to another. This places foot-and-mouth disease in the front ranks of the most devastating diseases to livestock. The disease has been known for centuries and has existed for long periods in many countries despite the more or less vigorous methods used for its control.

Foot-and-mouth disease is caused by a specific virus. The virus will pass through standard germproof filters. It is thus so small that it is not detected by ordinary straining methods or microscopes.

The disease can be spread directly by contact or indirectly by infected hay, drinking troughs, railway cars, and pastures. Human beings may carry the virus on their shoes and clothing. The virus can be carried by dogs, rabbits, and birds. It is estimated about 10 percent of the cattle that recover remain carriers. It may attack the same animals several times. There seems to be at least three different types of virus and thus the animal can be attacked by one of the three viruses from which it is now immune. The period of incubation is from 3 to 6 days. The disease is highly contagious and spreads rapidly to all susceptible animals.

The type of disease in Mexico had a low-mortality rate. However, a severe epidemic did visit Europe in 1920 where the mortality rate reached from 30 to 50 percent in the adult animals.

While the animals may not die they do have pain and fever and they lose weight. Milk cows dry up. Sometimes the udders become abscessed and permanently impairs the animals. Abortion is frequent with pregnant animals.

One reason for the failure of the program in Mexico was the cumbersome administrative set-up between the two countries. Every American veterinarian, with its appraiser, paymaster, technician, and general handyman, had a Mexican counterpart. We even had bilingual chauffeurs with go-betweens in attempting to interpret orders. Orders had to be cleared through the Governor of the State, or the President of the country. They had to be cleared through the Bureau of Animal Industry, the United States Department of Agriculture, and the State Department in both countries.

No one who was a qualified executive, with the ability and power to direct the campaign was on the job. No one had the power to make decisions, but frequently had to make phone calls to the several departments in Washington and have them cleared in Mexico before definite decisive action could be taken. There is little wonder that the program was doomed to failure.

A campaign of this magnitude, with all its ramifications needs speed, coordination, and efficiency if the job is to be done. There must be some one administrator of unquestioned ability. From the beginning the livestock industry and the Agriculture Committee in the House have recommended that a qualified, competent executive, with power to act be placed in charge of the entire program. These recommendations were just adopted in May 1948.

The United States has had six outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease and each one has been handled promptly through the slaughter and burying method. The outbreak in 1914 covered 22 States, including the District of Columbia. The outbreak in California in 1924 came through the use of some garbage from the Orient. It was fed to pigs and this in turn spread the disease to other cloven-hoofed animals. It is impossible to estimate the total cost and damage done by these outbreaks.

The disease in Mexico spread over an area of about 600 miles from north to south and about 700 miles from east to west in just a year's time. It is now about 280 miles from the closest point to the Texas border. The Agriculture Department has been given a blank check to help stamp out the disease. To date we have spent something like $60,000,000.

A quarantine line has been established in Mexico. There seems little possibility of giving it strong enforcement. A quarantine line, to be effective must stop all movements of man, beast, and vehicles, including produce out of the infected area. This would mean a 24-hour day, a 7-day week vigil which is a far cry from what is being done at this time. A well constructed, patrolled border fence would give some protection from the disease.

This country has entered into an agreement for the use of vaccines. There is probably not a veterinarian in the country who believes that the present vaccine can cure the disease. It may give the animal immunity from 4 to 6 months. It brings a false hope to Mexico.

The present economic and educational standards of the Mexicans are so low that he does not understand why it is necessary to kill his only oxen or milk cow and leave him with nothing he now owns and support his family. An attempt was made to use mules. I saw these mules hitched to a wooden plow jumping and jerking with two or three peons trying to control the movements of this skinny mule which looked like a cross between a wild jackass and a mare. The ox

was slow, but he kept moving. The ox eats grass and weeds. He could be turned out at night and would be back in the morning for water. He rustled for his living. The mule requires grain and is in competition with the Mexican's family who uses corn for food. The mule must be tied up or he will disappear into the hills.

It must be remembered that many of the cattle-keeping peasants are primitive almost to the level of savagery. They are totally ignorant of the threat implicit in this disease which run through their herds like fire through dry grass. They are suspicious and fearful of the white man. Very few speak English. Indeed they have trouble talking among themselves. They have so many different dialects. They have an inborn hatred for the gringos, reenhanced by the legend of two American invasions of their country.

The ox can pull a cart or a plow better than a man. These people have always seen poor, thin, sick cattle. It was hard for them to believe that their ox was even sick, that it had just been exposed and should be shot. Even the sick ox wasn't likely to die and as long as it didn't die, it was an asset. Maybe the only asset the family had. You did not shoot a sick ox any more than you would shoot a sick man.

When their animals were killed you could not even salvage the hide or the meat. The Americans paid an average of $50 for the ox and $5 for the pig or sheep. If the ox was killed and the other animals slaughtered, how could the family live? Was it any wonder that our American veterinarians found a sinister look coming from dark and doubtful eyes? Is it any wonder that they thought America had too great a desire to destroy Mexican meat supply by killing their cattle? Such a program could have only one result—failure. We have lost the battle. The Mexican Government could not permit the continuing slaughter of oxen and milk cows in the infected area. The Indians and the Mexicans would have been in revolt.

The answer to foot-and-mouth disease in this country is pretty involved and certainly not a very nice answer. I am certain that a vaccine can be found which will not only prevent, but cure the disease. We did conquer rinderpest. We can conquer this disease. In the meantime cattlemen everywhere should be alert for the first sign of foot-and-mouth disease in their herds. Prompt and efficient eradication must still be employed. It is bitter medicine, but it must be taken.

The one bright spot that I can see is the fact that the disease is probably now declining. Like every infectious epidemic in human or animals, it has its peak and then gradually fades away. This country has experienced several epidemics of influenza. Many communities have their measles, scarlet fever and mumps. These diseases all have a tendency to run their course. This does not mean that Mexico would be free of foot-and-mouth disease because a certain number of the cattle continue to harbor the virus. It may lull us to sleep and then a new outbreak can occur and jump our borders.

Our country is still strong and young. Our 11 Midwestern States produce 68 percent of the food for America and the world. If we deplete our soil and devastate our herds with disease, we could easily become like the Asiatic and European countries that live with the livestock diseases the best way they can. Never before have we been so conscious of where food is coming from as during and since the war. Our farmers showed the amazing ability to produce food and they will continue to do so if at all possible. Much of this food was produced because we had a different philosophy from most of the world. We raise our food free from the dozen or more destructive diseases of livestock. If we wreck our livestock industry with disease, our food supply will fail. Other countries tolerate the toll-taking diseases and are short of food.

This country has practically eradicated tuberculosis among cattle. We seldom see any more hunchbacks among cattle. We are controlling Bang's disease. All of these control methods must be continued. The Bang's disease is transmitted to the human. It is estimated that from 5 to 15 percent of the population is affected with undulant fever. It is an important public health problem that this generation must recognize. Pasteurization of milk destroys the germ. It is estimated that some 500 counties in our Nation are entirely free from Bang's disease. The American cattlemen will help our country to remain a strong, two-fisted, fighting Nation intent upon wiping out animal diseases. We will not become dormant and yield to the inroads of disease with all their handicaps. We must continue our philosophy of disease control in order to produce food for the world.

If the economic situation in this country is to remain sound, we should remember that throughout all of the ages, prosperity has depended upon the amount of wealth people could create from the crust of soil around the earth; from the wealth that comes from under the ground, from out of the water and from our forests. The prosperity, the wealth and health of humanity is directly related to the animal products and human food which can be produced from the soil and the crops which it grows.

We should be cautious and not permit other countries to make an impression on us with their philosophies and procedures, because we have demonstrated more than they that we know how to control animal diseases. It has meant much wealth to this country. They must not be permitted to impose their ideas of animal disease control upon our country. We must live without foot-and-mouth disease, without tuberculosis and bangs disease in cattle, and without any other costly livestock diseases. We must eradicate these diseases and keep our livestock clean—otherwise we present a definite threat to the economy of this country.

There are all kinds of suggestions on how to handle the foot-and-mouth disease problem in Mexico. There were some men who appeared before the committee who said we ought to get tough with Mexico and stop all commerce between the two countries. There are others who would go in and kill all cattle which are infected. To do it by force and use the Army if necessary. Well, we tried to do that once and it didn't work. There is no easy answer. All of us are deeply concerned about finding the correct solution. I believe the acute disease will finally run its course. It will become a chronic ever-present infection in Mexico.

The quarantine line is now being moved back to the south. In new outbreaks, cattle are being killed and buried. The cattlemen in northern Mexico are most cooperative in their attempts to keep the disease out of that part of the country. They forbid the movement of cattle from one State to another.

When I saw the cattle in northern Mexico last month, they were very thin. The ranges have been overgrazed and there has been a protracted drought. It is possible that three or four hundred thousand cattle may starve to death.

A laboratory is being established on Prudence Island, just off the coast of Rhode Island. They will employ about 300 people. The laboratory will cost over $30,000,000. I believe this is the correct step. It will be remembered that during the war the Army established a laboratory on Grosse Isle and in less than 2 years developed a vaccine which would not only cure but prevent the nearly 100 percent fatal disease of rinderpest. The vaccine was developed by the use of the hen's egg. I am confident that a vaccine can be produced which will not only cure, but prevent foot-and-mouth disease. The Appropriations Committee in the House is now considering an appropriation of $66,000,000 to carry on the program in Mexico for this next year. Included in this $66,000,000 is $27,000,000 earmarked for the purchase of canned meat. This meat will be shipped to European countries. There are many canneries now operating in northern Mexico and should help to take care of some of their surplus cattle.

We should all put our shoulders to the wheel. We should look confidently forward. We should all cooperate in helping to find a remedy for this disease. To do otherwise might well mean destruction to the livestock industry.

Constitution of Veterans' Alliance of World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD F. YOUNGBLOOD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of the constitution of the Veterans' Alliance of World War II:

CONSTITUTION OF THE VETERANS' ALLIANCE OF WORLD WAR II

PREAMBLE

To organize and advance a society of veterans of world wars, composed of men and women honorably discharged from the armed forces of the United States of America; and to associate themselves together by councils, local, State, and national. To protect, uphold, and maintain the Constitution of the United States of America, to advance the aims, ideals, and purposes of all veterans, namely: Peace, equality, justice, and religious freedom, and the preservation of our democratic form of government, for which these and other veterans have sacrificed their lives and fortunes, to the end that these inalienable rights shall not perish from this earth.

ARTICLE I. NAME

The name of this organization and association of veterans of both World War I and II shall be known and hailed as Veterans Alliance of World Wars; hereafter referred to as Veterans' Alliance. National headquarters shall be located at Detroit, Mich.

ARTICLE II. OBJECTS AND AIMS

SECTION 1. The Veterans' Alliance is an association consisting of honorably discharged men and women from the armed forces of the United States of America, associating themselves together to promote comradeship, education, fraternalism, patriotism, and to assist worthy veterans; to foster, promote, preserve, maintain, real Americanism; being ever mindful of our duties toward our wounded and families of deceased veterans. To defend our country against any and all enemies whomsoever and wherever they may be.

SEC. 2. And to advance and foster the interest and work of hospitalization of the wounded, disabled, and unfortunate veterans of world wars, and to help care for their widows and children. To promote a better understanding with the United States Veterans' Administration and all other public or private agencies devoted to helping alleviate hardships, sickness, and economic stress of all world war veterans.

SEC. 3. This organization to be nonpolitical and nonsectarian, except where an

organization or individual denounces or advocates the overthrow of our form of government, or is known to be against the principles contained herein.

ARTICLE III. ORGANIZATION

The Veterans' Alliance shall be formed into local and State councils. One State council to each State, District of Columbia, Territory, and possessions of the United States. Ten members or more can form a local council or post by writing and obtaining a charter from national headquarters, located at 424 Book Building, Detroit 26, Mich.

ARTICLE IV. MEMBERSHIP

SECTION 1. Any person or persons who have honorably served in the various branches of the armed forces of the United States of America and have received an honorable discharge shall be eligible to active membership, or any American citizen, who, upon entering service of the Allied Nations associated with the United States, at some time between April 6, 1917, and November 17, 1918, or from December 7, 1941, to January 31, 1946. Provided, however, that such service was terminated with an honorable discharge on separation, or an honorable release from active duty.

SEC. 2. There shall be no honorary memberships granted to civilians who have never served honorably in the armed forces. Only an active membership will be allowed. Dues shall be paid annually or for life.

SEC. 3. No member of Veterans' Alliance having been expelled from a post or council shall be admitted to another post or council unless he has appealed to the national executive committee and been granted permission to renew his or her membership or reinstatement approved.

SEC. 4. No person or persons, male or female, shall be eligible to membership who refuse to uphold, defend, support, by any and all means, the Constitution of the United States of America.

ARTICLE V. AUXILIARY

SECTION 1. The Veterans' Alliance does recognize the outstanding sacrifices of the mothers, wives, daughters, and sisters of the deceased veterans, and encourages the formation of a Veterans' Alliance ladies' auxiliary, composed of mothers, wives, daughters, and sisters of all men and women who were in the armed forces of the United States of America, and terminated their service honorably.

SEC. 2. Every auxiliary shall be affiliated with Veterans Alliance posts and councils, and be governed by such rules as set forth by the national executive committee and constitution.

ARTICLE VI. FINANCE

SECTION 1. The revenue of the Veterans Alliance shall be derived from the membership dues and other services as may be approved by the national executive committee.

SEC. 2. The amount of annual dues shall be set by the executive committee with the approval of local, State, and national councils in convention. After the first convention, nationally.

SEC. 3. Annual dues shall be due and payable on or before May 1, each year.

SEC. 4. Each post shall collect their dues and send statement and moneys to national secretary and treasurer.

ARTICLE VII. AMENDMENTS

The constitution of the Veterans' Alliance shall be amended or changed from time to time by a three-fourths referendum vote of all active members of Veterans' Alliance. This vote to be taken on a printed and individual ballot containing the proposed amendment, which first must be submitted in writing to a stated meeting of the national executive officers. Ballot to be printed containing the words "for or against." Also the name of the council and location. Each member shall be mailed a ballot at least 4 months before election of said amendment. Mailed back to national headquarters and the secretary then shall open and count all ballots in presence of national chairman or any other officer designated by him. If three-fourths are in favor, it will be declared and adopted. If not, the amendment shall be declared lost.

ARTICLE VIII. LANGUAGE

SECTION 1. That all councils and posts now or hereafter organized shall conduct their meetings in the English language.

SEC. 2. Any council or post violating section 1 of the article shall forfeit its charter at once.

Keynote Address of Hon. John W. Byrnes, of Wisconsin, at the Wisconsin State Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK B. KEEFE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Hon. JOHN W. BYRNES, delivered an inspiring keynote speech to the Wisconsin State convention on June 12 at Milwaukee, Wis. I ask unanimous consent that it may be included in the RECORD as part of these remarks:

Fellow Republicans, we meet today in anticipation of the victory that will be ours in November.

We meet to draw up the battle plans we will follow in the campaign leading to that climax.

From now until November 2, we will not be diverted from our goal—Republican victory in 1948.

We Wisconsin Republicans meet during a decisive period in the history of our State and Nation. Behind us lies 100 years of work and suffering and building. Ahead there stretches out a dim and distant future filled with vast and complex problems. How well we meet those problems determines our own future and the future of our children.

History can teach us many things, and we in Wisconsin have been studying a lot of history this year. It is a refreshing history. It is a noble history. It is a history of 100 years of the progress and growth of what we believe is the greatest State in the Union—the State of Wisconsin. Let us pause to look searchingly into the meaning of our history—and, from it, to draw inspiration and guidance for the great task before us.

The story of our State is the story of the pioneer in search of freedom. Settlers from many lands, representing many creeds, races, and beliefs, came to the Territory of Wisconsin to clear its fertile lands, cut its towering forests, dig into its rich earth, and build for themselves and their children a permanent home. Their epic story demonstrates the innate capacity of a free society to develop the talents of a new and mingled race. From them sprang the leaders demanded for the great adventure. From them came the forward-looking and liberal spirit which has dominated our history as a Commonwealth. It was these people—the people of Wisconsin—who gave birth to the Republican Party.

These pioneers lived and breathed the spirit of freedom. It was in spontaneous revolt against a limitation of individual liberty—the Kansas-Nebraska bill, a measure which would have stifled freedom by permitting slavery in the Territories—that a small band of Wisconsin pioneers met in Ripon to form the Republican Party. That hardy group ringingly resolved to form a party which would have liberty and freedom as its bywords. Just as our State was formed by men and women of different creeds, nationalities, and beliefs whose common meeting ground was a deep and elemental belief in freedom, so was the Republican Party formed.

While the Republican Party was drawing more and more believers in freedom and liberty to its folds, the party in power—the Democratic Party—was being torn apart by dissension and disagreement. Its southern element held that human property—slavery—was as valid as any other property. Another wing held to the doctrine of popular sovereignty—indifferent as to whether it would lead to the adoption of slavery in the Territories or not.

That party—the Democratic Party—failed to meet squarely the issue of the day—the issue of human liberty. They compromised on an issue on which we know there can be no compromise. In the convention of 1860 this internal strife in the Democratic Party bore fatal fruit. After a long and riotous convention, the elements within the party were irrevocably split. Two candidates were nominated and the election of the first Republican President was made inevitable. That President was a man who steadfastly refused tao compromise on principles—Abraham Lincoln.

What message do we Wisconsin Republicans—meeting in convention almost a hundred years later—draw from this hasty glimpse into the past history of our State and party?

Then, a Nation—faced with the internal break-down of the party in power—sought leadership and direction in the Republican Party—a new and unified party based upon the principle of human liberty.

Today—again faced with the disintegration of a Democratic coalition—in power for 16 long years by dint of expediency and compromise—the people again seek leadership and direction from a unified party whose basic principle is human liberty.

They will find that leadership—and that principle in the Republican Party in 1948.

Human liberty—today—is in danger. It is in danger of becoming the victim of unholy compromise. It is in danger of being sucked under in a deal between the advocates of paternalism and the disciples of unlimited Executive power. It is in danger because our national administration has lost faith in a representative government of the people.

The Democratic Party has again failed the people. It has failed because it again refuses to meet squarely the issue of human liberty.

The present national administration, in confusion and dismay, stands helplessly aside as the Democratic coalition disintegrates into the conflicting elements from which it was formed. As the Republican Party grew strong because it was formed upon the firm foundation of human liberty, so now does the Democratic Party threaten to disintegrate because they cannot agree on this basic principle.

One faction of the Democratic coalition is composed of those members who found comfort within the party as long as its leaders appeased the Soviet police state. This is the Moscow wing of the coalition. It is led by Henry Wallace, a former Democratic Vice President who, just two short years ago, was in our State campaigning for the Democratic Party. This wing has already set up its own shop and now displays its real merchandise—the appeasement of communism at any price.

The second faction, even now, threatens to repudiate the coalition's present leadership. This is the Jim Crow wing which finds itself unalterably opposed to the President's attempt to placate the Moscow wing. Indeed, it has only been selfish interests that have kept this wing within the coalition until this late date.

The third element in the Democratic coalition is the Pendergast wing of the party. It draws its sustenance from the corrupt political machines of the big cities. It is an unprincipled element whose only political philosophy is to win elections and stay in power. The present leader of the Democrats worked his way to the top through this wing and he is a dues-paying member to this very day.

Here in Wisconsin, we see the byproducts of the decay of this political party which has played fast and loose with political morality. The childish squabbling among Wisconsin Democrats over the last remaining spoils of a decadent coalition serves to demonstrate how deepseated is the schism within our opposition. Mr. Greene and Mr. Tehan apparently are not quarreling over principles. They are concerned only with who told what to whom, when, where, and why.

But it is not our purpose to discuss at length the plight of a political party which now faces disintegration. We take no lasting satisfaction from this spectacle. We deplore the consequent weakening of our great two-party system—a system which enables the American people to fix responsibilities for the conduct of their Government. Multiple parties, or multiple factions within parties, make the effective discharge of that responsibility impossible. We look forward, therefore, to the day when the Democratic Party will rebuild itself upon the foundations of political integrity and honesty.

In the meantime, we must be conscious of the fact that the instinct for self-preservation is strong and the thirst for power is great. In the face of disintegration, desperate Democrats now promise all things to all men. They seek deals by which they hope again to coalesce into an organ of political expediency. They search hard and long for a strong man who will unite their bickering groups into a popular front for election-day purposes. They have drunk from the cup of power; it will not be taken from their lips without a fight.

Our task, regardless of the predicament of the opposition, is clear. It is not in the tradition of Republicans to relax because of weakness in the rival camp. Because they are now in power, the incessant bickering among the Democrats is a tragedy at this critical point in American history. It makes all the more vital our conclusive victory in November. We pledge a fight for that victory with all of the energy and resources at our command.

Our immediate task, the task of 1948, has been clearly stated by the distinguished Republican and American who will address the convention tomorrow, Congressman DIRKSEN. He has declared that the "task of the Republican Party in 1948 is not to defeat another party but to save a country." Yes, it is that, and more than that. It is to save a country, and, in the process, to give solid meaning to the words liberty and freedom.

We Republicans have already begun that task. We have shown in the Congress, and in our State legislature, the workability of a functioning representative democracy.

On the national level, the first Republican Congress in 16 years has restored faith in representative government. It has restored faith in the capacity of a free people to govern themselves. By so doing, it has restored faith in human liberty. It has written out, in a record of achievement, its faith in the principle on which our party was founded.

During the days ahead, we Republicans will be under attack, as champions of freedom always are, from many angles. We will be targets for the barbs of the various factions into which our opposition is split. The attack will become more vicious as the plight of the opposition becomes more desperate. That attack will center upon our legislative bodies—the Eightieth Congress and our State legislature.

Even now, the leader of the Democratic coalition, as he rides the rails seeking to draw together the remnants of his party, makes it clear that he will base his last bid for power by irresponsible, venomous attacks upon the Congress. Even now, his camp followers are pointing their fingers at a Republican Congress for failing to bow down to the pressures of an executive branch which promises all things to all elements of the coalition it represents. As his plight becomes more desperate, his attacks become more vicious.

It is clear that these men, weaned for so long on the heady wine of power which New Deal Congresses abdicated to the Executive, have forgotten the meaning of freedom—and the manner in which a representative democracy breathes life into that symbol of man's highest hopes. They have forgotten that our representative democracy was established to insure the fullest possible expression of our collective desires but, at the same time, to safeguard our fundamental liberties from the tyrannies of an all-powerful state. They can't understand a Congress that can't be told what to do by the bureaucrats.

Mark this and mark it well. The Republican Eightieth Congress was a historic Congress. In a record of solid and lasting achievement, it demonstrated the workability of representative democracy and the inherent value of government by discussion. Wisconsin's Representatives and Senators—the largest solid Republican delegation in the country—played a leading role in the work of that Congress, and we Republicans can be proud of that delegation.

Consider the problems which faced this Republican Congress when it took office in 1947. It was the first Republican Congress in 16 years.

There was a jittery world situation, and facing it was a jittery national administration—a Democratic administration—which was fast losing its grip on itself and on the problems which beset our country at home and abroad. The peace which had looked so good only two short years previously was shaky on its feet and disappearing fast. There was no consistency in our foreign relations. We were vacillating between outright appeasement of the police-state aggressor and half-hearted measures to call a halt to the Red advance. With one hand, the administration would take steps to rebuff the aggressor; on the other, it pursued the policy of helping to make him strong. Our foreign policy was on the defensive. It would be well for us to remember 1946.

Internally, we were confused and disgusted. Wartime controls, controls which the administration clung to desperately, were stifling production. Recall the shortages of goods—meat, shoes, butter, stockings, shirts, bread. Black markets were common. There were fictitiously low prices on goods that could not be purchased. A long series of strikes was helping to add to the shortages induced by government controls. The power of certain labor leaders seemed greater than the power of the Federal Government or of any law of the land. Remember 1946.

At the same time, our Government had become an unwieldly monstrosity. We were spending terrific sums to maintain a growing Federal bureaucracy—a bureaucracy whose sole purpose was to stay in power and substitute governmental planning for the free play of the most productive economic system ever known to man. Our Federal budget was unbalanced, in spite of the greatest burden of taxation that an American people had ever been saddled with. Nothing was being done to reduce the huge national debt. Along with the growing distrust in the soundness of our representative government, there was a dangerous spread of foreign isms. Communists had wormed their way into our Army, our Government, and our labor unions. Remember 1946.

It was in this atmosphere of distrust, indecision, and confusion that the Eightieth Congress, the Republican Congress, began its work. It was an atmosphere in which representative democracy was to receive its greatest test. In the White House sat a man of opposite political faith. He promised cooperation, but he placed a strange interpretation on the word. It meant cooperation, if he could call the tune. It mean cooperation through the lavish use of 142 vetoes.

The men who made up this Congress were subject to no iron-fisted rule of one man, or one group of men. Threats, reprisals, and political purges had no place here. Legislation no longer slid over the bureaucrat's mimeograph machines and into the legislative hopper for the silent imprint of the rubber stamp. This was a Congress which investigated, studied, and discussed. Its leadership drew its strength, in true Republican fashion, from the entire membership. The keynote was action; the method was discussion, and the goal was sanity and honesty in a free government of the people.

What were the accomplishments of this Congress which was confronted with a black international picture, a confused and discouraging domestic outlook, a hostile President, and a vast and antagonistic political bureaucracy?

The accomplishments are there for all to examine. It is an imposing record of achievement. The record is vibrant testimony to the faith of Republicans everywhere in a representative government responsive only to the will of the people.

In the field of foreign policy, the Eightieth Congress—the Republican Congress—led our Nation from the defensive to the offensive. Reconstruction took the place of relief; decisive firmness substituted for weak-kneed appeasement.

This was a Congress which found out the facts for itself by on-the-spot study of our foreign problems. It insisted upon the clarification of our aid to Greece and Turkey and the relation of that aid to the United Nations. It forced upon the administration a reexamination of our far-eastern policy. It demanded consistency in our dealings with the nations of the world. It established the European recovery program—a monumental act of faith in the future of freedom. It passed this strengthened and safeguarded act with unparallelled speed in spite of the opposition of an administration which said, "Pass it our way or don't pass it at all."

At the outset, the Eightieth Congress knew that our policy for peace must be backed by a calm and confident military strength. It unified the armed forces—a unification which is being hamstrung because of the confusion and indecision which exists in the national administration. It had the courage to spend the savings it had brought about through hard-won economy for the strengthening of our armed branches. At the same time it insisted upon receiving a dollar's worth of defense for every precious dollar it appropriated for that purpose. In spite of interservice rivalries—tragic rivalries which could have been prevented by an intelligent administration—the Congress achieved a balance among our armed branches.

Thus, in the intimately related fields of foreign affairs and national strength, the Eightieth Congress—the Republican Congress—reestablished the leadership of the United States. It did so at a time when that leadership was never needed more—and in spite of the obstruction of a fumbling and confused Democratic administration.

The Eightieth Congress—the Republican Congress—took positive action on the domestic front. It enlisted freedom on its side in the fight to clear away the debris left by 14 years of the New Deal.

It swept away the controls which were stifling our production. It brought out into the open the inflation which the Democratic coalition sought to hide by deceitful ceiling prices and vicious black markets. It reasserted its faith in our free economic system and refused to yield to the pressure of

those who would have camouflaged the inflation brought about by huge Government spending. It did this in spite of the pleas of the titular leader of the Democratic coalition who thought he could appease inflation with more success than he had appeased the totalitarian aggressor.

This Congress did not cure inflation because inflation cannot be cured by legislation, and it was honest enough to tell that fact to the people. It enlisted the support of all elements in our economy—labor, management, agriculture, and consumer—in a fight against inflation in which it knew that all must take part. It laid the foundation for the final defeat of this menace by opening up the channels of production and by reducing the huge increase in our money supply.

The Eightieth Congress—the Republican Congress—took long-needed action to curb the vast economic powers of certain labor leaders who had set themselves, with the aid of the New Deal, far above the power of the national Government. It passed the Taft-Hartley law, an act which the weak-hearted had said could never be written. This act, denying no basic rights to American labor, forms a basis for labor peace and full production. It is an act which was vetoed by the President in a message which echoed the violent criticism of the left wing of the CIO.

The Eightieth Congress—the Republican Congress—kept faith with the people in its promises for relief from the crushing burden of oppressive taxation. It took three attempts—and three vetoes from the "cooperating" Chief Executive—before tax reduction became a fact, and it was only at the insistence of a Congress accurately reflecting the will of the people that it was possible at all. These three vetoes were written by the same man who had offered to compromise his views—by offering tax reduction at $40 a head.

The Eightieth Congress—the Republican Congress—as far as any legislative branch can without help from the executive, brought sanity to our Federal fiscal policies. It balanced the budget. It opened the way for an attack on the basic cause of inflation by providing budgetary surpluses for payment on the national debt. It reduced Federal spending in spite of the unprecedented demands made upon the Treasury by the necessity of foreign rehabilitation and national defense, and in spite of the resistance and hindrance of the President and the Federal departments. It cut the President's budget requests without regard for the unprincipled pressures of the sprawling Federal bureaucracy. It laid down the principle of economy for efficiency's sake. In a far-reaching move, it established a powerful commission which will report to the next Congress its recommendations for the entire reorganization of our executive branch.

In attempting to bring order out of the chaos in the Federal bureaus, the Congress—a Republican Congress—led the fight against the infiltration of Communists into key positions. It was an infiltration made possible by the previous position of esteem which the Moscow wing of the party enjoyed in the Democratic coalition. Republicans will have no truck with conspirators. The job of cleaning them out will be finished when a Republican is installed in the White House.

In these and in a hundred different ways, the first Republican Congress in 16 years restored the faith of people the world over in representative democracy. It gave the lie to the doubters who questioned the capacity of a free people to govern themselves. In the face of world crisis, domestic confusion and a hostile executive branch, it restored faith in human liberty by demonstrating the workability of representative government.

This is the Congress which is now under carping attack by the rail-riding President. It is attacked because it refused to bow down to his demagogic proposals—and to commit us, in a time of world crisis, to the further spending of additional billions of dollars. It is attacked by a President who says that you can't curb communism with a law, yet who proposes a law for every other human and economic problem known to man. It is attacked by a man who has become vicious as his position has grown desperate. It is attacked by a man who uses the prestige of the high office of President to resort to the tactics of a Kansas City ward heeler.

Our State legislature received much the same kind of attack as it was pounding out the splendid legislative program which has since received such wide acclaim. The far-reaching and progressive action taken by the last Wisconsin legislature will long outlive the cries of those critics who have an instinctive distrust of representative government at work. We pay tribute to that body and to our efficient and capable State administration under the able direction of our distinguished Governor.

Ours is a record, during our stewardship, of a living devotion to the principle which brought our party into being—the guaranty of human liberty under a working representative democracy. Our task is to hold fast to that principle in the face of attacks which will be made upon it by the dissident elements of a frantic opposition. Our task is to reenlist the spirit of human freedom during the days ahead—under a Republican State administration, a Republican Congress and a Republican President in 1948. It is to save a country and to demonstrate to the world the full flowering of American democracy under a cohesive national Republican administration.

We are equipped for these tasks. We have the enthusiasm and the energy. We have the organization. Rallying to our support throughout this great State and great Nation are all who pay true allegiance to the spirit which animates our party. Rallying to our support everywhere are those who cannot live unless they breathe the free air of a free nation.

We strike, today, the opening blow for the great Republican victory of 1948.

Grotesque Distortion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Raleigh News and Observer of June 12, 1948:

GROTESQUE DISTORTION

In a speech at the University of Pennsylvania commencement, former Secretary of State James F. Byrnes said two things that should have been said long ago and which should be repeated as often as may be necessary.

The first was a call for renewed efforts to demonstrate that this country is "at all times willing to live at peace with Russia on the basis of mutual respect and tolerance." That is a truth which cannot be stated too often and all persons in positions of responsibility should be particularly careful not to do or say anything that would justify even a suspicion that the United States has any other position.

Mr. Byrnes also answered sharply a charge that has been allowed to be made entirely too often without being answered. He said:

"Some of our people have the mistaken idea that no agreement can be made or has been made with the Russians that is not a surrender. That is a dangerous idea.

"Such people charge that we were 'hornswoggled' or overreached in nearly every agreement President Roosevelt made with the Soviet Union. That viewpoint is a grotesque distortion."

Speaking specifically of the much criticized Yalta agreement, Mr. Byrnes said:

"There was nothing wrong with this Yalta agreement. The trouble was that the Soviet Union later made a mockery of it.

"A realistic conclusion is that the war agreements gave the Soviet Union very little they were not in a position to take without agreement."

The record should be kept straight. Mr. Byrnes is to be commended for his contribution to that end. He should be supported by others who know the facts.

David Marcus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial that appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Sunday, June 13, 1948:

DAVID MARCUS

The struggle in Palestine has, no doubt, as many shades of meaning as there are men and women to share in it, actually or vicariously. The wealth of spiritual, historical, and cultural values of which the Holy Land is compact is a treasure in which millions have each his share, in greater or lesser amount. But the death of such a man as David Marcus gives an immediacy to the battle, makes it concrete for many to whom it might otherwise have remained a thing of distance and little substance, inspiring, perhaps, but remote, like the sounding phrases of Josephus or a passage of arms from The Talisman.

David Marcus was an American soldier, trained and commissioned at West Point. He served for 6 years as deputy commissioner of correction in New York City under Mayor LaGuardia, and became full commissioner in 1940. With the coming of war, the lines of his two earlier careers merged; he entered the Civil Affairs Division of the Army and became its head in 1943. No bomb-proofed staff officer, he saw action on many fronts, jumping into Normandy with the One Hundred and First Airborne Division on D-day. A good soldier and a good civilian servant of the public, the story of David Marcus is hardly commonplace but it is fortunately a familiar American story. And it ended under a blue-and-white flag on the road to Jerusalem, a few hours before the truce.

There are many Americans of all creeds who will mourn David Marcus because they knew him well, as a soldier, as a lawyer, as a city official, or simply as a neighbor. For them Israel's battle can never be strange or exotic. But there will be many more who never met him, who had, perhaps, only a vague recollection of his name, for whom the tangled, desperate fighting in faraway Palestine will have a new significance because a good American came to it by a route that thousands of his countrymen followed a part of the way—over the beaches in Normandy and down the contested road that led to the shock and shame of Dachau.

Supreme Court Cement Case Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article by Rader Winget:

CEMENT CASE POSES UPSET—PRICE TRADITIONS MAY REFORM AS A RESULT

(By Rader Winget)

NEW YORK.—Revolutionary change in business methods may come from a recent Supreme Court decision in the so-called cement case, a possible legal landmark in American industrial development.

The decision strikes at one of the traditional methods of quoting a series of uniform prices without regard to the distance of the customer from the producing plant.

The possibility for change is so complicated and so far reaching that considerable confusion exists as to just what will or could happen.

POSSIBLE EFECTS

Depending on final interpretation of the Supreme Court decision and future rulings now pending, together with enforcement of the law through the Federal Trade Commission, these things could occur.

1. American business could be broken up into scattered self-sufficient islands of industry.

2. Big producing centers could become smaller.

3. New production centers could rise.

4. Companies may merge or split into separate operating groups depending on location.

5. The national price structure may be decentralized, with different prices quoted in different places, some higher and some lower, depending on where you live.

Whatever the actual results in practice, and it may take years to reach the end-point, the outstanding question is whether it will be good or bad for the people. Historians probably will have to answer that.

SYSTEM HELD UNFAIR

Here is the background:

The Supreme Court April 26, in a 6-to-1 decision, upheld the Federal Trade Commission against the Cement Institute forbidding any combination or conspiracy to fix prices through a basing point system of quotations.

Justice Black in the majority decision wrote: "Concerted maintenance of the basing point delivered price system is an unfair method of competition prohibited by the Federal Trade Commission Act."

Many leaders in large industries interpret this to mean all basing point price systems and their variations are illegal. On the other hand, Robert E. Freer, chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, said it was unwarranted to assume that. Use of the basing-point system would be illegal, he said, if it was part of a price-fixing conspiracy or constituted unjust discrimination injuring competition.

HOW PRICES VARY

What is the basing-point system and who uses it?

Practically everybody uses it or is affected by it, and it has these forms:

1. Single basing point: Prices are quoted free on board (f. o. b.) at a single city, say Atlanta. Every manufacturer of a certain product will quote his price of that product f. o. b. Atlanta. The buyer pays the freight from Atlanta.

Suppose your business is in Chicago. You buy the product and it is delivered to your door at a fixed price plus freight from Atlanta, regardless of the location of the manufacturing plant. If the manufacturer is in Chicago, his freight is small. If he is in Dallas, his freight is large. You still pay only the equivalent of freight from Atlanta to Chicago.

2. Multiple basing points: The principle is the same, but the consumer can buy at the basing-point price nearest his business.

3. Zone basing price: Prices are the same within any zone regardless of the distance from the producer to the consumer. A familiar evidence of that is the phrase "prices slightly higher west of the Rockies."

POSTAL RATE EXAMPLE

4. Phantom freight: This occurs when a producer adds arbitrary freight costs to a product even though the product is not shipped the entire distance covered by the charge or when one type of freight such as rail is charged and a different method of shipment such as truck is used.

The United States postal system itself is a classic example of basing-point-system operation. A letter mailed within New York costs 3 cents. A letter mailed from New York to San Francisco costs 3 cents. The Government absorbs the difference.

Parcel-post rates are fixed on a zone basis regardless of the difference in distance within a zone.

The Government charges a phantom freight rate if it sends your air-mail letter by rail when the planes don't fly.

It absorbs freight rates when it handles large volumes of certain types of mail at a loss as a public service.

No one, however, suggests the Government should charge postage on a cost-plus-freight basis.

If business has to be done on a cost-plus-freight basis, then there are almost limitless changes in sight. Among some of them are:

1. Producers would have to move to a geographical point where their raw material freight costs and finished material freight costs would be in economical balance, either having one large plant in an area with all other competitors or a number of small plants.

2. Specialized producing areas, like steel in Pittsburgh, would produce far more than the immediate area could absorb and would have to sell in distant markets in competition with a local producer there. Their distant markets, because of added freight, would diminish.

3. One answer to that is establishment of new production centers. The automobile industry started decentralization by building scattered assembly plants to cut delivery costs. But construction of new production facilities to make low-priced goods is impossible at today's high building costs compared with prewar.

4. A general series of mergers between competitors might result in scattering production centers if separate units can't be built by a single company. But there is a risk of forming cartels that are illegal under antitrust laws.

5. Monopoly price areas and divergent prices on a geographical basis could result when one producer is located at a distance from his competitors who could not sell in his market because of the addition of freight costs. He could raise his price to that of his nearest competitor. On the other hand, producers barred from distant markets by freight rates would have to sell in their own backyard. If production exceeded demand in that area, price wars would eliminate the weakest producer.

If this total adjustment takes place over a long enough time, it could be done without chaos. Many would welcome the change. Decentralization of industry has been progressing steadily for 30 years.

The immediate aim of the Federal Trade Commission is to break up combinations fixing prices illegally to the detriment of the consumer.

The Richest Hill in the World Welcomes the Chief Executive of the Greatest Nation in the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD two newspaper articles and a copy of the speech made by President Truman in Butte, Mont., on June 8, 1948. This, and much more copy, was carried in the Montana Standard, Butte Daily Post, and other Montana papers in reporting the memorable visit of the President.

The President not only made a fighting speech which was well received by the great crowd but he also had the opportunity to see and hear the Butte High School Band—the greatest in the Nation—perform. These youngsters—the toast of the Nation at the Tournament of Roses in Pasadena—outdid themselves in their performance for President Truman and were called back time and time again for encores. The address of the President plus the outstanding performance by the 136 boys and girls, musicians, twirlers, and drum majorettes comprising the Butte High School Band has made the date of June 8, 1948 a memorable one for Butte.

The people of Butte and Anaconda and of Montana in general were happy to have had the Chief Executive visit us. We hope he will again come to visit us so that we may, in our traditional Butte spirit, once again bid him welcome.

The article follows:

POLITICS IS SUBJECT OF TALK AT NARANCHE STADIUM—CROWD ESTIMATED AT 10,000 TURNS OUT TO HEAR ADDRESS DESCRIBED AS MOST SPIRITED ONE OF WESTERN JUNKET

Discarding all pretense of a "nonpolitical" visit President Harry S. Truman, speaking before an estimated 10,000 residents of Butte and other nearby communities at Naranche Memorial Stadium here Tuesday night, lashed out bitterly at what he termed, "this famous Eightieth Congress, which is planning adjournment to go to Philadelphia, but which should stay in session in Washington until it gets things done."

In an "off-the-cuff" address, which newswriters aboard the Presidential special train said was his most spirited "fight talk" since he started his western swing, the President called for "action now" on what he said was his "long-shelved appeal for stand-by price controls," and for Government help on adequate, low-cost housing.

"The housing shortage," he said, "is not a theory. It is a condition which has resulted in the fact that the poor man and the veteran cannot pay the prices required for adequate housing."

Lashing out at Congress for vacillation in connection with price controls, he said, "I am extremely interested in the present situation with regard to prices. They are still going up. Now three times since this Congress has been in power I have asked for a control of the price situation. In January 1947, again the same year when I called the special session, and again in 1948 in the message on the state of the Union I asked that conditions be faced. You know the results I got. I was told that the prices would control themselves."

The President confined his Butte address to discussion of domestic problems and it was evident that his plan is to make high prices the No. 1 domestic issue in the political campaign.

With regard to foreign affairs, Mr. Truman gave credit to the Nation's bipartisan policy in this field for having made America a world leader. "I hope," he said, "our bipartisan policy continues. We must stop politics at the water's edge."

Indicative of even more strenuous campaigning yet to come, he said:

"The welfare of our country is at stake. I want you to get the facts as they are. Later I will tell you what you have to do to meet the situation."

Specifically the President practically recommended return of price control to the Government. Under Government control he said, the "consumer's interests were looked after."

Speaking briefly concerning labor situations, the first Missourian ever to become Chief Executive and the seventh Vice President to be elevated by a death in the White House, also chided Congress. "The Republicans said in their platform—of course, that is the platform of Congress now—they were going to make a strong Labor Department. Well, you know what they have done. They have almost completely abolished the Labor Department Act of 1946 to pieces and they have succeeded and admirably."

The huge crowd which packed the north bleachers and swarmed out over the football field into each end zone gave the President, Mrs. Truman, and their daughter, Margaret, a rousing ovation upon their entrance to the stadium. However, during the course of his address, the assemblage applauded only twice or three times. However, the public-address system, trouble with which delayed the ceremonies at the outset, never did generate enough volume to boom out to all the crowd.

W. D. Murray, Butte attorney, was chairman for the stadium ceremones. He presented the Butte high-school band under direction of Henry J. Schiesser, describing the band as one that was made up of "boys and girls who are the sons and daughters of families of Butte miners, business, and professional men."

The band had preceded President Truman and his party into the stadium and stood at attention while awaiting the Chief Executive's entrance to the platform from the high-school building. As the President, accompanied by Navy and Army aides, local and State leaders, mounted the platform the band played Hail to the Chief. Then, following Chairman Murray's introduction, the band swung into its Presidential program routine.

The band, toast of the Nation in its Pasadena Tournament of Roses on New Year's Day, outdid that superb performance in its showing before President Truman.

Working under handicap due to the fact that the 136 boys and girls, musicians, twirlers, and drum majorettes were forced to perform their intricate maneuvers in limited space between the two 30-yard lines of the stadium football field, the band gave one of its greatest exhibitions of all time.

President Truman beamed as the band, marching with clocklike precision and playing America, formed a huge shield with a large "T" for Truman in the center, and then gave a Truman cheer. Then at a signal from Majorette Jean Ann Fisher the youthful musicians swung into Missouri Waltz, a Truman favorite, and the Chief Executive really turned on the personality. His features glowed with pleasure, as did those of Mrs. Truman and their daughter, Margaret.

Then breaking into the John Phillip Sousa's immortal Stars and Stripes Forever, the band did a rear march toward the main audience on the north side of the playing field. Without apparent loss of motion, and with lightninglike rapidity the band converged once more toward the Presidential platform, while doing a Pasadena rcutine, playing such numbers as Pony Boy, Lone Prairie, and a medley of Indian music. At this point the band formed a huge map of Montana with gaily attired twirlers, resplendent in their shining white-satin suits, went through varied acrobatics. Then followed the National Emblem March and Tiger Rag, interspersed with numerous other modernistic selections. During the Tiger Rag number the entire group weaved in and out like angry tigers thrashing about in cages.

Followed a fanfare and the band rapidly formed an outline of the White House with 12 charming majorettes and twirlers topping the outline, waving the national colors of red, white, and blue. As the outline of the White House was completed the band played Hail, Columbia. Working once more with militarylike precision the band moved into basic alinement and passed in review before the President while repeating the thrilling music of the Stars and Stripes Forever. Thunderous cheers from the huge assemblage greeted completion of the band's portion of the stadium program.

Upon completion of the formal program by the band, Mayor Barry O'Leary, general chairman in charge of arrangements for the reception of the President, gave his address of welcome on behalf of the citizens of Butte. He said:

"It is with a deep sense of responsibility, and also one of pride, that I welcome the Nation's Chief Executive to Butte tonight. I say responsibility in the fact that I am delegated to perform this task on the part of the residents of Butte. I say pride because of the fact that I am justifiably proud of the loyalty of the citizens of Butte to the principle of American government.

"This loyalty, Mr. President, was never more forcibly demonstrated than it was during the days of World War II. During those crucial days, Mr. President, Butte and its people, labor and management alike, united in all-out effort to successfully prosecute the war. As you look northward from this stadium tonight, Mr. President, you can see the outline of the richest hill on earth. The resources of that hill were placed at our Government's disposal during the war days. The work of the people of Butte provided the medium for the shipment of all-important metals and other resources to the battle lines.

"Tonight, Mr. President, in addition to extending you a hearfelt welcome on behalf of the citizens of Butte, I also assure you of the continued loyalty of our community to those principles which have made our Nation great. Mr. President, may your stay and the stay of your party here be most happy. Butte is proud to say, 'Welcome to our Nation's leader,' and to bid you Godspeed and blessing upon your departure."

Mayor O'Leary, following his talk, read telegrams from Senator JAMES E. MURRAY and Congressman MIKE MANSFIELD expressing regret at their inability to be present. Chairman Murray then presented Mrs. Truman with a copper plate, hand-made in Butte from copper mined on Butte Hill. The gift was a presentation of the PEO Sisterhood of Butte, a women's organization in which Mrs. Truman is prominent in her home state of Missouri. At the same time Karen Schiesser, small daughter of Director and Mrs. Schiesser, of the Butte High Band, and a twirler in that organization, presented the President with a large picture of the band. Inscribed on the picture was "The Butte High School band proudly presents its appreciation to President H. S. Truman in commemoration of his visit to Butte, June 8, 1948. Henry J. Schiesser, director."

Chief Justice Hugh Adair of the Montana Supreme Court welcomed President Truman on the part of all residents of the Treasure State. Mr. Adair said, "we are met tonight on the 'richest hill in the world' to welcome the Chief Executive of the greatest Nation in the world. The people of Montana are happy at the privilege and high honor of acting as host to our President. We hope you come again, and again and again." Justice Adair reminded the President that the Columbia River, which created so much flood damage on its rampage, had its outgrowth in Silver Bow Creek of this community.

Seated on the Presidential platform, in addition to the naval and military aides, Mrs. Truman, Margaret Truman, and secret service men, were Mrs. Wallace Kingsbury, Valier, State Democratic vice chairman; Mrs. W. D. Murray, Mrs. Bart Riley, and Mrs. Barry O'Leary, Butte; Lt. Gov. Ernest Eaton, Billings, now acting Governor of the State in absence of Gov. Sam C. Ford and Lester Loble of Helena, State Democratic chairman. Paul Cannon and R. H. Glover, cochairmen of the general reception committee with Mayor O'Leary, also were on the platform while other general committee members occupied seats of honor to the left of the speakers' stand.

President Truman, opening his address, said: "I think it would be a nice thing if the band would play just one more piece before I speak." Asked by Director Schiesser what he would like the band to play, President Truman replied: "One of Sousa's numbers." The band swung into "Stars and Stripes Forever."

At the conclusion of the number, President Truman said: "I think half the reason for this great crowd tonight is that they just had to come to see this band. I would like the band to come to Missouri and steal the show sometime."

At the conclusion of his address, as officers and secret-service operators prepared the way for him to leave the platform, the President again requested that the band play and the happy Butte youngsters went through their routine, the President leaving the platform to the strains of the Missouri Waltz.

TEXT OF TRUMAN'S BUTTE ADDRESS

Mr. Governor, Mr. Mayor, Mr. Chairman, you know what I think? I think it would be a fine thing for this band to play just one more piece before I have to speak.

Thank you very much. I think that more than half of the reason for this good crowd being here tonight is just to see and hear this grand band. I understand they went out to Pasadena and stole the show. I wish you could come back to Missouri some time and steal the show. I can't tell you how overwhelmed I am at the welcome you gave me this afternoon on the street. In Kansas City, Mo., which is a suburb of my old home town, I have never had such a welcome. There are only two other places I know of to compare with it. That was Mexico City and Rio de Janeiro, the capital of Brazil.

I am indeed happy to be here tonight to say a word or two to this audience in this great city in Montana, this great city which made such a great contribution to winning two World Wars. I have been here before on several occasions. On one occasion I was here as a candidate for Vice President of the United States and had a wonderful representation. Of course, it wasn't anything like this because I was only a candidate for Vice President at that time, but I enjoyed my visit immensely and we evidently did some good.

I am also happy to be here in the State of Senator MURRAY and Congressman MIKE MANSFIELD. Both these gentlemen are close personal friends of mine. They both ably and capably represent Montana in the Congress of the United States and I have confidence in both of them.

I would like to discuss with you, just for a little while, some of the things with which this country is faced domestically. We have

a bipartisan foreign policy and I hope that bipartisan foreign policy will always continue. We are now the world's leader and we must have a foreign policy that is continuing. That is the reason it is necessary for our political efforts to stop at the water's edge. But there are other things which I can discuss and things in which you are vitally interested.

When the World War ceased, when Japan folded up, everyone was afraid that things would go into a tailspin and that there would be no jobs and that there might be a depression. On September 6, 1945, I sent a policy message to the Congress of the United States and, among other things, asked Congress to make an extension of price control, which would expire in 1946. And then again in January 1946 I made the same request of that Congress, and again in May I made the same request of that Congress, and price control was not extended until June 30, 1946, on the day on which it expired. And they sent me a bill that I could not sign; I had to veto it. It took 30 days for them to write another bill, which was almost as bad but I had to sign that or get nothing, and I signed it. It did not work. Prices began to climb and I immediately warned Congress what would happen if they could not control prices, and along in November 1946 about 66⅔ percent of the voters stayed at home and you elected the present Congress. You elected the present Congress.

I had a telegram just a little while ago from a group of laboring men on the West Coast, requesting me not to appoint a board to settle the dispute between them and their employer because, under the present labor law, it would not be to their advantage. I sent them a reply to that and told them that I am the President of the United States and I am sworn to enforce the laws that are on the books of the United States and I shall follow the law. They should have thought of that situation in November when they weren't voting.

But I am extremely interested in the present situation with regard to prices. They are still going up. Now three times since this Congress has been in power I have asked for a control of the price situation. In January 1947, again in 1947, when I called the special session, and again in 1948 in the message on the state of the Union, I asked for conditions to be met with which we are faced. You know the results I got. I was told that the prices would control themselves. Well, they will. Now the prices are so arranged that the people who have a lot of money can get anything they want. The people with very little money can't get what they want and food prices are at the top of the ladder. They have one of these graphs where they run lines up like that and the food prices run off the graph and it is the poor man who is affected by that. Under Government control of prices, the consumer's interest is looked after. Under the control we have now, it is often the man who controls the food and the clothing and the things like that and he can take all the traffic can bear and the common, everyday man can go hang if he can't do without it. I am not in that class.

I am out here to tell you people just exactly what is the matter with the situation, and the situation is just this: Price controls were released too quickly; production did not catch up with consumption. We have now more people at work than ever have been at work before in the history of the country, and the gloom artists said we would have people out of work. They have money to spend and they want goods and services, and when they are not available and there is no ceiling to prevent them from going out of sight, then the poor man can't get what he needs to wear and to live on.

Speaking about places to live. There is a housing shortage all over the United States. A lot of houses were just washed away at the mouth of the Columbia River. Some 18,000 people, I am told, have been made homeless by the rampage of the Columbia River. Part of that river started here in Silver Bow Creek. If we had control of the Silver Bow Creeks that go to make up the river, we could have stopped those floods. More than 4 years ago, in the Congress—in the Senate—there was introduced into the Senate a bill called the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill. TAFT has turned it around and calls it the other way, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. We worked on that bill, and it is a housing bill in the interest of the people of the whole country and not just in the interest of the real estate lobby. That bill passed the Senate three times—even passed the present Senate with the help of a lot of good men who knew what they were doing. It has been shelved in the House, is still shelved in the House, and the poor man and the veteran will be out of housing because they can't afford to pay the prices, because prices have gone out of sight in that line, too. I asked for the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, but I don't think I am going to get it; I think Congress will adjourn and I think some Members of this Congress will go to Philadelphia and try to fool the people into making them believe they have done something. If this Congress goes away without passing the agricultural bill, housing bill, without doing something about prices, this Congress has not done anything for the country. They should stay there until they get those things done.

This Congress said in its platform, the Republicans said in their platform—of course, that is the platform of Congress now—they said they were going to make a strong Labor Department, make something out of the Labor Department. Well, you know what they have done. They have almost completely abolished the Labor Department. They would not pass an employment bill way back right after the war, along in 1946. Senator MURRAY introduced the Employment Act of 1946 and it was passed by the Congress at that time. This Congress has spent its time trying to tear the Employment Act of 1946 to pieces, and they have succeeded and admirably. They are not satisfied with that. They have cut out the appropriation, or most of it, for the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and you know what that Bureau does. It shows us what the economic situation in the country is. It shows us what prices are and what causes their condition. They not only knocked out the price control and refused to enact another one which would be the control and brake on the situation, they are taking out the speedometer which tells you how fast you are going, how high prices are going up. They did not want a brake on prices; now they don't want a speedometer; they don't want us to know about that. If that is helping the Labor Department, then I don't understand government.

I wish I could stand here all evening and enumerate the things that should be done but have not been done by this famous Eightieth Congress. I could stand here for I-don't-know-how-long and tell you how they tore up the budget. They said they were going to cut billions off the budget last year. They finally came out with an expenditure of $200,000,000 more than I am asking for. The Treasury every year has to make refunds to people all over who overpay their taxes; they return about $2,300,000,000 to people who pay too much taxes, and they took out of that some $900,000,000 and said they were saving money. They had to put back $1,800,000,000 more to take the place of that. And that $900,000,000 was drawing 6 percent interest. That is economy in reverse.

I wish I could stand here all night talking to you about this because you should know these things—to tell you the truth, which you have not been getting. They have been telling you a lot of things about Harry Truman, but the country has been pretty well run in the last 3 years, business is better than ever in the history of the country, there is more money in the banks and they won't shut up in your face like they used to. That is one thing you can be proud of. But I want to say to you the welfare of this country is at stake and I want your level consideration of the facts as they are. Sometime later, I am going to tell you what you have to do to meet the situation.

It has been a pleasure to come out here and discuss this with you. I know you are interested. I know this is an intelligent audience because I have been here before and talked to you and you believed in me. I hope you continue to do that. Thank you very much.

"FINEST RECEPTION ON ENTIRE TRIP," PRESIDENT ASSERTS

"This is the best and finest reception I have had on the entire trip," President Harry S. Truman told a Post-Standard reporter in a special interview just before his train pulled out for Missoula and other west coast points, Tuesday night.

"I was tremendously pleased with the warmth of the reception accorded me in Butte. I want to thank the committee on arrangements and the people of Butte for this tremendous welcome."

The President then expressed his pleasure at the special guard of honor accorded him by the Butte miners in their working garb and said it recalled to him his previous visit to Butte and the subsequent formation of the Hard Rock Club in Washington, composed of men who visited the mining city with him in 1944.

Illinois Mayors Favor Slum Clearance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith letters which I have received from the Honorable John T. Connors, mayor of the city of East St. Louis, Ill., and from the Honorable C. H. Bloom, mayor of Rockford, Ill., in support of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, with provisions for slum clearance and public housing:

EAST ST. LOUIS, ILL., *June 9, 1948.*

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND MEL: I am writing you in behalf of Senate bill No. 866 which will be ready for House consideration the early part of next week. As the city council and myself are very much interested in it, I ask that you support this bill without any revisions.

Yours truly,

JOHN T. CONNORS,
Mayor.

ROCKFORD, ILL., *June 11, 1948.*

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
Congressman from Illinois,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRICE: Last Monday the Rockford City Council adopted a resolution in support of the passage in the House of the T-E-W bill, Senate 866.

Rockford, like so many other cities, has a serious housing shortage, and therefore is vitally interested that the House support this bill, especially the slum-clearance and public-housing titles. Only through a comprehensive slum-clearance and housing act can older cities effectively correct and eliminate blighted and slum areas and provide modern, sanitary housing in these areas.

Therefore it is urged that you vote for the enactment of an adequate housing bill.

Very respectfully yours,

C. H. BLOOM,
Mayor of Rockford.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the brother of one of our outstanding younger colleagues has written an extraordinary series of articles from Palestine for the Boston Post.

Aside from the affection and interest we all feel for the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I have found and believe others will find the dispatches from his brother, Mr. Robert Kennedy, of extraordinary interest. I cannot refrain from pointing out that the Kennedy family has personal ties with England which might have been expected to lead to a glossing over of some of the British terrorism and bad faith in Palestine. Instead, Mr. Kennedy, the journalist, has given a vivid account of the country and the events now going on which is unmistakably honest and impartial.

The text of the second and third articles in the series follows, the first already having been introduced into the RECORD. The fourth I shall insert in the future.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Post of June 4, 1948]

JEWS HAVE FINE FIGHTING FORCE—MAKE UP FOR LACK OF ARMS WITH UNDYING SPIRIT, UNPARALLELED COURAGE—IMPRESS WORLD

(This is the second of a series of four articles on the Palestine situation written for the Post by Robert Kennedy, Harvard senior and son of the former Ambassador to Great Britain. Young Kennedy has been traveling through the Middle East and his first-hand observations, appearing exclusively in the Post, will be of considerable interest in view of the current crisis.)

(By Robert Kennedy)

The Jewish people in Palestine who believe in and have been working toward this national state have become an immensely proud and determined people. It is already a truly great modern example of the birth of a nation with the primary ingredients of dignity and self-respect.

Malca and her family to me are the personification of that determination. She is a young girl of the age of 23 and her husband and four brothers are members of the Haganah. She herself is with the intelligence corps and worked on the average of 15 hours a day, which evidently was not unusual. She had seen and felt much horror and told me the story of a case she had just handled.

A Jewish girl in her teens was picked up by some members of the Haganah on the road from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem and, as she was injured, she was taken to the Hebrew Hospital in Jerusalem. They believed that she had somehow been separated from a Jewish convoy which had just gone through and which had had a scrap with the Arabs.

She was particularly noticed because of the strange people who were her visitors and by the fact that she insisted on being moved to the English hospital. Malca was sent to question her. She was turned away gruffly by the girl after the girl admitted that she had in reality been in a British tank with a boy friend and wanted nothing to do with the Jews. The Jewish agency offered to send the girl out on a farm in order to let her regain her health and give her a new start, but she just demanded her release which they were forced to give her. She continued consorting with British police despite warnings from the Stern gang.

BROTHER SHOOTS SISTER

One night the Stern gang followed the tactics of the underground forces in the last war. They shaved all the hair off the girl's head. Two days after Malca told me this story the sequel took place. The girl's brother returned for leave from duty with the Haganah up in Galilee and, finding her in such a state shot her.

Malca's youngest brother is only 13, but every night he takes up his post as a sentry with the Haganah at a small place outside of Jerusalem. His mother and father wait up every night until midnight for him and his older brother, 15, to return home. The other two brothers, both younger than Malca, give full-time duty with combat troops.

An understanding of the institutions it contains, and of the persons that run these institutions, is most important if one would make up one's mind as to the worth of this de facto Jewish state.

I visited and inspected a community farm through the kindness of a Jew who 40 years ago was in Boston making speeches for my grandfather, John F. Fitzgerald, when he was a candidate for Congress. A third of the agricultural population live in such community farms which were set up originally to help newly arrived refugees who had no money or prospects. They are in reality self-sustaining states within a state and all the people in common undergo arduous toil and labor and make great sacrifices in order that their children might become heir to a home. An example of this is that when a child is 1 year old he is placed in a common nursery, with the result that all but the sick and infirm are able to devote their talents to the common cause. They get paid nothing for they need no money. Everything is financed by a group of elected overseers who get their money by selling what the farms produce. In our country we shrink from such tactics but in that country their very lives depend upon them.

The whole thing is done on a volunteer basis and one may leave the farm with his proportionate share of wealth at any time he chooses.

The one we visited was at Givat Brenner and, although no one paid attention to the firing going on the plain below, one could see all around preparations being undertaken for the coming fight.

I talked to members of the underground organization Irgun. They were responsible for the King David Hotel disaster and told me proudly that they were responsible for blowing up the Cairo Haifa train which had just taken place with the loss of 50 British soldiers.

DISILLUSIONED

They believed the time had long since passed for the Jewish people to expect anything but treachery and broken promises from the outside world. If they wanted an independent state they would have to fight for it, and before they could even do that, they had to rid the country of foreign troops. They believe unquestionably that if it weren't for their so-called terrorist activities the British would have remained on in their country. Bevin's recent speeches in the House of Commons, they argue, have been ample proof of that. The question, though, in other Jews' minds is whether this compensated for what they have lost in good will by such tactics.

I went to the training camp at Nathanya, north of Tel Aviv, where for 3 weeks and with very little equipment, Jewish youths, trained mostly by former British officers, were attempting to learn the basic tenets of army life. We watched a first-week group attempt an obstacle course, and for many the flesh was weak, but it emphasized all the more what can be accomplished when the spirit is willing. We watched a graduation class make its final round and they gave the appearance that they might well be whipped into a fighting force before much time had passed.

The security forces and Haganah are far more experienced. After landing at Lydda Airport, I was immediately taken to be questioned and my credentials examined by the Haganah. After being released and going to my hotel in Tel Aviv, I went for a walk around this city of 200,000 inhabitants. I wasn't out for 10 minutes before I was recognized as a foreigner and picked up by the Haganah, blindfolded and once again brought to headquarters for questioning.

ALL VOLUNTEERS

Recognized immediately, I was released again with profuse apologies "that one can't be too careful." They are careful and have the means at their disposal to act. It is a volunteer force supported completely by the people by contributions and taxes that they levy on themselves. All the members are volunteers, but social ostracism results for those who are able to and have not donated their services. I was in a night club and MP's found a young man without his Jewish agency "draft card" which he claimed to have left at home. The proprietor refused to have music played or food and drinks served until the young Jew left the premises.

Besides these indications of spirit and determination, there is another equally important consideration—the remembrance of the brutal inhuman treatment received by the Jews in the countries of Europe.

A group of Jews were being herded out of Hungary across the Danube into Austria when one turned to the soldiers guarding them and said, "What shall we do? Where shall we go? The Germans don't want us." The guard pointed to the river.

I talked to a Haganah soldier who fled from Prague as the Germans were taking over the city and he and his brother, who was killed, fought with the British throughout the war. He received news that his mother and two sisters whom he had left in Prague were killed by the Germans and that his home had been completely destroyed.

CONDITIONS IN RUSSIA

I talked to a former major in the Russian army who had spent 5 years with a tank corps. Although the official Russian Government policy is one of hands off and toleration, he believed the individuals who formulate the policy and the Russian people as a whole are more anti-Semitic than the Germans. When he returned to his village after the war, things became so intolerable that he was finally forced to leave and had made his way to Palestine, where he had been for less than a month.

He told of standing in line for an hour in his Russian village to procure some rationed goods. When he finally got to the head of the line he was told that the store had just run out of that commodity. It began to

happen with increasing regularity. He and his fellow Jews were completely ostracized from any of the political or social affairs of the community.

The Jews who have been lucky enough to get to Palestine are hardy and tough. They are limited to two alternatives, for there is no country or group of countries that would ever even consider taking 800,000 Jews. They can go into the Mediterranean Sea and get drowned or they can stay and fight and perhaps get killed. They will fight and they will fight with unparalleled courage. This is their greatest and last chance. The eyes of the world are upon them and there can be no turning back.

Their shortages in arms and numbers are more than compensated by an undying spirit that the Arabs, Iraqui, Syrians, Lebanese, Saudi Arabians, Egyptians, and those from Trans-Jordan can never have. They are a young, tough, determined nation and will fight as such.

BRITISH POSITION HIT IN PALESTINE—KENNEDY SAYS THEY SEEK TO CRUSH JEWISH CAUSE BECAUSE THEY ARE NOT IN ACCORD WITH IT

(This is the third of a series of four articles on Palestine situation written for the Post by Robert Kennedy, Harvard senior and son of the former Ambassador to Great Britain. Young Kennedy has been traveling through the Middle East and his first-hand observations, appearing exclusively in the Post, will be of considerable interest in view of the current crisis.)

(By Robert Kennedy)

I was in Palestine over Easter week and even then people knew there was absolutely no chance to preserve peace. They just wanted the British out, so that a decision could be reached either way. An early departure of the British has been far more important strategically to the Jews than to the Arabs.

The city of Jerusalem has more Jews than Arabs but the immediate surrounding territory is predominantly Arab. Through part of that hilly territory winds the narrow road that leads from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. It is by this road that the Jewish population within Jerusalem must be supplied, but it is fantastically easy for the Arabs to ambush a convoy as it crawls along the difficult pass. On my trip from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem I saw grim realities of that fact and while in Jerusalem the failure and destruction of another Jewish convoy made meat non-existent and lengthened food queues for other items.

The Arabs living in the old city of Jerusalem have kept the age old habit of procuring their water from the individual cisterns that exist in almost every home. The Jews being more "educated" (an Arab told me that this was their trouble and now the Jews were going to really pay for it) had a central water system installed with pipes bringing fresh hot and cold water. Unfortunately for them, the reservoir is situated in the mountains and it and the whole pipe line are controlled by the Arabs. The British would not let them cut the water off until after May 15 but an Arab told me they would not even do it then. First they would poison it.

ORTHODOX COMMUNITY

Within the old city of Jerusalem there exists a small community of orthodox Jews. They wanted no part of this fight but just wanted to be left alone with their wailing wall. Unfortunately for them, the Arabs are unkindly disposed toward any kind of Jew and their annihilation would now undoubtedly have been a fact had it not been that at the beginning of hostilities the Haganah moved several hundred well-equipped men into their quarter.

This inability to make any long range military maneuvers because of the presence of the British has been a great and almost disastrous handicap to the Jews. If the brief but victorious military engagement on the Tel Aviv-Jerusalem road had not taken place, the Jewish cause would have suffered such a setback as to be virtually lost. If the Haganah had waited for May 15, and the withdrawal of the British troops, there would be few alive in Jerusalem today. Strong units of that body had moved into the hills on either side of that strategic road and repelled Arab counterattacks long enough for several hundred truckloads to make the 40-mile trip into the city, and then, only after threats from the British commander to use force against them, had withdrawn from their positions. As a Jew said to me at the time, "This is our battle of the Atlantic." The maneuvers had to take place and took place despite the British.

POWER SUPPLY

The same basic difficulty that exists in relation to the water exists with regard to electric and power supply. Fortunately, an immediate danger is not yet present, but the Arabs have had months of preparation of a maneuver they know their opponents must eventually make.

The Jewish ghetto in the old city of Jerusalem would not have been in such an untenable position if it could have been periodically relieved, or if with a Jewish victory in that area it could have been connected with the main Jewish section in the new city.

The Jews have small settlements or community farms such as Givat Brenner in completely hostile territory. They take pride that, despite the greatest difficulties, they have not evacuated any of them. From the very tip of Galilee right down to the arid Negiv these communities exist with such Jewish names as Zan, Safad, Yehsem, Mishmar Haemak, Ben Sheba, Laza. All have their supply problems. But no great military operation can be undertaken into Arab territory to relieve the increasing Arab pressure.

NEED TRUE FACTS

In addition to these handicaps that the Jews suffered through the presence of the British, there are many more far-reaching aspects of British administration which unfortunately concern or, rather, involve us in the United States.

Having been out of the United States for more than two months at this time of writing, I notice myself becoming more and more conscious of the great heritage and birthright to which we as United States citizens are heirs and which we have the duty to preserve. A force motivating my writing this paper is that I believe we have failed in this duty or are in great jeopardy of doing so. The failure is due chiefly to our inability to get the true facts of the policy in which we are partners in Palestine. The British Government, in its attitude toward the Jewish population in Palestine, has given ample credence to the suspicion that they are firmly against the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine.

When I was in Cairo shortly after the blowing up of the Jewish Agency I talked to a man who held a high position in the Arab League. He had just returned from Palestine where he had, among other things, interviewed and arranged transportation to Transjordan for the Arab responsible for that Jewish disaster. This Arab told him that after the explosion, upon reaching the British post which separated the Jewish section from a small neutral zone set up in the middle of Jerusalem, he was questioned by the British officers in charge. He quite freely admitted what he had done and was given immediate passage with the remark, "Nice going."

BRITISH MARKINGS

When I was in Tel Aviv, every night there was mortar duels between that city and Jaffa. One day I went to inspect the damage and found, amongst the ruins, the fin of a mortar shell with complete British markings. I was told by the commander of the Haganah defending Tel Aviv that this was very common and that the day before a British captain went so far as to come over and inspect his marksmanship.

Just before I arrived in Palestine there was the notorious story of the foundry outside of Tel Aviv. It was situated in a highly contested area and the British accused the Jews of using it as a sniper post for the Jaffa-Jerusalem road. One day the British moved in, stripping the Jews of all arms and ordered them to clear out within 10 minutes. The British had scarcely departed when a group of armed Arabs moved in, killing or wounding all the occupants. The British Government was most abject in its apologies.

There is, of course, no way to tell whether these stories are true, but the fact remains that they have been widely distributed and are widely believed.

I came in contact personally, however, with evidence that demonstrated clearly the British bitterness toward the Jews. I have ridden in Jewish armored car convoys which the British have stopped to inspect for arms. As always, there were members of the Haganah aboard and they quickly broke down their small arms, passing the pieces among the occupants to conceal them so as to prevent confiscation. Satisfied that none existed, the convoy, supposedly unarmed, was allowed to pass into Arab territory. If the arms had been found and confiscated and Arabs had attacked, there would have been but a remote chance of survival of any of the occupants. There have been many not as fortunate as we.

BRITISH INFORMANTS

When I was in Tel Aviv the Jews informed the British Government that 600 Iraqi troops were going to cross into Palestine from Transjordan by the Allenby Bridge on a certain date and requested the British to take appropriate action to prevent this passage. The troops crossed unmolested. It is impossible for the British to patrol the whole Palestinian border to prevent illegal crossings but such flagrant violations should certainly have led to some sort of action.

Mr. Marshall's informants must have been British, for an item appeared in the Herald-Tribune of April 29 quoting Mr. Marshall as saying that, according to all information available to him, "no invasion by the British-trained army of King Abdullah was planned and that a spokesman for the Arab League had assured the United States that Arab forces were not invading Palestine."

Five weeks ago I saw several thousand non-Palestinian Arab troops in Palestine, including many of the famed British-trained and equipped Arab legionnaires of King Abdullah. There were also soldiers from Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Transjordan, and there were all proudly pointed out to me by a spokesman of the Arab higher committee. He warned me against walking too extensively through Arab districts as most of the inhabitants there were now foreign troops. Every Arab to whom I talked spoke of thousands of soldiers massed in the terrible triangle of Nabulus Tukarim Janin and of hundreds that were pouring in daily.

OVERSUBSCRIBED

When I was in Lebanon and asked a dean at the American University at Beyruth if many students were leaving for the fight in Palestine, he shrugged and said, "Not now—the quota has been oversubscribed." When journeying by car from Jerusalem to Amman I passed many truckloads of armed Arabs and even then Jericho was alive with Arab troops. There is no question that it was taken over by the Arabs for an armed camp long before May 15.

Our Government first decided that justice was on the Jewish side in their desire for a

homeland, and then it reversed its decision temporarily. Because of this action I believe we have burdened ourselves with a great responsibility in our own eyes and in the eyes of the world. We fail to live up to that responsibility if we knowingly support the British Government, who, behind the skirts of their official position, attempt to crush a cause with which they are not in accord. If the American people knew the true facts, I am certain a more honest and forthright policy would be substituted for the benefit of all.

Churchill Said Britain's Dependence on the United States Is a "Terrible Fact Which Glares Upon Us All"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, in statements I made in this Chamber on March 29 and June 10 regarding the Marshall plan, I held the position that it was morally wrong for this Government to spend the American taxpayers' money to support incompetent, nonproductive socialistic governments in Europe; that Europe would not recover economically until they terminated all government restrictions on production and trade and be permitted to put their own house in order.

No one will accuse Winston Churchill, the great British statesman, of being anything but a patriotic and able public servant. It is gratifying to see that he maintains the same viewpoint and recognizes some plain, economic facts that our Government completely ignores.

The following is a United Press dispatch from London, June 12, quoting Mr. Churchill's remarks on this subject:

CHURCHILL BLASTS SOCIALIST SNIPING AFTER UNITED STATES LOANS

LONDON, June 12.—Winston Churchill charged Britain's Labor Government today with biting the American hand that feeds it.

The wartime British prime minister declared with tears in his eyes that his nation's Socialist government is able to keep going only because of doles and loans generously given by the capitalistic United States.

SLAPS WITH ONE HAND

Yet, he said, the government slaps at the United States system of free enterprise with one hand, while holding out the other for aid from across the Atlantic.

Churchill spoke to 7,000 cheering young members of his Conservative Party at a rally in Royal Albert Hall. He was visibly affected by the tremendous ovation given him as he entered the great circular hall with Mrs. Churchill, Anthony Eden, minority leader of commons, and other members of his party.

He trembled slightly as he stood with the rest of the assembly during the singing of the Conservative Party song, "Land of Hope and Glory." Mrs. Churchill reached over and patted his hand reassuringly.

As he rose to speak, Churchill was greeted with a second ovation. He wiped his eyes with his handkerchief as he launched into a characteristically Churchillian blast at the government he opposes.

"BAFFLES OUR LANGUAGE"

"How Socialist ministers can go about bragging of their social program and of nationalization of industry on party grounds, how they can deride the system of free enterprise and capitalism which makes America great and wealthy and at the same time eagerly seek aid, which has hitherto been so generously granted from across the Atlantic, is a grimace which baffles the limitations of our language to explain," Churchill said.

"We are not earning our own living or paying our way, nor does the government hold out any prospect of our doing so in the immediate future.

"Unless we free our country, while time remains, from the perverse doctrine of socialism, there can be no hope of recovery. This island cannot maintain its position as a great power under a socialist or collectivist system."

Churchill said Britain's dependence on the United States is a "terrible fact which glares upon us all."

"LOAN WAS SQUANDERED"

"I had hoped the loan which we borrowed from the United States in 1945 would be used to tide us over in the transition from war to peace and that it would give us a breathing space to adjust our affairs after the exhaustion of war," he said.

Platform for Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill:

(Insert here the name of friend, fellow worker, associate in business, community leader, editor, clergyman, educator, or any official now holding public office)

PLATFORM FOR AMERICANS

1. Stop the march of socialism. Pitilessly expose communism. Restore the American incentives to work, own, and save, and the old rewards to individuals for producing more and better goods.

2. Defend human rights to hold, use, and dispose of all property honestly acquired, and refrain from confiscating the property or income of any class.

3. Deport aliens having un-American ideals. Keep out undesirable immigration. Raise the standards for naturalized citizenship.

4. Stop Government use of the taxpayers' money to compete against private enterprise.

5. Stop politicians from buying votes by promising Federal aid (resulting eventually in Federal control) for education, socialized medicine, and public housing.

6. Stop the waste of public funds. Reduce the Federal pay roll by 1,000,000 needless jobholders. Balance the budget. Stop inflation—the process which, by cheapening the dollar, defrauds all thrifty Americans who have insurance policies, social-security cards, bank deposits, or investments. Keep American citizens solvent.

7. Limit by constitutional amendment the peacetime taxing power of the Federal Government. Abolish or reduce immediately taxes which especially hinder saving and capital accumulation essential for providing new inventions, and new and better tools, for financing new risk-taking, job-making enterprises, and for assuring increased production and higher income for wage workers and others.

8. Apply antitrust laws fearlessly and equally to all monopolies, both of business and labor. Abolish the assumed right of mass rioting, terrorism, and false sanctity attached to picket lines.

9. Protect every individual's right to work where he will, his right to bargain and contract as he wishes, his right to quit when he will if not under contract, and his right to go to and from his home and his place of business or occupation without interference by any individual, organization, or Government agency.

10. Build down Washington's swollen, bureaucratic big government; bolster State and local government; restore and protect the right of the individual to enjoy freedom and security. Preserve the Constitution of the United States and oppose all attempts to violate it by legislation or otherwise.

And remember: Those who have lost freedom have not the strength to regain it. And those who have it seldom realize, until too late, how easily their freedom can be lost beyond recall.

I endorse this Platform for Americans and am helping to carry it to twenty millions. If you agree, will you not help to mobilize public opinion on a Nation-wide scale in its support, sending for free copies or buying larger quantities for distribution in your circles?

Signed_____,
Address_____.

COMMITTEE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT, INC.,
New York, N. Y.

HAVE YOU THE WILL TO DEFEND YOUR OWN FREEDOM?

In all parts of the world today, socialism is driving forward. It has engulfed nearly all of Europe. It is sweeping ahead in Asia. In its most malignant form—the Russian tyranny known as communism—it has been crushing out freedom in nation after nation. Freedom has retreated to the smallest area in many decades. Collectivism is on the march. Wherever socialism is installed, the police state looms.

It is not the economic strength of socialism that is responsible. Nor is it the economic weakness of freedom itself. Time has proved that only the free can be strong. It is the will to defend freedom that is weak.

The battle is being lost by the failure of freedom's friends to defend it—to make its virtues known to the last citizen—to expose the false claims of the collectivists.

Such is the great issue of our time. If we who still have our freedom wish to preserve our liberties, we must resolve now to start a smashing counterattack and roll back this threatening tide of collectivism.

The year 1948 and the first half of 1949 are a critical period for America and the world. If courageous men, regardless of party, in Federal, State, and local governments stoutly uphold private enterprise against collectivism, their influence will turn up the flickering lights of liberty around the world.

In any free society, governments respond to informed public opinion.

Never was it more important for you to project your influence to fellow citizens to build alert and mobilized public opinion.

Tell them that you will uphold the platform for Americans and ask them to help you project its influence far and wide.

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

United States Chamber of Commerce Versus Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. DEANE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, the Members can expect a greatly increased load of mail this week, and most of it will have been inspired by the United States Chamber of Commerce. Through the department of governmental affairs the national chamber is flooding thousands and thousands of communities throughout the United States with direct-mail communications urging that local chambers of commerce and other groups write Members of Congress to oppose housing bill (H. R. 6841).

It is refreshing to receive from one chamber of commerce the correspondence indicated below:

SOUTHERN PINES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Southern Pines, N. C., June 12, 1948.

Hon. CHARLES B. DEANE,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.,

CONGRESSMAN DEANE: The Southern Pines Chamber of Commerce has received a direct mail communication from the United States Chamber of Commerce concerning the passage of S. 866, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner Housing Act. This communication contained a booklet which repeated the testimony of George W. West, the United States chamber witness, before the House Banking and Currency Committee. The Southern Pines Chamber of Commerce was urged to oppose S. 866 by letter or wire to congressional representatives.

The Southern Pines Chamber of Commerce not only wishes to go on record as strongly in favor of S. 866, but wishes to protest the high-handed and improper action of the United States chamber in representing to the Banking and Currency Committee that chambers of commerce were against passage of this bill. We have never, at any time, been consulted by the United States chamber on its policy in this regard. We have never, at any time, consented to the United States chamber expressing views for us before the House or the Senate.

The same situation has arisen before, notably in the case of Senate bill 472 (Federal aid to education). When this message was up for passage, the United States chamber urged that we wire you and other members of the Senate and House to defeat Senate bill 472. You may remember that we went on record as being in favor of that measure also, and that we also at that time protested the attitude and steps of the United States chamber.

We would like to have it noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that not only does the United States chamber misrepresent the attitude of some of its members to the Congress and the Senate, but that it attempts by misleading and untruthful propaganda to influence their opinions toward the traditional policies of the United States Chamber of Commerce—policies of supporting large business and commercial interests at all costs.

The letter which we received on S. 866, over the signature of Clarence B. Miles, manager, department of governmental affairs, United States Chamber of Commerce, contains this statement: "* * * Mr. West's testimony should give you all the information you need when you communicate your views to members of the House Banking and Currency Committee, or to the full membership of the House, as the case may be."

The booklet containing Mr. West's testimony contains not one impartial word, not one concession to parts of the bill which are obviously for the public good. It is a compilation of half-truths and misleading statements designed for the single purpose of obscuring the value of the bill and influencing smaller chambers of commerce and like organizations who may not be able to keep abreast of, and informed on, governmental affairs. We violently oppose these propagandistic tactics, and should like to have this protest and dissent noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and if possible, in the records of testimony of the Banking and Currency Committee, where Mr. West's testimony was delivered.

A copy of this letter has been sent to Mr. Miles, who originally sent the letter urging us to oppose S. 866. In summation, we wish to be placed on record as strongly in favor of S. 866, which we feel to be a definite step toward a break in the housing crisis as well as a step toward the disruption of the paralyzing grip of the United States building industry on national housing. We wish also to be placed on record as strongly opposed to the improper assumption of lobby powers by the United States Chamber of Commerce without proper recourse to the will of its dues-paying members, and the use of that lobby power in a misleading and harmful manner.

The Southern Pines Chamber of Commerce will deeply appreciate any action you may feel able to take in this matter.

Sincerely,

THOMAS G. WICKER,
Executive Secretary.

SOUTHERN PINES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Southern Pines, N. C., June 12, 1948.

Mr. CLARENCE R. MILES,
Manager, Department of Government Affairs, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MILES: A copy of a letter from the Southern Pines, N. C., Chamber of Commerce to Congressman C. B. Deane, Eighth North Carolina District, House of Representatives, is enclosed. Copies of this letter have also been sent to North Carolina Senators CLYDE R. HOEY and WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD.

The Southern Pines Chamber of Commerce would appreciate a personal letter from you, or another qualified person, explaining in detail just how this policy on S. 866 was arrived at by the United States Chamber, and further stating how your policy on the recent S. 472 (Federal aid to education) was determined. In the case of S. 472, we sent a letter similar to the enclosure to Congressman DEANE and Senators HOEY and UMSTEAD. A statement on your procedure in deciding policy is something we have desired for a long time.

I will state, before being asked, that no representative from the Southern Pines Chamber of Commerce was present at the last annual meeting of the United States Chamber. We could not afford to send a delegate. Our few resources are too vitally needed in Southern Pines.

To my knowledge, and to the knowledge of the president, for the last 2 years, of this chamber of commerce, this organization has never been consulted on any matter of governmental policy, other than by invitations to the annual meeting, which we felt to be an expenditure that could be better diverted to local channels. We feel that in many cases, the true attitude of the Southern Pines Chamber of Commerce on important affairs has been misrepresented by the United States Chamber. It does no good to remark that you spoke for the national chamber only; all chambers are automatically affiliated, in the mind, with the United States Chamber.

We further feel that such clearly propagandistic and biased communications as the recent booklet of Mr. West's testimony on S. 866 are prejudicial to the national interest—in other words, we think that many chambers of commerce accept your views blindly, simply because they are yours. You have a right to your own opinions. But in attempting to produce action from organizations with less opportunities for information than yours, you have an obligation to fairness and impartiality.

Let me assure you that the Southern Pines Chamber of Commerce has never, and will never, be influenced in any way whatsoever by any communication from the United States Chamber, except that it be a factual, unbiased presentation of a situation. And you do not have the right nor the duty to send any communications other than those which are factual and unbiased.

Sincerely,

THOMAS G. WICKER,
Executive Secretary.

Taxpayers Are To Be Congratulated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, the most significant and encouraging action of this, the Eighteith Congress, was the approval by the House of H. R. 6556, a bill extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for a period of 1 year, and H. R. 6801, the appropriation bill providing funds for European relief which reduced the amount of the original proposal by some $2,000,000,000.

If we had acted otherwise on these measures, we would have been unfaithful to the trust placed in us by the citizens of this Republic and we would have failed in our duty as directed by the Constitution of the United States.

This action on the part of the House of Representatives should and will give hope to the American people and increase their confidence in this legislative body. In these acts, above all others, the function of Government has been brought into the light from behind the iron curtain of bureaucracy, and the representatives of the people are again exercising their power as the lawmakers of this Government.

I am confident that no one outside of government after an impartial study of the House proposal regarding the trade agreements will find any justifiable basis for the criticism emulating from the powerful publicity facilities of the State Department.

All existing trade agreements remain undisturbed and provisions remain for the orderly negotiation of any trade proposal with any country. Every Member of this Congress desires a healthy trade intercourse with all nations.

The Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives was the first competent body with the proper experience and background to examine expertly and in detail the factors determining the

amount of money to be spent on European relief and what it is to be spent for. That is the function of the Appropriation Committee.

It is ridiculous to assume that anyone would take seriously the report of various thumbnail fly-by-night committees set up by the administration for the one purpose of promoting the Marshall plan.

In private conversation with many members of the committee, it was disclosed that spokesmen for the administration displayed gross ignorance of the problem at hand and failed to sustain their demands for additional billions to be expended on foreign relief.

Many significant facts came to light during the weeks of hearings. One was that the 16 European countries, benefactors of the Marshall plan, had to their credit in this country, as of January 1, a sum in excess of $3,000,000,000 remaining from former loans and grants, all to be spent in the American markets for goods to be exported.

In March $1,000,000,000 was advanced to the Administrator of ECA, or the Marshall plan, and in 2 months it has expended only $208,000,000 of that sum. That is at the rate of $1,200,000,000 per year. Thus it would appear the administration's demand for $5,300,000,000 for 1 year is out of all reason.

It is laughable to hear some Presidential hopefuls crying out for additional billions when we all know that their knowledge of the basic facts involved is just about zero.

The committee is to be congratulated for their great service to the House and to the people. And the taxpayers of this country are to be congratulated upon having their elected representatives do their job courageously and efficiently irrespective of the determined opposition, confusion, and distortion of facts brought about by an infuriated bureaucracy.

Again I say, it is a hopeful sign that Congress has asserted itself in exercising its constitutional authority as the lawmakers of this country, and by these acts demonstrated it is on the way to regain the stature and dignity the founding fathers intended for it.

St. Louis of France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a historical sketch of St. Louis of France, for whom my native city is named. This sketch was written by McCune Gill, who is the outstanding contemporary authority on the history of the city of St. Louis:

ST. LOUIS

(By McCune Gill, vice president, Title Insurance Corp., of St. Louis)

St. Louis should know more about St. Louis. Louis IX, King of France and saint, whose name our city bears, was great in many ways. He was a great jurist, for it was he who established the first national court of appeal in France. He was a great builder, the beautiful Ste. Chapelle and parts of the Cathedral of Notre Dame still remaining as evidences of that fact. He was a great warrior, defeating many enemies, domestic and foreign. He was a great statesman and consolidated most of the discordant principalities of France. He was a great educator, having established the Sorbonne at Paris and other institutions of learning. He was a great humanitarian, philanthropist and crusader, well deserving the the sainthood that was conferred on him, and on him alone of all of the kings of France.

LIFE OF ST. LOUIS

Louis was born in the year 1214; that is to say over seven centuries ago. He was a son of Louis VIII, who reigned but a few years and died in 1226 when "our" Louis was only 12. But the mother of Louis IX was entirely equal to the task of carrying on the affairs of state until her son should arrive at a more mature age. The mother was Blanche, princess of Castile, in Spain. From her teaching and counsel her son derived many of his fine traits of character and high principles.

When Louis was 20—tall, handsome, blond, and blue-eyed—he was married to the charming and beautiful Princess Marguerite, of Provence. The married and family life of the King and his Queen were ideal. Particularly interesting are the extending "instructions" or written advice that King Louis prepared for the perusal of his children. The opening sentence of one of these is typical. "Dear son, if you come to reign, do that which befits a king; that is, deviate in nothing from justice, whatever may befall you."

The King was noted for his piety and rigid attention to the religious duties of the period. His library of religious books was the largest in France. He was also noted for his charities and the aid he granted in unusual cases of misfortune and hardship that were brought to his attention. He established many hospitals and other institutions of mercy.

MILITARY ACCOMPLISHMENTS

King Louis was quite noted as a military leader and engaged in several wars defending and consolidating his kingdom, which up to that time did not include all of what we now call France. Brittany in the north and Aquitaine in the west were particularly independent, but were brought into subjection in wars against Henry III of England and Count Raymond of Toulouse.

One of the King's military ambitions was to establish a fortified port on the Mediterranean. So in 1246 he took over a town some 25 miles west of the Rhone River and 50 miles west of Marseilles. It was located on a salt lagoon called by the Romans the "aquae mortuae" or dead waters. The French called it Aigues Mortes. Here the King built a very complete fortress which is still in its original condition. It forms one of the most interesting mediaeval fortresses to be found anywhere. It has 30-foot walls, 15 towers and 10 gates, all built under the direction of the young King.

THE FIRST CRUSADE

In 1248 Louis fell ill of a fever and soon passed into a coma which led his family to suppose that he was dead. He regained consciousness however and after he had recovered, vowed that he would immediately "take the cross" and organize a crusade. Having appointed his capable mother to be regent during his absence, the King sailed from Aigues Mortes to Cyprus and from thence he attacked the Moslem stronghold of Damietta in Egypt. It was then and is still located near the mouth of one of the outlets of the Nile. To his surprise the enemy offered little resistance in protecting Damietta but retreated to Mansura, some 50 miles up the river. Louis and his army stayed for a while in Damietta and the Queen who had accompanied him, gave birth to 1 of her 11 children in this city. Then the King marched on Mansura, but was defeated there and he and many of his followers were taken captive. They were afterward released upon the payment of a large ransom. They then continued to wage war on the infidels at Jaffa in Palestine until his mother died in 1252.

THE SACRED RELICS

While the good King was on this first crusade he obtained possession of the reputedly authentic Crown of Thorns used at the Crucifixion, and part of the Cross. To house these precious relics he built in 1248 at Paris the beautiful gem of Gothic architecture known as the Holy Chapel or Sainte Chapelle. It is now surrounded by the Court House or Palais de Justice in Paris and each year before the opening of the courts a solemn red mass was formerly celebrated there for the French lawyers.

THE SORBONNE

The father confessor of Louis IX was Robert de Sorbonne. Among his other activities he kept a kind of hostel and school for the higher education of monks. In 1253 the King decided to change this school into a permanent seat of learning and thus was established the College of the Sorbonne, which is still one of the leading institutions of education in France.

ST. LOUIS THE JUDGE

One of the cherished activities of Louis was to act as judge in disputes arising between his subjects. At frequent intervals he would repair to the Great Oak of Vincennes about a league from Paris and there hear the pleas of litigants.

Finally in 1258 and particularly on the occasion of the hanging for poaching of some young nobles by another lord, Louis decided to establish a curia regis, or king's bench, as we would say. It was a sort of court of appeals, the first in France. This was called the Parlement of Paris, and its establishment constitutes one of the epochs in the development of our modern court system. Its immediate effect was to bring an end to the previously frequent private wars and trials by battle.

At various times Louis was also called on to act as arbitrator between contending kings and countries. His sense of fairness and justice made his decisions in these matters famous throughout Europe. Another legal accomplishment was when the King ordered the compilation of a revised or new code of laws, now known as the Establissments de St. Louis.

THE LAST CRUSADE

In 1270 King Louis set out on his second crusade. Embarking at Aigues Mortes he sailed to the site of the ancient and ruined Carthage, which lies just north of the Arabania or Mohammedan city of Tunis. Here Louis became sick of the plague and he and four of his family died. This brought an end to the expedition. On the Byrsa or castle hill at Carthage there can now be found a cathedral and chapel of St. Louis erected as a memorial to the last campaign and the place of death of the great King of France. He died in the 56th year of his age and the 44th of his reign.

THE CHARACTER OF SAINT LOUIS

A celebrated French writer thus summarizes the character of St. Louis. "Louis IX," he says, "was a prince destined to reform Europe, to render France triumphant and civilized, and to be in all things a pattern for men. His piety did not deprive him of any kingly virtue. A wise economy took nothing from his liberality. A profound policy was combined with strict justice. Prudent and firm in counsel, intrepid without rashness in his wars, he was eminently compassionate. No man could have carried virtue further."

An English writer says, "St. Louis stands in history as the ideal king of the Middle Ages. An accomplished knight, physically strong, fearless in battle, heroic in adversity, unyielding when sure of the justice of his cause, energetic and firm, he was indeed every inch a king."

THE KING BECOMES A SAINT

In 1273, only 3 years after the death of Louis IX, proceedings were commenced seeking his canonization. We have been left a rather complete story of these proceedings. Two bishops were sent to France and stayed there a long while inquiring into the King's life and works and miracles. After they had made inquiry of many witnesses, what they had learned was taken to the court of Rome and the Pope and cardinals diligently perused it. And finally in 1297 the good King Louis the IX became St. Louis.

THE KING'S BIOGRAPHER

Whatever may be the claims a great man has to fame, he is unusually fortunate if he has had an adequate contemporary biographer. Louis IX was thus fortunate in having as his senechal or private secretary one Jean de Joinville, who has left us a delightful and intimate diary or account of his association with the Crusader King.

One quotation from his admiring pen will suffice to illustrate the style of his History of St. Louis. It tells of a characteristic conversation between the King and his senechal.

"He asked me if I wished to be honored in this world and to have paradise at my death and I told him yea, and he said to me, 'Therefore so keep yourself that knowingly ye neither say nor do aught that, if all the world knew it, ye could not avow it'." In another part of the chronicles Joinville marvels that the King insisted on complying scrupulously with all of his contracts, "even those with the infidels."

Many other biographies of St. Louis have been written and the events of his life are frequently chosen by artists for their sculptures and paintings. Particularly fine are a series of large murals in the Pantheon at Paris.

CHURCHES OF ST. LOUIS

After Louis IX had become St. Louis, many churches in France were dedicated to him. In the Colonies missions carried forward the names of these French churches and were called missions of St. Louis. One in particular was located in New Orleans, and the church which succeeded this mission is still to be seen in the Place d'Armes there.

When the village that is now the city of St. Louis was founded, it had no official name, but was sometimes called Paincourt or Pencourt, and sometimes Laclede's village or post. When the first mission was established here by Father Meurin on the block reserved by Laclede for a church, it was called the Mission de St. Louis des Illinois; that is, the Mission of St. Louis to the Illinois Indians, the tribe which at that time occupied this part of the Mississippi Valley.

The name of the mission no doubt was copied from that of the mission at New Orleans and the reference to the Illinois was to distinguish our mission from theirs. In some the our earliest letters and orders we find an illustration of these facts in references to the "Mission of St. Louis of the Illinois, Post of Pencourt."

In a few years the town had ceased to be called Pencourt or Laclede's village, had taken on the name of the mission, and was called the post or village of St. Louis of the Illinois. Soon thereafter the reference to the Illinois was dropped and we became simply St. Louis—and incidentally quickly anglicized the pronunciation of our name. Many French and Spanish towns took their names from the parish in which they were situated.

THE OLD AND NEW CATHEDRALS

On the original church block there have been several buildings housing the mission, the church, and the cathedral of which St. Louis has continually been the patron and titular. In the present old cathedral, now called simply the Church of St. Louis, will be found a statue of the crusader King as a military man in all of his armor and equipment; also, a beautiful painting of St. Louis at prayer.

When the new cathedral was built on Lindell Boulevard, it was very appropriately decided to embellish the arched ceiling of the narthex or vestibule with mosaics depicting the life of the good King St. Louis. If you have never seen or studied these mosaics, you should cetrainly do so. They constitute one of the most unique and beautiful of the artistic and historic objects of our city.

These mosaic scenes are made of small glass squares backed with gold leaf and colored enamels. The style of the drawings is of medieval simplicity, as it should be. One shows St. Louis being instructed by his mother. Another shows him receiving communion. Next, in order, ruling his subjects, relieving the needy, and administering justice at the royal court. St. Louis then found the Sorbonne and accepts the habit of the Third Order of St. Francis. In other mosaics our good king accepts the crusader's cross, undertakes the two crusades in which he participated, and returns to Paris with the crown of thorns.

At the very top of the arched ceiling of this narthex there are three circles or seals quoting the favorite mottoes of our city's patron saint. The first is "By wisdom the mighty decree justice." The next, "Being rich He became poor for your sakes." The last, "I have fought a good fight, I have kept the faith."

In a nearby corridor there is a marble statue of St. Louis showing him in his religious rather than his military character.

He is wearing the royal crown, and his robes are adorned with the fleur-de-lis. In his hands he holds a cushion on which reposes the crown of thorns.

THE EQUESTRIAN STATUE OF ST. LOUIS

In addition to these representations of St. Louis there is of course the very fine equestrian statue of the king in armor in front of the art museum. This was originally modeled in plaster and stood in one of the plazas of the world's fair. So great was the praise of this work that after the fair had closed it was decided to have it cast in bronze as a permanent artistic and inspirational achievement. And it is indeed a magnificent creation, the majestic figures of man and horse in full armor, with the king holding high his sword, the hilt of which forms a cross emblematic of the crusader.

Truly St. Louis should know more about St. Louis.

Hawaii's Harvest From the Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article from the magazine, Paradise of the Pacific, of May 1948, on the tuna industry in the Territory of Hawaii. In view of the funds appropriated by this Congress for purposes of exploring the fish resources of the Pacific and assisting in the development of this industry, the contents of this article should prove of general interest.

The article follows:

HAWAII'S HARVEST FROM THE SEA—13,000,000 POUNDS OF TUNA IS GOAL OF FISHING FLEET THIS YEAR

Hawaii's harvest from the sea, tuna, may yield 13,000,000 pounds this season, the largest take in 8 years. And fishermen say this is only the beginning. Thirteen million pounds of tuna is a lot of fish. However, the Hawaiian fleet covers but a small area of the ocean around Hawaii and barely touches the supply of tuna in the Pacific, considered the world's largest unexploited source of protein food.

The two hundred and forty or so men who comprise Hawaii's small tuna fleet are anxious and impatient for the peak season, May through September, when they expect to land 85 percent of this year's catch. Production during that period determines in a large measure the fisherman's income for the year, because earnings are based upon the amount of fish his boat brings in. When fortune smiles, the tuna fisherman can afford that new car and radio. Otherwise, buying is postponed until the next good season.

Owners of tuna boats expect the fleet to exceed its 13,000,000-pound goal. Practically all of the twenty-odd boats in the fleet have been overhauled since the first of the year. They are ready now for the approaching season, with experienced crews eager to get into peak-season time.

This year Hawaii's tuna-fishing industry stands a chance to resume its prewar position in the island economy. Then Hawaiian tuna was a primary source of high-protein food, and canned tuna was Hawaii's third largest export item. However, the industry has its problems. Most serious is the shortage of nehu (live bait) needed to attract schools of tuna toward the boats. Tuna fishermen spend more time looking for bait than they do fishing. Around Oahu nehu live in shallow waters near shore at Kaneohe, Pearl Harbor, and the Ala Wai Canal. They sometimes disappear, and their departure disrupts all tuna fishing. The board of agriculture and forestry and other agencies are attempting to help fishermen solve their bait problem. However, experiments have not been encouraging. The shortage of bait remains the most limiting factor in development of Hawaii's fisheries resources.

Marketing of this year's catch in competition with California and South American packers is a second problem. California canners packed 5,269,618 cases of tuna last year, and expect to top this figure during 1948. Proximity to mass markets and to sources of material required for packing also gives California a definite advantage over Hawaiian packers.

Imports of tuna packed in South America, where costs are low, affect the market for Hawaiian tuna. During 4 months last year, Peru shipped two and a half million pounds of canned tuna into the United States. Peruvian fishermen were paid $30 a ton for their fish; cannery workers $8 per week. As a result, mainland importers can pay the Federal Government's duty on South American tuna and still undersell packers of tuna whose canneries are located in high-cost areas, such as Hawaii.

Despite competition from mainland and South American canneries, Hawaiian tuna packers expect to market this year's pack without serious difficulty. They recognize increased world production may depress the price, but feel that the superior quality of Hawaiian tuna will enable them to move their pack in selected markets.

The fine quality of Hawaiian tuna is not a gift from Mother Nature, but the result of several controlled conditions. First is the fact that Hawaiian tuna is packed while fresh. The cannery receives the fish a few hours after it is caught, then promptly prepares it for processing while it is still in prime condition. High standards of packing also help Hawaiian tuna to compete with that of

larger canneries. The Hawaiian tuna are trimmed carefully, only the light meat being used, and then are packed by hand. This results in a uniformity of quality usually not possible.

A typical tuna boat in the Hawaiian fleet is 75 feet in length. She is sampan style, with a narrow beam and high bow. Accommodations are meager, and frequently the crews sleep, eat, relax, and work on the small deck. Space is at a premium. Large storage capacity is needed for the live bait on the voyage out and for fresh tuna on the way home.

Most boats carry 10 men, who are rarely at home except on week-ends. Usually, they leave Kewalo Basin early Monday morning, spending most of the day going to Kaneohe and looking for bait. If they find the bait, they're off for the fishing areas before dawn Tuesday morning. With luck they'll catch from ten to thirty thousand pounds of tuna, depending upon how the tuna are running, and be back in port by 8 or 9 o'clock Tuesday night.

As soon as the ships are unloaded, the men start catching bait for the following day's fishing. Occasionally they have sufficient bait for the next day's operations, in which case the crews get a little extra rest on board before setting out again for the fishing grounds. Fishermen generally catch bait at night. They set a seine-like net near the shore and place a light on the surface of the water over the center of the net. When the light attracts enough nehu, the fishermen lift the net and transfer the bait into a skip. From the skip the bait is retransferred into special bait wells on the tuna boats. The net is generally lifted twice during the night, consequently 40 winks is a long nap for a working tuna fisherman.

This routine is followed throughout the year. The tempo increases during the summer months when chances for large catches are greatest, and slacks off during December and January, the poorest months for fishing.

Most of the boats require drydocking for short periods twice a year; and for a major overhaul once each year.

Little is known about the habits of the tuna, sometimes called the gypsy of the ocean. Many fisheries experts believe tuna found in Hawaiian waters travel a trans-ocean northwesterly course, beginning off the west coast of South America.

An experienced fisherman can locate a school of tuna while untrained eyes see nothing. Old hands at the game frequently predict the weight of the fish and the size of the school before putting a hook and line in the water. Birds near the schools of tuna give the experienced fisherman his clues. The birds, which feed on tiny fish chased to the surface by the tuna, are the fishermen's most dependable guide for locating tuna. The birds follow the schools, continuing even while the boats are fishing. This does not seem to bother the tuna.

In fact, nothing seems to bother the fish once they are attracted to the live bait tossed from the boat. When a boat approaches a school, one man tosses small quantities of the nehu overboard to attract the tuna to the surface and toward the boat. The nehu perform perfectly, swimming toward the boat in an effort to hide from the tuna. The fish become increasingly excited over this bait until finally they bite at anything and everything in the water.

At this point all the men, except the bait thrower, crowd across the stern and along the aft lea side of the vessel to begin fishing. Each man operates in a very restricted area. When large fish are biting the men use poles about 8 feet in length, with a line and leader approximately 6½ feet long, to which a barbless hook is attached.

Fish generally grab the barbless hook the moment it is tossed into the water. The men, balancing themselves on the slippery deck, haul in the fish with unbelievable speed. With what appears to be one motion, an experienced fisherman catches the fish under his arm and holds it against his body, removes the hook, drops the fish on the deck, and returns the line to the water to hook more fish. Experienced crews have been known to catch 15,000 pounds in half an hour.

Team work and coordination are "musts" on every tuna boat. One slip might disrupt a whole day's fishing; a carelessly handled pole might result in permanent injury to a crew member. Fishermen protect themselves as much as possible from flying fishhooks, the excited tuna, and the hot sun. They wear large straw hats tied securely around their chins for protection against the hooks and the sun. Long blue denim robes are worn to protect their bodies from the excited fish and flying hooks.

Many people watch with interest every development in Hawaii's growing tuna industry. A large tuna fishery may broaden Hawaii's economy, provide employment for growing population, and bring needed dollars into the Territory. While the coming season may not give the answer to all of these problems, it will mark the return of one of Hawaii's major industries, tuna, Hawaii's harvest from the sea.

My Argument Against the Draft in Peacetime, 1948—A Peacetime Draft Concentrates Dangerous Powers in the President; Does Not Provide Adequate National Defense; Is a Dangerous Step Into Militarism; and Cannot Be Justified in the Absence of Adequate Arms and Stock Piles for Making New Weapons

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the draft for military service in peacetime for five principal reasons, which I wish to discuss with you as fully as our time permits in the hope that we may avoid taking such a far-reaching step as the passage of the bill H. R. 6401.

I. DANGERS OF OVERCONCENTRATION OF POWER THROUGH THE DELEGATION TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE POWERS INCLUDED IN H. R. 6401

Before Congress resorts to compulsory military service or the draft in peacetime to raise armies and to provide a Navy under the authority and the obligation set forth in section 8 of article I of the Constitution, full study should be made of the extent of the power such legislation would bestow upon the President when combined with the powers granted to him in section 2 of article III of the Constitution making him Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States.

We are accustomed to consider our Federal Government as one operating under a system of checks and balances between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. Within their respective spheres of operation each branch of government is independent of the other branches and great care was taken by our forefathers to set out the jurisdiction for the legislative department in article I, for the executive department in article II, and for the judicial department in article III of the Constitution. Clearly our executive branch is not subordinate to the legislative branch to the same extent that the Prime Minister of England serves under the direction of Parliament. It is my belief that the power of our legislative branch over the Commander in Chief of the armed forces is limited to the constitutional provisions of section 8 of article I of the Constitution "to raise and support armies," "to provide and maintain a navy," and "to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces."

It is my belief also that the President in his capacity as Commander in Chief of the armed forces is not subject to the checks and balances of our legislative branch except as to the size and the support and maintenance of our armed forces, and as to the rules established by Congress for the government and regulation of them. The obligation and power to raise armies and to provide a navy is a congressional power by the terms of the Constitution, and does not come within the power of the President as Commander in Chief of the armed forces. His power is definitely limited to the command of the armed forces after they are raised or provided. There is no doubt in my mind that Congress has the constitutional power to enact legislation establishing compulsory military service in time of peace. Congress likewise has the power to perpetuate the peacetime policy of relying upon volunteers to fill our armed services to whatever size may be authorized by Congress. It is my firm conviction that Congress should not resort to compulsion of service in the armed forces in peacetime. Such resort to compulsory service in peacetime is a far-reaching departure from individual freedom as we have practiced it so successfully in America for 160 years. Furthermore, the placing of the power of the draft in the hands of the President establishes a dangerous and drastic concentration of power when coupled with the far-reaching powers of the President in his capacity as Commander in Chief of the armed forces thus created.

Selective service places men in the armed forces of the United States. Universal military training does not. Selective service brings men as soldiers and sailors involuntarily within the command of the President as Commander in Chief of the armed forces. This power over all men in our Nation is very essential in wartime, but it should be carefully examined and thoroughly understood before it is adopted as a peacetime policy.

I have been impressed with the wide divergence of views with reference to the powers of the President as Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States in peacetime. It is extremely important at this time that we examine as carefully and thoroughly as possible the extent of these powers. At the outset of my search for information, I was very much impressed when I found in reading the book, The Making of the Constitution, page 530, by Charles Warren, the following statement:

On August 27, 1787, another power suggested by the committee was granted to the President, without debate (so far as appears from Madison's notes) that of "Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States and of the militia of the several States when called into the actual service of the United States." Such a power had been vested in the State Governors in practically all the State constitutions; and in some the Governor had few powers or functions other than military.

That is why they did not debate the matter very thoroughly in the Constitutional Convention. So going back to the Constitutional Convention you cannot find any very great light on the division of power between the President and the Congress in the matter of national defense. The wording of the Constitution, of course, is quite general.

I was very much impressed in reading the annotations of the Constitution of the United States to find so few references therein to discussions of the peacetime power by our Supreme Court. In some of these cases, the statement is made that Congress has the power not only to raise and support and govern armies but to declare war and that it has therefore the power to provide by law for carrying on war. The Court in these cases states further that the command of forces and the conduct of campaigns are powers derived from the Constitution, but inasmuch as neither is defined by that instrument, their extent must be determined by their nature and by the principles of our institutions. The Court states also that the power to make the necessary laws is in Congress and the power to execute is in the President, and each includes all authority essential to its due exercise "but neither can the President, in war more than in peace, intrude upon the proper authority of Congress, nor Congress upon the proper authority of the President" (*Ex parte Milligan* (4 Wall. 2, 139 (1866)); *Swaim* v. *United States* (28 C. Cls. 173, 221 (1893)), affirmed 165 U. S. 553 (1897)).

I have made a very brief search for authoritative statements with particular reference to the powers of the President as Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States in time of peace. My purpose in making this small contribution to the discussion at this time is to impress upon the House the importance of the full exercise at this time of such powers as the House may wish to exercise in restricting the power of the President.

Prof. Edward S. Corwin, on the President's control of Foreign Relations, states:

> I conclude that the Presidential power under survey (the right to perform acts of war without congressional authorization where the question is as to his right to take measures which are technically acts of war in protection of American rights abroad) is somewhat analogous to the so-called right of self-preservation at international law. Theoretically, the power is a defensive power and reserved for grave and sudden emergencies. Practically, the limit to it is to be found in the powers of Congress and public opinion.

Elihu Root, in a famous debate in the Senate in 1912, had the following statement to make:

> In my judgment, there is no law which forbids the President to send troops of the United States out of this country into any country where he considers it to be his duty as Commander in Chief of the Army to send them, unless it be for the purpose of making war, which, of course, he cannot do.
>
> Doubtless, Congress could by law forbid the troops being sent out of the country; doubtless, Congress has not done it; and I apprehend that any Congress which undertook to do it would find a general protest from the people of the United States against depriving the Commander in Chief of the Army of the power to protect our citizens under those circumstances which exist widely throughout the world, in countries whose governments have not the power to maintain order within their jurisdiction. From time immemorial it has been the practice of civilized nations to send troops into those countries whose governments were too feeble or too ill-organized, too deficient in power to enforce their laws and protect foreigners.

This has primarily to do, of course, with protecting our own citizens abroad.

Prof. Clarence A. Berdahl, in his book, War Powers of the Executive in the United States, has the following to say:

> An eminent authority (Elihu Root) thinks that Congress could probably by law forbid the troops being sent out of the jurisdiction of the United States in time of peace, but in time of war the authority of the President is recognized as being absolute as to where the war is to be conducted, whether to await the onslaughts of the enemy and wage a purely defensive war within the boundaries of the United States, or to send the armed forces of the United States out of the country to carry on an offensive war in the enemy territory, in the territory of an ally, or perhaps even in the territory of a neutral.

William Howard Taft, in one of his lectures on our Chief Magistrate and his powers, had the following to say:

> The President is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and the militia when called into the service of the United States. Under this he can order the Army and Navy anywhere he will, if the appropriations furnish the means of transportation. Of course, the instrumentality which this power furnishes gives the President an opportunity to do things which involve consequences that it would be quite beyond his power under the Constitution directly to effect. Under the Constitution, only Congress has the power to declare war, but with the Army and the Navy the President can take action such as to involve the country in war and to leave Congress no option but to declare it or to recognize its existence. This was the charge made against President Polk in beginning the Mexican War. War as a legal fact, it was decided by the Supreme Court in prize cases, can exist by invasion of this country by a foreign enemy or by such an insurrection as occurred during the Civil War, without any declaration of war by Congress at all, and it is only in the case of a war of our aggression against a foreign country that the power of Congress must be affirmatively asserted to establish its legal existence.
>
> What constitutes an act of war by the land or naval forces of the United States is sometimes a nice question of law and fact. It really seems to differ with the character of the nation whose relations with the United States are affected. The unstable condition to as law and order of some of the Central American republics seems to create different rules of international law from those that obtain in governments than can be depended upon to maintain their own peace and order. It has been frequently necessary for the President to direct the landing of naval marines from United States vessels in Central America to protect the American consulate and American citizens and their property. He has done this under his general power as Commander in Chief. It grows not out of any specific act of Congress but out of that obligation, inferable from the Constitution, of the Government to protect the rights of an American citizen against foreign aggression, as in the Kotza incident, cited by Mr. Justice Miller in the Neagle case. In practice the use of the naval marines for such a purpose has become so common that their landing is treated as a mere local police measure, whereas if troops of the Regular Army are used for such a purpose, it seems to take on the color of an act of war.
>
> Thus it would be difficult to explain the landing of our Army in Vera Cruz by force as anything but an act of war to punish the government of Huerta in Mexico for its refusal to render what was deemed by President Wilson as a proper apology for a violation of our international rights in the arrest of some of our sailors. This act was committed before authority was given by Congress, but the necessary authority for it had passed one House and was passing another at the time, and the question as to the right of the Executive to take the action without congressional authority was avoided by full and immediate ratification.
>
> In Nicaragua in my administration an insurrection had led to the immurement of American citizens of insurrectos and the threatened destruction of American property. The President of Nicaragua, whom we had recognized and whose minister we had received, called upon us to protect our own citizens and their property because he was unable to render them the protection which their treaty rights give them. This led to the landing of marines and quite a campaign, which resulted in the maintenance of law and order and the elimination of the insurrectos. This was not an act of war because it was done at the request and with the consent of the lawful authorities of the territory where it took place.

Many of our Presidents have used the constitutional powers of the President as Commander in Chief of the armed forces in our relationship with other nations without awaiting legislative authorization of any kind. President John Adams, in 1798, authorized the arming of American merchantmen to resist attacks which were being made upon United States commerce. In 1801 President Jefferson sent a squadron of frigates into the Mediterranean to protect American commerce against the Barbary brigands. The action of President Jefferson in sending the American fleet into the Mediterranean to wage war against Tripoli was communicated to Congress at the opening of its next session, and Congress thereupon gave its authorization to the hostilities. President Buchanan in 1858 sent naval vessels to sea to protect the United States merchant marine. President Lincoln in 1861 did likewise with no congressional authorization. Blockades were established along the Mexican coast by President Polk in 1846 and along the southern coast by President Lincoln in 1861 and of some Cuban ports by President McKinley in 1898. President Roosevelt in 1940 agreed to the transfer of 50 destroyers to Great Britain in return for leases of important naval bases in British territory in the Western Hemisphere and then explained his action to Congress by pointing out "preparation for defense is an inalienable prerogative of a sovereign state. Under present circumstances, this exercise of sovereign rights is essential to the maintenance of our peace and safety."

In the light of the foregoing, the combination of unlimited power to compel men to serve in the armed forces in peacetime and to subject them to the almost unlimited power of the President as Commander in Chief of the armed forces, combines in the President greater power than any good President should want and certainly greater power than any poor President should have. It could be the very foundation of militarism, fascism, and imperialism all at one and the same time.

It is my belief that compulsory military service in peacetime is not sufficiently needed for adequate national defense to justify this tremendous concentration of power in the President. It certainly is not needed for the purpose of giving the great body of our citizens basic military training. In fact, as I shall discuss a little later, the draft and a large standing armed force will tend to defeat or make impossible any plan for universal training of our young men, and the standing forces cannot be maintained at a large enough size to provide our Nation with enough trained men to defend our Nation adequately at the outset of any future war.

Because of this vast extent of the President's power as Commander in Chief of the armed forces, I believe it is highly important for Congress to consider carefully and thoroughly the additional concentration of power granted to the President in any legislation giving him the power to draft men for military service in peacetime. I believe Congress should go slow in taking such a far-reaching step.

II. THE ARMED FORCES AS SERVANTS OR AS MASTERS

I have always looked upon service in the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Forces as an honor and a privilege and as an opportunity to serve our great Nation and the citizens thereof to the limit of one's ability for their defense against all enemies. I look upon the professional soldier, sailor, marine and air man as a leader upon whom our Nation can and should rely for proper guidance and instruction in the art of war and for immediate and actual defense in event of war. Such service in the role of leader and teacher and defender should not carry with it the power to force an individual into one of the services against his will except in time of war. Any man who has ever been a member of the armed services and who knows what it means to be amenable to the articles of war and subject to court martial knows and appreciates the far-reaching character of the authority provided in H. R. 6401 over the man drafted. Such powers can be given to the President and to the armed services by the Congress in the name of national defense, but the giving of such far-reaching powers in peace time is not only a highly dangerous concentration of power but is also an unnecessary step toward militarism, that needs only the will or desire of the President as Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces to be as ruthless and devastating as the fascistic structures we felt called upon to destroy in the two great world wars of our generation.

III. EFFECT OF THE DRAFT ON MORALE OF THE ARMED FORCES IN PEACETIME

Any man or woman who has had command of a military unit whether a squad or an army knows the threat to good morale of compulsory service in the armed forces in peacetime. The destruction of morale can even be manifest in wartime as soon as the shooting has ceased. All of us have a vivid recollection of the hue and cry for immediate demobilization after VJ-day. Revulsion to compulsory service was subdued and thoroughly controlled by the individuals affected so long as we were at war, but anyone who has had experience with troops can tell you that self-restraint in such matters cannot be counted on in peacetime and also that any infractions of Army regulations by discontented drafted men can be the cause for the imposition of drastic penalties through court-martial proceedings. Good morale cannot be built up through the threat of the exercise of such power against men who are compelled to serve in peacetime against their will. I have never held a command higher than that of captain in the Army so I will confine my own observation to the statement that if I had the choice in peacetime of a company made up of 225 volunteers or a company of 250 men, 25 of whom were drafted, and only a few of whom were malcontent because of their lot, I would far rather reduce my forces by 10 percent and maintain the good morale that has such a large bearing on the efficiency and the good record of my command.

I have heard one argument advanced that it will not be necessary to draft many men to maintain our standing Army, Navy, Marine, and Air Force at the desired size. To my way of thinking, if we resort to the draft it will not help the morale of those drafted to know that only 10 percent of the eligible men are required to serve and that he is one of the 10 percent whereas 90 percent of his buddies are permitted to go on their way unmolested. We know that approximately 1,200,000 men become 18 years of age each year and the total number of men within effective fighting age limits will therefore be between twelve and fifteen million. Even though the draft were necessary to secure the total personnel of the armed forces the present estimate of our needs at 2,000,000 men would require the drafting of only approximately 15 percent of men who are within the age limit. I have not seen recent estimates of the number of the Army and Navy and Air officials think will have to be drafted, but my own guess is that the total percentage will be much less than half of 15 percent of those within the age limits.

In times of high employment such as we have today, the number of volunteers is bound to be smaller than in times of general unemployment. In fact, the high employment of today has a very real bearing upon the situation confronting us in building up the armed forces to 2,000,000 men.

Whenever 1 man in 6, or 1 man in 20 is selected to serve, the question immediately arises as to how to select him in fairness to him and all other eligible men. In wartime compulsory service can be made universal service except for essential occupations. In peacetime the same yardstick is not available, and consequently untold problems will plague every draft board throughout the land far more than was experienced by them in wartime. Group exemptions of any kind whether educational, industrial, or other groups would only aggravate the resentment of any man selected to serve against his will. It is true the penalties can be made drastic enough to accomplish the objective notwithstanding any manifestations of discontent, but the very enforcement of this program efficiently and effectively in peacetime can build up a system closely akin to the systems of government we abhor and the effect on morale can be very damaging within the armed forces themselves.

IV. THE DRAFT AND A LARGE STANDING ARMY, NAVY, MARINE CORPS, AND AIR FORCE WOULD PROVIDE INADEQUATE NATIONAL DEFENSE

A standing Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force of 2,000,000 men is about as large as our Nation can support on a permanent peacetime basis. In fact, the cost of an armed force of this size is so large that it threatens to curtail the funds available for training and retraining adequate Reserve and National Guard forces. Total funds in process of appropriation for the Army and Air Force together with unexpended funds brought forward and still available and anticipated costs in excess of appropriations make the grand total funds for our armed forces for the fiscal year of 1949 come to the amazing total of $17,425,465,070. The average total personnel for the standing Army, Navy, and Air Force for the fiscal year 1949 is estimated at 1,638,014. If we were to maintain an average standing force of 2,000,000 men the cost would be somewhat greater.

The question immediately arises as to whether we can secure enough basically trained men from the Regular forces and the Reserve and National Guard forces to meet our needs for the initial impact and for the quick development of enough fighting teams to win any future war that may come to our Nation.

For adequate security our Nation should plan to have 8,000,000 basically trained men available for mobilization into fighting teams in the armed forces. We could then start them on their team training without the loss of precious time for recruit training after hostilities begin. Few people realize that it takes a full year of team training to whip a unit into effective fighting power, and few people realize that a fighting unit the size of a division cannot start this year of teamwork until it can mobilize the major part of its personnel with basic training behind them.

Our best insurance throughout the years ahead is to keep an ever freshly trained reservoir of young men available. With a regular army, navy, marine corps, and air force of 2,000,000 men, the discharged Regulars would add about 2,000,000 men with recent enough training to fit our needs. We can add to that number about 800,000 effective reservists and National Guard men for a grand total of 4,500,000 men. This is 3,500,000 men below what I consider the lowest

number of basically trained men needed at the first impact of any future war.

It has been estimated that UMT can supply us with 850,000 basically trained men per year or 3,500,000 men in 4 years' time and UMT can supply those men better and at less cost in money and manhours of time than any other plan for national defense.

In placing so much emphasis upon the draft and in relying upon it as a convenient and easy method for providing regular forces of any desired number, the responsible military leaders of our Nation have effectually deprived our Nation of any training program that will provide our Nation with adequate reserves of freshly trained men. I cannot imagine our Nation resorting to both the draft and UMT as a permament peacetime military policy. Responsible military officials assure us that the draft provided by the bill, H. R. 6401, is for temporary use only. But, once the principle of compulsory and selective military service is established for peacetime, the responsible military leaders of our Nation are not likely to return willingly to the task of recruiting men on a voluntary basis.

V. THE BETTER WAY TO RAISE ARMIES AND PROVIDE A NAVY OF ADEQUATE SIZE

In these days of 60,000,000 employed people, it is little wonder that our armed services are having difficulty in recruiting our standing forces up to more than 2,000,000 men and women. To recruit our standing forces to that size will require making the Regular services attractive in every possible way as to opportunities for advancement and as to compensation in comparison with other employment. Back of these factors is an even greater factor and one that is somewhat influenced by these, namely, morale.

During the past few weeks, I have been greatly impressed with Gen. Omar N. Bradley's general order setting forth the credo, "The individual is the most important single asset in any army," and setting forth the new policy by which the welfare of personnel is the paramount consideration. Fully recognizing the dignity and importance of the individual as set forth in General Bradley's words can be a real step toward a better Army and certainly the determination of responsible military leaders to make maximum use of each ability is a sensible decision.

General Bradley's emphasis upon removing causes of misunderstanding and dissatisfaction and acquainting men with procedures for registering complaints and the building of a feeling of confidence and sympathy which will insure the friendly approach of subordinates for advice and assistance not only in military matters but in personal problems as well and the training of leaders in personnel management are all steps that will help our armed forces tremendously in their competition for men.

Pay must be high enough to compete favorably with industry, agriculture, and business if we are to build our standing forces to 2,000,000 men and women through voluntary recruiting especially during time when our Nation has more than 60,000,000 men and women employed.

I have given considerable time during the past several years to the matter of pay. I served for 8 years on the Subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee that had jurisdiction of this matter and I took active part in increasing the pay of the armed forces in 1942 from $30 to $50 for grade 7 or private, then again in 1946 when the pay of grade 7 was raised to $75. I have taken active part in advocating the extension to January 1, 1950, of the exemption of all enlisted pay and the exemption of $1,500 of officers' pay from income tax. This extension is now included as section 107 of the bill H. R. 6712, which has been approved by the Committee on Ways and Means and is awaiting action by the House of Representatives. This action by the Committee on Ways and Means is most desirable in order to permit a complete study of the pay structure of the uniformed services and I understand that studies of the pay structure have been made at the direction of the Secretary of Defense but their studies cannot be completed in time to permit a recommendation being submitted to the Eightieth Congress.

I also took active part in the establishment of more adequate family allowances for enlisted men and in making these family allowances available for grades 4, 5, 6, and 7.

CONCLUSION

In the foregoing discussion I have emphasized the overconcentration of power in the President, the danger of placing our armed forces in the role of master rather than servant to our Nation, the effect of the draft on the morale of the armed forces in peacetime, the possible role of the draft in defeating any program for the training of adequate numbers of Reserve forces, and I have recommended what I think should be a better approach to meeting our problems of raising and providing the personnel of our armed forces in peacetime. In closing, I wish to call your attention briefly to some of the recommendations of General Eisenhower in his final report as Chief of Staff of the United States Army, to the Secretary of the Army, February 7, 1948. General Eisenhower stated:

> Many lessons of the last war are available for the design of a defense pattern: The necessity for unified direction of all combat forces in war; the strategic role of the air arm; the need for accurate military, economic, and political intelligence; the necessity of eliminating the costly industrial time lag between mobilization and the application of significant military effort; the necessity for ready Reserve units and a reservoir of trained men; the dependence of the United States for many raw materials on external sources, and the consequent need for stock piling adequate reserves of critical items essential to a defense program.

General Eisenhower also stated:

> Widespread dispersion of factories or the establishment of underground facilities is an obvious remedy. However, the economic, social, and political obstacles in the way of mass dispersion are so numerous and stupendous as to make accomplishment practically impossible.

I recommend the careful reading of General Eisenhower's entire report. It is worthy of the careful study of every American. I have singled out the above statements only to emphasize the need for a well-balanced preparedness program. I hope in doing this that I can bring to you a better realization of the unbalanced and inadequate approach we are today making to the matter of preparedness. We are witnessing on the one hand a hysteria verging on complete surrender to the inevitable and immediate approach of world war III and with that hysteria is set up a hue and cry for the adoption of the draft or compulsory military service. On the other hand we are witnessing the failure of responsible leaders to meet adequately the other requirements for preparedness. I have had much personal experience regarding our stock-pile program and the availability or nonavailability of strategic and critical materials. I took active part in the development of Public Law 117 of the Seventy-sixth Congress and of Public Law 520 of the Seventy-ninth Congress which have to do with our stock piles. I took active part also on the committee on investigation of our stock-pile situation in 1941 and I have been privileged to sit in on the consideration of the Russell bill, H. R. 6623, which has been under study by the Committee on Public Lands for the past several months and is now awaiting congressional action.

I have continued my interest in the matter of stock piles of strategic and critical materials because of the tremendous importance of them in the event of war. Notwithstanding my efforts and the efforts of many other Members of Congress throughout my 10 years of service in Congress, I need not give you any confidential or secret information to convince you that we are hopelessly unprepared for war today. I will only quote Secretary Krug when he appeared before the Interior Appropriation Committee April 29, 1948, and when he replied to a question put to him by Mr. FENTON, of Pennsylvania. Mr. Krug's statement is as follows:

> Frankly, I will let the committee know that military strategic stock piles don't exist. We have a few items that are not important; but, on the extremely important critical materials, we have virtually nothing in the stock pile.
>
> In commercial use we are pinched in practically every way, and we will be even more pinched with the increase in productivity activity that must come to meet this heavy production program for foreign aid and the defense program.

The newspapers of June 10, 1948, report a speech by Gen. Omar N. Bradley in Detroit, Mich., before the American Ordnance Association on June 9, quoting General Bradley as saying that "contrary to popular beliefs the Army lacks sufficient balanced stocks of weapons and equipment to tide the Nation through industrial conversion in event of another war."

These reports also state that Gen. Joseph T. McNarney, Commanding General of the Air Matériel Command, said:

> If war occurred today, the Air Force combat groups would be composed primarily of

planes that were on the drawing boards prior to Pearl Harbor.

And also that several years would be required to tool up for proper production because of the weakened state of the aviation industry.

The contrast between the hysteria built up for the draft at the same time that we have made so little progress in providing for our defense in other ways is little short of amazing to me. If war should come at any time soon, the lack of strategic and critical materials in our stock piles today would force our servicemen of world war III to fight the early years of that war with the weapons of World War II, and we would thereby repeat our history in every major war in which we have yet engaged.

All things considered, we must face the present situation in international affairs with sounder logic as to our own preparedness. If war is imminent, as the proponents of the draft would make us think it is, responsible leaders in our Government should be severely punished for our failure to prepare adequately in such important defense items as the stock pile of strategic and critical materials without which new and superior weapons cannot be made. If the international situation does not call for greater effort than has been made to date in regard to stock piles and in regard to the dispersion of our industrial development, the proponents of the draft have completely failed to prove that it is necessary for us to resort to the draft at this time.

Who Runs Wallace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Victor Lasky, which appeared in the June 1948 issue of Plain Talk:

WHO RUNS WALLACE?

(By Victor Lasky)

The Communist Party conceived, initiated, formed, staffed—and controls from top to bottom—the third-party movement fronting Henry Agard Wallace's bid for the White House. The New Party, as the self-appointed Gideon prefers to call it, is actually the Communist Party with a new look. The greatest political success Kremlin agents ever managed to pull off in this country, the New Party marks Josef Stalin's entrance into American politics in a big way—with no holds barred.

The Communists make no secret of their control of the new venture. The Daily Worker is the Wallaceite campaign organ and discusses constantly what stand the third party should take on this or that question. Almost contemptuously the Worker states that its readers "have become press agents for Henry A. Wallace." The recent Communist May Day parade in New York turned out to be a Wallace-for-President demonstration. Wallace buttons, even Wallace neckties, were sold by Daily Worker hawkers.

The new party serves as a made-to-order camouflage. Until its formation, the Communists had been on the down grade. The party, as the open exponent of the brutal Soviet foreign policy, had been losing members and influence. With the formation of the third party, at whose head stood a former Vice President preaching a Pax Sovietica, the Communists—solidly entrenched—could conspire with protective coloration. The new venture provided a mass base the CP never had before. And the CP's national board openly announced its intention of recruiting members from newcomers to third party ranks.

"Some of them are ready not only for the new party's answers, but for the more basic answers only our Communist Party can give," the national board proclaimed. The proclamation was signed by William Z. Foster, chairman of the party, Eugene Dennis, general secretary, and Henry Winston, organizational secretary.

The new party, probably insuring the defeat of President Truman come next November, marks Stalin's vengeance for the President's refusal to go all the way with Russia's imperialistic attempts to grab most of Europe. For all political quarters admit the new party controls key votes in key electoral districts. Those votes in the past have gone to Democratic candidates.

Any idea that the new party means to throw its strength behind progressive New Deal candidates should be dispelled, according to Americans for Democratic Action. ADA, leading non-Communist liberal organization, has pointed out that the new party actually constitutes the chief threat to the election of honest progressives. ADA contended that the Wallaceites are either attempting to blackmail progressives into supporting Soviet foreign policies, or punishing them at the polls for refusing to oppose such "war mongering" proposals as the Marshall plan.

This has already occurred in several areas. In Illinois the third partyites have put up candidates in opposition to Paul Douglas and Adlai Stevenson, Democratic candidates for United States Senator and Governor respectively. In California the Wallaceites are running candidates against Representatives HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS and CHET HOLIFIELD, both seeking reelection. In New York, the Wallaceites have threatened political oblivion for Representative SOL BLOOM because he supported ERP and the Mundt bill. In Minneapolis the third party is combating Mayor Hubert Humphrey in his race for the Senate, even though his opponent, Senator JOSEPH BALL, is an outstanding supporter of the Taft-Hartley law.

Wallace knows all this. In the not so distant past he referred to Mrs. Doublas, Bloom, Holifield and Humphrey as outstanding progressives. When Mayor Humphrey got to see him some time ago to complain about the antics of Minneapolis Wallaceites, Wallace—characteristically—advised him to "try and get in touch with Moscow and ask them to pass the word back to the party in Minnesota to lay off."

Wallace also knows that the Communist Party controls his movement and that he has become its creature; that the Kremlinites can make or break him. Repudiated by all leading liberal and labor groups, he is completely dependent on the Kremlin's local machine. Whereas in the past he would occasionally mildly rebuke the Communists, today he doesn't dare. His views now parrot the Daily Worker completely. The Worker has made it clear that, when he does say something not according to Stalin, he does so from a tactical point of view.

This was recognized by Marshal Tito in an interview with the acrobatic ex-Nazi, Johannes Steel, now a glib salesman of Stalinist ideology. "I do not agree with Mr. Wallace when he says the Soviet Union is an imperialist power like the United States," the Yugoslav dictator told Steel. "But, perhaps," he continued, understandingly, "Mr. Wallace said this for tactical reasons."

Most non-Communist liberals, as represented by ADA, view Wallace as a kind of American Benes, willing to lead them into the trap of Communist totalitarianism. They believe that the flood-tide strength he now appears to be showing will recede as soon as the major candidates are nominated.

Wallace's only backing—aside from the Communist Party—comes from the amazingly numerous and interlocking series of Communist fronts, as well as the baker's dozen of Communist-dominated unions. He does have the support of that political Santa Claus, Dr. Francis E. Townsend, creator of the old-age pension movement, whose previous third party venture in 1936 had been labeled Fascist by the Communists. The Townsendites rate high in the plans of the Stalinists in California, where third party strategy through the Independent Progressive Party is directed by Hugh Bryson, a member of the Communist Party.

BEHIND THE WALLACE LINE

To the growing number of repudiations of the Wallace candidacy by liberals and labor leaders Wallace has this answer—he will get the rank-and-file vote. His opponents in the labor movement are misleaders. This is the Stalinist line: Whoever is not with us is a misleader of labor at best, a Fascist at worst, probably both.

It was the line laid down by Eugene Dennis last January. The Wallace movement must be based on "the united front of struggle from below," Dennis said. Translated from Stalinism, this means the workers must be won to the third party, even if trade union leaders are bypassed. Thus far the trade union base of the third party is strictly Stalinist. Every one of the labor leaders identified with it has a Stalinist background.

Even Elliott Roosevelt recognized the Communist inspiration for the third party in refusing his support. Elliott had been a great favorite with the Stalinists. His book, As He Saw It, a party-line account of his father's diplomacy, said to have been ghosted by a Stalinist hack, was widely used for propaganda by Communists all over the world. It was even translated in Russia. Elliott appeared with Wallace several times at Madison Square Garden rallies sponsored by the Communists. But in announcing his refusal to support Wallace he declared:

"It has been indicated to me that the same individuals are running the policy making of the third party as was exemplified in that so-called group of liberals who bitterly fought Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1939 and 1940 in his efforts to rearm and prepare this Nation for possible war * * * the group who immediately became his ardent supporters as soon as the Soviet Union entered the war against Germany."

Elliott's statement proved a blow to the Wallaceites. It came after three other members of the Roosevelt family had disavowed the third party and complained of the unwarranted use of the F. D. R. name by the Wallaceites. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt said she was convinced that Wallace "has with him elements which are dangerous to this country." Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., declared that "no one has or ever will inherit the mantle of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and most certainly not Henry Wallace in pursuit of his present dangerous adventure." And Anna Roosevelt Boettiger, the late President's daughter and confidante, pointed out that in the Wallace camp there are those "who would prefer to see a Communist form of goverment in this country and the demise of our democracy."

When asked what he intended to do about Stalinist support, Wallace told the Socialist Call he would do as President Roosevelt had done. Told that F. D. R. had repudiated Communist support, Wallace replied he would have to check the record. Asked if he would repudiate Communist support if the record showed that F. D. R. had repudiated the Communists, Wallace said he

would have to check the record. Wallace has not indicated yet whether he has had time to check the record which shows that F. D. R. had repudiated Communist support on several occasions.

Last September Wallace told reporters in Trenton, N. J., that he would be happy to work "with Socialists and with Communists or with any group that wants to promote understanding with Russia." (The Socialists have disavowed Wallace from the start and are running Norman Thomas for President again.) Then he said: "The very few Communists I have met have been very good Americans."

As if to back him up, 2 days later William Z. Foster announced in Portland, Oreg., that Wallace was the Communist choice among prospective candidates for President. He described Wallace as "the man upon whom the mantle of Roosevelt has fallen."

Actually the Communist Party's national board first proclaimed for Wallace in mid-1946. Prior to that the third-party strategy appeared, for those willing to see, in the circumstances surrounding the ouster of Earl Browder as Communist top kick. Browder's leadership had been repudiated by Jacques Duclos, French Communist leader, following the latter's return from Moscow. The Duclos manifesto quoted copiously from Henry A. Wallace. The manifesto marked an end to the Communists playing "footie" with the Government and a return to an ultrarevolutionary line. Browder later confirmed that the third-party issue was the key to his expulsion.

"The only charge that might lie against me," Browder told his party branch in Yonkers, "in relation to the convention decisions, is that I failed to withdraw from the Roosevelt-labor Democratic coalition and break up the Truman administration."

The national board in mid-1946 specifically named Wallace as the leader of the proposed new party. Wallace was termed "honest but confused" for the opposition he then displayed to such a venture. The committee declared "he must be shown" the error of his ways. At that time Wallace opposed leaving the Democratic Party for the futility of a third party.

Addressing a Political Action Committee meeting in St. Louis, Wallace, pointing to the numerous obstacles confronting a new party, declared: "It is time for third-party advocates to stop kidding themselves."

But came the Madison Square Garden rally in September 1946, at which Wallace advocated chopping the world into two spheres, one for the Russians and one for this country. The appeasement speech created a storm and led to his forced resignation from the President's Cabinet. Explaining why he had omitted some passages mildly critical of Soviet practices, Wallace said he felt he "had been boced enough."

In February 1947 the all-out Communist drive for a new party was ordered by Foster. "It is absolutely necessary to begin building the new mass party now," Foster stated. "Conditions are ripe * * * the political situation promotes it * * * the Communists must form an active section of the movement."

Foster also noted that "the only possible chance (a faint one at best) to get a progressive candidate from the Democratic Party leadership will be precisely by holding over their heads the threat of a new party."

In other words, blackmail. Through this statement, editorials in the Daily Worker calling for a new party, resolutions passed by Communist-controlled groups ranging from the United Electrical Workers to the International Workers Order, the Kremlin served this notice on President Truman: Either behave or we'll drive you out of the White House with Wallace.

And Wallace, lonely, thwarted, and bitter over his ouster from the Cabinet (he rarely refers to the President by his title—he can never forget that in Chicago he was cheated out of the Presidency in favor of Truman), began seeing more of the Communist crowd which clustered about him like flies around jelly. The out-and-out Stalinization of Wallace had begun.

QUILL SPILLS THE BEANS

The secret maneuvers of the Communists in forming the third party have been disclosed by Victor Riesel, labor columnist of the New York Post. Riesel, who is close to Michael J. Quill, Transport Workers Union president, who has since broken with the party, said that the strategy was laid down by Communist Party leader Robert Thompson in a mid-Manhattan apartment near Bellevue Hospital. Quinn was there.

"First, we'll talk about the third party," Thompson said. "We have decided that Henry Wallace will head a third party ticket and that he'll make the announcement in 3 or 4 weeks. We want you union fellows to get busy and pass out petitions in your unions and send wires throughout the country ordering support for the third party."

"Who decided it?" Quill asked. "The central committee," replied Thompson.

Later Quill attended another Communist caucus in the Hay-Adams Hotel in Washington the night before the CIO national executive board met. Eugene Dennis and Thompson were there. Quill asked if the Communists would support a third party even if it meant splitting the CIO. "We're for the third party even if it splits CIO down the middle," Thompson said, reflecting the decision of the politburo. The next day the CIO board voted 33 to 11 to oppose the Wallaceites. The 11 included:

Harry Bridges, president of the Longshoremen's Union; Hugh Bryson, president of the Marine Cooks and Stewards; James H. Durkin, president of the United Office Workers (UOPWA); Julius Emspak, secretary-treasurer of the United Electrical Workers; Albert J. Fitzgerald, president of the United Electrical Workers; Ben Gold, president of the Fur Workers; Donald Henderson, president of the Food, Tobacco, Agricultural and Allied Workers; Grant Oakes, president of the United Farm Equipment Workers; Morris Pizer, president of the United Furniture Workers; Ferdinand C. Smith, secretary of the National Maritime Union; and Quill.

Quill later broke with the party, refusing to split the CIO. Meeting with Foster at the headquarters of the International Workers Order, 80 Fifth Avenue, New York, Quill asked him about Thompson's threat to destroy the CIO.

"That's not exactly the way to put it," Foster told Quill. "We in the central committee are now discussing the formation of a third federation of labor that should be made up of progressive (read: Communist-controlled) unions of the CIO."

A few days later Quill announced his resignation as president of the Stalinist-led Greater New York CIO Council. He denounced Wallace and other Communist leaders as crack-pots, after having taken their advice for years. The Communists, in turn, labeled him a Tammany Hall agent because of his support of a higher fare on the New York transit lines.

None of the other pro-Wallace CIO board members followed Quill in breaking with the Fosterites. All are playing active roles in the Wallace movement. Albert Fitzgerald is cochairman of the National Wallace-for-President Committee. He is chairman of a 125-man labor committee, of which Russell Nixon, United Electrical Workers, is executive secretary. Nixon is the veteran fellow-traveler who, as director of the decartelization branch of American military government in Germany, showed his pro-Russian bias. Fitzgerald is a pro-Communist, senior grade, and follows party orders down the line.

Three of the board members are admitted members of the Comunist Party: Ben Gold (a member of the national board), Hugh Bryson, and Donald Henderson. Ferdinand C. Smith is an alien Communist whom the Government is seeking to deport to his native West Indies. Harry Bridges has been named a party member by his former wife, and his long-standing record of service to Stalin is commonplace knowledge. On June 16, 1947, he conferred with top Communist leaders at a secret parley in an apartment at 340 West Fifty-sixth Street. Julius Emspak's party name is Comrade Juniper, according to Louis Budenz, former editor of the Daily Worker.

James Durkin's office workers union marched officially in this year's May Day parade. Durkin assumed office at the direction of the Communist strategists, following the "resignation" of Lewis Merrill as president. Merrill resigned for "reasons of health" after the Communist Party assailed him for severing connection with the New Masses and the Jefferson School of Social Science. Wallace appeared at the UOPWA convention last February.

OPERATION WALLACE

In the Stalinization of Henry Wallace, his appearances before sympathetic audiences was a key maneuvers of the Kremlinites. His Stalinization was carefully plotted in what might be called Operation Wallace. After a few months of playing editor of the New Republic, he took to making speeches before such groups as the Progressive Citizens of America. Wherever Wallace went, he heard the cry: "Wallace for President." His mail was heavy. The comrades are prolific letter writers.

But through the New Republic period Wallace played coy on the third-party issue. He didn't say yes. Neither did he say no.

He went to Europe for a series of American-baiting speeches and in France he spoke almost exclusively to Communist audiences. Upon his return home, he found himself a 2-day wonder on the Nation's front pages, drawing large crowds to his meetings. He disclaimed any notions of forming a new party, however. Instead, he said, he wanted to reform the Democratic Party from within.

For political guidance he began to rely heavily on a limited group of advisers. Key person in Operation Wallace was C. Benham "Beanie" Baldwin, currently Wallace's campaign manager. Baldwin's growing influence with Wallace drove Harold Young, his longtime political associate, back to his Texas law practice. Young refused to become a party to the Stalinist plot to kill Truman politically.

Young's departure did not affect Wallace a bit. He had new friends now, who were skilled at playing on the bewildered man's susceptibility and ego.

Baldwin had been a small-town businessman in Radford, Va. He first met Wallace when the latter was Secretary of Agriculture in 1933. After serving 2 years as an assistant to Wallace, Baldwin moved over to Rexford Guy Tugwell's Resettlement Administration (Tugwell currently is a member of the Wallace "brain trust"). Later Baldwin became Chief of the Farm Security Administration. He joined various Communist fronts through the thirties. At present he is a member of the Congress on Civil Rights (the party's legal arm), the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, the National Lawyers Guild, and other fronts.

In 1944 Baldwin sponsored a testimonial dinner for Ferdinand C. Smith. Chairman of the dinner was Basil Harris, president of the United States Lines, who called attention to the fact that Smith had been accused of being a Communist and remarked, "So what?"

Harris' so-what position was one taken by many ship operators during the war. The Communist line then was opposed to strikes while this country was aiding the Soviet Union. But, confronted with the new prostrike line of the Communists, Harris

charged in 1946 that Smith was a Communist and that NMU Communists were flooding American seamen with Communist literature. Unlike Harris, Baldwin is supporting Smith's fight against deportation. Joseph M. Curran, NMU president, with whom Smith is at bitter odds, is not.

During the war Baldwin had been active in forming the CIO's PAC, which today is opposed to the Wallace candidacy. After the war he found himself in disfavor with the administration, but at home in the National Citizens-PAC. In Operation Wallace, Baldwin was aided by the mysterious dark-eyed Hannah Dorner, a former New York newspaperwoman who is an expert in rounding up big names for pro-Communist causes. She did yeoman work for the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, and was executive director of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, which merged with NC-PAC to form the Progressive Citizens of America (PCA) in December 1946. From the first, PCA heralded Wallace as its spokesman.

Another figure in Operation Wallace with a penchant for big names was Jo Davidson, the bearded sculptor. Davidson, cochairman of PCA (the other cochairman, Dr. Frank Kingdon, resigned in refusal to support the Wallace bid), threw parties that brought together big names from Hollywood, Broadway, and the publishing world to meet Wallace. Wallace loved it. If he had looked more closely at the big names behind the hors d'oeuvres, he would have seen the Communist Party's most-publicized talent.

Davidson has long been a luminary in the Communist front firmament. As a member of the Civil Rights Congress, he spoke out for Gerhardt Eisler, the self-martyred Kremlin agent. He was a sponsor of the dinner for Ferdinand C. Smith. In 1943 he protested the distribution by the Book-of-the-Month Club of Mark Aldanov's The Fifth Seal, charging it was anti-Soviet. Replying to the charge, the book club declared:

"To describe it as anti-Soviet is about as justifiable as to call Pickwick Papers anti-English."

Davidson has been active in the campaign to stop distribution of the documentary film, The Iron Curtain, based on the real life story of Igor Gouzenko, former Soviet cipher clerk in Canada. The campaign is being spearheaded by Rev. William Howard Melish, chairman of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. Needless to say, Melish is an out-and-out supporter of Henry Wallace.

Also a key figure in Operation Wallace was Lee Pressman, whose Wallaceite position forced his resignation from a $19,000-a-year post as general counsel of the CIO. Since his resignation, in addition to directing the third party's strategy, Pressman has defended alien Communists in deportation proceedings and is counsel for Communist-led unions.

A member of the Communist Party from the earliest days of the New Deal, Pressman ironically was fired by Wallace from the Agricultural Adjustment Administration—as a radical. Associates recall that at the time Pressman vowed to "get" Wallace, if it was the last thing he did. As general counsel of CIO, Pressman directed Stalinist infiltration of the new labor group and its strategy. He was also general counsel of Philip Murray's United Steelworkers of America, a union which constitutionally bars Communists from holding office.

Pressman's links with Communist fronts are numerous. He "teaches" regularly at the Jefferson School. He recently appeared at a civil rights forum along with such party members as Howard Fast, Carl Marzani, Philip Foner, Doxey Wilkerson, and Herbert Aptheker, all speakers at Wallace rallies. Pressman is associated in a law firm with Harold Cammer and Nathan Witt, both Stalinists. His secretary at Wallace headquarters is Ruth Jett, a member of the CP's executive committee in Harlem.

Pressman shares an office at Wallace headquarters with John Abt, another party insider. Abt, who is on leave as general counsel of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers (CIO), which bolted the American Labor Party on the Wallace issue, is the husband of Jessica Smith, editor of Soviet Russia Today. The main Soviet propaganda medium in this country, the magazine has apologized for everything from Russian slave labor to the Soviet-Nazi pact.

Abt's sister, using the name of Marion Bachrach, is currently national organizer of the Eugene Dennis Defense Committee, a group set up to aid the party's national secretary in his appeal from a 1-year prison term. Her offices are in the party's national headquarters, 35 East Twelfth Street, New York. Miss Bachrach has been secretary of the Council for Pan-American Democracy, a front group headed by Frederick Vanderbilt Field, millionaire Communist and angel for the now defunct New Masses. Field contributed $5,000 to the Wallace campaign.

Another active in Operation Wallace is Lew Frank, Jr., scion of a wealthy Detroit clothing family. Frank, as the Communist whip in the American Veterans Committee, fought bitterly with such non-Communists as Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., Charles Boltè, Merle Miller, and Oren Root, Jr.

Later Frank turned up at the New Republic, as Wallace's assistant. According to William Harlan Hale, who resigned from the New Republic on the Wallace issue, Frank made himself the job of acting as intermediary between his chief and the staff, and of squashing editorial projects that might not serve him politically. With this, the PCA's (read Stalinists) process of absorbing Henry Wallace and isolating him from other influences seemed to have become about complete.

How the Frank technique operated at the New Republic is told by Hale: Wallace was presented with the draft of an editorial spelling out some legitimate American objections to Russian foreign policy. It came back several weeks later with a statement from Wallace that he would not countenance anything critical of Russia. He could not see how by himself he could affect Soviet policies. But he could affect American policies. Criticism must stay at home, he said.

"I don't care a darn," the usually noncussing Wallace told a liberal leader who, visiting him prior to his coming out for the Presidency, implored him not to unite with the Communists in an ill-fated venture.

Such old friends as Max Lerner, PM's editorial pundit, were given a cold brush-off by Wallace. Lerner had visited Wallace to inform him that not even PM would support his Presidential candidacy. PM, at this writing, still opposes Wallace, despite the uncertainty of its new owners' policy.

Thus the Operation Wallace was consummated. The Communists did not climb on the Wallace bandwagon. Wallace jumped—or was pushed—on theirs. On December 29, 1947, in a Vishinsky-like broadcast from Chicago, Wallace announced his Presidential candidacy. It marked the first time in American history that a candidate sought the highest office as a valet of a foreign government, to use the Walter Reuther expression. The Moscow press and radio went overboard with joy.

THE INNER CIRCLE

A few weeks later Wallace announced his six-man brain trust, consisting of C. B. Baldwin, Elmer Benson, Paul Robeson, Jo Davidson, Rexford G. Tugwell, and Angus Cameron.

Cameron, editor in chief of Little, Brown & Co., a trustee of the Samuel Adams School for Social Studies, a Communist front in Boston, and chairman of the Massachusetts PCA, was made treasurer of the National Wallace-for-President Committee. He recently resigned as national treasurer to be succeded by Clark Foreman, president of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, a leading Communist front.

Robeson is the baritone crusader who views Russia as his spiritual home. He holds the record for supporting Communist fronts, and throws a "So what?" at the reporters inquiring as to his being a party member. Appearing regularly with Wallace at campaign rallies, Robeson provides the entertainment, and Wallace the home-spun touch. After marching in the Communist May Day parade, Robeson packed off in a limousine bound for West Virginia to aid the campaign to put the Wallace ticket on the ballot. Another Russia-firster who appears regularly with Wallace is the notorious radio commentator, William Gailmor, an effective money raiser at the rallies.

Elmer Benson, the national chairman of the Wallace committee, is a former Governor of Minnesota and United States Senator from that State. He has a long record of affiliations with Communist fronts. Prior to the war he led a parade of the American League Against War and Fascism in New York. The league was branded as subversive by FDR's Attorney General, Francis E. Biddle. Benson recently signed a statement condemning the "shameful persecution" of Gerhardt Eisler. He was a member of the so-called nonpartisan committee for the reelection of Representative VITO MARCANTONIO, Stalin's ever-faithful echo in Congress. MARCANTONIO stumps regularly for the Wallaceites.

Despite the so-called brain trust, third-party strategy actually is determined by a Stalinist triumvirate—Lee Pressman, John Abt, both party members, and C. Benham Baldwin. The three confer almost daily in the five-story brownstone building at the corner of Park Avenue and Thirty-sixth Street in New York, the nerve center of the new party. Meeting with them occasionally is Lew Frank, Jr., who, since he left the New Republic, has been Wallace's speechwriter. Frank is assisted by the mysterious David Ramsey, described by the Alsops as one of the more important theoreticians in the Communist Party. It was Ramsey who helped prepare Wallace's recent ramblings before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on ERP.

Every key job at national headquarters is held by a Communist, pro-Communist or fellow-traveler. Even lowly office jobs are filled through the Stalinist-led UOPWA. Publicity director is Halph E. Shikes, who during the war served as an editor of the Daily Pacifican, an Army publication. Later he became publicity director of the NC-PAC. A wealthy socialite, Shikes contributed $1,000 to the campaign. His assistant is Elaine Mitchell, formerly assistant editor of the Harry Bridges publication, the Dispatcher. From their offices flows a steady stream of handouts, leaflets, and booklets, most of which are published in Stalinist shops.

Head of the women's division is Mrs. Elinor S. Gimbel, a behind-the-scenes financial backer of the numerous Communist fronts. The daughter of a millionaire, Mrs. Gimbel is cochairman of the party-line Congress of American Women. She is a member of the National Council of Soviet-American Friendship, the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, among other fronts. Her luxurious private home on East Seventy-eighth Street has been turned into a Stalinist salon.

Head of the Wallace arts, sciences, and professions division is none other than Miss Alice Barrows. It was at Miss Barrows' Virginia home that Lawrence Todd, Washington correspondent for Tass, the Soviet news agency, alleged called President Roosevelt "a Kerensky." The late Dr. William Wirt charged that revolutionary techniques had been discussed at Miss Barrows' home by Todd. Miss Barrows was later "retired from her well-paying job in the office of education when it was disclosed that she had been a member of the American League Against War and Fascism.

Another woman operative in the Wallace movement is Doris Senk, who plays the role of troubleshooter. Miss Senk arranged the Southern Negro Youth Congress gathering in Birmingham at which Senator GLEN TAYLOR was stupidly arrested for defying the Jim Crow law. Miss Senk had been chairman of the United States delegation to the World Youth Festival in Prague, a Communist-finagled stunt. A former member of the Young Communist League, she sent a letter to the Central Committee of Czechoslovak Youth in Prague, congratulating that Communist body for the Kremlin's coup in Czechoslovakia.

Coordinating activities in the Negro field for the Wallace committee is George B. Murphy, Jr., national commander of the United Negro and Allied Veterans of America. The UNAVA is a Communist organization, according to Attorney General Tom Clark. Wallace is making a big play for support of minorities, particularly Negroes. Here's what Crisis, official organ of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) had to say about Wallace and the Negro:

"Under his secretaryship, the Department of Commerce was more than ordinarily ridden with humiliating separation of workers because of color and limitation of promotion for the same reason. While in the latter months of 1947, Mr. Wallace was railing against segregation and refusing to speak to separated audiences, for 5 or 6 years prior to that time he had dodged speaking before conventions of the NAACP."

Work among veterans and youth is being directed by Seymour Linfield, formerly associate general counsel of the Communist-controlled United Electrical Workers, and one of the most active members of the Young Communist League. Among the first subsidiaries Linfield formed was the National Students for Wallace.

Another division of the Wallace movement is the Irish-American committee for Wallace and for peace, headed by an NMU Stalinist, James Gavin. Other officers are Mark Murphy, attorney for the Communist-dominated local 65, wholesale and warehouse workers (CIO), and Paedar Nunan of the Stalinist-controlled teachers union (CIO).

AND POINTS WESTWARD

Throughout the country the Wallace "apparatus" is similarly operated by Stalinists. In Wallace's home State the leader of the Iowa Wallace-for-President Committee, a man named Henry Felsen, was a Communist candidate for Presidential elector from Iowa in 1940. During the war Felsen was unable to qualify for an Office of Strategic Services job because of his Stalinist background. He was one of the few Communists who couldn't. Hugh Bryson, party member, runs the works in California. Mort Furay, Stalinist regional director of the United Office Workers, is the leading Wallace booster in Michigan's so-called Progressive Party. The Wisconsin Citizens for Wallace Committee is headed by one John F. Gminski, who was forced out of the Democratic Party for being a Communist.

Keynote speaker at the founding convention of the pro-Wallace Progressive Party when it met in Pennsylvania was Thomas Fitzpatrick, district president of the United Electrical Workers, a member of the Communist Party. The convention took place in York, where the fellow-traveling daily newspaper Gazette and Daily, is published by J. W. Gitt. Gitt supports Wallace. His newspaper has become a haven for Stalinists.

At the PCA convention in Chicago last January, Wallace was nominated by John Howard Lawson, one of the so-called Hollywood ten who refused to tell a congressional committee whether they were Communists. Lawson, a screen-writing commissar, is a Communist Party member. Chairman of the New York State Wallace-for-President Committee is O. John Rogge, former Assistant United States Attorney General, who today defends alien Communists and belongs to a number of front groups. In Chicago the Progressive Party is another name for the Communist Party. Its behind-the-scenes leader is Herbert March, a member of the CP's national board. Len de Caux, whose Stalinism forced his ouster as editor of the national CIO News, has suddenly popped up as Wallace's adviser on local campaigns.

A roster of the contributors to Wallace's "Molotov cocktail" party makes a United States Cliveden set in reverse. The third party's generous backers include almost all the American supporters of the infamous Stalin-Nazi pact.

A Federal Fair Employment Practice Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the House should not forget that bills for a Federal FEPC, including my own bill, H. R. 3034, have not been acted on at this session. People in my district want to know that we mean what we say in our Constitution, in the preamble to the United Nations Charter, and in our declaration of policy to the world in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1947, authorizing the European recovery program. The FEPC legislation must be passed. It will be a great day for the country when it is.

I append a resolution of the New York Young Republican Club which, I believe, represents a very widespread opinion among progressive Republicans favoring this legislation:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE NEW YORK YOUNG REPUBLICAN CLUB, MAY 11, 1948, REGARDING BILLS TO PROHIBIT DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT BECAUSE OF RELIGION, COLOR, NATIONAL ORIGIN OR ANCESTRY

Whereas identical bills have been introduced in the Senate of the United States by Mr. IVES (S. 984) and in the House of Representatives by Mr. FULTON (H. R. 2824) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; and

Whereas these bills have bipartisan sponsorship, both in the Senate and in the House of Representatives; and

Whereas the practice of discriminating in employment against properly qualified persons because of their race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry is contrary to the American principles of liberty and of equality of opportunity, is incompatible with the Constitution, forces large segments of our population into substandard conditions of living, foments industrial strife and domestic unrest, deprives the United States of the fullest utilization of its capacities for production, endangers the national security and the general welfare, and adversely affects the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States; and

Whereas each of the aforesaid bills is designed to attain its objectives in the first instance by conciliation and persuasion, and provides for the use of compulsion only as a last resort; and

Whereas Federal legislation is believed to be necessary and justified in this instance because the principle of equality of opportunity is of Nation-wide application, yet many States have failed to overcome the aforesaid discrimination and are continuing to neglect the problem: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the board of governors of the New York Young Republican Club strongly favors the enactment of the bills sponsored by Senator IVES and Congressman FULTON to prohibit discrimination in employment and urges the Congress of the United States to pass such legislation at the earliest practicable time.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have previously inserted the second and third installments of the fascinating reports by Robert Kennedy, the younger brother of our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. JOHN F. KENNEDY], on Palestine.

It gives me pleasure to insert here, under leave, the fourth and last installment, and to point out that in his Sunday night broadcast Walter Winchell took occasion to pay tribute to this series of splendid and objective reports which, without calling a single name, constitutes a biting indictment of Great Britain:

[From the Boston Sunday Post of June 6, 1948]

COMMUNISM NOT TO GET FOOTHOLD—JEWS GUARD AGAINST RED AGENTS IN GUISE OF REFUGEES—WANT NO PART OF RUSSIAN TYRANT

(This is the fourth and last of a series of stories on the Palestine situation written for the Post by Robert Kennedy, Harvard senior and son of the former Ambassador to Great Britain. Young Kennedy has been traveling through the Middle East and his first-hand observations, appearing exclusively in the Post, will be of considerable interest in view of the current crisis.)

(By Robert Kennedy)

The die has long since been cast; the fight will take place. The Jews, with their backs to the sea, fighting for their very homes, with 101 percent morale, will accept no compromise. On the other hand, the Arabs say:

RELIGIOUS CRUSADE

"We shall bring Moslem brigades from Pakistan, we shall lead a religious crusade for all loyal followers of Mohammed, we shall crush forever the invader. Whether it takes 3 months, 3 years, or 30, we will carry on the fight. Palestine will be Arab. We shall accept no compromise."

The United Nations is scoffed at by both sides, and the United States will never be able to regain the position of ascendency she previously enjoyed with the Arab world. She lost the love of the Arabs when she supported partition. She lost their respect when she reversed that decision. She lost it irreparably. For days on end Arab commentators drummed into their people that finally the power of the Arab world had been realized. No longer would it take second place to the United States and Britain.

The so-called great powers had learned that the Arabs were not a people who could be pushed around, and from now on the Arabs were the ones who were going to dictate the terms.

The Jews are bitter in disappointment. As one Jew said, "Britain let us down for 25 years but you bettered them in a week." The feeling stops at disappointment and there is none of the hatred that exists for the British. They can understand us not wishing to send troops and so become entangled in a war that does not immediately concern us, but they plead only for the right to make this fight themselves. They want arms and frankly admit that if they cannot get them from us they will turn to the East. "What else can we do?" They are fighting for their very lives and must act accordingly.

WON'T ACCEPT COMMUNISM

That the people might accept communism or that communism could exist in Palestine is fantastically absurd. Communism thrives on static discontent as sin thrives on idleness. With the type of issues and people involved, that state of affairs is nonexistent. I am as certain of that as of my name.

There is no question that Russia is sending agents into Palestine in the guise of refugees. But she is sending them into every country in the world and that just happens to be the manner which she has judged best for Palestine.

When I was in Tel Aviv, a group of refugees was landed and amongst them the Jewish agency's "FBI" immediately picked up one of these agents. He was loaded down with money and papers, and all agreed that he must have been sent with the intention that he be captured to mislead the security forces into thinking that all the Russian agents would be as inept as this one and equally easy to capture. Lethargy would set in and it would be then that they would smuggle in their Mata Hari.

DEMANDS ALLEGIANCE

Communism demands allegiance to the mother country, Russia, and it is impossible to believe that people would undergo such untold sufferings to replace one tyrant by another. Robert Emmet, the Irish patriot, on trial for his life before a British tribunal stated the principle. When accused of attempting to bring French forces into Ireland to help wrest it from the British, he said why he, who loved and had been fighting for his homeland, deemed it to his country's interests to replace a known tyrant by an unknown one. These people want a homeland of their own. That to them is the sole issue.

Vehemence and hatred between the Jews and Arabs increases daily. But in many cases Jews and Arabs work side by side in the fields and orange groves outside of Tel Aviv. Perhaps these Jews and Arabs are making a greater contribution to the future peace in Palestine than are those who carry guns on both sides.

The Arabs in command believe that eventually victory must be theirs. It is against all law and nature that this Jewish state should exist. They trace expectantly its long boundary and promise that if it does become a reality it will never have as neighbors anything but hostile countries, which will continue the fight militarily and economically until victory is achieved.

STABILIZING FACTOR

The Jews on the other hand believe in a few more years, if a Jewish state is formed, it will be the only stabilizing factor remaining in the Near and Middle East. The Arab world is made up of many disgruntled factions which would have been at each other's throats long ago if it had not been for the common war against Zionism. The United States and Great Britain before too long a time might well be looking to a Jewish state to preserve a toehold in that part of the world.

Both sides still hate the British far more deeply than they hate one another. There was a British high commissioner who when attending the opera used to have his car parked directly in front of the main door, a place usually reserved for discharging passengers. An even more unpopular practice was the regulation that at the end of the opera everyone had to remain in their seats until the British high commissioner was out of the opera house and in his car.

But the British have left—and now the issue is to be resolved in a bitter war between Jew and Arab. I do not think the freedom-loving nations of the world can stand by and see the sweet water of the River Jordan stained red with the blood of Jews and Arabs. The United States through the United Nations must take the lead in bringing about peace in the Holy Land.

H. R. 6302, United Nations Reorganization and Building Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, words without action are obviously inadequate. The American people believe in the United Nations. They now have an especially fine opportunity to show it. The United States by Concurrent Resolution 75 adopted December 11, 1945, invited the United Nations to make its home here. Now the United Nations needs suitable housing, as it is quartered way out on Long Island, about 25 miles from central New York City in a rented building formerly a wartime factory. An American private citizen, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., has contributed almost $8,000,000; the city of New York has contributed $20,000,000; the Federal Government is asked to lend $65,000,000 on an excellent security basis, as appraised by an outstanding New York private real-estate firm. The Committee on Foreign Affairs has given the House an opporunity to vote a splendid resolution to make the United Nations more effective and to utilize regional arrangements within the United Nations Charter for protecting the democracies. The committee has incorporated in the same bill the wherewithal for the United Nations to build its home in New York City. Action on this bill will show that the House accepts the responsibility for peace and supports a typically American threefold foreign policy: (1) Economic reconstruction through the ERP; (2) adequate military forces for the discharge of international responsibilities; and (3) the strengthening and proper housing of the United Nations in the United States. I append a news story from the New York Times of today showing the importance of the building loan and its security and fairness:

PUBLIC PLEA MADE TO SPEED UN LOAN—NATIONAL CAMPAIGN BEGUN TO BRING PRESSURE ON CONGRESS TO FINANCE CONSTRUCTION

(By George Barrett)

A Nation-wide campaign was begun here yesterday to marshal direct public support for immediate approval of the $65,000,000 United Nations world capital loan now pending in Congress.

Officials of the American Association for the United Nations, alarmed that the loan agreement for the East River skyscraper headquarters might be lost in a last-minute legislative jam before Congress adjourns, dispatched special instructions to 300 chapters throughout the country to mobilize a general protest against the long delay in passing the bill.

Clark M. Eichelberger, director of the association, supplemented his chapter instructions with an urgent message to each of the 150 business, labor, religious and special organizations accredited to the United Nations to win forces in an appeal to Congress.

Declaring that most persons were astonished to learn that Congress might not pass the $65,000,000 loan at this session, Mr. Eichelberger emphasized that every effort would be made to regain lost time and to prove beyond doubt that the American people were unanimously in support of the world capital loan.

"This is one of those instances of seeming public apathy resulting from unanimous support," the director of the AAUN said. "The American people have unanimously assumed that Congress, having invited the United Nations to locate here as a result of the overwhelming desire of Americans, would naturally pass the loan."

The people of the country are becoming aroused by congressional neglect of the loan bill, he added, and as a result a tremendous storm of protest is brewing.'

Mr. Eichelberger noted that all AAUN chapters in large cities were working over the week-end on an emergency basis to alert the people. From national headquarters here the director sent a telegram to JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, urging immediate passage of the bill.

Mr. Eichelberger stressed that the United States probably would be accused of bad faith if President Truman's offer to finance the East River project were not backed by Congress at this session, a feeling that is being echoed widely at Lake Success.

FINANCIAL RISK HELD NIL

In many quarters at Lake Success there is surprise that Congress should show any reluctance about passing the loan, for according to the report of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, just received at the interim headquarters, the United States stands virtually no financial risk on the construction loan even if the world peace organization should someday fold up.

Robert Moses, construction coordinator of the city of New York, informed the House committee that even by very conservative estimates between $50,000,000 to $60,000,000 could be realized from the sale of the improved six-block tract if the United Nations left. Mr. Moses told the committee members that property adjacent to the world capital tract had more than doubled in value since the United Nations moved into the East Side.

The report, noting inferentially that there had been criticism about aiding construction of a peace headquarters during a Nation-wide housing shortage, stressed that the whole skyscraper project would use about .36 percent of the total steel used in the United States for construction and maintenance in 1947.

Moreover, it was pointed out, the type of steel used would be different from that employed in multiple-dwelling housing structures, so competition with normal housing requirements would be negligible. The same held true for lumber requirements and other major material needs, it was declared.

In a separate appeal, the State Department said the United States would benefit from the world capital construction because American labor would be used and the bulk of the ma-

terials purchased in this country. The situating of the temporary world capital in the United States already brings about $20,500,000 a year into the country, it was held, and this sum would probably increase, according to the State Department.

Birth of a Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave I am inserting in the RECORD a thrilling eyewitness story of the birth of a new nation.

Written by Mrs. Golda Meyerson in simple moving language, this account needs no window dressing from me; I can only express the hope that many of the gentlemen here will take the time to read her story, which was published in the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, June 13.

ISRAEL IS BORN: TENSE MOMENT IN JEWISH HISTORY—DETAILS OF BRIEF QUIET CEREMONY TOLD FOR FIRST TIME BY EX-MILWAUKEE TEACHER

(Although the new Republic of Israel was proclaimed almost a month ago, the details of that historic event have not yet been told. Here, for the first time, is the story told by Golda Meyerson, one of the signers of the proclamation of independence and a member of the Council of the Provisional Government of Israel.

(Mrs. Meyerson, formerly a school teacher in Milwaukee, went to Palestine in 1921 and settled in one of the agricultural settlements. She subsequently became head of the Jerusalem section of the Political Department of the Jewish Agency for Palestine and during the war was a member of the Palestine Economic Council.)

(By Golda Meyerson)

On May 14, in Tel Aviv, the Jewish people compressed 34 centuries of their history into 34 minutes. On that day, Israel was redeemed and a nation was reborn.

At midnight, on May 14, the British mandate was to come to an end. Conceived in an act of inspired statesmanship in 1922 for the purpose of building the Jewish national home, the mandate had finally been abandoned as unworkable. At midnight, British rule in Palestine was to end and a new regime was to come into being. Eight hours before the midnight deadline the new government was created.

Throughout the day, busy Tel Aviv had gone about its business. But its customary bustle and vitality had been subdued by the self-conscious expectation that attends the rendezvous of men with their destiny.

Until the last moment, the site selected for this solemn occasion had been kept secret. Perhaps military security had dictated precaution, perhaps it was instinctive that political leaders, emerging from a symbolic underground, should insist on seclusion, perhaps there was a feeling that this historic ceremony should be sheltered lest it be profaned by unseemly demonstration.

At 4 p. m.—the ceremony had been advanced 8 hours because it was Sabbath eve—a little group of Israel's veteran leaders gathered in the Tel Aviv Art Museum, an ultramodern citadel, rising sheer, solid, and severe, gleaming white in the Mediterranean sun.

The ceremony was brief, almost hurried, and utterly devoid of ritual and festivity. At the stroke of 4, Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion gently tapped his gavel. The short, stocky man who had toiled half a century for this moment now rose to lay Israel's formal and legal claim to the land he had defended from the days of his youth when he had stood guard in the rocky hills of Galilee.

Without a word, Ben-Gurion's hand brought us to our feet to sing "Hatikvah" ("The Hope"), Israel's anthem. Many times in many lands "Hatikvah" had given fervent voice to Israel's immemorial hope for a national home, but this day, for the first time, its melody was broadcast officially over microphones throughout the land whose redemption it had envisaged.

On the dais sat the members of the Cabinet of Thirteen. Behind them hung a portrait of Theodor Herzl, modern prophet of Zionism, who just half a century ago had written: "The Jews who will it shall have their state." The blue and white flags of Zion hung on the walls. The museum's paintings and sculpture were like this new and old land—a mixture of modern and classical.

At the foot of the dais sat the members of the state council, and in the audience were the invited guests—members of the general council of the World Zionist Organization and the Vaad Leumi (the Jewish National Council), members of the high command, the leaders and representatives of the many Jewish public and philanthropic institutions established in the 30 years of Palestine's reclamation and upbuilding. Many wore their holiday clothes. Some had just come from work. And there were some, one knew, who would be in battle dress on the morrow.

When the "Hatikvah" ended, Mr. Ben-Gurion rose and said:

"Members of the National Council, delegates of the Yishuv and the Jewish nation, I shall read to you the proclamation of the Jewish state which has been adopted by the National Council at its first reading."

It was a brief statement, a simple declaration without rhetoric, sentiment, or passion. The proclamation quickly traversed the long history of the Jewish people. Each of its short paragraphs marked an epoch, marked it quickly, and moved ahead: The birth of Israel in the days of the Bible it gave to the world; the long centuries of exile and dispersion; the struggle to return home; the first Zionist Congress convened by Herzl in 1897; the high promise of the Balfour Declaration and the mandate; the Nazi machine gun and gas chamber census of Europe's 6,000,000 Jews—there were many in that audience who had seen the concentration camps and had lost their loved ones in the gas chambers and the crematoria; Israel's contribution to the winning of the war against the Nazis; the resolution of the United Nations calling for an independent Jewish state in Palestine.

And then Mr. Ben Gurion's voice trembled as he read:

"This recognition by the United Nations of the right of the Jewish people to establish their independent state may not be revoked. It is, moreover, the self-evident right of the Jewish people to be a nation, as all other nations, in its own sovereign state.

"Accordingly we, the members of the National Council, representing the Jewish people in Palestine and the Zionist movement of the world, met together in solemn assembly by virtue of the natural and historic right of the Jewish people and of the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations, hereby proclaim the establishment of the Jewish State in Palestine, to be called Medinat (the State) Israel."

There was a burst of applause.

INDEPENDENCE REALIZED

Mr. Ben Gurion had spoken 17 minutes. In those 17 minutes the land was transformed from a protectorate to an independent state and everyone in that room had become a freeman in command of his own future.

There were tears in his eyes as the venerable Rabbi Judah Leib Fishman, oldest member of the Provisional Government, rose to recite the simple little prayer which every observing Jew has said times without number:

"Blessed art Thou, O Lord, our God, King of the Universe, that Thou has maintained and preserved us to witness this day."

Then Mr. Ben-Gurion read the first legislative act of the Jewish state. A thunderclap of applause reverberated through the hall as the new government annulled the white paper of 1939, by the terms of which the Chamberlain government had arbitrarily restricted Jewish immigration and land settlement in Palestine.

The secretary of the new provisional government, Zeev Sharif, called upon each member in alphabetical order, to come forward and sign the declaration. The first was David Ben-Gurion. The last was Moshe Shertok, the new Foreign Minister, who had carried on the diplomatic struggle at Lake Success for more than a year, and who received a great ovation.

Some 10 blank lines were left on the proclamation for the signatures of members of the National Council who were in Jerusalem or abroad and unable to attend the ceremony at Tel Aviv.

The signing took another 17 minutes. When it ended, we waited for a speech. But there was nothing more to be said. And then suddenly from an upper floor there came again the melody of the "Hatikvah." We rose to our feet. Some tried to accompany the philharmonic's violins, but the audience had spent their emotion.

Then Mr. Ben-Gurion said:

"Hamedina Kamah, Hayeshiva Tamah." In Hebrew—just four words. "The state has been established. The meeting is adjourned." That was all. A great moment had passed into history.

PEOPLE CELEBRATE

Outside, the people of Tel Aviv were on their way from shops, offices, and apartments to the coolness of the Mediterranean shore. There were flags on public buildings and on some of the cars and busses. But there were no demonstrations. There was no gathering in the streets. There was no parade. There was no oratory saluting the new state. There was not even the Kaddish or Yizkor prayers in memory of Israel's dead.

A few were disappointed that Israel had been created without "pomp and circumstance." But most of us remembered that pageantry, tumult, and parade had reached the height of expression in the parade grounds of Nuremberg, and we were glad that Israel had come into being simply, modestly, humbly.

That night, as they do every night, Tel Aviv's people stood up on the embankment and looked out to the sea. Back to the east, from the depths of the Jordan Valley, Abdullah's modern chariots—tanks and armored cars—were rolling up the winding roads from Jericho, their guns oiled and ready for an assault on Jerusalem. Further to the north the Syrians and Iraqis were poised for raids against the Jewish settlements in Galilee and the Beisan Valley. Far to the south, across the Sinai Desert, rolled the descendants of Amenhotep, who had led Egyptian warriors into Palestine more than 3,400 years ago. The morning would bring death from the skies.

But that night Tel Aviv looked westward and out to the sea. Its mind was not on the invader. It looked expectantly for the boats that would soon bring Israel's wandering sons and daughters back home after a long and weary exile.

They were free, now, to come at last.

For, as Herzl had written:

"No individual is strong enough to transfer a people from one place of residence to another. Only an idea can do it. The state idea does possess that power."

Last Roll Call

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, in many respects the number one citizen of Rochester, N. Y., is James A. Hard, commander of the Department of New York, GAR, who next month celebrates his one hundred and seventh birthday. A fitting tribute to him and his few remaining comrades is contained in an editorial from the New York Times, which under leave to extend my remarks is set forth below.

Last week the Grand Army of the Republic closed its books with impressive ceremonies marking the passing of this organization, which has stood four-square over a span of more than 80 years for the finest features of American life. It is fortunate indeed that the Sons of Union Veterans and their Auxiliary, together with other allied patriotic organizations have banded together to carry on the great work which the GAR pursued with such vigor and devotion over a period of many years. I know I bespeak the unanimous feeling of my colleagues in extending to stalwart Comrade Hard and all those surviving patriots who bore arms at his side, as well, indeed, those who wore the Gray in the War Between the States, the gratitude of the Nation for their consistent championship of those ideals and principles upon which alone we can base a guaranty of future security.

LAST ROLL CALL

Many of us can still remember when the Grand Army of the Republic made a stalwart figure in parades. It is hard for us to realize that nearly as many years have now passed since Lincoln made his speech at Gettysburg as the fourscore and seven that had then elapsed since the Declaration of Independence. But James A. Hard, of Rochester, commander of the GAR, Department of New York, could realize the pathetic truth when he called the eighty-second annual encampment to order on Thursday. Not one man responded. That which Confederate weapons and valor could not accomplish, time had done.

The old battlefields are quiet these days. Of the thousands of young men who defended the ridge at Gettysburg, and those who attacked it, a handful are left. The tread of marching men retreating into Maryland is heard no more, except in sensitive imaginations. Only the monuments, the lines where the Confederate artillery stood, the valley where Pickett's infantry massed, the regimental memorials of the Union side, tell the terrible story. Chancellorsville and the Wilderness drowse in the summer weather. A Union soldier, dying too soon to be a member of the GAR, lies in nameless rest a few feet from where Stonewall Jackson fell. The old Confederate trenches can still be traced in the woods by Fredericksburg; the dead, most of them forever unknown, sleep in the old war cemeteries, and awaken to no bugles and to no drums.

We do not know how much of all this Mr. Hard remembers, what battles he fought, who were his comrades. We cannot read the decree of fate in any war which strikes one young man down and allows another to live on to a great age. But we salute Mr. Hard and those few surviving men who, in honor, fought with him and against him.

Rutgers Philosopher Believes That the British Government Is Trying To Destroy Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, more than once I have risen on this floor to protest against the Anglo-Arab war of annihilation against Israel, since the new nation was born and our Government recognized it.

I have found substantiation of my thesis in a letter written by Dr. Erwin Biser, a widely known American philosopher on the faculty of Rutgers University, who even uses my own phrase—that Great Britain is "the real aggressor."

Under leave, I am inserting in the RECORD Dr. Biser's letter as it was printed in the New York Post of June 8, 1948:

CHARGES BRITISH GOVERNMENT SEEKS TO DESTROY ISRAEL

The Socialist Government of Great Britain today was condemned as the real aggressor against Israel in an open letter to Sir Oliver Franks, British Ambassador to the United States.

The letter was written by Erwin Biser, an American philosopher associated with the department of mathematics, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J. It was written as to a British philosopher from an American one, since Sir Oliver formerly taught that subject.

The text follows:

"DEAR SIR: Upon hearing that you were professor of moral philosophy in one of the leading English universities, I thought it opportune to address the following letter to you with a view in mind of acquainting you with the reactions of an American philosopher toward the British conduct in Palestine.

"It is with painful regret and hesitation that I hold the Socialist Government of Great Britain to be the real aggressor against the state of Israel. Despite the legal niceties and perversities of your representative at the United Nation's Security Council, your Government stands condemned before the world conscience dulled as it is at the present moment—as waging a conscionless, cruel, and brutal war against the remnants of a persecuted people.

"Your Government has allied itself with Hitler accomplices, the very same Arab feudal princelings who stuck a dagger in your back while you were fighting for your very precious life and existence; they betrayed you twice and will not hesitate to do it again. The actions of your Government are detrimental and suicidal to the interests of the English people.

"It is almost inconceivable that a Government which pretends to espouse the ideals of liberty, social justice, and fair dealing should act with such utter disregard for human decency and time-honored pledges; should attempt to cover up its foul and monstrous deeds with Goebbels-like hypocrisy superposed on sanctimonious respectability and impartiality.

"Your ruthless, double-crossing and perfidious behavior is almost as cynical as that of Communist Russia—for all this you are paying the price of alienating millions of erstwhile friends and of kindling the fires of deep and intense hatred in the hearts and minds of millions of people throughout the world.

"I am using these words very advisedly, Mr. Ambassador, for I always admired the character, accomplishments, and civilizing genius of the British people; like other Americans I stood in awe-inspiring admiration at the austere sacrifices of your people in their valiant fight against the Nazi monster.

"Today one cannot help feeling that under the influence of the notorious Herr Bevin, that sickly psychopathic anti-Semite, purveyor of Hitler socialism in England, your government is slowly degenerating into a species rightfully characterized as the spiritual heirs of the Hitler philosophy. It is time for men and women the world over, and above all, for intellectuals and philosophers to recognize this evil for what it is and to unsheath their swords against the monster of anti-Semitism—the malady threatening to destroy our civilization.

"Your government is leaving no stone unturned to destroy the new state of Israel; it exerts tremendous pressure on all governments not to sell arms to the besieged Hebrew peoples while at the same time furnishing military instructors and equipment to its mercenaries, the feudal democrats of Arabia; it stealthily—under the guise of anti-communism—poisons the hearts and minds of our own officials with the deadly virus of the Bevin-Mufti (what strange bedfellows) brand on anti-Jewishness.

"In my humble opinion, the imposition of the embargo on arms to Israel by my own Government is a shameful, immoral, and ignoble action wholly inconsonant with our character and traditions; it was done at the behest of your foreign office which is quite adept in inventing plausible arguments, arguments as palpably false and as fraught with dangers to world peace as those advanced for the appeasement of Hitler.

"I protested to my Government against giving aid to your Government; my portion is given to you very reluctantly and begrudgingly, for I refuse to be an accomplice to the brutal and cynical assault on a people battling for the right to live. You are slowly being transformed into a cowardly, ungrateful Nation, forgetful of its noble heritage; it is a historic axiom that the death of empires is seldom unaccompanied by a life and death struggle against the people of Israel.

"You may succeed in crushing the youngest democracy in the world unless the deadening conscience of a once noble Nation is reawakened and aroused to repudiate with contempt and condemnation the perpetrators of this criminal folly. You still have time to redeem your honor and standing among nations, otherwise you will perish like all empires doomed to eternal shame.

"In conquering Zion, Mr. Ambassador, your Government will have lost its soul and its right to live; millions of human beings will drown in a sea of hatred and contempt. Reflect on your deeds, British statesmen, before history pronounces its irrevocable and final verdict; repent before it is too late.

"Sincerely yours,

"ERWIN BISER."

Who Will Answer This Question for American Mothers and Fathers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, on May 3 I reported to the House that I was writing Secretary of National Defense James Forrestal to secure from him a statement of our defensive boundaries, so that I could tell the people of my district what was embraced by our military policy.

On May 8 I received a reply from Secretary Forrestal, which I am including with these remarks.

The only interpretation I can make of Mr. Forrestal's letter is that the responsible authorities in this country have determined that our military must dominate the world outside the borders of Soviet Russia.

That concept seems fantastic, so perhaps I am wrong.

If so, I hope the leadership of the House will tell the Congress and the American people, before the draft is enacted, in plain and understandable language, exactly what our military policy is today.

Before Congress acts to abrogate human liberty by peacetime conscription, it should have this information. Otherwise, surely it will be acting in an irresponsible fashion that bodes ill for the future of the American people.

The exchange of correspondence follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1948.

Hon. JAMES FORRESTAL,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As I have pointed out in the House today, the President, the Secretary of State, yourself, and other high-ranking Government officials have at various times spoken of the urgent need for universal military training.

In connection with this most unusual request, I do not recall that the President, the Secretary of State, or yourself have ever disclosed to the American people in specific language what you as the responsible officials in our Government consider our defensive boundaries to be.

It appears to me that it is unfair to ask the Congress to pass upon this program for universal military training without presenting to Congress, in clear language, a statement of what the President and yourself consider our defensive boundaries to be.

Your helpfulness in supplying this information will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
HOWARD BUFFETT,
Member of Congress.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, May 8, 1948.

Hon. HOWARD BUFFETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BUFFETT: I was glad to receive your letter of May 3, 1948, since it affords me an opportunity to explain the basis of the Military Establishment's request for universal training and other measures designed to strengthen our national security.

I think the best exposition of my own views on this general subject is contained in the attached statement which I made before the House Armed Services Committee on April 12, 1948. This statement summarizes some of the measures which I feel are essential for our security, and it describes briefly the world conditions and other considerations which I believe require their adoption. In this connection, I particularly call your attention to that portion of my statement which begins on page 10.

The statement which I enclose does not specifically deal with what you refer to as "our defensive boundaries." Personally, I do not think that our security requirements can be defined in any such terms, although I may misunderstand the precise concept which you have in mind. It seems to me that in a world where scientific advances have largely broken down the geographic barriers of former times and in which there is a rapid and constant change in political, social, and economic conditions, one cannot think in terms of specific immutable boundaries when discussing the problem of our national security. In making this statement, I do not mean to imply that some areas do not, at any given time, because of their geographic location or for other reasons, have unusual strategic significance. I do wish to say that it by no means follows that one can circumscribe the United States with a definite line which can be denominated as our defensive boundary.

I hope that the statement which I enclose, together with the above explanation, will make my own position clear. However, if you feel that you require further information or that I have misinterpreted your meaning of the term "defensive boundaries," I should be pleased to hear from you further.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES FORRESTAL.

Arthur S. Flemming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1948

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, in the resignation of Mr. Arthur S. Flemming as a member of the United States Civil Service Commission, the Federal Government loses one of its most valuable public servants. Ohio Wesleyan University is to be congratulated upon his acceptance of the presidency of that great institution, but everyone who is familiar with Mr. Flemming's record as a member of the Civil Service Commission will concede that it will be difficult indeed to replace him. Mr. Flemming was remarkably well equipped by temperament and training for the particular duties which he was called upon to perform. He rendered them with consummate skill, painstaking thoroughness, and a conscientious attitude at all times. His many friends in every department of the Government will follow his career as an educator with interest and admiration.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Flemming's action dramatizes the fact of which we are often reminded that every step must be taken by Congress to make Federal administrative service as attractive as possible. His own decision was obviously reached with great reluctance. While not influenced by salary considerations in his own case, Mr. Flemming has repeatedly urged removal of pay ceilings for top professional employees subject to the Classification Act in order to strengthen the Federal service in its competition with private industry for competent personnel. This would constitute not only an act of simple justice, but a sound permanent policy as well.

Address of the President of the United States at the Thirty-fifth Division Reunion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by President Harry Truman at the Thirty-fifth Division reunion in Omaha, Nebr., Saturday, June 5, 1948:

I am very happy to be back again tonight with the men of the Thirty-fifth Division—one of the greatest fighting outfits this country ever had.

It is good to meet again with old friends who were my buddies in the First World War. I am proud also to meet the young men who brought new glory to the division in the Second World War.

The story of the Thirty-fifth Division is to me an example of one of the finest features of our democracy. This was a National Guard division. Here were trained civilians, ready to come to the defense of their country. When the need arose these men, and thousands of other National Guardsmen throughout the Nation, answered the call—and answered on time. I won't go so far as to say that the National Guard won the war. But I will say that if it had not been for the National Guard and the Reserve components of our armed forces the story would have been quite different.

You and I have shared the privilege of serving in the defense of our country. Now that the fighting is over, we have an equally great privilege to serve in another cause. In time of war we worked together for victory. Now we must work together to secure the peace and the blessings which that victory has made possible.

This time we must make sure that the tragic events that followed the First World War are not repeated. Looking back, the mistakes that were made in the years following the First World War are so obvious, and their consequences were so terrible, that there can be no excuse for repeating them.

Fortunately, we have learned from that bitter experience. After the First World War the chief hope for keeping the peace was the League of Nations—the great dream of Woodrow Wilson. But short-sighted men in the United States blocked our entry into the League, and it never recovered from that blow.

This time the United States took a leading part in organizing the United Nations. In spite of the difficulties it has run into the United Nations is working. And we are determined to make it succeed.

In addition to learning that we must cooperate with other nations to keep the peace, we have learned something, also, about how to maintain our prosperity at home—at least, most of us have. As a result of the boom and bust of the 1920's and the 1930's, we have learned that the welfare of our people cannot be divided. The farmer, the workingman, and the businessman prosper together, or they go down together.

At present, we are all busy and our economy is prosperous. But that prosperity can be lost if we fail to safeguard it. Right now it is threatened by inflation and by the high prices which are causing real hardship to millions of our people.

On the other hand, our prosperity can be maintained and greatly increased if we act with vision and courage. This is essential for our own comfort and well-being. It is essential also in order that we may contribute to the economic recovery of other nations, to help secure world peace.

Consequently, it is with a sense of real urgency that I speak to you tonight about one element of our economy, one which is fundamental to all the rest. That is American agriculture.

Do you remember what happened to the farmers shortly after the First World War? I'm sure most of you do. The farmers were hit by a disastrous slump.

In those years of farm depression, farmers could not sell their crops for a decent price; they could not pay for the equipment they needed; they could not provide a decent living for their families. In many cases they even lost their farms and were evicted from their homes because they could not keep up the unequal struggle.

The fact that farmers were unable to recover fully from this slump helped to bring on the great depression of the early 1930's that carried everybody—farmers, workers, and businessmen—down together. We can't let that happen again, and if I have anything to do with it, it won't happen again!

Since the dismal period of the 1920's and the early thirties, farmers and the Government have cooperated in what can truly be called a rebirth of American agriculture.

Now, most of the Nation's farmers are enjoying the best financial position they have ever known. Cash farm income last year reached a record high level of more than $30,000,000,000. Farm mortgage debt has dropped 25 percent since 1941. Bank deposits and savings of farmers are $22,000,000,000, the highest in our history.

While the present agricultural prosperity is due partly to special factors in the postwar situation, the sound farm legislation which has been adopted since 1932 provides a much better basis for sustained agricultural prosperity than we have ever had before. If you think back for a minute to 1932, you'll remember that we then had no soil-conservation program, no price-support program, no school-lunch program, only a limited research program. In the years since that time, we have built up these and other valuable farm programs, until today there is a solid basis for further agricultural progress.

But even though most of our farmers are better off than they have ever been before, farmers are concerned lest a sudden change may result in the bottom falling out of agricultural prices, as it did in 1921.

The American farmer has done a great production job during and since the war. In spite of shortages of labor, machinery, fertilizer, and many other materials, he has stepped up farm output to meet our needs. This was an essential contribution to winning the war, and to helping worldwide recovery after the war. Our farmers have earned the right to real protection against a postwar slump.

We need not—and we must not—allow an agricultural depression to happen. This is part of a larger problem—that of preventing general economic depressions. I believe that we should use every power and resource of the Government to maintain maximum employment, production, and purchasing power throughout the whole economy. I believe that a most vital part of this effort must be directed toward meeting agricultural problems.

We need action, and action now, to make sure that our farmers hold the gains they have made since 1932, and that we move forward with the job of providing a future of organized, sustained, realistic abundance for American agriculture.

We should also be deeply concerned about the many farm families who are not sharing fairly in the progress of American life.

In far too many farm communities, housing, medical services, and educational facilities are inadequate. Some farmers are isolated by poor roads. Some still do not have electricity.

Here again we need action, and action now, so that more farm areas will have better housing, adequate health services, good schools and good roads, electricity, and all the other benefits of modern living.

I believe that the Federal Government has a definite part to play in building for lasting agricultural prosperity and in assisting farm areas to obtain better living standards. The sound and far-reaching agricultural legislation we now have constitutes an excellent basis for continued progress. But we do need a number of extensions and improvements in our present farm programs.

First, the Congress should provide a permanent system of flexible price supports for agricultural commodities. For the benefit of farmers and of the whole Nation, we need price support legislation which will assure reasonable stability of farm income while encouraging desirable adjustments in production.

The wartime legislation for price support programs will expire next December. It must be replaced. Farmers right now don't know what to expect in the case of crops that go beyond the end of the year, including the important winter wheat crop.

I believe that the American farmer has the right to expect his Government to prevent the prices of farm commodities from falling to ruinous levels.

I believe also that the entire Nation should be protected against the wide swings in farm prices that have contributed in the past to economic insecurity for all of us.

A second important program for the future of American agriculture is that of soil conservation. Our present soil-conservation program must be vigorously supported and rapidly extended.

We have been preaching conservation in this country for more than 40 years, but it was not until the 1930's that we began to make important progress in conserving the soil—the most basic of all our resources. Today the soil-conservation program is going strong. We have come to realize more and more the vital necessity for protecting the thin layer of top soil which sustains our national life. Throughout the country, farmers have organized 2,000 soil-conservation districts to push this work forward, and the operators of nearly 3,000,000 farms are cooperating today in the agricultural-conservation program.

But I don't think we should be satisfied until every acre of farm land in the United States is being properly managed so that its fertility will be permanently maintained. We must not, through ignorance or misguided economy, lose any more of our vital soil resources.

As a third element of major importance to agricultural prosperity, we must take steps to maintain adequate markets for farm products and to improve the methods of distributing them to consumers.

The principal market for our farm products is here at home, among the American people. The best assurance of farm prosperity, therefore, is general prosperity for the whole country.

But, aside from doing all it can to assure general prosperity, the Federal Government should take specific steps to maintain strong and steady farm markets. For example, we need to press forward with our research program to develop new uses for farm products. We must also continue to take steps, in cooperation with other governments, to encourage export markets for many of our important farm commodities.

American farmers cannot expect to be prosperous if our trade with other nations is strangled by high tariffs and other trade barriers. In this regard, the most important step we can take is to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for 3 years in its present form.

We have a great opportunity, also, to develop programs which will help to assure stable markets for the products of our farms and at the same time will improve the health and the diets of our people. The excellent school-lunch program which has been worked out in recent years, for example, should be strengthened and extended.

I believe that we should also start now to develop a practical plan for safeguarding the diets of low-income families. We should have such a plan ready all the time on a stand-by basis, to be put into operation on short notice in case of need. We must never again allow Americans to go hungry while agricultural surpluses are going to waste.

Both farmers and consumers will be helped by continued improvements in the distribution of farm commodities. We all have the right to expect reasonable efficiency and minimum waste in processing, transporting, and distributing farm products. And we have the right to expect a reasonable relationship between the price the farmer receives for his commodities and the price the consumer must pay for them.

I believe very strongly that the Government should continue to encourage farm cooperatives. Cooperatives have proved their usefulness and their right of survival in a free-enterprise system. But they are under heavy attack. Some people, through selfishness or lack of foresight, seek to destroy cooperatives or limit their effectiveness. We must stand firm against these attacks.

I have spoken of price supports, soil conservation, and marketing and distribution. The fourth major element which I believe should continue to be a part of our national agricultural program is this: The Federal Government should assist farmers in meeting special problems of their occupation, just as it gives assistance to other great segments of our population.

I have recommended to the Congress, for example, measures to provide better health services to farm communities, and measures to help farm families get better houses. Better roads should be provided in many agricultural areas. We should go forward with rural electrification as rapidly as possible to bring the blessings of electricity—and they are real blessings—to the farms which they have not yet reached.

All the measures I have been discussing tonight are sound, practical steps needed to assure the future welfare of American agriculture. They represent no great change in our national policy, but instead are designed to improve and build upon the sound foundation we already have.

A number of the measures I have been talking about need to be enacted into law. Since the beginning of the Eightieth Congress, in January 1947, I have been recommending action on this necessary legislation. The Secretary of Agriculture has presented the program in detail to the Congress on a

number of occasions. The Congress has considered it, and studied it, and weighed it, and pondered it. But the Congress has not acted on it.

We must not give up hope. There is still time for the Congress to act. I am sure that American farmers join me in the wish that the Congress will not leave Washington without passing the farm legislation we need.

Here in Nebraska a few weeks ago there was a primary election. A lot of prominent politicians were interested in the outcome of that election. It happens that Nebraska is justly famous as a great independent farm State, in the heart of the agricultural region of the Middle West—the Breadbasket of the Nation and of the world. So, these prominent politicians got the idea that they should come out here to Nebraska and make farm speeches. And that's what they did.

They came and said they were for the farmers; they said they were for a farm program; and they said they were for the enactment of legislation needed for the farm program. Now, I must confess to you that these same politicians have great influence with the present Congress. So I think we might properly ask, "Why doesn't Congress act?"

I believe that is a fair question. I believe the time has passed when a man can be for a farm program when he is in the West and against a farm program when he is in the East. If everybody is in favor of a farm program, now is the time for the Congress to act.

We have it within our power to bring sound and lasting prosperity to our farms and to improve the standard of living here in our own country and in other countries.

This is the course we must follow to build for our future and to make our full contribution to peace and freedom in the world.

The Swedish Invasion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on Sunday, June 13, I had the honor of addressing the Swedish Centennial Mass Rally at the Coliseum in Detroit, Mich., on the subject of The Swedish Invasion. His Royal Highness Prince Bertil, of Sweden, was present as were Lieutenant Governor Keyes of Michigan and Mayor Van Antwerp of Detroit.

I ask unanimous consent to insert my address in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SWEDISH INVASION

The eyes of the Swedes have been turned toward America for hundreds of years. Shortly after the landing of the *Mayflower*, hardy sons of Sweden had established successful colonies on the Delaware River near Wilmington. And long centuries before that, the Vikings visited North America and left historic marks on this side of the Atlantic in many places to bear mute witness to their seagoing exploits and their wild, unconquerable spirit. Important and interesting as these ancient things may be, presently we are concerned with more commonplace, more important, and more recent adventures of the plucky Swedes.

This historic year of 1948 marks the one-hundredth anniversary of the beginning of the invasion of the Middle West by the Swedes. And we are assembled here today to observe that important event. These invaders were not noisy, colorful buccaneers. They came, not armed with guns, but with plows. They came, not clothed in military armor; they came with stout hearts and eager hands and set about their task of conquest. The invaders came, not to take, but to give; not to destroy, but to build. And especially do I emphasize this point—they came not in the usual manner to ride roughshod over helpless natives; they came in ever-increasing numbers to create out of a magnificent wilderness comfortable homes and richer living conditions for their loved ones.

They were not adventurers out on a lark in pursuit of quick riches, romance, and thrills; they were plain people with a strange light in their eyes, searching for a new home where their children's children might have a better chance. They brought with them their Bibles and their humble religious reverence and they brought with them habits of thrift and industry ingrained in them through the bleak centuries. They sought not something for nothing. Willingness to perform hard work was their stock-in-trade, and an opportunity to prove their worthiness their principal objective. History records that they received what they sought in full measure.

In those days, what America needed most was men with skill and brawn, and especially brawn, to clear the land, drain the swamps, build cities, and man infant industries. Therefore, the welcome sign was out to these men from the north, and the lowly immigrants of 100 years ago, to whom we pay tribute today, made the most of it.

When my mother was 9 years of age she came to America in an old-fashioned sailing vessel. It took her 6 weeks to cross the Atlantic. My father worked his way across on a tramp freighter and migrated to Illinois when a young man. With the pennies he earned through arduous toil, he brought to this land of opportunity, one by one, his large family of younger brothers and sisters. One can hardly believe that 100 years ago some of these present-day beautiful and fertile Illinois farms were malaria-infested swamps covered with heavy undergrowth. My father almost lost his life with malaria, but he didn't give up. When I visit those fertile acres I try to imagine how they appeared in their virgin state to my determined father. I am intensely proud that he had the hardihood, the vision, and the judgment to pioneer in their conquest, and that it was he who first brought them into the service of mankind.

Yes, my father was born across the sea, but I have never known anyone, regardless of where he might have been born, who had more respect and devotion for the American flag, the American Constitution, and the American institutions of freedom. No one could love a country more than he loved the land of his adoption. In respect to these things, I think of him as a typical Swede.

I do not want to leave the impression that the Swedes alone subdued the Middle West. Such is not the fact. Native American pioneers from the Atlantic seaboard were pushing farther and farther west constantly, and strong, thrifty men and women from all of Europe had a heroic part in the gigantic enterprise of subduing that wild and tremendous area. The Swedes were only a part of this great movement, but they played their part exceptionally well.

I do want to make the point, however, that no foreign element or group blended into the American pattern more naturally and more effectively than did those hardy Swedes. The first generation became thoroughgoing Americans over night, and the second generation is as American as Yankee Doodle. Fortunately, the new generations of Swedes did not lose their forbears' splendid attributes of thrift, industry, and deep religious faith.

No nation in all history has encouraged without prejudice and on equal terms the mingling of so many races and peoples within its borders as has America. Truly, this country is the melting pot of mankind. The traditional hates, century-old boundary disputes, bitter national jealousies and constant clashing, so common in Europe's struggling nations, have had no counterpart here.

Instead, the Scandinavian policies of live-and-let-live, which they developed and perfected across the sea, have prevailed among all peoples here. In a large part this accounts for the tremendous progress in industry, in the arts, and especially in social welfare which America has made in the past century.

It would require a long report to list all of the physical and material blessings which sprang from the loins of these men and women from the Land of the Midnight Sun during the past hundred years. They built substantial homes, productive farms, splendid school and church buildings, yet the real contribution of these immigrants has been spiritual rather than material. They brought something along with them which America must incorporate into its very soul, and which all the world must acquire for its own salvation. Sweden fought its last war many years ago. For centuries Scandinavians have lived in peaceful dignity and with mutual respect for all other peoples. All differences and disputes have been resolved by them across the conference table. They have mastered mankind's hardest and most vital task—that of living together with all peoples on a friendly, cooperative basis.

A generous God has given mankind a good earth, but criminal selfishness and downright meanness have kept man from making the most of it. Instead of friendly cooperation, war and conquest have been his practice. Everywhere we have a few creatures in human form who would rather rob than work. We have had political heads of governments, too, who craved the wealth of their neighbors and who attempted to seize it by force of arms. It cost civilization much blood and treasure in World War II to depose three such vicious rulers. Criminal tyrants who stage wars of conquest must be taught by certain destruction that such methods will not wor' anywhere any more, and peoples must be taught that they follow such leaders at their own peril. The United States was compelled by circumstances which it could not control to do the job of spanking which was required.

One would be stunned beyond expression if some morning he were to read in his paper that Michigan had declared war on Wisconsin. All would be shocked if anyone even suggested the remotest possibility of such a ridiculous thing. There is no more logic for a war between Russia and the United States today than for a war between Michigan and Wisconsin. Texas and Colorado are good neighbors. Their citizens travel back and forth across their respective borders with full confidence and mutual esteem. There isn't even one lawsuit pending between those two States. Their peoples mingle with one another on the most friendly terms. Texans may sing "The Eyes of Texas Are Upon You," and Coloradans might warble with deep feeling and patriotic fervor "Where the Silvery Colorado Wends Its Way," but there the rivalry ends. The States of the Union have learned to live in peace with one another as do the Scandinavian countries, without a hint of trouble of any kind. Nations everywhere must learn that important art, and be helpful to one another, instead of planning organized murder across their borders.

Today more than 25 percent of all the people of Swedish descent in the world are said to live in the United States. They are Sweden's gift to Americas noble experiment in democracy. But that gift, overwhelming as it is, left the mother country neither frustrated nor denuded. To the contrary, it is another case of "Casting thy bread upon the waters" and having it return a hundredfold. Sweden's generous contribution to America of the cream of her manpower has made both countries stronger. Sweden is one of the most progressive, efficient and satisfactory democracies in the world today. The influence on Sweden of the migrants she sent forth helped accomplish this fortunate phenomenon. Inspired letters to the old home, praising the kind of democracy they found here, did not go unnoticed.

Sweden, quick to see the advantages of the newer industrial, agricultural, social, and political methods of America, received all suggestions of improvement and progress coming from this side with open arms. Yes, Sweden, in her march toward better things, has been greatly influenced by the United States, but the United States has been greatly influenced by Sweden also. For both nations it has been a two-way street. Each is much stronger because of the other. Today no two nations are closer together in lofty ideals, wholesome principles, and sound thinking than are the United States and Sweden. The lowly immigrants who came to our shores, poor in worldly goods, but rich in pride and character, have bridged the wide gap across the Atlantic, and have made these two nations comrades in the great crusade to convert the world to law and order.

A year before World War II broke out, Colorado's foremost businessman and industrialist visited all parts of Europe. He was so enthused by what he found in Sweden that he invited me to lunch to tell me about it. He spoke of the cleanliness of the people, and their thrift, integrity, and efficiency. He was thrilled by the orderliness and the peace and tranquillity he found on every hand. He noted the stability of the Swedish people and their tolerance, patience, and judicial temperament. He commented most favorably on the fact that there were very few poor people and fewer rich in Sweden. He said that of all the countries he had visited, Sweden made the best impression on him. It took centuries of Christian culture to bring about such a happy situation.

One of the three main purposes of this centennial celebration is to preserve the records and documents of the history of the great Swedish migration to America. A worthy objective, to be sure. Coming generations, curious about such things, should see them, for out of these homely experiences of sacrifice and hardships they will gain inspiration and high resolve. But museums are stuffy things and carry with them the implications of the past tense and the feeling that the whole thing is accomplished.

I want to think of the invasion of the Swedes as a living, enduring, and continuing adventure. Great things have been accomplished which enlist our heartiest commendation and swell our pride, but there remains work for the descendants of these Swedes to do. What has happened is prologue. The main task remains.

The world today is torn by dissension and world war III at this very hour is a real threat. Militarism and the most devastating armament race of all history is plaguing mankind everywhere and destroying the economy of every country of the world.

The present Congress is appropriating four times as much money for rearmament as the total of our annual educational bill for all schools, public and private, from the kindergarten through the highest college course. I say four times the annual cost of all formal education in the United States goes into our current armament race. We are told that next year the cost of our Military Establishments will go up 25 percent, and the following year another very substantial increase will be imposed upon our taxpayers for the military.

Feverishly, we are turning out atomic bombs. Feverishly, American scientists are trying to increase six-hundredfold the potency of the atomic bombs we have already manufactured. Feverishly, Russia is growing bacteria cultures to be used on us.

Atomic and bacteriological warfare is aimed directly at noncombatants. It is said now that the safest place in the next war will be in uniform. Women and children living in large cities will be the targets of the next war. It is planned now to burn millions of them to a crisp. The brutality of world war III is too ghastly and monstrous to contemplate, and yet Americans who should know better are talking of a preventive war. That is why I am not much excited about museums today. Unless we can stop this trend toward war, records and history are not important.

All of us have been thrilled with the progress Count Folke Bernadotte, of Sweden, is making in bringing about a truce in the Holy Land. His patience, determination, and understanding are getting results.

It will take exactly that kind of a firm but friendly approach to resolve the differences between Washington and Moscow. The present dangerous developments must not continue. The stakes are great. The way is dark. Civilization hangs in the balance. In the name of the men and women of Swedish descent in America, I call upon the Mother Country to provide the leadership to save the world from impending disaster.

It is my fervent hope and my earnest prayer that Sweden will assume this leadership and that she will bring the great powers to the realization that there must not be another world war. I have faith that her iron men, with their deep humanitarian instincts and well-balanced minds, will work this thing out and save the world. As an American descendant of the Swedish "invasion" I plead with them to do so.

Salute the Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, inasmuch as this is Flag Day, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an original poem entitled "Salute the Flag," written by Karl Vass, a man with whom I served.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALUTE THE FLAG
(By Karl Vass)

Along the street the Colors come
With marching men and fife and drum;
Salute the flag!
With colors white and blue and red—
A living symbol of the dead
Who died that it might live instead;
Salute the flag!

Police patrolmen of the day
In V-formation lead the way;
Salute the flag!
The people come from far and wide,
And line the streets on either side,
And all with patriotic pride
Salute the flag!

The bands are finest ever seen—
The Army, Navy and Marine;
Salute the flag!
The men who man our planes and tanks
And battleships, are in the ranks—
True sons of Dixie, and the Yanks
Salute the flag!

The general leads the big parade
With admirals trimmed in golden braid;
Salute the flag!
The colonel leads the Cavalry,
Prancing ahead of the Infantry,
Supported by Artillery;
Salute the flag!

Our sailor boys from ships at sea
Have formed a marching company;
Salute the flag!
And with them, fresh from foreign scenes,
From Iceland to the Philippines,
Our soldier-sailors, the Marines;
Salute the flag!

Our airmen from the azure blue
Have come to earth to join us, too;
Salute the flag!
With other airmen in the air,
O'er land and sea and everywhere,
They keep Old Glory flying there;
Salute the flag!

And there come Middies dressed in blue
Who may some day be admirals, too;
Salute the flag!
The West Point boys are marching by,
Erect and handsome, youthful, shy,
Who nobly live and bravely die;
Salute the flag!

And that? Why, that's the Medical Corps
With doctors and pretty nurses galore;
Salute the flag!
They're soldiers, too, and just as brave,
Who would our wounded heroes save
From pain and anguish and the grave;
Salute the flag!

The Legion sends a company
Of veterans and auxiliary;
Salute the flag!
And other veterans ride in cars,
With medals and with battle scars,
And mothers wearing golden stars;
Salute the flag!

How proudly march the Waves and Wacs
Who follow in our heroes' tracks;
Salute the flag!
The loyal Scouts are on the way,
Mere lads and lassies fresh from play,
Who do a kind deed every day;
Salute the flag!

Along the street the Colors go,
Our hearts are high, our voices low,
Salute the flag!
It makes a freeman of the slave,
Protects our ships upon the wave,
And follows the hero to his grave;
God bless our flag!

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO ISACSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Speaker, the clock is ticking away the hours and minutes toward the end of the Eightieth Congress. Will it be said of this Congress that it sat for 2 years, through two regu-

lar sessions and one special session, and failed to accomplish the most important job before it? Mr. Speaker, the greatest challenge faced by Congress and the administration since the war ended has been inflation. I charge that, far from meeting this challenge, the two old parties and their representatives in and out of Congress have catered shamefully to the interests of the profiteers and ignored the welfare of the people.

Let us look at the record. It was a Democratic President, Mr. Truman, who took the safety catch off the anti-inflation lid when he removed the excess-profits tax at the end of the war. Make no mistake about it: No one in the United States had an interest in causing inflation except those who stood to profit by it.

And how they have profited. At the end of 1947, corporation profits before taxes were running at the rate of $32,000,000,000 a year. That is five times the profit the corporations made in 1939, before the war. For every dollar the corporations were paying their employees at the end of 1947, the corporations paid themselves and their executives about 46 cents. That is what it amounts to when you realize that corporations wages and salaries were about $80,000,000,000 a year, while profits and officers' salaries totaled about $37,000,000,000.

Once the safety catch was off, the lid flew up. This time it was the Republican leadership in Congress, in the spring of 1946, which mangled the OPA Act until only a shadow of price control was left. It does not take a very long memory to recall that some of the leaders of the Republican Party nearly came to blows over who should have the honor of best serving the National Association of Manufacturers in killing OPA. Nor have the housewives forgotten that as the Republican Congress ripped out the controls which protected the people from the profiteers, the public was assured through full-page ads that with OPA removed, prices will quickly adjust themselves through free competition to levels that consumers are willing to pay. One GOP Member of the upper House even predicted on June 12, 1946, that without price control, meat will cost less than today. I wonder if this gentleman, and the Republican-Democratic bipartisan coalition which voted with him for emasculation of price control, can hear the angry murmurs of the people over the fact that meat prices are today double what they were in June 1946?

The game of ticktacktoe with inflation continued. Even the shadow of price control was too much for President Truman. On October 14, 1946, he yielded to meat-packer pressure and decontrolled meats. On November 10, 1946, he removed all controls except those on rents, sugar, and rice. The lid was really off. By April 1948, wholesale prices had risen 45 percent above June 1946. Consumers' prices had risen 27 percent. These price rises are today costing consumers $37,000,000,000 a year over what they would have spent if OPA controls had remained.

Figures are dull, lifeless things. But the reality behind the figures is of flesh-and-blood human beings. It is because of them that inflation is so serious. These price rises are not just percentages. They mean that millions of our people are being deprived of the necessities of life—of milk, of shoes, of medical care, of education and recreation, of the opportunities to live in elementary decency.

Members of this House have warned in recent weeks against the evils of "totalitarian dictatorship," but does it never occur to them, as they seek to black-out freedom of thought in this country, that their action—or inaction—on price control has all the effects on the American people of a dictatorship? Let me quote to you from the magazine '48, concerning the effects of inflation on a worker named Jeff Logan:

> If a dictator came along and confiscated Jeff's savings, cut his standard of living in half, took away his car and his camera, yanked out his telephone and radio, limited his entertainment to five or six movies a year, denied his wife an operation, and forbade her to have another child, Jeff Logan would rear up on his hind legs and fight back. Rising prices have done these things and more to Jeff and his family.

High prices are costing each working family hundreds of dollars a year in lost purchasing power. Average manufacturing wages in April 1948 were close to $52 a week. That seems like an improvement over the best wartime wages—$47.50 in January 1945. But consumers' prices are at least 33 percent higher now. To maintain the standard of living he had in January 1945 an average worker needs $63 a week now. He has $52. So he is losing about $570 a year—even if he works full time.

A cut in standard of living is a menace to the health of our people. Even before this inflation began American workers were losing around 600,000,000 man-days a year due to illness and accident—about 40 times the average days lost through strikes in the 10 years before the war.

A cut in living standards is a menace to the stability of our economy. It means our people are using up their savings, going into debt to buy necessities, and cutting down their purchases of these and all other kinds of goods. As the Journal of Commerce observed some months ago, "What we don't like about the present business picture is the fact that the volume of unit retail sales is showing a persistent downtrend. If more goods are being produced than sold, that cannot go on forever."

There is a law of physics which applies equally in economics: What goes up must come down; and the higher inflation goes, the farther it must fall. The last time it fell we had 15 million unemployed.

A lot of lip service has been paid to this situation. But lip service won't stop inflationary profiteering. It was way back on October 23, 1947, that President Truman called a special session of Congress with the warning that it was urgently necessary—I repeat, urgently necessary—for the Congress to take legislative action designed to put an end to the continued rise in prices, which is causing hardship to millions of American families and endangering the prosperity and welfare of the entire Nation."

Was this just a pre-election-year gesture? Did the words "urgently necessary" mean nothing?

Why is it that the only response to the President's message has been the Republican-sponsored law, passed by the special session, to exempt voluntary allocation agreements from antitrust prosecution, while the principal feature of the Administration bill to check inflation is a wage freeze?

Why is it that Congress has recently acted to raise living costs yet another notch by exempting railway rate-fixing from antitrust prosecution?

Why is it that bills to raise public utility rates have gotten such sympathetic hearing in this Congress, while genuine price control bills are never reported out of committee?

I say the time is past when we can afford to play politics with inflation, to cater to selfish corporate interests, and to neglect our greatest resource, the health and welfare of our people.

By spending $21,000,000,000 a year and up on armaments and foreign aid, we may postpone a threatened depression. But the administration and the Congress cannot escape responsibility for the fact that such a gigantic program of Government spending with no controls on prices or profits simply fans the flames of inflation. It means we are putting what J. A. Livingston, in the Washington Post of April 4, 1948, calls a false, military prop under the business structure. To avoid pulling this prop out and collapsing the economy, we are headed straight toward the device of Adolf Hitler: making full employment by converting the economy into a war economy, which creates an irresistible drive for war itself. The horrifying conclusion of the stabilization program the President and the bipartisan majority in Congress would impose upon our country is a war of atomic devastation, bringing down incalculable horror and catastrophe on the entire world.

I believe there is yet time to escape such a suicidal path.

I believe the first step is to take the profits out of war preparation. That is why on June 2, 1948, I introduced H. R. 6780, to nationalize the military aircraft industry on the same basis as our Navy yards; and to limit munitions profits to 4 percent.

I believe the second step is to restore price controls. Voluntary methods have utterly failed. For 2 years now, we have witnessed appeals by the President and his advisers for restraint on the part of business. These appeals have been about as effective as Hoover's appeals in the early 1930's for increased employment. Each appeal has been met by big business with cold rebuff; business has arrogantly raised prices in the face of the President's appeals. The President did not help himself when, last fall, he succumbed to business propaganda and described price control as the method of a "police state." It does not make sense: Price control, which proved its worth in World War II as a basic measure of protection of the people's welfare and the Nation's economic stability, is called the method of a police state, whereas the big business press hails as an "act of

liberation" the truly police state bludgeon, the Mundt bill.

Last year, when the President called for voluntary price control, United States Steel gave him big business' answer by raising its prices an average of $5 a ton. Further increases in steel and other goods have followed in steady succession. Meanwhile, the American worker's chief defense against inflation, collective bargaining for decent wages, has been undermined by the Taft-Hartley Act. The companies have been bold this spring; they have resisted needed wage increases with an arrogant disregard for the welfare of their workers and of the communities which depend on those workers' wages for a large part of their business. They have done so in the face of over-all profits which are five times the prewar level. They have answered the earnest appeals of their workers for modest wage increases with token price cuts which have had absolutely no effect on the cost of living. In fact, the consumers' price index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which was at 167 in March before these token cuts, rose in April to 169 and gives every indication of going steadily higher. The auto industry, which benefited directly by the token cut in steel prices in April, has refused to lower its prices. Food prices, even with summer coming on, are almost as high as in February before the drop in speculative commodity prices. The speculators and gamblers continue to clean up; it is the people who pay.

Mr. Speaker, if this Congress adjourns without enacting price controls, we shall faced a period of 6 months, without the possibility of congressional action, of the utmost danger. The expenditures we are now authorizing—$15,000,000,000 for the armed forces, nearly $6,000,000,000 for foreign aid and the like—will begin to be felt in the market place as the buyers bid for commodities like steel and wheat which are still inadequate to meet demand.

There will be no restraint on the profiteers. The people will be at their mercy, and I shudder to think what will happen to the already-squeezed living standards of our people. It is absolutely necessary that this Congress provide some basic measure of protection for the living standards and the economic stability of the Nation in this coming period.

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced in the House a bill for genuine effective price control. A similar bill was introduced in the upper House by my distinguished colleague, Mr. GLEN TAYLOR, the junior Senator from Idaho. I have simply brought it up to date. It would immediately stop prices where they are, at June 1948 levels, with provision for later adjustment by the Administrator. It would give our housewives and their families desperately needed relief by rolling back prices of critical foods, for example, meat, milk, fats, to the lowest levels of 1947, with the use of subsidies to protect the farmers from loss. Commodities other than foods would be fixed at prices which would guarantee the sellers their prewar, 1936–39 margin of profit over costs before taxes. With the large volume of goods being sold today, that would ensure a generally larger volume of total profit than in 1936–39. The bill would also provide authority to allocate and ration goods, to whatever extent necessary to enforce the price ceilings and to distribute commodities in short supply in an equitable fashion.

The "Worst Congress"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said over the radio and in the press during the last few days concerning the President's western trip and his condemnation of the Congress. Stuart H. Perry, publisher of the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram, has discussed editorially this criticism of the Congress. Mr. Perry's editorials are widely read throughout Michigan and it seems to me in this particular instance he has stated the facts as they are in such plain and simple language that the editorial is worthy of repetition; therefore, pursuant to permission granted to me, I am including that editorial which is as follows:

THE "WORST CONGRESS"

When President Truman—or candidate Truman—told an audience at Spokane that the present Congress is "the worst Congress we have had since the first one met," he made a hasty and intemperate statement. He also made an erroneous one, for the present Congress is not the worst; it is not even bad; on the contrary its record has been clearly on the good side, if judged impartially and not through partisan spectacles.

If Mr. Truman had said, "from a Democratic Party standpoint, and from my own standpoint as a candidate, it is the worst," he would have been nearer right. But not right, even at that; for there have been Congresses more obnoxious to Democrats than this one has been.

The President, however, made no qualification. He just said that this Congress is the worst that ever sat, which is absurd. Actually it has enacted a large amount of very sound and profoundly important legislation. It passed the Taft-Hartley labor act—offensive politically to Mr. Truman, but a sound and constructive act which the public demanded and approved. It passed the Greek-Turkish aid bill, a basic step in our foreign policy. The administration proposed that step, and got almost exactly what it asked from Congress. Then came the European recovery plan, also asked by the administration, and passed by overwhelming majorities in both Houses of Congress. And finally the huge rearmament bills, also asked by the administration, giving even more than was asked and by practically unanimous votes in both Houses.

If Mr. Truman thinks all this was done by the worst Congress that ever sat, we wonder what kind of a Congress he would call a good one. Of course he didn't like the Taft-Hartley Act, and it was passed over his veto. The Congress also passed a tax reduction bill over his veto. But it took a lot of Democratic votes in Congress to do those things; he must include many of his party members among the worst ever. And public opinion supported both those bills and supported both vetoes; so public opinion likewise must be the worst ever.

Mr. Truman's blow-off against Congress must be ascribed to ill temper and unguarded loquacity. It was not the kind of statement that any President should make. It is as unseemly for a President to call Congress such a name as it would be for Congress to pass a resolution calling Mr. Truman the worst President we ever had.

It was not only bad manners, but bad politics. Nobody but strong Democratic partisans agree with him, and certainly his rash remark did not favorably impress the independent or doubtful voters.

To make a bad matter worse, Mr. Truman's violent partisan expressions—this one and others—are being made on a supposedly nonpolitical tour at the expense of the taxpayers. When he started from Washington on a luxurious 15-car special train for a 10,000-mile trip, the White House declared that the trip was nonpolitical because the President would not speak under Democratic auspices. He actually left all the officials of the Democratic National Committee behind, though he took 53 press, camera, and news-reel men along. But he soon showed that he could make a hot political speech without having a meeting under Democratic auspices. A rear-car platform, or any old place, will do very well.

Thus at Gary he told an audience from the rear platform that he hoped the people would elect a Congress that would work for the common people instead of for the people with money and that this Congress is responsible for high prices. At a station in Idaho he charged Congress with being indifferent to western interests. At Spokane he told a labor-union audience to throw out Republican Senators and Congressmen and that the floods out that way will continue as long as Congress thinks the West is no good.

For a nonpolitical tour at the expense of the Treasury, Mr. Truman's trip is a gem. It is really a campaign tour, pure and simple, by which he hopes to sell his cause to the voters. His success as a political salesman, however, is at least doubtful. But at any rate it costs the party treasury nothing, for the party chieftains didn't go along and therefore spent no money. The taxpayers are paying the whole bill of expense.

Memoirs of Cordell Hull

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, Cordell Hull, one of our country's greatest Secretaries of State has put down the record of his life and career in two volumes entitled "Memoirs of Cordell Hull."

As the father of our Nation's reciprocal trade program and one of the country's great statesmen these two volumes contain most valuable information. The contents of these volumes are an inspiration and guide to all thinking Americans in these trying times.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include in the RECORD two excellent reviews of Mr. Hull's Memoirs, as follows:

MEMOIRS OF GREAT STATESMAN, TENNESSEAN
(Reviewed by D. F. Fleming, author of The United States and the World Court)

Whatever Cordell Hull attempted he did thoroughly, including the writing of his memoirs.

Though gravely handicapped by much illness, he has completed his story, in 2 volumes, 124 chapters, 1,743 pages. The index is 61 pages long.

Hull was ably assisted by Andrew Berding, who in turn had a staff of three people, but the book was not "dictated." Most of the chapters were rewritten several times, and Colonel Berding assured one of my classes recently that it is truly Hull's book.

It is written simply enough for the general reader. Though hundreds of dated documents are quoted, most of them from State Department files, there are no footnotes. This will not prevent historians from considering it as a mine of information, any more than its formidable length will keep Tennesseans from reading it with great pride and profit.

The narrative covers Hull's entire life, but nine-tenths of it deals with his work as Secretary of State. He held that office nearly 12 years, about 50 percent longer than any other man, and during the greatest crisis in our national life, the full story of Hull's impact on the turbulent events of this epoch is here. All of his controversies—with Moley, Welles, Wallace, and Morgenthau—are dealt with fully, along with the story of his much greater bouts with Germany and Japan.

It is clear from these volumes that Hull's domestic achievements establish him as one of the greatest liberals of his time. From his youth he studied liberal teachers—Locke, Burke, Gladstone.

He began fighting the tariff-protected interests as a boy orator and never stopped until he had changed the whole method of tariff making from the shameless giving of "protection" to everybody who wanted it, in an orgy of lobbying and logrolling, to the present method of careful, gradual tariff making by executive agreement with other nations. Before Hull achieved this miracle no one would have thought it possible.

Yet, his work in taxation was still more revolutionary. For decades he worked incessantly for the legalization of income and inheritance taxes. He opposed sales taxes as falling on the poor man and labored without ceasing until income and inheritance laws, written under his own supervision, had become law.

The excess-profits tax followed, and during World War I, Hull helped increase the rates on these taxes, based on ability to pay, until they approached the 80-percent mark.

More than any other man, Hull is the father of these great taxes. He put in his people's hands the instruments whereby almost any economic reform can be brought about, and whereby the greatest reforms can be achieved without revolution.

Later, Hull sometimes told Roosevelt that he was proceeding too fast and far with social reform. When, however, he came to write his final evaluation of Franklin D. Roosevelt, he said: "President Roosevelt, in my opinion, was one of the greatest social reformers in our modern history." The same can be said of Hull with equal truth. In his last chapter he looks to a future in which the poll tax will not restrict the ballot in his native land, saying: "The right of all citizens freely to vote should be guarded, and their pathway to the voting booth should not be obstructed."

The greatest contemporary interest and probably the deepest historic significance of the book is its account of Hull's Russian diplomacy. Unlike so many people today, he knows Russian history, especially the 25 years of enforced Russian isolation after 1917 when "they became very seclusive and more suspicious than usual and vituperative in return."

At the Moscow Conference in 1943, Hull soon disarmed this tendency. Molotov became "increasingly pleasant and communicative" and "I was more and more impressed with his broad grasp of the questions entering into the discussions."

Moscow was a great diplomatic triumph for Hull. He came back with the foundation of the United Nations laid, and with full evidence that the Russians wanted to cooperate in the postwar world. This conviction is repeatedly stated and when he left office late in 1944 we were certain that Russia and the United States could work together in the United Nations. After that, Roosevelt visited Hull often at the hospital—his last visit only a few days before his death—without expressing any fears that Russia would abandon our cooperative movement for peace or would block it or destroy it.

Hull records that in the spring of 1944 newspapers, commentators, and columnists were already doing their best to drive Russia out of the international movement by constant attacks and criticisms, and in his final chapter he begs for moderation from the press and radio. We should, he says, "count 10 hours or 10 days before berating another nation." There is a full record of Britain's persistent efforts, beginning early in 1944 to divide the Balkan-Mediterranean area with Russia, a development which Hull consistently opposed, but in vain. Spheres of influence were blocked out.

Throughout his long account of the foundation of the United Nations he found ample evidence that the Soviet Union has made up its mind to follow the course of international cooperation.

There is no word of approval in the book for the Truman doctrine or for any other manifestation of the get-tough-with-Russia policy which mushroomed as soon as Hull and Roosevelt gave over control of our policy.

The "dangerous conduct of the Soviet Union in the last several years" is mentioned on page 1739—and followed by final pages of pleading for observance of the cardinal principles on which the United Nations is founded.

In 11 different parts of the book Hull records his total conviction that Hitler's plans for cold-blooded, diabolical world conquest were unlimited, and that our peril from his schemes and those of the Japanese was extremely grave, but there is not a single suggestion in the book that Russia has any such plans or that we stand in danger of her aggression.

The analogy upon which we have been acting so nervously and belligerently for 3 years does not impress Hull. If it had, a man so utterly in love with his country would have sounded the tocsin again, or at least have put in some word of warning.

Instead, Hull says: "Major wars are generally followed by a widespread feeling of uneasiness, impatience, unrest, and suspicion. Our people and leaders and the peoples and leaders of other nations must be willing to overcome this feeling. They must examine with sympathy and patience the views of others. They must try to ascertain the true facts in any situation. They must avoid assuming adamant positions. They must refrain from exaggerating and overemphasizing their own claims and from appealing to prejudice."

Very few men have ever rendered as great services to this country as has Cordell Hull, and his counsel about our relations with Russia will not be the least of his legacies to us. His failure even to discuss the inevitability of war with Russia, to which conclusion so many of his compatriots have jumped, is one of the most eloquent omissions in history.

MEMOIRS OF CORDELL HULL

(Reviewed by William E. Beard)

The Hull memoirs cover a period from the author's birth, October 2, 1871, through the formation of the United Nations at the conclusion of World War II, as eventful a period as the history of this country affords. Born in what was then Overton County but has since become Pickett, in Tennessee's Mountain District, at which Mark Twain poked fun in his Gilded Age, the author lived to become a world figure and leader, a spokesman for democracy in its broadest term, whose observations, broadcast in many languages, went to a listening world.

Born while his native State was still shadowed by the War Between the States, his own public service embraced three succeeding wars: (1) The Spanish-American, in which he served as captain of H Company, Fourth Tennessee, United States Volunteers; (2) World War I, during which he served his congressional district, Tennessee's old Fourth, as a Representative and a member of the House's all-important Ways and Means Committee; and (3) World War II, during the development and progress of which he was Secretary of State, the administrator of this country's foreign relations, administering such at the most tumultuous time in world history, and, too, for a longer period than had any of his predecessors in the office.

After his resignation as Secretary of State, November 27, 1944, he was hailed by President Roosevelt as the "Father of United Nations," the organization of the Allied countries, having in view making world peace permanent, and so preserving civilization from destruction by the weapons of modern warfare, developments of the last global conflict. Then came the more tangible recognition of his peace efforts, the Nobel Prize for Peace, 1945. Not the least of his contributions to his time are his memoirs, embracing as they do his views of measures and men, problems without number and some still to be solved, for example, Palestine.

The memoirs are dedicated as all familiar with the author's career would have expected, to his wife, Mrs. Frances Hull, the woman who has stood beside him in trials and triumphs, renowned as a helpmeet, Washington's Model Wife No. 1. As occasion offers elsewhere in the compilation, additional tributes are paid Mrs. Hull.

The two volumes of memoirs are divided into eight parts, designated as follows: Part 1, Tennessee and Congress (1871–1933); part 2, First 2 Years as Secretary of State (1933–35); part 3, Toward the Abyss (1935–39); part 4, Neutrality and Self-Defense (1939–41); part 5, The Year of War (1941); part 6, Diplomacy in War (1942–43); part 7, The Last Year (1944); part 8, Peace and After (1939–45), and these major subdivisions are further subdivided into 124 chapters, each with its own story to tell of the author's experiences or observations.

To this reviewer, whose acquaintance with Judge Hull traces back to the old Spanish-American War days, one of the most interesting features of his great work concerns his appraisals of some of those personages with whom he labored during his eventful career, such as Woodrow Wilson, Bryan, Churchill, Ramsay McDonald, Eden and Lord Lothian, Stalin, Litvinov and Molotov, Pierre Laval, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and among his more intimate associates in Government, Norman Davis, Jesse Jones, Col. Frank Knox, Forrestal, and Stimson. The latter name recalls an occasion early in Judge Hull's days as Secretary of State, this reviewer was riding somewhere in Washington with Mrs. Hull, when we passed a beautiful and ample estate, and Mrs. Hull quietly remarked:

"That is where Judge Hull plays croquet."

The property in question was that of former Secretary Stimson, one of Judge Hull's warm friends. "In our talks," it is noted in the memoirs, "I found him to measure up to his reputation as a very able, broad-gaged, patriotic statesman."

The memoirs are illustrated with a very handsome likeness of Judge Hull, and in a foreword the author of the memoirs makes general acknowledgment to all, including several Tennesseans, who assisted in any way in the extraordinary compilation, notably to Col. Andrew Berding, United States

Army Reserves; M. A., Oxford, and former Associated Press correspondent, a recent guest of Vanderbilt University, and Nashville's Kiwanis Club. To Colonel Berdin, Judge Hull voices a lasting debt of gratitude, a tribute well calculated to be shared by all Tennesseans.

Taft-Hartley Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. CROW
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Clement V. Conole.

TAFT-HARTLEY LAW MAKES A HIT
(By Clement V. Conole)

In the November issue of Philadelphia we took the bold position that the Taft-Hartley law, instead of being scrapped, should be strengthened. At that time, labor leaders across the country were "crying wolf," and endeavoring to tag the label "slave labor" to the legislation. Our position, even among many business firms, was not too popular.

Since that time, however, both business and employees have had considerable experience with the law, and we feel that it has been a genuine success. While it is true that certain politically minded labor leaders are still wailing, it is significant to note Senator TAFT's quip at the close of his address during the Bulletin Forum in March.

Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers Union (CIO) had preceded him in what was supposed to be a debate on the law. Reuther devoted most of his 15-minute statement to general economics and labor-leader propaganda.

After a detailed accounting of the operation of the law, Senator TAFT said: "Labor leaders are finding it difficult to criticize experience under the law, and even Mr. Reuther had very little to say about it." Actually, the experience has been extremely beneficial to employees and to the general American public.

It was also pointed out by the Senator that "labor union leaders, sincerely interested only in improving the economic conditions of their members, testify that they are in no way handicapped by the provisions of this act." It is true also that the rights of unions and the rights of individual union members are carefully preserved, and the only vigorous protestants are those who find their arbitrary power over their own members curbed.

It might be well to review here a few important provisions of the law and the effect they have had on our economy.

Union membership cannot be imposed on any employee unless a majority vote of the employees favors it. Even then, a man who is willing to pay his dues cannot be deprived of his job merely because a union arbitrary refuses to admit him. In more than 95 percent of the elections conducted on this provision by the National Labor Relations Board, the employees have voted in favor of a union shop. This would certainly belie the original claim of labor leaders that the union shop would be destroyed.

However, employees cannot be coerced by the labor unions to join or not to join a union. Nor may union dues be checked off from an employee's wages unless he has filed a written consent. The protection and freedom given to individual rights under the foregoing provisions are obvious. They have not hindered worth-while organization drives by any legitimate union.

Another section prevents the use of union dues, contributed for union purposes, to defeat or elect candidates in national elections. While it is true that this has curbed political ambitions of certain individuals within and without unions, it is also true that by a vast majority the American people want elections to be conducted under such conditions.

It should also be remembered that it is an express provision of the Taft-Hartley law that "nothing shall be construed to require an individual employee to render labor service without his consent." Also, the right to quit is absolutely unimpaired.

It is, therefore, our opinion that the Taft-Hartley law merely seeks to restore equal bargaining power between employers and labor organizations, making the Labor Relations Board a judicial body. The Wagner Act was entirely one-sided. As a matter of fact, Mr. Taft was very accurate when he said, "No such perversions of justice have occurred in the United States as were perpetrated by the first Labor Relations Board under that (the Wagner) act."

It may be remembered that the purpose of the Wagner Act was to give individual employees an opportunity to bargain collectively with an individual employer. As administered, however, the act required the individual employer to bargain not only with the union members in his own plant but also with the central labor union in the community, and sometimes the national or international union in the industry. For one individual employer to endeavor to negotiate with an international union was pure folly. The negotiations consisted merely in a backtracking maneuver by the employer until the union had obtained almost every concession it asked, regardless of its justification. It was—and in most instances still is—like the present Portuguese Navy tackling the British Fleet. The result has been as injurious to the individual worker or citizen as it has been to the individual employer.

Labor leaders gained so much power under the one-sided Wagner Act and exacted such tremendous moneys from workers that they decided they wanted to run not only their unions but the country as well. The Taft-Hartley law has definitely curbed their power, but at the same time has given greater freedom to union members and the public.

Karl Marx and the Graduated Income Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, as I, in my remarks made during the course of the debate on the Knutson income-tax-reduction bill on February 2, 1948, pointed out, Karl Marx, in his Communist Manifesto, listed the graduated income tax as the second most important legislative step to be taken in the effort to bring about the nationalization of private industry. Friedrich Engels, his partner in subversive activities, later declared it to be the first and most effective parliamentary weapon the Communists had with which to socialize our capitalistic system of free enterprise.

Because it contains one of the most timely, and, I must add, electrifying warnings of this communistic conspiracy to destroy the economic system under which our country has achieved the highest standard of living the world has ever known, I am, under unanimous consent of the membership, handing to the Public Printer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as a part of my instant remarks, a very able and most excellently composed editorial from California's famous weekly paper, The Argonaut, which under the significant title of "The National Income Tax," amply sustains and exposes the predictions and purposes of these two crafty plotters of our destruction of a century ago.

The editorial, Mr. Speaker, to which I have just referred, is the following:

THE NATIONAL INCOME TAX

It is not as commonly known as it should be that a graduated income tax was one of the devices advocated by Karl Marx for the destruction of free enterprise and the consummation of his scheme of communism. No end of politicians in this country, and many other countries, have been playing Karl Marx's game without knowing it, and even yet the greater number of them have not yet found it out. The politician tends to be a very stupid creature when he is asked to consider the influence of his policies upon the future, since he suffers from intellectual myopia. He considers only the present moment, without realizing that the prosperity of the future will be more or less determined by what he does today. The income tax first became a part of the law of Great Britain when it was thought to be required for the raising of money to fight Napoleon; the law was repealed with the treaty of Amiens, only to be reenacted when Great Britain went to war with Napoleon again. But it was once more repealed after Napoleon went down on the field of Waterloo, and was incarcerated on the desert rock of St. Helena. Unfortunately, it was enacted again by the government of Sir Robert Peel, and it has been a part of British law ever since, although both Mr. Gladstone, the leader of the Liberal Party, and Mr. Disraeli, the leader of the Conservative Party, opposed it, and each of these men served at one time or another as the Chancelor of the Exchequer. Both of these statesmen saw through it, though they were never able to do much about it, as Disraeli himself frankly confessed. When an individual or a nation begins to go wrong, he or it usually continues to go wrong until an immense disaster ensues. "Of all the taxes on the statute book," said Mr. Gladstone one time, in addressing the House of Commons, "the income tax is the one tax through which it is possible that socialism or communism or anything like them can, in the nature of things, find an entrance into our system. It cannot be done by indirect taxation. * * * I believe it does more than any other tax to demoralize and corrupt the people." Mr. Gladstone saw clearly through one of the pet devices of Karl Marx to overthrow the system of free enterprise. Alexander Hamilton would also have seen through it, and so would Thomas Jefferson and most of our elder statesmen. Our modern statesmen have not been so profound. We recall a conversation that we once had with Walter Hines Page, at a later date our Ambassador to Great Britain during the First World War, in which he maintained that a graduated income tax was the most equitable of all taxes. We did not agree with him, and said so. But at the time of our conversation there was no income tax in this country; at least, no national income tax.

Now, every form of taxation has its dangers, for any tax is a kind of legalized robbery. Emerson saw that fact clearly, and expressed it in his famous essay on politics. Thoreau saw it so clearly that he refused to pay his

tax when the Government acted, as he thought unjustly, and went to jail in consequence. "Give a man power over my subsistence," wrote Alexander Hamilton, "and he has power over the whole of my moral nature"; and none other than Daniel Webster said, in a congressional address: "A free government without adequate provisions for personal security is an absurdity. A free government with an uncontrolled power of military conscription is a solecism, at once the most ridiculous and abominable that ever entered into the head of man." Mr. Webster at this time was protesting against a war in which our Government was engaged, in which he did not believe; and the money raised by taxation for the purpose of carrying it on. And he spoke at that time for virtually the whole of New England.

Today we have a national income tax, a form of taxation against which all our elder statesmen from Washington to Lincoln, and beyond Lincoln, would have protested. And what has it done for us beyond getting us into all kinds of trouble? It has been raised more than once, and there are some who would raise it still higher. But it is a dangerous thing for most individuals to have too much money; and it is a far more dangerous thing for a government, especially after it has become largely a bureaucracy, to have too much. A government too abundantly supplied with money, raised by the taxation of the people, is always wasteful. The pork barrel grows larger and larger. How wasteful of the people's money a government can be was amply demonstrated by the administration of the late President Roosevelt, which poured it out like water; and it turned out in the end to be like the water that it poured into a sieve. It was poured out for the purpose of priming the pump of business during the great industrial depression, a pump that refused to stay primed. Wasted the money was—almost every dollar of it. Had there been no income tax, we should have had, necessarily, an economical government, and we should all be almost infinitely better off at the present time.

Today we have a $50,000,000,000 budget that has to be met for the most part by the income tax; and of this we are spending $10,000,000,000 for the alleged purpose of a military outfit, ready at the drop of a hat to combat Russian communism and to preserve free enterprise. What our politicians apparently are unable to understand is that, by means of an inordinate taxation of the people, they are destroying free enterprise, just as Karl Marx said it would. What is the use of damning Karl Marx if you adopt Marxist policies? What would be the sense of carrying on a military struggle against Russian Communists if such a struggle would probably make the Russian economic system of state capitalism, or something quite similar, inevitable at home? The burden of taxation which the people are bearing is even now almost beyond their strength. And most of the money raised is wasted in supporting a useless bureaucracy and the projects that the bureaucracy sets in operation. Moreover, the inflation produced quite largely, if not wholly, by the wasteful expenditure of the people's money raised by the income tax, is making it harder and harder to buy the goods that are necessaries to them, to say nothing of the luxuries.

There is an old fable about a goose which laid golden eggs, and her owner, disliking the loud cackle when she laid one, put an end to her existence. But he doubtless realized his folly when he found that he was getting no more golden eggs. Many persons have disliked what they considered the flaws of our economic system, and the New Dealers proposed to correct them. They have not succeeded. The more they tampered with it, the worse things got, and today we are all lying in the trough of the economic sea. Free enterprise has not yet been killed, but it is finding that conditions are making it harder and harder to survive; it is getting sick; it may yet be moribund. Either the income-tax law should be repealed or reduced to reasonable proportions. We should not require this dropsical tax, if we got rid of the useless governmental bureaus in Washington, and the wasteful and useless projects that they are constantly launching. We need a new administration in Washington.

Addresses by Hon. William O. Douglas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address by Mr. Justice William O. Douglas, distinguished member of the Supreme Court, given at the unveiling of the plaque in memory of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt. I wish also to include the remarks of Justice Douglas on the occasion of the Memorial Day services at Hyde Park, N. Y., May 30, 1948.

For all of us who loved Franklin Roosevelt and who honor him today these words of Justice Douglas rekindle our faith and our resolve to build the peace that Franklin Roosevelt died for.

ADDRESS BY MR. JUSTICE WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS AT THE GRAVE OF FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT IN MEMORIAL DAY SERVICES OF THE ROOSEVELT HOME CLUB

The hemlock hedge that surrounds this plot sets it apart as a quiet place of meditation, consecrated to earth and sky. It is a shrine for ordinary people the world around. Here they will come to make their pilgrimage and to bow their heads in thanks that the mind and heart of Franklin D. Roosevelt were dedicated to humanity.

The men and women who come here will recapture for a moment the precious sense of belonging that Roosevelt gave them. The sense of belonging is important to man. The feeling that he is accepted and a part of the community or the Nation is as important as the feeling that he is a member of a family. He does not belong if he has a second-class citizenship. When he feels he does not belong, he is not eager to assume responsibilities of citizenship. Being unanchored, he is easy prey to divisive influences that are designed to tear a nation apart or to woo it to a foreign ideology.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, like no other public figure in our history, was alive to this fact. And he knew how to fashion from it a positive and cohesive force in American life. He was in a very special sense the people's President, because he made them feel that with him in the White House they shared the Presidency. The sense of sharing the Presidency gave even the most humble citizen a lively sense of belonging, a keen feeling that he was an important part of a vital and vibrant system.

Roosevelt was acutely aware of the sorrows, perplexities, burdens, and fears of the common man. By his conquest of suffering and despair he removed forever from the American vocabulary the words "handicapped person." Moreover, he had a great appetite for ideas—and none was too startling or explosive to be unwelcome. He was a magnet for new ideas. Hence they flowed in from all sections of the country. His quick perception and sixth sense also drew from the minds of people ideas which the authors themselves had not yet matured. Thus did Franklin D. Roosevelt draw upon the energies and enthusiasm of the common people. Thus did they in fact as well as in feeling share the experience of leadership. As a result, no enterprise in history had more partners than his great crusade to make crusading practical.

So it was that men and women from every walk of life felt they were members of a great family. So it was that they wept when he died. And so it is that they will come to this shrine as long as America lives and here in the solitude of this grave pray for strength. For they know from the life and works of him who sleeps here that faith and love can work miracles—that faith and love can make even the lowliest of men noble.

ADDRESS BY MR. JUSTICE WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS AT THE UNVEILING OF THE PLAQUE IN MEMORY OF THE LATE FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, ST. JAMES CHURCH, HYDE PARK, N. Y.

I thank you for your invitation, extended by Mrs. Roosevelt, to participate in these services in dedication of this plaque to Franklin D. Roosevelt. This is the place where he worshiped. This church welcomed him as a youth and helped prepare him for the great destiny of his life. To these pews he repaired when the concerns of the world beset him. Here he renewed his strength. Here in communion with God he kept bright his faith in the goodness of man, his faith in the ability of people of all creeds and races to rise to greatness in the hours of need and to exemplify on earth the brotherhood of men. Through him this church exerted an influence that reached every shore that is washed by the oceans of the world. Because of him, people the world around will always consider this church a shrine. For these reasons it is proper that this plaque should hang here throughout all time.

Some of those gathered here this morning knew Roosevelt as a neighbor and a friend. Others knew him as a chief. And all of us knew him—as the people even in the faraway rice fields of China knew him—as a great leader.

From the martyrdom of Lincoln, America gained maturity and learned the strength of patient, tolerant wisdom. The great adventure of the Roosevelt years taught us the power of confidence and of coherent action. His personality and convictions, his actions even more than his words, became for a whole generation of Americans the thread by which we found our way through a labyrinth of depression, of uncertainty, of war.

Some of us are old enough to remember words that men have lived by and died for. And some of us are young enough now to feel in words an emptiness not known before.

I am concerned for the youth of our country and their distrust of the meaningless word. For them words are very tired unless they come from somewhere well behind the lips; they must represent deep convictions, an enduring faith, a warmth and understanding of human values; they must be fortified with deeds. Our young people have become good lip readers and falseness was never more easily detected.

We cannot, of course, find from another's life the answers to our own problems. There are no lessons, no precedents, which can do for us those things that we must do for ourselves. New campaigns cannot be plotted, new battles cannot be won merely by trying to guess what the fallen leader would do if he were here.

Roosevelt was a man who met each problem on its own terms and who found within himself the formula for coming to grips with it. It was his supreme genius which enabled him to face the crisis that exploded upon liberty and reduce it to a problem to be dealt with by democratic means. It was his native American confidence in the ability of average people to handle their problems that set the tone and style of his era. It

was indeed his confidence in people that matured his gift of leadership.

His leadership was great not only in words but in action. He understood that faith is built not by words but by works. He won the faith of the world for the United States and for himself, not by anything he said to other nations, but by the things he did right here at home.

The Declaration of Independence and the preamble of the Constitution are thrilling to us, not for their lofty sentiments alone, but for the courage, faith, and action which they symbolize. We of the United Nations can win faith only by action—by our assumption of tasks and by our faithful performance of them.

Without deeds, words become the instruments first of confusion, then of distrust, and finally of fear. But they should be an inspiration. Great phrases should ring with an echo of great deeds done and to be done. We can impart to youth the meaning of life and their part in making history. But the words must be pregnant with fulfillment. They must reflect promises that are kept, ideas whose impact on reality can be felt. Sincerity—as the days of Munich will always remind us—is not enough.

To an America overrun by economic panic in 1932, Roosevelt restored faith. His words "We have nothing to fear but fear itself" thrilled a Nation and a world because they were the cry of a man who had summoned his battalions and who was swinging them into battle position.

In those critical days, the ones hardest hit by cynicism and despair were those whose faith America could least afford to lose—her young people. That depression generation could have been a lost generation, like those in Germany who became Hitler's followers. Roosevelt saved these young people for democracy, and they in their turn, from 1941 to 1945, saved democracy.

To our new youth—the adolescents of the war years—Roosevelt was not an adventure in democracy but is a full-fashioned legend, part of the heritage of America. These young people will be the real victims of any crisis of confidence today. Where the depression generation doubted that they would ever be able to make a living, the new generation is beginning to wonder if it will ever be free to live.

The wonders of atomic power should open the door to a future filled with adventure and achievement. Instead the specter of the bomb haunts every home. The great danger—greater even than the atomic bomb itself—is the risk that our young people will conclude that our ability to produce a crisis exceeds our ability to manage it. Such a conviction soon creates a climate of fear. Fear can lead to appeasement—to surrender to the totalitarian forces that stand astride the world. Fear can also transform a problem to be thought out into a crisis to be fought out. But today both war and appeasement are roads that lead to chaos and destruction.

Today's crisis is one of democracy versus totalitarianism. Can we in this country by our deeds make democracy a fighting faith, a symbol of hope through the rest of the world? In this crisis Roosevelt's lesson for us is to act so that our actions will forge that faith.

Our slogans of equality, fraternity, opportunity, and justice become at home symbols of a never-never land when they are allowed to depreciate by inaction, neglect and nonobservance. They lift up the hearts of men and give direction to the revolutionary forces at loose in the world only when they represent an actual pattern of living or a plan in execution. Every human project needs some days of grace. But the days of grace cannot be postponed indefinitely. Loose promises, like insincere ones, can make words empty and meaningless.

If we who loved Franklin Roosevelt would honor him, we must take the lead in dispelling fear by coming to grips with the problems of our time.

We must be as bold as he in inventing new techniques to handle the new problems of our times. We must no more balk at novel ideas of world government, mass education, guaranteed annual wages, than he balked at the creation of radical instruments to handle the problems of the crises that tumbled on the heels of the depression in the early thirties. We must follow his example and put our inventive genius to work. For if we do no more than to cling to our traditional concepts of political management, we will be left in the backwash of the world.

Peace is not a word to be spoken, but a work to be organized. We cannot even undertake it without awakening anew in the hearts of America the faith, the confidence, and the practical idealism which forge programs. This faith, this confidence, this achievement are Franklin D. Roosevelt's gift to us. And, please God, they shall be our gift to those who come after us.

In today's crisis Roosevelt would have sustained his strength, as he always did, in personal communion with God. He believed in God's will, had faith in the efficacy of prayer. And so it is not unfitting that I should remind you of some words of his spoken 4 years ago, spoken, it is true, at a different moment, at a time when the American armies were landing on the beaches of Normandy. Yet as I read them again the other day these words—words spoken to God—have equal meaning for us today.

They are his D-day prayer of June 6, 1944:

"And let our hearts be stout, to wait out the long travail, to bear sorrows that may come, to impart our courage unto our sons wheresoever they may be.

"And, O Lord, give us faith. Give us faith in Thee; faith in our sons; faith in each other; faith in our united crusade. Let not the keenness of our spirit ever be dulled. Let not the impacts of temporary events, of temporal matters of but fleeting moment—let not these deter us in our unconquerable purpose.

"With Thy blessing, we shall prevail over the unholy forces of our enemy. Help us to conquer the apostles of greed and racial arrogancies. Lead us to the saving of our country, and with our sister nations into a world unity that will spell a sure peace—a peace invulnerable to the schemings of unworthy men. And a peace that will let all men live in freedom, reaping the just rewards of their honest toil. Thy will be done, almighty God. Amen."

To which I say also: Amen.

Preservation of Representative Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech which I made almost 9 years ago on the subject Who Can Preserve Representative Democracy?

This simple little speech contains the thoughts which had accumulated in my mind over a period of more than 45 years as an American citizen in the conduct of business under the Constitution of the United States and with due regard for the laws enacted by the people's Representatives. It is as true today as it was in 1939.

I am certain if we are to preserve our representative democracy and the American way of life we must all recognize that there is more than one side to every controversy. It might be well for all of us to remember that in most cases there are three sides to every controversy—"our side, the other fellow's side, and the right side." If we seek the right side and a fair balance in equity between all groups, and if we rebuild our moral fiber and character and are willing to pay the price of standing on principle, then, and only then, do I believe we will succeed in preserving our great form of government and the American system of free men.

I have obtained an estimate from the Public Printer as to the cost of printing this address. The estimated cost is $230.75.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO CAN PRESERVE REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY?

(By A. W. HAWKES)

The greatest things in the world are most often simple. And the simplest things most often neglected. Millions of people look upon the Constitution of the United States the same as they regard the beats of their heart. It always has worked, so why worry about it?

Many may ask, "What raises this question of 'Who can preserve representative democracy?'"

I believe it is raised in the mind of every thinking American at this time because of the fact that the people of many so-called representative democracies have surrendered their rights through emergencies that have arisen. First they surrender a limited number of rights—and the Government fails to solve the emergency, because "planned economy," accompanied by a partial or total destruction of reward, has never caused the people to vigorously contribute their best thinking and efforts to a solution of the problems confronting any nation. Next, when failure to solve the problem continues for a reasonable time, more rights are surrendered, until finally the people find they have a dictatorship in effect, if not in name and form. Then the dictatorship imposed in the name and interest of the people assumes complete command—and representative democracy, with its rights, liberties, and privileges, is abolished.

In this country we have been confronted for 10 years with a depression and we have done well not to surrender all of our rights, as has been done in some other countries.

The Honorable William B. Bankhead, on March 4, last, stated in Congress:

"God has not yet created any one man wise enough or benevolent enough to fix and enforce his individual pattern to govern the hearts and minds and conscience and property and lives of every citizen under his jurisdiction."

Thousands of people—young and old, college graduates and others—ask, "What liberties have I lost? What curtailment of my rights has occurred? Why all this excitement about the Constitution? No one has destroyed it, has he?"

My answer is that the curtailment of rights is a slow, almost unnoticed process—and that is why the price of liberty is eternal vigilance, based on intimate knowledge, coupled with a willingness to work for its preservation.

Free enterprise has been gradually bound hand and foot and cannot carry on with its inspiring, individual initiative based upon

the stimulus that comes from reward for accomplishment—if "planned economy" encroaches much further into its territory. Then the government must have all power, be supreme, and the individual reduced to a vassal of the state.

There are only two forms of government in the world, regardless of what we call them—the one where the individual is supreme, with the state or government as its servant; and the other where the government possesses dictatorial powers and is supreme, with the individual relegated to the position of servant of the state.

John Marshall said, "The constitutional power to tax contains the power to destroy." And history shows that governments fall when the rate of taxes passes a certain percentage of the people's total income.

I agree with anyone who says it is not of too great importance what happens to the fortunes of any individual man, although it is presumed in this country that a sufficient part of the reward for accomplishment will remain in the individual's hands, properly protected by law, to stimulate initiative and develop improved performance.

What I am concerned about is whether taxation will change sufficiently far from taxation for revenue to support Government to the point where it becomes redistribution of property (or confiscation), and thereby destroys the private enterprise system on which our form of Government depends for its existence and continuance, and our people depend for their liberty and freedom of action.

I find few people in industry or elsewhere who do not recognize their obligation as human beings to devise some sound way of taking care of the aged, the sick and the incapacitated. People recognize that the fit and capable are their "brother's keeper." But I believe the majority of the people resent part of the fit taking care of another part of the fit through any system that makes it comfortable for a man with health and ability to be unemployed. Such a system destroys the moral fiber of the people of the Nation.

Results of the investigation of the Dies Committee also clearly indicate why all good citizens of the United States should ask themselves, "Who can preserve our representative democracy?"

They should also ask themselves, "When must it be done?" My answer to that question is right now, before it is too late. History shows that just as soon as the balance of power in any nation passes from the people to an individual or small group in authority, then the people find it too late.

1. WHAT IS OUR REPRESENTATIVE FORM OF DEMOCRACY AND ON WHAT DOES IT REST?

The Declaration of Independence and our Constitution for the first time in history made clear to the world that the people of the Thirteen States recognized God Almighty as bestowing certain inalienable rights upon human beings. This concept of the human being was almost diametrically opposed to the previous theory and practice between sovereign state and subject. Previous to this the state or sovereign assumed all powers, granting only such limited rights and liberty to its citizens as the sovereign or dictator deemed wise.

Our Constitution brought before the world a new dignity of soul and manhood for a human being. It recognized that the people possessed the power—and the State or Government could exercise only powers and rights surrendered to it for the purpose of serving the best interests of the people as a whole. It was not planned so that our Government could usurp or itself create powers and use them to take away the inalienable rights of any of its citizens.

To man was born a new individualism through the Declaration of Independence, which breathed the life into our Constitution—and removed the limitations to individual growth, development, and accomplishment. A new faith in himself and others was born to man, and freedom of thought, expression, worship, and action became the rule, rather than the granted exception.

Millions could not directly represent themselves in Congress or our State legislatures. Therefore, it was provided that at stated periods the people would elect, under a carefully planned and balanced system, representatives who would function for the people in their districts. This put the representative part into democracy. This representative democracy is dual in form and is intended to leave local matters to the States, and national matters which affect the people of all the States, to the Federal Government.

Many of us do not appreciate that it was 4 years after the signing of the treaty on September 3, 1783, before the Constitution of the United States was adopted, and then another full 2 years of discussion took place before it was ratified by 9 of the 13 States. Few realize that during at least a year preceding the ratification of the Constitution the people in all States carefully considered, freely discussed and often debated the contents of this great document. It is said that every individual in all walks of life and every social group had an opportunity for the freest expression of opinion. History records the fact that the workingmen in Boston held a meeting at the Green Dragon Tavern and passed resolutions favoring the ratification of the Constitution. When John Adams heard this he asked Paul Revere, "How many mechanics were at the Green Dragon when those resolutions were passed?" Paul Revere replied, "More, sir, than the Green Dragon could hold." "And where were the rest, Mr. Revere?" "In the streets, sir." "And how many were in the streets?" asked John Adams. "More, sir, than there were stars in the sky," replied Paul Revere.

It is important that we should know that the people took part in the ratification of the Constitution by their representatives and that makes it peculiarly proper that the Constitution should start out in its preamble—"We, the people of the United States, do ordain and establish this Constitution * * *."

It has been said that weakness, unemployment, confusion, disorder, and lawlessness prevailed throughout the United States during this 4-year period and the adoption of the Constitution brought order out of chaos and put the light of hope in the hearts of many who had almost despaired of bringing the people into agreement—on a basis of the hopes and desires expressed in the Declaration of Independence. These hopes and desires had carried the Army through the War of Independence many days when the life of hope had almost ebbed away.

It was only at the time of the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of our Congress this last spring that I had brought to my attention the fact that in those 150 years—from the 4th day of March 1789 to the 4th day of March 1939—out of the millions of population, this country had been represented by only 8,124 men and women in the House of Representatives; and in the United States Senate, 1,384; and of that total number there had only been 461 of those who had served in both Houses. There had been 313 members of the cabinets of all the Presidents; and 1,558 individuals as governors of all the various States. There had been 42 Speakers of the House of Representatives; 32 different persons had served as Vice Presidents, of whom six had succeeded to the Presidency by virtue of the death of the President. Only 31 men had served as President of the United States and our Supreme Court had had only 70 Associate Justices and 11 Chief Justices.

These figures emphasize the necessity of thinking carefully and acting wisely in the selection of our representatives and, above all, illustrate the necessity of exercising our right of suffrage, to gain which millions made sacrifices and great numbers lost their lives. Millions today neglect this valuable privilege and vital factor in our lives and seem unwilling to do one-tenth as much to use and preserve it as was done to obtain it.

Our constitution guarantees—

1. Freedom of speech—of the press—of religious worship.

2. The right of the people peaceably to assemble.

3. The right to petition the Government for redress of grievances.

4. Trial by jury, coupled with protection against punishment for an act committed prior to the passage of the law; or the having of one's life put in jeopardy twice for the same offense.

5. Protection against prosecution for crime, except upon indictment by a grand jury which was intended to be a safeguard against persecution.

6. Our Constitution protects one from being a witness against himself in a criminal case.

7. It provides the right of a speedy and public trial, and if honestly adhered to, grants protection against wrongful imprisonment.

8. Gives a poor man without money the right to have witnesses and counsel for his defense.

9. Protects against excessive fines and cruel and unusual punishment.

10. Prohibits all forms of slavery, and prevents any State from denying any citizen the right to vote because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

11. It specifically prohibits the impairment of contracts by the States.

12. It guarantees that no man can be deprived of his life, liberty, or his property without due process of law.

13. The citizen is guaranteed against unreasonable searches and seizures of person, papers, or effects.

14. It guarantees that these rights of the citizens of the United States shall not be abridged by any State, and the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges of the citizens in the several States under the conditions prescribed.

15. And finally, it guarantees that no person shall be deprived of the equal protection of the laws.

Many citizens understand some, but few understand all, of these things.

Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, in his speech on the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary before the united Congress and the Chief Executive, stated—

"We shall do well on this anniversary if the thought of the people is directed to the essentials of our democracy. Here in this body we find the living exponents of the principle of representative government, not government by direct mass action, but by representation which means leadership as well as responsiveness and accountability. * * * We protect the fundamental rights of minorities, in order to save democratic government from destroying itself by the excesses of its own power. The firmest ground for confidence in the future is that more than ever we realize that, while democracy must have its organization and controls, its vital breath is individual liberty."

And the Chief Justice continued—

"I am happy to be here as the representative of the tribunal which is charged with the duty of maintaining, through the decision of controversies, these Constitutional guaranties. We are a separate, but not an independent, arm of the Government. * * * In the great enterprise of making democracy workable we are all partners. One member of our body politic cannot say to another, 'I have no need of thee.' We work in successful cooperation by being true, each department to its own function, and all to the spirit

which pervades our institutions—exalting the processes of reason, seeking through the very limitations of power the promotion of the wise use of power, and finding the ultimate security of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and the promise of continued stability and a rational progress, in the good sense of the American people."

Chief Justice Hughes also stated—

"We are here not as masters, but as servants, not to glory in power, but to attest our loyalty to the commands and restrictions laid down by our sovereign, the people of the United States, in whose name and by whose will we exercise our brief authority."

Gladstone said: "The American Constitution is the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

Harry F. Atwood said:

"It is the greatest heritage that has ever fallen to any single people in history. Its making was the greatest human achievement since creation, and it marked the greatest event in the history of the world, save only the birth of Christ."

If preserved, our Constitution may prove to be the instrumentality through which God converts the world to a practice of the Golden Rule.

2. WHAT HAS IT DONE FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES AND ELSEWHERE?

It has built this country into an outstanding success in human relationship, endeavor, and accomplishment, as related to all other countries in the world. This is evidenced by the following facts and figures:

With 6 percent of the world's land area, and 7 percent of the world's population, the people of the United States consume half of the world's coffee and rubber;

Have half of the world's communication facilities and electrical energy;

Thirty-five percent of the world's railroads, with equipment as a whole unequaled in any other country.

We wear three-fourths of the world's silk; consume one-fourth of the world's sugar, and use two-thirds of the world's oil.

We have, per capita, approximately 4½ times as many automobiles as France and England; 22 times as many as Italy;

We have, per capita, 2½ times as many telephones as England; almost 3 times as many as Germany; and more than 4 times as many as France.

In practically all lines of necessities and luxuries greater distribution exists among a greater number of our people than in any other country in the world.

"Wage" is only a relative term and its value is measured in exchange for necessities and luxuries of life. One hour's wages in the United States is convertible into the necessities of life at the rate of 3 times as much as in Germany; 2¼ times as in Great Britain; 2⅓ times as in France; and 2½ times as in Belgium. This refers to necessities such as bread, butter, beef, potatoes, coffee, shoes, much wearing apparel, and other things.

There are approximately 26,000,000 passenger automobiles on our roads—and these are certainly not all in the hands of "the 60 families." In America there are 29,000,000 radio sets, well distributed through 90 percent of the families. And a telephone is the rule, rather than the exception.

On December 31, 1938 there were 124,000,000 life-insurance policies in force, for a total amount of insurance of $111,054,000,000. It has been estimated that approximately 64,000,000 persons are insured in the United States. Where else on earth can you find such evidence of success and progress.

No place on earth is there more freedom to worship one's God, nor as great opportunity for education and mental development. In the depression year 1933 there was spent in the United States more than $3,000,000,000 for education—more than by all the other countries of the world. In the school year 1931–32 30,000,000 children out of the 32,000,000 of school age, were enrolled in public and private schools in the United States. More than $7,000,000,000 were invested in public and private schools; and nearly $4,000,000,000 in colleges and universities; and approximately $4,000,000,000 in churches.

Homes owned or partially owned, savings bank accounts numbering into millions, and other evidences of accomplishment and possession by our citizens make an amazing comparison with possessions of other people in other countries.

Critics of our American system say our progress is due more to natural resources than our free enterprise system. I ask how about the natural resources in China and the countries of South America, all much older than the United States? I believe we must give credit to our American system for our great development and distribution of necessities and luxuries.

Our free enterprise system and form of government are so interwoven that to destroy the one is to destroy the other.

3. WHY DOES IT WORK—WHAT ARE ITS COMPARATIVE BENEFITS

It works because man in his own estate of freedom can function better and contribute more for his own benefit and that of others, than he can under restricted privileges granted in one generation and withdrawn in another The effect of human endeavor is cumulative. The hope of accomplishment and fair reward, preserved to the individual by law, not only develops the existing generation, but causes them to develop their children who make up the next generation.

Results under any government that prescribes a rule of man, rather than of laws, are so apparent in countries where restricted individual rights and opportunities have existed or now prevail, that no further exposition of them is needed. In my travels through many countries I have often wished that every dissatisfied American could see, understand and compare conditions of humanity in all classes and all countries with the American citizens of any type. After such an experience, only a person bereft of his power to analyze and differentiate could suggest the destruction of this country, its form of government, or advocate the changing of our Constitution more rapidly than by its prescribed method of amendment.

4. HOW CAN WE IMPROVE, PRESERVE, AND PERPETUATE IT?

1. By continually remembering how and why it came about—through the efforts of the people to get rid of tyranny and preserve inalienable rights to themselves.

2. By studying and understanding our Constitution and form of government.

3 By informing ourselve. of the truth regarding other governments, which will prove none better exists in the world.

4 By remembering "haste makes waste," and our forefathers purposely devised and provided a slow method of amendment, wishing to avoid rapid changes because of temporary dissatisfaction, gusts of passion and prejudice, or unwillingness on the part of some to recognize the necessity of sacrifice in some personal interest for the common good of all.

5. By remembering that no hardship under our Constitution which might be continued for the period necessary to obtain a required amendment, could possibly injure any of us so much as the weakening or destruction of that great document through hasty or ill-conceived changes brought about by some new method or evasion of the purpose of the Constitution.

6. By always being willing carefully to weigh changing economic and social conditions and proceeding fairly in the interest of the greatest number, by the prescribed route for amendment.

7. By remembering the character of the Nation is absolutely determined by the character of the individual citizen. This calls for the development of better morals; serving on juries; voting regularly; participating in local affairs; obeying the laws, thus setting an example to others; respect for the rights of property in the hands of its lawful owners; tolerance, regardless of provocation; and remembering always there are two sides to every difference of opinion.

8. By invoking the teachings of Christ in our daily lives.

9. By recognizing the right of workers to join any legal organization—or none—as they themselves deem best in their own interests and of their own free will and volition, without coercion, duress, or intimidation from any source.

10. By studying carefully our present system of distribution of the "fruits" of labor and capital, as between each of those important factors in our industrial and economic system. Far-sighted industrialists are now diligently studying to see if there is not some sound, economic way through which the "fruits of industry" can be divided more equitably—after paying to labor a fair wage, under reasonable and healthful working conditions, and a fair "wage" to capital for its services, after considering the hazards of investment.

Maintenance of proper surplus for plant improvement and extension, new ventures, and "rainy day" demands in the interest of all—must be established and preserved.

A solution of these important things—established by slow, sound, progressive steps—will bring to our free enterprise system the support needed from workers as well as capital and management. These things will bring to the corporation methods of doing business a common touch and human interest, and eliminate the criticism regarding a corporation's being an invisible, intangible being, a creature of the law without heart and without soul. These vital things, progressively established as rapidly as is consistent with the conservation of industry, will progressively improve the standard of living for all, reduce the necessity of public relief to a minimum, and avoid the enactment of ill-conceived and unsound laws of compulsion.

11. We must always remember that enlightened public opinion, when it becomes positive and established, will cure the ills of both labor and capital, because it will, in due course, teach the workers of the country that only high-grade, intelligent, law-abiding, American-loving leaders can bring to labor ultimate and lasting good—and, in turn, it will teach capital that nothing but progressive management, operating along the lines of equity and standing on a foundation of sound, humane economics, will protect capital and bring to it continued satisfactory returns.

If this conclusion be correct, how important it is for you and me to become active in molding in the right direction this vital public opinion!

12. God put a head on everything in the animal kingdom, including man—and the head is presumed to direct the rest of the body. When the head fails, the body ceases to function or runs amuck. We must recognize rightfully established authority in industry and all other walks of life—otherwise we fail.

5. WHO CAN DO THESE THINGS?

A substantial majority of "We, the people," recognizing the values and accomplishments of our system. We, the people, must have or develop the necessary understanding and consideration for our fellow beings. We can do this and yet stand on sound economics, maintain orderly procedure, and accomplish progressive improvement at the right tempo.

We, the people, driven more firmly together by the ultra conservative and the radical, and by ridding ourselves of the "let George do it" attitude, which for years has been accepted by the great majority of us with complacency.

This majority of "We, the people," by remembering that somewhere between the brain and the heart regions is a level that will make the plan workable and successful in an economically sound way by producing voluntary cooperation. Cooperation can be neither legislated nor enforced by the mandates of any organization—big industrial leaders, labor leaders, or working people themselves. Enlightened self-interest and a fair regard for the rights of others should produce in a substantial majority of our citizens voluntary cooperation, based upon equity—so necessary to preserve our American way of life.

We, the people, by bringing about more meetings such as the one at the Green Dragon Tavern in Boston in 1789; also by causing meetings and discussions to take place on this important subject before industrial organizations, societies, and organizations of various kinds, whether public or quasi public; before labor meetings; men's and women's clubs; in churches and schools, contributed to by ministers, teachers, and businessmen and all public-spirited American citizens.

This substantial majority can preserve representative democracy by giving one-half the time and attention to the preservation of it that history records having been given to the establishment of it.

This majority can preserve it by speaking always in defense of the truth when it is under attack.

We, the people, by helping capital and labor to make right that which may be wrong within itself—each proving to the public that it is a "good citizen."

You and I, by remembering that the changes in the world today are not a swing of economics, but rather a new era in the world-wide relationship of human beings, which for us can be solved under a maintenance of our Constitution and structure of government in a satisfactory way—or will, through inattention, result in chaos and misery for millions. In this better relationship there must be some new relativity between the "wages" of capital and the wages of labor, and I believe this can be solved on a sound, economic basis through patient, understanding cooperation. In this process of development, labor must be patient and understanding, and must remember lean years bring problems to all.

Let us not deceive ourselves—this question of relativity between profits to capital and reward to workers for services rendered, and the question of regularity of employment are the most vital things in our employment relations problem. They touch the material side of life and the human expectations of millions of people. If capital, management and workers together can find this solution, they will have removed discord, bitterness, class hatred, and all those things leading to unfair and unsound laws and demands.

Sound economics and free enterprise are a most important means to an end, but the means must not exceed in importance the ends sought.

It should be remembered most working people in all walks of life are quite as good citizens and appreciate the value of our form of government as much as any of us. I find working people particularly happy and appreciative when the meaning of our Constitution and form of government is explained more in detail than they have previously understood it.

We, by not worrying more about the wrongs of labor than the wrongs of capital and management. Each needs our impartial consideration and equitable treatment. This is no time for self-glorification by any of us. Some labor and some capital is good all the time; and most capital and most labor is good part of the time. But we want most of each to be good all the time.

We, by remembering that our No. 1 job is the development of voluntary cooperation between employer and employee. Chief executives can improve this situation by occasionally meeting their men on common ground. We spend millions of dollars and much time in cultivating customers, whereas knowing our workers and producing harmonious relationship is equally important.

It is easier for business executives, if they only knew it, to spend days with their employees, than to spend months with outsiders and labor boards and courts.

We, by bringing about industrial and business peace, can produce political peace.

Our democracy will not be safe until the people become activated and imbued with the importance of this situation; then by unity of action and determination the proper solution will be found. Those citizens who understand that continued expenditures greater than income must result in bankruptcy, which usually produces dictatorship, the control of the people, and the destruction of the private-enterprise system, should make it their business to have more and more people in all walks of life understand this important relationship of things. The people should understand it is easier to distribute "lollipops" than to teach sound economics.

We can stimulate the will to preserve our representative democracy by the intelligent leadership of a comparative few, but the accomplishment must be the wish and will of the many. We must prove that right, not might, controls our relationship with our fellow man. We must stand by the enlightened twentieth-century code of fair industrial practices.

We must find ways to teach teachers and have teachers teach us, through a fair interchange of the practical with the theoretical.

We must understand and teach others the great importance of knowing who is educating our children. Does that teacher believe in sound and true philosophy in keeping with our American way of life? Thousands of parents have no appreciation whatever regarding this important and vital thing. Hence our duty to bring it to their attention and stimulate fair action in the interest of maintenance of our system.

Our motto should be: Tolerance of the truth always, but intolerance of philosophies proved to be false. The truth must be focused against all false philosophies and theories, even though free speech and freedom of the press grant any and all philosophies their "day in court."

If the majority of our people, after having the truth intelligently placed before them in simple language, fail to recognize it and choose what we consider the false—then under our democratic system the majority must rule until such time as the light of truth dawns upon another majority. God grant that we may see and strongly grasp the truth, which I believe supports our Constitution and our form of government, prepared for and bequeathed to us by those self-sacrificing and outstanding men in the last quarter of the eighteenth century.

We, by recognizing that Supreme Court decisions, have a record of following the tide of public opinion. Hence our duty to mold public opinion along lines of proven truth.

We, by helping to clear up confused thinking that has emotionalism for its foundation rather than sound economics, and helpful support that helps others to help themselves.

We must stimulate our people to a realization that a fair wage is the reward for a fair amount of work done under fair conditions. We can help human beings improve and better themselves and thus increase their share in the reward for more valuable service rendered.

We must remember man can only be custodian of funds, and under God's plan of life it is incumbent upon the financially successful to use their funds in creating good jobs as a means of livelihood for others.

We, the people, must see that our representatives do not try the impossible thing nor attempt experiments that have proved woeful failures elsewhere under like conditions.

We, the people, must retrace our footsteps to the faith of our forefathers in God and rebuild our reliance upon His power and will.

Our representative democracy has placed in the heavens above the United States of America the star of leadership and responsibility; and if we keep ourselves free from entanglements and wars, except in defense, we can be the beacon light to lead the world down the successful path of individual liberty and accomplishment.

Our charge is one of duty. Our objective is to get each American citizen to see this duty. Our reward, if we will it so, is the continuation of the greatest accomplishment in human relations yet recorded on history's pages, and, in my opinion, the upholding and advancement of God's will on earth.

The Veto of the Bulwinkle Bill Should Be Overridden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE F. LEA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, the message of the President vetoing S. 110, commonly known as the Bulwinkle bill, calls for review of this legislation in view of the reasons assigned to justify the veto.

In the first place, a general assertion is made that the bill, if enacted, would provide an immunity from the antitrust laws without providing adequate safeguards to protect the public interest. That would be a sufficient reason to sustain the veto if analysis of the legislation would justify that interpretation.

It is asserted that the legislation, if enacted, would exempt from the antitrust laws contracts between carriers "in the establishment of rates and related matters, if the Interstate Commerce Commission approves the procedure of agreements under which such action would be taken."

That statement, as well as the general tenor of the veto message seems to assume that we should have a policy of criminal prosecution of intercarrier agreements, even though the Commission after investigation finds that such agreements are consistent with the public interest.

Apparently the veto contemplates that a proposed agreement for rates between carriers, even though approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, should be subject to criminal prosecution by another agency of the Government. We would create one agency to destroy the usefulness of the other.

It is further noted that under the bill the Commission could approve only agreements which it finds to be in

"furtherance of the national transportation policy."

TRANSPORTATION ACT PROTECTS THE PUBLIC

The national transportation policy is well defined in the Transportation Act of 1940. That act gives the Interstate Commerce Commission, as the established regulatory body, well-defined powers to protect the public against unreasonable charges or discriminatory rates against the shipper. Through interpretation of the transportation laws by the Interstate Commerce Commission and by the courts those powers are well defined, and, if properly executed, are well calculated to protect the public. Regulation to protect the public is not a two-agency job with one agency authorized by the Government to institute criminal prosecutions for matters approved by the other.

The bill would not give the carriers any right in themselves, or with the approval and cooperation of other agencies, private or public, to make agreements in violation of the Transportation Act.

BULWINKLE BILL AFFORDS NEW PROTECTION

Heretofore, the Commission has usually not intervened for the protection of the public, except after rates have been put into effect which violate the Transportation Act. The Bulwinkle bill requires advance approval of the agreements specified in the bill. That is a further protection beyond what the law now gives the public.

So the right of protection, which it is contended should exist, would arise only after the Commission has approved the acts and notwithstanding the approval by the Commission.

Transportation rates do affect the economy of the country in a broad way. The Government must exercise a power to control those rates. It does have that power in the Interstate Commerce Commission under the Transportation Act.

It should be borne in mind at all times that the Commission has complete control over rates and full power to fix reasonable and non-discriminatory rates.

Is it a practical proposal that the carriers should be prosecuted criminally after the regulatory agency created to control them has determined the lawfulness of the act complained of under the powers given it by the Congress? Would such a policy be either sensible or just?

Our transportation system, particularly railroad transportation, is so integrated that the shippers of the country can transport their goods with a convenience substantially the same as if the whole rail system were under one company. This integration of the services of these agencies can be accomplished only by intercontractual relations which are numerous and important. All of them to which this bill applies are subject to control under the Interstate Commerce Act.

The proposed legislation does not eliminate any protection of the public afforded under the Transportation Act. The Commission has full power to prevent and if necessary to cause criminal proceedings to be instituted with respect to any acts which would violate any provision of the Transportation Act or any of its orders or regulations for the protection of the public against unreasonable or discriminatory rates or practices.

PENDING CASES

It is true that antitrust cases are pending in the courts with respect to certain agreements among carriers concerning rates.

These cases have raised serious doubts as to the legality of long-standing practices of carriers and shippers.

In this bill, Congress undertakes to establish a just and wise rule for future application, and to dispell the uncertainty which now exists and which has caused much confusion.

DO NOT MAKE REGULATION A FUTILITY

The power to regulate but without power to enforce respect for its regulations or protect the regulated carriers in obeying its orders would be a futility and a legal absurdity.

Two public agencies, the one instructed to prosecute what the other after proper investigation has approved, are not consistent with the efficient regulation of our transportation system nor with the public welfare.

Transportation is necessarily to some extent carried on under monopoly conditions, in that frequently there cannot be unrestrained competition. The very justification of regulation rests primarily upon the fact that the public utility frequently enjoys a monopoly and therefore must be regulated. Proper control of public utilities must be dependent upon proper regulation and criminal prosecutions of violations of regulatory laws and orders, and not by prosecution for compliance with the regulatory laws or regulations.

The general policy of authorizing criminal prosecutions of carriers for doing what the Commission has approved would not be different from a case where the Commission approves a rate and then the carrier and shipper who abided by the terms of the rate were made subject to criminal prosecution. Such a policy would be destructive and wholly inappropriate to a businesslike or a just system of regulation. It would leave the carriers, as well as the shippers, in harassing uncertainty as to the legality of their acts.

This situation in my judgment calls for overriding the veto in the interest of the efficient operation of our transportation system.

Suggestion for ECA Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, if newspaper reports are correct that the Senate will support the recommendations of the Senate Appropriations Committee to make $4,000,000,000 of appropriated funds for ECA available for the 12 months' period ending March 31, 1949, it is my personal opinion that it should not be hard for the Senate and House to reach agreement.

In the discussions within our committee prior to reporting the bill, I never heard the distinguished chairman [Mr. TABER, of New York] or anyone else suggest that in extending availability to June 30, we were actually bringing the foreign aid money under the antideficiency statute which requires funds of most regular domestic agencies to be expended evenly over the period for which appropriated. The points I heard discussed were there:

First. That all regular and most other appropriations, including several items in the Foreign Aid bill—notably GARIOA—are on a fiscal year basis; that is, they run to June 30 of a given year.

Second. That since ECA appropriations tie in with GARIOA funds for Germany and Austria, it would be desirable to get them on a fiscal-year rather than fractional basis.

Third. That under the ECA Act before appropriations could be made beyond March 31 it will be necessary to have a new authorization. This means hearings by Foreign Affairs Committees of both House and Senate, consideration and passage of an authorization bill in both bodies, plus hearings and appropriations in both bodies.

Remembering that next January will see the organization of a new Congress and new committees, and the inauguration of a President, and probably another tussle over the general legislative budget ceiling, all prior to February 15, it may be a tight squeeze for the new ECA authorization to get passed and appropriated before the end of March. ECA, itself, might want this leeway. Hence, it would be simply good foresight to make ECA money available for expenditure until the end of the regular fiscal year.

The language in the House bill does not compel spreading the funds over 15 months, but simply makes it possible. There is nothing in the actual wording to prevent ECA from obligating and expending its funds prior to March 31, 1949.

To make this perfectly certain and to conform to the indicated attitude of the Senate, it seems to me the whole fuss can be simply resolved, Mr. Speaker. Instead of the House version, which says "until June 30, 1949," and instead of the Senate version, which says "until March 31, 1949," we can say "to be available until June 30, 1949: *Provided, however,* That this shall not be construed to prevent obligation and expenditure of these funds, if necessary, prior to March 31, 1949."

And there is a special reason why ECA itself should want such language. For in the first 2 months they were far behind possible expenditures on a monthly average basis. Unless they catch up, they could come to March 31, 1949, and might be without authority to complete their expenditure program.

The full $5,300,000,000 ECA program would permit an average expenditure of

$450,000,000 per month on a 12-month basis—April 1, 1948, to March 31, 1949.

In its first 2 months, drawing on the $1,000,000,000 advanced by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the $55,000,000 advanced in an earlier appropriation, ECA actually obligated only slightly more than $200,000,000 of the $900,000,000 indicated for 2 months on an average monthly basis.

This gives ECA almost $700,000,000 more than the average for the remainder of whatever period is allowed and was one of the factors considered by the House committee in making its reductions.

The suggested language, Mr. Speaker, would clearly leave the rate of expenditure in the hands of the Administrator with the flexibility which Mr. Hoffman asked for, to meet changing economic conditions at home and abroad. Our committee did not particularize the cuts because he asked us not to do so.

Statement by Hon. Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington, Before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations on Department of Interior Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 1), 1948

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I made before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations dealing with the Department of Interior bill for the fiscal year 1949.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned about appropriations for some specific projects in this bill, but more particularly about the general legislative provisions the House has seen fit to hang like a millstone around the neck of the Department—a millstone, which I am forced to suspect, is designed to cripple our great western projects. The technique used by those who are opposed to Federal development of our great river systems is clever, in that it seeks to accomplish by indirection what its sponsors have failed to accomplish by direct frontal attack.

First, I call the committee's attention to the provision beginning at the bottom of page 53, which stipulates that, "All interest heretofore or hereafter collected on sums invested in power or municipal water features of any project constructed or operated by the Bureau of Reclamation under the authority of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 shall be covered into the reclamation fund and shall not be allocated." A similar provision is found on page 7, applicable to Bonneville Power Administration.

I am sure the committee is fully aware of the heated controversy which exists over the use of interest on power features of our multiple-purpose projects, collected as a part of the power rate. There are those who believe that the 1939 act permits the Department of the Interior to apply this interest against the irrigation costs allocated to power. During the pay-out period on the Columbia Basin project, power features will pay about $70,000,000 in interest to the Federal Treasury. One school of thought contends that this $70,000,000 collected as a part of the power rate should be used, and under the 1939 act can be used, to pay a part of the approximately $300,000,000 of irrigation costs assigned to power. On the other hand, there are those who contend that this so-called interest component should be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, or allowed to accumulate unallocated in the reclamation fund.

This issue has been fought out—particularly in the Public Lands Committee of the House—beginning with the introduction by Congressman ROCKWELL of H. R. 2873 and H. R. 2874 early in the first session of the Eightieth Congress. Finally, a compromise bill was reported to the House in January of this year and the issue redebated on the floor. In essence the compromise was as follows: The pay-out period was extended to 78 years, the interest charge on Federal funds invested in power features reduced to 2½ percent, and it was provided that ⅓ or ½ percent of the interest charge could be used to pay irrigation costs assigned to power on the specific project involved.

Opponents of low-cost hydroelectric power emasculated the bill on the floor to such an extent that its sponsor, Congressman ROCKWELL, has all but refused to permit the bill to travel under his name. That bill as amended on the floor appropriately has been slumbering in the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for the last 2 or 3 months. Now comes the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior, and the same faction responsible for emasculating the Rockwell bill, H. R. 2873, seeks to accomplish by the legislative provision I have just read what they were unable to accomplish after months of open hearings in the House Public Lands Committee and after 2 days of extended debate on the floor of the House.

The legislative provisions on pages 53 and 57 of the bill say that interest heretofore or hereafter collected shall go into the reclamation fund and remain unallocated. If that provision means what it says—and I have no doubt it does—the net effect is to increase by $70,000,000 the amount of money which must be collected in our power rate over the pay-out period on Grand Coulee Dam. The final determination as to what the power policy of the Federal Government in this regard should be is a matter which should be decided in an orderly legislative way. In other words, the legislative committees should consider the question, make recommendation to their respective bodies, and the Members of both the House and Senate should have an opportunity to vote on the issue after full debate on this specific question. Certainly it is not sound legislative procedure to attempt to settle in an appropriation bill an issue so important to the development of every river system in the Nation. I sincerely hope your committee will delete these legislative provisions from this bill.

I now call your attention to what I consider another violation by the House of orderly legislative procedure and further, what I consider to be an invasion by the legislative branch of the prerogatives of executive departments. On page 38, line 21, the bill states: "*Provided further*, That no part of any appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this act shall be used for the salaries and expenses of a person in any of the following positions in the Bureau of Reclamation or of any person who performs the duties of any such position, who is not a qualified engineer with at least 10 years engineering and administrative experience; (1) Commissioner of Reclamation; (2) Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation; (3) Regional Director of Reclamation." It is obvious to all of us that this provision was written into the bill on the floor of the House for the specific purpose of forcing the discharge of the present Commissioner of Reclamation, Mr. Straus; his Assistant, Mr. Markwell; and the Regional Director in California, Mr. Boke. I have consistently refused to become involved in the squabble between the Commissioner, some of his associates and certain Members of Congress from California. These men in the Bureau have been accused of mismanagement and even of fraud. If the charges against them can be proved, certainly corrective steps should be taken by the Secretary of Interior or, if necessary, the President. I submit, however, it is a strange procedure a certain faction of the House has adopted to accomplish their objective. On other occasions where the House has sought to legislate in an appropriation bill against specific individuals, your committee has corrected the error in judgment and refused to go along with that type of vindictive infringement upon the perogatives of the executive branch. I am not arguing the merits of the case against the Commissioner or his associates. I do assert most vigorously, however, that the section of the bill I have just quoted is not a proper approach to the problem.

In addition the House has written into the bill limitations upon administrative personnel of the Bureau and Department which, I am convinced, will affect adversely the efficiency of their operation. Secretary Krug discussed this problem with you when he testified on the first day of the hearings. I do not have full details to transmit to the committee, but the principle involved is as follows. On the one hand, the House has given Bonneville Power Administration, for example, almost twice as much money as was appropriated last year, but on the other it has placed personnel limitations upon the administration which, if permitted to stand, will seriously impair the Administration's ability to spend that money effectively. I am sure Bonneville Power Administration and the Bureau of Reclamation have already presented, or will present this problem to you in full detail. For my own part, I have almost come to the conclusion that these personnel limitations are designed to prevent full expenditure of the increased funds the House committee has allotted.

On the positive side, the House committee on the whole, has done a fine job of providing funds for Columbia Basin and Bonneville for fiscal 1949. In my judgment, it will be extremely unfortunate if that constructive action is vitiated by the destructive provisions I have been discussing.

There is one other matter of general policy, I would like to discuss before turning to specific projects. The budget for the Bureau of Reclamation, as it came from the President, recommended an appropriation of $20,805,690 for transmission lines. This was cut in the House to $7,895,041, a decrease of more than 60 percent. Members of the committee know that there are some Members of Congress who believe that a-sale-at-the-bus-bar policy should be established for distribution of electrical power generated at Federal dams. Last year bills were introduced on both sides of the Capitol to establish such a policy. To date not one of those bills have been acted upon favorably by a legislative committee.

For many, many years the policy of the Federal Government has been to construct backbone transmission lines as a means of carrying power to major load centers. Construction of substations is an indispensable part of this policy. The policy is predicated upon the sound theory that when the people's money is invested in a hydroelectric facility, the people themselves are entitled

to receive that power at the lowest possible cost consistent with sound business principle. As a matter of fact, the reclamation law and most special acts, authorizing specific projects, contain a declaration that power shall be available first to public or municipally owned utilities, to rural electrification administrations, etc.

There is no better way to reverse this long-standing policy than by refusing to appropriate funds for transmission lines. This 60 percent cut over-all, in the Department's request for transmission lines, indicates conclusively, to me at least, that there are Members of Congress who are determined to establish by indirect means a bus-bar policy which they have been unable to force through regular committees. Personally, I believe private power companies, public utilities, REA's, should have equal treatment under the law, as concerns distribution of federally generated power. I am not opposed to private power companies receiving an equitable share of Government-generated power. I am in favor of supplying these companies by giving an opportunity, insofar as it is possible to do so under the priorities set-up under the reclamation laws, to make a profit on the Government-generated power they distribute. However, I am vigorously opposed to a policy, the practical effect of which would be to give them a monopoly on power generated at Federal dams constructed with the funds of the American people. A small REA in southwest Washington cannot build a transmission line to the bus-bar at Grand Coulee Dam, but if the Congress persists in cutting funds for transmission lines, that REA will be faced with three alternatives—either to build its own line to the bus-bar, or to purchase Federally generated power from a private company that has built a line to the bus-bar, or go out of business.

ARCHEOLOGICAL WORK—M'NARY RESERVOIR

I turn now to a problem of historical significance to the Pacific Northwest. The Department requested $400,000 in fiscal 1949 for investigations and studies of the recreational resources and archeological remains in river basins of the United States. The House allowed $122,954 for this purpose. One of the projects included in this item was archeological excavations to be conducted in the area behind McNary Dam, which will be flooded as the dam is completed.

The Department was particularly eager to uncover and preserve archeological data and materials in and around the historic site of Fort Walla Walla, Wash. Unless work is initiated this year, we run the risk as a Northwest region and as a Nation of losing forever significant pioneer historical data and even prehistoric objects and information. The Smithsonian Institution and the National Parks Service have surveyed important historic and archeological sites within the McNary Reservoir to determine the extent and seriousness of impending losses. There is no question that the site of Fort Walla Walla will be flooded, together with neighboring sites identified with villages where Indians were living at the time of the Lewis and Clark expedition. These latter sites contain trade goods of the Hudson's Bay Co. and the Northwest Fur Co. of the early nineteenth century, which will be lost. In addition, within the reservoir are situated at least 20 prehistoric Indian sites, including some extending back perhaps 4,000 years. I am informed that the recovery of unique and irreplaceable scientific data from these sites by selective archeological excavations provides the last opportunity to salvage the prehistory of a vital area of the Columbia River Basin.

It is the opinion of the Indian Service and the Smithsonian Institution that archeological excavations in the McNary Reservoir are more important than in any other reservoir in the Columbia Basin.

The Department has requested Bureau of the Budget to clear a supplemental request of $61,250 for this important purpose. I am informed that the Bureau will probably act favorably on this request some time this week. I, therefore, urge the committee to add $61,250 as insurance against the possible loss of this cultural and scientific heritage to the Pacific Northwest and to the country.

Postal Employees—The Laborer Is Worthy of His Hire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Los Angeles Daily News.

Surely Congress will not adjourn without granting an adequate salary increase to the postal employees. The postal and Federal employees are a direct responsibility of Congress. Moreover Congress is responsible for having removed price controls.

The postal employee and the Federal worker today find it impossible to make ends meet.

The editorial which follows shows clearly how the people of Los Angeles feel about the plight of those who serve them so loyally and faithfully:

POLITICS OR POSTAL PAY?

If Congress insists upon rushing toward adjournment 1 week from today, leaving much critical legislation unfinished, it is going to have a lot to answer for.

In fact, the Republican leadership in the House and Senate must feel almost psychotically sure of itself to consign so much vital legislation to the limbo of unfinished business.

Here in Los Angeles, however, 8,000 postal employees and their families and friends are volubly reminding congressional GQP's that there's an election this November and that unless something is done this week about raising postal employes' wages a forthcoming expression at the polls may not confirm the widely advertised Republican victory the tealeaves purport to be spelling out.

Postal employees, frankly, are in a bad way. They've been pushed to the bottom of the economic ladder. In July 1946, the Nation's 450,000 letter carriers, clerks and other postal workers received their first pay increases in 20 years. The postal salary schedule of 1925, which ranged from $1,700 for beginners to a top of $2,100, was increased in 1946 to $2,100–$3,100.

Since this adjustment was made, however, living costs have risen nearly 30 percent and are still going up. Beginning postal workers now earn $1.04 per hour—which is less, in most cases, than the prevailing wage for common labor. The weekly wage of the beginning postal employe, after deductions, is approximately $37.

What this all amounts to is substandard living. The result is that the postal service is experiencing an enormous personnel turnover. In the Los Angeles post office, where 60 percent of new employees are veterans, this turn-over is tremendous, necessitating repeated civil-service examinations. For after all, no one in his right mind would want to remain in the employ of such a penny-pinching employer as Uncle Sam has turned out to be in the postal business.

The plight of post-office employees can and must be relieved. The Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee has approved and reported out the Baldwin bill (S. 1949) authorizing an $800 boost in postal pay schedules. This bill is now somewhere on the Senate calendar—a calendar a Congress ready to stampede toward two national conventions is about to throw in the wastebasket.

Nevertheless, the Senate Rules Committee, headed by Senator C. WAYLAND BROOKS, Republican of Illinois, can call the measure up for consideration. This should be done, and then the measure should be acted upon promptly by the House.

Los Angeles' 8,000 postal employees, the Nation's 450,000 loyal postal workers, are entitled to be decently paid and to enjoy a decent standard of living in these inflationary times.

Citizens should respond to the postal employees' appeal and write or wire the key Members of the Senate at once.

Postal workers, as these columns pointed out last March 3 in discussing this subject, aren't just "pay-rollers" and "tax-eaters." They are among the most responsible, the most indispensable, of our civil servants.

The public which employs them should insist upon S. 1149's quick passage and put it squarely up to the GOP leadership in the Senate and House to stop playing politics and to stand up for what is right.

A political party which refuses to meet the challenge of keeping in public service men and women of capacity and character can scarcely make claim to the loyalty of any fair-minded voter.

R. E. G. HARRIS.

JUNE 12, 1948.

The Panama Canal Question—Bibliographical List

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 years many informative articles, reflecting a great public interest in the Panama Canal, have been published. Some of these represent original contributions of great value to the Nation. To make these sources more widely known and readily available I have prepared a selected bibliography of these articles as well as of authoritative books.

The following recent articles deal with many phases of the Canal question:

The late Hon. Fred Bradley: The Panama Canal; radio address of March 24, 1947; Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A2597, in extension of remarks of Hon. WILLIS W. BRADLEY. The Panama Canal; radio address of March 31, 1947; Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A2632, in extension of remarks of Hon. WILLIS W. BRADLEY. The Panama Canal; press release of April 10, 1947; Appendix of the CON-

GRESSIONAL RECORD, page A2674, in extension of remarks of Hon. WILLIS W. BRADLEY.

Hon. WILLIS W. BRADLEY: The Panama Canal and Theodore Roosevelt, Inseparable in History; address before the Panama Canal Societies of the United States on May 3, 1947; Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A2127, in extension of remarks of Hon. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR. What of the Panama Canal? address before the Cosmos Club, Washington, D. C., April 19, 1948; Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A2450.

Harry O. Cole: What Should Be Done To Improve the Panama Canal? Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A2743, in extension of remarks of Hon. MELVIN C. SNYDER. Commemorative address honoring the late Sydney B. Williamson; before the Panama Canal Societies of the United States, May 8, 1948; Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A3190, in extension of remarks of Senator CHAPMAN REVERCOMB. Panama Sea Level Canal Seen Unsound; summary of the address of Harry O. Cole, of May 8, 1948; Engineering News-Record, May 13, 1948, volume 140, No. 20, page 60.

Capt. Miles P. DuVal, United States Navy: The Marine Operating Problems, Panama Canal, and the Solution: American Society of Civil Engineers Proceedings, February 1947, volume 73, No. 2, pages 161–174. Same, reprinted in Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A1176, in extension of remarks of Hon. Schuyler Otis Bland. Same; reprinted in Marine News, August 1947, volume XXXIV, No. 2, page 41. The Marine Operating Problems of the Panama Canal Involved in Its Modernization and Their Solution; lecture before the District of Columbia section of the American Society of Civil Engineers, April 15, 1947; summarized in the Christian Science Monitor, May 28, 1947, page 9.

Stephen L. Freeland: New Plans for Panama; Popular Science, July 1947, volume 151, No. 1, pages 66–72.

Charles H. Godsoe, editor: The Panama Canal Modernization; Marine Progress, April 1946, volume 14, No. 4, page 16. Same; reprinted in Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A2563, in extension of remarks of Hon. EUGENE J. KEOGH. Panama Canal; Marine Progress, September 1946, volume 14, No. 9, page 16. The Panama Canal Modernization; Marine Progress, June 1947, volume 15, No. 6, page 22.

Capt. H. H. Little, United States Navy, retired: Let Us Build the Best Canal at Panama; American Society of Naval Engineers Journal, November 1946, volume 58, No. 4, pages 560–572.

Roy L. Pepperburg: The Battle of the Levels; Sea Power, Spring 1947, volume 7, No. 4, page 18.

Hon. DAVID M. POTTS: The Panama Canal; Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A2516, quoting article by S. H. Scheibla in Wall Street Journal of May 27, 1947. Alternate Canal Routes; Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A2826, quoting letter of W. G. B. Thompson published in the Wall Street Journal, June 4, 1947. The Panama Canal in the Atomic Age; radio address of December 8, 1947; Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A4682. Defense of the Panama Canal; radio address of December 27, 1947; Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A23.

Arthur Stanley Riggs: Panama Futility; The Catholic World, January 1947, volume CLXIV, No. 982, pages 298–305. The Panama Canal: Operations or Engineering? United States Naval Institute Proceedings, December 1947, volume 73, No. 538, pages 1455–1464. Same; reprinted in Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A19, in extension of remarks of Hon. Schuyler Otis Bland. What Panama Canal Proposals Mean to Tanker Operators; excerpt from same; The Oil Forum, April 1948, page 151. The Panama Question; Shipmate, May 1948, volume 11, No. 5, page 7. Same; reprinted in Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A3399, in extension of remarks of Hon. THOMAS E. MARTIN.

Robert K. Shellaby: United States Engineers Differ, and so forth; Christian Science Monitor, May 28, 1947, page 9.

Our National Investment in the Panama Canal; Shipping Survey, volume 4, No. 4, April 1948. Panama Canal Losing Major Oil Artery Status; The Oil Forum, May 1947, volume I, No. 4, page 138. Something's Going to Happen to the Panama Canal—But What? Army Transportation Journal, May–June 1947, volume 3, page 20. Who Pays for the Panama Canal? The Log, July 1947, volume 42, No. 7, page 36.

The following articles mainly concern or advocate the construction of a new tidal lock canal (sea level) at Panama for the replacement of the present high lake type canal:

Waldo G. Bowman: Puzzle in Panama; Engineering News-Record, May 1, 1947.

J. G. Claybourn: Seal Level Plan for Panama Canal; American Society of Civil Engineers Proceedings, February 1947; volume 73, No. 2, pages 175–196.

Col. James H. Stratton, et al.: Panama Canal—the Sea Level Project; American Society of Civil Engineers Proceedings, April 1948, volume 74, No. 4, pages 444–632.

Among the most authoritative books concerning the Panama Canal are:

William L. Sibert and John F. Stevens: The Construction of the Panama Canal; New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1915.

Miles P. DuVal: Cadiz to Cathay; Stanford University Press, 1947. And the Mountains Will Move, Stanford University Press, 1947.

The great constructive engineering contributions of both William L. Sibert and John F. Stevens, and the well-known operational and historical studies of Captain DuVal entitle their works to universal consideration by both professional interests and the general public.

Even a casual examination of the references listed above will show that the modernization of the Panama Canal is a great national issue involving interoceanic shipping, engineering, marine operational, national defense and diplomatic interests of the United States as well as vast expenditures of public funds. The implications of this question are so great as to require the most careful consideration of the entire subject by the Congress before arriving at any decision.

Political Gravy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Political Gravy," published in this morning's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICAL GRAVY

Congress has made it as difficult as possible for the President to veto the Gearhart resolution. It has covered a capsule which would gnaw at the vitals of the social-security program with a sugar-coating that would hand out approximately $200,000,000 in additional payments to the needy aged and blind next year. Nevertheless, politically embarrassing as it may be, a Presidential veto is imperative in the national interest. And the political fortitude Mr. Truman has exhibited in preventing enactment of other deceptively alluring measures affords promise that he will step into the breach once more. He sent back to the Hill without his signature an earlier Gearhart resolution which removed news vendors from social-security coverage; in that instance, unhappily, Congress overrode his opposition. We hope that he will use his veto power again and that in this instance it will prevail.

The present Gearhart bill would redefine the term "employee" in such a way as to exclude from the protection of the Social Security Act anyone not employed in the old-fashioned master-servant relationship. It would, in short, markedly narrow the act's protection, in spite of the fact that the Republican Party responsible for this sabotage pledged itself in its 1944 platform to extension of the existing old-age insurance and unemployment insurance systems to all employees not already covered. Great numbers of workers who are employees by any rational or pragmatic interpretation of the term, who urgently need protection against the vicissitudes of old age and unemployment and who, under prevailing court interpretations of the term, receive that protection now, would be summarily excluded.

The Gearhart resolution, moreover, would aggravate a trend already dangerous and undesirable. It was the theory of the Social Security Act that in time the Nation would enable all its workers to provide, through their own contributions supplemented by those of their employers, a fund to care for themselves in retirement or misfortune. And it was hoped that Americans would get away from the humiliating and demoralizing influences of the dole. The Gearhart sugar-coating is, of course, an expansion of the dole. In 1937, the United States expended about $400,000,000 for assistance payments to the needy. If the Gearhart resolution becomes law, the expenditure for outright assistance next year will be about $1,000,000,000. This is not social security. It is not sound economics. And it is not good Americanism.

Erroneous, Extreme, and Unrealistic Attack on H. R. 6712 Refuted—Every Member of Ways and Means Committee Present, Including Hon. Herman P. Eberharter, of Pennsylvania, Voted To Report H. R. 6712 Favorably

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, on June 11, 1948, my colleague, Mr. EBERHARTER, made a speech appearing on page 8088 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which he criticizes the provisions of H. R. 6712 relating to general tax revision. In the course of his remarks Mr. EBERHARTER submitted for the RECORD an unsigned memorandum relating to this matter. The objections to H. R. 6712 as set forth in the memorandum are so erroneous, extreme, and unrealistic that I do not feel that I can let them go unchallenged.

At the end of the memorandum a letter is appended from the Under Secretary of the Treasury to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, dated May 26, 1948, in which the Under Secretary states that the bill contains a large number of provisions, many of which have merit. However, objections are raised in the case of 12 of the provisions included.

It is interesting to note that one of these 12 provisions to which the Under Secretary objects is the extension of the special income-tax exemption for military personnel. Your committee inserted this provision at the insistence of the Secretary of the Navy. It might be well for the Under Secretary of the Treasury to get together with the Secretary of the Navy and determine just what the administration's position is on this proposal.

However, even the Treasury Department objects to only 12 out of a total of 81 provisions in your committee's bill. Therefore, for the most part the bill is noncontroversial and deserves the support of all. If further evidence of this fact is needed, it can be found in the substantial support received by this bill from the minority on the Ways and Means Committee.

Because of the severely critical nature of the comments included in the memorandum, it seems desirable to answer the objections raised in some detail.

The topics are discussed in the order in which they appear in the memorandum.

1. PENALTY TAX ON UNDUE ACCUMULATION OF SURPLUS

The memorandum is critical of the amendments to section 102, the part of the code dealing with the surtax on corporations improperly accumulating surplus. This cricitism is based upon a failure to recognize a very real problem existing under present law. It is claimed that tremendous accumulations of undistributed profits out of the unprecedented earnings of recent years prove that section 102 does not inhibit accumulation for legitimate business needs. While it is true that corporate earnings have been large in the past few years, and that a heavy percentage of these earnings has been retained by the corporations, it does not follow, as alleged, that the corporations have retained a sufficiently large percentage of their earnings to finance the vast expansion of plant, equipment, and inventory which the postwar transition requires. In fact, as indicated in the report on this bill, your committee has received complaints that the fear of subjecting earnings to the penalty tax has resulted frequently in the distribution of funds which ought to have been retained for expansion, protection against possible business declines, or other valid business purposes. These complaints are heard most frequently from small-business men who cannot afford to retain expensive tax counsel.

It may well be that many of those distributions were based upon a groundless fear. The officials of the Bureau of Internal Revenue have reported that section 102 is, in fact, applied in a small number of cases. However, the individual businessman always fears that he will fall beneath the scope of this tax. He does not understand how an improper accumulation is determined, since the Bureau never has been able to produce a sufficiently precise explanation of the tests applied to remove uncertainty from the mind of the taxpayer. Moreover, the taxpayer knows that if the Bureau sees fit to contest an accumulation, he will have to carry the burden of proof in any subsequent court test. This represents a very expensive procedure for a small business.

The amendments to section 102 are designed primarily to allay this fear. The committee has looked into this matter thoroughly. After extended consultation with both taxpayers and administrative officials, it has reached the firm conclusion that the amendments will not, as the memorandum alleges, invite avoidance or practically assure its success.

Specific objection is taken to two of the changes made in section 102. First, it is argued, "The bill would weaken this very limited guard against tax avoidance by shifting to the Government the burden of proving that accumulations were not for the reasonable needs of the business." Distortions of this type occur frequently in the memorandum. Only in certain cases does your committee's bill shift the burden of proof to the Government—only in those cases where the taxpayer presents material showing why he accumulated the surplus, and then only if he presents no further grounds when his case is taken to court. Where the taxpayer introduces new grounds at that time or where he fails to present the original explanation of his accumulation, he has to bear the full burden of proof as under existing law.

Objection is also raised to the penalty tax being made inapplicable to capital gains of corporations. This ignores the fact that although a penalty tax is not imposed upon such gains, they are taken into consideration in determining whether or not there is an improper accumulation. Your committee believes it is undesirable to subject these capital gains to the penalty tax for two reasons. First, if capital gains are received directly by an individual, they are subjected to approximately the same tax rate as is paid by the corporation. Thus, even if capital gains are accumulated by a corporation, no avoidance of the graduated individual income tax occurs. Therefore, no reason exists for the imposition of a penalty tax.

Second, personal holding companies, which under present law are required to pay a special penalty tax of their own, are not required to include capital gains in their tax base. It is hard to believe that ordinary corporations should be subjected to more severe taxation than personal holding companies.

Your committee believes that instead of inviting avoidance and assuring its success, the amendments contained in section 125 of the bill will not only remove an inequity from the present penalty tax on the undue accumulation of corporate surtax, but also dispel the vague and very troublesome fear of an erratic and unpredictable application of this section, which is so disturbing to businessmen and which frequently has unfortunate consequences on their dividend policies. Small busines will be the primary beneficiary of these changes.

2. CORPORATE LIQUIDATIONS

The memorandum raises strenuous objections to section 129 of the bill dealing with gain or loss in connection with certain corporate liquidations. The memorandum states:

> A favorite scheme for avoiding the corporate tax on capital gains has been to liquidate the corporation's assets into the hands of the stockholders, whereupon the stockholders purport to sell the assets in their individual capacities. The Supreme Court has partially closed this loophole.

What this memorandum really should have said is that the Supreme Court has sufficiently confused the issue so that stockholders are never sure whether the courts and administrative officials will rule that the sale of a corporation's assets took place before or after the distribution to the stockholders.

At the present time if a corporation is liquidated by distributing its assets to its stockholders, no tax is imposed on the corporation on any appreciation in the value of the assets distributed. This is true even if the stockholder subsequently sells these assets. However, if the corporation itself sells the assets just prior to liquidation a tax is imposed on the corporation, and when the proceeds are distributed to the stockholders another tax may be imposed on them.

The two methods of liquidation are essentially the same. Your committee believes there is no justification in subjecting the second method to discriminatory tax treatment, particularly since it is generally the most efficient form of

liquidation. Moreover, the confusion brought about by the Supreme Court, and admitted in the memorandum when the statement is made that the Supreme Court had partially closed this loophole, is eliminated.

3. LOSS CARRY-OVER

While the memorandum approves of the change from a 2-year carry-back and 2-year carry-forward of operating losses to a 1-year carry-back and 5-year carry-forward, strong exception is taken to the revision of the definition of a net operating loss. Since your committee regards this change as one of the most equitable of all of the provisions contained in the bill, it is difficult for the committee to understand how the preverse conclusion reached in the memorandum can be sustained.

Existing law discriminates sharply between competing corporations having similar earning experience on the basis of differences between them in the receipt of tax-exempt interest, intercorporate dividends, capital gains, and the excess of percentage over cost depletion. Take for example of two mining companies which are direct competitors but have equivalent production and income over a period of time. One, having a fluctuating income, in effect is denied the benefits of the percentage depletion formula, whereas the other, having a stable income, realizes these benefits in full. Such discrimination is manifestly unfair. It is eliminated under your committee's bill which ends the practice of reducing the amount of the net operating loss carried over by the amount of tax-exempt income, percent depletion, and capital gains and losses not taken into account.

The fundamental objection to your committee's action is revealed in the final sentence of the section of the memorandum dealing with the net operating loss carry-over. This sentence reads:

> Instead of extending additional benefits to tax-exempt interest and percentage depletion, the existing exemption with respect to these items should be reexamined.

It is evident that the author of the memorandum objects fundamentally to portions of existing law which deal with tax-exempt interest and percentage depletion. Essentially, he would have us continue to whittle down the benefits of these provisions by denying them to corporations and enterprises which are forced to use the net operating loss carry-over. If tax-evempt securities and percentage depletion are objectionable, the issue ought to be fought out on its own merits. Giving a privilege with one hand only to withdraw it in particular cases with the other is a policy that is extremely difficult to justify, since it results in discriminatory treatment against the relatively hazardous enterprises with fluctuating incomes.

4. EMPLOYEE STOCK OPTIONS

The memorandum's criticism of the employee stock option section of the bill completely misses the point. The existing regulations governing the tax treatment of such options are so stringent that in effect their use for incentive purposes is denied. Employee stock options can be used effectively by corporations as a means of establishing an incentive to attract new management, to convert officers into partners by giving them a stake in the business, to retain the services of executives who might otherwise leave or to give employees generally a more direct interest in the success of the business. Your committee has investigated the possible application of this incentive device and has reached the conclusion that its use is desirable. Therefore, your committee has provided a new formula for taxing employee stock options which will remove the existing penalties.

However, it should be noted at the outset that this formula applies only to what the bill calls restricted stock options. To fall within this category, and hence to obtain the tax treatment provided by the formula, the option must conform to a set of rules laid down in the bill. These rules are intended to limit the application of the formula to cases where the option is actually used as an incentive device. Options which do not conform, and which may in fact be mere devices for paying additional compensation to corporate executives, will have to take their chances under existing law.

The memorandum challenges the efficacy of these restrictions. To satisfy that challenge it is necessary only to examine the restrictions themselves. Probably the most important is the requirement that at the time the option is granted the option price must be not less than 90 percent of the fair market value of the stock which can be purchased under the option. Because of this limit it is impossible for a corporation to use the employee stock option as a means of making an immediate and certain addition to an employee's compensation. In order for an employee to benefit fully under a restricted stock option it is necessary for the value of the stock to rise subsequent to the date on which the option is granted. The efforts of the employee will be reflected in this increase in the value of the security. By sharing in the resulting gains he is compensated for his additional efforts. Thus the 10-percent spread effectively restricts the full benefits of the stock option provision to cases in which a true incentive is being established.

The other rules laid down in your bill are described briefly in the following excerpt from the report:

> (a) The option must not be transferable except by will or in case of intestacy. * * *
>
> (b) The option must be exercisable only while the grantee is an employee of the corporation granting the option. To have a 'restricted stock option' the employee of a subsidiary may receive stock in a parent corporation, but the converse is not permitted. Neither will an option qualify if it results in the sale of the stock of one subsidiary to the employee of another.
>
> (c) The option must be exercisable only within 10 years of the date when it is granted. This rule is intended to eliminate cases where options are granted covering a period of such great duration that the employee is almost certain to benefit, even though there is no action on his part to increase the success of the employer corporation. Of course, an option can be renewed or modified at any time, but, in this event, the spread between the option price and the fair-market value at the time of renewal or modification or at the time of the original granting of the option, whichever is higher, must be used to determine whether the employee is to receive preferred treatment on this portion of his gain.
>
> (d) Prior to its exercise, the option must be approved or ratified at a duly constituted meeting of the stockholders of the employer corporation.
>
> (e) The recipient of the option must not own directly or indirectly more than 10 percent of the combined voting power of all classes of stock of the employer corporation or of a parent corporation at the time the option is granted.
>
> Rules (d) and (e) are intended to prevent the use of stock options by insiders who wish to siphon off the earnings of the corporation, or who merely wish to convert ordinary income into a capital gain.

These are severe restrictions upon the application of the new stock option formula. In the opinion of your committee they are a real safeguard against the misuse of the tax benefits which that formula provides.

The memorandum also ignores the fact that in addition to reestablishing a useful incentive device your committee's bill will probably increase the amount of taxes collected on the basis of employee stock options. Because existing law treats the gains of the employees under such options as compensation, the issuing corporations are granted corresponding deductions. Under your committee's bill such deductions will be allowed only in cases where the option price is less than 90 percent of the fair-market value at the time the option is granted and then only with respect to such a spread. The resulting increase in corporate tax collections will more than offset the concessions made to the individuals receiving restricted stock options.

5. FAMILY PARTNERSHIPS

The memorandum paints an especially black picture in the case of section 142 of your committee's bill dealing with family partnerships. It states: "This provision is nothing less than ratification of tax-avoidance schemes which have heretofore been successfully frustrated by the courts." Yet at the same time the memorandum admits that the new section on family partnerships will deal primarily with the cases where one partner's contribution represents a gift made to him by another related partner.

In effect, the memorandum is saying that interests in family partnerships are different from other forms of property. No one would says that an individual was guilty of tax avoidance because he gave corporate stock in corporations controlled by him to a relative. Nor would it be contended that the gift of income-earning property, such as a piece of real estate, to a relative was a tax-avoidance scheme. Yet the memorandum implies that a tax provision which permits the same thing in the case of partnership

interests is very bad. The justification for this conclusion is not apparent.

The memorandum goes on in an attempt to set up some horrible examples of how badly the new provision on family partnerships will work. It is stated that this bill will legalize four, five, and six-way splits of income among members of a family. It must be remembered, however, that the income-splitting provision of the Revenue Act of 1948 already provides for splitting between husbands and wives. Thus, any additional splitting brought about must be either among parents and children or among the children themselves. This bill, however, specifically provides that in order to come under the new section on family partnerships, related partners must be at least 21 years of age. Thus, of necessity, the splitting must be between or among adults. It is difficult to see what there is about a partnership between a father and a son who has reached majority which makes such a partnership a sham, as the memorandum implies that all family partnerships are. Moreover, it should be noted that in those few cases where a father does control the partnership the earnings of even a son who has reached majority are not covered by the new section on family partnerships. One of the tests to be met before a partner can receive the beneficial treatment accorded partners under the new section provides that the earnings actually received by him must not be subject to control by any other partner. It is difficult to see what objection there can be to the splitting of income between adult members of a family group who in fact are acting as separate entities.

A specific example in the memorandum attempts to show that large potential tax savings will result from the family-partnership provision. The case is cited of a married businessman with two children. However, the age of these children is not specified. If they are under 21, as it might readily be inferred from the example, they would receive no special treatment whatsoever as the result of your committee's provision dealing with family partnerships. If they are of age 21 or over, and are, in fact, not under the domination or control of the parent in any way, there is no reason to object to the fact that the father can lower his taxes by making gifts of capital in a partnership to these children since this can be done in the case of any other form of property. Why should capital invested in a family partnership be discriminated against?

The memorandum points out that the family partnership provision is retroactive to all years beginning after 1940. It is claimed that this feature of the bill will legalize flagrant attempts at tax avoidance during the war. This is an obvious distortion. Only those family partnerships which can meet the tests set out in the new provision will receive any retroactive benefits. Rather than representing flagrant attempts at tax avoidance, these cases in reality represent flagrant attempts on the part of the Government to penalize partnerships where the members are relatives.

It is claimed that the retroactive feature of this bill will result in substantial revenue loss. However, on October 31, 1947, there were only 566 cases on family partnerships pending in the offices of Internal Revenue agents, and only a part of these will be able to meet the tests specified in your committee's bill. If it were assumed that as many as 300 of these cases would result in refunds to the taxpayer, and that as much as $10,000 was involved in each case, the revenue loss from this provision would be only $3,000,000. These exaggerated figures are used purposely to show how outlandish the claims in the memorandum really are.

Because of the clamor raised against the family partnership provision, the tests which must be met before a partner can qualify under it in any future year should be clearly understood.

For each related partner the rules with respect to future years provide that:

1. He must be 21 years old.

2. He must be an individual, a trust created by the will of a deceased partner, a trust where neither the grantor nor any trustee is a partner or the spouse of a partner, or an estate of a former partner, who is deceased or incompetent (other than by reason of minority).

3. He must have contributed either capital (including capital originating with another partner who is a relative) or substantial personal services to the partnership.

4. The partnership agreement must be in writing.

5. The partnership books must show his interest in the partnership's capital and income.

6. No misrepresentation may be made by any of the partners with respect to his contribution of capital or interest in income.

7. His share of the income (whether distributed or not) must be substantially in proportion to his contribution to the total capital and personal services.

8. He must have an equal right with other partners who are his relatives in determining how much, if any, of the partnership earnings are to be distributed.

9. The earnings actually received by him, and not left in the partnership, must not be subject to control by any other partner. The provisions relating to prior years differ somewhat. An explanation of this difference can be found on page 12 of the committee report.

6. POSSIBILITY OF REVERTER

The memorandum objects to section 202 of the bill, which provides that in the case of a reversionary interest only the actuarial value immediately prior to the time of death shall be included in the decedent's gross estate. The memorandum sets out a case in which it is alleged that this provision will lead to the loss of almost the entire amount of tax due. This is where a donor sets up a trust during his life, the income of which accumulates up to the time of his death when the assets are turned over to his wife. However, should the wife die first, the trust is to revert to the donor. It is implied that practically no estate tax will be collected if the husband dies first. The fact is ignored that a gift tax is paid at the time the transfer to the trust was made. Moreover, there are implicit assumptions that the transfer to the trust is of an irrevocable character and that the accumulation during the decedent's life goes to the wife. If these assumptions are not met, the full value of the trust would be included in the decedent's gross estate irrespective of the reversionary interest.

Moreover, even in the case where the transfer was irrevocable, the claim that practically no tax would be collected at the time the reversionary interest lapsed is based upon the assumption that the actuarial value of that interest is small. This is the same as assuming that the wife is many years younger than the decedent. If they are of approximately the same age, the actuarial value of the reversionary interest will be large, and the extent of the alleged evasion will be correspondingly small.

Your committee has been impressed with a problem which the memorandum ignores entirely. Under existing law the full value of assets in which a decedent held a reversionary interest is included in the gross estate. This is extremely harsh treatment. The retained power may have a microscopic value just prior to the date of death, yet this is made to serve as a basis for tax on the full value of the assets to which that power relates.

Therefore, your committee has stipulated in section 202 of the bill that the amount to be included in the gross estate is to be limited to the actuarial value of the reversionary interest just prior to the date of death. Your committee is not engaged in opening up loopholes. It is trying to eliminate an excessively harsh rule which has been the source of major inequities.

7. PROCEEDS OF LIFE INSURANCE

The memorandum points out that under existing law, insurance purchased by an individual on his own life is included in his taxable estate if he retains incidents of ownership or pays the premiums on the policy. Since nothing akin to the premium-payment test is applied to other types of property, the law implies that life insurance is fundamentally different from other transfers which become effective at death. The reason given for this in the memorandum is that life insurance is inherently testamentary. It is not stated, however, why these other transfers are not equally inherently testamentary. In reality, when your committee's bill eliminates the premium-payments test, it merely places insurance upon an equitable basis with other property.

As long as there is a tax—namely, the gift tax—which is intended to apply to transfers made before death, and another—namely, the estate tax—intended to apply to transfers made at death, life insurance ought to be placed in the category in which it properly belongs. It

represents property which is transferred at the time the beneficiary is named. Premium payments made after that date represent additional gifts to the designated beneficiary. Your committee's bill recognizes these obvious facts.

Here, again, the memorandum proceeds by raising a horrible example. A case is set up where a 40-year-old married man with three children buys life insurance on his own life with annual premium payments of $6,000 a year on policies set up for his wife and each of his children. It is said that this would provide $900,000 worth of life insurance free of tax. This ignores, of course, the fact that in the case of each of these annual premium payments, present income-tax law provides that one-half of the payment was made by the husband and one-half by the wife. Thus, in reality the husband provided only $3,000 for each of the policies instead of $6,000.

The example goes on to assume that the married man left an estate of $700,000 to his wife in addition to his insurance estate of $900,000. Then it shows that a substantially smaller tax is paid in this case than if there had been an estate of $1,600,000 under existing law. This, of course, ignores the fact that where life insurance was used, the husband did not in fact transfer the insurance at death, and, therefore, should not be subject to the estate tax on the policy. Had the gifts of life insurance been sufficiently large, he would have been subjected to the gift tax which is proper in an inter-vivos transfer.

8. ESTATE AND GIFT TAXES ON PAYMENTS UNDER CERTAIN PENSION PLANS

Among the various improvements in existing law relating to the taxation of employee pension plans contained in your committee's bill are two provisions excluding certain payments made under such plans from the estate and gift taxes. The memorandum claims that these confer an unnecessary benefit on extremely wealthy taxpayers. Naturally, since the gift and estate taxes are equipped with substantial exemptions, exclusion from these taxes cannot be of primary interest to taxpayers of very small means. However, this does not mean that the benefits are confined to extremely wealthy people.

The benefits of these portions of the bill are restricted to payments made under the pension plans of Federal, State, and local governments, and their subordinate agencies, and under so-called approved plans operated by private industry. The latter consist of plans which have met the tests set out under section 165 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code. To meet these tests the plans must cover a substantial proportion of all employees and be nondiscriminatory in nature. It is not possible to have an approved pension plan which will be for the exclusive benefit of a small group of wealthy executives.

Because of the socially desirable nature of these pension plans substantial advantages have been conferred upon them under the income tax. It is only consistent with this action to grant preferential treatment under the estate and gift taxes as well.

Many people are unaware of the fact that under current interest rates the capital value of the pensions and annuities payable under private and public-pension plans has increased materially. For this reason they underestimate the number of cases which will fall beneath the estate and gift taxes. Hence these sections will benefit persons of modest means.

The exemption from the gift tax is especially desirable for a reason which is not even mentioned in the memorandum. Under existing law a gift tax is due if the employee makes an irrevocable designation of his surviving beneficiary. The tax is imposed upon the value of the employee's rights at the time the designation is made. If the latter is irrevocable no tax is due. Under some plans an irrevocable designation can never be made; under others it is obligatory. Under some plans the irrevocable designation can be made early in the employee's working life when the value of the survivor interest is small. Under others, it cannot be made until later when the value of the survivor interest is comparatively large. The consequence is that the tax treatment imposed on the employee varies with the technical nature of the plan under which he benefits. His tax depends on circumstances which are for the most part beyond his control. As a result the tax is discriminatory and should be eliminated.

9. GIFT TAX EXCLUSION FOR FUTURE INTERESTS

The final provision to which the memorandum objects deals with the gift tax exclusion for future interests. Your committee's bill grants an aggregate exclusion from gift tax of $3,000 a year for all gifts of future interest made by any donor. Existing law allows an annual exclusion of $3,000 per donee but this does not apply to gifts which are future interests in property. The omission of future interests from this exclusion was due in large part to the difficulty of fixing, in the case of a remainder interest, the identity of the ultimate donee. Your committee's bill avoids this problem by providing each donor with one exclusion of $3,000 for his gifts of future interests.

The memorandum states that the present gift tax exclusion was allowed only for administrative reasons. This is highly debatable. However, administrative reasons did play an important part in your committee's decision to provide an exclusion in the case of future interests. At the present time any remainder interest in a trust is held to be a future interest. As a result the filing of a gift-tax return has been necessary in the case of most gifts in trust no matter how small, and many administrative complications have arisen. Your committee's bill makes it unnecessary for a donor to file a return where only small gifts of future interests are involved and thus avoids this very difficult administrative problem.

Much of the space in the memorandum supposedly devoted to the gift-tax exclusion for future interests really deals with the Revenue Act of 1948. Gift tax splitting between husbands and wives and the $600 personal income-tax exemption, both provisions of the Revenue Act of 1948, are presented as reasons for not providing a gift-tax exclusion for future interests. The author of the memorandum must really be complimented on his ingenuity in going so far afield in an attempt to find some objection to the gift-tax exclusion for future interests. The personal income-tax exemption is obviously a red herring which has no relationship to this subject.

Gift tax splitting is only slightly more relevant to the subject. It is claimed that the gift tax exclusion for future interests enlarges an exemption which already amounts to $6,000 a year as the result of gift tax splitting. This is an obvious misinterpretation of the gift tax splitting provision. This provision, like the income- and estate-tax provisions, recognizes the fact that husbands and wives tend to pool their incomes and assets. When either of them earns income or accumulates capital this is partially due to the efforts of the other spouse. The splitting provisions of the Revenue Act of 1948 recognized this fact. Thus in reality the gift-tax exclusion is an exclusion of $3,000 per taxpayer, not $6,000.

Moreover, the gift-tax exclusion for future interests is not piled on top of the regular exclusion but represents a separate exclusion for a type of property which cannot be included in the present $3,000 exclusion.

Independence Hall, 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein an address delivered by me at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, yesterday, Flag Day—June 14, 1948:

FREEDOM IMPERILED

One hundred seventy-one years ago today the Continental Congress resolved "that the flag of the 13 United States be 13 stripes, alternate red and white, that the union be 13 stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation."

It is most fitting and proper that we meet to commemorate the anniversary of the adoption of our flag and to reaffirm our allegiance to it. It is also most appropriate that our meeting should take place here at Independence Hall where Washington was appointed Commander in Chief, where the Declaration of Independence was drafted, where the Constitution was framed, and where the Liberty Bell is sheltered.

Here were hammered out on the anvil of debate the principles on which our Nation stands. The founding fathers reached upward into the azure blue of the sky for the stars to announce their faith and trust in Almighty God.

Many changes have taken place, both in the flag and in the Nation for which it

stands; but the inspiring thing is that it represents today the same purpose and the same spirit that it represented on June 14, 1777.

What is a flag? It is not just a piece of cheap muslin done in colors, mounted on a stick, to be waved and unfurled on patriotic occasions. It is not just a piece of silk to be set in an office or on a rostrum for ornamental purposes. It is not mere decorative material to be draped along streets or hung from windows when some distinguished person comes to visit.

The flag is the symbol of a nation, and the nation is more than an aggregation of cities and towns, buildings and highways, factories and farms, churches and schools. It is a moral and spiritual entity where good will among men must prevail and mutual helpfulness is enshrined.

The flag is a symbol and something else. It is the embodiment of our ideals and aspirations, our hopes and our prayers, the purposes and traditions of our country. It is a reminder of what we are and what we hope to be.

Since time immemorial, mankind has fashioned banners to enrich emotional experience and to arouse the moral zeal of people for a cause. Centuries ago the Psalmist sang: "We will rejoice in thy salvation and in the name of our God we will set up our banners." (Psalms 20: 5.)

A great philosopher once said: "The deterioration of every government begins with the decay of the principles on which it was founded."

Constitutional government, free competitive enterprise, religious and civil liberty, are the bedrock on which our way of life stands. Here the individual is master, government the servant, acting only as umpire for fairness among its citizens.

It was here that Lincoln stated he would rather be assassinated than surrender these principles which gave such promise of lifting the weights from the shoulders of men. This concept of government is now threatened with destruction by an ideology which says the state is god and master.

Freedom, wrought out here with patience and skill by the founding fathers, is slowly dying in our beloved land. Government as they conceived it was never intended to be a social agency; but such is the present trend.

The Federal Government appeals to the weaknesses of people, not to their strength.

Too many believe if it comes from Washington it costs nothing.

Too many believe we can have more by doing less.

Too many believe food, shelter, and clothing grow under the dome on Capitol Hill.

Too many believe it is no longer necessary to carve out their own destiny.

Industry and thrift are vanishing virtues. Jefferson's warning—"were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread"—has been forgotten.

Schools, churches, and homes are no longer exempt from Federal influence. The march is steadily toward Moscow, not away from it. Every activity of our way of life is affected by some bureau in Washington.

Government becomes the master; the citizen the slave; and freedom dies in the land of its birth.

The road of good intent leads to destruction. Dignity of the individual and faith in God guided the political philosophers who laid the foundation of our Government. To all the earth we proclaim on our medium of exchange "In God we trust." As a people and a Nation, God has rewarded us with achievement and greatness without parallel in the history of mankind.

Are we worthy of that priceless heritage left us by the makers of our flag? Are we losing that faith in Divine guidance which sustained the men who labored here to bring forth a new nation?

Behold our Nation at San Francisco appeasing a godless nation by opening the conference to establish the United Nations without asking the gracious favor of Almighty God.

Do our schools and colleges teach the whole truth of our history to the rising generations? To know the cost in blood and treasure of freedom is to cherish it. Two weeks ago we tenderly deposited the sweetest blossoms of springtime in loving memory of those who died to preserve freedom.

Liberty is our inheritance. It is not a static thing. It cannot be taken for granted. It is a moral thing and it will be defended only when every hearthstone is stirred to a deeper appreciation of its value.

If America is to build, if America is to grow, if America is to live, we must all become more conscious of the blessings and privileges we have under our free representative Government.

The rise of the United States to a degree of achievement unequaled in history resulted from the freedom, independence, and protection against the collective crowd, which our Constitution gives to each citizen. This protection released the energies of men, making it possible for them to accumulate capital, create inventions, and provide better tools than the world had ever before known. The result has been a higher standard of living, better homes, more food, and a larger portion of the material and good things of life than any people in history have ever had.

Nearly the whole world turns to us for help in time of trouble and travail, yet we represent only 7 percent of the world's population and possess but 6 percent of the earth's surface.

People from all corners of the world desire to come here. Why do they desire to come and what is it that makes our country different from theirs? It is but one thing—our government of freedom—individual freedom. Under it, we have become the greatest Nation in the world. Under it, we have and enjoy more of the world's goods than any other people. We have more automobiles, radios, telephones, railroads, and spend more on education than the rest of the world combined.

In spite of that enviable record, we have some people in this land who are insane enough to believe that we should throw overboard our way of life, our system of free enterprise, and our government of freedom which has accomplished so much—and import the godless ideology of communism. In some mysterious manner, they believe we would be happier, raise our living standards, and dwell in some kind of Utopia. It is the sheerest kind of nonsense and it would be humorous if it were not so tragic.

We watch and shudder at the awful despotism and dictatorship of our time, where men are controlled by states not states by men; where people have traded their freedom for promised security.

We Americans must be aware that progress in the realm of invention and science affects the individual lives of all men. It has created pitfalls in the rules by which men live and the relationship between the individual and his government, which strike at the very heart of individual freedom.

If we as a people and as a nation would survive and preserve the freedom we have, we must revive and restore the fundamental principles upon which our Government was founded. Our patriotism is individual and not collective. It is a religion with us. It is a thing of the spirit. It is the love of a person for his individual rights. People of every race and creed have built America with their blood and sweat and their determination to be freemen.

Today there is a tendency to increase the power of the state at the expense of individual liberty. This evil is growing, not diminishing. The founding fathers understood this clearly. They wisely provided against it. They set up a system of checks and balances over the three branches of government. All initial powers were left in the hands of the people and only a few delegated to the President, Congress, and the courts.

In the final analysis, the functioning of our Republic is largely dependent upon the people of the 48 States—dependent upon each citizen to discharge his individual responsibility in the proper functioning of his Government.

We Americans accept no dictatorial concept of superior wisdom of government. We must face our problems as Americans. The strength of a state is the strength of the individuals comprising it.

Ideologies and political parties play their parts on history's stage and pass, but love of freedom will not pass from the hearts of Americans. We have and enjoy blessings never shared by other peoples of the world, making the United States the finest country in which to live.

Let our prayers this Flag Day be that we may forever sing My Country 'Tis of Thee, and that we may continue to enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness in a land "where the air is full of sunshine and the flag is full of stars."

"One flag, one land, one heart, one hand, one nation evermore."

Address of Hon. Ellsworth B. Foote, of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include therein an address made by my colleague, the Honorable ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE, Member of Congress, Third District of Connecticut, at the commencement exercises of Larson College, Hamden, Conn., on Monday, June 14, 1948:

Mr. President, members of the faculty, graduates of 1948, students and friends of Larson College. This is probably one of the rare occasions in life where a man may have the first word and the last and such a large group of women have to listen. I appreciate the honor of coming before you because I have been interested in Larson College for many years, and in recent years because my elder daughter has been one of your student body. I have watched your institution grow until it is now one of the leading colleges of its kind in this part of America. I am sure that the class of 1948 is going to add to that developing reputation and heap further honors upon the name of "Larson" by the triumphs you will achieve.

Graduation day is really a solemn moment. We look forward to it from the very first day we enter a school or college. And then when it comes we realize with many misgivings that in the very possession of a diploma and degree we are parting with much that we have cherished and enjoyed. Graduation day is an end and at the same time a beginning. You young ladies have accomplished one great step in the field of higher education. But you are just at the beginning. The world and life lie before you and I regret to say that the picture in many aspects is not an attractive one. You must not let that discourage you, for the

more difficult the problem the more satisfying will be the attainment of success in whatever field you choose. For some of you this is the end of your years as scholars. For others, it is the first step in designated careers. American business has always welcomed the addition of educated employees. The better your education the better your chances of improvement in every line. Primary, of course, with women are the teaching and nursing fields. But today women are in every line and we have a few very active and attractive ladies in Congress, and I apprehend that after November we may have at least one in the Senate of the United States. Physical science, law, medicine, market research, radio, advertising, retailing and merchandising, are all fields in which women have met with distinguished success. Life is the same in school or out of it. We still have to rely on industry and interest. We still must learn a little more each day, profiting by experience and by our own mistakes. Never surrender the desire to learn. Never be ashamed of making justifiable errors because they will aid you in rounding out a full and useful life. Someone once said that nothing would ever be done if one were afraid of failure, afraid to stumble and fall. The greatest have been those who conquered greater obstacles than most of you will ever meet. You will recall Elizabeth Barrett Browning, who would not allow physical pain to blind her eyes to the beauty of nature expressed in rhythmic language. Florence Nightingale, who was not appalled by the restrictions of the social customs of her time, and who went through years of weary labor to produce the modern science of nursing. Clara Barton, who founded the Red Cross, seized upon an idea and made it her ideal, a banner of red and white flung to the breeze in the name of mercy and humanity. Julia Ward Howe, who gave us the ringing Battle Hymn of the Republic. Harriet Beecher Stowe, of good New England stock, whose pen aroused a Nation to the evils of slavery. Madame Curie, who delved into the mysterious mists of science. Yes; there are many of them. Many inspirations for you to remember as you go through the years.

There are some who would hesitate in this modern world, who would pause too long before making a decision. It took courage in any age to accomplish one's task. It took foresight and faith to carry it on. We all have our own little problems and sometimes we conclude that they are very great, in fact, insurmountable. Then a day or a week passes and what we believed was so very important or so very difficult does not seem so at all. By tackling each day the problems thereof, we find that we are building into the future and we are stronger each hour. You can probably apply this to some of your subjects here at Larson, or even further back in your grammar-school days. Yet you have come this far and with that conviction you should go on to further heights.

When you leave these halls, don't be afraid or ashamed that you are starting at the beginning. If you take a job, you can't expect to receive a top-bracket salary the first month or even the first year. Try to find the one with the best opportunity. Remember it is the experience that counts. Experience plus knowledge eventually pay off in satisfaction as well as in cash. The great professors did not all begin in the greatest universities. The most famous writers did not launch their careers in the ranking publications. The artists and poets all had lowly beginnings but they never lost faith in themselves or the world or hope in the realization of their efforts.

Don't be a chronic complainer. Don't blame the other fellow for your lack of success. Don't be whining about the breaks. Get out and get those breaks for yourself. What we call breaks are usually the result of honest efforts. Don't wait for the breaks. Don't wait for your luck to change. Change it yourself. The disappointed ones are usually those who have not tried hard enough, who have not been consistent in their efforts, who, in fact, have not been true to themselves. You know when you have really studied a subject thoroughly. You and you alone are often the only competent judge of when you have done a good job. The older you grow the more you will have to rely on your own good judgment, and from this moment on you will find the helping hand a little less stern, a little less helpful, a little less of a crutch.

You are graduating here today because your faculty believes that you have attained the proper mental stature. They have judged you and have not found you wanting. You should seize upon this assurance they have in you. Implant it in your own heart and go forward to the job at hand. You are part of a great Nation. This Nation is today the champion of democracy throughout the world. Each one of you has to play a part in the unfolding drama of peace and freedom. America can only be strong because its people are strong and alert and active. Take an interest in your own Government. Learn to know the town in which you live and discuss its problems with your friends and neighbors. It is perhaps tragic that so many Americans know so little, and care so little about their government, even the administration of their own towns and villages. Our Republic has been built on the rule of the majority, but so often that majority is led, or misled by a belligerent minority. Too many people sit back and let others do it. They say let others do it and then they complain when the result is not in accordance with their views. Too many Americans dodge their responsibilities as citizens although few of them fail to take advantage of the constitutional right of free speech in criticism. It may be perfectly legal for you to say that such and such a situation here or in Hartford or Washington is wrong. But what are you going to do about it? What interest are you going to take in solving it? How are you going to make your wishes heard? You should begin in your own neighborhood in your own town. When there is a public meeting be there and speak your mind. It will usually concern measures with which you have a daily and perhaps a life-long familiarity. You will know what you are talking about, and you will gain confidence in yourself, and what is really important, in your form of government. Read your newspapers and magazines of proven caliber. Listen to your radio commentators and speakers, but form your own opinions on facts. Each one of you is a part of this Nation. You have a right to your own opinion and a duty to express it.

The answer to the future of America and of the free world lies in the ability of today's graduates to assume their destined places in our economic, social, and professional life. The lessons that you learned during your formative years have culminated in the degree which you receive today. The curriculum here at Larson has been designed to give you a strong foundation upon which to build your various careers. Take heart from the success of those who have preceded you, from the women of other schools, yes, and I might say from the women, the pioneer women of America, who had no schooling at all. They were not afraid to grasp the problems of their day and help build a nation for us all. Be faithful to your daily responsibilities, however dull they may seem at the moment. Assume your duties as a citizen without reserve. Remember you have to do all this yourself because no one can do it for you. These are days of decision. The young men and young women of America must lead the way for the youth of the world to follow. We can only hope and pray in all that we do that our young people will not desert the cause of the fathers, but will go on toward the goal of freedom under justice and law.

I congratulate you again upon your success. I urge you to keep in mind the principles upon which it is based and through which it may grow to great and lasting heights.

Adjournment of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in the Albuquerque Tribune, a Scripps-Howard newspaper, of Wednesday, June 9, there was published an editorial of a nature which I have not seen elsewhere, the concluding paragraphs of which are:

But Congress, after all, is paid by the year. And its Members weren't hired to get a lot of vital legislation just up to the point of final action, then run away and leave it cold and dead.

Congress should keep working until it cleans up its urgent chores. An extra 2 weeks will be little enough time for that.

This morning in the Washington Post on the same subject is an editorial entitled "Congressional Recess," which concludes:

The first duty of Congress is to the national welfare, and especially in a political year the operations of present-day government are simply too complex to permit Members to quit with their job half done.

I ask unanimous consent to have the two editorials published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Albuquerque Tribune of June 9, 1948]

FINISH THE JOB

Congress cannot get done by the end of next week many of the things it should do before it quits for the year.

Senator TAFT and other Republican leaders in the Senate realize that fact. Some of them, Mr. TAFT says, "rather favor" the idea of returning to Washington for at least 2 weeks to work after the Republican national convention.

The idea is sound. Indeed, it is essential. We hope the Senate and House will agree on it promptly.

Mr. TAFT lists three measures which will have top priority for Senate consideration after passage of the draft bill. They are the Vandenberg resolution to strengthen the United Nations and to promise eventual American support for mutual defense pacts; extension of the reciprocal trade agreements act; the long-range farm program.

Debate of these three, and of appropriation bills for the European recovery program

and for Government Departments, will consume most or all of the Senate's time between now and June 19, the date on which Congress has been planning to adjourn.

Other urgently important measures are awaiting consideration by the Senate, the House, or both. Most of them are sure to be lost in the shuffle if Congress does adjourn on June 19.

Among them are repeal of the Federal margarine taxes; the housing bill; extension of the Atomic Energy Commission's terms; a new highway program; pay increases for Government employees, and many more.

We can understand the eagerness of Senators and Representatives to get home and start politicking.

But Congress after all, is paid by the year. And its members weren't hired to get a lot of vital legislation just up to the point of final action, then run away and leave it cold and dead.

Congress should keep working until it cleans up its urgent chores. An extra 2 weeks will be little enough time for that.

[From the Washington Post of June 15, 1948]

CONGRESSIONAL RECESS

Even if Congress completes action on several of the must issues before it by the Saturday adjournment date, there is not a prayer of a chance that it will find time to take up many of the items related intimately to the national welfare. Among the legislation in the "iffy" category is farm support, aid to education, marginal sea oil, Atomic Energy Commission nominations, housing, removal of the margarine tax, and civil rights—and the present creeping progress threatens to add to the list even more vital items. Accordingly congressional leaders ought to be giving the most serious consideration to proposals for prolonging the session.

Such a suggestion was made by Senator TAFT himself before pique over President Truman's blasts at Congress apparently caused him to retreat. If the matters yet unacted upon were important enough to evoke such a suggestion from Mr. TAFT, then nothing the President has said has made them any less important. It is foolish for leaders to contend that either House will be ready for adjournment, unless such readiness implies an evasion of questions that ought to be decided. Moreover, a determination to stick to the June 10 date puts a premium on the kind of obstructionism that has been witnessed all too frequently in committees, where a small group often is able to keep controversial measures from coming to a vote.

It is questionable whether Senator TAFT's original suggestion for a 2-week session between the Republican and Democratic conventions is feasible. Such a session inevitably would be charged with a political atmosphere that would militate against constructive work. A better suggestion was that broached tentatively by Speaker MARTIN for an extra session after the conventions. Admittedly, the prospect of an August in Washington is not pleasing to many legislators. Admittedly, too, platform pledges made at Philadelphia might create some embarrassment for those members whose prime purpose seems to be to spite the administration. But even though it would not be possible for Congress to act on all important bills even in an extended session, at least some of the items which now must weigh on congressional consciences could be disposed of. The first duty of Congress is to the national welfare, and especially in a political year the operations of present-day government are simply too complex to permit Members to quit with their job half done.

How the Low-Cost Housing Program Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, there has been no section of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill that has been so misunderstood as that dealing with public housing.

Therefore Mr. JAVITS, of New York, and I have sent to each Member a break-down of how a typical public-housing project is financed and administered.

The break-down follows:

HOW THE LOW-RENT HOUSING PROGRAM WORKS

The low-rent housing program was authorized by the United States Housing Act which Congress adopted in 1937. This program is administered by the Public Housing Administration. Under it 190,000 simple but adequate homes have been provided at rents which low-income families can afford to pay.

The best way to understand how this program works is to follow through the story of a typical low-rent housing project. A project in Seattle, Wash., is described in detail, and figures for it and for four other typical projects are presented in the accompanying table. Nation-wide averages for the original low-rent projects are also shown in the table.

The Yesler Terrace project in Seattle, Wash., is owned and operated by the Seattle Housing Authority. This authority, like all local public housing authorities, was set up by the city government under State-enabling legislation. Members of the Authority are appointed by the mayor.

The need for the project was determined by the local authority, and its development was approved by the city government. The local authority purchased the site, plans were prepared by Seattle architects and engineers, and construction contracts were let to private contractors on the basis of competitive bids. The local authority operates the project with its own staff, and selects tenants on the basis of low income and their need for housing, with preference to veterans.

The role of the Federal Government is limited to the making of loans to cover part of the capital cost, the payment of annual contributions to help meet the deficits incurred in achieving low rents, and the review of local actions as to conformity with the provisions of the act.

There are 690 family dwellings in the Yesler Terrace project. It was built on the site of one of the worst slums in Seattle, and clearance of this area involved the demolition of 446 old slum dwellings. Under the United States Housing Act, one slum dwelling has to be eliminated for every new dwelling built, so that 244 slum dwellings in other parts of Seattle have been eliminated in connection with the project.

The total capital cost of Yesler Terrace was $3,190,000, or $4,623 per dwelling. This included $2,813 per unit for the actual construction cost of the dwellings, while the balance represented the cost of the site and of the old slum buildings demolished, site improvement and utility lay-outs, architect and engineering fees, and local authority overhead expenses.

The Public Housing Administration is authorized to loan up to 90 percent of the capital cost of a low-rent project, while the local authority must secure at least 10 percent from other sources. On the Yesler Terrace project the local authority obtained private financing for 16 percent of the capital cost at an interest rate of 1.98 percent per annum, by the sale of its bonds through established investment bankers. Funds to cover 84 percent of the cost were loaned by PHA at a rate of interest which covers the cost of the money to the Federal Treasury.

The total expense of operating the project last year (including interest on the capital funds and amortization of principal) amounted to $286,890. The total income amounted to $259,587, and was derived almost entirely from rents. The resulting deficit was met by a Federal annual contribution of $27,303, which required only 28 percent of the maximum amount authorized under the act. This relatively low contribution was due primarily to the increased rent-paying ability of families in times of prosperity.

The local government also contributed to the cost of achieving low rents by exempting the project from all local real-estate taxes. Contributions in this form, or in cash or tax remissions, are required by the act and must equal at least 20 percent of the Federal contributions. Small payments in lieu of taxes equal to 10 percent of shelter rents have been authorized in the past, and in such cases the local contribution was equal to the difference between the full taxes and the payments in lieu of taxes. The Federal Appropriation Act for 1948, however, limited payments in lieu of taxes to the amounts, if any, which had been specified in the earliest contracts with the local authorities. Since no such payments had been specified in the Seattle contract, none were made last year in respect to Yesler Terrace, and local contribution was equal to the full tax exemption of $33,245. This local contribution amounted to 122 percent of the Federal contribution or over six times the amount required under the act.

To be eligible for admission to low-rent projects, families must have incomes below maximum limits set by the local authorities and approved by the PHA. No family can be admitted whose income exceeds five times the rent to be paid including utilities, except that for families with three or more minor dependents the limit is six times the rent. In 1947, out of 177 families admitted to dwellings which became vacant, 46 percent were the families of veterans and servicemen of low income. The balance were low-income families, all of whom came from substandard dwelling quarters. The average income of all the families admitted in 1947 was only $1,204 per year.

Maximum income limits are also set for continued occupancy in low-rent projects. These limits are, in general, 20 percent or 25 percent above the limits for admission, in order that families will not become ineligible through small increases in income. All tenants living in the project are reexamined each year as to their income status, both to determine their eligibility for continued occupancy and in order to adjust their rent either upward or downward in the event of a substantial change in income. In the 1947 reexamination at Yesler Terrace it was found that 24 percent of the tenants were families of veterans. The average income of all families living in the project in 1947 was $1,360. These same families, when they were first admitted to the project had incomes averaging $1,118. This increase in family income from the time of admission up to the present is considerably greater in most projects than in Yesler Terrace.

Although the local authority is making every effort to limit occupancy exclusively to families of low income, there are now in Yesler Terrace, as in most of the low-rent projects, a substantial number of families whose incomes exceed the limits established for continued occupancy. This is due to conditions beyond the local authorities' control, which have arisen out of the war and its aftermath. During the war the local authorities admitted workers in defense industries pursuant to specific congressional authorization; moreover, substantial numbers of families originally admitted because of their low-income status, have experienced income increases during the war and postwar years which have made them ineligible for continued occupancy. Because of the very acute housing shortage, however, it has been almost impossible to remove all of these families. Nevertheless, the local authorities have been required by PHA to remove at least 5 percent of their over-income tenants each month, beginning with those of highest income. The carrying out of this policy has been made difficult by subsequent action of the Congress in prohibiting the local authorities and PHA from resorting to legal action to secure eviction if such eviction would result in undue hardship. The local authorities, however, have been continuing their removal programs, subject to this limitation. In Yesler Terrace, for example, the proportion of ineligible tenants has now been reduced to 13 percent.

Despite the continued presence of over-income families in most of the projects, the average incomes of the families living in low-rent housing are extremely low. For the Nation as a whole, the average incomes of all families admitted to the original low-rent projects in 1947 was $1,382, and the income of all families living in the projects averaged $1,841. To appreciate how low these figures actually are they should be compared with the cost (as recently determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics) of a minimum adequate budget covering the essentials of life for an average city worker's family of four. These minimum average budgets in June 1947, ranged from a low of $3,004 in New Orleans to a high of $3,458 in Washington, D. C. The minimum adequate budget for the average city shown in this study exceeds the average income of all tenants in low-rent housing by 76 percent.

The low-rent program has achieved rents that are within the means of families of low income taken from the slums. Tenant families are required to pay all that they reasonably can in relation to their income. On the other hand, the pressure of food, clothing, and other necessities of life on the meager budgets of these families is so insistent that rents must not exceed a reasonable proportion of their income. In the Yesler Terrace project, for example, the average monthly rent in 1947 including heat and all other utilities averaged $28.08. This amounted to approximately 25 percent of the average income of the families living in the project.

The low rents necessary for families taken from the slums are made possible only through the aid of the contributions made by the local and Federal Governments. The cost to the Federal Government of its contributions for Yesler Terrace in 1947 amounted to only $3.30 per dwelling per month, while the national average was $2.91. The total contributions paid by the Federal Government from the inception of the program in 1937 to July 1, 1947, have amounted to only $56,211,611.

The system of Federal annual contributions combined with local contributions in the form of tax exemption has, in its 10 years of operation, proved to be an efficient, flexible, and economical method of administering Federal aid for low-rent housing. Under this system Federal aid is limited each year to the amount actually required. In good times only a fraction of the authorized maximum subsidy has been required; in bad times, when the rent-paying income of low-rent families decreases, necessary reductions in rent can be made by increasing contributions up to the maximum level permitted by the act.

An extension of the low-rent program is desperately needed. The plain facts are that private enterprise cannot now afford to provide adequate housing either new or second-hand, at prices within the means of low-income families coming from the slums. The initiative and ingenuity of American private enterprise would long since have wiped out the slums and rehoused the slum dwellers if this could have been done on the basis of a proper economic return.

We must face the fact that if we are to clear the slums and if we are to provide decent housing for the families displaced from them, Government aid will be necessary. That such Government aid is a proper Federal purpose under our Constitution has been unanimously affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Low-rent housing projects under United States Housing Act—5 typical projects and Nation-wide averages

Project location and No.	Seattle, Wash-1-1	Baltimore, Md-2-2	Kokomo, Ind-7-1	Chattanooga, Tenn-4-1	Meridian, Miss-4-1	Nation-wide average, all low-rent projects
Project name	Yesler Terrace	McCulloh Homes	Gateway Gardens	College Hill Courts	Highway Village	
Number of dwellings in project	690	434	176	497	89	304
Type of site	Slum	Slum	Vacant	Slum	Slum	
Elimination of slum dwellings:						
Dwellings eliminated on site	446	434	0	430	38	124
Dwellings eliminated off site	244	0	176	67	51	162
Total already eliminated	690	434	176	497	89	286
Capital cost of project:						
Total development cost	$3,190,000	$2,151,721	$742,000	$2,323,841	$311,390	$1,348,930
Development cost per unit	$4,623	$4,958	$4,216	$4,676	$3,499	$4,443
Construction cost per unit	$2,813	$2,593	$2,756	$2,826	$2,354	$2,691
Financing of capital cost:						
Private loans, percent of total	16	58	11	86	11	39
Interest rate on private loans	1.98	1.89	2.77	1.74	2.11	1.89
Federal loans, percent of total	84	42	89	14	89	61
Income and expense, last fiscal year:						
Expense (including interest and amortization)	$286,890	$172,822	$66,624	$145,395	$25,356	$111,775
Less: Income (rents and miscellaneous)	$259,587	$161,509	$62,760	$132,775	$22,684	$101,170
Federal contribution	$27,303	$11,313	$3,864	$12,620	$2,672	$10,605
Federal contribution as percent of maximum	29	18	15	16	23	24.7
Local contribution, last fiscal year:						
Full: taxes, if paid	$33,245	$43,562	$12,424	$29,598	$7,082	$27,472
Less Payments in lieu of taxes	0	$5,464	0	$2,128	$269	$3,909
Local contribution	$33,245	$38,098	$12,424	$27,470	$6,813	$23,563
Local contribution as percent of Federal	122	337	322	218	255	222
Families admitted, 1947:						
Number of families	177	25	45	86	19	43
Veterans and servicemen, percent	46	92	78	33	37	55
Average annual income, all admissions	$1,204	$1,325	$1,525	$1,256	$1,175	$1,382
All families living in project, 1947:						
Veterans and servicemen, percent	24	14	49	25	35	34
Average annual income all families, 1947	$1,360	$1,684	$2,260	$1,545	$1,308	$1,841
Average annual income when admitted	$1,118	$989	$1,114	$764	$829	$996
Ineligible families, April 1948, percent	13	21	28	17	5	22
Average monthly rent with all utilities, 1947	$28.08	$34.00	$37.30	$26.09	$22.30	$31.95
Average percent of family income for rent, 1947	25	24	20	20	21	21
Cost of Federal contributions, per family per month, 1947	$3.30	$2.17	$1.83	$2.12	$2.50	$2.91

This table relates to locally owned projects under the original United States Housing Act (Public Law 412, 75th Cong.), except that Nation-wide averages of family incomes and rents also cover PWA low-rent projects.

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the House on the subject of social security. I am pleased with the progress that has been made in this field. I have supported the legislation for improvement and extension that has already been acted upon by the House. But, Mr. Speaker, I submit that we have not gone far enough in the way of providing pensions for our old people. The provisions now available under what we term old-age assistance, even with the increase that we have just recently voted, are far from adequate. Old-age assistance now provides approximately $1 per day on an average throughout the Nation. We have added around $5 per month or about 17 cents per day increase. This increase just about represents the increase in cost of a reasonably priced lunch. The Federal Government only pays part of the $1.17, the States sharing in the total payment. This is not sufficient for decent Americans to keep body and soul together. Certainly if we owe them the part we pay toward the mere lunch money that is now provided, we owe them something for breakfast and also something for their evening meal. Then, too, they need housing, clothing, medical care, and other necessary living expenses. If we do not owe them a decent pension to live on, then we should be courageous enough to admit it and quit paying the amounts we are appropriating for this purpose. But I say we do have a responsibility here. We should pay a decent Federal pension to our old people, uniformly, in all the States.

We have a program to enact a pension of $60 per month to be paid by the Federal Government uniformly in all the States. We have asked the Committee on Ways and Means to report a bill to the floor to provide such a pension. Now I am most happy to announce that a majority of the members of the House have joined in this polite request to the committee. The request itself contains the salient features of the pension bill for which we ask. It is a simple and reasonable request. Now that time is short and the House may consider urgently needed legislation under the suspension of the rules, we ask that this very badly needed pension legislation be considered. However it may come forth, Mr. Speaker, whether by a rule or under the suspension of rules, is not material to those of us who seek action on this request. It is a decent pension for our own American elder citizens that we are concerned about. Unless we do take action perhaps many thousands of them will be hungry and cold before Congress meets again. In my opinion there is no more deserving cause. There is no greater need. There is nothing closer to the heart of America or more vital to our happiness and well being than this very question. I urge with all of the earnestness that I possess that the House may act upon it before we adjourn. The friendly request petition for action to which I referred is as follows:

A FRIENDLY REQUEST TO THE HONORABLE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Subject: Old-age pensions.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, we, the undersigned Members of the Eightieth Congress, respectfully represent—

1. That our present pensions for the aged are inadequate.

2. We feel that they should be increased at least to $60 per month.

3. The age of availability should be reduced from 65 to 60 years.

4. That the Federal appropriation should be available uniformly in all the States, irrespective of whether the various States find themselves in position to match the Federal grant.

5. We feel there is abundant evidence in the records of this and previous sessions of Congress to support these statements.

Will you therefore report to the floor an open bill that will accomplish these very reasonable objectives? May we also ask that the said bill be reported far enough in advance of any recess that it may have thorough consideration and a vote?

We have, as we should, found the time and the means to legislate and appropriate the funds liberally for the relief of needy people in other lands. Millions of our deserving elders are now in dire need. In fact, with the increased costs of living, many are in desperate circumstances. Many of us have promised them we would do our best to secure for them a reasonable pension, and during this session of the Congress. We trust your honorable committee will cooperate with us to this end.

Respectfully,

_____,
_____,

SOCIAL-SECURITY PROGRAM FACES INCREASE BENEFITS, HIGHER PAY-ROLL TAXES, AND BROADER COVERAGE

The living-cost problem facing 6,400,000 people living on relief and annuities is classed as a "crisis."

In order to meet this crisis Congress will have to increase the benefits and increase the pay-roll tax to 1½ percent immediately.

The average check received each month by a retired worker and his wife is $39.20. Actually, the purchasing power of that check is only $23.52 in 1939 dollars. Workers are finding that this is not enough for a retired couple to live on, even if there are small additional sources of income.

We could replace the relief system if we extended the coverage to 23,000,000 more workers. Persons not covered are 5,000,000 employees of State and local governments and certain nonprofit organizations—religious, hospitals, colleges, and others; 3,500,000 farmers; 3,500,000 farm laborers; 6,000,000 self-employed; 2,500,000 domestic workers.

The social security trust fund amounts to about $10,000,000,000.

The maximum limits for Federal participation are particularly serious in aid to dependent children, since the amounts are lower and no allowance is made specifically for the mother or other relative who cares for the child.

The need for medical care is greatest among the people who are least able to purchase it. Preventing and curing illness is a prime means of eliminating not only individual suffering but also unnecessarily large public burdens for relief. More than three-fifths of the children receiving aid to dependent children are in need because of the death or disability of one or both parents. Many old people are on the assistance rolls because ill health kept them from earning and saving in their earlier years or because the sickness or death of others has deprived them of what would normally have been their source of support in old age. Many recipients of aid to the blind are suffering from eye ailments that would have yielded to timely care or could even now be ameliorated by proper care.

No State should be permitted to require actual transfer or control of property to the State or any political subdivision as a condition of eligibility.

The theory of relatives' responsibility does not work and it deprives the needy person of assistance rather than induces relatives to help.

The people in equal need ought to receive equal assistance regardless of where they happen to reside and the Federal Government ought to participate financially to make that certain. The obligation on the part of the United States is to make certain that minimum needs of people throughout the States are met.

There should be a uniform pension to take the place of the old-age assistance provision. This uniform pension should be $60 per month to those American citizens over the age of 60 who do not pay a Federal-income tax.

Our great and wealthy Nation, for security reasons, has been, and is now, pouring billions of dollars in resources to aid the needy of the world. Surely our own citizens have the right to expect that their Government will not continue to neglect the security and needs of home folks.

Old-age assistance, by States, for March 1948

State	Number of recipients	Total amount	State average
Alabama	63,166	$1,233,992	$19.54
Arizona	10,693	510,400	47.73
Arkansas	46,004	836,935	18.19
California	183,919	10,506,744	57.13
Colorado	44,847	2,716,173	60.57
Connecticut	15,386	750,658	48.79
Delaware	1,282	32,456	25.32
Florida	56,767	2,158,623	38.03
Georgia	81,825	1,513,895	18.50
Idaho	10,455	437,233	41.66
Illinois	125,666	5,142,550	40.92
Indiana	50,446	1,623,361	32.18
Iowa	48,532	2,057,670	42.40
Kansas	35,551	1,405,717	39.48
Kentucky	51,421	893,672	17.38
Louisiana	54,968	1,221,185	22.22
Maine	12,979	473,731	36.50
Maryland	11,814	384,368	32.53
Massachusetts	88,341	4,868,092	55.11
Michigan	91,043	3,501,782	38.46
Minnesota	54,416	2,345,956	43.11
Mississippi	40,187	634,312	15.78
Missouri	115,589	4,205,057	36.38
Montana	10,876	430,380	39.57
Nebraska	24,140	957,844	39.68
Nevada	2,125	103,204	48.57
New Hampshire	6,827	269,847	39.53
New Jersey	23,186	982,157	42.36
New Mexico	8,696	311,700	35.84
New York	111,458	5,563,723	49.92
North Carolina	42,659	770,973	18.07
North Dakota	8,799	346,866	39.42
Ohio	122,278	5,102,389	41.73
Oklahoma	95,860	4,064,735	42.40
Oregon	22,178	966,559	43.58
Pennsylvania	88,718	3,117,522	35.14
Rhode Island	8,882	369,380	41.59
South Carolina	32,678	647,508	19.81
South Dakota	12,172	390,312	32.07
Tennessee	50,501	1,027,568	20.35
Texas	200,635	6,250,320	31.15
Utah	11,683	545,545	46.70
Vermont	6,012	201,488	33.51
Virginia	16,374	301,914	18.44
Washington	63,800	3,611,788	56.61
West Virginia	21,945	446,374	20.34
Wisconsin	47,744	1,787,802	37.45
Wyoming	3,915	192,644	49.21
National average	2,345,136	88,430,967	37.71

Old-Age Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I am also for a better old-age pension now. I consider it a very serious matter. This Congress should not end, Mr. Speaker, without doing something about this situation. I do not mean just merely a token increase of $5 per month added to our pitiable old-age assistance. What does $5 per month amount to per day? Just about 17 cents, Mr. Speaker. Add this to the approximate $1 which we are paying, and you hardly take care of the recent price increase on that one meal per day about which we have been talking. Is one meal per day enough for our mothers and fathers? What about clothing, housing, medical care, and how about breakfast and the evening meal? They will need these too. Mr. Speaker, we do need so badly to give this matter attention. I am asking for this House to do something about it before we adjourn. I am asking it in all the earnestness that I possess.

On With the Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Post, Boston, Mass., Friday, June 11, 1948:

ON WITH THE JOB

History repeated itself in the Harvard College yard yesterday.

A year ago, on June 5, Secretary of State Marshall received an honorary degree. He then arose and propounded the Marshall plan, which at long last has come into being.

Yesterday, 1 year and 5 days later, Paul G. Hoffman, Administrator of the United States Economic Cooperation Administration, likewise, in the same spot, received a degree. The man who has on his shoulders the burden of making the Marshall plan work for sake of the physical peace of nations and the mental peace of mankind, also spoke.

"The growing sense of solidarity among free peoples which has developed since the announcement of the Marshall plan is not confined to Europe alone," he said. "All free peoples are at last discovering a firm, sound basis for united action. We are joined now not by mere expediency but by fundamental morality.

"In this growing sense of a common purpose among all free peoples—in their awareness of the type of conflict in which, we are now engaged—lies our greatest hope of avoiding another world war. Hitler would never have marched in 1939, in my opinion, if he had had arrayed against him the united strength of the world's free nations. Nor will any other aggressor march if the free nations stand together and are prepared spiritually and militarily to meet aggression."

When Secretary Marshall presented the Marshall plan, it was done with the hope that all nations of Europe would join in the titanic effort to pull the continent out of the abyss of the war's aftermath onto the path of progress that led to a stable and calm future.

At the last minute of the meeting in Paris of all hands, Russia reneged. By force, she made her satellites, greatly in need of Marshall plan aid, likewise turn their backs on the greatest largesse ever offered to the world in all history.

It is to America's everlasting credit that then and there the plan did not collapse. The United States pressed it as offering the only hope of maintaining peace. The alternative was the Red subjugation of Europe, and inevitably, war.

Soviet Russia's march across Europe was halted by the hope of the Marshall plan. War did not come. It will not come if Europe's nations are not afraid to stand together and face Russia. But they will only do this if they are backed and bolstered by the United States.

Yet even as Director Hoffman spoke so hopefully yesterday at Harvard, hearings were getting under way in Washington on the cut that has suddenly been proposed in the Marshall plan financing which has so upset Europe, making the friends of America there wonder if again, as in the time of the founding of the League of Nations, America is going to quibble and subsequently back out.

"Any material reduction in the amount is certain not only to slow us down, but lessen our opportunity to get going with a real recovery program," commented Administrator Hoffman. "Moreover, any material reduction now might cause great damage to the spirit of confidence and hopefulness among the peoples of western Europe which is so vital to the success of our efforts.

"We feel—all of us should feel—a great sense of urgency in getting on with the job. Not only is the economic recovery of the free nations of Europe, with their 260,000,000 of productive people, vital, but their quick recovery is vital to the achievement of genuine peace in the world." Let us, therefore get on with the job."

If America does not get on with the job, if America, because it is an election year, indulges in the luxury of playing politics with out peace and the peace of the world, what follows? Early today truce began in the Holy Land. Yesterday afternoon the Senate passed the draft. Are those the shadows of things to come if, from aiding Europe forthrightly, America once more turns away?

There was history in the Harvard yard yesterday, foreboding history.

Gas Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON H. CARSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John M. Peart and Cyril J. O'Brian, of the Irwin News Service, which gives an excellent forecast of the inevitable gas shortage which faces the mid-West next winter:

WASHINGTON.—With the approach of summer little thought has been given to the need for winter fuel; however, throughout the Midwest warning signals have been hoisted to warn both industry and the general public that natural-gas supplies will be spread more thinly than ever.

This danger sign comes in the wake of the defeat of the Moore-Rizley bill (H. R. 4051) by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee by a vote of 9 to 4.

The bill was an effort to amend the Natural Gas Act and insure transportation, through interstate pipe lines, of greater quantities of natural gas to feed the expanding requirements of the great consuming markets of eastern Ohio, western Pennsylvania, and the great industrial East.

The second reason of the Moore-Rizley bill was to release from the control of the Federal Power Commission, and its Czar Administrator Leland Olds, the supplies of natural gas from the great Southwest where it is being diverted into nonproductive fields, or stored against future use.

Commissioner Olds contended that the natural gas should be retained in the fields of Oklahoma, Texas, and Kansas. He made this contention in the face of facts presented by Representative HENDERSON H. CARSON (R., Ohio) which gave proof of the dire need of additional fuel in the East and mid-West by both the public and industry.

Commissioner Olds of the Federal Power Commission, which is a New Deal bureau, said that he was not in favor of the fuel movement, and was in favor of moving the industries to the source of supply. Olds said, "It seems to me, as I look at those pipe lines, that if they are to continue to expand, they will, in effect, draw the life blood of the Southwest up into the heavily industrialized States."

This statement, coming from the commissioner, seemed odd indeed to his listeners. And odd it was, due to the fact that the writers and coauthors of the bill are none other than Senator EDWARD H. MOORE, of Tulsa, and Representative ROSS RIZLEY, of Guyman, Okla. Both men in their efforts to market the natural gas from their native State had but one thought in mind, that of supplying the needs of another part of the country with a product from their section, which in turn would, of course, pay dividends to the people of their State. This was only natural for the supply of gas in the Southwest far outmarks the demand being made in the industrial East.

Their efforts, plus those of Representative CARSON, were unavailing against the powerful Federal Power Commission, especially in the Senate committee hearing, where the actual needs of the industrial sections went unheeded.

To complete the picture, according to Representative CARSON, last winter with insufficient fuel wrought untold hardships on the public of eastern Ohio, Michigan, and western Pennsylvania. Dropping gas pressures in the cold weather forced production of steel, alloys and ingot metals to a new low, which in turn caused a decline in production of needed articles which the country could hardly bear. Automobiles, razor blades, and every other metal constructed necessity felt the constriction of fuel. In addition, home owners huddled in single rooms to conserve heat, hospitals and nursing homes were hard put to render service. All of this went on while just a few hundred miles away great supplies of natural gas lay unused. But this was only part of the picture, according to CARSON, as he cited

another unfavorable side. * * * In the city of Canton, according to Chamber of Commerce reports, the Timken Roller Bearing Co. lost a total of 10 days, or 8,372 man-hours of work, which in turn resulted in a production loss of 741,750 vitally needed bearings and 345 tons of super alloy steel.

Republic Steel lost 30 days, or 55,152 man-hours—resulting in loss of over 1,500 tons of treated steel.

Spun Steel lost 5 days, or 5,000 man-hours—resulting in a loss of 30,000 pieces of stamped steel.

Canton Stamping & Engraving Co. lost 7 days, or 34,066 man-hours—resulting in a loss of 650,000 pieces of finished product which was estimated to be worth $130,000.

For an absolutely clear picture, Canton alone lost a total of 339,966 man-hours of labor. Labor lost $408,000 in wages. Loss of units soared to the amazingly high total of 1,488,800 pieces—all due to a shortage of gas fuel.

In a report from the Detroit Board of Commerce to the Federal Power Commission, Willis W. Hall, manager of the industrial department, deplored the heavy toll the motor city paid in lost man-hours, wages, and in suffering to its citizens.

In his report Hall said, "We do not try to place blame, that is of no avail. We must bury past errors, grievances, and prejudices and bring to life a lot of cooperative effort to lick this problem."

While many radio commentators and newspaper columnists glorified the saving of $50,000,000 by the Federal Power Commission and the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Hall's little publicized report gave the actual facts, based on comprehensive study of Detroit's industrial output, comparing the production of normal months with those of gas-curtailment periods.

In a normal period of 28 days 570,000 automobiles were produced.

In the same period of 28 days, during the gas shortage, only 489,000 came off the assembly line. This is a loss of over 80,000 units, valued at $105,750,000. This loss to one industry many times overbalances the $50,000,000 boasted saved by the FPC and the Senate committee.

Labor paid the price, too. One million seven hundred thousand man-hours were lost and that time lost meant $20,876,000 which labor could ill afford to miss. No union, corporation, or organization could stand many losses of this type.

"With the prospect of another winter like the last staring us in the face," CARSON concludes, "I believe it's about time we did something about the whole thing. Let's increase the supply in the Big Inch and the Little Inch—let's bring in that vitally needed fuel that is literally going to waste at our very door step."

However, that is easier said than done. The Senate has killed the Moore-Rizley bill in committee, despite passage by the House. That was the only plan in sight to relieve this dilemma. The congressional adjournment time is approaching and another winter will be upon us before appropriate action can again be undertaken.

What Fehr Thinks About

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article of the well-known columnist of the New York Inquirer, Louis Fehr, appearing on May 31, 1948:

WHAT FEHR THINKS ABOUT IT

(By Louis Fehr)

IN THAT A COUNTRY

His Excellency, Fuzzy Wuzzy Pasha, Foreign Minister of the Sovereign State of Lebanon, writes a note to His Excellency, the Honorable George Catlett Marshall, Secretary of State of the United States of America. It says in effect:

"You go swiftly to the Infernal Regions."

Who pays Fuzzy's salary? Isn't it Ernest Bevin? Where does Bevin get the money? Isn't it from the dear income-tax payers of the United States?

How big is Lebanon? Isn't all Palestine as big as Long Island? Is Lebanon as big as one quarter of the American State of Delaware? Has Lebanon got as many residents as Staten Island?

SATELLITES OF SATELLITES

We squawk about Russia's satellites in the UN. We carp about the fake Soviet Ukraine which F. D. cooked up with Uncle Joe to give Russia three more votes. We know that Russian Poland and the rest are just Russian satellites.

And don't we have a lot of funny little countries, Ecuador, Peru, Chili, Bolivia, Colombia, Cuba, and so on that we use as satellites, to make motions that gag even Warren Austin?

FLEAS UPON FLEAS

And don't we hold the power of the purse over France, Holland, Luxemburg, and Belgium?

England holds out its right hand for our money, but it puts the thumb of its left hand at its nose. England, too, has its satellites. Don't forget Iraq, Iran, Saudi-Arabia, Syria, as well as Lebanon, Burma, et cetera.

Doesn't it remind you of the poem:

"The bigger fleas have smaller fleas
Upon their backs to bite 'em.
The smaller fleas have smaller fleas
And so—ad infinitum."

THOSE UN DELEGATIONS

There are 58 so-called nations at UN's Lake Success. Some of the little countries have a hard job getting enough chaps who can read and write to hold the fat jobs the American taxpayers furnish them.

Did you ever see some of the Ambassadors and Delegates of these countries? How long have those bozoes been wearing shoes? In what hills did they catch them? And shouldn't quite a few of them learn to buy Mum, Arid, Odorono, and other things which give prizes on the radio to ladies who want to be nice to be near?

How can George Marshall and Warren Austin keep a straight face when they salute these geezers as "Your Excellency"?

Warren can't stand it much longer. He wants to go home to Vermont and breathe some fine, fresh air.

STUNG AGAIN

The people on the corner were laughing at the drunk the village loafers had smeared with shoe polish. They thought his black nose was comical. But one young lady wept. A passerby asked:

"Why don't you laugh? Isn't it a funny sight?"

The young lady explained:

"I have a sense of humor, also, but, you see, he is my father."

It was comical this week to read that Marshall had to crawfish out of accepting a testimonial dinner and an award from a Red magazine, which had hooked him some weeks ago and was going to parade him for its customers.

NOT THE FIRST TIME

It was comical to read how Marshall's Voice of America was broadcasting to South America stories about the drinking habits of American heroes and the uncouth manners of citizens of Texas.

Washington still titters over how Marshall forgets up to the present time where he was the night before Pearl Harbor.

And about how he walked into that Communist surprise party in Bogota, Colombia.

But some folks can't laugh. They realize the comic character at which the world is laughing is our Secretary of State.

THE NERVE OF SOME FOLKS

Ernest Bevin hit the sky when Harry Truman received Chaim Weizmann and talked about giving a loan of $100,000,000 to Palestine.

Our latest British loan was nearly $4,000,000,000. And we're never going to get back the lend-lease billions the British got from F. D. R.

Would there be any England today if Wilson hadn't saved it from the Kaiser and F. D. hadn't come to its aid against Hitler?

John Bull is the man who came to dinner and took over the house. Now he doesn't even want us to say what we can do with the small change he lets us keep.

DON'T TREAD ON ME

One of the earliest American banners was the rattlesnake flag, with the motto "Don't tread on me."

When the South mistreated its slaves, we drafted an Army and sent Sherman marching and burning from Atlanta to the sea.

When Mexico slaughtered the defenders of the Alamo, Winfield Scott slashed through from Veracruz to Mexico City.

When Spain starved Cubans in concentration camps, we took away the Spanish Empire from Puerto Rico to the Philippines.

After the Japs tortured Stillwell's men on the Bataan death march, we dropped the atom bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The ruins of German cities our bombers laid waste show how our hot anger responded to Hitler's gas chambers.

Let their example warn Stalin when he sees how far he can try the generous patience of a humane America.

AMERICANIZATION

King Canute took out his broom and tried to sweep back the tide. He failed.

Old-fashioned politicians try in vain to keep voters herded into racial blocs. Radical politicians try to keep voters herded into groups with grievances.

But it works less and less successfully. Teddy Roosevelt didn't look at the world through the tulip-colored specs of a Hollander. Eisenhower never once thought of himself—in spite of his German ancestry and his German name—as anything but an American.

PATRIOTISM KNOWS NO ANCESTRY

The voters of the great State of New York twice chose Herbert Lehman governor. His attack on packing the Supreme Court was the high-water mark of Lehman's demonstration that he was an American in the best tradition of this land.

In earlier days, padrones crowded Italian immigrants into ghettoes and robbed them of a large part of their wages, while selling their votes to the high bidders who enriched the padrones. But the thousands of letters their sons and daughters sent to Italy in the last campaign against communism shows that the grip of the padrone is broken.

The politician who thinks he can deliver our votes because his father came from the same land as ours is deceiving himself.

Faith in American Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Robert M. Grannis that appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle on Sunday, June 13:

PEOPLE OF LITTLE FAITH HACK AT ROOTS OF UNITED STATES—THE FAINT OF HEART CAN'T SEEM TO REALIZE THAT DEMOCRACY IS STILL A MODEL WAY OF LIFE

(By Robert M. Grannis)

I know a lot of people who have only one little gripe in their lives, yet they slam the door on their blessings and devote their entire energies to being miserable. Worse than that, they go out of their way to lure recruits into their gloomy web and thus set up a chain reaction which can render a disservice to a whole community.

I'm no Pollyanna. In fact, many of my readers have accused me of being a pessimist, a charge I vigorously deny. But there is nothing wrong with searching out the dark spots and talking about them frankly so long as we don't decide we can't take them in stride and perhaps someday rub them out.

What gets me hopping mad at some of the boys with long faces is how they use them to burrow into the fertile heart of our American democracy in the hope that it will die one day and give rise to something else. They are not necessarily Communists either. They are merely people of little faith who have decided that because they can't get everything they want immediately they don't want anything else that is available to them.

FINISHERS HARD TO FIND

We belong to a restless generation. Frequently, before we get a project well under way, we decide to junk it and try something else. As a result we have developed a race of starters in America. Finishers are hard to find. It is so much easier to give up at the halfway point and try something that looks easier. This is true in domestic affairs as well as international affairs. Destructiveness has become such a national fetish that the average man would rather buy a new necktie than clean a couple of spots off a better old one.

To me our democracy is like the good green grass. You can bury it under snow and ice. You can flood it with swollen rivers and hack at it with spades and hoes but one day it springs up again on schedule as good as new.

NO CLOSED DOOR HERE

I wish we could discover that there is no need to attack the foundation of our democracy. I wish we could see that it is everlasting and capable of adjusting itself to any day and age. I wish we could see that there is no reform needed in its basic precepts to provide room for a forgotten man. There is no forgotten man in America so long as we hang on to the original formula. Our Constitution recognizes no closed doors.

The fact that some exist in America is due to our failure to live up to what we have been taught to believe in.

A MODEL WAY OF LIFE

Perhaps a new generation will have a less gloomy face than this one. Perhaps they will learn to accent the perfections to such an extent that the imperfections will take care of themselves. I have hopes that this will happen. If it doesn't, one day we will bury our wonderful way of life in a time capsule and some more thoughtful people will dig it up, examine it with awe, wonder why it was ever discarded and use it as a model to build a lasting future.

There are many things that are wrong in America, but against that there are so many more things that are right. As an American, I prefer to be steadfast to that which is good, acknowledge what is wrong, and let time and our native energy wear down the rough spots.

Let's stop concentrating on creating impressive ruins. There is so much to be thankful for in America—every day, every hour.

Congress Should Act To Strengthen the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on June 13, 1948:

SINEWS FOR THE UN

The Senate passage of the Vandenberg resolution by the resounding vote of 64 to 4 gives strong underpinning to the United States bipartisan foreign policy. To be sure, the resolution is only an expression of general policy which the Senate would like to see adopted. It makes no commitments. Yet its indorsement of collective defense agreements under article 51 of the United Nations Charter and the suggestion that the United States aline itself with such groups of friendly powers whenever our security would be strengthened by such action are evidence of a powerful determination on the part of the American people to seek the maintenance of peace through cooperation with like-minded nations. Here is the third pillar of a strong democratic foreign policy—the other two pillars being the European recovery program and rearmament.

The chief question now is whether the House will follow the Senate's lead. A good start has been made in the Foreign Affairs Committee's approval of the Eaton bill to strengthen the United Nations and our participation in it. While this bill covers much the same ground as the Vandenberg resolution so far as the declaration of policy is concerned, it goes much further than the Senate's action. In addition to urging partial elimination of the veto in the Security Council and regional arrangements to implement United Nations policy while the Security Council is in stalemate, it would eliminate several obstacles to successful operation of the UN. It would enact so far as the United States is concerned the privileges and immunities convention giving the UN and its personnel diplomatic freedom. It would authorize the loan agreement between this country and the UN for construction of the world organization's headquarters in New York. Other sections of the bill would increase the remuneration of the United States representatives in the UN to place them on a par with the delegates from other countries. In short, this bill brings together the numerous steps that are essential to strengthen the UN as a going concern.

We have no doubt that the bill reflects a strong trend of American public opinion. In the language of the committee report, the bill "presents five specific avenues toward realization of the purposes of the Charter. It does not undertake to recast those purposes." Linked with ERP and rearmament, it represents the strongest buttressing that can be given to peace at this time. There are some indications that the House leadership is lukewarm toward the measure and that it may be lost in the adjournment rush. In our opinion, that would be a grave mistake which would cost the House dearly in terms of standing with the voters. For every citizen is interested in the attainment of a democratic peace, and the other two pillars of United States policy will necessarily be weakened if Congress does not do its part in making the UN function more effectively.

Power Needs of Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, for many years, the tremendous possibilities of development in Alaska have been recognized; but problems such as transportation, establishment of year-round industries, interesting new capital, and providing competition with outdated established interests have combined to erect barriers to the expansion of population which the Territory should have. The foundation for realizing the full potentials of Alaska is to be found in providing a free and competitive atmosphere for private enterprise—large or small.

Alaska's present three basic industries, built upon its natural resources, are commercial fishing, mining, and the taking of furs. It has at least one other important resource which can be developed that may rival and surpass the importance of the first three—its timber resource. Today, Alaska stands on the threshold of one of its most important developments—the establishment within 2 or 3 years of possibly several pulp and paper plants assured perpetuity of supply through sustained yield. The requirements of these pulp and paper plants for pure fresh water and large quantities of electrical power have drawn considerable attention to the hydroelectric potentials of southeastern Alaska. If these timber resources of Alaska are to be utilized, power is one of the first requisites for the construction of a mill. Certainly, it is only a question of time until the timber, at least that most favorably situated, will be utilized. If power is made available, the time necessary to place a pulp plant in operation will be confined to the erection of the plant free of the many problems involved in the provision of a power supply.

If power is to be developed economically and made available to the public and to industry at large, rather than to just one industry, the only practical way is through public developments. It would be undesirable to have the most economical hydro projects developed by

industry with the initial objective of getting the most out of the projects for just a single purpose. Private industry has to date shown a marked reluctance to embark on a new enterprise requiring provision of both pulp and power plants. If the Government will build the power facilities, there will be a distinct incentive to private interests to establish a pulp industry based on low-cost power. Besides that, Federal responsibility will encourage the development of these hydro resources consistent with the needs of the area rather than directed toward a single industry, however important that may be.

If hydro projects are developed by the Government, they can be constructed so as to best fit into both the present and the future and in advance of an assured market. When more than one project is feasible in a basin, the development of key projects in that basin by the Government will result in benefits from the development of the remaining projects accruing to the public.

Most of the potential hydroelectric projects would have capacities of less than 25,000 kilowatts, based on heads in excess of 500 feet, while a few projects will permit developments in excess of 25,000 kilowatts.

Inasmuch as high heads can be secured within a short distance, the projects will require the minimum of labor, materials, and equipment. The reservoirs, in most cases, are natural reservoirs of glacial origin, requiring the minimum of dam construction. Most of these projects are not multipurpose projects but their correlation with navigation, fish life, and recreation will involve no greatly complicated problems.

These Alaskan projects are ideal for developing electric energy at low cost. For this reason their full use and feasibility are assured in locations where power is or will be needed. Construction, when funds are appropriated, will cover only such projects as are financially feasible and can be used for general service.

Power is needed not only for the development of resources but also for the reduction in bulk of mined ores, thus reducing demands on scarce and expensive shipping space.

The Development Board of Alaska, a Territorial agency, has designated certain areas where, in its opinion, the greatest benefits resulting from a power supply could be realized in the least time. The areas and the need for power are as follows:

Haines-Skagway: Highway gateway to Alaska; timber products, fisheries, mining, and small industries.

Juneau, Petersburg, Wrangell, Ketchikan, Sitka: Timber products, fisheries, mining, and small industries.

Anchorage: Seward, Whittier, sea gateway to Kenai Peninsula and railroad to Fairbanks; fisheries, agriculture, lumber, mining, and small industries.

Fairbanks: Mining.

The proposed legislation would authorize the construction and operation of hydroelectric plants in these areas and permit the carrying out of the recommendations for the development of the power resources at potential pulp sites embodied in the Senate Report No. 852, Eightieth Congress, second session, entitled "Survey of Alaskan Newsprint Resources."

Considerable exploratory and estimating work has been done during the past half century on worth-while hydro projects in Alaska. However, this work has resulted in only a pitifully few small developments.

The slow development of hydro power in Alaska is shown by the figures. Prior to 1900, 4,500 kilowatts were in operation. Today only 34,735 kilowatts of hydro capacity have been installed in all Alaska. More than 25,000 kilowatts of that amount are found in industrial installations. Utility installations for hydro, steam, and internal-combustion power amount to only 14,255 kilowatts.

Low-cost power is essential to meet the public needs and to enable industries to get power in order to develop resources and manufacture produce needed in Alaska. Without ample low-cost power, and with a regulation that prevents shipping of timber out of Alaska without processing, where it is feasible to do so, industrial development is under a handicap that will continue to slow down the development of Alaska. If power is made available, then most of the resources can be refined before shipment and gainful employment provided for the present and future residents of Alaska, thus realizing more benefits from its resources.

In those portions of Alaska where proposed improvements are contemplated, there are six publicly operated and five privately operated sources of electric power. In the construction of power facilities in each of these areas, provision was made to take care of only the immediate power needs, and now there is not sufficient power to safeguard service in seven out of the eight areas. Shutdowns may occur at any time.

Anchorage, for instance, is the largest city in Alaska. It has grown from a population of 3,000 in 1938 to approximately 15,000 at the present time. The principal base of the Department of National Defense is located there; the best-known agricultural area in Alaska is in this area; and the headquarters of the railroad serving the Fairbanks area is located at Anchorage. It is the sea and rail shipping center for the Kenai Peninsula and the Fairbanks area, and its growth will continue unless it encounters too much frustration in the process of development. Thus far, the city has been unable to secure sufficient funds to provide facilities for a rapidly growing city of this size. Even school additions have had to be provided through Quonset huts for use as classrooms.

During the past 4 years, Anchorage has appealed, and is now appealing, to the Department of the Interior for relief for its municipally operated electric system. Its present power service has been made possible through the use of an engine section of a disabled merchant vessel. This section was salvaged and tied up in the Anchorage Harbor, and is now connected to the city's electric system.

Anchorage now owns a hydro project below Lake Eklutna containing 2,500 kilowatts of hydroelectric equipment, but it cannot be depended upon to give continuous service. This project is capable of being developed to a firm capacity of 15,000 kilowatts. However, the city is unable to proceed with this development. Anchorage should have power in sufficient quantities to aid industry and permit the production of building materials and other products for use in Alaska.

The development of Alaska requires the development of a power program for Alaska. I am in consultation with the Department of the Interior, which is the logical department to sponsor such a program, and I hope that they will submit promptly a bill which can be introduced without delay.

"The Labourer Is Worthy of His Hire"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following open letter:

"THE LABOURER IS WORTHY OF HIS HIRE"
(LUKE X: 7)

AN OPEN LETTER TO CONGRESS AND THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Two hundred forty-three Members of both Houses of Congress appeared at hearings during this session to express their approval of legislation providing wage increases for the people who operate the Federal Government and its postal service.

An overwhelming majority of the Members of both House and Senate favor immediate legislation granting these long overdue wage adjustments. We base this statement of fact on personal contacts and knowledge of written commitments by Members of Congress to the American people.

The leaders in Congress have the moral responsibility of allowing the majority of the Congress and the American people to have an opportunity to express their will on this subject. We are certain that the American people want legislation to grant a reasonable salary increase to the underpaid postal and Federal employees to be at the top of any "must" list of work to be completed by the Eightieth Congress.

We ask our friends in Congress to impress upon the leadership the fact that they have pledged themselves to enactment of an adequate salary increase for the people who serve our Government.

We ask the American people again to inform their Senators and Representatives that they want the Government to provide a decent standard of living for all postal and other Federal employees.

We urge the Congress to grant an adequate salary increase prior to any recess or adjournment.

This is the hour of decision.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES' COUNCIL,
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR.

Member unions: National Federation of Post Office Clerks; Railway Mail Association; American Federation Government Employees; Building Service Employees' International

Union; International Brotherhood of Bookbinders; International Association of Bridge, Structural and Ornamental Iron Workers; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; International Association of Fire Fighters; Office Employes' International Union; International Union of Operating Engineers; International Plate Printers, Die Stampers and Engravers' Union of North America; The Commercial Telegraphers' Union; National Association of Letter Carriers; National Association Postal Supervisors; National Association Special Delivery Messengers; International Federation Technical Engineers, Architects and Draftsmen's Union; United Association of Journeymen Plumbers and Steam Fitters of the United States and Canada; National Association of Post Office and Railway Mail Handlers; International Typographical Union; International Printing Pressmen and Assistants Union of North America; International Photo-Engravers Union of North America.

Brooklyn Has a Remedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article that appeared in this week's issue of Collier's magazine.

BROOKLYN HAS A REMEDY

The Brooklyn, N. Y., chapter of the American Red Cross came up the other day with a document which we wish could be pondered in the United States State Department, the British Foreign Office, and the Kremlin.

As most of the civilized world is aware, the Brooklyn baseball fan is a unique character. Backing his beloved Dodger National League team ("dem dear bums"), he can and often does rise to pitches of incredible fury, excitement, hysteria. Mayhem often results. Homicide hasn't occurred yet, but you never know.

Taking note of all this, the Brooklyn Red Cross chapter has got out a dead-pan instruction sheet entitled "Care and Protection of Dodger Fans * * * a First-Aid Manual for the 1948 Baseball Season." We quote some of the more poignant passages of this treatise:

"One thing Dodger fans should remember at all times is this rule: Relax. Take it easy. Don't get excited. Sit down.

"Concussion: Dodger fans have been seen pounding each other on the head during an exciting moment. If brain concussion results, lay victim down with head level or slightly lowered. Keep him warm and call a doctor. Don't give him any stimulants. Not even soda pop.

"Battery: Dodger fans have been known to engage in fisticuffs with Giant fans. When bloody nose results, have loser sit up with head thrown back. Loosen clothing around neck (he may have been grabbed by the cravat). Apply cold wet compresses to nose, and press bleeding nostril for 4 to 5 minutes. Black eyes are treated with ice or cold cloth applications. Steak is unnecessary [also too damn expensive—Ed.]"

We repeat that we'd much like to see copies of these "Relax. Take it easy," exhortations circulated among the top echelons of our State Department, the British Foreign Office, and the Kremlin. A world of good might just conceivably come of it.

Long-Range Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, time is running out on the Eightieth Congress. But there is still time for full consideration of the biggest domestic issue before our Nation, and that is the establishment of the long-range housing program.

All that is necessary for the consideration of H. R. 6888, the Wolcott bill, is for the Rules Committee to grant a rule, and I hope the Republican leadership sees fit to do all in its power to clear this vital and necessary legislation for consideration this week.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an editorial from the New York Times of Sunday, June 13, 1948, entitled "No Time for Housing"; an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune, Sunday, June 13, entitled "The Major Home-Front Issue"; and an article which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on June 2, 1948, entitled "Stassen Declares Self in Favor of Federally Subsidized Housing for Those in Low-Income Group," as follows:

[From the New York Times of June 13, 1948]

NO TIME FOR HOUSING?

The hour is late in Congress. Important matters crowd the calendar. Some bills will obviously fall by the wayside. Yet we cannot believe that Members of Congress will be willing to return to their constituents and say that there was not time to pass a housing bill.

Something of the political urgency in this issue must have been at work in the minds of members of the House Banking Committee, we believe, when, to the considerable surprise of some House Members, there was a sudden switch of sentiment that overrode the wishes of the chairman, Representative WOLCOTT, Republican, of Michigan, and reinstated public-housing provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. The victory was by a hairline decision, 14 to 13. There is still no certainty of a vote in the House this week. But, at any rate, it is encouraging that conscience, or perhaps merely political awareness, has come awake.

There seems little doubt that the lobbying, or the testimony in open hearings, of some real-estate and business interests has succeeded in turning many House Members against public slum-clearing and low-rent housing. Representative WOLCOTT has called such housing socialistic. We find ourselves unmoved by the anxieties that this warning is intended to produce. We are convinced the surest safeguard for our traditional way of life lies in seeing to it that the American family has a decent place to live.

It is beyond our means to provide at once low-rent, subsidized housing for all who need it. But we can, at least, through the public-housing provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and other features that promise substantial encouragement to private building demonstrate our good faith. Without that demonstration of good faith Congress' prolonged investigation of the house shortage and any Republican platform plank on housing will become a hollow mockery. For the Republicans to fail to pass an adequate housing bill now, after all the talking done about housing, is to hand to the opposition in the coming campaign one of its most damaging political weapons. We are hopeful, of course, that they will be moved to action by more lofty purposes.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of June 13, 1948]

THE MAJOR HOME-FRONT ISSUE

A chronic housing shortage made acute by wartime postponement of building has been and is the No. 1 domestic problem of this country. The measure to establish and implement a long-range national housing policy has been debated, rewritten, and steadily improved over a 4-year period. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, as its name indicates, now represents full bipartisan agreement on an issue whose direct and basic interest to millions of American families transcends partisan division. Its major provisions are designed to encourage private enterprise to build housing in the next 10 years; it also provides governmental assistance for slum clearance and essential low-cost housing. The stimulus to the steady building of homes which this measure offers is needed in every section of the country. Most of all it is needed in the great expanding urban centers, where large constituencies in this election year rightfully demand their Representatives' attention to an issue which has so great an impact on their daily lives.

The Senate passed the T-E-W bill 6 weeks ago. Now favorable action by the House Banking Committee has made possible its consideration in the lower House before adjournment. For the Wolcott bill, approved by the committee, was first amended to include the main provisions of the bill as it passed the Senate. Concerned though the Congress has been with legislation required for the Nation's security in this era of uncertain peace, the challenge to take this action in behalf of millions of American citizens is one that the Representatives can and should meet. We urge, therefore, that the Rules Committee lose no time in releasing the housing bill for action on the floor. That action need not take long; there can hardly be a Member so preoccupied that he does not already know where he stands on housing. Passage of the T-E-W bill would add a major constructive item, this one, happily, on the home front, to the session's record of achievement.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 2, 1948]

STASSEN DECLARES SELF IN FAVOR OF FEDERALLY SUBSIDIZED HOUSING FOR THOSE IN LOW-INCOME GROUP—ASSERTS THAT, IF HE HAD BEEN IN THE SENATE, HE WOULD HAVE VOTED FOR THE TAFT-ELLENDER-WAGNER BILL IN THE FORM IT WAS PASSED BY THAT CHAMBER

(By Richard G. Baumhoff)

Harold E. Stassen, candidate for the Republican nomination for President, in an interview with the Post-Dispatch has declared himself unequivocally in favor of federally subsidized, tax-exempt, locally operated housing for persons in the low-income group who cannot afford the rents which unaided private enterprise must charge for dwelling.

This is the type of public housing proposed under one phase of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. It is the kind which informed quarters generally regard as essential to solution of the problem of shelter in St. Louis and many other large cities.

Although Stassen had expressed himself briefly heretofore as favoring this kind of public housing, it was pointed out to him in the interview that his written and spoken

words in the past had raised a doubt in some persons' minds about where he really stood on the question.

He paused to reexamine the housing chapter in his book published last November, Where I Stand. Then he volunteered that he had not made himself clear there, but had, in effect overemphasized Government-aided private-enterprise housing and ignored public housing of the type defined above.

He declared categorically that, had he been in the Senate, he would have voted for the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill in the form it finally passed the Senate recently—with provision for 500,000 family dwelling units in the public-housing class. He added that he would have voted against the Cain amendment for elimination of this public-housing provision.

The interview took place in a tiny hotel suite at Springfield, Mo., shortly before midnight last Saturday. It came after Stassen had spent a busy afternoon and evening in his hunt for Missouri Republican delegates, a speech before about 2,500 persons, and an ensuing period of answering frank questions from the auditorium. Stassen was still alert and fresh-looking, his neat blue coat still buttoned. He devoted nearly an hour to the housing interview while the anteroom resembled a familiar scene from the play, The State of the Union, as his staff shuffled the right people into the right rooms.

In Where I Stand, and his opening Wisconsin campaign speech at Milwaukee last November 24, Stassen was outspoken against "the Government as a landlord." The book said also that "rent for the indigent should be handled just like any other facility needed by the indigent," and "should not be intermixed with the necessity of building more houses in America."

PLAN ON SALES

He wrote also that the large-scale Government-built housing of the type he advocated and mentioned in his Milwaukee speech, should be sold at once to the highest bidders, half to individual owners or cooperative groups, and half to insurance companies and other large investors.

It was pointed out to him that these assertions seemed inconsistent with support of public housing. After he had looked over his housing chapter, which sets out his proposal in detail, he said this criticism was justified, and that he felt on rereading the passages that he had overemphasized his ideas, to the neglect of public housing.

He explained that his objection to the Government as landlord definitely did not apply to the now well-established form of public-housing management under locally created agencies such as the St. Louis Housing Authority, which operates Clinton-Peabody Terrace and Carr Square Village. He approves of agencies such as these and the establishments they operate, he said. It was the old type of Federal housing set up as an unemployment relief measure by the Public Works Administration in the early days of the New Deal by Harold Ickes as Secretary of the Interior to which he objected, he explained.

EXPLAINS RENT FOR INDIGENT

With reference to what he had written about "rent for the indigent," Stassen said: "I can see how, standing alone, this passage might be confusing. This doesn't tie up with the question of public housing at all. I was referring in this connection only to those persons who have no income, but are on welfare aid and cannot pay rent for themselves. I was not referring to those with small incomes of their own."

As to the objections he had written to having the Government as landlord, he conceded that the language he had used in the book was "too restrictive."

"I did not make myself clear enough," he continued. "I did not say I was opposed to housing for the lower income group, but I can see now that that inference is there. I overemphasized my desire to improve building technique. What my position actually is—is that there is an existing housing shortage for low-income families, and there is a need and a desirability for taking care of it, working through local public-housing authorities, like the St. Louis Housing Authority.

"But that alone I do not consider to be a sufficient answer to the problem. We need to get a higher total of units built, which in turn will improve housing conditions of all income groups. We now have a housing problem for almost all income groups, and I want to see action on all parts of this need."

Stassen made it clear that he favors a dual program for coping with the housing problem—public housing, federally subsidized, for low-income tenants, and Government help for what he called the "general market." Under the kind of program he outlined in his book only the latter, not the former, was contemplated. The program suggested in the book called for expenditure of $1,000,000,000 a year by the Federal Government for big-scale, Nation-wide construction of homes.

Sale of such homes would be to the highest bidders, with the expectation that the Government would absorb some loss in the course of acquiring sites and erecting the dwellings, under Stassen's plan. There would be no tax exemption. This plan manifestly would not meet the requirements for public housing for the low-income group.

Local housing authorities, such as that in St. Louis, which build and operate public housing, are created by State law or local ordinance. In the case of St. Louis, a Missouri enabling statute was enacted in 1939 and the authority was established by the board of aldermen. This and similar agencies operate through contracts with the Federal Public Housing Authority, which supervises them. They charge rents within the means of their tenants, but since their operating and capital costs exceed this income, they draw subsidies from the Federal Treasury. They are exempt from taxation but pay substantial service fees to the city in lieu of taxes.

OPPOSES "ICKES TYPE"

"The idea of the St. Louis Housing Authority and the other local authorities is fine," Stassen declared. "Where we are dealing with public housing, it should be by such local authorities, not by the old Ickes type of management. I don't consider I have altered my position as to public housing, because I have always favored it. I supported such local authorities in Minnesota when I was Governor."

Stassen said he was willing to support construction of public housing to the extent the need for decent shelter for the low-income group existed, remarking, "Obviously, my thinking isn't limited to the 500,000 units of the T-E-W bill." He said there should be a "fairly substantial volume of public housing erected annually, but that he would be inclined to suggest as a limit this volume should not exceed, say, 20 percent of all housing construction at any given time. Pausing for some quick mental calculation, he said there still would be opportunity for the Government to back "several million" dwelling units in public housing.

Asked how he reconciled his housing stand with the fact that his Wisconsin campaign manager, Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY (Republican), has opposed the public-housing phase of the T-E-W bill, Stassen said: "I never try to control the position of men I work with. Senator WAYNE MORSE (Republican), for instance, takes stands on some things more liberal than mine, while Senator MCCARTHY takes more conservative stands, and I consider them both my friends."

In one important particular, Stassen expressed opposition to the present method of operation of public housing under local authorities. This is the practice of sliding scales of rent, with the monthly charge to tenants varying in accordance with the family income and with the size of the family. Checks are made from time to time to determine increases or decreases of income for purpose of adjusting the rent.

"I consider this differentiation undesirable," said Stassen. "You ought to set a proper scale of low rent and have standards of eligibility under an initial check of income (as is the case now), and then stick to the rent set. Then you would not run the risk of political favoritism in fixing the rent. I don't like to see an administrative agent set a varying scale of prices for what amounts to the same commodity."

He conceded that there was no risk of favoritism if the directors and executives of a housing authority were of high type, and he said he had no positive knowledge of any public-housing project where there had been such favoritism.

"Suppose a man works hard and gets a raise in pay," Stassen commented. "He runs the risk then of having the raise taken away from him through higher rent. Or he may get a raise in pay and try to hide the fact; that creates a bad psychology. We ought to have a standard of rent and hold to it."

Stassen repeated his published stand in favor of energetic governmental encouragement of new technique in house building, and reforms in building codes and labor practices.

Human Rights—Key to World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose clippings from the Naugatuck (Conn.) Daily News of June 10 and June 11, quoting texts of essays receiving second and third prizes in local competition in a contest sponsored by the Connecticut VFW Auxiliary on the subject, Human Rights—Key to World Peace.

Miss Cecille Tracy and Mr. Donald House are to be congratulated for their fine insight into the practicalities necessary to make democracy function.

CECILLE TRACY WINS SECOND PRIZE IN VFW ESSAY CONTEST—RECEIVES HONORS IN LOCAL COMPETITION

(By Cecille Tracy)

At the outset we should make a distinction between human rights and civil rights. Human rights, which allow us to live, to be free, and to possess property, are granted to us by our Creator. While civil rights, which guarantee a preservation of our human rights, are those agreed upon by man.

In human rights, which were born with the creation of the universe and preserved by the birth of our Saviour, we most certainly have the master key to world peace and happiness. I agree with James Otis, a great American of

the Revolutionary period, when he says: "Old Magna Carta was not the beginning of all things." And also with his fellow patriot, Alexander Hamilton, who at the same time said: "The sacred rights of mankind are not to be rummaged for among old parchments or musty records. They are written as with a sunbeam in the whole volume of human destiny by the hand of divinity itself, and can never be erased or obscured by mortal power."

The problem, it appears to me, is to use properly this master key and to further cement these human rights by providing civil laws which people will recognize, have respect for, and enforce. Perhaps the first use of this "key" and the first "locks" it would open are those attached to men's minds and hearts.

Should the peoples of the world not only occasionally utter and listen to "Peace on earth, good will toward men," but actually put into practice this doctrine and all that it implies, there could be no doubt but that peace throughout the universe would automatically and quickly become a reality.

Since the "master key" (human rights) has been used once, it is my firm belief that this key can be used in several places with equal success. The occasion I refer to is during the American struggle for independence.

Our Declaration of Independence is given immortality and forms a landmark in human history because it originated a political ideal, then so novel, now so familiar, "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." American patriotism is forever associated with this document, but patriotism alone does not make it great.

Neither does the vigor of its language. The secret of its greatness lies in the aforementioned concept. This ideal returns us to the individual and his natural right to enact civil rules which preserve the freedoms he inherits.

Our first governmental scheme as an independent nation was the Articles of Confederation, a sincere attempt to practice self-government. However, since every right implies an obligation, and since these articles provided no means of enforcement or interpretation, they were not successful.

In 1787 a convention was called to correct the defects in these articles. Rather than just making these corrections, an entire new document was prepared and after much debate, adopted in 1788. Fortunately this document provided means of amendment and addition, because even before its adoption, the need for amendments was recognized, and 21 times since being adopted the amending processes have been used. The original Constitution contained no Bill of Rights, but in 1791 the first 10 amendments were added guaranteeing human rights by governmental regulations. This country has been among the more peaceful nations of the world during its life under our Constitution. We have had several periods of unrest, because our system, although the best ever devised by man, is not a perfect one.

Civil laws are temporary to provide for existing conditions which are ever changing. Moral laws are permanent for all conditions and for all times. So many civil laws have been enacted, that it would take more than a lifetime to read them, but there are so few human laws that require so little time for anyone to learn.

All attempts at governmental systems have given no permanent solution to local, State, national, or universal unrest because the gateway to world peace is through men's hearts and minds. Halos still fit angels much better than men. Even where we have majority rule we often have a dissatisfied minority. So the result is controversy and confusion. If all men would abide by moral laws there could be no dissatisfaction.

For example, national unrest in our country is prevalent in many sections. Unsatisfactory labor relations in manufacturing centers, race or color discrimination in the South, threats of communism throughout the country could all be satisfactorily settled if all men would respect the human rights of others.

World unrest in Russia, China, Palestine, and central Europe prevails because men have not learned or at least are not practicing "Peace on earth, good will toward men." Conditions throughout the world are terrifying because men are not abiding by the Golden Rule—"Do unto others as you would have others do unto you."

It is my belief that one of the first steps that we might make to secure peace, would be to adopt the Marshall plan, which will allow us who have to assist peoples who have not. This plan appears to be a step toward the world's actual practicing of the Golden Rule, by providing the necessities of life, the pleasure of living, and regard for property rights.

The key to world peace is not just enactment of civil regulations. Certainly the solution is not atomic power, but it does appear that the solution lies within each person respecting the human rights of every other person.

We should dehypnotize ourselves and realize that the answer is not only the greatest good for the greatest number but the greatest good for all. Hence it becomes the obligation of each one of us to know the natural or human laws, to allow others to be aware of these laws, to practice the Golden Rule as originally expressed and interpreted, and finally and happily, to achieve the goal intended by Heaven—world peace.

DONALD HOUSE ESSAY WINS THIRD PRIZE IN VFW CONTEST—ANNUAL AUXILIARY PROJECT TAKES HUMAN RIGHTS AS SUBJECT

(By Donald House)

War.

Bloody, ruthless war. Wanton ravaging and plundering of human life and property. Barbaric tortures and merciless death. Unmindful of color, creed, race, religion, or age, it strikes at everyone with privation, heartaches and death.

Peace—antonym of war.

Brotherhood and fellowship. That way of living which is followed by decent, God-fearing human beings.

How, then, can war exist in its entirety, when even partial peace, on an earth inhabited by civilized and educated people, seems as far away as the moon itself? It sounds like an unsolvable problem that will simply continue to exist, despite all earthly efforts to undo it.

However, there is an answer to this problem somewhere. By a process of elimination we find: (1) It is a greatly enlarged form of spontaneous combustion. Ridiculous—things don't "just happen" without some external ignition; (2) it is the will of God. Ridiculous again—we cannot blame our faults on our Creator. There remains only one solution: We ourselves are the cause. "We" does not mean every living soul, rather those few of us who do not believe Lincoln's statement that all men are created equal.

In that sentence lies the foundation of the civilization which Wendell Willkie called "one world." When all people come to the realization that all of God's creatures have been endowed with the same rights and privileges, we shall have indeed reached that ideal way of life in which everyone will be treated as a blood brother instead of a blood enemy.

Winning the war just past, as opposed to winning the peace that should follow, was a comparatively simply task. Surely no one of us is under the impression that being shot at, maimed, wounded, crippled, or killed is the easiest thing on earth to do. However, there are too many people who do believe that after the shooting has stopped peace will follow immediately, despite the fact that there are many who still continue their struggle for supremacy. It is here that we enter upon the question of human rights.

These power-crazed maniacs, Kaisers, Hitlers, and more especially their followers, the "little people" who do their bidding, either do not realize or do not want to realize that no matter how important or how insignificant a person may be, he is born the possessor of the same human rights as his next-door neighbor and his neighbor half way around the world.

What are these human rights about which we have been talking? They may be expressed any number of ways. One might explain them as the right to choose—to choose a life of work—business, trade or profession; the right to choose whether we will listen to the doctrines of a priest, minister, or rabbi in church on a Sunday morning; the right to choose these things which we like and enjoy.

Human rights might also be expressed as the right to live in the way that pleases us, to rear our children as we see fit, and to do the things to which we are accustomed, as long as our actions do not interfere with the rights and privileges of others. It must be remembered that our human rights end where someone else's begin.

It is granted that these rights are ours. But what about the question of exercising them? The preservation of world peace is undeniably dependent upon the preservation to our natural human rights. He who allows his own rights to be overshadowed and stamped upon is well on the road to becoming the underdog, dominated and dictated to by people, not his superiors, but actually his equals, simply because of negligence and perhaps stupidity. If this condition continues to grow like the disease it is, disputes, and eventually war, are bound to follow. A happy medium must therefore be attained and maintained as far as is humanly possible. Too little is as dangerous as too much.

Complete disregard for the human rights of others is as evident, even in America, as the skies above. Such things as race riots, religious intolerance, jimcrow practices, anti-Jewish, anti-Protestant, and anti-Catholic movements are glaring examples. America itself is bogged down with parents who forbid their children to associate with certain others because "he's Italian" or "she's Polish." Expressions such as "The Niggers are taking over the town" and "Watch out for the Jews, they're after your money" are, unfortunately, too prevalent in every city, town, and hamlet in the United States today. These conditions exist in a democracy, a nation governed of, by, and for the people. A very sensible question would be "of, by, and for how many of the people?" And as long as they continue to exist all hopes for a lasting world peace are defeated at the outset.

Time is the only solution to the problem. Time to educate people and to impress upon them the fact that the superior race of Germany was a madman's dream, that racial and religious inferiority are merely tools of the trade of those who are trying to undermine a civilization that has been growing since the days of Christ. We have progressed so very far in 2,000 years that it would be pure unadulterated insanity to let these millions of cultural, scientific, and religious achievements be torn out by the very roots, simply because there are those who have not been taught that human rights belong without

exception to all men, regardless of nationality, regardless of religious faith, regardless of anything else, good or bad, that might have been bestowed upon them at birth.

World peace still seems to be a thing of the very dim future, but if the people want it it can be obtained. It will not come with a snap of the fingers, or mere wishful thinking and a lot of idle talk. Time, patience, and hard work on the part of all the people are the three greatest factors. It is worth it, isn't it?

Merited Praise for Hon. Robert F. Crosser, of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, one does not need to know our colleague from Ohio, Mr. CROSSER, very long to recognize him for the scholar and statesman that he is. But he is even more than these things. He is a lover of mankind. His constant interest in the improvement of the lot of his fellow man is conspicuous in his long years of legislative labors.

His friends of the House—and they are ever so many—were delighted by the reception accorded him by the membership on the occasion when the bill raising railroad pensions and annuities was recently considered. These friends, and countless numbers outside the membership, were delighted to read in the June 12 issue of the national weekly newspaper, Labor, the account of the recognition granted him by the House in connection with his persistent work in behalf of railroad pensions and annuities, and the editorial tribute paid him in the same issue.

I include herewith as part of my remarks both the editorial and the reportorial feature referred to:

"BOB" CROSSER—LABOR SALUTES CLEVELAND'S GREAT PROGRESSIVE IN NAME OF MORE THAN A MILLION RAIL WORKERS

The amended Crosser bills are pretty certain to be passed by both Houses before Congress adjourns. Like all compromises, they are not entirely satisfactory to either side, but this much may be emphasized: They give retired railroad workers a flat 20-percent increase; and they assure the solvency of both the retirement and the unemployment insurance funds.

Labor is convinced that if a vote could have been secured in both Houses on the Crosser bills, they would have passed by a substantial majority. It was impossible to get a vote before adjournment, despite the herculean efforts made by the devoted representatives of the rail unions; because the foes of the Crosser proposals were in temporary control of the parliamentary machinery.

Therefore, the rail union chiefs did the wise thing. They accepted a compromise which means much to the tens of thousands of retired railroad men, who are carrying on a discouraging contest with the mounting cost of living.

Railroad workers will not forget the scores of true-blue friends in House and Senate who stood by them in this long and difficult struggle.

They will not forget the many rail workers—local chairmen, general chairmen, legislative representatives—who came to Washington and with persuasive courtesy presented to the lawmakers the facts concerning the Crosser bills and thus helped scotch the false claims put forward by the rail lobbyists and their "stooges," who, with dirty money in their pockets, masqueraded as spokesmen for railroad workers.

Above all, rail workers will not forget "BOB" CROSSER. It is difficult to find words to express an adequate tribute to this statesman, philosopher, and humanitarian. Perhaps the best way to put it is to point out that for more than 30 years in the National House of Representatives he has battled eloquently and unflinchingly for every cause designed to advance the general welfare, and yet, today commands the love and esteem of his colleagues, without regard to their party affiliations or their economic and political beliefs.

Whether in victory or defeat, no Member of the House has ever questioned his ability, his devotion, or the granite-like quality of his integrity.

In the name of more than a million railroad workers, Labor salutes "BOB" CROSSER and prays God to spare him for many, many years, so he may continue to serve his country and defend the highest concepts of American democracy and human rights.

After a heart-warming ovation to Congressman "BOB" CROSSER, the House on Tuesday on a roll-call vote, passed a bill raising railroad pensions and annuities, by 381 to 0. It was an extraordinary, and almost unprecedented, event in Congress.

A Senate Labor subcommittee reported an identical bill to the full Labor Committe, which met on Wednesday and passed the measure along to the Senate with a strong recommendation it be enacted promptly.

Incidentally, 12 of the 13 members of the Senate Labor Committee joined in sponsoring the bill when it was introduced. That also is an extraordinary performance.

PRODUCT OF AGREEMENT

Prompt and favorable action in the Senate seems assured.

The House bill was brought onto the floor by Congressman CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, Republican, New Jersey, chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which had unanimously approved.

The bill, WOLVERTON pointed out, is the product of an agreement between railroad labor and railroad management.

It provides for a 20-percent increase in pensions and annuities, for those who are retired, and those who will retire in the future.

NO NEED TO APPLY

The increase is effective in the month following enactment of this law, without necessity for any application by the persons affected.

The 20 percent is the best increase which can be made safely. In the words of the railway labor executives:

"We are concerned with maintaining the soundness of the railroad retirement fund, and we have gone as far in increasing benefits as it is prudent to go."

WOLVERTON also explained that the bill restores on an optional basis the lump-sum death benefits in effect before 1946. This guarantees that every employee who has contributed to the retirement system, or his survivors, will receive the amount he paid in taxes, plus interest.

MAINTAINS AMPLE BALANCE

To the railroads, who alone pay the tax for unemployment, the bill gives a reduction in the tax rate so long as an ample balance is maintained in the unemployment fund.

The rate of tax ranges from one-half of 1 percent when the balance is $450,000,000 or more, to 3 percent if the balance is less than $250,000,000.

Then all the Congressmen present, on both sides of the aisle, burst into applause as CROSSER, veteran Ohio Democrat, was recognized by the Speaker.

They all knew that "BOB" led the long battles which won the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Insurance Acts more than a decade ago, improved them in 1946, and now were bringing further gains for the railroad workers.

GIVES CREDIT TO ALL

Modestly refraining from referring to all this, and generously forgiving the opposition he had met, CROSSER gave full credit to the railroad unions and their many friends in Congress, to the railroads for their agreement to the pension boosts, and to the House for the warm welcome it was giving the present bill.

After "BOB" finished other Members vied with each other in commending the measure and urging its passage. Then came the unanimous vote.

Only final action by the Senate remains, and then railroad pension and annuity increases will be a reality. Retired railroad workers will have more money to meet the increased cost of living.

A Toast to the Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I feel it most appropriate to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Flag Day the inspiring recitation on our revered national emblem composed by John Jay Daly.

This should inspire each of us to remember more vividly the ideals embodied in our flag which is a symbol of liberty, not only to us, but to all freedom-loving peoples of the world.

A TOAST TO THE FLAG

(By John Jay Daly)

Here's to the red of it—
There's not a thread of it,
No, nor a shred of it
In all the spread of it
From foot to head,
But heroes bled for it,
Faced steel and lead for it,
Precious blood shed for it,
Bathing it red!

Here's to the white of it—
Thrilled by the sight of it,
Who knows the right of it
But feels the might of it
Through day and night?
Womanhood's care for it
Made manhood dare for it;
Purity's pray'r for it
Keeps it so white!

Here's to the blue of it—
Beauteous view of it,
Heavenly hue of it,
Star-spangled dew of it
Constant and true;
Diadems gleam for it,
States stand supreme for it,
Liberty's beam for it
Brightens the blue!

Here's to the whole of it—
Stars, stripes, and pole of it,
Body and soul of it,
O, and the roll of it,
Sun shining through;
Hearts in accord for it
Swear by the sword for it,
Thanking the Lord for it,
Red, white, and blue!

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, the rural electrification program of the REA is doing more to raise the standard of living of the American farmer, his wife and family than any other program of the Federal Government. Because of the widespread interest and participation in this program, a summary of REA's development and history is set forth with special reference to Minnesota.

It was in 1935 that Congress first established the REA to bring electricity to the American farm family. An initial appropriation of $13,928,288 was provided and the agency was authorized to lend to locally organized farm groups to assist rural electrification projects. Except for the war years when materials were scarce the sums voted by Congress for this purpose have steadily increased.

PRESENT CONGRESS BEST REA SUPPORTER

The present Congress is the staunchest supporter of REA of any Congress in history as is attested by the fact that it has voted more money for REA than any previous Congress, in fact, more than the previous four Congresses. In 2 years the present Congress has voted $800,000,000 which is 42 percent of all funds voted in the 15 years of REA's history. Here are the figures since the beginning:

REA funds voted by Congress

Fiscal year:	
1935-36	$13,928,288
1937	46,500,000
1938	30,000,000
1939	140,000,000
1940	40,000,000
1941	100,000,000
1942	100,000,000
1943	10,000,000
1944	20,000,000
1945	25,000,000
1946	300,000,000
1947	250,000,000
1948	400,000,000
1949	400,000,000
Total	1,875,428,288

Out of the $1,875,000,000 total appropriations through 1949, the sum of $1,068,426,162 had been loaned as of June 30, 1947, to local power associations for distribution lines, generation, transmission and consumer facilities. These loans have provided service for $1,843,351 consumers. According to latest reports $94,747,414 of the principal has been repaid. All except a tiny portion of the loans are up to date. The REA repayment record is excellent.

LEADING REA STATES

Minnesota farmers have been alert to the advantages of the REA program. Here are comparative statistics for the leading States:

State	Money loaned by REA	Operating revenue	Miles of power lines	Number of consumers	Rural electric systems
Texas	$89,518,074	$7,219,496	56,694	154,640	74
Minnesota	63,317,301	7,258,681	38,524	91,516	50
Iowa	58,482,698	6,863,769	36,026	90,074	54

Of all the States in the Union only Texas leads Minnesota in the number of rural consumers. Only Texas has received more money from REA than Minnesota. Only Texas leads Minnesota in total miles of rural electric power lines. When you consider that Minnesota has a population of 2,792,300 and an area of 84,286 square miles and Texas has a population of 6,414,824 and an area of 265,896 square miles—more than twice as many people and over three times the area—the comparison is not unfavorable to Minnesota. In fact only 55.8 percent of Texas farms are electrified while 62.4 percent of Minnesota farms are electrified and Minnesota leads all States in the Nation—even Texas—in revenue from REA operations. REA has done pretty well by Minnesota.

REA IN THIRD MINNESOTA DISTRICT

In the Third Congressional District there are three REA-financed cooperatives operating power-distribution lines. They are (1) Anoka County Cooperative Light and Power Association, Anoka; (2) Wright-Hennepin Cooperative Electric Association, Maple Lake, and (3) P. I. C. K. Cooperative Electric Association, Braham. Interesting data on the these associations follows:

	Amount of REA loans to Feb. 1, 1947	Miles of lines (estimated)	Farmers served, Dec. 1, 1946
Anoka	$1,219,000	1,001	2,534
Wright-Hennepin	1,173,000	1,132	2,608
P. I. C. K.	2,636,000	1,787	2,333
Total	5,028,000	3,920	7,475

The foregoing data was recently furnished by the REA Administrator who also stated:

Each of these cooperatives has approved REA loans available to extend service to unserved rural consumers in the Third Congressional District. These lines will be built as rapidly as materials can be obtained.

NEW REA PROJECT

The most recent REA loan in the Third Congressional District was authorized on March 30, 1948, to the Anoka County Cooperative Light & Power Association of Anoka. The authorized loan was $2,340,000 to finance 410 miles of power lines to furnish electricity to 1,021 rural customers. With the loan it is proposed to erect power lines and build the first unit of a steam generating plant. Latest information from the Anoka County Cooperative reports 3,400 consumers.

Continuing the sound development of REA will do much to improve farm living.

Americans Demand Low Rent, Public Housing—Action!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the housing shortage—and the high cost of living—are the two outstanding issues on which the public looks to this Congress for the right answers.

On November 2, 1948, they will retire from the public service, those members of this House who have obstructed or evaded the job of finding solutions to these pressing problems.

And rightly so.

Hearings on housing have been going on for so long that they have every appearance of being filibuster in disguise. But the people are not deceived by parliamentary maneuvers. They want laws, in operation, which will stimulate building. They want to see more adequate housing for our farmers. They want to see the rat-hole slums of America torn down. For the millions of families who are doubled up because they cannot buy, build, or even rent decent accommodation, they insist on public housing.

This being election year it is possible that those who secretly oppose these remedies because they run counter to the wishes of privileged interests will permit some mumbo-jumbo of a bill with the word housing attached to it to pass.

They think that a word will substitute for reality. They hope, in this manner, to give profiteering service to the real-estate lobby—while they fool the public with lip service.

Such tactics seriously underestimate the gravity of the problem.

The people know that any alleged housing bill that is stripped of its public housing minority provisions will not put a roof over the heads of those who are most in need of adequate shelter.

The people are getting fed up with those who are forever shouting about the dangers on the international scene, as if to distract the public's attention away from dangers which also exist on the home front.

The deplorable housing situation is one of these dangers.

It is not enough to hope that the shortage will be taken care of, somehow. Blind faith that the old, established procedures will see us through this muddle will not bring these good works into being.

We have had too much bungling drift on this problem, when we should have had positive and realistic action.

Even though this is the last regularly scheduled week of the Eightieth Congress, it is not too late to make up for past delays and put through a bold and courageous program which will bring some measure of relief to the people. In doing so we shall prove that this representative body can cope with the problems of our times, and is not paralyzed by disunity and red tape.

This is June 1948. The Eighty-first Congress will not meet until January 1949.

This is too long a period for the people to be without representation. By that time, many will have suffered the additional distress of another winter without decent shelter.

Public housing, as a part of the general housing problem, is definitely our responsibility, and should be authorized this week. If certain elements block its passage, the next 6 months during which a start might have been made will be lost. If the door is closed on the public's demand that we meet this housing crisis those responsible for it will deservedly pay the piper.

The T-E-W housing bill passed by the Senate calls for the construction of 15,000,000 homes in 10 years, including 500,000 low-cost units financed by the Government.

More than 90 percent of the program will be in the hands of private builders, thanks to a shot-in-the-arm from the United States Treasury by way of the taxpayers.

And yet these private builders clamor against the less than 10 percent quota for public housing, weeping crocodile tears for the renters of such units because "they can never hope to own a home of their own."

This in the face of private industry's failure to provide them with adequate housing at rentals—not purchases—which they can afford to pay.

The truth is that public housing is intended to take care of elemental needs only. Renters of such units will rush to buy homes of their own if the construction industry ever wakes up, modernizes its procedures and offers homes at prices that are reasonably within reach of incomes.

Meanwhile we cannot stand by and allow those in the lower-income group to suffer because of the shortcomings of private builders.

Private housing being built today does not meet the problem. It provides accommodations only for those families in the upper income brackets. During the 4 years in which the United States Senate has held hearings on the housing situation, private enterprise has not offered any workable plan to provide minimum adequate housing for families of low income living in substandard facilities.

Some opponents of the Senate bill maintain that no Government aid is required for the proper housing of low-income families and that private enterprise can supply the entire housing needs of the country. The number of doubled-up families and the persistence of slums which menace the health, safety, and morale of millions is plain and ugly evidence that private enterprise is not doing the job. Any attempts to gloss over this situation will not stand up to scrutiny.

While we are genuinely concerned about the threat of communism, and are spending billions abroad to enable other countries to earn a standard of living which will make them prefer it to the false promises of communism, let us not overlook a weakness in our own nation.

THE CRITICAL HOUSING SITUATION

The character of family life, the conditions under which our children grow up and assume the obligations of citizenship, and the general attitude of the people toward their system of government are determined by the character of the home and the environment in which they live.

The Senate Committee on Banking and Currency took cognizance of this in its report where it stated:

The committee is convinced that we must take the measures which are necessary, not only to meet the housing needs of our expanding population but also to replace the backlog of bad housing within the foreseeable future. The committee is convinced that we cannot safely face the difficult years to come, with the burden of hardship and discontent which unsatisfactory housing imposes upon the people and that those conditions can no longer be accepted as unavoidable.

The final majority report of the Joint Committee on Housing, submitted on March 15, 1948, stated:

It is a matter of common knowledge that millions of American families are forced to live in slum dwellings which constitute a menace to health, safety, and decency, and which are particularly injurious to children brought up under such adverse conditions. The committee has heard an abundance of testimony in cities all over the Nation that the removal of families from the slums and their rehousing in decent dwellings at rents they can afford is one of the most pressing problems confronting the Nation.

The wide disparity between the rents which low-income families can pay and the prices at which private enterprise can supply decent housing, either new or second-hand, is so great that public aid must be made available if these families are to be decently housed.

The report concludes:

Only the low-rent public-housing formula, involving annual Federal subsidies and local tax exemption, would reduce rents sufficiently to meet the requirements of the average family in the lowest income third.

No one thought that a bill providing even for a small measure of public housing would ever escape from the House Banking Committee.

Several Republicans with a conscience joined the Democratic minority to reinstate the public housing provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill by a vote of 14 to 13.

We do not want meaningless planks on housing in the platforms of the Democratic and Republican Parties when they assemble in political convention within the next 30 days.

We want the opportunity to vote, as representatives of the people, for a bill with public-housing provisions, this week.

We want to get on with our job of serving the American public.

Mundt-Nixon Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article I wrote on the Mundt-Nixon bill, which appeared in the Brooklyn (N. Y.) Eagle on Sunday, June 13, 1948:

REPRESENTATIVE MULTER EXPLAINS OBJECTIONS TO MUNDT-NIXON BILL

(This is another in a series of articles written by Members of the Brooklyn delegation to Congress. Representatives are asked to discuss vital issues under debate in Washington. Each selects his own subject and treats it as he wishes.)

(By Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Fourteenth Congressional District)

Few people find fault with the purpose of the Mundt-Nixon bill. With few exceptions, the difference of opinion is not in objective, but in the method of attainment thereof.

The bill properly defines the aims of communism (not the economic theories of cooperative movements, but the Soviet political ideology of a tyrannical dictatorship) as an attempt to enslave the world and to subjugate all of its people by any and all means, fair or foul, as Communists deem expedient.

No freedom-loving person objects to the declaration of principles there set forth.

AT WHOM IS THE BILL AIMED?

William Foster, president of the Communist Party of the United States of America, says it has only 15,000 members. The FBI and the Un-American Activities Committee say there are 75,000 avowed members. The committee estimates the number of fellow travelers at 750,000. The maximum number of votes they ever corralled in a national election was 102,891 in 1936 for William Z. Foster. In 1940 their candidate, Earl Browder, received only 46,251. Let us assume they can muster 1,500,000 voters. (I purposely exaggerate the figure to about double the estimates of the bitterest opponents of communism.)

In this country of almost 150,000,000 people, this year will find 90,000,000 qualified voters, and we can be sure at least 60,000,000 to 70,000,000 of them will vote.

Therefore this bill is aimed at a very small percentage of our people. If there is any possibility of it affecting adversely our basic American rights, we must look for a better way of combating the poisonous mouthings of this small but militant group.

In addition to a large Federal military force, every State has a substantial militia able to protect us against internal disorders. Vigorous enforcement of our State and Federal statutes (we have 27 Federal statutes alone) will keep them in their place.

HOW TO DEFEAT COMMUNISM?

Spreading of Americanism by teaching and practice can more effectually defeat this foreign ideology.

Nevertheless, my antipathy to communism is so deep-seated that I favor and would support a constitutional amendment to outlaw it. But nothing short of such an amendment can do.

There is no doubt (despite the sponsors' protestation to the contrary) that this bill does outlaw communism.

The bill, however, in an effort to disguise that purpose and in order to evade the constitutional restrictions against it, declares persons and organizations guilty by legislative fiat and directs the Attorney General to so find. The penalties that flow from the Attorney General's findings are severe and onerous. The only review by any court is to determine whether the Attorney General proceeded in the manner provided. The Attorney General and not the court or a jury will determine the facts conclusively against any review.

HITS WALLACE BACKERS

Like it or not, some unions are openly supporting Wallace and his organization.

Under section 3, subdivision 3, the Wallace third party movement is a Communist political organization.

Under section 3, subdivision 4, a "Communist front organization" is one with respect to which some or all of the following considerations give rise to the reasonable conclusion "that its views and policies are in general adopted and advanced because such views and policies are those of a Communist political organization."

UNION MEMBERS IN PERIL

The innocent, decent American members of these misguided unions have no redress and no means of protection.

They are labeled members of Communist-front organizations and given no opportunity to clean house.

For instance, there is at least one union made up of Government employees, a large number of whom are supporting Wallace. Thirty days after the enactment of this bill every member will lose his job, no matter how hard he may be fighting within his union to rid it of Wallace supporters, Communists and fellow travelers.

My constituents can rest assured that, despite my opposition to the bill, I will continue in the forefront of the fight against communism. It will be carried on, however, with the utmost respect for our Bill of Rights, a Bill of Rights so eternally fine that it has been incorporated in the Charter of the United Nations and on May 2, 1948, at Bogotá, was made a part of the 21-nation agreement entered into at the Ninth International Conference of American States.

Many of the Members of Congress, including myself, tried to improve the bill by amendment. All our amendments were voted down because the committee in charge of this bill was insistent upon having it in the form they presented it and they would permit no changes, despite the fact that the bill in the form submitted to the House was never considered at a single public hearing. I hope that the Senate committee will not be badgered by the Communist opponents of this bill into approving this bill to show how anti-Communist the committee can be. No haste is needed in the enactment of this legislation. It should be carefully and thoroughly considered.

The Evil of Socialism: "When the Theory of Socialism Is Placed Into Practice It Becomes a Totalitarian Economic Control in Fact"—Stassen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MacKINNON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an excerpt from the speech delivered by former Governor Stassen, of Minnesota, at Philadelphia, Pa., on June 1, 1948. The included remarks contain the best analysis of the fundamental evils of socialism that has come to my attention.

THE EVIL OF SOCIALISM—EXCERPT FROM SPEECH OF HON. HAROLD E. STASSEN

Socialism is an economic system under which the means of production and distribution are owned and controlled by the state. Classic socialism sounded fine. But when the socialist economy theory is placed into practice it becomes a totalitarian economic control in fact. Men lose their freedom to work, to earn, to invest, to buy, to sell, and to produce.

GOVERNMENT CONTROLS DAILY LIFE

They become dependent upon decisions of men in government as to where they shall work, what they shall earn, what they shall produce, where they may live, and what they may buy.

When economic liberties vanish, social and civil liberties cannot long endure.

This analysis does not mean there should never be any government ownership or socialism. There are great resources, such as major rivers and atomic energy, that can best be developed under the direct hand of government on behalf of the people. There are public facilities and conveniences, such as postal service and water, that can best be a part of the direct service of government. There are situations in which abuses of capital or shortcomings in private ownership can from a practical standpoint best be corrected by direct governmental operation. Governments which take steps of this kind for special reasons should not be called socialist. In fact the only completely socialist economies that exist in the world today are Russia and Yugoslavia.

INTENTION IS KEY

The key question is the direction and intention of the Government. The objective should be that the predominant production and distribution should be in private hands.

The greater the percentage is private, the stronger is the assurance of freedom and high production. Curbs do not need to be placed upon the extremes of selfishness. In many countries land reforms are overdue and monopolies need to be broken. But it must be clear that we believe that complete socialization of an economy, the bringing into control by government of production and distribution of a Nation's goods, results in low production and poor standards of living and the loss of liberties. Such a course by others puts an impossible strain and demand upon the country's capacity for foreign aid.

It is vital that with understanding and patience in connection with a generous program of aid to other nations we endeavor to dissuade them not to make the mistake of moving into completely socialized economies.

Taft-Ellender-Wagner Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of Sunday, June 13, 1948, calling for the immediate passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill:

NO TIME FOR HOUSING?

The hour is late in Congress. Important matters crowd the calendar. Some bills will obviously fall by the wayside. Yet we cannot believe that Members of Congress will be willing to return to their constituents and say that there was not time to pass a housing bill.

Something of the political urgency in this issue must have been at work in the minds of members of the House Banking Committee, we believe, when, to the considerable surprise of some House Members, there was a sudden switch of sentiment that overrode the wishes of the chairman, Representative WOLCOTT, Republican, of Michigan, and reinstated public-housing provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. The victory was by a hairline decision, 14 to 13. There is still no certainty of a vote in the House this week. But, at any rate, it is encouraging that conscience, or perhaps merely political awareness, has come awake.

There seems little doubt that the lobbying, or the testimony in open hearings, of some real-estate and business interests has succeeded in turning many House Members against public slum-clearing, low-rent housing. Representative WOLCOTT has called such housing socialistic. We find ourselves unmoved by the anxieties that this warning is intended to produce. We are convinced the surest safeguard for our traditional way of life lies in seeing to it that the American family has a decent place to live.

It is beyond our means to provide at once low-rent, subsidized housing for all who need it. But we can, at least, through the public housing provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and other features that promise substantial encouragement to private building demonstrate our good faith. Without that demonstration of good faith Congress' prolonged investigation of the housing shortage and any Republican platform plank on housing will become a hollow mockery. For the Republicans to fail to pass an adequate housing bill now, after all the talking done about housing, is to hand to the opposition in the coming campaign one of its most damaging political weapons. We are hopeful, of course, that they will be moved to action by more lofty purposes.

Address by President Demanding Congress Action on Eight Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the address of President Truman demanding Congress action on eight projects, delivered before the Greater Los Angeles Press Club, and printed in the New York Times of Tuesday, June 15, 1948:

ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT DEMANDING CONGRESS ACTION ON EIGHT PROJECTS

(Following is the text of President Truman's address before the Greater Los Angeles Press Club yesterday as recorded and transcribed by the New York Times:)

This has been a most rousing welcome in this great city in southern California. The mayor of Omaha told me that the greatest crowd that had ever been on the streets of Omaha was there to see me at that great city. At Butte, Mont., there were more people in the arena than live in Butte. I think they must have come from miles around in order to see what I looked like and hear what I had to say. At Spokane, Wash., early in the morning, there were about 2 acres of people downtown in a park in the center of town. In Seattle, the greatest reception they said that anybody had ever received in that great city. San Francisco, the same way. And here you top them all.

The reason I make that reference, it was said over the radio the other night by a Member of the Senate that I was stopping at the whistling stops and misinforming the people about the situation. Los Angeles is the biggest whistling stop at which I have been.

I have been trying to speak on the issues on this trip which are before the country. That's my privilege as President of the United States. I have a right and a duty to inform the people what I believe is good for the country. And I took this opportunity before Congress adjourned, because I think there are some things the Congress has not done that they should have done. And I wanted to give them an opportunity to find out what the people think of those things that they have not done. Therefore, I took this trip before the Congress adjourned in order that they may have that opportunity to act. I sincerely hope that they'll take advantage of that opportunity. They still have time and if they haven't time they ought to take it.

WANTS RECORD CLEAR

I wanted the record to be entirely clear. Congress should pass laws for the benefit of all the people, in my opinion, and they should pass those laws to meet the situations with which we are faced. And we are faced with some very serious situations.

One, I think, that is most important and is closest to everyone is prices. Prices have been on the skyrocket ever since July 1946, when the price-control law was repealed by furnishing me with an impossible law which I had to sign because I had vetoed one just as bad on the 30th of June. I had to take the law of July 31 or have none. And I said at that time that it was worse than none and it turned out to be just that.

Now, the price index, which is made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and on which everyone in the country relies for the situation in the price set-up, at the time that those price controls were released, was in the neighborhood of 130 or 133. Immediately after those price controls were released that price index went up 20 points. And it has been steadily climbing ever since. It now stands in the neighborhood of 172 and a fraction.

That means that costs of everything that you have to have—food, clothing, everything which you have to buy—have gone up almost 50 percent. That means that the dollar that was worth a dollar at 133 is worth about 66⅔ cents at the present time.

RECALLS 10-POINT PROPOSAL

Now, in September 1945, in my message to the Congress which stated the 21 points on which I had proposed to stand as President, I asked for an extension of the price-control law which expired on June 30, 1946. In the message on the State of the Union in January 1946, I made the same request. In May 1946, I made the same request. I got nothing. I got a law that was no good. It wouldn't work. I called a special session of the Congress in November 1947. In the meantime, in the message on the state of the Union, I told the Congress what the state of the price situation was at that time.

In November 1947, when the special session was called, I set out a 10-point program which I asked the Congress to give me to meet the situation with which we were faced in regard to prices and commodities. It is the object of the price-control law in wartime to protect the consumer. It was a consumer's price-control law.

This Eightieth Congress has said that prices would adjust themselves. Well, the prices have adjusted themselves and are adjusting themselves and almost flown off the graph adjusting themselves in favor of the man who controls the goods—and the consumer pays through the nose.

Now, that situation has not been met. We should have a stand-by price-control law to be put into effect when it is necessary, and it is necessary right now and we should have an allocations law which would allow the allocations of scarce materials into the channels where they would do the most good. Nothing's been done about that situation. I still hope the Congress will act.

Now, the next thing in which you are vitally interested down here, and every great city in the country is vitally interested, is housing. Four years ago, while I was in the Senate, the Senate passed a bill called the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill. That bill died in the House. Efforts have continually been made ever since that time to pass that bill. And the fundamental thing in that bill is a Federal low-cost housing program. That's a low-cost rental-housing program. Had that bill been passed 4 years ago, or 2 years ago, or 1 year ago, we would be beginning to get some benefit from it now.

This city, I think, understands the housing shortage better than the Congress does. While I was here during wartime you had an immense housing shortage. The mayor tells me that the situation has not improved because every GI who was trained in this part of the world wants to come back here and live.

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill—see, they reversed it in this Eightieth Congress—has passed the Senate and is now pending in the House. It would still be helpful if the House would pass that bill. The chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency in the House has been sitting on that bill. But the other day he got the surprise of his lifetime. The committee took the bit in the teeth and 11 Democrats and 3 Republicans voted that bill out to the calendar of the House by a vote of 14 to 13. Eleven Democrats and three Republicans voted that bill out.

DOUBTS ACTION ON HOUSING

Now, it is necessary under the House rules that a rule be made so that that bill may be debated on the floor of the House and passed. The Rules Committee now can roost on that bill until the Congress adjourns unless the people of the United States wake up and do something about it and force action. The chairman of the Rules Committee is a little bit tougher than the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, so I doubt very much whether we'll get action, but the Congress ought to stay in session until we get action on the housing bill.

It's vitally important to the welfare of this country that we have proper housing—proper housing at a cost at which men and women can afford to live in the houses. At a cost which will not take everything that these GI's have. At a cost which would be easy on the people who have to pay the bill. I think the Wagner (Taft-Ellender-Wagner) bill would in all probability help to meet that situation. I sincerely hope something will be done about it.

Now I have another subject in which you are vitally interested and which I have been discussing on this trip and that is the labor situation.

The Republican platform of 1944, in bold, broad type, made the statement that they would build up a real Labor Department. That they would strengthen the Labor Department. You know what they have done to the Labor Department? They have practically abolished the Labor Department. They have practically put the Labor Department out of business. Not by proper legislation but by choking it to death with appropriations that are not sufficient.

The last great contribution that this Eightieth Congress made to the Labor Department was to so choke off the Bureau of Labor Statistics that it is impossible for them to act. And every business, every branch of the Government, is dependent upon the Bureau of Labor Statistics to find out just exactly what's happening in prices and in the labor market, and in everything else that goes on where statistics are needed. You see, they were not satisfied with taking the lid off the prices and letting them go at a mile-a-minute rate. They want to jerk the speedometer out of the car so you can't see how fast you are going to the dickens and to inflation.

URGES REBUILT LABOR DEPARTMENT

The last great effort they have made on the Labor Department is to take the United States Employment Service out of the Labor Department. They have already taken the Conciliation Service out of the Labor Department and I'm saying to you that I think the Labor Department is one of the most important and necessary departments of this Government and I think the Congress ought to study this situation and take the necessary action to restore the Labor Department to the department which I had built up in the first 2 years I took over. The Labor Department suffered during the war. It necessarily had to suffer during the war on account of the special agencies which went to work during the war. I have been trying to restore that Labor Department to its prewar height. That is what ought to happen. I think Congress ought to take some action on that before they quit.

Now then, the Congress in their Republican platform was very much interested in social security. I've been asking the Congress to broaden the base of social security so more people could benefit from the Social Security Act—so that more people could get the benefit of employment insurance and help to pay it while they worked, so that when they are out of work they'll be contributing to their support when they are out of work and will not have to go on relief.

Now, do you know how Congress has broadened the base of social security? They've just taken 750,000 people off social security and sent me a bill to that effect and tied a rider onto it increasing the old-age assistance, hoping I'd take that bait and let them get away with tearing up social security. I didn't do it. I vetoed that bill this morning. I've told the Congress that if they would pass the bill in the proper form I'd be happy to sign it, and they have plenty of time to pass it in the proper form—don't think they haven't.

Now, I have had a health program. I sent the Congress a special message on health. * * * On health and health insurance. * * * And they have had plenty of time. There were hearings on that * * * to debate it * * * to go into it and they have done nothing about it. Now, the health of this Nation is the foundation on which the Nation is built. I've made a personal study of that situation. We've got a heatlh and accident situation in this country that is the most disgraceful of any country in the world.

There are only two classes of people who can get the proper medical care nowadays, and that is the indigent and the very rich. The ordinary fellow who gets from $2,400 to $5,000 a year and is trying to raise a family and keep up a home can't afford to have his family get sick because he can't afford medical care at the price it has to be served at now. Something ought to be done about that. A healthy nation is a great nation. And unless we maintain the health of this Nation we will not have a great Nation.

I'm interested also in those people who are disabled in industry. I'm just as anxious to see those people restored to working ability as I am to see the crippled GI's taken care of. We've done a magnificent job with the GI's. We can do the same sort of a job with those crippled in industry. In Seattle the other day I was in an institution that was just started to rehabilitate men and women who are injured in industry. Do you know that there are in the neighborhood of 26,000,000 people in this country who have been injured and who are permanently disabled or temporarily disabled and that the vast majority of those people could be rehabilitated and put back on a self-supporting basis if the situation was properly approached? That's appalling.

The vast majority of those people are injured in automobile accidents. The most terrible weapon that was ever invented by man. It is much safer in the front line in a war than it is on the roads in this country in peacetime when the automobiles are going full tilt. I have had session after session on that subject in Washington in an endeavor to remedy the situation. I wish the Congress would go into this health situation and pass an intelligent health bill for the benefit of the whole country, so that everybody could get medical care at a reasonable price when he needs it.

CITES AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

I appointed a commission to make a survey of the educational situation in this country. That commission made a formidable report and pointed out exactly what the condition in the schools in this country is—what the conditions are today. And I made a recommendation to the Congress that the Federal Government make a contribution to the support of the schools of the Nation. No action—no action. It is the most disgraceful thing in this country that the teachers in this country are not adequately paid. There are conditions in nearly all the public schools in the country where the teacher has so many pupils under her care that she doesn't even have time to learn their names. Something must be done about that.

The bill has passed the Senate. It wouldn't take 10 minutes for it to pass the House if they weren't roosting on it over there. They should stay in session until they pass the bill for the assistance of education in this country.

Now, I have sent a special message to the Congress on agriculture. I made a speech on the agricultural program at Omaha, Nebr., on a national hook-up on all four networks and I set out very clearly in that statement and in the message which I had sent to the Congress what the agricultural program in this country should be.

You know those support prices for agriculture will expire at the end of this year. Now there is a bill pending before the Congress which is adequate to meet this situation if we could only get it passed.

A lot of the gentlemen who are interested in taking over the residence of the President of the United States in 1949 have been out in the Farm Belt telling the people what is necessary for a farm program and how strongly they are for it. Now some of these people have powerful influence in this Eightieth Congress and if they really mean what they say they ought to do something about it. They can do something about it. There is plenty of time.

You see, unless this price-support bill is passed the farm situation can very easily go back to what it was in the 1920's when the farmer had about $4,700,000,000 in income against about $30,000,000,000 last year; when the farmer didn't have a dime in the bank and if he had the money to put in the bank he's been afraid to go and put it in at that time. He now has $23,000,000,000 in the banks and he is not afraid of losing it for there hasn't been a bank failure in this country in 3 years.

RECALLS WEBSTER COMMENT

Now, you's got something down here that you are vitally interested in and I'm vitally interested in and so is the whole West. I've told people all over the country west of the one hundredth meridian that water and the proper development and control of the water resources of that area is more important to that one-third area of the Nation than any other one thing in it, for without water you can't exist.

I always considered this of vital importance to this part of the country. And I have made recommendations on three separate occasions in the budget in regards to that, and this Congress last year cut that budget appropriation and they cut this one, but they didn't cut it quite as much because—well, this is 1948. It makes a difference. You know, Dan Webster, when we were—when the United States was trying to build the Pacific Railroad, made the statement in the Senate along in the 1830's that the West wasn't any good and the further it could be kept from the eastern part of the United States the better off the country would be. And there are a lot of Republicans nowadays who believe just like old Dan Webster did.

But money spent on reclamation and public power and irrigation is an investment. It gives a return of the money to the Treasury of the United States. It creates more agricultural production—and had it not been for the tremendous agricultural production of this part of the country and the Mississippi Valley this country would have been in an awful fix in the last war. That is one of the greatest contributions ever made in the history of the world that was made by agriculture during those war years and they are still making that contribution, for had it not been for the immense crops which we've been able to raise in this country millions of people would have starved to death.

You know, this country has done something never done before in the history of the world. This country has prevented the conquered nations from starving. In the Napoleonic Wars millions of people starved to death in Bavaria, in Germany, and in Poland. We've made every effort to prevent people from starving to death after this last terrible war and I want to see the agricultural sections of this country properly improved. I want to see the water resources of these rivers properly used. I want to see the proper development of the Columbia River Basin, the Central Valley of California, and the Colorado River, and I want to see the land irrigated on a power basis so that there won't have to be a brown-out in California in the summertime.

Now, gentlemen, that's a synopsis of eight important measures in which I am vitally interested. There are several more but the time is too short and I don't think I ought to try to inflict any more conversation on you about what Congress ought to do. I think I've made it perfectly plain in eight major instances. And I do that in a most kindly frame of mind. I know the majority of the Congressmen. As individuals, they are fine people. I have some of the best friends in the world in the Congress.

But when I speak of the Eightieth Congress and its accomplishments in the last year and a half I say that that Congress has not done very much for the benefit of the people. They passed a rich man's tax law, they've passed a lot of special legislation that helps special classes. And I'm against class legislation and I've tried to show that in numerous vetoes. And I've made this trip so I could lay before you personally my views on this subject and if I'm wrong you'll have a chance to tend to me later on, but if I'm not wrong you ought to tend to somebody else.

Thank you very much.

Kennedy Says Inflation Big Danger of ERP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Journal-American of June 13, 1948:

KENNEDY SAYS INFLATION BIG DANGER OF ERP

(By Robert S. Allen)

Joseph P. Kennedy, United States Ambassador to Britain, during the Roosevelt administration, yesterday stated there was no real meaning to the controversy between the Senate and the House over the House slashing of more than $1,000,000,000 from the ERP appropriation bill.

Just returned from Europe, where he made an extensive survey of economic and political conditions, Kennedy declared in an exclusive interview that the Marshall plan offered no necessarily sound or permanent solution for the many and complex problems of the war-wrecked Continent.

"From my observations in Europe," he said, "I have concluded that no one has the right to say that any single plan is the answer to the numerous and great difficulties over there.

"No one can rightfully say that $6,000,000,000 is the exact amount of money needed for the so-called recovery program.

"No one can rightfully say, as is being done, that a smaller sum would be disastrous.

"I make this statement on the basis of my extensive personal observations in Europe, and on the plain and simple facts of conditions there."

SEES INFLATION PERIL IN ERP

"The underlying weakness and danger of the ERP is that it can easily further increase and accelerate inflation in Europe as well as here in the United States.

"That is a fundamental danger the importance of which cannot be exaggerated.

"No one disputes the contention that we must help Europe. That is necessary.

"But, at the same time, we are only laying ourselves open to a lot of trouble both over there and here at home to go on the basis that any single plan or a certain sum of money is the answer to the problem.

"That's a delusion and a snare. Because, when we stop sending billions to Europe, as we will have to do sooner or later, they will hold it against us and resentment will be greater against us than if we hadn't done anything."

Kennedy laid great stress on the danger of incurring European hostility.

WARNS OF EUROPE'S HOSTILITY

He said Europeans envision this country as fabulously rich and prosperous, and have been told now for many months that the United States is going to put them back on their feet.

The European, Kennedy warned, translates all this in strictly personal terms; what it will mean personally to him in more food and other commodities.

"As a result," Kennedy declared, "when the time comes that we can't give them what they think they should have, they will be very sore and hold it bitterly against us.

"That's the reality about which very little is said, but which is a very important factor."

The growth and strength of communism among the masses in Europe, Kennedy asserted, is due basically to the underlying economic "imbalance" there—the spread that exists for the masses between their wants and their means of satisfying them.

Official statistics superficially deny this. Everywhere he went, Kennedy continued, he was shown reams of government statistics and charts proving production was steadily getting better.

But, actually, conditions are a different story, and they are not improving for the great mass of Europeans.

Not only are conditions no better for the ordinary European, Kennedy said, but the European sees no hope for the future.

Everywhere he went he found an "underlying feeling of hopelessness and discontent," he declared.

"That is giving communism its hold and its propaganda appeal. Communism feeds on discontent and hopelessness, and there is plenty of both in Europe."

CITIES BLACK MARKET

Illustrative of this basic economic imbalance, Kennedy cited the widespread black marketing. Everywhere he went, even in places where controls were supposed to function, he said he found on one hand mass need and poverty and on the other wealth and plenty.

"You can get anything you want in Europe if you have the money to pay for it," Kennedy declared. "The black market will supply you with white bread, the finest in foods, and other commodities. The European masses know that, and the Communists are making the most of it."

The simple fact is, Kennedy held that the great mass of European workers and salaried employes continues to suffer from the lack of balance between their needs and their means to satisfy these needs. This is the root problem in Europe.

The former Ambassador held that the Marshall plan does not of itself offer any sound or permanent solution.

"The world simply cannot without catastrophe continue indefinitely on the basis of conditions as they exist," he declared.

"There is no one solution for the problems of the world.

"They are too vast and too complex.

"Above all, we must never forget that we have many grave problems right here in our own country that are just as pressing and vital as those in Europe."

Outstanding among these domestic problems, the solution of which is necessary if ERP is to succeed, Kennedy asserted, is that of high prices and high profits.

MUST CURB PRICES

Unless United States business itself solves this problem, Kennedy warned, another and more painful solution might be forced on businessmen.

Either business takes steps to control high prices by reducing profits, he declared, or others will do it for business.

"United States business must accept a smaller margin of profits to bring prices down," the former chairman of the SEC asserted.

"Unless United States business does that, the spiraling of the price level will continue and that means just one thing, eventually—an economic bust.

"And the higher the spiral goes, the deeper will be the reaction.

"Piling on wage increases solves nothing, even temporarily.

"Only a small portion of the population is directly benefited by these boosts, while the whole country pays for them in the resulting inflationary price spiraling."

MUST END VICIOUS CIRCLE

"A halt must be called to this vicious circle, or a crash is inevitable.

"And an economic upset in the United States would have catastrophic consequences throughout the world.

"It would play directly into the hands of the Communists. That's what they have been waiting and hoping for.

"That is why it is so terribly vital for us to solve, first, our own basic problem.

"Unless we do that, we will get nowhere with the Marshall plan or any other plan. We will merely be frittering away our vital resources, without solving anything.

"The basic issue before our country today is how to help Europe to obtain hope and the basis for stability, without at the same time undermining our own stability and security.

"These two problems are inseparable.

"It is impossible to neglect one without running great risks in the other."

ASSAILS POLICY MAKERS

Kennedy vigorously criticized the failure of United States foreign-policy makers to build up the defenses of the Western Hemisphere to meet the menace of world communism.

He declared a plan for the Western Hemisphere is as vital for the security of the United States as the Marshall plan is for Europe. Concentrating all our attention and resources on Europe amounted to putting "all our eggs in a very uncertain basket," he said.

"European recovery can be only one phase of our planning," Kennedy declared.

"It is a beginning, not an end; and a beginning that cannot be free from doubts.

"The Marshall plan may or may not succeed, and we must accustom ourselves to think in terms of failure or partial failure as well as success.

"We must therefore look elsewhere, especially at problems that are close at hand.

"The answer, in my judgment, lies in great measure in our own hemisphere.

"Can we make this hemisphere self-sufficient and so economically strong that as a whole it can support the armament program we must have and still provide for all of us a reasonably decent standard of living?

"An answer to that question has an urgency that is highlighted by the recent events in Bogota.

"Already communism is making inroads in South America with the same stealth and drive that 10 years ago characterized Nazi Germany.

"Moreover, South America is strategically more vulnerable to attack than our continent."

EUROPE OFFERS LITTLE

Kennedy pointed out that South America offers the United States a ready source of supply of all major strategic raw material.

In contrast, he declared Europe offers us very little in security measures.

"To sink billions of dollars into countries which can produce nothing that matters to us that in the end turn Communist," Kennedy said, "is merely to waste our strength.

"Even a rehabilitated Europe cannot provide us with strategic materials.

"Europe's main effort for years will be limited to merely trying to keep alive, and for years it will continue to ask more of us than it can possibly give us."

He asserted that it was the height of shortsightedness to neglect develoment of the Western Hemisphere as an economic and military resource.

PROPOSES FIVE-POINT PLAN

To accomplish this, he proposed the following five-point foreign policy:

1. "Deploy our available capital resources, both private and public, in this area."

2. "This program should emphasize aid that will improve the transportation facilities within the Western Hemisphere."

3. "We should seek greater economic integration within the area by a revision of trade agreements."

4. "We should evolve a broad program for cultural understanding.

5. "We should initiate carefully and without irrevocable commitments—since strategy is still uncertain—measures to promote the military integration of this area."

"A foreign policy of this character is admittedly bold," Kennedy said.

"But we are dealing with an antagonist accustomed to bold and ruthless world strategy.

"To meet the moves now being made, it is up to us to make the democratic idea into something more than words. To make it into a force that will preserve its peoples and furnish a real foundation for their enduring prosperity.

"Against the possibility of war, such a policy will be a shield; in the event of war, a mighty sword."

Grass Roots Opinion and Presidential Primaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MacKINNON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by the Honorable Luther Youngdahl, Governor of Minnesota, on the Presidential primary system in force in a number of States. This article appeared in the June issue of the Republican Work Shop publication, Education for Action. It follows:

FROM THE GRASS ROOTS

(By Hon. Luther Youngdahl, Governor of Minnesota)

During recent weeks I have had an opportunity to visit several States which use the Presidential primary as a means of giving the rank and file voter a greater voice in the affairs of politics.

I can report to you that everywhere I went I found an intense interest in the forthcoming elections, in the candidates and in the important issues at stake. My observations gave me renewed faith in the future of our form of government. Certainly we need not fear for the preservation of our free institutions as long as the citizenry has the enthusiasm and interest that I saw displaced in States holding Presidential primaries.

My visits took me right to the so-called grass roots. I met voters on Main Street. I went from store to store. I stopped people so that we could discuss the election. I conversed with farmers, businessmen, taxi drivers, school teachers, students, laborers, doctors, lawyers, housewives—Americans from all walks of life. All of them seemed glad to hear my views and to express their own thoughts to me on the merits of the respective candidates. It was clear that they sensed the importance of this election in choosing the best leadership for the Nation in the days ahead.

These experiences convinced me of the important values of the Presidential primary. I believe wholeheartedly in this procedure as a means of increasing interest in government at the grass roots. It is sound government which permits the citizens to make their wishes felt at the ballot box in selecting the Presidential nominees of the parties.

While in Nebraska, I noted on every hand that the interest of the people was at fever pitch and that they enjoyed the Nation-wide publicity which their elections were given by the press and radio. I found similar high interest in Oregon. One man said to me, "There hasn't been such excitement here since Oregon was admitted to statehood." Such widespread public enthusiasm for politics bespeaks a healthy condition for our democracy.

The enthusiasm shown in the Presidential primaries has been a wholesome thing for the Nation because it indicates very clearly that the people have become tired of having candidates chosen in "smoke-filled convention rooms" by a handful of men. The voter wants, and deserves, the opportunity to make his influence felt through the ballot in deciding the candidate of his party.

I believe it would be a step forward for democracy if every State held a Presidential primary. A move to have such a primary installed in Minnesota for future Presidential elections would have my full support.

Harold Stassen is also deserving of major credit for stimulating interest in politics at the "grass roots." He has made it a policy to be forthright and to come out to talk to the people. In so doing he has also forced other aspirants to the presidency—regardless of whether they like it or not—to change their tactics and reveal their intentions and positions on the vital public questions. That the voters are grateful for the change Harold Stassen has brought to the campaign is evidenced in the strong support that he has been given at the ballot box.

These are days in which we must all be politicians. We need to constantly remind ourselves that politics is the science of government requiring the participation of all citizens if it is to function properly. It has also been appropriately called "the machinery by which society renders its moral decisions." Clearly, we have no one to blame but ourselves for bad government, if we fail to meet our obligations as politicians.

The late Raymond Clapper, one of the outstanding political observers and writers, had a guiding maxim which was "never overestimate the people's knowledge, nor underestimate their intelligence." That belief, based on a lifetime of close analysis of the thinking of the American people, reveals a notable and intense respect for the average citizen, for the sanity of the United States mass mind.

Our fundamental job, then, is to get all citizens to participate in politics and to supply them with the knowledge of facts on which to reach a decision. That is the important task being carried on by the Republican workshop. You are helping bring politics to the "grass roots"—the source of strength for our democracy.

Harvey Plans Interviews With Indiana Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, during the month of July, I plan to interview a large number of citizens in my district—the Tenth, of Indiana.

Barring mishap, I shall visit each of 10 county seats, conduct informal conferences at the courthouses, and consider individual problems coming within the scope of congressional jurisdiction. It shall be my purpose, too, to familiarize myself with the sentiment of representative citizens on public issues now pending.

Following is my scheduled itinerary covering the last half of the month:

July 19, Connersville; July 20, Greensburg; July 21, Shelbyville; July 22 and 23, Richmond; July 24, Rushville.

July 26, New Castle; July 27, Winchester; July 28 and 29, Muncie; July 30, Greenfield; July 31, Liberty.

Appointments between the hours of 9 a. m. and 4:30 p. m. will not be necessary, while it will be my intention to confer with all those voluntarily appearing.

In arranging the visitations, I seek not only to maintain the custom of my predecessor in Washington, but also to implement my own ambition of keeping abreast with the people of the district I serve.

Army Training Problem as Related to Selective Service Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, we have only a few days to go before adjournment. Our schedule calls for a vote on the pending selective service bill tomorrow.

This is a duty which we cannot escape and for which we shall be held responsible by the country. I realize that there is a disposition in some quarters to seek an easy way out. Everyone would like to make the application of selective service as painless as possible—perhaps by anaesthetizing the voters. The issue cannot be met in that fashion. There is no painless method of dealing with this problem.

I think most of us agree that the security of the United States and of our free institutions requires a return to some kind of compulsory military service. When we abandoned the draft following the conclusion of hostilities it was in the hope that there would be no major war or threat of such a war at any time soon to disturb our own devotion to the ways of peace. That hope has been shattered by the events of the past year. Our problem now is realistically to adjust our own program to the facts as we find them.

We have already made liberal provision for the other requirements of the armed forces. We have tried to give them what they need to enable them to act quickly and effectively in an emergency. The problem confronting us now is to provide the manpower needed to bring them up to required strength, and likewise fill the ranks of the Reserves to the point where they, too, can be maintained in a state of reasonable readiness for service.

Military authorities who have appeared before the several committees concerned with this problem have testified that 2 years is the minimum time required to produce a thoroughly trained member of the combat forces and at the same time give him some experience on the job he is expected to do. My particular purpose today is to emphasize this point, and to warn my colleagues of the danger of any amendment which would weaken this basic requirement.

It takes time and effort, as well as money, to build and train an army. The American people realize the necessity of training for all nonmilitary activities, but we have not always accepted the even greater necessity for military training.

We know that it takes from 2 to 4 years to train a competent mechanic—a member, let us say, of the building trades. And then his training must be topped off by experience before he can be regarded as a first-class workman. We have apprentice or training systems of many kinds in all of our industrial establishments. Even in the case of college graduates with degrees in chemistry, engineering, or other branches of the physical sciences it is the custom of the larger industries to put these young men through a training course for the field in which it is intended to use them.

In the world of sport I venture to say that no man becomes a champion boxer in less than 5 or 6 years, nor has any member of the major baseball leagues ever developed a championship team in less than 5 or 6 years. Notre Dame wins at football partly because of the weight, speed and maturity of its players, but primarily because of team training. A football team may have a good line, a good aerial offense and all of the other characteristics of a good team, but still would not win many games without long and arduous training in team play, and without adequate reserves on the bench, ready to be sent into the line when needed.

War is not sport. It is infinitely more important than sport, and I employ this illustration only to emphasize the point that champions are made and not born. We shall never have the largest Army in the world. We do not want the largest Army. We want only the best, and for the safety of the Nation we must have the best.

War involves the deadly business of killing your enemy and destroying his capacity to wage war before he can kill you and crush the country and the institutions which it is your privilege to defend. It involves far more than the winning of pennants and championship belts and All-American recognition. War is a problem in survival. Your enemy may have been planning and training for years and waiting for the appropriate moment to attack you. Under modern conditions no nation can expect to survive unless ready to meet such an attack when it comes.

When prehistoric man emerged from his cave to repel an enemy, he seized the nearest stone or club, or employed his bare hands to defend himself. As time passed he learned to fashion crude weapons from wood and stone, and with these fought his earliest battles. His successors discovered that by using a sling it was possible to hurl a stone farther and with greater force than it can be hurled by hand. Others discovered that by fastening a string to a wooden bow it was possible to shoot an arrow a considerable distance, and this became a weapon. As metals were discovered the sticks and clubs became spears and

swords and lances. The stones became missiles. And finally, with the discovery of gunpowder, the whole science of warfare changed once more and entered a deadlier phase.

Little training was required to use a club on an enemy. The only requirement was brute strength. But as weapons increased in number greater facility was required in their use. The training problem became important, and it has become increasingly important down through the centuries with every new development in the methods and weapons of warfare.

Because major wars involve the organization and movement of large numbers of men, and because these men fight together against an organized and disciplined enemy, training has long since become an indispensable element of military success. Without it an Army would be little more than a mob, doomed to advance to destruction

Never in the world's history has military training been so important as it is today for any nation which regards itself as the custodian of institutions or resources which are subject to attack, and worth defending. This is doubly true where a rich nation and a free nation of peaceful, self-governing people is threatened by a powerful, envious and unscrupulous rival with the morals of a thief and the potentialities of a murderer. That is the situation today.

We know that Russia, ruled by an iron dictatorship more ruthless than that of Nazi Germany under Hitler, is arming for war. We know that Russia has enough combat divisions drawn up on a line stretching from East Prussia to Trieste to sweep unchecked through western Europe. We know that they begin the military training of their youth at the tender age of 10, and that their able-bodied men are retained in the reserves until they are 50. I hope my colleagues will have read the Staff Study on Foreign Systems of Military Science in the appendix of the Compton report, beginning on page 261. The section dealing with Soviet Russia starts on page 341. This study shows broadly that Russia, possessing the largest population of any modern nation and controlling as well the military policy and manpower of several satellite states, is prepared to put more men into the field than all of western Europe combined. We know further that they use women in the military service in far greater numbers than we do. And we know that in addition to foot soldiers they are training large numbers of men in all of the techniques of modern warfare in the air, on the ground, and under the sea.

Having these facts before us, failure to provide for effective training program for the smaller forces available to us in a war emergency would be an invitation to extinction of the United States as a nation.

As recently as World War I the weapons employed even by modern armies were limited in number and relatively simple in construction and operation. The chief weapons were the rifle, bayonet, machine gun, grenade, mortar, artillery, and poison gas. The tank appeared on the battlefield in primitive form for the first time in that conflict. A few hundred planes were employed in individual combat or for observation or attack on ground forces. The battleship was the backbone of the Navy.

Twenty-five years later, without discarding any of these older weapons, all of which were useful and perhaps indispensable, we added a multitude of new weapons, ranging from huge tanks and batteries of rockets to skies filled with planes and seas covered by ships of many types stretching farther than the eye could reach.

Vastly improved artillery, including antiaircraft weapons, was controlled electrically. Our soldiers were given bazookas capable of destroying tanks.

Radio and radar added tremendously to the effectiveness of air and ground operations.

Our armored columns raced through enemy territory with a mobility and at speeds never dreamed of a few years ago.

Flame throwers and mines of many varieties added to the hazards of the battlefields.

In the air we had fighters, light bombers, medium bombers, heavy bombers, reconnaissance planes, liaison planes, and transport planes by the thousands.

American soldiers fought in the Arctic and in tropic jungles. And fought magnificently wherever they were sent.

Paratroopers dropped out of the skies to perform special missions and whole divisions were at times transported by air.

Everyone who saw members of our military forces returning from World War II must have been impressed with their soldierly bearing, their confidence, and their discipline. Their performance in civilian life, both in school and in business and industry, testified to the value of the training received in the Armed Services. I do not mean to glorify war. Many men did not return. Others suffered injuries from which they will never recover. War is the deadly business of killing. It unleashes savagery and terror and all of the primitive forces which we attempt to control through what we call civilization. But life continues to be competitive and wars continue to be fought. My purpose in emphasizing the quality of the men who did return from World War II is to suggest that many of them—and I think a great majority—benefited greatly from the training they received.

This training was not accomplished in a day. The time has passed when a man can be trained for military service in 8 weeks or 13 weeks, or even in a year. The infantry alone may use a dozen different weapons. The infantryman must know how to handle a rifle, carbine, mortar, machine gun, knife, mines, bazookas, and other weapons. Beyond that he must not only know how to protect himself in every possible way against those weapons in the hands of the enemy, but must be prepared to advance in the face of resistance by tanks, planes, and enemy artillery.

He must learn how to take care of himself under every conceivable condition of terrain and climate. In World War II more men were incapacitated by other causes than from wounds inflicted by enemy weapons.

Of approximately 12,000,000 men who served in the Army and Air Force, 640,000 were wounded, 460,000 suffered from malaria, 171,000 from jaundice, 266,000 from pneumonia, 523,000 from dysentery, and 212,000 from neuropsychiatric disorders. The fact that only 15,125 men in the Army and Air Force died from disease is a remarkable tribute to the treatment they received. But it does not alter the fact that hundreds of thousands of others, in numbers far exceeding the number disabled by wounds, were out of action at one time or another as a result of other disabilities, some of which might have been avoided had training lessons been heeded. It follows, of course, that training saved the lives and health of many men.

General Eisenhower has made three statements bearing on this general subject which impressed me deeply.

Appearing before the members of the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training, otherwise known as the Compton Commission, he particularly emphasized his belief that discipline saves lives and wins battles. Discipline is the result of training. In part, it means automatic response to orders. It means mental discipline as well as physical discipline. It means training in such simple things as keeping your head down, and not jumping from one shell hole to another while under artillery attack. A disciplined Army is the only kind of an Army that can win a war.

Second, General Eisenhower said in this same connection that there was no comparison between the American divisions which were sent into Africa and those which stormed the Normandy beaches, broke through at St. Lo, stopped the German thrust in the Battle of the Bulge, and finally smashed the German armies on their home grounds. The divisions which fought their way through France and Germany were for the most part trained for 2 years before going into action. It is true that some of the replacements, particularly those rushed into the breach during the Battle of the Bulge, had only a few weeks' training. And it was among these men that casualties were greatest. The well-trained soldier always has a better chance for survival than one who is only half trained.

Third, General Eisenhower said on another occasion that the 18-month draftee brought into the Army following VJ-day was the most expensive soldier in the world. In the case of these 18-month selectees used in Japan, for example, it was found that the Army was able to get only 7 months overseas service out of them. The remaining 11 months were occupied with processing, training, or movement to and from the overseas theater. And even then the training of these men was compressed far more than is desirable in the case of men sent directly to combat, or who

might have to be used in combat in the immediate future.

The training problem of the modern army has been complicated both by the increase in the number of weapons used, by the complexity of these weapons, and by the great variety of conditions under which a global war must be fought. We must have mountain troops, Arctic troops, men trained in jungle warfare, airborne divisions, infantry, artillery, armored forces, and men trained for amphibious assaults. In the Air Force, men must be trained to fly in and to service every type of plane from the primary trainer up to and including the new 6-engine jet bombers. Some of them must fly at supersonic speeds.

All of this involves a terrific training problem, some of it on-the-job training, but much of it training in Army and Air Force schools. The average American who has not seen service in the armed forces has no conception of the extent of the school systems of the military services. Even a member of the ground crew in the Air Force requires at least a year of training, part of it in school, before he can be considered trained for even the simplest duties assigned to him. Beyond that, it requires months of additional seasoning and experience, working alongside other men who have been in service longer, before he can become a first-class mechanic. All enlisted men in air crews must spend several months in school. For example, it requires 6 months of schooling to train a turret gunner after he has had his basic training, and comparable training for other Air Force specialties.

In the ground forces, from 2,500 to 3,000 hours of training are considered the minimum for basic land operations, and 6,000 hours of training the minimum for specialized forces such as those used in amphibious operations, or as mountain infantry, or in Arctic operations. That means, in effect, that at the rate of 2,000 training hours per year, from 15 to 18 months are required as a minimum for basic land operations. For amphibious, mountain, Arctic, and commando-type missions, and for some of the technical services as well, a minimum of 6,000 hours of training is regarded as necessary.

In general, the Army's specialist training program calls for attendance at Army schools for from 3 to 9 months, depending on the type of training given. Master gunners and radar repair and maintenance men go to school for 9 months, cooks and bakers for 3 months, and refrigeration mechanics and motor maintenance men for 3 months also. As specialist training follows basic training, this means that the average Army recruit is in training for from 6 months to a year before he is considered ready for service.

As for the value of training to the individual and to the military services we have the testimony of such officers as Lt. Gen. Raymond S. McLain, now Chief of Information of the Army and one of the great combat commanders to come into World War II from civilian life. General McLain has pointed out that an artilleryman must know that the sound from his gun can be picked up by sound and ranging devices. A tanker must know that when he parks his tank he must be camouflaged to avoid attack from the air. The rifleman and machine gunner must know the type of concealment and shelter they will require for protection when not advancing. They must know how to use ground cover in moving forward and how their own supporting weapons operate to give them support. If they do not know these things and act on what they know, they will suffer unnecessary casualties.

A machine gunner and rifleman must also know tank tactics. Knowing them, he might be able to stop them, since the vision of tanks is very limited and they cannot move without exposing themselves by their bulk and noise.

These illustrations could be multiplied, but they all add up to training.

Profoundly significant also is morale, and morale is due to training more than to any other single factor. It is hard to visualize high morale among those called on to expose themselves to the dangers of the battlefield if they do not understand what they are fighting for and believe in the justice of their cause. They must also understand why they are called on to fight and have confidence in their commanders and comrades. And they must be prewarned of what to expect in battle or they may go to pieces under fire.

Morale is in part related also to discipline, to which I have already alluded. Discipline is a habit. It is simply the habit of doing things surely and thoroughly, even under stress. General McLain tells us that it is fairly simple to teach a gunner on an artillery piece how to raise or lower his gun or to move it from right to left on command, but it requires months of training for a crew serving four guns to lay them on the same target each time without error. A gun out of line may mean a target missed, or it may mean some of our own men will become victims of our own fire.

It is easy enough to teach a soldier driving a truck to keep his truck clean and watch the water level of his battery, but even after months of training one man may fail in even these simple duties. On the battlefield this may mean that his truck will not deliver its load. Or if the driver of a truck fails to keep his distance or gets out of line there will be road jams. On the battlefields this may mean hundreds of trucks wiped out by air attack, thousands of tons of supplies not delivered, and delay which may mean defeat.

General Cook, of the Air Force, says that even after a year's training of ground crews some men would persist in putting oil into the gas tank and gas into the oil tank.

Discipline and morale and adequate performance of duty are hard to get. Only thorough training and constant repetition will produce them. And this takes time—not 13 weeks or 26 weeks or even a year, but all the training it is possible to crowd into a year or two a man may have to be trained before he is ready for service.

And at the end of a soldier's active service his training will be of tremendous value to him, to his family, and to his home community if we are ever attacked at home. It is the men who have seen service or who had this training who will bulwark our civil defense if we should have to defend ourselves on our own soil, or perhaps be attacked by air. There would be problems of evacuation, fire control, hospitalization, supply, and bomb destruction that only men with military training could handle.

Let us not delude ourselves, therefore, into thinking that we can safely skimp the training required or cut it short. Considering the problems involved, I would rather err on the side of a longer period of service than anything less than 2 years.

There is, of course, no comparison between the Army and Air Force today and those which fought in World War I. It can further be assumed that if there should be another war it would move faster and be fought with still more numerous and more complex weapons, necessitating more and more training as the science of military operations becomes more complicated.

It is already evident that unless men can be drafted or enlisted for at least 2 years the armed forces cannot hope to get more than perhaps 6 months of service out of them except as such service may be a part of their training. This is not a sound basis on which to build an effective military machine.

Even 2 years' training and service is considered inadequate for best results, as indicated by the recent preference of the Army and Air Force for enlistments ranging from 3 to 6 years. In the Army and Air Force 90 percent of all current enlistments are for 3 years.

We are confronted today with the necessity of bringing the regular services up full strength, maintaining them at strength, and providing a steady flow of well-trained men into the Reserve components. That is the whole purpose of this legislation. Unless we can give the services men who can be used effectively in another emergency, and in addition give the National Guard and Organized Reserves the thoroughly trained men they need for military effectiveness, we shall have failed in our duty and jeopardized the security of the country. Anything less than 2 years' service for inductees would likewise throw an added training burden on the civilian components and by implication require a larger investment in training facilities and active-duty training than would be required otherwise.

Speaking at a Memorial Day service in Massachusetts, General Bradley said to his audience:

> This lad we buried today is partly the victim of your folly. He is the victim of your folly and of the folly of all the peace-loving peoples who turned their backs on the ills of the world. For at the very time those aggressors at whose hands he met his death conspired against the peace of the world, we blinded ourselves to their threats and by

our painful inaction countenanced their starting attack.

If the United States ever again stoops to expedients to avoid the difficult decisions that come with leadership, the heavy burdens that come with defense, we shall once more run the dangers of all halfway measures and waste our strength and conscience as a weather vane rather than a force.

In a more recent address delivered in Detroit on June 9, General Bradley remarked that throughout the battle for France it was not numerical superiority in manpower but the vast superiority of our equipment over that of the German Army which gave us our advantage. He might have added that this equipment, for which in time of war we are willing to spend unlimited amounts, can only be used by thoroughly trained men.

Occasionally we still hear it charged that the selective-service program and its companion proposed for universal military training are designed to train mass armies. In other words, to train goose-steppers to be led like lambs to the slaughter. Passing the point that selective service as well as universal military training are intended to supply the requirements of the Navy and Air Force as well as the Army, I think it well to remember that even the Army without the Air Force is not and never has been a mass army. We do not have mass armies in the United States. About half of the American Army at present is assigned to the supply, engineering, and technical services. The other half is divided in varying proportions among the infantry, armored force, and artillery. When we hit an enemy we hit him with the most powerful military machine ever devised by man. It is a machine capable of moving at greater speeds than any other army in the world, and it is a machine manned by specialists and technicians who, in addition to great courage and discipline, must know how to handle the mechanical equipment and automatic weapons designed for their use.

As warfare has tended to become more and more deadly and more highly mechanized, the men who fight wars, and particularly those in our Army, are more widely dispersed than ever before. A wholly false notion of the Army seems to exist in the minds of many persons. Perhaps this is attributable to seeing marching men in parade formation. We hear a great deal of criticism of an Army which trains men in close-order drill and in the other requirements of military formations. The fact that men march in column, whether on the parade ground or as they come down Fifth Avenue in New York or Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington following their return from overseas, does not mean that they go into action 8 abreast, 10 abreast, or 12 abreast. In battle, when they move in columns, it is likely to be in an armored column racing down a highway and sweeping everything before it. It is true that some men still fight on foot, but it is equally true that for every man that does fight on foot there are at least a dozen others in the supply, technical, and transport organizations necessary to keep him in the line, or in the air over him providing the protection he must have to enable him to advance. I have heard it said by competent military authorities that not more than 10 percent of the men in our Army actually fired a rifle in combat in World War II.

Thus there is no such thing as a mass army in our scheme of things. The mass army about which we hear is a myth, conjured by critics of our military services for their own ends—and unfortunately in many cases for evil ends. Close-order drill is employed only for physical and mental training and as a condition of the orderly movement of large numbers of men from one point to another. It bears no other relationship whatever to the requirements of the military service. Even the Air Force employs close-order drill in its basic-training program. And certainly no one would call the Air Force a mass army.

So let us not be deluded by the deliberate distortions of Communists, pacifists, and misguided innocents who attack selective service on this score.

Finally there is another and further training requirement which will become increasingly important as time goes on. This is the requirement of teamwork involving all of the military services. As General Bradley and General Spaatz have pointed out, success in modern war can come only through carefully planned employment of balanced forces—land, sea, and air—operating as a team. After they have learned the functions of their own service, the men in all of the military services will have to be trained in teamwork from now on to a greater degree than ever before. This training requirement necessarily will have to be superimposed on that required for the functioning of the several services separately.

In modern war the enemy no longer sounds a siren as he comes in for his first attack. He attempts at the outset to obtain an initial advantage by surprise. Germany invaded Poland without even an ultimatum as a warning of what might come. Rotterdam was blasted by the German Air Force without warning and without excuse. Japanese flyers sank most of our battleships at Pearl Harbor on a peaceful Sunday morning as our patrol planes were returning from their routine morning mission. The only chance Russia or any other hostile power would have to immobilize us militarily or to deliver a crippling blow at the outset of any new war would necessarily involve the element of surprise. If we had advance notice of an attack, we could, of course, take steps to meet it. The fact that we shall have no warning of a future attack makes it imperative, first, that the Regular Military Establishment be ready to move at a moment's notice; and second, that the civilian reserves be filled with thoroughly trained men who could be put in the field shortly after D-day to support the military elements. Behind them, available as replacements and for the organization of the civilian forces which under modern conditions must be depended for final decision; there must be an even larger pool of well-trained men who can be mobilized for any war lasting more than a few months.

For all of these requirements the one indispensable element is training and more training and still more training. Equipment is valueless unless there are trained men to use it. Untrained men are of little value in an Army designed to use weapons and machines to save lives. The modern military machine can hope to succeed only if built on a foundation of adequate training, and we shall be derelict in our duty and fail the country in its hour of need if we seek the easy way out by adopting half-way measures.

In a show-down, a second-best Army is no better than a second-best poker hand. We want to be ready when the show-down comes.

Pray for Peace in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Harry Schlacht:

PRAY FOR PEACE IN PALESTINE

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

That which God has forged no human hand or nation will ever break asunder.

Pope Pius XII prayed for peace in Palestine.

His Holiness said: "May the truce, though temporary, be the greeter of the dawn of peace in the Holy Land.

"This is our dearest hope. This is our fervent supplication."

When the President of the United States recognized the infant state of Israel, the American people wrote an historic chapter to this epic story.

Our generation will be remembered in the ages to come, with that which left Egypt and stood at Mount Sinai.

Blessed is the generation which has worked for it. Blessed is the generation which has been worthy to witness it.

This is one of the great moments in the history of mankind. This is one of the great moments unprecedented in recorded history.

Never before has a people so long bereft of its homeland, exiled, dispersed, decimated, persecuted, and oppressed—never before has a people survived such vicissitudes—returned to its native soil, reclaimed its wilderness, and reestablished its national existence.

It was not only an act of heroism; it was an act of supreme faith which compels the admiration of the world.

It will not be long before the finger of history will point to all peace-loving people that the land of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob is the most formidable outpost in the gutted wasteland of neo-Fascists, Pashas, and Effendi.

If the Hebrew warriors of Israel are engaged in deadly strife, it was not a quarrel of their choosing.

They are fighting and dying just as valiantly for their political independence as our forefathers did at Lexington and Concord. They are fighting for justice for the Jews because of centuries of injustice to the Jews. They are fighting for their homeland—"Eretz Israel."

The Hebrew warriors will defend their birthright with the last drop of their blood.

They want to build a state on the foundations of justice and equality. They want to built a state in the spirit of the truths expounded by the prophets and sages.

They want a haven for the harried Jews throughout the world.

It will be a bulwark against reaction and oppression. It will be an outpost of liberty and justice. It will be a strong democracy in the Middle East. It will be a guaranty of protection for the democratic way of life which we enjoy in America.

America led the way with its blessings. It did right because before God it was right.

America showed the world that its heart is as kindly as its sword is mighty and invincible.

The seven Arab nations have served notice on the United Nations that they will resume war unless the new state of Israel is dissolved.

Let the Arabs remember that there are three things they cannot keep out of Palestine—the rain, the wind, and the Jews.

This is the test for the United Nations. This is the challenge to the United Nations—whether any of its mandates is to be regarded as a mere scrap of paper.

Let us all unite in prayer with His Holiness that the Palestine situation will be solved through the machinery of the United Nations.

Let us all pray to God for peace in the land of peace. Let us all pray to God that the dove of peace will build its nest in the cannon's mouth in the Holy Land.

God speed the day.

Palestine: Playing With Fire—People Oppose Sending Troops to Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, again the President and the State Department are suggesting that American seamen and soldiers be used to police the waters around Palestine to insure that the truce is maintained between the Jews and Arabs.

I am calling attention, Mr. Speaker, to Public Law 264 which prohibits the use of our men and matériel to support United Nations action in the absence of agreements approved by the Congress. Section 6 of that law provides:

The President is authorized to negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the Security Council which shall be subject to the approval of the Congress.

And so forth. The language is clear and specific.

Mr. Speaker, on April 22 the question as to the intent of Public Law 264 was discussed in the Senate pursuant to a question raised by Senator BREWSTER, as follows:

Is there any question regarding the necessity of congressional action in order to supply police forces or military forces so far as action under the United Nations is concerned? (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 22, 1948, p. 4862.)

The distinguished Senator went on to explain that he was distinguishing between action which might take place to protect American lives or property unilaterally under our authority and the question of whether under the United Nations Charter there would be executive authority for supply police or military forces for any purpose under the United Nations without further congressional action. The question was addressed to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] who in a direct reply to the question said, "Coming down then to the Senator's present question, I suppose we still confront the same old argument as to the latitudes within which the President can operate under his Presidential responsibility to protect American life and property and to protect the American interests under his responsibility as Commander in Chief. Beyond that I think he would require the consent of Congress to use the armed forces of the United States for any external purpose." Senator VANDENBERG also called attention to the fact that the Charter of the United Nations contemplated agreements between the member nations of the United Nations and the Security Council identifying specific quotas of armed forces which should be held available by each member nation for the ultimate use of the Security Council. Any such agreement, before it became effective, had to be approved by constitutional processes. He then directed attention to the fact that the Security Council had never been able to come to any agreement on the subject because of the intransigence of the Soviet Union and its satellites and therefore there is no such force and no such agreements and no action has been taken by the American Congress in respect to such agreements. That particular machinery has never been set up and no such agreement has ever been made.

From this colloquy between the distinguished Senators above named, it is obvious that the President is bound to seek permission of the Congress before he can use American troops to police that troubled area in Palestine unless it would be on the theory that American life and property were endangered.

Mr. Speaker, the sending of our armed troops, be they military or naval, into that area is wholly opposed by the American people and I am including herewith a poll which appeared in the Sunday Star of May 2, 1948, in which Dr. Henry C. Link indicates that 60 percent of the people in this country are opposed to sending troops into Palestine to enforce partition or otherwise. Under leave to extend my remarks I am including the result of that poll.

SIXTY PERCENT IN POLL OPPOSE SENDING UNITED STATES TROOPS TO ENFORCE PARTITION

(By Dr. Henry C. Link)

NEW YORK, May 1.—Although almost one-half of American city people are in favor of partitioning Palestine to make a separate Jewish state, 60 percent are against our sending soldiers to help enforce this partition.

This was learned in the latest psychological barometer survey conducted by the Psychological Corp. in 140 cities and towns from coast to coast. Twenty-five hundred personal interviews were made with adult men and women by 393 interviewers. The survey was made in such a way as to give a good cross section of the urban population of the country.

The first question asked was:

"Are you in favor of splitting Palestine into two parts, one for the Jews, the other for the Arabs?"

Answered—	*Percent*
Yes	45
No	27
Were uncertain	28

There was practically no difference between various income levels in answers to this question. However, by geographic sections, the East and far West were slightly more in favor of partition than the Midwestern and Southern States.

Following this question, we asked:

"Would you favor sending United States troops to Palestine to keep order?"

Answered—	*Percent*
No	60
Yes	25
Were uncertain	15

Here, again, there were no important differences by income groups. The Midwestern States, however, were more strongly against sending soldiers than other sections. The percent against in the Midwest was 67.

An analysis of the answers to these two questions shows that only 15 percent of all people questioned favor both partition of Palestine and the sending of United States troops. Therefore, if the questions had been combined, not more than 15 to 25 percent would have favored partitioning of Palestine.

H. R. 6802, United Nations Reorganization and Building Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, support continues to flow in from the whole country on the implementation of the assurance of the United States that the United Nations would be given an adequate home here contained in Concurrent Resolution 75, adopted December 11, 1945. If we want to make the United Nations the world's instrument for peace, as indeed we do, we must show that we mean it by our tangible support. No other language will do. I append additional editorial comment from leading newspapers in New York, Washington, and San Francisco to the same effect:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 22, 1948]

THE UN HEADQUARTERS LOAN

An urgent piece of unfinished business before Congress is approval of the $65,000,000 loan for the construction of the permanent headquarters of the United Nations on New York's East River site. The country is committed to the loan insofar its executive and its United Nations representatives can act without congressional authorization. The Secretary of State has signed an agreement on terms of the loan. The terms are fair. The risk which this country offers to assume

is fully covered by what is, in effect, a first mortgage upon the property. The loan will be repaid from the regular UN budget. It will be interest free. The only contribution of the United States beyond its own proportionate share of the costs will be that gift of interest—a gift more than offset by the advantages the location of the UN headquarters here will bring to the country.

Construction of the headquarters, symbolizing a change from temporary to permanent status for the UN, is of enormous importance to its prestige, to the morale of its staff, and to the hopes of peace lovers everywhere in the world. Yet construction cannot begin without the loan. Without question it must be approved. Senator IVES and Congressman JAVITS, of New York, have introduced separate resolutions to authorize it. But simultaneously with the decision of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to support the bipartisan declaration of foreign policy sought by Senator VANDENBERG, the corresponding House committee decided to draft a similar policy bill and to include in it the $65,000,000 loan. The policy declaration now in the making commands the utmost support; high-level debate upon it is assured in both Houses of Congress. And certainly approval of the loan will contribute to an affirmation of the Nation's resolution to make the UN work more effectively for "peace with justice."

The loan issue is, however, clear cut. It is vitally important that it not be lost to sight in an omnibus bill nor too long delayed by a full-scale debate on foreign policy.

[From the New York Times of May 27, 1948]

A HOME FOR UN

The agreement for a $65,000,000 interest-free loan from the United States to the United Nations for the erection of a permanent home for that organization in this city was signed more than 2 months ago by Senator Austin and Trygve Lie. It still lacks congressional approval. The matter must be brought to a prompt vote if it is to be disposed of at this session.

The legislative delay seems to hang chiefly on the fact that this is a political year. Some Members of Congress feel that if they can dawdle along without facing a vote their future prospects will be improved. Everybody else is ready to go. All plans for a group of fine buildings on the East River are complete. The city has authorized improvements to the approaches which will cost about $13,000,000. The power machinery of the builders stands idle, waiting for the word of command to start work.

As an ordinary business risk the proposal is indisputably sound. Every dollar put into the enterprise will be recoverable. But there are considerations far beyond and above that. We have committed ourselves to this project. Our national prestige, as well as that of the United Nations, is involved. If we believe our own assertions that we are backing the UN to the fullest extent and hope that it may survive and expand as the world's first guarantee of future peace, we should be prepared to prove it. Congressional approval of this loan would supply proof in a substantial manner. Senator IVES' and Mr. JAVITS' joint resolution should be passed without further delay.

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 4, 1948]

THE UN HEADQUARTERS LOAN—THE CAUSE FOR PEACE AS WELL AS OURSELVES WILL SUFFER IF CONGRESS FAILS TO APPROVE IT NOW

(By Newbold Noyes, Jr.)

The most embarrassed man in Paris next September 21 may be an American. If worst comes to the worst, he will be a member of our delegation to the United Nations General Assembly who has to get up when the session opens and make a little speech running something like this:

"About 3 years ago, my Government invited the United Nations to set up its headquarters in the United States, and you all accepted the invitation. Later, my Government also offered to lend you the money you needed to build your headquarters in New York. You accepted that offer, too.

"We made the offer in good faith, because we spend dollars in billions these days for all sorts of purposes and we thought we certainly could spare the UN a loan of $65,000,000. But I am sorry to report to you that we have not been able to provide this money. Congress just didn't get around to acting on it. Sorry."

That day, if it comes, will be a black one for us and for the UN, all the more so because of the relative insignificance of the sum involved.

UN was important enough to John D. Rockefeller to warrant his giving it $8,500,000 worth of centrally located New York land, between Forty-second and Forty-eighth Streets on the East River, an ideal location for headquarters of the world organization. New York City thought enough of it to agree to spend $13,000,000 improving the site—building a traffic diversion tunnel under it, widening First Avenue, renovating the East River drive, and providing proper approaches and services.

BUT DOUBT ASSAILS US NOW

Now, however, it is a matter of considerable doubt whether this Congress thinks highly enough of UN prospects to advance the small and thoroughly sound mortgage loan required by the international organization to house itself here.

Even if a majority favors it, the danger remains that UN loan legislation will get lost in the last-minute shuffle as Congress drives to its June 19 adjournment date. It is the kind of measure likely to get lost. Already it has been tucked into a "package" bill to "strengthen the United Nations and promote international cooperation for peace." This bill was introduced yesterday by Chairman EATON, of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, which is expected to report it to the House immediately.

Quite naturally all the headlines on the story today deal with this bill's grander objectives—seeing what can be done about abolishing the veto, directing the President's attention to the possibility of our entering a regional agreement with western Europe, and so on. These are big and exciting prospects. But a failure by Congress to approve the loan provision would be a more serious kick in the teeth to UN than would rejection of all the rest of the bill put together.

Mr. EATON and Representative VORYS, a Republican committee member from Ohio, told reporters yesterday that they thought the UN loan had at least as good a chance of getting through this Congress in the new omnibus bill as it would have had by itself. They were not too sure, however, how good that chance was.

"Hope springs eternal in the human breast," Mr. VORYS said. "You are as cognizant of the situation up here these days as we are."

WHAT THE LOAN WOULD DO

The loan in question is what UN needs to provide itself with a headquarters worthy of the dignity of the organization, but by no means extravagant. The plan calls for a hall for the General Assembly, with space for 70 delegations, 1,300 spectators, the press, and necessary staff workers. Another building would house UN's three councils, with room on the side for other conference and committee chambers. There would be an office building for the secretariat, providing working accommodations for 4,200 people, and possibly another building for the offices of delegations and specialized UN agencies. Already on the site is a structure formerly occupied by part of New York City's municipal government, which would be converted to a library with a capacity of 325,000 books.

To provide such a plant, we would make our loan, without interest, repayable by 1962 in installments beginning July 1, 1951. The buildings themselves would be our security. UN could not sell them, change them, or encumber them without our approval. If UN dissolved or decided it did not need the buildings, they would revert to us.

We would turn the money over to UN, not in one chunk, but gradually while the buildings were going up, as construction bills came due. Thus UN would not make money on the deal by banking the funds. We, of course, theoretically, would lose about $2,000,000 a year at first in interest not collected on the money—progressively less after that as loan was repaid. Actually, however, from a strict dollars and cents point of view, the transaction is eminently worth our while.

It is estimated, in the first place, that UN delegates and the organization's staff spent about $20,000,000 in the United States during the last year. That is not all we gain by having them in this country. We save around $300,000 a year as a result of not having to send our delegation to a UN headquarters abroad.

Assuming, then, that this loan is a necessary condition to the UN's locating here—and it is just that—then, instead of our sacrificing $2,000,000 a year in the transaction, the United States as a community would make at least $18,300,000 a year on it, with the Government collecting its share.

SOUND FINANCIAL INVESTMENT

Such a calculation omits the fact that all the money would be spent in this country. It omits, too, the increase of New York real-estate values resulting from establishment of the headquarters there—another clear gain. Already property adjacent to the site has doubled in value.

Finally, it must be remembered that the United States is 40 percent of the UN, when it comes to finances. We reap 40 percent of the benefit accruing to UN through the generous conditions of this loan. And if the money were borrowed elsewhere, on less generous terms, we would have to bear 40 percent of that burden.

In fact, our Government is the only agency to which UN can logically turn in seeking this plan. The possibility of a private loan has been investigated and found out of the question. There are legal barriers, since the world organization is immune to suit. There are financial barriers, in that for a private loan each member nation would have to put up collateral in dollars, which many of them would not be willing to do. And if the loan is to be made by a member state, ours is the one to do it. Certainly no other member would be willing to advance the money for the construction of headquarters in this country.

UN is ready to start building as soon as we make the money available. Its officials hope to complete the work by 1950. It is true that the full $65,000,000 cannot be "in the bag" for UN until Congress has appropriated the money as well as approved the loan. The present bill, of course, is not an appropriation, and it is almost certain that an appropriation cannot be made until the next Congress. But this bill would authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to advance $25,000,000 in the meantime to get the work under way. It also would put Congress on record with its approval, morally committing us to follow through with the rest of the money next autumn.

That is a commitment which, as the richest nation on earth, we can well afford to

make. It is also a commitment which, as moral leader in the quest for peace, we can ill afford to forego.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of June 10, 1948]

ISOLATIONISTS TRY A NEW ANGLE

Isolationist elements in the United States have sprung a rear-guard attack upon the United Nations—thinly disguised as rational objection to this country lending $65,000,000 to the United Nations to build its New York headquarters.

Perhaps the United Nations headquarters should be in Switzerland, after all, it is suggested, "in view of strained relations between the United States and Russia"; Switzerland is neutral and there are already buildings at Geneva.

The true spirit of all this is tipped off when the isolationist propagandists call it euphemistic to describe the proposed loan as a loan. What really lies behind this rational objection is the same old nickel nursing which figures so strongly in the absolutist, no-foreign-entanglements fantasy of the kind of American mind which persists in the delusion that we can secede from the world if only we will determine to do it.

To any reasonable person the strained relations between the United States and Russia are one of the chief reasons why we should have headquarters not at Geneva but at New York. The gravity center of world power has shifted to the American Atlantic seaboard, and this dictates an American site for two overriding reasons: One, United Nations affairs should be conducted close to the people wielding the critical power—a people not yet fully aware of our role in the world and a people which must have every access to the problem of world cooperation lest we mistake its nature through remoteness and fall into the very isolation dealt with here; two, because every symbolic showing of American participation is a necessary encouragement and tonic to the battered and weary peoples of western Europe who must not be allowed to entertain despair because despair would soften them for the power machinery of totalitarianism.

Even if, as sneeringly predicted, we are not repaid, the $65,000,000, it is a sum so small by comparison with what we hope the United Nations to achieve that the risk would disturb no one with more vision and idealism than that of the elements who are propagandizing now.

Fortunately, the signs are that Congress will not tarry over this routine transaction, but will authorize and appropriate the money as a matter of course.

[From the Washington Sunday Star of June 13, 1948]

ANOTHER PREADJOURNMENT "MUST"

It will be a sorry thing if Congress, in the last-minute rush before adjournment, fails to authorize the projected $65,000,000 loan to build the United Nations' headquarters in Manhattan.

Provision for the loan is contained in a bill already introduced by Chairman EATON of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, but unless Speaker MARTIN uses his influence to get favorable action in the Senate, in time for similar action in the Senate, it will be lost in the preadjournment melee.

This would be most unfortunate for a number of reasons. In the first place, it would spread the impression abroad, whether justified or not, that the American Congress had lost faith in the United Nations. In the second place, it would place our Government in the position of being unable to advance the loan after having offered it when the UN accepted our invitation to make its home in this country. And in the third place, failure to act now might lead to a movement to shift the organization's headquarters to Europe.

Moreover, wholly apart from these and similar international considerations, failure to authorize the loan before adjournment would make no sense even in the narrow terms of the relatively small sum of money involved. Excavating has already begun. Detailed construction plans have been completed. New York City has pledged $20,000,000 for site improvements. All that is needed to get the project started in earnest is the congressional authorization embodied in the Eaton bill. The bill would empower the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to advance $25,000,000 immediately, with the balance to be appropriated later as the work proceeds and the bills come due. As far as dollars and cents are concerned, there would be no risk involved, for the loan, though interest free, would be repayable to 1982 and it would be secured by the buildings themselves.

In other words, should be United Nations fall apart after its home is built, or should it decide to move somewhere else, ownership of the valuable Manhattan property would revert to the United States and be available for profitable business purposes—a fact that makes the loan as safe and sound as anything of its kind could be.

Looked at in any light, in short, whether as an international political matter or as a matter of hard-headed business, the proposed loan should be authorized without further delay. Speaker MARTIN should feel impelled to exert his best efforts to that end. There is very little time left before adjournment, but there is still enough to push the measure through.

Strikes Cut Steel Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, the economy of the United States is basically dependent on steel. When there is a shortage of this vital material, all the Nation suffers through higher prices for practically every manufactured article and in shortages of many products. We have an acute shortage of steel today, and its effect is evidenced by shortages of automobiles, tractors, railroad cars, and similar items. The steel shortage also increases the prices of these and other articles in short supply, and by compelling producers and other businessmen to pay more for them, increases their cost of doing business and results in higher prices for the articles and services they furnish the public.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in the June issue of Steel Facts. This reports the extent to which our present steel shortage has been influenced by recent strikes:

STEEL LOST IN POSTWAR STRIKES IS NEARLY 20,000,000 TONS IN FINISHED PRODUCTS—THAT TOTAL IS ALMOST EQUAL TO STEEL SUPPLIED AUTO INDUSTRY IN 1946 AND 1947 COMBINED

Nearly 20,000,000 tons of raw steel has been lost as a result of major strikes since the beginning of 1946, according to the latest available figures. In terms of finished products that amount is nearly equivalent to all the steel supplied to the automobile industry in both 1946 and 1947.

The huge total includes more than 1,600,000 tons of ingots lost in March, April, and May of this year, a penalty of the spring walkout of coal miners.

LOSSES FOLLOW END OF STRIKE

More than 42 percent of the loss this spring occurred after the miners had agreed to return to work. First, coal had to be loaded at the mines and transported to coke ovens. Then many other steps had to be taken, all of which required additional time, before the operations of blast furnaces, open hearth furnaces and other facilities could be restored.

The 20,000,000-ton figure is computed by comparing operations week by week during the strikes and walkouts with the averages preceding the stoppages. However, not all of the indirect losses incurred in regaining prestrike levels can be included in the total.

Preceding the spring walkout of coal miners, steel furnaces were being operated at 97.5 percent of capacity, and were producing 1,757,400 tons of steel per week. During the walkout production declined to 71.3 percent of capacity, equal to 1,285,200 tons. Three weeks after the announced settlement operations had climbed back to only 91 percent of capacity.

Some companies dipped heavily into their coal reserves during the walkout in the spring. The rebuilding of coal stock piles was expected to be slow.

RECORD WAS BEING SOUGHT

The latest walk-out hit at the steel industry's attempts to set a new steel production record this year. In 1947 the industry produced approximately 84,784,000 tons of steel, an amount greater than ever before in peacetime. With additional capacity in operation in 1948, it was expected that this year's output would be greater than in 1947, and go far toward restoring the balance between supply and demand for those steel products which have been most eagerly sought.

Let's Be Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the address I delivered last Sunday, June 13, 1948, at the closing session of the seventh annual 3-day Institute of Labor, at Holy Cross College, in Worcester, Mass.

The meetings, during the session, were sponsored by the Massachusetts Federation of Labor.

The address follows:

LET'S BE FAIR

Recently there has been developed an atmosphere in the country of looking at the so-called labor movement as something sinister and mysterious.

To me, there is nothing mysterious or sinister about the labor movement. It's the most natural thing in the world for workers to organize unions for the purpose of dealing with their employers. In 99 percent of the cases, it is a good thing for the employer, as well as for the worker.

Farmers have their cooperatives; lawyers have their bar associations; businessmen have their trade associations; doctors have their medical societies. Why not labor unions for workers?

It may be said bar associations, medical societies, trade associations, farm cooperatives, are quite different from labor unions. Not as much as some people may think.

The closed shop will supply an example of what I have in mind.

There are many States where, if a lawyer doesn't pay his dues to the State bar association, he can't practice law. (No labor union, so far as I have been able to ascertain, has ever asked a legislature to pass a law compelling members of a particular craft to pay their dues or cease practicing their skill.)

I am not criticizing this lawyers' union. I am just calling attention to it, so the next time you hear a lawyer talking about the restrictive practices of trade unions, you may ask him about what the lawyers call the integrated bar, which is being pushed right now before a number of legislatures and which has already been adopted and enforced in Michigan and many other States. It isn't so very long ago that 200 or 300 lawyers were disbarred in 1 day in Michigan for failure to pay their dues to the bar association.

It is true there are closed shops in the labor movement but all unions do not demand the closed shop. For example, the standard railroad labor organizations. On the other hand, the printing trades and the building trades operated on the closed-shop principle from the beginning. The coal miners and other unions have gone a step further. The not only ask for the closed shop, but also the employer, under the check-off system, collects the union dues.

The differences within the unions on these issues reveal what a great many people overlook—that trade-unionism in this country has been an evolutionary movement. Practically every union has its own peculiar technique, involving practices and customs not found in other unions.

To discard these practices and to insist that every union shall proceed according to some plan evolved by a politician in Washington or an expert somewhere else would create chaos. This is recognized even by some of the gentlemen who introduced antilabor bills in Congress. One of these antilabor Senators said the other day that the adoption of his proposals would probably cause a certain amount of chaos, but that the experiment was worth the cost.

From the point of view of one who has had some experience in labor matters, this particular legislator has some quaint ideas. He is like a small boy playing with matches. He may set fire to the house. For example, he is constantly talking about jurisdictional disputes and their devastating effect on industry. However, the Labor Department comes along and points out that of the time lost because of strikes during the first year following VJ-day, only four-tenths of 1 percent was traceable to jurisdictional disputes.

Just 2 years ago Congress passed a reorganization bill, cut down the number of committees, and rearranged the duties of the committees that were retained. Now some of the eminent gentlemen who passed that legislation are battling each other in the fiercest fashion because they can't agree as to what that law means.

And just a short distance from Washington the authorities of the State of Maryland and of the State of Virginia not too long ago were actually shooting at each other. The issue was a jurisdictional squabble over the oyster beds of Chesapeake Bay.

Now, if the Congress of the United States and the two great Commonwealths of Maryland and Virginia—Commonwealths which have produced some of our most eminent statesmen—can't avoid jurisdictional disputes, why in heaven's name should we be so disturbed when two labor unions get into an occasional squabble over who shall do this or that job?

No labor leader likes jurisdictional disputes. They are extremely vexatious, but you can't dispose of them by passing a law. More of these antilabor lawmakers are talking about abolishing industry-wide collective bargaining. A more absurd proposal was never advanced by sane men.

Please do not imagine that I am arguing that the labor union is always right and that the employers are always wrong. I wouldn't insult your intelligence by pressing such an argument.

There are 15,000,000 trade-unionists in the United States. With the members of their families and close relatives, they undoubtedly represent at least a fifth, and possibly a fourth, of our population. Of course, there are many shortsighted, selfish, even dishonest, men among them. If that were not true, then the labor movement of America would constitute the greatest miracle witnessed by human beings since our Lord left His sepulcher on the third day and gave His disciples concrete evidence of His divinity.

But, my friends, the last time I visited a Federal penitentiary, I found that some of the inmates were bankers. I have known realtors whose word was not always good, and furthermore, I know two distinguished newspaper publishers who were sent to prison for cheating Uncle Sam.

Because some go wrong, shall we condemn all bankers, all newspaper publishers, all realtors? It all supports the contention of the poet that there is so much good in the worst of us and so much bad in the best of us that it ill becomes any of us to be throwing rocks at the rest of us.

This labor movement is as American as the Washington Monument or the Lincoln Memorial. Of course, it is constantly fighting to improve the condition of its members, and it will continue to do so; but it is not led by thieves and grafters, but by honorable men, whose records in private and public life will bear comparison with the records of the leaders of any other group in American life.

A distinguished Senator some time ago told me about his sweet, old grandmother who, in her youth, walked more than a thousand miles from the Missouri River to her husband's western claim. There wasn't sufficient room in the covered wagon for all their belongings, so some of the more precious things were placed in a two-wheel cart, and this gentle girl pushed the cart a third of the way across the continent, sustained by hope and love and faith in God. In the evening of her life, when her children and her children's children gathered about her and related their triumphs and disasters, sometimes placing great emphasis on the disasters, the dear old lady would smilingly admonish: "Don't forget to count your blessings."

Today those of us who are fortunate enough to be Americans should count our blessings and ignore those who are telling us that our country is going to the dogs.

Recently I attended a play in which there was a scene from Duffy's Tavern. Perhaps some of you are familiar with that classic. The barkeeper had the floor, and he said at least one thing worth remembering. It ran something like this: "They say that America is a melting pot. Perhaps it is. But there isn't another nation in all the world which wouldn't give everything it possesses to get just one leg of that pot."

In other words, this America of ours is the most fortunate country in all the world. If you don't believe that, try to persuade those who do not agree with the barkeeper in Duffy's Tavern to go to the country or countries they favor most.

We have just won the greatest war in the history of mankind. Our boys, on the land, on the sea, and in the air, did that job, but they had to have weapons and ships and airplanes and food and clothes and 10,000 other things. How were those supplies produced? By men and women on the home front—farmers and industrial workers. Once in a while there was a strike, but the fact remains that, from the beginning to the end of the war, there was never a single occasion when our men on a battle front were deprived of something vital because of something the workers did on the home front. No one can challenge that statement. It is sustained by every official report.

Judge Charles M. Hay, who was chief counsel for the War Mobilization Board, once said at a congressional hearing, that time lost by strikes during the war was so inconsequential that it might be said not to exceed the time required by war workers to blow their noses an extra time each day.

No responsible labor leader condoned wartime strikes, however inconsequential they might be. I have no desire to resurrect the dead past, but when anyone endeavors to disparage the work of trade-unionists during the war, trade-unionists may reply with the greatest assurance: "We are quite willing to compare our record with that of any other group."

What about the industrial conflicts which have developed after the shooting was over? There are at least two answers to that question. One is that you can't expect to wage a global war for years and then return to a peacetime status in a few days. Naturally, the workers were apprehensive. Hundreds of thousands were being separated from their jobs. Prices were soaring. Those who remained on the job were losing overtime pay. Tens of thousands were groping their way back to their old homes from shipyards and munitions plants.

Many observers believed we were drifting toward another world depression. Trade-union leaders said the only solution was to sustain buying power by raising take-home pay.

Naturally, some employers didn't like that. Negotiations dragged on for months, largely because Congress had so arranged the tax laws that many of the big employers could secure tax refunds to cover strike losses. Fortunately, that situation is behind us. It was never as bad as it was painted. At the peak of postwar labor troubles, we never had more than 4 out of 100 on strike, and then for only a brief period.

Today we have 57,000,000 men and women employed. We are in comparatively placid waters and should be able to view the future without hysteria and above all we should refuse to listen to demagogs who urge us to rock the boat.

We have another blessing to count. Only in this country and in Canada can you find so very few in the labor movement who are tainted by some "ism" which threatens the safety of the kind of democracy we have known. Ninety-five percent of the American trade-unionists are not Socialists or Communists or Fascists.

The Communists, in particular, have made desperate efforts to secure a foothold in the American labor movement. Up to date they have failed utterly. They have never succeeded in penetrating the standard railroad labor organizations. They have been practically eliminated from the American Federation of Labor. They are making their last stand in a few so-called independents and in some CIO unions, but the hand of American labor is against them and will continue to be against them.

Of course, that doesn't mean that American labor feels that every phase of our political and economic system is perfect. American labor is too intelligent for that. But

American trade-unionism is not a revolutionary movement. I like to think of it as an evolutionary movement—constantly progressing and always holding the ground it has won.

I am not apprehensive concerning the future of the American labor movement. I do not believe the efforts now being made to cripple or destroy it will succeed. I feel that such efforts are unwise, but I am also convinced they will be futile.

I wish to say to the employers of labor: "Extend the hand of fellowship to your workers. Recognize their right to organize unions which suit their needs. Don't be shocked when differences develop. Devise machinery to handle those differences, with a minimum of governmental or other outside interference."

If you do that in good faith, you will find that American trade-unionists will meet you at least halfway. That's all you have a right to expect, and that is all the trade-union movement should concede.

I think there is a trinity in economics, as there is in religion. The trinity in economics is made up of agriculture, labor, business. They are so closely affiliated that if one is injured, the others are bound to suffer.

Impoverish the farmer, and the industrial worker will find himself without a job, and the businessman will look in vain for a market for his wares. Treat business unfairly, and labor and farmer will discover the door of opportunity is closing. Deny a just wage to the worker, and business and agriculture cannot escape the disastrous consequences.

So, my friends, we are all in the same boat. In heaven's name, let's develop sense enough to pull together, in order to preserve our own national security and protect our position of world leadership.

Equal Rights for All Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of the Christian Century carries an article entitled "Equal Rights for All Children," written by the Reverend John A. O'Brien, Ph. D., of the University of Notre Dame.

The article presents in a friendly and noncontroversial manner certain facts and aspects of the school question which have not commonly been brought out.

The article follows:

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR ALL CHILDREN

(By John A. O'Brien)

The question of church-state relationship in the field of American education has been spotlighted in recent discussion, much of which has been characterized by a spirit of acrimony, hostility, and suspicion that has caused new tensions to arise. Like all other problems, this one can be solved only by reason and intelligence accompanied by mutual understanding and good will. I shall endeavor to deal with it in that spirit. If a case cannot be made out on thoroughly logical grounds and on considerations of justice and fairness, in accordance with the noblest traditions of America, without appealing to religious emotions and stirring up people's passions and prejudices, then there is something weak about the case and it should fail.

COMMON ASSUMPTIONS

Let us first explore what Justice Holmes aptly styled "the inarticulate major premise" of those who are agitating to deny public welfare benefits to children attending nonprofit, semipublic schools under religious auspices. From a fairly extensive review of the Protestant literature on the subject, I judge the following to be the grounds of their opposition:

First, the assumption that Catholics do not really believe in the separation of church and state, nor in religious liberty, nor in equality of treatment for all. There appears to be a widespread notion among our Protestant brethren that the hierarchy is seeking to maneuver the Catholic church into a position of special favor and privilege. Witness, they say, the presence of the President's personal representative at the Vatican.

Second, the assumption that Catholics have no stake in the public-school system and no interest in its development, and are in fact actually hostile to it. Third, the assumption that the religious school is not rooted in American tradition, is alien to the ideals of the founding fathers. Fourth, the assumption that the first amendment to the Constitution establishes "the great American principle of complete separation of church and state" and thus compels government, both Federal and State, to be indifferent to the religious welfare of the citizens. Fifth, the assumption that the extension of the benefits of public welfare legislation to children attending nonprofit, semipublic schools under religious auspices is taking the money of Protestant taxpayers to educate children in the Catholic religion.

CATHOLICS BELIEVE IN SEPARATION

Contrary to the impression of many of our Protestant friends, Catholics believe as strongly as any group in the separation of church and state in America. Whatever may have been the historical conditions that prompted union of the two in the countries of Europe, such conditions certainly do not prevail in the United States. Long ago Cardinal Gibbons expressed the conviction of American Catholics:

"The separation of church and state in this country seems to Catholics the natural, the inevitable, the best conceivable plan, the one that would work best among us, both for the good of religion and of the state. * * * American Catholics rejoice in our separation of church and state; and I can conceive of on combination of circumstances likely to arise which should make a union desirable either to church or to state. * * * For my part, I should be sorry to see the relations of church and state any closer than they are at present. * * * I thank God we have religious liberty."

The conviction so well expressed by the primate of the Catholic church in America has been deepened, broadened, and strengthened by the passing years. Never have I heard a Catholic question it.

Furthermore, Catholics believe in the equality of all churches before the law. Far from seeking to maneuver their church into a position of special privilege, they would resent any effort to do so. Like that of other Americans, their policy is simply: No discrimination, no favoritism, equal treatment, and equal rights for all. Incidentally, the sole criterion for determining the wisdom of the President's appointment of a personal representative to the Vatican would seem to be the assistance thus rendered in strengthening America's efforts to preserve the peace of the world or any other action which the Government would esteem to be in the Nation's interests.

CATHOLICS AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOL

The second of the assumptions listed above would seem to be based on the idea that all Catholic children are in parochial schools; hence Catholics are intruding into other people's business when they discuss public school matters. The truth is, however, that only a minority of our Catholic children are in parochial schools, and the percentage attending Catholic secondary schools and colleges is even smaller. Catholics have, therefore, an enormous stake in the public school system. We are proud of what it has accomplished and are profoundly interested in its growth and development. And since we pay taxes for the erection and maintenance of public schools we have every possible incentive to be solicitous for their continued improvement.

The third assumption—that the religious school is an alien importation without roots in American tradition—is likewise erroneous. Indeed, the exact opposite is the case. Virtually all the schools in the 13 colonies and in the early States were religious schools supported by public funds. They represented the common form of Government-supported educational establishment until the great waves of immigrants began to sweep in upon the country around 1848. These newcomers brought a great variety of religious faiths, a fact which rendered it increasingly difficult for the schools to teach a religion acceptable to all. Thus was born the public-school system from which all religion is excluded, as we have it today. It was a late arrival on the American scene, a radical departure from the American tradition. It represents an institution never even contemplated by the founding fathers. Nor has it ever seemed to great numbers of people of all faiths to be the ideal solution.

Rather than have their children denied all religious education, Catholics at enormous expense to themselves established schools wherein the truths of the Christian religion could be taught along with other subjects. In these schools devotion to country, the duties of citizenship, and respect and esteem for people of other faiths and races are inculcated from the first grade to the last. They meet the highest standards in the secular branches. Their graduates follow, with success and frequently with distinction, the courses in the public high schools and tax-supported colleges to which the majority subsequently go.

THE FIRST AMENDMENT

Now a word about the first amendment and the separation of church and state. Much recent Protestant literature on the school question speaks of "the great American principle of complete separation of church and state." The first amendment should not, however, be stretched to unrealistic extremes or erected into an iron curtain behind which the Government stands in utter indifference to all religion—an indifference now being tortured by some into practical hostility. To use it in such a manner is to substitute shibboleths, catch phrases, and pure myths for clear thinking.

The first amendment simply declares: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Its purpose, as the record of the debates upon it makes unmistakably plain, was to prevent the new National Government from imposing upon a people of various faiths (chiefly Episcopalians, Congregationalists, and Quakers) any one religion, thus violating the beliefs of the followers of all other religions. The first clause helps to secure the right guaranteed by the second, namely, the "free exercise" of religion.

PUBLIC WELFARE LEGISLATION

Note that the prohibition was laid solely upon Congress. The States remained as free as ever to maintain their established churches, to disestablish them, or to create new one. Thus did the Supreme Court interpret the first amendment as late as 1845 in the Permoli case. It is apparent that that amendment expresses no cold indifference to the religious welfare of the citizens, nor does it prohibit the States from assisting in the religious education of their children.

Now let us consider the meaning and purpose of public welfare legislation enacted by the various States and the right of all children to share in such benefits. We begin by pointing out that the right of parents to educate their offspring in schools of their own selection is a constitutional right affirmed in a unanimous decision by the United States Supreme Court in 1924 in the memorable Oregon case. But what good is a right if its exercise is made unduly onerous? Of what value are the vaunted constitutional rights of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" if they are not translated into economic and social realities?

Citizen Stanislaus Koslowski has the constitutional right to vote; but he can't vote if he can't live; and he can't live if he doesn't eat; and he won't eat if he doesn't have a job. Hence the right to vote logically entails the right to a job provided either by private industry or by the Government. These are the links in the iron chain of economic necessity.

The distinctive merit of the Supreme Court decision in the New Jersey bus case was that it breathed economic reality into the abstract constitutional right of children to attend nonprofit, semipublic schools of their parents' choice. It affirmed the constitutionality of New Jersey statutes authorizing the reimbursement for transportation costs of parents whose children were attending either public schools or other nonprofit schools. Out of $8,034 thus disbursed by New Jersey, but $357 went to the parents of 21 children attending nonprofit schools. Not a penny was paid to any parochial school. Hence the legislation was public benefit legislation, designed to enable children of every faith to reach their schools safely. The direct and immediate benefit, the Court ruled, was to the children and their parents.

HIGHWAYS ARE DANGEROUS TO ALL

Why all the hue and cry about this decision? What is unfair about it? Aren't the public highways with their swift traffic a menace to the life and limb of a little child of the Catholic faith as well as to children of other faiths? Should the Catholic child be crippled and maimed or perhaps killed because she tries to exercise a right—not merely a privilege—guaranteed her by the Constitution?

But such transportation, answer some, indirectly benefits the school she attends. Then why not deprive her of the right to walk on the paved highway, since that also indirectly benefits the school? Why not forbid her the use of the highway entirely and compel her to climb the barbed-wire fences and walk over the farmers' fields, and then arrest her for trespassing? There would be as much logic and justice in this as in depriving her of public transportation and protection from the traffic menace.

The Kentucky court of appeals recently upheld a State statute authorizing the transportation of children to either public or nonprofit schools. Judge E. Poe Harris analyzed the issue with admirable penetration and understanding:

"It cannot be said with any reason or consistency that tax legislation to provide our school children with safe transportation is not tax legislation for a public purpose. Neither can it be said that such legislation, or such taxation, is in aid of a church, or of a private, sectarian, or parochial school, nor that it is other than what it designs and purports to be, legislation for the health and safety of our children. The fact that in a strained and technical sense the school might derive an indirect benefit from the enactment, is not sufficient to defeat the declared purpose and the practical and wholesome effect of the law."

To grant the assistance flowing from public benefit legislation to some children and to deny it to others because of differences of faith or because of different schools attended embodies the element of unfair discrimination which constitutes the core of un-Americanism. It is a dagger aimed at the heart not only of Americanism but of Christianity. In its decision upholding the law providing free textbooks in secular subjects for nonprofit religious schools as well as for public schools (*Chance* v. *Mississippi*), the Mississippi Supreme Court put the case well: "The State is under duty to ignore the child's creed but not its need. * * * The State which allows the pupil to subscribe to any religious creed should not, because of his exercise of this right, proscribe him from benefits common to all."

HEALTH SERVICES FOR ALL CHILDREN

In this connection consider the matter of health services. The State deems it in the public interest to provide certain health services for children in order that they may grow into strong, useful citizens. Hence it arranges for dental and nurse's inspection, chest examination, hot lunches, and so on. By what rhyme or reason should such benefits be offered some children and denied others? Aren't they all the children of taxpayers? Isn't the health of all future citizens of concern to the State?

There is no reason on God's green earth why such health services should be tied up with the school except that of mere convenience in reaching the children. This is as plain as the nose on one's face, and more easily perceived. But many persons have lost sight of it. As George Santayana has pointed out, when there is a redoubling of devotion to the means and the original end has been lost to view, fanaticism results. Santayana's analysis explains much of the current fanaticism encountered when the simple truth is mentioned that the State has an equal concern in the health of all its future citizens.

PROTESTANT TAXES FOR CATHOLIC USE?

The last assumption of the "inarticulate major premise" of those opposing equal treatment for all American children is that Protestant tax funds are being used to teach Catholic children the Catholic religion. This surely is far-fetched and unrealistic. Through operating their own schools Catholics are saving the general public more than $400,000,000 annually. Moreover, the cost of building additional public schools to educate the millions now enrolled in elementary church-related schools alone would amount to the staggering total of $1,101,089,489 (these computations are based on figures compiled by the U. S. Office of Education). Thus it is seen that but the tiniest fraction of the vast sums Catholics pay in taxes ultimately benefits their children in the form of public welfare measures, while hundreds of millions of dollars of Catholic taxes are used to educate children of other faiths.

In all the hue and cry following the Supreme Court's decision in the New Jersey bus case, no cognizance was taken of this tremendous fact. The return of $357 in bus fares to the parents of Catholic pupils was loudly bemoaned, but not a single word was said about the hundreds of millions of dollars being saved the taxpayers that very year by Catholic parents who were concerned to give their children a Christian education. Does this make sense? Is this in accord with the American tradition of justice and fair play? Shall America be outdone in this respect by England, Scotland, and Canada, which allocate a part of the taxes for the benefit of children attending nonprofit church-related schools?

It seems to us Catholics that the overwhelming majority of Americans, regardless of faith, who examine carefully the realities will find their thought accurately expressed in the words with which that eminent Protestant theologian Reinhold Niebuhr sums up the Snpreme Court's decision in the New Jersey bus case:

"Some issues must be decided from the standpoint of the wisdom of the policy rather than legalistically. Since Catholics pay school taxes and tax themselves in addition to maintain their parochial schools, it would hardly seem too great a concession to permit the use of State school busses for their children. At any rate, the argument that this policy imperils democracy is a hysterical one. There is no other democracy in the world that does not go further in the use of State funds for the support of religious instruction."

NEED FOR UNITY OF ACTION

The churchmen who have launched plans for raising huge sums of money to agitate for the denial of all the fruits of public benefit legislation to children attending nonprofit, semipublic schools are rendering a singular service to America in this hour of urgent need for national unity. A recrudescence of the ugly passions crystallized in the Know Nothing movement, the APA, and the Ku Klux Klan may be in the offing. The spirit of Christian unity will be impaired, Christ's law of love will be forgotten, and after all the damage is done we shall have to learn once again to live together in peace and concord. We have no fear but that the American sense of justice and fair play will triumph in the end, and the passions unleashed will boomerang against the agitators who beat the tom-toms in the swamps and jungles of religious strife. The American way, we think, is to appeal to our courts of justice and abide by the verdict.

The whole situation, bristling with suspicion, fear, misunderstanding and rancor, brings out vividly the harm that results from the regrettable aloofness in almost every community of the representatives of the two major faiths. What is desperately needed is for Catholics and Protestants to meet together, not to discuss theological differences but to find ways of working with each other in a spirit of Christian unity for the common welfare. We should invite all of them to visit our church-related schools to see for themselves their high standards, their Americanism, their thoroughly Christian atmosphere. What could not Protestants, Catholics, Jews, and all people of good will accomplish in the struggle for peace, good government, clean politics, decent communities—if only we could banish our fears and suspicions, really know one another and work together for the common good!

Mundt-Nixon Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, with many important problems such as housing, inflation, Federal employees' pay raise, Federal aid to education, and so forth, still to be solved, the Republican

leadership chose to waste three legislative days on the Mundt-Nixon thought-control bill.

I predicted during the debate that this abortive and unconstitutional measure would never pass the other body. That prediction still stands. We are still in America dedicated to the principle of individual punishment for individual guilt because of overt acts. We are not yet ready for the police state methods of punishment for evil thoughts or for "association stigma."

The leading newspapers and magazines of the United States have condemned the Mundt-Nixon bill and the latest condemnation is the editorial of Life magazine, June 14 issue.

The Life editorial follows:

THE MUNDT-NIXON BILL—ONE CANNOT LOVE IT, EVEN FOR SOME OF ITS ENEMIES

When the House of Representatives passed the Mundt-Nixon bill, many people felt it would be killed by silence in the Senate. Then it became the subject of a striking radio debate between Governor Dewey and Mr. Stassen. The latter showed great enthusiasm for it, and Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, began pushing it. Whereupon Commissar William Z. Foster bellowed against it, and hybrid Henry A. Wallace came up with some emulatory protests. As a consequence some Senators began illogically to think of voting for a bill they had formerly opposed. So a dead issue was revived, at least for the moment.

The Mundt-Nixon bill aims primarily to jail whoever seeks by word, print, or association to set up a dictatorship in the interest of a foreign government. It would compel Commie-front groups to register and make the Communist Party and its fronts disclose the names of members. This "pure food labeling" approach to the Commies sounds good on its face.

Yet there are sound arguments against the Mundt-Nixon bill. Today the Communist Party is legal. Men like Governor Dewey, Senator Taft, J. Edgar Hoover, and William C. Bullitt say we should let it stay legal. So do Representatives MUNDT and NIXON. Why not? That part of the Communist Party apparatus which has always been underground has most successfully tricked anti-Communists. To push the entire party underground would only make a bad matter worse. An iceberg is easier to deal with than an underwater object.

Would the Mundt-Nixon bill outlaw the Communist Party? Despite the opinions of the coauthors it seems naive to doubt it. For one thing Communist Commissar Foster has said that it would. His party, so he has announced, would refuse to register under it. And in the last analysis there can be no better authority as to a man's future illegality than himself.

If Foster were eventually to outlaw himself under the proposed Mundt-Nixon legislation, he would win sympathy which would help his underground work. He could go to prison (he is willing) but his followers would disguise themselves (as Communists did when outlawed in Canada) and continue to function.

So much for policy. But there is also principle. As interpreted by the Supreme Court the first amendment to our Constitution means that we cannot punish people for thoughts, associations, or even statements except under circumstances of "clear and present danger." Stalinist rule of the United States is not a clear and present danger today. To abandon our old doctrine would be to confess that liberty is a phony, that the Communist theory of capitalist democracy is right.

Moreover the terms of the bill are a bit loose; it might be used against non-Communists. The bill would permit the Attorney General to determine guilt. But as Senator FERGUSON implies, this would violate the due process of law clause of the fourteenth amendment. The Espionage Act, the Subversive Organizations Registration Act, and the Foreign Agent Registration Act are already on the books, the United States prosecutors can enforce these laws without infringement of due process.

Even from sinners we can learn. This would presumably cover learning from Wallaceites, one of whom made an interesting remark in the Mundt-Nixon debate. Though "Communists wear clothes," said Congressman MARCANTONIO, "I am not going to advocate a nudist colony." While it is doubtful that many Wallaceites would stay dressed if the C. P. began stripping, there is instruction in MARCANTONIO's gag: We should take no position in terms of sheer contrariness to a tricky enemy.

So let us keep our constitutional shirt on. This means rejecting or shelving the Mundt-Nixon bill. Inasmuch as the Communist Party gives signs of preparing to go underground on its own volition, the better to bedevil us, rejection would disappoint them by depriving them of a chance to yell about police-state persecution.

A Threat to Good Labor-Management Relations Demands Action From Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER R. JONES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Seattle Post Intelligencer on Wednesday, June 9, 1948:

THE OVERTIME ISSUE

The gravest threat to good labor-management relations and to the financial stability of productive American industry generally since the mischievous portal-to-portal pay claims has appeared with the equally disruptive overtime-on-overtime wage claims advanced by some sections of organized labor.

The American people have a wry memory of the plague of legal actions against employing industries and of the astronomical back-pay figures involved when the portal issue was raised by the extremists of the labor-union movement.

The aggregate of claims thus presented was never fully computed in billions of dollars, but few of the mass-employment industries of the country could have undertaken payment under legal compulsion with any hope of survival.

The prompt intercession of Congress in this menacing situation, accomplished with legislation outlawing the confiscatory portal claims, was reckoned by the vast majority of workers as a service to their best interests, since it was their employment and thus their means of livelihood which was jeopardized.

Similar congressional intercession seems to be called for in view of the United States Supreme Court's action in upholding overtime-on-overtime claims. It is estimated that if this decision is enforced on a Nation-wide basis it will assess upward of $7,000,000,000 against employing industries and will inevitably wipe many of them out of existence.

The issue presently raised derives from a complicated misinterpretation—or distortion—of "regular" and "overtime" rates involved in the 40-hour week under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and the inadequacy of the existing law in this respect certainly requires clarification.

But the willingness and alacrity of certain elements of union leadership to turn this inadequacy of existing law to their own unreasonable advantage, with callous disregard for the destructive effect upon industry and labor alike, reflect little concern for the real interests of American labor and none at all for the American people as a whole.

All of the organized labor movement in the United States is not by any means supporting these preposterous claims, and in fact some of the most powerful and responsible unions are opposing them.

The International Longshoremen's Association of the American Federation of Labor, for example, is on record against the prosecution of the claims in the Federal courts, for the good and sufficient reason, as President Joe Ryan says: "It would completely disrupt collective bargaining."

There is already a rash of these vindictive back-pay claims in the courts of the country, and unless Congress acts to outlaw them in the same manner it banished the menace of the portal claims, the lengthening shadow of a wholesale and blighting bankruptcy will fall upon every worker's job and home.

There is even now a bill before Congress for this purpose, called the Goodwin bill, but it is languishing in the pigeonhole of a House of Representatives labor subcommittee.

While Congress procrastinates on this necessary and vital remedial legislation, suits embodying the "overtime-on-overtime" claims are pending in Federal courts in Portland, San Francisco, and Los Angeles and are thus hanging over the heads of employing industries in a Damoclean manner.

The shipping industries of the Pacific coast alone are confronted by the prospect of paying out more than $20,000,000 as long as the claims are unresolved, and they are only the first of all the American industries to be so threatened and attacked.

Congress has set its own laudable precedent by the manner in which it put national interest above selfish and opportunistic group interests in the portal claims case, and it had the complete approval of the country in that instance.

Congress has the same opportunity and obligation in the present instance, and it should similarly uphold the national interest without fail and without delay.

How To Make Democracy Live

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. Robert P. Cort, of Greenwich, Conn.:

GREENWICH, CONN.

HOW TO MAKE DEMOCRACY LIVE

When a man's car breaks down, he doesn't stand around and talk or indulge in wishful thinking. He fixes it.

When a man's democracy is not functioning as it should, more talk and wishful thinking will have no more effect that it would

have on his car. He must do something about it. And since democracy is a joint enterprise, he must arouse his fellow citizens to the urgency of the particular repair job that needs to be done.

To keep our democracy in good working repair—a dynamic, satisfying way of life—every citizen must first of all keep informed on all government developments, local, State, national, international. He must carefully weigh this information with no prejudice in mind other than the goal of the greatest good of the greatest number.

Finally, he must go into action. By example and precept, he must strike to overcome that deadly enemy of democracy—the spirit of "let George do it."

There are many ways of going into action. He must take his voting privilege seriously and, if need be, assist others to register and vote. Having voted, he must feel responsibility for keeping his elected administrators and lawmakers informed of his considered opinions. He should contribute, in his own way, to public weal, whether it be through schools, Scouts, philanthropies, forums, and the like; or even running for office to expose an intrenched gang of incompetents.

In short, the way to make democracy work is to work at it.

ROBERT P. CORT.

Dried Skim Milk Should Have Legal, Lawful, Legislative Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it becomes discouraging at times to note the crocodile tears in regard to feeding starving people, and see funds obtained for that purpose wasted on other commodities.

In the first place the Secretary of Agriculture has not followed the law nor the spirit of the Steagall amendment in regard to dried skim milk. Why the Secretary of Agriculture did not follow the law and the spirit of the Steagall amendment is a question yet to be answered by someone sometime. It is just one more of the many examples of the antilivestock attitude that prevails.

The following letter is an example of the true situation in regard to dried skim milk with its 35.6 percent of digestible animal protein:

SHAWANO, WIS., *June 11, 1948.*
Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I know that you need no urging with reference to any bill before Congress affecting the dairy industry of Wisconsin, but I am writing this in the hope that you might appreciate some encouragement with respect to specific proposals which are pending before your body.

The Murray amendment to the ECA appropriation bill (requiring the set-aside of $65,000,000 for skim-milk powder) is, in my opinion, one of the most helpful things that can be done for our entire dairy economy. At the present time, skim-milk powder is the only dairy product in surplus supply, which partially explains the reluctance of the purchasing department of the Department of Agriculture to accord to skim-milk powder a comparable rate of increase to that granted to other dairy products. A review of the so-called OPA prices for the basic dairy products and the prices used by the Government today makes an interesting comparison:

	OPA prices	Current prices
Cheddar cheese	$0.27	$0.43
Butter	.45	.80
Evaporated milk	4.10	6.15
Spray skim powder	.14½	.14½

The result of the Government's purchase program, in attempting to buy skim milk powder at OPA levels has been depressing, and has made it impossible for our Wisconsin creameries (who are dependent upon butter and skim-milk powder as their principal outlets for manufactured products) to meet the competition of the cheese plants and the evaporated-milk plants.

Under pressure of war demands, with 75 percent of the spray skim-milk powder requisitioned by the Government during the war—which was the highest set aside of any one of the basic dairy products—the industry expanded its production to maintain double its prewar sales; and, at the same time, because of the demand for this healthful product, was forced to curtail its domestic sales by approximately 50 percent of the prewar level.

Many buyers of skim-milk powder have not as yet been brought back into the fold as regular customers, and it will undoubtedly take at least another year for this very important branch of the dairy industry to reach a level of postwar equilibrium.

I know of no specific proposal that has been made which will be as helpful to the large number of splendid Wisconsin cooperative dairy plants as will the provisions of the Murray amendment, which will insure to them a decent price for this product, which is recognized as the most nutritious pound for pound of any of the dairy products. It has the added advantages of being easily used by almost any nationality, since it can comprise 10 percent of the total weight of bread; and it can be used very efficiently and effectively in relief feeding by mixing it with grain or meal and then when cooked with hot water provides a completely balanced diet.

I thank you on behalf of the many organizations which I have been permitted to represent for the splendid fight which you have been leading on the oleomargarine question.

With kindest personal regards,
Sincerely yours,
MATTHEW M. WALLRICH.

Of course, if the Secretary of Agriculture can continue to "bush" the producers of dried skim milk, just so long will these producers be "gypped."

An Answer to President Truman's Veto Message on the Bulwinkle Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, by his message vetoing the Bulwinkle rate conference bill, President Truman shows that he had not made himself familiar with the actual provisions of the bill which he vetoed. The reasons for veto given in the message are so little applicable, in fact, that it might well be said that the President has vetoed something which neither this House nor the Senate passed.

The bill which Congress passed differs in at least three fundamental particulars from the conception of it expressed in the President's message.

The bill which passed Congress puts rate conferences under the control of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The President's misconception is that through these conferences the carriers could agree privately among themselves upon rates, and that groups of carriers could exercise a powerful influence upon what an individual carrier might do about filing proposed rates.

This is a completely mistaken understanding of what the bill says and what its effect would be. The bill expressly provides that the Interstate Commerce Commission shall not approve or authorize any rate conference procedure which interferes with the right of independent decision and action by any individual carrier with respect to its own rates. Words could not be drawn which would impose a clearer prohibition upon rate-fixing agreements or interferences by carriers as a group with the freedom of action of the individual carrier.

The second misconception evidenced in the President's message is his statement that the bill would compel the Interstate Commerce Commission to act upon basic procedural agreements submitted to it without being able to foresee fully the nature and effect of the joint action which might be taken thereunder, and that these subsequent actions could be taken without the necessity of further Commission approval. In both parts of this statement, the President is in error.

In the first place, the Interstate Commerce Commission will have full and continuing control over the only sort of action which the conferences could possibly take—that is, action as to rates. It will continue to be true that no rate can become effective until it is filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission, and that the Commission has full control over all rates so filed. It can approve, modify, or reject any rate filed by any carrier or group of carriers. It can do so either on its own motion or on complaint by any shipper. And in that respect, the bill which Congress passed will leave the law as it is now, absolutely unchanged.

There is no possibility that conferences whose procedural arrangements have once been approved might go ahead and do as they please without further Interstate Commerce Commission approval. The bill not only does not weaken the present controls and powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission, but expressly adds to them the power of a continuing control and supervision of the conference procedures, as well as their results.

The bill also provides that the Interstate Commerce Commission, upon its own motion, or upon complaint of any

person—and this includes the Attorney General of the United States—may modify or terminate the agreement or may attach to it additional terms or conditions. More complete safeguards as to both the procedures of conferences, and the results arrived at, cannot be imagined, and no specific additional safeguards are suggested in the President's message vetoing the bill.

The President also seems to believe that the bill would authorize the creation of associations which would bring railroads, trucks, busses, water carriers, pipe lines, and the freight forwarders all under some sort of broad and common power. The bill expressly guards against this by providing that the Commission shall not approve any agreement among carriers of these different classes except agreements relating to transportation under joint rates or over through routes to be performed by carriers of more than one of these classes. Naturally, joint rates or through routes over the lines of two or more carriers of these different types would require some sort of agreement and that is the only sort of agreement between or among carriers of different types which this bill would authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to approve.

The President complains that the standard which the bill provides shall guide the Interstate Commerce Commission in its approval or disapproval of conference procedures is the national transportation policy declared and enacted by Congress as late as 1940 as an amendment to the Interstate Commerce Act. In his conception of this feature of the bill, the President is correct. The standard provided is the national transportation policy—and what standard could possibly be more appropriate? This national transportation policy is not a vague and general standard. It is neither inadequate nor inappropriate. It is broad and comprehensive in its coverage, and specific in its safeguards of the public interest.

It is for Congress to declare the purposes and policies which it wishes applied to the regulation of the agencies of interstate commerce, and this Congress has done. Why should the President now insist that some other and different standard than that prescribed by Congress be set up to deal with this particular aspect of the transportation problem?

Toward the end of his message, the President seems to imply that it is not for Congress to declare the national transportation policy, but that this should be done by the courts. Such a view represents a total misconception of the function of the courts in the regulation of commerce. All that the courts can do in that field is to administer and apply the policy laid down by Congress in the statutes. The courts do not make these policies. They look to the Congress to declare them. By the same token, it is no interference with the function of the courts for Congress to clarify by additional legislation a policy which it has previously laid down for the courts to follow. And that is what Congress has done in passing S. 110.

No legislation which has been before us in all my long experience in this House has had more careful consideration than this bill. Its meaning and effect are understood here. It has received the virtually unanimous support not only of the public authorities who have responsibility for the successful working of transportation regulation, but also of the shippers who pay the bills—the farm organizations, the commercial and industrial bodies, of every section of this country. The same reasons which have caused these experienced and practical men to give this bill their virtually unanimous support have impelled the Members of this House to support it overwhelmingly. The same reasons will justify this House in sustaining its previous action by voting to make this bill law over the Presidential veto.

California Is Making a Determined Effort To Solve Its Own Welfare Problems Through the Aged and Blind Aid Constitutional Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the implications of the amendments to the Federal Social Security Act, which were recently passed by Congress. These amendments, which will allow a possible 3,500,000 additional persons to qualify for benefits under the social security program, were rightly approved as better than no legislation at all. However, in my opinion, they constitute at the very best only a short step toward the goal of really broadening and expanding our social-security laws in such a way as to provide maximum benefits for all our people.

President Truman made certain specific proposals which would have benefited great masses of people—young and old alike. Among the most important of his suggestions was the proposal that old age and blind assistance payments be increased to $37.50 per month per recipient. Also included was the recommendation that the eligibility age for old age assistance for women be lowered from 65 to 60 years, and that the Federal Government participate in direct relief in the various States by making Federal moneys available for that purpose.

The Republican majority in both Houses of Congress saw fit to bypass the Presidential message on social security, and to substitute their own much watered-down version. There are, nevertheless, several provisions in this substitute measure which will have beneficial effects. The most important of these is the amendment introduced by our Democratic colleague, Senator MACFARLAND, of Arizona, which provides that Federal funds be made available to give the needy aged and blind a $5 monthly increase, and to give dependent children a $3 monthly increase. States such as my own, which have enacted the necessary enabling legislation, can take advantage of this Federal increase, and so pass it along directly to their own needy aged and blind pensioners.

This $5 increase will be most gratefully received by aged and blind persons all over our country, who are struggling to make ends meet in this period of inflationary costs and prices.

However, piecemeal changes and improvements, dictated by necessity and expediency, simply will not suffice. What we must have—and have soon—is a real, scientific broadening of our Federal Social Security Act to make it truly national in scope, and to ensure that it will supply genuine security to all employed persons—whether they are self-employed or whether they work for others.

From recent manifestations all over the country, the most obvious implication that I can draw is that the voters everywhere are becoming increasingly impatient for the Congress to take basic action on the subject of social security. No such action has been taken for 12 long years—since the act was originally passed—despite periodic protestations that important action was just around the corner.

I must say that, for my own part, I believe that this impatience on the part of our constituents is justified. In my own State of California, a group known as the Citizens' Committee for Old Age Pensions, has determined to take action where we have not acted, and to attempt to improve conditions for themselves on a State-wide basis. To this end, they have qualified an initiative amendment to the California State constitution for the November 2, 1948 election. This measure, which is officially known as the aged and blind aid constitutional amendment, would increase old age assistance from $60 to $75 per month and blind pensions from $75 to $85 per month.

This initiative is sponsored by Mr. George H. McLain, who is chairman of the Citizens' Committee for Old Age Pensions. More than 7 years ago, Mr. McLain founded the Citizens' Committee for the purpose of providing more adequate protection and security for the needy aged and blind; and he has since worked ceaselessly to improve conditions for the aged and blind through sponsoring new legislation and through being constantly vigilant to see that existing legislation is being administered in a humane and equitable manner. Mr. McLain himself feels that the Federal Social Security Act should be basically amended and expanded, since he believes that it is clearly the duty of Congress to establish a nation-wide old age pension system. However, he also is most strongly convinced that something must be done to sustain and protect the needy aged and blind immediately.

Besides increasing pension payments to the aged and blind of California, the aged-and-blind-aid amendment provides that the eligibility age for aged

assistance will be lowered from 65 to 63 years in cases where the applicant has been a resident of the State for 10 out of the past 15 years. It also provides that the office of State welfare director will become an elective position, so that this important post will cease to be manipulated as a political appointment. Further, the measure proposes to eliminate the misnamed responsible-relatives clause from the present State welfare laws; and this action, of course, is in complete agreement with the recent recommendations of the Federal Social Security Administration. Other important provisions include increased personal-property allowances for pensioners, and a savings to county taxpayers of approximately $15,000,000 annually through returning the administration of the pension program to the State, and eliminating county property taxes now required for pension payments and administration. Finally, every precaution has been taken to see that the measure is in complete conformity with all the requirements of our Federal social-security laws.

Such, very briefly, is the aged-and-blind-aid constitutional amendment, which, most California political observers believe, will be approved in November. I, myself, am convinced that it is a good measure—practical, workable, and necessary—and I earnestly hope that the voters of California will see fit to make it a part of our State constitution.

In many other States, I understand, proposals also are being made, or will be made, to alter security legislation and to increase pension payments. Some of these measures may not be as practical as the aged and blind aid constitutional amendment, but they all represent efforts to do something about a problem that we, on the national level, have failed to act upon decisively.

The liberal, progressive Members of Congress must, in my opinion, renew their efforts to see that President Truman's social-security program is enacted into law at the earliest possible date. They should determine as well that a Nation-wide old age and blind pension system, equitable and adequate in nature, should be made the law of the land. If we are thwarted in this effort by a majority dedicated to false economy and outworn individualism, we can have no alternative but to support sound, progressive measures on a State basis, until more basic action can be taken.

For my part, I propose to do just that. I am pledged to work for a complete Federal social-welfare program, but meanwhile, in my own State of California, I am supporting the aged and blind aid constitutional amendment. It is a sound measure, and it will go a long way toward guaranteeing the needy aged and blind freedom from want and freedom from the fear that is born in insecurity and despair. It will provide them with the minimum necessities of life and enable them to live with the dignity and security to which, as good citizens, they are entitled.

The Rail Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appears in today's issue of the Wall Street Journal:

THE RAIL BILL VETO

President Truman's veto message on the Bulwinkle bill disregards half a century of railroad legislation in the United States. The moral of that history is that in respect to the vital public services the people have declared for regulation by public authority, in preference to unrestricted competition. They got a bellyful of cutthroat rate making more than a generation ago and stopped it.

Mr. Truman imagines that the bill, as law, would radically alter rate-making practices now in use. It would not. It would only give express statutory sanction to the joint preparation of rate tariffs by the carriers concerned when such tariffs were approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission as reasonable, non-discriminatory and "in furtherance of the national transportation policy" as declared by Congress.

That has been the actual state of affairs since 1910. In that year Congress gave the Interstate Commerce Commission practically unlimited control over railroad rates and fares. No charge for service, or change therein, can become effective until the Commission has approved it.

Nor does this measure the full extent of the Commission's power over rates. A change in a lawful rate need not await carrier initiative. The Commission can and frequently does open a rate inquiry on complaint of shippers or "on its own motion." When the President says that if the Bulwinkle bill were enacted, "carriers could agree privately among themselves upon the rates to be filed with or withheld from the Interstate Commerce Commission" he argues as though the Interstate Commerce Act did not exist.

There would have been no occasion for such a measure as that the President has vetoed were it not for charges of violation of the antitrust laws which the Department of Justice has filed in the Federal courts against groups of railroads within the past 2 years. Under public regulation rate making has become an immeasurably more complicated and finely adjusted process than it was under the cut-and-slash methods of the last century. For that reason rate adjustment without the tariff bureaus at which Government prosecution is now aimed would be slow, crude, and obstructive of the free flow of commerce.

Competition in the making of railroad rates is not absent now, nor would it be under the Bulwinkle bill, contrary to the belief of Mr. Truman—or whoever wrote the veto message for him. A railroad freight solicitor goes to a manufacturer and says, "I think that if you will give us a few cars a week of your shipments we can get you a lower rate." So the requested shipments are given experimentally and the railroad concerned files a lower rate with the Commission. That body sanctions the new rate if it finds it will cover out-of-pocket costs of the service, contribute substantially to the carrier's overhead costs, and effect no "undue" discrimination as between producers or markets. An approved rate, of course, becomes available to all shippers of like merchandise.

Public regulation is a substitute for unrestricted competition where experience has shown that the latter is too expensive for all concerned to be tolerated. The railroads can serve under either condition, but not under both.

A Mother Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER H. GROSS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "A Mother Speaks":

A MOTHER SPEAKS

May 9, 1948, was the day set aside for tribute and remembrance for mothers living and dead; the living mothers being queen for 1 day only as far as some members of our Government and some citizens were concerned. What will the Mother's Day of 1949 hold for them? Will they be free American mothers or in a class similar to the Negro mother of pre-Civil War days? This may seem a bit radical but if UMT, Selective Service or draft laws are passed, that is where the Christian American mothers will be placed. When her son reaches the age of 18, she no longer will have the right to help guide him along life's way at the age when Christian home life means so much to a young man, yet in the eyes of the law responsible for him until he is 21 years of age.

Mothers have suffered criticism unjustly from such writers as Philip Wylie in "Generation of Vipers," and Edward A. Strecker, M. D., in his article "Mom's Blame for Emotional Instability of Children." What type of mother did each of these men have or were these men "problem children," the type that mother just couldn't discipline? Thank God for the thousands of writers that give Mother her credit for home training to make her sons useful, law-abiding citizens and a credit to their country. From the time a mother first holds her little bundle of love and innocence, her hands never stop tasks of work or love. They are comforting hands that make childhood grief disappear, guiding hands in the outside world, the little hands folded in prayer are held in her hands with Mother praying too. Are these Christian mothers to be called "vipers"? No real Mother wants her son "tied to her apron strings" but certainly does not want him to be trained to hate and kill.

Make a check of those favoring military training and find how many have sons. The women especially, such as the three pictured with the 33-foot petition urging UMT and the women of the American Legion Auxiliary, are among them. Then the mother who had three sons in World War II who writes what fine health her boys have since being in the service. She is a lobbyist and probably active in other work outside her home most of her time. Is she home long enough to know about her family?

I come from Representative GROSS' district and we mothers have guided our sons from infancy to young manhood and then stand by as a pillar to our home for them to look up to and honor for our personal interest in their future. We do not turn our children over to baby sitters, maids, or boarding

schools. We are anxious for their good health, happiness, and religious training. We are the type who have a cookie jar filled with cakes baked by us, not bought at the corner store.

During the war my husband and I visited our son at his training camp. We were alert and observing in every way as to the training of all boys, and found that what we need most is a good overhauling of our "brass." We found a few fine officers, but the majority not fit to be even in the presence of Christian young men. One officer was very efficient, yet so considerate, that even the roughest man admired him. He was soon transferred because he was too popular with his men. There is no such need of compulsory training if men in uniform are placed on a level with civilians, namely, salary equal to civilians, good food, and treatment as if they were protectors, not slaves, of our Nation.

I should like to make just three illustrations from what I found at camp which ought to show why UMT would have to be compulsory, although I could give hundreds. One young man told this: "My pay for 1 month is what I received in 1 week in civilian life; my wife and baby are here to spend Christmas with me, and I am confined to area because one man in our company didn't pass gun inspection." The second was 19 years old, and this was his mother's story to me: "Jimmy was always a sickly boy, his brother being in fine physical condition. The brother was rejected by his draft-board doctor and he pleaded to be taken and let Jimmy stay home. Jimmy weighed only 115 pounds when inducted, and after 2 weeks' training 105 pounds. When the stage of training came to shoulder full field pack, he staggered under the load and was cursed and shoved around until he fell down and couldn't get on his feet again. He talked that evening with his mother by telephone 2,000 miles away, and she sensed something wrong by his tone of voice, so she and her husband left immediately for his camp. Whatever happened to Jimmy, I don't know, but the day we left camp B———, Jimmy had blacked out in marching and was placed in the hospital in a critical condition." The third: A healthy, robust young man, who was a football player on his high-school team, blacked out in marching and his officer got the idea that he was tired, so ordered him "Up and march" as soon as he regained consciousness. He tried, but couldn't with full field pack, so was kicked in the head by this officer and lay unconscious for 20 minutes.

Then there are the members of the selective service boards who should be investigated, particularly the doctors. One young man examined was diabetic from 7 years of age. The doctor passed him in perfect physical condition, then he handed over his records from his family physician and hospital where he was receiving insulin. He went through the examining routine again, with "rejection" on each paper. What was done with his first papers? In the waste basket? Another man was cursed by the doctor because he couldn't pass the eye test. He told the doctor he couldn't see to give him the correct answers and that he should know by eye examination that he was truthful. The doctor replied, "H——, I am here to put you in uniform and don't know a d—— thing about eyes." So the man handed over his credentials from the Wills Eye Hospital.

Can we expect voluntary enlistments when our young men know these things? Only when our young men are treated like human beings, civilians, and not slaves, can this be attained. Then the mother can have her rightful place in the world every day and not be condemned, but be able to hold her head up with faith in her country, not feeling she is placed in the position of mothers of foreign lands where their sons have no other outlook on life but a military one.

Have those urging UMT ever given a thought to why and how we won this war? All praise was given to the wonderful strategy of our generals. Here is food for thought: The Christian mothers prayed that power and understanding be given those generals, and God answered their prayers. Let us win the peace now by sending ministers of the Gospel—Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish—to a peace conference, and instead of a toast with drinks, a prayer from each according to his faith for understanding and cooperation with all nations. Let us not forget the chaplains of the different faiths who perished in the sea. Remember the words of our Lord, "Where two or more are gathered together in my name, there will I be also." If we are a Christian Nation and have the faith, "In God we trust," let us look to God in prayer for a lasting peace.

A Positive Program for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the text of a sermon by the Reverend John Curry Walker, D. D., pastor of the Second Congregational Church, Waterbury, Conn., delivered on Memorial Day, Sunday, May 30, 1948.

In his sermon, Dr. Walker has made a keen analysis of the ills besetting this sphere, and draws upon his profound knowledge in submitting a positive program for peace.

A POSITIVE PROGRAM FOR PEACE

(A sermon by the Reverend John Curry Walker, D. D., Second Congregational Church, Waterbury, Conn., Memorial Day, Sunday, May 30, 1948)

"And the works of righteousness shall be peace; and the effect of righteousness quietness and assurance forever."—Isaiah 32: 17.

The Scripture lesson will be found in Isaiah 35: 1–10.

On Memorial Sunday with these memorial flowers for the fallen in the pulpit, with the memory of the dedication of our memorial window fresh in our memory, there is one subject uppermost in our minds. To put it in few words and in simple terms, we are concerned with the cost and the cure of war. "Crisis" is perhaps the most overworked word in the English language but every intelligent person realizes by this time that the atom bomb is a time bomb. We are approaching a crisis in the life of our civilization, in the history of man on this earth, the like of which has never been known before. The present crisis is not artificial, it is not synthetic, it is not a creature of the imagination. It is a ghastly reality. A third world war would be total war and the indications are that with the help of such lethal weapons as atomic bombs, disease germs, death rays, robot planes, guided missiles and the like, it would be a final war as far as modern western civilization is concerned. Rear Adm. Ellis M. Zacharias is quoted in the United Nations World, "There are today in the arsenals of the great powers weapons—chemical, biological, and climatological—more devastating than the atom bomb, capable of exterminating the last vestige of human, animal, and vegetable life from the earth. They are being manufactured at this moment." And remember that Waterbury is an industrial city and would be one of the primary targets in the next war. Nothing happened to Waterbury in the last war but how much insurance do you think you could get for Waterbury in the next world war?

In this present international crisis I am grateful for the leadership of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. The executive committee of the Federal Council has printed a pamphlet prepared by its Department of International Justice and Goodwill, John Foster Dulles, chairman. The Federal Council has urged the various State councils to place a copy in the hands of every minister in America. Every minister is asked to preach a sermon on the subject of the pamphlet, "A Positive Program for Peace."

In turn I wish that I could place a copy of the pamphlet in the hands of every member of this congregation. The avowed purpose of the writers of the pamphlet is to avert war without yielding sound democratic principles, to check the forces that have brought us to the very edge of the abyss. The leaders of the Federal Council can be trusted. The leaders of our Protestant churches can be expected to take a disinterested and objective attitude toward Russia and Russian communism. We have no axe to grind, no wealth, no political privilege or power in Europe to protect. John Foster Dulles is a realist. He knows the Russians about as well as anyone outside Russia can know them. He says that the Russian leaders have deliberately pursued a policy "not war, not peace." He says that the men in the Kremlin conjure up enemies so that they can justify the retention of power. He protests that the Soviet outcry about war is designed not merely to help Soviet dictators keep their power but to help them extend their power. If Mr. Dulles and his friends have some positive program to promote peace in contrast to a holy war, a crusade of hate against communism, we can afford to give them a hearing.

Let me comment on some of the most significant statements in the pamphlet. The first is very much to the point, "Our people should not tolerate any complacency about war. War would engulf all in misery." Some are foolish enough to suggest that a preventive war against Russia would solve our problem. But if two atomic bombs of primitive and experimental design killed over 100,000 people, if the first counter move expected of Russia in a new war would be the occupation or destruction within a few short weeks of every great city in western Europe, if communism thrives on chaos and destruction, where would a new war lead us, even supposing we could repel all atomic attack on our own country? And who will give us the guaranty against atomic weapons? Not the military men certainly. Gen. H. H. Arnold can be quoted, "If we fought Russia, the best we could hope to achieve is a moral victory, and that would be small comfort to the remnants of our people, crawling amid the burnt-out foundations and charred chimneys of a ruined Nation. We must not, we cannot talk about waging war with Russia. Even if we wiped out Russia, we would be wiped out in the process. War itself is defeat. We must talk about waging peace."

And please do not think that our friends on the Federal Council Commission were drawing their bow at a venture when they used the word "complacency." A New York newspaper reporting the last American Legion Convention in New York noted that repeated appeals for preparedness for war brought lusty cheers and applause while one cautious suggestion, that perhaps it would

be a shame to embark upon another world war without first exhausting every possibility of creating peace, was greeted with icy silence. What a burden of responsibility this places on those who have the intelligence to understand some measure of the awful gravity of the present crisis.

The second strong statement in the pamphlet reads, "Our people should combat a mood of hysteria or blind hatred." We must exert self-control and we must do everything possible to persuade others to exert self-control. We must do our best to counteract propaganda, whether for attack on Russia or for surrender to Russia. There are people, some of them I regret to say in religious orders, who preach hatred of communism with such self-righteousness and such passion that they generate hatred of the Russian people as well as of the Russian system. There is a distinction here and as Christian people we ought to make it very clear. We despise the cruelties and brutalities of the police state but we believe that the great mass of the Russian people are friendlily disposed toward us and other peoples of the world if and when they are not the victims of their own government propaganda.

The third statement reads, "Our people should reject fatalism about war. War is not inevitable." The sad part of believing war inevitable is that it tends to make it so. We are well reminded that there is no irresistible tide that is carrying men to destruction. The evil forces in our world today are man-made and can be man-changed. History has some encouragement for us here. Through the latter part of the nineteenth century and into the twentieth a great many men thought that war between Russia and Great Britain was inevitable. They said it was inevitable but it never came. Twenty-five years ago there were in the main two schools of thought with regard to Russia. One group said that the collapse of Russia was inevitable and most of these people were willing to give you a timetable. Some said within the year, some said 5 years. But the inevitable collapse never came. Others predicted an inevitable war between Russian communism and the western world. That war never came. It was fascism, it was the forces of reaction in Italy, Spain, and Germany, that broke the uneasy peace of Europe in the late thirties. Neither the collapse of Russian communism nor war with Russia is inevitable. It is highly dangerous to accept the doctrine of inevitability on the one side or the other.

In the fourth place it is stated, "Our people should not rely on military strategy to meet Communist aggression. Such reliance is more apt to bring war than to prevent it. There should be greater concentration on positive programs of an economic, social, political, and moral character." When so many seem to be thinking only in terms of unlimited expenditures for military preparedness and atomic war on the global scale, Mr. Dulles has been pleading for a new department in Washington, a department of nonmilitary defense. Why not meet the Communists on their own level and in the places where they are winning great victories? If we are spending billions for armaments why not a few extra millions on counter propaganda? Why not take pains to inform the peoples of the world of the intrigues, the brutalities, the tyrannies that go with communism? Why not extol the virtues of democracy—and I would suggest that our case would be much more convincing if we told the peoples of the world quite frankly that we have not yet achieved ideal democracy in America. We can take some of the wind out of Communist sails if we confess that we do have racial discrimination, Jim Crow laws, second-class citizenship, political corruption, considerable economic injustice in America. But we don't have to employ secret police to drag millions of people off to concentration camps. We don't have to seal off our borders with barbed wire and tommy guns to prevent Americans from escaping to Canada and Mexico. We don't throw people into prison, we don't shoot them for speaking a few friendly words to a foreigner. Our standards of living and of freedom will stand comparison.

Two months ago Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., No. 2 man on the powerful Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, spoke words of blunt and sober realism at a world trade conference in New Orleans. He pointed out that we were losing out in the battle to win men's minds in Europe. We spent nearly $2,000,000,000 in Italy and we won a close victory in the recent election, but the membership in the Communist Party has gone from less than 100,000 to 2,500,000 since the war. What is more, Senator LODGE pointed out that the chronic ills of Europe, overpopulation, maldistribution of goods and wealth, the failure of educated classes to provide leadership, the selfishness of the wealthy are the facts which create Communists. We are fighting for men's minds and we must appeal to the aspirations of men's souls. You can't stop communism and you can't win souls with jet planes and atomic bombs. It isn't part of the nature of things.

We must convince those who are in doubt that we have better ideas and better ideals than the Communists. The European recovery plan is a positive answer to communism in the realm of economics and international trade. Here at home we must prove that our system, our economy, pays higher dividends, not simply to stockholders but to workers. We must convince the world that the people who believe in democracy are interested in something more than the maintenance of the status quo. We want better things, finer working conditions, more security, more political rights and privileges for men everywhere, for Negroes and Mexican Americans in the United States, for landless peasants in Greece and Italy and Spain, for industrial workers all over the world. We want the United Nations to be more than a proving ground for power politics, more than a debating society to further American trade overseas. We want the United Nations to promote disarmament and the peaceful settlements of disputes wherever they may arise. We want the United Nations to press for the exchange of religious, scientific, educational ideas of all sorts. We want to help change the atmosphere of fear, hate, distrust. The dinosaurs died, not because they were killed by their enemies, but because the climate of the world changed. We want to help change the moral and spiritual climate of the world so that the forces of destruction will take precedence over the forces that make for disintegration and destruction, so that fear and hate between the great powers will die a natural death.

The final statement in the Federal Council list says, "Our churches ought to testify with renewed vigor to God's righteous love for all men and the reality of the Christian world fellowship." Others may talk of war as inevitable, others may say that human nature never changes, others may eat, drink, and be merry without any serious thought for the future of the rising generation but it ill becomes Christians to sit idly by while foolish and evil men prepare the world for an atomic bonfire. We are called to be steadfast in prayer that we may learn the things that belong to the peace of the world. In the sight of God all nations, not excepting our own, have left undone the things we ought to have done, we have done the things we ought not to have done. We must proclaim a God of judgment, a God of justice, a God of mercy.

We must hasten to build a world church. The formation of the World Council of Churches in Amsterdam this summer will be one great step in advance. We are not likely to have any effective world government of any sort unless we have a growing spirit of world unity and how can we expect the world to unite, or the nations to unite, unless the churches set a far better example in the future than they have in the past! If we want democracy and cooperation in world affairs we must demonstrate democracy and cooperation on an increasing scale in church affairs.

I saw a headline the other day in what I supposed was a secular magazine. "The greatest fraternity on earth is the brotherhood of the Christian Church." The story which followed was a reprint of a broadcast over a national radio chain. It seems that an executive secretary of the Foreign Mission Board of the Presbyterian Church was traveling on a train in Korea. At a way station a Korean gentleman got on and took a seat opposite. Suddenly this Korean spoke to the missionary. His manner was gracious and it was plain that his intent was as friendly as could be but to the American what the man said sounded like a code message from Mars. All he could do was to reply in the one sentence in Korean he knew, one learned for just such an occasion, "I do not understand Korean." But the man was not dismayed. He poured forth more Korean. The third or fourth time the missionary suddenly caught a word, Yesu. That must be the word for Jesus! The missionary pointed to himself and repeated the magic word. The Korean corresponded in kind. Immediately they were friends, brothers akin, blood brothers in Christ.

Presently the man drew out a Bible. He pointed to a verse. Now the Korean's Bible was printed back to front and read right to left, but the names of the books could be deciphered and you could trace down the chapters and the verses. What was the Korean trying to say? He had pointed to the fourteenth verse of the third chapter of the First Epistle of John, "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren." Not to be outdone the American missionary took the Korean Bible and searched out the first verse of Psalm 133, "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." And so the missionary added, "The greatest fraternity on earth is the brotherhood of the Christian Church. In this the church offers the brightest hope for the reuniting of a broken divided world."

Revision of the Italian Peace Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT NODAR, JR.
OF NEW YORK.
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. NODAR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS,
NEW YORK STATE COUNCIL,
New York, N. Y., June 14, 1948.

Hon. ROBERT NODAR,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. NODAR: I am pleased to forward to you copies of resolutions adopted by New York State Council, Knights of Columbus, at its recent meeting held in Rochester, N. Y. They are as follows:

"*Resolved*, That New York State Council, Knights of Columbus, in annual meeting assembled, urges a revision of the Italian peace treaty to enable the Italian nation to reestablish itself and to permit it to offer a defense against the empty promises of atheistic communism and that the provision

allowing the Soviet Union to take $100,000,000 in part by furnishing raw materials to Italy and taking back the finished product at a price to be determined by the Soviet Union, be stricken from the treaty, and that Trieste be returned to the Italian people, and finally that the 500,000 Italian war prisoners who are presently serving in slave-labor battalions in Russia be returned to their homes forthwith.

"*Resolved*, That New York State Council, Knights of Columbus, in annual meeting assembled, endorses the passage of the bill of Representative ROBERT NODAR which will permit the admittance of 34,275 Italian immigrants whose quotas were suspended during the Mussolini regime."

Yours sincerely,

FRED F. HARRISON,
State Secretary.

President Truman's Visit to Butte

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD several newspaper articles covering President Truman's visit to Butte on June 8. The President and his family made an excellent impression on the people of Montana and his down-to-earth personality and remarks were deeply appreciated.

President Truman also recognized the outstanding qualities of the Butte High School Band—the greatest in the Nation—when he repeatedly requested additional numbers. This band is the pride of Butte and Montana and as one of the newspapermen traveling with the presidential party said, "Give us that Butte high school band and we will make the Nation sit up and take notice. They are a great bunch of kids and musicians." Truer words were never spoken.

Mr. Speaker, the following newspaper articles are from the Montana Standard of Butte, Mont., under date of June 9, 1948:

TRUMAN LASHES OUT AT CONGRESS—THOUSANDS GREET PRESIDENT HERE—OFFICIAL WELCOME IS ACCORDED AT TRAIN STATION—SPECIAL IS DELAYED FOR NEARLY AN HOUR ON TRIP FROM IDAHO; CROWDS JAM ROUTE OF PARADE TO SEE EXECUTIVE

President Harry S. Truman arrived in Butte Tuesday night and his westward swing, beset by grumblings in Nebraska and rumblings elsewhere, landed in the lap of mining city friendship. A tremendous outpouring of people, hopeful of a close-up glimpse of the President, Mrs. Truman, and their daughter Margaret, jammed the streets to salute the man, who beyond much doubt, will be the Democratic standard bearer when the party's national convention lines up the slate in Philadelphia next month.

Mr. Truman, looking sunburned and extremely fit, flashed the familiar Presidential grin to the crowd which gathered at the UP-NP railway depot and along the parade route to Narranche Memorial Stadium.

It was the first visit of a President to Butte since President Warren G. Harding came here in June 1923.

The train was 40 minutes behind schedule at arrival, but the program was run off smoothly. Mr. Truman, flanked by his wife and daughter, stood on the rear platform and shook hands with more than a hundred State and local Democratic leaders and other well-wishers. The reception done, the President and Mayor Barry O'Leary were escorted to a sleek tan-hued convertible auto, driven by two secret-service agents.

The parade, with Assistant Police Chief Jack Duggan as marshal swept out of the station and up Utah Avenue. As the President's car passed, followed by that carrying Mrs. Truman and Miss Truman, the sidewalk crowds broke into spontaneous applause. The people, many of whom came from Anaconda, Deer Lodge, Helena, and other nearby communities, stood elbow-to-elbow.

It was the largest throng President Truman had attracted on the western trip, aides said.

The parade proceeded up Utah to Broadway, turned west and then south on Washington and east again on Park. People who had only glimpsed the President's party from one vanatage point sprinted a block or two in order to catch up with the procession again.

Mr. Truman throughout the parade waved jauntily to the sidewalk crowds. He appeared to be in fine fettle.

The parade took him from Park street south on Wyoming to the Butte high school, where Mr. Truman delivered a brief address. He spoke extemporaneously.

Newspaper and radio correspondents aboard the train were on the station platform as soon as the President's car was spotted into position.

Lt. Gov. Ernest T. Eaton, acting chief executive of the Treasure State in the absence of Gov. Sam C. Ford, who is in Washington on official business, was the first to greet President Truman after the train pulled into the siding.

Hugh Adair, chief justice of the Montana Supreme Court, R. H. Glover, and Paul Cannon, cochairmen with Mayor Barry O'Leary on the executive reception committee and their ladies then shook hands with President Truman after which they entered the President's private car where they were greeted in turn by Mrs. Truman and Miss Margaret Truman.

Lester Loble, chairman of the State Democratic central committee was among the first to shake hands with Mr. Truman as was W. D. Murray, Mrs. W. W. Hamilton, national committeewoman from Montana for the Democratic Party and Mae Narvaez, member of the Silver Bow county central committee.

As each Montanan shook hands with President Truman, the Chief Executive flashed a broad smile and responded with "Very happy to meet you, indeed." Because of the long line of persons on the executive committee and also because the train was late in pulling into the station the line moved rapidly.

The President then left his train and entered a special automobile that was to take him to the parade through the business district and the stadium where he addressed the assembly. As he relaxed in his seat, President Truman turned in time to see a security agent shooing a couple of young Butte boys from the depot platform.

"Let them come over," President Truman instructed the guard and as the boys reached the side of his car, Mr. Truman threw one arm about each of the boys in turn and shook their hands with the other. Then the President and the boys posed while news and movie photographers made pictures of the event.

The boys were Dennis Ferriter, son of Mr. and Mrs. Martin "Buzz" Ferriter, of 1133 Sampson, and his cousin Don Ferriter, son of Mr. and Mrs. John Ferriter, 1312 Madison. Both are students at St. Ann school.

The boys said the President asked them how they were and "what kind of city do you have?"

The mining-city lads answered readily, "We are fine and we have a swell town, Mr. President."

In the meantime newsmen traveling with President Truman's train swarmed around Mr. Loble seeking a statement on his reaction to the President's visit. They asked if he had changed his opinion about being barred from traveling with the President after he had met the Chief Executive.

Mr. Loble said: "I have not changed my opinion as previously stated. This reception was arranged by the Republicans. That's all I have to say."

Mr. Loble previously said party members were "hot under the collar" because they won't be allowed on the Presidential train when it goes through the State.

Spectators gathered in great numbers at the depot to see the President's arrival. However, long before the train arrived, secret service agents issued strict orders that the platform was to be cleared of all persons who were not on privileged committees or representing Montana's press.

A military police detachment, composed of men assigned to the Army recruiting and induction centers and augmented by Butte police, State highway patrolmen, and special railroad detectives, forced the crowd well back from the siding where the President's train was to be stopped on its arrival.

Many persons remained on the platform, however, until President Truman's train passed by in hopes they could see the Chief Executive. President Truman did come onto the platform and wave, but not until the train had almost passed beyond the east end of the Northern Pacific station platform.

After the train disappeared from view round a curve a swarm of secret-service agents walked along the track returning to the station to check arrangements that had been made to receive Mr. and Mrs. Truman, their daughter, and other members of the party. There was some delay while the Diesel locomotive that pulled the train to Butte was cut off and a switch engine coupled onto the train to bring it to the siding.

The Montana State band, under the direction of Martin Cesare, entertained the waiting crowd with a number of selections, and as the train pulled in from the west the strains of the Missouri Waltz, a favorite of the President, floated on the breeze. The selection was repeated when the train returned to the siding.

The President and his party loaded into cars to travel to the business section and join the parade.

Swinging up East Broadway, the parade got under way behind the colorful Butte High School Band.

Blocks away, as the standards of the Naval Reserve detachment color guard could be seen, the cry went through the crowd "Here he comes."

The crowd of many thousands, which had started forming 3 hours before the parade, lined Broadway and Park Streets and watched from buildings to give the President a tumultuous welcome.

A squad of motorcyclists from the Butte police department pushed back the crowd to make way for the prancing high school band. This group of talented musicians undoubtedly gave one of the best street performances ever seen here by any musical organization, as it led the Presidential party through the streets.

Following the band in the line of march was the first section of the special honor guard from the Butte miners union. The guard marched in two columns, single file, down each side of the street, wearing mine helmets and lights.

The miners union auxiliary came next in line, followed by the miners union Boy Scout troop. The American Legion drum corps, made up of many veterans of World War I, in which the President also saw service, came

next in the parade. The Legionettes followed with the Eagles drum corps closing the file of musical organizations.

A respectful crowd, with children waving flags and grown-ups applauding, greeted the President as he rode through the streets sitting beside Mayor Barry O'Leary on the tonneau of an open car.

Mr. Truman, smiling and waving back to the crowd, had a special smile for an impromptu guard of small youngsters who followed along beside his car.

Flanking the President's car were eight members of the miners union honor guard, specially picked for the occasion.

Traveling ahead of his car were carloads of secret service men, ever watchful of the crowd and constantly scanning the roof tops of surrounding buildings.

Mrs. Truman, riding in the car immediately behind the secret service corps, drew rounds of applause. The crowd was somewhat late in recognizing her, but after identification, cheers broke out and greetings were shouted.

Eager questions by the crowd preceded the passage of the car bearing Margaret Truman which followed her mother's car. The President's charming daughter was easily identified by the crowd and the spectators called and waved to Miss Truman, giving equally as warm a reception as they did her father.

Remarks of "isn't she pretty," or "she is nicer looking than her pictures," were heard from the feminine portions of the throng. Miss Truman, flashing a large smile, waved back to the people.

Following the Presidential party were cars bearing State officers, party leaders, and members of the local committee who planned the reception program for the President here.

Riding in cars following local leaders were members of the official party, including high-ranking Army and naval aides, members of the newspaper corps covering the President's tour, and special aides and assistants.

Following its sweep through the main streets of the city the parade turned south on Wyoming Street to the Butte High School stadium, where the President made his address.

As the parade passed along Broadway Street part of the throng moved down to Park Street for a second look, and as the parade passed on Park Street the crowd immediately broke up and hurried to the stadium to hear the President's address.

SIDE LIGHTS OF THE TRUMAN TRIP

The President, who comes from the Show-me State of Missouri, earned a real western welcome Tuesday night from Butte residents, who were eager for their first look at a national Chief Executive since Warren Gamaliel Harding came to the mining city in 1923.

It was the biggest single day Butte has had in some time, and for President Truman it was a big day, as well. Douglas B. Cornell, White House correspondent for the Associated Press, described the turn-out of people as the biggest crowd the President has attracted in the far West. He compared it with the crowd jam at Omaha and commented: "Everybody's showed up here, all right—even the Republicans."

The 58 newspaper, wire service, and radio correspondents aboard the Union Pacific special train collared Lester Loble of Helena, Democratic State chairman, on the station platform and immediately engulfed him with queries about resentment among Montana Democratic leaders because they were prohibited from riding aboard the train. Loble, as a result, was one of the last to climb up on the train at the station to shake hands with Mr. Truman. "I'm glad to see you," Loble said, while the President's remark, if any, was lost for the moment.

Mr. Truman looked to be in fine physical condition, but he seemed facetiously concerned lest his newly acquired sunburn peel. He said he thought it wouldn't.

When the train was some 40 minutes late, the crowd at the railway station took it all in good time. Then the special pulled in—and kept right on going through the yards. Mr. Truman appeared briefly on the rear platform, waved once or twice, and the train vanished around a bend in the yards to do some switching. When it backed into the station several minutes later, the committee members and others of the welcoming delegation took it easy in getting to the President's side to shake hands. There was no untoward incident.

Mayor O'Leary was the first to greet the President formally. Charles Murray handled the introductions in every case.

Ed Foley, 18, and Bill Curran, 17, Butte High School seniors, assigned as pages for President Truman, are known in high-school circles as Damon and Pythias. Their friendship has extended throughout their entire school careers.

The Secret Service, whose chief, James J. Maloney, was here for the event, didn't have all the work to do. Butte police and sheriff's officers were out in full force. Besides Capt. James Simms, Lt. Joseph McGarry, and a detail of 20 MP's from the Great Falls Army Air Base assisted in handling the crowd. Police and State highway patrolmen manned the parade route and the intersections.

Jack hammers were required to soften the surface of Naranche Memorial Stadium for installing of the posts to which ropes were attached closing off the field between the two 30-yard lines.

Butte High School band members did not feel the least bit nervous in their Presidential appearance. Director Schiesser recalled before the performance started that Butte High bandsmen of an earlier era had played for the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt. At that time, during F. D. R.'s first Presidential campaign tour, President Truman's predecessor requested that the band play Home on the Range, one of his favorite selections. The Butte band performed without music. All of the band's performances are accomplished entirely from memory.

The railroads overlooked nothing. As is customary whenever a President travels by special train, a pilot train preceded Mr. Truman's special, running about 30 minutes ahead of the streamliner as a safety and courtesy measure. Fred Rouse of Pocatello was the Presidential train conductor and Ben Proctor the engineer. The Northern Pacific sent its chief of special agents, O. Parrhysius, here, along with Police Captain C. B. Jacobsen, of Duluth, Minn.

Marvin Gjerde, a sheep rancher near Martinsdale and a friend of Eddie Price, wanted to be sure to be here. So he offered the use of his classy 1948 automobile—and wound up driving it in the parade.

The White House staff of Mr. Truman's, of course, was aboard the special. Besides Brig. Gen. Wallace Graham, the President's physician, there were Clark Clifford, Mr. Truman's personal counsel; Secretary Matthew Connoly; Press Secretary Charles G. Ross; Administrative Assistant Charles G. Murphy, and many others.

The press corps included Douglas B. Cornell and Ernest B. Vaccaro of the AP, Merriman Smith of the UP, representatives of INS, and the New York and Washington dailies. Vaccaro has been a White House reporter ever since he was first assigned to Senator Harry S. Truman when the latter was campaigning 4 years ago for Vice President. When Mr. Truman succeeded to the Presidency, Vaccaro moved up, too.

David Low, the eminent cartoonist for the London Evening Standard, whose drawings of Churchill, Attlee, and other British figures have become world-famous, arrived in Butte Monday and climbed aboard the Presidential special when it left Tuesday night. Low, now in this country on vacation, is doing some special work for Life magazine.

Police Officers Vern Maddock and James Clark are agreed that President Truman can execute a "snappy" salute. The Chief Executive returned the salute of each officer as he passed their post of duty. Officers Maddock and Clark are in a position to recognize a good salute, both having had long military service during World War II.

Newsmen on the Presidential special estimated they filed more than 35,000 words over telegraphic wires to their home newspapers and news services covering President Truman's speech, highlights and color surrounding the visit here.

"Butte's turn-out and show has been the most wonderful of the entire trip," Charles G. Ross, press secretary to President Truman, declared Tuesday night just before the Presidential special train departed for west-coast points after a 3-hour visit in the mining city. "Mr. Truman also made the best speech of the entire journey."

Brig. Gen. Wallace Graham, the President's personal physician, voiced enthusiasm over the reception accorded the President and declared that Mr. Truman's talk was the best he has made on the entire trip. General Graham was also enthusiastic about the Butte high school band and the reception of the party by Butte and Montana residents.

There are 56 counties in Montana. License plates representing at least half of them were to be seen on the streets for the Presidential parade.

The stalwart secret-service boys surrounding the President drew the attention of the teen-age lads along the line of march.

The theme number, of course, was the Missouri Waltz.

If Butte had any 20-story buildings there would have been spectators at the top level.

The amateur photographers had a big night and it is hoped all of them obtained results.

The reporters couldn't turn up anyone who knew Mr. Truman back home in Missouri.

It was a memorable day all around. The sky held a hint of showers throughout the afternoon, but the rain held off. The weatherman, himself a Federal employee who knows what's what, forecast "possible showers later Tuesday night, but maybe not until Wednesday."

Just before President Truman's train left the Butte station a newsman who refused to give his name remarked:

"Give us that Butte high band and we'll make the Nation sit up and take notice. They're a great bunch of kids and musicians."

Letter of Conference of American Small Business Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN
SMALL BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS,
June 14, 1948.

Hon. A. L. BULWINKLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Conference of American Small Business Organizations urges the

Members of the House and Senate to adopt the Reed-Bulwinkle bill, S. 110, notwithstanding the disapproval of the President. Our group represents more than 600,000 affiliated members engaged in all lines of business in every State in America. The continuation of the existing conference method of initiating freight rates, which this bill would validate under the supervision of the Interstate Commerce Commission and subject to its approval is vital to small business and is of greater importance to the small concerns than to the large companies or to the railroads and truck lines.

Full and final authority over the actual rates charged is vested in the Commission and your bill would leave it there. The existing conferences, which your bill would authorize, are a necessary means of discovering and ironing out differences before proposed changes in the rate structure are filed with the Commission. Those proposals, when filed, will be subject to all the existing powers of the Commission and all the present requirements of the law.

Under the existing system, every shipper, large and small, has a practical means of negotiating changes in freight rates, fair to his competitors and to the carriers concerned, and which may be required by changing circumstances. He may meet at one time and place the representatives of all the various carriers who must participate in the through movement of his goods. While large companies might, conceivably, find a way to get along without rate bureaus, small concerns could not long exist without them.

The rate conferences which would be authorized by this bill certainly are not price-fixing conspiracies nor monopolies and should not be barred by the antitrust laws or any other laws. Certainly the small-business man abhors monopoly but in our zeal to prevent it we should not blindly strike down the very facilities which are vital to the existence and development of small business enterprise.

Your bill would recognize and validate procedures necessary to the utilization of transportation in a practical way and would place them under the control of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It affords a common-sense solution to a practical problem. Those who oppose your bill actually oppose the best interest of thousands of independent, smaller business institutions.

Very truly yours,

F. L. VIRKUS,
Conference of American Small Business Organizations.

Flag Day Address of Hon. Ellsworth B. Foote, of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include therein an address made by my colleague the Honorable ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE, Member of Congress, Third District of Connecticut, at the Flag Day services of the West Haven Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, Lodge No. 1537, at West Haven, Conn., on Sunday, June 13, 1948:

Officers and members of the West Haven Elks and my West Haven friends, I appreciate being able to take part in this ceremony. The Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks has always been one of the most active exponents of American patriotic principles as is being demonstrated again here today.

This is the golden jubilee of Flag Day. It was on June 14, 1777, that the Continental Congress approved of the Stars and Stripes as our national emblem. Sixty years ago this day was set aside as the occasion to honor the institution of this flag. In many ways it has become the greatest unofficial holiday on our calendar. The Continental Congress resolved that the flag of the United States be 13 stripes alternate red and white; that the union be 13 stars, white in a blue field representing a new constellation. That flag today truly represents a new constellation. It is the flag of the free world standing out in majestic dignity against the sky, spreading faith in the rights of man, and giving men everywhere hope and courage and the desire for life with honor and justice. This tricolored symbol of a new nation led the Continental Armies through Saratoga, Brandywine, and Trenton to the surrender at Yorktown. It went out upon the sea to bear its message of liberty under law and the rights of ships and seamen. Perry bore it aloft at Lake Erie and Jackson at New Orleans. It embraced the Republic of Texas and spread its furls to winds from California to our own New England. When the Union stood in danger the men of the North rallied around this banner at the call of Lincoln and it was raised in triumph at Appomattox when the Confederacy laid down her arms and peace came again to the Nation. It brought independence to Cuba and the Philippines. It was twice carried abroad in two of the greatest wars in history and today its folds proclaim the power and the promise of the United States to the people of two occupied areas. Through the years the poor and oppressed, the persecuted and the enslaved have looked to this flag as the embodiment of those inalienable rights inscribed with all the wizardry of Thomas Jefferson. This flag has made every tyrant, every aggressor tremble with fear. It has proven its strength time and again to the peoples of all colors, creeds, and classes. In its very colors it tells the story of how we have assimilated different tongues and faiths and stations in life. Three colors blended into one meaning, into one flag, each standing out in its own designated place, yet each contributing to the whole banner. It bespeaks the unity of citizenship, the Union of States. It says that there shall be no divided loyalty. It proclaims that nothing less shall be accepted but unqualified, unreserved, wholehearted allegiance to the Republic which is ours. Here under this flag a man may work out his own destiny, may raise and educate his children without fear, may build his home and his fortune in peace, may worship God according to dictates of his own conscience. Each man stands in his own right. He bears no title of nobility save the aristocracy of those united, for here it is what you are and not who you are that counts in the long run.

There are those who would tear down this flag. There are those who hate it with a passion stronger in many ways than those who love it. Why do they hate it? Why do some even plot beneath this flag to destroy its meaning and its purpose? I believe it is because they are ignorant as to the benefits it entails. Because they are blind to the beauties of life which it can give. Because under it blossoms the freedoms they do not understand. They cannot or will not understand that a nation of 140,000,000 persons can be ruled by free franchise, by the vote and the will of a majority. They cannot understand how the bootblack and the newsboy may become the bank president and the successful businessman. They have not learned the lesson which tells of how a boy named Abraham, who first saw the light of day in a log cabin came at last to lay down his life as President of the United States. Perhaps if those who hate this flag would ride across our country they might lose some of this hatred, their eyes might be opened to a truth that is brighter than the sun. They would see the children studying in free schools, playing in public parks, laughing and singing their days out in healthy development. They would see the son of the factory hand learning to become a great doctor. They would see millions of homes under the visible protection of the people's law. They would see automobiles, and radios, washing machines and electric lights, heating and piped water, cleanliness and strong fences, all that go to make up our every day life. They would hear the voices raised at town meetings and public hearings. They could read in a thousand newspapers varied opinions on topics of the day and from the radio would come forth conflicting views as the slow mill of public opinions ground out its wheat of mutual understanding. They would see factories and stores rising to the testimony of the doctrine of free enterprise. They would see fields blossoming with produce and great ships bearing overseas the packages that spell America's love for her fellowman. They would see the churches of hundreds of creeds raised along our highways and in the monuments to the dead they would know that from these memorials we rekindle the flame of many freedoms. Yes; if those who scoff at our flag and its meaning would study the results of our way of life, they might come at last to reverence this symbol. I do not think that this is the only day on which we should honor this flag. Every waking hour should be devoted to its silent commands. We should each of us work to strengthen its place in the world, by performing our duties as well as we can, by taking an interest in our Government at all times. This flag has lived through the years because others have not betrayed the trust placed in them when they became citizens of the United States, either by birth or by choice. It waves unshackled because men and women of many generations have looked upon it as their inspiration to sacrifice and even death.

Too many of us forget the meaning of this flag. We see it so often we are apt to treat it casually, almost carelessly. And we are as apt to be cool toward its creed forgetting the benefits it brings and maintains. If we pause but a moment to look abroad, to contrast our lot with those who do not live under this flag we may come to realize its true meaning. When we grumble or complain or even scoff at the American way, it is always good to look at the other forms of government and study the conditions which exist in other lands. Sometimes it is the citizen who has become an American by choice, who appreciates more than mere words may say, the blessings of this country of ours. Abroad we have the concentration camp, the lack of due process under law, the seizure of property and land, the desecration of the house of God and the houses of men, lack of education, few hospitals and similar institutions, traditions that warp the mind and soul, slave labor, and a minimum of opportunity. What a ghastly picture that is in comparison to our own. No wonder millions of persons now are clamoring for admission to our shores. We have our problems it is true, but as a people we have a paradise no other nation may duplicate or even approach. Recently we have had several examples of young men betraying their American heritage and accepting foreign allegiance, at least two of them becoming men without countries. I wonder what they really thought? I wonder if they understood the priceless treasure they were surrendering? We all know the story of Philip Nolan,

which Hale described in his Man Without a Country. We recall the agonies that Nolan suffered because he did not even hear the name of the United States of America. The man who scorns his American citizenship is entering upon a long dark way that can only end in bitter disappointment. The man who does not cherish his citizenship is not true to his country or to himself. When we look upon the flag let us remember what it took to put it there. Let us remember what it has taken and what it will take to keep it there flying.

Let these words be the prayer of all of us:

"What builds the Nation's pillars high and
its foundations strong,
What makes it mighty to defy the foes that
round it throng?
Not gold, but only men can make a people
great and strong;
Men who, for truth and honor's sake, stand
fast and suffer long.
Brave men who work while other sleep who
dare while others fly—
They build a nation's pillars deep and lift
them to the sky."

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include part of the testimony of Dr. Charles A. Beard, eminent historian, as presented before the Senate Armed Services Committee on April 3, 1948.

Although I do not always agree with Dr. Beard's political philosophy, I think it will not hurt us to read his testimony which analyzes the effect compulsory military training had on German thought and German everyday life.

The matter referred to is as follows:

STATEMENT OF DR. CHARLES A. BEARD

Universal military training, so called, represents an attempt to implant in the United States a well-known curse of the Old World. I have studied it on the ground there and in the melancholy history of the nations brought to ruin or servitude under its degrading influence, gross and subtle.

This system of conscription would violate every liberty to which our Nation has been dedicated since the foundation of the Republic.

It would destroy the freedom which our ancestors, having fled from the despotism of Europe, established for themselves and their posterity on American soil.

It would create a monstrous military bureaucracy drawn from the upper and middle classes.

It would enslave the sons of plain people—farmers, industrial workers, and all other laborers who toil with their hands for a living.

It would exalt the military above the civil and thus would work for the overthrow of the first principles upon which the Constitution of the United States is based.

In its insinuating and insidious course, it would serve the cause of those leaders in military and civil life who exalt the executive above the legislative and are now claiming that the President has a right to make war at his own discretion, without any declaration of hostilities by the Congress—under the new dogma that the best defense is secret offense.

* * * * *

The people of the United States are now called upon by high civil and military authorities in Washington to take the most momentous step in the history of the Republic.

They are called upon to make conscription of young men, or, to use more pleasant words, universal military service, a permanent policy in peacetime as well as wartime.

* * * * *

Whether a huge conscript army would be the most effective instrument of defense in an age of atom bombs and guided projectiles is debatable. In fact, grave doubts as to its effectiveness in our age are warranted by the knowledge that military men are prone to prepare for the next war mainly in terms of experience in the last war. But in the argument over conscription, this is not the main point.

The main point in the argument before the country is: The menacing impacts of universal military service on every branch of civil life, on all civil liberties, on all the virtues that make America precious to the people, on every aspect of American civilization.

* * * * *

It will be replied by the exponents of the new course, the American people are different from all other peoples and so they will preserve their civil liberties intact and all other values of American life under a regime of universal military service.

With respect to those who reject experience with universal military service and proceed on the pleasing theory that Americans are a chosen people immune to its dangerous consequences, there is an authority on the other side of the argument more worthy of consideration.

It is the authority of the framers of the Constitution, to whom we are indebted for our form of government, which survived the storms of 160 years. The one thing on which they all agreed was that historical experience with military establishments, ancient and modern, had demonstrated their peril to civilian life, economy, and liberty.

* * * * *

Surely, in the first principles of the Constitution and in the experience of all countries which have had or now have universal conscription, we have better guidance than in all the rhetoric employed by contemporaries who know little or nothing about universal service as historical experience or at first hand.

To indicate what will be found when Europe's experience with universal military service is examined, I give the following brief description of a common soldier's career under the regime as operated in Germany before World War I—before Hitler's "refinements" had been invented. This description is drawn from specific sources of information for the authenticity of which I can vouch.

1. The influence of the Army on this common soldier's life began as soon as he entered the first grade of the elementary school. In a short time, a wooden stick was placed in his hand and along with his classmates he was taught the goose step. The teacher, a former soldier himself, took advantage of every occasion to praise the military virtues and the textbooks used for instruction confirmed the praise. Not a breath of criticism or objection was ever allowed in the classroom or on the playground. Boys who gave any hints of opposition were warned and marked. The one thing constantly hammered into the head of every boy was his duty to render his obligatory military service, without raising any questions whatever, and to render it in the spirit of abject obedience to military authorities.

2. As the time approached for the induction of this German boy into the military training service, he was not free to leave the country. The only way he could have escaped it was to run away secretly by hook or crook, or to secure a forged passport by bribing the proper officials. As he was a poor boy, whose parents had no money or special privileges, he had to stay in his country and take what came. In other words, the boy in a working class or farming family could seldom, if ever, escape the clutches of the military authorities by fleeing to some foreign land.

3. As soon as this boy was inducted into training service, he was given a small record book in which were entered certain facts about his early life, and then from time to time other facts about his conduct in the service. This book he had to keep always at hand and show it on demand when questioned by his superiors.

Our own War Department is already moving in the direction of requiring just such a record. In its form on officer qualifications (AGO No. 0857) a complete personal history is compiled for each officer, and I am certain records of the same nature will be maintained for all enlisted men. In time this will develop into the same detailed inquisition into the private life of every citizen as it did in Germany.

4. While in training service this boy was subject in all matters to strict military law, which provided forms of punishment for breaches of duty. In addition, there were innumerable ways in which any officer, high or low, could punish him for trivial or other acts not mentioned in the military law and make life miserable for him during the entire period of his original training service, and later while he was in the various stages of reserve service and called up at specific times for supplementary training.

5. During the period of his original training service the soldier's life and activities were regimented down to the last detail. All newspapers, magazines, books, pamphlets, and other reading matter available to the privates were censored by officers. The mere possession of any printed matter not officially approved was dangerous and might send the soldier to the guardhouse for days, to live on bread and water. Every package of food, cigarettes, or other objects sent to the boy by his parents or friends had to be opened in the presence of an officer, and if it happened to be wrapped in a piece of a newspaper banned by the military, the private was penalized for the very act of receiving it.

6. Even when on furlough during the original training period, the soldier was ever under the watchful eye of the military. On his arrival home, he had to report his whereabouts immediately to the head of his military district so that he could be reached at any moment. Before leaving home on his return to service he had to report again to the head of his district and give him the details of the return journey to the barracks.

7. After this German private had finished his original training period, his record book was duly signed and he was allowed to go home. When he sought employment, his prospective employer might ask for his record book. This act on the part of the employer was not required by law, but he was on the safe side in inquiring into the applicant's military record. At all events an "unsatisfactory" military record could make it difficult for a man to secure employment after he had completed the first stage of his military training.

If we say all these military controls over our people will not happen here, let me answer that such authority over private lives of our people is already proposed by an official report and endorsed by the military.

I quote paragraph 7 on page 35 in the Report of the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training as follows:

"Universal training would involve the maintenance of an appropriate selective-service system adaptable to rapid conversion to wartime needs. It would make possible

also a continuous inventory of military skills, aptitudes, and leadership qualities, which could be used advantageously in making military assignments in wartime. This inventory would be especially helpful if a check were maintained on the whereabouts, subsequent training, skills, occupation, and dependency status of those who complete their basic training. A selective-service machinery, actively functioning in peacetime, would be a decided military asset in wartime."

8. Completion of the original training service did not free the young man from military control. His after life, until he reached the age of 45, was divided into two periods. For the first period, he was in the Reserve, or reserves, and for the second, in the Landwehr, or militia. During each of these periods he had to report at stated times for supplementary military training.

A particular obnoxious feature of the German military reserve system was the Kontrollversammlung, or muster of reserves. This control meeting was an assembly at which the men of a country or smaller unit who were in the reserve or landwehr had to appear for inspection and instruction by a military officer. On the day of this meeting all of these men were under military law and jurisdiction and any one of them who committed a misdemeanor during the day could be severely punished under military law.

If to this description of a young man's career under the system of universal service in Germany were added a description of the way in which the military system affected the daily affairs of all German people—family life, education, employment, amusements, intellectual pursuits, and civil liberties—it would be seen immediately that the whole of German society was subdued by its weight. To imagine that the American people would escape the major effects of this militarism, if universal military service were permanently established in the United States, is to indulge in daydreaming and self-deception.

If the President and the military leaders force conscription upon the American people, they will find that instead of gaining in national security, they will have destroyed the real essence of American strength—the spirit of a free people which has twice brought us victories over conscripted armies.

Power To Tax Power To Destroy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point an article appearing in the Washington Evening Star of Monday, June 14, 1948, discussing the tax situation in England.

It will be noted from a reading of the article that Sir Stafford Cripps, Chancelor of the Exchequer, is recommending punitive taxes upon income derived from investments. It is stated in the article that this special tax on investments will require a man with a wife and two children, who makes all his money from investments, to pay $125,130 tax on a $100,000 income. No wonder the British are unable to regain their prior position in world trade if private investment is to be punished through a punitive tax of this sort.

This is the very sort of legislation which the present Republican Congress has fought. By providing for some relief to the harassed taxpayer this Congress, over the opposition of the President, has taken the first step in getting our tax system upon a sound and economic basis. Further reductions will be necessary to keep the country away from the plight of the British. No better example of the devastating effect of taxation upon the drying up of capital can be had than the present experience of the British people. Let us take warning and learn from the British experience.

The article follows:

TAXES EXCEED EARNINGS FOR SOME BRITONS IN NEW CRIPPS PROPOSAL

LONDON, June 14.—Englishmen are wondering what the American taxpayer would think if he were saddled with taxes so heavy they amounted to more than he earned.

That will be the situation, in some instances, when a new tax proposal, shortly due for a third reading before the House of Commons, becomes law.

Some Englishmen will have to sell stocks, bonds, or other capital assets to get the money with which to pay the capital levy whereby Sir Stafford Cripps, Chancelor of the Exchequer, will soak the rich.

On top of the regular income taxes, Sir Stafford will slap on a special tax on investments so that a man with a wife and two children who makes all his money from investments, will pay a $125,130 tax on a $100,000 income.

EXAMPLE IS OFFERED

If he gets half of his $100,000 from investments and the other half in salary he will have to pay "only" a combined investment and income tax of $99,410. If he gets all of his income from salary his tax will come "down" to $81,910.

In the United States a man with a similar family, making $100,000 from either salary or investments, pays only $45,643.

The new investment tax will affect an estimated 100,000 Englishmen. It is supposed to be a special 1-year measure, not to be repeated. However, Englishmen have their doubts. "We've heard that one before," they say.

Not only will the levy apply to people in the $100,000 bracket. It will begin with Englishmen whose incomes total more than $8,000, of which more than $1,000 comes from investments. On such an income the investment-tax rate is 10 percent. The rate amounts to a top of 50 percent on investment income above $20,000.

PAYMENTS COMPARED

An Englishman with a wife and two children who makes $10,000, all from investments, will have to pay $4,080 altogether in taxes. If he gets his $10,000 all in salary and none from investments, he will pay $3,260. If it is half and half, salary and investments, he will pay $3,530. An American with similar income would pay $1,361.

An Englishman making $30,000, all from investments, will have exactly nothing left after he pays his income and investment taxes. From this point on the levy is confiscatory of capital.

One of the hardest hit Englishmen will be the fabulously wealthy Duke of Westminster, who gets most of his income from ground rents received from huge property holdings in London. It is estimated in the city that he will have to raise the equivalent of $1,000,000 to pay his taxes.

A Step Forward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial appearing in the San Francisco Call-Bulletin under date of June 9. The Call-Bulletin has published many constructive editorials in the interest of the great international seaport of San Francisco, the American merchant marine, and our foreign trade:

A STEP FORWARD—FOREIGN TRADE ZONE OPENS HERE TOMORROW; MARKS PROGRESS IN SAN FRANCISCO COMMERCE

Chalk up another one for San Francisco.

Our foreign-trade zone will be formally opened tomorrow with ceremonies at Pier 45, the location of the zone, giving the United States for the first time such zones on all three coasts and, of course, putting San Francisco farther out in front as the No. 1 port on the Pacific seaboard.

The official designation of the zone is "Foreign Trade Zone No. 3," the other two being New York's, on Staten Island, and New Orleans'. (The latter, incidentally, established only a little more than a year, has set us a good example of the benefits we can expect here, having given vital stimulus to the maritime commerce of the Gulf port.)

Purpose of the foreign trade zone is to provide an area where goods in the process of shipment can be stored, duty free, pending their consignment to other ports.

It should be emphasized that the zone is in no way a free trade zone, wherein the import of foreign goods would be freely admitted to this country to compete with American products.

Thus, a cargo from China destined for American consumption would be subject to the appropriate levies by the customs officials; but were that same cargo destined, say, for South America, and were consigned to transshipment at San Francisco, the shippers could utilize the zone.

It is easy to see how this zone can have an immensely beneficial affect upon our shipping.

Shippers and forwarders, looking over the situation on the coast here, will spot the fact that San Francisco, to date, is the only port with such a zone. They'll be quick to take advantage of the fact, and our waterfront industry will be the gainer.

The city owes a rousing vote of thanks to all of those who have, over a period of years, worked diligently to bring this about.

The chamber of commerce—and more especially, its world trade association, the harbor board, our congressional Representatives, all have accomplished splendid services whose fruition will be formally and gratefully celebrated here tomorrow.

But let's not rest on our laurels.

There's still a lot of work to be done before the over-all project—the world trade center—is completed, centered around a modernized structure which would replace the Ferry Building and with the trade zone as a companion piece.

Achievement of the trade zone shows what can be done by earnest and assiduous work and cooperation.

The same can, and, we are sure, will, bring about the completion of our world trade center in the not too far distant future.

John Thomas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD various comments by colleagues of the late Senator John Thomas, of Idaho, and newspaper editorial and comments.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 13, 1945]

COMMENTS BY SENATORS

Mr. VANDENBERG: "Mr. President, in just a word, for the time being, I wish to express the deep sorrow which is felt by all the colleagues of the late Senator Thomas on this side of the aisle in the loss of a very dear friend and a very cherished colleague.

"Senator Thomas represented Christian character in about as fine a fashion as I have ever seen it in this life. He lived with a shining integrity which was the hallmark of his private life and his public service. He was quiet, modest, and unassuming as he moved among us, yet he constantly left his influence upon the labors of Congress.

"He had our confidence, he had our affection. He represented in his lifetime the great American saga of self-made opportunity in building himself from the lowest levels of opportunity to the highest levels of service.

"Mr. President, Senator Thomas was a great citizen, a great Senator, a great American, a great friend. We shall miss him deeply."

AP DISPATCH, WASHINGTON, NOVEMBER 10

Senator ROBERTSON of Wyoming: "Senator Thomas' death was a tremendous shock, although it was not entirely unexpected. I held him in deep regard. He was a grand American and a great westerner, an outstanding figure in the livestock business. He was a real straight shooter, and I trusted his judgment implicitly."

Senator MILLIKIN, Colorado: "Senator Thomas' death was very, very shocking. He was a grand, fine man, and I am awfully sorry to see him gone. He was an outstanding champion of the West. He was an expert and everyone respected his judgment in these things."

Senator JOHNSON, Colorado: "Personally, I was very fond of Senator Thomas. We were close friends. I had the greatest respect for his abundant common sense. He was a good businessman, the kind of man that we need more of in the Senate. He understood the problems of ranchers and miners and was always diligent in behalf of the West."

[From the Boise Statesman of November 11]

The death of Senator John Thomas in Washington brought expressions of condolences from leaders of both political parties in Idaho.

Gov. Charles C. Gossett, "I was very sorry to hear of the Senator's death. He was held in the highest esteem by his colleagues in the Congress of the United States. Idaho loses a valuable man in his death.

State Republican Chairman Reilly Atkinson described Thomas' death as a tremendous blow. He added "Senator Thomas has been a commanding personality in the Republican Party for more than 30 years and has made a great contribution to the State of Idaho in Congress. With Thomas at the helm, things went right."

Chief Justice James F. Allshie of the Idaho Supreme Court said: "Senator Thomas was a keen and able business man and a remarkably good organizer. I have known him ever since he came to Idaho. Both as a private citizen and a public official he served the State courageously and efficiently."

"The death of Senator Thomas of Idaho deprived the State of its outstanding citizen, politically, intellectually, and financially," said William G. Bissell, prominent Gooding attorney and long-time friend of the late senator. "He has always been a great asset to the State."

Lloyd Admas, Rexburg, who was Senator Thomas' campaign manager and his close political associate in Idaho, said:

"Senator Thomas' death is the greatest loss in individuals Idaho has ever had. He was always for the people of Idaho. The humblest and the greatest have always been given justice at his hands. That was why he was able to be elected three times."

Mayor Sam S. Griffin, of Boise, said, "Idaho has lost a great friend with the death of Senator Thomas, who in the past did all in his power to further its and the Nation's interests."

J. Mack Dodds, chairman of the Board of Ada County Commissioners said, "This is shocking news. Senator Thomas was a man who had the welfare of Idaho and the West in his heart. We will miss him. County officials like myself always found him ready to help with our problems?

Steve Collins, president of the Boise Chamber of Commerce, said that "the Senator was cooperative with the chamber of commerce at all times and on various items of business his help was the deciding factor."

R. M. Logsdon, Ada County Republican chairman, said, "We all regret the passing of Senator John Thomas, a fine, honorable public servant."

[From the Twin Falls Times-News of November 12]

R. P. Parry, Twin Falls attorney, stated, "With the passing of Senator Thomas, Idaho has lost the services of one who has contributed greatly to the State's development.

"No single man worked harder or accomplished more in making our great irrigated region the success it has become," Parry said. "A stockman and a farmer himself, he was always alert to fight their battles. For the sane advice and judgment, he was without peer. In the troublous days of the past his counsel has helped our State and its citizens through many difficulties, and in loyalty and steadfastness to his friends he was outstanding. Idaho has lost a great faithful servant and many of us a great personal friend."

H. Dudley Swim, notified of the death of Senator Thomas, stated that "Senator Thomas was a sterling friend, a great Idahoan, and a true and courageous American. We have lost a sturdy public servant who fearlessly pursued principle and conviction."

"Senator Thomas did a splendid job as Idaho's Representative in the United States Senate," T. Clyde Bacon, Twin Falls, said. He added, "Senator Thomas had a thorough knowledge of the State and its problems. He was especially interested with Idaho agriculture, having engaged in livestock breeding and farming for many years in this area.

"He was not an orator and made few speeches but he had an unusual ability in dealing with people, and in the committee room, where practically all legislation is formulated, he was most effective. Idaho will miss him. He has been a great friend to Idaho and its people."

Mrs. Emma Clouchek, in paying tribute to Senator Thomas, said, "He had always been an able statesman. There does not seem to be much to add to his record, for that certainly speaks for itself. His work for Idaho has always been outstanding."

Judge James R. Bothwell said, "Idaho has lost one of its best known and most influential citizens. Senator Thomas' death came at a time when his talents are vitally needed in the upper House of Congress, now confronted with grave problems of national and international importance."

In paying tribute to Senator Thomas, Asher B. Wilson, Twin Falls, stated, "I am shocked by this news, and am sorry beyond expression to hear of Jack's death.

"I knew him so well when we were both living in Colby, Kans., where he was engaged as the register of the Government land office. He always did everything he could for Idaho. I feel a great personal loss in his death."

[Editorial from the Twin Falls (Idaho) Telegram of November 15]

Idaho pays today a final tribute to John Thomas, United States Senator from Idaho for 11 years since 1928, who died last Saturday at his post in the National Capital.

In this solemn tribute, Idahoans will be joined by Americans in all walks of life who have been privileged to know John Thomas as we of Idaho have known him—a good man to tie to.

Vaulting ambition for self-advancement had no place in John Thomas' pattern of life. There was nothing of the demagogue or political showmanship in his makeup.

He was a man who held steadfast to the view that two and two make four, that debts are to be paid, that promises are to be fulfilled and that contracts are to be performed.

A man of unusual attainments, he approached his tasks in the political field with a sense of humility that did not depart from him when he was called to high station, but he fulfilled the work with which he was entrusted, honestly, and efficiently.

Burdened with responsibility, Senator Thomas and his then congressional colleague, former Congressman Addison T. Smith, during the economic depression that started in 1929, became aged and haggard in earnest endeavor to balance the budget when national and emergency expenditures mounted to a record level—though it would be chicken feed today—and to help to steer the ship of state along an experience-charted course into a haven of safety.

So long as the principles which he so ably exemplified endure, the memory and the influence of John Thomas will continue. He is an outstanding exponent of the gospel of honesty, and fair play, and common sense.

[Editorial from the Twin Falls (Idaho) Times-News of November 15]

As everyone knows, all politicians have their political enemies, and those whose accomplishments are outstanding are seldom given full credit until after their death. Then even the political rivals join in expressing their respects for a man of note.

There is an underlying sincerity in the praise that is now being spoken for the late Senator Thomas, because he was a man who has done so much for Idaho.

Senator Thomas demonstrated and took advantage of one of the greatest heritages of Americanism—the opportunity for an individual to make good on his own. From meager beginnings, he took to farming and eventually won the distinction of being a successful banker and large-scale livestock raiser.

His own success, coupled with a wide knowledge of Idaho's agricultural, mining, and livestock industries, made him a valuable man to the State during the several terms he served in the United States Senate.

During the recent sociological upheaval in American Government, there are those who criticize Senator Thomas for being too much of a conservative, but now that the glitter of that era of social reform is beginning to dim, there is a better appreciation of how often he was right in spite of such criticism.

From the political angle, the Republican Party of Idaho has lost one of its outstanding leaders. Many were the times he steered his party over the shoals of factionalism, which shoals unfortunately loom all too ominously in the party's present set-up.

As time goes on, the Republican Party and the people of Idaho may have occasion even better to appreciate what a man like Senator Thomas means to a State.

[Editorial from the Idaho Daily Statesman of November 15, 1945]

John Thomas is dead and Idaho has lost a valuable friend, citizen, and Senator.

Senator Thomas came up the hard way; finally became a farmer, livestock raiser, and banker. His industry and interests brought him a knowledge of Idaho from north to south. He was appointed twice, once by Governor Baldridge upon the death of Senator Gooding, once by Governor Bottolfsen upon the death of Senator Borah. He was elected three times. His record as a party State chairman has never been equaled.

Upon his first appointment he told friends that he did not believe he was fitted by education or experience to take his place in the most important legislative branch of our Government, but he was rapidly selected for the most important committees in the Senate and his counsel in them was considered wise, intelligent, and fair.

Senator Thomas was not a speaker. He worked, not for publicity, but for his Nation and his State.

TRIBUTE FROM NATIONAL GRANGE LEADERS

Albert Goss, national master of the Grange, said that the record of Senator Thomas "was so in line with all agricultural needs that I never bothered after the first year to contact him in regard to pending legislation because I knew he would vote right. He was by far one of our most outstanding agricultural leaders."

Ray McKaig, Boise, deputy national master, commented, "Idaho agriculture has suffered a tremendous loss. Senator Thomas never went back on his word and never made a promise he didn't keep. That is a character a number of other political leaders should learn. He had intense loyalty for all his friends and never betrayed them. Our Grange always received splendid cooperation from him."

Should Food Be Provided for Starving People or Should Public Funds Be Continually Wasted?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the amendment to provide $65,000,000 for dried skim milk in the ECA bill is being interpreted very incorrectly.

First of all, it has been evident that dried skim milk with 35.6 percent animal protein is the cheapest animal protein to be found anywhere. This dried skim milk, together with peanut butter with its 26 percent vegetable protein and its 47 percent vegetable oil and 2,800 calories per pound, are two foods that have not been purchased in the amounts they should have been purchased.

I realize what is taking place. The ERP bill was passed under the guise of being for foreign relief, but it is apparently to end up as a relief measure for the cotton and tobacco South.

While the Appropriations Committee has been told that $110,000,000 are proposed for tobacco, will you be surprised if twice the $110,000,000 for tobacco is the amount that is really purchased? Will you be surprised if more than 550,000,000 pounds of cotton are purchased if it can be found?

The $65,000,000 worth of dried skim milk would at least provide a real food and the money will not all be used for cotton sandwiches and tobacco juleps.

UNRRA showed the way for wasting public funds. If the present outfit administering the ECA does not change its viewpoint it will end up with as much public disapproval as the UNRRA now enjoys.

I have made a constructive effort to make the best possible use of public funds in the food program. If anyone wishes to be misled by false argument against my amendment it is a responsibility he must assume.

Power, the Draft, and the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, at the same time that we propose to draft our young men we take action in Congress to cripple our power development program. What short-sightedness—what madness. Here is the list of the restrictions imposed upon the power developments by action taken on the Interior appropriation bill for the Bureau of Reclamation, inserted under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD:

POWER, THE DRAFT, AND THE FUTURE

In power-deficient California the House denied—and was sustained in Senate—funds for design work on Delta steam plant, initiating construction of transmission lines to serve areas requiring adequate power for municipal purposes, irrigation pumping for maximum crop production, and examination and surveys for transmission lines interconnecting Federal plants as a fuel-oil-saving measure.

In the Pacific Northwest, the reduction in amounts for power facilities at the major Northwest power source—Grand Coulee Dam.

Denied funds for a transmission line from Mountain Home to Anderson Ranch required an outlet for power to be generated.

The House denied funds for the Havre-Shelby line on the Fort Peck project, Montana, for service to REA cooperatives, thereby hampering food production and development of oil resources. Reduced funds for transmission-line construction in the Missouri River Basin, resulting in delayed delivery of power to rural areas and important industrial and oil developments. (Restored in part by the Senate.)

No recognition was given to a request for the construction of a transmission line to serve important coal fields in northwestern Colorado and important municipal loads at Longmont, Loveland, and Fort Collins, Colo., from the Colorado-Big Thompson project, which factor was also passed over by the Senate.

Denied funds for construction of tap service and increasing capacity of service to important military establishments in New Mexico, cooperatives, and municipalities. (Restored by the Senate.)

Denied funds for construction of vitally needed transmission lines in Arizona and reduced funds for adding major generating capacity at Davis Dam in Arizona and Nevada. (Restored in part by the Senate.)

Serious reductions were made in funds for operation and maintenance of important power systems. (Partially restored by Senate but not sufficiently in many cases to assure maximum efficient operation.)

Further restrictions were placed on power functions by the House but were deleted by the Senate. These restrictions are as follows:

Disallowed the application of the interest component on power investment to assist irrigation repayment. This, in effect, will retard future development and reduce repayment of projects now under construction.

Restrictions on power contract negotiations which hamper sale of power to assure adequate return in revenues and further eliminate the possibility of replacing fuel-burning generation with hydro-generation. The result is a waste of critically needed oil reserves.

Placed restrictions on sales to preference customers, such as rural and municipal loads, resulting in curtailed development of diversified industry and agricultural developments.

Notre Dame Commencement Address by Paul G. Hoffman, Administrator of ECA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the text of an address by Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, at the one hundred and third commencement exercises of the University of Notre Dame:

Father Cavanaugh's introduction is an expression of his attitude toward his friends. He sees reflected in them those qualities of mind, heart, and spirit that he himself possesses. I am not the man Father Cavanaugh says I am, but that makes me ever more appreciative of his praise. I also appreciate very deeply the honor he has shown me by inviting me to deliver this Commencement address. I share with all the citizens of South Bend a very special regard and affection for the University of Notre Dame. It has a significant place in our lives.

It is with a definite feeling of humility that I address this graduating class. You got your degrees the hard way; I left college in 1909 without one. However, I recall quite vividly the remarks of the commencement

speaker I heard that June. He gave the lucky graduates precise instructions not only for "launching their ships on the sea of life," but also for sailing them in fair and stormy weather. He hinted rather strongly that there would be no storms for those young navigators who were in bed by 10 p. m., kept their shoes shined, their eyes off the clock, their noses to the grindstone, and who were properly respectful of their elders. It was a meticulously signposted and comfortable world he pictured for us.

We who listened to the commencement speaker on that June day were almost as smug and complacent as he was. If any of us were uneasy in mind, it was because we weren't sure as to whether we could get a job, or whether a certain girl would wait until we were making $18 a week. We were utterly unconscious of the fact that just below the placid surface of that post-Victorian world a conflict was brewing which in less than 6 years was to burst forth as World War I.

Only a few people in the United States realized that World War I was more than a war between nations—that it was a war between conflicting ideologies, a war, as Woodrow Wilson put it, to make the world safe for democracy. As that war started, the autocratic states of Germany, Austria, and Bulgaria were alined against the democratic states of Britain, France, and Belgium, but the situation was later complicated by the entry of autocratic Russia on the side of the Allies. Most of us were not concerned with issues—we were out to lick the Kaiser.

That is why, once victory was ours, we succumbed to a yearning for a return to normalcy and refused to accept our responsibilities as the new world leader and hence failed to play our part in winning the peace. Within 3 years after the end of World War I, we as a people forgot that it had been won at a cost of more than 10,000,000 lives and billions of treasure. It was a gay irresponsible period of flappers, jazz, and soaring prosperity. If we gave any thought to our own free economy it was to assume that it was invincible and permanently established.

We who had special advantages in the way of education or position were largely unconcerned about those who lived on the wrong side of the tracks. If we had a twitch of conscience, we soothed it by recalling the Biblical assurance that the poor are always with us. We had even less interest in people across the oceans. As detached spectators we watched Hitler's rise to power in Germany. Winston Churchill warned that Nazism was a threat to freedom everywhere. He quoted from Mein Kampf to prove it—but his voice was crying in the wilderness. Not until France fell did many of us in the United States realize that our freedoms might be involved—that Hitler's real purpose was to destroy all free societies and supplant them with totalitarian states. Despite this, it was not Hitler but the Japanese attack at Pearl Harbor that forced us into the war.

Within a few weeks it will have been 3 years since World War II ended in victory. According to the Vatican, more than 31,000,000 lives were lost in that conflict, and we ourselves poured out over 300 billions of treasure.

Thank God, the American people are no longer smug and complacent. It is obvious to all that a ruthless dictatorship—probably the most powerful the world has ever seen—is launched on a well-thought-out program of destroying all free institutions. Stalin's objectives have been as clearly spelled out in many Communist documents as were Hitler's in Mein Kampf.

In this year of our Lord, 1948, to an unprecedented degree, the opposing forces are being brought into sharp focus. In World War I the participation of autocratic Russia and autocratic Japan clouded the struggle of free societies for survival. In World War II the issue seemed clear with Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin, and Tojo in alliance against the free nations—but became confused when Hitler turned on Stalin. Today there is a clear-cut division between the barbaric dictatorship of Stalin, aggressive, expanding, insatiable, and the free western civilization developed through 20 centuries of Christianity on the broad foundation of classical Greece and Rome. Woven into the fabric of western civilization is the Christian ethic with its moral and spiritual code. The Politbureau has no moral or spiritual code; in fact, it prides itself on its amorality. It respects force, and force alone, and will yield only to force.

The free peoples of western civilization are at last discovering a firm, sound basis for united action. We are joined now not by mere expediency but by fundamental morality. As James Russell Lowell, American Ambassador to Great Britain, prophetically wrote a hundred years ago:

"For mankind are one in spirit, and an instinct bears along,
Round the earth's electric circle, the swift flash of right or wrong;
Whether conscious or unconscious, yet humanity's vast frame
Through its ocean-sundered fibers feels the gush of joy or shame;
In the gain or loss of one race all the rest have equal claim."

Never before have so many nations felt so inspired by their common heritage of Western Christian culture. Never before have these nations been so willing to act on what they have in common and to disregard the things that separate them.

In this growing sense of solidarity among all free peoples—in their awareness of the type of conflict in which we are now engaged lies our greatest hope of avoiding another world war. Hitler would never have marched in 1939, in my opinion, if he had arrayed against him the united strength of the world's free nations. Nor will Stalin march today if the free nations together and are prepared militarily to meet aggression.

Whether we like it or not, and most of us do not like the idea, the leadership of the free world today rests with the United States of America. To meet this new responsibility calls for action on our part both at home and abroad.

We must first safeguard and enrich our free institutions and our free economy in the United States. I yield to no one the esteem in which I hold our political institutions and our economic system. But it is not enough to point to our past accomplishments. If we are to preserve the American system for our children and their children, it's up to us not only to determine the sources of its strength and safeguard them, but to search out its weaknesses and correct them. It is up to us to see that the benefits of our great productiveness are spread to more and more of our people.

But our concern about free institutions and the freedoms of peoples must extend beyond our shores. We must remember that there are in western Europe some 260,000,000 people with whom most of us share a common ancestry. If totalitarianism should be imposed upon those people our own free society would be put in jeopardy. Surely two terrible wars have taught us that we cannot exist as a free, prosperous island in a world of slavery and misery.

In June of last year in a commencement address delivered at Harvard University, General Marshall proposed that the United States should help Europe to help itself back to economic health. He said, and I quote, "It is logical that the United States should do whatever it is able to do to assist in the return of normal economic health in the world, without which there can be no political stability and no assured peace. Our policy is directed not against any country or doctrine but against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos. Its purpose should be the revival of a working economy in the world so as to permit the emergence of political and social conditions in which free institutions can exist." That proposal of General Marshall's gave new hope to many desperate nations and found concrete expression here in the Foreign Assistance Act setting up the Economic Cooperation Administration.

The task set by the Congress for the Economic Cooperation Administration has no precedent in history. By the use of American dollars, American food, American steel, coal, and other goods, we are to promote the recovery of hundreds of millions of people in many great nations from the disastrous aftermath of the world's most terrible war.

We are to seek above all to have each of these nations cooperate fully with all the others. We are to help them to help themselves. We are to use our own resources to build up other nations agriculturally, industrially, commercially. We are to exert ourselves to the utmost to strengthen nations which in the past we have regarded as rivals and competitors.

In other words, as the Soviets seek to share their slavery and starvation with the rest of the world we seek to share our freedom and abundance. As Elizabeth Barrett Browning wrote:

"Happy are all free peoples
Too strong to be dispossessed;
But blessed are they among nations
Who dare to be strong for the rest."

I cannot offer you the pleasant platitudes and rosy prospects of the commencement orator of 1909—nor need I offer you, as Winston Churchill offered to England, "nothing but blood, sweat, and tears." But I do say that if you and I—all of us—unite wholeheartedly in work and sacrifice and sweat we shall avoid the blood and the tears.

Good Old Joe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star for June 15, 1948:

GOOD OLD JOE

One hardly knows whether to laugh or cry at President Truman's remarks last week about Premier Stalin. Mr. Truman, it seems, got "very well acquainted" with the Russian dictator in 1945 as they conversed—through interpreters of course—across the banquet and conference tables at Potsdam. "I like old Joe," Mr. Truman tells us now. "He is a decent fellow."

Unfortunately, as the President sees it, his old friend is a prisoner of the Politbureau. "He can't do what he wants to. He makes agreements, and, if he could, he would keep them. But the people who run the Government are very specific in saying that he cannot keep them."

Good old Joe—he smokes a pipe. Was it his fault, after all, that he seized total power in the Soviet state, despite Lenin's express wishes to the contrary? What if he did build history's most ruthless political machine, climbing to the driver's seat over the piled corpses of friend and foe alike? He looks so fatherly, when the lighting is right.

And he makes agreements. To dispose of Leon Trotsky, for instance, he made one once with a couple of other Politbureau members named Zinoviev and Kamenev. They were even closer friends of his than President Truman is. They were going to run the state with him after Trotsky was out of the way. Could Joe help it if he was compelled shortly to tighten his personal hold on the reins by disposing of Zinoviev and Kamenev, too?

Of course not. He is a decent fellow, and his eyes crinkle around the edges when he smiles. How painful it must have been to this kindly old man as, by his orders, the Russian kulak class was exterminated, some 15,000,000 Soviet citizens thrown into concentration camps and his followers (including members of the Politbureau) subjected to a blood purge so severe that nobody but Joe himself was sure of his safety. Poor old Joe.

Americans can point with pride, at least, to the evident fact that their Chief of State is bossed by no underlings. There is probably not another responsible official in this country—or anybody even remotely acquainted with the Russian system, for that matter—who agrees with Mr. Truman about Mr. Stalin. Good old Harry—it is strictly his own idea. It should be kept that way.

Scandinavian Countries Set Unselfish Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, because of the great interest in the Scandinavian countries at this time, I believe the members of the House and the readers of the RECORD will find of interest an article published in the Washington, D. C. Star for May 23, 1948, which was entitled "Scandinavian Countries Set Unselfish Example."

The article in question, written by John L. Hulteng, follows:

SCANDINAVIAN COUNTRIES SET UNSELFISH EXAMPLE—NORWAY AND DENMARK CONTRIBUTE TO RELIEF OF FORMER OPPRESSORS IN SPITE OF HARD TIMES AT HOME

(By John L. Hulteng)

OSLO, NORWAY.—For a stirring lesson in unselfish forgiveness the world could well spare a glance at Scandinavia, where nations liberated less than 3 years ago from German occupation are quietly shipping a steady stream of food and medical aid to the needy of Central Europe—including the wives and children of those same Germans who so recently lorded it over Oslo and Copenhagen.

Begun only a few months after VE-day, the mercy shipments have now reached thousands of tons of food and medicine as well as millions of dollars in cash grants for food purchase. The recipients so far include Hungary, Austria, Greece, Italy, Poland, Yugoslavia, Rumania, France, Finland, and Germany. Donors are the people of Norway, Denmark, and Sweden, through their local Red Cross and government agencies.

NORWAY STILL RATIONED

Probably the most striking contribution has been that of the Norwegians—not because of its size—since Norway is the poorest of the three and her share of the aid has actually been smaller than that of either of the two other nations.

But Norway's efforts are particularly impressive because she took the worst war beating of the three, suffered most from German invaders and was left in the worst economic straits.

Norway's people still must put up with one of Europe's most restricted rationing systems—many families see no meat at all for weeks at a time and such luxuries as fruit, candy or new clothing are almost entirely unobtainable.

Yet in a special drive last fall to raise money for food shipments to central Europe—including Germany—Norwegians contributed 12,000,000 crowns. That is about 4 crowns, or 80 cents, for every man, woman and child in Norway. In a nation where average wages are from one-fourth to one-third as large as those in America, this is an impressive total.

This, said Jens C. Meinich, assistant general director of the Norwegian Red Cross, was only the most recent phase of the aid program. Beginning in the early spring of 1946 and up to the beginning of the fund-raising campaign last fall, Norwegians had sent more than 3,000 tons of food and medicine, as well as smaller shipments of scarce clothing.

TO SEND HEALTH TEAMS

"In this we cooperated with the Danes, who sent at least three times as much as we did, and the Swedes, who must have contributed at least twice as much as we," Mr. Meinich added.

The latest phase of the campaign involves a drive to combat the spread of tuberculosis in Central Europe. Special teams of Scandinavian doctors, nurses, and health workers have been organized and are about to leave for the troubled areas to start work.

Mr. Meinich explained that "most shipments from Norway have been fish and fish-liver oil—the latter worth its weight in gold to the undernourished children of Germany and the Balkans." He said Norway cannot send much of anything else, since she has little else to feed her own people.

When asked how the Norwegian Government, desperately short of foreign exchange, regarded these gift shipments of valuable export products, Mr. Meinich laughed.

"Oh, the government always grumbles and tells us we are costing them money every day," he answered, "but we always get our licenses on schedule."

TO TAKE ENEMY CHILDREN

A nearly incredible feature of the campaign, in the light of World War I experience, is the plan to bring dren of central European nations to sp summers with Norwegian families. Aft 1918, thousands of Norwegian families thu adopted German children for one, two, or more years—only to find those same youngsters, grown into sturdy, brown-shirted Nazis, flooding back with the invading armies of 1940 as interpreters, judges, and esplonage agents.

"Yes," Mr. Meinich smiled, "but we are going to try it again. After all, we cannot blame anything on children, can we?"

French children have spent carefree Norwegian summers every year since the liberation, and this year plans are being laid for youngsters of other nationalities to come.

Norway has invited children of Poland, Hungary, Austria, and Yugoslavia. Only Yugoslavia has so far vetoed the idea.

HUNGER TAUGHT LESSON

The Red Cross official said that nearly every Norwegian family has adopted a central European child in a different sense under a supplementary campaign. Each family thus enrolled must send its adopted child a minimum of one 6-pound food package every month for at least 6 months. "But actually no one ever stops at the end of 6 months," he added.

"It isn't that we are particularly noble, to share the little that we have with others," Mr. Meinich told me. "It is just that after 5 years of occupation we know what it is to be everlastingly hungry, and we know how gloriously welcome food packages from outside can be. Suffering is an international affliction, and we can't discriminate in trying to combat it."

North Carolina Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, recently there came to my attention an outline of North Carolina's laws affecting veterans, their wives, their widows, their children, their orphans, and their organizations, compiled by Joe Boyarsky, department adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans, 1204 Independence Building, Charlotte, N. C.

Most of the potential beneficiaries under these State laws are not aware of the valuable rights, privileges, exemptions, and benefits available to them, under certain circumstances, and therefore, I am hopeful that this résumé of North Carolina's veteran laws will come to their attention.

The outline is as follows:

EURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

A county allowance of $30 and a State allowance of $100 is available for the burial of Confederate pensioners.

A county allowance is provided for the burial of indigent World War I veterans.

Election of benefits is provided upon death of a member of a burial association while serving in the military or naval services of the United States.

The Confederate cemetery in Raleigh is cared for by convict labor.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

A conservator is appointed by the clerk of the superior court for the property of persons reported missing.

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments executed by members of the armed forces.

Evidence of presumed death or absence may be admitted.

Wills of deceased members of the armed forces may be admitted to probate.

Disability of minority is removed for qualified veterans or spouses under the GI bill of rights.

Protection is provided in actions for the foreclosure of county or municipal taxes during World War II.

Protection is granted persons acting under power of attorney granted by members of the armed forces.

Depositions may be taken from servicemen.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND DUTIES

Absentee registration and voting is provided.

Acknowledgment is made of signatures for absentee ballots of men in the armed forces.

CLAIMS, ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS, SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

Free copies of public records are available for wards of the Veterans' Administration.

The Bureau of Vital Statistics is required to furnish, without charge to an officer of any veterans' organization, copies of vital records for veterans, their families, or beneficiaries under Government insurance or adjusted-compensation certificates.

The fee of the registrar of deeds for issuing a copy of the record of discharge papers is limited to 50 cents.

Upon application by a representative of the State veterans' commission, the registrars of deeds or the bureau of vital statistics shall furnish, free of charge, copies of records relative to veterans.

Discharges from any branch of the armed services are recorded free. The registrar of deeds shall furnish copies of such discharges without charge.

A State veterans' commission has been established with county service officers in the following counties: Beaufort, Catawba, Cleveland, Gaston, Dulpin, Harnett, Henderson, Iredell, Johnston, Lee, Lincoln, Moore, Pitt, Rockingham, Rutherford, and Washington.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS; QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

Barber certificates are renewed without examination after service in the armed forces.

The State employment bureau cooperates with the Federal Board for Vocational Education, Division for Rehabilitation of Crippled Soldiers and Sailors, in securing employment and fair treatment.

Teachers, principals, and superintendents of public schools are allowed credit for experience increments for period of service in the armed forces.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Aid is extended to children of veterans who were killed in action or died while serving in the armed forces during World Wars I and II or who have since died as a result of such service and to children of certain other veterans of such wars who were or are permanently or partially disabled. This aid includes free tuition in the State's educational institutions.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

A member of the armed forces is exempt from the law which vacates place as trustee of University of North Carolina for absence from meetings for two successive years.

Members of the teachers' and State employees' retirement system are exempt from contributions during military service.

The county boards of pensions are composed of the clerk of the superior court and three Confederate veterans or sons, daughters, grandsons, or granddaughters of such veterans.

The State legislature adopted a joint resolution desiring that members of the armed forces be represented on the World War II Peace Commission.

An employment bureau has been established to assist crippled veterans to secure employment.

Leaves of absence are given State and local officials who enter the armed forces.

Veterans and their widows, and wives of disabled veterans, are given preference ratings in State examinations and in employment in State and local units.

Benefit rights are preserved under the State retirement system of State employees serving the Federal Government on a loan basis or by virtue of an Executive order of the President of the United States.

Benefit rights are preserved under the Unemployment Compensation Act.

Use of the words "Army" or "Navy" in the name of a mercantile establishment is prohibited.

War-service credit is extended to teachers and State employees who entered the armed forces during, on, or after September 16, 1940, if they return to State service within 2 years after discharge from military service.

GUARDIANSHIP

Clerk of the superior court acts as temporary guardian and receives and disburses allotments and allowances made to children of servicemen.

A Uniform Veterans' Guardianship Act has been enacted with modifications, providing for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran or the minor child of a veteran, to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

HOMES

Wives and widows of Confederate soldiers, and other worthy dependent women of the Confederacy are admitted to the Confederate woman's home.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

An alien mother of a serviceman may be admitted to the hospital for the insane.

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

The State cooperates in the program for the organization of the Women's Army Corps general hospital companies.

Land has been donated for a veterans' hospital in Iredell County.

The town of Mount Airy is authorized to donate to the Veterans' Administration certain property as a site for a veterans' hospital.

Inmates of State hospitals may be transferred to Federal hospitals.

LAND SETTLEMENT

A World War Veterans' Loan Act has been enacted, providing means by which veterans may acquire urban farms or homes upon favorable terms.

MEDALS

The Governor is authorized to issue certificates of appreciation to families of deceased veterans of World War II and certificates of meritorious service to certain veterans.

MEETING PLACES, MEMORIAL BUILDING PRIVILEGES, ETC.

The board of commissioners of Allamance County is authorized to use $2,500 of the general funds for a monument to the county's veterans of all wars.

The board of commissioners of Bertie County is authorized to sell, leave, or give Dundee and Queen Street property in the town of Windsor for erection of a Bertie County American Legion memorial building.

The city of Greensboro is authorized to establish a war memorial fund commission and to acquire property for construction of a war memorial.

War memorials have been erected for World War II veterans with counties, cities, and towns participating.

PENSIONS

Pensions are paid to Confederate veterans ($864) or their widows (class A, $420; class B, $220), and servants ($220).

RECORDS, RELICS, ETC.

Caldwell County has compiled and published a history of members of the armed forces of the county.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Emergency funds were allocated to the veterans' service office to supplement the biennial appropriation for the purpose of meeting increased demands during World War II.

Building and loan companies may make or buy and sell loans guaranteed under the GI bill of rights.

Land has been provided for veterans' recreation in Mecklenburg County.

Veterans' recreational authorities have been set up for establishing recreational facilities in cities of 100,000 population or over.

TAX EXEMPTIONS; EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Resident members of the armed forces home on furlough may hunt and fish without a license.

Military compensation received during World War II and any insurance or compensation received from any of the allied countries because of injuries received during World Wars I or II is exempt from income tax.

Proceeds of policies of insurance and of adjusted-service certificates paid by the Federal Government to heirs of veterans is exempt from inheritance tax.

Deposits received as benefits to World War veterans from the Federal Government are exempt from intangible tax.

Disabled veterans of the Spanish-American War and World War are exempt from fee for county peddler's license.

Disabled veterans of any war are permanently exempted from poll tax.

Billiard or pool tables and bowling alleys operated by veterans' organizations are exempt from license tax.

Exemption is granted from payment of taxes and fees for professional and occupational licenses during military service (not applicable to an agent carrying on trade or profession.)

Free-privilege licenses are issued to certain veterans while visually handicapped.

Property of the American Legion or any patriotic association is exempt from taxation.

No penalty, fee, or interest shall be assessed or collected on ad valorem taxes assessed against the property, real or personal, of members of the armed forces.

The city of Wilmington and the county of New Hanover make settlement of taxes on property owned by American Legion Post, No. 10.

UNIFORMS

Veterans are exempt, under certain circumstances, from the prohibition on wearing the uniform of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Fairs and tobacco festivals held by American Legion posts are excepted from certain restrictions.

The unauthorized wearing or use of the insignia of the American Legion is a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine not to exceed $50 or imprisonment for not more than 30 days.

Much of the above legislation has been enacted by the North Carolina Legislature through the sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veteran organizations.

At the present time there are some 17 chapters of the DAV throughout the State, most of which maintain volunteer or part-time service and employment officers to assist veterans in their own communities.

In addition to this service on a local level, the DAV maintains four full-time national service officers, under the direction of James K. Finch, at the Veterans' Administration regional office, Winston-Salem, N. C.

These DAV experts render all types of assistance to veterans and their dependents, more particularly in the technical preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their justifiable claims for various types of governmental benefits to which they may be lawfully entitled.

DAV MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official voice of America's disabled defenders.

According to its congressional charter of incorporation—Public Law 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law 668, approved July 15, 1942—active membership in the DAV is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities incurred during, or by reason of, active service during time of war in the armed forces of the United States.

More and more wounded and disabled veterans of World War II are becoming active members of the DAV.

Eligibles may become life members upon payment of a fee of $100—$50 if born before January 1, 1902—in cash, or by a down pay-

ment of $5, or more, plus such installments as will complete payment of the full fee by the end of the second succeeding fiscal year—ending on June 30—after which, if not fully paid, a carrying charge of $5 per year would accrue. A growing percentage are becoming DAV life members. Annual membership is available at $5.

DAV NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Located at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati 6, Ohio, the national headquarters of the DAV takes care of all administrative matters and records, and publishes the Disabled American Veterans semimonthly newspaper, containing accurate information of interest and of value to disabled veterans and their dependents.

The present national commander of the DAV is John L. Golob, of Hibbing, Minn., a severely wounded World War I veteran, who has had a broad background of experience in various local, State, and National DAV activities which qualify him to lead an organization composed exclusively of America's disabled war veterans.

Its national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-treasurer (business manager) of the organization, and editor of its newspaper since 1925. Capt. Circero F. Hogan is his able assistant.

The largest bank in Cincinnati—the Fifth Third Union Trust Co.—has, for 28 years, been the depository for the funds of both the DAV and its incorporated trusteeship, the DAV Service Foundation. Officials handling funds have always been adequately bonded by the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The National Service Headquarters of the DAV is now located in a beautiful building at 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C., which was acquired by the organization in 1945.

In this Washington office are located the department of claims, headed by William E. Tate; the department of legislation, headed by Francis Sullivan; and the department of public relations and employment, headed by my friend, Millard W. Rice. In addition to these service departments the headquarters has as its office manager John E. Feighner, assistant national adjutant. All of these various departments are staffed by trained experts, all of whom are themselves war wounded or disabled veterans.

These DAV national officers know all about the technical complications that disabled veterans must overcome factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration.

Understanding such vexatious problems by personal experience, DAV national service officers are naturally more sympathetic than are nondisabled veterans or civilians and are, therefore, generally more effective in helping disabled claimants to comply with technical requirements to prove legal entitlement to benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The DAV has adopted, on a Nation-wide basis, a man-job-matching-method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,200,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally unemployable. The remaining 93 percent are less than totally disabled and must, therefore, supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment.

This scientific approach to a most distressing problem has produced some worthwhile results thus far. The handicapped veteran's remaining abilities have been matched with the requirements of the job, rather than stressing his disabilities. It has been demonstrated by the employment record of such disabled veterans that they have a low absentee record, a low turn-over record, a low accident record, and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been demonstrated that to hire disabled veterans is just plain, good business, bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers, and taxpayers generally.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation—its military and naval services during time of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as with those who are or have been dependent upon these heroes, so that other young men who in the future may be called upon to make similar sacrifices will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that if they, too, should also be so unfortunate they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth, and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

As a veteran of World War I myself it is a pleasure for me to commend the service program of the DAV and I am sure it merits the consideration and support of the entire country.

Veto Message on S. 110

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, it is my considered opinion that the President's veto message on S. 110 reflects a misunderstanding of the provisions of the bill and a lack of confidence in the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The message states that the bill "would require the Commission to approve any agreement which it finds to be in furtherance of the national transportation policy." This statement is clearly not justified. Actually, the bill provides that an agreement shall be approved by the Commission only if it finds that, by reason of furtherance of the national transportation policy declared in this act, the antitrust law relief provided in paragraph (9) "should apply with respect to the making and carrying out of such agreement." Thus, a mere finding of furtherance of the national transportation policy would not be enough. In addition to determining that the national transportation policy will be furthered, the Commission also must find that the furtherance of such policy is of such a character as to justify the waiving of the antitrust laws to the extent necessary to permit the agreement to be made and carried out. As stated in the report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House, for purposes of passing on any proposed agreement, the bill "directs the Commission to determine whether the advantages to the public interest, through furtherance of the national transportation policy, are such as to outweigh the disadvantages to the public interest intended to be guarded against by the antitrust laws."

Another stated objection is that the Commission would be called upon to approve the basic procedural agreements without being able to foresee fully the nature and effect of the joint actions which would be taken thereunder. The answer to this is that the bill directs the Commission, in granting approval, to impose necessary terms and conditions governing the agreement and operations thereunder. Also, authority is granted to the Commission, upon complaint or upon its own initiative, to investigate and determine, in the case of any agreement which has been approved and has become operative, whether its previous approval should be terminated or modified, and whether additional terms and conditions should be imposed.

The message further states that carriers could agree privately among themselves upon the rates to be filed with, or withheld from, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and that as a result of this groups of carriers could "exercise a powerful deterrent influence upon the filing by an individual carrier of proposed rates which might benefit the public." To guard against this very possibility, the bill expressly provides that the Commission shall not approve any agreement which establishes a procedure for joint determination of any matter unless "there is accorded to each party the free and unrestrained right to take independent action either before or after any determination arrived at through such procedure."

Finally, the message states that the legislation would represent a departure from the present transportation policy of regulated competition by "sanctioning rate control by groups of carriers." It is submitted that this statement is made without due regard for the fact that rates filed would be subject to all the regulatory powers now possessed by the Commission. Such rates would be subject to the power of the Commission to suspend and modify them to the same extent as though this legislation had not become law. Furthermore, as pointed out in the report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House, there is already precedent for this character of legislation in the field of air transportation and water transportation. Instead of being a departure from established legislative policy, the bill is consistent with action heretofore taken by Congress.

It is clear that the bill contains adequate safeguards, to be applied by the Interstate Commerce Commission, to protect the public interest. The Commission is composed of men of acknowledged ability and a high sense of public responsibility. Notwithstanding the contrary implications contained in the President's message, there is every reason to believe that the Commission can be safely entrusted with the authority granted by the bill.

Statement by Walter P. Reuther

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following excerpts from a statement by Walter P. Reuther, president of the UAW-CIO, before the Senate Armed Services Committee on Friday, April 2, 1948:

STATEMENT BY WALTER P. REUTHER, PRESIDENT, UAW-CIO, IN OPPOSITION TO PROPOSALS FOR UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING, PRESENTED TO THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

In opposing UMT as a permanent peacetime policy of the United States, the UAW-CIO does not, in our opinion, oppose measures necessary for the strength and security of our Nation, nor measures that are needed for the most effective defense of democracy here and throughout the world.

We favor and actively support measures that will make our productive plant at least as strong, in manpower and material terms, as it was when we won World War II with the greatest production record in the history of the world.

That record was made without resort to such extreme regimentation as universal military training. The final margin for early victory—the release and use of atomic energy—was made possible by great public-power developments in the Tennessee Valley and the Northwest.

Such proposals as the May-Bailey work-or-jail bill were rejected, even in the heat of war and despite a military lobby as insistent as the one now operating. Even in war we kept the civilian control that is vital to our democracy. Under a civilian Government and in cooperation with the military, we supplied the men, the food, and the equipment for military victory.

The same policies and methods offer the best hope for success in the cold war of food, clothing, shelter, machinery, production, and ideas that has been forced upon us by the world's necessity and by totalitarian expansionism. They offer the best hope for survival in any hot war that may come—and is sure to come if we continue to piddle away our strength and opportunities to win a peace of free men by peaceful cooperation in rehabilitation and reconstruction.

While the UAW-CIO is firmly opposed to peacetime universal military training for reasons that will be developed in some detail later, we would, if the need were shown, agree to the use of selective service to meet an emergency, but, as of this date, on the showing thus far made, we are not persuaded that a draft is necessary. It seems to us that the armed services should be able to recruit the 220,000 men whom it is proposed to obtain by use of the selective-service system. We understand that the Air Force has filled its authorized quotas by voluntary enlistment, that the Navy is substantially up to authorized manpower strength by voluntary enlistments.

As to the manpower deficit in the Army Ground Forces, it is our opinion that certain reforms within the Army would improve the recruiting record there. For example, improved court-martial procedures, the abolition of discrimination and segregation, better pay, and opportunities for advancement would make service more attractive. Jim Crow has no place in the armies of democracy. The fact that the Air Forces have been turning down applications suggests that the Ground Forces should find out what the Air Forces offer that the Ground Forces do not.

Ever since August 14, 1945, we have opposed the reckless and, in our opinion, suicidal back-to-normalcy decontrol policies imposed on the executive agencies by profit-hungry pressure groups and a bipartisan coalition of reaction in the Congress. These policies were highly advertised as necessary to increase production, to prevent inflation, and to establish stable prosperity in the reconversion and postwar period.

As everyone knows now, these premature decontrol policies created bottlenecks and shortages. They set off one spiral after another of price and profit increases. They brought on an inflation that reduced purchasing power, wiped out savings, and increased consumer debt. Despite two rounds of wage increases, they reduced workers' real wages, and now a third round of wage increases is required to get workers' real wages and living standards back in the neighborhood of where they were 2 years ago. The shrinkage in purchasing power that has been brought about by 2 years of profiteering threatens a new recession or depression. Only ERP and defense orders keep the market from a disorderly collapse.

This inflation of prices and profit and deflation of the ability to consume a fair share of our production are coupled with shortages in steel, oil, gas, electric power, and heavy equipment. Together, they form the principal threat to our domestic stability and productive strength, to the meeting of our heavy responsibilities under ERP and whatever step-up in defense or war production may be required.

It was in anticipation of the domestic and world situation now before us that the CIO stated last January that ERP and an integrated anti-inflation, full production program comprised the No. 1 legislative job before the Congress.

On February 4, the day S. 2126 was introduced by Senators Elbert Thomas and Wagner, Emil Rieve, international president of the Textile Workers Union—CIO, testifying for the CIO before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, urged such a program to take the fever of inflation out of our economic system. He endorsed S. 2126, which was designed to accomplish this purpose. As to wages, Mr. Rieve stated that the CIO would seek wage increases within existing price patterns.

It was in anticipation of today's grim situation that, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 5, I warned against the creeping Pearl Harbor of economic unpreparedness—unpreparedness to meet our own domestic needs, ERP needs, and whatever other needs may develop.

To date, except for the renewal of rent control, exactly nothing has been done against inflation.

Nothing whatever has been done to break production bottlenecks and expand production of steel and other vital items. I suggest that now, with ERP a fact, the Congress face up to its responsibilities and buckle down to the job of getting our productive plant in good working order for the same sort of all-out production job we did during World War II. That, in our opinion, will do more for America's security, will do more to win the global contest between freedom and totalitarianism than the seemingly easy solutions of UMT and selective service.

At the end of my statement I will offer certain proposals, in line with CIO legislative policy and recommendations, for stamping out inflation, stabilizing our economy and breaking the production bottlenecks that, unless broken, will block prosperity, adequate ERP aid, and defense or war production.

* * * * *

As an alternative to the unproductive, wasteful, and weakening UMT proposals I suggest the following immediate steps as needed to get our economy and our productive machine in full production of the materials and finished products that we need, that ERP needs, that our national defense and security will require. These steps, together with a military-defense program based on voluntary enlistments and—when and if the emergency is proved—by selective service, will make America strong. We will be strong both in the production of constructive munitions of peace and the destructive munitions of war. The more of peaceful munitions we can produce and distribute to the areas of greatest need, and the quicker we do so, the less will be the danger of resort to war. This is true economy of our funds, our materials, and, most important, the lives of our young men.

First. Get the fever of inflation out of our economic system by a price freeze and price control, rationing, effective rent control, priorities and allocations of scarce materials, tighter controls of bank credit for commercial, agricultural, and real-estate loans, installment buying, high margins for commodity exchanges, restriction of 90-percent loans on construction to low-cost homes and low-rent apartments, with more limited loans for other residential construction;

Restore excess-profits tax; exempt incomes below $5,000 and maintain rates on incomes above that figure; make joint returns mandatory in all States, thereby equalizing taxes in community-property and other States; a recapture tax on speculative profits, including inventory gains of business.

These are the principal features of the CIO legislative program against inflation, which CIO Vice President Emil Rieve recommended to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on February 4. Except for rent control, nothing has been done.

Second. Break the production bottlenecks by—

Expanding steel capacity and production by eight to ten million tons over the January 1, 1947, level; bringing back into production marginal plants, mines, and other productive facilities on a subsidy basis, assisting private operators to expand operations, and to extent necessary, building supplemental Government-owned capacity to meet current domestic, ERP, and subsequent normal needs of a full-employment economy.

Expanding oil production and distribution, as with steel, by financing, priorities, allocations of materials, machinery, pipe, etc., meantime using rationing and price control to conserve supplies for most needed uses.

Expanding power production by speed-up of waterpower development, steam plants, and breaking a bottleneck within a bottleneck by—

Expanding production of turbines, generators, dynamos, etc.

Expanding coal production by priorities and allocations for coal cars, mining machinery, etc.

Expanding building material production and mass fabrication of housing units.

Expanding railway facilities, particularly freight, coal, tank, and passenger cars and locomotives, by allocations and, as necessary, financing.

Expanding food production by—

(a) Extending selective price supports to get kinds and quantities needed.

(b) Giving capital aid and management assistance to small farmers and veterans with farm experience seeking to establish themselves as operators of family-type farms, as was done by Farm Security Administration in early days of World War II with most successful results.

(c) Extending wage-hour, social security, collective bargaining, health insurance, and other rights to hired farm labor, instead of importing aliens.

(d) Reviving former Farm Security Administration migrant farm-labor programs, including camps, health services, recruiting, transportation, and placement, these services

to be located within the United States Department of Labor instead of the producer-dominated Department of Agriculture.

When I made similar proposals in testifying on the ERP bill, suggestions for expanding food production were interpreted as implying that farmers had held down production for profit. This is not so. My suggestions are aimed at providing aid to farmers for further expansion of food production to meet the dire needs that, according to FAO, may be expected to continue for at least the next 4 years.

We are suffering from, and our national security is today put in danger by, a master pattern of privately planned scarcity-for-profit and defeat of the full-employment principle to which the Congress has subscribed and which both political parties are certain to endorse in the 1948 campaign.

* * * * *

CIO President Murray's testimony on ERP expressed the CIO contention that steel-production capacity can and should be expanded by from eight to ten million tons, starting now, and that full use of existing plants can get us five to six million more tons.

The Federal Government should launch a domestic peace-scrap campaign comparable to the war-scrap campaign. Effective steps should be taken to insure the collection and shipment of scrap from overseas where millions of tons of scrap is scattered as the result of war.

Private enterprise should be urged to expand production to break the steel and other bottlenecks I have mentioned.

To the extent that private enterprise can't or won't break these bottlenecks and step up production to meet domestic and ERP needs, the American people, acting through their democratically elected Federal Government, should close the gap, building and operating whatever facilities are necessary to get what it takes to maintain economic stability within the U. S. A. and freedom in the world. Let us never forget that a public corporation, TVA, supplied the margin of power that, together with public power generated in the Northwest, released atomic energy.

* * * * *

We appeal to the Congress to put first things first; to get our economic and productive plant in order for continuing full production. That, in our view, is the strongest and surest armament for peace. It is not exclusive of strong military defenses. But military defense without industrial production is no defense.

With all-out utilization of human and material resources under fair conditions, the resulting full production and distribution will lessen the likelihood of war, increase the prospect for surviving such a catastrophe, and, most important, strengthen the possibility that a peace among free men may be firmly established without a descent to the atomic, bacterial, supersonic hell of another war.

In conclusion, I present a request that a report be made to the American people on 8-month-old charges of improper lobbying activities made against the Army by a subcommittee of the House Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments. In making this request, I want to say that we who oppose UMT do not impugn the sincerity and integrity of all those who advocate it as necessary to our national security. We resent blanket charges impugning the motives and sincerity of all who oppose UMT. I recognize that some who are opposed to UMT may be more sensitive to the momentary foreign policy of another power than to our own Government, but their motives, that policy, and the judgment of both that foreign power and its collaborators can be wrong. They have often been wrong before. They are, in my opinion, wrong now. Communist totalitarianism is not winning in the long run in the countries that have come under its domination. I believe most profoundly that a combination of adequate military strength and the sort of international aid and democratic cooperation we have begun with ERP comprise the winning combination and the only combination that can win against totalitarianism, either Communist or Fascist.

I appeal to this committee not to link or lump Communist opposition to UMT and the militarization of America that it would bring about with the opposition to UMT that is held and expressed by anti-Communists who have more experience in fighting and beating communism than the big brass of the armed services.

Democracy is going to beat communism if it "gets there fustest with the mostest" food, fuel, shelter, fertilizer, farm machinery, industrial machinery, technological know-how, and the credit necessary to get a healthy economy going. Communism is going to beat democracy if democracy continues to try to fight this war of ideas with its right hand tied behind its back so that it cannot produce and distribute and consume the potential abundance of this earth.

What's a Liberal?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, we hear much these days about stand-patters, conservatives, progressives, liberals, and radicals. The Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram carries an editorial which is most apropos, and pursuant to permission given to me I include that editorial in these remarks. It is as follows:

WHAT'S A LIBERAL

Just about every candidate for the Presidential nomination of either party professes to be a liberal. A few years ago when animosity to the New Deal began mounting many political leaders, and especially Republican leaders, began calling themselves conservatives. But not so today. Almost nobody is an out-and-out conservative.

Stassen says he is a dyed-in-the-wool liberal. Dewey says he's just as liberal as Stassen and maybe more so. So also with Taft. Vandenberg is regarded by his followers as an outstanding liberal in foreign affairs. And the admirers of Eisenhower just know he would be a liberal President.

President Truman is describing himself as a liberal, even one having traces of New Deal liberalism. Of course the New Deal Democrats who had hoped Justice Douglas would be their party's choice look on him as a real liberal. Various adjectives have been applied to Henry Wallace, but there can be no doubt that he considers himself a liberal.

But just what is a liberal in American politics in 1948? That's a tough question. The answer would be as varied as the personalities of the leading aspirants for the nomination. The dictionaries are not much help. They define a liberal as a person independent in thought, as not bound by orthodox tenets or established forms in political philosophy. It is a popular belief that a liberal is eager for change and impatient with the past. A conservative respects the past, adheres to existing institutions, and is not extreme but moderate in his views. But often a break with the past is reactionary and a return to the past might be a liberal move.

If the above is confusing it is symptomatic of the difficulty in defining the word "liberal" in American politics today. The candidates are impelled to profess liberalism for fear of being dubbed conservative. Nobody wants to be known as a conservative. Even Speaker JOE MARTIN is not dead set against liberalism.

The difficulty in distinguishing between liberalism and conservatism goes beyond the differing personalities of candidates. It goes back to the two major political parties. They had pretty well lost all familiar party marks before Franklin D. Roosevelt was first elected in 1932. Then came the laundering that faded the colors of the party fabrics.

The American people will cast ballots indicating party preferences this year. But unless party platforms are much more specific and precise than they customarily are, and the people believe those platforms will be followed closely, their choice will be for the man more than for the party whose label he bears.

Mr. Speaker, years ago President Theodore Roosevelt said the Congress was composed of three groups: conservatives, radicals, and progressives.

He defined a conservative as one so wedded to the past that he needs a self-starter; a radical as one so anxious to go somewhere that he pays little attention to direction, and needs a self-stopper; and in between was the progressive who thought in prospect, giving due consideration to the experience of the past, appreciating that the world is not static. Those definitions can be aptly applied to the present-day Congress.

Possibly there are some stand-patters. There are some conservatives, some progressives, some radicals, and therefore the above editorial on a liberal is interesting.

The Late Honorable Lewis B. Schwellenbach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly shocked by the death last week of Secretary of Labor Lewis B. Schwellenbach and it is with very deep emotion and a feeling of genuine sorrow that I raise my voice in brief, but nonetheless sincere, tribute to the life and character and public service of such a distinguished gentleman.

I had the privilege of knowing Judge Schwellenbach quite well and came into contact with him on a number of occasions in connection with my duties as ranking minority member of the Labor Department-Federal Security Agency Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. As Secretary of Labor he appeared before our committee in behalf of the appropriations requested for the operations of that great department. Immediately upon meeting him for the first time I was convinced that he was a man of devoted patriotism to this great country of ours and of sincere allegiance to the people whom he was

privileged to serve. His passing is an irreparable loss as he gave his all to achieve a more harmonious relationship between the conflicting forces of our society.

Judge Schwellenbach was a member of the Cabinet for nearly 3 years after service as a Democratic Senator from Washington and as a Federal judge in that State. He gave up this lifetime place as a member of the Federal judiciary at the request of his close friend President Truman and accepted the Cabinet post at a time when the administrative burdens were enought to destroy anybody's health. Our Nation and the entire world were just entering the many postwar readjustments. He worked endless hours to help solve many difficult and complex problems and strove courageously to bring about better relations between management and labor. Throughout his public career he espoused the cause of the men and women who had to earn a livelihood by the sweat of their brows. He was a great advocate of social-justice legislation and strenuously fought against all antilabor legislation, including the vicious Taft-Hartley bill.

I am sure that I speak not only for myself but for many colleagues in this House and his host of friends when I say that Judge Schwellenbach's kindness, his memory, will linger in our hearts forever. It is my fervent hope that his good family will be consoled by the fact that his life was well and faithfully spent. I extend to them, and especially to his faithful and loving wife, and mother, my sincere and deepest sympathy.

The Ominous Atom—Politics and the Atom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Ominous Atom," published in the Hartford (Conn.) Daily Courant, of Friday, June 11, 1948, and an editorial entitled "Politics and the Atom," published in the New York Times of June 14, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Daily Courant of June 11, 1948]

THE OMINOUS ATOM

While the atom is not much in the headlines these days, time ticks on. Maneuvers are taking place under the surface of both international and domestic control. Today international control is to come before the Security Council at Lake Success, in the form of a report making the East-West deadlock official and ending negotiations until the General Assembly decides the impasse can be broken. Meanwhile the doings of the domestic Atomic Energy Commission are largely concealed behind a curtain of secrecy. But the military authorities, who are anxious to get their hands on the AEC, are busy once more. Neither activity is likely to lessen the gloom that surrounds this ominous force.

The domestic issue is the more likely of the two to strike sparks. Our military authorities, and the commercial groups who look to them, have never been satisfied since it was decided 2 years ago to put the atom in civilian hands. There is more to this than the renomination of Mr. Lilienthal and his fellow AEC commissioners, who seem destined to coast along on interim appointments until after the election. Current activity revolves about a plea that the stock pile of atomic bombs themselves should be given to the armed services. While there are arguments against this, by and large it makes sense. This, however, is only a first step in the drive to put the atomic program in military hands. And a change of this significance is something else again.

Nevertheless the dark outlook for international control, caused only by Russia's refusal to accept the Baruch plan, will be used to reinforce the military argument. It will be said that because there is to be no international control now, we must concentrate on the bomb, and the bomb is purely a weapon. Regrettably true though this is, the fact remains that this basic force of the universe itself is too powerful to be entrusted to any control other than civilian trusteeship on behalf of all the people. The restive discouragement of our scientists even now is only one indication of the danger. Meanwhile, the fact remains that the world is in an atomic arms race. Unless checked, that can end only in atomic war.

[From the New York (N. Y.) Times of June 15, 1948]

POLITICS AND THE ATOM

There seems to be a general tendency in this country at present to shrink from the full implications of atomic energy and at the same time to show continued curiosity concerning any scraps of dramtic information in this field that may be permitted to leak out. Yesterday, Chairman David E. Lilienthal told the graduating class of the University of Virginia—and, of course, all the rest of us—that there is a "probability that in your lifetime there will be created new sources of energy that may shape the future of the undeveloped continents of the world." This is thrilling. It may even thrill the Republican Senators who are resisting President Truman's proposal to reappoint Mr. Lilienthal for 5 years and his associates for the staggered terms provided by law. Senator TAFT and his friends now lean to a plan to avoid the nomination and ratification problem by extending all five terms to June 30, 1950. But these Republicans, thrill or no thrill, are playing politics. They anticipate a Republican victory this fall and it seems certain that they intend to make partisan appointments in 1950. They could not do this if they realized all that atomic energy means and can mean.

Mr. Lilienthal yesterday was not thinking in partisan terms. He had a plan reminiscent of something that William James said long ago—that every educated and qualified citizen give at least a part of his life to the public service. He sees the need for such unselfish service because he believes that we face "a decade, more probably a generation, of continued tension," which will call not only "for steadfastness and faith, but for great skills in self-government, great judgment and open-mindedness in the development of public policies, and creativeness in all the arts of government." He proposed to substitute for the motto "Take care of Number One" a higher ideal—"Be an active, living part of your time."

At commencement time we expect an expression of high ideals, not always to be taken too literally. But Mr. Lilienthal is a literal man. He served his countrymen as chairman of TVA and he and his colleagues are serving it now, under great difficulties, through the Atomic Energy Commission. We don't believe any fair-minded American can read yesterday's speech and not deplore the spectacle the Senate policy makers present when they play peanut politics with the Nation's greatest opportunity and most ominous danger.

The Palestine Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO ISACSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Speaker, the role played by our Government in bringing about the present situation in Palestine is a role unworthy of our traditions and incalculably damaging not only to the besieged people of Israel but also to the integrity of our Nation in international affairs.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, this damage can still be undone. The people of Israel, the world's newest democracy, warrant and deserve and should be accorded the fullest possible support of the United States, the pioncer among modern democracies.

We should exemplify this support in our direct dealings with Israel, nation to nation; in our policies and positions in the United Nations regarding the Middle East and those nations which now combine to set at naught the United Nations decisions regarding establishment of the Jewish national homeland in Palestine by partition; and by turning our attention at once to enforcing appropriate discipline on those in our Government who for one reason or another have acted to frustrate the United Nations decisions regarding Palestine of which our own Nation was the principal proponent.

The Lawyers Committee for Justice in Palestine has addressed a communication to President Truman, Secretary of State Marshall, and to congressional leaders in both Houses, setting forth a program for speedy solution of the Palestine problem in the true spirit of the United Nations decisions; with full regard for the welfare of the new state of Israel; and with the conviction that our Nation's integrity in international affairs must be retrieved by positive affirmation of our original position on the United Nations partition decision and the undertaking of appropriate steps to discountenance those persons and nations which have worked and are working to frustrate and sabotage the United Nations decisions.

The Lawyers Committee for Justice in Palestine has as its national chairman Mr. Bartley Crum, lawyer, publisher, and one of our Nation's most authoritative citizens with respect to Palestine. The chairman of the New York City committee, of which I am a member, is Mr. Paul O Dwyer, prominent

lawyer and brother of the mayor of our city.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the text of the communication addressed to the heads of our Government by the Lawyers Committee for Justice in Palestine:

JUNE 10, 1948.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN.
Hon. GEORGE C. MARSHALL.
Hon. JOSEPH MARTIN.
Hon. ARTHUR VANDENBERG.
Hon. WARREN AUSTIN.
Hon. CHARLES EATON.

MY DEAR SIR: The resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations on November 29, 1947, for partition with economic union for Palestine was supported by the United States because it provided the most equitable solution for Palestine in view of the sharp tension between the Jewish people and the Arab peoples living there, created in no small measure by Britain as mandatory.

That resolution is still valid. It is still the only practicable compromise solution bringing a measure of justice to all the inhabitants of Palestine. Its fulfillment insofar as the Jewish people are concerned, was advanced by the establishment on May 15, 1948, of the Jewish state provided for therein. The Arab state, giving Palestinian Arabs equal independence, as well as the international regime for Jerusalem, are yet to be established. They await the withdrawal from Palestine of foreign Arab armies invading the country to divide it amongst themselves.

The actions of Arab states have violated the resolution and the United Nations Charter itself.

Our Government must shoulder much of the responsibility for the present state of events in Palestine because of its failure in the period between February 18, 1948, and May 15, 1948, to take the necessary steps to implement the resolution, and especially because of our imposition of an arms embargo on December 7, 1947.

Britain also, by its obstructionist tactics toward and refusal to cooperate with the United Nations Commission, by arming and training Arab troops, by violating its pledges to withdraw the Arab Legion by May 15, 1948, and by opposing the cease-fire proposal of May 24, 1948, stands condemned as the chief instigator of the breach of peace that has occurred in Palestine. Britain's efforts to justify the invasion by Transjordan are particularly shocking. When United States Delegate Herschel Johnson, in August 1947 in connection with Greece, defined a threat to the peace as "giving support to armed bands * * *" and—going into the territory of another state." (UN Weekly Bulletin, August 5, 1947.) Britain gave full approval and support to the definition. Yet Bevin, when asked if he considered Transjordan's participation in the Palestine fighting an act of aggression, cynically replied "Certainly not. She has been invited to go into the territory by her fellow Arabs." (New York Post, June 2, 1948.)

Even Trygve Lie, secretary general of the United Nations, found it necessary to warn Bevin that Britain's policy toward Palestine might destroy the United Nations, and that in his opinion, Britain could do much to end the war in the Holy Land.

The State of Israel, recognized now by 10 nations, is a fact. Its continued existence as a sovereign and independent nation must not be interfered with or infringed upon.

Support for Israel strenthens the United Nations and restores the hope of the world that it will continue to be a world force for peace and justice, whose decisions cannot be set aside by aggression.

Arab rejection of the cease-fire order of May 24, 1948, brought further appeasement of aggression in the form of Britain's truce proposal of May 29, 1948, instead of punitive action by the Security Council. This truce proposal was but one further step by Britain in its support of Arab aggression against Israel and Arab violation of the United Nations Charter. Small wonder then, as reported in the New York Times, that the Arab states were delighted by the proposal (May 29, 1948).

We set forth without comment the following from the New York Times: "Complete silence on Israel's acceptance of the truce proposal was maintained by the United States delegation whose lack of expressed opposition to the British 'cease fire' resolution was one of the key factors in the approval of it by the Security Council last Saturday" (June 2, 1948).

The British truce proposal, although adopted by the Council in a modified form on May 29, 1948 and accepted by Israel on June 1, 1948, must be condemned. It treats equally Arab aggressors and Israeli defenders. It permits Arab aggressors to maintain military positions achieved as a direct result of their aggression, yet it limits Israel in its efforts to secure the arms needed to repel these aggressive acts. The truce freezes the initial advantage in military equipment enjoyed by the Arabs, created in great part by our own arms embargo and the constant flow of arms to the Arabs from Britain.

In the very act of aceeptance of the truce proposal, the Arab states committed a further threat to the peace by coupling their acceptance with a specific refusal to respect the independence and integrity of Israel. For they openly declared that at the end of the truce period aggression will commence again and that the peace will be ended unless Israel's independence is terminated. "We will never under any circumstances accept a Jewish state," declared Abdullah on June 2, 1948. The King of Egypt made a similar statement, while Jemal El Husseini, cousin of the Mufti and Vice Chairman of the Arab Higher Committee stated bluntly at Lake Success that the truce would "only delay matters one month" unless Israel agreed to dissolve. "We will fight against the existence of the Jewish state and we will not waiver in this fight," he declared. (New York Post, June 2, 1948.)

The Security Council must, therefore, take immediate steps to determine the specific nonmilitary sanctions under the charter it will invoke against the Arabs if they break the truce or resort to warlike measures again at the expiration of the truce. The council must call upon all member nations to adhere to these measures. The council will thus be ready to act at once. Failure to do this now opens the door to more delay and more encouragement to aggressors. These nonmilitary sanctions provided for in article 41 of the charter, include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of railroad, sea, air, coastal, telegraphic, radio, or other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations.

That Transjordan is not a member of the United Nations organization does not free it from the consequences of its acts, nor exempt it from Security Council action. Article 2, paragraph 6 of the charter provides that the organization shall ensure that states which are not member states of the United Nations act in accordance with these principles so far as may be necessary for the maintainance of the peace and security. Ambassador Austin took the same position in June 1947, in connection with the Balkan reports: The council must treat alike all states using force against the territorial integrity of another—whether they are members of the United Nations or not."

We must be alert that the truce is not used in an attempt again to weaken or abandon the partition resolution, or to substitute for it any trusteeship, federalization or cantonization proposal that would destroy the existence of Israel as an independent state.

The record of the United States of Palestine is good in words, but not in needs:

Arms are still being withheld from Israel.

No effective measures are being taken to prevent passengers from being taken off and cargoes from being confiscated from American ships.

It is time for us to act as well as to speak in support of the United Nations and Israel. Therefore, we call upon our President, our State Department, our Congress, and our delegation to the United Nations immediately to do the following:

(a) Accord de jure recognition of Israel, enter into diplomatic relations with it, and extend economic assistance to it.

(b) Take appropriate action against Lebanon and Egypt in respect to their acts against American ships, cargoes, and passengers in violation of international law.

(c) Discipline those officials of the executive departments of the United States Government who have endeavored to frustrate the United Nations resolution of November 29, 1947.

(d) That Congress immediately investigate the extent to which American funds have facilitated British action in arming and financing Arab aggressors, and take measures to prevent any further economic aid from the United States to Britain from being so used.

(e) That our delegation to the United Nations move in the Security Council the immediate adoption of nonmilitary sanctions, to be applied at once in the event of further aggression against Israel.

Very truly yours,

LAWYERS COMMITTEE FOR
JUSTICE IN PALESTINE,
BARTLEY CRUM,
National Chairman.
PAUL O'DWYER,
New York City Chairman.

The Search for Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. VORYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1948

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following commencement address delivered by me entitled "The Search for Security," at Otterbein College, Westerville, Ohio, June 7, 1948:

Seniors of the class of 1948, congratulations on your graduation. To be asked to speak at your commencement, closing the one hundred and first year of Otterbein College, is a great honor, and a responsibility which I deeply appreciate.

They call this commencement. The general idea is that you have finished preparing for life and are now commencing your life. This is not quite true. You commenced life long ago; in fact, you are nearly one-third of the way through life now. You have not finished your education; it will continue through the rest of your life. You will forget much of what you have already learned, and much of it will become outdated by new discoveries of truth, but if you have truly learned to learn, you are equipped for your life-long education and you are needed in a troubled, perplexed world.

I know that it is customary on such occasions to warn you that you are going out

equipped only with high ideals and academic theories into a practical world of reality. I want to tell you that you are going out into an impractical world of unreality; a world wanting peace and prosperity, with peace and plenty within its reach, but consuming its wealth in wars. Other generations of elders might say on commencement day, "Come out into the world and learn of our success so that you too may succeed." Today your elders can only say to your generation, "We have failed; come and help us or we will all fail together."

The whole world is searching for security, and so far the search has failed. The dreadful possibilities of atomic warfare are well known; knowledge of the ghastly possibilities of bacteriological warfare is becoming more widespread. The experts in these fields tell us that these man-made disasters will come without warning. We are just beginning to understand fully the persuasive, coercive, and disabolically effective methods of international communism and we know that this threat to our security is now at work here and all over the world, with no more warning than we now have. Here at home, each one feels himself in the clutch of economic tides and currents beyond his control. In this situation, people are searching for security, scientific, materialist security, and up to date the search has been in vain. A United Nations was created with a security council to prevent trouble all over the world; its attempts so far have resulted in collective military insecurity. People want social security from the cradle to the grave; and the steps taken by Britain toward this goal have resulted so far in collective social and economic insecurity.

A typical American reaction to all this is, that there "ought to be a law; Congress should pass a lot of laws, to give us more security at home and abroad." Congress has been considering bills to increase and broaden social security here at home; to guarantee farm prices; to fix minimum wages and maximum prices; to furnish health, housing, and education by Federal laws. As we study these plans to relieve the strain on each of us by increasing the burden on all of us, here at home, we realize that threats from abroad and the cost of meeting them, are interfering with our own social-security program. We have learned that peace and plenty cannot be secure here if there is war and misery abroad, so national security comes ahead of social security. We find ourselves, unready and unwilling, in a position of world leadership, not because we want to lead, but because we must, to protect our own security. From now on we must lead or die, and we intend to lead.

Congress enacted the foreign assistance bill this spring, providing about $6,000,000,000 for economic reconstruction of foreign countries, under many restrictions, with an over-all proviso that continuity of our assistance depends upon continuity of their cooperation. They must help themselves and each other and help us. This was not a relief bill for foreigners. Under it, nothing is given away, free. This act was for our own security, to preserve and strengthen our side in case of war, and to provide good business in times of peace. Our aid benefits other nations, but the main purpose is to help ourselves in the long run. We know, however, that this act alone will not prevent the Soviets from overrunning Europe or China, if they decide to move before recovery gets under way. ECA alone will not guarantee our security.

Congress has provided for a 70-group Air Force program, in order to do our part in policing the world. Military experts tell us, however, that we must have ground forces and sea power to support this giant Air Force, for it alone will not guarantee our security.

Congress is making ready to take the hateful, necessary step of drafting men sufficient for the minimum forces necessary for our defense and our share of occupation and world police duty, because we cannot secure enough volunteers. We find, however, that Communist infiltration and seizure of Czechoslovakia took place when no Soviet soldiers were in the country; that Italy's freedom was in danger, although Soviet troops were far away. Troops alone will not guarantee our security.

We find that we are in a war of ideas. Congress has created a Government propaganda machine politely called the Office of Information and Educational Exchange. It is not doing well, because Government propaganda does not fit well in the American way of free speech and a free press. Last year, because of the stupid, silly, and often un-American broadcasts put out by this Government agency, Congress indicated a preference for the use of private agencies to prepare the broadcasts. We have found in the past few days that this plan has not worked well, either, and that things that private individuals say and write about each other here in this country with perfect freedom under our guaranties of free speech and press make very bad Government propaganda as the Voice of America. We are going to improve our propaganda and use our ingenuity and inventiveness to carry our message to the world, but we realize that propaganda alone will not guarantee our security.

We find that Communist infiltration is not a dim and distant danger in Europe but is going on here. There are those among us who are using the protection of our constitutional guaranties of freedom to undermine freedom itself. The Government has finally set up a board to eliminate such people from the Government pay rolls, and the board is called a security board. Congress is considering laws to combat this insidious menace, and the House has passed the Mundt-Nixon bill to require registration of all foreign-controlled organizations and to prohibit all attempts to set up a foreign-controlled totalitarian government in this country. This bill does not outlaw the Communist Party, but by violating its provisions the Communists may outlaw themselves. On Capitol Hill this week American Communists have brazenly threatened to defy this law if it is enacted. Such open defiance of our laws by Communists and their fellow travelers have been punished by the courts repeatedly in the past year and will be similarly dealt with under any new law we enact, but we know that clever evasion and underground activity will be hard to reach by law. We know these anti-Communist laws alone will not guarantee our security.

The dissatisfaction with the failure of the UN to guarantee security has caused a widespread feeling in the country that we must strengthen the UN or scrap it and start a new and better world organization. Our committee has just finished long hearings on the structure of the UN. We had before us four different problems connected with the UN.

1. Congress was asked to authorize an agreement for a $65,000,000 loan from the United States to the UN to finance its headquarters, its physical structure.

2. Congressional approval was requested for an immunities agreement to give the United Nations the necessary diplomatic immunities in this country to protect its structure as an international organization.

3. Senator Austin, our American representative, needed an assistant, because of the many meetings of the United Nations.

4. A number of organizations and public leaders in the hearings made criticisms of the working structure of the United Nations and suggestions for its improvement.

There was bitter criticism of the Soviet abuse of the veto and demand that the veto be abolished by amending the Charter. The difficulty is that the so-called veto applies to amendments to the Charter and, therefore, any attempt to amend it can be vetoed and any attempt to override such a veto would, of course, destroy the United Nations. As a matter of fact, the word veto is not mentioned in the Charter. It is of interest to note that the word veto is not mentioned in the Constitution of the United States. Veto simply means forbid. The President has a partial veto in the passage of a law, but the House has a complete veto on a bill and so has the Senate, and so has the Supreme Court. All these vetoes make legislation cumbersome under our Constitution, but there is very little sentiment for abolishing these vetoes. Our system works because we known how to make it work and we do not think of our system of checks and balances as vetoes.

General Marshall said at the hearing on strengthening the United Nations: "Basic human frailties cannot be overcome by Charter provisions alone, for they exist in the behavior of men and governments. * * * It is not changes in the form of international intercourse which we now require. It is to changes of substance that we must look."

Curiously enough, the most significant step to date in changing the veto started with the Soviets. The United Nations Charter requires the concurrence of five permanent members of the Security Council on all except procedural questions. When an issue came up on which the Soviets did not wish to vote yes, but did not wish to prevent action by voting no, they abstained from voting. When it was pointed out that the Charter required concurrence or agreement of the five permanent members, they asked that their abstention be interpreted as not preventing concurrence. This interpretation is a little hard to follow from a logical or legalistic viewpoint. As a practical matter, it helps to make the United Nations work.

At the end of the hearings our committee realized that our problem involved not only the physical structure of the United Nations but also its legal structure—its working structure as a living organization. We felt that these problems should be considered together or not at all. To be perfectly frank, we felt that there was little use for the United States to lend money for housing an organization that was not going to function effectively and, conversely, that there was little use of passing pious resolutions to improve the United Nations while neglecting its housing, its personnel, and its business arrangements. We, therefore, brought out "a bill to strengthen the United Nations and promote international cooperation for peace." It covers all four of the present needs of the United Nations. It incorporates not only provision for permanently housing the United Nations, giving it proper legal status and strengthening our own representation, but contains a formal policy statement. Our committee faced the fact that with the President of one political party and Congress of another any statement by the President alone, or any resolution passed by the House alone or by the Senate alone, or Congress alone, would be unsatisfactory, but a policy statement in a bill, if passed by the House and the Senate and signed by the President, would have great force.

We attempted to make such a statement in our bill. Because of its importance, it should receive careful scrutiny and doubtless it will. Our committee put a great deal of thought and effort into it, but we realize that we are not the possessors of infinite wisdom and it may be that it will be improved during the legislative process. Our statement starts as follows:

"It is the policy of the people of the United States through constitutional processes to strive to accomplish the aims and purposes set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and to strengthen the United Nations by"—then follow five brief paragraphs:

First. Stating what we will do ourselves to strengthen the UN structure.

Second. Seeking by voluntary agreements to improve the functioning of the UN without changing its form.

Third. Pressing for agreements to provide the UN with armed forces for police purposes, and universal control and reduction of all other armament, including mass armies.

Fourth. Encouraging collective self-defense arrangements under Article 51 of the Charter.

Fifth. Initiating consultations with other nations on amendments to the Charter to enable the UN to prevent aggression.

The provisions of this bill can have a far-reaching effect in strengthening the UN, giving it a better structure; but this bill alone will not guarantee our security.

I have reviewed some of the steps your Congress is taking to increase your security. Such steps are necessary. We need laws in this lawless world; we need to make the UN a government of laws and not of men; but as a lawmaker, I tell you that no law, or set of laws, can guarantee your security. No legal control over men, no scientific control over matter can give you the inner sense of security you need.

It is questionable whether people want complete security. What do people do who have complete social security? Plenty of money, with no work to do, nothing to worry about? Why, they play cards, they play the races, they run for office, they pursue big game, or hobbies or problems or blondes. Why? For the thrill that comes from security? No; for the thrill that comes from insecurity.

You know of the man who was in great trouble and dreamed that he died. When he woke up in another world, an unearthly being told him: "You are now in an existence where you can have everything you want without effort." The man asked for food and more food, for fine clothes, for automobiles, yachts, and palaces, and received whatever he wanted merely for the asking. After a few days this type of existence began to pall and the man told the being: "What I want now is to have a little effort connected with my activities." The being said: "That is the one thing we cannot arrange." The man, in desperation, cried: "I would rather be in hell than to go on existing like this." The being said: "Well, where did you think you were?"

I doubt whether most people need as much security as they want. We yearn for freedom from fear and want, when fear of want is what makes most of us work.

Nevertheless, there is a kind of inner security that you crave, and deserve, and can have, but it comes only from within, and no law can guarantee it. There is no control over men or matter that is as important for your security as self-control. You have to behave yourself. You cannot behave anyone else. The generation that sought security by achieving mastery over men and matter, and liberation from self-control, has ended up with 70 percent of its disabled war veterans suffering from neuropsychiatric troubles, Congress establishing a National Institute of Mental Health, and millions suffering from anxiety, worry, terror, guilt, and despair under new-fangled names, pschyco-something or other.

As a mere Congressman, I cannot adequately analyze or describe such troubles, much less prescribe their cure. The answers lie in philosophy and religion. I doubt very much if modern, scientific materialism can solve these problems of the spirit, the soul, the inner life. I know, however, that there are mental, moral, spiritual forces inside you that can give you a real security that cannot be created by act of Congress and cannot be destroyed by act of the Soviets. You may say that the complexities, the terrors of modern life, cause all this. I do not think so. I have talked with people in the concentration camps of Germany, who lived through the horrors planned with scientific sadism, by the Nazis for the very purpose of breaking their spirit. A Czech university professor who had spent 2 years in Buchenwold was one of the most serene men I ever met, although he was a walking skeleton, clad in rags, I asked him why all the inmates did not go insane. He told me that the very weak went to pieces immediately; the others developed their inner resources in order to survive. Last fall I talked with a Frenchman who had spent 2 years in Buchenwold. His serenity, his peace of mind, impressed me. He, too, said "The camps brought out the best, as well as the worst in us; these who tried, found inner resources that made it possible, not only to survive, but be happy, in the camps." If these men and thousands of others could keep their own inner security under the most terrible conditions on this planet, you can do it.

If you learn to do this, you will not only be more happy and useful, you will help with the problem of collective security. I know that all of the plans for a finer country, a better world, depend in the last analysis upon the individual actions and reactions of people who practice self-control, who behave themselves. We cannot have a free country, a free world, full of people who misbehave. The greatest need in the whole world is spiritual, and souls do not develop en masse, but one at a time. You have the God-given power to choose for yourself. God Almighty has given up part of His infinite power and put it in you, in order to give you the power to decide. He has surrendered his power to direct you. God must get anxious about this, because He loves us all and hates to see us make mistakes. It is not nearly as important for God to answer your prayers, as for you to answer God's prayers.

In our hymn, America the Beautiful, we pray as we sing:

> "America, America
> God mend thine every flaw
> Confirm thy soul in self-control
> Thy liberty in law."

Remember, that means you, personally. I beg each of you for the sake of your own inner security, for the sake of your country and your planet—behave yourself.

President Truman's Address on Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address delivered at the University of California by President Truman:

President Sproul, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I deeply appreciate the privilege you have given me of taking part in these exercises at this great university.

I regret that I could not arrange my schedule to permit me to be here next week at the time for which you first invited me. Under these circumstances, I am pleased that an adjustment could be made on the part of the university so as to make it possible for me to be here today.

Three years ago this month, across the bay in San Francisco, I witnessed the signing of the Charter of the United Nations. That Charter represents man's hope for a world order based upon law and for lasting peace based on justice.

Today, I have come back to the shores of San Francisco Bay to discuss with you recent world events and, in particular, to appraise the progress we are making toward world peace.

Many students here today and in colleges across the country are veterans. They fought for peace, peace with freedom and justice. They, above all, have reason to expect a plain statement of the progress we are making in that direction.

The American people know from experience that our daily lives are affected not only by what happens in this country, but also by events abroad. Most American families bear the scars and memories of a war which began thousands of miles from this Nation. Every American wants to be sure that this country is doing everything in its power to build a lasting peace and a just peace. We believe that such a peace can be achieved by the nations of the world.

Anyone can talk of peace. But only the work that is done for peace really counts.

I propose to describe the specific steps the United States has taken to obtain peace in the world. I propose, also, to discuss what further measures we must take, and what measures others must take, if our hopes for peace are to be fulfilled.

The United States has consistently done its part in meeting the requirements for a peaceful world.

We fought through World War II with only one purpose—to destroy the tyrants who tried to impose their rule on the world and enslave its people. We sought no territories, we asked for only token reparations. At the end of the war we quickly dismantled the greatest military machine ever built by any nation. We withdrew and demobilized the American armies that had swept across Europe and the Pacific, leaving only minimum occupation forces in Germany, Austria, Japan, and Korea. The nations which our Army had helped to liberate were left free to work out their postwar problems without interference from us.

That was not the course of a nation that sought to impose its will upon others. It was not the course of an aggressor.

Long before the fighting had ended our Government began planning for a world organization which could provide security for all nations. At Dumbarton Oaks, at Yalta, at San Francisco, the United States led the way in preparing for a strong and useful United Nations.

PUTS BLAME ON SOVIET UNION

In the past 3 years we have taken a leading part in establishing the United Nations and the related agencies—such as the World Bank and the Food and Agricultural Organization—which are fundamental to world peace and prosperity.

No action by the United States has revealed more clearly our sincere desire for peace than our proposal in the United Nations for the international control of atomic energy. In a step without precedent we have voluntarily offered to share with others the secrets of atomic power. We ask only for conditions that will guarantee its use for the benefit of humanity and not for the destruction of humanity.

To assist world economic recovery, we have contributed nearly $20,000,000,000 in loans and grants to other nations. American dollars have been invested generously in the cause of peace because we know what peace is worth.

This is a record of action in behalf of peace without parallel in history.

Many other nations have joined wholeheartedly with us in our work for peace. They share our desire for international control of atomic energy, for the early conclusion of peace treaties, for world economic recovery, and for the effective development of the United Nations.

Why, then, after such great exertions and huge expenditures, do we live today in a twilight period—between a war so dearly won and a peace that still eludes our grasp?

The answer is not hard to find.

It lies largely in the attitude of one nation—the Soviet Union.

Long before the war, the United States established normal diplomatic and commercial relations with the Soviet Union. In doing so, we demonstrated our belief that it was possible to get along with a nation whose economic and political system differs sharply from ours.

During the war, we worked with the Soviet Union wholeheartedly in defeating the common enemy.

In every way we could we tried to convince the Soviet Government that it was possible and necessary for Allied unity to continue in the great task of establishing the peace. We hoped that the Soviet Union, secure in her own strength and doubly secure in the respect of her allies, would accept full partnership in a peaceful world community.

The record, however, is clear for all to read. The Soviet Government has rejected the invitation to participate, freely and on equal terms, in a great cooperative program for reconstruction of Europe. It has constantly maneuvered for delay and for propaganda effect in every international conference. It has used the veto excessively and unreasonably in the Security Council of the United Nations. It has boycotted the "Little Assembly" and several special United Nations commissions. It has used indirect aggression against a number of nations in eastern Europe and extreme pressure against others in the Middle East. It has intervened in the internal affairs of many other countries by means of Communist Parties directed from Moscow.

The refusal of the Soviet Union to work with its wartime allies for world recovery and world peace is the most bitter disappointment of our time.

The great issues of world peace and world recovery are sometimes portrayed as disputes solely between the United States and the Soviet Union. This is not the case. The fact is that not a single one of the major unsettled questions of the postwar world is primarily a disagreement between this country and the Soviet Union.

We are not engaged in a struggle with the Soviet Union for any territory or for any economic gain. We have no hostile or aggressive designs against the Soviet Union or any other country. We are not waging a "cold war."

The cleavage that exists is not between the Soviet Union and the United States. It is between the Soviet Union and the rest of the world.

The great questions at stake today affect not only the United States and the Soviet Union; they affect all nations.

Whether it be control of atomic energy, aggression against small nations, the German or the Austrian peace settlements, or any of the other questions, the majority of nations concerned have found a common basis for action. But in every case the majority agreement has been rejected, denounced, and openly attacked by the Soviet Union and her satellites whose policies it controls.

Let me repeat: The division has not been between the United States and the Soviet Union but between the Soviet Union and the free nations of the world.

The United States is strongly devoted to the principle of discussion and negotiation in settling international differences. We do not believe in settling differences by force. There are certain types of disputes in international affairs which can and must be settled by negotiation and agreement.

But there are others which are not susceptible to negotiation.

There is nothing to negotiate when one nation disregards the principles of international conduct to which all the members of the United Nations have subscribed. There is nothing to negotiate when one nation habitually uses coercion and open aggression in international affairs.

What the world needs in order to regain a sense of security is an end to Soviet obstruction and aggression. I will give you two clear illustrations of what I have in mind.

The situation in Greece has caused uneasiness throughout the world. It has been the subject of a series of investigations on the part of commissions of the United Nations. The facts have been established over and over again by these investigations. They are clear beyond dispute. Some 20,000 Greek guerrillas have been able to keep Greece in a state of unrest and to disrupt Greek recovery, primarily because of the aid and comfort they have been receiving from the neighboring countries of Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Albania.

Last October the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution calling upon Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Albania to stop their illegal aid and comfort to the Greek rebels. This resolution was agreed to by more than two-thirds of the membership of the United Nations. But it has been boycotted by Russia.

The situation in Greece requires no special negotiation, or discussion, or conference.

On its own initiative the Soviet Government can cease its boycott of the United Nations recommendation. It can join with other nations in stopping illegal foreign support of the Greek guerrillas so that Greece may have an opportunity for peaceful reconstruction.

If the Soviet Union genuinely desires to make a contribution to peace and recovery of the world, it can prove it in Greece.

The situation in Korea is also disturbing. There the Soviet Government has defied the clearly expressed will of an overwhelming majority of the United Nations by boycotting the United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea. This commission was created last fall by the General Assembly to help set up a Korean national government based on free and democratic elections.

The Soviet boycott has prevented the residents of the northern zone of Korea from electing representatives to establish a unified national government for Korea.

The situation in Korea requires no special negotiation or discussion or conference.

On its own initiative the Soviet Government can abandon its boycott of the United Nations Commission. It can permit the people of north Korea to work with their compatriots in the south in creating an independent and democratic nation.

If the Soviet Union genuinely desires to make a contribution to peace and recovery in the world, it can prove it in Korea.

In these questions, as in all others, there are practical ways for the Soviet Union to show its good faith by proper action.

The United States will always respond to an honest move by any nation to further the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations.

But no nation has the right to exact a price for good behavior.

What is needed is a will for peace. What is needed is the abandonment of the absurd idea that the capitalistic nations will collapse and that the instability in international affairs will hasten their collapse, leaving the world free for communism.

It is possible for different economic systems to live side by side and in peace, one with the other, provided one of these systems is not determined to destroy the other by force.

I have said before and I repeat now: The door is always open for honest negotiations looking toward genuine settlements.

The door is not open, however, for deals between great powers to the detriment of other nations or at the expense of principle. We refuse to play fast and loose with man's hope for peace. That hope is too sacred to be trifled with for propaganda purposes, or selfish advantage, by any individual or nation. We are interested in peace—not, in propaganda.

We shall judge the policy of every nation by whether it advances or obstructs world progress toward peace and we wish our own policy to be judged by the same standard.

I stated our American policy for peace at the end of the war. It has been restated many times, but I shall repeat the essential elements of our policy again so that there can be no misunderstanding anywhere by anyone:

"We seek no territorial expansion or selfish advantage.

"We have no plans for aggression against any other state, large or small.

"We have no objective which need clash with the peaceful aims of any other nation."

The United States has been conscientious and consistent in its devotion to these principles.

We have sought to assist free nations in creating economic conditions under which free institutions can survive and flourish.

SAYS WE WILL KEEP STRONG

We have sought through the United Nations the development of a world order in which each nation feels secure under law and can make its contribution to world civilization in accordance with its own means and national tradition.

We have sought to help free nations protect themselves against aggression. We know that peace through weakness has proved to be a dangerous illusion. We are determined, therefore, to keep strong for the sake of peace.

This course is not an easy one, but it is the practical, realistic path to peace. It has required, and will continue to require, hard work and some sacrifice by the people of the United States. But from many quarters there is tangible evidence that it is succeeding.

This is the course we must follow. I do not propose that we shall be turned aside by those who want to see us fail.

Our policy will continue to be a policy of recovery, reconstruction, prosperity—and peace with freedom and justice. In its furtherance we gladly join with all those of like purpose.

The only expansion we are interested in is the expansion of human freedom and the wider enjoyment of the good things of the earth in all countries.

The only prize we covet is the respect and good will of our fellow members of the family of nations.

The only realm in which we aspire to eminence exists in the minds of men, where authority is exercised through the qualities of sincerity, compassion, and right conduct.

Abiding devotion to these ideals and profound faith in their ultimate triumph sustain and guide the American people in the service of the most compelling cause of our time—the crusade for peace.

I believe the men and women of every part of the globe intensely desire peace and freedom. I believe good people everywhere will not permit their rulers, no matter how powerful they may have made themselves, to lead them to destruction. America has faith in people. It knows that rulers rise and fall, but the people live on.

The American people, from the mighty rostrum of the United Nations, call out to all peoples of the world to join with them to preserve the peace.

Farmers Home Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to insert the following instances of families in my district who have made great progress in their farming activities through the Farmers Home Administration:

THE CANTRELL FAMILY, BOONE COUNTY

In 1939, Mr. and Mrs. James Cantrell of Everton, Ark., made application to the Farm Security Administration, now Farmers Home Administration, for a loan to purchase some livestock. At that time the Cantrell family owned only one cow and was renting land from Mr. Cantrell's mother.

Mr. Cantrell was 21 years of age and was unable to obtain a loan from any other credit source with which to start farming. A loan of $506.50 was made to the Cantrells to purchase a team, harness, four cows, a brood sow, feed, and seed. This young family now had their first opportunity to make a go of farming. The Cantrells were allowed 5 years at 5 percent interest to repay this loan and through careful planning and hard work on the part of both Mr. and Mrs. Cantrell they were able to repay their entire loan on schedule and at the same time increased their herd of cows to seven and added some new farm machinery and household goods.

In the fall of 1942, Mr. Cantrell decided it was a "slow go" farming a rented farm so he made application to the Farm Security Administration for a loan to purchase a farm. The loan of $3,235 was obtained to purchase a 96-acre farm, construct a new dairy barn and improve other buildings.

Under the provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, which made possible the FSA farm loan, the Cantrells had 40 years to repay this loan at 3-percent interest and their annual repayment was $139.95 a year, which covered both principal and interest.

During the first year of operation Mr. and Mrs. Cantrell showed a net cash income of $535. Their income has continued to increase from year to year. Not only have the Cantrells shown a steady increase in farm income but more important a steady rise in net worth.

Since 1943, Mr. and Mrs. Cantrell have constructed a new barn, remodeled their house, adding two porches and two rooms to the house, and built a new cellar and smokehouse. While adding the improvements to the place they are 9 years ahead of schedule with their land payments.

Mrs. Cantrell has shared in the success of the family by practicing a live-at-home program of food production and preservation. In 1946 the Cantrell family was chosen second place winner in the Farmers Home Administration "Farm family of the year," contest for Boone County.

THE NORTON FAMILY, BOONE COUNTY

Until 1938 the Denner Norton family had rented land to operate each year but when Congress passed the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act making loan funds available to low-income farm families through the Farm Security Administration, now Farmers Home Administration, Mr. Norton filed an application with the Boone County FSA supervisor. At that time Mr. Norton owned 2 horses, 7 cows, 10 calves, but livestock was not listed very high in price and Mr. Norton was unable to obtain a loan from any other credit source with which to buy a farm.

In June of 1939 a loan was approved to the Norton family to purchase a 390-acre farm on Bear Creek at Lowry, Ark. At the time of purchase the buildings were in very bad condition so funds were included in the loan to construct a new dwelling and barn. Under the terms of the loan Mr. Norton had up to 40 years to repay his indebtedness at 3 percent interest.

Mr. Norton's first task and accomplishments were to construct a new farm home and barn and at the same time begin developing and improving his soil. He had to overcome an erosion problem on the bottom land along Bear Creek and the Soil Conservation Service aided him in this task.

Mr. Norton and sons have greatly improved the carrying capacity of the pastures through sodding, seeding, and fertilization and have made a practice of producing their own feed supply at home.

Mrs. Norton has contributed a great deal to the success of the family through her garden and canning program. In 1946 the Norton family spent only $188 for food bought, which is remarkably good for a family of four during a time when the cost of living is so high.

Due to their outstanding record of progress the Norton family was chosen to represent Boone County in the 1946 FHA Farm Family of the Year contest.

While increasing their net worth by six times since 1939 the Nortons have paid their loan up 6 years ahead of schedule.

Mr. Norton does not believe in a one-source cash income but instead had income from six different sources during 1947. Beef cattle is his major source of income at present with hogs second in importance followed by eggs. For the past 5 years the Norton family has led all other Boone County farm ownership borrowers in net income for the year.

This record has been accomplished through careful planning and hard work on the farm by all members of the Norton family.

THE WILSON FAMILY, BOONE COUNTY

Although he had 40 years to repay his farm loan, W. J. Wilson, of route 1, Harrison, Ark., took advantage of his opportunities and through good farming methods and hard work paid his farm-ownership loan 34 years ahead of schedule. Mr. Wilson saved $1,963 interest figured at the rate of 3 percent.

Mr. Wilson obtained a loan in 1941 through the Farm Security Administration, now the Farmers Home Administration, and purchased the Wagley farm consisting of 80 acres located about 4 miles southwest of Harrison on the Walnut Grove road.

Mr. Wilson had a net worth of $1,225 and nine children at home when he purchased the farm. Now Mr. Wilson owns his farm and has a nice herd of high-quality Jersey cows. Mr. Wilson did not just purchase his farm and then repay the loan but immediately after purchasing the farm he repaired and painted the house and constructed a new barn. Then the Wilson family cleared and cleaned up all the land on the farm in order to put every acre into production.

Through the technical guidance of the county FHA supervisor and the Soil Conservation Service, Mr. Wilson has practiced a crop-rotation and soil-building program that has increased production rather than depleted his soil.

Of the 25 farm-ownership loans in Boone County, Mr. Wilson spent less money for livestock feed than any of the other families the past year, according to Lendon E. Chambers, Boone County FHA supervisor. Mrs. Wilson has also carried her share of the load by keeping the home income and expenses in line. Mrs. Wilson has always had an exceptionally good garden not only during the spring and early summer, but maintains a good late summer and fall garden. Mrs. Wilson always succeeds in canning more than her family requirements. Last fall when everything was burned and dry the Wilson family was enjoying nice fresh roasting ears from their garden, according to Mr. Chambers.

This is the vision that the late Senator Bankhead had when in 1938 he introduced a bill in Congress making loan funds available to low-income farmers through the Farm Security Administration, with which to purchase and improve their own farms. The Wilson family is positive proof of the soundness of this type loan.

THE ETCHISON FAMILY, CARROLL COUNTY

Mr. and Mrs. Tom Etchison, route 4, Green Forest, Carroll County, Ark., applied for a farm ownership loan on October 15, 1942. The loan was made and on January 1, 1947, they paid the loan in full.

Prior to the time that they acquired their farm ownership loan, the Etchisons had been tenants and share croppers. They had never gone into debt for more than $50, but after learning of the farm ownership program they requested a loan. Soon the family found a farm of 100 acres which was considered suitable by the FHA committee, and the loan was closed.

The purchase price of this farm, plus necessary improvements, was $2420, and as the family had no outside debts they set as their goal two payments the first year. The farm which they purchased was rough with only a limited amount of land suitable for cultivation, but the soil was especially well adapted to grass. Mr. Etchison realized this fact and utilized his farm for the purpose for which it was best adapted. Except for the garden, potato, and berry patches, the only row crop he has grown on the place since he has owned it was two acres of tomatoes in 1946. The crops to which the fields have been planted have consisted of small grain, alfalfa, lespedeza, and other hay and pasture crops.

The Etchisons have developed their farm and improved their buildings until their unit is an attractive and productive farm. People going through their community comment on the neatness, good taste, and splendid farming methods employed.

Since the Etchisons have owned their farm, they have made many improvements such as developing springs, establishing meadows and cutting brush, seeding pasture, and availing themselves of AAA service. Nor has the home and other buildings been neglected. Water has been piped to the house and a sink installed. Electric lights for both barn and dwelling have been added. A new poultry house has been built and the barn remodeled.

Mrs. Etchison is an immaculate housekeeper, an excellent seamstress, and an industrious homemaker. The cellar is well stocked with an adequate amount of dried vegetables, fruit, and approximately 200 quarts of canned food per person. Her food-conservation program is evidenced by both quality and quantity products. The Etchisons do not buy meat or lard but produce an ample supply for home use, and also some for sale. Last year the sale of strawberries netted them approximately $500.

Mr. Etchison sells his surplus livestock each year and builds up his herd of dairy cows by growing his own heifers. Today the Etchison herd is their chief source of income; however, they have several sources, but all income is derived from the farm.

During the time they participated in the farm-ownership program, their repayments were as follows:

1943	$209.38
1944	325.00
1945	600.00
1946	1,379.77

Final payment on the loan was made in January of 1947.

Today the Etchisons are proud and progressive farm owners. The daughter, Rose Marie, attends a consolidated school and is making a splendid record as a student. Mr. Etchison is now serving as an able member of the county FHA committee. He knows

the FHA program, and is intensely interested in it as he realizes from personal experience the great value it is to worth-while applicants seeking help in owning their farm and home.

The Etchison family now have a net worth of more than $5,000 and their farm, home, and chattels reflect the excellent care that they receive. Their well-kept buildings are attractive and speak well of the owners, and the pride in land and home which they now own.

The record of the Etchison family is an enviable one, and is a credit to themselves, their community, and to the Farmers Home Administration who helped them to help themselves.

THE LAWRENCE FAMILY, CARROLL COUNTY

Emery Lawrence made an application for a farm-ownership loan in Carroll County in March 1941. At that time he was a cash tenant on a 60-acre farm in the county, with such limited acreage that he was unable to increase his dairy herd sufficiently to bring in a satisfactory income.

A loan was approved by the FSA Committee for the purchase and repair of a 104-acre farm northeast of Green Forest. The amount required was $2,520. The farm was occupied to the end of the 1941 crop year, and Mr. Lawrence proceeded to repair his buildings and properly utilize his farm acreage. Pasture has been developed, and sufficient acreage planted to feed to supply the farm livestock. In addition, Mr. Lawrence has produced various horticultural crops including watermelons, tomatoes, sweetpotatoes, and applies. These crops have not been depended on as the chief source of income, however, as Mr. Lawrence feels that livestock must remain the chief product of his farm. He states that he has purchased hay only 1 year since he has been on this farm.

As an example of diversification practiced on this farm, the following is the list of sources of income in 1947:

Milk	$1,486.11
Eggs	514.42
Hogs	391.54
Cattle	936.00
Melons	190.00
Apples	175.00
AAA payment	32.00
Total	3,725.07

During 1947 Mr. Lawrence milked from 12 to 16 cows. The food supply was largely produced on the farm, and Mrs. Lawrence practiced a good conservation program as well as having fresh fruit and vegetables, milk, eggs, and meat.

A payment of $800 was made on the farm loan during the year and an electric refrigerator was purchased. The farm debt is now reduced to $200, and the family's net worth at the end of the year was $5,773. Thus in 7 years this family has nearly completed payment for a farm and home. They are demonstrating that a thrifty and progressive family does not need the 40 years allowed under the terms of their loan.

Mr. Lawrence feels that without this loan he might still be operating as a tenant farmer, with limited income, insufficient livestock, and few of the advantages that he and his family now enjoy.

THE WEBB FAMILY, CARROLL COUNTY

One of the first applicants for a farm ownership loan in Carroll County when the program began was Otto Webb. At that time Mr. Webb was a rehabilitation borrower, operating a 47-acre hill farm with tomatoes as the only cash crop. He had a net worth of less than $700 with livestock consisting of a team, two milk cows, and eight ewes.

Mr. Webb's loan was approved for the purchase of a 213-acre farm about 1½ miles northwest of Osage. For the land and necessary improvements he had to borrow $5,000. He then borrowed additional funds to increase his herd of milk cows. Since that time he has no longer depended on tomatoes alone for a cash crop. While he still raises 4 or 5 acres of tomatoes annually, he also produces sufficient feed for his livestock, and has sold butterfat, hogs, lambs, and wool for other sources of income. Some years he has also sold surplus feed and seed oats. Because of the damage by wolves Mr. Webb had to dispose of his sheep in 1946, but states he expects to replace them as soon as the wolf menace is lessened.

The Webb family, consisting of Mr. and Mrs. Webb and their 13-year-old son, practice a real live-at-home program. Most of the family food supply is produced on the farm, thereby having more cash for debt payment and purchase of needed equipment.

In 1946 Mr. Webb's income was as follows:

Dairy products	$800
Eggs	150
Poultry	65
Hogs	508
Cattle	239
Sheep	288
Tomatoes	900
AAA payment	39
Total income	2,989

Farm and family living expenses amounted to $814, leaving a net income of $2,175.

In 1947 this income was somewhat less due to a short tomato crop, but because of the several different sources of income their financial condition was much better than that of neighbors with less livestock.

Mr. Webb has now reduced his farm indebtedness to less than $900 with no other debts. Net worth has increased to $7,160, including 12 dairy cows, 12 other cows, 4 work animals, hogs, and poultry. The farm has electricity and many modern conveniences.

Without the farm-ownership loan, Mr. Webb would probably still be a tenant farmer or would have purchased a small hill unit that would have required less capital and would not have provided sufficient pasture to expand livestock production. This family feels the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act provided a real opportunity to them—a chance to get a start.

THE HURST FAMILY, MARION COUNTY

Mr. and Mrs. Elmo Hurst, Flippin, secured a loan through the Farmers Home Administration on September 4, 1946, to purchase a 252-acre farm on lower Crooked Creek in Marion County, Ark. The total amount of the loan was $5,850, which included $1,035 for repairs and improvements on the farmstead.

Mr. and Mrs. Hurst went to work immediately after securing the loan to fix up their newly acquired home. They have repaired the house, built new window screens and doors, painted and put a new roof on the house, and built two 10-by-54-foot sheds on their barn.

They have terraced several acres of land, dug a 500-cubic-foot pond for water for livestock, and made various other improvements on the place.

Besides making the above improvements on the place since January 1, 1947, the Hursts have made total payments on their FO loan of $2,149.99 from products produced on their farm. They are a thrifty and hard-working farm family, and Mr. Hurst stated that they hoped to have their farm paid out in three more years, if the price of livestock and farm commodities continue at anything like their present price.

Mr. and Mrs. Hurst were renters until the time they received this loan. Mr. Hurst is a veteran of World War II, and he and his wife are to be commended for their determination and untiring efforts to move up from renters to landowners of one of the best producing farms in Marion County.

THE SANDERS FAMILY, MARION COUNTY

Richard Von Sanders, Yellville, and his family first came on the FHA program in May of 1946 when they were granted a production loan of $1,000. This money was used to purchase 15 head of cattle to stock the farm they were renting. Von, as Mr. Sanders is commonly known, had just returned to the farm after having served some 27 months in the United States Navy.

On December 31, 1946, the Sanderses were granted a farm ownership loan to purchase the farm on which they lived as renters. Included in this loan was sufficient money to build a new barn for the livestock they had purchased and to store hay and other feed crops. This barn is now under construction and will add much to the value of their farm.

Since January 1947, Mr. and Mrs. Sanders have built new kitchen cabinets, installed a bathroom and fixtures, built additional clothes closets, installed a kitchen sink and running water. They have set out shrubs and trees for shade and made numerous other improvements that add to the comfort and convenience of their home. Electricity has been available to their farm for some time.

Repayments on their operating loan and farm-ownership loan have not worked a hardship on this family. Their farm-ownership loan is up to schedule and all of the original operating loan has been repaid except $175 which is not due until September 15, 1948.

The principal crops grown on the Sanders farm are corn, oats, lespedeza, and alfalfa. This year Mr. Sanders is planting 6 acres of barley to compare with his other crops to see its value as feed for his livestock. Mr. Sanders is also changing from dairy cattle to beef cattle.

Mrs. Sanders contributes her part to make this a successful family-type farm. Each year she cans from 500 to 600 quarts of fruits and vegetables for the family, thus helping much in their live-at-home program.

This family made an excellent showing in their farm-production work by stepping from farm tenants to farm owners in a few short years.

At the present time their entire farm program is on a sound basis and their long-time planning shows that they are well on their way to absolute ownership of a nice farm home and all the essentials for a successful and happy farm future.

High Cost of Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dr. Frank Kingdon that appeared in the New York Post on June 15, 1948:

TO BE FRANK

(By Dr. Frank Kingdon)

The Tweedles (Dum and Dee and Dada) are winding up this session of Congress. They have heard the cry of the conventions, the call of the Tweedle wild.

Their professional judgment of each other is that they are the worst we have ever had at whatever individually and collectively they are the worst at. Well, upon second thought, perhaps the worst but one. What's one exception more or less among calamities?

They are now rushing to the microphones to expound cosmic issues. Never did Tweedle tongues have more magniloquent themes for Tweedle eloquence. They roll their words and rattle their rostrums with empyrean omniscience about atomic energy and rival ideologies, moral crisis, and epochal decision. The scarlet check matches the purple phrase and democracy is saved in every peroration.

Even dollars are tipped with wings and statistics glow with the rosy mist of the imagination when a Tweedle explodes the "b" in billion. Once we boasted we were a million-dollar country. Those were the days of small potatoes. We would hardly deign to lend an ear now to anyone less than a billion-dollar candidate.

In the resounding cavern of such immensities I hesitate to raise a feeble voice for the humble cent, the forgotten coin. Yet I suggest it is not unimportant. I remember not so long ago when a quart of milk cost 8 cents. It now costs 25 and threatens to go higher. This is a small matter in a great world, but a big matter for 30,000,000 families. Even the Tweedles (President, Senator, and candidate) may well be interested. The hand that empties the milk bottle marks the ballot.

HCL has been eclipsed these recent months by ERP. Perhaps it had to be, but I have a feeling that it's time to get back to the price of our muttons. I have the further notion that the first Tweedle who says so will find a sudden popularity. If I were President Tweedle I would issue this week before the Congress adjourns a call for a special session after the conventions are over. I would call this special session to consider nothing else but the cost of living.

I don't see how any Tweedle could criticize such a call. If politicians don't do something about prices before November prices are likely to do a lot to them on election day. I have an idea that speeches about billions for munitions in this campaign are going to be interrupted by troubled housewives saying: "Excuse us, but what about the price of meat?" The watchdogs of the family budgets are due to bark.

It's strange to me how quiet housewives have been. They don't know their own strength. They've been letting the Tweedles get away with mumbling. I don't think they will, come November.

Marcella says: Checking the rising cost of living is a matter of common cents.

The Rich Married Couple's Tax Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from a letter received by me from a constituent. The author of this letter is one of the ablest, most experienced men on tax matters in Florida and I am confident this letter will be of interest:

MIAMI, FLA., *May 5, 1948.*

THE RICH MARRIED COUPLE'S TAX LAW

1. The new tax law has been called a rich man's tax law, but you not only have to be rich, you have to be married to get much tax reduction under the new law. It is the splitting of incomes, gifts, and estates between husband and wife that gives real tax reduction. Perhaps it should be called the rich married couple's tax law. The tax on one big income is much greater than if the income is split into two incomes as you are permitted to do under the new tax law. Instead of paying a tax on one big income at high tax rates, you can pay a tax on two incomes one-half that size at tax rates that are much lower—as was previously permitted only in the 12 community-property States. If your income is under $3,600 you won't get any benefit out of this feature of the law. The income-splitting feature of the new law benefits only those whose incomes are $3,600 or over.

The following table shows the tax savings provided by the new law to husband and wife with no other dependents, where the husband earned all the money:

Income	1947 tax	1948 tax	Savings
$4,000	$510.00	$402.00	$108.00
$6,000	921.50	712.00	209.50
$8,000	1,434.50	1,060.00	374.50
$10,000	2,130.00	1,400.00	730.00
$15,000	3,714.50	2,564.80	1,149.70
$20,000	6,141.75	3,928.40	2,213.35
$30,000	11,675.00	7,381.92	4,293.08
$50,000	24,453.00	16,681.76	7,771.24
$100,000	62,707.50	40,700.00	22,007.50

2. Standard deduction of $1,000: Another feature of the law is the increase in the standard deduction from $500 to 10 percent of your income with a maximum standard deduction of $1,000 upon incomes above $10,000. Thus, instead of listing your personal deductions on page three of the return you can subtract the standard deduction, which is 10 percent of your income up to $10,000. If your income is $10,000 or over, you can subtract the standard deduction of $1,000 whereas before the maximum was $500. There is one exception and that is where husband and wife file separate returns.

3. Personal exemptions now $600: The personal exemptions have been raised from $500 to $600 each. Now $600 of your income is tax-free for yourself and $600 for every person you list on page one of your return.

4. Six hundred dollars additional old-age exemption at age 65: If you have attained the age of 65 by December 31, you get an additional old-age exemption of $600. Likewise, if your wife has attained the age of 65, you get the additional old-age exemption, if you either list her as an exemption or if you file a joint return. This apparently is also true in the year she dies, if she had reached the age of 65 at the time of death. But you cannot claim the additional old-age exemption for dependents such as dependent fathers and mothers.

5. Income splitting in the year of death: Even in the year of the death of either husband or wife, the income may be split and a joint return may be filed.

6. Capital gains may be split between husband and wife: Under the new law capital gains may be split between husband and wife by filing a joint return. The result is that the tax upon capital gains is less than 25 percent if your income is below $44,000. If your income is above $44,000 you pay the maximum tax of 25 percent upon your capital gains. Under the former law the tax upon capital gains was less than 25 percent upon incomes up to $18,000 but now up to $44,000 if you are married, $22,000 if you are single.

7. Get married by December 31, and file joint return: If you are not, you have until December 31 to get married. Then all you have to do to get the benefits of the income-splitting feature of the new law is to file a joint return. In the new tax return for 1948 you may combine the incomes of husband and wife and then split the combined income in half and figure the tax. Your tax is double this amount.

8. Amended estimate June 15: If you estimated your tax for this year and used last year's tax rates you no doubt estimated your tax too high. You do not have to amend your estimate. You may continue to make the payments under the original estimate and file your income-tax return January 15 or March 15 and pay any balance you owe then, or if you have overpaid, claim a refund or have the overpayment credited to your next year's tax.

However you may, using the new tax rates, again estimate your tax and file another estimate and mark it "Amended" and pay one-third of the balance on each June 15, September 15, and January 15.

9. Withholding rates changed: By now you should have received from the Government the new withholding tables. The new rates apply to all wages which you pay on or after May 1 regardless of when they were earned.

10. Alternative percentage withholding 15 percent above exemptions which are now $1.80 a day, $13 a week, or $56 a month: You may, instead of using the new withholding tables, withhold a flat 15 percent above the employee's exemptions. One exemption is now $1.80 a day, $13 a week, or $56 a month. You may multiply the above amounts by the number of exemptions and withhold a flat 15 percent on the balance. The flat 15 percent usually means a lower withholding, but it will mean that the employee is underpaying his tax and will have to pay the balance when he files his income-tax return.

11. Estate taxes reduced to less than half. Married man's estate now one-half tax-free if he leaves at least one-half to his wife: The most drastic change in the new tax law wasn't the change in income taxes but the change in estate taxes. One-half of a person's estate, no matter how big, is now tax-free if he leaves at least that amount to his wife (or husband). There is then no estate tax whatever to pay upon one-half a person's estate. All you have to do is to leave her at least half of all of your estate by will or otherwise and one-half of your estate is tax-free. That amount is excluded from your estate in figuring the estate taxes.

The reduction in estate taxes to married couples is shown in the following tables where at least one-half the estate is left to surviving spouse.

Your estate	Old tax	New tax	Tax saving
$120,000	$9,500	0	$9,500
$250,000	44,700	$10,900	33,800
$500,000	126,000	47,700	78,300
$1,000,000	303,000	126,500	176,500
$5,000,000	2,436,400	969,400	1,467,000

Thus in every instance the estate tax has been reduced more than half; upon estates of $250,000 and under, the tax is now less than one-fourth what it was. However if you are unmarried, or are a widow or widower, there is no tax reduction. The estate tax upon your estate would then be the same as it was.

12. Change your will: Thus, unless you have left your wife at least one-half of your estate you should immediately change your will to do so if your estate exceeds $60,000 in order to get the lowest estate taxes after death.

13. Gifts of $6,000 per person per year to as many persons as you desire tax-free if you are married: Formerly you could make annual gifts of $3,000 per person to as many persons as you desired without paying any gift tax. These were called " exclusions." They were excluded from your gift-tax computation. You could also make additional gifts of $30,000 during your lifetime without paying any gift tax. This was called your "lifetime gift tax exemption." But now these amounts have been doubled if you are married. You can now make annual gifts of $6,000 per person to as many beneficiaries as

you desire and you can also make gifts of $60,000 above the annual gifts without paying any gift tax.

Very truly yours,

PHILIP PAINE.

P. S.—If in order to make half of your estate free from estate taxes, you should leave your wife half of your estate, what should be done with the other half? This question will be answered in the next letter.

Why Not Be Forthright and Accurate, Mr. President?—The Veto Message on House Joint Resolution 296

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the veto message of the President on House Joint Resolution 296, to maintain the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage states that:

1. The real issue is whether the social-security coverage of many hundreds of thousands of individuals should be left largely to the discretion of their employers; and

2. Despite representations to the contrary sections 1 and 2 of this resolution would exclude from the coverage of the old-age and survivors' insurance and unemployment-compensation systems up to 750,000 employees.

The message, in support of what is referred to as the real issue, states:

This resolution would overturn the present sound principle that employment relationships under the social-security laws should be determined in the light of realities rather than on the basis of technical legal forms. In so doing, it would make the social-security rights of the employees directly excluded, and many thousands of additional employees, depend almost entirely upon the manner in which their employers might choose to cast their employment arrangements.

The issue that the President contended was the real issue is nonexistent and the President's assertions in connection therewith wholly and completely incorrect in every respect.

(a) House Joint Resolution 296 does no more than reaffirm the principle that the common-law rule shall determine the employer-employee relationship. That principle is embodied in the existing regulations and has been applicable since the start of social security in 1935.

(b) The applicable common-law rules themselves, as well as the existing regulations by specific provisions thereof, require that reality, and not technical legal forms, shall govern in the determination of whether an individual is an employee or an independent contractor.

(c) House Joint Resolution 296 does not in any way affect the existing regulations. Both the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Finance in their reports thereon emphasized that the whole purpose of House Joint Resolution 296 was to prevent those regulations from being scrapped.

The assertion that House Joint Resolution 296 "would exclude from the coverage of old-age and survivors' insurance and unemployment compensation systems up to 750,000 employees" is also wholly and completely incorrect in every particular.

(a) By preserving the common-law rule and the present regulations which are a mere statement of that rule, House Joint Resolution 296 excludes no one from coverage who is covered under the existing regulations.

(b) The so-called exclusion is not an exclusion at all. It is completely misleading reference to individuals which the Treasury stated are not presently covered under the existing regulations but which the Treasury expected would be covered if the proposed Treasury regulations had been permitted by Congress to go into effect.

(c) The Treasury was utterly unable, in the hearings on House Joint Resolution 296 before the Committee on Finance, to furnish any basis whatsoever of estimating either the minimum or maximum number of individuals whose status would be changed by the proposed new regulations.

(d) Unemployment compensation coverage, which the President asserts would be denied to "up to 750,000 employees," in fact is not determined under Federal law at all. Unemployment-compensation coverage is determined solely by the States, and the enactment of House Joint Resolution 296 could not affect the coverage definitions under State law.

Revercomb-West Virginia Plan for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAPMAN REVERCOMB

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 15), 1948

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD certain letters, statements, and supporting material pertaining to the Revercomb-West Virginia plan for veterans.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. CHAPMAN REVERCOMB, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, the subject of my remarks today are the hundreds of thousands of new opportunities in West Virginia for increasing the prosperity and security of every individual in the communities of the State. To help veterans, small-business men and other members of the communities make the most of these economic opportunities, I have devised the "Revercomb-West Virginia Plan," which I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, following an explanation of its functions.

West Virginia typifies the all-American spirit as it is partly a Northern, Eastern, Southern and Middle Western State. As a result, it is fortunate in possessing the good sentiments of all sections of the country. The position of our State on the map also presents profitable geographical advantages. The agriculture and industry of the Mountain State integrates it with the North and South, and East and West. Our varied industries, our scenery, our natural resources and our agriculture represent a diversity of interests that could truly make West Virginia the model for economic expansion of other States in the United States.

Mr. President, long ago this Nation won its liberty from the tyranny of kings. Today we are again threatened by the most potent tyranny at large in the world—communism. It is another force to defeat personal freedom and economic democracy. The surest way to challenge and overcome communism without resorting to war is to maintain our national strength by increasing the prosperity and economic security of all the people in our communities. The Revercomb-West Virginia plan, which I have devised, will help us to achieve this goal.

The Department of the American Legion of West Virginia was one of the first veterans' organizations in the United States to endorse this bill. It has also been endorsed by other veterans' organizations and small business organizations. Now, at this time, I want to take this oportunity to introduce in the RECORD a letter from a great American and public servant, a man whom all veterans and fellow citizens honor, James F. O'Neil, the present national commander of the American Legion. This letter was written to Senator STYLES BRIDGES, the chairman of the important Senate Appropriations Committee, one of the many distinguished cosponsors of our Veterans' Economic Development Corporation bill.

Hon. STYLES BRIDGES,

Chairman, Appropriations Committee,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C

DEAR SENATOR BRIDGES: I wish to compliment you * * * in formulating an "American doctrine" to build mutual prosperity between our communities in America and the communities in friendly countries that are trying to hold the line against communism. I believe it is possible that your doctrine may go far to assure prosperity and peace for the United States and for the United Nations, by integrating the economy of other countries with ours.

By utilizing the manpower and the skills of our veterans, you put your finger on what I believe is the spearhead to prosperity and Americanism against depression and communism. In their stand on Americanism, 20,000,000 living American veterans can't be wrong. From what I know of veterans, I can say that we have at least one more good fight left in us and this is it. As you gentlemen in Congress have challenged us, I believe we can meet the challenge in peace with as much vigor and determination as we have met the challenge in war.

Furthermore, as all veterans alike have served their neighbors and our Nation, I am confident that the Legionnaires in our State will invite the cooperation of the members of other veterans' organizations to meet this new challenge to champion Americanism against communism through your economic development plan.

The Army and the Navy were charged with being prepared to defend Pearl Harbor, but obviously their lack of coordination paid its toll. I, for one, wish to prevent a Pearl Harbor in veterans' affairs. To that end I am confident that the American Legion will cooperate with other veterans' organizations in our communities, and in our States to help unify our people for the best interest of all.

I am impressed by the number of Legionnaires in the Congress who are cosponsoring

with you your "Veterans Corporation" bill, which appears to be a good basis to afford veterans economic opportunities and housing and to complete an over-all veterans' program for the benefit of the veterans and of the Nation.

With my best wishes for your success in your plan to "fight communism with prosperity," I am

Sincerely,

JAMES F. O'NEIL.

At this point I wish to insert another letter that I believe will interest our veterans, small-business men, farmers, and community fathers in West Virginia:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., May 25, 1948.

Hon. CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
Chairman, Senate Public Works Committee, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REVERCOMB: I am glad to learn you have prepared a West Virginia plan of projects which could be implemented under provisions of S. 1652—the Veterans' Economic Development Corporation Act. Such State plans will aid the people of many communities, including veterans, by bringing new industries to the communities, expanding present businesses, modernizing agriculture, and by creating new industrial uses for agricultural products and other raw materials.

Representatives of friendly nations are interested in developing programs similar to your "West Virginia plan" to enable their people to prosper and to hold the line against communism and war. It is not an overstatement to say that if applied here at home and abroad, such a plan would help win a bloodless victory.

Your championship in Congress of small business in the United States and the establishment of veterans in businesses and profitable careers has our strong support. The bill that your are sponsoring in the Senate, S. 1652, entitled "The Veterans' Economic Development Corporation Act," will enable millions of veterans to catch up with the economic parade at home and abroad. This will interest the taxpayers particularly as no appropriation of taxpayers' money is contemplated. In addition, it is estimated that it will reduce taxes as it will save our taxpayers a billion dollars a year in the present cost of government.

The bipartisan support of this bill and its early passage is indicated by the companion bills introduced in the House by Representative ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, a champion of small business; Representative EDITH ROGERS of Massachusetts, chairman of the important Veterans' Committee; Representative JESSE WOLCOTT, of Michigan, an authority on finance and chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee; the past chairman, Congressman SPENCE, of Kentucky; by Congressman KEARNEY, of New York, and VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, both former commanders in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The unusual support of this bill in the Senate is shown in the cosponsorship of S. 1652 by Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, chairman of the important Appropriations Committee, and by Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky, and 30 other distinguished Senators.

As the Veterans' Economic Development Corporation bill is not limited to veterans, your "West Virginia plan" will help to implement this program in an orderly manner, marking a new milestone in the illustrious history of West Virginia and the Nation.

Sincerely,

RAY H. BRANNAMAN,
Commander in Chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Mr. President, before I insert in the RECORD an outline of the West Virginia plan, I believe the people in our communities back home would like to have me describe briefly the proposed Veterans' Economic Development Corporation Act, which is popularly known as the "Little Man's RFC" and is termed by veterans' organizations as "one of the most constructive pieces of veterans' legislation ever to be introduced." It will enable our veterans, as well as others, to become constructive leaders in our communities and to reinforce the American economy, as it covers the next 20 years of the lives of the majority of our veterans.

HOW WILL THE "LITTLE MAN'S RFC" OPERATE

The act will create a Government corporation vested with broad powers to provide long-range credit and technical advisory services to (a) private business (individuals, firms, and corporations), and (b) State and municipal self-liquidating public projects, with the condition that preference in new career opportunities would be afforded veterans, if available.

When our "Little Man's RFC" bill was introduced concurrently in the Senate and House, one of our cosponsors, a national authority on finance, Chairman JESSE P. WOLCOTT, of the important House Banking and Currency Committee, wrote an illuminating opinion on our bill to Chairman STYLES BRIDGES, of the Senate Appropriations Committee, who introduced the bill in the Senate on his behalf and that of 20 other Senators. I quote Chairman WOLCOTT's interesting statements, as follows:

"At home and abroad the Veterans' Corporation, popularly called 'The Little Man's RFC,' would create economic opportunities for veterans and others through broad lending powers along the lines of the present RFC. But, in addition, the Veterans' Corporation would afford skilled technical advisory service to self-liquidating projects that will employ veterans and to qualified veterans themselves. It would be a move toward matching veterans' skills against the unused production capacities of the Nation and our untapped abundant national resources to meet the phenomenal demand for American goods and services throughout the world.

"Although the proposed Veterans' Corporation is charged specifically with solving veterans' short-range and long-range economic problems, at the same time, it is designed to produce an economic profit to the Nation. It is estimated that it will reduce the cost of veterans' affairs by $1,000,000,000 per year by creating gainful employment; also, it may make it possible to save taxpayers other billions of dollars in direct expense. The Veterans' Corporation is so designed that it should operate without cost to the taxpayers, as the spread between the rate of interest the Treasury pays the public for the bonds and the interest rates charged on loans made by the Veterans' Corporation will more than cover administration, losses from loans, and operating costs. The present RFC reports that under similar conditions it has returned more than $500,000,000 profit to the Treasury. It is estimated that with the wider distribution of loans made by the Veterans' Corporation and with its skilled technical advisory and research services to protect the Government against loss the Veterans' Corporation should return a still greater profit to the Treasury than the present RFC.

"For the first time in American history, we have a specific foreign policy. Consequently, it is possible for the State Department, with the help of the Senate, to put teeth in our new foreign policy. We believe that the Veterans' Corporation provides the most immediate approach to this objective and in support of what Senator VANDENBERG, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, says, this approach will help 'peace living' countries rather than 'peace loving' countries to bring lasting peace to the world. At a time when we no longer have a powerful Army to reinforce our foreign policy, it is significant that 20,000,000 living American veterans, who with their families represent 60 percent of the people of the United States, constitute a potential new moral and economic force in the world. More than 13,000,000 of these living veterans are veterans of foreign wars. Our veterans were selected from the cream of 140,000,000 people for their physical, mental, and educational superiority and are now the finest essence of our people. Many of them are experienced and capable and, if properly utilized, are a source of a new domestic economic power. They are also a source of vast new power to reinforce our foreign relations, as many experienced veterans are eager to go as business and technical missionaries to countries that we have helped to liberate, including Korea, China, India, the Philippines, Iraq, Iran, Arabia, Italy, France, Turkey, and Greece. Our veterans are potentially, the greatest army of good-will missionaries in all human history. Under the provisions of this legislation our veterans could help to tip the scales now between war and peace.

"The passage of this act is immediately necessary and urgent as no other Government or private agency can perform the functions to meet the emergency.

"The Veterans' Corporation would strengthen the hand of the Eightieth Congress for several reasons:

"(a) It appeals to the taxpayers as it will save an estimated $1,000,000,000 per year in veterans' unemployment compensation and obviate the abuses of the '52-20 club.'

"(b) Banking approves of the Veterans Corporation because, like the present RFC, it will make only loans that do not compete with private banks. It will help to balance the Federal budget. The American Bankers Association in their journal of January 15, said: 'During a term of office in which economy and tax reduction will offer no new plums for veterans, the proposed "Veterans' RFC" (sponsored by Chairman WOLCOTT of the House Banking and Currency Committee and several Senators) will provide something which Members of Congress can loudly endorse. The Veterans' Corporation should cost the taxpayers nothing, as all projects and enterprises will be self-liquidating and will show a profit to the Nation. It will utilize all existing facilities of Government without duplication and simplify veterans' affairs. (The veteran had nine agencies of Government to give him the run-around after World War I, and now after World War II has 29 agencies of Government to confuse him.)'

"(c) A good cross-section of labor leaders—in fact, all we have contacted—favor this bill. They recognize that it means the halfway mark in permanent full employment because veterans would otherwise compose half the unemployed labor force during depressions. It would prevent the inevitable conflict between the veterans' organizations and organized labor by opening new opportunities for fuller employment where both will profit.

"(d) The veterans' organizations are supporting this bill because it will enable veterans to recoup their losses in economic opportunities in competition with those who remained at home, and it will provide self-supporting careers for disabled veterans. For example, veterans' organizations are urging the enactment of this legislation, as it will immediately help to break the bottlenecks in veterans' housing and provide careers for veterans. The veterans' organizations also like the features that will enable capable veterans to trade abroad, to return as technical and business experts to help modernize many of the very countries they helped to liberate such a short time ago. They believe, also, that the program provided by the Veterans' Corporation will be a powerful factor in strengthening our ties with other countries in the United Nations, thus helping to prevent war.

"This legislation will also enable us to plan ahead for the 2,700,000 now in training. Domestically, the Veterans' Corporation should spread the base of our economy, which has already suffered by the alarming loss of many small industries and businesses which, heretofore, have given America its phenomenal economic strength. Unless we act quickly, there is the recognized danger that our economy will become top-heavy, as big business must feed largely on small business. We believe, furthermore, that this legislation will be insurance against a recession; in fact, the best insurance now in sight.

"A statement, prepared by the experts of the Department of Commerce over the signature of Under Secretary Alfred Schindler, to Senator WAYNE MORSE, concerning the Veterans' Corporation, said: 'It is a well-recognized fundamental of business economics that expanded commercial activity creates employment, and your bill, designed to incorporate the existing reservoir of young veterans in such expansion, offers the most intriguing possibilities of any piece of current legislation which has come to my attention. * * * America, in the years ahead, needs alert young men in business, and the men released by the armed forces are the natural source of this necessary manpower potential. It seems to me that your bill strikes a new and intelligent cord. Government support in a business-expansion program of the type you visualize is simply common sense.'

"The Commerce Department tells us that we now have hundreds of thousands of captured enemy trade secrets, patents, and secret processes, many of which are immediately commercially profitable and suited to this program. The Interior Department tells us that millions of acres of good land are ready to be opened. There is a vast new opportunity in the further mechanization of agriculture and in industrial uses of agricultural products that they themselves can manufacture—establishing a better balanced economy.

"General Bradley said: 'We must have an agency such as this "Veterans' RFC," as the Veterans' Administration, with its 200 hospitals and enormous load, has all that it can handle with hospitalization, pensions, claims, and insurance. We cannot handle the creation of employment opportunities for veterans; yet we receive thousands of letters blaming us for veterans being obliged to work at substandard wages or not finding a job at all.

"In sponsoring this bill, we propose to nominate for appointment to the Board of Directors and to the Advisory Council of the Veterans' Corporation (with the advice and consent of the Senate) outstanding leaders, such as Herbert Hoover, who can direct and counsel this important agency to serve its new high purpose for the Nation. The Board of Directors would establish standards for loans. Under it, a staff of the best technical experts would have two primary responsibilities; to enforce the standards, both before and after the establishment of the projects or enterprises; and, to provide technical service to the organizations or individuals to protect the Government against loss by protecting the organizations or individuals against failure.

"After other American wars, new frontiers were developed, with the help of veterans. From the days of the Cumberland Road, which George Washington and other veterans helped to build and which speeded the development of our rich Midwest after the Revolutionary War, veterans have engineered and worked to stimulate our Nation's growth. Veterans helped to open the plains beyond St. Louis after the War of 1812. After the War Between the States, veterans helped to engineer and build our railroads to the west coast and to develop the valleys along the Pacific seaboard. The Federal Government helped develop these frontiers. Now vast new frontiers—the greatest frontiers in all American history—are ripe for development: the new technological frontier at home and the vast new frontier where we can help modernize other friendly countries, (quoting from the bill) 'thereby cultivating those countries to become increasingly our friends and customers,' thus preventing war and strengthening the United Nations. There is also Alaska, the most strategic world area in this atomic age of over-the-pole flying. Our study of 'Veterans' Opportunities in the Development of Alaska,' that was made by Col. Richmond Harris at President Roosevelt's direction, reveals that the Veterans' Corporation now offers us a great opportunity to guide the rapid development of that vast, rich Territory through veterans and others who are loyal to our form of government. This program will offer protection against communism to us in that strategic Territory.

"Secretary of Commerce Harriman states: 'Without expanding world trade, our own economy must shrink.' The program provided by the Veterans' Corporation should make possible the peaceful, mutually profitable penetration of many foreign countries by American experts and capable veterans who are interested in setting up projects and business enterprises or developing natural resources. This will strengthen our foreign policy as it will demonstrate how on-the-scene democratic business can succeed in economic democracy. This would be particularly significant in those areas where our system of democracy must compete for survival with totalitarian and despotic systems. In this connection, it is important again to note that there should be little or no concern about the loyalties of the men selected and approved for such penetration. The War and Navy Departments already have their complete case histories, and our veterans have been screened as to their loyalties to our American form of government. Furthermore, this overseas-economic-development program would be accomplished without the drain on our Treasury that additional foreign loans would impose.

"The experts in the State Department are giving us their hearty cooperation in making plans for the modernization of certain countries where the Veterans' Corporation legislation will meet the emergency, as it is acknowledged that this Veterans' Corporation bill has prospects of earlier enactment than any other legislation for accomplishing those objectives of economic development on the ground level in other countries.

"This legislation will undoubtedly stimulate an over-expanding economy in industry, agriculture, unused natural resources, and overseas trade sufficient to assure full employment in the United States for the decades covered by the term of this legislation."

SMALL BUSINESS SPREADS ITS WINGS—TECHNICAL ADVISORY SERVICE UNDER THE "LITTLE MAN'S RFC"

The advisory service to be provided under our "Little Man's RFC" will afford the small-business man and the ambitious veteran the latest technical and trade information recently developed at an expense of many billions of dollars in research by the United States Government, other friendly governments, and private agencies. In addition, the great wealth of scientific information captured in enemy countries will be made available.

Our advisory service will save time and money for small-business men and veterans as it will afford them the specific information they wish, at the time they need it. As it is now, the little fellows in business must wait months, and even years, before the information they desire can be cleared through the many ramifications of Government and private agencies.

The surest way to avoid the danger of the encroachment of monopoly in the United States is to spread the base of our economy by aiding small business and veterans in domestic trade and in overseas trade.

The big industrial corporations, having large expert staffs, can acquire information from Government and private agencies more easily than small business because they know exactly where to go and what to look for. Our advisory service will give the little operator similar advantages.

Following is a brief presentation of the kind of information that is being coordinated and the services that will be made available to small-business men and ambitious veterans.

1. Technical information:

a. United States Government research, which includes the research carried on in all Government departments, including nonsecret developments in the Department of Defense. Several billion dollars have already been spent on this research, and much of the technical information can now be put to profitable commercial use.

b. Captured German and Japanese research documents, of which there are 1,600,000 German patents and processes. Many of them are unknown to the American market and are commercially practicable and profitable. It is estimated that the commercial value now of this material to American businessmen exceeds $25,000,000,000.

c. Exchange information with other countries. Under this plan, friendly countries provide the United States with their research information in exchange for American information.

d. Nonsecret atomic information applicable in industry, medicine, and science.

e. New techniques to produce better or cheaper products.

2. New markets and trade outlets:

a. Opportunities in the United States:

(1) The surveys we are currently making reveal new opportunities at home for small business to help fill the requirements under the European recovery program.

b. Opportunities overseas:

(1) Sales outlets—new opportunities for exporting goods.

(2) Manufacturing abroad:

(a) Licensees.

(b) Mutually owned stock companies.

(c) Branch plants.

(d) Advisory service to foreign firms on a royalty basis.

(3) The selection of commercial representatives abroad.

c. Opportunities in importing.

3. Larger share for small business and veterans in the exploitation of our natural resources:

a. The Government-controlled lands in the United States and in our possessions exceed 36 percent of the total land area. Our plan offers the small-business man new opportunities to expand his business or to start a new business:

(1) Mining: We have many known and unknown mineral deposits that have been exploited almost entirely by big business, as Government red tape and leasing laws have usually made it unprofitable for the little fellow to operate.

(2) Reclamation: In the reclamation areas, a wealth of new businesses can be started as new settlements are made or old settlements expand.

(3) Timber and forestry: Many small businesses can benefit from the new research in wood products and the derivatives of wood.

(4) New industrial uses for agricultural products.

4. Stock piling critical items for peacetime purposes and for the present national emergency. Under our plan small business at home and abroad can have an equitable share in stock piling.

Only a fraction of German and Japanese material has been made available to American industry. Our service will speed the dissemination of this valuable research information, through which America has already profited in large measure.

Among the many successful small businesses that have been started as a result of obtaining the new technology, we find: The manufacture of dry ice; tanning hides and skins into leather; molding compounds, using sawdust, wood flour, etc.; paper matchbook manufacture; making potato chips; metalizing baby shoes; tinning by hot-dipped methods; establishing a small ferrous metal foundry; mirror manufacture; hot-dip galvanizing; electroplating; precision or investment-mold casting; silver plating; porcelain enameling; the manufacturing of commercial candy, Christmas-tree ornaments, envelope and stamp adhesives and straw-hat cleaners.

In addition to the developments listed above, there are many other new developments. Following are a few examples:

1. Ointment preventing the sterility of cattle.
2. Vaccine against foot-and-mouth disease, which has been tested in Mexico and the United States.
3. Dental development in which plastic substances have been introduced as an alloy substitute.
4. Seed virility agent used for a quick test of germination and also as a diagnostic dye for living tissue.
5. Pesticides as a more effective substitute for DDT.
6. A nicotine substitute.
7. Food fat from synthetic fatty acids prepared in Germany especially for use in submarines, on account of its stability against rancidity.
8. Successful preparation of highly concentrated proteins from fish and shellfish.

The following machines and equipment were brought over from Germany to advance the technology of American industry:

1. Lathe and thread-rolling attachment.
2. Cylindrical grinding machine.
3. Ultra-precision form grinder.
4. Pavement breaker.
5. Expansion circuit breaker.
6. Measuring machine.
7. Double-twist cord twister.
8. Atmosphere compressor.
9. Metalized paper condensing machine.
10. Motorcycles.
11. Electric balance machine.

OTHER EXAMPLES OF BUSINESS OPPORTUNITIES

Synthetic fuel: The synthetic-fuel process is estimated to be worth $20,000,000,000 to the United States, as it will supplement our peacetime diminishing fuel supplies and reinforce our national security.

Ceramics: In the past ceramics were made by the wet process, in which shrinkage always occurred, and in an amount which could not be predicted accurately. A German machine has been found that stamps dry ceramic parts rather than wet parts, as has previously been done. This type of machine is now available to the American market and is being utilized to the advantage of the ceramic industry.

Vacuum tube techniques: More improvements have been made by the Germans in vacuum tube designs than in any other branch of electronics. At the end of hostilities many vacuum tubes were brought to this country and disseminated to our vacuum tube manufacturers. As a result new and improved tubes are already available.

X-ray tube developments: German scientists also greatly improved X-ray tubes and techniques. New materials were developed and new techniques evolved which have extended the power and application of X-rays and, at the same time, reduced the size and voltages required. Numerous complete X-ray installations have been made available to X-ray manufacturers in this country.

Metalized condenser process: The metalized condenser process is one of the most revolutionary finds brought over from Germany. A company in the United States has a contract with the military for supplying 8,000,000 small condensers for the proximity fuze. The condensers are 50 percent smaller and 40 percent cheaper. This new process alone will save the condenser industry of the Nation millions of dollars per year.

Another large company has already built five machines to be used in manufacturing 25,000,000 condensers for desk telephones similar to those in everyday office use. The reduction in size of the condensers has brought about a complete redesign of the desk telephone. The new telephone will soon be found in common use.

Hormones: Considerable progress has been made in the synthesis of hormones, especially of sex hormones from animal and vegetable material, such as certain species of soybeans, etc. This new research will be profitable to the medical profession.

Insulin: In Germany insulin—an important corrective agent in diabetes—was prepared from the pancreas of codfish. Its production from the whale might be a new, economical source opening up an entirely new field of insulin production.

Sand casting: In the field of metals and minerals, one of the important items to come to light was a new method of sand molding. This process was developed late in the war years in Germany, but its use had not obtained widespread practice. Some of the claims for it, and verified by a Government agency, were that castings made by this process had a much cleaner and smoother surface than ordinary sand castings, and that the process was applicable to the casting of unusually thin sections of steel. As a foundry process, it can be equally useful to both large and small industries. Present interest in its use in this country stems mostly from small business, as the capital investment it requires is unusually low. Other evidence of its importance appears in the interest shown in the process by one of our largest chemical companies.

Batteries: Another item which is likely to assume importance in military as well as in commercial use is the nickel cadmium storage battery, which can be used in such products as walkie-talkie sets and for other applications where lightweight batteries are essential.

Steel: The process of the cold extrusion of steel found its chief use in Germany in the mass production of military items such as shell cases and cylinders used in the landing gear of airplanes. We can now extend the application of this technology to our own production.

Magnesium die casting: The Germans developed pressure die casting of magnesium. Since the use of high pressure in casting has never been undertaken in this country, a complete die-casting machine was brought to the United States. Work with this machine is under way at this time in various fields where die casting can be used, and it has great promise for the future.

New optical devices: Due to the requirements of war, many new optical instruments were produced in Germany with improvements in associated techniques. New methods of grinding lenses and of coating them were found. The information was made available to the American optical companies. Likewise, numerous novel optical instruments were brought to this country and circulated among the optical manufacturers and any others who might desire them.

We found during the war that it facilitated production to have small companies make optical lenses. The new German methods can also be used to advantage by small companies.

Color photography: A new and less complicated method for producing color photography was developed in wartime Germany. This process has been analyzed with great precision, and excellent reports covering every phase of the new technique are available now to the American market. Climbing the Matterhorn, the first moving picture in which the process was used, was recently released. Feature films will be issued shortly.

Drugs—morphine substitutes: The Germans discovered morphine substitutes, which they synthesized to furnish medical agents that remove pain or spasms. The substitutes are much less poisonous and less habit forming than morphine. Further improvement led to a product which is now being marketed by at least three American firms and by one English firm under different names.

Blood substitute: The Germans developed a blood substitute which assists in restoring blood pressure and which is useful in heavy blood losses and also for sustaining effects in medication. This process is now being studied for use in the United States.

Oxo compounds: Oxo compounds made by the Fisher-Tropsch reaction: Through use of this reaction, synthetic fats, which are a direct substitute for the increasingly scarce edible fats, may prove to be a major article of commerce. In addition, the lower molecular weight compounds offer a wide range of raw materials of the aldehyde and acid type, the use of which may open up entirely new types of chemical raw materials for American industry.

While the Fisher-Tropsch reaction was originally intended for use in the development of synthetic liquid fuels of the gasoline and fuel-oil type, the development of oxo compounds may very probably develop into a major industry in this country. The use of these acids in the preparation of soaps and textile auxiliaries and wetting agents may well provide the solution of our present soap shortage. It is understood that at least one major chemical company is working on this type of reaction at the present time.

Rubber: Of particular interest to this country is the synthetic rubber developed as a direct outcome of German research. According to the newer procedures, greater cold resistance, flexibility and wearability can be imparted to the new synthetic rubbers. In addition, a number of rubbers for highly specialized uses, such as for inner tubes, high temperature gaskets, etc., have already been placed on the market by various manufacturers.

Plastics: Of major importance is the field of plastics. Several companies are understood to be developing new textile fibers, also low-temperature resistant and scratch resistant plastics as a result of the leads furnished by our investigators of the German methods. There are opportunities for independent small plants in the production of the ingredients of plastics and in the production, molding, and distribution of end products.

Toys: A toy company in the United States is producing a plastic toy automobile for children that is entirely new. This toy will meander across a desk or table top, but will not fall over the edge; it simply turns around and starts back in the other direction. The device which makes the toy automobile turn is a fifth wheel which is set in the middle of the frame at a right angle to the other wheels. The manufacturer states that bright plastics are used both because of their color appeal to children and because plastics will stand any amount of rugged handling by eager hands. Further advantages of plastics, according to the manufacturer, are the low number of handling and finishing operations necessary; the lightness of weight which cuts transportation costs; and the smooth finish of the plastic sharp edges.

Infrared ray as detector: The Germans developed techniques for detecting enemy men and machines in total darkness with invisible infrared rays. The United States Army engineers also conducted valuable research in this field. The infrared searchlights send out their invisible rays, and the image of the target is reflected and transformed into a

visible image on a viewing apparatus. A report of American experts discloses that the Nazis effectively used searchlights of invisible light on rifles of infantrymen, enabling a Nazi sniper to spot and shoot enemy soldiers "in complete darkness up to a distance of about 100 yards." Apart from its wartime use, the infrared apparatus could be used on rifles for night hunting and for many commercial purposes.

Selenium rectifiers: The Germans invented the selenium rectifier. Rectifiers are used in many branches of the electronics industry, in radio and radar sets, in battery-charging devices, and whenever it is necessary to convert alternating voltage into direct voltage. Such devices normally make use of the rectifying qualities of copper oxide. The use of selenium renders them cheaper and more reliable. This, of course, advances the art and benefits the public.

One United States company manufacturing selenium rectifiers has remodeled and expanded its factory to incorporate the lay-out and methods of German plants.

Torpedoes and bombs: The Germans developed a missile which was controlled in flight by electric impulses through very fine steel wires connecting plane and missile. As much as 50,000 feet of wire was used, even with bomb or torpedo traveling at high speeds. Another amazing discovery was a torpedo that could not miss; it was guided by the sound of the target's propeller and was effective at 10 miles. It traveled 30 feet below the surface at 40 miles an hour, leaving no wake, and exploded either on contact with the ship or when directly under it. This information has certain commercial applications.

Wired radio broadcasting: The Germans developed a system of wired radio broadcasting. The programs enter the telephone central offices on wires (modulating carrier frequencies between 100,000 and 200,000 cycles), then are distributed over local telephone circuits and selected by the subscribers who use their ordinary radio receivers. By this method, the programs are received entirely by metallic circuits, no radio being involved. In this way, static and other interferences are eliminated completely. The research and development carried out to produce these results can be used to the advantage of American Industry.

Ionization of the air: A German made a study of the effects of ionization of the air upon the health and sensations of human beings. In general, he found that positively ionized air has undesirable effects upon the feelings and health, producing discomfort, ill temper, depression, and fear. In sensitive or allergic persons, positive ionization is found to be the cause of, or condition for, attacks of asthma, hay fever, high blood pressure, nervous tension, and similar symptoms. On the other hand, negatively ionized air tends to create a feeling of well-being, buoyancy, and optimism, similar to the effects of mountain air.

After much study and research, the conclusion was that negatively ionized air is very beneficial to human beings, whereas positively ionized air is detrimental. It is easy to see, therefore, that it is desirable to maintain air negatively ionized wherever possible. Herein lies great possibilities for creating an entirely new industry for manufacturing and installing industrial and home machines for negatively ionizing air. Such an industry would become as important as the air-conditioning industry.

Typed speech: The German invention of a device for translating speech directly into typed words is most ingenious. It is evident that the machines and apparatus resulting from the research can be of great new value to American businessmen and manufacturers.

Canes: An ingenious modification of a cane for cripples without a leg was perfected during the war by a professor in Germany. This cane is now manufactured in this country and is being used by large American hospitals.

Oil: A fluid known as "R" fluid, obtained in Germany, is at present being studied as ignition oil for internal combustion engines. This oil will be used to replace electric ignition.

Springs: Specifications taken from Germany on independent springing of automobile wheels has been furnished to a large motor company in the United States.

Diesel engines: A company in America has been working on small two-cycle Diesel engines for the past few years. They expect the German data to be of material assistance to this new design.

Engines: A professor of one of our large State universities has been working with various Diesel manufacturers in the United States on the development of light, two-cycle loop scavenging engines. The Germans developed an air-cooled, two-stroke-cycle, valveless loop scavenging engine with a turned exhaust pipe which weighs approximately 7½ pounds. This engine could be used as a portable generator for Signal Corps radio stations or light plants.

Metallurgy: The field of powdered metallurgy products presents new industrial opportunities to both large and small business.

Blasting: Soft grit blasting and cleaning of metal surfaces has been promoted by one of our Government offices as a new business field. It is believed that there are great possibilities here.

Hemp industry: The hemp industry has been thoroughly studied by the Government. It is believed that the development of a "poor man's linen" industry, as well as of a domestic cordage business, could successfully be carried out.

X-ray: A large company in the United States recently announced it had developed an X-ray thickness gage, which enables continuous production of accurate sheet and strip. This gage will be used in measuring the thickness of all types of material, including steel, glass, plastics and nonferrous metals. Off-gage material is automatically rejected. Basic advantages of an X-ray thickness gage are the following: there is no contact with material, the surface will not be marred, thin foil will not be torn, and no part of the gage will be worn; there is instant response to changes, and easy access to areas difficult to gage by other methods. The design can be changed for inspection of complicated shapes, which, it is expected, will make the gage applicable to the production of bottles and similar objects with internal voids.

Dyes: A dye plant in New Jersey, employing 60 men, secured a new German method of making dyes that would be usable on all kinds of cloths. The plant is now operating successfully in competition with the larger dye companies, and the owner proudly states that he now has "as much information on dyes as the largest chemical companies."

Plywood boats: Government research enabled two veterans in Minneapolis to go into the production of plywood round-bottom rowboats. In this case the information was about the proper adhesive to use and problems of pressure and temperature. A detailed report was submitted to the two veterans, who now employ 150 people and are publicizing their boats and enjoying a good business.

Wool plant: During the war a firm engaged in war production considered entering the woolen mill business after the war. They owned a large building with rail, truck and water shipping facilities. Plenty of good water and wool were available.

These people had sufficient capital, but knew nothing of the woolen business. They obtained Government technical advice, and all of the problems were worked out. The plant now employs 140 persons making woolen sports clothing of the California type.

Recording machine: A company in New Jersey, employing two dozen men, is now in the business of manufacturing the German magnetic recording machine called the Magnetophone. This is a sound recording device using a metalized plastic tape instead of the usual disc. This machine is one of several now being produced in the United States as copied from German developments. This particular machine is a high-fidelity model for radio station transcriptions and sells for $3,000. The machines manufactured by several other companies are less expensive models for home use.

Fertilizer: Nitrogenous fertilizer is in critical short supply both here and abroad. Great new opportunities exist in the manufacture and separate distribution of these products.

Fertilizer made from fish and sea food byproducts has also been the subject of thorough study by the Government. A few trial plants have already entered this field.

Atomic energy: Among the many reasons why we should have a "Little Man's RFC" is that it would enable our veterans to participate in the tremendous economic possibilities which lie in the field of peacetime uses of atomic energy. Industrial and commercial opportunities in the field of atomic energy are becoming more clearly defined and there are firm indications that the development of nuclear science will have a far-reaching effect in many fields. Even in the most conservative estimates, the proposed possibilities of peacetime uses of atomic power are sufficient to stagger the imagination of the average citizen.

Industry: There is a combination of advantages for many new kinds of industry in West Virginia. New and better methods for mixing and processing clay offer new opportunities in the manufacture of bricks and pottery. Many improved types of building and construction materials have been developed by clay and cement companies which open additional channels for new businesses. Other potential industries are the manufacture of insulators, tile, cement, and glass.

Research is constantly being carried on for new and improved processes for the manufacture of aluminum, zinc, magnesium, and many other metals. There are also many new developments for the use of alloys, which can result in new and beneficial businesses.

West Virginia has natural resources for the manufacture of salt for table salt and stock salt. Salt byproducts such as calcium chloride and bromine can also be produced. Scientific research can be applied to the manufacture of chlorine and chlorine compounds. Chlorine itself has many uses. It is important in water purification, in the treatment of sewage, for bleaching textiles and in the manufacture of many useful organic and inorganic compounds. Other opportunities lie in the manufacture of caustic soda, which is used in the manufacture of soap and for the purification of coal tar and petroleum products.

The manufacturer of synthetic organic chemicals, ingredients used in paint, linoleum, paper, dusting powders, rubber, storage batteries, dyes, detergents, medicinals, fabrics, synthetic textiles, and explosives are just a few of the many new businesses that could be started.

Coal, natural gas, and brine are important raw materials of many industries. West Virginia has such vast reserves of these and many other raw materials that she could easily become one of the greatest chemical centers of the world. There is tremendous opportunity here for the individual.

Natural gas in West Virginia has been instrumental in the development of its large industries and the industries of adjacent States. As this fuel is used for specialized

purposes, new markets can be found in order to utilize the State's domestic production of natural gas.

NEW OPPORTUNITIES UNDER THE REVERCOMB WEST VIRGINIA PLAN

Agriculture

Although agriculture is one of the leading industries of West Virginia, many farmers have low cash incomes. Since the opportunity for settling new claims in West Virginia is limited, present conditions must be improved in order to make agriculture thrive. For the best possible use of soil resources, attention could be given the following:

1. Classification of the soil resources to determine what the land is best adapted for.

2. After the land has been classified, it should be properly utilized for maximum production. In order to do this, farm lands should be divided to provide forest, cropland, and pasture land.

3. Employment of soil and conservation measures, such as diversion terraces, contour cultivation, and contour strip cropping should be more widely adopted.

4. Proper fertilizers should be used in accordance with the needs of crops and soil.

5. Pasture can be improved through the application of lime and fertilizers, good management practices, and reseeding.

6. Lands can be drained when they are found to be potentially profitable.

7. One of the greatest problems of certain areas in West Virginia is that of strip mining, which has affected 11,000 acres of land. Study should be given to returning such land to a high level of fertility.

Although these are large problems that require proper planning and education, it can be done in such a manner that the cost would not exceed the expected returns over a number of years. There is great opportunity here for the individual to prosper instead of barely maintaining a subsistence on his farm.

Vital to agriculture is water. Adequate water for West Virginia farm lands can be provided by spring-improvement measures, construction of farm ponds and adequate protection of watersheds.

Grain production can be increased as the average yields are at present low. More emphasis should be placed on selection of the variety and quality of the seed, both of which would raise the grain yield.

Vegetable and fruit producing programs could be developed in many areas of the State. There is great opportunity for growing cauliflower, potatoes, grapes, black raspberries, and blueberries. There are nearby markets for such crops. Theer is also great opportunity here for processing, packaging, and byproduct plants to be erected and located near the growing areas. Too, frozen-food lockers, freezing plants and dehydrating plants could be established.

Each year pests and plant diseases exact a heavy toll of farm crops. New businesses could be started to control and eradicate such diseases.

In order to properly market products, there must be an adequate road system. According to the 1940 census, 48 percent of the farms of West Virginia were situated on unimproved dirt roads. Consideration should be given to the construction of all-weather roads.

During the war, building repairs did not keep up with depreciation. Modern research has discovered many new types of buildings, new building materials, and better methods of construction. A few examples are new adaptions of plywood, concrete, and sheet metal. New businesses could be started in the sale and distribution of these products and in teaching farmers the advantages of these new developments.

West Virginia dairy farmers are producing only about 60 percent of the consumer requirements for bottled milk and the remaining 40 percent must be imported, as the need for dairy products is unlimited. The expansion of the dairy program could continue for a long time since the small farms are adaptable to dairy farming. There is also a great need for the raw materials for the expansion of processing plants for the handling of dairy products—market milk, ice cream, cheese, butter, condensed and powdered milk. Such a program would increase farm income and farm improvement, which would provide additional jobs.

A good strong dairy program is related to many other industries and improvements such as soil and water conservation, good land use, improved roads, expansion of public utilities and services, banking, machinery business, supply business, and feed and fertilizer business, in addition to many other types of business which directly or indirectly would affect every person in the community.

Forestry

West Virginia has productive forest land and many commercially valuable trees; 58 percent of the total land area is forest land and 8,859,000 acres are capable of commercial timber production. Although forest deterioration is serious and widespread, forest production in West Virginia is only half of what it could be, and full advantage is not being taken of this potential source of income for the people and for the community.

In addition to the lumber that is cut, more secondary wood-using industries are needed. Additional flooring mills to process rough lumber are also needed. As it is now, much of this rough lumber is being sent out of the State for processing. Housing conditions could be improved by the proper utilization of local forest resources. Additional opportunities are offered in the manufacture of plastics and the preparation of chemical by-products from forest materials.

Recreation and wildlife

There is a potential value of thousands of dollars in West Virginia forests and streams for relaxation purposes and tourist trade. Hunting, fishing, swimming, hiking, skiing, and nature study are among the few attractions that could be fully developed. Since West Virginia is only 3 to 4 hours removed from such cities as Washington, D. C., Baltimore, Md., Pittsburgh, Pa., and many others, additional forest areas could be developed as a recreation and tourist attraction, thereby creating new sources of income.

Communication

Plans to improve communications on West Virginia farms should be made. A great many farms need telephones. New developments in radio and television hold great promise for the future and two-way communication by wireless is a distinct possibility. This will all have a tendency to bind our farm population more closely to our national life.

Aviation

There are only 43 airports in West Virginia and only 648 registered aircraft. Many communities in West Virginia need more combined passenger-cargo airports. There is little doubt that since the end of the war private-owned airplanes and private airports have become increasingly popular, and the family airplane will become popular.

Expansion of the airlines and airport industry will create many new opportunities. In addition to the aircraft manufacture and aircraft sales, there will be a need for aeronautical schools, airplane service stations, hangars, storage, and servicing facilities for private-owned aircraft, charter service, plane rental services, pilot supply service, and aviation insurance concessions. New jobs will be created for manager, mechanics, salesmen, cperators, pilots, janitors, and many others.

Whenever new municipal airports are built, many more opportunities are offered for people not connected with the actual aeronautical service. A few of these are: restaurant, coffee shop and employees' cafeteria, soda fountain, news stand, novelty shop, barber shop, cocktail bar, outside refreshment stands, vending machines, automobile filling stations, bus and taxi service, parcel lockers, sale of utilities, sale of advertising space, special business privileges (photographic service, telegraph and telephone, tourist bureau, etc.), rental of merchandise display space, and recreational facilities.

Other opportunities

A successful business could be started in aerial photographic surveys which could be used for studies and projects, such as land use, highway location, location of tax-delinquent lands, and rural zoning.

Parks could be further developed and recreational facilities improved and expanded.

Reservoirs could be built to guarantee minimum stream flow and assure industrial and agricultural developments of adequate water supplies.

PROFITABLE TO TAXPAYERS

Heretofore, our experience with loan programs, such as our proposed Veterans' Economic Development Corporation, has been profitable to the taxpayers. To illustrate this point, I quote another distinguished cosponsor of our "Little Man's RFC," Senator HUGH BUTLER, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which committee is concerned with the natural resources in the vast domain of the United States and our possesions:

"As chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and as a cosponsor of the bill to establish a Veterans' Economic Development Corporation, I would like to let you know some of the tremendous potentialities that I hope can be realized through enactment of this bill. I refer to the almost unlimited opportunities for development of the economic resources of our great West, and of our last and greatest frontier in Alaska.

"Responsible economists are authority for the statement that our 11 Western States, with a present population of only about 16,00,000 could easily support a population of 60,000,000 people at a high level of prosperity if the resources of those States were adequately developed. If this statement seems amazing, it is only because too many of our people do not realize the tremendous possibilities of growth in the West. These resources include vast mineral deposits not yet surveyed in many cases, tremendous quantities of potential hydroelectric power, millions of acres of dry land to be brought under irrigation, and many others.

"To give only one example of the wealth that is waiting there to be opened up for productive use, the full development of irrigation in the 17 western reclamation States can bring into cultivation 20,000,000 additional acres of highly productive land.

"Irrigated land of this type has a high value per acre and a high productive capacity, and can be conservatively valued, on the average, at $200 per acre. It is evident that such a program would involve the ultimate development of agricultural wealth to the extent of a $4,000,000,000 increase in the value of the land alone. That should give some idea of the size af the program, without even mentioning the possibilities of mineral and industrial development.

"The other great undeveloped region that seems to offer tremendous hope for the future is Alaska. This vast territory is more than one-sixth of the entire area of the United States. Alaska is now the key to our national security. It will never be safe until it is more densely populated. The economic potentialities are equally important. Alaska has abundant natural resources and an equable climate. Its area is far greater than that of Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, yet the population of Alaska is only 100,000, compared to 13,000,000 in

Scandinavia. To mention only one important resource, Alaska has enough good timber to supply one-fourth of the newsprint pulp requirements of the United States in perpetuity, taking into account the regrowth of the trees. This means that thousands of new industries based on wood, wood pulp, and their byproducts and chemical derivatives could provide a tremendous basis for employment.

"All of this development means opportunities for expanded prosperity to thousands of our people. I am thinking particularly of our millions of veterans, many of whom are looking for an opportunity to help carve out a new economic empire. This bill is particularly designed to provide such an opportunity.

"What our Western States and Alaska need is capital that would stay in the country and develop it, plus the energy of our veterans. This bill provides for both, plus the adequate technical advice that is necessary for sound development and assurance of success.

"I believe this bill would serve as a spearhead to get this development going. Section 2a (6) of the bill provides for the stimulation of profitable activity so as to attract the investment of private risk capital within areas which at present still need such capital. The following subsection provides for assisting State, community, and private agencies in financing self-liquidating projects which will utilize profitably the services of our veterans. I believe these two subsections fit precisely the needs of our undeveloped territories in the West and Alaska.

"In many fields, the Federal Government has found it necesasry to stimulate economic expansion and pioneering development by self-liquidating loans. It is worth mentioning that our experience with such loan programs has been profitable to the Government and the taxpayers. To illustrate this point, I only need mention such programs as Rural Electrification, Home Owners' Loan, and Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, all of which are distinct financial successes. I am confident that the Veteran's Economic Development Corporation would be at least as successful from a financial standpoint.

"In short, I believe that veterans need and deserve some such program as this, and I believe that the Nation will benefit from mobilizing their talents in a program of economic expansion. I am glad to join with you in pushing for early consideration of the proposal.

"Sincerely,

"HUGH BUTLER,
"United States Senate."

At this time, I would like to insert in the RECORD a copy of a letter I wrote to my esteemed colleague and one of the distinguished cosponsors of the bill, Senator STYLES BRIDGES:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
July 16, 1947.

Senator STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Appropriations.

DEAR SENATOR BRIDGES: As a cosponsor of the Veterans Economic Development Corporation bill which I regard as a basis for study toward our enactment of sound legislation to solve critical problems for our taxpayers and veterans and, as chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, I am naturally interested in all phases of current public works and those we will undoubtedly need in the future.

Certainly, it is clear to most of us that we can learn from our mistakes of the past. We should be ready in the event of need to carry forward a constructive, efficient public works program.

The possibilities contained in this Veterans Corporation are unlimited. State by State we should be ready to meet present and future unemployment needs with a program which will enhance the real wealth of the Nation rather than haphazard, temporary boondoggling projects.

Under the provisions of this act, State and municipalities would be able to care for their own unemployed veterans and others through essential self-liquidating public projects such as: Parking buildings, auditoriums, toll roads and bridges, public markets, airports, and irrigation projects.

Also, under the provisions of this legislation, cities and communities would be able to rehabilitate their local public works after years of neglect due to war and intense industrial activity. Similar public utilities such as run-down transportation lines, waterworks, gas companies, rural communication lines and all such public conveniences could and would be revitalized.

I can foresee the real benefits of such legislation to my own State of West Virginia. Whether or not we all realize at this time that the youth of our Nation which fought the last war returned to a situation which will inevitably lead to their being placed at the ends of the pay rolls and the first in the unemployed lines is a question. The signs of such a condition already face us.

The public works provisions of this act could be aimed as a stimulant to agriculture, small industry, and small business toward an ever-expanding economy as insurance against depression, communism, and war. This bill could act as a spearhead in the proper utilization of our surplus war plants and equipment as a means of spreading and expanding our economy. It would be also an effective brake on any cycle of unemployment.

We hear a great deal these days about a threatened collapse in the American educational system. A public works program such as could be created by this legislation could do a great deal in improving the physical structures in our educational system and also a great deal in providing the means whereby much-needed improvement of schools and school districts could be accomplished.

The application of this legislation could be coordinated with similar programs under the provisions of the veterans corporations operated in the States, within geographical areas, thereby eliminating much of the overlapping and confusion which too often develops between Federal and State governmental programs.

With these thoughts in mind, I am anxious to offer my unlimited support and encouragement to the enactment of this act.

Sincerely,

CHAPMAN REVERCOMB.

Mr. President, my West Virginia plan will be implemented with the enactment of the "little man's RFC." It will be among the first of many similar plans to be enacted throughout the Nation, and I am sure that it will herald the arrival of a new era of prosperity for the people of my State and the Nation. My main purpose as a representative of my State is to help the individuals in my State as much as possible, for we all know that what helps the individual State helps the Nation as a whole. Therefore, at this time, I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to insert in the RECORD the Revercomb West Virginia plan.

REVERCOMB-WEST VIRGINIA STATE PLAN

The State plan is designed to develop, under the provisions of the Veterans' Economic Development Corporation, the resources of the State to promote the prosperity, welfare, and health of all its people. Career opportunities for veterans as well as continued full employment for others would be fostered through the development of needed new businesses, the modernized productivity of agriculture, the utilization of unused natural resources, and the implementation of needed self-liquidating public projects.

The Veterans Corporation, with authority to extend credit totaling $5,000,000,000, will direct its loans toward supplementing the loans of banks and other existing private lending agencies, and the capital needed will derive from existing public money. No appropriations from Congress will be necessary, as only profitable self-liquidating projects will be considered.

Planning activities would be on a State, county, regional, or community level. The State planning board, with the assistance of a know-how committee composed of technical experts, would plan for the physical development of the State, cooperating with other State agencies in the preparation of programs. It would also assist regional and county committees (which would plan for county and regional projects) and community planning boards, giving technical advice and assisting in the coordination of State, county, and community plans. It would further extend technical assistance to individuals, new businesses, and projects.

Since the Veterans' Economic Development program is essentially a grass-roots program—designed to serve small business and industry and agriculture in the community—emphasis on planning would be on a community level. Thus, while the State planning board and know-how committee would engage in planning on a State-wide basis, their primary function would be to serve the interests of the communities and to bring to bear the cooperation of the Federal Government on local projects whenever advisable and necessary.

Because of this emphasis on local planning, the following outline on State and community planning will list specific opportunities for development and expansion under the section on community planning.

Foreign aid

Ambassadors, ministers, and technical experts of friendly nations seeking our help under the Economic Cooperation Administration and other forms of aid have shown great interest in applying this State plan to their own countries. In their opinion, the plan will speed modernization of their economy and enable the people in their communities to become increasingly self-sufficient. This economic-development plan will increase two-way trade between the people in the communities of the United States and of other countries for the increasing profit and security of all the people.

It is the belief of American authorities that the application of this plan in the communities of friendly countries will help provide a firmer foundation upon which our financial aid at Government level to these countries will rest. Further, the State plan may be put into effect abroad without cost to the American taxpayers as no appropriations of public money are required.

Community planning

1. Local planning board established, representing industry, finance, business, labor, sciences, the professions, veterans, religious groups, agriculture.

2. Planning board sets up a know-how committee.

3. Planning board outlines program of activity, receiving assistance in organizing and formulating programs from State planning commission or State know-how committee.

a. Inventory to determine present and future economic needs, including preparation of town and agricultural maps on the following:

(1) Population distribution and trends.
(2) Property tax surveys.
(3) Land use.
(4) Zoning ordinances.
(5) Traffic studies.
(6) Recreational facility requirements.
(7) Health and welfare survey.
(8) Community center redevelopments.
(9) Highway maintenance.
(10) Fire protection.
(11) Water supply.
(12) Housing.
(13) School system.

(14) Farming, acreages, crop production, livestock.
(15) Utility services.
(16) Transportation service—airport, etc.
(a) Uses facilities of Federal, State, and regional agencies for fact-finding and making projective studies.
4. Opportunities for development and expansion:
a. Local industries:
(1) Needed expansion of existing industries.
(2) Needed new industries:
(a) Research for new products.
(b) Use of captured enemy patents and new processes.
(c) Use of natural resources.
(d) New industrial uses for agricultural products.
(3) Processing plants for local products.
(4) Assembling plants for local markets.
(5) Service industries.
(6) Retail trade.
b. Land use:
(1) Land conservation:
(a) Irrigation—surface and underground water resources.
(b) Reforestation.
(c) Erosion control.
(d) Soil treatment.
(e) Fertilizers.
(2) Water-power development:
(a) Utilities.
(b) Industrial uses.
(c) Agricultural purposes.
(d) Home.
(3) Agricultural practices:
(a) New methods of farming and livestock improvement.
(b) New farm enterprises and better use of land resources.
c. Commerce:
(1) Sales development—new market centers in growing communities.
(2) Farm cooperatives.
(3) Export development opportunities.
(4) Shipping:
(a) Assembly, processing, and warehousing facilities.
(b) Harbor improvements; feeder lines.
(5) Air transport.
(6) Trucking.
(7) Freight.
d. Mining:
(1) Geological surveys.
(2) Development of mineral resources.
(3) New uses for mineral products.
e. Tourist and recreational areas:
(1) Beaches and artificial ponds and lakes.
(2) Wood trails and roads, camping areas.
(3) Sports, fish and game stocking.
(4) Restoration of historical areas, scenic improvement.
(5) Hotels, cabins, and restaurants.
(6) Stream- and pond-pollution control.
(7) Handicrafts.
f. Public service (self-liquidating):
(1) Utilities and power development.
(2) Transportation of passengers.
(a) Bus.
(b) Streetcar.
(c) Train.
(d) Air travel.
(e) Boat.
g. Public health and welfare (self-liquidating):
(1) Medical clinics.
(2) Fire prevention.
(3) Sanitation.
(a) Stream-pollution abatement.
(b) Sewage disposal.
(c) Garbage disposal.
(4) Hospitals (improvement and/or expansion).
h. Public works and public improvements (self-liquidating):
(1) Housing.
(a) Multiple low rental units.
(b) Prefabricated and industrial housing.
(2) Toll bridges.
(3) Parking areas and buildings.
(4) Municipal projects.
1. Education (self-liquidating):
(1) Colleges, professional and trade schools (improvement and/or expansion).
(2) Housing to accommodate veteran students.
(3) Community recreation centers.
(4) Vocational and social guidance.
(5) Rural school program, consolidation and transportation.

State and regional planning

1. State planning board established, representing industry, finance, business labor, sciences, the professions, veterans, religious groups:
a. Supplements and implements work of existing State planning agencies.
b. Cooperates with and serves community planning boards.
2. Planning board sets up a State know-how committee composed of technical experts in various fields:
a. Know-how committee gives technical advice to planning board, to community know-how committees, to county or regional committees, to individuals, to new businesses and projects.
3. Planning board outlines program of activity, receiving assistance in organizing and formulating programs from State know-how committee or State planning commission:
a. Takes inventory to determine present and future economic needs of State and geographical area, preparing State, regional, and county maps and statistical studies.
(1) Uses facilities of Federal, State, and regional departments and agencies for fact-finding and making projective studies.
4. Planning board relates county, community, and intrastate regional plans to one another, thereby eliminating overlapping, confusion, and unprofitable enterprises and projects.
5. Planning board cooperates with other States on regional projects in same geographic area, such as power developments, land conservation, etc.
(Specific opportunities for development and expansion outlined in detail in section on community planning.)

Pearl Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the debate on this measure a Member gave the disaster at Pearl Harbor as an example of unpreparedness. I wish to challenge his conclusions.

As prewar navies go, we had a powerful naval force at Pearl Harbor. Hundreds of millions of dollars had been expended on shore installations and it was our strongest outpost. It was manned by the regular personnel of the Army and Navy—the best in the world.

Pearl Harbor demonstrates conclusively that defensive preparedness means nothing unless we have competent leadership. Our leadership failed, and that leadership was not located in Hawaii—we did not fail in military preparation. And if we are to believe some members of the Armed Services Committee who tell us that our armed forces are pitifully weak, after spending some $10,000,000,000 annually, then that is a most serious indictment of the ability and purpose of the national leadership of today.

American Policy in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. MULTER. I rise, Mr. Speaker, to comment briefly on the continued inaction by the State Department in the face of affronts to this Nation by three member states of the Arab League. I refer to the willful disregard for international law and freedom of the seas of which the Governments of Lebanon, Syria, and Egypt are guilty in their illegal acts along the coasts of the new state of Israel.

The State Department duly protested the blockade when it was first established last month. On June 3 the Egyptian Government replied to our protest in such a manner as to elicit the comment from the State Department that the reply was not satisfactory. Since that time, nearly 2 weeks ago, the blockade has continued but the State Department has merely kept the situation under study and has not even sent another note.

On June 14 the Syrian Government finally got around to replying to a similar protest lodged by the State Department for the same reason. In the words of the State Department's press officer, Michael J. McDermott, the gist of the Syrian note was that Syria is in agreement with the other Arab League states in acting to suppress disorder and restore peace to Palestine as soon as possible. This type of double talk may be considered good diplomatic usage, but to the people of Israel, who have been fighting off the invading armies sent into the northern part of their country by the Syrian Government, it must sound like gibberish.

It is time that the United States of America stopped acting as if it were a third-rate power which can be pushed around at will by the feudal cliques that dominate the Arab League countries. The outrage perpetrated by the Government of Lebanon a few weeks ago in forcibly seizing 41 American citizens from an American ship in transit through the port of Beirut is only one of many such insults to the United States which the gentlemen of the State Department have allowed to pass without more than a meaningless protest.

We have all heard propaganda to the effect that if the United States did not meekly accept the pro-Arab line of the British Foreign Office in the Middle East our prestige would be irretrievably damaged.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what greater loss of prestige could this country suffer than to permit the series of indignities and insults which have been heaped upon us by certain Arab League states to go unchallenged or, what is worse, to be feebly protested.

Our citizens have been dragged from ships flying the American flag and thrown into prisons. The very act of the Lebanese Government in freeing them was an insult, when she told us

where she would allow our citizens to travel.

The Syrian and Egyptian Governments have been operating and still operate a naval blockade of Palestine's coast, all the while claiming that there is no war in Palestine. Our feeble protests to these governments have brought no change in their illegal blockade. Despite the fact that two weeks ago our State Department termed the Egyptian reply to our protest "not satisfactory," we have not heard that it has taken any new official action.

All these incidents, to my mind, form a pattern—the discredited and disreputable pattern called "appeasement." Our President has recognized the state of Israel. In addition to this dramatic step, however, we must demand positive evidence that the policy of the United States Government is an independent American policy in the Middle East. We must stop following the British line; we must stop appeasing Britain's Arab League puppets; we must resolve to act for our own country's best interests in the strategic Middle East by stopping all direct and indirect aid and comfort to aggressors and to the enemies of our way of life.

Murder of George Polk in Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I rise again in connection with the murder in Greece of the American journalist, George Polk. That murder was shocking, not merely because it removed a valuable and promising young man in a world which badly needs men of his type; it is desperately serious because it is a threat to American newspapermen all over the world.

One reason for pursuing the perpetrator of this crime and bringing him to justice is not only that vengeance may be had for the murder of George Polk, but also so that elements all over the world may stand on notice that we do not propose to stand idly by and see American newspapermen assassinated and maltreated in whatever country they may happen to be.

In order further to attract attention to this vital matter, I ask that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two documents. The first is a resolution adopted by the standing committee of the United Nations correspondents, and the second is a summary of editorial opinion from newspapers all over the country on the murder of George Polk.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY MAY 27, 1948, BY THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF UNITED NATIONS CORRESPONDENTS, AT LAKE SUCCESS, N. Y.

The standing committee of United Nations correspondents at Lake Success expresses its profound concern at the murder of George Polk, Columbia Broadcasting System correspondent in Greece, in circumstances which are so far unclarified.

The committee considers that the unsolved murder of any correspondent, honestly carrying out his professional duties, is a threat to the successful work of all other correspondents. Mr. Polk's death arouses special concern because his unbiased reporting is known to have produced threats against him.

The committee feels that every effort should be made to solve this murder and to make the facts known as soon as possible.

The United Nations is seeking to promote freedom of information throughout the world, and the Human Rights Commission is now deliberating means of making this freedom effective.

The standing committee therefore—

1. Welcomes the proposal of the New York Newspaper Guild for the appointment of a joint commission composed of impartial correspondents and representatives of the United States Government to investigate Mr. Polk's death.

2. Supports the efforts of any other impartial body set up to pursue this investigation.

3. Requests the Governments of Greece and the United States to give their full support to any impartial investigating body.

4. Requests the Secretary-General of the United Nations to bring this matter to the attenion of all appropriate organs of the United Nations—in particular the Human Rights Commission and the United Nations Special Commission on the Balkans.

5. Establishes a subcommittee of three members to maintain contact with the progress of any investigation and to report regularly to the committee.

(Copies of this resolution to be sent to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the representative of the United States at the UN, the representative of Greece at the UN, the Columbia Broadcasting System.)

EDITORIAL OPINION ON THE MURDER OF GEORGE POLK

Blytheville (Ark.) Courier News: "It is absolutely necessary that the American authorities take the strongest possible measures to safeguard the unhampered flow of news from troubled countries which are dependent on American aid. Dwight Griswold, the American Aid Administrator in Athens, has been all too quick in the past to dip his brush into the whitewash bucket."

Lewiston (Idaho) Tribune (Marquis Childs in Washington Calling): "Because he wanted to get the story behind the surface of the news, he was not content to take Government hand-outs and Government favors. In the midst of the intrigues of Athens, he kept his eyes on the main goal—to give the American people the whole story, regardless of who might be hurt or offended. * * * Until recently there were several American correspondents in Greece interested in getting more than the routine news and not at all interested in sending out merely the Government point of view. * * * Today only Argyris is left in Athens. * * * I have lost a friend, a gallant and loyal friend. I saw him last at a wedding party when he was about to marry a charming young Greek girl. He was gay and very happy. We have all lost a man who believed in freedom and in truth, and it is a loss we can ill afford. * * * The murder * * * is like a sudden lightning flash in the murky atmosphere of that troubled country. It deserves the fullest investigation, which should have the backing of the Government of the United States."

Natchez (Miss.) Democrat: "From another point of view—that of censorship—the death of Polk is a danger signal. American newsmen are the vanguard of world freedom because they seek to tell the story of what's happening in every part of the world. Likewise they're the peacetime front line troops for the United States and its freedom. A free press is the first line of defense for this Nation. It is not free when its representatives are gagged—in Greece or anywhere else. * * * Any correspondent may become another George Polk in some harbor at any time. It is high time the American government took cognizance of censorship and did something about it."

Rocky Mount (N. C.) Telegram: "The dark aspects of this tragedy should not go uninvestigated. The fact that Polk, an American citizen, was violently murdered in a foreign nation is, in itself, sufficient grounds for our Government to take action. But there are further implications to the tragedy. * * * Polk's death comes at a time when other happenings in Greece cause us to look at our 'fellow democracy' with grave apprehension."

Oxnard (Calif.) Evening Press: "That an American was foully murdered is reason enough for distress, and this Government must, of course, insist that every effort be made to find and punish the murderer."

Altoona (Pa.) Tribune: "Our Government should investigate this murder closely, to see if there is any link with official Greek circles."

Auburn (N. Y.) Citizen-Advertiser: "The murder in Salonika of George Polk, the conscientious and able reporter of the Columbia Broadcasting System should be given a full and vigorous investigation by this country. * * * Why can't our administrator and the Greek Government stand for honest reporting of men of this type? Whatever it is, the Administration in Washington had better find out the reason. * * * We do know that when the full revelations are given about this case, there will be a call from this country to investigate the whole question of Greek relief."

Greensboro (N. C.) News: "It is possible that he was murdered by Communists who wanted to throw the blame on the Greek Government. But it is also possible that he was murdered by those who thought they were doing the Government a good turn. It is not likely that the Government looked forward to the broadcasting of the interview with Markos with any pleasure. * * * The Greek Government has a very pressing duty to discover and punish the murderer of George Polk, and the United States Government has an interest in seeing that it does."

Boston (Mass.) Traveler: "Senator LODGE has done exactly the right thing in demanding a full inquiry into the murder of George W. Polk, CES correspondent in Greece. Agitation raised in protest against Polk's tragic fate may very well save the lives of other Americans who see it their duty to report facts, rather than dispense propaganda calculated to further corrupt regimes."

Salem (Oreg.) Statesman: "Polk evidently thought Americans should know what has become of the $800,000,000 poured into Greece since the end of the war, and he also wanted to expose the 'embarrassingly effective' anti-American campaign current. Obviously someone was eager to see him shut up."

Asheville (N. C.) Citizen: "One man's death—that of Jan Masaryk in Czechoslovakia—awakened the Western World to the terrible dimensions of the Communist conspiracy. The death of another man—George Polk, of the Columbia Broadcasting System—should arouse thinking men to the parallel danger of appeasing, in Greece, the very opposite extreme."

Springfield (Ill.) State Journal: "Add to the roster of American heroes of the free press, the name of George Polk, who was found bound, gagged, and shot through the back of the head on the shore of Salonika Bay, Greece. No less courageous than John Peter Zenger, Elijah Lovejoy, or the late Ernie Pyle, Polk died in the line of duty to a

world which hungers for truth. * * * To him, surrender of his right to free and open inquiry was unthinkable. * * * There are ample danger signs the world over that freedom of the press on the global front is one of the major struggles of our time. Without such freedom, citizens of the United States and of other countries cannot possibly draw accurate conclusions and take intelligent political action."

Wilmington (Del.) Journal Every Evening re UN Standing Committee resolution: "The committee considers that the unsolved murder of any correspondent honestly carrying out his professional duties is a threat to the successful work of all other correspondents. * * * By all means, the UN should investigate. The future of peace in the world is not bright while good reporters are restricted, obstructed, beaten up, or slain in any part of the world."

Boston (Mass.) Herald: "Senator LODGE's request of Secretary Marshall for a thorough investigation of the apparent murder of George W. Polk, chief CBS correspondent in the Middle East, should have the support of the public. News and radio correspondents are exposed to enough risk in any event, but when one of them appears to have been murdered in cold blood for political reasons, it is time for appropriate Government action."

Boise (Idaho) Statesman: "Upon their factual reports of the circumstances under which the Greek Royalists and Rebels, the Arabs and Jews, the Chinese Nationalists and Communists and the several other combatants of the world are contesting their differences are based the popular opinions which eventually shape the courses of other nations in regard to these conflicts."

Boston (Mass.) Evening Globe: "Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., is to be congratulated for his demand that the Government open immediately a complete inquiry into the murder of George Polk, American news correspondonent in Greece, 10 days ago. * * * George Polk's murder, according to evidence thus far available, was the act of officials associated with the right-wing extremists in Greece. If that evidence is disproved, something other than the fog of propaganda emanating from the Athens government will be needed."

New York (N. Y.) Post and Home News: "But the murder of CBS Correspondent Polk in Salonika by persons unknown may have been indirectly caused by the attitude of American officials in Greece. But Polk did manage to get out a few words before he was ambushed. Noting that Bigart no longer covered Greece, he told his home office that Greek officials, 'lacking the guts to attack us openly * * * are working behind the scenes to get certain American reporters transferred or fired.'"

Lamar (Colo.) News: "Dead men tell no tales. But before George Polk, the American news comentator, was murdered in Greece, he wrote some dynamite."

Beaumont (Tex.) Journal (Paul Galico): "And am I mistaken or just naive, when I seem to recollect that there was a time once—it seems many years ago—when the solicitation and the protection of the United States Government were extended to its nationals abroad? When an American citizen living or traveling in Europe was pushed around, hurt, or tossed into the cooler, Uncle Sam's man was around in very jigtime, asking how come and who was doing what to whom. * * * I would like to know is what my old Uncle Samuel (is) doing to find out who ordered him liquidated and who did it and to see that they are punished? It won't bring Polk back but it might cause a foreign government or a political element within a foreign government, or even private citizens of a foreign (state) from bumping off their next American citizen.

"A week after the murder, there was a squib out of Washington 'Congress may be asked to investigate the slaying in Greece of George Polk, American CBS news commentator.' Boy, what a strong word that 'may' is for the American Government."

Oakland (Calif.) Tribune (Chicago Daily News foreign service): "Lake Success * * * Polk's murder in Greece means that the magic circle surrounding fearless, impartial foreign correspondents is now broken.

"They and their families must now worry about personal safety."

Providence (R. I.) Journal (On the Dial by Maurice Dolbier, quoting Polk's Harper's article on Greece): "Polk also pointed out the danger from the Right, and dubbed Napoleon Zervas, Minister of Public Order in a recent Royalist Cabinet, as an unscrupulous, sinister, and ruthless politician who 'in and out of government, is backed by the British-organized Greek gendarmerie force which still includes many officers and men who did police duty for the Germans during the occupation.' * * * The Greek Government as I say is investigating it. (It may have been an unfortunate translation which had Premier Sophoulis saying 'It is a question of honor to discover the motives of this tragic calamity—if it was not an accident.') Presumably our Greek Aid Mission is also conducting an investigation."

New York (N. Y.) PM (by Victor H. Bernstein): "Thoughtful correspondents at UN are not prejudging the case in any way. Most seem to agree, however, on two basic issues:

"That the Greek Government, which has charged but offered no proof that Polk was murdered by Communists cannot be considered unbiased in its investigations in view of the undisputed antigovernment tone of the correspondent's recent dispatches."

New York (ONA, by Constantine Poulos): "The murder of George Polk * * * not only punctuates that daily blood orgy, it draws into sharper focus the difficulties and dangers facing American correspondents overseas as well as the responsibilities of governments toward foreign reporters * * * Greece being on the outside of the iron curtain is another story, and it is not insignificant that the first case of the murder of the American correspondent should have occurred there."

Newark (N. J.) Star (by Donald Bell): "It is the first obligation of any government to protect its citizens in foreign countries."

Newsweek Magazine: "Greek police at first picturing Polk's death as accidental, finally gave out details that spelled murder. Then they sought to picture Polk as a victim of a Communist death trap while en route via the underground to get an interview with Gen. Markos Vafiades, leader of the Communist-backed guerrilas now fighting the Athens regime. But behind him, Polk left evidence disputing this theory. For broadcasting and writing the news as he saw it, Polk, like Bigart and Vermillion of the UP, had been smeared as a Red himself by the right-wing, progovernment press."

Evansville (Ind.) Press (by George Weller): "Death lurks for any newspaperman who tries to serve neutrally in Greece's civil war. Such is the lesson of the assassination of George Polk * * * for his daring, for his insistence on breaking through the fog of war in Greece, George Polk paid with his life. * * * Now that Polk is dead and Rhea, his lovely young wife of 8 months is left a childless widow, the hunt for his murderer satisfies little except the eagerness of both sides in Greece to whitewash themselves."

Oakland (Calif.) Tribune (Chicago Daily News Service): "Polk's death, to those who followed his pattern of objective, fearless reporting strikes deeply into the whole subject of the freedom of foreign correspondents—in fact, at the very heart of freedom of the press. * * * Correspondents covering the United Nations will meet Tuesday to discusss the Polk murder in the light of its international aspects and the freedom of foreign correspondents to write and speak without fear of reprisal."

York (Pa.) Gazette and Daily (by Don C. Matchan): "Last rites were conducted yesterday in Anglican church for George Polk, ace CBS reporter who died because he did his job too well. * * * One of the ablest reporters ever assigned to the Middle East task, he possessed a passion for uncovering facts regardless of on whose toes he trod. That devotion to duty and objective reporting led to his death."

Rockford (Ill.) Register (quotes Sadowski): "This man was an American citizen and certainly his death in this brutal manner should not be allowed to go overlooked and unsolved."

Fort Worth (Texas) Star-Telegram: "Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, asked Secretary of State Marshall Sunday for a full-scale investigation into the murder of George Polk."

Charlotte (N. C.) Observer (by Leland Stowe): "These facts point to several questions of exceptional importance; fully as important to the American people as to the editors and reporters: On all occasions the United States Government champions universal freedom of reporting with full security for journalists concerned and without censorship. If Washington means what it says, why has it failed to take drastic steps to bring Polk's murderers to justice. * * * Nearly half a billion dollars of American taxpayers' money has been poured into Greece. A military and economic United States Mission has been operating there for almost a year. With this huge investment in a small country of less than 7,000,000 people, are not the American people entitled to absolute assurance of free, independent, and utterly frank reporting from Greece."

Boston (Mass.) Evening Globe and coast to coast on the Columbia Broadcasting System, by Edward R. Murrow: "As far back as February 3, George Polk in a private letter said there were a number of vague hints that somebody was likely to get hurt. But he was inclined to think then that it was more likely that correspondents writing material critical of the present regime in Athens might be framed on some black market charge as an excuse to expell them from the country. * * * The question is * * * who killed him? And that would seem to be a matter with which our Government might concern itself with full vigor. * * * George Polk probably knew more about Greece than any other American reporter there. He was coming home. He was murdered. It may be that he knew too much. It may be that those who killed him will be apprehended and punished. But certain it is that you have lost one of the ablest, most conscientious, and courageous reporters who has ever served you."

The Church and Military Measures for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 15), 1948

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, a couple of days ago I asked and obtained consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a sermon on the subject The Church and Military Measures for

Peace, by Rev. Edward L. R. Elson, pastor of the National Presbyterian Church, of Washington, D. C., which has to do with universal military training. I am informed that the sermon will make approximately 2⅔ pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $189.34. However, it is so important at the present time that I ask consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHURCH AND MILITARY MEASURES FOR PEACE

(By the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D. D., pastor, the National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C.)

I

When the President of the United States unveiled the bronze plaque at the door of this church last October 19, he took occasion to say that in our troubled postwar world the Government in all its aspects sought and valued the counsel and support of all the spiritual and moral forces of the land. The President insisted that our world desperately needed the concentrated moral influence of religion in the establishment of peace founded on justice. That these remarks should have been made in the shadow of the statue of John Witherspoon, the only minister to sign the Declaration of Independence, was entirely fitting. For while in its basic philosophy our instruments of Government provide for the separation of the institution of the church from the institution of the state, it was never the intention of the founding fathers to divorce national life from the influences of religion. Indeed, the documents of our Government are permeated with Christian principles, and it is a fact of history that our republican form of government is derived more from the Judeo-Christian conception of the dignity and worth of man than from any other source. It is a notable fact that the Constitutional Convention and the convention preparing the constitution of the Presbyterian Church met simultaneously in the city of Philadelphia and that members of one body were members of the other. The faith of the reformed churches has ever been joined with the cause of freedom and the Calvinian tradition synchronizes with democracy. The highest expressions of our national life and the noblest patriotism of our people have been motivated and sustained by a genuine piety.

It is well for the President and the Congress to seek the counsel of churchmen and to encourage the application of moral and spiritual forces to the difficult problems of our age. Leaders in government of all parties have been getting much counsel since that day when the President spoke here. There are churchmen of insight and wisdom with great contributions to make toward national policy whose words ought to be measured and heeded. But there is the danger now that these churchmen will neither be heard nor heeded because of the precipitous pronouncements of professional propagandizers, based upon partial truths or inaccurate data, and uttered with such dogmatic finality as to cause disregard for the well-conceived and cogently expressed statements of church statesmen. Moreover, the recurrent practice of giving expression to one position as the only Christian position or the unanimously supported position of a particular church compromises equally sincere Christians who differ in their conclusions.

I want to speak quite clearly in this pulpit today. You, my parishioners, know quite well that the treatment of a theme such as we have chosen today is exceedingly rare. Since that Sunday when the President spoke there has been a veritable invasion of Washington by a miscellaneous assortment of itinerating clergymen from many denominations. They have come because of "war hysteria." We were not always aware of the hysteria until they arrived. They have had spotty and fleeting interviews with busy folk in Government and, departing, have made declarations sometimes lacking mature synthesis and incredibly naive in perspective. One suspects they were the conclusions of the men before they arrived in the Capital. Such visits should be made by church leaders, and I hope our church will be host to many such groups seeking light on important problems. But care must be exercised lest expressions on platform and in the press purport to be the only possible Christian view and that thereby those whose conclusions differ are holding an inferior Christian position. In every given situation there are moral alternatves. And the suggestion that one position is exclusively the Christian position may deprive the church and the public from consideration of alternate Christian views.

It may be said by some that I speak as an exponent of the military because in the late war for 5 years my ministry was expressed to our parishioners in uniform and now, as a Reserve chaplain, I am in one of the components of the armed services. I want to make it clear that I do not speak as an apologist for any agency of the Government or for persons in Government or for the armed services. I speak only as a clergyman in the Presbyterian order of the holy catholic church. I want to make it clear that it is because I am a minister prompted by conscience and measuring the moral issues of our day that I do speak. It is a favorite phrases of Presbyterians that "God alone is Lord of the conscience." There are many Presbyterians of sensitive conscience who are greatly troubled because they cannot accept as conclusive the expressions of other Presbyterians who are more vocal and whose pens are less restrained.

II

What are some of the things which are being said with which issue must be taken?

1. It is said that the United States Government has been militarized in peacetime. Peace has, in fact, not yet been made. That is another subject. But the "militarization of the Nation" is a phrase repeated over and over again until it is assumed to be a fact. What really has happened is quite the opposite of the militarization of the Government. While it is true that the Secretary of State and several of our Ambassadors were formerly professional soldiers, it does not follow that our Government has been militarized. Nearly 16,000,000 men and women have been in the armed services in recent years. That fact does not make them militarists. What is happening today is similar to that which happened in the years following the War Between the States. When a great percentage of the population has served in the armed forces, it is natural that many who demonstrated talents of leadership would also be called upon to serve in the postwar world. Today, as was true following the War Between the States, many people have military titles in the Reserve components of the armed services. Because men of ability served in the armed forces in time of war with a military title does not make them any more militaristic than those who are permanent civilians. Churchmen should understand this fact. Several days ago the President, in the presence of several clergymen of our church, categorically denied the militarization of our Government. It would be more accurate to say that what really has been accomplished is not the militarization of the Nation or the Government but the civilianization of the military—the infiltration of the military services by civilians until the old-time professional military leader has become a minority influence.

2. It is asserted that selective service and universal military training are being foisted upon us, or that the American people are being stampeded in its adoption. This is a gross misunderstanding of American character, an affront to our civic intelligence and should be resented. You do not foist things upon Americans and we are not being stampeded into adopting anything. Whatever is being done, is being done by the constitutional processes. Americans are expressing themselves, and the voice of the clergymen is, in itself, a refutation of their charge that something is being foisted upon the American people.

3. The phrase "military mind" is used repetitiously as though it were a mind which some people have and others do not. The imputation is that persons with a military mind are, therefore, diabolical and evil in their personal structure. And more often than not persons employing the term military mind as a unique mind, will in the same discourse speak of modern war as total war from which no one finds deliverance. The truth is that the military mind as such may not be any more evil than the clerical mind or the editorial mind. It is even conceivable that, in a particular historical situation, a conscientious, professional soldier may make a higher moral choice than those who disdain his profession. The careless use of this phrase erects a false dualism. The military mind as such may be no more evil than the pacifist mind as such. Men of good conscience and good character can only choose between moral alternatives in any given situation. What can be said, in the name of religion, is that all men are under the same condemnation—the condemnation of sin—and all men with all types of minds are in need of the same redeeming grace.

4. It is the assumption in some statements that opposition to a program for greater military strength is the only Christian atitude and that it, therefore, represents the highest moral choice. There are no men infallible in their moral choices. In the light of all possible options for discharging our unprecedented obligations, it is conceivable that a Christian espousing stronger military forces, though not necessarily the specific measures now under discussion, may be representing a higher moral choice than those who oppose them. But you get the impression from some of our most expressive churchmen that it is not possible to be a Christian at all unless you oppose the strengthening of our armed forces. Good men and great men inside the church certainly differ as to the means by which peace can be achieved and maintained and the military power requisite to its maintenance. It ought to be said there are differences. To deny adequate manpower and material as reinforcement of our policies could force our Government to the lower moral alternative of primary reliance upon atomic weapons. Atomic weapons are weapons of desperation. It may turn out, when all the facts of history are in, that those who now contend for greater military establishments with adequately trained reserves, may be making a vastly higher moral choice than those who oppose it. Drive our country to place primary reliance upon atomic weapons and you press her into a lower moral position.

5. Pastors in Washington sometimes find their parishioners called uncomplimentary names. For example, early this month there came across our desks a communication in which several times the phrases "irresponsible public servants" or "irresponsible acts of men in responsible public office" were used. These inaccurate epithets are serious charges

when written in the name of the Presbyterian Department of Social Education and Action. There are people in all parties who sincerely differ about public questions. There are men who make mistakes. But to say that they are "irresponsible men" is not true. I have met men who have made mistakes and men who differed in judgment but I cannot think of a single irresponsible person in a position of great responsibility. I, therefore, repudiate such characterizations emanating from Presbyterian sources and I apologize to my parishioners for the application of such untrue appellations to some of you who are as devout in Christian character and as trustworthy in public office as any in the country.

6. Today, as in 1939, those who insist upon seeking the reality of peace instead of its phantom are called warmongers. What does that word mean? Dr. A Powell Davies in a notable exposition of this point last month pointed out that "warmongering" is reckless and irresponsible talk about war. If "warmongering" is reckless and irresponsible talk about war, then "peacemongering" is reckless and careless talk about peace, and that is vastly worse. To talk about peace when there is no peace, or peace being possible without justice and real freedom, it seems to me, is a much lower moral position. Dr. Davies aptly pointed out that what so many churchmen appear willing to accept is any peace so long as there is uninterrupted serenity. What they do now, as before World War II, is compromise "with evils which destroy power to deal with realities, including moral realities. * * * Peace at any price was (and is) a moral inversion and illusion. * * * The dominant fact was and is that you cannot have peace without justice; and you cannot have it without liberty; and you cannot have it at all if your supreme motive is to save your skin." You cannot condone aggressive barbarism, blatant injustice, the destruction of liberty in our kind of world, and be spared military preparation—not yet. As Dr. Davies said, "We have to face the moral reality of justice. If personality is sacred and human dignity supreme, liberty is not an option but a moral obligation." "Peacemongering", which is careless talk about peace, is morally inferior. If it is said that military power will not guarantee the peace, it must be replied, nothing will "guarantee it." But in today's world we cannot even begin to negotiate peace without military power.

I am inclined to add another excerpt from Dr. Davies: "When you condone abominable evil for the sake of keeping the peace, you have abandoned morality almost altogether and are interested only in saving your own skin. I repeat: This was not morality and it was not religion and it never will be. It is not now, when Stalinism has taken the place of the aggressions of Hitler. Nor will it do to say that compromise with Stalinism is justified because there are American injustices too. Facing the moral realities means facing them with a sense of proportion. There are lesser injustices and larger ones. Moreover, there is a world of difference between the injustices that a nation is struggling to remove and those that another nation is deliberately imposing—imposing on other nations helpless to resist. I say flatly that compromise with Stalinism is a refusal to face the moral realities." Someone must say what Dr. Davies said so well in noting the parallel attitudes of pacifist churchmen today and the attitude which the same churchmen held before World War II.

One of the most disturbing intimations is that military preparation is evil in America but pardonable, necessary, and almost virtuous in Russia. More revolting than this is the implication that, after all, we are really responsible for Russia maintaining her enormous land armies. This is repugnant to moral judgment and must be repudiated. Put simply, what must be done today is to revise the error of too rapid and too complete demobilization in 1945 so that with sufficient military resources we are in a position to make and maintain a moral peace. Smaller nations—depending upon the moral and physical strength of the United States—have succumbed in the presence of military might which was not ours. It was not the conviction of Marxian communism as a philosophy of government that caused Czechoslovakia to capitulate, but the presence of Russian hordes at her borders.

7. It is also asserted that men in Government, and our military leaders in particular, do not understand that the answer to communism involves more than military measures. It is reiterated by some churchmen that, because our leaders do not understand the nature of the world's peril, they therefore make the error of relying solely upon military measures as the primary answer to communism. This is not true, and reveals an unpardonable underevaluation of the character of men in American public life. No less than the clergy, many Christian men in public life, including military leaders, understand quite thoroughly that the primary requirement in arresting communism is the elimination of the hunger, despair, and bitterness which breeds a response to communism. This ought to be clear enough, since the most significant legislation in all history for human and economic rehabilitation was thought out and proposed by a former professional soldier and for a while bore the name Marshall Plan. What some churchmen forget is that there will be no opportunity to apply the measures for economic and social amelioration without sufficient military strength to assure that freedom-loving peoples, who are our friends and who really believe in democracy, are not denied their real freedom before constructive programs find expression. Moreover, military leaders—charged with both the security of our own Nation and the reinforcement of its policies—are stewards of these responsibilities, and, as Christians, must act as stewards. Because the specific responsibility of some men is the creation of an adequate Military Establishment, it does not follow that they do not understand or respond to the needs of human beings.

8. It has been said that the prospect of temporary selective service or UMT has caused widespread frustration in American youth. This statement was made before the Armed Services Committee of the United States Senate in a document prepared by Dr. Paul Payne, general secretary of our Board of Christian Education, and Dr. Paul Poling, of the Department of Social Education and action of the Board, and read to the Committee. The declaration had in it many admirable expressions, especially in its closing paragraphs. Nevertheless, many Presbyterians must be amazed by the statement to the Senate committee that, "as representatives of the church conducting Christian work in 101 university centers and 45 colleges, we report that the imminence of the proposed draft added to universal military training has already created a general sense of frustration among the college youth of the Nation. The proposed temporary draft has created a negative and hopeless mood among young people who recall a previous temporary draft." As one who believes in our Board of Christian Education and its leaders, such a statement, it seems to me, is unfortunate. Now, one of two things must be said about such a statement. Either the statement is not true, or we are failing in American education. To say that our young people are frustrated by the suggestion of military duty is a libel against our youth. Young people today are no less patriotic than were their ancestors. They respond with as commendable idealism and dedication as the youth of any generation.

If our youth are as easily frustrated, as has been suggested, then we are failing to educate them as regards their social responsibility and civic duty, including military service. It is because I do not think our youth are so easily frustrated, and because I do not think we are failing in education, that I believe this statement to be unfortunate. We ought not to libel our youth when there is so much evidence to the contrary. The Purdue opinion poll for young people conducted a survey over a considerable period of time and discovered that as many as 82 percent of the 10,000 young people interviewed felt some military training should be given to all able-bodied men, while never at any time during the period of the survey did more than 23 percent say that such training should not be given. One of our own church members, now a student at Cornell University, where Dr. Payne was formerly pastor of the Presbyterian Church, participated in a poll of students in which one of the questions was, "Do you think that the United States should have peacetime military training?" The overwhelming majority of students replied that we should. I have not been to as many colleges and universities during the past year as some other church leaders, but I have addressed and conferred with students at seven or eight institutions of higher education since last September. I found neither frustrated nor hopeless youth, but alert, serious-minded and eager youth. When the question as to the frustration of youth because of prospective military service was raised recently on the campus of a State university one young man replied that this subject just provided a focal point at which there was revealed a general frustration, not of youth, but of adults.

9. We ought to understand clearly another subject which finds frequent expression by pacifist churchmen. It is stated that conscientious objectors have been imprisoned and that some even now, 3 years after the end of the war, are in prison. Conscientious objectors are not now, nor have they ever been, in prison because they are conscientious objectors to military service. To the honor of our Nation, our laws have always provided for the protection of conscientious objectors. This is a fact which ought to be heralded with gratitude instead of condemnation. When one has conscientious objections to bearing arms, the laws of our country have always provided that such a person has only to register and indicate his conscientious objection. His status is protected within the law, and he is not penalized for conscientious objections to bearing arms. When you hear or read about persons being imprisoned as conscientious objectors, I hope you will remember that this is not true. Such persons as were imprisoned during the war were not penalized for being conscientious objectors but for civil disobedience. This is a very different matter and the distinction ought always to be made clear. Sometimes it is said that our prisons are now full of conscientious objectors and our professional pacifists attempt to dramatize the need for their amnesty. Let us be clear. There are no conscientious objectors in prison, for conscientious objectors are not sent to prison. Moreover, except for a handful (less than a dozen), the persons alluded to by the pacifists as still imprisoned for conscientious objection to military service, but who in reality are there for civil disobedience, are in prison at this late date only because of appeals and delaying tactics in legal processes. These facts I verified last night with the Attorney General. It is for civil disobedience and not "conscientious objection" that such persons have been penalized; and you cannot have an orderly society and civil disobedience too. Any pleas to release "conscientious objectors" as

such must be pronounced a distortion of the facts.

On Friday of this week several ministers, including two Presbyterians, issued an appeal to youth, "to refuse to register or render any service under any conscription act." Fortunately, they made clear their position did not represent the stand of any denomination but solely personal opinions. To many this must be repugnant. From the point of view of the Nation, it is degrading and socially immoral. Such an attitude espouses disrespect for law and promotes the avoidance of the obligations of citizenship. That men have a right under the Constitution to hold such views is granted, but they need to understand and we need to understand that they are assured this privilege by others with no less a conscience who are willing to fulfill all the requirements of civic duty, including military service.

The Confession of Faith of our church, in chapter 23, section 4, states: "It is the duty of people to pray for magistrates (office bearers), to honor their persons, to pay them tribute and other dues, to obey their lawful demands, and to be subject to their authority for conscience' sake. Infidelity or difference in religion, doth not make void the magistrate's just and legal authority, nor free the people from their due obedience to him: from which ecclesiastical persons are not exempted." It should be noted that conscience is not to be followed in choosing which laws to keep and which to violate, but it is the conscience which assures the keeping of the laws of the state by the Christian. How the Presbyterian clergymen, calling upon young people to violate prospective laws, accommodate that action to their ordination vows with reference to the Confession of Faith, is difficult to understand.

Jesus said nothing specifically about participation in military service. And those who think that He did fall into the fallacy of eisegesis—reading into Jesus' statements ideas or concepts of the interpreter. It should be made clear in men's minds and in their speech, what Jesus himself has said, as distinguished from what is believed to be legitimate deductions from His sayings. The story of Jesus begins with Mary and Joseph going up to the capital city to be taxed—to pay their obligations to government and an occupation government at that. The only thing which Jesus said about duty to the state, He said with great emphasis, "Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's." Christians have a higher duty than violating the law of the Nation; and that duty is to make the Nation as thoroughly Christian as possible and as morally responsible as possible in the use of the great power God has placed at our disposal.

III

It is only proper to say that there are some positive propositions which ought to consume the attention of the church in these tragic days. On these I shall elaborate more fully next Sunday.

1. The evangelization of the world is our first obligation. The problems of our age are not primarily social, economic, or military, but theological. They involve the relationship of men to God, which issues in proper relation between man. The church in its gospel of redemptive grace has the answer, and we need to proclaim it with zeal.

2. The church must participate in the relief and rehabilitation of all mankind and encourage the application of our national resources, through the Government, to that end. I cannot refrain from pointing out that we have tried to put first things first. After 5 years of service as a minister to troops, I found myself called to give more than a full year to assisting in raising our $27,000,000 Restoration Fund, and the first major accomplishment in this pastorate was underwriting our share of that Fund. We feel perfectly free to take issue with some of our leaders on other matters because we do put first things first.

3. We may constantly seek to implant in our youth such moral and spiritual disciplines, such strength of character and allegiance to proper authority, that they cannot be frustrated easily (if ever they were) by the obligations of citizenship including military service.

4. Since it is reasonably clear that tensions between nations which tend to jeopardize a just peace will continue for some years to come, and since our country will be obligated to maintain for a short period at least, military forces in considerable strength, the Church should make every effort to provide a vital ministry for young people both in and out of the military service. We should now have plans for implementing the military chaplaincy.

5. We should seek to make America morally, diplomatically, and militarily strong enough to discharge our heavy resonsibilities to the world, remembering that we do not live in a world of fantasy but that we must act in the framework of contemporary reality. We must seek to be great enough and good enough in our character for the tasks which God in His providence has imposed upon us. As has always been true in history, the employment of great power for moral ends is always a serious obligation. The Church, as a society committed to a common Lord, in which fellowship is preserved despite difference of opinion and judgment, should contribute toward making us socially cohesive, culturally rich, and economically stable.

6. We may teach the superiority of American life as more nearly expressing the Christian ethic than any other way yet developed. This does not mean that we shall ignore our defects, but that—while working to correct our acknowledged defects—we shall at the same time appreciate the quality of life which we actually have. Next Sunday, I shall endeavor to suggest specifically some ways in which, from a Christian point of view, our culture is superior to that of our chief competitor, Soviet communism.

Here are a number of major proposals for the church on which there ought to be common agreement which can engage maximum zeal and in which there should be minimum embarrassment to the noblest efforts of our leaders. May God help us as Christians to rise to the great demands of this age.

The "Poor" Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE WORLEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a very interesting editorial written by Mr. Fred A. Story, editor and publisher of Farming for Profit, Childress, Tex., dated May 20, 1948, which I am sure will be of interest to many Members from agricultural sections of the Nation:

THE "POOR" FARMER

"Most farm people fare worse than city people in many ways other than income. They have poorer schools, poorer medical and hospital services, poorer libraries and recreational facilities. Fewer of them have telephones, electricity, and running water in their homes. In short, the opportunities of good living in rural areas lag far behind the rest of the Nation."

The foregoing remarks were made by Nathan Koenig, executive assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Far be it from us to stand in the path of progress or to depreciate the value of improved facilities to more convenient living in farm areas. We are just a bit fed up, however, by some statements that have been made in connection with testimony on a long-range agricultural policy.

Farmers have been portrayed as a group of underprivileged, unhappy people, the underdogs of our society. We vigorously challenge this point of view. We know that certain segments of our population (city as well as farm) do not have the bathtubs, telephones, libraries, and recreational facilities that others may possess. That does not necessarily make for poor living. Some of the happiest people we have ever known, and some of the finest, were among those who did not have the material possessions that the planners think so important.

We, as well as the planners, wish that everyone might have all these nice things but we do not believe that we are going to legislate that utopia into realization. There are a great number of people living on so-called farms solely from choice, and they are not classed as successful farmers. So what? There are millions in the city in a far worse category.

These good people on the marginal farms are living as they choose. They have the opportunity to go to the city and, at present, make a good deal more money. They like country life, however, and they are independent. They will not in hard times add to the city unemployed. They are happier and far better off doing what they are than following some other line of endeavor. Many of them do not have the aptitude of commercialized farming or making money elsewhere.

We think it is very desirable that a long-range agricultural policy be formulated. Let's recognize life and human values as they are, however. Good living is not measured in the dollar sign. Good living is measured by contentment and satisfaction, independence, and the mastery of our respective destinies. End of an editorial in Hoard's Dairyman.

The foregoing editorial impresses one as having been written by somebody who has never known what life is without bathtubs, telephones, libraries, and recreational facilities, to say nothing of electricity and running water. This writer has done more living that kind than he ever wants to live again, and to do so at any time in his life will be too soon.

So "we do not believe that we are going to legislate that Utopia into realization," eh? "These good people on the marginal farms are living as they choose," eh? And "many of them do not have the aptitude for commercialized farming or making money elsewhere?" What abysmal ignorance of what goes on in a farmer's mind and those of his wife and children.

How else, may we ask, has the farmer's opportunity for better living ever been improved except by the legislative processes which Hoard's editorial writer scorns? From the law that provided free mail delivery at the farmer's gate and on down to the present day we do not recall anything that so completely revolutionized life on a farm as rural electrification. It would be interesting to know Hoard's editorial viewpoint on the bitterly fought piece of legislation that brought REA electricity to American farm homes by the tens of thousands.

How about soil conservation? How else, except by legislation, could it ever have come into existence? How about county farm agent and county home demonstration agent, agricultural college education, agricultural research? The list is long.

Farmers of today's generation were quick to learn, mainly because of the broadening effects of closer contacts with every level of the American way of life. Give us one more generation of 4-H and FFA boys and girls to lead agriculture's mass thinking and voting and we shall probably see in life on the farm the most ideal existence to be found under the flag of any people on earth. But the opportunities which today's farmers want for better living for their boys and girls are most likely to be won in legislative halls.

Is there anything fundamentally wrong with wanting a better way of life? After all, have the cultural advantages which have been won by the legislative method been too costly, or have they resulted in any real loss of personal liberty? We do not think so, do we?

Housing Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 15), 1948

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an illuminating editorial entitled "Housing Progress," published in the Providence Journal of Monday, June 14, 1948. I read therefrom the last two sentences, as follows:

It is in the power of the Republican-controlled Congress now to give strong impetus to efforts to cure this condition. How well it responds to this urgent problem will quite clearly reveal the quality of its social thinking.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSING PROGRESS

To the Democrats must be attributed the chief credit for prying loose at last the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill from the House Banking Committee. Even of the 14 votes necessary to move it a step nearer hoped-for passage were cast by Democratic members of the committee. It was a striking defeat for Chairman WOLCOTT, who had tried to substitute a bill devoid of perhaps the most urgent feature of the T-E-W measure, namely, its provision for low-rental, federally financed, and municipally regulated living space for low-income families.

Virtually every family in America, whether or not now properly housed, is aware of the fact that 3 years after war's end this country is far from its goal of providing enough livable homes for its people. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is an effort by its sponsors both to assure and to expedite achievement of this purpose. While the Government necessarily has to offer certain financial guarantees in respect to some of the objectives of the bill, the emphasis very clearly is on giving encouragement to private enterprise in meeting the current severe deficiency of dwelling space.

Although the Democrats deserve the praise for moving the bill out of the House Banking Committee, plenty of opportunity remains for the Republican majority of the House to distinguish itself in this vital matter. For the Banking Committee is—or was—only one of the tough barriers to cross. Mr. ALLEN'S unbelievably obstinate Rules Committee may be a formidable obstacle. House Republican leaders, carefully apportioning the brief time remaining for legislative action, may choose to shunt the housing measure aside. But the bill has now reached a stage where clear responsibility for failure will rest on the Republicans if it finally does not pass.

Here in Rhode Island one has only to note the number of executions in trespass and ejectment cases that sheriffs have been notified to complete since the beginning of this month to appreciate how desperate still is the need for additional dwelling space. Clearly similar, in some areas perhaps greater need exists in urban localities.

Current conditions, in fact, are not much improved beyond those detailed by Mr. Truman in his special message to Congress late in February. "Today," the President said, "far too many of our families are living in substandard housing, in painfully cramped quarters, or doubled up with friends or relatives. Over 5,000,000 of our present homes are below minimum standards. About 2,500,000 married couples live with other families, a 50-percent increase since 1940. Large numbers of families do not have enough space to give their children decent accommodations. These conditions cannot help but be reflected in unsatisfactory home life and lowered standards of health."

It is in the power of the Republican-controlled Congress now to give strong impetus to efforts to cure this condition. How well it responds to this urgent problem will quite clearly reveal the quality of its social thinking.

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over Station WNBF on June 12, 1948:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, a letter from Messers. Donald Gould, president, and John Dent, secretary, of the West Corners Civic Organization, rural route No. 2, Endicott, requests that West Corners be considered and included in any flood-control project for the greater Endicott area.

The people of West Corners can count on my seeing their wishes in this matter carried out. Certainly no part of Broome County that needs protection from floods can be overlooked or neglected.

The same goes for Oakdale where I spoke a short time back and saw how the river had covered that important section.

I wish to congratulate the public-spirited attitude of groups such as the civic body I mentioned, placed as they are in practically every corner and suburb of our "valley of opportunity."

Their vigilance and lively interest in the welfare of each community account for the progress Broome County is making in all endeavors.

My nominating petitions are starting to pour in. Members of our Republican committees in Broome, Chenango, and Madison Counties are apparently meeting with good results if the responses I am receiving are any indication.

Other friends who are contacting neighbors on their home streets report the same enthusiastic reaction when they ask people to sign the petitions.

That means the smear campaign has failed. That means the peddlers haven't sold much poison. All the more remarkable when you realize they've been in the business of belittling me for the past 10 years.

And it's become quite a business. It requires the full-time of a trained band of glib-talkers, who exude smear from every street corner. It consumes enough inches of public print so if one were forced to buy such an amount of advertising space, thousands of dollars would have to be raised by these anti-Hall hucksters.

But in spite of their brass, their loud mouths, their insatiable desire to hurl mud, the rank and file still feel safe and free to put my posters in their windows and ask their neighbors to sign my petitions.

John L. Lewis stooges are organizing a speakers bureau to further besmirch your Congressman. These speakers will try to convert honest citizens to their Don Quixote crusade against the elected Representative from this district.

Several months ago, I said to you that our triple cities area would be threatened by this sabotage and I stated I would organize the Americans to resist this smear bund to the limit.

I am happy to tell you the people are now organized to handle their enemies and they are rallying around your Congressman as strongly as they have through the years.

To you railroad men of our section, I have a cheering message and want to read the speech I made in your behalf this week on the House floor when I spoke for increased retirement pensions for the railroad people.

"Mr. Speaker, the passage of this bill is necessary, and I believe certain.

"It is a satisfaction for me to say I represent a district in which reside hundreds of railroad men. They have been my friends ever since I first ran for Congress.

"Unlike some groups in organized labor, the railway brotherhoods do not make it a practice of crucifying Congressmen who do not always agree with them. They are generally fair and considerate to men who vote their convictions.

"I have usually gone along with what the railroad employees in my section want. They are hard-working, honest citizens, and in my opinion, deserve the best this Congress can give them.

"Today we are voting to raise their retirement pensions 20 percent. Many people back home who have been writing me on this subject for years will be glad indeed of the action we are taking.

"Retired railroad workers are faced with higher costs just like the rest of us. Their families are in need, and we are fulfilling promises made in the past by approving their pension increase today."

Thank you.

Keynote Speech at Indiana State Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Democratic Party of Indiana held its State convention at Indianapolis. It was the most enthusiastic and well-attended convention in years.

I am hereby submitting the keynote speech which I delivered as temporary chairman of the convention:

Mr. Chairman, I wish to extend my greetings to Indiana Democracy represented here by delegates from all sections of our great State. Your deliberations and actions in this solemn convention must be guided by good judgment and common sense.

Democrats here today are renewing allegiance to the only political party that has, during the century of its existence, constantly fought for the welfare of the common man. Our party has succeeded because it elevates the rights of the average man above the material prosperity of the few.

We can, indeed, take great pride in the national record of our party. That record reveals that from Thomas Jefferson on through the years to Wilson, Roosevelt, and Truman the Democratic Party has always been called upon in national emergencies to extricate our economy from the malfeasance and misfeasance of Republican administrations.

Our party's record in State administration has been equally outstanding. The greatest tribute and testimonial our party can receive is to compare the records of Indiana Republican governors of the last 30 years with the memorable administrations of Ralston, McNutt, Townsend, and Schricker.

Every politically informed Hoosier voter knows that the candidates nominated in this convention today will be inaugurated as Indiana State officials next January.

Our Government is still struggling to release itself from the devastating aftermath of the greatest war in all history. The American people have exhibited their intense patriotism by making abnormal sacrifices and enduring numerous inconveniences, not only during the shooting war, but also in the postwar reconstruction period. The only exceptions to this demonstration of patriotic cooperation are the special-interest groups and a few politicians. These influences succeeded in destroying certain wartime restrictions long before the pendulum of economic recovery started on its upswing. By reason of this, we are today in an inflationary spiral which has materially retarded postwar recovery.

HIGH COST OF LIVING

The paramount issue in the minds of the American people today is the problem of the high cost of living. This issue will overshadow all other questions, either international or domestic, in the coming campaign. Unless the present inflation is curtailed and the cost of living reduced, our domestic economy will be ruined. A ruined domestic economy will nullify all our efforts to reestablish and rehabilitate war-stricken democracies in Europe and postpone peace indefinitely.

In the 1946 elections, the Republican leaders made fantastic promises to the American people that they would reduce the cost of living if given control of the Congress. In the campaign 2 years ago, the American housewives were bombarded with pamphlet, newspaper, and radio propaganda by Republican leaders and the National Association of Manufacturers promising that the elimination of price control would produce an abundant market and the cost of living would be back to normal in a few months. The American consumer was sold a "gold brick" in November 1946. The Republican leaders must appear before the bar of public opinion this fall and answer for their failures to carry out their promises.

The National Association of Manufacturers and the Republican National Committee spent millions to elect the Eightieth Congress. Their campaign slogan was: "Eliminate price control, and the cost of living will be back to normal within a few months." I now call upon the leaders of the Republican Party to explain to the American housewife why butter, which was 65 cents under OPA, increased to 82 cents last year, and today is 97 cents per pound. The Indiana housewife wants to know why 3 pounds of round steak that cost $1.35 under OPA jumped to $2.07 last year and is $2.76 today; she also will ask why 2 pounds of Maxwell House coffee cost 60 cents under OPA and $1.06 today. These cost prices are from Washington stores as of June 1948. I could narrate dozens of similar profiteering price advances on numerous food items; and the same relative skyrocketing has occurred on the cost of clothing, furniture, and other essentials for the American family.

Every Republican candidate for public office in Indiana must explain to the Indiana housewives why their guaranties to reduce the high cost of living during the 1946 campaign have been such a monumental flop. The Presidential and congressional elections not only in Indiana but throughout America this fall will be truly a campaign which will be decided by the aroused American housewives. Republican Congressmen and Senators in the last 17 months of legislative control have discovered that it is easier to orate than to perform.

RENTS

The head of every American home has also been burdened with meeting the Republican rent increases. The real-estate lobby converged on Washington a year ago last January and in a very short time the Republican Rent (de)Control Act of 1947 was passed. The Indiana tenant knows today that in the first 4 months of operation under this legislation rents increased five times more than they did all through the five difficult war years of Democratic rent control of 1942–47.

It is my earnest hope that our experience with this Eightieth Congress will be a blessing in disguise. For the first time in 16 years, this coming November, the American voter will have the advantage of a choice between two plainly written records of the two major political parties. For 16 years while the Republican Party was out of power it confined itself to criticism and elaborate promises. In those campaign years, they could promise the moon because they fully realized they would never be called upon to deliver. The congressional elections of 1946 lifted the Republican Party from blissful irresponsibility to absolute control of the legislative branch of our Government.

VETERANS' HOUSING

When the control of Congress passed from the Democrats on January 3, 1947, the greatest housing crisis in our history scourged the country. Millions of returning veterans, anxious to purchase or rent a home, discovered there were no houses available. Seventeen months ago the Eightieth Congress had a magnificent opportunity to pass constructive legislation which would aid the homeless veterans and also help other citizens who were in the same situation. At that time millions of American house hunters did not anticipate the power of the real-estate and building-construction lobby which converged on Washington and succeeded in blocking the enactment of substantial legislation which would aid in relieving the housing crisis.

SOCIAL-SECURITY EXPANSION AND PENSIONS

We are all familiar with the plank in the Republican Party platform promising social-security expansion and pensions for the aged. Every informed voter today realizes that these promises were made to catch the votes in 1946 because the leadership in this Eightieth Congress has stymied every effort to bring practical social-security expansion or old-age-pension legislation to the floor of Congress.

The social-security payments as applied to old-age assistance, especially during the present inflationary high prices, is a starvation program.

MINIMUM WAGE

As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, I was called back to Washington during the recess last fall to participate in hearings on legislation which would raise the minimum wage from the present 40 cents per hour to 65 cents. One of the bills under consideration was a bill introduced by me calling for 75 cents per hour minimum wage. Our subcommittee spent 3 weeks holding extensive hearings, but to this day the Republican majority of our committee has refused to report out any minimum-wage legislation.

TAFT-HARTLEY LAW

Millions of dollars have been spent by the National Association of Manufacturers and antilabor employers, not only for propaganda to enact the Taft-Hartley law, but also to misrepresent its failures since its enactment. I will now enumerate 14 facts about the Taft-Hartley law which you seldom read about or hear over the radio.

1. The right to strike has been restricted in every manner that legal ingenuity could devise.

2. It hampered procedures of the NLRB by widening powers of the courts, instituting technical rules at Board hearings and a host of minor changes which nullifies important provisions of the Wagner act.

3. The protection against company unions organized and controlled by the employer is greatly weakened.

4. Restores government by injunction in certain types of strikes.

5. Outlaws the closed shop which has worked so well and satisfactorily to management in many industries.

6. Hampers union security.

7. The Taft-Hartley Act weakened labor's bargaining power at a time when corporation profits were the largest in history. In 1947, profits mounted to $17,000,000,000, after taxes—an increase of $5,000,000,000 over the previous year. The act has made it difficult for wage earners to protect their families against the high cost of living.

8. Before the Taft-Hartley Act, if employees were no longer satisfied, they would join another union, but now every legitimate union may be harassed at least once a year by petitions instigated by employers seeking to certify the union. Another union-busting device.

9. Regulations of initiation fees. (Curtails union unemployment benefits, union old-age benefits, union retirement funds, union burial provisions, etc.)

10. Ban on compulsory check-off. (By banning the compulsory check-off, the Taft-Hartley gives inducement to the "free rider" who will not carry his fair load of union obligations.)

11. Individual members of unions can adjust grievances outside of the union which is another union-busting device.

12. The reestablishment of individual unions. (Before the Wagner Act, these unions were almost wholly controlled by the employer.)

13. Restricting the right of free speech by curtailing unions from campaigning for or against Federal public officials.

14. The Taft-Hartley law makes unions subject to various types of lawsuits and an obstinate employer could keep unions in courts almost constantly. Lawsuits versus unions already are pyramiding into millions of dollars.

When President Truman, in his veto message of this antilabor law, said it would

lead to chaos, confusion, and strife, he was correct.

COMMUNISM

Conflicts between labor and management, traceable to this law, have been widespread. During March a total of 6,000,000 man-days were lost because of work stoppages. This represents an increase of 500 percent over the month of March 1947, which was prior to the Taft-Hartley Act. Reports of violence in labor disputes, reminiscent of twenty-odd years ago, are frequently seen in the daily press. These are only some of the symptoms bred by this restrictive legislation which was condemned on the eve of its enactment by fair-minded employers, leading economists, and experts in the field of labor relations.

The Republican leaders have drawn the red herring of communism across the political trail in every campaign since 1936.

Reasonable living costs, economic contentment, and security for the home and family will do more to destroy communism than all the laws that can be placed on the statute books.

RECIPROCAL TRADE EXTENSION

One of the principal reasons for our recovery from the devastating Republican depression of the early 1930's was the establishment of the Democratic reciprocal-trade treaties with various nations throughout the world. These treaties expanded foreign trade and brought unbounded prosperity to the farmer, the businessman, and labor.

Two weeks ago, the Eightieth Congress by almost unanimous vote of its Republican Members attempted to scuttle our great reciprocal-trade system. This action means that if the Republicans continue in control, we will revert back to the disastrous Smoot-Hawley tariff barriers that contributed so much in bringing on the depression of 1929, 30, 31, and 32. It is my hope that the Congress will give the customary 3-year extension to the reciprocal-trade treaties before adjournment.

GOVERNMENT SAVINGS AND TAX CUT

The Republican preelection promise of a $6,000,000,000 cut in the annual budget has not materialized. Their economy performance for this year, when trick bookkeeping is exposed, will be almost a complete blank. Last year the much-publicized "budget savings" was reduced approximately four-fifths by reinstatements and emergency appropriations.

The American people will receive a terrific shock after the coming election when they realize that the so-called Republican tax cut is nothing more than election bait, counterfeit financing. From fantastic and nonexistent savings was to come the money for the election-year tax cut. This tax cut will reduce the Government revenue almost $5,000,000,000. The anticipated Government savings are mostly campaign oratory, but the $5,000,000,000 lost in revenue will positively lead to an unbalanced budget. When the Republicans mention Government expense they diligently omit the annual $8,000,000,000 appropriations for our war veterans and approximately $5,000,000,000 for payment on our war debt.

They have placed election-year tax reduction ahead of debt reduction and ahead of a balanced budget. Very few newspapers or radio commentators informed the people that 43 percent of the nearly $5,000,000,000 tax reduction will be a windfall to less than 5 percent of the high-bracket taxpayers.

"PEANUTS TO THE ELEPHANTS"

In the June 12, 1948, edition of the Washington Post Marquis Childs' article revealed a shocking exposure of the Republican National Committee soliciting campaign contributions from high-bracket taxpayers who have saved millions on the so-called Republican tax cut. I quote from Mr. Childs' article:

"In the current issue of the Republican News, official paper of the Republican National Committee, is a remarkable appeal captioned, 'Don't throw peanuts to the elephant.' This article gives a table of the tax savings under the tax-cut bill put through by the GOP Congress. Among the various tax-saving tabulations was that the taxpayer with a $50,000 income annually saves $7,533 under the new tax bill. The appeal further says: 'Many of our friends feel that, entirely apart from other important considerations, the least they can do to express their appreciation is to contribute a substantial part of their tax savings for this year to insure the reelection of the Congress which made this possible.'"

This request coming from the official paper of the Republican National Committee, asking for substantial campaign contributions from the taxpayers who received such a terrific tax windfall, is a violation of all rules of political ethics and honesty in elections. When the Democratic Congress assumes control next January, a complete investigation must be made on all campaign contributions from the savings made this year by the high-bracket taxpayers.

From present indications, the campaign chest of the Republican National Committee in 1948 will make the Harding campaign fund under Will Hayes and the McKinley campaign fund under Mark Hannah appear as chicken feed.

EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

I have only time to mention but a few of the acts and omissions of our Eightieth Congress. The country by next November should be familiar with this deplorable legislative record. The railroads had no difficulty whatsoever in passing House legislation granting exemption from antitrust actions. The oil companies won their bill in the House to take the tideland oil rights away from the Federal Government and place it under the control of the various States. The utility lobby won its fight against the appropriations for the TVA steam plants and the high tariff crowd has secured everything they asked for. It is hoped before adjournment that the President, through his power of veto, may defeat these bills.

DEMOCRATIC RECORD

The record of President Truman and the Democratic congressional leadership in this present Congress has been a constant fight against the legislative enactments which I have just reviewed. President Truman has on a great number of occasions reported to Congress in person and by special message demands for legislation which would correct the present inflationary high cost of living and other conditions which I have outlined in this message.

CIVIL RIGHTS

For the first time in the history of our country a President of the United States has personally appeared before the Congress and asked for practical civil-rights legislation. He requested the Congress specifically to pass legislation which would promote and encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, color, or religion. President Truman merely asked the Congress to place in practical application the principles of liberty and freedom which are so vividly set out in our Constitution. To this day the Republican leadership has not made any serious effort to bring to the floor of Congress civil-rights provisions as recommended by President Truman in his historical message.

AGRICULTURE

The farmers of Indiana vividly remember their dark, sorrowful struggle of the Republican 1920's and early 1930's. No group in our economy was more neglected or took such a beating than the farmer under Republican administrations. The Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, to which the Eightieth Congress is again reverting, contributed greatly to this condition. Thirty-cent wheat and 10-cent corn, foreclosures, and farm auctions are easily within the memory of every Indiana farmer.

Fifteen years of Democratic administration has elevated Indiana pay checks from $970,000,000 to $4,400,000,000. Today 85 percent of Indiana farms have electricity. When the Democrats set up rural electrification in 1935, only 1 farmer in 10 had electric lights.

The last year of Republican national administration, 68 Indiana banks closed their doors. None has failed in recent years.

The school-lunch program, started in 1935, now serves 144,000 Indiana children in 971 schools.

The State farm income in 1932 was one hundred and forty-six million and today it is more than a billion dollars. In the great Republican "boom" year of 1929 the Indiana farmer earned only $1 in annual income where he is earning over three today.

The Democratic Farm Credit Administration, established 15 years ago, has aided 42,000 Indiana residents in buying farms with loans of ninety-eight million.

Almost three-fourths of the State's farm land is under the agricultural conservation program.

Today the agricultural population of America can thank its present prosperity to the aid and service rendered by Democratic administration during the last 15 years.

VETERANS

Under President Roosevelt, a Democratic Congress inaugurated the greatest veterans' legislative program in the history of any country. President Truman has done everything in his power to continue and perfect further practical legislation for all veterans, disabled or otherwise.

STATE OF INDIANA

The Republican convention last Friday clearly demonstrated that Gov. Ralph Gates is the undisputed boss of the Republican Party. If the Republican nominee is elected, we will have four more years of the Gates administration by proxy.

The public cannot help but be bewildered by the stand the Republican State convention took last week on the liquor-control question. First, in a platform adopted without debate, it silently endorsed Republican administration of the liquor laws.

That meant, of course, that it approved the system set up by the Republicans in 1945. Gates parceled out the beer and liquor wholesalerships to so-called deserving Republicans. Everyone knows that the widely publicized liquor-reform law, pushed so vigorously by Gov. Ralph F. Gates in 1947, was a farce, and it was designed not to take the politicians out of the business but to insure that they could continue to operate without fear of competition.

PROHIBITION

The State convention, by their silences, endorsed the liquor and beer machine set up by Governor Gates, and then nominated Hobart Creighton, a "dry" of long standing, for Governor. If there is any doubt about where he stands, let me refresh your memory by reading what he said before a group of students at Butler University on April 23, 1948:

"I come from a dry county, and I have no hesitation in saying that if I had to vote on local option as a legislator I would vote for it."

We know by experience that local-option legislation is merely the proving ground for the reincarnation of prohibition. In 1932 it took the Democratic Party several years to rid the country of bootleggers, law violators, and

numerous mobs similar to the Capone gang in Chicago. This was the aftermath of prohibition, which Herbert Hoover so aptly called the "noble experiment."

The people of Indiana in 1948 are going to continue to fight against incompetent State and local government, as evidenced by the election last year of more Democratic mayors than at any time in the history of our party.

The Democratic majorities in these cities last November was 69,000 greater than 4 years ago, which conclusively proves that the people of Indiana are on the march for good Democratic State government.

I say to the voters of Indiana, it is now time to do some real common-sense thinking. In the last 3½ years you have been taken on the same political sleigh ride which you received from Republican governors in the 1920's.

It is now time to recover from this junket of governmental mismanagement, reestablish our statehouse to the position of honor it deserves in the eyes of all respectable Hoosiers. We will be crowned with victory in this fight for good government within our State. With the aid of the rest of the Nation, a reactionary Congress will be replaced by one which will work in harmony with a Democratic President who believes in the rights of the common man.

Increased Earnings of North Carolina Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Durham (N. C.) Herald of June 14, 1948:

INCREASING EARNINGS OF NORTH CAROLINA WORKERS

The gap between the earnings of North Carolina workers and those of the Nation as a whole is being rapidly closed. Statistics cited recently by State Commissioner of Labor Forrest Shuford reveal that hourly earnings of North Carolina manufacturing workers have risen 77.6 percent during the last 5 years while the national hourly average rose only 38.7 percent.

Average weekly earnings, according to the Commissioner, have risen 76.4 percent in 5 years while the national average rose only 24 percent.

"If the same State and national rates of increase were to continue, we would outstrip the national average in another 5 years," Mr. Shuford said. "That, of course, is not to be expected, because it is most unlikely that the combination of unusual circumstances which produced North Carolina's high rate of increase during the last 5 years will continue indefinitely. Already a leveling out process is taking place.

But, said the Commissioner, "despite this leveling out, the fact remains that the gap between State and national hourly and weekly earnings has been partly closed during the last 5 years. On the basis of our present high employment and production, it is reasonable to expect some further closing of the gap during the years ahead."

The rise in earnings in North Carolina is encouraging in a number of ways. It means increased purchasing power for the individual with a consequent increase in the economic health of the State. It means increased purchasing power for the State itself through the taxes paid by the individual.

There are those who feel that the lower wages received by southern workers was an advantage to the South in attracting new industry. It has always been this newspaper's belief that this view was shortsighted at best; that the South should strive constantly to raise the income of its people; that the southern worker was as good a worker and deserved as good pay as the worker of any section.

In North Carolina we seem gradually to be working toward the achievement of a more favorable income comparison with the rest of the Nation so far as the hourly and weekly earnings of workers are concerned. There is no need for us to bemoan the passing of cheap labor. North Carolina labor must continue to strive for greater skills, higher production, and better pay.

Mundt-Nixon Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following broadcast by Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill, a former Member of the House from Indiana:

PETTENGILL SAYS: "THAT MUNDT-NIXON BILL IS A PURE FOOD AND DRUG ACT IN THE FIELD OF POLITCAL ACTION"

(Text of broadcast by Samuel B. Pettengill over ABC network, May 23, 1948)

THE DEWEY-STASSEN DEBATE AND THE MUNDT-NIXON BILL

The Lincoln-Douglas debates, 90 years ago, helped to make clear the great issue of that time. They were free speech at its best. There ought to be many more such debates.

Governor Dewey and Mr. Stassen rendered a public service last week. In their limited time, however, it was necessary for them to leave unsaid much that is important. This is especially true because 3 days later the House of Representatives passed the Mundt-Nixon bill by the overwhelming vote of 319 to 58. It now goes to the Senate.

Today, I give you the highlights of that bill. One can be for it, or against it, on its merits. But to simply be against it in ignorance of what it really seeks to do gives aid and comfort to the agents of an international conspiracy against America. No one of you wants to be in that position.

Mr. Dewey and Mr. Stassen dealt with two questions: First, should the Communist Party be outlawed? and second, Does the Mundt-Nixon bill do so?

SHOULD REDS BE OUTLAWED?

To outlaw the Communist Party, it would be necessary to make it illegal for that party to have a place on the ticket in an election; to prevent it from holding political meetings; or to publish its literature, newspapers, and magazines. Now a great many people think that is exactly what Congress or State legislatures should do. I will discuss that point later.

But it is plain that the Mundt-Nixon bill does none of these things. If it becomes law, the Communist Party can still argue its case to the people and campaign to elect its candidates, provided it registers with the Attorney General of the United States. Therefore, it is clear that Mr. Stassen was wrong and Governor Dewey was right on this point.

On the other hand, it is perfectly plain that if the bill passes the Senate and is signed by the President it will make the going tougher for the Communist Party in the way in which it has been operating.

MAKING THE LABEL HONEST

What is the purpose of the bill? Years ago we passed a very useful piece of legislation—the Pure Food and Drug Act. This law requires not only that food be wholesome and drugs be pre but that they be honestly labeled.

The Mundt-Nixon bill is a pure food and drug act in the field of political action.

Every candidate for Congress and the Senate this fall is required to file a sworn public report showing who his financial backers are and for what purposes he spends their contributions.

The Mundt-Nixon bill does just that to the Communist Party and its fifth-column or front organizations.

MUST OPERATE IN THE OPEN

Do you believe any organization in the field of American politics, whether it is the Communist Party, or the Ku Klux Klan, or the Anarchists, or the Mafia, or Japanese Black Dragon Society, has or should have the constitutional right to operate in the dark and not in the light?

The Mundt-Nixon bill attempts to bring the activities of the Communist Party out into the open. It requires the Communist Party and its front organizations to register with the Attorney General of the United States; to give the names and addresses of its officers; to make an accounting of its receipts and disbursements; to label the literature it sends through the United States mails so the public will know what it is and who sent it; and, in the case of a radio speech, to announce that the speech is in behalf of a Communist organization.

What is wrong about that? Should the sacred right of free speech and a free press in the field of political action protect secret activities? The Corrupt Practices Act, passed years ago, answers that question "No." So does the law requiring newspapers to tell who their owners are.

COMMUNISTS NOT LOYAL TO UNITED STATES

The Mundt-Nixon bill says that the Communist Party must either register with the Attorney General or cut its connection with Soviet Russia—one or the other.

As I said last Sunday, the Communist Party is not an American party. Its loyalty is not to this country or its Constitution.

It follows the "party line" laid down by a world conspiracy centering in Moscow and is loyal to Soviet Russia as the base of a worldwide revolutionary movement.

As the present chairman of the Communist Party in the United States of America, William Z. Foster says in his book, Toward a Soviet America: "The Communist Party of the United States * * * is the American section of the Communist International. * * * The Communist International is a disciplined world party."

If you get that point clearly in your mind, you will no longer "see as through a glass, darkly" on this matter. A so-called political party which is in truth and fact a section of an international world party cannot be loyal to this country or its free institutions.

The Mundt-Nixon bill makes it a crime to carry on activities looking toward the establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in the United States under foreign control—under foreign control. It says that American Communists shall not have passports to attend meetings of this world party—or conspiracy—in foreign lands; to be there schooled to sabotage American industry; to blow up our factories; to prevent the movement of our ships and railroads; and to

organize other subversive activities in this country.

WOULD BAR INTERNATIONAL CONSPIRACY

The bill thus attempts to cut the threads of this world-wide network; to quarantine the Communists here from their associates abroad.

To this extent, the bill does attempt to outlaw or prevent some of the more direct activities of the Communist Party.

You are familiar, of course, with the fact that members of the Communist Party have been convicted and served time for going abroad on forged passports so the fact that they visited Moscow would not be known.

Does any American have the constitutional right to belong to and travel abroad in the interests of a foreign political party committed to the overthrow of our Government?

On this point, consider the case of every one of the millions of immigrants who have come to this country and applied for American citizenship. What are they required to do? They are required to swear and swear honestly "that I absolutely and entirely renounce * * * all allegiance to any foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty of whom or of which I have heretofore been a subject; that I will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States of America against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same."

WHY NOT RESPECT THIS OATH?

Now, if we can require that oath and that loyalty from the humblest immigrant who has ever come to this country, why can we not require it of native-born American Communists and take steps to make them live up to it? Must the Constitution protect those who propose to destroy it?

We would conscript every able-bodied man we have to prevent Russian soldiers from crossing our frontiers to take possession of this country. Those soldiers would be the agents of a foreign power.

If we can lawfully and constitutionally stop the military agents of a foreign power from attempting to take over this country, why can't we stop their spies, saboteurs, and political agents?

BANS TAX-FREE SUPPORT

Another thing the Mundt-Nixon bill does is to deny income-tax deduction for contributions to the support of Communist Party front organizations. This will tend to dry up some of their funds.

To permit Communist-front organizations to continue to get tax-free financial support simply means that the United States Treasury and every one of you are forced to help underwrite organizations whose purpose it is to overthrow or undermine our Government based on free elections and the private-property system. We have a right to stop that.

I have described this bill in some detail because a hue and cry has gone up that it invades the legitimate civil rights of Americans. This bill affects no man or group of men unless he or they are dominated by and follow the party line of a foreign power or foreign political organization.

Even the Communist Party can carry on if it registers with the Attorney General and operates in the open. It can carry on without registering if it cuts all connections with the international Communist organization.

DOESN'T ENJOIN FREE SPEECH

Every innocent dupe of a Communist-front organization will have full opportunity to resign without publicity.

Every American, loyal to America, can freely speak, write, or organize for any economic, social, or political reform whatever except the overthrow of our Government by force and violence. This bill does not affect him. He can agitate for public housing, socialized medicine, Government ownership, the closed shop, 16 to 1, or anything else. The purpose of the bill is to make sure that the Communist Party shall never destroy those very rights in America as it has done in Czechoslovakia and elsewhere.

A noted labor lawyer, Louis Waldman, says that all talk about this bill being antilabor is just so much nonsense.

Some people think the bill is not needed. They point to the 27 Federal statutes already on the books dealing with sedition, mutiny, insurrection, treason, sabotage, espionage, etc.

They say that vigorous enforcement of the laws we already have is more important than passing another law. There is merit in that, but there are some loopholes in existing legislation—such as failure to cut the connection between the Communist Party here and its world-wide network.

On the other hand, some are dissatisfied with the bill because it does not completely outlaw the Communist Party. But, as Governor Dewey pointed out, outlawing has not worked well where tried.

HOOVER'S SENSIBLE WARNING

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, of the FBI, is our best authority on that point. It is his view that it would be a mistake to attempt to outlaw the party. He thinks that the more Communist activities we can keep in the open, above ground, the better.

Whatever may be said for, or against, the Mundt-Nixon bill, its passage by the House of Representatives by a vote of 319 to 58, and by a majority of both the Republican and Democratic Members, is proof that Congress and our people have stopped being suckers.

This awakening is 10 or 15 years late. You will remember how persons in high office attempted to degrade and discredit the House Committee on Un-American Activities when it was headed by Congressman Dies, and was then trying to expose the danger we now see so clearly.

Harassed as he was, Mr. Dies made some mistakes of method and procedure, but on the over-all picture he and his committee and the Congress which supported his committee were much nearer right than those in the executive branch. Otherwise, how do you explain President Truman's request for $25,000,000 to screen out Communists and fellow travelers and Trojan horses who got into Government offices under the administration of his predecessor? And what about billions of dollars to stop Communist aggression—in Europe?

President Truman and Congress deserve credit for facing the revolutionary realities of the tough postwar world in which we now find ourselves, largely because of our own blind folly in the past.

When we have a fifth column to deal with, we have got to be both wise and on the alert.

The Price of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, on June 7 a commencement address was delivered at Swarthmore College in Pennsylvania which was exceptionally thoughtful and timely. The address was entitled "The Price of Freedom" and it was made by Dr. Clair Wilcox, who has been a professor of economics at that college for 20 years. During the last 3 years Dr. Wilcox has been on leave from the college, serving as Director of the Office of International Trade in the Department of State. He was chief of the United States delegations to the international trade conferences at Geneva and Habana which negotiated the new world trade charter.

His commencement address is such a masterly and challenging one that I offer it for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the hope that it may be widely read:

The United States of America—these are words that today inspire admiration and anxiety, gratitude and envy, hope and fear in every corner of the globe. For we Americans are incomparably the richest; in quantity, at least, the most generous; and by far the most powerful and the most influential people on earth. We are blessed by nature with abundant resources. We possess a magnificent productive plant, untouched by the ravages of war. We have skilled labor, advancing technology, alert and vigorous management. We produce nearly half of the world's output of manufactured goods. We ship more than a third of the world's exports. Our standard of living is the highest on earth. We have gone far toward the eradication of poverty. We have provided our people with a considerable measure of security—against unemployment, against old age and dependency. We have improved our standards of medical care and lengthened the span of human life. We have carried our youth to higher levels of learning, in numbers without precedent or parallel. We have made great strides in science and in the creative arts. We are alive; we are growing; we are strong. We have the biggest Navy on the seas, the mightiest Air Force, a military potential with which none other can compare. We have in our possession—in our exclusive possession, for a time at least—the greatest power for good or evil that man has ever known: we are the masters of the atom. What we say and what we do is often more important to other peoples than it is to us; more important, indeed, than anything that they could say or do themselves. When we speak, the world listens.

America's material progress is envied and emulated by every other nation in the world. But America is not known for her material achievements alone. Our people have come, at last, to realize the role that they must play in world affairs. They have renounced isolationism, one hopes, for good and all. They have displayed a readiness to assume the responsibility that goes with power. Our record, during and since the war, is one for which we need offer few apologies. We have financed our allies, during the war, through the instrument of lend-lease; we have had the wisdom, once the war was over, to cancel the lend-lease account. We have contributed heavily to relief, resettlement, and rehabilitation. We have made grants and loans for reconstruction, unprecedented in magnitude and in the generosity of their terms. We have taken action to promote the development of backward areas, to stabilize currencies, and to reduce barriers to trade. We have taken the lead in the creation of the United Nations and the establishment of other agencies of international cooperation in the fields of food and agriculture, money and banking, shipping and aviation, trade and employment, health and cultural interchange. We have made a proposal—an honest, imaginative, courageous proposal—for the international control of atomic energy. We have sought consistently, since the war, to build a just and an

enduring peace. Insofar as our efforts have failed, their failure can be ascribed neither to our purpose nor to the occasional ineptitude of our diplomacy.

Thus America—its wealth, its power, its generosity, its responsibility. But these are not the products of chance. Nor are they entirely the results of relative good fortune. They are the achievements of freemen, of voluntary cooperation in a free society. For progress flourishes in the air of freedom. Science, invention, and technology advance where the door is kept open to new talent, where hospitality is accorded to new ideas. Industry thrives where scope is given to initiative and ingenuity. Justice among men is more nearly realized where there is free discussion. Responsibility acquires a deeper meaning where governments derive their powers from the consent of the governed. All that America is, all that it does, is inspired by the tradition and shaped by the exercise of freedom.

So accustomed are we to freedom that many of us have forgotten, and some of us have never learned, that men have not always been free; that men are not everywhere free; that men before us have fought for freedom; that men around us, being denied it, most passionately desire it. To us, freedom comes as a gift. We accept it without question. The most precious of our possessions, we scarcely realize that it exists. Few of us have ever stopped to think what it really means to have freedom, or to lack it.

When we seek to study or to teach in school or college, we are not required first to pass an examination that will test our political orthodoxy. Our teachers are not compelled to expound, our students to accept, as truth in science and philosophy, as beauty in the arts, those doctrines, and only those, that bear the stamp of official approval, rejecting all other views as heresy. The books and magazines and papers we read, the pictures and the plays we see, the broadcasts and the music we hear are not confined to themes prescribed by persons in authority. Our travels, our personal contacts, our expressions of opinion are not subject to political censorship. We may explore any problem, espouse any theory, criticize anything or anybody that we please, without first determining whether someone is watching, listening, and reporting to the police. We have no need to look over the shoulder, to lower the voice, to search for the concealed microphone. We live in no fear of the heavy step on the stair, the knock at the door, the unexplained disappearance in the dark of the night, the long silence of the concentration camp. This is freedom. And, if it were taken away from us, we should fight, as men throughout history and all around the world have fought, to regain it. But, since it is unquestioned, we take it for granted.

That which one misses most in America today is a living faith, inspiring our thought and informing our policy. Our prevailing mood is a complex of complacency, benevolence, anxiety, and bewilderment. We are convinced of our own righteousness. We are animated by great good will toward others. But we face the future with uncertainty. We are disturbed by apparent threats to our peace and our prosperity. We look for quick and easy answers to hard questions. We are too impatient; too easily discouraged when progress is slow. We lack a clear sense of mission. We are too comfortable to burn with a holy fire.

It is in this mood that we meet the moving force of revolutionary communism. And we are rightly troubled. For communism—doctrinaire, authoritarian, intolerant, aggressive, ruthless, destructive—is the antithesis of freedom. And for millions in this world it is a living faith. To the victims of racial and religious discrimination, to the underprivileged and the dispossessed, to the hungry, the miserable, and the discontented, wherever they may be, it promises release. To idealism, it offers participation in a fight against injustice; to youth, excitement and adventure; to immaturity, a completely formulated philosophy that gives to life apparent meaning; a philosophy that need never be examined, but only memorized and repeated as a creed. No matter that its appeal is based on a callous and calculating opportunism. No matter that its doctrine begins with false assumptions and proceeds to conclusions that bear no relevance to reality. No matter that its promise of deliverance can end only in slavery. It is alive; it is expensive; we must face it and, in one way or another, we must deal with it.

Our anxiety and our bewilderment are understandable. We have emerged from World War II with victory, but not with peace. Our world is split in two; our hopes for collective security have given way to an uneasy truce. And now we find, among our people, a fatalistic acceptance of the inevitability of world war III. In an atmosphere verging on hysteria, we are engaged in feverish rearmament. And we even hear men say it would be wise for us to launch the first attack. We are driven into folly by our fright. For surely it is folly to accept the thesis that war is inevitable. There is nothing in the facts of economics or geography, in the possibilities of military action, to support it. We need not accept it; we dare not accept it. We must reject complacency and fatalism about war. We must refuse to think about our international relations exclusively in terms of military strategy. We must disclaim all talk of a preventive war. We Americans have no desire to conquer, to occupy, to govern the world. As aggressors, we should deny our own inheritance; we should forever bear the heavy burden of a guilty conscience; we should forfeit our moral leadership in the family of nations. And to what end? No man can say. For the forces of destruction, once unleashed, are not to be controlled.

America hungers for peace. And there are millions of Americans who believe that the way to achieve it is to sit down, at once, with the Russians and conclude a final settlement of all our differences. The prescription is too simple. We must deal with the world as it is, not as we wish it to be. We shall do mankind no service by closing our eyes to facts. And the facts are unpleasant. The leaders of Soviet Russia are provincial and ignorant, suspicious and distrustful, secretive and isolationist, fearful of all contacts with the outer world, jealous of their national sovereignty. They are victims of their own propaganda. They have long preached and, whatever they may now find it expedient to say, they apparently believe, that our social order and theirs are inherently antagonistic; that the one must eventually destroy the other; that the two cannot live side by side in peace. They have a distorted vocabulary, a warped logic, a disregard for truth that render discourse well-nigh impossible; a sense of mission as to ends and a lack of scruple as to means that impair the value of any commitments they may make. We have met with these people again and again, during and since the war; we have made concession after concession; we have concluded agreement after agreement. But each concession has served but to whet the appetite for another and each agreement has been made but to be broken. In a nation's attitude toward the control of the atom, it meets the acid test of its good faith; the Russians have flatly rejected cooperative development and international inspection as an infringement of national sovereignty. And for month after month, in conference after conference, we have sat in silence under a stream of continuous abuse. This has been our experience and, in the light of this experience, it would be less than wise to permit the prospect of another conference to raise our hopes too high; it would be naive, in the extreme, to suppose that such a conference would change things overnight. The sooner we come to realize that there is no simple solution to the problem of Russia, the better off we shall be.

The American people entered the United Nations, in 1945, with high hopes for the future of world peace. In three short years, they have been brought, by endless debate, by paralysis of action, by the abuse of the veto, to disillusionment and discouragement. And so there are insistent demands for reform; for the abolition of the veto; for the establishment of real world government among those states who are prepared to accept its obligations and adhere to its requirements. But these demands, born of impatience and desperation, hold little promise of peace. They would destroy the United Nations and substitute a military alliance among the members of an anti-Soviet bloc. Such an alliance would strengthen our hand in a continued conflict; it would not produce a peaceful settlement. The question of war and peace is a question of the future relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. There can be no real world government, no prospect of disarmament, no subjugation of the atom, unless the Russians will participate. Better a weak United Nations with Russia in than a strong one with Russia out.

What, then, shall we do? The prospect, as far ahead as we can see it, is for continuing irritation, recurrent crises, and a protracted truce. It is unlikely that we shall know tranquillity, a real sense of security, or an abiding peace for years to come. We must learn to live with this situation, however distressing it may be. We must be strong; we must be firm; we must be patient; we must be wise; we must be just. And none of these things will be simple or easy; none of them will produce quick results.

We must show the Russians that we have the strength and the will to defend ourselves. We must convince them that they have nothing to fear from anything that we may do. We must keep the door open to negotiation and agreement. We must preserve the United Nations and employ its instrumentalities to maintain continuous contact with the Communist world. We must do everything within our power to open the avenues of religious, scientific, cultural, and educational interchange. We must lend our support to democracy and freedom wherever their survival is at stake. We must help our weaker neighbors to help themselves. We must not attempt to force them into our own mold, by attaching humiliating conditions to our aid; we must respect their independence and their dignity. We must promote positive programs of economic development, social welfare, and human rights throughout the world. Above all, we must demonstrate our ability to abolish poverty, assure security, provide opportunity, and maintain freedom within our own borders. This is our best defense against communism.

A heartening statement on the problem of war and peace, full of wisdom and sympathy, was published by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America on May the first. "There was a time," said the Council, "when the western democracies were supreme in prestige because of their dynamic pursuit of liberty, equality, and fraternity. * * * Today, because Soviet communism attacks freedom, we are drawn into defense of the status quo. We ought rather to preach and practice the unique capacity of a free society to effect changes peacefully. We ought to develop and make known constructive programs which will again capture

the imagination and enlist the support of those who are unsatisfied, of those who feel themselves exploited, and of those who want to make their dreams come true." And the same idea is expressed in the words of an elder statesman, once Secretary of State and later Secretary of War. "The problem of Russia," writes Mr. Stimson, "is thus reduced to a question of our own fitness to survive. * * * The essential question is one which we should have to answer if there were not a Communist alive. Can we make freedom and prosperity real in the present world? If we can, communism is no threat. If not, with or without communism, our own civilization would ultimately fail."

There is plenty of work, within our society today, for the architects and builders of a better future. America is not completed. There are still problems to be solved, wrongs to be righted, battles to be fought. There is still a challenge to the mind and spirit of man, to the idealism of youth, to the zeal of the reformer. There is still a promise of struggle, excitement, and high adventure.

Our first problem, and our most difficult one, is the maintenance of industrial stability. We stand now at the peak of a postwar boom, financed, in large part, by exports for reconstruction and expenditures for rearmament. We do not know when this tenuous prosperity will end, how sharp the recession will be, whether deep depression will follow, or, if it does, how long it will endure. We do know that widespread and protracted unemployment in the United States would inflict untold damage, not only on our own people, but on all the peoples who are bound to us by ties of trade. We know that it would impose a severe strain upon our social structure; that it would tax our capacity for peaceful adjustment; that it would impair our position of world leadership. We know that our economy is vulnerable. But we can reject, with some confidence, the Communist prophecy that it will work its own destruction.

We demonstrated, during the great depression of the thirties, that our society is tough, that it is flexible, that it has the power to survive adversity. We are more acutely aware, today, of the difficulties that face us; more adequately equipped to deal with them. We have in our hands new knowledge, new resources, new instruments of control. We shall not see, in the postwar boom, another era of permanent prosperity. We shall not be willing, when the boom has ended, to acquiesce in mass unemployment and prolonged depression. We shall seek to be the masters of our economic fate.

But there is another danger, and a more serious one, against which we must be eternally on guard. It is the danger that we shall place too high a value on stability; that we shall seek to purchase permanence at the expense of progress, to obtain security by bartering away our liberty. For progress means change, and liberty means change, and change is always difficult to take. Wherever there is a vested interest in a particular form of employment or source of income, whether in business, agriculture, or labor, there is antagonism to change and resistance to the adjustments which it would require. Wherever there is a concentration of power, among businessmen, farmers, or workers, there is insistent pressure to prevent change and to obviate the necessity for adjustment. And wherever industry or Government yields to this pressure, freedom gives way to regimentation, competition to monopoly, and progress to stagnation. It is easy to assure security in a static state; it is difficult to provide it in a dynamic state. We can have stability without progress; we can have progress without stability; but if we want them both, the conflict between them must be compromised. We must soften the impact of change, but we must keep the door open to innovation, to enterprise, to new blood and new ideas.

If there is one thing that democracy demands more than any other, it is equality of opportunity. If the potentialities of freedom are fully to be realized, an equal chance must be provided for the development of talent, wherever it may be found. We in America, through our system of public education, have gone further than most peoples in providing such a chance. But we carry on our record one black mark. Whenever one defends our country against her critics, at home or abroad, he has no answer to the charge that we discriminate against minorities. And this discrimination is not only shameful; it is dangerous. We may lead the world in material progress; we may attain the highest standard of living on earth; we may achieve stability and provide security; but as long as we condemn large numbers of our people to a class B citizenship we shall leave in the hands of communism a trump that it will not hesitate to play. If we wish our society to survive, we must make it worthy to survive. We must reassert our belief in the dignity of human personality, in the rights of man. We must cultivate sympathy for others, consideration for their difficulties, respect for their hopes and their desires. Insofar as it lies within our power, we must make equality of opportunity a reality.

Our record of civil liberty, during and since the Second World War, has been surprisingly good, better than it was a quarter of a century ago. But here, too, we must be on the alert. Within the past few months, we have seen administrators and scientists subjected to congressional inquisitions that threaten to impair our national defense by driving men of character and ability from the public service. And now we even hear the suggestion that a legally constituted political party be denied a place on the ballot. When we in America engage in such practices we are paying the Communists the highest compliment within our power—the flattery of imitation. One fears that the greater threat to our freedom comes not from the tiny minority who cast their votes for the hammer and the sickle but from the large numbers of influential people who call themselves patriots. If we really believe in the virtues of a free society, we must practice them. We must allow diversity; we must tolerate heresy; we must encourage freedom of thought and speech. We must have confidence that the truth will prevail, not through indoctrination or resort to force but through public discussion and peaceful persuasion.

Here is an answer to communism; here is a task for America: to lend support to democratic governments wherever freedom is attacked; to promote positive programs of economic betterment and social amelioration throughout the world; to demonstrate the capacity of a free society to maintain high standards of living; to achieve industrial stability; to reconcile security and progress; to afford real opportunity to all its people and, whatever obstacles it may encounter, to preserve its essential liberties. These things we can do. We have the wealth, the power, the generosity, the consciousness of our responsibility. But if our answer is to carry conviction, if our task is really to be fulfilled, we shall need something more. We shall need a reaffirmation of faith in the fundamental values of freedom; a rededication of our energies to its service. For freedom, if it is to live, must be passionately believed and deeply felt. It must burn with a consuming flame. Freedom cannot be taken on authority; it must be discovered anew by each generation. We have it in our inheritance. We must find it in our hearts.

Essay by Sancy Hamilton, of Hughes, Ark.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following essay:

SECOND PLACE WINNER, HIGH SCHOOL DIVISION—1948 ESSAY CONTEST SPONSORED BY THE ARKANSAS FREE ENTERPRISE ASSOCIATION

COMMUNISM, SOCIALISM, FASCISM, AND CAPITALISM: THEIR BASIC DIFFERENCES ECONOMICALLY AND POLITICALLY

(By Sancy Hamilton)

(NOTE.—Sancy, 16, is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. E. C. Hamilton, Hughes, Ark. She was graduated this year from Hughes High School as valedictorian of her class, with one of the highest scholastic averages recorded by the school, and as the youngest member of a graduating class. She plans to enter Sophie Newcomb College, New Orleans, this fall, to major in mathematics and minor in history and English. The prize money will be used to further her education.)

In this modern world of free-thinking and postwar confusion we are beset by a mass of political isms. Any and all of them, when presented to a naive people by their ardent champions, appear to have definite advantages over all others. But to get a true picture of the advantages, as well as disadvantages, of each, one must view them with the unprejudiced eye which we in America are privileged to turn on any ism which may be presented to our open minds. Thus, we review four of the most popular present-day isms. We commence our survey with the discussion of communism.

Strictly speaking, communism is an economic rather than a political system. It connotes the collective ownership and control of all forms of production and distribution of wealth, and it may even mean the complete abolition of private property. In theory, this economic system may exist under many forms of government. But in the Communist Manifesto, issued by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels in 1848, a new conquest of power was proposed for the purpose of achieving communism. This is the dictatorship of the workingman. The Marxian theory assumes that the capitalist system has produced an unrelenting war between the proletariat, or working class, and the bourgeoisie, or property-holding class.

This struggle, according to Marxism, inevitably results in a revolution ending with the victory of the proletariat, the abolition of private property and the profit system, the creation of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the ultimate evolution of a classless society composed only of workers. The doctrine also appeals to the workingmen of all lands to unite in promoting a world revolution to hasten the collapse of the capitalist system.

The history of communism in Russia, as far as outward appearances are concerned, began with the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917. Although Karl Marx had said that communism could take hold and thrive only in an industrial economy, the opposite has been proven. He contended that inequality would be most apparent in the industrial economy, and that the proletariat could become united only where inequality was most extreme. He considered that this chasm of extreme inequality could develop only in industry, and never in an agricultural economy.

Lenin, the father of Russian communism (not Marxian communism) did more to change the course of history than any other individual in the last 100 years. This genius in the art of revolution brought the proletariat together in sufficient numbers to overthrow a system based on the monopolistic holding of land which had existed in Russia for over 300 years.

Wreden, in his book, The Unmaking of a Russian, unfolds for the reader the ponderous and dastardly work which has been done under the banner of communism in Russia.

Skaratina, author of A World Can End, gives a glowing contrast between the old order under the Czars and the recent order, or disorder if you please, imposed upon the masses by Lenin and Stalin.

Wendell Willkie, in his itinerary, One World, brings out the argument that the reason, or excuse as the case may be, why many of the Russians have faith in Russia's communism is due to the contrasting accomplishments which they have made over their previous condition of servitude under the rule of the Czars. Comparison has been the only teacher in the limited experiences of the proletariat in Russia.

For the conclusive reason that communism can thrive only among people of illiteracy and limited experience, Stalin has been forced, since the cessation of recent hostilities, to impose a strict belligerency toward all the world outside the Russian's sphere of influence. This has assured the failure of the UN and the millennium which was hoped would appear in our generation.

Fascism is derived from a Latin word meaning a bundle of sticks, carried before the ancient Roman lictors to denote authority, discipline, and law. Strictly speaking it is the political and social regime which dominated Italy after the "March on Rome" by Benito Mussolini in October 1922. Closely identified with fascism under Mussolini are the following systems: The corporative state, the totalitarian state, dictatorship, and autocracy.

The Fascist state is an embodied will to power and government. Everything is for the state and nothing human or spiritual can exist or have any value without the state. In fascism the state is an absolute, before which individuals and groups are relative. The state, the legal organization of society, is an organism distinct from the citizens.

The essence of fascism is the elimination of democratic institutions and principles in favor of government by a disciplined minority, generally with a single individual, as absolute dictator. In the case of Italy the dictator was Benito Mussolini. The principles of fascism are as old as human society and have been tried under various and sundry forms of government. It has flourished best in those countries which only recently attempted to function without regard for local conditions, the main objective being world domination.

Fascism came into being in Italy by the creation of a wartime mentality and flourished only so long as that attitude was permitted to prevail. In the case of Italy, it developed in the people an exaggerated patriotism in its disciples and fanned their emotions against neighboring people who presumed to thwart the national destinies of Italy. In the case of Italy, Mussolini's government was characterized by distinctive uniforms, much parading, and frequent holidays. Fascism, in all other instances, has emphasized militarism as a characteristic of a strong state.

The Rome-Berlin Axis agreement, which later included Japan also, was the climactic result of the will to power manifested in the movements of fascism in Italy, Germany, and, to a lesser degree, in Japan. The formation of this triparty agreement led to the great conflagration termed World War II. The vaunted system of fascism ruthlessly challenged on the battlefields of Europe the democratic way of life. History has recorded the result in favor of our most wholesome democratic way.

Socialism is a political world movement which seeks to adjust the relation of an individual to the community by means of collective ownership and management of the means of production and distribution.

Collective ownership includes ownership and management of railroads, telegraph and telephone, express services, steamboat lines, and all social means of transportation and communication. It includes the reducing of the cost of living by the government of these industrial agents. It asks for government ownership of mines, quarries, oil wells, and water power. Collective ownership, democratic management of banking and the currency system are demanded.

The tendency of socialism has been more and more to lay emphasis on the common man, until the wage earner has become the central figure in socialistic theory. In its modern sense, socialism means the theories and plans of those who would substitute public property in land and capital for private property in these instruments of production. It is industry of the people, by the people, for the people. Industry is carried on by the united efforts of thousands of men, and is no longer an individual function, but a social and collective one. Socialism teaches that moral interests should be supreme over the whole field of industrial and commercial activity. Modern socialism is thoroughly democratic and opposes state socialism of the ruling classes.

Under socialism, in theory, every man works for the state. In return for this he is supposed to get security against the evils of life. The state is his perpetual master, and he is presumably its loyal and happy servant.

Some of the political demands of socialism are: Freedom of press, speech, and assemblage, unrestricted and equal suffrage of men and women, election of President and Vice President by direct vote, calling for a convention for the revision of the Constitution of the United States.

As far as can be determined, the first organization of Socialists was the Association of All Classes and All Nations, founded in England in 1833. The leading nineteenth-century exponents of socialism were Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, compilers of the Communist Manifesto. Karl Marx, the author of some communistic doctrines, is regarded as the founder of socialism. His reason for organizing the Socialist Party was chiefly to help the workingman. Marx devoted most of his life to the work of spreading his Socialist views by means of his pen and through his genius for organization. Das Kapital, the monumental work of Marx, is the basis of modern socialism and the Manifesto is a summary of Socialist philosophy.

In 1845 Marx and Engels founded the German Workingmen's Association. This was more definitely a Socialist Party than the earlier English organization, and from Germany and Belgium the movement spread rapidly over the world, and Socialist Parties soon appeared in all civilized countries. In Great Britain the party of socialism was called the Labour Party.

The Russian Social Democratic Party, founded in 1898, grew rapidly in large cities. The aims of the Socialists were to make Russia a democratic republic, and make factories, mines, railways, banks, and land the collective property of the people. Some Socialists wanted the change to come gradually while some wanted the change to come rapidly by a revolution.

In 1895 this group was very strong and they often talked about this revolution, which would destroy militarism, set up a democratic republic, abolish private property, and put the working class in control of factories and farms. This party, the Socialist Democratic Party, formed the largest political power until 1914.

In 1917 the Bolsheviks obtained power in Russia and abolished private ownership of land and factories. The Bolsheviks did not believe in the Karl Marx doctrine and set up their modern party of communism.

The Socialist Party in America was founded in 1897 under the leadership of Eugene V. Debs, the father of socialism in America.

Marxism has failed because the nations cannot realize that the world is opening to new avenues for men's ingenuity and enterprises are constantly opening up where the areas of individual liberty are expanding. Liberty, like peace, is indivisible.

Even though communism, socialism, and capitalism seem to be closely related, there is a great difference between the three kinds of political movements. Communism is the doctrine of prescribing community ownership of property or the means of production. Socialism is ownership, operation, and control of the means of economic production by the public, rather than individuals in a community. Capitalism is an economic system in which goods are produced and distributed with the incentive of private profit or the possession of capital.

Mr. Hagel once said that the three words used in history—synthesis, thesis, and antithesis—were synonymous with the three kinds of government—communism, socialism, and capitalism. He said that they were like the pendulum of a clock swaying back and forth. Communism is the point at the extreme left and it goes to one extreme kind of government, in which all property is owned by the government. Capitalism is the point at the extreme right and it represents the system of government in which all property is owned by individuals alone. Socialism is the medium, and it is a part of both capitalism and communism. Socialism shows the ownership of property and capital by both individuals and government, as is coming to be true in Great Britain under the present Labor government of Clement Attlee. In discussing capitalism we encompass all activities which fully comply with the profit motive, or the theory of the greatest dividends.

The profit motive is as old as mankind. The urge to accumulate is seemingly the "fourth" inborn emotion of man. Capitalistic economy has been practiced by each succeeding civilization. In the days of Cain and Abel the profit motive was reflected in the action of Cain by his killing of Abel. The profit in this instance was favor with God as a reward for labor.

The Phoenicians, seamen of the ancient world, had as their chief interests trade and money making. They could fight if they had to, but they preferred to pay tribute to the rulers of other countries in return for being allowed to carry on trade by land or sea. They traded in the lands around the Black Sea until the Greeks took control of that region. They bartered with the natives on the northern coast of Africa, getting gold, ivory, and hides. They went to Spain for silver, tin, lead, and iron. They may have even brought tin from Cornwall in Britain. Perhaps when we think of how devoted they were to money making, the name "Peddlers of Civilization" quite accurately describes them.

The Carthagenians, foremost rivals of Rome, were successful traders and had prosperous markets and banks. Carthage had allies and kinsmen strung out all along the north African coast, and even in Spain, and controlled Sardinia, Corsica, and much of Sicily, but the citizens of Carthage did not fight for her. Her troops were hired soldiers, who served for pay, not for patriotism. They followed the Phoenicians in this prac-

tice. This left the entire male population of Carthage free to carry on economic enterprises.

After the period of the do-nothing kings, and after Charlemagne's Empire broke up, law and order in western Europe were in a bad way, so the arrangement which we call feudalism grew up to give some little measure of protection to life and private property. Since land was the only form of wealth that existed in abundance, the plan for government had to rest on it. Feudalism was, therefore, a relationship between a stronger and weaker people which depended upon the holding or use of land. It was really the relation between the debtor and the creditor, a phenomenon which is characteristic of capitalism in our day.

After the crusades we have the example of trade being revived to supplement farming in western Europe, and trade means cities, and therefore we witness the rise of the medieval town and later the city-states of Venice, Florence, Genoa, London, and Marseilles. From the towns sprang the Hanseatic League, which led to the chartering, by the kings, of trading companies, such as the London Company, the Moscow Company, and the East Indian Company.

Our capitalistic heritage can certainly be traced through the above events of Asia and Europe.

Capitalism is a competitive economic system designed for the enrichment of many, and not simply to make a few men rich. Under progressive capitalism, the individual is a free agent, with the right to make his own decisions. But he does not have the right to run roughshod over the rights of others. Man is more important than the machine—the primacy and dignity of man come first. That's the American concept of the primacy of the state.

This is the difference between Russia's economy and the American economy. In a democratic capitalism, if the individual gets in dutch with his boss, he can go around the corner and find a new boss. In a totalitarian state, the individual is told where he is to work. There is only one boss, the state itself. If he gets in dutch with his boss, he gets sent to the salt mines.

We ought to be proud of the capitalistic system. Other systems promise their people the good things of life. We've got them. Other systems say to their people: "Give us another 5 years or another 15 years, and then we will have an abundance of goods." We've got abundance. Other systems strive to perpetuate themselves on promises. We pitch our standard on performance.

Therefore, I prefer capitalism, wherein the individual is confronted with opportunity and privileged with decision.

Louis Ludlow Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, LOUIS LUDLOW, one of the most beloved Members of this House, announced sometime ago that he would not seek reelection in 1948. With the Eightieth Congress adjourning next Saturday, this will be his last week as a Member of the National House of Representatives, in which he has served constantly since 1929.

LOUIS LUDLOW is dean of the House in point of service, if you take into consideration the years he spent in the House Press Gallery as a reporter and news writer. Since 1901 he has been in continual contact with the Congress through the newspaper field or as a Member of this body. Through these 48 years he has no doubt been personally acquainted with more Members of both Houses than any man living today.

Last night his brothers of the newspaper fraternity extended to him a farewell dinner which I was unable to attend because I was present at the Democratic State Convention at Indianapolis which is Congressman LUDLOW'S home city. His friendship is held dear to the hearts of everybody who knows him throughout Indiana. Yesterday, at the Democratic State Convention, dozens of his old friends asked me to convey their felicitations and wishes for future health and happiness. Without exception, they expressed their keen regret and disappointment that "LOUIE" had seen fit to retire from his outstanding services in Congress. No Member of this body has worked harder and given more unstintingly of his time and hours to his district than LOUIS LUDLOW. A couple of years ago, a national magazine took a poll of the Members of Congress and among the questions asked was "Who, to your mind, is the hardest-working Congressman?" LOUIS LUDLOW won this distinction from his colleagues with votes to spare.

I voice the sentiment of every Member of the Congress when I express regret that he has seen fit to retire, but nevertheless, we all wish him many years of happiness and good health which he has so justly earned.

Platform of Affiliated Young Democrats of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the platform adopted by the Eighth Biennial State Convention of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York State on June 13, 1948:

With but little more than 3 years since the victorious Allied armies brought an end to hostilities in Europe and Japan, the hope and expectation which the American people then had that an era of world peace was impending has dissipated. Today a sense of overhanging crisis pervades the lives of all of us, and the grim prospect of impending new conflicts looms darkly on the horizon. The extension of the iron curtain over Czechoslovakia, liberated in 1945 only to be enslaved again in 1948, and the totalitarian lust for Scandinavia which has since manifested itself, leave little doubt that the task of the American people in the next 4 years is grave and heavy. At an election held at such a time the future of America and the world is in the balance, and the American people have a right to expect that the parties and candidates who seek election will present an honest program designed to safeguard the national interest. This we propose to do.

For almost 16 years the people have entrusted their government to the Democratic Party. That party has given our Nation an administration which has served the people well. When it was brought into office the Nation was in the paralysis of despair, disorder, and political bankruptcy. Under the leadership of President Roosevelt and a Democratic Congress, courageous measures were unhesitatingly taken which brought order, recovery, and a measure of social progress unknown in world history. The greatness of the steps that were taken can best be measured by the fact that those who so bitterly opposed them do not today seek their repeal, but say only that they can administer them better.

The Democratic administration, sensitive to the evil forces loosed abroad which were determined to make a second bid for world domination within a single generation, forcefully and genuinely sought to contain those forces and avoid a world conflict. The enormous sacrifices of the American people, mobilized under the leadership of our wartime President, and their willingness to subordinate private interest and petty factionalism to the public welfare were the decisive factors which led to the defeat of Germany and Japan. It is such a spirit, in the Government and the people, which alone can save the world from its present difficulties.

Since the conclusion of hostilities, President Harry S. Truman and the Democratic administration have worked hard for peace. Faced with a hostile Congress, President Truman has called in the leaders of both parties in the Congress to formulate a national bipartisan policy in foreign affairs to assure the accomplishment of such a goal. Despite the shock which came from finding one of the great powers which itself had been the victim of aggression turning to aggression and interference in the domestic affairs of its neighbors as a matter of national policy, our leaders have made strenuous efforts to bring about lasting peace. Because suspicion and self-interest are still strong in the world, they have not succeeded in so doing.

At such a time and under such circumstances there is only one course open to the American people—a course which requires definite action along two separate lines.

1. The European recovery plan: It is our firm conviction that peace is not possible until economic and political stability has again been restored to Europe and the Far East. We believe that such economic and political stability cannot be attained without the full cooperation of the United States and of the European and oriental countries that were overrun. We believe that the European recovery plan conceived by Secretary Marshall, extended to China, Indonesia, and other countries in the Far East affords the best pattern for attaining such a result. We advocate the continuance of this program to an extent that will insure world recovery. Such a program should continue to be open to all countries which desire to participate in it, and all nations which desire to participate in it should be welcomed. It is our strong conviction that if all nations will join this great cooperative effort, a peaceful and prosperous world for all peoples will result.

2. National defense: Literally, a danger signal has flashed on the horizon and our national security requires that we not be indifferent to it. If the war which we all dread should materialize, it will be a total war in a sense of totality hitherto unknown. If another war should materialize in this atomic age, it will be a terrible thing in which the home front will be in the first line of attack, and in which New York may well be the new Hiroshima. In such a war there is no time to prepare on Pearl Harbor Day.

In such circumstances, at the same time that we work for peace, we must make sure

that our Nation is strong and ready to meet the event that we devoutly hope will never occur. In our yearning for peace we thought that it could be attained by demobilization. We sent our armies home, placed the ships of our fleet in mothballs, and left on the scrap heap such of our combat aircraft as we did not sell to those who now menace us. The public safety and the defense of the Republic require that we rebuild our Navy, our Army, and our Air Force to the point where they are able and ready to defend the Nation against any and all aggressors.

3. Selective service: We endorse the recommendations for the reenactment by Congress of the Selective Service Act, and the passage of universal military training. These are weapons which the country needs if it is to survive. At the same time we urge that such legislation contain safeguards against the indiscriminate deferment of able-bodied young men and women. The abuses which occurred in such deferments during the last war (and the subsequent political preferment of many of those deferred) must be prevented from occurring again. Permitting such able-bodied young men to escape their obligations to their country and, under the guise of essential civilian employment, to enjoy high incomes and special privileges not afforded to their contemporaries in uniform is in itself a form of war profiteering abhorrent to servicemen and to the public at large.

4. War-profit controls: The enlarged national defense program and the European recovery plan require enormous sacrifices from the American people. These sacrifices must be evenly spread, and there must be no privileged few who profit from the sacrifices of their fellows. To this end, we advocate the immediate passage by Congress of a strict wartime-profits law, which will embrace all areas of war procurement, stock piling, and foreign aid, and which will make certain that no profiteers prey on our Nation's war needs. All must serve on an equal basis even under the proposed peacetime defense program.

5. Strengthening of the antitrust laws: Strengthening and modernization of the antitrust laws are long overdue, and we urge the immediate enactment of such legislation.

6. Reciprocal tariff program: We urge the extension of the reciprocal tariff and trade-agreements program, whose development by Secretary of State Cordell Hull was a major accomplishment of the Democratic administration. Such extension will be an important aid to the success of the world recovery program.

7. Inflation: As a result of the enormous sums of money let loose during the recent war, and of the premature removal of price controls, our people today are suffering a severe inflation which is unduly taxing their incomes and reducing their standard of living. We recommend the immediate enactment of price controls on rent, food, clothing, and other essential commodities. We advocate the continuance of such controls, and the imposition of ceilings on other basic commodities, throughout the present emergency.

8. Protection against communism and un-American activities at home: The danger to our democratic way of life does not come only from abroad. There are some misguided citizens and aliens who call themselves Americans who have lent themselves and their energies to the foreign doctrine and the foreign aggressors who seek to stamp out democracy in this country. We cannot afford to have an American Gottwald or an American Quisling, and we must take all steps that our Constitution permits to see that we do not have one. At the same time, we must apply traditional American methods in ferreting out and removing such hostile persons, and not those employed by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. It is clear to us that the members, both open and concealed, of the American Communist Party are in fact the willing agents of a foreign government committed to interference in our domestic affairs. We must deal with them as such.

9. Civil rights and antidiscrimination legislation: A shameful blot on our democratic record has been the continuance of racial discrimination and inequalities at home at the same time that we have been fighting such discrimination and inequalities abroad.

It is particularly a national disgrace that such discrimination and inequality should persist in our armed forces. While we recognize that National Guard units in homogeneous communities present an exceptional problem, we otherwise recommend the end of segregation and all other forms of discrimination and inequality in our armed forces, both active and Reserve, and in the National Guard.

The existence of such discrimination and inequalities within our borders is the greatest weapon which our enemies abroad have to use against us. We advocate the enactment of a full civil-liberties program by the Congress.

10. Territories and possessions: We advocate a full extension of the democratic way of life to our Territories and insular possessions. We advocate the immediate admission of Hawaii and Alaska to statehood. We urge the granting by Congress of American citizenship, bills of economic and political rights, and organic acts to the peoples of Guam and American Samoa, and elimination of discrimination in the Canal Zone, which recently jeopardized our national safety. We urge the prompt enactment of measures insuring American democracy to the trust territory of the Pacific, and the extension of full economic assistance to all dependent areas, including Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, so that they may have the ability and the right to enjoy the political blessings of the American Constitution.

11. Court-martial reform: The court-martial systems of the Army and the Navy do not provide the same democratic justice which our people have come to accept as an essential part of their lives. At a time when we are asking our young men and women to serve their country again under selective service and universal military training, it is unfair to perpetuate a system of military and naval justice which does not live up to its name. We advocate the immediate enactment by Congress of legislation establishing independent Judge Advocate Generals' Departments in the Army, Navy, and Air Force free from the control of command which will assure fair trials and simple justice to all men and women in the armed forces.

12. The United Nations: We affirm our full support of the United Nations, and advocate a policy of strengthening it so that it may enforce its judgments, and exercise its force for world peace. We are convinced that it can never achieve these ends so long as a single nation can exercise a veto by a single vote upon its actions. To this end we urge revision of the United Nations Charter so that the veto will be eliminated. We also believe that the United Nations cannot become completely effective until all nations in the world are members of it and subject to its control in matters affecting world peace. We advocate further revision of its Charter to that end.

13. Displaced persons: We deplore the fact that, 3 years after the end of hostilities in Europe, hundreds of thousands of displaced persons are still in concentration camps awaiting the determination of their destiny. We advocate passage of the Stratton bill and revision of our immigration laws so as to permit a substantial number of such persons to come to the United States.

14. Palestine: We further deplore the broken promises, the broken hearts, and the tragedy of unnecessary civil war which have marked the history of Palestine since the making of the Balfour Declaration. In the whole sordid story the prompt and courageous recognition of the new State of Israel by President Truman stands out like a beacon of hope. But that historic act can be nothing more than an empty hope unless it is implemented by decisive action on the part of the Congress of the United States and of the United Nations. We urge that the Congress speedily lift the embargo on the shipment of arms to Palestine so that its pioneering settlers may defend themselves against cruel raids and attacks on the part of the Middle East aggressors. We further urge that the Congress withhold assistance from other countries, including Great Britain, which are lending financial and military support to the invaders from Iraq, Transjordan, Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, and Saudi Arabia.

It is our conviction that peace and stability can come to Palestine only with a United Nations force sent there for such a purpose. We urge that such a force be speedily dispatched there by the United Nations to enforce the partition of Palestine voted by the United Nations. Only in such a way can the obligation to provide a homeland for the displaced Jews of Europe, and the attainment of self-rule, peace, and the four freedoms be assured to the peoples of all faiths and races living in the Holy Land.

We further support, as we have in the past, an immediate opening of immigration into Palestine which will permit the settlement there of those displaced persons of Europe who live only to go there.

15. Extension of social security: We continue to support extension of the social security program to provide full protection against old age, illness, and economic misfortune for everyone with benefits adequate to provide a minimum of health and decency, regardless of prior earnings. Also social-security benefits for self-employed individuals. The program should assure complete medical care for all and should allow no child to lack good food, adequate clothing, a decent home, and the opportunity for education. To this end we advocate immediate passage of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, and extension of the Social Security Act to all segments of the population not now covered by it.

16. Minimum-wage law: We advocate the raising of the minimum wage so as to make the minimum wage a living wage.

17. Housing: We urge the Congress to enact a vigorous and adequate Federal housing program which will assure adequate housing at reasonable costs to our citizens, and to make the necessary appropriations therefor. We also urge legislation to protect the veterans against any evil in buying or the construction of homes.

18. Labor: We deplore the repressive measures which a reactionary Republican Congress has taken to emasculate the progressive labor legislation of the last 16 years. We urge the repeal of the oppressive provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, and we recommend the making of sufficient appropriations to permit the Department of Labor and the National Labor Relations Board to do an effective job in protecting the rights of labor.

19. Veterans: We urge the Congress to extend the policy of protecting the interests of veterans, and of adequately providing for wounded, paralyzed, and other disabled veterans. We call for a greater recognition of service men and women in filling the important public posts of the Nation.

20. Equal rights for women: We urge the adoption of the equal-rights amendment to the Constitution. In conformity with the spirit of that amendment, we advocate, as we have for many years, a greater recognition of American women in public office and in government. We consider the women of our community a constructive force for good government, and we urge our responsible leaders to afford more and greater opportunities for that force to demonstrate its capacity.

Who Is Vet's Friend?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel of June 12, 1948:

WHO IS VET'S FRIEND?

How much of a friend is the Truman administration to the veteran?

The question can be answered, without guessing, and it leaves thoughtful people wondering whether the New Dealers have any basis at all for claiming veteran support in the November election.

Undoubtedly some veterans' benefit bills ought to be killed but Roosevelt, with 30 vetoes, and Truman with 3 up to 1948, have obstructed many constructive legislative efforts designed for the ex-GI.

The real black mark against the Democratic administration was that it gave away victory as fast as the GI's blood sacrifice won it.

The Russian Frankenstein now threatens all human freedom but who nourished it? At Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam our Government capitulated to Stalin.

In 1943 the Red Army and Russian people were fighting for their lives. Along the Leningrad-Moscow-Stalingrad line they were absorbing the impact of the greatest land army ever known.

We delivered to them vast stores of critical weapons. Over the protests of Churchill, Roosevelt submitted to the Stalin plea that the Allies invade on the western front. And the cost? Twenty-five hundred American boys daily from D-day to Normandy. But you see this relieved the pressure on Stalin's Red Army in the east.

Not only that—it permitted the Red Army to occupy central Europe and move into Berlin. Roosevelt's concessions short-changed our battle veterans. Our Ninth Army crossed the Elbe in the spring of 1945 and forward patrols even entered Potsdam on Berlin's outskirts. But the forces had to "retreat," not from Nazi fire but because of diplomatic pressure from Moscow.

It is now revealed that at Yalta F. D. R. agreed to leave eastern Germany to Russia and keep American boys out of Berlin so that the Red Army could have the conquering hero's honor.

It is understandingly difficult for veterans who took part in that campaign to take a charitable view of the double-cross.

How much different it could have been. Lend-lease and our decisive military assistance provided the leverage by which Roosevelt, during the war, could have forced Russia to a just peace. All any right-thinking veteran asked was that at least the United States get an even trade.

Yet Americans who then impugned the motives of the Russians were branded as traitors.

"Cooperation with our noble ally" was hemispheric in character. The Democratic regime sealed the fate of eastern Germany and central Europe. Russia annexed 40 percent of Poland, was handed control on the Adriatic, improved her position on the Pacific, and talked F. D. R., with the help of Morgenthau, into economic destruction of Germany. Cooperation with Russia gave it Manchuria and northern Korea for 5 days' help in the war against Japan. (Actually, Russia entered the war after Japan made its first peace overture.) In addition, Port Arthur was made available to Russia for 30 years. The Reds were given the Kurile Islands and south Sakhalin. China was obliged to share her Dairen base with Russia.

The Roosevelt-Truman forfeit of a World War II victory in the sense of building a sound peace is not the only grievance the veteran has with the present regime.

He returned home from the hell of war to a domestic hell. Housing was at its lowest ebb in history; taxes were sky high and were reduced only by determined GOP action; inflation cut the value of the dollar by half.

Since gaining control of Congress, Republican leadership has proved itself a better friend of the veteran than the rival party. Let's chuck generalities for the moment and cite the record.

It has authorized cash payment of terminal-leave bonds; boosted allowances for disabled vets on vocational training; passed a law to unify the armed services (now the Nation needs an administration that knows how to do it); enabled amputees to buy automobiles; granted benefits to vets holding Government insurance; extended vets' preference benefits in civil service to widowed mothers; made non-interest-bearing loans available to disabled vets on vocational rehabilitation; raised ceilings on wages and allowances payable to vets undergoing job training; and effected a host of other benefits.

Title 14 of District Home Rule Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I read in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page A3338, a criticism of title 14 of H. R. 6227 made by the gentleman from Kansas, Hon. EDWARD H. REES, chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of this House. I was amazed that my distinguished colleague, who is usually so expert on civil-service matters, would sponsor a statement containing so many errors of fact and interpretation of law. Had Mr. REES made this statement on the floor of the House during debate on H. R. 6227, the inaccuracies therein would have been pointed out to the satisfaction of the House. Lacking such an opportunity to set the record straight, it is necessary for me to make the following analysis of Mr. REES' statement so that there will be no further misunderstanding of this part of the District home rule charter bill.

First. Mr. REES stated:

Section 1402 of the bill provides that all incumbents of positions in the government of the District of Columbia shall, on the effective date of the act, be given civil-service status upon passing a noncompetitive examination and upon being certified by the head of his department.

The fact is that section 1402 confers such status upon those District employees who (a) do not have that status already or (b) come within the purview of section 1401 (a). Section 1401 (a) determines the positions to be covered by the civil-service law of 1883, as amended, and lists exemptions to such coverage in section 1401 (b) and (c). These exemptions list certain policy positions, judges, unskilled laborers, teachers, and school employees covered by the Teachers Salary Act of 1947, and the policemen and firemen of the District covered by their special civil-service law. Therefore, as I will demonstrate in my next point, section 1402 of H. R. 6227, rather than bringing "all incumbents of positions in the government of the District of Columbia" under civil service, in fact, brings approximately 45 percent of such employees, the rest being either exempt or already having such status. Mr. REES in the statement above quoted made another error by referring to the effective date of the act. H. R. 6227 has five effective dates, as set forth in title 23, and the effective date for title 14 would be July 1, 1949.

Second. Mr. REES further stated:

There will be approximately 10,000 District employees plus 5,000 school teachers who will be given civil-service status under this provision.

The fact is, as I stated above, the school teachers are exempted from the application of the civil-service law of 1883, as amended—section 1401 (b) (1). As for the number of employees brought under this act by section 1402 and its reference to section 1401, the following are the accurate figures:

Total authorized salaried District employees	14,559
Those exempted by section 1401 (a):	
Under teachers salary act	3,602
Those covered by a special law to whom the civil-service law applies at present in a modified form:	
Policemen and firemen	2,790
Those to whom the civil-service law of 1883 as amended now applies with full force and effect:	
Board of Public Welfare	752
Department of Corrections	537
Board of Unemployment Compensation	200
Juvenile Court	70
	7,951
Total District employees brought under civil service by sections 1401 and 1402	6,608

Third. Mr. REES also stated:

Further, the result will be that an additional 15,000 employees will be added to the Federal pay roll.

Disregarding the inaccurate figure used by Mr. REES, answered in my second point above, the fact is that none of the employees concerned in H. R. 6227 would be on a Federal pay roll; they would be on a District pay roll. The fact that Congress appropriates funds for the District does not mean that such appropriations are made out of Federal funds. On the contrary, they are made out of District funds and the employees of the District are District employees; not Federal.

Fourth. Mr. REES continued to state as follows:

While this provision would give one the impression that the employees in the District government were to be on the same level as civil-service employees in the Federal Government, you will observe that in section 1403 persons may be appointed to positions in the District government from

"registers of persons who have by virtue of special examinations qualified for positions in the government of the District."

The fact is that section 1403 provides an alternative method of certification of eligibles from civil-service registers for District positions. They may be certified from general registers or from registers developed from special examinations. Which method would be used would be discretionary with the Civil Service Commission. When general registers are used, preference would be given in the certification to residents of the metropolitan area. Eligibility to compete in special examinations would be limited to residents of the metropolitan area of Washington. The first method does not bar residents of other areas of the country; it simply gives preference to local residents. We have ample precedent for both of these methods. The following departments of District government now come under the full operation of the civil service law of 1883, as amended; Board of Public Welfare—Public Law 363, Seventy-seventh Congress; Department of Corrections—was part of Board of Public Welfare when Public Law 363 was passed; Board of Unemployment Compensation—Public Law 65, Seventy-eighth Congress; Juvenile Court—Public Law 571, Seventy-fifth Congress. In addition, policemen and firemen come under a special provision of the civil-service law applicable only to the District.

Employees of the Board of Public Welfare are certified from general civil-service registers, but the Commissioners in appointing such employees may give preference to residents of the District of Columbia—title 3, section 105, District of Columbia Code, 1940 edition. Furthermore, employees so appointed can be and have been transferred to positions in the Federal Civil Service and, equally important, Federal employees have been transferred to such District positions without loss of status. Policemen and firemen in the Disrict are recruited by special examinations given by the Civil Service Commission—title 4, section 103, District of Columbia Code, 1940 edition. Although no residence requirements are imposed for these examinations, appointments are not subject to apportionment and, following appointment, employees must live within the metropolitan area of Washington in a prescribed radius.

Fifth. Mr. REES is critical of the suggested role of the joint committee in section 1404. He states:

It provides that the Civil Service Commission shall not have complete authority over the practices of the District government with respect to the selection, classification, or retirement of officers and employees of such government.

The fact is that section 1404 in no way detracts from the authority of the Civil Service Commission with respect to District employees. The normal operation of the Civil Service Commission is in conjunction with executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government where the President is the supreme executive authority to enforce the decisions of the Commission. Under H. R. 6227 the President would have only such authority with respect to the District as existing law would provide. We believed that such authority over District personnel administration would be limited and additional safeguards were necessary. Therefore, we propose that the joint committee make a finding of fact only, upon notification by the Civil Service Commission, as to whether or not the District is complying with the law or the rules and regulations. Following that, certain things happen and the District either complies or is denied Federal civil service privilege. Thus, the procedure is to enforce the authority of the Civil Service Commission.

Sixth. Mr. REES concluded with:

Mr. Speaker, this bill also violates the provision of the law * * * that provides for apportionment of employment in the District of Columbia from the various States in accordance with their population.

The fact is the apportionment law applies only to appointment to positions in the Federal Government. There is no such law which applies to positions in District government. Since H. R. 6227 does not amend the apportionment law or otherwise refer to appointment to Federal positions, it is not a violation of the apportionment law. What Mr. REES obviously questions is the provision that District employees under full Federal civil service could transfer to Federal positions and vice versa. He seems to think that people would use District jobs as an entry to the Federal service and thus escape apportionment. That does not seem to be the experience at the present time in those departments of District government where such transfers are now possible for two substantial reasons: (1) The level of Federal position concerned is usually one which would be otherwise filled by promotion and apportionment does not apply to promotion appointments. (2) The transfer of persons from Federal to District positions seems to about equal the reverse transfer.

Seventh. As a final wind up, Mr. REES made a statement which is so preposterous that I doubt if it was meant seriously:

Unless this bill is properly amended, citizens and residents of States outside the District of Columbia will have little chance at the jobs in the departments in the Nation's capital.

The fact is that there are about 200,000 Federal jobs in Washington. Mr. REES is suggesting that the 15,000 District positions will be used as the sole source of recruitment for the 200,000 positions, because people will first get District jobs then transfer to the Federal level. Maybe he uses a different kind of arithmetic, but mine does not work out that way. The suggestion is too ridiculous for further comment.

The rest of Mr. REES' article is composed of conclusions reached upon consideration of the points I have demonstrated to be in error. I can only assume that these conclusions are equally faulty and, possessed with the facts, Mr. REES will reach different conclusions.

The proposed legislation contained in title 14 of H. R. 6227 was carefully considered. It is an attempt to extend to those District employees not covered by a merit system the Federal civil-service system in the same manner and on the same basis as Congress has done in the past for certain District agencies. What was good enough for these agencies should be good enough for the remaining agencies under no merit system. That was the opinion of both the District budget officer and a representative of the Civil Service Commission who testified at our hearings. Therefore, these proposals merit the consideration of and the approval by the Congress.

A Paternalistic ECA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel of June 12, 1948:

A PATERNALISTIC ECA

An attempt to reward with lush subsidies newspapers and magazines which favored the Marshall plan has been charged to the State Department. According to recommendations revealed on the House floor, $15,000,000 will be funneled to the press and motion-picture producers who followed the "correct line" while the European recovery plan was being whipped into law.

One of the newspapers high on the favored list is the Washington Post. Its owner, Eugene Meyer, and four top officials are recommended for top-drawer positions in determining policies that will govern the spending of $6,000,000,000 of American taxpayers' money.

As readers may have guessed, the News-Sentinel is not on the list to be rewarded. We did not oppose the principle of the Marshall plan in toto, but we questioned whether it would do what was advertised for it. We said that the doubtful effort to stem the tide of communism might so weaken our own economy and potential defense in America as to make this country prey to the same danger threatening Europe. If the principle of the Marshall plan is sound, we suggested, it could be tried on a lesser scale and increased or curtailed as results might dictate.

One's faith in a free government is shaken, however, when it undertakes to reward the faithful. It is the most despicable kind of paternalism and a gross insult to American principles.

In addition to the Washington Post, which had many good things to say about the Marshall plan (and that is a right we'd defend with all our vigor), other newspapers may get subsidies totaling about $6,000,000, some of them for circulating their editions in Europe.

A clause in ERP legislation makes the arrangement sound harmless enough. It provides that appropriations to "enable newspapers, magazines, motion pictures, etc., which sell products abroad to convert foreign exchange into dollars up to the dollar cost of production of that particular product." Some of the publications listed for subsidies say they wouldn't accept a subsidy and that it isn't a subsidy anyhow. "It is merely a way to convert foreign currency into dollars." Nevertheless, a number of publishers approached the Department on the matter. They must have had an interest of some kind.

Subsidy may not be the polite name for it, but it has the earmarks. And the House committee which pared the fifteen million to ten million must have challenged its wisdom.

ECA Administrator Paul G. Hoffman would be wise to reject recommendations of this character. But if he doesn't, Congress would do well to investigate such expenditures and disclose its findings to the public.

Pay Increase for Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the St. Paul Pioneer Press for Saturday, June 12, written by Gustaf A. Nordin. Mr. Nordin points up the case of the Federal employee having to ask his employer, the Congress, for an increase in pay which is long overdue. Now that the Rules Committee has granted a rule so that this question of pay increase legislation may be discussed on the floor of the House, I urge you, Mr. Speaker, and the leaders of the House to see that this legislation is scheduled for the earliest possible moment so that the Members may express to these conscientious civil servants their appreciation of a job well done.

PAY BOOST MERITED
(By Gustaf A. Nordin)

WASHINGTON.—The Republican leadership cannot avoid a positive decision on a pay increase for Federal employees—all of them—before the close of this session of Congress.

It is easy to sit back and claim that Federal workers have an easy job. Their hours are usually better than for most. They have certain retirement benefits which are seldom matched by private industry. They have sick leave and regular vacations with pay.

There are shirkers, just as such employees exist in private industry. But the vast majority are conscientious, hard-working men and women who have to take a lot from an exacting public.

Public service is not the easiest job in the world. A few who neglect their work, or give the tax-paying public poor service, are to blame for the uncomplimentary talk circulated about public employees.

By and large, the Federal employee is ready, willing, and able to serve. He should be considered only upon that basis. The tax-paying citizen, whether an ultraconservative or a labor-union member who strikes for higher wages, is inclined to hold down the pay check for a public servant.

Politically the Republican-controlled Congress has to decide whether it is going to worry about the reaction of taxpayers, most of whom vote, or be concerned about fair treatment for Federal employees, who also vote.

The Federal employee has not had an increase in pay in more than 2 years. The consumer's cost of living has gone up more than 23 percent since the last Federal pay increase. Organized labor has been granted several pay boosts during that same period. White-collar, middle-class employees are perhaps caught somewhat in the same vice that now faces the Federal worker.

If Congress fails to grant the pay raise now, the Federal employee will be unable to look forward to an increase for at least another year. The compromise pay bills before Congress would make up only half the loss in dollar values since 1946. It should be allowed.

Representative EDWARD J. DEVITT, St. Paul, a Republican, voiced it quite well in the House this week when he warned his GOP leadership that something had to be done.

"Here we are in the role of representing the employers and we sit by without giving careful and proper consideration to the most vital problem affecting the men and women who work for the American people," DEVITT declared. "Private business has made an adjustment to offset the rising cost of living. The Federal Government has not.

"We who condemn representatives of private employers for inaction had better remember that we are representing the employers in this instance. We who condemn labor unions for demanding too much and using ruthless methods had better remember that we forbid the Federal employees to even consider such tactics or pressure in order to bring about fair consideration of their case."

Communist Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN McDOWELL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, some months back the Congress of Industrial Organizations announced its determination to clean its official ranks of Communists and fellow-travelers of communism, and the announcement was made by Phillip Murray, president of the CIO and a prominent resident of the city which I represent, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Although I was one who urged Mr. Murray to become a candidate for the preidency of the CIO years ago when John L. Lewis, its creator, to keep his publicized bargain, was not a candidate, there have been few occasions since then when I agreed with his idea of how we ought to run the United States of America.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I must pay tribute to Mr. Murray for keeping his word, as most Scots and those of that blood do.

One of the foulest messes of Communist propaganda for many years here has been the CIO News.

Its stories, which were largely untruths; its cartoons; its editorials were merely a reprint of the things that appear daily in the Communist Daily Worker.

Mr. Murray broke with the Communists and for that patriotic action he deserves the accolade of our Nation.

He ripped out of power the Red-dominated writers of the CIO News and named Allan L. Swim to edit the weekly newspaper. I do not know Mr. Swim, but he is not disloyal and he does want a better break for the millions of Americans who work for a living—and that includes me and my kind.

The certain proof that the Communists hate him and his editing is their vicious attacks on Mr. Murray and Mr. Swim.

I am not a demagog and am not trying to make either of these men believe I think their tactics or thoughts are wise or the best for American workers, but I want to illustrate how communism works by placing here an article in the CIO News of this week, written by Allan L. Swim, new and more wholesome editor of the CIO News:

CERTAINLY, THIS IS RED-BAITING!—DAILY WORKER'S FICTION ABOUT P. MURRAY & CO. PROMPTS OUR CRITICISM

(By Allan L. Swim)

George Morris, Daily Worker columnist, is becoming one of the Nation's most prolific fiction writers.

And the word "fiction," according to Funk & Wagnalls dictionary, is "that which is feigned or imagined, as opposed to that which is true."

Morris, unlike most fictioneers, follows the same plot week after week and writes about the same characters.

Hero No. 1 of this stories, of course, is the current party-line policy.

The villains are Phil Murray, Jim Carey, a guy named Swim who edits the CIO News, and other right-wingers in the CIO.

Right now Murray is villain No. 1. The rest of us are merely minor villains—small fry, that is.

The Morris plot, as fantastic as a Sax Rohmer mystery yarn, is designed to make the gullible reader believe that there's a Wall Street firm named P. Murray & Co., Inc.

Philip Murray, of course, is president and Jim Carey is secretary-treasurer. A fellow named Swim edits the "house organ" of the firm and writes about the "dirty capitalistic lies" which the officers peddle here and there.

This "firm," Morris would have you believe, is engaged almost exclusively in the business of selling the workingman down the river.

What other business could it be in, Morris reasons, if it opposes Henry Wallace and indorses the European recovery program?

Morris, although he frequently writes beautiful fiction, doesn't dream up his own plots. They're hatched by top CPers and they're an important part of the party line.

The current plot is the most interesting one the Commies have designed since that campaign entitled "The Yanks Aren't Coming." You remember—that's the campaign which was dropped like a hot potato when Uncle Joe Stalin and Adolph quit playing military footsie.

Purpose of the current drive is to discredit the leadership of the CIO, sow dissension in the ranks of labor, and elect H. Agard Wallace to the Presidency.

In such a campaign the lefties—like other groups—turn their biggest pop guns loose on their most powerful opponent. In this case the guy they're trying to scalp is Phil Murray.

Any resemblance between Red baiting and what is written here is purely intentional—and make no mistake about it.

We're not talking about that despicable type of Red baiting which consists almost entirely of branding as a Communist anybody who advocates a liberal or progressive idea. There's been too much of that.

We're merely using the Commie's pet phrase for those of us who feel compelled to criticize them—and if giving a Red hell for doing something you don't like is Red baiting, then we're proudly guilty.

We're guilty of a lot of NAM baiting, too.

And, furthermore, we intend to "bait" any group which engages in activities we consider harmful to a majority of the CIO membership.

Morris, if he's as human as the boys around the press table say he is, will denounce me for writing this—and he'll probably say something about my being a "dirty so-and-so."

He couldn't be blamed for that.

The term "fiction writer" as used here isn't exactly a compliment, you know.

But, ho-hum.

Why go on?

General Property Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the Congress, today I am introducing a bill which will go far in solving many of the recurring problems which plague Congress from year to year, and which will beyond a doubt effect economies in the operation of Government amounting to millions each year.

The bill will establish the framework for a new and independent agency of the Government which will eventually place all procurement, planning, building, managing, and disposal of property, both real and personal, under unified control, with standardized accounting and complete inventory control.

The bill creates a General Property Office which will be the buying, selling, leasing, planning, and building agency of the Government, servicing the executive departments, the independent offices, and all agencies and corporations of the United States.

At this time, as a matter of policy, the armed services have been excluded from the program. However, since procurement for the armed services in the past has in part been accomplished through the Bureau of Federal Supply and other agencies of the Government, there will be no bar to such continued procurement for the armed services.

The new General Property Office, as proposed, initially will consist of, and perform the functions of:

1. The Bureau of Federal Supply, which will be transferred out of the Treasury Department;

2. The General Land Office, which will be transferred from Interior;

3. The Public Buildings Administration from the Federal Works Agency; and

4. The War Assets Administration, and/or its components from the Executive Office of the President, or wherever it may then be located.

If this Office is established as proposed by the bill introduced today, all buying, warehousing, distributing, and disposal of Government property would come under standardized procedures with complete inventory and accounting control, which today appears to be sadly lacking in the War Assets Administration and elsewhere in Government.

Economies effected by the creation of this new agency of Government should run in many millions each year. Standardization alone will effect economies in manpower and in paper work that should not be overlooked.

All transactions of the proposed new agency will be subject to continuous surveillance by the General Accounting Office, and the Comptroller General is directed by the bill to make expenditure analyses and report the findings to Congress. The Comptroller General also will provide the General Property Office with standardized procedures for property accounting, inventory control, and fund and fiscal accounting.

It is my hope that the Members of this body will give the bill their careful study and consideration.

Forgotten Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial entitled "Forgotten Veterans," which appeared in the Washington Post for June 16:

FORGOTTEN VETERANS

Tardy and inadequate recognition of the claims upon the United States of Filipino veterans who served under the American flag in the war has at last come out of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. The veterans in question, some 338,000 of them, were made a part of the American Army by Executive order in 1941, when the Philippines still owed allegiance to this country. They served faithfully and are entitled to benefits similar to those accorded our own veterans. Nearly a year ago President Truman sent to Congress a bill that would have restored, in modified form, the educational, hospitalization, and burial and funeral benefits taken away from Filipino veterans by the Rescission Act of 1946. The House Committee has now trimmed this down to a simple hospitalization bill for Filipino veterans with service-connected disabilities and dropped the bill into the preadjournment log jam.

Certainly this is shabby treatment of the men of Bataan and the guerrillas who through the dark years of Japanese occupation continued fighting for the common American-Philippine cause. It may account in part for the reported popularity of collaborationists in Manila today. Of course, hope of making complete amends at the present session of Congress is nil. But Congress can enact the noncontroversial and apparently unopposed bill to grant to the Philippine Republic $22,500,000 for construction and equipment of veterans' hospitals and $3,285,000 a year for expenses incident to the hospitalization of Filipino veterans with service-connected disabilities.

The condition of many Filipinos wounded in action is said to be deplorable 3 years after the end of the war. The House committee found that "adequate hospitalization is so necessary and pressing that it should receive immediate attention." In the face of such need the committee's stalling has been truly shocking. The least that Congress can now do is to put H. R. 4073 on its "must" list as a token of good faith.

Flag Day Address of Brig. Gen. John K. Rice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, a Flag Day speech which was publicized widely in the newspapers of the United States last Monday was delivered in Springfield, Mass., on Sunday, June 13, 1948, by Brig. Gen. John K. Rice, chief of the Troop Information and Education Division of the Department of the Army. The exercises were held under the auspices of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks in the Municipal Auditorium.

As I believe that this address contains information concerning our armed forces which will be of particular interest to the Members of Congress at this time, I am glad to have the opportunity to bring the entire address to their attention.

ADDRESS BY BRIG. GEN. JOHN K. RICE, CHIEF, TROOP INFORMATION AND EDUCATION DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Our flag; what it means to me; what I am sure it means to you; what it means and what we intend that it shall mean to the world.

May I quote from General Bradley, Chief of Staff of the Army, who was present with you a few weeks ago. He said in his remarks to the National Association of Magazine Publishers in New York on April 27:

"It is to the United States that all freemen look for the light and the hope of the world. Unless we dedicate ourselves completely to this struggle, unless we combat hunger with food, fear with trust, suspicion with faith, fraud with justice—and threats with power—nations will surrender to the futility, the hopelessness, the panic on which wars feed."

And quoting again: "If we are to avert another conflict, what we must do is first clothe ourselves against the danger with a cloak of power that would smother all threats of aggression. And then, in unity with all free peoples, put our intellect, power, wealth, resources—yes, and our freedoms—to work in rebuilding the world. To make it a fit place—not only for heroes—but a fit place for peace."

Recently the editors of the Associated Press listed what they considered to be the 10 greatest news stories of the past 100 years. Among these were such events as America's expansion westward—the War Between the States—the Franco-Prussian War and the establishment of the German Empire—Marconi and opening of a century of science—World War I—World War II—atomic energy, etc.

The executive editor then cited our present-day events as "perhaps the greatest story of them all."

How much do we realize our actual individual participation in this event and our personal influence as freemen in molding the character of our destinies. To what degree do we feel the responsibilities incumbent upon us as citizens to serve our flag and to define its character—that composite character of us all—with all of the shades of ingenuity, intelligence, and judgment based upon freedom of thought and expression and love of living that exist within its folds.

Speed of flight and communications have not only shrunk the world but have expanded our individual as well as our collective horizons. I personally, since VE-day in 1945, have served in Germany, the United States, the Philippine Islands, and Korea (with official visits also to Japan). I have flown the full span of both the Atlantic and Pacific and have dealt with thousands among these nationalities. I have sensed their personal characteristics, good and bad, from the primitive to the highly intellectual. I have seen the expression of their faith in us and the hope that we are right—people who have been liberated from downtrodding tyranny and who are avidly looking for guidance. When that guidance is strong our character is contagious. When we give evidence of being a hollow shell to the extent that their own avaricious people can take advantage of us—and we have such individuals of our own watching for that opportunity within our own doors—then they lose faith and respect for our ability, no matter how genuine we may try to be in our presentations.

I mention my personal travels only because these are common experiences by your representatives of every category over the well-traveled world routes of today. We are in direct and rapid contact with the world and its problems. This would seem silly to express if it were not for emphasis upon the widespread roles that we as individuals, whoever we may be, find ourselves playing. Roles never contemplated in our youth. Certainly, "All the world's a stage, and each man in his turn plays many parts"—a large share of them in the service of what we believe to be the common good. This for us should be an inspired service based upon individual knowledge and firm belief in our American heritage, a comprehension as best we can of the problems of our generation, and a progressive willingness to cooperate mentally and physically as our elected and appointed officials may delineate the path in execution of their offices.

May I submit by paraphrase that "All war is divided into three parts." First, the destructive stage, in which we break down the barriers to that which we are determined to correct. Second, the clearing away of the rubble which we have created in our destruction and putting out the smoking embers which might cause unintended destructive conflagration; and, third, we build the structure for which we have fought and cleared the ground.

Yes, the emergency may be declared over after the destructive phase, but the war is not then terminated because we have not yet accomplished our purpose and we have by no means justified the faith of those who fought. I believe that we never finished World War I—we permitted a mass of weeds to grow in the rubble. These, matured and dried, caught fire and in World War II consumed much of the foundation and materials that we had stock piled for the building of life that we had hoped to erect.

This time, if I interpret correctly, it is our national intention that the weeds shall not grow and burn again over the graves of our loved ones. Our occupation forces are maintaining the law and order and administering such military government as necessary throughout the world to keep the ground clear and to secure it, in order to permit freedom of action to our diplomatic and other architects, designers, and engineers of our destinies.

Dollars alone can't do this. Dollars don't help the attitude of that soldier who meets himself going on and coming off guard without relief because he does not have enough companions to do the job. Dollars don't help that commanding general who holds responsibility for the health and reasonable security of the personnel of his command, if he is not equipped with the strength in personnel and arms designed to accomplish his assigned mission. Dollars without personnel and equipment to do the job do not fool those who observe us from the outside, with regard to the genuineness of our expressed intentions—rather the hollowness is so evident that it entices them into believing that to take advantage of us would be profitable to them.

To execute our armed forces mission as given to us by you today we need not only common physical participation but due to the complicated tools with which we operate we require a real cross section of the intelligence of our country. Unless we have that we cannot be what you—or our flag—expects us to be. Certainly those of us who mingle on foreign soil with those whom we would like to impress with our character and way of life should be a true cross section of you all.

And now, with the Senate having recently passed the Draft Act and that presently under serious consideration by the House, I feel that a word to the mothers with regard to one or two modified characteristics of the armed forces today is appropriate. In traveling throughout the country during the past 2 months I have sensed that the thoughts of mothers dwell essentially on one particular theme:

What effect is this service going to have on the educational prospects of my son?

I should like to give you some rather amazing facts. As Chief of the Troop Information and Education Division of the Department of the Army, I am thoroughly familiar with the real transition that has occurred in the armed forces during the past few years. It has to do particularly with the opportunities for education which surround men in the service today, coupled with a complete change of structure to permit career planning. This is one of those combined, or merged, functions and the opportunities apply equally to Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, and Coast Guard.

The armed forces, and particularly the Army, have recently been vitally interested in the matter of human relations and personnel management with a view to doing away with that anonymity that is so characteristic of mass or streamlined operations—that feeling that when a man enters the services he becomes nothing but a subjugated serial number and that he is to do nothing other than what he is told. Neither of these feelings is wanted and the present system emphasizes that a man may progress along the innumerable career lines that are offered, to the maximum extent of his demonstrated capabilities. Not only that, but the armed forces will assist him to do so in his chosen field by making the finest educational facilities in the world available to him and will assist him in obtaining credit in his own home-town schools for successful completion of his educational work.

The heart of this operation is the United States Armed Forces Institute, at Madison, Wis. Of the nine-hundred-and-fifty-thousand-odd volunteers in the Army and Air Force today, 230,000 are enrolled in the United States Armed Forces Institute with some 160,000 of these taking extension courses and the remaining 70,000 participating in classroom group instruction throughout the world. This is all on off-duty time and comprises a world-wide university. The scope of curriculum covers the entire bracket from illiterate to college graduate. Test papers are marked by professors in 58 cooperating colleges and universities throughout the United States.

Through the fine cooperation of the Accreditation Committee of the American Council on Education the results of successfully completed work are submitted by the United States Armed Forces Institute at the serviceman's request to the school of his former association or choice. In 46 of the 48 States, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii these reports are accepted for credit. I am sorry to say that Massachusetts is one of the two which does not yet accept them, but we sincerely hope that they will.

As sufficient credits are built up, these "home town" schools award the man his diploma. "Believe it or not," and this figure is truly amazing—men in the services today are being graduated from their own high schools, or are receiving certificates of equivalency of graduation, at the rate of 5,000 per month. A city the size of Washington, D. C., graduates some 3,500 or 4,000 per year.

There is another angle. United States Armed Forces Institute administers what we call General Educational Development Tests by means of which men who have left school but later have absorbed knowledge from practical sources may determine their existing level of education. These are given at the high-school graduation and the 2 years of college levels. During the first quarter of this year, on their off-duty time 50,000 of these GED tests were administered. It takes a man 10 hours to take one of these tests. Give that a thought—that is 500,000 man-hours voluntarily devoted to determination of level of education in 3 months. Think of the social implications—that is 500,000 man-hours on this alone, devoted to self-improvement in spare time rather than running around town or being engaged in haphazard entertainment.

Our feeling is that "the better the citizen the better the soldier and the better the soldier the better the citizen." We feel that in the service the young man being surrounded with educational opportunities to do his present job well, to improve his capabilities, to accept further responsibility, and, not the least, to be able to satisfy his intellectual desires whatever his degree of intelligence or previous education is the happy and contented man from whom we can expect the best efforts, in arduous duty, and that at the end of his service he is the young man whom we can turn back to civilian life with pride.

I have said these things because I think you and your sons should appreciate our genuineness in these thoughts, that the facilities exist and that it is our desire—as a part of our flag—that they be used to the maximum in accordance with individual desires. There is no excuse for a serviceman to live in an educational void and we foster his inspiration in our common interest.

And now in closing—let us develop and sustain an intelligent and determined national will—developed through intelligent discussion, followed by acceptance of appropriate decision.

Then, may we execute with proud and firm conviction that justifies the efforts of those who have gone before, with a conviction that puts the thrill of life into our waving symbol, that composite representation of the character of us all.

If we do these things and guard our possessions well, our good will must be understood and our good works will permeate the ends of the earth.

Just a few words written by a soldier on the north shoulder of "The Bulge" in Europe in 1944:

"I believe this true—that this can be done. If that were not so, I'd be fighting this Hun with a laxness of manner, unbecoming to duty and not with a sense of creation of beauty. You may call it religion, but not of a sect—a deepness of faith in our kind, to direct and to focus activity throughout the world—into strong unanimity—our flag unfurled."

Civil Works and the Military Engineer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Military Engineer of June 1948:

CIVIL WORKS AND THE MILITARY ENGINEER

We frequently see the term "miracle" applied by writers of recent histories and magazine articles to the exploits of the engineers in World War II. This is, in a sense, unfortunate because there is an implication that luck, or at least a happy combination of circumstances, played a large part in these operations. To anyone who studies the history of the Corps of Engineers, the brilliant record of the corps, both as an organization and as individuals, in recent years appears simply as a natural consequence of a system of organization and training that was established in the earliest days of our history. It was no accident that the full weight of the construction industry of the country was brought to bear with such telling results at home and on the battlefield during the war. It is no accident that two of the spots in this world requiring the highest order of administrative ability are occupied by former officers of the Corps of Engineers. At this time the immediate course which world events will take is dependent in large measure upon the skill with which General MacArthur and General Clay discharge the enormous responsibilities which our country has placed upon them. They are the natural products of the traditional Corps of Engineers' organization.

The corps is truly an American organization in that it has retained at the base of its system the concept of the close interdependence of the civil and the military which George Washington had so clearly in mind.

Washington, an engineer in his own right, well knew that day-by-day practical experience is essential to the military engineer, and as President he established the wise—and unique—policy of having United States Army engineers assigned peacetime jobs that are civil rather than military. Under this policy, the knowledge and skills acquired by the Army engineer on peacetime civil works are applied to the defense of the country in war; and, conversely, what the engineers learn in war they apply to the development of the country in time of peace. In this way, which remains unique among the armies of the world, the United States Army engineer is continuously kept equipped with the essential skills in all phases of modern engineering. Collectively, he represents the Nation's work power at its greatest and speediest efficiency. Individually, he embodies the finest traditions of the American pioneer.

Moreover, in maintaining the assignment of civil works to the Corps of Engineers for almost two centuries, Congress purposely has considered in addition to the development of the country's natural resources—which is, of course, a job for engineers—the unparalleled advantages which such an assignment brings to the Nation's Military Establishment.

Specifically, civil-works projects first provide opportunities that are not otherwise available for the training of our Regular Army engineer officers on large construction jobs. Second, our peacetime construction program activities bring the Corps of Engineers into working contact with civilian engineering and construction firms, and afford the opportunity of placing before them our military engineering problems. Third, in time of war all this experience contributes to the successful mobilization of the entire construction industry and insures that this mobilization is accompanied by rapid integration of the industry into the over-all military effort.

At one time or another, civil-works projects require all specialties of the engineering profession. The work includes field surveys, damage studies, soil investigations, hydrologic and hydraulic design, utility relocation, structural design, model studies, construction supervision and inspection, consultant services, and maintenance and operation. Also included are the broad fields of mechanical and electrical engineering. Consequently, assignment to civil works in the decentralized division and district offices offers the engineer officers an opportunity for specialization, as well as the broad development in knowledge and experience essential to a successful performance of duty.

And the training is not limited strictly to the science of engineering. The engineer officer assigned to flood control and river and harbor projects gains experience in labor operations to a degree not available elsewhere. In addition, he finds splendid opportunities in engineering management, and his duties require participation to a large degree in community and public affairs. In short, years spent by Army engineers on large civil projects necessarily develop their administrative abilities to a degree that would be difficult to obtain in any other type of organization. The Nation has reaped the advantage of this training in peace as well as war as is evidenced by the frequency with which engineer officers have been called to high administrative posts.

Recently, General Eisenhower, in testifying before a committee of the Congress, summed up these training advantages to the military as follows: "I have always believed that not only do the Army engineers render a splendid service in the rivers and harbors work, but I also believe that the rivers and harbors program does more to train our engineers in the large concepts by which they perform their wartime mission than could any other field of endeavor."

R. C. CRAWFORD,
Major General, United States Army,
Deputy Chief of Engineers.

Pittsburgh Quartets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN McDOWELL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, on May 24, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] rose to inform the House of the staging of the world championship barber shop quartet contest at Oklahoma City the past week end under the auspices of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Inc. He graciously extended an invitation to all lovers of harmony to attend this great convention.

I am proud today to report to the House that two quartets from Pittsburgh went, sang, and conquered. The four harmonizers, known as the Pittsburghers, were crowned international champions last Saturday night. Pennsylvania and the entire United States of America salute Thomas J. Palamone, William P. Conway, John M. Ward, and Harry A. Conte, the new champs. The Westinghouse Quartet of Pittsburgh also were medalists in the finals, along with the Mid-States Four, Chicago, second; Clef Dwellers, Oakland County, Mich., third; and Four Shades of Harmony, Terre Haute, Ind., fifth.

Considering that the SPEBSQSA boasts of 1,700 organized quartets located in more than 450 cities in the Nation, the achievement of the Pittsburghers and Westinghouse Quartet establishes a great record without precedence in barbershopping history. Hats off to a magnificent coach and arranger, Maurice E. Reagan, of Pittsburgh.

Whenever you hear Sweet Adeline think of Pittsburgh, "the swipey city," rightly famed for its barber shop swipes. The world could profit from lessons in harmony from Pittsburgh.

The Detroit Council of Churches Opposes Peacetime Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter in opposition to the peacetime draft bill. This letter comes from the Detroit Council of Churches, in which organization are included 500 churches in the Detroit area.

THE DETROIT COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,
Detroit, Mich., June 14, 1948.
Hon. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SADOWSKI: I think you will be interested to know that the Detroit Council of Churches representing the major Protestant denominations and some 550 churches in this city at an official meeting on Thursday, June 10, adopted a resolution condemning UMT and draft legislation.

The resolution acknowledges that a serious power struggle exists between the United States and the Soviet Union, but asserts that political and economic weapons are the most effective weapons against communism at this point. The resolution incorporates a quotation from an AP dispatch covering a statement made by Secretary of State George C. Marshall on May 6, 1948. The AP dispatch reported as follows:

"The Secretary of State said in effect that world conditions now are as bad as they are likely to get, and that improvement can be expected if the European recovery program, the Western European Union, and like measures make progress, but 'military strength,' Secretary of State Marshall said, 'is not the element which will be paramount in the long run. The underlying problem in the immediate future,' he said, 'is to bring about the restoration of economic, social, and political health in the world, and to give the peoples of the world a sense of security.'"

The resolution further asserts that our current defense budget of some $15,000,000,000, the authorized strength of our armed forces, our Reserves of over 2,000,000 coupled with America's overwhelming industrial capacity, and her possession of the atom bomb constitute an entirely adequate defense insofar as military security is concerned. The resolution supports all necessary provisions for an adequate national defense but feels that those provisions are already made, and that voluntary recruitments have been sufficient to meet quotas in all sections of the armed services except the Army. Even in the Army the shortage of voluntary recruitments is not impressive and could be met if Army leaders put their minds to it.

Most of all the resolution deplored the efforts of certain special interests in the Nation to fasten regimentation and a peacetime draft upon the Nation when such defense measures are both irreconcilable with the tradition of American democracy and outdated in the face of the political struggle with Russia in which we are now involved.

We look to you to defeat draft legislation in the House.

Cordially yours,

SHELDON RAHN,
Director, Social Service Department.

Ode to Harry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker—

ODE TO HARRY

Blame it all on Congress,
That's the easy way;
Charge they're halting progress
With all they do and say.

Forget about our Harry,
None blame his careless words.
You never find him wary
Of what comes afterwards.

He's labor's pal to hear him talk,
Railroad men he'd never harm.
But when they took a little walk—
Cried he, "Put them in uniform."

He favored Palestine partition,
UN blessed it, too.
But Harry did a somersault
And now what can we do?

When it comes to taxes
Our Harry's a sensation.
He works to keep them very high
Yet thinks that's not inflation.

Take now that note to Russia—
Here's Harry at his best:
"The door is always open"—
The doorway to the West.

He blames it all on Congress,
The President of the U. S. A.
But what he does is alibi—
'Cause he can't have his way.

Blame it all on Congress,
On Democrats and GOP.
For they have joined together
To return democracy.

Frank Hague's Greatest Victory for the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD the following editorials from the Jersey Journal, edition of June 4, 1948, and the issue of the Hudson Dispatch for June 5, 1948. Both refer to the recent payment to the State of New Jersey by the New Jersey Central Railroad of $9,750,000 in final settlement of taxes long owed to the State of New Jersey from 1932.

The editorials, commendatory as they are, relate only part of the story. No public official in the history of our country has ever fought with greater courage and more pertinacity against greater obstacles for justice and right. Opposed by tremendously powerful forces and by small-minded officials in high places who pretended to be interested in the people, Mayor Hague carried on this titanic struggle to its successful conclusion. In this fight he had the constant support of the former attorney general of New Jersey, Mr. David Wilentz, whose own courage and supreme legal skill, helped in no small measure to achieve the great victory to which these editorials refer.

The part played by the present mayor of Jersey City, Hon. Frank H. Eggers, and the fine men associated with him as members of the 1947 Constitutional Convention, in rounding off the work of Mayor Hague, must also be given appropriate mention.

[From the Jersey Journal of June 4, 1948]

FINAL CURTAIN COMES DOWN ON HAGUE'S $80,000,000 RAIL-TAX TRIUMPH

The final curtain came down today on the greatest railroad-tax battle ever witnessed in the United States when the New Jersey Central paid to the State $9,750,000 in final settlement of overdue taxes, dating back to 1932. Of this sum, Jersey City gets $2,900,000, most of the New Jersey Central property being within the city limits.

This action today brings the total up to $80,000,000 that the railroads have paid the State because of the successful fight waged in the courts by Frank Hague as mayor against the vicious preferential railroad-tax legislation of 1941. Of the $80,000,000, Jersey City has received $25,000,000 that the railroads would have escaped and that would have been saddled on the taxpayers of Jersey City but for the long and resolute contest put up by Hague, who was as unmoved by the advice of timid politicians as he was by the threats of coercion and reprisals of political foes.

Attorney General David T. Wilentz, who, at the behest of Hague, fought with great skill in the courts the most-talented lawyers that the railroad interests could muster, shares the praise due in this hour of triumph for the people.

The $80,000,000 received by the State and city do not include the gains made by the action of the constitutional convention which insured the end of another preferential act that had for 7 years favored the railroads as to second-class property. That was the Edison-Hendrickson Act of 1941.

The new constitution gives to Jersey City approximately $4,000,000 a year that it would not be getting if Mayor Frank H. Eggers, as one of the delegates to the constitutional convention, had not pressed the cause that the people a few months later ratified at the polls, where the new constitution, wiping out colossal favors to the railroads, was approved by nearly half a million majority. This was a triumph not only for Eggers but also for the fine body of Republican and Democratic delegates who stood by Eggers in that convention.

In politics the usual sight in days gone by, and in such circumstances, has been that of a political boss fighting against the interests of the taxpayers. In the railroad tax fights the scene showed Hague contending with rare skill and determination on the side of the people while self-styled statesmen were found doing the bidding of the corporations and the moneybags and helping to deny the taxpayers a square deal.

It is customary to laud the dead and gloss over their shortcomings. In this instance it is a privilege to register anew the credit that the people of Hudson, at many elections in the past, have gladly given the living Frank Hague as the man who, in spite of terrific pressure in the crisis of the railroad tax fight, and facing apparently insurmountable odds, stood unmoved by the pressure of the tempters and the arguments of expediency. He had refused to sell the truth and the people's cause to serve the fleeting hour.

[From the Hudson Dispatch of June 5, 1948]

WILL LONG REMEMBER HAGUE RAILROAD TAX VICTORIES

Except for the great medical center, probably the achievement for which former Mayor Frank Hague, of Jersey City, will be remembered longest will be the hard-fought-for victories over the railroads of this State to force them to bear their fair share of taxation.

Of course, the medical center is a perpetual monument to the political leader with such a far-seeing and clear vision of the future, because generations to come whose sufferings are healed will remember affectionately the name of Hague. But the taxpayers of the present era will long give him due credit for the series of tax victories over the railroads that lifted part of their heavy burden.

The announcement that Central Railroad of New Jersey had agreed to pay $9,750,000 in tax arrearages dating all the way back to 1932 might be said to have marked the climax of the Hague battles for the past decade to make these corporations pay on the same basis as do the small home owners. Jersey City, with the large acreage encompassing the terminal and network of tracks owned by CRR, will get an estimated $2,900,000 cut of this final accounting by a railroad which was able to hold out longer than the rest through bankruptcy proceedings in the Federal courts.

Frank Hague was the most feared man by the railroad corporations because they had never come up against a political leader who was so uncompromising in the matter of making them pay their share of the taxation, which, otherwise, would have fallen principally on the backs of the small taxpayers.

The outstanding of the series of victories in Hague versus the railroads was achieved in 1944 and in 1947. In the former year, the then Mayor Hague had the satisfaction of having Court of Errors and Appeals uphold the contention of the then Attorney General David T. Wilentz involving $66,000,000 in tax moneys that the Democratic State leader charged were due the State and municipalities.

This decision knocked out the Republican legislature's virtual gift of $24,000,000 in

waived overdue penalty interest on delinquent tax payments. It also provided for the settlement of $34,358,989 in back taxes, which the kindly legislature had decreed could be paid over a period of 20 years with only 3 percent interest.

That smashing decision set aside pernicious laws passed by the Republican-dominated legislatures of 1941 and 1942.

Yet there was one important phase of this famous court fight that went against Frank Hague and Mr. Wilentz. The high court upheld the preferential tax rate of $30 per $1,000 assessed valuations that the railroad lobby of 1942 put over.

It was not until 1947 that Frank Hague finally put the skids under this discriminatory legislation via the medium of the new charter that was adopted on November 4, 1947.

Through the present Mayor Frank H. Eggers, of Jersey City, leader of the Hudson delegation to the constitutional convention at New Brunswick, this final blow to the railroads was given. It was a permanent victory over preferential tax rates for the railroads. The new charter expressly forbids establishment of any tax rate, other than the regular rate paid by other property owners, for the benefit of the railroads. The 1948 legislature passed the implementing legislation and today the railroad property is taxed at the same rate that John Jones pays on his one-family house. This victory meant that Jersey City receives this year approximately $4,000,000 in additional railroad taxation and more millions are flowing into the municipal coffers of Hoboken, Weehawken, and North Bergen. Smaller shares come to Union City, West New York, and Secaucus.

Yes, Frank Hague, who retired last year as mayor of Jersey City after 34 years as city commissioner and chief executive, will be remembered first for the great medical center, and second for his tax victories over the railroads.

A New Attack on TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appears in the New York Times of June 15, 1948:

A NEW ATTACK ON TVA

A Congress which has been handling billions of dollars will face an important $4,000,000 issue during the next 2 weeks. This is the question of an initial appropriation to begin work on an $84,000,000 steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., to supplement TVA's hydraulic output during low-water seasons. The House has already voted, by an almost exclusively Republican majority of 192 to 152, to cut this item out, on the ground that it would "justify unlimited future expansion of electric generating stations by TVA by means of steam plants or other methods having nothing to do with navigation or flood control."

The truth is that TVA was authorized by Congress 9 years ago to buy up steam plants in its area, and 8 years ago to add to its steam capacity. Its latest report shows 8 percent of its power produced by steam, mostly at Watts Bar on the main river below Knoxville. Steam power helped maintain the flow of electricity during the war years into Oak Ridge and the great aluminum plants. It is necessary to any well-balanced electric generating system, and any privately owned system in the Tennessee Valley would have it.

If TVA does not get its new steam equipment it will have to "dump" about $2,000,000 worth of power a year during high-water seasons because it will not be able to make contracts to supply "firm" or all-year power. This may be a small waste of the taxpayers' money, but it is a waste just the same. Conceivably it might cause a far greater waste in carrying out our stepped-up preparedness program. The seven Tennessee Valley States know well what is at stake. They are for the new plant, regardless of party lines and old rivalries. So is Senator KENNETH D. MCKELLAR, long a gadfly in TVA's ear during the chairmanship of David E. Lilienthal. The Senate now has a chance to undo the error made in the House. If it fails to do so the public will know that one mainstay of the national defense has been impaired and it will know which major party is responsible.

Taconite-Lignite Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Roger S. Berglund which appeared in the June 14, 1948, edition of the St. Paul Dispatch. This article relates to the effects of taconite development in Minnesota upon the use of North Dakota lignite as an important source of fuel.

TACONITE SEEN SPUR TO USE OF LIGNITE

(By Roger S. Berglund)

A "tremendous increase" in North Dakota's lignite production was seen today as a future result of the development of taconite mining in northern Minnesota.

A Minneapolis combustion engineer said lignite undoubtedly will be one of the "primary fuels" used in producing power to mine and process taconite—a hard, iron-bearing rock which is expected to supply the Nation with iron for hundreds of years.

And the lignite will come from North Dakota's vast supplies, according to Frank J. Palm, Northwest representative for the Combustion Engineering Co.

Lignite—a low-grade fuel containing about half as much potential heat energy as soft coal—is found in most of North Dakota. In fact, Palm said, that State has more unmined heat energy than any other, including the major oil- and coal-producing States.

Palm said lignite can be stripmined easily in North Dakota and then shipped to the taconite plants expected to spring up in Minnesota as present high-grade iron-ore supplies are exhausted.

He expects this to add at least 50 percent to North Dakota's market in Minnesota.

"Lignite," Palm said, "already is competitive with coal in northern Minnesota and will become 'very competitive' as new furnaces are used and engineering problems are ironed out."

It is adaptable as a fuel to any conditions when the best equipment is used, he added.

Palm said lignite will be used in steam generating plants to produce electricity to operate equipment needed in mining and processing taconite.

He said the low-grade fuel already is being used by some power companies and will be used even more extensively in the future.

"There won't be enough coal to meet the demand," he said, "and the added fuel will have to be obtained in North Dakota. With greater demand lignite may be mined on a year-round basis, boosting production and lowering costs.

"The fuel also can be processed into gas and oils—the same synthetic fuels used in Germany and Russia.

"Engineering problems formerly held down use of lignite, but now it probably will be the answer to the demand for a cheap fuel for power production."

Our Failure in Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Marquis Childs.

OUR FAILURE IN GREECE

(By Marquis Childs)

WASHINGTON.—Rumors persist of an impending change in the government of Greece that may well provide new embarrassments for the United States in its uneasy role of protector. Today, 1 year after the start of the United States program, progress must be measured with a microscope.

The achievement is almost wholly a negative one. Greece has not gone Communist and the government in Athens is not an outright dictatorship.

But it is not enough, as Greece abundantly illustrates, to have stopped communism. Such a negative approach will not win over Europe. It is not enough to stop communism if the alternative is support of something that looks very much like fascism.

We will grant that Greece is a riddle within a riddle. We will also grant that Aid Administrator Dwight Griswold did his best to broaden the Athens government, over the opposition of career diplomats and the former ambassador, Lincoln McVeagh.

Griswold used his influence to have the 87-year-old liberal leader, Themistocles Sophoulis, made prime minister. Sophoulis, a man of integrity and courage, found himself surrounded by members of the Royalist Populist Party in key positions. He has often said privately that he felt himself a captive with little power to make the changes that would win greater confidence from the Greek people.

Now, according to reports from Greece, powerful leaders on the extreme right feel the opportunity is drawing near to end this so-called coalition government. They want to replace it with what they would call a service government to be headed by a military man.

Such a service government would be little more than a thinly disguised dictatorship. That will be the fact behind the propaganda out of Athens to the effect that only a "strong" government can meet the mounting threat of communism.

Following the murder of CBS Correspondent George Polk, the rightist press in Athens unleashed a savage attack on Constantine Argyris, of the Christian Science Monitor.

It seemed almost as though the attackers were inviting the same fate for Argyris as befell Polk. Argyris is almost the last re-

maining newspaper correspondent who ventured any criticism of the Athens government.

The right-wing leaders apparently had not expected American opinion to react so strongly to the Polk murder. This reaction has produced at least one result in Athens. Argyris reports in the Monitor that the government is investigating the terrorist activities of the extreme right. Presumably this would include the activities of a secret terrorist society with its own armed bands.

There are unhappy signs that American policy-makers in Greece are in a frame of mind to accept almost anything, yielding to the Greek right-wing view that any and all forms of repression are justified in the war against communism. And communism, by this definition, becomes any expression to the left of, say, the late William Jennings Bryan.

A remarkable piece of testimony was the letter that appeared recently in the New York Herald-Tribune from Homer Bigart, that paper's correspondent in Greece until some weeks ago. Bigart's letter was in reply to one from Griswold attacking the correspondent for his critical dispatches from Athens.

The Bigart letter makes a powerful case against the Greek Government for its continuing repressions and for the mass executions of those who participated in the uprising that followed the liberation of Greece. In his attack on Bigart, Griswold had made the astonishing statement that he was surprised that the excesses have not been greater. In an editorial footnote the Herald-Tribune expresses its complete confidence in Mr. Bigart's accuracy of observation and fidelity to the truth.

Should the United States be put in the position of backing a thinly disguised dictatorship in Greece, the evil consequences would extend far beyond that sick nation.

The European recovery program, on which Greece depends, must be renewed in the coming winter. Isolationists would love to cite blundering in Greece to prove the program should be shut off.

Griswold and the newly appointed United States Ambassador to Greece, Henry F. Grady, will have to make this clear to the stubborn deadenders in Athens. Above all, they must disabuse them of the idea that they can do what they please since in their view the United States needs Greece more than Greece needs the United States.

Federal Pay Raise Is a Must

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I hope indeed that this Congress will enact legislation to provide much needed wage increases for the employees of the Federal Government and the postal service. It is obvious that an overwhelming majority of the membership of both Houses of Congress are in favor of immediate action on this legislation, as 243 Members appeared at hearings during the present session and expressed their approval of the proposed increases. The great number of communications which I have received from my constituents offer convincing proof that the American people want this Congress to grant reasonable salary increases to the underpaid employees of our Government. It is really unnecessary for me to say that these increases are urgently needed, because the mounting cost of living in recent months has made it impossible for the average Government employee to provide a decent standard of living for his family. I urgently hope that the Congress will not adjourn without approving the bill to make these increases effective.

A Timely Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a very timely and informative editorial which recently appeared in the Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette. The editorial follows:

SHOULD UNITED STATES REFUSE COAL TO FRANCE AND ITALY?

The balance of payments difficulties in Europe, which have been deplored so academically but insistently by economists for months, have at last come to the point where they squarely confront the United States.

It has long been understood that Europe cannot recover, under the Marshall plan or anything else, without (1) a great increase in trade and economic cooperation among the 16 countries, and (2) a revival of trade between eastern and western Europe. A long series of considerations, principally impoverishment by war, have forced European countries into bilateral trade agreements with each other. These prevent trade from stopping altogether, but make impossible the free exchange of currencies which is needed if trade is to revive generally.

A perfect example of the meaning of revived trade is Polish coal. If the European countries can get coal from Poland, they do not have to buy it in the United States. That means more coal for us, and less dollars granted to the Europeans. Poland, through the cooperation of the Economic Commission for Europe (a United Nations subsidiary), has just offered to France and Italy coal worth $4,500,000, in addition to the coal those countries are already receiving under bilateral agreements with Poland. Both countries have refused the coal, France on the old ground of payments difficulties and Italy for no publicly stated reason. Acutally the reason on both sides is simple: It is much easier to get the coal free from the United States.

This Government faces the question of refusing any more coal to these countries. It will be up to Paul Hoffman's Economic Cooperation Administration. The decision is difficult because France and Italy really do have a problem. Poland won't ship her coal for nothing she wants industrial machinery in return, and this is often hard to supply.

This discouraging problem comes while another project of the Economic Commission for Europe is meeting with success. This is a plan to build a network of highways across Europe, already agreed to by eight Marshall plan countries. In this case, of course, there was not much sacrifice involved by the eight countries. In the case of the ECE's coal plan, there is such a sacrifice.

The basic assumption of European cooperation still holds if the Marshall plan is to have a chance. Cooperation usually means a bit of give as well as take. Europe had better learn that fact, and soon.

Lesson on Coulee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes that appeared in the Evening Star of June 15, 1948:

LESSON ON THE COULEE

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

ABOARD PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S SPECIAL TRAIN.—Looking upon Grand Coulee Dam in Washington for the third time, as President Truman saw it again for the third time, there came back a declamation we boys used to deliver in high school—Napoleon's speech to his army at the Pyramids, beginning:

"Forty centuries look down upon you."

Now the Grand Coulee of the Columbia is being transformed into a great reservoir from which water pumped into it from the Columbia is to be distributed to reclaim a million acres of land for farming and homes for many families. The monster dam, 550 feet high and three quarters of a mile across, finished some time ago, which now checks the Columbia in its present course, not only make this possible, but also is busily providing power that serves new industries all over the Northwest.

It was a boon to save us in wartime, for it provided energy for development of the atomic bomb, for aluminum, for airplanes, for ships, and the manifold weapons of war.

Standing on top of the great dam, watching the waters hurtle down from one side and from the other, looking up the lake formed by the dam which extends 151 miles to the Canadian border, you are gazing into the future—a future of boundless promises created by man in his engineering and scientific role.

The late President Roosevelt, with his vision, saw it and initiated the Grand Coulee project in Washington and the Bonneville project in Oregon, also on the Columbia River. He urged a series of dams to control and utilize this great river in the development of the Northwest. Had that been done the disastrous floods which wiped out the whole town of Vanport, Oreg., and devastated vast areas over which President Truman flew in a trip of inspection, would not have happened.

They could have been controlled, just as floods have been controlled by unified development of the Tennessee River by TVA.

President Truman's gospel, as was that of Franklin D. Roosevelt, is an expanding America. But, as he pointed out, there are what he aptly called "men of little faith" who bitterly fought this development which has meant so much for the Northwest, and who are now bitterly fighting its expansion—the private utilities and their agents in Congress. They not only choke off appropriations in Congress in this sabotage attempt, but they also are seeking to prevent the Government from building transmission lines from its public power projects to provide electricity cheaply to householders and industry.

For all that is being done to check extension of public power development, the President indicts this Congress, and properly. He has indicted this Congress also for blocking so many other measures for the welfare of the people of our country—housing, health, education, increased minimum wages, wider and more effective social-security coverage, among others, and for refusing to do anything about inflation and high prices.

He is speaking very plainly and very frankly in what developed into a virtual crusade against the present Congress, which he described as the worst in his memory. There is fire in his eye and fury in his voice.

As you listen to all of this, day after day, it suddenly occurs to you that this man should not have to be out on the stump this way, in this day and age, arguing for these simple and fundamental things for the people.

It all goes to show how we have been thrown back and how we shall be stopped in our progress, halted in the march toward our natural destiny, by "men of little faith," unless we, as a people, arouse ourselves and strike back at those who are pulling the strings on Congress, the lobbyists of special, selfish interests, once again confident of their power.

What the Draft Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under consent, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Post of Tuesday, June 15, 1948, in regard to the proposed conscription act which I believe expresses the views of an overwhelming majority of the American people:

OLIVE-DRAB OUTLOOK

Everything would seem to be set.

The draft machinery is ready to clang into action on 60 days' notice; 21-year-olds reportedly have been singled out as the first to go; the Department of Defense is eagerly awaiting the signal to start indoctrinating hundreds of thousands of American youngsters in a new way of life—the militaristic way which might be called living, but only if your horizons are olive drab.

If the House approves the Senate draft bill, the Pentagon's most cherished dreams will come true. It wasn't enough—it never is—that over 50 percent of our tax revenue should be siphoned off to maintain an American war machine. In the minds of our generals and their Mr. Forrestal the Russian threat demands more—much more.

America will be safe, they argue, only if we put our 19- to 25-year-olds under arms.

Whose America, Mr. Forrestal? Certainly not the America which we have known and loved and found adequate to any real or imagined foreign threat. That America spent its peacetime billions on social security, education, health—improving the welfare of its citizens.

The America which Forrestal and his four-star friends are fighting to insure is an alien state, cast in their own destructive image, where kids are kept out of college to learn to kill like robots—where militarism is allowed to choke off free civilian pursuits.

We are a part of America as it really is; not the nightmare fortress of Mr. Forrestal which must be sealed with more and more tons of armor, but a democracy which finds its strength in peace or war through the freedom and increasing opportunities of its people.

Speak out for your America. Wire your Representative that the militarists' draft bill deserves sudden, democratic death on the House floor.

Address of Most Rev. Richard J. Cushing, D. D.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following commencement address delivered at Marquette University, Milwaukee, on June 12, 1948, by Most Rev. Richard J. Cushing, D. D., archbishop of Boston:

The greater part of your academic time has been devoted to the pursuits of reason through the liberal arts and the sciences. It is not out of order, therefore, to devote the few moments left to us during the commencement season to some compressed thinking about the tremendous place of revelation, of religion in a civilized scheme of things. The importance of that place is not so cordially recognized nor so universally acknowledged here in America as once it was. There are abroad in our land several strange, not to say sinister movements which bid fair to diminish that recognition even further and mayhap cripple the influence of religion, at least for a time and a space, on the formation by general education of the national community.

A generation or two ago only frankly atheistic organizations or groups of self-confessed adversaries to all religion—they used to call themselves free thinkers—would have been actively engaged in an effort to place the favor of the law on the side of practical atheism or a religious education. As a matter of fact, a generation ago only an occasional and particularly rabid free thinker would have been sufficiently militant to sift school books, school curricula, and school programs in the effort to purge them of any supernatural overtones or religious references. Certainly American Protestants, Catholics, and believers of every kind, even in the days when the older persons here present were young, would have been scandalized, not to say aroused to indignant anger, if even atheists had banded together to eliminate by legal action all religious inspiration from general education or to influence judicial action in favor of agnosticism as against reverent belief as the dominant mood of public education.

I cannot imagine how the devout Protestants, Catholics, and Jews of a century ago would have reacted to the disturbing situation which has developed recently in our national community and which seems destined to develop further; a situation in which not professional atheists or freak infidel free lancers against religion in popular education, but conventions of organized Christians, some assemblies of ordained clergymen systematically place their strength behind efforts to embarrass religious education and lift their voices in favor of more legal and other restrictions on efforts to integrate with the work of reason the contribution which religion can alone make to the perfection of the individual person and the general community.

I am not concerned this evening with presenting any particular theory of church or state or of the relations between the two. I most certainly am not interested in arguing theory of cooperation between organized religious and organized civil society. But I am sincerely interested in making a plea for the renewal of the ancient American appreciation of the intimate connection between spiritual sanctity and social sanity, between political reason and the standards revealed by religious revelation, between religious morality and national stability.

Let no one misunderstand me and no man misrepresent what we are about to say. Devout Christians, even better than agnostics and certainly better than atheists, well understand how supremely important it is that religion and patriotism never become confused, combined, or confounded. History bears witness that freedom and faith both suffer when religion and patriotism become identified as if they were one and the same thing and in such fashion that the church and state become indistinguishable one from the other. Far better than secularists, the devout appreciate that. Religious people read with indignant regret those chapters of history which record the confusion and scandal which are the results of the failure to keep clearly distinct the voice of Caesar and the voice of Christ, the authority of the church and the authority of the state, the requirements of religion and the obligations of patriotism.

People who know our land well see no danger that such a confusion is likely to exist in these United States where both the traditions of religion and the law of the land are alike obstacles to the identification of spiritual piety and civic patriotism. But there is another danger, an opposite danger, a danger against which history also provides stern warnings. That is the danger of so divorcing spiritual morality and secular loyalty that the latter loses its only effective sanctions and therefore disintegrates and dies. It is the danger that we in America, spellbound by secular legalists and bewildered by pseudotheologians, may forget that, although not identical, religion and patriotism are twin virtues, two parallel and related duties of the first order from which no man can exempt himself. History bears, disturbing witness that the land which smothers religious piety and fails to foster the education that produces piety betrays its own civil interests and saps the strength of the general patriotism upon which it depends for national survival.

If I read history aright, that nation is preparing its own disintegration and promoting its own destruction which forgets the intimate dependence of healthy patriotism on religious piety. The nation is headed for grief which fails to appreciate the close connection between national stability and the religious education which schools a people in the spiritual traditions underlying their unity. Religion does not so much say to the modern state: "I have a real right to your homage and you have a duty to hear me," though religion might speak in just such terms if these were properly understood. What religion does say to the modern state is this: "You have a real need of me and I have an essential contribution to make to your stability." That proposition is almost self-evident, but even if it were not, history abundantly confirms it.

It was religion which provided the moral restraints and also the sublime inspirations which tamed barbarism and brought the ancient nations to a grandeur that still fascinates students of history. When the valiant Cardinal Faulhaber wanted to make his most conclusive defense of religion and his most devastating criticism of Nazi secularism, he had only to recall what the German nations were before religion ennobled them, to point out the place of religion in their rise from barbarism and in the stability the German people acquired in their highest points of civilization. Fifteen tragic years for Germany have passed since the Nazi secularists turned deaf ears to the great Catholic prelate and loyal German citizen who stood in his cathedral at Munich and uttered these prophetic, universally valid words, the Cardinal said, "It is my conviction that the defense of Christianity is also the defense of my

nation. I mean that the German people will either be Christian or else they will cease to be. An apostasy from Christianity, a relapse into paganism, including a pagan concept of the state, will be the beginning of the end of the German nation." So spoke Cardinal Faulhaber 15 years ago. So will speak every true Christian prelate to his own nation when the secularists, the atheists, the materialists, and the muddle anti-Catholic preachers seek to divorce beyond their proper relationship religion and patriotism, spiritual education and national stability. It was through religion, the Christian religion, that the Germans became a great and civilized nation; it was by the hampering and hounding of religion that the modern German liberals and later the Nazis destroyed not religion but the German state; crippled not Christendom but the great German nation.

The history of France bears a like testimony. Religion, the Christian religion, made France the queen of Christendom for almost a thousand years. Religion provided the energies which sent French explorers and carried French culture to the ends of the earth. So long as religion as well as patriotism enjoyed the favor of French institutions and its proper place in French life, France was a mighty nation. But once the deadly hand of a religious secularism attempted to strangle religious education and the religious traditions of France, not catholicism but France suffered; not religion but French national stability declined almost to the point of distintegration.

The same point is dramatically demonstrated by the story of Poland. How would the Polish people have survived as a nation had it not been for their religion when they were politically dismembered, parceled out time and again under divided and hostile regimes? They remained united as a nation even without a state of their own, only because of their religion. It is the story of Hungary, whose great national hero Jean Hunyadi declared: "I frankly confess that had our fatherland not possessed the energy of its religious faith her natural resources would not have permitted her to survive." It is the story of the small but valiant nations of the Christian east, each one of which flourished under the inspiration of religion and endured only so long as it remained faithful to its religious heritage. It is the story of Ireland—in short, of every western people: Religion and patriotism are distinct, but there is a strict dependence between them. Patriotism is nourished by piety or it dies. A nation survives in great part on the vitality it derives from its religious faith, or it does not survive at all.

Most of the founding fathers of these United States were not Catholics, but on this point their thinking was crystal clear. They would have subscribed to every letter of the warning Pope Pius XI gave to the German people when secularism was gaining the upper hand in that ill-fated land, and the German courts were interpreting German civil law in a manner that excluded religion from German schools and religious inspiration from German national life. The Pope uttered—and every founding father of this Christian Nation would have agreed—this profound truth: "No coercive power of the state, no merely secular ideals, though they be high and noble in themselves, will be able in the long run to replace the final and decisive motives that come from belief in God and Christ." The destruction of religious education by direct obstacles or by indirect discrimination against students in religious schools is a crime against the State quite as much as it is against the church. The state should remember that to hand over moral teaching to subjective human opinions which change with the trend of the times instead of anchoring it to the holy will of God and to His commandments is to open wide the door to the forces of destruction. So the Pope warned the German people, saying: "This is a sin against the future of the nation and its bitter fruits will be tasted by the coming generations."

That warning was uttered in 1937, to the German people 11 years ago. Every schoolboy knows the history of the German Nation since. How did it happen? Could it happen here? Do not be deceived by any talk of alleged differences between the character of the German people and the character of our people. The disasters which have befallen Germany are not to be explained in such terms. The German people, in themselves and in their natural characteristics, are a great people, a good people, a people deserving of a far happier history than has been theirs in these last hundred years. The true gifts of the German people, the fruits of their discipline and spiritualized genius, may be found in the gracious traditions of those areas of Germany where the work of religion has been done sufficiently long and sufficiently thoroughly to survive in some measure the onslaught of modern German secularism and its brutal organization in modern nazism. The German character has revealed itself here in America, in the Middle West, and in the very region where we are now met, and it has revealed itself as a force for peace and piety and loyalty and love. The Germans are a good people—the evil in Germany has been due to coldly scientific, rigorously secular education, and to the systematic crippling of the independent Christian schools, once by direct persecution, as under Bismarck, and later by official discrimination against the rights and interests of the children in religious schools.

How can we love our own Nation and keep silent in the face of a legal trend within our courts and an organized pressure campaign among secularist educators to reduce religious schools to inferior positions, to purge public education of every spiritual overtone, and to outlaw every possibility of cooperation, even oblique, between state and church, reason and revelation, public school and spiritual program in behalf of the young? It is love of America, quite as much as love of the faith, which prompts us to protest against the systematic endeavor to divorce religion and education, religious morality, and the elements of national stability.

Not all those assembled before me tonight share my religious faith, but I take it that all of you share my belief in the sovereignty of God and the intimate connection between the sanctity which is God's will for all of us and the sanity which is our will for America. Few of you may be expected to develop the special preoccupations of a priest with regard to the need for some formula under which religion and general education can cooperate in producing among our citizens to be both the piety and the patriotism which are needed alike for faith and for freedom. But most of you will eventually be parents with children whom you will receive from God, whom you will educate here in America, and whom you must one day return to God. All of you will depend on the integrity of American institutions, the spiritual as well as material prosperity of America for your personal security and well-being in the professions, trades, or vocations of your life. You have a stake in America, and though you are not priests and may not all be Christians in my sense of the term, you will do well to weigh what kind of country this will be if strict secularism gains the day and the effort to relegate religion into vestries, sodalities, and cloisters proves successful. You will do well to demand certain things of those who write the laws under which you will live and those who make the decisions which will determine the conditions of your life and the characters of your children. Among those demands you may well include the age-old challenge of St. Augustine to those who try to isolate religion from general education in his day: "Let those who declare the teaching of Christ to be opposed to the welfare of the commonwealth furnish us with an army of soldiers such as Christ says soldiers ought to be; let them give us subjects, husbands, wives, parents, children, masters, servants, kings, judges, taxpayers, and tax gatherers who live up to the teachings of Christ; and then let them dare to assert that Christian doctrine is harmful to the commonwealth. Rather, let them not hesitate one moment to acclaim that doctrine, rightly observed, the greatest safeguard of the commonwealth." And let them then see to it that the commonwealth does its proper part to make possible the spread of such doctrine.

My friends, I am a priest of God, but I speak also as a citizen. You, as you graduate tonight, go forth as citizens into the civil community, but without exception you are the children of God and you are responsive to the things of the spirit. I need not ask you to remember the classroom lessons you have learned at Marquette, but I do ask you to retain always the sense acquired here of the true place of religion in education, of piety in patriotism, of spiritual values in social stability. I beg you be vigilant against those who are attempting to drive the spirit of religion out of community affairs, the values of religion out of education. A nation is cradled in its homes, but it is made in its schools. Unless God be present in both the home and the school, college and university, I know not how he can enter the national life. This only thing I know: Reason, revelation, and history all agree that a nation without God is a nation doomed. Blessed is the nation whose Lord is God. Keep close to God yourselves—keep America close to God. Then you shall have faith and freedom—life, liberty, and happiness—all these, and heaven, too.

Western Germany—Invitation for a Play-Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Sumner Welles that appeared in the Washington Post of Tuesday, June 15, 1948:

WESTERN GERMANY—INVITATION FOR A PLAY-OFF

(By Sumner Welles)

The plan for western Germany proves again how catastrophic was the failure of the four great powers to agree before the victory upon a long-range policy designed to create a regenerated Germany.

The best that can be said for this plan is that almost any change would be better than the chaos existing in western Germany since the end of 1945.

It has these immediate benefits:

By establishing the economic internationalization of the Ruhr, the plan gives the western powers control over the major source of Germany's military potential. It can increase Germany's productivity. It can prepare the ground for the gradual integration of the economy of western Germany with that of the rest of western Europe. It can facilitate the success of the European recovery program. These combined factors can raise German living standards at the same time that they speed up European reconstruction.

The American commitment to retain troops in Germany "until the peace of Europe is secured" should strengthen confidence in western Europe, and particularly in France.

These aspects appeal to those in the executive and legislative branches of our Government who are thinking primarily of the political advantages to be gained by "getting our foreign policy off the backs of the taxpayers."

The underlying dangers of the plan, which involve the world of tomorrow, are relegated to the background in this election year of 1948.

The United States and Great Britain have failed to reeducate the Germans. In a secret poll conducted recently in western Germany, 64 percent expressed the belief that the Hitler regime had committed no crimes against humanity and indicated their approval of the Nazi government.

Are such conditions conducive to the successful inauguration of self-government? The public reaction of even the more moderate of western Germany's political leaders to the six-power plan shows that German nationalism is again rampant. The objectives that the pan-Germans and the militarists have preached for 70 years are more than ever the ideal of a majority of the Germans.

During recent months British policy has been directed to rebuilding a strong Germany as a buffer state against Russia. Britain's chief authorities in Germany, Sir Brian Robertson and Lord Pakenham, have been currying favor with the Germans by proclaiming the need "to forgive and forget." American policy is now apparently the same. The fatal delusions that governed the policy of Britain and the United States toward Germany in the 1920's are once more dominant. We are losing sight of our future security.

Once the German leaders regain even a limited measure of authority they will revert to the practice they so successfully pursued after the First World War of playing off one ally against the other as a means of breaking down all controls imposed upon them. The breach between the Soviet Union and the West seems made to order for their purposes.

The six-power plan will be used by the Soviet Union as a propaganda weapon to convince the German masses that the western democracies are bent upon Germany's obliteration.

The announcement of the plan affords the Kremlin a valid pretext for establishing within eastern Germany a government for a united Germany. Should the present plan for western Germany be placed in operation, the English-speaking powers will be increasingly tempted to outbid the Russians for German support by agreeing to the reconstitution of a united Germany under a highly centralized government.

What our policymakers have apparently overlooked is that the historic motives for Russo-German cooperation were not ended merely because of the aberrations of Wilhelm II and of Hitler. Bismarck's policy was founded on his reinsurance treaty with Russia. The German people are not forgetting that when Germany and Russia were allied the German Reich became Europe's greatest power, and that Germany was defeated in two world wars when Russia joined Germany's enemies.

There is one card in the Politburo's hands that the western powers cannot match. The common interest of Russia and of Germany in dividing Poland between them was one of the strongest motives for the Russo-German alliances of the past. As Bismarck's successor, Von Bulow, phrased it, "I always believed that it was in our own interests to avoid a war with Russia * * * I believed above all that no greater disaster could happen to us than the reestablishment of an independent Poland state."

Russia cannot dominate Europe unless she can count on German cooperation. That has become the Kremlin's primary ambition. Moscow will not hesitate to offer Germany her former provinces now occupied by Poland if in return it can win the support of the German people and control Germany's future government.

The six-power plan increases the probability that the Germans will see in an alinement with the Soviet bloc means by which the "master race" can eventually secure its long-awaited triumph.

Appropriations for Foreign-Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, confusion and short memories are the allies of those forces who would try to put one over on this body and, through us, on the American public. I have bided my time to give the advocates of blank-check appropriations ample opportunity to engage in mental cart wheels and to vent their spleen on the House for its well-considered and well-founded action on reducing the funds for the administration's foreign-aid program. The recent hysterical exhibition of some newspapers and deluded columnists who would like to give the impression that they know and see all should give us food for serious thought and discussion at a later date. Never let it be said that these self-appointed, but unelected, authorities know what the public is thinking. Take, for instance, the sorry spectacle of the New York Herald Tribune. That paper almost had a nervous breakdown over the House action. For several days last week it became nothing more or less than a handbill for well-organized New York pressure groups. As evidence of how far astray this paper has wandered, I quote a statement made on this floor during debate on the bill by my colleague, RALPH W. GWINN, of New York, who said:

Let me tell you that in my district, where the New York Herald Tribune and the New York Times are widely read, the people are writing me letters 8 to 1 against the Marshall plan.

As far as some of the columnists were concerned, they sounded as though their copy had been prepared in a psychopathic ward. Apparently, they had taken it for granted that the House would abdicate its functions in order to appease the world-wide relief planners.

In view of the apprehension that seems to prevail in many quarters with reference to foreign relief, I wish to call attention at this time to certain outstanding facts. The authorization bill, Public Law 472, Eightieth Congress, provided for foreign relief and was approved April 3, 1948. In section 114 (c) of this bill appears the following language:

Nothing in this title is intended nor shall it be construed as an express or implied commitment to provide any specific assistance, whether of funds, commodities, or services, to any country or countries. The authorization in this title is limited to the period of 12 months in order that subsequent Congresses may pass on any subsequent authorizations.

Now let me refer you to some revealing oratory engaged in at the time the Economic Cooperation Act was being debated. Let me quote Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, of Michigan. On March 1 he said:

I say again—as I have said so many times before—these recommended figures are not sacred. I do not undertake to demonstrate that the resultant 12-month figure of $5,300,000,000 in the bill is precisely accurate. I have no sympathy with any "take this or nothing" attitude.

A few minutes later he advised his colleagues that—

It would be a final blunder to jeopardize our stabilities at home. We shall not do so. I am glad to echo the warning of the Harriman report that "it is not wise to underestimate the steepness of the climb" and that "the aid which the United States gives will impose definite sacrifice on the United States." That is obvious. Any drain upon our commodities not in surplus also is a burden. The sound administration of the act will hold all these impacts to a minimum.

The Senator went on to say:

It is the universal opinion that the success of the enterprise is largely dependent upon the character of its management.

Remember these statements for I will refer to them again in connection with another matter.

Senator TOM CONNALLY said on March 2:

I do not agree at all that an authorization is a commitment. It is not a commitment. It is simply a permit to Congress to appropriate or not to appropriate, and Congress retains its sovereign power not to appropriate a cent under any authorization unless it desires to make an appropriation. That is fundamental.

On the same day Senator VANDENBERG made this statement on the floor of the Senate:

The standard practice is to make an authorization for the total project, reserving the right of appropriation, as is absolutely required by the Constitution, to each Congress upon its own responsibility. This program is precisely comparable. This is an over-all project which is set up on the basis of 4½ years just as it might require 4½ years to build a battleship. If we authorized the construction of a battleship, we appropriate from year to year to cover whatever expenditure is involved from year to year. There is no way in the world, even in the construction of a battleship, for one Congress to bind another. However, it can set down a project and in standard practice it does, in precisely the fashion we have undertaken with respect to this bill.

Later on the same day, in answering an inquiry with regard to the difference between an authorization figure and the appropriation figure, the Senator said:

I think there are two different functions in respect to an authorization figure and an appropriation figure. I can very well understand how the Senator [BALL, of Minnesota] himself might vote for an authorization of $5,300,000,000 for the first 12 months of its (ECA) operation and subsequently confront in his committee testimony which indicated that a different figure would be appropriate.

I think, so far as the identification of a plan is concerned, we should put the $5,300,000,000 in the bill and submit it to a review by the Appropriations Committee. I am trying to say that I think there are two different functions served by the act of authorization and the act of appropriation. Otherwise, we would not have this system in the law. I think the authorization as identified in the bill reported by the committee is necessary to identify what the plan of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 contemplates.

Again, on March 12, the Senator from Michigan said:

I believe that the Appropriations Committee has an independent function in the operations of the business of the Senate. I think it is the business of the Senate Appropriations Committee to proceed under precisely the same sense of responsibility in connection with its tasks as the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has done. I expect the Senate Appropriations Committee to give due consideration to the record which has been written as part of the basis of its judgment. I do not expect the committee to consider that it is bound to accept the figure in the authorization unless it finds the figure justified by its own independent investigation.

A few minutes later the Senator went on to say:

I have repeatedly emphasized before that, in the opinion of the Senator from Michigan, there never can be too much scrutiny put forth at every step of the evolution in this almost completely speculative enterprise and adventure.

The Senator from Michigan thinks it is indispensable to proceed with the adventure. He offers no guaranties in connection with it. He has claimed no sanctity for any of the figures in connection with it * * * within that authorization there is not only freedom, I repeat, but a duty not only upon the Senator's committee (Bridges' Appropriations Committee) but certainly upon the so-called watch-dog committee * * * to provide a scrutiny of this enterprise which cannot be detailed too completely to satisfy the Senator from Michigan.

On March 29, Congressman JAMES G. FULTON, of Pennsylvania, told this body:

There is no one in this House that feels that this bill we are now passing (ECA) actually appropriates money other than the $1,000,000,000 which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to give immediately. The current House version of the bill reported out by the Foreign Affairs Committee, now under consideration, requires both an authorization and an appropriation each year. We intend to watch the program closely as progress is made under it.

On the following day, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, said:

We have provided in this bill that each year there shall be appropriations. There would have to be an authorization in order that the Foreign Affairs Committee, in addition to the Appropriations Committee, retain original jurisdiction as a matter of right, not as a matter of sufference.

I cannot for the life of me reconcile these statements to the emotional outbursts to which we have been subjected in the past week. Unless it was deliberately planned that way, I cannot see why an authorization is flexible in March and by June it becomes an irrevocable commitment.

I advised the House on March 31 that—and I quote:

When this legislation comes to me after this bill is passed, I intend to go into the need of every nation before recommending funds to the House. I intend to go into the capacity of the United States to provide for this program and I am going to give you an illustration on how that might work. There is no individual today who can tell what we can possibly provide for the countries across the water on a wheat basis. It is probable that the budget will not be up here on this proposition before the middle of April and that we cannot conclude our operations on the budget estimate and have the bill in here much before the 10th of May, no matter how hard we work. Around that time we will be able to learn something about what the wheat crop is going to be, and make an intelligent recommendation as to what this country might be able to provide. Today we cannot. I hope that the membership realizes the importance of that statement and how necessary it is that these things be kept in mind when the final appropriations are provided. It is very important. If we are going to do that, we will have to take the responsibility for it, and whether we do it right or not is up to us. We cannot do it and have some other committee running around trying to follow it up.

My colleague, Mr. CHARLES FATON, of New Jersey, was kind enough to comment:

It would be impossible for any sane man to imagine a better watchdog than JOHN TABER. He would have to be a thoroughbred, and he has not been bred yet anywhere in the world.

This was followed by a series of remarks, the total gist of which were that many Members of this body would vote for the legislation on the strength of a thorough and searching investigation of the requests and requirements by the House Appropriations Committee.

It is apparent from the quotation directly from the law itself and the statements that were made on the floor of the Senate and the remarks I made in the House when the bill was up, that the granting of only the amount that is needed is not a violation of a pledge but is strictly in accordance with the regular rules and practices of the laws of Congress.

I have served on the House Appropriations Committee for 26 years and I say this in all sincerity and honesty—if the Congress succumbs to the threats and innuendos and misrepresentations of groups trying to push this gargantuan world-wide relief and rehabilitation project on a bewildered public, without benefit of the checks and balances provided for by law, then you might as well legislate funds by general authorizations and do away with the Appropriations Committee.

The liberties of the American people have their source in, and are preserved by, the power of the purse; that is, the Congress must appropriate funds before they can be expended by the administration.

If we should cease to consider the merits of the appropriations for foreign relief as the spenders are asking us to do because they now say that we are committed to the authorized amount—in direct contradiction to their previous statements quoted above—then the liberty of the American people and our form of government are gone.

I maintain the House provided sufficient funds for a judicious administration of ECA. Let us see that arbitrary action to increase them is stopped.

End Partition of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, just 1 week ago, I had the pleasure of being present in your office, when a delegation representing the American Legion for an Undivided Ireland presented their petition to you. That petition signed by 300,000 Americans urged that the United States Government should use its good offices to bring about the unification of Ireland and the reuniting of all the Irish people under a single government. That petition was thereafter referred by you, Mr. Speaker, to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs for their consideration. It is my hope that this committee will initiate a discussion of this matter with the State Department at the earliest opportunity.

For centuries the Irish people have endeavored to obtain their freedom and independence. At long last, during the First World War, it appeared that they might at least be granted home rule in Ireland, as an equal member of the British Commonwealth of Nations. However, it was soon evident that England actually had no such intention in spite of the many promises made to the Irish prior to and during that war. Thereupon the Irish expressed their desire for complete independence, free from the promises and empty hopes which England was constantly offering but never putting into execution. This desire for complete independence was twice expressed in votes of the people of Ireland, in free, democratic elections. In 1918 the people voted in favor of independence with a majority of 80 percent, and again in 1920 they so voted, this time with an 82-percent majority.

In the light of such overwhelming votes of the people, one would think that the British would have acceded to this popular demand and granted to Ireland the freedom which they so eagerly sought. Instead a crafty program of partitioning Ireland was concocted, and so two governments were established in this small island. In the north, six of the nine counties of the Province of Ulster were cut off from the rest of the nation and a British satellite government established.

It has always been the rule in democratic countries that the desires of the majority controlled the destiny of the nation. Not so in the case of Ireland, where a small minority of the people, voting against separation from England, were cut off from the rest of their country and given an independent government, that is, independent of the rest of Ireland, but very much dependent upon Great Britain, since this new parliament was subject to the control of the British Parliament, and the country was policed by British troops. Thus the fundamental basis of democratic government

was violated and the rule of the majority was rejected by establishing in Ireland two nations and two governments in a land that was destined by the very hand of nature to be but one united nation and one united people.

If the principle which was set up in the case of Ireland were to be carried out generally in democratic nations not one would long be able to exist. Actually, if we had followed that principle in this country, then during the past years, when the Democratic Party has been in power, the States of Maine and Vermont might well have cut themselves off from the rest of the Nation, since they had voted for a Republican administration. Or if the situation in 1944 is considered, then an additional 10 States might have joined Maine and Vermont in establishing a separate government for the nonconforming minority. The absurdity of such a situation is even more evident if we were to permit the traditionally Democratic States of the South to establish an independent government for themselves when the Republicans are in power.

However, in Ireland, even this principle was not actually carried out in a logical fashion, because six counties were included in the government of northern Ireland, whereas not more than four at the most could show a majority in favor of union with England. Two and possibly three of the six counties would have preferred to have joined with free Ireland, but they were denied this right and were included in the six-county government. As a result, today there are 428,000 Nationalists in Northern Ireland who prefer union with the rest of Ireland, while the balance of the population, 851,000, are divided amongst Independents, Laborites, and Unionists, the Unionists being the only group wholeheartedly in favor of the union with Great Britain. Thus it is clearly seen that there is no unanimity of political opinion throughout the six counties which would justify the grouping of the six counties into a separate government. On the contrary, the six counties should be redivided into their composite groups and one or more additional governments established, if the principle that the minority opinion shall prevail is to be fully carried out. Actually the six counties were selected because that was as much of Ireland as could be cut off by Great Britain and still maintain a government favoring British union. If all of Ulster had been cut off, then the great majority in the new government would have been in favor of union with the rest of Ireland. But, even as things now stand, the only way in which power is maintained and control secured is by denying equal representation to the voters in Northern Ireland. Through a system of gerrymandering the people who favor union with Ireland are grouped together and given half as many delegates to the Parliament as are given to a numerically smaller group of people, but who, grouped together into another district, favor union with Great Britain. It is because of this system of gerrymandering alone that the British are enabled to retain control in Northern Ireland and continue this unwelcome separation of the nation.

What I have indicated as a lack of political unanimity in the six counties of Northern Ireland applies also in the religious field, since one-third of the population in this area are Catholic, numbering 428,290, while the Presbyterians total 390,931, the Church of Ireland 345,474, the Methodists 55,135, and others total 59,915. Even racially the people of Northern Ireland do not differ from those of the rest of Ireland, but have the same predominance of Gaelic stock as is to be found throughout all of Ireland. In the economic field, the principal activity of the people is agriculture as it is in the rest of Ireland, and although their industry is more concentrated in the northern counties, they have an amount equal to that located in the other 26 counties.

From all that I have said, Mr. Speaker, it will be clear to anyone that there can be no justifiable excuse for maintaining the fictitious boundary that divides Ireland into two separate countries. As a matter of fact, there was no one in all Ireland who wanted partition of the country prior to December of 1920. Everyone in Ireland was always in favor of a united Ireland, either under the rule of the British or free from that rule, but not in favor of a divided Ireland. Only the force of British arms was able to foist this division upon the country and continue it during the past 27 years. So it is now time that Great Britain realized the mistake which they have made and restore the unity of the Irish Nation. In doing so, they will eliminate the ill will that has been engendered all these years amongst the Irish, and will create anew the natural friendship and good will that should and could exist between these two countries. Moreover Britain will stand to gain much in the eyes of the world by removing this stain on her history and by confirming publicly the right of small nations to self-determination. One can have little confidence in the British demand for the freedom of small nations so long as she denies that right to the Irish people, who are her closest neighbors.

In the world today, as the various nations are drawn closer together, we must be able to put faith and trust in one another—must be able to rely upon the promises which each nation makes to the others. The greater our feeling of confidence in the integrity of nations, the more willing are we to assist them in the time of their need. Were Great Britain to reunite Ireland at this time, I am sure that the American people—not just the 30,000,000 of Irish extraction but all the American people—would have greater confidence in the sincerity of Great Britain and be the more desirous of coming to her assistance at this time. Instead a large number of Americans feel a certain amount of resentment that even a part of the European recovery funds which are going to Great Britain will find their way into subsidies for the Government of Northern Ireland, for only with British subsidies is this government maintained.

Actually our own Government is being placed in a rather embarrassing position as a result of the method of distribution of these European recovery funds, since it has been proposed that Eire is to be given only a loan of money, while three-quarters of the British funds are in the nature of a grant. As a consequence, our Government is in effect giving indirect support to the maintenance of partition in Ireland, since whatever funds end up in Northern Ireland will be three-quarters grant and one-quarter loan, while those to Eire are all loan. We thus are being placed in the position of treating the two parts of this single country in very different ways—being more generous to Northern Ireland than to the rest of the country. On this account alone our State Department would well be justified in urging that the British Government end the partition and remove this embarrassment to the United States, for I am sure that it is not the intention of the Congress, or any other branch of our Government, to be a party, if only indirectly, to the domination or subjugation of any people. To maintain our position as the friend of free peoples everywhere, we should insist upon freedom for all of Ireland. To avoid embarrassment, we should treat all Ireland alike and either make grants of three-quarters of all money going to Eire as we are doing to Northern Ireland through British subsidies or else should make all of Britain's funds on the basis of a loan as we are doing in the case of Eire. For these reasons, I feel that our State Department can very properly urge upon England the unification of all of Ireland and the reuniting of all the Irish people under a single government.

The President's Trip

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the following article by George E. Sokolsky from the Washington Times-Herald of June 16, 1948:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Few Presidents have quite faced the situation that finds Harry Truman desperate to the point of hysteria. For only a hysterical or dishonest man could have described the Eightieth Congress as the worst in American history.

After all, it has not been a rubber-stamp Congress of which servility Harry Truman partook as a Member of the Senate.

It has had a record of hard work, of constructive legislation, of great decisions on domestic and international policy.

Harry Truman's despair does not arise from the prospect of defeat by the Republicans as

much as from a knowledge that his own party has turned upon him. He has lost the confidence of his own associates.

In fact, he has, in some matters, acted with such infantile petulance that no one can explain what he had hoped to accomplish.

He is seeking an issue, a rallying point, and, finding none at hand, hopes to use Congress as a whipping boy. He apparently will say anything, like his talking about what a good guy his pal, Joe Stalin, is.

No matter what we think of Joe, he is the head of a state and it sounds cheap and vulgar for the President of the United States to refer to the prime minister of another state in the language Truman used for Stalin. I am sure it did not take one vote from Wallace.

This business of not permitting Democratic State leaders to travel on his train arises from a fiction that this is an inspection tour by the President of the United States, not a political tour by the Democratic aspirant for the Presidential nomination.

The reason for the fiction is money. If President Truman, as President, is traveling, the expenses are paid out of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. Truman has no private means: his salary as President is altogether inadequate, particularly after income-tax deductions. The Democratic National Committee is as financially flat as it is intellectually and politically.

So Mr. Truman could only have taken this trip at the people's expense, as his predecessor, Franklin D. Roosevelt, had done before him with less justification.

Also, there is the matter of radio time. As President of the United States, Mr. Truman is entitled to many courtesies; as a political aspirant, he is entitled to what he can get, the same as anybody else.

So Mr. Truman had to keep the Democratic State chairmen and similar fry off the train; otherwise the trip would have been too obviously political.

This requires careful management at this time. Mr. Roosevelt made these inspection tours without any moral sense of propriety. But, then, Mr. Roosevelt had the advantage of a war to cover up for him and to provide a censorship for reasons of "national security."

Nothing like that is available for Harry Truman. So he not only kept the politicians off the train but, as I understand it, he kept them off the arrangement committees in the various cities.

For instance, Lester Loble, chairman of the Democratic State central committee of Montana, is reported to have said concerning the visit to Montana:

"I have not changed my opinion as previously stated. This reception was arranged by the Republicans. That's all I have to say."

That is undoubtedly correct because when I was in Butte some of my friends, ardent Republicans, were preparing for the visit of the President of the United States.

Without them it is doubtful whether the greeting could have been a success, but how does that help the Democratic leader of the State who is faced with the necessity of trying not only to elect President Truman but to reelect Senator MURRAY, whose chances are practically nil?

Harry Truman's visit to Montana practically guaranteed the local Republican candidates their election.

Perhaps that is why, in his nonpolitical way, Harry Truman made a special appeal for Senator JAMES E. MURRAY and Representative MIKE MANSFIELD.

Of course, there was no politics in that—only the President reminiscing about old friends. Nobody can naturally be so crude.

Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

RESOLUTION APPROVING A SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT FOR THE DRAFTING OF YOUNG MEN IN THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES AND URGING THE SPEEDY ENACTMENT OF SUCH AN ACT BY CONGRESS

Whereas there has been introduced in Congress a bill, known as Selective Service Act of 1948 (S. 2655), which has been passed by the United States Senate, the purpose of which is to make liable for training and service in the armed forces of the Nation the young men of this country between the ages of 19 and 26 years; and

Whereas this Nation has attained a position of leadership among the nations of the world today, and has assumed commitments in connection therewith which must be kept in order to preserve its integrity and to promote peace throughout the world; and

Whereas since the close of hostilities of World War II the armed forces of our country have become so depleted as to impair seriously the security of the nation; and

Whereas social, political, and economic conditions in many nations of the world at this time are in such a chaotic state of confusion as to make the prospect of war ever imminent; and

Whereas it is imperative that this Nation place itself in a state of adequate defense by increasing and strengthening its armed forces; and

Whereas voluntary enlistments thus far have failed to maintain the military requirements necessary for the security of the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-ninth Division Association, Department of Maryland, Inc., in convention assembled this 13th day of June, 1948, does hereby approved the drafting of young men into the armed forces of the United States as generally provided by the Selective Service Act of 1948 (S. 2655), and does recommend the passage of such an act as an emergency measure at the earliest time possible by the Congress of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and to each of the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from Maryland.

This certifies that the aforegoing is a true copy of a resolution passed by the Department of Maryland, Twenty-ninth Division Association, Inc., in convention June 13, 1948.

BENJAMIN F. CASSELL,
Adjutant.

Lack of Manpower Hits British Mines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a highly enlightening article by a star staff reporter, which appeared in the New York Times of June 15. This should be of particular interest at this time:

LACK OF MANPOWER HITS BRITISH MINES—FATHERS DO NOT WANT SONS TO TOIL IN PITS—MEN FOUND WANTING IN INCENTIVE

(By Herbert L. Matthews)

CARDIFF, WALES, June 14.—At the coal face in one of the seams of Tydraw Colliery, at the northern end of Rhondda Valley, six or eight Welsh miners crouched around this correspondent to discuss their problems.

The talk cost Great Britain's nationalized industry about 1 ton of steam coal, since all work stopped as we conversed by the fitful light cast by our torches, but for one observer it helped explain why the industry was in a bad way.

The miners were too satisfied, while the colliery manager and the area manager who were with us were bitter and critical—and both were old-time miners with many years' experience underground.

Minister of Fuel and Power Hugh Gaitskell said last Thursday that it was "a critical situation," with coal production running 100,000 tons a week short of the objective. The recruiting of mine labor is half the weekly rate needed to maintain the target and there is no hope but to get more work from the miners.

Well, here it all was—a moderately good mine, all electrically mechanized except for hand cutting, with unusually wide seams of 3 to 5 feet.

This mine, under the typical narrow, bare gray valley of South Wales, should be a minor triumph for nationalization. Actually, its 500 miners are producing about 50 tons less a day than in 1946, the year before nationalization. Absenteeism is up.

MANAGER MAKES DENIALS

I asked the fathers among those leaning and crouching around me—there was no room to stand—whether they wanted their sons to take up mining. The answer was an emphatic "no" and it was a "no" echoed from the Rhondda Valley through the Midlands to Fifeshire in Scotland.

Yet every one of the miners told me that he was glad coal had been nationalized and each insisted that things were better, although David Evans, the colliery manager, refuted or denied everything they said.

The point of the matter is that the miner is satisfied. He is getting more money for less work and not only his week but all kinds of social services are guaranteed, even if he slacks on the job, even if 1 week in 5 he does not work at all.

He has little incentive to work harder. There is not much he could buy with the extra money; pay-as-you-earn taxes would take a large slice of his overtime, and anyway to him the time off from his grueling, dangerous work is the greatest luxury he can earn.

While we were walking through the labyrinth of tunnels to the coal face a man was brought back with his chest nearly crushed in. Last week one section of a tunnel caved in, although fortunately nobody was underneath at the time.

COAL BOARD CRITICIZED

Those who are miners already are relatively satisfied, although they do not like the way the stiffs of the National Coal Board are running things. One old-timer down in Tydraw called the men who compose the coal board that runs the nation's industry "spivs," meaning loafers getting paid for nothing.

The miner wants a greater say in running the industry, but Government leaders, the National Coal Board, and the colliery managers all seem to agree that the miner has the wrong idea. The only hope for the coal

industry is for the miner to work harder. In the long run mechanization, the elimination of uneconomic mines, and modernization will put the coal industry on its feet, but the Government needs 10 or more years.

The miner does not see that. He cannot understand that if he continues to produce less each man-shift hour now, that he has more mechanization, his country's economy will collapse, and his present relative prosperity and security along with it.

In 1913 South Wales produced 56,000,000 tons of coal a year, of which 36,000,000 tons were exported. Now its total production is only 22,000,000 tons. Last year Cardiff and Swansea, once the greatest coal-exporting ports in the world, imported United States coal.

The paradox of it all weighed on the foreign observer in the fetid black tunnel where we talked. There was coal in every direction. We were sitting on it, leaning on it, and our torchlights gleamed along its metallic surfaces.

And all through the valleys around us and on to the north there was enough coal to solve the economic problems of Britain; to make her once again something like the power that she was.

Yet it remains in the ground, primarily because Britain cannot get the men to dig it out.

Old St. Mary's—A National Shrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARDIE SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. HARDIE SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. Michael J. Ryan:

OLD ST. MARY'S—A NATIONAL SHRINE

(Address of Hon. Michael J. Ryan, of Philadelphia)

In the shadow of this ancient church we meet this Memorial Day to honor the memory of the mighty dead whose bodies here found burial.

"Their swords are rust; their bones are dust;
Their souls are with the saints, I trust."

No place in all America should have for us a more gripping hold, for no place compares with it in Catholic historic interest.

Around and about us are the graves of the men who helped to make America.

Here lie the companions in arms of Washington and the friends and associates of Lafayette. Not only soldiers and sailors, but pioneers of finance and commerce and triumphant industry and molders of the minds of men.

All around and about us is their bivouac and our mission is to guard their glory. The easily remembered names of but a few should be complete defense to all the arrows of malice aimed at our people. Over there lies Barry. Measured by any test, whether continuity of service, quality and success of service, faithfulness, loyalty, daring courage, responsibilities imposed and fulfilled—he is surpassed by no naval commander of the Revolution. To him the Continental Congress gave the first warship it owned; he brought into the Capital the first vessel captured under our flag; and he fought with success the last sea fight of the Revolution. He enjoyed beyond any other of the captains—and there was then no higher rank—the confidence of the naval committee, of Robert Morris, and of Washington. To him were entrusted the delicate and the important missions—such as the safe conduct of the representatives of France and the transport in security of the French loans—without which our success would have been impossible.

There can be little wonder that when the Navy of the United States came to be organized the great President gave to him "Commission No. 1" and thus designated him, so far as such act could convey the import, "Father of the American Navy."

STEPHEN MOYLAN

And in the pathway near him, in an unmarked grave, lies Stephen Moylan. Moylan was aide-de-camp and private secretary to Washington at the siege of Boston. He it was who first suggested the adoption of a common flag by the Colonies. He was muster-master general, quartermaster general, colonel of a regiment of the famous Pennsylvania Line, chief of the dashing corps known as Moylan's Dragoons, and after the death of Pulaski, the commander of all the cavalry forces of the new Republic. In a letter of introduction to the great leader whom he was to serve so zealously, Moylan was described as a "gentleman of fortune." He was that and more and he served America with a zeal and devotion unsurpassed.

THOMAS FITZSIMONS

And mingling with both is the dust of Thomas FitzSimons, the great unknown. If we who meet here this day shall have done nothing else than make plain his name and fame, we shall have deserved well of our kind. Undoubtedly he was the foremost American Catholic, and yet we have permitted his name and his memory to be "sealed in the urn of oblivion." FitzSimons was one of the foremost merchants of Philadelphia. His ships traded in all the traffic marts of the world. He was a trustee of the University of Pennsylvania, one of the founders and directing heads of the first Bank of North America, president of the chamber of commerce, member of the congress of the Confederacy, Member of the First, Second, and Third Congress of the United States, and member of the convention which adopted and a signer from Pennsylvania of the Constitution of the United States. In the First Congress, when every power of the new Government had to be directed into the proper channels and every faculty trained and guided, his was the directing mind which fashioned our Statutes upon all questions of trade, finance, commerce, and navigation. He proposed the creation of and was Pennsylvania's representative upon the first Ways and Means Committee. He was chairman of the committee to plan the frame of Government for that great "Northwest Territory" which afterwards became Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin. He stood resolute for the maintenance of our national credit and the payment without abatement of our national debt, foreign and domestic. With a vision that seems more than human he saw America the industrial mistress of the world and was the first to propose that our tariff upon imports should be so levied that American labor would be protected and American industries encouraged.

This principle for which he strove in the dawning days of the Nation triumphed and was written into our law. It become the vital spark of the national life and with absolute verity do we proclaim him above his grave today—Father of the American Protective Tariff System. He was one of the very rich men of the Republic. He was not only a partisan but an intimate of Washington. After the ratification of the Jay treaty, the President appointed him and James Innes, of Virginia, to carry out on the part of America the financial section of its terms. His home in our city was the social meeting place of Madison and Hamilton and Rutledge and Carroll and the other molding minds of the new Government. He was the friend of Robert Morris and in his desire to aid that mighty man was himself pulled down to adversity. From his prison cell Morris wrote: "Thomas FitzSimons, Esq: The balance of this account as it stand is $156,386.58. This has arisen almost entirely out of the loan of his name for my accommodation" and again he wrote: "My houshold furniture was sold by public auction. What is now in Mrs. Morris' use has been lent her by Mr. FitzSimons." With Daniel and Charles Carroll and Dominic Lynch he signed on behalf of the Roman Catholic laity the address to George Washington and received that famous reply which is as applicable today as then—"As mankind becomes more liberal they will be more apt to allow that all those who conduct themselves as worthy members of the community are equally entitled to the protection of civil government. I hope ever to see America among the foremost Nations in examples of justice and liberty. And I presume that you fellow citizens will not forget the patriotic part which you took in the accomplishment of their Revolution and the establishment of their Government or the important assistance which they received from a nation in which the Catholic faith is professed."

In my humble judgment FitzSimons ranks with Franklin and Morris as the three mightiest Pennsylvanians; and considering his constructive and formative service, his distinctions, his position in the Nation, his attainments and triumphs as a legislator, his unswerving loyalty to his church, his devotion to his country, his faithful adherence to his rule of life—"I conceive it to be a duty to contend for what is right, be the issue as it may"—I salute his shade and, if his soul hears, hail him as first and foremost Catholic citizen.

GEORGE MEADE

And in the tomb beside him is George Meade, his brother-in-law and partner, illustrious in himself—the citizen soldier who rallied to Washington's call to save liberty by winning victory at Trenton and Princeton—the trader whose ventures in strange seas and new lands brought wealth and honor to the new Nation. He was the ancestor of a distinguished line—winning glory and honor on sea and land—and particularly the grandfather of the mighty general under whose command the forces of union and freedom drove back in defeat the hosts of secession and slavery at Gettysburg—George Gordon Meade.

MATHEW CAREY

And on the other side of the little dividing line is the unmarked tomb of one of the builders of America. He, too, is unknown. His fame unsung. And yet Prof. Earl J. Bradsher, of Columbia University, in his essay, A Study in American Literature, declares: "From 1785 to 1817 Carey was the sole owner and from 1817 to 1824, he was actively at the head of the greatest publishing and distributing firm in this country." The books which came from the presses and shelves of Mathew Carey include the best and most important printed in all the Colonies: the Bible—both Douai and King James version, Blackstone's Commentaries on the Laws of England, medical books, text books for all the professions, histories, novels, dictionaries, encyclopedias and compendiums; anything and everything calculated to exalt and instruct and inspire.

He won the title of "pamphleteer of the Republic" and to index his own literary productions, many of them in the Ridgway branch of the Philadelphia Library, requires at least 8 great bound volumes. He was the greatest force in bringing about the second war with England, which Franklin said would be "our war for independence"—the first being only the Revolution, and was the foremost champion of American rights upon the oceans and chief advocate of the duty of America to win commercial freedom.

If ever proof was needed of Byron's dictum: "A drop of ink makes millions think"—it could be found in Carey's writings. Circulated in every part of the land—sharp, concise, and persuasively argumentative—couched in language the simplest could understand and with an invincible logic that the ablest enemy found unanswerable. A wondrous man—tried for treason libel in Ireland; urged to come to America by Franklin; started in business here in Philadelphia by Lafayette. Vigorous and relentless in his antipathy to Great Britain—he became not only one of our foremost citizens—but one of the most useful, valuable and helpful. His talents were varied and his fields of endeavor well-nigh myriad. Any attacks by anyone upon the race from which he sprung or the church of which he was a member, he repelled with courage and learning. He recognized the need of religious instruction and in company with Bishop White, of the Protestant Episcopal Church, he organized and was the first secretary of the American Sunday School Association which survives until this day, and of which, by the way, George Meade was also a director. We have put a marker upon his tomb; but it ought to be only a prelude to the building of a memorial to him by the publishers and newspapermen of America.

All about us are the graves of illustrious men and we tread the dust of the kin and forebears of the most conspicuous and honorable even in the social life of America. At least one of the generals commanding the French troops is here. At his funeral in this church the Continental Congress attended. Immediately adjoining the tomb of Barry is that of another forgotten hero of the seas—Capt. John Rossiter.

Farther along the pathway is the son of the marshal of France whom Napoleon sent as his representative to transfer Louisiana to Jefferson. In various of the corners are buried headstones, almost undecipherable, which we are trying to make legible, telling of soldiers of the Revolution.

In one of the graves is a child of James White—great grandfather of the mighty Chief Justice of the United States—Edward Douglass White. It may be of interest to record that two generations before a State or city supported free public school was in existence in Pennsylvania, this James White left a part of his estate to support the free parochial school carried on then as now in old St. Mary's. Then as now religion and patriotism went hand in hand, and now as then the men and women who gather here and the children who will spring from their loins may be depended upon to be numbered among the soldiers of liberty—faithful to the Republic.

THE CHURCH OF ST. MARY

And this old church itself—how glorious is its history—it has been added to and sought to be beautified—but the old church stands with its service unchanged and unchangeable. "From the rising of the sun until the going down of the same" and until time shall be no more.

It is older than the Government of the United States. It is older than the Declaration of Independence. It is older than the Constitution.

At least four times from 1776 to 1781 the Continental Congress here came in official attendance. Here was held the first public religious celebration of the Declaration of Independence.

The French Minister was testing out the extent of national feeling. It was claimed only a fraction of the people were on the side of the new government. The wealth and the fashion of America were inimical. The adherence of churches now vehement in an assertion of dominant Americanism were then open enemies of the Republic. At the invitation of the French Minister—the Continental Congress, all the officers of the new government, all the officers of the Army and Navy then at the Capital, and the representatives of foreign governments came on July 4, 1779, to this Church of St. Mary.

At that service his chaplain, Abbe Bandol, delivered a sermon so splendidly assertive of the right of America to freedom and the blessings that would come from God Almighty upon all who would espouse the patriot cause that Congress upon reassembling immediately ordered that thousands of copies of the address be printed and circulated throughout Canada and Europe.

Again—at the close of the Revolution—when Cornwallis had surrendered to Washington at Yorktown, the French troops under Rochambeau and Dillon and the Armies of the Republic under Washington and Wayne and Moylan came to Philadelphia, the Capital, again the Continental Congress assembled in this old St. Mary; and there rang out the solemn mass of thanksgiving, as you have heard it today; and the Te Deum was sung even as it was sung this morning; and the banners of England, the surrendered and conquered flags, were placed upon the altar steps as a sign and symbol that God's hand guided and to Him was praise and glory forever and forever.

MEMORIAL TABLETS

Upon the Fourth Street wall of this old church, on either side of the main entrance, we unveil today two tablets, of splendid proportions, recording together in enduring bronze a part of the story I have tried to tell. The committee in charge of this celebration hopes that as the throngs pass by on the busy street they will pause and read and think and be inspired to renewed endeavor in behalf of America; and that they will face the discouragements of their own lives with greater confidence of ultimate success when they recall the sufferings and sacrifices of the Nation's founders.

We hope to awaken new interest in our holy places and arouse in our people the spirit of the Pilgrims.

ANCIENT CHURCHES

Almost immediately adjacent to where we stand is to be found the oldest Catholic church in continuous life in the Republic. While missionaries celebrated mass in Philadelphia as early as 1686, yet when old St. Joseph's was built in 1733 it was the only place on either side of the Atlantic Ocean where the British flag waved where the holy sacrifice of the mass could be openly offered. It is the real birthplace of American religious liberty, for the building and opening of the little chapel marked the beginning of the triumph of that principle which is the crowning glory of our Republic.

At Sixth and Spruce Streets is Holy Trinity—standing today as it was built in 1787. In its graveyard Stephen Girard, the great benefactor of the orphans, whose wealth established and has maintained Girard College in the city of Philadelphia, directed he should be buried and where he was buried; and in the same graveyard Longfellow places the grave of Evangeline, the heroine of his immortal poem.

ST. AUGUSTINE'S

Four squares to the north of us is the Church of St. Augustine. To its building in 1789 and 1790, President Washington and the members of his Cabinet subscribed. It was in St. Augustine's in 1799 that the phrase, "Father of his Country," was applied for the first time, by Rev. Matthew Carr, the rector, in a sermon at a memorial mass following the death of the childless Washington.

In its tower was placed the old clock which until then had marked the hours in the steeple of Independence Hall and by which the signers of the Declaration of Independence noted the passing of time marking the dawn of freedom. This clock remained there until it went down to destruction with the spire and cross of St. Augustine's in the tidal wave of fiery irreligious hate which overwhelmed Philadelphia in 1844.

At the southeast corner of Washington Square—within a stone's throw—are the unmarked graves of the Acadian refugees, who in the Catholic section of the Stranger's Burial Ground, found at last rest in exile as a prelude to eternal peace. The whole locality is crowded with places of historic interest and glorious memories, and the committee having in charge this St. Mary Memorial Celebration hopes that this old church will become a national shrine; that it will prove a center from which shall radiate into every part of our land the glory and the story of exalted patriotism.

What a lesson of good, incalculable, would be taught if all America could know that which we see and hear today; if all our fellow countrymen could visit with us places where the immortal patriot fathers came in reverence; if they could look upon the graves where the great dead are buried.

If we could only make our fellow Americans—children as are we of a common Father—know and feel that before the Government of the United States was born, the Catholic citizenship of America was battling and sacrificing, even as they, for liberty and humanity; and that in the struggle for freedom and independence, then as today they contributed more than their quota; and were numbered among the very first of America's soldiers for the right. If we could make these plain, surely intolerance and irreligious bigotry would hide its hideous head and freedom of conscience and equality be a reality.

And let each of us do his part to make our dead live again; and God of our fathers make us worthy to be numbered with them as faithful servitors of the Republic. Give us strength and courage and wisdom to advance the interests of the United States; keeping her truly free and independent; and so making her the very foremost among the nations of the earth.

Tribute to the Polish People by Hon. C. Wayland Brooks, of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 15), 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech which I delivered Sunday, June 6, 1948, under the auspices of the Polish National Alliance, in Humboldt Park, Chicago, Ill.

Approximately 50,000 persons, principally of Polish descent, attended the meeting, which was in commemoration of the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I was delighted to accept the kind invitation extended to me through the Polish National Alliance to participate in the commemoration of the one hundred and fifty-seventh anniversary of Poland's adoption of the Constitution on May 3, 1791.

The tragedy is that while we celebrate this historic occasion in America no corresponding celebration will be allowed today in Poland.

It is fitting that we should honor this occasion at the foot of the Kosciusko monument in this magnificent park in the second largest city of America.

General Kosciusko will live in the heart of all Americans for his outstanding contribution to the successful struggle on this continent to shake off the shackles of oppression so that there might be created here the government of freemen that you and I enjoy together today.

It should be remembered and recorded today that after General Kosciusko had fought six fateful years in the American Army to make this Nation free he returned to his native country to fight for freedom there. It was in that struggle that this great champion of liberty was wounded and fell prisoner at the hands of the Russians. For 2 years he was held in prison by that same menacing power that imprisons the whole of Poland today.

Shortly after his release from prison he revisited America again only to be called back to help defend once more his distressed homeland.

I think we should recall that before he left our shores, this man who loved liberty more than he loved life itself, drew up his will providing that the funds which he made available should be used to purchase the freedom and provide education in trades for Negroes who then were held in bondage in America.

I could use all of the limited time at my disposal in merely recording the events and acts of the life of this one man, for he truly exemplifies the spirit of the countless thousands who laid their life on the altar to keep the light of liberty aglow during the dark and tragic years of oppression through which glorious Poland has had to pass.

Poland for more than 400 years was one of the vast states of all Europe, stretching over that flat expanse of forest, swamp, and plain that lies between the Baltic and the Black Seas.

In the days of old she was the champion of Christianity against the Mohammedan Turk. Today she is a champion of Christianity against the evil forces of godless communism.

No nation has suffered more from the ravages of war. She has passed through the flames but risen from the ashes time after time, and she will rise again.

Poland has not only been the sad victim of the onslaught of her enemies but she has also been the victim of the cruel deceit of her friends.

While Poland for her size has been one of the greatest contributors of fighting men and women in the cause of liberty, she has made likewise tremendous contributions to knowledge, to beauty, to music, to art, and to science.

America is greatly indebted to Poland for her countless contributions to our present-day greatness. Not only to such generals as Kosciusko and Pulaski, but to the countless others who helped in the intervening years, and the 6,000,000 who help make up our present-day population.

We are indebted to these vibrant, eager, ambitious Polish men and women who turned to the soil of America, who entered the factories and the mines, who sent their sons and grandsons to our schools and universities to become doctors and lawyers, to become leaders in our professional, business, religious, and political life.

It is fitting that we pay humble and sincere tribute to the Gold Star Mothers of the Polish youth who made the supreme sacrifice in World Wars I and II.

There is no better example of the loyalty and devotion of Americans of Polish extraction to the United States than to merely recite the facts covering our military strength in the single year of 1941. Even before the enactment of selective service, Americans of Polish descent furnished 17 percent of all our volunteers in that year to our armed services. Proportionately that was four times as many as the rest of the Nation's population.

These courageous young men came from the homes of the 6,000,000 Americans of Polish ancestry, many from homes of the State of Illinois. Many of them were from the homes of those who converged in this great metropolis of Chicago, where today they help constitute more than 360,000 of our present citizenry.

While the Americans of Polish ancestry were making their overproportionate contribution in World War II, so were the people of Poland.

Following the ideals of freedom established by the Constitution of May 3, 1791, and following and believing the lofty pronouncement of the Atlantic Charter, almost 10,000,000 Poles—approximately 28 percent of the entire prewar population—were either killed, wounded, taken prisoner, deported, or placed in concentration camps. This was an appalling price, for the first country to fight aggression, to pay. A price that made her ultimately the greatest loser in the entire war.

Poland's present sad plight is not attributable entirely to the actions of her enemies, but also to the concealment of appeasement and failure on the part of her friends.

Individuals as well as nations must always be on guard against attack or robbery on the part of enemies, but it is vastly more difficult to defend against the deceit of a supposed friend.

Poland and civilization have and will pay dearly for the secret agreements made at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam. Those were tragic agreements made at a time when we had in being the most powerful Army, Navy, and Air Corps in the world.

As a result of those secret agreements millions live under rules of enslavement and countless millions more live in constant confusion and fear.

We must insist constantly in the future that our citizens be kept informed of the truth of our dealings with the other people of the earth. This knowledge is not the private property of a few individuals. The public has a right to know when the executive branch of our Government make far-reaching commitments which affect all our citizens and may seriously endanger the security of our beloved country.

The very foundation of the United States is based upon the support of its citizens. They are entitled to be kept informed, so that on truth and the truth alone, they may build their judgments.

We must not follow the constant cause of secret agreements and appeasement of forces that would destroy us. We must never glorify again evil forces as gallant allies for political purposes.

Many Polish leaders in America point with satisfaction to the fact that they warned against the treachery of Russian leaders, but they can get little satisfaction out of their unqualified support of those other leaders who deceived them and sold Poland down the river.

No people in history ever sent so many million men, spent so many billions of dollars, or shipped so much material so many thousands of miles from home for victory, justice, and peace, as did the American people.

They were promised peace. They expected peace. They were entitled to peace based upon justice.

Lasting peace requires mutual and sincere respect among peoples of the world; cooperation must exist among nations.

But the American people were not told the truth. We were not told that Russia demanded secret concessions that defied justice, and denied freedom. Consequently, the road ahead is long and hard, for all of the people in the world who believe in freedom. As a result of false promises and secret agreements, America must prepare again her military strength to guarantee her own security at home and her influence abroad.

America must regain her position of integrity and firmness to inspire and guarantee that cooperation which is so essential as a basis for respect and peace.

In the meantime, we must encourage people the world over to fight on and live on to the end that we reestablish once more faith in the hope that liberty and justice will ultimately prevail.

Poland, dismembered time after time, will respond again under such a guiding influence.

As a part of that encouragement, when the Senate was considering legislation to grant further asylum to men who love liberty, I sponsored the amendment which gives priority to the gallant soldiers of Poland who fought on our side both before and after Poland fell. As we open our doors to welcome those who love liberty, after the orphans, none should have a priority above or before we welcome these gallant fighters for liberty.

The liberty-loving spirit of Poland has lived through centuries. It will rise again.

A Political United States Foreign Policy in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I need not remind this body that there is a war in the Middle East. We might call it President Truman's war under the direction of one Dave Niles. It may soon involve the United States and Russia—possibly the whole world. Our stake in the present situation is considerable.

For some reason, obvious to all, Mr. Speaker, there has been a reluctance on the part of public officials to speak out on the issues involved in this situation. Notwithstanding the danger to our own national security members of this body are strangely silent. A hush-hush attitude prevails at a time when militant voices should be heard in an effort to reconcile differences and reestablish peace in the Holy Land. When our security is involved it is our duty to speak frankly regardless of threats of political consequences. This situation does not involve partisanship for or against the Arab or the Jew. I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that many Members and the public generally are confused about the situation in the Holy Land.

Mr. Speaker, a very prominent Rabbi recently said:

The public is confused, the man on the street does not know what it is all about. He may be upset, sympathetic, angry or indifferent, as his knowledge or ignorance or prejudice may prompt. He asks a Jew whom he knows and receives any one of a number of different answers depending on the point of view held by his friend, which may be Zionist, non-Zionist, or anti-Zionist. If his inquiry extends far enough among Jews, he will

discover great differences of opinion among them. The answers may be heated on both sides of the Jewish state question or coolly aloof and indifferent so that he is more confused than ever. He knows that great issues are at stake and that more Jews and many Christians and Gentiles feel keenly about it; he knows too, in a vague way, that the United States seems to be drawn into the controversy. * * * The persisting unpleasant discussion disturbs and annoys him; he would like to see justice done and the irksome situation resolved.

Mr. Speaker, I have recited the above quote from an article by Rabbi Lazaron, because I believe he has correctly stated the position of a great majority of our people. And from this statement it is obvious that even the Jews are not agreed on the Palestine issue.

It cannot successfully be denied, Mr. Speaker, that much of the confusion results from the vacillating foreign policy of the United States, directed by the President from the White House and not the State Department. For political reasons, Mr. Truman forced through a resolution recommending the partition of Palestine, in the United Nations assembly last November. The inside story of events which led to that action remains to be written; it is certain to be interesting. A reading of the Assembly debates shows quite clearly that the partition resolution was approved on the assumption that, once passed, it could be effected without the use of force; that the resolution when adopted would be accepted by the Arabs and there would be no resistance to it.

In February of this year the President reversed himself on partition, and Warren Austin, our member on the Security Council, announced that we—the United States—could not support partition and recommended some form of trusteeship. Well, the Zionists were furious and that was understandable. Within a few weeks the President took a licking in a New York congressional election and his political fortunes hit a new low. His enemies, once his friends, avowed they would "get him." Something had to be done about that situation and the opportunity came on May 15 when the British pulled their military forces out of Palestine. Quicker than a wink the President beat every other country to the draw by announcing the recognition of the new Jewish state. In fact, according to reliable reports, he was so quick on the trigger that he could find no responsible person in the new government to advise that the United States was ready to recognize the new state.

But, Mr. Speaker, that is not so important as is the fact that in less than 2 months the Arabs gave the answer to the promise that partition would bring peace in the Holy Land. The Arabs have gone to war, they say, to protect their homeland against an invader. The atmosphere is one of intense nationalism on both sides. The Arab says, "This is our country; we have struggled against all nations who have attempted to subjugate us; we will not permit any nation or any group to carve another state out of our land." The Zionist contends that a promise was made to provide a homeland for the Jews in Palestine under an old League of Nations mandate and they intend to see a fulfillment of that promise, come what may.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the world believed that the purpose of the United Nations is to promote peace. In this instance it has helped to promote a war in which this Nation may soon be involved. Harsh demands are being made for a lifting of the arms embargo, a sure road to war.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the time to listen to extremists on either side; it is a moment when this country can render a great service to the cause of peace by calling for a truce and a demand that reasonable people sit down and seek a solution. There must be ground for compromise; there always has been. But time is running out. Angry leaders must realize their responsibilities for the blood that now flows. It is on their hands. Failure to achieve peace during the present truce will eventually mean armed intervention.

Mr. Speaker, it is an historical fact that for hundreds of years the Arab and the Jew have lived together peacefully in Palestine. Right now the average Jew and Arab desire to live at peace, but extremists on both sides deny them that right. Can there be peace or peace conferences so long as the Irgun and Stern gangs dominate and terrorize community life in Palestine?

It is of considerable interest, Mr. Speaker, to note that since the outbreak of war Arabs are leaving whole cities rather than remain where they are dominated by the Jews. This is a very significant fact and from it we can assume that this will be a war of extermination unless it is speedily concluded. Time would appear to be on the side of the Arabs even though the Zionist state might win a temporary victory, for they surround the new state.

Mr. Speaker, the truth of the statement I have just made finds support in an article which came to my attention a few weeks ago. Hannah Arendt, in an article appearing in Commentary, probes to the basic realities in the present Palestine situation. She is a longtime Zionist, and has written an article entitled, "To Save the Jewish Homeland." At one point in the article Miss Arendt says that the idea of Arab-Jewish cooperation is not an idealistic day dream, but a sober statement of the fact that without it the whole Jewish venture in Palestine is doomed. She takes the position that Jews and Arabs could be forced by circumstances to show the world that there are no differences between two people that cannot be bridged.

Mr. Speaker, in this challenging article Miss Arendt goes on to say:

> There is very little doubt about the final outcome of an all-out war between Arabs and Jews. One can win many battles without winning a war. And up to now no real battle has yet taken place in Palestine. And even if the Jews were to win the war, its end would find the unique possibilities and the unique achievement in Palestine destroyed. The land that would come into being would be something quite other than the dream of world Jewry, Zionist and non-Zionist. The victorious Jews would live surrounded by an entirely hostile Arab population, secluded inside ever-threatened borders, absorbed with physical self-defense to a degree that would submerge all other interests and activities.

She reaches the conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that at this moment and under present circumstances a Jewish state can only be erected at the price of the Jewish homeland.

Surely this is something of great concern to the leaders of Zionism who are dead set in their ambitions to maintain a Jewish state in Palestine. They are, perhaps, foreclosed from being parties to a conference of Jews and Arabs who believe that cooperation is the way out of this war.

Mr. Speaker, domestic politics should not motivate our action or our decisions in the conflict that is going on in the Middle East. History might well lay the cause of this war on our doorstep.

It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that President Truman has wholly disqualified himself to act for the United States in this crucial matter. He is the captive of his political henchmen who have advised him to plumb for the Jewish state. He has taken sides with the group that is promising him an extension of his political life at the expense of the best interests of this country. To continue a policy that is bound to defeat our program in the Middle East, in Greece and Turkey and Italy is sheer folly and political suicide on an international scale.

Mr. Speaker, this country has a religious and cultural stake in the Near East. Billions of dollars have been spent in the past century in education through missionary efforts. These missionary movements by western Christian churches have a monetary and spiritual stake in this problem. Both Protestant and Roman Catholic circles have also been roused to state their demand that the holy places shall remain inviolate, but their shrines are being demolished by war.

And let us not forget, Mr. Speaker, that there is another reason for cautious action, to wit: our national security from the military standpoint. Every military expert in this country will tell you that we need and must have Middle East oil to adequately maintain our fighting services. We can't laugh this off.

Then there is the necessity to maintain peace in order to insure commercial air lines with friendly bases for round-the-world service. These lines must pass through the Middle East. Our trade interests require the good will of the people who live in that part of the world.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this country is now committed to the promotion of economic and political stability throughout the world and to security for all nations and peoples under the Charter of the United Nations. We can take it as a fact that there will be no peace in the Holy Land, one of the world's great strategic centers, if any one group attempts to prevail against the other. Peace must be our objective there without delay and not by the use of United States military might.

The Silent Curtain Separating Austria From Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 15), 1948

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article entitled "Compassion Inn."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPASSION INN

(As told to Margaret Pearson by Ulrich Haussmann)

You in America hear much about the iron curtain which separates east from west, but of the silent curtain cutting south and north no mention is ever made. As impenetrable as any man-created barrier in existence, this silent curtain separates Austria from Germany. Tragedy stalks on either side—the tragedy of war-broken homes and war-shattered men, women, and children.

But, as in every theater curtain, between the folds of this invisible screen there is a peephole. Compassion Inn, I named it, the real name of the tavern being irrelevant.

Hidden away in the mountains between Tyrol and Bavaria, the inn, through tacit agreement and consent of border officials, has in recent weeks become the meeting place of Austrians and Germans. These people are permitted a 2-hour rendezvous with their families, appointments for which are made at least a month in advance. When the big moment arrives a small boy does what you Americans call the leg work—the errand running and paging. For not until both parties are present are the visitors allowed to step across no man's land.

Through this blessed peephole in the 200-mile solid curtain of silence I have witnessed enough human drama to fill a shelf full of books. Stark, staring tragedy there is, and rich romance as well, and always what you call comedy relief.

How did this rift in the unpartable curtain come about? I shall try to explain.

Even before the "Anschluss" in 1938, trade and travel had created numerous family ties and countless unsanctioned bonds between citizens of the two German speaking countries. This was constantly on the increase after Hitler-dominated Germany had swallowed Austria. Marriages spurred by war furloughs, transfers, and the general "get hooked" craze during those soldier-glorifying times, coupled tens of thousands of men from "old Germany" and girls from Austria, and vice versa.

Then arrived that day in May 1945. Austria began to rise, Phoenix-like—only not nearly so beautiful—out of the ashes of World War II. Borders sprung up again.

"All Germans must leave Austria immediately" was the stern order. The order was carried out. Well, the less said about the manner in which orders were enforced, the better, since postwar methods under Allied supervision smack all too strongly of first-rate Hitlerism.

Women and children, their husbands and fathers for the most part dead or missing or prisoners of war, were relentlessly herded together after 1 hour's notice. Clots of helpless, hopeless humanity—each individual among which was allowed 55 pounds of luggage—were packed in freight cars and shipped over the border. Care Zero.

Formerly when an Austrian girl married a German she automatically acquired German nationality. Many Germans had lived for 20 years or more in Austria without becoming Austrian citizens because of the stiff naturalization fee, the equivalent of $340 at that time. That was and still is a sizable pile of money in Europe. These people had never been urged to become Austrian citizens. According to Austrian law children of these marriages were German.

When the time for separation came families were cruelly torn apart. Many had never seen the land to which were being exiled. Unseen and unheard by an indifferent outside world, floods of tears and screams of anguish made hideous the partings of families on both sides of the war-created border. Silently, irrevocably, the solid wall of silence settled down. The Austrian German border was closed, sternly guarded by Allied troops, and Austrian and German police whose orders were to shoot to kill.

Not until a whole year later was mail service reestablished. All too often the letters carried tragic news of death and illness. Missives of grief and sorrow still shuttle back and forth. But regardless of the urgency of the situation it is impossible to obtain passes for family reasons. Illegal crossing, sometimes tried by the daring or desperate, is punished by months of imprisonment. There is no lawful parting of that formidable 200-mile curtain.

Yet a loophole has been devised—Compassion Inn. United States constabulary and French gendarmes have been withdrawn at points. Austrian border officials, who would not have dared do so before, are now able to give members of separated families a break without breaking the rules of duty. They searched their own hearts and discovered the traditional soft spot was still there. Furthermore, their German colleagues could see the Austrian point of view and finally agreed to the plan of compassion.

Ground floor of Compassion Inn houses the offices of the Austrian border police and customs, whereas the German boom cuts the road 300 feet farther north. The no man's land is easily overlooked and makes skipping or other unlawful crossing practically impossible.

The plan is simple, yet serves well its purpose. The physical hunger of the body and its need for food is the expedient by which return of the individual is insured. For today a person in Austria or Germany without his or her identity card is deprived of the very basis of existence. So if a German's papers are temporarily taken away by the German border officials he can be trusted to journey only so far as Compassion Inn to visit relatives.

The date and the very hour have been arranged by mail. The big moment arrives. The members of long-separated families are gathered on either side of that invisible but well nigh impenetrable screen. The little page boy, catching the excitement of the occasion, runs from group to group paging members who anxiously await the summons. They have waited so long for this moment. Due to the censor-hampered slowness of the mail the exact time of the meeting was fixed a month or more ago. Now at last it is here. Two hours are all they are allotted for the visit.

Many meetings are happy ones. Babies, born since 1945, are brought for grandmother to see for the first time. New in-laws are exhibited for parental blessings. Growing children proudly show papa how many inches they have grown. And so it goes.

But not all the meetings are glad ones. Some are worse than heartbreaking. Old cancer-ridden or young tuberculosis-destroyed people come for the final farewell. The latter arrive in ever-increasing numbers due to starvation and living in inhuman conditions in cellars and dugouts of bombed cities.

Owner of Compassion Inn, a full-bosomed, motherly woman, told me:

"We were all very happy when this rendezvous place was initiated and, let us say, quarter officially permitted. For my business it was a life saver because I used to live on border trade. But aside from that it is the pleasure of seeing people reunited if only for 2 hours. Sit here and watch awhile and you will see what I mean.

"Compassion Inn," she went on, "has been from the first the idea of the boys downstairs—not the higher ups. Officially the 'Brass' doesn't know anything about the arrangement. They neither forbid nor consent. The 'boys' at the border were all front-line soldiers and know what separation and uncertainty means. That is why they are willing to take the responsibility upon their own shoulders.

"I could tell you happenings no end of joy and of sorrow at Compassion Inn. Only the other day an old Austrian mother waited for her German son who had recently returned as prisoner of war from Russia. She was a good soul—a typical mother. Tears of joy ran down her wrinkled cheeks as she showed me a letter written by her daughter-in-law. She simply had to tell me about her boy—he was so good looking, so gentle and kind. He lived with his young wife and his two children in Munich. She was telling me about his happy family life and his love for her, his mother, when the door opened and a man was led by a haggard young woman. The man's face was distorted, horribly disfigured by scars, the skin blue from powder marks and the empty sockets of his eyes were covered by dark glasses.

"The old lady collapsed in my arms. It was her son."

Yes; at Compassion Inn which is the loophole in the silent curtain between Austria and Germany, one sees much—far too much—of heartbreak and tragedy. Yet there are many spirit-lifting scenes too enacted there. And to the uprooted and dispossessed and the separated on either side the unofficial plan of compassion is a Heaven-sent boon.

Air Force Promotions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, recently I joined the overwhelming majority of the Members of the House in supporting enthusiastically the 70-group air force. I personally am proud of the record that the Air Force made during World War II. Its place among our armed forces is becoming more and more important. Most of us were happy upon the consolidation of our military forces under one Cabinet head to see the Air Force receive equal status with our older land and sea services. Some of us regretted, however, to read in the Air Force Times an editorial, under date of June 12, 1948, indicating that our new Air Force might be slipping at this early date into the arbitrary ways of the more moss-covered bureaucracies. I refer to the unfair and bureaucratic promotion directive discriminating against regular Air Force officers who have at some time served on official military or-

ders as Reserve officers with the Civilian Conservation Corps.

The editorial follows:

"EXCLUSIVE OF CCC DUTY"

The board for selection of permanent lieutenant colonels will also select a limited number of officers—Regular and non-Regular—in grade of lieutenant colonel for promotion to temporary grade of full colonel. The announced criteria call for 11 years of commissioned service "exclusive of CCC duty."

Whatever compelling personnel reason was behind this apparently gratuitous phrase (probably an age-in-grade reason), it seems worth while for those who knew the Civilian Conservation Corps to set down here the character of the duty thus excluded from promotion-list service. It is barely possible that the young Air Force, which numbered only a handful of officers and men during the 1934–41 period of the CCC's existence, is not well acquainted with the CCC.

The Army, many of whose top-rankers once served as CCC district and corps area staff and commanders, counts the duty for promotion purposes. Both the Army and Air Force have hundreds of ex-CCC officers in both the Regular and non-Regular active-duty status.

To praise the Civilian Conservation Corps itself is to gild the lily. It was the only one of the myriad projects of the late President Roosevelt universally esteemed. The comparison here is only that of CCC duty with other types of Army and Air Force duty since the policy implies such a comparison or contrast.

At the outset in 1934, the CCC was staffed by both Regular and Reserve Officers. Both were on active Federal service in their commissioned rank and many of the Regulars commanded CCC companies in the same districts with Reserve officer commanders.

The enrollees (corresponding to enlisted men) under these officers were civilian and not subject to the Articles of War. They were liable only to civilian laws.

Moreover, there was a division of authority in the camps. Civilian officials of Government agencies such as the Soil Conservation Service supervised the enrollees during the normal workday; the Army (and Air Force) officers were responsible for them round the clock. Neither the civilian officials nor the CCC officers had authority over each other. They negotiated, sometimes at white heat.

Under such conditions, authority over the enrollees had to be exercised through leadership. It could not be enforced by military law as in the regular establishments.

There was a community problem also. Many communities loudly objected to having Brooklyn or Tennessee or other foreign companies placed near them. The officers had the task of integrating their companies into the communities where they were placed for long periods of time.

Some of the Regulars who had the ill luck to be made commanders of CCC companies and some of the Reserve officers soon learned the value of the Articles of War in the exercise of discipline. For lack of the articles, some of the officers were attacked with knives, clubs, and guns; others thrown bodily into rivers; and others subjected to still worse military humiliation due to the incredible insubordination of tough lads from the East and from the hills who objected to obeying orders.

The Regulars were quickly transferred to other duty. The Reserves who could not run a company without the articles were B-boarded and summarily deprived of their commissions and jobs.

By 1935, the Regulars were in command of all the higher echelons such as districts and corps areas and the Reserves had sole possession of the actual work camps. Within a comparative brief period, the Regulars in the higher echelons and the Reserve officers at all levels were carefully selected men, diplomatic, able negotiators of acknowledged leadership.

The Regulars, of course, get credit for their CCC service toward promotion under the recently announced policy.

The CCC duty constituted superior service experience and training according to the highest authority among those who knew it best. Many of the top-ranking Regulars who knew the CCC are still in the Army, very few in the USAF.

General of the Army George C. Marshall, citizen-soldier, now Secretary of State, was a CCC district commander who commanded two districts at separate periods. Let his testimony suffice to make the case for the value of CCC duty.

Marshall called forest-fire fighting, one of the major CCC duties, the best training exercise available to the Army in peacetime. It had, he said, the principal elements of logistics at all echelons—air and water transport, deployment, the forced march, bivouac, critical communications, the care and utilization of men and equipment under primitive conditions—all against the menacing back drop of great personal risk and consequent officer and noncom responsibility.

As for the result of such training and experience, he told newsmen that his Reserve officer (district) staff at Vancouver, Wash., was the best he had ever assembled in his Army career. At that time he had behind him 36 years of distinguished Army service, including that of World War I, and was a brigadier general.

He had the staff make a presentation of their CCC duties to the staff of the distinguished Seventh Infantry Division, the other member of his dual command at Vancouver, to acquaint them with CCC duties. One of the points he stressed was that the financial responsibility and property accountability of his and 50 similar CCC Army Reserve staffs was the greatest ever carried by company grade officers in any peacetime Military Establishment in American history. Not one of them was above company grade. Promotion to field grade automatically relieved them from CCC duty.

Their administrative overhead were civilian enrollees whom they had to train themselves, starting from snuff.

When World War II began the Army top rankers, privately thanking God for the late President's foresight, called the CCC reserve officers by the thousands. There was sharpest competition for the services of even the mediocre ones, for by Army standards at that time they were not mediocre. The harsh B-boarding had taken care of that.

Later when the AAF achieved autonomy under Gen. H. H. Arnold, it also competed for ex-CCC officers to form nuclei of administrative experience in mushrooming echelons. It will be remembered that the AAF mushroomed from 16,000 to 2,400,000 and met an expansion problem beside which that of the Army was simple indeed.

These CCC-experienced officers together with a handful of Regular enlisted men called to commissioned service, kept the paperwork of higher echelons on an even keel and thus contributed inestimatedly to winning the war. However damnable paper work is to the military in all ranks, bad paper work at the higher echelons usually means ineffective lower echelons performance, as any officer knows.

The value of the ex-CCC officers was recognized by promotion during the war years. Very few failed to achieve lieutenant colonel rank and above. Some became general officers. A large number of the higher echelon CCC Regulars became general officers.

In the face of these facts which anyone can verify, who is there to say that the CCC duty of both Regulars and non-Regulars is not the equivalent of any military service anywhere during any peactime period, for promotion purposes or for any other purpose?

For the evident desire of the United States Air Force to lower its average age and to place in key positions rated officers who understand better the requirements of flight, this newspaper has always had profound sympathy. But that policy is long-range. We question whether it is wise to pass over even to such a limited extent the guiding experience of the small number of experienced administrative ex-CCC officers still in the active USAF. At least they deserve some official explanation in all such cases for their sake and for the sake of the Air Force to be.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article of particular interest at this time by a recognized and distinguished expert in the field of economic affairs, a one-time editor-staff member of the New York Times and presently an editor of the well-known magazine, Newsweek:

BUSINESS TIDES—PRICE FIXING INTO FAMINE

(By Henry Hazlitt)

The principal cause of the present world economic crisis, with its chronic shortages of food, coal, steel, and dollars, has not been the physical destruction of the war, great as that was, but the world-wide mania for government economic controls. Striking confirmation of this in the realm of food appears in a forthcoming article by three agricultural economists (F. A. Pearson, W. I. Myers, and E. E. Vial) in the periodical Farm Economics published at Cornell University. The facts it presents speak for themselves:

The Argentine Government sells wheat for export at $5 or more a bushel in United States dollars. It pays the Argentine farmer the equivalent of $1.59 to $1.83 a bushel and pockets the difference. The Canadian farmer is allowed only $1.35 a bushel plus a participation certificate worth about 20 cents. The United States farmer gets a free market price of about $2.80 a bushel. (Prices cited are those prevailing when the article was written.)

What has been the consequence of these policies? In spite of the desperate world shortage of wheat, the 1947 acreage of wheat in Argentina was 22 percent below the 1935–39 level. In Canada the 1947 acreage of wheat was also 7 percent below prewar. Neither decrease can be blamed on the weather; in both countries the acreage for the 2 preceding years was also below the prewar level. In the United States, on the other hand, wheat acreage expanded as prices rose, and in 1947 was 29 percent above the prewar level. In brief, farmers in this hemisphere responded to price incentives or their absence rather than to verbal exhortations. The farmers obliged to take low wheat prices contracted their acreage; the farmers permitted high prices expanded it.

The articles finds it difficult to generalize about Europe with its divergent price policies, varying degrees of devastation, etc. The only European country it specifically cites is bizonal Germany, in which the 1947

acreage of food grains was 20 percent below prewar level. I shall therefore add some supplementary material from other sources.

It is the official French doctrine that the disastrous shrinkage of the French wheat crop last year was caused solely by unprecedented frost and drought. Bad weather undoubtedly accounts for a great deal. But comparative statistics are instructive. Whereas in 1947 the French acreage harvested of the bread crops, wheat and rye, was 37 percent below average prewar levels, the acreage of the feed grains (barley, oats, corn, etc.) was only 14 percent below. It is hard to escape the suspicion that this contrast has something to do with the fact, pointed out by the French economist Jacques Rueff in the April issue of Foreign Affairs, that the official price of wheat in France is fixed relatively lower than that for other cereals, and that stricter measures are adopted to make the official price respected. In contrast to the government-controlled price of wheat in Canada, for example, the Winnipeg price of rye is free. On December 30, 1947, rye was $4.05 a bushel, compared with the controlled wheat price of about $1.55. Result: The 1947 acreage of rye was 42 percent above the prewar level, while wheat acreage was 7 percent below.

Finally, as the economist Wilhelm Röpke writes from Switzerland in the April 25 issue of the Commercial and Financial Chronicle: In Germany "a lady's hat may be freely sold at the equivalent of more than 1 ton of wheat. We can hardly expect the German farmer to sell his products forever at official prices which not only mean that he is practically giving them away, but also that he cannot go on producing them since he cannot buy with his paper money what he needs on his farm."

In brief, the fantastic collectivist controls imposed by our own American bureaucracy in Germany have put a tremendous premium on not producing food. And in spite of its appalling results in bringing world food scarcity, President Truman insists on a restoration of price control here. That would complete the disaster.

An International Raid on Our Taxpayers and Treasury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it will take time for the taxpayers to discover how they are being robbed by the promoters of ERP, but gradually truth will overtake the fraud and corruption of the international raid upon our resources and the pockets of our people.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting an editorial from Wall Street Journal of June 16, 1948:

THE ERP APPROPRIATIONS

A correspondent who apparently believes that it is wrong to attempt any reduction in appropriations for the European recovery program writes us as follows:

"Is it the usual practice of banks in this country to definitely and publicly agree upon a loan and then allow a minority opinion within the bank to change the sum agreed upon?

"You so obviously avoid this point in your editorial of June 10.

"I would be very much interested to know whether or not you honestly feel that saving money is the primary issue involved."

We are exceedingly glad to discuss the point.

Banks ascertain the purposes for which they make loans. They watch the expenditure. If the borrower uses the money for other than specified purposes, the bank speaks to him unpleasantly. If the loan is $1,000,000 and it develops that only half that sum is needed, it is hardly necessary for the bank to suggest that the borrower refrain from using the $1,000,000; his attempt to do so would be clear evidence of intention to use the money for purposes other than those specified.

As Mr. Cromley showed on this page in Monday's issue the proposed expenditures under ERP cannot be justified in many cases. They include such things as immediate procurement of machinery which cannot be used for years; for assistance to a Belgian tractor industry which last year produced no tractors and farm tractors for Austria and Denmark far beyond the needs of those countries.

Again the ERP appropriations were based on the promise that they would help Europe to help itself and revive European trade. The fact is that trade among European countries has decreased since the ERP was voted. Materials which the countries of Europe could very well get from each other, they insist on getting from the United States. Nothing has been done to resolve the currency mess in which the nations of Europe have involved themselves and suggestions that something be done are resented by the governments of those countries as interference.

If anyone wants to know what a bank will do when a borrower overstates his needs and then fails to live up to the conditions of a loan, let him try to experiment with any bank. And if the bank officers do not act, the Federal bank examiner will have some harsh things to say on his next visit.

Then our correspondent wants to know whether saving money is the primary issue. Well, what purpose is to be served by spending money for things which are not needed, or which at best may be needed months and years hence? Is there something to be accomplished by just spending money; for instance by giving Denmark more tractors than Denmark can possibly use?

Now someone may say these ERP funds are not loans. They are gifts and so should be regarded as on a different basis.

The Rockefeller Foundation is an example of an institution which gave away a great deal of money to finance many worthy projects. That organization has not distributed money heedlessly. It has been very careful and many of the things it did were done with an expenditure far less than the trustees would have been willing to make. They knew very well that just giving out money accomplishes nothing.

The reason that the House Appropriations Committee made these cuts in ERP funds have not been adequately presented. We hope that Chairman TABER and his colleagues will present them in a way that the country will understand.

Reasons That Justify Voting To Override Veto of Bulwinkle Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the President's veto of the Bulwinkle-Reed bill exempting rate agreements by railroads and other common carriers from the antitrust laws, should be overridden.

The bill, as law, would not radically alter rate-making practices now in use, as the President seems to imagine. It would only give express satutory sanction, subject to approval of Interstate Commerce Commission, to the joint preparation of rate tariffs by the carriers concerned under processes that have stood the test of time and meet with the approval of shippers as well as the Interstate Commerce Commission and State regulatory officials.

Such sanction, with accompanying exemption from proceedings under the antitrust laws, would apply only where the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission had been obtained to the basic agreements.

I am unable to understand the basis or the reasoning used by the President in vetoing the bill.

The President states that "no legislation giving a major industry immunity from the antitrust laws should be enacted unless adequate alternate safeguards are provided for the public interest. I do not disagree with this statement as a basic principle, but, it does not apply to this bill.

The bill contains many provisions that fully safeguard the public interest. It is provided that every agreement must be found to be in accord with and consistent with the national transportation policy as set forth in the Interstate Commerce Act. This in itself is sufficient even without considering the many other provisions that provide adequate safeguards. But the President continues with a statement that, even though rates are regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission, "the public interest nevertheless demands that the general national policy of maintaining competition continue to be applied to this industry."

The President appears to be in favor of the very policy set forth in the national transportation policy, without knowing it.

Surely the President cannot be familiar with the language of that policy.

This policy as contained in the act was well defined in the Transportation Act of 1940. It was a policy well considered and thought out by the Congress. It is not a vague and general standard, nor inadequate nor inappropriate. It is broad and comprehensive in its coverage and specific in its safeguards of the public interest.

That act gives the Interstate Commerce Commission, as the established regulatory body, well-defined powers to protect the public against unreasonable charges or discriminatory rates against the shipper. Through long interpretation of the transportation laws by the Commission and the courts, these powers are well defined and well calculated to protect the public.

What better standard is there to be used than that formulated by the Congress in this declaration of the purposes and policies which it wishes applied to the regulation of agencies of interstate commerce?

Nor what better agency to treat of the entire matter of rates than that entrust-

ed by the Congress under the Interstate Commerce Act?

I therefore feel that the President has missed the point entirely in this proposed legislation.

It amplifies and intensifies the scope of Interstate Commerce Commission authority over the matter of rate making. Rate bureaus and associations are now brought within their purview, just as the rates and tariffs themselves have been since 1910.

Approval of these rate association agreements does not automatically carry with it the Commission blessing into eternity, for the Commission is specifically authorized not only on complaint, but on its own initiative, to review its approvals and ascertain whether agreements are being carried out as intended and within the standards set forth.

This conference method of working out rate matters for subsequent Interstate Commerce Commission approval is long standing and invaluable. In the absence of rate conferences, tariff schedules would have to be filed by individual railroads and thousands of motor carriers. The result would be regulatory chaos. Prompt legislative action is needed to insure preservation of a regulated system of rate-making that is overwhelmingly approved by those affected.

The President seems to have in mind, as is also shown in this reference to pending Department of Justice suits, that the bill as passed by the Congress covers some other matters under consideration in earlier bills of long ago. This bill is confined to rate matters only. Other types of agreements in previously proposed legislation have been eliminated. Indeed, the result has been that the only group which previously appeared in opposition to the bill, has endorsed the bill in its present form.

I know of no legislation in my own experience in this House which has had more careful consideration than this bill. Its support is practically unanimous. The same reasons which warranted my own support in urging its original passage, remain unchallenged in my own mind by the veto message, and prompt me again to ask the House for action to make this bill law.

In accordance with consent given I herewith include as part of my remarks, the editorial appearing in the Washington Post June 16, 1948, reading as follows:

RATE MAKING

The President's veto of the Bulwinkle-Reed bill exempting rate agreements by railroads and other common carriers from the antitrust laws should be overridden. For, if upheld by Congress, it would result in serious disruption of rate-making processes that have stood the test of time and meet with the approval of shippers as well as the Interstate Commerce Commission and State regulatory officials. A great deal depends, therefore, upon the action taken today by the Senate on the rejected measure. If it votes to override the veto the chances are that the House, which passed the bill by a very large majority, will follow suit.

In passing the Bulwinkle-Reed bill, Congress sought to remove the confusion and uncertainty that have resulted from a conflict of views regarding the applicability of the antitrust laws to certain kinds of agreements among regulated common carriers. As the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce said in its report on the bill, "a large measure of collective action by and among common carriers is necessary if the national transportation policy is to be effected and if the public is to receive the kind of transportation service to which it is entitled and if rates are to be reasonable and nondiscriminatory." If, as the Department of Justice maintains, rate agreements effectuated through rate bureaus and associations are to be regarded as illegal restraints of competition, the regulatory system under which the carriers have been operating for years will be shot to pieces.

The late Joseph B. Eastman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, who was also director of the Office of Defense Transportation, was an ardent defender of the existing system of rate conferences. He said some years ago that he did not know how the carriers could comply with the mandates of the law and the orders of the commission unless they could consult and confer with one another. He further pointed out that such joint action was always subject to protest and review by the ICC if in violation of the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act. The bill vetoed last week by the President does not impair any of these existing safeguards against abuse. The carriers will have the right, as at present, to propose rates to the ICC, subject to its approval. And the Commission may suspend any proposed changes on protest or of its own initiative as at present. The bill also protects the rights of a carrier to take independent action regardless of conference decisions. Spokesmen for the Department of Justice have made much of the fact that few protests reach the Commission, citing it as an indication that rate bureaus are in a position virtually to compel individual roads to adhere to collective agreements. However, it can just as well be maintained that the small proportion of protested rate changes is proof that the conference method of rate adjustment works very satisfactorily for all interested parties, roads and shippers alike.

The President's charge that the Bulwinkle-Reed bill represents a departure from the present transportation policy of regulated competition simply does not fit the facts of the case. For the bill does not impair the regulatory powers over rate making now exercised by the ICC. Nor does it render the carriers immune from the antitrust laws except as to joint rate agreements of the kind they have long been accustomed to enter into with the approval of the ICC.

In the absence of rate conferences tariff schedules would have to be filed by individual railroads and by thousands of motor carriers. The result would be not competition but regulatory chaos. The integrated rate structure would fall apart and the ICC would be overwhelmed by the burden of work thrust upon it by protesting shippers and carriers. Consequently, prompt legislative action is needed to insure preservation of a regulated system of rate making that an overwhelming majority of transportation officials, regulatory agencies, and shippers consider indispensable and in the public interest.

The pending antitrust cases referred to by President Truman as one reason for vetoing the Bulwinkle-Reed bill may not be settled for some time. Nor is it certain that those suits will result in judicial clarification of the issues raised in the present instance. Incidentally, the pending Georgia and Lincoln, Nebr., suits to which the President was evidently referring in his veto message, would not be thrown out of court by legalization of carrier-rate agreements, since the roads concerned have been charged with conspiracy to fix rates of a discriminatory nature. Such practices are outlawed by the antitrust laws, whether they are engineered by rate bureaus or other agencies. And the Bulwinkle-Reed bill would not legalize such unlawful antisocial practices. In sum, the national interest appears to require that Congress override Mr. Truman's veto of this important measure.

John Hollis Bankhead 2d

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 21 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JOHN HOLLIS BANKHEAD 2D, late a Senator from the State of Alabama

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on this occasion I wish to pay tribute to one of America's greatest public servants. Few men, if any, have served their country with more distinction or more honor than the late beloved JOHN H. BANKHEAD served his.

In fact, I dare say that no family has contributed more to the history of a State or a country than the Bankhead family contributed to the history of Alabama and the Nation during the last half century.

Some of you no doubt know of this family's many fine achievements. Even so, I wish to relate some congressional history in which the Bankhead family participated.

It is most unusual for a father who has served in both Houses of Congress to have two sons and a grandson serve in either or both branches of Congress. Yet, John H. Bankhead, Sr., father of the late Senator BANKHEAD, was elected to Congress, served steadfastly and honestly in the House of Representatives, was elected to the Senate and served there until his death. He acquired a Nation-wide reputation because of his faithfulness and the excellent performance of duty.

One of his sons, William B. Bankhead, was elected to the House of Representatives, and rose by dint of ability to majority leadership of the House of Representatives, and thence to the speakership. I say with pride that no person ever filled this important position with more fairness, impartiality, and ability. He was loved and respected by members of all political parties.

In the meantime, Speaker Bankhead's brother, JOHN H. BANKHEAD 2D, to whom we do honor today, was elected to the Senate. He held that office with distinction and ability, with the admiration and personal friendship of all who knew him.

Walter Will Bankhead, son of Senator BANKHEAD, also served in Congress for a short while as successor to his uncle, Speaker Bankhead. Thus three generations of the Bankhead family have rendered distinguished service to this State and to this Nation in the Halls of Congress.

The Bankhead family has not only given to both branches of Congress Members who have had long and successful

tenure of office, but it also has given to the fields of art and literature outstanding names that are familiar to us all. I know that others in this famous family will carry on the tradition of fidelity to duty which has so aptly characterized their forefathers.

Senator BANKHEAD was well equipped for his successful tenure in the Senate. Born in Lamar County, Ala., in 1872, he attended the public schools of Alabama, and graduated from the University of Alabama in 1891, only 19 years of age. He was a member of Phi Beta Kappa. In 1893 he received his law degree from the Georgetown Law School, and was admitted to the bar the same year. He was the senior partner with his brother, the late Speaker W. B. Bankhead, in the law firm of Bankhead & Bankhead until his election to the Senate in 1930, where he represented the people of Alabama until his untimely death in 1946.

Senator BANKHEAD was a member of the important Banking and Currency Committee, and took a leading part in enacting legislation that played a major part in helping to win the great conflict through which we have just passed.

The many statutes which bear his name are eloquent testimony to the outstanding part he played in the work of the Senate, and the splendid contributions he made to the progress and welfare of Alabama and the Nation.

Although he served well and with distinction on the Banking and Currency Committee, and also on the influential Appropriations Committee, it was on the Agriculture Committee that he probably attained the most fame. He labored long and tirelessly for American agriculture, and was known throughout the Nation as the champion of the American farmer and agriculture's principal leader in Congress. His name was known in all parts of our country as an authority upon all agricultural problems. He endeavored seriously and sincerely to solve these problems, be they problems connected with cotton or wheat, be they problems of Alabama or of the Northwest. Never at any time did he permit partisanship or sectionalism to limit in any way the efforts he exerted in behalf of the farmers of the United States.

The laws which bear his name are too numerous to discuss in detail here. A few which have meant so much to the American farmer, and indirectly to the whole world are:

BANKHEAD COTTON CONTROL ACT (APRIL 21, 1934)

We all remember the desperate plight of the cotton farmers in the early 1930's. This act fostered and protected interstate and foreign commerce in cotton, and was the forerunner of the present marketing quota law. It supplemented the voluntary cotton crop reduction program which had been authorized under the Agricultural Adjustment Act. The result of this act was to enable farmers to grow less cotton, to receive higher pay for cotton produced, to let land rest from exhaustive demands of cotton production, and to practice diversification of farming.

BANKHEAD-JONES ACT (JUNE 29, 1935)

Among other things the Bankhead-Jones Act provided for additional research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture, notably in connection with production, distribution, and conservation. Previous Federal legislation had authorized and financed some agricultural research; but the Bankhead-Jones Act expanded the authorization, and provided especially for better coordination of Federal and State efforts. When matched with equal State funds, 60 percent of the appropriations authorized under the Bankhead-Jones Act became available to the States, the Territories, and Puerto Rico, on the basis of their respective populations.

Under sections 1 and 4 of this legislation, the Federal Government established special research laboratories in major agricultural regions. These laboratories soon had impressive achievements to their credit, among which were new methods of producing the wonder-drug penicillin; findings in the production of synthetic rubber; pilot-plant demonstrations in the production of plastics; and ways of getting motor fuel and even synthetic fibers from agricultural materials. For example, one laboratory produced a new artificial fiber experimentally from peanut protein. Another laboratory produced an artificial fiber from the protein of corn.

SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT (FEBRUARY 29, 1936)

This was an amendment to the Soil Conservation Act of 1935. Features that went beyond the provisions of the earlier act included several of great importance, such as paramount emphasis on long-time soil conservation through improved farm management; and provisions for apportioning conservation payments among landlords, tenants, and share croppers.

Prior to the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act the United States was losing the productivity of 100,000,000 acres a year from erosion alone. Today these losses have been cut in half. In the conditions that prevailed during the 1930's, when farm incomes were very low, agriculture needed special help and special incentives to conserve the soil. This measure, which Senator BANKHEAD sponsored in 1936, was an important means to that end.

BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT ACT (JULY 22, 1937)

This measure authorized loans to farm tenants, laborers, share croppers, and others, to enable them to become farm owners. It provided also for rehabilitation loans to worthy individuals, out of which such persons might purchase livestock, supplies, and equipment, and get back on their feet as solvent farmers. In the fiscal year 1946 the Farm Security Administration approved more than 3,000 applications for farm ownership loans to several thousand tenants or other eligible persons. In Alabama the percentage of farms operated by tenants declined from 58 percent—1940 census—to less than 50 percent—1945 census. But again we must admit that though a beginning of a trend back to wider ownership has been started, it is still only that—a beginning—and the longest and hardest part of the work is down the road a piece.

Senator BANKHEAD played an active part in agricultural legislation almost to the end of his life. In 1945 he was joint-author of the Bankhead-Flannagan Act, which authorized additional appropriations for cooperative extension work in agriculture and home economics. It provided especially for technical and educational assistance to farm people in improving their standards of living, their marketing, their individual plans for farm and home improvement, their youth clubs, and their programs for correcting nutritional deficiencies. Authorized on a matched-fund basis, this measure provided that part of each appropriation under it should be available for allotment on the basis of special needs.

This great legislation and other laws he supported have left the Nation a rich legacy of farm legislation. It was due in part to these enlightened agricultural policies that our farmers were able to increase their production more than a third above prewar level, and thus made it possible to feed our soldiers and those of our allies as we struggled for survival in World War II. It was due in part to these policies that agriculture is today an industry whose assets total well over a hundred billion dollars, and whose quick assets are several times as great as its total debt.

The farmer has never had a more devoted champion in Congress. There are many other things I might say about Senator BANKHEAD in tribute to his legislative genius and to his devotion to duty.

He was a Democrat in politics, but he was not a shortsighted partisan. When partisan advantage clashed with national welfare he acted first for the interest of his country.

In his passing the Nation lost a valued leader.

The gratitude in the hearts of farm people all over America and the love of all who knew him will stand as a lasting memorial to him.

An Editorial in a Million

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following pertinent and timely editorial from the Chicago Tribune which should be of interest to all Members of Congress:

AN EDITORIAL IN A MILLION

The New York Herald Tribune published an editorial on its front page the other day protesting against the action of the House in reducing the Marshall plan appropriation.

Pronouncing itself a Republican newspaper, the Herald Tribune called upon the Senate's Republican majority to undo what the House had done.

The Herald Tribune was offered a million dollars of Marshall plan funds to encourage the sale of its foreign edition. Obviously no newspaper with that kind of a stake in the appropriation is in a position to advise the Republican Party on this or on any other matter.

The ERP (the Marshall Plan) a Fraud on Our Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have a communication from a Gold Star Mother in my district with reference to conditions abroad. I am not going to comment on what this fine Christian sacrificing mother has to say after she has seen with her own eyes conditions in the foreign country where her son is buried.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting a copy of the letter written to me by this Gold Star Mother, who resides in my district. The letter is dated June 12, 1948, and I hope that my constituents will read this letter that they may better understand this foreign-aid racket known as ERP, which I have been fighting since it was started in England and adopted by our own internationalists in this country.

Hon. DANIEL REED,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. REED: As to your fight against ERP and the sending of American dollars to Europe, I don't believe even you can know and understand some of the conditions there as I do.

I just returned from Holland this week. I went there simply as a Gold Star Mother to visit the grave of my only son at Margraten, Holland. I am just a western New York farmer's wife, but I do some writing for several papers from time to time so I made it a point to visit modern farms, poorest farms, an agriculture school, grade and high school, homes of first-, second-, and third-class people and to cover a greater part of Holland, also going into Belgium.

I am shocked for I see greater need for a helping hand by our Government within sight of my own home, and found no one living in conditions as bad as some of our own people who, because they are Americans, living the American way, surely ask no help from anyone and expect none.

Yes, they have a housing shortage but no more acute than ours. They are building thousands and thousands of new homes. As for food, they all eat five times a day and a great deal more than we Americans do.

They breakfast on three or more kinds of meats, cheese, eggs, breads, coffee or tea, jam and cereal. At 10:30 a. m. they have coffee and cakes, at noon a big meal of soup, meat or fish, potatoes, vegetables, pudding and pie; at 4: 30 p. m. they have tea, sandwiches, cakes. At 6: 00 p. m. they have supper of cold meats, eggs, cheese, three kinds of bread, coffee, cookies, etc. There is every kind of liquors, wines, brandy, and beer testing 7 to 11 percent. I saw no more beautiful clothes, shoes and store displays in New York City. People are all well dressed.

The country is wealthy, agriculturally speaking, and they admit that crops are lush and abundant in all sections. Fuel and most foods and clothing are on a ration or point system, but surely they have plenty. A man working there gets paid and rations according to the number in his family.

I went with a post-office inspector through all of southern Holland. True there is still evidence of bombings, but I saw not the poor conditions I could see right here at home. This inspector asked me what I thought of poor Holland. I said "I can't see why you say poor Holland. I can see greater need in the United States." He did not believe me, for they see too many movies and think the United States is a fairyland where no one works and money falls from trees. He said "Surely you won't go home and say we don't need the Marshall plan, will you?" I told him I surely would have to. To people over there it is the gravy train from the United States.

A young man, most interested in coming to the States, came to see me and said he hoped soon to get into the United States. I said, "What shall you do in the United States?" He replied, "Oh, I do nothing." I told him he better stay in Holland, for in the States even the richest had some work to do. I asked him if he served with the Dutch Army, as he is the same age as my son would have been. He said, "No, I hide from the Germans and Dutch," but when the Americans came they found him and took him to serve as an interpreter, so he's most proud he served with the American Army. This boy's father was a general in Indonesia for 27 years.

One Dutchman working at Margraten said, "There's nothing wrong with Holland. All she needs is to tighten her belt and the people go to work and stop waiting for help." You know if you always help people, Mr. REED, they'll never help themselves.

Of course the classes burn me up. There's a class who do nothing whatever, and receive pensions from the Government for various reasons. They may own farms or city property and rent it. The Government sets the rent prices which they feel is unfair.

Where a farmer is respected in the United States, he is not there. They don't know we were ever on rations, too, or had rent control, or what a day's work is as American work. Even the farmer must stop for 4:30 tea and food. Did you ever see our farmers doing so? No.

In every large town they have a carnival playing and the people have plenty to spend there, and to get drunk on at night. Everyone from baby to grandpa is well dressed.

I feel if only I can do the least thing to stop this flow of United States dollars to Europe, or even help you to better understand what you're fighting, then my son will not have died so much in vain. Would Europe send money to us? Bah! Our money might better be spent to help Americans first.

Mr. REED, I could tell you much more, I assure you, and no one can say what I write you is Republican talk for I am a Democrat, but in this matter politics should not be considered.

My opinion is Americans did enough for Europe when they liberated them, and if they stood and looked at 20,000 white crosses in just one cemetery they'd think the same.

England and France can return to normal in time but Holland without Indonesia never can maintain herself as a nation for she cannot export enough to cover her imports—so shall the United States continue to pour money into a rat hole? Belgium is very well off and she has everything, the people want for nothing, stores have California fruit, bananas, etc., jewels and furs. Holland does not have as much luxury as Belgium but more than enough, and more than necessities of life.

If I could be of help to you or our people in any way I'd be only too glad to do so, and if you were home I'd be so glad to talk to you and answer any questions which I'm able to answer.

Let us fight for dollars for Americans for a change.

Very truly yours.

Peace and More

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Paul Breese:

PEACE AND MORE
(By Paul Breese, Ontario, Calif.)

What is wanted nationally and internationally today? Freedom from want, an increased standard of living, saving of national resources, elimination of another world war, cooperation between powers. Summed up, this means the common purpose of all.

At present, Russia is in the throes of mobilization to back up her aggressive policy. England is placed in a position where she must bend as much effort toward defense measures as she does to provide a living for her people. The United States is faced with the necessity of a standing Army and Navy second to none. Where does this place Denmark? What chance has Turkey?

Our thinking is certainly distorted in relation to our neighbors, when we ship munitions to one country, mobilize to defy another, send meat and corn to another, maintain occupational forces in yet another. Aren't we, after all, attempting the impossible in traveling a road with no final destination?

Let us get to the crux of the situation. It is not possible for us to maintain armies large enough to dominate the world, or to successfully assist the numerous nations with their various needs?

Here is the answer: An international police force.

With the United Nations as a nucleus, the organization is already set up. All that is needed is development of international army, navy, air force, and atomic centers in the Mediterranean for the eastern hemisphere and in Central America, for the western.

Contributions of natural resources and personnel into these centralized armies by the member nations would build a force with power beyond the possibilities of any individual nation. This would minimize the effort of any one nation. Take the United States and Great Britain alone—a combination of their efforts and contributions would overshadow any attempt that could be made by either individually. By this method then, Spain could have at her disposal, as we would, an army greater than any. We would be doing a marvelous service to the smaller nations of the world. Where we are now trying in various ways to be of assistance, with comparatively little success, these smaller nations would then be in a position to concentrate on helping themselves.

I am thinking, too, of how much more we would be able to do for ourselves. At present, a great amount of our thinking, our ability, our steel, our manpower goes into war effort—into planes for flight, to mutilate,

to tear down, to dominate. Let us spend the same effort, the same billions, on beautification of our Nation, on distribution of electricity, building of roads, elimination of slums, prisons—amelioration of conditions resulting from disease and for an increase in our standard of living.

Wars are based primarily on greed. For those greedy, they may continue operation by assisting us in our program. The warmongers may still have their outlet for gunpowder, steel, aluminum. We would still need generals, admirals, lieutenants. At the central points (the two police stations mentioned) men could look to a full life of generalship. Those two spots would represent a marvelous outlet for materials for war for those who work only along such lines.

With such a concentration of power it would then be futile for one nation to set up a plan to overpower his neighbor. It would be very definitely inadvisable for one nation to dominate another. With United Nations surveillance it would be as impossible for an underworld to gain damaging proportions as it would for a present-day guerrilla force to become dangerous.

Now, let us consider another important angle. Much thought, effort, time, and planning has been given since World War I toward a plan of international cooperation. But just where does the world stand today in the way of cooperation? Just suppose I walk by my neighbor's door each day with a meat ax in my hand or a pistol in my pocket. Some day he is going to knife me in the back. Isn't this just what has happened between nations in the centuries past? But I have no qualms about such happenings with my next-door neighbor and you have none, because we contribute to the maintenance of a central police force for preservation of law and order. This may just as well be carried out on a larger scale to make for amity among nations.

Planned Economy—The Middle Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAX SCHWABE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the St. Louis Union Trust Co. letter of November 1947:

PLANNED ECONOMY—THE MIDDLE WAY

The ideas of economists and political philosophers, both when they are right and when they are wrong, are more powerful than is commonly understood. Indeed, the world is ruled by little else.

History demonstrates the truth of these words of John Maynard Keynes. The free society of the United States is but the lengthened shadow of two men, John Locke and Adam Smith, who developed the philosophy of individual liberty and free enterprise. Their philosophy is locked in deadly struggle with that of John Maynard Keynes, which today is the principal influence upon the economic direction of the western world. Keynesian philosophy is in the ascendancy in England and western Europe; it is in the balance in the United States. According to the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

"Keynes was Franklin Roosevelt's preceptor. * * * The American people, consciously or not, voted for Keynes' views in 1936, 1940, and 1944." (St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorial, April 27, 1946.)

Keynesians tell us persuasively that there is a "middle way" between socialism and capitalism, combining the best features of both systems. According to this theory, governmental control of our economy will be combined with the preservation of democratic government and civil liberties. As a result, the material resources and manpower of the Nation will be directed to social ends, bringing security and material comfort to all without sacrifice of individual freedom. This Keynesian middle way of planned economy and democratic freedom is pictured by Henry Wallace and our New Dealers as the road to the millenium.

It is our thesis that the middle way is a delusion, that its component parts are mutually incompatible and that a planned economy, in the long run, will destroy both freedom and democracy. It is our thesis that planned economy is not new but is as old as history, that its record is not that of success, but of perpetual failure. It is our thesis that the middle way is not the way to the millenium but is the way to the poorhouse; that it will bring to man, not security but false hopes, not material comforts but poverty, not freedom but slavery. It is our thesis that we are following this middle way with little hope of turning back and with grim disaster as our destination.

Basically there are only two methods of directing and controlling a nation's economy. One is control by the impersonal play of economic forces. This is the method of free enterprise. The other is through centralized, man-directed control. Centralized controls may be operated by the government, by private groups or by a combination of both. The institution of such controls always requires further centralization. They begin as isolated interferences with free enterprise and end as the controlling mechanism of an authoritarian state.

Advocates of the middle way deny that the institution of centralized, man-directed controls necessarily leads to the authoritarian state. As Merle Fainsod, professor of government in Harvard University, puts it—

"Whether we like it or not, we are in fact 'a mixed economy.' There is no turning back. Do these increased governmental responsibilities spell the omnipotent state and the end of individual liberties as we have known them in the past? No one can make a certain answer."—St. Louis Post Dispatch, March 23, 1947.

In a sense, all economies are mixed economies. No economy has ever been completely free or completely planned. By a free economy we mean one in which business activity, production, and prices fluctuate primarily on a basis of millions of independent, individual decisions. By a planned economy we mean one in which Government or private group intervention in the markets and in economic processes plays the decisive role.

PLANNED ECONOMY 4,000 YEARS AGO

Planned economy is as old as civilization. Two thousand years before the birth of Christ, Hammurabi adopted planned economy in Mesopotamia and instituted a code of law which regulated business, commerce, and agriculture, and fixed prices, wages, and rents. Twenty-three hundred years later, when the Roman Empire was far along the road to its final downfall, Emperor Diocletian resorted to a managed economy. As Will Durant expresses it, "to overcome depression and prevent revolution he—Diocletian—substituted a managed economy for the law of supply and demand. He distributed food to the poor at half the market price * * * and undertook extensive public works to appease the unemployed. The majority of industrial establishments and guilds in Italy were brought under control of the corporate state. Such a system could not work without price control. In 301 AD. Diocletian and his colleagues issued an edictum de pretiis, dictating maximum legal prices or wages for all important articles or services in the Empire." (Caesar and Christ by Will Durant, pp. 641–645.)

At the close of the Middle Ages, the Italian city-states and the cities of the Hanseatic League developed as great business and trading centers, with business activities controlled by the city governments and the guilds. This set the pattern for "mercantilism," the planned economoy of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries. In England, during this period, business was strictly controlled by the Government, by state chartered monopolies and by the guilds. For example, the number of iron foundries in England was controlled by law. The Statute of Artificers, enacted in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, prohibited a common laborer or skilled artisan from leaving his parish without the consent of his last employer. Similar controls prevailed upon the European Continent and mercantilism remained unchallenged until 1776, when the American Revolution and the publication of The Wealth of Nations, by Adam Smith, foreshadowed the development of a free society.

The planned economies of the modern world vary greatly from nation to nation. They range from one extreme of the limited planning that took place in the United States under the New Deal and in England from 1914 to the outbreak of World War II to the other extreme of the completely controlled economies of the totalitarian states. Between these extremes are the planned economies of Germany under the Kaiser, the United States and England in World War II, England under the present labor government and those of most western European nations today.

PLANNING TO EAT THE SEED CORN

In democratic countries, except in time of war, economic planning has been resorted to primarily in a vain attempt to evade economic law and to enable the people to consume more than they produce. In totalitarian countries planning has been used to accomplish the direct opposite, to restrict consumption in order to promote the accumulation of capital. This is a fact that New Deal planners overlook. Their past enthusiasm for the Russian 5-year plans completely ignored the fact that Russian planning is used deliberately to lower living standards. Its purpose is to increase capital in the form of industrial plants and equipment, whereas planning in democratic countries is used to subsidize an increase in immediate consumption at the expense of capital accumulation. Democratic planning is a plan to eat the seed corn.

In the short run, diverting funds from capital accumulation to immediate consumption increases the standard of living. In the long run, it lowers the standard of living because it halts the accumulation of capital without which there can be no permanent improvement in living standards.

In the modern world the most conspicuous example of planned economy, prior to World War I, was provided by Germany under the Kaiser. About the time Franklin D. Roosevelt was born, Bismarck invented "social security" and sponsored state guaranteed insurance for workmen against sickness, accidents, old age, and disability. According to Dr. Ludwig von Mises, "All the essential ideas of present-day interventionist progressivism (planned economy) were neatly expounded by the supreme brain-trusters of imperial Germany, Professors Schmoller and Wagner."

Economic planning was relatively successful in pre-1914 Germany, but Germany never achieved a standard of living comparable to that afforded by the free economies of England and the United States.

Planned economy was far more comprehensive in Germany under Hitler than under the Kaiser. The state controlled entry

into business, the supply of capital, material, and labor, wages, prices, and profits. The Brookings Institution comments as follows:

"The Nazis, however, have out-feudalized the Middle Ages * * * out-organized both the corporations of late antiquity and the medieval guilds * * * outdone the absolute kings, who fixed prices of only a limited number of commodities. * * * Total regulation has done a job equivalent to nationalizing. It was not necessary for the Nazis to convert business into a government department." (Brookings Institution, How Nazi Germany Has Controlled Business, by L. Hamburger, pp. 99–101.)

Planned economy in Russia has made business a government department like the postal system. The record proves that it is extremely inefficient. The Russian 5-year plans have concentrated on trying to build up heavy industry. Although Russia has 50,000,000 more people than we, her steel and coal production planned for 1950 is far less than half of our current production. The same is true of nearly every important commodity. Even if Russia's 1950 production goals, which greatly exceed current production, are reached, Russia's per capita production will be only a fraction of that of the United States. Colin Clark, an authority on Russia, estimates the productivity of the Russian worker as only 18 percent of that of the American worker. (Military and Economic Potential of the Soviet Union, address by Colin Clark, Under Secretary of Labor to Queensland, Australia, September 5, 1947, sponsored by St. Louis University.) Despite the inefficiency of planned economy in Russia, it nevertheless has resulted in an enormous increase in productive capital in the form of new industrial plants and equipment. But this is due to the fact that living standards in Russia have been cut down to Asiatic levels so that capital can be increased at the expense of current consumption.

PLANNING FAILS IN ENGLAND

Although economic planning was relatively successful in totalitarian states and in pre-1914 Germany, it is the world's most conspicuous failure in England. This is admitted by an influential advocate of planning, the London Economist, which says:

"It must be confessed, however, that the experience of the last 2 years has considerably dimmed that faith (the Economist's faith in planning). * * * If 'planning' is defined * * * as the net cumulative effect upon the economic system of all the actions and policies of the state, there can hardly be any room for doubt that it has been bad." (London Economist, August 2, 1947, p. 179.)

"Planning as practiced by the present Government is now clearly bankrupt." (London Economist, August 16, 1947, p. 266.)

The reason for this failure is clear. Planned economy may work in a totalitarian state, but it cannot work in a democracy. As Dorothy Thompson expresses it—

"Sheer logic compels recognition that democratic collectivism never can compete with tyrannical collectivism. The latter is at least able to enforce its blueprints without asking the suffrage of those against whom they are enforced. It can compel labor to make them somewhat realizable." (St. Louis Post-Dispatch, August 9, 1947.)

After World War I, England was unwilling to make the sacrifice in her living standards required by war losses, and undertook economic planning in an effort to avoid the inevitable. The driving force behind this movement was the economic and political power of the trade-unions. Their economic power, based on a labor monopoly, forced wages higher than the productivity of labor justified. Their political power was sufficient to force even conservative governments to engage in economic planning and provide subsidies for lower income groups and a broad program of social-security benefits at the taxpayer's expense.

Business was caught between the upper and nether millstones of high labor costs and crushing taxation, and sought security in cartels which fixed prices and divided markets. Free enterprise gave way before man-directed, centralized controls instituted by the Government, by the unions, and by cartels.

The British people demanded maximum current benefits at the expense of future progress. Their economy was sucked dry to provide unearned wage increases, public subsidies, and current dividends. World War II accelerated this progressive consumption of British capital that owed its genesis to the losses of World War I and to England's attempt, through economic planning, to escape the lowering of her living standard which was the inevitable consequence of those losses. England might be likened to a corporation that had grown rich by following the policy of "plowing back" earnings into the business and then changed its policy to one of "milking" the business to pay unearned dividends. Capital ceased to accumulate while Britain lived on its fat. Now the fat is gone.

Britain is still trying to live beyond her means. She is still using economic planning in a hopeless attempt to escape the consequences of the great drains upon her accumulated capital. As the London Economist expresses it:

"What is basically wrong with the British economy at the moment is that, as a nation, we are trying to consume much more than we produce. We do not, of course, succeed in doing so except to the extent that we are borrowing from foreign countries or using up our working capital—but, in the effort to do so, untold harm is done." (London Economist, August 2, 1947, p. 178.)

In western Europe today planned economy is playing havoc and is one of the chief obstacles to economic recovery. It is a consequence, as in England, of the pressure of popular demands upon government for a better standard of living than it is possible to provide under existing circumstances. Present-day planning in England and western Europe has these characteristics: (1) The national currency is pegged at an artificially high rate in relation to the dollar. (2) The Government controls imports and use of dollar exchange in an effort to prevent currency depreciation. (3) Wages are permitted to rise and the Government attempts to hold down prices by price fixing and subsidies in an effort to improve living standards. (4) Vast social security programs provide further subsidies for the lower-income groups. (5) Crushing taxation and unbalanced governmental budgets subsidize this planned economy.

The effect of these measures is almost wholly bad. England and western Europe need desperately to export in order to pay for needed imports and to increase the volume of trade. Overvaluation of the pound and other European currencies restricts the export market for European goods by overpricing them. For example, the official rate of the pound sterling is $4.03, but "blocked" sterling sells in New York at $2.40. As a result, we must pay $4.03 for British imports that would sell for much less in a free market. We buy less and this aggravates European dependence upon loans or gifts from the United States. Overvaluation of currencies stimulates imports by making them cheaper and makes it easier for governments to subsidize consumption and inflate consumer incomes. But since production does not keep pace with inflated incomes, there is little to buy. Price fixing makes it unprofitable to produce, transport, or sell goods. It curtails production, diverts goods to black markets, and aggravates inflation. It encourages farmers to feed their grain to livestock instead of selling it for bread. This requires the import of more grain from the Western Hemisphere. The whole economy is disrupted by false prices which all but destroy the mechanism of production and trade.

ABUNDANCE IN BELGIUM

Belgium alone among the occupied countries of Europe has staged a genuine recovery. It did so by following orthodox capitalist practices. Government controls were used as a temporary expedient for unpopular deflationary ends in order to pave the way for the lifting of all controls and the return to a free economy. According to Egon Kaskeline, writing in the Commercial and Financial Chronicle:

"When the Belgian Government-in-exile returned to their homeland from London in September 1944, they found the country in a stage of advanced monetary inflation. Production had come to a standstill and goods were extremely short. * * * Prices were almost three times as high as before the war, while the wage index was only at 182. * * * But Minister of Finance Gutt * * * had no hesitation to impose on a suffering country the new hardship of a deflationary policy" (Belgium's Remarkable Recovery, by Egon Kaseline, Commercial and Financial Chronicle, May 15, 1947, p. 2632).

Mr. Gutt's first step was to freeze bank accounts and call in all currency of high denomination for exchange into new currency. This freeze took place October 6, 1944, and was used to deflat bank note circulation to one-fourth of its previous level. Nearly all import duties were temporarily suspended to encourage imports. As this action and greater production increased the supply of goods, frozen bank credits were rapidly released. Mr. Gutt instituted a program to reduce government expenses 10 percent and the number of government officials 20 percent. Wages were frozen and prices reduced 10 percent. Marked progress was made toward a balanced budget. This deflationary program paved the way for the progressive and rapid elimination of government controls of all sorts. The government began abolishing controls as early as March 27, 1945. The most far-reaching step in this direction was taken in the decree of April 4, 1947, and today Belgium is far along the road to free enterprise. The results of Mr. Gutt's policy are described by Mr. Kaskeline as follows:

"Belgium is the only one among the formerly occupied countries in Europe which has found its political equilibrium, which has successfully struggled against inflation and which is increasingly winning the battle of production. * * * This country is definitely back on the road toward internal peace and prosperity. * * *" "Today, the Belgian market is abundantly supplied with all kinds of goods, the food situation is almost back to normal, and government rationing is increasingly abolished. Production in many industries exceeds the prewar level considerably, especially in the iron and steel industry, in the textile industries, and in the chemical plants." (Ibid, p. 2597.)

According to the London Economist, "Economic recovery has been more rapid and sustained [in Belgium] than in any other liberated country." (London Economist, March 23, 1946, supplement pp. 9–10.)

The almost insoluble character of the economic difficulties in England and most of western Europe is due to the political impossibility of instituting the measures needed to restore economic health. What is needed is a policy roughly corresponding to that of Belgium. This involves the temporary use of government controls for unpopular deflationary ends followed by the ending of price controls, subsidies, deficit spending, exchange restrictions and other

controls as rapidly as possible. The London Economist admits the effectiveness of orthodox capitalistic remedies in these words,

"Capitalistic economics of the orthodox type can successfully cope with situations such as this [the desperate British economic situation]. * * *. Whatever the defects of the free capitalist disinflation, it does work." (London Economist, August 2, 1947, p. 178.)

The Economist suggests these measures: (1) "Immediate export of coal * * * if necessary at the cost of domestic consumption." (2) To cut food imports "before essential industry is allowed to stop for lack of raw material." (3) "To postpone the bulk of the housing program to clear the way for productive capital projects." (4) "To face the fact that these large capital projects can only be accomplished at the cost of consumption and that they can only be prevented from causing inflation by deliberately cutting the national consumption until they are wholly financed by current savings—which involves creating a real budget surplus. * * *" (London Economist, August 16, 1947, p. 266.

The economist admits,

"These things are terribly difficult for politicians to attempt."

We must recognize that the peoples of England and western Europe are wholly unwilling to abandon socialistic planning for free enterprise. They would be extremely reluctant to put into effect deflationary policies. The political obstacles to recovery are far more difficult to meet than the economic ones. The relation of these factors to the Marshall plan is of immense importance, but is beyond the scope of this letter.

The record of planned economy is a record of disastrous failure. It failed in ancient Rome. It failed as mercantilism. It is preventing economic recovery in England and western Europe today. Its limited successes have occurred either in small countries, such as Sweden, or in totalitarian states where it was employed to build armaments and the supply of capital by grinding down the standard of living.

FREE ENTERPRISE—A SUCCESS STORY

The history of free enterprise is short; its accomplishments are immense. In a brief period of 150 years it resulted in more material progress than occurred in all previous history. This material progress was paralleled by a less spectacular, but even more important extension of human freedom. Free enterprise and political freedom are inseparable. There can be no economic freedom without political freedom, and political freedom cannot long endure if man's livelihood is controlled by the state. It is no accident that the great burst of creative activity which gave to England and the United States, successively, the leadership of the world, occurred under conditions of freedom and was largely concentrated in countries providing a maximum of freedom. It is significant that this material progress still continues in the United States, but came to a slow death in England with the gradual strangling of a free economy. Mr. Churchill's recent eloquent warning to the British people comes 30 years too late. But it is not too late for us to heed these words of his from across the seas:

"I warn you solemnly that if you submit yourselves to totalitarian compulsion and regimentation of our national life and labor, there lies before you an almost measureless prospect of misery and tribulation of which national bankruptcy will be the first result, hunger the second, and the dispersal or death of a large proportion of our population the third." (St. Louis Post-Dispatch, August 17, 1947.)

TOWNER PHELAN,
Vice President, St. Louis Union Trust Co.

Farm Program, Soil Conservation, Price Support, Land Utilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, agriculture is our basic and greatest industry. It has been so well said "As the farmers prosper, so does the Nation."

Our agriculture industry has gone through some trying and tragic experiences. It has had some prosperous and progressive eras. The future destiny of our country and the world depends upon the manner in which we conserve and utilize our soil.

Few people understand fully the importance of a strong and healthy agricultural industry. Few people, I think, understand the full import of our program to conserve, preserve, improve, and properly utilize our land and water resources.

Every year—yes, every day—we are permitting tremendous quantities of our productive land to go to waste. It has been estimated, Mr. Speaker, that we will lose approximately 500,000 acres of cropland each year through erosion, silt, improper land use, and other preventable causes.

Few people, in my opinion, recognize that this devastation is taking place each day and at the same time our requirements for agricultural production are increasing proportionately to our increase in population of about 2,000,000 annually. It requires about 3 acres of productive land per person to maintain what we regard as an American standard of life. Therefore, this Nation is presented with an alarming situation and one that should cause every person to give the greatest of care and attention.

There is no question but what agricultural leaders throughout the Nation and the farmers of this country are in complete agreement that the conservation of our soil and water resources is our most pressing problem. All of us who have given study and attention to this basic problem are unanimous in our belief that our most urgent and imperative need is for a program of conservation that will stop the devastating loss of our agricultural resources and provide a coordinated program of conservation and land utilization in accordance with the needs of American consumers and our responsibility in world rehabilitation toward peace and prosperity.

We have given a great deal of attention to various programs and have made much progress toward our objectives for the last few years. Conditions have made the approach to these problems much more difficult. There have been differences of opinion to be sure, but in various ways we have experienced beneficial results. We have endeavored to protect the interest of those who till the soil and care for our land. We have endeavored to improve their condition in many ways that they may be better able to accomplish this single purpose. However, we have experienced too much of the temporary type of program. We have not had sufficient long-range coordination to do the kind of a job that is necessary to be successful as we should in preserving this basic industry for the American people. It is encouraging indeed that the entire field is being surveyed and studied by so many people and they recognize the importance and the necessity of taking some very definite action in the near future. There are several phases to this approach to which I wish to call specific attention.

SOIL CONSERVATION—LAND UTILIZATION

One of the most pressing needs for a long-range program is something definite on which our farmers can depend in a program of soil conservation by continuing the soil-building practices, formerly the Triple A and now under the Production and Marketing Administration.

This program has been kicked around for the last few years, up and down, until the farmers hardly know what to depend on from year to year. It is unfortunate that there are those who are so shortsighted that they fail to recognize the importance of building our soil and thereby preventing continued soil erosion and would, in fact, destroy the entire program and ultimately the greatest Nation in the world.

Every Member of this House is familiar with the soil-conservation program. It developed under the old Triple-A program. We are familiar with the fact that in 1946 our farmers were assured of a $300,000,000 program for 1947. You are familiar with the fact that even though this assurance had been given the Congress provided only approximately $265,000,000. At the same time reduced the program for this year of 1948 to a pitiful sum of $150,000,000. Our farmers are expected to stop the devastation referred to with this greatly reduced program.

Today we are fighting over the difference of a reduced program on a sustained basis of $225,000,000 annually or a $300,000,000 program estimated to be the minimum to do the job that is necessary.

Mr. Speaker, it is a tragedy to fail to provide that that is necessary for this program and we should not quibble any longer over the amounts but give to our farmers the full $300,000,000 for this program and assure them of a return for such a worthy contribution toward the preservation of our Nation.

PRICE SUPPORT

For years it has been the policy of the Government to provide various price-support programs. Some of these go back to 1938 under the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Others were inaugurated during the war for the protection of agricultural economy.

It becomes our responsibility to face the inevitable and adequate prices for farm products, and commodities is one of those inevitable problems in the whole economy of our country.

For years we have endeavored to reach a goal of parity for farm commodities. Parity is that fair relationship between

the prices of the things farmers sell and the things they buy. I have long since been of the belief that those who produce the food and fiber for the life of this Nation should have full parity prices for their commodities.

As I said to this House in 1942, the farmers of America do not expect, nor do they want, anything more than a fair and equal price for their commodities. They are entitled to an equality on a well-balanced economy program. Parity should be calculated to include all cost of production, including the cost of labor.

This Congress has extended the price support again until June 30, 1950. This is another piecemeal job. This provides an assurance of support prices to 90 percent of parity only for the next year, 1949. We did even more than that during the war, as we assured price support for the next 2 years following the war.

What we need and must have in our agricultural economy is a definite and permanent price-support program on which our farmers can base their production. The method of computing parity in support prices is important, but the real important problem is to have something definite on which they can depend.

Some people try to make it appear that the farmers of this country are in exceedingly good financial condition. It is true they are in much better condition generally than they have been in the past but are only catching up with other phases of our national life. We must not permit them to fall in the terrible plight as in the early thirties when we saw farm prices go down to almost nothing. We cannot permit the destruction of the progress we have made for a healthy agricultural industry and a permanent adequate price-support program.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Commodity Credit Corporation was established as an agency to stabilize American agriculture. It has proved to be sound and the key to the financing of programs both foreign and domestic in a most beneficial way to the agricultural industry. It should be made permanent and, furthermore, should have adequate lending authority as well as flexible for any contingency that might arise. It should be a program for the benefit of our agricultural industry in the stabilization of agricultural commodities.

SURPLUS COMMODITIES

Disposal of surpluses in export markets at competitive cost prices is and is going to continue to be a major issue in protecting the agricultural industry. A well-balanced program domestically will also be important in an adequate distribution and disposing of surpluses that might exist. This makes it necessary to have a procedure whereby a surplus in any commodity will not necessarily destroy the price of the product.

In this connection section 32 of the AAA, which provides for funds for use in supporting farm prices and disposing of agricultural surplus at such times as may be necessary, is to be retained. An effort has been made to dispense with this proviso altogether, but it has proved to be a highly necessary program in the interest of agriculture.

In this connection marketing agreements have proved highly important for the past several years, and through such agreements many difficult problems have been determined, and particularly with reference to perishables. This has been effective in many ways and should be continued as a permanent part of our agricultural farm program.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

For many years it has been the policy of our Government to have a program of cooperative relationship between the United States Department of Agriculture and the respective States. This started in what we know as the land-grant-college program. It was their recognition that extension work carried on by the Department in the States shall be done in cooperation with State extension service. Agricultural research is a part of this program. The cooperative extension work is an educational and research program found from many years of experience to be highly desirable. We have observed that not only in the schools but in the various agricultural extension services that this program is highly beneficial to the farmers in their efforts to improve their farming methods to a greater production goal.

FERTILIZER

One of the most pressing and difficult problems for the last few years has been the shortage of fertilizer and particularly ammonia nitrate. It is interesting to note the increase in production we have had during the war and since of agricultural commodities. Although last year the production of fertilizer more than doubled prewar production and we have had a 4-percent increase this year over last year, farmers have had a difficult time in obtaining their needs that would permit them to surpass the all-time peak production.

For the year of 1947–48, the nitrogen production of the United States is 690,000 tons. We imported 187,000 tons. Our exports have been reduced each year, and out of the total production last year of 877,000 tons, 67,000 was for exports.

In that we are increasing the production available this year by 4 percent and reducing the export to 61,000 we will be using for domestic purposes some 92 percent, a record consumption of the farmers of this country and in my opinion real encouragement toward the building of our soil. Yet, Mr. Speaker, there is still a shortage which we hope to avoid next year.

It is estimated by the end of the year only 6 percent of our commercial production will go for exports. We provided in the extension of the decontrol act only recently that 50 percent of this amount for export in the future must be supplied by Army production. This means that during the next year only 3 percent of our commercial production can be taken for export, making more than 30,000 additional tons available for our local consumption.

In addition, when the appropriation for the European recovery program was considered by the House, the committee very appropriately included a proviso that not less than 50 percent of nitrogenous fertilizer materials obtained for the participating countries with the funds therein shall come from Army production. This proviso was to prevent the diversion of our import supplies and reassuring that this additional amount for domestic supply will be available to our farmers.

In addition to this action we have provided several thousand tons from Army production but made available for domestic consumption. Shipments to certain areas in the Communist controlled countries have been canceled.

These actions, we believe, should assure our farmers for the next crop year all the fertilizer they will need.

It is well to remember that there is no control that can be exercised over the domestic distribution of fertilizer. The fertilizer industry has complete jurisdiction for distributing available fertilizer, just as any other industry producing other commodities. It is the American way and the demands will be met progressively and in accordance with our system of free enterprise.

FORESTRY

One of the most important segments of our economy is our timber resources. The conservation of our forest lands is imperative to the future of our country. In many ways we are providing for the preservation and protection of our forests.

The most effective way of protecting this industry has been through a cooperative program between the Federal Government, State agencies, and private land owners. Under the Clark-McNary Act, the Congress has appropriated funds each year for this cooperative program. We find it necessary to expand the program to adequately protect our timber resources.

In my State of Arkansas, the forestry industry constitutes perhaps the largest industrial program and we have tremendous land potential for growing timber. We have found it necessary to increase the facilities to prevent fire, to preserve the timber areas, and to give adequate protection in every way to this conservation program.

In addition to this, we have experimental stations which are proving very effectively how our timber resources can be better utilized. Small farmers and timber owners are personally observing the manner and ways to improve their timber production and disposal. This is also a cooperative program, encouraged by the Government and carried out by the local agencies and private companies.

SCHOOL LUNCH

For several years we have had a school-lunch program, not necessarily as a part of our agricultural program though it is related, but in an effort to improve the nutrition and the health of school children. This program has progressed steadily and its value has been determined. Authorization has been provided by the Congress and appropriations made from year to year to carry it out. Sixty-five million dollars is being appropriated for the program next year. It is administered through the local school districts, and the Parent

Teachers Association and other organizations throughout the country are rendering an outstanding service in carrying out this program and providing many children throughout the Nation food and sustenance, improving their health, and developing more substantial and better citizens on whom this country must depend in the future.

We must recognize that agricultural reconversion period is still ahead. We are still operating under wartime urgency. While we must retain and strengthen the Soil Conservation and Allotment Act, the agricultural-adjustment program and related measures, including the conservation and preservation of our soil, water, and forest resources, we must look forward to a permanent farm program. In doing so, I believe it to be in the interest of our economic welfare to have an effective coordinated-agricultural program without centralized control. If it is necessary to have certain regulatory features and in making conservation payments to the farmers, the farmers themselves should be responsible and it should be handled at the State, county, and local levels. There are many phases that must be considered in such a long-range farm program which will be determined perhaps in the near future. We must maintain a healthy, stable, and prosperous program on a sound and stable basis.

Shall We Remain Free or Become Slaves?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement which I delivered before the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives on Monday, June 14, 1948:

H. R. 6401, A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE COMMON DEFENSE BY INCREASING THE STRENGTH OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON RULES,
Monday, June 14, 1948.

The committee this day met at 11 o'clock a. m., Hon. LEO E. ALLEN, chairman, presiding, for further consideration of H. R. 6401.

STATEMENT OF HON. DEWEY SHORT, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI

The CHAIRMAN. We are going to hear two witnesses this morning. We have not heard anybody from the Committee on the Armed Services who is opposed to this bill. We will hear Mr. SHORT and then hear the chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services, Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. SHORT was the first one to sign the minority report on this bill. Mr. SHORT.

Mr. SHORT. First, I wish to thank the members of this committee for the opportunity of being heard at this time. At the outset, I wish to say that the chairman of our Committee on the Armed Services has been eminently fair at all times in connection with this matter. We had rather long and exhaustive hearings on this subject, and we heard people of every kind and shade of opinion. I do dislike very much to find myself in disagreement with my good friend and able chairman from New York, Mr. ANDREWS; and surely I have always had enough trouble coming to me without searching for it. I anticipate some of the harsh criticism that might possibly result from my appearing before this committee this morning on this bill.

This is a matter to which I have devoted many years of thinking and in connection with which I hold firm and deep convictions; therefore I feel compelled, out of a sense of both conscience and duty, to appear before you gentlemen this morning.

If we should become immediately involved in war, we should find ourselves in a most precarious position because we do not have the equipment, the tools, or the weapons of war with which even our present military and naval forces could fight very long. I want to repeat what I said here a day or two ago, namely, that I think it is asinine and stupid to think of building up and spending billions of dollars on our armed services without first assuring ourselves of an adequate stock pile of critical and strategic materials for these services to use. Therefore, I am hoping that this committee will report favorably the Russell bill, which would provide these strategic and critical materials of war.

Mr. Chairman, it is incredible to me that within 3 years after the close of the last war—after we had won two wars in Europe and Asia, in the Atlantic and the Pacific—we seriously propose to adopt the method—the very technique—which we paid so much in blood and treasure to destroy. Whatever the proponents and opponents of this measure may say, I think that history is on the side of those who oppose peacetime military conscription. Every major country of any size or importance that has adopted peacetime military conscription has inevitably and irresistibly been led down the path to war, defeat, and destruction. Germany, Japan, and Italy all had peacetime military conscription. We whipped slave nations twice in our own generation. France and Poland had universal military training. France felt perfectly secure behind the Maginot line, and that, perhaps more than anything else, lulled her into a false sense of national security. Modern wars are not won by men alone or obsolete methods, but by research and technological developments, and many of us think we could build up a more adequate power for national defense in ways other than resorting to the old, tried, and disproved methods of peacetime military conscription. I think freemen have always produced more and outfought slaves, and even the members of the military themselves will tell you that a volunteer army is the best on earth.

Men love liberty because in liberty there is freedom and strength. When we regiment a society of men they are no longer freemen. Their consciences stop. They do not have free, scientific opinion and opportunity to pursue truth as we usually do in our Republic.

There is no difference in opinion between members of our committee and members of this committee so far as national defense is concerned. We all know that, in this uncertain world, troubled as it has been and as it will be until the United Nations Organization becomes firmly established, with an adequate international police force to effect its decisions, the United States, which is left supreme among the sovereign nations, must of necessity remain strong on land, on the sea, and in the air. We all grant that.

We do not disagree so far as being able to defend ourselves is concerned. We agree on the goal, but differ on the method to achieve it. I do not know what nation, if any, is going to attack us soon. I am sure that Germany, Italy, and Japan are not going to jump onto the United States or any other nation very soon. I do not expect the United States to be bombarded by Greek planes or Texas to be overrun by the Rumanian hordes.

True, the international situation is tense. It has been aggravated by our own bungling. As to Russia, I have been all through Russia. She is more or less an enigma. I do not speak with dogmatic finality, but I know as much about the social, political, and economic conditions in Russia, if not more, than some of the high brass and braid. I have visited Russia and her satellites as well as other European countries, and, also, as a student of history, I am as well, if not better, acquainted with their background.

First of all, Russian economy is bad. The standard of living there is low. She has plenty of misery at home, considering that what Germany did not destroy in her march from Berlin to the gates of Leningrad, Moscow, and Stalingrad, and back again, she herself destroyed in her scorch-the-earth policy during the war. I am not fearful, so long as the United States has a Navy larger than all the other navies in the world, the most flexible and efficient Air Force the world has ever seen, particularly since we have provided a 70-group air force; so long as we possess the greatest industrial output, not only potential but actual, in the world; because it was our productive capacity in action that won the last war. I am not fearful so long as we have the atom bomb and the latest weapons.

Our vast resources were bled white in carrying on two successful wars, and I feel that with increasing expenditures and the tremendous demands upon our resources we may very seriously weaken our domestic economy and become the object of successful attack. That fear is strengthened by the amount of goods we are sending to Europe and elsewhere under the ERP. Russia hopes for our economic collapse.

Before our committee the representatives of the Navy and the Air Force frankly testified that they can get all the men they need through the volunteer method. I have been in continual contact with young men fit for the service. I have received numerous letters from those who are not only willing but eager to go back into the Air Force and the Army. There are thousands and thousands of rejected applications in the departments today.

If we are attacked, we are going to be attacked from the air and from the sea, and so long as we remain supreme in the air and on the sea I do not think we will have much to worry about; and we should change the emphasis from war talk to peace talk and to cooperation, mutual help, and understanding.

One reason we have a shortage of personnel in the Ground Forces is, of course, that service is not so attractive as are other branches of the service. I think it is very clear and unmistakably true that the Army has circumvented the clear intent of the Congress in the way it has treated the National Guard and particularly the Reserve Corps. When the shooting stopped these discharged soldiers were supposed by law to go automatically into the Reserve Corps. The Army completely disregarded that law. We have more than 2,000,000 in the Reserve Corps, but I do not know of a single unit in the Reserves that is fully and adequately equipped. I think our National Guard and Reserve Corps have been sadly—but I would not say with malicious forethought—neglected and shamefully treated. I do not say they have been neglected and ill treated with premeditation. I will read a little from our hearings about this matter. I want to read what General Evans and General Reckord told our committee. I tried in our hearings to bring out their position. General Evans told our committee that the Army had done very little to help the Reserve Corps. He said the Army had not equipped the Reserve Corps properly, that it had assigned about 80,000 to pools but not to any specific unit or units.

He said: "I am not talking about procurement. All I am urging and begging and what I have been doing for 3 years is to have somebody do something with what we have now." General Evans agreed that there would be no need for a draft, UMT, or anything else if the Army had done its duty and supported the Guard and the Reserves, having made a sincere, earnest, and determined effort to build them up.

Mr. HARNESS. Why did the War Department refuse to carry out the law and place those who were discharged from the Army at the conclusion of the war in the Reserve Corps?

Mr. SHORT. It wished to create a UMT system or reenact a draft law. Let me say that I have as high regard and respect and as deep gratitude for the admirals and the generals who did a superb job during the war as anybody else. We could not place them upon too high a pedestal, but you and I know that in time of peace the two things in which the Army and the Navy are most interested in are pay and promotion. They are interested in stars and braid, rank and pay. Naturally they have a selfish, vested interest, just as have Members of Congress and others. They are simply human beings. They are not angels. They are like Members of Congress and other large bodies of men.

The reason they have neglected the National Guard and the Reserve Corps is to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money, and I think illegally, as was discovered by a special committee headed by a member of this committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS], to put across UMT. If the Army had spent $1 for every $10 it spent to propagandize the UMT and a draft law, we would not have any shortage of men in any of the armed services today.

Mr. RICH. Will anybody be demoted if this bill does not become law?

Mr. SHORT. The larger the Army the more high-ranking jobs available. No minister ever had a congregation big enough and no general ever had an army big enough. I think that accounts for the current shortage in the Ground Forces only. The Navy and the Air Forces have testified before our committee that they can get all the men necessary without imposing upon us a discredited system that has led every nation of any consequence and importance that adopted it to utter ruin and defeat.

If you want some constructive suggestions, I can give them. I think that the Army would do well to do five things I have in mind in accordance with our historical traditions, without a radical departure from the American ways of life, and get all the men it needs. First, if they would accept shorter terms of enlistment. Congress enacted a law providing for 1-year and 18-month enlistments, but the Army cut that out more than a year ago. They require a man to enlist for 3 years. They have lengthened the period of enlistment and that cut down the volunteers. Secondly, if they would reduce the number of required points from 80 to 70. During the war they took men passing an aptitude test of 59 points. Following the war they boosted the requirement to 80 points, so that it would require a classical scholar in Latin and Greek or a Philadelphia lawyer to answer the preposterous and unusual questions propounded. You tried that examination out in your own committee.

An experienced cook wants to enlist, but because he cannot attain 80 points he is rejected. They take a high-school boy who can pass the 80 points but with no experience in cooking. He could not boil water without scorching it. That is one sample of our Army red tape.

General Eisenhower testified that he was under the impression that if they would lower the points from 80 to 70 many men within that 10-point bracket could qualify and perhaps they could reach the number required. Third, better housing should be provided, particularly for the sergeants with families. After all, armies are pretty much run by sergeants and wars are pretty much won by them. Those of us who have had the honor of being buck sergeants will not argue that, and especially those in the infantry, where some of us were. We need better housing because a lot of the old Army men are married and they are not content to live in a chicken coup or a drygoods box without any conveniences of life.

Fourth, we should pay more attention to the National Guard and the ROTC in our colleges, particularly the land-grant schools, and to building up properly the Organized Reserves. If that should be done, I think we can meet all our military requirements and remain strong. I do not think we will divide the American people if we do that, as we will divide them by the enactment of this pending bill. I fear that if we pass a bill calling for peacetime military conscription—call it UMT or soften it by calling it a rose, but anything smelling so sweet is the same thing, and the same is true of a polecat—we will thereby go into the American home and disrupt American life. We will take 18- to 22-year-old boys in the formative and plastic period of their lives, take them from home, from church, from school, which bodes ill. It is bad enough to segregate a body of men of any age, but especially during the ages I have given. I do not know and you do not know what habits they will form or what thinking will be framed. They will be indoctrinated in war and taught the nice art of killing. They will not be able to talk back in the Army. They will have to obey, and I admit that many of them need more discipline than they are getting today. What this country needs is more internal conviction and less external compulsion. There is great and pressing need for a moral awakening of dynamic proportions. I lived in barracks with teen-age boys more than 25 years ago. I would not particularly choose that as a spot to develop character.

Of the boys that would be drafted under this bill, I know many of them would not go back to school to finish their education. If we interrupt their education for 2 years, we are going to take away the earning capacity of those kids from many families that need it. That will have a serious impact on our economy.

I do not want to trespass at great length upon your time. We could talk indefinitely about this complex and vitally important subject.

In January when we met the Congress overwhelmingly voted, with only two dissenting votes, eleven billion for the armed services. Everybody wants the country to remain strong and safe. Thereafter, in a supplemental appropriation we gave another $3,400,000,000 when we were frightened by the President's message of March 17, but we have cooled off by now. Then we put up $882,000,000 for the 70-group air force. If you pass this proposed legislation, you will have to spend about two billion for drafting machinery and equipment. You will have almost as many men administering the draft law as will be drafted. Then to equip 25 new divisions it will take an additional four billion. Those items make $21,000,000,000 for national defense alone. If you add seven billion on account of Veterans' Administration, they make an annual expenditure of $28,000,000,000 for national defense and care of soldiers of our wars. The interest charge on our national debt will be five and one-half billion at the low rate of 2 percent. That calls for a budget of thirty-three billion. That covers only three things, national defense, veterans' relief, and interest on the debt. We shall not have spent anything to take care of the ordinary functions of government. How much longer can we continue down that road?

The Army, the Navy, and the Air Force are only one arm of our national defense. The first line of defense of this country is a sound economy and financial solvency. We need a going industrial system to support these armies and navies in time of conflict. We must have that first. This legislation will not only force us to establish priorities, but perhaps even rationing. The bigger we build up our armed forces, to scatter them in the role of international policemen, to prevent aggression not only without but within freedom-loving countries, the greater and more terrific will be the drain on our national resources. We know that in fighting and winning two wars in our generation we came near pumping many of our oil wells dry; we depleted our supplies of copper in Montana and Arizona; we denuded our forests in the great Northwest; we have exhausted many of our lead and zinc mines; we depleted our iron-ore supply until the manufacturers of automobiles and other industrial machinery are becoming genuinely alarmed and saying we shall have to import iron ore from new discoveries in Labrador and Brazil. Our expenses in connection with national defense, coupled with foreign aid and relief under the Marshall plan, will lead us where in a few years? I shudder to think of that. Of course, we will keep up our Navy. We are going to keep up our Air Force, and I hope we will carry on scientific research and technological developments to build up a strong, centralized intelligence corps, which corps is one of the weakest links in our national defense, to learn what is actually going on behind the iron curtain.

I am very much opposed to this pending bill; I have worried a great deal about it, so I do not sleep well at nights, and that is not a matter of conscience. I worry about what is going to happen if we adopt the thing we fought and bled and died to destroy. I do not think conscription is necessary. I think it would weaken rather than strengthen our country. I think it would be a sign to the remainder of the world that we are going to enter upon an unlimited armament race; we are going to adopt the system and practices that Germany, Japan, and Italy tried with such utter devastation.

In this age of might, money, and materialism I wish we could employ faith and hope and love. We have lost faith in ourselves, in our former successful practices. That may sound like the language of a preacher, I know. We have tried everything but love, cooperation, and understanding. Unless we place a little more emphasis on spiritual qualities, and not place all our faith in horses that run upon the rocks, we are doomed to failure and disappointment, I fear.

Mr. COX. What effect would moral suasion have in such a condition?

Mr. SHORT. GENE, I went through Russia in 1931. They are a backward country. They are poor people who have lived for centuries under the heel of tyranny and the yoke of oppression; but I tell you with confidence that the masses of the Russian people do not want war. They do not want to fight anybody. They are worn out. They are simple human beings. They possess many admirable qualities. But I would not trust the gang of cutthroats in the Kremlin any more than I would trust Hitler and his outlaws. If we could penetrate that iron curtain, I think it would be our greatest hope, because the Russian people and her satellites have bitten off more than they can chew. Stalin has made the same mistake Hitler made. He has gone too far. Like Hitler, he finds that he could not supply his army so far away from his home bases. Hitler made that mistake, and, like Napoleon, he perished.

I was much interested in reading an article about Russia by Henry J. Taylor, in the Reader's Digest, this month. Russia has three times as much area as we have, but

it is closer from Washington to Leningrad than it is from Leningrad to Vladivostok. Millions of acres of forestry in Russia have never heard a woodsman's ax. Many areas of ores have not been developed. There are only 3,000,000 or 4,000,000 Russians who are Communists; and the Russian Government is doomed to collapse the same as the Nazis did, because both were, and Russia is, totalitarian and rule by force and terror and murder. The people in Russia have a pistol to their temples and a bayonet to their backs. They are well acquainted with the concentration camp and the firing squad.

I can say this, I think, without revealing secrets given in executive sessions of our committee, I do not believe our military fear very much an immediate war with Russia. Generals Eisenhower, Marshall, and others have said there is no grave danger of immediate conflict with Russia. The greatest mistakes were made at Tehran and Yalta and apparently ratified at Potsdam.

Mr. COX. Is not this a continuation of appeasement?

Mr. SHORT. No. I do not think drafting of 250,000 young men and setting up a system of technique that has been discredited is going to stop Russia.

Mr. COX. Do our armed services need to be strengthened?

Mr. SHORT. Yes; I think they should be.

Mr. COX. If we are unable to do that by the volunteer method, what must we do?

Mr. SHORT. By carrying out the five constructive suggestions that I have already made, I think we can do the job. Let me say to you, GENE COX from Georgia, that your political philosophy is much like my own. It would surprise you to know the number of admirals and generals who, when one talks to them off the record, in his office, agree that we do not need a draft; but they are hog-tied. I do not want this country to fall under a military control and domination. If it does, we can kiss freedom good-by. I know many in the armed services who do not want the draft.

Mr. COX. Defense of country is a privilege and an obligation, is it not?

Mr. SHORT. Yes. Responsibility always goes with freedom.

Mr. COX. The responsibility should be equitably distributed.

Mr. SHORT. Yes; but this bill will not make that distribution.

Mr. COX. Why not?

Mr. SHORT. It will be a small percentage of the ones. We cannot have exact justice in this bill—in life. There always will be inequities. If this is such a good thing, why are not more men enlisting; why are they not availing themselves of it? There is no law to keep them out. If this is going to build the good health and morals and afford an education, give fine medical treatment, and even retirement, why do not more avail themselves of it?

I do not want to forget to bring out three things we have done recently in Congress to correct our present position. First, we voted a 70-group air force; second, 2 months ago we voted inactive-duty pay; third, we provided retirement benefits. I think those three measures, particularly the last two, will do much to increase volunteer enlistments.

Mr. COX. You mentioned as a reason for opposing this bill that by its adoption we will spend ourselves white, which will invite attack from abroad. Are we to understand that we must build an armed force to where we could adequately defend our country against all possible attacks?

Mr. SHORT. Yes. Trust God, but keep your powder dry. We must at all times work for peace. I do not know any nation that would want or dare to attack us.

Mr. COX. You said that to spend ourselves white would invite attack upon us.

Mr. SHORT. Yes.

Mr. COX. And you say that you fear by adopting this we will spend ourselves white.

Mr. SHORT. The money we would spend under this bill to get 250,000 soldiers would double present pay of servicemen. This is more expense than the inducements we could offer. I am not strong for giving bounties for serving our country.

Mr. COX. Your argument is not new to me. I have been reading it as an announcement of a particular individual much in the public mind.

Mr. SHORT. Some of the people who have agreed with me on this make me skeptical as to the soundness of my position. I do not like to be found in their company.

Mr. COX. You are making headlines for them this morning.

Mr. SHORT. Perhaps so, but I feel that only in our liberty is there strength. I feel that if we are going to saddle peacetime military conscription upon the American people we might as well join the Nazis and Japanese, the radicals, and commies.

Mr. COX. Could you in any case justify conscription?

Mr. SHORT. Yes; in time of war.

Mr. COX. Suppose the volunteer system does not produce the necessary results in time of peace?

Mr. SHORT. Let us try it honestly and sincerely. And determinedly.

Mr. COX. The testimony before your committee showed that the Army was being reduced progressively every month. The same was true of the Navy. The only branch of the service that maintained its strength was the Air Corps.

Mr. SHORT. The reason the strength was reduced was that the Army lengthened the term of enlistment and raised the physical and mental standards for enlistment. The Air Force and the Navy have rejected more than 50 percent of all applicants, and the Army has rejected 33.33 percent of applicants. The Army has rejected a third of all who applied to enlist.

The CHAIRMAN. To some of us who are opposing the draft it has been said we voted for a large Air Force, and along with it must come sufficient personnel. They said, "How can you vote for an increased Air Force and not for personnel to operate it?" Yet they have more men in the Air Force than they want.

Mr. SHORT. I do not want to get involved in the rivalry between the armed services.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not true that the history of war shows it takes longer to provide equipment than trained personnel? In the beginning of the last war were they not drilling with broomsticks instead of rifles?

Mr. SHORT. Yes. You should vote out the Russell bill before considering the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Referring to Russia, has she ever used in aggression a regular military machine? Does she not go into a country and spread the principles of communism, without marching armies into a country?

Mr. SHORT. She depends upon psychological penetration and infiltration. They "divide and conquer," as did Hitler. The Russians are using that technique here.

The CHAIRMAN. Some people say everybody is for this proposed draft. If that be true, the young men would already be in the Army and a draft would not be necessary.

Mr. SHORT. You received 400 telegrams and 200 letters this morning opposing this draft.

The CHAIRMAN. There were 51 against to 1 for the draft.

Mr. RICH. That [indicating] is what I received. All, except one, are opposed to a draft law in peacetime.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not a fact that we used to feel a pride when we read in the history books that our ancestors came here to get away from military conscription?

Mr. SHORT. That is one reason the people from abroad came here.

Mr. COX. Speaking for the people of my district, I swear to you that up to the present time all the communications I have received on this subject from those in my State are for this draft law.

The CHAIRMAN. Why do they not volunteer for service?

Mr. COX. Prior to the last war, when we were relying upon volunteer enlistments, in my district of 300,000 more men volunteered for the armed services than volunteered in some States with a bigger population. I know that to be true.

Mr. RICH. They all know how you will vote, and there is no use writing to you. All my correspondents say they do not want a draft. Only one favored it. I am unalterably against this proposal.

Mr. SABATH. I have a great deal of confidence in Mr. SHORT, and I appreciate that he has a broad and penetrating knowledge of this subject and the historical background involved. I have observed that wherever they have had compulsory military training in time of peace, they always went down to defeat and disaster. That is an unmistakable fact of history. People generally are against militarism with its inevitable consequences, and it would be a reversal of age-long policy for us to conscript our young men in peacetime. Our country does not want militarism and a running of the country by the military, taking away the rights and liberties of civilians. Those with the brass hats do not do so well as overseers, even in their own fields of activity. It is our traditional policy that the military always be subordinate to the civil, certainly in matters of national policy.

Mr. SHORT. I could not disagree for one moment with your contention or observation. I think it is an accurate, historical statement.

Mr. SABATH. Large armies and peacetime conscription have not helped these nations that have fallen beneath the weight of their armaments. I refer to these countries that depend upon force to create a standing army. In wartime, of course, we have to conscript men in order to equalize the burden of defending the country.

Mr. SHORT. When leaders build up a great army there is a great temptation to use it sometimes.

Mr. SABATH. I, too, have talked privately and confidentially with some of the military gentlemen, and they give me the same information that you have received. They are, by traditions of the service, forced to support anything, no matter how illogical or nonsensical, if it is service policy and that word comes down from on high. These officers admit to me confidentially that there is really no need for a draft law, especially if an earnest, genuine effort were made to acquire the number of men the Army says it needs; while, as has been repeatedly said here, the Air Force and the Navy have all the men they want. It is largely a matter of treating the servicemen decently in the Army, providing them proper housing when they are married. If service conditions were improved, they would get all the men they needed by the traditional volunteer method. I remember that we fought the Spanish-American War with a volunteer Army plus the National Guard. If your five recommendations should be followed by the Army, I have no doubt we would get the 250,000 men needed by the Army or allegedly needed by it. I want to congratulate you on the splendid, logical, and devastating statement you have made. To me, it seems unanswerable.

In the last 3 days I have received 350 or 450 communications, mostly telegrams, from church organizations, civic organizations, labor groups, State and municipal officers, and other leaders of public opinion in my State and elsewhere, all patriotic men and women who dearly love our country and desire above all else to retain our hard-won freedom and liberty; and they, with only a very few exceptions, are urging that we not yield to the military gentlemen, who would benefit by the enactment of this bill, in that

they would receive increased rank which means increased pay, regardless of the actual need for their services in the higher ranks. It is the same old story. Among those who do not favor this proposal are former Secretary of State Byrnes, Mr. Sumner Welles, and many other gentlemen of experience and learning, who say our country is not in any immediate danger of attack. The President himself says the same thing. I think we should avail ourselves of the opportunity to effect a real peace by negotiation. Why cannot those who frame treaties after wars sit at the table in advance of war and arrange an amicable adjustment of differences; why can they not do their good work before the killing starts and the destruction of property is under way? As has been pointed out repeatedly before this committee very recently, we no longer have the natural resources to squander in war making. We are having hard enough time trying to get materials to build housing that is imperative, and certainly we have none to shoot away in the unmanly business of war.

Mr. SHORT. Just what you have said corroborates a statement I made a few minutes ago. On an issue of this kind and nature, in connection with which our people are sincerely, honestly, deeply, and intensely divided, sharply divided, how foolish, in my opinion, it would be to enact the pending bill at this time. I hope we can have some semblance of unity and solidarity such as we had during the late war, when we cooperated and worked and pulled together. Many of us deeply feel, with convincing evidence at hand, that we cannot continue a wartime economy in time of peace without involving us in another conflict.

The CHAIRMAN. Some people would have us believe that those who oppose this draft law are allned with Stalin, while, as a matter of fact, great educators, farmers, labor groups, and many others are against this proposal.

Mr. SHORT. I dislike to have people say that those who are opposed to peacetime conscription are friendly toward Stalin and Wallace. I volunteered with two brothers and many kinsmen in the First World War, and two of them are now pushing up poppies overseas. Also I had many relatives in World War II, including a brother in the Eighth Air Corps and a nephew, with two little girls at home, who went to the South Pacific; and they do not want this draft. We want none of it. That is their testimony. They volunteered and remained in service until the shooting was over. Needless to say, one does not answer a man's argument by calling him names.

Mr. SABATH. Does it not seem that within the next 6 months we may reach an agreement with the nation that is supposed to be our only potential enemy? Why not wait a while to give those who are ardently and praiseworthily striving for peace full opportunity to work out an agreement that would render unnecessary all or most of these huge expenditures in the name of national security? Do you not think that is a worth-while thought?

Mr. SHORT. I am convinced.

At page 6142 of our hearings on the pending bill Mr. Secretary Symington said in part:

"I would like to answer Mr. NORBLAD as to some figures. I do not know what they are, but at one time, from the standpoint of the pilots that have served, we had some 80,000 applications for 6,000 jobs." Somebody wants to say that, if we have a 70-group air force, there will not be enough pilots to fly the airplanes. For myself, I hope we may have the airplanes for the pilots to fly and the metal for them to shoot.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Do you believe that this Committee on Rules should deny to the House of Representatives an opportunity to pass upon this question?

Mr. SHORT. That is a matter that members of this committee will have to decide.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I asked whether in your opinion this committee should deny to the House of Representatives an opportunity to pass upon this question.

Mr. SHORT. I am rather torn between opinions. My personal opinion is that this committee should bury this bill. On the other hand, when a majority of any committee of this House reports a bill—I tried to stop this bill in committee by every legal means, even by absenting myself from quorum calls—when a majority of a committee reports a bill to your committee it is up to the members of this committee to say whether, in their opinion, enough of the American people or enough Members of the House want it considered, to call it up.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Are you asking us to bury the pending bill?

Mr. SHORT. I know that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] is going to discharge his duty with a high sense of patriotism and firm conviction. This is a matter for you gentlemen of the Rules Committee to determine.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Your answer is not very informative.

Mr. SHORT. I must, being frank, confess it is a little evasive. You have me behind the eight ball. If I were a member of this committee I would not vote to report this bill to the House. I would be influenced in that decision somewhat by my friendship and affection for my good colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, that I would like to see back here next year. If this bill is reported I fear many of them will not be back here next year. I am at least being honest.

I know the gentleman from New York does not want his cattle in New York regimented or controlled by the bureaucrats, but he wants to regiment the people of America. His sheep and cattle are more important to him than the young men of the Nation.

Mr. RICH. This is supposed to be the political committee of the House, and if a matter is to be considered, is it not the duty of the whole House to determine that, especially in a matter of such importance as this bill?

Mr. SHORT. Many bills have been reported to this committee and then tabled without any action thereon. Your committee does not necessarily report every bill that comes here. I think this committee is composed of about the most able and some of the very best men in Congress, and its judgment would be equally as good, or perhaps better, than the judgment of the Committee on the Armed Services.

Before I go further, I want to assure the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] that I did not mean to take an unkind dig at him a little while ago. He has firm convictions in connection with anything to which he applies his inordinate talents. I wish I had some of his great ability.

Mr. SABATH. Do you not think we should devote our attention to legislation that is more important than this draft bill? There is more important legislation pending, do you not think?

Mr. SHORT. I certainly do. If you get through this session of the Congress without enacting this draft bill, you will not hear of peacetime draft again. The Army has spent millions and millions of dollars in propagandizing the country in behalf of this draft law and UMT, trying to sell the Nation the idea of a draft, but it has not been sold, in my opinion. It is hard to buck the Federal Treasury, as we all know.

Mr. HARNESS. The War Department spent a lot of money illegally putting out propaganda for the UMT proposal.

Mr. SHORT. Yes. That is what your own committee said; and I have always believed in your honesty and courage and wisdom.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I want to say that I do appreciate your statement.

Mr. SHORT. Thank you. I can assure you that this is not a pleasant task. I did not force myself upon the committee. The chairman was kind enough to let me speak to you. I am grateful to all of you for that. You do not have to remember anything I have said, but I have plainly told you where I stand on this proposal. I can do no other, God helping me.

Mr. CHENOWETH. You are the ranking majority member of the Committee on the Armed Services, are you not?

Mr. SHORT. Yes.

Mr. CHENOWETH. You will be chairman of that committee next year, will you not?

Mr. SHORT. I have not been reelected yet. I know it will cause some people very much displeasure.

Mr. SABATH. You can rest assured that your courageous and intelligent stand in connection with the pending bill makes certain your reelection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. As the ranking majority member of your committee, no doubt you heard much of the testimony on this bill, some of which was confidential, no doubt. Do you feel that our national security is going to be in any way or degree imperiled if this momentous issue should be postponed until next January?

Mr. SHORT. No. I think we will become stronger as a Nation.

Mr. CHENOWETH. You are convinced, are you, that there is no immediate necessity from a military standpoint for this proposed legislation? Does that sum up your position in the matter?

Mr. SHORT. Yes; it does.

Mr. RIZLEY. Do you think war is as imminent now as it was in the late part of 1941 or early 1942?

Mr. SHORT. No. In spite of some contentions that have been made, I think we are slowly but painfully and surely making some progress in international relations. I voted for the UNO; and I am still hopeful, in spite of its blundering and lack of a definite, firm policy, but with its patient policy, that we have made progress; and I hope it will continue.

It is rather difficult for other nations not to laugh at us when we insist upon the Morgenthau plan and then reject it, or when we overthrow Trieste to appease Yugoslavia and then give it back to Italy, or when we go to Palestine and say we are for a partitioning, but when we fear losing our oil in the Near East we turn face about and say "we do not know whether we are right." We are for it one day and against it the next.

Mr. RIZLEY. In view of our commitments made at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam, and in view of our changes time after time in foreign policy, if such we have, since that time, does that put us in a position where we might be in as much danger as we were in during, say, 1942?

Mr. SHORT. It puts us in an unenviable position. No witness before our committee in the hearings on the pending bill was willing to admit that we were facing a crisis. They preferred to use the word "tension." There was a tense situation and not a crisis. Our foreign relations were strained. Everybody knows that if Russia wanted to sweep over Europe now she could do it within 2 or 3 weeks. But she knows her domestic economy will not support a global war. She is not going to jump on to the United States. She is assuming one big bluff in her negotiations and conduct. You remember that it was the late Will Rogers who said that we never lost a war or won a peace, or a treaty!

Mr. RIZLEY. You have been around here a long time.

Mr. SHORT. Some people think I have been here too long.

Mr. RIZLEY. I understand that this committee is really after all the political committee of the party in power.

Mr. SHORT. That is right, as I understand.

Mr. RIZLEY. It has a duty and that is to program legislation recommended by the leadership of the party in power. For this reason the committee is composed of 8 Republicans and 4 Democrats, and when the Democrats are in power it is vice versa. The candidates for the Presidency, or every known candidate for the presidency on the Republican ticket, has advocated this pending program. Is not that true?

Mr. SHORT. Yes; much to my regret.

Mr. RIZLEY. Two of the well-known candidates voted for the program last week?

Mr. SHORT. Reluctantly.

Mr. RIZLEY. The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the majority leader of the House have both urged that this bill be reported. Now, as man to man, as Missourian to Oklahoman, tell me whether, in your opinion, the members of this committee should exercise their individual preference in respect to legislation of this kind, or should they be bound by what most of us understand to be the function of the Rules Committee, namely, program legislation that the party in power recommends unanimously, you might say?

Mr. SHORT. Strange to say, I am happy that you asked that question. I welcome the opportunity to answer it. I have made my presentation solely on the ground of merit, and without any thought of politics. I know that we have some politics in every committee. I am going to let two other men answer your question. Martin Luther once said that "to act contrary to conscience is neither safe nor upright. Here I stand, God helping me, I can do no other." And the great Emerson once said, "To be great is to be alone." If I were a member of this or any other committee I would oppose this measure at every turn, if I had to stand alone. I would never allow this bill to come here and get its nose under the tent, because, once the nose is under, the tail also will soon be under. We have to stand alone at times. Luther was alone. Washington was alone when he fell on his knees at Valley Forge and asked divine guidance and help. Lincoln was alone in the dark hours of the great Civil War. Savonarola and Huss were alone when they were burned at the stake. The Son of God was alone at Calvary.

Mr. RIZLEY. It is a matter of individual responsibility when one votes in the House for or against a measure, but it is another thing when one votes to report or not report a bill from this committee. For instance, take the Russell bill or any other bill before this committee, I can conceive of a condition in which this committee would not let any legislation go to the floor if the members of the committee followed their sentiments and opinions on the merits of legislative proposals. I think your argument about standing alone on the bill is not applicable.

Mr. SABATH. Is not this pending proposal too important to all the American people to make it a political issue? It would affect the masses of the people, therefore it should be considered with a national conscience, I think.

Mr. SHORT. This is not an ordinary bill, in my opinion, because it strikes at the very root of human liberty; therefore I would be guided in any vote I might cast by two things, namely, my honest, best judgment, and justice and reason, of which conscience would be the sole arbiter. I have reached my conclusion and the world knows what it is. My people always have given me credit at home when I did not agree for standing up and opposing in a manly way. I do not pussyfoot or crawl or back-track.

Mr. RIZLEY. Do you imply that I am inclined to crawl?

Mr. SHORT. No; not at all. You are one of the most courageous and best.

Mr. RIZLEY. I was just trying to get your opinion as an old-time Member as to the functions of the Rules Committee.

Mr. SHORT. I understand quite well. As much as I love the Republican Party, I must put the welfare of country first. I am always an American.

Mr. RIZLEY. That would be true if voting on whether this bill were to become law. This committee does not say whether a bill shall become law. All it does is give the Congress, composed of 435 coordinate Members, a chance to express an opinion.

Mr. SHORT. Yes.

Mr. RIZLEY. You know the functions of this committee, which is to program the legislation that is recommended by the responsible leaders of the party in power.

Mr. RICH. If the Rules Committee does what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] thinks it ought to do, and if the bill does not get out to the floor of the House, the membership of the House has the right of petition to discharge, and the Rules Committee can be overruled.

Mr. RIZLEY. I do not believe in the practice of petitioning legislation to the floor. I do not believe that is a good practice. I am sure the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] and I understand each other perfectly.

Mr. HARNESS. No doubt you sat through the hearings on this proposed legislation as a member of the Committee on Armed Services and as a member or a former member of the Committee on Military Affairs before and during the war.

Mr. SHORT. Yes. I was also a member of a special committee of which the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] was a member—the committee headed by former Representative Woodrum.

Mr. HARNESS. Is this bill designed as a permanent or temporary measure?

Mr. SHORT. The bill has a termination date of 2 years, but it was clearly brought out in all the testimony by Generals Eisenhower and Bradley, and others, that we would have to continue this draft law perhaps indefinitely unless UMT is enacted.

Do not be fooled for one minute. I hope nobody will be fooled for one minute into thinking this is a temporary law for 2 years.

Mr. HARNESS. If you were satisfied this is to be a temporary measure, an expedient to take us over this short period of time until international relations become clarified, would you feel the same as you do about it?

Mr. SHORT. I have wrestled with that possibility. We know it is not something temporary.

Mr. HARNESS. If this is a permanent program for peacetime conscription, I would feel like you do about it.

Mr. SHORT. I feel it will be permanent unless we get UMT.

Mr. HARNESS. Does the Congress have a right to say whether it will be extended beyond 2 years?

Mr. SHORT. Yes. I think there is a provision in the bill whereby it could be terminated before the end of 2 years.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Yes; it could be terminated short of 2 years. It is provided in the bill that it shall be for only 2 years.

Mr. SHORT. Terminated by concurrent resolution of the two Houses?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Yes. However, the men drafted will be drafted for 2 years.

Mr. SHORT. If a man is drafted immediately before the expiration of 2 years, he will have to remain in service 2 years.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a 4-year proposition—2 years of uncertainty and 2 years of service.

Mr. RICH. You have said it is costing $7,500,000,000 to take care of veterans; $10,500,000,000 to take care of the armed forces; and we have made other appropriations that will eventually, if this is enacted, run us over thirty billions per annum to take care of things.

Mr. SHORT. About $33,000,000,000.

Mr. RICH. That does not provide for the ordinary expenses of government?

Mr. SHORT. That is right.

Mr. RICH. If we put up thirty-three billions annually for defense and past and future wars, how much more would it cost us to pay the ordinary running expenses of the Government?

Mr. SHORT. Your guess would be as good as mine. I think it would be near forty-five or fifty billions annually.

Mr. RICH. Granted it were forty-five or fifty billions annually, do you think this country could under present conditions stand an expenditure of that kind of expense?

Mr. SHORT. It would be a very serious burden. We had in circulation in this country in 1940 seven billions in currency; today we have four times as much, or twenty-eight and five-tenths billions of this "lettuce." We have more dollars but they will not buy anything much. The purchasing power has been cut in two. If we continue vast Government expenditures, if we do not start paying off the national debt, I fear we are going to find within a few years we are going to pay off Government bonds and insurance policies with 10-cent dollars.

Mr. RICH. If we are wrecked financially, what good will an Army be?

Mr. SHORT. None. Our first line of defense, as I have stated, is a sound financial economy. When a woman goes to the grocery store nowadays, she can bring everything $10 will buy in her hat.

Mr. RICH. I am wondering what our Army and Navy will be worth if we wreck our financial economy.

Mr. SHORT. An army and navy would not be any good with a bankrupt currency and nation.

I do not know whether you lawyers have given consideration to whether or not this proposed bill is constitutional. Please think about it.

I thank you for hearing me.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. SHORT.

The Eightieth Congress Kept Faith With the American Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1948

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of America seem to be well pleased with action of the Eightieth Congress in providing the Department of Agriculture with $1,123,000,000 in appropriations and loan authorizations for the 12 months of the 1949 fiscal year, starting July 1, 1948. This is considerably more than the 936 million the President requested. There was the usual amount of controversy over items in the bill but it was so generally regarded as a good job that it passed unanimously on June 14, 1948, when the conference report was finally approved. The 1948 appropriation bill passed by a vote of 315 to 38, which was almost unanimous. Reductions in the Department of Agriculture were proportionately less than for most other Government departments for the 1948 fiscal year. In fact, there was very little so-called economy in agricultural appropriations for the 1948 fiscal year—July 1, 1947, to July 1, 1948—and no over-all economy for the 1949 fiscal year—July 1, 1948, to July 1, 1949.

There are some who, for political reasons, would lead us to believe that the time has come when a Congressman is regarded as a friend or enemy of the farmer by the amount of Federal appropriations he is willing to provide for activities in which the farmer is interested. This is an insult to the farmer who is the most independent and individualistic of our citizens and the backbone of that spirit which has made America great. To be sure, the farmer has a right to expect that his Congress will not neglect those activities which will promote prosperity for the farmer and for the Nation, and which will conserve our greatest natural resource, the soil. But, I denounce the demagogic proposition that it is necessary to vote "yes" on every proposition to hand out more and bigger subsidies or face political death. The average farmer would rather collect his profits at the stock scale and elevator than to get them in a check from some politician in Washington seeking to buy his vote with his own money.

The farmer is willing to do his part to restore an economically stable and sound America. He does not adhere to the theory that every bureau ought to have its appropriations reduced, except the Department of Agriculture. Just how important it is for Congress to prune some of the agricultural appropriations was demonstrated, for instance, when we found that the Farm Security Agency, in the Department of Agriculture, had been using funds provided by Congress to do some things we never dreamed of. The FSA spent almost a million dollars taking photographs, which are now stored in the Library of Congress, where they are of no use to anyone and never were. These photographs, 8 by 10 inches in size are carefully mounted and catalogued. There are 150,000 of them and they fill 137 file cases. Most of them were taken at a time during and right after the war when the average citizen could not even get a roll of film to take a picture of his children with his box camera. Yet, I well remember that some of the professional farm leaders, and some of those who were getting the biggest subsidies, proclaimed along with the administration, that it was a crime against the farmer to vote to reduce that appropriation bill. All of these pictures have titles. Here are some of them:

Men Picking Their Teeth.
A Pile of Bricks.
Mr. Hastings in His General Store.
The Telephone Used in the Information Division of the Department of Agriculture.
Detroit Vicinity: Jack Dwyer Taking Off His Coat in a Saloon.
Thresher Taking a Drink.
People in a Streetcar.
Man Sitting in Front of a Store.
A Woman, Probably a Government Clerk, Waiting for Street Car on Rainy Day, Probably Near the United States Bureau of Engraving.
Oil Cans at the Side of a Filling Station.
Fat Man Dozing in Shade of a Tree in New Hampshire.
Baby Carriage in Front of a Lunch Room.
Spanish Muskrat Trapper Lying on His Bed After Too Much Whisky and Red Wine.
Farmers Sitting Against a Wall.
Three Women, Probably Government Clerks, Waiting for a Bus on a Fall Afternoon.
A Corn Shock Caught on a Barbed Wire Fence.

Were those of us voting to squeeze the water out of these padded appropriation bills voting against the farmer? These bureaus usually ask for more money than they need or expect to get so that when we trim their requests they can set up a hue and cry that we have cut out their heart. So far as I am concerned, it is weaning time for the bureaucrats. They are crying loudly. Their cries are music to my ears.

Congress does not consider these agricultural appropriation bills lightly. Last year I well recall that the printed record contained 2,833 pages of hearings, weighed 6 pounds and contained the testimony of 411 witnesses before the House committee. This year, the House hearings occupied 2 volumes, totaling 2,237 pages. The report covered 52 additional pages and the bill 63 pages. It took over 2 days to pass the bill, which was thoroughly debated after it had been studied daily for about 2 months in committee. The Department of Agriculture was created under President Lincoln's Administration, in 1862, and $64,000 was appropriated for it. It has been growing ever since until now it is more than a billion-dollar annual business. It employs over 77,000 people.

I believe that the best evidence Congress has done a good job for the farmer is that farm income today is at a record high. Farm income is affected by a number of factors, and over some of these things Congress has no control. We cannot control the weather for instance. But, we have given diligent attention to those things within our jurisdiction.

REA

One of the most popular programs is rural electrification. I am for it. For the 1948 fiscal year we gave REA $225,000,000 to add to three hundred and twenty-five it had left over, unspent, from the previous year. Later we gave it $175,000,000 more. This was all it had requested. It has not been able to spend all of this money, because of inability to get materials. For next year we have provided it with $400,000,000, which is $100,000,000 more than the President requested. In addition, we appropriated $5,450,000 for REA administrative expenses. If every farmer has not got electricity it is not because Congress has been stingy with money. We have uniformly given it more than it has been able either to allocate or spend. I believe now that materials are becoming more abundant, that this program will move forward rapidly. The administration is giving away to foreign countries a lot of electrical equipment which should be held for American farms, around half a billion dollars worth annually. But, that situation will be corrected in November.

SOIL CONSERVATION

I suppose everybody agrees on the importance of soil conservation, although there is no complete agreement about what agency of Government should lead in it. Congress created an agency known as the Soil Conservation Service. For their field operations for 1948 this agency asked for $43,500,000. That was twice the amount they had only 10 years ago. The House reduced this item $6,000,000, and the howl is still being heard, especially from some New Deal candidates for Congress hoping to get in on a I-love-the-farmer platform. What ought to be known is that we found this outfit employed 124 publicity people to send out press releases to farmers and farm organizations and newspapers to promote their agency and put pressure on Congress to give it more money. They also employed 146 persons just to supervise the other people employed in this agency. Still another defect in this agency was that the cost of its operations was $300 per farm whereas other methods of soil conservation, with as good or better results, did it at one-third the cost. For 1949, after squeezing the water out of this agency in 1948, we provided $45,048,000 for soil conservation operations and research, which was over $7,000,000 above the administration budget request and the biggest such appropriation in history. So they got all they originally asked for, but it was channeled into help for the farmer rather than into salaries for the bureaucrats and publicity hounds, occupying swivel chairs in some air-cooled Washington office where they dream up press releases while their feet rest in the wastebasket and their heads float among the clouds.

We recognized that other agencies with some 30,000 employees also provide advice and aid on soil conservation and duplicate much of the work of the Soil Conservation Service. These agencies are:

First. The agriculture experiment stations for soil work. Their funds were not reduced.

Second. The Extension Service, or county agents, with their soil specialists who have been doing this work for 30 years. Their funds were not reduced below requests in 1948 and were increased $3,000,000 above budget requests of the administration for 1949.

Third. The TVA distribution of fertilizers is also a soil-conservation activity.

Fourth. The Forest Service tree-planting program was not reduced. I take particular pride in the fact that we succeeded in getting a Forest Service Research Laboratory authorized for Missouri.

And, finally, fifth, the AAA or PMA program payments. This is the agency which gained fame a few years ago killing little pigs and burning wheat to promote scarcity and high prices and plowed under crops as late as the first year of the war. Now it is paying half of the price of lime for a farmer's fields. This is a worthy program, on the whole. The subsidy probably keeps the price of lime higher than it otherwise would be but as long as the farmer is called upon to raise food for the Government to give away to the foreigners, and thus to ship abroad the fertility of his soil, the Government ought to help put that fertility back, with lime.

The President in his budget message to Congress, January 10, 1947, suggested that we shift our efforts from this kind of subsidy to providing technical guidance to all farmers for soil conservation

and management along the lines of the Soil Conservation Service and Extension Service. The President said further:

> More than 60 percent of total payments have been going to only 20 percent of the Nation's farmers.

Naturally, some of the big farmers, the paid AAA committeemen of whom there are over 100,000, the lime dealers and those with a direct personal interest in farming the farmer, are not always influenced by the fact that the average farmer is not getting all the benefit he should from this program. A loud minority of them set up such an uproar that the Senate largely restored House cuts in this program for 1948 and for 1949 Congress has provided $262,500,000. I supported a $300,000,000 appropriation, on roll-call vote, providing that in the future, no one farmer could draw annually in payments over $750.

As I say, the difficulty with this program and the one thing I do not like about it, is that the average farmer does not benefit by it, or has not in the past. For instance, payments totaling $819,644.22, think of it, over a quarter of a million dollars, were paid to one big farm operator in Mississippi from 1933 to this year. At the same time, the great percentage of farmers were receiving around twenty to forty dollars annually under the same program. A quarter of a million dollars was paid to one big New Deal wheat farmer in Montana during the same period. Hundreds of other examples could be given.

It would seem to me that ultimately there is going to have to be coordination of this branch of soil-conservation activities with the other branches, and that in so doing there can be economy, the average farmer can get his share of the benefits now going to the big farmers and bureaucrats, and the lime program can, at the same time, be continued on an adequate scale. I would also like to see favorable action in Congress on a bill reported favorably by the Ways and Means Committee which would give a farmer credit on his income tax for expenditures he makes for soil conservation from his own pocket. This would reduce the cost of direct appropriations and provide an incentive for greater efforts along this line, which would doubtless mean greater investments in soil conservation than the Government will ever be able to afford in direct appropriations. That would be a constructive approach to this important problem.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

Congress has set up the Farmers' Home Administration as successor to the Farm Security Administration, which I discussed earlier in these remarks, and which made the photographs described and engaged in various Communist collective farm experiments. The FHA now administers loans to tenant farm purchasers, production and subsistence loans, and rehabilitation services to farmers. Five other Government agencies also have farm-loan programs. FHA has 8,120 employees and spends several million dollars annually. It has done some good work. The President has said that it is no particular service or favor to the tenant farmer to put him in debt for present sky-high land which might bankrupt him if there was a slight decline in land prices or farm commodity prices. Banks are bursting with money to loan, and under the FHA program are providing the bulk of the money, as they do for farm purchases under the provisions of the GI bill of rights for veterans. For 1949, Congress provided a fund of $75,000,000 to FHA, which should be sufficient to take care of continuation of this program at a sane level, in view of current economic conditions. This is all the President and his Budget Bureau requested.

Other items in this appropriation bill could be discussed, but these are the principal ones and those which have been in controversy. The full request of $75,000,000 for school lunches was granted. Flood control and other items were liberally treated.

I want now to make, in closing, a few general observations about a long-range farm program. We need and will have such a program. In the meantime, Congress has provided billions of dollars to the Commodity Credit Corporation to support farm prices if necessary for another year. Congress has been holding hearings not only in Washington but around the country, getting ideas about a long-range farm program. That work is not completed. The present time is a very unrealistic one so far as farm prices and conditions are concerned. There is a strong body of opinion to the effect that we should not try to write a long-range farm program until we return to more normal conditions and that any program written under present conditions could not possibly operate also under normal conditions. Further, the new President elected in November should have a voice in any long-range program. At any rate, the matter is receiving attention, and a sound foundation is being laid for a system of permanent price supports, integrated soil conservation, aid to cooperatives, and all the other matters which will help rural America. The Senate Agriculture Committee has reported a tentative long-range program. The idea has been taken up and endorsed by the President and his party which failed during 16 years of power to write such a program and has failed in a number of short-range programs. This should be a nonpartisan effort. It should be based on the idea that the farmer wants and is entitled to parity and not charity, that we should have an economy of abundance rather than one of scarcity so long advocated and practiced with failure, and a program that will increase efficiency in production, distribution, and research.

I want to register opposition to any attempt by the left-wingers to restore price controls on farm products. I fought these controls from the beginning. There are some in the cities who now say that they should be restored. The President and his congressional leaders have repeatedly advocated that Congress restore price controls. Food prices are high principally because of exports the Government is making, farm-labor costs are up 300 percent over prewar, all farm costs are higher and, finally, because our per capita consumption of food is 16 percent above prewar. Our population has increased over 11,000,000 since 1940. So, demand is high, and with greater national income than ever before, people are bidding against each other for food items. Farmers do not fix the prices of what they sell. They take it to market and take the market price. They are at the mercy of buyers and consumers. Unlike labor and industry, the farmer does not go on strike to stop production in order to hike prices. The farmer does not engage in a slow-down like some of his city cousins. Farm production is 35 percent above prewar, in spite of farm labor and machinery shortages, the latter due to strikes in industry and to our Government giving scarce farm machinery to the foreigners. Price controls on farm products, set below cost of production in many cases, retarded production and stimulated inflation and black markets.

Some people think it is wicked for farmers to make money. According to Government statistics for 1947, the per capita income from farming was $725. For the city dweller it was $1,480. Farmers worked harder and longer hours than others for half as much profit. Since 1941, 2,500,000 farmers have given up and moved to the city. If farmers were getting rich would they have done that? Incomes and wages have advanced faster than food prices in the cities, according to Government figures.

Let us be fair to the farmer. All the farmer asks is a fair chance and freedom, together with the kind of justice he received from the Eightieth Congress in the 1948 and 1949 agricultural appropriation bills, here discussed.

Federal Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 17, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, we are all conscious of the tremendous rise in the cost of living which has inflicted much hardship on all of our working people. To my mind those who have been hardest hit are the Federal workers, who must wait upon the action of Congress before any adjustments in their salaries can be made. Workers in industry have, through strikes, secured necessary wage adjustments to meet increased costs. Some interesting facts are as follows: Wages in retail trade have increased nearly 70 percent since 1939. In manufacturing the wages have increased 100 percent. In coal mining they have gone up 175 percent. In the Federal service salaries have gone up approximately 20 percent. It is time that we reached a positive decision on a pay

increase for Federal employees—all of them.

Our Government workers have not had an increase in pay in more than 2 years. The consumers cost of living has gone up more than 23 percent since the last increase. If we fail to grant the pay raise now the Federal employee will be unable to look forward to an increase for at least another year. It would be a shame to treat our Federal employees so shabbily.

The Federal Government has an obligation to the people it employs. As an employer it must consider the vital problems which affect the men and women who work so conscientiously for America. I think it is important that we consider some of the consequences of a failure to assist these people at this time. In many families where the bread winner is a Government employee finances have become so inadequate to meet the essential needs that it has become necessary for the mother of the family to go to work. It has also become necessary in many instances for young boys and girls of high-school age to cut short their education and go to work in order to help out financially at home.

This sort of existence is not good for the family. There can be no normal home life when the father and mother and even the older children must combine their energies to keep the family going. I ask those of you who consider the Federal pay raise bill unimportant, Is the preservation of our American home life also unimportant? The answer to this question will be clearly indicated in the votes that are cast on this measure. Now is the time for us to show in a material way our appreciation of the loyal service these public servants have performed.

I have heretofore testified before the Civil Service Committee on the postal employees' pay raise and I also am very anxious for its passage. However, in addition to this I feel that the Congress should also pass a general increase bill for all Federal employees. It should be done. Fair dealing to the faithful employees of our Government requires this.

Cost of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1948

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, for 6 years now I, with many other Members of Congress, have consistently spoken and voted in an effort to reduce the cost again over $3,000,000 this year as well of government. We have made much progress but not nearly enough as the following figures will show. This Government is taking more out of the pockets of the people for taxes than they spend for food. That is a bad situation and must be corrected.

Mr. Speaker, today I want to point out to the Members of Congress and particularly to the Illinois delegation what the Truman budget of $39,700,000,000 really means to local, county, and State governments. In dealing with these enormous sums which place such a terrible tax burden on the American people, if occasionally we break the figures down we can better understand the amount of hours in toil it takes to earn the money to meet the national budget.

Here is what a $39,700,000,000 budget means to the taxpayers of Illinois.

This Federal tax budget will take $3,100,000,000 from the taxpayers of my State. It is about seven times the amount of all taxes required for our State government and about seven times the State's total of city, school, and all other local tax units of the government of Illinois. Here is another way to put it.

Every billion dollars of Federal expenses places a burden on the taxpayers of Illinois to raise $76,000,000, through their investments, sweat, and toil. This being true, and it is true, when we cut the President's budget by approximately $4,000,000,000 in the first session of Congress, we saved the taxpayers of Illinois in Federal taxes alone, for the year 1947, $304,000,000.

In addition to that, during this session of Congress, when we passed the tax reduction bill in the amount of $4,500,000,000, we saved the taxpayers in Illinois again over $300,000,000 this year, as well as other States many millions of dollars in Federal taxes.

While State, county, and school taxes in Illinois are high, yet the taxpayers do have the satisfaction of knowing that the great volume of the millions of dollars taken in taxes go for the expansion of our school system, better roads and highways throughout the State, the building of many new institutions to help take care of our unfortunate people, to feed, clothe, give them medical care and housing; that many millions go for the relief of the aged, blind, and those who are not sufficiently able to care for themselves.

It is well to remember that while it costs less than a billion dollars to run the State government for 1947, that Uncle Sam through the Federal Government at Washington during the same year took over $3,000,000,000 in taxes away from the people of Illinois. This picture of the alarming take from the taxpayers of Illinois and from other States has steadily grown each year since 1931, and it graphically demonstrates what the "tax and tax, spend and spend, and elect and elect" policy of the New Dealers has pyramided to in this year of successor Truman, 1948. Keep in mind that the President's present request for $39,700,000,000 will take from Illinois $3,100,000,000 during the year 1948.

These figures are authentic.

Mr. Speaker, in order that the people of the Twenty-fourth Congressional District may have an accurate comparison and know approximately how each county is affected I have broken the tax cost down into counties and insert the following table:

Costs of a Federal budget of $39,700,000,000 and local property taxes, in Illinois, by counties

County	Share of Federal expenditures	Property taxes payable, 1947	Ratio
Clay	$4,030,000	$617,000	6.5
Clinton	4,340,000	667,000	6.5
Edwards	1,550,000	308,000	5.0
Gallatin	1,550,000	367,000	4.2
Hamilton	1,550,000	477,000	3.3
Hardin	930,000	181,000	5.1
Jefferson	9,610,000	1,154,000	8.3
Johnson	1,550,000	211,000	7.3
Marion	17,670,000	1,568,000	11.3
Massac	2,480,000	394,000	6.3
Pope	930,000	129,000	7.2
Saline	8,990,000	861,000	10.5
Washington	2,790,000	475,000	5.9
Wayne	3,720,000	776,000	4.8
White	4,030,000	815,000	4.9

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Congress for the past 2 years has constantly done its very best to reduce the cost of government. It is a truthful statement when I say that the President, his powerfully entrenched bureaucratic department heads, and his leaders in the House and Senate have opposed our effort on practically every appropriation bill that has come to the floor of the House. We made considerable progress in 1947 notwithstanding that opposition. We have attempted to reduce unnecessary expenses and have made considerable progress this session, yet, due to the war scare and several extra billions we have had to appropriate for national defense which were not foreseen, we will be fortunate if the budget for 1948 can be held to the $39,700,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out that after the President sent us his request for the $39,700,000,000 budget he has since sent requests for new legislation to the Congress that would add approximately $17,000,000,000, making a total approaching $56,000,000,000. He has endorsed every scheme for spending regardless of how wild it is. On his recent west-coast trip he criticized the Congress for not passing this legislation which would add approximately $17,000,000,000 extra to his former budget request I have referred to. When you consider the budget contains nearly $4,000,000,000 extra for national defense and the over $6,000,000,000 for the Marshall plan, you can begin to realize why the Republican Congress, with the opposition instead of the help of the administration, has had a difficult job in keeping the budget as low as we have.

Every American Is Entitled to Low-Cost Electricity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1948

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, since I first came to Congress

in 1943, it has been my pleasure to know that the lights have been turned on in almost 20,000 farm homes in my congressional district, as a result of appropriations to the Rural Electrification Administration, for which I vote.

The 11 counties of my congressional district have had the lion's share of these funds allocated to Missouri. For instance, in the 1946 fiscal year, Missouri's share of the $300,000,000 in loan funds Congress made available to REA amounted to $13,700,000. My district, 1 of 13 in Missouri, got over one-fourth of Missouri's total allocation, or $3,651,929. These funds, for which I voted and which I helped local cooperatives to secure after the funds had been provided by Congress, built 2,129 miles of additional lines, serving 6,415 additional consumers in my district.

From the time I entered Congress in January 1943 up to the end of the session of Congress in 1946, I had supported legislation which had allocated to my district a total of 6,662 miles of REA lines to serve 14,837 farm families. The appropriations for the Sixth Missouri Congressional District, for this purpose, totaled $7,234,000. This has helped increase the standard of living of my constituents and provided much employment for them.

I stated then, and repeat it now, that I was not satisfied to stop at that point. There are still many farm homes and small businesses without electric power or without power for which the people can afford to pay. I will continue to fight, as long as I am a Member of Congress, for extension of REA. The program as presently set up provides only a framework upon which we must build ever greater rural prosperity.

EIGHTIETH CONGRESS BEST FRIEND OF REA

Pleased though I am with the results of activity in this endeavor in the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses, what we were able to do in the Eightieth Congress sets some new records. From January 1947 to June 1948 I have seen allocated to the eight cooperatives serving my congressional district a total of $7,333,000. Before this year is over, this sum will be greatly increased from the $400,000,000 appropriation we have made for the 1949 fiscal year, which starts July 1, 1948. That appropriation, which I supported, is $100,000,000 above the President's request. In addition, we appropriated $5,450,000 for REA administrative expenses. Why did we provide more than the administration requested? It is because Congress is sold on the value of this program and wants REA to be able to place orders for material which it believes will be more abundant than the administration anticipates. REA appropriations are not down the drain. They are actually loans which these locally owned and managed cooperatives pay back to the United States Treasury. The record of their repayment is good.

Last year, Congress let REA keep $325,000,000 it had left over from the previous year, unspent because it was not able to find materials to spend it on. In addition, we provided it with $225,000,000 more, a total of $550,000,000. A little later, as materials became more abundant, we provided it with an additional deficiency appropriation of $175,000,000, making a grand total of $725,000,000, which was all it had asked. As already pointed out, for next year we gave it more than the President asked. My voting record will show that in all of these cases I supported the amounts finally granted.

While we have doubtless provided it with more money than it will be able to spend or perhaps allocate in full, to the local cooperatives, it is my feeling that, unless the money is available to REA, orders cannot even be placed for future delivery of materials now in short supply.

This action will not provide electricity for every farmer as soon as he wants it, or for all those who have long been subscribers. I wish it could. The job is too big for that. Much will depend upon the decisions of the management of the respective cooperatives and upon their ability and diligence in finding materials and labor. Since all local plans must be approved by the Washington REA headquarters, much depends on the plans submitted to it by the local co-ops. Congress can only provide the money for the loans. The rest is up to the REA. Where the lines are built and when is not the business of Congress but of these locally owned and managed business enterprises.

PLENTY OF MONEY BUT SHORT ON MATERIALS, AND WHY

One thing which has disturbed me recently is propaganda put out by some parties to the effect that consumers wanting electricity and signed up for it do not have it because Congress has not provided the money. The foregoing facts are a complete refutation of this falsehood. The real fact of the matter is that it has been a shortage of materials and not of money that has slowed down this worthy program. And why has there been a shortage of materials? During the war such a shortage was quite understandable. But why a shortage now?

On March 23, 1948, I was advised by the Assistant Secretary of Commerce that our total exports of electrical machinery and apparatus, July 1, 1946, through June 30, 1947, totaled $454,698,000. Much of this, of course, was given away by our Government under our so-called foreign policy and reciprocal trade program, under which we have undertaken to subsidize the world and buy friends everywhere. The administration has even exported many millions of dollars worth of electrical equipment to Communist Russia.

Congress has, time and again, demanded that these exports of electrical machinery and apparatus be halted. Congress has demanded that the administration stop the export of war materials, steel, oil, farm machinery, and many other things to Russia and to Soviet-dominated countries. Nothing in short supply can be exported without a license granted by the Secretary of Commerce, appointed by the President. But these exports continue, and the President says they should.

The Department of Commerce has prepared for me two sheets of tables, each measuring 16 by 23 inches, listing 95 foreign countries and the dollar values and items of electrical equipment furnished each country in recent months.

Scarce wire, generators, magnetos, batteries, boxes, insulation, metal conduits, transformers, sockets, fuses, lighting fixtures, and parts of all kinds have gone to these 95 foreign countries, including such places as Ethiopia, the Belgian Congo, Afghanistan, Ceylon, Mozambique, Kuwait, Cameron, Curacao, Surinam, the Fiji Islands, and a lot of other places most people cannot even find with an atlas, in addition to all the nations we have recently been fighting, to neutrals, and anyone else wanting something we have, for free, or with loans we provide which will never be repaid.

Some of my constituents will have to wait a little while until the boys in the State Department and Commerce Department run a power line out to a few more Eskimo igloos or to cannibal thatched huts, in the wilds of the Congo. Of course, if the people here at home get impatient, they can change a few faces in the executive department when the opportunity arises in November. And they probably will. In the meantime, they can look with satisfaction upon the record of Congress in meeting the needs of our own people for electricity, so far as the authority of Congress has permitted.

In conclusion, let me repeat that the present Congress, a Republican Congress, is the stanchest supporter of REA of any in our history. This is attested by the fact that it has voted more money for REA than any previous Congress, in fact, more than the previous four Congresses. In 2 years the present Congress has voted $800,000,000, which is 42 percent of all funds voted in the 15 years of REA's history. Here are the figures since the beginning:

REA funds voted by Congress

Fiscal year:	
1935–36	$13,928,288
1937	46,500,000
1938	30,000,000
1939	140,000,000
1940	40,000,000
1941	100,000,000
1942	100,000,000
1943	10,000,000
1944	20,000,000
1945	25,000,000
1946	300,000,000
1947	250,000,000
1948	400,000,000
1949	400,000,000
Total	1,875,428,288

Wyoming Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. BARRETT

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1948

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, recently there came to my attention an outline of Wyoming's laws affecting veterans, their dependents, and their organizations, compiled by Walter H. Van Alyne, national service officer for the Disabled American Veterans, who has his

office with the Veterans' Administration center in Cheyenne, Wyo.

Most of the potential beneficiaries under these State laws are not aware of the valuable rights, privileges, exemptions, and benefits available to them under certain circumstances and, therefore, I am hopeful that this résumé of Wyoming's veteran laws will come to their attention.

The outline is as follows:

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

A county allowance is provided for the burial of indigent veterans.

The dead bodies of veterans shall not be turned over to medical schools for dissection.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments executed by members of the armed forces.

Disability of minority is removed for qualified veterans under the GI bill of rights.

Protection is afforded to persons acting under power of attorney granted by members of the armed forces.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Absentee registration and voting is provided.

Absentee-voting statutes have been validated by amendments to the State constitution.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

Free copies of public records are provided for wards of the Veterans' Administration under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

Discharges are recorded free of charge by county clerk and register of deeds.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS

State vocational-education programs have been set up.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Free tuition is provided in State educational institutions to orphans of war veterans.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Preference is given to veterans in employment under the State merit system with 5 and 10 points allowed.

Preference is given to veterans in public departments and on public works of State and local units.

Benefit rights are preserved under the Unemployment Compensation Act.

Teachers who entered the military service in time of war did not lose credit for prior service if they subsequently became members of the retirement system.

The employment security committee may enter into agreements with the Veterans' Administration under the GI bill of rights.

GUARDIANSHIP

A Uniform Veterans' Guardianship Act has been enacted with modifications, providing for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran, or the minor child of a veteran, to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

HOMES

Veterans and their dependents may be admitted to the soldiers' and sailors' home.

Acceptance of $100,000 from the Federal Government has been authorized for the construction of a residence hall at the State soldiers' home.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

LAND SETTLEMENT BENEFITS

Veterans are extended benefits under the Land Settlement Act.

TAX EXEMPTIONS; EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Veterans of the Civil War, the Indian wars, the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, the Boxer Rebellion, the Puerto Rican campaign, and World Wars I and II are exempt from poll taxes (excepting school polls).

Certain veterans are exempt from county motor-vehicle registration fees.

Foreign vehicles owned and operated by members of the armed forces are exempt from registration fee.

Property of resident veterans and their widow during widowhood, to the amount of $2,000, is exempt from taxation.

TRANSPORTATION

Transportation facilities may grant free or reduced transportation within the State to certain officers of the American Legion, VFW, DAV, and United Spanish War Veterans.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

The American Legion and other veteran organizations have been granted certain corporate rights to hold property.

Most of these laws have been enacted by the Wyoming Legislature through the sponsorship and cooperation of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, DAV, and other veteran organizations.

Comrade Van Alyne has been expertly trained as a national service officer for the DAV and spends his full time in rendering all types of assistance to veterans and their dependents, particularly in the technical preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their justifiable claims for various types of governmental benefits to which they may be lawfully entitled.

DAV MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official voice of America's disabled defenders.

According to its congressional charter of incorporation—Public Law 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law 668, approved July 15, 1942—active membership in the DAV is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities incurred during, or by reason of, active service during time of war in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it.

DAV SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM

Realizing the need for extending assistance to all veterans and their dependents after the close of World War II, the DAV entered into an agreement with the Veterans' Administration and the American University in Washington, D. C., back in 1944, to train some 400 handicapped veterans of World War II to become national service officers. An intensive 6-month special course was set up, followed by 18 more months of on-the-job training in three different regional offices of the Veterans' Administration, under the supervision of old-time, long-experienced DAV service officers.

During the more than 28 years of its service activities, the DAV has sponsored and supported much liberalizing legislation on behalf of disabled veterans and their dependents.

DAV NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

The present national commander of the DAV is John L. Golob, of Hibbing, Minn., a severely wounded World War I veteran, who has had a broad background of experience in various local, State, and national DAV activities which qualify him to lead an organization composed exclusively of America's disabled war veterans.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The National Service Headquarters of the DAV is now located at 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C., which was acquired by the organization in 1945.

In this Washington office are located the department of claims, headed by William E. Tate; the department on legislation, headed by Francis Sullivan; and the department of public relations and employment, headed by Millard W. Rice. In addition to these service departments, the DAV Service Headquarters has as its office manager John E. Feighner, as assistant national adjutant. All of these various departments are staffed by trained experts, all of whom are themselves war-wounded or disabled veterans.

DAV SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

It is, of course, not practicable, in a brief statistical résumé, to indicate the many different types of service extended by service officers. Many liberalizing precedents have been established by the decisions obtained, which subsequently have proved of value to hundreds of thousands of disabled veterans having similar claims, the results of which cannot be computed from service records.

DIFFICULTIES OF PROVING SERVICE ORIGIN

Most citizens agree with the DAV that the Federal Government should bear the burden of providing for the Nation's defenders, but only when it has been established that the veteran's disabilities were incurred in or aggravated by his military service.

To prove service connection of a disability, however, is not an easy task, except where official records show its inception in service. An equitable claim cannot necessarily be legally established.

Many different factors may make it extremely difficult, and in many cases impossible, for a veteran factually to prove that his disabilities were caused by his war service, even though actually service incurred or aggravated.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation, its military and naval services during time of war.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported, as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth, and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

As a veteran of World War I, myself, and as the father of two sons who served in World War II it is a pleasure for me to commend the service program of the DAV and I am sure it merits the consideration and support of the entire country.

The Housing Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO ISACSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1948

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Speaker, if the Republican majority in this House had set out deliberately to earn for the Eightieth Congress the reputation of being the worst Congress in our Nation's history, it could have taken a no more

convincing step than to kill public housing.

The housing needs of our Nation are acknowledged on all sides to be a minimum of a million and a half new dwelling units a year for the next 10 years.

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill which the Republican majority is now in the process of throttling would have made it the responsibility of our Government to advance loans and meet the deficits for 500,000 low-rent, low-cost public housing units a year for the next 5 years.

These public-housing units, Mr. Speaker, were envisioned for the poor people of our Nation, whose rate of income has fallen far behind any vestige of ability to pay the swollen costs of an inflation period.

These public-housing units were envisioned, too, for our homeless veterans, whose reward for bringing us victory in the war has thus far been to stand at the end of the line where economic gains are concerned.

Even the conservative New York Times this morning voices its editorial distaste for the tactics being used by the Republicans to rob our veterans and our youth of decent housing and consign them and the generations they are rearing to spare rooms, slums, trailer camps, and cast-off huts and shacks left over from the war.

"We owe these homes particularly to our veterans and to young people just coming of marriageable age," the New York Times states.

"The whole cost of the public-housing program to the Federal taxpayer would be about $150,000,000 a year.

"If we do not owe our veterans and our young people this much help, what do our fine words about youth mean?"

The flagrant disregard by this Congress of the real and dire needs of millions of America's families for decent housing spells misery, domestic unhappiness, illness and, yes, even death for American people who might have been spared these misfortunes if this Congress had insisted on enacting a people's housing bill.

Think of the plight in which this outright betrayal by the Eightieth Congress leaves the ex-GI, the young man who offered up literally the best years of his life in the uniform of his country and who, for the lengthening years since the end of the war, has been forced to exist—if this can be called existence—in Quonset huts and miserable shacks, dilapidated trailers, or crowded into the spare rooms and sleeping porches of in-laws and friends.

Mr. Speaker, these young Americans do not possess and cannot foresee possession of sufficient income to purchase homes at the minimum of $13,500 which is now being demanded for the $5,000 small home of 10 years ago. They cannot pay rents of $100 and more a month.

Are they to have no escape, during the whole childhood of their newborn sons and daughters, from the squalor and flimsiness of discarded shacks and huts and the actual physical peril of long-condemned tenements and frame firetraps?

Some of the gentlemen of this Congress would do well to visit the teeming hutments in the crowded New York area in which thousands of GI couples are beginning their domestic careers and raising a most treasured brood for our next generation.

They would see leaky shacks huddled in swamplands, the ceilings and walls cracked and parting at the seams so that the rain and snow seep in; huts invaded by rats and vermin; death traps in which children's lives are always in danger from fire, exposure, and epidemic where, indeed, only last winter the death of a child sleeping in its crib was attributed officially to exposure.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the grim harvesters of illness and death will take their toll again this winter among the children of our Nation's forsaken heroes, housed in crude huts as their reward in the postwar world. And this time the responsibility must lie at the door of the bipartisan political coalition in the Eightieth Congress which has scuttled or killed every move to guarantee and advance the health and welfare of the people of our country.

This Congress has broken every housing pledge and promise made to the returning veteran. Millions of them, with their wives and infant families, are now living in conditions far, far worse than those afforded them while they were in uniform.

One veteran asked me before I came down here in March as a Member of Congress, "How is it that our country erected thousands of Army camps and installations in a few months during the war but now cannot provide a house I can afford to live in?"

I have noted previously that the $13,500 home is today the average low-cost home in place of the $5,000 home of 10 years ago. However, even this unthinkable increase is not the result of a steady climb in costs over the intervening 10 years.

In 1946, when this Congress was elected, the $13,500 house of today had a ceiling of $10,000 on it.

The Eightieth Congress surrendered to the pressure of the real estate and building lobby. Ceilings and controls on prices and building materials disappeared. In the less than 2 years of this Eightieth Congress, the $10,000 home of 1946 has undergone a 35-percent increase in price.

Mr. Speaker, this situation is not only prevalent around New York; it is typical of the whole country. Families all over our Nation live huddled in cellars or parked in trailer camps which are as tumble-down as the Hoovervilles of the Republican depression era. Even the slums, which we are pledged and determined to eliminate from our society, are more crowded and teeming now than ever. A slum home is a haven, indeed, in a nation with half of its families ill-housed or homeless.

In apology for the failure of Congress to provide for the housing needs of the Nation, the leaders of the old parties have expressed a conviction that private industry and free enterprise will do the job.

But the facts are that private enterprise has not only flunked the job of rehousing America; it has actually sabotaged low-cost housing for the American wage earner. Private enterprise has built only for the topmost income groups. It has demanded and reaped profits of as high as 100 percent.

America came out of World War II with the accumulated housing deficits of a generation during which private enterprise consistently pursued its determination to build only for the topmost income group, the group willing and able to pay inflated prices for decent housing. During this period there was little or no improvement of housing for the two-thirds of urban and rural families who represent the bulk of American people.

The housing program for the future must provide for these two-thirds of American families which private enterprise does not and will not serve.

We of the new party consider it the responsibility of government, both legislative and executive, to recognize the housing emergency which exists and to assume the job of guaranteeing a decent home in a democratic community for every American family, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.

Our democracy cannot thrive in squalor; the men who fought to preserve democracy do not deserve to live in war-surplus shacks. They did not leave their foxholes to come home and live in ratholes. America's heroes and the plain people who kept the home fires burning and the industries producing for victory deserve to be the best-housed people in the world.

The Eightieth Congress Is the Best Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARION T. BENNETT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 17, 1948

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under permission of the House to extend my remarks, I include the following address of Speaker JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., over the Columbia Broadcasting System, Wednesday, June 16, 1948:

Good evening, fellow Americans. The President of the United States, during the course of a political tour, has seen fit to attack the Eightieth Congress as the worst in the history of our country.

As Speaker of the House, I feel it incumbent upon me to answer unequivocally and objectively this unwarranted attack upon the elected representatives of the American people.

Mr. Truman is apparently provoked because this Congress refused to blindly follow his dictates, to rubber stamp his wild and reckless schemes for spending and his left-wing plans for Government control of everything in America.

If the American people had wanted a Congress of "yes" men for this administration, they would have elected one.

In the opinion of many impartial observers this is the best and most constructive Congress in many years.

This Congress is discharging its duty to the American people. It is putting this country back on the American track where there can be hope and opportunity.

Let's look at the record.

In less than 2 years since the Republicans were elected to majority control of the House and Senate, Congress has abruptly reversed America's 14-year drift toward state socialism and eventual national bankruptcy.

The sessions of 1947 and 1948 have reestablished solid foundations for the complete restoration of orderly constitutional government responsive to the needs of the people. The people once more have faith that the American way of life will be maintained. They have had reestablished their belief in the pledged word of a political party. We have made good on our promises.

We set out in January 1947 with a pledge to root out ultraradicalism and regimentation, and to restore the American way of life—the way of freedom, abundance, and security. This we are doing.

We were pledged to eliminate deficit spending and to reduce taxes. This we have accomplished, despite a series of Presidential vetoes, and strong bureaucratic obstruction from the administrative agencies. These agencies continued to burn the lights at night, thinking up new ways of spending and increasing crushing taxes on the people. But this Congress has curbed careless spending and socialistic bungling.

Our policy has been to restore and reestablish in all its grandeur and strength the full stature and splendor of constitutional government under law.

Where freedom prevails today, the forces of reconstruction and regeneration are at work. Conditions are better. We are going forward.

We have maintained persistent and effective legislative pressure against excessive and burdensome bureaucracy in Washington.

The work of constitutional restoration is far from finished. We have just begun our work. Wherever it operates, bureaucracy leads to regimentation of the people and the slow snuffing out of the spirit of freedom and enterprise.

We have made a strong beginning in the tremendous task of unscrambling the war powers of the President. Nothing can be more oppressive to business than excessive meddling and interference by government. But in this work, also, we have encountered nothing but obstruction and delaying tactics from a confused executive branch.

If it be the secret purpose of the present administration to perpetuate or to increase its remaining war powers indefinitely in the hope that the American people eventually will forget their full rights as free men and free women, we in Congress accept that challenge.

America has made a tremendous contribution in two wars to preserve the American way of life. This is not just a catch phrase. We mean the American way of life as we know it, life as you and I have known it since our birth, as every American has known it since the birth of this Nation.

We have fought to exterminate all forms of totalitarianism. Fascism has been driven into the ground.

Your Eightieth Congress likewise has made a good beginning in the task of rooting out of our Federal establishment the Communists and fellow travelers who follow the party line of international revolutionary wrecking.

During the last year there have been indictments and convictions in Washington of Communist workers in our own Federal agencies. These are the first such indictments or convictions since 1933.

There is no room in the American Government for those who would destroy America.

During the last 15 years Communists and fellow travelers found Washington a world haven of refuge and benign official protection.

Not until the Eightieth Congress provided the funds and the investigations for the house cleaning were the Communists driven from high places in our Federal civil service.

One more election, and we shall see the administrative chambers in Washington vibrant once more with the stimulating fresh air of fundamental Americanism.

This Congress has brought about improvement in labor-management relations.

It has increased social-security benefits for 3,500,000 needy children, the aged, and the blind. Among other humanitarian measures enacted has been the establishment of a National Heart Institute for research on diseases of the heart and circulatory system. We provided for American participation in the World Health Organization.

This Congress has made large appropriations for reclamation and river and harbor development projects. It has made the largest grants in history for flood control.

We recently approved an emergency appropriation of $10,000,000 for the flood victims of the Northwest. That bill passed the House in 3 seconds.

Recognizing that one of the Nation's major problems is adequate housing for our people, this Congress removed the bureaucratic regulations which shackled the construction field, and we expect to pass additional legislation to aid housing before adjournment.

While the housing shortage is still acute, real progress has been made since regulations which were bogging down production were lifted. In 1947, 835,000 new permanent family dwelling units were completed. This is almost twice the number completed in 1946. Competent testimony indicates more than a million new dwelling units will be completed this year.

For our 18,000,000 war veterans the Eightieth Congress has provided the most far-reaching and effective system of rehabilitation benefits and aids ever placed on the statute books of any nation in the world. The program for the construction of veterans' hospitals has been accelerated, educational opportunities have been expanded, veterans' preference in the civil service has been reinforced. Benefits for the disabled and survivors of those who made the supreme sacrifice have been increased.

Terminal-leave bonds were paid off in cash.

We have provided for an adequate and balanced national defense, an Air Force adequate to meet any emergency which may arise under the new conditions of military tactics. Nothing has been left undone which would provide our forces with the most effective arms and equipment which our twentieth-century technical skill and scientific research might provide.

In a determined attempt to untangle and unscramble the patchwork of bureaus, commissions, authorities, offices, and Federal corporations reared by 15 years of New Deal socialism, the Eightieth Congress has set up a Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. Under the law this Commission has a mandate to present to the Eighty-first Congress next January a comprehensive plan to consolidate, reorganize, coordinate, and trim down the entire executive establishment.

Our American Bill of Rights is a beacon light to which all the world turns today in an agonized prayer for peace, security, justice, and orderly progress under law.

Yet this administration flounders on the rocks of indecision.

With an administration that will build and preserve the honor, integrity, and prestige of our Nation throughout the world, we can achieve the basis for a sound and everlasting peace.

These are the great aspirations of the American people. Your Eightieth Congress has cherished them and nurtured them. It has protected them against the reckless chatter of irresponsible ambition. It has defended them against the excesses of little men temporarily vested with large powers. It has defended them against the godless fury of the Communist wreckers.

We must not deceive ourselves that the work of constitutional restoration in America will be easy. Our national debt of $250,000,000,000 is a reality which will influence every decision of policy for a generation to come. The national debt is the very crux of our baffling problem of high prices. The fiscal policies of the Government which sustain that debt are the controlling factors in a monetary situation which must be guided by sound policies and wise counsel if we are to escape a disastrous inflation.

Your Eightieth Congress also has declared unrelenting warfare upon Government propaganda carried on at the expense of the taxpayer. Official propaganda and official misinformation are devices of dictatorship. In them lie the seeds of national destruction. A special committee of the House of Representatives has been investigating Government publicity and propaganda since May 1947. The five interim reports from that committee have shocked the Nation with their revelations of official chicanery and manipulation in the administration's persistent propaganda campaign for more spending, more powers, and more bureaus to harass the people. This investigation reaches to the very core of representative government.

Propaganda by the Government against the people is a lawless and indefensible perversion of executive duty and responsibility.

But this campaign of propaganda pressure against the Eightieth Congress has failed to move either the House or Senate from its sworn path of responsible independent action.

In the field of foreign relations, your Eightieth Congress has moved courageously to restore the shattered economic life of two war-torn continents. It gave succor and hope to millions of hopeless people. It is ready to continue to render effective assistance to the world.

We have provided generous aid to Europe and Asia, and insisted upon measures and policies in the administration of this assistance to protect our basic economic strength. The problem of world reconstruction is literally a blood transfusion.

America today, due to the inept, vacillating, and indecisive handling of our foreign relations has bewildered the world. We, to whom the world turns for inspired leadership, are honor bound to present a concrete policy of American thinking and action. Our foreign policy as presently administered is on a day-to-day basis. A sound and stated foreign policy, clear in its principles and unswerving in its aims to bring about and maintain world peace, would be backed wholeheartedly by the people of the United States.

Only by keeping American strong can we hope to accomplish the reconstruction overseas which every consideration of humanity and conscience dictates to be our policy.

These are but the mere outlines of the great national crusade which has guided and inspired the Eightieth Congress. Our aim has been to lift the dreadful pall of threatened stateism from our national life.

We are striving toward the day when the American worker and the American farmer may do more than work for the tax collector.

We are striving toward the day when the job maker and the job giver rightfully will be regarded once more as the honorable servants of a stable economy. But this program can be accomplished only by practical measures, by wise policies formulated under the established process of representative government, by faithful and competent administration in the executive branch and by a prudent regard for the lessons of history.

With the support of the American people and under the guidance of the Almighty we will keep America strong and solvent, prosperous and secure, and a beacon of hope for all mankind.

The More We Arm, the More We Must Strive for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 17, 1948

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I place in the RECORD the following statement by a greatly respected writer and thinker of our times:

[From the New York Times of March 27, 1948]

EASTER REFLECTIONS IN A TIME OF DECISION

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

The dark uncertainties of the times will not prevent a large segment of the human race from celebrating Easter. Easter is the feast of hope, of the triumph of the spirit over death and defeat, and that is what millions of bewildered people want to think of in these days.

They are hungrier for hope than for bread.

They turn with relief from the panorama called the world, so thickly strewn with man-made trouble spots, to the earth itself, which can always be depended on to blossom out at this season with a burst of new life, as fresh as if each year were the first spring.

With faith or doubt, some turn to heaven, drawn by the thought that somewhere there must be a world as well ordered and reliable as the visible creation.

THE EASTER FESTIVAL

The Fifth Avenue parade may be unique in its careless opulence, but in London, Paris, Rome, Athens, Prague, if the day is bright, streets and parks will be filled with similar crowds, all dressed up in the best they have and equally bent on making the most of a holiday. The Easter outing is more real than any political demonstration. In the Luxemburg Gardens, as in Central Park, it is mostly made up of little family parties, merged together in the observance of a common festival, and in this community people are more themselves than when they separate into parties, sects, or classes.

This year the parade is perhaps more meaningful than usual. Now more than ever people seem anxious to cling to the customary. In Western Europe, at least, they never appeared so determined to maintain the appearance of normality, to go through the motions of normal living. Never were they so jealous of their habits and traditions. One hears more of "Western Culture" than ever before.

AN INSTINCTIVE FEELING

The churches are unwontedly crowded. So are the public gardens. It is almost impossible to get a seat for a concert. Extraordinary art exhibits travel from city to city and the throngs pushing into the museums are so great that the masterpieces are nearly invisible. These manifestations may or may not indicate a great religious revival or an increased popular interest in nature or the arts. They do express a quickened sense of the value of the civilization that is felt to be in danger.

This feeling is widespread and instinctive. In a queue in front of a Paris bank when 5,000-franc notes were being turned in, a workman in faded blue overalls passed the time studying the sculptured facade of a famous old church across the street.

As the line moved up he said to his companion: "It's worth something to live in a country that has been civilized so long." When Togliatti, the Communist leader, wants to flatter the Roman masses, he does better with talk of the glories of the Roman past than with Marxist arguments.

The Europe we are trying to strengthen needs to believe in itself.

It needs the stimulant of hope and self-confidence quite as much as material help. Americans will delude themselves if they imagine that the recovery program for Europe or the military measures by which we propose to fortify ourselves will be enough to win the tremendous contest we are now engaged in.

THE FEAR OF WAR

By their infiltration into every country and their complete disregard of rules, truth, and human feeling, the Communists have weapons we cannot match. But we have moral weapons which they cannot match, which they would not know how to use if they could, and the sooner we mobilize our moral forces and appeal to Europe to join us in saving the virtues as well as the values of our civilization—honor, truth, self-respect, compassion—the more effective will be the material and military defenses we are setting up.

Europe trembles because it is physically weak and dependent on outside help. It is terrified by talk of war because it sees itself as the battleground.

As a matter of fact, although fear of war colors the thought of every European nation, there is less talk about it over there than here at home. That is partly because this country has to take the responsibility for action. It is faced with decisions, evidently sudden decisions, which require that the American people should be aroused to a sense of danger. But is it impossible to take the steps common prudence dictates quietly and calmly?

OUR MORAL RESPONSIBILITY

Obviously we are acting to prevent a miscalculated move that would lead to war. We have to safeguard ourselves in the first place, and as a great power we have to safeguard the world.

But the more we prepare for war, the more we are obligated to keep the emphasis on peace and redouble our efforts to construct the framework and conditions of peace.

It is hard for Americans to keep an even keel and an even temper, but the time has come when it is quite as incumbent on us to be steady as to be strong. The issues are in our hands; we create the moral atmosphere of the world.

Even to carry out the Marshall plan, Europe needs the Easter hope of resurrection and peace. With hope it can build, with hope it can rise and march, with hope it can win a great war without bombs or armies. But only this country can cast out the fear that corrodes the spring, and it cannot do this without rising to heights of courage, wisdom, and confidence of which we have never dreamed ourselves capable.

American Cancer Society's Program To Combat Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 15), 1948

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, last week a bill was passed by the Congress, and sent to the President for signature, which provides for a program of study and research into the causes of the diseases of the heart. I was particularly gratified with the passage of this legislation, as it is a further step forward in the plans of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to develop research in the field of fatal diseases. This is also in line with the legislation setting up a National Science Foundation for research in the basic sciences, including the medical sciences.

For the last few years the Cancer Research Institute of the Department of Public Health has been functioning under legislation previously passed, and is working most effectively in conjunction with the program of the American Cancer Institute, a voluntary organization supported by popular subscription.

The work of the Cancer Institute is subdivided among the several States, and in my own State of New Jersey has been carried on under the able leadership of Mr. George Stringfellow, of West Orange, who has done an outstanding piece of work in organizing committees and raising voluntary funds for this important purpose. Recently Mr. Stringfellow made an important address on the subject of cancer research, and I ask unanimous consent to have his address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD together with two editorials from the Chattanooga, Tenn., News-Free Press.

There being no objection, the address and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY'S PROGRAM TO COMBAT CANCER

(By George E. Stringfellow, potentate, Salaam Temple, AAONMS, and president of the New Jersey division, American Cancer Society, Chattanooga, Tenn., March 30, 1948)

The objective of the American Cancer Society is to prevent suffering and death from cancer by (1) research, (2) education, and (3) service.

From 1940 to 1947 the American Cancer Society raised $28,600,000. It is significant that over 92 percent was raised in the last three campaigns.

During these 3 years the national society received about $10,500,000 of the funds raised. More than 60 percent—over $6,000,000—was set aside or appropriated for research.

There are three phases of the research program:

1. Fellowships for training.
2. Grants-in-aid projects in basic research.
3. Institutional grants for cancer research.

The committee on growth of the National Research Council is guiding us in the huge expenditure of funds for research.

The American Cancer Society has mobilized the largest group of scientists in history—even greater than the mobilization that resulted in the atomic bomb. Through the committee on growth, every new discovery is coordinated. Some day the missing link will be found. When it is found it will doubtless be the result of the coordinated program of our society.

A research program can proceed no faster than the scientifically trained manpower available. To meet the personnel needs to carry out these projects, the society has fostered a training program including 100 fellowships in 26 institutions at a cost of $742,000.

The society financed 239 grants-in-aid projects in 70 institutions in 27 of our States. These grants-in-aid have totaled over $4,000,000. This is the second step in our crusade against cancer.

The grants-in-aid program is largely basic or fundamental research. This program naturally evolves into an institutional grant. These grants are made where the concentration of projects in an institution is such that

a cancer research committee can administer a grant with maximum efficiency.

The society has approved 27 institutional grants totaling $1,500,000. These grants combine a unique combination of power, knowledge, and facilities.

Of the $163,141 raised in the State of Tennessee in 1947, 40 percent or approximately $59,000 was turned over to the national organization for the over-all program of research and education.

Of the $59,000, however, the State of Tennessee is receiving in return practically two-thirds in grants-in-aid and institutional grants. The research money earmarked for Tennessee this year includes an institutional grant of $25,000 for the University of Tennessee, grant-in-aid of $5,500 to John L. Wood at the University of Tennessee, and a grant-in-aid to Vanderbilt University of $7,750.

EDUCATION

The education program is recognized as a problem of persuading the individual citizen to act in his own behalf.

Thirty to fifty percent of those who currently die of cancer need not die—think of it. Thirty to fifty percent of those who die of cancer need not die—they could be saved by early diagnosis and treatment. Therefore, a substantial percentage of your funds is spent to enlighten the public on this fact. We are familiarizing our citizens with the seven cancer signals. These signals are:

1. Any sore that does not heal.
2. A painless lump or thickness, especially in the breast, lip, or tongue.
3. Bleeding from any natural body opening.
4. Progressive change in the color or size of a wart, mole, or birthmark.
5. Persistent indigestion.
6. Persistent hoarseness, unexplained cough, or difficulty in swallowing.
7. Any change in normal bowel habits.

The reason more progress has not been made in the control of cancer in the past has been the hush-hush attitude of the public toward cancer. Cancer has been looked upon as an incurable disease. For hundreds of years cancer has been considered by many as a disgrace. Cancer is neither incurable nor is it a disgrace. Cancer is a misfortune which can be overcome if detected in its early stages. To dispel the false notion that cancer is a disgrace or incurable is one of the functions of the American Cancer Society.

SERVICE

As our education program progresses, the need for service becomes greater. As the people become more and more conscious of cancer's signals and learn that cancer can be cured if detected in time, increased clinic facilities for diagnosis and treatment will be needed.

Until research provides more knowledge of cancer, we have only three ways to treat this disease. These are:

1. Surgery.
2. X-ray.
3. Radium.

By early diagnosis and treatment, 30 to 50 percent of the more than 180,000 cancer victims in the United States last year could have been saved.

The responsibility for the service program rests largely with the State divisions. In addition to raising the funds needed, the States guide that phase of the program which gives direct service to the cancer patients—or the people who may fall victims to cancer.

This is done through improvement of clinic facilities, by purchase of X-ray equipment and radium, and by providing nursing service. It is done through a program of bedside nursing care for patients who cannot afford such care.

Our field army provides important service to cancer victims, such as—

1. Dressings and sick-room comforts; and
2. Transportation for patients to clinics and doctors.

These enthusiastic public-spirited women provide these dressings and transportation without cost to cancer patients.

We have proceeded cautiously in formulating our policies. We have sought to spend the public's money where it will produce best results. At national level, in preparing research projects, the question is always: Is the project an integral part of the broad attack on cancer? At State levels, in preparing medical projects, our doctors have kept uppermost in mind this question: Will the project benefit cancer sufferers?

Many would like the society to underwrite the cost of terminal patients—those hopeless cases who are waiting to die. Our hearts tell us to do something for them. Our heads—which must govern our expenditures—tell us we cannot underwrite the cost of the care of these incurable cases. Expenditures for research, education, and service must have priority on all funds.

If we were to attempt to underwrite the cost of all terminal cases, we would never solve the problem of cancer, for we would have no money for research nor would we prevent death from cancer by education. We will never control cancer until we find the cause. That is why we emphasize research.

Should we underwrite the cost of these incurable cases, we would make it possible for more people to die more comfortably, but we would have done nothing to stop people from suffering and dying of cancer. No volunteer organization can cope with the whole problem of the chronically ill.

We must keep our minds glued to these two goals:

1. Alert the public to cancer signals and urge early diagnosis so that suffering may be prevented and lives saved.
2. Discover the cause of cancer and develop an effective control.

The State of Tennessee is among the leaders of the Nation in fighting cancer. During the 1947 campaign, Tennessee exceeded its goal by over 11 percent. This amounted to 5.6 cents per person of $43.80 per million dollars of total estimated wealth.

The contribution per capita is not necessarily a fair basis of comparing a State's ability to raise funds. On the basis of total estimated wealth, Tennessee made a very commendable showing. Her $43.80 per million dollars of wealth was well above the national average of $30.60. Tennessee ranks fourteenth among the 48 States in this respect. Under the able and inspiring leadership of Dr. James L. Fowle, Chattanooga raised over $20,000 last year, with an overhead of $25. That, so far as I am able to determine, is the lowest of any city or community in the Nation, and you are certainly to be congratulated.

Your citizens responded generously last year to the appeal for funds. Another appeal will be made in April, and I know you will again respond generously. Your money is needed if we are to do our share in financing the research program, if we are to do our share in providing greater clinic facilities, and if we are to do our share in enlightening the public of cancer signals. I urge you to give of your time to help raise funds with which to fight cancer.

[From the Chattanooga News-Free Press of April 1, 1948]

WILL CANCER HIT YOUR HOME?

Are you or some member of your family doomed to die of cancer? As things now stand, every American family has a 50-50 chance of being bereaved by this cruel killer.

Cancer, the Nation's most vicious untamed "malady murderer," is now killing Americans at the rate of 188,000 a year—one every 3 minutes. At the present rate, 17,000,000 Americans now alive are doomed to be killed by this dread disease, and it will strike one out of every two homes.

Cancer shows no favoritism—it takes its terrible toll from all age groups, from all races, from rich and poor alike.

No matter what your station in life may be, your home has a one-in-two chance of being one of those that will see loved ones die as cancer victims.

That is why everybody has a real personal interest in the drive, now under way, for funds with which to finance the war of science to conquer cancer.

It's as simple as this—the more the scientists find out about cancer, the more chance you and your loved ones will have of not being killed by cancer. And the more you and other citizens give, the better the scientists will be equipped to search for the secrets that will finally bring this scourge under control.

In order to conquer cancer scientists must find the cause of cancer. George E. Stringfellow, head of the New Jersey division of the American Cancer Society, told members of the Third District Cancer Association at a meeting here the other night. Mr. Stringfellow added that the American Cancer Society has mobilized the largest army of scientists in the world, one larger than that which worked to develop the atom bomb, for this fight to find the cause of cancer and save millions and millions of lives.

While the great secret has not yet been uncovered, the war against cancer is already paying big dividends. People who are stricken with cancer now have a 30 to 50 percent chance of being cured if treatments are started early enough.

The two big jobs in the cancer war, therefore, are research and education—research for the cause and other knowledge which will help save lives of cancer victims, and education to arouse the public to the danger of cancer and get those who have the disease to the doctors while there is still a chance that they can be saved.

Money donated to the cancer fund goes to finance both these phases of the cancer war, and also to local efforts, like the tumor clinic at Erlanger Hospital that has done so much good in the fight against cancer here.

One reason, probably the biggest reason, that so many people die of cancer is the fact that this great cause of suffering and death—second only to heart trouble as a cause of death—has been "neglected" in the past. Compared with the money spent to combat other diseases, some of them not nearly as serious a threat to as many people as cancer is, the amount that has been spent on cancer is negligible.

Hamilton County has an excellent record for financial support of the cancer program. Our county's quota this year is $35,000. Let's keep the record good.

Remember, when you are asked for a contribution to this fund, that the money being given this year may save a member of your family from death.

[From the Chattanooga News-Free Press of April 3, 1948]

CANCER DANGER SIGNALS

One of the tragic facts about the toll of death and suffering taken by cancer is that so many of the victims could be cured if they were treated in time.

"All the tools of service and all the knowledge of research are of no avail—unless the public is aroused to the personal threat of cancer," says a pamphlet in use in connection with the American Cancer Society's current drive for funds.

"For years science has been hampered by the 'taboo of silence'—the cloak of fear and ignorance which is cancer's greatest ally. Everyone, everywhere, must learn that delay can cause as high as 35 percent of all cancer

deaths. Everyone must learn cancer's danger signals, and what to do when cancer is suspected."

Public education, designed to crack the taboo of silence and save lives by getting cancer victims under medical care while there is yet time, is one of the major activities of the cancer society and its affiliated organizations.

The other major activity is research—the unending search by scientists for the cause of cancer, in order that it may be really conquered.

Both of these vital activities are financed by funds contributed in the annual cancer campaigns, like the one now being conducted here. Give to this campaign; help save many from being killed by cancer now, and many, many more in the future, when cancer will be given a knock-out blow by science.

Meanwhile, it is important for everyone to know the cancer danger signs, and to act quickly when they appear or are suspected. Here are seven danger signals given by the cancer society:

1. Any sore than does not heal, particularly about the tongue, mouth, or lips.
2. A painless lump or thickening, especially in the breast, lip, or tongue.
3. Progressive change in the color or size of a wart, mole, or birthmark.
4. Persistent indigestion.
5. Persistent hoarseness, unexplained cough, or difficulty in swallowing.
6. Bloody discharge from the breast or irregular bleeding from any of the natural body openings.
7. Any change in the normal elimination habits.

Pro America Address by Louise Hawkes Padelford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 15), 1948

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, Louise Hawkes Padelford is well and affectionately known to many of us for the double reason that she is the daughter of the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], and because she is presently the president of national Pro America. She is completely worth knowing in both capacities, and for herself as well.

On June 11, in Evanston, Ill., Mrs. Padelford delivered a keynote address before the national board meeting of Pro America. Her remarks were stimulating and thought provoking. Her challenge will result in securing an even greater faith in the promise of America by the women of our land.

I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Padelford's speech be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Pro America is a national, educational, political organization for women, young and old. They may be Republicans or independents or constitutional Democrats. They may be any women who suspect and want to prove that the Constitution of the United States, providing freedom under God to all its citizens, is the most liberal, most hopeful document of government ever written by man for his own protection and happiness.

Pro America women know that the socialistic theories and socialistic legislation of the New Deal are certain to destroy our American form of constitutional, representative government. We are women who know that the sole real strength of our Republic comes from the dynamic love our citizens feel for it. Just the mood of liking America, the sense of having inherited something of worth, just a childish notion that someone somewhere will take care of us without our making any effort, we know is not enough to preserve and improve our American form of government. "Good things," my father often says, "don't just happen; they have to be made to happen." We have to care. We have to know. We have to be social philosophers, as men and women were 150 years ago when they knew, all of them, what they were talking about when they explained the need for man's freedom, the suffering and stultification without it, and the specific provisions in the Constitution guaranteeing those freedoms which most men dream of and which so few in the history of a half million years on this earth have known how to obtain.

Today, except for all too rare exceptions, only the Communists are social philosophers. They know how to articulate skillfully and they argue for the overthrow of our American system of government and economy in favor of their own ancient, always unhappy plan to give a few fallible men absolute power over all other men.

Pro America members know, and are also learning to articulate skillfully, that man is master of the state; that the state is a servant of the people from whose consent it derives its power; and that we live under the rule of law, not the whim of any men.

Founded in 1933 in Seattle, Wash., to combat New Deal ideology, and dedicated by Mrs. Theodore Roosevelt, Sr., Pro America women feel the responsibility of informing themselves by study groups or reading groups, as well as by large general meetings, where problems of legislation, national, State, and local, and problems of education, both textbooks and teacher qualifications, are discussed.

We know that the majority of registered voters are women, the majority of life-insurance beneficiaries, of owners of stocks and bonds and savings accounts are women. Women exercise the greatest majority of buying power in the country. Women have closer relations with the schools and early years of their children's education than men. In other words, women not only stand to lose more than men by a disastrous change in our Government and economy but they have more power for good through their influence and their vote—if they care enough to exercise them both properly. Only when the ballot is inside the ballot box does it count in an election, and our women work in every way to get out the vote. We study, sponsor, and work for candidates and legislation.

That is why Pro America wants millions of women to give a minimum of 2 hours a month to a study group of their own friends, if they so choose. In political study, as in most other activities in life, it is by personal effort we learn most. By this effort we try to acquire for ourselves a political yardstick with which to measure any candidate or proposed legislation. If our yardstick is accurate, we need not be swept away by winsome campaign speeches or even by tragic problems calling for immediate help; we need not, as too many women's organizations are doing today, decide through emotion rather than knowledge upon some socialistic solution for the problems. With our political yardstick we can measure the whole picture, calculate something of the effect of one socialistic solution upon our whole structure of government and economy. In the flip words of a radio commentator, we suspect that "you can no more be a little bit socialistic than you can be a little bit pregnant." And we mean to find American, not socialistic, solutions for our problems.

Through our study groups Pro America women learn, or recall, that our Constitution is built on two great ideas: (1) That man's mind should be forever free; and (2) that man, being created in the image of God, has a soul that is eternal, a personality that is sacred and of utmost importance. It is, as Dr. Norman Vincent Peale has indicated, the attempts of communism to erase the importance of the individual as well as the importance of God which constitute the gravest perils to freedom today.

We learn much about the value of constitutional, representative government and the price that must be paid by each individual voter in choosing candidates to run, in working for their election, and in following their performance in office to see that they promote the kind of legislation needed for the welfare of society. We study the miracle of production under free private competitive enterprise, the ever-higher standard of living it produces.

We learn that our people, only 7 percent of the world population, have half the world's telephones, a third of the world's railways and improved highways, 60 percent of the world's life insurance, 80 percent of the world's automobiles, more money invested in our educational plant than does the entire world, and that even before the war the American worker earned twice as big a market basket as the British worker for the same amount of time, and seven times as big as the Russian worker. We learn that what has created this high standard and increased the real wages of the American worker at least four times in 150 years, while reducing work hours from 60 or 70 to 40 per week, has been the American system of free, private enterprise, with little bureaucracy, low taxes, small government debt, high investment by employers in machinery and tools for workers, protection to investors, and free trade over the entire United States. Thus the trend of the last 15 years seems tragedy to us.

We study legislation necessary to restrict monopolies, fraud, and deceit, in business, and to decrease unemployment, sweatshop methods, slums, social inequities, and many unworthy and unjust situations which indeed exist, but which can be cured without socialism and are far from justifiable reasons for overthrowing or deforming the greatest Government this earth has ever known.

Pro America believes in a strong two-party system and with the intention of defeating any "ism" which will undermine our American constitutional government—whether New Dealism, socialism, or communism—we work through the Republican Party but remain independent of it. Completely volunteer and amateur, Pro America is attracting unselfish women in all of the 10 States in which it is organized and is spreading into other States.

We invite and urge to membership all women who love our country enough to help save and improve it, who share the true American philosophy of the importance of God and of the individual, recognizing both rights and responsibilities, and who believe in their own ability to grow through study and work.

For years in my own family we have known a brief prayer: "Give me serenity against the things I cannot change; the courage to change the things I can; and the wisdom to know the difference."

I pray for the women of America that they may have the wisdom to know the difference and the courage to do what they can do easily, do if informed, and united to act for the welfare of our beloved country.

States' Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 15), 1948

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable Will S. Atkins, of Hope, Ark., at the southwest Arkansas States' rights meeting held there on April 20, 1948. Mr. Atkins was a former mayor of Hope and is now chairman of the Hempstead County Democratic Central Committee, and a member of the State Democratic central committee.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You are probably wondering why this meeting is being held and what the purposes of it are. Of course, it has to do with our Government and how it is administered. Our Government was conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal, and when the Union of States was effected and the Federal Government established the States composing that Union reserved to themselves all powers of government not delegated to the Federal Government. That great English statesman Gladstone said, "That the best government is the government that enables the people to govern themselves," and the founders of our Government, realizing and believing in that principle of government and that the geographical location of the various States of the Union would develop problems which would demand laws and regulations for one State that would be entirely inapplicable to States of another section, reserved to themselves the powers to govern themselves on all matters that pertained to the general welfare of the individual State. Under this form of government our States and the Union of States, in the brief time of our existence, has prospered and become the greatest Nation on earth. Our Federal Government is composed of three separate departments—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial, each performing the particular function of government as authorized by those who wrote the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, as ratified by the people, and specifically prohibiting the infringement of one department of government upon the rights of another department. If those regulations had been adhered to, the grave problems that confront our people today would not exist and meetings of this nature would be unnecessary and out of place. But it is well known to all lawyers and most of our people that, little by little, step by step, the Federal Government has infringed upon the rights of the States until there is only a semblance of States' rights left and we are now confronted by the President of the United States, the leader of the National Democratic Party, backed by his associates, leaders in the party, with the demand that Congress immediately enact what he sees fit to call the civil-rights program. Without going into details to analyze the different requests embodied in said program, which will be analyzed and discussed by other speakers, it goes without saying that if this program is enacted into law then the last star of hope for States' rights will have faded and the principle of local self-government of the various States of the Union will be a thing of the past. States' rights to the States of the North and East are as important to them as they are to the States of the South and some day those States will certainly realize such importance, but possibly at a time when it is too late to do anything about it.

At this particular time the said civil-rights program strikes harder on the South than any other part of the Union, but we probably should be getting used to such deals on the part of the national administration because for the last 16 years it has been heaped upon us time after time. The question naturally arises as to what we propose to do about it and to this question some of our people might answer, "Whither can we go and what can be done more than our Representatives in Congress are doing?" Let me pause here to commend our Representatives in Congress for the splendid fight they are making in behalf of the South. As to where we can go, let me answer that I don't know. I do know that we haven't gone anywhere, that we are still advocating and fighting for the principles as advocated by Thomas Jefferson, founder of the Democratic Party, and Andrew Jackson, that great Southerner, who was the defender of the principle of democracy. The national administration is the one that has left home. They are the ones that have gone away, and we don't propose to follow them. By the united effort of the Southern States it is my firm belief that we can make our influence felt and in the end be instrumental in reestablishing the Democratic Party as it was originally conceived of and established by its founders.

Others may say, "Well, your objectives are laudable, but you can't win." It seems to me that I recall a great statesman who said, on one occasion, that he had rather be right than to be President. If I may offer an observation as to the causes that have brought about this crisis that now confronts the South, I would say that there is too much consideration being given to the question of whether or not we could win and not enough to the question of right, and in many instances our leaders, because of the objective of winning, have unconsciously, for a mess of political pottage, sold the South down the river and, little by little, step by step, our States' rights have been taken from us until there is not much left.

I know not what course others may take on this question, but as for myself I had rather go down in defeat a thousand times, fighting for the principles of Jefferson and Jackson, the principles that have made this a Nation patterned after the teachings of the Great Teacher, I had rather go politically I know not where, than to stand and knock at the back door and beg for the crumbs that fall from the table of a national administration that has helped to destroy some of the main principles upon which the greatest government under God's sun was founded.

Billions for Defense, Not One Cent for Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 15), 1948

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Billions for Defense, Not One Cent for Tribute," published in the Denver Post of June 14, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILLIONS FOR DEFENSE, NOT ONE CENT FOR TRIBUTE

In his University of California address, President Truman pulled no rabbits out of the hat. He discussed America's role in a world hungry for peace, but he asked his listeners to understand there is no sleight-of-hand, no magical trick for producing this desired object.

There is no way to peace—that is, peace with freedom—less difficult or more certain than the one which we are pursuing today. That is the way of firm, patient resistance to aggression, accompanied by self-sacrificing exertions to strengthen free peoples.

The method is costly and, at times, nerve-racking and confusing. Moreover, it is a way fraught with risk. But it is neither as costly nor as risky as the alternatives.

So there was nothing in the President's statement which suggested a fresh approach to the problem of peace between the eastern and western worlds. He did, however, redefine this crisis in terms which can never be too greatly emphasized.

Above all, he underscored the fact that "not a single one of the major unsettled questions of the postwar world is primarily a disagreement between this country and the Soviet Union."

The dangerous cleavage today is not between the United States alone and Russia—rather it is "between the Soviet Union and the rest of the world."

The President had a challenging answer to the Wallaceites and the persons of faint heart who have been urging a short cut to "peace" through negotiation.

"There is nothing to negotiate," the President observed, "when one nation disregards the principles of international conduct to which all the members of the United Nations have subscribed."

Indeed, just what is there to negotiate unless we are prepared to recognize the wrongs which the aggressor has already committed? There is a question for Mr. Wallace to answer. In negotiations, there is give and take. What do we give, Mr. Wallace, which is ours to give in honor?

Negotiations with Russia, on the terms now acceptable to Stalin, would smack of tribute, and, as President Truman aptly observed, "No nation has a right to exact a price for good behavior."

Reduction of ERP Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 15), 1948

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "ERP in Conference," published in the Baltimore Sun on June 17, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ERP IN CONFERENCE

When the Senate corrected the worst features of the House bill to renew the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, the House promptly acquiesced in the Senate's amendments; and the renewal bill was sent to the President. In the case of the bill appropriating funds for the European Cooperation Administration (the Marshall

plan) the House has been much less amenable.

In the original House bill, the total which had been asked for to get the Marshall plan going for this year was reduced by approximately one-fourth. Secretary Marshall promptly protested. So did Senator VANDENBERG. So did all those who look upon the Marshall plan as the kingpin of our European policy. The Senate heeded these protests and, by a vote of 60 to 9, early Wednesday morning it restored most of the amount which the House had cut. But the House has not acquiesced in these restorations. Yesterday afternoon it refused to accept the Senate version of the bill. So now the bill goes into conference committee.

Representative TABER, the man immediately responsible for paring down the Marshall plan appropriation, leads the House conferees; Senator BRIDGES, a stanch advocate of the Marshall plan, leads the Senate conferees. There will be nothing perfunctory about the job of reconciling differences in House and Senate points of view.

The Sun believes that a drastic cutting down of the Marshall plan appropriation would be a tragic mistake. Yet it is only proper to look at Representative TABER'S argument with an open mind. Representative TABER objects that many of the figures involved in the Marshall plan are tentative—he has indeed exposed some of those figures as being very badly founded in Europe's needs. Some of them, as he has demonstrated, represent hardly more than hopes. To cite a single illustration, the European nations need power equipment. But in some instances it is doubtful that such equipment, though provided for in the Marshall plan figures for the coming year, could actually be made use of during that year. Mr. TABER can see no reason why Congress should appropriate for materials before there is proof that they can be used. He believes that the number of unproved or questionable provisions in the Marshall plan schedules is large enough to justify his drastic cut.

But such wholly respectable scruples overlook three very important points.

The first is that, considering what is at stake in the economic recovery of Europe, it is false economy to quibble and unwise to give the appearance of quibbling. The cost of failure, to the United States, would be vastly larger than any economies which Representative TABER might win. The kind of exactness which a business, say, would be expected to display in arguing the need for a loan with its banker is hardly possible in the case of this vast project for helping a continent to work out its salvation—and it is risky to insist on it.

The second is that all of the money appropriated will not necessarily be spent.

The third is that the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 (which sets up the Marshall plan administration) specifies an impressive array of safeguards designed to see that dollars are not wasted or misspent—and that the ECA is itself headed by an Administrator, Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, whose training and career in business offer good assurance that he would not squander those dollars foolishly even if the law allowed him to do so.

Tomorrow's No Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 15), 1948

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a commencement address delivered by Alex H. Washburn at Wyoming Seminary, Kingston, Pa., June 5, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOMORROW'S NO HOLIDAY

Thirty years ago at Wyoming Seminary I delivered a student oration. I was competing with Ike Davis—and he defeated me.

As a consolation prize my father gave me a gun. I do not mean to suggest that back yonder there was any connection between losing a debate and getting a gun—but in the light of world affairs today it could be called significant.

I lost in that speaking contest, but maybe something can be salvaged from it 30 years later. The title of my oration was The Power Behind the Throne. It was a study of Gregory Rasputin, evil monk who ruled Russia under the Czar at the time of World War I. Rasputin not only ran the established church of Russia but also determined his country's foreign policy.

The oration showed, as I recall, that 30 years ago Russia was having trouble at home with her immortal soul, and abroad was feared by her neighbors.

And that's a sentence that time has stood still on for 30 years. The dictator of World War I wears a new name in 1948, but the Russia that he rules is unchanged.

The subject of my oration 30 years ago was suggested by the late Professor Trebilcox, head of the seminary's English department.

And I in turn suggest today:

That when nations' relations wear an uncompromising face steadfastly for 30 years the foreign situation at any particular moment may not be as critical as our public spokesmen and our private fears would lead us to believe. Where is the danger of being caught by surprise and overwhelmed when the nature of our antagonist is clearly disclosed?

On the other hand, thoughtful men reject as a safe human goal that one of the late President Roosevelt's four freedoms which he called freedom from fear. I should say that the safety of our country today, the safety of the world, the safety of every individual in his role as a liberty-loving citizen, absolutely depends on our capacity for fear.

For when men are afraid, compulsion is upon them to be alert, courageous, and resourceful.

Never before in all history has so much depended on men's thorough understanding of the unique nature of this Republic. The danger that threatens us from abroad is less to be feared, because it is a known quantity, than the danger that threatens us from within—for the internal threat to our free institutions and republican form of government is as powerful and real as the willful desires of millions of men. All that Americans need to do to turn this vague internal threat into a grim reality is to resolve to quit working together and begin working separately. Thus do nations fly apart, substituting for present power and wealth and freedom that ancient weakness, poverty, and slavery from which our civilization slowly climbed through painful ages.

The quality of American Government is unique among all nations and all ages. But, as John C. Calhoun said of liberty, it may be harder to preserve than it was to obtain.

Our country has come a long way—from primitive wilderness to the richest and most powerful nation in history—but not because of any special genius in the American people, either today or yesterday.

Rather, it was due to the accident of a few great minds in colonial times hitting upon a scheme of government that had never been tried before. It was a government in which the people elected a Congress to make the law, elected a President to enforce the law—but established above both of them a Constitution and a Supreme Court to interpret the law.

This was the original government that permitted America to grow great, rich in peace, powerful in war—because there was harmony and stability. When the people fell momentarily into error, or the Congress or the President made a mistake, the error was caught by a nonpolitical Supreme Court, impartially interpreting the basic law of the land to an angry or hasty Congress—or people.

But if America should fall upon evil times, it will be due to the people's own error in destroying by legalized force the sacred altar of self-government that was accidentally disclosed to their forefathers.

If the prestige and power of the United States Supreme Court as interpreter of the Constitution and check on popular government is ever destroyed, you should pause to consider this fact:

We would no longer have our threefold form of government—legislative, executive, judicial. We would have only the first two. That is to say, ours would no longer be the American form of government—but it would be the form of government that they have in France and Italy, where cabinets change many times in a year, where the people are at each others' throats, where many are hungry—and all are afraid.

This is the inherent danger confronting every nation ruled by its citizens, where responsibility is spread among millions instead of being lodged in a monarch or a dictator—and an especially real danger for Americans because our republic superficially resembles popular government in certain other countries and therefore the significance of basic change in our constitutional form might escape attention until disaster was upon us.

Fundamentally, ours is a government of the majority, with constitutional protection for minorities.

What is going on in America today is an attempt to reverse this fundamental aim—to substitute for a true majority a combination of minorities, each with their special ax to grind; and to substitute for our ancient guaranty of liberty for all a series of force bills extending government police powers just as they have been extended in every nation unless stopped by an informed and watchful people.

Specific examples of what I am talking about are two force bills on the current political scene. One is the Mundt-Nixon bill in Congress to outlaw the Communist Party. It is proposed in free America to establish political labels under which individual citizens can be prosecuted for what they think rather than what they do. This is proposed in the name of democracy, notwithstanding the fact that the United States has always had laws to punish treason, and the further fact that laws to punish dangerous thoughts are generally associated with dictatorships rather than democracies.

The second example of proposed force bills is President Truman's so-called civil rights program, which would take the Federal Government into local elections, local courts, and even into private homes, in the South, under the pretext of obtaining votes for Negroes, ending the crime of lynching, and breaking up the practice of segregating whites and Negroes. I am a northerner who has lived in the South for 25 years. You must believe me when I say that the goals of such force bills are more or less the same goals sought by southerners themselves—but voluntarily, not by compulsion. After all, we already have laws to punish murder; the courts are taking care of the voting question; and segregation is a social rather than a legal matter, and is as apt to occur in the North as it is in the South.

I cite the foregoing examples of force bills not as a partisan spokesman for the South but as a reminder that Americans are guilty in our times of thinking that law will make better men than the homes and schools and churches of the Nation have been able to do.

Our Nation was founded on the gospel that there is no substitute for a good man, and government should keep its hands off him. Therefore the founding fathers said that that government was best which governed least.

And once we lose that faith, looking back to the European continent for lessons in how to make men by law rather than by home training, church teaching, and education, then we will in effect have returned to that sad continent from which our forefathers fled—and the United States will have become just another chapter in the long history of nations that rose from humble beginnings to wealth and power and then slipped back into the ashes of oblivion.

Do I sound like a prophet of doom? But in my own lifetime, in the relatively few years since leaving these ivied halls, I have seen Europe change from a rich and teeming and free continent to a land bankrupt of human liberty as well as pocketbook. Her institutions went down, and with them the liberty of her people—and you can't charge it all to the toll of war. Something basic in the lives of freemen was lost to the people of Europe. France, modern home of liberty and sponsor of our own revolution, was so divided in the 1930's that each Frenchman followed his own particular "ism" and none would fight for France when the enemy came knocking at her gates in World War II.

But against this stands in bold relief the heroic picture of another democracy, little Switzerland, which, surrounded by a dictatorship and the world's greatest army, resolutely fortified the Alps and told the Germans to come on—the Swiss would defend their country or die in the attempt.

To explain such faith, courage, and resourcefulness you need to look into the hearts of the Swiss people. They knew their own country. They knew that however little they might have it was more than some other countries enjoy. And they had good homes and churches and schools to furnish a leadership which constantly preached Switzerland to the Swiss, interpreted government to its people, and kept together one mighty atom of a nation when all the world seemed to be sweeping toward destruction.

Such an example will do for our own people, and we need it—for what America faces tomorrow is no holiday.

We have a troubled world abroad; and at home our people, harassed by inflation, are divided in quarrels over what constitutes a fair share of the national economy. It might help all of us to know how well off we are by comparison with some of the rest of the world. I was struck by this paragraph from the Atlantic Report on the Middle East this past January:

"One-half of 1 percent of the population owns one-third of the land. Under an antiquated system of land tenure, the Arab peasantry is chronically in debt to usurers and absentee landlords; interest rates frequently range from 50 to 200 percent. The average annual income of an Iraqui peasant family before the war was $35. Children 6 years old are employed in the cotton-gin plant of the Banque Misr, of Egypt, for a daily wage of 15 cents. The Syrian agricultural worker is paid even less. Iraq, once the seat of a flowering civilization, now cultivates only 20 percent of its arable land; Syria only 35 percent. Slavery is recognized by law in Saudi Arabia and the Yemen, which was recently admitted to the United Nations."

There is a disposition by an increasing number of Americans, when they read reports like this, to suggest that our country do something about it. But a more fully informed person might seize the illustration and use it as a warning to unify our own country, to harbor our own resources, and prepare against the evil day when trouble will come to our own doorstep.

There is a section of informed opinion in America which holds that there is no sure peace for the world regardless of the United Nations, regardless of what Russia, Britain, and the United States may work out among themselves—because of factors that aren't concerned with politics at all. I will give you a sample of this opinion.

William Vogt, Chief of the Conservation Section of the Pan American Union, wrote in the Saturday Evening Post for May 12, 1945, an article "Hunger at the Peace Table," which said in part:

"The great Guatemalan civilization of the Mayas is thought to have been wiped out by soil erosion and exhaustion; their modern descendants are plodding down the same road.

"The grim catalog could be extended to include virtually every country in the Western Hemisphere, southern and eastern Europe, most of civilized Asia and Africa, and Australia. The earth is constantly cutting its dividends.

"At the same time, demands for the fruits of the earth are increasing. Except for countries overwhelmed by war, where the trend has been temporarily reversed, populations are mounting nearly everywhere. * * *

"Agitators, both internal and foreign, are making use of hunger, and the winds that whip about tottering governments are shaking the good-neighbor policy to the core. It's hard to reason with a starving man. * * *

"It is relatively easy, in most countries, to secure funds to keep more people alive—to build up populations. To insure those populations against starvation is something else again. During the war, our own Government spent, abroad, tens of millions of dollars on public health. Our conservation expenditures in those same areas—apart from a few shot-in-the-arm scholarships—have been less than 1 percent of these amounts. * * *

"Perhaps we can visualize the situation if we think of two trains. One of them represents world population; the other, natural resources. They are running toward each other—on the same track. What is going to happen when they meet? What is being done to keep them from meeting? * * *

"A Guatemalan Indian—whom I had shown the meaning of the gullies through the corn and wheat fields—and the chocolate color of the river—said, 'Why, my country is a New Atlantis. It is disappearing beneath the ocean.'

"There is, as yet, no indication that that New Atlantis is to have equal representation at the peace tables with the Big Four. Yet it is at least their equal in power. As a potential cause of wars, it is far more dangerous than could be even an unchastened Germany. Unless something is done to limit the size of this New Atlantis, its invasion of the land of other nations—even of the Big Four—is inevitable. To control it will require statesmanship of a higher order. Unless it is controlled there can be no peace."

But if an American looks out upon the rest of the world and echoes that ancient lament, "I found no peace," he can at least discharge to the best of his ability his duty to keep war away from his own country. I have here some notes, amounting to a young man's confession, taken from the Saturday Evening Post article of May 19, 1945, by E. J. Kahn, Jr. This serviceman reports:

"Some 9 or 10 years ago I was a member of a not unduly disreputable group of young men who, standing in massed solemnity on a college campus, loudly took the Oxford pledge. By doing so, we committed ourselves with rather heady optimism to nonparticipation in any war."

The author, writing as a warrant officer then 3½ years in service, continued:

"This war and our paradoxical attitude before it have taught us one vivid lesson: That it is extremely risky to leave the security of a modern nation at peace up to those who live in it. A nation must inherit its security from the generation that has seen that security jeopardized. It will be no more possible to convince a young man in 1965 that the prevention of war is a personal concern of his—assuming that he is at peace by then—by describing to him the historical nature of war than it is possible today to convince his mother of the toughness of the life of an infantryman in the front lines by showing her a few hundred feet of newsreel film. * * * That is why I, who not so long ago regarded universal military training as a reactionary absurdity, think that it is essential for us to put such a program into effect right now, before we start to forget again. * * *

"I have just had something over 3½ of my presumably better years taken away—and I do not feel that my future, such as it may be, has been sabotaged by this interlude. I think that I shall be fortunate if I have any future, and that I am lucky to be alive now, and that there are too many Americans who are insufficiently grateful for their own similar good fortune."

And this soldier's note makes a good ending.

Neither war nor panic nor political division surprises an American familiar with his country's history.

And if, on scanning the horizon, we fail to find immediately some bright tomorrow, why, tomorrow measured in terms of history is just another day. America is a land where the people meet and solve their country's problems—and we'll never be lost as long as we work on it.

Trouble in Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 17, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, for months upon months I have demanded that the President, the Secretary of State, or the appropriate congressional committees do something about Loy Henderson and his clique in the Division of Near Eastern and African Affairs.

I have not been alone.

Particularly two New York newspapers, the Jewish Day and the New York Post, have carried on an effective news and editorial campaign, in which they have exposed to the world the ignominious role of our great and powerful and democratic country tied to the decadent policies of the decaying British Empire through the machinations of a few American officials who have openly flouted the policies laid down by the President.

I am inserting, under leave, an editorial from the Day, of June 17, and another from the Post, of June 16. Both are clear and cogent. Both express admirably the views which millions hold. Both are well worth reading.

[From the Jewish Day of June 17, 1948]

NEWS AND VIEWS—PERILS OF THE TRUCE—THE POLITICAL OFFENSIVE—THE WASHINGTON-LONDON AXIS ON GUARD

(By Dr. S. Margoshes)

It is no paradox that, now that the Arab guns have fallen silent in Palestine, there

is a truly menacing situation for Israel. The threat to Israel's survival, far from having diminished, has increased immensely. For, with the Arab military offensive practically brought to a standstill, the political offensive begins.

It will continue unabated during the 4 weeks of the truce period. Attempt after attempt will be made to abolish the Jewish state if possible, to push in its frontiers until it is nothing more than a sizable ghetto, to hedge it around with restrictive provisions until nothing remains of its sovereignty. In brief, an effort will be made to wrest for the Arabs and Britain by political means what could not be achieved by force of arms.

Moreover, there is a grave danger that in this political offensive Britain and the United States will once again become partners. Walter Lippmann, an old admirer of the American-British partnership, writing nostalgically the other day of its ancient glory, laid out a simple play for its revival through a British-American accord on Palestine. To Lippmann nothing is simpler than such an accord. "It is preposterous to suppose," he writes, "that Britain and America cannot make peace in Palestine when, of the two main parties at interest, Israel is dependent upon the United States and Trans-Jordan upon Britain. Only stubborn stupidity in London and in Washington can make that problem insoluble; among the really difficult problems of the world, it is one of the simplest and the most manageable." Mr. Lippmann's plan for America and Britain in Palestine is, indeed, simplicity itself. "Far from dividing Britain and America," he says, "the Palestinian problem is an opportunity which can be seized and used to unite them on the strong foundation of the vital interests. For peace and a treaty of alliance between Israel and Transjordan, under the joint protection of Britain and America, and under the aegis of the United Nations, is attainable if the two governments are resolutely determined to attain it. No one can veto it. No one can effectively obstruct it. Only by carrying it through can the authority of the United Nations be limited."

The trouble, however, is that Mr. Lippmann is not in the State Department and is not in charge of the United States Palestine policy. Loy Henderson is. Together with his counterpart at 10 Downing Street, he will, no doubt, attempt to steer the Arab-Israel peace negotiations at the Island of Rhodes. Whether Count Bernadotte admits it or not, it will not be the United Nations whose influence will be felt at the peace table, but America's and Britain's, and that means that the old hands of the Near Eastern Division of the State Department in Washington and of the Colonial Office in London will have a new opportunity to prepare a new mess in the Near East.

With the world tension being what it is, and everybody jittery, there is real danger that they will succeed unless the true friends of Israel are on guard. Among these true friends I count first and foremost American liberal public opinion and, of course, American Jewry. They have to be on the alert from now on and constantly through the truce period against the maneuvers that are sure to be started, both in Washington and in London, aimed at the very heart of Israel.

It is heartening to see that even such an organ of conservative American public opinion as the New York Times realizes that nothing can be done by way of a settlement that will not fully recognize the state of Israel. "Whatever settlement may be proposed," says the New York Times anent the peace negotiations during the truce period, "there can no longer be any doubt that it must be based on the continued existence of the state of Israel. That state now has behind it not only the sanction of the United Nations, as expressed in the partition solution, and of the recognition accorded to it by the United States, Russia, and other nations; it has likewise stood the test of battle in defense of its sovereignty and independence." However, our State Department has often been found to be lagging even behind conservative public opinion, and it may, in this case, be intent on forming a new American-British partnership on Palestine, but along lines altogether different from those envisaged by Walter Lippmann. The State Department-Foreign Office combination may try to revive once again the Morrison-Grady plan, or do its level best to grab the Negev for the Abdullah-Bevin partnership.

That Israel will never consent to purchase peace on such terms goes without saying. There is no doubt that, with the choice left to Israel, she will elect to resume fighting rather than endure another partition of the Jewish patrimony. If such an eventuality is to be avoided American public opinion, together with American Jewry, must bring their full weight to bear on the American Government while peace negotiations are proceeding on the isle of Rhodes.

[From the New York Post of June 16, 1948]

AMERICA'S RESPONSIBILITY

(By T. O. Thackrey)

The rising tide of resentment against Great Britain's pro-Arab, anti-Israel policy in the Middle East must not be permitted to blind us to the real and basic responsibility which lies in Washington now rather than in London.

It is true, of course, that Great Britain under Foreign Minister Bevin has made a desperate effort, first, to give the Arabs all-out help in their effort to wipe out the Jews who dared declare their independence and, next, to bring such economic pressure that Israel's defense would be greatly hampered by the end of the truce.

British encouragement of Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Transjordan, and their allies in refusing to pay heed to warnings from the United States against blockade; British diversion of oil from Haifa to deprive Israel of its use; British refusal to surrender the Jews imprisoned at Cyprus and elsewhere for the crime of seeking entrance to the country promised them for 30 years; all these and much more properly build resentment.

But the cure for these evil-inspired policies is to be found in Washington.

Each dreadful move by Bevin has been made either by agreement with the national administration at Washington, or has been made possible by our failure to exert the proper pressure for change.

President Truman, whether he favors the establishment of Israel or not, has either failed to give sufficiently sharp and clear directives to his State and Defense Departments, or he has permitted his public statements of policy to be sabotaged.

As a result, the war which could have been stopped before it began, has now been stopped because it has become clear that the seven Arab nations are no match for little Israel, the David of the Goliath legend come to life.

There is no doubt that in many departments of the national administration, including the White House, there has been some relief at the diversion of the mounting protest over middle eastern policy from centering on Washington to centering on Bevin.

And Bevin's responsibility is very great.

But it is not nearly as great in fact as that of President Truman and his advisers.

We have been acting as though we were a colony rather than a great power; and we have been publicly excusing ourselves for our shameless and spineless failure to give Israel all-out support with the theory that we need Britain's friendship for the sake of military alliance, and for the sake of Europe's economic recovery.

But the United States of America is the essential partner to such an alliance—not Great Britain.

It is our tax money, our military and economic strength, our unqualified assistance, which is being called upon.

The truth is that Bevin would never have dared embark on his bitter war of extermination against Palestinian Jews if he had not been led to believe that President Truman's statements were merely for domestic political consumption and would not be translated into decisive action.

Meanwhile, Israel lives in spite of our failures and Bevin's hopes. Left without Britain's—or our—money, arms, and intervention, the Arab armies have already demonstrated that they cannot possibly defeat Israel in battle.

Peace—and prosperity for the Middle East—can be achieved during the present period of truce only if the United States recognizes the inevitability of the State of Israel which will not die and will not surrender.

But it is up to President Truman to instruct Secretary Marshall, Secretary Forrestal, and Ambassador Douglas that having recognized Israel we will not see it destroyed either in debate or in war.

The responsibility for a firm peace arising from today's tentative truce lies with him.

The "New" Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 15), 1948

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The 'New' Truman," written by Barnet Nover and published in the Denver Post of June 14, 1948.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE "NEW" TRUMAN

(By Barnet Nover)

Aboard the Truman train: Until President Truman left Washington on his western trip early this month, the Republican leaders in and out of Congress were increasingly inclined to treat him as a spent force, a political cipher.

Even the most cautious among them were convinced that Harry Truman's days as Chief Executive were numbered; that come January 1949 there would be a Republican in the White House. For that reason they have been far more concerned over what was going to happen in Philadelphia late this month than with what is going to happen in the Nation in November.

Anticipating certain victory, they began to act as though the victory had already occurred. Walt Whitman once referred to the incredible audacity of elected persons. Certain of the actions of the present Republican-dominated Congress suggest that such audacity may also be characteristic of individuals and a party who feel they cannot lose.

Sure that the electorate had no choice but to vote them back into power and also elect a Republican President for the first time in 20 years, the congressional majority sought to legislate on a temporary basis, as in the

case of the trade agreements, or postponed action altogether, as in the matter of legislation involving housing, aid to education, agriculture, price controls, and other vital matters.

Then came the Truman visit to the West. It soon became apparent that the little man from Missouri did not intend to bow to the inevitable but was prepared to fight for his political life, to do so with no holds barred.

His campaign tour—the "nonpolitical" label soon disappeared—got off to a slow and somewhat fumbling start. The "new" Truman emerged only slowly.

As Truman warmed up, as he began to lash out at Congress without gloves, something began to happen which left those same political observers rubbing their eyes.

In Wyoming, the crowds were friendlier, warmer, even somewhat enthusiastic. Butte, Mont., was a revelation. The Truman who spoke there was, in fact, a new Truman; he was no longer the bewildered, feeble, ineffective individual the country had come to believe he was, but a scrapper who was not going to take his defeat lying down.

As his tour continued, Truman's challenge to Congress, which meant in effect to the Republican Party which controlled Congress, became sharper, more belligerent. At Spokane, Wash., a chance remark to a reporter that the eightieth Congress was "the worst since the first one met in Washington's day," brought a violent reaction from some Republican Members of Congress. The barb went home and drew blood.

The country, this observer has found in traveling with the President, is in a mood to be highly critical of Congress. In hitting out at that body, Truman has undoubtedly increased his popularity.

The President has shown sound political instincts in carrying his case directly to the people. Increasingly, in the opinion of the great majority of reporters on the Presidential caravan, Truman's efforts are beginning to bear fruit. It has begun to win support from the masses; what is of no less importance, it has begun to revivify the moribund Democratic Party organizations in the Western States. Democratic politicians do not hide their delight with the President's tactics.

The people may still be puzzled by this new and hitherto unknown Truman who confronts them face to face and talks to them man to man. But they appear to like the "new" Truman, to be convinced that he is in effect, as he claims, their champion against the "interests" who, he says on every occasion, dominate the Eightieth Congress.

There is no doubt Harry Truman is putting on a good show. He is doing more. He is also altering the political equation which, only very recently, suggested an overwhelming Republican victory.

Wiser heads on the GOP are beginning to wonder whether the Republicans hadn't made the cardinal mistake in politics, which is to take victory for granted before the ballots had been counted.

Minnesota Women at the Republican National Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1948

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Speaker, 40 percent of the Minnesota delegates to the Republican National Convention this year will be women. It appears that Minnesota will have a larger delegation of women than any other State. I include the following excerpt from the publication Education for Action, published by the Republican Work Shop, Minneapolis, Minn.:

Women made their first official appearance at a national convention in Minneapolis, Minn., in 1892, when two were seated as alternates and one addressed the convention. In the succeeding years as women have made steady gains in representation, Minnesota has continued to set the pace in the recognition of women by electing 10 women delegates and 10 women alternates to the 1948 convention. The record of 1944 has been maintained by the women again having 40 percent of the delegates. From all available information it appears that Minnesota will have the largest delegation of women.

European Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 15), 1948

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interview with Hon. Joseph P. Kennedy, former United States Ambassador to Great Britain, on the subject of appropriations for European aid, which appeared in an article in the Evening Star of Washington, D. C., on Wednesday, June 16.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNEDY ASSERTS ROW OVER ERP CUT HAS NO REAL MEANING

(By Robert S. Allen)

NEW YORK, June 16.—Joseph P. Kennedy, United States Ambassador to Britain during the Roosevelt administration, says there is no real meaning to the controversy between the Senate and the House over the action of the House in slashing more than $1,000,000,000 from the ERP appropriation bill.

Just returned from a visit to Europe, where he made an extensive survey of economic and political conditions, Mr. Kennedy declared in an interview that the Marshall plan offered no necessarily sound or permanent solution for the many complex problems of the war-wrecked continent.

"From my observations in Europe," he said, "I have concluded that no one has the right to say that any single plan is the answer to the numerous and great difficulties over there. No one can rightfully say that $6,000,000,000 is the exact amount of money that is needed for the so-called recovery program. No one can rightfully say, as is being done, that a smaller sum would be disastrous.

INFLATION DANGERS

"I make this statement on the basis of my extensive personal observations in Europe and on the plain and simple facts of conditions there. The underlying weakness and danger of the ERP is that it can easily further increase and accelerate inflation in Europe as well as here in the United States. That is a fundamental danger the importance of which cannot be exaggerated.

"No one disputes the contention that we must help Europe. That is necessary. But, at the same time, we are only laying ourselves open to a lot of trouble both over there and here at home to go on the basis that any single plan or a certain sum of money is the answer to the problem. That's a delusion and a snare. Because, when we stop sending billions to Europe, as we will have to do sooner or later, they will hold it against us and resentment will be greater against us than if we hadn't done anything."

The American business leader and former diplomat, who conferred with British, French, Italian, and other European chiefs during his recent visit, laid great stress on the danger of incurring European hostility.

PERSONAL WITH EUROPEANS

He pointed out that Europeans have only the sketchiest idea of what is going on in the United States and in Congress. They envision this country as fabulously rich and prosperous, and have been told now for many months that the United State is going to put them back on their feet. The European, Mr. Kennedy warned, translates all this in strictly personal terms; what it will mean personally to him in more food and other commodities.

"As a result," he declared, "when the time comes that we can't give them what they think they should have, they will be very sore and hold it bitterly against us. That's the reality about which very little is said, but which is a very important factor."

The growth and strength of communism among the masses in Europe, Mr. Kennedy asserted, is due basically to the underlying economic "imbalance" there—the spread that exists for the masses between their wants and their means of satisfying them. Official statistics superficially deny this. Everywhere he went, Mr. Kennedy continued, he was shown reams of government statistics and charts proving the production was steadily getting better. But actually conditions are a different story, and they are not improving for the great mass of Europeans.

Mr. Kennedy vigorously criticized the failure of United States foreign policy makers to build up the defenses of the Western Hemisphere to meet the menace of world communism. He contended that a plan for the Western Hemisphere is as vital for the security of the United States as the Marshall plan is for Europe. Mr. Kennedy asserted that concentrating all our attention and resources on Europe amounted to putting "all our eggs in a very uncertain basket."

PLAN MAY NOT SUCCEED

"European recovery can be only one phase of our planning," Mr. Kennedy declared. "It is a beginning, not an end; and a beginning that cannot be free from doubts. The Marshall plan may or may not succeed, and we must accustom ourselves to think in terms of failure or partial failure as well as success. We must therefore look elsewhere, especially at problems that are close at hand.

"The answer in my judgment lies in great measure in our own hemisphere. Can we make this hemisphere self-sufficient and so economically strong that as a whole it can support the armament program we must have and still provide for all of us a reasonably decent standard of living? An answer to that question has an urgency that is high-lighted by the recent events in Bogotá.

"To sink billions of dollars into countries which can produce nothing that matters to us or that in the end turn Communist," Mr. Kennedy went on, "is merely to waste our strength. Even a rehabilitated Europe cannot provide us with strategic materials, oil, tin, mica, etc. Europe's main effort for years will be limited to merely trying to keep alive, and for years it will continue to ask more of us than it can possibly give us."

No Obligation Whatsoever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 17, 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, we hear much today when we discuss the billion-dollar reduction our Appropriations Committee made in the European relief money, about our promises, commitments, obligations, and so forth.

The proponents of extra billions for European relief are crying from coast to coast that we are deceiving or betraying someone. The assumption is absolutely erroneous and surely will not be seriously considered by any responsible person.

In section 114 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, we find this language:

> Nothing in this title is intended nor shall it be construed as an expressed or implied commitment to provide any specific assistance, whether of funds, commodities, or services, to any country or countries.

Consequently, there is no obligation whatsoever expressed or implied.

Jewish War Veterans Hold Fifty-third Annual Memorial Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 17, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, on May 30, observed throughout the Nation as a day of remembrance for the brave men who fell in battle that our country might live, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States observed its fifty-third annual memorial services at Temple Emanuel, New York, symbolizing the local services held by member posts in all the States.

The principal speaker of the day was Maj. Gen. George E. Stratemeyer, commanding general of the Air Defense Command, an officer tested by battle conditions against a grim enemy.

Besides the principal address scores of greetings were received and read. They came from every walk of life—from the President, from members of the Cabinet, from high-ranking officers, from Members of Congress, and from well wishers in private life.

Under consent, I am inserting a number of these messages in the RECORD.

The history of the Jewish War Veterans is one of which every American can be proud.

There have been distinguished Jewish military leaders in every war which has involved the American people since earliest colonial times. The American Revolution was financed in large part by a Jewish merchant of Philadelphia. Every American thrills with pride at the recital of the deeds of bravery and sacrifice of Americans whose religious heritage is Jewish.

I hope that Members will find these inspiring messages well worth the few minutes it will take to read them.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 13, 1948.

Mr. JULIUS KLEIN,
National Commander, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. KLEIN: The fifty-third annual memorial service of the Jewish War Veterans is a reminder of our sacred obligation to keep alive the ideals of freedom and liberty for which Americans of every race and creed have sacrificed their lives in war.

Your organization has, through the years, devoted itself to perpetuation of the traditions of national service left us by Americans of Jewish faith, who with Americans of every other religious belief and national origin, have fallen in combat in all wars of our Nation since the War of Independence.

It is not enough that we pay lip service to those who died in the fight to bring tolerance and good will to the world. We must ever keep in our hearts the need for understanding and peace among all peoples wherever they may be. Under God, let us hold high the torch of freedom and justice for all people.

Very sincerely yours,
HARRY S. TRUMAN.

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., April 30, 1948.

Mr. JULIUS KLEIN,
National Commander, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America,
New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. KLEIN: It affords me genuine pleasure to extend greetings to the Jewish War Veterans of the United States on its fifty-third annual memorial services at Temple Emanu-El, New York City, May 30, 1948.

You gather in the house of God to do honor to those who gave their lives in our wars since the War of Independence, so that we might live in peace and freedom. The fallen and the survivors fought to advance the spirit of the good neighbor—to banish tyranny from the world.

The countless heroic feats of your comrades are enshrined on and illuminate the pages of America's brilliant history.

No false barriers separated our men on the fighting fronts. Hate and bigotry find no place in the hearts of good and true Americans today. Those would-be destroyers of democracy shall find here no fertile field for their sinister propaganda.

As you are doing today, Americans will continue to dedicate themselves to freedom and unity.

I join you in humble prayer for the repose of the souls to whom you do reverence today.

God bless you all.
Sincerely,
TOM CLARK,
Attorney General.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, May 12, 1948.

Col. JULIUS KLEIN,
National Commander, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America,
New York, N. Y.:

This one day in the year is set aside traditionally to honor all our dead of all our wars. It is fitting that we give expression to the gratitude we cherish toward those who died in protecting the right of Amercans to be free.

The dead we honor today had no more love of war than those who survived. Our roll of the dead, and our ceremonies of tribute to them, are unhappy reminders that America's abhorrence of war has not kept us from conflict, or from paying its price.

If, on Memorial Day, we can remember not only our dead but why they died, and devote ourselves to planning as well as hoping to use our power to prevent wars rather than to fight them, that will be a tribute worthy of the heroes we honor.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES FORRESTAL.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, May 25, 1948.

Mr. JULIUS KLEIN,
National Commander,
Jewish War Veterans of the United States,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR JULIUS: We refer to your letter of April 21 regarding the Fifty-third Annual Memorial Service of the Jewish War Veterans.

In response to your request, we are enclosing a statement which may be read at the ceremonies on May 30.

With best wishes and kindest regards,
Sincerely,
W. STUART SYMINGTON.

MESSAGE FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE TO JEWISH WAR VETERANS, FIFTY-THIRD ANNUAL MEMORIAL SERVICE

The Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America are to be congratulated on their success in perpetuating the traditions of national service rendered by Americans of Jewish faith, especially by those who have given their lives in the defense of our country.

Each group in the United States makes its own distinctive contribution to our national life. Thus our national experience is enriched and strengthed, and we become qualified to bear the position of world leadership that victory in two World Wars has forced upon us.

No group has made a more distinctive contribution than those of Jewish faith, whose service has been consistent and notable in all the wars of our Nation since the War of Independence.

Today the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force are working together in a unified military establishment to guarantee the security of the United States against aggression. We know that men who are veterans of other wars and who themselves enjoy the full privileges of American citizenship will continue to support us in our effort. Only through the preservation of freedom and liberty here can we expect peace to be maintained elsewhere in the world. Only by maintaining the peace, do we properly commemorate those who have given their lives for their country.

W. STUART SYMINGTON.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, May 11, 1948.

This observance, originating in 1896 and dedicated to the memory of the men who died upholding our traditions of democracy and liberty, has contributed materially, I am sure, to the continuing unity of all Americans in the preservation and strengthening of our national security and freedom. Further, it has performed a distinct service in helping to keep the people of this country keenly aware of the great debt we owe these men of all faiths who regarded their ideals more highly than their lives. We can repay our debt to them only by our willingness to make sacrifices for the preservation of our ideals, and to make them as willingly for the peace that preparedness will insure as the men we honor today made them during war.

KENNETH C. ROYALL,
Secretary of the Army.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, April 23, 1948.

Commander JULIUS KLEIN,
National Commander,
Jewish War Veterans of America,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR COMMANDER KLEIN: Your letter of the 21st advising me that on the morning of Sunday, May 30, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States will hold its fifty-third annual memorial service at Temple Emanu-El in New York City, and inviting me to use that opportunity to give a message which would be conveyed to the assembled guests and those who will listen to an attendant Nation-wide radio broadcast.

I appreciate the compliment very much and I would be delighted to accept if I had not made a previous engagement which contemplates my being in another part of the United States, namely Ohio on that particular day. I congratulate you upon your fifty-third service and I am sure that you will carry it on indefinitely. It is only through those kind of understanding services that the people who have not been through what others have been through can understand the ravages of war and the sorrows and heartaches that come from wars. If the future generation could learn early enough maybe it would help to keep future wars from occurring.

I regret exceedingly that I cannot be with you.

Most sincerely yours,
CARL R. GRAY, Jr.,
Administrator.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., April 29, 1948.

Brig. Gen. JULIUS KLEIN,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR JULIUS: I have your letter of April 21.

I am grateful for this opportunity to join with the many members and friends of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America in honoring the memory of the American veterans of Jewish faith who have fallen in combat in the service of their country.

Memorial Day is an occasion not only for remembering our heroes of the past, but also for looking to the future and rededicating ourselves to the preservation of the American principles of liberty and justice for which those whom we honor today gave their lives. Therefore, it seems especially fitting today that Americans of every creed, color, and race are standing side by side honoring their men who fought and died together in the battle against the forces of prejudice and tyranny.

With best wishes,
Sincerely yours,
ROBERT A. TAFT.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 12, 1948.*

As Secretary of the Treasury during the war years, I was in a position to observe intimately the magnificent contribution in terms of courage, service, and material support which the Jewish war veterans gave to our country in its hour of peril. As general chairman of the united Jewish appeal I have been greatly encouraged by the self-sacrificing devotion and generosity with which your members have helped to meet the needs of Jewish survivors everywhere and of the land of freedom, democracy, and dignity which the Jewish people are building in Palestine.

It is my earnest hope that the Jewish War Veterans may carry on through many peaceful years the great work in which you are engaged. My prayers are with you in your memorial services for the dead. To you, who go forward in their name, go my warm greetings and good wishes.

HENRY MORGENTHAU, Jr.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., May 27, 1948.

Hon. JULIUS KLEIN,
National Commander, Jewish War Veterans
of the United States of America,
New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR COMMANDER KLEIN: I am happy to have an opportunity to send greetings to the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America at their fifty-third annual memorial service in New York City on Memorial Day.

I join in solemn tribute to the millions of Americans of Jewish faith who have rendered high service and made the ultimate sacrifice when it became necessary for our Nation to take up arms for the defense of our way of life.

On this occasion we should all rededicate ourselves to the ideals and principles for which they fought and died.

Yours most sincerely,
SCOTT W. LUCAS.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
April 28, 1948.

Mr. JULIUS KLEIN,
National Commander, Jewish War Veterans
of the United States of America,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. KLEIN: I have received your letter of April 21, requesting a statement to be conveyed to the Jewish War Veterans of the United States at its fifty-third annual memorial services on May 30.

I am indeed privileged to comply with your request, and am enclosing the statement herewith.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely yours,
BRIEN MCMAHON,
United States Senator.

A life given in defense of country is the noblest expression of human brotherhood. On this hallowed day, we revere the memory of those gallant heroes who paid the supreme sacrifice to preserve our Nation's liberty and its independence.

In paying honor to the Jewish war dead, we are reminded once again that patriotism is the common heritage of all loyal Americans; that on the field of duty the artificial barriers of race or color are soon forgotten.

Over the past decade, millions of innocent human beings suffered torture and extinction because evil men preached the doctrine of racism in its most hated form. Let us hope and pray and labor that this noxious doctrine shall never take root in our own land.

When the lesson of human brotherhood is universally learned, then we shall achieve the permanent peace for which all mankind yearns.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., May 11, 1948.

Gen. JULIUS KLEIN,
National Commander, Jewish War Veterans
of the United States of America,
New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR COMMANDER: It is a matter of deep regret that I cannot be with the Jewish War Veterans at your fifty-third annual memorial services.

It is well that we pause to remember the sacrifices of those who have made our way of life possible. It is an inspiring thought that among the men and women of our own generation as well as of generations gone by all races and creeds have been represented. Regardless of their racial heritage or condition or station in life they have all been Americans held together by a common love of freedom. It is that common love of freedom which holds us together in unity as one and which in God's good time will overcome all prejudice and differences among mankind, until at last we have a world truly at peace.

I am proud of the sacrifices that my fellow citizens of the Jewish faith have made for this common cause and join with you in deep reverence in doing them honor.

Yours very sincerely.
RAYMOND E. BALDWIN.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
May 24, 1948.

Brig. Gen. JULIUS KLEIN,
National Commander, Jewish War Veterans
of the United States of America,
New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR GENERAL: I am privileged for this opportunity to send greetings to the Jewish War Veterans of America upon the occasion of your fifty-third annual memorial service.

For more than a half century your organization has been active in perpetuating the traditions of military service to our country which have existed among our Jewish citizens from the War of the Revolution through World War II.

At the same time the organization has served effectively by its active and constructive promotion of a better understanding among Americans of all faiths so that in unity we may enjoy the richness of America as a freer and happier land.

Americans of all faiths must appreciate, as I do in sending these greetings, the spirit, and the reality of the traditions and services that distinguish the Jewish War Veterans of America.

Yours sincerely,
HOMER FERGUSON.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., May 28, 1948.

Brig. Gen. JULIUS KLEIN,
National Commander, Jewish War Veterans
of the United States of America,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR GENERAL KLEIN: In compliance with your request of April 21, I enclose herewith a message to the annual memorial service of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States.

With kindest regards, believe me,
Very sincerely,
EDWARD MARTIN.

I am proud to salute the Jewish War Veterans of the United States as they meet in reverent tribute to the sacred memory of our departed comrades.

On this day of solemn remembrance we honor all Americans—of all faiths and all national origins—who died in every generation to preserve American freedom.

Let us on this day rededicate ourselves in patriotic spirit to the service of our beloved country and our flag.

EDWARD MARTIN.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
April 24, 1948.

Mr. JULIUS KLEIN,
National Commander, Jewish War Veterans
of the United States of America,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. KLEIN: It is, indeed, an honor for me to have the opportunity to pay my respects to such a fine organization as the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America on its fifty-third annual memorial service, May 30. I believe it is symbolic of true Americanism that the veterans of the wars which have kept this Nation free and great represent all faiths and nationalities.

Our people have come from every nation and have combined their efforts to create a country and a government unequaled on the globe. They have also joined in the great sacrifices which have been necessary to protect what they have created.

With kindest personal regards,
Sincerely,
HOMER E. CAPEHART.

Moral Rearmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the following is the substance of a press release issued from my office on June 16 concerning this meeting:

One hundred fifty Members of the Senate and House of Representatives were my guests at a breakfast in the ballroom of the Mayflower Hotel this morning in honor of 90 leaders of Government and industry and labor from 14 countries in Europe and Asia. The distinguished visitors included the first representatives of Germany, Japan, and Italy to meet with delegates from the former Allied Nations in Washington since the war.

"This is the most remarkable occasion in my 10 years in Washington," Representative HINSHAW said in introducing the speakers. Among those at the head table were Senators Owen Brewster, of Maine, and Theodore Green, of Rhode Island; Representatives Clarence Lea, of California, and Walter Judd, of Minnesota; Dr. Chen Li-Fu, Vice President of the National Parliament of China; Hon. Knud Kristensen, first postwar Prime Minister of Denmark and now leader of the opposition in the Danish Parliament; Kensuke Horinouchi, who was Japanese Ambassador to Washington until November 1940, when he was recalled for his opposition to his Government's militarist policies; Hon. Umberto Calosso, Socialist Member of the Italian Parliament; Dr. Wilhelm Hoegner, first postwar Minister-President of Bavaria and now leader of the Socialist opposition in the Bavarian Parliament; Dr. Erwin Stein, Minister of Education for Hesse; Baron Karl Karwinsky, twice member of the Austrian Cabinet; William Yates, president of the National Union of Mine Workers of Victoria Pit, North Staffordshire; and Lord Hardinge of Penshurst, private secretary to the last three Kings of England.

Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG of Michigan, President pro tempore of the Senate, wired: "I deeply regret that my official responsibilities make it impossible for me to attend your congressional breakfast. Please extend my heartiest greetings to your distinguished visitors from abroad. Their visit and your great MRA World Assembly symbolize the tremendous service to peace and recovery which international fellowship and the spirit of hearty cooperation can render. The hearts and souls and consciences of men are incomparably the greatest forces that can mobilize for a better world."

Congressman HINSHAW called on H. Kenston Twitchell, son-in-law of Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey, to introduce the overseas guests. Twitchell called attention to a message from Paul Hoffman, ECA Administrator who called moral rearmament the ideological counterpart of the Marshall plan." "We have seen evidence of results through moral rearmament," Twitchell said, "that can match science with morality."

Speaking of the problems of British coal production Yates said, "When the Labor Party and nationalization of the mines went in, the human problems still remained. Since applying the spirit of moral rearmament our pit has raised a record output of coal." He said coal production had increased 7 percent nationally over last year, but in the mines where moral rearmament had been in it had gone up 15 percent.

Lord Hardinge said, "Many vicious people are trying to create a rift and break down the friendship of the war years between Britain and America. That must never be allowed to happen. If our two countries cannot set a pattern of cooperation, then the peace of the world is indeed in danger. Our greatest need now in Britain is to regain our lost unity. To regain this goal we can look with hope and confidence to the spirit of moral rearmament. I have found it to be based sincerely and truly on the fellowship of man, operative and creative and not merely talkative. It is my firm conviction that the spirit of the people in Britain with all groups cooperating will bring us through our present troubles."

Speaking on behalf of the German delegation, Dr. Stein, who is responsible for the reeducation of 13,000,000 Germans expressed his gratitude for American aid and generosity since the war. "Germany went the wrong way," he said. "Today we regret the harm we have done to mankind. MRA has shown us the way to God-inspired democracy. Our biggest task is to bring the youth of Germany into a new moral climate. That is the only thing to save us from legalism, communism, fascism or other isms."

He spoke of the publication in Germany of the first postwar handbook on democracy called Everything Has Got to Change, and said a copy had gone to every teacher in Hesse.

Dr. Chen Li-fu, who was sent by Gen. Chiang Kai-shek to attend the Moral Rearmament Assembly and study American democratic institutions, said, "The common need among the democracies is to join forces in the face of militant materialism. We have great needs both material and spiritual, but our greatest need is for ideological preparedness. The answer for that need is moral rearmament."

Congressman HINSHAW remarked in closing that it signified "the dawn of a new day when men will say not 'I am right,' or 'you are right,' but 'what is right?' Confirm what is right in the sight of God and the world will live."

The distinguished visitors from Europe and Asia will be the guests of Congressman LEA, of California, at a luncheon in the Senate dining room today and will be received at the Supreme Court before leaving in a special chartered plane for Europe this evening. They arrived in Washington yesterday from California where they took part with 500 representatives of 24 nations in a world assembly for "ideological preparedness for the democracies." The Assembly convened in response to a tabled invitation from 82 Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, early this year the following cable of invitation to the World Assembly on Moral Rearmament was sent to a list of distinguished visitors by a group of Senators and Representatives of the Congress of the United States. The cablegram is as follows:

As Americans who believe in the urgency of ideological preparedness for the democracies we cordially invite you to speak at a World Assembly for Moral Rearmament in the Hollywood Bowl, Los Angeles, Calif., beginning June 2 and 3.

In our view the developing world situation puts an overriding priority on skill in ideological warfare. This skill demands intensive training for governments and peoples.

Economic aid is essential to world recovery. Military strength is vital. But without the force of a superior idea neither economic nor military force of themselves hold a solution.

Millions the world over are looking for a positive creative answer to totalitarianism in any form. The education of our countries in this field is a grave responsibility. We feel your presence in California would be an invaluable first step. With kindest regards.

Senators ALBEN W. BARKLEY, Kentucky; OWEN BREWSTER, Maine; STYLES BRIDGES, New Hampshire; HARRY P. CAIN, Washington; ARTHUR CAPPER, Kansas; HENRY C. DWORSHAK, Idaho; HOMER FERGUSON, Michigan; RALPH E. FLANDERS, Vermont; LISTER HILL, Alabama; OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina; BRIEN MCMAHON, Connecticut; JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Wyoming; CHAPMAN REVERCOMB, West Virginia; A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Virginia; H. ALEXANDER SMITH, New Jersey; JOHN C. STENNIS, Mississippi; ELBERT D. THOMAS, Utah; EDWARD J. THYE, Minnesota; CHARLES W. TOBEY, New Hampshire; ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin.

Representatives GEORGE J. BATES, Massachusetts; LAURIE C. BATTLE, Alabama; J. GLENN BEALL, Maryland; JOHN B. BENNETT, Michigan; HALE BOGGS, Louisiana; JOSEPH R. BRYSON, South Carolina; ELLSWORTH B. BUCK, New York; FRANCIS CASE, South Dakota; RALPH E. CHURCH, Illinois; HOWARD A. COFFIN, Michigan; E. E. COX, Georgia; ROBERT CROSSER, Ohio; CHARLES B. DEANE, North Carolina; EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Illinois; GEORGE A. DONDERO, Michigan; ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, New Mexico; CHARLES K. FLETCHER, California; H. C. FULLER, New York; J. VAUGHAN GARY, Virginia; CHESTER H. GROSS, Pennsylvania; RALPH W. GWINN, New York; HAROLD C. HAGEN, Minnesota; BROOKS HAYS, Arkansas; CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, Massachusetts; CARL HINSHAW, California; WALT HORAN, Washington; DONALD L. JACKSON, California; PETE JARMAN, Alabama; THOMAS A. JENKINS, Ohio; ANTON J. JOHNSON, Illinois; ROBERT W. KEAN, New Jersey; CHARLES J. KERSTEN, Wisconsin; HAROLD KNUTSON, Minnesota; HENDERSON LANHAM, Georgia; CLARENCE F. LEA, California; KARL M. LECOMPTE, Iowa; JOHN DAVIS LODGE, Connecticut; LOUIS LUDLOW, Indiana; GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, California; A. L. MILLER, Nebraska; KARL E. MUNDT, South Dakota; JOHN R. MURDOCK, Arizona; RICHARD M. NIXON, California; TOM PICKETT, Texas; W. R. POAGE, Texas; NORRIS POULSON, California; PRINCE H. PRESTON, Jr., Georgia; J. PERCY PRIEST, Tennessee; R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, New York; L. MENDEL RIVERS, South Carolina; DWIGHT L. ROGERS, Florida; EDWARD G. ROHRBOUGH, West Virginia; CHARLES H. RUSSELL, Nevada; GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Florida; LAWRENCE H. SMITH, Wisconsin; THOMAS B. STANLEY, Virginia; ROBERT J. TWYMAN, Illinois; JAMES W. WADSWORTH, New York; ARTHUR WINSTEAD, Mississippi; JESSE P. WOLCOTT, Michigan; HAROLD F. YOUNGBLOOD, Michigan; E. L. BARTLETT, Delegate from Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to this cablegram, the following list of distinguished persons from abroad responded and attended the session held in California:

Australia: Mr. Gordon Wise, son of leader of Parliamentary Labor Party, western Australia, who was Premier, 1945–47.

Austria: Baron Karl Karwinsky, twice member of Austrian Cabinet, leader of resistance movement; Dr. Josef Kauth, Socialist editor.

British West Indies: Mr. G. Louis Byles, city manager, St. Ann's Bay, Jamaica.

Burma: U Ba Lwin, wartime Ambassador to Siam, leading educationalist who has trained many of Burma's present leaders;

Daw Nyein Tha, Burmese national women's leader; the Right Reverend and Mrs. George West, Bishop of Rangoon.

Canada: Mr. and Mrs. G. Cecil Morrison, wartime Bread Administrator; Mr. and the Honorable Mrs. Bernard M. Hallward, president, St. Raymond Paper Co.; Mr. O. A. Petersen, personnel director, British Columbia Electric Co.; Mr. and Mrs. Carl Berg, vice president, Trades and Labor Congress of Canada; Brig. Gen. W. G. Beeman, D. S. O.; Col. Mark Vernon, formerly of Royal Canadian Mounted Police; Mr. Cecil Harvest; Mr. and Mrs. Howard Reynolds; Mr. and Mrs. Norman Keene.

China: Dr. Chen Li-fu, Vice President of the Legislative Yuan (National Parliament); four other Chinese leaders whose names we have been advised cannot be released until arrival for reasons of national security; Dr. H. R. Wei, Chinese representative, United Nations Atomic Energy Commission; Mr. S. S. Lo, for 8 years executive secretary to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek; Dr. F. Catherine Woo, M. B. E., principal of St. Paul's College, Hong Kong; Mr. Leonard S. Allen, wartime radio commentator from Chungking for National Broadcasting Co., The Voice of China.

Denmark: Mr. Jens Carl Just, member of board, National Wholesalers Association; Col. and Mrs. H. A. V. Hansen, in charge of orientation, Danish Army; Hon. and Mrs. Ingvard Arent, mayor of Fredericia; Miss Gudrun Egebjerg, journalist.

Finland: Mr. Olavi Snellman, grandson of founder of the modern Finland.

France: Gen. Pierre de Benouville, commanding resistance leader under General De Gaulle; Mme. Eugenie Eboue, member for Guadaloupe in Upper House of French Parliament; Hon. Joseph Wasmer, member for Haut-Rhin in the Chamber of Deputies; Madame Irene Laure, head of Socialist Women of France, former resistance leader; M. Jean Courbier, industrialist, Lyon; M. Faidutti, engineer, Lyon; M. Andre Segard, industrialist, Lille; M. Alain Carmichael, Lille.

Germany: Dr. Gustav Heinemann, mayor of Essen, Minister of Justice for North Rhine-Westphalia (Ruhr); Dr. Erwin Stein, Minister of Education for Hesse; Dr. Michael Horlacher, president of Bavarian Parliament, leader of Bavarian farmer's organization; Dr. Wilhelm Hoegner, Socialist, leader of opposition in Bavarian Parliament, first postwar Minister-President of Bavaria; Dr. H. Katzenberger, chief of the press bureau of Minister-President of North Rhine-Westphalia (Ruhr); Dr. Erich Kordt, professor in University of Munich, leading figure in wartime resistance movement in German State Department; Baroness Guggenberg, Catholic women's leader, Bavaria; Mr. Hans von Herwarth, executive director of the office of Minister-President of Bavaria; Mr. Robert Daum, mayor of Wuppertal, Ruhr industrial city, 40 years Socialist trades-union leader; Dr. Dieter Sattler, Ministry of Education, Bavaria.

Great Britain: Lord and Lady Hardinge, of Penshurst; the Honorable Elizabeth Hardinge; Hon. James Simmons, M. P., labor member of Parliament, Lord Commissioner of the Treasury, Labor Whip; Lieut. Gen. Sir Alexander Hood, G. B. E., K. C. B., and Lady Hood, director general, Medical Services of British Army, 1941–48; Mr. A. R. K. Mackenzie, member of British Delegation to the United Nations; Sir Charles and Lady Mander, British industrialist, past president, Rotary International for Great Britain and Ireland; Mr. and Mrs. Roy Pinsent, corporation lawyer; Miss Margaret Carey Evans, granddaughter of David Lloyd George, British Prime Minister during World War I; Brig. David Forster, C. M. G., D. S. O.; Brig. Gen. C. R. P. Winser, C. M. G., D. S. O.; Mr. David Lancashire, Political Division, Control Commission for Germany; Wing Comdr. Edward A. Howell, O. B. E., D. F. C., Greek D. F. C., commanded RAF Fighter Squadron, Battle of Crete, author of Escape To Live; Mr. Fred Copeman, national executive board member, Constructional Engineering Union of Great Britain, 1947, commanded the British battalions of the International Brigade in the Spanish Civil War; Mr. James Leask, secretary, Engineering Division of Transport and General Workers Union, Birmingham; Mr. William Yates, president, National Union of Mine Workers of Victoria Pit, North Staffordshire; Mr. Frank Smith secretary, National Union of Mineworkers, Leicestershire; Mr. Peter O'Connor, coal-face worker from the Midlothian, Scotland, coal fields; Mr. and Mrs. Peter Howard, author and Fleet Street political columnist; Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Belden; Miss Beatrice Burnside; Mr. John Caulfeild; Miss Hazel Colville; Mr. Basil Entwistle; Mr. Geoffrey Gain; Mr. George Marjoribanks; Mr. Adam McLean; Mr. Christopher Prescott; Miss Irene Prestwich; Mr. Ian Rae; Mr. Roland Wilson; Mr. and Mrs. George Wood.

Greece: Hon. and Mrs. Panyotis Kanellopoulos, leader of the National Union Party, former Prime Minister; Miss Alessandra Poumpoura, M. B. E., decorated by the King of the Hellenes and the King of England for her services during the war.

India: Mr. Nawal Tata, director of Tata's, India's largest industrial concern; Sir Homi Mody, industrialist; Mr. and Mrs. Vishnu Dalmia, industrialist; Dr. Mukerjee, representative, Dalmia industries; Mr. Haribar Nath Shastri, president, Indian National Trades Union Congress; Mr. Lionel Jardine, I. C. S., C. I. E., and Mrs. Jardine, formerly British resident (King's representative), Baroda State.

Italy: Count and Countess Carlo Lovera, di Castiglione, Rome; Hon. and Mrs. Umberto Calosso, secretary of Saragat-Socialist Workers Party, member of Parliament, editor of Umanita; Hon. Fausto Pecorari, vice president and representative of Trieste in the Constituent Assembly; Baroness Stephanie Eyrl, Bolzano.

Japan: Mr. Kensuke Horinouchi, president, Foreign Service Training Institute, former Ambassador to the United States; Viscount and Viscountes Yasutane Sohma; Mr. Tsuruhara, director of the bank of Japan; Mr. and Mrs. Takasumi Mitsui, director, Mitsui Education Foundation; Miss Naoko Mitsui; Mr. Sadanobu Ogawa; Rev. Tsunenori Takase.

Netherlands: Mr. Evert Kupers, president, Dutch Confederation of Labor, vice president, World Federation of Trade Unions; Mr. and Mrs. J. Deenen, mine director, Limburg; Mr. A. Hennekens, chairman of the Catholic Mine Employees; Mr. H. J. van den Broek, head of World Broadcasting Corp. (P. C. J.), Hilversum; Mrs. Willem van Beuningen, decorated by the Belgian Government for saving the lives of Allied prisoners in World War II; Prof. and Mrs. Nico Halbertsma, professor of electrical illumination, University of Utrecht, past president, World Society of Illuminating Engineers.

Norway: Mr. and Mrs. Nikolai Alfsen, managing director, Alfsen & Gundersen, constructional engineers, Oslo; Mr. Gunnar Frenger, industrialist; Mr. Randulf Haslund.

Pakistan: Hon. M. A. H. Ispahani, Ambassador to Washington and delegate to United Nations.

South Africa: Mr. Cyril Pearce, industrialist.

Sweden: Admiral and Mrs. Yngve Ekstrand; Bishop and Mrs. Bengt Jonzon, Bishop of Lulea, mining area in northern Sweden; Rev. and Mrs. Ake Zetterberg.

Switzerland: Hon. Ernst Boerlin, Member of Parliament, member of foreign affairs committee; Dr. Max Volland, city councillor, St. Gallen; Mr. Jean Louis Gillieron, banker; Mr. and Mrs. Philippe Mottu, director of Moral Rearmament World Assembly, Caux-sur-Montreux; Mr. and Mrs. Robert Hahnloser, director of Moral Rearmament World Assembly, Caux-sur-Montreux.

Mr. Speaker, some of those who had been invited to this assembly could not attend but sent messages to the Assembly as follows:

FROM THE PRIME MINISTER OF FRANCE

Governments are at grips with grave and difficult problems of feeding, of production, of wages and prices. They see peace between nations endangered by the prejudices of race and by the rivalry of conflicting interests. Inside nations people are seeking the reconciliation of liberty with authority and an understanding between the classes. I salute in Moral Rearmament one of the animating forces at work for inspired democracy which must reestablish the supremacy of all the spiritual values at the heart of our tormented humanity.

ROBERT SCHUMAN.

FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE BELGIAN CHAMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES

Any effort for economic recovery or military security will finally fail if Moral Rearmament is lacking. I am working along your lines on this side of the Atlantic and wish fervently your movement may reap brilliant success.

FRANS VAN CAUWELAERT.

FROM THE FOREIGN MINISTER OF ITALY

The Italians are with you when you ask for moral freedom, for independence in the spirit, for more social justice. We will never forget what America did for us. We will be happy to work with America for the cause of peace in a world without slavery.

COUNT SFORZA.

FROM THE VICE PREMIER OF ITALY

I am glad to be able to send you by the hand of my friend, Umberto Calosso, Deputy in the Italian Parliament, my best wishes for the tenth anniversary of Moral Rearmament which I would like to see spread over the whole world and not only in Italy; because in it is found the solution to social and international problems which if not resolved lead inevitably to war.

GUISEPPE SARAGAT,
Leader of the Socialist Workers Party.

FROM THE FOREIGN MINISTER OF GREECE

I fully approve ideological aims of your movement. Can assure you that fighting Greece spares no effort to achieve ideological preparedness for the democracies. Her valiant resistance to foreign pressure and to the attack by an armed minority supported by totalitarian neighbors sufficiently demonstrates that the Greek people is fully accepting the purposes of Moral Rearmament. We are decided to continue our efforts for peace and for a better world based on justice and democratic principles.

CONSTANTINE TSALDARIS.

FROM THE MINISTER-PRESIDENTS OF GERMANY

On your seventieth birthday you can look back on your life's work and be proud of it. You may rest assured that the seed which you have sown in the hearts of mankind has flourished and has already borne rich fruit. Germany is ready for your message which has restored meaning again in daily life to many old eternal truths. The spirit of genuine, unselfish love of one's fellow men is what is needed to bring Germany through her present distress and lead her to a better future. Moreover, the ideology of Moral Rearmament is an indispensable foundation for the reconstruction and peace of Europe and the world.

Millions of Germans therefore think of you on your seventieth birthday with best wishes for the continued success of your work and for your own health and happiness.

KARL ARNOLD,
Minister-President, North Rhine-Westphalia.
HANS EHARD,
Minister-President, Bavaria.
HINRICH WILHELM KOPF,
Minister-President, Lower Saxony.
DR. LUEDEMANN,
Minister-President, Schleswig-Holstein.
REINHOLD MAIER,
Minister-President, Wurttemberg-Baden.
WERNER HILPERT,
Deputy Minister-President of Hesse.
W. KAISEN,
President of the Senate of Bremen.
MAX BRAUER,
Governor and Mayor of Hamburg.

The answer to the problems of the world is the Christian answer. I wish every success to this most important World Assembly.

LORD PAKENHAM,
Chancelor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Minister Responsible for the British Zone in Germany.

I send my best wishes to the World Assembly. Totalitarianism born in Europe by imperialism and fostered by misery should be fought not only by material coercion but on spiritual grounds, too. Sense of solidarity the world over is growing among all people. The Assembly will bring an important contribution to that urgent work.

PIERRE SCHNEITER,
French Secretary of State for German Affairs.

FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE FRENCH SENATE

Modern economic machinery is essential for the life of nations, but moral reconstruction is our first task. The questions which are put before those attending the World Assembly are such as will greatly help to get up a practical program and put into men's hands the peaceful weapons for a real crusade for union and understanding. I am convinced that in the crucial struggle for the victory of the great ideas of democracy and brotherhood men will be able to find together solutions which will be accepted by the citizens of good will in all countries.

GASTON MONNERVILLE.

FROM THE SWISS PARLIAMENT

Please convey to this eminent great Congress the greetings of the Swiss Parliament. I send my most sincere good wishes that your group composed of personalities so varied and representing so many nations will find the key to that spirit which would lead the world to an answer founded not on force but on the power of love of justice and of right.

ALBERT PICOT,
President of the Swiss Parliament.

Wish full success mass assembly and greatest blessing for world peace among citizens and nations. May your movement grow and prosper and lead men more and more to goodness.

OSKAR LEIMGRUBER,
Chancelor of the Swiss Confederation.

FROM THE BRITISH COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS

South Africa

The world needs Moral Rearmament. Your early work in South Africa has borne rich fruit and brought individuals in every walk of the nation's life to acknowledge the supremacy of God's plan. Herein amid our difficulties of race and color lies the one sure promise of an enduring answer.

J. H. HOFMEYR,
Deputy Prime Minister.
J. J. PIENAAR,
Administrator of the Transvaal.
W. NICOL,
Moderator of Dutch Reformed Church of the Transvaal.
K. BREMER,
Nationalist Member of Parliament for Stellenbosch.
R. H. MORLEY,
President, Johannesburg Chamber of Commerce.
J. L. P. BOTHA,
Acting General Secretary, Mine Workers Union of South Africa.

New Zealand

Collective security and unity of nations are prime essentials to peace, but they cannot be successfully achieved until as individuals we have determined to find the source of the strength to enable us to make our personal contribution. I know of no better way than the way of the founder of the Christian faith to achieve, which requires for many of us much intensive personal and collective training, and I trust that the mass meeting and proposed training will contribute to this objective. All good wishes.

The Right Honorable WALTER NASH,
Deputy Prime Minister.

Australia

My best wishes for complete success of both meetings. Please accept this humble message given in my personal capacity; that the creative power of Moral Rearmament will continue to give strength and power to inspire and influence the mind of mankind toward better world understanding of social and spiritual needs of the people and the defeat of totalitarianism in all its forms. I join in felicitations to Dr. Buchman on his birthday and its coincidence with tenth anniversary of Moral Rearmament.

Hon. A. S. DRAKEFORD,
Minister of Air.

Pakistan

Among my friends of the MRA I have been delighted to observe a practical working of this spirit; the constant striving after discovering God's plan and purpose and putting their lives in accord with it. I am convinced that that is the world's supreme need at the moment and it is only through sincere and sustained effort in that direction that mankind can win through to its true redemption.

SIR ZAFRULLAH KHAN,
Foreign Minister.

India

Am wholeheartedly in sympathy with the ideals of Moral Rearmament. Without a spiritual program neither economic rehabilitation nor military preparation will save the peoples of the world from disasters too terrible to contemplate.

The Honorable JAGJIVAN RAM,
Minister of Labor.

I write to congratulate you heartily on your seventieth birthday and hope that you will still live many years. You and the Oxford group have done very good work. In particular you have striven and are striving for the peace of the world and recognize no barriers of race. With renewed congratulations and every good wish,

Yours sincerely,

MAHARAJ SINGH,
Governor, Bombay.

FROM THE FAR EAST

I heartily associate myself with your urgent call for ideological preparedness as the first priority of all free nations. My first-hand contact with Moral Rearmament has convinced me that this world force is pioneering the way from an age of crisis to an era of cure. The critical need of the hour is to undergird material recovery with moral rearmament. Warmest regards.

General Ho YING-CHIN,
Minister of Defense, China.

Moral strength and spiritual value are far superior to material and military force. I will work with you for our common cause and assure you of my full measure of support.

CHEN LI-FU,
Vice President of the Chinese Parliament.

My 2 years' experience in the Balkans has convinced me once more that this positive creative ideological force is the only answer to the solution of world problems. Best personal regards.

K. T. SIH,
Chinese delegate to the United Nations, Member Balkan Control Commission; Former Chinese Minister in Rome.

Warmest birthday greetings. Gratefully recall inspiring weeks with you at the Mackinac World Assembly for Moral Rearmament in 1944 which helped me grasp more deeply the moral and spiritual dynamic of teamwork in public affairs so urgently needed just now. Ever faithfully, your friend,

CHANG KIA-NGAU,
Governor of the Bank of China; for seven years Minister of Transportation in the Chinese Government and builder of the Burma Road.

FROM NATIONAL WOMEN LEADERS OF BURMA

As women from the several races of Burma we wish to congratulate Dr. Buchman on his seventieth birthday and to rededicate ourselves to the task of building sound homes and a united nation. We know that in the great moral and spiritual principles of Moral Rearmament lies the one hope for embattled Asia.

Mrs. Aung San, Minister of Health, whose husband was first Premier of independent Burma; Mrs. Tin Tut, wife of the Minister of Foreign Affairs; Mrs. Sydney Loo Nee, whose husband represented the Karens on Goodwill Mission to England after the war; Mrs. San Po Thin, wife of the Minister for Karen Affairs; Mrs. Raschid, wife of the Burma delegate to the ILO Conference in San Francisco; Mrs. Chit Thoung, wife of leader of the Mons, one of the minority races in Burma; Mrs. Ba Lwin, wife of Burmese representative to UNESCO; Mrs. Ba Maung Chain; Mrs. Calvin Ogh; Mrs. Hla Bu; Daw Khin Khin; Mrs. Ah Mya; Daw Nu.

FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE GREEK FEDERATION OF LABOR

Workers of Greece, continuing to suffer disruption and economic distress of 7 years war, send warmest fraternal greetings to workers of America on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of Moral Rearmament. Profoundly grateful for vital American aid through this terrible period of Greek history, also for equally vital moral and spiritual aid offered by your world force of Moral Rearmament. We shall continue to work and fight unsparingly in the cause of world freedom supported by your help, encouraged by your progress, and sustained by your prayers.

JOHN KALOMIRIS,
President, Greek Confederation of Labor.

FROM BRITISH INDUSTRY

As representatives of all sections of the British coal industry we send our warmest greetings on this memorable occasion.

Thousands from the coal face to Coal Board offices are grateful for the remarkable results Moral Rearmament has had in our industry in creating revolutionary teamwork, sound leadership, new incentives, and increasing production. The evidence convinces us that Moral Rearmament offers a workable answer to a world in crisis.

Harold Lockett, president, National Union of Mineworkers, North Staffordshire; William Rowell, agent, NUM, Leicestershire; A. Baddeley, chairman, Midland Area, and secretary, NUM, North Staffordshire; J. Brought, Lancashire executive member, National Association of Colliery Management; Jack Clayton, secretary, North Wales Overmen, Deputies, and Shotfirers Association; Emerys Davies, secretary, South Wales Overmen, Deputies, and Shotfirers Association; Spencer Hughes, agent, Yorkshire Main and Rossington Main Collieries; Frank Painter, president, NUM, Warwickshire; Frank Smith, secretary, NUM, Leicestershire; W. Sperring, president, South Wales Overmen, Deputies, and Shotfirers Association; John Colthart, Assistant Labor Director, National Coal Board, Scotland; George Mackay, Safety Officer for National Coal Board, Scotland; John Rutherford, chairman, Midlothian and East Lothian Miners; James Cook, former secretary, Scottish Miners Federation.

Wish abounding success for Moral Rearmament as barrier against materialism and instrument for rehabilitation of Christian chivalry and the safety of civilization.

SIR PATRICK HANNON,
Conservative Member of Parliament for Birmingham for 28 Years; Chairman, National Union of Manufacturers.

Mr. Speaker, it was a matter of keen regret that the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, who signed the cablegram of invitation were unable to attend the sessions in California on account of the press of business in the closing session of the Eightieth Congress. However, the Honorable ANTON J. JOHNSON, Representative from the State of Illinois, addressed the gathering in California on behalf of those who signed the cablegram of invitation.

These distinguished people are now en route to their homes in the various places throughout the world from which they came. We wish them Godspeed and happy landings, with the hope that they may spread the truths that they have learned and know so well to be truths.

Two American-Born Soldiers, Heroes of World War II, of Japanese Ancestry, Buried With Full Military Honors at Arlington Cemetery—First in History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, on June 4, two American-born soldiers, both of whom were heroes of World War II, of Japanese ancestry, were buried at Arlington Cemetery with full military honors. Both of these men served this Nation honorably and won and deserved the honor and recognition of being buried in the national shrine of American heroes. Following is a brief sketch of each of them:

Pfc Fumitake Nagato: Born in Los Angeles, Calif., August 2, 1918. Next of kin: Mr. and Mrs. Bunzo Nagato, now living at 2037 Twelfth Street, Arlington, Va. Member of Company G, Four Hundred and Forty-second Regimental Combat Team. Killed October 29, 1944, during rescue of the Lost Texas Battalion in northeastern France. Younger brother, Private First Class Yoshiiwa, now serving with occupation forces in Korea. Two sisters living in Los Angeles; another sister employed by the Treasury Department in Washington, D. C.; youngest brother attending junior high school in Arlington. Awards: Bronze Star, Purple Heart, Presidential Distinguished Unit Citation, Combat Infantryman's Badge.

Pfc Saburo Tanamachi: Born in Long Beach, Calif., April 1, 1917. Moved to Texas in 1921. Next of kin: Mr. Kumazo Tanamachi, route 4, box 144, San Benito, Tex. Member of Company E, Four Hundred and Forty-second Regimental Combat Team. Killed October 29, 1944, during the rescue of the Lost Texas Battalion. Two younger brothers, Goro and Walter, also served overseas in Europe during World War II; another brother, William, is now with the occupation forces in Germany. Awards: Silver Star, Bronze Star, Purple Heart, Presidential Distinguished Unit Citation, and Combat Infantryman's Badge.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of speaking at the graveside at this double burial because both of these men were born in California, together with Congressman Gossett, of Texas, Congressman Judd, of Minnesota, and Gen. Jacob Devers, Chief of the Army Field Forces. Following is the speech I made, followed by the speeches made by the others:

SPEECH OF HON. GORDON L. M'DONOUGH, OF CALIFORNIA

Greater love hath no man than he that lays down his life for a friend.

No greater patriotism can any man have than he who gives up his life in defense of his country and that patriotism is increased and the honor and glory is greater when a man lays down his life in an attempt to save the life of his fellow man and in defense of his nation when that nation is at war with the native country of his ancestors.

The deserved honor which has been so richly earned by these two American-born soldiers of the Army of the United States, Privates First Class Fumitake Nagato and Saburo Tanamachi, of Japanese ancestry, to be buried in this shrine of national heroes at Arlington Cemetery is a source of pride to the great State of California where they were born, reared, and educated, and is grateful acknowledgment by this Nation of the valiant services they rendered in its defense.

Words are a feeble means of expressing our gratitude to them when compared to the heroic deeds they performed in defense of this Nation and in an attempt to rescue the Lost Texas Battalion. They have earned a place of honor in our Nation's history.

May they rest in peace which they so honorably fought for and which they so richly deserve.

SPEECH OF HON. ED GOSSETT, OF TEXAS

It is a great honor for me, personally, and on behalf of the people of Texas, to pay tribute to the memory and heroism of Privates First Class Fumitake Nagato and Saburo Tanamachi.

Private Tanamachi was himself a Texan. These men inscribed their names high on an imperishable roll of fame. They will live forever among those to whom America pays homage.

All Texans are proud of their famed Thirty-sixth Division. These men died in late October of 1944, in the successful rescue of a part of the Texas Thirty-sixth Division, the so-called Lost Battalion. America in general, and Texas in particular, is grateful to them and to the Four Hundred and Forty-second Regimental Combat Team of which they were a part. In life and in death they glorified the finest American traditions. Through heroic sacrifice, they did even more than this. They enhanced the stature and dignity of two races of men, the American and the Japanese. In one brave hour of death, and at a time when this Nation was locked in mortal combat with the nation of their ancestors, their blood and that of their heroic comrades washed away a century of suspicion and prejudice with which Americans generally had regarded the American of Japanese descent. History does not record any other such monumental achievement.

Yesterday, the House Committe on Immigration unanimously reported a bill to remove all racial bars on immigration to, and naturalization within, this country. Such legislation will soon be written upon the statute books of the Nation. It will be a direct result of the heroism of the American-Japanese soldiers whom Privates Nagato and Tanamachi represent. It has been given to few men to contribute so much, not only to their own generation, but to future generations.

May divine providence bless their bereaved families, and may their heroic example make of us a better Nation.

SPEECH OF HON. WALTER H. JUDD, OF MINNESOTA

To honor today these two American heroes, Privates Nagato and Tanamachi, by placing their remains in this national shrine for for American heroes is in reality to honor the country which they loved so dearly that they gave their lives to preserve it.

The glory of America is not her fields and forests, mountains and rivers, much as we love them, or even her schools and temples, cities and industries, proud as we are of them. The real glory of America is the kind of person that her principles and institutions have consistently developed.

All Americans are immigrants or descendants of immigrants. Almost all of them—no matter from what land or race or culture they came—have developed in this atmosphere of freedom an amazing likeness in attitudes and beliefs, values and loyalties. In superficial externals we may be different, but in the deep, basic fundamentals we are all the same.

The kind of Americans these grieving fathers and mothers, born in another land, themselves became and reared their sons to be is the real glory of America. I suspect those so lately come to these shores understand that better than do those of us whose immigrant fathers came earlier. We are inclined to take our priceless heritage for granted. They value it more highly because they know how different things are in so many other lands.

What we are reminded of afresh today is that in America at her best it is only the man himself that counts. The first foundation stone of our society is the right of the individual to be judged on the basis of what he himself is. The second is the right of the individual to improve his condition—to rise in accordance with his merit. The third is the principle of teamwork, which takes

individuals of different origins and backgrounds, respects and treasures their differing gifts, and fits them together to work for the good of the whole as the true way to promote the good of each.

These whom a grateful nation proudly honors today have demonstrated how well they learned that true Americanism; they have proved themselves. The task of us who live is to prove ourselves—to strive ceaselessly to make our lives and our land worthy of the supreme sacrifice they and so many others have made that "this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom," and that that freedom shall live and grow throughout the world.

SPEECH OF GEN. JACOB L. DEVERS, CHIEF OF ARMY FIELD FORCES

There is one supreme, final test of loyalty to one's native land—readiness and willingness to fight for, and, if need be, to die for, one's country. These Americans and their fellows passed that test with colors flying. They proved their loyalty and devotion beyond all question.

They volunteered for Army combat service and they made a record second to none. In Europe theirs was the combat team most feared by the enemy. In the Pacific they placed themselves on double jeopardy, chancing the bullets of friend as well as foe. Everywhere they were the soldiers most decorated for valor—most devoted to duty. Their only absences without leave were from hospitals which they quit before they recovered from their wounds, in order to get back into the fight for what they knew to be the right.

These men, to two of whom we pay our heartfelt respects today, more than earned the right to be called just Americans, not Japanese-Americans. Their Americanism may be described only by degree—and that the highest.

The United States Army salutes you, Privates First Class Fumitake Nagato and Saburo Tanamachi. You and your compatriots will live in our hearts and our history as Americans first class.

John Thomas

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 21 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JOHN THOMAS, late a Senator from the State of Idaho

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I wish to remind my fellow Senators of the memory of one of us whose departure from these chambers has been a sustained loss to the Nation. I refer to Senator JOHN THOMAS, my late Senatorial colleague from Idaho, who died on November 10, 1945, in the city of Washington.

JOHN THOMAS was born January 4, 1874, on his father's homestead at Prairieview, Kans. He was the son of Daniel W. Thomas and Mary Elizabeth (nee Sparks) Thomas. From this humble rock dugout there went forth a rugged but unostentatious boy, a typical American with the fighting pioneer spirit. He prevailed over tremendous odds.

Here was an Abraham Lincoln of a later generation. An education came by work. He worked his way while studying in high school and finished the ordinary high school course in 3 years. He then taught country school before entering Kansas State Normal School, where he graduated in 3 years.

Following graduation, JOHN THOMAS became superintendent of schools of the Phillips County schools, where he remained 4 years. He was a great admirer of President Theodore Roosevelt and the President honored him in 1906 with an appointment as registrar of the United States Land Office at Colby, Kans.

As many pioneers went forever westward, so JOHN THOMAS went west from Kansas and arrived in southern Idaho in 1909. He remained there the rest of his life and settled at Gooding. Quietly he interested himself in business, banking, and politics, and laid the foundations for a solid political career. He became mayor of Gooding. Also he managed the political campaigns of the late Senator Gooding of my own State. This was during the campaigns of 1918, 1920, and 1926. In the last two of these campaigns, Mr. Gooding was elected Senator. This followed a period in which JOHN THOMAS had been chairman of the Republican State central committee for a 4-year period.

When the late Senator Gooding died, Gov. H. C. Baldridge appointed Mr. THOMAS on June 30, 1928, to fill this unexpired term. This was Senator THOMAS' first term and he was later elected to the same seat. He defeated J. W. Holden, of Idaho Falls, for the Republican nomination.

Senator THOMAS remained in the Senate until the end of this term, having been defeated in the New Deal landslide in the 1932 elections by Senator James P. Pope.

Mr. THOMAS served a second term in these halls when he was appointed to succeed that illustrious son of Idaho, William E. Borah, upon occasion of the latter's death. Senator THOMAS was appointed January 26, 1940, by Gov. C. A. Bottolfsen. The following November he was elected to fill the unexpired term of Senator Borah and was reelected to the same senatorial seat in 1942.

It so happened I was the Democratic candidate in these two elections. The political rivalry between us in no manner diminished my high opinion of Senator THOMAS' integrity and ability. I came to know him well and recognized in my opponent one of Idaho's most outstanding men of all time.

In his political thinking Senator THOMAS has been compared to Senator Borah, but was a Senator of less flourish and oratory. He was a short, stockily built man, mild-mannered, and able to present his views precisely, with deep-seated conviction.

When Senator THOMAS died of a cerebral hemorrhage, his adopted State of Idaho was shrouded in grief. Many citizens, of diverse walks and occupations in life, paid high tribute to his talents. He rests in a beautiful green valley near Gooding that was but recently a part of vast expanse of purple sage. He is part and parcel of the soil of the State which he represented. Neither the withering snows of winter, nor the spring rains with their carpet of green bedecked with mountain flowers, nor the fading caused by bright summer suns, nor the whirling of autumn winds and leaves will erase the memory of JOHN THOMAS from a secure and exalted place in the history of our pioneer State and Nation.

Josiah William Bailey

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS
OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 21 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JOSIAH WILLIAM BAILEY, late a Senator from the State of North Carolina

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, North Carolina may well be proud of the record made by one of her great sons, Senator JOSIAH BAILEY, in the Senate of the United States. During his 16 years of service in this great body, he was outstanding for his high character, courage, devotion to duty, and intellectual capacity.

He left his mark upon much of the legislation that came before the Congress during his service here. In fact, as much as any of his colleagues, he influenced many of the major decisions made in the Congress in both peace and war.

Reason and logic were normal products of his fertile mind and a profound wisdom attended all his utterances.

When he rose to speak in this body, he always drew a large and attentive audience. He had that rare eloquence that indelibly impresses with its transparent earnestness and sincerity. When he engaged in debate, he covered the subject under discussion with a unique and mature thoroughness. Calm and deliberate in mien, he was nevertheless a most powerful and convincing speaker. His long service as an editor and writer fashioned the words and phrases which he used with such facility and force to convey the thoughts he wished to express. His marshalling of the facts in the case was always masterful. In a word, he was easily one of the great speakers of his day and generation.

In his utterances, in his votes upon public questions, in his philosophy and in his daily actions, there was clearly visible his unswerving devotion to his native state of North Carolina and to its citizens. He had a deep and abiding love for his country and a great faith in its past, present, and future. He was reverent and humble and loyal to his God.

Because he labored so diligently, long and well here, his State and the Nation, and indeed, the world, are the richer.

As a friend, I mourn his untimely passing, both for his friendship and his statesmanship. For a man of such talents and ability, life is all too short.

Always a strong defender of truth and justice, Senator JOSIAH BAILEY was great in those rare qualities of mind and heart

which give to a very few men deserved eminence when they occupy high places.

His resolves were the result of deep thought and, once reached, these resolves were rugged. His remarks supporting such resolution were always persuasive and convincing, and his reasoning cogent and generally unanswerable.

All who knew him are finer and better for that acquaintance—this Nation, his State, his constituents, his friends, and his family. In his last days, I am sure all of us realized that his work was such that it will be evidenced in the Nation's progress for many years to come.

The people of North Carolina, from whose ranks have come an unusually large number of illustrious and outstanding public servants, may take great pride in Senator BAILEY'S career, for he has further enriched this priceless heritage in the service to his State and to his country.

Address by Burr McCloskey at John Brown Memorial Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 15), 1948

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Burr McCloskey, general secretary of the United Labor Party of America, on Sunday, April 4, 1948, at Perkins Woods, Summit County, Ohio, at a public meeting called to memorialize John Brown, famed abolitionist.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As I address you, standing before this monument which was erected 10 years ago this month in honor of one of Ohio's true heroes, my heart is filled with pity and compassion for the deluded folk who think of greatness in men as if it were a commodity with price tag, something which can be bought or sold.

John Brown was a man of such magnificent historical stature that it is with shame and in mockery that the names of Ohio's allegedly revered "statesmen" are mentioned in the same breath—I refer to the propaganda-inflated mediocrities of Harding, Cox, McKinley and the rest. The greatness for which John Brown was hanged by his neck until dead, dead, dead, is the flaming purpose which elevated the blood bath of the Civil War to the level of the Emancipation Proclamation. It is the cause which brought the party of Abraham Lincoln out of the wilderness. It is the cause which looked at the eager peoples of this continent, and at the fecund resources of the land, and promised us a great and powerful industrial democracy. It is the struggle for genuine representation, so that each and every voice may be heard: That all voices may be heard.

With fewer than two dozen men, John Brown, armed mainly with magnificent purpose and with prayer, challenged the nasty symbols of slavery at Harpers Ferry. Today the social custom of his martyrdom carries his memory on and on in the hearts of all plain people. Why?

Why is this? That a man with no distinction or title or prestige could ignite a spark in the breasts of so large a multitude? Not only black men, brown men, pink or white * * *? There are certain precious moments when a whole nation can tremble precariously on the threshold of tomorrow. These are moments when it is the popular will of great masses to toss up John Brown to the summit of universal greatness. These are moments when the allies of the men who are later to be honored, are not the kings or the titans, but the plain farmers, the anonymous citizens of villages, and the underprivileged of great cities.

I say today is such a time. I say now is such a moment. It is not idly that we memorialize John Brown; that we hark back to the abuse which was his lot—the charge of treason, the insult of rioter, and the accusation of maniac. Always, it is always so—that the hysterical voice of a decadent system seeks to vilify its opposition out of existence.

Today, as we search out the routes and patterns for constructing a grand new political movement of all people who toil we are the target for similar invective. It does not hurt us. Beneath the avalanche of commercial and emotional criticism, we shall not flinch as we push on toward the unity between a man and his neighbor which alone can set the world free.

Now there are some obstructions which we cannot possibly remove with any appeal to reason, however sincere. The sea will still beat away at the rocky cliffs, and the leopard will not change his spots. The speculators will not relent in their conspiracies to fleece the worker who harvests the grain; and the coupon clippers will remain intent in exploiting the wage hands in the mills.

But the lack of communication, the absence of sympathy, of consciousness of kind, between the toiler on the land and the worker in the factory—this obstruction we intend to overcome, and the moment will not be far distant. The most unnecessary, retarding, mutually injurious division which keeps people apart today, is the division between town and country. On other matters we need strength and organized force, but here we need intelligence, and a communion of interest.

Our State, Ohio, is a pivotal State, and its social composition is peculiar. It has more large cities and it has more small towns than any other State in the Union. Its natural bounty and its historical position have left it endowed with both a mighty industry and a fertile agriculture—equal in importance—and both are staffed by the hardiest citizens of the world. Wherever you may find them—a factory worker in a suburb, a retired farmer in a hamlet, or an independent producer on his own homestead—these are the folk who together hold the power in Ohio.

But you will search in vain in the executive and legislative offices to find evidence of the joined strength of our people, or testimony of their bonds of common cause. We are ruled and swindled by a ruthless clique which thrives on our disunion, and—indeed—which perpetuates the separation between our urban and our rural groups. The tradition of the Ohio gang ranks with the infamous record of the Missouri gang, the boss machines of New York, Tennessee, New Jersey, and Illinois. Truly, Ohio has long ago lost a living biparty democracy. Our bankrupt political dictatorship saddles us with an inhumane administration, representative only of our vices, but with none of our tremendous virtues. This they are able to do because they divide and rule, because they disrupt our natural tendencies toward unity and commonness of purpose, and they corrupt and buy off incipient leadership which might weld us into a solid fighting force.

People of Ohio! Farm folks, citizens of the many towns and villages, industrial workers of the village and the city, we cannot allow this division of our forces to continue! In all the various realms of State aid, Federal grants, universal education, public welfare and labor relations, we suffer daily due to the absence of our own organized movement, because the candidates in the field are not our candidates, neither by us nor for us. We are in political bondage to alien elements to our common needs and common welfare.

We see signs and portents that in this year 1948 a tide of popular resentment against such conditions is being generated, and that tide is beginning to swell and manifest itself in the political arena. In Illinois and Ohio the tide swells out into the Democratic Party by attempts of independently minded persons to dominate the machine. As fast as they win an office the machine politicians, whose law is: if you can't beat them join them, reaffiliate with them and reestablish the old machine. These are the axioms of our present-day politics. In spite of them it cannot be denied that the people are on the march with independent ideas. This we must not forget nor ignore. And among these ideas is the resurgent notion that farm and city need no longer be divided. This idea is our rock, and it is a foundation upon which we must build. The wrath of the reactionary politician cannot prevail against it.

People of Ohio remember this: The opportunity for creating inspired weapons for our emancipation does not come often to us. Nor does it always linger. The mere existence of such a widespread independent movement among the people challenges the cupidity of machine-minded men to ensnare, convert, and destroy it. This we must not allow. This opportunity to build a movement of our own we must not let pass.

We need no ideas of freedom or progress smuggled into Ohio from Europe or Russia. John Brown's struggle against slavery established once and forever that deep in America were the forces that could take into their own hands their common destiny. Forces, rooted in the soil of Ohio, in the traditions of the Western Reserve, in the personalities of our people, and in truth in the very air we breathe.

The place to find leadership is in our own ranks. We need not look elsewhere. Here we have had before and here we have now, men and women whose passion for justice, whose sense of democratic strategy, and whose capacity for organizational tactics are not only equal to but superior to machine-minded bosses, fellow-travelers devoted to the cause of another, or to those who foster the tactic of divide and rule.

I have not come here today to regale you with historical reminiscences. There is a proven route for us to follow which I want to describe. It is simple. It is direct. It is intrinsically democratic, open and inviting for the broadest representation of the ordinary citizen, rural and urban, town and country.

This is a program made known on a wide scale by a man who has borne his share of the pillory at the hands of the moneyed powers and the gang-politicians of the Democratic and Republican Parties. It is a program for an open convention, where the will of the majority is bound to carry the day. I speak of the program spread by the Honorable WILLIAM LANGER, United States Senator from North Dakota.

BILL LANGER is a farmer's Senator, one who has triumphed over the merciless persecution campaign of his and his people's enemies. I ask you to consider his plan, and to respond to his call for action here in Ohio. On one day later this fall, to be selected, an announcement for a convention will be broadcast, that convention to be open to every patriotic man or woman,

regardless of race, color, or creed, who is willing to meet in democratic assembly with fellow citizens, to discuss and to resolve ways and means to avert a new war, to fend off the threat of atomic destruction, and to remove poverty from the face of this rich land of ours.

Such an open convention, if you decide to attend and make it your own, can by majority vote, resolve to run an independent State-wide ticket this November, or to set up a permanent organization, or to build immediately a new Ohio party, or whatever steps its delegates think wisest. If you will let Senator LANGER know of your response, then we can set the day, choose the assembly place in a central location in Ohio, and march ahead toward our common goals.

In such an environment, we will be able to look one another in the eye, exchange our opinions with dignity and good humor, and take the first step toward the social emancipation for which John Brown gave his life.

I hope you will all be there.

A Summary of S. 110, the Bulwinkle-Reed Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1948

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, the President vetoed S. 110. The veto message shows clearly the misconception of the purposes of the bill by the Presidential advisers.

The public should have a full, complete, and correct knowledge of what the bill does. The public should also have knowledge of what the bill does not do. Since the veto has been overridden in both Houses, this bill will become the law, and I desire to state what the law will do and what it will not do.

WHAT THE BILL DOES

S. 110 extends the regulatory power of the Interstate Commerce Commission; sets up standards for the Commission to follow in the exercise of its increased authority; protects the right of independent action—prohibits "mixed" rate conferences; and provides that rate conferences, when approved by the ICC, and whose rate decisions are under final control of the ICC, shall not be subject to the antitrust laws with respect to the making and carrying out of such agreements in conformity with the Commission's requirements.

WHAT THE BILL DOES NOT DO

S. 110 does not give carriers the right to fix rates, either through conference or otherwise; does not weaken ICC control over carrier action as to rates and charges; does not freeze the rate structure; does not bring about, or permit, regional or sectional discrimination in rates; does not favor big shippers as against small shippers; does not establish a precedent of exemption from the antitrust laws; does not make possible carrier agreements to limit or reduce service to the public; and does not render moot or defeat the Georgia or Lincoln antitrust suits if the plaintiffs are able to prove the charges alleged.

THE SUPPORT OF THE BILL

S. 110 is supported with an unparallelled degree of unanimity by shippers and shippers' organizations from all sections, by farm organizations, by the attorney for the Southern Governors' Conference, and by public regulatory authorities, State and Federal.

WHAT S. 110 DOES

S. 110 as amended and passed by Congress does these five things:

First. It extends the regulatory power of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The bill brings under Commission regulation the organization and procedures of the rate conferences in which the carriers consider in a preliminary way rates affecting more than one carrier which are to be proposed to, or filed with, the Commission for its final and controlling action. This final and controlling authority of the Commission is in nowise diminished.

Second. It sets up standards for the Commission to follow in exercise of its increased authority. The bill provides that the Commission may not approve the making and carrying out of a rate conference agreement except upon a finding that it is in "furtherance of the national transportation policy declared in this [Interstate Commerce] Act."

Third. It fully protects the right of independent action by carriers. The bill provides that the ICC may not approve any agreement for rate conferences unless it finds that "there is accorded to each party the free and unrestrained right to take independent action either before or after any determination arrived at," regardless of what is done by the conference or by any other carrier. Thus the essential values of competition are preserved.

Fourth. It prohibits "mixed" rate conferences. The bill provides that the ICC may not approve any conference which includes carriers of more than one type. Thus railroads may not be part of the same conference with motor carriers, nor either of them with carriers by water, or any of these with freight forwarders or pipe lines.

Fifth. It provides that rate conferences of the sort prescribed, when approved by the ICC and whose rate decisions are under final control of the ICC shall not be subject to the antitrust laws with respect to the making and carrying out of such agreements in conformity with the Commission's requirements. The bill recognizes that since conferences are necessary for the successful working of our scheme of transportation regulation, and since the organization and procedures of the conferences are to be brought under the ICC regulation, and since the rates and charges proposed by the conferences are under full Commission control, then those conferences which are approved by the Commission shall be "relieved from the operation of the antitrust laws with respect to the making of such agreement, and with respect to the carrying out of such agreement in conformity with its provisions and in conformity with the terms and conditions prescribed by the Commission." In all other respects, and as to all actions not in accord with the requirements of this bill, the antitrust laws will continue to apply just as they do now.

In many areas there is no necessary conflict between the Interstate Commerce Act and the antitrust laws. Where there is conflict, or where conflict is asserted, it is up to the Congress to declare which body of law shall apply. This Congress has done by the passage through both Houses of S. 110.

WHAT S. 110 DOES NOT DO

Despite misunderstandings to the contrary, S. 110 does not do these things:

First. It does not give carriers the right to fix rates, either through conference or otherwise. Under the bill the carriers have only the right they now have to propose rates to the ICC. The power to fix rates remains in the Interstate Commerce Commission. It is sometimes charged that the Commission exercises its powers of investigation and suspension over only a very small percent—even as little as 1 percent—of the rates filed with it. The charge is incorrect both as a matter of arithmetic and in substance. It arises from a complete misconception of the scope and use of the Commission's rate-making functions. As a matter of fact, the overwhelming majority of all rates are made as the result of Commission action, either in specific proceedings or in general orders to which rates are made to conform. Current changes are usually in the form of adjustments. All such proposed changes are docketed. The docket is published in appropriate transportation journals, and interested carriers and shippers are notified. Opportunity for discussion or hearing is always provided.

If any interested shipper or carrier is not satisfied it is a simple matter to object or protest to the ICC. The fact that so small a percentage of the rate changes filed require the active intervention of the Commission is in itself evidence of the satisfactory practical working of the conference system for the advance consideration of rates.

Second. It does not weaken the ICC's control over carrier action as to rates and charges. The bill, on the other hand, by preserving and regulating rate conferences, helps to make more effective the practical workings of the ICC. Persons experienced in the workings of transportation regulation are agreed that if there were no rate conferences to thresh out matters before they are submitted to the Commission for final action, the Commission's staff would be swamped and its procedures clogged with unnecessary controversies and proceedings.

Third. It does not freeze the rate structure. Continued operation of rate conferences is necessary to maintain necessary flexibility in the consideration of rates. If each carrier had to propose, without conference, rates which almost always concern other carriers and shippers on other lines, the great majority of rate proposals would bring on proceedings before the ICC. The resulting volume of litigation would impose upon Government, upon shippers, and upon carriers such an intolerable burden of expense and delay as would blockade effectively the normal processes of adjustment of rates under regulation. Far from freezing rates in any set pattern,

therefore, S. 110 is essential to their normal adjustment to meet changing conditions. Conferences of the sort contemplated by S. 110 are especially desirable in providing rates for new products, new plants or new industries.

Fourth. It does not bring about, or permit, regional or sectional discrimination in rates. The Interstate Commerce Act prohibits in section 3 (1), applying to railroads, and in the corresponding sections applying to motor and water carriers, discrimination not only as between shippers, places, and products, but also as between any "region, district, [or] territory."

This provision of the act is in no way changed by S. 110. Neither are the similar and more general prohibitions against preference and discrimination, all of which remain in full force and effect without change. The fact that S. 110 is actively supported by virtually all the shippers' organizations which have been most active in the fight for more favorable freight-rate treatment of the South and the Southwest is sufficient evidence that the bill would not weaken the protection of these sections against discrimination.

Fifth. It does not favor big shippers as against small shippers. The only shippers who might get along without rate conferences, after a fashion, are big shippers who are able to maintain fully staffed traffic departments to keep track of changes in rates affecting their business. The rate conferences furnish a method by which any shipper, small as well as large, can keep track of proposed changes through regularly published dockets listing all proposals. The conferences provide, also, a place where any shipper, small as well as large, may present his views on proposed changes to all interested carriers. The big shipper might be able to get along without rate conferences but without them the small shipper, who would be working in the dark and compelled to hunt up railroad after railroad to make his representations even when he might be informed, would be helpless.

Sixth. It does not establish a precedent of exemption from the antitrust laws. As to regulated surface carriers, S. 110 follows the precedent already established as to ocean carriers in the Shipping Act of 1916 and as to air carriers in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. Neither does it set a precedent as to business in general. The only actions of regulated carriers which are declared to be not subject to the antitrust laws are such actions as are themselves subject to complete regulations in the public interest by the Interstate Commerce Commission—a situation totally different from that applying to unregulated business.

The purpose of the antitrust laws is to protect the public from price fixing at the hands of private business. But in the field of transportation this protection is already provided through Government price fixing by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act requiring that rates shall be just and reasonable, fair, and free from unjust discrimination, and the power of the Commission to enforce these provisions, remain undiminished and unimpaired by S. 110.

Seventh. It would not make possible carrier agreements to limit and reduce service to the public. S. 110 as originally introduced and as passed by the Senate authorized the approval of agreements as to matters of service. Objection was made to such agreements that action resulting from them would not be subject, as rates are, to the final action and control of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It was felt by some that to permit agreements of this sort without the restraint of the antitrust laws would leave this area of carrier activity covered by neither law. Those interested in the bill do not accept the validity of this contention but they are so vitally interested in the preservation of the rate conference method of giving preliminary consideration to rates that they proposed that the bill be amended so as to restrict its application to rate conferences and nothing else. This having been done by amendment in the House, subsequently accepted by the Senate, the bill no longer applies to agreements as to service matters but only to rate conferences, the results of whose deliberations are completely and finally subject to ICC control.

Eighth. It does not render moot or defeat the Georgia or Lincoln antitrust suits if the plaintiffs are able to prove the charges alleged. The bill, if enacted into law, would not defeat the antitrust suit of the State of Georgia against certain eastern and southern railroads, or the Department of Justice's antitrust suit at Lincoln, Nebr., against certain western railroads and the Association of American Railroads. The reasons why this is not the case are dealt with on pages 7 to 9 of this memorandum.

THE SUPPORT OF S. 110

This brief summary of what S. 110 does, and what it does not do, explains why it is supported by shippers of all sizes and in every section of the country with a degree of unanimity unparalleled. These shippers are experienced and practical men. They pay the bills and they have a first-hand knowledge of rates and the making of rates. They have seen and worked with rate conferences, which have been in perfectly open, above-board and unquestioned operation for the greater part of the past 50 years. They know what will work and what will not. And with the most extraordinary unanimity, they say that they want the law so clarified as to remove any doubt as to the legality of rate conferences.

Some go further. They not only want to clear away any doubt about conferences but also want them regulated. Thus, Mr. J. V. Norman, attorney for the Southern Governors' Conference in their rate proceedings before the Interstate Commerce Commission, told the committee that he was for the bill chiefly because it brought under the direct regulation of the Interstate Commerce Commission the conference process which he considered to be an essential part of the rate-making machinery but which is not now so regulated.

A complete roster of shippers and shippers' organizations which supported the bill before the committees of Senate and House includes more than a thousand such bodies. These organizations represent shippers of every sort of commodity, in all quantities, and from all sections of the country.

They include such farm organizations as the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and scores of others representing particular sections or products.

They include such representatives of shippers generally as the National Industrial Traffic League, the principal national organization representing all sorts of shippers. Equally significant, the active supporters of the bill include such regional shippers' organizations as the Southern Traffic League, the Texas Industrial Traffic League, and others which have been most active in the fight for more favorable treatment of the South and the Southwest in freight-rate matters. Regardless of their views as to particular rates and rate adjustments, these shippers' organizations are almost a unit in support of S. 110, because they know that the rate conferences are essential to our system of regulated transportation and that steps should be taken to regularize and regulate their status.

The regulatory agencies of the State and Federal Governments are equally strong for the bill. The Interstate Commerce Commission, the Office of Defense Transportation, the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, the Mountain-Pacific States Conference of these commissions, indeed, 47 out of the 48 State commissions, have expressed themselves in support of the bill.

THE EFFECT ON THE GEORGIA AND LINCOLN CASES

The effect of S. 110 on the Georgia Case

The enactment of S. 110 will not make the Georgia case moot or prevent the Supreme Court from granting the State of Georgia injunctive relief if the State is able to prove the charges made in the complaint.

The charge made against the railroads in the Georgia case is that they combined and conspired to fix rates by coercion and to discriminate against Georgia. A combination or conspiracy of that kind would not be protected or immunized by S. 110.

The conspiracy charged by the State of Georgia is a conspiracy to fix rates by coercion and to discriminate against the State of Georgia in the rates so fixed. This is the way the Supreme Court construed Georgia's pleading; it was this kind of a cause of action that the Supreme Court permitted the State to bring. In its opinion granting the State leave to file the amended bill of complaint, the majority of the Supreme Court said:

> As we have said, we construe the bill to charge a conspiracy among defendants to use coercion in the fixing of rates and to discriminate against Georgia in the rates which are fixed. We hold that under that construction of the bill a cause of action under the antitrust laws is alleged. (*Georgia* v. *Penna. R. Co.* (324 U. S. 439, 462).)

The Supreme Court made it perfectly clear that it did not regard Georgia's complaint as charging merely that the

railroads had violated the antitrust laws by conferring together about rates. The Court said that it would not express an opinion on the question "whether a rate-fixing combination would be legal under the Interstate Commerce Act and the Sherman Act but for the features of discrimination and coercion charged here." *Georgia* v. *Pennsylvania R. Co.* (324 U. S. 439, 463.) Thus, the issue in the Georgia case is not whether mere participation in rate conferences by the railroads violates the antitrust laws but whether the railroads have used the rate conferences to fix rates by coercion and to discriminate against Georgia.

S. 110 does not authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to approve rate conferences that are used in a conspiracy to fix rates by coercion or to discriminate against a region. So far as concerns coercion, paragraph 6 of the bill provides that the Commission shall not approve any agreement unless the agreement gives to each party the free and unrestrained right to take independent action. So far as concerns discrimination the bill, read with the act to which it is amendatory, makes it impossible for the Commission to approve any rate conference that is used to fix rates that discriminate against a region. Paragraph 2 of the bill provides that the Commission cannot approve a rate conference unless it finds that the rate conference will promote the national transportation policy declared in the Interstate Commerce Act. One of the terms of the national transportation policy declared in the Interstate Commerce Act is the establishment and maintenance of reasonable charges for transportation service, without unjust discriminations, undue preferences or advantages.

It should be assumed that even in the absence of these restrictions the Interstate Commerce Commission would not approve a rate conference that was a conspiracy to fix rates by coercion and to discriminate against a region. But Congress has not left that matter to the discretion of the Commission; on the contrary, Congress has, by the terms of S. 110, directed the Commission not to approve a rate conference of that kind. Besides, such discrimination is prohibited by section 3 of the Interstate Commerce Act.

The Supreme Court in its opinion granting the State of Georgia leave to file its amended bill of complaint held that a certificate issued under a statutory provision similar to S. 110 did not prevent the Court from granting the State of Georgia equitable relief if the State could prove its charges. This holding was made with respect to the effect of certificate 44 which had been issued under section 12 of the act of June 11, 1942. The provisions of that act were analogous to the provisions of S. 110. The act authorized the Chairman of the War Production Board to issue certificates which provided that the antitrust law should not apply to certain kinds of activity which were found by the Chairman of the War Production Board to be requisite to the prosecution of the war. Such a certificate had been issued by the Chairman of the War Production Board with respect to the rate conferences and committees involved in the Georgia case. The Supreme Court held that this certificate did not prevent the State of Georgia from bringing suit in the Supreme Court. Speaking of certificate 44 the Court said:

> It does not sanction the use of coercion. It does not authorize any combination to discriminate against a region in the establishment of rates. (*Georgia* v. *Pennsylvania R. Co.* (324 U. S. 439, 459), footnote 7.)

This holding of the Supreme Court is a decisive answer to the suggestion that if S. 110 becomes law the Georgia case will be moot and the Supreme Court will be prevented from granting relief to the State of Georgia.

It follows that if the State of Georgia can prove that, in fact, the railroads have combined and conspired to fix rates by coercion and to discriminate against the State of Georgia, nothing in S. 110 will prevent the Supreme Court from issuing an injunction that prohibits the railroads from engaging in that kind of activity.

The effect of S. 110 on the Lincoln case

S. 110 will not make the Lincoln case moot and it will not prevent the court from granting the United States injunctive relief in that case if the United States is able to prove its charges.

The complaint in the Lincoln case does not confine its charges to the matter of rates; it also alleges that the railroads have violated the antitrust laws by conferring together and acting in concert with respect to other matters, particularly transportation services and facilities of various kinds. This aspect of the Lincoln case could not be touched or affected in any way by any action taken by the Interstate Commerce Commission under S. 110. The agreements contemplated by S. 110 must be agreements "relating to rates, fares, classifications, divisions, allowances, or charges," and so forth. The Commission cannot approve arrangements that relate to services, or facilities, or to any aspect of transportation other than rates, fares, classifications, and so forth. Any arrangements with respect to services and other such matters will still be subject to the provisions of the antitrust laws to the same extent that they are now and cannot be affected in any way by any action of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

It should also be remembered that the complaint in the Lincoln case charges that one of the purposes of the conspiracy was to fix rates that discriminate against the West. In this respect the complaint in the Lincoln case alleges a cause of action similar to the cause of action alleged by the State of Georgia and the same general considerations that we have discussed in connection with the Georgia case apply.

It is perfectly clear that if S. 110 becomes law the case at Lincoln, Nebr., will proceed with respect to charges of unlawful conspiratorial action having to do with service matters which are beyond the scope of the bill. It seems equally clear that if the bill becomes law, neither in the Georgia case nor in the Lincoln case can an injunction be granted prohibiting the operation of rate bureaus if approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission; but there is nothing in the bill which would prevent issuance of an injunction against coercion or invidious discrimination whether accomplished by a rate bureau or by any other means.

In the Lincoln case the same kind of motion to dismiss, based on certificate 44, was made as in the Georgia case, and with the same result. Certificate 44 was held not to be a bar to prosecution of either case, and, by the same token, neither would S. 110 be such a bar.

Work of Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 15), 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, for the past 2 years it has been my privilege, among my other duties to serve as chairman of the subcommittee handling the annual agriculture appropriation bill for the Senate Appropriations Committee.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I received from Mr. Charles B. Shuman, president of the Illinois Agriculture Association, with reference to this vital and important activity.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ILLINOIS AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., June 10, 1948.

Hon. C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BROOKS: I want to express my sincere appreciation for the opportunity to represent the Illinois Agricultural Association before the Senate Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, of which you are chairman. I wish it were possible for every farmer in Illinois to have a similar opportunity to meet with this committee and to actually observe the careful consideration given to the needs of agriculture by the distinguished group.

We in Illinois certainly appreciate the responsible position which you hold as chairman of this committee, which influences to such a marked extent the progress of national agricultural legislation. We want you to know that we appreciate your past efforts to maintain essential agricultural appropriations, and particularly those which have enabled the most worth-while programs of Government to be carried on in this postwar period. I refer particularly to your definite assistance in securing adequate funds for the Extension Service, REA loans, and the research and marketing program, as well as many other projects. During this same period of time great reductions in Government spending have been made and agriculture has borne its full share of these economies.

I congratulate you and your committee on your practical approach to the present-day needs of agriculture.

Very truly yours,

ILLINOIS AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATION,
CHARLES B. SHUMAN, *President.*

Penalty of Surrender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1948

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an article by Leonard E. Read, The Foundation for Economic Education, Inc., entitled "The Penalty of Surrender." The article follows:

THE PENALTY OF SURRENDER

These remarks, hardly more than a personal confession of faith, have their origin in an attitude or behavior commonly referred to as compromising.

A compromising attitude is exalted by many and deplored by only a few.

As an example of the way this attitude is exalted, a certain business leader, perhaps the most publicized one in the country, once severely lectured me on my unswerving and uncompromising behaviors. He charged that I saw things only in blacks and whites. He said that practical life was lived in shades of grays, actually in the shadows of these two extremes. He suggested that I had a nice chance of going far in the world if only I would become more pliable to the thoughts and actions of my fellows:

This criticism by so popular a person left me somewhat speechless. While it is true that I felt no sense of guilt whatever, nor even any unfaithfulness to those who thought differently than I, nonetheless, I found myself unable to do more than stammer in my own defense. Did you ever experience a feeling of rightness in the face of criticism, but were unable to explain your feeling? If so, you know how I felt on that occasion 5 years ago.

THE FUTILITY OF COMPROMISE

Thus I was happy to accept this invitation to talk about The Futility of Compromise. Here was an opportunity for me to think this thing through, to give expression to something that had too long remained in the vague area of feeling. Here was the chance to say what I mean, to explain to myself—and not, as you shall see, to impose my ideas on any other person.

Compromise, like many other words, has different meanings for different persons. After some reflection I concluded that it was a confusion in the meaning of words that was largely responsible for so much misunderstanding; that maybe it wasn't compromise after all which deserved condemnation.

PHYSICAL COMPROMISE IS POSSIBLE

I want to use the term in this definition by Webster, one of several, "The result or embodiment of concession or adjustment." I want to show that compromise is potentially good when applied in a physical sense and that it has no application whatever in a moral sense.

For example, you and your wife are spending what is hoped will be a happy evening at home. She chooses to listen to the radio and you elect to figure out what Toynbee is driving at in his Study of History. The scene appears peaceful as you sit side by side near this beautiful piece of furniture. But to you the furniture is making a lot of distracting noise.

Here are all the possibilities for turning a cheerful evening into one of disharmony. But compromise can come to your aid. Your wife can decrease the noise of the radio to the point where she can still hear it, and you can move to some remote corner where you can comprehend Toynbee just as well as anywhere else. Harmony can thus be preserved by compromise.

Compromise in this sense is an adjustment of physical situations. It is the process by which conflicts are reduced to the point most satisfactory to all parties concerned. When thought of in this way, compromise is the great harmonizer, the attitude that makes living together—social life—a pleasure.

Indeed, the market place, where tens of millions of transactions go on daily, is one vast area of compromise. Buyers aim at low prices. Sellers aim at high prices. In a free market there is an adjustment of these diverse desires. Compromise establishes the price at which the mutual satisfaction of buyer and seller is at its highest level.

It is in this physical realm that most of our daily life is lived. In this realm compromise is good and it is practical. It begets harmony and peace.

MORAL COMPROMISE IS IMPOSSIBLE

How easy it would seem then, finding compromise so useful in such a vast segment of life, to conclude unthoughtfully that it has an equal place, a comparable value, in that phase of life which consciously occupies our thoughts so little: moral life.

But this is precisely the point where I believe many of us are the victims of a confusion of terms. What is compromise in physical affairs, that is, in an adjustment of physical positions, is something entirely different when applied to principles and morality.

For example, let us make the reckless assumption that most of us are committed to the Biblical injunction, "Thou shalt not steal." This is a moral principle. The point I want to make—my major point—is that this as a principle defies compromising. You either take someone else's property without his consent, or you do not. If you steal just a teensy weensy bit you do not compromise the principle. You abandon it. You surrender your principle.

By taking only a little of someone else's property without his consent, as distinguished from taking a lot of someone else's property without his consent, you do compromise in the physical sense. You compromise the physical amount you steal. But the moral principle, whatever the amount of the theft, is surrendered and utterly abandoned.

If all the rest of mankind are in favor of passing a law that would take the property, honestly acquired, of only one person without due compensation, even though the purpose be allegedly for the so-called social good, you cannot adjust yourself both to the moral principle "Thou shalt not steal" and to the demand of the millions. Principle does not lend itself to bending or to compromising. It stands impregnable. I must either abide by it, or in all fairness I must on this point regard myself, not as a rational, reasonable person, but rather as an unprincipled person.

WHAT ARE MORAL PRINCIPLES?

The question immediately arises as to what constitutes principle. Here again is a term with many meanings. I cannot derive the exact satisfaction I want from reading the several definitions; therefore, it seems necessary to define what I mean.

The Ten Commandments are principles, moral principles. They were principles at least to the ones who wrote them, and they have been adopted and held as principles by countless millions. They receive their validity as principles through the deductions of the wiser among us and through centuries of observations and experience. Actually, they are principles only insofar as they are revealed truth to particular persons.

What may be a principle to one is not necessarily a principle to another. It is a matter of revealed truth, that is, revelation, "the disclosing or discovering * * * of what was before unknown."

To me "Thou shalt not steal" is a principle not because some sage of antiquity said so but because, in my own experience, it has been revealed as a principle which must be adhered to if we are not to perish from the earth.

To the ones who have not been graced with this revelation; to the ones who hold that they should gratify their personal charitable feelings, not with their own goods but by using the police force to take goods from others; to those who would indulge in legal thievery and honestly think the practice right and honorable; to those, I say, "Thou shalt not steal" is no principle at all. It is only the principle of someone else.

A principle then is what one holds to be a fact of life, of nature, or, as some of us would put it, of God. If this is correct, it follows that a principle is a matter of personal individual judgment. Judgment is fallible. Therefore there are wrong principles as well as right principles. Aristotle said there were a million ways to be wrong, only one way to be right. That suggests the measure of fallibility among us.

MORAL PRINCIPLES REQUIRE UNDERSTANDING

Now then, if principle is a matter of personal judgment, and judgment is conceded to be fallible, on what is right principle dependent?

The discovery and adoption of right principle is dependent on the evolution of judgment through logic, reason, observation, and honesty. When judgments deteriorate we have what history refers to as the Dark Ages. When judgments evolve or improve reference is made to The Renaissance. The question that grows out of this reasoning is, How does judgment evolve? My answer is, by revelation.

For instance, I am convinced that no person is capable of rising above his best judgment. To live in strict accordance with one's best judgment is to live as perfectly as one can, as humble or as mediocre as that may be. The one hope for personal betterment lies in raising the level of one's judgment; judgment is a limiting factor.

If the evolution of judgment rests on revelation how is revelation to be achieved? I can think of no answer superior to that suggested by Goethe:

"Nature understands no jesting; she is always true, always serious, always severe; she is always right, and the errors and faults are always those of man. The man incapable of appreciating her she despises; and only to the apt, the pure, and the true, does she resign herself, and reveal her secrets."

The sole way to revelation, to ultimate truth, to nature, as Goethe puts it, or to God, as I put it, lies through one's own person. It is my faith that the individual is God's manifestation so far as any given individual is concerned. My way to God is through my own person. He will reveal Himself to me, I will be His manifestation, only to the extent that I am apt, pure, and true.

UNDERSTANDING REQUIRES EFFORT

But the revelation of truth and of principles does not come automatically, without

effort, like manna from heaven. Revelation is the product of a diligent application of an individual's mental resources. Truth must be sought, and its revelation is most likely in an active mind.

It is rather easy to observe that to some very little, if anything, is ever revealed. To others there come revelations far beyond anything I now possess or have any right seriously to expect.

Anyway, with this as a faith, based, as it is, on such revelation as is mine, God is as intimate to me as my own person. He exists for each of us only insofar as we achieve our own conception of His likeness.

GOD AND INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY ARE ONE

This is why I believe, so fervently, in the sanctity and dignity of the individual. This is why I subscribe to the philosophy that each person has inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. For me to deny this philosophy by violating the life, liberty, or property of another, by inflicting my ways on other persons, is for me to assert myself as a god over God, to interfere with another person's relationship with God. For me to use compulsion in any manner whatsoever to cast others in my image is for me to rebuke God in His several manifestations.

If one accepts the individual in this light, a rule of conduct emerges with crystal clarity: Reflect in word and in deed, always and accurately, that which one's best judgment dictates. This is you in such Godliness as you possess. To do less, to deviate one iota, is to sin against yourself, that is, against your Maker as He has manifested Himself in you. To do less is not to compromise. To do less is to surrender.

Certainly, there is nothing new about the efficacy of accurately reflecting one's best judgment. This principle of conduct has been known throughout the ages. Now and then it has been expressed beautifully and simply. Shakespeare enunciated this principle when he had Polonius say:

> This above all: To thine own self be true,
> And it must follow, as the night the day,
> Thou canst not then be false to any man.

Edmond Rostand meant nothing different when he wrote this line for Cyrano:

> Never to make a line I have not heard in my own heart;

American folklore counselled intellectual integrity with,

> Honesty is the best policy.

THE PRICE OF UNTRUTH

The Bible announces the penalty of surrender; what it means to abandon principle. It says,

> The wages of sin is death.

Whether the wages of sin be mere physical death or the death of man's spirit—his character, his integrity, his self respect—one needs to make no further inquiry to verify this Biblical pronouncement. Abundant testimony has been provided all of us in our lifetime. Nor is the end in sight. All the world is filled with examples of warped judgments and principles abandoned: men ruling over man; the glamour of popularity rather than the strictness of judgment directing policy; expediency substituting for such truth as is known; businessmen employing experts to help them seem right, often at the expense of rightness itself; labor leaders justifying any action that gratifies their lust for power; political leaders asserting that the end justifies the means; clergymen preaching expropriation of property without consent in the name of the "common good"; teachers advocating collectivism and denying the sanctity and the dignity of the individual; politicians building platforms from public-opinion polls; farmers and miners joining other plunderbundists in demands for other people's property; arrogance replacing humility; in short, we are sinking into a new dark age, an age darkened by persons who have abandoned intellectual integrity; who through ignorance or design, have adopted bad ideas and principles.

If we were suddenly to become aware of foreign vandals invading our shores, vandals that would kill our children, rape our women, and pilfer our industry, every last man of us would rise in arms that we might sweep them from our land.

Yet, these bad ideas, these ideas based on the abandonment of absolute integrity, are the most depraved and dangerous vandals known to man. Is the Bible right that the wages of sin is death? I give you the last two wars, wars born of unreason and lies. And the present so-called peace. I give you the Russia of 1929–32 where millions died of starvation and, in other years, where other millions died in this and other ways. I give you almost any place in the world today.

IS HONESTY DANGEROUS?

Perhaps the reason that so many fear stating accurately what they believe is that they are not aware that it is safe to do so.

Does it take courage to be honest, that is, does one have to be brave to state accurately one's highest opinion? Indeed, not. A part of revealed truth is: It is not dangerous to be honest. One who possesses this revelation is to that extent intelligent. Being honest, not surrendering principle, rests only upon intelligence, not at all upon courage. Relying, erroneously, on courage, many persons become blusterous with their opinions; they get cantankerous when they are honest. But, in this case, the villain is their cantankerousness, not their honesty.

Finally, some may contend that even if everyone were a model of intellectual integrity, that by reason of the great variety of judgments, differences, and antagonisms would still remain. This is true. But differences lend themselves to a change toward the truth in an atmosphere of honesty. Under these circumstances they can be lived with. For, after all, life, in a physical sense is, and for ages to come, will be a compromise. But if principle is abandoned even compromise will not be possible. Nothing but chaos.

Honesty—each person true to himself at his best—is the condition from which revelation springs; from which knowledge expands; from which intelligence grows; and from which judgments improve.

Honesty and intelligence are Godlike and are, therefore, primary virtues. Anyone is capable of being true to himself. That is the one equality we were all born with. Its abandonment is the greatest sin of all.

If there be no falseness there will then be as much intelligence as we are capable of. How nearer God can we get?

Harbors Are Hard To Have

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD T. MILLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, there are many sections of this great land of ours where waterways and water-borne transportation are a vital factor in the life and economy of the area.

The district I represent on the Eastern Shore of the Chesapeake Bay is such a locality. Historically, this beautiful tidewater country became important in early colonial times because the rivers and coves making in from the bay provided thoroughfares for the early settlers. Good routes of travel were at hand when the land provided only crude Indian trails. To this day, in such sections, harbors and channels must be maintained or improved if commerce and seafood industries are to function normally.

Unfortunately, waterways require upkeep and maintenance, even as do the highways on land. As the years go by, forests are cut down, soil and beach erosion take their tolls, and the fine harbors and channels of yesteryear become the mud flats and marshes of today—unless there is regular attention to upkeep and occasional reconstruction.

Nothwithstanding the need for simple and immediate action in matters of this kind, the machinery for bringing about a small harbor or channel restoration is as cumbersome today as when the country was much smaller and the demands upon Congress less complex and voluminous.

Let me hasten to say that I am most appreciative of the fine service performed during this Eightieth Congress by the Appropriations and Public Works Committees. They have been most cooperative and tolerant of me, and generous in their treatment of the problems of my district. I am indeed grateful to the former for appropriating funds for six sorely needed projects on the Eastern Shore of Maryland that had been passed over by the Administration and were not recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. I refer to the small-boat harbor at Crisfield; the channel from Tangier Sound known as Lower Thoroughfare, Deals Island, including a mooring basin at the head of the cove at Wenona; the channel and mooring basin at Duck Point Cove, Fox Creek, Honga River; the harbor at Black Walnut Point; the improvement in the channel in the Pocomoke River above the bridge at Snow Hill; and deepening of the channel and construction of turning and anchorage basins in Town Creek at Oxford. The harbor at Crisfield, by the way, has been completed for some weeks.

I also appreciate the authorizations approved by the Committee on Public Works in the Rivers and Harbors bill of the harbors at Rock Hall and Cambridge, and the new channels from Kent Island Narrows to Wells Cove in the Chester River; and into Back Creek from Honga River and Tar Bay. There are anchorage and turning basins to be built in connection with these also.

They represent 4 of 32 river and harbor projects authorized in the entire bill, which also granted a preliminary examination and survey for a harbor near Tolchester Beach.

We are also indebted to the Committee on Public Works for passing favorable

resolutions for preliminary examinations and surveys of Goose Creek and Jenkins Creek, Somerset County, and Little Creek, Queenstown Harbor.

I might add that I am also grateful to the District Engineer for compliance with my requests for surveys relative to maintenance dredging of many existing projects, including Smith Island Channel, Ewell to Chesapeake Bay; McCready's Creek, Ocean City Inlet and Harbor, Sinepuxent Bay, Assateague Channel, Nanticoke Harbor, Pocomoke Muds; Marshy Hope flood control, and Kent Island Narrows, to name only some.

I would indeed be ungrateful, if I did not record my thanks and that of my constituents for all these matters.

However, Mr. Speaker, the system that we follow is much too cumbersome and time-consuming for proper functioning in this important field. We must devise a simpler way of getting a channel deepened. We cannot afford to have it take years to accomplish something so routine and often both urgent and inexpensive.

The control by the Federal Government over rivers and harbors is derived from the third clause of the eighth section of article I of the Constitution, which provides that the Congress shall have power: "To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes."

The policy with respect to improvements in the interest of navigation has been formulated over many years. Following the case of Gibbons against Ogden, decided by the Supreme Court in 1824, it became established that the lifting of a snag, the removal of a sand bar, or the building of a breakwater is a Federal matter. This policy, limited in scope at first, has grown and broadened from year to year.

The first distinct act of Congress for improving navigation was that of May 24, 1824, which appropriated funds for removing sand bars from the Ohio River and snags from the Mississippi.

Today ,to effect a river and harbor improvement, a long procedure must be followed: Local interests, through the action of their Representatives in Congress, make request for an item to be included in a river and harbor bill to authorize a study by the Corps of Engineers to determine the feasibility and the economic soundness of doing the work desired. This is called a preliminary examination and survey. If such an investigation has been made previously, a review study to determine modifications can be authorized by a resolution of the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives or of the Senate. These studies, it should be noted, can be made only as a result of congressional action.

Upon receipt of the requisite directive from Congress, the duty of making a preliminary investigation is assigned to the district engineer in the particular area. He must hold an open public hearing, full notice of which must be given, and at which all interested parties may be heard, whether for or against the plan. Then the district engineer makes a study. Months—even years—may be consumed by this step. Later, the results of the investigation, which include the recommendations of the district engineer and his immediate superior, the division engineer, are referred to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in Washington for review and recommendation as to whether sufficient merit exists in the project to warrant a more costly survey. In case the project is not deemed feasible from the standpoint of either engineering or economics, an unfavorable report is submitted to Congress with a recommendation that no further action be taken.

If the preliminary investigation indicates that further study is warranted, the duty of making the survey is assigned to the district engineer who, at that time, goes into an exacting analysis and study of the various details of the project in an endeavor to set up a practical engineering solution and an accurate determination of the cost involved. At this stage he may, if necessary, again hold public hearings in order to obtain the current views of the citizens. He correlates his work with other Federal agencies involved. He obtains the views of the local and State governments. Finally, the results of the survey, together with the recommendations of the district and division engineers, are referred to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors as in the case of the preliminary examination report. If the report is adverse, an appeal may be taken and an additional public hearing may be held by the Board. After further consideration of all the factors involved, the Board makes its recommendations to the Chief of Engineers who then sends the report, together with his proposed recommendations, to the Governor of the State in order that his views may be obtained and made a permanent part of the record. The formal views of other Federal agencies interested are also obtained at this time, as well as a statement from the Bureau of the Budget as to the relationship of the project to the program of the President.

The report with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the views of other agencies is finally transmitted to Congress by the Secretary of the Army. Unless the report to Congress is favorable, nothing can be done. Even if it is favorable, the Congressman has to secure a hearing and favorable action by the Committee on Public Works to seek authorization in a subsequent river and harbor and flood-control bill. Those concerned with the project, usually have to appear before the committees and again urge their views. After all this, if the bill including the project is passed by both Houses and approved by the President, the project is authorized. During the last 10 years there have been only four omnibus River and Harbor Authorization Acts, including the one that just passed. But that still does not mean the work will be done unless and until another law is passed providing the funds in a Department of the Army civil functions appropriation bill. Therefore, hearings are repeated at a later session before the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate, and as before—both Houses of Congress must pass the bill and the President approve.

It will be noted from the foregoing that three positive actions must be taken by Congress before construction can begin: The authorization of the preliminary examination and survey, the authorization by enactment into law of the project, and finally the appropriation.

In recent years, I am told, more than half of all projects advocated by local interests and investigated by the Corps of Engineers have been unfavorably reported to Congress. With the exception of projects, such as flood control or harbors of refuge, no projects are recommended for construction unless the average annual benefits to accrue therefrom, after exhaustive investigation, are estimated to be greater than the average annual charges for construction, amortization and maintenance.

After learning the numerous intricate and time-consuming steps that lie ahead, a Congressman cannot but shudder inwardly whenever an unsuspecting constituent casually and confidently asks to have the channel into Black Acre deepened—and, perhaps, adds that it really should be done before the fishing season starts.

Seldom does the constituent realize that it might be simpler if he asked for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States or for a new treaty with the Argentine. Let us hope that some day a shorter and easier procedure can be devised.

Before and After the Labor Act, 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MacKINNON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. The true standard to test the 1947 amendments to the labor law is to note their actual effect on workers, management, and the public. We should inquire whether strikes have increased or decreased since the 1947 amendments to the labor law became effective. Whether worker's wages have increased or decreased under the law? Whether workers are better off or worse off or just about the same? Here are the answers to these and associated questions as reported by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics. In this discussion the entire postwar period since VJ-day—August 15, 1945—is considered as that represents the whole of the present era.

Obviously the conditions existing in the two prior periods; that is, the period of World War II, and the prewar period, are not comparable, because conditions then were materially different than present-day conditions.

STRIKES HAVE DECREASED

Work stoppages have decreased materially since the passage of the Labor-Management Act which became effective on August 22, 1947. An examination of the data published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that from VJ-day until the Labor Act became effective the number of work stoppages average 395 per month. Since the act became effective work stoppages have been running on an average of 201 per month. This is a reduction in strikes of 49 percent. From VJ-day until the effective date of the Labor Act the average number of workers involved in new strikes per month was 337,000. Since the passage of the act the average number of workers so involved is 131,000. This represents a reduction since passage of the act of 61 percent. From VJ-day until the effective date of the act the average number of man-days of idleness caused by work stoppages was 7,213,000 per month. Since the passage of the act the average number of man-days of idleness lost through work stoppages is 2,613,000 days per month. This is the most important figure because it represents the actual payroll losses suffered by workers because of strikes. The reduction since the passage of the Labor Act in this item is 64 percent. Conversely stated time lost through strikes before the act was more than two and a half times the time lost since passage of the act. Table I below reflects these comparisons. Table II represents the figures of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics upon which the comparison is based.

TABLE I.—*Work stoppages before and after the Labor Act, 1947*

Period	Work stoppages beginning in period		Number of man-days idle
	Number	Workers involved	
Before act (VJ-day to effective date of act)	*Average per month* 395	*Average per month* 337,000	*Average per month* 7,213,000
After act (from August 1947 to date)	201	131,000	2,613,000

TABLE II.—*Strike data from VJ-day (Aug. 15, 1945) to Aug. 22, 1947*

Period	Work stoppages beginning in period		Number of man-days idle
	Number	Workers involved	
		Thousands	*Thousands*
1945: [1]			
September	573	526	4,340
October	474	551	8,610
November	358	420	6,930
December	134	50.4	7,720
Total	1,539	1,547.4	27,600

[1] From p. 10, U. S. Department of Labor Bull. No. 918 (1946).

TABLE II.—*Strike data from VJ-day (Aug. 15, 1945) to Aug. 22, 1947*—Continued

Period	Work stoppages beginning in period		Number of man-days idle
	Number	Workers involved	
		Thousands	*Thousands*
1946: [1]			
January	337	1,370	19,700
February	290	134	1,500
March	440	147	1,010
April	504	566	14,300
May	376	569	13,700
June	388	181	4,580
July	563	228	3,970
August	560	227	3,900
September	499	356	4,880
October	516	307	6,220
November	344	435	4,980
December	168	76	3,130
Total	4,985	4,600	116,000
1947:			
January [2]	320	105	1,400
February [2]	300	75	1,300
March [2]	361	96	1,100
April [3]	479	624	8,540
May [3]	471	230	6,730
June [3]	379	448	3,960
July [3]	315	242	3,970
August [3]	336	113	2,520
Total	2,961	1,933	29,520

RECAPITULATION OF PERIOD FROM VJ-DAY TO EFFECTIVE DATE OF LABOR ACT, 1947

4 months 1945	1,539	1,547	27,600
Year 1946	4,985	4,600	116,000
8 months 1947	2,961	1,933	29,520
Total	9,485	8,080	173,120
Average per month	395	337	7,213
Average per year	4,742	4,040	86,560

[1] From p. 10, U. S. Department of Labor Bull. No. 918 (1946).
[2] P. 3, U. S. Department of Labor, release, Jan. 7, 1948.
[3] P. 594, U. S. Department of Labor, Monthly Labor Review, May 1948.

Strike data since effective date of Labor Act (Aug. 22, 1947) to date

Period	Work stoppages beginning in period		Number of man-days idle
	Number	Workers involved	
		Thousands	*Thousands*
1947: [3]			
September	219	79	1,970
October	219	64	1,780
November	178	57	829
December	119	32	590
1948:			
January [3]	175	75	1,000
February [3]	200	70	725
March [4]	225	500	6,000
April [5]	275	175	8,000
Total	1,610	1,052	20,904
Average per month	201	131	2,613
Average per year	2,412	1,572	31,356

COMPARISON OF AVERAGES BEFORE AND AFTER EFFECTIVE DATE OF LABOR ACT, 1947

Before act, VJ-Day to effective date of act.	[6] 395 [7] 4,742	337 4,040	7,213 86,560
After act to date	[6] 201 [7] 2,412	131 1,572	2,613 31,356

[3] P. 594, U. S. Dept. of Labor, Monthly Labor Review, May 1948.
[4] U. S. Department of Labor release of April 29, 1948.
[5] U. S. Department of Labor release of May 28, 1948.
[6] Average per month.
[7] Average per year.

WAGES HAVE INCREASED

Accurate statistics on wages are also available in the official published reports of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics. The key dates in this connection are, first, the starting period at VJ-day, August 15, 1945; second, the date the Labor Act amendments became effective, August 22, 1947; and, third, the latest available date. Comparative figures for these three vital dates are set forth below for the industries that are the most highly organized by labor unions and hence would be the quickest to feel the effect of legislation detrimental to labor unions. These industries are the manufacturing industry, which includes all types of manufacturing, the bituminous-coal-mining industry, and the private building construction field. The figures with respect to these three industries are set forth separately in table 3 and then added and averaged with equal basis being given to each industry in table 4. It is apparent from these figures that wages have continued to rise, more leisure time has been made available through a shorter workweek and the average hourly earnings have also increased. The percentage increase in average hourly earnings over the 2-year period from VJ-day to the effective date of the Labor Act was 27 percent. From the passage of the act to the present time, a period of 7 months, the average hourly earnings increased from 27 percent to 35 percent over the wages paid on VJ-day. Thus 8 percent of this increase was reflected during the 7 months from the passage of the act until March 19, 1948.

For the same dates the increase in weekly earnings was 26.6 percent and 30.7 percent, respectively. These figures reflect the shortened workweek.

TABLE III.—*Wages*

ALL MANUFACTURING

Period	Average weekly earnings	Average weekly hours	Average hourly earnings
August 1945	41.81	40.8	1.025
August 1947	49.21	39.8	1.238
March 1948	52.07	40.3	1.291

BITUMINOUS COAL MINING

August 1945	49.89	40.1	1.248
August 1947	71.49	40.1	1.778
March 1948	74.61	40.4	1.847

PRIVATE BUILDING CONSTRUCTION

August 1945	55.79	40.3	1.383
August 1947	66.13	39.8	1.662
March 1948	66.14	36.5	1.810

TABLE IV.—*Wages (all manufacturing, bituminous-coal mining, private building construction)*

	Average weekly earnings	Weekly earnings percentage increase since VJ-day	Average weekly hours	Average hourly earnings	Hourly earnings percentage increase since VJ-day
August 1945	$49.16	.....	40.4	$1.215	.....
August 1947	62.24	26.6	39.9	1.559	27
March 1948	64.27	30.7	39.0	1.649	35

PRICES AND COST OF LIVING

Now let us examine what has happened to prices and the cost of living during

this same period. First, what were prices and the cost of living on VJ-day; second, what was the situation on the day the Labor Act became effective, August 22, 1947; and, third, what is the price and cost of living situation today?

Here are the figures as reported by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics for prices and the cost of living for all items on the three dates in question.

TABLE V.—*Prices and cost of living since VJ-day*

	All items [1]	Increase since VJ-day
		Percent
VJ-day (Aug. 15, 1945)	129.3	
When Labor Act became effective (Aug. 15, 1947)	160.3	24
Present time (latest available date, Mar. 15, 1948)	166.9	29

[1] As reported by U. S. Department of Labor in Monthly Labor Review, May 1948, p. 586.

WAGE INCREASES HAVE MORE THAN KEPT PACE WITH PRICE INCREASES

It is, of course, of vital importance to compare the percentage increase in the cost of living as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics with the percentage increase in wages which occurred in the heavily unionized industries for which data was reported in table IV. This can be done by setting side by side the percentage-increase figures contained in tables IV–V. Such comparison shows that hourly wages paid on VJ-day in the highly unionized industries above referred to had increased 27 percent by the effective date of the labor law and the percentage increase in prices and the cost of living during the same period was 24 percent. It also shows that the increase in the hourly wages from the effective date of the labor law until the present time was 35 percent, and was 30.7 percent in weekly earnings over wages paid on VJ-day and that prices and the cost of living in the same period increased 29 percent. These statistics are compared in table VI.

TABLE VI.—*Comparison of hourly wages paid in all manufacturing industries, bituminous-coal mining and private building construction with the percentage increase in prices and the cost of living and monthly average of man-days lost through strikes*

	Increase in hourly wages [1]	Increase in weekly wages [1]	Increase in prices and cost of living	Average man-days idle per month
From VJ-day to effective date of labor law (Aug. 22, 1947)	*Percent* 27	26.6	*Percent* 24	7,213,000
From effective date of labor law to present date [2]	35	30.7	29	2,613,000

[1] Manufacturing, bituminous coal, private building.
[2] Latest available data.

LABOR ACT WILL SAVE WORKERS ESTIMATED $1,000,000,000 IN FIRST YEAR

Thus the actual proof shows that labor has not been hurt by the Labor-Management Act of 1947, but instead has been helped. They are continuing to make progress to improve their wages and hours of work and to keep abreast of the cost of living just as well and in some respects a little better since the passage of the act than they did before. But the vital point is that these gains are now being made much more frequently through peaceful collective bargaining rather than through costly strikes. The ability to obtain wage increases without suffering severe losses in wages through time-consuming strikes is of incalculable benefit to wage earners. It means a better annual wage. Obviously hourly wage increases are of little benefit if the increase is absorbed by losses caused by strikes.

In the calendar year 1946 there were 116,000,000 man-days lost through strikes. Since the passage of the Labor Act in 1947 an average of 213,000 days per month has been lost through strikes. That would be 31,356,000 man-days for a 12 months' period. This would be a net saving of 84,644,000 man-days over the 1946 experience. At the present time average hourly earnings in the three industries reported in table III is $1.649 per hour and workmen in these industries work an average 39-hour week, or 7.8 hours a day. Thus, the average daily earnings of this group is $12.86 a day. If the 84,644,000 man-days saved since passage of the act applied to this group of workers, or those with similar wages, it would mean that $1,088,521,840 went into the workers' family budget to meet living expenses, instead of being lost to the workers through strikes as it was in the year 1946 before the passage of the act. That is just as much a wage increase as though it had been added to the hourly rate because it reflects take-home pay that the worker will get and take home rather than lose through costly work stoppages. That is a real benefit to all workers. It shows that the Labor Act of 1947 is providing real benefits to workers, to management, and, most of all, to the public. No claim is made that this is an exhaustive analysis, but all statistics I have seen support the conclusion that this fairly represents in a general way the actual experience both before and after the act.

Necessity for an Adequate American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 15), 1948

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Shipping Raid," published in this morning's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHIPPING RAID

The necessity for an adequate American merchant marine has been used in the House as a disguise to cloak what amounts virtually to an outright gift to shipping interests. The two Weichel bills, which the House passed Monday, authorize construction subsidies and tax-relief provisions far in excess of what can be justified by foreign shipping competition. The bills promote this Treasury raid, moreover, by a ruse that represents the Maritime Commission as favoring the purposes of the legislation, a contention that is decidely at variance with the facts. Now strong pressure reportedly is being brought to bear on the Senate by shipping firms to pass the Weichel bills before adjournment.

One of the most intriguing features is that which amends the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to extend construction subsidies to shipping lines in domestic as well as foreign traffic. The original justification for the subsidy was that it was necessary to equalize the operating costs of American ships competing with cheap-labor foreign companies in international trade. Foreign shipping concerns are excluded by statute, however, from participation in domestic American commerce. Hence the construction subsidy for domestic shipping is totally unwarranted on the ground of foreign competition.

Furthermore, the construction differential subsidy for new shipping to be used in both foreign and domestic trade is set for the next 3 years at a flat 50 percent of the construction cost, irrespective of Maritime Commission figures showing that the actual differential in construction cost between American and foreign-owned shipping is substantially less than this amount. The bills also provide for a subsidy to meet any differential in health and safety standards between American and foreign-owned shipping, though there is no objective way of determining what such a differential may be. As these subsidy increases stand, they constitute a radical departure from the American policy of equalization of costs that would cause great embarrassment in dealing with other nations.

The same pattern is followed with respect to tax legislation. Operating profits may be set aside to make up past or future losses without being subject to tax. Tax-exempt funds may also be used for the purchase of terminal facilities, although no such exemption was granted firms now operating such facilities. The trade-in age of obsolete vessels is reduced from 17 to 12 years, and the bills fix the trade-in allowance at the current market price rather than at a sum consistent with actual cost and depreciation. There are many more such jokers in the Weichel bills, and it is no credit to the House that such substantial changes in the Merchant Marine Act were voted with so little consideration. Surely the Senate owes it to the interest of a healthy merchant marine to lay the Weichel bills aside until the whole shipbuilding program can be examined apart from the efforts to make it a vehicle to guarantee the profits of a favored few.

The Economic Test: Will We Act in Time?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 15), 1948

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, there appeared in the New York Times magazine of last Sunday a well written and very informative article on the economic test which faces the country at the present time, written by Mr. Leon H.

Keyserling, one of the three members of the Board of Economic Advisers to the President under the Employment Act. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times Magazine of June 13, 1948]

THE ECONOMIC TEST: WILL WE ACT IN TIME?

(By Leon H. Keyserling)

WASHINGTON.—Until recently, rising prices caused a mounting fear of inflation and a growing sentiment for an affirmative program to combat it. Many felt that an uncurbed boom might lead quickly to a substantial recession in employment and business activity.

Today opinion has perceptibly changed. There are some who think that the peak of prices has been reached, although the odds are even that these people are in for a rude awakening. There are others who think that, let prices do what they may, the European recovery program and the new preparedness program will help to maintain such a high level of business activity for a few years that worry should be shelved and affirmative measures ignored.

It is, indeed, becoming more likely that high employment and production may continue for some time. But there is little novelty or surprise about a few years of prosperity after a great war; we have seen all this before. And nothing in the present boom has led reputable economists to claim that it will be of indefinite duration, or that it will not be succeeded by a depression if left to its own devices.

The main question is when a vigorous antidepression program should be commenced. The tendency to postpone action until the eleventh hour of crisis disregards the supreme lesson of the last great depression—that it is easier to retain prosperity with mild measures than to regain a lost prosperity with heroic measures. Those in the area of economic policy who do not acknowledge this are as far behind the times as those physicians who remain unaware that the early detection and prevention of disease now weighs more heavily in the scales of the Nation's health than surgery or the treatment of epidemics.

The most deep-rooted dogma of the totalitarians regarding democracy is that we remain passive until too late. Fortunately, in international affairs we are moving ahead. To deal more tardily with our domestic affairs would erect the hope of stable world relations upon a foundation as unstable as the traditional business cycle. Depression deferred is not disaster averted, and a setback some years from now would leave us relatively weaker in the face of economic reconstruction elsewhere in the world.

Against this background we may better appraise the current economic situation and some of the reactions to it.

Looking at three significant periods—the last prewar year (1939), the first postwar year (1946), and the present time—the index of wholesale prices has risen from 77 to 121 to 163, and the consumer price index has risen from 99 to 139 to 169. The annual rate of compensation to employees has risen from $48,000,000,000 to one hundred and seventeen billion to one hundred and thirty-five billion; proprietors' and rental income from fifteen billion to forty-two billion to fifty-three billion; and corporate profits and inventory valuation adjustment from six billion to seventeen billion to twenty-six billion. The total value of national output has risen from ninety billion to two hundred and four billion to two hundred and forty-four billion.

These advances in prices and in dollar incomes have been accompanied by large gains in employment, production, and standards of living. Viewing the same three periods, civilian employment has risen from forty-six million to fifty-five million to fifty-eight million. The index of industrial production has risen from 109 to 170 to 191. Per capita income after taxes, which is one measurement of living standards, rose (in first half of 1947 dollars) from $838 in 1939 to $1,251 in 1946, and stands at $1,184, according to the most recent figures.

Before discussing the seeds of depression in this boom it is noteworthy that those who reject an affirmative program because the depression seems not imminent are reinforced by those who say that natural forces will rid it of these seeds before they sprout. It is stated that inflation will be followed by stability when supply catches up or when there is a softening of demand. These predictions usually contemplate some leveling off or lowering not only of prices but also of employment, production, and trade.

This kind of leveling off, to be sure, may take place without an affirmative program. However, while price adjustments that promote full activity are desirable, price adjustments as the counterpart of rising unemployment and below-capacity operations would reflect neither stability nor safety. These would reflect rather a phase of the swing of the business cycle from ascent to plateau to descent; and although the plateau might last for a spell it would still be the connecting link. If the disease of instability has three discernible phases, and we are now in the first, now is the best time to act.

Occasionally this prospect of leveling off is dressed up in bright clothes. It is said that an economy running at four-fifths capacity could avoid the wide swings from full operations to 50-percent operations. Even if this were true, we must do better. With other nations using their resources to the hilt, America cannot afford less efficiency because its endowments are greater, lest we be surpassed, in the long run. Besides, all experience denies that an economic machine hitting on seven cylinders will run more smoothly than when hitting on all eight.

In the dynamics of national and world events the only meaningful stability is a steady rate of continuous growth. This means job opportunities that grow with a growing labor force, and maximum production that keeps pace with improved efficiency and new techniques. We may not succeed completely in this effort; but only by steering in this direction can we be reasonably secure.

Simply stated, a stable rate of growth depends primarily upon a flow of national income so balanced that producers receive adequate funds and incentives for capital investment at a rate which assures maximum utilization of resources and skills, while consumers of final products earn enough to absorb the increasing output.

In this context of economic balance profits affect the amount of money available for business undertakings. Wages are the largest item in consumer incomes. Prices determine the real amount of goods that wages can buy and the real amount of capital equipment and expansion that businessmen can purchase with their profits. Recognizing this function of prices, wages, and profits, one may dispose of some current fallacies which fan bitterness and partisanship where good will and objectivity are vital for sound adjustments.

The first fallacy is that economic balance depends arbitrarily upon whether the price level is rising, falling, or stable. The fairly stable price level for a few years before 1929 did not store up the conditions for permanent stability; the main debate is whether prices and profits too low for adequate investment, or prices too high and wages too low for adequate consumption, had more to do with the ensuing depression.

The falling price level in the early thirties was accompanied by a progressive worsening of the economic situation; the debated question is whether a more or less rapid reduction of wages in relation to prices would have checked the downward spiral sooner. The upswing of prices after 1932 was accompanied by improved economic conditions; the debated question is whether recovery would have been faster and more solid if the movement of wages relative to prices and profits had been slower or faster.

While all do not agree what the relationship among these three items should be, there is more general agreement that this relationship is more crucial to economic balance than the separate levels or trends. It follows that, in the current situation, economic balance cannot be achieved solely by voluntary agreements or laws which would hold prices, wages, and profits where they are now or by a fiscal policy which would lower all three by contracting the monetary supply. Such blunderbuss methods, without more, might make the relationships worse instead of better.

The second fallacy is the belief that economic balance depends upon the movement of prices, wages, and profits at the same speed. Since 1939, for example, the consumer-price index has increased by 71 percent, and compensation to employees by 181 percent.

Whether one believes that wages have increased too much or too little, it is palpable that they had to increase more than prices to help absorb an increased national output of about 171 percent; otherwise widespread unemployment would have resulted. On the other hand, if at any time (contrary to present expectation) the foreign-aid and preparedness programs should reach such proportions as to cause a downward trend in the amount of goods available for home consumption, the cost of living would have to rise more rapidly than wages unless affirmative policies were adopted to withhold a larger part of wages from immediate use.

The recent General Motors wage settlement has two merits: It encourages smooth operations for 2 years, and by allowing for an improvement factor (presumably productivity as well as cost of living in the determination of wage rates it recognizes that wages and consumer prices should not move at the same pace in an expanding economy. However, the GM formula, while an important step forward for these reasons, does not cover the whole range of considerations that should enter into a wage policy before it is applied lastingly or widely. The formula reveals no guides for determining whether the relationships among costs, wages, prices, and profits within the industry and between it and other industries are workable. Further improvement in wage-price-profit policies, pointed toward better economic balance, will require additional criteria furnishing a broader perspective. For example, wage increases based upon higher productivity in the auto industry will not enable such workers to buy more food, clothing, and shelter—except at the expense of other consumers—unless the economy as a whole produces more food, clothing, and shelter.

While some of the criteria for this broader perspective will require something akin to a national prosperity budget (to be described shortly), we already know enough to discern in the current economic situation some clear balances which call for an affirmative program before they upset us completely. These observations fall under five main points.

1. The foreign aid and new preparedness programs mean that less goods will be available for domestic consumers than if these programs were not necessary. But these pro-

grams neither impair profit accumulations for healthy capital growth nor prevent price-wage policies that balance consumer incomes and available goods.

The war period demonstrated this even when almost half of our total output was diverted from civilian use. Further, a total annual export surplus ranging from five to ten billion dollars over the next few years and a preparedness program which as now formulated indicates total defense expenditures and commitments of around $15,000,000,000 a year should not prevent our $244,000,000,000 economy from providing even higher standards of living if its growth is maintained.

2. The business profit situation is sometimes confused by indiscriminate charges that profits are beyond all reason. This sometimes results from the fallacies earlier discussed. And it is an incomplete story when dollar wages are adjusted to changes in the cost of living while dollar profits are not adjusted to the cost of doing business. There is need for more penetrating analysis of the profit picture. Yet the available facts do not reveal any imminent threat of inadequate capital funds.

In 1947, corporations utilized unparalleled funds—$26,700,000,000—for plant and equipment and working capital, including the replacement of inventories at high prices. This sum was provided by retained earnings after taxes and dividends of $10,100,000,000, which were raised to fourteen billion four hundred million by accrual of depreciation charges; by new capital issues of four billion one hundred million; by long-term and short-term bank loans of three billion; and by funds from other sources amounting to five billion two hundred million. Thus, even in a year of extraordinary high demand for funds, the largest portion was supplied by internal financing in an amount almost equal to the $14,700,000,000 spent for plant and equipment.

The outlook for 1948 is that corporations will have available for internal financing an amount at least equal to their likely investment in plant and equipment even if the current record level of investment is maintained. Dividends and other savings must also have outlets for investment, and there have been sizable tax reductions which will add to investment capital.

3. Trends in consumer income show a greater potential danger. Although production and employment have risen sharply since 1946, the purchasing power of per capita consumer income after taxes has fallen by about 8 percent since the middle of 1946. It is true that, through drawing down wartime savings and increased use of credit (which cannot go on forever), consumers are still able to buy the portion of national output available for their use. But if full employment is maintained and productivity improved, a large increase in consumer incomes will be needed in addition to high business investment to avert a sharp recession or depression in the fifties unless still larger foreign-aid and defense expenditures are undertaken. And we hope and expect that within a few years these expenditures will move sharply downward.

When this situation arises, it does not seem realistic to anticipate that wages would be increased voluntarily or prices decreased systematically at the very time when the business outlook might be dampened by a decline in Government-created demand for foreign aid and preparedness. Experience indicates that the delay of adjustment until that time would result in curtailment of employment and production followed by disorderly price breaks and general economic decline—the typical spiral of depression.

It would be far safer, for the long run, if real consumer incomes were now kept more nearly abreast of increases in domestic output. If compelling reasons of national policy require for a time that an extraordinary part of this output be diverted away from domestic consumers, the worst way to deal with the situation is by price increases that ration goods unfairly and enormously magnify the problem of future adjustment. A more prudent approach, for the time being, would be to follow a restrained price policy and to cut consumer spending rather than consumer income by voluntary savings and high taxes.

We should then have a better chance to maintain a full economy later on by enlarging consumer spending when more output becomes available for domestic use.

4. The plight of millions of families on fixed or low incomes is more immediately unsettling. In desperation they have watched the cost-of-living index rise by 71 percent since before the war, by 27 percent since the middle of 1946, and by 8 percent since the middle of last year. According to the most recent information (1946), almost 7 percent of the four-person urban families in the country had annual incomes below $1,500, about 27 percent fell below $2,500, and almost 39 percent below $3,000. A recent Bureau of Labor Statistics study indicated that the annual cost of maintaining an acceptable family standard of living in typical cities was more than $2,700 in the middle of 1946 and more than $3,200 in the middle of 1947. The friction and turmoil created by this strain upon broad segments of the population translate themselves quickly into disturbances affecting the whole structure.

5. The uncertainty of the price-wage outlook is the most serious present danger. The conscious decisions of businessmen and labor unions, far more than impersonal forces, now enter into the making of prices and wages. The maladjustments already created make it certain that neither side will accept the status quo. And with the cost of living now at its peak and rising sharply, according to the most recent figures, with industrial prices also at their peak, and with demand from many sources still expanding faster than production and now being increased, the current outlook in the absence of an affirmative economic policy is for additional wage increases, price increases, industrial disturbances and attendant maladjustments. These may not stop prosperity for a few years, but they may lead to an awful reckoning if we are lulled into unwatchful waiting.

These conditions define outlines of desirable action:

First. The social and economic tensions already created by recent price-wage changes, and likely to be exacerbated by coming events, call for a breathing spell. Hence President Truman's requests for consumer credit restrictions and powers of allocation and selective price and wage control. This would not be a permanent solution. But the calmness and discernment necessary for lasting solutions cannot be found when industry and labor are kept breathless in a mad chase to catch up tomorrow with the changes of today.

Second. This respite should be used at once to develop better criteria for price-wage-profit policies that promote stable growth based upon broad economic perspective rather than the prevailing fallacies already discussed, and effectuated by agreement rather than by the force of government or of blindly contending parties. This calls for the development of a national prosperity budget.

Such a budget would not be a "national plan," it would not deal with all the minutiae of economic life, and it would be forced upon no one. But it would focus national attention upon a few broad goals for maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

By broad delineation of the capital needs for stable growth it would provide realistic standards for profit policy; by projecting the farm-production needs for a well-fed people and a well-supplied industry it would shed light upon workable levels of farm prices and income; by striking a balance between resources to be consumed now and resources needed for further production it would provide a guide to wage policy. This would give management and labor a basis for improved relations by demonstrating their essential interdependence.

Third. Better machinery is needed for the formulation and follow-through on such a national prosperity budget. In the work of the Council of Economic Advisers under the Employment Act of 1946, in the efforts of the administration and the Congress to develop a long-range agricultural policy, and especially in the economic reports of President Truman, there have appeared the beginnings of this approach.

But further progress should depend increasingly upon voluntary organizations of business, labor, agriculture, and consumers. Professor Slichter, recently in the New York Times, set forth in excellent perspective the new tasks that industry and labor must assume in a highly integrated economy where the alternative to excessive Government controls lies in the exercise of affirmative policy outside of Government and not in helpless drift.

Fourth. Those measures that are essentially within the governmental sphere, such as fiscal policy, regulation, social security, and various resources, construction, and welfare, activities, should be harmonized with a national prosperity budget and thus measured in terms of all their effects upon the economic life of the country. Whether these Government programs are larger or smaller, they should certainly have this common frame of reference.

If we compute our total national income over the next decade on the basis of a steady but unspectacular rate of constant growth, and then compute it on the assumption of a boom-bust cycle, the 10-year difference comes to about $850,000,000,000.

This difference is far more than twice the cost to us of World War II. One-tenth of it would be sufficient to rebuild and modernize all the obsolescent and slum areas of all our cities. If even a sizable portion of it accrued to those in the lower ranges of the income structure, we could achieve satisfactory living standards throughout the country; and the balance would assure vast sums for capital improvements and for superior reward based upon ability and initiative. A moderate fraction would enable the financing of adequate programs of resource development, conservation, health, security, and education without increased tax burdens. We could meet without strain any likely international commitments or requirements for national defense. The difference between prosperity and depression would mean the difference between safety and danger for our free institutions at home and our place in world affairs.

But there is grave likelihood that an affirmative economic policy will not be adopted. This is because the present prosperity, even if we call it inflation, is rather pleasant and assuring for so many people. Paradoxically, while a period of prosperity is the time when action to preserve that prosperity could be taken with relative ease and through moderate measures, it is also the time when psychologically we are least ready to act at all.

Democracy has repeatedly demonstrated its capacity to cope with crisis. We survived the depression and won the war, albeit at terrific cost. Today democracy is faced with a far more searching test: can democracy act without a crisis?

This, indeed, is the core problem of democracy in the twentieth century. For even as we by firmness in foreign policy avoid a clash of arms with totalitarian forces, there remains the ideological conflict competing for the minds of men and the decisions of whole peoples. The totalitarian system does not have purpose and unity only in times of crisis; it has these positive qualities at all times. Democracy, to thrive and triumph in this ideological conflict, cannot afford to have purpose and unity only on occasion. We must achieve a continuing purpose by inspiration rather than by arbitrary decree. We must achieve a continuing unity by glad consent rather than by suppression. We must conserve our institutions without standing still and we must preserve our liberties without becoming aimless.

Our present test is not what we would do in the event of depression but rather what uses we shall now make of prosperity, just as our real test is not what we would do in the event of war but rather how we shall preserve peace.

No opportunity so great ever confronted any people. The spirit in which we face this opportunity will set the pattern for the future of free people in this century.

Victory and Peace—Address by Judge J. F. T. O'Connor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 15), 1948

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, there has just come to my hands the text of a Memorial Day address delivered at the coliseum in Los Angeles on May 31 of this year by United States District Judge J. F. T. O'Connor. Judge O'Connor, of course, is well known to most Members of Congress.

The occasion was described in the Los Angeles press as being one of the most spectacular ever witnessed in that city. Judge O'Connor was fittingly introduced to the large audience by the presiding officer as a recognized national leader who had served the public interest with great distinction.

I ask unanimous consent that the address of the evening by the distinguished jurist, on Victory and Peace, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Lieutenant Nicholas, I deeply appreciate your kind words of introduction. Lieutenant Governor of California Goodwin J. Knight, Mayor Bowron, members of the armed forces of the United States. Gold Star Mothers, ladies, and gentlemen:

Eighty years ago Gen. John A. Logan issued a proclamation dedicating May 30 in memory of the fallen heroes of the Civil War. On this day we honor and pay tribute to the fallen soldiers and sailors of all our wars. The spectacular parade witnessed by so many thousands gathered in this Memorial Coliseum was a fitting tribute to the memory of our war dead. Old Glory held in worthy hands in stillness entwined its staff in mourning. Never before in history had our flag challenged governments of oppression in such distant lands. Henceforth the sun will never set on the graves of American soldiers and sailors. Each unit in the parade paid this tribute—the Army, the Navy, the Marines, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, the United Spanish War Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the Combat Veterans, Veterans of Siberia Wolf Hounds, the Jewish War Veterans, the Catholic War Veterans, the Amvets, the Wacs, the Waves, the Spars, the Army nurses, and the various bands, drum corps, and auxiliaries, together with high-ranking officers of the Army, Navy, Marines, and the three grand old veterans of the Civil War: Honorary Chairman Charles L. Chappell, 101 years old, New York Infantry; Honorary Vice Chairman William Allen Magee, 102 years old, Twelfth Ohio Volunteer Cavalry; and Honorary Vice Chairman Douglas T. Story, 104 years old, One Hundred and Thirty-sixth Illinois Volunteer Infantry.

We met here on May 30, 1943, for the same purpose. The press and radio estimated about 70,000 people were present. I was honored to speak on that occasion. The atmosphere was different. The guns, the bombs, were destroying human lives and devastating cities. Everyone in that great audience uttered a silent prayer that a dear one or a friend or an acquaintance might be spared and return home. Many who wore the uniform are here tonight. Had that meeting been televised to our fighting men they would have been inspired.

War! war! war! Oh, great God, will the time come when men can settle disputes with reason and not resort to the arbitrament of the sword? The guns, the bombs, the casualties and cost in money of the wars we have participated in staggers the imagination. Let us examine the statistics in the Revolutionary War, War of 1812, War with Mexico, Civil War (both sides), Spanish-American War, World War I, and World War II. The total cost, including pensions and interest, amounted to $412,743,561,855, with millions yet to be paid. However, the cost in dollars was not our greatest loss—it was in the fine young men crippled and dead. The casualties in these 7 wars were 2,028,586. The cost in men and money does not tell the whole story. The broken homes, the fatherless children, the widows, the farms unplowed and abandoned, the heartaches, the orphans denied an education, deprived of their rightful opportunities in life—these sacrifices cannot be measured in dollars nor compensated for in any manner.

Nearly 2,000 years ago a great leader came upon earth and preached peace. Yet there is no peace. It is estimated that there are over 2,000,000,000 people in the world who profess to believe in God. If the precepts in the Decalogue were adhered to, there would be peace in every nation in every corner of the world. Great leaders in every generation have suggested plans for universal peace. One of the earliest plans was suggested by Pierce Dubois 642 years ago. He suggested one monarch ruler over the nations—a general council, each nation to contribute its quota of armed forces to preserve the peace; nations should pledge to submit differences to a tribunal for settlement. There, if not earlier, was born the idea of one world. Down through the years other plans were suggested.

The King of Bohemia in 1464; Desiderius Erasmus, famous Dutch scholar in 1514; Wolsey, English statesman and churchman, 1518; Emeric Cruce, 1623; Hugo Crotius, Dutch jurist, in 1625; Campanella, Italian leader, 1633; Johann Amos Comenius Comenius (Komensky), Moravian Bishop, 1666; Samuel Rachel of Schleswig-Holstein, political leader, in 1676; William Penn in 1693; Charles Irenee Castel in 1712; Pierre Andre Gargaz, French writer and political philosopher, 1779, his plan published by Benjamin Franklin; Jeremy Bentham, English author, 1793.

In 1923 Mr. Bok, an American, offered $100,000 for the best plan for world peace and 22,165 plans were submitted. The late Dr. Raphael Herman, of Beverly Hills, Calif., at the conclusion of World War I offered $25,000 for the best peace plan and the award went to Dr. David Starr Jordan; and the late Wendell Willkie: "One World."

A score of plans by anonymous authors and hundreds of outstanding political writers and statesmen in the past century and a half have been presented to the world. The only plan for world peace actually put in operation was the League of Nations. It was adopted at the Peace Conference in Paris, April 28, 1919. Although the sponsor was President Woodrow Wilson, the plan was rejected by the United States Senate. This is not the time nor the place to discuss the merits of the plan, or attempt to justify Woodrow Wilson's declaration that if the plan were rejected, another war more devastating than World War I would break out within 25 years. Leaders of the major parties were found on opposite sides of the controversy. These facts have been presented to you to prove the serious effort mankind has made to establish peace on earth, and for the additional reason that the committee responsible for this program have dedicated it to "Victory in Peace."

The second forward step in attempting to prevent war was the adoption of the Charter of the United Nations in San Francisco, June 26, 1945. None of us who were present can ever forget the dramatic climax of the long sessions when nation after nation affixed its signature to the charter. The President of the United States, by his presence, added dignity and emphasized the importance of the occasion. The Senate of the United States adopted the Charter by a vote of 89 to 2. Party lines were abandoned. There was no long acrimonious debate; no challenge of motives; no personalities criticized; no attempt by either side to gain political advantage. In one great, united voice, the world was advised this country wanted peace, understanding and good will with every nation on earth. We welcomed the opportunity to meet in the council chamber with other nations to discuss our differences and to find a solution in reason and justice, and not on the battlefield.

The Charter is not perfect. Our own Federal Constitution, adopted in Philadelphia on September 17, 1787, by the delegates, became effective on the first Wednesday in March, 1789, and was not perfect. The Bill of Rights, the great safeguard of the people's liberties, was not a part of the original Constitution. They were submitted and approved by Congress on September 25, 1789, and became a part of our Constitution when Virginia, the eleventh State, ratified the first 10 amendments known as the Bill of Rights.

It is doubtful if the Constitution would have been adopted without the promise that these amendments would be submitted to the States. We have amended our Constitution 21 times. Gen. George Washington was doubtful if the Constitution would last more than 20 years. In some States it was saved by a few votes. If imperfections were found in our own Constitution, and many amendments required—surely it is too much to expect that the United Nations Charter is perfect. The ratification of the Charter by the United States Senate is a monument to American statesmanship. The outstanding leaders of both major parties are agreed on the value of the Charter. Let us be patient. Let us withhold our criticism until experience justifies it. It is the last chance for international cooperation. It is the last chance to settle differences across the table and not on the battlefield.

Only a strong nation can hope to be a free nation. On December 7, 1941, we were caught off-guard. We were not prepared. There were those in high places who did not believe

in protecting our outlying possessions. We were at peace with the world when suddenly the enemy forces sunk our battleships and murdered American sailors and soldiers without even a declaration of war—that must not happen again.

The President of the United States said in his message to Congress, in part:

"Yesterday, December 7, 1941—a date which will live in infamy—the United States of America was suddenly and deliberately attacked by naval and air forces of the Empire of Japan. The United States was at peace with that nation and, at the solicitation of Japan, was still in conversation with its Government and its Emperor looking toward the maintenance of peace in the Pacific. Indeed, one hour after Japanese air squadrons had commenced bombing in Oahu, the Japanese Ambassador to the United States and his colleague delivered to the Secretary of State a formal reply to a recent American message. While this reply stated that it seemed useless to continue the existing diplomatic negotiations, it contained no threat or hint of war or armed attack.

"It will be recorded that the distance of Hawaii from Japan makes it obvious that the attack was deliberately planned many days or even weeks ago. During the intervening time the Japanese Government has deliberately sought to deceive the United States by false statements and expressions of hope for continued peace."

To prevent such a recurrence, we must be prepared. We must have a strong army, a strong navy, a strong air force. This is the best insurance that our young men, the flower of American manhood, will never again die in battle. No nation need fear our strength. In all our history we have never been the aggressor. We fought and won our independence; we defended our rights on the high seas; we defended our honor when the Maine was sunk; we avenged American citizens who were torpedoed and killed on the Atlantic without warning; and we answered the cowardly attack on Pearl Harbor. The Dominion of Canada to the North, and the Republic of Mexico to the South are positive evidence that we live in peace with our neighbors. Ask these countries if they fear American might. There is not a gun, not a soldier, not a fort along those great international boundaries. We do not fear our neighbors and they do not fear us.

By right of conquest Cuba and the Philippines came under our jurisdiction. These countries were ours by all the laws of nations. We did not make slaves of the people. We gave both countries their independence. This is positive evidence to the world that we do not seek territory nor domination over any people. If that example were adopted by every nation in the world there could be no future wars. It is a proud page in American history. We found our greatest defense and protection in the yesterdays in the vast expanse of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. The atom bomb has eliminated these defenses. With planes flying faster than sound, space has been annihiliated and within a few hours every city in the United States could be destroyed. Hiroshima and Nagasaki give mute and tragic evidence of this fact. A flash of brilliant light and in a few seconds in Hiroshima buildings crumbled, the ground shook—78,150 people had been killed; 13,963 were missing; 37,425 had been injured. Out of 90,000 buildings, 62,000 were destroyed, and 6,000 more were damaged beyond repair. Only 5 modern buildings could be used again without major repairs. No limit to the effort, the sacrifice, and the expenditure of money in wars. Would it not be more sensible to spend a small fraction of this amount in preparedness so overwhelming that no nation would dare to strike? Japan, Germany, and Italy learned their lesson. Let that be a warning to the world.

If the vast expenditures in war had been used in peaceful pursuits to improve the conditions of our people, to build better schools with adequate pay for teachers, to build parks and libraries, playgrounds and swimming pools for children, to wipe out the last vestige of tenements in our cities, to improve our economic conditions and make possible a home for every family, what happiness there would be throughout the Nation, and what an example to the world.

Those who believe there is a better country and a better government in some other land should go to that country and leave those of us in peace who believe we have the greatest Nation and the best Government on earth.

We bow our heads in silent tribute to those who gave their all that we might live and enjoy this day. We are honored in paying this tribute to their memory. We can say with the poet: "Whether on the scaffold high or in the battle's van, the fittest place where man can die is where he dies for man."

Accomplishments of the Ways and Means Committee in the Eightieth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee of the Eightieth Congress can point with genuine satisfaction to the work accomplished by this committee during the Eightieth Congress, and it has been a source of great pleasure and pride to me to have served as chairman on this great committee, which is composed of most able and distinguished Members from both sides of the House.

As you know, among the fields of legislation entrusted to our committee are revenue measures, national social security, and tariffs and foreign trade, and I wish to call your attention at this time to some of the major legislation we have acted on dealing with these subjects, and to set forth the record of our accomplishments to date.

REVENUE MEASURES

The most significant and far-reaching revenue legislation was the Revenue Act of 1948, which was three times vetoed by the President, but finally became law (Public Law 471) over his veto on April 2, 1948. This law reduced the extremely high rates of individual income taxes through the medium of percentage tax reduction and increased exemption amounts. It removed an estimated 6,000,000 taxpayers from the tax rolls by increasing the $500 exemption to $600, and it provided an additional exemption of $600 for those people 65 years of age and over. This exemption removed approximately 1,400,000 taxpayers from the tax rolls. This bill also increased the $500 allowance for the blind to $600 exemption. It also provided for equalization in the tax burdens of married couples in common-law and community-property States by giving husbands and wives in all States the option to file joint returns and by the splitting of their combined income. This eliminated the unfair impact of the Federal income tax on married couples living in noncommunity-property States and put these citizens on the same basis as residents living in community-property States for estate- and gift-tax purposes.

On June 2 of this year our committee favorably reported H. R. 6712, which is a tax-revision bill representing the first step in our program to revise the Internal Revenue Code in order to keep its provisions in line with our constantly shifting economic forces and in order to make it workable and fair to all our taxpayers. Beginning back in May 1947, we held hearings on tax revision in which over 100 witnesses from all over the country appeared and outlined to us their recommendations for improving our tax laws, for not since 1927 has Congress made a thorough study of the Internal Revenue Code. We had a Special Study Tax Committee appointed to study the subject and on November 2 this committee made a report containing a great many helpful suggestions for removing tax inequities and for simplifying the administration of our tax laws. This bill, with amendments to be offered, contains 82 sections dealing with the income- and estate- and gift-tax laws, designed to remove inequities, prevent tax avoidance, moderate certain harsh provisions, and to provide increased incentive to management and venture capital, without any substantial decrease in our revenue. The bill contains provisions, among others, dealing with family partnerships, net operating-loss carry-over, stock options, pensions and annuities, and the taxation of estates and trusts. Certain provisions are designed to specifically benefit members of the armed forces and farmers. This bill will serve as a basis for our continuing revenue-revision work which is so sorely needed and on which our committee has worked for over a year.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Our committee was responsible for two major pieces of social-security legislation. The first of these was House Joint Resolution 296, which was designed to maintain the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits, pending further action by Congress on extended social-security coverage. This resolution was vetoed by the President on June 14 but was passed over the President's veto by a vote of 297 to 75 on the same day. The resolution, as amended by the Senate, carried an estimated $184,000,000 increase under Federal contributions to the States at the rate of $5 per month additional for needy aged persons and the blind, and $3 monthly for each dependent child. The resolution prevented extension of coverage of the Social Security Act to between 500,000 and 750,000 persons who had not been, are not now, and should not be under the act until coverage is provided by an act of Congress. The resolution,

therefore, stopped a more than $1,000,000 impairment of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund which has been built up over the years out of taxes collected on the wages of those who are truly employees and who have paid for their coverage under the system. This resolution, moreover, restored to the trust fund, by appropriation, moneys which have been paid out of the fund in the form of social-security benefits to persons not employees under the act and who have not contributed social-security taxes to this fund. The act reaffirmed the intent of Congress that the usual common-law rules, realistically applied, should continue to be used to determine whether a person is an employee for purposes of applying the Social Security Act.

Our second major piece of Social Security legislation is H. R. 6777, which passed the House with only two dissenting votes on June 15. The Subcommittee on Social Security, of which the able Mr. REED of New York is chairman, spent 3 months studying and evaluating a great number of proposed amendments to title II of the Social Security Act contained in bills introduced by Members of the House and referred to us, as well as in correspondence from individuals, and in recommendations of the Social Security Administration. This bill is the result of that work. It extends coverage to approximately three and one-half million employed persons who are not covered under title II of the Social Security Act. Among these are State and local officers and employees, such coverage to be effected under voluntary compacts or agreements between the Federal Government and the States and Territories; employees of nonprofit institutions; employees in farm loan and farm credit institutions, civilian employees in military posts and exchanges, naval stores and similar instrumentalities of the armed forces, and others. This bill also liberalizes certain family benefits, increases to $40 the amount which an individual may earn in covered employment without loss or reduction of his benefit payment, also provides that time spent in active service be disregarded in computing a retired wage earner's benefits and contains many other constructive amendments and provisions. We are, of course, fully aware that there is much further revision of our Social Security laws to be done and our subcommittee is continuing its study and work with a view to making further improvements.

TARIFFS AND TRADE AGREEMENTS

A potentially heavy schedule of tariff legislation confronted our committee at the opening of the session. A conference had been called at Geneva by the United States and 22 other countries to consider a multilateral trade agreement. The State Department was planning an International Trade Organization which would revolutionize the foreign trade economy of the United States. A number of adjustments in the tariff classification of individual commodities appeared to be warranted.

Foreseeing a crowded calendar in 1948 and having in mind the multilateral trade agreement being negotiated at Geneva, the committee held hearings in 1947 concerning the operation of the Trade Agreements Act. It was hoped that the administration would supply the committee with a record of its past operations and submit some evidence which would justify a continuation of the program. Government officials competent to give this testimony were absent in 1947 at Geneva and later were at Habana discussing an International Trade Organization. It was not until April 1948, that these officials were available for consultation.

The committee held about 7 weeks of hearings and accumulated almost 2,000 pages of printed testimony in 1947, although it was unable at that time to get an official report from those administering the program. A subcommittee, under the able direction of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART], undertook this task in 1948. In a week of executive sessions the subcommittee listened to recognized experts, including Secretary of State Marshall, and it finally proposed legislation continuing the Trade Agreements Act. Our committee accepted the recommendations of the subcommittee and on May 24, 1948, favorably reported H. R. 6556. This bill extended until June 30, 1949, the authority of the President to enter into foreign-trade agreements. It, however, established a procedure requiring the Tariff Commission to study the maximum or minimum rates of duty which should be applied and provided that if the President exceeded these limits he must send the agreement to Congress for examination. This was later amended to provide that if the President exceeded the Commission's recommendations he must give to Congress his reasons for so doing.

This bill is the first step in more than 14 years toward a scientific adjustment of trade regulations consistent with maximum beneficial world trade. The administrative machinery provided for under the bill was designed by the committee to safeguard our domestic agriculture, labor, and industry. H. R. 6556 was passed by the House on May 26 and by the Senate with minor amendments on June 14. The amendments made by the Senate were agreed to by the House on June 15.

Official consideration of the International Trade Organization Charter has not been undertaken, as the State Department has delayed presenting it to the Congress. Individual committee members have, however, anticipated its coming and will be prepared for a full discussion when it is finally presented, possibly during the next Congress.

In addition to the major legislation extending and improving the Trade Agreements Act, the committee took action on an unusually large number of bills affecting rates of duty on specific items. The demand in our country for goods in short supply made it advisable to provide for either the permanent or temporary suspension of duties on a number of products, and to revise others. The committee favorably reported bills temporarily suspending import duties on such items as copper, lead, scrap iron, scrap steel, and nonferrous metal scrap. The committee also favorably reported bills removing import duties on synthetic rubber, scrap, limestone to be used as fertilizer, and others.

All tariff bills reported by the committee were approved by the President.

This major legislation, which I have sketched briefly, represents only a part of the work accomplished by the Ways and Means Committee during the Eightieth Congress. During both sessions the committee as of June 18, 1948, favorably reported 62 bills, of which 36 have become public laws, and 9 others are now on the President's desk. We analyzed and discussed in committee meetings many other bills referred to us which we could not see our way clear to favorably report due to resulting revenue loss, or for other reasons inimicable to the welfare of our country. The following is a summary of the bills and resolutions favorably reported by our committee during this Congress, together with a statement of the action taken on these bills and resolutions as of June 18, 1948:

First session

Bill number and author	Title and summary of major provisions of bill	Record of action (1947)
H. R. 1, by Mr. KNUTSON, Jan. 3, 1947.	To reduce individual income-tax payments: This bill was designed to relieve individual income-tax payers from a portion of their heavy wartime tax burdens. All but a few taxpayers would have received at least a 20-percent cut in their tax liabilities while a 30-percent cut would have gone to those having surtax net incomes of $1,000 or less. In addition persons 65 years old or more, would have received an additional exemption of $500 over and above their existing exemptions.	Mar. 24—Reported, H. Rept. No. 180. Mar. 27—Passed House, yeas, 274; nays, 137. May 28—Passed Senate (S. Rept. No. 173), yeas, 56; nays, 34. June 2—House agrees to conference report. June 3—Senate agrees to conference report. June 16—Vetoed. June 17—Failed to pass over veto in House, yeas, 268; nays, 137. June 24—Reintroduced as H. R. 3950.
H. R. 3950, by Mr. KNUTSON, June 24, 1947.	Same as H. R. 1 with effective date for reductions changed to Jan. 1, 1948, instead of July 1, 1947, as provided in H. R. 1. H. R. 3950 did not go to conference.	July 3—Reported, H. Rept. 795. July 8—Passed House, yeas, 302; nays, 112; motion to recommit, yeas, 151; nays, 261. July 14—Passed Senate (S. Rept. No. 468), yeas, 60; nays, 108. July 18—Vetoed; passed House over veto, yeas, 299; nays, 108; failed of passage over veto in Senate, yeas, 57; nays, 36.

First session—Continued

Bill number and author	Title and summary of major provisions of bill	Record of action (1947)
H. R. 468, By Mr. CURTIS, Jan. 6, 1947.	To amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to distributions by personal holding companies: This bill renders provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which determine to what extent distributions by personal holding companies are taxable dividends in the hands of shareholders, consistent with other provisions of the code imposing a surtax on the "undistributed subchapter A net income" of such a company.	May 26—Reported, H. Rept. No. 454. June 2—Passed House. June 16—Passed Senate (S. Rept. No. 274). June 25—Approved, Public Law 113.
H. R. 479, by Mr. GAMBLE, Jan. 6, 1947. Virtually identical with H. R. 469 by Mr. CURTIS.	Relating to the income tax liabilities of members of the armed forces dying in the service: This bill corrects, retroactively, an unfair tax situation upon the death of a member of the armed forces. Prior to enactment of this bill, no refund of any income tax paid, by or on behalf of one who subsequently died in the service was possible, though if such person had lived, refunds would be possible in proper cases. Accordingly under this bill the estate of a deceased serviceman is placed on parity with the individual who did not die in service with respect to refunds.	July 19—Reported, H. Rept. No. 1006. July 22—Passed House. July 25—Passed Senate with amendments (S. Rept. No. 711). July 26—House agrees to Senate amendments. Aug. 5—Approved, Public Law 367.
H. R. 958, by Mr. LYNCH, Jan. 14, 1947.	To amend sec. 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to excise tax on cosmetics, including aromatic cachous: This bill would exempt aromatic cachous from the tax imposed on certain toilet articles and cosmetics. Aromatic cachous are nuts, used in making such confections as sen sen and other breath sweetening pellets and not toilet articles or cosmetics in any sense of the word. Enactment of the bill not only clarified this situation but removed many administrative diffieulties in its enforcement.	July 16—Reported, H. Rept. No. 934. July 18—Passed House, pending before Senate Committee on Finance.
H. R. 959, by Mr. LYNCH, Jan. 14, 1947.	To amend sec. 3179 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to the draw-back on distilled spirits for export: This bill should facilitate exportation of distilled spirits and wines by permitting the use of casks or packages including barrels or similar containers other than bottles in packaging tax-paid distilled spirits and wines purchased exclusively for export with benefit of the draw-back of taxes paid thereon.	May 22—Reported, H. Rept. No. 422. June 12—Passed House. July 3—Passed Senate (S. Rept. No. 401). July 14—Approved, Public Law 185.
H. R. 1030, by Mr. GRANT of Indiana, Jan. 15, 1947.	To continue in effect certain war excise tax rates: This bill continues indefinitely, the wartime excise tax rates made in the Revenue Act of 1943. Among the taxes affected are those levied on admissions, dues and membership fees, jewelry, furs, toilet goods, wines, distilled spirits, malt liquors, billiard and pool tables, bowling alleys, telephone and telegraph messages, and transportation of persons. Action was taken on this bill to relieve the tension created by the automatic reversion of the wartime rates to their prewar levels July 1, 1947. Senate amendments relate to the fur and transportation taxes. They were agreed to by the House. The fur amendment simply revised the formula for determining the scope of the tax and in effect removed the tax on certain less expensive fur and fur-trimmed garments. The effect of the transportation tax amendment was to remove the 15-percent tax on foreign travel.	Jan. 20—Reported, H. Rept. No. 6. Jan. 29—Passed House. Feb. 17—Passed Senate with amendment (S. Rept. No. 21). Mar. 6—House agrees to conference report. Mar. 7—Senate agrees to conference report. Mar. 11—Approved, Public Law 17.
H. R. 1945, by Mr. GEARHART, Feb. 13, 1947.	To amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to wines: This bill makes 5 technical amendments to the code governing the production of wines. Tax rates and tax liabilities are not affected. In general the amendments permit American wine growers to compete with foreign-made imported wines on a more favorable basis and provide greater flexibility in the production of wines.	May 26—Reported, H. Rept. No. 457. June 16—Passed House. July 3—Passed Senate (S. Rept. No. 402). July 14—Approved, Public Law 186.
H. R. 1946, by Mr. GEARHART, Feb. 13, 1947.	To amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to brandies: This bill liberalizes existing provisions of the code with respect to blending of beverage brandies, by permitting them, within certain specific limitations, to be blended and subsequently aged in bonded warehouses prior to payment of production and rectification taxes.	May 26—Reported, H. Rept. No. 458. June 16—Passed House. July 3—Passed Senate (S. Rept. No. 403). July 14—Approved, Public Law 187.
H. R. 1947, by Mr. GEARHART, Feb. 13, 1947.	To amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to taxation of distilleries: This bill would relieve stockholders and other innocent investors in registered distilleries from liability (subject to certain specific limitations) for payment of taxes on distilled spirits assessed against operators of such distilleries. It would not remove the liability imposed by existing law upon any person interested in the operation of a bootleg or unregistered distillery, or upon operators of registered distilleries or their sureties.	May 26—Reported, H. Rept. No. 459. June 16—Passed House; pending before Senate Finance Committee.
H. R. 2029, by Mr. HUBER, Feb. 18, 1947.	To provide for the free importation of synthetic rubber scrap: This bill would amend par. 1697 of the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to permit synthetic rubber scrap to be imported free of duty along with natural rubber scrap now accorded free entry under that paragraph. In so doing the bill would remove an inevitable discrimination arising under existing law between these 2 types of rubber scrap and would eliminate a serious administrative problem in the classification of scrap rubber for import purposes.	July 18—Reported, H. Rept. No. 695. July 26—Passed House; pending before Senate Finance Committee. Dec. 12—Reported in Senate (S. Rept. No. 773). Feb. 2, 1948—Passed Senate with amendment. Feb. 16, 1948—House agrees to Senate amendment. Feb. 25, 1948—Approved, Public Law 415.
H. R. 2404, by Mr. PATTERSON, Mar. 6, 1947.	To suspend certain import taxes on copper: This bill is directed toward alleviation of a serious shortage of copper in the United States. It suspends until Mar. 31, 1949, import taxes imposed under sec. 3425 of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to copper, copper-bearing ores, copper concentrates, or with respect to certain manufactured items containing copper. In the Senate the bill was amended to terminate the tax suspension Mar. 31, 1949, instead of Mar. 31, 1950.	Mar. 10—Reported, H. Rept. No. 108. Mar. 12—Passed House. Apr. 21—Passed Senate with amendment (S. Rept. No. 98). Apr. 22—House agrees to Senate amendment. Apr. 29—Approved, Public Law 42.
H. R. 2872, by Mr. KNUTSON, Mar. 31, 1947.	To amend sec. 4 of the Public Debt Act of 1941, as amended, and to clarify its application: This bill eliminates an existing ambiguity with respect to the taxation of Federal securities by other jurisdictions than the Federal Government. It was directed to a peculiar situation in the District of Columbia whereby interest on United States bonds in the hands of local banks was taxed under a local statute imposing a tax on gross earnings of such institutions. It places the District on a par with the several States with respect to the taxation of United States securities.	May 22—Reported, H. Rept. No. 423. June 2—Passed House. June 16—Passed Senate (S. Rept. No. 275). June 25—Approved, Public Law 116.
H. R. 3101, by Mr. KNUTSON, Apr. 17, 1947. Superseded by S. 1073.	To extend until June 30, 1949, the period during which persons may serve in certain executive departments and agencies without being prohibited from acting as counsel, agent, or attorney for prosecuting claims against the United States by reason of having so served: Under prior law certain highly trained professional personnel employed in specialized capacities on contract renegotiation and excess-profits tax relief work would have been barred from employment on claims against the United States for 2 years after termination of their services. Consequently their services, which were absolutely essential, would have been lost through their resignation prior to June 30, 1947, unless this bill had become a law, prior to that date.	May 12—S. 1073 reported in Senate, S. Rept. No. 163. May 22—Passed Senate. May 22—H. R. 3101 reported in House, H. Rept. No. 424. June 2—S. 1073 passed House. June 14—S. 1073 approved, Public Law 93.
H. R. 3444, by Mr. REED of New York, May 13, 1947.	To amend sec. 251 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the tax treatment of income derived within possessions of the United States: This bill equalizes the tax treatment of income acquired by prisoners of war, and certain civilian internees, taken prisoner by the enemy within a possession of the United States and interned subsequently in territory not a possession of the United States with those prisoners and internees who were not removed to a place of internment in territory not a possession of the United States. It gives such internees, so removed from a possession of the United States, the benefits of sec. 251 with respect to their income earned while not within a possession of the United States, and who otherwise would not have had such benefits for the period of their internment spent in non-United States territory.	June 19—Reported, H. Rept. No. 617. June 20—Passed House. July 23—Passed Senate (S. Rept. No. 575). Aug. 1—Approved, Public Law 310.
H. R. 3602, by Mr. REED of New York, May 23, 1947.	To exempt from admissions tax general admissions to agricultural fairs: This bill would exempt from the admissions tax imposed by sec. 1700 of the Internal Revenue Code, outside general gate admissions to agricultural fairs. Admissions to amusements and other concessions within the fair grounds would not be exempt under the provisions of the bill. It is directed to encourage attendance at such fairs and would apply exclusively to those fairs operated strictly as nonprofit enterprises. It was estimated the revenue loss would have been negligible.	June 4—Reported, H. Rept. No. 519. June 5—Passed House; pending in Senate Finance Committee.

First session—Continued

Bill number and author	Title and summary of major provisions of bill	Record of action (1947)
H. R. 3613, by Mr. KEAN, May 26, 1947.	To amend secs. 1802 (a), 1802 (b), and 3481 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the document and stamp taxes on corporate stocks and bonds: This bill removes inequities arising under prior law whereby the tax imposed on issues of corporate stock was reimposed on portions of a new stock issue upon which the tax had already been paid. In addition the bill provides a more equitable assessment of the tax in the case of stock loans and in the transfer of partnership interests involving transfers of partnership-owned stock or other securities. In such cases the bill provides for a pro rata tax measured by the extent of the interest transferred both with respect to the stamp and document taxes.	July 17—Reported, H. Rept. No. 969. July 23—Passed House. July 26—Passed Senate (S. Rept. No. 713). Aug. 8—Approved, Public Law 387.
H. R. 3810, by Mr. KEAN, June 12, 1947.	To amend sec. 522 of the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to clarify the procedure in ascertaining the value of foreign currency for customs purposes where there are dual or multiple exchange rates: If enacted, this bill would have stabilized without taking away any existing rights of appeal, the procedure for determining the value of foreign currencies in terms of United States dollars. It would have permitted the Secretary of the Treasury to promulgate a fixed, single rate of dollar conversion and thus would have removed difficulties now experienced by virtue of the promulgation of 2 rates. Thus the landed cost of imported merchandise could be more readily and more accurately ascertained than at present.	June 25—Reported, H. Rept. No. 689. June 26—Passed House; pending in Senate Finance Committee.
H. R. 3818, by Mr. KNUTSON, June 12, 1947.	To amend the Federal Insurance Contributions Act with respect to rates of tax on employers and employees: This bill, as revised in conference, freezes the so-called social-security taxes imposed to finance the insurance program under title II of the Social Security Act, at 1 percent for the calendar years 1948 and 1949; 1½ percent for the calendar years 1950 and 1951, and at 2 percent for each calendar year thereafter. In addition it continues until June 30, 1950, the additional Federal grants ($25 maximum in lieu of the old $20 maximum) for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children and aid to the blind. It also continues until Dec. 31, 1949, authority for appropriation of certain excess tax collections under the Unemployment Tax Act to a special reserve account.	June 16—Reported, H. Rept. No. 594. June 18—Passed House. July 16—Passed Senate with amendments (S. Rept. No. 477). July 24—House and Senate agree to conference report. Aug. 6—Approved, Public Law No. 379.
H. R. 3861, by Mr. JENKINS of Ohio, June 16, 1947.	To allow to a successor railroad corporation the benefits of certain carry-overs of a predecessor corporation for the purposes of certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code: This bill supercedes a similar bill, H. R. 3369 and is designed to afford equality of tax treatment as between railroad corporations reorganized in receivership proceedings. Prior to enactment of this legislation a reorganized railroad might be, or might not be regarded as the same taxpayer by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, in determining its right to certain loss carry-overs, depending upon the laws of the State of its incorporation. Senate amendments merely clarified certain language in the bill and extended the period within which certain assets of the predecessor corporation must be acquired by the reorganized railroad.	June 20—Reported H. Rept. No. 624. June 23—Passed House. July 3—Passed Senate with amendments (S. Rept. No. 406). July 7—House agreed to Senate amendments. July 15—Approved Public Law No. 189.
H. R. 3930, by Mr. KNUTSON, June 24, 1947.	(See above following H. R. 1)	
H. R. 3967, by Mr. GEARHART, June 26, 1947.	To exclude certain vendors of newspapers or magazines from certain provisions of the Social Security Act and Internal Revenue Code: This bill supersedes similar bills, H. R. 3704 and H. R. 3920. This bill would have clarified a confused situation arising under a Federal district court decision whereby certain newspaper vendors were held to be employees of the papers they sold notwithstanding the fact that such vendors were not salaried employees but self-employed independent contractors—a type of gainful employment already excluded from coverage under the Social Security Act.	June 27—Reported, H. Rept. No. 733. July 16—Passed House. July 23—Passed Senate (S. Rept. No. 678). Aug. 6—Pocket veto.
H. R. 4011, by Mr. MACKINNON, June 27, 1947.	To amend sec. 1602 of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act: This bill gives express statutory sanction to the administrative interpretation which has permitted voluntary contributions, made by an employer to a State unemployment fund, under the provisions of State law, to be used in the computation of reduced contribution rates. It also contains other provisions with respect to the manner of making voluntary contributions by employers.	July 1—Reported, H. Rept. No. 759. July 3—Passed House. July 16—Passed Senate (S. Rept. No. 479). July 24—Approved, Public Law 226.
H. R. 4069, by Mr. KNUTSON, July 2, 1947.	To terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II: This is an omnibus measure amending various sections of the Internal Revenue Code and other revenue and tariff acts, so as to fix specific termination dates for revenue laws intended to be in force only through the war, or national emergency period. As amended in conference it terminates existing servicemen's income tax exemption on active service pay as of Jan. 1, 1949; extends the privilege of free entry of gifts from members of the armed forces to July 1, 1949; extends suspension of tariff duty on coconuts to 30 days following enactment of the legislation (Sept. 8, 1947); continues indefinitely the percentage depletion allowance accorded producers of various minerals adding several minerals or mineral ores to the list of such articles. Senate amendments made no substantial changes in the bill.	July 7—Reported, H. Rept. No. 802. July 21—Passed House. July 24—Passed Senate with amendments (S. Rept. No. 693). July 25—House and Senate agree to conference report. Aug. 8—Approved, Public Law 384.
H. R. 4257, by Mr. KNUTSON, July 17, 1947.	To provide an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses: This bill simply gives certain corporate taxpayers more time within which to file and perfect claims for credits or refunds arising from overpayments of tax and resulting from the failure of the taxpayer to take a deduction with respect to property deemed destroyed or seized for a taxable year beginning in 1941 or 1942 by extending the 3-year period normally applicable to Jan. 1, 1949. This extension is necessary to enable perfection of permanent legislation which would apply to such claims when filed.	July 18—Reported, H. Rept. No. 1003. July 22—Passed House. July 25—Passed Senate (S. Rept. No. 714). Aug. 4—Approved, Public Law 356.
H. R. 4279, by Mr. REED of New York, July 17, 1947.	To amend secs. 3404 (d), 3406 (a) (4) and 3443 (a) (3) (A) (i) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to the excise taxes imposed on certain photographic equipment and on musical instruments: This bill, if enacted, would have removed the present taxes imposed on heavier commercial type of photograph equipment (25 percent), retaining a 10-percent tax on cameras and roll film intended for amateur use. In addition it would have exempt from the 10-percent tax on musical instruments such instruments sold to religious institutions or nonprofit educational institutions.	July 19—Reported, H. Rept. No. 1005. July 22—Passed House; pending in Senate Finance Committee.
H. J. Res. 57, by Mr. CURTIS, Jan. 8 1947. S. J. Res. 5 is identical but was superseded by H. J. Res. 57.	To extend for 15 months the period during which alcohol plants are permitted to produce sugars and sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol: This bill merely continues a temporary privilege extended to alcohol producers to produce sugars and sirups. The sole purpose of the privilege is, first, the alleviation of a sugar shortage and, second, the beneficial use of certain surplus agricultural products. The original authority was granted under Public Law 210, approved Nov. 5, 1945, 79th Cong., 1st sess.	Jan. 20—Reported, H. Rept. No. 7. Jan. 21—Passed House. Jan. 27—Passed Senate (S. Rept. No. 5 on S. J. Res. 5). Feb. 1—Approved, Public Law 2.
H. J. Res. 121, by Mr. KNUTSON, Feb. 12, 1947. Superseded H. J. Res. 120 incorporating certain amendments agreed to in committee.	Granting, in the case of income, estate, and gift taxes, deductions for contributions to the United Nations: This legislation permits for 1 year, ending Dec. 1, 1947, tax exemption of gifts to the United Nations which are made exclusively for the acquisition of a site for the United Nations in New York City, N. Y.	Feb. 12—Reported, H. Rept. No. 32. Feb. 17—Passed House. Feb. 21—Passed Senate (no Senate report). Feb. 26—Approved, Public Law 7.
H. J. Res. 210, by Mr. KNUTSON, May 28, 1947.	To extend the time for the release, free of estate and gift tax, of certain powers: This bill merely extends the grace period allowed under previous legislation, for the release of certain powers of appointment in the absence of which the holders of such powers may become liable for estate or gift taxes in proper cases on property which they do not actually own. The extension permits further study of the problems involved with a view to permanent legislation.	June 4—Reported, H. Rept. No. 514. June 5—Passed House. June 16—Passed Senate (S. Rept. No. 276). June 25—Approved, Public Law 112.

First session—Continued

Bill number and author	Title and summary of major provisions of bill	Record of action (1947)
H. J. Res. 238, by Mr. BROWN of Ohio, July 14, 1947.	To amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930 relating to free entry of standard newsprint paper: This bill gives specific authorization for the free entry of standard newsprint paper in rolls of 15 or more inches. The Senate amended the bill cutting the permissible width of the rolls to 9 inches. Previously the minimum width was 16 inches which was determined by administrative ruling. Free entry of such paper in 15-inch rolls had been allowed as a temporary expedient during the war period as a step in relieving the paper shortage. Since there is a continuing shortage of paper and because unfortunate discriminations occur in the use of 16-inch as a standard it was deemed advisable to specifically extend the period and reduce the width of rolls to which the authority would apply.	July 17—Reported, H. Rept. No. 968. July 19—Passed House. July 24—Passed Senate with amendments (S. Rept. No. 692). July 25—Conference report agreed to in House and Senate. Aug. 1—Approved, Public Law 315.
S. 1072, by Mr. MILLIKIN, Apr. 10, 1947.	To extend until July 1, 1949, the period during which income from agricultural labor and nursing services may be disregarded by the States in making old-age assistance payments without prejudicing their rights to grants-in-aid under the Social Security Act: This bill makes it possible for the several States, at their option, to pay benefits to eligible old-age assistance beneficiaries notwithstanding the limitation of $15 placed on the amount of income permitted to be earned while drawing such benefits, if such additional income is earned in performance of farm labor or nursing services. It thus continues a temporary wartime privilege made to encourage persons to engage in such occupations.	Apr. 11—Reported in Senate (S. Rept. No. 100). Apr. 21—Passed Senate. June 26—Reported in House (H. Rept. No. 713). June 27—Passed House. June 30—Approved, Public Law 131.

Second session

Bill number and author	Title and summary of major provisions of bill	Record of action (1948)
H. R. 5229, by Mr. FARRINGTON, Apr. 28, 1947.	To repeal the act of Apr. 29, 1902, relating to procurement of statistics of trade between the United States and its noncontiguous territory: This bill repeals the law requiring the filing of cargo manifests covering shipments of goods between the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii and continental United States.	Mar. 2—Reported, H. Rept. No. 1478. Mar. 15—Passed House. Mar. 26—Reported in Senate (S. Rept. No. 1029). Mar. 29—Passed Senate. Apr. 7—Approved, Public Law 476.
H. R. 3825, by Mr. CURTIS, June 13, 1947.	To exempt excise tax on cosmetics when sold to barber shops, beauty parlors, or similar establishments for use in operation thereof: The bill would exempt from the retailers' tax toilet preparations sold to the operator of a barber shop, beauty parlor, or similar establishment for use in the operation thereof. Resales by such an establishment would continue to be taxed under existing law.	May 18—Reported, H. Rept. No. 1970. June 3—Passed House.
H. R. 4739, by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Dec. 15, 1947.	To provide for the free importation of exposed X-ray film: Such film is classified in the category of photographs, but does not have commercial significance. Administrative requirements for payment of duty thereon has been found to be extremely burdensome and scarcely justifies the expense of its collections.	Feb. 23—Reported, H. Rept. No. 1413. Feb. 24—Passed House. Mar. 26—Reported in Senate (S. Rept. No. 1031). Mar. 29—Passed Senate with amendments. Apr. 12—House agrees to Senate amendments. Apr. 20—Approved, Public Law 490.
H. R. 4790, by Mr. KNUTSON, Dec. 18, 1947.	To reduce individual income-tax payments and for other purposes: As the bill finally passed, personal and dependency exemptions were raised to $600, percentage tax reductions ranging from 12.6 percent to 5 percent according to the size of the income, and an additional $600 exemption granted to taxpayers who are 65 years old or over and if blind a second additional $600 exemption was granted. Husbands and wives are permitted to split their income for tax purposes in order to eliminate the tax advantage of community-property States. Estate-and gift-tax amendments were made as a necessary part of the community-property provision.	Jan. 27—Reported, H. Rept. No. 1274. Feb. 2—Passed House with committee amendment, yeas, 297; nays, 120. Mar. 16—Reported in Senate (S. Rept. No. 1013) with amendments. Mar. 22—Passed Senate, yeas, 78, nays, 11. Mar. 24—House agrees to Senate amendments. Apr. 2—House passed over veto, 311 to 88. Apr. 2—Senate passed over veto, 77 to 10. Public Law 471.
H. R. 4938, by Mr. WOODRUFF, Jan. 12, 1948.	To place import duty on platinum foxes and platinum fox furs: The purpose of this bill is to provide a dutiable status for foxes and fox furs commonly known as the platinum type by including them within the term silver or black fox which are dutiable at rate of 37½ percent ad valorem.	Feb. 23—Reported, H. Rept. No. 1414. Feb. 24—Passed House. Mar. 26—Reported in Senate (S. Rept. No. 1030). Mar. 29—Passed Senate. Apr. 5—Approved; Public Law 475.
H. R. 5052, by Mr. GEARHART, Jan. 20, 1948.	To exclude certain vendors of newspapers or magazines from certain provisions of the Social Security Act and Internal Revenue Code: This bill seeks to clarify the coverage provisions of title II of the Social Security Act as applies to the vendors of newspapers and magazines, whereby in certain cases they would be treated as independent contractors.	Feb. 3—Reported. H. Rept. No. 1320. Mar. 4—Passed House. Mar. 13—Reported in Senate (S. Rept. No. 985). Mar. 23—Passed Senate. Apr. 5—Vetoed. Apr. 14—House passed over veto. Apr. 20—Senate passed over veto. Public Law 492.
H. R. 5067, by Mr. MITCHELL, Jan. 21, 1948.	To exempt from admissions tax hospitalized servicemen and veterans when admitted free: This bill would exempt from payment of the present 20-percent admissions tax on free admissions furnished to hospitalized service personnel and veterans hospitalized in any Government hospital or institution.	Mar. 9—Reported, H. Rept. No. 1540. Mar. 22—Passed House. May 28—Reported in Senate (S. Rept. No. 1424). June 1—Passed Senate with amendment. June 8—House agrees to Senate amendments.
H. R. 5275, by Mr. HOLMES, Feb. 4, 1948.	To provide for free importation of limestone to be used in the manufacture of fertilizer: Ground or pulverized limestone enters free of duty when used for fertilizer but the stone does not. The bill would correct this anomalous situation by also permitting free entry of the stone.	Feb. 23—Reported, H. Rept. No. 1415. Feb. 24—Passed House. Apr. 15—Reported in Senate (S. Rept. No. 1129).
H. R. 5328, by Mr. DEVITT, Feb. 9, 1948.	To provide for free entry of compressed wood waste as firewood: Action was taken on this bill in order to facilitate the utilization of wood wastes as firewood. Compressed wood waste is now being produced in United States and Canada of material formerly going to waste and is relieving shortage of firewood in some areas. Canada is not a competitor since United States does not have sufficient material.	Feb. 23—Reported, H. Rept. No. 1416. Feb. 24—Passed House. Mar. 26—Reported in Senate (S. Rept. 1032). Mar. 29—Passed Senate with amendment. Apr. 12—House agrees to Senate amendments. May 3—Approved, Public Law 510.
H. R. 5448, by Mr. REED of New York, Feb. 17, 1948	To exclude from gross income, income derived by nonresident aliens from operations of aircraft of foreign registry upon reciprocal treatment of American taxpayers: The bill would extend to earnings of aircraft under foreign registry the same exemption that has been granted ships for many years under a reciprocal agreement. It is felt that these provisions will encourage expansion of the air-transport industry.	Feb. 27—Reported, H. Rept. No. 1435. Mar. 4—Passed House. Apr. 15—Reported in Senate with amendment. (S. Rept. No. 1128). Apr. 27—House agrees to Senate amendments. May 4—Approved, Public Law 514.
H. R. 5553, by Mr. ELLIS, Feb. 25, 1948.	To extend until July 1, 1949, the period during which 9-inch newsprint may be imported free of duty: 9-inch newsprint was accorded free entry in 1947 for 1 year because of the shortage. The shortage still exists and this bill would extend free entry for another year.	Mar. 23—Reported, H. Rept No. 1590. Apr. 20—Passed House. May 6—Reported in Senate (S. Rept. No. 1253). June 1—Passed Senate. June 12—Approved, Public Law 630.
H. R. 5608, by Mr. GOODWIN, Feb. 27, 1948.	To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to change from compound rate to 40 percent ad valorem rate on hose made of vegetable fiber for conduction of liquid or gases: This change would slightly increase present duties, but more important, by this change domestic producers would know definitely where they stand with respect to protection.	May 11—Reported, H. Rept. No. 1911. June 8—Passed House.
H. R. 5612, by Mr. GRANT of Indiana, Feb. 27, 1948.	To provide for free importation of evergreen Christmas trees: Action was taken on this bill because the present rates bound in the Geneva agreement do not afford protection and the expense involved has been very high in relation to the duties collected.	May 11—Reported, H. Rept. No. 1912.
H. R. 5641, by Mr. WOODRUFF, Mar. 2, 1948.	To provide for free importation of salt brine: Producers of salt brine for use in chemical plants must transport by pipe line. Chemical firms located along the Canadian border are finding it necessary to use salt deposits located just across the border and in order not to make this prohibitive, action was taken on this bill.	May 11—Reported, H. Rept. No. 1913. May 18—Passed House.
H. R. 5645, by Mr. JENKINS, Mar. 1, 1948.	To assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes: Avoidance of State sales and use taxes on cigarettes, through their shipment directly to consumers in the taxing State from sources outside its borders, has reached alarming proportions. This bill would correct the situation by requiring information be sent to the tax administrator of shipments into the States upon which to base assessment and collection. Violation would be punishable by fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 6 months, or both.	Mar. 23—Reported, H. Rept. No. 1913. May 28—Passed House.

Second session—Continued

Bill number and author	Title and summary of major provisions of bill	Record of action (1948)
H. R. 5933, by Mr. EBERHARTER, Mar. 22, 1948.	To permit free importation of racing shells until Jan. 1, 1949: This bill originally permitted free importation of racing shells to facilitate try-outs for places on the Olympic games in the United States. The Senate amended the bill to allow an exemption of $500 in addition to the $100 exemption of dutible goods brought in by returning residents who have remained abroad for a continuous period of at least 12 days. The House receded with an amendment which fixed the amount of additional exemption at $300.	Apr. 12—Reported, H. Rept. No. 1718. Apr. 21—Passed House. May 6—Reported in Senate (S. Rept. No. 1254). May 10—Passed Senate with amendment. May 13—House and Senate agree to Conference Report No. 1950. May 19—Approved, Public Law 540.
H. R. 5965, by Mr. GRANT of Indiana Mar. 23, 1948.	To provide for assessment of import duties on the same basis as the application of internal revenue taxes: This bill was designed to remove discriminations and to facilitate the collection of duties on liquors. Duties would be collected on the basis of quantities imported rather than on the basis of quantities exported. By this method duties would not be collected on losses through leakage, breakage, or damage, which is now done in certain cases.	May 11—Reported, H. Rept. No. 1919. May 18—Passed House. May 27—Reported in Senate (S. Rept. No. 1421). June 1—Passed Senate. June 8—Approved Public Law 612.
H. R. 6162, by Mr. DINGELL, Apr. 7, 1948.	To make imported beer and similar fermented liquors subject to the internal revenue tax: Internal revenue taxes have been imposed on imported distilled spirits and wine, but not on imported fermented malt liquor. Imported fermented malt liquor is only subject to the import duty. This bill would also place the internal revenue tax of $8 per gallon on such liquor. Brewers along the Mexican and Canadian borders justifiably complained because of the Canadian import tax of $35 per barrel and the Mexican duty of $40 per barrel.	June 1—Reported, H. Rept. No. 2097. June 12—Passed House. June 16—Reported in Senate (S. Rept. No. 1709). June 18—Passed Senate with amendment. June 18—House agrees to Senate Amendments.
H. R. 6242, by Mr. GRANT of Indiana, Apr. 14, 1948.	To suspend until June 30, 1949, import duties on scrap iron, scrap steel, and nonferrous-metal scrap: This bill would continue the suspension of duties on these items which was permitted during the late war and extended for 1 year in 1947. The demand for iron, steel, aluminum, and other metals is probably more acute than in 1947, and thus, the reason for action on this bill.	May 11—Reported, H. Rept. No. 1917. May 18—Passed House. May 27—Reported in Senate (S. Rept. No. 1416). June 1—Passed Senate. June 8—Approved. Public Law 613.
H. R. 6275, by Mr. REED of New York, Apr. 20, 1948.	To exempt from estate tax national service life insurance and U. S. Government life insurance of a decedent dying while in active serviee as a member of the military or naval forces: Regardless of the fact that there is a $60,000 specific exemption for Federal estate-tax purposes, there results a real hardship for beneficiaries of U. S. Government and national service life insurance. The reason is that the insurance is included in the gross estate at the face value of the policy, though it may be payable in monthly installments over a period of 20 years or more.	May 11—Reported, H. Rept. No. 1937. May 18—Passed House.
H. R. 6489, by Mr. KNUTSON, May 10. 1948.	To provide for temporary free importation of lead: It is essential that every obstacle to the importation of greater quantities be removed since there is a shortage of lead. Many domestic producers of finished lead products are operating at half capacity because of their inability to obtain raw material.	May 12—Reported, H. Rept. No. 1944. May 18—Passed House. June 7—Reported in Senate (S. Rept. No. 1524). June 10—Passed Senate.
H. R. 6556, by Mr. GEARHART, May 13, 1948.	To extend for 1 year and to amend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act: This bill is the first step in 14 years toward a scientific adjustment of trade regulations consistent with the goal of maximum beneficial world trade. This bill continues until June 30, 1949, the authority of the President to negotiate and enter into trade agreements with other countries. Under the bill the Tariff Commission, as a bipartisan, independent agency, is directed to make factual studies and determinations concerning the extent to which tariffs can be raised or lowered in any such agreement without endangering the national security or consequential injury to our domestic economy.	May 24—Reported, H. Rept. No. 2009. May 26—Passed House, yeas, 234; nays, 149. June 8—Reported in Senate with amendment (S. Rept. No. 1558). June 14—Passed Senate, yeas, 70; nays, 18. June 15—House agrees to Senate amendments.
H. R. 6712, by Mr. KNUTSON, May 26, 1948.	To provide for revenue revisions, to correct tax inequities, and for other purposes: This bill is the first step in the revision of the Federal tax structure. It contains 80 sections dealing with the income, estate, and gift taxes and with certain administrative problems. The bill will remove inequities, eliminate uncertainties for both taxpayers and tax administrators, prevent tax avoidance, simplify the tax system, moderate certain harsh provisions and provide increased incentives to management and venture capital. During the war years many changes were made in the tax system and the proper amount of attention was given the many problems that accompanied these changes. The bill deals with some major problems but is restricted to those which have little effect on the revenues. The total reduction in tax liabilities will probably be less than $400,000,000.	May 28—Reported, H. Rept. No. 2087.
H. R. 6777, by Mr. REED of New York, June 2, 1948.	To extend coverage of title II of the Social Security Act, to increase certain benefits, and for other purposes: The bill contains important and timely amendments to the old-age and survivors' insurance provisions of the Social Security Act. In general the bill extends coverage to 11 types of employment not now covered under the insurance provisions of the act, increases certain family benefits, liberalizes other provisions related to benefits, eliminates administrative red tape and for the first time provides specifically for the all-important need of preserving the contributory principle which underlies the insurance program by conditioning benefit payments on taxable wages. This provision is of major importance. Approximately 3,500,000 employed persons not now covered under title II of the act will thus be able to enjoy its protective advantages beginning Jan. 1, 1949.	June 2—Reported, H. Rept. No. 2168. June 14—Passed House.
H. R. 6800, by Mr. GRANT of Indiana, June 3, 1948.	To permit withdrawal of alcohol tax-free from alcohol plants for use in medicinal preparations, food products, flavors, or flavoring extracts: Existing law requires a tax of $9 a proof gallon on alcohol withdrawn for use in manufacture of medicines, food products, etc. However, this type withdrawal is eligible for a $6 draw-back if certain conditions are complied with. As a result large sums of working capital are tied up for periods of 6 to 9 months. This bill would permit withdrawals of this type by payment of the ultimate $3 tax plus the occupational taxes. Revenue receipts would not be effected by this bill.	June 8—Reported, H. Rept. No. 2254.
H. R. 6808, by Mr. FORAND, June 3, 1948.	To permit refund or credit to brewers of taxes paid on beer lost or wasted in bottling operations: Tests by the Bureau of Internal Revenue show the average losses resulting from bottling operations on tax-paid beer are approximately 2.39 percent. Existing law recognizes the injustice of tax imposed on fermented malt liquors of sales that are rendered impossible, and the committee felt that the same principle should apply to tax-paid liquor lost in bottling operations. The bill provides a maximum refund or credit of 2½ percent, and the taxpayer would be required to prove such loss to the satisfaction of the Commissioner. The Senate amended the bill to eliminate excise tax on musical instruments sold to nonprofit organizations.	June 9—Reported, H. Rept. No. 2294. June 12—Passed House. June 16—Reported in Senate (S. Rept. No. 1711). June 18—Passed Senate with amendment. June 18—House agrees to Senate amendments.
H. R. 6818, by Mr. REED of New York, June 4, 1948.	To amend title X of Social Security Act to liberalize eligibility requirements for aid to the blind: This bill is designed to liberalize existing law with respect to payments, by the States, to the needy blind. The bill authorizes the States to disregard the first $40 of income received for personal services by a recipient of such aid in any calendar month in the determination of relative need for assistance. The committee believes that blind individuals should be given every possible incentive to pursue useful occupations.	June 8—Reported, H. Rept. 2253. June 9—Passed House. June 16—Reported in Senate (S. Rept. 1727). June 18—Passed Senate.
H. J. Res. 296, by Mr. GEARHART, Jan. 15, 1948.	To maintain the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage: The issue involved in the proposed regulations is whether the scope of social-security coverage should be determined by the Congress or by other branches of the Government. The Senate added a provision to the bill which would increase by $5 the maximum Federal grants to States for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to dependent children. It also changed the formula under which the Federal Government contributes to the States as its share of financing these programs.	Feb. 3—Reported, H. Rept. 1319. Feb. 27—Passed House. May 6—Reported in Senate (S. Rept. 1250). June 4—Passed Senate with amendments. June 4—House agrees to Senate amendments. June 14—Vetoed; House overrides, yeas, 297; nays, 75. Senate overrides, yeas, 65; nays, 12; Public Law 642.

Second session—Continued

Bill number and author	Title and summary of major provisions of bill	Record of action (1948)
H. J. Res. 384, by Mr. HAND, Apr. 26, 1948.	To provide for free importation of articles for exhibition at the International Industrial Exposition: This resolution follows a pattern instituted many years ago to provide for the free importation of articles to be used solely for exhibition purposes in organized expositions. This resolution is for the specific benefit of the International Industrial Exposition to be held at Atlantic City, N. J., from June 26 to September 11, 1948. If the articles imported are sold within 3 months after the close of the exposition, it will be subject to import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.	May 18—Reported, H. Rept. 1968. May 18—Passed House. May 28—Reported in Senate (S. Rept. 1425). June 1—Passed Senate. June 8—Approved, Pubic Law 614.
H. J. Res. 395, by Mr. REED of New York, May 6, 1948.	To extend time for the release, free of estate and gift tax, of certain powers of appointment: This bill merely extends the grace period allowed under previous legislation, for the release of certain powers of appointment in the absence of which the holders of such powers may become liable for estate or gift taxes in proper cases on property which they do not actually own. The extension permits further study of the problems involved with a view to permanent legislation.	May 11—Reported, H. Rept. No. 1907. May 11—Passed House. May 21—Reported in Senate with amendment. (S. Rept. No. 1383). May 24—Passed Senate with amendment. June 1—House agrees to Senate amendments. June 12—Approved, Public Law 635.
H. J. Res. 428, by Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, June 15, 1948.	To provide an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses: The staffs of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and the Treasury Department have been studying for several years the treatment of war-loss recoveries with various groups representing a large number of the taxpayers concerned. Since this is an extremely difficult subject, it was not possible for the committee to deal with the problem prior to adjournment. Therefore, this resolution extends for another year the time for filing of claims for credit or refund with respect to war losses.	June 16—Reported, H. Rept. No. 2371. June 17—Passed House. June 17—Reported in Senate (S. Rept. No. 1745).
H. J. Res. 429, by Mr. REED of New York, June 15, 1948.	Relating to the marital deduction for estate-tax purposes, in the case of life insurance or annuity payments: This resolution extends the marital deduction under the estate tax to life insurance optional settlements where the proceeds of insurance on the life of the decedent are left at interest and surviving spouse is (1) entitled for life to all such interest, payable annually or at more frequent intervals and (2) has power to appoint to himself or herself or the estate all such benefits.	June 16—Reported, H. Rept. No. 2370. June 17—Passed House. June 17—Reported in Senate (S. Rept. No. 1746).

The Wyoming Plan for Economic Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD V. ROBERTSON
OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD certain letters, statements, and supporting material pertaining to the Wyoming plan for veterans and the economic development of the West.

STATEMENT OF HON. E. V. ROBERTSON, OF WYOMING

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I shall discuss today a program of economic development founded upon the principles of free and private enterprise, which I believe will open a new era in prosperity and contribute greatly to the maximum development of business and industry throughout the country, with full employment and countless opportunities for new careers for veterans and all others with courage and vision.

The program to which I refer can be realized through the provisions of the Economic Development Corporation Act, S. 1652, popularly called the "little man's RFC," of which I am proud to be a sponsor. I am confident this measure will be favorably considered by the next Congress.

The State of Wyoming offers unique opportunities for individual advancements through private enterprise and the information set forth in the following pages under the outline of the Wyoming plan will illustrate some of the opportunities which await only the application of personal initiative and adequate capital backing. The bill I have referred to is intended to provide the capital backing, and I am convinced there is no lack of initiative and know-how among the people of Wyoming, many of whom are descendent from the pioneers who first settled the Rocky Mountain region.

Known as the Equality State because it pioneered in woman suffrage, Wyoming has continued to pioneer in many other fields. Now our State can pioneer in the greatest of all fields—economic development to promote prosperity of the individual and the Nation. I am assured by the veterans and small business organizations that, under the Wyoming plan, which I have devised to implement the Economic Development Corporation Act, a new West can arise and become the agricultural industrial frontier of America. The industrial development of the West will be aided by our favorable climate, our raw materials, the pooling of chemical, metallurgical, and scientific knowledge, low-cost power, and growing markets at home and abroad. The continued expansion of the West is a certainty, both for these reasons, and because it is on the main line to the Pacific and accessible to the markets of South America and the Orient. Indeed, we have before us an entire new era of economic productivity that will set all the people of Wyoming on the road to the greatest prosperity they have ever known.

Wyoming, the birthplace of the great western river systems—the Missouri, the Colorado, and the Snake River systems—has untold opportunities for agricultural as well as industrial development through the harnessing of its waterpower. The potential irrigable acreage is vast and could become an important source of food production for the Nation. Drainage and better adaptation of farm programs to available soil types in some areas also provide new ways for increasing individual profit and to benefit the State.

Mr. President, before continuing with the economic opportunities that are available in Wyoming for veterans, small-business men, and other individuals in the communities, I wish to insert in the RECORD, with the unanimous consent of the Senate, a letter on this subject from James F. O'Neil, national commander of the American Legion, to Senator STYLES BRIDGES, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. Senator BRIDGES is one of the 30 cosponsors of this legislation.

MAY 18, 1948.

Hon. STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman, Appropriations Committee,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BRIDGES: I wish to compliment you * * * in formulating an American doctrine to build mutual prosperity between our communities in America and the communities in friendly countries that are trying to hold the line against communism. * * * I believe it is possible that your doctrine may go far to assure prosperity and peace for the United States and for the United Nations, by integrating the economy of other countries with ours.

By utilizing the manpower and the skills of our veterans, you put your finger on what I believe is the spearhead to prosperity and Americanism against depression and communism. In their stand on Americanism, 20,000,000 living American veterans can't be wrong. From what I know of veterans, I can say that we have at least one more good fight left in us and this is it. As you gentlemen in Congress have challenged us, I believe we can meet the challenge in peace with as much vigor and determination as we have met the challenge in war.

Furthermore, as all veterans alike have served their neighbors and our Nation, I am confident that the Legionnaires in our State will invite the cooperation of the members of other veterans' organizations to meet this new challenge to champion Americanism against communism through your economic development plan.

The Army and the Navy were charged with being prepared to defend Pearl Harbor, but obviously their lack of coordination paid its toll. I, for one, wish to prevent a Pearl Harbor in veterans' affairs. To that end I am confident that the American Legion will cooperate with other veterans' organizations in our communities, and in our States to help unify our people for the best interest of all.

I am impressed by the number of Legionnaires in the Congress who are cosponsoring with you your Veterans' Corporation bill, which appears to be a good basis to afford veterans economic opportunities and housing and to complete an over-all veterans' program for the benefit of the veterans and of the Nation.

With my best wishes for your success in your plan to fight communism with prosperity, I am

Sincerely,

JAMES F. O'NEIL.

I also wish to insert in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by Thomas A. Nicholas, department commander, VFW, of Wyoming.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
DEPARTMENT OF WYOMING,
Casper, Wyo., May 7, 1948.

Hon. EDWARD V. ROBERTSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: It is with enthusiasm that we veterans learn of your Wyoming plan, which you make possible under the proposed Veterans Economic Development Corporation Act—the little man's RFC—sponsored by you and 30 other distinguished Senators and Representatives.

From the study of our economic requirements being made by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, it is apparent that practically every community needs some new businesses or the expansion of old businesses, or the development of self-liquidating projects in which veterans and others will profit. What we like about your plan is that the individual can carve out his own new gainful career and share in the great wealth of the State and the Nation, and profit in foreign trade.

Your Wyoming plan should also gain the enthusiasm of all the people of Wyoming, as other citizens besides veterans can profit under its provisions. This plan enables the veterans to assume new civic leadership together with the community fathers who are interested in bringing in new industries or expanding old businesses, and in developing much-needed public projects throughout the State.

Senator ROBERTSON, please call upon us for any help we can give toward the passage of your "little man's RFC" bill, as this measure has high priority in the legislation being supported by the VFW. We also wish to implement your Wyoming plan, as we should like to establish a model of economic expansion for other States in the Union and demonstrate that we veterans have another good fight in us and this is it.

With our hopes for a greater Wyoming through your bill and the Wyoming plan, we are,

Sincerely,

THOS. A. NICHOLAS,
Department Commander, VFW, Wyoming.

The following letter was addressed to me by Ray H. Brannaman, commander in chief, VFW of the United States, in reference to the Wyoming plan and the Veterans' Economic Development Corporation Act:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., April 9, 1948.

Hon. E. V. ROBERTSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: I am glad to learn you have prepared a Wyoming plan of projects which could be implemented under provisions of S. 1652—the Veterans' Economic Development Corporation Act. Such State plans will aid the people of many communities, including veterans, by bringing new industries to the communities, expanding present businesses, modernizing agriculture, and by creating new industrial uses for agricultural products and other raw materials.

Representatives of friendly nations are interested in developing programs similar to your Wyoming plan to enable their people to prosper and to hold the line against communism and war. It is not an overstatement to say that if applied here at home and abroad such a plan would help win a bloodless victory.

Your championship in Congress of small business in the United States and the establishment of veterans in businesses and profitable careers has our strong support. The bill that you are sponsoring in the Senate, S. 1652, entitled "Veterans Economic Development Corporation Act," will enable millions of veterans to catch up with the economic parade at home and abroad. This bill will interest the taxpayers particularly, as no appropriation of taxpayers' money is contemplated. In addition, it is estimated that it will reduce taxes, as it will save our taxpayers a billion dollars a year in the present cost of Government.

The bipartisan support of this bill and its early passage is indicated by the companion bills introduced in the House by ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, a champion of small business; Representative EDITH ROGERS of Massachusetts, chairman of the important Veterans' Committee; Representative JESSE WOLCOTT, of Michigan, an authority on finance and chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee; the past chairman, Congressman SPENCE, of Kentucky; by Congressmen KEARNEY, of New York, and VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, both former commanders in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The unusual support of the bill in the Senate is evidenced by the sponsorship of S. 1652 by Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, chairman of the important Appropriations Committee; Senator BUCK, of the Senate Banking Committee; Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky; Senator BUTLER, of Nebraska, chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and 20 other distinguished Senators.

As the Veterans Economic Development Corporation bill is not limited to veterans, your Wyoming plan will help to implement this program in an orderly manner, marking a new milestone in the illustrious history of Wyoming and of the Nation.

Sincerely,

RAY H. BRANNAMAN,
Commander in Chief.

Mr. President, before I insert in the RECORD an outline of the Wyoming plan, I believe the people in our communities back home would like to have me describe briefly the proposed Veterans' Economic Development Corporation Act. It will enable our veterans, as well as others, to become constructive leaders in our communities and to reinforce the American economy, as it covers the next 20 years of the lives of the majority of our veterans.

WHAT IS THE VETERANS' CORPORATION?

The fundamental purpose of the Veterans' Economic Development Corporation Act are to develop unused natural resources and unused productive capacity and to increase business and career opportunities, with particular emphasis upon jobs for veterans. The act will create a Government corporation vested with broad powers to provide long-range credit and technical advisory services to: (a) private business, individuals, firms, and corporations, and (b) State and municipal self-liquidating public projects, with the condition that preference in new employment opportunities created would be given veterans, if available.

This "little man's RFC" will be set up and will operate along lines similar to those of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, with its broad lending powers and, in addition, will have authority to provide technical advisory services. Applicants for loans will have to satisfy sound business requirements established by the Corporation to assure efficient operation and protect the Government against loss.

WILL THE CORPORATION OPERATE WITHOUT COST TO THE TAXPAYER?

Yes. The Corporation will borrow money through the Federal Treasury at its prevailing low rate of interest and lend it at a higher rate. Experience, based on RFC operations, indicates that the earnings of the Corporation will not only cover all administrative costs and any losses from loans, but should return a profit to the Treasury. The technical advisory services authorized in the act will serve to minimize losses and at the same time protect the borrowers against business failures.

ARE THE LOANS AND BENEFITS OF THE ACT LIMITED TO VETERANS?

No. Credit may be granted individuals, irrespective of veteran or nonveteran status, or to firms, corporations, other organizations and municipalities. The only condition is that preference shall be given veterans in new employment opportunities, if available. The over-all benefits of the act will apply to the entire Nation.

Of special significance to our taxpayers is that no appropriations of public money are required to carry out the provisions of the act, as only self-liquidating projects will be considered. It is estimated that with gainful, self-sufficient careers being afforded veterans, an annual saving to our taxpayers of approximately $1,000,000,000 will be made.

The veterans' organizations have termed this "little man's RFC" bill one of the most constructive pieces of veterans' legislation ever to be introduced. This bipartisan bill has been endorsed by many outstanding people, among whom are President Truman and Gen. Omar N. Bradley, the former Veterans' Administrator; Mr. Alfred Schindler, the former Under Secretary of Commerce; and former Secretary of State Byrnes.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES

As a cosponsor of this bill, I should like to refer to some of the tremendous potentialities that can be realized through its enactment. I have already commented on the new era of prosperity that awaits the West, contingent on the development of its natural resources. Responsible economists are authority for the statement that our 11 Western States, with a present population of only about 16,000,000, could easily support a population of 60,000,000 people at a high level of prosperity. The population of Wyoming, according to the 1940 census, was 250,742 people. The total land area in the State is 62,460,160 acres. Thus, the population per square mile was 2.6 in 1940 as compared with 44.2 for the United States as a whole. From these figures alone it is clear that there is much room for expansion in Wyoming. The enactment of the Veterans' Economic Development Corporation Act would enable us to increase the opportunities for ambitious veterans and others in crowded areas of the Nation, giving them the chance to become pioneers like their forefathers and help make Wyoming the State of opportunity as well as the State of equality.

Under this bill new opportunities will also be opened in further developing the tourist trade, as the natural wonders of Wyoming, including Yellowstone National Park, the Teton Mountains, Jackson Hole, the Devil's Tower, and the majestic scenery of the many other mountain ranges already attract tens of thousands of visitors each year.

It is highly significant that coal-bearing formations underlie about 60 percent of the area of the State, so that coal mining is carried on in every county of the State. The United States Geological Survey estimates Wyoming to contain over 1,076,000,000,000 tons of coal. This amounts to one-seventh of the coal resources of the Nation—a staggering amount. My bill and my Wyoming plan will facilitate the utilization of our vast natural wealth. It will also speed the profitable application of such research as that being conducted by the Natural Resources Research Institute of the University of Wyoming. The reports of this research at Laramie will contain information of wide general use to the coal producers of Wyoming and to many others who are interested in the conversion of subbituminous coals. A briquetting plant has already been operated and demonstrated, and the unit will continue to be operated for some time, making briquettes (a pressed brick of coal dust, made solid by some binding material and used for fuel) from the various typical coals for which this type of briquetting holds commercial promise. It is becoming increasingly

important that research of this type be carried on, especially under the sponsorship of the State, not only of the Federal Government. Some coals may be converted into smokeless fuel without briquetting by a new distilling process which extracts petroleum products from lump coal without disintegration of the lumps.

MINERAL IMPROVEMENT

Despite the fact that Wyoming is so rich in minerals, it has never been an important producer of precious metals. But now we have an opportunity to remedy that situation. For example, announcement was made just recently of the discovery of a 50,000-ton deposit of jade, worth millions of dollars. In the vicinity of Lander, semiprecious stones are produced and marketed. Considerable black and green jade (nephrite) is collected and sold for polishing. Under the Wyoming plan more of our people can benefit from such new businesses.

As a result of a recent discovery in Wyoming of an almost inexhaustible supply of vanadium ore, which is now being mined, the State may well become the largest vanadium-producing State and relieve our Nation of dependence on vanadium imports. Wyoming is the largest producer of bentonite and yields nearly half of the Nation's supply. Bentonite is a rock derived from accumulations of volcanic ash on an ancient sea floor with subsequent alteration to clay. Of the half hundred uses known, the principal ones are as a binder for foundry sands, a mud-laden fluid used in oil-well drilling, and a refining filter.

There are several promising iron deposits in the State that could be developed under my Wyoming plan. The United States Bureau of Mines has constructed a pilot plant at Laramie to test the practicability of production of metallic sponge iron from Wyoming and other western iron ores. Another important mineral is vermiculite, a mica which expands to many times its original size when heated. Utilized in warfare as an insulator, a fireproofing material, and a shock-absorbing substance, it has a number of profitable peacetime uses. Other important mineral deposits in the State that have never been developed or are not utilized at the present time are trona (sodium carbonate), epsomite (magnesium sulfate), and rock salt (sodium chloride), which occur as saline deposits. The undeveloped trona deposits are especially large, and the material is essentially pure sodium carbonate and bicarbonate. In the Laramie mountains are large dikes of titaniferous magnetite which have never been utilized.

Western Wyoming offers many opportunities for profitable development of other types of minerals. For example, it has a great reserve of unutilized phosphate rock which runs as high as 70 percent or more tricalcium phosphate. The phosphate rock lies near coal deposits and the trona deposits are not far away. In the vicinity of the trona are large amounts of leucite, a rock which contains about 11 percent each of alumina and potash. Western Wyoming also has great deposits of high-grade oil shale which, when utilized, will yield about 40 gallons of petroleum per ton, in addition to ammonia. The Wyoming deposits are estimated to contain nearly 2,000,000,000 barrels of recoverable petroleum. Under my Wyoming plan, many more of our people would have a chance to profit from the development of a petroleum industry.

Along the Union Pacific Railroad there is a large deposit of ammonium alum which might be utilized in the production of synthetic ammonia. In the Laramie mountains are hundreds of square miles of anorthosite, a sodic feldspar containing 40 percent or more of alumina. This rock is being used in the manufacture of special high-grade cements. Then, over wide areas in Wyoming are thick beds of pure dolomite which contain over 20 percent magnesia, also large deposits of antigorite which run as high as 40 percent magnesia. None of these materials have been utilized to date, and it appears that practically all can be profitably developed.

Wyoming has large deposits of clays and shale which would unquestionably yield a variety of desirable ceramic products. Nephelinesyenite, present in the northeastern part of the State, is of probable value in ceramics. Radioactive ores are known to occur in several places in the States, as does allanite, which contains the rare metals cerium and yttrium.

OIL AND NATURAL GAS

We may also expect Wyoming to become the site for more extensive explorations for natural gas, since the discovery of new fields is becoming more difficult in more thoroughly explored States. Wyoming now ranks eighth as an oil-producing State, and we are constantly trying to find new uses for oil. At Laramie, Wyo., a new oil-shale research and development laboratory building has been completed for determining the fundamental chemical, physical, and engineering facts of oil-shale processing. Engine tests have been started on shale gasoline and Diesel fuel to determine their characteristics for use in internal-combustion engines. In refining research, work has continued on thermal and catalytic cracking of shale-oil fractions and the catalytic treating of shale-oil naphthas. Assays for oil yield have been made on approximately 1,400 shale samples, largely from core-drill holes on the United States Naval Oil-Shale Reserve.

WILDLIFE

Another of Wyoming's important natural heritages is its wildlife. In the mountains and on the plains we have elk, deer, moose, bear, mountain sheep, and antelope, and big-game hunting is one of the important attractions in the State. Upland birds and wildfowl attract the nimrod, and the lakes and streams offer fine trout fishing. Thus, opportunities to set up varied types of tourist accommodations are many.

AGRICULTURE

The great plains of Wyoming contain a mineral-rich soil excellent for farming when it receives sufficient moisture. Half of the land area in the State is privately owned, and much of it is devoted to farming, with hay and wheat the chief crops. Here can be created many opportunities in farming for veterans. The veterans who have had the opportunity to take up homesteads (after having fulfilled the necessary requirements of ability and initial capital to file on a homestead) now find they are severely handicapped in their efforts to develop physical facilities on their homesteads, because with the rising costs they must put their money in fertilizer, seed, and the like. Under the Veterans' Economic Development Corporation Act they will obtain funds to improve their buildings, drill water wells, and make other improvements. They can pay back these loans through cash crops. As it is now they cannot get loans because of legal technicalities preventing them from gaining an equity in their land, to secure loans until they have proved up. They may get small loans on farm machinery, but the land itself does not constitute security for a loan. My bill would permit them to get money for improvements before they get full title to their land.

We have interstate organizations of farmers—Farm Bureau, Grange, Veterans Homesteader Association. Under the Veterans' Corporation these groups could obtain cooperatively the equipment that would be used on their projects. The joint purchasing of equipment which they could not otherwise afford could be arranged under this plan.

The extensive grazing lands of Wyoming have favored livestock raising, mainly cattle and sheep, since Territorial days. As a result of its sheep raising, Wyoming has become one of the greatest wool-producing States. Yet no wool is processed there for commercial use. There is considerable activity at present to develop wool-storage warehouses so that our people will gain the advantages of this storage activity, and under my plan we could also have plants to process the wool, manufacture wool yarns, and even produce woolen fabrics and finished products, such as clothing and blankets.

Livestock raising has always been such an important industry that stockmen have long been among our leaders in the State. Today many of these stockmen are also veterans of the past two world wars, and they are steadily becoming the leaders in our State and national affairs. The Congress can help veterans and other small-business men to make ever-increasing contributions to the advancement of the West and of the Nation. This can be done by affording them economic opportunities under my Wyoming plan, and the Veterans' Economic Development Corporation, by making available to them, on a repayment basis, funds to finance expansion and modernization of their essential operations. This is consistent with the opportunities now being made available to farmers in many areas, through the reimbursable appropriations provided by the Congress to finance irrigation and reclamation projects under the Reclamation Act of 1902.

TECHNICAL ADVISORY SERVICE UNDER THE "LITTLE MAN'S RFC"

The advisory service to be provided under the "little man's RFC" will afford the small-business man the latest technical, market and trade information—the kind of information which heretofore has been acquired only by big corporations having large expert staffs. With the help of this information, the little fellow can establish a new business, or expand his present business and increase his profits by:

1. Adding new products to his line;
2. Obtaining new markets and trade outlets for his products;
3. Finding better or cheaper ways to produce his present products;
4. Helping to fill the urgent need for American products in other countries;
5. Supplying defense program requirements;
6. Sharing in the present extensive program of exploitation of our natural resources;
7. Participating in the import and domestic stock piling of critical items for peacetime purposes for national defense.

Through this advisory service, technical and trade information recently developed at an expense of many billions of dollars in research by the United States Government, other friendly governments and private agencies, can be put to immediate profitable use by businessmen. Captured German and Japanese patents and secret processes—commercially valued at $25,000,000,000—also will be made available through the service.

Many successful small businesses have been started already as a result of obtaining this new technology. Among them are: The manufacture of dry ice, paper-match books, candy, Christmas-tree ornaments, envelope and stamp adhesives, straw-hat cleaners; the tanning of hides and skins into leather; making potato chips; metalizing baby shoes; tinning by hot-dipped methods; hot-dip galvanizing; electroplating; precision- or investment-mold casting; silver plating; porcelain enameling; and establishment of a small ferrous-metal foundry.

Following is a brief presentation of the kind of information and services that will be made available under the "little man's RFC."

1. Technical information:

a. United States Government research, costing billions of dollars, which includes the research carried on in all Government departments, including nonsecret developments in the Department of Defense.

b. Captured German and Japanese research documents, of which there are 1,600,000 German patents and processes. Many of them are unknown to the American market and are commercially practicable and profitable.

c. Exchange information with other countries. Friendly countries provide the United States with research information in exchange for American information.

2. Exploitation of our national resources:

a. The Government-controlled lands in the United States and in our possessions exceed 36 percent of the total land area. The small businessman can now have many new opportunities to expand his business or to start a new business.

(1) Mining: We have many known and unknown mineral deposits that have been exploited almost entirely by big business, as Government red tape and leasing laws have usually made it unprofitable for the little fellow to operate.

(2) Reclamation: In the reclamation areas, a wealth of new businesses can be started as new settlements are made or old settlements expanded.

(3) Timber and Forestry: Many small businesses can benefit from the new research in wood products and the derivatives of wood.

(4) New industrial uses for agricultural products.

Following are examples of the many new technical developments that are available to businessmen, and are now being utilized or studied for commercial production:

1. Synthetic fuel process to supplement, at competitive costs, our diminishing fuel supplies.

2. A new machine that will stamp dry ceramic parts rather than wet parts.

3. New and improved vacuum tubes and vacuum-tube techniques.

4. Greatly improved X-ray tubes and techniques.

5. Synthesis of hormones for medical profession.

6. Newer and better method of sand molding.

7. Development of pressure die casting of magnesium.

8. Development of new optical instruments and new methods of grinding and coating lenses.

9. New and less complicated method of producing color photography.

10. Ointment preventing the sterility of cattle.

11. Vaccine against foot and mouth disease, which has been tested in Mexico and the United States.

12. Dental development in which plastic substances have been introduced as an alloy substitute.

13. Seed virility agent used for a quick test of germination and also as a diagnostic dye for living tissue.

14. Pesticides as a more effective substitute for DDT.

15. Food fat from synthetic fatty acids, prepared in Germany especially for use in submarines, on account of its stability against rancidity.

16. Newer and better synthetic rubber.

17. Development of new textile fibers and low-temperature and scratch-resistant plastics.

18. Infrared searchlights and invisible rays for detecting objects in total darkness.

19. Invention of the selenium rectifier which is used in branches of the electronics industry.

20. Development of a new system of wired radio broadcasting in which no transmitter is involved and programs are received by metallic circuits.

21. A new device for translating speech directly into typed words.

22. A new fluid for ignition oil that will replace electric ignition.

23. Specifications for independent springing of automobile wheels.

24. Development of a small two-cycle Diesel engine.

25. Development in the field of powdered metallurgy products.

26. Soft grit blasting and cleaning of metal surfaces.

27. New methods of making dyes that would be usable on all kinds of cloths.

28. New techniques in building plywood boats.

29. Manufacture of a magnetic recording machine for radio station and home use.

30. Manufacture and distribution of nitrogenous fertilizer and manufacture of fertilizer from fish and sea-food byproducts.

ATOMIC ENERGY

Among the many reasons why we should have a "Little Man's RFC" is the fact that it would enable our veterans to participate in the tremendous economic possibilities which lie in the field of peacetime uses of atomic energy. Industrial and commercial opportunity in the field of atomic energy are more clearly defined today and there are firm indications that the development of nuclear science will have a far-reaching effect in many allied fields. Even in the most conservative estimates, the proposed possibilities of peacetime uses of atomic power are sufficient to stagger the imagination of the average citizen.

Mr. President, I now ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to insert in the RECORD an outline of the Wyoming State plan, which will be implemented by the enactment of the Veterans' Economic Development Corporation Act, initiated by my colleagues and myself in this historic Eightieth Congress.

WYOMING PLAN FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The State plan is designed to develop, under the provisions of the Veterans' Economic Development Corporation, the resources of the State to promote the prosperity, welfare, and health of all its people. Career opportunities for veterans as well as continued full employment for others would be fostered through the development of needed new businesses, the modernized productivity of agriculture, the utilization of unused natural resources and the implementation of needed self-liquidating public projects.

The Veterans' Corporation, with authority to extend credit totaling $5,000,000,000, will direct its loans toward supplementing the loans of banks and other existing private lending agencies, and the capital needed will derive from existing public money. No appropriations from Congress will be necessary, as only profitable, self-liquidating projects will be considered.

Planning activities would be on a State, county, regional, or community level. The State planning board, with the assistance of a know-how committee composed of technical experts, would plan for the physical development of the State, cooperating with other State agencies in the preparation of programs. It would also assist regional and county committees (which would plan for county and regional projects) and community planning boards, giving technical advice and assisting in the coordination of State, county, and community plans. It would further extend technical assistance to individuals, new businesses and projects.

Since the veterans' economic development program is essentially a grass-roots program, designed to serve small business and industry and agriculture in the community, emphasis on planning would be on a community level. Thus, while the State planning board and know-how committee would engage in planning on a State-wide basis, their primary function would be to serve the interests of the communities and to bring to bear the cooperation of the Federal Government on local projects whenever advisable and necessary.

Because of this emphasis on local planning, the following outline on State and community planning will list specific opportunities for development and expansion under the section on community planning.

FOREIGN AID

Ambassadors, ministers, and technical experts of friendly nations seeking our help under the Economic Cooperation Administration and other forms of aid have shown great interest in applying this State plan to their own countries. In their opinion, the plan will speed modernization of their economy and enable the people in their communities to become increasingly self-sufficient. This economic development plan will increase two-way trade between the people in the communities of the United States and of other countries for the increasing profit and security of all the people.

It is the belief of American authorities that the application of this plan in the communities of friendly countries will help provide a firmer foundation upon which our financial aid at Government level to these countries will rest. Further, the State plan may be put into effect abroad without cost to the American taxpayers as no appropriations of public money are required.

COMMUNITY PLANNING

1. Local planning board established, representing industry, finance, business, labor, sciences, the professions, veterans, religious groups, agriculture.

2. Planning board sets up a know-how committee.

3. Planning board outlines program of activity, receiving assistance in organizing and formulating programs from State planning commission or State know-how committee.

a. Inventory to determine present and future economic needs, including preparation of town and agricultural maps on the following:

(1) Population distribution and trends.
(2) Property tax surveys.
(3) Land use.
(4) Zoning ordinances.
(5) Traffic studies.
(6) Recreational facility requirements.
(7) Health and welfare survey.
(8) Community center redevelopments.
(9) Highway maintenance.
(10) Fire protection.
(11) Water supply.
(12) Housing.
(13) School system.
(14) Farming, acreages, crop production, livestock.
(15) Utility services.
(16) Transportation service—airport, etc.

(a) Uses facilities of Federal, State, and regional agencies for fact-finding and making projective studies.

4. Opportunities for development and expansion:

a. Local industries:

(1) Needed expansion of existing industries.

(2) Needed new industries:

(a) Research for new products.

(b) Use of captured enemy patents and new processes.

(c) Use of natural resources.

(d) New industrial uses for agricultural products.

(3) Processing plants for local products.
(4) Assembling plants for local markets.
(5) Service industries.
(6) Retail trade.

b. Land use:

(1) Land conservation:

(a) Irrigation—surface and underground-water resources.

(b) Reforestation.

(c) Erosion control.

(d) Soil treatment.
(e) Fertilizers.
(2) Water-power development:
(a) Utilities.
(b) Industrial uses.
(c) Agricultural purposes.
(d) Home.
(3) Agricultural practices:
(a) New methods of farming and livestock improvement.
(b) New farm enterprises and better use of land resources.
c. Commerce:
(1) Sales development—new market centers in growing communities.
(2) Farm cooperatives.
(3) Export development opportunities.
(4) Shipping:
(a) Assembly, processing, and warehousing facilities.
(b) Harbor improvements; feeder lines.
(5) Air transport.
(6) Trucking.
(7) Freight.
d. Mining:
(1) Geological surveys.
(2) Development of mineral resources.
(3) New uses for mineral products.
e. Tourist and recreational areas:
(1) Beaches and artificial ponds and lakes.
(2) Wood trails and roads, camping areas.
(3) Sports, fish and game stocking.
(4) Restoration of historical areas, scenic improvement.
(5) Hotels, cabins, and restaurants.
(6) Stream- and pond-pollution control.
(7) Handicrafts.
f. Public service (self-liquidating):
(1) Utilities and power development.
(2) Transportation of passengers:
(a) Bus.
(b) Streetcar.
(c) Train.
(d) Air travel.
(e) Boat.
g. Public health and welfare (self-liquidating):
(1) Medical clinics.
(2) Fire prevention.
(3) Sanitation:
(a) Stream-pollution abatement.
(b) Sewage disposal.
(c) Garbage disposal.
(4) Hospitals (improvement and/or expansion).
h. Public works and public improvements (self-liquidating):
(1) Housing:
(a) Multiple low-rental units.
(b) Prefabricated and industrial housing.
(2) Toll bridges.
(3) Parking areas and buildings.
(4) Municipal projects.
i. Education (self-liquidating):
(1) Colleges, professional and trade schools (improvement and/or expansion).
(2) Housing to accommodate veteran students.
(3) Community recreation centers.
(4) Vocational and social guidance.
(5) Rural school program, consolidation and transportation.

STATE AND REGIONAL PLANNING

1. State planning board established, representing industry, finance, business, labor, sciences, the professions, veterans, religious groups.

a. Supplements and implements work of existing State planning agencies.

b. Cooperates with and serves community planning boards.

2. Planning board sets up a State know-how committee composed of technical experts in various fields.

a. Know-how committee gives technical advice to planning board, to community know-how committees, to county or regional committees, to individuals, to new businesses and projects.

3. Planning board outlines program of activity, receiving assistance in organizing and formulating programs from State know-how committee or State planning commission.

a. Takes inventory to determine present and future economic needs of State and geographical area, preparing State, regional, and county maps and statistical studies.

(1) Uses facilities of Federal, State, and regional departments and agencies for fact-finding and making projective studies.

4. Planning board relates county, community, and intrastate regional plans to one another, thereby eliminating overlapping, confusion and unprofitable enterprises and projects.

5. Planning board cooperates with other States on regional projects in same geographic area, such as power developments, land conservation, etc.

(Specific opportunities for development and expansion outlined in detail in section on community planning.)

Communism in the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Un-American Activities, of which I am a member, has just issued a most important report on communism in the United States, consisting of 100 questions and answers which should be read and reread by every individual in America.

It contains the following sworn statement of William Z. Foster, head of the Communist Party in the United States, which shows what that subversive movement is driving at. It reads as follows:

No Communist, no matter how many votes he should secure in a national election, could, even if he would, become President of the present Government. When a Communist heads the Government of the United States—and that day will come just as surely as the sun rises—the Government will not be a capitalist Government but a Soviet government, and behind this Government will stand the Red army to enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The report then proceeds to set out the following questions and answers which turn the pitiless sunlight of merciless publicity onto the most dangerous subversive movement that has ever attempted to get a hold in the United States. It reads as follows:

ONE HUNDRED THINGS YOU SHOULD KNOW ABOUT COMMUNISM IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Forty years ago communism was just a plot in the minds of a very few peculiar people.

Today, communism is a world force governing millions of the human race and threatening to govern all of it.

Who are the Communists? How do they work? What do they want? What would they do to you?

For the past 10 years your committee has studied these and other questions and now some positive answers can be made.

Some answers will shock the citizen who has not examined communism closely. Most answers will infuriate the Communists.

These answers are given in five booklets, as follows:

1. One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism in the U. S. A.
2. One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism in Religion.
3. One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism in Education.
4. One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism in Labor.
5. One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism in Government.

These booklets are intended to help you know a Communist when you hear him speak and when you see him work.

If you ever find yourself in open debate with a Communist the facts here given can be used to destroy his arguments completely and expose him as he is for all to see.

Every citizen owes himself and his family the truth about communism because the world today is faced with a single choice: To go Communist or not to go Communist. Here are the facts.

1. What is communism? A system by which one small group seeks to rule the world.

2. Has any nation ever gone Communist in a free election? No.

3. Then how do the Communists try to get control? Legally or illegally, any way they can. Communism's first big victory was through bloody revolution. Every one since has been by military conquest, or internal corruption, or the threat of these.

Conspiracy is the basic method of communism in countries it is trying to capture.

Iron force is the basic method of communism in countries it has already captured.

4. What would happen if communism should come into power in this country? Our capital would move from Washington to Moscow. Every man, woman, and child would come under Communist discipline.

5. Would I be better off than I am now? No. And the next 17 answers show why.

6. Could I belong to a union? Under communism, all labor unions are run by the Government and the Communists run the Government. Unions couldn't help you get higher pay, shorter hours or better working conditions.

They would only be used by the Communists to help keep you down.

More complete details are given in One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism in Labor.

7. Could I change my job? No, you would work where you are told, at what you are told, for wages fixed by the Government.

8. Could I go to school? You could go to the kind of school the Communists tell you to, and nowhere else. You could go as long as they let you and no longer.

You could read only what the Communists let you; hear only what they let you, and as far as they could manage, you would know only what they let you.

For details, see One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism in Education.

9. Could I belong to the Elks, Rotary, or the American Legion? No. William Z. Foster, the head of the Communists in the United States, says:

"Under the dictatorship all the capitalist parties—Republican, Democratic, Progressive, Socialist, etc.—will be liquidated, the Communist Party functioning alone as the party of the toiling masses.

"Likewise will be dissolved, all other organizations that are political props of the bourgeois rule, including chambers of commerce, employers' associations, Rotary Clubs, American Legion, YMCA, and such fraternal orders as the Masons, Odd Fellows, Elks, Knights of Columbus, etc."

10. Could I own my own farm? No. Under communism, the land is the property of the Government, and the Government is run by the Communists.

You would farm the land under orders and you could not make any decisions as to when or where you would sell the produce of your work, or for how much.

11. Could I own my own home? No. Under communism, all real estate in the city as well as the country belongs to the Government, which is in turn run by the Communists.

Your living quarters would be assigned to you, and you would pay rent as ordered.

12. What would happen to my insurance? The Communists would take it over.

13. What would happen to my bank account? All above a small sum would be confiscated. The rest would be controlled for you.

14. Could I leave any property to my family when I die? No, because you wouldn't have any to leave.

15. Could I travel around the country as I please? No. You would have to get police permission for every move you make, if you could get it.

16. Could I belong to a church? In Russia, the Communists have for 30 years tried every way they could to destroy religion.

Having failed that, they are now trying to use religion from the inside and the same party strategy is now operating in the United States of America.

See One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism in Religion.

17. Could I start up a business and hire people to work for me? To do so would be a crime for which you would be severely punished.

18. Could I teach what I please with "academic freedom"? You would teach only what the Communists authorize you to teach. You would be asking for jail or death to try anything else.

19. Could I do scientific research free of governmental interference and restrictions? Police and spies would watch your every move. You would be liquidated on the slightest suspicion of doing anything contrary to orders.

20. Could I have friends of my own choice as I do now? No, except those approved by the Communists in charge of your life from cradle to grave.

21. Could I travel abroad or marry a foreigner? You could do nothing of that sort except with permission of the Communists.

22. Could I exchange letters with friends in other countries? With the police reading your mail, you could try—once.

23. Could I vote the Communists out of control. No. See One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism in Government, showing the facts of Communist government in other countries and the facts of Communism at work within our own government.

24. But doesn't communism promise poor people a better life? Communist politicians all over the world try in every way to break down nations as they are, hoping that in the confusion they will be able to seize control.

Promising more than you can deliver is an old trick in the history of the human race.

Compare communism's promises with communism's performances in countries where it has come to power.

25. What are some differences between Communist promise and Communist performance? When it is agitating for power, communism promises more money for less work and security against war and poverty.

In practice, it has not delivered any of this, anywhere in the world.

26. But don't the Communists promise an end to racial and religious intolerance? Yes, but in practice they have murdered millions for being religious and for belonging to a particular class. Your race would be no help to you under communism.

Your beliefs could get you killed.

27. Why shouldn't I turn Communist? You know what the United States is like today. If you want it exactly the opposite, you should turn Communist.

But before you do, remember you will lose your independence, your property, and your freedom of mind.

You will gain only a risky membership in a conspiracy which is ruthless, godless, and crushing upon all except a very few at the top.

28. How many Communists are there in the world? There are 20,000,000 Communists, more or less, in a world of 2,295,125,000 people. In other words, about 1 person in 115 is a Communist, on a world basis.

29. How many people are now ruled by communism? About 200,000,000 directly; 200,000,000 more indirectly, and an additional 250,000,000 are under daily Communist pressure to surrender.

30. Which countries are Communist controlled or governed? Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Finland, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Russia, Yugoslavia.

Important regions of Austria, Germany, Korea, Mongolia and Manchuria.

Communism is concentrating now on immediate capture of Afghanistan, China, France, Greece, Latin America, Iran, and Palestine.

It has plans to seize every other country including the United States.

31. How many Communists are there in the United States? There are approximately 80,000 out of a population of 145,340,000 people. J. Edgar Hoover has testified that "in 1917 when the Communists overthrew the Russian Government there was one Communist for every 2,277 persons in Russia. In the United States today there is one Communist for every 1,814 persons in the country."

32. Why aren't there more? Because the Communist Party does not rely upon actual Party membership for its strength. J. Edgar Hoover testified:

"What is important is the claim of the Communists themselves that for every Party member there are ten others ready, willing, and able to do the party's work. Herein lies the greatest menace of communism.

"For these are the people who infiltrate and corrupt various spheres of American life. So rather than the size of the Communist Party the way to weigh its true importance is by testing its influence, its ability to infiltrate."

33. How are they organized? Primarily around something they call a political party, behind which they operate a carefully trained force of spies, revolutionaries, and conspirators.

The basic fact to remember is that communism is a world revolutionary movement and Communists are disciplined agents, operating under a plan of war.

34. Where are their headquarters in the United States, and who is in charge? Headquarters are at 35 East Twelfth Street, New York City. William Z. Foster, of 1040 Melton Avenue, New York City, has the title of "Chairman of the Communist Party of the United States," but Foster is actually just a figurehead under control of foreign operatives unseen by and unknown to rank and file Communists.

35. What is the emblem of the Communist Party in the United States? The hammer and sickle.

36. What is the emblem of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union? The hammer and sickle.

It is also the official emblem of the Soviet Government.

37. What is the flag of the Communist Party in the United States? The red flag, the same as that of all Communist Parties of the world.

38. What is the official song of the Communist Party of the United States? The Internationale. Here is the chorus:

"'Tis the final conflict,
Let each stand in his place;
The International Soviet shall be the human race."

39. Do the Communists pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States? The present head of the Communists in the United States has testified under oath that they do not.

40. What is the Communist Party set-up? At the bottom level are "shop and street units" composed of three or more Communists in a single factory, office, or neighborhood.

Next is the section which includes all units in a given area of a city. Then come districts, composed of one or more States.

At the top is the national organization, composed of a national committee and a number of commissions.

In the appendix of this pamphlet you will find listed the officers and address for each district of the Communist Party in the United States.

41. Who can become a member of the Communist Party of the United States? Anybody over 17 years of age who can convince the party that his first loyalty will be to the Soviet Union and that he is able to do the party's work as a Soviet agent.

He must be an active member of a party unit. He must obey all party decisions. He must read the party literature. He must pay dues regularly.

42. How do you go about joining the party? You must know some member in good standing who will vouch for you to his party unit. Your acceptance still depends on the verdict of party officials that you will and can obey orders.

43. Can you be a secret member? All Communists are secret members until authorized by the party to reveal their connection. Party membership records are kept in code. Communists have a real name and a "party name."

44. Are meetings public like those of ordinary political parties? No; meetings are secret and at secret addresses. Records are all secret and in code. Public demonstrations are held at regular periods.

45. What dues do you have to pay? They are adjusted according to income. They may range from as low as 2 cents a week to $15 a week with special assessments in addition.

46. What do you have to promise? To carry out Communist Party orders promptly. To submit without question to party decisions and discipline.

To work for "The triumph of Soviet power in the United States."

47. After you join, what do you have to do? You have to obey the party in all things. It may tell you to change your home, your job, your husband, or wife. It may order you to lie, steal, rob, or to go out into the street and fight.

It claims the power to tell you what to think and what to do every day of your life.

When you become a Communist, you become a revolutionary agent under a discipline more strict than the United States Army, Navy, Marines, or Air Force have ever known.

48. Why do people become Communists then? Basically, because they seek power and recognize the opportunities that communism offers the unscrupulous.

But no matter why a particular person becomes a Communist, every member of the Party must be regarded the same way, as one seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States.

49. What kind of people become Communists? The real center of power in communism is within the professional classes.

Of course, a few poor people respond to the Communist claim that it is a "working class movement."

But taken as a whole the party depends for its strength on the support it gets from teachers, preachers, actors, writers, union officials, doctors, lawyers, editors, business men, and even from millionaires.

50. Can you quit being a Communist when you want to? The Communists regard themselves as being in a state of actual war against life as the majority of Americans want it.

Therefore, party members who quit or fail to obey orders are looked on as traitors to the "class war" and they may expect to suffer accordingly when and as the party gets around to them.

51. How does the Communist Party of the United States work, day by day? The Communist Party of the United States works inside the law and the Constitution, and outside the law and the Constitution with intent to get control any way it can.

52. What are some types of Communist activities within the law? Working their way into key positions in the schools, the churches, the labor unions, and farm organizations. Inserting Communist propaganda into art, literature, and entertainment. Nominating or seeking control of candidates for public office. The immediate objective of the Communist Party is to confuse and divide the majority so that in a time of chaos they can seize control.

53. What are some types of Communist activities outside the law? Spying, sabotage, passport fraud, perjury, counterfeiting, rioting, disloyalty in the Army, Navy and Air Force.

54. What are some official newspapers or magazines of the Communist Party? Daily and Sunday Worker, 50 East Thirteenth Street, New York City; Morning Freiheit, 50 East Thirteenth Street, New York City; Daily Peoples World, 590 Folsom Street, San Francisco, Calif.; Masses and Mainstream, 832 Broadway, New York City; Political Affairs, 832 Broadway, New York City. There are also numerous foreign language publications.

55. Does the party also publish books and pamphlets? Yes, thousands of them, through such official publishing houses as: International Publishers, 381 Fourth Street, New York City; Workers Library Publishers, 832 Broadway, New York City; New Century Publishers, 832 Broadway, New York City.

56. Does the party have public speakers and press agents? Hundreds of them, paid and unpaid, public and secret, hired and volunteered, intentional and unintentional.

Publicity seeking is one of the party's principal "legal" occupations, intended to confuse people on all important issues of the day.

57. How does the party get the money for all this? At first it received money from Moscow but now it raises millions of dollars here in the United States through dues, foundations, endowments, special drives, and appeals.

58. Do only Communists carry out Communist work? No. The party uses what it calls "Fellow Travelers" and "Front Organizations" in some of its most effective work.

59. What is a fellow traveler? One who sympathizes with the Party's aims and serves the Party's purposes in one or more respects without actually holding a Party card.

60. Is he important in the Communist movement? Vital. The fellow traveler is the hook with which the Party reaches out for funds and respectability and the wedge that it drives between people who try to move against it.

61. What is a Communist front? An organization created or captured by the Communists to do the Party's work in special fields. The front organization is Communism's greatest weapon in this country today and takes it places it could never go otherwise—among people who would never willingly act as Party agents.

It is usually found hiding among groups devoted to idealistic activities. Here are 10 examples out of hundreds of Communist fronts which have been exposed:

1. American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.
2. American Slav Congress.
3. American Youth for Democracy.
4. Civil Rights Congress.
5. Congress of American Women.
6. Council for Pan-American Democracy.
7. International Workers Order.
8. National Committee to Win the Peace.
9. People's Institute of Applied Religion.
10. League of American Writers.

62. How can a Communist be identified? It is easy. Ask him to name ten things wrong with the United States. Then ask him to name two things wrong with Russia.

His answers will show him up even to a child.

Communists will denounce the President of the United States.

They will never denounce Stalin.

63. How can a fellow traveler be identified? Apply the same test as above and watch him defend Communists and Communism.

65. How can a Communist front be identified? If you are ever in doubt, write, wire or telephone the House Committee on Un-American Activities, room 226, House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C. Telephone National 3120, Extension 1405.

65. What do Communists call those who criticize them? "Red baiters," "witch hunters," "Fascists." These are just three out of a tremendous stock of abusive labels Communists attempt to smear anybody who challenges them.

66. How do they smear labor opposition? As "scabs," "finks," "company stooges," and "labor spies."

67. How do they smear public officials? As "reactionaries," "Wall Street tools," "Hitlerites," and "imperialists."

68. What is their favorite escape when challenged on a point of fact? To accuse you of "dragging in a red herring," a distortion of an old folk saying that originally described the way to throw hounds off the track of a hot trail.

69. What is the difference in fact between a Communist and a Fascist? None worth noticing.

70. How do Communists get control of organizations in which the majority are not Communists?

They work. Others won't.

They come early and stay late. Others don't.

They know how to run a meeting. Others don't.

They demand the floor. Others won't.

They do not hesitate to use physical violence or any form of persecution. They stay organized and prepared in advance of each meeting. The thing to remember is that Communists are trained agents under rigid discipline, but they can always be defeated by the facts.

71. When was the Communist Party of the United States organized, and where? September 1919, at Chicago.

72. Has it always been called by its present name? No. Here are the recorded, official name changes:

1919: Communist Party of America, and the Communist Labor Party of America.

1921: The above parties merged into the United Communist Party of America.

1922: The Communist Party of America and the Workers Party of America.

1925: The above merged into one organization known as Workers (Communist) Party of America.

1928: Communist Party of the United States.

1944: Communist Political Association.

1945 to present: Communist Party of the United States of America.

73. Why has it changed its name so often? To serve Moscow and evade the law of the United States.

74. Why isn't the Communist party a political party just like the Democratic and Republican Parties? Because it takes its orders from Moscow.

75. Are the Communists agents of a foreign power? Yes. For full details write the Committee on Un-American Activities, room 226, House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C., for House Report No. 209, entitled "The Communist Party of the United States as an Agent of a Foreign Power."

76. Where can a Communist be found in everyday American life? Look for him in your school, your labor union, your church, or your civic club. Communists themselves say that they can be found "on almost any conceivable battlefront for the human mind."

77. What States have barred the Communist Party from the ballot? Alabama, Arkansas, Illinois, Kansas, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Tennessee, and Wisconsin.

78. How does communism expect to get power over the United States if it cannot win elections? The Communists only compete for votes to cover their fifth-column work behind a cloak of legality. They expect to get power by any means, just so they get it.

The examples of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other countries in Europe show just how many methods communism applies.

In each country different details—in all the same result.

79. Why don't Communists over here go to Russia if they like that system so much? They are on duty here to take over this country. They couldn't go to Russia even if they wanted to, except on orders from Moscow.

80. Which Communists get such orders? High party officials and special agents who are to be trained in spying, sabotage, and detailed planning for capture of this country.

81. Where are they trained in Moscow? The Lenin Institute, a college in revolution which teaches how to capture railroads, ships, radio stations, banks, telephone exchanges, newspapers, waterworks, power plants, and such things.

82. Does Stalin let American Communists in to see him? Yes. Earl Browder and William Z. Foster, the two heads of the party for the last 20 years, have both admitted under oath that they conferred with Stalin.

The records show that Browder, for instance, made 15 known trips to Moscow, several with false passports.

83. Are American Communists used in the Soviet secret service? Yes, here are the names of a few such agents proved on the public records:

Nicholas Dozenberg, George Mink, Philip Aronberg, Charles Dirba, Pascal Cosgrove, J. Mindel, Alexander Trachtenberg, Julia Stuart Poyntz, Jack Johnstone, Charles Krumbein, and Albert Feirabend.

84. What central organization controls all the Communist parties of the world? An organization originally set up in Moscow by the Government of Russia, and known as the Communist International called Comintern for short.

It has since changed its name to Communist Information Bureau and is known as the Cominform.

85. Who is the most important Communist in the United States today? The Cominform representative.

86. Why is he here? To see that American Communists follow the orders of the Soviet-directed Cominform in all things.

87. Do they? Yes.

88. Has any representative of this central organization ever been caught? Yes. For example, over a period of 12 years one Gerhart Eisler, alias Brown, alias Edwards, alias

Berger, did such work, making regular trips between the United States and Europe.

On February 6, 1947, his activities were exposed by the House Committee on Un-American Activities and he has since been convicted in court of perjury and contempt of Congress.

89. What is the best way to combat communism? Detection, exposure, and prosecution.

90. Are these being done? Millions of dollars have been spent by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Army and Navy Intelligence, and other executive agencies to detect and keep track of Communists since the party's organization in this country a generation ago.

Exposure in a systematic way began with the formation of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, May 26, 1938.

Prosecution of Communists, as such, has never taken place in this country, as yet.

91. Have any Communists been prosecuted on other grounds? Yes. For violations of such laws as those governing passports, immigration, perjury, criminal syndicalism, and contempt.

92. Is this enough? No. The House of Representatives maintains this Committee on Un-American Activities to study the problems of communism and all other subversive movements and recommend new laws if it feels they are needed.

93. Has the committee made any such recommendations? Yes. The latest is H. R. 5852, known as the Mundt-Nixon bill, which passed the House of Representatives on May 19, 1948, by a vote of 319 to 58.

94. What does the bill do? The main points are:

To expose Communists and their fronts by requiring them to register publicly with the Attorney General and plainly label all their propaganda as their own.

To forbid Communists passports or Government jobs.

To make it illegal for anybody to try to set up in this country a totalitarian dictatorship having any connection with a foreign power.

95. What is communism's greatest strength? Its secret appeal to the lust for power. Some people have a natural urge to dominate others in all things.

Communism invites them to try.

The money, hard work, conspiracy, and violence that go into communism, add up to a powerful force moving in a straight line toward control of the world.

96. What is communism's greatest weakness? The very things that give it strength. For just as some people have a natural lust to dominate everybody else, so do most people have a natural determination to be free.

Communism can dominate only by force.

Communism can be stopped by driving every communist out of the place where he can capture power.

97. What is treason? Our Constitution says that "Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort. No person shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in open court."

98. Are the communists committing treason today? The Soviet Union has launched what has been called a "cold war" on the United States. Therefore, communists are engaged in what might be called "Cold War Treason."

The Mundt-Nixon bill is intended to fight this "cold war treason."

If our war with communism should ever change from "cold" to "hot" we can expect the communists of the United States to fight against the flag of this country openly.

99. What should I do about all this? Know the facts. Stay on the alert. Work as hard against the communists as they work against you.

100. Where can I get information about communism regularly? Write the House Committee on Un-American Activities, room 226, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C., for a selected list of official publications.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if Congress would have this document printed in sufficient numbers and made available to every patriotic American, it might go a long way toward saving our Government and our American way of life from destruction at the hands of these subversive elements.

United Minorities Make American Majorities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on June 15, 1948, during the course of the reading of the draft bill, our ears were offended by an ill-conceived tirade by the Representative from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Because two of our colleagues of shades of skin and of religious belief different from his, saw fit to offer and support a civil rights amendment, he felt called upon to condemn them as "misrepresentative of certain minorities."

That same evening I flew back to Brooklyn to attend a dinner tendered by Youth United for Better Citizens of Tomorrow. The guests of honor were the members of the Brooklyn Dodgers baseball team.

On the upper dais were serious-minded, public-spirited citizens and public officials from all over the State, of all shades of political opinion, religious beliefs, and color of skin.

On the lower dais were seated 25 young men (the Dodgers ball team) recruited from every corner of this country and every walk of life. They, too, were of all shades of color and belief.

In the audience were about 1,000 of Brooklyn's leading citizenry, also of all shades of color and belief. They paid $100 a head to be there.

They broke bread together and all came away, white and black, Christian and Jew, the better for it. Under the leadership of John Cashmore, the Democratic leader of the county, John Crews, the Republican leader of the county, and George Beldock, a supreme court justice, and many others too numerous to mention, a united community endeavor was launched to make the youth of today the better citizens of tomorrow.

There we had the minorities of America welded together into the kind of irrepressible majority that makes this country strong.

Those are the kind of minorities which my colleagues (so unjustifiably attacked by the Representative from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]) represent honestly and decently in the American way, the Godly way.

My county alone contributed to the armed services of our country in World War II seven times as many men and women as voted in 1946 in all of Mississippi. They served us to keep this country free—yes, free even from the wild and irrational rantings and ravings of some people who claim to be "the white Christian majority."

If we have television strong enough to reach into the heavens on their judgment day, we would probably see them standing before their Maker, our God, and hear Him say: "Can these be My children? Have they learned nothing of My teachings?"

I wonder if they do not have many sleepless nights, fearing that their reincarnation may see them returned to earth in black skins. Would their own brethren then cast them out?

When the minorities of Mississippi amalgamate and form a majority, they will permanently consign the representative from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] to the Middle Ages in which he seems to live.

Ireland's Bad Economic Condition Can Be Solved Only by Ending the Partition of That Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to discuss briefly the present economic situation in Ireland, also known as Eire, which is composed of the 26 free and independent counties of Ireland, as opposed to the remaining 6 counties, which constitute northern Ireland and which is still subject to British control and domination.

Ireland is largely dependent upon a steady flow of imports into the country in order to maintain her economy on an even footing. Agriculture is the principal occupation of the Irish people, and throughout the war era, the Irish were unable to import the fertilizers so essential to the maintenance of the productivity of her soil. The inability to import feedstuffs for her cattle, hogs, and poultry had a very damaging effect upon the agricultural economy of Ireland.

Prior to the war, Ireland annually imported 400,000 tons of wheat, 300,000 tons of maize and 30,000 tons of oil cake. Since such imports were impossible during the war, Ireland found it necessary to attempt the production of these products at home or to produce substitute crops for them. As a result 62 percent more acreage was turned to the plow than had been previously. This had a two-fold effect on Irish agriculture in that it impoverished the soil and also reduced the grazing areas.

Today the number of cattle in Ireland is at its lowest figure in more than 40 years. The number of pigs have been reduced by half and the number of poultry dropped one-third. Because of the chemical deficiencies in the grass today,

the livestock population is threatened with still further reduction in numbers. In this regard Ireland has suffered more than many of the occupied areas of Europe, since many of these countries were not dependent upon the import of fertilizers or of feeds, and so their agricultural production was maintained in order to provide more foodstuffs for the German people.

In order to indicate the extent of the loss of fertility of Irish soil I submit the following production figures of the major crops in Ireland.

Comparative production per acre in 1938 and 1947

Crop	Unit	1938	1947
Wheat	Hundredweight	17.2	10.8
Oats	do	19.6	15.8
Barley	do	18.7	12.1
Turnips	Ton	17.5	14.9
Mangels	do	18.2	14.8
Potatoes	do	7.5	6.8

The remedy for this situation depends upon the ability of Ireland to procure, principally from the Western Hemisphere, coarse grains, fertilizers, and agricultural machinery. In addition Ireland requires consumer goods, such as wheat, sugar, fruit, and so on, since her climate is not conducive to their production, and in order to permit the acreage, which was used during the war for producing such crops or substitutes for them, may be returned to more beneficial production and use.

If it becomes possible for Ireland to obtain the assistance she needs then it will be possible for her to play an important part in the general recovery program of Europe. In order to do this Ireland has planned, in addition to her program for soil revitalization and reconversion to more beneficial use, a program of land drainage and reclamation, as well as for an increase in the generation of electricity to augment her rural electrification and to reduce somewhat her petroleum imports. Ireland's program, dependent upon the availability of adequate assistance, calls for very material increases in agricultural production. The changes which would be effected are shown by the following production estimate figures:

Crop	Unit	1947–48	1950–51
Bread grains	Hectare	233,000	103,000
Coarse grains	do	387,000	338,000
Sugar beets	do	24,000	26,000
Potatoes	do	154,000	174,000
Butter	Metric ton	45,000	60,000
Meat	do	315,000	384,000
Milk	do	1,905,000	2,533,000
Eggs	do	51,000	100,000
Potatoes	do	3,009,000	3,503,000
Pig meats	do	40,000	100,000
Cattle	Number	3,961,000	4,200,000
Pigs	do	463,000	1,000,000
Sheep	do	2,095,000	3,000,000
Poultry	do	17,107,000	25,000,000

In addition it is planned in 1951–52 to further increase the production of pig meats to 150,000 metric tons; eggs to 120,000 tons and poultry to 30,000,000 head. Interestingly enough the production goals for 1951–52 under the European recovery program will still be running short of these very products. Taking the average production for the years 1934–38 as 100 percent, the program estimates that production should reach the following percentages: pigs 85 percent, meat 85 percent, milk 92 percent and eggs 90 percent. If Irish production is therefore increased, European production goals will come closer to being met and the demand upon the Western Hemisphere for assistance thereby reduced.

With this picture of the agricultural economy of Ireland in mind, it is somewhat surprising to note that Ireland is at present being offered only loans under the European recovery program, while Northern Ireland, which enjoys in general the same type of economy, along with Britain is receiving three-fourths by way of grant and only one-fourth by way of loan. Why this unequal treatment is being proposed is not clear to me, since the agricultural, financial and other economic conditions in both parts of this island are the same and no material difference can be found in Northern Ireland and in Eire. I hope that this unequal treatment is not being rendered because of any desire on the part of our State Department to bolster the efforts of Great Britain to maintain the forceful partition of Ireland. Whether it is or not, certainly it must have that result and will create the belief that the United States Government is supporting the British domination of Northern Ireland contrary to the wishes of the great majority of the Irish people.

Ireland is grouped within the Sterling block and so her finances are tied to those of England. Any shortage of dollars in Ireland can only be made up from whatever dollars are available in the Sterling pool controlled by Great Britain. Last year Ireland had a deficit of $90,000,000 in balancing her payments with the Western Hemisphere. There is little opportunity for Ireland to alter this situation, since the bulk of her exports go to England and Europe generally, so that they are not productive of dollar revenues. As a result any loan to Ireland will have to be repaid by drawing upon the Sterling pool and thus further reducing these balances and thereby further jeopardizing the ultimate recovery of the Sterling area group of countries. So closely linked together are the economies of Ireland and Great Britain, that what happens in one country directly and promptly affects conditions in the other. Likewise whatever conditions prevail in Eire, the same also prevail in Northern Ireland more or less, since the two are but one country in fact, regardless of the existence of the fictitious border between the two.

Because of these various considerations I feel that whatever treatment is accorded to Great Britain should likewise be accorded to Ireland, if we are to achieve beneficial results with our program for European recovery. Instead we are making a grant of three-quarters of every dollar going to Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the while we demand the repayment of every dollar advanced to Eire. The inescapable conclusion of all this is that this country is directly trying to influence the people of Ireland to return to British subjugation, or else, indirectly allowing Great Britain to create that impression in Ireland. Far from allowing ourselves to be placed in such a position, we should demand that Great Britain withdraw her control over Northern Ireland and permit the reunification of this nation without further delay. As soon as that can occur, I am sure that a great portion of the American public will feel more kindly disposed towards England, especially when they know that none of the funds being advanced by the United States are being used to subsidize the government in Belfast of Northern Ireland. Not only would the ending of the partition of Ireland mean the upbuilding of British good will in this country, but also throughout the world, particularly wherever the sons of Erin have migrated and whence they look with sincere concern for the welfare of their ancestral land, a welfare that can only be assured when the people have once more been united and that ancient land takes its proper place in the family of nations.

Selling Peace Through World Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to insert an address by the Honorable James A. Farley, entitled "Selling Peace Through World Trade" given at the sales executive club luncheon during the National Federation of Sales Executives' convention, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel on June 17, 1948. The address follows:

This is a particularly opportune time to talk about selling, world trade, and peace. Selling is what most of us in this room make our living by. Trade, in one form or another, is what practically all the rest of us make our living by. Even the farmer who grows wheat is dependent on world conditions for his market.

Peace—or, rather, the absence of it—is probably the most important single factor in the lives of all of us today. The absence of peace makes necessary a large Army, Navy, and Air Force, and this in turn affects our manpower and creates shortages of goods. The absence of peace is, to a large extent, responsible for the continuing inflationary rise in our price structure. Failure to conclude a world-wide peace has made it impossible to demobilize fully, and has rudely interrupted the return from wartime conditions to normal.

If you are a globe trotter like me, you cannot fail but be impressed by the way the American goods have been broadcast throughout the globe, both during the war and since. In France you see a railroad car and it looks French. It is small and has those peculiar-looking European bumpers instead of couplings as we have here, but if you go up and look at it closely you see that it says on it, "Made in the U. S. A." You see a bulldozer in India and it is an American product. You see a huge highway truck on the China roads and it comes from America. You are surprised to see a tractor on a small farm in Italy—but your surprise ends in the discovery that it was made in America.

The American world traveler today is amazed at the degree to which our substance—our iron, our steel, our coal, our copper, our wheat, our food, and our clothes—dots the landscape of the world. Everywhere American goods, American money, and American energy have gone to work speeding the rehabilitation and reconstruction of the world. In fact, it is doubtful whether without American aid this world reconstruction could take place at all. Last year about this time it was announced that we were considering the Marshall plan. The announcement was like turning on a light all over Europe.

The Marshall plan, or the ERP, as it is now known, has as its purpose the rehabilitation of nations so that they can again become self-supporting participants in world economy and in world trade.

We need this trade because we need export business. If the American economy is to thrive, we need a larger export business than ever before.

We need this trade because, in many respects, the United States is changing from a have nation to a have-not nation. Many of our raw materials are becoming depleted; and if they are to be replenished, they must be restocked by imports.

We need this trade because it is the history of trade that it increases the standard of living of all the people who participate in it. The nation that trades has always been materially better off than the nation that does not.

In other words, we need this world trade for economic reasons.

But we also need world trade for a far bigger reason, which, for want of a better name, I shall call a moral reason.

It is not only true that American goods are now all over the world, but if you could see them in all the far-off places—in Brisbane, in Ceylon, in Alexandria, in Paris, in Rome—as I have, you would follow them with a feeling of intense pride. American goods abroad everywhere carry with them a feeling of integrity and of good faith.

This is true practically no matter what the merchandise may be. You see a second-hand coat on the back of a woman in Marseilles and she points out to you, with pride, that it comes from America and pauses to point out the exceptional quality of the cloth. You see a woman shopper go into a store in Genoa to ask for sugar, and she tells the storekeeper that she is not looking for some of that coarse, dingy-looking stuff that passes for sugar at home, but that she wants white, fine-grained American sugar. All over the world American soap and cigarettes have become so known for their quality that they pass for currency and take the place of money. In Greece the word nylon has come to be a synonym for anything fine. They may not have nylon stockings in Greece, but they do have nylon days, nylon weather, nylon health, and nylon friends. To say that you're nylon is to say you're tops.

In fact, the foreigner is apt to appreciate the quality of American goods far more than we do. He does not take it for granted, but is continually surprised and gratified by it.

The American system of a standardized product, uniformly made, of a constant quality and accompanied by a trade-mark which designates its source so that the customer may know who to hold responsible—whom to praise or to blame for it—has never received a more sincere tribute than this preference on the part of the foreigner for our goods to his own.

This is only natural. American products are a product of our way of living—not only of our economic system, but of our morality. Implicit in every American product is a sense of fair dealing, of responsibility, of keeping a promise, of identification of source, and of a contract entered into by buyer and seller in good faith.

This uniform quality of the American product is more important today than ever before. For if you travel around the globe as I do, you are impressed by a startling thing. The world is tired of words. Everywhere the meaning of words is tending to break down—they are used by too many people in too many untruthful ways. The finest words have been used to make so many promises that have not been kept that people everywhere are skeptical. It is practically impossible for the average foreigner to separate fact from fiction. He has heard so many lies that all too often when he hears the truth he is apt to dismiss it as propaganda. Everywhere in the world people have been driven by abuse of language to judge you not so much by what you say as by what you do.

Now, it is a well known fact that people understand things much better than they understand ideas. Even a poor woman who lives in a slum in Naples can see and feel and appreciate a washing machine. When we speak to the outsider of democracy he may or may not understand us—the idea may be beyond his depth, or perhaps a poor brand of democracy has been sold to him by somebody else before. But when you offer him a ride in your jeep or you offer him a cigarette or a bar of chocolate, this is something that he can taste or feel. This is something that he can easily judge for himself.

We are, therefore, in a position where the things that we manufacture are perhaps the best proof and the very best ambassadors of what we are. Perhaps the most impressive thing that can be said to the foreigner about American democracy is that it is a system capable of producing low-priced merchandise of standard quality for universal distribution—that it is a system capable of producing for ordinary folks everywhere the kind of American merchandise, from trucks to shoe laces, that they saw and appreciated during the war.

I would like to quote a few examples from my own experience with Coca-Cola.

If you were to visit Alexandria, Egypt, you would find there a modern new Coca-Cola plant. It sets new standards of sanitation in the manufacture of foodstuffs. Every food plant that will be built in the future in Egypt will be the better off for the example which this modern Coca-Cola bottling plant has set. A public health official in the Near East told one of our people that the influence of Coca-Cola on sanitation would be one of the most effective factors in promoting health that had ever reached his country. To use his own words, "Coca-Cola is worth its weight in gold as education in cleanliness".

In a Coca-Cola plant in Africa shower baths for the employees are mandatory. In the beginning it was hard to get employees because shower baths were required. Today people come and apply at this plant for work, giving as a reason the fact that they can take a shower.

This influence goes far beyond the physical. For example, again in Egypt, the Coca-Cola man wears a uniform. At first the employees were skeptical. Today they wear it as a badge of honor because it represents to them and to the people that they deal with the whole idea of the fair treatment of a salesman by his employer and of a dealer by his salesman. One of our salesmen is one of the wealthiest people in his community. He sells Coca-Cola not because he needs to make a living, but because it gives him prestige.

Here is a story brought back by one of our men from one of the remote Arab villages in which you would hardly expect to find Coca-Cola at all. An old man stood in front of a kiosk drinking a bottle of coke. Our interviewer asked him why he drank it. The old man said: "I tried a bottle and found it sweet. It had sugar in it and I liked it. I passed it to my wife to taste and she liked it. The children tasted it and they also found it good. Every morning I have bought a bottle and it is always the same and such a thing has never been with us before."

The more people we expose to American products, the better they will understand the kind of people we are. The more who experience our merchandise, the better off both they and we will be, and the greater the mutual understanding between us. There is no doubt in my mind that a Sears, Roebuck or a Montgomery Ward catalog, if we could distribute one to every inhabitant of the globe, would be better propaganda for the American way than all the propaganda in the world.

Let us now consider the kind of a world we live in. I think that you will readily agree with me that the most important single economic, political, and moral fact in the world today is Russia and Russian communism.

What Russian communism really is is difficult for an American even to visualize. It is so far from our own purposes that even after we see it we refuse to believe it. Its objective is deliberate destruction—to produce chaos and weakness on a world-wide basis, so that the communistic idea may inherit and control. It is a system based on labor camps where workmen are used and thrown away exactly as we might use and throw away a pair of shoes. It is a system of faithlessness where a promise means nothing and all is expediency. It represents a high-jacking of both scientific and intellectual movement for purposes of world control.

This faces us with the problem of what to do. We could follow one of two courses, both extreme.

The first is to depend on words, propaganda, and argument. This is not sufficient. As we have already said, the world is confused about words and too many words have been spoken already. Further, it will do us no good to stoop to the same level as our competitor. All of you engaged in commerce know that the best thing to do about competition is to leave it strictly alone and that no way has ever been devised of winning an argument with a skunk.

The second way is to depend on the atom bomb. This, likewise, as Americans, we find repulsive. The trouble with the atom bomb is that if you use it you have to kill 97 Russians who are plain ordinary well-meaning human beings like ourselves to get at 3 Communist Russian fanatics. Such methods do not fit our way of life, and with us the atom bomb must remain as the last resort in self-defense and not a weapon of attack.

What does this leave us? It leaves us, as usual with Americans, the middle way, and that middle way is trade. Trade leads to an intermingling, interdependence, and understanding between peoples.

Now, some of our Russian friends might contend that trade is the cause of wars. I deny that categorically. Wars are not caused by trade but by artificial barriers raised to trade. The history of trade everywhere is that it makes people so mutually dependent that they cannot get along without each other.

We sometimes forget the extent to which this is true. I should like to quote just two recent carefully considered observations on this subject—one by a world-famous historian, the other by a world-famous ethnologist.

The first is from Arnold J. Toynbee's scholarly best seller, A Study of History. You will recall that he attributes the downfall of Greece to its failure to convert from an agricultural to a trading economy. Instead of attempting to raise their standard of living by trading with the outside world, the cities of ancient Greece attempted to increase their possessions by wars with each other, and the result was destruction both for warlike Sparta and for the more peace-like Athens.

The second case is from a lecture delivered by Dr. Edwin M. Loeb, ethnologist of the University of California on May 12 in Johannesburg, South Africa. As a result of studies of the cultures of the Ovambo tribes in southwest Africa, Dr. Löeb says: "It is common belief that some primitive tribes live in communistic societies, but I have yet to run across a single society in history that lived under a communistic form of government. The Ovambos have a government similar to state socialism but with an occasional Fascist twist. Their form of society is similar to that of the ancients of Peru and Sparta. Invariably throughout history the pattern is the same. In ancient Peru, in Sparta during the fifth century B. C., and among the Ovambos and other primitive African tribes, the use of money is limited or discouraged; the state takes a hand in raising or training the children or the youth, and contact with the outside world through trade is restricted or prohibited. In every case, countries without foreign trade become aggressor nations because of the threatened collapse of their self-contained economy.

There you have the answer to why the Russian is against trade, why he is against the ERP, and you have further proof that his purpose is an aggressive one. A member of the Politburo cannot afford to let his own people see the products of others, lest his own suffer by comparison. He has to maintain the myth that the world is against him to enable him to keep the yoke on the neck of his countrymen. Let the Russian ruling class admit world trade and their whole premise is lost.

This makes it all the more important that we continue our efforts against all odds and difficulties to promote and sell world trade today.

Our objective is really a simple one. To exchange goods with everybody to our mutual profit. To make friends. To be as strong as possible, through the cultivation of mutual understanding and through the development of allies as well as through the manufacture of munitions. The greatest possible understanding of our character and purpose forms the best basis for an adequate American defense. The more people who know what kind of folks we are the better. We have nothing to fear and nothing to lose by being known. And world trade—the integrity of American goods—can do a powerful job of explaining who we are and how we operate. Perhaps a better job than we can do through any other means.

It is thus up to all of us who are engaged in the art of selling, to sell to the outside world—to promote world trade—continuously and as fully as we know how. The introduction of American products to our neighbors is as worthy a cause as any to which a salesman has ever dedicated himself. For where American products go, understanding of what they stand for will not be very far behind.

Observance of Lithuania's Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, the observance of the thirtieth anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania called forth from Members of Congress of the United States and Governors of the various States numerous expressions of encouragement and support for Lithuania's valiant fight for existence. These expressions show a firm approval of the United States foreign policy in regard to the continuing recognition of the sovereignty of Lithuania and the other Baltic States.

Several Members spoke on the floor of the Senate and House of Representatives. Other Members addressed large audiences of citizens of this great country of ours in various cities where observances of this significant anniversary were held. Numerous Members voiced their sentiments in statements to the Lithuanian American Information Center, New York City, a press agency of the Lithuanian American Council which unites the overwhelming majority of Americans of Lithuanian descent or extraction of various political and religious affiliations.

With a sublime faith and trust in Almighty God and a confidence that the people of Lithuania will eventually regain their God-given rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, Mr. Speaker, I present to the Congress the following proclamations, speeches, and statements made on the occasion of the Lithuanian Independence Day observances:

STATEMENTS FROM SENATORS, RELEASED THROUGH THE LITHUANIAN AMERICAN INFORMATION CENTER, NEW YORK CITY

Hon. RAYMOND E. BALDWIN, of Connecticut, by telegram from Washington:

"Will you extend to the many fine American citizens in Connecticut of Lithuanian parentage my geetings on this, the thirtieth anniversary of Lithuania's proclamation of freedom? By their courage and faith the good people of Lithuania, through many generations, have advanced the cause of human liberty. May the day soon come when their homeland will again be a free and independent nation."

Hon. OWEN BREWSTER, of Maine:

"It is in the very nature of an American to sympathize with and encourage all nations in their aspiration and struggle for freedom and independence.

"Lithuania, which has for 120 years hoped and fought for her independence, is fully justified now in looking forward to eventually once again regaining her independence.

"On the thirtieth anniversary of the day of proclamation of their independence, I wish to send the people of Lithuania my best wishes and encouragement in their hopes and struggles for a bright national future."

Hon. C. WAYLAND BROOKS, of Illinois:

"The thirtieth anniversary of the signing of the declaration of independence by the heroic nation of Lithuania is another milestone in the endless struggle for independence. The hearts of the American people, ever mindful of the blessings of their own independence won by our founding fathers, beat today for the good people of Lithuania, and I join with others in the hope that the day may be near when Lithuania again can stand as a free and sovereign state among other free people of the earth."

Hon. STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire:

"The American people are proud of the courage of the Lithuanian people and of their great faith in this time which is so difficult for them. I hope that real freedom will again dawn for Lithuania so that her existence as a nation can be unfettered.

"The Lithuanian people have contributed distinguished pages to the history of Europe and they deserve the opportunity to resume their achievements. It is in the interest of free men everywhere that the Lithuanian people should again be free themselves so that future anniversaries of their independence can mean rejoicing for the present as well as the past."

Hon. ALFRED W. HAWKES, of New Jersey:

"You may be assured of my deep concern and continued interest and cooperation in every proper effort that our Government may take in the direction of restoring to these courageous and freedom-seeking people the independence and freedom to which they are clearly entitled."

Hon. IRVING M. IVES, of New York:

"Upon the thirtieth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence by the people of Lithuania, which was proclaimed in February 16, 1918, I join a host of my fellow Americans in extending to our fellow citizens of Lithuanian descent in this country a brief message of encouragement and admiration in connection with their patriotic endeavor in behalf of the people of Lithuania.

"The road to self-determination and freedom over the centuries has been tortuous and at times discouraging. Yet, all of us can find satisfaction in the knowledge that, with persistence and determination and self-sacrifice, these goals have already been reached in large areas in the world.

"To be sure, the world outlook at the present time is not a happy one and the objectives of freedom and independence for all peoples may seem sometimes remote and elusive. However, as long as we persist in our efforts and remain firm in our convictions, these objectives will remain in sight and can be attained.

"So I urge the people of Lithuania in the United States, who would help to bring freedom and independence to their friends and kindred in Lithuania, to be of strong heart, firm in their purpose, patient in their determination, unyielding in their endeavor. In this way, the ultimate goal, which they and all of us are seeking, will be finally achieved."

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., of Massachusetts:

"On the occasion of the thirtieth anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence on February 16, I join with my friends of Lithuanian descent in uttering the fervent hope that the day is not far distant when we shall see that country once again the beneficiary of all those individual liberties which it is our privilege here in this country to enjoy. To those of you who through ties of family, friendship, and tradition are more deeply associated with the commemoration of Lithuania's independence day, it is a real privilege to send my greetings and hopes for happier days overseas."

Hon. J. HOWARD MCGRATH, of Rhode Island:

"America has profited from the fact that people from many lands have contributed to her strength. Some have brought special gifts for the sciences which is their racial characteristic. Others have enriched American culture by bringing to fruition on the soil of this young country the skill in the arts long identified with their racial tradition.

"Because the world is the true mother country of America, we Americans rejoice to observe the significant anniversaries in the history of the people who have made our country what it is. So it is that we join with our fellow citizens in commemorating the thirtieth anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

"The people of Lithuanian origin brought to America more than quick minds, more than industry, more than frugality, more than their ancient valor. Above all else, they brought love of home and devotion to God. Wherever people of Lithuanian blood are found in our country, our citizenship is strengthened as these qualities are manifested. And it is good that this is so, because America now faces stern challenges

which will test to the utmost the character of her people.

"Mindful of what Lithuania has meant to the world in her long history, and what men and women of Lithuanian blood have done for America, we acknowledge our spiritual and cultural debt to a great people on this anniversary observance."

Hon. FRANCIS J. MYERS, of Pennsylvania:

"The years of peace—if we can call this nervous state of world affairs peace—have not fulfilled their promise. The shooting war on a global scale has ended, but many of the fundamental injustices we had hoped would be ended by an end of war are still present and cruelly heavy on our hearts and consciences.

"Lithuania and its neighbor Baltic States, Latvia and Estonia, are perfect examples of the imperfect state of peace and of world justice. Here we have freedom-loving peoples of once proud and sovereign nations held in bondage to a power which denied freedom not only for those of other nationalities unfortunate enough to be enslaved by it, but for its own citizens as well.

"Although Lithuania is not now free, it is proper that the thirtieth anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence should be observed this year for what the document represents—the solemn dedication of a courageous people to the principles of liberty. The anniversary is important not only to the sorrowing people of Lithuania and to Americans and others of Lithuanian descent, but to all peoples everywhere who believe in freedom and in the sanctity of human dignity and in elementary human rights. As the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt declared in those darkest days when not only Lithuania but all civilization lay threatened, 'Lithuania will be free again.' I firmly believe that."

Hon. HERBERT R. O'CONOR, of Maryland:

"During my 8 years at Annapolis, one of my most agreeable duties was the publication of a proclamation setting February 16 as Lithuanian Day, pursuant to a resolution of the Maryland General Assembly.

"The century-long struggle for independence by the people of this grand land and the great strides made following the declaration of the independence of the people of Lithuania on February 16, 1918, have won for Lithuania the respect and admiration of free peoples everywhere. Our own citizens of Lithuanian birth and descent can take justifiable pride in the unceasing efforts that have been made to make and retain Lithuania as a free and independent nation. They can look with confidence to the future, I am convinced, for the people, backed by their heritage of patriotic efforts for freedom, will never rest content until once more their native land is free from the oppressor. I join with every admirer of this great country in wishing the utmost success in the not too distant future of Lithuania's efforts for self-determination."

Hon. H. ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey:

"I am delighted to have an opportunity to extend my good wishes on this memorable occasion. During the past summer when I was in Europe as chairman of the Smith-Mundt congressional committee, I had the opportunity of visiting displaced-persons camps in the American zone in Germany. At a number of these camps were many citizens of Lithuania, and I was tremendously impressed with their fine character and devotion to their homeland. I am frank to say that I was so inspired by their strength of character that upon my return to the United States I introduced legislation in the Senate which would allow a reasonable number of displaced persons to enter this country over and above the existing quota.

"I truly feel that the fine Lithuanians I had met at the displaced-persons camps would be a real asset to America. I have dedicated myself to this problem of displaced persons in the hope that I may be able to alleviate the distress of these people. I welcome an opportunity to send this message to my fellow citizens of Lithuanian descent in New Jersey."

Hon. ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, by telegram from Mankato, Minn.:

"I am pleased to have this opportunity to join today with the many American citizens of Lithuanian descent in commemorating the thirtieth anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence. These are times of untold hardship within Lithuania. And we Americans cannot look upon that Nation's present lot without some feeling of shame. For despite the ideals enunciated in the Atlantic Charter our representatives at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam apparently did not even suggest that Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors are entitled to have their sovereign rights and self-government restored. It is my sincere hope that the principles of liberty and justice which are basic to both the American and the Lithuanian way of life will triumph and that future Lithuanian Independence Days will be occasions for happier celebration."

Hon. MILLARD E. TYDINGS, of Maryland:

"I have ever viewed the destruction of Lithuania and other Baltic nations, growing out of the conflict of World War II, with deep regret and with unremitting opposition. That these nations have lost their identity is a reflection on the cause of freedom and justice all over the world.

"The people of Lithuania will ever have my sympathy and support towards their aspiration to be a free and independent country. On the anniversary of the founding of their nation, I extend them good wishes and hope for better days yet to come."

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER, of New York, by telegram from Washington:

"I wish to join you my fellow citizens of Lithuanian descent in commemorating the thirtieth anniversary of Lithuania's proclamation of freedom. Today more than ever before, when the fate of world civilization is at stake, we need organizations whose faith in the principles of freedom and justice inspire and encourage those who are still fighting for freedom let us pray to God that the time is not too distant when men everywhere will be free to live their lives according to their own light."

Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY, of Nebraska:

"On February 16, 30 years will have elapsed since Lithuania recovered her independence only to lose it again in 1939. It was with great joy that many of us greeted Lithuania's Declaration of Independence, for it climaxed a long and painful yet distinguished struggle for freedom of a people which once ruled eastern Europe from the Baltic to the Black Sea.

"In the period between the two world wars the Lithuanians lived peaceably together and achieved notable success in the creation of a new government and a new state. From the shattered remains of their country, in less than a generation with the toil of their hands and in the sweat of their brows, they created a new unified political community possessed of a fruitful economy and a rich cultural life. And to what purpose? In the Peace Treaty of Moscow of July 12, 1920, the U. S. S. R. stated that, 'Russia without any prejudice recognizes the self-rule and independence of the state of Lithuania with all the juridical consequences * * * and for all times renounces with good will all the sovereignty rights of Russia, which it has had in regard to the Lithuanian nation or territory.'

"But in 1939, Russia wrung out of Lithuania a security treaty which virtually annexed that country to the U. S. S. R. And to make the irony complete, within a year Lithuania was overrun by the Nazis. Finally in 1944 and 1945, it again fell under Soviet Russia, and there it remains today.

"We note the activities of the U. S. S. R. in Lithuania today with great apprehension; for in order to consolidate her hold upon this unfortunate land Soviet Russia is systematically changing the character of the Lithuanian population. She is practicing genocide here in unabated form. The iron curtain may make it hard for us to know every detail, but the enormity of the wrong is such that it cannot be suppressed by even the strictest censorship. Thousands of Lithuanians continue to be moved from their native soil into central Russia to slave and toil for their Soviet masters, while Russians from other parts of the vast empire are being brought into Lithuania to replace the Lithuanians who are being moved out. A communistic state is being created, as opposition wherever it appears is being ruthlessly and systematically eradicated. On this thirtieth anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence we in the United States hail the indomitable courage of the Lithuanian people in this desperate hour of national need. As a government speaking through our State Department, we have announced that we do not recognize Russian conquest disguised in the form of the Fourteenth Soviet Socialist Republic. We know that the Lithuanian people love their freedom and liberty in exactly the same measure that we do; and it is in that spirit that we now send our greetings to Lithuanians in Lithuania, encouraging them to carry on the fight for freedom and for their homeland; and we also send our greetings to people of Lithuanian descent everywhere in our own country, as they hope and work for the freedom of the land of their ancestors. Where the will to independence is as strong as it is among the Lithuanian people, no power can stop it. Lithuania, we salute you!"

Telegram from Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts, Speaker of the House of Representatives:

"On this thirtieth anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence, I want to send a message of hope and cheer to the Lithuanians of America and those in their native country. No peoples have ever had love of liberty more deeply rooted in their hearts. Because of that intense love of liberty, and the traditional devotion to principles and bravery under adversity of the Lithuanian people, Lithuania will not remain enslaved. They will again, through their magnificent courage and perseverance, demonstrate their right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. I send my greetings to every gathering of Lithuanians in America to commemorate the anniversary of Lithuania's proclamation of freedom. I know that Lithuanians everywhere in the world will hold fast to their hope and determination that the soil of their native homeland shall be free and that their people shall know liberty as we in America know liberty. May God strengthen your hearts and hands in the cause of freedom."

Telegram from Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, Democratic whip:

"The thirtieth anniversary of the declaration of the independence by the people of Lithuania should be fittingly observed this year. The suppression of the freedom and liberty of the brave people of Lithuania by the Soviet Union is deplored by freedom-loving peoples everywhere. I am confident the unceasing struggle for liberation from foreign domination by the Lithuanian people will result in victory and the march of atheistic communism will be turned back. I trust the near future will again see Lithuania regain her rightful place among the free nations, free and independent. I join with the many friends of Lithuania in extending greetings on this thirtieth anniversary of Lithuania's independence."

Telegram from Hon. CHARLES A. EATON, of New Jersey, chairman of Committee on Foreign Affairs:

"Because the spirit of freedom in the Lithuanian people is unconquerable and deathless it is the faith of all true Americans and especially of those of Lithuanian descent that Lithuania will finally be set free to live her own life in her own way."

STATEMENTS FROM UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVES

Hon. FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio:

"After 120 years of unceasing struggle against foreign domination the principle of self-determination was proclaimed in Lithuania on February 16, 1918. On this, the thirtieth anniversary of the Proclamation of Freedom, people everywhere are joining together with appreciation of the proud and courageous spirit that has inspired the people of this little Baltic country.

"I join with all these on this memorable day with the hope that the light of freedom may again shine forth in unclouded beauty."

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL, of Michigan:

"On the occasion of the thirtieth anniversary of Lithuania's independence permit me to express my sentiments as regards the hapless and enslaved people of Lithuania. They are as deep-rooted and consistent as they are friendly toward this great Lithuanian segment in the family of civilized nations.

"Lithuania is more than a symbol of freedom. In her chains and enslavement, she is an inspiration to all liberty-loving peoples throughout the world. As long as her indomitable spirit lives, Lithuania will go on forever.

"The contributions made to civilization in science, music, and in every field of culture have left a permanent and wholesome imprint upon the pages of history which cannot be eradicated. The world owes the heroic people of this struggling little country every consideration in its fight for freedom and independence. The struggle must go on until the day when the fiendish hordes of Communist Russians are driven out far beyond Lithuania's sacred borders, and let us hope that this drive will not terminate until Bolshevism and all that it stands for is trampled to death by all of the free and victorious people who are its victims behind the iron curtain.

"I have expressed similar sentiments on ever so many occasions and am, therefore, happy to join with you in this movement to focus the attention of the people upon the tragic plight of Lithuania."

Hon. HAROLD D. DONOHUE, of Massachusetts:

"It is a pleasure for me, as United States Representative from the Fourth Congressional District of Massachusetts, to join with you in commemorating the thirtieth anniversary of the Declaration of Lithuanian Independence.

"This is a day dear to the hearts of all Lithuanians, because back in 1918 it marked the end of well over a century of suffering under a hostile, foreign rule. Lithuania, on that day, stood forth as an independent and democratic Republic.

"Unfortunately, in this year of 1948, our commemoration is shaded with sorrow. Caught, like other small nations, within the meshes of ruthless imperialism, the bright star of Lithuania's freedom has been clouded over by the violent storms of tyranny, which, we pray, will be of short duration.

"Although we mourn over her present plight, there is no cause for despair. Repeatedly, through her history, Lithuania has proved that her people can eventually overcome the temporary triumphs of oppressive neighbors. The Christian faith which, in 1399, repelled the Tartar invasion and saved all of Europe from barbarism, is still with her today. It gives her the spiritual vigor to outlive any dictatorship. Deep in the heart of every Lithuanian is that passion for liberty and freedom which never dies. There is no power which can forever enslave a people who are determined to be free.

"All over the world, Lithuanians are gathering today to renew their vows to work for the independence of their homeland. Here in the United States I earnestly believe that most Americans are becoming increasingly more concerned about the present fate of Lithuania which stands in accusing testimony to our failure to live and act according to the principles for which our people have fought and died in two world wars.

"The case of Lithuania, and the other small nations, is a challenge to the moral conscience of this Nation and the United Nations to carry out the great basic principles of establishing freedom and liberty for all people. In simple justice, our Government must insist that the Lithuanian people be permitted their inalienable right to govern their internal existence as they themselves see fit.

"A great wrong that has been done to Lithuania must be righted, and I regard it as a duty to extend my pledge of continued efforts to the sacred cause of Lithuania and all human freedom."

Hon. GEORGE H. FALLON, of Maryland:

"Thirty years ago when Lithuania won her freedom, there was great rejoicing by the people who love liberty in this country and everywhere else in the world, and although the Russian yoke hangs heavy on Lithuania today, we still regard Lithuania as an independent state.

"On this thirtieth anniversary of Lithuania's freedom, we look forward to the day when we shall see Lithuania resume her admirable progress as a free self-government."

Hon. IVOR D. FENTON, of Pennsylvania:

"I am glad to know that Sunday, February 15, has been designated (in New York) to observe the thirtieth anniversary of the declaration of independence proclaimed by the people of Lithuania on February 16, 1918.

"I sincerely hope the day is not too far distant when Lithuania will regain her independence, and I think that no better day than a Sunday could be selected for the observance, when we can all join in prayer for the freedom of liberty loving Lithuanians everywhere."

Hon. JAMES G. FULTON, of Pennsylvania, by telegram:

"The Lithuanian people now in displaced persons camps in Europe have every right to expect a free Lithuania to return to, as one of the prime objects of World War II. The bright hope of the declaration of independence of the people of Lithuania of February 16, 1918, should not be lost."

Hon. AIME J. FORAND, of Rhode Island:

"I congratulate you and your fellow Lithuanians for commemorating this glorious day and for your continued efforts to restore to Lithuania its freedom from oppression and tyranny, which has been imposed upon it since the end of World War II.

"Let all of us, regardless of the country of our origin, join in prayer to the end that peace and democracy may soon prevail all over the world."

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York:

"As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Displaced Persons which visited over 150 DP camps in Europe last summer, I came in personal contact with many DP's of Lithuanian descent and found them to be among those most deserving of immediate consideration, by people of good will throughout the world. I have been doing everything possible to see to it that the Lithuanian DP's as well as all others are given an opportunity to resettle in free and democratic countries such as the United States, so that they will not have to return to an environment and community that holds nothing but memories of horror and destruction for them.

"I do hope that the efforts of myself and my colleagues to pass legislation such as the Stratton bill will bear fruit within the near future, so that your fellow Lithuanians will find a new home and a new life in a new world."

Hon. MARTIN GORSKI, of Illinois:

"You can feel assured that I am still wholeheartedly in favor of independence for Lithuania and all other small nations."

Hon. DONALD L. JACKSON, of California:

"I have a high regard for the many fine Americans of Lithuanian descent, and I trust that they will never forget their great heritage of freedom and liberty. So long as that flame is kept alive in the hearts of all Lithuanians, particularly the children, I am sure that we all shall live to see the day of a new and greater Lithuania."

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York:

"I deem it a privilege to salute my fellow citizens of Lithuanian descent on the thirtieth anniversary of their declaration of independence—the more so, since this declaration is the result of blood and tears expended by courageous Lithuanian citizens over the years during which their country was the battleground for conflicting ideologies foreign to their own beliefs.

"In our preoccupation with the many pressing problems now besetting our own country, we do not forget the courage and suffering of our sister nation in reestablishing her right of self-government and independence, and congratulate her people upon erecting, through their declaration of independence, a strong bulwark against the spread of a totalitarian communism.

"Recognition of February 16 as Lithuanian Day is a well-merited honor for a country which has preserved the ideals near and dear to her people, as to ours—independence and the right of self-government."

Hon. BERNARD W. KEARNEY, of New York:

"February 16, 1948, is the thirtieth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania.

"During the few short years that followed the signing, Lithuanians not only in their own homeland but all over the world celebrated with unrestrained joy this great day. Lithuania was a proud nation, her people of great culture, and imbued with a spirit of independence that boded well for the infant republic.

"From 1918 to 1940 Lithuanians were happy in the knowledge that they were free and independent. Then in violation of a solemn agreement, Russia took over Lithuania—to the despair of a great people. Then Germany liberated Lithuania from the Russians—and later Russia again liberated Lithuania from the Germans. I speak advisedly when I use the word "liberated"—because liberation in this instance meant the destruction of all that the people of Lithuania held dear. Deportation, murder, rape, imprisonment, slavery, that is what "liberation" by the Russians and Germans meant to the people of Lithuania.

"Liberty-loving Americans, millions of them foreign-born, those who believe in liberty without the playing of power politics, Americans who for years have fought to hold their own liberty and independence and who today are fighting the evils of communism, fascism, and all forms of "isms" except Americanism, both at home and abroad, hope and pray with the liberty-loving Lithuanians that the day is not far away when once again out of the ashes of oppression will arise a new, free, and independent Lithuania—once more taking its place beside the democratic nations of the world."

Hon. ARTHUR G. KLEIN, of New York:

"The Declaration of Independence of the American Republic declares: 'We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with inherent and unalienable

rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.'

"Every freedom-loving man will agree that next only to life, liberty is the most important of natural rights; and the victims of the Nazi charnel houses prove that there are millions of hardy souls to whom liberty is more valued than life.

"Lithuania became a free and independent state after the First World War through the direct intervention and influence of Woodrow Wilson. Every American has a deep sympathy with the aspirations to full liberty which burn in the hearts of Lithuanians, and we look forward to the time when Lithuania may rejoin the community of nations."

Hon. FRANCIS J. LOVE, of West Virginia, by telegram from Washington:

"It is a pleasure for me to extend best wishes to my Lithuanian-American friends on the occasion of the thirtieth anniversary of Lithuania's proclamation of freedom. I commend your people on their fight for freedom and individual liberty and pledge continued interest in their cause."

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN, of Indiana:

"The Lithuanian people today are continuing their fight to make their country a free and independent nation. On the thirtieth anniversary of the declaration of independence for the people of Lithuania, it is appropriate to recall to the minds of the American people that Lithuania is today carrying on the battle for the identical freedom which our country won in 1776.

"The past history of the Lithuanian people reveals that their desire for liberty and independence is so deeply imbedded in their blood stream that their patriotic fervor cannot be decreased until Lithuania succeeds in obtaining a free and independent government.

"It is fitting and proper that February 16 be set aside and declared as Lithuanian Day to remind the people of the world that the Lithuanian nation has not turned back in its fight for independence and freedom."

Hon. HUGH A. MEADE, of Maryland:

"After the recent war, when the Balkan countries were faced with starvation, their homes and lands destroyed and their economic security shattered, the people of Lithuania and other countries, were lulled by false promises of health, wealth, and security made by the Russians. Today poor Lithuania finds herself just another victim of Russian treachery and betrayal. Today she finds herself nearer the brink of starvation, her homes in worse condition than they were after the war, her valuables stolen by the Russian soldiers, and her economy completely destroyed. But thank God stories of her betrayal by Russia have seeped out from behind the iron curtain and word has gone across the length and breadth of Europe that Russia has not kept her promises. Her betrayal of the weak countries has acted as a boomerang and the stories of her treachery have been largely responsible for the halt of the wave of communism in Europe. France, Italy, and Austria have taken drastic steps to rid themselves of Communist leaders within their borders, and I firmly believe we have the spread of communism in Europe licked.

"My heart goes out to the liberty and peace-loving people of these Russian dominated countries and while their immediate future is indeed a dark one, let us thank God for the progress the United Nations organization has made and let us hope and pray that the day will not be far distant when the mighty may no longer betray the weak and then, if justice still lives in the world, with the help of God, I pray that Lithuania may rise and live again and be forever free."

Hon. MARY T. NORTON, of New Jersey:

"On the thirtieth anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence, it is a pleasure for me to extend greetings to Americans of Lithuanian descent. Through many generations you have earned the admiration of all freedom-loving peoples for your valiant fight to preserve the ideals of justice, liberty, and equality. Yours has been a most courageous struggle and must lead to final triumph. It is my hope that the Lithuanians of today will hold fast to the ideals of those who led their country's fight for freedom many years ago."

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Massachusetts:

"As you know, I am a strong advocate of Lithuanian freedom, and I do not believe that this great issue can be compromised.

"I favor that our Nation should press with determination for a settlement of this great question.

"It is time for us to determine once and for all whether we are going to live in the free world of the Atlantic Charter under the American Constitution or the slave world of communism and oppression."

Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY, of New York:

"Historic Lithuania, once a great kingdom, extending from the Baltic to the Black Sea, regained her well-deserved independence in 1918. In the shaping of this new state, Americans of Lithuanian ancestry had a large and important share. In this work they were encouraged by our Government and our people, and the history of independent Lithuania from 1918 to 1940 amply proved that, notwithstanding the vicissitudes of many centuries, the descendants of the old sturdy stock have not lost their national character. Since 1940 the oppressing hand of foreign invaders had once more been imposed upon unfortunate Lithuanians in their homelands. We ardently hope that in due time these invaders will be turned out of the country and Lithuania will regain her independence.

"I feel that Americans of Lithuanian ancestry have made many contributions to American civilization. They have given their best in the building of this Nation and we are proud to have given them the opportunity for the free development of their talents. America today extends greetings to all Lithuanians on the occasion of the thirtieth anniversary of the Lithuanian declaration of independence."

Hon. A. J. SABATH, of Illinois:

"Permit me to congratulate the people of Lithuania on the occasion of the thirtieth anniversary of their declaration of independence.

"As one who aided in obtaining Lithuania's independence and recognition, and knowing of the Lithuanians' love for freedom and liberty, it is my sincere hope that this little nation will soon again gain its independence."

Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH, of Wisconsin:

"I am indeed interested in the people of Lithuania and will support their struggle for freedom.

"I believe that ultimately this objective will be reached."

GUBERNATORIAL PROCLAMATIONS

Connecticut

On February 16 Americans of Lithuanian extraction celebrate the thirtieth anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. In a tradition parallel to that of our own great Nation, the gallant people of Lithuania have kept alive their spiritual and patriotic inspiration, despite tragic adversity. Bowed under the brutal yoke of war and its aftermath, they still look up with hope and forward with determination toward a new day of peace, freedom, and neighborly prosperity.

The courageous hearts and indomitable will of the Lithuanian people earn them the undying respect of time. Their fortitude and their imperishable love of liberty and amity for and among men has set an example for the neighborhood of nations in the world.

As Governor of Connecticut, I call upon the people of our State to recognize the thirtieth anniversary of the independence of Lithuania with appropriate tribute and urge them to take part in ceremonies commemorating the historic date of February 16.

JAMES L. MCCONAUGHY,
Governor.

Maryland

Governor's Proclamation, "Republic of Lithuania Day," February 16, 1948

Whereas in accordance with Joint Resolution No. 8, of the acts of the General Assembly of Maryland of 1935, the Governor is directed to proclaim February 16 of each year for the observance and commemoration of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania; and

Whereas February 16, 1948, will make the thirtieth anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania;

Now, therefore, I, William Preston Lane, Jr., Governor of the State of Maryland, do hereby proclaim Monday, February 16, 1948, as Republic of Lithuania Day and request that the flag of the United States be displayed on all government buildings and urge that our people observe that day by appropriate ceremonies.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Maryland at the city of Annapolis on this 14th day of January, in the year of Our Lord 1948.

WM. PRESTON LANE, JR.,
Governor,
BERTRAM L. BOONE, II,
Secretary of State.

Massachusetts

Proclamation by Gov. Robert F. Bradford

The great Congress of Lithuania had met in Vilna to demand freedom from Russia in 1917 and there elected the Council of Lithuania which on February 16, 1918, proclaimed the independence of Lithuania in accordance with the recognized right of national self-determination and asserted its restoration as an independent State, which status was thereafter recognized by all the great nations of the world, and marked the severance of ties of bondage by which it had been enslaved since 1795. This action corresponded to the American Declaration of Independence of July 4, 1776, wherein, among other pronouncements, it was declared, "these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." To Lithuanians, the declaration of independence proclaimed 30 years ago at Vilna bore the same hope for the future as our American Declaration of Independence proclaimed almost 172 years ago at Philadelphia bore for Americans. This hope has been shattered by the territorial aggrandizements accomplished by Soviet Russia in recent years in violation of the principles of the Atlantic Charter to which Soviet Russia subscribed and by which it certified its desire to see no territorial changes which do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned and in which Soviet Russia guaranteed that it would respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they would live, and gave assurances that it wished to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them. Nothing less than these principles can be the foundation for a lasting peace. Yet Lithuania is today enslaved behind the iron curtain, in utter repudiation of the pledge so given to and so deserved by a freedom-loving people, about 100,000 of whom are now scattered over various sections of Europe in camps for displaced persons, who choose to suffer privation and hardship rather than to return to their homes where they would incur the risk of exile to Siberia and death by its frigid horrors.

Therefore, I designate Monday, February 16, as Independence of Lithuania Memorial Day, and urge all citizens to recognize it by

appropriate exercises, recalling the declaration of independence of Lithuania on February 16, 1918, and the present sad plight of the subjected people of Lithuania and its refugees, as well as the promises of the Atlantic Charter to which they hopefully cling and await fulfillment.

New York

Statement by Governor Dewey

The Republic of Lithuania was one of the victims of war and aggression planned by Hitler and Stalin and expressed in the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact of 1939. Lithuania's sovereignty, internal freedom, and prosperity born of her people's diligent industry were destroyed and the country devastated by three successive military occupations. Today, instead of regaining their freedom, the people of Lithuania are still in the grip of their oppressive conquerors.

The realization of this tragic plight of a freedom-loving people saddens the observance on February 16 of the thirtieth anniversary of their declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania. It is fitting that the people of the State of New York, who maintained cultural and economic relations with Lithuania since the middle of the seventeenth century join with the many other loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent in expressing sympathy and hope for liberation of the people of Lithuania.

Illinois

Proclamation

Whereas the thirtieth anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania occurs on February 16, 1948; and

Whereas this anniversary, which stirs fond memories and cherished hopes in the hearts of thousands of Americans of Lithuanian birth or ancestry, deserves formal public recognition:

Now, therefore, I, Dwight H. Green, Governor of the State of Illinois, do hereby proclaim Monday, February 16, of the present year, as Republic of Lithuania Day throughout Illinois and commend the appropriate observance of the occasion to all interested groups, organizations, and individuals.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and have caused the great seal of the State of Illinois to be affixed.

Done at the capitol, in the city of Springfield, this 3d day of February A. D. 1948, and of the State of Illinois the one hundred thirtieth.

DWIGHT H. GREEN,
Governor.

MAYORAL PROCLAMATIONS

Maryland

Proclamation by Mayor Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., Designating Monday, February 16, 1948, as Republic of Lithuania Day

Whereas the patriotic peace-loving citizens of Lithuania have an abiding desire to retain their national unity and have earned the admiration of the freedom-loving nations of the earth by their gallant struggle to establish a Lithuanian Republic; and

Whereas, despite untold hardships and brutal occupations, the people of Lithuania have never lost hope of ultimate freedom; and

Whereas many thousands of heroic Lithuanians who refused to live under the yoke of despotism emigrated to America and, as is fitting and proper, these Americans of Lithuanian ancestry retain a love of their native country and its destinies; and

Whereas Baltimore is justly proud of its many citizens of Lithuanian ancestry for their many contributions to the civic welfare of our city, State, and Nation; and

Whereas February 16 has by an act of the Maryland Assembly been designated as Republic of Lithuania Day, commemorating the founding of the Lithuanian Republic:

Now, therefore, I, Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., mayor of the city of Baltimore, do hereby proclaim Monday, February 16, 1948, as Republic of Lithuania Day, and do urge all our citizens to give serious thoughts to the many cultural contributions made by Lithuania and the trials and tribulations of Lithuania in its endeavor to its God-given right to maintain its status as a free nation. I further urge a display of the American flag on our public buildings and request our citizens to take part in the various ceremonies being arranged for the proper observance of Republic of Lithuania Day.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the city of Baltimore to be affixed this 2d day of February, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and forty-eight.

THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
Mayor.

New York

CITY OF NEW YORK,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
New York, N. Y., February 26, 1948.

The people of the city of New York have maintained cultural and economic relations with Lithuania since 1659 when Dr. Alexander Carolius Cursius arrived here to teach the classics. During the past century and a half the port of New York has been the gateway to America for masses of Lithuanians who sought a new life on our shores.

Americans of Lithuanian descent have made a distinct contribution to the development of this country and the State of New York. Lithuanians are active in democratic ways of life both in this country and abroad.

I wish to extend my personal greetings to my fellow citizens who are observing the thirtieth anniversary of the recovery of political sovereignty and internal freedom by the people of Lithuania.

WILLIAM O'DWYER,
Mayor.

Gael Sullivan (by telegram from Washington), executive director of the Democratic National Committee:

"On the occasion of the thirtieth anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania, I wish, as executive director of the Democratic National Committee, to tell our loyal and patriotic Americans of Lithuanian descent that the Democratic Party gives its full support to a world peace structure that will protect the rights of all nations. We believe all nations should have the freedom to determine their own destinies. We are also in full accord with our President's humanitarian program for admission to the United States of displaced persons who have been so cruelly uprooted from their homes during the war in Europe. I hope and pray that on the next anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania we will be able to hail great steps of progress toward a just and lasting peace in Europe and all over the world based on full respect for the rights of all nations large and small to live together in peace and freedom. We join you in wishing that all the world may enjoy the freedom we share in America."

CONDENSED ADDRESS OF HON. P. ZADEIKIS, MINISTER OF LITHUANIA, AT WEBSTER HALL, NEW YORK CITY, FEBRUARY 16, 1948

We did not expect to be celebrating this, the thirtieth anniversary of Lithuania's independence, in such grievous circumstances: due to the lawless acts of the Moscow dictatorship, our country remains enslaved, its people continue to be driven to death in Siberia, while about 55,000 of our exiles who took refuge in the western world are facing another year of hardship in DP camps. Today the Lithuanian tricolor no longer flies from the hill of Gediminas in Vilnius; Te Deum Laudamus is not sung in the churches, and their bells are silent, as is also silent the Freedom Bell which was the gift of Americans to Lithuania in token of mutual friendship. The sighs of the enslaved people are heard instead of the happy folk-songs of yesterday.

Thirty years ago we saw how our nation, a nation of tillers of the soil, inspired by great historical traditions of the time of Gediminas, Kestutis, Vytautas, determined to become independent again. Twenty deputies of the nation signed the Declaration of the Restoration of Independence in Vilnius. Without a cent in the treasury, without so much as one company of soldiers under arms, the Lithuanian Republic began its life in collaboration with the western democracies. The only resources of the republic were the pure patriotic enthusiasm of its people. The organizational genius of the nation had the opportunity to express itself, and, in spite of arduous circumstances, attained wonderful results. The world wondered at the fact that a nation, small in numbers, but free and independent, could attain the results that it did in such a short period of time.

Lithuania, as a member of the League of Nations, honorably discharged the obligations incumbent upon it as a cultured nation, and gained the respect of the world.

Alas, fate so willed that the rapacious dictators of Moscow and Berlin, having reached secret agreements in 1939, should wantonly destroy the patient work of years. On June 15, 1940, the Red Army invaded Lithuania. After an experience of 3 years of Hitlerite occupation, Lithuania today is again in the grip of the "northern bear," in spite of the promises of the Big Four at Yalta.

However, this historical truth remains: those who use force to gain their ends finally get their just desserts.

Speaking of the present, it is clear that the present situation cannot last long. The opinion of some United Nations authorities holds that changes are inevitable and that things may get a great deal worse before they get better. The watchword of all Lithuanians, wherever they may be, on this, the anniversary of Lithuania's independence, should be that this is an occasion to make known to the world the present sufferings of the Lithuanian people, and their just and sacred efforts in the struggle for freedom—an opportunity to appeal to the world conscience, crying for right and justice for the oppressed nations. We remember the words of Cordell Hull, in connection with Poland, that "mere seizure of territory * * * does not extinguish the legal existence of a government." We recall the declaration of the American Government on July 23, 1940, that "the people of the United States * * * are opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however weak. The United States will continue to stand by those principles * * *." And also President Roosevelt's prophetic words to a Lithuanian American delegation that "the time will come when Lithuania will be free again. This may happen sooner than you may expect." President Truman, in his speech of March 1947, in Mexico City, made this significant remark: "No strong nation has the right to force its will upon a weak nation, just for the reason that it is strong." And the Governor of the State of New York, the Honorable Thomas E. Dewey, cheered us greatly when he said on the occasion of this anniversary: "It is fitting that the people of the State of New York, who maintained cultural and economic relations with Lithuania since the middle of the seventeenth century, join with the many other loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent in expressing sympathy and hope for liberation of the people of Lithuania."

It would be hardly fitting to mention here Stalin's solemn promise to respect Lithuania's independence for all time which promise he has, of course, broken. Again, let us have this possibility in mind, that

the liberation of Lithuania may take place only after important events have taken place elsewhere. Therefore the Lithuanian Nation at this transitory period, when the horizon of the future is still dark continues to yearn and hope for the time when Lithuanian refugees and displaced persons can return to their homes and live in peace and freedom in a ravaged, but freed and independent Lithuania.

Let us hope that the day will come soon when the words of the Atlantic Charter will be fulfilled, and "the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live" will be realized in Lithuania too.

The Current Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an address by Richard Reid, editor of the Catholic News, New York City, at St. Mary's Auditorium, Lawrence, Mass., on April 19, 1948, under the auspices of Merrimack College:

THE CURRENT CRISIS

To speak under the auspices of Merrimack College would be a privilege at any time; it is doubly an honor now. For these pioneer days are historic ones in the history of Merrimack, which is inevitably destined to become one of the truly great educational centers of the United States. Famed Villanova College in Pennsylvania, from which the distinguished president, Father Vincent A. McQuade, and most of the faculty come may be called the Mother of Merrimack. New England's youngest college can, however, trace its ancestry back to the illustrious members of the Order of St. Augustine whose learning added luster to the Universities of Paris, Oxford, Naples, Heidelberg, Padua, Vienna, and Prague, to mention only a few.

The most precious treasures of any State are her sons and daughters. No greater service can be rendered Massachusetts or any other commonwealth than training its young people in mind and heart. It is to this work that the members of the faculty of Merrimack College are devoting their lives. We may be certain that the old Bay State is duly appreciative of her good fortune in her newest addition to her roster of eminent institutions of learning.

The subject of our discussion this evening is the current crisis, one we are often inclined to regard as being far removed from our own spheres of experience. The current crisis has developed not merely in those nations from the Baltic to the Balkans which are under the domination of the Red Fascists, or in those countries like Italy and France which the Communists are seeking to bring under their yoke, but in our American cities and towns. For in our own communities the agents and dupes of atheistic totalitarianism are striving through every means in their power to destroy the basis for democracy and the American way of life.

The basis of our institutions, the basis of our democracy, is moral, spiritual, religious. When we speak of democracy we mean American democracy, the essence of which is expressed in these words of the Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

"All men are created equal." In what does this equality consist? The Communists insist that its essence is economic, that all men will be equal if they possess the same things, if no one has more than another. It places all property in the hands of the state. Classes, it reasons, are based on private property, and if there is no private property there can be no classes. This is the theory not only of communism but, basically at least, of fascism and nazism.

But such "economic equality," far from being democracy, is the death of democracy. For there can be no democracy without freedom, and there can be no real freedom without economic freedom. Such economic equality does away with big bankers, but it gives us Red commissars; it eliminates classes based on wealth and gives us classes based on privilege.

Yet the Declaration of Independence says that "all men are created equal." This obviously does not mean equality in health, in strength, in intelligence, in ability, or in any of the other numerous ways in which men differ. The equality cannot, therefore, be in body or in mind, and yet it cannot mean anything outside of man. There is only one way in which men are equal—in their common origin, their common nature, their common destiny, in the possession of immortal souls which, as the Scriptures tell us, God made in His own image and likeness. It is only in the souls of men that men are equal and men are free. This is the only principle that is a basis for true democracy, for it is the only principle that says to the worker that he is the equal of the mightiest in the land.

The Declaration of Independence not only says that all men are created equal but that they are endowed with certain "unalienable" rights. The equality of man does not come from law. The French and the Russian Revolutionists sought to make men equal by law, and they failed. The Declaration of Independence did not try to make men equal by law, but it recognized that equality comes from man's Maker, that the source of his basic rights is not a declaration or a constitution or a congress or a parliament or the will of the majority or a dictator, but God. And it has not failed.

The enemies of American democracy dismiss these spiritual principles as a promise of "pie in the sky by and by." But it is these principles which have been responsible for the difference between the American way of life, which, with all its defects, is unsurpassed under the blue canopy of heaven, and that of Russia where even the few in the privileged class who enjoy some degree of prosperity are as much at the mercy of the whims of the commissars as any slave of ancient Rome.

When these principles were first preached in ancient Rome by the disciples of the Founder of Christianity, there were there as many slaves as there are now workers in a comparable population in the western world. These slaves had no rights which the law or public opinion bound the masters to respect. Slaves were in many cases the superiors of their masters in education and culture; Greeks made slaves by the misfortune of war were frequently the tutors in noble Roman families. Caesar on one occasion sold as slaves 63,000 of the enemy captured in Gaul, which is only a hint of the barbarities practiced by the most respected and cultured persons in the pagan world.

But the preachers of the doctrine of Christ ministered to the slaves at the same altar as the master. They insisted on the revolutionary teaching, which the pagan world regarded as sheer insanity, that the slave is the equal of the master; slaves became priests, bishops, and Popes. This principle of the equality of all persons before God, with a common origin, a common nature, a common destiny, and common rights growing out of this equality, far from promising "pie in the sky by and by," has been responsible for the elevation of the great bulk of mankind from slavery to serfdom, from serfdom to peasantry, and from peasantry to such political freedom as the world now enjoys. And it is in the forefront of the next great step in human progress, the establishment of economic security. Without the concept of the equality of man under the Fatherhood of God being impressed on the common conscience of mankind by Christianity through the generations, the centuries, and the ages, there could have been no Declaration of Independence, no Constitution of the United States, and no United States of America.

Because the basis of our western civilization and our American democracy is moral and spiritual, the primary target of the enemy is religion, and especially the Catholic Church, the bulwark of the opposition to totalitarianism. While seeking to set citizen against citizen by accentuating their differences in every field, particularly racial, economic, and religious, they are more active nowhere than in efforts to sow seeds of suspicion and dissension because of the varying manner in which men worship God. Their purpose is to incite hatred of neighbor against neighbor, friend against friend, thus discouraging and preventing cooperation of religious-minded men and women against the common enemy.

For the Communists realize that all but a minute minority of the people of the United States of America, irrespective of race or creed, are irreconcilably opposed to totalitarianism and its atheistic basis. They know that if the American people who are so opposed to totalitarianism united against it, the spirit of communism and any other brand of tyranny would wither and die overnight even if it ever succeeded in sinking its roots in any locality in this free country. They know that their best chance of success is to divide our people along religious lines, and particularly to create antagonisms on the part of Protestants and Jews against Catholics. They know that Catholics constitute not only the largest religious unit in the Nation, but they are the most vigorous and effective opponents of the philosophy and tactics of totalitarianism.

This is the explanation of the wave of prejudice-breeding propaganda now agitating the Nation, a movement which has been discussed and deplored by none more ably than by two of New England's greatest sons, His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, Archbishop of New York, and the Most Rev. Richard J. Cushing, Archbishop of Boston. Participating in this un-Christian, un-American effort are not only the Communists and other sworn enemies of religion, but many good, honest, sincere, religious-minded persons who have been misinformed and misled.

A full generation ago self-seeking individuals launched such a campaign in the South, where Catholics were few and where acquaintance with Catholic teaching and practice was correspondingly scant. The purpose of those responsible for this campaign of misrepresentation and hate was the winning of political power through the votes of the people misled, just as the purpose of the sponsors of the current campaign is the weakening of America and the corresponding strengthening of the forces of totalitarianism. Through distortion, misrepresentation, and smears, they inflamed many good people to such an extent that in some areas a candidate's fitness for public office seemed to be

gaged by his vehemence against the Catholic Church.

This spirit was particularly strong in Georgia, because it was here that the most notorious of the anti-Catholics had been active longest. But the Catholic citizens of Georgia knew that those attacking their Church did not represent the traditions of the people of the State. They recalled that the first United States Senator Walsh was not David I., of Massachusetts, or Thomas J., of Montana, but Patrick Walsh, of Georgia, an alumnus of Georgetown, a distinguished Catholic layman, editor and publisher of the Augusta Chronicle, appointed by a governor who was a Baptist to fill an unexpired term, and then elected by the State legislature. They were convinced that most of the people of Georgia who were hostile toward Catholics owed their antipathy to the fact that they had been misinformed and misled by demagogues, and that they, like Americans in general, would be fair when they knew the facts. They realized that they had been remiss in not seeking to acquaint them with their facts. They had not realized that it was a physical impossibility for their distinguished bishop and their zealous priests to do this work, since they had one bishop for the 60,000 square miles of Georgia territory and its 3,000,000 people, and 60 priests, 1 for every 1,000 square miles, 1 for every 50,000 persons. And where there were no priests and few or no Catholics, the bitterness was greatest.

They therefore established an organization, the Catholic Laymen's Association of Georgia, "to bring about a friendlier feeling among Georgians irrespective of creed." They offered to answer inquiries about their faith, especially on the relations of its teachings to their duties as citizens. They wrote letters to the editors of those newspapers in which misrepresentations of Catholic teaching and practice appeared, chiefly through the instigation of professional anti-Catholics. In their correspondence with inquirers and editors, the laymen were never sarcastic, disdainful, or funny. They assume that those to whom they wrote were sincere and wished to know the truth. They found that, except in a small minority of cases, this was the fact. In the early days of their efforts they wrote as many as a hundred letters a week to editors. The reaction of the editors and of the people in general is indicated by the fact that now the average is 2 letters a month to the 200 newspapers, daily and weekly, in Georgia, and that, more often than not, current letters are occasioned by syndicated matter from outside the South. It can be said now, as it could for many years back, that the press of Georgia is today as fair toward Catholics as that of any State in the Union.

The experience of the Catholics of Georgia is of vital importance today, against the background of the Communist efforts to divide religious-minded Americans by the inciting of prejudice and bigotry. Too often we of the Catholic laity have acted as though the matter of misrepresentation of our church is of concern only to our bishops and clergy. We have in the United States approximately 150 bishops, men unsurpassed anywhere as a group in intellectual attainments, culture, capacity for leadership and, of course, in character. But we have only one bishop for every million persons in the Nation. We have over 39,000 priests, every one a man of education and character. But we of the laity are more than 600 times as numerous as our priests. If our Protestant and Jewish neighbors who have been misinformed and misled by those seeking to stir up religious strife are to know the facts, if the movement to divide us into contentious groups along religious lines is to be defeated, we of the laity must realize our obligation to serve as missionaries of the truth, apostles of good will.

This is not a work on behalf of the church alone, but for harmony in the community, for the strengthening of the Nation, for the preservation of our civilization. It is part of the great battle which must be waged against those who would set us one against the other by making any of our differences, particularly racial and economic, a basis for bitterness and hatred. Nor is it a work for Catholics alone; it is the solemn duty of all right-minded Americans, of all persons who appreciate the value of religion, whether they be Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish, to guard our religious heritage with every fiber of our being so that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

Should the Mundt-Nixon Bill Be Enacted Into Law?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, in response to a great many requests for copies of the transcript of the recent radio debate broadcast by the American Broadcasting Co. on the question, Should the Mundt-Nixon bill be enacted into law? I am inserting the entire debate in the RECORD at this point. In this debate, I upheld the affirmative side and the national chairman of the Communist Party, William Z. Foster, of New York City, supported the negative position.

The debate grew out of a challenge hurled at me by Mr. Foster as a sequel to the Dewey-Stassen debate which played such a significant part in the Oregon primary election and which in large part revolved around the Mundt-Nixon bill. Mr. Foster suggested the debate be held in Madison Square Garden of New York City where Communists have so frequently held meetings in the past. I countered by proposing the debate be held at the Shrine of Democracy on Mount Rushmore in South Dakota's beautiful magic mountain country, the Black Hills, where the historic figures of four great Americans could lend their inspiration to the occasion and perhaps cause even my Communist opponent to realize some of the significant values of the American freedoms he and his cohorts would destroy through the imposition of tryannical communism as a substitute for representative government of this Republic. As a compromise the debate was held in the studios of ABC affiliate stations since neither of us was willing to cross the country to meet the other in his preferred environment.

The transcript follows:

THE NEGATIVE

Mr. FOSTER. Fellow citizens, the Mundt bill is backed by big employers, union-busters, open-shoppers, Jew-haters, Negro-baiters, warmongers, and Fascists generally.

This bill has reactionary aims, similar to the Taft-Hartley slave-labor law, but worse to cut the heart out of the labor movement, to establish a police state, and to rush us into war. The labor and progressive forces are strongly against this bill.

First, the bill aims to outlaw the Communist Party. It does this by prohibiting the advocacy of communism under heavy penalties and by compelling the Communists to register. But we Communists refuse to be gagged. We will not register under the Mundt bill or any other Communist registration bill. We refuse to help scuttle the Bill of Rights. We will never turn over the names of thousands of honest people to employers, police, and witch hunters, to be hounded, blacklisted, and persecuted. This bill is deliberately planned to drive the Communist Party underground.

The second and major purpose of the Mundt bill is to shatter the labor and progressive movement. With the Communist Party forced underground, the reactionaries would be able to attack fiercely every struggle of the trade unions, third parties, Negroes, farmers, foreign-born, and others, as the work of hidden Communist conspirators. Under such a Fascist law, strikers could be punished as Communists. With the Attorney General as chief witch hunter, every progressive body could be condemned as a Communist front. This would be a perfect set-up for the reactionaries. The present anti-Red hysteria would be mild in comparison with the wild witch hunt they would then initiate. All this would be disastrous for organized labor and other democratic movements.

The third basic aim of the Mundt bill is to lay the basis for a police state. With their Taft-Hartley law, loyalty oaths, increase in Negro-, Jew-, and Red-baiting, growth of militarism and warmongering, the reactionaries are building fascism in this country. If they can pass the Mundt bill, then fascism will be at our very doors.

The fourth main purpose of the Mundt bill is to push our country into the disastrous war that Wall Street is now organizing in its mad determination to rule the world. Our Government, controlled by the trusts, is carrying on the biggest campaign of imperialist expansion in the history of the world. Our Navy, bigger than all other navies combined, completely dominates all the oceans. Our Air Force, with bases all over the world, is being hugely extended, to make our air domination of the world as complete as our naval domination. Japan is entirely under our control. So is western Germany. France and Italy are little more than American puppet states. Likewise, Nationalist China and Latin America, and we have Great Britain on the dole. The big aim of Wall Street imperialism now is to force the Soviet Union, the new European democracy and the colonial liberation movements under its control, and thus make its world rule complete.

Hitler hardly even dreamed of such imperialist expansion. This Wall Street expansionism is the cause of the present war scare and it will lead to a clash, fatal to America and the world if the American people do not halt it. The Mundt police state bill is part of this Wall Street plot against world peace. Under such a law with its Japanese thought control and its savage prison penalties, those who oppose the draft or UMT, the handing over of our Government to reactionary generals or the giving of arms to reactionary governments of Greece and China, could be sent to jail for 10 years for "Giving aid and comfort to a Communist political organization, a Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement.

There you have it, in a nutshell. Outlawing the Communist Party would knife organized labor, undermine American democracy, clear the way for a police state and speed us into war, which is just what Big Business wants.

The Mundt bill backers shout that this bill would not outlaw the Communist Party. They are extremely anxious to have you believe this lie. They want to throw dust in your eyes so that you can't see that the Mundt bill destroys our basic freedoms, so that you can't realize the deadly danger to organized labor, if our party were driven underground, and above all, they don't want you to recall that Hitler and Mussolini also started building fascism by outlawing the Communist Party.

To further hide the purpose of their Fascist bill the reactionaries are trying to rush it through Congress under a cloud of red-baiting and anti-Communist hysteria. They are trying to paralyze your political judgment by denouncing every advocate of peace as a red, or a foreign agent. That was the method of Hitler, to scare the people with the bogey of communism and then to ram through his reactionary program. That, too, is the strategy behind the Mundt bill. Hitler, like the sponsor of this bill, also made wild charges against communism and for the same purpose, to plunge the country into fascism and war.

Fellow Americans, whether or not you believe the current fantastic anti-Communist slanders is not decisive at this critical moment. On this Memorial Day, the important thing is that you should realize the Fascist content of the Mundt bill. Don't let the reactionaries fasten a police state on us, under the false pretext that it would hit only the Communists. Actually, the Communists are only a secondary objective of the Mundt bill. Its real purpose is to give a deadly blow to the labor and progressive movement, to American democracy and to world peace. With their Taft-Hartley law, loyalty oaths, red-baiting and war mongering, the reactionaries are erecting fascism in the United States. Don't let them add the Mundt bill to their hideous Fascist structure. Under this bill the Attorney General could condemn all fighters for higher wages, united labor action, the Third Party, antilynch laws, and so on, and all those who oppose the Taft-Hartley Act, the program of the NAM, Jim Crowism and the poll tax, or who criticize the Government. They attacked Roosevelt and LaGuardia as fellow-travelers of the Communists. They are now denouncing Wallace as pro-Communist because he wants peace, not war, with the Soviet Union.

If the Mundt bill passes, such progressives could be jailed, under the new crime of guilt by association, because Communists support their causes. The Mundt bill shows the complete collapse of the charge that Communists advocate force and violence. Now they intend to forbid us even to speak of socialism. That's thought control.

The passage of the Mundt bill would shock the world like our barbarous treatment of the Negro; it would expose the weak state of our democracy and would ruin American prestige abroad. It would be a clear signal to the world that the forces of fascism and war are on the march in the United States. Don't let them distort your judgment about horror tales, about Communist conspirators just about to grab the Government. Keep your eye on the ball, the Fascist Mundt bill. Beware of the ruin that this Hitler bill would bring to your unions, your living standards, your liberties and to world peace.

Communist parties can and do survive under ferocious Fascist dictatorships, but trade unions cannot. To avoid a Fascist war-torn America, to march toward peace and democracy, defeat the Mundt bill. Throw it into history's ash can, along with the notorious alien and sedition laws of 1798.

You have the power to defeat this bill, if you will send your protests to the United States Senate. Act, before it is too late.

THE AFFIRMATIVE

Congressman MUNDT. Ladies and gentlemen, you have just heard the statements of Mr. W. Z. Foster, national chairman of the Communist Party in America.

At the outset I would like to point out that if Mr. Foster could have his way and if he and his party were tonight in control of the United States, this debate would now be over. The whole program would be concluded because, under the Communist concept of life, which Mr. Foster represents and reflects, there is no freedom of discussion, no minority rights, no opportunity to speak out against the position and the policies of the Communist Party. Such a debate as this one to which Communist Leader Foster has challenged me could take place only in a democratic country like our great United States. It could not take place in the Soviet Union, which William Foster so affectionately admires. It could not take place in Poland or Bulgaria, or Yugoslavia or Hungary, or Czechoslavakia or any of the 11 countries of Europe which the Communist regime in Russia has overrun, and conquered and reduced to the slavery which is always the earmark of communism everywhere.

No; my fellow Americans, this debate tonight could not take place in any country in the world which is ruled by the Communist Party, and Mr. Foster knows it, and Mr. Foster is unable to refer you tonight to any similar debate taking place in Russia.

It is interesting that this debate occurs on the evening of a national holiday, Memorial Day, to which Mr. Foster has made very passing reference. I think that fact helps to underscore and emphasize the basic difference in opinion tonight between his attitude on the Mundt-Nixon bill and my position in supporting that legislation.

You see, fellow Americans, the Communists also have a special day in May. Now, they call it May Day. And on that day in the United States the Communist Party here joins the sister Communist Parties all over the world in parades and plots and plans to advance the day when these Communists hope to take over the control and management of all established governments. It is a day as far removed from Memorial Day as it is possible to stretch a contrast. May Day applauds and supports a Communist cause in which every country where it is in power has destroyed human freedoms, circumscribed the worship of God, and has placed the state, the godless materialistic, gun-toting state which it invariably establishes, above the rights and freedoms of its subjects and gives its people the kind of Red fascism of which Mr. Foster has been speaking to you in the last 10 minutes.

On the other hand, on Memorial Day, we Americans who love our country more than any foreign flag or cause, meet together to commemorate a day of freedom, since Memorial Day marks the end of our war between the States, which put an end to human slavery in America.

So, on this Memorial Day, Mr. Foster and I discuss two points of view. You have heard him discuss the Communist concept which in its world-wide program sets up dictatorships to enforce slavery upon people and devotes its annual May Day to rededicating itself to that pagan purpose.

The other concept is Americanism which renounces slavery and dictatorship, which has become the envy of the entire world by operating under the formula that under God the people rule.

In stating his reasons for hoping that the Mundt-Nixon bill to expose and to register and to circumscribe the activities of Communists within the United States is not approved by the Senate and does not become law, and in urging you to join him in his Communist opposition to this legislation, Mr. Foster gave three or four reasons about the bill, and devoted the rest of his time to a widely scattered, shotgun attack on most of the things that Congress and the Government have been doing in this country for the past 2 years.

Now, these points which Mr. Foster made are not his real reasons for opposing this legislation. His real reason is that he knows, and you know, and Congress knows that the Mundt-Nixon bill will cripple the efforts of the Communist Party to continue to undermine the country and eventually to set up here a totalitarian government operated and dominated from abroad.

He made four or five points which I want to discuss specifically. He said that it aims to outlaw the Communist Party. Well, it just happens that this bill does not have any such aim at all. It very specifically says it does not outlaw the Communist Party, and if it does, it outlaws the Communist Party only because then Mr. Foster admits that section 4 of the bill is directed at the Communist Party. We who wrote the bill, in section 4 never mentioned the Communist Party. We simply said in that section that any group in America who conspires to establish within this country a government dominated from abroad, and dictatorial in nature, shall be engaging in an illegal process. Now, if the shoe fits, Mr. Foster, put it on. If that's what you Communists are trying to do, that program is outlawed. Otherwise, there's nothing in the bill anywhere, anyplace, even remotely beginning to outlaw the Communist Party. We continue to let you broadcast in America, as you have done tonight, a privilege denied to everybody but Communists in every communistic country in the world. We continue to let you use the mails. We continue to let you have access to the ballot. You can have every right any other American party has except the right, if you can call it that, to undermine the government by conspiracies, in an effort to subjugate it to some other country.

He also said that we seek to drive the Communists underground. That, indeed, was a far cry in the dark, because the thing that worries him is that we require the Communists to register, in the open If making the Communists register is driving them under the ground, then it seems to me that one is trying to conceal smallpox when he puts a quarantine sign on a diseased home. It exposes them. It does not drive them underground.

He says we are trying to undermine labor and intimidate labor. We don't even mention any restrictions about labor in this proposition. He is the one who sets himself up as a self-proclaimed spokesman for labor, and I'm glad to say that a great many labor leaders and individual laborers in this country are supporting this legislation because they recognize communism is the worst enemy they have and, of course, Foster raises the old cry, it's a Fascist bill.

Well, the best answer to that is that fascism and communism are also closely akin that if anybody knows what fascism is, it must be Mr. Foster, because he practices the concepts and promotes the program of fascism when he supports communism.

And now, since Mr. Foster challenged me to debate him tonight, and I have accepted his challenge and am meeting him, I propose to make two challenges to Mr. Foster and let you, the radio audience, decide whether he acts with equal promptitude in answering my challenges.

The first challenge I make, Mr. Foster, is this: I challenge Mr. Foster when the microphone is turned back to him to name one single instance when the Communist Party in America has criticized and found fault with the foreign policy and actions of Communist Russia.

My second challenge, Mr. Foster, is as follows: Last week you testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee in opposition to

the Mundt-Nixon bill, you're speaking against it on the radio tonight, despite the fact it passed the House by a roll call vote of 319 to 58. Okay, that's all right. Under our American concept of democracy we believe in freedom of speech and freedom of opposition, but I now challenge Mr. Foster, when he takes the microphone, to name one single opposition leader in all of Russia as well known as he is in this country who, within the last 10 years, has appeared before a Russian governing board to criticize or opposed its decisions and who has lived to tell the tale.

Now, Mr. Foster, please be specific if you answer that challenge. Name the date. Name the man. Name the issue, so we can prove to the American public that it did not happen, or, if it did happen, so we can direct the American public to the spot in Siberia where that opposition leader has been sent, or to the grave he occupies for having been shot for daring to oppose this dictatorial, godless, communism creed which you espouse.

Now, friends, on this Mundt-Nixon bill, it simply requires the Communists to register in the open. It requires, also, that no Communist can circularize literature through the mails without putting the imprint of the Communist Party on it, and then it strikes directly at the Communists, and that is what causes Mr. Foster to mourn so sorrowfully to you tonight.

Our bill says that no Communist shall be permitted to work for the Federal Government. And why should he work there? Why should a fire department employ an arsonist as its fire chief? Why should a police department take a burglar and make him chief of police, and why should Americans employ on the Federal pay roll Communists whose loyalty is to Moscow, and who are sworn to try to destroy this free Republic? And our bill requires, finally, that anybody in this country, whether Communist or not, who conspires to establish a totalitarian dictatorship here, controlled from abroad, that that act shall be illegal.

My fellow Americans, I hope you will wire the Senate Judiciary Committee, putting yourself on record now against the Communist attempt to defeat this legislation, because they know if this legislation passes, communism begins passing from the dark into the open, and that means passing out of effective existence in our free American Republic.

REBUTTAL—NEGATIVE

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. MUNDT has just given us a big dose of Red baiting. I would like to know, What are we discussing here, the Mundt bill or the Constitution of Soviet Russia?

Here in his speech Mr. MUNDT has given us a graphic example of the strategy by which they hope to put across this police-state bill, by cultivating an anti-Communist hysteria of hatred, fear, and confusion. He wants to paralyze your political judgment. He wants them to put through his police-state bill without your realizing its deadly significance. If the people cannot see through such red-baiting, then the United States will take the path of Nazi Germany.

Mr. MUNDT said that I was putting myself up here as a spokesman of labor; that, in fact, the labor movement of the country is supporting the Mundt bill. This is not true. The CIO has gone on record, categorically against the Mundt bill, and Mr. Green has stated that he fears that this legislation will be used against organized labor, and he has good reason for his fear. Mr. Whitney, of the Railroad Trainmen, and a whole host of other trade-union leaders, are on record against this bill. Mr. MUNDT failed to prove that his bill would not outlaw the Communist Party.

Isn't it a peculiar thing that Mr. MUNDT and the other champions of this bill are so anxious to prove to America that this bill would not outlaw the Communist Party? The reason for that is, as I stated in the opening, that if they can once get the Communist Party underground, then they can proceed to attack every labor movement, every movement of labor, every progressive movement in the country, as the work of hidden Communist conspirators. You must beware of a law that forces the Communist Party underground. Take away the rights of the Communist Party, and the rights of the whole labor movement are gone.

Mr. MUNDT stated that the House voted for the Mundt bill. Yes, that's true. And the House also voted, not long ago, to give financial aid to Franco Spain. Democratic spirit in the House is at the lowest ebb since the foundation of this Republic. The supporters of the Mundt bill constitute a roster of reaction in America. The bill's opponents comprise the progressive movement and a whole host of labor, Negro, farmer, third party, social, cultural, and political leaders and organizations. This fact tells its own story.

Workers, citizens, beware of the Mundt bill. Don't let them put across the Mundt police-state bill. If they do pass it, prepare to bid goodby to American democracy and peace. The Mundt bill would be a long step in the direction of fascism in this country. Protest now. The bill can still be defeated.

REBUTTAL—AFFIRMATIVE

Congressman MUNDT. Ladies and gentlemen, now, let me say, first of all, that you have just witnessed a life-size laboratory demonstration of the manner in which communism operates in this country. Mr. Foster challenged me to this debate. I accepted his challenge. In return, I challenged him on two questions, and he ignored them, as Communists invariably do. He ignored my challenge to name a single instance in America when the Communist Party has criticized or found fault with the foreign policy of Communist Russia. He ignored it because no such case exists. We have studied the records for years in the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and, without a single exception, the Daily Worker, Mr. Foster, your American Communists see eye to eye with the men of Moscow, because the men of Moscow tell them at what they should look and what they should say.

He likewise ignored my second challenge, to name a single opposition leader in Russia who had appeared before a Russian governing group to exercise the privilege Mr. Foster is utilizing tonight to criticize the action of a branch of Government. He could not name one, because anybody who has tried that in Russia has been shot or sentenced to Siberia. And that is communism, my friends, the thing that Mr. Foster seeks to protect and promote in this Republic.

And what does he say now? "We're going to drive it underground." Drive it underground, how? By making it register, in the open, by making it put its name on its propaganda, by making it put its name on its broadcasts. That certainly is exposing it in the open, not driving it underground, unless, of course, Mr. Foster intends to ignore the law, and refuses to register, as he told the Senate Judiciary Committee he might do a day or two ago. The New York Times quotes him as saying he will disobey the law, even though we pass it, even though the Supreme Court upholds it, and if America goes to war with Russia he will not support the American side. Of course, under such outlawry technique, the procedures of Mr. Foster are going to be outlawed, because, sooner or later they're going to lead him to jail.

And hear what he says about the labor situation: Let me tell you what Mr. William Z. Foster actually thinks about these labor leaders that he's quoted. Writing in the Daily Worker for January 1, 1948, just a couple of months ago, page 2, he says: "I don't care whether the name is William Green, Philip Murray, or A. F. Whitney—they are betraying the interests of the workers in America today." He says Bill Green, Phil Murray, and Whitney do not speak for the workers of the country; assuming that he, the Communist leader, of course, does.

I'm glad to say Mr. Foster is rapidly losing any grip that he's had on any element of American labor, and rapidly American labor is divorcing itself from his Communist cause.

Now, friends, the conspiracy of communism is a very tightly organized group in this country, and they have been launching a tirade against Washington, trying to defeat the Mundt-Nixon bill, because they know if that bill passes their days are numbered in America. They have sent 30,000 telegrams to Washington, denouncing this bill. This bill, that the American Legion, that the Veterans of Foreign Wars, that the United States Chamber of Commerce, that many individual labor organizations, that so many liberals and progressives, Republicans and Democrats alike, are endorsing; the Communists have gotten 30,000 telegrams on the Senate Judiciary Committee's desk tonight urging its defeat.

I wonder if there are not at least 30,000 good Americans listening to this debate tonight who will volunteer to strike a blow for freedom on this Memorial Day by spending just a dollar to send a Western Union telegram to the Senate Judiciary Committee, favoring the immediate passage of the Mundt-Nixon bill, saying not to be frightened by this Communist tirade of telegrams; asking the Senate Judiciary Committee, wiring your own Senator if you care to do that, telling them to get action in this session of Congress so that communism can be drawn into the open in this country and its poisonous fangs destroyed before it achieves its objective of destroying freedom in this Republic.

High Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address I delivered over Station WMEX, in Boston, Mass., June 17, 1948:

RISING PRICES—PUBLIC ENEMY NO. 1

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, the steady increase in the cost of living is causing worry in every American home.

The housing shortage affects millions, but the high cost of existence bears heavily on tens of millions.

The people, with slowly mounting anger, are beginning to ask why this Nation, which mastered every problem which came up during the war, cannot halt that inflation which leads to "boom and bust."

High prices and the responsibility for them may well be the decisive issue in the national election on November the second.

For the people are tired of high-sounding excuses. They look for, and expect, a remedy.

Many people, especially in the big industries, have received wage increases which have enabled their incomes to keep within hailing distance of prices. Many others have not received this first aid. The aged, and the disabled veterans, who have nothing but

their fixed pensions, Government workers, clerks in stores and offices, these are the major casualties of the price-wage war.

Those who succeeded in throwing off Government price controls, too soon, have also abandoned their self-control. They insist on free enterprise, during an emergency, on the plea that the law of supply and demand will eventually bring prices down.

That is true, as far as it goes. But I maintain that they are using this as a pretext to confiscate the savings of the majority of our people, before supply catches up with demand.

The clever and the unscrupulous are observing the letter of a law while they are violating its spirit.

But the American people see through this deception, and not all the $5-words in the dictionary can divert the people's attention from the main issue. They will demand an accounting from those who are short-changing them.

We are being forced to pay prices for the necessities of life which are beyond all reason. For the mental and physical effort which the people are putting into the production of goods and services, they are getting a diminishing return, as measured by purchasing power.

Many workers cannot pay their way. After their meager savings are exhausted, they must go into debt. More and more family budgets are failing to break even.

The burden of distress which this is placing on the breadwinners of the Nation can be known only by the countless individuals who are suffering such an experience. The threat which this places on our economy as a whole borders on a national scandal.

Try to balance these facts.

On one side of the ledger we have corporations making more money, after taxes, than at any other time in their history.

On the other side of the ledger we find that the consumers' price index is 8½ percent above 1 year ago, and 70 percent higher than the 1935–39 average.

Remember how, in the campaign of 1946, those who now control Congress campaigned on the slogan "Had enough?" Remember how they insisted that, with the sudden ending of controls, prices would certainly go down?

Let's look at the record to see how their misrepresentations backfired on the average American's pocketbook.

Since June of 1946 prices, instead of going down as the turn-back-to-yesterday boys had promised, went up 27 percent. And, as the Federal Reserve Board said, as of May 20 of this year, "Inflationary pressure will be stronger in the last half of this year than in the first half. Price increases will be hard to forestall."

Where does this leave the public? Betrayed by the majority party in the present Congress, and where does this leave them? To face the voters' wrath in November, for the 27-percent jump in the cost of living which their big-business-first policies have inflicted on the consumers of our Nation.

After 14 years out of office they were desperate to get back in. They seized on the question of prices, promising to cut Federal spending and to lower the cost of living.

In both of these promises they have failed.

Instead of reducing the Federal budget, they have increased it. Instead of lowering prices, they have added fuel to the fires of inflation. The latest figures show that 25 percent of all American families are either using up their meager savings or are going into debt.

This is the party which shouts for free enterprise, and then votes the other way. With this party to do its bidding in the Congress, big business has had a field day for the past 2 years. And legislation in the public interest hasn't had a chance. This is the party which prefers the secret government of monopoly, which will be stronger than the duly elected Government of the people.

And now this party is asking us to approve, with our votes, the higher cost of living which they have presented to us.

In my opinion, the American people are not content to have their earnings taken from them through high prices, on the assurance that production will finally bring prices down. By that time they will be broke, or deep in debt.

If sacrifices must be made during this transitional period, they must be shared by industry and by the highest paid workers, as well as by the public. The rank and file of Americans—which is the majority—is not in a mood to carry the entire burden alone.

On December 7, 1941, we had to change over completely from a peacetime to a wartime way of doing business. Millions of our young men and women left their jobs and went into the armed forces. Millions of civilians left farm and factory to work in war plants, producing ships and guns and planes and tanks. Production to meet the ordinary needs of life, was sharply curtailed. As a result, over a period of 4 years, a great backlog of demand was built up. This was held in check by price controls and rationing to insure that everyone got his fair share of those goods which were in short supply and at reasonable prices. In the meantime, in order to meet the needs of war the volume of money or purchasing power increased.

Too soon after the war ended the party of monopoly voted price controls away. Everyone rushed to buy those goods which they had gone without during the war before production had caught up with demand. Many people were bidding against each other for every scarce item thereby pushing prices sky high.

Finally, prices have gone beyond the reach of millions, even for the bare necessities of life.

The danger signals are flying, but certain powerful groups in our economy, show no inclination toward giving the public a break.

Offhand, I can recall only two corporations which, with a commendable sense of their responsibility toward the public, have voluntarily cut prices. Only a few labor unions have signified that they would prefer to see prices reduced, rather than seek further wage boosts for their members.

Unless inflation is halted, it will bring hardship to nearly everyone, regardless of source of income. Peoples bank savings would still draw interest, but the money itself would depreciate in value. People who had paid premiums on insurance annuities over a period of years, would face a similar loss. Disabled veterans who depend for their livelihood on pensions, would be especially hard hit by uncontrolled inflation, since many of them are unable to work, and would have no chance to make up for their loss of income.

Even with rising prices, people still have to buy necessities like food and clothing. More and more of each family's income must be spent for essentials. As food and clothing eat up most of the money, less and less is spent on other things. The demand for other commodities begins to fall off. When demand begins to weaken, manufacturers begin to reduce production. Lower production means a further reduction of purchasing power by putting some people out of work.

If a drastic drop in buying should follow, business houses would find their shelves overstocked with goods, bought at high prices, which they could not sell. Orders to manufacturers would be canceled, and prices would go down almost as fast as they had gone up.

This might be considered desirable by those people who had refused to buy at higher prices. This temporary advantage would be canceled by the other effects of deflation. Take the field of housing, for instance. Veterans, in particular, have bought houses at the high prices which have been the rule since the end of the war. Very few of these houses are owned outright. Mortgage payments and interest charges go on, unaffected by the changes in the owners' incomes. These charges are fixed money terms. Payments and interest must be made on the same level, even though the values of the houses themselves go down. If an owner is forced to sell his house because he cannot keep up the payments on it, he will have to take a loss on the transaction.

Deflation is therefore the opposite of inflation. Both situations are dangerous. People have more money during inflation, but high prices take away their additional buying power. During a period of deflation, goods can be bought for less money, but, because incomes drop, people have not the money to take advantage of the lower prices.

Sound prosperity, therefore, depends on a proper balance somewhere between the extremes of inflation and deflation.

Under the Marshall plan, which will enable war-torn nations to get economic assistance from us, there will be a demand for American goods. Our stepped-up defense program will call for more. These will exert an upward pressure on prices.

What are we doing to head off higher prices which could lead to collapse and depression?

Our Government urges us to buy United States Security bonds. By our purchases of these bonds, we make the safest investment in the world, backed by all the wealth and resources of the United States. At the same time, we put money out of circulation, thereby reducing the competitive bidding which raises prices.

By practicing thrift, and doing without some things for awhile—we shall help to stop inflation, and give production a chance to come close to demand.

The President has asked for the restoration of certain selective controls, but the majority in Congress ignores his warning.

Meanwhile prices continue to rise.

There is only one chance to save the situtation and that is for "we, the people" to practice that self-discipline upon which democracy depends.

If enough of us act together, to avoid overbuying and careless buying, we shall put the brakes on demand. If we hold back on our purchasing power, even those who are trying to gouge every last nickel out of us, must stop. And prices will drop in an orderly manner, without upsetting the economy of our Nation.

This is one weapon against inflation that we can put our hands on and use.

Those families in the upper half of the income scale, whose members earn $3,000 a year and more, must share the responsibility for driving prices up. I appeal to them for the sake of our national welfare—of which they are an inescapable part—to save, instead of spending their disposable income. Don't buy recklessly and thereby bid up prices for those in the lower income group who cannot afford to pay them.

Remember, we shall either curb inflation, or be crushed by it together.

Welcome to Wonderful Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 15), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the Record a statement I have prepared entitled "Welcome to Wonderful Wisconsin."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELCOME TO WONDERFUL WISCONSIN

THE BADGER STATE WARMLY INVITES AMERICAN VACATIONERS

This is the time of year when tens of millions of Americans are thinking of enjoying themselves in vacation fun and merriment. They need look no further than the State of Wisconsin for all that is within their heart's desire for a magnificent vacation. There is "a little bit of all the world in Wisconsin"—a magnificent blend of cultures and peoples that will be fascinating to every American tourist, and there is every type of wholesome thrill to suit every vacation appetite.

NEED FOR RECREATION

In this election year particularly, Americans feel the need for some wholesome relaxation. "Man does not live by bread alone", and Americans know that they must "go apart" from the feverish pace of the crowded cities and must find a haven of rest of health and enjoyment—of serene simplicity.

It has become a standard joke in America that folks complain about that "let-down feeling," "upset nerves", lack of sleep, poor digestion, tension, anxiety, worry, and all the other ailments which we have come to associate with modern civilization. If you want a good prescription for which you don't have to go far, but which you can fill yourself, may I respectfully prescribe the one word, "Wisconsin."

100 CANDLES IN WISCONSIN'S BIRTHDAY CAKE

This year Wisconsin is celebrating the one-hundredth anniversary of its admission to statehood. Its calendar therefore is crowded with memorable events, with celebrations, ceremonials, and a thousand and one other observances to vary your vacation schedule, including the great state fair in West Allis, a suburb of Milwaukee, in August. A visit to this gigantic exposition alone is worth the price of your trip to Wisconsin.

VARIETY OF WISCONSIN THRILLS

Whether you are looking for the thrilling coolness of water sports—swimming, leisurely rowing, swift canoeing, zooming motorboats, sails billowing in the breezes—whether it is long hours of restful tanning on the beaches in the sun, whether it is the exciting thrill of fishing for the widest variety of fish in the country, American vacationers can find the fulfillment of all their vacation expectations in the Badger State.

It is no mere act of natural pride in my native State to present these facts. On the contrary, the record of the constantly increasing number of vacationers who enjoy the matchless splendors of the Badger State is proof in itself that Wisconsin courtesy, Wisconsin hospitality, Wisconsin facilities and accommodations, are among the finest, if not the finest, in all America. And that's no exaggeration.

VISITING INDUSTRY AND FARMING

Here in the prosperous Badger State you will find an ideal balance of industry and agriculture. If you are looking for a fascinating assortment of industrial enterprises to visit, you will find them in our clean, friendly cities, in Milwaukee, in Racine, Madison, Kenosha, and our other fine metropolisis. If you are looking for the refreshing naturalness of farming at its best, you will find it in America's dairyland, in the green rolling country that houses 175,000 of the Nation's finest farms—farms and cheese factories that, for example, produce more delicious cheese than all 47 other States combined. Wherever you go, you will find land that is impressive in its scenic beauty, inspiring in its romantic past, abundant in its facilities for affording pleasure—from border to border a great vacation State, 56,000 square miles—and most of it "heaven on earth."

HIGHSPOTS OF BADGER PANORAMA

You will thrill to the splendid variety of tourist attractions—

The most concentrated cherry-producing area in the United States in Door County.

Twenty-two State Parks in Wisconsin, covering 178,000 acres.

Seventy-five hundred lakes of matchless beauty; 10,000 miles of streams.

Milwaukee Harbor constituting one of the greatest on the Great Lakes and rivaling in beauty with the Bay of Naples.

The magnificent Wisconsin Dells, where last year more than 150,000 persons made the trip up the river through the gorgeous scenery.

The awesome lakelands region of southern Wisconsin.

The scenic southwestern region fringed by the Mississippi River.

The serene and beautiful Apostle Islands in Lake Superior.

The fascinating Indian Head country—a paradise of recreation.

Wilderness and wonderland, cottage-fringed lakes and purebred cows grazing on sweet pastureland, well-governed cities and secluded cabins.

World famous restaurants with tempting cuisines.

Gorgeous sunsets and awesome dawns from picturesque views.

SAFE COMFORTABLE TRAVEL

Here, as throughout the Nation, the American Automobile Association is ready to aid in every way with fast, efficient, eager service. Local chambers of commerce and travel bureaus assure you prompt, accurate information and aid.

It is easy to get there and it is easy to travel there. In your own car, by railroad, by comfortable buses, by speedy plane, by steamship over the Great Lakes, your journey to and in Wisconsin will be pleasant and safe. If you are traveling by your own car, you will find our State's 80,000 miles of model highways ideal for your motoring comfort, with every mile either concrete or dust-proof.

LEGEND-RICH WISCONSIN

Here is a State that is rich in folklore, a State filled with the imprints of its fascinating Indian past, of the era of French rule and British rule. Here is a land settled by the pioneers of the old world, of every extraction, who brought with them the colorful costumes, the tuneful folk songs, the varied customs, the tasty foods of their native lands, together with a deep love of freedom, of independence, and of friendship which characterize the Badger State.

If you want to hike and explore through virgin forests, to camp out in the great outdoors and rough it to your heart's content, to enjoy America's traditional summer sports, tennis, golf, volleyball, cycling, and horseback riding—whatever your choice, you will find it fulfilled in Wisconsin.

OUTDOOR SPLENDORS

America's he-men will, of course, be particularly interested in the biggest, strongest, most spectacular and most thrilling fresh water game fish—the rugged muskie—the king of all trophies for any fisherman. Wisconsin has long led the world in fish propagation and in stocking of lakes and streams—with bass, wall-eyes, perch, trout, and others. Wisconsin's Conservation Commission is a model for the Nation in all phases of enhancing your recreation, preserving the beauty of the outdoors, while assuring every pleasure for the hunter, the fisherman, and the outdoors man. "That's no fish story."

Here you will find scenery that will set your heart afire with satisfaction; leaping water falls that spray the air with a cool mist, rocky cliffs reflected in the clear water, great rivers sweeping past towering palisades, the waves of the great inland sea washing the clean beaches of shining sand, forests serene in natural beauty.

MODEL TOURIST ENTERPRISES

Wisconsin's great vacation industry has not rested on its laurels. It has used the postwar period for development of its wonderful facilities. Many resort owners have entirely refurnished their establishments, widened their variety of facilities, built new game rooms, organized new scenic tours and trips, put in tennis courts, built playgrounds, equipped cottages with the latest conveniences, modernized hotel rooms, hired expert guides. Attractive literature is available upon request.

CONCLUSION

If you are tired of all the political talk that is filling the air, if you are weary of your endless work responsibilities, if you don't intend to be fleeced in so-called vacation spots which empty your pockets without giving you any wholesome relaxation in return, spots which are long on promises but short on fulfillment, then Wisconsin is the "happy hunting grounds" for you, and for your whole family.

There is a vacation to fit every budget and to give you real value for every dollar you spend.

Welcome to wonderful Wisconsin. Celebrate in the Badger State in '48.

Accomplishments of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 15), 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, as chairman of the subcommittee handling the agricultural appropriations bill for the Senate Appropriations Committee for the last 2 years, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, retired president of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Chicago, Ill., July 26, 1947.

Hon. C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BROOKS: I want to congratulate you on the outstanding job which you have done as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the agricultural appropriations bill, in preventing the elimination or wrecking of vital farm programs and services, and at the same time, bringing about constructive, effective economy.

As you know, we were greatly disturbed over the actions taken by the House which would have completely eliminated or seriously handicapped some of our basic agricultural programs. Fortunately, however, in the Senate, under your able leadership, and with the effective assistance of your colleagues on the committee, the most serious cuts were restored.

It was a great tribute to you and your associates on the committee that the Senate three times voted unanimously to stand by your committee on items in dispute with the House. This action of the Senate by Republicans and Democrats is an edifying example of placing principle above partisanship, and is deeply appreciated by farm people.

On behalf of our organization, I want to thank you for your great assistance on these issues of such vital importance to agriculture.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD A. O'NEAL,
President.

Revolving Fund Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I appear here in support of S. 2376, the so-called "revolving fund bill."

The bill, as indicated in the Senate report, provides for the establishment of a revolving fund of $150,000,000, available to the Secretary of the Army, for the purchase of natural fibers in the United States for processing in the occupied areas. Upon sale of the processed goods either in the domestic market of the occupied areas or for export, a sum equal to the amount withdrawn from the revolving fund plus 2½ percent interest would be returned to the fund in United States dollars.

This bill was readily passed by the Senate, based upon a report that the bankrupt condition of the textile industry in the occupied areas plus the problem of inadequate supplies of raw materials justifies the legislation. Moreover, it was found that in order to reduce certain occupation costs now being borne by the United States, some means must be provided for the recovery and reestablishment of a working, productive textile industry in those areas. It was estimated by witnesses before the Senate committee that the appropriation for occupation requirements for the 1949 fiscal year would have been approximately $300,000,000 less if an adequate revolving fund had been established 2 years ago.

So, Mr. Speaker, this bill can serve two purposes. First, it can have the effect of saving this Government some money by helping the textile industries in the occupied countries to get back on their feet and help them to become self-supporting. Secondly, it affords an opportunity to help dispose of some of our surplus fibers, including mohair, wool, and cotton, and in that way it would directly help our own economy.

I wish to point out that at this moment there is an unprecedented surplus of mohair in our warehouses that approximates 12,000,000 pounds. Angora mohair is a rather delicate fiber and can be put to good use in the textile mills in both Germany and Japan. It blends with wool for clothing and is also very desirable in the manufacture of blankets, upholstery, draperies, etc.

As I have pointed out, we now have a surplus of around 12,000,000 pounds of mohair. A new crop of some 8,000,000 pounds will be shorn in August. It is believed that under the terms of this bill a considerable amount of this large surplus can be included in the program. And by doing so no damage whatever will be done to our economy. On the contrary, such use will be beneficial to our mohair growers and will help to sustain an industry that is now in a depressed condition.

The surplus of mohair offers an available fiber that will contribute to the success of the program, as will the surplus of cotton, wool, and flax. I am laying considerable stress on mohair because the surplus is admittedly relatively more pronounced.

Christian Marriage and the American Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as this Congress approaches adjournment, it appears that House Joint Resolution 375, which I introduced in the House on April 15, 1948, authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim an annual National Rededication to Marriage Week, will be one of the hundreds of bills and resolutions that will not be reached for action.

However, I want you to know that neither I, nor the multitudinous number of individuals and organizations who have endorsed this resolution and encouraged me in my effort, will abandon our objective to have Congress approve this recognition of the necessity to preserve and promote the sanctity of the Christian American home. I know that, if not tomorrow, this resolution will eventually be passed; there never was a more appropriate period of our history in which to record the sentiment of the Congress on the family unit as the basis for the survival of our American democracy.

I regret that time does not permit me to list the tremendous number of societies and persons who have worked unceasingly for the acceptance and approval of this resolution, and that being so, it would perhaps be best to record none at all.

Nevertheless, I should like to name one man, from my own State of Massachusetts, who was the earliest and most vigorous of the pioneers of this worthy idea. Attorney Samuel G. Thorner, of Boston, Mass., has been indefatigable in his advocacy of this proposal. He has repeatedly written to all Members of Congress, particularly to the members of the Judiciary Committee, urging adoption and approval of this resolution. Mr. Thorner conducts a daily column in a prominent Massachusetts newspaper, entitled "This Business of Marriage," and continues to devote a large portion of his time to the establishment of a firmer and more enduring basis for the American home.

The moral strength of a Nation depends upon the individual caliber of its citizens and home influence exerts the deciding factor in molding our future citizens. The family is the basis of our American strength and stability; an annual National Rededication to Marriage Week is vitally needed, and I am confident that it will receive early congressional sanction.

Jewish War Veterans of the United States Statement on the Mundt-Nixon Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, following is the position announced as that of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States on the Mundt-Nixon bill as approved in an emergency poll of its policy committee and submitted to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary:

In connection with the hearing on the Mundt-Nixon bill, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States will appreciate consideration by your committee and the Senate of the following observations:

The stated objectives of the bill meet with the whole-hearted approval of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States. Some way must be found to combat and to destroy these movements or organizations which have for their purpose and reason for existence impairment or destruction of the principles upon which this democratic government was founded, and through which the United States of America has become the hope of mankind.

We must not, however, in our zeal to protect those principles, give way to procedures that would endanger their continued existence. Liberty and freedom cannot exist where freedom of thought and expression are denied. This, of course, does not require that there can or should be no restraint upon those who, through selfish motives or what actually is treasonable conduct, threaten the existence of our form of government. In this connection, however, the thought must ever be in mind that in creating such restraints the guarantees of the Federal Constitution must not be negated.

In the preamble to the constitution of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States it is stated:

"We, citizens of the United States of America, of the Jewish faith, who served in the wars of the United States of America, in order that we may be of greater service to our country and to one another, associate ourselves together for the following purposes:

"To maintain true allegiance to the United States of America; to foster and perpetuate true Americanism; to combat whatever tends to impair the efficiency and permanency of our free institutions; to uphold the fair name of the Jew and fight his battles wher-

ever unjustly assailed; to encourage the doctrine of universal liberty, equal rights, and full justice to all men; to combat the powers of bigotry and darkness wherever originating and whatever their target; to preserve the spirit of comradeship by mutual helpfulness to comrades and their families; to cooperate with and support existing educational institutions and establish educational institutions and foster the education of ex-servicemen and our members in the ideals and principles of Americanism; to instill love of country and flag and to promote sound minds and bodies in our members and our youth; to preserve the memories and records of patriotic service performed by the men of our faith; to honor their memory and shield from neglect the graves of our heroic dead."

In keeping with the stated objectives of combatting the powers of bigotry and darkness wherever originating and whatever their target, we respectfully suggest to the committee and to the Congress that restrictions against incursions from the left or the right aimed at our democratic institutions are equally objectionable unless enacted with safeguards which will preserve and keep alive a government of laws rather than one of men.

We emphasize our abhorrence for and opposition to communism and fascism alike. Any form of government which does not derive its authority from people free to express their views and opinions cannot be accepted by a free people. The American people must expose and clean up the false fronts, the false names, and the false issues of fascism and communism and any other subversive or bigoted groups.

It is our considered judgment that the Mundt-Nixon bill is objectionable because in setting up those safeguards intended by proponents of the bill to preserve our form of government, it tears down and in fact destroys those principles upon which that government is founded. The valid objectives of the bill must and should be realized. We are confident that your committee can and will accomplish enactment of effective legislation judicially enforceable; legislation based upon the traditional American principle that violation of the rights of any group endangers the rights of all.

JULIUS KLEIN,
National Commander.

With the Present Truce in Palestine Now Is the Time To Secure a Settlement and Permanent Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, with the present truce in Palestine there is a golden opportunity to provide a settlement and a permanent peace. This war in the Holy Land has threatened world security and peace. Thousands of lives have been lost not counting the destruction of millions of dollars in property.

We are counting on the United Nations for this urgent solution and all of us here in America should do everything possible to cooperate with the United Nations on this important matter.

The crimes, brutality, systematic mass murders, tortures, and fiendish barbarism committed upon the Jewish people by Hitler will be an indelible blot of eternal disgrace on civilized mankind forever. It is beyond comprehension that one man could so persecute these defenseless Jews.

No one can deny that many of those that died could have been saved had the doors of Palestine been opened. The death of many of the victims of the Nazi concentration camps is a burden upon the conscience of the civilized world.

Now is the time to help these long-suffering people who were fortunate enough to escape Hitler's brutalities by seeing to it that they have a place to live where the rest of their lives will be spent in peace, something that has been denied them for so long.

Establish the $1 Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO ISACSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Speaker, Henry A. Wallace has applied the term "larceny" to the unimpeded rifling of our Nation's pocketbook which has gone on ever since the Eightieth Congress took over.

The charge of larceny of the people's wages will not need spelling out to people who are feeling the tremendous pressure and hardship of the inflation which this Congress has let loose on the Nation.

I have reviewed in other addresses to this House the part played in this scheme to rob the American people of their wages and savings by Congress through the killing of effective price control and the infliction of the Taft-Hartley law on American labor to prevent it from organizing the wage earners of our country to safeguard themselves against this larceny by collective bargaining for suitable wages.

I have introduced legislation to restore price controls and to repeal the Taft-Hartley law and once again free the strength of American labor to carry out its job of maintaining and advancing the American standard of living.

The volume of profits today is so enormous that substantial wage increases could be paid and prices cut to their previously controlled levels and still leave profits after taxes of American business at a level far higher than they were before the war.

Yet in the face of these economic truths, industry today has not only won from this Congress and the bipartisan leadership of our Nation a license to plunder the American people, but Congress itself has robbed the American people of their only protections against such plunder—namely, full freedom of organization and collective bargaining for labor and a basic minimum wage structure for the Nation which will truly safeguard the American standard of living against the depredations of unleashed free enterprise.

I have introduced legislation calling for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act to establish the basic wage rate of $1 an hour as the minimum fair pay standard of our country.

Presently the minimum hourly wage rate called for under the law is a mere 40 cents an hour and certain great sectors of American workers are deprived of even this minimum protection under the law.

I speak today in behalf of the $1 minimum hourly wage and other long-needed reforms of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The opponents of the $1 minimum hourly wage and other proposals to increase the wage structure of American workers would deny them to the workers on the ground that wage increases are inflationary. This argument has been used by the President of the United States himself with respect to demands that the miserable pay rates of Federal employees be increased.

Mr. Speaker, those who oppose wage increases for American workers are not really protecting the country against inflation.

They are indeed demanding and enforcing on the whole Nation a lowered American standard of living.

Apparently speaking for the Republicans of our Nation, Senator TAFT has frankly espoused this objective. As his remedy for spiraling prices and food shortages, he has advised the American people to eat less.

Mr. Speaker, if the American people are to be subjected to the ravages of unbridled free enterprise, robbing them of their wages and savings through uncontrolled prices and planned scarcity, the people must at least be armed with the means of survival, if not self-defense.

Legislation has been proposed in this Congress to raise the basic hourly minimum wage to 75 cents. Mr. Speaker, it takes at least $1 today to buy what 75 cents would have bought in 1946.

This means a loss of some 35 percent in buying power in the last 2 years alone.

Consider what has happened over-all since 1941.

The patriotic American wage-earner who bought a war bond the day after Pearl Harbor paid, let us say, $18.75 for it. He was told that in 10 years it would repay him $25.

Today, nearly 7 years later, that war bond should be worth $21.

But, Mr. Speaker, the purchasing power of those $21 today equals only $14 of 1941's dollars.

The war bond holder actually lost $7 by buying a war bond. He has lost that amount in the only real value money has, the power to purchase goods and services.

Even his original $18.75 investment, without interest, represents a loss of over $4 on the transaction in terms of how much meat he can buy, or how much housing he can rent or what the money would mean as a down payment on a washing machine or an automobile.

Mr. Wallace's word "larceny" is much too gentle for this crudest kind of fraud.

This is outright highway robbery of the American people.

And, make no mistake about it, this larceny is only in the beginning stages.

It is petty larceny indeed compared to the wholesale looting of the American pocketbook that industry has in prospect.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has the responsibility to protect the American people against this profiteering which Congress itself has enabled by shackling labor and taking the check-reins off American industry.

My bill establishes a $1 national minimum hourly wage and provides for an industry committee comprised of labor, management, and the public which can set minimums for any industry at levels above the basic $1 after consideration of economic conditions in the industry.

My bill removes the discriminatory provisions denying protection of the basic minimum wages and fair labor standards to the people of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

My bill brings under the minimum wage-maximum hour provisions of the act a great many workers not now covered because of the fiction that their industries are not coverable by Federal statute.

My bill would extend the protection of the act to food and agricultural workers who are now "exempted" (which means exposed to sub-minimum wages) by virtue of being employed in canning and packing industries set up in the "area of production" of certain vegetables and foodstuffs. It also brings the benefits of overtime pay rates to many in other sections of the food and processing industry who can now be forced to work overtime without proper recompense.

And finally, my bill would remove the agricultural "exemption" from the act except for bona fide farmers.

Mr. Speaker, the provisions of my bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act represent the program of the new party of Henry Wallace. They are but a portion of a whole program of eliminating inflation and bringing the income of the wage earners of the United States into real relationship with the needs of the people and the importance of their labor.

To combat inflation and remove its effects, to keep independent business alive, to preserve the farmer's markets, to keep business and professional people occupied, and to assure an expanding standard of living for all Americans, there can be no more delay in bringing about a basic and lasting increase in the earning power of the people.

United Nations Reorganization and Headquarters Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the tide of public opinion continues to rise on the need for making good on our invitation to the United Nations to make its home here, and keeping it in the United States. The following is a communication from the Board of Estimate of New York:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 16, 1948.*

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The United Nations $65,000,000 building loan legislation has been reported favorably from both Senate and House Foreign Relations Committees but is held up in the House Rules Committee. Failure to pass this legislation at this session will seriously jeopardize establishment of permanent headquarters in this city on land dedicated and cleared for this purpose and may mean removal to Europe with consequent loss of interest in the United Nations throughout the United States. New York City has committed itself to an expenditure of an additional $20,000,000 for surrounding street and other improvements. As plans are ready, construction can start immediately. Ample security for the loan is provided by United States United Nations treaty protecting the United States in case of abandonment of site by United Nations. We urge you to exert every effort at your command for the passage of this legislation before Congress adjourns.

WILLIAM O'DWYER, LAZARUS JOSEPH, VINCENT IMPELLITTERI, JOHN CASHMORE, JAMES LYONS, HUGO ROGERS, JAMES BURKE, CORNELIUS HALL, *Comprising Board of Estimate of the City of New York.*

Women in Journalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD, at the request of the National Association of Women Lawyers, an article entitled "Women in Journalism":

[From the Women Lawyers Journal]

WOMEN IN JOURNALISM

(By Florence Wessels, member, New York Newspaper Women's Club)

There is scarcely any newspaper position from cub reporter to editor and publisher which is not now filled by a woman journalist.

Editor and Publisher is authority for the statement that there are some 121 women in the United States who are guiding the destinies of 131 newspaper dailies as publishers, presidents, general managers or editors. The most recent census listed 14,750 women in a total of 58,253 editors and reporters. In the preceding census of 1920, only 5,730 were listed in the total group of 34,197 editors and reporters. Ten years later that number of women in the profession had increased to 11,924 in the aggregate of 51,844, representing an increase of 6.25 percent during the 10-year period.

All available evidence indicates a much greater increase in the percentage of women to men in the sphere of journalism as a result of the last war period. Only a few weeks ago the director of foreign service for International News Service, Mr. J. C. Oestreicher, stated that the brilliant performance of women journalists during World War II had genuinely emancipated them in the field of foreign correspondents. "They did a wonderful job," he said, "facing the emergency the same as men and there was not one who did not do a full man's work. Above all, they asked no favors or special treatment."

Prior to this, it was the bugbear of male newspaper management that women in such service might ask special favors, be the cause of nameless trouble, and break under the heavy strain in war-torn regions; this notwithstanding the previous notable records of such foreign correspondents as Dorothy Thompson, Anne O'Hare McCormick and Sonia Tomara.

Yet, there was no need to have waited for the Second World War for outstanding demonstration of the capacity of women in the profession.

It was Nelly Bly who made the whole world conscious of the American woman reporter. Her great stunt was the famous trip in 1889 around the world. She made it for the New York World in 72 days, 6 hours and 11 minutes, bettering Jules Verne's fanciful 80 days, and inaugurating for women the stunt era in journalism.

Other women followed with more stunts. Speaking broadly, the decade 1890–1900 has been called the stunt era; 1900–1910 the sob era; 1910–20 the suffrage era; and 1920–30 the tabloid era. And since World War II there is no forecasting where women may go in the new fields in which they find themselves. They have not all remained in the promised land, but the doors have opened.

William Randolph Hearst has, more than any other publisher, placed women up front in the journalistic world.

William Randolph Hearst, Jr., publisher of the New York Journal-American, told this writer:

"Of course there is room for more women in journalism. Ever since the establishment of the Hearst newspapers in San Francisco 60 years ago, my father has encouraged women to the Hearst staffs throughout the country. Without women reporters, feature writers, and even editors, newspapers would be unbalanced and incomplete. Any list of great journalists should include the names of such reporters and feature writers as Winifred Black, otherwise Annie Laurie, Gertrude Atherton, Kathleen Norris, Elsie Robinson, Nelly Bly, all of whom were Hearst reporters in the old days. Even the very gifted artists, Nell Brinkley and Fay King, were first line feature writers, too. Today, stars of international importance like Louella Parsons, Adela Rogers St. John, Dorothy Kilgallen, Princess Pignatelli and a score of others almost as famous, have made good in our organization, not in spite of their sex but because of it. They have sustained splendidly the tradition of the stars of the past and they set a high standard for those who would compete with or follow them. But there is limitless opportunity in journalism for more like them and there always will be. As for the qualifications of a star reporter, I do not believe anyone can give an exact formula. But whether the gift must be born in one or can be developed, it is the same for women as men. If they have the spark and ignite a flame, they will burst into print so brightly and loudly that the world will listen to them. Every intelligent editor is looking for such reporters and is eager to set them to work in what we newspaper people modestly refer to as 'the greatest profession on earth'."

During the war young women in Mr. Hearst's International News Service proved themselves magnificently.

Barry Faris, editor in chief of International News Service, says:

"We started training young women as executives for the first time during the war. Men were not available. We even used girls as bureau managers; they functioned exactly as well as the men. In fact, some bureaus were staffed entirely by young women. At one time we had six or seven bureaus with feminine managers. A dozen are still functioning as executives and about 30 or 40 re-

main as reporters or on rewrite desks. There is no ban on women executives today. If they show the same aptitudes, they will be given the same opportunities as men and will be paid equally, according to ability and experience. A great majority of our girls married and dropped out when their men came home from war. We have had great success with women; we didn't like to lose them. Only a few career girls stay on after marriage. After all, there is a lot of moving around in a wire service."

The proportion of women to men in INS is about 1 out of 8, nationally, at the present time.

The Associated Press is proud of the accomplishment of its young women. In 1941 only eight women writers were in the employ of the great syndicate, and only four bureaus were so represented. Today there are 90 women writers engaged in reportorial, desk, and wire filing assignments in 30 bureaus. An article in the AP World, association magazine, speaking of the work done by their women journalists, reports: "As evidence of a diversity of interest, these ladies not only wrote news, but edited wires, ran bureaus, specialized in sports, took an interest in financial news, and, in fact, ran the gamut of newspaper business on the same footing as their fellow working males."

The war brought widened opportunities to women in all organizations purveying news to the public, the United Press Association included. Young women were trained as bureau managers and staff members. The number has diminished due to return of veterans to former jobs and the toll of marriage. About 80 still remain—an approximate proportion of women to men in UP of 5 percent.

In the Hearst syndication field there are many women stars. Ward Greene, general manager and executive editor of the great King Features Syndicate, cited Marion Clyde McCarroll as an outstanding example of the woman editor. She edits the woman's page for King Features, the most widely read woman's page in the world, going to about 100 newspapers. Mr. Greene said: "The old theory of the woman's angle is gone. We like to think that women are people, interested in the same things as men." King Features managing editor, Frank McLearn, mentioned Mary Haworth, who started on the Washington Post, as typical of a new kind of syndication success. Her column, Mary Haworth's Mail, gives advice, but it completely revolutionized the old advice column, according to her editor. Mr. McLearn explained: "Mary Haworth anticipated the modern interest in psychiatry; she developed a new angle. She does very good thinking, herself, but she backs up every opinion with sound advice from physicians, clergymen, priests. It shocks readers a little but makes them really face up to their problems. It is one of the fastest-growing columns in the business."

Dorothy Kilgallen, the glamorous Broadway columnist and radio star, stated that:

"Boys and girls in high school may say to themselves, 'I'm going to be a columnist. Gee, it would be grand—see all the movie stars, go to the Stork Club every night—wow!' But no young person, no matter how brilliant, man or woman, can walk into a newspaper office and say, 'I'm brilliant. I want a column.' The column simply would not be forthcoming. Any young woman who wants a column must start out as a reporter, do all the drudgery and hard work first and keep her mind open. The most important thing is to know people. Find out how the world got this way; read current periodicals, good or bad—read all you can. Starting newspaper work with a column would be like starting from the top, bursting forth in a star role. It cannot be done."

Dorothy, herself, was a police reporter at 17 and anyone who has observed Miss Kilgallen covering important trials and other assignments, as this writer had the pleasure of doing, knows what an expert newspaperwoman she is.

My own newspaper, the New York Journal-American, has 150 editorial employees—exclusive of artists, photographers, copy boys, etc.—of which 15 are women, or approximately 10 percent.

There are phases of news, of course, which men can cover and handle better than women. But women have invaded fields supposedly sacred to the men. Even in the sports departments, as noted above, it is not unheard of to find a pretty blonde pounding away at the typewriter among the men and capably covering sports events. Women even set type and make up pages on many newspapers. Women are admittedly wonderful feature writers. They can plan and handle picture lay-outs. They are supreme in the "departments," where the greatest number find their places, writing on society, food, youth movements, women's clubs, fashion. Some of the finest trial reporters have been women.

The place which is still most difficult for them to invade is the city room, where news happens fast, where not too many have the equipment to cover, write, and sort news under heavy deadline pressure. But there have been and are great women spot news reporters and there will be more. They are in one of the most exciting games in the world—one of the most fascinating. They have very little time or strength for anything in life except being a top-flight reporter. The woman who sees her name on the lead story, page 1, of a great newspaper, has attained a great and rather rare achievement.

Headed by the brilliant Mrs. Ogden Reid, president—also first vice president of the New York Newspaper Women's Club—the great New York Herald Tribune has many women on its staff and agrees that they have definitely proved themselves. Men and women are never thought of as separate in talent; both are considered necessary to a newspaper, just as a good play needs both in the cast.

And as to the old cry that marriage ends feminine newspaper careers. "Not so," returns the Herald Tribune, rising in defense of its women writers. They may take leaves of absence to have their children, but they come back.

In the face of the enthusiasm among youngsters to whom reporting seems the mecca of all existence, there are not as many girls who have truly trained themselves for a big city reporting job as one might expect. In the opinion of the Herald-Tribune, no reporter can be too well-educated. Any fund of information is valuable; the more she has, the better. Above all, it is generally agreed, the woman journalist must know how to write. This, plus achievement of absolute accuracy, is emphasized by the Herald-Tribune. That famous newspaper also advises selling experience as part of reportorial training. It puts a girl on the firing line of criticism of the product she is marketing. This reporter humbly admits having started out selling rotogravure to undertakers for a San Francisco newspaper's New Year edition before the Examiner gave her a chance at reporting.

Working on college publications, making a start on a small-town newspaper where a young woman may learn something of almost every angle of her vocation, are advised generally. Journalism courses are helpful, but apparently not considered as necessary as sound general education.

At Columbia University, where the first graduate school of journalism came into existence, there were 20 women graduates in the 1947 class to 45 men. Ten years ago there were 15 women to 45 men.

At the New York Times—or, indeed, in journalism anywhere—there is no more inspiring example to women than Anne O'Hare McCormick, member of the editorial board of her newspaper and one of its outstanding writers, former United States Delegate to UNESCO, the admiration of everyone in the profession. Mrs. McCormick attended no journalism school nor did she work on a small town newspaper. She says, "I wish I had."

Anne O'Hare McCormick started as a free lance writer, doing feature articles on foreign politics. Her husband, Francis J. McCormick, of Dayton, Ohio, had to travel much and she went with him. Then she was made special correspondent for the Times with roving assingments all over Europe between the two wars. This wonderful woman, who works so quietly and with so much wisdom and discernment, has also done a tremendous amount of domestic political writing. During the last war she was on all European fronts. Her articles on global situations are famous. Loving the work, she admits it is very tense and hard. She says: "One needs a very broad foundation of education, broader than in any other profession. What you are really doing is a picture of the world. Demands on the understanding of a reporter today are tremendous. We are living in an extraordinary time, though terrible."

Women on the staff of the New York Times are fairly recent additions. For a long time, even the society editor was a man.

A recent recruit to the art of publishing is Mrs. Dorothy S. Thackrey, publisher of the New York Post since 1942. She told this writer: "My editors were not too keen about it when they had to take on more women through force of circumstances during the war—they were rather skeptical about how it would work out. But now they are all agreed that the girls are wonderful, more dependable even than the men." Mrs. Thackrey also declared that women have to do twice as well as men on a newspaper, or in any field. "But I think there is always room at the top if you are very determined," she added.

Another very famous woman publisher has given us her opinion on women in journalism today—Mrs. Eleanor Patterson, publisher of the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald. Here are questions sent to her and her answers:

"1. What are the prospects for women entering journalism today?

"Answer: Better than ever.

"(a) What progress did they make during the war?

"Answer: Considerable.

"(b) Are those gains held?

"Answer: As reporters or at desk work, no.

"2. What are the most important qualifications for a woman reporter?

"Answer: Imagination. Quick thinking. Judgment.

"3. In what phases of journalism are their greatest opportunities?

"Answer: Feature writers, reporters, women's pages, society, fashions, etc.

"4. What is required in a girl to be a success as a Washington correspondent, considering Washington, D. C., virtually the world capital?

"Answer: Education, political savvy, clear writing, tact. And charm and a pretty face don't hurt, either.

"(a) Who are the outstanding Washington newspaper women and what makes them so?

"Answer: This is a matter of personal opinion. In my opinion, Ruth Montgomery is tops.

"5. How far can a girl rise and how much can she earn today?

"Answer: I don't know.

"6. What can a girl give to a newspaper that a man cannot?

Answer: What can a girl give to cooking, hair-dressing, millinery, or dress-making that a man cannot?

"7. Who are the most important women publishers besides yourself?

"Answer: I was, and am, a trifle better editor. I think I was at one time a fair reporter. (It may be that no one on my staff

agrees with me). Anyhow, that's the only job on this newspaper I thoroughly enjoyed."

Eleanor Roosevelt, as a personality much in the news and in her many contacts with the press, has learned to know the woman reporter intimately. She told this writer:

"Every woman is trying to do a better job than the men, to justify her position. Emotionally, she takes things a bit harder, feels things more keenly through her intuitive perception. But this makes her stories better. She needs not only talent but great perseverance. However, the profession requires so much that a young woman must be sure of good health and enough self-discipline, unless she wants to squander her resources and break, through irregular hours, irregular food, the pressure of the profession."

Mrs. Roosevelt agrees that prospects for women in journalism are better today, even though, as in every other profession, they must meet the competition of the returned veteran. She concluded: "The mere fact of their widened experience during the war years has given many more editors an appreciation of their abilities."

When Sally MacDougall, of the New York World-Telegram, and president of the New York Newspaper Women's Club, asked her distinguished city editor, B. O. McAnney, how he felt about women on his staff, he told her: "When I was a young editor, I was warned that girls couldn't spell and were temperamental, that they were just not as good as men. But it wasn't true then and it isn't true now. There never has been a time in all these years when I did not have women working on my staff. As far as the work goes, there is no difference between men and women." Sally asked, "How is it then that thre are just two of us women on the World-Telegram city staff today, among all these men? Is it because men support families?" Her editor admitted: "That might have something to do with it, but more men come into this work."

Anne Morgan once told Miss MacDougall: "No matter what the job, women have to do it 10 times better than the man." But Sally who, 3 years ago, won the New York Newspaper Women's Club prize for the best general-interest writing on a New York newspaper or syndicate through her series on war casualties at Halloran Hospital, declared: "I have never met any prejudice. My experience has been that in our profession men and women work on equal terms in a friendly atmosphere."

One of the greatest of all women reporters is on the New York Daily News. She is Grace Robinson, small, silver-haired, ivory-skinned, with tilted dark eyes that miss nothing of a news story. In discussing women on the newspaper, Grace Robinson:

"A woman can often get into places where a man cannot. There are many cases, especially where crime is involved, where harrassed individuals, a grieving family, the accused, other distraught characters, respond to the warm and sympathetic approach of a woman. But don't think that the woman reporter doesn't get disturbed, too. If she doesn't react whole-heartedly to what she sees, she is either not a good reporter or else is terribly young. After a murder trial I have often been ill, myself. One feels especially the jury wait, that awful suspense before the verdict comes in, even if the accused is unquestionably guilty."

Grace believes, with many others, that morning papers give women a better chance to show ability than afternoon newspapers. Despite her own very successful record, she admits there is still discrimination against women in the field in certain respects. She said:

"If a man has been on a paper a great number of years and done really outstanding work, he has a good chance of eventually becoming an editor in the large salary brackets. A woman seldom does. The boy you see answering the phone on the desk today so often is the city editor of tomorrow. Of course there are exceptions, notably Anne O'Hare McCormick, who is on the editorial board of the New York Times."

Miss Robinson herself, does not want to be an editor. She dislikes "inside work" intensely. If they cannot often be top editors, women reporters can expand into writing for feature syndicates and magazines. "But," commented Miss Robinson, "This is very difficult when you are holding an active news job. The minute you make a date with a magazine editor, you are sent out of town on an assignment for your own paper."

Almost without exception, these women journalists have reached success the hard way and are the stronger for having done so. They have an instinct for news and timing, persistence, intrepid courage and rare sympathy, which are requisites for success in the journalistic field.

It is also helpful to women journalists to have some knowledge of the law. Law and journalism really complement each other. They come together in every court in the land, before every judge from a Justice of the Peace to the Chief Justice of the United States.

Jewish War Veterans Hold Fifty-third Annual Memorial Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under consent I am inserting in the RECORD more of the messages received from high-ranking personages on the occasion of the fifty-third annual memorial services of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, held on May 30 in Temple Emanu-El, New York:

CHIEF OF STAFF TO THE
COMMANDER IN CHIEF,
THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 10, 1948.

Mr. JULIUS KLEIN,
National Commander,
Jewish War Veterans,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR COMMANDER KLEIN: I send my heartfelt sympathy to the families of those who did not return and my greetings and well wishes to you who join in this memorial service.

This pageant of heroism and fidelity unites us in a covenant of memory in which we are reminded of the words of Burke, that a nation is a contract in which three parties are involved: the dead, the living, and the yet unborn. This becomes to us a legacy, a trust and a prophesy that we dedicate ourselves to live together in peace, and to carry on the struggle so valiantly begun by those whom we honor today.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM D. LEAHY.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF
OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,
Washington, D. C.

On this Memorial Day as we honor the heroic dead of all our wars let us reaffirm our faith in the ideals for which they gave their lives. American soldiers, sailors and marines were inspired by the conviction that individual freedom and enlightenment were basic principles of that great country for which they died. Let us keep their faith alive by perpetuating those same ideals. Only by so doing may we hope to give the world those measures of stability and security which are the foundations of a lasting peace.

LEWIS DENFELD,
Admiral, United States Navy.

PERMANENT JOINT BOARD ON DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. JULIUS KLEIN,
National Commander,
Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America.

DEAR JULIUS: I am honored that you should invite me to send a message to the members of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America on the occasion of its fifty-third annual memorial service at Temple Emanu-El.

You have devoted yourselves to the perpetuation of the traditions of national service rendered by Americans of Jewish faith who have fallen in combat. Your memorial service is dedicated to the continuing unity of all Americans and the preservation of our Nation's security and freedom. There can be no loftier motive in this day of bewilderment, uncertainty and confusion, for, unless we achieve the unity for which you strive, we will not be worthy of the position of leadership we now hold in the world nor will we be able to maintain that position. The old adage of "unity and strength" was never more significant.

Your organization is to be congratulated on its achievements in the past, and I am happy to join with your many friends in the Regular Armed Forces in sending greetings and good wishes for the future.

Sincerely yours,

EMMETT O'DONNELL, Jr.,
Major General, United States Armed Forces.

MAY 6, 1948.

Commander JULIUS KLEIN,
Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR COMMANDER KLEIN: It was with considerable pleasure that I received your letter requesting a message from me on the occasion of the fifty-third annual memorial service of the Jewish War Veterans at Temple Emanu-El in New York City.

I am inc[illegible]g a message which I trust will be appropr[illegible] to the occasion.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH F. CRAMER,
Major General,
Chief, National Guard Bureau.

In striving for the continuing unity of all Americans in the preservation of our Nation's security and freedom, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America are assuming the obligations requisite to citizenship in a free, democratic nation.

The men of the new National Guard are meeting their responsibility to their country by giving their personal service for the establishment of a strong national defense.

The mutual interest and objectives of these two organizations heighten my pleasure in extending the best wishes of the National Guard of the United States to the Jewish War Veterans on the occasion of their fifty-third annual memorial service.

GENERAL STAFF,
UNITED STATES ARMY,
Washington, D. C., April 28, 1948.

Mr. JULIUS KLEIN,
National Commander, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. KLEIN: Thank you for your kind letter of April 21 concerning the annual services scheduled Memorial Day. I appreciate the opportunity to pass along my message to your guests and the radio audience.

During the past 53 years the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America

have observed the rights, duties, and privileges of American citizenship during their memorial services. Jewish War Veterans, like Americans of every religious belief and national origin have served their country with honor. The tradition of service to God and country must be preserved if this country is to live.

Let us hope and pray that this memorial service and others throughout the country will be dedicated to the continued unity of all Americans in the preservation of our Nation's security and freedom. We, as true Americans, realize that the "four freedoms" must be preserved through a living democracy.

I wish you continued success in your great endeavor.

Sincerely,

W. S. PAUL,
Lieutenant General, General Staff Corps, Director of Personnel and Administration.

HEADQUARTERS FIRST ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE COMMANDING GENERAL,
GOVERNOR'S ISLAND, NEW YORK, N. Y.,
May 18, 1948.

JULIUS KLEIN, Esq.,
National Commander, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. KLEIN: Thank you for your letter of May 7. I hope you will be kind enough to accept the enclosed message as a part of your memorial services.

Let me repeat my regret that prior engagements prevent my presence.

Sincerely yours,

COURTNEY H. HODGES,
General, United States Army.

To the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Assembled in Memorial Services:

It is required of use that we gather in memory of our valiant dead.

It is right that we should meet in our several groups, friends brought together by ties of race, and of religion, of fealty to ancient and hallowed tradition.

Yet let us remember that they in whose memory we meet today died in the company of brothers from many races, and of many religions.

These men of America—children and fellow citizens of these United States, sallied forth together, all to fight, and some to die, for the idea which had brought them together in friendliness and peace, in dignity and pride, in the very spirit and practice of human brotherhood.

As we mourn our dead, let us again resolve that the values they prized above life itself will continue to flourish, will wax and grow strong, until in God's good time, they are beyond challenge, anywhere on earth.

The blood of our sons is a charge upon us forever, to be met only as we maintain what they died to preserve.

May our conduct over the years to come permit them to rest in peace.

COURTNEY H. HODGES,
General, United States Army.

HEADQUARTERS FIFTH ARMY,
Chicago, Ill., April 26, 1948.

To the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America:

Traditionally, on this day, May 30, the people of our country gather to renew the memory of those who have died in the defense of the Nation. The observance of this tradition in 1948 finds the world in turmoil and our country beset by many dangers.

The principles upon which this country was founded are under attack in many places. Powerful forces are at work to destroy our democracy. The freedom which we Americans enjoy was not achieved without sacrifice, nor can it be maintained without the vigilant support of all of our citizens.

Because we are free to differ in our political beliefs, because we are free to worship as we please, let us today resolve to unite with all citizens in an unselfish effort in removing from this world the threat of war. May our devotion to our country serve as an inspiration to our people in their search for the means by which the freedom we enjoy may be extended to the nations of the earth, and thus justify the sacrifices which our fallen heroes have made for us.

As commanding general of the Fifth Army, I am glad to have an opportunity to extend to the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, my warmest greetings.

WALTON H. WALKER,
Lieutenant General,
United States Army, Commanding.

HEADQUARTERS, SIXTH ARMY,
Presidio of San Francisco,
Calif., May 6, 1948.

Brig. Gen. JULIUS KLEIN,
National Commander, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, New York, N. Y.

DEAR GENERAL KLEIN: In the campaign in Italy as commander of the Fifth Army and the 15th Army Group, I was privileged to command, from the six continents of the world, troops who were composed of many races, nationalities, and religions. The pages of history record the gallant deeds of the Palestinian brigade which served so ably in the campaign, and those of Jews in the forces of the many nations that fought under my command.

I am in complete accord with the basic objectives of the Jewish War Veterans of America as set forth in the preamble to their constitution. I, with countless other Americans, am proud of their splendid contributions to the strength, peace, and stability of our United States and the preservation of our American way of life.

I wish for their every success in their patriotic endeavors for our great Nation.

Sincerely yours,

MARK W. CLARK,
General,
United States Army, Commanding.

HEADQUARTERS EIGHTH ARMY,
UNITED STATES ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE COMMANDING GHENERAL.
Yokohama, Japan, May 3, 1948.

Brig. General JULIUS KLEIN,
National Commander,
Jewish War Veterans of the
United States of America,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR JULIUS: In the attached message I have tried to express my sincere feelings of respect for the Jewish War Veterans. It would please me if you feel it suitable to read this message at your 53d annual Memorial Service on May 30. I know that the service will be a successful one in which you will have the good wishes of all American veterans.

With warm regards,

Sincerely,

ROBT. EICHELBERGER.

To the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America:

On the occasion of the 53d annual Memorial Service of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, I wish to extend to all participants, sincere greetings. It is fitting that such a service be held every year in order that in the United States, one of the few remaining free countries of the world, the people may be cognizant of the sacrifices whereby that freedom has been dearly bought. We must be firm in our resolve always to be ready to defend it by whatever means necessary.

R. L. EICHELBERGER,
Lieutenant General,
United States Army,
Commanding.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C.

I consider it a signal privilege to join in the tribute to those Americans of Jewish faith who have fallen in combat during the wars of our Nation since the War of Independence. On this most solemn occasion a most fitting tribute in memory of those dear to us would be the rededication of our future to the type of zealous patriotism to our Nation exhibited and exemplified by our Jewish War Veterans. We join today in the hope that the future will bring the continued development of a nation truly consecrated to democracy and divorced from hatred and intolerance.

With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

J. EDGAR HOOVER.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
May 20, 1948.

MY FELLOW AMERICANS: It is with deep regret that I find myself unable to be your guest at the 53rd Annual Memorial Services of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America. I do wish to join with you in paying tribute to those of your faith who have served our country in its hour of need and who are now gone to their eternal reward.

Love of America can only be measured by one standard. That is willingness to defend it against all enemies to the last full measure of devotion. The strength of America lies in its ability to inspire such devotion in all its sons and daughters, irrespective of race, color, creed or political belief. We honor the Unknown Soldier resting in Arlington, not because he was a Jew, or Protestant, or Catholic, or white or colored, or a Republican or Democrat, but because he was an American patriot to the death.

You are paying tribute today to brave men who sacrificed to keep America free. Their lives and their services went into building a greater nation, dedicated to the ideals of freedom, justice, and tolerance. It is fitting we should honor them.

But the greatest honor we can pay these revered dead is to make sure through our own unceasing efforts that their great sacrifice shall outlast the victory which they have purchased for us so dearly.

In that endeavor the American Legion will always work in closest partnership with the Jewish War Veterans—for God and country!

JAMES F. O'NEIL,
National Commander.

COMMANDER JULIUS KLEIN,
Jewish War Veterans of United States,
New York, N. Y.

My dear NATIONAL COMMANDER: The membership of your organization is a living testimony to the fundamental truth that we American Jews are bone of the bone and flesh of the flesh of America, ready not only to fight and, if need be, to die for America, but also with utter and single loyalty to dedicate our lives in peace to the welfare of our country.

With kindest regards, I am,

Yours faithfully,

JOSEPH M. PROSKAUER.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Springfield, May 25, 1948.

GENERAL JULIUS KLEIN,
National Commander, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America,
New York, N. Y.

Dear General Klein: I keenly appreciate this opportunity of extending, through you, my most cordial greetings to all who are participating in the Fifty-third Annual Memorial Service of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States.

This service is a well-deserved tribute to the memory of valiant men. It is appropriate and timely. In these stern days it is well for us to be reminded afresh that our national liberty was won by the shedding of blood, and has been preserved in every generation by renewed sacrifice.

From the courage of those you honor, let us take heart to face our own duties bravely. From their consecration, let us gain a freshened sense of the dignity of American citizenship. As they stood shoulder to shoulder against the foe, let us close our community and national ranks against every force that seeks to divide us.

The loyal valor of Americans of Jewish faith, and of others such as they, in every time of national peril constitutes heartening assurance that our Republic will ever be the home of freedom and the hope of freedom-loving men the earth around!

Sincerely,

DWIGHT H. GREEN,
Governor.

Churchill Sees Labor Rule Biting United States Hand Feeding It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the New York Times of June 13, 1948:

CHURCHILL SEES LABOR RULE BITING U. S. HAND FEEDING IT

(By Charles E. Egan)

LONDON, June 12.—Winston Churchill denounced the Labor government today for virtually biting the hand that feeds it by deriding the United States of private enterprise while at the same time being dependent upon that system for aid.

The wartime Prime Minister, addressing a political rally of 7,000 Young Conservative Party members in the Royal Albert Hall, said:

"How the ministers can deride the system of free enterprise and capitalism which makes America great and wealthy and then at the same time eagerly seek the aid which has hitherto been so generously granted from across the Atlantic—that is a grimace which baffles the limitations of our language to explain."

The loan advanced by the United States at the close of the war, he charged, had been dissipated and the Labor government was now dependent upon the American private-enterprise system, which it abhors, to aid Britain.

Mr. Churchill said that the Government's nationalization program was a demonstration of failure. State ownership of basic industries, he said, had brought higher prices and increased costs.

Despite the record in coal and other industries, he said, the Government was determined to proceed to the nationalization of steel, "the most efficient breadwinning and export-conquering industry in Britain."

Describing socialism as the "philosophy of failure and the gospel of envy," Mr. Churhill called for the ousting of the Labor government and the return of his party to power. He predicted that the Labor Party would be defeated at the next general election.

SEES EXODUS FROM COUNTRY

LONDON, June 12.—"We are not earning our own living or paying our way, nor does the Government hold out the prospect of our doing so in the immediate future", Mr. Churchill said today in his Albert Hall speech.

"Unless we free our country, while time remains, from the perverse doctrine of socialism, there can be no hope of recovery. This island can not maintain its position as a great power under a socialist or collectivist system."

Mr. Churchill predicted that the most energetic and nimble Britons would leave the country, if the Labor government stayed in power.

"We should be left here with a horde of safe officials brooding over a vast mess of worried, hungry, and broken human beings," he said. "Our place in the world will be lost forever, and not only our individual self-respect, but our national independence, will be gone."

"A little while ago we were told: 'See how few are unemployed.' But now Morrison (Herbert Morrison, Deputy Prime Minister) and Bevin (Foreign Secretary) alike are forced to admit that but for the American loan and doles there would be unemployment on a scale of millions."

My Record in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is proper that Members of Congress render to their constituents from time to time a report of their congressional activities. This is necessary in order that the people can properly judge our work. I take this occasion to submit a summarized record of many of the services I have rendered to the people of my district. This information will show that I have been diligent, competent, energetic, and faithful in my duties to my Nation, State, and district. I have the honor and distinction of representing a congressional district that is considered one of the richest in natural resources in the entire country. It is an area that also abounds in charm, hospitality, and culture of its people. I have represented this great section for some eight years, excepting the period of time that I served in the United States Army as a private, after having resigned my membership in the Congress. I am everlastingly grateful for the opportunity that the people have afforded me to serve my country in Congress during these serious and perilous times. I am glad to present this record of my stewardship.

AGRICULTURE

The people of the Third Congressional District are to a large extent dependent upon agriculture for a livelihood. Our rich lands, fertilized by the accumulation of the soils of the Mississippi Valley, are most adaptable to the production of sugarcane, rice, cotton, sweetpotatoes, truck crops, and numerous other agricultural products. Realizing the importance of agriculture, I am constantly devoting attention to the best development of our farm resources, as well as the expansion and development of our livestock and dairy industries. I believe that my record in behalf of agriculture is well known and that I have the good will and confidence of the farmers of my district.

SUGAR

Those connected with the sugar industry, which means so much to the economic welfare of Louisiana, are familiar with my work in its behalf. They know of my leadership in the adoption of necessary legislation, particularly the recent Sugar Act passed by Congress. This act brought more stability and security to the sugar industry than at any time in its history and will be in effect until December 31, 1952. It allows Louisiana and Florida a production quota of 500,000 tons of sugar annually, providing the largest percentage quota increase of any of the domestic areas and permits Louisiana to grow practically all the sugarcane it is now capable of producing, at the same time continuing the benefit payments. It was through my efforts that the fair wage and fair price determination provisions of the former Sugar Act were retained, in keeping with the wishes of the industry.

AID FOR SMALL FARMERS

I have been especially sympathetic to the cause of the small sugar farmers. Through my efforts it was possible to have all sugarcane growers share for the first time in payments on blackstrap molasses and as a result they are enjoying an additional revenue of around 60 cents per ton for sugarcane, which they never received before.

During the labor shortage World War II occasioned I was instrumental in obtaining the service of thousands of prisoners of war for farm work in Louisiana. Without this labor it would have been impossible to harvest our cane crop. During the war I gave much attention to the shortage of farm equipment confronting the farmer and was able to secure for them necessary machinery, trucks, tires, and other items they required for the cultivation and harvesting of the cane crop.

More recently I assisted in obtaining fertilizer for the 1948 cane crop. A serious shortage developed, but through contacts with the Department of Agriculture officials and manufacturers, we were able to relieve the situation.

The sugar industry throughout the years has been unsettled because of its position in international trade; it has frequently been used as a political football. Sugar legislation is the most complicated of all agricultural legislation in Washington. It is only through constant study and experience that one becomes competent in the handling of the various complex problems. I am glad of the knowledge that I have gained in this connection which enables me to be of the greatest possible service.

RICE

Louisiana produces over one-third of the rice that is grown in the United States. Vermilion Parish, in my district, is the largest rice-producing parish, or county, in the country, and rice is also produced in every other parish in the Third Congressional District. The rice

farmers and the industry in general have enjoyed prosperity during the last few years. Many of our citizens are engaged in the farming, milling, and marketing of rice. They are aware that I have been active and successful in looking after their interests.

The rice industry has been confronted with many problems during and since World War II and I have given much attention to these matters. My efforts have been directed toward seeing that adequate markets are made available and fair prices maintained. I fought the establishment of a price ceiling on rough rice in 1943, but when it was established, I worked for an increased ceiling which was granted. I have fought the efforts of the Government to assist the production of rice in other countries in competition to our own industry. I opposed the unreasonable Government set-aside policy of allocating American rice to other nations on a basis which greatly limited our domestic supply. This was a blow to the movement to increase the per capita consumption of rice in this country. I have repeatedly pointed out that the per capita consumption must be raised and new uses found for rice if we are to avoid surplus rice production in normal periods.

Last year when the rough-rice market was paralyzed, due to harvesting difficulties and lack of adequate storage space, and the situation was steadily growing worse, I flew to Washington from Louisiana, as Congress was then in recess. After conferences with officials of the Department of Agriculture, a program was worked out by which the Government agreed to purchase a large quantity of rice for foreign relief. This action accelerated the market for rough rice, the mills began to buy and the Louisiana rice growers were saved from a ruinous loss. Only recently, together with other Members of Congress from rice areas, I headed the movement to prevent the Government from arbitrarily reducing the price to be paid for export rice to foreign countries. If this had occurred it would have resulted in a break in the rice market, and our farmers, as well as millers, would have suffered a great loss this season.

SWEETPOTATOES AND SIRUP SURPLUS

The sweetpotato industry in south Louisiana has made great strides. The sirup industry has been in existence since sugarcane was first produced in this country. The war brought about a dislocation in these two industries, placing them in danger of having to curtail operations or stop them altogether. I assisted, with other interested Congressmen, in helping to remove the surplus on sweetpotatoes. We are now assisting the sirup producers to sell the large surplus they have on hand, to the Economic Cooperation Administration. I am confident we will be successful.

FARM LEGISLATION

I have advocated and worked for:

1. Support price for cotton.
2. Parity income for farmers.
3. Scientific research to discover new uses for farm products.
4. Low interest rate on farm loans.
5. Better farm tenant program.
6. More stability for family-sized farms.
7. Soil-conservation program.

And all other legislation beneficial to the interest of the farmer.

COMMENDED BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Sometime ago a constituent of mine wrote the Secretary of Agriculture about my activities in Congress on agricultural matters and I am very glad to produce the Secretary's letter in reply:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 1, 1948.

Mr. RAY BREAUX,
Lafayette Parish Farm Bureau,
Carencro, La.

MY DEAR MR. BREAUX: I received your inquiry in behalf of farmers of your section, relative to the activities of Congressman JAMES DOMENGEAUX in agricultural matters.

I have had occasion to observe Congressman Domengeaux's work on many occasions and I can say with the utmost sincerity that he is most energetic, progressive, and effective in representing the farming interests of the Nation and particularly those of the Third Congressional District of Louisiana.

Congressman DOMENGEAUX was very active and forceful in adoption of the present Sugar Act. He is especially helpful to the small farmers. Through his efforts these farmers were able for the first time to share in payments on blackstrap molasses and now enjoy an additional revenue of around 60 cents a ton of sugarcane.

We have felt that in rice matters Congressman DOMENGEAUX has constantly protected the best interests of the farmers, millers, and distributors. When the rice industry faced a crisis last year, due to a paralyzed market for rough rice in the face of an approaching new crop, Congressman DOMENGEAUX, then in Louisiana during the recess of Congress, flew to Washington and conferred with Department of Agriculture officials. Out of these conferences grew a program by which the Department was able to arrange for the purchase of rice for relief purposes abroad.

The sweetpotato people also have a real friend in Congressman DOMENGEAUX, who has likewise faithfully looked after the interests of the cotton industry, the truck farmers, and others engaged in agricultural endeavors.

Congressman DOMENGEAUX has frequently conferred with me and it has been a pleasure to cooperate with him.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary of Agriculture.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

When I first came to Congress 8 years ago, REA was an infant. Notwithstanding the shortage of materials resulting from the war, this program has developed to the extent that thousands of farms in my congressional district and numerous thousands elsewhere are now serviced with electricity. I hope to see the day when every farm in Louisiana and throughout the Nation will be able to obtain electric service. Farm life must be made easier so as to encourage more people to stay on the farms. Just as soon as it is humanly possible to do so, those living on farms everywhere in the United States should be able to enjoy the same electrical conveniences as those in the towns and cities. I have always supported adequate appropriations to maintain and develop this service and will continue to do so.

SEAFOOD INDUSTRY

Louisiana is widely famed for its delicious seafoods. Much of the commercial fishing centers in my congressional district, which borders on the Gulf of Mexico, and its numerous bays, lakes, and bayous. Thousands of our people make a livelihood from the production and marketing of shrimp, oysters, and other seafood. This brings to them and to our State many millions of dollars annually.

Throughout my service in Congress I have constantly devoted time to looking after the welfare and development of the steadily growing seafood industry. I have done this because I realize the Gulf of Mexico offers to our people an inexhaustible means of wealth. No one knows how great the possibilities are. I am confident, however, that the income of our citizens can be increased many millions of dollars a year through scientific and intelligent approach to the various problems confronting the fishing industry. We must determine with accuracy just what these resources are and how best to utilize them. I have recently proposed legislation that I have every reason to believe can be passed at the next session of Congress, which will provide an appropriation of $500,000 for the purpose of providing the necessary research work in behalf of the fishing industry of the Gulf coast. Due to wartime activities and shortage of personnel it has been difficult to collect fishery statistics in that area.

The oyster industry can be greatly expanded. At the present time we do not use more than 10 percent of potential tidal bottoms which could be utilized for oyster production. The Louisiana oyster industry has expanded in the past few years, but mass mortality of oysters has seriously threatened the continued existence of that industry.

GREAT POSSIBILITIES

Louisiana could produce more crab meat than any other State, yet it falls much below Maryland and Virginia in this respect. We could increase our crab production tremendously. No study of a biological nature has been made of the menhaden; still there was a greater poundage of menhaden produced in the United States in 1946 and 1947 than any other species of fish. Only a small percentage of this came from the Gulf, although it is well known that menhaden are abundant in these waters.

This may be a critical period in the shrimp fishery. The shrimp catch has remained about the same, notwithstanding the fact there have been many new boats added for shrimp fishing. We have not learned sufficient about the biology of the shrimp and it is estimated that an annual production valued at $100,000,000 is in prospect if properly developed.

Very little is known of the life history of such valuable sport and commercial fishes as speckled trout, redfish, croakers, sheephead, mullet, and tarpon. The passage of this bill that I have introduced, together with an appropriation, will make it possible to increase our seafood production many millions of dollars. I pledge myself to work untiringly to secure the passage of this legislation.

MEXICO SHRIMP IMPORTATIONS

Louisiana shrimp interests are being menaced by the increasing importation of Mexican shrimp. Mexico enjoys an advantage because of cheap labor. To protect the many producers and packers in Louisiana and other Gulf States, I have introduced legislation providing that the total importation from Mexico of fresh, iced, canned, and processed shrimp into the United States in any one calendar year shall not exceed the largest total quantity of such importations during any calendar year between January 1, 1942, and December 31, 1945. Imports restricted to this period would be relatively small.

OYSTER REHABILITATION

The Louisiana oyster industry sustained heavy losses in the Mississippi River flood of 1945. I succeeded in having a bill enacted for an appropriation of $50,000 for a survey to be made by the Fish and Wildlife Service to determine the extent of this damage and method of rehabilitating the beds. After this survey is completed I will endeavor to secure additional funds so as to reimburse those oyster producers who suffered this loss. I am particularly gratified by the passage of this legislation because it establishes a precedent that the Government must be responsible for damages that may be sustained through the use of flood-control projects, such as the Atchafalaya-Morganza spillway.

The seafood industry in Louisiana has enjoyed much prosperity during the last few years. I am glad that I have been able to contribute in many ways to the welfare and development of this great industry and I pledge my continued efforts in this direction.

WATERWAY AND FLOOD CONTROL

Flood control and improvement of our waterways are most important to the safety and success of our people. Louisiana, particularly the Third Congressional District, until recent years has suffered from disastrous inundation and flood control is a subject close to all of us. The Mississippi River and its tributaries drain approximately one-third of the United States and much of these waters eventually descend on Louisiana. Much progress in protecting our area against floods has been made, but much remains to be done.

ATCHAFALAYA BASIN—MORGANZA SPILLWAY

Of foremost importance to flood control in our area is the need for completing work on the Atchafalaya spillway. Congress recently appropriated some six million dollars toward completing the project. In May of 1945, when flood conditions developed in the Red River Basin, the United States engineers decided to open the Morganza floodway, which would have released the waters of the Mississippi into the Atchafalaya Basin. In the latter's uncompleted stage this would have meant the flooding of vast areas in the parishes of Assumption, Terrebonne, Lafourche, St. Mary, St. Martin, and Iberia, or practically all of the Third Congressional District, resulting in untold loss and indescribable suffering by our people. There was great political pressure to open the spillway at that time from Members of Congress representing other sections of the State. I opposed this movement with every force at my command. Happily my protests and warnings were heeded and great damage and possible loss of life were averted.

PROJECTS AIDED

I have constantly devoted my efforts in behalf of flood control, improvement of waterways, and establishment of new facilities. In this connection I might refer to the Bayou Carlin-Delcambre Canal; Bayou Lafourche; Bayou Boeuf; Bayous Little Caillou, Grand Caillou, Dularge, and Terrebonne; Bayou L'Eau Bleu; Teche-Vermilion program which recently received an additional appropriation of $600,000; Schooner Bayou, and other necessary projects.

I opposed, together with the people of the Morgan City-Berwick area, the inadequate floodgate proposed by the United States engineers in Bayou Boeuf. I will continue my efforts to have an adequate lock constructed instead.

Our people are seriously dependent upon our networks of bayous and other streams not only for adequate drainage but in their everyday pursuits. It is my plan and purpose to eventually secure an authorization and appropriation for the dredging of our many streams that flow into the Gulf, so as to afford our people the opportunity for full utilization of these waterways.

For quite some time I have been working with the people of the parishes of Assumption and Terrebonne to assist them in securing fresh waters in Bayou Lafourche at Napoleonville. The United States engineers are now studying this proposal and as soon as it is recommended I will continue my efforts toward securing the necessary funds to complete this project.

WATER HYACINTH AND ALLIGATOR GRASS ERADICATION

The problem of the water hyacinths and alligator grass which congest so many streams in Louisiana and other States is a matter of much concern. These water plants interfere with our drainage, obstruct navigation, menace health, and are killing our fish and wildlife. They cause many millions of dollars of damage to the State. I have realized this problem and in February of 1945, I secured an appropriation of $78,000 to make it possible for the United States engineers, the Department of Agriculture, the United States Public Health Service, and the Department of Fish and Wildlife of the Interior Department to conduct a comprehensive study and survey of the problem in order to find means of eradicating this menace once and for all. This scientific study and survey are now being made. Experimentation in the use of chemicals is under way and I hope that within a short time an economical and practical method may be found, through these agencies, to do the job of extermination. I have a bill pending to appropriate $25,000,000 over a period of years for this purpose. The reports from the departments will be in shortly and in the next Congress it is my plan to secure at least $5,000,000 to start the program of killing the water lily and alligator grass in all of our streams.

VETERANS

I am particularly happy to be of assistance to veterans and their dependents. I feel that the veterans, who made great sacrifices, are entitled to every consideration that the Federal Government is able to give them. I have always given close attention to their needs and have been able to help thousands of ex-servicemen who have written to me about their problems.

I had the privilege of serving as a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, which afforded me the opportunity of taking part in the preparation and enactment of much veteran legislation, including the GI bill of rights.

The best evidence of my service and achievements in behalf of the veterans and their dependents is contained in the following letters from national representatives of major veterans' organizations:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 19, 1948.

Mr. J. ELLIOTT CADE,
Past Vice Commander, The American Legion, Department of Louisiana, Abbeville, La.

DEAR MR. CADE: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 6, asking for the legislative record of Hon. JAMES DOMENGEAUX, the Congressman from the Third Louisiana District.

As you know, he is a World War II veteran and a member of the American Legion.

In addition to the voting record, which I am attaching hereto, I might add that he has taken a very active interest in legislation affecting veterans, and in particular bills which we have requested him to introduce on our behalf. During the Eightieth Congress he introduced for us H. R. 1342, exempting from income tax individual income up to $5,000 earned in certain taxable years following discharge; and H. R. 3691, providing for the continuance of compensation of pension payments and subsistence allowance for certain children of deceased veterans of World War I and World War II during education and training.

When he was a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee he visited a number of veterans' hospitals in connection with the inspection program authorized by that committee and as a result influenced the reorganization of the medical service of the Veterans' Administration.

I trust this is the information which you desire.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN THOMAS TAYLOR,
Director, National Legislative Commission.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
NATIONAL SERVICE HEADQUARTERS,
Washington, D. C., May 10, 1948.

Mr. SIDNEY DAIGLE,
Past Commander DAV,
Lafayette, La.

DEAR MR. DAIGLE: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 1, requesting information as to the legislative record of the Honorable JAMES DOMENGEAUX, Representative of the Third Louisiana District. In reply please be advised that so far as veterans' legislation is concerned, we of the DAV have found Congressman Domengeaux most helpful and cooperative.

Congressman Domengeaux has always taken special interest in the welfare of veterans and has sponsored much legislation in their behalf. This included the increase granted in the rates of compensation, pension, and retirement pay of veterans of both

world wars and their dependents. He is author of a bill to extend to children of men who died in World War II the educational benefits of the GI bill of rights. He has sought tax relief for veterans of World War II, and the enactment of a measure which he introduced in Congress has made it possible for veterans to have priority in purchasing surplus boats, 65 feet in length or under, from the Government.

Congressman DOMENGEAUX was formerly a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, in which connection he was particularly active. He took a prominent part in adoption of the GI bill of rights and as a one-man subcommittee inspected various veterans' hospitals. His recommendations for improved conditions undoubtedly influenced to a considerable extent the reorganization of the medical service of the Veterans' Administration. His record as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs was excellent from the viewpoint of veteran organizations. He is now a member of another committee, but has retained his great interest in veterans' legislation.

I hope this information will be of assistance to you in your chapter.

Yours very sincerely,

FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
Director for National Legislation.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS, OFFICE OF DIRECTOR, NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE SERVICE

Washington, D. C., April 23, 1948.

To Whom It May Concern:

This is to advise that to the best of my knowledge and belief Representative JAMES DOMENGEAUX, of Louisiana, has a most favorable record in the Congress of the United States with respect to legislation affecting veterans and dependents of veterans. This office, as legislative spokesman for the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, has always found Mr. DOMENGEAUX sympathetic and cooperative to our legislative program.

No effort has been made by this office to appraise Mr. DOMENGEAUX's record on legislation other than that which affects veterans and their dependents because it is not within the province or jurisdiction of this office to judge a Member of Congress except on his record dealing with veteran affairs. Mr. DOMENGEAUX was at one time a member of the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation which handled the bulk of veteran legislation in the House of Representatives and his record as a member of that committee was excellent from the viewpoint of veteran organizations.

Very truly yours,

OMAR B. KETCHUM, *Director.*

AMVETS, NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR,
Washington, D. C., June 8, 1948.

MY DEAR MR. DOMENGEAUX: In behalf of the American Veterans of World War II, better known as the AMVETS, I wish to take this means of expressing the appreciation of our organization for your efforts in Congress in behalf of the veterans and their dependents. We have observed your outstanding record in veterans' legislation matters and we are also familiar with the assistance you have given so many veterans with their individual problems. As you are yourself a veteran you are in an excellent position to best understand our views and our needs.

We are particularly grateful for your work in sponsoring legislation increasing the rates of compensation, pension, and retirement pay for veterans of both world wars and their dependents. You are also to be commended for the introduction of a bill to provide income tax relief for veterans of World War II.

You recognized a duty the Nation owes to the memory of the men who died in World War II, by introducing legislation to extend to their children the educational benefits of the GI bill of rights.

You made it possible, through another measure in Congress, for veterans of World War II to have priority in the purchase of surplus boats of 65 feet in length or under, and you took a very active part in the enactment of legislation enabling veterans to convert their terminal-leave bonds into cash.

As a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs you had a prominent part in the preparation and adoption of the GI bill of rights. Also as a member of the committee your energetic and thorough inspection of veterans' hospitals and your recommendations in this connection were followed by the reorganization of the medical service of the Veterans' Administration, a step which had long been necessary.

We are very glad to take this opportunity to express our thanks.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. MCLAUGHLIN,
National Legislative Director.

I took an active part in the enactment of legislation to provide housing facilities for veterans. I was also active in the movement to provide terminal-leave payments and to convert these bonds into cash. Through my efforts several additional offices of the Veterans' Administration were established in Louisiana to better meet local requirements.

MUSKRAT INDUSTRY

Large numbers of our citizens depend upon the fur industry for their livelihood. Muskrat trapping is a very important one in the Third Louisiana District. I have looked after the interests of the trappers at all times, particularly in the matter of a just return for their labor and securing for them fair prices for their skins. During OPA days I made a determined fight for lifting the ceiling price on muskrat fur, as the ceiling that had been established was creating a black market and working hardships on those engaged in trapping.

FEDERAL SCHOOL AID

I consider that it is necessary for the Federal Government to assist our schools. I recognize that our teachers throughout the Nation are underpaid for the great work and responsibility that they shoulder. The problem involved in providing proper educational facilities and adequate salaries for teachers has become too extensive for the States to bear alone. There is no good reason why the Federal Government should not help in this matter. It is a national problem like health or safety or highways. It is a matter of national interest and national responsibility. Of course, we must guard against Federal control of schools. Bills that Congress considered during this session provide this safeguard. I regret that Congress did not enact these bills into law. I pledge and promise myself to see that this legislation is reintroduced in the next Congress and will work untiringly for its successful enactment.

FREE SCHOOL LUNCHES

Without the aid of the Federal Government, Louisiana and other States, would not be able to give free school lunches to our school children. The Federal Government has contributed hundreds of thousands of dollars yearly to the State of Louisiana for this purpose and you may be assured that I will continue my efforts in seeing that these appropriations are continued so that school children of our State may be assured of appetizing and nutritious school lunches.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

It is the duty of the Federal Government to look after the welfare of our old people who need help. Surely they should not be forced to face privation and disaster after they have worked hard all of their lives. The Government can and should give them the assurance of security in their last years.

The Federal Government now contributes up to $25 per month payment for the old folks and the blind and up to $13.50 per month for dependent children. I am glad to state that only a few days ago Congress adopted legislation which will increase Federal payments to the old folks and the blind $5 a month and to dependent children $3 a month.

Our State has long struggled with the problem to furnish aid to the aged, the blind, and dependent children. Without Federal cooperation State aid would amount to comparatively little. If increases are to be granted, as have been planned in Louisiana, and elsewhere, it is necessary that the Federal Government offer additional benefits. The action of Congress makes this possible.

AUTHOR OF OLD-AGE PENSION BILL

When I first came to Congress in 1940 I introduced an old-age pension bill which would have provided at least $30 per month. This represented a substantial sum at that time, but because of the high cost of living today this amount is not adequate. For that reason I have introduced another bill known as H. R. 6638 which would provide direct Federal old-age assistance at the rate of $60 per month to citizens 60 years of age or over.

I am sure that you realize that in Louisiana today over half of the money that goes toward paying an old-age pension is paid by the Federal Government. I am glad to state that I have voted and advocated these payments and will continue my efforts toward assisting the old people of the State.

TIDELANDS

The protection of the rights of the States to submerged lands within their respective boundaries is of vast importance to Louisiana. The income from these lands, through oil leases and otherwise, go to the State and parishes and make many public improvements possible, as well as contributing greatly to the financial support of our schools. Recently the United States Supreme Court held that these tidelands belonged to the United States instead of to the respective States. Louisiana stands to lose over one billion dollars by this decision.

LEADS FIGHT

Shortly after the United States Supreme Court decision I introduced legislation in the House of Representatives for the purpose of having the Congress declare these lands belong to the States. The House of Representatives recently passed a measure which included the provisions of the bill I introduced. Unfortunately the Senate failed to vote on this legislation. As this is so important

to the State of Louisiana, and since we stand to lose over $1,000,000,000, which is one thousand million, I, in the new Congress next year, will do everything in my power to reenact this legislation with the hope that it will successfully pass the Congress.

TAX REDUCTION

Tax reduction is necessary for the health of the American economic system and as a precaution against depression periods.

I voted for the income-tax-reduction bill in Congress this year because it was greatly needed for relief of the American taxpayer from an excessive tax burden. I will continue to vote for tax reduction at every opportunity, providing it does not impair our national security and stability.

American business should be granted every opportunity to exercise free enterprise and initiative, with the least possible Government interference. Small business should be especially protected. There has been entirely too much Government regulation of business, even in time of war. I have consistently opposed moves toward business regimentation by the Federal Government, and have opposed legislation that would endanger small business because of monopolistic policies.

I have frequently criticized bureaucratic government and warned against increasing Federal control. The Government is intended to be the servant of the people, not the people the servants of the Government. States' rights must be respected and the principle of local government recognized to the fullest extent. The Federal pay roll should be watched carefully and all possible reductions made, consistent with good public service.

THE SOUTH AND CIVIL RIGHTS

I have fought at every opportunity the so-called civil-rights program recently advocated by the President at the expense of the South. I will continue to do so, for this is a matter that strikes at those natural rights which we in the South enjoy as a heritage from our forefathers, who established the principles of States' rights and self-government.

Prominent in the civil-rights program is the proposal for Fair Employment Practices Committee. This would mean Federal control over private business; the right to say whom a businessman should employ, regardless of race or color. The FEPC would destroy initiative and free enterprise.

The civil-rights program is opposed to segregation of the white and Negro races. If this idea was put into effect it would be a body blow to the South and to her people who know best how to handle the Negro situation.

Those who argue for antilynching legislation and an anti-poll-tax law, the abolishment of segregation, or for the FEPC disregard the fact that the first three would be an illegal invasion of States' rights and the latter an encroachment upon the fundamental conception of free enterprise.

The whole South must join in this fight, for those things which the South hold sacred are in danger of being destroyed. You can depend upon me to make this fight to the bitter end.

MY SERVICES APPRECIATED

I am very much gratified over the numerous expressions of appreciation regarding the services I render. The following extracts are taken from some of the many letters, telegrams, and other communications addressed to me by my constituents and others:

It is with pleasure I write to express my gratitude for your approval of the Federal Aid to Education bills. We of Terrebonne Parish hope that no complications will arise to prevent you from giving them your continued support.

Mrs. ODESSA BABIN,
Schriever Route, Box 126.

Be it resolved, That the teachers of Terrebonne Parish commend Representative JAMES DOMENGEAUX and express their appreciation to him for the interest that he has taken in the affairs of the teachers and children of the State and Nation.—(From resolution adopted by Terrebonne Parish Teachers Association, Marguerite E. Watkins, chairman.)

GERMANY, *January 2, 1945.*

I really admired your action in resigning from Congress to join the Army as a private. I'm sorry you had to get out on a medical discharge, but I feel that a guy like you can do us more good in Washington than as a private anyway.

Lt. WILLIAM J. DODD,
(Now Lieutenant Governor of Louisiana).

Thank you and your office for the splendid cooperation in getting adequate housing here for veterans. With the completion of the apartments at the airport and the 118 which were recently constructed on the campus, I feel that the problem is well on the way toward being solved. We deeply appreciate your cooperation in this matter.

JOEL L. FLETCHER,
President of Southwestern Louisiana Institute.

My people join with me in expressing their appreciation and thanks for the fine cooperation given to the town of Thibodaux in getting planning money from the Federal Works Agency for our city projects. Accept personal thanks from me.

CHAS. E. DELAS, *Mayor.*

I received a copy of your remarks on increased pay for servicemen. I am proud to know that you are still fighting for us and for our people at home. I am one of the happiest soldiers in the service to know that I have not been forgotten by our Congressman.

Pvt. PAUL J. BREAUX.

It is with pleasure I write to thank and congratulate you for your good work and your support as a Member of Congress from Louisiana in increasing the pay for men in our armed forces. I felt proud to show all the boys in our company how you have done your part in passing the bill we have been waiting for so long. You will never be forgotten.

Pvt. CLAUDE JUDICE.

I wish to thank you for the help you gave me in obtaining for my son, Charles L. Broussard, his subsistence pay while attending the Acme Neon Institute in Chicago. Charles is very appreciative also of your kindness in this matter and sends his best regards.

Mrs. J. L. BROUSSARD,
New Iberia, La.

The Lafayette Parish World War II Veterans Association extends its thanks and appreciation for the assistance and splendid cooperation which you have rendered in our campaign for veterans' housing and fair rent rates.

CHARLES PERILLOUX,
President.

I want to thank you for your letter of the 14th with copy of your speech enclosed, both of which have reference to the absurd action of Price Administrator Leon Henderson in ceiling the price of raw sugar at 3.5 cents per pound, and to compliment you on the vigorous opposition that you offered on the floor of the House.

GEO. L. BILLEAUD,
Broussard, La.

Your efforts to secure an effective priority rating for the owners of powerboats in the fishing industry is very much appreciated by the owners and operators of such boats.

C. E. KING,
THE MORGAN CITY REVIEW,
Morgan City, La.

The Jeanerette Chamber of Commerce wishes to express its thanks for your prompt efforts in helping us to maintain the dairy at the Iberia Live Stock Experiment Farm. It is our hope that the experimental farm will be allotted sufficient funds for continuation.

L. C. LAMPO, JR.,
Secretary-Manager, Jeanerette Chamber of Commerce.

I want to thank you for your interest and good work in behalf of the United States postal employees' H. R. 5059. This increase in pay is much needed by all. We know we can always count on you for a helping hand.

JOSEPH E. BLANCHARD,
Postmaster, Raceland, La.

Thanks for everything, and if I can ever repay you in any way for the interest you are taking in me, all you have to do is tell me what I can do for you.

RUFUS W. FONTENOT,
New Orleans.

I wish to thank you for your telegram received today about my son, Wilson M. O'Niell, who is in England in a hospital. Your news was very welcome, and I assure you Anne and I both appreciate your efforts in the matter.

W. M'KERALL O'NIELL,
Franklin, La.

At our recent Louisiana parent-teacher convention in Lafayette, our organization reaffirmed its belief in the urgent need of Federal aid to education. We appreciate all your efforts in helping to secure this legislation.

Mrs. W. S. VINCENT,
President.

I really believe this editorial represents the opinion of a great majority of the people of this section. (Editorial referred to appeared in Lafayette Daily Advertiser of June 18, 1946, commending members of Louisiana delegation in the House of Representatives for voting to override the Presidential veto of tax-reduction bill. It stated in part: "Congressman JAMES DOMENGEAUX was lined up with the Louisiana delegation and the Democrats who crossed the party line in the effort to save some money for the overburdened taxpayer. The Third District is to be congratulated that its Congressman had the welfare of the people at heart and that

he was not concerned in the expediency of politics.)

A. P. ELLIOTT,
Lafayette, La.

You have read my wishes in your demands on President Truman regarding rice and sugar. I am as yet wondering why the unadulterated discrimination against southern farmers. Glory to you.

Dr. A. A. COMEAUX,
Abbeville, La.

I wish to take this means to tell you that your vote on matters of importance have coincided with my views most of the time and have met with my hearty approval.

G. O. PHARR,
New Iberia, La.

I want to take this means of thanking you for all that you have done for me in settling a travel claim. Final payments have been received.

JOHN R. REAUX, *Veteran,*
Lafayette, La.

With reference to our phone conversation and the wires we exchanged, I wish to express my appreciation for the efforts you put forth and the manner in which you kept us posted on developments. Your bill on the oyster situation is causing much favorable comment from the oyster people around here, and it is another act for which you are being highly commended.

DONALD BOLLINGER,
Lockport, La.

I am in receipt of notice that our WPA street and drainage project has been approved by the President. I want to thank you for your efforts in having this project approved and assure you that all of the residents of Abbeville appreciate your services,

J. E. KIBBE, *Abbeville.*

Your letter of the 9th was received, together with a copy of your speech in regard to Nation-wide rationing of gasoline. I was very much interested and impressed by the speech you delivered in Congress and wish to tell you that this country needs your type of representative in Congress who is not afraid to express his beliefs. Keep up the good work. We are with you.

GUST CATSULIS, *New Iberia.*

Just to let you know I deeply appreciated your prompt attention and answer to my inquiry. Mrs. Duhon and I both thank you for your kind and courteous service.

J. O. DUHON, M. D.,
Lafayette, La.

At a recent meeting of our organization we discussed with elation the manner in which you supported the passage of our retirement bill. We unanimously resolved to take the pleasure and the privilege of thanking you for your interest in our legislation.

ABRAHAM KOKOCINSKI,
President,
CLARENCE O. LEBLANC,
Secretary,
Branch 1760, National Association of Letter Carriers.

The board of directors of the Lafayette Chamber of Commerce unanimously endorse your splendid effort to have flood-control appropriations restored by President. Activation and completion of these important works are economically justified and should provide beneficial returns to State and Nation. We commend your action and offer our continued help to further this cause.

LAFAYETTE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
LEE G. LAFOSSE,
Secretary-Manager.

We want to thank you for the special effort and attention you have shown in behalf of the sirup manufacturers of Louisiana. We will be glad to furnish any information you may need.

C. S. STEEN SYRUP MILL, INC.,
J. WESLEY STEEN,
Abbeville.

I want to take this opportunity to thank you for the work you have been doing in behalf of the Louisiana sirup manufacturers. The situation is very serious with quite a number of us, and unless we get some relief through the Government purcasing a large quantity of the 1947 crop it is going to be tough sledding. Please keep up the good work; I am sure you will do all that you can to help out.

HALL GRAIN & SYRUP CO.,
H. T. HALL,
Manager, New Iberia.

I want to let you know that the people around here are for you. They appreciate the things you have done for us in Congress.

LYDIA COMEAUX,
Milton, La.

I want to thank you on behalf of the Vermilion Parish Teachers' Association for your support.

NOAH LANGLINAIS,
President, Indian Bayou, La.

Your letter and your remarks in the House of Representatives, Tuesday, May 12, 1942, were received today. I want to commend you on the stand you took relative to increasing the pay of men in the armed forces. I have two sons in the country's service. Needless to say I am proud of them, but I too think the boys who have had to give up their home life deserve an increase in pay. So again I congratulate you on your noble stand.

MRS. LLOYD B. MILLER,
Abbeville, La.

This is to express the sincere appreciation of the large segment of the rice industry which we represent, for your untiring efforts and the splendid contribution which you made in having the administrative agencies of the Government provide an export allocation for rice, principally for shipment to Cuba. This allocation, although long and unnecessarily delayed, will permit millers and exporters to dispose of the surplus from the 1947 crop, and enable producers to prepare for the 1948 crop with some assurance of being able to obtain a fair price.

THE RICE MILLER'S ASSOCIATION,
W. M. REID,
Executive Vice President.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for the favor rendered my son, Edward, and myself. It is nice to have friends that you can depend on when you are in trouble and that is exactly what you have done for us. Edward was in the Marines and wounded three times, and is still a little nervous. Not receiving his pay did not help matters at all. Through your kind efforts the check has been received.

LARRY LOGAN, *Lafayette, La.*

I was fortunate enough to read a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which you put up a fight for the soldiers' increase in pay. May I congratulate you for the work and effort put forth on that bill. I hope every father and soldier in the Third District realize the good work you have done.

J. J. PRINCE,
Lafayette, La.

Thanks for your vote and support of farm bloc bill regarding new formula for parity price. Keep up the fight we know you can put up and will. We appreciate your work.

LAFAYETTE PARRISH FARM BUREAU,
S. A. CALLAHAN,
President, Lafayette, La.

Your brilliant work played an important part in winning the game. Congratulations. We are solid behind you.

A. O. RAPPELET, *Houma, La.*

I want to thank you for your efforts in the matter of automobile deal discounts before the House Small Business Committee. Your interest and efforts in this matter are very much appreciated and I hope you will continue them toward a just settlement.

JOS. A. DAIGRE,
President, New Iberia Auto Co., New Iberia.

I want to sincerely thank you for your wholehearted efforts which resulted in the announcement of decontrol of all types of shrimp. In behalf of the industry and your many friends here, and for myself, please accept sincere thanks.

JULIAN M'PHILLIPS,
Chairman, Shrimp Industry Advisory Committee.

Moved by Mr. Howard Olivier, seconded by Mr. Roy LaBauve, that the police jury of Iberia Parish extends its expression of gratitude to United States Representative James Domengeaux for his good work in trying to have government controls removed from sugar and rice. Motion carried. (From minutes of meeting of police jury of Iberia Parish, November 14, and submitted by Marcul Deblanc, secretary and treasurer.)

It is with gratitude that I express my sincere appreciation for your continued and successful effort concerning the dredging of the mouth of Bayou Lafourche. I cannot over-emphasize the value of this project and what it means to our industry and I take pleasure in assuring you that I and the community will be ever grateful.

E. MILTON EGLE,
Golden Meadow, La.

OFFICE POLICY

Since I have been in Congress I have followed certain policies which have enabled me to render careful and able service to my constituents:

1. Answer mail promptly.

2. I never ask "For whom did you vote in the last election". I ask, "What can I do to help you?"

3. Always remember that each day is a day closer to the next election when an accounting must be made.

4. There is no unimportant problem to the constituent who seeks the aid of his Congressman, and if it is important to my constituent it is important to me.

5. There are no factions or political lines after the vote is counted. A good Congressman is everybody's Congressman.

6. It doesn't matter who you are, what you are or where you came from. If you think enough of me to ask my help, I think enough of you to do all I can to help.

7. I can't do everything, but I do everything I can.

8. A direct question justifies a direct answer. It must either be "Yes" or "No."

9. You may not agree with me but you will always know where I stand.

10. I am hired by the people of the Third District to represent them. It is a 24-hour job. I have no other business or interest, except that of being a good Congressman—and being a good Congressman takes undivided attention and time.

IMPORTANCE OF EXPERIENCE

The value of the service of a member of Congress and his ability to help his people increase with each succeeding term of office. I would like to refer to a statement by that great statesman and former Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Honorable Champ Clark:

A man has to learn to be a Representative just as he must learn to be a blacksmith, a carpenter, a farmer, an engineer, a lawyer or a doctor * * * A new Congressman must begin at the foot of the class * * * The best rule * * * is for a district to select a man with at least fair capacity, industrious, honest, energetic, sober and courageous, and keep him there so long as he discharges his duties faithfully and well. Such a man will gradually rise to high position and influence in the House.

I am glad to have had this opportunity to review in general my record as a Member of the United States House of Representatives. I greatly appreciate the honor the people of the Third Louisiana District conferred upon me when they selected me to represent them in Congress, and their approval of my work as expressed by my reelection for the past three successive terms of office. I trust that I will have the privilege of continuing my service to them and to the Nation.

Seven-Billion-Dollar Treasury Surplus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, the irresponsible charge that the bill which cut income taxes $5,100,000,000 would unbalance the Federal budget has been proved false by the recent statement of the Secretary of the Treasury reporting a Treasury surplus of "more than $7,000,000,000" for fiscal 1948.

The newspaper report of this statement which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on June 17, is included:

SNYDER FORESEES SEVEN-BILLION SURPLUS

Secretary of Treasury Snyder said yesterday the Government will wind up the current fiscal year June 30 with a budget surplus of more than $7,000,000,000.

Snyder told a news conference the excess of income over spending will be "very close" to President Truman's $7,482,000,000 estimate, despite an expected $600,000,000 loss in revenue due to the recent tax cut.

Snyder declined comment on recent automobile or other price increases. He said he has not had a chance to analyze the producers' costs.

He recalled he had "urged manufacturers, industrialists and businessmen not to overprice" where their 1947 year-end financial statement showed excessive profits. He said he will do so again if their 1948 semiannual statements show excessive profits.

Snyder was silent about congressional plans to adjourn without enacting Mr. Truman's program for price controls and other anti-inflationary steps. He said Mr. Truman has outlined his own views definitely, and "let's rest on his statement."

Selling—A Friendly Journey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a brief of the address recently delivered before the Worcester Sales Executives Club by Mr. Harry G. Goddard, president, Wyman-Gordon Co., Worcester, Mass. Mr. Goddard's speech, titled "Selling—A Friendly Journey," outlines the early history of Worcester, giving well deserved tribute to those pioneer men and families mainly responsible for the foundation and development of our modern city; his talk contains many pertinent and timely references for the inspiration of the young people of today.

Mr. Goddard is preeminently qualified to recount this thesis, having risen from humble beginnings to a foremost position among the outstanding industrial executives of the United States.

His address follows:

It is a great honor to be asked to address the Sales Executives Club of Worcester. I prize the opportunity because of my regard for its members and because of the part they are playing in our city and national life. It would ill become me if I should feel that I could give guidance or instruction in the important art of selling to such an expert audience. The notice of this meeting depicted as stepping stones to success: Hard work, confidence and good will. These qualities indeed are high on the list of those required for success.

I wish to congratulate your previous presidents, Mr. George Abbott and Mr. Everett Merrill, and Mr. William R. Moore, now president, on the great progress your club has made, indicated by this splendid assemblage on its second presidents' anniversary night. You, like many others, are spreading the story of Worcester of which we are justly proud.

Today, Worcester is a city of 200,000 people with greatly diversified industries, many cultural institutions, and an enviable worldwide reputation in many fields. I asked myself why this could be, in a location devoid of many natural advantages and far from raw materials. The answer is "men." Progress such as this does not just happen. It may seem foreign to my subject to ask you to think with me for a few moments about these men and their accomplishments, but, as we tell their story we will realize that they laid the foundations which made possible the industries you represent.

Lend me your imagination and consider what we would find if this entire group here could from some far-off land have been dropped into the beautiful valley where Worcester is situated, approximately one hundred years ago. We would have found a little community of approximately 10,000 people. There would have been little to tell except the record of the courage and vision of the men there, and their belief in the future of American freedom and enterprise. It is because of such men, willing to work, to sacrifice and to risk, that we have here, and in many like communities throughout our land, the conditions of which we are so proud.

There was a time when commercial activities were looked upon with a certain degree of condescension. That time has long since passed. It is now fully acknowledged that the resources required for the upbuilding of our country could not have been available except from the proceeds of business given by men successful in their fields. Their interests were not primarily in profit or display. Their pride was in accomplishment and in the community benefits so well exemplified in the instances that I would like to call to your attention.

One hundred years or more ago there was a storekeeper at the north end of the city, now called Lincoln Square, named Stephen Salisbury. He and his descendants through the third generation were successful, and made wide investments and great contributions to the development of Worcester. The institutions owing the Salisbury's a great debt are the Worcester Polytechnic Institute, the Worcester Art Museum, the American Antiquarian Society and many another civic activity of Worcester.

William Merrifield, a builder, foresaw that "mighty oaks from little acorns grow." One of the wonders of his day was the "Merrifield Building," built by him for lease with power to infant industries. Built in 1854 it was 1,000 feet long, three stories high, and 50 feet wide. The power was a 359-horsepower steam engine, the largest and one of the costliest in Worcester. It is interesting to note that this project is in line with the plans of the economic group of our chamber of commerce which is using the same method for aid and encouragement to new and small enterprises.

Washburn is a worthy name in Worcester, Ichabod, the blacksmith, being the first. Renting space in a small factory built by the Salisburys, he founded the wire and steel industry. The rent for his first building was $1,011 a year. From this small beginning came the Washburn & Moen Manufacturing Co., now succeeded by the American Steel & Wire Co. Mr. Washburn is another example of the civic-mindedness of the businessman of those days. His contributions were many to all good causes in Worcester including the Worcester Polytechnic Institute, where he put into practice the idea of a work shop as an adjunct to textbook education.

The "dividends" from the contributions of these and other pioneers are indicated by the many successful industries which have benefited by the institutions these men founded. An outstanding example is the Norton Co., manufacturers of abrasive wheels and machines and our largest industry.

The beginning of this company was in a little pottery where someone had the idea materials could be put together and produce something which would grind surfaces better and cheaper than could be done with the natural stone. Two professors at the Worcester Tech, Milton P. Higgins and George I. Alden, recognized the value of this idea. The Norton Co. was born. Both men became great contributors to every movement contributing to the growth of the city. Mr. Higgins was the father of the trade school in the public-school system of this country.

If time permitted I could tell you romance-filled stories of many a Worcester industry.

Suffice it to mention one or two. James Heald, the son of the founder of the Heald Machine Co., by dint of real salesmanship raised $10,000 to purchase from his father the machine shop portion of the business and move it to Worcester. To meet the time limit set for the completion of the transaction he drove behind a pair of fast horses 16 miles into the country and completed the bargain made with his father. Today the third generation is carrying on this business, the products of which are widely known.

The Rice Barton Corp., builders of paper machinery, was a little machine shop 100 years ago. Strange as it may seem, in that little shop the first machine for making envelopes was developed. The inventor was a physician, Dr. Russell Hawes. Henry Swift walked from the seashore town of Falmouth 100 miles to Worcester and as the result of his inventions Worcester is the center of the envelope industry, represented by the U. S. Envelope Co.

Many another instance could be related: Matthew J. Whittall coming over from England to collaborate with George Crompton, the inventor of the modern loom. This developed into the Whittall Mills and the Crompton and Knowles Loom Works. Henry Graton, with $800 capital, starting the little leather shop which is now the Graton and Knight Co. One thing in common in all these instances is that start with little or no capital. They were brought to their present position by hard work and the plowing of earnings back into the business. There were then no hampering laws such as we have today, many of which seem to be based on the false premise that success cannot be obtained without harm to others. True success is of benefit to all.

Coming a little closer to our subject, salesmanship, I wish to mention two famous Worcester salesmen. One, John Boynton, was what we used to call a tin-peddler. He went throughout the country towns peddling or selling household articles. He became an institution and his regular trips were looked forward to by all with whom he dealt. His business expanded; he was frugal and one day he came to Worcester and talked with some of his associates, saying, "I want to help found a school that will give boys a better training for business and life, both in cultural activities and mechanics." He had saved from his little business $100,000, which was the first gift toward the founding of the Worcester Polytechnic Institute.

Another, Jonas Clark, at the time of the "forty-niners" went to California, not to dig gold, but to sell supplies to those who did. Toward the end of his life he, too, had the urge to help boys get an education, which he had not had, and at less cost than was then available. He was the founder of Clark University, to which he left $3,000,000. I have related some of these instances to show our indebtedness to the past and the proud heritage which is ours.

I confess my own life has been a pleasant journey and that I seek above all things for myself and the company with which I am associated the friendship and respect of customer, vendor, and competitor alike. A gentleman for whom I worked as a young man once said to me, "I have lived a long life, and there are three things which to my mind are of great importance. They are health, friends, and a pleasant occupation." An analysis of this simple statement shows how much of life it embraces. Unhappy the man who does not have friends and who does not enjoy his occupation.

Someone has said, "We learn in three ways—by precept, by example, and by experience." We will all agree with this and, I think, admit that we learn more by example and experience than we do by precept. Following the suggestion of your President, I will mention a few experiences that have been of help and interest to me and that illustrate some of the fundamental qualities required for true success in life.

My first experience with an executive salesman was with my father. You will be surprised when I tell you he was a minister. He would have been a success, however, in any field. He taught or "sold" me many ideas, the value of which I little realized until many years had passed. As I think of him, I remember that statement of Calvin Coolidge, "My folks were happy and contented; they lived within their means and feared no man." I was fortunate in that heritage.

I will take the liberty of giving you an instance of my father's method of teaching. He was a pastor of a small church; his duties included those of janitor, treasurer, and whatnot. One of the things I enjoyed and was allowed to do on a Sunday afternoon was to count the morning collection. In that little parish it was meager. One day I found a half dollar in the collection plate. This was so unusual I called it to my father's attention. He said, "I didn't see any 50-cent person in the congregation today. Let me see it." He took the coin, looked it over, tested it and said, "Son, that's counterfeit." Then he said he hoped that whoever had put it on the Lord's plate didn't know that it was counterfeit, but that it was counterfeit just the same. I asked him if I could have it. He gave it to me. I carried it around in my pocket for a number of days. I had never had a 50-cent piece before. I was saying to myself that if nobody knew it was counterfeit why couldn't I use it and kept thinking how many things it would buy. One day, walking with my father on the bridge over a nearby river, he said, "Have you that 50-cent piece in your pocket?" I knew what was coming but at his request, handed it to him. He gave me a little talk about the importance of sincerity and not having anything about one that was counterfeit. He then said, "You don't want to keep this, do you?" My answer was a feeble "no." He threw it into the river. I can still hear that splash. As I have observed men under many circumstances, I have found that it is impossible for them for any length of time to prosper with counterfeit ideas. So I say the fundamental basis of any business or any profession, and none more than salesmanship, is integrity, both of person and product.

My first business venture was a failure. It is interesting how things repeat themselves. This venture was subsidized, not by the Government but by my parents. They furnished me the lemons and the sugar to start in business. I set up a box in front of the house with a sign, "Lemonade, ice cold, 5 cents a glass." I was doing a pretty good business when a boy across the street came over to see what was going on. A little later a box appeared on the other side of the street with a sign, "Lemonade, 3 cents a glass." He got the business. I still had some lemons and sugar so I added a little more water and changed the price to two glasses for 5 cents. I did quite a volume of business but at the end of the day had not made enough profit to pay back the capital invested. This taught me that a fair profit is not only justifiable, but necessary. Many people today, without practical experience, are assuming that profit in business should be limited and are preaching mediocrity and security rather than opportunity and incentive.

My next business venture was selling newspapers, a great experience which many of you have had. On my first day I purchased four papers for five cents and sold them for 8 cents. Overhead, general expense and shoe leather did not enter into my accounting. As the days went by and "fair weather" newsboys dropped out when winter days came, I built up a substantial route. I purchased the papers and made the collections. I collected every 2 weeks and each customer owed me 24 cents. My experiences with those newspaper customers have been duplicated many times in later business relationships.

There were three kinds of people: one kind lived exactly up to his contract without any sentiment. I was paid 24 cents and if a quarter was handed me, the penny in change was waited for. I have no fault to find with those in that group, but they miss an awful lot of fun in life. The second group always seemed to find some way to chisel; they would claim a paper or two had been missed and deductions were made from the 24 cents. I might add that such people didn't gain much by it for on stormy days I gave my special attention to the customer in the third class. This kind of customer was friendly. He went beyond the letter of the law. He gave me a quarter and said, "Son, keep the change." It is possible that you in your business dealings may have met people who are in all of these classes. Few businesses have succeeded that did not have the guiding principle of doing more than is simply required.

I was fortunate to have begun my business life in the period when industrial development was advancing by leaps and bounds and thus had the opportunities to observe many men whose names were nationally known in that early industrial era. They were not supermen. The biggest of them were friendly and simple.

Why is our country great? I believe it is because of the old-fashioned, homely qualities of its citizens; character, enthusiasm, courage and a belief in the Golden Rule. As a result of these we have what we call free enterprise, that is freedom for a private individual to profit by his own efforts and to enjoy those profits with a proper conception of the responsibility to the society which gave him that opportunity.

It is sad to note that our American way of life is under attack. Its assumptions are open to question from many quarters. For these reasons we must renew our pride in the American story and our confidence in America's destiny. Democracy can last only as long as men and women of intelligence follow the charts of human experience. If we look well to them, the shoals of expediency and selfishness are plainly marked.

It is possible that we in business have failed to preach, in season and out, the doctrines that have made America great and have somehow feared to tell the true story of business and what a successful enterprise involves over the years. Leaders must be furnished who will answer the insidious propaganda which comes from so many sources all seeking to alter the system which has been the basis of our progress.

Where will these leaders come from? From the same source as in the past. Not from a restricted group but from every walk of life—school, college, farm and shop. We don't need extraordinary men; leadership is furnished by ordinary men with more than ordinary determination.

I look forward to the future of our city, our industries and our Nation with unshaken optimism. I feel sure we have the power and the spirit to meet the problems of the present as did our forebears in the earlier periods of our history. Each can contribute his part. No group or organization has more opportunity for usefulness than a sales executive group such as is here tonight.

We must all be salesmen of these truths. If we fulfill this obligation we shall have helped to build a highway with guideposts which will aid generations to come to find the kind of a life which they can honestly call a "friendly journey."

Federal Guarantee of Right to Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 15), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Federal Guarantee of Right to Work Called Basic American Need," published in the Detroit Free Press on Sunday, May 30, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL GUARANTEE OF RIGHT TO WORK CALLED BASIC AMERICAN NEED

The cost of living formula which settled the threatened General Motors strike has been hailed by economists and the press as a "new era in labor-management relations."

Actually, the plan is not new but this is the first time it has been applied in an industry of such magnitude. Time alone can determine how well it will work.

There was another development in Detroit last week, however, which generally has been overlooked by those who hailed so enthusiastically GM's new agreement with the unions.

In its impact upon American life, it is far more fundamental than merely finding a method to avoid a strike. We refer specifically to a demonstration of the callous disregard of constitutional guarantees which should give every American the right to work.

TRIBUTE TO THE UNIONS

As reported by the Detroit Times, Chrysler strikers "turned the vacation-pay line into a dues and membership drive, refusing to allow any nonmember of the UAW-CIO or any delinquent member to collect the check."

A committee of pickets demanded to see the badges and union dues receipts of everyone who approached the window. Those who could show no up-to-date receipt were told to go to the union hall and pay up or go home. New employees who had not joined the union were instructed to go to the union hall and sign up.

Policemen and plant-protection men stood by and watched. One of them expressed the opinion that he thought it was a violation of the Taft-Hartley Act but added hopelessly, "There's nothing we can do about it, anyway."

What happened at Chrysler is nothing new. In hundreds of plants throughout the United States, compulsory union membership is the price of earning a living.

Even though there is a Federal statute carrying a penalty of $5,000 of a 10-year prison term for any "two or more persons who conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any citizen in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States," the law is flagrantly disregarded and held in utter contempt.

In the now famous case of Cecil B. De Mille, who was expelled from the American Federation of Radio Artists and forced to give up a lucrative radio program because he refused to pay a $1 political assessment, the Supreme Court of the United States denied Mr. De Mille a hearing.

De Mille correctly and courageously stood for the principle that one's liberties as a citizen and his obligations as a member of a labor union ought to be separated.

To this clearly American concept of democracy, the courts turned a deaf ear. And this in view of the fact that Mr. Justice Hughes once declared for the Supreme Court of the United States that "it requires no argument to show that the right to work for a living in the common occupations of the community is of the very essence of the personal freedom and opportunity that it was the purpose of the amendment (Fourteenth) to secure."

GUARANTEES LACKING

Had the Taft-Hartley Act been in effect when Mr. De Mille challenged the right of his own union to levy an assessment for the purpose of advancing the political philosophies of its leaders, his rights under the Constitution would have been safeguarded.

With the present complexion of the Supreme Court which interprets old laws in new ways, there is no such guarantee safeguarding the right of every individual to work when he pleases, where he pleases, for himself or whoever wants to hire him under the full protection of the Government of the United States.

That is why we believe the right to work should be written into law quite as indelibly as is the right to strike. As Mr. De Mille inquired in his testimony before the House Committee on Education and Labor, "Which is more basic? Which is more essential to life and the pursuit of happiness?"

While the questions answer themselves, Mr. De Mille points out that while we have Constitutional provisions and statutes which seemingly are broad enough to guarantee a citizen's individual liberty, nowhere is the right to work even asserted, much less emphasized or explicitly defended.

We can no longer pretend that it is Constitutional to deprive some people of the right to work because others have the right to strike.

In urging that interference with the right to work be made a Federal offense, Mr. De Mille makes it clear that he is not advocating revival of professional strike breakers or urging any support to employers who would use them. He stated emphatically to the Congressional committee that "employers' thugs are as bad as union thugs."

"I am speaking," said De Mille, "for the man or woman who has a job, is satisfied with it and wants to keep it."

POWER OF COMMUNISTS

Five months ago in France, the Communists fomented strikes which resulted in the collapse of transportation and stoppage of fuel supplies. Millions of workers had left their jobs.

In this crisis, Premier Schuman told the National Assembly that "We will not permit any attack on the right to work and we will punish any act of sabotage." As a result, the public service workers voted to return to work.

The Communist threat to the United States is not now so dangerous as in France, a nation long noted for the corruption of its public officials and the venality of its press.

Yet Harry Bridges, whose policies are indistinguishable from the Communist Party line, holds not only our west coast shipping but the sugar workers of the United States, Hawaii, Cuba, Puerto Rico and the Dominican Republic in the hollow of his hand.

It is not difficult to imagine what a threat to our national safety in time of war reposes in the rigid control of millions of workers by one man whose ideologies are diametrically opposed to our own.

LEGAL PROTECTION NEEDED

We do not favor legislation outlawing the Communist Party or the Mundt-Nixon bill which would drive it underground.

It is naive to believe that such restrictions would have any salutary effect upon trained Communist workers who do not hesitate to lie, steal, cheat or falsify their identity.

But if our Federal Government protected the right of every man and woman to work, it would be impossible for the Communists and their dupes within the labor unions to cripple our industry and commerce at their will.

Such a Federal safeguard would shear arrogant labor bosses of much of their power and make their unions more responsive to the will of the membership.

It would discourage the use of intimidation and goon tactics on American citizens who choose to exercise their right to work.

It would stop reactionary labor bosses from crying, "To hell with the law."

It would put an end to the use of threats, intimidation, assault and violence in what is cynically called "peaceful picketing."

More than anything else, a Federal right to work statute, backed by stiff penalties, would, as Mr. De Mille says, "keep this Nation face forward on the road charted by our forefathers—the road of liberty under laws that protect and expand individual freedom, not restrict it."

We commend such a law to the attention of a Congress now unhappily engaged in forging new shackles for our civil liberties when it should be demonstrating that the strength of American Democracy lies in the unfettered privileges and rights afforded free men.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Statement on Spain by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 15), 1948

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on Spain, written by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of The Americas and World Affairs. Dr. Thorning, who is a splendid citizen of Maryland, made a first-hand study of conditions in the Iberian Peninsula. His competence in the field of international relations is widely recognized.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In view of the world conspiracy against freedom and progress, a piece by Mr. Paul F. Kennedy (The New York Times, June 7, 1948) about the friendly moves of some of the other American republics toward Spain is worthy of fuller consideration. Mr. Kennedy, reporting from Madrid, writes that Colombia, Costa Rica (which just freed itself from Leftist terror), Cuba, Peru, Honduras and, possibly, Brazil are inclined to look favorably upon a resumption of complete diplomatic relations with the one country in Europe that scored a definite victory over the Soviet Union. In the same despatch, mention is made of the fact that both Bolivia and El Salvador now have Ministers in Madrid, while Argentina and the Dominican Republic are represented by ambassadors. Certainly, this is enough evidence to show a new orientation is being displayed in important areas of the Western Hemisphere.

In the light of this undeniable trend, Mr. Kennedy's final paragraph has special significance. He writes as follows:

"While Spanish observers are optimistic that the United Nations will fall into line soon and send an ambassador, embassy of-

ficials see this as impossible as long as the 1946 resolution of the United Nations holds good."

Obviously, the first "United Nations," mentioned here, was meant to be the United States.

Much more important, however, is the "unofficial" opinion of United States embassy officials in Madrid to the effect that a "1946 United Nations resolution" prohibits the United States, or any other member state, from resuming full diplomatic relations with a nation which, according to Ambassador Carlton J. H. Hayes, accorded us loyal, valuable cooperation in World War II.

To be sure, a 1946 United Nations resolution required "the recall of the chiefs of diplomatic missions from Madrid."

What our correspondent fails to mention, however, is that the same resolution was placed before the United Nations in 1947; and was not approved. The United Nations rules require a two-thirds vote to pass a resolution. Although such a margin was obtained in 1946, it was unattainable in 1947. Inasmuch as the resolution was not renewed, it cannot now be in effect. That explains why Argentina, the Dominican Republic, Bolivia, and El Salvador are actually represented by "Chiefs of diplomatic missions" in Madrid, while a number of the other Republics are giving serious thought to the advisability of similar representation.

Furthermore, it is a matter of record that the United States was one of the countries which in 1947 not only opposed, but also voted against, the resolution recalling the Chiefs of diplomatic missions from Madrid.

Consequently, it should be clear that there is no legal provision which would control the freedom of action which every nation enjoys under international law, and according to the United Nations charter, to accredit envoys in Madrid. With respect to the United States, it may be borne in mind that, since April 1939, Spain has been recognized as the de facto and de jure Government of the Spanish people.

At a time, therefore, when the United States maintains ambassadors in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in Soviet-dominated Poland, in totalitarian Yugoslavia, and in raped Czechoslovakia, it is to strain at a gnat and swallow a camel to pretend that peace-loving states may not continue friendly relations with the de facto and de jure Government of Spain.

Pay of Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1948

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a letter I received from a constituent, the wife of a Federal worker. The writer asked that her identity be kept confidential so I have omitted the signature.

JUNE 10, 1948.

Hon. JAMES GLENN BEALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BEALL: I am writing this letter to you in the hope that you will read this letter to the Members of the Congress or convey my message in the best manner possible to impress them with the realization that poverty, almost impossible to reconcile with the American way of life, exists right here, under their very noses. As an example, take our own case:

My husband is a Federal employee, holding a responsible position and drawing a salary that was considered good before the value of a dollar was reduced to 30 cents. We have five small children, and in order to merely feed, clothe, and house our family it has been necessary for the past 2 or 3 years to "scrape up" out of thin air more money than comes in. There are no savings, therefore this is how we have "existed" for the last few years. First we sold our radio-phonograph that we dearly loved and enjoyed but considered a "luxury". Now we have no radio at all. A few months later, when the going was tough, we had to sell our bedroom rug. A few months later, our living room rug. Last winter when there was no coal and our house went down to zero and there was no money for coal, I was forced to sell the antique bedsteads (that I greatly prized) out from under our children. Now they sleep on their mattresses and box-springs without benefit of the bedsteads. Last winter my husband was very ill, or he would have probably obtained a small additional job like he has done many times before in order to make ends meet. Many times we were without groceries and each time I would have to sell something else. Little by little, but oh, so steadily, our possessions have been sacrificed in order that we might feed our children and pay our bills. But the antiques couldn't last forever, so what then?

This is what. Although I do all my own work (except for my husband's help) and have an infant, I, the mother of five small children, had to take a job. I would like the Members of Congress to close their eyes a moment and picture what it would mean for their wives to get up in the morning, pack three school lunches, make breakfast and get three children off to school, dress a smaller child to drop him at a neighbor's house and then begin the day's work at an office. Then in the evening to come home and wash breakfast dishes, make dinner, run through a wash, hear lessons, mend, iron, wash supper dishes and fall into bed exhausted. I would like the Members of Congress to imagine themselves leading such an existence. But over and above the physical hardship of being overworked, my husband and I have the added grief of not having our baby with us. We haven't had him for several months because it is necessary for his grandmother to take care of him in her home while I work.

We do not ask for a luxury wage—only a living wage. We have not had a vacation in years. I have not bought one piece of wearing apparel (and I can verify this) except hose for five years. (Since I was employed in 1943.) Five years of hand-me-downs is a long time. As for clothing for the children, I have to submit myself to the humiliation of going into private homes and buying their children's cast-offs.

This is our case (and I would be only too glad to have the circumstances under which we are living investigated for verification if our identity could remain confidential). But our case is not unique. In talking with families of other Federal employees, I have heard of conditions as sordid as ours. Living in poverty such as ours (and many others) over a long period of time is a very degrading and disheartening thing. And I feel that somehow, in spite of the hearings and testimonials, Congress is still not acutely aware of our deplorable economic plight.

Therefore I ask that you bring this letter to the attention of the proper persons because it is difficult for me to believe that they could be so calloused and indifferent if they really knew the facts.

Sincerely.

One Hundredth Anniversary of American Turners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD F. YOUNGBLOOD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a speech delivered by Hon. Carl M. Weideman, national president, on the occasion of the one hundredth anniversary program of the American Turners:

It has been 100 years ago that the revolution against the domination of Greater Germany by the Prussian kings took place and the failure of that revolution by the freedom-loving Germans caused their forced exile from their own native land. They thought America was the haven which they sought and a land in which they could be free people. Between 1848 and 1856, some six hundred thousand people, who wanted to be free, came to our shores, which then offered a haven to all oppressed persons of all countries. Their contributions to the development of America have amply repaid the land of their refuge—contributions to the economic, social, civic, and cultural life of these United States. Those German Turner immigrants and others who came to our shores in that period and before have indelibly written their names in our history by their contributions to the building of America. There was Carl Follen, Carl Beck, and Francis Leber, who came to America about 1819 and established the first public gymnasiums here. Then there was Carl Schurz and the Turners of the Civil War period, who fought to keep America free. It is well perhaps to enumerate the more important regiments that were composed wholly or in part of Turners:

"From Missouri, the First (Colonel Blair), the Third (Col. Franz Siegel), the Twelfth (Colonel Osterhaus), the Seventeenth (Colonel Hassendeubel, later Colonel Kramer), and the Forty-first (Colonel Wiedemeyer); from Wisconsin, the Fifth, the Ninth (Colonel Salomon), the Twenty-sixth (Colonel Hans Bobel); from Ohio, the Ninth (Colonel McCook), the Twenty-eighth (Colonel Moor), the Thirty-seventh (Colonel Siebert), the Hundred and Sixth (Col. G. Tafel), the Hundred and Eighth (Colonel Limberg); from Illinois, the Ninth (Colonel Mersy), the Twenty-fourth (Col. Frederick Hecker), the Forty-third (Colonel Engelmann), the Eighty-second (Col. Frederick Hecker); the First and Second of Kentucky; the Forty-seventh of Pennsylvania; the Twentieth of New York (Col. Max Weber, later Col. Engelbert Schnepf); the Second Cavalry Regiment of Minnesota (Lieutenant-Colonel Pfander); the Artillery Brigade of Ohio (Col. Max Hoffmann); and the Artillery Brigade of Minnesota (Col. William Pfander)."

In later days, we find the names of Congressman Richard Barthold; Dr. H. M. Starkloff, Alvin Kindervater, Louis Kittlaus, and Carl Heckrich of St. Louis, Mo.; Herman Lieber, Theodore Stempfel, Emil Rath, Franklin and George Vonnegut, Leo Rappaport, and Dr. Carl B. Sputh of Indianapolis, Ind.; George Brosius, George Wittich of Milwaukee, Wis.; Henry Suder, Leopold Saltiel, Max Strass, and Congressman Tom Owens of Chicago, Ill.; Richard Pertuch and William A. Stecher of Philadelphia, Pa.; Carl Burkhardt of Buffalo, N. Y.; Paul Krimmel

of Syracuse, N. Y.; Karl Schroder of Harvard University; Henry Metzner, Christ Wuest of New York City; Chris Neubauer of Springfield, Mass.; William Reuter of Davenport, Iowa; Ben Jacobson of Clinton, Iowa; William Pfaender, Herman Hein and Albert Steinhauser of New Ulm, Minn.; Henry Luther of Cleveland, Ohio; Dr. Carl Ziegler, Adolph Varrelmann of Cincinnati, Ohio; George Seibel, Dr. Herman Groth, Richard Turnt and William Voelker of Pittsburgh, Pa.; Carl Entenmann of Los Angeles, Calif.; Theodore Ahrens of Louisville, Ky.; Henry Pfeiffer, Berthold Seiffert, and Dr. Tobias Sigel of Detroit, Mich.; Herman Koehler of the United States Military Academy; George Heintz of the United States Naval Academy; Dr. Carl Zapp; Dr. Carl Kroh; Hugo Fisher and many others who have helped build America.

Our national committee, during the past one hundred years, has traveled to many cities. It was located here, in the city of St. Louis, from the year 1870 to 1882, which was one of the finest periods of Turner history in America. It was at that time that such men as Carl Schurz, Secretary of the Interior, General Sigel, General Willich, General Hecker, Colonel Bennecke, and many others, who had served their country well in the Civil War, were active in trying to make America a still better place in which to live, through the Turner movement.

During the years gone by, the Turners were the first to promote and urge the right of women to vote; to urge the public election of United States Senators; to object to the passage of the prohibition amendment, when that movement was first started in 1855; to urge the conservation of all natural resources, in 1872. They believed that eventually wars should be abolished, while at the same time, they were the first to volunteer their services in defense of their adopted land.

We cannot help but remember that it was the Turners of St. Louis that took over Camp Jackson at a critical time in the Civil War and saved Missouri for the Union, nor can we forget that the last place that flew the Stars and Stripes in Maryland was a Turner Hall in Baltimore, nor can we forget that Turner rifles stood guard over Wendell Phillips at such times as his voice spoke out against the enslavement of man and, when he could speak in no other public halls, the Turner halls in America were thrown open to him. The principles that we stand for today, they fought for then.

Nor can we forget the contribution of Turners to the development of the physical educational program and the public recreational program as it exists today. Without the impetus of the Turners of America, public recreation would not have been afforded our citizens for a long time to come. It was the Turners of Chicago, St. Louis, Kansas City, and other cities, who established the first recreational centers in America, and from those modest beginnings, the health and recreation program has grown to the tremendous position it now assumes in America.

Nor can we forget that the Turner families in America turned out men who were fit to serve their country in time of need. While the national rejection in the first world war was 32.6 percent, the Turner rejection was about 6 percent. During the second world war, while the national rejection for unfitness for various reasons amounted to about 42 percent, Turner rejections were less than 5 percent. Not only have we contributed men and women who were physically fit to defend their country in time of need, but nearly all of them displayed their leadership and discipline which they had acquired in our gymnasiums, and my best judgment leads me to believe that about 90 percent of our Turners became either commissioned or noncommissioned officers in the armed forces.

The contribution of the Turners to the physical and moral health of all youth cannot be overestimated. Juvenile delinquency, as it is known in America today, is unknown in Turner movements. We have no delinquency problems among our Turner boys and girls; and, were there sufficient Turn halls erected in every city in America where families could live together in a natural and healthy environment, America would not need its juvenile detention homes nor its jails.

While the Turners have not actively been engaged in politics, as such, each one has taken an active part in the political and civic life of our communities and has exercised the right of franchise, independently always voting to secure the best man for public office regardless of party.

We Turners are proud of the contribution we have made to America to its development as a healthier, more sane and happier Nation. We are proud that for a hundred years we have contributed something to each community in which our societies have been located, by giving to that community a family program for health and happiness.

Following the introduction of physical education and recreation in our schools and cities, many of our older Turners thought that the mission of Turnerism in America was completed and their lack of enthusiasm allowed our movement to deteriorate for some years. While maintaining our strength, we were gradually losing our numbers.

Today, in the one hundredth year of our existence, the Turners have a program which is more extensive and more necessary than our program of even one hundred years ago. Our society is growing again and is gaining new members faster than in any other period of our existence.

The Turners today, and in the future, have a big job to do for America. Our aim should be to develop a model Turner society with proper buildings in every organized community in America. The Turners today are unique, in that we are practically the only society that offers full membership privileges to men and women alike and on an equal basis. It is the only society that offers a program for every member of the family, including the children, in an equal degree. The new Turner Society building plans, which have been completed and sent to the Turner Societies of America, provide for the following facilities:

The Turner buildings of today should house, first of all, a gymnasium, which occupies a prominent part of the building and is the keystone of our foundation. We should have two instructors in every Turn Hall—one for men and one for women. Our Society should have sufficient members so that it can support a building of the type we are planning. Dues should be large enough to adequately support our civic program, which includes not only the maintenance of this gymnasium, but also the maintenance and operation of a swimming pool and other cultural departments that are so necessary to make a complete society.

We recommend that a stage be built at the end of the gymnasium of generous proportion that can be used for large society affairs.

We also recommend a swimming pool large enough so that competitive swimming can be held therein.

Every Turn hall should have bowling alleys to give older members, who no longer care to participate in gymnasium activities, a chance to get a mild form of exercise. A bowling alley can be used by both men and women and gives an outlet for their competitive spirit.

A small auditorium should be built for the use of little theatre dramatic groups, glee club, Red Cross activities, veterans' posts, for weekly cultural programs by the members, etc. We believe large auditoriums are unnecessary. Such auditoriums can be furnished by the public school systems when needed or our gymnasiums can be used, eliminating the cost of operating a large auditorium.

A dining room of generous proportions, which will seat approximately 500 people, has been set up in our building plans.

A tap room and card room have been provided for our social life.

A room has been provided for the use of the Ladies' Auxiliary.

Also included is a recreation room for our children.

Handball courts and steam rooms for the use of the members are also provided.

We believe that, with these facilities embodied into one building, the Turner Society will be the headquarters of the better citizens of each city in America.

The Turn Hall of the future should have grounds large enough to provide an outdoor exercising space, softball field, and at least two tennis courts to make the Turner Society available for use throughout the year.

The Turners have a vital program today and have more chance for expansion than ever before in their history. We look to you Turners of today to give us your wholehearted support, willingly, for the development of our program as a contribution to the betterment of life in the United States.

In order that a record may be made of the Turner movement of today and our plans for tomorrow so that 100 years from today the Turners may understand what we were doing in the United States in the year 1948, I have gone quite extensively into the Turner history. Let us now project our plans and aims for the future. The program of today is essentially this:

The Turners are a family organization—catering to and always desiring participation in its affairs by all members of the family and, in turn, furnishing a program for all members of the family of all ages. You are never too young nor too old to find an outlet for your enthusiasm and energy in the Turner societies. Our program should provide, first: A planned program of physical and health education and recreation for the development of a sound body; and second: A course of cultural education for the development of a sound mind; third: A planned social program for men, women, and children, to give us a happy and peaceful life; fourth: We should participate in all worthy local and national civic and patriotic projects, in order to repay to America the security and decent living that it has given to all of us during the years and in order to maintain our standard of life in the future, as we have in the past—free and without oppression, tolerant and without prejudice, so that we can continue to be an independent thinking Nation.

We have established for the perpetuation and promulgation of Turnerism in America, the American Turners endowment trust. Our goal is to secure a fund of $500,000, voluntarily, among our 100 societies so that each of us can gradually help the other societies finance their building a new hall. Moneys from the endowment trust fund will not be given away, but will be loaned to local societies, so that, upon the repayment of these moneys, new halls can always, constantly, be built.

We must provide that a sound business administration be effectuated in all of our societies so that they will be self-supporting and will not be required to live off the public.

If each Turner would contribute an average of $25, our goal of $500,000 would be attained this year. We hope that you, who are the most loyal Turners, will not only contribute $25 but much more. There must be some among our members, who, we know, are able to contribute $10,000 and we hope that they will leave, as a memory to their names, a sum of money for the use of the endowment fund so that the land which has been so kind to them will be made still better through the operation of our Turner com-

munity buildings or national athletic and cultural societies in every city in America.

To be a good Turner is not only to be a society member, it is more than that. By being a good Turner and acquiring the real meaning of Turnerism, you develop a philosophy of life and a pattern for ideal living. We are as right today as we were a hundred years ago in our basic principles; and we will be as right a thousand years from today, in knowing that our plan for a better and more useful life is sound. We can't help but be proud to be a Turner and to be able to put into practice our Turner principles. These are some of the things we believe:

The American Turners is a federation of Turner societies in the United States of America, organized to promote physical education and disseminate rational ideas, in order to advance the health, happiness, prosperity, and progress of mankind.

It is the principal duty of our societies to provide courses in physical training for youth and adults and also to promote their intellectual growth and moral character through special schools, instructive lectures, and stimulative debates.

Believing in the United States as a democracy in a republic, established upon the principles of freedom and equality, dedicated to justice and humanity, we recognize in the harmonious education of body and mind the most important factor to preserve and perfect such a democracy. Therefore we seek to train the citizen for the efficient discharge of all his duties toward the community, also showing him how to live his own life in a wholesome and rational way, with happiness as its proper goal.

Our Turner philosophy of living can be reflected in the words of John Locke, "A sound mind in a sound body is a short but full description of a happy state in this world; he that has these two has little more to wish for, and he that wants either of them will be but little better for anything else."

We have had a glorious past of which we are proud. Let us start to build today for a more glorious future, that will indelibly write the word "Turner" into history, not only of the United States, but of the world. Let us make it a better place for all to live in peace, tolerance, justice, freedom, and equality.

In closing my remarks I want to extend my sincere personal thanks and the thanks of this organization to the Honorable Harold F. Youngblood, Congressman from Michigan's fourteenth district, an old and valued friend of mine for his assistance in introducing a bill authorizing the issuance of a commemorative stamp in honor of the 100th anniversary of the founding of our organization. As you no doubt are all aware, this bill is now law and the stamp for which Harold Youngblood and I worked so hard to make a reality will be issued in the very near future.

I personally feel that we can be proud of the fact that our contribution to America has been commemorated by the issuance of this stamp.

Bestowing of Degree of Doctor of Laws on Hon. Walter C. Ploeser, of Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I announce to the House that on June 7 of this year Norwich University bestowed the degree of doctor of laws upon one of our distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]. Permit me to say that I have served with Mr. PLOESER on the Committee on Appropriations for several years. During that time he has distinguished himself not only as a member of that committee but as a Member of the House. All of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle hold in high regard his good judgment, his common honesty, and his ability to get things done. We are proud that the great Norwich University has bestowed this well-deserved honor upon him.

Mr. Speaker, let me place in the RECORD the citation from the university and also the address delivered by the gentleman from Missouri to the graduating class of Norwich, as follows:

NORWICH UNIVERSITY,
Northfield, Vt.

WALTER CHRISTIAN PLOESER:

Distinguished son of the State of Missouri; educated in the public schools of that State and the City College of Law and Finance of St. Louis; prominent in youth movements and business activities; sometime member of and leader in his State legislature; elected to Congress by friends and neighbors regardless of political affiliation in recognition of demonstrated ability and public-minded civic service; ardent advocate of the cause of economic progress for small business; defender of free enterprise; one of the younger Members of Congress, yet by virtue of recognized qualities of leadership, already occupying positions of great responsibility in that representative body of Americans—Norwich University honors itself and the younger men of America by conferring upon you the degree of doctor of laws.

DOCTORAL ADDRESS OF HON. WALTER C. PLOESER, OF MISSOURI, BEFORE THE GRADUATING CLASS OF NORWICH UNIVERSITY, JUNE 7, 1948, NORTHFIELD, VT.

AMERICAN CAPITALISM—YOUR CHALLENGE!

President Dodge, Governor Gibson, distinguished guests, members of the faculty, student body, and friends of Norwich University, it is a particular privilege for me to enjoy this honor and association on this occasion with your great university.

The history of Norwich is rich with accomplishment and progress. Across the pages of such time we see particularly enscribed the names of numerous distinguished men who devotedly think of Norwich as their alma mater—lawyers, doctors, scientists, businessmen, cabinet officers, legislators, and judges. To recall such accomplishment is to express a desire to emulate those who have gone before you and made important contributions to society.

One of the most cherished friendships of my experience comes as a result of working many years in the Congress of the United States with one of your most noted alumni—the Honorable CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, alumnus, former president and great son of Norwich University. Mr. PLUMLEY is, without question, one of the strong leaders of the United States House of Representatives and Vermont's most distinguished servant in Washington.

Let me say right here that it has not heretofore been my privilege to know Doctor Dodge personally, or Colonel Dodge, as his place as President entitles him to be addressed, but I know of him, officially, as one of the leading physicists of the United States, called to Washington repeatedly for conferences with those who are working on highly important scientific problems. Norwich should be proud to have at its head a modest man of such great distinction.

From the soil of New England grew a great society of people, banded together as a nation, loving and seeking freedom. To me it is significant that I, a Westerner, should receive this privilege. In time, we are as children to the maturity—or as blooms to the intellectual and cultural roots of New England. Our common concern is the future of this day's graduates and of the scores who will follow in subsequent commencements. As you build your lives—as you practice your faiths and ideologies and convictions—so will the Nation be shaped.

This modern world has all too frequently paid superficial respect to bigness—to the startling impression of size. Yet, history has recorded that the world has moved forward more by small forces than by gigantic ones. The individual thinker has done the most for thought—the individual inventor has eclipsed the great laboratory in achievement—the small business enterprise has blazed the trails of new methods in production and distribution—and the small institution of learning has established the most enviable record in the training of leaders in all phases of our national life. In this particular regard, your university experience has been most enviable.

If one looks philosophically for a common cause of many of our great troubles in the modern world, he may quickly find that many of them come as a result of bigness. It was the excessive size which dropped the dinosaur from the animal register. Where the individual brain has grown too large, idiocy has resulted. Where governments have become too big, they have produced autocracy, waste, and decadence. Where cities have overexpanded, people have been plunged into slums and filth. Where businesses have reached too great a size, they have tended toward monopoly and the stifling of the free movement of trade. Where the modern labor union has grown too big, it has threatened the economic life of a nation with paralysis and injured the individual workingman for whom it was designed to benefit.

In the field of education the threat of bigness has also manifested itself. Where we reckon the importance of a university by the number of students enrolled, we miscalculate the importance of the real educational atmosphere and the great influences and the opportunities afforded for personalized instruction—the extensive curriculum—the amount of masonry visible to the eye—frequently can contribute a greater impression to outsiders, to the tourist, than to the student.

One has only to look about your campus to be tremendously impressed with one fact. With so little you have accomplished so much. The tragic inefficiency of the world today is in institutions and organizations that with so much have accomplished so little. So, I say, be proud of your smallness. Be grateful for it. Above all, do not envy educational rivals whose vast endowment, buildings, enrollment, and far-flung activities seem to overshadow yours. In our littleness there is mightiness. Your creative power has been kept alive and vigorous just because you have kept your educational efforts within the bounds of manageability and efficiency—always you might have enlarged—wise men have kept you sound.

I am reminded of a comment made to me the other day by a friend who attended one of our most powerful universities and graduated with highest honors. He said:

"A quarter of a century ago my class marked the beginning of a big change in the life of my university. Before our day there, the professors were bigger than the buildings. During my 4 years the buildings became bigger than the professors. We went up on masonry and down on true intellectuality.

"All the old lovely atmosphere of small buildings covered with ivy, breathing a spirit of rich tradition and true intellectual purpose was effaced—and great was the loss. Our new giant edifices tended to dwarf the spirit of genuine culture and to rob us of something indefinable but precious."

So I salute Norwich University as exemplifying that sturdiness of achievement as a result of the close association of men—student and master—in a true atmosphere of learning. I believe I can with clarity see your founder, Capt. Alden Partridge, 129 years ago, laying the cornerstone of what you have today. He was one of those vigorous and far-seeing individuals who leave behind them a heritage which molds the lives of countless men who come after them. Though he was at one time Superintendent of West Point, and, consequently, a professional soldier, I read in his collected papers the wisdom of an educational pioneer whose vision was far and clear. I like his emphasis on education as the basic medium for training good citizens. I like his homely aversion to permitting students of the wealthier classes to have too much money "thereby inducing habits of extravagance and dissipation highly injurious to themselves and also to the seminaries of which they are members." I applaud his view that education must not chain the bright to the average mind but afford the former special opportunities for advancement. In fact your Capt. Alden Partridge stands out in the dim past of many years ago like that Biblical tree which was certain to produce good fruit because it was a sound tree.

Commencement means the beginning of new obligations. Your individual lives must be successful and success means the achievement of different objectives to different men. The ultimate in life is not efficiency—it is, necessarily, happiness. Your obligations are to yourself—your families—to the families you will create—to your vocation—your profession—your nation. There never was a time in the history of America when the educated man had a greater obligation toward his country. He must not be in a class apart, but rather of a class among all our people.

In this great Republic, greatest in the recorded history of governments—our noble legacy of freedom is facing a pernicious and unperceived peril. Our sturdy forebears endowed us with the richest fortune in personal liberty. Left to us was a way of freedom which they had earned. It is ours for a life tenancy. With its existence goes a tremendous obligation to perpetuate it—to improve it. To dissipate or to spend our precious legacy of freedom is to fail.

Our republican form of life is facing its greatest crisis. Why are we the richest and most powerful nation in the world? It cannot be explained on the ground that America has the best climate—the greatest natural wealth—or best human stock. There are other parts of the earth that equal—or excel in climate—and other parts of the world that excel in natural wealth. We do not contend that we are a superior people. What then is it that has raised America so high? It is the fact that our people have enjoyed a greater freedom than have the majority of the people in the history of the world. Freedom has been a very scarce privilege in that history.

Flynn estimates in his challenging new book—"The Epic of Freedom"—that during the past 2,000 years some 200 billion persons have lived on this planet, but of these 200 billion less than one-half of 1 percent have possessed freedom. Accordingly, more than 99½ percent of all the persons who have lived on this earth in the past 2,000 years have lived as slaves or subjects of others. It was the ambition and the rights and the substantial attainment of freedom in America which caused our people to scale the heights of progress. If you and I permit the impairment of this freedom we will go backwards—as surely as the plummet goes downward.

Our Nation has known many crises. In all of them our enemy was obvious. In the Revolution, it was a foreign king; in 1812 it was a foreign king; in the Civil War, it was an attempt at disunion; in the First World War, it was the Kaiser; in the Second World War, it was Hitler, Mussolini and Hirohito. Our present foe which now threatens our freedom is not quite so obvious. A war of subtle, little understood and dangerous ideas is now being waged in the United States. We are menaced, not by the actual enemies so much, as by the misunderstanding and misguidance of the sincerely intended protectors of the freedom.

Our voters who do not realize the poison in the political philosophy which has been sold to them in the past decade and a half, could easily vote away the last vestige of our great heritage. There is a deadly parallel between our present-day situation and the history of other republics.

Ballinger records in his important book, By Vote of the People: "Since before the Christian era, democratic governments have been appearing and disappearing in history. During the past 2,500 years 8 important free governments have risen and perished. Two were conquered but after internal economic conditions had already reduced them to a hollow shell. * * *

"The destruction of the other six free governments, however, was accomplished entirely within the framework of democratic processes. One was liquidated under the guise of legality by a conspiracy of rich industrialists and traders. Five, however, perished by the paradoxical process of 'by vote of the people.'" People vote away their freedoms under the delusion that an all powerful government can by patronage guarantee security.

Our peril paradoxically could be found in our sovereign—the voter. Unless a clear majority of our citizens cling steadfastly to sound and proved political and economic doctrines, the ballot boxes could in misuse become an effective weapon against us. Yet, it is in this very weapon that free men must find their greatest strength. In the war between sound and unsound ideas, the college-trained man has a special duty. If our educational institutions have done their task well, then the future augurs well. Fundamentals — right from wrong — and moral strength are the lessons which you must keep in living partnership because you, Mr. Citizen, are the sovereign.

I recognize, of course, that education in the United States raises its yearly crop of weeds—along with the fruitful harvest—those few who emerge from our portals of learning misdirected in their thinking and eager to make converts to their fallacies. But, I choose to pin my faith on that majority of educated men and women who drink deeply of the Pierian Spring and who can separate the kernel of liberty from the husk of ideologies poisonous to its existence.

The world struggles between four kinds of social economic organization. Three of them must be rejected by America if liberty is to survive. Rejection comes only as a result of clear understanding of the ultimate.

Let us begin with Communism. Millions of Americans hate this creed. But you only have to talk a little with people to realize that even those who hate it do not understand precisely what it is and what it seeks to accomplish. Communism has an economic and political side. It is an economic system in which the government owns and operates directly all the instrumentalities of production. The factories and stores and mines and farms and utilities and financial institutions are all government owned and operated. In a Communistic economic system everybody in addition to being ruled by the State is also an employee of the State.

On the political side communism is a dictatorship. The basis of this kind of autocracy is the fact that government directly controls the economic life of every person. In such a system freedom is impossible. The individual could not exercise freedom even if he had the legal right to do so. He could not dare to vote against a government that had the power to control his opportunity to eat.

Those who believe in communism are not content to indulge themselves. They emphasize the necessity of making it world wide and they advocate that this be achieved through revolutions instigated within those countries not possessing their cherished system. They thus preach the violent seizure of power and the setting up of new communistic States through the weapon of violence.

Do not underestimate the Communists in America. I think that even those who are accused of exaggerating the Communist role in America, underestimate them. Remember the Communist is an accomplished revolutionary. He knows quite well where he is going. He knows that the average American is against his hated "ism." He knows that there is no chance for his grand objective until the present economic system of capitalism in the United States has been destroyed. He must do two things. He must disrupt the economic system. He must also completely discredit the present political system.

Find no complacency in the thought that communism is doomed to failure here because Communists are so few in numbers. The Communists are not a political party as we understand parties. They are a wrecking crew. A hundred thousand men and women in a party are futile—in so vast a country as America—but a hundred thousand in a wrecking crew is something else.

They are a secret brotherhood of conspirators, banded together under an iron discipline, not to elect Communists to office but to wreck the American economic system and to discredit the American political system, to create disunity, to create discontent, to set race against race, religion against religion, to set employer against worker and worker against employer, to produce by every subtle means known to revolutionary propaganda the condition of crisis in this country.

Communists throw their support to whatever group advances their cause. That is why so many organizations in America with names which invoke Christianity, liberalism and freedom are Communist infested. Communistic tactical strategy places a high value on respectable dupes.

Socialism, too, has an economic and political side. On the economic side it is the counterpart of communism. In the socialistic State, government owns and operates directly all the instrumentalities of production just as it does in a communistic State. On the political side, however, the Socialists claim a wide difference. They declare that they favor democracy and that in a Socialist State, government would be a democracy. The Socialists may sincerely believe that there is no incompatibility between democracy and the socialistic economic system. But there is. Whatever the government may be called, if it can control the economic life of the individual, it will be—or become—a dictatorship. I grant that many Socialists do not believe in—nay even despise—the Communist faith in violence as a means to establishing their system. But of this I am certain. If socialism arrives in America, it will quickly gravitate into tyranny.

In practice, therefore, there is no difference between the end result of either communism or socialism. So far the world has never seen a full-fledged Socialistic State.

Fascism is the most dangerous antiliberty system the world has known because its approach is deceptive. In winning its way it has enlisted the support of more otherwise intelligent people who believe in liberty than any other revolutionary creed.

Many misconceptions of fascism exist. That is why it thrives and threatens. To many people fascism means antisemitism. To others it is synonymous with dictatorship. Still others think of it as merely another form of communism. Others describe it as a war upon religion, or think of it as government by gangsters, or regard it as something which big business started in Italy and Germany to crush labor.

Now fascism is one thing. Antisemitism is something very different. Mussolini did not introduce antisemitism into Italy. Two of his most admiring biographers before the war were Emil Ludwig and Theodore Wolff—both Jews. Mussolini ran fascism in Italy without antisemitism. Antisemitism played no part in several other Fascist nations in Europe. Hitler used it because it suited his tastes and his propaganda objectives.

Fascism involves dictatorship. But there are dictatorships without fascism—as for instance, in Stalin's Russia—and, for that matter, in the Russia of the czars. Fascism is not essentially irreligious, although it may be so in some places, as under Hitler in Germany. In Italy and Germany, fascism was launched by Socialists and ex-Socialists and Communists. The businessmen came in when fascism had gotten so strong they did not know how to defeat it. They thought they could use it, just as a lot of very foolish politicians in this country think they can use communism and then cast it off.

The essential characteristic of fascism is economic. It sets up an economic system in which government controls the economic life of the individual just as government does in a communistic or socialistic economic system. But it achieves that control in a different way than is done in either communism or socialism. In fascism the factories, stores, mines, utilities are owned by private individuals and theoretically are managed by them. Thus everyone engaged in economic activity in a Fascist state is an employee of private business. Actually, however, all business is managed in accordance with plans made by the state through the medium of powerful and far-flung bureaus.

The Fascist state decides what will be produced, in what amounts, by whom, the price of goods and services, the rents of landlords, the rate of return on investment. Through bureaucratic blueprints a Fascist state imposes its will on the economic life of the individual. Like communism and socialism it establishes an economic environment in which liberty cannot exist and in which tyranny is inescapable. It has three economic postulates: (1) Business must be planned, (2) government through bureaus must do the planning, (3) large government spending to take up any unemployment that may arise out of the attempt by government to plan production and distribution.

Because fascism has the feature of private ownership of the means of production it does not alarm voters like a call to communism or socialism. Its approach may not seem odious because it is probably dressed in the cloak of a scheme for producing prosperity for the common man. Dressed up in this guise, it can fool Americans.

Actually we have been menaced by fascism in America for some 10 years without the average American being at all aware that it is here in the land of Jefferson and Lincoln.

In recent years the President of the United States sent to the Congress with his endorsement a plan of the National Resources Planning Board. This plan proposed that representatives of Government be admitted to the directory board of all important corporations in the Nation. This was to be done so that Government could get its foot in the door looking towards Government planning of our business life—a fundamental economic plank in Fascist doctrine. Next our Government was to be the only investor. It was to each year take over the savings of the people and invest such savings where they would best promote production. Such a control of savings meant, of course, a control of business by Government. Who controls the credit of our economy would inevitably control the economy.

Finally government was to engage in large scale public spending to prevent any unemployment. As one surveys this amazing proposal from the Resources Planning Board the conclusion is unavoidable that here the American people were being lured into fascism under the most respectable auspices—the Executive branch of the Government of our Republic.

Last January, the President, in his State of the Union message unintentionally gave fascism another whirl in national politics. In his address the President told the people in effect to look to Government for their prosperity. Government was to lift them to prosperity through the medium of large scale public spending. They were to get houses, health, free lunches, power and light and what not, all on a platter of Government spending. Government spending, of course, is the choicest weapon in the Fascist arsenal for victory. As I listened to the words of our President a few months ago, I realized just how dangerous fascism can be. When a "show me" Missourian can't tell Fascist doctrine from good Americanism, it is time to be alarmed.

American capitalism. This is an economic system in which the means of production are owned by private persons or organizations and operated by them for a profit under the guidance of competition. Capitalism is thus a system of natural law. It is the only kind of economic system in which liberty is possible. The economic basis of liberty is an economic system in which the individual can make a living without Government being able to coerce his livelihood. It is through the competitive mechanism that this is made possible in a capitalistic system. No other economic system plans production through the operation of competitive forces. That is why liberty is possible only in a capitalistic system.

Now in America—as it was in Germany and Italy—capitalism is in trouble. The source of this trouble is clear. Competition as the organizer of economic activity will not work unless democratic government in a capitalistic economy will insure by regulation—free competition.

Capitalism is not a static condition. Within its life there are tendencies toward bad habit. Not perfect, though best, it has permitted monopolies to grow, unfair trade practices to flourish. These habits corrupt the system and cause it to lose productive power. Too large a segment of our American economy is today lodged on the reefs of enormous government spending. Our ever-present obligation is to get the capitalistic system back to private production under its own income power. The destruction of monopoly, equalization and relaxation of tax obligation, elimination of unfair practices and drastic decrease in government spending are essential to a full restoration of the system. Capitalism is by its very nature risk—and liberty is risk. To maintain liberty is always inconvenient because it means work. It costs time and profit and sweat and brain. But there is only one real security and that is freedom. To this crucial task you must dedicate your services. It is a continuing task demanding educated men and women—strong-hearted, honest, persistent men and women.

The American capitalistic system is the ingenuous home of liberty. Young men of Norwich—it is your challenge! It is the biggest task ahead for America. It is your obligation—because at stake is your freedom.

Revolving Fund for Purchase of Agricultural Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 19, 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad indeed that S. 2376, which is to provide a revolving fund of $150,000,000 for the purchase of agricultural commodities, has gone through with no opposition whatsoever. Since last summer I have been working actively upon the principle set forth in this bill. I have helped nurture the bill through the House Committee on Armed Services, helping to make changes and explanations where they were needed. It is a most important bill and one which will be of tremendous help to the people from the agricultural sections of both the West and the South.

The bill contains a provision appropriating $150,000,000. This money is to be used as a revolving fund to finance the purchase of wool, mohair, and cotton which will be processed in occupied areas of Europe and in Japan. The processed wool and cotton will be then sold or bartered and our Government will be paid for the cotton or wool used in full. In fact, the bill provides more than this. We will be paid interest at the rate of 2½ percent per annum on the money tied up in this transaction.

This means that we are making a supreme effort to restore our overseas market for cotton. Before the war, Japan and Europe were the best customers of this country. The war took these markets away from the American producers and only the world-wide scarcity of commodities has prevented cotton from being a surplus on the market. Unless our overseas markets are restored, the time will not be far distant when cotton may be selling far below the cost of production. This must not happen. Our farmers must be protected with a reasonable price for the products of their toil. This bill will permit the sale of at least a million bales of American cotton over the next year's time and in the course of several years will run the estimated overseas use of American cotton to many millions of bales.

I am very much pleased with the bill and hope the President will sign it immediately.

Poll of Voters of Thirtieth District of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, periodically during the past 4 years and earlier during the Seventy-fifth Congress I conducted opinion polls on vital issues among the registered voters of the Thirtieth Congressional District of Pennsylvania. This district embraces large industrial areas of metropolitan Pittsburgh, fine residential districts and very considerable farms. The registered voters are almost evenly divided between Republicans and Democrats.

Over a period of years we feel that we have perfected techniques which make it possible for us to ascertain with satisfactory accuracy the prevailing opinion of the people on major issues. The people of the district have been marvelously cooperative and have always returned a much greater number of the questionnaires than could be expected. More than 99 percent of the responses are signed and at least 50 percent of them contain comments.

The poll which has just been completed was of unusual interest. Not only does it reveal the majority opinion of a typical metropolitan district, but on five major questions it shows that the thinking of Republicans and Democrats in the district is almost identical.

The results of the poll are herewith included without further comment:

Republicans—Figures indicate percentages, not total replies received

	Yes	No
Do you, in principle, favor or oppose universal military training?	75	25
Do you favor the enactment of selective service (draft) at this time?	67	33
Do you favor a Government program to build and operate low cost rental units?	37	63
Do you favor the extension of the reciprocal trade agreements?	84	16
Do you believe that the Taft-Hartley bill has been generally beneficial to the country?	81	19
Are you agreed that Federal and postal employees should be given a raise this year?	80	20
Do you favor the elimination of the Federal and State laws which tax or prohibit the sale of colored margarine?	90	10
Are you in accord with our expenditures for foreign aid and rehabilitation? (the Marshall plan)	66	34
Do you believe that war with Russia is a future certainty?	42	58

Do you think the Government is spending (A) too much (12), (B) enough (41), (C) too little (47) for military preparedness?

Would you rate the efforts of the present Congress as (A) good (39), (B) indifferent (46), (C) bad? (15)

As of today which of the following would receive your vote for President: Truman (9), Dewey (34), Stassen (20), Taft (16), or Vandenberg (18). Others (3).

Democrats—Figures indicate percentages, not total replies received

	Yes	No
Do you, in principle, favor or oppose universal military training?	76	24
Do you favor the enactment of selective service (draft) at this time?	66	34
Do you favor a Government program to build and operate low cost rental units?	61	39
Do you favor the extension of the reciprocal trade agreements?	89	11
Do you believe that the Taft-Hartley bill has been generally beneficial to the country?	57	43
Are you agreed that Federal and postal employees should be given a raise this year?	89	11
Do you favor the elimination of the Federal and State laws which tax or prohibit the sale of colored margarine?	92	8
Are you in accord with our expenditures for foreign aid and rehabilitation? (The Marshall plan)	65	35
Do you believe that war with Russia is a future certainty?	43	57

Do you think the Government is spending (A) too much (12) (B) enough (33) (C) too little (55) for military preparedness?

Would you rate the efforts of the present Congress as (A) good (25) (B) indifferent (46) (C) bad (29)?

As of today which of the following would receive your vote for President: Truman (30), Dewey (14), Stassen (25), Taft (13), or Vandenberg (14)? Others (4).

Church Group a Red Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 19, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal in this Congress of insinuation, and some direct charge, that the Communist movement in this country is led by Jews, and that a large portion of the Communist Party is Jewish. Whenever the charge or insinuation has come to my attention I have refuted it, not with oratory, but with facts and figures from unimpeachable sources. I have repeatedly stated that no person, Christian or Jew, professing a belief in God can be a Communist.

Yesterday's New York World-Telegram carried an article by Frederick Woltman as follows:

CHURCH GROUP A RED FRONT

By Frederick Woltman

Formed 12 years ago by social action groups of six Protestant denominations, the United Christian Council for Democracy in the past year or so has turned into a religious front for Communist causes, a study of its recent history showed today.

Using the label of Christianity, its executive secretary, the Rev. John W. Darr, Jr., has headed, sponsored, or otherwise aided no less than eight movements termed Communist and subversive by the Department of Justice as well as others not included in the official list.

Within the past few weeks he led a picket line in front of the Greek consulate, organized the Communists' demonstration against "The Iron Curtain" at the Roxy Theater and sponsored the Communist Party's May Day parade.

DRAFT VIGIL

Mr. Darr yesterday announced his current venture, a vigil in front of Republican and Democratic national headquarters here to pressure Congress into defeating the draft before adjournment. He's staging this one as chairman of a new Red front, the National Youth Assembly Against UMT, which the Daily Worker extolled as "the youth front of Gideon's army."

Because of these involvements, the Unitarian Fellowship of Social Justice recently withdrew from all participation in the council and notified the latter to stop using its name.

The council, the Unitarian Fellowship declared at its annual meeting in Boston:

1. "Does not hold regular meetings of its board of directors or does not notify all representatives of meetings that are held," and

2. "Through its executive secretary, is represented as supporting causes the validity of which its member groups have not had an opportunity to discuss or approve or disapprove."

CITED BY COMMIES

Citing the United Christian Council for Democracy in connection with Mr. Darr's activities is a favorite device of the Communist press. But a check by the World-Telegram today revealed that much of the council's original backing has evaporated.

Thus, the Presbyterian Fellowship for Social Action reported it is no longer affiliated. The Raushenbusch Fellowship for Baptists has become inactive and the Evangelical and Reformed Council for Social Reconstruction dissolved last year.

PERENNIAL FRONTER

This leaves only two church groups from the council's six original supporters. They are the Methodist Federation for Social Action, which, while unofficial, claims the backing of sixteen Methodist bishops, and the Church League for Industrial Democracy (Episcopal), which has no connection with the antitotalitarian League for Industrial Democracy.

At a council meeting last fall, the Methodist Federation was represented by the Rev. Jack R. McMichael, perennial fronter for the Communists; the Church League by the Rev. William B. Spofford, Sr., editor of the Episcopal magazine, The Witness.

With the prestige of a Christian council behind him, Mr. Darr has become one of the most valuable front men for the Communists among any clergymen on the scene today.

He is chairman of the board of the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born, the Communist Party's legal arm in defending deportation cases, and a member of the board of the pro-Soviet propaganda agency, the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. Both were cited by the Attorney General.

Two months ago he acted as chairman of a conference called by the Civil Rights Congress, the Communist Party's legal defense front for the party faithful who run afoul of the law. Gerhart Eisler, the German Communist agent, whose 1-year prison sentence was upheld Monday by the United States Court of Appeals, was a featured speaker.

A rooter for Wallace-for-President, the clergyman last February addressed American Youth for Democracy, formerly called the Young Communist League, and the International Workers Order, the Communist Party's propaganda and fraternal affiliate. (Spotlight, AYD's official magazine, listed him on its editorial board from December 1943 to May 1945.)

A WALLACE BACKER

About a year ago he issued a release in the name of the council, defending Eugene Dennis, Communist Party general secretary, and

the other defendants in the Washington contempt cases, including the 11 leaders of the so-called Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee whose convictions the Supreme Court 2 days ago refused to review.

"The important thing for churchmen," said Mr. Darr, "is to understand that these defendants have already taken a stand in upholding American freedom and democracy * * *."

In a February 1947 release in the name of the council, Mr. Darr put out a surprising defense of the Communist Party. He said it wants to do nothing more than "come to power peacefully, by democratic elections."

Mr. Speaker, I want it distinctly understood that neither I nor any other Jew, at any time, has claimed or will claim that because any of the persons named in the foregoing article happened to have been born Christians that, therefore, all Communist leaders are Christians, or that Christians make up the bulk of the Communist Party. Christianity and communism, like Judaism and communism, are as antipathetic to one another as anything can be. I trust the gentlemen who find it so easy to cast aspersions upon those they dislike will bear in mind the foregoing article every time they are inclined to call any religious people Communists.

Minnesota's John Blatnik and Iron Ore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, the economic demands of World War II upon America's reserve of petroleum, coal, iron and other strategic minerals was tremendous, and our Nation was forced to expend these resources at a terrific rate in order to defeat the enemy. As a result, there is a serious danger that shortages of many vital minerals will develop sometime in the future unless our Government takes positive steps toward the formulation of a broad and constructive program of development of new sources of fuel and mineral resources.

For this reason, as a member of the House Committee on Public Lands, I always have been very much interested in the mineral resources investigations of the United States Bureau of Mines, and its program of technological and scientific research to develop new methods and processing in the mining field. This work naturally is of interest to the people of my home State of Colorado, which is one of the leading coal, silver, gold, and lead-producing States of the Union. However, this question of mineral resources development is not confined only to the State of Colorado, but is one of national concern which directly effects the national welfare.

I would like to remind the House that the Nation's supply of high grade iron ore is fast being depleted. America's industrial economy is based chiefly upon our great deposits of iron and coal—our civilization is one of iron and coal. Yet in this age of iron and steel and technology, we find that the great iron ore mines of the Lake Superior district may be exhausted within another generation. This is especially true of the Mesabi iron range in Minnesota which for the last 50 years has supplied more than half of the Nation's iron ore needs, with the proportion reaching 66 percent during World War II. Some 80 percent of the Nation's steel industry is geared to the iron ore deposits of the Great Lakes, and 85 percent of all Great Lakes iron ore is mined on the Mesabi Range, making this area the key iron ore-producing center in the United States.

Unfortunately, the Mesabi iron ore deposits are not unlimited, and recent official reports of pending exhaustion of this supply are most disturbing. According to the United States Bureau of Mines, there are only 992,000,000 tons of known high grade iron ore remaining, and this supply will be depleted in another 20 years at the present rate of consumption. Other reliable investigators have made the same prediction, and the University of Minnesota's Mines Experiment Station has gone so far as to say that all the best ore will be gone by 1954 at the war-time rate of consumption of 80,000,000 tons per year.

It seems to me that the exhaustion of Mesabi's high grade iron ore in a few years poses a serious threat to our national security, and that it becomes most important that our Government emphasize investigative research to discover new iron ore deposits, and stress research work to develop new processes to extract iron from other mineral formation in the United States. My growing concern over the possible future shortages of iron has caused me to follow new developments in this direction.

Hence I have read with great interest the extensive remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD regarding taconite in connection with the Senate debate on the St. Lawrence waterway bill last spring, and was happy to note the national attention being paid to taconite as an important new source of iron ore. I have also carefully read the various articles inserted in the RECORD on this subject, and was happy to hear that the University of Minnesota Mines Experiment Station has developed processes whereby pig iron is made from the taconite of the Mesabi Range.

I want to call the attention of the House to the significance of this revolutionary development. Minnesota's Mesabi Range has enough taconite, in the opinion of the United States Bureau of Mines, to supply the Nation's iron needs for a thousand years. Actual taconite processing plants are already becoming a reality in northern Minnesota. Definite announcement has been made for two such plants which represent a combined capital investment of $100,000,000. One, located at Beaver Bay, Minn., is designed to produce 5,000,000 tons of processed taconite ore each year in the immediate future, and the plans are to double this output in a few years. The second project is at Aurora, Minn., with the initial capacity of 2,500,000 tons of iron pellets per year. These developments reflect the emerging trends toward taconite as an important source of iron ore, and promise a new era of prosperity to Minnesota mining communities.

The commercialization of taconite ore in Minnesota has other far-reaching implications. Reports indicate that a future result of taconite mining in Minnesota will be new emphasis upon the production and use of North Dakota's lignite. Few people realize that lignite—a low grade fuel containing about 50 percent as much heat energy as soft coal—is found in most of North Dakota, and that State has more unmined heat energy than any other because of its lignite deposits. This lignite can be stripped easily and then shipped to the taconite plants of Minnesota as a primary fuel for the mining and processing of taconite, as well as for the production of electric power for other purposes. These events in the commercial utilization of taconite, and exploitation of lignite fuel is the forerunner of things to come, and the Minnesota-Dakota region may well emerge as one of the great iron and fuel-producing areas of the United States.

In discussing these events of such far-reaching importance affecting America's iron needs in years to come, and which virtually assure the future prosperity of the Mesabi Range, it is only proper to give credit to those pioneers in the taconite mining field. Tribute must be paid to Prof. E. W. Davis, director of the mines experiment station of the University of Minnesota, to whom belongs the major credit for his research work to make taconite commercially feasible. Not only did he do the basic research in this field, but I am told that for years he has been traveling about his State, speaking to all kinds of groups in an effort to publicize the idea of taconite development, and to interest State legislators in taconite as a possible substitute for high grade iron ore, when such deposits were exhausted. Professor Davis had the vision to realize the importance of taconite to America's future, and he carried on as a crusader in selling its possibilities to the public. For this he deserves the thanks of all men.

I would also like to remind the House that my distinguished colleague and very good friend from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] likewise deserves great credit for his work in the field of taconite development. The Mesabi iron range is located in his district, and his home town of Chisholm lies only a few miles from the largest open pit iron mine in the world, and near the world's iron ore capital of Hibbing. Few members of the House realize, and the modest gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] does not tell them, that he was the sole author of the Minnesota taconite law of 1941 while serving in the Minnesota Senate. Working with then Minnesota State Representatives Thomas Vukelich of Gilbert, William Huhtala of Virginia, and Elmer Peterson of Hibbing, who co-sponsored the bill in Minnesota's lower house, Mr. BLATNIK

was able to enact into law this measure which paved the way for making commercially feasible Professor Davis's brilliant research work in the University of Minnesota mines experiment station.

It is a real pleasure to pay tribute to Professor Davis of the University of Minnesota, to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] and to his former colleagues of the Minnesota Legislature, Thomas Vukelich, William Huhtala, and Elmer Peterson for their contributions in th field of taconite legislation. I feel that any praise which I may express is well-deserved, because I am convinced that taconite assures not only the future prosperity of their area, but that it guarantees a great new supply of iron to the American industrial system in the years to come.

Josiah William Bailey

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 21 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JOSIAH WILLIAM BAILEY, late a Senator from the State of North Carolina.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. President, the death of Hon. JOSIAH WILLIAM BAILEY on December 15, 1946, removed one of the ablest and most versatile men ever to represent the State of North Carolina in this Chamber. At the time of his death Senator BAILEY had completed 15 years of service characterized by ability, integrity, courage, foresight and statesmanship. His excellent record will find its place in history along with that of the illustrious men who have represented North Carolina in the United States Senate since the foundation of the Government.

Senator BAILEY was born at Warrenton, N. C., on September 14, 1873. He was the son of Christopher Thomas Bailey and Annie Sarah Bailey. Both his father and his grandfather were Baptist ministers and through them he inherited strong religious traditions. His intellectual ability was noticeable at an early age and his family lost no opportunity of training and developing his mind and stimulating an interest in religious activities and Bible study. As a result he possessed an alertness of mind and firm moral convictions throughout his entire life. In 1893 he was awarded the degree of bachelor of arts at Wake Forest College, a Baptist school which has long been one of the outstanding educational institutions of our State. In the same year that he graduated, Senator BAILEY became editor of the Biblical Recorder, the official organ of the Baptist denomination in North Carolina, and continued in this position for 14 years. His extreme youth rendered conspicuous his editorship of a paper of such wide circulation and potent influence, but he met the responsibilities of this important position with a brilliance that characterized all that he did.

While still editor of the Biblical Recorder, he studied law under S. F. Mordecai, the famed North Carolina professor of law at Trinity College, now Duke University. In 1907 he resigned his editorship and studied law at Wake Forest. In 1908 he was admitted to the bar and began the practice of law at Raleigh, N. C. Though he was at that time 34 years of age he was unusually successful from the beginning. In addition to having a brilliant mind he was a diligent and thorough student and an advocate of unusual forcefulness. It is consequently no occasion for surprise that in a few years he commanded one of the best practices in the State and he remained devoted to the law and to supremacy of the law as long as he lived. The great speech that he made in this Chamber upon the reorganization of the Supreme Court of the United States eloquently attests that fact.

Being always concerned about whatever affected the public welfare, it was natural that Senator BAILEY should become interested in politics, as he did. He often played a leading part in matters of local political concern and never hesitated to stand and fight openly for whatever he believed to be right and best. He took an active part in every general election and always presented in a masterful manner the issues of the day.

He served as presidential elector-at-large in 1908. From 1913 to 1921 he held the position of collector of internal revenue for North Carolina. In 1928 there was bitter opposition to the Democratic nominee for President, but Mr. BAILEY stood uncompromisingly for the ticket from bottom to top though in doing so he had to part company with many long and close political associates. Much prominence came to him as a result. Two years later his offer of assistance to several likely senatorial candidates being declined, he announced his own candidacy. His vigorous campaign won immediate response from the people of the State. In the Democratic primary he swept the State and in the following general election won by the largest vote ever received by a senatorial candidate in North Carolina up to that time.

He qualified as a United States Senator in 1931 and accepted the high responsibilities of this office with the same serious and sober purpose that was characteristic of his entire life. But it rested securely upon his resolute shoulders. He was not easily swayed from the path of public duty. An ardent believer in States rights and private industry, he was often an outspoken critic of the Roosevelt administration and just as bold a champion of its policies when he believed them to be right. Despite the fact that he was often with a small minority, he never faltered in voting as he believed to be best for the general welfare and the future of the Nation. He quickly established, and maintained to the end, a reputation in the Senate for absolute devotion to the fundamental principles upon which our Government is founded.

He once wrote:

When I was a young fellow and all the way of life was unknown to me, my teachers urged me to have the courage of my convictions. My Sunday school teacher would tell me to "Dare to be a Daniel."

He never forgot his early teachings and he never hesitated to be a Daniel when circumstances necessitated. Questioned once by a friend on the wisdom of his conservative views Senator BAILEY answered:

History * * * teaches me that second thoughts are more to be trusted than first thoughts; that reason is better than impulse; that the long view is better than the view of apparent immediate self-interest; that the best friends of the people are not those who appeal either to their prejudices or emotions, nor who agree with them just to please, nor those who make the loudest professions of interest in them; that one who would serve them must study measures and seek the right; that men engaged in the tasks of life have but little time for study or meditation, and that if someone does not study for them they will learn only at the cost of bitter experience; and that one honest man who will tell them the truth is worth ten thousand who are content with them rather than take their criticisms or their curses. And history also tells me that in the long run only the men who are willing to pay this price receive the rewards of a grateful posterity, or the satisfaction of duty done.

Senator BAILEY was broad-minded. He always had firm personal convictions but was always glad to consider the views of those who differed, and never hesitated to change if upon consideration he was convinced that his own position was wrong. This very thing happened in a conspicuous manner when the Senate was considering the lend-lease bill. Speaking to a hushed Chamber during this debate he said simply:

I have utterly changed my mind * * * I am advocating intervention with all its implications. I am not hedging. All my life I have looked a thing in the face and argued it as it is.

This was typical of the courage of this dignified and earnest North Carolinian. From this day on he worked diligently in shaping all legislation necessary in the successful prosecution of World War II.

An eloquent speaker with a resonant voice and emphatic manner, Senator BAILEY frequently used Biblical and historical quotations to emphasize points in his powerful oratory on the Senate floor. As chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, he exhibited great skill in the handling of all types of legislation. The progress of civil aviation greatly interested him, and in 1944 he attended the International Civil Aviation Conference in Chicago to assist in the world-wide planning for postwar civil aviation.

Senator BAILEY's primary interest was the preservation and protection of our constitutional form of government, and he studied carefully all pending legislation to make certain that the measures did not violate the basic principles set forth by our forefathers. He considered efforts to reorganize the United States Supreme Court a direct threat to our constitutional form of government, and he believed that his unceasing work to defeat the measure was one of his major achievements during 15 years of service in the Senate. Examination of his speech on this question is worth the time of anyone. A member of the Senate Finance Committee for many years, he was vitally interested in all tax legisla-

tion and became a champion of fair and equitable taxes. While he represented a Southern State, it is a matter of record that he never sought favor for any section of the country or group of people at the expense of any other part of the Nation or any other group of people. Representative government within the framework of our Constitution was always the focal point of his political philosophy.

Senator BAILEY'S intellectual ability, his moral courage, and his analytical and logical mind stamped him as one of the outstanding members of the United States Senate. He bowed to no group, and served no interest except what he believed to be the best interest of all the people of the United States. He would have been a great Senator in any Congress in the history of our Nation. His entire service was a demonstration of profound statesmanship.

In 1916, Senator BAILEY was fortunate in winning the hand of Edith Walker Pou, a beautiful woman and distinguished in her own right. This union was blessed by three daughters and two sons—Annie Elizabeth, Edith Pou, and Sallie Bailey and James H. Pou Bailey and Josiah W. Bailey, Jr. It is superfluous to add that Senator BAILEY was proud and happy in this family and was ever a devoted husband and father.

There have been few men who loved nature and the outdoor world better than Senator BAILEY. In his youth he roamed the fields and woods of North Carolina and fished in its streams and the sea. He delighted in each season of the year, and his wide knowledge of the wonders of nature often surprised even his close friends. In The Song of the Cardinal, an article he wrote on nature, he mentioned 23 birds and 45 trees, shrubs, and flowers. He expressed in this article his great understanding of wildlife and the great outdoors of North Carolina. Speaking of the coming of summer he said:

> The catbird comes with gentle song and at last the scarlet tanager with summer in his throat. The fields are sweet with clover blooms. The blackberry is out in white. The wild locust is festooned here in pure white and yonder in mauve. Honeysuckle on every roadside breathes forth sweetness and delight. The tall poplars lift aloft their golden-nectared cups. The trees are once again in full leaf. And now the roses, gorgeous and in infinite variety—and fairest of them the wild rose, sweet and fragile, an idyl in bloom.

His work is done. His day is ended. Sustained by a deep faith, he lived and died—unafraid. God grant that his soul has found rest in a celestial spring of eternity.

Aspects of the Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SANBORN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Second Congressional District of Idaho have shown unusual interest in the European Recovery Program, popularly known as the Marshall Plan, and for their information I have compiled some facts about this plan—what it is, who it affects, what it will do to the United States and the European Nations participating.

It is proposed that the United States grant in loans and gifts, over a 4½-year period, about $17,000,000,000 to 16 European countries. The European countries qualifying to receive this money are: England, about one-third, or more than five billion; France, about one-fifth, or more than three billion; Italy, about one-seventh, or more than two billion.

Other countries participating are: United States-British Zone in Germany, Holland, Belgium, Luxembourg, Austria, Denmark, Ireland, Greece, Norway, Portugal, Iceland, and Turkey.

The cost of the European recovery program to individual counties in the Second Congressional District of Idaho is as follows:

Ada	$6,989,024
Bear Lake	876,672
Bannock	4,906,923
Bingham	2,556,960
Blaine	560,096
Bonneville	3,518,864
Butte	243,520
Camas	133,936
Caribou	280,048
Cassia	1,607,232
Clark	109,584
Elmore	888,848
Franklin	1,132,368
Fremont	1,083,664
Gooding	998,432
Jefferson	1,181,072
Jerome	2,496,080
Lincoln	474,864
Madison	951,904
Minidoka	1,095,840
Oneida	535,744
Owyhee	669,680
Power	426,160
Teton	413,984
Twin Falls	4,651,232
Total	33,792,736

The money, as presently set up, is credited to these countries who in turn send their buyers to the United States to make the purchases direct from our manufacturers. Under the first installment of the Marshall plan, the United States is to give these European countries $262,500,000 worth of tobacco, and in addition we are committed to buy $30,900,000 worth of tobacco from other countries to ship to European nations. We are to furnish $285,000,000 worth of crude and finished steel and buy $27,100,000 worth of steel from other countries, which we will send to Europe. We are to ship and give to European countries $580,800,000 worth of American cotton and $209,200,000 worth of cotton purchased from Western Hemisphere countries, under the first year of the Marshall plan.

The following table will disclose that under the first 15 months of the Marshall plan, with the high cost of living and inflation at home, we are shipping to European countries $1,275,500,000 worth of food products:

Bread grains	$753,800,000
Fats and oils	100,400,000
Sugar	27,900,000
Meat	7,700,000
Dairy products	235,200,000
Eggs	$36,000,000
Dried fruits	33,500,000
Rice	7,200,000
Other foods	73,800,000
Total	1,275,500,000

The next table gives a break-down of many articles, including farm machinery, to be shipped under the first 15 months of the program:

Tobacco	$262,500,000
Petroleum products	651,900,000
Agricultural machinery	136,000,000
Coal	388,300,000
Mine machinery	81,900,000
Timber	96,300,000
Electric equipment	95,000,000
Trucks	80,900,000
Freight cars	60,000,000
Steel equipment	48,100,000
Timber equipment	16,900,000
Oil cake and meal	21,100,000
Nitrogen	16,400,000
Phosphates	3,100,000
Cotton	580,800,000
Steel	285,800,000
Total	2,825,000,000

Including the above mentioned items and other goods, the United States is to ship $4,500,000,000 worth of supplies to Europe during the first 15 months of the Marshall plan.

What does this mean to the American farmer and the American housewife? For one thing, it means farm machinery will continue to be scarce and difficult to obtain. I have letters from farmers in Idaho who are begging for machinery but cannot get it because of our foreign exports under the Marshall Plan. There is strong evidence that the French padded their reports when they presented their figures for the Marshall Plan. It appears now that of the total export of agricultural machinery to Europe, we are going to let France and her dependencies have a total of $63,300,000 in one year. When our American farmers were breaking their backs to feed the world, the French farmers went on a sit-down strike in 1946–47 and took a million acres of wheat out of production. It seems very strange that we should honor such behavior by taking farm machinery, so badly needed on American farms, and ship it as a gift to French farmers who, if they worked more, could more than feed the whole French population.

It is estimated that the amount of goods to be shipped to Europe would fill 49,400 trains. It will mean free to Europe, 13,200 trainloads of coal, 11,800 trainloads of grains, 10,200 trainloads of meat, 4,900 trainloads of fats and oils, 3,700 trainloads of sugar, 1,500 trainloads of cotton, 152,000 trucks, 26,000 freight cars, 200 more merchant ships, in addition to the 800 already given away.

This is an enormous amount of goods and equipment and I am confident there would be little objection if these goods were going directly to alleviate suffering and hunger. I am not an isolationist and I believe we should give sufficient aid, direct, to forestall any suffering because of hunger or scarcity of clothing.

When importuned to feed the starving, the American people are the most generous, kind-hearted people in the world. They will give until it hurts to relieve suffering. We can be proud of America in such circumstances. But the Marshall

Plan is going to accomplish very little along that line. The grants under the Plan go directly to the participating governments, which for the most part will sell the food in trade channels. And we must remember that less than twenty percent of the money authorized will be spent for food.

It is not contemplated that the food be given directly to the poor, nor is it likely that the consumer will even know that it came from America through the generosity of the American people.

We must sponsor the rehabilitation of European countries but we must do it on a sound basis and not on the same basis our administration has operated for the past several years.

Make no mistake about it, those of you who believe in the American way of life, freedom and opportunity, the Marshall Plan has little to do with feeding starving people or with European recovery. The starving people and economic recovery are being used as a shield or a blind so that you will unwittingly approve as a taxpayer the financing of not a four year but a permanent world-wide planned economy. A planned economy is dictatorship—look at Russia today. It is a planned economy.

For months you have been hearing glowing words and promises for the Marshall Plan. All this oratory reminds me of a wise old Englishmen who said: "It is not important what men say, nor the way in which they say it; it is what they propose to do."

This Englishman was, of course, just restating a solemn truth phrased long ago by the Man of Galilee when he said to his disciples, "By their fruits ye shall know them."

The people who have been spouting the oratory and making the promises for the Marshall Plan are the same people who have been strutting across America making promises to you for 10 years. What have been the fruits of their promises? To determine whether their promises for the Marshall Plan are worth considering, let us look at the record of these global planners.

In 1940 the clique now promoting the Marshall Plan was demanding a peacetime draft army. They claimed that by having a peacetime draft we would keep out of war. Was that promise true or false?

In 1941 the Wall Street crowd now promoting the Marshall Plan told you that lend-lease would keep us out of war. Was that promise true or false?

In 1942–43 the present promoters of the Marshall Plan were telling you that we were fighting for the Atlantic Charter and that would be the law everywhere. Was that promise true or false?

In 1943–44 the Marshall Plan promoters were promising the "four freedoms" to the whole world. Was that promise true or false?

In 1944–45 the Marshall Plan promoters were telling us that Russia was a great democracy and a friend of America. Was that promise true or false?

In 1944 the Marshall Plan promoters were telling you that UNRRA, into which the United States poured $2,750,000,000, was going to bring about recovery in Europe and was going to help prevent communism in Europe. The record shows that hundreds of millions of UNRRA went to Tito's forces. Was that promise to stop communism in Europe with UNRRA funds true or false?

In 1945 the present promoters of the Marshall Plan told you that Bretton Woods, into which the United States has poured some billions of dollars, would insure world peace and make it unnecessary to send more hand-outs abroad. Was that promise true or false?

In 1946 the promoters of the Marshall Plan drove through a hypnotized Congress the British loan. They promised that that hand-out would bring recovery to England and make further aid unnecessary. Was that promise true or false?

No, my fellow Americans, the simple truth is that this administration has been playing into the hands of the Communists from the date Mr. Roosevelt recognized the infamous Communist regime in 1933. And this administration, through the Marshall Plan, will continue to play into Stalin's hands.

This program, the so-called Marshall Plan, is not to stop communism. This program will promote communism by underwriting and propping up the socialist dictatorships of Europe. These socialist dictatorships are blood brothers with communism. The only difference is that Socialists enslave the people by degrees while the Communists, who don't get direct American hand-outs to sweeten the transition, make the change-over from freedom to despotism at one stroke.

Further than that, this program will continue the deterioration of the American currency and cause the cost of living to go higher and higher. Lenin said that the surest way to overthrow the existing social order was through debauchery of the currency.

Much of the Marshall plan cannot avoid dissipation and restricted success because of the complete lack of a definite foreign policy. The present foreign policy has been a day-to-day affair resulting in confusion, backtracking, and chaos for many nations who depend on the United States for stability. The Marshall plan, as I see it, is an attempt to implement a foreign policy that is still so nebulous that most Americans do not know what it is. Our first step is to think through this policy. And it will not do to say, for example, merely that the main purpose of our foreign policy is to halt Communist aggression, or to contain Russia. This may be a principle for a policy, but a policy would be an outline of the means of containment.

It has been truly said that the most important question confronting the world today is whether Europe survives as a community of free nations. But this will depend chiefly upon two things: First, the economic and political policies followed by the nations of Western Europe themselves, and, second, the diplomatic and military policies followed both by them and by our own Government in relation to Russia. For dealing with this problem the Marshall Plan is at best something secondary and subordinate. It is a means rather than an end in itself.

The Marshall plan was put forward as a substitute for the hard and unpleasant diplomatic decisions that we will sooner or later have to make. The United States is challenged by Russia diplomatically and militarily on three chief fronts: China, Greece, and Berlin. If we are to prevent further diplomatic defeats and catastrophies, like those at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, our diplomatic policy on these present three chief fronts should be firm and unmistakable. The pleasant illusion that we can buy off the Russian nightmare merely by turning a few billions more of the American taxpayer's dollars over to socialized European governments cannot much longer be maintained.

It is the contention of the European governments, and the belief of Secretary Marshall, that Europe is still suffering today primarily from the physical destruction and dislocation of the war. It is true that in some countries the physical destruction caused by the war was enormous. It is true also that Europe's crops last year were damaged and reduced by bad weather. But neither of these is the main reason for Europe's present series of economic crises. The main reason for these crises has been and still is the dominant economic policies being followed by nearly all the principal governments of Europe.

Most European government budgets are unbalanced by various things, but in large part by excessive socialistic expenditures—among them the payment of deficits on state-owned enterprises. These governments have sought to pay for their deficits by printing more money. The increased volume of new money has been pushing up prices. Instead of stopping the cause, these governments have preferred to try and suppress the symptoms. They have made it illegal for people to charge or to pay higher prices for goods. But by thus dislocating, reducing, and wiping out profit margins they have distorted and paralyzed production and intensified the very scarcities they were trying to cure.

The practices of these socialistic European nations has resulted in driving private capital into hiding. It is reliably reported by the United States Treasury Department that British citizens, alone, have $2,300,000,000 in this country. Holdings of wealthy Frenchmen, Turks, and other European nations bring this figure up to a total of $4,300,000,000. This amount is known to exist without a thorough census. Undoubtedly additional billions will be discovered by the Treasury Department. The Commerce Department reports that the wealthy foreign corporations and individuals of European nations have $27,000,000,000 in deposits in this country.

You may ask why do not these people invest their money to help rebuild Europe? The answer is simple. They will not put their money in circulation to be collected by the socialistic government for liquidation. The danger is too great that socialist governments will fall to the Communists. Coups similar to that

which recently occurred in Czechoslovakia are a constant threat in any country where a comparable Socialist-Communist bipartisan coalition exists, for as George Bernard Shaw so aptly remarked, "Socialism is nothing but communism with better English." Lenin stated that "Socialism is termed by Marx as the first stage, or lower phase of communism."

Socialism and communism both have the same goal in mind—the complete state controlled, planned economy. Since the majority of the present administrations in control of the governments of the 16 western European countries who come under the Marshall plan are either Socialist or Socialist-Communist coalitions, it is difficult to understand how subsidizing those administrations can be expected to stop communism as advocated by its proponents.

Foreign spokesmen and many of our Government planners seem to think that by sharing our material wealth, they will share our prosperity and freedom. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Our material wealth in the United States is not the cause of our prosperity. It is not the cause at all. Our prosperity results from our way of life, our concept of freedom, our concept of representative, constitutional, limited government of law, not of men. It is the result of the freeing of initiative, of incentive, of risk-taking, which came about under our way of life. It is the result of the most cooperative civilization the world has ever known, voluntarily cooperative because our citizens were free to pool their efforts and savings in the ways they felt were most productive. It is the result of a way of life in which the individual citizen was king, not a dictator, not a bureaucrat, nor a self-appointed "leader," claiming to act for the good of his fellows, yet in reality increasing his coercive power over them.

Yet the foreign nations who now demand our wealth, the 16 so-called non-Communist European nations, including Britain, want no part of our concept of life. Their leaders and their press unashamedly assail our way of life in violent tirades. The trend in Great Britain, under the labor government, is toward complete socialization of industry. And as it stands, the Marshall plan is—like the British loan—a scheme for financing European socialism at the expense of American free enterprise.

We are aiding a socialism which is no less than a slow-motion form of communism since it, too, would destroy individual enterprise. In Great Britain, the Socialist government has taken over six major industries during the 3 years in which it has been in power, and is reaching for more. A few weeks ago, the Government absorbed all electric power plants, and in July it will take control over all doctors, making them virtually employees of a bureaucratic government. The gas industry and other important industries will be absorbed soon. Even a capitalist levy is being considered. That is the kind of government we are perpetuating in Great Britain with our taxpayers' money.

Many Britons realize this condition. Winston Churchill, the greatest living British statesman and one of the greatest that ever lived, recently remarked that the British people are living largely on the charity of the Americans and this is neither wise nor seemly. Mr. Churchill recognizes as do many others that Europe's economic crisis today is chiefly the result of its own postwar collectivist and inflationary policies.

The Marshall plan can become the greatest danger to our continued form of economy. Should socialism be successfully subsidized to the point of apparent strength, and our economy be dangerously weakened to a point of depressive collapse, the seeds of socialism and communism, lying dormant in this country might be given the opportunity to spring to sufficient growth to overpower and subdue private enterprise. This is our greatest threat and it is our duty as citizens to see that it does not happen.

Gen. Matt Whitaker Ransom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 15), 1948

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me at Jackson, N. C., on August 4, 1947, on Gen. Matt Whitaker Ransom, a son of North Carolina, who distinguished himself as a citizen, soldier, and Member of the United States Senate.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It has been said that "a people who have not the pride to record their history will not long have the virtue to make history that is worth recording." We are proud of our State, proud of her achievements and traditions, and glory in her part in the American struggle for freedom and justice. Not always ranked high in material wealth, North Carolina has always been rich in men—high-minded men, whose integrity, character, and judgment have made us the grateful beneficiaries of their constructive statesmanship of the past.

The people of Northampton County, beginning with its early settlers, have been known for their courage, character, and leadership. We are met here today in this courthouse, in this temple of justice, in this great county, rich in tradition and heritage, to honor the memory of one of North Carolina's most distinguished sons, Matt Whitaker Ransom. His record as a scholar, soldier, patriot, statesman, and diplomat is permanently engraved upon North Carolina's scroll of famous sons. Our State should never forget his great ability, his wise counsel, his matchless courage, his unsurpassed eloquence, his enduring patriotism, and his excellent diplomacy.

EARLY LIFE

Matt Whitaker Ransom was born on his father's plantation near Warrenton, N. C., on October 8, 1826. He was the oldest of six children. His father, Robert Ransom, was the son of Seymour Ransom, who was the half brother of Nathaniel Macon. His mother, Priscilla Whitaker, was a member of a family that has long been distinguished in Halifax County.

In his youth he was handsome, with intelligent features and a natural dignity far beyond his years. At an early age he showed an ambition for acquiring knowledge and attaining distinction. He entered the University of North Carolina in January 1844 and made a brilliant record as a scholar. He developed into a forceful debater and an eloquent orator. It is a matter of record that during his college years he did not miss a recitation or fail to be present at prayers. While at the university, he studied law under Hon. William H. Battle and was prepared to take his place at the bar of North Carolina. Following graduation he returned to Warren County and began the practice of law. His keen intellect, his knowledge of human nature, and clarity of thought quickly brought him outstanding success as a lawyer. There was dignity, power, and an irresistible force in his speeches to the jury and logic and sound reasoning in his arguments before the court.

In 1852 he was named a Presidential elector. A few months later, at the age of 26, he was chosen by a Democratic legislature, although at that time he was a Whig, to be attorney general of North Carolina. He was the youngest man ever selected for the post and served 3 years with great distinction. On January 19, 1853, he married Miss Martha Anne Exum, daughter of Joseph Exum, Esq., of Northampton County. He moved to Northampton following his marriage, and in 1858 he was elected to represent Northampton County in the legislature and again in 1860.

MILITARY SERVICE

The differences between the North and the South, which had been developing over the years, were moving rapidly toward a climax. Matt Ransom had observed the gathering of the clouds of dissension and danger, which threatened the peace and security of the Nation. Always a leader, Matt W. Ransom never sought to evade any public issue affecting the people of his State, or the welfare of the Union. He held a deep-seated conviction that the best interest of the South would not be promoted by secession. He believed that a united nation was the only hope for the people of the United States and for the oppressed of the entire world.

During the years prior to 1861, at his home near the banks of the Roanoke, he had carefully studied the vast problems of slavery, secession, and the effects of a possible war. He could see no permanent value which could result from a war between the States. He did not agree with the extremists of the North or of the South, who sometimes appealed to the hates and the passions of the people. He joined with Governor Graham in the plea: "Let's fight out our rights within the Union." As a member of the legislature in 1861, he was active in the passage of the bill creating a peace commission. The bill was passed, and he and others appointed under its provisions travelled to Montgomery, Ala., in a last-minute effort to prevent the approaching conflict. The mission proved a failure, and on April 14, 1861, Fort Sumter fell. The next day, April 15, President Lincoln called on the States for troops. North Carolina's Governor Ellis, sick on his couch in the executive office, promptly replied as follows:

"Sir: I regard the levy of troops made by the administration for the purpose of subjecting the States of the South, as in violation of the Constitution and as a gross usurpation of power. I can be no party to this wicked war upon the liberties of a free people. You can get no troops from North Carolina".

Matt W. Ramson subscribed to the magnificent reply of Governor Ellis. The State legislature met in extraordinary session and issued a call for 20,000 soldiers. In spite of his untiring efforts to prevent the war and his active opposition to secession, Matt W. Ransom was among the first to volunteer and his record in the Confederate Army placed him among the ranks of the most brilliant soldiers North Carolina has produced. From May 8, 1861, when he was commissioned a lieutenant colonel of the First North Carolina Regiment of Infantry until April 9, 1865, when Appomattox put an end to southern hopes for victory, this brave man rose by sheer merit to major general in General Lee's Army. He fought in more than 10 major battles and was wounded twice in combat. His leadership during the four bloody years of war received the praise of General Lee, and he was among those named in a vote of thanks by the State legislature and the Confederate Congress for the brilliant victory at Plymouth, N. C. His striking appearance, calmness under fire, unexcelled courage, and dashing bravery caused the troops under his command to love him, and to follow him. It is said that he disliked the monotony of military drill and that he did not care to be a student of military tactics. He was the type whose leadership under fire in the fierceness of the conflict was irresistible. He was thoughtful of his men, as truly great officers are, and always sought to take the best possible care of them. He assisted the wounded, encouraged the weary, and spoke to them words of comfort and inspiration. As though his life was charmed to be spared for future service and greatness, Matt W. Ransom, with reckless courage, survived the 4 years of fierce and bloody war to return to his native State and to his home near the banks of the Roanoke. His record as a soldier will live in North Carolina so long as men, true to the faith of their fathers, respect and admire strength of character, conviction, courage, and bravery.

HIS LIFE FOLLOWING THE WAR

Realizing the inevitable consequences of defeat, the tired and worn soldier remained quietly at his Northampton home during the first years following the war. He accepted defeat without apology and with the nobility which had prompted him to go to the defense of his State and the Southland. He, like many others, retained his calm wisdom, seasoned judgment, and self-control during the dark days following Appomattox when poverty, desolation, the Freedman's Bureau, carpetbaggers, and uncontrolled government marked a tragic era in the history of North Carolina and the South.

During the period from the end of the war until 1870, General Ransom retained his place in the confidence and the affection of the people of North Carolina, and rendered the State an outstanding service when almost single-handed he persuaded Judge George W. Brooks, United States District Judge, to issue a writ of habeas corpus for the release of citizens of Alamance and Caswell Counties who had been arrested under the orders of Governor Holden.

SERVICE IN THE UNITED STATES SENATE

In 1870 Zebulon B. Vance was elected by the State legislature to the United States Senate. The Senate refused to seat Governor Vance and the legislature promptly elected Gen. Matt W. Ransom, and he took his seat on April 23, 1872. He held the office of United States Senator until March 1895. No State ever had a more efficient or capable public servant. His main purpose was to reconcile the divided sections of the country and he watched over the interest of his State and the South always. He was one of those who subscribed to the doctrine that too much speaking in a legislative body diminishes one's influence. He, therefore, spoke but seldom in the Senate but when he did speak he exercised great influence upon northern as well as southern Senators in a forum still torn by the recent war. He did nothing to rekindle sectional hate. His every effort was toward reconciliation. In a great speech on February 15, 1875, he sounded the keynote upon which his conduct as a southern Senator was based:

"I came from the true State of North Carolina to the Senate of the United States with a sacred purpose to reconcile the once-divided people of my country, to harmonize all sectional differences and disputes, to bury in oblivion every bitter recollection of war, and to convince the people of the North that our people of the South sincerely desired to live with them in accord under the common protection of a constitutional and united government."

He apparently did not pity the South or himself. He, I think, understood that if fairness prevailed, and if law and order were maintained, the people of the South would solve their problems, reconstruct their homes, rebuild that which had been destroyed, and move on into a new era of development and progress unsurpassed by any section of our country. He believed in the people of North Carolina and the South, as he believed in himself. He had faith that ultimately the South would someday regain its leadership in the Nation and that someday it would surpass all other sections of our country in worth-while attainments. To this hour our progress has justified his faith and if we possess faith equal to his and work to implement, as he worked, then we shall truly someday in leadership and attainment surpass any section of this great Nation.

Senator Ransom was active in the political life of North Carolina during his service in the Senate. He made many speeches in the State. He did not seek to arouse passions or make misrepresentations. He appealed to patriotism, love of home, fidelity of duty, and to intelligent understanding of the policies of the existing political parties. Senator Ransom was Democratic National Committeeman from North Carolina and he also served as chairman of the important Senate Committee on Commerce. He aided the progress of the State by aiding in securing appropriations for our rivers and harbors. He attained the high position of President pro tempore of the Senate, which was a great honor to the State of North Carolina. In Washington, he lived a simple, quiet life, always active in the councils of the party. He was greatly respected by the Senators from both the North and the South. They had confidence in him. He instilled confidence by his fairness, honesty, and wisdom. He will continue to rank as one of the ablest men ever sent to the Senate of the United States by the State of North Carolina. He was true to his convictions, whether popular or unpopular, and the same quiet, calm, courage which he demonstrated as a soldier made him a truly great Senator of the United States.

In 1894, due to a combination of the Republican and Populist Parties, Senator Ransom was retired from the Senate. Shortly afterward he was appointed by President Cleveland to be Ambassador to Mexico. He held this post of honor for 2 years and served with distinction and success. He then resigned and the great lawyer, planter, soldier, statesman, diplomat, and patriot returned to North Carolina. He came back to his beloved Northampton County estate, Verona, and spent the remainder of his life with his devoted wife and children. He loved the land and acquired much of it. He was known throughout the State as the Grand Old Roman. Even in his latter years, Senator Ransom made a striking picture with his tall, erect figure, prominent nose and calm eyes. Perhaps his outstanding characteristics were his loyalty and his patriotism. He ran life's race like a thoroughbred, which he was, and until the end was vitally interested in every worth-while endeavor. He left to his family and friends and to posterity a heritage of useful service seldom equaled and not surpassed in the life of our Commonwealth.

Senator Matt W. Ransom died suddenly at his home on October 8, 1894, his seventy-eighth birthday. The editor of the Charlotte Observer closed an editorial with these words:

"We have not the heart to write further at this moment of General Ransom. There remains not his like. He was our fittest scholar, our most accomplished diplomat, the handsomest man among us, the ablest man, the man who did us most credit in the eyes of the country. He is indeed the last of the Romans. We shall not look upon his like again."

Two days after his death, he was buried in a garden near his home. The sinking rays of the evening sun fell on the scene as the Masons buried the Senator in his own ground, which he loved so dearly. His life of achievement then became a part of the rich heritage of North Carolina and the Nation and, as the years pass, will continue to be a source of inspiration and encouragement to all those who seek to build a better world, and a finer civilization.

In 1870, Gen. Matt W. Ransom, and other men of the South, faced a confused and difficult problem. Could they build here, in the Southland, something of a new, something of a better civilization? He, and they, had faith to believe that it could be done, and courage to find the ways to do it. Today our country faces many complex and unsolved problems following World War II. The world is in chaos and confusion. The question is: will we be able to rebuild and reconstruct a torn world; can we establish peace in a world of conflict and selfishness; or shall we permit another war to destroy civilization? We, today, must have the same courage which Gen. Matt Ransom and other southern leaders possessed in 1870. We must, somehow, find the way to build a better world and preserve civilization. This can be done if we face the future as General Ransom faced it. We, too, must have faith to believe that it can be done and courage to find the ways to do it. We must believe as men believed in 1870, that the omnipotent power of the Supreme Judge of the world has not changed, that it still guides the destinies of man, and that there is no substitute for religious and spiritual values.

The Pope's Peace Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include two radio addresses, part I and part II, entitled "The Pope's Peace Plan" made in May of 1945, by Rev. (Fr.) Francis X. Sallaway, S. T. D., permanent pastor of the Sacred Heart Church of West Lynn, Mass., and Archdiocesan Director of Radio Activities of the Archdiocese of Boston.

THE POPE'S PEACE PLAN

PART I

Law is the principal language by which God has told us what His wishes are with regard to His government of His world.

The fivefold law which we have explained is the basis upon which rests our Holy

Father's postwar peace plan, undoubtedly the sanest, wisest, most disinterested, in fact really thet only true, correct, and effective solution of the whole confusion which faces mankind. To make this clear to you is the purpose of today's broadcast.

The fact is that men in power in the world today are attempting first to imagine and then to create some sort of international court or tribunal or power to control the ambitions, greeds, animosities, and aggressions of nations. We have learned how to do that pretty well for individuals within a single state or nation, but beyond that, historically, we have never progressed successfully, due to the numerous national sovereignties, loathe to submit themselves to any other power, even such as a United States of Nations.

Really most of the success of our efforts to control and govern individuals within a city, or state or single nation is due more to the individual's recognition and respect for the first four forms of law, than it is to the fifth form merely; that is, human civil law. But our modern lawmakers are not very much given to admitting that fact. They are apt to give far too much credit to the laws they make themselves. And so when the few powerful men in whose hands the world's fate happens to rest at the moment, confer about peace, they proceed upon the very false assumption that the laws or regulations which they frame are the really important things, forgetting that usually they have about the same strength and permanence as a shifting breeze, unless backed up by military forces, which they will no doubt be in the future.

They may or may not try to make them appeal, on grounds of reason, to all nations, but after all, the other nations can see in them only the political theories of a handful of men, whom they may or may not like, —nothing more. And therefore whatever the proposals, they are always open to the same old suspicions of self-interest, "nonliquidation of power already attained," whether justly or not is left unsettled. And so these originators of new schemes for peace look around for some sanctions, some means to enforce their theories, or charters, or agreements, or treaties, or pacts, and usually they can find none, except military might.

Having excluded God and His law, or taken for granted that God's word has no influence with the nations with whom they are dealing they are driven to rely upon an international police force, hitherto nonexistent. But when the international police force has to be invoked to discipline one or two of the four or five nations who comprise it: what then? Where are we? Just about where we were with the League of Nations, or in other words: nowhere. And that is the actual, sad situation which faces us.

What then is the answer to this problem? Simple enough, as the Pope gives it, merely reechoing God's own words:—

"Go back to the beginning and teach all men what I their Almighty Creator have said and done. Substitute for the confused vaporing of diplomats, the far more simple, more fundamental, and truer divine code: all so clearly universal, so easily remembered, the only laws that have ever meant peace, order, and prosperity for individuals and nations, the laws which I gave to Moses, the Hebrew formula which built up a great race, that formula which Christ, my divine Son, then strengthened by observance and extended to all peoples. That law I have written upon every human heart when I created it. It is still there and need only be appealed to, and insisted upon by other lawmakers and listened to by all subjects who in so doing will be listening, not to a Stalin or a Hitler, but to their own Father who is in heaven."

And not until all men do recognize it and obey it, will we ever have peace or security in the world. It is only because it is denied and disobeyed that we have any wars at all! Wasn't Versailles proof enough for us of the futility of man's plans, when by secret pact the only voice in the world which insisted upon these basic laws, was excluded from taking any part in the Peace Conference? Must we now repeat the same mistake because a Stalin asks, as he did at Teheran, "Who is the Holy Father? How many divisions of soldiers did he contribute to the victory?" How much thought is given to the voice of the Almighty, in all the conferences which have taken place to date?

An interesting story is told of the visit of President Woodrow Wilson to the Vatican on January 4, 1919. He had just crossed Europe in triumphal procession and was finally received by Pope Benedict XV midst scenes of medieval splendor. Court etiquette required that he then pay a formal call upon the Papal Secretary of State, Pietro Cardinal Gasparri, that eminent canon lawyer who for 13 years had labored, at the bidding of the Pope, to create the new code of canon law that was to modernize, simplify, and supplant all previous law and extend to the whole world.

The President at the time was on his way back to Paris and to Versailles for the Peace Conference. The Cardinal Secretary of State had lived and taught law in Paris for 18 years. He knew its every cross-road, its every cross-current of international opinion and intrigue. He also knew that the Vicar of the Prince of Peace, the only unselfish exponent of that true peace which the world cannot give, had been excluded from the peace table by a pact hatched in ignoble secrecy. He no doubt felt that the idealistic President of the United States of America, acclaimed as the savior of the world, no less!—was like an innocent abroad, a mere child in diplomacy in comparison with the Europeans with whom he was about to deal. The aged, experienced Cardinal must have looked into the steel blue eyes of the American dreamer and wondered sadly how he would fare at Versailles.

As his guest rose to depart, Cardinal Gasparri placed in his hand a gift, a token, an ominous token one might say, of his visit to the house of Peter the Fisherman. It was a book, beautifully bound in white parchment. On its cover gleamed in letters of gold, the title: Codex Juris Canonici (the Code of Canon Law). It was the law by which the Catholic Church rules and governs her 300,000,000 children of all races and nations. Its distinctive feature, in contrast to all other codes of law, is that it is a clear, simple, logical, impersonal series of practical rules of life, deduced by scholars from the natural law planted by God in every human heart, reinforced by further expressions of the divine will found in Scripture and the traditional teaching of the church, His voice to men on earth. Truly a contrast indeed to many types of civic law which govern nations, laws ranging from the popular voice of unthinking majorities to the overnight whims and ultimatums of dictators.

It was as if Michelangelo had presented him with his masterpiece of painting or sculpture. It was indeed the masterpiece of this great canon lawyer, the child of his brain, in the sense that it was the fruit of years of study, research, experience, and judgment. In fact it was the distillation of the Catholic Church's practical wisdom gathered from 2,000 years of dealing with men, and all compressed within a single book of law. What a significant gift to bring to the glittering Hall of Mirrors at Versailles, where the fate of nations was to be decided. Significant gift, yes; it really contained the secret of true just, lasting peace, although little did Wilson realize it and still less did he or anyone else use it. It contained the world-sanctifying program of Christ's earthly kingdom. But it remained unread and unopened by the bargainers who patched together that so-called peace.

And the pity of it all is that history bids fair to repeat itself. Law is an impersonal thing, by which persons are guided, ruled, governed according to a plan of wisdom and justice, of rights, duties, and responsibilities, established by God, not invented by man. Law has many forms and names—natural, divine, ecclesiastical, human, civil, national, international—of which we have spoken in detail now at some length, but if it is true law, it must be logically deduced, it must flow clearly from the will of God, ordaining and promulgating a certain order of right living for His human creatures on earth. Otherwise, it is not true law, worthy to bind the noble spirit and free conscience of man.

But if it is derived legitimately from the authentic source of God's will, then all men are automatically subject to it, no matter to what nation they may belong. None are above it, no matter what their position, for to place one's self above it, would be to make one's self the equal or superior of God.

That is the concept of law which the Catholic Church teaches to the world.

On the contrary what is law in the minds of the statesmen who rule the world today? It is no more than the will of some individual man, or group or combination of men, temporarily in the saddle, shaping other men's destinies to their own will, enslaving their freedom to some ambitious program of their own concoction. If any higher law should stand in their way, it is ruthlessly brushed aside. All who would proclaim it, are silenced by threat of hangman, firing squad, or concentration camp. Thus do personal schemes of power become the law of some lands. And such a concept of law leads automatically and has led actually to the woes in which the world finds itself engulfed today.

Therefore the first step in the Holy Father's peace plan is to recall all men, with special emphasis upon those in places of power, to the acceptance of that supreme law of right and wrong that is above and independent of any man or combine of men, however powerful, that law which flows directly, logically, and impersonally from God's will and commandments; that law which continues to thunder: "Thou shalt not steal," no matter what nation may be the thief, no matter whether the thief be the victor or the conquered—that law which continues to announce: "Thou shalt not commit adultery" no matter if 80 percent of a nation laugh light-heartedly at such an old-fashioned idea, no matter even if the state itself has actually thrown the mantle of legal protection over such immorality.

And unless men do return to the acceptance of that divine law in its entirety that law proclaiming right and wrong as calmly, boldly, openly, fearlessly and impartially to a ruthless totalitarian state as to a democracy, or monarchy or single individual, then men must be ready to bow as slaves to whatever madman may grasp the reins of any government and impose his crazy will upon a hopeless and helpless world.

Pray that those who attempt to formulate the postwar peace may accept God's idea of law. Pray, I say, because the chances are about even that they will not. The temptation is great indeed, perhaps too great to resist, that they will make their own wills and schemes, backed by their own militaristic power and quite regardless of any higher will, the law of the future under which we will all have to live.

POPE'S PEACE PLAN—PART II

All minds are yearning for peace, and the air is filled with plans for postwar peace. And yet for the last 300 years or more, this world has not known any real peace. It has known only periods of armistice, like the years between the Treaty of Versailles and

the German invasion of Poland. Why? Because after the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, Europe entered upon a long period, not yet ended, of intense nationalisms, so anti-Christian in character that the church's influence over rulers was scarcely any more than a warning finger pointed in the direction opposite to the course upon which they were traveling.

It was Protestantism which shortly before had lessened Europe's respect for Peter's voice. And that unbelieving attitude gradually settled into an habitual ignoring, if not a proud, obstinate, superior contempt for such pious teachings, as not sufficiently worldly wise. As a result, there has not been in the world for 300 years now, any central agency, any universally recognized powerhouse of truth and authority, sufficiently strong to curb these warring nationalisms, with their worldly wise ambitions and greeds, no voice to which they would listen when any questions of justice and morality would stand in the path of their plans. The result of that mad, unchecked race for power is only too evident now.

There was a time, and would to God it could return to this distracted world, when the whole Christian world at least did recognize a supreme arbiter and judge of right and wrong, someone to whose disinterested decisions all men could safely look with confidence, with a trust based, if not on an infallible divine guidance, then at least based upon an impartial, fatherly love of all men as his own spiritual children in Christ, whatever their nationality. That time, I repeat, has been gone now for 300 years. And as a result, men have strayed farther and farther away from any practical idea of unity and harmony among themselves.

And now we face the enormous, if not insuperable problem of creating a peace that will be permanent at last. And it will be permanent only if it is just. For it is instinctive in the human heart, and gloriously so, to resist injustice just as soon as physically able to do so. What are the chances of success? I said last week, that they were only about an even 50 percent. Why? Because we placed as the first condition of success, the acceptance by all men of an eternal, unchanging fearless law of which God, not men, is the author.

And some of those who will make the peace will bow to no law—even God's—higher than their own will. The men who will be in the saddle will likely be men and nations whose worldly interests might be somewhat thwarted by the dictates of Christian principles. God's law might call for too much generosity, kindness, charity, foregiveness. These men will prefer to think about vengeance, about ever greedier plans of conquest, holding of past and present gains, "nonliquidation of empires" to quote a classic expression, they will be thinking in terms which will make the victors more powerful and the conquered still weaker, but not less resentful. The danger is that the pattern of the peace will be the same old futile formula: treaties and secret agreements reinforcing special privilege for the most powerful of the victors, more and more intense nationalisms that will simply start the trouble all over again.

We need not be prophets to see these jealous nationalisms already seated around a table carving up helpless countries, some made stronger by victory, some ground to ashes by defeat, the only guiding law in the whole heartless process being the plans and ambitious schemes of those whom might has made the dictators. We can almost hear their exultant language: "We are now supreme at last, with no one strong enough to stop us further. Why should we now bow before any man, or even God?"

Thus do they speak even now, before they are victorious. They will certainly not be any more humble or considerate later on. And if we were to penetrate beneath the surface of such language, it seems quite evident that it is a part of their scheme to undermine ahead of time, any force in the world that might snatch from them the fruits of their might, the spoils of war. Therefore is the Pope's prestige outlawed in the councils of the nations. Therefore is the law of God equally a stranger to their deliberations!

There is only mind and one voice in the world which is assured of divine guidance. And he is not recognized by the majority of men. There is only one heart far removed from nationalistic ambitions, one great impartial Father to whom all nations are merely children who should be seeking the Word of God from his lips, although they are far from doing so. To him, no nation's aspirations can outweigh a single act of injustice to a single individual. He alone knows more about what is really right and what is really wrong in God's eyes and by God's laws, than all the other representatives of the nations who will sit at the peace table, all put together. But will be he allowed to sit there? He wasn't in 1918.

And if excluded, would it be because he would have no plan to offer? Not at all. It would be more likely because his plan is too clear, too simple, too just to suit the angry bargainers who want no divine law to cross the future laws they have in mind to enact. It would be because in his Christmas broadcast of 1941 he said: "The destruction brought out by this present war is on so vast a scale that there must not be added to it the further ruin of a frustrated and illusory peace."

And then he points out the real heart of the whole problem, the essence of its solution, but a medicine which will not be popular at the peace table and which therefore excludes the doctor who would prescribe it:

"The peace is an atmosphere, a state of mind among all peoples in which the very seeds of conflict are dispersed and killed and in which in their place grows a mutual spirit of active cooperation for the common good.

"This longed-for atmosphere of lasting peace, (the Holy Father says) will not be created by peace treaties, nor by solemn pacts, nor international conventions, conferences, nor charters, nor even by the noble and sincere efforts of statesmen unless beforehand the sacred rights of the natural and divine laws are recognized and obeyed.

"This is the true strength upon which the life of all nations depends. This is the most assured of all values. As long as it stays steady, the others cannot waver, for they would then be guaranteed by the most unshakable authority, the unchanging and eternal law of God."

I ask you whether the delegates who will sit at the peace table will be able to understand such language. And if they could, would they listen to it or heed it?

His Holiness knows the answer to that question as well as you or I. He knows that numerically Catholics are in a minority in most of the nations and governments of the world today, and so as a separate unit, able to accomplish little. And what does he say about it? He appeals therefore directly and openly for cooperation with and from "all men who believe in God * * * collaboration, interassociation with men of other creeds, provided they are animated, however vaguely, by Christian ideals of justice."

And this is the second step of the Pope's peace plan: Cooperation with others, not of the faith, to increase the influence of Christian teaching upon those momentarily in power.

How is this accomplished? In many ways:

(a) Perhaps the most effective of which is by diplomatic relations of the Holy See itself with various governments, in fact, with all who seek this advantage, even with Germany and Japan. Thus are these nations and governments made conscious of the Pope's standards and principles, which otherwise they might never have guessed.

(b) By public statements, interviews, protests made from time to time by cardinals, archbishops, whole hierarchies of one country or another. All these means help to formulate the policies of these governments and these countries.

(c) And in a smaller way, but in democracies like ours, a very effective way, through instructions by pastors to their flocks at Sunday masses, or in sodalities or in study clubs or other channels of teaching, such as this radio programme for instance.

After all, the theory of democratic government is that the people's will, as felt by their legislative representatives, is the ultimate source of law. If that theory is to work out in harmony with the higher divine law, the people will need and will appreciate clear enlightenment and authoritative guidance, in such complicated matters as these, lest the popular will be confused and divided by false or futile emphases.

The providence of God itself is a thing which sometimes does not wait for such slow means of progress. It may easily provide other means by which this leaven may spread more rapidly, more completely, even startlingly. The very miseries of war which God permits, may so disgust the world with the games of greed and schemes of shameless usurpation of sacred individual rights by states, that through sheer exhaustion and weariness and degradation of spirit, whole peoples may rise up in their might, and in the light of Christian Truth, as expounded by the Holy Father, wend their way back to God and His laws, in spite of their dictators and oppressors.

No matter how the world may seem to get out of hand, it can never get out of God's hands. He still remains its Creator, its Governor, and its Judge. Great public catastrophies have led whole peoples back to Him, just as proud prosperity leads them away from Him.

These are thoughts that should lead us never to despair. Nor to be idle on the sidelines. We can aid the situation by prayer, prayer that the benign influence of the Holy Father's teachings may permeate the minds and hearts of men in positions of power and not of our faith. We Catholics can aid by explaining to others the fundamental principles of the Church's plan for peace. We know them almost instinctively, almost without study. We know the teachings from childhood by which she would make us holy. She simply wants all men to accept them and live by them. Thus and only thus can true peace come and remain.

My Voting Record on Farm Legislation in the Eightieth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have had the Library of Congress prepare for me a summary showing how I voted on all legislation passed by the House of Representatives and in any way relating to agriculture, in the Eightieth Congress. This record speaks for itself. It shows that I have consistently supported those bills which help the farmer.

On many measures in Congress there is no roll call record vote. But, in this summary I am listing how I voted on every measure, whether there was a record vote on it or not. I am proud of my support of legislation designed to be of aid to agriculture and feel that my constituents are entitled to have that record. I do not expect everyone in my district to agree with every vote I cast. That would be to expect the unreasonable. Honest and informed people can differ. However, I cast my votes after careful consideration of all the evidence presented to the committees, which is to say, I voted with full information which is not generally available to others than Members of Congress charged with this responsibility. As the following summary will show, there were a great many important votes on agriculture in the Eightieth Congress, just as there were in prior Congresses of which I have been a Member. If anyone can raise any objection to any of my votes it must be to an insignificant minority of those votes as compared to the large total of 59 cast in the Eightieth Congress.

This record is as nearly complete as it can be made at this date. If any measures are passed pertaining to agriculture in the next and final day of the session, they will be by unanimous consent and not of a controversial nature and for that reason not listed here.

Now, as Al Smith used to say, "Let's look at the record":

Public Law 2; approved Feb. 1, 1947: Extending time during which Federal alcohol plants could manufacture sugar to relieve shortage and provide a market for surplus potatoes and soft and wet grain. BENNETT voted "Yes."

Public Law 30; approved March 31, 1947: To extend the powers of authorities to ration distribution of sugar and fix prices. BENNETT voted "No."

Public Law 40; approved April 28, 1947: An Act to permit importation of Mexican farm labor. BENNETT voted "No."

Public Law 104; approved June 25, 1947: The Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act, to protect the public, and especially farmers, against misbranded or adulterated economic poisons of great value to agriculture but which were unknown and not covered by the Insecticide Act of 1910. BENNETT voted "Yes."

Public Law 131; approved June 30, 1947: An act to extend until July 1, 1949, the period during which income from agricultural labor and nursing services may be disregarded by the States in making old-age-assistance payments without prejudicing their rights to grants-in-aid under the Social Security Act. This law is to encourage recipients of such assistance to engage in these occupations, in which there is a labor shortage, and to do so without loss of assistance, the State governments being given the option to disregard such income in the granting of eligibility. BENNETT voted "Yes."

Public Law 145; approved June 30, 1947: Extending the Second War Powers Act for 15 days. BENNETT voted "Yes."

Public Law 188; approved July 15, 1947: To extend until February 29, 1948, certain powers of the President under the Second War Powers Act and Export Control Act, retaining certain war controls upon American farm products. BENNETT voted "No."

Public Law 249; approved July 26, 1947: To extend provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to the Virgin Islands. BENNETT voted "Yes."

Public Law 266; approved July 30, 1947: An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the 1948 fiscal year.

On agreement to waive all points of order, May 27, 1947. BENNETT voted "Yes."

On motion to recommit bill to committee with instructions to increase funds for AAA, school lunch, and REA, above committee estimates and justifications, May 28, 1947. BENNETT voted "No."

On final passage of bill, May 28, 1947. BENNETT voted "Yes."

NOTE.—Total vote was: Yes, 315; No, 38; indicating general agreement between majority and minority.

On conference report motion to recommit and raise REA funds from $225,000,000 to $250,000,000, July 18, 1947. BENNETT voted "No."

On motion to recede and concur in Senate amendment which raised the appropriation for soil-conservation payments from $165,614,290 to $295,635,044, July 18, 1947. BENNETT voted "Yes."

On motion to concur in above Senate amendment with an amendment to strike out authorization for 1948 program and appropriate $228,000,000 for 1947 commitments, July 18, 1947. BENNETT voted "Yes."

On motion to recede and concur in Senate amendment increasing school-lunch fund from $45,000,000 to $75,000,000, July 18, 1947. BENNETT voted "No."

On motion to recede and concur in Senate amendment which made an appropriation of $20,000,000 for farm-tenant loans, July 18, 1947. BENNETT voted "Yes."

NOTE.—Speech by Congressman MARION T. BENNETT, July 25, 1947, page A3631, Appendix of the RECORD, "The Facts About Action of Congress on Agricultural Appropriations." This speech debunks the propaganda of pressure groups and the administration that the Department of Agriculture funds were reduced to such a degree as to harm any farm program. Over-all reduction was 19 percent, which was proportionately less than any other departmental reduction. President accepted and signed the bill and majority of Democrats voted for it, as well as Republicans.

Public Law 290; approved July 31, 1947: To amend the Plant Quarantine Act to protect American nursery stock against disease-infested stock and plant pests from abroad. BENNETT voted "Yes."

Public Law 297; approved July 31, 1947: An act to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work and the more complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges. BENNETT voted "Yes."

Public Law 298; approved July 31, 1947: To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of farm labor supply centers, camps, facilities, and equipment used in connection with the farm labor supply program at such prices, and under such terms and conditions and in such manner as to insure, as far as possible, their continued use in the housing of migratory labor engaged in agricultural work. BENNETT voted "Yes."

Public Law 305; approved August 1, 1947: To amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act relating to marketing agreements and orders, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain such minimum standards of quality and such grading and inspection requirements for agricultural commodities, other than milk and its products, in interstate commerce, as will effectuate orderly marketing of such commodities in the public interest. BENNETT voted "Yes."

Public Law 320; approved August 1, 1947: An act to promote the national welfare by improving the economic stability of agriculture through a sound system of crop insurance and providing the means for the research and experience helpful in devising and establishing such insurance. BENNETT voted "Yes."

Public Law 323; approved August 1, 1947: To amend the peanut marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. BENNETT voted "Yes."

Public Law 360; approved August 5, 1947: To assist the Commodity Credit Corporation to dispose of surplus wool, protecting the price and the American market. BENNETT voted "Yes."

Public Law 388; approved August 8, 1947: An act to protect consumers of sugar and of those engaged in the domestic sugar-producing industry, to promote trade, and for other purposes. BENNETT voted "Yes."

Public Law 389; approved Dec. 17, 1947: European Interim Aid Act, providing, among other things, that the President be authorized to purchase for gift to Europe, foodstuffs from other countries at a higher price than paid for the same products in the United States. BENNETT voted "No."

Public Law 395; approved December 30, 1947: Authorizing Government and industry to enter into certain voluntary arrangements for price stabilization. BENNETT absent. Paired for rule on bill. General pair on passage.

Public Law 427; approved February 28, 1948: Second Decontrol Act of 1947. BENNETT voted "Yes."

Public Law 430; approved March 3, 1948: Urgent Deficiency Appropriation, 1948. Vote on motion to recommit with instructions to add a new section furnishing $300,000,000 for REA. BENNETT voted "Yes."

Public Law 472; approved April 3, 1948: Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, to provide former allies, neutrals, and enemies with $17,000,000,000 worth of gifts, including farm machinery, fertilizer, automobiles and trucks, and other materials, such as steel, oil, foodstuffs, etc., in short supply at home. Sponsors of bill admitted it would increase cost of living and lower standard of living at home but was necessary supplement to $20,000,000,000 in gifts to foreigners since VJ-day, and to buy friends to resist Russia. BENNETT voted "Yes" on question of considering and debating bill. BENNETT voted "No" on passage of bill.

NOTE.—Fifty-two thousand questionnaires distributed to all rural, star, and post-office boxholders and telephone subscribers in Sixth District on this question brought replies to Congressman MARION T. BENNETT as follows: For Truman-Marshall plan, 15 percent. Against plan, 76.9 percent. No opinion on plan, 8.1 percent.

Public Law 495; approved April 21, 1948: To amend the Bankruptcy Act of 1898, extending benefits of its provisions to farmers. BENNETT voted "Yes."

Public Law 519; approved May 10, 1948: First deficiency appropriation, 1948. Vote on motion to recommit with instructions to report back with an amendment to raise the appropriation for REA from three hundred million to four hundred million dollars. BENNETT voted "Yes." (Motion defeated 199–154.) On final passage BENNETT voted "Yes."

The following bill was vetoed:

S. 814: Vetoed by President June 26, 1947. A bill to support wool prices and protect American producers against unfair foreign competition. This bill was supported by all farm organizations and wool growers. Bill passed House May 23, 1947. BENNETT voted "Yes."

The following bill failed of passage in House:

House Joint Resolution 273 (S. J. Res. 167). Failed to pass House December 15, 1947: To stabilize by voluntary agreements entered into under sponsorship of Government, the

prices of livestock, poultry, etc., to aid in stabilization of the national economy, to regulate speculative trading on commodity exchanges which would injure farm prices, and to allocate transportation equipment for movement of grain. BENNETT voted "Yes."

The following bills passed the House but had not yet become public laws as of June 18, 1948: There was little doubt but that they would become law. Most of them were on the President's desk, awaiting his signature when Congress adopted a motion to adjourn June 19.

H. R. 3370. Passed House July 21, 1947: A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of milk at not less than 90 percent of parity. BENNETT voted "Yes."

H. R. 4856. Passed House February 3, 1948: To require liquidation of mineral interests reserved to the United States to be delayed until such time as Congress may establish a policy on the subject. Bill seeks to halt sale of such rights as surplus property, to highest bidder. This measure would protect farmers in Bates County, Mo., from having Government sell its mineral rights, reserved on their land, to someone from whom they might not be able to buy them. BENNETT voted "Yes."

H. R. 5883. Passed House March 18, 1948: Department of Agriculture appropriation for 1949 fiscal year. Bill provided $400,000,000 for REA which was $100,000,000 more than President requested. It provided also $1,048,000 for soil-conservation research and $44,000,000 for the Soil Conservation Service. This was $6,000,000 above the Administration budget request of $38,000,000. The PMA or AAA program was given $225,000,000. Congressman BENNETT got a $30,000 item put in the bill to establish a Forest Research Center in Missouri. Funds for certain work of the Extension Service were increased $2,000,000 above Administration requests. Sixty-five million dollars were provided for the school-lunch program, adequate funds for crop insurance, research, etc. Total appropriation for the year was $1,010,000,000. BENNETT voted "Yes." Note: Democratic Congressmen were so well pleased with this bill that they did not contest it, letting it pass without requesting a roll call vote.

Conference report on H. R. 5883:

On motion to disagree to Senate amendments increasing agriculture appropriations and to send bill to conference June 4, 1948 (H. Res. 624). BENNETT voted "No."

On question insisting upon House position appropriating $262,500,000 for AAA payments and disagreeing to Senate amendment appropriating $300,000,000 for same purpose. BENNETT voted "No."

On passage of conference report June 14, 1948, BENNETT voted "Yes."

NOTE.—Bill as finally approved in conference report, June 14, 1948, contained the record-breaking total appropriation of $1,123,000,000 for the 1949 fiscal year. Among other things the conference report increased Extension Service funds $3,000,000 above the President's request; increased the Soil Conservation Service funds to a total of $45,048,000, which was over $7,000,000 above the President's request; increased REA funds to a total of $400,540,000, which is over $100,500,000 above the President's request; and included $75,000,000 for free hot school lunches and $262,500,000 for AAA subsidy payments.

Again, as on passage of original House bill on March 18, 1948, the conference report (compromise bill agreed on by Senate) with increases specified, passed unanimously, with the Democratic minority so well satisfied that they did not even contest it by asking for a roll call record vote.

H. R. 2245. Passed House April 28, 1948: A bill to repeal taxes on oleomargarine.

On vote to take this measure away from Agriculture Committee which had refused to report it. BENNETT voted "No."

On final passage. BENNETT paired against it.

NOTE.—Congressman spoke on House floor against the measure and outlined in detail the damage it would do to the dairy industry, especially in the Sixth Missouri District, which is the largest dairy district in the State. Speech is on pages 4867-4869 of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 26, 1948.

H. R. 6114. Passed House May 18, 1948: A bill to encourage extension of loans to qualified veterans, tenants, share croppers and farm laborers, for the purpose of acquiring, enlarging and improving family size farm units.

BENNETT voted "Yes."

H. R. 6556. Passed House May 18, 1948: A bill to encourage extension of loans to qualified veterans, tenants, share croppers, and farm laborers, for the purpose of acquiring, enlarging and improving family size farm units.

BENNETT voted "Yes."

H. R. 6556. Passed House May 26, 1948: Extension of Reciprocal Trade Act, reserving to Congress its constitutional authority over tariffs which had previously been surrendered to State Department bureaucrats, and requiring President to seek advice of the Tariff Commission on whether or not tariff cuts will injure American industry and agriculture.

BENNETT voted "Yes."

H. R. 5048. Passed House June 8, 1948: A bill by Congressman BENNETT directing Secretary of Agriculture to convey on behalf of the United States, without consideration, all the mineral rights heretofore reserved by the Missouri Defense Relocation Association, Inc., to the respective persons who at the time of enactment of this act are the owners of the lands in and under which such mineral rights exist, in Bates County. BENNETT voted "Yes."

S. 1249. Passed House June 8, 1948: A bill authorizing additional research and investigation into problems and methods relating to the eradication of cattle grubs, and for other purposes. BENNETT voted "Yes."

House Resolution 452. Passed House June 8, 1948: A resolution to request the Secretary of Agriculture to take action to prevent damage to valuable crops as a result of the use of the weed killer known as 2,4-D. BENNETT voted "Yes."

H. R. 5263. Passed House June 8, 1948: A bill to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to execute and deliver to present owners of certain real property quitclaim deeds to the minerals in or under such property. BENNETT voted "Yes."

H. R. 5154. Passed House June 8, 1948: A bill to extend the period within which the Secretary of Agriculture may carry out the purposes of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by making payments to agricultural producers. BENNETT voted "Yes."

S. 1090. Passed House June 8, 1948: An act to safeguard and consolidate certain areas of exceptional public value within the Superior National Forest, State of Minnesota, and for other purposes. BENNETT voted "Yes."

S. 2137. Passed House June 8, 1948: An act to provide for the protection of potato and tomato production from the golden nematode, and for other purposes. BENNETT voted "Yes."

H. R. 6248. Passed House, June 12, 1948: The farm-price-support bill to place supports of at least 90 percent of parity on hogs, poultry, eggs, wheat, corn, cotton, peanuts, rice and tobacco, and supporting nonbasic commodities on a sliding scale ranging down to 60 percent of parity for the next 2 years. In reporting this bill, the committee said the idea of approving a long-range farm program at this time was abandoned because an abnormal world demand for farm products exists now, and any program worked out under such conditions could not be expected to operate in normal times and at the present, too. The committee is continuing its hearings and studies and states it will report such a program at the proper time. In the meantime, this bill gives farmers assurance of continued price support so they can, with confidence, plan for the future. BENNETT voted "Yes."

H. R. 2028. Passed House June 16, 1948: A bill to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes. BENNETT voted "Yes."

H. R. 5861. Passed House June 16, 1948: A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to the State of Oklahoma. BENNETT voted "Yes."

S. 1087. Passed House June 16, 1948: An act to amend section 502 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944. BENNETT voted "Yes."

H. R. 6935. Passed House June 16, 1948: A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes. This bill provides $33,300,000 for the Department of Agriculture, including appropriations for the agriculture remount service, forest roads and trails, and eradication of contagious diseases of animals. BENNETT voted "Yes."

On motion to recommit bill with instructions to report it back with the following amendment: Add: "Rural Electrification Administration. Salaries and expenses. For an additional amount for the fiscal year 1949 for administrative expenses, $450,000." (Motion was rejected.) BENNETT voted "Yes."

H. R. 6263. Passed House June 18, 1948: A bill to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of stabilizing, supporting, and protecting farm income and prices; of assisting in the maintenance of balanced and adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, products thereof, foods, feeds, and fibers; and of facilitating the orderly distribution of agricultural commodities. BENNETT voted "Yes."

Management and Labor Join To Show the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 19, 1948

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose an article which appeared in the New York Times of March 17, 1948, showing the advancements made by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America and employers in the men's clothing industry, relative to liberalization of the benefits provided under that industry's welfare program. The article follows:

The Amalgamated Clothing Workers, CIO, and employers in the men's clothing industry reached peaceful agreement yesterday on liberalization of the benefits provided under the industry's welfare program.

Trustees representing the union and the Clothing Manufacturers Association of the United States agreed to start surgical benefits up to $150 for workers requiring operations. Sick and accident benefits for men were increased from $12 to $15 a week and for women from $8 to $10 a week. These benefits continue for a maximum of 13 weeks in any single year.

Hospitalization benefits were raised from $5 to $6 a day and the allowance for incidental hospital expenses were doubled from $25 to $50. Other benefits, which continue unchanged, include a $500 death benefit and old-age retirement payments matching dollar-for-dollar benefits paid under the Federal social security program. The pensions are open to workers with 20 years' employment in the industry when they reach the age of 65.

The Amalgamated Insurance Fund, which provides protection for 150,000 workers in all parts of the country, is financed through an employer contribution of 5 percent of weekly pay rolls. Three-fifths of this goes to finance retirement benefits and the rest for other types of insurance.

In a joint statement, the manufacturers and the union expressed gratification that the financial condition of the fund was sufficiently healthy to permit the expansion in benefits.

"The sole objective of employers and union alike, ever since the fund was established in 1943, has been to provide security for men and women who toil in the clothing industry," the joint statement said. "We have been concerned with all the natural hazards of the breadwinner and have sought to cushion the normal fears associated with illness, old age, and death.

"We have found that the comprehensive system of social security we have set up in the industry has been a great contribution to workers' morale. The latest decision is another demonstration of enlightened employer-union relations, which have marked the men's and boys' clothing industry for more than a quarter of a century."

The statement was issued by Raymond H. Reiss, president, and David Drescher, general counsel, for the association, and Jacob S. Potofsky, president, Frank Rosenblum, secretary-treasurer, and Hyman Blumberg, executive vice president, for the Amalgamated.

Congratulations, Raymond Foley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD an editorial from one of the prominent papers of my congressional district, the Pontiac Daily Press of June 10, 1948, entitled "Congratulations, Ray Foley." I heartily concur in everything this editorial says, and wish to add my own congratulations to that of the Pontiac Chamber of Commerce and his many friends.

CONGRATULATIONS, RAY FOLEY

Today's Chamber of Commerce luncheon honoring Raymond M. Foley is a fitting and well-deserved tribute to a former Pontiac resident.

His unusual ability, unquestioned integrity and devotion to the tasks at hand have highlighted the Washington career of Federal Housing Administrator Foley. They have enabled him to achieve a success in National Government equaled by few appointive officeholders.

Without resort to the political maneuverings of lesser men, Ray Foley has won a national reputation in an office so politically trying it has broken several predecessors.

Not only has he earned the confidence and respect of his own party, but of Republicans as well. His contribution to good government also has won him the unusual recognition of an honoray degree which was conferred on him Wednesday evening by the University of Detroit.

No one in Pontiac who has known him is surprised by Ray Foley's Washington success.

He would succeed in any chosen field.

He doesn't know how to slight a task.

In the finest and fullest meaning of the words, he is a former home-town resident who has made good in one of the most difficult appointive posts in our National Capital.

We of the Daily Press who worked with him when he was our managing editor are proud to join in the congratulations extended to him.

National Health Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO ISACSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. ISACSON. Mr Speaker, one of the greatest of all American legislators today dwells in the twilight of a life spent without stint in the service of the American people.

The great Senator from my State, Mr. WAGNER, is indeed enshrined in the hearts of Americans in every walk of life for his unswerving devotion to the magnificent mission of bringing to fulfillment the rich promise of democracy for America, in terms of expanding security and health and well-being for the American family.

It is therefore most tragic and poignant that the monumental public health measure of this incomparable toiler for the welfare of the people, introduced in cooperation with Senator MURRAY and Congressman DINGELL, should now lie unheeded and forgotten in the unfinished business of Congress.

The health of the American people is something this Congress and this Administration have not been able to bestir themselves about. Preparation for war and robbing the American people of their hard-earned civil rights, yes. These have been worked on with diligence, not to say frenzy. But the senseless waste of thousands of American lives every year from preventable or curable diseases, the inability of millions of Americans to receive essential medical care, in this there has been complacency—coupled with a cynical disregard for the express wishes of the American people for a national health program. In recent weeks this body has been subjected to opposition by one of its most powerful committees to United States participation in the World Health Organization of the United Nations on the brilliant grounds expressed by one of its members that it was part of a "world plot to socialize medicine." Even as the bill passed the House, degrading amendments were added directing that a doctor in private practice for 10 years would have to be the United States delegate to the WHO executive agency (probably in the hope that an opponent of socialized medicine would be chosen) and ruling out qualified public health experts who have proven their value to serve their country in this way a thousand times over; also limiting the budget and providing the possibility of quick United States withdrawal. No other nation has seen fit to introduce such weakening amendments.

The Republicans and the Democrats are equally culpable. The Republicans have shown themselves completely bankrupt on vitally needed health issues. In the Senate the best they have been able to do is to propose a charity medicine bill to throw a few crumbs to the people, while they red-baited and killed the soundly devised national health insurance and public health bill of 1948, whose proposals were shown by a National Opinion Research Center poll to be backed by a clear majority of the American people. In the House there have not even been sham hearings such as these. Instead, one of its subcommittees "discovered" a plot to "socialize medicine" in America, allegedly on the part of certain outstanding government health experts, who dared to participate in health conferences (as they are directed to do by public interest) with the three great labor unions—the A. F. of L., the CIO, and the railway brotherhoods—together with the Farmers Union. This subcommittee actually had the gall to call for a Justice Department investigation of the participants in these health education conferences—and got it, with full FBI investigations of the whole matter!

The Truman administration has declared itself in favor of the national health program which has been demanded by the people and which was created under the leadership of President Roosevelt. But what about actions? Have the Democrats united behind this program? Have they pressed the Congress for action on it? They most certainly have not! The fantastic "plot to socialize medicine discovery" was embraced in the report by the only two Democrats on the subcommittee in question. The Democrats have hardly opened their mouths in favor of a national health program. They have not even fought for hearings on it in the House. I ask the Democrats who have been jumping all over themselves to curry favor with the American Medical Association and the witch-hunters, what have you done for the health of the American people?

We of the New Party have a real health program, we are fighting for it, and we will win the support of it for its enactment absolutely as soon as possible—not in some vague ten year or longer pie-in-the-sky future. I would like to introduce this "Progressive Health Program for America", devised under the leadership of Henry A. Wallace and his New Party, into the record and to describe some of our health objectives for the American people.

Every American has the right to good health. Immediate steps must be taken to lift the staggering burden of needless

disability, disease, and death. The full benefits of medical science must be brought to all our people. To assure these ends the new party of Henry Wallace proposes:

1. Immediate enactment of national health insurance, providing comprehensive medical care for all the people financed by social security payments.

2. Enactment of a national sick benefit and disability insurance program to protect family income by providing cash payments in time of sickness or injury.

3. Positive measures to relieve the serious shortage of physicians, dentists, nurses, and other health personnel, especially in rural areas, through Federal assistance for medical education.

4. Revision of the present Hospital Survey and Construction Act and increased appropriations to provide special grants for hospital construction and maintenance to needy areas.

5. Repeal of restrictive State legislation which creates a monopoly by organized medicine in the establishment and operation of voluntary prepaid medical-care plans. Immediate enactment of State legislation to aid the formation of such plans by farmer, labor, and consumer groups.

6. Additional Government aid to assure the best possible health care for mothers and children, including delivery service in hospitals, the correction of defects discovered during school health examinations, and the development of adequate child-care centers.

7. Planned development of a large-scale, federally supervised research program utilizing and developing all available resources to prevent or cure such diseases as cancer, heart disease, mental illness, and other major ailments.

8. Active support for the best quality medical care for veterans, free from political interference and false economy.

9. The initiation of a dental health program directed towards complete dental care for all age groups.

10. Protection for all communities through the establishment of full-time adequately staffed local heath departments.

11. Immediate and unrestricted participation by the United States in the World Health Organization of the United Nations.

To achieve the benefits of this program for all the people, discrimination and segregation in all phases of professional education, the provision of health services and in the care of the sick must be eliminated.

We propose immediate enactment of national health insurance providing comprehensive medical care for all the people financed by social security payments. Essential doctor, hospital, dentist, nursing, and other types of medical care are beyond the ability of the average American to purchase. The costs of illness have prevented millions of Americans from seeking competent medical advice for themselves and their children before illness has developed or while it is still developing (and is therefore susceptible to cure, as is the case in cancer, tuberculosis, and many other diseases). While the average city worker paid $155 per family for medical care in 1947, he still did not get enough of it, and these figures disguise the fact that it was the sickest who had to pay the bills at a time they were least able to. Unpaid doctor and hospital bills are a major worry to the worker and the farmer. A survey by the small-loan companies in a recent year showed that medical bills were the greatest single cause for people running into debt. The Atlanta, Ga., chapter of the American Veterans Committee showed that the majority of their members were either unable to purchase the medical care they needed or they had heavy unpaid medical bills. It showed further that the wild inflation resulting from the bipartisan policies had raised the cost of living for them so much a majority who wanted babies were unable to have them because of the high costs of supporting a family. And these members had incomes considerably above the average for the country.

We propose enactment "of a national sick benefit and disability insurance program to protect family income by providing cash payments in time of sickness or injury" so the worker, farmer, professional and small-business man will not have his life savings wiped out, run into debt and not have enough food for his children when he is the victim of some disabling illness or accident.

We shall insist, that discrimination and segregation in all phases of professional education, the provision of health services and in the care of the sick must be eliminated. The Negro, the Jew, the Puerto Rican, the Italian, and many other minority groups in American life are systematically discriminated against in health and medical care. There are only some 147 Negro medical graduates each year, despite the desperate need for more Negro physicians and other health personnel. It is well-known that outside of two medical schools, Howard and Meharry, almost none will take but an occasional Negro medical student—and those so infrequently it does not amount to much more than a score a year. So widespread and rigid has the limitation been on Jewish and Italian students that the enrollment of medical students of these minorities has dropped precipitously during recent years in schools of professional education. According to figures of the American Jewish Congress these percents of decline varied from 20 to 90 percent during the 10-year period 1936–46, depending on the type of professional education concerned.

As for medical care and health protection, can we say that the Negro in America has health and medical services available to him on the same basis as his white neighbor in the same community? The shortage of doctors, hospitals, public-health services and all other types of preventive and curative measures are so great as they affect the Negro people the situation is a national disgrace. Even the Negro veteran, disabled in the fight for his country, gets care on a segregated basis. Is it any wonder then that the average Negro can expect to die 10 years before the average white, that Negro mothers have twice as high a maternal mortality rate as white mothers, and that the Negro rate of tuberculosis deaths is seven times as high as for the white?

A MEDICAL PROGRAM FOR VETERANS

Specifically as to veterans the new party considers a program along the following lines to be a minimum:

The injuries sustained in military service, the economic hardships suffered as a result of service entitle veterans to special consideration. We approve in general of the medical activities of the Veterans' Administration, and urge the intensification and expansion of these activities.

A comprehensive and adequate medical program for the entire population would make it unnecessary to single out veterans. Pending the adoption of such a program, however, we consider it essential to maintain and extend the existing special provisions for the medical care of veterans.

Veterans are entitled to their medical privileges as dignified rights and not merely because of inability to pay. We propose, therefore, to do away with the degrading statement of indigence required of veterans before they accept hospitalization.

With the appointment of General Bradley as Administrator of Veterans Affairs, and of General Hawley as his medical director, the Veterans' Administration made a serious effort to improve its hospitals. The hospitals were associated with medical schools, medical residents were appointed, qualified consultants were added to the staffs. A policy of locating new hospitals in medical centers was announced. Better medical care was encouraged and some research projects were started.

There can be no doubt that these changes have been desirable and have worked to the advantage of veterans. A great deal remains to be done to make some of these changes fully effective. We support these changes and will protect them against the attacks of reactionaries, both political and medical.

We find nevertheless, the following serious shortcomings that must be overcome:

First. An unsatisfactory personnel policy in Veterans Administration which interferes with high quality medical care.

In spite of some steps to improve matters, the levels of training and pay, and the working conditions and morale of the personnel are generally poor and inconsistent with what are required. Some increases in pay have been granted, especially to physicians, and some attempts have been made to attract more qualified personnel, but these steps have been inadequate. Very little has been done to train and advance both non-professional and professional personnel who play the essential role in patient care.

Seriously planned and continued training of personnel, promotions and pay increases must be extended to all grades.

Complaints are frequent about unfair promotions policies, insecurity of jobs, and inadequate provisions to protect employees exposed to communicable diseases.

Conditions of work especially among attendants and maintenance workers are not generally such as to encourage the high degree of morale required for good medical care.

Second. A tendency to concentrate on the immediate treatment of the veteran's illness and a failure to explore adequately the possibilities of preventive medicine.

Veterans frequently complain, with considerable justification, that they are discharged from hospitals with little or no advice for the future.

Not only must administrative machinery be organized to remedy this, but a thorough and careful study of the entire problem is required.

Third. Segregation of Negro veterans and personnel and the inadequacy of the facilities provided for Negro veterans and personnel.

We condemn the Jim Crow policy of Veterans' Administration. We oppose the policy of building Negro hospitals, and urge the abolition of segregated wards.

There is an immediate need for the training of Negro physicians and other personnel, and we urge the appointment of qualified Negro residents, medical consultants, nurses, dentists, technicians, and other personnel in veterans' hospitals.

Fourth. Failure carefully to record and to analyze and study the tremendous amount of medical information made available to the Veterans' Administration.

No other medical agency in the country treats so many patients and can follow their cases so long. There is a great responsibility to veterans and to the entire population to keep careful records, to subject the records to suitable analysis and study and to document the results. Very little has been done along these lines. Out of such study could come important contributions to medical science which would benefit both veterans and the people as a whole.

Fifth. Failure to carry out adequate investigations of disease in the wards and laboratories.

A great deal has been said about research, but little has been done. Dealing with a wide variety of illnesses among such large numbers of people, the Veterans' Administration has an obligation to carry on research with an end to finding out more about disease. We endorse an intensified and comprehensive program of medical research in the Veterans' Administration.

The remedy of some of these shortcomings, such as the latter two, require a new concept of the scope of the Veterans' Administration. A new orientation is necessary to appreciate the contributions it can make to American medicine. To these ends much greater appropriations and greatly expanded facilities are required.

We of the new party seek better health and medical care for the farmer. We shall insist that the shortage of doctors, of hospitals, of public-health services, indeed of every aspect of medical care which besets our farm families be met by immediate government and citizens action. We call for the end of the pernicious restrictive State legislation which prevents consumer groups from forming prepayment plans for bringing the benefits of modern medical care to their members. In each of the 21 States in which these laws exist, we pledge our full support to all citizen groups interested in their repeal.

If this Congress can vote a billion dollars to the corrupt military government of Turkey, it can vote for a National Health Program for the American people. We of the new party put the welfare of the American people before profits for big-business monopoly and the saber-rattling of the military brass and their political batmen. We challenge the reactionary old parties to place real concern for the health of the American people above profits and war.

Increased Pay for Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, there is very little time left in which to act on legislation to provide a pay raise for Post Office and other Federal employees.

There seems to be much indecision on the part of the House leadership. In an effort to keep expenditures at a minimum, they are willing to sacrifice the well-being of the Government employees who are dependent upon us for an adequate, living wage. Private industry has taken care of its workers, but the Federal workers have little hope of being taken care of.

Surely the fact that 243 Members of the House have appeared before the committee to voice their approval of a pay increase, should convince the leadership that it is the desire of the Members to help the Government workers. Why, then, are we not given an opportunity to put our desires in concrete form, by voting on this legislation?

The bills which have come out of committee provide a much lower increase than should be granted, but since it appears that nothing better can be hoped for, we should at least have an opportunity to pass these bills.

We cannot expect the Federal employees to continue their high standard of efficiency, when they are constantly beset with financial worries. Salary increases granted them since 1939 are nowhere near the increase in the cost of living since that time. When they must resort to extra jobs to secure the bare necessities of life, as many of them have had to do, it is high time we did our duty by them.

Therefore, I strongly urge the leadership to permit this legislation to be acted upon before tomorrow night. If they fail to do so, they will be guilty of gross neglect of one of the most faithful groups of employees in the country.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. COLE of MISSOURI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by Jack Beall:

INTERVIEW WITH FREDA UTLEY

Good evening, Those of you who have followed this series on Communism know that, with great frequency, I have referred to the writings of Freda Utley.

The record of her disillusionment with the Communist way of life has been written in "The Dream We Lost." It is now reissued under the title of "Lost Illusion" by the Fireside Press.

It constitutes one of the basic books on the Soviet Union. It is written by an Englishwoman who went to Russia, married a Russian, lived as a Russian for 6 years, saw the whole thing from the viewpoint of one who lived there—not of a visitor who stayed 3 weeks, or even of a correspondent. Trippers and correspondents may see the way of life of the Soviet people from a distance, but they can't live it. Freda Utley lived it intimately. She saw how the Soviet system worked out in actual practice.

I suppose it can be said truthfully that no other Westerner has had her intimate experience and got out to tell the tale.

Miss Utley went to Russia with full sympathy for the Communist experiment. In the course of her 6 years, her hopes were completely destroyed, she wrestled with her doubts and finally arrived at the bitter truth.

Truly—as she has written: "You believe what you wish to believe until experience bangs your head against the wall and awakens you."

I count it a great privilege to be able to introduce Miss Utley, in person, to this audience and to ask her some questions. Miss Utley, why do you call your book "Lost Illusion"?

Miss UTLEY. Mr. Beall, I once shared illusions still held by many young people today that the Soviet Union is a country where there is greater social justice and equality and opportunity than anywhere else in the world. As soon as I went to live in Russia, however, I found the reality the very opposite of my expectations. Nowhere else in the world is there greater inequality, and more misery and fear.

Mr. BEALL. Well, how about the inequality?

Miss UTLEY. In the first place, there is, in no country, a greater difference between the incomes of the ruling class—the Communist aristocracy—and the mass of the people. When I left Russia, Commissars were getting about ten thousand rubles a month, directors of enterprises between three and seven thousand, while the average wage was less than 300 rubles a month. In addition to this, the Communist big shots had their automobiles, country houses, luxurious apartments—special schools for their children, special hospitals and other privileges, enabling them to lead a life even more remote from that of the workers and peasants than that of a Park Avenue millionaire from the Oakies of which we have heard so much in the United States.

And then there is the dreadful hypocrisy. Even while living so well at the expense of the blood and sweat of the people, these

Communist aristocrats would talk about "our sacrifices."

Then there was the spectacle of visiting foreigners—not only Communists but the ignorant admirers of the Soviet Union, of the Henry Wallace type—these also used to make one feel sick. They just lapped up all the lies and the propaganda. When they saw starving women and children and the overworked, exhausted factory-workers, they would either say that it was all right for people to starve if their fathers had been capitalists or peasant landowners; or that their overwork and undernourishment was just fine—so long as it contributed to the building of the so-called Socialist State.

Mr. BEALL. You say "so-called Socialist state." Don't you consider that the Soviet Union is a Socialist state?

Miss UTLEY. Well—unless you consider that fascism and naziism are the same as socialism, then you can't consider that it is socialism in Russia.

Mr. BEALL. Well, what would you say it was?

Miss UTLEY. I have described it in my book as state capitalism, with the Communist Party drawing the dividends. It is just as if, in the United States, the big corporations had been able to deprive all other Americans of the vote and owned every factory, every farm and every mine in America as a group. They would then draw their incomes and control the life and livelihood of every single American, as members of the ruling party. As in Soviet Russia today they would be able to lower wages, increase working hours, raise prices just as they pleased. Anyone who protested would be refused a job and starved to death or sent to a concentration camp.

Mr. BEALL. Where did they get off the track, in Soviet Russia—that is, the track of pure socialism?

Miss UTLEY. I suppose the Bolsheviks really went off the track even in Lenin's day. When they first tried to force Socialism on the Russian people, when the Russian people didn't want it, and had to be terrorized into accepting it. But the big turning point came after Lenin's death and Trotsky's expulsion, when Stalin got complete control, took the land away from the peasants and converted them into state serfs. They also abolished the Party Maximum.

Mr. BEALL. And what was the party maximum, Miss Utley?

Miss UTLEY. Lenin had established it as a fundamental principle that no Communist was to draw a wage higher than that of a skilled worker. He knew that the temptation of holding absolute power was very great and he hoped to keep the Communist Party clean by not allowing any Communist to become rich. But Stalin abolished this party maximum and gave Communists higher incomes than anyone else. That was in order to attach them to his person. Today, in Russia, every Communist knows that if he opposes Stalin and speaks up for the downtrodden Russian people, he will lose all his privileges and his high income and be thrown into abject poverty—if, indeed, he escapes being shot or sent to a concentration camp, where he will slowly die of starvation and overwork. Another important point, which is not generally understood in America where we have so long enjoyed freedom that we don't understand what it means to be without it, is that Stalin invented that terrible method of coercing people and keeping them obedient—punishment of a man's children or of his mother and father. Perhaps some of you, listening to us this evening, have seen the movie "Iron Curtain" and will remember that the Soviet authorities expected to keep Gouzenko in line by threatening to kill or torture his family. I saw, while I lived in Russia, that even the bravest men can be broken by fear of reprisals on their wives and children.

Mr. BEALL. In your book, Miss Utley, you use the phrase "Stalin's Counter-Revolution." What did you mean by it?

Miss UTLEY. I meant, in general, that Stalin and those who constitute the inner circle—the Politburo—

Mr. BEALL. Just a moment, Miss Utley—right on that point. I saw in this morning's papers where President Truman had said that Stalin is the "prisoner of the Politburo." What about that?

Miss UTLEY. That is a perfect example of the tragic ignorance of the American people, including, evidently President Truman and, presumably, General Marshall, concerning the nature of the Soviet government. It sounds exactly the same as the way people used to talk about Hitler—you remember how the Germans and others used to say that all the horrible things that went on, in Nazi Germany, were not the fault of the beloved Fuhrer, or leader, that Hitler, himself, was not responsible. So, now, the American people, having been taught by war propaganda to regard Stalin as a great friend of America and democracy, want to believe that he is not responsible for Soviet aggression and Soviet atrocities. I was quite shocked to read that President Truman said yesterday that he—I quote—"liked old Joe. He is a decent fellow." And, I quote again, that he had had "the kindest feelings in the world toward Russia" when he became President. May I say that I really think that President Truman ought to know better, by now, and I hope that he is not trying to save the face of the Democratic party.

By "saving face" I mean the endeavor to cover up the consequences of the Administration's former mistaken belief in Stalin's good intentions by exonerating Stalin, personally, as President Truman did yesterday. Any one who has lived in the Soviet Union, as I did for six years, knows that Stalin has far greater power than any Czar in the past. He is the absolute dictator of all the Russians—it is quite ridiculous to describe him as the prisoner of the Politburo. Why any member of the Politburo who dared to argue with Stalin wouldn't last 2 minutes.

Mr. BEALL. I recall that in Eric Johnston's report on his conversation with Stalin and Molotoff, Mr. Johnston said that he made a proposal to Stalin about what he was to see in Russia which Stalin accepted. Mr. Johnston then politely turned to Molotoff and said, "If that is agreeable to Mr. Molotoff."

Stalin seemed to enjoy publicly humiliating Molotoff by saying back to Mr. Johnston, "You didn't suppose that Mr. Molotoff would disagree with me, did you?"

We got off the subject a bit, Miss Utley. We were discussing the way socialism, as originally conceived, has been perverted into state capitalism, or Stalinism. There is a very great difference from the standpoint of both theory and practice, I am sure. What is the quintessential difference that you see?

Miss UTLEY. Socialism, as I believed in it, and as some other liberals believe in it, means social justice, equality of opportunity, freedom from want and from fear. But Soviet Russia is a society in which there is misery, starvation, constant fear, and greater inequality than anywhere else in the world. I have been in China and other places where poverty is acute but nowhere have I seen such poverty, overwork, undernourishment, and acute contrast between the privileged and unprivileged as in Stalin's Russia, where the Communists live in luxury, while most other people work for a starvation wage.

Mr. BEALL. Then, Stalinism is going under a false label, throughout the world, appealing to intellectuals and the downtrodden on the basis of something that no longer exists?

Miss UTLEY. Absolutely. That is the tragedy of it. Many American liberals who should be opposing Stalin's horrible tyranny, are instead white-washing the Soviet Union, deceiving the American people, and spending their time undermining American democracy, which, for all its shortcomings, provides better material conditions, more freedom, a greater degree of social justice and opportunity to all than any other country.

Mr. BEALL. Your experiences in the Soviet Union, then, "cured" you as a party member?

Miss UTLEY. Yes; I was cured of political illusions or at least the propensity to fall for slogans, facile panaceas, and hypocritical pretenses. Ever since I lived in Russia it has been almost impossible for me to accept professions and declared aims at their face value anywhere. I am, I believe, forever cured of the western intellectual's preoccupation with external forms and labels. I cannot accept tyranny, cruelty, and starvation as justified because they are being inflicted on people in the name of a humanitarian ideal. Nor can I understand how western intellectuals, who call themselves liberals or socialist, can seek to bring on their own countries the Russian pattern of blood-stained dictatorship, misguidedly called a "classless society."

Life in the Soviet Union also made me realize that some absolute standards of behavior are essential to mankind if we are not to return to the level of the brute. * * * Russia taught me that even if one does not believe in God one must have a moral code, must accept certain social values as absolutes and allow some freedom to the individual conscience.

How can a just and humane social order be created if we root out our own humanity in the process of destroying the old society?

After long years of bitter experience, I have come to accept Bertrand Russell's social philosophy. I have learned that more evil is caused by fanatics than by wicked men, that no movement or individual can be certain enough of the effect their actions will have to subordinate means entirely to ends.

Mr. BEALL. It all comes down to that question of means and ends, doesn't it?

Miss UTLEY. Fundamentally, it does. Six years in Soviet Russia have convinced me that democracy, for all its inefficiency, is likely to secure more justice than any despot, however benevolent he may be or may profess himself to be.

Mr. BEALL. Why is it that Western liberals are so bemused by this tyranny under false colors?

Miss UTLEY. Seemingly, only personal experience of Communist terror and tyranny, with the never-absent physical fear of the secret police, can shatter the illusions of those who call ourselves Western liberals. Men like Henry Wallace who glibly speak of our overemphasis on bill of rights democracy and who speak of the superiority of Russia's so-called economic democracy are just ignorant.

I, myself, wonder why it is that we who have enjoyed the human freedoms that our forefathers fought so hard to win and to bequeath to us, do not—with the example of Russia before us—realize the horrors of life without freedom. Why is it that we cannot understand that there is no such thing as embracing communism as an experiment? It is a one-way street, ending in a cul de sac of secret police terror, firing squads for the intellectuals and leaders and concentration camps and slave labor for the masses. There is no turning back; there is no escape.

Instead of seeking for a way to combine order and control with individual liberty, a great many of our so-called progressive intellectuals, of recent years, have taken refuge under the mantle of Stalin's cruel despotism. Their critical faculties have become atrophied, together with their liberalism; and while barricading the front door against brown national socialism, they opened the back door to the red variety of the same thing.

Mr. BEALL. So you see very little difference between the red and the brown variety of totalitarianism?

Miss UTLEY. I see no difference except that the red variety is much more successful because it is much more hypocritical and has been able to delude liberals and others who would be fighting against it, in the same way they fought the brown variety, if they only knew what it was.

Mr. BEALL. Thank you very much, Freda Utley, for being with us today.

This is JACK BEALL saying good night from Washington.

Will We Ever Learn?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I append hereto a recent editorial from the Melrose (Mass.) Free Press. When such a large proportion of communications which come to the desk of the Members of Congress at this time ask us to vote for something which is going to cost the people more money in taxes and when it seems to be so much the fashion for many newspapers to criticize the Congress for honest attempts to bring about economy in government, it is certainly refreshing to read an editorial from one of my own home newspapers which I am glad to call specifically to the attention of my colleagues. The editorial follows:

WILL WE EVER LEARN?

We have just learned what it is which makes Americans work harder and skimp and save to get ahead. We always thought that the primary urge came from love of family, "I want to give my children a better start than I had," or a desire to have and enjoy more and more of the better things of life, and so on. But according to the Treasury Department that's all wrong. The real incentive is high taxes.

Here's the way the Treasury Department expressed it in a recent study on taxation:

"If taxes take larger proportions of their income (all of us, that is) the incentive of these individuals to work tends to be increased rather than decreased. They will try, within the limits of their abilities, energies, and opportunities, to earn more to attain and maintain the desired income after taxes. A tax reduction would tend to reduce their incentive to work and slacken their efforts since their objectives could be met with smaller incomes before tax."

There you have it. As your taxes are reduced and you have more of your income left for your own use, you have less incentive to work. You don't need a new car or a new suit or a new rug for the living room; your wife and the children have all of the clothes and everything else they want or need, therefore, you haven't any use for the extra money, so naturally you ease up, don't work as hard or as many hours. Ben Franklin and all the others down through the years who advocated hard work and thrift as the secret of success were wrong—100 percent wrong.

If this sort of cockeyed thinking or reasoning or whatever it should be called, on the part of the Treasury Department, surprises you, it shouldn't. It's part and parcel of the basic New Deal philosophy of scarcity, something for nothing. If this something for nothing idea were carried to its ultimate conclusion, it could only mean that after a while everyone would have everything for producing nothing. Silly? Absurd? Of course it is, but silly or not, that's the soothing sirup which has been fed to the American people since 1932. And now in 1948 the Treasury Department comes along with another great big dose of the same medicine.

Will we—the people—ever learn that the only way to stop this merry-go-round before it wrecks all of us is to shut down on the fuel supply—tax money—so as to force a drastic reduction in the size and scope of operation of the bureaucratic machine which runs the "Washington merry-go-round."

This can and will be done when we, the people, demand it. After all, it's our Government; it belongs to us, not to those we elect to run it. They are our servants. But like any and all servants, when the master becomes careless and indifferent, they also become careless and indifferent, and the whole set-up goes to pot.

Come on, let's wake up and get after these servants of ours. Let's each of us let our representatives know that we are not going to vote for anyone next November who is not pledged to work hard for a drastic reduction in the cost of government and a further reduction of taxes.

Reciprocity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I include a recent editorial from the Malden (Mass.) Evening News under leave to extend my remarks as an indication that there are some newspapers which seem to have a wholesome editorial policy toward reciprocal trade. The editorial is as follows:

RECIPROCITY

Congress is getting ready to extend the reciprocal trade agreements for 1 year, but with some stiff amendments. During the Roosevelt era the executive departments of the Government administered the agreements and rates were moved vertically or horizontally at will. Now several vetoes are apparently to be applied, based upon what Congress deems to have been abuses of the system in the past. There is confusion in foreign trade, with tariff rates determined by the White House from day to day and various relief plans buying goods in this country and donating them to other nations. It would be difficult under present conditions to determine what America's real exports are. There are gigantic markets abroad—that is, there would be if foreign countries had the money to buy at present inflated prices. This country needs more imports than it did in the past. Russia, as in all problems, is a troublesome factor. Congress, worked up about Russian aggression, wants to make sure reciprocity doesn't toss some vital potentials for war into Russia's lap. Some industries are concerned about recent policies. America was weaned and brought up on high tariffs. If an industry finds a tariff to be harmful to its interests, it can be depended upon to make the fact known until something is done about it. Anyway, there can be no quarrel with Congress if it eliminates some bad policies of the past and brings reciprocity into line with America's best interests.

Communism's Latest Threat to Poland's Children and Businessmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the appendix of the RECORD, I include an address recently given by Hon. Arthur W. Coolidge, Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts, on the occasion of the annual national convention of the Polish-American Congress in Philadelphia:

The American free enterprise system has given us more security, more opportunity, more prosperity and more freedom than any economic system on earth.

You businessmen are witnesses of its worth. Some of you came to the United States as immigrants. Some are the sons of poor families. You wisely took advantage of the opportunities offered. Now, by your efforts and your vision, you are making that American system an even greater success. Your achievements are an inspiration to the young men graduated from our schools and colleges this spring.

But let us not be selfish in the enjoyment of our economic blessings. Let us not be content until the security, opportunity, and freedom experienced by us is shared by nations which have lost these rights.

CONCENTRATION CAMPS REOPENED UNDER NEW MANAGEMENT

We meet on Memorial Day, a day first set apart to honor the Grand Army for banishing slavery from this continent. We also salute the veterans of the Spanish War and the two world wars who fought overseas against other forms of slavery. But victory for the cause which they so nobly advanced has not yet been won. Several countries, including Poland, are in shackles. So let us today strike a new blow against human slavery.

Poland was the first Allied country invaded in the war and the last liberated.

That phony liberation by the Soviet Army merely meant exchanging German chains for Russian handcuffs. It meant concentration camps reopened under new management.

During the war more than 6,000,000 Poles perished. Two million victims were carried into captivity by the Nazis and the Communists. Eight hundred thousand cripples hobble about the streets. One home in five has lost a loved one. The blood smears and tear stains cannot be washed away.

WORRIED ABOUT FATE OF RELATIVES

The United States has a specific interest in Poland. American armed forces in 1917–1918 helped tear the claws of the Prussian eagle from her throat. Unless we are to sell out the veterans of World War I, we must insist that Polish independence be restored.

The United States has a specific interest in Poland because approximately 6,000,000 persons of Polish extraction live in America. They—like all the rest—are entitled to the American rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. How can they pursue happiness here when they are worried about the fate of relatives in the toils

of the Russian MVD or the Warsaw secret police?

The United States has a specific interest in Poland because in the heart of every American is the desire for justice. Both the United States and the Soviet Union at the Moscow Conference in 1943 accepted the Atlantic Charter. This war aim says—and I quote—"they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live."

The Warsaw government today is run either by Soviet citizens, disguised as Poles, or by Poles who obey the Politburo and do not represent the people. Its form was devised in the Kremlin. It was thrust on a prostrate nation by the Red Army. Its officials are backed by Soviet machine guns. There can be no justice until Polish people have a government of their own choice, a right guaranteed by the Atlantic Charter.

STALIN'S GESTURE TO KISS AND MAKE UP

Stalin again has hinted that he is willing to kiss and make up with the United States. Our State Department's first reaction is to sidestep the trap. One of the matters which the dictator would negotiate is—and I quote Stalin—"The insuring of civil rights in all countries."

As Stalin already has violated previous pledges on that general subject, how can we know but that he would do it again? We have learned from bitter experience since Yalta that whenever Stalin crosses his heart, someone gets double-crossed.

When Hitler invaded Poland in 1939, Stalin tore up his Polish nonaggression pact, invaded from the east and swept away civil rights previously enjoyed by independent Poles. At first only leaders suspected of enmity to communism, were arrested. But in a few months began the mass shipments to Siberia of innocent men, women, and children.

STAINED BY EXILES' BLEEDING FEET

Every milestone from Europe to Asia became a gravestone. Every bit of ground stained by the bleeding feet of the exiled Polish insurgents of 1863 again was drenched by the blood of their grandchildren in 1939. More than a million Poles were victims of this forced migration. Many of them died at the hand of the man in Moscow who now cynically talks about negotiating "civil rights."

I have just received from Europe the latest official statistics announced in Warsaw on the number of Poles still held captive by Russia. These figures show that 570,000 Poles, approximately half of those deported between 1939 and 1941, are still in the Soviet Union. Of this number there are more than 40,000 members of the Polish resistance movement. Last year only 8,000 Poles were returned from Russia, mostly invalids shipped home to die.

RUSSIA ROBS POLAND OF MANPOWER

Poland needs these exiles to clear away war's rubble, to farm the new western provinces, to dig the new Silesian mines. But Russia is robbing Polish business of this manpower. Instead of rehabilitating their own country, these men are forced to make Russia an even stronger jailor than before. Instead of rebuilding their own homes, they are compelled to erect their own prisons.

If the Warsaw government is the independent, sovereign government which it pretends to be, why does it not demand of Russia, Poland's wartime ally, that these Polish citizens be returned to their families.

It does not do so because Bierut and his fellow traitors are using the slave labor of half a million of their countrymen to recompense Russia for placing and keeping the Warsaw government in the saddle.

Not only has the Cyrankiewicz cabinet abandoned half a million of its own people but it allows forced migration to continue. A sergeant in the Polish underground, arrested last summer, was deported on a Russian vessel to a prison in a Russian seaport. He has just escaped to the American zone in Germany. There he testified under oath that Russian MVD agents are using torture to unseal the lips of new Polish prisoners.

DRACULAS NOURISHING THEMSELVES ON BLOOD OF FELLOW POLES

Workers as well as political prisoners are being seized. The first Poles deported to Russia in 1939 were laborers sent to the Donetz mines. It is a grim irony that today's deportees also are being sent to these same Donetz mines.

Russian seizure of Polish labor is a callous act. But what of a Polish government which aids and abets this crime? Its officials are like Draculas, nourishing themselves on the blood and sweat and tears of fellow Poles.

POISONING MINDS OF CHILDREN

The Warsaw government has stooped to a new low. Deportations enslave bodies and political murders snuff out breath. But the Communist cabal in Warsaw has embarked on a new campaign to poison the minds of children.

Poland has more than a million war orphans. Ordinarily little ones receive their religious faith from their devout mothers' knee. But these motherless waifs are brought up in state institutions, run by atheistic Communists, whose clenched fist is battering down the Christian cross.

Even children with religious parents also are in mortal peril. The Boy Scout movement has been attacked as the tool of outside "capitalism" and its leaders compelled to teach Communist doctrine.

The Communist-dominated Diet has just decreed that every boy and girl between the ages of 16 and 21 must become members of a new "Service for Poland" organization. This thought-control outfit has adopted the methods used by the Hitler Youth, the Italian Balilla, and the Soviet Komsomol to warp immature minds.

The Polish Communist press discloses that the object of this draft of juveniles is to "form their outlook and ideological attitude"—in other words, to mold them into young Communists.

Thus Warsaw's Borgias of Bolshevism are injecting doses of Communist poison into all age groups—from the cradle to the grave.

WORSE THAN HEROD'S "SLAUGHTER OF INNOCENTS"

At present the youth of Poland is the stronghold of patriotism. High school students in particular have been ardent supporters of freedom. Older people who remember Paderewski and his cause will never bow their knee to the Red Baal.

But if the coming generation is taught atheistic Communism from kindergarten to graduation—if youth organizations become merely adjuncts of Communist education—the boys and girls of today will grow into godless Communists of tomorrow.

I accuse the Warsaw Red government of wholesale seduction of the young, the most diabolical of crimes against Poland. Talk about Herod's "Slaughter of the Innocents." Here in our time is a greater infamy. Herod's sword killed infant bodies—but the hammer and sickle strikes down children's souls.

CONSTRUCTIVE STEPS TO STOP TERRIBLE WRONGS

However, lest our gathering today be only an indignation meeting, let us, as businessmen, consider some practical and constructive steps to stop these terrible wrongs.

Our natural inclination is for quick action because Communist control in Poland increases every week. There are certain measures which we can adopt at once. But I should be a cheap rabble-rouser, kidding the public, were I not to warn of the formidable road block to the immediate establishment in Warsaw of a government truly representative of the people's choice.

Because of current international tension, any unilateral effort by the United States government to oust the Polish Red regime would be regarded by Moscow as a direct attempt on Russian security. The threat of force by Washington might result in war—and the temper of the American public is against measures that encourage war.

But Washington can express its disapproval of every tyrannical act of the Bierut government and this opposition may influence Warsaw to change its course.

BEWARE LEST PIPE OF PEACE IS OPIUM PIPE

A genuine settlement of the differences between Washington and Moscow, of course, would pave the way to a solution of the Polish problem. But before we smoke the pipe of peace with Stalin, we must be sure that we are not offered an opium pipe, beguiling us to ruin with dope fiend dreams that fail to materialize.

If, however, we continue to wax strong and to increase the prosperity and the military strength of the free world, the time may come when Moscow will alter its attitude.

We have many bargaining points, including goods which Russia and her satellites require. Despite the iron curtain, the latest figures show that in the first quarter of this year, our total exports to Poland and Danzig were valued at more than $28,000,000. This total is larger than our total annual exports to Poland and Danzig in 1938, the prewar year.

AMERICANS FEEDING POLISH CHILDREN

The Warsaw government was invited to share in the Marshall plan but refused. Despite this rejection, Poland will profit by the European recovery program in the sale of Polish coal to Austria.

The United States has extended large financial aid to Poland since the war. For example, credits of $40,000,000 for the purchase of locomotives, coal cars, etc. in 1946, and $50,000,000 more for the purchase of United States surplus property in Europe. America furnishes the lion's share of the United Nations Children's Emergency Fund which is distributing milk, cod liver oil, and fats to 700,000 undernourished Polish children. Our share of UNRRA given to Poland was more than $300,000,000.

Were the present Communist-imposed barriers to trade lowered by Warsaw, the United States could help the Polish people even more. Any final settlement with the Soviet Union would imply restored intercommunication between Poland and the West.

POLAND'S CASE BEFORE UNITED NATIONS

Thereafter, should domination by the Warsaw Communist government be continued and it became unmistakingly clear that a majority of the Polish people were seeking to overthrow such a dictatorship, the basic question could be brought before the United Nations by Washington—or any member state—under chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, the articles referring to "action with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression." Mere ventilation of the issue might result in remedies.

Such a pattern is an over-all strategic plan. If we do not quit in our efforts to save Poland, the day of her salvation may come sooner than we expect.

In the meanwhile we should continue to champion the real Poland through measures which even now are at our disposal. Your own organization is one vehicle that can be used in the mobilization of American public opinion and in the action which can stem from that course.

Persuade your acquaintances to support the Polish-American Congress. Righteous indignation can become a wasted force unless it is harnessed to organization. The Congress has the know-how to effectively educate the American public to the truth and the experienced personnel to promote Poland's cause.

GROUND UNDER PRUSSIAN BOOT

As Polish-American businessmen, act as muzzled Poland's unofficial ambassadors in your home communities. Write letters to your State and national government officials on your office stationery acquainting them with Poland's case.

Present the arguments for Poland's claims to the restored provinces, explaining the importance of their agriculture and industry in strengthening the economy of Poland so that it will never again be a door mat for either Russia or Germany.

Warn the pro-American sentiment among Poles abroad can be chilled if German industry is revived without proper safeguards for Poland, France, and Belgium. For these lands twice within a generation have been ground under the Prussian boot and their people dread a repetition.

URGE THAT THE TERROR BE STOPPED

Caution Washington against engaging in top level negotiations with Moscow that ultimately do not guarantee the end of Russian interference in the affairs of Poland. Urge that unfettered elections be held, that the terror be stopped, and that the four freedoms be granted.

Do all this, not as Poles, but as Americans, earnest in your desire to make certain that our own country, the United States of America, leads the world to peace through freedom and justice and righteousness.

Moreover, everything which you do as businessmen to advance American free enterprise strengthens the United States. An America weakened by management-labor disputes, unwise economic policies, and another depression could not help the rest of mankind. But so long as we are strong, there always will be hope for the captives behind the iron curtain.

As economic factors are of such importance, you, as businessmen, are among the most powerful forces on earth to make this old world free.

LISTENED WITH AN ACHING HEART

My fellow Americans, I know how long and how much you have suffered. In my Boston office I have listened with an aching heart as my Polish-American neighbors have told me of their anxieties about loved ones overseas whose fate is unknown. I have sat with Polish-American clergymen who are torn by anguish over atheistic Communism's threat to the coming generation.

I realize how disappointed you sometimes must feel when you observe such great American effort to keep Italy and Greece from going Communist and so little done to release Lithuania and Poland from Red bondage. But every step taken anywhere to block communism and to strengthen the free world also is an advance along the road that eventually leads to Warsaw.

My friends, keep up your courage by visiting the historic shrines of Philadelphia. Go out to nearby Valley Forge, where George Washington in the darkest hour of the American Revolution prayed for divine support. His prayers were answered. Go down to Independence Hall to the Liberty Bell. If you listen closely it will ring again—for you. It will chime your fathers' national anthem: "Poland is not lost."

Community Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. Herman W. Steinkraus, president of the Bridgeport Brass Co., before the National Conference on Community Improvement:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I think if we got no more out of this conference than the thrilling speech which Mr. Branch Rickey just made, it would make the day very well worth while. I was very proud that I and my whole family are Dodger fans and Red Barber fans, but we have the most profound respect for one of the great exponents in this country of clean sport and manly living, Mr. Branch Rickey.

I am an industrialist. I come from an industrial State—the State of Connecticut. We're rather proud of that State as an industrial State. One of the sets of figures that has always intrigued me is one that our former Governor, and now Senator, Raymond E. Baldwin, was so happy to give during the war. The State of Connecticut, he said, is forty-sixth in area among the 48 States. It is the third smallest State. It is thirty-ninth in population. During the war, however, it was eighth in total war production, and first in per capita war production in the United States.

Now, I'm supposed to speak on the subject of how community planning affects business and industry. That is an extremely important matter to business and industry in our section of the country. New England is an old section of the country. I'm sure that in the early days when the settlers came to New England, they didn't think much about planning for high-speed transportation or for conditions when large-scale production would be the order of the day, because New England was mostly known for its small industries.

Settlers gathered along the river banks and built small dams. They set up a little power wheel and made all sorts of things which history tells about. Today, New England has some very severe problems of community planning. And I might say also we feel the competition of you westerners who have great community plans, and who every once in a while come up there to old New England and steal one of our good industries because of the inducements that you can offer due to the fine plans you have in some of the western and some of the southwestern States.

That's all right. We like to see the New England gospel spread all over the country. We have a great people up there, and a little leaven for the rest of the country is probably good.

This matter of planning and the value of planning is becoming more and more recognized everywhere. And a point in which I wholeheartedly concur is, that the closer this planning is to the grass roots, the more sound it is apt to be. It is desirable of course to coordinate and that is the value of the organizations such as you are developing here, of coordinating these plans, of passing on the good information from one community to another.

Basically, I think that American people are learning more and more that the essence of a strong country is strong communities. Give us strong towns throughout the United States—self-reliant people who get together, iron out their differences and set up a plan which is sound and you will have a sound nation. But no matter what may be done on a national level, if this work is not translated into the real work on the local level it cannot possibly succeed.

American industry in my judgment is no stronger than American communities. No business or industry can be prosperous or successful if it is in a community which is failing and which is bad. That is how basic I believe the matter of community strength and sound community planning is to American industry. American industry is no stranger to community planning.

As you well recognize, there have been many attempts made by industry itself, to build communities. Some have been successful, but by and large I believe it would not be a false statement to say the experiment has not been good. But we have such communities as Hershey, Pa., which was quite successful. Shawsheen Village was built by the American Woolen Co. many years ago; Kohler, Wis., and many others that you may recall.

By and large these experiments, however, have failed largely for one reason. It was because there was a certain amount of paternalism. And red-blooded Americans don't live well with anything which dominates their living even though it may have been done with the most munificent purpose imaginable. But that does not mean because industry has failed to do as good a job in those cases where it has tried that industry isn't very closely linked in, and must be linked in to any community planning.

As I said before, no company can be really successful in an unsuccessful community. That's a pretty broad statement, and you might challenge it. Why is this so? Well, in the first place, a community that is not very successful is not apt to have very good housing, not very apt to have very good schools. It is likely to have little or no recreational facilities. Therefore, any company which wants to grow, and which must build its future growth on the kind of men that it can attract to that company, finds it impossible to bring capable executives to a community which does not have civic spirit, and have forward looking ideas.

Furthermore, even the working force, in a community which has a lack of forward looking spirit, is not apt to be as efficient and as much on its toes as the working force in a community which is going ahead. Not so many years ago, I rather doubt whether companies considered these things. There was a time when companies moved to cheap towns to get cheap help. They never succeeded. Those companies which have the best help, the best paid help, the happiest help, have learned that they also have the best products and the lowest costs.

That was such a great discovery that many, many companies did not believe it was possible that higher standards of living, more comfortable homes, and all the things that go with a fine community, really did not make the product cost more, but actually made it cost less.

As Mr. Rickey has just said, "true sportsmanship is a matter of honor and not honors", so the matter of a successful company is linked very closely into the honor, the standing of the community in which it is located. A good community with a fine forward looking plan attracts good citizens—attracts good people who have pride and ambition to make that community even better; And as they come, they take part and help to build the community.

Industry can also make a great contribution to help build the community. Industry certainly cannot be the passive one who gets the benefit of the planning that others may do. I'm happy to say there are many evidences throughout the country of the great change in attitude of industrial leaders toward taking leadership in local community planning. Increasingly they are learning that a company cannot live in a community without becoming an integral part of that community.

As many large corporations grew and had plants all over the country, and transferred their men rather frequently from one plant to another, some of them for a period of years felt that those men should not link themselves too closely in the community because they might be transferred out. In recent years that idea has been found to be wrong, and increasingly, large corporations are encouraging their local managers

to become closely linked up with the planning of the community.

You will pardon me if I tell you about a little planning we did right in the city of Bridgeport which is practically a 100 percent industrial community, and incidentally we have around 35 different nationalities in our community, so the problem is perhaps a little more difficult than in some communities where you have a hundred percent American born and English speaking people. Near the end of the war, we realized we had a tremendous problem ahead for that community. It had grown terrifically—the number of people who had come into the town from surrounding small villages and even from New York City, had overflowed the town's facilities of every kind. And many of them had indicated they liked Connecticut. It is a beautiful State, and they wanted to stay there.

The community had a real problem. Beside that we had a very large number of veterans of war service who were coming back. The Bridgeport Chamber of Commerce, formed a postwar planning council of which I happened to have been the chairman. We divided our council up into a number of committees. One of these committees gained national fame as did this Omaha committee which Mr. Hopley told us about. It was the committee which organized our veteran's center. You may recall the Life story on the veteran's center in Bridgeport.

That committee was created to avert difficulties that had been experienced after the First World War. Then for example, veterans' organizations vied with each other, promising returning veterans all sorts of help to get themselves reestablished, but largely for the purpose of membership drives. We did not want that to happen again. After the First World War, Bridgeport, Conn., had bread lines. It was a disgrace. During the First World War, Bridgeport had unfortunate strikes. During the Second World War, Bridgeport was free of those things, and it was largely due to the planning.

The veteran's center was organized by the combined efforts of all of the agencies in the community. The municipal officials, all of the veterans organizations, the Red Cross, the leaders of all of the hospitals of the community, the heads of businesses, the chairman of the industrial relations departments of the various plants, a group of about 150 which organized a program.

We bought an old mansion in town to set up as a center, and before we were through we had 18 different departments in that one home with an expert in charge of each. A veteran could come there after he had been discharged, and get every kind of assistance. We had a banker there, paid by the bankers, to advise him on his financial affairs; had a real estate man there to help him on his getting a rental. We had every kind of expert that that veteran could want. We had a group of special people to check his aptitudes; we had men representing the educational system to help him choose the right kind of a career.

The result was that our veteran's center was so successful we embodied it in our Community Chest program with a substantial budget, and eventually, because of its success, we had people sent from other sections of the country who were problems in their own communities to have our veteran's center give them a look over and see whether they could find the right solution for individual problems. And the Federal Government paid us a fee for that which helped carry our budget successfully.

I do not want to go into too much detail as to the various programs that were made for the plans of that city, but I do want to say that I am a confirmed believer in community planning. And it doesn't take a lot of experts to do it. It takes public-spirited citizens who will get together and learn about such things. Your chairman said I live in the little town of Westport, which is a town of 10,000. We have a planning council there. And I am happy to say that it is making plans of substantial value to the community.

I want to speak, however, for a moment, on one other point before I close. All of the planning for communities must not be done on the basis of the physical lay-outs of the community. Too often, people think that community planning is solving the parking problem—we all admit that is a tremendous problem—or straightening a road somewhere, or putting certain restrictions on it.

The social and cultural side of a community, however, warrant a great deal of consideration in a program such as your organization is undertaking. I am happy to say that such experiments as have been made along that line by industry in our section of the country have had gratifying results. I will mention three or four of them as illustrations.

The matter of recreation came up, and we had no decent place in this industrial community for a good recreational program. We had an old armory, I don't know how many years old, and it was idle three-fourths of the time. Some industrialists went to the State legislature, and asked: "Will you permit us to fix up the armory, clean it up, put in some more safety doors, and so on, put in some bleachers, and permit us to use the armory for sports on those nights and those days when the National Guard isn't using it?" The assembly approved the bill.

We worked closely with the National Guard, and today, way beyond anything that we had started with in the way of basketball teams between different industrial concerns, we have developed a center for large gatherings of from three to four thousand. Boy Scout jamborees are being held there; the various racial groups are putting on their own kind of parties and displays over week ends, and it has become a social center for any large type of gathering. It was all made possible by industry.

Then some thought we should have our own symphony orchestra. And where better to start it than in Bridgeport where we have plenty of community spirit. So they did. And among those things which Bridgeport industry has done, has been the underwriting of some of the concerts. Particularly did industry support certain concerts on which the dress rehearsal in the afternoon was made open for the children. Thousands and thousands of school children in Bridgeport have had their first chance to get the benefit of hearing an orchestra play symphony numbers through the help of the Bridgeport industrialists. What's more, the director always went out of his way to show the children just what all the different instruments are and just what they sound like individually, and I want to tell you they got a great thrill out of it.

The past winter was pretty severe, and yet in the coldest of weather and the deepest of snow those children couldn't be kept away from those rehearsals on the afternoon of the symphony concerts.

I could talk at further length, but I think I ought to stop. If I have given you any conception at all of how I feel regarding community planning and its effect upon business, and industry, as well as how business and industry can help in community planning, then I will have felt it was worth while coming.

Facts Relating to My Congressional Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

JUNE 17, 1948.

Mr. B. MCCOLLUM,
Heth, Ark.

DEAR B: Your recent letter with reference to my service as your Representative is most appreciated. It pleases me to set out some of the facts that relate to my congressional service.

I have supported all legislation coming before the House to build up the defenses of the Nation. I remained at my post of duty while Congress was in session during the war years, to the end that this Nation would be safe from attack. I served on the Military Affairs Committee during these years. It was my view then, as it is now, that a strong America is necessary and essential to the maintenance of peace and the perpetuation of liberty and freedom. I was glad to have had a part as a member of the Military Affairs Committee during those perilous days in helping to frame some of the most significant legislation for the security of the Nation. I supported reciprocal trade acts legislation.

Having served on the Veterans' Committee of the House, I have stanchly supported all legislation for the benefit of the veteran as well as for his widow, orphans, and dependents. I was the author of a bill which provided preference to veterans in the purchase of surplus supplies. This legislation was enacted into law. I voted to increase the rates of compensation to the surviving widows, children, and dependent parents of deceased veterans of World War I and of World War II. I supported the terminal leave pay legislation which paid terminal leave bonds in cash. I have appeared before the Board of Veterans' Appeals whenever I have been requested to do so by any veteran residing in the First Congressional District.

I have consistently supported the Dies committee and its successor, the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I worked for the passage of the anti-Communist proposal, known as the Mundt bill.

I have labored tirelessly for high support prices for farm commodities and for soil conservation in all its phases. I was one of the sponsors of the Agriculture Research Act, which is most beneficial in finding new uses for cotton. I have been commended by rice producers and rice millers for my efforts in connection with maintaining a good price for rice. My every energy has been exerted in the interest of rural electrification and its expansion.

I was successful, with the assistance of the whole Arkansas delegation in Congress, in the passage of H. R. 2665, the Gathings bill, which saved Arkansas' seventh seat in Congress. This bill bore my name since I was a member of the Census Committee of the House at that time.

Tirelessly have I worked for flood control and drainage projects in the alluvial valley of Arkansas. These projects, in which I appeared before the Flood Control Commit-

tee, where the projects were authorized, and for whose construction I subsequently urged the Appropriations Committee to provide funds. These projects include the White River Levee from Augusta to Clarendon. I have urged the appropriation of funds for Mississippi River levee work, which project is now under construction and about thirty percent complete. I have appealed for appropriations for Big Slough and New Levee St. Francis drainage district in Clay and Greene Counties. The project is now under construction and about 99 percent complete. I have obtained the passage of a resolution for the investigation with a view to determining the need for the construction of a river terminal at West Memphis, which, if built, would reduce freight rates throughout Arkansas and the Southwest. The report is substantially complete. I passed a resolution through the Flood Control Committee for the investigation of the need for flood control on L'Anguille River. The report was favorable and I have appeared before the Committee, requesting authorization for its construction. These efforts have been rewarded as the L'Anguille project has just recently been approved by Congress. I am at present working on the flood control project which has been approved by the United States Army Engineers along the St. Francis River in Cross and St. Francis Counties and on Big Lake in Mississippi County. I am at present urging favorable action by the Army engineers on the project known as Cache River and Bayou De View.

I introduced a bill to provide that certain cooperatives should be required to pay Federal taxes on profits earned. This legislation is intended to place competitive businesses, operated for profit, on the same footing and be subject to the same taxes. This bill would not tax cooperative farmers' associations where a group of farmers banded themselves together for the purpose of buying needed supplies to be used in crop production, returning the savings to the individual members of the cooperative. Neither would it apply to savings of cooperative associations, organized for the purpose of marketing their commodities.

I supported the recovery program and the appropriations to make it effective. I felt that it was necessary to pass the Marshall plan in order to stop the spread of communism in western Europe. The vote on this measure came a few days after the fall of Czechoslovakia and the ultimatum to brave little Finland. The program also provided an export market for cotton and other agricultural commodities.

I strongly supported the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act to establish industrial peace and give the American working man many rights which he had not enjoyed under the National Labor Relations Act, as well as to set up machinery for the settlement of strikes and to prevent labor-management disorders.

I am glad to hear from you at any time and on any subject.

With sincere best wishes, I am

Your friend,

E. C. GATHINGS.

Let's Have Real Unification of Our Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in this period of international unrest, I am deeply concerned that the unification law has not put a stop to the struggle between our armed services. As the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Lodge, so accurately stated during a recent discussion on the floor of the Senate: "The (air) controversy is passed to the Congress and we are thus required to pass judgment on a technical dispute between professionals. It is utterly preposterous, and would be comical, if the consequences were not so dangerous."

This responsibility is not new with the Congress. For many years we have heard and passed judgment on controversial military issues which should not have passed unsolved from the Military Establishment.

In the past year, two civilian boards have been commissioned to study national air policy. Each of these groups was confronted by the same obstacle. I quote from the President's Air Policy Commission:

> The strategic plans and requirements which we have been discussing were received by us from representatives of the Air Force and Navy. These are independent statements of each of the Services and give no effect to the consolidation of functions and savings which must be made to result from the National Security Act of 1947.

The Congressional Aviation Policy Board concluded in part:

> The Board has endeavored to learn the air requirements of the Navy and Air Force in accordance with a unified plan of action, but no such plan has been agreed upon.

The Congress had hoped that, by this time, the Unification Act would have brought about teamwork between the services and a uniting of their heretofore separate programs. In this respect, the unification is yet to succeed.

We were told that the Key West conference had resolved major disagreements. Yet I have been able to detect no visible change in any military program established prior to Key West. Recent congressional hearings have disclosed that the Joint Chiefs of Staff do not agree on development of the supercarrier.

On March 26, 1948, Secretary Forrestal made the following statement at Key West concerning functions of the services:

> Thus, in illustration, the Navy would not build a large carrier on the basis of its contribution to strategic air warfare. On the other hand, it might not be able to justify the carrier solely on the basis of its naval function, but a consideration of its purely navy function plus the contribution which it could make to a strategic air mission might be enough to warrant its construction if so decided by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Note that Mr. Forrestal said "might be enough to warrant its—the 65,000-ton carrier—construction if approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff." But the Joint Chiefs have not approved the carrier and Congress has been asked to appropriate money for its construction.

In furtherance of these unilateral military programs, the Congress is being subjected to service-slanted propaganda similar to that which characterized the unification controversy.

As a case in point, Mr. Speaker, I cite an article which appeared in the May 10 issue of the Buffalo Evening News, under the authorship of a Naval Reserve officer named Richard Essex. It is a matter of regret with me that the distinguished Representative from New York [Mr. COLE], saw fit to have this article inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The article clearly reflects a biased viewpoint and represents a vicious attack against the United States Air Force and the role of land-based air power. The record must be put straight.

The Essex article charges that pressure applied by the Air Force has muzzled the Navy, thereby preventing the Navy from presenting to the public full facts concerning its achievements in the Pacific war. I have looked into this matter and am convinced that nothing could be further from the truth. Members of all services have appeared before various committees of the Eightieth Congress and were given ample opportunity to express their views freely. To allege that the Navy has been muzzled is to impugn the integrity of the officials who testified under oath before this body. It has been my impression that all services were quite outspoken during these hearings.

The Essex article also states:

> The Air Force has for 3 years conducted a vigorous propaganda campaign to identify itself as the exclusive proprietor of American air power.

Members of Congress, having listened to the lengthy debates on unification, are aware that all services agreed to the Navy's having its own air arm. The Air Force did not agree, however to the Navy's building a long-range air force, in competition with the assigned mission of the Air Force. This is the heart of the present controversy.

In reviewing testimony before Congress and before the Finletter and Brewster committees, I find that during the past 6 months, the Navy has increased its program from 8,000 planes to 14,500 planes, including over 9,000 first-line combat planes of the Regular Navy. The latter figure exceeds by 2,100 Air Force requirements for first-line combat planes for the Regular Air Force. The Navy visualizes the 65,000-ton carrier as a launching deck for long-range jet bombers carrying atomic explosives. There is a growing conviction that this program constitutes an incursion into the field of strategic air warfare and there is a mounting concern over the Nation's ability to build and support two competing air forces.

The following is extracted from testimony of May 17, 1948, before a subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee:

> Mr. HESS. Admiral, as Chief of Naval Operations are you in a position to tell the committee what your plans are for a future air force of the Navy insofar as planes and carriers are concerned?
>
> Admiral DENFELD. Well, of course, the mission of the Navy is to have the necessary carriers and naval aviation to perform any mission that the Navy is given by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. At Key West it was agreed that in carrying out these missions that the Navy would be authorized to attack targets, inland or otherwise, in carrying out this mission.

It is also believed that the naval aviation should carry out whatever missions they were asked to perform to further the over-all air effort and that, of course, will be decided by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Therefore, in our plane program we hope to have sufficient planes, and we considered that 14,500 were sufficient at the start of any emergency to carry out any mission which we might be called upon to perform.

The facts are, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that in the absence of a jointly approved plan of strategy, the Navy is building an air force to carry out any possible mission which they might be called upon to perform, including strategic air warware. The extravagance of this type of planning is self-evident.

In order to justify this extravagance, invidious comparisons are being made concerning the ability of carrier and land-based aircraft to do the same job. I have seen many statements of this kind. The Buffalo Evening News article, by Richard Essex, makes the following statement:

United States carrier aviation in the Pacific war had a far better record against the Japanese air forces than did our land-based aviation.

Mr. Speaker, the Navy's war record in the Pacific is admirable, and no issue is taken with it. It is a proud record, acknowledged by all. It can stand on its own without belittling the equally proud records of other services. The carriers did a superb job, along with other elements of our armed forces.

However, when it comes to determining the future composition of our armed forces, we must, in the interest of survival, assure that the Congress is presented a fair evaluation.

The Essex article makes the following statement:

Our carrier air force established air supremacy wherever it went.

In considering this bold statement, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote a few passages from an official document published by the United States Strategic Bombing Survey and prepared by its Military Analysis Division, entitled "Air Campaigns of the Pacific War":

The landing (Guadalcanal, August 1942) was made under carrier air cover, though our carriers were forced to retire southward the night of 8 August due to the presence of enemy land-based aircraft in the area.

Even though our carriers were within 150 miles of the action at the time, no attempt was made to attack the enemy task force on the following morning. The enemy land-based air threat to our own carriers, if they entered the area, and the fact that there were no carriers in the enemy force—whose presence would have justified risking our own carriers—undoubtedly influenced the decision not to attack with our carrier force on the following morning (p. 19).

The Battles of Coral Sea and Midway and numerous other engagements around the Solomons had demonstrated the vulnerability of the carriers to air attack, and had further demonstrated the relatively limited capacity of carriers for sustained operations. Following these engagements, the Japanese aircraft carriers, less their air components, had been withdrawn to Truk, November 1942, and from there to the home islands for refitting and remanning. Meanwhile United States carriers, after the Battle of Santa Cruz Island in October 1942, had as a general practice kept well out of range of land-based enemy aircraft (survey study, p. 25).

On the afternoon of 25 October the Commander of Task Force 77 notified the Commander in Chief, Southwest Pacific Area, that his escort aircraft carriers had been seriously crippled by air and surface attack, that there had been no fighter cover for Leyte on that date, and in some cases none for the escort aircraft carriers, and that the escort aircraft carriers' maximum effort had been expended in defending themselves. He further stated that apparently a large number of enemy aircraft had been flown in and that it was of the utmost importance for land-based aircraft to be flown into Leyte immediately. Original plans had called for land-based aircraft to be operational and take over the defense of Leyte on 5 November. However, due to the inability of the Seventh and Third Fleets to break up the enemy air opposition—which was taking heavy toll of our destroyers and escort carriers in suicide attacks—Fifth AF P–38s were flown into the area on 27 October, just as soon as the Tacloban strip could take them. At 1600, 27 October, the Fifth AF assumed the responsibility for the air defense of Leyte and for air support to the surface forces—with a total of 33 P–38s. By 31 October all carriers of Task Force 38 had been withdrawn toward Ulithi.

The 33 P–38s had been built up to 66 and this force of landbased AAF fighters, 6 days after arrival, had established local air superiority (survey study, p. 39).

The loss of air superiority in the area prior to the arrival of land-based fighters was not due to a rebirth of Japanese air power. Actually, of the thousands of enemy aircraft in the Philippines at the time, only a small number were operable. Enemy aircraft sorties in the Leyte area averaged less than 100 per day during the critical period of the Leyte operation. The enemy's adoption of suicide tactics increased the vulnerability of our carriers and to this was added the damage inflicted by the Japanese surface fleet. The air power of the fleet, being dependent upon the floating airbase, found itself unable to reassert a sufficient degree of air domination.

It is significant to note that, at Leyte, our carrier air forces for the first time in the Pacific War endeavored to maintain air superiority in the proximity of a land mass suitable for the basing of an effective land-based air force, and that, despite the low order of combat capability to which that opposing land-based air force had been reduced, it—the Japanese land-based air force—still retained the capability of forcing a more powerful concentration of airpower, far excelling the defender in combat capability, to an early withdrawal from the battle area by reason of a fundamental and controlling factor—the high vulnerability of the carrier base (survey study, p. 48).

The Essex article charges that the "AAF progressed slowly."

The survey study states on page 45:

Carrier strikes against Japan proper had little, if any, effect on the opposition encountered by the Twentieth AF over Japan. B–29 attacks had been started 8 months before the first carrier attack and had been going on successfully since that time. Here again was clearly shown that a high degree of air domination had to be achieved before a fleet might approach land masses with impunity—while a lesser degree of air domination permitted air attack with an acceptable loss rate.

It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress would dignify, by insertion in the RECORD, any article presenting an evaluation of the role of air power in the Pacific which fails to even mention the B-29s. Testimony before the Congress indicates that B-29s dropped 146,000 tons of bombs on the Japanese mainland as compared to 6,760 tons dropped by carrier aircraft. In this connection, I would like to quote from page 4 of the survey study:

In the later stages of the war, while our full-scale amphibious invasion force was being readied, our long-range bombers, based 1,500 miles from Japan and outside the operating radius of her land-based aircraft, carried sufficient tonnage of bombs to Japan to destroy her principal cities and industries and to convince her leaders of the futility of further resistance. Japan surrendered because her intact home army could no longer protect her people from destruction by air attack, even though it should repel the surface invasion.

Continuing his attack against the United States Air Force, the Essex article states:

Carrier air power established air superiority more quickly and at far less cost than did our land-based air forces. Carrier air power carried our air offensive forward more rapidly than did our land-based air forces.

The survey study, page 20:

The defeat of the Japanese Naval Air Force in the New Guinea-Rabaul-Solomons area, predominantly by land-based aircraft, but materially assisted by carrier-based aircraft, was the most significant result of this phase of the war. This action insured not only local air superiority, but our air domination of any area in which only Japanese Naval Air Force units would be encountered during the balance of the war.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the above passages which I have extracted from an official Government document will serve to expose the bias and inaccuracy of the Essex article. This type of one-sided presentation reminds me of the following statement made by Stalin on the occasion of a VJ-anniversary commemoration in Russia: "Here again the Soviet people and the Soviet armed forces victoriously concluded the war against imperialist Japan." No mention was made of any other nation's contribution to this victory. The official Soviet war movie showed only Red officers signing for the Allies.

The controversy over "who won the war in the Pacific" has been going on now since VJ-day. Reams of statistics have been presented, showing who sank the most ships and who destroyed the most aircraft. This program of propaganda is becoming extremely tiresome and offers nothing constructive.

The war in the Pacific required the employment of all Allied air, sea and ground forces, and their supporting Services at home and abroad. It is idle to speculate which of these forces contributed more to the defeat of Japan, since any future enemy will present an entirely different problem in time, space and weapons. Those men who died to carry out the will of a united country need no service insignia to honor their contribution. Those who lived to see the victory they helped make possible are eagerly awaiting the time when our Services start working together in a unified effort to insure our freedom. No single force and no single weapon defeated Japan. She was conquered by the United States, and in a broader sense, by the united nations.

The present controversy over the carrier closely parallels the old fight over the battleship. The Navy once contended that the battleship would remain the primary weapon of naval power, and

that it could not be sunk by aircraft. Time and the Japanese Air Force declined to honor this prediction during the fateful month of December 1941 at Pearl Harbor and off the coast of Malaya. Today, the battleship has been relegated to a back seat and the carrier is called the spearhead of naval power. The old term "sea-power" has now become "air-sea power" as the Navy enters the realm of air power. There being no opposing fleets to threaten us, the field of strategic air warfare becomes of primary interest. But carriers, like battleships, can be sunk. As one of our most experienced generals stated before the Senate Military Affairs Committee in 1945, "The carrier has two attributes—one attribute is that it can move about, and the other attribute is that it can be sunk."

The Finletter Commission, in recognition of the danger of individual Services advancing their own interests, made the following statement:

We view with great anxiety the pressures from many sides directed toward the maintenance of yesterday's establishment to fight tomorrow's war; of unwillingness to discard the old and take on the new; of a determination to advance the interest of a segment at the sacrifice of the body as a whole. All this is understandable, for it comes in large part from loyalty of each Service to its traditions. But we can no longer afford the waste it involves. Hope rests only with the ability of the Secretary of Defense under the President to discharge effectively the authority vested in him, with one objective in mind—the maximum in security for the minimum in cost. It is imperative that this be done; for unless it is, we will not have a military establishment capable of defending the country.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, may I quote the final paragraph of an article from a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor by Roscoe Drummond. In my opinion, this paragraph accurately states our present situation:

It is not the purpose of this column to assume lightly to judge whether the Navy or the Air Force should be built into the prime offensive force of the Nation's defense. But what needs to be seen is that if the United States doesn't look out, instead of making the mistake of trying to have two adequate air forces, it will end up by so dividing its funds and production that it won't have one adequate air force.

Secretary Marshall Is Not the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Felix Morley appearing in Human Events.

This article proves again how far we have gone toward the totalitarian concept of government in our State Department.

SECRETARY MARSHALL IS NOT THE GOVERNMENT

(By Felix Morley)

On June 9, Secretary of State Marshall announced that the Government of the United States "approves and accepts" the recommendations of the London Conference for the disposition of western Germany. His announcement was made almost casually, at a routine State Department "news conference."

It is not unlikely that these recommendations will prove to be the nearest thing to a peace treaty with Germany that will ever be written. They commit the American people to undertakings of indefinite duration and far-reaching importance. Under the London Agreement, announced on June 7, the United States becomes morally obligated to apply "necessary enforcement measures" in Germany on the majority decision of a new International Authority where American representatives will have 3 out of 15 votes.

Very few Americans have any idea of what this new arrangement is, or how it came to be made. While the text of the undertaking is available, it has received only summary attention in most of our newspapers. Editorial comment, judging by samples at hand, has been both superficial and misleading. For this the press is scarcely to blame. Currently there is a stern competition of news items for available space. And the Department of State has made no attempt to emphasize the significance of the undertaking which Secretary Marshall has personally "accepted" in the name of the American Government.

There are two major reasons why the Department of State is tacitly underplaying the news in this extremely important development, in spite of the huge propaganda machine which this department has built to influence public opinion at home, and to carry what is euphemistically called the Voice of America to the far corners of the earth.

In the case of the pending agreement for Germany the Department of State is publicity shy because—not for the first time—the Administration is completely bypassing the United Nations in a manner scarcely consistent with the obligations of membership. The second, and more important, reason for aversion to publicity in this matter is that the Department of State is also playing fast and loose with the Constitution of the United States.

II

At his news conference on June 9, Secretary Marshall was asked whether he had considered the constitutional implications of his decision to accept the London Agreement, in the name of the Government of the United States. The Secretary replied that he had not consulted any lawyers in the matter. It is to be assumed that he has President Truman's approval, but that is not enough.

Certainly it might have been embarrassing to take legal opinion, since the political objective is to put this agreement into effect as quickly as possible, and since there is a very strong case for the argument that this agreement is a treaty between the United States and other sovereignties. If so, it must have congressional approval under that part of Article II, Section 2 of the Constitution, which says:

"He (the President) shall have power by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

The London Agreement of June 9 covers a lot of ground, with the purpose of establishing in western Germany an independent federal republic to which the areas under Russian occupation might eventually adhere. But from the viewpoint of international law the most significant part of the arrangement is the proposal to establish an "International Authority for the Ruhr," the great coal, coke, and steel producing area which for a century has given Germany most of its economic strength.

As released by the Department of State, the recommendation for this new International Authority is textually as long as the general communique to which it is attached. The annex concerning the Ruhr is the tail which wags the dog. It contains 12 sections, of which Nos. 2 and 3 indicate the magnitude of the step which Secretary Marshall has now approved, in the name of the United States.

"2. The International Authority shall be composed of representatives of the United States, United Kingdom, France, Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, and Germany.

"3. The International Authority shall take its decisions by majority vote. The United States, United Kingdom, France, and Germany shall have three votes each, and the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg one vote each."

Admittedly there is room for debate as to what is and is not a treaty. But if the above arrangement among the United States and five other sovereign powers is a mere executive agreement, then it must be said that there is no longer any such thing as a treaty and Article II, Section 2 of the Constitution has become a dead letter.

There is much evidence for the belief that elimination of the treaty-making power of the Senate is one objective of State Department policy in this matter. Many appointed officials of that Department have long been restive under the restraints on personal government imposed by the provision for obtaining senatorial "advice and consent".

III

It is interesting to note the different procedures followed in Great Britain, France, and the United States in the effort to establish the London Agreement as a matter of national policy.

In Great Britain, the Foreign Minister, Mr. Ernest Bevin, kept the Prime Minister and Cabinet fully informed during the 6 weeks of diplomatic negotiations. When agreement was reached, by the normal procedure of discussion and concession, it received Cabinet approval. Then the agreement was submitted to Parliament for inquiry and examination. Full opportunity was given the elected representatives of the people to accept, to modify or to reject the program to which the executive had given approval.

The same democratic procedure operates in France. There, in addition to Cabinet sanction, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the Chamber of Deputies had to be consulted before submission of the agreement to the popular Assembly. Foreign Minister Bidault observed on the floor of the Chamber, on June 11, that "the agreement is not definite until it has been approved by Parliament".

The American system of government is unquestionably less democratic than that of either Great Britain or France. The Constitution of the United States does not provide that international agreements made by the executive arm be submitted to the House of Representatives for approval. But for that very reason the provision for securing the "advice and consent" of the Senate is the more important.

So it appears that Secretary Marshall was grossly exceeding the constitutional prerogative of his office in accepting the London Agreement on Western Germany in the name of the Government of the United States. Without the consent of the Senate, as was promptly pointed out by Senator Taft and others, the Secretary of State has no authority to bind the country in this manner. This appointed official may and should recommend approval of a treaty in the President's name. But the President cannot

himself adopt a treaty, and no treaty agreement adopted in this unconstitutional manner is binding on the American people. That should be clearly understood in Europe.

This argument, of course, has nothing whatever to do with the merit or demerit of the particular proposal. Much could be said for, and much against, the actual provisions of the pending London Agreement. But the primary issue is a matter of constitutional government. To deny this is simply to deny authority to our republican institutions.

IV

There is an underlying moral in all this. The moral is not new—it has merely been forgotten by the men who have run the United States for the last 15 years. They have come to believe that the end justifies the means. And in this case the end is merely to escape somehow from the ghastly tangle in which the doctrine of personal government has involved the United States.

It is now almost 3 years since President Truman went to Potsdam and made an unbelievably stupid agreement for the disposition of postwar Germany. Under the wartime powers of the President, and as a result of the unconditional surrender policy, Mr. Truman had the power to turn half of Germany over to Russia. But the possession of power did not make that action wise.

In addition to this inept division of Germany the President of the United States authorized a fantastic policy of vengeance, industrial dismantling and general ruination for that part of Germany which was not handed over to Stalin. Three years of this policy has done more than destroy what was left of Germany. It has also ruined all Western Europe, which must now be subsidized indefinitely by Americans.

The outlook is so bad, and the results of the Roosevelt-Truman policy of personal rule so disastrous, that the Administration belatedly realizes it must completely change the direction of its German policy—with a minimum of delay. To do this it must simultaneously placate the French, whose narrow and intransigeant nationalism is not adverse to the utter destruction of Germany, so long as they can count on the American taxpayer to stand the cost involved.

Because it has become hopelessly entangled in the alien politics of Europe the Truman administration seems to feel that it must now scuttle the Constitution of the United States, as the only quick way of escape from the mess of its own making. To reveal the sordid picture as it is, in an election year, would be politically disastrous.

Secretary Marshall is not the culprit. He is merely attempting to hold together a policy for which he is not responsible. Many a good soldier has gone down courageously in an unsavory cause.

Farmers and Their Spokesmen Endorse Congressman Marion T. Bennett's Record

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, one of the most heartening and pleasant experiences I have had as a result of my 6 years in Congress is the warm appreciation expressed for my work on behalf of agriculture by the farmers themselves, and their recognized spokesmen.

This is especially encouraging to me because I have the honor to represent a congressional district which is important in an agricultural way. I like to think that the farmers of my district realize I understand their problems because I have come from a long line of Missouri farmers and have knowledge of their case as it relates to legislation. I am not a farmer. My training has been in the law and government service, which is the best preparation for a congressional career. But, a Congressman's previous occupation is not too important. What is important is his education and his determination to be fair, and courageous, and whether he is youthful and vigorous enough to do the hard work. Missouri's late Champ Clark (Democrat), Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, put it this way:

A man has to learn to be a Representative just as he must learn to be a blacksmith, a carpenter, a farmer, an engineer, a lawyer, or a doctor. It is an unwise performance for any district to change Representatives at short intervals. A new Congressman must begin at the foot of the class and spell up. The best rule, it seems to me, is for a district to select a young man with capacity, industrious, honest, energetic, sober and courageous, and keep him here so long as he discharges his duties faithfully and well. Such a man will gradually rise to high position and influence in the House. His wide acquaintance with Members helps him amazingly in doing things for his constituents.

The farmers of my district, in every county, have given me increasing majorities at each election. They wouldn't want a Congressman who had a one-track mind or experience or education in only one field. They realize that the complex questions now before Congress require a broad education, experience and understanding of many things. The business, labor, and other interests of my district are also important. The 6th Missouri Congressional District was, on one occasion, called by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch "the most typically representative district in Missouri." Yes, our interests are diversified. Even our farming is diversified. It is no easy task to learn how to represent all these interests in such a way as to promote the prosperity of all without hurting some. But, that's what I have tried to be, a Representative for all the people, not just the farmers, not just the businessmen, union men, professional people, or housewives, but all the people. The purpose of this statement is to summarize how the farmers feel I have served them. They are entitled to such a report on my record.

On June 11, 1948, I received the following letter from the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the United States House of Representatives, Hon. CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of Kansas:

DEAR MARION: I want to express to you my appreciation for your cooperation with the Committee on Agriculture throughout your service in Congress. This has been most helpful in promoting the prosperity of our farmers and gaining for them legislation of sound and lasting benefit. The Agriculture Committee has recognized the merit of legislation you have sponsored to help the farmers and has favorably reported it. You have demonstrated to the committee and to Congress your keen understanding of the farm problem and your willingness to cooperate with farmers and their spokesmen to help solve it. Every farmer in your district, I am sure, knows this, to judge from past election returns, but you can quote me as saying that I am sure no Congressman from Missouri has, can, or will do more than you, for the farmer.

It has been a source of great satisfaction to me as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture to know that in the consideration of any legislation involving the farmers of this country, you could always be found on the farmers' side. Further, the suggestions which you have made to me concerning the long range program and other important legislation have been most helpful.

It looks now as if the 81st Congress would have before it many matters affecting agriculture, and I am certainly counting on your aid and assistance in working out those problems in such a way as to be of the greatest benefit to those who live and work on our farms.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Cordially yours,

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,

Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, United States House of Representatives.

Shortly before his death recently I received an unsolicited letter from E. A. Trowbridge, dean and director of the College of Agriculture at Missouri University, Columbia, Mo. He says:

We appreciate your interest in agriculture; in fact, with you, we think agriculture, not only in your district but all over the State, is basic to the welfare of the State.

I have always enjoyed the fullest cooperation with the University and the confidence of the County Extension Agents, from whom I have received letters. These county agents are not in politics but hold public positions. For this reason I would not want to embarrass any one of them by quoting their letters. But any farmer can inquire for himself of his county agent whether or not I have cooperated with him at every opportunity.

It has been a pleasure to help farmers of my district with their individual problems as well as to help them in a general way by voting right on farm legislation. Recently I received the following letter from Mr. J. O. McCullough, Route 2, Richards, Mo.:

Received your kind letter today and want to thank you for your kindness in helping to remove one of my long-time worries, the matter of farmers feed loan. This has been hanging over my head with threats of dire things that would happen to me if I could not raise the cash. I feel very thankful for this help and if an old lifelong Democratic vote will do you any good when the next election arrives, and I am still able to get to a voting place, please rest assured you will get my vote.

I was a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Legislation which wrote the so-called GI bill of rights, or Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. This, among other things, provided for the on-the-farm training program, which has been of great benefit to thousands of veterans. Typical of letters I have received from these veterans is the following from Clark L. Parscal, Route 2, Schell City, Mo.:

I want to thank you for your help in getting me into the on-the-farm training school. I started October 1st and am grateful for all the trouble you went to.

One of the things I helped accomplish in Congress of great benefit to rural Missouri, was to get an authorization and appropriation to establish a forest research center. Typical of the letters I have received for that effort is one from Hugh Steavenson, Director of the Agricultural Bureau of the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce. He says:

We are especially delighted that, largely through your good efforts, a forest research center for Missouri has been approved with an initial allocation of $30,000.

Other letters I have received on the matter of helping forestry, include ones from Col. E. M. Stayton, chairman of the State-wide forestry committee of the Conservation Federation of Missouri, and from the director of the Missouri Division of Resources and Development.

Forests are one of Missouri's greatest but most neglected natural resources. They occupy some 19 million acres, about 43 percent of the total area of the State. Thousands of people in our State depend on forest products for jobs. Due to this legislation for which I have been given credit, the wealth and prosperity of Missouri and her people will increase, especially in the rural areas. It will be a boon to conservation of our soil and to small business.

I have received numerous letters from officials of the Farm Bureau Federation and from the Missouri Farmers' Association, too many to quote here. Typical of these letters is one from W. T. Crighton, manager of the M. F. A. Producers Creamery Co. at Springfield, Mo. He says:

Through the rush of business, we oftentimes neglect to express our sentiments to you on important Washington matters. But, we have a feeling that you understand our position in most of these matters and in view of our confidence in your good judgment, it may appear that we are somewhat indifferent in giving you the proper support on important issues.

You can be assured that we know your work meets with approval of the farmers, small-business men and a large number of the union members of your district, outside of the radical C. I. O.

Numerous individual farmers, known and unknown to me, often identifying themselves as Democrats, have written me. Here are some typical examples:

"Just a note to let you know I am pleased with your good work. Stay in there and pitch for the farmers."—E. C. Kerr, route 1, box 10, Brookline, Mo.

"We appreciate the good job you are doing for us in Congress, and the integrity with which you carry out your responsibilities."—Sylva J. Hood, Walker, Mo.

"This is to indicate my approval of your opposition to organized pressure groups. I am a farmer and I think a sound financial condition in our Government is most important to all citizens in the long run. Economy is the only way to this end. Farmers of America are more interested in their country than they are in a Government check from the Washington politicians who seek to buy their votes with their own tax money. It is true that some professional farm leaders and politicians oppose economy in government if it applies to them. They are like the professional labor leaders who don't want labor legislation, or the nontaxpayers who don't want tax reduction, or the brass hats who want our Military Establishment operated in peacetime with the same extravagance as in war. I know the pressure that must be on you from all sides. But, rest assured, that while the average farmer does not take the time to write his Congressman that he is willing to do his part to see government expenses reduced, the budget balanced, the debt scaled down and taxes slashed. More power to you."—Conley Harmon, Odessa, Mo.

"May I thank you for the good work you are doing for the farmers. We won't forget it when election time comes again. You certainly were a wise choice on our part."—C. H. Fuller, Route 4, Lamar, Mo.

"While I have never met you personally, I am for you and your work 100 percent. You are the farmer's true friend."—L. H. Dunn, Nevada, Mo.

"I want to thank you for the good things you are doing for the common man and the farmer and for the open-minded judgment in which you conduct yourself as our Congressman. I only wish we could get more men in Congress like you. From a Democrat supporter."—Luther C. Dameron, Holden, Mo.

"Please be advised that I am and always will be one of your farmer friends. I know you are doing a great job up in Washington, against adverse conditions."—Paul Tremayne, Route 1, Brighton, Mo.

"I want to thank you for the great work you are doing as our Representative in Congress. You are the best Congressman we have ever had, so far as the farmers are concerned. And, we farmers all know it."—P. J. Mayer, Montrose, Mo.

Mr. Speaker, I have had a lot of other letters, making favorable and specific reference to my efforts to save the rich agricultural bottom land of our district from the ambitions of the Army engineers to destroy it with lakes, from the packing plant managers and livestock commission men who approve my votes on meat inspection, from those approving the millions of dollars I have obtained, to match State funds, for the building of rural roads, and many other matters. In closing I want to make reference to the letters I have had about REA and dairy farming.

My congressional district is the greatest dairy district in the State. There are 154,000 dairy cows in the Sixth District and within a radius of 75 miles of Springfield there is a daily milk production of three and a half to five million pounds, making this area the greatest milk producing area of comparable size in the United States. The Census Bureau reports that dairying provides the total cash income on 17,936 farms in the eleven counties of my district. In addition, there are 26 milk manufacturing plants in the district, producing butter, cheese, and so forth. The 25,866 farms that sell dairy products in my district, realize an annual cash income of around $12,000,000. I have fought for the dairy industry against the oleo lobby, with its highly financed pressure campaigns. I spoke on the floor against the oleo tax repeal bill and paired against it on the roll call. I shall not go into all the arguments on this question here. I think I have said enough to indicate that, whether you agree with my position or not, I was representing my district, which is largely based on a farm economy and the dairy industry is perhaps the biggest part of it.

Letters I have received in appreciation for my fight for the farmer on this issue are enough to fill a book. They have come from almost every dairy farmer in the District and from employees dependent upon the numerous milk manufacturing plants. They have come from not only individual dairy farmers but from the county agents, from H. E. Klinefelter, editor of the Missouri Farmers' Association newspaper, The Missouri Farmer, and from Warren W. Fuqua, public relations director of the Missouri Farm Bureau Federation.

Finally, now, about the Rural Electrification Program. This program came to a standstill during the war because of manpower and materials shortages. It has moved slowly since the war because materials are still short. But, it is picking up speed. Congress has provided it each year since the war with more money than it has been able either to allocate or spend to extend lines to the farms. For the 1949 fiscal year we have provided it with over $400,000,000 which is over $100,000,000 more than the President requested. I have supported the REA program and voted to give it more money than it has been able to spend. This might look like I have gone overboard on the subject but I know how important it is not only to the convenience of a farm family but to its prosperity and thus to the prosperity of my District and country. This is not money down the rathole. These are government loans which the locally managed and owned cooperatives pay back. When and where the lines are built is decided by the REA and not by Congress, which simply provides the funds for approved projects. Many constituents have written me about getting lines extended to their farms. I have no authority on such an individual problem but have taken many of these cases up with the REA managers. These managers have not been handicapped by lack of money but by lack of materials. Since I have been in Congress I have voted for appropriations from which about 20,000 farm families have already received REA service and thousands of miles of lines have been built in the Sixth District. These appropriations which I have supported for my District total in excess of $13,000,000. That is a record to be proud of, and I am proud of it. My constituents know of it and approve it. Here is what a typical one says:

"Your interest in REA for us is far beyond our expectations but very greatly appreciated."—Mr. and Mrs. Lewis Leaton, Knob Noster, Mo.

Here is what some of the REA cooperative managers say:

"Allow us to commend you on your recent remarks which I picked up over KWTO, relative to continuance of rural electrification. As manager of one of the Missouri cooperatives, I say your attitude is truly an expression of our people."—L. N. Speight, manager, White River Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc.

"I know of your outright support of the REA program. Your support is of great benefit to the farmers, and I am sure they will continue to support you wholeheartedly in the future. I am a native of the Springfield area, and have a kind feeling for the progress of your work in Congress. Wishing you the greatest of success."—P. G. Wingo, president, Ozark Border Electric Cooperative, Inc.

The following statement was the concluding paragraph in a two-page report on my activities in the House of Representatives, on behalf of REA, as put out in March 1948, by the "REA News Reel," publication of the West-Central Electric Cooperative, Inc. which serves Johnson County, in my Congressional District. The manager of this cooperative told his patrons and those who are signed up for future service:

Let's give Congressman MARION T. BENNETT our backing to see that such appropriations are increased in accordance with the needs of the program. I believe that it is due to Mr. BENNETT that each and every one of you as member users or applicants awaiting service, write a few lines to him in appreciation for his efforts. I would like to say, personally, that we appreciate Mr. BENNETT's efforts very much.

The Present Situation in Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following declaration of my friend, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor, World Affairs:

THE PRESENT SITUATION IN SPAIN

THE BACKGROUND

It is impossible to understand the reactions of the Spanish people today if we forget the serious nature of the civil war. Spain had more than a million casualties between July 1936 and April 1939. The figures for religious killed have often been published and number over 7,000, among them 12 bishops. These Spanish figures are impressive when we remember that during the French revolution only 17,000 lost their lives.

Such a catastrophe would leave marked reminders in any country. In a nation where passion is known to be traditionally violent, where the intensity of hatred and the desire for vengeance left by conflict is very strong, only a government with great authority can maintain order. Any move to unleash this passion would be to start a new period of violence and crime in Spain.

The situation of the Spanish Government, therefore, should not be judged as one would a normal government in peaceful circumstances. The conditions within Spain and the difficulties created by European international affairs require a long-range and exceptional measure of authority and a moderate limitation of liberty. It has been stated that in the United States, after a civil war, the political rights of a good part of the population affected by the war were suspended. This temporary suspension of civil liberties is never a denial of fundamental rights nor is it a doctrinary definition in itself, but is only an indispensable medical treatment applied to an ailing body and spirit.

At bottom the movement which brought the present government into power had its origin in the disappearance of law in Spain. A significant act caused the explosion. Spain was subjected to a period of violence. The statistics given in the Cortes by Mr. Calvo Sotelo are well-known and cover churches burned, private homes assaulted, persons assassinated. The list is impressive. But the immediate cause of the civil war was the murder of the leader of the opposition. At 4 o'clock in the morning, a government truck drove up to his home carrying police and members of the respected Civil Guard, to which the peace of the country had been entrusted during both the monarchy and the republic, as it still is today. Accustomed to the violence of the time, and reassured by the sight of the Civil Guards, Mr. Calvo Sotelo did not resist them, for he believed he was to be arrested. During the trip through the streets of Madrid a police officer fired a shot point-blank into the back of Calvo Sotelo's head. Shortly afterwards, his body was left at the gate of a cemetery.

The crime showed that the country had ceased to be governed by law. If the most outstanding man among the parliamentary opponents of the government was killed in such a manner, could less important citizens rely on the government to respect their lives and personal rights? This thought and its natural effects and the majority of Spaniards realized they must resort to force as law had officially ceased to exist. It was at this moment that a good part of the army—not only one general as it had been said—rose against the government and was supported and encouraged by numerous members of Parliament and large masses of the citizens.

Notwithstanding these difficulties, Spain is in the midst of an evolutionary political process which would have been more rapid if the unfortunate pressure of certain countries and some foreign political groups had not made even a semblance of compliance impossible to the great majority of Spaniards, who remain loyal to national honor and independence. The Spanish State has a bill of rights which underscores, as its guiding principle, the respect of the dignity, integrity, and liberty of the human person, and recognizes man as bearer of spiritual values and as member of the national community. The Spanish State is a Catholic state, but no one is molested because of their religious beliefs or in the private exercise of their cult. These facts are defined in the same terms and subject to the same conditions as under the monarchy before 1931. All Spaniards have a right to participate in public office of a representative character, through the family, the municipality and the syndicate (without barring other representation that the laws may establish). All Spaniards may hold office and public functions according to their merits and capacity and may freely express their ideas so long as they do not advocate the overthrow of the fundamental principles of government, and the inviolability of correspondence is also guaranteed. No Spaniard may be arrested except in the cases and in the form prescribed by law. Nobody may be condemned except under a law prior to the act, under sentence by a competent tribunal.

The Spanish charter includes social rights and declares that all workers will be protected by the state in their right to a just and sufficient return. The Spanish state recognizes and protects private property and declares that in no case will a sentence of confiscation of property be passed.

Social insurance for old age, death, sickness, maternity, accidents, family subsidies, are established by law. The antituberculosis program, infantile paralysis—prevention and cures—and unemployment relief are also covered by these laws.

The fundamental legal structure was submitted to a national referendum on July 6, 1947, in which all Spaniards were free to vote. Out of a census of 17,000,000 electors, 3,000,000 voted "no" or abstained; 14,000,000 votes were favorable. Impartial and competent foreign observers stated that balloting had been both secret and free.

Foreign newspaper correspondents are subjected to no censorship measures since 1944. A curious point, little known in the United States, is the fact that approximately 90 percent of the news published in Spanish newspapers on international affairs comes from a United States news agency.

It is useless to insist on the fact that Spain was neutral during the war. Ambassador Carlton Hayes' book on his mission in Madrid during 1942-45 gives a clear and complete picture of this theme, and he shows how in certain aspects Spanish policy favored the United Nations.

United States Seizes Hoodlum Ricca

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following articles which appeared in the Chicago Tribune of Thursday, June 17, 1948:

UNITED STATES SEIZES HOODLUM RICCA—REVOKE PAROLES OF FOUR GANGSTERS, CONGRESSMEN DEMAND—MOBSTER ORDERED BACK TO PRISON FOR HEARING—HEAVY SPENDING, FAILURE TO LIST IT CHARGED

BULLETIN

Application for a writ of habeas corpus for the release of Paul Ricca was filed in Federal district court yesterday afternoon by attorney William Scott Stewart. The application, printed and apparently prepared long in advance, also includes Phil D'Andrea, Charles Gioe, and Louis Campagna, paroled with Ricca, as petitioners.

Paul Ricca, one of four Capone hoodlums turned loose by the Federal Parole Board last August after serving one-third of a 10-year sentence for extortion, was arrested at his home yesterday by deputy United States marshals on a warrant charging him with parole violation.

He will be returned to a Federal prison to be designated by the United States Attorney General's office, to await a hearing at the prison by the parole board to determine whether he is, in fact, a parole violator. If the board concludes that he is, then it might, in its discretion, revoke his parole.

BOARD MEMBER SIGNS WARRANT

The warrant on which Ricca was arrested was signed by Fred S. Rogers, a member of the Federal Parole Board, and was transmitted to United States Attorney Otto Kerner, Jr., for execution.

Kerner said that the warrant was based on information resulting from a Federal grand jury investigation of the release of the four hoodlums, and on an investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Thus far, no charges of parole violation have been lodged against Ricca's three companions in the wholesale parole, Louis (Little New York) Campagna, Charles Gioe, and Phil D'Andrea.

REPORTS INCOMPLETE

Kerner said the warrant charges Ricca with failure to make full and true written reports to the supervisor of parole, including detailed reports of income and disbursements, and of associating with persons of bad reputation, and refusing to reveal the source of money used to settle the government's compromised income tax claim against him prior to the granting of his parole.

Specifically, the warrant is based on reports of an elaborate reception in a Chicago hotel after the wedding of Ricca's daughter last January 24th. On this occasion, Kerner said, Ricca is reported to have settled the $12,000 bill for the wedding supper with $100 bills, and this amount was exclusive of the orchestra, flowers, and champagne. Champagne for 600 guests is reported to have cost $4,000. Ricca's reports to the parole board made no mention of such expenditures, although he is required to submit accurate reports of all income and disbursements as a condition of his parole.

MONEY DROPPED ON DESK

The charge in the warrant relating to Ricca's refusal to disclose the source of the money used to settle his compromised income tax debt was reflected in the testimony before a congressional subcommittee by Eugene Bernstein, one of Ricca's attorneys, that the money he used to pay the claim was dropped on his desk in large bundles by men he didn't know.

Bernstein at present is under Federal indictment on a charge of conspiracy to falsify government records in connection with visits he made to Ricca and Campagna in prison, accompanied by Tony Accardo, who was handling syndicate affairs in the absence of Ricca and his three fellow convicts. Accardo signed the name of a Chicago attorney to the prison register.

The marshals, who found Ricca at his home, 814 Lathrop Ave., River Forest, took him to the county jail where he will be held until he is returned to prison.

Until the indictment on charges of extorting more than $1,000,000 from the movie industry, which resulted in his prison sentence, Ricca had been called "the army and navy for Nitti." Frank Nitti, former leader of the Capone gang, who was indicted with Ricca and the others, committed suicide.

PROBE STILL ON TO UNCOVER FULL TRUTH

(By James Doherty)

WASHINGTON, June 16.—Without objection the House Committee on Expenditures today adopted a report stating that the Federal paroles of four Capone gangsters of Chicago, Paul Ricca, Louis Campagna, Charles Gioe, and Phil D'Andrea, were "improvidently" granted and should be revoked. The committee consists of 25 Members of Congress, 10 Democrats, 14 Republicans and 1 American Labor Party member. The chairman is Representative HOFFMAN (Republican of Michigan) and a Chicago member is Representative BUSBEY (Republican of Illinois).

The report summed up the history of the investigation of the release of the gangsters, HOFFMAN'S committee spent many months seeking evidence of corruption in the Department of Justice and, it was announced in the report, intends to continue the hunt because the full truth has not yet been told.

CHANGES SUGGESTED

Today the committee suggested a few minor changes in the report drafted by HOFFMAN. One Democratic Congressman asked that a sentence be included stating that President TRUMAN had no knowledge that his name was used in the gang prison delivery proceedings.

Representative HARDY (Democrat of Virginia) wanted a statement changed to show that Paul Dillon, attorney of St. Louis, Mo., and old associate of Boss Pendergast of Kansas City, Mo., had "boasted" of his friendship with President Truman. It was Dillon who appeared before the parole board in behalf of the Chicagoans.

As requested by HARDY the report as adopted said "he (Dillon) boasted at the Chicago hearings that he was a personal friend of President Truman, that he had managed the President's senatorial campaigns on two occasions, and that, when he came to Washington, he felt free to call at the White House without an invitation.

"He also stated that he had been on social, friendly terms with Mr. Wilson, chairman of the parole board, and that with his family had, on occasions, dined with Mr. Wilson when business called him to Washington."

ANOTHER CHANGE

Another change made this morning was in the vindication the committee voted to Harry A. Ash, former superintendent of crime prevention for Illinois, whose name had been bandied about in the investigation. As originally stated, Ash was the victim of a campaign to smear him. It was changed to discredit.

The committee decided that a large sum of money was used to get the paroles, but was unable to say how much.

The report stated that Attorney General Clark and the FBI were asked to help the committee investigate the charges of corruption, but that Clark and the FBI refused to give the Congressmen whatever information was obtained.

The story of the trial of the men on charges of extorting more than $1,000,000 from Hollywood motion picture producers, was told.

The denouncement of judge and prosecutor when the men were convicted was recited, including the past criminal records as given by the prosecutor when each of the men was sentenced to 10 years imprisonment and fined $20,000.

CLARK'S PAL NAMED

Details are given of the activities of Maury Hughes, Dallas, Tex., lawyer and pal of Attorney General Clark (whose home also is in Dallas). Hughes obtained a fee of $15,000 from "mysterious Mike Ryan"—a person whose identity still is unknown to the committee—for his services in having Clark's office dismiss a mail fraud indictment against the gang that would have been a bar to their paroles.

The Congressmen were critical of the statements of Fred S. Rogers and B. K. Monkiewicz, members of the parole board which freed the four Chicagoans as soon as it was legally possible—when they had served slightly more than one third of their 10 year sentences. The attitude of Daniel Lyons, who became chairman of the parole board after the men were freed, was termed "hostile."

Minutes of the interviews of the parole board members with the four convicts were given and show "the perfunctory manner of the examination conducted by the board."

RIPPED BY TRIBUNE

The report began with the statement that the four gangsters were permitted to return to Chicago last August 13. Then it continued:

"Because it was a matter of common knowledge in Chicago that these men were former members of the Capone mob and what was known as the crime syndicate, the Chicago Tribune and other Chicago newspapers bitterly denounced the granting of the paroles and called for an investigation.

"To date, while the hearings we held have disclosed the use of considerable money and the employment of individuals in a position to exert influence with those in authority, the committee has been unable to discover any violation of Federal law.

"The hearings have not been concluded. The department of justice had refused to permit the FBI to advise the committee as to the result of its investigation."

The report stated that Superintendent Ash of the Illinois crime prevention bureau was called as the first witness because of a newspaper item saying he was in some way instrumental in the granting of the paroles. Daniel Lyons, newly appointed parole board chairman, led in the attempt to discredit Ash. A statement by Ash showed his records to be "beyond criticism in this matter," the congressional document declared.

CALLED FANTASTIC

Mention was made of the testimony of Attorney Eugene Bernstein of Chicago—who was indicted in connection with illegal visits to Ricca and Campagna in prison—regarding the source of money used to make a settlement of income tax liens against Ricca and Campagna amounting to $670,000. Bernstein characterized his own testimony as fantastic, the committee recalled.

That had to do with the story that numerous persons he had never seen before, nor since walked into Bernstein's office at various times and tossed large bundles of cash on his desk, saying "pay this for Paul (Ricca)," or "pay this for Louis (Campagna)."

The parolees themselves claimed not to know who furnished the cash, the report states.

Concerning the connection of Attorney Hughes with the release of the gangsters, the report stated:

"Some time before the paroles were granted, Maury Hughes, an attorney of Dallas, Tex., and a boyhood friend of Attorney General Clark, was retained by the parolees. It appeared that, before the paroles could be granted, it was necessary to secure the dismissal of the indictment alleging the fraudulent use of the mails and a violation of section 338 of title 18 of the United States code. * * *

"From the testimony, it is evident that Mr. Hughes was employed principally to obtain the dismissal of the (mail fraud) indictment, as well as to use his ability and influence in obtaining the granting of the paroles."

Regarding reasons for the revocation of the paroles, the congressmen said:

"The hearings disclosed that the parolees, with the possible exception of Gioe, had made false answers to question 6 carried in their applications (which asked the convict to set forth a record of his past arrests), in that they failed to disclose truthfully their previous arrests and the results of these arrests."

Numerous instances then were cited to show that the convicts had omitted many items of their past. The committee said there was no pretense that any of the four ever had been engaged in a legitimate business over any length of time. "No claim ever was made that any of the parolees had attempted to reimburse those they had defrauded," the report said and then mentioned testimony that they were habitual criminals who had obtained more than a million dollars in the crime of which they were convicted.

Regarding the parole board's "refusing for more than 7 months to take any action," the congressional finding ended with this question:

"Can it be that the same influences which caused the paroles to be granted in the first instances are still operating?"

The committee recommends that the parole system be overhauled and the board's policy of secrecy be ended.

More on State Department Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression that we had heard

the last of the art project of the State Department when last year, after spending many days investigating the project, I and others were responsible for Secretary of State Marshall recalling the paintings, many of them without question Communist and drawn by Communist artists. These are the paintings acquired at a cost of $49,000 of the taxpayers' money.

I have now learned that these same paintings, instead of being declared scrap and salvage and sold for whatever they could realize for them in the open market, have been declared surplus by the State Department and are being offered for sale on Saturday, June 19, 1948, by the War Assets Administration. By this clever method the purchaser, I predict, will receive a 95-percent discount of the price bid.

In addition, the War Assets Administration spent over $1,000 to have 7,500 copies of a catalog printed to advertise the sale of the paintings, to say nothing of the expense for help in addressing envelopes as well as the cost of the envelopes. Of course, I appreciate that the cost so far is only a small part of the expense. The real cost is the administrative expense of the men in WAA, who are required to conduct the sale and many, many conferences, plus the handling of thousands of inquiries through the mail. In other words, I do not hesitate to say that the actual money realized from the sale of these pictures will not equal the expense of conducting the sale.

Secretary Marshall should never have permitted these pictures to be returned to the United States at great expense and insurance, personnel to handle them, together with clerical and administrative expense.

At the present time the pictures are on exhibit in New York at more expense to the taxpayers. However, one must agree that this way of doing things seems to be consistent with State Department policy. The State Department should have declared these pictures salvage or scrap in Europe. Under the law they could have sold them for cash instead of bringing them back to the United States at great expense to sell them through the War Assets Administration at more expense, and for 95 percent discount on whatever is bid for them. This is an unwarranted waste of the taxpayers' money and a waste of manpower.

Up to this point I have been emphasizing the monetary situation. I sincerely believe the field of art would have been far better off if the pictures had been sold outside the United States in hopes they would never again get into this country. Yes, and the State Department and the War Assets Administration would have saved a great deal of expense and work, plus the realization of more money for the United States Treasury.

Now, let us take a look at the catalog. The information contained in the catalog is not only misleading but untrue. I do not blame anyone in the War Assets Administration for this because they had to rely on Mr. Lawrence S. Morris of the State Department and Mr. Parker, a director of the American Federation of Arts for their information.

On the face of the brochure advertising the pictures appears the following:

Catalog of 117 oil and water color originals by leading American artists.

It should have read, "Misleading American artists."

The very first line of the foreword reads:

The 79 oils and 38 water colors offered in this sale were assembled in response to numerous requests from both Europe and Latin America for exhibitions of American art, particularly paintings of the modern school.

This is a boldface untruth, because in my investigation of this project last year I discovered the fact that the so-called "demand in response to numerous requests from both Europe and Latin America" was created by what was known as an "Artcast" sent out to our various Embassies by Hannah Goldman of the Press and Publications Division, OIC, at the suggestion of Mr. LeRoy Davidson, who had purchased the pictures in the first place. Incidentally, Mr. Davidson resigned from the State Department right after I started my investigation last year and Hannah Goldman was fired along with the now famous first 10 who were let out last year.

As further proof that the statement contained in the first sentence of the foreword of the WAA catalog is not true, I call your attention to the fact that the paintings had been purchased by Mr. Davidson in the spring of 1946 and were shown at the Metropolitan Museum in New York City from October 4 to October 18, 1946. The Artcast sent out by Hannah Goldman was dated September 9, 1946, and all the numerous requests came back in response to the Artcast while the paintings were on exhibit at the Metropolitan Museum.

A great deal of the information contained in the catalog was lifted from a Memorandum on Art Program prepared by the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State dated February 18, 1947.

Mr. Speaker, I am thoroughly convinced we will never be able to correct conditions in the State Department, as well as other departments of the Executive Branch of our Government until we elect a Republican President and get rid of all the people who have had such a wonderful time squandering the taxpayers' money and praising Soviet Russia.

Warren Read, A Country Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a column from the Amador Dispatch written by Arthur Robinson in tribute to Warren Read, the editor and publisher of that paper, who died recently and unexpectedly. Arthur Robinson has caught and expressed as few writers could the deep sense of shock and personal loss Warren Read's friends and community feel on his passing.

YOUR TOWN—OUR COUNTRY—THE WORLD

WARREN READ

The Dispatch office was closed and there was a wreath on the door when Warren Read went by last Monday afternoon.

The presses and the printing machines and the linotypes on which his fingers had played so lovingly for so long were silent.

This was one story he couldn't cover.

Warren was dead.

I last saw Warren alive on one of those hectic nights before election when he printed a quick job of campaign material for us. My last words to him were: "Thanks, Warren."

I think this county owes him a lot, too.

In death we see the merits of a man in clear perspective.

Warren, of course, died happy.

He had worked hard—very hard—for a long time, and family and friends had tried to slow him down; but hours mean nothing when you love your work and there's still a string of copy to be set or a rush job of printing to be done. Good newspapermen don't measure happiness by the mere hands of a clock, or even the sun or the moon; and there never was a good newspaperman who didn't work harder than he should.

So Warren was tired at the end.

Very tired.

But he was happy.

He had done his job—as an editor—as a printer—and as a man.

There was, of course, nothing wrong with Warren's heart. That was just something the doctor said. The last issue of the Dispatch which Warren himself had put to press just before election day proved the soundness of his heart—and his courage as an editor.

Warren Read was a mild-spoken man, but he had much inner force and quietly asserted strength.

I think Warren died because he loved his print shop just a little too much; but of course, that's like saying a man can love his family and home too much. For the Dispatch was part of Warren's home; and, though the office and print shop were on Main Street and the house around the corner and down the street a way, they had a singular and dual identity and were connected and made one by Warren's love of both.

It was hard to tell where one began and the other ended. You were just as apt to find three generations of the family at the office as at the house—kids, bikes, dogs, dolls; and daughters, and sons-in-law, and friends and neighbors.

The office of William Allen White's Emporia Gazette was like that, too.

So when you didn't see one of the grandchildren, or any of the others, it simply meant that they were in another part of the office, or house, or print shop, or part of town; and that it was all like going from one room to another in a house of many doors and much warm, related humanity.

Earlier in the day the board of supervisors had met at the county courthouse and adjourned out of respect for Warren. On Main Street, stores were closed. Friends crowded the house and stood on the lawn outside.

Leo Scapuzzi sang The Holy City. Grace Wanzer accompanied him on the piano. The Masonic ritual was read. In the garden behind the house red poppies—Flanders poppies—bloomed in the fullness of spring; and across the street, like a celestial floral piece,

Chinese tulips hung in rich profusion from a great massive tree that Warren loved.

The Masons, wearing their ceremonial aprons, lined themselves on both sides of the walk that leads out of the house and down the lawn through the gate in the old iron fence to the street. It was hot and murky and a few drops of rain fell. In the stillness the birds sounded like an arboral choir.

Some friends carried the casket out of the house: Harold Tallon, the postmaster; Bill Tam, the movie-theater owner; Ralph McGee, Judge of the Superior Court; Mike Traynor, the novelist; Amos Seifert, of the Bank of Amador County; and Bud Huberty, of The Ledger.

Then came Warren's wife, Maude—gallantly. And Betty, one of his three daughters, and right hand in his work around the shop, and his left hand, too. Then the rest of the family. All gallantly, too.

Warren's death had been a terrific shock. He was stricken on election day and seemed to be recovering, with only a long rest indicated, when he died shortly before noon a week ago today.

But the paper came out. Babe Garbarini and Bud Huberty, of The Ledger, moved across the street into The Dispatch office after getting out their own paper and helped C. W. Rodebaugh, a printer who had come down from Stockton when Warren first took sick.

Warren knew before he died that Babe and Bud would help.

It's a good thing for any town when papers are friendly competitors in that spirit.

Warren was practically born in a newspaper shop. His father owned a paper in Middletown and Warren was setting type and handling a "stick" when he was only 13. He worked in the State printing office as makeup foreman for 15 years, and before coming to Jackson 21 years ago owned papers in Lakeport, Loyalton, and Sebastopol. He also worked on the Oakland Tribune for a year, and in Marysville.

It was always good to see a father-and-daughter combination like Warren and Betty working in The Dispatch office. And Warren was proud, very proud, of Betty's craftsmanship. He once told me he thought Betty could set a cleaner string of copy than any printer he ever knew.

For years on Saturday nights, and later on Sunday afternoons, Warren would shut himself up in the office and go through the old files and lovingly extract and rewrite items from the papers of 25 and 50 years ago for the feature he always printed in the same place in the upper right-hand part of page 2.

It used to take Warren about 4 hours to do that; but that was because he lingered and mused over the old files and had a grand time—especially when he uncovered a colorful or juicy item. The work, of course, really wasn't work. It was, rather, a ritualistic devotion; and I often passed the office while he was at it; but you respect a man's privacy and don't intrude when he's living some of his finest and most intensely personal moments.

And there was some old type that Warren had a special affection for—it had been hand-carved out of cherry wood with a penknife and a horseshoe nail by "Old Man" Penry, who owned and edited The Dispatch at the time of the Civil War. Warren had a perceptive zest for the early history of the county and local folklore, and I always regretted he didn't have time to write his own column, "Main Street Looks," more often than he did.

I think we can all understand how Warren felt on that proud day about 2 years ago when, after some preliminary tutelage, he let his young grandson, Dick Bierce, sit down to a linotype machine for the first time.

I wish there were some way by which we could let Warren know how we all feel about him now.

Maybe he does. A. R.

Staff of Committee on Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to express something of the appreciation I, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, feel relative to the professional and clerical staffs that have served so conscientiously and efficiently.

Chosen with the utmost care something over a year ago under the Reorganization Act, the professional staff have been of inestimable value. With their efficient help the committee has covered an incredible amount of work that could not have been done without them.

To all of them do I want to express my personal thanks for their very fine contribution to the arduous work of the committee in this Congress. Such expressions as these would be wholly inadequate without a word or two about the administrative officer of the committee, Boyd Crawford—quiet, calm, efficient, helpful. Mr. Crawford has been a tower of strength upon whom the staffs and the committee unquestioningly rely.

In due course, the Subcommittee on National and International Movements had delegated to it Dr. George S. Pettee of Hartford, Conn.

Dr. Pettee secured his doctorate at Harvard where he was instructor in government until he was taken over by the War Production Board in the Stockpile Branch. After this he served in the Office of War Information, Bureau of Intelligence, and in the Foreign Economic Administration, European Enemy Division until he returned to his teaching as associate professor of political science at Amherst, from which he came to the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the spring of 1947. Author of The Process of Revolution, in 1938, and The Future of American Secret Intelligence, in 1946, Dr. Pettee brought to the work of Subcommittee No. 5 a most valuable background.

This subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, undertook an exhaustive study of communism. A 60-page report, The Strategy and Tactics of World Communism, was released as a committee print and later made a House document available for purchase. With this report were included two supplements, one containing documentation of the report itself and one containing the protests made to the U. S. S. R. by the United States with correspondence relative thereto. Since that time further supplements have been printed, one The Coup d'Etât in Czechoslovakia, one Communism in the Near East, one a list of 501 Known Communists of Europe and Asia. Supplements on five other countries will be available during the coming months.

This exhaustive research project was most efficiently headed up by Dr. Pettee. Each study is the result of as fine a piece of cooperation of Government departments and recognized authorities as I have ever seen.

Our committee has taken very seriously it own responsibility to check each report and supplement as carefully as is possible. Members of the full committee whose specialized knowledge made their opinions and checks valuable have given generously of their time and help. But the major part of the work has been done by Dr. Pettee and it is a pleasure to me to thank him for the selfless work that has made this extremely important presentation of world communism possible.

American Taxpayers Finance Communist Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

MR. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of June 14, 1948, states that universities in the United States will be permitted to receive as Czechoslovak exchange students only those considered politically reliable by the Communist Ministry of the Interior equivalent to our police department.

Apparently—

Declares the New York Times—

what is meant by a reliable student is simply a Communist or communistically inclined student.

The article further adds that exchange students sent to this country from behind the iron curtain, "receive specific instructions before leaving to submit regular reports on the growth of Marxism on the American campuses they visited, the names of professors who show Marxist tendencies, factors opposing the growth of Marxism," and so forth. The New York Times concludes that the "information gathered by exchange students * * * is primarily for the use of the Cominform," formerly known as the Communist International.

I wish to take the opportunity at this point to enter into the RECORD a quotation from Igor Gouzenko's book, The Iron Curtain, which describes in great detail the actual reason for the sending of students to this country, from Communist-controlled areas.

THE IRON CURTAIN

(By Igor Gouzenko)

The much-discussed and much-written-about international exchange of students between foreign and Soviet Union universities was still another ingenious Red ruse for developing better trained spies. It was a made-to-order idea whereby young spies of tomorrow could actually be trained in the foreign countries they would eventually return to in spy roles under diplomatic guises.

I was particularly interested in this activity, wherein Military and Naval Intelligence, the NKVD, and Ministry of External Affairs were sending "students" to universities such as Columbia in New York. During my period as teacher at the foundry in Moscow I had to cultivate enough interest and basic knowledge of drawing and painting at the Chemko Art Studio to long for an opportunity to continue such studies abroad.

However, my inquiries about being given such a student assignment met only with frowns and vague replies. One day I was handed a message for ciphering that revealed more precisely just what was behind the exchange.

The message instructed a supervising agent in New York to impress upon Soviet students studying there that they were to appear as "nothing more than simple, harmless students" and never, under any circumstances, to admit any association with Intelligence.

"It must be impressed on them repeatedly," the order said in part, "that their primary purpose as students is to acquire an intimate knowledge of the language and, as far as possible, of the people and their customs. This will qualify them for subsequent use as Intelligence workers."

I have frequently marveled at the naïveté of American and Canadian newspapers in commenting editorially on advantages to be gained from extensive exchange of students between the Soviet Union and the Western democracies.

These editorials stress the international friendship and mutual understanding themes. To us Russians such suggestions seemed amusing because we knew the only reason for the Soviet's active interest in sending students abroad was to train future spies in the terrain where they would eventually have to work.

I met a number of such students returned from the United States to Intelligence Headquarters but soon learned not to question them about the merits of life there. Instructions on "talking" about such things had been too definite and frightening for them to loosen up, even confidentially. Anyway, before being allowed to go abroad you may be sure these students had been most carefully selected with an eye to the future.

Some foreign students had been accepted for study in the Soviet Union before the war, but they had been first investigated by Soviet agents in the country of their application. They had to be established Communists or sympathizers. They were constantly "guided" while in Russia, so that they saw only what would help make them even more eager agitators on their return home. Meanwhile, much publicity was given their presence in Russia and the implication was always contained, both in the Soviet press and by fellow travelers abroad, that such students were welcomed in large numbers. In reality, the total was never more than a handful. Many of them were used later as "contacts" during the war.

In view of the fact that this exchange program is costing the United States and its taxpayers huge sums of money which is actually financing a flood of espionage agents in our midst, it would seem to me that we have here another one of the suicidal ventures emanating from the Cultural Division of the State Department.

Fight, Give, Educate, To Make Democracy Live

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a most interesting and worth-while letter that is worthy of the attention and consideration of all the Members of Congress. The author of the letter has asked that his name be withheld in order that it will not appear that he is seeking publicity. He desires the contents of the letter to stand on its merits. The letter follows:

FIGHT, GIVE, EDUCATE TO MAKE DEMOCRACY LIVE

The Congress of the United States is in the midst of passing laws to draft the youth of the Nation to place them in Army camps for military training in time of peace. There are many against the measure as well as those that are for it.

For one to object to a measure that will not give us military strength for reserve in case of need is foolish thinking. I'm sure both sides will admit that Russia and all nations would not wish a war with its destructive forces that have set back their planning for years to come. But we in America do not wish to take chances. The argument for it is, "See what happened before." Yes, we all must admit we did not know the strength or the preparedness Germany was making, or Russia either. So it is true not to take chances.

But is it not true that we are taking chances with our democratic way of life, when we adopt universal military training. Is it not one of the very things along with religious freedom that our forefathers left Europe for to come to these very shores? Men were forced to serve time in armies of their countries.

Those in doubt in Congress have been forced to vote for this measure so as not to be caught in a situation such as last time when Mr. Willkie and Mr. Roosevelt were arguing this issue. Also for the lack of a better plan.

To say this Nation's manpower should not be ready, willing, and able to go to war when aggressors attack us is foolish but we are not going about it in the right manner in peacetime. This Nation never has been conquered and although outnumbered in many instances still came through the victor. For man that believes in "a free way of life, shall never lose that right." If this draft bill goes through we will be losing a peacetime battle.

In this Nation we have colleges in every State of the Union. Many need help and buildings. Would it not be far wiser to have the youth of this Nation in time of peace go off to colleges to get along with a college education in all phases of study and along with it a broader program than ROTC offers? The youth of the Nation would come home not only better physically fit and trained, but educated to fit themselves into better jobs and in many instances to newer and bigger fields than have ever been dreamed of before. The money spent will be an investment in the future of America and not like wartime boom places and camps put up to be later torn down. The investment in the buildings will be staple and ones that will increase the facilities in colleges in all of the States of the Union. Youth will gladly go to college without bitterness or feeling of force, realizing that this Government is giving them an education in dollars and cents that many of them could never afford, but more important a training to keep that free way of life defended at all times. Let that be our answer to Russia instead of all our criticism which we hear so much about. To build a larger army than Russia is not the way, it is the knowledge of mass production and scientific knowledge, too, that makes a great army. France found that out, that the Maginot Line, with all its fortifications and men, that lay there stagnantly waiting for something to happen did no good. Their morale was low.

Today, boys 14 and 15 years old are being trained in the public schools of Washington on the handling of guns and large dress-parade pictures dominate the local newspapers.

I realize there are many arguments against the plan I suggest but I have but one answer to those that criticize this plan:

The two finest institutions and colleges in the United States are at Annapolis and at West Point, where many of our great men have been turned out. There is no one that can argue against this manner of training the youth of this Nation but remember also it is education. To enter either of these two institutions you must pass with highest marks in an examination and added to that you must have a Senator or Congressman recommend you. Not all of the youth of this Nation are that fortunate.

These new institutions will be patterned on that idea and colleges that accept the grant from Congress try to work on that system. Give youth a campus life with all the fun and fraternalship that goes with it. Not having all these men taken out of civilian life to spend it in corner saloons or houses of prostitution and jails on week-end leaves. And in many instances filling the mental institutions that are overcrowded now.

To the Congressmen of the South (a section from whence I come and therefore know best) that are trying to write a segregation clause into any draft legislation, this plan will be a solution to your problem in the South. The better education the colored race receives the sooner this problem that has not been solved even though Mr. Lincoln and thousands of men died in a most bitter Civil War to defend that right, will find a solution to this most controversial issue. We of the South know that even though you may write into law segregation legislation, it will and justly so be fought out in the Supreme Court of this land and will be found unconstitutional.

The draft as planned will also drain from this Nation thousands of doctors that are badly needed and many that are in the process of finishing their education to become doctors. The health of the Nation must also be taken into consideration.

You will notice that I have not mentioned facts regarding the amount of money that will be required to set up draft boards because I did not feel it was as important as individual rights. The paper has stated that it will take approximately 60,000 officeholders at an annual expense of $40,000,000, a figure that is low in comparison to the last time such set-up was made. Could this not be eliminated and used to a better advantage, by the plan I have outlined, that can be added to and better planned by educators along with congressional leaders and military men? Thus, I'm sure that politics can be greatly lessened, segregation, and sectional differences ironed out, but more important, costly spending reduced.

General Eisenhower would be the most logical man for such position. I'm sure if he felt this Nation was in immediate danger he would not have stepped out of uniform to accept the position at Columbia University.

I'm sure the youth of the Nation that must leave their homes and loved ones, many their wives, have a right to a voice in their choice.

college military education (CME) or selective military training (SMT).

Their mothers and fathers also have a right, the same one they exercise, in voting for a President and at the same time the European way of life or Russian or the good old American way, so that they may vote, fight, give, and educate. So that democracy may live.

To you men of the Eightieth Congress that have valiantly spoken the truth against great odds against draft legislation, openly admitting along with the press that mass hysteria in both Houses will force this legislation through, brushing aside your speeches and many times eliminating your time that should be allotted with the remarks, "We know where you stood last time." In that manner persuading others against their better judgment. Openly thereby admitting that UN also is a failure with its power of embargo, financially as well as materially, to prevent the bankrupt nations from waging war against one another. I had the pleasure just 2 weeks ago to sit and watch it in action and I say it is not a failure, it is a solution to world understanding as well as world peace. It may have to go through a stage of all things starting, changes, but basically it is to the world what the Supreme Court of the United States is to us: The last and final word as to the constitutionality of legislation. It will eventually be enforced with a small army, navy, air force taken from all nations that are a part of it. A think that we too should at present take in consideration in building up these nations with our help, militarily as well as otherwise, those nations, of course, that not only show but believe in our way of life.

Senator TAFT has asked both Houses to adjourn in answer to President Truman's criticism, thereby letting the people give a vote of confidence in this next election. To you of the Republican Party I have this to say: It is your duty to write it in your platform so all the people can express their views on it. To those of the Democratic Party, you have been greatly divided, proving it by some of the legislation that has been written into it, also deep heartedly you are against it but you must not divide your party on this bill and are voting for it for that reason. This is one bit of legislation that party lines should not matter; but, more important, the homes and future lives of the young citizens that the President spoke about are going to take over the ruling of this Nation. If that was not a political speech and was one of sincerity, then I say you men of both parties must find it your duty to place it before that youth, as well as his mother and father, to decide. Even if this bill has been passed, it still can be changed by a popular vote in the next election to change it from SMT to CME training before men are inducted.

In this land majority rules on so vital an issue, not party.

Let's try to keep it that way.

Address by Hon. Frances P. Bolton of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered before the Advertising Federation of America on June 13, 1948:

Madame Chairman, members of the Advertising Federation of America, and guests, it is both a pleasure and a privilege to break bread with you at such a delightful gathering—to have opportunity to speak frankly with you who are such wholehearted advocates and builders of free enterprise.

What an overwhelming job you do daily showing the world how America lives! One has but to turn the pages of magazines and newspapers if one desires proof! Intriguing pictures of the luscious colored soft bath towels we take for granted, full-page ads of Lux and Ivory Snow to attract the eye even as one's ear is often tuned in to further competition from Rinso and other sudsings. Art on the page and gay songs on the air promising to do away with drudgery. Oh! It's a wonderful picture—so much of it true! And now education and all the implications of the pyramiding of babies fill pages in our newspapers calling citizens to action as nurses were called in the war days. There is no end to your accomplishments nor to your possibilities!

Yes—you have great power—great opportunity—grave responsibility—for America can no longer sit on the sidelines. She is right in the pitcher's box whether she likes it or not—and she got there because her way of life has capacities for power few had believed possible.

But unfortunately being strong doesn't get us friends—rather is it apt to build hatreds and suspicions. Somehow we must show the world that we have no desire to use this power against other countries. We must find ways to build fair competition on foundations of good will. No group is so well equipped to do a sales job such as this as are the advertising forces of these United States.

And no group has currently taken such a general rap for the carelessness * * * heedlessness * * * and failure of a company to recognize the responsibility placed in its hands. I refer, of course, to the recent revelation of the harmful Voice of America broadcasts that were made without copy clearance with a responsible authority. A singing commercial for chewing gum is more carefully prepared and checked. This regrettable fact of irresponsibility but increases our challenge to "show the world."

Is it an idle dream that we can "show the world" how we have what we have—the visible and the invisible as well—and how people all over the world may raise their standards of living as they free their hearts of the frightening, deadening burden of communism? Who can answer such a question better than you?

As a member of the Committe on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and chairman of a Subcommittee on National and International Movements, it has been my responsibility to be exceedingly realistic about the world to which, regardless of any reluctance we may feel, we must give leadership. Confusion and fear hang over every area, suspicion stalks every highway, hatreds thrive in the darkness of misunderstanding. It's a tough job—friends, but since when have Americans been afraid of rough going. Isn't it rather our way to follow the line, "It just couldn't be done—so he did it?"

To fail to examine the situation in which we as a world find ourselves would be the height of folly. Just a superficial glance shows us a terrific opposing force with its headquarters in the Kremlin, which for one hundred years has not deviated one iota from its goal: the communization of the entire world.

My subcommittee recently issued a report on The Strategy and Tactics of World Communism with supplements. This has become a House document (No. 619, 80th Cong., 2d sess.) and can be had by writing the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. Two supplements—one, a documentation of the report itself, and two, the protests of the United States Government since the war with related correspondence—are bound into the present reprint. Three others are ready for reprinting—one, The Coup d'Etât in Prague; one, Communism in the Near East; and one, a listing of some 500 well-known Communists in various countries, with still others in galley proofs.

These reports give an objective history of the ways and means used and show the skill with which the old idea that the end justifies the means is applied, and the undeviating purpose of their actions.

In studying these reports, as well as other portrayals of Communist method and growth, it becomes clear that we should differentiate between Russia and communism. Russia gave communism the most fertile soil in which to plant itself, but no thoughtful person can fail to realize that the mystically religious people of Russia will not accept permanently the controls of an irreligious group. Once one has this clearly in mind one sees that it is not against Russia that our faces are set, but against communism.

Moscow showed its hand clearly when the European recovery program was announced by reestablishing the Comintern under the name of Cominform. How they hold to the established line!—and what a line!

The fact that Italy's election went against them has not changed their determination—be sure of that. Of necessity it has somewhat changed their direction. The pressures now are on Germany and Austria, on Indochina and Kashmir. And whether we like to acknowledge it or not, pressures are being applied right here in our own country, often so well camouflaged that we do not recognize them for what they are. As a matter of fact we have been somewhat conditioned to unawareness, to a curious blindness. Yet this is not altogether strange when one considers that only a few years ago Roosevelt was saying over the air (July 28, 1943):

"The world has never seen greater devotion, determination and self-sacrifice than have been displayed by the Russian people and their armies under the leadership of Marshal Joseph Stalin. * * * With a nation which, in saving itself is hereby helping to save all the world from the Nazi menace, this country should always be glad to be a good neighbor and a sincere friend in the world of the future."

A very fine altruistic statement! But few nations would not do all these things when an enemy was at the gate of its inner sanctum!

And Winston Churchill in the House of Commons September 28, 1944, said:

"Profound changes have taken place in Soviet Russia. The Trotskyite form of communism has been completely wiped out. The victories of the Russian armies have been attended by a great rise in strength of the Russian state and a remarkable broadening of its views."

"* * * after all the Russian people have suffered at the hands of Germany, they are entitled to safe frontiers and to have friendly neighbors on their western flank."

Yes—if they understand that friendship, like cooperation, is a two-way street! Unfortunately the fundamental principles of the Communist doctrine preclude cooperation for they are based upon an unfaltering determination to control the entire world—a rather far cry from the friendly sounding "safe frontiers"!

That there has been a tremendous shift in this country in public opinion from that time no one can deny. Some have felt it too rapid, others too slow. Bitterness has entered in, but bitterness is only a byproduct and must not be mistaken for any constructive part of the necessary work of changing our national mind.

One aspect of this transition is the change in the assignment of values. For a time we identified Russia and to a degree communism, as good. Now the tendency is to change the label to bad. The danger in this shift is that we lose balance and let emotionalism be too large a factor. Another aspect is that whereas we were thinking of Russia as the important matter, we now regard communism far more critically important. It is imperative that we do this—for it is not Russia that is the crucial factor, it is the ideology we call communism. It is a doctrine, a movement with which we clash, not a country or a people.

Then there is a third shift taking place which can be expressed perhaps by saying we are going from confidence to fear, from a point where we thought we knew what to expect to a sense of surprise and dismay at a series of distressing developments.

To meet these surprises we have had to abandon the relaxation we felt the war had earned us, to renewed and new effort to mobilize our nervous energies. It is a little the way we feel as we're on the sofa reading at the end of a pretty strenuous day and we've just decided we're off to bed, when unexpected callers arrive and keep us up until all hours.

The most important change we must make is in our thinking, in our mental approach to the abandonment of a policy of appeasement to the assumption of a policy of resistance and counter attack.

In doing this we must remember that it will not necessarily be a right policy just because it will be against. It will be right only if it is skillful and wise, if it actually achieves the ends envisioned and intended. And that vision, that intention, must be free of hatreds and vengeance, bitterness and revenge. It must rest upon a deep certainty that because we have been privileged to attempt to set up and develop a way of life that aims to give all men an opportunity to be born with healthy bodies and sound minds, to have education adequate to the capacity of the individual, work in the same degree and a bit of sunshine and laughter scattered in, we cannot permit the gradual strangulation of freedom as we understand it by a small group that has set up the State as its god and uses men and women as tools to build more and more power.

There is great danger in this moment of transition. It is so easy to drift from the false direction of naiveté that has been ours as a nation to another equally false direction—hysteria, fear, even stampede or panic.

It is at this point that it seems to me every loyal citizen of America must be part of the guiding force, the steady and serene light. This means that we must find the courage that lies deep within us to look at the forces contending in the world with complete objectiveness and with a sight so keen that we will recognize them for what they are whether we see them in other lands or find them in our own. Just as there are many people in the countries being pressured by the Kremlin striving to retain their freedom, so are there people here in this glorious country of ours who are playing into alien hands and by fair means or foul are preparing the soil for Communist controls. Even a quick look gives evidence of deep infiltration into our schools and colleges and our endless organizations. And what a tragic evidence of dangerous unbalance is the hysterical pyramiding of Henry Wallace's followers, young and old.

But these evidences of danger are not causes. They are, in a large measure, results. Yes, they are the results of our own lack of vigilance on so many of the paths of our free way of life that we shall have hard going when the moment comes that we face up to them and go about correcting them. Criticism will get us nowhere; attempting to fix the blame, even less. Rather is this a moment when, having had the courage and the good sense to open our eyes and our minds to the unvarnished facts about us, we join hands and dig in.

You see, this ideology that we call communism must have certain soils to grow in. The soils I have in mind are not all material ones—nor are they necessarily entirely economic. Here especially, where people have had so much more ease than in any other country ever, the greatest danger is a spiritual danger, which would be no danger at all if we loved our wonderful country more fervently and showed it.

For more years than most nations have had, by the grace of Infinite Direction, of Infinite Wisdom, this country was protected by oceans and by the strength of a great seapower. We were able to concentrate upon one thing—our own growth. This we did. Then came a call to go out and slay the dragon—and by that same grace we went—and it was a magnificent going. Unfortunately few understood, few knew why. So when the battle was over we returned to our own shores as youngsters do when the game is done. And again we went forth and again the visible dragon was chained. And again few knew, and again we dispersed our forces and brought back our leaders, leaving the second string who had not participated in the greatest events and had a sense of frustration and ill will, to do their way. Almost in the twinkling of an eye we brought our boys home as unprepared mentally and spiritually for their return as they were when they went forth. Did anyone tell them the responsibilities they carried with them? Has anyone told them where they have been or even what the evil they contended with was and still is? And we had promised them everything. We who are parents know that it is bad to promise a child and not fulfill the promise.

So the boy came home and said to his love, let us walk hand in hand and have a family—Where, on what?—And bitterness enters into his soul—and he walks away. Perhaps on a nearby street corner he hears a voice promising him everything. He is young and doesn't realize they are the same promises—he forgets that this one also will probably not keep his word—and so he listens to tales of a new world just over the hill and because he has bitterness in his heart he goes along.

Why? Is it because we have forgotten that vigilance is the price we must pay for freedom? Is it because we have forgotten that disciplines are necessary, that a country is never stronger than the restraint of its people? Is it that we have taken too lightly the implications of our spiritual heritage? What have we to show the world if it be not our invisible securities? Let's tell the truth about ourselves—the one commodity above all others we have to sell that can make us invulnerable.

Let's put up our goal against the Communist goal. Let's not try to fool people—let's just say in simple language: We believe the individual is important, remembering that under Communist domination the individual is no more than a tool of the state.

We have a wonderful system that no one can take from us so long as we are vigilant. Oh, yes, we see our weaknesses, but seeing them we have set ourselves to cure them. Even with them we have something as near freedom as anything that exists, for it is based on truth. We have a formula which, as it is perfected, protects and develops individual opportunity. Should the day ever come when that is over then the day of creative intelligence is over. When opportunity is taken away, when individual effort is gone, then indeed shall we have become something else again—not ourselves.

As we face our weaknesses, our mistakes, as we take hold of our responsibilities to all mankind, let us not slip into the tempting attitude of just being against communism, against fascism, against—Oh—anything. Let's be profreedom here and everywhere—not license, but true freedom. Because we have had more of it than other men let's give the world such a demonstration of its true worth that all people will find fresh courage and new hope.

Let's share our skills, our knowledge as we divide our energies between strengthening our own structure and showing our world neighbors how they, too, can be free.

What a job for you godparents of free enterprise. What a challenge to you who have done so much and can do so much more to awaken our people to their responsibilities to the people of the world. You who are constantly developing new techniques, finding broader, deeper, more constructive fields for your peculiarly American genius—you have much work to do. You have the skills. I believe with all my heart that you are aware that yours is a grave and thrilling responsibility—to paint a true picture of America—the dream that conceived her, the vision of a land of homes where love and respect, restraints and freedom dwell, of schools where wholesome discipline prevails and truth is taught, of work for everyone according to his capacity and to his need, of tolerance and understanding in all areas of living and a glorious certainty that the responsibility that is now ours can be carried without endangering our own security because our trust is in the infinite, all powerful, all merciful God.

That is the America that we must show to the world.

Truman and Johnson, Our Two Most Veto-Overridden Presidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT L. REEVES, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1948

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, as a part of these remarks I include the text of a statement which I issued on June 17, 1948, immediately after the Congress completed action in overriding the third of three vetoes overridden in a period of 4 days:

Congress has accepted Mr. Truman's challenge by overriding three of his vetoes in the last 4 days.

In the past year and a half the Eightieth Congress has overridden Truman vetoes of six major bills. They include the Taft-Hartley Act, the tax-reduction bill, the news-vendors' bill, social-security legislation, the carriers' agreements (Bulwinkle) bill, and the appropriation bill for the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency.

It is particularly significant, in view of Mr. Truman's slurs at Congress, to note that the only other President in American history who had as many vetoes overridden in one 2-year term of Congress was Andrew Johnson, and you remember what happened to him. The Thirty-ninth Congress (1865–67) overrode his vetoes six times. The next Congress, the Fortieth (1867–69) overrode his vetoes nine times.

President Johnson holds the record as the most veto-overridden President, with Truman running a close second. President Pierce stands third, with five vetoes over-

ridden by the Thirty-fourth Congress (1855–57), and Cleveland stands fourth with four vetoes overridden by the Fifty-fourth Congress (1895–97).

In other words, no President in 80 years has been more consistently and more frequently repudiated by Congress than has Mr. Truman during the last 18 months. The action by the Senate and House in overriding 3 vetoes in 1 week simply means that the breach between Mr. Truman and the Congress has become a chasm, deep and wide. It must be remembered that in every one of the six cases a substantial number of Senators and Representatives of his own party—in some cases a majority—have voted to override Mr. Truman.

By his insistence on controlling what legislation the Congress shall pass, Mr. Truman confirms what he has been saying to the country in the past 3 weeks: "It is the duty of the Congress to do my bidding." It is that political philosophy which, together with Mr. Truman himself, will be rejected by the people in November.

Remarks of Hon. Brooks Hays, of Arkansas, in Presenting Arkansas Dog to the Gentleman From Pennsylvania, Hon. Chester H. Gross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, my feud with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. GROSS] is ended. Today in a short ceremony attended by several members of the Pennsylvania and Arkansas delegations I presented an Arkansas dog to the gentleman and under leave to extend my remarks I include the following statement which accompanied the gift:

Chester, it gives me a lot of pleasure to present to you this dog, a fair representative of the Arkansas home product which you good-naturedly disparaged in a speech to the House. I offer it as a symbol of the fact that our feud has ended.

This dog is the gift of Dr. Joe Shuffield of Little Rock, Arkansas, like Nimrod, "a mighty hunter before the Lord" and a swell fellow. The good doctor has worried a little about the environment in which his beloved pup is to be placed and I have had to reassure him on that point. I know you will take good care of him. Please remember that while he has no high society aspirations, he does desire good company and a wholesome environment. He has good blood, as shown by the pedigree certificate which I am giving you. It is certified as to five generations but information as to nine is available. He is of good stock. Frankly, we don't go in for that sort of thing in Arkansas. We think more of character than we do of social background, but it is good to know that the animal has a fine parentage. He is 7 months old and should not be used in the chase until he is 10 months of age.

I am indebted to you for starting the controversy about Arkansas. When your remarks were interpreted as a slur upon our State, I was given the opportunity to voice the resentment of 2,000,000 people and offer evidence that our home products, including the greatest variety of industrial products, are of the highest standard. If the rejoinders were a bit personal, I hope you will pardon them.

In all friendliness, this final word of caution. We Arkansers regard our State as "the greatest commonwealth in the galaxy of sovereign powers, whose star shines out from the flag like the brightest orb of celestial night." Be careful how you spell the glorious word, Arkansas, and how you pronounce it and, if tempted to belittle us, remember suh, them is fightin' words.

In these final moments of a hectic session, fraught with political strife and personal tension, I am glad of this brief interlude of friendship and good will. The puppy carries all of that. No one should be amazed that Arkansas rebelled over your speech. You stirred a universal impulse, namely, an appreciation of our dogs and their value in the art of finding happiness.

Military Program Means Higher Prices, Economic Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article appearing in the Trainman News of May 29, 1948. The article typifies the country's growing concern with the effect of the rearmament program on our day-to-day economy, as pointed out in the minority views of the Committee on Armed Services of the House on H. R. 6401. In the light of the far-flung economic implications of the national defense program I commend its reading to every Member of the House:

Observers on Capitol Hill have long since learned to expect a certain amount of confusion whenever major changes of national policy take place in Washington. There is plenty of confusion in our national defense picture today.

Most of us are aware that the United States is embarking on a very large military program—but just how large is it, and what effects may it have on our day-to-day living?

In a democratic society we are entitled to a clearer view of our expanding national defense program than the average intelligent citizen can make out from ordinary newspaper reading these days.

In an election year when we are choosing our leadership for the next critical period, it is particularly important to know the answers to these questions.

As the following résumé will show, the present planned program of defense expenditures is large and growing rapidly. Whether the amounts to be spent are absolutely essential or inadequate is not the point of this article—we do not pretend to be military experts. Rather we are attempting to point out that the present program carries far-flung economic implications for our domestic policy, implications that it might be disastrous to ignore much longer.

But first, just what are the dimension of our current and contemplated defense program? A simple straightforward answer to this question is not available. Anyone reading accounts of testimony before the various congressional committees is aware that literally scores of different "estimates" are floating around. We are tempted to say that not even the highly placed military planners have a definitive answer. It should be clear, therefore, the the figures which follow are tentative, but are the best public estimates we have seen.

When the President's budget for the next fiscal year (1949) was presented to Congress early this January, we apparently expected to spend about $11,000,000,000 for the military services. This sum is a ground-floor estimate—the real question is how much additional will be appropriated or authorized above and beyond $11,000,000,000.

SEVENTY-GROUP AIR FORCE IS EXPANSION GOAL

For more than a month now you have been reading about House and Senate hearings on a "supplementary defense bill," which has just passed Congress and been sent to the President. Technically this bill, which is designed to start our 70-group air force program into high gear, is charged to the current fiscal year which ends June 30. Realistically we can regard it as the first appropriation additional to the regular $11,000,000,000 budget for next year. The bill authorizes $3,200,000,000 in cash or contract authorizations. Of course, this amount alone is not sufficient to bring the Air Force up to its planned 70-group strength with completely modernized planes. The expansion has to start gradually, increasing year by year until it reaches a peak about 1952, when the Air Force budget will be stabilized at a cost of about $7,500,000,000 annually.

So we can summarize the new plan's effect on the budget as follows: In fiscal 1949, we will spend about $14,200,000,000 (11.0 plus 3.2), and in 1952, about $18,500,000,000 (11.0 plus 7.5).

It is likely that some sort of universal service law, either compulsory military training or the draft, will pass the present Congress. This program will of course cost additional money. Again it is difficult to find out exactly how much. According to the testimony given before the House Military Affairs Committee the cost will include two major items. To set up the training equipment and other initial machinery under the draft involves spending about $2,100,000,000. Secondly, the Army Ground Forces testified as to the importance of modernizing the equipment of the 25-division strategic Reserve of the Army as augmented under the draft bill. The cost of this modernization in fiscal 1949 was estimated to be $3,900,000,000. So altogether with the increased size of the armed forces authorized under H. R. 6401 (the House version of the draft law) we have an additional $6,000,000,000 which is to be added to the $14,200,000,000 above.

Thus, it now appears that our present plans contemplate an expenditure of about $20,000,000,000 in 1949 when the draft and the increased Army and Air Force requirements are added to the President's budget of $11,000,000,000.

ALL SIGNS INDICATE $20,000,000,000 FIGURE

It is always possible, of course, that less than the full amount will be appropriated. But all indications point to our soon reaching the $20,000,000,000 figure. Secretary Forrestal has repeatedly emphasized that the present military requests represent a minimum program. On May 12 such a stanch advocate of government economy as Senator BYRD was reported by the New York Times as conceding that within 2 years the cost of the armed forces would amount to at least $20,000,000,000 and carry the full national budget to some $50,000,000,000.

Another reason for believing that the estimate of $20,000,000,000 may be on the low side is the possibility of lend-lease military aid

to the Marshall plan countries as the Secretary of State admitted was being considered. (New York Times, April 28.) No quantitative estimates of the billions in additional costs involved have yet been made public.

Unless a drastic reversal in our military planning takes place, the above analysis indicates that for the foreseeable future we can expect a military budget of perhaps $20,000,000,000 or $25,000,000,000 annually. What will this mean in terms of our domestic economy and specifically in terms of our standard of living?

Corresponding to expenditures for military purposes is a real cost in goods and services which must be diverted from peacetime production.

As the minority report on the House Selective Service Act of 1948 (H. R. 6401) put it:

"We are at a stage when there is no slack in the use of our resources, including both men and materials, and the imposition of a permanent military program can only be effected by switching our resources from the production of necessary civilian goods.

"GASOLINE RATIONING MAY BE NECESSARY

"There will be less lumber for housing and fewer automobiles because of the reduced supplies of steel. * * * Even the rationing of gasoline may well be necessary. Because of shortages of materials such as copper, lumber and nails, much needed construction will again have to be deferred. We will have fewer new school buildings, fewer new hospitals, less of the necessities."

This is the unpleasant side of the rearmament picture which is too often brushed over when military appropriations are voted by the Congress. There is very little testimony on this subject in the Congressional hearings. Occasionally such an exception is voiced by the responsible armed service representatives as when Mr. Forrestal, Secretary of Defense, candidly remarked: "* * * you cannot get a big military program unless you stop the making of motor cars, washing machines and refrigerators." (New York Times, April 26.) The truth unfortunately is that the industries which produce the large scale weapons of war must simultaneously curtail sharply their output of many of the most important durable consumer goods.

Furthermore, many other plants not actually being used to supply the armed forces may have to reduce their output because the materials will be no longer available for civilian production. The steel, aluminum and copper that goes into aircraft and tanks just cannot be used (at the same time) for passenger cars and civilian housing. It also cannot be used for the expansion of our basic industrial capacity which is necessary for our long hoped-for economy of abundance.

How serious will this peacetime military program affect the production of civilian goods? No clear-cut answer to this question can be provided in the abstract. The answer depends a great deal on how we manage the defense program. And this management or planning is the crux of the whole problem. Congress has refused to meet the issue squarely—for economic controls are perhaps the most unpopular issues in our political life. But the facts remain—we will not have enough scarce basic materials to serve all of our needs—the materials must be allocated in some fashion to meet our essential requirements.

INFLATION WILL RATION UNLESS CONTROLS ADDED

One way is to sit tight and do nothing. Then the price system will do the allocating—higher and higher prices will ration the steel, aluminum, lumber and many other items. If only enough steel will be available to build (say) 3,000,000 cars annually, instead of the present 5,000,000, the price of steel will go up, either openly or on the black market, until only 3,000,000 cars can be marketed. If a race track is willing to pay more for construction materials than a contractor building houses, the available scarce materials go to the track. And similarly for every other product. To be realistically blunt—continued inflation will do the rationing. Our experience since July of 1946 when OPA expired is recent enough so that we can all remember the consequences of inflation rationing. The burden falls most heavily on the low income groups least able to increase their money incomes. The working population has to tighten its belt and do without, while the high income groups are denied nothing—they can pay the higher prices.

The alternative is not without unpleasant memories either. No one likes controls. Materials allocation and prices control do involve red tape and increased governmental intervention—but we must face up to the situation confronting us. We must not continue to plan large military expenditures without providing for the necessary counterpart—a system of controls sufficient to spread the burden fairly and to distribute the remaining raw materials according to needs of our economy.

Second San Francisco Bay Crossing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 529, 79th Congress, which I introduced, a Joint Army-Navy Board of Engineers was appointed to investigate and report on the feasibility and necessity, from the standpoint of national defense and the development of peacetime economy, of building a second bay crossing from the city of San Francisco to Bay Farm Island, which in itself intended a southerly crossing.

Exhaustive hearings were held and careful engineering studies were made lasting upwards of a year. A complete report was made to Congress as required by the resolution. After hearing all interested parties and completing their studies, the Joint Army-Navy Board recommended a crossing from a point near Army Street in San Francisco to Alameda on the eastern shore of San Francisco Bay. They recommended a type of crossing to consist of a combination of tube and trestle.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of the fact that up through the years the United States Government has maintained the most proficient corps of engineers on the face of the earth, the report of this Joint Army-Navy Board has been questioned by the California State engineer in charge of public works and highways and a small group of sectional and selfish interests. This group, led by the State engineer has in effect repudiated the Joint Army-Navy Board's thorough study and recommendations by continuing to urge that a second bay crossing be constructed paralleling within a few hundred yards to the north the present San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, which would bring further traffic congestion to the already most congested area in the great international seaport city of San Francisco. Their plan would necessitate the use of the Government owned Yerba Buena (Goat) Island. The promoters of this parallel crossing who have disregarded the recommendations of this Joint Army-Navy Board, have also disregarded the necessity of securing congressional authorization for the issuance of a permit, and have proceeded to spend vast sums of the taxpayers money to carry out a plan almost unanimously opposed by the people of San Francisco and San Francisco peninsula, as well as by many of the farsighted communities on the eastern side of San Francisco Bay which have expressed themselves on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, in questioning their right to so waste public funds without authorization, I personally contacted the Attorney General of the United States and received from him the following communication:

JUNE 16, 1948.

Hon. RICHARD J. WELCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGESSMAN: This is in response to your request for my informal opinion as to whether another act of Congress will be required before a second bridge may be erected by the State of California crossing San Francisco Bay from the Rincon Hill district in San Francisco by way of Yerba Buena (Goat) Island to Oakland.

While I cannot, under established precedents, advise you officially on this matter, the problem presented has received careful consideration in this department. I enclose a copy of a memorandum prepared here, which I trust will be of service to you.

The copies of Public Law 695, Seventy-first Congress; Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress; and House Resolution 529, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, which you forwarded for my consideration, in connection with your request, are returned herewith.

Sincerely yours,
TOM C. CLARK, *Attorney General.*

MEMORANDUM

The question has been raised whether another act of Congress will be required before a second bridge may be erected by the State of California crossing San Francisco Bay from the Rincon Hill district in San Francisco by way of Yerba Buena (Goat) Island to Oakland.

The location and construction of the present bridge was consented to by Public Law 695, Seventy-first Congress (46 Stat. 1192), in pursuance of the provisions of "an act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters" (act of March 23, 1906, 34 Stat. 84; 33 U. S. C. 491–498) which required the authorization of Congress and the approval of the Secretary of War and Chief of Engineers as to the plans and specifications of the bridge. Public Law 695 required that permission to cross the Government reservation on Yerba Buena Island be first obtained from the Secretaries of War, Navy, and Commerce, and also required the repair or replacement on sites acceptable to the respective head of the department having jurisdiction thereof, of any buildings, improvements or facilities on the Government reservation as are damaged or destroyed by the construction of the bridge.

Under the General Bridge Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 847; 33 U. S. C. 525), which would be applicable to such a new structure as is suggested, the consent of Congress is granted for the construction, maintenance, and operation of bridges and approaches over the navigable waters of the United States. This Act also requires the approval of the Chief of En-

gineers and the Secretary of the Army, as to the location and plans for such bridges, before construction is commenced. In view of the consent provision in the Bridge Act of 1946, it would appear that legislation, similar to Public Law 695, would be unnecessary except for the fact that the new bridge would impose an additional burden upon Yerba Buena Island, which is understood to be presently used and occupied by activities of the Army, Navy, and Coast Guard.

While the Secretary of the Army may have sufficient authority under existing law to grant a permit for the crossing of that part of Yerba Buena Island which may constitute a "military reservation," Congress has not granted the Secretary of the Navy nor the Secretary of the Treasury such broad powers with regard to Government land under their jurisdiction and control. It may be pointed out, however, that the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Treasury are empowered by law to grant, in their discretion, temporary or revocable permits for the entry and crossing of Federal lands under their jurisdiction. This authority, however, may not be commensurate with the needs presented here relative to the construction of a bridge, which is inherently permanent in nature. Accordingly, it appears that the soundest course would be to obtain legislation authorizing the Secretaries of the Navy and Treasury to grant the easements on Yerba Buena Island which would be necessary for the construction of the proposed bridge. This legislation could follow the form used in Public Law 695, which provides that permission for the bridge to cross the Government reservation on Yerba Buena Island be first obtained from the appropriate Secretaries of the Departments using the Island and, if any buildings, improvements, or facilities on the Government reservation on Yerba Buena Island are damaged or destroyed by the construction of the bridge they shall be repaired or replaced by the State of California on a site or sites acceptable to the respective head of the Department having jurisdiction over the property involved.

In a somewhat similar situation arising in Massachusetts, a bill (S. 2553) has recently been introduced, and has passed the Senate, giving the express consent of Congress to the construction of a bridge over certain properties of the Navy Department. This bill affords a precedent in the instant matter.

America's Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an editorial written by the publisher of the New York Post, Mr. Ted O. Thackrey, whose courageous stand on the Palestine problem has been greatly responsible for the vast growth of public interest and knowledge on the subject throughout our country. In this editorial once again Mr. Thackrey has torn through the maze of politics and chicanery and put his finger clearly on the true core of the problem and defined ways and means for its correction. The editorial, entitled "America's Responsibility," appeared in the New York Post on June 16, 1948, and calls for a forthright stand by America on the entire middle eastern picture, which is not only to our advantage but, more than that, is our sacred duty.

AMERICA'S RESPONSIBILITY

(By T. O. Thackrey)

The rising tide of resentment against Great Britain's pro-Arab, anti-Israel policy in the Middle East must not be permitted to blind us to the real and basic responsibility, which lies in Washington now, rather than in London.

It is true, of course, that Great Britain under Foreign Minister Bevin has made a desperate effort, first to give the Arabs all out help in their effort to wipe out the Jews who dared declare their independence and next to bring such economic pressure that Israel's defense would be greatly hampered by the end of the truce.

British encouragement of Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Transjordan and their allies in refusing to pay heed to warnings from the United States against blockade; British diversion of oil from Haifa to deprive Israel of its use; British refusal to surrender the Jews imprisoned at Cyprus and elsewhere for the "crime" of seeking entrance to the country promised them for thirty years; all these and much more properly build resentment.

But the cure for these evil-inspired policies is to be found in Washington.

Each dreadful move by Bevin has been made either by agreement with the national administration at Washington, or has been made possible by our failure to exert the proper pressure for change.

President Truman, whether he favors the establishment of Israel or not, has either failed to give sufficiently sharp and clear directives to his State and Defense Departments, or he has permitted his public statements of policy to be sabotaged.

As a result, the war which could have been stopped before it began, has now been stopped because it has become clear that the seven Arab nations are no match for little Israel, the David of the Goliath legend come to life.

There is no doubt that in many departments of the national administration, including the White House, there has been some relief at the diversion of the mounting protest over middle eastern policy from centering on Washington to centering on Bevin.

And Bevin's responsibility is very great.

But it is not nearly as great in fact as that of President Truman and his advisers.

We have been acting as though we were a colony rather than a great power; and we have been publicly excusing ourselves for our shameless and spineless failure to give Israel all-out support with the theory that we need Britain's friendship for the sake of military alliance, and for the sake of Europe's economic recovery.

But the United States of America is the essential partner to such an alliance—not Great Britain.

It is our tax money; our military and economic strength; our unqualified assistance, which is being called upon.

The truth is that Bevin would never have dared embark on his bitter war of extermination against Palestinian Jews if he had not been led to believe that President Truman's statements were merely for domestic political consumption and would not be translated into decisive action.

Meanwhile, Israel lives in spite of our failures and Bevin's hopes. Left without Britain's—or our—money, arms and intervention, the Arab armies have already demonstrated that they cannot possibly defeat Israel in battle.

Peace—and prosperity for the Middle East—can be achieved during the present period of truce, only if the United States recognizes the inevitability of the State of Israel which will not die, and will not surrender.

But it is up to President Truman to instruct Secretary Marshall, Secretary Forrestal, and Ambassador Douglas that having recognized Israel we will not see it destroyed either in debate or in war.

The responsibility for a firm peace arising from today's tentative truce lies with him.

Rural Electrification in Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, the greatest REA expansion in history has been authorized by the Eightieth Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am going to set the record straight on this program, and particularly on rural electrification in Montana. In so doing, I shall refute certain rash and unfounded statements made for political purposes not only in my own State but throughout the West.

I am proud of the record Montana has made in rural electrification, and I am proud of the enlightened generosity with which the Eightieth Congress has provided REA with more funds than it ever had or hoped to have at any time in its history. REA funds are more than doubled this year.

I have a personal interest in this matter since I served as the first president of the Park Electric Cooperative, back in the days when REA was a new and untried venture. My home in the Shields River valley of Montana is supplied by that local REA. I have always been and I will always be a supporter of REA, because I know at first hand and I appreciate the benefits electric power brings to rural areas.

The fact is that this session of Congress has authorized a total of $575,000,000 for loans to REA cooperatives for the 13 months beginning June 1, 1948. The REA already had available about $400,000,000. This means that the REA cooperatives of this nation can spend, if they can find the men and materials and a place to spend it, $975,000,000 in the next year. That is almost one billion dollars. It is $75,000,000 more than all the money REA has used since the program began.

Montana's share of the new funds authorized should be about $11,500,000. Montana cooperatives now have allocated but unspent at least $9,803,831. In all of their history since REA began, Montana cooperatives have been able to spend $12,300,767. All of the applications for loans now on file in REA headquarters from Montana REA cooperatives total only $8,875,000. From this it is shown that:

First, new funds available to Montana REA are $3,000,000 greater than the amount requested by Montana REA cooperatives.

Second, total funds available to Montana during the next year are almost twice as much as Montana REA has been able to use in 12 years.

I am glad that Montana REA cooperatives are in this fine position. It should be possible to extend service to all who wish it just as rapidly as men and materials are available. Shortages of labor and equipment have been responsible for the fact that we have never been able to energize lines and serve consumers as rapidly as funds were made available for the work. I am glad that these shortages are now being overcome to some extent. Expenditure of the tremendous sums available to REA places a heavy responsibility on the Washington headquarters and the local cooperatives to use the money wisely.

In Montana, according to the most recent figures I can secure from the Washington office, 6,704 miles of REA line are now serving 16,640 consumers. When the money already allocated has been spent, 13,707 miles of line will serve 27,914 consumers. Additional thousands of miles can be built and thousands of consumers can be served with the new funds now made available by this Congress.

In this connection I am glad to report that the Congress has appropriated the largest number of dollars in history, larger by nearly $30,000,000 than any previous appropriation, for the development of soil and water resources in the Missouri Basin, under the reclamation program. In Montana this means that construction will start for the first time this year on four new reclamation and power projects. Construction will continue on four others. Many new transmission lines and substations, serving REA and pumping projects, are provided for with adequate funds. We are ready to start operation of the second generator at Fort Peck, and we have this year appropriated funds for a third. When these are in operation, together with power from other projects now under study or in the construction stage, there will be a vast supply of power for all of our REA, irrigation pumping, industrial and mining development. I have worked diligently for these and for REA funds.

When President Truman requested $300,000,000 for REA for fiscal 1949, I appeared before the Appropriations Committee and stated that this was not enough. The committee, the House and the Senate agreed, and the fund authorized was increased to $400,000,000.

Subsequently a deficiency authorization of $75,000,000 was approved by the Appropriations Committee in an omnibus deficiency bill along with funds for the essential activities of many other Government agencies. For reasons of their own, certain persons offered a motion to send this bill back to committee to add another hundred million for REA. Their purpose in so doing had nothing to do with the welfare of REA. REA Administrator Claude Wickard said that he could not use the money before June 30. The motion would not have accomplished a thing, except to delay the salaries for many Government employees, funds for several reclamation projects, and a host of other items; and I voted against it.

I voted for the $75,000,000 plus an additional $100,000,000 in the regular appropriation measure which would make it available after June 30 for the next fiscal year. This was in accordance with Mr. Wickard's remarks which can be found in the hearings.

The manager of the Fergus REA and certain others questioned this vote. The fact is that the Fergus REA at that time and until June 4, 1948, which is the latest date for which I can get a report, had no requests for new funds and no applications for new extensions on file here in Washington. Fergus REA has received allocations of $1,961,000, which is more than any other REA in Montana. It has been able to use $1,158,879 in its extension work. With no request for new funds and $800,000 available from former allocations, it is hard to understand the attack on a Congress which has been so generous with REA. I want the people of Musselshell County who have been disturbed by the misinformation sent to them to know that ample funds are available to give them REA service as soon as the Fergus REA can build the lines.

The Congress has a duty to keep the Federal Government solvent and on a firm economic basis. We also recognize the virtue of certain Federal public works, among them REA. We operate on a fiscal year basis. It is wasteful and invites extravagance to appropriate more money than an agency can actually expect to need in any one year. There is room in the Federal budget for generous support of sound public works, but there must be sound economy in making appropriations and in the subsequent use of the funds.

In this lies a lesson for all organizations and individuals who seek Federal funds. Where the facts are presented fairly and fully, and when the Federal Treasury can stand the expense, Congress provides funds in adequate amounts for worthy and proper proposals. When extravagant or unnecessary requests are made, beyond the ability of the recipient to use the money wisely, the suspicion of the Congress is aroused. The reaction is unfavorable not only to the unnecessary request but also to any subsequent request however justified. High-pressure tactics may get results once in a while, but the long-term effect is harmful.

I am glad to say that I have worked for and supported the authorization of all the funds that REA needs and can use. As swiftly as men and materials become available, the work will go ahead. We will extend REA service to every area where it is feasible under the most liberal interpretation of the regulations.

The consumers and managers of REA cooperatives can rest assured that whenever they have the men and materials to do the job, they will find that Congress is ready with the funds.

Was This Bribery?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include two articles from Today's World. If the deal to give $15,000,000 or even $10,000,000 of the taxpayers' money to these newspapers and periodicals from the money appropriated under the so-called Marshall plan was made before the passage of the appropriation, then it is clearly bribery.

I suggest a thorough investigation be made of the Departments that sponsored this $15,000,000 to be handed to these newspapers and periodicals. Did these Departments bribe these newspapers and periodicals by assuring them that they would get $15,000,000 added to the billions appropriated for the Marshall plan. Was that the price that induced these newspapers and periodicals to so vigorously support the un-American and unconstitutional Marshall plan?

This international situation is getting rotten. It smells heaven high. I repeat, "take the profits out of the Marshall plan, and there would be no Marshall plan." But, let the articles speak for themselves.

THE $15,000,000 PROPAGANDA BRIBERY

(By Washington correspondent)

President Truman seems to have taken control of the Nation's purse string completely away from Congress. And what is Congress doing about it? Nothing.

The House Appropriations Committee recently uncovered the boldest piece of press bribery with public funds ever told in this country. The amount of the bribes total $15,000,000. The prize is that $24,000,000,000 that is being extracted from the American taxpayers to be ladled out to the panhandling nations of Europe and to militarize Greece and Turkey for a quick world war III.

Tremendous pressure has been brought on Congress, by certain segments of the press and radio, to appropriate huge sums for relief of starving Europeans, and to arm Greece and Turkey to save Standard's oil concessions in Saudi Arabia. This segment of the press reports nearly everybody in Europe starving, while crop reports show that more grain is being grown in the destitute countries than before the war.

Most effects have a cause. This tremendous barrage of propaganda and pressure seems to have a cause in the illegal and pernicious activities of the comic opera war organization called Office of War Information which is still operating under the high-faluting title of Office of Culture and International Information of the State Department.

Congress has just appropriated $27,000,000 for the activities of these domestic brigands, with only feeble voices arising in protest. When is this kind of taxpayer robbery going to stop? It is time for all voters to ask this question of their congressional candidates before November.

The House Appropriations Committee heard J. Noel Macy, a State Department official, blandly admit that $15,000,000 has been promised certain publications and radio sta-

tions. With typical political double talk, Mr. Macy explained to the committee that this money was to be given these gold diggers to increase the circulation of their foreign editions and thereby create good will and understanding with our friends across the sea.

Of more significance is the fact that these beneficiaries of this vicious raid on the Treasury Department are the publications which have been most active and influential in turning on the heat for passage of the "Martial plan"—as the latest capital satire (Washington Squirrel Cage) characterizes the so-called Marshall plan. The list includes some of our wealthiest publications and makes them look as cheap as neighborhood shake-down sheets. It includes:

The Paris Herald (foreign edition of the New York Herald Tribune), $872,000 a year.
New York Herald Tribune, $150,000 a year.
New York Times, $110,000 a year.
Life Magazine, $853,000.
Time Magazine, $360,000.
Newsweek Magazine, $200,000.
Reader's Digest, $305,000.

As bait for additional publications to "see the light," Mr. Macy's program includes a subsidy of $1,168,454 for magazines to be circulated in Great Britain, and $6,018,422 bait for motion picture concerns also was included in the statement that "companies which distribute films abroad would be eligible" for visit from Santa Claus. Mr. Macy even named the firm companies who are now "eligible"—Loew's Paramount, Fox, R-K-O, Universal, Warner Bros., Columbia, Monogram, Republic, United Artists and Selznick.

Of course this is just a scratch on the surface. Our $37,000,000,000 peacetime budget is bigger than any of our wartime ones—and Congress is equally guilty with the administration in allowing this robbery of the taxpayers to go on and on and on.

THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE ON RAMPAGE—GOVERNMENT SUBSIDY FOR INTERNATIONAL PRESS

(By staff)

The great international and intervention newspaper, the New York Herald Tribune, owned to a considerable extent in England, has been throwing several fits recently because the House Appropriations Committee, composed of some of the ablest and most loyal Republicans in Congress, reduced the Marshall plan by 25 percent.

Chairman TABER, and his committee, after extended hearings, were justified in urging a 25 percent reduction to prevent waste of United States funds abroad. When the House approved the cut made by the Appropriations Committee, the New York Herald Tribune let loose a violent attack on the House Republicans. The Herald Tribune said, editorially: "The most shocking aspect of the effort by the little men of the House of Representatives to emasculate the European recovery program is that this blow to American honor was administered by taking advantage of every parliamentary device to confuse and evade responsibility."

Could this reduction also be a blow to the $1,000,000 allocated to subsidize the New York Herald Tribune and its Paris edition?

Is the New York Herald Tribune trying to confuse the economy issue now that its own pocketbook is affected?

Why should American taxpayers be called upon to underwrite and guarantee the expenses of a private corporation such as the New York Herald Tribune and its Paris edition, or such international-minded newspapers as the New York Times and the Luce magazines?

Has Congress gone crazy to permit such an un-American swindle and unprecedented grab of taxpayers' money? The New York Herald Tribune represents the views of a small element in America. Why spend Government money to circularize its views abroad?

Representative KEEFE, a member of the Committee on Appropriations said: "I do not see how we could justify ourselves in taking the money of American taxpayers to promote private profit-making institutions by guaranteeing them against loss in the operation of their foreign business."

It is the duty of Congress to make sure that no more funds are appropriated than are actually needed. Chairman TABER and his committee rendered a needed and patriotic service to the American people. We need more of that kind of courage, independence and intelligent supervision of our taxpayers money. There is nothing sacred about the Marshall plan except to the New York Herald Tribune, Governor Dewey and Governor Stassen. All three rushed into print without any study of the facts, and denounced the Republican Congress for performing their sworn duty.

Chairman TABER and Representative COUDERT, a member of the Appropriations Committee, are both from New York State, and must have been amused at Desperate Tom Dewey's efforts to reach for any plank before he sinks out of sight. He won his nickname of "Me Too" Dewey in 1944, and he is running true to colors again and again.

That's why "Me Too" Dewey won't do.

Newspaper Comment on Mundt-Foster Debate Highly Critical of Communist's Failure To Answer Direct Challenges—Support Rapidly Developing for Mundt-Nixon Bill—Passage Strictly Up to Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, many radio listeners witnessed for the first time in their lives as they listened to the recent Mundt-Foster debate on the merits of the Mundt-Nixon bill the duplicity and the evasive tactics which Communists invariably utilize the world over in their efforts to trick the public into advancing the Communist cause. Mr. Foster's fearful refusal to answer the direct challenges put to him in that debate provides eloquent testimony in support of the validity of the charges upon which I based these direct challenges to the Communist leader.

Typical of the many editorials carried in the American press in criticism of Foster's hit-and-run tactics is the following editorial from the Daily Plainsman, progressive daily newspaper published in Huron, S. Dak., and edited by Robert D. Lusk:

MUNDT WINNER IN RADIO DEBATE

On Monday night, Representative KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, debated William Foster, chairman of the American Communist Party, on the subject of the Mundt-Nixon bill to control Communists. MUNDT spoke in favor of the bill, from Yankton. Foster spoke from a broadcasting room in New York on the negative side.

It was an interesting debate and Karl Mundt undoubtedly was the winner. William Foster not only lost the debate but he lost considerable face and revealed the typical sophistry of the Communist Party. It would not be surprising, because of that, if he were replaced as abruptly as was his predecessor, Earl Browder.

It was interesting for several reasons. In the first place, Foster lived up to the true Communist doctrine. His first 10 minutes could have been written in advance by anyone who has studied typical Communist dialectics and verbiage. It was a storm of insults and adjectives intended to insult, without any establishment of a base of criticism. It was without logic. Foster merely ranted and raved and cursed the Mundt-Nixon bill in typically Communist terms.

He gave Mundt the perfect opening to point out the defects of communism, of Communists and why the Mundt-Nixon bill was originated. Mundt then seized the opportunity, shrewdly, to really put the No. 1 United States Communist on the spot. Since Foster had challenged Mundt to the debate, Mundt then challenged Foster, with a large radio audience listening, to—

1. Name one instance in which the United States Communist Party has criticized the actions of Russia.

2. Give the name of one opposition party leader in Russia who has vocally opposed the Soviet Government and lived to tell of it.

In his 5-minute rebuttal, Foster ignored both MUNDT'S challenges. He never mentioned them. Obviously, he could furnish no answer and what was worse for him and communism he was thus tacitly forced to admit it to a national radio audience. Furthermore, Foster in his speech floundered and fluttered haltingly, as if he knew he was going down for the count. He could resort only to his Communist doctrine of name-calling. He did not have the freedom of choice, to begin with, which could have enabled him to adapt himself to the debate, because he was bound mind and soul to the inflexible Communist doctrine. And MUNDT'S two shrewd questions helped remind listeners of what Communists do, on the one hand, and ask others to do, on the other.

In his 5-minute closing rebuttal, MUNDT pointed out these facts tellingly and explained specifically what the provisions of the Mundt-Nixon bill are, why they are in the bill, and what they are intended to do. Foster had not gotten down to detail; he had merely fulminated in generalizations. Lastly, MUNDT got in a telling blow against Foster by reading Foster's January 1, 1948, editorial in the Daily Worker, Communist organ, in which Foster stated flatly that William Green of the AFL, Phil Murray of the CIO, and John L. Lewis are not the real leaders of the American labor movement.

It would be a good bet that William Foster today is being thoroughly chastised on order from Moscow's Kremlin.

Resolutions of Henry H. Houston 2d Post No. 3, American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I include the following resolutions:

Whereas the United States of America has been engaged in two world-wide wars in a generation; and

Whereas the United States of America is vitally interested in affairs all over the world having to do with the interests of its citizens and the protection of the self-government of peoples of other lands for whose freedom, as well as our own, we fought; and

Whereas there are forces abroad in the world of such an aggressive nature as to cause concern to us who prefer peace but prefer to defend what we know is right; and

Whereas in order to maintain the prestige of the United States of America at the conference tables of the world, and to fulfill our commitments at home and abroad, large numbers of land, sea and air forces are necessary; and

Whereas it has been found impossible to fill the ranks of our forces with voluntary enlistments; and

Whereas military service is a duty owed by the citizen to his country when he is needed, and such service may be and has on several occasions been made compulsory without damage to our democratic processes; and

Whereas compulsory military service is the only feasible alternative to a dishonorable renunciation of our pledges and commitments at home and abroad: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Henry H. Houston 2d Post, No. 3, Department of Pennsylvania, the American Legion, favors and supports selective-service legislation to provide immediate replacements for our armed forces; and be it further

Resolved, That this post favors and supports universal military training as a long-range program for keeping our armed forces at full strength in peace and war; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the honorable Senators from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States of America, to the honorable Representative in Congress from the Sixth Pennsylvania District, and to national and department of Pennsylvania headquarters, the American Legion.

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of resolution passed unanimously at the regular meeting of Henry H. Houston 2d Post, No. 3, Department of Pennsylvania, the American Legion, held on Tuesday evening, June 15, 1948, at its headquarters, 47 High Street, Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa.

JOSEPH D. WALSH, *Adjutant*.

Whereas the paraplegic veterans are among the greatest sufferers from war; and

Whereas they face unusual problems in employment and housing as a result of their infirmity; and

Whereas it is the duty of a grateful country to make restitution to them insofar as possible for their suffering: therefore be it

Resolved, That the Henry H. Houston 2d Post, No. 3, Department of Pennsylvania, the American Legion, favors the enactment into law of H. R. 4244, Eightieth Congress, a bill which would provide half the cost of a home for all paralyzed veterans; and be it further

Resolved, That this post strongly urges the American Legion to take all appropriate steps toward insuring early and favorable consideration of this bill in the Senate; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be submitted to the Honorable Senators from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States of America, to the Honorable Representative in Congress from the Sixth Pennsylvania District, and to national and department of Pennsylvania headquarters, the American Legion.

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of resolution unanimously adopted at the regular meeting of Henry H. Houston 2d Post, No. 3, Department of Pennsylvania, the American Legion, held on Tuesday evening, June 15, 1948, at its headquarters, 47 High Street, Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa.

JOSEPH D. WALSH, *Adjutant*.

Africa Seen as World Boon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I am including a very interesting letter which was written by Mr. J. S. Wilner to the Boston Herald, and which appeared in that newspaper on June 8, 1948:

AFRICA SEEN AS WORLD BOON

To the EDITOR OF THE HERALD:

The postwar era seems likely to witness an unprecedented development of unchartered and backward territories as an outgrowth of the search for basic raw materials. If this expansion is not controlled and regulated by international agreement, a competitive scramble may ensue that will once again endanger the peace of the world. Since the Atlantic Charter established the principle that all nations of the earth should have equal access to such products it becomes the paramount duty of the United Nations organization to consider ways and means of finding a practical fulfillment of this promise.

Most of the suggestions that have been made for such world league activity have been based on the old idea of spheres of influence and reciprocal trade agreements. These proposals offer no more hope for peace today than they did in the past. It is my opinion that the small nations of the earth will no longer be bandied about with fine phrases but are today united in their demand that the United Nations organization do something practical and constructive to secure for them equal access to the products of the earth. In their behalf, and in behalf of millions of Germans and Italians who have a devotion for freedom, I offer a plan for a joint-operative project to develop certain sections of the earth on a share-and-share-alike basis. I suggest that large areas of Africa are available and suitable for such experiment.

Africa, the vast continent, gives us not only the assurance of a great mineral and soil wealth, but offers a challenge to the explorer for new and more bountiful wealth. It is not our purpose to select any particular acreage of the Dark Continent. England and France with centuries of knowledge in colonization, the nations which will share largely in this experiment, control the major portion of exploitable areas. Together with Belgium and Portugal they can be prevailed upon to contribute pro rata from their holdings land in such amounts and in such places as will help the success of the plan. Reimbursement to them for such contribution is only an operative detail. The choice of any site can be most properly made by a legally created adjunct body of the world league. The method of creating this subsidiary or the manner in which it should operate we are not particularly concerned with. It remains our prime purpose to advocate merely the acceptance of Africa as the guinea-pig ground for a world experiment of exploitation.

Included in the territories available for our experiment are approximately 4,000,000 square miles made up of British, French, Belgium, Portuguese dominions, Ethiopia, and Liberia. Together, they produce for the world today a most significant proportion of its minerals and tropical fruits.

The native population, furthermore, of approximately 60,000,000 can be counted on to supply all the unskilled labor necessary. With the use of modern equipment and machinery and all this low cost labor at hand, production could reach staggering totals.

Waterpower for development is at hand in abundance in rivers and lakes which provide low cost and easy power for any undertaking however great. * * * The development of electric energy is the urgent need in Central Africa, and that can be achieved by harnessing the great horseshoe of rivers, Congo, Lualaba, and Kasai-Kwango basin and their tributaries; also a number of small rivers now flowing wild and in many directions. By building dams, canals and locks in strategic points the large and smaller rivers can be made to flow in their natural beds in the rainy as well as the dry seasons. * * *

The idea of developing Africa is not a new one. Prior to the war all ownership countries were contemplating their individual projects upon larger and larger scales. Even today England has under advisement Secretary Bevin's proposal to expend hundreds of millions on such colonial development. The fault with these proposals have been that too little has been allocated to Africa. Our plan now is to encourage England, France and Belgium, who now make up a part of the United Nations, together with Portugal, Italy and Ethiopia to pool their efforts and cooperate on the vast enterprise.

Immediately upon acceptance of a specified area a governing commission should be put in charge. Sufficient working capital may be loaned from the World Bank in accordance with the Bretton Woods agreement. Leased territory can be assigned upon a fair ratable proportion to all nations participating. All nations contributing to the joint effort should receive their proportionate share of the products. If the purposes of the United Nations Charter are honestly observed, the small nations, as well as the large, will have no difficulty in securing their share of capital for the venture. It is not too fantastic to conceive that such a joint operation for mutual good may have untold results in dispelling national prejudice and hatreds. Getting foreigners together and making them understand one another is now accepted as a healthy way of bringing together international harmony. Witness the change in our attitude toward the people of China brought about by our Union in the World War. * * *

I propose that our Congress earmark 5 percent of all future appropriations of the Marshall plan for the development of central Africa. We must look ahead and take in consideration that in event of conflict in Europe, the Mediterranean African countries' food supply can be ruined. If the African nations with the United Nations accept this plan, it could undoubtedly furnish attractive conditions of employment. With the promise of peaceful life the inducement will in itself be the lure for millions of persecuted, underfed men and women to make the trek to a land free from conflicts. Should the nations answer the prayers of these unfortunate people it will not only earn the gratitude of the entire world but it will be solving its own problem of fulfilling its manifest duty to mankind.

J. S. WILNER.

BOSTON.

Migratory Bird Treaty Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and H. R. 5493 and H. R. 5579, I am including a report and recommendation with reference to the administration of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, together with copies of the bills:

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES ON H. R. 5493 AND H. R. 5579

The above-mentioned bills are designed to amend section 3 of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act in two respects. First they would emphasize an adoption of the so-called flyway method of regulating bag limits and shooting seasons for waterfowl, and second they would establish a Migratory Game Bird Advisory Committee.

This proposed legislation is enthusiastically endorsed by many duck hunters organizations throughout the United States, many of whom appeared or filed statements with the committee during the public hearing on H. R. 5493 and H. R. 5579 on April 20, 1948.

The principle of basing regulations, for the taking of migratory game birds, on flyways, has long been recognized by sportsmen and conceded by public officials, including the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service, to be fundamentally sound. It is well established that there are four distinct and definitely marked migratory waterfowl flyways. Duck and geese follow, with perhaps minor variations in small overlapping areas, these definite flyways in their migrations to and from their nesting grounds. Consequently, what happens in one flyway will have no appreciable effect, if any, on the supply of ducks and geese in other flyways.

During the course of the hearings referred to above the following information was disclosed: The Fish and Wildlife Service and the Department of the Interior, prior to the introduction of these bills, repeatedly have gone on record that the principle of regulation by flyways is entirely sound. Secretary of the Interior Krug, in his letter of July 8, 1947, to Eugene Bennett, president of Duck Hunters Association of California, stated:

"The Department is convinced that the flyway concept as a basis for regulations is sound but, as is so often the case in establishing regulations governing the actions of our citizens, officials must move slowly and be sure that they have gained support for their actions."

Albert Day, Director of the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service, in his letter of July 1, 1947, to Mr. Bennett also said:

"We are gradually moving toward the idea of establishing regulations in line with the conditions in the various sections of the country or by flyways. We find, however, that the general public is a bit slow to accept this sort of a departure."

In his letter of April 7, 1947, Mr. Ray Benson, then executive director of Ducks Unlimited, Mr. Day also stated:

"We are thinking about including in the regulations a definition of States included in the four flyways and to suggest regulations by flyways."

While recognizing that this principle of management by flyways is sound, the Federal agency, nevertheless, has demurred to putting it into effect on the asserted ground that some objection would be voiced by those in other flyways or areas of the country where conditions were bad and more stringent regulations were required. The attitude of those Federal officials, is summed up in a letter of July 22, 1947, from William E. Warne, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, to Hon. GEORGE P. MILLER, Congressman from California. In this letter Mr. Warne states:

"Mr. Day tells me that the waterfowl flights along the Pacific coast are in better shape than in any of the other flyways, and that from a pure biological standpoint more liberal regulations could be granted California, Oregon, and Washington. However, it is the feeling of the Service that the time is not quite ripe for a complete shift to flyway management. There are many thousands of people in the Mississippi Valley in particular who would fail to understand that, despite some common breeding grounds, the waterfowl populations of the two regions are separate and distinct, and that increased hunting on the Pacific coast will have no effect upon the population status of the birds of the Mississippi flyway."

Furthermore, during the hearings the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Albert M. Day, made the following comment: "We are opposed to these bills. We are not opposed to the general idea of flyway management, because we are sponsoring it, we are pushing it, we are pressing it as rapidly as we think it is advisable. Maybe we are mistaken. But we think that we are moving as rapidly as we can. The Treaty Act already contains ample authority for this, under which authority we have been carrying on this program of waterfowl management by flyways."

It is indicated, therefore, that although the Fish and Wildlife Service appears to have ample authority to make the regulation changes indicated in H. R. 5493 and 5579 for some reason or other they hesitate to do so. Why, the Committee is unable to ascertain although the following exchange between Mr. ALLEN of California and Mr. Day may be significant.

"Mr. ALLEN. Is it not true that the three States on the Pacific coast are all pretty much in favor of a flyway regulation?

"Mr. DAY. Oh, yes. So are we. There is no argument on that point—about managing by flyways. We are doing it. We are advocating it. I do not like to be pressured into going farther with it and faster with it than we feel is advisable, looking at the over-all picture."

The committee is not persuaded that the time is now ripe for making the changes in regulations indicated in these bills. However, it does feel that further consideration should be given to the suggested Advisory Committee. It therefore recommends that the Fish and Wildlife Service move as expeditiously as possible to place in effect the so-called flyway method of setting wildfowl regulations rather than the current system of regulations by horizontal temperature zones.

[H. R. 5493, 80th Cong., 2d sess.]

A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act so as to provide that regulations adopted pursuant to such act for any area, section, or flyway shall be based on conditions existing within such area, section, or flyway, and to create a Migratory Game Bird Advisory Committee

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 16, sec. 704), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) Subject to the provisions and order to carry out the purposes of the conventions referred to in section 2, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed, from time to time, having due regard to the zones of temperature and to the distribution, abundance, economic value, breeding habits, and times and lines of migratory flight of such birds, and after conferring with the committee created by subsection (c), to determine when, and to what extent, if at all, and by what means, it is compatible with the terms of such conventions to allow hunting, taking, capture, killing, possession, sale, purchase, shipment, transportation, carriage, or export of any such bird, or any part, nest, or egg thereof, and to adopt suitable regulations permitting and governing the same, in accordance with such determinations and with the provisions of subsection (b), which regulations shall become effective when approved by the President.

"(b) Insofar as it is practicable and consistent with the purposes of such conventions and of this act to do so, each regulation adopted pursuant to subsection (a) shall be based upon and make due allowance for local conditions (including abundance of the species, biological conditions, and any actual or threatened injury to agricultural or other interests) existing within each section, area, and flyway of the United States to which such regulation shall apply. The Secretary shall adopt special regulations for particular areas, sections, and flyways if such action is necessary in order to carry out the provisions of this subsection.

"(c) There is hereby created a Migratory Game Bird Advisory Committee, to be composed of one representative from each State, to be selected by the Governor thereof. Such committee shall confer with and advise the Secretary of the Interior with respect to all determinations made and regulations adopted by him pursuant to subsection (a). The members of the committee shall select a chairman from among their number. Any vacancy in the committee shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made. The members of the committee shall receive no compensation for their services as such, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the committee."

SEC. 2. No regulation heretofore adopted pursuant to section 3 of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act shall remain in effect after the close of the sixth calendar month which begins after the month in which this act is enacted.

[H. R. 5579, 80th Cong., 2d sess.]

A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act so as to provide that regulations adopted pursuant to such act for any area, section, or flyway shall be based on conditions existing within such area, section, or flyway, and to create a Migratory Game Bird Advisory Committee

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 16, sec. 704), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) Subject to the provisions and in order to carry out the purposes of the conventions referred to in section 2, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed, from time to time, having due regard to the zones of temperature and to the distribution, abundance, economic value, breeding habits, and times and lines of migratory flight of such birds, and after conferring with the committee created by subsection (c), to determine when, and to what extent, if at all, and by what means, it is

compatible with the terms of such conventions to allow hunting, taking, capture, killing, possession, sale, purchase, shipment, transportation, carriage, or export of any such bird, or any part, nest, or egg thereof, and to adopt suitable regulations permitting and governing the same, in accordance with such determinations and with the provisions of subsection (b), which regulations shall become effective when approved by the President.

"(b) Insofar as it is practicable and consistent with the purposes of such conventions and of this act to do so, each regulation adopted pursuant to subsection (a) shall be based upon and make due allowance for local conditions (including abundance of the species, biological conditions, and any actual or threatened injury to agricultural or other interests) existing within each section, area, and flyway of the United States to which such regulation shall apply. The Secretary shall adopt special regulations for particular areas, sections, and flyways if such action is necessary in order to carry out the provisions of this subsection.

"(c) There is hereby created a Migratory Game Bird Advisory Committee, to be composed of one representative from each State, to be selected by the Governor thereof. Such committee shall confer with and advise the Secretary of the Interior with respect to all determinations made and regulations adopted by him pursuant to subsection (a). The members of the committee shall select a chairman from among their number. Any vacancy in the committee shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made. The members of the committee shall receive no compensation for their services as such, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the committee."

SEC. 2. No regulation heretofore adopted pursuant to section 3 of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act shall remain in effect after the close of the sixth calendar month which begins after the month in which this act is enacted.

David A. Morse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, it should please the Congress to learn this week of the selection of David A. Morse as Director General of the International Labor Organization, following the retirement of Edward J. Phelan, of Ireland.

David Morse, present Under Secretary of Labor, will bring to his new position intelligence, vigor, and a thorough understanding of the problems confronting the International Labor Organization, a special agency of the United Nations. He has had much experience in the affairs of the organization in the last few years, having been leading representative of the United States Government at the annual conferences. My association with him at the conferences in the last two years enabled me to observe his work, especially last year in Geneva when he was chairman of the Committee on Freedom of Association. All of the matters coming before that committee were handled with dispatch and diplomacy, and it is no easy task to bring the representatives of 52 nations to almost unanimous agreement on problems concerning labor. We can have confidence that in David Morse we have a man who will bring credit to the United States in his leadership of the International Labor Organization.

The American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PARKE M. BANTA
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. BANTA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by DeWitt Emery from the Missouri Bismarck Gazette dated June 11, 1948:

THE AMERICAN WAY—WILL WE EVER LEARN?

(By DeWitt Emery)

I have just learned what it is which make Americans work harder and skimp and save to get ahead. I always thought that the primary urge came from love of family, "I want to give my children a better start than I had," or a desire to have and enjoy more and more of the better things of life, and so on. But according to the Treasury Department that's all wrong. The real incentive is high taxes.

Here's the way the Treasury Department expressed it in a recent study on taxation:

"If taxes take larger proportions of their income (all of us, that is) the incentive of these individuals to work tends to be increased rather than decreased. They will try, within the limits of their abilities, energies, and opportunities, to earn more to attain and maintain the desired income after taxes. A tax reduction would tend to reduce their incentive to work and slacken their efforts since their objectives could be met with smaller incomes before tax."

There you have it. As your taxes are reduced and you have more of your income left for your own use, you have less incentive to work. You don't need a new car or a new suit or a new rug for the living room, your wife and the children have all of the clothes and everything else they want or need, therefore, you haven't any use for the extra money, so naturally you ease up, don't work as hard or as many hours. Yes sir, that's the way our forefathers figured it and is why the United States is today the wealthiest nation in the world. Ben Franklin and all others down through the years who advocated hard work and thrift as the secret of success were wrong—100 per cent wrong.

If this sort of cockeyed thinking or reasoning or whatever it should be called, on the part of the Treasury Department, surprises you, it shouldn't. It's part and parcel of the basic New Deal philosophy of scarcity, something for nothing. If this something for nothing idea were carried to its ultimate conclusion, it could only mean that after a while everyone would have everything for producing nothing. Silly? Absurd? Of course it is, but silly or not, that's the soothing sirup which has been fed to the American people since 1932. And now in 1948 the Treasury Department comes along with another great big dose of the same medicine.

Will we—the people—ever learn that the only way to stop this merry-go-round before it wrecks all of us is to shut down on the fuel supply—tax money—so as to force a drastic reduction in the size and scope of operation of the bureaucratic machine which runs the "Washington merry-go-round."

This can and will be done when we, the people, demand it. After all it's our Government; it belongs to us, not to those we elect to run it. They are our servants. But like any and all servants, when the master becomes careless and indifferent, they also become careless and indifferent, and the whole set-up goes to pot.

Come on, let's wake up and get after these servants of ours. Let's each of us let our representatives know that we are not going to vote for anyone next November who is not pledged to work hard for a drastic reduction in the cost of government and a further reduction of taxes.

The Christmas Orange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARDIN PETERSON
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1948

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have a very good friend, Russell Kay, in Tampa, Fla., who publishes a column, Too Late To Classify. In this he quoted The Christmas Orange, by Frank Kay Anderson, another friend of mine of many years standing, who was quite active in the citrus industry of Florida. I think it merits a place in the RECORD and I have therefore asked leave to extend my remarks and include it therein, as follows:

TOO LATE TO CLASSIFY

(By Russell Kay)

Years ago when I was editor and general manager of the Florida Grower Magazine, I had a friendly competitor in Frank Kay Anderson, who was then editor of the Citrus Industry Magazine.

Frank, now deceased, truly loved Florida. Long identified with activities in connection with the citrus industry, he never let an opportunity pass to say or write a good word for Florida citrus. Like the writer, he was opposed to the shipment of green fruit and pointed out in his able writings that when ripe no citrus fruit in the world could touch Florida's product.

Not long ago I received a letter from Mrs. Anderson. She said she had been going through some old files and ran across a manuscript, the original copy of Frank Kay Anderson's tribute to "The Christmas Orange" which had been featured in Citrus Industry Magazine in 1923 when he was its editor.

Her thought was that it might bear republishing at this time and, with another Christmas so close at hand, I concur and find reproducing it in this column and at the same time pay tribute to its deceased author who was one of my warmest friends.

Here is Frank's editorial, just as he wrote it:

"THE CHRISTMAS ORANGE

(By Frank Kay Anderson)

"I am the gold of the sunshine, the nectar of the flowers, the aroma of the tropic

twilight when dusky nightfall slips silently upon a stilled and fragant world.

"I am a gleam of cheer to brighten the murk of gray sky, a pledge of warmth and gladness to dull the menace of a chill wind that flutters dead leaves outside, a glint of perpetual summer against snowflakes hurrying past the window pane.

"I am the token of love and remembrance, a jolly bulge in the chimney-side stocking, a cherished gift from Santa Claus.

"I am Health. Within me is that which brings color to the cheek, gives zest to the appetite, and bids the body awake.

"I am Wealth. The riches of Ind are the treasures I bring, for health is wealth, to all mankind.

"I am Happiness. I radiate good cheer and symbolize the spirit of giving. I go hand in hand with unselfish service.

"Chubby fingers fondle me, lean fingers caress me, rosy faces and wan hold me for a smile of welcome and delight. I am an accompaniment and a token of the spirit of the occasion.

"I am the Christmas orange."

The Jugglers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND H. BURKE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which I believe all should take time to read:

THE JUGGLERS

An acquaintance of ours was born and raised in the Kaiser's Germany. His youth was spent under the shadow of "Papa's annuity." To gain this anchor against the future the whole family scrimped and saved. It was for Papa's annuity that the family forewent vacations, that Mama passed up new dresses, and that the children did with makeshift toys.

In the spring of 1922 Papa's policy matured. The policy was paid all right, at full face value. But Mama took the whole of it, a lifetime of savings, and the family celebrated with one good Sunday dinner.

We have a neighbor who was born here and has lived his life in one neighborhood. In the dark and uncertain days of the depression he, too, bought an annuity. In 15 years, if he was frugal, he was to retire on $150 a month.

Last Christmas he began to receive the fruits of his sacrifices. His checks come regularly and are helpful, but the dream of retirement is gone. He no longer talks about the cottage in Florida.

These two men, unknown to one another, have a common bond. With both of them their community, that is to say their Government, failed to keep faith. They sacrificed something of value and got back a thing which bore the same label but which had cheapened. Both of these men feel cheated.

There is a difference between what happened to the German mark and to the United States dollar. But the difference is quantitative, not qualitative. The same thing happened to the dollar as happened to the mark, and for some of the same reasons. It did happen here; just not so badly.

Cheapening money is an age-old device to get currency for armament programs and other nonproductive governmental projects. The people who pay for it are all those who are frugal, all those who have savings, who buy insurance policies, or who participate in pension plans.

There are many ways to cheapen money. Kings used to shave the edges of their gold pieces. After governments simply whirled the tempo of the printing presses. A more progressive method is to pump up the currency and credit supply through the government-controlled central banking system. That has the advantage of being too subtle to alarm the populace.

Under the impelling necessity of war this country used the up-to-date method. The results require no commentary.

Now we are embarking once more on a great armament program to be piled atop an already huge Government budget. And in Washington they are again talking dangerous language.

In the past few weeks there have been a series of news stories with all the earmarks of road dredgers for an about-face in Government fiscal policy. In one case an "authoritative Government spokesman," who addressed a formal press conference but who refused to let his name be used, said the administration "might" have to drop all credit-curbing programs. On the contrary, the Government "might" deliberately encourage more credit expansion to pay for the huge spending.

Stripped of the economist's jargon, this means that the administration is toying with the idea of inflating again.

Everybody knows what inflation does to daily prices. We are prone to forget too easily that it also cheapens—and can completely destroy—the accomplishments of a lifetime.

That's not an academic evil to the man in the street. It is a threat to every laborer who looks forward to a pension, to every man who buys savings bonds or puts away a dollar for the proverbial rainy day, to every man who scrimps for an insurance policy. And 73,000,000 individuals in this country hold private life-insurance policies, not counting social security. These policies affect three out of every four American families.

The wartime inflation has already stolen half the savings of many of these. Further inflation, so glibly talked about, can only dissolve most of the remainder.

We think it's about time irresponsible officials stopped playing ducks and drakes with a people's future.

Bunker Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, Under leave to extend my remarks I include therein a message I recently had the honor to send to Hon. James M. Curley, mayor of Boston, and formerly a distinguished Member of this body on the occasion of the observance of a great patriotic holiday at Charlestown, Mass.

I was designated as principal speaker on this occasion but the pendency of the all-important draft bill in the House unavoidably and most regrettably detained me.

The message follows:

It is a source of deepest regret and keenest disappointment to me that because of the pendency of the draft bill in the House, it will be impossible for me to be with you this evening. For I had looked forward with great anticipation and a profound sense of honor and privilege to addressing your historic gathering at Charlestown which will again fittingly celebrate such a significant and decisive milestone in the early history of our Nation. I am confident that the distinguished committee and assemblage will fully recognize the vital importance and critical urgency of the pending measure which so unfortunately, but unavoidably, detains me in the National Capitol.

As many of you know, I am a member of the House Armed Services Committee and one of the sponsors and signers of the minority report of that committee upon the pending draft bill which, if enacted, will indenture hundreds of thousands of American boys into military conscription in peacetime. I have taken a leading part in the opposition to this ill-advised and ill-considered measure and consequently my presence in the House during the debate and vote is indeed directed and compelled by every consideration of public duty and conscience.

The occasion you celebrate is epochal in American history because it marked the triumph of the courage, moral strength and idealism of our early American forebears in their determined immortal fight against oppression and tyranny and it exemplified the forward-march toward the free representative democracy of the Colonists from which that day to this has contributed so gloriously to the development of the greatest free Government and the most prosperous and happiest Nation and people in history.

Let me, therefore, congratulate and commend my friend, the distinguished Mayor of Boston, Hon. James M. Curley, and his able committee, to whom I am so deeply indebted for their kind invitation, for arranging such eminently appropriate ceremonies to commemorate these great events, and to recall and revive that spirit of devotion to individual liberty which animated the gallant Colonists as it must animate, possess and inspire us in these troublous days if we are to preserve the great heritage bequeathed to us by the original founders and which the Nation has protected since that time by the loyalty, the bloodshed and the bitter sacrifices of our noble sons and our faithful people.

Evil forces confront us as never before in this world today. On a world-wide front, atheism, paganism, irreligion, and sacrilegious enmity to our cherished beliefs in God and democracy are waging a determined, well-organized campaign to undermine, overthrow and destroy the fundamental tenets of free Government and the exalted philosophical concepts upon which it rests.

Our Nation joining with other allied powers succeeded after lavishly spending our wealth and resources, unselfishly offering the blood of our best and noblest sons, unflinchingly harnessing the great strength of our people, in liquidating one set of tyrants who threatened human liberty. Before and during this great and bloody conflict we were solemnly promised peace, order, and a democratic world. We were solemnly assured that the greatest fulfillment of the hopes and aspirations of democratic nations was at hand.

What bitter disillusionment our Nation has suffered, what shameful betrayals of our war aims we have experienced, what ironical denials of our high ideals and purposes we have witnessed.

Instead of liberty, security and peace we are confronted by chaos, confusion, disorder, aggression and conspiracy to overthrow all

our most precious institutions. A great Red Colossus, drunk with power, emboldened by appeasement, encouraged and strengthened all too often by the unwise policies of some in our own Government has moved steadily across the face of Europe and the Orient, taking over small free nations and penetrating and infiltrating with poisonous anti-democratic, anti-Christian, anti-American ideologies into very many parts of the world including many segments of opinion and political and social action in our own country.

This Marxist conspiracy must and will be defeated and smashed. This brazen campaign to destroy Christianity and democracy must and will be combatted and blocked. Americanism and freedom must and will triumph over totalitarianism and slavery. But Americans must be as alert and vigilant and courageous as the heroes of Bunker Hill in meeting this great crisis in the affairs of Christendom and democracy. Americans must be just as zealous in preserving the basic attributes of our freedom which are under savage or subtle challenge and attack. Americans must unitedly move, regardless of race, color, creed or station in life, to check the onward march of communism which casts an ominous shadow over modern civilization. Americans must act to protect and save the Nation from the ravages of the Marxist tyranny which is boring its way deep into the fabric of our religious, political, social and economic institutions.

But there are other grave dangers to democracy confronting us. In our efforts to check Communism abroad and at home, measures have been proposed which are not in keeping with our Constitution or the spirit of Americanism. First are repressive measures to stifle free speech, free advocacy, free expression, and legitimate free political action. Secondly, policies looking toward supermilitarism and an ultimate military dictatorship are threatening us with the same methods of regimentation and slavery typical of the regimes and systems of Hitler and Stalin.

Every true and thinking American favors an adequate national defense spear-headed by commanding air power and implemented by modern scientific weapons and innovations to secure the nation and effectuate a strong vigorous pro-American foreign policy. But we insist upon the retention of our traditional American voluntary techniques. We abhor and renounce extreme militarism and compulsion in peacetime which adopts the very totalitarian philosophy and pattern of arbitrary regimentation so objectionable to the American people. Compulsion of this kind directed against the individual, against the home, the school, and the church is justifiable only in a genuine emergency affecting the actual security of the Nation.

Let this then, my friends and fellow Americans, be a time of rejoicing and gratitude for the ideals and courage and heroism of the past, and also a time of rededication to the high purpose and patriotism of all those who strove so mightily and contributed so valiantly and magnificently to the formation and preservation of this—the greatest free government ever achieved by man.

Tonight as we recall the noble deeds of the early patriots, as we commemorate their noble accomplishments for God and country, as we reverently thank the Almighty for the great work they wrought and the priceless blessings of their heritage, let us resolve to take new courage from their example, to derive new inspiration from their Americanism, to move fearlessly and militantly toward the goal which was ever present in their minds and hearts, "undying enmity against every form of tryanny over the mind of man," the protection and enrichment of human freedom, the preservation in all its glory of our beloved America.

Congratulations, greetings, and best wishes to all.

United States Employment Policy in the Panama Canal Zone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 14, 1948.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are writing to urge that you take immediate action to eliminate by administrative action the infamous Jim Crow, silver-gold system which is the official employment policy of the United States Government on the Panama Canal Zone. This is one of the reasons the Panama Government refused to allow our troops to remain.

Several weeks ago representatives of the so-called silver workers visited this country to attend the convention of the United Public Workers, CIO. While here we conferred with them and heard of the grave injustice which is being perpetrated against these employees by the United States Government, their employer.

As you know, the silver-gold system has been in operation on the Canal Zone since the early construction days. Originally, American citizens employed on the Zone were paid in gold and native or alien workers were paid in silver. Hence the use of the terms silver and gold. Since that time the silver-gold system has solidified into a plain unadulterated and vicious policy of discrimination which forces thousands of darker employees to work and live under the most miserable Jim Crow conditions, in sharp contrast to the facilities offered United States citizen employees. Silver workers employed on the Canal Zone are West Indian Negroes, citizens of Panama and other Latin American countries, Hindus, Chinese, etc.

It is also true that the few American Negroes employed on the Canal Zone are discriminated against in the use of housing, educational, recreational, and commissary facilities because of the Jim Crow atmosphere created by the silver-gold system.

In fact, the continued use of the silver-gold system by the United States Government has become one of the major reasons for the development of the growing bitterness against the United States in Latin America. We can no longer ignore this shameful practice of discrimination, which is now looked upon as a mirror of our real policy on race relations. Actually the conditions under which the so-called silver workers live on the Canal Zone are inexcusable.

In the United States a growing number of Americans, Negro and white, are beginning to understand and resent this discriminatory policy of our Government towards thousands of West Indian Negroes, Latin Americans, Hindus and other darker peoples. As a matter of fact, thousands of people who came originally from the West Indies, Panama, and other sections of Latin America are now voting citizens in the United States. Many of these citizens have relatives and friends now working and living under the silver-gold system on the Panama Canal Zone.

Under the Panama Canal Act (August 24, 1924) the President of the United States or his representative is given full authority to prescribe conditions of employment, transportation, medical care, housing, education, etc. Moreover, the basic legislative authority of the Panama Canal Act permits changes in Executive Orders establishing the above-mentioned conditions without congressional action.

We therefore state that the continuance of this policy is entirely your responsibility. We urge that you immediately use the power vested in you as our Chief Executive to abolish the silver-gold system as has been recommended by your Committee on Civil Rights and the United Public Workers of America, CIO. Only in this way can our country go before all the peoples of the world as a nation which practices as well as preaches the basic tenets of equality and democracy for all men.

Sincerely,

ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr., New York; GEO. G. SADOWSKI, Michigan; JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota; ARTHUR G. KLEIN, New York; LEO ISACSON, New York; FRANCK R. HAVENNER, California; FRANK BUCHANAN, Pennsylvania; WALTER B. HUBER, Ohio; HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, California; VITO MARCANTONIO, New York; EMANUEL CELLER, New York.

Indonesia—No United States Loans To Perpetuate Imperialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a hot spot exists in Indonesia. A contest is in progress between imperialism and freedom. The position of the United States must be on the side of those people who are fighting to advance the principles of justice and liberty. We have no quarrel with the Dutch Government, but we say that justice must prevail between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Republic of Indonesia.

Mr. Speaker, it would be a tragic mistake to permit our policy in Indonesia to be determined by pressure from commercial interests. Our money must not be advanced as a vehicle against a new government which seeks to establish a democratic way of life.

Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the New York Times of June 8, the following news item date-lined The Hague:

A Government spokesman said today that the Netherlands was seeking a $400,000,000 loan from the United States for the Netherlands East Indies. Dollar proceeds from Banka Island tin would secure the advance.

J. E. van Hoogstraten, head of the Indies Department for Economic Affairs, discussed the loan recently in Washington. The Export-Import Bank there previously was reported to be willing to lend $100,000,000, provided the islands were quiet internally.

The Netherlands East Indies Government has a five-eighth interest in the Banka tin mines. The Billiton Co. does the mining.

This proposed action would be most regrettable in the light of current developments in Indonesia. It would appear from such action that the United States

of America, which was a party to the Renville agreement, was taking sides in the dispute that has arisen between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Republic of Indonesia.

Both parties to the dispute, with the help of the Committee of Good Offices, signed a truce agreement on the 17th of January 1948. That selfsame day both parties appended their signatures to the principles forming an agreed basis for the political discussions as accepted at the fourth meeting of the Committee of Good Offices. Article 5 of the Renville agreement states:

> That as soon as practicable after the signing of the truce agreement, economic activity, trade, transportation, and communications be restored through the cooperation of both parties, taking into consideration the interests of all the constituent parts of Indonesia.

The over-all effect of the Renville agreement taken in conjunction with the truce agreement, was to cause a shrinkage in the territory and population of the Republic, because both agreements permitted continued Dutch tenure of areas of Java, Sumatra and Madura occupied by the Dutch subsequent to their military action in July, 1947. The main reason why the Republic of Indonesia agreed to the disadvantageous terms of the truce and Renville agreements was because the Indonesians looked to the United Nations, and specifically to the United States of America (which is one of the nations represented on the Committee of Good Offices), to assist in the achievement of a political settlement between the Republic and the Netherlands. Latest reports from Indonesia indicate that the outlook for a quick settlement is not hopeful and neutral observers attribute the difficulties to the recalcitrance of the Dutch.

The United States of America has a vital interest in what is happening in Indonesia. Because of its strategic location and of the wealth of strategic products so essential to our military stockpiles, it is our concern—as much as that of the Netherlands and Indonesia—that there should be a quick political settlement designed to secure a lasting peace. Only when there is real cooperation based on equality and good will between the Dutch and Indonesians can we expect a regular flow of materials from Indonesia to the United States.

When the Linggajati agreement was signed between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Republic of Indonesia in March, 1947, the Dutch recognized the de facto authority of the Republic over Java, Sumatra and Madura. We did likewise. As a result of the Dutch military action which followed within a little over three months of signing that Treaty, certain territories of the Republic have passed into Dutch occupation. But we have not abrogated our recognition of the territories comprised within the de facto sovereignty of the Republic.

It will be remembered that by the terms of the Linggajati agreement, any disputes arising between the two parties were to be settled by arbitration by a neutral chairman or by the Court of International Justice. However, this was not observed by the Dutch. In the fighting that ensued the Republic resorted to scorched-earth tactics; thereby large stores of valuable military stockpiles went up in smoke. That was a loss as much to the United States as to the economy of Indonesia, and we cannot afford a repetition of such an event.

There is another facet to the Indonesian-Dutch dispute. The United States of America is spending billions of dollars in Europe and hundreds of millions of dollars in other parts of the world to stem the advance of ideologies foreign to our way of life. In Indonesia, communism has never been able to gain a strong following among the 72,000,000 people of the archipelago. The most strengthening support which the United States could give the Indonesians in their stand for democracy as opposed to communism, would be to refuse to make any loan to either party to the dispute until such time as a strong Indonesian-controlled government has been established. The Dutch have declared their intention to set up a sovereign independent United States of Indonesia, linked in partnership with Holland through a Netherlands-Indonesian union, on or shortly after the first of January 1949. If we have waited this long to grant an American loan, common prudence would dictate that we wait another 6 months.

The application for the present loan of $400,000,000 is by the Netherlands-East Indies Government, which, on its own statement, will hand over sovereign powers to the United States of Indonesia in 6 months or so. That being the case, repayment of this loan will be not by the Netherlands-East Indies Government but by the United States of Indonesia. Therefore, any loan we make must be to a fully representative democratically created United States of Indonesia which will include each and every territory of the Indonesian Archipelago.

Indonesia has been and continues to be one of the main tension areas of the world. It is also one area where American prestige stands very low because the Indonesians feel that the Dutch occupation of Indonesia has been due to American loans and American-trained Dutch soldiers equipped with American guns, ammunition, tanks, and airplanes.

Also there is the offer made by the American Government in June last year when it called upon the Republic of Indonesia and the Netherlands-East Indies Government to arrive at a settlement which would enable the United States to lend jointly to them $100,000,000 for rehabilitation purposes. It was then our purpose, as made clear by the terms we attached to that offer, not to offer the money to one party. That was a sound principle and we must not go back on that now.

It is an open secret that moneys lent to European nations for rehabilitation in Europe have been diverted to the maintenance of armies in colonial areas in Asia. It would be infinitely worse to lend money directly to colonial governments in Asia unless and until the Asiatic populations of the countries concerned can through democratically elected governments have a say in the spending of that money. It would be unwise for the United States of America to place money in the hands of one party to a dispute as in Indonesia, because that will be interpreted as American support for that particular party against the other. The United States should make it plain to both parties that no American loan will be forthcoming unless and until Dutch and Indonesians have achieved a lasting political settlement.

Christian and Civilized People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following editorial entitled "Christian and Civilized People," which appeared on June 11, 1948 in the Answer magazine. I believe this editorial will be of great interest to my colleagues in view of the fact that we are now at the crucial period of our foreign policy toward Germany and we must keep in mind what kind of people we are dealing with. Curiously enough, it is the English that the editorial shows are treating the Germans in the foolish soft manner that will inevitably bring disastrous results; and it is interesting to remember what the English have done and are doing today to the Hebrew people in the Middle East.

The editorial follows:

"CHRISTIAN AND CIVILIZED PEOPLE"

Gen. Sir Brian Robertson, the British military governor for Germany, told a press conference in Berlin that an immediate amnesty had been ordered in the British zone for all noncommissioned officers of Hitler's SS Elite Guard, except those accused of specific war crimes. The pardon, which covered both the Death's-Head Elite Guard and the ordinary SS organization, was motivated by the British military governor with statements such as the following: "The Germans are Christian and civilized people . . . and we no longer owe them any ill will," also that "German interests coincide closely with our own," and finally, that he was "extremely anxious to encourage social contact with Germans by our officers, military government officials and British troops."

Now everything is clear. It appears that it was all a sad mistake, that those brave American boys who died on the beaches of Normandy, on the plains of Holland, on the hills of Ardennes, in the forests of Rhineland and the mountains of Bavaria gave their lives for a mistaken conception. It is now obvious that the billions of dollars which we poured into the war effort in the mistaken belief that we were saving the world and Christian civilization from the Hitlerian scourge, were just so much waste. There can no longer be any doubt that when Churchill dramatically called upon the American people to furnish Britain with weapons in order to defend herself against the Nazi hordes poised across the Channel for a final blow against the people of Britain, he was just day-dreaming. For those good, decent people of Germany were only missionaries of Christian civilization which they wanted to spread the world over for the greater glory of God.

Now it is our duty, in fairness to our children and our children's children, to expurgate from the textbooks of history some very regrettable misconceptions which most probably slipped into them under the influence of ill-informed or misguided historians. Just to mention a few; the crematoria in which the Christian civilized Germans burned alive millions of Jews and other innocent men, women and children, should henceforth be referred to as "altars of God," the gas chambers—"monuments of the new era of Christian civilization," and those 12 top Nazis sentenced to the gallows in Nuremberg in 1946 should be called the "12 martyred apostles" of the new Christian era of the German Reich.

In Britain, of course, this slight "readjustment" of the conception of Christian civilization would not meet with great difficulties. For a people who gave the world a new concept of Socialism, a Socialism that has surpassed, in Palestine and elsewhere, the most despicable practices and traditions of Czarist Russia of inglorious memory, or any other infamous tyranny of the past, a people who swallowed Bevinism without a grimace is perfectly conditioned for this "new look," in Christianity and civilization. A nation which allied itself with the Mufti, a nation which took upon itself to lead "the Moslem civilized people" of the Arab League in a war of aggression in shameless defiance of the laws of man and God, certainly should not experience any difficulties in aligning itself with the "Christian civilized" Germans. For after all, there is no difference between Hitler and the Mufti, except that the latter is still alive.

But what about America? Is the land of the free and the home of the brave ready to accept this new decalog by the grace of His Majesty and his High Priest, Mr. Bevin? Or are we still hesitating to plunge into the cauldron of neo-paganism even though it be dressed up as a new interpretation of Christian civilization? Are we to find a clever way out of this embarrassing situation; namely, not to embrace the new creed but to quietly build it up and help it spread over the world with our wealth and substance, with our billions and our skill?

If this is the case, if this is what some of our high officials in the Department of State and elsewhere have in mind, we must warn the people of America that they are being led to the third and final holocaust, to a war to end all wars by finishing off all mankind so that there will be no one to wage war again. We must warn the American people against repeating the same fatal mistake which we committed in the early days of the new Hitlerian era of Christian civilization, when we poured billions into Germany to build up that monstrous war machine which brought so much grief and disaster to the whole world, and into our own homes.

We still choose to believe that Americans of all creeds have a different conception of civilization than that of Sir Brian Robertson, and that Americans of the Christian faith still refuse to consider Hitler and his henchmen as latter-day saints.

Women and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the women Members of the House of Representatives have made outstanding contributions to the political life of America. It is to be regretted that their numbers in this body are so few and it is to be hoped that their numbers will increase so that the outlook of this body may be broadened and much needed legislation brought into existence through their activities. It has been my privilege to work closely with such outstanding members as Mrs. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS of California, Mrs. FRANCES BOLTON of Ohio, and Mrs. EDITH ROGERS of Massachusetts on the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Knowing them was to respect and admire them for their courage, intelligence, and sense of responsibility. The same can be said for Mrs. MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine, Mrs. MARY NORTON, of New Jersey, Mrs. GEORGIA LUSK, of New Mexico, and Mrs. KATHERINE ST. GEORGE, of New York. They have all contributed greatly to the dignity, intelligence, and understanding of the House and it is my sincere hope that they will be with us for many years to come. We are proud of all of them.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting an editorial from the Montana Standard of Butte, Mont., dated June 14, 1948:

WOMEN AND POLITICS

Mrs. MARY NORTON, who has been a Member of Congress from New Jersey for 24 years, has been made chairman of the credentials committee for the Democratic National Convention. It is one of the important groups of the convention.

Mrs. NORTON in an interview with a New York paper said she considered her selection a definite step forward for women in politics, and predicted many more such positions for them in the future. She had, however, a criticism of women in general in their attitude toward politics. She said they have no confidence in their own sex as candidates for public office. She attributed this in part as due to their upbringing, and in part to the fact that women have had the vote for only 28 years. They must learn, she asserted, to give their support to other women.

The veteran Congresswoman might also have said that women should learn to be impersonal in their selection and support of candidates. The sex of a candidate is not so important as is his or her fitness for the office under consideration.

Marquis Childs, well-known writer, in a recent column, gave high praise to Representative MARGARET CHASE SMITH (Republican, of Maine) and Representative HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS (Democrat, of California). He noted their sense of responsibility, their firmness of conviction and their practical grasp of public affairs as being outstanding among their colleagues. It is for such qualities as these that women deserve the support of voters.

The fact that Mrs. NORTON has been sent to Congress by the voters of her district for nearly a quarter of a century suggests that she, too, must have high qualifications for public office.

Increase of Pay of Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Grand Rapids Press of June 15, 1948:

POSTAL WORKERS HAVE A CASE

With a formidable list of must legislation still to be acted upon if Congress is to adjourn this week, the fate of separate House and Senate bills to raise the pay of postal workers is in serious doubt. And this is in spite of the fact that the legislation was given a high priority by Senator TAFT only a few weeks ago and still is on the list of secondary issues marked "urgent."

The present House bill provides for a blanket increase of $585 a year for all postal clerks and carriers. The Senate measure calls for an $800 increase. Obviously a compromise will have to be reached if any action is to be taken—which means that both Senate and House will have to pass their respective bills and then send them to conference.

The case for raising postal workers' wages is a strong one: Throughout the war and postwar periods they have had but one general increase—that of January 1, 1946, which gave them a $400-a-year raise. Previous to that they had had but a minor readjustment in wages, which came on July 1, 1945, when postal jobs were reclassified. The reclassification, however, did not benefit new employees.

The so-called entrance wage for new postal workers hired as substitutes is $1.04 an hour. Once they attain the status of regulars, they are put on an annual wage of $2,100. Tops for clerks and carriers, after having served for 10 years, is now $3,100. Approximately one-third of postal workers in the Grand Rapids post office are receiving $2,100 to $2,200 a year.

The only way postal workers have of obtaining wage increases is through Congress. They long ago committed themselves to a no-strike policy. It takes no statistician to prove that with only one general increase throughout the entire inflationary period postal workers' income has lagged notably behind a rising cost of living and incomes in other lines of work. That point is underlined by the fact that post offices all over the country are finding it difficult, and even impossible, to fill vacant jobs.

Concern for the continued efficient and unimpaired operation of the postal service demands that favorable action be taken on some bill to raise postal workers' wages. It should be taken, too, as a matter of simple justice to one of the most faithful and hard-working groups in Government service.

Use of Steel for Development of Oil Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, in the report of the Special Subcommittee on Petroleum of the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, a recommendation was made as to the use of steel for the development of oil supply. The order of priority of desirable use consistent with the national security was, first, the development of domestic resources; second, in the Western Hemi-

sphere; and, third, in the rest of the world.

The figures on exports of seamless and welded casing and oil line pipe for the first 4 months of this year show that the total exports of these classes of tubular goods are at a rate which if maintained throughout this year promise an increase of more than one-third over the total exports for 1947, and over seven times the prewar rate.

They show that exports to Venezuela to the end of April this year had totaled 64,356 tons, or an annual rate of about 193,000 tons. The total for last year was 152,630 tons. Shipments to Mexico and Colombia were at a rate substantially less than last year, and to Canada about the same as in 1947.

The big increase was to the Middle East. The total exports of these tubular goods in 1947 was 51,673 tons. That total has already been exceeded in the first 4 months of this year, which latter total was 56,838 tons. That rate of exports, if kept up, would mean that the Middle East would increase its supply of pipe by more than three times.

The domestic producer is still desperately in need of tubular goods. The Department of Commerce was instructed by statute to satisfy itself that the domestic economy was safeguarded in its exercise of licensing authority. I invite the attention of the Members to this and to the rapid increase in exports of goods which we need to make certain that we have an adequate, dependable, and accessible supply of petroleum.

Increase of Pay for Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, postal and Federal employees are entitled to and in need of an increase in wages. Their wages have not kept pace with those employed in private industry. The case presented by these workers to the Congress places us in much the same category as a jury sitting in a civil case where liability is admitted, leaving only the amount of the recovery to be determined.

I know that the Post Office Department is operating under a very large annual deficit, but this is no argument to be used against a fair increase to its employees. The theory that the Post Office Department should produce revenue equal to the cost of operation is one not indulged in when we consider any other agency of the Federal Government. Certainly there is no branch of it that renders greater service to the people of the country than does the Post Office Department. If there is any one thing that is distressing, it is the fact that your mail is not delivered promptly or possibly not at all, and, therefore, in order to see that a high standard of service is maintained, it is essential that we continue to have competent postal employees. There has been a failure on the part of many qualified persons to enter the postal service because of the low salary paid. An increase is very desirable so that it may attract qualified people into the service to replace those who may be retired or who leave it. It is in the interest, not only of the employees, but of the Government and the people of the United States, that postal employees and Federal employees, generally, be paid sufficient wages so that they can keep their minds on their work and not be obliged to worry about whether or not they are going to be able to meet the grocery bill on Saturday night.

It requires no argument to demonstrate the difficulty of the postal and Federal employee endeavoring to exist on the wages paid in these modern times and this is more especially true in the case of an employee with a family.

Aged and Blind Aid Constitutional Amendment Is California's Answer to Crisis Now Facing Needy Aged and Blind Pensioners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, considerable interest has been aroused in California by an initiative proposal to amend the State constitution, which will be voted upon in the November 2, 1948, election. This measure is entitled "The Aged and Blind Aid Constitutional Amendment," and it seems important that we gain an understanding of the nature of this proposal and of the underlying circumstances and forces which have combined to bring it into existence. It is significant that action such as is envisaged by this amendment, is being taken on a State rather than a national level—particularly when the sponsor of the measure has gone on record as favoring a uniform, national pension program under the social-security program.

The California aged and blind aid amendment is just what its name implies—an amendment to aid the needy aged and blind of the State by providing them with more adequate pension security in this inflationary period when persons on small fixed incomes are forced to live on substandard levels that barely sustain existence.

The sponsor of the measure is George H. McLain, who is the chairman and founder of the Citizens' Committee for Old Age Pensions, a California organization that was founded 8 years ago in Los Angeles as a service center for the needy aged and blind of the State.

During these 8 years, the citizens' committee has greatly improved conditions for aged and blind pensioners. Many of the measures it has sponsored before the State legislature have been passed, and its influence has resulted in making the administration of the existing State welfare laws more humanitarian and impartial.

However, with the advent of the present inflationary period which apparently is the inevitable result of a war and postwar economy, it became evident that pension payments were inadequate to sustain a decent standard of life for the needy aged and blind. Some increases were granted to the pensioners, but these proved insufficient. Also, there was no safeguard to prevent a politically minded State legislature from reducing pensions and slashing relief rolls.

Mr. McLain sponsored a pension measure before the State legislature, which was substantially the same as the aged and blind aid constitutional amendment, and this bill was acted upon favorably by the assembly of the legislature—only to be sidetracked in committee in the State senate by three or four die-hard senators.

Faced with this impasse, Mr. McLain decided that—in the interests of the needy aged and blind, whom he represents—the matter should be taken to the people of California through an initiative constitutional amendment. The aged and blind aid amendment proved most popular with the voters, who recognized it as a practical and reasonable measure, and more than 330,000 signatures were secured on its qualifying petitions in a matter of 8 weeks.

Briefly, the main provisions of the aged and blind aid amendment are as follows: Old-age-assistance payments will be increased $15 a month from $60 to $75, and blind-aid payments will be increased $10 from $75 to $85 per month. The misnamed "responsible relatives" clause will be repealed—and I would remind you that the Federal Social Security Administration has gone on record as opposing State provisions which condition eligibility for assistance on the ability of relatives to support the applicant. The amendment also provides for an increased personal property allowance for pensioners, and states that no county shall discriminate against or charge a recipient for hospitalization or health services. Most important is the section which will make the State welfare director an elected official instead of an appointive one; this is being done in an effort to terminate the practice of looking upon this vital office as a political plum to be handed out by whatever governor happens to be in office.

The aged and blind aid amendment also will save home owners and property owners approximately $15,000,000 annually in county taxes, by eliminating the county welfare agencies' part in the aged and blind assistance program, and centralizing the control of the program in the State welfare department. This streamlining will result in economy, better administration, and uniform pension

payments throughout the State. Every effort has been exerted, of course, to make sure that the amendment is in complete conformity with all requirements of the Federal social-security laws.

When George McLain appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee on May 3, 1946, as chairman of the National Pension Committee, Inc. and the Citizens' Committee for Old Age Pensions, his remarks included a statement to the effect that one of the important reasons he was at that time favoring a certain amendment to the Social Security Act was that it would "encourage uniform, higher grants for old-age and blind assistance throughout the entire Nation."

It seems obvious that when responsible leaders in the public welfare field go on record as favoring uniform national pension legislation, but are forced by circumstances to rely instead on State programs, that there must of necessity be a basic reason for such action. The reason, in my mind, is very clear. It is simply that Congress has failed to take any fundamental action to improve and extend the Federal Social Security Act since it was adopted more than 12 years ago.

The recent watered-down amendments to the Social Security Act, which have been enacted by the Republican majority as a substitute to the legislation requested by President Truman in his social security message, constitute only a very weak step in the right direction. The $5 monthly increase for the needy aged and blind, which this legislation provides, can be passed on to the aged and blind only in the few States, such as my own, which have enacted the necessary enabling legislation.

Meanwhile, the need for immediate action to provide a basic minimum of economic security for our needy aged and blind in this inflationary period is a problem which must be solved—and which must be solved at once. That, it seems to me, is why action is being taken on the State level. It is being taken because some solution must be provided at once for the dilemma now facing the needy aged and blind, and because Congress has failed to provide that solution.

Fortunately for the people of my State, the solution being offered them through aged and blind aid constitutional amendment is a thoroughly practical one, and one that will immediately guarantee our aged and blind that minimum of basic economic security which they must have to continue their struggle for existence.

It is my hope that Congress will, in the very near future, see fit to amend the Federal Social Security Act so that it will provide the real security for our people which should be theirs, and so that a Nation-wide uniform old age assistance program will become a reality.

Meanwhile, I am giving my support to the California aged and blind aid constitutional amendment as a realistic solution to problems which must be acted upon at once; and I earnestly hope and recommend that the voters see fit to make it a part of our State constitution in November.

Excerpts From Addresses Made on the Floor of Congress by Hon. J. Harry McGregor, of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House of Representatives from the Seventeenth District of Ohio, I have earnestly endeavored to voice on the floor of Congress the opinions of the people it is my honor to represent. In order to obtain these opinions I have kept in constant contact with my constituents relative to their suggestions and views and have held meetings in the six county courthouses of the district each summer and have sent out questionnaires annually.

Under consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts of various speeches and remarks I have made on the floor of the Eightieth Congress relative to our national issues. Anyone who so desires may find these speeches in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS on the dates indicated:

M'GREGOR ASKS FOR WISDOM IN FEDERAL SPENDING

(March 25, 1947)

Mr. Speaker, the huge sprawling structure of Federal bureaucracy invites and compels waste, confusion, and inefficiency. The whole bureaucracy is too complex for our people to understand, for the President to supervise, or for Congress to control. The Eightieth Congress is finding it increasingly difficult to unravel and establish good and sound and efficient Government. The almost incredible duplications of effort and overlappings of authority are baffling obstacles to wise economy.

Recently there were no less than 29 agencies lending Government funds, 3 insuring deposits, 34 engaged in the acquisition of land, 16 in wildlife preservation, 9 in credit and finance, 12 in home and community planning, 10 in materials and construction, 28 in welfare matters, 14 in forestry matters, 4 in bank examinations, and 65 in gathering statistics. In 1932 there were 521 agencies ranking as bureaus or the equivalent, and now 1,141 exist.

The people of my district want to know where their tax dollars are going and how wisely they are being spent. President Truman's recent budget called for two to three times as much money to be spent by each Government department in the coming fiscal year as was spent in any prewar year. Why should it cost taxpayers almost $700,000,000 more in 1947 than in 1946 to operate regular Government bureaus and departments? Why does the operation and cost of upkeep of the Executive Mansion have to be more than three times the amount spent before the war? Do we need over a million more civilian personnel in war agencies today than we did before Pearl Harbor?

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to do away with any department, or with any individual, absolutely essential to the orderly functioning of our Government, but I venture the assertion that if the various department pay rolls were gone over carefully, the results would show that some of their pay rolls are havens for displaced bureaucrats and wartime refugees who do not want to go back where they came from.

As I have said many times, the Government is just a big individual, or a big family, and no family ever balanced its budget by arguing that it "could not do without this, that, or the other thing." It has to use the approach, "What can we afford?" So it is with the Government—$260,000,000,000 in debt. We can afford an adequate Army, Navy, and Air Force and whatever is absolutely necessary to give us a full and complete program for national defense and protection for our American way of life.

Congress might have to repeal a few laws which provide some services which it once thought essential. But we can reduce by at least 700,000 those on our Federal pay roll, if we start thinking in terms of what the country can afford. When a family can no longer afford a maid and a gardener, Mama goes into the kitchen and Papa mows the lawn. A Government in debt, like a family, has to put into effect the same kind of wisdom.

A DEFINITE STAND AGAINST COMMUNISM

(March 4, 1947)

Mr. Speaker, the battle against communism should be waged by all Americans, regardless of party, race, creed, or color. Only a handful of people stand to gain anything from a successful Communist revolution in this country, and it appears doubtful that the communists would be generous in handing out patronage to Americans just because they were passive, or gullible, or even cooperative. A quisling wins the respect of neither the people he betrays, nor the invaders whom he joins. And yet, I regret to say, there are some folks in our country who fail so far to appreciate the blessings of freedom and the advantages of our free-enterprise system that they scoff at the dangers from communistic doctrine, and may add that, well, if communism does come to America, they'll be smart enough to be commissars. Surely they cannot know the import of their words and the price of appeasement.

H. R. 1, A BILL TO REDUCE TAXES

(March 27, 1947)

Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for H. R. 1, a bill to reduce taxes, because I think it gives aid to every man, woman, and child in these United States. I think it is about time we gave more consideration to our own people. This bill, H. R. 1, will do two things:

First. It will give income-tax relief for all individual taxpayers.

Second. It will give an incentive to venture capital and allow business expansion which means more work and more income for all.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, also gives special recognition and exemptions to taxpayers who have attained the age of 65. I have been especially concerned about this group. Many of them, including retired groups, such as retired school teachers, policemen, municipal workers, and others who have retired from private industry, have as their sole source of livelihood, the small amount which they receive as a pension, annuity, or retirement pay. H. R. 1 allows each taxpayer in this age group, an additional exemption of $500, making a total personal exemption of $1,000.

This bill, H. R. 1, is equitable and fair. The people want relief from high taxes and high living costs. This is not a political measure. Politics should be forgotten and we should all vote for this bill and give to the people the aid and relief which they so justly deserve.

M'GREGOR OBJECTS TO PETROLEUM EXPORTS

(June 19, 1947)

Mr. Speaker, I note in the newspapers of today that President Truman is greatly disturbed over the Nation's critical petroleum-supply shortage and I also note that Secre-

tary of Interior J. A. Krug declares it may be necessary to again ration gasoline and fuel oil.

Mr. Speaker, I insist that the exporting of our petroleum products to Russia be stopped immediately. Is it not about time we gave the American people some consideration?

I am wondering if this policy of exporting critical materials is not a cleverly arranged plan to maintain shortages in the United States which certainly makes our living costs remain at a high level. I firmly believe if we would stop these exports we would have sufficient amounts of everything to meet our needs in this country, which would mean our living costs would be reduced. Again I say, let us give the American people more consideration.

GIVE VETERANS THE RIGHT TO CASH TERMINAL-LEAVE BONDS

(July 7, 1947)

Mr. Speaker, I am indeed glad to support H. R. 4017—introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BLACKNEY]—a bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946. This bill gives our veterans the right to cash their terminal-leave pay bonds at any time after September 1, 1947.

May I respectfully call to your attention that I introduced H. R. 4498 on October 25, 1945, during the Seventy-ninth Congress, to provide for the discharge or release from active duty of certain members of the armed forces, and restrict jurisdiction of commanding officers in declaring essentiality, and for terminal leave for enlisted personnel.

Also, on January 6, 1947, I introduced H. R. 534, a bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 which would provide that bonds issued under this act shall be redeemable at any time, to permit settlement and compensation under such act to be made in cash, and for other purposes.

I believe this record will justify the statement that I have always firmly believed that the members of our armed forces should be paid in cash and not in the form of bonds. I also would like to insert at this point, Mr. Speaker, my statement before the Armed Services Committee on June 26, 1947:

I appreciate the privilege of appearing before you this morning during the consideration of legislation to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946. May I respectfully call to your attention my bill, H. R. 534, which I introduced on January 6, 1947.

This bill would give to our veterans, who are qualified to receive terminal-leave pay, the privilege of receiving cash, instead of bonds, if they so desire. This bill provides that bonds issued under this act shall be redeemable at any time, to permit settlement and compensation to be made in cash. In other words, it leaves to the veteran the choice of whether or not he shall receive cash or bonds commensurate with the amount allowed for this terminal leave.

I strongly contend that if we are able to loan or give money to other countries to pay their veterans in cash, we certainly should be able to take care of our own veterans in the same manner.

I fully recognize that many bills have been introduced on this subject and I am certain that the general public is in accord with the views contained therein. I respectfully urge the Committee on Armed Services to immediately give a favorable report on this subject.

ASSISTANCE NEEDED FOR OUR AGED CITIZENS

(July 8, 1947)

Mr. Speaker, day after day we are appropriating and sending American taxpayers' money to help people of Europe, some of whom not many months ago were killing our American boys and girls. Yet, when we ask for a more adequate program to take care of our own aged people—a group of loyal Americans—we find that our program is seemingly blocked. I certainly would like to know why and I think the American people want to know why.

I contend, Mr. Speaker, it is the responsibility of our Federal Government to help attain security for our people, and immediate action should be taken to definitely establish this program.

ASSISTANCE FOR WHOM?

(December 5, 1947)

Mr. Chairman, the time has arrived when we must decide just whom we are going to aid—people of foreign nations or the people of the United States. Whom will we help reach a sound economic basis and whom will we assist in the establishment of a definite defense program that can be of real assistance in time of a definite emergency?

I spent several weeks this fall, as a member of a congressional committee, in making a survey of the conditions that exist in our own country. We found a dire need for developing our own natural resources; a dire need for a definite flood-control and reclamation program. Our rivers and harbors need dredging; our docks and shipyards need repairing; our roads and Federal buildings are nearly in a state of ruin; our shipyards and shipbuilding facilities are in a high state of neglect. A real emergency exists in our housing needs and we have a critical shortage in a great number of commodities, including food. We have a high living and tax cost that has never been equaled. Our national defense program will require hundreds of millions of dollars to put it in first-class condition.

The bill now before us, H. R. 4604, will take the money so badly needed in the United States and send it to foreign countries. Our investigation definitely established the fact that if we were faced with another emergency tomorrow, we would be found sadly wanting. So the question arises, Whom are we going to help? Can we, as a Congress, afford to take the chance? What assurance do we have that this money or aid, if we give it to foreign countries, will go to the people who really need it? We have given the authority to the President to spend about $20,000,000,000 for foreign relief since VJ-day. What is the result? These nations are in worse shape now than before our money was spent.

I do not want anyone to starve, and that most certainly means people of other nations, as well as our own people. My survey has shown to me that our defense program is at a very low ebb; our harbors and shipbuilding yards are at a dangerous point of deterioration; we definitely need flood control to protect our own farm lands, cities, and the lives of our people. We need a reclamation program which is very vital to our production; our housing shortage is critical; we have a high cost of living that makes it practically impossible for the low-bracket income workers, as well as our aged people, to barely live; and we have a tax rate that has reached an all-time high.

We must decide whether or not we are going to strengthen our own defenses, both military and economic, or give to other nations more and more American dollars. Our own defense and economic situation in this country is in such a weakened condition that it will take hundreds of millions of dollars to restore it to the level we maintained as of VJ-day. Our Nation has been built upon the principles of hard work, sacrifice and initiative and it is questionable as to whether or not the continued spending of billions of American dollars in Europe will eventually give those countries the sound economic basis which they need for recovery.

Mr. Chairman, it is time that we take heed to the need of our own American people.

FARM-TO-MARKET ROADS

(April 12, 1948)

Mr. Speaker, for some time, however, I have felt that our farm-to-market roads were being neglected, as some have failed to recognize the tremendous importance of secondary and farm-to-market roads. These roads are most vital to production and distribution of agricultural commodities, as well as to the local people, the State, and the Nation. I feel that adequate road transportation for the farmers is most essential to the continued prosperity of all Americans.

We must not forget there are 3,300,000 miles of roads, alleys, and streets in our Nation, and of that number 3,000,000 miles are in rural districts of which 23 percent are graded and drained but not surfaced, while 31 percent are primitive, undrained and not surfaced. Thus, more than 50 percent of the roads serving our farmers are not all-weather roads. Four million children ride to school daily over secondary and feeder roads and one-fourth of our entire population receives mail delivery over these roads. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, improvement of these roads is an undisputable need in the problem of reduced costs of food products. For this reason, I submitted an amendment to clarify the original wording of the 1944 act, which I quote:

"Thirty percent for projects as set forth in paragraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), except that, for the purposes of this act and all subsequent acts continuing the postwar construction and reconstruction of highways in accordance with the provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, (1) the term 'secondary and feeder roads' and the term 'principal secondary and feeder roads,' wherever used in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 shall include county and township roads and (2) in selecting county and township roads on which funds are to be expended the State highway depaartments shall cooperate with township trustees and other appropriate local road officials, and—"

This amendment guarantees Federal aid for county and township roads since it specifically describes them to be a part of the secondary system. There is much remaining to be done on our secondary road system, but this is a start in seeing that a definite program is put into effect to get the farmer out of the mud, and it is my hope that the House will pass this bill by unanimous vote.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I would call the attention of the members to the splendid work of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR], in proposing and securing the adoption of an amendment which includes township roads. I think he is to be highly complimented for what he did for the township roads in States east of the Mississippi. He has done this in such a way that it does not interfere with the regular program for the county roads in the States where there are no township roads.

WHY CONTINUE EXPORT TO RUSSIA?

(June 10, 1948)

Mr. Speaker, I have just learned that one of our Cabinet members, seemingly, has had orders from the administration to keep mum on the amount of material we are shipping to Russia.

On many, many occasions, on the floor of the House, I have objected to our exporting heavy machinery and war goods to the Soviet Union. I am also informed that Mr. Harriman who was recently appointed by President Truman as our roving Ambassador for the European recovery program said, and I quote:

"It is my strong personal view that we should give no aid to any country behind the iron curtain."

The records show, however, the President is again requesting more money for Europe, demanding the draft, universal military training, and price and production controls under the pretense of stopping communism, and, at the same time, he is asking that our exports to Russia continue.

The records also show the State Department is trying to bolster United States and Russian trade through a new policy which will soon ease export licenses for all goods, except military supplies. Western European nations will be allowed to re-export processed American goods over the iron curtain as long as they cannot be used for war.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, why export any of our critical material which causes shortages and high prices here at home?

THE RECORD—STOP, LOOK, LISTEN

(June 11, 1948)

Mr. Speaker, I believe our people should know the true facts concerning the past and what present activities might lead to, and I am quoting briefly from a recent editorial:

"In the 1940 Presidential campaign, Roosevelt promised Americans 'again and again and again,' not to send their boys into foreign wars. He got the third term for which he had been plotting since 1937 or 1938.

"Safely re-elected, he set about stepping up his push toward war. Shortly after the New Year, 1941, the drive began to jam the lend-lease bill through Congress—a plan which Roosevelt swore would buy peace for us by supplying the allies with war materials so that they could go on fighting the Germans. The bill became a law March 11, 1941.

"There followed a long dispute as to whether the United States Navy should or should not convoy lend-lease shipments to Britain. What happened was that Roosevelt, without a by-your-leave to Congress, set the Navy patrolling the North Atlantic fairly early in 1941.

"Even this failed to provoke a shooting war in the Atlantic with Hitler. Adolf had other fish to fry, since he was then meditating his attack on Russia which took place June 22, 1941.

"Roosevelt at the same time was warming up his campaign of provocation against Japan. If Hitler would not fight, Tojo might. How well this drive succeeded is a matter of history. Following Cordell Hull's November 26, 1941, ultimatum, Japan attacked us at Pearl Harbor."

Let us connect present activities with past performances. Mr. Truman has said time after time, and I quote from his first address to the Congress:

"I call upon all Americans to help me keep our Nation united in defense of those ideals which have been so eloquently proclaimed by Franklin D. Roosevelt. I will support and defend those ideals with all my strength and with all my heart."

Then again in his Hyde Park address, he stated, and I quote:

"In the aftermath of a global war the overall task is difficult. But it can be stated simply; it is to carry forward the underlying principles and policies, foreign and domestic of Franklin D. Roosevelt."

I ask, Mr. Speaker, are we going into another war? Beware Americans, we must not let history repeat itself. We must take time to stop, look, and listen.

Brazen Barter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. DEANE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial, Brazen Barter, from the News and Observer, Raleigh, N. C., published on June 16, 1948:

BRAZEN BARTER

From the time the Eightieth Congress assembled in January 1947, it has been apparent that there was a deal to reduce taxes of the rich in return for contributions to the 1946 campaign and in hope of contributions in 1948.

But no one ever thought that such an idea would be put in plain words by the Republican National Committee itself. Yet that is precisely what has happened. The current issue of the Republican News, published by the committee, contains the following, in large type, occupying three columns:

"Don't throw peanuts to the elephant. Take a look at the table below. Many of our friends feel that, entirely apart from other important considerations, the least they can do to express their appreciation is to contribute a substantial part of their tax savings for this year to insure the reelection of the Congress which made this possible.

"Savings of a family of four under new tax plan.

"Net income $2,500 for a family of four, present tax, $95; new tax, $16.60; savings, $74.40.

"Income of $5,000. Present tax, $589; new tax, $431.60; savings, $157.40.

"Income of $10,000. Present tax, $1,862; new tax, $1,360.96; savings, $501.04.

"Net income $15,000. Present tax, $3,658.50; new tax, $2,512; savings, $1,126.50.

"Net income of $25,000. Present tax, $8,521.50; new tax, $5,475.84; savings, $3,045.66.

"Net income, $50,000. Present tax, $24,111; new tax, $16,577.92; savings, $7,533.08."

At the bottom is this instruction:

"Make checks payable to Republican National Committee."

Until this year the all-time low in the use of money in a political campaign was reached in the McKinley campaign of 1896 managed by Mark Hanna. But not even Mr. Hanna ever made so bold a bid for payment for services rendered as the one that has been made by Carroll Reece, his successor in 1948.

Education for the New Social Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the concern throughout our country over the content of materials in our public education makes the inclusion of a speech by Mr. Rudd, of Newark, most appropriate.

[Address before the National Society of New England Women, New York, N. Y., February 26, 1948, by Augustin G. Rudd, Garden City, N. Y., chairman, Guardians of American Education, Inc.]

I am very happy to be here today to talk to you about a subject of vital concern to all of us—the education of youth. Not only are we deeply concerned with the education of our children as a personal matter but also from a patriotic standpoint, for the destiny of this Republic will soon be in their hands. They will decide whether it remains a great Republic of free men and women or falls into the totalitarian abyss of socialism, communism or any other police state.

I should like, however, to first make my personal position clear. I am not a teacher, nor do I have any personal or material interest in the teaching profession. I am not a writer of textbooks and have no interest nor connection with the publication or sale of them.

But I have a deep feeling of gratitude for the opportunities that were given me as a child, to learn about and understand our great American heritage, and feel a sincere obligation to do what I can to see that our youngsters have equal opportunity. I shall attempt to explain why that opportunity is lost to millions of the children of today.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS' FINE RECORD

Free public schools are distinctly an American institution. The principle that every child is entitled to an equal opportunity for a sound education was recognized almost from the beginning of colonization in America. It was on February 13, 1635, that the first free public school was opened in New England, to become known as the Boston Latin School.

For almost 300 years, and until quite recently, this great American institution has been a bulwark of freedom. It has done a great job. It has had our unlimited confidence. More than any other institution, it is the one which the average American would unqualifiedly say is thoroughly sound.

And why has the public school enjoyed such complete confidence? Because it had been free of politics and propaganda. It had given pupils a factual knowledge, while training them in the homely virtues and developing mental discipline. Its textbooks had provided reliable information and encouraged sound thinking. No one doubted that the teacher's main purpose was to educate the child. Both teachers and textbooks truly reflected our faith and belief in the basic principles upon which our liberties were founded. The teaching profession may well be proud of this record of many generations. But, a profound change has been apparent during the past 20–25 years.

STUDENTS LOSE FAITH IN AMERICAN WAY

At a delightful garden party near the banks of the Hudson River, there were present several students from a nearby women's college, two of whom I engaged in conversation. Although these young ladies were born and bred in the finest American tradition, I was amazed to hear their opinions on economic and political philosophy. Both held that our American free economy was outmoded, that the profit motive was bad, and that socialism would be an improvement. Both were lukewarm about the value of the Constitution of the United States, saying that it had outlived its usefulness in many respects and now retarded democracy. One said that communism was a modern form of democracy from which we could adopt many desirable features. In short, these college girls had little or no faith or belief in our American system regardless of its glorious record of material and spiritual blessings, the envy of oppressed peoples all over the world.

COLLEGE POLL SHOWS 63 PERCENT FAVOR SOCIALISM

No doubt all of you have had similar experiences, for this leading girls college is not unique. It could be any of about two-thirds of our colleges, for men or women, North, South, East, or West; for a carefully conducted survey recently revealed that nearly two-thirds of our college students favored socialism. Dr. Henry Link posed the following question to a cross section of 5,000 people: "If the Government owned and managed industries, would you get more or less for your money than you do now?" Among the general population, 43 percent said that they would get as much or more under Government ownership, and 63 percent of the college students polled were of this opinion.

Bewildered parents all over the country have been asking themselves in recent years, "How do these youngsters get that way?" Time and again I have heard a distressed parent say, "Jim certainly didn't get it at

home." Or, "Jane was all right before she went to college." Or, "I thought we had the best schools in the country." So, what is the answer? Is there a pattern or plan behind a widespread movement? Unfortunately, this condition has been brought about largely by design. Briefly, this is the story.

DEBUNKING THE FOUNDING FATHERS

Thirty-five years ago, Charles A. Beard, then a young professor at Columbia University, wrote a book called An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States, in which he questioned the motives and the work of the founding fathers of this Republic. This book may be properly considered the primary source of the debunkers of American history. It advanced the theory of economic determinism, meaning that any man's motives are dominated by his present or expected wealth, and therefore his actions must be judged solely in this light. Since most of the signers of the Constitution were men of some wealth (quite naturally, since they were educated and education was rare and expensive in those days) it follows, according to the book, that their impelling motives for creating this great charter of freedom were not necessarily for the good of the whole people but rather for the delegates' own personal interest.

In his 1913 book Beard states: "Suppose * * * that substantially all of the merchants, money lenders, securityholders, manufacturers, shippers, capitalists, and financiers and their professional associates are to be found on one side in support of the Constitution and that substantially all or the major portion of the opposition came from the nonslaveholding farmers and the debtors—would it not be pretty conclusively demonstrated that our fundamental law was not the product of an abstraction known as 'the whole people,' but of a group of economic interests which must have expected beneficial results from its adoption?" The greater part of the book is then devoted to showing that the delegates had economic interests and property, and thus he proves his case.

Seldom has a more unjust and destructive theory been advanced in the history of our country. And yet, this book has been required reading in thousands of schools and colleges for a generation. "This book," says Walter Lippmann, "has had an immense influence upon the writing and teaching of American history and upon the outlook of the generation that was educated in the interval between the two great wars. It would hardly be an exaggeration to say that this book is the classic which set the fashion for the debunking historians."

"BUILDING AMERICA" TEXTBOOKS

Now do we find this propaganda in our school classrooms? We certainly do. There is a series of textbooks called Building America sponsored by the National Education Association. In California the Sons of the American Revolution, learning that the State department of education intended to introduce these books into the public schools, vigorously opposed the proposal and instituted court action to prevent it. I now quote one item from the SAR complaint and petition in the proceedings before the legislature of the State of California:

"Building America is a subversive publication in that it undermines principles essential to our form of government. The following material contained therein is of that character:

"1. The representation that the Constitution of the United States was the work of well-to-do lawyers, bankers, and businessmen, acting against the interest of the common people, as part of a program to make personal profit."

On page 6 of volume II of Building America we find this text:

"Nearly all the men who gave their great talents to the job were capable, well-to-do lawyers, planters, merchants, bankers, or businessmen. Some of them had lent money to carry on the Revolution. Many had Continental bonds and paper money which were almost worthless, but which they wanted the new government to make good. None of the delegates was a city mechanic or a small farmer who owned little or no property."

There you see copying from Professor Beard's book—as plain as day.

The SAR petition continues:

"The board was put on notice regarding the subversive origin of propaganda in the Building America books. It was shown that the unit, Our Constitution, had been prepared in 1936 in a Federal writers' project in New York City with WPA funds; that a considerable part of the material consisted of hand-outs from Federal propaganda agencies; that the educational pattern was based on programs of left-wing radical groups."

Fortunately the SAR won a complete victory in California and the legislature refused money for the purchase of the books, Building America. Incidentally, who do you suppose put up a good part of the money to finance these textbooks? The General Education Board (founded by John D. Rockefeller) which advanced $50,000 for this purpose.

ORIGIN OF PROGRESSIVE MOVEMENT

With the rise of communism in Soviet Russia, the alien theories of Karl Marx began to take root in the United States. They found particularly fertile soil among the radical educators at Teachers College, Columbia University, where a small group decided the time was ripe for a new social order of a collectivist character.

Getting stimulus from the ideas of Professors John Dewey, Charles Beard, and others, the Institute of International Education was established in Columbia University in 1919. It started conducting trips to foreign lands, aided by educational foundation funds.

A noted educator, Dr. John C. Almack, professor of education, Stanford University, says:

"Many teachers and students took the pilgrimage to the Old World, usually including Germany and Russia in their itineraries. Many of them returned challenging everything American, breathing fire and defiance to property, the profit system, and the Constitution, and beating the tom-toms for a new social order. They began the active diffusion of economic reform ideas by means of pamphlets, papers, panel discussions, forums, lecturers, teaching, and books. They were filled with the notion that revolution was just around the corner, and that they must declare the way, after insuring their own safety, should things go wrong, by guaranties of academic freedom.

"The new schools in Russia were organized and conducted after the model laid out by John Dewey in Chicago many years earlier. The children ran the schools, worked when they pleased, were rude and unmannerly, and showed no respect for parents or teachers. No reading, writing, arithmetic, and such old-fashioned fundamentals were tolerated in these modern schools. Instead, there was a complex system, in which, with social activities, skills were supposed to be introduced when and if the pupils wanted them.

"In the Russian schools indoctrination in the practice of communism was included as direct instruction. A teacher who would have introduced a doubt of its merits would have been liquidated by a comrade on guard as a counterrevolutionary.

"Ardent American tourists saw and heard only what the boss Bolshevik wanted them to see and hear. They missed many of the views that would have shown the system for what it was.

"However, they came back to America bubbling over with evangelism for the 'new' education, and particularly ballyhooed 'education for a new social order.' Needless to say, this 'new social order' embraced the tenets and practices of collectivism, a name caution taught these apostles to prefer to Communism."

Prof. George S. Counts says in his "The Soviet Challenge to America?" I am indebted to the International Institute of Teachers College for making both trips to Russia possible."

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LEADS THE WAY

Since these activities were largely under the command of Columbia teachers, it was only natural that Teachers College, Columbia University, should become the fountainhead of this new type of education. Not only were teachers who were looking for advancement beginning to come in great numbers to Teachers College, but the summer schools which taught these most advanced ideas were so well advertised that many thousands came each summer, swept off their feet by teachings—things they had never heard before. They became the victims of new theories of society and the kind of education (so-called), which was necessary to produce and perpetuate such a society. Consequently, they went back to their respective cities, towns and hamlets with the absolute conviction that they had discovered the fount of all educational knowledge (Teachers College) and the sure way to save the world from the plague, and civilization from its worst enemy, namely, itself.

Now multiply this yearly performance by the number of years since the first World War and you can imagine how many men and women in our teaching profession have become inoculated with these subversive doctrines.

Styling themselves the Frontier Thinkers, these educator-reformers and their colleagues, the more aggressive social reformers experimented in liberal schools and tested the possibilities of capturing our educational system. Their methods and technique were extremely subtle, and their doctrines were artfully concealed in an attractive package labeled "progressive education," and decorated with ribbons called Social Science. Socialism? Of course not. This was the new twentieth century streamlined model of democracy, said the Frontier Thinkers. As everyone likes to be progressive, and everybody wants democracy, little opposition developed.

GRANT FROM CARNEGIE CORPORATION

In 1926 a group known as the American Historical Association appointed a commission of liberal educators to "investigate the teaching of history and other social studies in the schools." After bringing in a preliminary report in 1928, this commission was enlarged, secured a grant of $300,000 from the Carnegie Corporation and spent 5 years in deliberations. From about this time the more militant social reformers, or hard progressives, dominated the movement. In 1934 the commission published its report, the fifteenth volume of which is entitled "Conclusions and Recommendations," and contains the premise and philosophy of the left-wing educators: Our American way of life is a failure and must make way for a collectivist form of society. Education is to bring the day of this utopian integrated order.

From "Conclusions and Recommendations" we learn in detail how this indoctrination through the schools is to be accomplished. The propaganda vehicle is to be the new Social Science courses, supplanting the traditional United States history, geography, and civics. Textbooks are to be rewritten, special courses and teacher's guides are to be prepared and other teaching material is

to be carefully selected to accomplish this purpose of education.

PROFESSOR LASKI CALLS IT SOCIALISM

Perhaps the most fitting characterization of this book is the statement of Prof. Harold Laski, prominent English educator and Marxist, who says:

"Stripped of its carefully neutral phrases, the report is an educational program for a Socialist America * * * (It) could be implemented in a society only where socialism was the accepted way of life; for it is a direct criticism of the ideals that have shaped capitalist America." (New Republic, July 29, 1940.)

Thus, was hatched the plan of the collectivists at Teachers College to propagate alien ideologies through the public schools from coast to coast.

Having formulated this ambitious plan, they found that the most difficult part of the program was to introduce it into the public schools. After all, to change the climate of opinion of American citizens so that they will discard many traditional institutions is no small undertaking. Who knew what boards of education and parents would have to say? Obviously the task required skill in preparation and extreme tact in presentation.

PROFESSOR RUGG'S SOCIAL SCIENCE COURSES

One of the ablest for this task was Prof. Harold Rugg, of Teachers College, keen, resourceful, teacher of teachers. Rugg had long been an exponent of the new social order and had experimented with courses developing the idea. In fact, in the early 1920's he introduced his social science pamphlets into the Lincoln School of New York City. With the strong support of radical colleagues, Professor Rugg introduced his social science courses into other schools, and in time his whole comprehensive courses, including 10 or more textbooks and various accessories, were in use in approximately 5,000 schools.

The working tools of this system are as follows: Textbooks, workbooks, and Teacher's Guides. One or two examples will show the nature of this system, which emphasizes attitudes at expense of knowledge.

In one of the pupil's workbooks the question is asked: "Is the United States a land of opportuntiy for all our people? Why? This is the answer the child should give according to the Teacher's Guide For Our Country and Our People (p. 38):

"The United States is not a land of opportunity for all our people; for one-fifth of the people do not earn any money at all. There are great differences in the standards of living of the different classes of people. The majority do not have any real security."

Most of us hold the belief that our country is superior to dictatorships of other nations. But apparently we are wrong. For this is how the Teacher's Guide for America's March Toward Democracy (p. 52) rules out any such attitude:

"Of the 315 pupils 88 percent said that the following statement was true, 'My country is unquestionably the best country in the world.' Now the attitude thus expressed is one that we decidedly do not want to develop in our classes."

Among other tips to teachers, we find this in the Teacher's Guide for America's March Toward Democracy (p. 68):

"Treat the War for Independence essentially as an economic struggle between the ruling classes of England and the Colonies."

Thus we find many instances of the influence of Beard's thinking in 1913. In one of Prof. Harold Rugg's social-science textbooks, History of American Government and Culture, page 127, the following text appears:

"For land speculation later involved many leaders. Among them were Franklin, Gallatin, Patrick Henry, Robert Morris, James Wilson, and many less widely known men. The speculators soon saw that to protect their ownership they must have the help of a recognized Central Government which would establish land offices, make accurate surveys, and establish Army posts to protect the settlers. There was a second group of speculators who also wanted a Central Government. They were gamblers who were buying up the depreciated paper money."

In Rugg's Teacher's Guide for America's March Toward Democracy, page 71, we find the following:

"The convention, however, consisted of a very small self-selected group of well-to-do, educated upper-class Americans, many of whom were exceedingly conservative. This was the group that made the written Constitution of the United States."

And in the same Teacher's Guide on page 72 is this:

"Furthermore, show that not more than 3 percent of all the inhabitants of the United States actually voted on the ratification of the new Constitution. Emphasize that thus only the small property class was represented in this conservative government."

This is history as taught by the Rugg system.

These examples illustrate the kind of attitude taught by the Rugg courses. In scores of other instances the American way of life is subtly undermined, disparaged or openly attacked.

While Beard did not teach socialism the alternative to constitutional freedom in this age is socialism.

The pity is that the millions who have read and are still being taught the economic interpretation of the Constitution of the United States will not read or be taught the histories, by Charles A. and Mary Beard, written 30 and 35 years later. They powerfully present the facts that reveal the blessings of a free society as against the workings of the socialized or authoritarian state, particularly the Republic, the Federalist papers, Roosevelt and the Coming of the War, and Basic History of the United States in which the professor and his wife say:

"With this book we bring to a close our many years of cooperative efforts in seeking to interpret the long course of American history, newly written to express the historical judgment which we have reached after more than 40 years devoted to the study of documents and the observation of life at first hand in all parts of the United States, rural and urban, and in parts of the Old World and the Orient."

SCHEME OF INDOCTRINATION

Soon the entire scheme of indoctrination of the Frontier Thinkers became entrenched in our educational system from grade schools to colleges. Beard, Dewey, Counts and numerous others did the spade work. Rugg and others write the courses for children to fit the specifications of the plan. Then they devise courses for teachers, which sell them on the philosophy and expect them to sell the community through the medium of the children. Then teachers' colleges fall into line by making similar courses mandatory for those seeking advanced degrees. Qualifying teachers then are rated as specialists in the social sciences and favored in progressive schools, where they naturally advocate the use of Rugg's and similar courses. And so the cycle of propaganda is complete. All of which has been financed by millions of good capitalistic dollars from educational foundations assisting to cut the throat of the very economic system which created them!

TRAGIC RESULTS NOW APPARENT

Briefly, that is how it happened—how the radical teachers captured the citadel of learning, while parents did not realize what was going on, and consolidated their position by means of great organizations such as the NEA.

Now, what has been the result of 20 years or more of this kind of education? After all, we are not prejudiced against new ideas or methods and should judge any institution by its results—its effect on our society. There have been some benefits or good points, but they have been so minor as compared to the bad ones that the general effect on millions of the younger generation has been little short of tragic. A fair appraisal of this educational scheme for a new social order will reveal vital defects, as follows: (1) It has caused shocking deficiencies in knowledge of mathematics, history, civics, geography, spelling, grammar, and other basic subjects. (2) It has given unsound citizenship training by ignoring or weakening discipline, initiative, respect for authority, willingness to work, and other attributes of good training. (3) The social science in particular has been used as a cover in many instances for indoctrination in Marxism and other subversive activities undermining faith in our American institutions.

Time will not permit detailed reference to the many fallacies of progessive education. We all have seen these costly failures, including many to show the deficiencies now apparent in basic education. For instance, Mathematics—I have a letter written during the war from an admiral of our Navy to a professor of the University of Michigan. It says in part:

"A carefully prepared selective examination was given to 4,200 entering freshmen at 27 of the leading universities and colleges of the United States. Sixty-eight percent of the men taking this examination were unable to pass the arithmetical reasoning test. Sixty-two percent failed the whole test, which included also arithmetical combinations, vocabulary, and spatial relations. The majority of failures were not merely border line, but were far below passing grade. Of the 4,200 entering freshmen who wished to enter the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, only 10 percent had already taken elementary trigonometry in the high schools from which they had graduated. Only 23 percent had taken more than one and a half years of mathematics in high school. In order to enroll the necessary number of men in the training schools, it was found necessary at one of the training stations to lower the standards in 50 percent of the admissions. This necessity is attributed to a deficiency in the early educations of the men involved."

The Army had similar experiences.

History: Wise men have long known that a knowledge of history is indispensable to good citizenship, for it is the essence of man's experience through the ages. "Not to know what happened before one was born is always to be a child," said Cicero. No nation can be severed from a preceding generation, and history, therefore, becomes a continuous drama wherein each scene leads to the next.

In a survey made by the New York Times in 1943, college freshmen throughout the Nation revealed a striking ignorance of even the elementary aspects of United States history, "and knew almost nothing about many important phases of their country's growth and development," said Benjamin Fine.

Seven thousand students in 36 colleges and universities in all sections of the country were examined. A large majority of these college freshmen could not identify such names as Abraham Lincoln, Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, or Theodore Roosevelt. Of those questioned, 1,705, or 25 percent did not know that Abraham Lincoln was President of the United States during the Civil War. Twenty-five students listed George Washington as having been president during that highly important period; 35 percent listed Alexander Hamilton as being principally famous as President of the United States. A goodly number of students listed Hamilton as being historically important because of his watches!

The survey revealed that most of these students had taken courses in social studies

or social science, but that 82 percent of the colleges of this country do not require the teaching of United States history for the undergraduate degree. Few of the students had any notion of the geographical and historical formation of the United States.

Civics: For many generations, the course known as civics was an important one in American schools, featuring a study of the United States Constitution, its history and philosophy. But under the scheme of the Frontier Thinkers, civics as a separate course was dropped along with history and geography to make room for social science. Figures of the United States Office of Education show that only 5.97 percent of high-school students, or 1 in 17, took civil government, and many of these courses stressed police, firemen, garbage can, fly control, and similar matters of local government . Such information is desirable, but hardly at the expense of the knowledge and understanding of our charter of freedom and the basic law of the land.

Although the Bill of Rights and the Constitution are significant milestones in this Nation's life, the students queried in the N. Y. Times survey were only slightly familiar with both of these great documents. Less than half of these college freshmen could name two of the many specific powers granted to Congress by the Constitution, while only 45 percent could name four specific freedoms guaranteed in the Bill of Rights.

Geography: "Inasmuch as America's history unfolds in a geographic setting, without some concept of this setting an understanding of local and sectional trends would appear impossible," says Benjamin Fine in Times survey. The students were asked to name the States starting with Massachusetts in their geographic order from north to south. Only 3 percent of the students—198 out of 7,000 could list the States along the eastern seaboard with any degree of accuracy.

Most of our students did not have the faintest notion of what this country looks like. St. Louis, located on America's most famous river, the Mississippi, was placed on the Pacific Ocean, Lake Huron, Lake Erie, the Atlantic Ocean, Ohio River, St. Lawrence River, and almost every place else. Only 15 percent of the college freshmen had any idea where Portland, Oreg., was located. Two hundred and fifty students thought that Portland, Oreg., was on the Atlantic Ocean.

As you may know, Scarsdale, N. Y. has long been a stronghold of progressive education. Long after its fallacies had been exposed throughout the Nation, the Frontier Thinkers were able to hold out at Scarsdale, until a committee of alarmed parents made their own survey, viewed the results and insisted on cleaning house. On the subject of social studies versus the separate teaching of geography, history and civics under their own names, their report, which should be read by every school board in the country, states: "Some fathers and apparently mothers have been surprised at the ignorance of some Scarsdale school graduates about geography; and there is a country-wide recognition of deficiencies in history."

A sample question illustrating the way geography is taught, is offered as a possible explanation of the deficiency in this subject. The question is: "Petroleum is getting more important because—." These four possible answers are printed from which pupils are to mark one as being correct: "1. Much money is invested in it. 2. There are many oil wells. 3. Oil wells are valuable. 4. Gasoline is needed for autos." "Just what element of geography," says the committee, "would that implant in sixth-grade pupil minds?"

Reading and spelling: It was found that 39 percent of the parents were dissatisfied with the progress their children had made in reading, and 77.3 percent of parents were dissatisfied with their children's ability to spell. The committee said:

"Simple subjects singly taught accumulate more ultimate knowledge than any potpourri which is 'predominently social.'"

The following recommendations were made:

1. We urge that the term social studies be dropped completely from teacher intercourse with pupils and parents and from their reports.

2. We recommend the teaching of geography as a distinct course of study in the elementary schools, with emphasis on map or space geography as distinguished from economic geography.

3. We recommend the teaching of a continuity of undiluted history. By undiluted we mean what a most eminent educator expressed thus: "More teaching from history and less from contemporary scenes."

If time permitted, a similar condition could be shown in writing, speaking, grammar, sound economics and other subjects necessary to a basic education, and also deficiencies in general citizenship training.

English: For instance, the average American high-school graduate is ill-prepared to read, write and speak the English language, according to a report prepared by Prof. Albert Elsasser of Princeton University and Prof. Albert H. Thayer of Bowdoin College, and submitted recently to the School and College Conference on English at the Hotel New Yorker.

Based on a poll of English instructors in 106 colleges and universities which trained Army and Navy students during the war, the report made 15 recommendations to modify English teaching practices in secondary schools.

Of the 106 colleges and universities polled, only 7 disapproved of the committee's indictment of the trainees' preparation in English. One institution reported that a third of its trainees was so "grossly deficient as to make it incredible to us that any secondary school would permit their graduation."

DEMOLISHING LOYALTIES AND TRADITIONS

Another serious objection to this education for the new social order is that it is a philosophy of pure materialism.

The theory is that the religious influence which fits certain standards of morality, honesty, integrity, and loyalty is a sham and a delusion and has no place in education. In short, these time-tested verities must give way to a philosophy of change in which nothing is constant or stable. It is a simple step from this to the acceptance of a materialistic philosophy which is the Marxian doctrine.

Effort is centered on demolishing loyalties and shattering our objects of allegiance. This is cleverly termed "changing our attitude" which is an essential step to the uprooting of many time-honored loyalties and respected customs and traditions of patriotism and culture which have been the foundations upon which our Republic was built.

Coupled with this, the child is deprived of history, geography and civics as separate courses. These time-honored and vitally important subjects are lost in these social science courses of indoctrination. As a consequence, the student so educated is cut loose from the philosophies of life which the ages have proved of value.

He is taught that there are no permanent values or standards and that he must have no concept but one of change, inevitable change. Thus the child is submerged in a propaganda of disbelief and cast adrift in a sea of doubt and cynicism. He is like a ship without a rudder.

This whole scheme is so skillfully designed that it has fooled millions of people. In fact, many adults and even teachers have been deceived by this program which masquerades cleverly under the attractive banner of "liberalism," "progressive education," and an effort to improve our "democracy."

A serious aspect is the radical teacher's concept of his function in our society. According to a committee of the Progressive Education Association, of which Prof. George Counts was chairman, our teachers should consider themselves as "the spiritual leaders of the masses of the people." (A Call to Teachers of the Nation, p. 19.) The Committee explains that teachers should not consider themselves "tools of the State; nor does it mean that they are constrained to defend the existing social system." (ibid.) "Even the taxpayers," it says, "have no special claim on the schools; they are but the tax collectors of society." (Ibid.)

Most citizens are unaware of this attitude, but it exists in many places and fortunately the Scarsdale (N. Y.) parents, heretofore mentioned, dealt with it in the good-old American tradition. They said:

"Our considered position is that, greatly as we admire our school leaders, we believe ourselves capable as a community of debating educational methods on an even footing. We accept no inferior status for parents in counseling with school authorities on the education of our children.

"Many of our club members in the professions, arts and industries are more than adequately educated for teaching requirements, but find other callings more attractive or congenial."

So, when we review this revolutionary educational plan objectively and see the results of 20 years in operation, we find that on balance it is definitely bad. To sum up, I can do no better than to quote from that keen student of our times—Dr. Henry Link—who said:

"Our capitalistic system supports the largest, I will not say the greatest, educational system in history, but its lack of an adequate ideology encourages that system to turn out more and more Socialists who would destroy the very system which made their education possible. That is one reason why I have described the American educational system in some of my writings as 'The most elaborate plan ever conceived for obscuring and even denying the elementary facts of life.' But let us not blame the educators, let us blame ourselves, because while we have supported education with our dollars, we have neglected to guide it with our principles."

MANY ABLE EDUCATORS FIGHT PLAN

Now, in these remarks, I have dealt rather roughly with our educational setup because it deserved it. But, I wish to make it very clear that I am not condemning all our schools and colleges and certainly not the teaching profession as a whole, for which I have the highest regard. Thousands of schools have refused to accept in whole or in part this insidious pattern of education, and others have thrown it out when its true nature was revealed.

Great credit must be given to the teachers who have fought for years without organization or recognition, against the apparently overwhelming influence of the radical educators. Against all kinds of pressure, they have held true to their principles and now see their judgment vindicated.

ENGLAND'S DRESS REHEARSAL FOR UNITED STATES

Now, if you would see the pattern that these politico-educators have for the United States you should follow closely the program of the Socialist labor government in England. This labor government is the child of the Fabian Society, pioneered by Sidney and Beatrice Webb in London in 1884. As you see one industry after another being nationalized, the farmers being told what they may sow, how they must reap, and citizens generally ordered to work where directed and under conditions prescribed by the state—all under heavy penalty on refusal—you can see liberty rapidly disappearing and the hollow mockery

of Britain's proud boast of centuries that every man's home is his castle.

And when you read that the nationalization of the medical profession, with all the evil consequences, is being ruthlessly pushed against the violent protests of 87 percent of England's doctors and surgeons, you should shudder at the bills now pending in our Congress for socialized medicine, for it is the beginning of the same plan.

Yes, you are now being afforded a dress rehearsal of what these professors have planned for our country and are successfully carrying out. A year or so ago, George Bernard Shaw, a leader of the Fabian Society in England, declared that the objectives of this organization were being accomplished in England, and the United States was next.

When the Frontier Thinkers conceived their elaborate and clever plan many years ago, they estimated that it would take one complete generation to accomplish their purpose by means of education. They have now had about two-thirds of the allotted time. They have completed the job in England and you may judge for yourself how nearly they have reached their goal in our country.

These leaders are able, intelligent and determined, and they are using your money and your schools and your children to bring it about. And if and when that sad day ever strikes this glorious country you will find emerging from their pink ivory towers as the real heroes of the movement, several radical educators just as Prof. Harold Laski took the plaudits in England when the Socialists took over.

EMOTIONALIZED SOCIAL REFORMERS

A noted educator, Dr. John L. Tildsley, former Assistant Superintendent of Schools, New York City, holds this view of these Frontier Thinkers. "I have come to believe the group in the main favors a society not dominated by the profit motive, a society labelled as a democratic collectivist society * * * they are primarily social reformers, new world-makers rather than school masters, and are therefore seemingly indifferent to the quality of education today. * * * The extreme Frontier Thinkers plan to capture the collectivist society by exploiting (not really educating) the children through the agency of the teachers and enrolling them in a movement approved by probably not 5 percent of the parents. Such a plan is both immoral and impracticable. * * * As I see it they are no longer School Masters, they are just emotionalized social reformers. The world needs both school masters and renovators of society; but why mix the labels? Why employ the very expensive machinery of the school for an end that is not education but merely conversion?" (The Social Frontier, July 1, 1938.)

At long last, many people are becoming alarmed and endeavoring to do something about this serious condition in education, but they lack leadership and organization. The great majority are too engrossed in their own affairs to visit their schools, read their children's textbooks and find out what they are being taught. It is truly amazing that more parents are not enraged at those responsible for this shocking betrayal of our youth. Have we lost our great American tradition of righteous indignation? Sometimes I think we have. Perhaps we are punch-drunk. If so, we had better sober up and soon, for time is fast running out, and huge numbers of the younger generation have been educated to worship false gods.

We should know by now that all our efforts to rout Communism amongst adults will be only a temporary victory at best, if so many of our schools and colleges continue to spawn collectivists and socialists, for these alien forms of society are based on the economic and political principles of Marxism, which pave the way for Communism. We have seen the proof of this a dozen times in countries that have fallen behind the iron curtain.

Let us not forget that when Cicero's last effort failed and the gates of the Roman Republic were opened to the barbarians from the North, it perished in the dust along with the hopes and aspirations of mankind. And it was nearly 1,500 years thereafter before a republican form of government worthy of the name dared to rear its head in Italy. Wealth may come, wealth may go; material security may be a fact today and a fiction tomorrow, but once the liberties of men are destroyed no one can tell when or if they will ever be restored.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMILTON C. JONES
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1948

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have been selected a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives. I have always been deeply interested in veterans and veterans' dependents' matters, and my membership on the committee has given me the opportunity to help enact beneficial legislation for the deserving veterans and their dependents.

I have studied H. R. 3748 and H. R. 5588, and I am very glad that the House of Representatives passed both of these bills without a dissenting vote. H. R. 3748 authorizes a greatly needed increase in pension rates for the dependents of World War I and World War II veterans whose deaths were the result of service in these wars. Too much cannot be done for the dependents of the men and women who have made the supreme sacrifice in defense of our Nation. Certainly no amount of money could take the place of a father, mother, son, or daughter.

The pensions authorized by H. R. 3748 will go a long way toward assisting widows and other dependents of veterans in their efforts to meet the present economic situation. When it is considered that the cost-of-living index published by the Department of Commerce in May 1943, when the last pension rates were set for dependents of veterans, was 125.1 for all items and 143 for food and that in January 1948 the cost of living index had risen to 168.8 for all items and 207.7 for food, the problems of living under the old pension rates can be readily understood for widows and other dependents of veterans.

Under the provisions of H. R. 3748 a widow will receive $75 per month, a widow and one child, $115; and for a widow and two or more children there is authorized $20 additional for each child. Where the deceased veteran leaves no widow but one child, the amount is raised from the present $30 to $50 with $20 for each additional child, the total amount to be equally divided. Where the veteran has left a dependent father or mother, the pension is $75 and where there is a dependent mother and father, $40 each. The bill defines as dependent one parent whose annual income does not exceed $1,800 or both parents who do not have an income of $3,000. In determining the annual income, any payments made by a parent for expense of last illness of the veteran or such expense of burial of the veteran as exceeds the amount of the allowance authorized by Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended, shall be excluded and any payments by the United States Government because of disability or death under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration shall not be considered nor shall life-insurance payments from any other source, including income therefrom in an amount less than $3,000 received in any one year, be considered.

The authorizing of pensions for widows and other dependents of veterans under the provisions of this bill does not constitute a gift, contribution, or charity but simply represents our great nation's effort to assume the obligations of the men and women who fought and died in its defense. It is my opinion that the more our Nation can assume in the way of helping widows and other dependents of these veterans, the better will the Nation be able in the future to have sufficient military strength for any national emergency.

H. R. 5588 provides an increase of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities of 60 percent or more who have dependents. It applies to veterans of the Spanish-American War, World War I and World War II, and to peacetime veterans whose disabilities are the result of extrahazardous duty or conditions simulating war.

Under existing laws the amount paid for service-connected disabilities is the same whether the veteran is unmarried, married, has one child, several children, or a dependent parent or parents. This bill provides that in cases of total disability the veteran shall receive in addition to the flat award compensation in the amount of $30 if he has a wife but no children; $50 if he has a wife and one child; $65 if he has a wife and two children; $80 if he has a wife and three or more children. If the veteran has no wife and one child living, he would get $20 additional; no wife but two children living, $35 additional; no wife but three or more children living, $50 additional; and if he has a mother or father, either or both dependent upon him for support, $25 additional for each parent so dependent. Certainly no objection could be raised by anyone authorizing additional payments of compensation to a veteran 60 percent or more disabled by service-connected disabilities to help him meet the high cost of living today in supporting his dependents. When Congress again meets I feel certain legislation will be proposed and considered that will provide additional benefits for veterans suffering from service-connected disabilities of less than 60 percent.

Let me again state that I am glad that I have had the opportunity to study these bills as well as other proposed bills introduced for the benefit of veterans

and veterans' dependents and to do what I could to procure favorable action by the House of Representatives.

I desire to commend my colleague, Judge MATHEWS, for his splendid work in the Congress of the United States and especially on the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives.

The two bills, H. R. 3748 and H. R. 5588, which have been taken up, are the result of some of Judge MATHEWS' effort to rectify an inequitable condition existing in our pension laws. It has been a pleasure to have been associated with Judge MATHEWS on the Veterans' Affairs Committee. The service of this splendid legislator will be greatly missed when he voluntarily terminates his service in the United States House of Representatives at the end of this Congress. The great body of veterans and veterans' dependents will miss Judge MATHEWS who has labored so tirelessly in their behalf. I prophesy a most successful future for Judge MATHEWS because of the prodigious effort he applies to whatever he chooses to do.

I cannot let this opportunity go by without expressing my deep appreciation for the splendid work of the Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS. I am especially grateful to Mrs. ROGERS for the assistance she has given me in the work I have tried to do on the Veterans' Affairs Committee. I know of no one who has a greater heartfelt interest in the veterans and their dependents than Mrs. ROGERS.

Necessity for Federal Pay Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. RUSSELL
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include a letter received from Marwood A. Dodd, a Government worker at Boulder City, Nev., which I feel further demonstrates the great need for an increase in the pay of all Federal employees, both classified and hourly workers:

The letter follows:

BOULDER CITY, NEV.,
June 10, 1948.

Hon. CHARLES H. RUSSELL,
United States Representative,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. RUSSELL: Current reports on legislation relating to pay increase for classified Government employees indicate that certain Members of the congressional body are not aware of the need that exists.

An informal survey among 30 of the classified employees in our immediate section shows that, of the 30, there are 26 who cannot live normally on the Government salary which they receive.

Report of the survey is as follows:

(a) Eighteen persons, wives and husbands are both employed.

(b) Four persons (two included in item (a) draw compensation).

(1) One person (widow), has used in excess of $400 savings since January 1, 1948.

(d) One person (widow), has two children, helped by parents.

(e) One person (included in item (a)), does janitor work in local lodge hall 12 nights per month.

(f) One person, does landscape maintenance work evenings, Saturdays and Sundays; has drawn $600 from savings since January 1, 1948.

(g) Two persons, do bookkeeping for local business firms.

(h) One person, acts as insurance adjuster and local contact man for eastern firm.

(i) Four persons, refused to comment.

It seems certain that, if time would permit a more extensive survey, it would prove beyond a doubt, that there is urgent need for an early adjustment of salaries of classified Government employees.

In view of these circumstances, it can easily be seen that those who have children that require a mother's care are severely handicapped by greater living costs and lower family-earning power.

May I urge that you lend your support to the early passage of pay bill S. 1537.

Very truly yours,

MARWOOD A. DODD.

Mineral Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, it seems strange that we should be debating a draft bill in order to keep our nation adequately prepared for any emergency and give no attention whatever this session of Congress to the fact that in strategic minerals and metals we are woefully short of the necessities of a sustained wartime effort. There are some who will recall the desperate shortages of copper, lead, zinc, and other strategic and critical minerals and metals during the last war. And also the fact that at one time we were within 4 or 6 months of shutting down our steel production because of the lack of manganese, which is an absolute essential in steel production.

This condition still continues and has not been remedied. I wish to quote from recent issues of the American Metal Market:

June 8, 1948: Supplies (of zinc in Great Britain) are on the tight side * * * the Belgian smelters continue to complain of inadequate zinc-ore supplies, and some furnaces may have to close down.

June 9, 1948: There continues to be a tremendous demand for zinc from many points on the globe, with buyers willing to take anything they can get * * *. Sellers, however, appear to be completely sold out.

June 11, 1948: Activity in the (zinc) export market was practically at a standstill today, due to the fact that sellers simply haven't got the metal with which to do business * * * the market continues to be featured by very heavy demands from European and Asiatic sources.

It may also be instructive to examine the domestic zinc statistics published by the American Zinc Institute for August 1947, the month in which the President vetoed H. R. 1602, and for May 1948—in short tons:

	Total shipments, smelters to users	Stocks in hands of smelters and Office of Metals Reserve	Smelters, unfilled orders
August 1947	57,609	161,256	40,028
May 1948	71,629	43,934	71,018

The shipment rate has increased 25 percent, stocks available for shipment have declined 73 percent to less than 20 days' supply, and unfilled orders, have increased 78 percent. The same report shows that during last month there were entered into our national stock pile the absurd amount of 89 tons, when for our national security the total should reach millions of tons within a few years.

All this while 100,000 tons a year of our own mine productive capacity lies prostrate under monopolistic control of zinc prices, and another 50,000 tons is being produced at a loss to the irreparable damage of the mines from which it is being robbed. At the same time, we are importing vast amounts of ores which normally go to feed the smelting industry of northwestern Europe, undermining one of the great props to the economies of those countries to whose rehabilitation we are committed.

More than 200,000 tons of copper a year is being produced in this country at a loss or a dangerously inadequate profit, and yet the head of our greatest copper corporation stated recently that his major problem this year is to prevent another increase in the price of copper.

The Russell bill which was recently denied action in this section by the Rules Committee provides for maximum copper production without increasing the price to the consumers and presents the Department of the Interior with the tools to salvage the ore deposits in this country which have been gutted by selective mining since World War I. The Department of the Interior has provided an excellent definition of conservation, as follows:

> By "conservation" is meant the wisest use of resources to achieve sustained or stable production with a minimum of waste.

The Russell bill will provide for mass mining at average grade for all remaining deposits and thus meet exactly the foregoing definition by seeing to it that our over-all grade of ore diminishes at the lowest possible rate. If the Russell bill could be passed it will constitute an offer to the Department of the Interior to go forward into a great constructive conservation program to protect and increase the power of our mineral economy. We need the Russell bill as an integral part of the effort of this Nation to remain strong and prepared.

Record of Performance Set Forth in Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, with leave to enter my remarks, I wish to include a letter which I have sent to some of my constituents. The letter is as follows:

MY DEAR FRIEND: It has been my privilege and honor to be your Congressman for the past 6 years, representing and serving you in the Nation's Capitol. It was through your most kind efforts and support that I was given the grave responsibility and honor to serve in the Congress of the United States during one of the most critical periods in our Nation's history.

In former letters I have explained to you the accomplishments that I have worked so hard and faithfully to achieve. It was not with any boasting that I related them to you, but to inform you in such a manner that you would get in detail this information. Even my most bitter political enemy and critics will readily admit that I have made one of the best Congressmen that has served from the Sixth District of Louisiana.

Your Congress has faced a multitude of difficult problems and issues during the past years. I have tried to work diligently to help all the people of my district by putting forth my best effort to solve these problems—I shall continue those efforts. I have consistently voted for all measures that would help my people. My support of all farm legislation is a well-established fact. No one can deny the tremendous effort that I put forth in trying to help our deserving veterans. No problem has been too small nor none too large to receive my best attention. Regardless of your walk in life or your past political alinements, I have helped everyone who ever called on me to the best of my ability. Naturally, I am proud of this effort.

I pledge unhesitatingly to do everything within my power to continue to help you to remedy the problems and troubles that beset you at this time, and to improve your working and living conditions.

Feeling that my efforts, work, and record of achievement are deserving of another term, I take this means of asking you for your vote and support in my reelection. Your support and that of your friends will help me to help you. I will be deeply grateful if you can contact your friends, neighbors, or relatives and urge them to support my candidacy.

In closing, may I again stress the importance of the greatest problem we face today—the establishment of a permanent peace. To this I shall devote the full measure of my ability, energy, and experience. We want to live in a world where we and those who come after us can look into the future without fear of any man, but with peace on earth, good will toward our fellowmen and faith in God.

Sincerely,

JIMMY MORRISON, M. C.

P. S.—You no doubt realize that with 6 years in Washington as your Congressman, that I am in a most advantageous position to render to you and the rest of the people of this district the greatest possible service. The experience, seniority, and my personal contacts and acquaintances with hundreds of department heads in Washington puts me in a position to give you the highest type of congressional performance. My record is one of performance. You cannot compare performance and experience with no experience and mere idle promises.

If I can ever be of any service or assistance to you in my capacity as your Congressman at any time, I am sure you feel no hesitancy in calling on me.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to include the following letter:

DEAR FELLOW OFFICIAL: I am taking the liberty of addressing you in this manner because both of us have one thing in common and that is that we hold public office and were elected by the people.

As you know, I am running for reelection to Congress. I have tried to do everything within my power to aid my district and feel that you will agree that I have done a conscientious job. Even my worst critic admits that I have done a good job as Congressman. I will certainly appreciate it if you could see fit to support my candidacy. I sincerely hope that I will be able to contact you personally, but prior to that opportunity I decided to write you this letter asking for your support.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

JIMMY MORRISON, M. C.

The Apple Industry and the Postwar Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, the letter below was presented to President Truman upon the occasion of his visit to Grand Coulee Dam.

It outlines an interesting problem in the postwar era affecting the fruit industry.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The famed, fertile mountain-rimmed apple valleys of the State of Washington, known around the world as the Apple Bowl of America, bid you welcome.

Your stay here is necessarily brief. We regret that you cannot visit our thousands of orchards which last year produced over 38,000 cars of apples which were shipped to nearly every one of the 48 States of the Union. Nearly 5,000 families farm these orchards which range in size from 7 to 700 acres, and behind these families are thousands more whose livelihood, too, is apples—spraying, pruning, thinning, picking, packing, warehousing, selling, and shipping.

Had last year been a prewar year, over 10,500 of these cars, based on a prewar average export of 28 percent of the crop, would have gone into export markets all over the world, but last year was a postwar year in a troubled world and fewer than 1,000 cars moved into export, with the result that Washington apple growers struggled with super-human effort to sell virtually their entire crop to their fellow citizens here in the United States.

While we growers took losses in crop values running into the millions, the apples were sold and we are surviving to harvest and market another crop this fall.

We growers believe that God helps them who helps themselves. Here in Washington we have a cooperative State-wide apple organization to tackle industry problems and advertise our apples—the Washington State Apple Advertising Commission. During the war years we did only token advertising; put the rest of the money away for a rainy day. That day was last season. We spent our entire reserve plus our current income and put on the biggest selling campaign we have ever tackled. It worked. We sold our entire large crop right here at home in the United States.

But we cannot advertise again next season on as large a scale—our reserves are gone. To make up for this somewhat we have raised our tax that we tax ourselves for advertising purposes, so that we are going to be in there pitching again, next fall. Our advertising commission has other fields of work, too. There is a research department for improving the quality of our fruit and improving handling practices, a merchandising staff that works with the wholesalers and retailers throughout the country improving their knowledge of apples, active cooperation with groups having a mutual interest in the development of export through private trade channels, study into new packaging methods, etc. It's all part of our program of carrying our load ourselves, financed by taxing ourselves for this multiple-purpose program at the rate of about $20 per car of apples sold.

You know about apples, Mr. President; you're from Missouri and they grow fine apples down there, too. Here our principal varieties are Delicious and Winesap. Now we sell Delicious right from harvest time through the holidays and to the end of January. Winesaps, you know, are a good keeper, so those sell naturally in the January through May season, and, since they are good keepers, we're the big export sellers. Our neighbors right across the border in British Columbia grow and sell apples, too—good apples, wrapped and packed in wooden boxes just like ours. Favorable duties make our United States a good export market for them and hundreds of thousands of boxes came in last fall and really hurt us badly and hurt us early just as we were getting the market off to a good start. We couldn't retaliate; higher costs down here, plus a high dump duty, makes it impossible for us to sell our apples in Canada.

We know Canada is a good American customer, Mr. President, but can't we sort of ask them to sell their apples the way we have to sell ours, month after month, giving them a monthly quota right through the 9 months that we sell ours. That would surely give us a break because that is the way we have to sell. But if they come in heavy during October and November and then stop after the market is beaten down, well, that's hardly fair. Is it?

Mr. President, we are very grateful for those 700 cars the Government bought here in our State on the Federal school-lunch program. Shipments were made in March and April and helped us a great deal. You know, apples are universal favorites with kids of all ages, and we think the school-lunch program should always include apples. Our apples are a good source of vitamins, minerals, calcium, and calories—just what youngsters need.

Then there was the European Cooperation Act of 1948. The 16 nations in this plan were all good apple customers before World War II, and we feel certain their desire for our Washington Winesap apples has not diminished, only their ability to buy. We hope the Marshall plan for these nations can include our Winesaps in some relation to their prewar importance. Fresh fruits are an essential in health-giving diet, and more and more health values are being discovered by researchers delving into the therapeutic values of apples. We growers will have a

large supply of Winesap apples next season, according to crop predictions, and we will badly need export for the survival of our industry. We ask the President's particular consideration for Washington apples under ECA.

Thoughtful and thankful Washington apple growers have not forgotten your work, Mr. President, when you were in the United States Senate, along with our Governor, the Honorable Mon C. Wallgren, then, too, a Senator, in coming to the rescue of our industry in the 30's with Government-backed loans through the RACC and other financing vehicles. You did so then because we were helping ourselves. We are helping ourselves today in a broader and more complete way. We do not look forward today to Government-backed financing in the immediate future, if at all. Our resources are known to you and your fellow workers in Washington, Mr. President. But we will want and need full and continued cooperation based on accurate knowledge from all governmental agencies at the proper time. We are not, as you know, an agricultural product under support prices or subsidy of any kind. The nearly 5,000 families who own the orchards that last year produced over 38,000 carloads of Washington apples are wholeheartedly and steadfast supporters of the free-enterprise system which flourishes in a democratic America holding high the light of freedom to the entire world.

Come again, Mr. President; the welcome mat is always out for you here in the applelands of Washington State.

Respectfully submitted.

Apple Growers Committee: Victor Larse, Cashmere, Chairman; L. J. Richardson, Monitor; E. C. Loudenback, Cashmere; Ray Cain, Wenatchee; Grady Auvil, Orondo; Tom Clawson, Chelan; Arden Harris, Entiat; J. W. Welch, Jr., Wenatchee; George D. Hamilton, East Wenatchee.

Can We Defeat Communism by Adopting Its Principles?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following broadcast by Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill:

CAN WE DEFEAT COMMUNISM BY ADOPTING ITS PRINCIPLES?

Last Sunday, I told how Social Security card holders are cheated by being paid back dollars that are worth less than the dollars they pay in. Listeners have asked me what to do about it. The best answer to that is Thomas Jefferson's. His remedy was: "A wise and frugal government * * * that shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread that it has earned." He said, "We must make our selection between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of taking care of them, they must become happy."

In short, the waste of the people's wealth by the profligate spending of big Government makes social security a moral fraud.

Jefferson was not a Socialist or Communist and he certainly was not a Fascist. He was the founder of the Democratic Party which has now almost completely repudiated his teaching. It is worth while for Republicans to recall that Abraham Lincoln said: "The principles of Jefferson are the definitions and axioms of a free society."

JEFFERSON SAW THE FAULTS

As our Ambassador, Jefferson lived in France in the days of Marie Antoinette and had seen the labors of the people wasted and their ambition and enterprise strangled by the red tape and countless rules, regulations, and orders of big government.

What he say then, we see now in Socialist Britain and Communist Russia where the government wastes the labor of the people and destroys their liberty under the pretense of taking care of them.

A distinguished British writer, Charles Morgan, says of England today:

"The people of England are in a prison. It is a prison of just-endurable discomfort. A discomfort they would endure stubbornly enough if endurance offered them the prospect of freedom. No such prospect is offered. The walls of the prison close in day by day; the area of enterprise shrinks. * * * There is no property not subject to capture, no endowment that may not be seized, no contract that may not be overridden, and no government obligation that may not be indefinitely postponed. * * *

SAFER TO BE A BUREAUCRAT

"Today," he says, "it is safer to be a bureaucrat than a maker and the young men know it. * * * Socialism as now interpreted is competition without prizes, boredom without hope, war without victory, and statistics without end.

"It is not only politically false but morally destructive."

That is an Englishman's description of Socialist Britain today. Do you want it in our country?

We Americans have recently tried to cure the evils of the selfishness of individuals by substituting the greed of the group.

Now we are face to face with the final question: Shall we have private property, or socially owned, politically managed, and politically distributed property? The political distribution of property is the transfer of property by force.

Yet we protest against the police state. We vote billions to prevent the Russian police state from sweeping over the world. But let us examine this problem with complete honesty.

DO WE BOW TO EXPEDIENCY?

Is our objection to the police state based on the fact that the force of such a tyranny is used by a minority over a majority; by a few men in the Kremlin over millions of men?

Or, is our objection to the use of force itself, no matter whether the force is used by a minority over a majority, or by a majority over a minority?

In short, is it morally right to take honestly acquired property by force if a sufficient number vote to do so, or if they have other means to take it?

If the transfer of property by force is morally right, then the class struggle of the Marxists cannot be successfully attacked. For the class struggle involves the transfer of property by the force of a minority or a majority, carried out by either the tax collector, or by the secret police.

I have just read an article in this month's American magazine. It is entitled, "If We Pull Together" and is by Mr. Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

The story of Mr. Murray's rise, from humble origin as the immigrant child of a Scottish coal miner to a position of leadership, is in the great American tradition. Mr. Murray, in addition, is a devout and religious man.

With much that he says in his article about the evils in American life—past and present—I am in complete agreement.

COMPROMISING WITH COMMUNISM

But running through his article is a thread of thought that is widely held in the world today. That is, that the way to beat communism is to go partly collectivist ourselves—to meet it halfway, to adopt the less violent half of the "class struggle."

Jefferson would not agree that that is the way to defeat communism. This country was built by men and not by pressure blocs.

It was built by men, and the tools, inventions, and machinery that they created under a system that rewarded work, encouraged investment, upheld contracts and protected honestly acquired private property.

Mr. Murray, as a loyal union man, believes that much, if not most, of the improvement in the lives of wage earners is due to the growth and power of labor unions.

He apparently does not believe a competitive market economy had much to do with the growth of this country.

OBJECTS TO ALL RESTRAINT

He is against the Taft-Hartley law. He would repeal it outright. Nor do I find the slightest hint that he would approve any law restraining labor union leaders in the exercise of force over the life of the community.

The Taft-Hartley law has put restraints on the arbitrary use of force by labor leaders—either over their own men, or the life of the community—as shown in the coal strike and the railroad strike called by three out of twenty-one railroad brotherhoods.

It becomes more apparent daily that the rank and file wage earner approves the main objectives of that law. Labor unions have brought home to management the importance of the human factor in industry. They have helped to free wage earners from the arbitrary use of force by employers. They have helped to create in industry a government by law, and not by men, rules and agreements that men and management can go by—rules laid down in advance regarding hiring, firing, promotion, discipline, etc.

REAL VALUE OF UNIONISM

This has helped to create a sense of security and human dignity that can contribute much to our industrial advance. The good in labor unionism is that it has put limits on the arbitrary use of force against workingmen by management. The harm in labor unionism is that it too often justifies the arbitrary use of force by unions against the community.

But, admitting all the good labor unions have actually done, Mr. Murray, and others, make claims for them that are much broader than the facts warrant. Let me cite a few examples:

One is that labor unions have taken children out of the mines and factories. But, other reasons are chiefly responsible. One is the smaller family today as against 50 or 100 years ago. Fewer mouths to feed. The head of the house is better able to earn enough by his own labor to support a smaller family. Second, the rise in the productivity of the head of the house, aided by machines supplied by capital, means, therefore, a rise in his real wage.

It is tools, mechanical horsepower, and the capital that has financed them that are chiefly responsible for the rising productivity of the American wage earner.

THE VALUE OF TOOLS

If some calamity forced us to use nothing but wooden tools, and only the power of horses, oxen, windmills, and human backs,

we would return overnight to child labor, long hours of killing toil, and the low scale of living of pioneer days, and nothing government or labor unions could do would prevent it.

Another claim made by Mr. Murray is social insurance. But, as I pointed out last Sunday, under political management, the social insurance taxes are spent for other purposes, and with a constantly cheaper dollar, social insurance is in the way of becoming a moral fraud as men put in 100-cent dollars in their working years and are paid back in 59-cent dollars, or less, when they are old and "on the shelf."

Mr. Murray says that he does not believe free enterprise includes the right to gouge the public or suppress competition. Neither does any decent American.

COMPETITION IS WHOLESOME

But what shall be said of suppressing competition by encouraging featherbedding and by warning the ambitious man to "take it easy"—don't "produce too much"—and penalizing the unusual man by forcing him to accept the wage scale of the average man?

He thinks a great mistake was made in abolishing OPA. It is a question whether he does not think OPA should be a permanent feature of a regimented society.

It is said that prices did not fall when OPA came to an end. But they did fall and they will continue to fall if we do three things: Maintain and increase production, and keep Government from making dollars cheap. The charge that prices have risen since OPA ended is a statistical illusion. It is based on the Bureau of Labor's Index of posted, legal prices (often for nonexistent goods), and completely overlooking black-market prices and Government subsidies which you pay in your tax bill.

PUBLIC HOUSING IN RUSSIA

Mr. Murray is for public housing. They have that in Russia. Very few houses are privately owned in that unhappy land.

Mr. Murray is for Federal aid to schools and colleges; for Government health insurance; for price controls; for minimum wages; for the Government telling the efficient employer how much profit he can make.

In the last bulletin issued by the Soviet Embassy in Washington, I find all these things claimed for communism in Russia.

We know that these claims are not justified by the facts. Research by the American Federation of Labor and other organizations proves that the scale of living in Communist Russia is pitiable compared with that in the still relatively free economy in America.

FACTORS MURRAY IGNORES

Mr. Murray does not see that the blight of price controls, the heavy load of debt, and the forced transfer of property by rising taxes tend inevitably to turn social gains thus attempted into the ashes of ruined business and worthless money.

We used to have runs on the banks. Now we have runs on the Government. Those who made a run on a bank were trying to get their own money. Those who make runs on the Government are trying to get other people's money. From a moral standpoint, this is no improvement.

Years ago, Justice Brandeis, of the United States Supreme Court, coined the phrase "other people's money." He had chiefly in mind the taking of other people's money by salesmen of blue-sky stock, and by other financial racketeers.

Now it is pressure blocs who take other people's money for their own use by the process of the vote. On the surface, this is made to appear legal. The principle of majority rule is misused to justify it.

The governmental appropriation of what others have produced is getting to be a greater threat to the unity, prosperity, and solvency of our country than the financial racketeers of years gone by.

THE RELIGION OF FORCE

State socialism is the religion of force. It believes that property and prosperity can be rightly transferred by force.

This raises an old question. To what extent and for what purposes can the taxing power of government and economic power of either industry or labor unions be rightfully used in a free society?

This so-called social gospel has been carried so far that it boils down to this: "What is my fair share of what you have earned?"

When people begin to ask that question, they are attempting to defeat communism by adopting its principles.

Let the Iranian Government Pay Its Debts to American Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the Iranian Government owes Ulen & Co. and the J. G. White Engineering Corp., both of New York, an amount well in excess of $1,000,000, which debt is fully documented. For many years the Iranian Government has doggedly refused to settle.

The policy of the Department of State seems to be more interested in protecting the interests of foreign governments rather than American citizens, which policy can only react to the detriment and injury of the latter.

It is my understanding that, at no time in this controversy, has our Department of State shown any interest in Ulen or J. G. White's position, nor has it in any way shown a disposition to remind the Government of Iran of the necessity of settling its contractual obligations.

As stated in the newspaper article of June 16 in the Star:

The American Government paid Iran several million dollars for wartime use of the Trans-Iranian Railroad, which was built by Ulen, the J. G. White Engineering Corp., both of New York, et al., and is still unpaid for by Iran. As an added generosity, the Department of State is now sponsoring an additional $60,000,000 grant for war surplus equipment and supplies, which sum provides for reconditioning and the cost of shipment to Iran—all at the expense of American taxpayers. The Department of State has attempted likewise to bring pressure to bear on the International Bank to grant Iran's application for a $250,000,000 loan.

It is highly ironical that our benevolent Department of State, so ably represented by Mr. John D. Jernegan, Chief, Division of Greek, Turkish, and Iranian Affairs, testified on Friday, May 28, in Iran's behalf, before the Senate Appropriations Committee, that not only are we transferring $120,000,000 face value worth of war surplus equipment to the Iranians for a fraction of its original cost, but the Congress is asked to appropriate $19,155,000 for the "care, handling, and disposal" of the foregoing mentioned war surplus equipment. This means, in effect, that the Department of State, not content with practically giving away American property, sponsors the cost of shipment to Iran as well as the reconditioning costs.

In connection with the foregoing, it is pertinent to refer to Dr. Millspaugh's statement:

For Iran, stabilization and real independence depend primarily on governmental reform, financial solvency, and economic development. Militarization stands as the greatest single obstacle to progress along these lines, and our aid in the militarizing of Iran plays directly into the hands of the Communist agitators. No Iranian Army, however well equipped, could resist Soviet aggression and a large army is unnecessary for the maintenance of internal order.

Since Dr. Millspaugh of the Brookings Institution lived in Iran many years as administrator of Iranian finances, I consider him unquestionably the best-informed and most reliable expert on Iranian affairs in the United States, the so-called experts in the Department of State to the contrary notwithstanding. It would appear, therefore, that the Department's policy is actually further contributing to the fiscal delinquency of the Iranian Government.

Let the Iranians pay their debts before further grants or credits are handed out so generously.

American citizens and taxpayers protest the unrealistic policy of the Department of State in connection with its Iranian policy. It seems to me to be about time the Department of State be reminded that its first and primary policy should be to protect the interests of American citizens.

How about a new deal for American citizens, Mr. Secretary Marshall?

[From the Evening Star (Washington, D. C.), Thursday, June 10, 1948]

POLICY IN IRAN AN ERROR?

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

The article by Constantine Brown in the Star of June 5 forecasts a new crisis in Iran, resulting from and complicated by reborn Soviet activity in the country.

What Mr. Brown says indicates the futility of the State Department's policy in Iran. Our aim is a laudable one: To keep Iran independent and to prevent Soviet expansion toward the Persian Gulf and along the east flank of Turkey. To carry out this aim, we supply military equipment and military advisers to the Iranian Army, and, in the incredible shifting maze of oriental intrigue, our somewhat unpracticed diplomats attempt to make friends and influence politicians.

In the view of one who has had considerable experience in Iran, these procedures have little chance of success. Apparently, they already are failing. For Iran, stabilization and real independence depend primarily on governmental reform, financial solvency, and economic development. Militarization stands as the greatest single obstacle to progress along these lines, and our aid in the militarizing of Iran plays directly into the hands of the Communist agitators. No Iranian Army, however well equipped, could resist Soviet aggression and a large army is unnecessary for the maintenance of internal order.

Moreover, the State Department is badly advised if it puts any faith in the friendship of Iranian politicians or in the promises of the Iranian Government. The past record of that Government is not one of stability

or integrity. A certain well-known American construction company can testify that, even now, the Iranian Government shows no disposition to observe its clearest obligations.

By the way, Mr. Brown is mistaken in his belief that the Tehran Conference in December 1943 formally guaranteed the independence and territorial integrity of Iran. The unflinching loyalty of the Iran Government, mentioned by Mr. Brown as the reason for the guarantee, was due to the fact that the Iranians had no choice. Their territory was occupied by the Allied forces. Before the occupation, Iran had practically delivered itself to the Nazis.

A. C. MILLSPAUGH.

[From the Evening Star (Washington, D. C.), Wednesday, June 16, 1948]

IRAN AND UNPAID BILLS

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

I have read with interest the June 5 article on Iran by Constantine Brown, and the subsequent letter to the editor, captioned "Policy in Iran an error?" dated June 10, signed by Dr. A. C. Millspaugh of the Brookings Institution of Washington.

My interest in these communications will be understood from the fact that I am the authorized representative of "a certain well-known American construction company" which Dr. Millspaugh states "can testify that, even now, the Iranian Government shows no disposition to observe its clearest obligations."

It is not my intent to take issue with the policy of our Department of State as regards Iran. I am as interested as is any other American in safeguarding the territorial integrity of Iran against Russia. As one who has lived among the Iranians, I share their ambition for a reformed, financially solvent, and economically developed country.

But, I am also interested that the Iranian Government should resolve its clearest obligations and execute signed covenants in the spirit and intent contracted for. My company has sought for many years, without success, to collect certain moneys due and owing for material, equipment, and services in connection with the construction of the southern portion of the Trans-Iranian Railroad. Iranian Government officials refuse even to discuss their responsibilities in settling this debt; nor do they show any inclination to rectify the injustices of a previous arrogant and despotic administration.

The American Government paid Iran several million dollars for wartime use of the Trans-Iranian Railroad, which was built by Ulen, the J. G. White Engineering Corp., both of New York, et al., and is still unpaid for by Iran. As an added generosity, the Department of State is now sponsoring an additional $60,000,000 grant for war surplus equipment and supplies, which sum provides for reconditioning and the cost of shipment to Iran—all at the expense of American taxpayers. The Department of State has attempted likewise to bring pressure to bear on the International Bank to grant Iran's application for a $250,000,000 loan.

It is not my contention that our Department of State ought to act as a collection agency, in this, or any similar matter, but neither ought it to act exclusively as a disbursing agency of American taxpayers' dollars for the benefit of foreign governments.

Iran is benefiting substantially, as a result of the generosity of the American Government and its citizens. Does it seem unreasonable, therefore, to expect Iran and other countries to pay their contractual obligations to American taxpayers who provide the moneys so generously distributed by the United States?

FRANK H. REDIKER,
Agent and Attorney-in-Fact for Ulen.

How To Make Democracy Live

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride and pleasure that I include with my remarks two well-written and thought-provoking essays on How To Make Democracy Live. Miss Carol Breckenridge, of Redwood City, Calif., and Mrs. Martha Pitman, of San Jose, Calif., were the only two women to win prizes in the recent essay contest conducted by Drew Pearson. I am proud of the fact that both of them reside in my congressional district.

I hope that my colleagues will take the time to read these two excellent articles on the most important subject in the world—democracy. If we as legislators, serving as the elected representatives of the people, can implement by word and action the thoughts set forth in the following essays, we will be doing our part in making democracy live.

HOW TO MAKE DEMOCRACY LIVE, BY CAROL BRECKENRIDGE, 303 FULTON STREET, REDWOOD CITY, CALIF.

As I read of the struggles to establish our form of government, I resolve to do my best to preserve it. I shall try never to become too complacent. Active, intelligent voting is one of the fundamental duties of all who want to make democracy live. An informed interest should govern my choice of candidates for public office. After election I should write my Congressman in order to let him know how I wish to be represented.

Quite apart from this active participation in making democracy live is another phase of obligation, more subtle, but equally important: It is building up within myself a deeper appreciation of the Bill of Rights and a willingness to make myself worthy of my Government. No system of representative government can be better than the people whom it represents. Therefore, I shall resolve to use my glorious freedom of speech to express only those ideas which will help all mankind, and never abuse it by using words to gain selfish or unworthy aims.

Each individual thinks often of his privileges, but now is the time to think often of one's duties and responsibilities in maintaining our Government. No one is immune to the process of making our democracy live.

HOW TO MAKE DEMOCRACY LIVE, BY MRS. MARTHA PITMAN, 395 EAST SAN ANTONIO STREET, SAN JOSE 12, CALIF.

I can help make democracy live because the best citizen is not the one who knows most but the one who cares most. Being a mother, I can teach my children to care about people, about those values essential to a democracy.

If I show my child that his rights and possessions are respected, if I teach him to take his turn and do his share, if I make him feel loved and valued for himself, I'll be teaching him to believe in the inalienable rights of all people.

I will not train my child in blind obedience born of fear, for that makes dictators possible. I will expect only the conformity suitable to his age. I will not demand acceptance of all my opinions. I will tolerate the stress and strain of disagreement in order to encourage that free expression of ideas which enriches group life, and in order to further the self-discipline required for democratic living. My child can become truly democratic only by practicing that way of life.

By my example I will seek to show my child that democracy is worth all that it costs. I will obey the laws, even those I dislike. I will pay my taxes without evasion. I will be fair to people who differ from me in race, religion, or political philosophy. I will study my Government in order to vote intelligently. I will take time to serve my community.

If we parents care enough, we can make democracy live.

Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on a problem which has long been grossly neglected—the problem of the small-business man. I take this opportunity to call the attention of the House to certain economic danger signals which threaten small business, and to urge congressional action to protect the interests of the small-business man from the economic pitfalls that lie ahead.

During this period of high prices and heavy consumer purchases it is often incorrectly assumed that small firms are making enormous profits. It is true that the great corporations and chain stores are reaping huge profits—1947 corporate profits reached an all-time high of $18,000,000,000 after taxes. But the average small-business man is not so fortunate.

According to a recent survey of the United States Department of Commerce, small firms are making only 4.7 percent profits from each sales dollar—a profit margin that cannot be considered excessive. On the other hand, big business reports an 8-percent profit for each sales dollar, which is double the margin of the small-business enterprise. An analysis of profits for the years 1936 to 1947, inclusive, reveals that large companies have without fail earned from three to eight times as high a percentage of profits as did the smaller companies.

I am not suggesting that small business is in a starved condition at the present time; small firms are admittedly making more money today than during the thirties. But I am saying that their wartime profits have been greatly exaggerated, and their prewar famine has been forgotten. Experience shows that small firms will show a reasonable profit only during periods of boom, and normally their profits are meager. For this reason, many small-business men are without adequate reserves to weather the economic adjustments of the postwar period.

The precarious position of small business is emphasized by the recent rise in the bankruptcy rate. Small-business

failures during 1947 were over three times as numerous as in 1946, and a responsible Wall Street journal reports that the bankruptcy rate is increasing still more this year. This trend is a warning that small firms are far from secure.

The future of small business is made still more uncertain by the shadow of depression. The Economic Report of the President (January 1948) points out that consumer purchasing power has declined by 8 percent in recent months due to the rapid rise in prices, and that the present heavy expenditure for consumption is being maintained by drawing on past savings and by consumer credit. This shrinkage of purchasing power and the current inflation are the forerunners of depression. In fact, Babson's Business Statistics, Inc., is openly predicting that the worst depression which this country has ever experienced will occur in 1952.

Let us not forget that it is the small-business man who is one of the first casualties of economic collapse. We should not forget the last depression when 110,000 businesses with total assets valued at over $3,000,000,000 failed between 1929 and 1932. The future of small business—the economic foundation of our free competitive system—requires that 1929 shall not repeat itself.

Mr. Speaker, Congress cannot afford to continue its present do-nothing policy; we cannot afford to neglect the problems of small business any longer. We must recognize the fact that the small-business man is threatened on one hand by the unfair competition of the great corporations and the chain stores, and by the growing danger of economic recession on the other. The situation demands that Congress take bold and statesmanlike action to formulate and make effective a construction program which will stimulate the growth and guarantee the prosperity of the small type of business enterprise.

I take this opportunity to remind the House that on July 26, 1947, I presented to my colleagues a seven-point program which, in my opinion, reflects the immediate needs of the 3,000,000 small-business men in America. The major proposals included in this program are: (1) An effective program to curb monopolies and all forms of unfair competition; (2) the revision of the Federal patent laws; (3) a Federal program of scientific research; (4) the establishment of a small-business bureau in the Department of Commerce; (5) an expansion of RFC credit facilities for small firms; (6) tax relief for the small-business man; and (7) a program of expanding production for full prosperity.

When Congress reconvened for the second session last January, I was hopeful that Congress would enact at least part of this program into law. Now the second session is coming to a close but no such action has been forthcoming. Instead of protecting small business against monopoly, Congress has continued to favor the growth of monopoly. Instead of giving tax reductions to small business, Congress has adopted the Knutson tax bill which favors big business and the wealthy taxpayer at the expense of the small-business man and the common people. Instead of expanding the Commerce Department's program of service to small business, Congress abolished the Office of Small Business and closed its field offices. Nothing has been done to break the monopoly control over industrial patents, or to formulate a Federal research program for the benefit of small firms who cannot maintain their own research laboratories. Instead of supporting a program of full employment and prosperity, which is the only climate in which small business can prosper, the Congress has continued to follow the depression-breeding, boom-bust policies of the Hoover administration which will inevitably end in depression.

It is my hope that the next Congress will not show the same lack of concern for the small-business man as the Eightieth Congress. Small business is essential to the continued existence of our free competitive economy, and Congress cannot afford to neglect taking necessary steps to insure its future welfare.

Father's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1948

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, next Sunday, as the Members of this Eightieth Congress, the vast majority of whom are themselves fathers and who collectively are the paternal guardians of our great Nation's welfare, breathe a sigh of relief and take a well-earned rest, the United States will celebrate one of the most fitting of its holidays—Father's Day.

It happens, Mr. Speaker, that Father's Day was born in the city of Spokane, in my Fifth District of Washington, in the mind of a truly wonderful woman, Mrs. John Bruce Dodd. She first promulgated the idea as a tribute to her own father, William Jackson Smart, on June 6, 1910. It was for many years a local custom before it finally spread to national recognition.

This week, out in Spokane, there has been added a new plaque on the facade of the Spokane home of the Young Men's Christian Association. It reads:

Within this building, June 6, 1910, "Father's Day" was founded by Mrs. John Bruce Dodd as a tribute to her father, William Jackson Smart, a pioneer, and to all devoted fathers. This plaque is an honor gift from the Spokane County Pioneer Society, June 1948.

We who still cling to the pioneering spirit which fathered our country and nurtured the growth of the Pacific Northwest are proud that this national tribute to fatherhood had its beginnings among our kind of people. For this day, like Mother's Day which precedes it by 5 weeks, is an annual reminder that the strength of America lies in its individuals, in its families, and in a responsible parenthood which never is subservient to king or dictator.

In many lands today we have seen the role of fatherhood pass from the family to the state—and in every instance, chaos and turmoil and incipient slavery have been the result. We can all thank our Creator on this Father's Day that we have been spared this evil and that we can join our minds and hearts in tributes to the millions of fathers to whom we all owe so much.

Radio Address to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address to be made by me over Station WNBF:

SPEECH OVER STATION WNBF BY CONGRESSMAN EDWIN ARTHUR HALL ON SATURDAY EVENING, JUNE 19, 1948

Dear Friends of the Triple Cities and my Congressional Districts: The seriousness of the matter about which I address you this evening prompts me to ask your undivided attention for the next few moments.

Last week, I sent out several thousand of my pictures and asked my friends to put them in their windows.

As was to be expected, a newspaper made so much fun of the idea they probably caused several to hesitate. They tried ridicule, which sometimes works with the sensitive ones.

The boys had their laugh and I suppose derived huge satisfaction from the smart quips sent in my direction designed to put the damper on the thing they know will advertise your Congressman better than all the billboard displays a rich opponent could possibly buy.

Just how much the ridicule stopped honest citizens from using my posters, I can't say. From reports, however, I don't think many were affected by it.

To the contrary, the light of publicity may have spurred more people to put my pictures in their window. I am receiving assurance from many by mail that said windows have them and that the pictures are there to stay.

To you friends who have placed these posters on your property, I wish to express my heartfelt thanks. To you friends who are thinking about putting them up, I urge you to do so without further delay.

And the reason I am asking you so urgently tonight to do this for me, is because I have a shocking experience to tell you.

This is the story as it was told to me face to face by one who has supported me for many years. There is no doubt about the truth of this, for the integrity of the person who told me is beyond reproach.

It seems that this lady, who lives on Binghamton's west side, put up my picture in her window as soon as it arrived. A short time later came a knock on the door.

She opened it and was accosted by a rough-looking fellow who ordered her to take the picture down. She refused to do this and the man went his way.

This testimony proves beyond a doubt that the gangsters are up to their old tricks of

trying to intimidate everybody who is openly for your Congressman.

This proves beyond a doubt that there is a systematic campaign going on back home to get all citizens to remove my posters from their property.

This also proves that people with a little spunk cannot be pushed around and if you are like this lady, you will tell these tomatoes to mind their own business.

America is yet a free country. People still have the right to vote as they wish and moreover they have the right to display pictures of their favorite Congressman, too, without being ordered to take them down.

If you have a Hall poster, will you do me a great favor? Put it in your window or in some safe place on your premises where it can be seen. Then let me know if anyone annoys you.

In case somebody orders you to take my picture down, try to get his name. Write immediately and send me all details about his visit.

I am grateful to the courageous woman who defied such a hoodlum. I am appealing to all of you to resist such gestapo tactics to the fullest. Be like this lady was, fearless and defiant.

Most of these rowdies who are hired to threaten respectable citizens are yellow. They will run at the drop of the hat. They are trespassers on your property if they come to your home and order you to take down my pictures.

It is early in the game. Those who are trying to make you think that no opponent is going to jump in against me may not have correct information. Then, too, some may be trying to lull you into a sense of security. Then, the last minute, when they get our guard down, they can come in and give us the works.

Let's keep alert, prepared, and not let such a thing happen.

Above all, watch out for the bad actors I have described. Challenge them if they try to insult you because you're using my picture. Defy them when they tread upon your rights as an American.

One further word. My petitions are coming in faster and faster. However, in order to file a record number of names at Albany this year to get my name on the ballot they must come even faster. So please, dear committee members and friends, get me those names of your neighbors as soon as possible so that I will have them to show the world that the Americans of our district are still supporting me.

Thank you.

Selective Service Act of 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. WALLACE CHADWICK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. CHADWICK. Mr. Speaker, I take advantage of this opportunity by extension of remarks, not to praise this bill, about which I have grave doubts, but for which I feel compelled to vote because of my own appraisal of the factual situation in the world. It is rather to express my protest against the attitude of the armed services, and particularly, the Army, which has preceded the consideration of this measure.

I have been honestly convinced, up to now, that this country was not in danger of what we call militarism; this confidence is now shaken by the obvious failure of the Army to use every effort to save this country from the necessity of resorting to the draft at this time. It rather appears that they have intentionally refused to use the means, ready to their hand, which might readily have relieved the situation, and saved us from this unhappy decision.

We can only hope that the amendments which have been adopted, so far as they survive the conference, will prove as constructive as their advocates no doubt sincerely believe. I was glad to support the exclusion of the medical profession; the Army's ambition to further expand its Medical Corps is one of the many disturbing evidences of the thing I am talking about.

I think the decision to reduce the required period of service to one year is wise, and if allowed to become operative will prove useful. The amendments deferring the real effective date of the act seemed to me inconsistent with the considerations which induce me to support it at all, and I therefor regret them.

If it is the fact that the generals are moving toward an America more brilliantly studded with shoulder stars, it behooves the civil government to keep a sharp eye on them. But since we depend upon soldiers for military security, and since I believe our Army must be strengthened to the prescribed limits at once, I am going to vote for this bill now, and for the conference bill when it comes back.

Increase of Pay of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK L. SUNDSTROM
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution. It was introduced in the Legislature of the State of New Jersey by the Honorable Lewis M. Herrmann, an assemblyman from my home county of Essex.

ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 5, STATE OF NEW JERSEY

INTRODUCED FEBRUARY 16, 1948, BY MR. HERRMANN. REFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL WELFARE

A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for salary increases for postal employees

Whereas the price of all commodities and services has been continuously rising since 1939 to such an extent that the New Jersey consumer's dollar, as reported by the State department of agriculture, was worth only 57.4 cents in January 1948, as compared to that of June 1939; with every indication that the advance in prices will continue; and

Whereas this condition of high prices has lowered the standards of living for all postal employees, increased indebtedness, threatened ownership of homes, and dissipated savings; and

Whereas this lowered standard of living for postal employees seriously threatens the efficiency of the postal services by the loss of employees, resigning from the service, so that no permanent, efficient force can be built up: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Assembly of the State of New Jersey (the Senate concurring):

1. That the New Jersey Legislature memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation, at the earliest possible date, granting to postal employees an annual increase compatible with present living conditions, and that such increase be retroactive to January 1, 1948; and

2. That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the chairman of the House Committee on Civil Service and Post Offices, Hon. EDWARD H. REES; the chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Civil Service, Hon. WILLIAM LANGER; and to each Member of the United States Senate and House of Representatives duly elected from the State of New Jersey.

Passed State house of assembly, April 5, 1948.

Attest: PHILIP C. WADSWORTH,
Clerk of the House of Assembly.

Passed State Senate on May 10, 1948.

Attest: OLIVER F. VAN CAMP,
Secretary of the Senate.

Housing: A Party Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. BYRNE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of June 17, 1948:

HOUSING: A PARTY TEST

There is no more desperate and basic need in this country than that for housing. This need has been estimated by backers of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, which passed the Senate by voice vote on April 22, at 1,500,000 dwelling units a year for the next 10 years. We owe these homes particularly to our veterans and to young people just coming of marriageable age. If we believe in the American home we have to believe in the living space that makes it possible.

The TEW bill tackled this problem from all sides, putting its major emphasis on encouragement to private industry, with low-interest loans and low-cost insurance. But Senator TAFT and his colleagues, who are certainly no Socialists, included a provision for the construction, during the next 5 years, of 500,000 low-rent public-housing units. The whole cost of the program to the Federal taxpayer would be about $150,000,000 a year. If we don't owe our veterans and other young people this much help, what do our fine words about youth mean?

In the lower House it has begun to seem that they do not mean much to some members. By a parliamentary technicality, the main TEW provisions were tacked to a bill by Representative WALCOTT, of Michigan, who is no friend of public housing. Over Mr. WOLCOTT's stormy protests the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which he is chairman, reported the amended bill out by a vote

of 14 to 13 a week ago. It then went to that cemetery of so many good bills, the Rules Committee.

Yesterday that committee, with its Republican chairman and majority, voted to table by 6 to 2. Thus, by its power to suppress the measure, it is in effect legislating, for the Banking Committee is now compelled to amend, wreck, or forget the housing bill. This abuse of power does not seem to us fair to our young married people or to the democratic system. We believe it is time the House Republican leaders, who soon will be asking for votes, saw the light. The Republicans will hardly dare go before the country without at least a pretense of housing legislation; many of them, like Senator TAFT and the present Senate majority, are willing to do all they can to meet the crisis.

The Republican Keynoter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 14, 1948:

HOPING FOR A KICK UPSTAIRS

Scratch a Republican Party worker in Illinois and you will not find any Green blood rushing to the surface. Cut him pretty deep and you still won't. The striking thing about the GOP campaign across the Mississippi is the hope against hope that somehow at Philadelphia lightning will strike the present Governor and knock him onto the national ticket.

It isn't that very many Illinois Republicans really think Dwight Green should be nominated for Vice President and so perhaps be posted to sit on the White House doorstep and maybe by accident be called inside. Certainly it isn't that they think he has the qualities of leadership and integrity for the highest office in the land. Just the opposite. This hope against hope is based on the conviction that by one means or another the Republican Party in Illinois must be spared Dwight Green as a third-term nominee for Governor.

Why? Because Dwight Green has piled up a vast accumulation of liabilities. Because he has let State affairs slide while he went out to build himself up nationally. Because he has ignored many issues and people at home. Because he has disheartened State workers and depressed State services. So they want to kick him upstairs. They want to get him on the national ticket to get him off the State ticket. For they are deathly afraid that if Dwight Green runs against Adlai Stevenson in November, Adlai Stevenson will be Governor next January.

Dwight Green wangles himself a third-term nomination by a trick which forces primary opposition out of the field. The party workers then have no choice but to give him a seemingly unanimous renomination. Yet he is so weak among those who know him that his associates want to run him on the national ticket since voters over the country don't know him at all.

What a callous, cynical approach to public life this is. What it tells about Keynoter Green.

Can it be that the GOP delegates will be so unmindful of the Nation's interests as to show any preferment at all for Dwight Green?

Party Platforms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Frank C. Waldrop, as follows:

Beginning today, some Republicans go into labor on a kind of work that too many people treat as a joke. That is the job of writing a "party platform," to be accepted by the whole party in convention and as the basis for the 1948 campaign.

Just why is a political party's platform supposed to be funny?

Actually, nothing could be more significant and less trivial than a party platform. For a platform is a system of pledges and a statement of aims.

By what they promise as compared with what they deliver politicians can be judged better than any other way.

Take the case of Roosevelt. In 1932 the Democratic Party was trying to get the country's most serious attention. Those were days when money was tight and nothing hurt more than to pay taxes.

So the No. 1 attack of the Democrats was upon extravagance and waste by the Hoover administration, coupled with a pledge of 25 percent cut in the cost of government, stringent economy, and supreme efficiency.

Well, how long did Mr. Roosevelt live by that platform? And when he left it behind did he offer any apologies or explanations to anybody at all?

His platform, after all, showed the country very quickly what we could expect of him.

The 1936 platform for the Democrats was meaningless and so was the Republican and so was the campaign, as a contest.

Look again to the campaign of 1940. What did we get that time? A slippery story about how both parties would keep us out of the war. And as soon as the campaign was past, Roosevelt rushed to Congress with lend-lease, and Willkie, his supposed opponent of a few months before, was up there helping him and speaking of his own past performances as "campaign oratory."

The more you looked at them, the more Roosevelt and Willkie merged into one. And it was natural that they would, for neither the Republican nor the Democratic platforms of 1940 told anybody about the basic proposition of the day, how to stay out of the war.

The 1944 campaign was conducted under the cloud of war and so it is really unreasonable to complain about the generalities and vagueness of the Republican platform and as for the Democrats, they were only one man, anyhow.

But now things are different. We are facing the first Presidential contest after the war. The time is right for a new shaping up of things, a new direction and a new quality in politics.

Senator TAFT has put the case better than anybody in saying that now is the time for the Republicans to spell out a program so plainly and clearly that nobody can mistake it.

The United States is a good country, has done well in the world and now is surely, if ever, due to be treated by its politicians as if it were grown up.

Writing platforms that are patty-cake love notes or squashy evasions is a trick that ought by now to be so obviously cheap that the voters will not stand for it.

The Republicans will never be stronger in politics than they are this very hour, will never have better odds to sweep the Presidency and all of Congress than they have this year.

Now, then, is the hour to risk frankness, fairness, and a detailed statement of position if ever that hour can come.

The advantage is double: (1) it will show the Republican Party's courage, and (2) it will test the Democrats'.

And the Democrats have no real courage today, any more than they have a program.

They have spent 16 years coasting on the coattails of one who cannot help them now. Their lack of fiber, their indifference to responsibility and their absence of ideas will show nowhere more clearly than in the platform they write.

The more plainly the Republicans spell out their own ideas of government the more obviously the Democrats will show the lack of theirs.

Federal Aid to Education Is Imperative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remind the House that for the last 3 months the Committee on Education and Labor has been blocking action on S. 472, the Educational Finance Act of 1948. Although the other body passed this measure on April 1, 1948, the committee has refused to discuss its provisions and report it to the floor for debate. The responsibility of this miscarriage of legislative justice rests squarely upon the shoulders of the House Republican leadership, who are following their usual do-nothing policy with respect to education in the same way that they have neglected housing, health, social security, old-age pension, and other welfare legislation during the whole life of the Eightieth Congress.

I want to go on record as protesting against the high-handed manner with which the committee has chosen to pigeonhole this education bill. In my opinion, there are few bills so deserving of support as this measure. It would, if passed, authorize $300,000,000 each year in Federal grants to States for the benefit of the Nation's grade and high schools. Its passage would represent a big step toward the equalization of the amount of money spent for education in the various States, and would tend to establish some degree of uniformity with respect to educational opportunities for the children of America. Without establishing one iota of Federal control over public education, and without interfering with the States to determine their own methods of school finance, this bill would establish a national floor under annual educational expenditures of $50 per pupil.

In view of existing conditions in the public-school system in many States, this proposal certainly deserves careful con-

sideration. The crisis in American education is serious. During the last year some 4,000,000 American children between 5 and 17 years of age were not attending any school whatsoever. Another 2,000,000 children are suffering a major impairment in their schooling because of lack of adequate facilities and poorly prepared teachers. Some 350,000 teachers left the teaching profession during the war years never to return due to low pay. Since 54 percent of the public-school teachers are paid less than $2,000 per year, and 16 percent of them less than $1,200, you can hardly blame them for seeking more lucrative fields.

The root-cause of all these educational problems are largely economic. Educational inequalities, the lack of educational facilities, and low teacher salaries are primarily due to the inequalities in the taxable resources in the various States. The per capita income in Mississippi is only $556 per year, as compared to New York which has a per capita annual income of $1,595—a ratio of 3 to 1. As a result, Mississippi can afford to spend only $44 per year for each pupil, while New York is able to spend $194.

S. 472 would make a start in the correction in these inequities. Its purpose is to provide financial assistance to the various States in accordance with their need for educational funds. Every State would obtain a minimum of $5 per pupil each year, with the poorer States obtaining as much as $28 per year for each pupil. My State of Minnesota, for example, would receive nearly $3,000,000 annually from this bill—an amount which would be a great help to many school districts in meeting their school budget. The underlying principle of this bill is to help those States the most whose needs for financial assistance are greatest, while benefiting every State to some extent.

Mr. Speaker, America cannot afford to economize at the expense of education. Apart from the humanitarian aspects involved, better educational facilities are justified in terms of citizenship—an enlightened citizenry is necessary for the proper functioning of democracy. Furthermore, education is important in terms of industrial efficiency and individual earning power. We have neglected education in the past, and the 10,000,000 illiterates and semi-illiterates in the country represent the social costs of our failure. We must no repeat the same mistake with the next generation.

I am convinced that the formula for allocating Federal assistance to the States under this bill is equitable, and that its objectives of equalizing educational opportunities and establishing a floor under educational expenditures, is worthy of full consideration and wholehearted support. The most precious asset this Nation has is its children. To conserve and develop this human resource is the best assurance we have for the future welfare of our Nation, and the preservation of democracy. Therefore, I take this opportunity to appeal to the House to act favorably upon the Federal aid to education bill before adjournment.

Socialization of National Park Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, the House Public Lands Committee has conducted hearings on the relationships between the National Park Service and the private concessioners who operate tourist facilities in our national parks. From these hearings it has become obvious that the intent of the Interior Department is to do away with the concessioners and set up a Government-owned corporation to manage park facilities. This socialization of the national parks is being carried on as policy of the Interior Department.

The House Public Lands Subcommittee has adopted a resolution stating that it is the intent of the committee that the concessioners be not disturbed in the use and operation of their facilities until Congress has had time to investigate and enact policy legislation.

I am pleased to have our viewpoint substantiated by one of the most respected leaders of the conservation movement in this country, Mr. Horace M. Albright, of New York City. Mr. Albright for 10 years was superintendent of Yellowstone National Park and following that was on the staff of Secretary Lane. He is an authority on the parks of this Nation. He has given me permission to place in the record the following letter which he had addressed to Under Secretary Chapman of the Department of the Interior, and which I think is a splendid exposition of the current problem.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter from Mr. Albright:

MAY 25, 1948.

HON. OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Under Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I appreciate very much the recognition of my experience in National Park affairs and your confidence in me which prompted you to ask me to comment on the report of the Concessions Advisory Group recently submitted to the Department.

I was first concerned with national park concessions 35 years ago when, as a young man, I was on the staff of Secretary Lane, and during all the years I was in the National Park Service no one had more to do officially with these concessions than I did.

For 10 years, when I was in charge of Yellowstone National Park, I was daily in contact with some of the biggest concessions—with some of the largest investments in the park system. It was necessary to know the history of the development of those properties from their beginnings, and it was essential that every feature of their operations be understood. Naturally I came to know and fully understand their history, policies, advantages and hazards; and I knew the men and women who were in these park business enterprises. By and large they were good people. They did not always look at affairs as we Government officials did, but there was always a wide area of agreement in every field of activity and in general we had concession support in our undertakings and we extended aid to the lessees that was consistent with the performance of our duties as and when needed in the public interest.

It would be foolish for me to say that national park concessioners always gave the best possible service to the public. There were lapses and occasionally we had complaints that made revision of practices necessary. There were times when I thought I could run some of the enterprises better than their owners, but I also realized that I did not have to meet the pay rolls and raise the money to open and operate these park business properties.

Complaints through the years were relatively few. Even in the peak of the season when there was no possibility of giving full satisfaction, especially in housing, complaints were few. There were utterly unreasonable people who could never be pleased, and occasionally I found it advisable to take such tourists into my own home rather than try to deal with the aftermath, which would be charges filed in Washington against the hotel or lodge companies.

But the Government itself came in for tough complaints against its roads, sprinkling system, etc., no matter how hard we tried to do a good job with the money and equipment at our command. I remember one lady filed a long complaint with the secretary against our roads, saying her gallstones had been jarred about and had caused her great pain. The understanding secretary merely cautioned us to "try to make your roads safe for gallstones." He knew with what we had to contend.

Now to the report of the advisory group.

The group is a very able one. I have the good fortune to know all of the members except Mr. Charles P. Taft. I never met him. However, it is my impression that he did not get into the work of the group very deeply.

The report is an excellent one, and I find very little in it that I must disagree with. If I were a high department officer with power to effectively use the findings, discussions, and recommendations of the group, I would not hesitate to adopt the report as the guiding force in concession affairs in the national parks.

I do not agree with the group that automobile fees charged tourists at the gates of most national parks should be abolished. This is an old problem that was discussed over and over again in the first 15 years of the life of the Park Service and none of us were ever able to see why the people who use the national parks should not pay a little something directly toward the maintenance of the park facilities and not let the whole burden be borne by the taxpayers in general.

The group, it seems to me, in their report convey a slightly wrong impression when they infer that the national park concesión system began with the establishment of the National Park Service. That is not the case. The concession policies were originally established under the early Yellowstone Park laws, and the first concessions of importance were installed in Yellowstone with the aid of the Northern Pacific Railroad immediately upon the completion of that transcontinental line and its branch to the north gate of Yellowstone in 1883.

The general policy of maintaining a regulated monopoly at least within a certain field of tourist accommodations grew up long before the National Park Service. In fact, when Secretary F. K. Lane became head of the department in 1913, and in 1915 had Stephen T. Mather join him for national park administration, this monopoly policy, through intervention of politics especially in Yellowstone, had been broken down and we found some of the most terrible facilities and services being inflicted on visitors that anyone had ever heard of. It was necessary in 1916

to cancel some permits and force consolidations to restore order and adequate service.

Several of the great parks, notably Yellowstone, Glacier, Zion, Bryce Canyon, and Grand Canyon, fortunately commanded the interest of railroads who were able to install facilities and equipment of a grade and character far above what any smaller operator could have provided. These railroads were able to charge losses to advertising expenses. They have been uniformly good concession operators.

It is my firm conviction that with the possible exception of Yellowstone, today these particular parks would not have hotels and lodges even remotely comparable to those now available to the public had not the railroads intervened.

In certain other parks, transportation has aided in carrying the burden of hotel and even lodge operations, and had the hotel company not had the transportation concession too, the hotels would have failed. This was true in Yellowstone after the Northern Pacific withdrew and sold its interests. The hotels could not have been profitably operated without the support of the transportation income.

On the other hand, transportation lines such as those in Glacier and Rocky Mountain Parks are utterly dependent on railroad good-will, ticket selling services, etc., to operate successfully.

Since very essential services, such as horse and pack animal transportation, are extremely hazardous, no operator undertakes to furnish them unless he is protected with income from other concessions. In Glacier Park today you have no saddle horse service worthy of recommendation, and it is doubtful if you ever will have such service again, despite the fact that this is a really great trail park.

Almost every concessioner must of necessity furnish some services at a loss, or, at most, inconsequential profit.

The hazards of the short season, the possibilities of railroad and other strikes curtailing travel, the crushing peak loads of weekends and holidays, the fast highways enabling motorists to go to and through a park with almost lightning speed, create uncertainties and difficulties that one can only appreciate by being on the ground and watching day by day concession operations.

It was only with the greatest difficulties that companies were formed by public-spirited businessmen to install adequate facilities in Mt. Rainier and Yosemite Parks. These operations, while fairly large, have never paid adequate returns on money invested and the Rainier National Park Co. is broke and wants to sell its physical plant to the Government. It has a bill in Congress to authorize purchase.

All those things, the advisory group took into consideration and they gave weight to them in reaching their conclusions. They viewed all the problems they encountered realistically and came to sound conclusions which, stated generally, were that the long established policy of regulated monopoly contracts, with terms long enough to secure adequate financing, with renewal privileges recognized, with provision made for protection of investment, with rate and franchise charge policies reasonable and fair, should be continued.

The concession policy built up through the years from 1883 to date was found to be good and worth continuing. And I heartily agree with that conclusion. I hope it will be adopted forthwith to govern new concession contracts.

My principal regret is that the group did not attach to its report a draft of franchise contract-lease embodying all the terms the members thought necessary to have included. Had they done so, I am sure the document would not have differed materially from those approved in the year 1916 down to 1940 or whenever the last important contract was approved in the present administration.

Naturally I have wondered why all this disturbance of national park business interests was stirred up. One reason I assign after reading Congressional hearings, especially on appropriation bills, is that the concession policy for several years was not strongly defended and too much weight was given to a few complaints. Another was the disposition to regard Government ownership of concession properties, if not operation, too, as a possibility especially if Congressional disapproval of the present concession policy was strong and enduring.

While I agree that it will ultimately be best for the Government to own (not operate) the physical structures of business enterprises in the parks, as in the case of Bear Mountain Inn in the Palisades Interstate Park (New York-New Jersey) of which I am a commissioner, it is and has been unrealistic to regard early Government action in this direction as likely to happen. On the contrary, the need for economy in Federal expenditures on the one hand and the pressing need for appropriations for more important and even essential park projects and services make even a budget request for funds for concession acquisition absurd.

Even with comprehensive concessions in these parks and with competition only by photographic studios can some small stores (and not even these in Mount Rainier), the concessions are not paying operations over a long period of time.

I have long felt that the controlled monopoly is the thing for national parks, except that small highly personalized operations like photographic studios, curio stands, and perhaps small feeding operations might in the larger parks be authorized without jeopardizing the essential housing and feeding and transportation services. But in the smaller parks, even these picture and curio concessions are essential to profitable operations.

Terms of concessions have to be long enough to permit adequate financing. There must be sound protective clauses in the franchise contracts to protect equities in case of failure to renew the concession or when Government policy endangers the investment, as when a business property is forced away from a feature of interest and is subjected to the hazard of reduction or disappearance of tourist patronage.

There must be reasonable expectation of concession renewal upon contract expiration if the interest, enthusiasm and talents of a concessioner are to be thrown into the business; otherwise he is tempted to milk the business getting everything he can out of it as he goes along.

It is not possible to put up a concession to public offering and let it to the highest bidder, for you are very likely to get an utterly incompetent, inexperienced, and uninterested party in place of a concessioner who at least knows the business, understands park policy, and has a real interest in his park. There is not enough profit in any park enterprise to entice any bidder to promise much for a park concession. Income from concessions ought not to be a governing factor in granting them. Service to the public, protection of park features, and maintenance of park management ideals are far more important than the paltry sums that can be obtained in payment for franchises and privileges to do business in a national park.

Rates should be governed by prevailing rates for similar services outside the parks with due regard to the duration of the season and other hazards. It is hardly possible for many rates to be less inside a park than outside. In my long experience the rates for services in the parks compared very favorably with rates outside, and, generally, service inside the park for the same rates was superior to that outside.

After all, it is the responsibility of the Department and the National Park Service to administer the national parks and the concessions therein. Congressional criticisms must always be respectfully considered, but in my time it was always relatively easy to explain situations to Members of Congress, and we always found them understanding and reasonable.

I would not be afraid to stand up for the long-established concession system which the advisory group has now advised be continued and I am sure the Congressmen would go along with me.

Furthermore, I would not hesitate a moment to defend the earnings of park concessioners in the few good years in the past 35 years that yielded profits that might be regarded at first blush as large in relation to investment. In the late 1920's when rail travel was heavy and transportation earnings were large, several concession companies had very satisfactory earnings. It was mighty fortunate that we looked on these successes with equanimity and tolerance because had we cut rates and otherwise interfered, there would have been no adequate accumulations to tide the companies over the depression and war yars. But even in these years, no one could call the earnings excessive. If the concessioner (or the Park Service) is due for criticism at all it is for not enforcing execution of certain building programs (as in Yosemite) which had been agreed upon and to which a portion of earnings had probably been committed.

It was inevitable that I would hear from concessioners and others not in Government service that the Department may not follow the advisory group's advice, especially in contract provisions to protect equities in properties in which investment has been made; in the preferential right to renewal, and as a corollary to the second point, adopt a policy of inviting bids for concessions the rights for which have expired even though a preferential renewal right was promised. And I know that the Haynes concession in Yellowstone is affected by these tentative digressions from advisory group recommendations.

I cannot too strongly urge that the old policy be continued.

I am absolutely certain the Department will get no bids for any concessions unless they be the sort that apparently promise "cream"—such as curio stores, gasoline and oil stations, and perhaps photographic studios. Even then what chance is there that the new operator will give better service than the old one unless perchance the old one has been obnoxious or otherwise undesirable or a failure? If an operator has been a good one he should be kept, and there should not even be a question raised about him. Jack Haynes, of the Yellowstone, for instance, is one of the best concessioners that the park system ever had, and his father before him was an outstanding operator of both transportation and photographic businesses. The elder Haynes went into Yellowstone in 1862, was in President Arthur's party in 1883, and until he died in 1921 was prominent in Yellowstone affairs. The son has not only carried on with efficiency, cooperating always with the Park Service and rendering superb public service, but he has devoted untold numbers of hours in developing the park museum, extending its educational service, writing for its publications, lecturing, etc. It would be a crime for such monumental ingratitude and lack of appreciation of a fine family to replace Haynes in Yellowstone, that the Department would find the reaction vastly more disturbing than perhaps anyone has dreamed could happen.

There may be a concessioner here and there who ought to be replaced, but this should occur only for poor service, or for obnoxious conduct, or for failure to observe

N. P. S. rules and policies over a period of time. My guess is that in such cases if the business is reasonably profitable a new operator can be obtained. In most cases, there will be no bidders for one of these expired concessions. I think, too, that for some essential operations like saddle-horse service in Glacier Park no satisfactory operator will ever be found, and in view of costs of construction now it is extremely doubtful that any more hotels, large lodges, etc., will be built in national parks.

The Department is going to have the utmost difficulty in inducing a businessman or corporation (except perhaps railroads) to install and operate tourist facilities in a national park because the hazards of park business are too great, because costs are too high, and because the digression from the sound policies of the Advisory Group report will frighten men away from park-development programs.

I realize that this is a long statement but, try hard as I could, shorter coverage was not possible.

Hoping you will have time to read this statement, and with very best wishes, I am

Faithfully yours,

HORACE M. ALBRIGHT.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. LOVE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligence of June 17:

A LOCAL ISSUE

Once upon a time someone very wisely said "the tariff is a local issue." The saying was brought forcefully to mind when the United States Senate refused to extend the so-called reciprocal trade pacts for more than 1 year. Mr. Truman and the internationalist crowd of free traders with whom he has been surrounded had pressed insistently, but vainly, for a 3-year extension.

The full impact of these treaties, originated in 1934 during the early days of the New Deal has not yet been felt, because of the war boom, followed by war itself, and the present postwar boom in which the United States Government is subsidizing huge exports by means of gifts of our products to foreign nations financed by heavy taxation and emissions of printing-press money.

As a matter of fact many tariff schedules are today at the lowest point in 100 years—a very dangerous level, as all past experience admonishes. In our area are many industries, particularly glass and pottery, in which the protective tariff is a vital factor. Already the workers here have sensed the perils and are protesting against the secret and dangerous manner in which tariff duties have been lowered. The reason is that when the tariff drops below a certain point, foreign goods flood our markets, and their jobs are imperiled.

We have had enough of high-flown tariff theories in Washington. Congress is doing precisely right in reclaiming its tariff powers and delegating them only according to a pattern which bureaucrats would not dare violate. During the year that reciprocal tariffs will be permitted to survive, we hope the Congress will study the matter carefully and then correct the abuses that have grown up.

As it is now, the United States State Department is using the tariff as a political weapon to reinforce the various whims which unfortunately have been attendant upon our foreign policy. It is a sure way to make enemies, rather than friends, for the United States people.

Women and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 19, 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include excerpts from an address made by Mrs. E. Wyatt Payne of Huntington, W. Va., before the State Convention of Business and Professional Women at Charleston, W. Va.

Mrs. Payne is president of the Federation of Republican Women's Clubs of West Virginia, an elegant speaker and well-informed on political and governmental matters.

The statement follows:

[Excerpts from address before State Convention of Business and Professional Women, Charleston, W. Va.]

WOMEN AND POLITICS

We need an awakening among the better class of women in America, an awakening which will bring them face to face with the reality of political choice as the prerequisite for sound government. First, I should like to preface these remarks with the definition of "better-class women" to whom I refer. I do not mean women of any particular class, color, or creed, but women in all walks of life who, because of their innate integrity and fundamental Americanism, and their devotion to home, church, and country, constitute the greatest potential for good in America. These women are conscious of the great needs of the hour; they ponder the problems from the United Nations to the local dog pound; but too often, because of timidity and lack of contacts and experience with organized units, and especially because of the stigma attached to the word "politics," they take the line of least resistance and steer clear of it all.

The hour is late, and we are again faced with the crisis of saving the Republic from foreign ideologies and internal disintegration. The better class of our womanhood must fearlessly and practically face the question which is theirs by moral and legal right—namely, shall we, as recipients of the franchise, use it for social, political, and religious advancement, or shall we, through negligence, let a small group of women misuse it?

No point in taking refuge in that time-worn saying, "Politics belongs to the men—they don't affect me or my home." The reverse is obviously true. Everything, from the bread on our table to the earth's remotest border, is, and probably will be, controlled by some political group in which we will either be represented, therefore helping to shape our destiny, or, in which we will be misrepresented by our absence. It may be comforting to dwell in platitudes, but we shall never solve the problems before us by remote control. Women must know politics—not through that superficial and totally misleading headline knowledge which comes from campaign speeches, billboards, and circular letters. Rather, we must know how to evaluate these on the basis of facts.

Many sermons have been preached, and much editorial space has been given to Utopian doctrinaires on the evils of elections. Year after year, however, the results seem to prove that a few people in all parties, whether in local, State or National politics, somehow manage to get together to sell, trade, buy, or borrow candidates, precincts, and even States in order to set up their preconceived idea of what is best for the rest of us. The truth is, that by and large, these selfish minorities with their vote buying, precinct maneuvering, and double talk are interested mainly in setting up a closed corporation for themselves and their friends.

Many women know these things and abhor both the method and the consequent unsavory conditions, but the better element seem to feel the situation is hopeless and continually refuse to lend their services or cast a vote to correct the evils. Too many are afraid they will get their hands dirty. When will we learn that those who stay away from the polls and refuse to use their great potential strength through the ballot are directly and inescapably responsible for the very evils they decry? It is to this large majority of good-intentioned, unorganized and, as of today, not politically minded women that I suggest a plan which will become the most vocal and intelligent instrument for good in our world. Remember, progress in all things is ours, not for the asking, but for the voting, and the future progress of the Nation depends largely on the awakened sensibility of our women to their obvious duty as citizens in a rapidly changing social order. I sincerely believe that leadership, plus a rational approach to the problem will challenge the intelligent and patriotic women of America and soon we shall make a concerted effort to know the truth about good government and thus be free from the wrong connotation and stigma of the word "politics."

Suggested plan:

1. Form active study groups in practical politics, within the framework of existing clubs (political or nonpolitical) or in your own neighborhood. Study trends and issues as they arise between elections, remembering that individual views and opinions crystallize into trends, public opinion, and platforms, finally becoming the balance of power on election day.

2. Study the ways and means, the tricks of the trade, in local, State, and national politics. Know what is going on in your town and know the law which corrects illegal voting and election frauds; then make your knowledge effective by your personal or cooperative participation in political affairs. You can rest assured the former reasons for staying away from the polls and out of politics will vanish like the mist when women are thus informed.

3. Learn how to serve your party. To offer one's service in any capacity without the necessary knowledge which makes that service effective, may be emotionally patriotic, but it can be very detrimental to the cause we champion. Perhaps we do not intend to be active—simply vote on election day, but this does not prelude the wisdom of knowing the how and why of the ballot you cast.

4. Learn through study and observation how to evaluate issues, candidates, and platforms on the basis of past performance, rationality of statements or promises, and particularly on what all or each of these mean to our homes, schools, government, and churches in today's world.

Believe me, I am not advocating soap-box speeches, or a national female barnstorming tour. I am anxious that women quietly and persistently take up the challenge of the hour and learn the things we need to know for

the preservation of the American way. Recognizing free elections and the ballot as the medium through which the Republic functions, we must concern ourselves with keeping this medium clean. To do the job we must be willing to put first things first, knowing that although the home is the center of our family life and affection, the community soon becomes the playground and influence to be reckoned with for our children and our neighbors. We cannot afford to deal in personalities or destructive criticism, but rather we should be governed by the principle of what blesses one blesses all. We will have good government when—and only when—the selection or election of honest, fearless committeemen, election officials, and workers in all parties makes it possible to elect efficient and dependable people to any and all offices. We will never clean up politics from the top, we will do it when you and you and you decide to guard your own freedom and your children's right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness by assuming your share of the responsibility for clean, efficient government in your community and in your own precinct. Good government is assured when good people make it good.

When we consider what we, as women, have at stake for ourselves and our children, and that the doors of opportunity swing open or shut on the hinges of our thoughtful care, or thoughtless carelessness in the use of the ballot, we shall with courage and joy do our full duty as enlightened citizens.

Mrs. E. WYATT PAYNE,
Huntington, W. Va.

Campaigning at Our Expense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Jefferson County Union:

CAMPAIGNING AT OUR EXPENSE

"How can the people of this country be expected to believe anything the President says or authorizes to be said?"

That indictment was made by one of the top political writers of the Nation after Mr. Truman made his first major address of his present western tour.

"It seems to me that the President of the United States would be prompted by the dignity and prestige of the high office he holds to be aloof to such political indignities practiced in connection with his trip to the West," the writer said. "The response to his appearances on the tour has been in keeping with the falseness of the tour. He authorized the official statement that the trip would be nonpolitical; then, he proceeded to make it purely political.

"How can the people of this country be expected to believe anything the President says or authorizes to be said? Perhaps it is this lack of confidence in his utterances that has resulted in the great stay-away movement in the West.

What was said by the writer was not said without confirming facts. Before Mr. Truman even reached the Chicago scene of his first major address on the "nonpolitical" tour the taxpayers' train was boarded in Gary, Ind., by Frank McHale, Democrat, national committeeman from Indiana; Henry F. Schricker, former Democratic Governor of Indiana and Democratic candidate for election to that office again, and Paul M. Butler, Indiana Third District Democrat chairman.

Right there the political tempo was set for the taxpayers' train, and it has been maintained since.

Last week on a national radio hook-up, Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat of Washington, chuckled at the nonpolitical reference to Mr. Truman's trip and admitted with great delight that he was going to ride the train into his home state and make appearances there alongside the President.

Senator MAGNUSON will not be on Presidential business when he rides the taxpayers' train.

All this is going on at considerable expense to the taxpayers. The cost of the train will not be great, but when one takes into consideration the great security measures attendant on the Presidential trip the cost mounts considerably.

Well, Mr. Truman is accustomed to free rides; he got one into the Senate on the Pendergast train and another into the White House on the F. D. R. special.

Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have several times during the past months discussed in speeches before the House as well as over the radio the operation of the Taft-Hartley Act which will not have been in effect a year until August 22, and every day brings fresh evidence of the intent of those who wrote or inspired this antilabor legislation which has been condemned by all the leaders of American labor because it is destructive of the aspirations of the workingmen and women of this country. It was passed over the emphatic veto of President Truman by a Republican-controlled House and Senate.

I desire to call to the attention of this House today the testimony of Mr. T. A. Johnstone, assistant director, General Motors Department, UAW-CIO, who testified at length at the morning session of June 4, 1948, of the hearings before the Joint Committee on Labor Management Relations. Incidentally, I am the ranking Democrat on the House Committee on Education and Labor and also the ranking House Democratic member on the Joint Committee on Labor Management Relations, which is composed of 7 members of the House and Senate labor committees, respectively.

The following is an excerpt of Mr. Johnstone's concluding oral statement before the Joint Committee on Labor Management Relations on June 4, 1948:

Mr. JOHNSTONE. * * * And now I have a constructive proposal to make: You may ask me "What amendments can you offer to the act?" I have only one. I hope that you will let me read it. It is only nine lines long:

"A BILL TO REPEAL THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law No. 101, Eightieth Congress (the Taft-Hartley Act), is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The National Labor Relations Act (Wagner Act) in effect prior to the enactment of such Public Law No. 101, and section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, in effect prior to the amendment of the War Labor Disputes Act, are hereby reviewed and reenacted."

This is House bill 4241, introduced in the House of Representatives July 16, 1947, by Congressman LESINSKI. It was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

We believe Congressman LESINSKI was right when he introduced this bill the day after the Taft-Hartley law was passed over President Truman's veto. We still think he is right and we hope that the bill is enacted into law.

Mr. Speaker, my following observations are very pertinent, in my humble opinion, to an intelligent discussion of this subject.

Are you responsible for the antilabor Taft-Hartley law?

If you lived in an industrial area—

And if you failed to vote for a Democratic Congressman in 1946—

You helped make the Taft-Hartley Act the law of the land.

The antilabor Taft-Hartley Act became law because a Detroit auto worker did not get to the polls in 1946.

The pro-management Taft-Hartley Act was enacted because a Chicago cement finisher forgot to vote 2 years ago.

The antilabor Taft-Hartley Act became law because a New York garment worker forgot to register in 1946.

In the last congressional elections less than 40 percent of the 91,000,000 eligible American voters went to the polls.

When only a minority of Americans vote, minority rule results in Congress. The little band of men that ran the Eightieth Congress was the National Association of Manufacturers. The NAM pulled Republican Party strings.

And the Taft-Hartley law was one of the worst instances of NAM-GOP cooperation.

But workers would not be fighting for their rights in 1948 if they had exercised their right to vote in 1946.

American industry is concentrated in 16 Northeast and Midwest States. These States send 214 Members to the House of Representatives. That is almost a majority of the House.

Of the 214 Congressmen, 167 are Republicans and 47 Democrats. All but four of the Republicans cast votes against labor and for the Taft-Hartley law last year. But all 47 Democrats voted for labor and against the Taft-Hartley law.

The record shows that Republican Congressmen from such industrial States as Illinois, Ohio, Michigan, and New York represent big business rather than labor.

Yet 25,000,000 of the 44,000,000 American workers live in the 16 Northeast and Midwest industrial States.

The Congressmen from the industrial States who fought the antilabor Taft-Hartley law were Democrats. Almost all of the Republicans from these States followed the labor-hating philosophy of the NAM.

A vote for the Taft-Hartley law was antilabor. A vote against the Taft-Hartley law was prolabor. On this basis, here are the labor records of Congressmen in the 16 States where most American industry is located:

Five of Connecticut's six Congressmen are antilabor. The five are Republicans.

Delaware's single Republican Congressman has an antilabor record.

Two-thirds of the Illinois Congressmen, 18 of 26, support Taft-Hartley legislation. The 18 antilabor men are Republicans.

All but 1 of Indiana's 11 Representatives are foes of the workers. The one congressional friend of labor in the State is a Democrat. The antilabor people are Republicans.

All three of Maine's Republican Congressmen are for the Taft-Hartley law.

Massachusetts has five prolabor Democratic Congressmen. The nine Republican Representatives are fighting labor.

Thirteen Members of the 17-man Michigan delegation are Republicans and supporters of the Taft-Hartley law.

Both of New Hampshire's Republican Congressmen think the Taft-Hartley law is fine.

Twelve New Jersey Republican Representatives support the NAM's Taft-Hartley law. The two other New Jersey Congressmen, both Democrats, support labor.

In New York, 28 Republican Congressmen oppose the rights of the workingman. That is a majority of the 45-man New York congressional delegation.

Nineteen Republicans in Ohio's 23-man congressional delegation support the Taft-Hartley law.

Pennsylvania has 33 Representatives. Twenty-nine, all Republicans, oppose labor.

Rhode Island is the only bright spot in this list. The State's two Congressmen oppose the Taft-Hartley law. The prolabor Representatives are Democrats.

The one Republican Representative from Vermont is for the Taft-Hartley law.

Four of the six West Virginia Congressmen are opposed to labor's rights. The four are Republicans.

Eight of Wisconsin's ten Republican Congressmen voted for the Taft-Hartley law.

That is the record of Congressmen who are supposed to represent 25,000,000 American workers.

Remember the 47 Democratic Congressmen always were fighting for the worker. But the Republicans were content to let the NAM write their antilabor legislation.

In 1946, before the elections, the Republicans were talking loudly about the rights of labor.

The Republican policy statement in the 1946 congressional campaigns said:

> We reaffirm our belief in the right of labor or organize and bargain collectively with employers as one of the cornerstones of competitive enterprise. The processes of such bargaining must be protected and strengthened if we are to have real jobs and prosperity for all.

Before the elections, the GOP wanted to protect and strengthen collective bargaining. After the elections came the Taft-Hartley law to throw stumbling block after stumbling block in the way of collective bargaining.

The Republicans also said before the 1946 elections:

> We believe that governmental decision must not be substituted for free agreement, but governmental machinery to promote peaceful settlement of disputes should be improved.

Today, the National Labor Relations Board is bogged down with needless elections demanded by antilabor employers. Cumbersome machinery for union-shop elections was written into the Taft-Hartley law by big business. Union-busting businessmen wanted to delay union recognition in their plants as long as possible. Delay gives industry more time to break the backs of American unions.

The Republican 1946 pre-election statement continued:

> Demands by either side must be kept within bounds of reason and fairness, and both sides must recognize the rights of the general public.
>
> The desired end of bargaining between management and men is a contract. Once that contract is made, it should and must be equally binding on both parties as to agreements made.
>
> Free collective bargaining and contracts resulting therefrom must not be nullified or destroyed by resort on either side to willful violence or unlawful destruction of property.

Yes, those sentences are vague. The Republicans had to use nice words to cover up their real feelings about labor.

The Taft-Hartley law represents Republican feelings about the workingman translated into legislative action.

As a result of the Taft-Hartley law the Eightieth Congress has written one of the worst labor records in American history.

Two years of GOP control in Congress have knocked the props out from under the 14 years of constructive work done by a Democratic Congress.

The antilabor record of the Eightieth Congress is tragic and ironic. The tragedy is that many of the gains of long years of cooperation between a national democratic administration and unions have been lost in 2 short years of Republican domination. The irony is that the majority of the votes cast in the House of Representatives for the Taft-Hartley law were from 163 Republican Congressman representing 25,000,000 American workers.

It is clear that the interests of American workers in 16 industrial States have not been served.

Why has labor lost its friends in Congress?

And how can labor regain the ground it has lost in the past 2 years?

The principal reason for NAM rule in Congress is minority rule at the polls in 1946. Less than half of the eligible voters cast their ballots in 1946. Some of the stay-at-homes were union members who suffered the most at the hands of the Eightieth Congress.

American workers have learned through their bitter experience with the Eightieth Congress that every vote counts. If a majority of eligible voters had gone to the polls in 1946, a people's Congress, not the reactionary Eightieth Congress, would have been elected.

And the only way workers can get true representation in the Eighty-first Congress is to vote, and vote Democratic in 1948.

The first step in assuring a liberal Congress is to register.

Then study the labor record of your Congressman. If he voted for the Taft-Hartley law, you know that he is more interested in the welfare of big business than in the welfare of his constituents, the American workers.

All the votes from the industrial States for restrictive labor legislation came from reactionary Republicans. Only the Democratic representatives from the Northeast and Midwest voted for labor.

Look for the Democratic candidates in your congressional district. Sound them out on the Taft-Hartley law. You will find that Democrats support labor. The Democrats will return labor's basic rights to the workingman.

The last step in ridding Congress of reactionaries must be taken at the polls in November. The record of the Eightieth Congress shows reaction and Republican are synonomous. And Democrats and democracy go hand in hand.

The workingman who values his rights and wants to protect those rights will vote Democratic in 1948.

If a majority of eligible American voters goes to the polls in 1948 majority rule will return to Congress. The sign posts for 1948 are: Register, vote, and vote Democratic.

Housing and the Rules Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

[An editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of June 16, 1948]

HOUSING AND THE RULES COMMITTEE

It is rather surprising that Representative WOLCOTT, testifying yesterday before the Rules Committee, did not get to the point. He appeared before the committee as a representative of the Banking Committee to ask for a rule on the general housing bill. But after fulminating against the public-housing provisions of the bill, as it was passed by his own committee, Mr. WOLCOTT never managed to come to the point. The Rules Committee finally put off its decision on the legislative disposition of the bill. It will have to decide today, for the House is scheduled to take up the housing bill on Thursday.

We think the issue here is clear-cut. After prolonged consideration a housing bill has advanced to the point of being considered by the House. Speaker MARTIN has given his assurance the House would receive the bill. It should go to them in such a form that a free and open chance for consideration by the entire House is possible.

The Internationalists Have Pretty Well Confused Everybody

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 19, 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by George E. Sokolsky, as follows:

I hate to use round terms, but there is a crowd in this country whom their opponents call the internationalists: This crowd loves the world and would absorb the United States of America in it by draining off the wealth of this country, leveling downward the standard of living of its people, exporting its precious raw materials until it has to import what it once had plentifully.

This crowd is extraordinarily active, rich, strong in ownership of publications and eager for power.

Once they put over Wendell Willkie, who one-worlded all over the place. Then, when Willkie ceased to be available, they took up a fine and active young governor, Harold Stassen, and projected him for 4 or 5 years until they wore him out and made him politically unacceptable to his party.

In between, they picked up Dr. Dwight Eisenhower as a Republican and stirred up so much antagonism to him in the Republican Party that he became a favorite among the Democrats.

So the internationalists, having pretty well confused everybody, including themselves, decided that their best hope would be Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG. They dropped Harold Stassen, whose campaign had already cost them a fortune, but they pulled out Eisenhower again—this time not as a candidate, but as a whip.

This is the gag. They tell Republicans that they must drop Dewey, Taft, Stassen, Martin, and everybody else and take Senator VANDENBERG.

If, so they put it, Senator VANDENBERG is not accepted by the Republicans, they will get the Democrats to drop Harry Truman and accept the recent Republican, Dwight Eisenhower. In a word, they are blackmailing the Republicans to accept their most recent favorite.

I wish to interject into this story the sentence that I do not believe for a moment that Senator VANDENBERG is a party to this trickery. I am sure he has never given his consent to such crude maneuvering.

However, that is the game that is being played and everybody is now cognizant of it and it has been discussed in greater detail than I give here—also with plenty of names of the brilliant minds at work—in all the necessary quarters, even by and among candidates who have undoubtedly taken the appropriate measures to safeguard themselves against blackmail.

What it amounts to is this: There can be little question but should Dewey and TAFT deadlock each other a strong movement will develop after the third or fourth ballot to nominate a compromise.

Until the internationalists butted into this situation it looked very much as though VANDENBERG would be that compromise. For several weeks that seemed to be the consensus of opinion, although in several quarters Speaker JOE MARTIN, JR., and JOHN BRICKER were being considered as possible compromises to offset VANDENBERG.

Meanwhile, all the internationalist magazines, weekly and monthly, and their associated columnists and commentators, began to talk of VANDENBERG, who had not even declared himself as a candidate, as inevitable. They particularly emphasized a difference of opinion in the Pennsylvania delegation, which this year is crucial, giving the impression that Governor Duff would support VANDENBERG, which came as a shock to the Dewey and TAFT contingents in that State.

After investigation, both the Dewey and TAFT people discovered that these accounts of raucous goings-on in Pennsylvania did not alter their original estimates.

Both groups believe that they will do well in Pennsylvania; neither expects VANDENBERG to get much there.

But the whip is Eisenhower. The Republicans feel that the election is sure because anybody can lick Truman in 1948. But not anybody can defeat Eisenhower, even if he runs not as a Republican but as a Democrat—that is, unless it is planned to have one of the smeariest compaigns ever known in American history.

So the internationalists spread the tale that a campaign of VANDENBERG versus Eisenhower would be very gentlemanly, with the foreign policy not discussed and the two candidates all but kissing in public. The symbol would be "Me, too."

So that is the set-up of the moment. And nobody likes it because it may mean that the Republican convention will be too hot in too hot weather. The sentiment is growing for a short convention.

Palestine: Rabbi Fineshriber Issues Statement Before Resolutions Committee of the Republican Party in Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
Saturday, June 19, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a statement by Rabbi William H. Fineshriber, of Philadelphia, before the resolutions committee at the National Convention of the Republican Party today. His statement commands the attention of all Republicans who are interested in the welfare of their party.

STATEMENT BY RABBI WILLIAM H. FINESHRIBER OF PHILADELPHIA, PA., BEFORE THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY FRIDAY, JUNE 18, 1948

I speak to you as a member of an organization of Americans of Jewish faith called the American Council for Judaism. I appreciate the opportunity you are giving me for a brief statement on the Palestine question.

The United States has learned in the past few months how terribly complex that problem is. It is not—as it has been made out to be by some—a simple matter, to be determined by domestic pressure groups, so that by some magic it will obtain a "Jewish" vote. Actually, you will find that there is no "Jewish" vote. That is a myth which has far too long been used by astute propagandists to impose their will on the political leadership of this country.

But apart from this libel that Americans of Jewish faith vote on the basis of special interests, you are aware that profound American national interests are at stake in this issue—the world-wide political struggle; the security of the United States and its way of life; the conflict with communism; the question of the resources of the Near East and their place in restoring world economy; the mixed character of the peoples living in the Near East; the many, and I stress the many, religious sensibilities involved; and the strength of feeling, not only among many Jews, but among many Arabs and hundreds of millions of Moslems.

These together, with the tragedy of the Jewish DP's, are important elements in the situation.

You know that in the past our national policy on Palestine and in the Near East has been bedeviled because of resolutions, pledges and commitments exacted from candidates and parties mainly on the say-so of highly articulate pressure groups without full disclosure and consideration of all the relevant facts.

But you also know that, once in power, the party and the candidates from which such pledges have been obtained are at fearful disadvantage. They are confronted with one of two equally disagreeable alternatives: Either to carry out broad pledges, which are constantly given new and wider interpretations by the pressure groups that first exacted them, or to be guided by the realities of our international situation which make the redemption of such broad advance promises impossible, leading to the odium of betrayal of campaign pledges.

The Palestine problem is so fluid that such unhappy alternatives are particularly likely to follow. The bitter experience of the Labor Party in England should be fully taken into account. While out of power it passed many glib and high-sounding resolutions on this subject. When it acquired power it learned to its sorrow that the national interests of England required a different course.

I sincerely believe that it would be in the best interests of our country if there were no planks on this subject by either party.

But I also believe that the Republican Party will win in the November elections and therefore that it has the greater responsibility.

I therefore urge that, if there must be a resolution, it be limited to a recognition of the existing facts; that it extend sympathy to the DP's; that it pledge, as of paramount importance, efforts to peace in Palestine and the preservation of its holy places and of its people; and that it give clear expression of equal and nondiscriminatory friendship for all the peoples of Palestine and the neighboring lands whether Moslems, Christians, or Jews.

I shall be glad to answer your questions in further explanation of my views, which are here submitted in the best interests of the Republican Party and of our country.

A Strong and Adequate Merchant Marine Is Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, because of the great interest throughout the country in the American merchant marine, I desire to insert into the RECORD a statement made by Frazer A. Bailey, president of the National Federation of American Shipping. The article which he prepared was published in the Ameri-

can Press, June 1948 issue, as an editorial. It follows:

For the third time in the lives of many Americans, public apathy and indifference to the urgent necessity for a strong and adequate American merchant marine are beginning to creep with slow paralysis over the Nation.

Public apathy in 1914 cost us a World War I shipbuilding program of $3,000,000,000, and most of the ships were built too late for use. Again our unpreparedness on the seas in 1939, largely a result of public indifference to our maritime debilitation, necessitated a wartime construction program of $15,000,000,000.

To recount briefly, we learned a bitter and costly lesson in 1914, when foreign ships, carrying over 90 percent of our foreign trade, were suddenly withdrawn from service. Our docks piled up with the products of our farms and factories. The Nation literally screamed for ships. A haste and waste program, at taxpayers' expense, built the ships, but most of them were too late for actual service in World War I.

Again in 1939–40 we were unprepared with an adequate merchant fleet. The Government spent fifteen billion to produce a wartime fleet. We could not have won the war without it.

Since the end of the recent unparalleled devastation, the wartime size and importance of the American merchant marine has been steadily decreasing. Our highly trained officers and seamen and skilled shipbuilding workers are drifting into other industries. Foreign ships are again beginning to carry more of our trade than do our own American ships.

Coastwise and intercoastal shipping, the first segment of the industry called upon in an emergency, has been unable to reestablish itself. One Government agency has not yet corrected a discriminatory rate system despite urgent pleas, while another agency has imposed onerous and unjustified Panama Canal toll increases adversely affecting American ships transiting the Canal.

Our passenger fleet, the vital troop carriers in war, is less than half its prewar size and unable to answer the demands of Americans who want to travel on American ships.

And yet, history with all of its pages teaches us nothing if not the indisputable fact that every nation which has reached commercial supremacy—even achieved national security—has done so by developing and fostering a dependable merchant marine. That corollary should be even more important when we consider the leading position of the United States among all nations of the world today. We cannot be a first-rate power with a second-string merchant marine.

What is needed is a strong and consistent Government policy which will lead, not follow, in fostering and developing a merchant marine commensurate with our position in world affairs; which will use reasons for actions rather than create reasons for lack of action.

We cannot expect our Government to do this unless the public—aware of the need and convinced of the reasons for an adequate privately owned American merchant marine—communicate their interest, their opinions, and their requests for such a merchant marine to their representatives who establish national policy.

A great statesman once said, "Give the people the facts, and they will act." I count the future of the American merchant marine among the major problems of this Nation.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—Frazer A. Bailey has been president of the National Federation of American Shipping, which represents a majority of steamship owners and operators of United States-flag shipping, for the past year. Prior to the federation presidency, Mr. Bailey was president of Matson Navigation Co., with headquarters in San Francisco.

Mr. Bailey has had more than 38 years' experience in American shipping as well as a number of years experience in the shipbuilding industry. He had extensive experience in wartime shipping, being largely responsible for direction of merchant shipping in the Southwest Pacific during the crucial period that led to the capitulation of Japan.

Pay Raises for Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, during the past week or 10 days the status of legislation to provide pay raises for Federal employees has varied and fluctuated from day to day. One day the report is out that there is no chance for a pay raise at this session of Congress. The next day that statement is repudiated and the report is circulated that legislation providing these pay increases is certain to be enacted before Congress adjourns. These conflicting reports are circulated from one day to another, and it is no wonder that the postal and Federal employees are worried about their fate, and are uncertain as to what it will be.

I believe that the overwhelming sentiment of the Members of Congress favors pay increases for these employees. I have spoken on the floor of the House heretofore, urging that this legislation be enacted. I again urge that prompt action be taken now to provide these deserved increases.

I am today in receipt of two telegrams from groups of Federal employees in the district which I represent, and under leave previously granted, I insert these telegrams herewith for the consideration of the House:

MARIETTA, GA., *June 17, 1948.*

Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Local newspaper reports indicate House favors passage of pay raise for postal employees only. We trust reports of such discrimination are in error. Our ability to help pay all the pay raises granted labor through increased costs has long passed the breaking point. We appreciate your past support and earnestly solicit your continued efforts on behalf of all civil-service employees. Your assurance will be appreciated.

Arthur L. Sparks, Collection Unit, Veterans' Administration, Branch 5, Atlanta, Ga.; William P. Foster; Estelle B. Reed; Lennon M. Bowden; Idolene L. Huddleston; Barbara Adams; Alfred W. Mullins; Eleanor E. Windham; Russell Marvin Cooke; Marie C. McFarland; Mary Culbreath; L. Jeanette Holloway; Ed O. Ludwig; Patty Skinner; Harold C. Hanson; Elizabeth Mapp; Charles Green; Joseph Richards; Paul J. Newell; Ernest C. Rowe; William L. Moon; F. M. Lenoir; M. L. Bentley; Lula Johnson; H. E. Shelnutt; Clyde Quigley; Mary J. Glenn; Mary V. Knight; Thomas I. Crawford; Geraldine Defoor; Florine E. Porter; Barie Harrison; Alvin W. Mayo; Claudia O. Hildebrand; Maude M. Foster; Mabel J. Alford; Helen Sue Bettis; Virginia Wingard; Marjorie V. Herod; Rose M. Smith; L. Jean Thomas; Laura G. Duncan; Nell Ellison; Grace A. Hasty; Willodean H. Phillips; Joseph F. Baker; George A. Kendrick; Ivan G. Price; Henry A. Weldon; Victor H. Crusselle; James T. Ferguson; Fred Brandshaw; James Carson; Leroy Harlin; Mary E. Pope; Betty H. Duncan; Paul C. Swords; William C. Sockwell; E. W. Gatewood; J. A. Nance; J. R. Hutcheson; M. Florence Eller; Teresa A. Fischer; Rosalind Shepherd; Ruth Wells; Chester T. Mokrzyck; Everlyn F. Brogdon; H. E. Pelfrey; A. L. Allred; Ben C. Fryer; Edward L. Youngblood; Wynell Owen; R. Frank Jones; George Henderson; Jennie Smith; D. D. Anderson; Elsie Thacker; L. M. Ashbury; David Thompson; George Hayes; Horace Brumbalow; James Carpenter; James Bottoms; William Croft; James Shaw; John McLaughlin; Ralph Shelton; Mary Bramlett; Lola Trammell; Grady Guess; Margaret Martin; Ruth Wolf; Nell Deloach; Helen Anglin; Williams Cole; Jack Lueschen; Robert Swain; Stan Hoynowski; O. S. Myrich; Mary M. Smith; W. T. Gazoway; Hugh Millwood; Velma Viates; Eula Brown; Myrtle Roberts; Billie Ragsdale; Kathleen Miliam; Everette Kelly; Albert Christy; John Westbrook; Frances Clark; Pauline Bowers; Evelyn Stewart; Carrie Tate; William Webb; Freddy Hammac; Ester Shrivers; Catherine Hendrix; Leonard Alfred; Alfred Gilroy; Clyde Bryan; William Lancaster; Frank Campbell; Forrest Rutledge; Jimmie Tucker; Paul Smith; J. R. Walsh; W. T. Culbreath; L. T. Mann; William McCrea; M. Escue; C. R. Burke; Katherine McLeod; Hattie McKenzie; Pat Murphy; H. G. Owens; J. W. McArthur; Marian Honea; Caroline Brown; Mildred Moore; William Awtry; Walter Freeman; H. M. Williams; W. T. Marr; E. L. McNabb; Ruth Prewitt'; Anelia Ashworth; Martha Cutter; W. B. Parris; J. D. Moreland; Arthur Hardison; H. G. Allen; Charles McIntosh; Wilma Pickens; Edith McClure; Betty McEves; J. E. Bramlett; Marie Simmons; Annette Poor; Betty Johnson; Martha Wright; Evelyn White; Bernice Roe; W. M. Jordon; Helen Henderson; H. A. Stamp; A. E. Page; S. H. Howel; R. L. Holcombe; C. W. Hightower; G. E. Hamilton; S. W. Pierce; Alice Miner; Stanley Birch; W. T. Beard; B. G. Smith; J. Y. Walston; G. Gatlin; J. R. Middlebrooks; T. P. Huff; R. W. Chasewood; Mamie Broach; Robert Sawyer; Glenn Barnette; Jack Goldstin; R. W. Newman; Alma McGehee; Clyde Grogan; Leon Bizzell; Curtis Chandler; Joyce Leroy; Charles Hardin.

ATLANTA, GA., *June 17, 1948.*

Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Report of last evening's newspaper indicates passage of $5,000,000,000 plus for foreign aid. Same newspaper indicates possible passage of permanent increase for postal employees and also states that other civil-service employees possibly might not be considered during this term of Congress. We trust this newspaper report is in error. If it be true, it appears that you are familiar with

the high cost of living with particular reference to our lower-grade civil-service employees. It would be appreciated if you would furnish a copy of this wire to Representative JOSEPH MARTIN for recording in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

J. L. Peacock, B. B. Christian, J. L. Broom, Glenn J. Barnett, Mamie Broach, Alma McGehee, Jack Goldstein, O. P. Parker, Jean E. Johnson, G. G. Powell, H. F. Wright, L. A. Hesalroad, K. C. Shaver, James E. Eaton, Martha Howard, Wm. W. Camp, Jane S. Holt, J. Celko, Robert W. Sawyer, B. E. Roberts, R. J. Redding, C. L. Padgett, C. McGraw, Frances Coley, Louise Smith, B. B. Meacham, Glenn Smith, R. E. Chewning, C. D. Lyon, Louise E. Copher, Foster Massey, M. Brown.

The House on the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times for today:

THE HOUSE ON THE DRAFT

The House of Representatives went yesterday from bad to worse on the selective-service bill. Having adopted on Wednesday a political formula for its implementation and a crippling amendment limiting the period of service to 1 year instead of 2, it yesterday practically gutted the original bill. If the amendment proposed by Representative SHAFER remains in the bill, we might better, perhaps, have no action at all this session. The Michigan Republican's amendment would defer all inductions until January 31, 1949, raise service pay, lower entrance qualifications (now at the seventh-grade level) and offer other inducements to stimulate voluntary enlistments.

Such an alliance of pro-Russians, isolationists, and other elements as seldom is seen joined in a rowdy, shouting phalanx to scuttle a measure on whose successful passage hang international questions of almost incalculable consequence. Instead of the calm and ordered debate on its merits that the American people have a right to expect and to demand of their elected Representatives on one of the most vital issues presented to this Congress, this country and the world were treated to an exhibition that included such depth of absurdity as the statement that immorality of some Army officers was responsible for failure of recruiting to provide the men needed for America's armed services. Representative RICH of Pennsylvania accused proponents of a sensible selective service measure of already being so greatly under the control of the military that they were afraid to do anything the Army didn't want them to do.

The fault for the situation now prevailing on selective service rests on those Republican leaders who have been so concerned with the approaching Philadelphia convention and the November elections that they have been willing to gamble with national security to promote their own political ends. Good legislation seldom is passed when the Members have one eye on the clock. This bill should have been debated and passed on weeks ago. It had been bottled up in the Republican-controlled Rules Committee since May 7.

With only two more legislative days to go before adjournment, or recess, only a modern Nostradamus would dare predict what sort of a selective service bill finally will come out. If the hysterical House atmosphere of yesterday continues, we would favor Senator TAFT'S proposal to recess over the convention period and bring Congress back later to take up the measure in a calmer mood, even though that would mean a further delay in bringing our armed services to required strength. Speaker MARTIN might then be willing to assert leadership and restore some order to the ranks of his followers.

This is no period of ordered peace when this country can afford to swing like a weather vane to every regional political wind. These are days of great decision, when peace for our time is the stake. The best hope of that is a strong, united United States, holding to a calm and steady course in international affairs, its strength mobilized to guarantee that freedom of decision for men and nations shall not be abridged. An important element of that strength and unity is in the selective service bill.

Colorado's Attractive Winter Playgrounds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 15), 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, some days ago Cedric Foster reporting in Denver over radio station KFEL on Mutual, paid a beautiful and eloquent tribute to one of Colorado's attractive winter playgrounds. Foster seems to have caught the spirit of the high-altitude country. He has made it so crystal clear to his audience that I want others to enjoy it. Therefore I ask unanimous consent to insert this broadcast in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is Cedric Foster reporting to you from Denver.

And speaking of peace and security, this gorgeous Colorado countryside, particularly when you are high in the mountains, radiates a freedom and freshness of life that so many persons are seeking so desperately in war-torn and strife-ridden countries of the world. You get out here in Colorado and all of the meanness and narrowness of humanity vanishes as you stand in awe of the works of God.

This last week end I went up into the mountains, up over Loveland Pass, which is just 8 feet short of 12 thousand above the sea. A few miles beyond Georgetown, Colo., which is an old mining town nestling in the very depths of canyons which cut deeply in the heart of the Rockies, just beyond Georgetown is the Arapahoe Basin ski area where thousands of skiers enjoyed the greatest of all winter sports for weeks past, one which is carried on right into the month of June. The main slope of the mountains, which throw their protecting shoulders into what seems like the very heart of the blue heavens, that slope has northern exposure with the result that there are still 4 feet of snow with excellent skiing.

This broadcaster has had many thrills in the past few years, flying nonstop more than 3,000 miles across the Pacific in a land plane, riding the engine cab in the Diesel on the Rocky Mountain Rocket from Chicago to Omaha, hurtling through space at 17,000 feet in a pressurized cockpit of a DC-6 at 250 to 300 miles an hour, but none ever exceeded that of last Saturday afternoon as the ski-lift carried me 40 to 50 feet above the snow-packed ground, no thrill was greater than the one which I experienced as the Arapahoe Basin, the handiwork of God, unfolded in the hot-brilliant sunshine of Colorado as the ski-lift carried me ever higher into the rarefied air.

Range after range of mountains, some blue with haze, others sparkling with infinitesimal particles of snow, or raising their barren and rocky heads in somber majesty into the deepest of all blue skies, range after range, with peak after peak were thrown at your feet, not in disordered array, but with a precision and a symmetry which left no doubt that man was small and that God was great, truly it was a breath-taking experience, that Arapahoe ski lift, 12,500 feet above the sea.

As the steel cables ground out their steady and rhythmic humming sound, I drank deeply of the reviving waters of this all but unknown world. One trip like that and the brain clears, one trip into the well-spring of these massive giants, which God, through millions of years had thrown up from the floor of an ocean which once covered this continent, just one trip and you forgot the fight on oleomargarine taxation, the eternal squabbles and bickerings of the United Nations, the blood-drenched terrain of the Palestinian Holy Land and the absolute necessity of a peacetime draft to ensure this Nation's survival in a postwar world. You even forgot the Soviet Union and its ever advancing, militant communism, aided and abetted by those who seek a greater degree of liberalism but, who through their muddled thinking, and their unrealistic attitude play into the hands of those who would destroy us all.

In the last 3 months, more than 13,000 persons have gone up into the clouds above Arapahoe Basin and next year the number will be more than doubled. All this summer, those going over Loveland Pass will have the opportunity to ride high above the trees and rugged terrain. They will have a nearness to God and a vitality of life and a zest of living in the very heart and core of the mountains which divide the Atlantic and Pacific watersheds. If the statesmen of the world could take one trip in that ski lift, well, you know the answer, the people of the world would have a better chance of living in peace and security. Nothing is so small as the smallness of man when the backdrop of the stage on which he acts his part is the awe-inspiring sight, the vision of sheer beauty to be found in the Arapahoe country of the State of Colorado.

False Promises, False Economy—The 1948 Budget Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 15), 1948

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I had intended to make some remarks today on the budgetary situation, but in

view of the situation in the Senate, the large number of measures which are still to be considered and passed, I do not want to take up the time of the Senate for that purpose. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the prepared statement may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FALSE PROMISES—FALSE ECONOMY

THE 1948 BUDGET CUTS—A BRIEF LOOK AT REPUBLICANS IN ACTION

One of the most appealing arguments used by the Republican Party in the first postwar election campaign was an eloquent promise to reduce the level of Federal expenditures by eliminating unnecessary Government activities. They assured the American voter that many billions of dollars of padding existed in the Federal budget. If only the Republicans were given the chance to control Government spending, they would institute businesslike practices and save the country five or six billions a year.

As we all know the Republicans won enough congressional seats in the election of 1946 to give them absolute control of both Houses of the Eightieth Congress, and, consequently, also control of the purse strings of the Federal Government. As the first fiscal year of Republican domination draws to a close, American voters have the opportunity to test the economy program on the basis of their performance.

The facts which follow will help the voter judge the effectiveness of the Republicans in action.

President Truman's budget for the fiscal year 1948 had to cover vast war-related expenditures as well as peacetime services, many of which had been temporarily shelved by the war. It provided for the spending of $37,500,000,000. This was the much criticized sum which the Republican Congress was so eager to reduce. The glib conversion of campaign promises into a concrete goal, largely a matter of picking a figure out of thin air, finally resulted in an agreement that the magic amount of the reduction should be either $4,500,000,000 or $6,000,000,000.

And so the Appropriations Committees tackled the actual detailed budgets. Even now the complete results are not in, but with important deficiency appropriations still outstanding, the record shows that only $1,500,000,000 of the economy quota can be claimed to have been achieved; the final reduction will probably be substantially less. In fact, there is much good evidence that, when all the deficiency appropriations have been granted, no real saving under what the President proposed will have been made.

The golden election promises have been badly blunted by the complex economic facts of modern life so little understood by the present Republican Party.

It would be a serious mistake, however, to think that the budget story ends with a simple exposure of the Republican inability to make good on irresponsible promises. There is another side of the picture even more important to the people of America.

For the failure to achieve solemnly pledged campaign promises has not meant that there has been no effect on the operating services performed by Government. In their desperate attempt to make a showing to the voters, the Republicans flailed wildly, slashing right and left, and seriously weakened countless vital services to the Nation. All parts of our population have suffered. Western farmers and businessmen who appreciated the value of reclamation dams and canals; all farmers who recognized the imperative need to restore our ebbing soil fertility; lumbermen and small-business men who know the need for expanding our forest conservation and lumber production; industry and labor alike who value such statistics as the cost-of-living index—these are only a few of the groups affected.

Not only were many worth-while Government projects completely eliminated or severely curtailed at a tremendous cost to the real wealth of America, but the uninformed economy methods followed caused confusion, uncertainty, and lowered working morale in almost every Government agency. Impossible drastic slashes were imposed which had to be hastily restored, but only at great costs to Government efficiency.

The Republicans were playing for headlines in making unjustifiable cuts, hoping that the restored budgets later in the year would receive less attention from the press. All in all, the spectacle has been that of uninformed and misleading promises, badly kept. Every American should know the story.

FALSE PROMISES—IT'S SO EASY TO DREAM ABOUT THE GOOD OLD DAYS

What the budget means to you

The price of more than a decade of depression and war, and now reconstruction and the maintenance of peace, is reflected in a level of annual Federal expenditures never before known in peacetime Government finances.

The money necessary to finance these Government expenditures is raised by taxes or borrowing, and is spent in accordance with a budget proposed by the President of the United States to Congress. But it is the Congress, elected by and representing the people, that finally determines what things shall be done by the Government and how we shall pay for them.

The final size of the Federal budget is decided by the Congress.

The Federal budget is of vital concern to every citizen. It takes his money, and it uses the money to pay for things he wants.

The Republican promise

Most citizens don't like to pay taxes, and many citizens believe their Government has grown too big, costs too much money.

Playing upon such sentiments, the Republican Party went before the voters in the 1946 national election accusing the Democrats of appropriating four times as much for fiscal year 1947 as was spent in any peacetime year before World War II, arguing that this was a terrible thing and the only way to stop it was to elect a Republican Congress.

Enough voters must have believed them, for they elected a Republican Congress. Now as the fiscal year draws to a close we can examine the true effects of Republican budget cutting on the 1948 fiscal budget as presented by President Truman. Have they made good on their promise to the voters who elected them?

No! For the Republican Party's record of expenditures approved for 1948 remains at more than four times any prewar year's budget. Despite their campaign promises, the Republicans have found that the responsibilities of Government required high budgets, and they had to vote them. But they did make great Don Quixote lunges at the windmill of cutting the budget. And they did cut at first in a penny-wise and dollar-foolish way which seriously curtailed or injured essential welfare services of the Government.

It is important to understand these Republican actions. The voters should know the facts before they go ahead and give any more approval to such irresponsible leadership in the Congress. Let's take a look at the record.

The President's 1948 Budget

In January 1947 President Truman transmitted to the Congress the Federal budget estimates for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948. He estimated expenditures required by existing and proposed legislation to be $37,500,000,000. He recommended the enactment of appropriations totaling $31,500,000,000, contract authorizations of $1,500,000,000, the remaining sums needed to meet the budget estimates to come from unexpended balances and contract authorizations previously made.

The target which the Republicans in control of Congress had to shoot at was a President's budget of $37,500,000,000. And as history has proven, this was not an inflated figure. President Truman had warned all Government departments that their requests must be rock-bottom. He had his own Budget Bureau go over them and cut wherever possible. Then he sent the budget to the Congress, stating he was ready to defend it as the absolute minimum to conduct the Government on a sound basis.

President Truman's was a balanced budget, something the Republicans had been demanding. Now, at the first opportunity, the Democrats provided for it. Moreover, it allowed a sizeable surplus which could be applied to our war debt.

The 1948 budget differed from most previous peacetime budgets, for it had to provide for vast war-incurred and war-related expenditures that had saved this country from Nazi defeat. It also had to start the Federal Government back on the road to providing properly for peacetime services. Five war and defense items—interest on debt, tax refunds, national defense, international affairs, and veterans aids—accounted for $29,200,000,000, or almost four-fifths of the total budget. Any major cuts in these items of the budget were impossible because of contracts previously made, or because of absolutely necessary defense measures.

When these war-related costs were subtracted from the budget, it left $8,300,000,000 for all peacetime services—a sum of $700,000,000 less than the total amount spent in 1939, the last peacetime year of Government operations.

President Truman had really offered an economy budget, especially when we consider that wages, supplies, utilities, rents and all the other costs of things the Government purchases had gone up sharply since 1939. Moreover, the population of the Nation had increased over 10,000,000 since that time, adding substantially to the demand for public services. A great many maintenance and repair items had been postponed because of lack of labor and materials during the war, and their further neglect would cause substantial losses to Government property. Some very important civilian services had been curtailed or dropped during the war and now had to be reestablished. Yet, President Truman asked for substantially less money for important selected civilian services than had been budgeted in 1939, if allowances are made for the change in dollar values in the 2 years.

Eight billion sounds like a lot of money to spend, even during these days of price inflation, for the wide variety of services which our Federal Government performs for the people. Yet, in terms of the possibility of cutting the 1948 Federal budget, we were dealing with only a fifth of that budget.

Within that civilian part of the budget are programs for regulating and improving our transport and communications systems and the development of natural resources; agriculture price supports guaranteed by law, conservation of farm lands and investments in rural electrification; social welfare, health and security, and education and general research; housing and many other services indispensable to the conduct of democratic government and effective domestic reconstruction.

It was in the face of these fiscal facts that the Republicans in control of the Congress sought to make good on their campaign promises.

The Republicans keep their campaign promises

That avowed spokesman of the Republican Party, the senior Senator from Ohio, speaking before the Economic Club of Detroit early in January 1947, said:

"In my opinion, without cutting the armed services, we should be able to squeeze from three to four billion dollars out of that budget [President Truman's] so that our total expenditures do not exceed $33,500,000,000."

But we don't have to take Senator TAFT'S word for the Republican majority's position, for there is an official means of determining that. The Congressional Reorganization Act of 1946 provides that the appropriating and taxing committees of both Houses of Congress shall sit as a single budget committee, consider the President's budget, and recommend the maximum amount to be spent for the ensuing fiscal year. Because the Republicans controlled both House and Senate, they likewise controlled the decisions of this budget committee.

The Democratic minority charged in its report that "No actual hearings [of the budget committee] were held. * * * No itemized estimate of major reductions has been submitted. * * * No information is available upon which to predicate such an estimate. As a result, any vote for the reduction proposed in the report [of the budget committee majority—the Republican members] is a vote to cut without knowing what is to be cut, how much is to be cut, or where the cut is to be made." Even the Republicans admitted, "that there are no details to justify the figures shown in the report * * * they are based on general information, and the best judgment of the committee * * *."

In these star-chamber proceedings, the Republican majority of the budget committee voted to recommend to the Congress a reduction in the budget estimate of $6,000,000,000. Here was a great achievement, cutting the budget by one-sixth. The news was carried in banner headlines by the Nation's press. And the Republicans basked in the sunshine of "promises made—promises kept."

But, "there's many a slip twixt the cup and the lip" says a familiar old adage. What happened to this fine Republican gesture actually smashed the whole cup, however. Here's what they did.

Each House of Congress had to vote to confirm the actions of the Republican-dominated budget committee in cutting the budget estimate by $6,000,000,000. The Republican majority in the House of Representatives steam-rollered that cut through by invoking a rule forbidding consideration of any amendments. But when the matter came up in the Republican-controlled Senate, fear that President Truman's was really an honest rock-bottom budget had taken hold. The chairman of the Finance Committee proposed that the budget estimate be reduced by $4,500,000,000, and the Republican-led Senate adopted that figure.

No agreement could be reached between the Republicans of the House and Senate, for each stood by its budget cut. So, as the examination of the items for the various departments of government proceeded in shaping a budget of expenditures, the House was seeking to make good on a proposed cut of $6,000,000,000, the Senate of $4,500,000,000. Events soon showed the utter fantasy of either estimate.

What finally emerged was shown in figures submitted by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget upon request of a Republican member of the House Ways and Means Committee in January 1948, giving facts on the changes in the budget made by the Congress from first consideration of that budget in January 1947 to the end of the first 6 months of its operation in December 1947. Here are the pertinent facts:

Changes in estimated expenditures—fiscal 1948 budget

Type of change made by Congress	In millions
Reductions in budget:	
1. Reduction in appropriations	−$2,185
Regarded as final	−1,272
Requiring offsets	−913
2. Reductions in Government corporations expenditures	−345
3. Rescision of prior year authorization	−153
Subtotal reductions	−2,683
Additions to budget (to be deducted from above):	
1. Increases initiated by Congress	+291
2. Estimated offsets by deficiency appropriations	+857
Net change in expenditure	1,148
	−1,535

Not $6,000,000,000, or even $4,500,000,000; not 16 percent or 12 percent—when the smoke cleared away it appeared that estimated expenditures had been reduced only $1,535,000,000, only 4 percent. For all the trumpeting the elephant had brought forth a mouse.

So, this Republican Congress has finally seen fit to tell the people that they misjudged the situation and the need when they made great gestures of reducing Government expenditures. But no fanfare of trumpets and no banner headlines accompanied this admission of error.

How the Republican razzle-dazzle took place

Let us take a look at these figures. It appears that initial action by the congressional Appropriations Committees reduced the estimated expenditures of the several Government agencies by a total of $2,185,000,000, $1,272,000,000 of which is expected to be final, the remaining $913,000,000 being of such character as Federal-State matching funds that require offsets in supplementary appropriations. So, while the pretense of actually cutting the budget was gone through, and the Government agencies agonized over how to get by with their work on such reduced budgets, work which they could not stop because it was contrary to law, the Republican majority appeared before the country claiming to have substantially reduced the budget.

The Republicans also took credit for reductions of $4,017,000,000 in "rescissions," which are unobligated funds from previous appropriations. However, as the foregoing table shows, all but $153,000,000 would have lapsed anyhow and so no real saving was made, despite the clamor the Republicans made about them.

Then, the Republican majority placed limitations on loans, and/or administrative expenses of such agencies as the RFC, Commodity Credit Corporation, and the Rural Electrification Administration. Rather than true budget reductions, they turn out to be limitations on the business which these agencies may do in behalf of their clients—the public. So, when the REA, for example, has to tell a rural electric cooperative group that farmers cannot have a loan because of the limitation placed by the Republican majority on the loaning powers of REA, then the true effect of the supposed budget cut is felt. The claim is made by the Republicans that this type of budget reduction really cuts Government expenditures. But where such items cover loans, at least, the return to the Government of the amount loaned has been customary, the losses slight, and the service rendered the business community and the people has been widely acclaimed.

Once having put Government business operations in the greatest turmoil in many years by first announcing enormous reductions in budgets, then after hearings reducing drastically some services, and then making what have become known as "phony cuts" which are in reality no saving to the taxpayers, the Republican majority in the Congress still had to eat more crow. For the offsets covered by deficiency appropriations already approved have in some cases even exceeded the Budget Bureau's estimates.

Let's take a look at one good example of Republican budget razzle-dazzle. The largest single cut in the 1948 budget was $800,000,000 in the appropriation of the Treasury Department. This amount was what that Department estimated they needed to make tax refunds to individuals who had overpaid their taxes. Not only is the Government obligated to make such tax refunds, but any unpaid tax refund is paid 6 percent interest from Government funds. So, apparently hoping to be nearer right than the Treasury Department in estimating tax refunds, the Republicans cut the $800,000,000 from the budget, only to restore the full amount and more a few months later.

This was not the only joker in the "economies" achieved in the internal revenue budget. In cutting the operating funds of the agency by $20,000,000, Congress played havoc with the tax-enforcement machinery, causing the Bureau to lay off 4,000 enforcement officers. Congress acted despite repeated advice that every dollar spent for enforcement returned $20 to the Treasury.

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue testifying in April of this year was able to show that, despite every effort to streamline procedures to increase the productivity of the remaining staff, more than half a billion dollars of tax revenues will have been lost during the year through lax enforcement. Thus the saving of $20,000,000 has actually cost the honest taxpayers of the country more than $500,000,000.

The Republicans stand condemned, not only by the facts which have been presented thus far and which follow in the subsequent parts of this report, but by one of their own spokesmen, conservative columnist for the New York Times, Arthur Krock. Last June he wrote in the Times, "The Republicans must be charged with one notable failure thus far. * * * The Republicans pledged reductions in the Federal expenditures when they appealed to the voters in 1946. * * * Their inability to produce * * * modifies that pledge. * * * For this performance the majority [Republican] can be held fully responsible."

So far we have given the summary of the Republican failure to reduce Government expenditures. Now it is necessary to show what their penny-wise, dollar-foolish cuts actually mean in terms of Government efficiency and economy. Presumably they cut a net of $1,535,000,000 from President Truman's original estimates of expenditures for 1948. How did such cuts affect the people of this country? For it is in terms of their effects that the cuts should be judged and the Republicans who made them should be either applauded or censored by the voters.

To give a comprehensive answer to this question would require a series of thick volumes which few of us would have time to read. Perhaps that is one reason the whole matter of budgets and budget economies is nearly always kept in dollar terms (preferably in almost incomprehensibly large amounts) and never presented to the people as goods and services produced and performed by the Government. To leave the realm of dollars and enter the world of real economic activity requires an effort which is seldom made. Since the Federal Government is the largest economic enterprise in the country, the work

required is immense, if an exhaustive analysis were to be attempted. At the present time only the activities of a few divisions of several important executive departments hard hit by the economy drive of the Eightieth Congress are high lighted. The findings can be regarded as illustrative of the effects on the general welfare of this drive. Countless other equally striking examples could have been chosen had time and effort permitted.

FALSE ECONOMY—SUMMARY

Department of the Interior

The Department of the Interior budget was slashed by a full third, with the Reclamation Bureau receiving the most heavy-handed treatment from the majority party.

The handling of the reclamation request is one of the most striking examples of Republican short-sightedness, both in their disregard for the needs of the people and their total ignorance of the way in which reclamation projects are adding so immeasurably to the wealth of the West. In addition the reclamation budget-cutting fiasco illustrates the willingness of the majority party to play to the press, by making impossibly large budget reductions in order to make a showing to the voters, knowing full well that most of the cuts must be restored as quietly as possible later in the year.

Department of Agriculture

The Department of Agriculture requested $1,257,000,000 to finance its activities for the fiscal year 1948. The request was reduced by $289,000,000 a cut of 23 percent. The reductions in the programs considered in the report are summarized.

1. Agricultural-conservation program: The request of $300,000,000 for this program to meet the authorization of the preceding year, was cut to $228,000,000, a reduction of 24 percent. In addition, the Republican Congress authorized only $150,000,000 for the crop year 1948, 50 percent less than the amount authorized for the previous crop year by a Democratic Congress.

Soil Conservation Service: The appropriation requested was $44,860,000. The Republican Congress cut this by $5,812,000, a reduction of 13 percent. The research activities of this service which have introduced many profitable methods into American agriculture sustained a cut of $375,000 making necessary the closing of the two major experiment stations.

3. Farmer's Home Administration: The appropriation of $170,000,000 requested was cut by $73,000,000, a reduction of 43 percent. This happened despite the testimony of the agency head that "we are besieged by veterans both to purchase farms and for operating loans."

4. Rural Electrification Administration: The loan authorization of this agency was cut from $250,000,000 to $225,000,000, a reduction of 10 percent at a time when the backlog of applications from farmers' cooperatives was growing and when 30 percent of the Nation's farms were still without electricity.

5. The school-lunch program: The request was cut from $75,000,000 to $65,000,000, a reduction of 13 percent preventing assistance to any additional schools in poor districts forcing many thousands of children from low-income families to be denied nourishing school lunches.

6. The Forest Service and forest road programs:

(a) Forest protection and management:

(1) Timber and timber products sales: The requested $3,915,166, was cut by $600,000. By this "saving" Congress reduced Government income by an approximate $3,000,000 as every dollar of expenditure actually returns $5 to the Government. The reduction also reduced the supply of lumber for housing by several hundred million board feet.

(2) Protection of wildlife resources: The budget of $162,813 requested for this work was eliminated. The removal of this modest budget injures directly the millions of hunters, fishermen, and seekers of outdoor recreation that each year make use of the national forests.

(3) Land-use management: The budget of $782,296 was cut by $182,296. Consequently it was necessary to reduce such activities as the mapping work needed to carry on the sales of timber and to delay the processing of applications from veterans for reexamination of land for possible agricultural use.

(b) Forest and range management investigations: The budget for forest management research was cut by $200,000. This reduction resulted in the curtailment of research on (a) methods of reforesting land in the Central States that had been torn up by strip-mining methods, (b) control of spruce budworm in the Northeast States, and (c) the naval stores mechanization project in the Southeast States.

(c) Forest products: The budget of $1,555,000 was cut by $305,000, reducing the research of the Forest Products Laboratory which has added many new industries located in the forested areas.

(d) Forest resources investigations: The budget of $1,000,000 for this purpose was cut by 25 percent delaying the completion of a much-needed inventory of our forest resources.

(e) Acquisition of lands for national forests: The budget of $1,000,000 was cut by 25 percent. This is typical of short-sighted action for the consolidation of our national forests makes possible sustained yields from these forests and stable wood-using industries.

(f) Forest development roads: Cutting the budget request of $12,500,000 by $1,500,000 will reduce the mileage of timber access road construction by 27 percent. This budget cut means 750,000,000 less board feet of lumber for construction in 1948 on which the Government would have received an income of $2,250,000.

(g) Forest highways: The budget request of $11,300,000 was cut to $5,300,000, a reduction of more than 50 percent. Since three-fourths of the logs from our forests move to the mills over forest highways, the inability to repair roads neglected during the war results in much less badly needed lumber.

Department of Labor

The already modest budget of the Labor Department was cut by 38 percent. Among the hardest hit by the cut was the Bureau of Labor Statistics which had requested $6,700,000 and received only 60 percent of the funds necessary to carry out its activities. Consequently, the various key economic indicators gathered by this agency to measure labor's and the country's condition have been curtailed or rendered less useful. The cost-of-living index, detailed employment figures, and construction data have all been severely weakened.

The inadequate funds granted the Wage and Hour Division also deserve particular attention because the present budget does not permit sufficiently extensive inspections to prevent widespread violations of the minimum-wage law. In the light of crippling amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act during the first session of the present Congress, the limited budget of the Wage and Hour Administration provides a positive incentive for chiseling employers to violate the law.

Department of Commerce

The bulk of the $96,000,000 reduction borne by the Department of Commerce fell on two services: The Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Census Bureau.

CAA's efforts to deal with a mushrooming industry by modernizing and extending the radio navigation network on which air safety and regularity depend, and by development of public airports, have been substantially curtailed. The budget request for Federal airways system was cut by more than two-thirds; the airport program was sliced in two.

The Bureau of the Census is one of the oldest and best established agencies of our Government, providing all groups in our economy with essential information. Government and business alike can act intelligently only when the facts are available. As a result of the budget cuts made, it is now much more difficult to secure information about employment and unemployment, retail and wholesale sales, inventories, shipments, and new orders, to mention a few badly crippled census services. Not only is less information collected and published less frequently and in less usable form, but much of the basic research and analysis necessary to interpret the data has been discontinued. The result of this Republican congressional action will be ever increasing ignorance and inability to understand the complex problems of our day.

The Department of Interior

This important Department of Government was established to perform a wide variety of functions in developing and conserving the resources of the United States, its insular possessions, and Territories. With the years the responsibility of the Department of Interior has become greater due to laws enacted by Congress, and its cost has increased substantially.

The President requested $295,742,420 to operate all the Interior Department's services for the fiscal year 1948. But when the Republican majority in the Congress got through slashing this request, the Department received an annual appropriation totaling only $194,587,859, a scaling down of a third.

The impacts of this drastic reduction were widespread; they ranged from abandonment of geological survey work on critically scarce minerals to crippling the National Park Service's ability to administer the vacation wonderlands of the West. They included curtailing of fish hatcheries and laboratories and other wildlife conservation work, cruel cutbacks of the Indian education program, a slow down of the construction of electric-power transmission lines. But perhaps the most dramatic cut suffered by the Department of Interior was in the field of reclamation.

More than half of the costs of the Department of Interior are charged to the Eureau of Reclamation, and most of these are for construction which pays its way to a substantial degree through later reimbursement. Thus, we are dealing with a department which returns large direct revenues from the sale of water and power to farmers and other consumers. What happened to the program of the Reclamation Bureau should be known to every citizen and voter in the country. Here it is in brief.

Bureau of Reclamation

By now we should all be aware of the vital necessity of a sound reclamation program both for the well-being of the West and the entire Nation. Throughout vast areas of the West rainfall is inadequate to permit agriculture without irrigation, the rapid growth of population and industry is sorely straining presently developed power and water supplies, and American population growth requires an increasing amount of new crop land to maintain our high and rising standards of food consumption. The long-range objectives of the reclamation program which underpins these are clearly in the best interests of the American people.

This reclamation program was severely limited during the war and continues to be handicapped by current shortages of equipment and materials. The Bureau of Reclamation could only plan to build up gradually the momentum of construction to a rate of

progress consistent with the needs of the West. Accordingly the budget presented to this Congress for fiscal 1948 was a minimum request. It called for continuing operations at an economical rate of speed to finish units of projects already under way as they are needed to fit into a carefully integrated construction program.

Let us consider what an impairment of this program means. The reclamation work is creating both wealth and income from which the entire Nation draws benefits. A reclamation project is as much a form of productive capital investment as is a new steel mill. In 1946 farmers grew crops valued at a half billion dollars on lands irrigated by reclamation water. Every additional dollar spent on the reclamation program will swell the value of the Nation's agricultural output. And the markets created by the increased incomes of farmers carry benefits into every State in the Union.

Delaying this construction program means creating wealth at a slower rate. It often means more than that—it means rank economic waste. Remember that we are talking about projects already begun in which many millons of dollars are already invested. By their very nature many of the projects of dam and canal construction must be practically finished before they begin to produce a return. Such is the case of the Columbia Basin project where, despite our investment of over $200,000,000, it will not be until 1952 before irrigation benefits are available, before water is being pumped onto the land.

Of course, the power production of Grand Coulee has already proved invaluable during the war. But a full return on our investment cannot begin until the project is substantially completed. Moreover the repayment to the Treasury of the investment costs are deferred in the same proportion as the benefits are postponed. We must not forget that these are reimbursable projects—the water and power users will pay back every cent loaned by the Treasury.

The budget cuts

It is only in this setting that the action of the majority party in slashing reclamation funds can be evaluated. For the answer to the Reclamation budget request for 1948 was either a result of ignorance of the program, deliberate disregard of its objectives, or playing politics in a field where it is entirely out of order.

The budget facts are set forth in the following table:

Fiscal budget, 1948

Function	Request	Appropriated	Percent cut
Reclamation fund:			
Salaries and expenses	$4,800,000	$3,130,000	34.8
General investigations	5,000,000	2,000,000	60.0
Operation and maintenance	1,384,200	1,339,000	3.2
Construction	14,042,000	11,876,750	15.4
Power revenues [1]	4,032,900	4,766,700	------
General fund:			
Construction	86,600,000	49,841,288	42.4
Operation and maintenance	250,000	(2)	------
General account [3]	33,876,000	25,180,000	25.7
Total	149,985,100	98,133,738	34.6

[1] Authorization to spend revenue received from the sale of power, etc.
[2] Included under General account.
[3] Almost entirely construction.

Of the $150,000,000 requested in 1948, as shown in the table above, one hundred and thirty-one million was for continuation of construction on projects already under way. This part of the budget bore the immediate brunt of the economy drive, although less obvious reductions of much smaller magnitude may prove to be even more significant in the long run. When the appropriation finally emerged as a public law in late July of last year, a total appropriation of only ninety-eight million was authorized.

Every major project in the program was severely hit, but the five biggest construction projects were most drastically affected. Davis Dam in Arizona and Nevada, Colorado-Big Thompson in Colorado, Central Valley in California, Columbia Basin in Washington and Oregon, and the Missouri River Basin had requests which aggregated $102,000,000, of which only sixty-three million was appropriated. Here was economy with a vengeance—$40,000,000 worth.

Here is the price of that economy: In the Columbia Basin virtually all work would have ended with the exhaustion of funds in February 1948; at Central Valley, where the financial picture is complicated by earmarking of funds for specific projects, such work as the Friant-Kern canal and Shasta Dam ceased in November 1947 while carry-overs persisted on other parts of the project; on the Colorado Big Thompson operations could not be financed beyond March of 1948. Davis Dam was in relatively good shape, since unexpected and unforeseen foundation problems led to a slow-down on construction work, and hence on expenditures; available funds would have lasted until May of 1948. The cut of six million from the Missouri River Basin request was immediately followed by a compensating supplementary appropriation of six and four-tenths million in the same month of July 1947, so that this portion of the budget savings was of even shorter duration than the rest of the construction cuts.

But the immediate effect of the annual appropriation reductions was widespread cancellation of contracts and postponement of deliveries in order to slow down the rate of expenditures as much as possible. Every effort was made by the Reclamation Bureau to avoid the expense involved in complete shut-downs in the hopes that further congressional action would be forthcoming.

Such a slow-down means pushing back the completion dates of the projects, postponing such services as power, water, and flood control, as well as increasing the costs of the structures by the methods of stop-and-go construction. These are the real costs which the majority party was willing to inflict on the country in their false economy drive.

Restoring the Budget Cuts

The "savings" so easily achieved by slashing the construction program of the Reclamation Bureau did not last. When the voters became aroused and the Bureau brought its request for supplemental funds to the Congress, making a clear showing that Congress could either put up additional funds or shut down the programs, the supplemental funds appropriated largely wiped out the paper economies of July. Although the Reclamation Bureau had been harassed by uncertainty, by vast amounts of unnecessary paper work, the reclamation program was carried forward at substantially the rate provided in the President's budget.

The following table shows the effect on the budgets of the five major projects of the whole fiasco of cutting and restoration:

Bureau of Reclamation

Projects	President's budget	Annual appropriation	Budget cut	Restored by later appropriation
Davis Dam	$18,000,000	$9,700,000	$8,300,000	$2,800,000
Colorado-Big Thompson	14,000,000	9,500,000	4,500,000	4,150,000
Central Valley	20,000,000	9,141,288	10,858,712	11,405,000
Columbia Basin	27,500,000	17,500,000	10,000,000	13,584,000
Missouri River Basin	23,000,000	17,000,000	6,000,000	6,400,000
Total	102,500,000	62,841,288	39,658,712	38,339,000

With the exception of Davis Dam, the supplementary funds substantially equaled or exceeded the cuts imposed on the original request. In the case of Davis Dam, an act of God, rather than the foresight of Congress, accounted for the reduction in expenditures below the Presidential request.

To date, total appropriations have amounted to less than $137,000,000, as compared to the original request of $150,000,000. Unfortunately, however, the price paid for this $13,000,000 savings may prove to be very large over the years to come. It is not an exaggeration to say that the whole future program of the Bureau of Reclamation has been threatened by the short-sighted restrictions of general investigation funds and the forced break-up of the central engineering office.

Long before substantial Government funds are committed to a project a careful and exhaustive engineering investigation has to be conducted to determine how practical and desirable the project is. Water flow, rainfall, and soils must be thoroughly analyzed. Surveys to select the best sites for dam structures and irrigation canals involve preliminary design and cost estimation. Together with a study of increased crop returns due to irrigation, the repayment possibility of a potential project is established. All of these factors must be viewed in relation to other existing or planned units in the river basin development. A great deal of information is required before the feasibility of any new project can be established; even more is necessary before the best of several alternative plans can be determined.

Without this preliminary work we would have projects built in the wrong places or at costs which far outweighed their value to the community. In the absence of this sound advance work, either the reclamation program would dry up for lack of activity or it would degenerate into a political football, pouring funds into the areas crying the loudest, irrespective of the engineering and economic merits of proposed work. The surest way to kill the value of the reclamation program is to eliminate the essential investigation work which precedes any large-scale expenditure.

It is important to keep in mind our present position in developing the remaining natural resources of the West. We have been high-grading the available sites for these projects, taking the most desirable ones first. Future work must necessarily be largely confined to relatively less desirable areas, where careful planning is even more essential to prevent wasteful public investment and unduly high cost end product services.

We must expect to spend an increasing amount of total project costs on the preliminary work. Of course, as a matter of fact, these investigations cost remarkably little—either as a percent of total project or in absolute terms. In 1948 the President's budget provided $5,000,000 to cover operations on about 180 projects. The Republican reaction to this kind of common-sense planning was to throw it out altogether, reducing the appropriation to a token figure of $125,000 in the House.

The amount finally allowed by the appropriation bill was $2,000,000, or 40 percent of the request. As a result, more than 100 of the 180 investigations were substantially eliminated, and the whole future program of reclamation is threatened. Another year of operation at this low level will result in the complete disintegration of the specialized and experienced staff necessary to perform the

work. If one wants to use indirect and subtle means to kill the entire reclamation program, the simplest way to do it is to wipe out completely the general investigations operation. There was a good start in this direction made in 1948.

Another significant restriction imposed in the name of Republican wisdom on the internal operations of the Bureau was the break-up of the central engineering office in Denver. The Appropriation Act carried an unprecedented limitation of funds for the Chief Engineer's Office, reducing the $13,000,000 request to $7,800,000. Designed not so much with the idea of economizing as with the notion of forcing decentralization of operations, the cut has had far-reaching consequences.

Over many years the Denver engineering office had assumed the primary responsibility for central design and supervision of all construction activity. The office was large, had good laboratory facilities for research and materials testing, and the concentration of design work in one office permitted personnel specialization which is impossible under other circumstances. Without questioning the quality of the work produced, the Republican appropriation forced the break-up of this organization. Over 1,000 employees were either dismissed or transferred to project offices. Of the 600 employees who left the service, many resigned rather than work in general engineering at project offices where their special skills could not be utilized.

Another change in the internal operations of the Bureau of Reclamation which has produced set-backs in the program of construction is the virtual prohibition of force-account work. Over the last 15-year period, about 5 percent of all construction has been performed by Government forces rather than by private contract. This work has always been of the character that was uneconomic for a private contractor to carry out. For a variety of good engineering reasons the Bureau's own engineers could do the job more cheaply than a private contractor. The result of the restriction has been to curtail temporarily such valuable maintenance work as the spillway repairs on Coulee Dam, and to leave idle the expensive tailor-made equipment which had been built to do this work. The damage to the dam will continue and the cost via private contract will necessarily exceed the cost under Government forces.

The Republicans who have been crying the loudest for reduced public expenditures are also the same individuals who bewail what they call Government inefficiency. In this budget-making experience they have had a good chance to show what they could do in the way of economizing and promoting efficiency. The reclamation experience is a good example of their failure to understand the meaning of the word "economy" and of their willingness to cripple the ability of a great administrative agency to manage its present and future program efficiently.

The Department of Agriculture

The story of how the Republican Party cut $289,000,000 from the budget request of the Department of Agriculture is the story of a direct attack on the present and future living standards of the American people, as well as the future prosperity of the American farmer.

In 1947 Secretary Anderson, testifying before the House Committee on Agriculture, outlined a practical, long-range program for American agriculture. This program of organized and sustained abundance would have promoted not only the welfare of the farmer but the general interests of the United States as a whole.

It is true that the American people are at a high peak of prosperity and the American farmer is enjoying a high annual income. But our basic soil resources are being depleted and the nature of our crop production demands immediate measures of conservation if basic soil resources are to be maintained. Only by a long-range program can our continued high farm prosperity and high national food consumption be maintained and increased.

The program presented by Secretary Anderson in the 1948 budget was a program designed to promote greater output of farm crops and to conserve and add to our agricultural resources. The war had taken a toll of the soil, the forests, the farm buildings, and other physical equipment. Even in the lower requirements of peacetime production the Nation never had used systems of soil and forestry management that would sustain a permanent full-employment economy.

The Secretary of Agriculture pointed out that there were no halfway measures; that we had to change our course as a Nation; that instead of the progressive depletion of our resources with an inevitable lowered standard of living in the future if we followed our present course, we must build and conserve our resources to promote a progressive rise in living standards for all our citizens.

To achieve these goals the Department of Agriculture presented to the Republican Congress a rock-bottom budget for the fiscal year 1948.

What happened to this program which so many millions of American farmers had thought were basic elements of our agricultural policy? The American farmer knows the answer. He knows the answer in terms of the elimination or curtailment of the useful services in dozens of fields which were making possible his continued prosperity, which were rebuilding his worn-out acres and depleted forests, which were protecting his crops and herds against the ravages of insects and myriads of plant and animal diseases, and not the least, certainly, which were providing useful careers in the service of American agriculture for thousands of farm boys and girls who annually graduate from our agricultural colleges. The veteran who was denied the means of buying a farm or modernizing a ramshackle farm knows the answer. And all Americans should know that the reduction of the appropriation by one-fourth has meant that the programs designed to build up these wasting soil and forest resources were severely curtailed.

Let's look briefly at some of the big cuts made in the Department of Agriculture's 1948 request by the Republican majority in Congress reducing these programs:

1. The conservation and use of agricultural resources.
2. The Soil Conservation Service.
3. The Farmers Home Administration.
4. The Rural Electrification Administration.
5. The school-lunch program.
6. The Forest Service.

The following table summarizes the budget cuts in the important programs of the Department of Agriculture:

	President's budget request [1]	Congressional reductions	Percent cut
Total programs	$1,258,000,000	$289,000,000	23
Programs examined:			
1. Agricultural conservation program	301,720,000	73,720,000	24
2. Soil Conservation Service	44,860,000	5,812,000	13
3. Farmers Home Administration	170,000,000	73,000,000	43
4. Rural Electrification Administration	255,600,000	25,600,000	10
5. School-lunch program	75,000,000	10,000,000	13
6. Forest Service	72,600,000	9,832,000	14
Total programs examined	919,780,000	197,964,000	22

[1] Including authorizations to borrow.

The figures just presented show that the programs being examined here constitute almost three-fourths (73 percent of the President's budget request; and include more than two-thirds (68 percent) of all cuts made in agricultural program budgets.

Among the programs not examined is the hoof-and-mouth disease budget which received an apparent reduction of $57,000,000. However, inasmuch as the appropriation statute authorized the Secretary to spend the amount necessary for this purpose from other departmental funds which in turn could be replenished by deficiency appropriations, the apparent reduction achieved is entirely spurious.

Thus the report in fact considers 89 percent of the actual budget reduction of $232,000,000 ($289,000,000 less $57,000,000).

The study does not include the $19,000,000 requested for first-year operation of the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 because the $10,000,000 cut did not involve a reduction in a previously established level of activities. It is worthwhile noting, however, that Congressman HOPE, author of the act, and chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, was severely critical of the Appropriations Committee when it refused to appropriate the funds required by the act.

1. Conservation and use of agricultural land resources: The agricultural conservation program offers to farmers the means and the incentive, through cash payments by the Federal Government, of carrying out the conservation practices recommended by the technical experts of the State experiment stations and the Soil Conservation Service. Under the program, the Government pays $1 for every $2 spent by participating farmers. Payments are made to farmers for such conservation practices as terracing to curb soil erosion and for the cost of fertilizers to bring impoverished soil back into production. Approximately 3,600,000 farmers in 3,000 counties in every State participated in this program in 1947.

It is this agricultural conservation program which sustained one of the most severe reductions of any activity in the Department.

The Democratic Congress, meeting in 1946, had authorized $300,000,000 for conservation payments to farmers participating in the 1947 program. (There are two actions in every budget law for this program of conservation payments to farmers. On the one hand Congress enacts an appropriation to cover the conservation payments authorized in advance by the preceding Congress. On the other hand, Congress authorizes a level of payments for the next crop year. Thus the 1948 budget contains funds to pay for the 1947 crop year and an authorization for the 1948 crop year.) In 1947 the Republican Congress appropriated only $228,000,000 to meet this commitment. The same 1947 law also contained an authorization for the 1948 crop year of $150,000,000, 50 percent below the 1947 authorization. Thus, in its first session the Republican Congress had not only repudiated almost one-third of the commitment of the preceding Congress for the conservation of agricultural resources, but had cut the program in half for the calendar year 1948.

The demands for ever greater food output during and after the war have resulted in considerable depletion of our soil resources. An increase in such conservation practices as putting organic matter back into the soil is, therefore, of the greatest urgency.

The Department of Agriculture estimated an annual need for about five times as many acres of cover and green manure crops as are now being planted. The need for seeding and reseeding pastures and range was estimated to be about 30 times the acreage planted in 1945. Also, less than one-half the annual requirements for lime and about one-fifth the needs for phosphate are now being met.

These are some of the more urgent deficiencies in our basic soil resources that were presented to Congress as a guide to action on the agricultural conservation program for 1948.

But the Republican Congress chose to ignore these facts of life and appropriated $72,000,000 less than the amount requested in the President's budget to carry out the previous congressional authorization. The Department was forced to make up part of this deficit by taking $37,000,000 from the advance conservation material fund bringing the amount available to $265,000,000. But there still remained an unmet obligation of almost $35,000,000 which American farmers had every right to expect from Congress.

The final reduction was bad enough but the situation looked even worse as the appropriation bill was treated in the House of Representatives under Republican Representative TABER. As the bill passed the House, it provided for only $166,000,000 as compared to the final appropriation of $228,000,000. To add to the confusion, the House bill provided for no authorization whatever for the following year. During the uncertain days following this House action, the Department of Agriculture was compelled to notify all States not to incur more obligations until further notice. The $300,000,000 authorization of the year before had been accepted in good faith, and the Department feared that funds already obligated to farmers were in excess of the funds recommended by the committee. The program was at a standstill for 2 months while the appropriation was in doubt. This was reflected by the decline in conservation practices to a small fraction of the previous rate. Harassed by doubt and uncertainty, many of the contractors engaged in earth-moving practices such as dam construction and terrace building ceased operations while lime suppliers went out of business entirely with the result of increasing the cost of conservation practices and materials.

The full measure of the Republican attitude on this program is the simultaneous action on the authorization for the 1948 crop year. In their first authorization the Republican majority cut the agricultural conservation program to one-half of the 1946 level of $300,000,000.

Because of the rise in prices of materials used in conservation practices between 1946 and the start of the new program in 1948, the actual curtailment was far greater. The agricultural conservation program was reduced to this low level of activity at a time when the greatest food-production efforts in the Nation's history were taking a heavy toll of our soil resources.

It is estimated that the practices carried out will range no higher than 45 to 65 percent of the 1947 program. In addition the act reduced the amount of conservation payments that could be made to any one farmer from $10,000 to $500, thus driving out of the program the larger farms that were bearing the greatest burden in the current production drive.

In the last year the number of participating farmers has declined by 600,000. Farmers have every right to be doubtful about the continuation of the program as long as the Republican Party remains in power.

This is a sample of what can be expected from the Republican leadership whose only concern is the financial budget. Surely, in this action farmers have had a convincing demonstration of eastern absentee leadership on legislation affecting the Nation's agriculture.

2. Soil Conservation Service: Congress reduced the $44,860,000 budget requested for the Soil Conservation Service to $39,048,000, a cut of $5,812,000, or 13 percent.

The Soil Conservation Service in cooperation with the State agricultural experiment stations supplies the technical advice for the agricultural conservation program. The Service is universally considered the foremost agency in the world in the field of conservation research and the results of its varied work are available to all American farmers.

When asking for funds for the Soil Conservation Service, the Department of Agriculture advised Congress of the following essential facts on permanent soil-erosion damage:

"Erosion has permanently ruined between one hundred and one hundred and twenty-five million acres, or one-fifth of our original area of tillable land.

"We are losing land through erosion faster than we are safeguarding it by conservation work—each year we lose about 500,000 acres of tillable land.

"The productive capacity of millions more acres is being seriously impaired with an estimated cost of at least $1,000,000,000 per year."

On March 1, 1947, there were 1,763 soil-conservation districts including 951,000,000 acres and 4,231,000 farms, almost three-fourths of the farms in the United States. By the end of 1946 under all programs of the Soil Conservation Service 171,000,000 acres had been planned and 95,500,000 had received complete conservation treatment out of our total of about 400,000,000 acres of cropland.

Because the farmers have recognized the soundness of the technical advice on conservation practice obtained from the agents of the Soil Conservation Service, the number of conservation districts is growing steadily. Yet the cut of $5,800,000 in the appropriation has made it necessary to curtail technical services in the local conservation districts. The budget reduction forced the agency to spread their technical services so thin that the assistance furnished to the average conservation district in 1948 is a fifth less than that available in the previous year. This curtailment happened when American farmers were making genuine efforts to build up their soil resources.

The cut imposed on soil-conservation research was serious. The research budget cut from $1,423,000 to $1,048,000 (26 percent) made it necessary to close the two major conservation experiment stations. Soil-conservation research has already returned great savings to agriculture. In one item alone, the development of the proper slope in terracing operations, the cost to the taxpayer over a period of years was only $500,000 but that expenditure had a dollar value to American farmers of about $150,000,000.

The Soil Conservation Service has estimated that failure to do the soil conservation job for all American farmland would cost the country at least $20,000,000,000 in the next 20 years, and this estimate does not include such additional costs as reduced tax yields, lowered purchasing power, increased rural slums and the permanent ruin of a natural resource.

Republicans argued that the budgets of the agencies engaged in soil conservation were cut because of the necessity of balancing the budget. The fact is that our soil budget, a far more serious matter, is in the red. The more expenditures on soil conservation are sacrificed to balance the dollar budget, the greater becomes the lack of balance in our soil budget. Is it economy to save pennies by fostering the destruction of the soil, the true wealth of America?

3. Farmers' Home Administration: A budget of $170,000,000 was requested for this agency. The reduction of $73,000,000 (43 percent) is considered under the two headings of "Farm tenancy loans" and "Production and subsistence loans".

(a) Farm tenancy loans: The Bankhead-Jones Act of 1937 authorizes direct loans to purchase family-type farms and to make any necessary repairs and improvements. The purpose of the law as it has been administered was to help tenants, share croppers, and farm laborers, who would be unable to obtain credit from any other source, to become independent farmers. The budget request of $33,000,000 for these loans was reduced by 56 percent.

The Administrator advised Congress in 1948 that "half the farmers of this country received gross incomes under $1,500 in 1944," that it was not possible for these people to obtain loans from private sources. Moreover, because of an amendment giving preference to veterans, the law has become, and was at the time of consideration of the 1948 budget, a means of enabling veterans to become independent farmers.

Congress was advised of the growing demand by veterans for credit. Only 211 loans were made in the first half of 1946. But in the first half of 1947 the Administration had made 1,495 loans to veterans to purchase family-type farms. And by July 1947 there was a waiting list of 27,000 veterans' applications for ownership loans. This demand can be appreciated when compared to the 47,000 loans for farm purchase made in the previous 10 years of operation of the law. The Department's estimate that an appropriation of $50,000,000 would have been taken up by land-hungry veterans seems conservative.

However, these facts had no weight with a Republican Congress. For they appropriated only $15,000,000 for tenancy loans in fiscal 1948, 56 percent below the budget request and 70 percent below the previous year's appropriation. Just after the demobilization of 12,000,000 soldiers, producing a great demand for loans for farm purchase by returning servicemen, Congress reduced the appropriation to the lowest level of any year (except one unusually active war year) since the enactment of the law 10 years before.

(b) Production and subsistence loans: The budget request of $90,000,000 for this activity of the FHA was reduced to $60,000,000, a cut of one-third. Under the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946 the rural rehabilitation program of the Farm Security Administration and the emergency crop- and feed-loan program of the Farm Credit Administration were merged into a production- and subsistence-loan program. Loans are made in amounts up to $3,500 and are of the following types: Adjustment loans to farmers who have the basic resources necessary to carry on a sound and balanced farm business and who need practical on-the-farm guidance in planning their farming operations; annual loans made to farmers whose primary need is seasonal or emergency credit. In the 4 years beginning in 1945 the following is the record of funds voted by Congress for these purposes:

[Millions of dollars]

	Amount
1945	87.5
1946	100.5
1947	94.0
1948	60.0

As in the case of farm-tenancy loans for purchase of farms, the law provides for veterans' preference. The record is clearcut on the growing interest of veterans: In fiscal 1945, 5,210 veterans applied; in 1946, 32,104; and 32,897 more in the first 7 months of 1947. In the first 7 months of 1947, 57 percent of all adjustment operating loans were made to veterans.

Almost 11,000 veterans' applications for operating credit were unsatisfied in 1947 and were carried over into fiscal 1948. The Administrator described this situation to the House Appropriations Committee: "We are beseiged by veterans both to purchase farms and for operating loans."

Because of the necessity to protect the Government's investment and to meet the credit needs of present borrowers from the $60,000,000 appropriation, only $33,000,000 is

available for new operating loans to farmers seeking credit for the first time. The cut in this part of the FHA budget deprives tenants and share croppers who were former servicemen without capital resources of the advantages of Government loans with which to establish and maintain their own independent farm operations.

How can the Republican Party defend their record in refusing veterans the right to purchase farms and engage in the farming activities for which they are fitted?

Already hundreds of satisfied veterans have repaid their farm loans. Now, we are denying credit to many more thousands of qualified former servicemen. This false economy of the Republican Congress invalidates the preference accorded veterans for these loans by an earlier Democratic Congress.

4. Rural Electrification Administration: The budget request for rural electrification during 1948 was for a loan fund authorization of $250,000,000 to continue the electrification of farms at the rate authorized by Congress for the preceding year. Congress cut the budget request $25,000,000. Apparently the Republicans have preferred to forget that almost a third (30 percent) of the Nation's 5,600,000 farms are not as yet electrified. Surely, with the level of farm income as well as national income at a high figure in recent years, there is no reason for slowing down the electrification of rural homes, depriving the farm family of an increase in efficiency and an advanced standard of living.

The REA Administrator advised Congress that he was servicing almost $1,000,000,000 in outstanding good loans invested by 1,000 farm cooperatives. Yet, Congress cut the amount requested by the REA for expenses by 10 percent necessitating reducing the staff below the prewar level at a time when the program is almost three times as large as the peak prewar year!

5. School-lunch program: The budget request for the low-cost school-lunch program was $75,000,000. Congress cut this by $10,000,000, a 13-percent reduction.

The National School Lunch Act of 1946 has the twofold objective of safeguarding the health and well-being of the Nation's children and of encouraging the domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural commodities. These have been the objectives of the school-lunch program since its inception in 1935. By 1947 approximately 50,000 schools were participating in the program.

Under the act the Department of Agriculture may use up to 25 percent of the food purchase funds for the purchase of commodities for direct distribution to schools. Under this provision millions of dollars worth of food of high nutritive value has been distributed. Emphasis has been given to placing such foods as concentrated orange juice, tomato juice, cheese, canned vegetables and fruits, and raisins in areas where nutritional deficiencies are the greatest.

The remaining 75 percent of the funds for food purchase are allotted to the States for the purchase of foods that the Department has advised the participating schools are in abundant local supply and the prices of which need support in the local markets.

Thus the National School Lunch Act serves the double purpose of stabilizing farm prices by using commodities in surplus supply either nationally or locally, and in improving the health of school children throughout the country.

To accomplish the so-called savings of $10,000,000, Congress specified that no part of the funds be used for the purchase of equipment as required by the School Lunch Act. In setting aside the statutory requirement the Republicans prevented the granting of $10,000,000 to the poorer districts which were unable to purchase the equipment necessary for participation in the program.

Thousands of schools in poor districts, unequipped to operate a school-lunch program, would have used the funds to buy and install necessary new facilities so that many thousands more needy school children could obtain the boon of inexpensive, nutritious means.

What has been the net effect of this Republican economy? At a time when rising food prices made the cheap lunch for school children a matter of vital concern to millions of low-income families, the Republican Party shows itself blind to the expanding needs of the common people. During prosperity this program could have been expanded without burden to the community. Instead, the political bosses of the party, never in touch with the needs of the people, stopped the growth of this program and turned a deaf ear to the needs of millions of needy school children outside the program. Perhaps there has never been a more fitting commentary on the basic political philosophy of the present majority in Congress than in the budget cut in this program.

6. Forest Service:

(1) Forest protection and management:

(a) Timber and forest products sales: The total appropriation requested for timber and forest products sales was $3,915,166. Instead of granting the budget figure Congress cut it $600,000. Here is another story of petty Republican economy applied to the Nation's basic resources and to the welfare of its people.

Timber sales require such activities as determining boundaries, cruising the stands to determine volume, marking trees to be cut, scaling logs to determine payment, supervising of cutting, slash disposal, and road building.

Late in the fiscal year 1947 the Department was granted a deficiency appropriation of $410,000 for this work to be used in "handling an unexpected increase in the volume of timber sales business." Congress was advised in considering the 1948 budget that these additional funds had increased the cut of national forest timber by 400,000,000 board feet of timber worth about $2,000,000 to the Government.

The Forest Service further testified that in 1948 they anticipated a still larger cut of timber and would need more funds to handle the increased volume of sales.

What was the result? The Republican Congress cut this request $600,000. But instead of saving this $600,000, Congress actually reduced Government income by about $3,000,000, since this expenditure returns $5 to the Government for every dollar spent. In addition the failure to cut mature trees results in waste in the form of diseased timber as well as a delay in the growth of young trees.

Much more important to the thousands of people needing homes was the loss of lumber for housing caused by this action. A larger supply of lumber not only would have made possible the construction of more housing, but lower prices, too.

Is it sound public policy and economy to reduce the present supply of timber, to thereby maintain unnecessarily high lumber prices, to fail to meet the housing needs of the people, to curtail the earnings of lumber workers and businessmen—all for an illusory money saving which is returned fivefold by the Government expenditure?

(b) Protection of wildlife resources: The $162,813 appropriation requested for this item was eliminated entirely. The work which this small budget would have allowed involved the preservation of forest conditions favorable to the propagation of wildlife, the hunting by sportsmen of game animals in overstocked areas, and other miscellaneous activities. In some of the areas big game animals are damaging national-forest resources.

There are 180,000,000 acres of national forests used by four to five million sportsmen, recreation seekers and vacationists every year. There is no charge to anyone for the use of this vast playground.

The ruthless elimination of the meager budget for the protection of wildlife is an affront to the millions of hunters, fishermen, and recreation lovers that each year turn to some of the many forms of recreation available in the national forests.

(c) Land-use management: The requested appropriation for this project of $782,296 was cut by $182,296 to the lowest level in many years. The results included:

A 40-percent reduction in the amount of mapping work needed to carry on sales of timber, rental of forest land to private users, and protection of forests.

An increase in the backlog of wartime deferred improvements and maintenance work on forest-service properties.

Delay in processing applications for the rental of summer home sites and other uses of national forest lands, delay in processing applications from veterans for reexamination of land for possible agricultural use, and delay in processing examinations of mineral and other claims.

Any picayune savings at the expense of this program was achieved by slowing down the flow of services to the people.

(2) Forest and range management investigations: The budget for forest management research of $762,731 was cut by $200,000. This resulted in severe curtailments on the following research projects: The reforestation of strip-mined land in the Central States; the control of spruce budworm in the Northeast; and the naval stores mechanization project in the Southeast.

Approximately 200,000 acres of land have been mined by these strip-mining methods, destroying its use for almost any productive purpose, agricultural or otherwise. It is estimated that about 750,000 more acres will be subject to strip mining. The mining companies have made efforts to reforest the mined areas, without success, resulting in arousing much local resentment. Consequently, both the companies and the people of these areas have turned to the Forest Service for help.

An initial appropriation of $50,000 for this work was made in the fiscal year 1946. For fiscal 1948, after work had started on a project to ascertain answers to the many questions involved in this undertaking, the Republican majority cut the funds to $35,000, and for the fiscal year 1949 the Appropriations Committee has reduced the appropriation to $25,000. Thus, a project having as its objective the reclamation of thousands of acres of land for productive purposes has been cut in half since it was started, with the chances of accomplishing meaningful results reduced accordingly.

(3) Forest products: The Forest Products Laboratory carries on research to make wood products more serviceable. Current projects include: Conditioning and protection of wood products; properties, investigations, and wood products development; pulp and paper; chemically converted and derived products investigations. To carry on this work the Department requested $1,555,000—of which more than a fifth was eliminated by Congress.

The budget cuts forced curtailment of such an important project as testing the different kinds of lumber and plywood to determine their maximum usefulness in conventional and prefabricated housing. The tests were curtailed despite the urgent demands of the housing industry for knowledge of the different possible uses and properties of these materials. Cutting the work of the Forest Service in producing alcohol from wood waste, paper from hard woods, treating soft woods to make flooring, are other instances of curtailment of useful activities that would have meant new products for industry and

increased financial returns to owners of forests.

The efforts to develop uses for species of timber not now used commercially and to develop markets for large quantities of diseased and fire-killed timber are other activities which the Service had to eliminate or curtail.

The Forest Service testified that "we are particularly trying to find methods that are satisfactory for small-scale operations so that there can be many small or moderate-sized plants scattered throughout the wood-producing and wood-processing regions of the country; so that the plants for using the low value and waste wood can be an adjunct to the plants producing the waste."

The annual appropriation for the Forest Products Laboratory has been one of the most productive in terms of the utilization of the timber resources of the economy. Only recently their work resulted in the productive use as pulpwood of hitherto commercially unimportant species of timber. Another concrete example of research well done is the commercial utilization of lodge pole pine with the result that this species is now in heavy demand for use as poles, posts, ties, and other timbers. Already many new small businesses have been established in the Western States for processing this timber. New mills are either under construction or being projected in the Rocky Mountain region on such projects as the laminating of small timber into large pieces, wood sugar molasses as stock feed, and wall-board plants utilizing waste wood.

While our forest industries are being depleted more rapidly than they are being replenished, the economy of the Republican party in preventing every possible economical use of timber resources greatly accelerates the rate of disappearance of these enormously important resources.

This type of economy prevents the development of small business enterprises in the forest regions and undermines the foundations of a full-employment economy in the future. It seems incredible that anyone who knows the importance of the most economical use of our timber resources could vote for a curtailment of this service.

(4) Forest resources investigations: In 1928 the survey of forest resources started an inventory of all the forest resources in the United States. The inventory consists of (a) the area of forest land, (b) the tree volumes, (c) the stand tables, (d) the growth, and (e) the drain caused by use, fire, insects, and disease.

When the survey is completed for an area, the Government has an inventory of the existing conditions as well as the potential growth and drain that are likely to occur. Of the total timber resources of the United States, the survey had been completed on 340,000,000 acres by the end of 1947 with 284,000,000 acres remaining. To continue this work, $1,000,000 was requested; only $750,000 was appropriated.

The basic data in this inventory have proven highly useful to the States and to industrial enterprises which use the survey as the source of reliable information on the forest resources of a region. Completion of the inventory will make possible greater yields through improvement in fire protection and in the longer-range problems of the orderly development and use of such resources.

The effect of this reduction has been the complete elimination of work in the five States of Tennessee, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Maine, and sharp curtailment of the work in California, Arkansas, West Virginia, Vermont, New York, Illinois, and Missouri. The time required to complete the inventory at the 1948 level of appropriation will be increased by many years.

(5) Acquisition of lands for national forests: Congress reduced the budget for this project $250,000, or by 25 percent of the $1,000,000 request submitted by the President.

The purchase of forest timber for national forests has two objectives; the protection of watersheds on navigable streams and timber production. Most of the acquisitions serve both objectives. There are 24,000,000 acres yet to be acquired inside the present boundaries of national forests and other established purchase units.

The story of the acquisition of wastelands and forest-bearing lands for development into productive national forests is a sensational chapter of great achievement, at a small cost, in the long fight to rebuild these national resources. Moreover, the outlay the Government makes in the acquisition of forest lands comes back to the Treasury in the form of receipts in a relatively few years.

During the war the Government had to spend about $50,000,000 to expedite the production of urgently needed forest products. Had the same amount of money been spent over a period of several years getting nonproductive land into productive condition, the Government would have had the forest products when it needed them and, in addition, the Nation would have had a large capital asset in the form of productive forest lands.

Typically, the Government purchases, frequently at bargain prices, stands of young timber which would otherwise be sold for cordwood or pulpwood, and insures its optimum utilization as a source of lumber products for local wood-using industries. Congress was advised of one area in southern Indiana where purchase of additional units would make possible the consolidation and building up of forests into a far more extensive and permanent source of supply for 18 secondary wood-working industries now dependent on disappearing timber stands. Here the private forests are being exhausted very rapidly; unless the land in the existing national forests is consolidated by additional purchases, most of the industries will have to close. With consolidation and proper management, the employment in those local industries could be made permanent for about 12,000 workers instead of the 5,000 that will soon be reduced in number.

No one can deny that the fulfillment of the land acquisition program adds to the wealth of the entire Nation and the welfare of the local communities. The program means the perpetuation of local industries and increased receipts by the Treasury. It is a sound investment with a large return obtained both as increased productive resources and as receipts to the Treasury.

(6) Forest development roads: The Department of Agriculture request for the Forest Road Development project was $12,500,000 for 1948. It was cut $1,500,000. The Forest Service reports that this cut will reduce their construction of timber access roads by more than a fourth.

Congress was advised by the Forest Service that if the necessary access roads could be built, the cut from the national forest lands could be increased from four billion board feet per year to about six billion board feet per year. Furthermore, in addition to the loss from stagnation, gradual deterioration and disease, the county would lose the growth potential of about two billion board feet every year. In other words, the yield from the national forest lands could be increased by one half of what was now being cut and a sustained yield operation maintained if all the timber was accessible.

The cost of access roads runs about two dollars per thousand board feet of lumber, but with average stumpage price in the neighborhood of five dollars, the Government nets a profit of three dollars per thousand on the transaction. In other words, this budget reduction of $1,500,000 actually will cost the Government a total of $2,250,000 on 750,000,000 board feet which would have been placed on the market.

The loss to all the people is very real. In 1948 the country could have had 750,000,000 board feet more of lumber for housing and other construction but for the action of a Congress unwilling to increase the country's wealth. Republican economizers in operation seem determined to make the country poor.

(7) Forest highways: The budget submitted to Congress for forest highways called for an expenditure on the construction and repair of forest highways in the fiscal year 1948 of $11,300,000. Congress, on the recommendation of the Republican House Appropriations Committee, reduced this request by $6,000,000, or more than 50 percent.

Congress was advised that the Public Roads Administration had examined carefully each proposed project under the requested appropriation and selected only those projects which enter into the delivery of logs from the cuttings. It was pointed out that while access roads open inaccessible stands of timber, the logs must go out to the mills over the forest highways, that about three fourths of the logs now reaching the mills are carried by trucks.

Since it was not possible to build additional highways during the war or to maintain adequately those in use, existing forest highways are in a very poor state of repair. Load weights have had to be cut reducing the carrying capacity of present trucking equipment, slowing down the movement of logs to the mills, and increasing the cost of lumber. Delay in repairing existing forest highways means a slowing down of timber harvest and a greater cost of repair in the future.

In addition, Forest Service officials advised Congress that a more adequate system of roads would greatly reduce the cost of fire-fighting, and produce a considerable saving of timber resources.

This is another example of failure to get the greatest possible output from our national resources. False economy at its worst.

The Department of Labor

The Republican chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee, Mr. KEEFE, of Wisconsin, recently stated:

"The contention is made by certain people that because the subcommittee scrutinizes the requests for appropriations rather carefully and have made some very substantial reductions in funds for certain divisions of the Department of Labor, that the committee was antilabor and was out to destroy the Labor Department."

This statement was made on the day the Appropriations Committee submitted its report on part of the Department's 1949 appropriation request, recommending a cut in funds of 25 percent.

The 25 percent cut for fiscal 1949 was being recommended on top of a 28 percent cut in the Department's funds the previous year.

No other major department of the Government has suffered the drastic reduction in appropriations at the hands of the Eightieth Congress as has the Department of Labor.

What has been done to the work of this Department by the Republican budget cutters affects directly and in numerous important ways more people than cuts made in many other Government departments. The President's proposed 1948 budget called for $106,000,000 for the Department of Labor. This sum was such a small fraction of the total Federal budget—three-tenths of 1 percent—so no amount of savings made could have materially affected the size of the total budget.

When the budget ax had finally fallen on a prostrate Labor Department, the amount appropriated by the Congress was only $76,000,000 for the fiscal year 1948, a reduction of more than a fourth of the amount asked for by President Truman and almost 50 percent less than Congress appropriated in fiscal 1947. But this is not the entire story, for less than $16,000,000 went to the Labor Department directly; the remaining $60,882,000 went to

defray the cost of the United States Employment Service, all but a few million of which are Federal funds paid to the States for operating their employment agencies.

Let's take a quick look at the way the cuts were imposed, before examining in some detail an illustrative case or two. Here are the facts:

Function	Fiscal 1948		
	Budget request	Appropriated	Percent cut
Secretary's office	$1,190,000	$979,997	18
Office of Solicitor	1,251,000	1,067,758	15
Division of Labor Standards	718,700	342,900	52
Bureau of Apprenticeship Training	2,544,200	2,407,600	5
Bureau of Labor Statistics	6,700,700	4,073,794	39
Wage and Hour Division	5,204,500	5,052,811	3

1. The Bureau of Labor Statistics: The heavy weapons of the Republican majority in the Congress were devastatingly leveled at this economic intelligence center of the Government. As a consequence of their cuts, the Republican Party has seriously crippled the collection of those economic facts which are essential to the proper functioning of the several complementary elements of the economy—labor, management, and capital.

Here is what happened. The budget for the entire Bureau of Labor Statistics requested by the President totaled $6,700,700, a sum so small that even if it had all been wiped out only a fraction of a cent's difference would have been saved by the average taxpayer. Yet that request was cut almost 40 percent in the appropriation finally made for fiscal year 1948. Moreover, with work piling up for the Bureau, it was given a fourth less money with which to do the job than it had in the preceding year.

What does the Bureau of Labor Statistics do that is so important to you and me? Well, this Bureau has built up such an unassailed position for objectivity and reliability that its figures are quoted as authority more often by more people on more sides of any economic question than any department of Government.

(a) Cost-of-living figures: Probably its best known statistical series is the cost-of-living index. When the Nation's newspapers conducted a poll recently to determine the 10 biggest stories published during the year, the prices-cost-of-living subject ranked second. This second biggest item of public interest could not have been reported on, except from hearsay testimony, if the Bureau of Labor Statistics had not been carefully gathering and reporting the cost-of-living figures over the years in an uninterrupted series.

Where would we have been in trying to stabilize our wartime economy had we not been able to rely on the cost-of-living data compiled by an impartial Government agency in establishing the Little Steel formula to which the wages of millions of war workers were pegged? These figures enter into the wage negotiations of most employers and workers.

Alert employers make constant use of these facts. One firm with 150,000 employees scattered over the country, for example, has installed a plan of adjusting wages on a monthly basis, in order to reflect the changes in the cost of living.

In a survey conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the spring of 1947 employers of 8,000,000 workers reported that the wages of their employees were negotiated or adjusted on the basis of changes in the cost-of-living index.

Whoever thinks that this work on the cost of living can be curtailed, now that we are at peace once more, fails to understand the volatile character of our postwar economy. In the last peacetime year, 1939, for example, the consumer's price index was made once every 3 months from a sample taken in 34 cities. At that time the figures could be published 2 months later, for the timing was not important because between 1935 and 1939 the index changed less than 2 percent. Consider the situation now, when between 1945 and 1947 the consumer's price index has risen almost 27 percent. Today, with the widespread use of this statistical tool in adjusting wages and salaries, and with the cost of living so unstable, we need far better coverage in the collection of the figures and far more frequent reporting of the facts than ever before.

Surely the people of this country will question the judgment of the Republican majority in the Congress who have threatened an economic blackout of where we are, and where we are heading—for this is exactly what they have done in limiting the effectiveness of the Bureau of Labor Statistics in collecting, tabulating, and making up to date technical changes in the cost-of-living index. Until 1945, the series was compiled in 73 cities, including 20 of smaller size. Now, after the budget cuts, of the 34 large cities for which data are available, only 10 are available monthly, the rest only once a quarter. Now we know nothing accurately, and must guess about prices in small- or middle-sized cities. And while we still have a national index, its publication is delayed by at least a month, due to the niggardly budget allowed the Bureau.

Few people may realize it, but the fact is, there are no cost-of-living indexes for the whole Rocky Mountain and Great Plains States, with the exception of the cities of Houston and Denver. It is as if the Republican leaders in the Congress should decree that in their wisdom these great stretches of country with their millions of inhabitants are ostracized from our economic life and denied those measures of their economic situation by which they may determine how they are getting along and what adjustments are to be made in line with changes in the cost of living. In curtailing the collection of data which could provide the means by which workers and employers in those regions could read the signs of the times and adjust their course of action to avoid economic pitfalls which may lie ahead, Congress has effected what it chooses to call savings.

When the collection of cost-of-living data was emasculated by action of the Republican congressional majority, many other important price series were partially destroyed or so weakened as to greatly limit their usefulness. As an example, retail fuel prices were dropped in 21 of the 55 cities used to secure the coverage required for a widely applicable price indicator.

(b) The employment figures: Surely, no wide-awake citizen thinks we can get by for long without good figures on employment, hours of work, and wages. For such figures enter constantly into the calculations of management and organized labor. They aren't just some fancy figures for economists to play with for their own personal enjoyment. On the contrary, they are the hard realities of wage agreements; they are the basis of a determination of the successful operation of our economic life; they enter into the investment calculations of our money institutions; they are important indicators of the degree of stability of our economy, and they furnish the substance for national viewpoints which underlie many political decisions.

Yet, when the Republican budget cutters got through wielding their ax on this phase of the program of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the comprehensive monthly reports of employment for all major industries were curtailed so that current figures are now available for only 29 States which, through contract arrangements with the Bureau of Labor Statistics, prepare monthly estimates for various components of nonagricultural employment. For the other 19 States, little or no detailed data are available on employment, hours of work, or wages earned in the major industries.

How would you like to be a prospective employer trying to locate a new plant, or an enterprising State or private business official seeking to attract industry, without these vital economic facts. Yet the cost of supplying current employment figures for all our States is so small relative to the size of the budget, and so important in comparison with other items which were not cut, that any impartial observer must conclude that the Republicans slashed blindly and badly, serving the public interest very poorly in the process.

Equally important is the fact that continued neglect of the series by not providing the necessary funds makes essential technical improvements impossible and thereby undermines the reliability of the Bureau's figures.

(c) The construction figures: Probably the most serious damage inflicted upon the Bureau of Labor Statistics by Congress was the cut in funds for collection of construction statistics.

How can we deal intelligently with the country's housing problems unless we have the facts? Before the Republicans cut the Bureau of Labor Statistics 1948 budget so drastically, we had good figures on construction in 65 local areas. The reports provided monthly data on the number of dwelling units started and completed. Data were also available on labor requirements and costs, for selected building materials.

Instead of collecting fewer figures about what is going on in the construction industry now, we actually need more data. It is not a simple matter of totaling the reports from cities which require building permits, for a very substantial proportion of the dwellings now being built are in suburban areas where such permits are not required.

Yet, the budget-cutting majority ignored this situation entirely and forced such reductions in the Bureau's budget that the collection of construction figures was discontinued in 59 of the 65 local areas. Now we get construction data in only 6 areas. (As of March 1948 the Bureau has announced that due to lack of funds the data for the remaining 6 areas are no longer available.) The result is that reliable data are not available concerning such important matters as whether building costs are rising or falling, how various parts of the country compare on costs, whether the dwellings are being overbuilt in some places and underbuilt in others, whose needs are being met for housing, and to what extent changes in national housing policy are needed.

Not only have we been deprived of the detailed data on local situations but the reduction in coverage resulting from the cuts threatens to seriously undermine the technical strength behind the Nation-wide construction figures.

Only recently when the again reduced appropriation for the Bureau of Labor Statistics was being debated in Congress the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Housing, Representative GAMBLE (Republican, of New York) arguing futilely for restoration of the budget cut stated:

"I have, as chairman of the Joint Housing Committee, in recent months had to call upon the Bureau of Labor Statistics repeatedly for facts on housing, on labor costs, and on prices of building materials. My committee has found the Bureau's reports are universally regarded as accurate, impartial, and significant. Our only complaint has been that the Bureau has been unable to supply much of the information we needed because of its limited current budget.

"The Bureau has already been forced to discontinue gathering much of this vital information because of its reduced budget for the current fiscal year. How can we

deal intelligently with the country's housing problems if we do not have these facts?"

Surely, every one of our ill-housed millions—veteran and nonveteran alike—is concerned with such questions. They should know that it was the Republican majority in the Eightieth Congress which largely wiped out the facts on housing, forcing us to go blindly groping our way ahead.

(d) The Bureau of Labor Statistics's future: No agency of the Government has been under so severe and continuous an assault as this one during the Eightieth Congress. As the 1949 fiscal budget came up for congressional action, the Republicans, not content with their damaging slashes of the 1948 budget, cut still deeper. For the House of Representatives imposed a 54 percent cut for 1949 on top of the 39 percent cut the Bureau sustained at the hands of the Republican Congress in 1948.

An astute commentator in the Washington Post put the issue tersely in that paper on March 16, 1948 as follows:

"Our society is complex. Neither the President nor Congress can function intelligently unless they have basic information about wages, hours worked, employment, prices, home building, productivity, etc. In passing the Employment Act of 1946, Congress formally accepted the responsibility for watching over the economic ups and downs of the Nation. This doesn't mean that the BLS budget is sacrosanct budgetwise. But it does mean that Congressmen, in self-interest ought to investigate before they curtail research and statistics. They may discover too late that they have thrown away tools they'll later need. Statistics—like saws and chisels—must be kept up so that they'll be sharp and handy when you want them."

2. The Wage and Hour Division: Still another example of Republican budget-cutting philosophy is shown in their handling of the appropriation for the Labor Department's Wage and Hour Division. The Republican handling of this item discloses a philosophy not only completely unconcerned with the value of services rendered to the community but equally unconcerned with the enforcement of congressionally mandated law.

The Republicans cut the budget of the Wage and Hour Division for fiscal year 1948 by $150,000. The budget estimate for fiscal 1948 was $5,204,000, the Republicans cut it to $5,053,000, or a reduction of approximately 3 percent.

But consider this cut in the light of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 which the Wage and Hour Division is responsible for enforcing.

This act was designed to protect the wage earner from the undesirable evil of substandard wages paid by a minority of unscrupulous employers. The experience of the Wage and Hour Division in enforcing the law since 1938 provides eloquent justification for the statute. Proceeding by the annual inspection of a small percentage of the firms covered by the act, the Wage and Hour Division has consistently found a large proportion of violations in its yearly inspections. In 1946 it found volations in 50 percent of the firms inspected. The resulting restitution to underpaid employees amounted to more than three times the annual Wage and Hour budget—to more than $13,000,000. The social benefit accruing as a result of the enforcement operations can hardly be measured in such terms, since the benefits extend far beyond mere restitution of illegally withheld wages.

But the point is this: The Wage and Hour Division, doing an undeniably worth-while job, has been able to inpect only a small percent of all establishments in any year. In 1946 and 1947, the figure was about 8 percent. In fact, the majority of presently covered firms has never been inspected even once, since more new firms are born each year than are reached by Wage and Hour inspection. It would appear that there is a continuing job to do in the light of the high proportion of violators of the act. In reading the testimony in the hearings on the appropriation, you will find no evidence whatsoever that the job of the Division is becoming less necessary in the light of wider compliance with the law. Yet the budget of the Division was cut in the fact of the demonstrated social need for a function which was being well performed. And this is not the end of the story. The enactment of the Portal to Portal Act has made inspections more difficult and time consuming, reducing the number of inspections which can be made.

Instead of making the 40,000 inspections of 1947, the Division's budget will permit less than 30,000 in 1948. And this in spite of a 2-year statute of limitation imposed by the Portal to Portal Act. Thus, today, with less than 6 percent of all firms inspected each year, the greater incentive to ignore the law provided by the 2-year limitation means that more violations will occur and be undetected. Many violations which are discovered will be found too late to provide a remedy. Here we have a graphic illustration of the price after 40 hours a week. Their Government's borne by the scores of thousands of workers in the sweated industries whose owners refuse to pay a legal minimum of 40 cents an hour, or who are unwilling to pay overtime after 40 hours a week. This Government's power to protect them is being seriously crippled. Is this economy or is it sabotage of basic American standards of protection against predatory exploitation?

The Department of Commerce

Not even the Department which services our business community was spared the ax of the Republican budget cutters in the Congress. For the President's request of $287,000,000 to run that Department for the fiscal year 1948 was cut by them to $191,000,000, a reduction of one-third.

Two services in the Department of Commerce bore the brunt of the Republican attack. The Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Bureau of the Census were deeply cut; together they account for 82 percent of all cuts made in the Department of Commerce's budget. Let's take a look at what happened to these programs as a result of their reduced budgets.

1. Civil Aeronautics Administration: The Civil Aeronautics Administration was created in 1938 to do for civil aviation a job similar to that performed by the Coast Guard and the lighthouses for ocean shipping and Government-built highways and stop-and-go lights for automobile traffic. In this capacity it operates the Federal airways system of radio navigation aids, enforces safety regulations in all fields of aviation, and is responsible for the Federal airport program.

In all of this activity the CAA is dealing with a rapidly expanding industry which has mushroomed tremendously since the end of the war. To deal with the vastly increased problems of safety inspections, the modernization and expansion of the radio navigation network, and with the construction of landing areas, CAA asked for $190,000,000. The congressional response authorized $119,000,000, with the bulk of the reduction concentrated in the air-navigation facilities and the Federal-aid airport programs.

(a) The air-navigation facilities: The airways network is made up of hundreds of radio beacons, tied together by leased land lines. Keyed in with traffic-control centers and towers at the principal airports, they permit the air lines, the military, and private flyers, to find their way over the country, to avoid collisions in bad weather, and to make instrument landings under low-ceiling conditions. As we all know, this system of air-traffic control needs extension and improvement. The vast majority of the radio facilities presently installed have been rendered obsolete by the rapid technical developments of the last 15 years. This was true even before the war, which accentuated the condition—preventing modernization of existing facilities and accelerating technical progress. We are paying the price today in terms of both unsatisfactory safety and regularity records.

Accordingly, the President's budget requested $36,308,000 for the improvement and extension of the Federal airways system. The short-sighted appropriation of only $11,149,066 meant severely curtailing this modernization program, particularly in instrument-landing installations, and prevented the construction of Alaskan and Caribbean airways. It is significant to note the comments of the officials charged with the responsibility for the regulation of air safety and traffic control on the effect of the cuts:

"Plans for the expanding of the safety regulation program had to be revised downward. Activities had to be curtailed, raising of standards in certain instances deferred."

The conclusion is inescapable—the safety and efficiency of the American aviation industry has been impaired by the budget reductions of the air-navigation program. Common sense would tell us to proceed as rapidly as technology would permit; other considerations have apparently motivated the majority party.

(b) Federal-aid airport program: Under the Federal Aid Airport Act, the CAA administers a grant-in-aid program of Federal assistance in developing public airports throughout the Nation. The agency determines the relative urgency among the projects in the national airport plan, and formulates the construction and modernization programs accordingly. The $65,000,000 request for 1948 was cut in half by the majority party, setting back substantially the long-range program for an adequate public airport system. The reduction in the construction program will be even greater. Since this program provides for a matching of local and Federal funds, the actual loss to the country is measured by approximately double the congressional reduction. Thus, numerous projects for improving and constructing airports all over the country had to go by default.

2. Bureau of the Census: Among the smaller agencies hardest hit by the budget reductions was the Census Bureau. We do not have to look far afield to discover the majority party's philosophy in limiting the activities of the census. One Republican member of the House Appropriation Committee expressed very clearly what appears to be his party's line toward such agencies when he remarked:

"I eye with a good deal of suspicion and disillusionment the work of every fact-finding body in the Government."

When we contrast this irrational attitude toward objective facts with the commonsense judgment to which a moment's reflection will lead, it becomes increasingly clear that the Republican Party belief is ill-adapted to the requirements of a complex industrial society. The efficient conduct of both modern business and modern government requires a vast amount of reliable and easily accessible statistical information.

Under our system of private enterprise many hundreds of individual businessmen have the responsibility for making the critical decisions as to how much is to be produced and marketed. These decisions must blend together into a consistent and harmonious pattern which yields high levels of employment to our labor force, and general prosperity. But this complicated structure of decisions can only produce a good result if the individual components are reasonably accurate. If there are too many errors of judgment, based on either a lack of information, inadequate information, or faulty

analysis of existing information, there will be trouble. Intuition may be an admirable characteristic, but intuition without knowledge will not guarantee the business decisions which produce full employment.

A major part of the Census Bureau's job is to provide businessmen with usable, reliable, relevant facts to permit businessmen to cope intelligently with production, marketing, and fiscal problems. Only such an agency as the Census Bureau can do this job adequately. Its objectivity is guaranteed by its freedom from administrative duties and hence from any charge of bias arising from self-interest in the information collected. The agency receives excellent cooperation from businessmen who have no fear of unfair disclosure of information of their competitors.

After the dislocations occurring as a result of the war, the need for information is greater than at any peacetime period of our history. The war effort caused great population movement into the cities and war-production centers; it changed the patterns of retail and wholesale trade. New industrial products and processes were developed while old ones declined in importance. And yet our latest comprehensive information in these fields relates to 1939 and 1940. Business needs up-to-date information incorporating wartime changes into their purchasing, production, and marketing practices. Both new benchmark data and current measures of change are required to take account of current trends.

The President requested $19,205,000 to operate the Census Bureau in 1948. The Republican Congress cut this amount to $11,240,000, a reduction of 42 percent. Let us briefly consider the data reduced or abolished by this congressional action.

(a) Census of Manufactures: The Census of Manufactures provides a complete picture of the number and location of all manufacturing plants, the value of their products, the cost of materials they use, the value added by manufacturing to the processed raw materials, and much additional fundamental data about our economic life. Except during the war emergency, this census is normally taken every 2 years. The $5,000,000 request for 1948 was reduced by 20 percent. As a result, it has been necessary to reduce the number and variety of tabulations to be published and to extend the period of processing the material, thus delaying the usefulness and timeliness of the final results.

(b) Business statistics: This program collects and publishes monthly data on the volume of retail and wholesale sales for the principal cities and major regions of the country. This information, which is an invaluable aid to business's planning of its marketing program, would have cost $1,390,000 under the President's budget. After the 40-percent budget cut, the retail sales information was limited to comparatively few local areas and only a handful of individual cities. Considerable information in the wholesale trade field has been discontinued entirely.

(c) Industry statistics: The industry statistics program collects current data on the supply of manufactured products, inventories, and new and unfilled orders. The Presidential allowance for this valuable source to business was $2,278,000; the Republicans authorized only 43 percent of the request. As a consequence, it has been necessary to discontinue substantially reports on the domestic supply of such items as concrete, women's and children's clothing, steel castings, steel forgings, construction machinery, and many others.

(d) Foreign trade statistics: The Bureau of the Census is the official source of information on the imports and exports of commodities. To provide this information the President requested $1,600,000 which was reduced by 30 percent. As a result all monthly data on air shipments have been completely discontinued, and the whole flow of data respecting our foreign trade is retarded.

(e) Agriculture statistics: The basic Census of Agriculture is taken every 5 years but the preparation for the following census and the analysis of the last census requires continuous operation every year. In addition, detailed cotton statistics are collected monthly. The $449,000 requested was reduced by 24 percent. Hardest hit was the cotton-statistics program which cannot be continued on the same accurate basis as previously. Rational forecasting of the cotton crop is made much more difficult by the inconsequential savings achieved.

(f) Employment, population, and housing statistics: This program supplies current monthly information on employment, unemployment, and many other population characteristics such as housing, migration, education, etc. It operates by means of a highly scientific sample of households which are questioned monthly. Since a field staff and offices are set up on a permanent basis to secure the facts about employment, it is possible to secure supplementary information at very little additional expense. Accordingly a very flexible organization has been built up to secure information rapidly and accurately. To support this organization and general population work in 1948, $3,266,000 were requested; almost 60 percent was denied. As a consequence, there were no funds to utilize the survey organization for these supplementary inquiries. Among the most important surveys eliminated was the consumer income study which could have furnished sorely needed insight into consumer behavior in 1948. Moreover, actual coverage of the labor-force estimates was substantially reduced since many field offices were closed and the sample was correspondingly weakened for many purposes.

It is difficult to convey the long-run importance to our Nation of the information collecting and dispensing services. Statistics and statisticians are not dramatic subjects. But if we do not forget that Government and business alike can act intelligently only when the facts are available, we can view the Republican philosophy in its true prospective. With its suspicion of facts, with its willingness to slash uncritically at all statistical services, the Republican program is initiating a black-out of the knowledge of where we are and where we are going. Contempt for the facts is only one step removed from "burning of books."

Marlboro Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a summary of remarks I was honored to make at a recent dinner of the chamber at commerce at Marlboro, Mass., welcoming to that fine city the firm of Dan Danahy Shoe Co.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN BEFORE MARLBORO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, JUNE 14, 1948

Pointing to the current high price levels, particularly consumer goods and necessaries of life, which he said were bringing undue financial strain upon many citizens and businessmen Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton, warned against the evils of costly supermilitarism in the Nation and urged prudence and levelheadedness in meeting present difficulties.

"The Nation has really had no opportunity to settle down to normal peaceful pursuits since the war," he declared.

"The ill-advised agreements entered into at Yalta and Teheran speedily brought forth evil fruit and have been responsible for the encouragement and spread of radicalism and Sovietism in Europe and the Orient. Worthy small nations and decent freedom-loving peoples have been needlessly sacrificed to brutal domination by the Soviet Government—in spite of the overwhelming disapproval of the American Nation."

"Communist propaganda, infiltration and conspiracy not only abroad but in our own country has also deeply stirred the people. It is fortunate indeed that the Nation is at last aroused to the real menace of organized Marxist Sovietism and that Congress is working earnestly to bring the evil out into the open where it can be exposed and combatted."

"In our zeal to check communism we must be careful not to do violence to our own constitutional institutions and safeguards. Communism is not a physical entity. It is an idea, a social concept. It cannot be destroyed by force of arms or suppression. It must be fought with other ideas, democratic ideas, democratic concepts of freedom and social justice which under the Constitution are effective instruments of securing individual rights and promoting national welfare.

"As we smoke out Communist termites which have crawled into our governmental, industrial, and social edifice, let us never be tempted to adopt the same arbitrary techniques of suppression of the individual, government by edict and decree which typify the totalitarian systems of Hitler and Stalin. Our first great duty is to keep America free and democratic under the Constitution."

Stressing what he observed as the "alarming growth of militarism in this country," the Congressman said:

"Because of the unrest abroad and the refusal of Russia to cooperate with proposals for universal peace, it is regrettable that a war hysteria has been whipped up in the Nation. Obviously we must maintain a strong and impregnable, fast-striking national defense spear-headed by commanding air power. We must have a thoroughly modernized and streamlined military organization scientifically designed to meet every contingency."

"But war is not imminent. Peace is not impossible. International order is not beyond our reach if we but strive for it. Meanwhile in order to set up an adequate national defense there is absolutely no need to militarize the Nation, no need for drafting our young men and taking them away from their homes and schools and forming them into what may well become a vast military dictatorship that will overpower freedom in this country.

"It will not avail us, any more than it availed some of the nations of Europe, to defeat communism in this country and then find ourselves shackled by an omnipotent, all-embracing totalitarian military dictatorship, and that is not beyond the possibilities if we do not exercise prudence and levelheadedness in meeting present difficulties and moving to solve present problems, great as they are.

"The cost of military establishments for the next fiscal year are estimated to be more than $22,000,000,000. Added to the heavy costs of foreign relief and recovery, this huge sum has already wiped out savings and economies effected by the Congress by painstaking efforts and it threatens the return of deficit spending. Such outlays threaten the social

and economic welfare of the Nation, and will greatly hamper our efforts to assist our veterans, our workers, our farmers and our own people. These programs must be reappraised to conform to the demonstrated capacity of the Nation.

"It is time to recognize the fact that supermilitarism invariably leads to war and that war in this atomic age is an evil institution which may completely decimate democracy and civilization. Let us not yield to current hysteria. Fully prepared we must be and that preparedness can be achieved by wise and intelligent utilization of modern scientific innovations and by the readiness of our great industrial potential—the greatest and most powerful in the world.

"But let us seek and strive for peace among all the nations through every available instrumentality and method legitimately open to us. Instead of threats and bluffs, instead of saber-rattling and swashbuckling of unbridled supermilitarism, let us made a determined offensive for world peace. In that way we will be fulfilling with noble enlightenment, a large measure of the great debt we owe to those of every land, and particularly our own gallant sons who fought and died to insure a just enduring peace and to make this country and the world a better place in which to live."

Relief for Columbia River Flood Sufferers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Thursday, June 17), 1948

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement made by me before the Banking and Currency Committee this morning on the need of disaster relief loans for the Columbia River Valley flood sufferers.

The statement follows:

The total amount of flood damage in the Columbia River Valley is estimated by the newspapers at $140,000,000, making this one of the greatest flood disasters in American history.

During the course of the flood 4,000 homes were completely and utterly demolished at Vanport, Oreg., and in eastern Washington and in the lower Columbia Valley several hundred other homes were washed away and so wrecked that they are beyond repair. Adjacent to the town of Woodland, which lies between Vancouver and Longview, Wash., 70 farm homes were completely destroyed.

In addition, stores and homes in Woodland by the time the water fully recedes will have been under water for 4 weeks. Home owners and business people suffered enormous damages and in numerous cases, without the help of Government loans, will not be financially able to rehabilitate their properties or businesses.

Many industrial plants were flooded in the lower Columbia Valley area and in some instances may require help.

Probably one of the most serious aspects of the disaster is the housing shortage it has created. Washington and Oregon, in the past 7 years, according to the Census Bureau, increased more than 30 percent in population. The greatest growth in both States occurred in the Columbia River Valley section of those States, due, of course, to the power and reclamation developments. It was in this area of the greatest population growth that the floods did greatest damage.

Even before the flood disaster this region was exceptionally short of homes. There were no vacant homes there. Now 6,000 homes have been destroyed by the floods and an estimated 6,000 others damaged.

Also farmers and dairymen have suffered heavy losses. Many barns and farm buildings were destroyed and damaged. Vast quantities of livestock, foods, and crops were ruined. Some farmers will need loans to rehabilitate their properties.

Knowing this region and its people, I am quite sure that any loans made by RFC in this area will be repaid. If that is true, and I believe it is, this legislation will not cost the Government anything. The bill will merely advance loans to distressed flood victims and in due season the Government will be returned its money.

Meanwhile the people of this area will have been saved from continued distress and their properties rehabilitated or rebuilt and restored to the tax rolls.

The Myth of Jewish Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 19, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Eugene Lyons, entitled "The Myth of Jewish Communism" that appeared in Pageant in April 1947:

THE MYTH OF JEWISH COMMUNISM

(By Eugene Lyons)

In the fight against communism, American Jews—writers, labor leaders, public figures, Jewish organizations and the Jewish press—have played a leading and effective role, far out of proportion to their numbers in our population.

If, despite this, the silly myth of "Jewish communism" persists in some quarters, it only proves the extent of human credulity. It is a myth brought to full flower by Nazi propaganda, part of the evil heritage of Hitlerism. People familiar with the history of Bolshevism are inclined to dismiss it contemptuously as too grotesque to be refuted.

I share their contempt, but I am convinced that the nonsense should be thoroughly and openly debunked. The malicious legend that Jews are somehow to blame for communism in Russia and its fifth column here is a weapon in the armory of intolerance. With the pendulum of American sentiment swinging against everything Soviet abroad and at home, there is danger that weak and prejudiced minds may translate anti-communism into anti-Semitism.

I have some warrant for attempting to discuss the relation between Judaism and communism, since I am a Jew who has devoted a lot of study to the Communist movement. Because of books like Assignment in Utopia and The Red Decade, because I have fought the Communists during years when it was neither a fashionable nor a comfortable avocation, I flatter myself that I am in the list of American "red-baiters" earmarked for "liquidation" comes the revolution.

But when the tumbrils roll to the red squares of American cities, I know I shall be part of a large and gallant Jewish company. George E. Sokolsky will be there, and Benjamin Stolberg, Isaac Don Levine, David J. Dallin, Bertram Wolfe, Max Nomad, Lawrence E. Spivak, Louis Fischer, Benjamin Gitlow, Sydney Hook, Leon Dennen, Sol Levitas, Simeon Strunsky, Jay Lovetone, Morrie Ryskind, Harry Lang. These are but a few of the many Jewish writers and journalists who have been fearless in their assaults on Stalinism and its American agents.

The editors of virtually all Jewish newspapers would be there with us, the octogenarian Abraham Cahan, editor of the world's largest Yiddish paper, the Jewish Daily Forward, in a place of honor. Though there are some 5,000,000 Jews in the United States, there is only one Jewish Communist daily, the Freiheit, with a circulation of about 12,000; the Forward, by contrast, has 140,000. The whole of the Jewish English-language press (American Hebrew, Jewish Frontier, Commentary, etc.) is vigorously anti-Communist.

My colleagues in liquidation also would include practically all Jewish labor leaders, with David Dubinsky, head of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, Julius Hochman, head of the dressmakers, and Max Zaritsky, head of the cap and millinery workers, getting special attention. The United Hebrew Trades, representing the vast majority of organized Jewish workers, has been militantly anti-Communist at a time when the general American labor movement was crawling with Communist borers-from-within.

I am not implying that those red tumbrils would be filled exclusively with Jews. Plenty of deserving Christian culprits will be there, including seasoned "red-baiters" like Max Eastman, William Henry Chamberlin, Dr. John Dewey, and new recruits to their ranks like W. L. White and Brooks Atkinson.

Yet the prominence of Jews in the top ranks of anticommunism is a remarkable fact, considering that their race is only a 3½ percent minority in the American population.

Neither do I wish to imply that there are no well-known Jews on the pro-Soviet side. There are writers like Maurice Hindus, George Seldes, Mike Gold, Lillian Hellman, and Albert Maltz; labor men like Ben Gold, Abram Flaxer, Lee Pressman; personalities in the arts and sciences like Jo Davidson, Herman Shumlin, Dr. Edward Barsky, Edward G. Robinson.

But these would amount to a negligible minority in the Christian host. The outstanding pro-Communist and pro-Soviet writers and public figures in this country, it happens, have been overwhelmingly non-Jewish. I set down, almost at random as they come to mind, some of the names most frequently associated with Soviet apologetics, party-line propaganda or Communist innocent-front organizations:

Albert Rhys Williams, Anna Louise Strong, Walter Duranty, Louis Adamic, Prof. Frederick L. Schuman, Dr. Arthur Upham Pope, Corliss Lamont, Dr. Jerome Davis, Robert Morss Lovett, Rockwell Kent, Paul Robeson, Muriel Draper, Joseph E. Davies, Vito Marcantonio, Col. Evans Carlson, Frederick Vanderbilt Field, Rev. Harry Ward, Dr. William J. Schieffelin, Dr. Walter Rautenstrauch, Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Rev. Wayne White.

The list could be extended to book length. But the sampling should suffice to disprove the assumption that Jews have a special tendency toward the Communist orbit.

For reasons that are sociological rather than racial, Jews do hold an important place in the rank-and-file membership of the official Communist Party in the United States (not in other countries). But in the overall Communist movement, including the huge and tremendously important periphery of fellow travelers, they are outnumbered perhaps 50 to 1.

The same is true for the Communist Party high command. There are a few Jewish leaders, notably Jack Stachel and Israel Am-

ter, but the bulk of the leadership—William Z. Foster, Eugene Dennis, Robert Thompson, Robert Minor, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, John Williamson, Earl Browder (temporarily expelled, but in fact still a leader)—is non-Jewish.

This is not exceptional. It reflects the situation throughout the world. Thorez and Duclos in France, Togliatti in Italy, Pieck, and Ulbricht in Germany, Bierut in Poland, Tito in Yugoslavia, Dimitrov in Bulgaria are Christians. In the Near East and north Africa, the few remaining Jewish Communist leaders are being forced out, now that the Kremlin's foreign policy calls for all-out support of Arab, Moslem, and anti-Jewish elements in those areas.

It should be emphasized that the department of American life in which Communist penetration has been deepest and where it is most dangerous, particularly in case of war, is the organized labor movement. But here the pro-Communist leadership—typified by Harry Bridges, Mike Quill, Freddy Myers, Donald Henderson, Reid Robinson, James Matles, et al.—is strikingly non-Jewish, whereas the opposition to that leadership, typified by David Dubinsky, Morris Muster, Jack Altman, counts many Jews.

Perhaps the foregoing summation is weighted in favor of the Jews, though I am trying to be objective. But even if it is heavily discounted, the unfairness of the Jewish bolshevism charge still remains in clear relief.

This despite the fact that the membership—not the leadership—of the American Communist Party itself in this country is strongly Jewish. Exact figures are not available. Gitlow, in his book I Confess, put it at about 15 percent. Other estimates are as high as 50 percent. In New York City, where about one-fourth of the whole party membership is concentrated, the Jewish contingent probably exceeds 50 percent.

Let us keep in mind, however, that we are dealing with a party which claims no more than 80,000 members and whose actual paid-up membership in good standing is less than half the number; whose official newspaper, the Daily Worker, which is circulated all over the country, has only some 25,000 readers.

Even a substantial Jewish percentage of that party therefore represents only an infinitesimal fraction of the American Jewish population—a fraction so minute that in the larger picture of Jewish life it fades into nothingness.

It is unfair and mischievous to blame the Jewish community of 5,000,000 for the handful attracted by the Communist Party. It is a minority disowned, disliked and at best pitied by American Jewry as a whole.

That infinitesimal minority is concentrated in a few cities, largely in immigrant areas. It is emphatically untypical of American Jews as a whole, who are deeply individualistic in their economic ideas, deeply democratic in their political preferences.

The Jewish workers attracted by the Communist Party are mostly Russian in origin. They have a natural nostalgic emotion for anything Russian; unhappily that includes Sovietism, about which they have rose-tinted illusions. The czarist dynasty meant for them pogroms and discrimination. Its political heirs, though tyrants themselves, unavoidably have a certain glamour in the eyes of these refugees from persecution. Against this background the remarkable fact is that so few American Jews have swallowed the Communist line, trimmed as it is with fake-idealist and race-equality bait.

Another significant point: If some Jews are snared by the Communist Party, they do not long remain snared. The turnover in the Communist Party here is fantastically high—averaging about 40 percent a year. A member of 4 or 5 years' standing is a veteran. This means that workers who take the bait do not remain on the hook very long.

The Jewish community in the United States has during many generations developed great social and philanthropic organizations: the Arbeiter Ring (Workmen's Circle); the Gewerkschaften (United Hebrew Trades); the Jewish Labor Committee; B'nai B'rith; the American Jewish Committee. Taken together, these talk for the millions—and they are not merely not Communist but anti-Communist.

Totalitarianism in any form, in the final analysis, is alien to the spirit of the Jewish people, who are anything but collectivist. Despite the aberrations of a few, the average Jew knows in his bones that as a minority group Jewry has no chance for equality and normal existence except in liberal democratic societies.

How did the myth that communism is a Jewish movement arise?

To begin with it was deliberately fostered by the most reactionary elements in Russia, the so-called Black Hundreds and their ilk. They sought to turn the anti-Semitism of the darkest masses in their tragedy-ridden land against the Bolsheviks by identifying them with Jews. They even labeled Lenin, who came of the lower Russian nobility, a Jew.

Because a great many Jews, and in particular Leon Trotsky, did play a prominent role in the revolution, the propaganda took. Then came Hitlerism in Europe. With diabolical skill the Nazis expanded the lie about Jewish bolshevism and gave it universal circulation. The job begun by the Black Hundreds was thus finished by the brown marauders—and distorted minds everywhere, America included, soaked up the malicious invention.

The delusion that the Kremlin regime is dominated by Jews is one of the mainstays of such minds. Let us therefore examine it briefly.

Karl Marx, whom the Communists claim as the father of their faith, would hardly acknowledge the totalitarian set-up in Russia today as his own progeny. In any case, he was a Jew—a Jew who was baptized as a child, denied his racial heritage and at times wrote like a rabid anti-Semite. His most prominent associate and alter ego, Friedrich Engels, was a Christian. Not one of the social philosophers upon whom Marx and Engels based their system—St. Simon, Fourier, Hegel, etc.—was Jewish.

In czarist Russia, the Jews were a persecuted minority, living in restricted areas, denied the rights of full citizenship. Like other minority races, they could have no love for the established order and were drawn to the revolutionary movements. There were many Jews in the ranks of revolution in the czars' empire for the same reason that there were many Georgians—Stalin among them—and Armenians.

But even in dark Russia and in the face of terrible provocation to extremism, the Jews tended to join the moderate, democratic groups rather than the extremists. Their largest organization was the Bund, a moderate-socialist alinement.

In the actual revolution of 1917, a galaxy of brilliant Jews emerged in the Bolshevik camp—Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Radek, Uritzky, Litvinov and others. Because their counterrevolution against Kerensky's democratic regime succeeded, history has magnified these names until they seem to fill the whole stage of that period.

The anti-Jewish propaganda conveniently forgets that Jews were even more numerous and more prominent in the Menshevik and Social Revolutionary camps—in the groups, that is, opposing bolshevism.

Within the Bolshevik high command, Jews were always a distinct minority. The founders of the party and its most active leaders from 1903 to 1908 were Lenin, Malinovsky, Skvortzev-Stepanov, Vorovsky, Professor Pokrovsky, Bonch-Bruchevich, Rumyantzev—not a Jew among them. Only much later some Jews began to achieve posts of leadership.

Of the 124,000 Communist members in the Russian ruling party in 1918, the first Soviet year, only 3,200 or 2.6 percent were Jews. Today the percentage is almost normal in relation to the Jewish population in the country.

After the revolution, and especially since Stalin's rise to power, Jews have tended to disappear from the uppermost Soviet hierarchy. There is now only one, Lazaar Kaganovich, among the 14 who make up the all-powerful Politburo which rules Russia and the world Communist forces.

Jews, it is too often forgotten, held first place among the victims of the revolution. Being mainly small traders, they fell into the categories of capitalist and bourgeois elements told off for extermination. The groups in Russia officially denied a vote, the right to rations and other privileges of full citizenship, during the 1920's and early 1930's, were known as lishentzi. Thirty-five percent of all Jews were in this outlaw class, as against 5 or 6 percent for the whole Soviet population.

While Yiddish is a legal minority language, Hebrew is forbidden and Zionist views are punished as treason to the U. S. S. R. As for religious Jews—and at the outset they were the great majority—their life has been one long ordeal of persecution. It is no accident, therefore, that hundreds of thousands of Jews are fleeing from Soviet-dominated regions behind the iron curtain.

At the end of 1945 the Soviet government gave certain categories of Polish Jews who found themselves within the Soviet frontiers the choice of accepting Soviet citizenship or leaving. All of them, numbering about 150,000 and including thousands of Communists, chose to depart. They had no illusions about the troubles that awaited them outside, but anything seemed to them preferable to life in Stalin's country. It was in effect a poll of Jewish sentiment about the Soviet paradise and it registered unanimous opposition.

The anti-Semitic legend that the Soviet regime is somehow Jewish thus makes no more sense than the related myth that American communism is Jewish.

Speech of Hon. William B. Umstead, From Raleigh, N. C., on May 18, 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 15), 1948

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by me over a State-wide radio hookup from Raleigh, N. C., the evening of May 18, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, the time has now come for me to thank the people of North Carolina for the many, very many, expressions of confidence and support which have come to me in unprecedented volume during the past few weeks. I also wish to express my deep thanks and appreciation to all those

who are supporting my candidacy to succeed myself in the United States Senate. I now have every reason to believe that you will nominate me as your Senator on May 29, and wish for you to share with me the air of confidence and victory which comes from my friends in all sections of the State.

First, I wish to comment on the farm program. I was in Congress when the existing favorable farm legislation passed that body. I worked and voted for the AAA, the REA, the soil-conservation program, agricultural research, and other legislation which has come to be known as our national farm program. Between the time of my service in the House and the Senate, the parity and support price legislation was enacted by Congress. All of these things have brought unprecedented prosperity to our State.

The Commodity Credit Corporation, organized while I was a Member of Congress, is now authorized to use its funds to make loans on certain commodities, including tobacco, under the parity formula. The funds are provided by Congress, and in order to secure said funds it is necessary to organize a corporation and secure a charter subject to the approval of the Commodity Credit Corporation. It is as simple as that. There are hundreds of good lawyers in North Carolina, any one of whom could have, and I am sure would have, been glad to have drawn the charter for the Tobacco Stabilization Corporation. Certainly, it is rather unusual for the lawyer who did draw the charter to have it inferred that the benefits which have resulted from the operation of the Corporation as a part of the Federal parity and support-price system merely resulted from the drawing of the charter. I can hardly believe that any one man could or would claim that he is responsible for the benefits to tobacco farmers resulting from the operation of the parity formula. Similar organizations have been created under the authority of the Federal act, operated with Federal funds to help out difficult crop situations throughout the country. All of this program is the result of the leadership of the Democratic Members of Congress, including those from North Carolina who in season and out have worked tirelessly for the development and successful operation of the farm program, of which the Tobacco Stabilization Corporation is only a part. Members of the North Carolina delegation have been in the forefront of the struggle to devise and operate a farm program which would be fair to the South and to our peculiar agricultural conditions.

Almost everyone now favors the national farm program, including tobacco control and parity and support prices, but back in the depression years of the thirties, when agriculture was prostrate, President Roosevelt and Congress were plowing in new ground in an effort to find some way to aid agriculture. The various parts of the program we now have were then untried. It was not easy then for Congress to enact some of these laws, but they have proven their worth. It is a matter of satisfaction to me that during my 6 years of service in the House and since I have been in the Senate the other members of the North Carolina delegation in Congress and I have loyally supported measures for the benefit of agriculture. Our congressional delegation is due much credit for their foresight and courage, for their contribution to the development of our farm program, and especially in connection with tobacco.

Recently much has been said with reference to the medical-care program in North Carolina. This program was initiated by the medical profession. The legislation establishing the medical care commission and providing funds for the good-health program has been the work of many people. The bill which was passed by the 1945 legislature and which created the present medical care commission was drafted by me. I gave the matter most of my time for a period of more than 6 weeks. It had my support at every turn, and as chairman of the State Democratic executive committee I advocated the good-health program throughout North Carolina. I went to Washington in 1945 at my own expense, more than 18 months before I became a Member of the Senate, to testify in favor of the passage of the Hill-Burton bill to provide funds to assist in the construction of hospitals and medical-care centers without Federal control. This bill was later passed by Congress, and in 1947, as a Member of the Senate, it was my pleasure to vote to provide funds under the act to make the medical-care program in North Carolina and elsewhere possible. There is enough glory in this great undertaking for everyone who had a part in its success. I claim only to have had a modest part in its development, and although I do not wish to appear immodest in relating my part in this matter, I do wish to keep the record straight and to give credit to the great number of men and women who wholeheartedly gave of their time, energy, and money to the success of this great achievement.

Time does not permit me to discuss all of the matters which have been acted upon since I have been a Member of the Senate, nor all of the legislation now pending before that body. Many such matters of grave and serious concern I have discussed from time to time in this campaign in various parts of North Carolina. I have frankly presented many of the problems now facing our Nation and the world. These are perilous times, fraught with many hazards and dangers. Experience in Federal affairs and Federal legislation has perhaps never been more important than it is today.

When a Member of the United States Senate is faced with definite legislation affecting the life, the liberty, and the property of individuals, or affecting the peace of the world, such as the European recovery program, the reduction of taxes, civil rights legislation, or legislation affecting the rights of labor, industry, and the general public, and after bills are carefully considered, first by the committees and then on the floor of the Senate, there comes a time when the clerk calls the roll, then each Senator, as his name is called, on his own responsibility and without evasion, must vote either "yes" or "no." These votes become a part of the written record.

On his record each Senator is judged. The people back home have a right to know how each Senator voted. They have the right to weigh his record in the balance, and to decide if he is worthy of their confidence and entitled to their support. My record, as a member of the House and since I have been in the Senate, is written. In every instance, after conscientious study and consideration, I have been guided solely by what appeared to me to be for the best interest of all the people of my State and Nation. So far as I know, no attack has been made upon my legislative record except by leaders of organized labor. Therefore, if my record meets with your approval, then I feel entitled to ask your support on May 29.

Every candidate for the high office of United States Senator should be willing to express his views, when called upon to do so, concerning laws, national in scope, affecting the welfare of the people generally, or to state his position, in cases where the facts are known, on pending legislation of vital interest to the general public.

On February 28, and since that time, I have repeatedly expressed regret that the President recommended to Congress enactment of the so-called civil-rights program, which includes an anti-poll-tax, an antilynching, and an FEPC bill. All of these are now pending in Congress. I am opposed to each of them, and believe that all Democrats should oppose them. I have also stated that undertaking to pass such legislation would be unwise at any time, and particularly now, when we are struggling with so many problems of vital concern at home and abroad. The passage of two of these bills would result in bitter disagreement and division among our people at a time when unity is so essential to success. Furthermore, the bills referred to constitute an unwarranted invasion of State sovereignty and go beyond the limits clearly fixed by the Constitution of the United States.

The anti-poll-tax bill is of profound importance because of the principle involved. It would be the beginning, and would open the way for the Federal Government to determine all qualifications for voting and take charge of our election machinery. Few things could be more dangerous or further from the objective and intention of the founding fathers.

The antilynching bill is purely a political measure. If the Federal Government may take over the police power of the States in this one instance it may do so in all, and any constitutional guaranty to the contrary would be gone. Such legislation would be dangerous to the lives and liberty of citizens everywhere.

Even worse than the anti-poll-tax bill and the antilynching bill is the FEPC bill. It would eliminate by Federal control the free choice of employment by both employers and employees. Under its provisions the Federal Government would employ and send into each State a great force of inspectors, investigators, and Federal policemen to pry into the details of every business affecting commerce, and would result in unparalleled chaos and confusion. In North Carolina it would not work. Discord and friction and bitterness would be the result. The Federal Government has no moral or legal right to force upon the people conditions such as would be created by this law. Nothing should be done to disturb the peaceful relations now existing among the people of North Carolina.

When the Federal Government exercises the power to determine who should vote and takes charge of elections, when it takes over the police power of the States, and when it undertakes to interfere with and pass upon the hiring and firing of the employees of all who are engaged in a business affecting commerce, then, in truth and in fact, State lines will have been wiped out, and the power reserved to the States by the Constitution will no longer exist.

Today constitutional government everywhere is seriously threatened. Our own Republic is put to the test as never before. The Congress of the United States is faced with the greatest problems on every hand. Surely this can be no time to weaken the structure of our Constitution and our dual system of government by legislation that would spread discord and bitterness among our people.

It has been said that the race question has been injected into this campaign. If so, by whom? Mr. George L. Googe, of Atlanta, Ga., in his speech in Wilmington, N. C., on August 13, 1947, injected the race question into the politics of every Southern State. I have not used the word "race" except in referring to the speech of Mr. Googe and in quoting the word "race" from the pending FEPC bill. It is to be admitted, however, that, insofar as the antilynching bill and the FEPC bill involve race questions, it is an issue in many States where there is a contest for a seat in Congress.

I have taken my position against these measures on the sound ground of the lack of power on the part of Congress to enact this legislation, and I have no desire to discuss, and do not intend to be led into a discussion of, the race question. I did not introduce these bills. I regret that they have been introduced, and that they are now pending before the Senate. But they are pending, and will either be voted on at this or some subsequent session of Congress. I

have stated my position, and the people are entitled to know the position of every candidate for the United States Senate on these issues. They are now before the people. I therefore, here and now ask my opponent, if he is nominated and elected to the United States Senate, if he will vote for or against the anti-poll-tax bill, the antilynching bill, and the FEPC bill. The people are entitled to know, and I am requesting of him a direct answer without evasion.

As to the many votes I have cast both in the House and Senate during nearly 8 years in the Congress, I seem to have had only one group to seriously question my vote. That vote was for the Taft-Hartley bill. The necessity for this bill arose in the following manner:

Between July 1935, and January 1947, some labor leaders abused the rights granted under the Wagner Act, and began to exercise their powers in ways which disregarded the public welfare, and in some instances challenged the power of the Government itself. Labor disputes increased. During the war years, the patriotic restraints of wartime, and the efforts of the War Labor Board maintained some degree of industrial peace. But even during those years, there were some labor leaders who defied the general welfare of the people. Mr. John L. Lewis called a coal strike in the midst of World War II. After the war, strikes were called in industries which affected the public health, security, and general welfare of the people. This was illustrated by another coal strike called by Mr. John L. Lewis in cold weather, when his power had grown so great that he defied an order of a Federal court of the United States, and was tried and convicted of contempt. Furthermore, certain labor leaders assumed a tremendous power over the rank and file of union members.

By the time the Eightieth Congress convened in January, 1947, it was clear that public opinion in the Nation demanded action upon this question. After weeks and months of hearings, thorough debate, and detailed consideration, it became law by an overwhelming vote, clearly indicating a demand from the people of the Nation for the enactment of this legislature for the protection of the general welfare. It did not destroy the legal recognition of unions. It did not eliminate unfair labor practices on the part of the employers contained in the original act. It was not a perfect bill. However, it did offer some measure of protection to the American people, and a large amount of protection to members of unions and to workers in general.

Mr. George L. Googe, an out-of-State labor leader of Atlanta, Ga., in a speech in Wilmington last August 13, is quoted as saying:

"That increased labor activity would spell defeat for the North Carolina Senators in their reelection efforts. Senator UMSTEAD was singled out for an especially bitter attack because the Senator supported the Taft-Hartley bill."

I did not at that time take this hot-weather speech of an out-of-State labor leader very seriously; however, on February 23 of this year, Mr. Googe was in our State again. This time he met with the United Labor Political Committee for North Carolina, and I am informed, out-of-State CIO leaders, at the Yadkin Hotel in Salisbury, N. C., to make political plans. After an all-day meeting the word was passed down to the local unions that I must be defeated. It is now evident that Mr. Googe and the out-of-State CIO leaders were convincing in their demands that the voters of North Carolina should follow out-of-State dictation as to how they should vote.

On Tuesday night, May 11, both candidates for the Senate were on the same platform in Wilson. Each candidate was presented written questions by some of those present. One question addressed to both candidates was as follows:

"I want to know how both Senators stand on the Taft-Hartley labor bill. I have read that Senator UMSTEAD voted for this measure. I want to know if Mr. Broughton would have voted for this bill, as it passed the Senate, if he had been a Member of the United States Senate at that time."

My opponent gave no direct answer to this question and I quote as follows from an editorial which appeared thereafter in the Wilson daily newspaper:

"The campaign issues: Of late, Senator WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD has been under fire from the labor leaders. They're after his scalp because he voted for the Taft-Hartley Act. If, then, they're to vote against Senator UMSTEAD, they must vote for his opponent, former Governor J. Melville Broughton. Now how would Broughton have voted had he been in the Senate at that time?

"A lot of persons in Wilson tried the other night to find out. They pointedly asked the former Governor how he would have voted in like circumstances. Broughton, however, evaded. He wasn't in the Senate and therefore he didn't have to vote. Since the bill is a law, it doesn't have to come before the Senate again, except for amendment or repeal. Why, then, should he commit himself?

"But isn't that political? If the CIO leaders are after Senator UMSTEAD's scalp, won't Broughton be the beneficiary? And since he will be, can we understand why he doesn't want to commit himself? But isn't the campaign bigger than that? Would not any representative from North Carolina, if placed in the position Senator UMSTEAD was, have done what he did?

"The Times is bringing this out not because it wants to become a partisan in the campaign. It's doing so because it feels certain Broughton, had he been in the Senate, would have done what UMSTEAD did. If the Times is right in that surmise, why then, doesn't Broughton come out in the open and take the issue out of politics? Do we have statesmen running for office or do we have the old-style politicians?"

In the speech I made at the Wilson meeting, I openly declared my stand on this question and have done so many times in the State. I was puzzled as to why my opponent hesitated to answer directly and without evasion a question in which all the people in North Carolina are interested. However, perhaps there is a reason. I have recently been informed that my opponent for the Senate attended, for more than an hour, the meeting in Salisbury on February 23, previously referred to, and that Mr. George L. Googe, of Atlanta, and out-of-State CIO leaders were present. I am also informed that at the end of the conference, it was understood that nothing should be made public concerning the proceedings or who were present.

In the light of these circumstances, it is not hard to understand why Senator PEPPER, frequently a spokesman for labor leaders, was obtained to deliver in my home town of Durham a tirade against the Taft-Hartley act last Sunday, and to advocate its outright repeal. I shall not be surprised to hear of more out-of-State speakers coming to North Carolina to tell the union members and other citizens what they must do on May 29.

I am advised that they plan to make North Carolina an example for the other States to follow; that they plan to join all the unions together in an effort to defeat me, and supported by out-of-State speakers such as the Senator from Florida, to show the other States what foreign leadership and propaganda can accomplish in North Carolina politics.

If I had not voted to curb the power of certain labor dictators, I would have been unfaithful to the union members of this country, to the unorganized workers, to the farmers, the school teachers, the clerks, the housewives, the merchants, and the millions who risked their lives in combat on foreign soil to preserve freedom and destroy dictators, and to the general public. I would also have been unfaithful to our national heritage, to the fundamental principles upon which our Government is based, and to all those since the fundation of this Republic who have worked and struggled in the belief that there should be equal rights to all and special privileges to none.

I have stated my position. This is both a State and a national issue. The people are entitled to know the position of every candidate for the United States Senate on this vital question. I therefore here and now ask my opponent if he had been a Member of the United States Senate in 1947 would he have voted for or against the Taft-Hartley labor bill as it passed the Senate. I also here and now ask my opponent if he is nominated and elected to the United States Senate with the help of the labor vote in North Carolina if he will vote for or against the straight-out repeal of the Taft-Hartley law as it is now written, which repeal is undoubtedly the present aim of the labor leaders of America.

North Carolinians should think, speak, and act together on May 29 concerning these important subjects. I appeal to all who agree with the position I have expressed on these vital issues to rally to my standard on May 29.

We Want Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 15), 1948

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on June 13, President Truman was present at a Sunday morning breakfast given under the auspices of the International Labor Organization at the Fairmont Hotel at San Francisco, Calif. It will be remembered that our Government is represented at the ILO conference by our colleague, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and by the Acting Secretary of Labor, Mr. David A. Morse, who has just been appointed director general of the ILO. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the text of the extemporaneous statement which was made on that occasion by President Truman.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the ILO, Mr. Morse persuaded me to come and have breakfast with you, and I am very happy that I am able to do it.

I have a hard and fast rule about speeches on Sunday. You see, I believe that 6 days in the week are for work and one is for rest. Of course, I have never caught up with that. [Laughter.] But I only consented to say a word or two here because I think maybe this organization can make—and is making—a greater contribution to peace in the world

than nearly any other organization of its kind in the world. When I say any other kind of organization in the world, I mean parallel organization, because there is only one ILO, and there has only been one ILO.

I believe that if a cross section of every country in the world could sit down at breakfast, such as you are having here, and talk to each other so they can understand each other in a common language, we would never have any trouble in the world.

You know, honest men, when the facts are all in sight, never have any difficulty agreeing as to what the decision ought to be. It is my duty, as President of the United States, to make the decisions, because I can't pass the buck to anybody; and if I can get all the facts, I have found that the decisions that I make as a result of the facts are satisfactory to everybody.

Now, I think this organization is in a position to do more for peace in the world than any other organization of its kind in the world, as I said a while ago.

I want to pay a tribute to Mr. Phelan, retiring president, or presiding officer, or whatever he is called, because he has built this organization up over the 29 years that he has been in charge of it. He came to the White House and invited me to come to this breakfast, and I told him that I thought I would be so busy I couldn't possibly get here. Well, I have been so busy that I managed to get here, incidentally, because I decided to accept a degree from the University of California yesterday, and it became convenient for me to come over here. And I am certainly happy that I have had that opportunity.

This organization is represented from the United States by business and labor and government. Mr. Morse and Senator THOMAS—a great Senator from Utah—Mr. Morse, the Under Secretary and Acting Secretary of Labor, are representatives of the Government of the United States. Mr. Zellerbach represents the business cross section of the United States, and Mr. Fenton represents labor in the United States.

If we could get congresses together representing all those organizations—and I think probably it might be well to add another organization, since this is Sunday morning—we ought to have a cross section of religion in the world, a religion founded on a moral code.

I, the other day, was instrumental in starting a stamp sale dedicating the death of four chaplains in this Second World War, and those four chaplains represented Catholics, Protestants, and Jews. And those four chaplains, when their ship was sinking, handed out all the life preservers that were available in the box, and then took off their own and gave their lives that four young men might be saved.

Now you cannot witness, or hear about a thing of that kind, without understanding that the heart of the ordinary man is right. And that is what I want to impress upon you this morning, that when your heart is right, and you want to do only what is right, you will have plenty of help and assistance in doing it.

We want peace—peace. We want peace in the world. We want every country in the world to have the necessities of life, to be able to live with its neighbors on a basis of doing as you would be done by.

If we can accomplish that, there will be no difficulty whatever about our getting along in the world. I tried to make that perfectly clear yesterday over at the stadium, and I believe that we are approaching that sort of a situation in the world. The United Nations is just a fundamental start in understanding. The United Nations some day will come out just as the United States came out after 1787 when they adopted the Constitution of the United States. It took 80 years to implement that Constitution, and if we can get the United Nations to work as a court of justice, in which all the difficulties between the United Nations can be settled as we settle them between States in the United States, we will have no difficulty whatever, and never, never will we have to use this atomic release for anything but the welfare of mankind. That's all I am interested in. I want to see that the results of the good things that came out of this terrible war through which we went are used in the future for the welfare of mankind, and not for its destruction. That is the only ambition I have. That is the only ambition I have ever had. And if you read the record, you will find that that is what I have been working for ever since I was unforunate enough to be President of the United States on the death of one of the greatest Presidents the country ever had—Franklin Roosevelt.

If I can carry out the policies which he and I discussed a month or so before he died, there will be peace in the world. You people are making a great contribution.

It has been a pleasure to come over here and preach a Sunday morning sermon to you. [Applause.]

A Challenge to Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, June 15), 1948

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "A Challenge to Freedom" delivered by me at the Columbus Day banquet of the Progressive Club of Minneapolis, at Minneapolis, Minn., on October 11, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is altogether fitting, at this dinner on the eve of the four hundred and fifty-fifth anniversary of the landing of Columbus at Cat Island in the Caribbean, to talk about freedom.

Not only did Christopher Columbus, both in his unconquerable spirit and in his willingness to assume great risks and responsibilities in order to prove his ideas, exemplify the spirit of freedom. But whether by chance or divine design, this land America, which his discovery opened to settlement, became the greatest experiment in freedom for individual men and women recorded in history.

For centuries America has been the haven for the oppressed and persecuted of other lands, drawn here by the freedom and opportunity our system offered to all, and driven here to escape arbitrary and dictatorial systems in their home lands. That freedom is our most priceless heritage, and it is our task to guard it against the grave threats which it faces in our time.

The truly dangerous challenge to freedom today does not come from the big and little tyrants who rule so many nations and are striving constantly to enslave more millions. That is an obvious threat, easy to recognize and relatively simple to meet.

The real challenge to freedom comes from the numerous political groups, in America and elsewhere, who want to make it the primary function of government to guarantee complete security for everyone instead of to assure everyone equal opportunity and the maximum freedom consistent with the same freedom for all others.

By "freedom," I mean freedom for the individual. There is no other kind. Freedom means nothing in relation to groups or organizations. And I mean both political and economic freedom. The two are inseparable. Economic freedom is the individual's right to choose his own occupation, to spend his own earnings as he pleases, to own property and use it as he pleases, subject only to the rules protecting the rights of his fellow men.

Whoever can dictate to an individual how and where he may earn his livelihood can dictate also his political beliefs. That the Communists know this well is demonstrated by the way they seized economic control first in Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Poland, and then proceeded at their leisure to liquidate political opposition.

To estimate the magnitude of the challenge to freedom today, one need only survey the history of the past 600 years. From the Magna Carta until the turn of this century, individual rights and freedoms were increasing in nearly every land on earth. Since then individual freedom has been blotted out completely in one nation after another, and is steadily shrinking in many others.

But let's look at the converse of the picture. Until the turn of this century, the individual's security, both economic and political, likewise was increasing throughout the world, which enjoyed its first century of comparative peace and freedom from war. Our economic security was not perfect, true. We had depressions. Businessmen went broke and workers had difficulty finding jobs at times. But compared to any other period in history, people generally enjoyed unprecedented security and with it more freedom than ever before during the nineteenth century. Mankind had tapped the greatest resource on earth, the initiative and enterprise of millions of individuals, simply by freeing them from petty and arbitrary restraints. Freedom and security grew hand in hand.

But along toward 1900, many men, some of them well-meaning individuals and others simply greedy for power, began to lecture us so vehemently about the few faults and weaknesses in our free system, that they and many of us forgot about the enormous benefits it had brought to all people.

Sometimes by force, but more often by promises of economic security in return for power over our lives, these leaders gained control of one nation after another. The result since 1900 has been not only a steady curtailment of freedom throughout the world, but also growing insecurity, starvation for millions, and one great war after another.

The promises of those who told us that we must relinquish some freedom in return for security have been proven false again and again. But heedless of this plain lesson of history, millions of Americans seem to have forgotten that freedom and security are inseparable, that they must grow hand in hand. They listen to the siren promises of all the little political groups seeking power, who pay lip service to freedom, while at the same time advocating a whole series of measures, like socialized medicine, price control, planned production and Government subsidies, which are sure in the end to liquidate freedom.

Just in case you are thinking that I am talking only about some union leaders who cannot see the tyrannical limitation of freedom in the closed shop and secondary boycott, or the bureaucrats who are convinced they can regulate our production and consumption much better through Government planning than we do it ourselves through a free market, let me remind you that business executives are no different from these other groups in their forgetfulness of freedom. Every time any businessman sells out to monopoly, tries to rig a free market, or comes pleading to Washington for a high tariff or a subsidy to protect him from the

rigors of free competition, he is undermining a free system just as effectively as are the blind union leaders and bureaucrats.

I have seen union contracts signed by businessmen in which they literally signed away control of their own businesses. And those men profess to believe in free enterprise. I know all the alibis; about how one cannot fight if his competitors don't; the danger of bankruptcy; the power arrayed on the other side. But where would you and I be if our forefathers had listened to the same kind of alibis in 1775? If you believe in freedom and a free system, you fight for it, without alibis. You don't sell your birthright for a mess of economic-security pottage.

Let me make this clear. We in Congress can do our share, and are doing it, by writing into the law proper safeguards for freedom. But if individual Americans, employers and employees alike, no longer have the will or the courage to fight for their rights and freedoms, then all the laws in the world will not save them. That is why it is tough to be free, much tougher than to be slaves.

The paramount political issue facing the United States this year, in the 1948 campaign, and probably for decades to come, is whether we shall solve our domestic problems by methods that expand or contract the sum total of freedoms and opportunities enjoyed by all of us as individuals.

There are only two ways in which a modern industrial society can solve the complicated problems which constantly arise as this or that group acquires too great economic or political power and begins to trample on the freedoms and opportunities of others.

One way is simply to state the problem and delegate the power to solve it, by telling individuals what they must and cannot do, to some Government bureau. That is the modern version of the divine right of kings and is first cousin to the dictatorships of the twentieth century in Germany, Italy, and Russia.

The other way, and the one which the United States has followed, with some digressions, for the past 150 years, whenever our economic or social system gets out of balance (usually because some group has gained sufficient power to rig the free market), is to readjust it by redefining in laws, explicit and applying equally to all, the rights and obligations of individuals and organizations. This is the more difficult way, but all history demonstrates that it is the only way which in the end will safeguard our individual freedoms.

We adopted the first method in order to mobilize our economy for the Second World War, because we didn't have time to do the job the safer way, and because there is no workable way to fix prices or allocate production directly in a law. The power must be delegated. But how the little authoritarian groups which have attached themselves, like barnacles, to our free system screamed when Congress began to liquidate these dictatorial controls on freedom. They showed their real philosophy then.

The first session of the Eightieth Congress, and I am proud that it was under Republican leadership, devoted itself to the second and only liberal method of solving our problems. In that session, we liquidated most war controls, we trimmed down the funds and powers of Government bureaus, and we freed employees, small employers, and the public from the autocratic and irresponsible dictation of some union leaders.

A free society is always dynamic, changing. New problems are constantly arising as centers of power shift, and as political and economic power becomes concentrated in dangerous proportions in certain groups or individuals. It is the function of liberal government in a free society to solve such problems by laws, as we solved the monopoly problem as it then existed in the Sherman and Clayton Acts. Those acts are not adequate now, and we need to overhaul them again.

The original National Labor Relations Act was necessary to restore a free and fair market for their labor to employees in mass-production industries, where one employee bargaining alone had no chance against the boss. In the same way, the Taft-Hartley Act was necessary to protect employees, employers, and the public from irresponsible abuse of power which had been concentrated in a few union leaders.

Liberal government also has an obligation to undertake public works too big for local government or private enterprise and, insofar as possible, to make sure that opportunities are equal for all people. It is in carrying out the latter function that nearly all our State governments provide equalizing aids for education, that the Federal Government is now considering grants to equalize education among the States, and that we are considering legislation to strengthen public-health services and more nearly equalize opportunity in that field.

Beyond these functions of government, which are primarily to make sure the rules apply equally to all and assure equality of opportunity to all, it is the responsibility of the individual in a free society to achieve his own standard of living by his own initiative and effort.

That is the philosophy of government to which I am committed and to which the Republican Party by its record in the Eightieth and other Congresses is committed. It is not a philosophy which worships either the status quo, or change just for the sake of change. It is rooted in the faith that the ideas, initiative, and creative energy which are within all individuals are by all odds our richest resource once they are freed from petty, arbitrary, and monopolistic restraints.

The CIO Political Action Committee, the Progressive Citizens of America, the Americans for Democratic Action, the Communists and fellow travelers, and all the other front organizations trying to socialize America have an entirely different concept and philosophy of government.

They want government to do everything for everybody; to guarantee jobs for all regardless of individual effort, to fix wages and prices, to decide what and how much of everything we should produce, and to provide food, shelter and clothing for all, regardless of individual effort, at the high standards the rest of us achieve only by sweat and toil.

They want to change our social security system from its sound function of providing a minimum floor under living standards, which we are productive enough to afford, into a guaranty of high living standards for everyone, regardless of effort.

To see what will happen to the United States if we listen to the false promises of these front organizations who want government to make all our decisions for all of us, we need only look across the Atlantic to England. There the Labor government's experiment in socialism has so weakened individual incentive to produce that one of the world's greatest powers is facing economic bankruptcy and its people suffer greater privations than in the midst of world war. Some of England's trouble may be due to war damage, but it is significant that Belgium and Holland, who suffered as much or more damage but did no socialistic experimenting, are not facing bankruptcy.

And what is the solution proposed for England by the Government planners whose tinkering with a free economy is responsible for her crisis? More of the same. More and more government compulsion and control and less and less individual freedom.

Just in case you think the socialistic authoritarians in England are different from the United States brand, let me recall to you the fall of 1946, when we had a meat famine because farmers were so disgusted with OPA controls they would not market their livestock. Do you remember the remedy proposed by some of our CIO-PAC leaders, who were not quite so smooth in masking their real philosophy as the others? It was to have government seize the cattle and hogs on the farms. In other words, when a little government control fails to produce, as it inevitably does, the authoritarians' solution is always more control and more compulsion.

I earnestly hope that seeing England resort to drafting men, telling them for whom and for what they must work or starve, will wake up some of our people in America, who have been supporting various socialistic schemes and planned economy programs in the belief that they could have a government do everything for everybody without having it also tell everybody what they must and cannot do.

I have deliberately used socialism and a planned economy as synonymous because they are the same thing in reality. The socialists aim at government ownership and operation of all production and distribution. The planned-economy advocates would leave ownership technically in private hands, but have the government bureaus granted power to dictate every detail of operation. Either system adds up to government dictation, one by the Nazi pattern, and the other by the Communist pattern.

Typical of the kind of proposals supported by both groups are the Wagner-Murray-Dingle bill to socialize medicine and make health insurance compulsory for all of us, the Kilgore bill to concentrate control of all scientific research in the Federal Government, the Pepper bill to fix the minimum wage at 75 cents an hour, which is ridiculous as a minimum and gets the Government into wage fixing. Their opposition to removal of war controls, and their advocacy of all kinds of autocratic, self-contained authorities modeled on TVA are other examples.

The greatest hoax of this century is the theory that socialism, straight or modified, is the alternative which will save us from communism. What these naive theorists overlook is that political dictatorship, whether Fascist or Communist, is simply the political counterpart of a socialist economic system. One concentrates absolute economic power in the state, the other, absolute political power. That is the way it worked in Italy, Germany, and Russia. That is the way, unfortunately, it is working today in England.

Most of us work and produce in the hope of reward. Remove that incentive, and inevitably society must turn to compulsion to make people produce, which is exactly what England is doing. Personally, I do not think the English people will tolerate it much longer, unless they are so tired from two wars that their will to be free has been fatally weakened.

It amuses me to hear our socialists and planned-economy advocates criticize some of the little private monopolies, which do gum up our free economy and should be curbed. I don't like monopolies and I am thankful that we began fighting them 50 years ago, before they got too big to handle. But how these same people can advocate as a cure for these little monopolies one gigantic state monopoly of everything is beyond me. Their logic is as false as their promises.

I hope that this fundamental issue of individual freedom is presented clearly and without equivocation to the American people—in the national campaign next year so that we can make a real choice.

One of the issues which clearly involves this fundamental philosophy of freedom is the Taft-Hartley Labor Relations Act. Despite all of the false charges and misrepresentations of that law, those who have studied it know that what it does fundamentally

is to restore a measure of economic freedom to individual employees and small employers. I am proud of my share in drafting and passing that act, because I am convinced that its major principles are absolutely essential to individual freedom in America.

Another problem which poses the same fundamental conflict in approach is housing. We all know there is a housing shortage, due largely to the lack of construction for four war years and several depression years, but partly to the fact that the industry has priced housing out of the reach of most of us.

What is the proper cure? It is not, as our authoritarian groups would have us believe, for the Government to step in to subsidize inflated prices with a huge building program of its own. It is not for the Government to continue any longer its shameful discrimination against individuals who were unfortunate enough to invest their savings in rental properties, simply because there are more tenants than landlords.

The end result of this approach is bound to be Government control and operation of the whole construction industry, which must remain free if we are to maintain a free economy because it is basic to most other industry.

The liberal solution is to crack the bottlenecks that have made construction a sick industry. The outmoded building codes in most cities, which increase costs unnecessarily 20 percent, the monopolistic closed shop, closed union, feather bedding, and secondary boycott practices which have made a mockery of a free labor market in the industry; and, finally, the monopolistic practices that keep construction material costs far too high. The first job, revising of municipal building codes, must be done locally. The second one, breaking up the union monopolies, Congress tackled in the Taft-Hartley Act. And the third, the business monopolies, is up to the administration, which so far has talked big against monopolies, but done very little about them.

The United States has achieved the greatest production and the highest standard of living of any people in the world because more than any other nation we have freed the individual initiative and enterprise of all the people. All the rest of the world, which has been experimenting for several decades with various socialistic and planned economy schemes, is now looking to America with its free system to help feed and clothe their people.

It is supreme irony that, despite these facts, we have a substantial political group in this country urging us to kill the goose that lays the golden eggs by traveling down the same socialistic path to stagnation, privation, and dictation. That is the great challenge to freedom today.

